

FRANKS' DICHOTOMY FOR TORIC MANIFOLDS, HOFER–ZEHNDER CONJECTURE, AND GAUGED LINEAR SIGMA MODEL

SHAOYUN BAI AND GUANGBO XU

ABSTRACT. We prove that for any compact toric symplectic manifold, if a Hamiltonian diffeomorphism admits more fixed points, counted homologically, than the total Betti number, then it has infinitely many simple periodic points. This provides a vast generalization of Franks' famous two or infinity dichotomy for periodic orbits of area-preserving diffeomorphisms on the two-sphere, and establishes a conjecture attributed to Hofer–Zehnder in the case of toric manifolds. The key novelty is the application of gauged linear sigma model and its bulk deformations to the study of Hamiltonian dynamics of symplectic quotients.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Geometric preliminaries	9
3. Algebraic preliminaries	11
4. Vortex Hamiltonian Floer theory	27
5. Local Floer theory	42
6. Boundary depth	45
7. \mathbb{Z}/p -equivariant vortex Floer theory	50
8. Proof of the main theorem	60
9. Open string theory I. Quasimap Floer theory	61
10. Open string theory II. Closed-open maps	75
References	90

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. **Main result.** A celebrated theorem of Franks [Fra92, Fra96] says that any area-preserving diffeomorphism on S^2 has either 2 or infinitely many periodic points. An extension of this dichotomy to all compact symplectic toric manifolds is obtained in this paper.

Theorem A. *Let X be a compact symplectic toric manifold and $\phi : X \rightarrow X$ be a Hamiltonian diffeomorphism with isolated fixed points. If the number of fixed points of ϕ , counted homologically, is greater than the total rank of homology of X , then ϕ has infinitely many simple periodic points.*

Date: January 12, 2024.

The second author is supported by NSF DMS-2345030.

Here a point $x \in X$ is called a simple periodic point (of period k) if $\phi^k(x) = x$ for some positive integer k and $\phi^l(x) \neq x$ for all $l < k$. The homological count of the number of fixed points of ϕ , denoted by $N(\phi)$, is defined as

$$N(\phi) := \sum_{x \in \text{Fix}(\phi)} \dim HF^{\text{loc}}(\phi, x)$$

where $HF^{\text{loc}}(\phi, x)$ is the local Floer homology at a fixed point x . In particular, when ϕ is nondegenerate, meaning that for all $x \in \text{Fix}(\phi)$, the linearization ϕ at x has no eigenvalue 1, then $N(\phi)$ is equal to the naive count of fixed points.

Theorem A also resolves the following visionary conjecture set forth by Hofer and Zehnder [HZ11, Page 263] in the case of toric manifolds.

Conjecture 1.1 (Hofer–Zehnder conjecture). *Let ϕ be a Hamiltonian diffeomorphism on a compact symplectic manifold. If ϕ has more fixed points than the lower bound provided by the Arnold conjecture, then ϕ has infinitely many simple periodic points.*

From a dynamical perspective, the Hofer–Zehnder conjecture is related to the problem of finding Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms with minimal number of invariant ergodic measures, i.e., pseudo-rotations. Such maps are usually very rare. For toric manifolds, such pseudo-rotations were recently constructed by Le Roux–Seyfaddini [LRS22] using the Anosov–Katok method [AK70].

Our proof of Theorem A is built upon new connections between two distant stories:

- (1) **Quantitative Floer theory.** The energy filtration on Floer chain complexes leads to a powerful framework in studying Hamiltonian dynamics. Notions from topological data analysis, such as persistence module and barcode, have been incorporated with the quantitative symplectic geometry to prove many exciting results beyond the scope of the Arnold conjecture. Insights from [EP03] and [She22] about the quantitative implication of the semisimplicity of quantum cohomology are particularly crucial ingredients.
- (2) **Gauged linear sigma model (GLSM).** The GLSM was introduced by Witten [Wit93] in the physical context of 2-dimensional supersymmetric field theory, later becoming very impactful in enumerative algebraic geometry and mirror symmetry. The adaptation [Xu16][WX17b] of GLSM to Hamiltonian Floer theory brings in three significant advantages in carrying out the proof of Theorem A along the lines of [She22]: a) all curve counts are integers even for general toric manifolds, b) transversality can be achieved without using the virtual technique, and c) the semisimplicity can be achieved using “small” bulk deformation, i.e., divisor classes.

These new connections we build in this paper are perhaps equally interesting as our main result as a generalization of Franks’ theorem and deserve further exploration.

1.2. Pseudoholomorphic curves vs. vortices. A crucial feature of our proof is the systematic adaptation of the GLSM to a symplecto-geometric problem. As mentioned above, this approach has tremendous advantages in various levels over the traditional, i.e., the nonlinear sigma model (NLSM) approach. Here we try to provide a brief sketch of the idea of GLSM and explain the advantageous effects on Floer theory.

1.2.1. Pseudoholomorphic curves and the counting problem. Since Gromov [Gro85] the theory of pseudoholomorphic curves has become the main infrastructure of symplectic geometry. A central problem about pseudoholomorphic curves, roughly speaking, is to define invariants by counting them. The difficulty to count lies in the fact that the moduli spaces are often very singular

and that one needs to regularize the moduli spaces in order to define the contributions of the singularities. There are two main regularization methods which we recall here.

The first one is to “geometrically” perturb the pseudoholomorphic curve equation, resembling the strategy of perturbing the Riemannian metric in Yang–Mills gauge theory. This method works for symplectic manifolds satisfying the topological condition called “semipositivity,” including the exact ($\omega = d\theta$), positively monotone ($c_1 > 0$), and Calabi–Yau ($c_1 = 0$) cases. Though it limits the range of applications, due to its simplicity the method of geometric perturbations is still favored in many situations, with numerous distinguished works based upon.

The reason that the geometric perturbation method does not extend beyond the semipositive case is due to the issue of “multiple covers of holomorphic spheres with negative Chern numbers.” These multiple covers cause very wild singularities of the moduli spaces which cannot be perturbed away by geometric perturbations. The second regularization method, originally invented to deal with the general situation, is to embed the singular moduli spaces into regular spaces and apply “abstract perturbations” which no longer have concrete geometric meanings. The construction becomes substantially more involved and bulky. We mention one (but not the only) challenging task that is relevant in Floer theory. In the semipositive setting, as one can geometrically perturb the Floer equation to achieve transversality, moduli spaces with negative expected dimensions are automatically empty. As a result, one can work with individual moduli spaces. Beyond the semipositive setting, the regularization process must be taken simultaneously with all moduli spaces regardless of their expected dimensions. Greater care needs to be taken in order to obtain a coherent system of perturbations.

Despite the technical complexities caused by the spherical multiple covers, such singularities of moduli spaces shall be regarded as a feature, not a bug, in Gromov–Witten theory. Numerically, these multiple covers can make certain GW invariants fractional numbers. For example, the famous Aspinwall–Morrison formula (see [AM93][Voi96]) says that k -fold covers of a rigid holomorphic sphere in a Calabi–Yau threefold shall contribute $1/k^3$ to the genus zero Gromov–Witten invariant. From an abstract perspective, the non-integrality is due to the fact that moduli spaces are actually orbifolds/stacks rather than manifolds/spaces, while stacky points contribute fractionally to topological invariants such as the Euler number.

However, in Floer theory, regarding the multiple cover issue, at least the numerical non-integrality, the authors somehow view it as a bug rather than a feature. One way to justify this viewpoint is to look at Hamiltonian Floer theory. We know that Hamiltonian Floer homology should be isomorphic to the classical Morse homology which can be defined over integers. In the non-semipositive case, the spherical multiple covers, which appear in wrong dimensions, cannot be easily separated from Floer cylinders, although the latter can be made transverse by geometric perturbations. One must consider the fractional contributions from the stacky parts of moduli spaces. As a result, the Floer homology is only identified with the Morse homology over \mathbb{Q} , missing the information from the torsion part. This bug also makes the construction of interesting algebraic structures, such as equivariant pair-of-pants product [Sei15][SZ21] and quantum Steenrod operation [Wil20] impossible beyond the semipositive case. Recently the authors [BX22a] constructed a Hamiltonian Floer chain complex over \mathbb{Z} using the more refined abstract perturbation scheme discovered by Fukaya–Ono [FO97] and proved an integral version of the Arnold conjecture for general compact symplectic manifolds. This shows that the contributions from the “stacky” parts of moduli spaces can indeed be separated out in Floer theory. Still, the whole construction remains very involved as we need to work with infinitely many moduli spaces simultaneously, even if the recent invention of global Kuranishi charts by Abouzaid–McLean–Smith [AMS21, AMS23] (see also Hirschi–Swaminathan [HS22]) greatly reduced the technical burden.

1.2.2. *Mathematical theory of the GLSM.* It is clear that with the old infrastructure of pseudoholomorphic curves, the generality of applications and the simplicity of methodology hardly get along. The bug of numerical non-integrality is also hard, if not impossible, to remove. Remarkably, the new infrastructure of the gauged linear sigma model, which we systematically adopt in this paper, works for very general situations (i.e. beyond semipositive case) while only requiring the simple geometric perturbation method and provides an easy fix of the issue of spherical multiple covers.

Let us be slightly more technical. We would like to briefly discuss the **vortex equation**, the GLSM counterpart of the pseudoholomorphic curve equation. We use the case of $X = \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^n$ as an example. First, one views $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^n$, a nonlinear space, as the symplectic reduction of the linear space $V = \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ by the group $U(1)$. The moment map is $\mu(x_0, \dots, x_n) = |x_0|^2 + \dots + |x_n|^2 - c$. Then, instead of considering maps from a Riemann surface Σ to $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^n$ (the NLSM viewpoint), we consider the so-called “gauged maps” into the linear space V . They are nothing but triples (L, A, u) , where $L \rightarrow \Sigma$ is a Hermitian line bundle, A is a Hermitian connection on L , and $u = (u_0, \dots, u_n)$ is an $(n+1)$ -tuple of sections of L . The vortex equation reads

$$\bar{\partial}_A u_i = 0, \quad F_A = 2\pi\mathbf{i}\mu(u)\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma = 2\pi\mathbf{i}(|u_0|^2 + \dots + |u_n|^2 - c)\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma. \quad (1.1)$$

Up to gauge transformations, this defines a holomorphic line bundle with $n+1$ holomorphic sections. Notice that the equation depends on a volume form dvol_Σ on the surface, losing the conformal invariance of pseudoholomorphic curves. But this is a very useful feature, as one can manipulate the volume form to adjust the position of the section u relative to the moment map. For example, if one needs to define an evaluation map to the quotient space $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^n$ at a marked point, then one take a volume form which is cylindrical around the point. The finiteness of energy forces any solution to approach to the level set $\mu = 0$ at the cylindrical infinity.

The reason that we can avoid sphere bubbles is simply because the target space V has only constant holomorphic spheres. We can view this feature as giving a different way of compactifying the space of pseudoholomorphic curves downstairs. Notice that an $(n+1)$ -tuple of holomorphic sections (u_0, \dots, u_n) defines a holomorphic map into $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^n$ precisely when these sections have no common zeroes. Sphere bubbles form in a sequential limit when some of their distinct zeroes collide. However, in the vortex equation, there is no restriction on where the sections can vanish.

The absence of sphere bubbles make the geometric perturbation method possible, even if the target space downstairs is not semipositive. For example, one can perturb the standard almost complex structure on the linear space V as long as the perturbation is invariant under the gauge group action. As the solution intersect the region where the group action is free, the invariance restriction does not make the perturbation argument more difficult than the non-equivariant case.

We want to convince the reader that although the GLSM approach is only available for symplectic reductions, the drop of generality is small in a practical sense. Indeed, most target manifolds which can be explicitly defined have some “linear” feature, such as toric manifolds, flag manifolds, or subvarieties inside them. They are the targets for which explicit calculations can be expected.

The mathematical theory of the GLSM develops in two different directions. The first one is constructing gauged Gromov–Witten type invariants, relating them with classical GW invariants, and verifying physicists’ predictions such as classical mirror symmetry or LG/CY correspondence. Although there are substantial developments on the symplectic side (see [Mun99, Mun03, MT09] [GS05] [Zil05, Zil14] [TX18a, TX16, TX20, TX18b]), the progress has been far more successful on the algebraic side ([CKM14][FJR18][CJR21][CLLL16, CLLL19][CGLL21]) with significant applications [CK20] [CGL18, CGL21][GJR18] etc.

The second direction, which only exists in the symplectic setting, is Floer-theoretic applications of the GLSM technique, including [Fra04a, Fra04b][Woo11][Xu16][WX17b]. The key novelty is to

take advantage of the simple topology upstairs to reduce the cost of regularization. Meanwhile, the moduli spaces can sometimes be explicitly identified, making certain computations such as the disk potential calculation available.

1.2.3. *Exact relation between upstairs and downstairs.* To see that the GLSM approach is an ideal alternative of the pseudoholomorphic curve approach, but not anything distantly different, we explain a concrete relation between their numerical or algebraic outputs. Physically, this relation is about the renormalization process in GLSM. Similar phenomena show up in different situations, such as the Atiyah–Floer conjecture [Ati88]. Mathematically, this relation can be revealed by considering the limit of the vortex equation when we blow up the volume form on the surface. In the context of (1.1), consider the $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ limit of the following variant:

$$\bar{\partial}_A u_i = 0, \quad \epsilon^2 F_A = 2\pi i \mu(u) \text{dvol}_\Sigma.$$

Since the vortex theory is supposed to be independent of the parameters, then as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we shall obtain invariant countings, chain homotopy equivalent complexes, etc. On the other hand, if $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, the equation indicates that $\mu(u) \rightarrow 0$. Modulo gauge symmetry, in the limit the vortices become pseudoholomorphic curves in $X = \mu^{-1}(0)/K$. However, by looking more carefully at the $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ limit, one can find that vortices do not converge to pseudoholomorphic curves entirely, as certain gauge-theoretic bubbles may appear. Consequently, one should expect

$$\text{GLSM} \approx \text{NLSM} + \text{correction}. \quad (1.2)$$

The correction term is intimately related to mirror symmetry. For example, when X is Calabi–Yau, the correction can be viewed as a coordinate change on the Kähler moduli on the A-side, which should match the coordinates on the complex moduli on the B-side.

To finish, we remark that although the work conducted in this paper does not rely on a rigorous verification of (1.4) in the Floer setting, this picture shows that the GLSM approach of the Floer theory is equivalent to the ordinary one up to certain deformation.

1.3. **Outline of the proof.** Our proof is greatly indebted to the argument of Shelukhin [She22], which boils down to two key elements: 1) the uniform upper bound of the boundary depth under the semisimplicity condition, and 2) the linear growth of the total bar length under prime iterations. The reason why this argument can be applied to the toric case is because the quantum cohomology of toric manifolds are “generically semisimple,” a fact which can be easily deduced from mirror symmetry (see below). For 2), it is crucial for us to use the GLSM approach which leads to Floer chain complexes over \mathbb{Z} , hence all their mod p reductions.

1.3.1. *Hamiltonian Floer theory via GLSM.* (See Section 4 for more details.) Let X be a compact toric manifold. For any nondegenerate 1-periodic family of Hamiltonians $H_t : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ($t \in S^1$) in [Xu16] the second named author constructed a Floer chain complex over \mathbb{Z} following the suggestion of [CGS00] using the GIT presentation of the toric manifold. Basically, using the moment polytope $P \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ one can realize X as the symplectic reduction of a vector space $V \cong \mathbb{C}^N$ by a Hamiltonian action of T^{N-n} . Upon choosing a T^{N-n} -invariant lift $\hat{H}_t : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of H_t and T^{N-n} -invariant almost complex structure \hat{J}_t , one can define the **vortex Floer complex**

$$VCF_\bullet(\hat{H}, \hat{J})$$

whose generators are still 1-periodic orbits “downstairs” in X , but with differentials counting gauge equivalence classes of Hamiltonian perturbed vortices “upstairs” in V . As the target manifold V is contractible, the compactness problem about the moduli spaces of vortices becomes very simple, similar to the symplectically aspherical case in ordinary Hamiltonian Floer theory. As a

result, one can achieve transversality by just perturbing $(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J})$; moreover, the complex can be defined over the Novikov ring with integer coefficients:

$$\Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}} := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i T^{\lambda_i} \mid a_i \in \mathbb{Z}, \lambda_i \rightarrow +\infty \right\}.$$

The continuation maps and pair-of-pants product can also be constructed, resulting in a quantum algebra $VHF_{\bullet}(V)$ over $\Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}}$ which is independent of the data $(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J})$.¹

The filtered Floer theory can also be developed using the vortex equation. Indeed, an equivariant action functional makes the vortex Floer complex a Floer–Novikov complex in the sense of Usher [Ush08], hence leads to spectral invariants as defined in [WX17b]. By working over a Novikov field $\Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}$, one can also associate to each Hamiltonian H_t a **barcode** in the sense of Usher–Zhang [UZ16] and an infinite-dimensional persistence module.

1.3.2. Mirror symmetry via GLSM and generic semisimplicity. We recall certain folklore knowledge about toric mirror symmetry. Instead of classical mirror symmetry for Calabi–Yau manifolds [CdIOP91], the mirror object of a compact toric manifold X is a **Landau–Ginzburg model** (Y, W) , where Y is an algebraic torus with coordinates $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$ and W is a holomorphic function in y . This mirror correspondence implies the ring isomorphism

$$QH^{\bullet}(X) \cong \text{Jac}(W) \tag{1.3}$$

where the right hand side, the Jacobian ring, is roughly the ring of functions on the critical locus of W . When W is a Morse function, mirror symmetry implies that $QH^{\bullet}(X)$ is semisimple.

The work of Fukaya–Oh–Ohta–Ono [FOOO10, FOOO11, FOOO16] provides a geometric description of the mirror superpotential and the isomorphism (1.3). Indeed, W can be viewed as the count of (stable) holomorphic disks with boundary in Lagrangian tori and the isomorphism (1.3) is induced from the **closed-open map**. The mirror superpotential W can be Morsified by certain deformations, which can be realized by **bulk deformations**. Roughly speaking, cohomology classes \mathfrak{b} in X can deform the ring $QH^{\bullet}(X)$ to a family $QH_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\bullet}(X)$, deform the mirror superpotential W to a family $W_{\mathfrak{b}}$, and deform the closed-open map to a family of isomorphisms

$$QH_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\bullet}(X) \cong \text{Jac}(W_{\mathfrak{b}}). \tag{1.4}$$

Moreover, for a generic \mathfrak{b} , the superpotential $W_{\mathfrak{b}}$ a Morse function, implying the semisimplicity of $QH_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\bullet}(X)$. Notice that, the rigorous mathematical proof of (1.4) by Fukaya *et.al.* relies heavily on the machinery of (equivariant) Kuranishi structures.

Using the GLSM, one can reproduce the above picture with significantly reduced technicality. Indeed, viewing X as the GIT quotient of V , there is a GLSM version of disk potential, firstly discussed by Givental [Giv95] and Hori–Vafa [HV00] and rigorously defined by Woodward [Woo11]. We denote temporarily the GLSM version of the disk potential by W^{GLSM} and the previous disk potential defined by Fukaya–Oh–Ohta–Ono by W^{NLSM} . We remind the reader that when X is Fano, $W^{\text{GLSM}} = W^{\text{NLSM}}$ (see [Cho05][CO06]). In the general situation, schematically, one shall

¹The Piunikhin–Salamon–Schwarz (PSS) construction for the vortex Floer theory, however, do not work over \mathbb{Z} . However, by the special topology of toric manifolds, the homology group $VHF_{\bullet}(V)$ is still isomorphic to the ordinary homology of X .

have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} VHF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(V) & \longrightarrow & \text{Jac}(W_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\text{GLSM}}) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ QH_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}'}(X) & \longrightarrow & \text{Jac}(W_{\mathfrak{b}'}^{\text{NLMSM}}) \end{array} .$$

Here the left vertical arrow and the correspondence $\mathfrak{b} \mapsto \mathfrak{b}'$, often called the **quantum Kirwan map**, has been discussed in [GS05][Zil05, Zil14][Woo15], the right vertical arrow, which is realized by a coordinate change on the variables $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$, has been discussed in various cases in [FOOO16][CLLT17][WX18]. This picture allows us to work entirely upstairs.

Theorem B. *There exists a bulk deformation of the form*

$$\mathfrak{b} = \sum_{j=1}^N \log c_j V_j \quad (1.5)$$

with $c_j \in \mathbb{Z}[\mathfrak{i}] \cong \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathfrak{i}\mathbb{Z}$ such that the quantum algebra $VHF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(V)$ is semisimple over $\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}$.

Using purely algebraic argument one can derive the semisimplicity in finite characteristics.

Corollary 1.2. *Let \mathfrak{b} be given as in Theorem B. Then for any sufficiently large prime p , the quantum algebra $VHF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(V)$ is semisimple over the Novikov field $\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p}$, where $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p$ is an algebraic closure of \mathbb{F}_p .*

1.3.3. *Boundary depth estimate and linear growth of total bar length.* The bulk-deformed vortex Floer theory still provides us powerful quantitative invariants of Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms. Basically, over a Novikov field $\Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}$ the bulk-deformed complex $VCF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J})$ induces a barcode, whose longest finite bar has length equal to the **boundary depth** introduced by Usher [Ush11a]. The boundary depth only depends on the induced Hamiltonian diffeomorphism ϕ on X and we denote it by $\beta_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\phi)$; it also extends to possibly degenerate Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms. We prove the following uniform upper bound on boundary depth, similar to that of [She22, Theorem B].

Theorem C. *Let \mathfrak{b} be given as in Theorem B. Then there exists $C > 0$ such that for all sufficiently large prime p , for all Hamiltonian diffeomorphism ϕ on X , one has*

$$\beta_{\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\phi) \leq C. \quad (1.6)$$

On the other hand, the total bar length of the bulk-deformed vortex Floer complex can be extended to Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms with isolated fixed points. Denote it (over $\Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}$) by

$$\tau_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\phi) \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Following [SZ21] and [She22], via the algebraic Tate construction and geometrically constructed equivariant pair-of-pants product (extending Seidel's construction [Sei15] in characteristic 2), one obtains the following analogue of [She22, Theorem D].

Theorem D. *For any bulk \mathfrak{b} for the form (1.5) and any odd prime p , we have the inequality*

$$\tau_{\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\phi^p) \geq p \cdot \tau_{\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\phi). \quad (1.7)$$

Finally, Theorem A follows by a simple contradiction between Theorem C and Theorem D, if we assume the number of fixed points is great than the total rank of homology (see Section 8).

1.4. Outlook and speculations. We are very surprised to find out that classical considerations from mirror symmetry can be quite useful for investigations in Hamiltonian dynamics. We expect such a connection could open up new avenues for future research. As mentioned above, GLSM can more generally be used to study symplectic topology and Hamiltonian dynamics of other symplectic/GIT quotients or complete intersections in them, the latter of which requires studying the gauged Witten equation (see [TX18a, TX18b]) with Hamiltonian perturbations. It is conceivable that one could resolve the Hofer–Zehnder conjecture for a broader class of symplectic quotients, provided that certain form of closed string mirror symmetry can be established.

On a different note, except for deploying tools like GLSM, as mentioned earlier, there are some recent advances [BX22b, BX22a] on defining Hamiltonian Floer theory over integers for general symplectic manifolds. The methods from *loc. cit.* are general enough for us to expect that a version of symplectic Smith-type inequality should hold using such a theory. Deriving dynamical applications using such a toolkit, including proving the Hofer–Zehnder conjecture in more general settings, is another topic for future research.

1.5. Outline of the paper. The following provides an outline of this paper.

- Basic notions related to toric manifolds are recalled in Section 2, which also includes an introduction to the symplectic vortex equations arising from GLSM.
- In Section 3, various algebraic preliminaries relevant for our purpose, including semisimple algebras over Novikov rings defined over fields with possibly positive characteristics, abstract setups for filtered Floer theories, persistence modules, and A_∞ algebras and their Hochschild cohomology, are recalled systematically.
- A (filtered) Hamiltonian Floer theory package in the vortex setting is recorded in Section 4. Most notably, we introduce bulk deformations in vortex Hamiltonian Floer theory which allow us to incorporate ideas from generic semisimplicity of quantum homology to derive applications in quantitative symplectic topology.
- In Section 5, we introduce local Floer theory in the vortex setting in order to establish Theorem A for Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms with isolated but degenerate fixed points.
- The main purpose of Section 6 is to prove Theorem 6.2 = Theorem C, which ensures a uniform upper bound on the boundary depth of the bulk-deformed vortex Hamiltonian Floer persistence module of any Hamiltonian diffeomorphism provided that the bulk-deformed vortex quantum homology is semisimple.
- In Section 7, we develop \mathbb{Z}/p -equivariant vortex Hamiltonian Floer theory by adapting the work [Sei15, SZ21] in the GLSM setting. Theorem D = Theorem 7.1 is proven as a consequence by appealing to the work of Shelukhin [She22].
- In Section 8 we wrap up the preparations and give the proof of Theorem A.
- We turn our attention to Lagrangian Floer theory in Section 9. The key result is to demonstrate the existence of a “convenient” bulk deformation (cf. Definition 9.20) whose associated Fukaya category (in the GLSM setting) takes a very simple form, such that its Hochschild cohomology is a semisimple algebra.
- Lastly, in Section 10, Theorem 10.1 = Theorem B is proven by showing that the closed-open string map is a unital ring isomorphism.

Acknowledgements. :

We thank Marcelo Atallah, Hiroshi Iritani, Han Lou, Egor Shelukhin, Nick Sheridan, Michael Usher, and Chris Woodward for useful discussions and email correspondences. The first-named author is grateful to the Simons Center for Geometry and Physics for its warm hospitality during Spring 2023.

During the preparation of our paper we learned the then ongoing work of Atallah–Lou [AL23] on the Hofer–Zehnder conjecture for semipositive symplectic manifolds; we also communicated with them on methods of deriving semipositivity from characteristic zero to positive characteristics, although we have developed a completely different approach using the quantum multiplication by the first Chern class.

2. GEOMETRIC PRELIMINARIES

We recall basic notions about toric symplectic manifolds and symplectic vortex equations.

2.1. Toric manifolds as symplectic quotients. We briefly recall the notion of symplectic reduction/quotients. Let K be a compact Lie group with Lie algebra \mathfrak{k} . Let (V, ω_V) be a symplectic manifold having a Hamiltonian K -action with moment map

$$\mu : V \rightarrow \mathfrak{k}^*.$$

The **symplectic reduction** of V (with respect to the K -action and the moment map) is

$$X := \mu^{-1}(0)/K.$$

We always assume that 0 is a regular value of μ and the K -action on $\mu^{-1}(0)$ is free. This assumption implies that X is a smooth manifold with a naturally induced symplectic form ω_X .

When V has a K -invariant integrable almost complex structure J_V , the K -action can be extended to its complexification $K^{\mathbb{C}}$ as a holomorphic action. When this is the case, (under certain extra conditions), the Kempf–Ness theorem says that the symplectic reduction can be identified with the geometric invariant theory (GIT) quotient.

Symplectic toric manifolds can be realized as symplectic quotients of a vector space. We provide a minimal description of symplectic toric manifolds necessary for this paper. An $2n$ -dimensional compact symplectic toric manifold X is described by a convex polytope $P \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying the following conditions.

- (1) For each face $\partial_j P$ of P , there are $\mathbf{v}_j \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and $\lambda_j \in \mathbb{R}$ such that \mathbf{v}_j is an inward normal vector and the face is defined by

$$\partial_j P = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \langle \mathbf{v}_j, \mathbf{u} \rangle = \lambda_j\}.$$

- (2) For each vertex of P , the normal vectors $\mathbf{v}_{j_1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{j_n}$ of all adjacent faces form a \mathbb{Z} -basis of \mathbb{Z}^n .

In this paper, denote by N the number of faces of P . We can realize X as the symplectic quotient of \mathbb{C}^N (with the standard symplectic form) by the $N - n$ dimensional torus $K = T^{N-n} = (S^1)^{N-n}$. The collection of vectors $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_N$ defines a linear map

$$\tilde{\pi}_P : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$$

which sends \mathbb{Z}^N onto \mathbb{Z}^n . Hence it induces a surjective group homomorphism

$$\pi_P : T^N \rightarrow T^n.$$

Let K be the kernel of π_P . Hence K acts on \mathbb{C}^N as a subgroup of T^N . Notice that for the standard $\widehat{K} = T^N$ -action, the moment map can be written as

$$\widehat{\mu}(x_1, \dots, x_N) = (\pi|x_1|^2 - \lambda_1, \dots, \pi|x_N|^2 - \lambda_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N \cong \widehat{\mathfrak{k}}^*.$$

Then the moment map of the K -action is simply the composition

$$V \xrightarrow{\widehat{\mu}} \widehat{\mathfrak{k}}^* \longrightarrow \mathfrak{k}^*.$$

On the other hand, there is a residual torus action on X by the quotient T^n which is the torus action usually appear in the discussion of toric manifolds. Denote the associated moment map by

$$\pi_X : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \quad (2.1)$$

whose range is actually the moment polytope P .

Notice that if one translates the moment polytope P in \mathbb{R}^n by a vector in \mathbb{R}^n , then it does not change the moment map μ and hence the symplectic form on X .

2.2. Symplectic vortex equation. The symplectic vortex equation was originally introduced by Cieliebak–Gaio–Salamon [CGS00] and Mundet [Mun99]. It is a generalization of the pseudoholomorphic curve equation to the equivariant setting. Here we briefly recall its setup and some basic analytical result. We restrict to the toric setting described above.

2.2.1. Gauged maps and vortex equation. Vortices are special “gauged maps” in a similar way as holomorphic curves are special ordinary maps. Let Σ be a Riemann surface. A **gauged map** from Σ to the vector space V is a triple $\mathbf{u} = (P, A, u)$ where $P \rightarrow \Sigma$ is a principal K -bundle, $A \in \mathcal{A}(P)$ is a connection on P , and u is a section of the associated vector bundle $P(V) := P \times_K V$. The group of gauge transformations $\mathcal{G}(P)$, which, in the abelian case, is the group of smooth maps

$$g : \Sigma \rightarrow K,$$

which acts on gauged maps by

$$g^* \mathbf{u} = g^*(P, A, u) = (P, g^*A, g^*u) = (P, A + g^{-1}dg, g^{-1}u).$$

We need three quantities to define the vortex equation. First the covariant derivative of u is a section

$$d_A u \in \Omega^1(P, u^*TV)$$

which descends to an element in $\Omega^1(\Sigma, u^*TV/K)$. There are also the curvature and the moment potential

$$F_A \in \Omega^2(\Sigma, \text{ad}P), \quad \mu(u) \in \Omega^0(\Sigma, \text{ad}P^*).$$

By choosing an invariant inner product on the Lie algebra \mathfrak{k} one can identify $\text{ad}P \cong \text{ad}P^*$; by choosing a volume form ν_Σ one can identify $\Omega^2 \cong \Omega^0$. The gauged map \mathbf{u} is called a **vortex** if

$$\bar{\partial}_A u = 0, \quad *F_A + \mu(u) = 0. \quad (2.2)$$

Here $\bar{\partial}_A u$ is the $(0, 1)$ -part of the covariant derivative $d_A u$. Both equations are invariant under gauge transformations. The energy of a vortex is defined to be

$$E(\mathbf{u}) = \frac{1}{2} \int_\Sigma (\|d_A u\|^2 + \|F_A\|^2 + \|\mu(u)\|^2) \nu_\Sigma.$$

Analogous to pseudoholomorphic curves, vortices satisfy an energy identity. Suppose Σ is closed. Then each gauged map \mathbf{u} represents an equivariant homology class $[\mathbf{u}] \in H_2^K(V; \mathbb{Z})$ defined as follows. The section $u : \Sigma \rightarrow P(V)$ can be identified with a K -equivariant map $\tilde{u} : P \rightarrow V$. Let $EK \rightarrow BK$ be the universal K -bundle. The classifying map of $P \rightarrow \Sigma$ is a map $\iota : \Sigma \rightarrow BK$ which is covered by a bundle map $\tilde{\iota} : P \rightarrow EK$. Then the equivariant map $(\tilde{\iota}, \tilde{u}) : P \rightarrow EK \times V$ descends to a continuous map from Σ to $(EK \times V)/K$, which represents a class $[\mathbf{u}] \in H_2^K(V; \mathbb{Z})$. In the toric case, this class is just the degree of the principal bundle $P \rightarrow \Sigma$. Then for any gauged map $\mathbf{u} = (P, A, u)$, one has

$$E(\mathbf{u}) = \langle \omega^K, [\mathbf{u}] \rangle + \|\bar{\partial}_A u\|_{L^2(\Sigma)}^2 + \|*F_A + \mu(u)\|_{L^2(\Sigma)}^2.$$

Here $\omega^K \in H_K^2(V; \mathbb{R})$ is the equivariant class represented by the equivariant 2-form $\omega - \mu$ (see [CGS00, Proposition 3.1] and [Mun03, Lemma 14]).

Remark 2.1. An important feature of the symplectic vortex equation in the toric setting is that no bubbling happens as the space V is symplectically aspherical. In general, energy concentration could cause bubbling of holomorphic spheres as shown in [Mun99, Mun03, CGMS02, Ott14].

One can introduce Hamiltonian perturbations. Given a 1-form

$$\mathcal{H} \in \Omega^1(\Sigma, C^\infty(V)^K)$$

with coefficients in the space of K -invariant smooth functions on V , we can define a family of Hamiltonian vector fields

$$X_{\mathcal{H}} \in \Gamma(\Sigma \times V, \pi_\Sigma^* T^* \Sigma \otimes TV)$$

which is K -invariant, where $\pi_\Sigma : \Sigma \times V \rightarrow \Sigma$ is the projection to the first factor. Hence for any principal K -bundle $\pi_P : P \rightarrow \Sigma$, the vector field $X_{\mathcal{H}}$ induces a section on the total space of the vector bundle $\pi_{P(V)} : P(V) \rightarrow \Sigma$

$$X_{\mathcal{H}} \in \Gamma(P(V), \pi_{P(V)}^* T^* \Sigma \otimes P(TV)),$$

where $P(TV) := P \times_K u^* TV$. The perturbed symplectic vortex equation is

$$\bar{\partial}_{A, \mathcal{H}} u = 0, \quad *F_A + \mu(u) = 0. \quad (2.3)$$

where

$$\bar{\partial}_{A, \mathcal{H}} u = (d_A u)^{0,1} + (X_{\mathcal{H}}(u))^{0,1}.$$

For our applications, \mathcal{H} is obtained by extending the pullback of Hamiltonian connections in $\Omega^1(\Sigma, C^\infty(X)) = \Omega^1(\Sigma, C^\infty(\mu^{-1}(0)/K))$.

2.2.2. Compactness. Although in aspherical targets vortices cannot bubble off holomorphic spheres, in general holomorphic curves can bubble off. It is the case when one considers Lagrangian boundary conditions. Let $L \subset V$ be a K -invariant Lagrangian submanifold. One can impose the Lagrangian boundary condition for gauged maps $\mathbf{u} = (P, A, u)$ from Σ to V with $u|_{\partial\Sigma} \subset P(L)$. Given a sequence of solutions \mathbf{u}_i to the vortex equation on Σ subject to the Lagrangian boundary condition, if u_i has uniformly bounded image and $E(\mathbf{u}_i)$ is uniformly bounded, the energy density could blow up near a boundary point. The boundedness of the images of u_i implies that the curvatures F_{A_i} do not blowup. Moreover, if one scales by the rate of energy concentration, the sequence of connections A_i converge subsequentially (up to gauge transformation) to a flat connection. All Hamiltonian perturbations and variations of almost complex structures will also be scaled off. Hence a subsequence can bubble off a (stable) holomorphic disk in V with boundary in L with respect to a fixed almost complex structure. See details in [WX17a].

3. ALGEBRAIC PRELIMINARIES

3.1. Novikov rings. We set up the notations for our coefficient rings. In this paper, R always denotes a commutative ring with a unit, hence comes with a canonical ring map

$$\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow R.$$

Let $\Lambda = \Lambda_R$ be the (upward) **Novikov ring**

$$\Lambda_R = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i T^{g_i} \mid g_i \in \mathbb{R}, a_i \in R, \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} g_i = +\infty \right\}$$

The **valuation** on $\mathfrak{v} : \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ is defined by

$$\mathfrak{v} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i T^{g_i} \right) = \inf \{g_i \mid a_i \neq 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{v}(0) = +\infty.$$

We will also need the following version

$$\Lambda_{0,R} = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i T^{g_i} \mid g_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, a_i \in R, \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} g_i = +\infty \right\},$$

which also comes with a valuation by restricting the above valuation. When R is a field, Λ_R is also a field, and it is the field of fraction of $\Lambda_{0,R}$.

In many cases we can restrict to a Novikov ring of series $\sum a_i T^{g_i}$ where g_i are restricted to a finitely generated additive group $\Gamma \subsetneq \mathbb{R}$. In this paper Γ is fixed and actually determined by the GIT presentation of a toric manifold. Indeed, the discrete monoid Γ associated with the toric manifold $X(\Sigma)$ is defined to be the image of effective 1-cycles in \mathbb{R} defined from pairing with the cohomology class represented by the symplectic form, see Subsection 2.1. Denote

$$\Lambda_R^\Gamma := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i T^{g_i} \in \Lambda_R \mid g_i \in \Gamma \right\}$$

and

$$\Lambda_{0,R}^\Gamma := \Lambda_{0,R} \cap \Lambda_R^\Gamma.$$

However Λ_R^Γ does not enjoy certain algebraic properties of Λ_R . For example, when $R = \mathbb{K}$ is an algebraically closed field, $\Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}$ is algebraically closed but $\Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}^\Gamma$ is not.

3.1.1. Modules and algebras over Novikov rings.

Definition 3.1. A **non-Archimedean normed free module** over Λ_R is a pair (C, ℓ) where C is a free Λ_R -module endowed with a function $\ell : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ satisfying

- (1) **(Nondegeneracy)** $\ell(x) = -\infty$ if and only if $x = 0$.
- (2) **(Homogeneity)** For all $\lambda \in \Lambda_R$ and $x \in C$, $\ell(\lambda x) = \ell(x) - \mathfrak{v}(\lambda)$.
- (3) **(Subadditivity)** For $x, y \in C$, $\ell(x+y) \leq \max\{\ell(x), \ell(y)\}$; if $\ell(x) \neq \ell(y)$, then $\ell(x+y) = \max\{\ell(x), \ell(y)\}$.²

Now suppose \mathbb{K} is an R -module which is also a field. Then one can extend the function ℓ to $C \otimes_{\Lambda_R} \Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}$ via **(Homogeneity)**. Then one obtains a non-Archimedean normed vector space in the sense of [UZ16, Definition 2.2] (except that the coefficient field was $\Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}^\Gamma$ rather than $\Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}$).

We also need to consider multiplicative structures compatible with the non-Archimedean norm.

Definition 3.2. A **non-Archimedean normed algebra** over Λ_R is a non-Archimedean normed free module (C, ℓ) together with a commutative Λ_R -algebra structure (with multiplication denoted by $x * y$) satisfying

- **(Triangle inequality)** For all $x, y \in C$,

$$\ell(x * y) \leq \ell(x) + \ell(y).$$

²The second part is a consequence of the first, see [UZ16, Proposition 2.3].

3.1.2. *Specific coefficients and mod p reductions.* In this paper we need to use certain non-traditional coefficient ring or fields. Here we briefly summarize them and set up the notations. First, let $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ be the algebraic closure of \mathbb{Q} , which is viewed as a subfield of \mathbb{C} . Inside $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ there is the subring of algebraic integers $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}$, which is the set of algebraic numbers which are solutions to monic polynomials with integer coefficients. Further, in characteristic p (where p is an odd prime), let $\mathbb{F}_p \cong \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ be the smallest field with characteristic p . Let $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p$ be the algebraic closure of \mathbb{F}_p , which is only well-defined up to isomorphism of field extensions.

Notice that the notion of non-Archimedean normed algebras can be transferred between different coefficient rings via tensor products. A crucial feature of the geometric construction of this paper is that, as long as one has a counting theory over \mathbb{Z} (or $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}$), it automatically induces a theory over any ring R (or $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}$ -algebra). In particular, one needs to perform the “mod p reduction” which is roughly associated to the ring map $\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p$. In our situation, one needs the corresponding extension to the algebraic closure of \mathbb{F}_p .

Lemma 3.3. *For each prime p , there exists a unital ring map*

$$\overline{\pi}_p : \overline{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{F}}_p.$$

Proof. (Following the mathoverflow post [(23)]) $p \in \mathbb{Z} \subset \overline{\mathbb{Z}}$ is not an invertible element. Hence there exists a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} \subset \overline{\mathbb{Z}}$ containing p . Consider the quotient field $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}/\mathfrak{m}$, which is an extension of \mathbb{F}_p . We prove that it is an algebraic closure of \mathbb{F}_p . First, each element $x \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}/\mathfrak{m}$ has a lift $\tilde{x} \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}$ which is the solution to an algebraic equation with integer coefficients. Hence x is an algebraic element over \mathbb{F}_p . Therefore $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}/\mathfrak{m}$ is algebraic over \mathbb{F}_p . Second, for any monic polynomial f with \mathbb{F}_p -coefficients, one can find a monic integral lift \tilde{f} and all roots of \tilde{f} are in $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}$. Hence f has roots in the field $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}/\mathfrak{m}$. Therefore $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}/\mathfrak{m}$ is algebraically closed. Hence $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}/\mathfrak{m}$ is an algebraic closure of \mathbb{F}_p . Therefore, $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}/\mathfrak{m} \cong \overline{\mathbb{F}}_p$ as fields. Precomposing with $\overline{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{Z}}/\mathfrak{m}$ one obtains the desired ring map. \square

Remark 3.4. The map $\overline{\pi}_p$ is not unique. But we fix one for each prime p .

The “mod p reduction” also makes sense for any rational number as long as p is greater than the denominator. We need the following lemma to extend this simple fact to the algebraic closure.

Lemma 3.5. *For each $y \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$, there exists $m \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $my \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}$.*

Proof. If $y \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ is an algebraic number, then it is a root of a polynomial with integer coefficients $P = a_k u^k + \cdots + a_1 u + a_0$ with $a_k \neq 0$. Then

$$0 = a_k^{k-1} P(y) = (a_k y)^k + a_{k-1} (a_k y)^{k-1} + a_{k-2} a_k (a_k y)^{k-2} + \cdots + a_1 a_k^{k-2} (a_k y) + a_0 a_k^{k-1}.$$

So $a_k y$ is a root of a monic polynomial with integer coefficients, hence is in $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}$. \square

3.2. **Semisimple algebras over Novikov fields.** In this paper we use a more restrictive notion of semisimplicity of algebras over Novikov fields.

Definition 3.6. Let \mathbb{F} be a field. A unital \mathbb{F} -algebra $(A, *)$ is called **semisimple** if it splits as a direct sum of rings

$$A = F_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus F_k$$

where $F_i \cong \mathbb{F}$ as a ring. Each summand F_i is called an **idempotent summand** of A and the splitting is called the **idempotent splitting**.

Remark 3.7. In many papers such as [EP03, She22, FOOO10], the meaning of semisimplicity is more general: for example, each summand F_i is allowed to be a finite extension of the field \mathbb{F} . The number of idempotent summands also depends on the choice of the field. In our situation, one can achieve the above stronger semisimplicity of a version of quantum cohomology algebra by turning on bulk deformations and taking a sufficiently large field.

Suppose A is semisimple. Then for each idempotent summand F_i , there is a unique generator $e_i \in F_i$ such that $e_i * e_i = e_i$. We call e_i the **idempotent generator**. Then (e_1, \dots, e_k) is a basis of A . Given any element $\alpha = \lambda_1 e_1 + \dots + \lambda_k e_k$, one can see that the linear map

$$\alpha * : A \rightarrow A$$

has eigenspace decomposition $F_1 \oplus \dots \oplus F_k$ with eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$. The following statement shows that the converse also holds under additional assumptions.

Lemma 3.8. *Let A be a k -dimensional commutative unital \mathbb{F} -algebra and $\alpha \in A$. Suppose $\alpha * : A \rightarrow A$ has k distinct nonzero eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$. Then A is semisimple.*

Proof. Let $(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_k)$ be an eigen-basis of $\alpha *$ and write $\alpha = \mu_1 \varepsilon_1 + \dots + \mu_k \varepsilon_k$. Then we see

$$\alpha * (\varepsilon_i * \varepsilon_j) = \lambda_i \varepsilon_i * \varepsilon_j = \lambda_j \varepsilon_i * \varepsilon_j.$$

As λ_i are all distinct, one has $\varepsilon_i * \varepsilon_j = 0$ whenever $i \neq j$. Then one obtains

$$\alpha * \varepsilon_i = \mu_i \varepsilon_i * \varepsilon_i = \lambda_i \varepsilon_i.$$

As $\lambda_i \neq 0$, one can see $\mu_i \neq 0$. Define $e_i = \lambda_i^{-1} \mu_i \varepsilon_i$. Then

$$e_i * e_i = (\lambda_i^{-1} \mu_i)^2 \varepsilon_i * \varepsilon_i = \lambda_i^{-1} \mu_i \varepsilon_i = e_i.$$

Hence A is semisimple. □

3.2.1. Semi-simplicity and different characteristics. Here we prove a useful algebraic fact which allows us to derive semi-simplicity in finite characteristics from semi-simplicity in characteristic zero. We set up the problem as follows. Let (A, ℓ) be a non-Archimedean normed (free) algebra over the Novikov ring $\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}}}$. Denote

$$A_{(0)} := A \otimes_{\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}}}} \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}$$

and for each prime p

$$A_{(p)} := A \otimes_{\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}}}} \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p}.$$

Denote the induced valuations by

$$\ell_0 : A_{(0)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}, \quad \ell_p : A_{(p)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}.$$

Moreover, let $\mathcal{U} \in A$ be a distinguished nonzero element (which will be the first Chern class in quantum homology in our later discussions), and let $\mathcal{U}_{(0)} \in A_{(0)}$, $\mathcal{U}_{(p)} \in A_{(p)}$ be the corresponding induced element. They induce linear operators

$$E_{(m)} : A_{(m)} \rightarrow A_{(m)}, \quad x \mapsto \mathcal{U}_{(m)} * x, \quad m = 0, p.$$

Theorem 3.9. *Suppose $A_{(0)}$ is semisimple over $\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}$ and all eigenvalues of $E_{(0)}$ are nonzero and distinct. Then there exist $p_0 > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that for all prime $p \geq p_0$, the following conditions hold.*

- (1) $A_{(p)}$ is semisimple over $\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p}$.
- (2) If $e_{1,p}, \dots, e_{m,p}$ are idempotent generators of $A_{(p)}$, then

$$\ell(e_{l,p}) \leq C.$$

Proof of Theorem 3.9 (1). Consider the operator $E : A \rightarrow A$ defined by the multiplication with U and its characteristic polynomial f_E . Notice that $\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}$ is the field of fraction of $\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}}}$. Hence f_E has m distinct roots in $\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}$ and so the discriminant of f_E , denoted by $D(f_E) \in \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}}}$, is nonzero. Hence for sufficiently large prime p , the discriminant of $f_{E(p)}$, which is the mod p reduction of $D(f_E)$, is nonzero. It follows that $E(p)$ also has m distinct eigenvalues. Moreover, as all eigenvalues of $E(0)$ are nonzero, $f_E(0) \neq 0$. Hence $f_{E(p)}(0) \neq 0$ when p is sufficiently large. Hence $E(p)$ is invertible and has no zero eigenvalue. By Lemma 3.8, $A(p)$ is semisimple for sufficiently large p . \square

3.2.2. *Proof of Theorem 3.9 (2).* To prove the quantitative statement of Theorem 3.9, we introduce the notion of truncation. First, given an element

$$\lambda = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i T^{g_i} \in \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}},$$

and $Z \in \mathbb{R}$, define the Z -truncation of λ to be the element

$$\lambda^Z := \sum_{g_i \leq Z} a_i T^{g_i},$$

which has only finitely many terms. Then it follows easily

$$\mathfrak{v}(\lambda - \lambda^Z) \geq Z. \quad (3.1)$$

For an element in a module over $\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}$, its truncations are not canonically defined. We fix, throughout the proof, a basis $\mathfrak{r}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{r}_m$, of the $\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}}}$ -module A . Without loss of generality, we can choose the basis such that

$$\ell(\mathfrak{r}_1) = \dots = \ell(\mathfrak{r}_m) = 0.$$

By abuse of notations, denote the induced basis of $A(0)$ and $A(p)$ still by $\mathfrak{r}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{r}_m$. Then for each $\alpha \in A(0)$, we can write

$$\alpha = \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j \mathfrak{r}_j$$

where $\alpha_j \in \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}$. Then define the Z -truncation

$$\alpha^Z = \sum_{j=1}^B \alpha_j^Z \mathfrak{r}_j.$$

Then by (3.1) we have the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_0(\alpha - \alpha^Z) &= \ell_0 \left(\sum_{l=1}^m (\alpha_l - \alpha_l^Z) \mathfrak{r}_l \right) \leq \max_{1 \leq l \leq m} \ell_0((\alpha_l - \alpha_l^Z) \mathfrak{r}_l) \\ &= \max_{1 \leq l \leq m} (\ell_0(\mathfrak{r}_l) - \mathfrak{v}(\alpha_l - \alpha_l^Z)) \leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} \ell(\mathfrak{r}_j) - Z = -Z. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

Running convention. Within this proof, Z is a large real number which can be fixed from the beginning. The lower bound of p_0 which is valid for the statement of Theorem 3.9 depends on the choice of Z . The letter $C > 0$ denotes a real number which is independent of Z and $p \geq p_0$ but whose value is allowed to change from line to line.

Lemma 3.10. *Suppose $e_{1,(0)}, \dots, e_{m,(0)}$ constitute the idempotent generators of $A(0)$, with valuations $\lambda_{1,(0)}, \dots, \lambda_{m,(0)}$. Then for Z sufficiently large, $e_{1,(0)}^Z, \dots, e_{m,(0)}^Z$ form a basis of $A(0)$, and $\lambda_{1,(0)}^Z, \dots, \lambda_{m,(0)}^Z$ are all nonzero and distinct.*

Proof. With respect to the basis $(\mathbf{r}_{1,(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{r}_{m,(0)})$ of $A_{(0)}$, we identify $e_{l,(0)}$ with its coordinate vector in $(\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}})^m$. Then the $m \times m$ matrix with columns $e_{l,(0)}$ is invertible with a nonzero determinant. Then when Z is sufficiently large, the corresponding determinant with $e_{l,(0)}$ replaced by $e_{l,(0)}^Z$ is also nonzero. On the other hand, as all $\lambda_{l,(0)}$ are nonzero, $\lambda_{l,(0)}^Z \neq 0$ when Z is large. \square

We would like to construct, for large primes p , eigenvectors and eigenvalues of $\mathbb{E}_{(p)}$ over the field $\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p}$. The basic idea is to take some truncation $e_{l,(0)}^Z$ of the idempotent generators and their mod p reductions as an appropriate eigenbasis and then to apply certain corrections.

By Lemma 3.5, for each $Z \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists $m^Z \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$m^Z \lambda_{l,(0)}^Z \in \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}}}, \quad m^Z e_{l,(0)}^Z \in A_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}}}.$$

This allows us to define the “mod p reduction” of $\lambda_{l,(0)}^Z$ and $e_{l,(0)}^Z$ as follows. Fixing m^Z , by choosing a sufficiently large p so that it cannot divide m^Z , the quantity m^Z has a nonzero reduction $[m^Z]_p \in \mathbb{F}_p$. Moreover, $m^Z \lambda_{l,(0)}^Z$ has a mod p reduction $[m^Z \lambda_{l,(0)}^Z]_p \in \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p}$ and $m^Z e_{l,(0)}^Z$ has a mod p reduction $[m^Z e_{l,(0)}^Z]_p \in A_{(p)}$ (defined via the integral basis $\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_m$). Then define

$$\lambda_{l,(p)}^Z := [m^Z]_p^{-1} [m^Z \lambda_{l,(0)}^Z]_p, \quad e_{l,(p)}^Z := [m^Z]_p^{-1} [m^Z e_{l,(0)}^Z]_p.$$

Lemma 3.11. *There exists $C > 0$ such that for any sufficiently large Z , upon choosing m^Z as above, there exists $p^Z > 0$ such that whenever $p \geq p^Z$, $e_{l,(p)}^Z$ is a basis of $A_{(p)}$ and all $\lambda_{l,(p)}^Z$ are nonzero and distinct. Moreover, for some constant $C > 0$ one has*

$$\ell_p(e_{l,(p)}^Z) \geq -C, \quad \mathbf{v}(\lambda_{l,(p)}^Z) \leq C.$$

Moreover, for all $k \neq l$

$$\mathbf{v}(\lambda_{l,(p)}^Z - \lambda_{k,(p)}^Z) \leq C.$$

Proof. Straightforward. \square

Proposition 3.12. *There exists $C > 0$ such that given any sufficiently large Z , for all sufficiently large prime p , there exist eigenvectors $\varepsilon_{l,(p)}$ of $E_{(p)}$ with corresponding distinct eigenvalues $\lambda_{l,(p)} \in \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p}$ such that*

$$\ell_p(e_{l,(p)}^Z - \varepsilon_{l,(p)}) \leq -Z + C$$

and

$$\mathbf{v}(\lambda_{l,(p)}^Z - \lambda_{l,(p)}) \geq Z - C.$$

Proof. In $A_{(0)}$, one has

$$(m^Z)^{-1} E_{(0)}(m^Z e_{l,(0)}) = ((m^Z)^{-1} \lambda_{l,(0)})(m^Z e_{l,(0)}).$$

Using (3.2), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \ell_0 \left((m^Z)^{-1} E_{(0)}(m^Z e_{l,(0)}^Z) - ((m^Z)^{-1} \lambda_{l,(0)}^Z)(m^Z e_{l,(0)}^Z) \right) \\ &= \ell_0 \left(E_{(0)}(e_{l,(0)}^Z) - \lambda_{l,(0)}^Z e_{l,(0)}^Z \right) \\ &= \ell_0 \left(E_{(0)}(e_{l,(0)}^Z - e_{l,(0)}) + (\lambda_{l,(0)} - \lambda_{l,(0)}^Z) e_{l,(0)} + \lambda_{l,(0)}^Z (e_{l,(0)} - e_{l,(0)}^Z) \right) \\ &\leq \max \left\{ \ell_0(c_{1,(0)} * (e_{l,(0)}^Z - e_{l,(0)})), \ell_0((\lambda_{l,(0)} - \lambda_{l,(0)}^Z) e_{l,(0)}), \ell_0(\lambda_{l,(0)}^Z (e_{l,(0)} - e_{l,(0)}^Z)) \right\} \\ &\leq \max \left\{ \ell_0(c_{1,(0)}) + C - Z, \ell_0(e_{l,(0)}) - Z, -\mathbf{v}(\lambda_{l,(0)}) + C - Z \right\} \\ &\leq C - Z. \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

Now take a sufficiently large p . Notice that the left hand side of (3.3) is the valuation of an integral element, hence descends to $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p$. Then (3.3) implies

$$\ell_p \left(E_{(p)}(e_{l,(p)}^Z) - \lambda_{l,(p)}^Z e_{l,(p)}^Z \right) \leq C - Z. \quad (3.4)$$

We would like to correct $e_{l,(p)}^Z$ by adding higher order terms.

With respect to the basis $(e_{1,(p)}^Z, \dots, e_{m,(p)}^Z)$, let the matrix of $E_{(p)}$ be $T_{(p)}$. For a matrix $S = (S_{ij})$ with entries in $\Lambda_{\mathbb{k}}$, we write

$$\mathbf{v}(S) = \min_{i,j} \mathbf{v}(S_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Lemma 3.13. *One has*

$$\mathbf{v} \left(T_{(p)} - \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_{1,(p)}^Z & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_{2,(p)}^Z & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \lambda_{m,(p)}^Z \end{bmatrix} \right) \geq Z - C.$$

Proof. We can write

$$E_{(p)}(e_{l,(p)}^Z) - \lambda_{l,(p)}^Z e_{l,(p)}^Z = \sum_{l=1}^m a_l e_{l,(p)}^Z.$$

By (3.4) and the subadditivity property of the function ℓ (see Definition 3.1), one has $\mathbf{v}(a_l) \geq Z - C$ for some appropriate C . \square

For each l , consider the following equation for

$$x = \sum_{k \neq l} x_k e_{k,(p)}^Z, \quad \delta \in \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p}$$

which is

$$E_{(p)}(e_{l,(p)}^Z + x) = (\lambda_{l,(p)}^Z + \delta)(e_{l,(p)}^Z + x)$$

which is equivalent to

$$E_{(p)} \left(\sum_{k \neq l} x_k e_{k,(p)}^Z \right) - \sum_{k \neq l} \lambda_{l,(p)}^Z x_k e_{k,(p)}^Z - \delta e_{l,(p)}^Z = \delta \sum_{k \neq l} x_k e_{k,(p)}^Z + \rho_l.$$

Here ρ_l is the error term with $\mathbf{v}(\rho_l) \leq -Z + C$ by (3.4). To simplify notations, assume $l = 1$. Then using the basis $e_{1,(p)}^Z, \dots, e_{m,(p)}^Z$, this equation is equivalent to the linear system

$$\left(\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ & T'_{(p)} & & \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_{1,(p)}^Z & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \lambda_{1,(p)}^Z \end{bmatrix} \right) \begin{bmatrix} \delta \\ x_2 \\ \vdots \\ x_m \end{bmatrix} = Q(\delta, x_2, \dots, x_m) + \rho_1.$$

Here the left hand side is linear and Q is quadratic. Let the matrix on the left hand side be F_1 . Lemma 3.13 implies that F_1 is invertible with

$$\mathbf{v}(F_1) \leq C$$

where C is independent of Z and p . Then one can use an iteration argument to solve the equation term by term. The correction term has valuation at least $Z - C$ for some constant C . So the theorem follows. \square

We continue the proof of (2) of Theorem 3.9. By the proof of Lemma 3.8, each idempotent generator of $A_{(p)}$ is a multiple of $\varepsilon_{l,(p)}$. Indeed, if

$$\varepsilon_{l,(p)} * \varepsilon_{l,(p)} = \mu_l \varepsilon_{l,(p)}$$

then the corresponding idempotent generator is

$$e_{l,(p)} = \mu_l^{-1} \varepsilon_{l,(p)}.$$

So we need to estimate the valuation of μ_l . In characteristic zero one has

$$e_{l,(0)} * e_{l,(0)} = e_{l,(0)}.$$

Taking truncation at Z one has

$$\ell_0(e_{l,(0)}^Z * e_{l,(0)}^Z - e_{l,(0)}^Z) \leq C - Z.$$

Taking mod p reduction, one obtains

$$\ell_p(e_{l,(p)}^Z * e_{l,(p)}^Z - e_{l,(p)}^Z) \leq C - Z.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_p(\mu_l \varepsilon_{l,(p)} - e_{l,(p)}^Z) &= \ell_p(\varepsilon_{l,(p)} * \varepsilon_{l,(p)} - e_{l,(p)}^Z * e_{l,(p)}^Z + e_{l,(p)}^Z * e_{l,(p)}^Z - e_{l,(p)}^Z) \\ &\leq \max \left\{ \ell_p(\varepsilon_{l,(p)} - e_{l,(p)}^Z) + \ell_p(\varepsilon_{l,(p)} + e_{l,(p)}^Z), C - Z \right\} \leq C - Z. \end{aligned}$$

As we have $\ell_p(e_{l,(p)}^Z) \geq -C$, it follows that $\ell_p(\mu_l \varepsilon_{l,(p)}) = \ell_p(e_{l,(p)}^Z) = \ell_p(\varepsilon_{l,(p)})$. Hence $\mathbf{v}(\mu_l) = 0$ and hence

$$\ell_p(e_{l,(p)}) = \ell_p(\mu_l^{-1} \varepsilon_{l,(p)}) = \ell_p(\varepsilon_{l,(p)}) + \mathbf{v}(\mu_l) = \ell_p(e_{l,(p)}^Z) = \ell_0(e_{l,(0)})$$

which is independent of p . This finishes the proof of Theorem 3.9.

3.3. Floer–Novikov complexes. Let $\Gamma \subsetneq \mathbb{R}$ be a proper additive subgroup.

Definition 3.14 (Floer–Novikov complex). (cf. [Ush08, Definition 1.1]) A \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded filtered Floer–Novikov package over a commutative unital ring R consists of data

$$\mathbf{c} = \left(P, \mathcal{A}, gr, n_R \right)$$

where

- (1) P is a Γ -torsor with P/Γ finite.
- (2) $\mathcal{A} : P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the “action functional” and $gr : P \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2$ is the “grading.”
- (3) For $p \in P$ and $g \in \Gamma$, one has

$$\mathcal{A}(gp) = \mathcal{A}(p) - g, \quad gr(gp) = gr(p)$$

- (4) $n_R : P \times P \rightarrow R$ is a function such that
 - $n_R(p, q) \neq 0 \implies gr(p) = gr(q) + 1, \mathcal{A}(p) > \mathcal{A}(q)$;
 - for all $p \in P$ and $C \in \mathbb{R}$, the set

$$\{q \in P \mid n_R(p, q) \neq 0, \mathcal{A}(q) \geq C\}$$

is finite;

- for any $g \in \Gamma$, we have $n_R(gp, gq) = n_R(p, q)$;
- the Λ_R -linear map ∂ defined in (3.5) satisfies $\partial^2 = 0$.

Given a Floer–Novikov package one can construct the associated Floer chain complex. Define

$$CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c}) = \left\{ \sum_{p \in P} a_p p \mid a_p \in R, \forall C \in \mathbb{R}, \#\{p \in P \mid a_p \neq 0, \mathcal{A}(p) \geq C\} < \infty \right\}$$

which is \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded. The Λ_R^{Γ} -module structure is induced from the Γ -action on P . Define

$$\partial : CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c}) \rightarrow CF_{\bullet-1}(\mathfrak{c})$$

by

$$\partial \left(\sum_{p \in P} a_p p \right) = \sum_{q \in P} \left(\sum_{p \in P} a_p n_R(p, q) \right) q. \quad (3.5)$$

We also define the function

$$\ell : CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}, \quad \ell \left(\sum_{p \in P} a_p p \right) = \sup \{ \mathcal{A}(p) \mid a_p \neq 0 \}. \quad (3.6)$$

Given a Floer–Novikov package \mathfrak{c} over R , if $\iota : R \rightarrow \tilde{R}$ is a ring map, then one can extend \mathfrak{c} to a Floer–Novikov package $\mathfrak{c} \otimes_R \tilde{R}$ by simply defining $n_{\tilde{R}} := \iota \circ n : P \times P \rightarrow \tilde{R}$

Proposition 3.15. *If $R = \mathbb{K}$ is a field, the triple $(CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c}), \partial, \ell)$ is a Floer-type complex over $\Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}^{\Gamma}$ in the sense of [UZ16, Definition 4.1].*

Proof. It follows directly from the definitions of Floer-type complexes. The proof serves rather as a brief clarification about this concept. First, for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_2$, the pair $(CF_k(\mathfrak{c}), \ell|_{CF_k(\mathfrak{c})})$ is a non-Archimedean normed vector space over $\Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}^{\Gamma}$ (see [UZ16, Definition 2.2]). In addition it is an orthogonalizable $\Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}^{\Gamma}$ -space (see [UZ16, Definition 2.7]). The last requirement for being a Floer-type complex is the inequality

$$\ell(\partial(x)) \leq \ell(x) \quad \forall x \in CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c}),$$

which is a consequence of the property of the function $n_{\mathbb{K}}$ in the data \mathfrak{c} . \square

3.3.1. *Spectral invariants.* Following Usher [Ush08], one can also define spectral invariants in an abstract way. First, define the “energy filtration” on the complex $CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c})$: for each $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, define

$$CF_{\bullet}^{\leq \tau}(\mathfrak{c}) := \left\{ \sum_{p \in P} a_p p \in CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c}) \mid a_p \neq 0 \implies \mathcal{A}(p) \leq \tau \right\}.$$

Then since the differential decreases the action, it is a subcomplex with homology

$$HF_{\bullet}^{\leq \tau}(\mathfrak{c})$$

and natural maps when $\tau \leq \kappa$

$$\iota^{\tau, \kappa} : HF_{\bullet}^{\leq \tau}(\mathfrak{c}) \rightarrow HF_{\bullet}^{\leq \kappa}(\mathfrak{c}). \quad (3.7)$$

For $\alpha \in HF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c})$, define

$$\rho(\alpha) := \inf \left\{ \tau \in \mathbb{R} \mid \alpha \in \text{Im} \left(\iota^{\tau} : HF_{\bullet}^{\leq \tau}(\mathfrak{c}) \rightarrow HF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c}) \right) \right\} \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$$

Theorem 3.16. [Ush08, Theorem 1.3, 1.4] *Given a Floer–Novikov package \mathfrak{c} (over a Noetherian ring R) and $\alpha \in HF(\mathfrak{c}) \setminus \{0\}$, $\rho(\alpha) > -\infty$ and $\alpha \in \text{Im}(\iota_{\rho(\alpha)})$.*

3.3.2. Boundary depth.

Definition 3.17. [Ush11a] Let \mathfrak{c} be a Floer–Novikov package and let $CF_{\bullet}^{\leq \lambda}(\mathfrak{c})$ be the associated filtered Floer–Novikov complex over $\Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}^{\Gamma}$. Then the **boundary depth** of the filtered complex is the infimum of $\beta > 0$ such that for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$

$$CF^{\leq \lambda}(\mathfrak{c}) \cap \text{Im} \partial \subset \partial(CF^{\leq \lambda + \beta}(\mathfrak{c})).$$

Theorem 3.18. [Ush08, Theorem 1.3] *Given a Floer–Novikov package \mathfrak{c} , the boundary depth of the associated Floer–Novikov complex is finite.*

3.3.3. *Quasiequivalence distance.* We rephrase the notion of quasiequivalences between Floer–Novikov complexes, which was originally introduced in [UZ16] for the more general situation of Floer-type complexes.

Definition 3.19. (cf. [UZ16, Definition 1.3]) Let $(CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c}_i), \partial_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, be two Floer–Novikov complexes associated to Floer–Novikov packages \mathfrak{c}_i over a field \mathbb{K} . Let ℓ_i be the valuation function on the two complexes defined by (3.6). Let $\delta \geq 0$. A δ -**quasiequivalence** between $CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c}_1)$ and $CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c}_2)$ is a quadruple (Φ, Ψ, K_C, K_D) where

- (1) $\Phi : CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c}_1) \rightarrow CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c}_2)$ and $\Psi : CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c}_2) \rightarrow CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c}_1)$ are chain maps with

$$\ell_2(\Phi(x_1)) \leq \ell_1(x_1) + \delta, \quad \ell_1(\Psi(x_2)) \leq \ell_2(x_2) + \delta$$

for all $x_1 \in CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c}_1)$ and $x_2 \in CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c}_2)$.

- (2) $K_i : CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c}_i) \rightarrow CF_{\bullet+1}(\mathfrak{c}_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, obey the homotopy equations

$$\Psi \circ \Phi - \text{Id}_{CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c}_1)} = \partial_1 K_1 + K_1 \partial_1, \quad \Phi \circ \Psi - \text{Id}_{CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c}_2)} = \partial_2 K_2 + K_2 \partial_2$$

and for all $x_i \in CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c}_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, one has

$$\ell_i(K_i(x_i)) \leq \ell_i(x_i) + 2\delta.$$

The **quasiequivalence distance** between $CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c}_1)$ and $CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c}_2)$, denoted by $d_Q(CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c}_1), CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c}_2))$, is the infimum of δ such that there exists a δ -quasiequivalence between them.

3.4. Persistence modules and stability of boundary depth.

Definition 3.20. Let \mathbb{K} be a field.

- (1) A **persistence module** \mathbf{V} is a family of \mathbb{K} -vector spaces

$$\mathbf{V} = (V^s)_{s \in \mathbb{R}}$$

together with linear maps (called the **structural maps** of \mathbf{V})

$$\iota_{\mathbf{V}}^{s,t} := \iota_{\mathbf{V}}^{s,t} : V^s \rightarrow V^t \quad \forall s \leq t$$

such that $\iota^{s,s} = \text{Id}_{V^s}$ for all s and $\iota^{t,r} \circ \iota^{s,t} = \iota^{s,r}$ for all $s \leq t \leq r$.

- (2) Let \mathbf{V} be a persistence module and $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$. The δ -shift of \mathbf{V} is the persistence module $\mathbf{V}[\delta]$ with $V[\delta]^s = V^{s+\delta}$ and $\iota[\delta]^{s,t} = \iota^{s+\delta, t+\delta}$.
- (3) Let \mathbf{V} and \mathbf{W} be two persistence modules. A morphism from \mathbf{V} to \mathbf{W} is a collection of linear maps $\mathbf{f} = (f^s : V^s \rightarrow W^s)_{s \in \mathbb{R}}$ such that for all $s \leq t$ the following diagram commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} V^s & \xrightarrow{f^s} & W^s \\ \iota_{\mathbf{V}}^{s,t} \downarrow & & \downarrow \iota_{\mathbf{W}}^{s,t} \\ V^t & \xrightarrow{f^t} & W^t \end{array}$$

(4) The direct sum of persistence modules is defined in a natural way.

Remark 3.21. The notion of persistence modules first appeared in topological data analysis and then was adopted to symplectic topology (see [PS16, UZ16]). In many papers, notably in the symplectically aspherical or monotone setting such as [PS16, She22], the Floer persistence modules are usually finite-dimensional and hence generate *barcodes* as in the original situation of topological data analysis. However, in more general situations such as [UZ16] where the Floer persistence modules are infinite-dimensional, the notion of barcodes becomes more complicated. See Subsection 3.5 for more details.

3.4.1. Interleaving distance.

Definition 3.22. Let $\delta \geq 0$. Two persistence modules \mathbf{V} , \mathbf{W} are called δ -**interleaved** if there are \mathbb{K} -linear maps

$$f^s : V^s \rightarrow W^{s+\delta}, \quad g^s : W^s \rightarrow V^{s+\delta}$$

for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for all $s \leq t$ the following diagram commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & \xrightarrow{\iota_{\mathbf{V}}^{s-\delta, s+\delta}} & & & & \\
 V^{s-\delta} & \xrightarrow{f^{s-\delta}} & W^s & \xrightarrow{g^s} & V^{s+\delta} & \xrightarrow{f^{s+\delta}} & W^{s+2\delta} \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 V^{t-\delta} & \xrightarrow{f^{t-\delta}} & W^t & \xrightarrow{g^t} & V^{t+\delta} & \xrightarrow{f^{t+\delta}} & W^{t+2\delta} \\
 & & & & \xrightarrow{\iota_{\mathbf{W}}^{t, t+2\delta}} & &
 \end{array}$$

Here all vertical arrows are the structural maps in the persistence modules.

Define the **interleaving distance** between \mathbf{V} and \mathbf{W} to be the infimum of all $\delta \geq 0$ such that \mathbf{V} and \mathbf{W} are δ -interleaved; if such δ does not exist, define the interleaving distance to be $+\infty$. Here ends this definition.

3.4.2. *Boundary depth of persistence modules and stability.* We observe that one can generalize the notion of boundary depth to persistence modules.

Definition 3.23. Let \mathbf{V} be a persistence module over \mathbb{K} . The **boundary depth** of \mathbf{V} , denoted by $\beta(\mathbf{V})$, is the infimum of $\beta > 0$ such that for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $x \in V^s$, if $\iota^{s,t}(x) = 0$ for some $t > s$, then $\iota^{s, s+\beta}(x) = 0$.

As we allow persistent modules to be infinite-dimensional, we reprove the stability result of boundary depth.

Proposition 3.24. *Suppose \mathbf{V} , \mathbf{W} are δ -interleaved persistence modules. Suppose \mathbf{V} has finite boundary depth. Then \mathbf{W} has finite boundary depth and*

$$\beta(\mathbf{W}) \leq \beta(\mathbf{V}) + 2\delta.$$

Proof. Suppose on the contrary that $\beta(\mathbf{W}) \geq \beta(\mathbf{V}) + 2\delta + 2\epsilon$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. Then there exist $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x \in W_s$ such that $\iota^{s, s+\beta(\mathbf{V})+2\delta+\epsilon}(x) \neq 0$. Then by the definition of δ -interleaving, one has $y := f^{s, s+\delta}(x) \neq 0$ and

$$\iota^{s+\delta, s+\delta+\beta(\mathbf{V})+\epsilon}(y) \neq 0$$

but y cannot survive eventually. This contradicts the definition of $\beta(\mathbf{V})$. \square

3.4.3. *Persistence modules associated to filtered Floer–Novikov complexes.* Fix a field \mathbb{K} . Let \mathfrak{c} be a Floer–Novikov package (see Definition 3.14) and $CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c})$ be the associated filtered Floer–Novikov complex. Then the collection of homology groups

$$V^s(\mathfrak{c}) := HF_{\bullet}^{\leq s}(\mathfrak{c}; \Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}^{\Gamma})$$

together with the natural maps $\iota^{s,t}$ (cf. Equation (3.7)) is a persistence module over \mathbb{K} , denoted by $\mathbf{V}(\mathfrak{c})$.

It is easy to derive from definitions the following stability results of persistence modules coming from Floer–Novikov complexes.

Proposition 3.25. *Let $CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c}_i)$, $i = 1, 2$ be two Floer–Novikov complexes over a field \mathbb{K} and $\mathbf{V}(\mathfrak{c}_i)$ be the associated persistence module. Then the interleaving distance between $\mathbf{V}(\mathfrak{c}_1)$ and $\mathbf{V}(\mathfrak{c}_2)$ is no greater than the quasiequivalence distance between $CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c}_1)$ and $CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c}_2)$.*

Moreover, the two notions of boundary depths (Definition 3.17 and Definition 3.23) agree.

Proposition 3.26. *Let \mathfrak{c} be a Floer–Novikov package over \mathbb{K} . Then the boundary depth of the filtered Floer–Novikov complex $CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c})$ and the boundary depth of the persistence module $\mathbf{V}(\mathfrak{c})$ coincide.*

Proof. Let β_1 be the boundary depth of $CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c})$ and β_2 be the boundary depth of $\mathbf{V}(\mathfrak{c})$. Suppose $[x] \in HF_{\bullet}^{\leq s}(\mathfrak{c})$ which does not survive eventually. Let $x \in CF_{\bullet}^{\leq s}(\mathfrak{c})$ be a representative. Then x is exact. Then by Definition 3.17, for all $\epsilon > 0$, one has

$$x \in \partial(CF_{\bullet}^{\leq s+\beta_1+\epsilon}(\mathfrak{c})).$$

Hence $\iota^{s, s+\beta_1+\epsilon}([x]) = 0$. As ϵ is arbitrary, this implies that $\beta_2 \leq \beta_1$.

On the other hand, for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and all exact $x \in CF_{\bullet}^{\leq s}(\mathfrak{c})$, the class $[x] \in HF_{\bullet}^{\leq s}(\mathfrak{c})$ does not survive eventually. Then by Definition 3.23, for any $\epsilon > 0$, one has $\iota^{s, s+\beta_2+\epsilon}([x]) = 0$. This implies that

$$x \in \partial(CF_{\bullet}^{\leq s+\beta_2+\epsilon}(\mathfrak{c})).$$

It follows that $\beta_1 \leq \beta_2$. Hence $\beta_1 = \beta_2$. \square

3.5. **Reduced barcodes.** Barcodes, originally used in topological data analysis, have become a very convenient tool in quantitative symplectic geometry. In this paper, as we only need to use the lengths of bars rather than the positions of the bars, we define the following notion of reduced barcodes.

Definition 3.27. (cf. [UZ16, Definition 8.13, 8.14])

- (1) A **reduced barcode** is a finite multiset \mathcal{B} of elements of $(0, +\infty]$.³ Although \mathcal{B} is not a set in general and a member L of \mathcal{B} may appear multiple times, we still use the same notations as if L is an element of a set \mathcal{B} , such as $L \in \mathcal{B}$, without confusion. Let $\mathcal{B}_{\text{finite}} \subset \mathcal{B}$ denote the submultiset of finite bars, i.e., those with $L < +\infty$.
- (2) The **total bar length** of a reduced barcode \mathcal{B} is

$$\tau(\mathcal{B}) := \sum_{L_i \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{finite}}} L_i.$$

³To match with the traditional notion of barcode, one can regard a member of \mathcal{B} the length of either a finite interval or a semi-infinite interval.

- (3) The **reduced bottleneck distance** between two reduced barcodes \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{B}' , denoted by $d_B(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{B}')$, is the infimum of $\delta > 0$ such that, after removing certain submultisets $\mathcal{B}_{\text{short}} \subset \mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{B}'_{\text{short}} \subset \mathcal{B}'$ whose members all have length at most 2δ , there is a bijection between $\mathcal{B} \setminus \mathcal{B}_{\text{short}}$ and $\mathcal{B}' \setminus \mathcal{B}'_{\text{short}}$ such that the differences of the corresponding bar lengths are all bounded by δ .

The bottleneck distance is symmetric and satisfies the triangle inequality. It is not a metric in the usual sense as it may take infinite value. Indeed, $d_B(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{B}') < \infty$ if and only if \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{B}' has the same number of infinite bars.

Proposition 3.28. (cf. [RSV21, Proposition 20]) *For any $k \geq 0$, the completion of the set of reduced barcodes having k infinite bars is the set of possibly infinite reduced barcodes (with k infinite bars) such that for all $\epsilon > 0$, the number of finite bars with length greater than ϵ is finite.*

3.5.1. *Reduced barcodes associated to Floer–Novikov complexes.* Usher–Zhang [UZ16] defined for each \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded Floer-type complexes over $\Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}^{\Gamma}$ and each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_2$ the associated barcodes (which allows bars of length zero). As Floer–Novikov complexes are all Floer-type complexes, one has an associated reduced barcode. Let the reduced barcode associated to a Floer–Novikov complex $CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c})$ be $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{c})$. As the differential strictly decreases the action, there are no bars of length zero (which was allowed in the abstract setting of [UZ16]). We do not recall the detail of the definition here.

Proposition 3.29. *Let $\mathbf{V}(\mathfrak{c})$ be the persistence module induced from a filtered Floer–Novikov complex $CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c})$ over $\Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}^{\Gamma}$. Then the boundary depth of $\mathbf{V}(\mathfrak{c})$ (see Definition 3.17 and Definition 3.23) coincides with the length of the longest finite bar in $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{c})$. In particular, the boundary depth is zero if and only if $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{c})$ has no finite bar.*

Proof. It follows from the definitions of boundary depth and barcodes (via singular value decompositions, see [UZ16]). The details are left to the reader. \square

We also have the following stability result about reduced barcode.

Theorem 3.30. [UZ16, Theorem 8.17] *Let $(CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c}_1), \partial_1, \ell_1)$ and $(CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c}_2), \partial_2, \ell_2)$ be two Floer–Novikov complexes associated to Floer–Novikov data $\mathfrak{c}_1, \mathfrak{c}_2$ over a field \mathbb{K} . Suppose the quasiequivalence distance between $CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c}_1)$ and $CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c}_2)$ is finite. Then*

$$d_B(\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{c}_1), \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{c}_2)) \leq 2d_Q(CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c}_1), CF_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{c}_2)).$$

3.6. **A_{∞} algebras and Hochschild cohomology.** Let \mathbb{K} be a field of characteristic zero. We recall the notion of \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded A_{∞} algebras over the Novikov field $\Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}$.

Definition 3.31 (Curved A_{∞} algebra). (1) A \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded **curved A_{∞} algebra** over $\Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}$ consists of a \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded $\Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}$ -vector space \mathcal{A} (the degree of a homogeneous element a is denoted by $|a|$) and for all positive integers $k \geq 0$ **higher composition maps**

$$m_k : \mathcal{A}^{\otimes k} \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \text{ (where } m_0 : \Lambda_{\mathbb{K}} \rightarrow \mathcal{A})$$

(which are $\Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}$ -linear and have degree $k \bmod 2$). The higher composition maps need to satisfy the following A_{∞} composition law: for all $k \geq 1$ and $a_k, \dots, a_1 \in \mathcal{A}$,⁴

$$\sum_{i=0}^k \sum_{j=0}^{k-i} (-1)^{\mathfrak{X}_1^j} m_{k-i+1}(a_k, \dots, a_{i+j+1}, m_i(a_{i+j}, \dots, a_{j+1}), a_j, \dots, a_1) = 0$$

⁴There are two different conventions: the variables are either ordered as a_1, \dots, a_k or ordered as a_k, \dots, a_1 .

where the symbol \mathfrak{X}_a^b for all $a < b$ is defined as

$$\mathfrak{X}_a^b = \sum_{a \leq i \leq b} \|a_i\| \quad \text{where } \|a_i\| = |a_i| + 1. \quad (3.8)$$

- (2) The **curvature** of a curved A_∞ algebra is the element

$$m_0(1) \in \mathcal{A}.$$

If $m_0 = 0$, then we say that the A_∞ algebra is **flat**.

- (3) Given a (curved or flat) A_∞ algebra \mathcal{A} , a **cohomological unit** is an even element $e \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $m_1(e) = 0$ and that for all homogeneous $x \in \mathcal{A}$

$$(-1)^{|x|} m_2(e, x) = m_2(x, e) = x.$$

e is called a **strict unit** if in addition

$$m_k(\dots, e, \dots) = 0 \quad \forall k \geq 3.$$

In these two cases we call (\mathcal{A}, e) a cohomologically unital (resp. strictly unital) A_∞ algebra.

- (4) When \mathcal{A} is flat, A_∞ composition law implies that $m_1 \circ m_1 = 0$. The **cohomology algebra** of \mathcal{A} , denoted by $H^\bullet(\mathcal{A})$, is the \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded associative $\Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}$ algebra whose underlying space is $H^\bullet(\mathcal{A}) = \ker m_1 / \text{Im} m_1$ and whose multiplication is induced from m_2 .

Because of bubbling of holomorphic disks, A_∞ algebras associated to a Lagrangian brane is generally curved. There is a way to turn certain curved A_∞ algebras to flat ones.

Definition 3.32. Let (\mathcal{A}, e) be a strictly unital A_∞ algebra. A **weakly bounding cochain** of (\mathcal{A}, e) is an odd element $b \in \mathcal{A}^{\text{odd}}$ such that

$$m(b) := \sum_{k \geq 0} m_k(b, \dots, b) = W(b)e \quad \text{where } W(b) \in \Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}.$$

Suppose b is a weakly bounding cochain of (\mathcal{A}, e) . Then define \mathcal{A}^b (which depends on the weakly bounding cochain b) to be the flat A_∞ algebra whose underlying space is the same as \mathcal{A} and whose composition maps m_k^b is defined by

$$m_k^b(x_k, \dots, x_1) := \sum_{l_0, \dots, l_k \geq 0} m_{k+l_0+\dots+l_k}(\underbrace{b, \dots, b}_{l_k}, x_k, \dots, x_1, \underbrace{b, \dots, b}_{l_0}).$$

Lemma 3.33. \mathcal{A}^b is a flat A_∞ algebra. □

3.6.1. *Hochschild cohomology for associative algebras.* Let A be a \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded associative algebra over \mathbb{K} . Hochschild cohomology $HH^\bullet(A, M)$ can be defined for all \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded bimodules M of A . Here we only consider the case when $M = A$. The Hochschild cochain complex (with coefficients in A itself) is defined by

$$CC^{\bullet, n}(A) := CC^{\bullet, n}(A, A) := \text{Hom}_{\Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}}^\bullet(A^{\otimes n}, A[n]).$$

Here the bullet is the \mathbb{Z}_2 -grading on linear maps and $A[n]$ is the \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded vector space A with the \mathbb{Z}_2 -grading shifted by n (modulo 2). Denote the \mathbb{Z}_2 -degree of a homogeneous element $\phi \in CC^{\bullet, \bullet}(A)$ by $|\phi| \in \mathbb{Z}_2$ and the *reduced* degree by

$$\|\phi\| := |\phi| + 1 \in \mathbb{Z}_2.$$

A Hochschild cochain is represented by a sequence $\tau = (\tau_n)_{n \geq 0}$ of such multi-linear maps. The differential δ_{CC} , which raises the length grading n by 1, is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} (\delta_{CC}(\tau))(x_{n+1}, \dots, x_1) &= x_{n+1}\tau_n(x_n, \dots, x_1) + (-1)^{\|\tau\|\|x_1\|}\tau_n(x_{n+1}, \dots, x_2)x_1 \\ &\quad - \sum_{0 \leq i < n} (-1)^{\|\tau\| + \mathfrak{X}^i} \tau_n(x_{n+1}, \dots, x_{i+2}x_{i+1}, x_i, \dots, x_1). \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

The cohomology defined by δ_{CC} is called the **Hochschild cohomology** of A (with coefficients in A). As the simplest example, via a straightforward calculation one obtains (for $A = \mathbb{K}$ trivially graded)

$$HH^{\bullet, n}(\mathbb{K}) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{K}, & n = 0 \text{ and } n \text{ even,} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where the superscript n comes from the length filtration of Hochschild cochains.

Remark 3.34. The formula (3.9) differs from the usual version of Hochschild differential, see for example [Lod13, (1.5.1.1)]. Indeed, suppose A is ungraded, i.e. all elements are even. Then the \mathbb{Z}_2 -grading of a length n cochain is $n \bmod 2$. In this case (3.9) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} (\delta_{CC}(\tau))(x_{n+1}, \dots, x_1) &= x_{n+1}\tau_n(x_n, \dots, x_1) + (-1)^{n+1}\tau_n(x_{n+1}, \dots, x_2)x_1 \\ &\quad + (-1)^{n+i}\tau_n(x_{n+1}, \dots, x_{i+2}x_{i+1}, x_i, \dots, x_1). \end{aligned}$$

If we replace A by the opposite algebra A^{op} (i.e. the same set with multiplication reversed), and identify a length n Hochschild cochain τ on A with τ^{op} on A^{op} defined by $\tau^{\text{op}}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \tau(x_n, \dots, x_1)$. Then the above formula differ from the standard Hochschild differential on τ^{op} up to a sign $(-1)^{n+1}$.

3.6.2. *Hochschild cohomology for A_∞ algebras.* Now let \mathcal{A}^b be a flat \mathcal{A}_∞ algebra. Define the length n -part of Hochschild cochain complex of \mathcal{A}^b to be

$$CC^{\bullet, n}(\mathcal{A}^b) = CC^{\bullet, n}(\mathcal{A}^b, \mathcal{A}^b) = \text{Hom}_{\Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}}^{\bullet}((\mathcal{A}^b)^{\otimes n}, \mathcal{A}^b[n]).$$

Here \bullet denotes the \mathbb{Z}_2 -grading and $\mathcal{A}^b[n]$ denote the super vector space \mathcal{A}^b with grading shifted by $n \pmod{2}$.

On the Hochschild cochain complex there is the **Gerstenhaber product** (which is graded with respect to the reduced grading $\|\cdot\|$) defined by

$$(\phi \circ \psi)(x_s, \dots, x_1) = \sum_{i+j+k=s} (-1)^{\|\psi\| \cdot \mathfrak{X}^i} \phi(x_s, \dots, \psi(x_{i+j}, \dots), x_i, \dots, x_1)$$

as well as the **Gerstenhaber superbracket**

$$[\phi, \psi] := \phi \circ \psi - (-1)^{\|\phi\| \cdot \|\psi\|} \psi \circ \phi.$$

Then the A_∞ -structure on \mathcal{A}^b is equivalent to an even Hochschild cochain m^b with $m_0^b = 0$ with the A_∞ relation being equivalent to

$$[m^b, m^b] = 2m^b \circ m^b = 0.$$

We define the Hochschild differential δ_{CC} on

$$CC^{\bullet}(\mathcal{A}^b) = \prod_{n \geq 0} CC^{\bullet, n}(\mathcal{A}^b)$$

by the formula

$$\delta_{CC}(\phi) := [m^b, \phi].$$

Notice that if $m_k^b \neq 0$ only when $k = 2$, \mathcal{A}^b is a \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded associative algebra with the Hochschild differential reduces to the differential (3.9). The Hochschild cohomology of \mathcal{A}^b is defined by

$$HH^\bullet(\mathcal{A}^b) := \ker \delta_{CC} / \text{im} \delta_{CC}.$$

On $CC^\bullet(\mathcal{A}^b)$ there is also an A_∞ structure whose composition maps start with δ_{CC} . We only need the 2-fold composition map, i.e., the Yoneda product.

Definition 3.35. The **Yoneda product** on $CC^\bullet(\mathcal{A}^b)$, denoted by \star , is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} & (\phi \star \psi)(a_k, \dots, a_1) \\ &= \sum (-1)^{\clubsuit} m_k^b(a_k, \dots, \phi_r(a_{i+r}, \dots, a_{i+1}), \dots, \psi_s(a_{j+s}, \dots, a_{j+1}), \dots, a_1) \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

where the sum is taken over all i, j, r, l such that each summand makes sense. The sign is defined by (see (3.8) for the definition of \clubsuit)

$$\clubsuit := \|\phi\| \cdot (\boxtimes_1^i + |\psi|) + \|\psi\| \cdot \boxtimes_1^j. \quad (3.11)$$

The proof of the following can be found in [Gan12] and [Mes16].

Proposition 3.36. *The map $\star : CC^\bullet(\mathcal{A}^b) \otimes CC^\bullet(\mathcal{A}^b) \rightarrow CC^\bullet(\mathcal{A}^b)$ is a cochain map of even degree.*

Therefore the Yoneda product descends to Hochschild cohomology. We still call the induced one by Yoneda product and denote it by the same symbol \star . As the Yoneda product can be extended to an A_∞ structure on $CC^\bullet(\mathcal{A}^b)$, the Yoneda product on the Hochschild cohomology is associative. The Yoneda product has a chain-level unit in the strictly unital case.

Proposition 3.37. *Suppose \mathcal{A}^b has a strict unit e . Then the Hochschild cochain $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}^b}$ defined by*

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}^b}(x_k, \dots, x_1) = \begin{cases} 0, & k \geq 1, \\ e, & k = 0. \end{cases}$$

is a unit with respect to the Yoneda product.

Proof. Straightforward. □

Finally, we remark that the Yoneda product on $HH^\bullet(\mathcal{A}^b)$ is graded commutative. It is compatible with the Gerstenhaber bracket, which makes $HH^\bullet(\mathcal{A}^b)$ into a Gerstenhaber algebra.

3.6.3. Clifford algebras. The Lagrangian Floer cohomology ring of a torus is often isomorphic to a Clifford algebra. Hence the Hochschild cohomology of Clifford algebras are one of the most important cases related to symplectic geometry and mirror symmetry. Recall that given a finite-dimensional \mathbb{K} -vector space W equipped with a quadratic form q , the Clifford algebra $Cl(W, q)$ is the tensor algebra of W modulo the relation

$$w \otimes w' + w' \otimes w + 2q(w, w')\text{Id} = 0.$$

We only care about the case when q is nondegenerate and when \mathbb{K} has characteristic zero and is algebraically closed. In this case, all nondegenerate quadratic forms are equivalent to the standard one. When W has dimension n , we abbreviate $Cl(W, q)$ by Cl_n .

Proposition 3.38. *For all $n \geq 0$, the Hochschild cohomology of Cl_n is*

$$HH^k(Cl_n, Cl_n) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{K}, & k = 0, \\ 0, & k \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

In particular, $HH^0(Cl_n, Cl_n)$ is generated by the identity.

Proof. The calculation was provided by Sheridan [She16] and we recall it here. First, Hochschild cohomology is Morita invariant (see [Lod13, 1.5.6]). Second, there are only two Morita equivalence classes among Clifford algebras, the even ones and the odd ones (Bott periodicity). Hence we only need to calculate for $n = 0$ and $n = 1$. When $n = 0$, $Cl_0 \cong \mathbb{K}$, giving $HH^\bullet(\mathbb{K}, \mathbb{K}) = \mathbb{K}$. When $n = 1$ ⁵, the calculation can be deduced from the more general case of J. Smith [Smi19, Section 5] using reduced Hochschild cohomology. \square

When the Floer cohomology algebra of a Lagrangian brane is isomorphic to a Clifford algebra, the argument via *formality* shows that the Hochschild cohomology of the corresponding A_∞ algebra is the same as the Hochschild cohomology of the cohomology algebra. Recall that an A_∞ algebra is called *formal* if it is A_∞ quasi-isomorphic to its cohomology algebra. An associated algebra A is called *intrinsically formal* if any \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded A_∞ algebra whose cohomology algebra is isomorphic to A is formal. It was shown in [She16, Corollary 6.4] that Cl_n is intrinsically formal. Due to the Morita invariance of Hochschild cohomology, the following statement is immediate.

Corollary 3.39. *If \mathcal{A}^b is a flat A_∞ algebra over \mathbb{K} whose cohomology algebra is isomorphic to Cl_n , then*

$$HH^\bullet(\mathcal{A}^b) = \mathbb{K}.$$

Notice that if in addition \mathcal{A}^b is strictly unital, $1_{\mathcal{A}^b} \neq 0$ and it generates the Hochschild cohomology.

4. VORTEX HAMILTONIAN FLOER THEORY

We review the construction of vortex Hamiltonian Floer theory developed by the second author [Xu16] following the proposal of Cieliebak–Gaiotto–Salamon [CGS00].

4.1. Floer chain complexes.

4.1.1. *Equivariant action functional.* Our convention for Hamiltonian vector field is fixed as follows. Let (M, ω) be a symplectic manifold and $H : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function. The associated Hamiltonian vector field X_H is specified by

$$dH = \omega(X_H, \cdot).$$

We would like to consider the Hamiltonian dynamics upstairs in the gauged linear sigma model. Let X be the toric manifold we are considering. Let $H : S^1 \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth Hamiltonian function. Let $\text{Per}(H)$ be the set of 1-periodic orbits⁶ of H whose elements are maps $x : S^1 \rightarrow X$. The Hamiltonian H lifts to a K -invariant function on $S^1 \times \mu^{-1}(0)$. Choose an arbitrary K -invariant extension $\hat{H} : S^1 \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ whose support is compact and disjoint from the unstable locus V^{us} under the $K^{\mathbb{C}}$ -action. Consider the set of **equivariant loops**

$$L^K(V) := \left\{ \mathfrak{r} = (\hat{x}, \zeta) : S^1 \rightarrow V \times \mathfrak{k} \right\} \quad (4.1)$$

⁵The original calculation of [She16] for the $n = 1$ case has a mistake resulting in a false result. We thank Nick Sheridan for clarifying it.

⁶They must be contractible as X is simply connected.

Here function $\zeta : S^1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{k}$ can be viewed as a gauge field on S^1 . Notice that as V is contractible, the loop x is contractible and there is only one homotopy class of cappings. The loop group LK acts on the set of capped equivariant orbits by

$$g \cdot \mathfrak{r} = (g \cdot \widehat{x}, g \cdot \xi) \text{ where } (g \cdot \widehat{x})(t) = g(t)\widehat{x}(t), (g \cdot \xi)(t) = \zeta(t) - \frac{d}{dt} \log g(t).$$

Define the action functional

$$\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_H : L^K(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \mathfrak{r} \mapsto - \int_{\mathbb{D}^2} u^* \omega_V + \int_{S^1} \left(\langle \mu(\widehat{x}(t)), \zeta(t) \rangle - \widehat{H}_t(\widehat{x}(t)) \right) dt \quad (4.2)$$

where $u : \mathbb{D}^2 \rightarrow V$ is any capping. Critical points are solutions

$$\mu(\widehat{x}(t)) \equiv 0, \quad \widehat{x}'(t) = X_{\widehat{H}_t}(\widehat{x}(t)) - \mathcal{X}_{\zeta(t)}(\widehat{x}(t)). \quad (4.3)$$

Here $\mathcal{X}_{\zeta(t)}$ is the Hamiltonian vector field of the function $\langle \mu, \zeta(t) \rangle$.

The action functional satisfies the following transformational law with respect to the loop group action. Indeed, for $g \in LK$ and $\mathfrak{r} \in L^K(V)$, one has

$$\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_H(g\mathfrak{r}) = -\omega^K(g) + \mathcal{A}_H(\mathfrak{r}). \quad (4.4)$$

Denote

$$\mathfrak{L}^K(V) := L^K(V)/\ker \omega^K.$$

Its elements are denoted by $[\mathfrak{r}]$. Then $\Gamma \cong LK/\ker \omega^K$ acts on $\mathfrak{L}^K(V)$. We denote the action by $g \cdot [\mathfrak{r}]$. Then $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_H$ induces a functional on $\mathfrak{L}^K(V)$, denoted by

$$\mathcal{A}_H : \mathfrak{L}^K(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}.$$

Each critical point of \mathcal{A}_H is called an **equivariant 1-periodic Hamiltonian orbit**.

There is a correspondence between ordinary Hamiltonian orbits downstairs and equivariant Hamiltonian orbits upstairs. More precisely, let $\widetilde{\text{Per}}(H)$ be the covering of $\text{Per}(H)$ consisting of equivalence classes $[u, x]$ of capped 1-periodic orbits of H : the equivalence relation $(u, x) \sim (u', x')$ is defined by the equality of action values:

$$(u, x) \sim (u', x') \iff x = x' \in \text{Per}(H) \text{ and } \int_{\mathbb{D}^2} u^* \omega_X = \int_{\mathbb{D}^2} (u')^* \omega_X.$$

Then there is a map

$$\iota : \widetilde{\text{Per}}(H) \rightarrow \text{crit} \mathcal{A}_H \subset \mathfrak{L}^K(V). \quad (4.5)$$

Indeed, suppose $x : S^1 \rightarrow X$ is a contractible 1-periodic orbit of the Hamiltonian flow of H and $u : \mathbb{D}^2 \rightarrow X$ is a capping of x . View $\mu^{-1}(0) \rightarrow X$ as a principal K -bundle P . The Euclidean metric on V induces a connection on P whose horizontal distribution is the orthogonal complement of tangent planes of K -orbits; equivalently, this gives a connection 1-form $\theta \in \Omega^1(\mu^{-1}(0)) \otimes \mathfrak{k}$. The pullback $u^*P \rightarrow \mathbb{D}^2$ is trivial and different trivializations differ by a smooth map $g : \mathbb{D}^2 \rightarrow K$. Any trivialization of this pullback bundle induces a connection matrix $u^*\theta$ whose boundary restriction is $\zeta(t)dt$. A trivialization also induces a map $\widehat{u} : \mathbb{D}^2 \rightarrow \mu^{-1}(0)$ lifting u . Let the boundary restriction of \widehat{u} be \widehat{x} . Then $\mathfrak{r} = (\widehat{x}, \zeta)$ is an equivariant 1-periodic orbit, well-defined up to L_0K -actions. Furthermore, if u' is a different capping with the same resp. different action value, then the correspondence we just described gives the same resp. different element in $\mathfrak{L}^K(V)$.

Lemma 4.1. *In the toric case the map (4.5) is bijective.*

Proof. Given any equivariant Hamiltonian orbit \mathfrak{r} upstairs, the map $\widehat{x} : S^1 \rightarrow \mu^{-1}(0)$ projects down to a 1-periodic orbit $x : S^1 \rightarrow X$. As X is simply connected, x is contractible. Choose a capping $u : \mathbb{D}^2 \rightarrow X$ and let $\mathfrak{r}' = (\widehat{x}', \zeta')$ be equivariant Hamiltonian orbit lifting $[u, x]$. As the

K -action on $\mu^{-1}(0)$ is free, there is a gauge transformation on the circle making $\widehat{x}' = \widehat{x}$. The condition

$$\widehat{x}'(t) = X_{H_t}(\widehat{x}(t)) - \mathcal{X}_{\zeta(t)}(\widehat{x}(t))$$

implies that $\zeta = \zeta'$. \square

Definition 4.2. The **Conley–Zehnder index** of an equivariant 1-periodic orbit $\mathfrak{r} \in \text{crit}\mathcal{A}_H$ is the usual Conley–Zehnder index of the capped 1-periodic orbit $\iota^{-1}(\mathfrak{r}) \in \widetilde{\text{Per}}(H)$, denoted by $\text{CZ}(\mathfrak{r}) \in \mathbb{Z}$.

4.1.2. *Floer trajectories.* Similar to the standard Hamiltonian Floer theory, one considers the equation for the gradient flow of the equivariant action functional. Choose a 1-periodic K -invariant ω_V -compatible almost complex structure \widehat{J}_t on V . Formally the negative gradient flow equation of $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_H$ is the following equation for pairs $(u, \eta) : \mathbb{R} \times S^1 \rightarrow V \times \mathfrak{k}$

$$\partial_s u + \widehat{J}_t \left(\partial_t u + \mathcal{X}_\eta(u) - X_{\widehat{H}_t}(u) \right) = 0, \quad \partial_s \eta + \mu(u) = 0.$$

This is in fact the symplectic vortex equation on the cylinder $\mathbb{R} \times S^1$ for the trivial K -bundle and the standard cylindrical volume form, written in temporal gauge $A = d + \eta dt$. In general, for $A = d + \xi ds + \eta dt$, the vortex equation (2.2) reads

$$\partial_s u + \mathcal{X}_\xi(u) + \widehat{J}_t \left(\partial_t u + \mathcal{X}_\eta(u) - X_{\widehat{H}_t}(u) \right) = 0, \quad \partial_s \eta - \partial_t \xi + \mu(u) = 0. \quad (4.6)$$

It was shown in [Xu16] that any finite energy solution converges up to gauge transformation to critical points of \mathcal{A}_H .

Theorem 4.3. [Xu16, Theorem 3.1, Corollary 4.3]

- (1) *Given a bounded solution $\mathbf{u} = (u, \xi, \eta)$ (i.e. finite energy solution with $u(\mathbb{R} \times S^1)$ bounded) to (4.6), there exist a gauge equivalent solution, still denoted by (u, ξ, η) , as well as equivariant 1-periodic orbits $\mathfrak{r}_\pm = (\widehat{x}_\pm, \zeta_\pm)$ such that uniformly for $t \in S^1$*

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \pm\infty} (u(s, \cdot), \xi(s, \cdot), \eta(s, \cdot)) = (\widehat{x}_\pm, 0, \zeta_\pm). \quad (4.7)$$

- (2) *If \mathfrak{r}'_\pm are another pair of equivariant 1-periodic orbits satisfying (4.7) with \mathbf{u} replaced by any gauge equivalent solution, then there exists $g_\pm \in LK$ with $g_- g_+^{-1} \in L_0 K$ such that $\mathfrak{r}'_\pm = g_\pm \mathfrak{r}_\pm$.*
- (3) *If H is a nondegenerate Hamiltonian downstairs, then one can make the convergence (4.7) exponentially fast by choosing suitable gauge equivalent solutions. More precisely, there exist $C > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ such that*

$$d_V(u(s, t), \widehat{x}_\pm(t)) + |\xi(s, t)| + |\eta(s, t) - \zeta(t)| \leq C e^{-\delta|s|}.$$

Here d_V is the Euclidean distance on V . Similar exponential decay estimates hold for covariant derivatives of arbitrary higher orders.⁷

Therefore, one can use a pair of elements $\mathfrak{r}_\pm \in \text{crit}\mathcal{A}_H \subset \mathcal{L}^K(V)$ to label solutions. Let

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{r}_-, \mathfrak{r}_+)$$

be the set of gauge equivalence classes of bounded solutions \mathbf{u} to (4.6) modulo the \mathbb{R} -translation. One has the energy identity ([Xu16, Proposition 3.8])

$$E(\mathbf{u}) = \mathcal{A}_H(\mathfrak{r}_-) - \mathcal{A}_H(\mathfrak{r}_+).$$

⁷Exponential decay type estimates for vortices can also be found in [Zil09][Ven15][CWW17].

Remark 4.4. To achieve transversality, one has to avoid certain “bad” K -equivariant lifts of a given Hamiltonian H downstairs and choose almost complex structures appropriately. In [Xu16, Section 6] the second author used the notion of *admissible* almost complex structures and *admissible* K -invariant lifts of a Hamiltonian downstairs. We briefly recall the precise meanings of them adapted to the toric case. First, in the stable locus V^{st} there is the projection $\pi : V^{\text{st}} \rightarrow X$ which is invariant under the complex torus G . Hence there is a splitting

$$TV|_{V^{\text{st}}} \cong \pi^*TX \oplus (\mathfrak{k} \otimes \mathbb{C}).$$

Throughout this paper we fix a K -invariant (small) open neighborhood U of $\mu^{-1}(0)$ and consider only K -invariant, ω_V -compatible almost complex structures \widehat{J} on V which agrees with J_V outside U (this is necessary to guarantee the C^0 -compactness in [Xu16]). Moreover, given a *nondegenerate* Hamiltonian $H : S^1 \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, an S^1 -family of almost complex structures \widehat{J}_t is said to be *admissible* with respect to the H downstairs if for any loop $\widehat{x} : S^1 \rightarrow \mu^{-1}(0)$ that projects to a 1-periodic orbit downstairs, one imposes some conditions on the 1-jet of \widehat{J}_t along \widehat{x} (see [Xu16, Definition 6.2]). Then the notion of admissibility of K -invariant lifts of H was defined (see [Xu16, Definition 6.5]), which is a condition on the infinitesimal behavior of the lifts \widehat{H}_t along 1-periodic orbits given in terms of the Hessian of the equivariant action functional.

Theorem 4.5. *Given a nondegenerate Hamiltonian H_t downstairs, for a generic admissible pair $(\widehat{H}_t, \widehat{J}_t)$, the following is true.*

- (1) *Each moduli space $\mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{y})$ is regular and has dimension $\text{CZ}(\mathfrak{r}) - \text{CZ}(\mathfrak{y}) - 1$.*
- (2) *Moduli spaces with bounded energy are compact up to breaking as in the usual setting for the Uhlenbeck–Gromov–Floer compactification.*
- (3) *If $\text{CZ}(\mathfrak{r}) - \text{CZ}(\mathfrak{y}) = 1$, then the moduli space consists of finitely many points.*
- (4) *When $\text{CZ}(\mathfrak{r}) - \text{CZ}(\mathfrak{y}) = 2$, the compactified moduli space is a compact 1-dimensional manifold with boundary.*

We briefly explain the reason for transversality. Indeed, as the total energy is finite and the volume on the cylinder is infinite, near infinity any solution is contained in the neighborhood U of $\mu^{-1}(0)$ fixed in Remark 4.4. Therefore, there is a nonempty open subset of the cylinder whose image is contained in the free locus of the K -action. Then using an equivariant version of the argument of Floer–Hofer–Salamon [FHS95] one can achieve transversality by perturbing \widehat{J}_t in a neighborhood of $\mu^{-1}(0)$.

It is a standard procedure to construct a coherent system of orientations on the moduli spaces (see [FH93]). Then for $R = \mathbb{Z}$, there is a well-defined count

$$n(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{y}) \in \mathbb{Z}$$

which is the signed count of the number of Floer trajectories in 0-dimensional components of $\mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{y})$. When R is any commutative ring with a unit, $n(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{y})$ induces an element

$$n_R(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{y}) \in R$$

by the induced count via the map $\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow R$.

4.1.3. Floer homology. We first define the Floer chain group for a smaller Novikov ring. Recall that one has the finitely generated abelian group

$$\Gamma := LK/\ker\omega^K$$

which naturally embeds into \mathbb{R} . For any commutative ring R , introduce

$$\Lambda_R^\Gamma := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i T^{g_i} \in \Lambda_R \mid g_i \in \Gamma \right\}.$$

We define the Floer chain group $VCF_\bullet(\widehat{H})$ to be the ‘‘downward’’ completion:

$$VCF_\bullet(\widehat{H}; \Lambda_R^\Gamma) = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} b_i \mathfrak{x}_i \mid b_i \in R, \mathfrak{x}_i \in \text{crit } \mathcal{A}_H, \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{A}_H(\mathfrak{x}_i) = -\infty \right\}.$$

It is graded by the Conley–Zehnder index (modulo 2). The Λ_R^Γ -module structure is defined by

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i T^{g_i} \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} b_j \mathfrak{x}_j \right) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{\infty} a_i b_j (g_i \cdot \mathfrak{x}_j).$$

By (4.4), the right hand side is in $VCF_\bullet(\widehat{H}; \Lambda_R^\Gamma)$ and this is a well-defined action. Define

$$VCF_\bullet(\widehat{H}; \Lambda_R) := VCF_\bullet(\widehat{H}; \Lambda_R^\Gamma) \otimes_{\Lambda_R^\Gamma} \Lambda_R.$$

The Floer differential $\partial_{\widehat{J}} : VCF_\bullet(\widehat{H}; \Lambda_R^\Gamma) \rightarrow VCF_{\bullet-1}(\widehat{H}; \Lambda_R^\Gamma)$ is defined by the counts $n_R(\mathfrak{x}, \mathfrak{y})$. More precisely, on generators,

$$\partial_{\widehat{J}} \mathfrak{x} = \sum_{\mathfrak{y}} n_R(\mathfrak{x}, \mathfrak{y}) \mathfrak{y}.$$

One has $\partial_{\widehat{J}}^2 = 0$, resulting in the **vortex Floer homology**

$$VHF_\bullet(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J}; \Lambda_R^\Gamma).$$

Notice that the differential $\partial_{\widehat{J}}$ *decreases* the action.

4.1.4. Adiabatic limit. The adiabatic limit argument allows us to relate the gauged linear sigma model with holomorphic curves in the symplectic quotient. While we do not need a complete analysis of such a correspondence, we do need to consider the family of vortex equations related to the adiabatic limit argument. Indeed, if on the infinite cylinder we choose, instead of the standard area form $dsdt$, a rescaled one $\lambda^2 dsdt$, then the corresponding vortex Floer equation reads

$$\partial_s u + \mathcal{X}_\xi(u) + \widehat{J}_t \left(\partial_t u + \mathcal{X}_\eta(u) - X_{\widehat{H}_t}(u) \right) = 0, \quad \partial_s \eta - \partial_t \xi + \lambda^2 \mu(u) = 0. \quad (4.8)$$

One can define a vortex Floer chain complex for the triple $(\lambda, \widehat{H}, \widehat{J})$ in completely the same way as the $\lambda = 1$ case, once transversality holds, which can be achieved via perturbation. We denote the vortex Floer chain complex by $VCF_\bullet^\lambda(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J}; \Lambda_R^\Gamma)$. The corresponding homology is denoted by

$$VHF_\bullet^\lambda(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J}; \Lambda_R^\Gamma).$$

There are a few subtleties. First, given a nondegenerate Hamiltonian H downstairs on X , the notion of admissible almost complex structures ([Xu16, Definition 6.2]) is independent of λ ; the notion of admissible lifts, however, depends on λ .

Definition 4.6. A triple $(\lambda, \widehat{H}, \widehat{J})$ is called a **regular triple** if

- (1) The descent Hamiltonian H on X is nondegenerate.
- (2) $(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J})$ is admissible with respect to H .
- (3) Moduli spaces of gauge equivalence classes of finite energy solutions to (4.8) are all regular.

4.1.5. *Continuation map.* Given two regular triples $(\lambda_{\pm}, \widehat{H}_{\pm}, \widehat{J}_{\pm})$, one compares the two associated vortex Floer complexes via continuation maps. By an **interpolation** between these two triples, we mean a triple $(\lambda_s, \widehat{H}_s, \widehat{J}_s)$ where $\lambda_s \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is a smooth function in $s \in \mathbb{R}$ which agrees with λ_{\pm} near $\pm\infty$, \widehat{H}_s is a smooth family of K -invariant compactly supported functions parametrized by $(s, t) \in \mathbb{R} \times S^1$ which agrees with \widehat{H}_{\pm} near $\pm\infty$, and \widehat{J}_s is a smooth family of K -invariant ω_V -compatible almost complex structures parametrized by $(s, t) \in \mathbb{R} \times S^1$ which agrees with \widehat{J}_{\pm} near $\pm\infty$.

Choosing a generic interpolation $(\lambda_s, \widehat{H}_s, \widehat{J}_s)$, by considering moduli spaces of gauge equivalence classes of solutions to the equation

$$\partial_s u + \mathcal{X}_{\xi} + \widehat{J}_{s,t} \left(\partial_t u + \mathcal{X}_{\eta} - X_{\widehat{H}_{s,t}}(u) \right) = 0, \quad \partial_s \eta - \partial_t \xi + \lambda_s^2 \mu(u) = 0, \quad (4.9)$$

one can define a continuation map

$$\mathbf{cont} : VCF_{\bullet}^{\lambda^-}(\widehat{H}_-, \widehat{J}_-; \Lambda_R^{\Gamma}) \rightarrow VCF_{\bullet}^{\lambda^+}(\widehat{H}_+, \widehat{J}_+; \Lambda_R^{\Gamma})$$

completely analogous to the case of classical Hamiltonian Floer theory. The map \mathbf{cont} is a chain homotopy equivalence, inducing an isomorphism on Floer homology

$$VHF_{\bullet}^{\lambda^-}(\widehat{H}_-, \widehat{J}_-; \Lambda_R^{\Gamma}) \cong VHF_{\bullet}^{\lambda^+}(\widehat{H}_+, \widehat{J}_+; \Lambda_R^{\Gamma}).$$

Completely analogous to the classical situation, these isomorphisms are natural, hence the resulting homology groups define a common object called the **vortex Hamiltonian Floer homology** of V , denoted by

$$VHF_{\bullet}(V; \Lambda_R^{\Gamma}). \quad (4.10)$$

Define

$$VHF_{\bullet}(V; \Lambda_R) := VHF_{\bullet}(V; \Lambda_R^{\Gamma}) \otimes_{\Lambda_R^{\Gamma}} \Lambda_R.$$

In order to consider effects on the filtered theories, one needs to estimate the energy of solutions contributing to the continuation maps.

Proposition 4.7. *Given any solution $\mathbf{u} = (u, \xi, \eta)$ to (4.9) which converges to $\mathbf{r}_{\pm} \in \text{crit} \mathcal{A}_{H_{\pm}}$ at $\pm\infty$, one has*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R} \times S^1} \left(|\partial_s u + \mathcal{X}_{\xi}(u)|^2 + \lambda_s^2 |\mu(u)|^2 \right) ds dt = \mathcal{A}_{H_-}(\mathbf{r}_-) - \mathcal{A}_{H_+}(\mathbf{r}_+) - \int_{\mathbb{R} \times S^1} \frac{\partial \widehat{H}_{s,t}}{\partial s}(u) ds dt. \quad (4.11)$$

In particular, if $\widehat{H}_{s,t} = (1 - \chi(s))\widehat{H}_- + \chi(s)\widehat{H}_+$ for some non-decreasing function $\chi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$, then one has

$$\mathcal{A}_{H_+}(\mathbf{r}_+) \leq \mathcal{A}_{H_-}(\mathbf{r}_-) + \int_0^1 \max_V \left(\widehat{H}_- - \widehat{H}_+ \right) dt. \quad (4.12)$$

Proof. When λ_s is a constant, (4.11) is [Xu16, Proposition 7.5]. The general case is the same as the area form on the domain does not affect the topological nature of the energy. As the left-hand-side of (4.11) is nonnegative, (4.12) follows. \square

4.1.6. *Computation of VHF.* It is expected that the vortex Floer homology is isomorphic to the Hamiltonian Floer homology of the symplectic quotient, and hence its singular homology (in appropriate coefficients). However, such a calculation relies involved technical constructions. The Piunikhin–Salamon–Schwarz (PSS) approach forces one to deal with multiple covers of equivariant Floer cylinders with $H \equiv 0$ which may have negative equivariant Chern number. The adiabatic limit approach (similar to [GS05]) requires the study of affine vortices for a general toric manifold. In particular, for general symplectic quotients both approaches require the use of the virtual technique.

However, in the toric case, even without having the PSS map, it is rather easy to compute the rank of $VHF(V)$ as one can find a perfect Morse function.

Proposition 4.8. *For any commutative ring R , as Λ_R^Γ -modules, $VHF_\bullet(V; \Lambda_R^\Gamma)$ is isomorphic to $H_\bullet(X; \Lambda_R^\Gamma)$ (with the reduced \mathbb{Z}_2 -grading) up to a degree shifting.*

Proof. Recall that the $2n$ -dimensional toric manifold X carries a Hamiltonian T^n -action. For a generic circle $S^1 \subset T^n$, the induced moment map $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a perfect Morse function whose critical points are the toric fixed points. In particular, the Morse indices are all even. Then for ϵ small, ϵf is a nondegenerate time-independent Hamiltonian. After a small perturbation and K -invariant lift to V , the corresponding vortex Floer chain complex has no two generators with adjacent degrees. Hence the $VHF_\bullet(V; \Lambda_R^\Gamma)$ has the same rank as $H_\bullet(X; \Lambda_R^\Gamma)$. Lastly, the usual normalization of the Conley–Zehnder index is taken in such a way that if x is a critical point of ϵf viewed as a 1-periodic orbit with a constant capping, then

$$\text{CZ}(x) = n - \text{index}_f(x)$$

where $2n = \dim X$ and $\text{index}_f(x)$ is the Morse index of x (see [MS04, (12.1.7)]). \square

4.2. Small bulk deformations. Here we define a family of deformations of the vortex Floer homology parametrized by “small” bulk deformations. Recall that the toric manifold X has N toric divisors D_j corresponding to the N faces of the moment polytope. These divisors are GIT quotients of the coordinate hyperplanes

$$V_j = \{(x_1, \dots, x_N) \in V \mid x_j = 0\}.$$

Introduce a small bulk deformation of the form

$$\mathfrak{b} = \sum_{j=1}^N c_j V_j \text{ where } c_j \in \Lambda_{0,R}. \quad (4.13)$$

The \mathfrak{b} -deformed vortex Floer complex is the complex generated by equivariant 1-periodic orbits upstairs whose differential counts gauge equivalence classes of solutions to the vortex equation in a different way: for each rigid (modulo gauge transformation) solution $\mathbf{u} = (u, \xi, \eta)$, we weight the count by the factor

$$\exp \left(\sum_{j=1}^N c_j (u \cap V_j) \right) \in \Lambda_R$$

where $u \cap V_j$ is the intersection number between the cylinder u and the divisor V_j . Formally, this count coincides with the count of solutions on the cylinder with markings mapped to V_j .

Remark 4.9. The use of bulk deformations in Lagrangian Floer theory was invented by Fukaya–Oh–Ohta–Ono [FOOO11, FOOO16] which resembles the notion of *big quantum cohomology* in Gromov–Witten theory. Bulk deformations are adapted to Hamiltonian Floer theory in [Ush11b] and [FOOO19]. In gauged linear sigma model it was discussed in [Woo11]. The term “small” used here comes from the terminology in Gromov–Witten theory where small means deforming Gromov–Witten invariants by divisor classes and “big” means deforming by classes with arbitrary degrees.

4.2.1. *Bulk-avoiding Hamiltonians.* One can only have a well-defined topological intersection number between Floer cylinders and the divisors if periodic orbits do not intersect these toric divisors. We introduce the following type of Hamiltonians on the toric manifold.

Definition 4.10 (Bulk-avoiding Hamiltonians).

- (1) A Hamiltonian H on the toric manifold X is called **bulk-avoiding** if all 1-periodic orbits of nH for all $n \geq 1$ do not intersect the divisor $D_1 \cup \cdots \cup D_N$.
- (2) A bulk-avoiding admissible pair is an admissible pair $(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J})$ such that \widehat{H} descends to a bulk-avoiding Hamiltonian downstairs.

It is easy to see that one can perturb any Hamiltonian to a bulk-avoiding one by arbitrarily C^2 -small perturbation. Now we can define the topological intersection numbers. Let $\mathbf{u} = (u, \xi, \eta)$ be a solution to (4.6) which converges to equivariant 1-periodic orbits \mathfrak{r} resp. \mathfrak{q} at $-\infty$ resp. $+\infty$. Then a generic compactly supported perturbation \tilde{u} intersects transversely with V_j . Define

$$[\mathbf{u}] \cap V_j = \tilde{u} \cap V_j \in \mathbb{Z}$$

which counts transverse intersection points with signs. Notice that this number is well-defined: first, if \tilde{u}' is another perturbation, then $\tilde{u} \cap V_j = \tilde{u}' \cap V_j$; second, if $\mathbf{u}' = (u', \xi', \eta')$ is gauge equivalent to \mathbf{u} via a gauge transformation g , then $\tilde{u}' := g\tilde{u}$ is a perturbation of u' . As V_j is K -invariant, \tilde{u}' still intersect transversely with V_j and the intersection number is the same.

4.2.2. *Bulk-deformed vortex Floer complex.* For our application, we only consider small bulk deformations of the form

$$\mathfrak{b} = \sum_{j=1}^N \log c_j V_j \text{ where } c_j \in \mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{i}] = \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbf{i}\mathbb{Z}.$$

Here $\mathbf{i} = \sqrt{-1}$ and one can regard $\mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{i}] \subset \mathbb{C}$. The weighted counts eventually only depend on c_j so we allow c_j to be zero and the ambiguity of taking logarithm does not affect further discussions. Consider the vortex Floer chain complex

$$VCF_{\bullet}(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J}; \Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{i}]})$$

Due to the special behavior of the bulk \mathfrak{b} , the weighted counts of cylinders are still integral. Define the bulk-deformed vortex differential

$$\partial^{\mathfrak{b}} : VCF_{\bullet}(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J}; \Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{i}]}) \rightarrow VCF_{\bullet}(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J}; \Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{i}]})$$

by

$$\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathfrak{r}) = \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{q} \\ \text{CZ}(\mathfrak{r}) - \text{CZ}(\mathfrak{q}) = 1}} \left(\sum_{[\mathbf{u}] \in \mathcal{M}^{\text{cyl}}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{q})} \epsilon([\mathbf{u}]) \exp \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \log c_j [\mathbf{u}] \cap V_j \right) \right) \mathfrak{q}. \quad (4.14)$$

Here $\epsilon([\mathbf{u}]) \in \{\pm 1\}$ is the sign of the rigid solution $[\mathbf{u}]$. In particular, when $\mathfrak{b} = 0$, the above coincides with the original differential map ∂ .

Lemma 4.11. $\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}$ is a legitimate linear map and $(\partial^{\mathfrak{b}})^2 = 0$.

Proof. First, as $c_j \in \mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{i}]$, the weights

$$\exp \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \log c_j [\mathbf{u}] \cap V_j \right) = \prod_{j=1}^N c_j^{[\mathbf{u}] \cap V_j} \in \mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{i}].$$

Hence the coefficients on the right hand side of (4.14) are still in $\mathbb{Z}[\mathfrak{i}]$. Second, by Gromov compactness, the sum (4.14) is still in the module $VCF_{\bullet}(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J}; \Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}[\mathfrak{i}]})$. Hence $\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}$ is a well-defined linear map. To prove that its square is zero, consider for each \mathfrak{r} and \mathfrak{z} with Conley–Zehnder indices differing by 2 and consider the 1-dimensional components of the moduli space $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{cyl}}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{z})$. It can be further decomposed into connected components. Within each connected components, the topological intersection number for each cylinder with each V_j is a constant. Moreover, for the concatenation of two cylinders $[u_1]$ and $[u_2]$ which is in the boundary of such a component, this intersection number with V_j is equal to the sum $[u_1] \cap V_j + [u_2] \cap V_j$. It follows that $(\partial^{\mathfrak{b}})^2 = 0$. \square

Hence for each regular admissible bulk-avoiding pair $(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J})$, one can define the \mathfrak{b} -deformed vortex Floer homology by

$$VHF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J}; \Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}[\mathfrak{i}]}) := \ker \partial^{\mathfrak{b}} / \text{im} \partial^{\mathfrak{b}}.$$

Below we summarize its properties.

Theorem 4.12 (Properties of bulk-deformed vortex Floer complex).

- (1) For each regular bulk-avoiding admissible pair $(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J})$, the complex $VCF_{\bullet}(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J}; \Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}[\mathfrak{i}]})$ with differential $\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}$ is a \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded filtered Floer–Novikov complex (see Definition (3.14)).
- (2) For each two regular admissible bulk-avoiding pairs $(\widehat{H}_1, \widehat{J}_1)$ and $(\widehat{H}_2, \widehat{J}_2)$, there is a continuation map

$$\text{cont} : VCF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\widehat{H}_1, \widehat{J}_1; \Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}[\mathfrak{i}]}) \rightarrow VCF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\widehat{H}_2, \widehat{J}_2; \Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}[\mathfrak{i}]})$$

which is canonical up to chain homotopy. Hence there is a \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded $\Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}[\mathfrak{i}]}$ -module $VHF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(V; \Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}[\mathfrak{i}]})$, called the \mathfrak{b} -deformed vortex Floer homology, with canonical isomorphisms

$$VHF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J}; \Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}[\mathfrak{i}]}) \cong VHF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(V; \Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}[\mathfrak{i}]})$$

for all regular admissible bulk-avoiding pairs $(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J})$.

- (3) There is a linear isomorphism

$$VHF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(V; \Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}[\mathfrak{i}]}) \cong H_{\bullet}(X; \Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}[\mathfrak{i}]})$$

4.2.3. *Poincaré duality.* In Morse–Floer theory one can define the Poincaré duality on the chain-level by “reversing” the Morse function or the symplectic action functional. We recall this construction in the setting of vortex Floer theory. If $\widehat{H} : S^1 \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a K -invariant Hamiltonian, define $\widehat{H}^{\text{op}} : S^1 \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\widehat{H}^{\text{op}}(t, v) = -\widehat{H}(-t, v).$$

Then similar to the case of the ordinary Floer homology (see [MS04, Section 12.3]), there is a one-to-one correspondence between $\text{crit} \mathcal{A}_H$ and $\text{crit} \mathcal{A}_{H^{\text{op}}}$. More precisely, if $\mathfrak{r} = (\widehat{x}, \eta) \in L^K(V)$ is an equivariant 1-periodic orbit, then

$$\mathfrak{r}^{\text{op}} := (\widehat{x}^{\text{op}}, \eta^{\text{op}}) \text{ where } \widehat{x}^{\text{op}}(t) = \widehat{x}(-t), \eta^{\text{op}}(t) = -\eta(-t)$$

solves

$$\frac{d}{dt} \widehat{x}^{\text{op}}(t) + \mathcal{X}_{\eta^{\text{op}}(t)}(\widehat{x}^{\text{op}}(t)) - X_{\widehat{H}^{\text{op}}}(\widehat{x}^{\text{op}}(t)) = 0$$

and hence is an equivariant 1-periodic orbits for H^{op} . The map $\mathfrak{r} \mapsto \mathfrak{r}^{\text{op}}$ induces a one-to-one correspondence

$$\text{crit} \mathcal{A}_H \cong \text{crit} \mathcal{A}_{H^{\text{op}}}$$

with critical values and Conley–Zehnder indices reversed.

Similarly, if \widehat{J}_t is an S^1 -family of K -invariant almost complex structures on V , then define

$$(\widehat{J}^{\text{op}})_t = \widehat{J}_{-t}.$$

One can verify easily that if $(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J})$ is admissible, so is $(\widehat{H}^{\text{op}}, \widehat{J}^{\text{op}})$.

Now we define a Poincaré pairing on the vortex Floer homology. Let $(\widehat{H}_1, \widehat{J}_1)$ and $(\widehat{H}_2, \widehat{J}_2)$ be two regular bulk-avoiding admissible pairs on V . Consider the genus zero curve with two incoming cylindrical ends, denoted by Σ_{\supset} . Choose an area form with cylindrical ends on Σ_{\supset} . Define a K -invariant Hamiltonian perturbation \widehat{H}_{\supset} on Σ_{\supset} which is equal to $\widehat{H}_1 dt$ on the first cylindrical end and which is equal to $\widehat{H}_2^{\text{op}} dt$ on the second cylindrical end. Choose a domain-dependent K -invariant almost complex structure \widehat{J}_{\supset} which agrees on \widehat{J}_1 on the first cylindrical end and which is equal to $\widehat{J}_2^{\text{op}}$ on the second cylindrical end. Consider the \widehat{H}_{\supset} -perturbed symplectic vortex equation on Σ_{\supset} with respect to the family of almost complex structures \widehat{J}_{\supset} . Finite energy solutions converge to critical points of \mathcal{A}_{H_1} resp. $\mathcal{A}_{H_2^{\text{op}}}$ at the two cylindrical ends. Then given $\mathfrak{r} \in \text{crit} \mathcal{A}_{H_1}$ and $\mathfrak{h}^{\text{op}} \in \text{crit} \mathcal{A}_{H_2^{\text{op}}} \cong \text{crit} \mathcal{A}_{H_2}$, one can obtain a well-defined count

$$\mathfrak{n}_{\supset}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{h}) \in \mathbb{Z}$$

by looking at rigid solutions. Define a bilinear pairing

$$\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle^{\mathfrak{b}} : VCF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\widehat{H}_1, \widehat{J}_1; \Lambda_R^{\Gamma}) \otimes VCF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\widehat{H}_2^{\text{op}}, \widehat{J}_2^{\text{op}}; \Lambda_R^{\Gamma}) \rightarrow R$$

by

$$\left\langle \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i \mathfrak{r}_i, \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} b_j \mathfrak{h}_j^{\text{op}} \right\rangle^{\mathfrak{b}} := \sum_{i,j} a_i b_j \mathfrak{n}_{\supset}(\mathfrak{r}_i, \mathfrak{h}_j^{\text{op}}).$$

An argument via energy inequality shows that the above form is finite and well-defined; by considering 1-dimensional moduli spaces one can show that the above pairing descends to homology

$$\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle^{\mathfrak{b}} : VHF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\widehat{H}_1, \widehat{J}_1; \Lambda_R^{\Gamma}) \otimes VHF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\widehat{H}_2, \widehat{J}_2; \Lambda_R^{\Gamma}) \rightarrow R.$$

One can also show that the pairing is compatible with respect to the continuation map. Hence it induces a pairing

$$\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle^{\mathfrak{b}} : VHF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(V; \Lambda_R^{\Gamma}) \otimes VHF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(V; \Lambda_R^{\Gamma}) \rightarrow R.$$

Now we specialize to the case when $\widehat{H}_1 = \widehat{H}_2 = \widehat{H}$ and $\widehat{J}_1 = \widehat{J}_2 = \widehat{J}$. In this case the pairing takes a simple form on the chain level. Indeed, if we choose \widehat{H}_{\supset} and \widehat{J}_{\supset} to be the trivial ones, then the countings $\mathfrak{n}_{\supset}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{h}^{\text{op}})$ is 1 if $\mathfrak{r} = \mathfrak{h}$ and zero otherwise. Then if

$$\alpha = \sum a_i \mathfrak{r}_i \in VCF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J}; \Lambda_R^{\Gamma}), \quad \beta = \sum b_j \mathfrak{r}_j^{\text{op}} \in VCF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\widehat{H}^{\text{op}}, \widehat{J}^{\text{op}}; \Lambda_R^{\Gamma})$$

one has

$$\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle^{\mathfrak{b}} = \sum_i a_i b_i \in R.$$

This sum is finite as $\mathcal{A}_H(\mathfrak{r}_i) \rightarrow -\infty$ and $\mathcal{A}_{H^{\text{op}}}(\mathfrak{r}_j^{\text{op}}) = -\mathcal{A}_H(\mathfrak{r}_j) \rightarrow -\infty$.

4.2.4. Pair-of-pants products. A TQFT type construction allows us to define a multiplicative structure on the vortex Floer homology. In particular, using any volume form on the pair-of-pants with cylindrical ends, one can define the pair-of-pants product

$$*_{\mathfrak{b}} : VHF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(V; \Lambda_R^{\Gamma}) \otimes VHF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(V; \Lambda_R^{\Gamma}) \rightarrow VHF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(V; \Lambda_R^{\Gamma})[n]$$

which is associative. Here $2n = \dim X$. The details were given in [WX17b].

There is also an identity element in the vortex Floer homology. Fix a regular bulk-avoiding admissible pair $(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J})$. Consider a once-punctured sphere Σ_{cigar} which is biholomorphic to the

complex plane. View the puncture as an output. Equip Σ_{cigar} with a cylindrical volume form ν_{cigar} so that one has the isometric identification

$$\mathbb{C} \setminus B_1 \cong [0, +\infty) \times S^1.$$

Turn on the Hamiltonian perturbation on this cylindrical end, meaning that one has a Hamiltonian perturbation

$$\mathcal{H} \in \Omega^1(\Sigma_{\text{cigar}}, C_c^\infty(V)^K) \text{ s.t. } \mathcal{H}|_{[S, +\infty) \times S^1} = H_t dt \text{ for } S \gg 0.$$

Choose a domain-dependent K -invariant ω_V -compatible almost complex structure \mathcal{J} parametrized by $z \in \Sigma_{\text{cigar}}$ such that over the cylindrical end it agrees with J_t . Consider the Hamiltonian perturbed symplectic vortex equation

$$\bar{\partial}_{A, \mathcal{H}} u = 0, \quad F_A + \mu(u) \nu^{\text{cigar}} = 0.$$

Each finite energy solution $\mathbf{u} = (A, u)$ converges to an equivariant 1-periodic orbit and hence represents an element $\mathfrak{r} \in \text{crit } \mathcal{A}_H$. Hence for each \mathfrak{r} there is a moduli space

$$\mathcal{M}^{\text{cigar}}(\mathfrak{r}).$$

Elements in this moduli space have a uniform energy bound by $-\mathcal{A}_H(\mathfrak{r}) + C$ where C depends on the perturbation data on the cigar which is uniformly bounded. The virtual dimension is $n - \text{CZ}(\mathfrak{r})$. Counting elements (with signs) of index zero moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}^{\text{cigar}}(\mathfrak{r})$ defines an element

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{b}, \hat{H}}^{\text{GLSM}} = \sum_{\mathfrak{r}} \mathfrak{n}_{\text{cigar}}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathfrak{r}) \mathfrak{r} \in VCF_n^{\mathfrak{b}}(\hat{H}, \hat{\mathcal{J}}; \Lambda_R^\Gamma).$$

Standard TQFT argument shows that $\mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{b}, \hat{H}}^{\text{GLSM}}$ is closed, induces a well-defined element in $VHF_\bullet^{\mathfrak{b}}(V; \Lambda_R^\Gamma)$, and is the multiplicative identity of $VHF_\bullet^{\mathfrak{b}}(V; \Lambda_R^\Gamma)$. Denote this element by

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\text{GLSM}} \in VHF_n^{\mathfrak{b}}(V; \Lambda_R^\Gamma). \quad (4.15)$$

Lemma 4.13. *The element $\mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\text{GLSM}}$ is nonzero.*

Proof. In the undeformed case this was proved using the closed-open map in [WX17b] and the fact that some Lagrangian Floer theory is nontrivial. Here as we know that the algebra $VHF_\bullet^{\mathfrak{b}}(V; \Lambda_R^\Gamma)$ is nonzero (see Lemma 4.8) for any ring R , one must have $\mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\text{GLSM}} \neq 0$. \square

Lemma 4.14. *One has*

$$\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle^{\mathfrak{b}} \neq 0 \implies \langle \alpha *_\mathfrak{b} \beta, \mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\text{GLSM}} \rangle^{\mathfrak{b}} \neq 0.$$

Proof. This theorem follows from the standard TQFT and cobordism argument. See Figure 1. The details are left to the reader. \square

Before we end this part, we state a major step towards our proof of the Hofer–Zehnder conjecture.

Theorem E. *There exists a bulk-deformation \mathfrak{b} of the form*

$$\mathfrak{b} = \sum_{j=1}^N \log c_j V_j$$

with $c_j \in \mathbb{Z}[\mathfrak{i}]$ such that the algebra $VHF_\bullet^{\mathfrak{b}}(V; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}})$ is semisimple in the sense of Definition 3.6.

The proof occupies Section 9 and Section 10, using the closed-open string map in the vortex setting.




FIGURE 1.

4.3. Bulk-deformed spectral invariants, persistence modules, and barcodes. We fit the bulk-deformed vortex Floer theory into the abstract packages developed by Usher etc. Let \mathfrak{b} be a bulk-deformation of the form (4.13).

Proposition 4.15. *Given a regular bulk-avoiding pair $(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J})$, the quadruple*

$$\mathfrak{c}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J}) := (P_H, \mathcal{A}_H, \text{CZ}_{(2)}, n^{\mathfrak{b}})$$

is a \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded Floer–Novikov package over R (see Definition 3.14).

Proof. Straightforward. □

Next we consider the quantitative dependence of the vortex Floer chain complex on the Hamiltonian. We restrict to the case where $R = \mathbb{K}$ is a field. The vortex Floer chain complex $VCF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J}; \Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}^{\Gamma})$ is the associated Floer–Novikov complex.

Proposition 4.16. *Given two regular bulk-avoiding pairs $(\widehat{H}_1, \widehat{J}_1)$ and $(\widehat{H}_2, \widehat{J}_2)$, the quasi-equivalence distance (see Definition 3.19) between $VCF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\widehat{H}_1, \widehat{J}_1; \Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}^{\Gamma})$ and $VCF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\widehat{H}_2, \widehat{J}_2; \Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}^{\Gamma})$ is no greater than the Hofer distance between the induced Hamiltonians H_1, H_2 downstairs, i.e.*

$$d_Q\left(VCF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\widehat{H}_1, \widehat{J}_1; \Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}^{\Gamma}), VCF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\widehat{H}_2, \widehat{J}_2; \Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}^{\Gamma})\right) \leq \max\left\{\int_0^1 \max_X (H_2 - H_1) dt, \int_0^1 \max_X (H_1 - H_2) dt\right\}.$$

Proof. This follows from the quantitative analysis of the continuation map. As the bulk \mathfrak{b} and the coefficient field are fixed, we drop it from notations. To show that the complex only depends on the induced Hamiltonian downstairs (measured by quasiequivalence distance), we need to introduce the parameter λ (see (4.8)). For each regular bulk-avoiding triple $(\lambda, \widehat{H}, \widehat{J})$, there is a Floer–Novikov package $\mathfrak{c}^{\lambda}(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J})$ defined from (\mathfrak{b} -deformed) counts of solutions to (4.8). Denote the associated Floer–Novikov complex by $VCF_{\bullet}^{\lambda}(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J}; \Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}^{\Gamma})$ with valuation denoted by ℓ^{λ} .

Lemma 4.17. *The quasi-equivalence distance between $VCF_{\bullet}^{\lambda_1}(\widehat{H}_1, \widehat{J}_1)$ and $VCF_{\bullet}^{\lambda_2}(\widehat{H}_2, \widehat{J}_2)$ is bounded by*

$$\widehat{d}_{\text{Hofer}}(\widehat{H}_1, \widehat{H}_2) := \max \left\{ \int_0^1 \max_V (\widehat{H}_2 - \widehat{H}_1) dt, \int_0^1 \max_V (\widehat{H}_1 - \widehat{H}_2) dt \right\}.$$

Proof. Indeed, this follows from the energy calculation for the continuation maps (see Proposition 4.7). One can construct chain homotopy equivalences Φ, Ψ between these two complexes and maps K_1, K_2 as in the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \Phi & \\ K_1 \curvearrowright & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \curvearrowleft K_2 \\ VCF_{\bullet}^{\lambda_1}(\widehat{H}_1, \widehat{J}_1) & & VCF_{\bullet}^{\lambda_2}(\widehat{H}_2, \widehat{J}_2) \\ & \xleftarrow{\quad} & \\ & \Psi & \end{array}$$

The first item of Definition 3.19 follows directly from (4.12). Using the same method, the second item of Definition 3.19 can be verified for the maps K_1, K_2 . \square

We fix the two regular bulk-avoiding pairs $(\widehat{H}_{\pm}, \widehat{J}_{\pm})$. For each $\epsilon > 0$, one can find a K -invariant cut-off function $\rho_{\epsilon} : V \rightarrow [0, 1]$ supported near $\mu^{-1}(0)$ such that if we define $\widehat{H}_{\pm}^{\epsilon} := \rho_{\epsilon} \widehat{H}_{\pm}$, then

$$\widehat{d}_{\text{Hofer}}(\widehat{H}_{-}^{\epsilon}, \widehat{H}_{+}^{\epsilon}) \leq d_{\text{Hofer}}(H_{-}, H_{+}) + \epsilon.$$

Hence in view of Lemma 4.17 above, we only need to prove the following.

Lemma 4.18. *Suppose $(\widehat{H}_{\pm}, \widehat{J}_{\pm})$ are two regular bulk-avoiding pairs such that \widehat{H}_{+} and \widehat{H}_{-} descend to the same Hamiltonian H downstairs. Then*

$$d_Q(VCF_{\bullet}(\widehat{H}_{-}, \widehat{J}_{-}), VCF_{\bullet}(\widehat{H}_{+}, \widehat{J}_{+})) = 0.$$

Proof. We prove that the quasi-equivalence distance is less than ϵ for all $\epsilon > 0$. Notice that the potential failure of this assertion comes from the difference between \widehat{H}_{-} and \widehat{H}_{+} which is *a priori* large outside $\mu^{-1}(0)$. We use the adiabatic limit argument to push solutions contributing to the continuation maps near the level set $\mu^{-1}(0)$.

Choose a sequence $\lambda_i \rightarrow \infty$. For each λ_i , one can choose a λ_i -admissible lift $\widehat{H}_{\pm}^{\lambda_i}$ of H . As the admissible condition is only about the infinitesimal behaviors of the lifts $\widehat{H}_{\pm}^{\lambda_i}$ near lifts of 1-periodic orbits of H , we may require that

$$\|\widehat{H}_{\pm}^{\lambda_i} - \widehat{H}_{\pm}\|_{C^0} \leq \epsilon.$$

Hence by Lemma 4.17, one only needs to consider the quasi-equivalence

$$d_Q \left(VCF_{\bullet}^{\lambda_i}(\widehat{H}_{-}^{\lambda_i}, \widehat{J}_{-}^{\lambda_i}), VCF_{\bullet}^{\lambda_i}(\widehat{H}_{+}^{\lambda_i}, \widehat{J}_{+}^{\lambda_i}) \right).$$

We claim that the above sequence (in i) converges to zero.

We set up the moduli spaces for the continuation maps. Choose a non-decreasing function $\chi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ which is zero on $(-\infty, 0]$ and 1 on $[1, +\infty)$. Consider the equation with

$$\widehat{H}_{s,t}^{\lambda_i} = (1 - \chi(s))\widehat{H}_{-}^{\lambda_i} + \chi(s)\widehat{H}_{+}^{\lambda_i}.$$

We claim that, for all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $i_{\epsilon} > 0$ such that when $i \geq i_{\epsilon}$, for all finite energy solutions to (4.9), if the limit at $\pm\infty$ is \mathfrak{r}_{\pm} , then one has

$$\mathcal{A}_H(\mathfrak{r}_{+,i}) - \mathcal{A}_H(\mathfrak{r}_{-,i}) \leq \epsilon.$$

This would establish item (1) of Definition 3.19.

Suppose on the contrary that this is not true. Then there exist $\delta > 0$, a subsequence (still indexed by i), a sequence of solutions $\mathbf{u}_i = (u_i, \xi_i, \eta_i)$ to the equation connecting $\mathfrak{r}_{-,i}$ and $\mathfrak{r}_{+,i}$ such that

$$\mathcal{A}_H(\mathfrak{r}_{+,i}) - \mathcal{A}_H(\mathfrak{r}_{-,i}) \geq \delta > 0.$$

By the energy identity (4.11), one has a uniform bound which is independent of λ_i :

$$E_{\lambda_i}(\mathbf{u}_i) = \mathcal{A}_H(\mathfrak{r}_{-,i}) - \mathcal{A}_H(\mathfrak{r}_{+,i}) - \int_{[0,1] \times S^1} \partial_s \widehat{H}_{s,t}^{\lambda_i}(u) ds dt \leq C.$$

Now one can apply the adiabatic limit argument. Notice that although we cannot guarantee the convergence of $\widehat{H}_{s,t}^{\lambda_i}$, but we may require that $\widehat{J}_{s,t}^{\lambda_i}$ converges in sufficiently high order to a fixed almost complex structure \widehat{J} outside a compact subset of V . In the $\lambda_i \rightarrow \infty$ limit, *a priori* there are three types of bubbles (see [GS05, Section 11]): holomorphic spheres in V , holomorphic spheres in X , and *affine vortices*, which are solutions to the vortex equation over \mathbb{C} (without Hamiltonian term). The three kind of bubbles can be classified by the rate of energy concentration compared to the rate of the divergence $\lambda_i \rightarrow \infty$. As there is a lower bound on the energy of these bubbles, the uniform bound on energy implies that, after passing to a subsequence (still indexed by i), except near a finite subset $Z \subset [0,1] \times S^1 =: Q$ at which bubbling could occur, the energy density

$$|\partial_s u_i + \mathcal{X}_{\xi_i}(u_i)|^2 + \lambda_i^2 |\mu(u_i)|^2$$

stays bounded. In particular, the map $u_i|_Q$ stays arbitrarily close to $\mu^{-1}(0)$ except near Z as $i \rightarrow \infty$. More precisely, for any $r > 0$, there exists $i_r > 0$ such that for all $i \geq i_r$,

$$\sup_{z \in [0,1] \times S^1 \setminus B_r(Z)} |\mu(u_i(z))| \leq r. \quad (4.16)$$

Then one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_H(\mathfrak{r}_{+,i}) - \mathcal{A}_H(\mathfrak{r}_{-,i}) &\leq \int_Q |\partial_s \widehat{H}_{s,t}^{\lambda_i}(u_i)| ds dt \\ &\leq \int_{Q \setminus B_r(Z)} |\partial_s \widehat{H}_{s,t}^{\lambda_i}(u_i)| ds dt + \int_{B_r(Z)} |\partial_s \widehat{H}_{s,t}^{\lambda_i}(u_i)| ds dt. \end{aligned}$$

As $\widehat{H}_+^{\lambda_i} = \widehat{H}_+^{\lambda_i}$ on $\mu^{-1}(0)$, the first item is bounded by Cr ; the second term is bounded by $C \text{Area}(B_r(Z))$ which can be arbitrarily small. This contradicts the assumption that $\mathcal{A}_H(\mathfrak{r}_{+,i}) - \mathcal{A}_H(\mathfrak{r}_{-,i}) \geq \delta > 0$.

Therefore, we established item (1) of Definition 3.19. The case of item (2) is similar and hence omitted. \square

Now the proof of Proposition 4.16 is complete. \square

4.3.1. *Spectral invariants.* Spectral numbers of Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms were introduced by Oh [Oh99], Schwarz [Sch00] and enhanced by Entov–Polterovich [EP03, EP06, EP09]. In [WX17b] Wu and the second author constructed the analogue in the vortex Floer theory.

By Theorem 3.16 and Proposition 4.15, one can define the spectral numbers

$$\rho^{\mathfrak{b}}(\alpha; \widehat{H}, \widehat{J}) := \rho_{\mathfrak{c}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J})}(\alpha) \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}, \quad \forall \alpha \in VHF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(V; \Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}^{\Gamma}).$$

One can establish the following properties of these spectral numbers, which were proved in [WX17b] in the undeformed ($\mathfrak{b} = 0$) case.

Theorem 4.19. (cf. [WX17b, Proposition 3.6]) *The spectral numbers $\rho^{\mathfrak{b}}(\alpha; \widehat{H}, \widehat{J})$ have the following properties.*

- (1) **(Independence of lifting and almost complex structure)** The number $\rho^b(\alpha; \widehat{H}, \widehat{J})$ only depends on the induced Hamiltonian H downstairs. Denote this number by

$$c^b(\alpha, H) \in \mathbb{R}.$$

- (2) **(Homogeneity)** Given $\alpha \in VHF(V; \Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}^\Gamma)$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}^\Gamma$, for any H , one has

$$c^b(\lambda\alpha, H) = c^b(\alpha, H) - \mathbf{v}(\lambda).$$

One uses this formula to extend the spectral numbers to classes in

$$VHF_\bullet^b(V; \Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}) = VHF_\bullet^b(V; \Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}^\Gamma) \otimes_{\Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}^\Gamma} \Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}.$$

- (3) **(Lipschitz continuity)** Given any two nondegenerate Hamiltonians H_1, H_2 downstairs, one has

$$\int_{S^1} \min_X (H_1 - H_2) dt \leq c^b(\alpha, H_1) - c^b(\alpha, H_2) \leq \int_{S^1} \max_X (H_1 - H_2) dt.$$

This implies that $c^b(\alpha, H)$ is defined for all Hamiltonians.

- (4) **(Invariance)** $c^b(\alpha, H)$ only depends on the homotopy class of the Hamiltonian path $\tilde{\phi}_H$ on X . Let $\text{Ham}(X)$ be the group of Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms on X and let $\widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X) \rightarrow \text{Ham}(X)$ be the covering of homotopy classes of Hamiltonian isotopies on X . Then we can define

$$c^b(\alpha, \tilde{\phi}) \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\} \quad \forall \alpha \in VHF_\bullet^b(V; \Lambda_R), \quad \tilde{\phi} \in \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X).$$

- (5) **(Triangle inequality)** For any $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in VHF(V; \Lambda_R)$ and $\tilde{\phi}_1, \tilde{\phi}_2 \in \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X)$ one has

$$c^b(\alpha_1 * \alpha_2, \tilde{\phi}_1 \tilde{\phi}_2) \leq c^b(\alpha_1, \tilde{\phi}_1) + c^b(\alpha_2, \tilde{\phi}_2).$$

Definition 4.20. The **valuation** of a class $\alpha \in VHF_\bullet^b(V; \Lambda_R)$ is defined to be

$$\mathcal{A}^b(\alpha) := c^b(\alpha, \text{Id}) \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}.$$

4.3.2. *Poincaré duality.* One useful property of the spectral numbers is related to the Poincaré duality map.

Proposition 4.21. Let \mathbb{K} be a field.

- (1) For any $\alpha \in VHF_\bullet^b(V; \Lambda_{\mathbb{K}})$ and $\tilde{\phi} \in \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X)$, there holds

$$c^b(\alpha, \tilde{\phi}) = -\inf \left\{ c^b(\beta, \tilde{\phi}^{-1}) \mid \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle^b \neq 0 \right\}.$$

- (2) If $\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle^b \neq 0$, then

$$\mathcal{A}^b(\alpha) + \mathcal{A}^b(\beta) \geq 0.$$

Proof. Notice that one only needs to prove this proposition for coefficient field being $\Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}^\Gamma$. In the case of ordinary Hamiltonian Floer theory, the proof of (1) uses the PSS map and the correspondence between the pairing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and the intersection pairing on the singular homology of the manifold (see [EP03][Ost06][FOOO19]). It was pointed in [Ush10] that (1) holds for abstract filtered Floer–Novikov complexes. As the complex $VHF_\bullet^b(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J}; \Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}^\Gamma)$ is an abstract filtered Floer–Novikov complex over $\Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}^\Gamma$ (see Proposition 4.15), (1) follows. For (2), take $\tilde{\phi} = \text{Id}$. Then

$$\mathcal{A}^b(\alpha) = c^b(\alpha, \text{Id}) = -\inf \left\{ \mathcal{A}^b(\beta) \mid \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle^b \neq 0 \right\}.$$

Hence if $\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle^b \neq 0$, $\mathcal{A}^b(\beta) \geq -\mathcal{A}^b(\alpha)$. \square

4.3.3. *Persistence modules and barcodes.* Recall that (see Subsection 3.4) to any filtered Floer–Novikov complex $CF_\bullet(\mathfrak{c})$ over the Novikov field $\Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}^\Gamma$ one can associate a persistence module $\mathbf{V}(\mathfrak{c})$. In particular, for each regular bulk-avoiding admissible pair $(\widehat{H}, \widehat{\mathcal{J}})$, the bulk-deformed vortex Floer complex $VCF_\bullet^{\mathfrak{b}}(\widehat{H}, \widehat{\mathcal{J}}; \Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}^\Gamma)$ gives a persistence module, denoted by

$$\mathbf{V}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\widehat{H}, \widehat{\mathcal{J}}; \Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}^\Gamma).$$

We omit the dependence on the bulk deformation \mathfrak{b} most of the time. One can check easily that we can extend the coefficient field to the universal Novikov field $\Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}$, obtaining a persistence module $\mathbf{V}(\widehat{H}, \widehat{\mathcal{J}}; \Lambda_{\mathbb{K}})$ with

$$V^s(\widehat{H}, \widehat{\mathcal{J}}; \Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}) := HF_\bullet^{\leq s}(\widehat{H}, \widehat{\mathcal{J}}; \Lambda_{0, \mathbb{K}}^\Gamma) \otimes_{\Lambda_{0, \mathbb{K}}^\Gamma} \Lambda_{0, \mathbb{K}}.$$

When the ground field \mathbb{K} is clear from the context, we often abbreviate this persistence module by $\mathbf{V}(\widehat{H}, \widehat{\mathcal{J}})$. One can prove, using the continuation map, that up to isomorphism, this persistence module is independent of the choice of the almost complex structure $\widehat{\mathcal{J}}$. Hence denote the persistence module by $\mathbf{V}(\widehat{H})$. One can also use the same idea of proving Proposition 4.16 that, for different lifts $\widehat{H}_1, \widehat{H}_2$ of the same Hamiltonian H downstairs, the interleaving distance between $\mathbf{V}(\widehat{H}_1)$ and $\mathbf{V}(\widehat{H}_2)$ is zero. By identifying persistence modules with zero interleaving distance, the persistence module only depends on the Hamiltonian path $\tilde{\phi} \in \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X)$ generated by H . Hence we loosely denote the object by $\mathbf{V}(\tilde{\phi})$.

Recall also that to any Floer–Novikov complex one can associate a barcode (and hence a reduced barcode). The reduced barcode corresponding to a regular bulk-avoiding admissible pair $(\widehat{H}, \widehat{\mathcal{J}})$ is denoted by $\mathcal{B}(\widehat{H}, \widehat{\mathcal{J}})$. One can prove that (similar to the case of ordinary Floer barcodes, see [Ush13, Proposition 5.3]) the reduced barcode only depends on the time-1 map $\phi = \phi_H$ on the toric manifold X . Hence we also denote it by $\mathcal{B}(\phi)$.

5. LOCAL FLOER THEORY

To extend the Hofer–Zehnder conjecture to degenerate Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms, one needs to have a good notion of counts of fixed points. Following [She22], we will use the rank of a local version of the vortex Floer homology (with bulk deformation), which is ultimately isomorphic to the local Floer homology in the classical sense, to define a homological count of fixed points. This section can be skipped at first reading, especially if the reader is mainly interested in the nondegenerate case.

5.1. Local vortex Floer homology with bulk. We adapt the definition of local Floer homology in the vortex setting, possibly with bulk deformations. Let \mathfrak{b} be a small bulk deformation. Let $\phi : X \rightarrow X$ be a Hamiltonian diffeomorphism and $x \in X$ be an isolated fixed point. Let H_t be a 1-periodic family of Hamiltonian on X generating the Hamiltonian isotopy ϕ_t with $\phi_1 = \phi$. Let $x(t) = \phi_t(p)$ be the corresponding 1-periodic orbit of H , which may intersect the bulk divisor $D \subset X$. Choose a small perturbation H_1 of H supported near $x(t)$ such that all nearby 1-periodic orbits are nondegenerate and are disjoint from the bulk divisor D .

Let \widehat{H} be a K -invariant lift of H and \widehat{H}_1 be a K -invariant admissible lift of H_1 . Then the 1-periodic orbit $x(t)$ lifts to a gauge equivalence class of equivariant 1-periodic orbits. Let $\mathfrak{r}(t) = (x(t), \eta(t))$ be a representative. There are also gauge equivalence classes of equivariant 1-periodic orbits of \widehat{H}_1 which are near \mathfrak{r} . Indeed, fixing the L_0K -orbit of $\mathfrak{r}(t)$, there are well-defined L_0K -orbits of equivariant 1-periodic orbits which are nearby. Then for each pair of nearby equivariant 1-periodic orbits $\mathfrak{r}_1, \mathfrak{\eta}_1$ of \widehat{H}_1 , there is a canonical homotopy class of (small) cylinders connecting \mathfrak{r}_1 and $\mathfrak{\eta}_1$.

Consider the moduli space of solutions to the vortex equation over the cylinder connecting \mathfrak{r}_1 and \mathfrak{r}_1 . The energy of these solutions is

$$\mathcal{A}_{H_1}(\mathfrak{r}_1) - \mathcal{A}_{H_2}(\mathfrak{r}_1)$$

which can be arbitrarily small. Then similar to the case of ordinary local Floer homology, these moduli spaces can be used to define a chain complex over any coefficient field \mathbb{K} . As the orbits are disjoint from D , one can also use topological intersection numbers with the bulk divisor and associated weighted counts to define the bulk-deformed version. Denote the resulting homology by

$$VHF^{\mathfrak{b}, \text{loc}}(H, x; \mathbb{K}).$$

The continuation argument shows that the homology is independent of the data $(\widehat{H}_1, \widehat{J}_1)$. On the other hand, *a priori* the homology depends on the bulk \mathfrak{b} . When $\mathfrak{b} = 0$, denote this homology by $VHF_{\text{loc}}(H, x; \mathbb{K})$.

Proposition 5.1. *One has*

$$VHF^{\mathfrak{b}, \text{loc}}(H, x; \mathbb{K}) \cong VHF^{\text{loc}}(H, x; \mathbb{K}). \quad (5.1)$$

Proof. First, suppose x does not intersect the bulk divisor $D \subset X$. Then for any small perturbation H_1 of H , all cylinders contributing to the definition of the local Floer homology have zero topological intersection number with the divisor upstairs. Hence (5.1) holds in this case.

Now suppose x intersects the bulk divisor D . One can find a loop of Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms $\psi(t) \in \text{Ham}(X)$ supported near $x(t)$ such that $y(t) := \psi(t)(x(t))$ is disjoint from D . Moreover, define

$$y(t) = (\psi(t)\phi(t)\psi(0)^{-1})(\psi(0)(q)) = (\psi(t)\phi(t)\psi(0)^{-1})(y(0)),$$

then $y(t)$ is a 1-periodic orbit of the Hamiltonian isotopy $\psi(t)\phi(t)\psi(0)^{-1}$. Let the generating Hamiltonian function of this new family be G , which can be made sufficiently close to H . Then $y(t)$ is also an isolated 1-periodic orbit of G . Then a generic perturbation of G also serves as a perturbation of H . Hence for all bulk \mathfrak{b} ,

$$VHF^{\mathfrak{b}, \text{loc}}(H, x; \mathbb{K}) \cong VHF^{\mathfrak{b}, \text{loc}}(G, y; \mathbb{K}).$$

However, as y is disjoint from D , the right hand side is isomorphic to $VHF^{\text{loc}}(G, y; \mathbb{K})$, which is also isomorphic to $VHF^{\text{loc}}(H, x; \mathbb{K})$. \square

Now we prove that the local vortex Floer homology is isomorphic to the local Floer homology inside the symplectic quotient.

5.2. Isomorphism with ordinary local Floer homology. We prove the following result.

Proposition 5.2. *There is an isomorphism*

$$VHF^{\text{loc}}(H, x; \mathbb{K}) \cong HF^{\text{loc}}(H, x; \mathbb{K}).$$

Proof. It follows from the adiabatic limit argument in the same spirit as in [DS94, GS05] and [SX14]. Let H_1 be a nondegenerate Hamiltonian on X which is arbitrarily close to H . Let J_1 be an S^1 -family of almost complex structures on X such that the local Floer homology at the fixed point x can be defined via the Floer equation for (H_1, J_1) . Let \widehat{H}_1 be an admissible lift and \widehat{J}_1 be a lift of J_1 . Consider the local vortex Floer homology defined by critical points of \mathcal{A}_{H_1} which are close to the fixed point $x \in \text{Fix}(\phi)$ whose differential counts rigid solutions to the equation (4.8) (with $(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J})$ replaced by $(\widehat{H}_1, \widehat{J}_1)$). For all λ , we need to perturb \widehat{J}_1 to \widehat{J}_λ to achieve transversality. We assume that as $\lambda \rightarrow +\infty$, \widehat{J}_λ converges to \widehat{J}_1 in C^∞ . Using continuation maps we can show that the resulting homology is independent of λ . Moreover, the energy of relevant solutions can

be arbitrarily small. Then consider the $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ limit. For any sequence $\lambda_i \rightarrow \infty$ and any sequence of solutions to (4.8) for $\lambda = \lambda_i$ which contributes to the local vortex Floer differential, there is an upper bound of the energy of these solutions. Then by the adiabatic limit compactness theorem (see [GS05][WX17a] in similar settings) a subsequence converges to a possibly broken ordinary Floer trajectory inside X modulo bubbling. As there is a lower bound for the energy of bubbles (the minimal energy of J_1 -holomorphic spheres in X and affine vortices in V), we can choose the perturbation H_1 sufficiently close to H so that bubbles can be ruled out. Then if we are considering the zero-dimensional moduli spaces, then the possible limits must be unbroken trajectories in X .

Now we claim that for λ sufficiently large, there is an orientation-preserving bijection between index zero solutions to (4.8) (modulo gauge transformation) and index zero solutions to the ordinary Floer equation in X . Indeed, using the same kind of estimates as in [DS94][GS05] (and the much simpler case in [SX14]) one can construct a gluing map from the limiting moduli space to the vortex moduli space with sufficiently large parameter λ . The compactness result explained above shows that the gluing map is surjective, while via the implicit function theorem one can show that the gluing map is injective. The fact that the gluing map preserves orientation follows from the explicit comparison of the linearized Fredholm operators (they differ by, roughly speaking, an invertible operator). \square

In view of Proposition 5.2 and the properties of local Floer homology as proved in, e.g., [Gin10], one can derive the following property of the local vortex Floer homology.

Corollary 5.3. *The local vortex Floer homology has the following properties.*

- (1) *(Up to isomorphism) $VHF^{\text{loc}}(H, x; \mathbb{K})$ only depends on the fixed point x and the time-1 map $\phi \in \text{Ham}(X)$. Hence we denote the local vortex Floer homology by*

$$VHF^{\text{loc}}(\phi, x; \mathbb{K}).$$

- (2) *If ϕ^k is an admissible iteration of ϕ at x , then*

$$VHF^{\text{loc}}(\phi, x; \mathbb{K}) \cong VHF^{\text{loc}}(\phi^k, x; \mathbb{K}).$$

5.3. Reduced barcodes of degenerate Hamiltonians. Recall that one can associate to each nondegenerate Hamiltonian on a closed symplectic manifold a (finite) barcode. As this association is Lipschitz continuous with respect to the bottleneck distance for barcodes and Hofer metric for Hamiltonians, we hope one can define barcodes for all Hamiltonians using this Lipschitz continuity. However, the bottleneck distance is not complete. Therefore, *a priori*, the barcode for a general Hamiltonian only exists in the completion.

Theorem 5.4. *Let \mathbb{K} be a field. Let $\phi \in \text{Ham}(X)$ be a Hamiltonian diffeomorphism with isolated fixed points. Let $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\text{b}}(\phi)$ be the (a priori infinite) reduced barcode of ϕ (in coefficient field $\Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}^{\Gamma}$). Then $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\text{b}}(\phi)$ has finitely many bars whose number of end points is equal to $N(\phi; \mathbb{K})$.*

Corollary 5.5. *The total bar length is defined for all $\phi \in \text{Ham}(X)$ with isolated fixed points.*

Now we prove Theorem 5.4. Suppose $\phi \in \text{Ham}(X)$ has only isolated fixed points. Let H be a Hamiltonian whose time one map is ϕ . Let \widehat{H} be any K -invariant lift of H and let \widehat{J} be a K -invariant ω_V -compatible almost complex structure. Notice that in general $(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J})$ is not an admissible pair so does not have a vortex Floer complex. However, one can still consider the vortex equation with the data $(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J})$.

Lemma 5.6. *There exists $\delta > 0$ which only depends on $(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J})$ satisfying the following condition. Let $x(t) \neq y(t)$ be two different 1-periodic orbits of H downstairs. Let \mathbf{u} be a possibly broken solution to (4.6) which connects $x(t)$ and $y(t)$ (without conditions on capping). Then the energy of \mathbf{u} is at least δ .*

Proof. For admissible $(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J})$ this statement is proved as [Xu16, Proposition 5.5] using a compactness argument. Notice that to run the compactness argument and to have the notion of converging to a 1-periodic orbit, one does not really need to require that the Hamiltonian is nondegenerate or the pair $(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J})$ is admissible. \square

Corollary 5.7. *The lengths of all bars in $\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{K}^b(\phi)$ are no less than δ .*

Proof. Suppose on the contrary $\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{K}^b(\phi)$ has a finite bar whose length δ' is positive and smaller than δ . Let $(\widehat{H}_k, \widehat{J}_k)$ be a sequence of regular bulk-avoiding pairs such that $(\widehat{H}_k, \widehat{J}_k)$ converges to $(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J})$. Consider the reduced barcode associated to ϕ_{H_k} . By the continuous dependence of barcodes on the Hamiltonian, for k sufficiently large, there exists a finite bar in $\mathcal{B}(\phi_{H_k})$ whose length is between $\frac{\delta'}{2}$ and $\delta - \epsilon$ for some small ϵ . By the definition of barcodes by Usher–Zhang, there exists a rigid solution \mathbf{u}_k to (4.6) with data $(\widehat{H}_k, \widehat{J}_k)$ whose energy is between $\frac{\delta'}{2}$ and $\delta - \epsilon$. Via the compactness argument, there is a subsequence, still indexed by k , such that \mathbf{u}_k converges to a possibly broken trajectory with data $(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J})$ whose total energy is between $\frac{\delta'}{2}$ and $\delta - \epsilon$. This contradicts Lemma 5.6. \square

Proof of Theorem 5.4. Choose a sequence of regular bulk-avoiding admissible pair $(\widehat{H}_k, \widehat{J}_k)$ converging to $(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J})$. Notice that one can choose the sequence such that the number of fixed points of ϕ_{H_k} is bounded. Consider the complex $VCF_\bullet^b(\widehat{H}_k, \widehat{J}_k; \Lambda_\mathbb{K}^\Gamma)$. One can write

$$\partial = \partial_{\text{short}} + \partial_{\text{long}}$$

where ∂_{short} counts rigid trajectories whose energy is smaller than δ and ∂_{long} counts rigid trajectories whose energy is bigger than δ . Then $\partial_{\text{short}}^2 = 0$ and its homology coincides with the direct sum of all local vortex Floer homology of ϕ . Moreover, one can decompose the reduced barcode of ϕ_{H_k} as

$$\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{K}^b(\phi_{H_k}) = \mathcal{B}_{\text{short}}(\phi_{H_k}) \sqcup \mathcal{B}_{\text{long}}(\phi_{H_k}) \sqcup \mathcal{B}_\infty(\phi_{H_k})$$

where the first component consists of finite bars of lengths at most δ and the second component consists of other finite bars. As $\partial_{\text{short}}^2 = 0$, one can also define a barcode $\mathcal{B}_{\text{local}}(\phi_{H_k})$ by modifying the definition of Usher–Zhang, whose finite part coincides with $\mathcal{B}_{\text{short}}(\phi_{H_k})$. Then by the definition,

$$\begin{aligned} N(\phi_{H_k}; \mathbb{K}) &= \#\text{End}(\mathcal{B}_{\text{short}}(\phi_{H_k})) + \sum_{x \in \text{Fix}(\phi)} \dim VHF^{\text{loc}}(\phi, x) \\ &= \#\text{End}(\mathcal{B}_{\text{short}}(\phi_{H_k})) + \#\text{End}(\mathcal{B}_{\text{long}}(\phi_{H_k})) + \dim VHF_\bullet^b(V). \end{aligned}$$

As in the limit, all short bars disappear and long bars survive with respect to the bottleneck distance, the theorem follows. \square

6. BOUNDARY DEPTH

In this section we prove Theorem C, namely, under the semisimple condition, the boundary depth of the vortex Floer complex of any Hamiltonian diffeomorphism is uniformly bounded from above.

6.1. Vortex Floer persistence modules. Recall that from Section 3.4.3 we know that any Floer–Novikov complex over a Novikov field $\Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}^{\Gamma}$ induces a persistence module over \mathbb{K} . Given a regular bulk-avoiding admissible pair $(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J})$ and a bulk deformation

$$\mathbf{b} = \sum_{j=1}^N \log c_j V_j \text{ where } c_j \in \mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{i}],$$

the persistence module induced from the complex $VCF_{\bullet}^{\mathbf{b}}(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J}; \Lambda_{\mathbb{F}_p}^{\Gamma})$ is denoted by

$$\mathbf{V}_{(p)}(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J}).$$

Recall that each filtered Floer–Novikov complex has a finite boundary depth which coincides with the boundary depth of the associated persistence module. We denote the boundary depth of $\mathbf{V}_{(p)}(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J})$ by

$$\beta_{(p)}(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J}) \in [0, +\infty),$$

which is equal to the length of the longest finite bar in the associated barcode (Proposition 3.29).

Proposition 6.1. *Given any two regular bulk-avoiding admissible pairs $(\widehat{H}_1, \widehat{J}_1)$ and $(\widehat{H}_2, \widehat{J}_2)$, for any prime p , one has*

$$|\beta_{(p)}(\widehat{H}_1, \widehat{J}_1) - \beta_{(p)}(\widehat{H}_2, \widehat{J}_2)| \leq 2d_{\text{Hofer}}(H_1, H_2). \quad (6.1)$$

In particular, the boundary depth only depends on the descent Hamiltonian downstairs.

Proof. This is a consequence of the stability of the persistence module and the boundary depth. Indeed, Proposition 4.16 implies that the quasi-equivalence distance between $VCF_{\bullet}^{\mathbf{b}}(\widehat{H}_1, \widehat{J}_1; \Lambda_{\mathbb{F}_p}^{\Gamma})$ and $VCF_{\bullet}^{\mathbf{b}}(\widehat{H}_2, \widehat{J}_2; \Lambda_{\mathbb{F}_p}^{\Gamma})$ is at most equal to the Hofer distance $d_{\text{Hofer}}(H_1, H_2)$. Using Theorem 3.30, it implies that the interleaving distance between the two associated persistence modules is no greater than the same bound. By Proposition 3.24, one can conclude (6.1). \square

Using typical arguments, one can also show that the boundary depth only depends on the induced (nondegenerate) Hamiltonian isotopy $\tilde{\phi}_H$ on the toric manifold X . Then Proposition 3.24 implies that $\beta_{(p)}$ descends to a Hofer continuous function

$$\beta_{(p)} : \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X) \rightarrow [0, +\infty).$$

Below is the main theorem of this section.

Theorem 6.2. *Suppose there exist $p_0 > 0$ and $C_0 > 0$ such that for all prime $p \geq p_0$, the algebra $VHF_{\bullet}^{\mathbf{b}}(V; \Lambda_{\mathbb{F}_p}^{\Gamma})$ is a semisimple $\Lambda_{\mathbb{F}_p}^{\Gamma}$ -algebra with idempotent generators $e_{l,(p)}, \dots, e_{m,(p)}$ satisfying*

$$\ell_p(e_{l,(p)}) \leq C_0.$$

Then there exists $C > 0$ such that for all prime $p \geq p_0$ and all $\tilde{\phi} \in \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X)$, one has

$$\beta_{(p)}(\tilde{\phi}) \leq C.$$

6.2. Action by quantum multiplication. Recall how we define pair-of-pants product on the vortex Floer homology (see [WX17b]). On the pair-of-pants Σ^{pop} , equip the two inputs bulk-avoiding admissible pairs $(\widehat{H}_1, \widehat{J}_1)$ and $(\widehat{H}_2, \widehat{J}_2)$ and equip the output another bulk-avoiding admissible pair $(\widehat{H}_3, \widehat{J}_3)$. Extend these data to a domain-dependent Hamiltonian perturbation and a domain-dependent almost complex structure on Σ^{pop} . By counting solutions to the Hamiltonian perturbed vortex equation on Σ^{pop} (with appropriate weights coming from the bulk deformation \mathfrak{b}), one can define a chain map

$$VCF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\widehat{H}_1, \widehat{J}_1; \Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}) \otimes VCF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\widehat{H}_2, \widehat{J}_2; \Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}) \rightarrow VCF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\widehat{H}_3, \widehat{J}_3; \Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}).$$

We fix a class $\alpha \in VHF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(V; \Lambda_{\mathbb{K}})$. For each $\delta > 0$, let \widehat{H}_{δ} be a bulk-avoiding admissible Hamiltonian on V with $\|\widehat{H}_{\delta}\|_{C^2} \leq \delta$. We temporarily omit the dependence on the almost complex structure and the coefficient field from the notations. For notational simplicity, we also omit the bulk \mathfrak{b} in the formulas at the moment. Consider the chain-level map

$$VCF_{\bullet}(\widehat{H}_{\delta}) \otimes VCF_{\bullet}(\widehat{H}) \rightarrow VCF_{\bullet}(\widehat{H}).$$

By using the energy inequality, one can show that there exists a constant $C > 0$, such that for all $s, \tau \in \mathbb{R}$, the above multiplication induces a bilinear map

$$VHF_{\bullet}^{\leq \tau}(\widehat{H}_{\delta}) \otimes VHF_{\bullet}^{\leq s}(\widehat{H}) \rightarrow VHF_{\bullet}^{\leq s+\tau+C\delta}(\widehat{H}). \quad (6.2)$$

Denote

$$\mathcal{A}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\alpha) := c^{\mathfrak{b}}(\alpha, 0) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} c^{\mathfrak{b}}(\alpha, H_{\delta}).$$

Then one has the linear map for all $\epsilon > 0$, one can choose δ sufficiently small so that by setting $\tau = \mathcal{A}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\alpha) + \delta$ and inserting a representative of α in $VHF_{\bullet}^{\leq \tau}(\widehat{H}_{\delta})$ in (6.2), one obtains a well-defined map

$$m_{\epsilon}(\alpha) : VHF_{\bullet}^{\leq s}(\widehat{H}) \rightarrow VHF_{\bullet}^{\leq s+\mathcal{A}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\alpha)+\epsilon}(\widehat{H}).$$

Using the standard argument one can show that this map only depends on the class α . By applying any positive shift, the above operation defines a family of operations which are recorded in the following statement.

Proposition 6.3. *For all $\epsilon > 0$, the maps $m_{\epsilon}(\alpha)$ define a morphism of persistence modules*

$$m_{\epsilon}(\alpha) : \mathbf{V}(\tilde{\phi}) \rightarrow \mathbf{V}(\tilde{\phi})[\mathcal{A}(\alpha) + \epsilon] \quad \forall \epsilon > 0$$

satisfying for all $\epsilon < \epsilon'$, one has

$$m_{\epsilon'}(\alpha) = \text{shift}_{\epsilon'-\epsilon} \circ m_{\epsilon}(\alpha).$$

Definition 6.4. Given $\alpha \in VHF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(V; \Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}) \setminus \{0\}$ and $\epsilon > 0$, the persistence module $\mathbf{W}_{\alpha}(\tilde{\phi})_{\epsilon}$ is defined by

$$\mathbf{W}_{\alpha}(\tilde{\phi})_{\epsilon}^s = \text{Im} \left(m_{\epsilon}(\alpha) : VHF_{\bullet}^{\leq s-\mathcal{A}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\alpha)}(\tilde{H}) \rightarrow VHF_{\bullet}^{\leq s+\epsilon}(\tilde{H}) \right) \subset V(\tilde{\phi})^{s+\epsilon}.$$

Remark 6.5. Our notion of persistence modules (Definition 3.20) is very different from the traditionally used ones (see for example [PSS17] where similar operators were firstly defined for Floer persistence modules in the monotone case); notably we allow each piece V^s of a persistence module \mathbf{V} to be infinite-dimensional. Hence it is not straightforward, though not necessarily difficult, to prove that when $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, the above persistence modules “converges,” giving a limiting object similar to the one used in [She22]. However, we could also carry the ϵ everywhere as we are doing here.

6.3. Proof of Theorem 6.2. We prove Theorem 6.2 following the strategy of [She22]. This theorem is the consequence of Lemma 6.6, Lemma 6.7, and Lemma 6.8 below.

We first introduce and simplify the notations. As we work with an individual prime, we drop the dependence on the prime p in most notations. Let e_1, \dots, e_m be the idempotent generators of $VHF_{\bullet}^b(V; \Lambda_{\mathbb{F}_p})$. For each nondegenerate $\tilde{\phi} \in \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X)$, consider the direct sum persistence module

$$\mathbf{W}(\tilde{\phi})_{\epsilon} = \bigoplus_{l=1}^m \mathbf{W}_{e_l}(\tilde{\phi})_{\epsilon}.$$

Lemma 6.6. *The interleaving distance between $\mathbf{V}(\tilde{\phi})$ and $\mathbf{W}(\tilde{\phi})_{\epsilon}$ is at most $C_0 + \epsilon$.*

For all $\tilde{\phi} \in \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X)$, define

$$\gamma(\tilde{\phi}) := \max_{1 \leq l \leq m} \gamma_{e_l}(\tilde{\phi}) := \max_{1 \leq l \leq m} \left(c^b(e_l, \tilde{\phi}) + c^b(e_l, \tilde{\phi}^{-1}) \right).$$

Temporarily let $\text{pr} : \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X) \rightarrow \text{Ham}(X)$ be the canonical projection. Define for $\phi \in \text{Ham}(X)$

$$\gamma(\phi) := \inf_{\text{pr}(\tilde{\phi})=\phi} \gamma(\tilde{\phi}).$$

The following is an analogue of [She22, Proposition 12].

Lemma 6.7. *The boundary depth of the persistence module $\mathbf{W}_{e_l}(\tilde{\phi})_{\epsilon}$ is finite. Moreover, given nondegenerate $\tilde{\phi}, \tilde{\psi} \in \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X)$, for each $l = 1, \dots, m$, one has*

$$\left| \beta(\mathbf{W}_{e_l}(\tilde{\phi})_{\epsilon}) - \beta(\mathbf{W}_{e_l}(\tilde{\psi})_{\epsilon}) \right| \leq \gamma_{e_l}(\tilde{\phi}\tilde{\psi}^{-1}). \quad (6.3)$$

The following is analogous to [Ush11b, Proposition 5.4] and [She22, Proposition 13].

Lemma 6.8. *For all $\tilde{\phi} \in \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X)$, one has*

$$c^b(e_l, \tilde{\phi}) + c^b(e_l, \tilde{\phi}^{-1}) \leq 4C_0.$$

Proof of Theorem 6.2. As the boundary depth depends continuously on the Hamiltonian isotopy $\tilde{\phi}$, one only needs to prove the theorem for nondegenerate ones. First, by Lemma 6.6, the interleaving distance between $\mathbf{V}(\tilde{\phi})$ and $\mathbf{W}(\tilde{\phi})_{\epsilon}$ is bounded by C_0 . Hence by Proposition 3.24, it suffices to bound the boundary depth of $\mathbf{W}(\tilde{\phi})_{\epsilon}$. As $\mathbf{W}(\tilde{\phi})_{\epsilon}$ is the direct sum of $\mathbf{W}_{e_l}(\tilde{\phi})_{\epsilon}$, it suffices to bound the boundary depth of $\mathbf{W}_{e_l}(\tilde{\phi})_{\epsilon}$ for all idempotent generators e_l . Then applying Lemma 6.7, one obtains

$$\beta(\mathbf{W}_{e_l}(\tilde{\phi})_{\epsilon}) \leq \gamma_{e_l}(\tilde{\phi}\tilde{\psi}^{-1}) + \beta(\mathbf{W}_{e_l}(\tilde{\psi})_{\epsilon}) \leq 4C_0 + \beta(\mathbf{W}_{e_l}(\tilde{\psi})_{\epsilon})$$

where $\tilde{\psi} \in \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X)$ is an arbitrary fixed nondegenerate Hamiltonian isotopy on X . Then the right hand side is finite and independent of $\tilde{\phi}$. \square

6.4. Proofs of the technical lemmas. In this subsection we drop all dependence on the bulk deformation from notations.

Proof of Lemma 6.6. We construct maps between persistence modules $\mathbf{f}_{\epsilon} : \mathbf{V}(\tilde{\phi}) \rightarrow \mathbf{W}(\tilde{\phi})_{\epsilon}[C_0]$ and $\mathbf{g}_{\epsilon} : \mathbf{W}(\tilde{\phi})_{\epsilon} \rightarrow \mathbf{V}(\tilde{\phi})[C_0]$ as follows. For $s \in \mathbb{R}$, define

$$f_{\epsilon}^s : V(\tilde{\phi})^s \rightarrow \bigoplus_{l=1}^m W_{e_l}(\tilde{\phi})_{\epsilon}^{s+C_0}$$

to be the composition of

$$V(\tilde{\phi})^s \rightarrow \bigoplus_{l=1}^m W_{e_l}(\tilde{\phi})_\epsilon^{s+A(e_l)}, \quad \alpha \mapsto (e_1 * \alpha, \dots, e_m * \alpha)$$

and the natural map

$$\bigoplus_{l=1}^m W_{e_l}(\tilde{\phi})_\epsilon^{s+A(e_l)} \rightarrow \bigoplus_{l=1}^m W_{e_l}(\tilde{\phi})_\epsilon^{s+C_0}.$$

Define

$$g_{+\epsilon}^s : \bigoplus_{l=1}^m W_{e_l}(\tilde{\phi})_\epsilon^s \rightarrow V(\tilde{\phi})^{s+C_0}, \quad (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m) \mapsto \iota^{s+\epsilon, s+C_0}(\alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_m).$$

It is straightforward to check, using the fact that $e_1 + \dots + e_m = \mathbf{1}_b^{\text{GLSM}}$ and that e_l are idempotent generators, that $\mathbf{f}_\epsilon, \mathbf{g}_\epsilon$ provide C_0 -interleaving between $\mathbf{V}(\tilde{\phi})$ and $\mathbf{W}(\tilde{\phi})_\epsilon$. \square

Proof of Lemma 6.7. The detailed proof would be almost identical to the part of the proof of [She22, Proposition 12] corresponding to this lemma. Hence we only briefly sketch it. First we show the finiteness of the boundary depth. The boundary depth of $\mathbf{V}(\tilde{\phi})$ is finite because it coincides of the boundary depth of the associated Floer–Novikov complex (see Proposition 3.26). Hence by Lemma 6.6 and Proposition 3.24, $\mathbf{W}(\tilde{\phi})_\epsilon$ has finite boundary depth. Therefore each summand $\mathbf{W}_{e_l}(\tilde{\phi})_\epsilon$ has finite boundary depth.

Now we prove the inequality (6.3). Let F, G be Hamiltonians downstairs with time-1 maps $\tilde{\phi}$ and $\tilde{\psi}$ respectively. Choose bulk-avoiding admissible lifts \hat{F}, \hat{G} upstairs and let $(\hat{F}, \hat{J}_F), (\hat{G}, \hat{J}_G)$ be regular pairs. Let ℓ_F resp. ℓ_G be the non-Archimedean valuation on the complex $VCF_\bullet(\hat{F}, \hat{J}_F)$ resp. $VCF_\bullet(\hat{G}, \hat{J}_G)$. Let $\Delta_{\hat{F}, \hat{G}} = G \# \overline{F}$ be the difference Hamiltonian upstairs with descent difference Hamiltonian $\Delta_{F, G}$ downstairs. Let $\hat{J}_{F, G}$ be an admissible almost complex structure so that the pair $(\Delta_{\hat{F}, \hat{G}}, \hat{J}_{F, G})$ is regular. One can obtain a pair $(\Delta_{\hat{G}, \hat{F}}, \hat{J}_{G, F})$ with the roles of \hat{F} and \hat{G} reversed.

Now fix $\epsilon > 0$. Choose a cycle $c_{\hat{F}, \hat{G}, \epsilon} \in VCF_\bullet(\Delta_{\hat{F}, \hat{G}}, \hat{J}_{F, G})$ representing e_l such that

$$\ell(c_{\hat{F}, \hat{G}, \epsilon}) \leq c(e_l, \Delta_{\hat{F}, \hat{G}}) + \epsilon.$$

We also choose a cycle $c_{\hat{G}, \hat{F}, \epsilon} \in VCF_\bullet(\Delta_{\hat{G}, \hat{F}}, \hat{J}_{G, F})$ representing e_l with

$$\ell(c_{\hat{G}, \hat{F}, \epsilon}) \leq c(e_l, \Delta_{\hat{G}, \hat{F}}) + \epsilon.$$

Now after choosing perturbation data on the pair-of-pants, one can define a chain map

$$C_{\hat{F}, \hat{G}, \epsilon} : VCF_\bullet(\hat{F}, \hat{J}_F) \rightarrow VCF_\bullet(\hat{G}, \hat{J}_G), \quad x \mapsto c_{\hat{F}, \hat{G}, \epsilon} * x.$$

satisfying

$$\ell_G(C_{\hat{F}, \hat{G}, \epsilon}(x)) \leq c(e_l, \Delta_{\hat{F}, \hat{G}}) + \ell_F(x) + 2\epsilon.$$

Similarly, by using the cycle $c_{\hat{G}, \hat{F}, \epsilon}$ one can also define a chain map

$$C_{\hat{G}, \hat{F}, \epsilon} : VCF_\bullet(\hat{G}, \hat{J}_G) \rightarrow VCF_\bullet(\hat{F}, \hat{J}_F)$$

satisfying

$$\ell_F(C_{\hat{G}, \hat{F}, \epsilon}(y)) \leq c(e_l, \Delta_{G, F}) + \ell_G(y) + 2\epsilon.$$

The lemma will follow from the following claim.

Claim. $C_{\hat{F}, \hat{G}, \epsilon}$ and $C_{\hat{G}, \hat{F}, \epsilon}$ induce a $\frac{1}{2}\gamma_{e_l}(\tilde{\phi}\tilde{\psi}^{-1}) + 4\epsilon$ -interleaving between $\mathbf{W}_{e_l}(\hat{F})_\epsilon$ and $\mathbf{W}_{e_l}(\hat{G})_\epsilon$.

The detailed proof would also be almost identical to that of [She22] except for notations. We omit the details. \square

Remark 6.9. As one can infer from the above proof, the inequality “ $\beta \leq \gamma$ ” is a consequence of studying filtered continuations maps in terms of taking the pair-of-pants product with the filtered continuation elements, which in particular does not depend on the semi-simplicity assumption.

Proof of Lemma 6.8. Using Proposition 4.21, Lemma 4.14 and the triangle inequality for spectral invariants, one has

$$\begin{aligned} -c(e_l, \tilde{\phi}^{-1}) &= \inf \left\{ c(\alpha, \tilde{\phi}) \mid \langle e_l, \alpha \rangle \neq 0 \right\} \\ &\geq -\mathcal{A}(e_l) + \inf \left\{ c(e_l * \alpha, \tilde{\phi}) \mid \langle e_l * \alpha, \mathbf{1}^{\text{GLSM}} \rangle \neq 0 \right\} \\ &\geq -\mathcal{A}(e_l) + \inf \left\{ c(e_l, \tilde{\phi}) - \mathcal{A}((e_l * \alpha)^{-1}) \mid \langle e_l * \alpha, \mathbf{1}^{\text{GLSM}} \rangle \neq 0 \right\} \\ &\geq -\mathcal{A}(e_l) + c(e_l, \tilde{\phi}) + \inf \left\{ -\mathcal{A}(e_l * \alpha) - \mathcal{A}((e_l * \alpha)^{-1}) \mid e_l * \alpha \neq 0 \right\} \\ &\quad + \inf \left\{ \mathcal{A}(e_l * \alpha) \mid \langle e_l * \alpha, \mathbf{1}^{\text{GLSM}} \rangle \neq 0 \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Here the quantum product and the Poincaré pairing are both the bulk-deformed versions. Notice that as e_l is an idempotent generator, $e_l * \alpha = \lambda(\alpha)e_l$ and $(e_l * \alpha)^{-1} = \lambda(\alpha)^{-1}e_l$. Hence

$$\mathcal{A}(e_l * \alpha) + \mathcal{A}((e_l * \alpha)^{-1}) = 2\mathcal{A}(e_l) - \mathfrak{v}(\lambda(\alpha)) - \mathfrak{v}(\lambda(\alpha)^{-1}) = 2\mathcal{A}(e_l)$$

which is uniformly bounded. Moreover, by Proposition 4.21

$$\inf \left\{ \mathcal{A}(e_l * \alpha) \mid \langle e_l * \alpha, \mathbf{1}^{\text{GLSM}} \rangle \neq 0 \right\} \geq -\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{1}^{\text{GLSM}}).$$

Therefore

$$c(e_l, \tilde{\phi}) + c(e_l, \tilde{\phi}^{-1}) \leq 3\mathcal{A}(e_l) + \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{1}^{\text{GLSM}}).$$

Lemma 6.8 follows by using the assumption $\mathcal{A}(e_l) \leq C_0$ and noticing

$$\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{1}^{\text{GLSM}}) = \mathcal{A}(e_1 + \cdots + e_m) \leq \max_{1 \leq l \leq m} \mathcal{A}(e_l) \leq C_0. \quad \square$$

Remark 6.10. The above argument crucially relies on the semi-simplicity assumption, which allows us to take advantage of the feature that any nonzero element in a field summand of the quantum homology is invertible. Note that such a phenomenon is ultimately due to the abundance of rational curves in toric manifolds.

7. \mathbb{Z}/p -EQUIVARIANT VORTEX FLOER THEORY

Following [Sei15, SZ21], we develop \mathbb{Z}/p -equivariant Hamiltonian Floer theory in the vortex setting. Using equivariant pair of pants operations, we show that the following analogue of [She22, Theorem D] about the total bar length holds in our setting.

Theorem 7.1. *Let ϕ be a Hamiltonian diffeomorphism on the toric symplectic manifold (X, ω) with lift $\tilde{\phi} \in \widetilde{\text{Ham}}(X)$. Then for any odd prime p , if $\text{Fix}(\phi)$ and $\text{Fix}(\phi^p)$ are finite, then*

$$\tau_{(p)}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\tilde{\phi}^p) \geq p \cdot \tau_{(p)}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\tilde{\phi}) \quad (7.1)$$

Here we work over $\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p}$, which is omitted from the notations above. Given the arguments from [She22, Section 6], the only missing ingredient for establishing Theorem 7.1 is the package of \mathbb{Z}/p Borel equivariant vortex Floer theory with bulk deformation. As demonstrated in other parts of the paper, one salient feature of vortex Floer theory is the absence of sphere bubbles due to

the contractibility of symplectic vector space, which allows us to achieve transversality in many settings by only perturbing the almost complex structure. Specializing to the Borel equivariant theory, except for the necessity to deal with the symplectic vortex equations and the appearance of Novikov coefficients, our theory is quite similar to the exact setting as from the original reference [Sei15, SZ21], at least for bulk-avoiding Hamiltonians, which suffice for our purpose via a limiting argument. Therefore, unless there is anything special in our situation, we will be brief and refer the reader to the original references for full proofs.

In this section the bulk deformation \mathfrak{b} is fixed. All curve counts are weighted by the bulk term. We often drop it in order to shorten the notations.

7.1. The Borel construction. We take the following model of $E\mathbb{Z}/p$: the ambient space is

$$S^\infty := \{(z_0, z_1, \dots) \mid z_k \in \mathbb{C} \text{ for } k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, \sum |z_k|^2 = 1, \text{ only finitely many } z_k \text{'s are nonzero}\},$$

and the group \mathbb{Z}/p freely acts on S^∞ by multiplying each coordinate by p -th roots of unity. The quotient space of S^∞ under this \mathbb{Z}/p -action is a model for the classifying space $B\mathbb{Z}/p$. The group cohomology of \mathbb{Z}/p over \mathbb{F}_p is recovered as the (graded-commutative) cohomology ring

$$H^*(B\mathbb{Z}/p; \mathbb{F}_p) = \mathbb{F}_p\langle u \rangle \langle \theta \rangle, \deg(u) = 2 \text{ and } \deg(\theta) = 1.$$

For $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, $E\mathbb{Z}/p$ admits a \mathbb{Z}/p -invariant Morse function

$$\tilde{F}(z) = \sum k|z_k|^2 + \epsilon \sum \operatorname{re}(z_k^p)$$

obtained by perturbing the standard Morse–Bott function $\sum k|z_k|^2$ on S^∞ along the critical submanifolds. The function $\tilde{F}(z)$ has the following properties:

- (1) defining the map

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\tau} : S^\infty &\rightarrow S^\infty \\ (z_0, z_1, \dots) &\mapsto (0, z_0, z_1, \dots), \end{aligned} \tag{7.2}$$

then we have $\tilde{F} \circ \tilde{\tau} = \tilde{F} + 1$;

- (2) for any $l \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, the critical points of \tilde{F} obtained from perturbing the critical submanifold $\{|z_l| = 1\}$ of $\sum k|z_k|^2$ can be indexed by

$$Z_{2l}^0, \dots, Z_{2l}^{p-1}, \text{ and } Z_{2l+1}^0, \dots, Z_{2l+1}^{p-1},$$

where each Z_{2l}^i has Morse index $2l$ and each Z_{2l+1}^i has Morse index $2l + 1$;

- (3) the sets $\{Z_{2l}^0, \dots, Z_{2l}^{p-1}\}$ and $\{Z_{2l+1}^0, \dots, Z_{2l+1}^{p-1}\}$ respectively form an \mathbb{Z}/p -orbit of the \mathbb{Z}/p -action on S^∞ ;
- (4) there exists a \mathbb{Z}/p -equivariant Riemannian metric \tilde{g} on S^∞ such that (\tilde{f}, \tilde{g}) is Morse–Smale, and the differential on the corresponding Morse cochain complex is

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{2l}^m &\mapsto Z_{2l+1}^m - Z_{2l+1}^{m+1}, \\ Z_{2l+1}^m &\mapsto Z_{2l+2}^0 + \dots + Z_{2l+2}^{p-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where the index $m \in \mathbb{Z}/p$ is read cyclically.

7.2. The Tate construction. Next, we review the Tate construction for cyclic groups of prime order. Let R be a unital commutative ring which is an \mathbb{F}_p -algebra (later R will become $\overline{\mathbb{F}_p}$). Suppose $(\hat{C}_\bullet, d_{\hat{C}})$ is a \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded chain complex defined over the Novikov ring $\Lambda_{0,R}$. Note that $\Lambda_{0,R}$ is a module over Λ_{0,\mathbb{F}_p} . Introduce the graded field

$$\mathcal{K} = \mathbb{F}_p[u^{-1}, u], \deg(u) = 2.$$

Then the \mathbb{Z}/p -equivariant Tate complex

$$C_{\text{Tate}}(\mathbb{Z}/p, \hat{C}_{\bullet}^{\otimes p})$$

is a module over $\Lambda_{0,\mathcal{K}}\langle\theta\rangle$ where $\deg(\theta) = 1, \theta^2 = 0$, explicitly given by

$$\hat{C}_{\bullet}^{\otimes p} \otimes_{\Lambda_{0,\mathbb{F}_p}} \Lambda_{0,\mathcal{K}}\langle\theta\rangle.$$

The differential d_{Tate} is $\Lambda_{0,R} \otimes_{\Lambda_{0,\mathbb{F}_p}} \Lambda_{0,\mathcal{K}}$ -linear, such that for $x_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_{p-1} \in \hat{C}_{\bullet}^{\otimes p}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{Tate}}(x_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_{p-1}) &= d_{\hat{C}}^{\otimes p}(x_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_{p-1}) + \theta(id - \zeta)(x_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_{p-1}), \\ d_{\text{Tate}}(\theta(x_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_{p-1})) &= -\theta d_{\hat{C}}^{\otimes p}(x_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_{p-1}) + u(id + \zeta + \cdots + \zeta^{p-1})(x_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_{p-1}), \end{aligned}$$

in which the ζ is the automorphism on $\hat{C}_{\bullet}^{\otimes p}$ defined by

$$x_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_{p-1} \mapsto (-1)^{|x_{p-1}|(|x_0| + \cdots + |x_{p-2}|)} x_{p-1} \otimes x_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_{p-2}.$$

In other words, the Tate complex $(C_{\text{Tate}}(\mathbb{Z}/p, \hat{C}_{\bullet}^{\otimes p}), d_{\text{Tate}})$ is obtained from the \mathbb{Z}/p group cohomology of the chain complex $(\hat{C}_{\bullet}^{\otimes p}, d_{\hat{C}}^{\otimes p})$ by inverting the equivariant parameter u . Denote the homology of the Tate complex by

$$H_{\text{Tate}}(\mathbb{Z}/p, \hat{C}_{\bullet}^{\otimes p}).$$

The following algebraic statement will be used in establishing the localization result proved later.

Lemma 7.2. [She22, Lemma 21] *Denote the homology of $(\hat{C}_{\bullet}, d_{\hat{C}})$ by \hat{H}_{\bullet} . The p -th power map*

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{C}_{\bullet} &\rightarrow \hat{C}_{\bullet}^{\otimes p} \\ x &\mapsto x \otimes \cdots \otimes x \end{aligned} \tag{7.3}$$

induces an isomorphism of $\Lambda_{0,R} \otimes_{\Lambda_{0,\mathbb{F}_p}} \Lambda_{0,\mathcal{K}}$ -modules

$$r_p^*(\hat{H}_{\bullet} \otimes_{\Lambda_{0,\mathbb{F}_p}} \Lambda_{0,\mathcal{K}}) \rightarrow H_{\text{Tate}}(\mathbb{Z}/p, \hat{C}_{\bullet}^{\otimes p})$$

where r_p is the operator on $\Lambda_{0,R} \otimes_{\Lambda_{0,\mathbb{F}_p}} \Lambda_{0,\mathcal{K}}$ defined by mapping the Novikov variable T to $T^{1/p}$.

This is referred to as the quasi-Frobenius isomorphism in [She22, Section 7].

7.3. \mathbb{Z}/p -equivariant vortex Floer theory. Given a 1-periodic Hamiltonian H_t on X , its p -th iteration is the family $H_t^{(p)} := H_{pt}$. If $\phi : X \rightarrow X$ is the time-1 map of H , then the time-1 map of $H^{(p)}$ is the iteration ϕ^p . Following [Sei15, SZ21], we define the \mathbb{Z}/p -equivariant vortex Hamiltonian Floer homology for $H^{(p)}$ by using the family Floer homology coming from the Borel construction. For all the Floer-theoretic constructions involving moduli spaces, we always assume that the Hamiltonians involved in the discussion are nondegenerate.

Recall that the toric divisors of X are given by D_1, \dots, D_N , which are obtained as the symplectic quotient of the coordinate hyperplanes V_1, \dots, V_N in the symplectic vector space V . As in the definition of bulk-deformed Floer homology, we assume that the Hamiltonian H is bulk-avoiding; in particular, for any odd prime p , 1-periodic orbits of H and $H^{(p)}$ are disjoint from $V_1 \cup \cdots \cup V_N$. We also assume that both H and $H^{(p)}$ are nondegenerate. Let \hat{H} be an admissible lift of H and $\hat{H}^{(p)}$ an admissible lift of $H^{(p)}$ (see Remark 4.4). Let $\hat{\mathcal{J}}^{(p)} = \{\hat{\mathcal{J}}_t^{(p)}\}_{t \in S^1}$ be a 1-periodic family of compatible almost complex structures on V such that the pair $(\hat{H}^{(p)}, \hat{\mathcal{J}}^{(p)})$ is admissible and the Floer chain complex $VCF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\hat{H}^{(p)}, \hat{\mathcal{J}}^{(p)}; \Lambda_{0,R})$ has a well-defined bulk-deformed differential $\partial_{\mathfrak{b}}^{(p)}$, where $\mathfrak{b} = \sum_{i=1}^N \log c_i V_i$ is a chosen bulk in which $c_i \in \mathbb{Z}[i]$. Note that we work over $\Lambda_{0,R}$ instead

of Λ_R , which does not introduce any further difficulty due to the fact that $\partial_{\mathfrak{b}}^{(p)}$ preserves the energy filtration on $VCF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\widehat{H}^{(p)}, \widehat{J}^{(p)}; \Lambda_{0,R})$.

To define equivariant differentials, we include more parameters from the Borel construction. We choose an $S^\infty = EZ/p$ family of time-dependent compatible *admissible* almost complex structures

$$\widehat{J}_\infty^{(p)} = \{\widehat{J}_{t,z}^{(p)}\}_{t \in S^1, z \in S^\infty}$$

satisfying the following requirements:

- (1) Near each critical point $Z_i^0, i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ of the Morse function $\tilde{F}(z)$ on S^∞ , we have $\widehat{J}_{t,z}^{(p)} = \widehat{J}_t^{(p)}$;
- (2) Regard $\mathbb{Z}/p \subset S^1$. For any $m \in \mathbb{Z}/p$ and $z \in S^\infty$, there holds the equivariance relation

$$\widehat{J}_{t-m,z}^{(p)} = \widehat{J}_{t,m \cdot z}^{(p)};$$

- (3) $\widehat{J}_{t,z}^{(p)}$ is invariant under the translation (7.2). Namely

$$\widehat{J}_{t,\tilde{\tau}(z)}^{(p)} = \widehat{J}_{t,z}^{(p)}.$$

After making such a choice, we can write down the following version of parametrized vortex Floer equation. Let $\mathfrak{r}_\pm = (x_\pm, \eta_\pm) \in \text{crit} \mathcal{A}_{H^{(p)}}$ be a pair of equivariant 1-periodic orbits of $H^{(p)}$ (which do not depend on the lift $\widehat{H}^{(p)}$). Given $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, m \in \mathbb{Z}/p$ and $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}$, the moduli space

$$\mathcal{M}_\alpha^{i,m}(\mathfrak{r}_-, \mathfrak{r}_+)$$

consists of gauge equivalence classes of pairs of smooth maps (the gauge transformations act on the (u, ϕ, ψ) -component)

$$(u, \phi, \psi) : \mathbb{R}_s \times S_t^1 \rightarrow V \times \mathfrak{k} \times \mathfrak{k}, \quad w : \mathbb{R}_s \rightarrow S^\infty$$

which satisfy the equations and asymptotic conditions

$$\begin{cases} \partial_s u + \mathcal{X}_\phi(u) + \widehat{J}_{w(s),t}^{(p)}(\partial_t u + \mathcal{X}_\psi(u) - X_{\widehat{H}_t^{(p)}}(u)) = 0, & \partial_s \psi - \partial_t \phi + \mu(u) = 0, \\ \partial_s w(s) - \nabla \tilde{F}(w) = 0, \\ \lim_{s \rightarrow -\infty} (u(s, \cdot), \phi(s, \cdot), \psi(s, \cdot), w(s)) = (x_-, 0, \eta_-, Z_\alpha^0), \\ \lim_{s \rightarrow +\infty} (u(s, \cdot), \phi(s, \cdot), \psi(s, \cdot), w(s)) = (x_+, 0, \eta_+, Z_i^m), \end{cases} \quad (7.4)$$

modulo the \mathbb{R} -translation action given by

$$(u(s, \cdot), \phi(s, \cdot), \psi(s, \cdot), w(s)) \mapsto (u(s+r, \cdot), \phi(s+r, \cdot), \psi(s+r, \cdot), w(s+r)), \quad r \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Because of the absence of sphere bubbles, as the capped orbits impose an upper bound on energy, the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_\alpha^{i,m}(\mathfrak{r}_-, \mathfrak{r}_+)$ admits a Uhlenbeck–Gromov–Floer compactification $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_\alpha^{i,m}(\mathfrak{r}_-, \mathfrak{r}_+)$ by adding equivalence classes of solutions the above coupled equations defined over broken configurations. On the other hand, for a generic choice of $\{\widehat{J}_{t,z}^{(p)}\}_{t \in S^1, z \in S^\infty}$, the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_\alpha^{i,m}(\mathfrak{r}_-, \mathfrak{r}_+)$ is transversely cut out, and the dimension of the moduli space satisfies

$$\dim \mathcal{M}_\alpha^{i,m}(\mathfrak{r}_-, \mathfrak{r}_+) = \text{CZ}(\mathfrak{r}_-) - \text{CZ}(\mathfrak{r}_+) + i - \alpha - 1.$$

For a more detailed discussion of these facts, the reader may consult [Sei15, Section 4], [SZ21, Section 6], whose arguments apply to our case after using the setup from [Xu16, Section 6].

After achieving transversality, for each triple $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, m \in \mathbb{Z}/p$ and $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}$, we can define a $\Lambda_{0,R}$ -linear map $\partial_{\alpha,\mathfrak{b}}^{i,m}$ on $VCF_{\bullet}(\widehat{H}^{(p)}, \widehat{J}^{(p)}; \Lambda_{0,R})$ of the form

$$\partial_{\alpha,\mathfrak{b}}^{i,m}(\mathfrak{r}) = \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{r}} \\ \text{CZ}(\mathfrak{r}) - \text{CZ}(\mathfrak{r}) + i - \alpha = 1}} \left(\sum_{[(u,w)] \in \mathcal{M}_\alpha^{i,m}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{r})} \epsilon([(u,w)]) \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \log c_i [u] \cap V_i \right) \right) \eta,$$

where $\epsilon([\mathbf{u}, w]) \in \{\pm 1\}$ is the sign of the rigid solution $[\mathbf{u}]$, which is well-defined due to the existence of coherent orientations, and $[\mathbf{u}] \cap V_i$ is defined as before, coming from the topological intersection number. We further introduce the notation

$$\partial_{\alpha, \mathbf{b}}^i = \partial_{\alpha, \mathbf{b}}^{i,0} + \cdots + \partial_{\alpha, \mathbf{b}}^{i,p-1}.$$

Definition 7.3. The \mathbb{Z}/p -equivariant \mathbf{b} -deformed vortex Floer chain complex

$$VCF_{\bullet}^{\mathbb{Z}/p}(\widehat{H}^{(p)}, \widehat{J}_{\infty}^{(p)}; \Lambda_{0,R})$$

is the \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded $\Lambda_{0,R}$ -module given by

$$VCF_{\bullet}(\widehat{H}^{(p)}, \widehat{J}^{(p)}; \Lambda_{0,R})[[u]]\langle\theta\rangle, \deg(u) = 2, \deg(\theta) = 1$$

with $\Lambda_{0,R}[[u]]$ -linear differential

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{eq, \mathbf{b}}^{(p)}(\mathbf{x} \otimes 1) &= \sum_{i \geq 0} \partial_{0, \mathbf{b}}^{2i}(\mathbf{x}) \otimes u^i + \sum_{i \geq 0} \partial_{0, \mathbf{b}}^{2i+1}(\mathbf{x}) \otimes u^i \theta, \\ \partial_{eq, \mathbf{b}}^{(p)}(\mathbf{x} \otimes \theta) &= \sum_{i \geq 0} \partial_{1, \mathbf{b}}^{2i+1}(\mathbf{x}) \otimes u^i \theta + \sum_{i \geq 1} \partial_{1, \mathbf{b}}^{2i}(\mathbf{x}) \otimes u^i. \end{aligned}$$

The statement that $(\partial_{eq, \mathbf{b}}^{(p)})^2 = 0$ follows from the signed count of boundaries of the compactified 1-dimensional moduli spaces $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\alpha}^{i,m}(\mathbf{x}_-, \mathbf{x}_+)$. The differential is well-defined over Λ_R^0 because we only perturb the almost complex structure to achieve transversality. By continuation map considerations, the resulting homology group

$$VHF_{\bullet}^{\mathbb{Z}/p}(\widehat{H}^{(p)}, \widehat{J}_{\infty}^{(p)}; \Lambda_{0,R})$$

is independent of the choice of $\widehat{J}_{\infty}^{(p)}$, and it is a module over $\Lambda_{0,R}[[u]]\langle\theta\rangle$. By inverting u , we can define

$$VCF_{\text{Tate}}(\widehat{H}^{(p)}, \widehat{J}_{\infty}^{(p)}; \Lambda_{0,R}) = VCF^{\mathbb{Z}/p}(\widehat{H}^{(p)}, \widehat{J}_{\infty}^{(p)}; \Lambda_{0,R})[u^{-1}, u]\langle\theta\rangle$$

for which the differential is the $\Lambda_{0,R}[u^{-1}, u]$ -linear extension of $\partial_{eq, \mathbf{b}}^{(p)}$. The homology group is written as

$$VHF_{\text{Tate}}(\widehat{H}^{(p)}; \Lambda_{0,R}),$$

which is a module over $\Lambda^{0,R} \otimes_{\Lambda_{0, \mathbb{F}_p}} \Lambda^{0, \mathcal{K}}\langle\theta\rangle$.

Here is some explanation of the definition of the equivariant differential. By definition, the leading order term $\partial_{0, \mathbf{b}}^0$ agrees with the differential $\partial_{\mathbf{b}}^{(p)}$ on the complex $VCF_{\bullet}(\widehat{H}^{(p)}, \widehat{J}^{(p)}; \Lambda_{0,R})$, so does $\partial_{1, \mathbf{b}}^1$. The space of equivariant loops $L^K(V)$ admits an S^1 -action by shifting the domain parameter, and the natural inclusion $\mathbb{Z}/p \subset S^1$ defines a \mathbb{Z}/p -action on $L^K(V)$ such that the action functional $\mathcal{A}_{H^{(p)}}$ is invariant under such an action. More concretely, the reparametrization

$$\mathbf{x}(t) = (x(t), \eta(t)) \mapsto (x(t + \frac{1}{p}), \eta(t + \frac{1}{p}))$$

generates a \mathbb{Z}/p -action on the Floer homology

$$R_{1/p} : VHF_{\bullet}^{\mathbf{b}}(\widehat{H}^{(p)}; \Lambda_{0,R}) \rightarrow VHF_{\bullet}^{\mathbf{b}}(\widehat{H}^{(p)}; \Lambda_{0,R})$$

which is realized by the composition

$$VCF_{\bullet}(\widehat{H}^{(p)}, \widehat{J}^{(p)}; \Lambda_{0,R}) \xrightarrow[\text{pullback}]{\sim} VCF_{\bullet}(\widehat{H}^{(p)}, \widehat{J}_{-1/p}^{(p)}; \Lambda_{0,R}) \xrightarrow{\text{continuation}} VCF_{\bullet}(\widehat{H}^{(p)}, \widehat{J}^{(p)}; \Lambda_{0,R})$$

after passing to homology. Here $\widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{-\frac{1}{p}}^{(p)}$ is the S^1 -family of almost complex structures whose value at moment t is $\widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{t-\frac{1}{p}}^{(p)}$. The action $R_{1/p}$ generates a \mathbb{Z}/p -action on homology; we denote

$$R_{m/p} := (R_{1/p})^m : VHF_{\bullet}^b(\widehat{H}^{(p)}; \Lambda_{0,R}) \rightarrow VHF_{\bullet}^b(\widehat{H}^{(p)}; \Lambda_{0,R}).$$

Then the map $\partial_{0,b}^1$ descends to

$$id - R_{1/p} : VHF_{\bullet}^b(\widehat{H}^{(p)}; \Lambda_{0,R}) \rightarrow VHF_{\bullet}^b(\widehat{H}^{(p)}; \Lambda_{0,R})$$

on homology, while the map $\partial_{1,b}^2$ descends to $id + R_{1/p} + \cdots + R_{(p-1)/p}$. The higher order terms encodes the chain homotopies realizing relations of the form $(R_{1/p})^p = id$ on homology, and higher homotopy relations.

Finally, we observe that the degree filtration on the chain complex $VCF_{\bullet}^{\mathbb{Z}/p}(\widehat{H}^{(p)}, \widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{\infty}^{(p)}; \Lambda_R^0)$ induced from variables u and θ is preserved by the equivariant differential $\partial_{eq,b}^{(p)}$, and such a filtration is complete and exhaustive. Therefore, we have a spectral sequence converging to $VHF^{\mathbb{Z}/p}(\widehat{H}^{(p)}; \Lambda_{0,R})$, whose first page can be identified with $VHF_{\bullet}^b(\widehat{H}^{(p)}; \Lambda_{0,R})[[u]]\langle\theta\rangle$. The same holds for the Tate version, which inverts the variable u .

7.4. Equivariant p -legged pants operations. In this subsection, we define equivariant “ p -legged” pants operations on vortex Hamiltonian Floer theory, which generalizes the constructions from [Sei15, SZ21] to our situation. We use the homological convention, so the roles of the positive and negative cylindrical ends are the opposite of those from *loc. cit.*. We will continue the setup from the previous subsection, and keep using the notations H , \widehat{H} , $H^{(p)}$, $\widehat{H}^{(p)}$, and $\widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{t,z}^{(p)}$. Furthermore, we choose a 1-parameter family of compatible almost complex structures $\widehat{\mathcal{J}}$ on V such that $(\widehat{H}, \widehat{\mathcal{J}})$ is regular and the Floer chain complex $VCF_{\bullet}^b(\widehat{H}, \widehat{\mathcal{J}}; \Lambda_{0,R})$ is well-defined.

The equivariant pants operation is defined over a particularly designed domain. Let $\pi : S_{\mathcal{P}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times S^1$ be the p -fold branched cover with unique branch point $(0,0) \in \mathbb{R} \times S^1$ whose ramification point has maximal ramification order. Then $S_{\mathcal{P}}$ has $p+1$ punctures, regarded as p negative ends and one positive ends. Suppose $S_{\mathcal{P}}$ are equipped with cylindrical ends

$$\epsilon_i^- : (-\infty, -1] \times S^1 \rightarrow S_{\mathcal{P}}, \quad \epsilon_i^+ : [1, \infty) \times S^1 \rightarrow S_{\mathcal{P}}, \quad i \in \mathbb{Z}/p,$$

subject to the conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(\epsilon_i^-(s, t)) &= (s, t), & m \cdot (\epsilon_i^-(s, t)) &= \epsilon_{i+m}^-(s, t) \\ \pi(\epsilon_i^+(s, t)) &= (s, t), & m \cdot (\epsilon_i^+(s, t)) &= \epsilon_{i+m}^+(s, t) = \epsilon_i^+(s, t+m), \quad \text{for } m \in \mathbb{Z}/p, \end{aligned}$$

where $S_p^1 := \mathbb{R}/p\mathbb{Z}$ is the p -fold cover of $S^1 = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$. Note that all ϵ_i^+ are obtained from shifting from each other by certain $m \in \mathbb{Z}/p$.

The domain-dependent almost complex structure needs to have particular symmetry. We consider almost complex structures $\widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{\infty}^+$ on V parametrized by $z \in S^{\infty}$, $t \in S^1$, and $s \geq -1$, such that:

- (1) for $s \geq 2$ and $z \in S^{\infty}$, we have $\widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{s,t,z}^+ = \widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{t,z}^{(p)}$;
- (2) for any $m \in \mathbb{Z}/p$ and $z \in S^{\infty}$, there holds the equivariance relation

$$\widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{s,t-\frac{m}{p},z}^+ = \widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{s,t,m \cdot z}^+;$$

- (3) $\widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{s,t,z}^+$ is invariant under the translation:

$$\widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{s,t,\bar{\tau}(z)}^+ = \widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{s,t,z}^+.$$

Given such a choice, we further look at almost complex structures $\widehat{J}_\infty^{-,i}$ parametrized by with $s \leq 1$, $t \in S^1$, $z \in S^\infty$, and indexed by $i \in \mathbb{Z}/p$ (the label of negative ends) satisfying:

- (1) for $s \leq -2$ and any $w \in S^\infty$, we have $\widehat{J}_{s,t,z}^{-,i} = \widehat{J}_t$ for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}/p$;
- (2) for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}/p$ and $w \in S^\infty$, we have the equality $\widehat{J}_{s,t,z}^{-,i} = \widehat{J}_{s,t,z}^{+,i}$ hold for $-1 \leq s \leq 1$;
- (3) for any $m, i \in \mathbb{Z}/p$ and $z \in S^\infty$, there holds the equivariance relation

$$\widehat{J}_{s,t-\frac{m}{p},z}^{-,i} = \widehat{J}_{s,t,z}^{-,i+m};$$

- (4) $\widehat{J}_{s,t,z}^{-,i}$ is invariant under the translation:

$$\widehat{J}_{s,t,\tilde{\tau}(z)}^{-,i} = \widehat{J}_{s,t,z}^{-,i}.$$

If $w : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow S^\infty$ is a parametrized negative gradient flow line of \tilde{F} , the above data specify a family of almost complex structures $\{\widehat{J}_{v,w}^{\mathcal{P}}\}_{v \in S_{\mathcal{P}}}$ given by:

- (1) $\widehat{J}_{v,w}^{\mathcal{P}} = \pi^* \widehat{J}_{s,t,w(s)}^{-,i} = \pi^* J_{s,t,w(s)}^{+}$ for $v \in \pi^{-1}([-1, 1] \times S^1)$ and $\pi(v) = (s, t)$;
- (2) over the negative ends, $\widehat{J}_{v,w}^{\mathcal{P}} = \pi^* \widehat{J}_{s,t,w(s)}^{-,i}$ if $v = \epsilon_i^-(s, t)$ for all $i = 0, 1, \dots, p-1$;
- (3) over the positive end, $\widehat{J}_{v,w}^{\mathcal{P}} = \widehat{J}_{s,t,m \cdot w(s)}^{+,i}$ for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}/p$ and $z = \epsilon_m^+(s, t)$.

We need to further introduce a Hamiltonian perturbation term

$$\widehat{\mathcal{H}}^{\mathcal{P}} \in \Omega^1(S_{\mathcal{P}}, C^\infty(V)^K)$$

satisfying the following conditions.

- (1) For any $i \in \mathbb{Z}/p$, we have $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}^{\mathcal{P}}(\epsilon_i^-(s, t)) = \widehat{H}_t \otimes dt$;
- (2) On the positive end, for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}/p$, there holds $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}^{\mathcal{P}}(\epsilon_i^+(s, t)) = \widehat{H}_{t+i}^{(p)} \otimes dt$;
- (3) The \mathbb{Z}/p -equivariance condition $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}^{\mathcal{P}}(m \cdot v) = \widehat{\mathcal{H}}^{\mathcal{P}}(v)$ holds;
- (4) Let $\mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{P}} \in \Omega^1(S_{\mathcal{P}}, C^\infty(X))$ be the induced Hamiltonian perturbation term on X . Then the curvature of the Hamiltonian connection $\mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{P}}$ on $S_{\mathcal{P}}$ is 0.

Consider moduli spaces of perturbed vortex equation over the surface $S_{\mathcal{P}}$. Let $P \rightarrow S_{\mathcal{P}}$ be the trivial K -bundle. Given $\mathfrak{r}_+ = (x_+, \eta_+) \in \text{crit} \mathcal{A}_{H^{(p)}}$ and $\mathfrak{r}_0 = (x_0, \eta_0), \dots, \mathfrak{r}_{p-1} = (x_{p-1}, \eta_{p-1}) \in \text{crit} \mathcal{A}_H$, for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}/p$ and $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}$ we can introduce the moduli space

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}, \alpha}^{i,m}(\mathfrak{r}_0, \dots, \mathfrak{r}_{p-1}; \mathfrak{r}_+)$$

which parametrizes gauge equivalence classes of pairs

$$(u, A) \in C^\infty(S_{\mathcal{P}}, V) \times \mathcal{A}(P), \quad w : \mathbb{R}_s \rightarrow S^\infty$$

which satisfy the equations and asymptotic conditions

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \bar{\partial}_{A, \widehat{\mathcal{H}}^{\mathcal{P}}, \widehat{J}_{v,w}^{\mathcal{P}}} u = 0, \quad *F_A + \mu(u) = 0, \\ w'(s) - \nabla \tilde{F}(w) = 0, \\ \lim_{s \rightarrow -\infty} (u(\epsilon_j^-(s, \cdot)), A(\epsilon_j^-(s, \cdot)), w(\epsilon_j^-(s, \cdot))) = (x_j, 0, \eta_j, Z_\alpha^0), \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{Z}/p, \\ \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} (u(\epsilon_0^+(s, \cdot)), A(\epsilon_0^+(s, \cdot)), w(\epsilon_0^+(s, \cdot))) = (x_+, 0, \eta_+, Z_i^m). \end{array} \right.$$

As expected, the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}, \alpha}^{i,m}(\mathfrak{r}_0, \dots, \mathfrak{r}_{p-1}; \mathfrak{r}_+)$ admits an Uhlenbeck–Gromov–Floer compactification $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{P}, \alpha}^{i,m}(\mathfrak{r}_0, \dots, \mathfrak{r}_{p-1}; \mathfrak{r}_+)$, whose detailed description can be found in [Seil15, Section (4c)]. For a generic choice of almost complex structures and Hamiltonian connections, the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}, \alpha}^{i,m}(\mathfrak{r}_0, \dots, \mathfrak{r}_{p-1}; \mathfrak{r}_+)$ is cut out transversely, whose dimension is given by

$$\text{CZ}(\mathfrak{r}_0) + \dots + \text{CZ}(\mathfrak{r}_{p-1}) - \text{CZ}(\mathfrak{r}_+) + i - \alpha.$$

We define the pants operations using the above moduli spaces. For each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}/p$, and $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}$, define

$$\mathcal{P}_{\alpha, \mathfrak{b}}^{i, m} : VCF_{\bullet}(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J}; \Lambda_{0, R})^{\otimes p} \rightarrow VCF_{\bullet}(\widehat{H}^{(p)}, \widehat{J}^{(p)}; \Lambda_{0, R})$$

$$\mathfrak{r}_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathfrak{r}_{p-1} \mapsto \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{r} \\ CZ(\mathfrak{r}_0) + \cdots + CZ(\mathfrak{r}_{p-1}) - CZ(\mathfrak{r}) + i - \alpha = 0}} \left(\sum_{[(u, w)] \in \mathcal{M}_{\alpha}^{i, m}(\mathfrak{r}_0, \dots, \mathfrak{r}_{p-1}; \mathfrak{r})} \epsilon([(u, w)]) \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \log c_i [u] \cap V_i \right) \right) \mathfrak{r},$$

where a discussion on the sign $\epsilon([(u, w)])$ can be found in [SZ21, Appendix A].

Definition 7.4. Let $\mathcal{P}_{\alpha, \mathfrak{b}}^i = \mathcal{P}_{\alpha, \mathfrak{b}}^{i, 0} + \cdots + \mathcal{P}_{\alpha, \mathfrak{b}}^{i, p-1}$. The \mathbb{Z}/p -equivariant product is defined to be

$$\mathcal{P} : VCF_{\bullet}(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J}; \Lambda_{0, R})^{\otimes p} \llbracket u \rrbracket \langle \theta \rangle \rightarrow VCF^{\mathbb{Z}/p}(\widehat{H}^{(p)}, \widehat{J}_{\infty}^{(p)}; \Lambda_{0, R})$$

$$\mathcal{P}(- \otimes 1) = \sum_{i \geq 0} \mathcal{P}_{0, \mathfrak{b}}^{2i} \otimes u^i + \sum_{i \geq 0} \mathcal{P}_{0, \mathfrak{b}}^{2i+1} \otimes u^i \theta,$$

$$\mathcal{P}(- \otimes \theta) = \sum_{i \geq 1} \mathcal{P}_{1, \mathfrak{b}}^{2i} \otimes u^i + \sum_{i \geq 0} \mathcal{P}_{1, \mathfrak{b}}^{2i+1} \otimes u^i \theta.$$

We can apply the Tate construction to the complex $VCF_{\bullet}(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J}; \Lambda_{0, R})$, obtaining the Tate complex

$$(C_{\text{Tate}}(\mathbb{Z}/p, VCF_{\bullet}(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J}; \Lambda_{0, R})^{\otimes p}), \partial_{\text{Tate}}).$$

By inverting u , the \mathbb{Z}/p -equivariant product \mathcal{P} induces a map

$$C_{\text{Tate}}(\mathbb{Z}/p, VCF_{\bullet}(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J}; \Lambda_{0, R})^{\otimes p}) \rightarrow VCF_{\text{Tate}}(\widehat{H}^{(p)}, \widehat{J}_{\infty}^{(p)}; \Lambda_{0, R}),$$

which is also denoted by \mathcal{P} . By [SZ21, Section 8.3], \mathcal{P} defines a chain map on the Tate chain complexes. In fact, the chain map property holds without inverting u , but we will not need such a statement.

We also need to define a \mathbb{Z}/p -equivariant coproduct operation

$$\mathcal{C} : VCF^{\mathbb{Z}/p}(\widehat{H}^{(p)}, \widehat{J}_{\infty}^{(p)}; \Lambda_{0, R}) \rightarrow VCF_{\bullet}(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J}; \Lambda_{0, R})^{\otimes p} \llbracket u \rrbracket \langle \theta \rangle$$

by counting solutions to Hamiltonian-perturbed vortex equations defined over the Riemann surface $S_{\mathcal{C}}$ which is a p -fold branched cover of $\mathbb{R} \times S^1$ with unique branch point $(0, 0) \in \mathbb{R} \times S^1$ whose ramification point has maximal ramification order, coupled with negative gradient trajectory equations of $\tilde{F} : S^{\infty} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, but this time $S_{\mathcal{C}}$ has a single negative cylindrical end and p positive cylindrical ends. By inverting the u -variable, \mathcal{C} induces a map

$$VCF_{\text{Tate}}(\widehat{H}^{(p)}, \widehat{J}_{\infty}^{(p)}; \Lambda_{0, R}) \rightarrow C_{\text{Tate}}(\mathbb{Z}/p, VCF_{\bullet}(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J}; \Lambda_{0, R})^{\otimes p}).$$

7.5. Local theories and equivariant localization. In this subsection, we sketch the ingredients necessary for the proof of the following statement:

Theorem 7.5. *The equivariant \mathbb{Z}/p -equivariant product on homology*

$$\mathcal{P} : H_{\text{Tate}}(\mathbb{Z}/p, VCF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J}; \Lambda_{0, R})^{\otimes p}) \rightarrow VHF_{\text{Tate}}(\widehat{H}^{(p)}, \widehat{J}_{\infty}^{(p)}; \Lambda_{0, R}) \quad (7.5)$$

is an isomorphism.

First, one needs an equivariant version of the local vortex Floer theory as discussed in Section 5. Namely, if x is a 1-periodic orbit of the Hamiltonian H , and if we denote by $x^{(p)}$ the p -th iteration of x , which is necessarily a 1-periodic orbit of $H^{(p)}$, then there is a well-defined (bulk-deformed) \mathbb{Z}/p -equivariant local Floer homology group

$$VHF_{\text{loc}}^{\mathbb{Z}/p}(H^{(p)}, x^{(p)}; \Lambda_{0, R}),$$

which is defined by looking at contributions to $\partial_{eq,b}^{(p)}$ from solutions to (7.4) which are contained in a C^2 -small neighborhood of the equivariant lift of $x^{(p)}$. By inverting u , the Tate version is denoted by $VHF_{\text{Tate}}^{\text{loc}}(H^{(p)}, x^{(p)}; \Lambda_{0,R})$. One can similarly define the local version of the \mathbb{Z}/p -equivariant product and coproduct operation localized near x

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_x^{\text{loc}} &: H_{\text{Tate}}(\mathbb{Z}/p, VCF_{\bullet}^{\text{loc}}(H, x; \Lambda_{0,R})^{\otimes p}) \rightarrow VHF_{\text{Tate}}^{\text{loc}}(H^{(p)}, x^{(p)}; \Lambda_{0,R}), \\ \mathcal{C}_x^{\text{loc}} &: VHF_{\text{Tate}}^{\text{loc}}(H^{(p)}, x^{(p)}; \Lambda_R^0) \rightarrow H_{\text{Tate}}(\mathbb{Z}/p, VCF^{\text{loc}}(H, x; \Lambda_{0,R})^{\otimes p}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that just as in the non-equivariant setting, equivariant local Floer theories can be defined for isolated but not necessarily nondegenerate iterations.

Second, the main result of [SZ21, Section 10] shows that if x and $x^{(p)}$ are nondegenerate, the composition satisfies

$$\mathcal{C}_x^{\text{loc}} \circ \mathcal{P}_x^{\text{loc}} = (-1)^n u^{n(p-1)} \cdot id,$$

which is an isomorphism as u is invertible in the ground ring of the Tate version, thus $\mathcal{P}_x^{\text{loc}}$ is an isomorphism by rank considerations. The proof in *loc. cit.* goes through an auxiliary operation $\mathcal{Z}_x^{\text{loc}}$ satisfying $\mathcal{C}_x^{\text{loc}} \circ \mathcal{P}_x^{\text{loc}} = \mathcal{Z}_x^{\text{loc}}$, which can be defined in our setting following [SZ21, Definition 10.1]. On the other hand, the calculation $\mathcal{Z}_x^{\text{loc}} = (-1)^n u^{n(p-1)}$ is based on reducing to local Morse theory by a deformation argument, which is also legitimate in the vortex setting. Then by virtue of the proof of Proposition 5.2, when the Hamiltonian H is a C^2 -small Morse function, we can match the upstairs and downstairs moduli spaces, so that the calculation also works in our setting. Note that by Proposition 5.1, the bulk deformation does not affect the argument.

Finally, we can write

$$\mathcal{P} = \sum_x \mathcal{P}_x^{\text{loc}} + O(T^\delta), \quad \delta > 0,$$

in which x ranges over all 1-periodic orbits of H and $O(T^\delta)$ denotes an operation with positive valuation. Because the local operations $\mathcal{P}_x^{\text{loc}}$ are isomorphisms, and the contributions of the simple (i.e., non-iterated) 1-periodic orbits of $H^{(p)}$ to the Tate construction are trivial, we see that \mathcal{P} is an isomorphism over $\Lambda_{0,R}[u^{-1}, u] = \Lambda_{0,R} \otimes_{\Lambda_{0,\mathbb{F}_p}} \Lambda_{0,\mathcal{K}}$. This finishes the sketch of the proof of the equivariant localization isomorphism.

7.6. Growth of total bar length. After demonstrating the existence of the equivariant Hamiltonian Floer package in the vortex setting, we are in the right position to prove the inequality of total bar length.

Proof of Theorem 7.1. With equivariant Hamiltonian Floer theory and local Floer homology in our hands, the arguments from [She22, Section 7] can easily be adapted to the current situation without much modification. Consequently, we will only provide a sketch of the proof, and refer the reader to *loc. cit.* for complete arguments.

Firstly, we recall the following alternative characterization of the total bar length. Given a field \mathbb{K} , if we define the vortex Hamiltonian Floer homology over the Novikov ring

$$\Lambda_{0,\mathbb{K}} := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i T^{g_i} \mid g_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, a_i \in \mathbb{K}, \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} g_i = +\infty \right\}$$

instead of its field of fractions $\Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}$, then finite bars are reflected as nontrivial *torsion components*, which is the language used in [FOOO13]. If we denote the direct sum of the torsion components of the Floer homology $VHF_{\bullet}^{\text{b}}(\phi; \Lambda_{0,\mathbb{K}})$ by

$$\Lambda_{0,\mathbb{K}}/T^{g_1} \Lambda_{0,\mathbb{K}} \oplus \cdots \oplus \Lambda_{0,\mathbb{K}}/T^{g_s} \Lambda_{0,\mathbb{K}}, \quad \text{with } g_1 \geq \cdots \geq g_s \geq 0, \quad (7.6)$$

then we can write the total bar length of $\tilde{\phi}$ over $\Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}$ as

$$\tau_{(p)}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\tilde{\phi}, \Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}) = g_1 + \cdots + g_s,$$

and the boundary depth is given by g_1 , c.f. [She22, Section 4.4.4]. Note that these torsion exponents correspond to *verbose bar-length spectrum* in the sense of [UZ16], which means that g_i can be 0, due to that fact that the Floer differential in our discussion may not strictly decrease the energy.

The claim is more easily to be proved when $\tilde{\phi}^p$ is nondegenerate and bulk-avoiding. We choose a generating Hamiltonian H for the Hamiltonian isotopy $\tilde{\phi}$. The comparison between $\tau_{(p)}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\tilde{\phi}^p)$ and $\tau_{(p)}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\tilde{\phi})$ is established in the following three steps.

- (1) Using the quasi-Frobenius isomorphism from Lemma 7.2, one can show that the total bar length of

$$(C_{\text{Tate}}(\mathbb{Z}/p, VCF_{\bullet}(\hat{H}, \hat{J}; \Lambda_{0,R})^{\otimes p}), \partial_{\text{Tate}}),$$

i.e., the sum of torsion exponents of the homology group $H_{\text{Tate}}(\mathbb{Z}/p, VCF_{\bullet}(\hat{H}, \hat{J}; \Lambda_{0,R})^{\otimes p})$, is equal to p times the quantity $\tau_{(p)}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\tilde{\phi})$.

- (2) By appealing to the isomorphism in Equation 7.5 and an application of the homological perturbation lemma, it is shown in [She22, Section 7.3.1] the total boundary depth, i.e., the sum of torsion exponents of $H_{\text{Tate}}(\mathbb{Z}/p, VCF_{\bullet}(\hat{H}, \hat{J}; \Lambda_{0,R})^{\otimes p})$ agrees with that of $VHF_{\text{Tate}}(\hat{H}^{(p)}; \Lambda_{0,R})$.
- (3) Using [She22, Proposition 17, Lemma 18], one can prove that the total boundary depth of $VHF_{\text{Tate}}(\hat{H}^{(p)}; \Lambda_{0,R})$ is bounded from above by $\tau_{(p)}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\tilde{\phi}^p)$, which is a reminiscent of the Borel spectral sequence in the context of filtered Floer theory.

Finally, to establish Theorem 7.1 for $\tilde{\phi}$ and $\tilde{\phi}^p$ which are not necessarily bulk-avoiding and may admit isolated degenerate fixed points, an approximation argument and multiple applications of the homological perturbation lemma as in [She22, Section 7.4] suffice. \square

Remark 7.6. To prove Theorem 7.1 for degenerate Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms with isolated fixed points assuming the corresponding result for nondegenerate ones, one can alternatively use the following more elementary argument. Suppose H is not necessarily bulk-avoiding and may have isolated but degenerate fixed points and periodic points of period p . Let H_i be a sequence of nondegenerate and bulk-avoiding Hamiltonians on X which converges to H under C^2 -norm. We can choose the perturbations H_i to be supported in an arbitrarily small neighborhood of the one period orbits of H and $H^{(p)}$, over which the perturbation is modeled on $\epsilon_i f$ where f is a Morse function. Then the above implies that

$$\tau_{(p)}^{\mathfrak{b}}(H_i^{(p)}) \geq p\tau_{(p)}^{\mathfrak{b}}(H_i).$$

Notice that the reduced barcode of H_i resp. $H_i^{(p)}$ is a Cauchy sequence with respect to the bottleneck distance with a uniformly bounded number of bars. Our choice of perturbation also guarantees a uniform upper bound for the short bars. Moreover, we know that the barcode of the limit H resp. $H^{(p)}$ is finite. Hence the total bar length of H_i resp. $H_i^{(p)}$ converges to that of H resp. $H^{(p)}$, which implies the desired result.

8. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM

We now can prove Theorem A. Let $\phi : X \rightarrow X$ be a Hamiltonian diffeomorphism with isolated fixed points satisfying

$$N(\phi; \mathbb{Q}) := \sum_{x \in \text{Fix}(\phi)} HF^{\text{loc}}(\phi, x; \mathbb{Q}) > \sum_{i=0}^{\dim X} \dim H_i(X). \quad (8.1)$$

By Proposition 5.2, one can replace the ordinary local Floer homology by the (bulk-deformed) local vortex Floer homology. One also knows from Proposition 4.8 and Theorem 4.12 that the total rank of rational homology of X agrees with the rank of the bulk-deformed vortex Floer homology of V . Hence (8.1) can be rewritten as

$$N(\phi; \mathbb{Q}) = \sum_{x \in \text{Fix}(\phi)} \dim_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}} VHF^{\text{loc}}(\phi, x; \overline{\mathbb{Q}}) > \dim_{\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}} VHF_{\bullet}^{\text{b}}(V; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}).$$

Because the (local) vortex Floer homology are defined over the integers (see Section 5), by the universal coefficient theorem, for p sufficiently large,

$$\sum_{x \in \text{Fix}(\phi)} \dim_{\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p} VHF^{\text{loc}}(\phi, x; \overline{\mathbb{F}}_p) > \dim_{\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p}} VHF_{\bullet}^{\text{b}}(V; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p}).$$

Suppose on the contrary that ϕ only has only finitely many periodic points. Then for any sufficiently large prime p , for all $k \geq 1$, $\text{Fix}(\phi^{p^k}) = \text{Fix}(\phi)$. Then by Corollary 5.3, one has

$$\sum_{x \in \text{Fix}(\phi^{p^k})} \dim_{\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p} VHF^{\text{loc}}(\phi^{p^k}, x; \overline{\mathbb{F}}_p) = \sum_{x \in \text{Fix}(\phi)} \dim_{\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p} VHF^{\text{loc}}(\phi, x; \overline{\mathbb{F}}_p) > \dim_{\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p}} VHF_{\bullet}^{\text{b}}(V; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p}).$$

Consider the barcode of ϕ^{p^k} coming from the bulk-deformed vortex Floer theory (over the Novikov field $\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p}$). The above implies that the number of finite bars is positive and independent of the iteration p^k . The uniform bound on the boundary depth (length of the longest finite bar) given by Theorem C implies that the total bar length $\tau_{(p)}^{\text{b}}(\phi^{p^k})$ is uniformly bounded.

On the other hand, by Theorem D, for any $k \geq 1$, the total bar length grows as

$$\tau_{(p)}^{\text{b}}(\phi^{p^k}) \geq p^k \cdot \tau_{(p)}^{\text{b}}(\phi) \geq Cp^k > 0.$$

This is a contradiction. Hence ϕ must have infinitely many periodic points.

Remark 8.1. Because the above argument works for any $p \geq p_0$, we know that the number of periodic points of ϕ grows like $\frac{k}{\log(k)}$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, as a result of the prime number theorem.

Remark 8.2. Arguments of the above form first appeared in [She22, Section 8], which we reproduce in our context for completeness. As noted above, Shelukhin's result on the Hofer–Zehnder conjecture relies on the assumptions that the ambient symplectic manifold is monotone and that the quantum homology is semisimple, which respectively account for the inequalities (1.7) (the monotonicity condition allows one to define Floer theory integrally using classical methods) and (1.6) (which will be discussed in more detail in the body part of this paper). For general toric symplectic manifolds, traditional Hamiltonian Floer homology is only defined over the rationals, which sets difficulties for establishing symplectic Smith-type inequalities. Moreover, the quantum homology of toric symplectic manifolds fails to be semisimple in general, which is already the case even for Fano/monotone toric manifolds [OT09].

9. OPEN STRING THEORY I. QUASIMAP FLOER THEORY

In this section we recall the construction of quasimap Lagrangian Floer theory developed by Woodward [Woo11]. The basic idea agrees with the philosophy of gauged linear sigma model [Wit93]: one replaces the count of holomorphic curves in the toric manifold X by an equivariant count of holomorphic curves upstairs. There are two significant consequences: first, one can achieve transversality of moduli spaces at a very low cost; second, the counts of curves are all integer-valued.

We use the Morse–Bott model for Lagrangians Floer theory to construct open-string theories and closed-open maps. We extend the use of domain-dependent perturbations for bulk-deformed vortex Floer cohomology to the open-string situation. We first need to fix certain notions and notations to describe the combinatorial data of various moduli spaces.

9.1. Trees and treed disks. We first set up the convention of trees used in this paper.

Convention 9.1 (Convention for trees). A tree, usually denoted by Γ , consists of a nonempty set of vertices V_Γ and a nonempty set of edges E_Γ . The set of vertices is decomposed into the set of finite vertices and the set of vertices at infinity, and the decomposition is denote by

$$V_\Gamma = V_\Gamma^{\text{finite}} \sqcup V_\Gamma^\infty.$$

We always assume

- (1) V_Γ^∞ contains a distinguished vertex v_{root} called the *root*.
- (2) The valence (degree) of any $v \in V_\Gamma^\infty$ is either one or two.

The set V_Γ is partially ordered in the following way: we denote by $v_\alpha \succ v_\beta$ if v_α and v_β are adjacent and v_β is closer to the root. In this way vertices at infinities are either *incoming* (called *inputs*) or *outgoing* (called *outputs*); in particular the output v_{root} is outgoing.

Edges are decomposed into four groups: the set of finite edges E_Γ^{finite} consisting of edges connecting two finite vertices, the set of incoming semi-infinite edges E_Γ^{in} consisting of edges connecting $v_\alpha \in V_\Gamma^\infty$ with $v_\beta \in V_\Gamma^{\text{finite}}$ with $v_\alpha \succ v_\beta$, the set of outgoing semi-infinite edges E_Γ^{out} consisting edges connecting $v_\alpha \in V_\Gamma^{\text{finite}}$ and $v_\beta \in V_\Gamma^\infty$ with $v_\alpha \succ v_\beta$, and the set of infinite edges E_Γ^∞ connecting two vertices at infinity. We also call incoming resp. outgoing semi-infinite edges inputs resp. outputs.

A tree Γ is called *unbroken* if all vertices $v \in V_\Gamma^\infty$ has valence 1. A vertex $v \in V_\Gamma^\infty$ of valence 2 is called a *breaking* of the tree Γ . Breakings separate Γ into *unbroken components*.

A *ribbon tree* is a tree Γ together with an isotopy class of embeddings $\Gamma \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$. Equivalently, it means for each vertex $v \in V_\Gamma$ the adjacent edges are cyclically ordered. As Γ is rooted, it follows that all incoming edges are strictly ordered.

A ribbon tree is *stable* if the valence of each finite vertex is at least three.

9.1.1. Metric ribbon trees. A *metric* on a ribbon tree Γ is a function

$$\mathbf{l} : E_\Gamma^{\text{finite}} \rightarrow [0, +\infty).$$

The underlying decomposition

$$E_\Gamma^{\text{finite}} = E_\Gamma^{\text{finite},0} \sqcup E_\Gamma^{\text{finite},+} = \mathbf{l}^{-1}(\{0\}) \sqcup \mathbf{l}^{-1}((0, +\infty))$$

is called a *metric type*, denoted by $[\mathbf{l}]$. We often call the pair $(\Gamma, [\mathbf{l}])$ a **domain type**. A **metric ribbon tree** of type $(\Gamma, [\mathbf{l}])$ is a pair (Γ, \mathbf{l}) such that \mathbf{l} has the metric type $[\mathbf{l}]$.

As in [Woo11, Section 3.3], one needs to work with unstable trees. We hence replace the usual stability condition by another *minimality* condition. We say that a metric ribbon trees (Γ, \mathbf{l}) (resp. domain type $(\Gamma, [\mathbf{l}])$) is **minimal** if it has no finite edges of length zero or infinite edges. Hence for each domain type Γ , there is a canonical minimal one Γ^{\min} obtained from Γ by shrinking edges violating the minimality condition.

We define perturbations over the universal trees. Consider a minimal domain type $\Gamma = (\Gamma, [\mathbf{l}])$ (which is not necessarily stable). Then there is a moduli space of metric trees of type Γ , denoted by \mathcal{MT}_Γ , which is homeomorphic to $(0, +\infty)^{\#E_\Gamma^{\text{finite},+}}$, whose elements parametrize the lengths of finite edges with positive lengths. There is also a *universal tree*

$$\mathcal{UT}_\Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{MT}_\Gamma$$

whose fiber over a point $p \in \mathcal{MT}_\Gamma$ is homeomorphic to a metric tree representing p (the infinities of semi-infinite or infinite edges are regarded as points in the metric tree).

The above moduli spaces have natural compactifications. In fact, we can define a partial order among all minimal domain types. We say that a minimal domain type Γ **degenerates** to another minimal domain type Π , denoted by $\Pi \preceq \Gamma$, if Π is obtained from Γ by composing the following types of operations

- (1) Shrinking the length of a finite edge in Γ to zero and collapse this edge.
- (2) Breaking a finite edge of positive length to a pair of semi-infinite edges joined at a new vertex at infinity.

Notice that if $\Pi \preceq \Gamma$, then there is a canonical surjective map $\rho : V_\Gamma^{\text{finite}} \rightarrow V_\Pi^{\text{finite}}$. Then \mathcal{MT}_Γ has the natural compactification

$$\overline{\mathcal{MT}}_\Gamma := \bigsqcup_{\Pi \preceq \Gamma} \mathcal{MT}_\Pi.$$

The universal tree is also extended to the compactification, which is denoted by

$$\overline{\mathcal{UT}}_\Gamma \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{MT}}_\Gamma.$$

There is a special closed subset $\overline{\mathcal{UT}}_\Gamma^{\text{node}} \subset \overline{\mathcal{UT}}_\Gamma$ corresponding to infinities or vertices. Notice that the complement of $\overline{\mathcal{UT}}_\Gamma^{\text{node}}$ inside the interior \mathcal{UT}_Γ is a smooth manifold.

9.1.2. Treed disks.

Definition 9.2. Given a domain type $\Gamma = (\Gamma, [\mathbf{l}])$. A *treed disk* of type Γ , denoted by $C = S \cup T$, is the configuration given by the union of disk components $S_\alpha \cong \mathbb{D}$ for all vertices $v_\alpha \in V_\Gamma^{\text{finite}}$, a metric \mathbf{l} on Γ of type $[\mathbf{l}]$ and an interval I_e of length $\mathbf{l}(e)$ for each finite edge $e \in E_\Gamma^{\text{finite}}$. The notion of isomorphisms between treed disks is standard and omitted.

9.2. Quasimap Floer theory for Lagrangians. We recall the quasimap Floer theory developed by Woodward [Woo11]. Let $\mathbf{u} \in \text{Int}P \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an interior point of the moment polytope P of the toric manifold X . Recall that the number of faces N of P coincides with the dimension of V . Let $L = L(\mathbf{u}) \subset X$ be the torus fiber over \mathbf{u} . Let $\widehat{L} = \widehat{L}(\mathbf{u}) \subset \mu^{-1}(0) \subset V$ be the lift of $L(\mathbf{u})$, which is a K -invariant Lagrangian torus in V . Explicitly, we have

$$\widehat{L} = \prod_{i=1}^N \left\{ z_i \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z_i|^2 = \tau_i \right\}$$

where τ_i are determined by \mathbf{u} and the constant term in the moment map μ .

A **holomorphic quasidisk** is an ordinary holomorphic map $u : (\mathbb{D}, \partial\mathbb{D}) \rightarrow (V, \widehat{L})$ (with respect to the standard complex structure \widehat{J}_V). Two holomorphic quasidisks u and u' are K -equivalent

if there exists $g \in K$ such that $gu = u'$. Each K -equivalence class of holomorphic quasidisks represents a disk class

$$\beta \in H_2(V, \widehat{L})/K \cong H_2(V, \widehat{L}).$$

Each such class has a well-defined energy

$$\omega(\beta) = \omega_V(\beta) \in \mathbb{R}$$

and a well-defined Maslov index

$$i(\beta) \in 2\mathbb{Z}.$$

Given k and $\beta \in H_2(V, \widehat{L})$, let $\mathcal{M}_{k+1}^{\text{disk}}(\beta)$ be the moduli space of K -equivalence classes of holomorphic quasidisks of class β with $k+1$ boundary marked points, and let $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{k+1}^{\text{disk}}(\beta)$ be its compactification. Notice that as V is aspherical, configurations in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{k+1}^{\text{disk}}(\beta)$ have only disks bubbles but not sphere bubbles. The evaluation of a K -equivalence class of quasidisks at the last boundary marked point is well-defined as a point in the quotient Lagrangian $L \subset X$. Hence there is a continuous map

$$\text{ev} : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{k+1}^{\text{disk}}(\beta) \rightarrow L.$$

Theorem 9.3 (Blaschke product). *Let $u : \mathbb{D}^2 \rightarrow V$ be a holomorphic quasidisk. Then there exist $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_N \in [0, 2\pi)$ and $(a_{i,k})_{k=1, \dots, d_i} \subset \mathbb{D}^2 \subset \mathbb{C}$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$ such that*

$$u(z) = \left(\sqrt{\tau_1} e^{i\theta_1} \prod_{k=1}^{d_1} \frac{z - a_{1,k}}{1 - \overline{a_{1,k}}z}, \dots, \sqrt{\tau_N} e^{i\theta_N} \prod_{k=1}^{d_N} \frac{z - a_{N,k}}{1 - \overline{a_{N,k}}z} \right). \quad (9.1)$$

Moreover, the Maslov index of u is $2(d_1 + \dots + d_N)$.

In particular, there are N “basic” Maslov two disk classes $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_N \in H_2(V, L)$ where each β_i is represented by a quasidisk given as above with $d_j = \delta_{ij}$. These Maslov two classes form a basis of $H_2(V, \widehat{L})$.

Theorem 9.4. *The moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{k+1}^{\text{disk}}(\beta)$ is regular of dimension $n + 2i(\beta) + k - 2$ and the evaluation map*

$$\text{ev} : \mathcal{M}_{k+1}^{\text{disk}}(\beta) \rightarrow L$$

is a smooth submersion.

Proof. See [CO06, Section 6]. □

A consequence is that each stratum of the compactification $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{k+1}^{\text{disk}}(\beta)$ is regular. To be more precise, let Γ denote a ribbon tree representing the combinatorial type of a nodal disk (with k inputs and 1 output) with each vertex labelled by a disk class whose sum is equal to β . Then there is a stratum $\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma}^{\text{disk}} \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{k+1}^{\text{disk}}(\beta)$.

Corollary 9.5. *Each stratum $\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma}^{\text{disk}} \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{k+1}^{\text{disk}}(\beta)$ is regular and the evaluation map $\text{ev} : \mathcal{M}_{\Gamma}^{\text{disk}} \rightarrow L$ is a submersion.*

Proof. See [Woo11, Corollary 6.2]. □

9.2.1. *Treed holomorphic quasimaps.* The idea of treed holomorphic disks goes back to Cornea–Lalonde [CL05, CL06]. We recall the adaptation by Woodward [Woo11] in order to define the quasimap A_∞ algebras. Throughout our discussion, we fix a smooth perfect Morse function $f_L : L \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined over the Lagrangian torus $L \subset X$, which has exactly 2^n critical points.

Given a treed disk $C = S \cup T$ of type Γ , suppose we have a domain-dependent perturbation f of the Morse function $f_L : L \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ parametrized by points t on the tree part T , a **treed holomorphic quasimap** on C is a collection of objects

$$\left((u_v)_{v \in V_\Gamma^{\text{finite}}}, (x_e)_{e \in E_\Gamma} \right)$$

where for each finite vertex $v \in V_\Gamma^{\text{finite}}$, we assign a smooth map $u_v : S_v \rightarrow V$ satisfying

$$\bar{\partial}u_v = 0, \quad u_v(\partial S_v) \subset \widehat{L},$$

$x_e : I_e \rightarrow L$ is a smooth map satisfying

$$x_e'(t) + \nabla f(x_e(t)) = 0;$$

moreover, the matching condition requires 1) for each node joining a boundary point z of some surface component S_v and a finite end of an edge e , the value of $x_e(z)$ lies in the same K -orbit as the value of $u_v(z)$; 2) for each infinite vertex $v \in V_\Gamma^\infty$ joining two (semi-)infinite edges e_1 and e_2 , the limits of x_{e_1} and x_{e_2} at the corresponding infinities agree. Here to ensure the convergence of the maps x_e , we require that the perturbation f is supported away from the infinities.

Two treed holomorphic quasimaps are regarded as **equivalent** if after identifying domains, the maps on corresponding surfaces parts are K -equivalent (recall K is the gauge group).

To define the A_∞ structure (or other structures) one would like to regularize the moduli spaces of equivalence classes of treed holomorphic quasimaps and their boundaries. One first needs to use coherent systems of perturbations to describe such moduli spaces.

9.2.2. *Perturbations for the A_∞ algebra.* To achieve transversality relevant for defining the A_∞ algebra, we only need to perturb the Morse function on edges. Hence for a given *minimal* metric type Γ , a domain-dependent perturbation can be viewed as a map

$$P_\Gamma : \overline{\mathcal{UT}}_\Gamma \rightarrow C^\infty(L).$$

We require any such perturbation to vanish near infinities, i.e., vanish near the closed subset

$$\overline{\mathcal{UT}}_\Gamma^\infty \subset \overline{\mathcal{UT}}_\Gamma$$

corresponding to positions of vertices at infinity. Notice that if Γ is not necessarily stable, a perturbation $P_{\Gamma_{\text{min}}}$ for the minimal form is enough to determine the treed holomorphic map on any treed disks C of type Γ . Indeed, on any infinite edges of C (if any) the negative gradient flow equation is taken for the unperturbed Morse function f_L .

In order to establish the A_∞ relation, we also need to require that, if Γ degenerates to Π , then the restriction of P_Γ to the stratum $\overline{\mathcal{UT}}_\Pi \subset \overline{\mathcal{UT}}_\Gamma$ must agree with the perturbation P_Π which have been chosen for the minimal domain type Π . Hence we need to construct a *coherent* system of perturbations indexed for all minimal domain types Γ . To use the Sard–Smale theorem to prove that generic perturbations are regular, we also need to specify the neighborhood of $\overline{\mathcal{UT}}_\Gamma^\infty$ where we require the perturbation to vanish; such choices of neighborhoods need also be coherent.

Another complexity in this procedure is that we need to work with unstable domains (as in [Woo11], see also [Abo11]), unlike the cases of [CW15][WX18][VWX20] where domains are always stable. Here we give a different way of writing Woodward’s perturbation scheme for unstable trees (see Section [Woo11, Section 3]). Given a minimal domain type Γ , an **indexing function**

is a map $\vec{n} : V_{\Gamma}^{\text{finite}} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, whose values are denoted by n_v , satisfying that $n_v \geq 1$ when v is an unstable vertex. One should regard the values of \vec{n} as one half of the Maslov indices of disk components. We consider perturbations which depend also on such indexing functions.

Definition 9.6. A **coherent family of domain-dependent perturbations** is a collection of continuous maps

$$P_{\Gamma, \vec{n}}^{\text{qd}} : \overline{\mathcal{UT}}_{\Gamma} \rightarrow C^{\infty}(L)$$

indexed by all minimal domain types Γ and all indexing functions $\vec{n} : V_{\Gamma}^{\text{finite}} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ satisfying the following conditions.

- (1) For Γ the tree with a single vertex, no input, and one output, the Morse function on the outgoing edge is the unperturbed function f_L .
- (2) When Γ degenerates to Π , there is a canonical surjective map $\rho : V_{\Pi}^{\text{finite}} \rightarrow V_{\Gamma}^{\text{finite}}$. Hence any indexing function $\vec{n}_{\Pi} : V_{\Pi} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ induces a partition $\vec{n}_{\Gamma} : V_{\Gamma} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. We require that

$$P_{\Gamma, \vec{n}_{\Gamma}}^{\text{qd}}|_{\overline{\mathcal{U}}_{\Pi}} = P_{\Pi, \vec{n}_{\Pi}}^{\text{qd}}.$$

- (3) When Γ is broken with unbroken components $\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_s$, the partition \vec{n} on Γ is defined by assembling the partitions $\vec{n}_1, \dots, \vec{n}_s$ on $\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_s$. Then $P_{\Gamma, \vec{n}}^{\text{qd}}$ should be naturally induced from P_{Γ_i, \vec{n}_i} .

9.2.3. Compactification and transversality. Let Γ be a possibly unstable, non-minimal domain type. A **map type** over Γ , denoted by $\mathbf{\Gamma}$, assigns to each finite vertex $v_{\alpha} \in V_{\Gamma}^{\text{finite}}$ a disk class β_v (with nonnegative Maslov index) and to each vertex at infinity $v_{\beta} \in V_{\Gamma}^{\infty}$ a critical point $x_{\beta} \in \text{crit} f_L$. A map type $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ induces an indexing function \vec{n} on the minimal form Γ^{min} by setting n_v to be half of the Maslov index of β_v and adding together if several vertices are connected by finite edges of length zero. Then use the perturbation $P_{\Gamma^{\text{min}}, \vec{n}}^{\text{qd}}$ to define a moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{\Gamma}}$ of treed holomorphic disks. The topology of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{\Gamma}}$ is defined in the usual way.

Given a perturbation, the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{\Gamma}}$ is the zero locus a Fredholm section on certain Banach manifold. We say that the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{\Gamma}}$ is regular if the Fredholm section is transverse (it is independent of the corresponding Sobolev completions of the space of smooth maps). We say that a coherent system of perturbations is **regular** if all moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{\Gamma}}$ are regular.

Now we consider possible degenerations of treed holomorphic disks. In general, a sequence of treed holomorphic disks of a fixed map type $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ can converge to a limit by breaking an edge, shrinking an edge to zero, or bubbling off holomorphic disks. Notice that because V is a vector space and we do not have interior markings, there cannot be any sphere bubbles in the limit. The notion of convergence is standard and its definition is omitted here. As the perturbation system is coherent, any limiting object (of a possibly different map type $\mathbf{\Pi}$) is also a treed holomorphic disk defined using a corresponding perturbation $P_{\Pi^{\text{min}}, \vec{n}}^{\text{qd}}$, hence an element in $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{\Pi}}$. We denote

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathbf{\Gamma}} := \bigsqcup_{\mathbf{\Pi} \preceq \mathbf{\Gamma}} \mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{\Pi}}$$

where by abuse of notation, \preceq is the natural partial order among map types induced from the notion of convergence.

Proposition 9.7. *There exists a coherent system of perturbation data such that every moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{\Gamma}}$ is regular.*

Proof. The proof is an inductive construction with respect to the partial order $\mathbf{\Pi} \preceq \mathbf{\Gamma}$ among minimal domain types and the indexing function \vec{n} . First one can easily check, by the Blaschke

formula Theorem 9.3 that the specification of item (1) in Definition 9.6 can make the relevant configurations transverse. Then once regular perturbations on all boundary strata of \mathcal{UT}_Γ have been fixed, one can use the Sard–Smale theorem to find regular extensions to the interior. See details in [Woo11, Corollary 6.2]. \square

Now we consider the compactification of moduli spaces. A map type Γ is called **essential** if it is unbroken and has no boundary edges of length zero. Given a collection $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_k; x_\infty)$ of critical points of the Morse function f_L , for $i = 0, 1$, let

$$\mathcal{M}^{qd}(x_1, \dots, x_k; x_\infty)_i := \bigcup_{\Gamma} \mathcal{M}_\Gamma$$

where the union is taken over all essential map types of index i whose vertices at infinities are labelled by \mathbf{x} .

Lemma 9.8. *If $i = 0$, the moduli space $\mathcal{M}^{qd}(x_1, \dots, x_k; x_\infty)_0$ is discrete and has finitely many points below any given energy bound. If $i = 1$, the compactified moduli space $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{qd}(x_1, \dots, x_k; x_\infty)_1$ is a 1-dimensional (topological) manifold with boundary, which is compact below any given energy bound.*

Proof. For the zero-dimensional moduli space, the claimed finiteness follows from the compactness argument and the transversality. For the one-dimensional moduli space, the fact that it is a 1-dimensional manifold with boundary follows from the transversality, compactness, as well as the standard gluing construction. \square

Moreover, the moduli spaces are all oriented. The orientation depends on choices of orientations of unstable manifolds of critical points of f_L and the orientations of moduli spaces of quasidisks; the latter depends on the orientation of the Lagrangian torus and the spin structure, which we fix from the beginning. Notice that these choices can be made independent of the position $\mathbf{u} \in \text{Int}P$ in the interior of the moment polytope.

9.2.4. *Quasimap Fukaya A_∞ algebra.* We would like to define a (family of) cohomologically unital A_∞ algebra(s) over $\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}$ from the moment Lagrangian tori. Given a Lagrangian torus $L = L(\mathbf{u}) \subset X$, a **local system** on L is a homomorphism

$$\mathbf{y} : H_1(L; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow \exp(\Lambda_{0, \overline{\mathbb{Q}}}).$$

Introduce the notation $\mathbf{L} = (L, \mathbf{y})$. We denote the corresponding bulk-deformed A_∞ algebra of \mathbf{L} by $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{L})$, which is defined as follows. First, the underlying \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded vector space is

$$QCF_{\mathbf{b}}^\bullet(\mathbf{L}; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}) := \text{Span}_{\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}} \text{crit} f_L \cong (\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}})^{2^n}$$

where the degree of a critical point $x \in \text{crit} f_L$ is $|x| = n - \text{index}(x) \bmod 2$. Given critical points x_1, \dots, x_k , define

$$m_k(x_k, \dots, x_1) = \sum_{x_\infty} (-1)^{\heartsuit} \left(\sum_{[u] \in \mathcal{M}^{qd}(x_1, \dots, x_k; x_\infty)_0} \mathbf{b}([u]) T^{E([u])} \mathbf{y}^{\partial[u]} \epsilon([u]) \right) x_\infty. \quad (9.2)$$

We explain the terms below.

(1) The sign \heartsuit is defined as

$$\heartsuit := \sum_{i=1}^k i |x_i| \in \mathbb{Z}_2. \quad (9.3)$$

- (2) For each disk u with boundary on \widehat{L} , as \widehat{L} does not intersect the bulk, there is a well-defined topological intersection number

$$\mathfrak{b}([u]) := \prod_{j=1}^N c_j^{u \cap V_j}$$

which only depends on K -equivalence class $[u]$. Notice that if $c_j \in \mathbb{Z}[\mathfrak{i}]$, so is $\mathfrak{b}(u)$.

- (3) $E([u]) \in \mathbb{R}$ is the energy of $[u]$.
(4) $\mathbf{y}^{\partial[u]} \in \exp(\Lambda_{0, \overline{\mathbb{Q}}})$ is the value of the local system \mathbf{y} on the loop $\partial[u] \subset L$.
(5) $\epsilon([u]) \in \{\pm 1\}$ is determined by the orientation of the zero-dimensional moduli space.

Similar to previous cases involving bulk deformations, the expression (9.2) is a legitimate element of $QCF_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\bullet}(\mathbf{L}; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}})$. Extending linearly, one obtains a linear map

$$m_k : QCF_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\bullet}(\mathbf{L}; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}})^{\otimes k} \rightarrow QCF_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\bullet}(\mathbf{L}; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}).$$

Notice that when $k = 0$, this is a linear map

$$m_0 : \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}} \rightarrow QCF_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\bullet}(\mathbf{L}; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}).$$

Theorem 9.9 ([Woo11]). *The collection of linear maps m_0, m_1, \dots defines a curved A_{∞} algebra structure on $QCF_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\bullet}(\mathbf{L}; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}})$, denoted by $\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathbf{L})$. Moreover, if x_{\max} is the unique maximal point of f_L , then $\mathbf{e} = x_{\min}$ is a cohomological unit of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathbf{L})$, namely $m_1(\mathbf{e}) = 0$ and*

$$(-1)^{|x|} m_2(\mathbf{e}, x) = m_2(x, \mathbf{e}) = x, \quad \forall x \in QCF_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\bullet}(\mathbf{L}; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}).$$

Proof. See [Woo11, Theorem 3.6] for the case without bulk deformation. One can verify that the case with bulk deformation can be proved in the same way. \square

Remark 9.10. The A_{∞} algebra can be defined over \mathbb{Z} as long as the bulk deformation has integer coefficients, though we do not need such a fact in our discussion.

9.2.5. *Potential function and nontrivial Floer cohomology.* Although the quasimap Fukaya algebra is only cohomologically unital, one can still define the potential function.

Proposition 9.11. *For the quasimap A_{∞} algebra $QCF(\mathbf{L}; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}})$, $m_0(1)$ is a multiple of \mathbf{e} .*

Proof. See [Woo11, Proposition 3.7] for the case with $\mathfrak{b} = 0$. When we use a nontrivial (small) bulk deformation, as we only change the weights in counting but do not modify the perturbation method, the same proof goes through. \square

Definition 9.12. Define $W_{\mathfrak{b}}(u) : H_1(L(\mathbf{u}); \exp(\Lambda_{0, \overline{\mathbb{Q}}})) \rightarrow \Lambda$ by

$$m_0(1) = W_{\mathfrak{b}}(u)(\mathbf{y})\mathbf{e}$$

and call it the **potential function** of the brane $\mathbf{L} = (L(\mathbf{u}), y)$. By abuse of terminology, we also call $W_{\mathfrak{b}}$ the bulk-deformed potential function of the Lagrangian $L(\mathbf{u})$ or the toric manifold.

Let $(\mathbb{C}^*)^n \cong X^* \subset X$ be the complement of toric divisors. Choose a trivialization

$$\tau_X : \text{Int}P \times T^n \rightarrow X^*$$

which is unique up to isotopy, which induces a well-defined trivialization

$$\bigsqcup_{u \in \text{Int}P} H_1(L(\mathbf{u}); \exp(\Lambda_{0, \overline{\mathbb{Q}}})) = \text{Int}P \times (\exp(\Lambda_{0, \overline{\mathbb{Q}}}))^n.$$

The bulk-deformed **quasimap disk potential** of the toric manifold X is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\mathfrak{b}} : \text{Int}P \times (\exp \Lambda_0)^n &\rightarrow \Lambda \\ (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}) &\mapsto W_{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathbf{u})(\mathbf{y}). \end{aligned}$$

Now we can define the quasimap Floer cohomology. By the A_∞ relation, for any $x \in QCF(\mathbf{L}; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}})$,

$$m_1(m_1(x)) + (-1)^{\|x\|} m_2(m_0(1), x) + m_2(x, m_0(1)) = 0.$$

By Theorem 9.9, the last two terms cancel. Hence $m_1^2 = 0$. Hence one can define the \mathfrak{b} -deformed **quasimap Floer cohomology** of the brane \mathbf{L} to be

$$QHF_{\mathfrak{b}}^\bullet(\mathbf{L}; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}) := \ker m_1 / \text{im} m_1.$$

Following [Cho05] [CO06] [Woo11], to find nontrivial Floer cohomology, one needs to establish a version of the divisor equation. Recall that $L \cong (S^1)^n$ with $H_1(L; \mathbb{Z}) \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$. The perfect Morse function f_L has exactly n critical points of Morse index 1, whose homology classes are identified with the n standard generators of $H_1(L; \mathbb{Z})$. If x_1, \dots, x_n are these generators, then any local system \mathbf{y} is determined by the values

$$y_1 = \mathbf{y}(x_1), \dots, y_n = \mathbf{y}(x_n).$$

Theorem 9.13. *If x is a generator of $H_1(L; \mathbb{Z})$, then*

$$m_1(x) = \partial_x W_{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathbf{u})(y_1, \dots, y_n)$$

Proof. In the absence of bulk deformation, this is established in [Woo11, Section 3.6], which also carries over in our case. \square

Lagrangian branes with nontrivial Floer cohomology can be identified with critical points of the potential function.

Theorem 9.14. *(cf. [Woo11, Theorem 6.6]) If $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$ is a critical point of $W_{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathbf{u})$, then the Floer cohomology of $\mathbf{L}(\mathbf{u}) = (L(\mathbf{u}), \mathbf{y})$ is isomorphic to $H^\bullet(L(\mathbf{u}); \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}})$.*

Proof. The case with $\mathfrak{b} = 0$ is given by [Woo11, Theorem 6.6]. When we have a nonzero small bulk deformation, it is still a consequence of the divisor equation (Theorem 9.13). \square

9.3. Critical points of the Givental–Hori–Vafa potential. In this subsection we study various properties of the deformed Givental–Hori–Vafa potential which arises from disk counting in gauged linear sigma model.

We first recall the expression of the Givental–Hori–Vafa potential in terms of the data of the moment polytope and explain its relation with the quasimap disk potential. Let $\Delta \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be the moment polytope of X , described by

$$\Delta = \left\{ u \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid l_j(u) = \langle u, v_j \rangle - \lambda_j \geq 0, j = 1, \dots, N \right\}.$$

Here $v_j = (v_{j,1}, \dots, v_{j,n}) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, $j = 1, \dots, N$ are the inward normal vectors of each codimension 1 face of Δ coming from the toric data and $\lambda_j \in \mathbb{R}$. The **Givental–Hori–Vafa potential** of X (or rather its moment polytope) is the element

$$W_0 = \sum_{j=1}^N T^{-\lambda_j} y^{v_j} := \sum_{j=1}^N T^{-\lambda_j} y_1^{v_{j,1}} \cdots y_n^{v_{j,n}} \in \Lambda[y_1, \dots, y_n, y_1^{-1}, \dots, y_n^{-1}].$$

More generally, given any small bulk deformation $\mathfrak{b} = \sum_{j=1}^N \log c_j V_j$, the deformed Givental–Hori–Vafa potential is defined to be

$$W_{\mathfrak{b}} = \sum_{j=1}^N c_j T^{-\lambda_j} y^{v_j}.$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that the origin $0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is contained in the interior of Δ . Hence all λ_j are positive.

Definition 9.15. A point $\boldsymbol{\eta} = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n) \in (\Lambda \setminus \{0\})^n$ is called a **critical point** of $W_{\mathfrak{b}}$ if

$$\left(y_1 \frac{\partial W_{\mathfrak{b}}}{\partial y_1} \right) (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n) = \dots = \left(y_n \frac{\partial W_{\mathfrak{b}}}{\partial y_n} \right) (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n) = 0.$$

A critical point $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ is called **nondegenerate** if

$$\det \left(\eta_i \eta_j \frac{\partial^2 W_{\mathfrak{b}}}{\partial y_i \partial y_j} (\boldsymbol{\eta}) \right) \neq 0.$$

$W_{\mathfrak{b}}$ is called a **Morse function** if all the critical points are nondegenerate.

Observe that the Givental–Hori–Vafa potential is very similar to the quasidisk potential; the latter has a dependence on $u \in \text{Int}\Delta$. Indeed, the disk potential of the Lagrangian $L(u)$ with a local system $\mathbf{y} \in (\exp(\Lambda_0))^n$ is

$$W_{\mathfrak{b}}(T^{u_1} y_1, \dots, T^{u_n} y_n).$$

This is proved by [Woo11, Corollary 6.4] in the absence of bulk deformations, and the bulk-deformed version follows from the same argument by the Blaschke formula.

Hence a critical point of $W_{\mathfrak{b}}$ corresponds to a Floer nontrivial Lagrangian if the valuation of the coordinates of the critical point is in the interior of the moment polytope. On the other hand, in view of mirror symmetry, the Jacobian ring of the Givental–Hori–Vafa potential, or formally the ring of functions on the critical locus, is closely related to the quantum cohomology under mirror symmetry. However, their ranks agree only in the Fano case. In general, certain critical points fall outside the moment polytope and do not correspond to cohomology classes of the toric manifold.

Example 9.16. Consider the n -th Hirzebruch surface F_n ($n \geq 1$) whose moment polytope is

$$\Delta = \left\{ u = (u_1, u_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \left| \begin{array}{l} l_1(u) = u_1 \geq 0, \\ l_2(u) = u_2 \geq 0, \\ l_3(u) = 1 - \alpha - u_2 \geq 0, \\ l_4(u) = n - u_1 - nu_2 \geq 0. \end{array} \right. \right\}$$

Here $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ is a parameter. The (undeformed) Givental–Hori–Vafa potential is

$$W_0(y_1, y_2) = y_1 + y_2 + T^{1-\alpha} y_2^{-1} + T^n y_1^{-1} y_2^{-n}.$$

The equations for critical points are

$$y_1 = T^n y_1^{-1} y_2^{-n}, \quad y_2 = T^{1-\alpha} y_2^{-1} + n T^n y_1^{-1} y_2^{-n}.$$

Assume n is even to simplify notations. Solving y_1 one obtains

$$y_1 = \pm T^{\frac{n}{2}} y_2^{-\frac{n}{2}}$$

and hence

$$y_2 = T^{1-\alpha} y_2^{-1} \pm n T^{\frac{n}{2}} y_2^{-\frac{n}{2}} \implies y_2^{\frac{n}{2}-1} (y_2^2 - T^{1-\alpha}) = \pm T^{\frac{n}{2}}. \quad (9.4)$$

Each of the two equations has $\frac{n}{2} + 1$ roots, providing $n + 2$ critical points, much larger than the rank of homology (which is 4).

Notice that there are two solutions to (9.4) of the form

$$y_2 = \pm T^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}} + \text{higher order terms.}$$

They give 4 critical points whose “tropical” positions are inside the moment polytope Δ . There are also $n - 2$ roots of (9.4) whose valuations are

$$\frac{\frac{n}{2} - (1 - \alpha)}{\frac{n}{2} - 1} > 1 - \alpha.$$

They correspond to critical points which are outside the moment polytope. This ends the example.

Definition 9.17. We say that a critical point $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n)$ of $W_{\mathfrak{b}}$ is **inside the moment polytope** Δ if

$$\vec{\mathfrak{v}}_T(\eta) = (\mathfrak{v}_T(\eta_1), \dots, \mathfrak{v}_T(\eta_n)) \in \text{Int}\Delta \subset \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Denote by

$$\text{Crit}_X W_{\mathfrak{b}} \subset \text{Crit} W_{\mathfrak{b}}$$

the set of critical points of $W_{\mathfrak{b}}$ that are inside the moment polytope of X .

Proposition 9.18. *Let \mathfrak{b} be an arbitrary small bulk deformation. When $W_{\mathfrak{b}}$ is a Morse function, one has*

$$\#\text{Crit}_X W_{\mathfrak{b}} = \dim H_{\bullet}(X).$$

Proof. We use a result of Fukaya *et. al.* [FOOO16, Theorem 2.8.1 (2)]. First, Fukaya *et. al.* defined their bulk-deformed Lagrangian Floer disk potential $\mathfrak{P}\mathfrak{D}_{\mathfrak{b}}$ by counting (stable) holomorphic disks inside the toric manifold (using T^n -equivariant Kuranishi structures). For our bulk-deformed Givental–Hori–Vafa potential function $W_{\mathfrak{b}}$, their theorem shows that there exists a bulk deformation \mathfrak{b}' and a “change of coordinate” $y \mapsto y'$ such that

$$W_{\mathfrak{b}}(y') = \mathfrak{P}\mathfrak{D}_{\mathfrak{b}'}(y).$$

Notice that the change of coordinate does not change the Morse property and the tropical positions of the critical points. Hence one has

$$\#\text{Crit}_X(W_{\mathfrak{b}}) = \#\text{Crit}_X(\mathfrak{P}\mathfrak{D}_{\mathfrak{b}'}).$$

On the other hand, by [FOOO16, Theorem 1.1.3], this number of critical points coincides with the rank of homology. \square

Lastly we prove the following fact.

Theorem 9.19. *There exists a small bulk deformation $\mathfrak{b} = \sum_{j=1}^N \log c_j V_j$ with $c_j \in \mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{i}]$ such that $W_{\mathfrak{b}}$ is a Morse function and all critical values are distinct.*

Proof. We first show that the statement is true for generic \mathfrak{b} with complex coefficients. First, we relate the Givental–Hori–Vafa potential to a complex Laurent polynomial by evaluation at $T = t$ for some complex number t . To consider convergence issue, introduce

$$\Lambda_{0, \overline{\mathbb{Q}}}^{\text{conv}} := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i T^{\lambda_i} \in \Lambda_{0, \overline{\mathbb{Q}}} \mid \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |a_i| |t|^{\lambda_i} \text{ converges for } |t| \leq \epsilon \text{ for some } \epsilon > 0 \right\}.$$

Let $\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}^{\text{conv}}$ be its field of fractions. By [FOOO10, Proposition 8.5], $\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}^{\text{conv}}$ is algebraically closed. On the other hand, critical points of $W_{\mathfrak{b}}$ are solutions to algebraic equations with coefficients

in $\Lambda_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\text{conv}}$, as the convergence holds due to the fact that $W_{\mathfrak{b}}$ has only finitely many terms. Hence critical points are in $(\Lambda_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\text{conv}})^n$.

On the other hand, if we regard T as a complex number, then by Kouchnirenko's theorem [Kus75], there is a proper analytic subset $S \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ (which in particular has positive codimension) such that when

$$c(t) = (c_1 t^{-\lambda_1}, \dots, c_N t^{-\lambda_N}) \notin S$$

the function $W_{\mathfrak{b}}^t := \sum_{j=1}^N c_j t^{-\lambda_j} y^{v_j}$ has finitely many critical points and the number of them is bounded by $n!$ times the volume of the Newton polytope of this Laurent polynomial (which only depends on the moment polytope). As proved by Iritani [Iri09, Proposition 3.10], we can also guarantee that all critical points are nondegenerate. Now take a generic point (c_1, \dots, c_N) ⁸ so that $c(1) \notin S$. We claim that such a point satisfies our requirement.

Indeed, the map

$$c : \mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$$

is an analytic map. Hence the complement of $c^{-1}(S)$ contains points arbitrarily close to 0. We first show that the number of critical points of $W_{\mathfrak{b}}$ is no greater than Kouchnirenko's bound, temporarily denoted by N_{Δ} . Indeed, if there are $N_{\Delta} + 1$ critical points, then as the coordinates of them are in $\Lambda_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\text{conv}}$, we can evaluate them at $T = t$ with $|t|$ sufficiently small and $c(t) \notin S$, obtaining more critical points of $W_{\mathfrak{b}}^t$ than possible. Similarly, as we can evaluate critical points at $|t|$ small, all critical points have to be nondegenerate.

Lastly, we prove that for generic \mathfrak{b} all critical values of $W_{\mathfrak{b}}$ are distinct. First notice that the complex monomials W_1, \dots, W_N separate points, i.e., given $y', y'' \in (\mathbb{C}^*)^n$, $y' \neq y''$, for some W_j , $W_j(y') \neq W_j(y'')$. This is because a subset of n monomials among W_1, \dots, W_N are coordinates on the torus of y_1, \dots, y_n . Now consider the universal critical locus

$$\widetilde{\text{Crit}}W := \{(c_1, \dots, c_N, y_1, \dots, y_n) \mid dW_{\mathfrak{b}}(y_1, \dots, y_n) = 0\}.$$

Over the nondegenerate locus it is a smooth N -dimensional complex manifold and c_1, \dots, c_N are local parameters. Given a nondegenerate c_1, \dots, c_N , let $y^{(1)}, y^{(2)}$ be two different critical points. Suppose $W_j(y^{(1)}) \neq W_j(y^{(2)})$. Then deforming c along $(c_1, \dots, c_j + s, \dots, c_N)$ and let the two critical points deform as $y^{(1)}(s), y^{(2)}(s)$. Then

$$\frac{d}{ds} \left(W_s(y^{(1)}(s)) - W_s(y^{(2)}(s)) \right) = W_j(y^{(1)}) - W_j(y^{(2)}) \neq 0.$$

This means that the locus of c where two critical values coincide is cut out transversely.

Now we have shown that for generic complex \mathfrak{b} , $W_{\mathfrak{b}}$ satisfies the requirement. As the set of such complex \mathfrak{b} is open and dense, one can actually find \mathfrak{b} such that $c_j \in \mathbb{Q}[\sqrt{-1}]$. Then by rescaling one can find the desired bulk deformation. \square

Definition 9.20. A bulk-deformation $\mathfrak{b} = \sum_{j=1}^N \log c_j V_j$ with $c_j \in \mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{i}]$ is called **convenient** if $W_{\mathfrak{b}}$ is a Morse function and all critical values are distinct.

9.4. Homotopy units. The A_{∞} algebra constructed using our perturbation scheme only has cohomological units. In order to establish strict unitality one needs the system of perturbations to satisfy an additional property with respect to the operation of forgetting any boundary inputs and stabilize. This is difficult to achieve (in contrast to the case of [FOOO10]). Here we use a typical method of constructing a homotopy unit which appeared in [FOOO09][Gan12][She16][CW15][WX18][VWX20] etc.

⁸Within this proof, being generic means being in the complement of a proper complex analytic subset.

Definition 9.21. [She16, Section 4.3] Let (A, \mathbf{e}) be a cohomological unital A_∞ algebra over $\Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}$. A **homotopy unit structure** on (A, \mathbf{e}) is an A_∞ structure on the $\Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}$ -module

$$A^+ = A \oplus \Lambda_{\mathbb{K}} \mathbf{f}[1] \oplus \Lambda_{\mathbb{K}} \mathbf{e}^+$$

such that the A_∞ composition maps on A^+ restrict to the A_∞ composition maps on A , $m_1(\mathbf{f}) = \mathbf{e}^+ - \mathbf{e}$, and such that \mathbf{e}^+ is a strict unit, i.e.

$$(-1)^{|a|} m_2(\mathbf{e}^+, a) = m_2(a, \mathbf{e}^+) = a, \quad m_k(\cdots, \mathbf{e}^+, \cdots) = 0 \quad \forall k \neq 2.$$

To construct a homotopy unit, one needs to include a collection of extra moduli spaces. Consider **weighted ribbon trees** Γ whose vertices at infinity $v \in V_\Gamma^\infty$ are either **unweighted** or **weighted**. We require that when v is an output or a breaking, it must be unweighted. Each weighted boundary input carries an additional parameter $\rho \in [0, 1]$. Therefore a moduli space of weighted metric ribbon trees has additional parameters from weighted inputs. We require that the perturbations $P_{\Gamma, \vec{n}}^{\text{disk}}$ on any (minimal) tree Γ also depend on these parameters. Moreover, we require that

- (1) When all inputs are unweighted, the perturbation on this tree coincides with the perturbation we have chosen to define the cohomologically unital Fukaya algebra $\mathcal{F}_b(\mathbf{L})$.
- (2) For each weighted input, when the parameter $\rho = 0$, the perturbation on this tree agrees with the perturbation for the tree Γ' obtained by changing this weighted input to an unweighted input.
- (3) For each weighted input $v \in V_\Gamma^\infty$, when the parameter $\rho = 1$, the perturbation $P_{\Gamma, \vec{n}}^{\text{disk}}$ on this tree agrees with the perturbation obtained by pulling back a perturbation $P_{\Gamma', \vec{n}'}^{\text{disk}}$ via the forgetful map. Here Γ' is defined as follows. Suppose v is attached to a finite vertex v' . If $n_{v'} > 0$ or after forgetting v , v' is still stable, then Γ' is just obtained by Γ by removing v ; if $n_{v'} = 0$ and v' becomes unstable after removing v , then Γ' is obtained from Γ by removing v and contracting v' to the next adjacent finite vertex. See Figure 2 for illustration of this operation.




FIGURE 2. Forgetting a weighted input.

Now we need to define the additional composition maps m_k^+ on A^+ when involves the new generators f and e^+ , and prove the A_∞ relation for this enlarged set of compositions. We first define

$$m_k^+(\cdots, \mathbf{e}^+, \cdots)$$

according to the requirement of strict unit. Then we need to define m_k^+ for variables being either the original generators of A or the element \mathbf{f} . To define this, we require that the incoming edges corresponding to weighted inputs converge to the unique maximal point of the Morse function $f_L : L \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and count 0-dimensional moduli spaces. A consequence of the fact that all quasidisks have positive Maslov index is that

$$m_k^+(\mathbf{f}, \cdots, \mathbf{f}) = 0 \quad \forall k \geq 2.$$

We need to verify the A_∞ relation for all m_k^+ . Recall that the A_∞ relation reads

$$\sum_{j=0}^k \sum_{i=0}^{k-j} (-1)^{\mathfrak{A}_1^i} m_{k-j+1}^+(x_k, \cdots, m_j^+(x_{i+j+1}, \dots, x_{i+1}), x_i, \dots, x_1) = 0.$$

We only needs to verify for the case when all variables are generators of A^+ . When all of them are old generators of A , this is the same as the original A_∞ relation for m_k ; when some variable is \mathbf{e}^+ , this can be verified from the requirement that \mathbf{e}^+ satisfies the equations for a strict unit. Now assume that all variables are either old generators or \mathbf{f} . Consider 1-dimensional moduli spaces with this fixed sequence of inputs and consider its boundary strata. In addition to the strata corresponding to boundary edge breakings, additional boundary strata corresponding to parameters ρ on weighted inputs turn to 0 or 1. These strata correspond to the terms $m_k^+(\cdots, m_1^+(\mathbf{f}), \cdots)$ in the A_∞ relation. Hence the A_∞ relation for m_k^+ is verified. We summarize the above discussion as follows.

Proposition 9.22. *There exists a homotopy unit structure on the cohomologically unit A_∞ algebra $\mathcal{F}_\mathfrak{b}(\mathbf{L})$. Denote the corresponding strictly unital A_∞ algebra by $\mathcal{F}_\mathfrak{b}^+(\mathbf{L})$. Moreover, if we denote the element whose coboundary relates \mathbf{e} and \mathbf{e}^+ by $\mathbf{f}_\mathbf{L}$, then one has*

$$m_k^+(\underbrace{\mathbf{f}_\mathbf{L}, \dots, \mathbf{f}_\mathbf{L}}_k) = 0, \quad \forall k \geq 2.$$

9.4.1. *Canonical weakly bounding cochain.* Recall that a weakly bounding cochain is an odd element $b \in \mathcal{F}_\mathfrak{b}^+(\mathbf{L})$ solving the weak Maurer–Cartan equation

$$\sum_{k \geq 0} m_k^+(b, \cdots, b) \in \Lambda \mathbf{e}^+.$$

In general, worrying about convergence, we require that b has a positive Novikov valuation. In our case, we only use a special weakly bounding cochain.

Definition 9.23. The **canonical** weakly bounding cochain of the strictly unital A_∞ algebra $\mathcal{F}_\mathfrak{b}^+(\mathbf{L})$ is

$$b_\mathbf{L} = W_\mathfrak{b} \mathbf{f}_\mathbf{L}.$$

We check that, by the fact that $m_k^+(\mathbf{f}_\mathbf{L}, \cdots, \mathbf{f}_\mathbf{L}) = 0$ for $k \geq 2$ and $m_1^+(\mathbf{f}_\mathbf{L}) = \mathbf{e}_\mathbf{L}^+ - \mathbf{e}_\mathbf{L}$, one has

$$\sum_{k \geq 0} m_k^+(b_\mathbf{L}, \cdots, b_\mathbf{L}) = m_0^+(1) + m_1^+(W_\mathfrak{b} \mathbf{f}_\mathbf{L}) = W_\mathfrak{b} \mathbf{e}_\mathbf{L} + W_\mathfrak{b} (\mathbf{e}_\mathbf{L}^+ - \mathbf{e}_\mathbf{L}) = W_\mathfrak{b} \mathbf{e}_\mathbf{L}^+.$$

Hence indeed $b_\mathbf{L}$ is a weakly bounding cochain.

Now we can define the flat A_∞ algebra $\mathcal{F}_\mathfrak{b}^\flat(\mathbf{L})$ with compositions being (for $k \geq 1$)

$$m_k^\flat(x_k, \dots, x_1) = \sum_{l_0, \dots, l_k \geq 0} m_{k+l_0+\dots+l_k}^+ \left(\underbrace{b_{\mathbf{L}}, \dots, b_{\mathbf{L}}}_{l_k}, x_k, \dots, x_1, \underbrace{b_{\mathbf{L}}, \dots, b_{\mathbf{L}}}_{l_0} \right).$$

In particular, $m_1^\flat \circ m_1^\flat = 0$ and the cohomology of $\mathcal{F}_\mathfrak{b}^\flat(\mathbf{L})$ agrees with the quasimap Floer cohomology $QHF_\mathfrak{b}^\bullet(\mathbf{L}; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}})$.

9.4.2. Multiplicative structure. We need to identify the multiplicative structures on the quasimap Floer cohomology. The second composition m_2^\flat on $\mathcal{F}_\mathfrak{b}^\flat(\mathbf{L})$ induces a multiplication on $QHF_\mathfrak{b}^\bullet(\mathbf{L}; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}})$.

Proposition 9.24. *When \mathbf{y} is a critical point of $W_\mathfrak{b}(\mathbf{u})$ and the Hessian of $W_\mathfrak{b}(\mathbf{u})$ is nondegenerate at \mathbf{y} , i.e.*

$$\det \left(\frac{\partial^2 W_\mathfrak{b}(\mathbf{u})}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}(\mathbf{y}) \right) \neq 0,$$

the quasimap Floer cohomology algebra $QHF_\mathfrak{b}^\bullet(\mathbf{L}; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}})$ is isomorphic to a Clifford algebra over $\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}$ associated to a nondegenerate quadratic form on an n -dimensional space.

Note that the above nondegeneracy condition coincides with the one from Definition 9.15 because we are considering Laurent polynomials. The computation of the ring structure is carried out in a similar situation in [VWX20]. Here we only sketch it. The key of the computation is to establish another divisor equation

$$m_2^\flat(x_i, x_j) + m_2^\flat(x_j, x_i) = \frac{\partial^2 W_\mathfrak{b}}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} \mathbf{e}. \quad (9.5)$$

on cohomology. When the corresponding critical point of $W_\mathfrak{b}$ is nondegenerate, it follows that the Floer cohomology is isomorphic to a Clifford algebra induced from the Hessian of the critical point.

Remark 9.25. We explain why the divisor equation (9.5) fails on the chain level if one uses the naive way of perturbation. Consider $X = \mathbb{P}^1$. Fix a torus action. The (undeformed) potential function is

$$W = T^u y + T^{1-u} \frac{1}{y}.$$

The two terms come from the contribution of two disks, one through the north pole and the other through the south pole. If the divisor equation (9.5) holds, then there should be two configurations with two inputs labelled by the index 1 critical point, however, once the perturbation is chosen, one can only see one configurations exist in the moduli space. This is because the perturbation is not symmetric with respect to flipping the two incoming semi-infinite edges.

Proof of Proposition 9.24. Once the divisor equation (9.5) is established, the calculation of the ring structure follows immediately. Hence we only explain how to achieve the divisor equation following the same idea as [VWX20]. Notice that the A_∞ structure is independent of the perturbation up to homotopy equivalence. Hence the ring structure on the Floer cohomology is independent of the perturbation. Now we broaden the class of perturbations by considering multi-valued ones in order to achieve some symmetry, and use such perturbations to establish Equation (9.5) on the chain level. A multi-valued perturbation is just a (finite) multi-set of perturbations on each tree. We consider a coherent family of multi-valued perturbations which still satisfy Definition 9.6. We say that a multi-valued perturbation is symmetric, if, when restricted to the tree Γ_0 with two inputs, one output, and one finite vertex, the perturbation $P_{\Gamma_0, \vec{n}}$ (where \vec{n} on the only finite vertex is 1, corresponding to Maslov index two disks) is invariant under the \mathbb{Z}_2 -action on the universal tree \mathcal{UT}_{Γ_0} induced by switching the two incoming semi-infinite edges.

One can follow the same inductive argument to construct a symmetric coherent system of multi-valued perturbations and achieve transversality. Now when defining the counts, we need to count for each member of the multi-valued perturbation and then take an average. This still defines an A_∞ algebra and it is homotopy equivalent to any one defined using single-valued perturbations, provided that we work over the rationals. Moreover, for any two critical points x_i, x_j of Morse index $n - 1$, the divisor equation (9.5) holds. For details, see [VWX20, Lemma 5.12]. \square

9.4.3. *Hochschild cohomology.* Now consider the Hochschild cohomology of the A_∞ algebra $\mathcal{F}_\mathfrak{b}^\flat(\mathbf{L})$.

Proposition 9.26. *When \mathbf{L} corresponds to a nondegenerate critical point of $W_\mathfrak{b}$, one has*

$$HH^\bullet(\mathcal{F}_\mathfrak{b}^\flat(\mathbf{L})) \cong \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}$$

where the Hochschild cohomology is generated by the identity $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{F}_\mathfrak{b}^\flat(\mathbf{L})}$.

Proof. We know that the cohomology of $\mathcal{F}_\mathfrak{b}^\flat(\mathbf{L})$ is isomorphic to a Clifford algebra over $\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}$. This proposition follows from Proposition 3.38. \square

Remark 9.27. When the bulk-deformation \mathfrak{b} is convenient, we can formally define the quasimap Fukaya category as the disjoint union of the A_∞ algebras $\mathcal{F}_\mathfrak{b}^\flat(\mathbf{L})$ for \mathbf{L} corresponding to all critical points of $W_\mathfrak{b}$ inside the moment polytope. However, what we need is only the direct sum of these Hochschild cohomology.

10. OPEN STRING THEORY II. CLOSED-OPEN MAPS

In this section, we prove Theorem B. It is the consequence of the following theorem.

Theorem 10.1. *Let \mathfrak{b} be a convenient bulk deformation \mathfrak{b} .*

- (1) *There is an isomorphism of $\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}$ -algebras*

$$\mathrm{CO}_\mathfrak{b} : \mathrm{VHF}_\bullet^\mathfrak{b}(V; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\mathbf{L} \in \mathrm{Crit}_X W_\mathfrak{b}} HH^\bullet(\mathcal{F}_\mathfrak{b}^\flat(\mathbf{L})) \cong (\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}})^{\mathrm{Crit}_X W_\mathfrak{b}}.$$

- (2) *The operator on $\mathrm{VHF}_\bullet^\mathfrak{b}(V; \Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}[i]})$ defined by the pair-of-pants product with the (bulk-deformed) first Chern class (see Definition 10.14) has distinct eigenvalues in $\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}$.*

Remark 10.2. A closed-open map on the level of Floer cohomology, also in the setting of vortex Floer theory, was constructed in [WX17b]. The method of using quilted objects to prove the multiplicative property was learned from Woodward, see [VWX20].

10.1. Moduli spaces for the closed-open map.

10.1.1. *Based trees and closed-open domain types.* Recall our conventions about trees and ribbon trees given in the last section. To model curves with spherical components or Floer cylinders, we consider a broader class of trees called *based trees*. A **based tree** is a pair $(\Gamma, \underline{\Gamma})$ where $\underline{\Gamma}$ is a subtree with a ribbon structure containing the root v_{root} and adjacent semi-infinite edge. In a based tree, vertices in $V_{\underline{\Gamma}}$ are called a *boundary vertex*, and other vertices are called *interior vertices*. Similarly, an edge is either an interior edge or a boundary edge. A **metric based tree** is a based tree Γ together with a metric on its base $\underline{\Gamma}$.

Now specify domains responsible for the definition of the closed-open map on the chain level. Consider based trees with a distinguished interior vertex at infinity $v_{\mathrm{Ham}}^\infty \in V_\Gamma^\infty \setminus V_{\underline{\Gamma}}$. For each such tree Γ , let $v_{\mathrm{Ham}} \in V_{\underline{\Gamma}}^{\mathrm{finite}}$ be the distinguished vertex in the base $\underline{\Gamma}$ which is closest to v_{Ham}^∞ . We also assume that such trees always have exactly one boundary output v_{out} . We call such a

tree Γ (with a metric type on the base $\underline{\Gamma}$) a **closed-open domain type**. We say Γ is minimal if its base is minimal (see Subsection 9.1), i.e., the base has no finite edges of length zero or infinite edges. For a minimal Γ , the base $\underline{\Gamma}$ has a moduli space $\mathcal{MT}_{\underline{\Gamma}}^{\text{CO}}$ and universal tree $\mathcal{UT}_{\underline{\Gamma}}^{\text{CO}}$. One also has a compactification (see Section 9.1) denoted by $\overline{\mathcal{MT}}_{\underline{\Gamma}}^{\text{CO}}$.

Given a closed-open domain Γ , a closed-open domain of type Γ is a treed disk $C = S \cup T$ which has a distinguished “parametrized component” C_{Ham} corresponding to the vertex v_{Ham} which has a nonempty boundary. See Figure 3 for an illustration of a closed-open domain.




FIGURE 3. A closed-open domain. The component with a cylindrical end is the component C^{Ham} .

We define a type of “mixed equation” on closed-open domains. Fix an admissible bulk-avoiding pair $(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J})$ for which the bulk-deformed vortex Floer chain complex $VCF_{\bullet}^{\text{b}}(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J}; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}})$ is defined. Let $C = S \cup T$ be a closed-open domain with distinguished component C_{Ham} . Because there is at least one boundary output, C_{Ham} together with the interior puncture and boundary nodes is stable. Hence can always identify $C_{\text{Ham}} \cong \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\} \cong (-\infty, 0] \times S^1$ and equip it with the cylindrical metric. Using a cut-off function supported in $(-\infty, -1]$, one can homotope the pair $(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J})$ with the pair $(0, J_V)$ where J_V is the standard complex structure on the vector space $V \cong \mathbb{C}^N$, giving rise to a domain-dependent pair $(\widehat{H}_z, \widehat{J}_z)$ for $z \in C_{\text{Ham}}$. Given the above data, we consider tuples

$$\left((u_v)_{v \in V_{\Gamma}}, (x_e)_{e \in E_{\Gamma}} \right)$$

where

- (1) For each vertex v belong to the path connecting v_{Ham}^{∞} and v_{Ham} (not included), $u_v = [u_v, \xi_v, \eta_v]$ is a gauge equivalence class of solutions to the vortex equation

$$\partial_s u_v + \mathcal{X}_{\xi_v} + \widehat{J}_t(\partial_t u_v + \mathcal{X}_{\eta_v} - X_{\widehat{H}_t}(u_v)) = 0, \quad \partial_s \eta_v - \partial_t \xi_v + \mu(u_v) = 0.$$

- (2) For $v = v_{\text{Ham}}$, $u_v = [u_v, \xi_v, \eta_v]$ is a gauge equivalence class of solutions to

$$\partial_s u_v + \mathcal{X}_{\xi_v} + \widehat{J}_z(\partial_t u_v + \mathcal{X}_{\eta_v} - X_{\widehat{H}_z}(u_v)) = 0, \quad \partial_s \eta_v - \partial_t \xi_v + \mu(u_v) = 0. \quad (10.1)$$

Moreover, u_v satisfies the Lagrangian boundary condition

$$u_v(\partial C_{\text{Ham}}) \subset \widehat{L}. \quad (10.2)$$

- (3) For all other v , u_v is a K -orbit of quasidisk with boundary in \widehat{L} .
- (4) For each edge $e \in E_{\Gamma}$, x_e is a (perturbed) negative gradient line/ray/segment of the Morse function $f_L : L \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

- (5) These objects must have finite energy and must satisfy the obvious matching condition at interior and boundary nodes.

The finite energy condition forces the component u_v whose domain C_v has the distinguished input v_{Ham}^∞ to converge to an equivariant 1-periodic orbit of \widehat{H} . Given a closed-open domain type Γ , a **closed-open map type** over Γ , denoted by $\mathbf{\Gamma}$, consists of topological types of objects for each component. A closed-open map type is called **essential** if there is no interior node and all finite boundary edges have positive length and there is no breaking.

10.1.2. *Transversality.* Given a closed-open domain type Γ , a domain-dependent perturbation consists of a domain-dependent smooth function f_Γ depending on positions on the universal tree $\overline{\mathcal{UT}}_\Gamma$ and a domain-dependent almost complex structure \widehat{J}^{CO} depending only on positions on the component $C_{\text{Ham}} \cong (-\infty, 0] \times S^1$. In other words, we keep using the standard complex structure over disk components without interior marked point. As before, the perturbation function f_Γ also depends on a function $\vec{n} : V_\Gamma^{\text{finite}} \setminus \{v_{\text{Ham}}\} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. To achieve transversality, one can first fix \widehat{J}^{CO} which is equal to the given \widehat{J}_t near $-\infty$.

Next we need to extend the perturbation we have chosen to define the (bulk-deformed) quasimap A_∞ algebra of L . Notice that for any closed-open domain type Γ , the base $\underline{\Gamma}$ has a distinguished finite vertex v_{Ham} . The tree Γ degenerates to another tree Π which has an unbroken component Π' that does not contain the distinguished vertex. For such unbroken components Π' , the domain-dependent perturbation has been chosen as before to define the A_∞ structure. Hence we look for a system of domain-dependent perturbations

$$P_{\Gamma, \vec{n}}^{\text{CO}} : \overline{\mathcal{UT}}_{\underline{\Gamma}} \rightarrow C^\infty(L)$$

which respect similar conditions as Definition 9.6. We omit the complete definition here. Moreover, we require that, once Γ has an unbroken component Γ' which does not contain v_{Ham} , the perturbation on this component agrees with the existing one chosen before.

Now we consider relevant moduli spaces. Given a closed-open map type $\mathbf{\Gamma}$. Let $\vec{n} : V_\Gamma^{\text{finite}} \setminus \{v_{\text{Ham}}\} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ be the function whose value on v is half of the Maslov index of the disk class β_v contained in the data $\mathbf{\Gamma}$. The moduli space $\mathcal{M}_\Gamma^{\text{CO}}$ is the space of solutions to the mixed equation described above for the complex structure \widehat{J}_z in (10.1), and the negative gradient flow equation with the Morse function f_L perturbed by $P_{\Gamma, \vec{n}}^{\text{CO}}$. Then as before, one can find a coherent family of perturbations making all such moduli spaces regular. We omit the details.

Furthermore, one can incorporate the perturbations used for defining the homotopy units. For this we allow that the inputs of an closed-open domain type to be weighted or unweighted and require similar properties of perturbations on domains with weighted inputs as in Subsection 9.4 (the almost complex structure \widehat{J}^{CO} is independent of the weighting parameters ρ).

10.2. **The closed-open map.** Having regularized all relevant moduli spaces, we define the relevant counts for the closed-open maps. A closed-open map type $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ is called **essential** if it is stable, has no breakings and no sphere bubbles, no boundary edges of length zero. Given a $k+1$ -tuple of generators $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_k; x_\infty)$ ⁹, an equivariant 1-periodic orbit \mathfrak{r} of the bulk-avoiding Hamiltonian \widehat{H} and a disk class β , denote by

$$\mathcal{M}_\beta^{\text{CO}}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathbf{x})_i, \quad i = 0, 1$$

the union of moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}_\Gamma^{\text{CO}}$ of essential closed-open map types $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ whose boundary inputs/output are labelled by \mathbf{x} , whose (only) interior input v_{Ham}^∞ is labeled by \mathfrak{r} , and whose total

⁹Notice that among x_1, \dots, x_k some of them could be the weighted element \mathbf{f} .

disk class is β , and whose virtual dimension is i . Given $E \geq 0$, let

$$\mathcal{M}_\beta^{\text{CO}}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathbf{x})_i^{\leq E} \subset \mathcal{M}_\beta^{\text{CO}}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathbf{x})_i$$

be the subset of configurations whose (analytic) energy is at most E .

It is standard to prove the following theorem.

- Theorem 10.3.** (1) $\mathcal{M}_\beta^{\text{CO}}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathbf{x})_i$ is an oriented topological manifold of dimension i .
(2) For all $E \geq 0$, $\mathcal{M}_\beta^{\text{CO}}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathbf{x})_0^{\leq E}$ is a finite set.
(3) For all $E \geq 0$, $\mathcal{M}_\beta^{\text{CO}}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathbf{x})_1^{\leq E}$ is compact up to at most one 1) interior breaking, 2) boundary breaking, 3) bubbling of holomorphic disks, or 4) the length of a finite boundary edge shrinks to zero.
(4) By the standard gluing construction and identifying fake boundary strata, one can compactify the 1-dimensional moduli space to $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_\beta^{\text{CO}}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathbf{x})_1$ which is an oriented topological 1-manifold with boundary whose cut-off at any energy level E is compact.

Now given a local system \mathbf{y} , denote the brane with this local system by $\mathbf{L} = (L, \mathbf{y})$. We define a count

$$n_{\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{b}}^{\text{CO}}(\beta, \mathfrak{r}, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{[\mathbf{u}] \in \mathcal{M}_\beta^{\text{CO}}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathbf{x})_0} \exp \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \log c_j [\mathbf{u}] \cap V_j \right) T^{E(\beta)} \mathbf{y}^{\partial \beta} \epsilon([\mathbf{u}]) \in \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}$$

where $\mathbf{b} = \sum_{j=1}^N \log c_j V_j$. By Gromov compactness one has the following result.

Lemma 10.4. $n_{\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{b}}^{\text{CO}}(\beta, \mathfrak{r}, \mathbf{x})$ converges in $\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}$.

Then define a sequence of linear map

$$\widetilde{\text{CO}}_{\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{b}}^n : VCF_{\bullet}^{\mathbf{b}}(V; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}}(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{b}}^+(\mathbf{L})^{\otimes n}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{b}}^+(\mathbf{L})), n = 0, 1, \dots$$

by

$$\widetilde{\text{CO}}_{\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{b}}^n(\mathfrak{r})(x_n, \dots, x_1) = \sum_{x_\infty} n_{\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{b}}^{\text{CO}}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathbf{x}) x_\infty$$

and linear extension.

We use the canonical weakly bounding cochain $b_{\mathbf{L}}$ to turn it into a chain map. Define

$$\text{CO}_{\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{b}}^n : VCF_{\bullet}^{\mathbf{b}}(V; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}}(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{b}}^+(\mathbf{L})^{\otimes n}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{b}}^+(\mathbf{L})), n = 0, 1, \dots$$

by

$$\text{CO}_{\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{b}}^n(\mathfrak{r})(x_n, \dots, x_1) = \sum_{l_n, \dots, l_0} \widetilde{\text{CO}}_{\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{b}}^{n+l_0+\dots+l_n} \left(\underbrace{b_{\mathbf{L}}, \dots, b_{\mathbf{L}}}_{l_n}, x_n, \dots, x_1, \underbrace{b_{\mathbf{L}}, \dots, b_{\mathbf{L}}}_{l_0} \right).$$

The whole sequence $\{\text{CO}_{\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{b}}^n\}_{n=0, \dots}$ is then a linear map

$$\text{CO}_{\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{b}} : VCF_{\bullet}^{\mathbf{b}}(V; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}) \rightarrow CC^{\bullet}(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{b}}^+(\mathbf{L})).$$

Proposition 10.5. $\text{CO}_{\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{b}}$ is a chain map.

Proof. We analyze the boundary of 1-dimensional moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}_\beta^{\text{CO}}(\mathfrak{r}, x)_1$. Given any map type $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ contributing to this moduli space, the true boundaries of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{\Gamma}}^{\text{CO}}$ consists of configurations where either there is exactly one interior breaking (at an equivariant 1-periodic orbit) or exactly one boundary breaking (see Figure 4).




FIGURE 4. True boundaries of a 1-dimensional moduli space. The pictures represent the case when the weakly bounding cochain is zero and the insertions are all variables of the Hochschild cochains. One can draw the picture for general cases by arbitrarily inserting weakly bounding cochains on the boundary.

The configurations with interior breakings contribute to the composition $\text{CO}_{\mathbf{L},\mathbf{b}} \circ \delta_{VCF}$ (the upper left in Figure 4). On the other hand, there are three types of configurations with boundary breakings, described as follows.

- (1) The first (corresponding to the upper right in Figure 4) is where the breaking separates off a treed disk with no interior puncture or boundary insertions except for an arbitrary number of the weakly bounding cochain b . As we have

$$\sum_{k \geq 0} m_k^+(b, \dots, b) = W_{\mathbf{b}} \mathbf{e}^+.$$

Such configuration contributes by a multiple of the counting of a closed-open moduli space with a boundary insertion \mathbf{e}^+ , which vanishes by the forgetful property of the perturbation.

- (2) The second (corresponding to the lower left in Figure 4) is where the interior puncture and the output are separated by the breaking. This kind of broken configuration contributes to the Gerstenhaber product $m^{\mathbf{b}} \circ \text{CO}_{\mathbf{L},\mathbf{b}}(-)$ (up to a sign).
- (3) The third (corresponding to the lower right in Figure 4) is where the interior puncture and the output are not separated by the breaking. This kind of broken configuration contributes to the Gerstenhaber product $\text{CO}_{\mathbf{L},\mathbf{b}}(-) \circ m^{\mathbf{b}}$ (up to a sign).

Therefore, up to sign verifications which we skip here, $\text{CO}_{L,b}$ is a chain map. \square

Standard TQFT type argument shows that up to chain homotopy the closed-open map is well-defined, i.e., independent of the pair $(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J})$ defining the vortex Floer chain complex and independent of the choice of all relevant perturbations.

There is another map on the cohomology level which we also need. Namely, if we do not use any boundary inputs, by counting treed vortices over closed-open domains one can obtain a linear map

$$\text{CO}_{L,b}^0 : \text{VHF}_\bullet^b(V; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}) \rightarrow \text{QHF}_b^\bullet(L; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}). \quad (10.3)$$

It was firstly defined in [WX17b] in a slightly different way. Here we can easily generalize to the bulk-deformed case. Moreover, this map sends the identity $\mathbf{1}_b^{\text{GLSM}}$ to the identity in the Lagrangian Floer cohomology.

Summing over all Floer-nontrivial Lagrangian branes, we define the **closed-open map**

$$\text{CO}_b := \bigoplus_{L \in \text{Crit}_X W_b} \text{CO}_{L,b} : \text{VHF}_\bullet^b(V; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{L \in \text{Crit}_X W_b} \text{HH}^\bullet(\mathcal{F}_b^+(L)).$$

10.3. The closed-open map is multiplicative. Now we establish the following important property of the closed-open map.

Theorem 10.6. *The map $\text{CO}_{L,b}$ is multiplicative and maps the unit to the unit.*

We use an analogue of “quilted” moduli spaces to prove the multiplicativity, in the same way as in [VWX20, Section 3.6].

Definition 10.7 (Balanced marked disks and balanced treed disks).

- (1) A stable marked disk $S \cong \mathbb{D}$ with two interior markings $z', z'' \in \text{Int}S$ and $k+1$ boundary markings $\underline{z} = (z_0, \dots, z_k)$ is called **balanced** if z', z'', z_0 lies on a circle in \mathbb{D} tangent to $\partial\mathbb{D}$ at z_0 .
- (2) A treed disk with two interior leaves z', z'' , k boundary inputs and one boundary output is called **balanced** if the following conditions are satisfied.
 - (a) z', z'' are contained in the same spherical component.
 - (b) If z', z'' are contained in the same disk component S_v . Let $z'_0 \in \partial S_v$ be the boundary node connecting S_v to the output. Then (S_v, z', z'', z'_0) is a balanced marked disk.
 - (c) If z', z'' are contained in two different disk components, $S_{v'}$ and $S_{v''}$ respectively. Let e_1, \dots, e_l be the unique path connecting v' and v'' in the tree, then

$$\sum_{i=1}^l \pm \mathbf{l}(e_i) = 0$$

where the sign is positive resp. negative if the edge e_i is oriented toward resp. against the output. We call the unique path e_1, \dots, e_l the **bridge**.

Consider any stable domain type Γ with two interior inputs, k boundary inputs and one boundary output. Consider the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_\Gamma^{\text{balanced}}$ of balanced treed disks of type Γ . The list of codimension one boundary strata is different from the unbalanced case, as the balanced condition cuts down the dimension by 1. See Figure 5.

Notice that a real boundary $\mathcal{M}_\Gamma^{\text{balanced}} \subset \partial \mathcal{M}_\Gamma^{\text{balanced}}$ could be the product of several other moduli spaces whose types may have either one interior input or zero interior inputs. We have chosen surface metrics with cylindrical ends for stable closed-open domains (with one interior inputs);




FIGURE 5. The moduli space of balanced treed disks with two interior inputs and one boundary inputs. This moduli space is parametrized by one variable $\rho \in [-1, 1]$.

hence we can extend the choices to a family of surface metrics with cylindrical ends for the moduli space of stable closed-open domains with two interior inputs. We omit the details.

Now we can consider the following mixed equation for domains with two interior cylindrical ends. Choose two bulk-avoiding admissible pairs $(\widehat{H}'_t, \widehat{J}'_t)$ and $(\widehat{H}''_t, \widehat{J}''_t)$. Turn on the Hamiltonian perturbation on cylindrical ends. Consider the mixed equation similar to that for the closed-open map. We can extend the existing perturbation to this new type of moduli spaces to achieve transversality.

Proof of Theorem 10.6. Choose two Floer cycles \mathfrak{r}_1 and \mathfrak{r}_2 . We only need to show that

$$\mathrm{CO}_b(\mathfrak{r}_1 *_b \mathfrak{r}_2) - \mathrm{CO}_b(\mathfrak{r}_1) * \mathrm{CO}_b(\mathfrak{r}_2) \in \mathrm{Im} \delta_{CC}. \quad (10.4)$$

As one can choose perfect Morse functions on toric manifolds, we can assume that \mathfrak{r}_1 and \mathfrak{r}_2 are two single equivariant 1-periodic orbits.

Consider 1-dimensional moduli spaces of treed disks with two cylindrical ends labelled by \mathfrak{r}_1 and \mathfrak{r}_2 and arbitrary boundary output x_∞ and inputs

$$\underbrace{b_L, \dots, b_L}_{j_k}, x_k, \dots, x_1, \underbrace{b_L, \dots, b_L}_{j_0}.$$

We call x_k, \dots, x_1 **regular inputs**. Consider the true boundaries of such moduli spaces. *a priori* There are five types of them, listed as below. We count their contributions (weighted by the bulk deformation), whose sum should be zero.

- (1) Breaking of Floer cylinders at one interior input. As \mathfrak{r}_1 and \mathfrak{r}_2 are cycles, the contribution of this type of boundary points is zero.
- (2) Two cylindrical ends merge together to form a pair of pants. The contribution of this type of boundary is

$$\mathrm{CO}_b(\mathfrak{r}_1 *_b \mathfrak{r}_2).$$

- (3) One boundary edge not belonging to the bridge breaks and the piece broken off is not a disk without regular input. The contribution of this type of boundary is a Hochschild coboundary.
- (4) One boundary edge not belonging to the bridge breaks and the piece broken off is a disk without regular input. The broken off piece sums to a multiple of the strict unit e_L^\pm . By the property of the perturbation data, the contribution of this type of boundary is zero.

- (5) A pair of boundary edges belonging to the bridge break. The contribution of this type of boundary is the Yoneda product

$$\mathrm{CO}_{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathfrak{r}_1) \star \mathrm{CO}_{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathfrak{r}_2).$$

Therefore, one obtains (10.4).

Now we prove the unitality. By the choice of the small bulk deformation, the Hochschild cohomology of the quasimap Fukaya category is semisimple and splits as the direct sum of 1-dimensional pieces. Moreover, each piece is the Hochschild cohomology of the A_∞ algebra $\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{b}}^+(\mathbf{L})$, which is linearly spanned by the identity. Hence we only need to prove that the linear map (10.3) sends the identity $\mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathrm{GLSM}} \in VCF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(V; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}})$ to the identity element of $QHF_{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathbf{L})$. This verification can be found in [WX17b, Theorem 6.11] (this verification does not need to consider the homotopy unit and weakly bounding cochains). \square

10.4. The Kodaira–Spencer map. To prove the first item of Theorem 10.1, it remains to show that the closed-open map is a linear isomorphism. Proposition 9.18 shows that the domain and the codomain of $\mathrm{CO}_{\mathfrak{b}}$ have the same rank

$$\dim_{\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}} VHF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(V; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}) = \dim H^\bullet(X) = \#\mathrm{Crit}_X W_{\mathfrak{b}}.$$

Hence we only need to show that $\mathrm{CO}_{\mathfrak{b}}$ is either injective or surjective.

Following [FOOO16], we define another closed-open type map which we call the *Kodaira–Spencer map* at \mathfrak{b} , denoted by

$$\mathfrak{ks}_{\mathfrak{b}} : \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}[\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_N] \rightarrow (\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}})^{\mathrm{Crit}_X W_{\mathfrak{b}}}.$$

It is formally the derivative of the bulk-deformed potential function taken at the bulk \mathfrak{b} evaluated at critical points of the Morse function. We only need to use the standard complex structure to define this map.

10.4.1. Moduli spaces of quasidisks with tangency conditions. We go toward the definition of the Kodaira–Spencer map. Fix a Lagrangian $L = L(\mathbf{u})$ for a moment. Let $I = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N)$ be a multiindex of nonnegative integers, which defines a monomial

$$\mathbf{z}^I = \mathbf{z}_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots \mathbf{z}_N^{\alpha_N}.$$

Consider a holomorphic disk $u : (\mathbb{D}, \partial\mathbb{D}) \rightarrow (V, \widehat{L})$, which can be classified by Theorem 9.3. We write $u = (u_1, \dots, u_N)$ in coordinates. We say that u satisfies the I -tangency condition at $z \in \mathrm{Int}\mathbb{D}$ if u_i vanishes to the order of α_i at z , for all $i = 1, \dots, N$. In particular, when $\alpha_i = 0$, there is no restriction to u_i . Given a multiindex I and a disk class β , denote the moduli space of quasidisks with boundary in \widehat{L} (with one output) satisfying the I -tangency condition at the origin by

$$\mathcal{M}_{I,1}^{qd}(\beta).$$

Its virtual dimension is

$$\dim^{\mathrm{vir}} \mathcal{M}_{I,1}^{qd}(\beta) = n + m(\beta) - 2|I| - 2.$$

Remark 10.8. We can put the above moduli space into an infinitely dimensional Banach space where we can specify the tangency conditions for arbitrary maps with sufficiently high regularity. For example, using the setup of Cieliebak–Mohnke [CM07, Section 6]. Hence we can examine whether the moduli space of quasidisks subject to tangency conditions is regular or not.

Proposition 10.9. *Suppose $\beta = \sum_{j=1}^N d_j \beta_j$ with $d_j \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then $\dim \mathcal{M}_{I,1}^{qd}(\beta) \neq \emptyset$ only if $d_j \geq \alpha_j$ for all j . Moreover, the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{I,1}^{qd}(\beta)$ is smooth and the evaluation map at the boundary marking is a submersion.*

Proof. By Theorem 9.3, the j -th coordinate of the map u of the form (9.1) needs to vanish at least to the order α_j at the origin. Hence $d_j \geq \alpha_j$.

To prove the regularity of the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{I,1}^{qd}(\beta)$, one only needs to prove the regularity of the corresponding moduli space of holomorphic disks in V with boundary in \widehat{L} (before quotienting the K -action) as the K -action is free. Since the complex structure on $V \cong \mathbb{C}^N$ is the standard one, and the tangency condition is imposed on each coordinate independently, one only needs to prove the Fredholm regularity for the $N = 1$ case. In this case, we consider holomorphic disks in \mathbb{C} with boundary contained in the unit circle, which also vanish to a given order k at the origin. Choose $p > 2$ and m sufficiently large, so that one has the Sobolev embedding $W^{m,p} \hookrightarrow C^k$ in dimension two.

Now fix the disk class β . Consider the Banach space $W(\beta)$ of maps from $(\mathbb{D}, \partial\mathbb{D})$ to (\mathbb{C}, S^1) of regularity $W^{m+1,p}$. Let $W_0(\beta) \subset W(\beta)$ be the subspace of maps which vanish at 0 to the order $k+1$. Let $E(\beta) \rightarrow W(\beta)$ be the Banach space bundle, whose fiber over u is the space of $(0,1)$ -forms of regularity $W^{m,p}$, and let $E_0(\beta) \subset E(\beta)$ be the subbundle of those forms which vanish at 0 to the order k . Suppose $u_0 : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a holomorphic disk in $W_0(\beta)$. Then there is a commutative diagram (see [CM07, Section 6])

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T_{u_0}W(\beta) & \xrightarrow{F} & E(\beta)|_{u_0} \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ T_{u_0}W_0(\beta) & \xrightarrow{F_0} & E_0(\beta)|_{u_0} \end{array}$$

where F resp. F_0 is the standard Cauchy–Riemann operator, restricted to corresponding Banach spaces. One needs to prove that F_0 is surjective. Notice that by Cho–Oh’s theorem [CO06, Theorem 6.1], F is surjective. Hence for each $\eta_0 \in E_0(\beta)|_{u_0}$, there exists $\xi \in T_{u_0}W(\beta)$ such that $F(\xi) = \eta_0$. One only needs to modify ξ to some $\xi_0 \in T_{u_0}W_0(\beta)$ with $F(\xi) = F(\xi_0)$. Indeed, as u_0 vanishes up to order $k+1$ at the origin, the disk class β , which is only the degree of the map u_0 , is at least $k+1$. Then by the Blaschke formula (9.1), one can easily deform u_0 by $k+1$ -jet data. Such deformations are in the kernel of F . Hence we can obtain the desired ξ_0 . This proves the Fredholm regularity of the moduli spaces.

The fact that the evaluation map at the output is a submersion onto L follows easily from the Blaschke formula. \square

10.4.2. *The derivative of the potential.* Now we can define the Kodaira–Spencer map. For each critical point $\mathbf{L} \in \text{Crit}_X W_{\mathbf{b}}$ (lying inside the moment polytope), we will define a linear map

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{t}}_{\mathbf{L},\mathbf{b}} : \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}[\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_N] \rightarrow QCF_{\bullet}^+(\mathbf{L}; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}})$$

using the counts of certain zero-dimensional moduli spaces. It will turn out that the value of this map is always a multiple of the unique maximum $\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{L}} = x_{\max} \in \text{Crit} f_{\mathbf{L}}$, hence descends to a map

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{t}}_{\mathbf{L},\mathbf{b}} : \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}[\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_N] \rightarrow QHF_{\bullet}^{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{L}; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}).$$

We define the coefficients to be $\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbf{L},\mathbf{b}}$, i.e.,

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{t}}_{\mathbf{L},\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{z}^I) = \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbf{L},\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{z}^I)[\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{L}}].$$

We first fix a multiindex $I = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N)$. Denote

$$\beta^I = \alpha_1 \beta_1 + \dots + \alpha_N \beta_N \in H_2(V, \widehat{L}).$$

For each disk class $\beta \in H_2(V, \widehat{L})$ and each critical point $x \in \text{Crit} f_{L(\mathbf{u})}$ of the Morse function $f_{L(\mathbf{u})} : L(\mathbf{u}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, consider the moduli space

$$\mathcal{M}_{I,1}^{qd}(\beta; x)$$

where we require that the output converges to the critical point x . Proposition 10.9 implies that this moduli space is regular. Moreover,

$$\mathcal{M}_{I,1}^{qd}(\beta; x) \neq \emptyset \text{ and } \dim \mathcal{M}_{I,1}^{qd}(\beta; x) = 0 \implies \beta = \beta^I \text{ and } x = x_{\max}.$$

Moreover, in this case, the moduli space has exactly one point because of the Blaschke formula. We count the unique element weighted by the bulk deformation and the local system.

Remark 10.10. *A priori* we should consider treed holomorphic disks with one boundary output and one interior marking with certain tangency condition. It is similar to the case of proving that m_0 is a multiple of \mathbf{e}_L that one can prove for zero-dimensional moduli spaces, only those treed disks with one disk component contribute.

The count of the above moduli spaces (with a single point) defines the Kodaira–Spencer map. More explicitly, define

$$\widetilde{\mathfrak{ks}}_{L,\mathbf{b}} : \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}[\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_N] \rightarrow QHF_{\mathbf{b}}^{\bullet}(L; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}})$$

by

$$\widetilde{\mathfrak{ks}}_{L,\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{z}^I) = \mathbf{b}^I T^{E(\beta^I)} \mathbf{y}^{\partial \beta^I} [\mathbf{e}_L] = \mathfrak{ks}_{L,\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{z}^I)[\mathbf{e}_L].$$

Here for $\mathbf{b} = \sum_{j=1}^N \log c_j V_j$, the notation \mathbf{b}^I denotes the quantity

$$c_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots c_N^{\alpha_N},$$

which is the exponential of the intersection number between the above unique quasidisk in $\mathcal{M}_{I,1}^{qd}(\beta^I; x_{\max})$ and the bulk \mathbf{b} .

The Kodaira–Spencer map takes a very simple form. Recall that we have written

$$W_{\mathbf{b}} = W_{\mathbf{b},1} + \cdots + W_{\mathbf{b},N} = c_1 W_1 + \cdots + c_N W_N.$$

Proposition 10.11. *For each multiindex I , one has*

$$\mathfrak{ks}_{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{z}^I) = W_{\mathbf{b}}^I := W_{\mathbf{b},1}^{\alpha_1} \cdots W_{\mathbf{b},N}^{\alpha_N}. \quad (10.5)$$

Proof. The calculation is carried out in a straightforward way. The area of a disk in class β^I is

$$E(\beta^I) = \alpha_1 l_1(\mathbf{u}) + \cdots + \alpha_N l_N(\mathbf{u}).$$

The contribution of the local system is

$$\mathbf{y}^{\partial \beta^I} = \prod_{j=1}^N (y_1^{v_{j,1}} \cdots y_n^{v_{j,n}})^{\alpha_j}.$$

Hence the formula (10.5) follows. \square

Define the Kodaira–Spencer map by

$$\mathfrak{ks}_{\mathbf{b}} := \bigoplus_{L \in \text{Crit}_X W_{\mathbf{b}}} \mathfrak{ks}_{L,\mathbf{b}}.$$

Theorem 10.12. *The Kodaira–Spencer map $\mathfrak{ks}_{\mathbf{b}}$ is surjective.*

Proof. By [FOOO11, Lemma 3.12], the monomials W_1, \dots, W_N generate (over the ring $\Lambda_{0, \overline{\mathbb{Q}}}$) the ring

$$\Lambda_0^P \langle \langle y_1^\pm, \dots, y_n^\pm \rangle \rangle$$

which is a ring of formal Laurent series satisfying a particular valuation condition determined by the moment polytope P . Let $\boldsymbol{\eta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\eta}_s$ be the critical points of $W_{\mathfrak{b}}$ inside the moment polytope. Using the notion of convergent Novikov field $\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}^{\text{conv}}$, we see that for $T = t$ being a sufficiently small nonzero complex number, $\boldsymbol{\eta}_1^t, \dots, \boldsymbol{\eta}_s^t$ are distinct points in $(\mathbb{C}^*)^n$. Then there exist s complex Laurent polynomials

$$F_1, \dots, F_s \in \mathbb{C}[y_1, \dots, y_n, y_1^{-1}, \dots, y_n^{-1}]$$

such that the matrix $[F_a(\boldsymbol{\eta}_b^t)]_{1 \leq a, b \leq s}$ is invertible. Regard F_1, \dots, F_s as Laurent polynomials with Novikov coefficients, we see the determinant of the matrix

$$\det [F_a(\boldsymbol{\eta}_b)]_{1 \leq a, b \leq s} \neq 0 \in \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}.$$

The above is still true if we replace F_a by $T^A F_a$ for any $A \in \mathbb{R}$. On the other hand, for A sufficiently large, $T^A F_a \in \Lambda_0^P \langle \langle y_1^\pm, \dots, y_n^\pm \rangle \rangle$. This implies that, the restriction of $\boldsymbol{\mathfrak{s}}_{\mathfrak{b}}$ to the finite-dimensional subspace spanned by $T^A F_a$ is surjective due to the generation property of the monomials W_1, \dots, W_N . Hence $\boldsymbol{\mathfrak{s}}_{\mathfrak{b}}$ is also surjective. \square

10.5. A quantum Kirwan map. The set of small bulk-deformations is contained in the larger set of equivariant cohomology upstairs. Classically, there is the Kirwan map

$$\kappa^{\text{classical}} : H_K^\bullet(V) \rightarrow H^\bullet(X).$$

In principle, by incorporating vortices one can define a quantization of the Kirwan map. This has been pursued by Ziltener [Zil14] in the symplectic setting and worked out by Woodward [Woo15] in the algebraic setting. Here we define a variant of the quantum Kirwan map, denoted by

$$\kappa_{\mathfrak{b}} : \Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}[\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_N] \rightarrow VHF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(V; \Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}) \quad (10.6)$$

such that the image of the unit 1 is the identity $\mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\text{GLSM}}$.

We define the above map by imposing tangency conditions at the origin of the cigar. Fix a regular bulk-avoiding admissible pair $(\widehat{H}_\infty, \widehat{J}_\infty)$ which defines a bulk-deformed vortex Floer complex $VHF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J}; \Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}[i]})$. Consider a domain-dependent almost complex structure \widehat{J} (resp. Hamiltonian perturbation \widehat{H}) parametrized by points on the cigar $\Sigma^{\text{cigar}} \cong \mathbb{C}$ which is equal to the standard almost complex structure \widehat{J}_V (resp. vanishes) in a specified neighborhood of $0 \in \Sigma^{\text{cigar}}$ and which agrees with \widehat{J}_∞ (resp. \widehat{H}_∞) near infinity. Consider the vortex equation with the data $(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J})$ on the cigar. Any finite energy solution should converge to a critical point of \mathcal{A}_{H_∞} . Moreover, as the almost complex structure is standard near 0, one can impose the tangency condition corresponding to I at the origin. Such a tangency condition is gauge invariant. Then for each critical point $\mathfrak{r} \in \text{Crit} \mathcal{A}_{H_\infty}$, there is a moduli space

$$\mathcal{M}_I^{\text{cigar}}(\mathfrak{r}) \subset \mathcal{M}^{\text{cigar}}(\mathfrak{r}).$$

By using domain-dependent perturbations, one can achieve transversality for such a moduli space. Then one has

$$\dim \mathcal{M}_I^{\text{cigar}}(\mathfrak{r}) = \dim \mathcal{M}^{\text{cigar}}(\mathfrak{r}) - 2|I|.$$

On the other hand, as the Hamiltonian is bulk-avoiding, each solution has well-defined topological intersection numbers with V_j . Then define

$$\kappa_{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathbf{z}^I) = \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{r} \\ \dim \mathcal{M}_I^{\text{cigar}}(\mathfrak{r})=0}} \left(\sum_{[\mathbf{u}] \in \mathcal{M}_I^{\text{cigar}}(\mathfrak{r})} \left(\prod_{j=1}^N c_j^{[\mathbf{u}] \cap V_j} \right) \epsilon([\mathbf{u}]) \right) \mathfrak{r}.$$

Theorem 10.13 (Properties of the bulk-deformed quantum Kirwan map).

- (1) *The element $\kappa_{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathbf{z}^I)$ is a legitimate element of $VCF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\widehat{H}_{\infty}, \widehat{J}_{\infty}; \Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}[i]})$ and is $\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}$ -closed. Moreover, its homology class is independent of the choice of perturbation and its corresponding element in $VHF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(V; \Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}[i]})$ is well-defined.*
- (2) $\kappa_{\mathfrak{b}}(1) = \mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\text{GLSM}}$.

Proof. The first conclusion follows from the standard argument and the second one follows from the definition of $\mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\text{GLSM}}$. \square

We define another element in the vortex Floer homology which can be viewed as the first Chern class in the bulk-deformed Hamiltonian Floer homology, or the image of the first Chern class under the bulk-deformed PSS map. Recall that the first Chern class of a toric manifold is naturally represented by the union of toric divisors. Upstairs, they are the union of all coordinate hyperplanes.

Definition 10.14. The \mathfrak{b} -deformed first Chern class is the element

$$\kappa_{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathbf{z}_1 + \cdots + \mathbf{z}_N) \in VHF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(V; \Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}[i]})$$

Denote the operator on $VHF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(V; \Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}[i]})$ defined by the pair-of-pants product with the \mathfrak{b} -deformed first Chern class by

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{b}} : VHF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(V; \Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}) \rightarrow VHF_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(V; \Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}). \quad (10.7)$$

10.6. The commutative diagram. We prove the following proposition.

Proposition 10.15. *When the bulk deformation \mathfrak{b} is convenient, the following diagram commutes.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}[\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_N] & \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{t}\mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{b}}} & (\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}})^{\text{Crit}_X W_{\mathfrak{b}}} \\ \kappa_{\mathfrak{b}} \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ VHF_{\mathfrak{b}}(V; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}) & \xrightarrow{\text{CO}_{\mathfrak{b}}} & \bigoplus_{\mathbf{L} \in \text{Crit}_X W_{\mathfrak{b}}} HH^{\bullet}(\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathbf{L})) \end{array} \quad (10.8)$$

Here the right vertical arrow is the natural identification induced by the individual isomorphisms $HH^{\bullet}(\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathbf{L})) \cong \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}$.

Proof. We turn on Hamiltonian perturbations on disks to construct a homotopy between the Kodaira–Spencer map and the closed-open map composed with the quantum Kirwan map. Fix a critical point of $W_{\mathfrak{b}}$ lying in the interior of the moment polytope with the corresponding Lagrangian

brane $\mathbf{L} = (L(\mathbf{u}), \mathbf{y})$. We claim that the following diagram commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}[\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_N] & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\mathfrak{t}}_{\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{b}}} & QHF_{\mathbf{b}}^{\bullet}(\mathbf{L}; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}) \\
\kappa_{\mathbf{b}} \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
VHF_{\mathbf{b}}(V; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}) & \xrightarrow{\text{CO}_{\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{b}}^0} & QHF_{\mathbf{b}}^{\bullet}(\mathbf{L}; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}})
\end{array} \tag{10.9}$$

Once this is established, it follows that the image $\text{CO}_{\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{b}}^0 \circ \kappa_{\mathbf{b}}$ is contained in the line spanned by the identity element of $QHF_{\mathbf{b}}^{\bullet}(\mathbf{L}; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}})$. Hence on the chain level, one has

$$\text{CO}_{\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{b}}^0(\kappa_{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{z}^I)) - \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{z}^I) \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{L}}^{\dagger} \in \text{Im}(m_1^{\flat}).$$

As the Hochschild cohomology of \mathbf{L} is spanned by the identity element, it follows that the diagram (10.8) also commutes.

Now we prove that (10.9) commutes. Consider closed-open domains with one interior marking. Define a 1-parameter family of equations parametrized by $\nu \in [0, 1]$ such that when $\nu = 0$, the equation is the quasidisk equation with tangency condition at the marking. When ν is positive, we stretch a neighborhood of the interior marking and turn on a Hamiltonian perturbation by a bulk-avoiding pair $(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J})$. We always require the tangency condition at the interior marking. As for boundary insertions, we only allow the boundary inputs to be labelled by the canonical weakly bounding cochain $b_{\mathbf{L}}$, while the boundary output can be labelled by any critical point of $f_{\mathbf{L}}$. We can consider such moduli spaces with the tangency condition corresponding to multiindex I , total disk class β , and the output labelled by $x \in \text{Crit} f_{\mathbf{L}}$.

One can use similar arguments as before to regularize relevant moduli spaces using perturbations which naturally extend existing perturbations defining the A_{∞} structure, the closed-open map, and the quantum Kirwan map. Then by counting elements in zero-dimensional moduli spaces, one can define a linear map

$$R_{\mathbf{L}} : \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}[\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_N] \rightarrow QCF^{\bullet}(\mathbf{L}; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}) \subset QCF^{\bullet}(\mathbf{L}; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}})^+.$$

Now we consider boundaries of 1-dimensional moduli spaces. There are the following types of boundary strata.

- (1) The boundary at $\nu = 0$. This side of the boundary consists of points in zero-dimensional moduli spaces used to define the Kodaira–Spencer map. The contribution of these boundary points is equal to $\tilde{\mathfrak{t}}_{\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{b}}$.
- (2) The boundary at $\nu = 1$. This side of the boundary consists of configurations having exactly one interior breaking at certain equivariant 1-periodic orbit of the Hamiltonian \widehat{H} . As the perturbation extends the perturbations chosen for the closed-open map and the quantum Kirwan map, the contribution of these boundary points is equal to

$$\text{CO}_{\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{b}}^0 \circ \kappa_{\mathbf{b}}.$$

- (3) Boundary points at $\nu \in (0, 1)$. These configurations have exactly one boundary breakings. There are two possibilities. First, the interior puncture and the boundary output are in the same unbroken component. In this case, the other unbroken component is a treed quasidisk with only boundary insertions being the canonical weakly bounding cochain $b_{\mathbf{L}}$. As the perturbation satisfies the forgetful property when one input is unweighted (the strict unit \mathbf{e}^+), the contribution of this kind of boundary points is zero. Second, the

interior puncture and the boundary output are in two different unbroken component. The contribution of such configurations is

$$m_1^b(R_{\mathbf{L}}(\mathbf{z}^I))$$

which is exact.

Therefore, it follows that on the chain level, one has

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{t}}_{\mathbf{L}, \mathfrak{b}}(\mathbf{z}^I) - \text{CO}_{\mathbf{L}, \mathfrak{b}}^0(\kappa_{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathbf{z}^I)) \in \text{Im}(m_1^b).$$

Hence on the cohomology level the diagram (10.9) commutes. \square

Because the Kodaira–Spencer map is surjective, this finishes the proof of item (1) of Theorem 10.1.

10.7. Quantum multiplication by the first Chern class. Now we prove item (2) of Theorem 10.1. We prove the following theorem.

Theorem 10.16. *When \mathfrak{b} is a convenient small bulk deformation, the operator $\mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{b}}$ on $VHF_{\bullet}^b(V; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}})$ has an eigenspace decomposition*

$$VHF_{\bullet}^b(V; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}) = \bigoplus_{\mathbf{L} \in \text{Crit}_X(W_{\mathfrak{b}})} VHF_{\bullet}^b(V; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}})_{W_{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathbf{L})}.$$

Proof. By item (1) of Theorem 10.1, $VHF_{\bullet}^b(V; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}})$ is semisimple. Hence $\mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{b}}$ is diagonalizable, and let the eigenvalues be $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m$. Now take an eigenvalue $\lambda = \lambda_i$ and a critical point $\mathbf{L} = (L(\mathbf{u}), \mathbf{y}) \in \text{Crit}_X W_{\mathfrak{b}}$. We consider the restriction of $\text{CO}_{\mathbf{L}, \mathfrak{b}}^0 : VHF_{\bullet}^b(V; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}) \rightarrow QHF_{\bullet}^b(\mathbf{L}; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}})$ to the λ -eigenspace. We prove that this map is nonzero only when λ coincides with the critical value. Consider closed-open domains with two interior markings, one boundary output, and arbitrarily many boundary inputs (to be labelled by the canonical weakly bounding cochain of \mathbf{L}). We distinguish the two interior markings. The first one is v_{Ham} , which will be labelled by an equivariant 1-periodic orbit. The second one is denoted by v_{Chern} , which will be labelled by components of the equivariant toric divisor. Given any such closed-open domain $C = S \cup T$ where S is the surface part and T is the tree part, the marking corresponding to v_{Ham} becomes a puncture while the marking corresponding to v_{Chern} is denoted by $z_{\text{Chern}} \in \text{Int}S$.

We would like to include one more constraints on the position of v_{Chern} . In the same way as defining the closed-open map, there is a distinguished component C_{Ham} of such domains $C = S \cup T$. Because the domain C has a distinguished output, we can identify C_{Ham} with $\mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$ canonically such that the boundary node on C_{Ham} leading towards the output is the point $1 \in S^1 \cong \partial\mathbb{D}$. Define the **offset angle** of z_{Chern} as follows.

- (1) If z_{Chern} is in a cylindrical component, it does not have an offset angle.
- (2) If z_{Chern} is on $C_{\text{Ham}} \cong \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$, then the offset angle is the angular coordinate of z_{Chern} .
- (3) If z_{Chern} is not on C_{Ham} or any cylindrical component, then there is a unique boundary node on C_{Ham} connecting C_{Ham} to z_{Chern} . The offset angle is the angular coordinate of this boundary node.

We fix $\theta \in S^1 \setminus \{1\}$ and only consider closed-open domains described as above such that the offset angle of z_{Chern} is equal to θ or does not have an offset angle. Consider the same equation defining the closed-open maps on such domains with possibly different perturbation data, where on the cylindrical end one has the Hamiltonian perturbation by a regular bulk-avoiding pair $(\widehat{H}, \widehat{J})$, and along the boundary one imposes the Lagrangian boundary condition from \mathbf{L} .

We analyze the true boundaries of 1-dimensional such moduli spaces. We assume that the cylindrical end is labelled by a cycle a in $VCF_{\bullet}^b(V; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}})$. The true boundary components corresponding to configurations which have exactly one breaking, either an interior one or a boundary one. See Figure 6.




FIGURE 6. Boundary of 1-dimensional moduli spaces with one special interior marking.

- (1) The breaking is interior and the special marking z_{Chern} is not on a cylindrical component. The sum of this kind of contributions is zero as the interior input is a cycle. Note that as we are counting treed holomorphic disks, the line segment connecting the component on which z_{Chern} lies and C_{Ham} is not meant to be a breaking.
- (2) The breaking is boundary at the offset angle $1 \in S^1$ (which is different from θ) hence separates C_{Ham} and the output. The sum of this kind of configuration is a coboundary in $QCF_b(\mathbf{L})$, which is zero in cohomology.
- (3) The breaking is boundary at an offset angle different from $1 \in S^1$ and θ hence does not separate C_{Ham} and the output. The disk bubble contributes to a multiple of the strict unit $e_{\mathbf{L}}^{\pm}$. Hence by the forgetful property of the perturbation data, the contribution of such configurations is zero.
- (4) The breaking is boundary at the specified offset angle θ which separates the special marking z_{Chern} and the component C_{Ham} . The disk bubble always has Maslov index 2, hence the interior constraint imposed at z_{Chern} gives a factor 1. Hence the disk bubble contributes to $W_b(\mathbf{L})e_{\mathbf{L}}^{\pm}$. However, as the offset angle is fixed, there are such rigid configurations, and

the counting is equal to

$$W_{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathbf{L}) \cdot \mathrm{CO}_{\mathbf{L},\mathfrak{b}}^0(a).$$

- (5) The breaking is interior and the special marking z_{Chern} is on the cylindrical component that breaks off. This kind of configuration contributes to

$$\mathrm{CO}_{\mathbf{L},\mathfrak{b}}^0(\mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{b}}(a)) = \lambda \cdot \mathrm{CO}_{\mathbf{L},\mathfrak{b}}^0(a),$$

due to the appearance of the pair-of-pants product in the upper component.

The analysis above shows that in cohomology, one has

$$\lambda \cdot \mathrm{CO}_{\mathbf{L},\mathfrak{b}}^0(a) = W_{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathbf{L}) \cdot \mathrm{CO}_{\mathbf{L},\mathfrak{b}}^0(a).$$

Hence if $\lambda \neq W_{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathbf{L})$, the map $\mathrm{CO}_{\mathbf{L},\mathfrak{b}}^0$ vanishes on this eigenspace.

On the other hand, the linear map

$$\bigoplus_{\mathbf{L} \in \mathrm{Crit}_X W_{\mathfrak{b}}} \mathrm{CO}_{\mathbf{L},\mathfrak{b}}^0 : \mathrm{VHF}_{\bullet}^{\mathfrak{b}}(V; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\mathbf{L} \in \mathrm{Crit}_X W_{\mathfrak{b}}} \mathrm{QHF}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\bullet}(\mathbf{L}; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}})$$

is injective, because when we take the component generated by the identity elements of $\mathrm{QHF}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\bullet}(\mathbf{L}; \Lambda_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}})$, it descends to the isomorphism $\mathrm{CO}_{\mathfrak{b}}$ onto the direct sum of the Hochschild cohomology. Therefore, one has

$$\mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{b}}) \subset W_{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathrm{Crit}_X W_{\mathfrak{b}}). \quad (10.10)$$

On the other hand, for each critical point $\mathbf{L} \in \mathrm{Crit}_X(W_{\mathfrak{b}})$, the closed-open map $\mathrm{CO}_{\mathbf{L},\mathfrak{b}}^0$ is unital hence nonzero. This implies that $W_{\mathbf{L},\mathfrak{b}} \in \Lambda$ is also an eigenvalue of $\mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{b}}$. Hence (10.10) is an identity. As when \mathfrak{b} is convenient, all critical values are distinct, it follows that all eigenspaces of $\mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{b}}$ are 1-dimensional. \square

REFERENCES

- [Abo11] Mohammed Abouzaid, *A topological model for the Fukaya categories of plumbings*, Journal of Differential Geometry **87** (2011), no. 1, 1–80.
- [AK70] Dmitry Anosov and Anatolii Katok, *New examples of ergodic diffeomorphisms of smooth manifolds*, Uspekhi Matematicheskikh Nauk **25** (1970), no. 4, 173–174.
- [AL23] Marcelo Atallah and Han Lou, *On the Hofer–Zehnder conjecture for semipositive symplectic manifolds*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.13791>, 2023.
- [AM93] Paul Aspinwall and David Morrison, *Topological field theory and rational curves*, Communications in Mathematical Physics **151** (1993), 245–262.
- [AMS21] Mohammed Abouzaid, Mark McLean, and Ivan Smith, *Complex cobordism, Hamiltonian loops and global Kuramishi charts*, <http://arxiv.org/abs/2110.14320>, 2021.
- [AMS23] ———, *Gromov–Witten invariants in complex-oriented generalised cohomology theories*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.01883>, 2023.
- [Ati88] Michael Atiyah, *New invariants of three-dimensional and four-dimensional manifolds*, Proceedings, The Mathematical Heritage of Hermann Weyl: Durham, NC, USA, May 12–16, 1987, Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics, vol. 48, 1988, pp. 285–299.
- [BX22a] Shaoyun Bai and Guangbo Xu, *Arnold conjecture over integers*, <http://arxiv.org/abs/2209.08599>, 2022.
- [BX22b] ———, *An integral Euler cycle in normally complex orbifolds and \mathbb{Z} -valued Gromov–Witten type invariants*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.02688>, 2022.
- [CdIOGP91] Philip Candelas, Xenia de la Ossa, Paul Green, and Linda Parkes, *A pair of Calabi–Yau manifolds as an exactly soluble superconformal theory*, Nuclear Physics **B359** (1991), 21–74.
- [CGL18] Huai-Liang Chang, Shuai Guo, and Jun Li, *BCOV’s Feynman rule of quintic 3-folds*, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1810.00394>, 2018.
- [CGL21] ———, *Polynomial structure of Gromov–Witten potential of quintic 3-folds*, Annals of Mathematics **194** (2021), no. 3, 585–645.
- [CGLL21] Huai-Liang Chang, Shuai Guo, Jun Li, and Wei-Ping Li, *The theory of N -mixed-spin- P fields*, Geometry & Topology **25** (2021), no. 2, 775–811.

- [CGMS02] Kai Cieliebak, Ana Gaio, Ignasi Mundet i Riera, and Dietmar Salamon, *The symplectic vortex equations and invariants of Hamiltonian group actions*, Journal of Symplectic Geometry **1** (2002), no. 3, 543–645.
- [CGS00] Kai Cieliebak, Ana Gaio, and Dietmar Salamon, *J-holomorphic curves, moment maps, and invariants of Hamiltonian group actions*, International Mathematics Research Notices **16** (2000), 831–882.
- [Cho05] Cheol-Hyun Cho, *Products of Floer cohomology of torus fibres in toric Fano manifolds*, Communications in Mathematical Physics **260** (2005), no. 3, 613–640.
- [CJR21] Qile Chen, Felix Janda, and Yongbin Ruan, *The logarithmic gauged linear sigma model*, Inventiones Mathematicae **225** (2021), 1077–1154.
- [CK20] Ionuț Ciocan-Fontaine and Bumsig Kim, *Quasimap wall-crossing and mirror symmetry*, Publications Mathématiques de l’IHÉS **131** (2020), 201–260.
- [CKM14] Ionuț Ciocan-Fontaine, Bumsig Kim, and Davesh Maulik, *Stable quasimaps to GIT quotients*, Journal of Geometry and Physics **75** (2014), 17–47.
- [CL05] Octav Cornea and François Lalonde, *Cluster homology*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0508345>, 2005.
- [CL06] ———, *Cluster homology: an overview of the construction and results*, Electronic Research Announcements of the American Mathematical Society **12** (2006), 1–12.
- [CLLL16] Huai-Liang Chang, Jun Li, Wei-Ping Li, and Chiu-Chu Liu, *An effective theory of GW and FJRW invariants of quintics Calabi–Yau manifolds*, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1603.06184>, 2016.
- [CLLL19] ———, *Mixed-Spin-P fields of Fermat polynomials*, Cambridge Journal of Mathematics **7** (2019), no. 3, 319–364.
- [CLLT17] Kwokwai Chan, Siu-Cheong Lau, Naichung Leung, and Hsian-Hua Tseng, *Open Gromov–Witten invariants, mirror maps, and Seidel representations for toric manifolds*, Duke Mathematical Journal **166** (2017), 1405–1462.
- [CM07] Kai Cieliebak and Klaus Mohnke, *Symplectic hypersurfaces and transversality in Gromov–Witten theory*, Journal of Symplectic Geometry **5** (2007), 281–356.
- [CO06] Cheol-Hyun Cho and Yong-Geun Oh, *Floer cohomology and disk instantons of Lagrangian torus fibres in Fano toric manifolds*, Asian Journal of Mathematics **10** (2006), 773–814.
- [CW15] François Charest and Chris Woodward, *Floer cohomology and flips*, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1508.01573>, To appear in *Memoirs of the A.M.S.*, 2015.
- [CWW17] Bohui Chen, Bai-Ling Wang, and Rui Wang, *The asymptotic behavior of finite energy symplectic vortices with admissible metrics*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1706.07027>, 2017.
- [DS94] Stamatis Dostoglou and Dietmar Salamon, *Self-dual instantons and holomorphic curves*, Annals of Mathematics **139** (1994), no. 3, 581–640.
- [EP03] Michael Entov and Leonid Polterovich, *Calabi quasimorphism and quantum homology*, International Mathematics Research Notices **2003** (2003), 1635–1676.
- [EP06] ———, *Quasi-states and symplectic intersections*, Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici **81** (2006), 75–99.
- [EP09] ———, *Rigid subsets of symplectic manifolds*, Compositio Mathematica **145** (2009), 773–826.
- [FH93] Andreas Floer and Helmut Hofer, *Coherent orientations for periodic orbit problems in symplectic geometry*, Mathematische Zeitschrift **212** (1993), no. 1, 13–38.
- [FHS95] Andreas Floer, Helmut Hofer, and Dietmar Salamon, *Transversality in elliptic Morse theory for the symplectic action*, Duke Mathematical Journal **80** (1995), no. 1, 251–292.
- [FJR18] Huijun Fan, Tyler Jarvis, and Yongbin Ruan, *A mathematical theory of gauged linear σ -model*, Geometry and Topology **22** (2018), 235–303.
- [FO97] Kenji Fukaya and Kaoru Ono, *Floer homology and Gromov–Witten invariant over integer of general symplectic manifolds - summary -*, Proceeding of the Last Taniguchi Conference, 1997.
- [FOOO09] Kenji Fukaya, Yong-Geun Oh, Hiroshi Ohta, and Kaoru Ono, *Lagrangian intersection Floer theory: anomaly and obstruction, part i & ii*, AMS/IP studies in advanced mathematics, vol. 46, American Mathematical Society, 2009.
- [FOOO10] ———, *Lagrangian Floer theory on compact toric manifolds, I*, Duke Mathematical Journal **151** (2010), 23–175.
- [FOOO11] ———, *Lagrangian Floer theory on compact toric manifolds II: bulk deformations*, Selecta Mathematica New Series **17** (2011), 609–711.
- [FOOO13] Kenji Fukaya, Yong-Geun Oh, Hiroshi Ohta, and Kaoru Ono, *Displacement of polydisks and Lagrangian Floer theory*, J. Symplectic Geom. **11** (2013), no. 2, 231–268.
- [FOOO16] Kenji Fukaya, Yong-Geun Oh, Hiroshi Ohta, and Kaoru Ono, *Lagrangian Floer theory and mirror symmetry on compact toric manifolds*, Astérisque **376** (2016), 1–340.

- [FOOO19] ———, *Spectral invariants with bulk, quasimorphisms and Lagrangian Floer theory*, vol. 260, *Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society*, no. 1254, The American Mathematical Society, 2019.
- [Fra92] John Franks, *Geodesics on S^2 and periodic points of annulus homeomorphisms*, *Invent. Math.* **108** (1992), no. 2, 403–418.
- [Fra96] ———, *Area preserving homeomorphisms of open surfaces of genus zero*, *New York J. Math.* **2** (1996), 1–19, electronic.
- [Fra04a] Urs Frauenfelder, *Floer homology of symplectic quotients and the Arnold–Givental conjecture*, Ph.D. thesis, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, 2004.
- [Fra04b] ———, *Floer homology of symplectic quotients and the Arnold–Givental conjecture*, *International Mathematics Research Notices* **2004** (2004), no. 42, 2179–2269.
- [Gan12] Sheel Ganatra, *Symplectic cohomology and duality for the wrapped Fukaya category*, Ph.D. thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2012.
- [Gin10] Viktor Ginzburg, *The Conley conjecture*, *Annals of Mathematics* **172** (2010), 1127–1180.
- [Giv95] Alexander Givental, *Homological geometry and mirror symmetry*, *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. 1, 2 (Zürich, 1994)*, Birkhäuser, 1995, pp. 472–480.
- [GJR18] Shuai Guo, Felix Janda, and Yongbin Ruan, *Structure of higher genus Gromov–Witten invariants of quintic 3-folds*, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1812.11908>, 2018.
- [Gro85] Mikhael Gromov, *Pseudoholomorphic curves in symplectic manifolds*, *Inventiones Mathematicae* **82** (1985), no. 2, 307–347.
- [GS05] Ana Gaio and Dietmar Salamon, *Gromov–Witten invariants of symplectic quotients and adiabatic limits*, *Journal of Symplectic Geometry* **3** (2005), no. 1, 55–159.
- [HS22] Amanda Hirschi and Mohan Swaminathan, *Global Kuranishi charts and a product formula in symplectic Gromov–Witten theory*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.11797>, 2022.
- [HV00] Kentaro Hori and Cumrun Vafa, *Mirror symmetry*, <http://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0002222>, 2000.
- [HZ11] Helmut Hofer and Eduard Zehnder, *Symplectic invariants and Hamiltonian dynamics*, *Modern Birkhäuser Classics*, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2011, Reprint of the 1994 edition.
- [Iri09] Hiroshi Iritani, *An integral structure in quantum cohomology and mirror symmetry for toric orbifolds*, *Advances in Mathematics* **222** (2009), 1016–1079.
- [Kus75] Anatoly Kushnirenko, *A Newton polyhedron and the number of solutions of a system of k equations in k unknowns*, *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk* **30** (1975), 266–267.
- [Lod13] Jean-Louis Loday, *Cyclic homology*, vol. 301, Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [LRS22] Frédéric Le Roux and Sobhan Seyfaddini, *The Anosov–Katok method and pseudo-rotations in symplectic dynamics*, *J. Fixed Point Theory Appl.* **24** (2022), no. 2, Paper No. 36, 39.
- [Mes16] Stephan Mescher, *A primer on A_∞ algebras and their Hochschild homology*, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1601.03963>, 2016.
- [MS04] Dusa McDuff and Dietmar Salamon, *J-holomorphic curves and symplectic topology*, *Colloquium Publications*, vol. 52, American Mathematical Society, 2004.
- [MT09] Ignasi Mundet i Riera and Gang Tian, *A compactification of the moduli space of twisted holomorphic maps*, *Advances in Mathematics* **222** (2009), 1117–1196.
- [Mun99] Ignasi Mundet i Riera, *Yang–Mills–Higgs theory for symplectic fibrations*, Ph.D. thesis, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, 1999.
- [Mun03] ———, *Hamiltonian Gromov–Witten invariants*, *Topology* **43** (2003), no. 3, 525–553.
- [Oh99] Yong-Geun Oh, *Symplectic topology as the geometry of action functional ii*, *Communications of Analysis and Geometry* **7** (1999), 1–55.
- [Ost06] Yaron Ostrover, *Calabi quasi-morphisms for some non-monotone symplectic manifolds*, *Algebraic & Geometric Topology* (2006), 405–443.
- [OT09] Yaron Ostrover and Ilya Tyomkin, *On the quantum homology algebra of toric Fano manifolds*, *Selecta Math. (N.S.)* **15** (2009), no. 1, 121–149.
- [Ott14] Andreas Ott, *Removal of singularities and Gromov compactness for symplectic vortices*, *Journal of Symplectic Geometry* **12** (2014), no. 2, 257–311.
- [PS16] Leonid Polterovich and Egor Shelukhin, *Autonomous Hamiltonian flows, Hofer’s geometry and persistent modules*, *Selecta Mathematica New Series* **22** (2016), 227–296.
- [PSS17] Leonid Polterovich, Egor Shelukhin, and Vukašin Stojisavljević, *Persistence modules with operators in Morse and Floer theory*, *Moscow Mathematical Journal* **17** (2017), no. 4, 757–786.
- [RSV21] Frédéric Le Roux, Sobhan Seyfaddini, and Claude Viterbo, *Barcodes and area-preserving homeomorphisms*, *Geometry & Topology* **25** (2021), 2713–2825.
- [Sch00] Matthias Schwarz, *On the action spectrum for closed symplectically aspherical manifolds*, *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* **193** (2000), no. 2, 419–461. MR 1755825 (2001c:53113)

- [Sei15] Paul Seidel, *The equivariant pair-of-pants product in fixed point Floer cohomology*, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **25** (2015), no. 3, 942–1007.
- [She16] Nick Sheridan, *On the Fukaya category of a Fano hypersurface in projective space*, *Publications Mathématiques. Institut de Hautes Études Scientifiques* **124** (2016), 165–317.
- [She22] Egor Shelukhin, *On the Hofer–Zehnder conjecture*, *Annals of Mathematics* **195** (2022), no. 3, 775–839.
- [Smi19] Jack Smith, *Superfiltered A_∞ -deformations of the exterior algebra, and local mirror symmetry*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.01096v3>, 2019.
- [SX14] Stephen Schecter and Guangbo Xu, *Morse theory for Lagrange multipliers and adiabatic limits*, *Journal of Differential Equations* **257** (2014), 4277–4318.
- [SZ21] Egor Shelukhin and Jingyu Zhao, *The $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ -equivariant product-isomorphism in fixed point Floer cohomology*, *Journal of Symplectic Geomeometry* **19** (2021), no. 5, 1101–1188.
- [TX16] Gang Tian and Guangbo Xu, *Correlation functions in gauged linear σ -model*, *Science China. Mathematics* **59** (2016), 823–838.
- [TX18a] ———, *Analysis of gauged Witten equation*, *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik* **740** (2018), 187–274.
- [TX18b] ———, *Gauged linear sigma model in geometric phases*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1809.00424>, 2018.
- [TX20] ———, *Virtual fundamental cycles of gauged Witten equation*, *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik* **Published Online** (2020).
- [ȳ3] Wojowu (<https://mathoverflow.net/users/30186/wojowu>), *A ring map from algebraic integers to algebraic closure of \mathbb{F}_p* , *MathOverflow*, 2023, <https://mathoverflow.net/questions/446298/>.
- [Ush08] Michael Usher, *Spectral numbers in Floer theories*, *Compositio Mathematica* **144** (2008), no. 6, 1581–1592.
- [Ush10] ———, *Duality in filtered Floer–Novikov complexes*, *Journal of Topology and Analysis* **2** (2010), 233–258.
- [Ush11a] ———, *Boundary depth in Floer theory and its applications to Hamiltonian dynamics and coisotropic submanifolds*, *Israel Journal of Mathematics* **184** (2011), 1–57.
- [Ush11b] ———, *Deformed Hamiltonian Floer theory, capacity estimates and Calabi quasimorphisms*, *Geometry and Topology* **15** (2011), 1313–1417.
- [Ush13] ———, *Hofer’s metrics and boundary depth*, *Annales scientifiques de l’École Normale Supérieure, Serie 4* **46** (2013), no. 1, 57–129.
- [UZ16] Michael Usher and Jun Zhang, *Persistent homology and Floer–Novikov theory*, *Geometry & Topology* **20** (2016), no. 6, 3333–3430.
- [Ven15] Sushmita Venugopalan, *Vortices on surfaces with cylindrical ends*, *Journal of Geometry and Physics* **98** (2015), 575–606.
- [Voi96] Claire Voison, *A mathematical proof of a formula of Aspinwall and Morrison*, *Compositio Mathematica* **104** (1996), no. 2, 135–151.
- [VWX20] Sushmita Venugopalan, Chris Woodward, and Guangbo Xu, *Fukaya category of blowups*, <http://arxiv.org/abs/2006.12264>, 2020.
- [Wil20] Nicholas Wilkins, *A construction of the quantum Steenrod squares and their algebraic relations*, *Geom. Topol.* **24** (2020), no. 2, 885–970.
- [Wit93] Edward Witten, *Phases of $N = 2$ theories in two dimensions*, *Nuclear Physics* **B403** (1993), 159–222.
- [Woo11] Chris Woodward, *Gauged Floer theory for toric moment fibers*, *Geometric and Functional Analysis* **21** (2011), 680–749.
- [Woo15] ———, *Quantum Kirwan morphism and Gromov–Witten invariants of quotients I, II, III*, *Transformation Groups* **20** (2015), 507–556, 881–920, 1155–1193.
- [WX17a] Dongning Wang and Guangbo Xu, *A compactification of the moduli space of disk vortices in adiabatic limit*, *Mathematische Zeitschrift* **287** (2017), 405–459.
- [WX17b] Weiwei Wu and Guangbo Xu, *Vortex Floer homology and spectral invariants*, *International Mathematics Research Notices* **2018** (2017), no. 13, 3959–4021.
- [WX18] Chris Woodward and Guangbo Xu, *An open quantum Kirwan map*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1806.06717>, 2018.
- [Xu16] Guangbo Xu, *Gauged Hamiltonian Floer homology I: definition of the Floer homology groups*, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* **368** (2016), 2967–3015.
- [Zil05] Fabian Ziltener, *Symplectic vortices on the complex plane and quantum cohomology*, Ph.D. thesis, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich, 2005.
- [Zil09] ———, *The invariant symplectic action and decay for vortices*, *Journal of Symplectic Geometry* **7** (2009), no. 3, 357–376.

- [Zil14] ———, *A quantum Kirwan map: bubbling and Fredholm theory*, *Memiors of the American Mathematical Society* **230** (2014), no. 1082, 1–129.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, 2990 BROADWAY, NEW YORK, NY 10027, USA

Email address: `sb4841@columbia.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, RUTGERS UNIVERSITY, HILL CENTER–BUSCH CAMPUS, 110 FRELINGHUYSEN ROAD, PISCATAWAY, NJ 08854-8019, USA

Email address: `guangbo.xu@rutgers.edu`