

Donaldson divisors and spectral invariants

Yusuke Kawamoto

Abstract

We establish a comparison between spectral invariants for a symplectic manifold and a Donaldson divisor therein, and answer a question of Borman from 2012 on the reduction of Entov–Polterovich quasimorphisms, under a reasonable assumption. The method involves a quantitative interpretation of Biran–Khanevsky’s quantum Gysin sequence.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Historical context	2
1.2	Main result	3
1.3	Strategy	5
1.4	Acknowledgements	6
2	Preliminaries	6
2.1	Spectral invariant theory	7
2.2	Entov–Polterovich quasimorphisms and (super)heaviness	10
2.3	Donaldson divisors and Biran decomposition	12
2.4	Borman’s reduction of quasimorphisms	14
3	Proofs	16
3.1	Statement of the main result	16
3.2	Biran–Khanevsky’s quantum Gysin sequence	17
3.3	The connecting map of the quantum Gysin sequence	21
3.4	Floer–Gysin sequence	23
3.5	Filtered Floer–Gysin sequence	26
3.6	Completing the proof	27
4	Examples	31
4.1	Laurent and Novikov fields	31
4.2	Examples	32
5	Discussions	35
5.1	About the assumption	35
5.2	The Hamiltonian torus action case	36
	References	36

1 Introduction

1.1 Historical context

Since the seminal discovery of Donaldson [Don96] in the mid 1990s, a hypersurface Σ in a symplectic manifold (X, ω) that satisfies $PD([\Sigma]) = k[\omega]$ for some integer k , which we will refer to as a *Donaldson divisor*, became an important object in symplectic topology and had many fruitful consequences, e.g. Seidel’s proof of the Homological Mirror Symmetry conjecture for the quartic surfaces [Sei15]. One remarkable fact about Donaldson divisors is that its complement, i.e. $X \setminus \Sigma$, has a nice symplecto-geometric structure, namely the Liouville structure.

Biran noticed in the early 2000s that not only the complement of a Donaldson divisor but also the complement of the *skeleton* (which is, roughly speaking, the stable subset of the Liouville flow; see Section 2.3.3 for its precise definition) has a nice symplecto-geometric structure, namely the symplectic disk bundle:

$$X \setminus \Delta \xrightarrow{\cong} D\Sigma$$

where Δ denotes the skeleton and $D\Sigma$ is a symplectic disk bundle over Σ (see Section 2.3.3). This result is now known as the *Biran decomposition* and have found applications in symplectic embedding problems, Lagrangian rigidity phenomena [Bir01, Bir06].

In a different direction, around the same time as Biran’s discovery, Entov–Polterovich [EP03] brought a new insight to *Hofer geometry*, i.e. the study of the geometry of the group of Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms $\text{Ham}(X)^1$, which is a fundamental object of study in symplectic topology. Entov–Polterovich constructed *quasimorphisms* on $\text{Ham}(X)$ under some condition on the quantum cohomology ring (see Section 2.2), and this discovery triggered an extensive study of quasimorphisms in symplectic topology, which is summarized in Entov’s ICM-address [Ent14].

Borman [Bor12] made an interesting observation that given a Donaldson divisor Σ in X , quasimorphisms on $\widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X)$ get pulled-back to quasimorphisms on $\widetilde{\text{Ham}}(\Sigma)$ provided that the skeleton Δ is *small* (see Section 2.4 for the precise meaning of smallness), i.e. there is a map

$$\Theta^* : \{ \mu : \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : \text{quasimorphism} \} \rightarrow \{ \mu : \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(\Sigma) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : \text{quasimorphism} \}. \quad (1.1.1)$$

Note that Borman’s result concerns not only quasimorphisms of the Entov–Polterovich-type but all quasimorphisms on $\widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X)$. However, it was not clear if Entov–Polterovich-type quasimorphisms on $\widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X)$ get pulled-back to Entov–Polterovich-type quasimorphisms on $\widetilde{\text{Ham}}(\Sigma)$:

Question 1.1.1 (Borman’s question, [Bor12, Bor13]). *Let (X, Σ) be a pair of a symplectic manifold and a Donaldson divisor². Suppose that there is an Entov–Polterovich quasimorphism for X*

$$\mu_X^{EP} : \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}.$$

¹Its universal lift is denoted by $\widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X)$.

²Borman defines Donaldson divisors slightly differently; see Definition 2.3.1

Is the pulled-back quasimorphism

$$\Theta^* \mu_X^{EP} : \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(\Sigma) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

an Entov–Polterovich quasimorphism, i.e. does there exist an Entov–Polterovich quasimorphism for Σ

$$\mu_\Sigma^{EP} : \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(\Sigma) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

such that

$$\Theta^* \mu_X^{EP} = \mu_\Sigma^{EP}?$$

The difficulty of this question comes from the fact that there is no natural ring homomorphism between $QH(X)$ and $QH(\Sigma)$, and there is no progress on this question since it was posed in the early 2010s. Note that there is some ambiguity in the Borman’s question as a priori, it is not clear whether the quantum cohomology rings of the symplectic manifolds X and Σ satisfy the condition which guarantees the existence of Entov–Polterovich quasimorphisms on X and Σ .

1.2 Main result

The main aim of this paper is to answer Question 1.1.1. Once again, we emphasize that in Borman’s question, it is not clear whether the quantum cohomology rings of the symplectic manifolds X and Σ satisfy the condition which allows one get an Entov–Polterovich quasimorphism.

We now state the main result of the paper which positively answers Borman’s question under a reasonable condition.

Theorem A. *Let (X, Σ) be a pair of a closed monotone symplectic manifold and a Donaldson divisor. Assume that there is a monotone Lagrangian torus L in Σ whose superpotential W_L has a non-degenerate critical point as well as its lifted monotone Lagrangian torus \tilde{L} . Then, there exists an Entov–Polterovich quasimorphism for X*

$$\mu_X^{EP} : \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

for which the skeleton Δ is small with respect to μ_X^{EP} and the pulled-back quasimorphism $\Theta^* \mu_X^{EP}$ is an Entov–Polterovich quasimorphism for Σ , i.e. there exist an Entov–Polterovich quasimorphism for Σ

$$\mu_\Sigma^{EP} : \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(\Sigma) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

such that

$$\Theta^* \mu_X^{EP} = \mu_\Sigma^{EP}.$$

REMARK 1.2.1.

1. Theorem B states the same result more precisely but with some notions from the preliminary section (Section 2).

2. We believe that the condition in Theorem A is optimal, i.e. whenever there is an Entov–Polterovich quasimorphisms on X for which the skeleton Δ is small, there are monotone Lagrangian tori L and \tilde{L} as in Theorem A, c.f. [Aur07, Conjecture 1.1]. See Section 5 for a discussion on this.
3. It is possible that the second condition in Theorem A follows automatically from the first condition by the work of Diogo–Tonkonog–Vianna–Wu [DTVW]. See Section 5 for further remarks.

In order to illustrate Theorem A, we list some examples to which Theorem A applies. For further information and more detailed remarks concerning examples in Example 1.2.2, see Section 4.

EXAMPLE 1.2.2.

1. $(X, \Sigma) = (\mathbb{C}P^n, \mathbb{C}P^{n-1})$: There are (unique) Entov–Polterovich quasimorphisms $\mu_{\mathbb{C}P^n}^{\text{EP}}, \mu_{\mathbb{C}P^{n-1}}^{\text{EP}}$ for $\mathbb{C}P^n, \mathbb{C}P^{n-1}$, respectively. The skeleton for the pair $(\mathbb{C}P^n, \mathbb{C}P^{n-1})$ is a point which satisfies the *smallness condition*. Thus, Borman’s reduction theorem is applicable and $\Theta^* \mu_{\mathbb{C}P^n, \text{EP}}$ is a quasimorphism for $\mathbb{C}P^{n-1}$, which we do not know at this point whether or not it is of Entov–Polterovich-type. The assumption of Theorem A is satisfied for the pair of Lagrangian tori ($\tilde{L} = T_{\text{Clif}}^n, L = T_{\text{Clif}}^{n-1}$) and thus Theorem A implies that the following holds:

$$\Theta^* \mu_{\mathbb{C}P^n}^{\text{EP}} = \mu_{\mathbb{C}P^{n-1}}^{\text{EP}}$$

up to a constant factor.

2. $(X, \Sigma) = (S^2 \times S^2, \Delta := \{(x, x) \in S^2 \times S^2\} \simeq S^2)$: Note that this is merely the $n = 2$ case of the next example $(X, \Sigma) = (Q^n, Q^{n-1})$ but we decided that it is still instructive to treat this case differently. There are two Entov–Polterovich quasimorphisms for $S^2 \times S^2$ and only one for Δ . We denote them by $\mu_{S^2 \times S^2, \pm}^{\text{EP}}$ and $\mu_{S^2}^{\text{EP}}$. The skeleton for the pair $(S^2 \times S^2, \Delta)$ is the anti-diagonal

$$\overline{\Delta} := \{(x, -x) \in S^2 \times S^2\}$$

which satisfies the *smallness condition* for $\mu_{S^2 \times S^2, +}^{\text{EP}}$ but not for $\mu_{S^2 \times S^2, -}^{\text{EP}}$. Thus, Borman’s reduction theorem is applicable only to $\mu_{S^2 \times S^2, +}^{\text{EP}}$ and $\Theta^* \mu_{S^2 \times S^2, +}^{\text{EP}}$ is a quasimorphism for $\Delta \simeq S^2$, which we do not know at this point whether or not it is of Entov–Polterovich-type. The assumption of Theorem A is satisfied for the pair of Lagrangian tori ($\tilde{L} = T_{\text{Ch}}^2, L = S_{\text{equator}}^1$) and thus Theorem A implies that the following holds:

$$\Theta^* \mu_{S^2 \times S^2, +}^{\text{EP}} = \mu_{S^2}^{\text{EP}}$$

up to a constant factor.

3. $(X, \Sigma) = (Q^n, Q^{n-1})$ where

$$Q^n := \{[z_0 : z_1 : \cdots : z_{n+1}] \in \mathbb{C}P^{n+1} \mid z_0^2 + z_1^2 + \cdots + z_{n+1}^2 = 0\},$$

$$Q^{n-1} := \{z \in Q^n : z_{n+1} = 0\} :$$

There are two Entov–Polterovich quasimorphisms each for Q^n and Q^{n-1} , which we denote by $\mu_{Q^n, \pm}^{\text{EP}}$ and $\mu_{Q^{n-1}, \pm}^{\text{EP}}$. The skeleton for the pair (Q^n, Q^{n-1}) is

$$S^n := \{z \in Q^n \mid z_0^2 + \cdots + z_n^2 + z_{n+1}^2 = 0, z_0, \dots, z_n \in \mathbb{R}, z_{n+1} \in i\mathbb{R}\}$$

which satisfies the *smallness condition* for $\mu_{Q^n, +}^{\text{EP}}$ but not for $\mu_{Q^n, -}^{\text{EP}}$. Thus, Borman’s reduction theorem is applicable only to $\mu_{Q^n, +}^{\text{EP}}$ and $\Theta^* \mu_{Q^n, +}^{\text{EP}}$ is a quasimorphism for Q^{n-1} , which we do not know at this point whether or not it is of Entov–Polterovich-type. The assumption of Theorem A is satisfied for the pair of Lagrangian tori $(\tilde{L} = T_{\text{GZ}}^n, L = T_{\text{GZ}}^{n-1})$ (see [Kaw23, Theorem B(1)]) and thus Theorem A implies that the following holds:

$$\Theta^* \mu_{Q^n, +}^{\text{EP}} = \mu_{Q^{n-1}, +}^{\text{EP}}$$

up to a constant factor.

4. $(X, \Sigma) = (\mathbb{C}P^3, Q^2)$: For $\mathbb{C}P^3$, there is a unique Entov–Polterovich quasimorphism $\mu_{\mathbb{C}P^3}^{\text{EP}}$, and for Q^2 , there are two Entov–Polterovich quasimorphisms, $\mu_{Q^2, \pm}^{\text{EP}}$. The skeleton for the pair $(\mathbb{C}P^3, Q^2)$ is $\mathbb{R}P^3$ which satisfies the *smallness condition* for $\mu_{\mathbb{C}P^3}^{\text{EP}}$. Thus, Borman’s reduction theorem is applicable to $\mu_{\mathbb{C}P^3}^{\text{EP}}$ and $\Theta^* \mu_{\mathbb{C}P^3}^{\text{EP}}$ is a quasimorphism for Q^2 , which we do not know at this point whether or not it is of Entov–Polterovich-type. The assumption of Theorem A is satisfied for the pair of Lagrangian tori $(\tilde{L} = T_{\text{Ch}}^3, L = T_{\text{Ch}}^2)$ and thus Theorem A implies that the following holds:

$$\Theta^* \mu_{\mathbb{C}P^3}^{\text{EP}} = \mu_{Q^2, +}^{\text{EP}}$$

up to a constant factor.

1.3 Strategy

We summarize our approach to prove Theorem A and explain some ideas behind it.

As Entov–Polterovich quasimorphisms, which are reviewed in Section 2.2, are constructed by Hamiltonian spectral invariants, the main point of Question 1.1.1 is to study the relation between the Hamiltonian spectral invariants for the symplectic manifold X and its Donaldson divisor Σ . The main difficulty to do that is that the Floer/quantum cohomologies of X and Σ are a priori not related, e.g. there is no natural homomorphism from one to the other.

However, Biran–Khanevsky [BK13] constructed a long exact sequence, which we call the *quantum Gysin sequence*, that relates Lagrangian Floer homologies of a Lagrangian L in the Donaldson divisor Σ and its lifted Lagrangian \tilde{L} in X :

$$\longrightarrow QH^*(L, \rho) \xrightarrow{i} QH^*(\tilde{L}, \tilde{\rho}) \xrightarrow{p} QH^{*-1}(L, \rho) \longrightarrow . \quad (1.3.1)$$

In Section 3.2, we will review the construction of the quantum Gysin sequence by enhancing it to a version with local systems. Biran–Khanevsky’s method is based on Biran–Cornea’s pearl theory and therefore, it is not suited to consider symplectic invariants that are defined through filtration in Floer homology such as spectral invariants.

In order to overcome this issue, we translate their construction into the language of Lagrangian Floer homology, namely we construct its Floer-theoretic counterpart which we call the *Floer–Gysin sequence*. Finally, by taking the action filtration into consideration, we get the *filtered Floer–Gysin sequence* (Section 3.5):

$$\longrightarrow HF_{\Sigma}^{\tau}(L, H) \xrightarrow{i_{Fl}} HF_X^{h(r_0)\tau+\varepsilon'}(\tilde{L}, \tilde{H}) \xrightarrow{p_{Fl}} HF_{\Sigma}^{\tau}(L, H) \longrightarrow, \quad (1.3.2)$$

which is compatible with Biran–Khanevsky’s quantum Gysin sequence. The reason why we do not work only with the Floer–Gysin sequence is that, some computations and arguments are easier to do with the pearl theory than with the Floer theory, c.f. Section 3.3.

Once we have established the filtered Floer–Gysin sequence (1.3.2), we study the relation between the Lagrangian spectral invariants of L and \tilde{L} . We can also relate the Lagrangian spectral invariants of L and \tilde{L} to the Hamiltonian spectral invariants of Σ and X , respectively, via the closed-open/open-closed maps. The following diagram might be enlightening to understand the approach:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \longrightarrow & HF_{\Sigma}^{\tau}(L, H) & \longrightarrow & HF_X^{h(r_0)\tau+\varepsilon'}(\tilde{L}, \tilde{H}) & \longrightarrow & HF_{\Sigma}^{\tau}(L, H) & \longrightarrow \\ & \uparrow \mathcal{CO}^0 & & \mathcal{CO}^0 \updownarrow \mathcal{CO}^0 & & \downarrow \mathcal{CO}^0 & \\ & HF_{\Sigma}^{\tau}(H) & & HF_X^{h(r_0)\tau+\varepsilon'}(\tilde{H}) & & HF_{\Sigma}^{\tau}(H) & . \end{array} \quad (1.3.3)$$

Through diagram (1.3.3), we can study the relation between the Hamiltonian spectral invariants of Σ and X . All this is done in Section 3.6.

Examples to which the main result applies are discussed in Example 1.2.2 and Section 4 where the latter contains more details.

1.4 Acknowledgements

I thank Paul Biran and Octav Cornea for useful discussions, and Kaoru Ono and Leonid Polterovich for their interesting comments and feedback at the Mittag–Leffler institute in 2022. This project was conducted at Université de Montréal while the author was a CRM-postdoctoral fellow at Centre de Recherches Mathématiques (CRM). The author thanks CRM for their hospitality.

2 Preliminaries

We start this section by precisizing some conventions that are sometimes implicit in the paper. We say that a symplectic manifold (X, ω) is an *integral* symplectic manifold if the symplectic form admits an integral lift, i.e. $[\omega] \in H^2(X; \mathbb{R})$ can be seen as an element of the integral cohomology $H^2(X; \mathbb{Z})$.

Unless otherwise mentioned, the symplectic manifolds and the Lagrangian submanifolds that we consider in the results/proofs are assumed to be monotone; a symplectic manifold (X, ω) and a Lagrangian submanifold L are monotone when there exist $\tau, \kappa > 0$ such that

$$\omega|_{\pi_2(X)} = \tau \cdot \mu_{CZ}|_{\pi_2(X)},$$

$$\omega|_{\pi_2(X,L)} = \kappa \cdot \mu_L|_{\pi_2(X,L)}$$

where μ_{CZ}, μ_L denote the Conley–Zehnder and Maslov indices, respectively.

2.1 Spectral invariant theory

It is well-known that on a closed symplectic manifold (X, ω) ³, for a non-degenerate Hamiltonian $H := \{H_t : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}_{t \in [0,1]}$ and a choice of a nice coefficient field Λ^\downarrow , such as the downward Laurent coefficients $\Lambda_{\text{Lau}}^\downarrow$ for the monotone case

$$\Lambda_{\text{Lau}}^\downarrow := \left\{ \sum_{k \leq k_0} b_k t^k : k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}, b_k \in \mathbb{C} \right\},$$

or the downward Novikov coefficients $\Lambda_{\text{Nov}}^\downarrow$ for the general case

$$\Lambda_{\text{Nov}}^\downarrow := \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j T^{\lambda_j} : a_j \in \mathbb{C}, \lambda_j \in \mathbb{R}, \lim_{j \rightarrow -\infty} \lambda_j = +\infty \right\},$$

one can construct a filtered Floer homology group $\{HF^\tau(H) := HF^\tau(H; \Lambda^\downarrow)\}_{\tau \in \mathbb{R}}$. Note that in this paper, we only use Novikov coefficients, i.e.

$$\Lambda^\downarrow = \Lambda_{\text{Nov}}^\downarrow.$$

For two numbers $\tau < \tau'$, the groups $HF^\tau(H; \Lambda^\downarrow)$ and $HF^{\tau'}(H; \Lambda^\downarrow)$ are related by a map induced by the inclusion map on the chain level:

$$i_{\tau, \tau'} : HF^\tau(H; \Lambda^\downarrow) \longrightarrow HF^{\tau'}(H; \Lambda^\downarrow),$$

and especially we have

$$i_\tau : HF^\tau(H; \Lambda^\downarrow) \longrightarrow HF(H; \Lambda^\downarrow),$$

where $HF(H; \Lambda^\downarrow)$ is the Floer homology group. There is a canonical ring isomorphism called the Piunikhin–Salamon–Schwarz (PSS)-map [PSS96], [MS04]

$$PSS_{H; \Lambda} : QH(X, \omega; \Lambda) \xrightarrow{\sim} HF(H; \Lambda^\downarrow),$$

where $QH(X, \omega; \Lambda)$ denotes the quantum cohomology ring of (X, ω) with Λ -coefficients, i.e.

$$QH(X, \omega; \Lambda) := H^*(X; \mathbb{C}) \otimes \Lambda.$$

Here, Λ is the Novikov coefficients (the universal Novikov field) Λ_{Nov}

$$\Lambda_{\text{Nov}} := \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j T^{\lambda_j} : a_j \in \mathbb{C}, \lambda_j \in \mathbb{R}, \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda_j = +\infty \right\}.$$

³Although the results in this section hold for general closed symplectic manifolds, we will only be using the monotone case due to some Floer-theoretic constraints that will appear later, which is not from the spectral invariant theory.

From now on, we will always take the the universal Novikov field to set-up the quantum homology ring, so we will often abbreviate it by $QH(X, \omega)$, i.e.

$$QH(X, \omega) := QH(X, \omega; \Lambda_{\text{Nov}}).$$

The ring structure of $QH(X, \omega)$ is given by the quantum product, which is a quantum deformation of the intersection product

$$- * - : QH(X, \omega) \times QH(X, \omega) \rightarrow QH(X, \omega).$$

The spectral invariants, which were introduced by Schwarz [Sch00] and developed by Oh [Oh05] following the idea of Viterbo [Vit92], are real numbers $\{c(H, a) \in \mathbb{R}\}$ associated to a pair of a Hamiltonian H and a class $a \in QH(X, \omega)$ in the following way:

$$c(H, a) := \inf\{\tau \in \mathbb{R} : PSS_{H; \Lambda}(a) \in \text{Im}(i_\tau)\}.$$

REMARK 2.1.1. Although the Floer homology is only defined for a non-degenerate Hamiltonian H , the spectral invariants can be defined for any Hamiltonian by using the following *Hofer continuity property*:

$$\int_0^1 \min_{x \in X} (H_t(x) - G_t(x)) dt \leq c(H, a) - c(G, a) \leq \int_0^1 \max_{x \in X} (H_t(x) - G_t(x)) dt \quad (2.1.1)$$

for any $a \in QH(X, \omega)$, H and G .

Spectral invariants satisfy the *triangle inequality*: for Hamiltonians H, G and $a, b \in QH(X, \omega)$, we have

$$c(H, a) + c(G, b) \geq c(H \# G, a * b) \quad (2.1.2)$$

where $H \# G(t, x) := H_t(x) + G_t((\phi_H^t)^{-1}(x))$ and it generates the path $t \mapsto \phi_H^t \circ \phi_G^t$ in $\text{Ham}(X, \omega)$.

When we take the zero function as the Hamiltonian, we have the *valuation property*: for any $a \in QH(X; \Lambda) \setminus \{0\}$,

$$c(0, a) = \nu(a) \quad (2.1.3)$$

where 0 is the zero-function and $\nu : QH(X; \Lambda) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the natural valuation function

$$\begin{aligned} \nu : QH(X; \Lambda) &\rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ \nu(a) &:= \nu\left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j T^{\lambda_j}\right) := \min\{\lambda_j : a_j \neq 0\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.1.4)$$

Note that from the triangle inequality (2.1.2) and the valuation property (2.1.3), for any $a \in QH(X; \Lambda) \setminus \{0\}$, $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and a Hamiltonian H , we have

$$c(H, \lambda \cdot a) = c(H, a) + \nu(\lambda). \quad (2.1.5)$$

Analogous invariants for Lagrangian Floer homology, namely the Lagrangian spectral invariants, were defined in [Lec08, LZ18, FOOO19, PS]. We summarize some basic

properties of Lagrangian spectral invariants from these references. Once again, given a pair of a (non-degenerate) Hamiltonian H and a class $a \in HF(L)$ ⁴, we define

$$\ell(H, \alpha) := \inf\{\tau \in \mathbb{R} : PSS_{L,H}(\alpha) \in \text{Im}(i_\tau^L)\}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} PSS_{L,H} : HF(L) &\rightarrow HF(L, H), \\ i_\tau^L : HF^\tau(L, H) &\rightarrow HF^\tau(L, H). \end{aligned}$$

In this paper, we pay particular attention to the case where $\alpha = 1_L$. In this case, we simply denote

$$\ell_L(H) := \ell(H, 1_L).$$

Analogously to the Hamiltonian case (c.f. (2.1.1)), we have the *Lagrangian control property* for ℓ_L :

$$\int_0^1 \min_{x \in L} H_t(x) dt \leq \ell_L(H) \leq \int_0^1 \max_{x \in L} H_t(x) dt \quad (2.1.6)$$

Properties analogous to (2.1.2), (2.1.3), (2.1.5) also hold for Lagrangian spectral invariants.

Note that both Hamiltonian and Lagrangian spectral invariants satisfy the homotopy invariance, i.e. if two normalized Hamiltonians H and G generate homotopic Hamiltonian paths $t \mapsto \phi_H^t$ and $t \mapsto \phi_G^t$ in $\text{Ham}(X, \omega)$, then

$$c(H, -) = c(G, -).$$

Thus, one can define spectral invariants on $\widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X, \omega)$:

$$\begin{aligned} c : \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X, \omega) \times QH(X, \omega) &\rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ c(\tilde{\phi}, a) &:= c(H, a) \end{aligned} \quad (2.1.7)$$

where the path $t \mapsto \phi_H^t$ represents the class of paths $\tilde{\phi}$. Similarly, one can define

$$\ell : \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X, \omega) \times HF(L) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}.$$

Hamiltonian and Lagrangian Floer homologies are related by the closed-open and open-closed maps

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{CO}^0 : QH(X, \omega) &\rightarrow HF(L), \\ \mathcal{OC}^0 : HF(L) &\rightarrow QH(X, \omega), \end{aligned} \quad (2.1.8)$$

which are defined by counting certain holomorphic curves. The closed-open map \mathcal{CO}^0 is a ring homomorphism and the open-closed map \mathcal{OC}^0 defines a module action. As they are defined by counting certain holomorphic curves, which have positive ω -energy, they have the following effect on spectral invariants.

Proposition 2.1.2 ([BC09, LZ18, FOOO19]). *Let H be any Hamiltonian.*

1. *For any $a \in QH(X, \omega)$, we have*

$$c(H, a) \geq \ell(H, \mathcal{CO}^0(a)).$$

2. *For any $\alpha \in HF(L)$, we have*

$$\ell(H, \alpha) \geq c(H, \mathcal{OC}^0(\alpha)).$$

⁴The Lagrangian Floer homology for L without a Hamiltonian term $HF(L)$ stands for the Lagrangian quantum cohomology [BC09], which is also written as $QH(L)$ in the literature.

2.2 Entov–Polterovich quasimorphisms and (super)heaviness

Based on spectral invariants, Entov–Polterovich built two theories, namely the theory of (Calabi) quasimorphisms and the theory of (super)heaviness, which we briefly review in this section.

Quasimorphisms. Entov–Polterovich constructed a special map on $\widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X, \omega)$ called the quasimorphism for under some assumptions. Recall that a quasimorphism μ on a group G is a map to the real line \mathbb{R} that satisfies the following two properties:

1. There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$|\mu(f \cdot g) - \mu(f) - \mu(g)| < C$$

for any $f, g \in G$.

2. For any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $f \in G$, we have

$$\mu(f^k) = k \cdot \mu(f).$$

The following is Entov–Polterovich’s construction of quasimorphisms on $\widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X, \omega)$.

Theorem 2.2.1 ([EP03]). *Suppose $QH(X, \omega; \Lambda)$ has a field factor, i.e.*

$$QH(X, \omega) = Q \oplus A$$

where Q is a field and A is some algebra. Decompose the unit 1_X of $QH(X, \omega)$ with respect to this split, i.e.

$$1_X = e + a.$$

Then, the asymptotic spectral invariant of $\tilde{\phi}$ with respect to e defines a quasimorphism, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{c}_e &= \zeta_e : \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X, \omega) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ \bar{c}_e(\tilde{\phi}) = \zeta_e(\tilde{\phi}) &:= \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{c(\tilde{\phi}^k, e)}{k} = \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{c(H^{\#k}, e)}{k} \end{aligned} \tag{2.2.1}$$

where H is any mean-normalized Hamiltonian such that the path $t \mapsto \phi_H^t$ represents the class $\tilde{\phi}$ in $\widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X, \omega)$.

REMARK 2.2.2. We refer to quasimorphisms on $\widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X, \omega)$ defined as (2.2.1) as Entov–Polterovich quasimorphisms. Notations \bar{c}_e, ζ_e are both used to denote an Entov–Polterovich quasimorphism.

REMARK 2.2.3. By slight abuse of notation, we will also see ζ_e as a function on the set of time-independent Hamiltonians:

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_e &: C^\infty(X) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ \zeta_e(H) &:= \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{c(H^{\#k}, e)}{k}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.2.2}$$

REMARK 2.2.4. The Lagrangian spectral invariants do not appear in the result of Entov–Polterovich, but we define the *asymptotic Lagrangian spectral invariants*, as we will use them later on in the proofs.

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\ell}_L &: \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X, \omega) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ \bar{\ell}_L &:= \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\ell(\tilde{\phi}^k, 1_L)}{k} \end{aligned} \tag{2.2.3}$$

Superheaviness. Entov–Polterovich introduced a notion of symplectic rigidity for subsets in (X, ω) called (super)heaviness.

Definition 2.2.5 ([EP09],[EP06]). *Take an idempotent $e \in QH(X, \omega)$ and denote the asymptotic spectral invariant with respect to e by ζ_e . A subset S of (X, ω) is called*

1. *e -heavy if for any time-independent Hamiltonian $H : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$\inf_{x \in S} H(x) \leq \zeta_e(H),$$

2. *e -superheavy if for any time-independent Hamiltonian $H : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$\zeta_e(H) \leq \sup_{x \in S} H(x).$$

REMARK 2.2.6. Note that if a set S is e -superheavy, then it is also e -heavy.

The following is an easy corollary of the definition of superheaviness which is useful.

Proposition 2.2.7 ([EP09]). *Assume the same condition on $QH(X, \omega)$ as in Theorem 2.2.1. Let S be a subset of X that is e -superheavy. For a time-independent Hamiltonian $H : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ whose restriction to S is constant, i.e. $H|_S \equiv r$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$\zeta_e(H) = r.$$

In particular, two disjoint subsets of (X, ω) cannot be both e -superheavy.

Proof. The first part is an immediate consequence of the definition of (super)heaviness. As for the second part, suppose we have two disjoint sets A, B in (X, ω) that are both e -superheavy. Consider a Hamiltonian H that is

$$H|_A = 0, \quad H|_B = 1.$$

Then, by superheaviness, we have

$$1 = \inf_{x \in B} H(x) \leq \zeta_e(H) \leq \sup_{x \in A} H(x) = 0,$$

which is a contradiction. □

We end this section by giving a criterion for heaviness, proved by Fukaya–Oh–Ohta–Ono (there are earlier results with less generality, c.f. [Alb05]) using the closed-open map

$$\mathcal{CO}^0 : QH(X, \omega) \rightarrow HF(L).$$

Theorem 2.2.8 ([FOOO19, Theorem 1.6]). *Assume $HF(L) \neq 0$. If*

$$\mathcal{CO}^0(e) \neq 0$$

for an idempotent $e \in QH(X, \omega)$, then L is e -heavy.

REMARK 2.2.9. When ζ_e is homogeneous, e.g. when e is a unit of a field factor of $QH(X, \omega)$ and ζ_e is an Entov–Polterovich quasimorphism, then heaviness and superheaviness are equivalent so Theorem 2.2.8 will be good enough to obtain the superheaviness of L .

2.3 Donaldson divisors and Biran decomposition

In this section, we briefly review the notion of Donaldson divisors in the sense of [BK13] and explain an associated decomposition result due to Biran [Bir01, Bir06]. We will also see a way to construct a Lagrangian submanifold in a closed symplectic manifold from a Lagrangian submanifold in its Donaldson divisor, c.f. Definition 2.3.1.

We first review the construction of symplectic disk bundles.

Let (Σ, σ) be an integral symplectic manifold. Take a complex line bundle

$$\mathcal{L} \longrightarrow \Sigma$$

such that

$$c_1(\mathcal{L}) = [\sigma].$$

Fix a hermitian metric $|\cdot|$ on \mathcal{L} and a hermitian connection ∇ such that the curvature form satisfies

$$R^\nabla = \frac{i}{2\pi}\sigma.$$

These datum determine the global angular form α^∇ , which satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha^\nabla|_{\text{Hor}^\nabla} &= 0, \\ \alpha^\nabla_{(u)}(u) &= 0, \forall u \in \mathcal{L}, \\ \alpha^\nabla_{(u)}(iu) &= \frac{1}{2\pi}, \forall u \in \mathcal{L}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.3.1}$$

where Hor^∇ denotes the horizontal distribution for ∇ . The global angular form α^∇ satisfies

$$d\alpha^\nabla = -\pi^*\sigma.$$

The following form, which will be called the canonical symplectic form on \mathcal{L} induced by (Σ, σ) , defines a symplectic structure on \mathcal{L} :

$$\omega_{\text{can}} := -d(e^{-r^2}\alpha^\nabla) = e^{-r^2}\pi^*\sigma + 2re^{-r^2}dr \wedge \alpha^\nabla. \tag{2.3.2}$$

The radius r part of the line bundle will be denoted as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\leq r} := \{u \in \mathcal{L} : |u| \leq r\}.$$

We now define Donaldson divisors.

Definition 2.3.1 ([BK13, Section 2.3]). *Let (X, ω) be a closed integral symplectic manifold. A smooth hypersurface Σ is called a Donaldson divisor if it satisfies the following properties:*

1. *The homology class $\Sigma \in H_{2n-2}(X; \mathbb{Z})$ is Poincaré dual to $k[\omega] \in H^2(X; \mathbb{Z})$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$.*
2. *There exists a tubular neighborhood U of Σ in X such that its closure is symplectomorphic to a standard symplectic disk bundle $(\mathcal{L}_\delta, \frac{1}{k}\omega_{\text{can}})$ over $(\Sigma, k\omega_\Sigma)$ for some $\delta > 0$, where ω_Σ denotes the restriction of ω to Σ .*
3. *The complement of \bar{U} in X , i.e. $X \setminus \bar{U}$ is a Weinstein domain.*

Note that the integer k that appear in the second column is called the *degree* of the Donaldson divisor. We introduce two important classes of facts that give important examples of Donaldson divisors.

EXAMPLE 2.3.2.

1. Let X be a smooth projective variety and let Σ be a smooth ample divisor. Denote the Kähler form ω , which represents $c_1(\mathcal{O}_X(\Sigma))$. Biran showed in [Bir01] that Σ is a Donaldson divisor of (X, ω) .
2. For any integral symplectic manifold (X, ω) and a sufficiently large $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a Donaldson divisor Σ such that $PD([\Sigma]) = k[\omega]$, c.f. [Don96, Gir02]

In order to emphasise that \mathcal{L} is a fibration over Σ , we will denote

$$\mathcal{L} := D\Sigma$$

from now on. Biran, in [Bir01], proved the following decomposition associated to a Donaldson divisor.

Theorem 2.3.3. *Let (X, ω) be a closed integral symplectic manifold and let Σ be a Donaldson divisor of degree k . Denote the canonical symplectic disk bundle associated to $(\Sigma, k\omega_\Sigma)$ by $(\mathcal{L}, \frac{1}{k}\omega_{\text{can}})$. There exists a symplectic embedding*

$$F : (D\Sigma, \frac{1}{k}\omega_{\text{can}}) \hookrightarrow (X, \omega)$$

such that

1. $F(x, 0) = x$ for all $x \in \Sigma$, where $(x, 0) \in D\Sigma$ corresponds to a point in the zero section of \mathcal{L} .
2. The set $\Delta := X \setminus F(D\Sigma)$ is a isotropic CW-complex with respect to ω .
3. $(X \setminus F(D\Sigma_r), \omega)$ is a Weinstein domain for all $r > 0$.
4. If the Weinstein manifold $X \setminus \Sigma$ is subcritical, then Δ does not contain any Lagrangian cell, thus $\dim(\Delta) < n = \frac{1}{2}\dim(X)$.

We now explain the Lagrangian circle bundle construction. Let L be a Lagrangian submanifold in Σ . Consider the radius $r > 0$ circle bundle associated to the line bundle $\mathcal{L} \rightarrow \Sigma$:

$$\mathcal{L}_{|u|=r} := \{u \in \mathcal{L} : |u| = r\}.$$

The set

$$\tilde{L}_r := \pi_{|u|=r}^{-1}(L), \quad \pi_{|u|=r} : \mathcal{L}_{|u|=r} \rightarrow \Sigma$$

defines a Lagrangian submanifold in \mathcal{L} , which is a circle bundle over L . Note that π_r denotes the restricted projection $\mathcal{L}_{|u|=r} \rightarrow \Sigma$. Via the symplectic embedding $F : (\mathcal{L}, \frac{1}{k}\omega_{\text{can}}) \hookrightarrow (X, \omega)$, we can see \tilde{L}_r as a Lagrangian submanifold in $X \setminus \Sigma$ or X , which we will always do in the sequel without mentioning.

When L is a monotone in Σ , then there is a distinguished radius $r_0 > 0$ for which the lifted Lagrangian submanifold \tilde{L} becomes also monotone in X and according to [BC09, Proposition 6.4.1], it satisfies

$$r_0^2 = \frac{2\kappa_L}{2\kappa_L + 1} \tag{2.3.3}$$

where κ_L is the monotonicity constant for L in Σ , i.e. $\omega_\Sigma|_{\pi_2(\Sigma, L)} = \kappa_L \cdot \mu_L|_{\pi_2(\Sigma, L)}$. We sometimes call the radius r_0 the monotone radius as well.

In the following, the lifted Lagrangian submanifold $\tilde{L} := \tilde{L}_{r_0}$ will always be this distinguished monotone Lagrangian submanifold in X .

REMARK 2.3.4. Given a Donaldson divisor Σ of degree k in (X, ω) , we have $PD([\Sigma]) = k[\omega]$. By rescaling the symplectic form, we can assume that the divisor satisfies $PD([\Sigma]) = [\omega]$ without loss of generality. We will always do this rescaling beforehand so that the various formulae related to symplectic disk bundles and the Biran decomposition become simpler.

2.4 Borman's reduction of quasimorphisms

In this section, we briefly review Borman's method from [Bor12] to construct quasimorphisms on $\widetilde{\text{Ham}}(\Sigma)$ from quasimorphisms on $\widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X)$ where X is a monotone symplectic manifold and Σ is a Donaldson divisor therein.

We can see Biran decomposition as a special case of symplectization of a contact manifold in the following way: Let (Y, α) be a compact contact manifold. Now, assume that the Reeb flow defines a free S^1 -action on Y . Then the quotient $\Sigma := Y/S^1$ is a symplectic manifold and $Y \rightarrow \Sigma$ defines a circle bundle. Now, the symplectization of (Y, α) , namely $(Y \times \mathbb{R}, d(e^r \alpha))$, is precisely the standard disk bundle over Σ . Now, given a Hamiltonian H on Σ , one can lift it to a Hamiltonian on X in the following way: take a smooth function

$$h : [0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

such that $h(0) = 1$ and it vanishes near $r = 1$, and is a decreasing function. Consider the function

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times D\Sigma &\rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ (t, x) &\mapsto h(\|x\|)H \circ \pi(x) \end{aligned} \tag{2.4.1}$$

where $\|x\| = h(x, x)^{1/2}$ is the radial coordinate of $x \in D\Sigma$ (with respect to the hermitian metric h) and $\pi : D\Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$ is the projection. This function can be regarded as a Hamiltonian on X via the symplectomorphism

$$F : D\Sigma \xrightarrow{\simeq} X \setminus \Delta$$

and the trivial extension over Δ . Denote the set of paths of Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms on a symplectic manifold M by $\mathcal{P}\text{Ham}(M)$:

$$\mathcal{P}\text{Ham}(M) := \{\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \text{Ham}(M) : \gamma(0) = \text{id}\}.$$

The extension of Hamiltonians on Σ to X described above defines a map

$$\Theta : \mathcal{P}\text{Ham}(\Sigma) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}\text{Ham}(X),$$

as elements of $\mathcal{P}\text{Ham}(\Sigma)$ (resp. $\mathcal{P}\text{Ham}(X)$) can be identified with mean-normalized Hamiltonians on Σ (resp. X). Borman proved the following.

Theorem 2.4.1 ([Bor12]). *Let (X, Σ) be a pair of a closed symplectic manifold and a Donaldson divisor. Assume that the skeleton Δ is small (see Definition 2.4.2). For any homogeneous quasimorphism*

$$\mu : \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R},$$

the map

$$\begin{aligned} & \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(\Sigma) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ \Theta^* \mu(\phi) & := \mu \circ p_X \circ \Theta \circ p_\Sigma^{-1}(\phi) \end{aligned} \tag{2.4.2}$$

is well-defined and defines a homogeneous quasimorphism on $\widetilde{\text{Ham}}(\Sigma)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} p_X : \mathcal{P}\text{Ham}(X) & \rightarrow \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X) = \mathcal{P}\text{Ham}(X)/\text{homotopy equiv.} \\ \gamma & \mapsto [\gamma] \end{aligned} \tag{2.4.3}$$

is the homotopy projection. The map p_Σ is defined analogously.

The following diagram summarises the reduction procedure:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{P}\text{Ham}(\Sigma) & \xrightarrow{\Theta} & \mathcal{P}\text{Ham}(X) \\ \downarrow p_\Sigma & & \downarrow p_X \\ \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(\Sigma) & & \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X) \xrightarrow{\mu} \mathbb{R}. \end{array} \tag{2.4.4}$$

Note that the proof of Theorem 2.4.1 uses only properties of quasimorphisms and does not appeal to Floer theory, thus it applies not only to Entov–Polterovich quasimorphisms and to any closed symplectic manifold without the monotonicity condition.

We precise the *smallness* condition.

Definition 2.4.2. *Let (X, Σ) be a pair of a closed symplectic manifold and a Donaldson divisor and*

$$\zeta : \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

a quasimorphism. The skeleton Δ is called small with respect to ζ if there exists a small neighborhood U of Δ such that ζ restricts to the Calabi homomorphism on U , i.e. for any Hamiltonian H supported in U , we have

$$\zeta(H) = \text{Cal}(H) := \int_{t=0}^1 \left(\int_X H(t, x) \omega^n \right) dt.$$

In practice, the following properties are useful to decide that the skeleton is small.

Proposition 2.4.3. *Let (X, Σ) be a pair of a closed symplectic manifold and a Donaldson divisor and*

$$\bar{\tau}_e : \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

an Entov–Polterovich quasimorphism. If either one of the following conditions holds, then the skeleton Δ is small with respect to $\bar{\tau}_e$:

1. *The complement of the skeleton $X \setminus \Delta$ is $\bar{\tau}_e$ -superheavy.*
2. *The skeleton Δ has $\bar{\tau}_e$ -measure zero:*

$$\tau_{\bar{\tau}_e}(\Delta) = 0.$$

For the proof of Proposition 2.4.3, see [EP09].

3 Proofs

3.1 Statement of the main result

We start by restating Theorem A with the notions from the preliminary section 2.

Theorem B. *Let (X, Σ) be a pair of a closed monotone symplectic manifold and a Donaldson divisor therein. Assume that the following conditions are satisfied:*

- *There exists a monotone Lagrangian torus L in Σ whose superpotential W_L has a non-degenerate critical point.*
- *The superpotential $W_{\tilde{L}}$ of the lifted monotone Lagrangian torus \tilde{L} in X also has a non-degenerate critical point.*

Then, there exist

1. *an idempotent $e_X \in QH(X)$ that is a unit of a field factor for which the skeleton Δ is small with respect to $\bar{\tau}_{e_X}$, and*
2. *an idempotent $e_\Sigma \in QH(\Sigma)$ that is a unit of a field factor and satisfies*

$$\Theta^* \bar{\tau}_{e_X} = \frac{1}{2\kappa_L + 1} \bar{\tau}_{e_\Sigma}$$

where Θ^ denotes Borman’s pull-back of quasimorphisms (1.1.1) and κ_L is the monotonicity constant for L in Σ , i.e. $\omega_\Sigma|_{\pi_2(\Sigma, L)} = \kappa_L \cdot \mu_L|_{\pi_2(\Sigma, L)}$.*

A sketch of the main ideas of the proof is given in Section 1.3.

3.2 Biran–Khanevsky’s quantum Gysin sequence

In this section, we briefly review Biran–Khanevsky’s quantum Gysin sequence [BK13] but upgrading it to the \mathbb{C} -coefficient equipped with \mathbb{C}^* -local systems. Another important difference with [BK13] is that, they work with general Lagrangians while we only work with Lagrangian tori. Throughout the section, let (X, Σ) be a pair of a closed monotone symplectic manifold and a Donaldson divisor therein. Consider a monotone Lagrangian torus L in Σ equipped with a local system ρ which is a non-degenerate critical point of the superpotential W_L (provided that it exists), which we sometimes denote (L, ρ) for clarity. Consider also a local system $\tilde{\rho}$ for the lifted monotone Lagrangian torus \tilde{L} in X that is a non-degenerate critical point of the superpotential $W_{\tilde{L}}$ (provided that it exists).

Now, consider a generic pearl data $\mathcal{D} := (f, g, J)$ for L in Σ (see Section ?? for definitions). We would like to define a nice almost complex structure \tilde{J} on X so that the projection $\pi : X \setminus \Delta \simeq D\Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$ becomes (\tilde{J}, J) -holomorphic, which will be crucial to relate holomorphic curves in X and Σ later on. First, we define an almost complex structure $\tilde{J}_{D\Sigma}$ on X as follows:

For $v \in \text{Hor}^\nabla$,

$$\tilde{J}_{D\Sigma}(v) := (d\pi|_{\text{Hor}^\nabla})^{-1} \circ J \circ d\pi(v) \quad (3.2.1)$$

and in the fiber component, define \tilde{J} to be multiplication by i , i.e. $\tilde{J}_{D\Sigma}|_{\text{Vert}^\nabla} = i$. Note that Hor^∇ and Vert^∇ denote the horizontal and vertical distributions, respectively, with respect to the connection ∇ which we defined in Section ?. Now, fix a small $\kappa > 0$ and see $\tilde{J}_{D\Sigma}$ an almost complex structure in $F((D\Sigma)_{r_0+\kappa}) \subset X$ by using the embedding

$$F : D\Sigma \xrightarrow{\cong} X \setminus \Delta$$

from the Biran decomposition (see Theorem 2.3.3). Extend this almost complex structure to the complement $X \setminus F((D\Sigma)_{r_0+\kappa})$ in a generic way and denote the resulting almost complex structure by \tilde{J} .

Biran–Khanevsky showed that by performing a neck-stretching to \tilde{J} , we get a set of almost complex structures $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$, whose elements are called the admissible almost complex structures, that satisfies the following property:

Proposition 3.2.1 ([BK13, Proposition 5.1]). *For any $\tilde{J} \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$, any \tilde{J} -holomorphic curve $u : D \rightarrow X$ is contained in $F((D\Sigma)_{r_0+\kappa})$.*

We refer the readers to [BK13, Section 5] for details concerning this property. With an admissible almost complex structure $\tilde{J} \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$, we define a pearl complex $C^*(\mathcal{D})$ for \tilde{L} with the pearl datum $\mathcal{D} := (\tilde{f}, \tilde{X}, \tilde{J})$ where \tilde{X} is a suitable almost gradient vector field that projects to X .

Biran–Khanevsky show that even though an admissible almost complex structure $\tilde{J} \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ is not a generic almost complex structure and therefore the general pearl theory is not directly applicable, the map

$$\tilde{d} : C^*(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow C^{*+1}(\mathcal{D}),$$

which is defined in the same way as the pearl differential for generic almost complex structures, is well-defined with an admissible almost complex structure $\tilde{J} \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ and

defines a cochain complex $(C^*(\mathcal{D}), \tilde{d})$ whose cohomology is isomorphic to the generic pearl homology $QH^*(\tilde{L})$.

We define the relevant maps to construct the quantum Gysin sequence.

Definition 3.2.2. *Define the maps i, p as follows:*

$$\begin{aligned} i : C(\mathcal{D}) &\rightarrow C(\tilde{\mathcal{D}}) \\ x &\mapsto x' \end{aligned} \tag{3.2.2}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} p : C(\tilde{\mathcal{D}}) &\rightarrow C(\mathcal{D}) \\ x' &\mapsto 0, \\ x'' &\mapsto x. \end{aligned} \tag{3.2.3}$$

We will prove that the maps i, p are chain maps. This statement was proven in [BK13, Section 7.3] but without local systems.

Proposition 3.2.3. *The maps i, p are both chain maps.*

Once Proposition 3.2.3 is proven, as the sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow C(\mathcal{D}) \xrightarrow{i} C(\tilde{\mathcal{D}}) \xrightarrow{p} C(\mathcal{D}) \longrightarrow 0 \tag{3.2.4}$$

is a short exact sequence, we get the following long exact sequence which we call the quantum Gysin sequence:

Corollary 3.2.4 (Quantum Gysin sequence). *We have the following long exact sequence:*

$$\xrightarrow{\delta} QH^*(L, \rho) \xrightarrow{i} QH^*(\tilde{L}, \tilde{\rho}) \xrightarrow{p} QH^{*-1}(L, \rho) \xrightarrow{\delta} . \tag{3.2.5}$$

Proof of Proposition 3.2.3. We only prove it for i as the argument is similar for p . We will prove

$$d_{\tilde{\rho}} \circ i = i \circ d_{\rho}. \tag{3.2.6}$$

We will use the following useful description of the pearl differential for monotone Lagrangians that admit a perfect Morse function due to Biran–Cornea [BC12]. Recall that we work with (Lagrangian) tori so this applies to our case. We start by explaining the setup. Let $f : L \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a perfect Morse function where L is a $k = n - 1$ -dimensional Lagrangian torus. Denote its critical points of index 1 by $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k=n-1}\}$. Each critical point in $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k=n-1}\}$ represents a class $\gamma_j \in H_1(L) := H_1(L; \mathbb{Z})/\text{Torsion}$ and moreover, $\{\gamma_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq k}$ provides a basis of $H_1(L)$.

Denote the superpotential for L by W_L

$$\begin{aligned} W_L &: \text{hom}(H_1(L), \mathbb{C}^*) \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \\ W_L(\rho) &:= \sum_{\mu(A)=2, A \in H_2(\Sigma, L)} \rho(\partial A) \cdot \#\mathcal{M}(J; A) \end{aligned} \tag{3.2.7}$$

and by using the basis of $H_1(L)$ given by $\{\gamma_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq k}$, we can express W_L in the following way:

$$W_L : \mathbb{C}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
W_L(z) &= \sum_{\mu(A)=2, A \in H_2(\Sigma, L)} z^{\partial A} \# \mathcal{M}(J; A) \\
&= \sum_{\mu(A)=2, A \in H_2(\Sigma, L)} z_1^{(\partial A)_1} z_2^{(\partial A)_2} \dots z_k^{(\partial A)_k} \# \mathcal{M}(J; A)
\end{aligned} \tag{3.2.8}$$

where z_j is a variable representing the loop γ_j and $(\partial A)_j$ are integers determined by

$$\partial A = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq k=n-1} (\partial A)_j \cdot \gamma_j \in H_1(L). \tag{3.2.9}$$

Biran–Cornea proved that the pearl differential of $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k=n-1}\}$ is expressed in a rather simple way using the superpotential.

Proposition 3.2.5 ([BC12, Proposition 3.3.1]). *Take any index 1 critical point x_j of $f : L \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We have*

$$d_\rho(x_j) = z_j \frac{\partial W_L}{\partial z_j} x_{\min} t \tag{3.2.10}$$

where x_{\min} denotes the minimizer of the function f .

REMARK 3.2.6.

Strictly speaking, Biran–Cornea deal with index $k - 1$ critical points but the idea, which we will explain shortly, is essentially the same as they work with homology while we are considering its cohomological counterpart.

The idea behind Proposition 3.2.5 is that, for degree reason and that f is a perfect Morse function, we have

$$d_\rho(x_j) = \sum_{\mu(A)=2} \rho(\partial A) \# \mathcal{P}(x_{\min}, x_j; A) x_{\min} t, \tag{3.2.11}$$

and because x_{\min} is a minimum of the Morse function f and x_j presents the class γ_j , $\# \mathcal{P}(x_{\min}, x_j; A)$ counts Maslov 2-disks of class A whose boundary ∂A has γ_j components. Thus

$$\# \mathcal{P}(x_{\min}, x_j; A) = (\partial A)_j \cdot \# \mathcal{M}(J; A). \tag{3.2.12}$$

Thus, by using the expression (3.2.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
d_\rho(x_j) &= \sum_{\mu(A)=2} \rho(\partial A) \# \mathcal{P}(x_{\min}, x_j; A) x_{\min} t \\
&= \sum_{\mu(A)=2} z_1^{(\partial A)_1} z_2^{(\partial A)_2} \dots z_k^{(\partial A)_k} \cdot (A)_j \cdot \# \mathcal{M}(J; A) x_{\min} t \\
&= z_j \frac{\partial W_L}{\partial z_j} x_{\min} t.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.2.13}$$

Now, we turn our focus to (X, \tilde{L}) and study the index 1 critical points of $\tilde{f} : \tilde{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of the type x' , which are precisely the lifts of the index 1 critical points of $f : L \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, namely $\{x'_1, x'_2, \dots, x'_{k=n-1}\}$. Note that there is another index 1 critical point of $\tilde{f} : \tilde{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ but of the type x'' , which is a lift of the index 0 critical point of $f : L \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, i.e.

the minimum, but we are not interested in this. We will prove that an analogous result of Proposition 3.2.5 continues to hold for $\{x'_1, x'_2, \dots, x'_{k=n-1}\}$, which does not hold for the other index 1 critical point x'' .

Claim 3.2.7. *Take any index 1 critical point x'_j . We have*

$$d_{\tilde{\rho}}(x'_j) = z_j \frac{\partial W_{\tilde{L}}}{\partial z_j} x'_{\min} t. \quad (3.2.14)$$

We will prove this claim. Notice that each of the critical points $\{x'_1, x'_2, \dots, x'_{k=n-1}\}$, just as $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k=n-1}\}$, represent a class in $H_1(\tilde{L})$, which we will denote by $\tilde{\gamma}_j$. Denote the class in $H_1(\tilde{L})$ represented by the fiber circle by $\tilde{\gamma}_n$. Now, $\{\tilde{\gamma}_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq n}$ provides a basis for $H_1(\tilde{L})$. Now, the superpotential for \tilde{L} with respect to to this basis will be

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\tilde{L}} : \mathbb{C}^n &\rightarrow \mathbb{C} \\ W_{\tilde{L}}(z) &= \sum_{\mu(A)=2, A \in H_2(X, \tilde{L})} z^{\partial A} \cdot \#\mathcal{M}(J; A) \\ &= \sum_{\mu(A)=2, A \in H_2(X, \tilde{L})} z_1^{(\partial A)_1} z_2^{(\partial A)_2} \dots z_n^{(\partial A)_n} \# \cdot \mathcal{M}(J; A) \end{aligned} \quad (3.2.15)$$

where complex variables z_j correspond to the class $\tilde{\gamma}_j$ and integers $(\partial A)_j$ are determined by

$$\partial A = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq n} (\partial A)_j \cdot \tilde{\gamma}_j \in H_1(\tilde{L}). \quad (3.2.16)$$

Once again, for degree reason, we have

$$d_{\tilde{\rho}}(x'_j) = \sum_{i(\tilde{x})=2} \#\mathcal{P}(\tilde{x}, x'_j; 0) \tilde{x} + \sum_{\mu(A)=2} \rho(\partial A) \#\mathcal{P}(x_{\min}, x'_j; A) x_{\min} t. \quad (3.2.17)$$

The difference between here and its counterpart for L is that, as \tilde{f} is no longer a perfect Morse function, we need to take into account the first term. The critical points satisfying $i(\tilde{x}) = 2$ are either of the type x' with $i(x) = 2$ or of the type x'' with $i(x) = 1$. Thus,

$$\sum_{i(\tilde{x})=2} \#\mathcal{P}(\tilde{x}, x'_j; 0) \tilde{x} = \sum_{i(x)=1} \#\mathcal{P}(x'', x'_j; 0) x'' + \sum_{i(x)=2} \#\mathcal{P}(x', x'_j; 0) x'. \quad (3.2.18)$$

As it is explained in [BK13, Section 7.2, equations 13, 14], one can show that

$$\mathcal{P}(x'', x'_j; 0) = \emptyset \quad (3.2.19)$$

and

$$\#\mathcal{P}(x', x'_j; 0) = \#\mathcal{P}(x, x_j; 0) = 0 \quad (3.2.20)$$

where the last equality (3.2.20) uses that $f : L \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is perfect. Thus, we conclude that

$$d_{\tilde{\rho}}(x'_j) = \sum_{\mu(A)=2} \rho(\partial A) \#\mathcal{P}(x_{\min}, x'_j; A) x_{\min} t. \quad (3.2.21)$$

Now, because x'_{\min} is a minimum of the Morse function \tilde{f} and x'_j presents the class $\tilde{\gamma}_j$, $\#\mathcal{P}(x'_{\min}, x'_j; A)$ counts Maslov 2-disks of class A whose boundary ∂A has $\tilde{\gamma}_j$ components. Thus

$$\#\mathcal{P}(x'_{\min}, x'_j; A) = (\partial A)_j \cdot \#\mathcal{M}(J; A). \quad (3.2.22)$$

Thus, from (3.2.15), we have

$$d_{\tilde{\rho}}(x'_j) = z_j \frac{\partial W_{\tilde{L}}}{\partial z_j} x'_{\min} t. \quad (3.2.23)$$

which proves Claim 3.2.7.

Now, we are ready to prove Proposition 3.2.3. As $H^*(\tilde{L}) = H^*(T^n)$ is generated by $H^1(\tilde{L}) = H^1(T^n)$ and x_j represents a class γ_j where $\{\gamma_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq k}$ forms a basis of $H_1(L)$, it is sufficient to prove

$$i \circ d_{\rho}(x_j) = d_{\tilde{\rho}} \circ i(x_j) \quad (3.2.24)$$

for any index 1 critical point x_j of f . From Proposition 3.2.5, the left hand side is

$$i \circ d_{\rho}(x_j) = i(z_j \frac{\partial W_L}{\partial z_j} x_{\min} t) = 0 \quad (3.2.25)$$

as we have taken a local system ρ that is a critical point of the superpotential W_L . Next, Claim 3.2.7, the right hand side is

$$d_{\tilde{\rho}} \circ i(x_j) = d_{\tilde{\rho}}(x'_j) = z_j \frac{\partial W_{\tilde{L}}}{\partial z_j} x'_{\min} t = 0 \quad (3.2.26)$$

as we have taken a local system $\tilde{\rho}$ that is a critical point of the superpotential $W_{\tilde{L}}$. Thus,

$$i \circ d_{\rho}(x_j) = d_{\tilde{\rho}} \circ i(x_j) = 0 \quad (3.2.27)$$

for any the index 1 critical point x_j of $f : L \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. This completes the proof of Proposition 3.2.3. \square

3.3 The connecting map of the quantum Gysin sequence

In this section we prove that the connecting map $QH(L, \rho) \rightarrow QH(L, \rho)$ in quantum Gysin sequence for the Lagrangian torus L is a zero map.

Proposition 3.3.1. *The connecting map δ of the quantum Gysin sequence*

$$\xrightarrow{\delta} QH^*(L, \rho) \xrightarrow{i} QH^*(\tilde{L}, \tilde{\rho}) \xrightarrow{p} QH^{*-1}(L, \rho) \xrightarrow{\delta} .$$

is a zero map, i.e.

$$\delta = 0.$$

Proof of Proposition 3.3.1. The connecting map satisfies the following ([BK13]): for classes $a, b \in QH(L, \rho)$,

$$\delta(a \cdot b) = \delta(a) \cdot b. \quad (3.3.1)$$

Thus, in order to prove Proposition 3.3.1, it suffices to prove that

$$e_q := \delta(1_L) = 0. \quad (3.3.2)$$

We work in the same setup as in Proposition 3.2.3 and use the same notation. By the definition of the connecting map and that the class 1_L is represented by the unique minimum x_{\min} of the function f , we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} e_q &= \delta(1_L) \\ &= [i^{-1} \circ d_{\tilde{\rho}} \circ p^{-1}(x_{\min})] \\ &= [i^{-1} \circ d_{\tilde{\rho}}(x''_{\min})] \\ &= [i^{-1}(\sum_{A,x'} \tilde{\rho}(\partial A) \# \mathcal{P}(x', x''_{\min}; A) x' t^{\bar{\mu}(A)} + \sum_{A,x''} \tilde{\rho}(\partial A) \# \mathcal{P}(x'', x''_{\min}; A) x'' t^{\bar{\mu}(A)})] \\ &= [i^{-1}(\sum_{A,x'} \tilde{\rho}(\partial A) \# \mathcal{P}(x', x''_{\min}; A) x' t^{\bar{\mu}(A)})] \end{aligned} \quad (3.3.3)$$

where the final equality uses the definition of the map i . For degree reasons, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{A,x'} \tilde{\rho}(\partial A) \# \mathcal{P}(x', x''_{\min}; A) x' t^{\bar{\mu}(A)} \\ &= \sum_{i(x')=2} \# \mathcal{P}(x', x''_{\min}; 0) x' + \sum_{\mu(A)=2, i(x')=0} \tilde{\rho}(\partial A) \# \mathcal{P}(x', x''_{\min}; A) x' t \\ &= \sum_{i(x')=2} \# \mathcal{P}(x', x''_{\min}; 0) x' + \left(\sum_{\mu(A)=2} \tilde{\rho}(\partial A) \# \mathcal{P}(x'_{\min}, x''_{\min}; A) \right) x'_{\min} t \end{aligned} \quad (3.3.4)$$

where the final equality uses that x'_{\min} is the unique index 0 critical point of \tilde{f} . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} e_q &= [i^{-1}(\sum_{i(x')=2} \# \mathcal{P}(x', x''_{\min}; 0) x')] + [i^{-1}(\sum_{\mu(A)=2} \tilde{\rho}(\partial A) \# \mathcal{P}(x'_{\min}, x''_{\min}; A) x'_{\min} t)] \\ &= e(\tilde{L}) + \left(\sum_{\mu(A)=2} \tilde{\rho}(\partial A) \# \mathcal{P}(x'_{\min}, x''_{\min}; A) \right) 1_L t \end{aligned} \quad (3.3.5)$$

where we used the Morse theoretic interpretation of the classical Gysin sequence ($e(\tilde{L})$ denotes the classical Gysin class for the S^1 -bundle $\tilde{L} \rightarrow L$) and $1_L = [x_{\min}]$. We know that $e(\tilde{L}) = 0$ (as \tilde{L} and L are tori), and

$$\sum_{\mu(A)=2} \tilde{\rho}(\partial A) \# \mathcal{P}(x'_{\min}, x''_{\min}; A) = z_n \frac{\partial W_{\tilde{L}}}{\partial z_n} \quad (3.3.6)$$

as similar reasons to what we have discussed in the proof of Proposition 3.2.3: because x'_{\min} is a minimum of the Morse function \tilde{f} and the Morse trajectory of \tilde{f} between x''_{\min} and x'_{\min} presents the class $\tilde{\gamma}_n$ of the fiber circle, $\# \mathcal{P}(x'_{\min}, x''_{\min}; A)$ counts Maslov 2-disks of class A whose boundary ∂A has $\tilde{\gamma}_n$ components. Thus

$$\#\mathcal{P}(x'_{\min}, x''_{\min}; A) = (\partial A)_n \cdot \#\mathcal{M}(\tilde{J}; A), \quad (3.3.7)$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\mu(A)=2} \tilde{\rho}(\partial A) \#\mathcal{P}(x'_{\min}, x''_{\min}; A) &= \sum_{\mu(A)=2} \tilde{\rho}(\partial A) (\partial A)_n \cdot \#\mathcal{M}(\tilde{J}; A) \\ &= z_n \frac{\partial W_{\tilde{L}}}{\partial z_n}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3.8)$$

Thus,

$$e_q = z_n \frac{\partial W_{\tilde{L}}}{\partial z_n} 1_{Lt} = 0 \quad (3.3.9)$$

as we chose a local system that is a critical point of the superpotential $W_{\tilde{L}}$. This completes the proof of Proposition 3.3.1. \square

3.4 Floer–Gysin sequence

The aim of this section is to construct a self-Floer theoretic analogy, which we refer to the Floer–Gysin sequence, of the quantum Gysin sequence we have seen in Section 3.2.

First of all, notice that the lifted Hamiltonians considered by Borman (2.4.1) are degenerate (Hamiltonian chords of $h \cdot \pi^* H$ from \tilde{L} to itself appear in S^1 -families) and thus are not suitable for Floer theory. Thus, we slightly perturb them in the following way to make them non-degenerate:

$$\tilde{H} := \left(\varepsilon h(r) \sum_j (\nu_j \circ \pi) f(\theta) \right) \wedge (h(r)(H \circ \pi)) \quad (3.4.1)$$

which is a concatenation of

$$h(r)(H \circ \pi) \quad (3.4.2a)$$

$$F(x) := \varepsilon h(r) \sum_j (\nu_j \circ \pi) f(\theta) \quad (3.4.2b)$$

where $f : S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Morse function that has precisely two critical points. Recall that $h : [0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a decreasing function with $h(0) = 1$ and is constantly zero away from a neighborhood of $r_0 \in (0, 1)$. Note that the S^1 -action is only defined on $X \setminus \Sigma \setminus \Delta \simeq D\Sigma \setminus \Sigma$, so the S^1 -coordinate θ only makes sense on $X \setminus \Sigma \setminus \Delta$ but thanks to our choice of h_1 , the function $h_1(r)f(\theta)$ makes sense on the entire X . Remember that even though \tilde{H} is defined on $D\Sigma \simeq X \setminus \Delta$, by our choice of $h : [0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (see Section 2.4), it extends smoothly to X . We will study what the one-periodic orbits of \tilde{H} look like.

The symplectic form $\omega_{D\Sigma}$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{D\Sigma} &:= -d((1 - r^2)\alpha) \\ &= (1 - r^2)\pi^*\omega_\Sigma + 2rdr \wedge \alpha. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4.3)$$

Note that we have the following equivalence:

$$\pi^*\omega_\Sigma = -d\alpha \quad (3.4.4a)$$

$$\omega_\Sigma = -\pi_*d\alpha \quad (3.4.4b)$$

The Hamiltonian vector fields of $h(\|\cdot\|)\pi^*H$ and F (around the critical points) are as follows:

$$X_{h(\|\cdot\|)\pi^*H} := \frac{h'(r)}{2r}R_\alpha + \frac{h(r)}{1-r^2}\pi^*X_H \quad (3.4.5a)$$

$$X_F := \frac{h'(r)}{2r}f(\theta)R_\alpha + f'(\theta)\frac{h(r)}{2r}\partial_r. \quad (3.4.5b)$$

Thus, we get

$$\phi_{\tilde{H}}(\tilde{L}) \cap \tilde{L} = \bigcup_j \{x'_j, x''_j\} \quad (3.4.6)$$

where

$$\pi(x'_j) = \pi(x''_j) = x_j, \quad \phi_H(L) \cap L = \bigcup_j \{x_j\}.$$

Following [Bor12], we take

$$h(r) = 1 - r^2$$

for $r \in [0, 1 - \varepsilon]$ for a sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$ so that we have

$$\pi_*X_{h(\|\cdot\|)\pi^*H} = X_H.$$

Thus, the generators of $CF_X(\tilde{L}, \tilde{H})$ are the following capped Hamiltonian chords:

$$\begin{aligned} & [\phi_{\tilde{H}}^t(x'_j), \tilde{u}], \\ & [\phi_{\tilde{H}}^t(x''_j), \tilde{u}] \end{aligned} \quad (3.4.7)$$

where \tilde{u} is the capping of the Hamiltonian chord $\phi_{\tilde{H}}^t(x'_j), \phi_{\tilde{H}}^t(x''_j)$ that satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \mu([\phi_{\tilde{H}}^t(x'_j), \tilde{u}]) &= \mu([\phi_H^t(x_j), u]), \\ \mu([\phi_{\tilde{H}}^t(x''_j), \tilde{u}]) &= \mu([\phi_H^t(x_j), u]) + 1. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4.8)$$

We explain this a bit more in detail. As the chord $\phi_{\tilde{H}}^t(\tilde{x}_j)$ is a concatenation of the chords $\phi_F^t(x'_j)$ and $\phi_{h\cdot\pi^*H}^t(x'_j)$, where the former is a constant chord, it is geometrically identical to the latter. Recall that $\phi_{h\cdot\pi^*H}^t(x'_j)$ is contained in $F(D\Sigma_{r_0})$. One can take a capping \tilde{u} of $\phi_{h\cdot\pi^*H}^t(x'_j)$ contained in $F(D\Sigma_{r_0})$ that satisfies

$$\mu([\phi_{h\cdot\pi^*H}^t(x'_j), \tilde{u}]) = \mu([\phi_H^t(x_j), u]).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu([\phi_{\tilde{H}}^t(x'_j), \tilde{u}]) &= \mu([\phi_H^t(x_j), u]) + i_{Morse}(x'_j) \\ &= \mu([\phi_H^t(x_j), u]) + 0, \\ \mu([\phi_{\tilde{H}}^t(x''_j), \tilde{u}]) &= \mu([\phi_H^t(x_j), u]) + i_{Morse}(x''_j) \\ &= \mu([\phi_H^t(x_j), u]) + 1. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4.9)$$

REMARK 3.4.1. We will estimate the actions of the lifted Hamiltonian chords $[\phi_{\tilde{H}}^t(\tilde{x}_j), \tilde{u}]$ even though it will not be useful until Section 3.5. First of all, the action of $[\tilde{z}, \tilde{u}] := [\phi_{h \cdot \pi^* H}^t(x'_j), \tilde{u}]$ satisfies the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{L}, h \cdot \pi^* H}([\tilde{z}, \tilde{u}]) &= \int_0^1 h \cdot \pi^* H(\tilde{z}(t)) dt - \int_{D_+} \tilde{u}^* \omega_{D\Sigma} \\
&= \int_0^1 (h \cdot \pi^* H_t)(\tilde{z}(t)) dt - \int_{D_+} \tilde{u}^* ((1-r^2)\pi^* \omega_\Sigma + 2rdr \wedge \alpha) \\
&= \int_0^1 (1-r_0^2) H_t(z(t)) dt - \int_{D_+} ((1-r_0^2)(\tilde{u} \circ \pi)^* \omega_\Sigma + \tilde{u}^*(2rdr \wedge \alpha)) \\
&= (1-r_0^2) \int_0^1 H_t(z(t)) dt - \int_{D_+} u^* \omega_\Sigma - \int_{D_+} \tilde{u}^*(2rdr \wedge \alpha) \\
&= (1-r_0^2) \mathcal{A}_{L, H}([z, u]),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.4.10}$$

where $[z, u] := [\phi_H^t(x_j), u]$. Thus, the actions of $[\phi_{h \cdot \pi^* H}^t(x'_j), \tilde{u}]$ and $[\phi_{h \cdot \pi^* H}^t(x''_j), \tilde{u}]$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{L}, \tilde{H}}([\phi_{\tilde{H}}^t(x'_j), \tilde{u}]) &= (1-r_0^2) \mathcal{A}_{L, H}([z, u]) + \varepsilon h(r_0) f(\theta'), \\
\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{L}, \tilde{H}}([\phi_{\tilde{H}}^t(x''_j), \tilde{u}]) &= (1-r_0^2) \mathcal{A}_{L, H}([z, u]) + \varepsilon h(r_0) f(\theta'')
\end{aligned} \tag{3.4.11}$$

where θ' and θ'' are points that satisfy the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
\min_{\theta \in S^1} f(\theta) &= f(\theta'), \\
\max_{\theta \in S^1} f(\theta) &= f(\theta'').
\end{aligned} \tag{3.4.12}$$

We are now ready to define the Floer–Gysin sequence. We will introduce maps i_{Fl}, p_{Fl} , which are analogies of the maps i, p in the pearl case; compare with Definition 3.2.3.

Definition 3.4.2. *We define i_{Fl} as*

$$\begin{aligned}
i_{Fl} : CF^*(L, H) &\rightarrow CF^*(\tilde{L}, \tilde{H}) \\
[\phi_H^t(x_j), u] &\mapsto [\phi_{\tilde{H}}^t(x'_j), \tilde{u}]
\end{aligned} \tag{3.4.13}$$

where \tilde{u} is a disk chosen above, i.e. a disk that makes

$$\mu([\phi_H^t(x_j), u]) = \mu([\phi_{\tilde{H}}^t(x'_j), \tilde{u}]), \tag{3.4.14}$$

and p_{Fl} as

$$\begin{aligned}
p_{Fl} : CF^*(\tilde{L}, \tilde{H}) &\rightarrow CF^{*-1}(L, H) \\
[\phi_{\tilde{H}}^t(x'_j), \tilde{u}] &\mapsto 0, \\
[\phi_{\tilde{H}}^t(x''_j), \tilde{u}] &\mapsto [\phi_H^t(x_j), u].
\end{aligned} \tag{3.4.15}$$

where $u = \pi(\tilde{u})$.

By arguing as [BK13], one can check that i_{Fl}, p_{Fl} are chain maps, and moreover, by considering the lifted PSS map

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{PSS} : C(\mathcal{D}) &\rightarrow CF_X(\widetilde{L}, \widetilde{H}) \\
x' &\mapsto \sum_{\mu(\mathcal{T})=0} \# \mathcal{P}(\phi_{\widetilde{H}}^t(y'), x'; \mathcal{T}) \phi_{\widetilde{H}}^t(y') t^{\bar{\mu}(\mathcal{T})}, \\
x'' &\mapsto \sum_{\mu(\mathcal{T})=0} \# \mathcal{P}(\phi_{\widetilde{H}}^t(y'), x''; \mathcal{T}) \phi_{\widetilde{H}}^t(y') t^{\bar{\mu}(\mathcal{T})} \\
&+ \sum_{\mu(\mathcal{T})=0} \# \mathcal{P}(\phi_{\widetilde{H}}^t(y''), x''; \mathcal{T}) \phi_{\widetilde{H}}^t(y'') t^{\bar{\mu}(\mathcal{T})},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.4.16}$$

we can see that quantum and Floer Gysin sequences are compatible.

Proposition 3.4.3. *The following diagram commutes:*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\longrightarrow & \delta & \longrightarrow & C(\mathcal{D}) & \xrightarrow{i} & C(\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}) & \xrightarrow{p} & C(\mathcal{D}) & \xrightarrow{\delta} & \longrightarrow \\
& & & \downarrow PSS & & \downarrow \widetilde{PSS} & & \downarrow PSS & & \\
\longrightarrow & \delta_{Fl} & \longrightarrow & CF_{\Sigma}(L, H) & \xrightarrow{i_{Fl}} & CF_X(\widetilde{L}, \widetilde{H}) & \xrightarrow{p_{Fl}} & CF_{\Sigma}(L, H) & \xrightarrow{\delta_{Fl}} & \longrightarrow .
\end{array} \tag{3.4.17}$$

This immediately implies the following.

Corollary 3.4.4. *The following diagram commutes:*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\longrightarrow & \delta & \longrightarrow & QH^*(L) & \xrightarrow{i} & QH^*(\widetilde{L}) & \xrightarrow{p} & QH^{*-1}(L) & \xrightarrow{\delta} & \longrightarrow \\
& & & \downarrow PSS & & \downarrow \widetilde{PSS} & & \downarrow PSS & & \\
\longrightarrow & \delta_{Fl} & \longrightarrow & HF_{\Sigma}(L, H) & \xrightarrow{i_{Fl}} & HF_X(\widetilde{L}, \widetilde{H}) & \xrightarrow{p_{Fl}} & HF_{\Sigma}(L, H) & \xrightarrow{\delta_{Fl}} & \longrightarrow .
\end{array} \tag{3.4.18}$$

This compatibility of Floer–Gysin and quantum Gysin sequences (Corollary 3.4.4) and $\delta = 0$ (Proposition 3.3.1) imply the following:

Corollary 3.4.5. *The connecting map of the Floer–Gysin sequence is a zero map, i.e.*

$$\delta_{Fl} = 0.$$

3.5 Filtered Floer–Gysin sequence

In this section, we study the change of filtration in the Floer–Gysin sequence (3.4.18). The main result of the section is the following:

Proposition 3.5.1. *Let H be any non-degenerate Hamiltonian on Σ and define \widetilde{H} , which is a lifted non-degenerate Hamiltonian on X , defined by the equation (3.4.1). The filtration change in the Floer–Gysin sequence for these Hamiltonians are as follows:*

$$\longrightarrow \xrightarrow{\delta_{Fl}} HF_{\Sigma}^{\tau}(L, H) \xrightarrow{i_{Fl}} HF_X^{h(r_0)\tau + \varepsilon'}(\widetilde{L}, \widetilde{H}) \xrightarrow{p_{Fl}} HF_{\Sigma}^{\tau}(L, H) \xrightarrow{\delta_{Fl}} \longrightarrow \tag{3.5.1}$$

where $\varepsilon' := \varepsilon \max_{x \in X} f(\theta)h(r)$.

Proof of Proposition 3.5.1. From the definition of the maps i_{Fl} and p_{Fl} , we need to estimate the change of action in

$$\begin{aligned} i_{Fl} : CF(L, H) &\rightarrow CF(\tilde{L}, \tilde{H}) \\ [\phi_H^t(x_j), u] &\mapsto [\phi_{\tilde{H}}^t(x'_j), \tilde{u}] \end{aligned} \quad (3.5.2)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} p_{Fl} : CF(\tilde{L}, \tilde{H}) &\rightarrow CF(L, H) \\ [\phi_{\tilde{H}}^t(x''_j), \tilde{u}] &\mapsto [\phi_H^t(x_j), u]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5.3)$$

The equation (3.4.12) implies

$$\begin{aligned} CF_{\Sigma}^{\tau}(L, H) &\rightarrow CF_X^{(1-r_0^2)\cdot\tau+\varepsilon'}(\tilde{L}, \tilde{H}) \\ [\phi_H^t(x_j), u] &\mapsto [\phi_{\tilde{H}}^t(x'_j), \tilde{u}] \end{aligned} \quad (3.5.4)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} CF_X^{(1-r_0^2)\cdot\tau+\varepsilon'}(\tilde{L}, \tilde{H}) &\rightarrow CF_{\Sigma}^{\tau}(L, H) \\ [\phi_{\tilde{H}}^t(x''_j), \tilde{u}] &\mapsto [\phi_H^t(x_j), u]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5.5)$$

as we have

$$\varepsilon h(r_0) \min f < \varepsilon h(r_0) \max f < \varepsilon'$$

from our choice of ε . This finishes the proof of Proposition 3.5.1. \square

3.6 Completing the proof

We complete the proof of Theorem A (a.k.a B).

Proof of Theorem A (a.k.a B). Notice that from the definition of the reduction explained in Section 2.4.2, what we need to prove is the following:

$$\bar{c}_{e_X}(h\pi^*H) = \frac{1}{2\kappa_L + 1} \bar{c}_{e_{\Sigma}}(H) \quad (3.6.1)$$

for any Hamiltonian H on Σ .

First of all, we state the following property for Lagrangian tori.

Proposition 3.6.1 ([San21, Proposition 5.3]). *If K is a Lagrangian torus in M that corresponds to a non-degenerate critical point of its superpotential, then the class*

$$e_{M,K} := \frac{1}{\langle p_K, p_K \rangle_{Muk}} \mathcal{CO}^0(pt_K), \quad (3.6.2)$$

where pt_K is the point class in $HF(K)$, satisfies the following two properties:

1. It is an idempotent which is a unit of a field factor of $QH(M)$, i.e. $e_L \cdot QH(X)$ is a field.
2. It is mapped to 1_K by the closed-open map:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{CO}^0 : QH(M) &\rightarrow HF(K) \\ \mathcal{CO}^0(e_{M,K}) &= 1_K. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6.3)$$

REMARK 3.6.2. The bracket $\langle -, - \rangle_{\text{Muk}}$ denotes the Mukai pairing, which is a canonical pairing for $HF(K)$ (more precisely, for the Hochschild homology of the Fukaya category $HH_*(\mathcal{F}(M))$), see [San21]. Here, the only important thing is that $\frac{1}{\langle p_K, p_K \rangle_{\text{Muk}}}$ is an element of Λ that only depends on the Lagrangian K .

As we are assuming that L (resp. \tilde{L}) is a monotone Lagrangian torus equipped with a local system corresponding to a non-degenerate critical point of its superpotential, by Proposition 3.6.1, there exists a unit of a field factor $e_\Sigma := e_{\Sigma, L}$ (resp. $e_X := e_{X, \tilde{L}}$) of $QH(\Sigma)$ (resp. $QH(X)$). Thus, we have Entov–Polterovich quasimorphisms

$$\bar{c}_{e_X} : \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

and

$$\bar{c}_{e_\Sigma} : \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(\Sigma) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}.$$

We will now prove the equation (3.6.1).

Consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \longrightarrow & QH(L) & \xrightarrow{i} & QH(\tilde{L}) & \xrightarrow{p} & QH(L) & \longrightarrow \\ & \downarrow PSS & & \downarrow \widetilde{PSS} & & \downarrow PSS & \\ \longrightarrow & HF^\tau(L, H) & \xrightarrow{i} & HF^{\frac{1}{2\kappa_L+1} \cdot \tau + \varepsilon'}(\tilde{L}, \tilde{H}) & \xrightarrow{p} & HF^\tau(L, H) & \longrightarrow \\ & \uparrow c\mathcal{O}^0 & & \uparrow c\mathcal{O}^0 & & \downarrow c\mathcal{O}^0 & \\ & QH(\Sigma) & & QH(X) & & QH(\Sigma) & \end{array} \quad (3.6.4)$$

From Corollary 3.4.5, it follows that

$$i : QH(L) \rightarrow QH(\tilde{L})$$

is injective and

$$p : QH(\tilde{L}) \rightarrow QH(L)$$

is surjective. Thus,

$$i(1_L) = 1_{\tilde{L}}$$

and there exists a class $\alpha \in QH(\tilde{L})$ such that

$$p(\alpha) = 1_L.$$

By focusing on the left side of the diagram (3.6.4), we get

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \longrightarrow & HF^\tau(L, H) & \xrightarrow{i} & HF^{\frac{1}{2\kappa_L+1} \cdot \tau + \varepsilon'}(\tilde{L}, \tilde{H}) & \longrightarrow \\ & \uparrow c\mathcal{O}^0 & & \downarrow c\mathcal{O}^0 & \\ & QH(\Sigma) & & QH(X) & \end{array} \quad (3.6.5)$$

By using the diagram (3.6.5) and basic properties of spectral invariants, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\ell_L(H) &= \ell_{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{O}^0(e_\Sigma)}(H) \leq c_{e_\Sigma}(H), \\
\ell_{\tilde{L}}(\tilde{H}) &\leq \frac{1}{2\kappa_L + 1} \ell_L(H) + \varepsilon', \\
\ell_{p_{\tilde{L}}}(\tilde{H}) &\leq \ell_{\tilde{L}}(\tilde{H}), \\
c_{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{O}^0(p_{\tilde{L}})}(\tilde{H}) &\leq \ell_{p_{\tilde{L}}}(\tilde{H}), \\
c_{e_X}(\tilde{H}) &= c_{\frac{1}{\langle p_{\tilde{L}}, p_{\tilde{L}} \rangle_{\text{Muk}}} \mathcal{C}\mathcal{O}^0(p_{\tilde{L}})}(\tilde{H}) = c_{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{O}^0(p_{\tilde{L}})}(\tilde{H}) - \nu(\langle p_{\tilde{L}}, p_{\tilde{L}} \rangle_{\text{Muk}}^{-1}).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.6.6}$$

The chain of inequalities (3.6.6) imply

$$c_{e_X}(\tilde{H}) - \nu(\langle p_{\tilde{L}}, p_{\tilde{L}} \rangle_{\text{Muk}}) \leq \frac{1}{2\kappa_L + 1} c_{e_\Sigma}(H) + \varepsilon'. \tag{3.6.7}$$

From the triangle equality, we have

$$c_{e_X}(\tilde{H}) = c_{e_X}(h\pi^*H \wedge F) \geq c_{e_X}(h\pi^*H) - c_{e_X}(\bar{F}) \geq c_{e_X}(h\pi^*H) - \varepsilon'. \tag{3.6.8}$$

Thus, by combining the equations (3.6.7) and (3.6.8),

$$\frac{1}{2\kappa_L + 1} c_{e_\Sigma}(H) + \varepsilon' \geq c_{e_X}(h\pi^*H) - \varepsilon' - \nu(\langle p_{\tilde{L}}, p_{\tilde{L}} \rangle_{\text{Muk}}) \tag{3.6.9}$$

and as we can take ε' arbitrarily small, we have

$$\frac{1}{2\kappa_L + 1} c_{e_\Sigma}(H) \geq c_{e_X}(h\pi^*H) - \nu(\langle p_{\tilde{L}}, p_{\tilde{L}} \rangle_{\text{Muk}}). \tag{3.6.10}$$

Next, by focusing on the right side of the diagram (3.6.4), we get

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\longrightarrow & HF^{\frac{1}{2\kappa_L + 1} \cdot \tau + \varepsilon'}(\tilde{L}, \tilde{H}) & \xrightarrow{p} & HF^\tau(L, H) & \longrightarrow \\
& \mathcal{C}\mathcal{O}^0 \uparrow & & \downarrow \mathcal{C}\mathcal{O}^0 & \\
& QH(X) & & QH(\Sigma) &
\end{array} \tag{3.6.11}$$

By using the diagram (3.6.11) and basic properties of spectral invariants, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\ell_{\tilde{L}}(\tilde{H}) &= \ell_{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{O}^0(e_X)}(\tilde{H}) \leq c_{e_X}(\tilde{H}), \\
\ell_\alpha(\tilde{H}) &\leq \ell_{\tilde{L}}(\tilde{H}) + \nu_{\tilde{L}}(\alpha) \\
\frac{1}{2\kappa_L + 1} \ell_L(H) + \varepsilon' &\leq \ell_\alpha(\tilde{H}), \\
c_{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{O}^0(p_L)}(H) &\leq \ell_{p_L}(H), \\
c_{e_\Sigma}(H) &= c_{\frac{1}{\langle p_L, p_L \rangle_{\text{Muk}}} \mathcal{C}\mathcal{O}^0(p_L)}(H) = c_{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{O}^0(p_L)}(H) - \nu(\langle p_L, p_L \rangle_{\text{Muk}}^{-1})
\end{aligned} \tag{3.6.12}$$

where $p(\alpha) = 1_L$. This chain of inequalities imply

$$\frac{1}{2\kappa_L + 1} (c_{e_\Sigma}(H) - \nu(\langle p_L, p_L \rangle_{\text{Muk}})) + \varepsilon' \leq c_{e_X}(\tilde{H}) + \nu_{\tilde{L}}(\alpha). \tag{3.6.13}$$

From the triangle equality, we have

$$c_{e_X}(\tilde{H}) = c_{e_X}(h\pi^*H \wedge F) \leq c_{e_X}(h\pi^*H) + c_{e_X}(F) \leq c_{e_X}(h\pi^*H) + \varepsilon'. \quad (3.6.14)$$

Thus, by combining the equations (3.6.13) and (3.6.14),

$$\frac{1}{2\kappa_L + 1}(c_{e_\Sigma}(H) - \nu(\langle p_L, p_L \rangle_{\text{Muk}})) + \varepsilon' \leq c_{e_X}(h\pi^*H) + \varepsilon' + \nu_{\tilde{L}}(\alpha) \quad (3.6.15)$$

and as we can take ε' arbitrarily small, we have

$$\frac{1}{2\kappa_L + 1}(c_{e_\Sigma}(H) + \nu(\langle p_L, p_L \rangle_{\text{Muk}})) \leq c_{e_X}(h\pi^*H) + \nu_{\tilde{L}}(\alpha). \quad (3.6.16)$$

The equations (3.6.10) and (3.6.16) give

$$|c_{e_X}(h\pi^*H) - \frac{1}{2\kappa_L + 1}c_{e_\Sigma}(H)| \leq \text{Const} \quad (3.6.17)$$

where

$$\text{Const} := \max\{|\nu(\langle p_L, p_L \rangle_{\text{Muk}}) - \nu_{\tilde{L}}(\alpha)|, \nu(\langle p_{\tilde{L}}, p_{\tilde{L}} \rangle_{\text{Muk}})\}. \quad (3.6.18)$$

In particular, by homogenizing the equation (3.6.17), we get

$$\bar{c}_{e_X}(h\pi^*H) = \frac{1}{2\kappa_L + 1}\bar{c}_{e_\Sigma}(H), \quad (3.6.19)$$

which implies

$$\Theta^*\bar{c}_{e_X} = \frac{1}{2\kappa_L + 1}\bar{c}_{e_\Sigma}. \quad (3.6.20)$$

REMARK 3.6.3. Moreover, the part concerning Lagrangian spectral invariants in the equations (3.6.6), (3.6.12) imply the following stronger version of the equation (3.6.19):

$$\bar{c}_{e_X}(h\pi^*H) = \bar{\ell}_{\tilde{L}}(h\pi^*H) = \frac{1}{2\kappa_L + 1}\bar{\ell}_L(H) = \frac{1}{2\kappa_L + 1}\bar{c}_{e_\Sigma}(H) \quad (3.6.21)$$

for any Hamiltonian H on Σ .

We verify that the skeleton Δ satisfies Borman's *smallness* condition. The properties of the idempotent e_X from Proposition 3.6.1 imply

$$\bar{c}_{e_X} = \bar{\ell}_{\tilde{L}} \quad (3.6.22)$$

which implies that \tilde{L} is \bar{c}_{e_X} -superheavy. As $\tilde{L} \subset X \setminus \Delta$, the set $X \setminus \Delta$ is also \bar{c}_{e_X} -superheavy. Thus, from the criterion for smallness Proposition 2.4.3, we see that the skeleton Δ is indeed satisfying Borman's *smallness* condition.

We have seen that the skeleton Δ is small with respect to \bar{c}_{e_X} so one can apply Borman's reduction to the Entov–Polterovich quasimorphism \bar{c}_{e_X} and obtain a quasimorphism on $\widetilde{\text{Ham}}(\Sigma)$ which, according to (3.6.20), coincides with the Entov–Polterovich quasimorphism \bar{c}_{e_Σ} and this completes the proof of Theorem A (a.k.a B). \square

4 Examples

In this section, we will see Example 1.2.2, to which Theorem B apply, more in detail.

4.1 Laurent and Novikov fields

We start with a technical but a very useful and important remark concerning the coefficient field, which was considered in [Kaw22, Section 4.2, 4.5]. To summarize the point, to deal with spectral invariants, e.g. Entov–Polterovich quasimorphisms, it is more convenient to work with the Laurent coefficient

$$\Lambda_{\text{Lau}} := \left\{ \sum_{k \geq k_0} b_k t^k : k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}, b_k \in \mathbb{C} \right\},$$

where t is a formal variable, while Lagrangian Floer theory is more suited to work with the universal Novikov field

$$\Lambda := \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j T^{\lambda_j} : a_j \in \mathbb{C}, \lambda_j \in \mathbb{R}, \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda_j = +\infty \right\}.$$

In this paper, we have been working with the universal Novikov field Λ , as for example, Proposition 3.6.1 requires the universal Novikov field Λ . However, with the universal Novikov field Λ , it becomes more complicated to consider Entov–Polterovich quasimorphisms, as $QH(X) = QH(X; \Lambda)$ is more complicated than $QH(X; \Lambda_{\text{Lau}})$, e.g. while $QH(\mathbb{C}P^n; \Lambda_{\text{Lau}})$ is a field, $QH(\mathbb{C}P^n; \Lambda)$ splits into a sum of $n + 1$ fields:

$$QH(\mathbb{C}P^n; \Lambda) = \bigoplus_{1 \leq j \leq n+1} Q_j$$

where Q_j is a field. Thus, it might give an impression that we get more Entov–Polterovich quasimorphisms by taking the universal Novikov field Λ rather than the field of Laurent series (c.f. [Wu15, Remark 5.2]) but it was proved in [Kaw22, Section 4.5] that this is not the case. We will state the relevant result for the case of $\mathbb{C}P^n$ and Q^n which we will use later in Section 4.2.

Proposition 4.1.1. *1. For $\mathbb{C}P^n$, $QH(\mathbb{C}P^n; \Lambda_{\text{Lau}})$ is a field and $QH(\mathbb{C}P^n; \Lambda)$ splits into a sum of $n + 1$ fields but the Entov–Polterovich quasimorphisms all coincide:*

$$\bar{c}_{1_X} = \bar{c}_{e_X}$$

for any unit of a field factor $e_X \in Q_j$.

2. For Q^n , $QH(Q^n; \Lambda_{\text{Lau}})$ splits into a sum of two fields, i.e.

$$QH(Q^n; \Lambda_{\text{Lau}}) = Q_+ \oplus Q_-,$$

and $QH(Q^n; \Lambda)$ splits into a sum of finer fields but the Entov–Polterovich quasimorphisms all coincide:

$$\bar{c}_{e_+} = \bar{c}_{e_X}$$

or

$$\bar{c}_{e_-} = \bar{c}_{e_X}$$

for any unit of a field factor $e_X \in Q_j$, depending on whether Q_j is splitted from Q_+ or Q_- .

We do not give a proof as it is obtained by exactly the same argument as in [Kaw22, Proof of Theorem 6, Remark 44].

4.2 Examples

1. $(X, \Sigma) = (\mathbb{C}P^n, \mathbb{C}P^{n-1})$: The quantum cohomology rings of $\mathbb{C}P^n$ and $\mathbb{C}P^{n-1}$ with Laurent coefficient Λ_{Lau} are both fields. Thus, according to Theorem ??, their units 1_X and 1_Σ give rise to Entov–Polterovich quasimorphisms:

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{c}_{1_X} &: \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ \bar{c}_{1_\Sigma} &: \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(\Sigma) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.2.1}$$

Now, the skeleton for the pair $(\mathbb{C}P^n, \mathbb{C}P^{n-1})$ is a point which is *small* with respect to \bar{c}_{1_X} . Thus, Borman’s reduction theorem 2.4 is applicable and $\Theta^*\bar{c}_{1_X}$ is a quasimorphism for $\mathbb{C}P^{n-1}$, which we do not know at this point whether or not it is of Entov–Polterovich-type. The assumption of Theorem B is satisfied for the pair of the Clifford tori ($\tilde{L} = T_{\text{Clif}}^n$, $L = T_{\text{Clif}}^{n-1}$) whose superpotentials are as follows (see [Cho04]):

$$\begin{aligned}W_{T_{\text{Clif}}^n} &= z_1 + z_2 + \cdots + z_n + \frac{1}{z_1 z_2 \cdots z_n}, \\ W_{T_{\text{Clif}}^{n-1}} &= z_1 + z_2 + \cdots + z_{n-1} + \frac{1}{z_1 z_2 \cdots z_{n-1}}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.2.2}$$

These do have non-degenerate critical points and by choosing non-degenerate critical points as the local systems to setup Floer/pearl theory, we get units of field factors from the open-closed map by Proposition 3.6.1:

$$\begin{aligned}e_X &:= \frac{1}{\langle p_{\tilde{L}}, p_{\tilde{L}} \rangle_{\text{Muk}}} \mathcal{OC}^0(pt_{\tilde{L}}), \\ e_\Sigma &:= \frac{1}{\langle p_K, p_K \rangle_{\text{Muk}}} \mathcal{OC}^0(pt_L)\end{aligned}\tag{4.2.3}$$

where e_X (resp. e_Σ) is a unit factor in $QH(\mathbb{C}P^n, \Lambda)$ (resp. $QH(\mathbb{C}P^{n-1}, \Lambda)$). From Proposition 4.1.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{c}_{1_X} &= \bar{c}_{e_X}, \\ \bar{c}_{1_\Sigma} &= \bar{c}_{e_\Sigma}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.2.4}$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\Theta^*\bar{c}_{1_X} = \frac{1}{\kappa_\Sigma + 1} \bar{c}_{1_\Sigma} = \frac{n}{n+1} \bar{c}_{1_\Sigma}.$$

2. (Q^n, Q^{n-1}) : The quantum cohomology rings of Q^n and Q^{n-1} with Laurent coefficient Λ_{Lau} both split into direct sums of two fields:

$$\begin{aligned}QH(Q^n) &= QH(Q^n)_+ \oplus QH(Q^n)_-, \\ QH(Q^{n-1}) &= QH(Q^{n-1})_+ \oplus QH(Q^{n-1})_-.\end{aligned}\tag{4.2.5}$$

Thus, according to Theorem 2.2.1, the units of the field factors $e_{Q^n, \pm}$ and $e_{Q^{n-1}, \pm}$ where

$$\begin{aligned} 1_{Q^n} &= e_{Q^n, +} + e_{Q^n, -}, \\ 1_{Q^{n-1}} &= e_{Q^{n-1}, +} + e_{Q^{n-1}, -}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.2.6)$$

give rise to Entov–Polterovich quasimorphisms:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{c}_{e_{Q^n, \pm}} &: \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(Q^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \\ \bar{c}_{e_{Q^{n-1}, \pm}} &: \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(Q^{n-1}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.2.7)$$

Now, the skeleton for the pair (Q^n, Q^{n-1}) is a Lagrangian sphere

$$S^n := \{z \in \mathbb{C}P^{n+1} \mid z_0^2 + \cdots + z_n^2 + z_{n+1}^2 = 0, z_0, \dots, z_n \in \mathbb{R}, z_{n+1} \in i\mathbb{R}\}.$$

and it was proven in [Kaw23, Theorem B] that $Q^n \setminus S^n$ is $\bar{c}_{e_{Q^n, +}}$ -superheavy but not for $\bar{c}_{e_{Q^n, -}}$ -superheavy. Thus, by the criterion for smallness Proposition 2.4.3, we see that S^n is small with respect to $\bar{c}_{e_{Q^n, +}}$ but not with respect to $\bar{c}_{e_{Q^n, -}}$. Thus, Borman’s reduction theorem 2.4 is applicable only to $\bar{c}_{e_{Q^n, +}}$ and $\Theta^* \bar{c}_{e_{Q^n, +}}$ is a quasimorphism for Q^{n-1} , which we do not know at this point whether or not it is of Entov–Polterovich-type. The assumption of Theorem A is satisfied for the pair of monotone Lagrangian tori $(\tilde{L} = T_{\text{GZ}}^n, L = T_{\text{GZ}}^{n-1})$ (see Remark 4.2.1). Their superpotentials are as follows (see [Kim]):

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\tilde{L}}(\tilde{z}) &= \frac{1}{z_n} + \frac{z_n}{z_{n-1}} + \cdots + \frac{z_2}{z_1} + 2z_2 + z_1 z_2, \\ W_L(z) &= \frac{1}{z_{n-1}} + \frac{z_{n-1}}{z_{n-2}} + \cdots + \frac{z_2}{z_1} + 2z_2 + z_1 z_2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.2.8)$$

These do have non-degenerate critical points and by choosing non-degenerate critical points as the local systems to setup Floer/pearl theory, we get units of field factors from the open-closed map by Proposition 3.6.1:

$$\begin{aligned} e_X &:= \frac{1}{\langle p_{\tilde{L}}, p_{\tilde{L}} \rangle_{\text{Muk}}} \mathcal{OC}^0(pt_{\tilde{L}}), \\ e_\Sigma &:= \frac{1}{\langle p_L, p_L \rangle_{\text{Muk}}} \mathcal{OC}^0(pt_L) \end{aligned} \quad (4.2.9)$$

where e_X (resp. e_Σ) is a unit factor in $QH(Q^n; \Lambda_{\text{Lau}})_+$ (resp. $QH(Q^{n-1}; \Lambda_{\text{Lau}})_+$). From Proposition 4.1.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{c}_{e_{Q^n, +}} &= \bar{c}_{e_X}, \\ \bar{c}_{e_{Q^{n-1}, +}} &= \bar{c}_{e_\Sigma}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.2.10)$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\Theta^* \bar{c}_{e_{Q^n, +}} = \frac{1}{\kappa_\Sigma + 1} \bar{c}_{e_{Q^{n-1}, +}} = \frac{n-1}{n} \bar{c}_{e_{Q^{n-1}, +}}.$$

REMARK 4.2.1. The monotone Lagrangian torus T_{GZ}^n in Q^n that we use here was obtained by Nishinou–Nohara–Ueda [NNU] (see also Yoosik Kim [Kim]) by considering a Gelfand–Zeitlin system via toric degeneration. As the compatibility of toric degeneration and Biran decomposition is not obvious, it is not obvious that T_{GZ}^n in Q^n coincides with the torus obtained by the Biran circle bundle construction to T_{GZ}^{n-1} in Q^{n-1} for the polarization (Q^n, Q^{n-1}) , i.e.

$$T_{\text{GZ}}^n = \widetilde{T_{\text{GZ}}^{n-1}}.$$

However, this compatibility was proven by the author in [Kaw23, Theorem B].

3. $(\mathbb{C}P^3, Q^2)$: With Laurent coefficient Λ_{Lau} , the quantum cohomology rings of $\mathbb{C}P^3$ is a field and of Q^2 splits into a direct sum of two fields, where the unit 1_Σ splits as

$$1_\Sigma = e_{\Sigma,+} + e_{\Sigma,-}.$$

Thus, according to Theorem 2.2.1, the units 1_X , $e_{\Sigma,+}$ and $e_{\Sigma,-}$ give rise to Entov–Polterovich quasimorphisms:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{c}_{1_X} &: \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ \bar{c}_{e_{\Sigma,\pm}} &: \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(\Sigma) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.2.11}$$

The skeleton for the pair $(\mathbb{C}P^3, Q^2)$ is $\mathbb{R}P^3$. We know that the Lagrangian torus $\tilde{L} = T_{\text{Ch}}^3$ is \bar{c}_{1_X} -superheavy and as $\tilde{L} = T_{\text{Ch}}^3 \subset \mathbb{C}P^3 \setminus \mathbb{R}P^3$, the set $\mathbb{C}P^3 \setminus \mathbb{R}P^3$ is also \bar{c}_{1_X} -superheavy. Thus, by the criterion for smallness Proposition 2.4.3, $\mathbb{R}P^3$ is small with respect to \bar{c}_{1_X} . Thus, Borman’s reduction theorem 2.4 is applicable to $\mu_{\mathbb{C}P^3;EP}$ and $\Theta^* \mu_{\mathbb{C}P^3;EP}$ is a quasimorphism for Q^2 , which we do not know at this point whether or not it is of Entov–Polterovich-type. The assumption of Theorem A is satisfied for the pair of Lagrangian tori $(\tilde{L} = T_{\text{Ch}}^3, L = T_{\text{Ch}}^2)$ whose superpotentials were computed by Oakley–Usher [OU16, Proof of Corollary 8.6] and Auroux [Aur07, Corollary 5.13], respectively, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} W_{T_{\text{Ch}}^3} &= \frac{1}{z_3} (z_1 + z_1 z_2^{-1} + z_1^{-1} z_2 + z_1^{-1}) + z_3, \\ W_{T_{\text{Ch}}^2} &= z_1 + z_1 z_2^{-1} + z_1^{-1} z_2 + z_1^{-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.2.12}$$

They have non-degenerate critical points and by choosing non-degenerate critical points as the local systems to setup Floer/pearl theory, we get units of field factors from the open-closed map by Proposition 3.6.1:

$$\begin{aligned} e_X &:= \frac{1}{\langle p_{\tilde{L}}, p_{\tilde{L}} \rangle_{\text{Muk}}} \mathcal{OC}^0(pt_{\tilde{L}}), \\ e_\Sigma &:= \frac{1}{\langle p_L, p_L \rangle_{\text{Muk}}} \mathcal{OC}^0(pt_L) \end{aligned} \tag{4.2.13}$$

where e_X (resp. e_Σ) is a unit factor in $QH(\mathbb{C}P^3, \Lambda)$ (resp. $QH(Q^{n-1}, \Lambda)$). From Proposition 4.1.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{c}_{1_X} &= \bar{c}_{e_X}, \\ \bar{c}_{1_\Sigma} &= \bar{c}_{e_{\Sigma,+}}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.2.14}$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\Theta^* \bar{c}_{1_X} = \frac{1}{\kappa_\Sigma + 1} \bar{c}_{1_\Sigma} = \frac{1}{2} \bar{c}_{e_{\Sigma,+}}.$$

REMARK 4.2.2. One should be able to generalize this example to $(\mathbb{C}P^n, Q^{n-1})$ by considering the pair of the Lagrangian tori $(\tilde{L} = T_{\text{Ch}}^n, L = T_{\text{Ch}}^{n-1})$ but the superpotential for $\tilde{L} = T_{\text{Ch}}^n$ in $\mathbb{C}P^n$ needs to be computed.

5 Discussions

5.1 About the assumption

It is possible that the assumption on the superpotential of L in Theorem A (a.k.a B) automatically implies the assumption on the superpotential of \tilde{L} .

Question 5.1.1. *If the superpotential W_L of L has a non-degenerate critical point, then does the superpotential $W_{\tilde{L}}$ of \tilde{L} also have a non-degenerate critical point?*

The author learned that the relation between W_L and $W_{\tilde{L}}$ is currently being studied [DTVW].

As we claimed in Remark 1.2.1, we expect the following to hold:

Claim 5.1.2. *Let (X, Σ) be a pair of a closed monotone symplectic manifold and a Donaldson divisor therein. Assume there exists an Entov–Polterovich quasimorphism for X*

$$\mu_X^{EP} : \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

for which the skeleton Δ is small, i.e.

$$\tau_{\mu_X^{EP}}(\Delta) = 0.$$

Then, there exist

- *There exists a monotone Lagrangian torus L in Σ whose superpotential W_L has a non-degenerate critical point.*
- *The superpotential $W_{\tilde{L}}$ of the lifted monotone Lagrangian torus \tilde{L} in X also has a non-degenerate critical point.*

If Claim 5.1.2 holds, then the Borman’s question will be solved in the following ideal form.

Conjecture 5.1.3. *Let (X, Σ) be a pair of a closed monotone symplectic manifold and a Donaldson divisor therein. If there exists an Entov–Polterovich quasimorphism for X*

$$\mu_X^{EP} : \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

for which the skeleton Δ is small, then its reduction to Σ is also an Entov–Polterovich quasimorphism, i.e. there exists an Entov–Polterovich quasimorphism for Σ

$$\mu_\Sigma^{EP} : \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(\Sigma) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

that satisfies

$$\Theta^* \mu_X^{EP} = \mu_\Sigma^{EP}.$$

REMARK 5.1.4.

1. We should be able to get more examples if we have more data of the superpotentials. The study of the superpotential is beyond the scope of this paper.
2. The present paper only deals with monotone symplectic manifolds and Lagrangians for technical reasons but the author expects that similar argument should work for symplectic manifolds without the monotonicity condition.

5.2 The Hamiltonian torus action case

In [Bor13], Borman establishes a similar reduction of quasimorphisms on $\widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X)$ for the case where the symplectic manifold X admits a Hamiltonian torus action and asks an analogous question to Question 1.1.1 for this case. One approach this question is to establish a version of results in [Sch21] with action filtration and do a similar argument as in this paper. Note that Theorem A is precisely the $k = 1$ case of the Hamiltonian torus action version problem, as the superheavy assumption is also satisfied by (3.6.22).

References

- [Alb05] Peter Albers, *On the extrinsic topology of Lagrangian submanifolds*, IMRN 2005, 38, 2341–2371, Erratum IMRN 2010 7, 1363–1369
- [Aur07] Denis Auroux, *Mirror symmetry and T-duality in the complement of an anti-canonical divisor*. *J. Gökova Geom. Topol.*, GGT 1 (2007), 51–91.
- [Bir01] Paul Biran, *Lagrangian barriers and symplectic embeddings*, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 11 (2001), no. 3, 407–464.
- [Bir06] Paul Biran, *Lagrangian non-intersections*, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 16 (2006), no. 2, 279–326.
- [BC09] Paul Biran, Octav Cornea, *Rigidity and uniruling for Lagrangian submanifolds*, *Geom. Topol.* 13 (2009), no. 5, 2881–2989.
- [BC12] Paul Biran, Octav Cornea, *Lagrangian topology and enumerative geometry*, *Geom. Topol.*, 16, No. 2, 963–1052 (2012).
- [BK13] Paul Biran, Michael Khanevsky, *A Floer-Gysin exact sequence for Lagrangian submanifolds*. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 88, No. 4, 899–952 (2013).
- [Bor12] Matthew Strom Borman, *Symplectic reduction of quasi-morphisms and quasi-states*, *J. Symplectic Geom.*, 10(2):225–246, 2012.
- [Bor13] Matthew Strom Borman, *Quasi-states, quasi-morphisms, and the moment map*, *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, 2013(11):2497–2533, 2013.
- [Cho04] Cheol-Hyun Cho, *Holomorphic discs, spin structures and Floer cohomology of the Clifford torus*, *IMRN* 2004 No. 35 1803–1843

- [DTVW] Luis Diogo, Dmitry Tonkonog, Renato Vianna, Weiwei Wu, in preparation.
- [Don96] Simon Donaldson, *Symplectic submanifolds and almost-complex geometry*, *J. Differ. Geom.* 44, No. 4, 666–705 (1996).
- [Ent14] Michael Entov, *Quasi-morphisms and quasi-states in symplectic topology*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians–Seoul 2014. Vol. II, 1147–1171, Kyung Moon Sa, Seoul, 2014.
- [EP03] Michael Entov, Leonid Polterovich, *Calabi quasimorphism and quantum homology*, *Int. Math. Res. Not.* 2003, no. 30, 1635–1676.
- [EP06] Michael Entov, Leonid Polterovich, *Quasi-states and symplectic intersections*, *Comment. Math. Helv.* 81 (2006), 75–99
- [EP09] Michael Entov, Leonid Polterovich, *Rigid subsets of symplectic manifolds*, *Compos. Math.* 145 (2009), no. 3, 773–826.
- [EliP10] Yakov Eliashberg, Leonid Polterovich, *Symplectic quasi-states on the quadric surface and Lagrangian submanifolds*, arXiv:1006.2501
- [FOOO19] Kenji Fukaya, Yong-Geun Oh, Hiroshi Ohta, Kaoru Ono, *Spectral invariants with bulk, quasi-morphisms and Lagrangian Floer theory*, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* 260 (2019), no.1254
- [Gir02] Emmanuel Giroux, Géométrie de contact: De la dimension trois vers les dimensions supérieures, *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, ICM 2002*, Beijing, China, August 20-28, 2002. Vol. II: Invited lectures. Beijing: Higher Education Press. 405-414 (2002).
- [Kaw22] Yusuke Kawamoto, Homogeneous quasimorphisms, C^0 -topology and Lagrangian intersection, *Comment. Math. Helv.* 97 (2022), no. 2, pp. 209–254
- [Kaw23] Yusuke Kawamoto, Hofer geometry via toric degeneration. *Math. Ann.* (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00208-023-02775-8>
- [Kim] Yoosik Kim, Disk potential functions for quadrics, *J. Fixed Point Theory Appl.* 25, 46 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11784-023-01049-9>
- [Lec08] Rémi Leclercq, Spectral invariants in Lagrangian Floer theory, *J. Mod. Dyn.* 2 (2008) 249–286.
- [LZ18] Rémi Leclercq, Frol Zapolsky, Spectral invariants for monotone Lagrangians, *J. Topol. Anal.* 10 (2018), no. 3, 627–700.
- [MS04] Dusa McDuff, Dietmar Salamon, *J-holomorphic Curves and Symplectic Topology: Second Edition*, American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, 52. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2004
- [NNU] Yuichi Nohara, Takeo Nishinou, Kazushi Ueda, Potential functions via toric degenerations, arXiv:0812.0066v2

- [OU16] Joel Oakley, Michael Usher, *On certain Lagrangian submanifolds of $S^2 \times S^2$ and $\mathbb{C}P^n$* , *Algebr. Geom. Topol.* Volume 16, Number 1 (2016), 149–209.
- [Oh05] Yong-Geun Oh, *Construction of spectral invariants of Hamiltonian paths on closed symplectic manifolds*, *The breadth of symplectic and Poisson geometry*, 525–570, *Progr. Math.*, 232 2005
- [PS] Leonid Polterovich, Egor Shelukhin, *Lagrangian configurations and Hamiltonian maps*, arXiv:2102.06118v3
- [PSS96] Sergey Piunikhin, Dietmar Salamon, Matthias Schwarz, *Symplectic Floer–Donaldson theory and quantum cohomology. Contact and Symplectic Geometry*. Cambridge University Press. (1996) pp. 171–200.
- [San21] Fumihiko Sanda, *Computation of quantum cohomology from Fukaya categories*, *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, 2021, No. 1, 769–803 (2021).
- [Sch21] Douglas Schultz, *Holomorphic disks and the disk potential for a fibered Lagrangian*, *J. Symplectic Geom.* 19 (2021), no. 1, 143–239.
- [Sch00] Matthias Schwarz, *On the action spectrum for closed symplectically aspherical manifolds*, *Pacific J. Math.* 193 (2000), no. 2, 419–461.
- [Sei15] Paul Seidel, *Homological mirror symmetry for the quartic surface*, *Mem. Am. Math. Soc.* 1116, v, 129 p. (2015).
- [Vit92] Claude Viterbo, *Symplectic topology as the geometry of generating functions*, *Math. Ann.* 292 (1992), no. 4, 685–710.
- [Wu15] Weiwei Wu, *On an exotic Lagrangian torus in $\mathbb{C}P^2$* , *Compositio Math.*, 151 (2015), no. 07, pp 1372–1394.

YUSUKE KAWAMOTO, INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICAL RESEARCH (FIM), ETH-ZÜRICH, RÄMIS-
TRASSE 101, 8092 ZÜRICH SWITZERLAND

E-mail address: yusukekawamoto81@gmail.com, yusuke.kawamoto@math.ethz.ch