# arXiv:2104.10860v2 [math.DG] 25 May 2021

## POSITIVE SCALAR CURVATURE AND HOMOLOGY **COBORDISM INVARIANTS**

HOKUTO KONNO AND MASAKI TANIGUCHI

ABSTRACT. We determine the local equivalence class of the Seiberg–Witten Floer stable homotopy type of a spin rational homology 3-sphere Y embedded into a spin rational homology  $S^1 \times S^3$  with a positive scalar curvature metric so that Y generates the third homology. The main tool of the proof is a relative Bauer–Furuta-type invariant on a periodic-end 4-manifold. As a consequence, we give obstructions to positive scalar curvature metrics on spin rational homology  $S^1\times S^3,$  typically described as the coincidence of various Frøyshov-type invariants. This coincidence also yields alternative proofs of two known obstructions by Jianfeng Lin and by the authors for the same class of 4-manifolds.

### Contents

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Seiberg–Witten Floer stable homotopy type and local equivalence	2
1.2. Main theorem	3
1.3. Obstructions to PSC metrics	3
1.4. Outline of the proof of the main theorem	5
1.5. Examples	5
1.6. Outline of this paper	6
2. Preliminaries	6
2.1. Notations $\sim$	6
2.2. Fredholm theory on $\tilde{X}$	7
2.3. Seiberg–Witten Floer stable homotopy type	9
2.4. The Seiberg–Witten equations on $W[-\infty, 0]$	11
3. Linear analysis on $W[-\infty, 0]$	12
3.1. Fredholm theory on $W[-\infty, 0]$	12
3.2. Global slice theorem	20
3.3. Dirac index on $W[-\infty, 0]$	21
4. The boundedness result	23
5. Relative Bauer–Furuta type invariant	25
6. The proof of Theorem 1.1	27
7. Obstruction to embeddings of 3-manifolds into 4-manifolds with PSC	
metric	29
8. Examples	30
References	33

### 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Seiberg–Witten Floer stable homotopy type and local equivalence. Manolescu's Seiberg–Witten Floer stable homotopy type [31] is a space-valued Floer theoretic invariant of a rational homology 3-sphere equipped with a spin<sup>c</sup> structure, and recovers the monopole Floer homology defined by Kronheimer and Mrowka [24] for this class of 3-manifolds [26]. Therefore, in principle, the Seiberg–Witten Floer stable homotopy type contains all Floer-theoretic information from Seiberg–Witten theory for rational homology 3-spheres.

In this paper, we will consider a spin rational homology 3-sphere  $(Y, \mathfrak{t})$  embedded into a spin 4-manifold  $(X, \mathfrak{s})$  with the rational homology of  $S^1 \times S^3$  so that the fundamental class of Y generates  $H_3(X;\mathbb{Z})$ . The main theorem of this paper states that, if X admits a metric with positive scalar curvature (PSC), we can determine the Seiberg–Witten Floer stable homotopy type of such  $(Y, \mathfrak{t})$ , denoted by SWF $(Y, \mathfrak{t})$ , up to the local equivalence relation explained below. This result gives a strong obstruction to PSC metrics of spin rational homology  $S^1 \times S^3$ , and this is the authors' original motivation for this study. To the same class of 4-manifolds, there are two known obstructions based on Seiberg–Witten theory, Jianfeng Lin's obstruction [28] and the authors' obstruction [23] explained later, and the main theorem of this paper recovers both of them.

To motivate to consider the local equivalence relation, let us recall several homology cobordism invariants from Seiberg–Witten theory. Applying various equivariant ordinary/generalized cohomologies to the Seiberg–Witten Floer stable homotopy type, many numerical homology cobordism invariants can be extracted, such as, the Frøyshov invariant [8,9], which we denote by  $\delta$  following [33], Manolescu's invariants  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \kappa$  [32,33], and Stoffregen's invariants  $\overline{\delta}, \underline{\delta}$  [44]. These invariants have different applications, for example: The Frøyshov invariant  $\delta$  was used to extend Donaldson's diagonalization theorem [5] to negative-definite 4-manifolds with boundary [8,9,31]. Manolescu used the invariant  $\beta$  to disprove the triangulation conjecture [33], and used  $\kappa$  to extend Furuta's 10/8-inequality [13] to spin 4-manifolds with boundary [32]. Stoffregen's invariants  $\overline{\delta}, \underline{\delta}$  should correspond, respectively, to  $\overline{d}, \underline{d}$  in involutive Heegaard Floer homology [16], using  $\mathbb{Z}/4$ -equivariant ordinary cohomology.

These invariants  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \overline{\delta}, \underline{\delta}, \kappa$  are spin rational homology cobordism invariants, and obtained from SWF(Y, t) described above. However, these invariants factor through a weaker invariant than SWF(Y, t), the *local equivalence class* of SWF(Y, t), defined by Stoffregen [45]. The local equivalence is an equivalence relation on a certain class of spaces including SWF(Y, t) for rational homology 3-spheres Y, and this is an abstraction of a relation between SWF(Y<sub>0</sub>, t<sub>0</sub>) and SWF(Y<sub>1</sub>, t<sub>1</sub>) for (Y<sub>0</sub>, t<sub>0</sub>) and (Y<sub>1</sub>, t<sub>1</sub>) which are spin rational homology cobordant to each other. To summarize this situation, let us denote by  $\Theta^3_{\mathbb{Z}}$  the 3-dimensional homology cobordism group, and denote by  $\Theta^3_{\mathbb{Q},spin}$  the 3-dimensional spin rational homology cobordism group. Namely, an element of  $\Theta^3_{\mathbb{Q},spin}$  is the equivalence class [(Y, t)] of a spin rational homology 3-sphere, and the equivalence relation is given by a spin rational homology cobordism. Stoffregen [45] introduced the *local equivalence group*  $\mathcal{LE}$ , which consists of the local equivalence classes of certain spaces modeled on SWF(Y, t). Then one has group homomorphisms For a spin rational homology 3-sphere  $(Y, \mathfrak{t})$ , the local equivalence class  $[SWF(Y, \mathfrak{t})]$ is valued in  $\mathcal{LE}$ , and the above numerical invariants  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \overline{\delta}, \underline{\delta}, \kappa$  factor through  $\mathcal{LE}$ , such as  $\alpha(Y, \mathfrak{t}) = \alpha([(Y, \mathfrak{t})]) = \alpha([SWF(Y, \mathfrak{t})])$ :

$$\Theta^3_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{spin}} o \mathcal{LE} \xrightarrow{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta,\overline{\delta},\underline{\delta},\kappa} \mathbb{Q}.$$

1.2. Main theorem. As described, the local equivalence class  $[SWF(Y, t)] \in \mathcal{LE}$  of SWF(Y, t) is, so far at least, a candidate of the 'universal' Seiberg–Witten theoretic homology cobordism invariant of (Y, t): it contains information of all known homology cobordism invariants obtained from Seiberg–Witten theory. The main theorem of this paper determines [SWF(Y, t)] when Y is embedded into a spin rational homology  $S^1 \times S^3$  admitting a PSC metric so that Y generates  $H_3(X; \mathbb{Z})$ :

**Theorem 1.1.** Let  $(X, \mathfrak{s})$  be an oriented spin rational homology  $S^1 \times S^3$ , and  $(Y, \mathfrak{t})$  be an oriented spin rational homology 3-sphere. Suppose that  $(Y, \mathfrak{t})$  is a cross-section of  $(X, \mathfrak{s})$ , i.e. Y is embedded into X so that it represents a fixed generator of  $H_3(X;\mathbb{Z})$ , and that  $\mathfrak{s}|_Y$  is isomorphic to  $\mathfrak{t}$ . Assume that X admits a PSC metric. Then the local equivalence class of SWF $(Y, \mathfrak{t})$  is given by

(1) 
$$[SWF(Y,\mathfrak{t})] = \left[ \left( S^0, 0, -\frac{\lambda_{SW}(X,\mathfrak{s})}{2} \right) \right]$$

In particular, for an arbitrary spin rational homology cobordism invariant which factors through  $\mathcal{LE}$ , the invariant of  $(Y, \mathfrak{t})$  coincides with the invariant of the right-hand side of (1).

Here  $\lambda_{SW}(X, \mathfrak{s})$  is the Casson-type invariant defined by the Mrowka–Ruberman– Saveliev [34] for an integral homology  $S^1 \times S^3$ , which was later generalized for a rational homology  $S^1 \times S^3$  by J. Lin–Ruberman–Saveliev [30]. Recall that an element of  $\mathcal{LE}$  is expressed as the class of a triple (Z, m, n), where Z is a space of type SWF [33, Definition 2.7], and  $m \in \mathbb{Z}, n \in \mathbb{Q}$ .

*Remark* 1.2. In this paper, we developed Seiberg–Witten theory for 4-manifolds with periodic ends to prove Theorem 1.1. But we expect that an alternative proof of Theorem 1.1 without using Seiberg–Witten theory for 4-manifolds with periodic ends could be given by using Schoen–Yau's argument [42] combined with a kind of gluing theorems for relative Bauer–Furuta invariants [21, 22, 39].

1.3. **Obstructions to PSC metrics.** Now we regard Theorem 1.1 as an obstruction to PSC metrics on homology  $S^1 \times S^3$ , and compare this with known obstructions on PSC metrics for the same class of 4-manifolds. We can extract from Theorem 1.1 convenient obstructions to PSC metrics, and moreover that Theorem 1.1 provides a systematic way to recover prior results.

Recall that it is well-understood which rational homology 3-spheres admit PSC metrics: only connected sums of spherical 3-manifolds. Rational homology  $S^1 \times S^3$  is a class of 4-manifold that may be seen to be closed to rational homology 3-sphere, but it is not easy to rule out the existence of PSC metrics on such 4-manifolds. In dimension 4, the Seiberg–Witten invariant is known as a powerful obstruction to PSC metric, but it cannot be used to rational homology  $S^1 \times S^3$ , since the Seiberg–Witten invariant is not well-defined for such 4-manifolds. J. Lin recently made a breakthrough in this situation: he gave the first obstruction to PSC metric based on Seiberg–Witten theory for integral homology  $S^1 \times S^3$  in [28], and later this result was generalized by himself with Ruberman and Saveliev to any rational

homology  $S^1 \times S^3$  in [30]. J. Lin's obstruction is described as follows: under the same assumption with Theorem 1.1, one has the equality

(2) 
$$\delta(Y,\mathfrak{t}) = \lambda_{SW}(X,\mathfrak{s}).$$

Using Theorem 1.1, we can give an alternative proof of J. Lin's formula (2), and further generalize it to various Frøyshov-type invariants:

**Corollary 1.3.** Let  $(X, \mathfrak{s})$  be an oriented spin rational homology  $S^1 \times S^3$ , and  $(Y, \mathfrak{t})$  be an oriented spin rational homology 3-sphere. Suppose that  $(Y, \mathfrak{t})$  is a cross-section of  $(X, \mathfrak{s})$ . Assume that X admits a PSC metric. Then we have

(3) 
$$\alpha(Y,\mathfrak{t}) = \beta(Y,\mathfrak{t}) = \gamma(Y,\mathfrak{t}) = \delta(Y,\mathfrak{t}) = \delta(Y,\mathfrak{t}) = \underline{\delta}(Y,\mathfrak{t}) = \kappa(Y,\mathfrak{t}) = \lambda_{SW}(X,\mathfrak{s}).$$

*Proof.* By the definition of  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \overline{\delta}, \underline{\delta}, \kappa$  [32, 33, 44], it is easy to see that the values of these invariants for the right-hand side of (1) are given by  $\lambda_{SW}(X, \mathfrak{s})$ . Therefore the corollary directly follows from Theorem 1.1.

Note that, by Corollary 1.3, we can replace  $\lambda_{SW}(X, \mathfrak{s})$  in the right-hand side of (1) with various invariants of  $(Y, \mathfrak{t})$ .

An obvious consequence of Corollary 1.3 is:

**Corollary 1.4.** Let Y be an oriented homology 3-sphere. Suppose that at least two of  $\alpha(Y), \beta(Y), \gamma(Y), \delta(Y), \overline{\delta}(Y), \underline{\delta}(Y), \kappa(Y)$  do not coincide with each other. Then, for any homology cobordism W from Y to itself, the homology  $S^1 \times S^3$  obtained from W by gluing the boundary components does not admit a PSC metric.

Here we drop the unique spin structure from our notation for (integral) homology 3-spheres.

J. Lin [28] and J. Lin–Ruberman–Saveliev [30] used monopole Floer homology to establish the obstruction (2). Morally, our argument in this paper can be thought of as a stable cohomotopy version of J. Lin's argument in [28].

After J. Lin's work, the authors [23] gave another obstruction based on a 10/8type inequality, described in Corollary 1.5. Using Corollary 1.3 combined with Manolescu's relative 10/8-inequality [32], we can give an alternative proof of the authors' previous result (with a minor change):

**Corollary 1.5** ([23]). Let  $(X, \mathfrak{s}), (Y, \mathfrak{t})$  be as in Theorem 1.1. Take a compact smooth spin 4-manifold M bounded by  $(Y, \mathfrak{t})$ . Suppose that  $(Y, \mathfrak{t})$  is a cross-section of  $(X, \mathfrak{s})$ . Assume that X admits a PSC metric. Then we have

(4) 
$$b^+(M) \ge -\frac{\sigma(M)}{8} - \delta(Y, \mathfrak{t}) - 1.$$

*Proof.* Manolescu's relative 10/8-inequality, which is [32, Theorem 1] generalized to a rational homology 3-sphere (see [32, Remark 2]), implies that

$$b^+(M) \ge -\frac{\sigma(M)}{8} - \kappa(Y, \mathfrak{t}) - 1.$$

Combining this with (3), we obtain (4).

Remark 1.6. The inequality (4) is slightly weaker than the original inequality given in [23, Theorem 1.1]. The source of this difference is that, in [23], we used Furuta-Kametani's 10/8-type inequality [14] based on KO-theory, whereas Manolescu's inequality is based on K-theory.

1.4. Outline of the proof of the main theorem. Here is an explanation of an outline of the proof of Theorem 1.1. The heart of this paper is, under the assumption of the existence of PSC metric on X, to consider finite-dimensional approximations of the Seiberg–Witten equations on a periodic-end 4-manifold. More precisely, we shall construct a relative Bauer–Furuta-type invariant over a half-periodic-end 4-manifold

$$W[-\infty, 0] = \cdots \cup_Y W \cup_Y W \cup_Y W,$$

along the spirit of Furuta [13], Bauer–Furuta [3], and Manolescu [31]. Here W is the 4-manifold defined by cutting X open along Y, and the 'left side' end is equipped with a periodic PSC metric and a neighborhood of the 'right side' boundary is equipped with a product metric of the form  $[0,1] \times Y$ . Technically, the relative Bauer–Furuta invariant over such a non-compact 4-manifold is defined using the similar method given in [17] which defines the relative Bauer–Furuta invariant for a certain class of 4-manifolds with conical end.

The key observation is that  $W[-\infty, 0]$  with such a periodic PSC metric on the end looks like a homology cobordism from  $S^3$  to Y from Seiberg–Witten theoretic point of view. The relative Bauer–Furuta invariant over  $W[-\infty, 0]$  gives a local map from  $[(S^0, 0, -\lambda_{SW}(X, \mathfrak{s})/2)]$  to SWF $(Y, \mathfrak{t})$ . The quantity  $\lambda_{SW}(X, \mathfrak{s})$  emerges from the spin Dirac index over  $W[-\infty, 0]$ , discussed in Subsection 3.3.

Similarly, by considering the relative Bauer–Furuta invariant over

$$W[0,\infty] = W \cup_Y W \cup_Y W \cup_Y \cdots,$$

we get a local map from SWF(Y,  $\mathfrak{t}$ ) to  $[(S^0, 0, -\lambda_{SW}(X, \mathfrak{s})/2)]$ , and we can conclude that SWF(Y,  $\mathfrak{t}$ ) is locally equivalent to  $[(S^0, 0, -\lambda_{SW}(X, \mathfrak{s})/2)]$ .

1.5. **Examples.** In Section 8 we shall give examples of concrete 3-manifolds Y to which we can apply the obstructions given in Subsection 1.3. Here let us exhibit a part of those examples.

As a consequence of his formula (2), J. Lin proved in [28, Corollary 1.3] that a homology  $S^1 \times S^3$  having a cross-section Y with  $\mu(Y) \neq \delta(Y) \mod 2$  does not admit a PSC metric. Here  $\mu(Y) \in \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$  denotes the Rohlin invariant. For Seifert homology 3-spheres, we can get an 'integer-valued lift' of this result by J. Lin. Moreover, also for linear combinations of Seifert homology 3-spheres of certain type, we can get an obstructions described in terms of some integer-valued invariants of certain 3-manifolds:

**Theorem 1.7.** The following statements hold:

(i) Let Y' be a Seifert homology 3-sphere such that

$$-\overline{\mu}(Y') \neq \delta(Y'),$$

where  $\overline{\mu}$  is the Neumann–Siebenmann invariant for graph homology 3-spheres, introduced in [36,43]. Let Y be an oriented homology 3-sphere which is homology cobordant to Y'. Then, for any homology cobordism W from Y to itself, the 4-manifold obtained from W by gluing the boundary components does not admit a PSC metric.

(ii) Let  $Y_1, \dots, Y_n$  be negative Seifert homology 3-spheres of projective type. Suppose that  $\delta(Y_1) \leq \dots \leq \delta(Y_n)$ . Set  $\tilde{\delta}_i := \delta(Y_i) + \overline{\mu}(Y_i)$ . Suppose that at least two of following four integers are distinct:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta(Y_i), \quad 2\lfloor \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \widetilde{\delta}_i + 1}{2} \rfloor - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \overline{\mu}(Y_i),$$
$$2\lfloor \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \widetilde{\delta}_i + 1}{2} \rfloor - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \overline{\mu}(Y_i), \quad 2\lfloor \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \widetilde{\delta}_i + 1}{2} \rfloor - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \overline{\mu}(Y_i).$$

Let Y be an oriented homology 3-sphere which is homology cobordant to  $Y_1 \# \cdots \# Y_n$ . Then, for any homology cobordism W from Y to itself, the 4-manifold obtained from W by gluing the boundary components does not admit a PSC metric.

For the definition of projective Seifert homology 3-spheres, see Section 8.

1.6. Outline of this paper. We finish off this introduction with an outline of the contents of this paper. The contents until Section 5 are devoted to construct the relative Bauer–Furuta invariant on the periodic-end 4-manifold  $W[-\infty,0]$ . In Section 2 we give several notations related to infinite cyclic covering spaces of a 4-manifold. We also review Fredholm theory for infinite cyclic covering spaces, Seiberg–Witten Floer homotopy types and notion of local equivalence. In Section 3 we ensure Fredholm properties of elliptic operators on certain 4-manifolds with periodic end and boundary. We calculate cohomologies of the Atiyah–Hitchin– Singer operator on such non-compact 4-manifolds. We also calculate the Dirac index on  $W[-\infty, 0]$  in Subsection 3.3. In Section 4 we show a boundedness result which is needed to construct the relative Bauer–Furuta invariant. In Section 5 we construct the relative Bauer–Furuta invariant for the 4-manifolds  $W[-\infty, 0]$  with periodic end and boundary. In Section 6 we prove Theorem 1.1 along the idea explained in Subsection 1.4. In Section 7 we give a generalization of Theorem 1.1, which is stated as an obstruction of embeddings of 3-manifolds into 4-manifolds admitting PSC metrics. In Section 8 we provide several families of examples of homology  $S^1 \times S^3$ 's which cannot admit PSC metrics using Theorem 1.1.

Acknowledgment. The authors would like to express their gratitude to the organizers and participants of Gauge Theory Virtual for giving them an opportunity to reconsider their past work [23]. The authors also wish to thank Nobuo Iida for discussing Remark 1.2 with us. The first author was partially supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers 17H06461, 19K23412, and 21K13785. The second author was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 20K22319 and RIKEN iTHEMS Program.

### 2. Preliminaries

2.1. Notations. In this subsection we introduce several notations on periodic 4manifolds. Let  $(X, \mathfrak{s})$  be an oriented spin rational homology  $S^1 \times S^3$ , i.e. a spin 4-manifold whose rational homology is isomorphic to that of  $S^1 \times S^3$ . Fix a Riemannian metric  $g_X$  on X and a generator of  $H_3(X;\mathbb{Z})$ , denoted by  $1 \in H_3(X;\mathbb{Z})$ . Note that  $H_3(X;\mathbb{Z})$  is isomorphic to  $H^1(X;\mathbb{Z})$ , and hence to  $\mathbb{Z}$ . Let Y be an oriented rational homology 3-sphere, and assume that Y is embedded into X so that [Y] = 1. We call such Y a *cross-section* of X. Let  $W_0$  be the rational homology cobordism from Y to itself obtained by cutting X open along Y. The manifold  $W_0$  is equipped with an orientation and a spin structure induced by those of X. For  $(m, n) \in (\{-\infty\} \cup \mathbb{Z}) \times (\mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\})$  with m < n, we define the periodic 4-manifold

$$W[m,n] := W_m \cup_Y W_{m+1} \cup_Y \cdots \cup_Y W_n,$$

where  $W_i$  is a copy of  $W_0$  for each  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ . This 4-manifold W[m, n] is also equipped with an orientation and a spin structure as well as  $W_0$ . The element of  $H^1(X;\mathbb{Z})$ corresponding to  $1 \in H_3(X;\mathbb{Z})$  via the Poincaré duality gives the isomorphism class of an infinite cyclic covering

$$(5) p: X \to X$$

and an identification

(6)  $\widetilde{X} \cong W[-\infty, \infty].$ 

Via the identification (6), let us think of p as a map from  $W[-\infty,\infty]$  to X. Define the map  $p_-: W[-\infty,0] \to X$  as the restriction of p. We call an object defined on  $W[-\infty,0]$ , such as connection, metric, bundle, and differential operator, a *periodic object* if the restriction of the object to  $W[-\infty,0]$  can be identified with the pull-back of an object on X under  $p_-$ . Considering the pull-back under  $p_-$ , the Riemannian metric  $g_X$  on X induces a Riemannian metric, denoted by  $g_{W[-\infty,0]}$ , on  $W[-\infty,0]$ . Let  $S^+, S^-$  be the positive/negative spinor bundles respectively over  $W[-\infty,0]$  with respect to the metric and the spin structure above. Fixing a trivialization of the determinant line bundle of the spin structure on  $W[-\infty,0]$ , we obtain the canonical reference connection  $A_0$  on  $W[-\infty,0]$  corresponding to the trivial connection.

To consider the weighted Sobolev norms on  $W[-\infty, 0]$ , fix a function

$$\tau:X\to\mathbb{R}$$

with  $T^*\tau = \tau + 1$ , where  $T: \widetilde{X} \to \widetilde{X}$  is the deck transform determined by  $T(W_i) = W_{i-1}$ . Note that  $d\tau$  defined a cohomology class  $[d\tau] \in H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})$  which is equal to  $1 \in H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})$  corresponding to  $1 \in H_3(X; \mathbb{Z})$  via the Poincaré duality.

**Definition 2.1.** Let *E* be a periodic vector bundle on  $W[-\infty, 0]$  with a periodic inner product. For a fixed k > 0 and  $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$ , we define the *weighted Sobolev norm* by

$$||f||_{L^2_{k,\delta}(W[-\infty,0])} := ||e^{\delta\tau}f||_{L^2_k(W[-\infty,0])}$$

for a smooth comactly supported section f of E. Here we used a periodic metric and a periodic connection on E to define the  $L^2_k$ -norm. Let  $L^2_{k,\delta}(E)$  denote the  $L^2_{k,\delta}$ -completion of compactly supported smooth sections of E.

Note that the equivalence class of norms  $\| - \|_{L^2_{k,\delta}(W[-\infty,0])}$  does not depend on the choices of a periodic metric and a periodic connection on E.

2.2. Fredholm theory on  $\tilde{X}$ . In this subsection we review the Fredholm property of periodic elliptic operators on the infinite cyclic covering  $\tilde{X}$  developed by C. Taubes [47]. He showed that a periodic elliptic operator is Fredholm under some condition with respect to  $L^2_{k,\delta}$ -norms for generic  $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$ . For the details, see [47], or [23, Subsection 2.1].

Let  $\mathbb{D} = (D_i, E_i)$  be a periodic elliptic complex on  $\widetilde{X}$ , i.e. the complex

(7) 
$$0 \to \Gamma(\widetilde{X}; E_N) \xrightarrow{D_N} \Gamma(\widetilde{X}; E_{N-1}) \to \cdots \xrightarrow{D_1} \Gamma(\widetilde{X}; E_0) \to 0$$

consisting of first order periodic linear differential operators  $D_i$  between periodic vector bundles  $E_i$  on  $\widetilde{X}$  with exact symbol sequence. Here, for a vector bundle E, the notation  $\Gamma(\widetilde{X}, E)$  denotes the set of compactly supported smooth sections of E. As well as Definition 2.1, define the weighted Sobolev norm on  $\widetilde{X}$  by

$$\|f\|_{L^2_{k,\delta}(\widetilde{X})} := \|e^{\tau\delta}f\|_{L^2_k(\widetilde{X})}$$

using a periodic connection and a periodic metric. The complex (7) gives rise to the complex of bounded operators

(8) 
$$L^2_{k+N+1,\delta}(\widetilde{X}; E_N) \xrightarrow{D_N} L^2_{k+N,\delta}(\widetilde{X}; E_{N-1}) \to \cdots \xrightarrow{D_1} L^2_{k,\delta}(\widetilde{X}; E_0)$$

for each k > 0 and  $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$ .

Note that, since the operators in (8) are periodic differential operators, there exist differential operators  $\hat{\mathbb{D}} = (\hat{D}_i, \hat{E}_i)_{i=0,\dots,N}$  on X such that  $\mathbb{D}$  is given as the pull-back  $p_{-}^*\hat{\mathbb{D}}$ .

**Definition 2.2.** For  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ , define the complex  $\hat{\mathbb{D}}(z)$  by

$$0 \to \Gamma(X; \hat{E}_N) \xrightarrow{D_N(z)} \Gamma(X; \hat{E}_{N-1}) \to \cdots \xrightarrow{D_1(z)} \Gamma(X; \hat{E}_0) \to 0,$$

where the operators  $\hat{D}_i(z) : \Gamma(X; \hat{E}_i) \to \Gamma(X; \hat{E}_{i-1})$  are defined by

$$\hat{D}_i(z)(f) := e^{-\tau z} \hat{D}_i(e^{\tau z} f).$$

**Theorem 2.3** ([47, Lemmas 4.3 and 4.5]). Suppose that there exists  $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$  where the complex  $\hat{\mathbb{D}}(z_0)$  is acyclic. Then there exists a discrete subset  $\mathcal{D}$  in  $\mathbb{R}$  with no accumulation points such that the complex (8) is an acyclic complex for all  $\delta$  in  $\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{D}$ .

**Definition 2.4** ([38]). We call  $g_X$  an *admissible metric* on X if the kernel of

$$D_{A_0}^+ + f^* d\theta : L_k^2(X; S^+) \to L_{k-1}^2(X; S^-)$$

is zero, where the map  $f: X \to S^1$  is a smooth classifying map of (5).

The admissibility condition does not depend on the choice of classifying map f. One can show that every PSC metric on X is an admissible metric (See (2) in [38]).

In [23], we confirmed that Theorem 2.3 can be used for differential operators appearing as the linearization of the Seiberg–Witten equations:

**Lemma 2.5** ([23, Lemma 2.6]). The assumption of Theorem 2.3 is satisfied for the following operator/complexes:

- The Dirac operator  $D^+_{A_0}: L^2_{k,\delta}(\widetilde{X}; S^+) \to L^2_{k-1,\delta}(\widetilde{X}; S^-)$  with respect to the pull-back of an admissible metric  $g_X$  on X.
- The Atiyah–Hitchin–Singer complex

 $0 \to L^2_{k+1,\delta}(i\Lambda^0(\widetilde{X})) \xrightarrow{d} L^2_{k,\delta}(i\Lambda^1(\widetilde{X})) \xrightarrow{d^+} L^2_{k-1,\delta}(i\Lambda^+(\widetilde{X})) \to 0.$ 

• The de Rham complex

$$0 \to L^2_{k+1,\delta}(i\Lambda^0(\widetilde{X})) \xrightarrow{d} L^2_{k,\delta}(i\Lambda^1(\widetilde{X})) \xrightarrow{d} \cdots \xrightarrow{d} L^2_{k-3,\delta}(i\Lambda^4(\widetilde{X})) \to 0.$$

Remark 2.6. Since the subset  $\mathcal{D}$  of  $\mathbb{R}$  given in Theorem 2.3 has no accumulation points, we can take a sufficiently small  $\delta_0 > 0$  so that for any  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$  the operators in Lemma 2.5 are Fredholm. Henceforth we fix the notation  $\delta_0$ .

2.3. Seiberg–Witten Floer stable homotopy type. In the proof of Theorem 1.1, we use a variant of the relative Bauer–Furuta invariant for 4-manifolds with periodic end. In this subsection we review several notions of Manolescu's Seiberg– Witten Floer stable homotopy type, which is necessary to describe the relative Bauer–Furuta invariant. The main references of this subsection are Manolescu [31] and Khandhawit [19].

Let Y be an oriented rational homology 3-sphere with a Riemannian metric  $g_Y$ . Let t be a spin<sup>c</sup> structure on Y, and S be the spinor bundle of t. We fix a flat spin<sup>c</sup> reference connection  $a_0$  of the determinant line bundle of S.

**Definition 2.7.** For an integer k > 2, we define the *configuration space* by

$$\mathcal{C}_k(Y,\mathfrak{t}) := (a_0 + L^2_{k-\frac{1}{2}}(i\Lambda^1_Y)) \oplus L^2_{k-\frac{1}{2}}(S).$$

The Chern-Simons-Dirac functional  $CSD: \mathcal{C}_k(Y, \mathfrak{t}) \to \mathbb{R}$  is defined by

$$CSD(a,\phi) := \frac{1}{2} \left( -\int_Y a \wedge da + \int_Y \left\langle \phi, \partial\!\!\!/_{a_0+a} \phi \right\rangle \operatorname{dvol}_Y \right),$$

where  $\partial_{a_0+a}^+$  is the spin<sup>c</sup> Dirac operator with respect to the connection  $a_0 + a$ .

The gauge group  $\mathcal{G}_k(Y)$  and a subgroup  $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_k(Y)$  of  $\mathcal{G}_k(Y)$  are defined by

$$\mathcal{G}_k(Y) := L^2_{k+\frac{1}{2}}(Y, S^1)$$

and

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_k(Y) := \left\{ \left. g \in \mathcal{G}_k(Y) \right| g = e^{if}, \int_Y f \operatorname{vol}_Y = 0 \right\}.$$

The gauge group  $\mathcal{G}_k(Y)$  naturally acts on  $\mathcal{C}_k(Y, \mathfrak{t})$  and the functional CSD is invariant under the action. The global slice of the action of  $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_k(Y)$  on  $\mathcal{C}_k(Y, \mathfrak{t})$  is given by

$$V_k(Y, \mathfrak{s}) = (\operatorname{Ker} d^* : L^2_{k - \frac{1}{2}}(\Lambda^1_Y) \to L^2_{k - \frac{3}{2}}(\Lambda^0_Y)) \oplus L^2_{k - \frac{1}{2}}(S),$$

on which we still have the remaining  $S^1$ -action. We often drop k and/or  $(Y, \mathfrak{s})$  from our notation to denote  $V_k(Y, \mathfrak{s})$ . The  $S^1$ -equivariant formal gradient flow on  $V(Y, \mathfrak{s})$ of CSD with respect to the Coulomb projection of the  $L^2$ -metric can be written as the sum of the linear term

$$l = (*d, \mathscr{D}_{a_0}) : V_k(Y, \mathfrak{s}) \to V_{k-1}(Y, \mathfrak{s})$$

and some quadratic term, denoted by  $c: V_k(Y, \mathfrak{s}) \to V_{k-1}(Y, \mathfrak{s})$ .

For  $\lambda < 0 < \mu$ , we define  $V_{\lambda}^{\mu}(Y)$  as the direct sum of eigenspaces of l, regarded as an unbounded operator on  $V_{1/2}(Y, \mathfrak{s})$ , whose eigenvalues belong to  $(\lambda, \mu]$ . Here we think of  $V_{\lambda}^{\mu}(Y)$  as a subspace of  $V_k(Y, \mathfrak{s})$ . We denote by

$$p_{\lambda}^{\mu}: V_k(Y, \mathfrak{s}) \to V_{\lambda}^{\mu}(Y)$$

the  $L^2$ -projection of  $V_k(Y, \mathfrak{s})$  onto  $V_{\lambda}^{\mu}(Y)$ . We often abbreviate  $V_{\lambda}^{\mu}(Y)$  as  $V_{\lambda}^{\mu}$ . Since l is the sum of a real operator and a complex operator,  $V_{\lambda}^{\mu}$  decomposes into a real vector space and a complex vector space, denoted by

(9) 
$$V_{\lambda}^{\mu} = V_{\lambda}^{\mu}(\mathbb{R}) \oplus V_{\lambda}^{\mu}(\mathbb{C}).$$

Let us use basic terms of Conley index theory following [31, Section 5]. Manolescu proved some compactness result [31, Proposition 3], and as a consequence, it turns out that a closed ball in  $V^{\mu}_{\lambda}$  of sufficiently large radius centered at the origin is an isolating neighborhood of the invariant part of the ball. Precisely, the flow on  $V^{\mu}_{\lambda}$  considered here is a flow obtained from  $(l + p_{\lambda}^{\mu}c)$  by cutting off outside a larger ball (see [31, page 907]). We denote by  $I_{\lambda}^{\mu}$  the  $S^1$ -equivariant Conley index of the invariant part. The Seiberg–Witten Floer homotopy type SWF $(Y, \mathfrak{t})$  is defined as the triple  $(\Sigma^{-V_{\lambda}^{0}}I_{\lambda}^{\mu}, 0, n(Y, \mathfrak{t}, g_{Y}))$ , which is symbolically denoted by

$$SWF(Y, \mathfrak{t}) = \Sigma^{-n(Y, \mathfrak{t}, g_Y)\mathbb{C} - V_{\lambda}^0} I_{\lambda}^{\mu}.$$

The triple is regarded as an object a certain suspension category  $\mathfrak{C}$ . In general an object of  $\mathfrak{C}$  is given as a triple (Z, m, n), where Z is a pointed topological  $S^1$ -space,  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ , and  $n \in \mathbb{Q}$ . The quantity  $n(Y, \mathfrak{t}, g_Y) \in \mathbb{Q}$  is defined to be

(10) 
$$n(Y, \mathfrak{t}, g_Y) := \operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D^+ + \frac{\sigma(W)}{8},$$

where  $(W, \mathfrak{t}')$  is a compact spin<sup>c</sup> 4-manifold satisfying  $\partial(W, \mathfrak{t}') = (Y, \mathfrak{t})$  and  $\operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D^+$  means the index of the Dirac operator with APS boundary condition. For the meaning of formal desuspensions, see [31].

Here let us consider the case when the spin<sup>c</sup> structure t comes from a spin structure. In this case, the formal gradient flow of CSD admits a larger symmetry of the group Pin(2) defined by

$$\operatorname{Pin}(2) := S^1 \cup jS^1 \subset Sp(1).$$

This group  $\operatorname{Pin}(2)$  acts on  $V_k(Y, \mathfrak{s})$  for any non-negative integer k as follows: the  $\operatorname{Pin}(2)$ -action on spinors given as the restriction of the natural Sp(1)-action on spinor bundles, and the  $\operatorname{Pin}(2)$ -action on  $\Omega^1_Y$  is given via the non-trivial homomorphism  $\operatorname{Pin}(2) \to O(1)$ . We denote by  $\mathbb{R}$  the real 1-dimensional representation of  $\operatorname{Pin}(2)$ , and by  $\mathbb{H}$  the space of quaternions, on which  $\operatorname{Pin}(2)$  naturally acts. Thus we have decompositions

$$V_k(Y,\mathfrak{s}) = V(\mathbb{R}) \oplus V(\mathbb{H})$$

and

(11) 
$$V_{\lambda}^{\mu} = V_{\lambda}^{\mu}(\mathbb{R}) \oplus V_{\lambda}^{\mu}(\mathbb{H}).$$

Considering Pin(2)-equivariant Conley index instead, we obtain a stable homotopy type of a pointed Pin(2)-space

$$SWF(Y, \mathfrak{t}) = \Sigma^{-\frac{n(Y, \mathfrak{t}, g)}{2} \mathbb{H} - V_{\lambda}^{0}} I_{\lambda}^{\mu},$$

which lies in a suspension category  $\mathfrak{C}'$ . An object of  $\mathfrak{C}'$  is given as a triple (Z, m, n), where Z is a pointed topological Pin(2)-space,  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ , and  $n \in \mathbb{Q}$ .

Let us recall the definition of local equivalence.

**Definition 2.8** ([45]). For two objects  $(Z_1, m_1, n_1)$  and  $(Z_2, m_2, n_2)$  in  $\mathfrak{C}'$ , a local map is a Pin(2)-equivariant map

$$f: \Sigma^{(N-n_1)\mathbb{H}} \Sigma^{(M-m_1)\widetilde{\mathbb{R}}} Z_1 \to \Sigma^{(N-n_2)\mathbb{H}} \Sigma^{(M-m_2)\widetilde{\mathbb{R}}} Z_2$$

for some  $M \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $N \in \mathbb{Q}$  such that the  $S^1$ -invariant part  $f^{S^1}$  is a Pin(2)homotopy equivalence. Two objects  $(Z_1, m_1, n_1)$  and  $(Z_2, m_2, n_2)$  are *locally equivalent* if there exist local maps  $f : (Z_1, m_1, n_1) \to (Z_2, m_2, n_2)$  and  $g : (Z_2, m_2, n_2) \to (Z_1, m_1, n_1)$ .

Typical examples of local maps are obtained as the relative Bauer–Furuta invariants for negative definite spin cobordisms between rational homology 3-spheres. 2.4. The Seiberg–Witten equations on  $W[-\infty, 0]$ . In this subsection we describe the Seiberg–Witten equations on  $W[-\infty, 0]$ , mainly to fix notations. We use the double Cloumb gauge condition introduced in [19].

**Definition 2.9.** Let k be a positive integer with  $k \ge 4$  and  $\delta$  a positive real number. We first define the *configuration space*  $C_{k,\delta}(W[-\infty, 0])$  by

$$\mathcal{C}_{k,\delta}(W[-\infty,0]) := (A_0,0) + L^2_{k,\delta}(i\Lambda^1_{W[-\infty,0]}) \oplus L^2_{k,\delta}(S^+_{W[-\infty,0]}).$$

The gauge group  $\mathcal{G}_{k+1,\delta}(W[-\infty,0])$  is given by

$$\mathcal{G}_{k+1,\delta}(W[-\infty,0]) := \left\{ u : W[-\infty,0] \to \mathbb{C} \mid |u(x)| = 1 \ (\forall x \in W[-\infty,0]), \ 1-u \in L^2_{k+1,\delta}(\underline{\mathbb{C}}) \right\}.$$

Here  $\underline{\mathbb{C}}$  denotes the trivial bundle over  $W[-\infty, 0]$  with fiber  $\mathbb{C}$ . The action of  $\mathcal{G}_{k+1,\delta}(W[-\infty, 0])$  on  $\mathcal{C}_{k,\delta}(W[-\infty, 0])$  is given by

$$u \cdot (A, \Phi) := (A - u^{-1}du, u\Phi).$$

The *double Coulomb slice* introduced in [19] is defined by

$$\mathcal{U}_{k,\delta}(W[-\infty,0]) := L^2_{k,\delta}(i\Lambda^1_{W[-\infty,0]})_{CC} \oplus L^2_{k,\delta}(S^+_{W[-\infty,0]}),$$

where

$$L^{2}_{k,\delta}(i\Lambda^{1}_{W[-\infty,0]})_{CC} := \left\{ a \in L^{2}_{k,\delta}(i\Lambda^{1}_{W[-\infty,0]}) \mid d^{*\delta}a = 0, d^{*}\mathbf{t}a = 0 \right\}.$$

Here **t** denotes the restriction of 1-forms as differential forms and  $d^{*_{\delta}}$  is the formal adjoint of d with respect to  $L^2_{\delta}$ .

We will prove that  $\mathcal{U}_{k,\delta}(W[-\infty,0])$  gives a global slice with respect to the action of  $\mathcal{G}_{k+1,\delta}(W[-\infty,0])$  on  $\mathcal{C}_{k,\delta}(W[-\infty,0])$ . Note that, on  $\mathcal{C}_{k,\delta}(W[-\infty,0])$ , the 'full gauge group'

$$\left\{u: W[-\infty, 0] \to \mathbb{C} \mid |u(x)| = 1 \ (\forall x \in W[-\infty, 0]), \ du \in L^2_{k,\delta}(\underline{\mathbb{C}})\right\}$$

also acts. Thus we have an additional  $S^1$ -symmetry on  $\mathcal{U}_{k,\delta}(W[-\infty,0])$  coming from the limits with respect to the end of gauge transformations.

Based on the Sobolev embedding  $\mathcal{G}_{k+1,\delta}(W[-\infty,0]) \to C^0(W[-\infty,0],S^1)$ , we can naturally define the group structure on  $\mathcal{G}_{k+1,\delta}(W[-\infty,0])$  by pointwise multiplication.

On  $W[-\infty, 0]$ , one can define the Seiberg-Witten map

(13) 
$$\mathcal{F}_{W[-\infty,0]} : \mathcal{C}_{k,\delta}(W[-\infty,0]) \to L^2_{k-1,\delta}(i\Lambda^+_{W[-\infty,0]} \oplus S^-_{W[-\infty,0]})$$

by

(14) 
$$\mathcal{F}_{W[-\infty,0]}(A,\Phi) := \left(\frac{1}{2}F_{A^t}^+ - \rho^{-1}(\Phi\Phi^*)_0, D_A^+\Phi\right).$$

When we write  $(a, \phi) = (A, \Phi) - (A_0, 0)$ , we often decompose the Seiberg–Witten map  $\mathcal{F}_{W[-\infty,0]}$  as the sum of the linear part

(15) 
$$L_{W[-\infty,0]}(a,\phi) := \left(d^+a, D^+_{A_0}\phi\right),$$

the quadratic part

$$C_{W[-\infty,0]}(a,\phi) := (-(\phi\phi^*)_0,\rho(a)\phi).$$

We regard  $L_{W[-\infty,0]}$  also as an operator with domain  $\mathcal{U}_{k,\delta}(W[-\infty,0])$  by the restriction. The quadratic part is a compact operator by [28, Proposition 2.13] for a positive  $\delta$ . The differential equation

(16) 
$$\mathcal{F}_{W[-\infty,0]}(A,\Phi) = 0$$

is called the Seiberg-Witten equation for  $W[-\infty, 0]$ . The linearlization of  $\mathcal{F}_{W[-\infty, 0]}$ is given by  $L_{W[-\infty,0]}$ .

3. Linear analysis on  $W[-\infty, 0]$ 

Fix a Riemann metric  $g_{W[-\infty,0]}$  on  $W[-\infty,0]$  such that

- g<sub>W[-∞,0]</sub>|<sub>W[-∞,-1]</sub> is periodic and PSC, and
  g<sub>W[-∞,0]</sub> is product metric near ∂W[-∞,0] = Y.

3.1. Fredholm theory on  $W[-\infty, 0]$ . In this subsection, we prove certain Fredholm properties which will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.1. For a fixed periodic spin structure on  $W[-\infty, 0]$ , the spinor bundles are written as  $S^+$  and  $S^-$ . In this section, we use the following completions:

$$L^{2}_{k,\delta}(i\Lambda^{1}_{W[-\infty,0]}), \ L^{2}_{k,\delta}(i\Lambda^{+}_{W[-\infty,0]}), \text{ and } L^{2}_{k,\delta}(S^{\pm}).$$

We prove the Fredholm properties of the following two types of operators on  $W[-\infty,0]$ :

• the Atiyah–Hitchin–Singer operator with APS-boundary condition:

(17)  
$$d^{*\delta} + d^{+} + \hat{p}^{0}_{-\infty} \circ \hat{r} : L^{2}_{k,\delta}(i\Lambda^{1}_{W[-\infty,0]}) \rightarrow L^{2}_{k-1,\delta}(i\Lambda^{0}_{W[-\infty,0]} \oplus \Lambda^{+}_{W[-\infty,0]}) \oplus \widehat{V}^{0}_{-\infty}(Y;\mathbb{R}),$$

where

(i) the space  $\widehat{V}^0_{-\infty}(Y;\mathbb{R})$  is the  $L^2_{k-\frac{1}{2}}$ -completion of the negative eigenspaces of the operator

$$\widehat{l} := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -d^* \\ -d & *d \end{pmatrix} : \Omega^0_Y \oplus \Omega^1_Y \to \Omega^0_Y \oplus \Omega^1_Y,$$

- (ii) the map  $\widehat{r}: L^2_{k,\delta}(i\Lambda^1_{W[-\infty,0]}) \to L^2_{k-\frac{1}{2}}(\Lambda^0_Y \oplus \Lambda^1_Y)$  is the restriction,
- (iii) the operator

$$\widehat{p}^0_{-\infty}: L^2_{k-\frac{1}{2}}(\Lambda^0_Y \oplus \Lambda^1_Y) \to \widehat{V}^0_{-\infty}(Y;\mathbb{R})$$

is the  $L^2$ -projection to  $\widehat{V}^0_{-\infty}(Y;\mathbb{R})$ .

• the Dirac operator with APS-boundary condition:

(18) 
$$D_{A_0}^+ + \hat{p}_{-\infty}^0 \circ \hat{r} : L^2_{k,\delta}(S^+_{W[-\infty,0]}) \to L^2_{k-1,\delta}(S^-_{W[-\infty,0]}) \oplus \hat{V}^0_{-\infty}(Y,\mathbb{C}),$$

where

(i) the space  $\widehat{V}^0_{-\infty}(Y,\mathbb{C})$  is the  $L^2_{k-\frac{1}{2}}$ -completion of the negative eigenspaces of the operator

$$\mathscr{D}_{B_0}: \Gamma(S) \to \Gamma(S).$$

(ii) the map  $\widehat{r}: L^2_{k,\delta}(S^+_{W[-\infty,0]}) \to L^2_{k-\frac{1}{2}}(S)$  is the restriction,

(iii) the operator

$$\widehat{p}^0_{-\infty}: L^2_{k-\frac{1}{2}}(S) \to \widehat{V}^0_{-\infty}(Y, \mathbb{C})$$

is the  $L^2$ -projection to  $\widehat{V}^0_{-\infty}(Y)$ .

We first prove the following proposition:

**Proposition 3.1.** The following facts hold:

- (i) For any  $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$ , the operator (18) is Fredholm.
- (ii) Let  $\delta_0$  be a positive real number given in Remark 2.6. For any  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$ , the operator (17) is Fredholm.

*Proof.* Both statements follow from the standard patching argument of parametrixes of these operators.

• First, we prove (i). By Lemma 2.5, since positive scalar curvature metrics are admissible, we see that the Dirac operator

$$D^+_{A_0}: L^2_{k,\delta}(\widetilde{X}; S^+) \to L^2_{k-1,\delta}(\widetilde{X}; S^-)$$

is an isomorphism for any  $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$ , and we get a continuous inverse  $P_{\delta}$ :  $L^{2}_{k-1,\delta}(\widetilde{X}; S^{-}) \to L^{2}_{k,\delta}(\widetilde{X}; S^{+})$ . By patching a local parametrix of (18) near the boundary Y and  $P_{\delta}$ , we obtain a parametrix of (18). This implies the conclusion.

• Next, we prove (ii). By Lemma 2.5,

$$0 \to L^2_{k+1,\delta}(i\Lambda^0(\widetilde{X})) \xrightarrow{d} L^2_{k,\delta}(i\Lambda^1(\widetilde{X})) \xrightarrow{d^+} L^2_{k-1,\delta}(i\Lambda^+(\widetilde{X})) \to 0$$

is an acyclic complex for  $\delta \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{D}$ , where  $\mathcal{D}$  is a discrete subset of  $\mathbb{R}$  given in Theorem 2.3. This implies that

$$d^+ + d^{*_\delta}: L^2_{k,\delta}(i\Lambda^1(\widetilde{X})) \to L^2_{k-1,\delta}(i\Lambda^+(\widetilde{X})) \oplus L^2_{k-1,\delta}(i\Lambda^0(\widetilde{X}))$$

is an isomorphism for  $\delta \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{D}$ . Since  $\mathcal{D}$  does not have accumulation points, there exists a small positive real number  $\delta_0$  such that

$$(0,\delta_0)\cap\mathcal{D}=\emptyset$$

Then the remaining part is the same as the proof of (i).

 $\operatorname{Set}$ 

$$W(Y) := i\mathbb{R}^{b_0(Y)} \oplus dL^2_{k-1/2}(i\Lambda^0_Y)$$

and consider the operators

$$\begin{split} L_{W[-\infty,0]} &\oplus (p^0_{-\infty} \circ r) : \mathcal{U}_{k,\delta} \to L^2_{k-1,\delta}(i\Lambda^+ \oplus S^-) \oplus V^0_{-\infty}, \\ \hat{L}_{W[-\infty,0]} &\oplus (\hat{p}^0_{-\infty} \circ \hat{r}) : L^2_{k,\delta}(i\Lambda^1 \oplus S^+) \to L^2_{k-1,\delta}(i\Lambda^0 \oplus i\Lambda^+ \oplus S^-) \oplus \hat{V}^0_{-\infty} \end{split}$$

over  $W[-\infty, 0]$ . Here  $L_{W[-\infty, 0]}$  is defined in (15), and  $\widehat{L}_{W[-\infty, 0]}$  is defined by

$$\widehat{L}_{W[-\infty,0]}(a,\phi) := (d^{*\delta}a, d^+a, D^+_{A_0}\phi).$$

It follows from Proposition 3.1 that the operator  $\widehat{L}_{W[-\infty,0]} \oplus (\widehat{p}^0_{-\infty} \circ \widehat{r})$  is Fredholm for all  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$ .

**Proposition 3.2.** Let  $\delta_0$  be the positive real number given in Remark 2.6. For any  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$ , we obtain

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{Ker}(L_{W[-\infty,0]} \oplus (p_{-\infty}^0 \circ r)) \cong \operatorname{Ker}(\widehat{L}_{W[-\infty,0]} \oplus (\widehat{p}_{-\infty}^0 \circ \widehat{r})), \\ \operatorname{Coker}(L_{W[-\infty,0]} \oplus (p_{-\infty}^0 \circ r)) \cong \operatorname{Coker}(\widehat{L}_{W[-\infty,0]} \oplus (\widehat{p}_{-\infty}^0 \circ \widehat{r})), \end{cases}$$

where Coker denotes the algebraic cokernel. In particular,  $L_{W[-\infty,0]} \oplus (p^0_{-\infty} \circ r)$  is Fredholm and the index of  $L_{W[-\infty,0]} \oplus (p^0_{-\infty} \circ r)$  coincides with that of  $\widehat{L}_{W[-\infty,0]} \oplus (\widehat{p}^0_{-\infty} \circ \widehat{r})$ .

*Proof.* The proof is essentially the same as the proof in [20]. First, by the choice of  $\delta$ , Proposition 3.1 implies that  $d^{*_{\delta}} + d^+ + \hat{p}^0_{-\infty} \circ \hat{r}$  is Fredholm. Set

$$\widehat{V}(Y) = \widehat{V} = i\Omega^0(Y) \oplus i\Omega^1(Y)$$

and let

$$\varpi: \widehat{V}(Y) \to W(Y)$$

be the  $L^2$ -orthogonal projection, and consider an operator

(19) 
$$\begin{array}{c}
\widehat{L}_{W[-\infty,0]} \oplus ((p^{0}_{-\infty} \oplus \varpi) \circ \widehat{r}) : L^{2}_{k,\delta}(i\Lambda^{1}_{W[-\infty,0]} \oplus S^{+}) \\
\rightarrow L^{2}_{k-1,\delta}(i\Lambda^{0}_{W[-\infty,0]} \oplus i\Lambda^{+}_{W[-\infty,0]} \oplus S^{-}) \oplus V^{0}_{-\infty}(Y;\mathbb{R}) \oplus W(Y)
\end{array}$$

as an intermediary between the two operators in the statement of the proposition. We first show that

(20) 
$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{Ker}(\widehat{L}_{W[-\infty,0]} \oplus ((p_{-\infty}^{0} \oplus \varpi) \circ \widehat{r})) \cong \operatorname{Ker}(\widehat{L} \oplus (\widehat{p}_{-\infty}^{0} \circ \widehat{r})) \\ \operatorname{Coker}(\widehat{L}_{W[-\infty,0]} \oplus ((p_{-\infty}^{0} \oplus \varpi) \circ \widehat{r})) \cong \operatorname{Coker}(\widehat{L} \oplus (\widehat{p}_{-\infty}^{0} \circ \widehat{r})). \end{cases}$$

 $\operatorname{Set}$ 

$$V^{\perp} = V^{\perp}(Y) = i\Omega^0(Y) \oplus id\Omega^0(Y),$$

and let

$$l^{\perp}:V^{\perp}\to V^{\perp}$$

be the operator defined by

$$l^{\perp} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -d^* \\ -d & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

We denote the  $L^2_{k-1/2}$ -completion of  $l^{\perp}$  by the same notation. Then we have

$$\widehat{V} = V \oplus V^{-}$$

and

$$\widehat{l} = l \oplus l^{\perp}.$$

Let  $(V^{\perp})^0_{-\infty}$  be the span of non-positive eigenvectors of  $l^{\perp}$ . As shown in [20], the projection  $\varpi : (V^{\perp})^0_{-\infty} \to W(Y)$  is an isomorphism, and hence so is

$$id_{V^0_{-\infty}} \oplus \varpi : \widehat{V}^0_{-\infty} = V^0_{-\infty} \oplus (V^{\perp})^0_{-\infty} \to V^0_{-\infty} \oplus W(Y).$$

Thus we obtain the following commutative diagram between functional spaces over  $W[-\infty, 0]$ :

$$\begin{array}{cccc} L^2_{k,\delta}(i\Lambda^1\oplus S^+) & \xrightarrow{\hat{L}_{W[-\infty,0]}\oplus\hat{p}^0_{-\infty}\circ\hat{r}} & L^2_{k-1,\delta}(i\Lambda^0\oplus i\Lambda^+\oplus S^-)\oplus\hat{V}^0_{-\infty} \\ & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & id\oplus\varpi \mbox{$\downarrow$$\cong$} \\ L^2_{k,\delta}(i\Lambda^1\oplus S^+) & \xrightarrow{\hat{L}_{W[-\infty,0]}\oplus((p^0_{-\infty}\oplus\varpi)\circ\hat{r})} & L^2_{k-1,\delta}(i\Lambda^0\oplus i\Lambda^+\oplus S^-)\oplus V^0_{-\infty}\oplus W(Y). \end{array}$$

From this diagram we obtain the isomorphisms (20). Moreover, as noted, it follows from Proposition 3.1 that the operator  $\widehat{L}_{W[-\infty,0]} \oplus (\widehat{p}^0_{-\infty} \circ \widehat{r})$  is Fredholm. Therefore this diagram implies that  $\widehat{L}_{W[-\infty,0]} \oplus ((p_{-\infty}^0 \oplus \varpi) \circ \widehat{r})$  is also Fredholm. The remaining task is to show that

(21) 
$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{Ker}(L_{W[-\infty,0]} \oplus (p_{-\infty}^{0} \circ r)) \cong \operatorname{Ker}(\widehat{L}_{W[-\infty,0]} \oplus ((p_{-\infty}^{0} \oplus \varpi) \circ \widehat{r})) \\ \operatorname{Coker}(L_{W[-\infty,0]} \oplus (p_{-\infty}^{0} \circ r)) \cong \operatorname{Coker}(\widehat{L}_{W[-\infty,0]} \oplus ((p_{-\infty}^{0} \oplus \varpi) \circ \widehat{r})). \end{cases}$$

The assertion of the proposition immediately follows from this and (20). But applying the snake lemma to the following commutative diagram between functional spaces over  $W[-\infty, 0]$ , we can obtain (21):

We consider a Riemannian manifold

$$\hat{W}[-\infty,0] := W[-\infty,0] \cup (\mathbb{R}^{\ge 0} \times Y)$$

obtained by gluing the half-cylinder  $(\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0} \times Y, dt^2 + g_Y)$  with  $W[-\infty, 0]$  along their boundary. We will compare formal adjoints  $d^*$  for several weights, and would like to introduce a family of weight functions

$$\tau_{\delta,\delta'}: \hat{W}[-\infty,0] \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$$

such that

$$(\tau_{\delta,\delta'})|_{W[-\infty,-1]} = \delta \tau$$
 and  $(\tau_{\delta,\delta'})|_{[1,\infty)\times Y} = \delta' t.$ 

**Definition 3.3.** Let  $(\delta, \delta') \in \mathbb{R}^2$ . For a bundle *E* which is periodic on  $W[-\infty, 0]$ and cylindrical on  $[0,\infty) \times Y$ , we define the norm  $\|-\|_{L^2_{k,(\delta,\delta')}(E)}$  by

$$\|f\|_{L^2_{k,(\delta,\delta')}(E)} := \|e^{\tau_{\delta,\delta'}}f\|_{L^2_k(E)}$$

and define  $L^2_{k,(\delta,\delta')}(E)$  to be the completion of compactly supported sections with respect to  $\|-\|_{L^2_{k,(\delta,\delta')}(E)}$ .

Note that the formal adjoint with respect to  $L^2_{(\delta,\delta')}$  of d is given as

$$d^{*_{(\delta,\delta')}}(w) = e^{-\tau_{\delta,\delta'}} d^*(e^{\tau_{\delta,\delta'}}w).$$

We also consider the 'sliced' Atiyah–Hitchin–Singer operator with APS-boundary condition:

(22) 
$$d^+ + p^0_{-\infty} \circ r : L^2_{k,\delta}(i\Lambda^1_{W[-\infty,0]})_{CC} \to L^2_{k-1,\delta}(i\Lambda^+_{W[-\infty,0]}) \oplus V^0_{-\infty}(Y;\mathbb{R}).$$

We calculate the kernel and the cokernel of (22):

**Theorem 3.4.** There exists  $\delta_1 > 0$  such that for any  $\delta \in (0, \delta_1)$ , the operator (22) is an isomorphism.

We take the constant  $\delta_1$  to be smaller than  $\delta_0$  given in Remark 2.6. The rest of this subsection is devoted to prove Theorem 3.4.

To prove Theorem 3.4, it is sufficient to prove the operator (17) is invertible for a sufficiently small  $\delta > 0$ . First we shall calculate the kernel and the cokernel of

(23)  
$$d^{*\delta} + d^{+} + \widehat{p}^{0}_{-\infty} \circ \widehat{r} : L^{2}_{k,\delta}(i\Lambda^{1}_{W[-\infty,0]}) \rightarrow L^{2}_{k-1,\delta}(i\Lambda^{0}_{W[-\infty,0]} \oplus \Lambda^{+}_{W[-\infty,0]}) \oplus \widehat{V}^{0}_{-\infty}(Y;\mathbb{R}).$$

The following lemma can be proved by considering the similar discussion given in [2].

Lemma 3.5. We have the following identifications:

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{Ker}(d^{*\delta} + d^{+} + \hat{p}^{0}_{-\infty} \circ \hat{r}) = \left\{ \left. a \in L^{2}_{k,(\delta,0)}(i\Lambda^{1}_{\hat{W}[-\infty,0]}) \right| d^{*(\delta,0)} a = 0, d^{+}a = 0 \right\}, \\ \operatorname{Coker}(d^{*\delta} + d^{+} + \hat{p}^{0}_{-\infty} \circ \hat{r}) \\ = \left\{ \left. (0,b) \in L^{2}_{k-1,(\delta,0)}(i\Lambda^{0}_{\hat{W}[-\infty,0]} \oplus \Lambda^{+}_{\hat{W}[-\infty,0]}) \right| d^{*(\delta,0)} b = 0 \right\}. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* By the same discussion in [2, Proposition 3.11], a solution under the spectral boundary condition can be identified with an  $L^2$ -solution on a cylindrical end manifold. Thus one has an isomorphism

$$\operatorname{Ker}(d^{*_{\delta}} + d^{+} + \hat{p}^{0}_{-\infty} \circ \hat{r}) \cong \left\{ a \in L^{2}_{k,(\delta,0)}(i\Lambda^{1}_{\hat{W}[-\infty,0]}) \mid d^{*_{(\delta,0)}}a = 0, d^{+}a = 0 \right\},$$

and the cokernel can be written by using extended  $L_k^2$ -solutions:

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Coker}(d^{*\delta} + d^{+} + \hat{p}_{-\infty}^{0} \circ \hat{r}) \\ &\cong \left\{ \begin{array}{c} (a,b) \\ (a,b)|_{W[-\infty,0]} \in L^{2}_{k-1,\delta}(i\Lambda_{W[-\infty,0]}^{0} \oplus \Lambda_{W[-\infty,0]}^{+}), \\ (a-c,b) \in L^{2}_{k-1}(i\Lambda_{[0,\infty)\times Y}^{0} \oplus \Lambda_{[0,\infty)\times Y}^{+}), \ \exists c \in \mathbb{R} \end{array} \right\} \\ &\subset L^{2}_{k-1,\operatorname{loc}}(i\Lambda_{\hat{W}[-\infty,0]}^{0} \oplus \Lambda_{\hat{W}[-\infty,0]}^{+}). \end{aligned}$$

Here we used  $H^*(Y; \mathbb{R}) \cong H^*(S^3; \mathbb{R})$ . On the other hand, da = 0 implies a is a constant and c should be zero. This gives the conclusion.

**Lemma 3.6.** For  $\delta$  sufficiently small, the space

$$\left\{ a \in L^2_{k,(\delta,0)}(i\Lambda^1_{\hat{W}[-\infty,0]}) \mid d^{*(\delta,0)}a = 0, da = 0 \right\}$$

can be identified with the middle cohomology of

$$L^2_{k+1,(\delta,\delta)}(i\Lambda^0_{\hat{W}[-\infty,0]}) \xrightarrow{d} L^2_{k,(\delta,\delta)}(i\Lambda^1_{\hat{W}[-\infty,0]}) \xrightarrow{d} L^2_{k-1,(\delta,\delta)}(i\Lambda^2_{\hat{W}[-\infty,0]}).$$

16

*Proof.* By the exponential decay result, one can see the correspondence

$$f \mapsto e^{\tau_{\delta,\delta} - \tau_{\delta,0}} f$$

gives an identification

$$\left\{ a \in L^2_{k,(\delta,0)}(i\Lambda^1_{\hat{W}[-\infty,0]}) \mid e^{-\tau_{\delta,0}}d^*(e^{\tau_{\delta,0}}b) = 0, da = 0 \right\}$$
$$\rightarrow \left\{ a \in L^2_{k,(\delta,\delta)}(i\Lambda^1_{\hat{W}[-\infty,0]}) \mid e^{-\tau_{\delta,\delta}}d^*(e^{\tau_{\delta,\delta}}b) = 0, da = 0 \right\}.$$

On the other hand, for an appropriate  $\delta$ , the complex

(24) 
$$L^2_{k,(\delta,\delta)}(i\Lambda^0_{\hat{W}[-\infty,0]}) \xrightarrow{d} L^2_{k,(\delta,\delta)}(i\Lambda^1_{\hat{W}[-\infty,0]}) \xrightarrow{d} L^2_{k,(\delta,\delta)}(i\Lambda^2_{\hat{W}[-\infty,0]})$$

is Fredholm, and we can identify the kernel of

$$L^2_{k,(\delta,\delta)}(i\Lambda^1_{\hat{W}[-\infty,0]}) \xrightarrow{d+d^{*(\delta,\delta)}} L^2_{k-1,(\delta,\delta)}(i\Lambda^0_{\hat{W}[-\infty,0]} \oplus i\Lambda^2_{\hat{W}[-\infty,0]})$$

with the middle cohomology of (24).

The exponential decay result enables us to prove the following correspondence:

**Lemma 3.7.** For  $\delta > 0$  sufficiently small, the space

$$\left\{ b \in L^2_{k-1,(\delta,0)}(i\Lambda^+_{\hat{W}[-\infty,0]}) \mid d^{*_{(\delta,0)}}b = 0 \right\}$$

can be identified with

$$\left\{ b \in L^2_{k-1,(\delta,\delta)}(i\Lambda^+_{\hat{W}[-\infty,0]}) \mid d^{*(\delta,\delta)}b = 0 \right\}.$$

*Proof.* The proof is the same as in that of Lemma 3.6.

Lemma 3.8. We have that

(25) 
$$\left\{ a \in L^2_{k,(\delta,0)}(i\Lambda^1_{\hat{W}[-\infty,0]}) \mid d^{*(\delta,0)}a = 0, da = 0 \right\} = \{0\},$$

and one can construct an injective homomorphism

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (0,b) \in L^2_{k-1,(\delta,0)}(i\Lambda^0_{\hat{W}[-\infty,0]} \oplus \Lambda^+_{\hat{W}[-\infty,0]}) \mid d^{*(\delta,0)}b = 0 \end{array} \right\} \\ \to H^2(W[-n,0] \cup [0,n] \times Y, \partial(W[-n,0] \cup [0,n] \times Y); \mathbb{R})$$

for n sufficiently large.

*Proof.* This is essentially the same argument given in [47, Proof of Proposition 5.1]. To prove the first assertion, we construct an injective homomorphism

$$\begin{split} &\{a \in L^2_{k,(\delta,0)}(i\Lambda^1_{\hat{W}[-\infty,0]}) \mid d^{*(\delta,0)}a = 0, da = 0\} \\ &\to H^1(W[-2,0] \cup [0,2] \times Y, \partial(W[-2,0] \cup [0,2] \times Y); \mathbb{R}), \end{split}$$

and show that this map factors through  $\{0\}$ . The proof uses the condition  $H^1(W_n; \mathbb{R}) =$ 0. This map is defined by choosing a bump function  $\beta: \hat{W}[-\infty, 0] \to \mathbb{R}$  such that

- $\label{eq:product} \begin{array}{l} \bullet \ \beta|_{W[-1,0]\cup[0,1]\times Y}=0 \ \text{and} \\ \bullet \ \beta|_{\hat{W}[-\infty,0]\backslash \mathrm{int}\ W[-2,0]\cup[0,2]\times Y}=1. \end{array}$

For a given  $w \in \operatorname{Ker} d \subset L^2_{k,(\delta,\delta)}(i\Lambda^1_{\hat{W}[-\infty,0]})$ , one can assume w is smooth. Since  $H^1(W[-\infty, -1]; \mathbb{R}) = 0$  and  $H^1(Y; \mathbb{R}) = 0$ , one can choose smooth functions  $f_-$  on  $W[-\infty, -1]$  and  $f_+$  on  $[1, \infty) \times Y$  such that

$$w|_{W[-\infty,-1]} = df_-$$
 and  $w|_{[1,\infty)\times Y} = df_+$ .

Since  $w|_{W[-\infty,-1]} = df_- \in L^2_{k,\delta}$  and  $w|_{[1,\infty)\times Y} = df_+ \in L^2_{k,0}$ , up to adding constants, one can assume

$$f_{-} \in L^{2}_{k+1,\delta}(W[-\infty, -1]) \text{ and } f_{+} \in L^{2}_{k+1,\delta}([1, \infty) \times Y).$$

Define

$$\phi([w]) := w - d(\beta f_+ + \beta f_-).$$

One can see that  $\phi$  induces a homomorphism

 $\phi: (\operatorname{Ker} d \subset L^2_{k,(\delta,\delta)}(i\Lambda^1_{\hat{W}[-\infty,0]}))/d(L^2_{k,(\delta,\delta)}(i\Lambda^0_{\hat{W}[-\infty,0]})) \to$ 

$$H^{1}(W[-2,0] \cup [0,2] \times Y, \partial W[-2,0] \cup [0,2] \times Y; \mathbb{R}).$$

The same argument given in [47, (5.8)-(5.10)] shows that  $\phi$  is an injection. Under our assumption, the cohomology

$$H^1(W[-2,0] \cup [0,2] \times Y, \partial W[-2,0] \cup [0,2] \times Y; \mathbb{R})$$

is generated by

$$[dg_0] \in H^1(W[-2,0] \cup [0,2] \times Y, \partial W[-2,0] \cup [0,2] \times Y; \mathbb{R})$$

which is constant near  $\partial(W[-2,0]\cup[0,2]\times Y)$  and  $g_0|_{Y_2} \neq g_0|_{\{2\}\times Y}$ , where  $\partial W_i =$  $Y_i^- \cup Y_i^+$  and  $-Y = Y_i^-$  as oriented manifolds. Next we show that  $\operatorname{Im} \phi = \{0\}$ . Suppose that  $[dg_0] = \phi([w])$ . Then we have

$$\phi([w]) = w - df = dg_0 + dg'$$

for some  $g' \in \Omega^0(W[-2,0] \cup [0,2] \times Y, \partial W[-2,0] \cup [0,2] \times Y)$  and for some  $f \in \mathcal{O}(W[-2,0] \cup [0,2] \times Y)$  $L^2_{k+1,(\delta,\delta)}(\hat{W}[-\infty,0])$ . Up to image d, we can assume  $d^{*(\delta,\delta)}w = 0$ . Thus we have

$$-d^{*(\delta,\delta)}df = d^{*(\delta,\delta)}dg_0 + d^{*(\delta,\delta)}dg'$$

here we consider  $g_0$  and g' as constant extensions on the ends. This implies

$$-f = g_0 + g' + \text{constant.}$$

Since f goes to 0 on the ends, this gives a contradiction.

Combining this with the injectivity of  $\phi$ , we have that the domain of  $\phi$  is  $\{0\}$ . Here Lemma 3.6 implies that the domain of  $\phi$  is isomorphic to the left-hand side of (25), and now the first assertion of the lemma follows.

On the second assertion, a homomorphism

$$\begin{split} \phi_n : &\{ (0,b) \in L^2_{k-1,(\delta,0)}(i\Lambda^0_{\hat{W}[-\infty,0]} \oplus \Lambda^+_{\hat{W}[-\infty,0]}) \mid d^{*_{(\delta,0)}}b = 0 \} \\ &\to H^2(W[-n,0] \cup [0,n] \times Y, \partial(W[-n,0] \cup [0,n] \times Y); \mathbb{R}) \end{split}$$

is given as follows. First note that the domain of  $\phi_n$  is identified with the corresponding functional space for the weight  $(\delta, \delta)$  because of Lemma 3.7. Take a sequence of bump functions  $\beta_n : \hat{W}[-\infty, 0] \to \mathbb{R}$  satisfying

$$\beta_n|_{W[-n+1,0]\cup[0,n-1]\times Y} = 1$$
,  $\beta_n|_{W[-\infty,-n]\cup[n,\infty]\times Y} = 0$ , and  $|d\beta_n|_{C^0} < C$ .

For a given  $w \in \{b \in L^2_{k-1,(\delta,\delta)}(i\Lambda^+_{\hat{W}[-\infty,0]}) \mid d^{*_{(\delta,\delta)}}b = 0\}$ , one can see

$$de^{\hat{\tau}\delta}w = 0.$$

Since  $H^2(W[-n-2, -n+2]; \mathbb{R}) = 0$  and  $H^2([n-2, n+2] \times Y; \mathbb{R}) = 0$ , one can choose  $\gamma_-$  and  $\gamma_+$  such that

$$e^{\hat{\tau}\delta}w|_{W[-n-2,-n+2]} = d\gamma_{-}^{n} \text{ and } e^{\hat{\tau}\delta}w|_{[n-2,n+2]\times Y} = d\gamma_{+}^{n}.$$

Define

$$\phi_n(w) := \begin{cases} e^{\hat{\tau}\delta} w \text{ on } W[-n-2,0] \cup [0,n+1] \times Y \\ d(\beta_n \gamma_-^n + \beta_n \gamma_+^n) \text{ on } W[-n-2,-n+2] \cup [n-2,n+2] \times Y \\ 0 \text{ otherwise }. \end{cases}$$

The proof of the injectivity of  $\phi_n$  is the same as the proof of [47, Lemma 5.4].  $\Box$ 

*Proof of Theorem 3.4.* Note that Proposition 3.2 gives isomorphisms of the kernels and cokernels between the operators (22) and (23), since the operator dealt with in Proposition 3.2 is the direct sum of a real operator and a complex operator. Using this and Lemma 3.5, to show the theorem, it suffices to see that

(26) 
$$\left\{ a \in L^2_{k,(\delta,0)}(i\Lambda^1_{\hat{W}[-\infty,0]}) \mid d^{*(\delta,0)}a = 0, d^+a = 0 \right\} = \{0\}$$

and

(27) 
$$\left\{ (0,b) \in L^2_{k-1,(\delta,0)}(i\Lambda^0_{\hat{W}[-\infty,0]} \oplus \Lambda^+_{\hat{W}[-\infty,0]}) \mid d^{*(\delta,0)}b = 0 \right\} = \{0\}.$$

By integration by parts, one has

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} a \in L^2_{k,(\delta,0)}(i\Lambda^1_{\hat{W}[-\infty,0]}) \mid d^{*(\delta,0)}a = 0, d^+a = 0 \end{array} \right\} \\ = \left\{ \left. a \in L^2_{k,(\delta,0)}(i\Lambda^1_{\hat{W}[-\infty,0]}) \mid d^{*(\delta,0)}a = 0, da = 0 \right. \right\}. \end{array}$$

The vanishing (26) follows from this and the first assertion of Lemma 3.8.

Our assumption implies  $H^2(W[-n, 0], \partial W[-n, 0]) = 0$ , and the vanishing (27) follows from the second assertion of Lemma 3.8.

In the proof of Theorem 1.1, we also consider the 'right-periodic' manifold  $W[0,\infty]$ . Fix a Riemann metric  $g_{W[0,\infty]}$  on  $W[0,\infty]$  such that

- $g_{W[0,\infty]}|_{W[1,\infty]}$  is periodic and PSC, and
- $g_{W[0,\infty]}$  is product metric near  $\partial W[0,\infty] = -Y$ .

Let us consider the following operators:

• the Atiyah–Hitchin–Singer operator with APS-boundary condition:

(28) 
$$d^+ + p^0_{-\infty} \circ r : L^2_{k,\delta}(i\Lambda^1_{W[0,\infty]})_{CC} \to L^2_{k-1,\delta}(i\Lambda^+_{W[0,\infty]}) \oplus V^0_{-\infty}(-Y;\mathbb{R}),$$

• the linearlization of the Seiberg–Witten equation

(29) 
$$L_{W[0,\infty]} \oplus (p_{-\infty}^0 \circ r) : \mathcal{U}_{k,\delta} \to L^2_{k-1,\delta}(i\Lambda^+ \oplus S^-) \oplus V^0_{-\infty}(-Y).$$

**Theorem 3.9.** There exists  $\delta'_1 > 0$  such that for any  $\delta \in (0, \delta'_1)$ , the followings are true:

- (i) the operator (29) is Fredholm, and
- (ii) the operator (28) is isomorphism.

*Proof.* The proof of (i) is the same as that of Proposition 3.1. The proof of (ii) is also essentially the same as that of Theorem 3.4.  $\Box$ 

3.2. Global slice theorem. In this subsection we prove the global slice theorem in our situation. We follow the method given in [17]. In [17], for 4-manifolds with conical end, a global slice theorem is given and the essentially same method can be applied to our situation.

The following proposition is a key lemma to prove the global slice theorem:

**Proposition 3.10.** There exists a small positive number  $\delta_2$  such that for any positive real number  $0 < \delta \leq \delta_2$ ,

(30) 
$$L^2_{k,\delta}(i\Lambda^1_{W[-\infty,0]}) = L^2_{k,\delta}(i\Lambda^1_{W[-\infty,0]})_{CC} \oplus dL^2_{k+1,\delta}(i\Lambda^0_{W[-\infty,0]}).$$

This proposition corresponds to [17, Proposition 3.5].

*Proof.* The proof is essentially same as the proof of [17, Proposition 3.5]. We first prove

(31) 
$$L^{2}_{k,\delta}(i\Lambda^{1}_{W[-\infty,0]})_{CC} \cap dL^{2}_{k+1,\delta}(i\Lambda^{0}_{W[-\infty,0]}) = \{0\}.$$

However, the proof of (31) is the same as the proof of (21) in [17, Proposition 3.5], and we omit this.

Next, we will see

$$L^{2}_{k,\delta}(i\Lambda^{1}_{W[-\infty,0]}) = L^{2}_{k,\delta}(i\Lambda^{1}_{W[-\infty,0]})_{CC} + dL^{2}_{k+1,\delta}(i\Lambda^{0}_{W[-\infty,0]}).$$

We need to prove that, for any  $\alpha \in L^2_{k,\delta}(i\Lambda^1_{W[-\infty,0]})$ , there exists  $\xi \in L^2_{k+1,\delta}(i\Lambda^0_{W[-\infty,0]})$  such that  $\alpha - d\xi \in L^2_{k,\delta}(i\Lambda^1_{W[-\infty,0]})_{CC}$ , i.e.

$$d^{*\delta}d\xi = d^{*\delta}\alpha$$
$$d^{*}\mathbf{t}d\xi = d^{*}\mathbf{t}\alpha$$

hold. These equations are equivalent to

$$\Delta_{\delta}\xi = d^{*\delta}\alpha$$
$$\mathbf{t}\xi = G_Y d^* \mathbf{t}\alpha,$$

where  $G_Y$  is the Green operator on Y. Therefore we need to prove surjectivity of the map

$$\Delta_{\delta}(W[-\infty,0],\partial): L^2_{k+1,\delta}(i\Lambda^0_{W[-\infty,0]}) \to L^2_{k-1,\delta}(i\Lambda^0_{W[-\infty,0]}) \oplus L^2_{k+\frac{1}{2}}(i\Lambda^0_Y),$$

defined by

$$\Delta_{\delta}(W[-\infty, 0], \partial)\xi = (\Delta_{\delta}\xi, \mathbf{t}\xi).$$

In order to prove this, we use the excision principle and reduce the surjectivity of  $\Delta_{\alpha}(W[-\infty,0],\partial)$  to calculations of indexes for several Laplacian operators. The calculation of indicies of Laplacian operators are also given in [17, Proposition 3.5, page 18]. We can confirm the surjectivity of  $\Delta_{\delta}(W[-\infty,0],\partial)$  and obtain the conclusion.

Proposition 3.10 implies the following global slice theorem:

**Lemma 3.11.** Let  $\delta_2$  be the constant given in Proposition 3.10. Then, for  $\delta \in (0, \delta_2)$ , there is a  $\mathcal{G}_{k+1,\delta}(W[-\infty, 0])$ -equivariant diffeomorphism

$$\mathcal{U}_{k,\delta}(W[-\infty,0]) \cong L^2_{k,\delta}(i\Lambda^1_{W[-\infty,0]})_{CC} \times \mathcal{G}_{k+1,\delta}(W[-\infty,0]).$$

The proof is the essentially same as in the case of closed 4-manifolds.

3.3. Dirac index on  $W[-\infty, 0]$ . In this subsection, we shall calculate the spin Dirac index  $\operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D^+_{W[-\infty,0]}$  on the half-periodic 4-manifold  $W[-\infty,0]$ :

**Proposition 3.12.** Assuming that a PSC metric is equipped with X, we have

(32) 
$$\operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D^+_{W[-\infty,0]} = \lambda_{SW}(X,\mathfrak{s}) + n(Y,\mathfrak{t},g),$$

where  $\operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D^+_{W[-\infty,0]}$  means the index of the Dirac operator under the APS-boundary condition and  $n(Y, \mathfrak{t}, g)$  is given in (10).

Before proving Proposition 3.12, we note a few lemmas:

**Lemma 3.13.** Let  $M_1, M_2$  be compact spin 4-manifolds with common boundary Y with orientation  $\partial M_1 = Y = -\partial M_2$ . Equip  $M_1, M_2$  with metrics so that the metrics are the product metric

$$dt^2 + pr^*g_Y$$

near the boundary for a Riemann metric  $g_Y$  on Y, where t is a collar coordinate of the product neighborhood and pr means the projection from the collar neighborhoods of Y to Y. Then we have

$$\operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D_{M_1}^+ + \operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D_{M_2}^+ + \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \operatorname{Ker} \mathscr{D} = \operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D_{M_1 \cup_Y M_2}^+$$

where  $\emptyset$  is the 3-dimensional Dirac operator on Y and  $\operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D^+_{M_i}$  denotes the index of the Dirac operator under the APS-boundary condition.

*Proof.* This can be checked by the Atiyah–Singer–Patodi index theorem [2] immediately, but we give a bit more direct proof to make clear the following Lemma 3.14.

We follow an argument given in Donaldson's book [6], mainly [6, Subsubsection 3.3.1]. For  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  which is not a spectrum of  $\mathcal{D}$ , denote by  $\operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D^+_{M_1,\alpha}$  the Fredholm index defined using the weighted Sobolev norm described as

$$\|f\|_{L^2_k} = \|e^{\alpha t}f\|_{L^2_k}$$

at the end of  $M_1 = M_1 \cup [0, \infty) \times Y$ . Take  $\alpha > 0$  so that  $|\alpha|$  is smaller than the absolute value of the smallest non-zero eigenvalue of  $\partial$ . Then we obtain

$$\operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D^+_{M_1 \cup_Y M_2} = \operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D^+_{M_1,\alpha} + \operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D^+_{M_2,-\alpha}$$

by the gluing formula, Equation (3.2) of [6]. Hence it suffices to show that

(33)  $\operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D_{M_1,\alpha}^+ + \operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D_{M_2,-\alpha}^+ = \operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D_{M_1}^+ + \operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D_{M_2}^+ + \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \operatorname{Ker} \not\partial.$ 

By the definition of the APS-boundary condition, we have

$$\operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D^+_{M_1,\alpha} = \operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D^+_{M_1,\alpha}$$

On the other hand, we have that

$$\operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D^+_{M_2,-\alpha} = \operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D^+_{M_2} + \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \operatorname{Ker} \mathscr{A}$$

by [6, Proposition 3.10], which is shown considering a certain ordinary equation [6, Lemma 3.11] corresponding to the cylinder  $(-\infty, \infty) \times Y$  appearing the neck stretching of  $M_1 \cup_Y M_2$ . Now we have checked (33) and this completes the proof.  $\Box$ 

The proof of Lemma 3.13 involves only near the neck of  $M_1 \cup_Y M_2$ . Even if we replace  $M_1$  with a manifold with an additional end, we obtain a similar result as far as we work in Fredholm setting. This makes clear the following lemma:

**Lemma 3.14.** Let M be a compact spin manifold bounded by Y with the orientation  $\partial M = -Y$ . Equip M with a metric so that the metrics are product metrics near the boundary. Then we have

(34) 
$$\operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D^+_{W[-\infty,0]} + \operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D^+_M + \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \operatorname{Ker} \not \partial = \operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D^+_{M_{\infty}},$$

where

$$M_{\infty} = \dots \cup_Y W \cup_Y W \cup_Y M.$$

Now we are ready to prove Proposition 3.12.

Proof of Proposition 3.12. Take a compact spin bound M of Y with the orientation  $\partial M = -Y$ . Take a metric on M so that the metrics are product metrics near the boundary.

Now we shall check

(35) 
$$\operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D^+_{M_{\infty}} = -\frac{\sigma(M)}{8} + \lambda_{SW}(X, \mathfrak{s}).$$

Note the sign: this comes from the orientation of M with  $\partial M = -Y$ . Indeed, by [28, Lemma 2.21], it follows from the existence of PSC metric on X that

(36) 
$$-\lambda_{SW}(-X,\mathfrak{s}) = \lambda_{SW}(X,\mathfrak{s}).$$

(Precisely, X is supposed to be an integral homology  $S^1 \times S^3$  in [28], but the proof of [28, Lemma 2.21] is valid also for rational homology  $S^1 \times S^3$ 's without any changes.) On the other hand, for a PSC metric g on X, we have

(37) 
$$\lambda_{SW}(-X,\mathfrak{s}) = -w(-X,g,0) = -\operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D^+_{M_{\infty}} - \frac{\sigma(M)}{8}.$$

Equation (35) is deduced from (36) and (37).

On the other hand, we also have

(38) 
$$\operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D_M^+ = -\frac{\sigma(M)}{8} - n(Y, \mathfrak{t}, g) - \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \operatorname{Ker} \widetilde{\mathscr{A}}.$$

Indeed, it follows that

(39) 
$$\operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D^+_{-M} + \operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D^+_M + \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \operatorname{Ker} \not \partial = 0$$

because of Lemma 3.13 and

$$\operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D^+_{-M\cup_Y M} = \frac{\sigma(-M)}{8} + \frac{\sigma(M)}{8} = 0.$$

By the definition of  $n(Y, \mathfrak{t}, g)$ , we have

(40) 
$$n(Y,\mathfrak{t},g) = \operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D^+_{-M} + \frac{\sigma(-M)}{8}$$

Equation (38) is deduced from (39), (40).

Combining Lemma 3.14 with (35) and (38), we obtain the desired equality (32).

### 4. The boundedness result

In this section, we prove a certain boundedness result in order to construct Bauer–Furuta type invariant. We mainly follow the methods given in [19, 31]. The situation is similar to that in [17], which gives a Bauer-Furuta invariant for 4-manifolds with conical end.

Our main result in this section is:

**Theorem 4.1.** There exists  $\delta_3 > 0$  and a constant R > 0 such that the following conclusion holds. Let  $\delta$  be an element in  $(0, \delta_3]$ . Suppose that a pair (x, y) of

$$x \in \mathcal{U}_{k,\delta}(W[-\infty,0])$$

and  $y: [0, \infty) \to V(Y)$  satisfy the following conditions:

- (i) the element  $x + (A_0, \Phi_0)$  is a solution to the equation (16) on  $W[-\infty, 0]$ ,
- (ii) the element y is a solution to the Seiberg–Witten equations on  $\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0} \times Y$ ,
- (iii) y is temporal gauge, i.e.  $d^*b(t) = 0$  for each t, where  $y(t) = (b(t), \psi(t))$ , and y is of finite type,
- (iv)  $x|_{Y} = y(0)$ , and
- (v)  $|\lim_{t\to\infty} CSD(y(t))| < \infty.$

Then we have the following universal bounds:

$$||x||_{L^2_{k,\delta}} < R \text{ and } ||y(t)||_{L^2_{k-\frac{1}{2}}} < R \ (\forall t \ge 0).$$

In order to prove Theorem 4.1, we use several corresponding notions used in [31].

Definition 4.2. We consider a Riemannian manifold

$$\hat{W}[-\infty, 0] = W[-\infty, 0] \cup (\mathbb{R}^{\ge 0} \times Y)$$

obtained by gluing the half-cylinder  $(\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0} \times Y, dt^2 + g_Y)$  and  $W[-\infty, 0]$  along their boundary. A solution  $(A, \Phi)$  to the Seiberg–Witten equations on  $\hat{W}[-\infty, 0]$  is called  $W[-\infty, 0]$ -trajectories. If a  $W[-\infty, 0]$ -trajectory  $(A, \Phi)$  satisfies

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}}|CSD(A|_{\{t\}\times Y})|<\infty \text{ and } \|\Phi\|_{C^0(\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}\times Y)}<\infty,$$

then  $(A, \Phi)$  is called a *finite type*  $W[-\infty, 0]$ -trajectory.

Let us note the following boundedness result:

**Theorem 4.3.** Let C be a positive real number and

$$(A,\Phi) \in (A_0,0) + L^2_{k,\delta}(i\Lambda^1_{W[-\infty,0]\cup[0,1]\times Y}) \oplus L^2_{k,\delta}(S^+_{W[-\infty,0]\cup[0,1]\times Y})$$

be a solution to  $\mathcal{F}(A, \Phi) = 0$  such that

$$\mathcal{E}^{top}(A,\Phi) \le C$$

and

$$(A, \Phi) \in \mathcal{U}_{k,\delta}(W[-\infty, 0])$$

Then, there exists  $\delta_3$  such that for any  $\delta \in (0, \delta_3)$ , the inequality

$$\|(A,\Phi) - (A_0,0)\|_{L^2_{k,\delta}(W[-\infty,0])} \le D(C)$$

holds, where D(C) is a constant depending only on D.

*Proof.* We compare gauge transformations constructed by J. Lin [28, Subsection 4.2] with the global slice obtained in Proposition 3.10. The proof of [28, Lemma 4.10] implies that there exists a constant  $\delta'_3$  and a gauge transformation g' on  $W[-\infty, 0]$  such that for any  $\delta \in (0, \delta'_3)$ ,

$$||(g')^*(A,\Phi) - (A_0,0)||_{L^2_{k,\delta}(W[-\infty,0])} \le D(C).$$

Define

$$\delta_3 := \min\{\delta'_3, \delta_2\}$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 3.11, the map obtained by giving a slice

$$\mathcal{U}_{k,\delta}(W[-\infty,0]) \xrightarrow{\cong} L^2_{k,\delta}(i\Lambda^1_{W[-\infty,0]})_{CC} \times \mathcal{G}_{k+1,\delta}(W[-\infty,0])$$

is continuous. This implies there is a gauge transformation g such that

$$g^*(A, \Phi) \in \mathcal{U}_{k,\delta}(W[-\infty, 0])$$

and

$$\|g^*(A,\Phi) - (A_0,0)\|_{L^2_{k,\delta}(W[-\infty,0])} \le C' \|(g')^*(A,\Phi) - (A_0,0)\|_{L^2_{k,\delta}(W[-\infty,0])} \le C' D(C).$$
  
This gives the desired result.

The topological energy  $\mathcal{E}^{\text{top}}$  and the analytic energy  $\mathcal{E}^{\text{top}}$  for configurations on  $\hat{W}[-\infty, 0]$  are defined along the book by Kronheimer–Mrowka [24, Definition 4.5.4]. Note that, for a configuration  $(A, \Phi)$  converging to  $(A_0, 0)$  on the periodic end, the boundary terms in the topological energy corresponding to the end vanishes, while the boundary terms corresponding to the cylindrical end may survive. If such a configuration  $(A, \Phi)$  is a  $W[-\infty, 0]$ -trajectory and is asymptotic to  $\mathfrak{c}$  on the cylindrical end, we have that

(41) 
$$\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{top}}(A,\Phi) = C_X - CSD(\mathfrak{c}),$$

where  $C_X$  depends only on X and the fixed metric and spin structure on X. Moreover, we have that  $\mathcal{E}^{\text{top}}(A, \Phi) = \mathcal{E}^{\text{an}}(A, \Phi)$  as well as for a configuration over a compact 4-manifold.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Let  $\delta_3$  be the constant given in Theorem 4.3. Suppose that  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{U}_{k,\delta} \oplus (\operatorname{Map}([0, \infty), L^2_{k-\frac{1}{2}}(i\Lambda^1_Y) \oplus L^2_{k-\frac{1}{2}}(S^+_Y))$ 

satisfies the assumption of Theorem 4.1. First, we state a pasting lemma:

**Lemma 4.4.** The pair (x, y) gives rise to a finite type  $W[-\infty, 0]$ -trajectory  $(A, \Phi)$ .

*Proof.* This is essentially the same as the proof of [20, Corollary 4.3].

It follows from Lemma 4.4 that we have a solution  $(A, \Phi)$  to the Seiberg–Witten equations on  $\hat{W}[-\infty, 0]$  whose topological energy is finite.

Recall that the set of critical points of CSD modulo gauge is compact. Since we consider a spin structure now, CSD is gauge invariant. Therefore the set of critical values of CSD is compact.

Since we have assumed that  $|\lim_{t\to\infty} CSD(y(t))| < \infty$ , we have that

$$|CSD(y(t)) - CSD(y(t+1))| \to 0$$

as  $t \to \infty$ , and therefore there exists a critical point of CSD to which  $(A, \Phi)$  is  $L^2_{k-\frac{1}{2}}$ -asymptotic as  $t \to \infty$ . This combined with (41) implies that  $\mathcal{E}^{\text{top}}(A, \Phi)$  is uniformly bounded, and hence so is  $\mathcal{E}^{\text{an}}(A, \Phi)$ .

We claim that the analytic energy of  $(A, \Phi)$  restricted to  $W[-\infty, -1]$  is also uniformly bounded. To see this, let us decompose  $\hat{W}[-\infty, -1]$  into three parts: the periodic part  $W[-\infty, -1]$ , the cylindrical part  $\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0} \times Y$ , and the 'joint' between the periodic part and the cylindrical part. We have seen that the analytic energy of  $(A, \Phi)$  on  $\hat{W}[-\infty, -1]$  is uniformly bounded, and this energy is the sum of the energies on these three parts. Therefore, to prove that the analytic energy of  $(A, \Phi)$ restricted to  $W[-\infty, -1]$  is also uniformly bounded, it suffices to show that all of the energies on these three parts are bounded from below. But this is obvious to recalling the definition of the analytic energy. (See the proof of [28, Lemma 4.8].)

This uniform boundedness enables us to apply Theorem 4.3, and thus we obtain the boundedness of  $||x||_{L^2_{k,\delta}} < R$ :

$$\|(A, \Phi) - (A_0, 0)\|_{L^2_{h,\delta}(W[-\infty, 0])} \le R$$

for any  $\delta \in [0, \delta_3)$ . The remaining boundedness result  $\|y(t)\|_{L^2_{k-\frac{1}{2}}} < R$  follows from the same argument for X-trajectories, where X is a compact 4-manifold bounded by Y. See [20, Corollary 4.3] for example.

### 5. Relative Bauer-Furuta type invariant

In this section, we construct a relative Bauer–Furuta type invariant for 4-manifolds with periodic end and boundary  $W[-\infty, 0]$ . We mainly follow the methods given by Manolescu [31] and Khandhawit [19].

We consider a finite-dimensional approximation of the map

$$\mathcal{F}_{W[-\infty,0]}: \mathcal{U}_{k,\delta} \to \mathcal{V}_{k-1,\delta} \oplus V(Y).$$

We fix a weight  $\delta \in (0, \infty)$  satisfying

$$\delta \leq \min\{\delta_0, \delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3\}$$

in the rest of this paper, where  $\delta_i$  are the constants appeared in Remark 2.6, Theorem 3.4, Proposition 3.10, and Theorem 4.1. Take sequences of subspaces

$$\mathcal{V}_1 \subset \mathcal{V}_2 \subset \cdots \subset \mathcal{V}_{k-1,\delta} \text{ and } V_{-\lambda_1}^{\lambda_1} \subset V_{-\lambda_2}^{\lambda_2} \subset \cdots \subset V(Y)$$

such that

(i)  $(\operatorname{Im} L_{W[-\infty,0]} + p_{-\lambda_n}^{\lambda_n} \circ r)^{\perp_{\mathcal{V}_{k-1,\delta} \oplus V(Y)}} \subset \mathcal{V}_n \oplus V_{-\lambda_n}^{\lambda_n}(Y)$ (ii) the  $L^2$ -projection  $P_n : \mathcal{V}_{k-1,\alpha} \oplus V(Y) \to \mathcal{V}_n \oplus V_{-\lambda_n}^{\lambda_n}(Y)$  satisfies

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} P_n(v) = v$$

for any  $v \in \mathcal{V}_{k-1,\delta} \oplus V(Y)$ .

Then we define a sequence of subspaces

$$\mathcal{U}_n := (L_{W[-\infty,0]} + p_{-\lambda_n}^{\lambda_n} \circ r)^{-1} (\mathcal{V}_n \oplus V_{-\lambda_n}^{\lambda_n}).$$

This gives a family of the approximated Seiberg–Witten maps

$$\{\mathcal{F}_n := P_n(L_{W[-\infty,0]} + C_{W[-\infty,0]}, p_{-\lambda_n}^{\lambda_n} \circ r) \colon \mathcal{U}_n \to \mathcal{V}_n \oplus V_{-\lambda_n}^{\lambda_n}(Y)\}$$

The following proposition gives us a well-defined continuous map between spheres.

**Proposition 5.1.** For a large n and a large positive real number R, there exists an index pair  $(N_n, L_n)$  of  $V_{-\lambda_n}^{\lambda_n}(Y)$  and a sequence  $\{\varepsilon_n\}$  of positive numbers such that

(42) 
$$B(\mathcal{U}_n; R) / S(\mathcal{U}_n; R) \to (\mathcal{V}_n / B(\mathcal{V}_n, \varepsilon_n)^c) \land (N_n / L_n)$$

is well-defined, where B(V; R) is the closed ball in V with radius R and S(V; R) is the sphere in V with radius R.

For the proof of Proposition 5.1, we use the following proposition.

**Proposition 5.2.** Let  $\{x_n\}$  be a bounded sequence in  $\mathcal{U}_{k,\delta}$  such that

$$(L_{W[-\infty,0]}(x_n), p_{-\infty}^{\lambda_n} \circ r(x_n)) \in \mathcal{V}_n \times V_{-\lambda_n}^{\lambda_n}$$

and

$$P_n(L_{W[-\infty,0]} + C_{W[-\infty,0]})x_n \to 0.$$

Let  $y_n: [0,\infty) \to V_{-\lambda_n}^{\lambda_n}$  be a uniformly bounded sequence of trajectories such that

$$y_n(0) = p_{-\infty}^{\lambda_n} \circ r(x_n).$$

Then, after taking a subsequence,  $\{x_n\}$  converges to a solution  $x \in \mathcal{U}_{k,\delta}$  (in the topology of  $\mathcal{U}_{k,\delta}$ ) and  $\{y_n(t)\}$  converges to  $y(t)(\forall t \in [0,\infty))$  in  $L^2_{k-\frac{1}{2}}$  which is a solution of the Seiberg–Witten equations on  $\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0} \times Y$ .

*Proof.* The proof is similar to the proof of [19, Proposition 3]. By the same argument, one sees the following result: for any compact set  $I \subset (0, \infty)$ , after taking a subsequence,  $y_n(t)$  uniformly converges to y(t) in  $L^2_{k-\frac{1}{2}}$ , where y(t) is the weak limit.

For the sequence  $\{x_n\}$ , we need to ensure:

- after taking a subsequence,  $p_{-\infty}^0 y_n(0) \to p_{-\infty}^0 r(x)$  in  $L^2_{k-\frac{1}{2}}$ , where x is the weak limit and
- after taking a subsequence, the sequence  $\{x_n\}$  converges to x in  $L^2_{k,\delta}(X)$ .

The proof of the second statement is the only difference between our construction and the usual Bauer–Furuta invariant. Here we again follow the method given in [17]. To obtain the convergence of  $\{x_n\}$ , we will use the following inequality obtained by the Fredholm property of  $L_{W[-\infty,0]}$ : there exists a constant C > 0such that, for any  $x \in \mathcal{U}_{k,\delta}$ ,

$$\|x\|_{L^{2}_{k,\delta}} \leq C(\|L_{W[-\infty,0]}(x)\|_{L^{2}_{k-1,\delta}} + \|p^{0}_{-\infty}r(x)\|_{L^{2}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}} + \|x\|_{L^{2}}).$$

Then, by the same discussion given in the proof of [17, Lemma 3.18], we complete the proof.  $\hfill \Box$ 

*Proof of Proposition 5.1.* We combine Proposition 5.2, Theorem 4.1 and the proof of [19, Proposition 4.5] and complete the proof.  $\Box$ 

By Proposition 5.1, we obtain a family of the continuous maps (42). By the definition of Fredholm index, we have

$$\operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{R}}(L_{W[-\infty,0]} \oplus p_{-\infty}^{\lambda_n} \circ r) = \dim_{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{U}_n - \dim_{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{V}_n - \dim_{\mathbb{R}} V_{-\lambda_n}^{\lambda_n}.$$

We obtain a map stably written by

$$\Psi: (\widetilde{\mathbb{R}}^m \oplus \mathbb{H}^n)^+ \to (\widetilde{\mathbb{R}}^{m'} \oplus \mathbb{H}^{n'})^+ \wedge \Sigma^{-V_{-\lambda_n}^0}(N_n/L_n),$$

here we fixed trivializations of vector spaces.

*Remark* 5.3. Our construction gives an invariant of 4-manifolds with periodic end admitting periodic PSC metric on the end. This can be regarded as relative Bauer–Furuta invariant corresponding to [49].

### 6. The proof of Theorem 1.1

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.1. Recalling the definition of local equivalence [45], what we have to do is to construct a certain type of map called *local map* from SWF(Y,t) to  $[(S^0, 0, -\lambda_{SW}(X, \mathfrak{s})/2)]$ , and also a local map from  $[(S^0, 0, -\lambda_{SW}(X, \mathfrak{s})/2)]$  to SWF(Y,t).

We shall consider the relative Bauer–Furuta invariant on the 'left-periodic' manifold  $W[-\infty, 0]$  and that on 'right-periodic' manifold  $W[0, \infty]$ . These two relative Bauer–Furuta invariants give the desired two local maps.

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* In Section 5, under the assumption of the existence of PSC metric on X, we constructed a Pin(2)-equivariant continuous map of the form

(43) 
$$f: (\tilde{\mathbb{R}}^{m_0} \oplus \mathbb{H}^{n_0})^+ \to (\tilde{\mathbb{R}}^{m_1} \oplus \mathbb{H}^{n_1})^+ \wedge I^{\lambda}_{-\lambda}$$

as the relative Bauer–Furuta invariant over  $W[-\infty, 0]$ . One sees that  $f^{S^1}$  induces a Pin(2)-homotopy equivalence by Theorem 3.4. The numbers  $m_0 - m_1, n_0 - n_1$ are given by

(44)  

$$m_{0} - m_{1} = \dim V_{-\lambda}^{0}(\mathbb{R}),$$

$$2(n_{0} - n_{1}) = \operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D_{W[-\infty,0]}^{+} + \dim_{\mathbb{C}} V_{-\lambda}^{0}(\mathbb{H})$$

$$= \lambda_{SW}(X,\mathfrak{s}) + n(Y,\mathfrak{t},g) + \dim_{\mathbb{C}} V_{-\lambda}^{0}(\mathbb{H})$$

For the notations  $V^0_{-\lambda}(\mathbb{R})$  and  $V^0_{-\lambda}(\mathbb{H})$ , see (11). Here we have used Proposition 3.12 to get the second equality of (44) and Theorem 3.4 to get the first equality.

Equations (43) and (44) mean that the map f gives a local map from  $[(S^0, 0, -\lambda_{SW}(X, \mathfrak{s})/2)]$  to SWF $(Y, \mathfrak{t})$ .

Next, instead of the 'left-periodic' manifold  $W[-\infty, 0]$ , we consider the 'right-periodic' manifold

$$W[0,\infty] = W \cup_Y W \cup_Y W \cup_Y \cdots$$

Repeating analysis in Section 5 for  $W[0,\infty]$  instead of  $W[-\infty,0]$ , we obtain a  $\operatorname{Pin}(2)$ -map of the form

(45) 
$$f': (\tilde{\mathbb{R}}^{m'_0} \oplus \mathbb{H}^{n'_0})^+ \to (\tilde{\mathbb{R}}^{m'_1} \oplus \mathbb{H}^{n'_1})^+ \wedge \bar{I}^{\lambda}_{-\lambda}$$

as the relative Bauer–Furuta invariant over  $W[0, \infty]$ . Here  $\bar{I}^{\lambda}_{-\lambda}$  denotes the Conley index for -Y. As well as f above,  $(f')^{S^1}$  induces a Pin(2)-homotopy equivalence by Theorem 3.9. For  $\mu \leq 0 \leq \lambda$ , as in [33, Proof of Proposition 3.8], let us denote by  $\bar{V}^{\lambda}_{\mu}$  the vector space  $V^{\lambda}_{\mu}$  defined for -Y. Note that, for  $\mu < 0 < \lambda$ , we have an identification  $\bar{V}^{\lambda}_{\mu} \cong V^{-\mu}_{-\lambda}$ , and in particular  $\bar{V}^{\lambda}_{-\lambda} \cong V^{\lambda}_{-\lambda}$ . Under this notation,  $m'_0 - m'_1, n'_0 - n'_1$  are given by

(46) 
$$m'_{0} - m'_{1} = \dim \bar{V}^{0}_{-\lambda}(\mathbb{R}), 2(n'_{0} - n'_{1}) = \operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D^{+}_{W[0,\infty]} + \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \bar{V}^{0}_{-\lambda}(\mathbb{H})$$

By an argument using a duality map as in [33, page 168], we obtain a Pin(2)-map

$$f'': (\tilde{\mathbb{R}}^{m'_0} \oplus \mathbb{H}^{n'_0})^+ \wedge I^{\lambda}_{-\lambda} \to (\tilde{\mathbb{R}}^{m'_1} \oplus \mathbb{H}^{n'_1})^+ \wedge (V^{\lambda}_{-\lambda})^+$$

from (45). The vector space  $V_{-\lambda}^{\lambda}$  can be decomposed so that  $V_{-\lambda}^{\lambda}(\mathbb{R}) \oplus V_{-\lambda}^{\lambda}(\mathbb{H})$ . Set

$$m_1'' = m_1' + \dim V_{-\lambda}^{\lambda}(\mathbb{R}),$$

$$n_1'' = n_1' + \dim_{\mathbb{H}} V^{\star}_{-\lambda}(\mathbb{H})$$

Then the domain and codomain of f'' are given by

(48) 
$$f'': (\tilde{\mathbb{R}}^{m'_0} \oplus \mathbb{H}^{n'_0})^+ \wedge I^{\lambda}_{-\lambda} \to (\tilde{\mathbb{R}}^{m''_1} \oplus \mathbb{H}^{n''_1})^+.$$

We shall show that f'' gives a local map from SWF $(Y, \mathfrak{t})$  to  $[(S^0, 0, -\lambda_{SW}(X, \mathfrak{s})/2)]$ . The restriction  $(f'')^{S^1}$  is a Pin(2)-homotopy equivalence since f' is so. One may assume  $\lambda$  was taken to avoid the eigenvalues of the linearization l of the flow equations. Then we have

(49) 
$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{V}^{0}_{-\lambda}(\mathbb{R}) &= V^{\lambda}_{0}(\mathbb{R}), \\
\bar{V}^{0}_{-\lambda}(\mathbb{H}) &= V^{\lambda}_{0}(\mathbb{H}) \oplus \ker \not\partial.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, to obtain the first equality, we have used  $\operatorname{Ker}(*d : \operatorname{ker} d^* \to \Omega^1(Y)) = 0$ deduced from the assumption that  $b_1(Y) = 0$ . Using (49), we have

(50) 
$$V^{\lambda}_{-\lambda}(\mathbb{R}) \cong V^{0}_{-\lambda}(\mathbb{R}) \oplus V^{0}_{-\lambda}(\mathbb{R}) \\ \cong V^{0}_{-\lambda}(\mathbb{R}) \oplus \bar{V}^{0}_{-\lambda}(\mathbb{R})$$

and

(51) 
$$V^{\lambda}_{-\lambda}(\mathbb{H}) \oplus \ker \not \!\!\! \partial \cong V^{0}_{-\lambda}(\mathbb{H}) \oplus V^{0}_{-\lambda}(\mathbb{H}) \oplus \ker \not \!\!\! \partial$$
$$\cong V^{0}_{-\lambda}(\mathbb{H}) \oplus \bar{V}^{0}_{-\lambda}(\mathbb{H}).$$

Combining (46) with (47), (50) and (51), we obtain

(52) 
$$m_0' - m_1'' = m_0' - m_1' - \dim \bar{V}_{-\lambda}^{\lambda}(\mathbb{R}) = \dim \bar{V}_{-\lambda}^0(\mathbb{R}) - \dim V_{-\lambda}^{\lambda}(\mathbb{R}) = -\dim V_{-\lambda}^0(\mathbb{R}),$$

(53)  
$$n_{0}' - n_{1}'' = n_{0}' - n_{1}' - \dim \bar{V}_{-\lambda}^{\lambda}(\mathbb{H})$$
$$= \dim \bar{V}_{-\lambda}^{0}(\mathbb{H}) - \dim V_{-\lambda}^{\lambda}(\mathbb{H})$$
$$= \operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{H}} D_{W[0,\infty]}^{+} + \dim \ker \not \partial - \dim_{\mathbb{H}} V_{-\lambda}^{0}(\mathbb{H}).$$

Let us calculate  $\operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{H}} D^+_{W[0,\infty]}$  in the last equality. Let M' be an oriented compact smooth 4-manifold with boundary  $\partial M' = Y$ . Set

$$M'_{\infty} = M' \cup_Y W \cup_Y W \cup_Y \cdots$$

Then, as well as Lemma 3.14, we obtain

(54) 
$$\operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D^+_{W[0,\infty]} + \operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D^+_{M'} + \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \operatorname{Ker} \not \partial = \operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D^+_{M'_{\infty}}$$

On the other hand, for a PSC metric g on X, we have

(55) 
$$\lambda_{SW}(X,\mathfrak{s}) = -w(X,g,0) = -\operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D^+_{M'_{\infty}} - \frac{\sigma(M')}{8}.$$

Recalling the definition of  $n(Y, \mathfrak{t}, g)$ , we have

(56) 
$$n(Y,\mathfrak{t},g) = \operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{C}} D_{M'}^+ + \frac{\sigma(M')}{8}.$$

(47)

Combining (54) with (55) and (56), we have

(57) 
$$\operatorname{ind}_{\mathbb{H}} D^+_{W[0,\infty]} = -\frac{1}{2} (\lambda_{SW}(X,\mathfrak{s}) + n(Y,\mathfrak{t},g)) - \dim_{\mathbb{H}} \ker \mathscr{O}.$$

It follows from (53) and (57) that

(58) 
$$n'_0 - n''_1 = -\frac{1}{2}(\lambda_{SW}(X, \mathfrak{s}) + n(Y, \mathfrak{t}, g)) - \dim_{\mathbb{H}} V^0_{-\lambda}(\mathbb{H}).$$

Now we deduce from (48), (52), and (58) that f'' gives a local map from SWF $(Y, \mathfrak{t})$  to  $[(S^0, 0, -\lambda_{SW}(X, \mathfrak{s})/2)]$ .

# 7. Obstruction to embeddings of 3-manifolds into 4-manifolds with PSC metric

Theorem 1.1 gives an obstruction to embedding of 3-manifolds into 4-manifolds with PSC metric under a homological assumption. By a standard surgery argument enables us to prove the following generalization of Theorem 1.1.

**Theorem 7.1.** Let  $(X, \mathfrak{s})$  be an oriented spin closed connected 4-manifold with  $b_2(X) = 0$  and Y a smooth oriented closed codimension-1 submanifold of X. Suppose  $b_1(Y) = 0$  and X admits a PSC metric. Then the local equivalence class of  $SWF(Y, \mathfrak{t})$  is given by

(59) 
$$[SWF(Y,\mathfrak{t})] = \left[ \left( S^0, 0, -\frac{\delta(Y,\mathfrak{t})}{2} \right) \right]$$

where  $\mathfrak{t} := \mathfrak{s}|_Y$ .

This theorem can be seen as a Seiberg–Witten analogue of the result proven by Yang–Mills gauge theory [46, Theorem 1.9]. Using the Heegaard Floer correction term, Levine–Ruberman [25] gave an obstruction of codimension-1 smooth embeddings into homology  $S^1 \times S^3$ 's. For the obstructions to codimension-1 smooth embeddings into indefinite spin 4-maniolds, see [1].

*Proof.* We argue the case that  $[Y] \neq 0$  and that [Y] = 0 individually. First, let us assume  $[Y] \neq 0$ . In this case, the cobordism  $W_0 := \overline{X \setminus Y}$  from Y to itself is connected. When  $b_2(W_0) = 0$ , one can see X is a rational homology  $S^1 \times S^3$  and [Y] generates  $H_3(X)$ . Thus, by Theorem 1.1, one has

$$[SWF(Y,\mathfrak{t})] = \left[ \left( S^0, 0, -\frac{\lambda_{SW}(X,\mathfrak{s})}{2} \right) \right] = \left[ \left( S^0, 0, -\frac{\delta(Y,\mathfrak{t})}{2} \right) \right].$$

When  $b_2(W_0) > 1$ , we take disjoint simple closed curves  $l_1, \dots, l_{b_2(W_0)}$  in X which generate  $H_2(W_0; \mathbb{Z})$ . We extend  $l_1, \dots, l_{b_2(W_0)}$  to disjoint smooth embeddings from  $S^1 \times D^3$ 's into  $W_0$  and denote them by the same notations. We consider the manifold

$$W_0(l_1, \cdots, l_{b_2(W_0)})$$

obtained by the surgery of  $W_0$  along  $l_1 \cup \cdots \cup l_{b_2(W_0)}$ . One can see  $W_0(l_1, \cdots, l_{b_2(W_0)})$ also admits a spin structure. We write the glued manifold along the boundary of  $W_0(l_1, \cdots, l_{b_2(W_0)})$  by  $X(l_1, \cdots, l_{b_2(W_0)})$ .

Since we are considering codimension-3 surgeries, [15, Theorem A] implies that  $X(l_1, \dots, l_{b_2(W_0)})$  also admits a PSC metric. The manifold  $X(l_1, \dots, l_{b_2(W_0)})$  is a

spin rational homology  $S^1 \times S^3$ . By construction, Y is smoothly embedded into  $X(l_1, \dots, l_{b_2(W_0)})$  such that

$$0 \neq [Y] \in H_3(X(l_1, \cdots, l_{b_2(W_0)}); \mathbb{Z}) \cong \mathbb{Z}.$$

An easy observation shows that [Y] generates  $H_3(X(l_1, \dots, l_{b_2(W_0)}); \mathbb{Z})$ . Thus one can use Theorem 1.1 and see

$$[\mathrm{SWF}(Y,\mathfrak{t})] = \left[ \left( S^0, 0, -\frac{\lambda_{SW}(X(l_1, \cdots, l_{b_2(W_0)}))}{2} \right) \right] = \left[ \left( S^0, 0, -\frac{\delta(Y, \mathfrak{t})}{2} \right) \right].$$

Next, we consider the case [Y] = 0. In this case, our cobordism  $W_0$  should have two connected components:  $W_0^+ \cup W_0^-$ . Suppose  $\partial W_0^+ = Y$  and  $\partial W_0^- = -Y$ . By 1handle surgery, one can assume that  $W_0^+$  and  $W_0^-$  are spin rational homology  $D^4$ 's. Thus the relative Bauer–Furuta invariants  $BF_{W_0^+}$  and  $BF_{W_0^-}$  gives rise to the local equivalence between  $SWF(Y, \mathfrak{t})$  and  $[(S^0, 0, 0)]$ . This completes the proof.  $\Box$ 

**Corollary 7.2.** Let Y be an integral homology 3-sphere. Suppose that at least two of  $\alpha(Y), \beta(Y), \gamma(Y), \delta(Y), \overline{\delta}(Y), \underline{\delta}(Y), \kappa(Y)$  do not coincide with each other. Then Y does not admit any smooth embedding into a spin closed 4-manifold with a PSC metric satisfying  $b_2(X) = 0$ .

*Remark* 7.3. Freedman's result ([7]) implies that all homology 3-spheres have a locally flat embedding into  $S^4$ , and Corollary 7.2 is false for locally flat topological embeddings.

### 8. Examples

In this section we use Corollary 1.4 to obtain a concrete family of 4-manifolds which does not admit PSC metrics. In order to use Corollary 1.4, we need to calculate the homology cobordism invariants  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $\gamma$ ,  $\delta$ . The following remark gives a method to calculate  $\delta$  for a large class of 3-manifolds:

*Remark* 8.1. In [29, Remark 1.1], it is mentioned that Heegaad Floer correction term  $d(Y, \mathfrak{s})$  and the monopole Frøyshov invariant  $h(Y, \mathfrak{s})$  satisfy

$$d(Y,\mathfrak{s}) = -2h(Y,\mathfrak{s}),$$

for any spin<sup>c</sup> rational homology 3-sphere  $(Y, \mathfrak{s})$ . Moreover, it is proved in [26] that

$$-h(Y,\mathfrak{s}) = \delta(Y,\mathfrak{s}).$$

Therefore one can use calculations of correction terms in Heegaard Floer theory ([4, 18, 37, 48]) in order to calculate  $\delta(Y, \mathfrak{s})$ .

For the invariants  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$ , we mainly use Stoffregen's computation results [45] for Seifert homology 3-spheres and connected sums of them.

Before considering to the connected sum, we start with a single Seifert homology 3-sphere. The following result is proved by Stoffregen [45]. Recall that a Seifert rational homology 3-sphere Y is called *negative* if the underlying orbifold line bundle of Y is of negative degree (see [45, Section 5]).

**Theorem 8.2** ([45]). The following results hold.

(i) Let Y be a Seifert homology 3-sphere with negative fibration. Then

$$\beta(Y) = \gamma(Y) = -\overline{\mu}(Y), \quad and$$

$$\alpha(Y) = \begin{cases} d(Y)/2 = \delta(Y) \text{ if } d(Y)/2 \equiv -\overline{\mu}(Y) \mod 2\\ d(Y)/2 + 1 = \delta(Y) + 1 \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}$$

hold.

(ii) Let Y be a Seifert homology 3-sphere with positive fibration. Then

$$\alpha(Y) = \beta(Y) = -\overline{\mu}(Y), \quad and$$

$$\gamma(Y) = \begin{cases} d(Y)/2 = \delta(Y) \text{ if } d(Y)/2 \equiv -\overline{\mu}(Y) \mod 2\\ d(Y)/2 - 1 = \delta(Y) - 1 \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}$$

hold.

Combining Corollary 1.3 with Theorem 8.2, we obtain:

**Theorem 8.3.** Let Y' be a Seifert homology 3-sphere such that

 $-\overline{\mu}(Y') \neq \delta(Y'),$ 

where  $\overline{\mu}$  is the Neumann-Siebenmann invariant for graph homology 3-spheres introduced in [36, 43]. Let Y be an oriented homology 3-sphere which is homology cobordant to Y'. Then, for any homology cobordism W from Y to itself, the 4manifold obtained from W by gluing the boundary components does not admit a PSC metric.

The invariant  $\overline{\mu}$  has a concrete recursion formula for  $\Sigma(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ . See [41, (2.8), (2.9) in Subsection 2.4.2]. Although (2.8) and (2.9) in [41, Subsection 2.4.2] are formulae for the Rochlin invariant, it is pointed out in [41, page 197] that the same formula holds also for the invariant  $\overline{\mu}$ . We also note another way to compute  $\overline{\mu}$  based on the *w*-invariant. For the definition of *w*-invariant, see [11, Definition 2.2]. In [11], the *w*-invariants of several types of Seifert homology 3-spheres are computed, and the following relation is given in [10, 12, 40]: for any Seifert homology 3-sphere of type  $\Sigma(2, q, r)$ ,

$$w(\Sigma(2,q,r), X(2,q,r), \mathfrak{s}) = -\overline{\mu}(\Sigma(2,q,r)).$$

Here  $(X(2,q,r),\mathfrak{s})$  is a certain spin 4-orbifold. For the unique way to construct X(2,q,r), see the sentences after [11, Theorem 3.1].

Also, in [45], there are direct computations of  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$ . Using them, we can prove:

**Corollary 8.4.** Suppose a homology 3-sphere Y is homology cobordant to one of Seifert homology 3-spheres with types:

$$\begin{array}{l}(2,3,12k-1),(2,3,12n+7),(2,5,20k+11),(2,5,20k-1),(2,5,20k-3),\\(2,5,20k+13),(2,7,28k-1),(2,7,28k+15),(2,7,28k-3),(2,7,14k+3),\\ and\ (2,7,14k-5).\end{array}$$

Then, for any homology cobordism W from Y to itself, the 4-manifold obtained from W by gluing the boundary components does not admit a PSC metric.

*Proof.* We just combine computation results [11,33,45] of  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$  and  $\overline{\mu}$  and Corollary 1.4.

*Remark* 8.5. We remark that for homology  $S^1 \times S^3$ 's obtained as mapping tori, enlargeable obstruction [15] can be used to obstruct PSC metrics. A large class of homology  $S^1 \times S^3$  which are not obtained as mapping tori are introduced in [23, Subsection 4.4.1]. Also, a review of several known obstructions for homology  $S^1 \times S^3$ 's is given in [23, Subsection 4.4].

Next, we consider the connected sums of Seifert homology 3-spheres. In order to obtain a certain connected sum formula of invariants  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  for Seifert homology 3-spheres, Stoffregen considered a class of Seifert homology 3-spheres, called projective type. We call a negative Seifert rational homology 3-sphere Ywith a spin structure  $\mathfrak{s}$  projective if its Heegaard Floer homology is of the form

$$HF^+(Y,\mathfrak{s}) \cong \mathcal{T}_d^+ \oplus \mathcal{T}_{-2n+1}^+(m) \oplus \bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathcal{T}_{a_i}^+(m_i)^{\oplus 2}$$

for some  $n, m, d, a_i, m_i$  and some index set I, where

- $\mathcal{T}^+ := \mathbb{F}[U, U^{-1}]/\mathbb{F}[U]$ , where  $\mathbb{F}$  is the field of two elements,  $\mathcal{T}^+(i) := \mathbb{F}[U^{-i+1}, U^{-i+2}]/\mathbb{F}[U]$ , and  $\mathcal{T}^+_d(n) := \mathcal{T}^+(n)$  whose grading is shifted by -d.

There are many examples of projective Seifert homology 3-spheres [4,35,48]. It is confirmed in [4,35,48] that  $\Sigma(p,q,pqk \pm 1)$  is projective for a relatively prime pair (p,q) and positive integer k.

**Theorem 8.6** ([45]). Let  $Y_1, \dots, Y_n$  be negative Seifert homology 3-spheres of projective type. Suppose  $\delta(Y_1) \leq \cdots \leq \delta(Y_n)$ . Set  $\widetilde{\delta}_i := \delta(Y_i) + \overline{\mu}(Y_i)$ . Then

- $\alpha(Y_1 \# \cdots \# Y_n) = 2\lfloor \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \widetilde{\delta}_i + 1}{2} \rfloor \sum_{i=1}^n \overline{\mu}(Y_i)$   $\beta(Y_1 \# \cdots \# Y_n) = 2\lfloor \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \widetilde{\delta}_i + 1}{2} \rfloor \sum_{i=1}^n \overline{\mu}(Y_i)$   $\gamma(Y_1 \# \cdots \# Y_n) = 2\lfloor \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \widetilde{\delta}_i + 1}{2} \rfloor \sum_{i=1}^n \overline{\mu}(Y_i)$

Combining Corollary 1.3 with Theorem 8.6, we can prove:

**Theorem 8.7.** Let  $Y_1, \dots, Y_n$  be negative Seifert homology 3-spheres of projective type. Suppose  $\delta(Y_1) \leq \cdots \leq \delta(Y_n)$ . Set  $\widetilde{\delta}_i := \delta(Y_i) + \overline{\mu}(Y_i)$ . Suppose that at least two of the following four integers are distinct:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta(Y_i), \quad 2\lfloor \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \widetilde{\delta}_i + 1}{2} \rfloor - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \overline{\mu}(Y_i),$$
$$2\lfloor \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \widetilde{\delta}_i + 1}{2} \rfloor - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \overline{\mu}(Y_i), \quad 2\lfloor \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \widetilde{\delta}_i + 1}{2} \rfloor - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \overline{\mu}(Y_i).$$

Let Y be an oriented homology 3-sphere which is homology cobordant to  $Y_1 \# \cdots \# Y_n$ . Then, for any homology cobordism W from Y to itself, the 4-manifold obtained from W by gluing the boundary components does not admit a PSC metric.

For a concrete family, one can see the following non-existence of PSC metrics for connected sums:

**Corollary 8.8.** Suppose a homology 3-sphere Y is homology cobordant to one of homology 3-spheres:

- #<sub>j</sub>Σ(2,3,12n-1),
  #<sub>j</sub>Σ(2,5,20n-1), and

•  $\#_i \Sigma(2,7,28n-1)$ 

for some  $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ , where  $\#_j Y$  means the connected sum of j-copies of Y. Then, for any homology cobordism W from Y to itself, the 4-manifold obtained from W by gluing the boundary components does not admit a PSC metric.

*Proof.* As it is calculated in [45], one has

- $\alpha(\Sigma(2,3,12n-1)) = 2, \beta(\Sigma(2,3,12n-1)) = 0, \gamma(\Sigma(2,3,12n-1)) = 0,$  $\overline{\mu}(\Sigma(2,3,12n-1)) = 1, \delta(\Sigma(2,3,12n-1)) = 1,$
- $\alpha(\Sigma(2,5,20n-1)) = 2, \beta(\Sigma(2,5,20n-1)) = 0, \gamma(\Sigma(2,5,20n-1)) = 0,$  $\overline{\mu}(\Sigma(2,5,20n-1)) = 1, \delta(\Sigma(2,5,20n-1)) = 1$ , and
- $\alpha(\Sigma(2,7,28n-1)) = 2, \beta(\Sigma(2,7,28n-1)) = 0, \gamma(\Sigma(2,7,28n-1)) = 0,$  $\overline{\mu}(\Sigma(2,7,28n-1)) = 1, \delta(\Sigma(2,7,28n-1)) = 2.$

Since  $\Sigma(p, q, pq \pm 1)$  are projective, it follows from from Theorem 8.6 that

- $\alpha(\Sigma(2,3,12n-1)) = 2\lfloor \frac{j+1}{2} \rfloor, \beta(\Sigma(2,3,12n-1)) = 2\lfloor \frac{j}{2} \rfloor,$  $\gamma(\Sigma(2,3,12n-1)) = 2\lfloor \frac{j-1}{2} \rfloor, \delta(\#_j \Sigma(2,3,12n-1)) = j,$
- $\alpha(\Sigma(2,5,20n-1)) = 2\lfloor \frac{j+1}{2} \rfloor, \beta(\Sigma(2,5,20n-1)) = 2\lfloor \frac{j}{2} \rfloor,$
- $$\begin{split} &\gamma(\Sigma(2,5,20n-1)) = 2\lfloor \frac{j-1}{2} \rfloor, \delta(\#_j \Sigma(2,5,20n-1)) = j, \text{ and} \\ \bullet \ &\alpha(\Sigma(2,7,28n-1)) = 2\lfloor \frac{2j+1}{2} \rfloor, \beta(\Sigma(2,7,28n-1)) = 2j, \gamma(\Sigma(2,7,28n-1)) = 2\lfloor \frac{2j-1}{2} \rfloor, \delta(\#_j \Sigma(2,7,28n-1)) = j. \end{split}$$

Therefore, in these cases, the assumptions of Theorem 8.7 are satisfied, and Theorem 8.7 implies the desired conclusion.  $\square$ 

Remark 8.9. We expect that the connected Seiberg–Witten Floer homology  $SWFH_{\text{conn}}(Y, \mathfrak{s})$ introduced in [45] can be used to obstruct PSC metrics. Also, the equivariant KOtheoretic homology cobordism invariants introduced in [27] should give another obstruction.

### References

- [1] Paolo Aceto, Marco Golla, and Kyle Larson, Embedding 3-manifolds in spin 4-manifolds, J. Topol. 10 (2017), no. 2, 301-323. MR3653313
- [2] M. F. Atiyah, V. K. Patodi, and I. M. Singer, Spectral asymmetry and Riemannian geometry. I, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 77 (1975), 43-69. MR397797
- [3] Stefan Bauer and Mikio Furuta, A stable cohomotopy refinement of Seiberg-Witten invariants. I, Invent. Math. 155 (2004), no. 1, 1-19. MR2025298
- [4] Maciej Borodzik and András Némethi, Heegaard-Floer homologies of (+1) surgeries on torus knots, Acta Math. Hungar. 139 (2013), no. 4, 303-319. MR3061478
- [5] S. K. Donaldson, An application of gauge theory to four-dimensional topology, J. Differential Geom. 18 (1983), no. 2, 279-315. MR710056
- \_\_\_, Floer homology groups in Yang-Mills theory, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, [6]vol. 147, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002. With the assistance of M. Furuta and D. Kotschick. MR1883043
- [7] Michael Hartley Freedman, The topology of four-dimensional manifolds, J. Differential Geom. 17 (1982), no. 3, 357-453. MR679066
- [8] Kim A. Frøyshov, The Seiberg-Witten equations and four-manifolds with boundary, Math. Res. Lett. 3 (1996), no. 3, 373–390. MR1397685
- \_\_\_\_, Monopole Floer homology for rational homology 3-spheres, Duke Math. J. 155 [9] (2010), no. 3, 519-576. MR2738582
- [10] Y. Fukumoto, On an invariant of plumbed homology 3-spheres, J. Math. Kyoto Univ. 40 (2000), no. 2, 379-388. MR1787877
- [11] Yoshihiro Fukumoto, Manolescu invariants of connected sums, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 137 (2009), 1509-1517.

- [12] Yoshihiro Fukumoto, Mikio Furuta, and Masaaki Ue, W-invariants and Neumann-Siebenmann invariants for Seifert homology 3-spheres, Topology Appl. 116 (2001), no. 3, 333–369. MR1857670
- [13] M. Furuta, Monopole equation and the <sup>11</sup>/<sub>8</sub>-conjecture, Math. Res. Lett. 8 (2001), no. 3, 279– 291. MR1839478
- M. Furuta and Y. Kametani, Equivariant maps between sphere bundles over tori and KOdegree (2005), available at arXiv:math/0502511.
- [15] Mikhael Gromov and H. Blaine Lawson Jr., The classification of simply connected manifolds of positive scalar curvature, Ann. of Math. (2) 111 (1980), no. 3, 423–434. MR577131
- [16] Kristen Hendricks and Ciprian Manolescu, Involutive Heegaard Floer homology, Duke Math. J. 166 (2017), no. 7, 1211–1299. MR3649355
- [17] Nobuo Iida and Masaki Taniguchi, Seiberg-Witten Floer homotopy contact invariant (2020), available at arXiv:2010.02132.
- [18] Cagri Karakurt and Oguz Savk, Ozsvath-Szabo d-invariants of almost simple linear graphs (2019), available at arXiv:1911.01688.
- [19] Tirasan Khandhawit, A new gauge slice for the relative Bauer-Furuta invariants, Geom. Topol. 19 (2015), no. 3, 1631–1655. MR3352245
- [20] \_\_\_\_\_, A new gauge slice for the relative Bauer-Furuta invariants, Geom. Topol. 19 (2015), no. 3, 1631–1655. MR3352245
- [21] Tirasan Khandhawit, Jianfeng Lin, and Hirofumi Sasahira, Unfolded Seiberg-Witten Floer spectra, I: Definition and invariance, Geom. Topol. 22 (2018), no. 4, 2027–2114. MR3784516
- [22] \_\_\_\_\_, Unfolded Seiberg-Witten Floer spectra, ii: Relative invariants and the gluing theorem (2018), available at arXiv:1809.09151.
- [23] Hokuto Konno and Masaki Taniguchi, Positive scalar curvature and 10/8-type inequalities on 4-manifolds with periodic ends, Invent. Math. 222 (2020), no. 3, 833–880. MR4169052
- [24] Peter Kronheimer and Tomasz Mrowka, Monopoles and three-manifolds, New Mathematical Monographs, vol. 10, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007. MR2388043
- [25] Adam Simon Levine and Daniel Ruberman, Heegaard Floer invariants in codimension one, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 371 (2019), no. 5, 3049–3081. MR3896105
- [26] Tye Lidman and Ciprian Manolescu, The equivalence of two Seiberg-Witten Floer homologies, Astérisque 399 (2018), vii+220. MR3818611
- [27] Jianfeng Lin, Pin(2)-equivariant KO-theory and intersection forms of spin 4-manifolds, Algebr. Geom. Topol. 15 (2015), no. 2, 863–902. MR3342679
- [28] \_\_\_\_\_, The Seiberg-Witten equations on end-periodic manifolds and an obstruction to positive scalar curvature metrics, J. Topol. 12 (2019), no. 2, 328–371. MR3911569
- [29] Jianfeng Lin, Daniel Ruberman, and Nikolai Saveliev, On the Frøyshov invariant and monopole Lefschetz number (2018), available at arXiv:1802.07704. to appear in Journal of Differential Geometry.
- [30] \_\_\_\_\_, A splitting theorem for the Seiberg-Witten invariant of a homology  $S^1 \times S^3$ , Geom. Topol. **22** (2018), no. 5, 2865–2942. MR3811774
- [31] Ciprian Manolescu, Seiberg-Witten-Floer stable homotopy type of three-manifolds with  $b_1 = 0$ , Geom. Topol. 7 (2003), 889–932. MR2026550
- [32] \_\_\_\_\_, On the intersection forms of spin four-manifolds with boundary, Math. Ann. 359 (2014), no. 3-4, 695–728. MR3231012
- [33] \_\_\_\_\_, Pin(2)-equivariant Seiberg-Witten Floer homology and the triangulation conjecture, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 29 (2016), no. 1, 147–176. MR3402697
- [34] Tomasz Mrowka, Daniel Ruberman, and Nikolai Saveliev, Seiberg-Witten equations, endperiodic Dirac operators, and a lift of Rohlin's invariant, J. Differential Geom. 88 (2011), no. 2, 333–377. MR2838269
- [35] András Némethi, Graded roots and singularities, Singularities in geometry and topology, 2007, pp. 394–463. MR2311495
- [36] Walter D. Neumann, An invariant of plumbed homology spheres, Topology Symposium, Siegen 1979 (Proc. Sympos., Univ. Siegen, Siegen, 1979), 1980, pp. 125–144. MR585657
- [37] Peter Ozsváth and Zoltán Szabó, On the Floer homology of plumbed three-manifolds, Geom. Topol. 7 (2003), 185–224. MR1988284
- [38] Daniel Ruberman and Nikolai Saveliev, Dirac operators on manifolds with periodic ends, J. Gökova Geom. Topol. GGT 1 (2007), 33–50. MR2386534

- [39] Hirofumi Sasahira and Matthew Stoffregen, Seiberg-Witten Floer spectra for  $b_1 > 0$  (2021), available at arXiv:2103.16536.
- [40] Nikolai Saveliev, Fukumoto-Furuta invariants of plumbed homology 3-spheres, Pacific J. Math. 205 (2002), no. 2, 465–490. MR1922741
- [41] \_\_\_\_\_, Invariants of homology 3-spheres., Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences, vol. 140 (Springer, Berlin)., 2002.
- [42] Richard Schoen and Shing-Tung Yau, The structure of manifolds with positive scalar curvature, Directions in partial differential equations (Madison, WI, 1985), 1987, pp. 235–242. MR1013841
- [43] L. Siebenmann, On vanishing of the Rohlin invariant and nonfinitely amphicheiral homology 3-spheres, Topology Symposium, Siegen 1979 (Proc. Sympos., Univ. Siegen, Siegen, 1979), 1980, pp. 172–222. MR585660
- [44] Matthew Stoffregen, A remark on Pin(2)-equivariant Floer homology, Michigan Math. J. 66 (2017), no. 4, 867–884. MR3720328
- [45] \_\_\_\_\_, Pin(2)-equivariant Seiberg-Witten Floer homology of Seifert fibrations, Compos. Math. 156 (2020), no. 2, 199–250. MR4044465
- [46] Masaki Taniguchi, Seifert hypersurfaces of 2-knots and Chern-Simons functional (2019), available at arXiv:1910.02234.
- [47] Clifford Henry Taubes, Gauge theory on asymptotically periodic 4-manifolds, J. Differential Geom. 25 (1987), no. 3, 363–430. MR882829
- [48] Eamonn Tweedy, Heegaard Floer homology and several families of Brieskorn spheres, Topology Appl. 160 (2013), no. 4, 620–632. MR3018077
- [49] Diogo Veloso, Seiberg-Witten theory on 4-manifolds with periodic ends (2018), available at arXiv:1807.11930.

Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences, the University of Tokyo, 3-8-1 Komaba, Meguro, Tokyo 153-8914, Japan

Email address: konno@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp

2-1 HIROSAWA, WAKO, SAITAMA 351-0198, JAPAN Email address: masaki.taniguchi@riken.jp