

On the Hochschild cohomology of Tamarkin categories

Christopher Kuo, Vivek Shende, and Bingyu Zhang

Abstract

To any open subset of a cotangent bundle, Tamarkin has associated a certain quotient of a category of sheaves. Here we show that the Hochschild cohomology of this category agrees with filtered symplectic cohomology.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Traces	4
3	Trace of $\mathrm{Sh}_X(M)$	6
4	The Tamarkin category of a point	8
4.1	Symmetric monoidal structure from convolution on \mathbb{R}	9
4.2	Filtered complexes	10
5	Some properties of Tamarkin categories	11
5.1	\mathcal{T} -linearity of $\mathcal{T}(U)$	11
5.2	Tamarkin category as a sheaf category	12
5.3	Dualizability	13
5.4	Some compatibilities of \mathcal{T} -linear kernels	13
5.5	Tensor product and integral functors	15
5.6	Sheaf quantization of Hamiltonian isotopies	16
6	Trace of the Tamarkin category	18
6.1	Projector via Fourier transform and cutoff	18
6.2	Projector via wrapping	19
6.3	Calabi-Yau property and Hochschild cohomology	20
6.4	Microsupport estimation of trace for open sets with restricted contact boundary	23
6.5	Action window	24
6.6	Wrapping formula for HH and generating function homology	24
6.7	\mathbf{k} -linear Hochschild cohomology	27
7	Comparison to symplectic cohomology	28
7.1	Floer theory review (and some lemmas)	29
7.2	Proof of Theorem 7.1	33
	References	34

1 Introduction

To open subsets U of a Liouville manifold W , one defines the symplectic cohomology by the following prescription [13, 11, 3]:

$$\widetilde{SH}^*(U) := \varprojlim_{\text{Supp}(f) \subseteq U} HF^*(W, f).$$

Here, $f : W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are compactly supported smooth functions; $HF(W, f)$ is the Hamiltonian Floer cohomology for the Hamiltonian function f ; the limit is taken over ‘continuation’ maps $HF^*(W, f) \rightarrow HF^*(W, g)$, which are defined when $f \leq g$ everywhere.

The symplectic cohomology carries an \mathbb{R} -filtration via which it can be used to study embedding problems, in particular furnishing a symplectic capacity [49] sufficient to establish the non-squeezing principle. An S^1 -equivariant version has been an even richer source of embedding obstructions [24]. The filtration comes from the symplectic action functional $\int(\lambda - Hdz)$ on Hamiltonian trajectories, which are by definition the generators of the Hamiltonian Floer complexes.

Symplectic cohomology has also been studied in connection with Fukaya categories and homological mirror symmetry. In this context, one typically considers the situation where \overline{U} has contact boundary, such that attaching a cylindrical end recovers W [49, 44]. Then, *after forgetting the filtration*, the symplectic cohomology $\widetilde{SH}^*(U)$ is independent of the choice of such U , and per [12, Prop 2.5], agrees with:

$$SH^*(W) := \varinjlim_{f \text{ linear}} HF^*(W, f),$$

where now we take the limit over Hamiltonians which grow linearly at infinity. In this situation, one can also define a wrapped Fukaya category $Fuk(W)$, by allowing noncompact but eventually conic Lagrangians, and taking the corresponding colimits over Lagrangian Floer homology. In this case there are comparisons with Hochschild homology [1] and cohomology

[43]:

$$HH_{*-n}(Fuk(W)) \rightarrow SH^*(W) \rightarrow HH^*(Fuk(W)). \quad (1)$$

These have been shown to be isomorphisms [16, 17], under hypotheses that are known to be satisfied when W is Weinstein [7, 19].

It is presently unknown (to us) how to define a filtered version of the wrapped Fukaya category, but it is natural to expect that such a category should exist and admit filtered versions of the morphisms (1), which should be isomorphisms under good circumstances. In light of works like [35, 18, 51, 23], it is also natural to expect the filtered Fukaya category to be equivalent to some category of sheaves.

The purpose of the present article is to show that, for open subsets of cotangent bundles, a version of (1) holds, with the Fukaya category replaced by a certain category of sheaves. The category in question was introduced by Tamarkin at the very beginning of the modern incursion of sheaf theory into symplectic topology [46]. We recall now its definition.

Fix some background choice of symmetric monoidal stable presentable category \mathbf{k} e.g. the category of modules over a ring or ring spectrum.

For a topological space X we write $\text{Sh}(X)$ for the (symmetric monoidal stable presentable) category of sheaves valued in \mathbf{k} .

For a manifold M and sheaf $F \in \text{Sh}(M)$, Kashiwara and Schapira introduced a closed conic coisotropic subset $ss(F) \subseteq T^*M$ measuring the failure of propagation of sections of F [28].

Tamarkin explained [46, 45] that to study non-conic subsets, one should consider the symplectic reduction diagram

$$T^*(M \times \mathbb{R}) \xleftarrow{i} J^1 M \xrightarrow{\pi} T^* M$$

and consider, for $U \subseteq T^* M$, the category

$$\mathcal{T}(U) := \text{Sh}(M \times \mathbb{R}) / \{F \mid \pi(i^{-1} \text{ss}(F)) \cap U = \emptyset\}$$

Let us note a technical point about discussing the Hochschild homology of categories like $\text{Sh}(M)$ or $\mathcal{T}(U)$. Since these categories are not compactly generated, at least one usual definition of Hochschild homology (bar complex on compact objects) is not appropriate. Fortunately, $\text{Sh}(M)$ and $\mathcal{T}(U)$ are dualizable as presentable categories. For such categories, the trace of the identity functor is a natural notion of Hochschild homology, in particular, specializing to the usual notion for compactly generated categories [26, Prop. 4.24].

We recall some ideas about traces in Section 2. In Section 3, we explain how to compute traces of sheaf categories:

Theorem 1.1 (Cor. 3.3). *Let H be a locally compact Hausdorff space. Then for $K \in \text{Sh}(H \times H)$ with associated integral transform $\Phi_K : \text{Sh}(H) \rightarrow \text{Sh}(H)$ we have*

$$\text{Tr}(\Phi_K) = \Gamma_c(H, \Delta^* K),$$

where $\Delta : H \rightarrow H \times H$ is the diagonal morphism.

In particular, we recover a variant of a result of Efimov, asserting that the category of sheaves is a categorification of compactly supported cohomology:

$$\text{Tr}(1_{\text{Sh}(H)}) = \Gamma_c(H, 1_H).$$

Let us next explain why $\text{Tr}(1_{\mathcal{T}(U)})$ should carry a filtration. The point is that the category $\mathcal{T} := \mathcal{T}(\text{point})$, which carries a symmetric monoidal structure (§4.1) and a natural $(\vec{\mathbb{R}}, +)$ action induced by $1_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq a}} \rightarrow 1_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq b}}$ ($b \geq a$), is equivalent to a category of filtered complexes (§4.2), and moreover:

Theorem 1.2 (Prop. 5.3 and 5.8). *The category $\mathcal{T}(U)$ is linear over \mathcal{T} , and \mathcal{T} -linearly dualizable.*

Thus we may take the \mathcal{T} -linear trace

$$\text{Tr} : \text{End}(\mathcal{T}(U)) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$$

and in particular have $\text{Tr}(1_{\mathcal{T}(U)}) \in \mathcal{T}$.

To study the trace, we use the following fact: when $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ is the image of some projector $P_{\mathcal{C}}$, then $\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{C}}(1_{\mathcal{C}}) = \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{D}}(P_{\mathcal{C}})$ (see Lem. 2.2). We will write

$$P_U : \mathcal{T}(T^* M) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(T^* M)$$

for the projector onto $\mathcal{T}(U)$.

In fact, there is a natural isomorphism $\mathcal{T}(T^* M) = \text{Sh}(M, \mathcal{T})$ (Prop. 5.5). Thus if one expresses P_U as an integral kernel $P_U \in \text{Sh}(M \times M, \mathcal{T})$, we have, by Theorem 1.1 and the above discussion,

$$\text{Tr}(1_{\mathcal{T}(U)}) = \Gamma_c(M, \Delta^* P_U). \tag{2}$$

To make use of Equation (2), one needs a formula for the projector P_U . In [8], a formula for the projector was given in terms of a microlocal cutoff via Fourier transform when U is a ball; as explained in [53], the formula and proof works in much more generality. We review this in §6.1. Meanwhile in [30], a formula was given which computes the adjoint of inclusions $\mathrm{Sh}_X(M) \rightarrow \mathrm{Sh}(M)$ ‘by wrapping sheaves’; the ideas can be straightforwardly extended to the setting $\mathcal{T}(U) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(T^*M)$, which we do in §6.2. Finally, the right hand side of (2) was the main object of study in [53, 55]; we recall some results of that article in §6.3.

Let us mention also two important new results of §6. The first is in Theorem 6.7, where we show that the categories $\mathcal{T}(U)$ are right Calabi-Yau. It allows us switch study of trace and Hochschild cohomology. The second is a comparison result between the Hochschild cohomology and filtered generating function homology, which we prove as an application of the wrapping formula in Theorem 6.21.

In §7, we turn to a comparison with filtered symplectic cohomology; for this purpose (due to the present status of the symplectic literature) we fix our coefficients \mathbf{k} to be the dg category of modules over a field \mathbb{F} . Rather than discuss \mathcal{T} -linear structures, it will be more convenient to consider the Hochschild cohomology with coefficients in the functor \mathbb{T}_{L^*} , which is the pushforward by translation by L in the \mathbb{R} direction. On the Floer-theoretic side, we mostly follow the conventions of [12]. In particular, for a Liouville domain V and for any interval $(a, b) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ whose ends a, b are not in the action spectrum of $\partial_\infty V$, there is a graded abelian group $SH_{(a,b)}^*(V)$. By applying a comparison result of Guillemou and Viterbo [23, App. E] to the aforementioned ‘wrapping’ formula for the projector, we deduce:

Theorem 1.3. *Let M be a closed manifold. Let $U \subseteq T^*M$ be a relatively compact set such that the Liouville form on T^*M restricts to a contact form on ∂U . For any $L > 0$ which is not in the action spectrum of ∂U , we have an isomorphism*

$$\mathrm{HH}^*(\mathcal{T}(U), \mathbb{T}_{L^*}) \simeq SH_{(-\infty, L)}^*(\overline{U}).$$

Corollary 1.4. *The symplectic capacities defined in [49] and [55] agree.*

Theorem 1.3 and Corollary 1.4 establish the non-equivariant version of Conjectures 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 from [54].

Acknowledgements. We thank Tomohiro Asano, Shaoyun Bai, Sheng-Fu Chiu, Kai Cieliebak, Sheel Ganatra, Zhen Gao, Stéphane Guillermou, Peter Haine, Joseph Helfer, Yuichi Ike, Wenyuan Li, Shuaipeng Liu, Alexandru Oancea, Nick Rozenblyum, Germán Stefanich, Kyler Siegel, and Claude Viterbo for helpful conversations. The work presented in this article is supported by Novo Nordisk Foundation grant NNF20OC0066298, Villum Fonden Villum Investigator grant 37814, and Danish National Research Foundation grant DNRF157.

2 Traces

Let us recall the formalism of traces, which provides an appropriate notion of Hochschild homology for presentable categories which are dualizable but not compactly generated.

Let \mathcal{M} be a symmetric monoidal 1-category and $1_{\mathcal{M}}$ its unit object. An object $X \in \mathcal{M}$ is said to be dualizable if there exists $Y \in \mathcal{M}$ and maps

$$\eta : 1_{\mathcal{M}} \rightarrow Y \otimes X, \quad \epsilon : X \otimes Y \rightarrow 1_{\mathcal{M}} \tag{3}$$

such that $(\eta \otimes \mathrm{id}) \circ (\mathrm{id} \otimes \epsilon) = \mathrm{id}$ and $(\mathrm{id} \otimes \eta) \circ (\epsilon \otimes \mathrm{id}) = \mathrm{id}$. In this case we write $Y = X^\vee$.

We recall the classical:

Definition 2.1. For an dualizable object X , and an endomorphism $f : X \rightarrow X$, the trace of f , denoted by $\mathrm{Tr}(f, X) = \mathrm{Tr}(f)$, is defined to be the object in $\mathrm{End}(1_{\mathcal{M}})$ defined by the composition

$$1_{\mathcal{M}} \xrightarrow{\eta} X^{\vee} \otimes X \xrightarrow{\mathrm{id} \otimes f} X^{\vee} \otimes X = X \otimes X^{\vee} \xrightarrow{\epsilon} 1_{\mathcal{M}}.$$

The term ‘trace’ comes from the fact that when \mathcal{M} is the category of vector spaces, dualizability is equivalent to finite dimensionality, and the trace of an endomorphism of a finite dimensional vector space is the trace in the sense of linear algebra.

The notion of trace generalizes naturally to higher categorical contexts, where the trace recovers and generalizes Hochschild homology. Here we recall some of the relevant notions from [26, §4]; see also [2, §5.1.1].

Fix a rigid symmetric monoidal idempotent-complete small stable category \mathcal{E} and $\mathbf{k} := \mathrm{Ind}(\mathcal{E})$; we consider $\mathrm{Pr}_{st}^L(\mathbf{k})$, the symmetric monoidal category of stable presentable categories linear over \mathbf{k} .

We recall some relevant facts about $\mathrm{Pr}_{st}^L(\mathbf{k})$, all of which can be found in [26, §4].

- The endomorphisms of \mathbf{k} in $\mathrm{Pr}_{st}^L(\mathbf{k})$ is \mathbf{k} .
- There is a full subcategory $Cat^{Mor}(\mathcal{E}) \subseteq \mathrm{Pr}_{st}^L(\mathbf{k})$, whose objects comprise the essential image of Ind .
- Passing to compact objects gives an equivalence from $Cat^{Mor}(\mathcal{E})$ to a category whose objects are small idempotent complete \mathbf{k} -linear categories and whose morphisms can be identified with bimodules.
- The objects of $Cat^{Mor}(\mathcal{E})$ are all dualizable, with $\mathrm{Ind}(\mathcal{C})^{\vee} = \mathrm{Ind}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$.
- If a morphism $f : \mathrm{Ind} \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathrm{Ind} \mathcal{C}$ is given by the \mathcal{C} -bimodule B_f , then $\mathrm{Tr}(f) \in \mathrm{Ind} \mathcal{E}$ is naturally identified with the Hochschild homology of B_f , e.g. as computed by the bar complex [26, Prop. 4.24].

Because of the last point above, it is natural to use the trace as a definition of (or substitute for) the Hochschild homology for categories in $\mathrm{Pr}_{st}^L(\mathbf{k})$ which are dualizable but not compactly generated. By Effimov’s study of continuous K-theory, this extension is canonical in a certain sense [25]. For a functor $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ in $\mathrm{Pr}_{st}^L(\mathbf{k})$, we also define the Hochschild cohomology as $\mathrm{HH}^*(\mathcal{D}, f) := \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{End} \mathcal{D}}(1_{\mathcal{D}}, f)$.

Dualizable but not compactly generated categories are plentiful: a classical and relevant example is the category of sheaves on a manifold [36, 37]. More generally, Lurie has shown that presentable categories are dualizable iff they are retracts of compactly generated categories [33, Proposition D.7.0.7] – which applies to the above example, as the category of sheaves is a retract of the compactly generated category of presheaves [33, Proposition 21.1.7.1].

In linear algebra, the trace of a projector is equal to the trace of the identity on its image. We have the following generalization:

Lemma 2.2. *For a duality pair $(X, X^{\vee}, \epsilon, \eta)$ in \mathcal{M} , let $e : X \rightarrow X$ be an idempotent which can be written as $X \xrightarrow{r} Y \xrightarrow{i} X$ for some inclusion i and some retraction r .*

Assume that the dual idempotent $e^{\vee} : X^{\vee} \rightarrow X^{\vee}$ also splits to $X^{\vee} \xrightarrow{s} Z \xrightarrow{j} X^{\vee}$. Then the pair

$$\epsilon_0 := \epsilon \circ (i \otimes j) : Y \otimes Z \rightarrow 1_{\mathcal{M}} \qquad \eta_0 := (s \otimes r) \circ \eta : 1_{\mathcal{M}} \rightarrow Z \otimes Y$$

exhibits Z as the dual of Y . Moreover, we have

$$\mathrm{Tr}(e, X) = \mathrm{Tr}(\mathrm{id}_Y, Y) = \mathrm{Tr}(\mathrm{id}_Z, Z) = \mathrm{Tr}(e^{\vee}, X^{\vee}).$$

Proof. A straightforward diagram tracing implies that the composition $(\epsilon_0 \otimes \text{id}_Y) \circ (\text{id}_Y \otimes \eta_0)$ is given by

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
Y & \xrightarrow{\hspace{10em}} & Y \\
\text{id}_Y \otimes \eta \downarrow & & \uparrow \epsilon \otimes \text{id}_Y \\
Y \otimes X^\vee \otimes X & \xrightarrow{\hspace{10em}} & X \otimes X^\vee \otimes Y \\
& & i \otimes e^\vee \otimes r
\end{array}$$

and a similar discussion implies that it is also equivalent to

$$r \circ (e^\vee)^\vee \circ i = r \circ e \circ i = r \circ i \circ r \circ i = \text{id}_Y.$$

The other triangle identity can be checked similarly.

For the trace, we have

$$\text{Tr}(e, X) = \text{Tr}(i \circ r, X) = \text{Tr}(r \circ i, Y) = \text{Tr}(\text{id}_Y, Y),$$

where the second equality is the commutativity of trace [38, Proposition 2.4]. \square

In all cases of interest to us, splitting of the dual idempotent is verified by the following:

Lemma 2.3. *If \mathcal{M} is closed, then the dual idempotent splits.*

Proof. We can naturally identify $X^\vee = \underline{\text{Hom}}(X, 1_{\mathcal{M}})$ and $e^\vee = \underline{\text{Hom}}(e, 1_{\mathcal{M}})$. So, we can take $Z = \underline{\text{Hom}}(Y, 1_{\mathcal{M}})$, $j = \underline{\text{Hom}}(r, 1_{\mathcal{M}})$ and $s = \underline{\text{Hom}}(i, 1_{\mathcal{M}})$. \square

3 Trace of $\text{Sh}_X(M)$

For H a locally compact Hausdorff space, $\text{Sh}(H)$ is a retract of the category of presheaves [33, Def. 21.1.2.1, Thm. 21.1.6.12, Prop. 21.1.7.1] and hence is dualizable. It is also easy to explicitly exhibit the unit and counit, using the (closely related) fact that the natural functor $\text{Sh}(H) \otimes \text{Sh}(H) \rightarrow \text{Sh}(H \times H)$ is an equivalence, for any locally compact Hausdorff H [52, Proposition 2.30].

Proposition 3.1. *For H locally compact Hausdorff, the category $\text{Sh}(H)$ is its own dual, with unit and co-unit given by*

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta : \mathbf{k} &\rightarrow \text{Sh}(H \times H), & V &\mapsto \Delta_! a^* V, \\
\epsilon : \text{Sh}(H \times H) &\rightarrow \mathbf{k}, & F &\mapsto a_! \Delta^* F,
\end{aligned}$$

where $a : H \rightarrow \{*\}$ is the constant map and $\Delta : H \rightarrow H \times H$ is the diagonal map.

Proof. Computing $(1 \otimes \eta) \circ (\epsilon \otimes 1)$ is an elementary exercise in the use of base change. \square

Proposition 3.2. *Via the above identification $\text{Sh}(H) = \text{Sh}(H)^\vee$, the composition of equivalences*

$$\text{Sh}(H_1 \times H_2) \xleftarrow{\sim} \text{Sh}(H_1) \otimes \text{Sh}(H_2) = \text{Sh}(H_1)^\vee \otimes \text{Sh}(H_2) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Fun}^L(\text{Sh}(H_1), \text{Sh}(H_2))$$

sends $K \in \text{Sh}(H_1 \times H_2)$ to the integral transform $\Phi_K = [F \mapsto p_{2!}(K \otimes p_1^* F)]$.

Proof. For $K \in \mathrm{Sh}(H_1 \times H_2) \xleftarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Sh}(H_1) \otimes \mathrm{Sh}(H_2) = \mathrm{Sh}(H_1)^\vee \otimes \mathrm{Sh}(H_2)$, the corresponding functor is computed by the composition

$$\mathrm{Sh}(H_1) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Id}_1 \otimes K} \mathrm{Sh}(H_1) \otimes \mathrm{Sh}(H_1 \times H_2) \simeq \mathrm{Sh}(H_1 \times H_1) \otimes \mathrm{Sh}(H_2) \xrightarrow{\epsilon_1 \otimes \mathrm{Id}_2} \mathrm{Sh}(H_2).$$

On objects this sends

$$F \mapsto F \boxtimes K \mapsto p_{2!}(\Delta_1 \times \mathrm{Id}_{H_2})^*(F \boxtimes K) \simeq p_{2!}(K \otimes p_1^*F). \quad \square$$

Corollary 3.3. *There is a natural isomorphism*

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\Phi_K) = \Gamma_c(H, \Delta^*K).$$

In particular, as $\Phi_{1_\Delta} = 1_{\mathrm{Sh}(H)}$, we have

$$\mathrm{Tr}(1_{\mathrm{Sh}(H)}) = \Gamma_c(H, 1_H).$$

Proof. We compute:

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\Phi_K) \cong a_! \Delta^* v^* K \cong \Gamma_c(H, \Delta^*K).$$

where $v : H \times H \rightarrow H \times H$ is the interchange of factors (and is acting trivially in this formula since $\Delta^* v^* = \Delta^*$). \square

Remark 3.4. We first learned the $K = 1$ case of Corollary 3.3 from Efimov, albeit with a different definition of Hochschild homology, and a very different proof.

Let us turn to the category of sheaves with some prescribed microsupport. For a closed subset $X \subseteq S^*M$, the inclusion $\mathrm{Sh}_X(M) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Sh}(M)$ is continuous and co-continuous, so in particular has for formal reasons a left adjoint, which we denote $\iota_X^* : \mathrm{Sh}(M) \rightarrow \mathrm{Sh}_X(M)$.

In fact, this functor is realized by the integral transform Φ_K when $K = \iota_{-X \times^c X}^*(1_{\Delta_M})$ where, for another closed subset $Y := S^*N$, the product $X \times^c Y$ ‘conic’ product in $S^*(M \times N)$ which is given by

$$X \times^c Y := (((\mathbb{R}_{>0}X \cup 0_M) \times (\mathbb{R}_{>0}Y \cup 0_N)) \setminus 0_{M \times N}) / \mathbb{R}_{>0}.$$

This assertion is a special case of the following proposition:

Proposition 3.5. *For any sheaf kernel $K \in \mathrm{Sh}(M \times M)$, the three functors from $\mathrm{Sh}(M)$ to $\mathrm{Sh}_X(M)$, $\iota_X^* \circ \Phi_K \circ \iota_X^*$, $\Phi_{\iota_{-X \times X}^*(K)}$, and $\Phi_{\iota_{-X \times X}^*(K)} \circ \iota_X^*$ are all equivalent to each other.*

In particular, $\iota_X^ = \Phi_{\iota_{-X \times X}^*(1_\Delta)}$.*

Proof. All three functors having target in $\mathrm{Sh}_X(M)$ is a standard exercise of microsupport estimation. The functor Φ_K has a right adjoint which is given by $\Psi_K := [G \mapsto p_{1*} \mathcal{H}om(K, p_2^!G)]$. Thus, for any $G \in \mathrm{Sh}(M)$ and $F \in \mathrm{Sh}_X(M)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Hom}(\Phi_{\iota_{-X \times X}^*(K)}(G), F) &= \mathrm{Hom}\left(G, \Psi_{\iota_{-X \times X}^*(K)}(F)\right) \\ &= \mathrm{Hom}\left(\iota_X^*(G), \Psi_{\iota_{-X \times X}^*(K)}(F)\right) = \mathrm{Hom}(\Phi_{\iota_{-X \times X}^*(K)} \circ \iota_X^*(G), F), \end{aligned}$$

and we conclude the latter two are the same. Note we use the fact that $\Psi_{\iota_{-X \times X}^*(K)}(F)$ is in $\mathrm{Sh}_X(M)$ for the third equality.

To show that the first two are the same, by the above, we may restrict them to $\mathrm{Sh}_X(M)$ and assume $G \in \mathrm{Sh}_X(M)$. As a consequence, for $F \in \mathrm{Sh}_X(M)$, we have $\mathcal{H}om(p_1^*G, p_2^!F) \in \mathrm{Sh}_{-X \times X}(M \times M)$. This implies that,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Hom}(\Phi_{\iota_{-X \times X}^*(K)}(G), F) &:= \mathrm{Hom}(p_{2!}(\iota_{-X \times X}^*(K) \otimes G), F) = \mathrm{Hom}\left(\iota_{-X \times X}^*(K), \mathcal{H}om(p_1^*G, p_2^!F)\right) \\ &= \mathrm{Hom}\left(K, \mathcal{H}om(p_1^*G, p_2^!F)\right) = \mathrm{Hom}(\Phi_K(G), F) = \mathrm{Hom}(\iota_X^* \circ \Phi_K(G), F). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 3.6. $\mathrm{Tr}(1_{\mathrm{Sh}_X(M)}, \mathrm{Sh}_X(M)) = \mathrm{Tr}(\Phi_{\iota_{-X \times X}^*(1_\Delta)}, \mathrm{Sh}(M)) = \Gamma_c(M, \Delta^* \iota_{-X \times X}^*(1_\Delta))$.

Proof. Immediate from Cor. 3.3 and Prop. 3.5. \square

Remark 3.7. One can show along similar lines that the dual idempotent in the sense of Lemma 2.2 is given by $\iota_{X \times -X}^*(1_\Delta) \circ (-) : \mathrm{Sh}(M) \rightarrow \mathrm{Sh}(M)$, and that correspondingly $\mathrm{Sh}_X(M)^\vee = \mathrm{Sh}_{-X}(M)$ with unit and counit given by

$$\epsilon_X := a_! \Delta^* : \mathrm{Sh}(M \times M) \rightarrow \mathbf{k}, \quad \eta_X := \iota_{-X \times X}^*(1_\Delta) : \mathbf{k} \rightarrow \mathrm{Sh}(M \times M).$$

This is a consequence of the following proposition which states that the dual of an integral transform is simply given by the same integral transform with its components swapped.

Proposition 3.8. *Let $K \in \mathrm{Sh}(H \times H')$ be a sheaf kernel. The dual of the integral transform $\Phi_K : \mathrm{Sh}(H) \rightarrow \mathrm{Sh}(H')$, under Proposition 3.1, is given by $\Phi_{v^*K} : \mathrm{Sh}(H') \rightarrow \mathrm{Sh}(H)$ where $v : H \times H' = H' \times H$ is the swapping map $v(x, y) := (y, x)$.*

Proof. Recall that if X and Y are dualizable, then for a morphism $f : X \rightarrow Y$, the dual f^\vee is given by the composition

$$Y^\vee \xrightarrow{\eta_X \otimes \mathrm{id}_{Y^\vee}} X^\vee \otimes X \otimes Y^\vee \xrightarrow{\mathrm{id}_{X^\vee} \otimes f \otimes \mathrm{id}_{Y^\vee}} X^\vee \otimes Y \otimes Y^\vee \xrightarrow{\mathrm{id}_{X^\vee} \otimes \epsilon_Y} X^\vee.$$

Following this definition, the proof for the statement becomes a straightforward yet lengthy six-functor yoga on the triple product $H' \times H \times H$, which is very close, in spirit, to the proof of [28, Proposition 3.6.4]. \square

4 The Tamarkin category of a point

Let us write $\mathrm{Sh}_-(\mathbb{R})$ for the category of sheaves with nonpositive microsupport, and correspondingly $\mathrm{Sh}_+(\mathbb{R})$ for the sheaves with nonnegative microsupport. In this section we study

$$\mathcal{T} := \mathrm{Sh}(\mathbb{R}) / \mathrm{Sh}_-(\mathbb{R})$$

We can also think of \mathcal{T} in terms of the left adjoint to the quotient $\mathrm{Sh}(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$, which embeds $\mathcal{T} \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Sh}_+(\mathbb{R})$ as the full subcategory on objects with no compactly supported global sections.

Proposition 4.1. *The following three subcategory of $\mathrm{Sh}(\mathbb{R})$ are the same:*

- (i) \mathcal{T} ,
- (ii) $\{F \in \mathrm{Sh}_+(\mathbb{R}) \mid \Gamma_c(\mathbb{R}; F) = 0\}$,
- (iii) $\langle 1_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq a}}, a \in \mathbb{R} \rangle$.

Here, for a set of objects $S \subseteq \mathrm{Obj}(\mathrm{Sh}(\mathbb{R}))$, $\langle S \rangle$ means the smallest subcategory closed under taking colimits containing S .

Proof. Recall that the recollement

$$\mathrm{Sh}_-(\mathbb{R}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Sh}(\mathbb{R}) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{T}$$

decomposes objects in $\mathrm{Sh}(\mathbb{R})$, using the left adjoints, by the fiber sequence

$$1_{\{t_2 \geq t_1\}} \rightarrow 1_{\Delta_{\mathbb{R}}} \rightarrow 1_{\{t_2 > t_1\}}[1],$$

where (t_1, t_2) is the coordinate for \mathbb{R}^2 . This implies that $\langle 1_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq a}}, a \in \mathbb{R} \rangle$ is contained in both $\{F \in \text{Sh}_+(\mathbb{R}) | \Gamma_c(\mathbb{R}; F) = 0\}$ and \mathcal{T} , since $1_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq a}} = 1_{\{t_2 \geq t_1\}} \circ 1_{\{a\}}$. In addition, standard microsupport estimation, e.g., [30, Proposition 3.2], implies that $F \in \text{Sh}_+(\mathbb{R})$ so $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \text{Sh}_+(\mathbb{R})$ as well.

To show that both inclusions are in fact equalities, we have to check that, for both cases, $F = 0$ if and only if $\text{Hom}(1_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq a}}, F) = 0$ by, e.g., [15, I.1, Proposition 5.4.5]. The latter is equivalent to

$$\Gamma((-\infty, b); F) \xrightarrow{\sim} \Gamma((-\infty, a); F),$$

for all $a \leq b$.

For any $F \in \text{Sh}_+(\mathbb{R})$, the non-characteristic deformation lemma [28, Proposition 2.7.2] implies that $\Gamma((-\infty, a); F) \xrightarrow{\sim} \Gamma((c, a); F)$ for all $c < a$. In short, we conclude that, for $F \in \text{Sh}_+(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying $\text{Hom}(1_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq a}}, F) = 0$ for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\Gamma((a - \epsilon, a + \epsilon); F) \xrightarrow{\sim} \Gamma((a - \epsilon, a); F)$$

for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\epsilon > 0$. So $F \in \text{Sh}_-(\mathbb{R})$. Thus $F \in \text{Loc}(\mathbb{R})$ is locally constant, which can only be 0 if F is also in \mathcal{T} or $\{F \in \text{Sh}_+(\mathbb{R}) | \Gamma_c(\mathbb{R}; F) = 0\}$. \square

4.1 Symmetric monoidal structure from convolution on \mathbb{R}

We recall some results from [46, 22].

Let $s : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the sum. Consider the map $\star : \text{Sh}(\mathbb{R}) \times \text{Sh}(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \text{Sh}(\mathbb{R})$ which is given by the formula

$$(G, F) \mapsto s_!(G \boxtimes F) = s_!(p_2^* G \otimes p_1^* F).$$

This underlies a symmetric monoidal structure, with unit $1_{\{0\}}$. More generally, if we write the translation map on \mathbb{R} as $T_c(t) = t + c$, then one checks readily that $T_{c*} H \cong 1_{\{c\}} \star H$.

For $a, b > 0$, we note the formulas:

$$1_{(-a, a)}[1] \star 1_{(-b, b)}[1] = 1_{(-(a+b), a+b)}[1], \quad 1_{[-a, a]} \star 1_{(-a, a)}[1] = 1_{\{0\}}. \quad (4)$$

Using 6-functor formalism over \mathbf{k} , we can define a $\mathcal{H}\text{om}^\star$ with the formula

$$\mathcal{H}\text{om}^\star(F, G) = p_{2*} \mathcal{H}\text{om}(p_1^* F, s^! G), \quad F, G \in \text{Sh}(\mathbb{R}),$$

such that, for $F, G, H \in \text{Sh}(\mathbb{R})$,

$$\text{Hom}_{\text{Sh}(\mathbb{R})}(F \star G, H) = \text{Hom}_{\text{Sh}(\mathbb{R})}(F, \mathcal{H}\text{om}^\star(G, H)).$$

Then we find that $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{R})$ is a closed symmetric monoidal category.

Lemma 4.2. *The following estimates hold (see [22, Corollary 4.14])*

$$\begin{aligned} \star : \text{Sh}(\mathbb{R}) \times \text{Sh}(\mathbb{R})_- &\rightarrow \text{Sh}(\mathbb{R})_-, \quad \text{or } \text{Sh}(\mathbb{R})_- \times \text{Sh}(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \text{Sh}(\mathbb{R})_-; \\ \mathcal{H}\text{om}^\star : \text{Sh}(\mathbb{R})^{op} \times \text{Sh}(\mathbb{R})_- &\rightarrow \text{Sh}(\mathbb{R})_-, \quad \text{or } \text{Sh}(\mathbb{R})_-^{op} \times \text{Sh}(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \text{Sh}(\mathbb{R})_-. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4.2 implies that the closed symmetric monoidal structure determined by \star descends to \mathcal{T} . Note that in \mathcal{T} , we have $[1_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}] \cong [1_{\{0\}}]$, giving two useful expressions for the unit. Let us note also that the inclusion $\mathcal{T} \hookrightarrow \text{Sh}(\mathbb{R})$, $[F] \mapsto F \star 1_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$ respects the monoidal structure \star . Indeed: $1_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} \star 1_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} = 1_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$, so

$$([F] \star [G]) \star 1_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} = [F \star G] \star 1_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} = F \star G \star 1_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} = (F \star 1_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}) \star (G \star 1_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}).$$

Lemma 4.3. *For $F, G \in \mathcal{T}$, we have*

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(F, T_{c*} G) = \text{Hom}_{\text{Sh}(\mathbb{R})}(F \star 1_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}, T_{c*} G) = \Gamma_{[-c, \infty)}(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{H}\text{om}^\star(F, G)).$$

Proof. The first isomorphism comes from [22, (61)], and the second comes from adjunction and $\text{Hom}_{\text{Sh}(\mathbb{R})}(F \star 1_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}, T_{c*} G) \simeq \text{Hom}_{\text{Sh}(\mathbb{R})}(F \star T_{-c*} 1_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}, G)$. \square

4.2 Filtered complexes

Consider the symmetric monoidal category $(\vec{\mathbb{R}}, +)$ associated to the ordered group \mathbb{R} (there's a map $a \rightarrow b$ if $a \leq b$).

Lemma 4.4. *There is a symmetric monoidal functor*

$$\begin{aligned} (\vec{\mathbb{R}}, +) &\rightarrow (\mathrm{Sh}(\mathbb{R}), \star) \\ c &\mapsto \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R} \geq c} \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The content of the assertion is that there are natural isomorphisms $\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R} \geq a} \star \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R} \geq b} = \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R} \geq a+b}$ and, when $d \geq c$, canonical maps $\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R} \geq c} \rightarrow \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R} \geq d}$. This is straightforward. \square

We may of course further compose with $(\mathrm{Sh}(\mathbb{R}), \star) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$. Pullback of Yoneda modules defines a functor

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{[\cdot, \infty)} : \mathcal{T} &\rightarrow \mathrm{Fun}(\vec{\mathbb{R}}^{op}, \mathbf{k}) \\ G &\mapsto [c \mapsto \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R} \geq c}, G)], \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where the image carries the natural ‘Hopf algebra’ monoidal structure on functors out of a monoidal category. We regard the target as a version of ‘ \mathbb{R} -filtered complexes’.

We choose the notation for this functor because:

$$\Gamma_{[c, \infty)}(\mathbb{R}, -) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{Sh}(\mathbb{R})}(\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R} \geq c}, -) : \mathrm{Sh}(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbf{k}.$$

Remark 4.5. By the microlocal Morse lemma, $\Gamma_{[c, \infty)}(\mathbb{R}, H) = 0$ when $H \in \mathrm{Sh}_-(\mathbb{R})$. Thus always $\Gamma_{[c, \infty)}(\mathbb{R}, H)$ depends only on the isomorphism class $[H] \in \mathcal{T}$, and

$$\Gamma_{[c, \infty)}(\mathbb{R}, H) = \Gamma_{[\cdot, \infty)}([H])(c).$$

Let us introduce notation for the categories of \mathbb{R} -filtered objects:

$$Filt^+ := \mathrm{Fun}(\vec{\mathbb{R}}, \mathbf{k}), \quad Filt^- := \mathrm{Fun}(\vec{\mathbb{R}}^{op}, \mathbf{k}), \tag{6}$$

which have increasing and decreasing filtrations, respectively.

Definition 4.6. For a filtered complex $F \in Filt^\pm$ and an element $x \in F(s)$,¹ we define the *persistence*:

$$Per(x) := \inf\{\epsilon \mid \text{the image of } x \text{ in } F(s \pm \epsilon) \text{ is zero}\}.$$

We say $F \in Filt^\pm$ is a *persistence module* if every nonzero element has nonzero persistence.² We say $F \in Filt^\pm$ is *torsion* if every element has bounded persistence.

Lemma 4.7. $\Gamma_{[\cdot, \infty)}$ embeds \mathcal{T} fully faithfully in the torsion persistence modules in $Filt^-$.

Proof. This is a special case of [29, §1.4]. Let us explain the origin of the persistence and torsion conditions.

¹We allow ourselves the following standard abuse of language: for $M \in \mathbf{k}$, by ‘element of M ’ we mean ‘map from $\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{k}} \rightarrow M$. An element ‘is zero’ if the map factors through the zero object, etc.

²In the literature, the term ‘persistence module’ is used for various flavors of \mathbb{R} -filtered complexes; here we reserve it for this kind.

The embedding of Lemma 4.4 preserves filtered colimits, so any $F \in \text{Fun}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^{op}, \mathbf{k})$ in the image of $\Gamma_{[\cdot, \infty)}$ preserves limits. The only nontrivial resulting condition is

$$\varprojlim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} F(x - \epsilon) = F(x).$$

This is precisely the condition of being a persistence module.

Additionally, $\varinjlim_{c \rightarrow \infty} 1_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq c}} = 0$, so such functors must satisfy

$$\varprojlim_{N \rightarrow \infty} F(N) = 0.$$

This is the condition of being torsion. □

Remark 4.8. One can also describe the image as the category of limit-preserving functors $(\overline{\mathbb{R}} \cup \infty)^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{k}$.

5 Some properties of Tamarkin categories

Recall that for $U \subseteq T^*M$, we define

$$\mathcal{T}(U) := \text{Sh}(M \times \mathbb{R}) / \{F \mid \pi(i^{-1}ss(F)) \cap U = \emptyset\},$$

where maps are $T^*(M \times \mathbb{R}) \xleftarrow{i} J^1M \xrightarrow{\pi} T^*M$. Note that for $V \subseteq U$, there is an evident natural surjection $\mathcal{T}(U) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(V)$. The notion of microsupport descends to define a map \underline{ss} from objects of $\mathcal{T}(U)$ to closed coisotropic subsets of U . The corresponding triangulated version $\mathcal{D}_U(M)$ (over a discrete ring \mathbb{F}) was defined in [8, 53]. By results of [4, Section 5], we have an equivalence of \mathbb{F} -linear triangulated categories $h\mathcal{T}(U) \simeq \mathcal{D}_U(M)$.

In this section we give various further properties of $\mathcal{T}(U)$. Many are taken from or reformulations of results in [46, 22, 21, 20], or are otherwise known or obvious to experts.

5.1 \mathcal{T} -linearity of $\mathcal{T}(U)$

For a subset $X \subseteq T^*(M \times \mathbb{R})$, let us write $\mathbb{R} \cdot X$ for the union of all translates of X along the base \mathbb{R} direction.

For $U \subseteq T^*M$, let us write $\tilde{U} \subseteq T^*(M \times \mathbb{R})$ for the conic saturation of $i(\pi^{-1}(U))$. Microsupports being conic, we have, for any $F \in \text{Sh}(M \times \mathbb{R})$,

$$\pi(i^{-1}ss(F)) \cap U = \emptyset \iff ss(F) \cap \tilde{U} = \emptyset.$$

Lemma 5.1. $\tilde{U} = \mathbb{R} \cdot \tilde{U}$.

Proof. If we write (q, t) for coordinates on $M \times \mathbb{R}$ and (q, p, t, τ) for coordinates on $T^*(M \times \mathbb{R})$, then $\tilde{U} = \{(q, p, t, \tau) : (q, p/\tau) \in U, \tau > 0\}$. □

Lemma 5.2. [22, Proposition 3.13.] For any $A \in \text{Sh}(\mathbb{R})$ and $F \in \text{Sh}(M \times \mathbb{R})$

$$ss(A \star F) \subseteq \mathbb{R} \cdot ((T^*M \times ss(A)) \cap ss(F)) \subseteq \mathbb{R} \cdot ss(F).$$

Proposition 5.3. The natural action of $(\text{Sh}(\mathbb{R}), \star)$ on $\text{Sh}(M \times \mathbb{R})$ descends to an action of \mathcal{T} on $\mathcal{T}(U)$.

Proof. First let us check that the action of $(\mathrm{Sh}(\mathbb{R}), \star)$ descends to an action on $\mathcal{T}(U)$. We must show that for any $A \in \mathrm{Sh}(\mathbb{R})$, the functor $A \star (-) : \mathrm{Sh}(M \times \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Sh}(M \times \mathbb{R})$ fixes the subcategory $\{F \mid \mathrm{ss}(F) \cap \tilde{U} = \emptyset\}$. This is clear from Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2.

Now let us check that the action on $\mathcal{T}(U)$ factors through \mathcal{T} . We should show that if $A \in \mathrm{Sh}_-(\mathbb{R})$, then the action of A on $\mathcal{T}(U)$ is trivial. Now recall that $A \in \mathrm{Sh}_-(\mathbb{R})$ if and only if $A = 1_{\{0\}} \star A \xrightarrow{\sim} 1_{\mathbb{R}_{>0}}[1] \star A$ is an isomorphism. For such A , we have

$$A \star F = (1_{\mathbb{R}_{>0}}[1] \star A) \star F = 1_{\mathbb{R}_{>0}}[1] \star (A \star F),$$

and we recall that $1_{\mathbb{R}_{>0}}[1]$ sends $\mathrm{Sh}(M \times \mathbb{R})$ into $\mathrm{Sh}_-(M \times \mathbb{R})$. \square

The same considerations show:

Proposition 5.4. *For $V \subseteq U$, the quotient map and both its adjoints $\mathcal{T}(U) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(V)$ are \mathcal{T} -linear.*

5.2 Tamarkin category as a sheaf category

As \mathcal{T} is a symmetric monoidal presentable stable category, we may consider the (symmetric monoidal presentable stable) categories $\mathrm{Sh}(M; \mathcal{T})$ of sheaves with coefficients in \mathcal{T} . As always we have a 6-functor formalism [52, 42]. We denote the resulting functors by $\otimes_{\mathcal{T}}, \mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}_{\mathcal{T}}, f_{\star}^{\mathcal{T}}, f_{\mathcal{T}}^{\star}, f_{!}^{\mathcal{T}}, f_{\mathcal{T}}^{!}$.

Proposition 5.5. *As \mathcal{T} -linear categories, we have $\mathcal{T}(T^*M) \cong \mathrm{Sh}(M; \mathcal{T})$.*

Proof. We first prove that two categories are equivalent as \mathbf{k} -linear categories.

We use the identification $\mathrm{Sh}(M; \mathcal{T}) = \mathrm{Sh}(M) \otimes \mathcal{T}$ (see [33, Corollary 1.3.1.8], [32, Theorem 7.3.3.9], or [52, Corollary 2.24]).

The functor $- \mapsto \mathrm{Sh}(M) \otimes -$ preserves colimits, so

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Sh}(M) \otimes \mathcal{T} &= \mathrm{Sh}(M) \otimes \mathrm{cof}(\mathrm{Sh}_-(\mathbb{R}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Sh}(\mathbb{R})) \\ &\cong \mathrm{cof}(\mathrm{Sh}(M) \otimes \mathrm{Sh}_-(\mathbb{R}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Sh}(M) \otimes \mathrm{Sh}(\mathbb{R})) \\ &= \mathrm{cof}(\mathrm{Sh}(M) \otimes \mathrm{Sh}_-(\mathbb{R}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Sh}(M \times \mathbb{R})). \end{aligned}$$

It remains to verify that the essential image of the functor

$$\mathrm{Sh}(M) \otimes \mathrm{Sh}_-(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Sh}(M) \otimes \mathrm{Sh}(\mathbb{R}) = \mathrm{Sh}(M \times \mathbb{R}), \quad F \otimes G \mapsto F \boxtimes G$$

is $\mathrm{Sh}_-(M \times \mathbb{R})$.

Any object in $\mathrm{Sh}_-(M \times \mathbb{R})$ can be written as a colimit of some $F_{\alpha} \boxtimes G_{\alpha} \in \mathrm{Sh}(M) \boxtimes \mathrm{Sh}(\mathbb{R})$. We should show that the G_{α} can be chosen to be in $\mathrm{Sh}_-(\mathbb{R})$. But since $\mathrm{Sh}_-(M \times \mathbb{R})$ is stable under the convolution with $1_{\mathbb{R}_{>0}}[1]$, we have:

$$\mathrm{colim} F_{\alpha} \boxtimes G_{\alpha} = (\mathrm{colim} F_{\alpha} \boxtimes G_{\alpha}) \star 1_{\mathbb{R}_{>0}}[1] = \mathrm{colim} F_{\alpha} \boxtimes (G_{\alpha} \star 1_{\mathbb{R}_{>0}}[1]).$$

Now, we show that the equivalence is actually \mathcal{T} -linear. Any arbitrary object in $\mathrm{Sh}(M) \otimes \mathcal{T}$ can be written as a colimit of some $F_{\alpha} \boxtimes G_{\alpha} \in \mathrm{Sh}(M) \otimes \mathcal{T}$. So $A \in \mathcal{T}$, we have

$$A \star (\mathrm{colim} F_{\alpha} \boxtimes G_{\alpha}) = \mathrm{colim} F_{\alpha} \boxtimes (A \star G_{\alpha}). \quad \square$$

Remark 5.6. For a continuous map $f : M \rightarrow N$, we set $\underline{f} = f \times \mathrm{id}_{\mathbb{R}}$, and one can check $\underline{f}_{\star}, \underline{f}^{\star}, \underline{f}_{!}, \underline{f}^{!}$ descent to $\mathcal{T}(T^*M)$. One can check that, under the above isomorphism, $f_{\star}^{\mathcal{T}}, f_{\mathcal{T}}^{\star}, f_{!}^{\mathcal{T}}, f_{\mathcal{T}}^{!}$ correspond to these $\underline{f}_{\star}, \underline{f}^{\star}, \underline{f}_{!}, \underline{f}^{!}$.

In [22], a closed symmetric monoidal structure $(\star, \mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}^{\star})$ is defined on $\mathcal{T}(T^*M)$ by tensor in the M factor and convolution in the \mathbb{R} factor. One can check that under the above isomorphism, it is carried to $(\otimes_{\mathcal{T}}, \mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}_{\mathcal{T}})$. Indeed, the argument of Proposition 5.5 also gives us that $\otimes_{\mathcal{T}} \simeq \star$ as bifunctors. Then $\mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}_{\mathcal{T}} \simeq \mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}^{\star}$ since they are right adjoints of $\otimes_{\mathcal{T}} \simeq \star$.

Remark 5.7. Another way to read Proposition 5.5 is that for $F \in \text{Sh}(M; \mathcal{T})$, there is a natural *nonconic* microsupport $\underline{ss}(F) \subseteq T^*M$. In this language, $\mathcal{T}(U)$ is the quotient of $\text{Sh}(M; \mathcal{T})$ by

$$\text{Sh}_{U^c}(M; \mathcal{T}) := \{F \in \text{Sh}(M; \mathcal{T}) \mid \underline{ss}(F) \subseteq U^c\}.$$

5.3 Dualizability

Proposition 5.8. $\mathcal{T}(U)$ is dualizable as \mathcal{T} -linear category.

Proof. The case of $U = T^*M$ is a special case of Proposition 3.1 after the identification $\mathcal{T}(T^*M) = \text{Sh}(M; \mathcal{T})$ of Proposition 5.5.

We may then deduce the result for general U , via Proposition 5.4 and Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3. \square

5.4 Some compatibilities of \mathcal{T} -linear kernels

Lemma 5.9. Denote $m : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $(t_1, t_2) \mapsto t_2 - t_1$. The functor $m^* : (\text{Sh}(\mathbb{R}), \star) \rightarrow (\text{Sh}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}), \circ)$ is monoidal, i.e.,

$$m^*(G \star F) = (m^*G) \circ (m^*F)$$

for any $G, F \in \text{Sh}(\mathbb{R})$.

Proof. By the definition, $m^*(G \star F) = m^*s_!(p_2^*G \otimes p_1^*F)$. The pullback diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{R}^3 & \xrightarrow{m \times \text{id}} & \mathbb{R}^2 \\ \downarrow \text{id} \times s & & \downarrow s \\ \mathbb{R}^2 & \xrightarrow{m} & \mathbb{R} \end{array}$$

implies that $m^*(G \star F) = (\text{id} \times s)_!(m \times \text{id})^*(p_2^*G \otimes p_1^*F) = (\text{id} \times s)_!(q_3^*G \otimes q_{12}^*m^*F)$ where we use the equality $p_1 \circ (m \times \text{id}) = m \circ q_{12} = [(t_1, t_2, t_3) \mapsto t_2 - t_1]$. Next, we notice that $q_{13} = (\text{id} \times s) \circ (q_1, q_2, m \circ q_{23}) = [(t_1, t_2, t_3) \mapsto (t_1, t_2, t_3 - t_2) \mapsto (t_1, t_3)]$, and thus

$$\begin{aligned} m^*(G \star F) &= (\text{id} \times s)_!(q_1, q_2, m \circ q_{23})_!(q_1, q_2, m \circ q_{23})^*(q_3^*G \otimes q_{12}^*m^*F) \\ &= q_{13!}(q_1, q_2, m \circ q_{23})^*(q_3^*G \otimes q_{12}^*m^*F) \\ &= q_{13!}(q_{23}^*m^*G \otimes q_{12}^*m^*F) = (m^*G) \circ (m^*F), \end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that $q_3 \circ (q_1, q_2, m \circ q_{23}) = m \circ q_{23}$ for the second to last equality. \square

Lemma 5.10. For $K \in \text{Sh}(\mathbb{R})$, we have $K \star F = (m^*K) \circ F$.

Proof. By base change, we assume $M = N = \{*\}$. By the definition, $(m^*K) \circ F = q_{13!}(q_{23}^*m^*K \otimes q_{12}^*F)$. Similar to the previous proposition, we have $q_{13} = (\text{id} \times s) \circ (q_1, q_2, m \circ q_{23}) = (q_1, q_2, s \circ q_{23})$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (m^*K) \circ F &= (\text{id}_X \times s)_!(q_1, q_2, m \circ q_{23})_!(q_{23}^*m^*K \otimes q_{12}^*F) \\ &= (\text{id}_X \times s)_!(q_1, q_2, s \circ q_{23})^*(q_{23}^*m^*K \otimes q_{12}^*F) \\ &= (\text{id}_X \times s)_!(q_3^*K \otimes q_{12}^*F) = K \star F, \end{aligned}$$

where we use the computation $m \circ q_{23} \circ (q_1, q_2, s \circ q_{23})$ has the effect,

$$(x, t, s) \mapsto (x, t, t + s) \mapsto (t, t + s) \mapsto -t + t + s = s.$$

\square

Similar to Proposition 3.2, we naturally identify

$$\mathrm{Sh}(M \times N \times \mathbb{R}) = \mathrm{Sh}(M \times N; \mathrm{Sh}(\mathbb{R})) \cong \mathrm{Fun}_{\mathrm{Sh}(\mathbb{R})}^L(\mathrm{Sh}(M; \mathrm{Sh}(\mathbb{R})), \mathrm{Sh}(N; \mathrm{Sh}(\mathbb{R}))),$$

where on objects level

$$\mathcal{K} \mapsto [F \mapsto \mathcal{K} \circ_{\mathrm{Sh}(\mathbb{R})} F := q_{2!}(\mathcal{K} \star q_1^* F)],$$

and

$$\mathrm{Sh}(M \times \mathbb{R} \times N \times \mathbb{R}) = \mathrm{Fun}^L(\mathrm{Sh}(M \times \mathbb{R}), \mathrm{Sh}(N \times \mathbb{R})),$$

where on objects level

$$K \mapsto [F \mapsto K \circ F := p_{2!}(K \otimes p_1^* F)].$$

Then these two lemmas induce the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Sh}(M \times N \times \mathbb{R}) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \mathrm{Fun}_{\mathrm{Sh}(\mathbb{R})}^L(\mathrm{Sh}(M; \mathrm{Sh}(\mathbb{R})), \mathrm{Sh}(N; \mathrm{Sh}(\mathbb{R}))) \\ \downarrow m^* & & \downarrow \\ \mathrm{Sh}(M \times \mathbb{R} \times N \times \mathbb{R}) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \mathrm{Fun}^L(\mathrm{Sh}(M \times \mathbb{R}), \mathrm{Sh}(N \times \mathbb{R})), \end{array}$$

where the right vertical functor is

$$[F \mapsto \mathcal{K} \circ_{\mathrm{Sh}(\mathbb{R})} F] \mapsto [F \mapsto m^* \mathcal{K} \circ F].$$

By [22, Proposition 3.13.] or a base change version of Lemma 5.2, the \star action

$$\mathrm{Sh}(M \times N \times \mathbb{R}) \otimes_{\mathrm{Sh}(\mathbb{R})} \mathrm{Sh}(M \times \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Sh}(N \times \mathbb{R}), \quad K \otimes_{\mathrm{Sh}(\mathbb{R})} F \mapsto K \circ_{\mathrm{Sh}(\mathbb{R})} F$$

descends to an action

$$\mathrm{Sh}(M \times N; \mathcal{T}) \otimes_{\mathcal{T}} \mathrm{Sh}(M; \mathcal{T}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Sh}(N; \mathcal{T}), \quad K \otimes_{\mathcal{T}} F \mapsto K \circ_{\mathcal{T}} F,$$

which is the same as the \circ -action defined by \mathcal{T} -linear 6-functors. From the point of view of Proposition 5.5, it is more convenient to consider $\mathcal{T}(U)$ as a quotient of $\mathrm{Sh}(M; \mathcal{T})$. As an example as well as a corollary from the above computation, we have

Corollary 5.11. *The functor*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}(T^*M) \otimes_{\mathcal{T}} \mathcal{T}(T^*N) &\xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{T}(T^*M \times T^*N) \\ (F, G) &\mapsto s_!(F \boxtimes G), \end{aligned}$$

where the map $s : M \times \mathbb{R} \times N \times \mathbb{R}$ is given by $s(x, t_1, y, t_2) = (x, y, t_1 + t_2)$, is an equivalence.

Proof. The content of the proof is that $\mathcal{T}(T^*M) \otimes_{\mathcal{T}} \mathcal{T}(T^*N)$ is, a priori, a relative tensor product which is given by a colimit in $\mathrm{Pr}_{st}^L(\mathcal{T})$. It can be computed directly using the standard trick $\mathrm{Pr}_{st}^L(\mathcal{T}) = (\mathrm{Pr}_{st}^R(\mathcal{T}))^{op}$ by passing to right adjoints. However, we can use Proposition 5.5 to identify the desired map as $\mathrm{Sh}(M; \mathcal{T}) \otimes_{\mathcal{T}} \mathrm{Sh}(N; \mathcal{T}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Sh}(M \times N; \mathcal{T})$ and its equivalence follows from general category theory as discussed in the beginning of Section 3. \square

Lemma 5.12. *For $F \in \mathrm{Sh}(M; \mathcal{T})$ and $G \in \mathrm{Sh}(N; \mathcal{T})$, we have microsupport estimation $\underline{ss}(F \boxtimes_{\mathcal{T}} G) \subseteq \underline{ss}(F) \times \underline{ss}(G)$.*

Proof. We returned to the point of view that $\mathcal{T}(U)$ is a quotient of $\mathrm{Sh}(M \times \mathbb{R})$. Then the statement is a combination of [28, Proposition 5.4.1] and [22, Proposition 4.13]. \square

5.5 Tensor product and integral functors

For this section, we take the point of view that, for an open set $U \subseteq T^*M$, the Tamarkin category $\mathcal{T}(U)$ is the quotient of the inclusion $\mathrm{Sh}_{U^c}(M; \mathcal{T}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Sh}(M; \mathcal{T})$, where the subscript indicates the not-necessarily-conic microsupport condition on $\underline{\mathrm{ss}}(F)$. Thus, all the functors, categorical operations, etc. will automatically be \mathcal{T} -linear as discussed in Remark 5.6. In this subsection, we take open sets $U \subseteq T^*M$ and $V \subseteq T^*N$ and we set $X = T^*M \setminus U$ and $Z = T^*N \setminus V$.

Proposition 5.13. *We set*

$$\mathrm{Sh}_{X \times U}(N \times M; \mathcal{T}) := \mathrm{Sh}_{X \times T^*M}(N \times M; \mathcal{T}) / \mathrm{Sh}_{X \times Z}(M \times N; \mathcal{T}).$$

Then we have an isomorphism of fiber sequences

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Sh}_{X \times Z}(M \times N; \mathcal{T}) &\rightarrow \mathrm{Sh}_{T^*M \times Z}(M \times N; \mathcal{T}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Sh}_{U \times Z}(M \times N; \mathcal{T}) \\ &\simeq [\mathrm{Sh}_X(M; \mathcal{T}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Sh}(M; \mathcal{T}) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(U)] \otimes_{\mathcal{T}} \mathrm{Sh}_Z(N; \mathcal{T}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. With the help of Lemma 5.12 and Corollary 5.11. The proof can be proven by using the same argument as Proposition 5.5. We only need to replace the functor $\star 1_{\mathbb{R} < 0}[1]$ by the functor $\mathrm{Sh}(M; \mathcal{T}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Sh}_X(M; \mathcal{T}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Sh}(M; \mathcal{T})$, where the second functor is the canonical inclusion and the first functor is the left adjoint of the canonical inclusion. \square

Proposition 5.14. *We have the equivalence*

$$\mathcal{T}(U) \otimes_{\mathcal{T}} \mathcal{T}(V) = \mathcal{T}(U \times V).$$

Proof. By the third isomorphism theorem of Verdier quotient, we have an equivalence

$$\mathcal{T}(U \times V) \simeq \mathrm{Sh}_{T^*M \times V}(M \times N; \mathcal{T}) / \mathrm{Sh}_{X \times V}(M \times N; \mathcal{T}).$$

The Proposition 5.13 shows that

$$\mathrm{Sh}_{X \times V}(M \times N; \mathcal{T}) \simeq \mathrm{Sh}_X(M; \mathcal{T}) \otimes_{\mathcal{T}} \mathcal{T}(V), \quad \mathrm{Sh}_{T^*M \times V}(M \times N; \mathcal{T}) \simeq \mathrm{Sh}(M; \mathcal{T}) \otimes_{\mathcal{T}} \mathcal{T}(V),$$

and one can verify the following equality

$$[\mathrm{Sh}_{X \times V}(M \times N; \mathcal{T}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Sh}_{T^*M \times V}(M \times N; \mathcal{T})] = [\mathrm{Sh}_X(M; \mathcal{T}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Sh}(M; \mathcal{T})] \otimes_{\mathcal{T}} \mathcal{T}(V).$$

Then the result follows. \square

Proposition 5.15. *We have the equivalence*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}(-U \times V) &\xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Fun}_{\mathcal{T}}^L(\mathcal{T}(U), \mathcal{T}(V)) \\ K &\mapsto (F \mapsto K \circ F). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. For any symmetric monoidal category \mathcal{M} , there is a canonical equivalence $\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(X, Y) = X^\vee \otimes Y$, for any dualizable object X . Thus, the right hand side is given by $\mathrm{Fun}_{\mathcal{T}}^L(\mathcal{T}(U), \mathcal{T}(V)) = \mathcal{T}(U)^\vee \otimes_{\mathcal{T}} \mathcal{T}(V)$ by Lemma 2.2 and Proposition 5.4. A small modification of Remark 3.7, implies that $\mathcal{T}(U)^\vee = \mathcal{T}(-U)$. \square

Example 5.16. The identity functor on $\mathcal{T}(T^*M) = \mathrm{Sh}(M; \mathcal{T})$ is identified as $1_{\Delta_M}^{\mathcal{T}}$ where $1^{\mathcal{T}}$ here means the symmetric monoidal unit $1^{\mathcal{T}} = 1_{[0, \infty)} \in \mathcal{T}$. This is because it corresponds to $1_{\Delta_M} \boxtimes 1_{[0, \infty)}$ in previous literatures where now 1 means simply the unit in the coefficient category \mathbf{k} . To clean up the notation and keep a microlocal point of view, we denote $1_{\Delta_M}^{\mathcal{T}}$ by $1_{\Delta_{T^*M}}$.

5.6 Sheaf quantization of Hamiltonian isotopies

We recall the results of [21]. Let Y be a manifold. On the cotangent bundle, we choose the exact symplectic form $\omega = d\lambda$ with $\lambda = pdq$ (this determines some signs).

Let \dot{T}^*Y be the complement of the zero section in T^*Y . Let $(I, 0)$ be a pointed interval. Consider a $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ -equivariant C^∞ symplectic isotopy

$$\phi : I \times \dot{T}^*Y \rightarrow \dot{T}^*Y,$$

which is the identity at $0 \in I$. Such an isotopy is always the Hamiltonian flow for a unique $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ -equivariant function $H : I \times \dot{T}^*Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We identify $T^*(Y \times Y) = \overline{T^*Y} \times T^*Y$.

At fixed $z \in I$, we have the graph of ϕ_z :

$$\Lambda_{\phi_z} := \left\{ ((q, -p), \phi_z(q, p)) : (q, p) \in \dot{T}^*Y \right\} \subseteq \dot{T}^*(Y \times Y). \quad (7)$$

As for any of Hamiltonian isotopy, we may consider the Lagrangian graph, which by definition is a Lagrangian subset $\Lambda_\phi \subseteq T^*I \times \dot{T}^*(Y \times Y)$ with the property that $\Lambda_{\phi_{z_0}}$ is the symplectic reduction of Λ_ϕ along $\{z = z_0\}$. It is given by the formula:

$$\Lambda_\phi := \left\{ (z, -H(z, \phi_z(q, p)), (q, -p), \phi_z(q, p)) : z \in I, (q, p) \in \dot{T}^*Y \right\}. \quad (8)$$

For $F \in \text{Sh}(Y)$, we set $\dot{s}s(F) := ss(F) \cap \dot{T}^*Y$.

Theorem 5.17 ([21, Theorem 3.7, Prop. 4.8]). *For ϕ as above, there is a sheaf $K = K(\phi) \in \text{Sh}(I \times Y \times Y)$ such that $\dot{s}s(K) = \Lambda_\phi$ and $K|_{\{0\} \times Y^2} \cong 1_{\Delta_Y}$.*

The pair $(K, K|_{\{0\} \times Y^2} \cong 1_{\Delta_Y})$ is unique up to unique isomorphism.

Moreover, for isotopies ϕ, ϕ' generated by Hamiltonians $H' \leq H$, there's a map $K(\phi') \rightarrow K(\phi)$.

In particular, when $H \geq 0$, then there is a map $1_{I \times \Delta_Y} \rightarrow K(\phi)$.

From general properties of microsupports, one has

$$\phi_t(\dot{s}s(F)) = \dot{s}s(K_t \circ F). \quad (9)$$

Remark 5.18. The basic idea of the proof of Theorem 5.17 is that (1) for sufficiently small positive H , the locus Λ_ϕ is the conormal to the boundary of a neighborhood of the diagonal, and the corresponding K is just the constant sheaf on the closed neighborhood and (2) any ϕ can be obtained by composing ϕ as in (1) and their inverses.

To see the existence of the morphism $K(\phi') \rightarrow K(\phi)$, one also reduces to the case when ϕ' is the identity so $H \geq 0$. As remark by Guillermou, Kashiwara, and Schapira in [21, Remark 3.9], the existence and uniqueness statement holds for any contractible manifold B . Apply to the case when $B = I \times J$ for some open interval J containing $[0, 1]$ so that the family-Hamiltonian \tilde{H} is given by sH for s near $[0, 1] \subseteq J$, we see the the total sheaf quantization $\tilde{K} \in \text{Sh}(I \times J \times Y \times Y)$ satisfies $\tilde{K}_{s=0} = 1_{I \times \Delta_Y}$ and $\tilde{K}_{s=1} = K(\phi)$. A similar formula to Λ_ϕ implies that $\tilde{K} \in \text{Sh}_{J \leq 0}(I \times J \times Y \times Y)$ and the canonical map comes from the property of the latter category.

To apply to non-conic situations, consider some manifold M . We write coordinates q on M , and (q, p) on T^*M . We write coordinates (q, t) on $M \times \mathbb{R}$ and (q, p, t, τ) on $T^*(M \times \mathbb{R})$. We identify $T^*(M \times \mathbb{R})$ with $\overline{T^*M} \times T^*\mathbb{R}$. We consider the map

$$\begin{aligned} \rho : T^*M \times \dot{T}^*\mathbb{R} &\rightarrow T^*M \\ (q, p, t, \tau) &\mapsto (q, p/\tau). \end{aligned}$$

For a smooth function H with compactly supported derivative, denote X_H the Hamiltonian vector field defined by $\iota_{X_H}\omega = -dH$, and let $\varphi : I \times T^*M \rightarrow T^*M$ be the isotopy generated by X_H . One can lift φ to $\widehat{\varphi} : I \times \dot{T}^*(M \times \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \dot{T}^*(M \times \mathbb{R})$:

Proposition 5.19 ([21, Proposition A.6]). *Let $H : I \times T^*M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function with compactly supported derivative, and $\varphi : I \times T^*M \rightarrow T^*M$ the corresponding Hamiltonian isotopy. Then φ lifts along ρ to some conic*

$$\widehat{\varphi} : I \times \dot{T}^*(M \times \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \dot{T}^*(M \times \mathbb{R}).$$

On the locus $I \times T^*M \times \dot{T}^*\mathbb{R}$, i.e. where $\tau \neq 0$, the corresponding Hamiltonian function is

$$\widehat{H} := \tau H(-, \rho(-)) : I \times T^*M \times \dot{T}^*\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}.$$

The extension of φ over $\tau = 0$ has the following property. Let

$$S_H^z(q, p) = \int_0^z [\lambda(X_{H_s}) - H_s] \circ \varphi_H^s(q, p) ds \quad (10)$$

be the symplectic action function. Then there exists $v \in C^\infty(I)$ such that:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\varphi}(z, q, t, p, \tau) &= (\tau \cdot \varphi(z, q, p/\tau), t - S_H^z(q, p/\tau), \tau), & \tau \neq 0, \\ \widehat{\varphi}(z, q, t, p, 0) &= (q, p, t + v(z), 0), & \tau = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

We call this $\widehat{\varphi}$ the conification of φ .

Remark 5.20. In the proof, the compact support condition on H arises in the construction of $v(z)$ by solving a differential equation.

Corollary 5.21. [20, Corollary 2.3.2.] *Given a compactly supported Hamiltonian isotopy $\varphi : I \times T^*M \rightarrow T^*M$, there is a unique $\mathcal{K}(\varphi) \in \text{Sh}(I, \mathcal{J}(T^*(M \times M)))$ such that $\mathcal{K}(\varphi)|_0 \cong 1_{\Delta_{T^*M}}$ (See Example 5.16 for the notation), and*

$$ss(\mathcal{K}(\varphi))/\mathbb{R}_+ \subseteq \{(z, -H(z, \varphi_z(q, p)), (q, -p), \varphi_z(q, p), -S_H^z(q, p)) : z \in I, (q, p) \in T^*M\}.$$

Moreover, if φ, φ' are generated by compactly supported Hamiltonians with $\varphi' \leq \varphi$, then there is a map $\mathcal{K}(\varphi') \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(\varphi)$.

Proof. We first apply the GKS theorem to $\phi = \widehat{\varphi}$ to obtain a sheaf $K(\widehat{\varphi}) \in \text{Sh}(I \times (M \times \mathbb{R})^2)$. By the formula (11), we have $\tau' = -\tau$, then

$$ss(K(\widehat{\varphi})) \subseteq \Lambda_{\widehat{\varphi}} \subseteq \{\tau + \tau' = 0\}.$$

By [28, Proposition 5.4.5.], for $m(z, q_1, t_1, q_2, t_2) = (z, q_1, q_2, t_2 - t_1)$, we have $K(\widehat{\varphi}) \cong m^*m_*K(\widehat{\varphi})$. Then we can take $\mathcal{K}(\varphi)$ as the image of $m_*K(\widehat{\varphi}) \in \text{Sh}(I \times M^2 \times \mathbb{R})$ under the natural functor $\text{Sh}(I \times M^2 \times \mathbb{R}) \simeq \text{Sh}(I; \text{Sh}(M^2 \times \mathbb{R})) \rightarrow \text{Sh}(I; \mathcal{J}(M^2))$.

If $\varphi' \leq \varphi$, we cannot use Theorem 5.17 directly since $\widehat{\varphi}' \leq \widehat{\varphi}$ is not true on whole $\dot{T}^*(M \times \mathbb{R})$. Therefore, we embed $\text{Sh}(I, \mathcal{J}(T^*(M^2))) \hookrightarrow \text{Sh}(I \times M^2 \times \mathbb{R})$. Under this identification, we have $\mathcal{K}(\varphi) \simeq K(\widehat{\varphi}) \star 1_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$. Then we have that $ss(\mathcal{K}(\varphi)) \subseteq ss(K(\widehat{\varphi})) \cap \{\tau \geq 0\}$ by Lemma 5.2. Therefore, the argument in Remark 5.18 works. Precisely, we first reduce to the case that $\varphi' = \text{id}$. Then we can find an s -family of $\widetilde{\mathcal{K}} \in \text{Sh}_{J_{\leq 0}^V}(J \times I \times M^2 \times \mathbb{R})$ with $\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{s=0} = 1_{I \times \Delta_M \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$, $\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{s=1} = \mathcal{K}(\varphi)$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{K}} \simeq \widetilde{\mathcal{K}} \star 1_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$. The microsupport constrain $ss(\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}) \subseteq J_{\leq 0}^V$ follows from that the Hamiltonian function is $\widetilde{H} = \tau \widehat{H} = \tau s H \geq 0$ and $\tau, s \geq 0$. Then we have a morphism $1_{I \times \Delta_M \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(\varphi)$, which descent to a morphism in $\text{Sh}(I, \mathcal{J}(T^*(M^2)))$. \square

For each $z \in I$, we set

$$\widehat{\Lambda}_{\varphi_z} := \{((q, -p), \varphi_z(q, p), -S_H^z(q, p)) : (q, p) \in T^*M\}. \quad (12)$$

Then we have $ss(\mathcal{K}(\varphi)|_z)/\mathbb{R}_+ \subseteq \widehat{\Lambda}_{\varphi_z}$ and

$$\mathcal{K}(\varphi)|_z \circ_{\mathcal{T}} - : \mathcal{T}(T^*M) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(T^*M)$$

defines an equivalence, and we have

$$\underline{ss}(\mathcal{K}(\varphi)|_z \circ_{\mathcal{T}} -) = \varphi_z(\underline{ss}(F)).$$

In particular, it induces an equivalence by [8, Proposition 4.5.]

$$\mathcal{K}(\varphi)|_z \circ_{\mathcal{T}} - : \mathcal{T}(U) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\varphi_z(U)).$$

By [56, Proposition 4.18.], if φ_z is fixed, then the functor only depends on the relative homotopy class of the path $[s \in [0, z] \mapsto \varphi_s]$.

6 Trace of the Tamarkin category

For $U \subseteq T^*M$, we have by now shown that $\mathcal{T}(U)$ is linear (Prop. 5.3) and dualizable (Prop. 5.8) over \mathcal{T} . Thus we have a well defined element

$$\mathrm{Tr}(1_{\mathcal{T}(U)}) \in \mathcal{T}$$

We introduce the notation

$$P_U : \mathcal{T}(T^*M) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(T^*M)$$

for the projector with image $\mathcal{T}(U)$. Recalling that $\mathcal{T}(T^*M) = \mathrm{Sh}(M, \mathcal{T})$, the projector P_U can be expressed as an integral kernel, i.e. as an element of $\mathrm{Sh}(M \times M, \mathcal{T})$. Given the projector in such a form, we have, by Lemma 2.2 and Corollary 3.3:

$$\mathrm{Tr}(1_{\mathcal{T}(U)}, \mathcal{T}(U)) = \mathrm{Tr}(P_U, \mathrm{Sh}(M, \mathcal{T})) = \Gamma_c^{\mathcal{T}}(M, \Delta_{\mathcal{T}}^* P_U) \in \mathcal{T}, \quad (13)$$

where $\Delta : M \rightarrow M \times M$ is the inclusion of the diagonal.

In short, the problem of computing the trace of $\mathcal{T}(U)$ is reduced to that of explicitly expressing the projector P_U as an integral kernel. We will also be interested in the projector Q_U to the full subcategory of $\mathrm{Sh}_{U^c}(M, \mathcal{T})$. For formal reasons, there is an fiber sequence

$$P_U \rightarrow 1_{\Delta_{T^*M}} \rightarrow Q_U.$$

In fact, much work has already been done on expressing the projectors and computing the RHS of Equation (13) [8, 53, 55, 30]. We spend the rest of the present section recalling these results.

6.1 Projector via Fourier transform and cutoff

Given a sheaf F on a manifold M , one can ‘cut off’ the support of the sheaf to some closed $c : C \subseteq M$ by e.g. $F \mapsto c_* c^* F$. The classical ‘devisage’ arguments in sheaf theory amount to the fact that $c_* c^*$ is the projector associated to $\mathrm{Sh}(C) \rightarrow \mathrm{Sh}(M)$.

In favorable situations, one can perform a ‘microlocal cutoff’, for instance by composing cutoffs and Fourier transform. Such a cutoff for the Tamarkin category was constructed in [8] when U is a ball; in fact the method works more generally:

Theorem 6.1 ([53, Proposition 2.8]). *Let φ^H be a complete Hamiltonian flow on T^*X with a Hamiltonian function H . Assume that there exists a sheaf quantization, i.e. some*

$$\mathcal{K}(\varphi^H) \in \text{Sh}(\mathbb{R}_z, \mathcal{T}(T^*(M \times M)))$$

*such that $\mathcal{K}(\varphi^H)|_0 = 1_{\Delta_{T^*M}}$ and $\underline{ss}(\mathcal{K}(\varphi^H))$ is contained in the Lagrangian graph of φ^H . If we further assume that, for all $\zeta > 0$, the level set $\{H = \zeta\}$ is compact, then for the open set $U = \{H > 0\}$, we have that the fiber sequence $P_U \rightarrow 1_{\Delta_{T^*M}} \rightarrow Q_U$ is isomorphic to*

$$\mathcal{K}(\varphi^H) \circ_{\mathcal{T}} 1_{\{t+z\zeta \geq 0\}}[1] \circ [1_{\mathbb{R}_{>0}} \rightarrow 1_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow 1_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq 0}}].$$

Remark 6.2. Let us explain the idea of the theorem. Recall that $\underline{ss}(\mathcal{K}(\varphi^H))$ is bounded by the Lagrangian graph of φ^H , i.e.

$$\underline{ss}(\mathcal{K}(\varphi^H)) \subseteq \{z, -H(q, p), q, -p, \varphi_z(q, p) : (z, q, p) \in \mathbb{R} \times T^*X\}. \quad (14)$$

We want to cut off the microsupport of $\mathcal{K}(\varphi^H)$ on ζ -variable. If we use the Fourier-Sato-Tamarkin transform to the z -variable, i.e. $\widehat{\mathcal{K}(\varphi^H)} = \mathcal{K}(\varphi^H) \circ_{\mathcal{T}} 1_{\{t+z\zeta \geq 0\}}[1] \in \text{Sh}(\mathbb{R}_\zeta, \mathcal{T}(T^*(M \times M)))$, then, by [53, Theorem 1.14.], we have

$$\underline{ss}(\widehat{\mathcal{K}(\varphi^H)}) \subseteq \{(H(q, p), z, q, -p, \varphi_z(q, p)) : (z, q, p) \in \mathbb{R} \times T^*X\}. \quad (15)$$

Then we can use the compose with $1_{\mathbb{R}_{\zeta > 0}}$ to achieve a microlocal bound of ζ .

For Hamiltonian functions H with compactly supported derivative, existence of the sheaf quantization follows from Cor. 5.21 above. Chiu constructed such a sheaf quantization of $H(q, p) = (q^2 + p^2)/2$ on \mathbb{R}^{2n} [8].

We do not know a general result on existence of sheaf quantization for not compactly supported Hamiltonian.

Remark 6.3. In [9], Chiu claims that the condition that the level sets are compact can be relaxed.

6.2 Projector via wrapping

Motivated by ideas of [34, 18], it was shown in [30] that for any closed set $X \subseteq S^*M$, the left adjoint ι^* to the inclusion $\iota_* : \text{Sh}_X(M) \hookrightarrow \text{Sh}(M)$ can be computed ‘by wrapping’. More precisely,

Theorem 6.4 ([30, Thm. 1.2]). *If H_α is any increasing sequence of positive compactly supported Hamiltonians supported on $S^*M \setminus X$ such that $H_\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ pointwise in this locus. Then*

$$\iota^*F = \varinjlim (K(\phi_{H_\alpha})|_1 \circ F) = (\varinjlim K(\phi_{H_\alpha})|_1) \circ F.$$

That is, $\varinjlim K(\phi_{H_\alpha})|_1$ is left adjoint to $\iota_ : \text{Sh}_X(M) \hookrightarrow \text{Sh}(M)$.*

Moreover, the unit of the adjoint is given by the map $1_{\Delta_M} \rightarrow \varinjlim K(\phi_{H_\alpha})|_1$, which is induced by the continuation map $1_{\Delta_M} \rightarrow K(\phi_{H_\alpha})|_1$ defined by positivity of H_α .

Remark 6.5. Let us give the idea of the proof. The kernels $K(\phi_{H_\alpha})$ preserve $\text{Sh}_X(M)$. By compact support of M , any two such sequences of such H_α can be interleaved, hence have the same colimit. In particular, it follows from this that $(\varinjlim K(\phi_{H_\alpha})|_1)$ is idempotent. It remains only to check that $\underline{ss}(\varinjlim (K(\phi_{H_\alpha})|_1 \circ F)) \subseteq X$, and moreover it suffices to do some for one family $H_\alpha \rightarrow \infty$. In fact, it moreover suffices to construct one such family for each point of $T^*M \setminus X$ to witness that $(\varinjlim K(\phi_{H_\alpha})|_1) \circ F$ has no microsupport at this point. Such a sequence of Hamiltonians is described in [30].

The above argument suffices to prove the theorem, but differs from [30] in that in said reference, the colimit is taken over an ∞ -categorical ‘wrapping category’. For the purposes here, one can just define the colimit by mapping telescope. The constructions agree: one can prove that colimit defined by mapping telescope agrees with the coherent ∞ -categorical version, by appeal to a version of Theorem 5.17 valid over a higher dimensional ball in place of I . The existence of such a version is [21, Rem. 3.9]. We leave detailed consideration of this point to the interested reader.

The corresponding \mathcal{T} -linear result for Tamarkin categories follows by combining Corollary 5.21 and Theorem 6.4:

Corollary 6.6. *Let $U \subseteq T^*M$ be an open set, and let H_α be any increasing sequence of compactly supported Hamiltonians which are supported on U and such that $H_\alpha(u) \rightarrow \infty$ for all $u \in U$. Then*

$$Q_U \cong \varinjlim_{\alpha} \mathcal{K}(\varphi^{H_\alpha})|_1, \quad (16)$$

and the morphism $1_{\Delta_{T^*M}} \rightarrow Q_U$ is induced by the continuation map $1_{\Delta_{T^*M}} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(\varphi^{H_\alpha})|_1$ defined by positivity of H_α .

Proof. First of all, if H_α is compactly supported and supported on U , then (11) shows that $\widehat{\varphi^{H_\alpha}}$ is compactly supported on $\tilde{U}/\mathbb{R}_+ \subseteq S^*(M \times \mathbb{R})$. We can check that the contact lifting of H_α still form an increasing sequence convergent to infinity supported on $\tilde{U}/\mathbb{R}_+ \subseteq S^*(M \times \mathbb{R})$. Let $X = S^*(M \times \mathbb{R}) \setminus (\tilde{U}/\mathbb{R}_+)$, then $\varinjlim_{\alpha} K(\widehat{\varphi^{H_\alpha}})|_1 \circ_{\mathcal{T}}$ defines the left adjoint of $\mathrm{Sh}_X(M \times \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Sh}(M \times \mathbb{R})$ by Theorem 6.4. On the other hand, for $m(z, q_1, t_1, q_2, t_2) = (z, q_1, q_2, t_2 - t_1)$, we apply m^* to $\varinjlim_{\alpha} K(\widehat{\varphi^{H_\alpha}})|_1$, and project it to the Tamarkin category $\mathcal{T}(M \times M)$, to obtain a \mathcal{T} -linear integral kernel $\varinjlim_{\alpha} \mathcal{K}(\varphi^\alpha)|_1$. Then we conclude since $\varinjlim_{\alpha} \mathcal{K}(\varphi^\alpha)|_1$ defines the left adjoint of the inclusion

$$\mathrm{Sh}_{U^c}(M; \mathcal{T}) = \{F \in \mathrm{Sh}(M; \mathcal{T}) : \underline{ss}(F) \subseteq U^c\} \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Sh}(M; \mathcal{T}),$$

because $\varinjlim_{\alpha} K(\widehat{\varphi^{H_\alpha}})|_1 \circ_{\mathcal{T}}$, m^* , and the natural functor $\mathrm{Sh}(M \times M \times \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(M \times M)$ are all left adjoints and $X = S^*(M \times \mathbb{R}) \setminus (\tilde{U}/\mathbb{R}_+)$ is the contact lifting of U^c . The second statement follows that the morphism $1_{\Delta_{T^*M}} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(\varphi^{H_\alpha})|_1$ is induced by $1_{\Delta_{M \times \mathbb{R}}} \rightarrow K(\widehat{\varphi^{H_\alpha}})|_1$. \square

6.3 Calabi-Yau property and Hochschild cohomology

In [53, 55], motivated by and building on [8], the expression $\Gamma_c^{\mathcal{T}}(M, \Delta_{\mathcal{T}}^* P_U)$ was studied both in terms of its general properties, and values for certain specific U . Here we recall the results, and identify this quantity with the Hochschild (co)homology of $\mathcal{T}(U)$.

In [53, 55], all formulas were expressed in terms of the fully faithful images of $\mathcal{T} \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Sh}(\mathbb{R})$ and, for $U \subseteq T^*M$, of $\mathcal{T}(U) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Sh}(M \times \mathbb{R})$. With this identification, $\Gamma_c^{\mathcal{T}}(M, \Delta_{\mathcal{T}}^* P_U)$ is computed in terms of $\underline{a} : M \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\underline{\Delta} : M \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M \times M \times \mathbb{R}$ as $\underline{a}_! \underline{\Delta}^* P_U \in \mathrm{Sh}(\mathbb{R})$ (cf. Remark 5.6).

The following notation was used [55, (2.1), Definition 2.1]³:

$$\begin{aligned} F_1(U, \mathbf{k}) &:= \underline{a}_! \underline{\Delta}^* P_U \in \mathrm{Sh}(\mathbb{R}), & C_L(U, \mathbf{k}) &:= \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{k}}(F_1(U, \mathbf{k})|_L, 1_{\mathbf{k}}[-n]) \in \mathbf{k}; \\ F_1^{out}(U, \mathbf{k}) &:= \underline{a}_! \underline{\Delta}^* Q_U \in \mathrm{Sh}(\mathbb{R}), & C_L^{out}(U, \mathbf{k}) &:= \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{k}}(F_1^{out}(U, \mathbf{k})|_L, 1_{\mathbf{k}}[-n]) \in \mathbf{k}. \end{aligned}$$

Then Lemma 2.2 implies that

$$F_1(U, \mathbf{k}) = \mathrm{Tr}(1_{\mathcal{T}(U)}), \quad F_1^{out}(U, \mathbf{k}) = \mathrm{Tr}(1_{\mathrm{Sh}_{U^c}(M; \mathcal{T})}). \quad (17)$$

³We call them Chiu-Tamarkin invariants in *loc.cit.*

If we write $i_L : \{L\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for the inclusion, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} C_L(U, \mathbf{k}) &= \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{k}}(i_L^* F_1(U, \mathbf{k}), 1_{\mathbf{k}}[-n]) = \text{Hom}_{\text{Sh}(\mathbb{R})}(F_1(U, \mathbf{k}), 1_{\{L\}}[-n]) \\ &= \text{Hom}_{\text{Sh}(\mathbb{R})}(F_1(U, \mathbf{k}), 1_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq L}}[-n]) = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(\text{Tr}(1_{\mathcal{T}(U)}), 1_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq L}}[-n]). \end{aligned}$$

As the coefficient category \mathbf{k} is an abstract compactly generated symmetric monoidal category, we define the dualizing sheaf as $\omega_{M, \mathbf{k}} := a^! 1_{\mathbf{k}}$, and a \mathbf{k} -orientation of M is defined as an isomorphism of sheaves $\omega_{M, \mathbf{k}} = a^! 1_{\mathbf{k}} \simeq a^* 1_{\mathbf{k}}[n]$. When $\mathbf{k} = \text{Mod}_E$ for a commutative ring spectrum E , we know that an E -orientation defines a \mathbf{k} -orientation based on [52, Proposition 6.18.].

The same proposition implies that if M is \mathbf{k} -orientable, the orientation induces an equivalence of functors $a_{\mathcal{T}}^! \simeq a_{\mathcal{T}}^*[n]$ and we have $\omega_M^{\mathcal{T}} := a_{\mathcal{T}}^! 1_{\mathcal{T}} \simeq a_{\mathcal{T}}^* 1_{\mathcal{T}}[n]$ where $1_{\mathcal{T}} = 1_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$.

Now, we explain the right Calabi-Yau property of the Tamarkin category. We refer to [6, Section 4.3] for related definition in our case. ⁴

Theorem 6.7. *For open sets $U \subseteq T^*M$, the Tamarkin category $\mathcal{T}(U)$ is proper whose Serre functor is $\text{id}_{\mathcal{T}(U)}^{\vee}(F) = F \otimes_{\mathcal{T}} \omega_M^{\mathcal{T}}$ for $F \in \mathcal{T}(U)$.*

If M is \mathbf{k} -orientable, the Tamarkin category $\mathcal{T}(U)$ is (absolutely) right Calabi-Yau. In particular, we have $\text{HH}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{T}(U); \text{id}_{\mathcal{T}(U)}^{\vee}[-n]) \simeq \text{HH}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{T}(U))$.

Proof. By Lemma 2.2, the counit of $\mathcal{T}(U)$ as a dualizable category is computed by

$$\mathcal{T}(U)^{\vee} \otimes \mathcal{T}(U) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{T}(T^*M)^{\vee} \otimes \mathcal{T}(T^*M) = \mathcal{T}(T^*(M \times M)) \xrightarrow{a_{\mathcal{T}}^{\vee} \Delta_{\mathcal{T}}^*} \mathcal{T}.$$

The right adjoint of the first functor is the natural quotient functor $\mathcal{T}(T^*M)^{\vee} \otimes \mathcal{T}(T^*M) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(U)^{\vee} \otimes \mathcal{T}(U)$, which is continuous.

The last functor admits an obvious right adjoint $\Delta_{\mathcal{T}}^{\vee} a_{\mathcal{T}}^!$, which is naturally equivalent to $\Delta_{\mathcal{T}}^{\vee}(a_{\mathcal{T}}^*(-) \otimes_{\mathcal{T}} \omega_M^{\mathcal{T}})$. Therefore, the right adjoint is continuous and $\mathcal{T}(U)$ is proper. In particular, the Serre functor $\text{id}_{\mathcal{T}(U)}^{\vee}$ of $\mathcal{T}(U)$ is given by $\text{id}_{\mathcal{T}(U)}^{\vee}(F) = F \otimes_{\mathcal{T}} \omega_M^{\mathcal{T}}$ for $F \in \mathcal{T}(U)$.

To prove the Calabi-Yau property, we first noticed that when M is orientable, the Serre functor $\text{id}_{\mathcal{T}(U)}^{\vee}$ is equivalent to $\text{id}_{\mathcal{T}(U)}^{\vee}[n]$. Moreover, we noticed that the equivalence is induced by the following composition

$$\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{T}}(\text{id}_{\mathcal{T}(U)}) \simeq a_{\mathcal{T}}^{\vee} \Delta_{\mathcal{T}}^*(P_U) \rightarrow \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{T}}(\text{id}_{\mathcal{T}(T^*M)}) = a_{\mathcal{T}}^{\vee} \Delta_{\mathcal{T}}^*(1_{\Delta_{T^*M}}) = \Gamma_c(M, \mathbf{k})_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} \rightarrow 1_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}[-n].$$

We finish the proof of Calabi-Yau property by showing that the morphism is S^1 -equivariant. By the result of [26], the first arrow is S^1 -equivariant. For the arrow $\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{T}}(\text{id}_{\mathcal{T}(T^*M)}) \rightarrow 1_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}[-n]$, we notice that the S^1 -action on both sheaves are trivial. \square

Recall we write T_L for translation by L in the \mathbb{R} direction. Let $\pi : M^2 \rightarrow \{*\}$ be the constant map.

Corollary 6.8. *We have*

$$\text{HH}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{T}(U), \text{id}_{\mathcal{T}(U)}^{\vee}[-n]) \simeq \mathcal{H}\text{om}^*(F_1(U, \mathbf{k}), 1_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}[-n]) \simeq \pi_*^{\mathcal{T}} \mathcal{H}\text{om}^*(P_U, \Delta_{\mathcal{T}}^{\vee} \omega_M^{\mathcal{T}}[-n]) \in \mathcal{T},$$

and

$$C_L(U, \mathbf{k}) \simeq \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(P_U, T_{L*} \Delta_{\mathcal{T}}^{\vee} \omega_M^{\mathcal{T}}[-n]) \simeq \text{HH}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{T}(U), T_{L*} \text{id}_{\mathcal{T}(U)}^{\vee}[-n]).$$

In particular, when M is k -orientable, we have

$$C_L(U, \mathbf{k}) \simeq \text{HH}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{T}(U), T_{L*}).$$

⁴The notions of properness, Serre functor, and right Calabi-Yau structure is a generalization of the classical definition on small categories. See [5, 10] for details.

Proof. The equivalence $\mathrm{HH}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{T}(U); \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{T}(U)}^{\vee}[-n]) \simeq \mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}^*(F_1(U, \mathbf{k}), \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}[-n])$ is a general fact of proper categories (see [6, 4.3.5])

The equivalence $\mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}^*(F_1(U, \mathbf{k}), \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}[-n]) \simeq \pi_*^{\mathcal{T}} \mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}^*(P_U, \Delta_*^{\mathcal{T}} \omega_M^{\mathcal{T}}[-n])$ follows adjunctions from 6-operations of sheaves.

For the second statement, we take the functor $\Gamma_{[-L, \infty)}(-)$ defined in (5), and we use Lemma 4.3.

For the last statement, we use the Calabi-Yau property. \square

Now, we consider the Hochschild cohomology with the identity coefficient.

Proposition 6.9. *We have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{HH}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{T}(U)) &\simeq \pi_*^{\mathcal{T}} \mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}^*(P_U, P_U) \simeq \pi_*^{\mathcal{T}} \mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}^*(P_U, \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{T^*M}}), \\ \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{T}(U), \mathbf{T}_{L^*}) &\simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(P_U, \mathbf{T}_L P_U) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(P_U, \mathbf{T}_{L^*} \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{T^*M}}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Proposition 5.15 and the fully faithful embedding $\mathcal{T}(-U \times U) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Sh}(M^2; \mathcal{T})$ induces a fully-faithful embedding

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Fun}_{\mathcal{T}}^L(\mathcal{T}(U), \mathcal{T}(U)) &\hookrightarrow \mathrm{Fun}_{\mathcal{T}}^L(\mathrm{Sh}(M; \mathcal{T}), \mathrm{Sh}(M; \mathcal{T})); \\ \mathcal{F} &\mapsto [\mathrm{Sh}(M; \mathcal{T}) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(U) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{T}(U) \xrightarrow{\Phi_{P_U}} \mathrm{Sh}(M; \mathcal{T})]. \end{aligned}$$

Under this fully-faithful embedding, we have that $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{T}(U)}$ is mapped to Φ_{P_U} . This prove the first isomorphism in the first line. The second follows from orthogonal decomposition.

For the second line, we take the functor $\Gamma_{[-L, \infty)}(-)$ defined in (5), and we use Lemma 4.3. \square

Remark 6.10. Theorem 6.7, Corollary 6.8, and Proposition 6.9 are also true for $\mathrm{Sh}_{U^c}(M; \mathcal{T})$ by replacing P_U by Q_U , and replacing C_L by C_L^{out} .

It follows the computations and the $P_U \rightarrow \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{T^*M}} \rightarrow Q_U$ fiber sequence that we have fiber sequences as follows. We remark that they are also still true for Serre functor coefficient HH .

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{HH}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\bullet}(\mathrm{Sh}_{U^c}(M; \mathcal{T})) &\rightarrow \Gamma(M, \mathbf{1}_M^{\mathcal{T}}) \rightarrow \mathrm{HH}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{T}(U)), \\ \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\bullet}(\mathrm{Sh}_{U^c}(M; \mathcal{T}), \mathbf{T}_{L^*}) &\rightarrow i_L^* \Gamma(M, \mathbf{1}_M^{\mathcal{T}}) \rightarrow \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{T}(U), \mathbf{T}_{L^*}). \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Remark 6.11. By the cyclic Deligne conjecture for Hochschild cochains (cf. [6]), the cochain version of $\mathrm{HH}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{T}(U))$ carries a E_2 structure, which could be lift to a framed E_2 -structure if M is orientable. The corresponding product on cohomology was already constructed in [55] by expression $C_L(U, \mathbf{k}) \simeq \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{T}(U), \mathbf{T}_{L^*})$ by $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(P_U, \mathbf{T}_{L^*} P_U)$ in the orientable case.

In [53], we constructed a combinatorial scheme to compute $C_L(U, \mathbf{k}) = \mathrm{HH}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{T}(U))$ for convex toric domains $U \subseteq T^*\mathbb{R}^n$. In [55], we compute $C_L(D^*M, \mathbf{k}) = \mathrm{HH}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{T}(D^*M), \mathbf{T}_{L^*} \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{T}(D^*M)}^{\vee}[-n])$ for the disk bundle over a compact Riemannian manifold M , specifically, we prove the following Viterbo-type isomorphism.

Theorem 6.12 ([55, Subsection 4.3]). *For a compact connected oriented Riemannian manifold M and $L \geq 0$, we have an isomorphism that intertwines the cup product on the Chiu-Tamarkin invariant and the loop-product product on the string topology*

$$H^* C_L(D^*M, \mathbb{Z}) \cong H_{n-*}(\mathcal{L}_{\leq L} M, \mathbb{Z}).$$

6.4 Microsupport estimation of trace for open sets with restricted contact boundary

Recall that a compact smooth hypersurface $S \subseteq T^*M$ is of restricted contact type (RCT) if the Liouville field on T^*M is transverse to S . In particular, S is a contact manifold. For an open set $U \subseteq T^*M$ with a restricted contact type boundary, we have the following microsupport estimation of $F_1(U, \mathbf{k})$, if we embedded it into $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{R})$. The following result was established [56, (74)] for the case of U a ball; the argument there works generally, as is verified in detail in [54, Lemma 3.28.]:

Lemma 6.13 ([56, (74)], [54, Lemma 3.28.]). *Let U be a bounded open set such that ∂U is a RCT hypersurface, then we have*

$$ss(F_1(U, \mathbf{k}))/\mathbb{R}_+ \subseteq \mathcal{A}(\partial U) \subseteq [0, \infty). \quad (19)$$

When ∂U is of RCT, we can take a Hamiltonian function H such that $U = \{H < 1\}$ and $\partial U = \{H = 1\}$ is a regular hypersurface. In particular, for an $e > 0$ small enough, we can identify a collar neighborhood N of $\partial U = \{H = 1\}$ with $(1 - e, 1 + e) \times \partial U$, and under this identification, we have $H(r, y) = r$ for $(r, y) \in (1 - e, 1 + e) \times \partial U = N$. Now, we can take a particular cofinal sequence H_α to define the kernel Q_U .

For $\alpha > 0$, we can take C^∞ -functions $\rho_\alpha : I \times [0, 1 + e) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that, for each $z \in I$,

1. $\rho_\alpha(z, -) = \alpha$ on $[0, d_\alpha]$ for $d_\alpha > 0$ small enough;
2. $\rho_\alpha(z, -) = 0$ on $(1 - e_\alpha, 1 + e)$, $0 < e_\alpha < e$;
3. $\rho'_\alpha(z, -) < 0$ and $\rho''_\alpha(z, -) > 0$ on $(2d_\alpha, 1 - 2e_\alpha)$;
4. $\rho'_\alpha(z, -) < 0$ elsewhere.

We set $H_\alpha = \rho_\alpha \circ H$. Then there exists ρ_α such that H_α form a cofinal sequence, and moreover we assume all non-constant 1-periodic orbits of X_{H_α} are non-degenerate.

Then we use this sequence H_α to exhibit the wrapping formula $Q_U \cong \varinjlim_\alpha \mathcal{K}(\varphi^{H_\alpha})|_1$.

Lemma 6.14. *If U has a RCT boundary, we have $i_L^* F_1(U, \mathbf{k}) \simeq i_L^* F_1^{out}(U, \mathbf{k})[1] = 0$ for $L < 0$.*

Proof. Let us prove that $i_L^* F_1^{out}(U, \mathbf{k}) = 0$ for $L < 0$. Actually, by Lemma 6.13, we only need to prove this is true for $L \ll 0$. By virtue of the wrapping formula, we only need to show that for the cofinal sequence H_α we taken as above, we have $i_L^* \underline{a}_1 \Delta^* \mathcal{K}(\varphi^{H_\alpha})|_1 = 0$ for big enough α and $L \leq -1$.

Consider

$$\mathcal{S}(H) = \{t = -S_H^1(q, p) : (q, p) \text{ is a fixed point of } \varphi_1^H\}.$$

Using the given cofinal sequence, we have that $\mathcal{S}(H_\alpha)$ is a discrete subset of \mathbb{R} , and if $\alpha \gg 0$, we have $\mathcal{S}(H_\alpha) \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{t \geq -1}$ for $\alpha \gg 0$. Then the similar argument of Lemma 6.13 implies that $ss(\underline{a}_1 \Delta^* \mathcal{K}(\varphi^{H_\alpha})|_1)/\mathbb{R}_+ \subseteq \mathcal{S}(H_\alpha) \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{t \geq -1}$. Therefore, by the microlocal Morse lemma, we only need to show that $i_L^* \underline{a}_1 \Delta^* \mathcal{K}(\varphi^{H_\alpha})|_1 = 0$ for $L \ll 0$.

On the other hand, it is explained in [23, Section 4] that, for all compactly supported functions H , $\mathcal{K}(\varphi^H)|_1$ is isomorphic to $1_{\Delta_{T^*M}}$ outside a compact of $M^2 \times \mathbb{R}$ (Argument therein is microlocal, so the coefficient category does not matter.) In particular, we have $i_L^* \underline{a}_1 \Delta^* \mathcal{K}(\varphi^H)|_1 = 0$ for $L \ll 0$. Then the result follows. \square

Remark 6.15. We will apply those those results to the Serre coefficient Hochschild cohomology using Corollary 6.8.

We have the same result $ss(\underline{a}_1(\Delta^* P_U \otimes_{\mathcal{T}} \omega_M^{\mathcal{T}}))/\mathbb{R}_+ \subseteq \mathcal{A}(\partial U)$, and $i_L^*(\underline{a}_1(\Delta^* P_U \otimes_{\mathcal{T}} \omega_M^{\mathcal{T}})) = 0$ since $\omega_M^{\mathcal{T}}$ is a local system. Then by Proposition 6.9, we can apply the estimation to Hochschild cohomology (with the identity coefficient).

6.5 Action window

For $-\infty \leq a < b < \infty$, we introduce

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{T}(U), (a, b]) &= \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(1_{[-b, -a]}, \mathrm{HH}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{T}(U))), \\ \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\bullet}(\mathrm{Sh}_{U^c}(M; \mathcal{T}), (a, b]) &= \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(1_{[-b, -a]}, \mathrm{HH}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\bullet}(\mathrm{Sh}_{U^c}(M; \mathcal{T}))). \end{aligned}$$

Tautologically, we have $\mathrm{HH}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{T}(U), (-\infty, b]) = \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{T}(U), T_{b*})$. We have fiber sequences

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{T}(U), T_{a*}) &\rightarrow \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{T}(U), T_{b*}) \rightarrow \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{T}(U), (a, b]), \\ \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\bullet}(\mathrm{Sh}_{U^c}(M; \mathcal{T}), T_{a*}) &\rightarrow \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\bullet}(\mathrm{Sh}_{U^c}(M; \mathcal{T}), T_{b*}) \rightarrow \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\bullet}(\mathrm{Sh}_{U^c}(M; \mathcal{T}), (a, b]). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 6.14, when $a < 0$ and U has a RCT boundary, we have

$$\mathrm{HH}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{T}(U), (a, b]) = \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{T}(U), T_{b*}), \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\bullet}(\mathrm{Sh}_{U^c}(M; \mathcal{T}), (a, b]) = \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\bullet}(\mathrm{Sh}_{U^c}(M; \mathcal{T}), T_{b*}).$$

Lemma 6.16. *For $\infty > L > \epsilon > 0 > -\delta > -\infty$, we have an isomorphism of fiber sequences:*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\bullet}(\mathrm{Sh}_{U^c}(M; \mathcal{T}), (-\delta, \epsilon]) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\bullet}(\mathrm{Sh}_{U^c}(M; \mathcal{T}), (-\delta, L]) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\bullet}(\mathrm{Sh}_{U^c}(M; \mathcal{T}), (\epsilon, L]) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Gamma(M, \mathbf{k}) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \Gamma(M, \mathbf{k}) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{T}(U), (-\delta, \epsilon]) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{T}(U), (-\delta, L]) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{T}(U), (\epsilon, L]) \end{array}$$

Proof. We apply the fiber sequence of functors

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(1_{[-\epsilon, \delta]}, -) \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(1_{[-L, \delta]}, -) \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(1_{[-L, -\epsilon]}, -)$$

to

$$\mathrm{HH}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\bullet}(\mathrm{Sh}_{U^c}(M; \mathcal{T})) \rightarrow \Gamma(M, 1_M^{\mathcal{T}}) \rightarrow \mathrm{HH}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{T}(U)). \quad \square$$

We remark that the construction and the lemma is also true for Serre functor coefficient HH^{\bullet} . In this case, we have

$$\mathrm{HH}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{T}(U), \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{T}(U)}^{\vee}[-n], (a, b]) \simeq C_{(a,b)}(U, \mathbf{k}), \quad \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\bullet}(\mathrm{Sh}_{U^c}(M; \mathcal{T}), \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{T}(U)}^{\vee}[-n], (a, b]) \simeq C_{(a,b)}^{\mathrm{out}}(U, \mathbf{k}),$$

where $C_{(a,b)}(U, \mathbf{k})$ and $C_{(a,b)}^{\mathrm{out}}(U, \mathbf{k})$ are originally defined in [55].

6.6 Wrapping formula for HH and generating function homology

We will now give some formulas expressing these quantities in terms of the ‘wrapping’ formula for the projector. We will need the formula (22) for the comparison to symplectic cohomology in the next section; here we already establish a comparison to generating function homology.

Lemma 6.17. *For $-\infty \leq a < b < \infty$, we have an isomorphism*

$$\mathrm{HH}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\bullet}(\mathrm{Sh}_{U^c}(M; \mathcal{T}), (a, b]) = \varprojlim_{\alpha} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(1_{M^2 \times [-b, -a]}, \mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}^*(\mathcal{K}(\varphi^{H\alpha})|_1, \mathcal{K}(\mathrm{id}))). \quad (20)$$

Proof. First, by Proposition 6.9 and adjunction, we have

$$\mathrm{HH}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\bullet}(\mathrm{Sh}_{U^c}(M; \mathcal{T}), (a, b]) = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(1_{M^2 \times [-b, -a]}, \mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}^*(Q_U, 1_{\Delta_{T^*M}})).$$

We plug $\mathcal{K}(\mathrm{id}) = 1_{\Delta_{T^*M}}$ and the wrapping formula for Q_U (Corollary 6.6):

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(1_{M^2 \times [-b, -a]}, \mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}^*(Q_U, 1_{\Delta_{T^*M}})) \\ &= \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(1_{M^2 \times [-b, -a]}, \mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}^*(\varinjlim_{\alpha} \mathcal{K}(\varphi^{H_{\alpha}})|_1, \mathcal{K}(\mathrm{id}))) \\ &= \varprojlim_{\alpha} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(1_{M^2 \times [-b, -a]}, \mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}^*(\mathcal{K}(\varphi^{H_{\alpha}})|_1, \mathcal{K}(\mathrm{id}))) \end{aligned}$$

This establishes the result. \square

Recall the fiber sequence $P_U \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow Q_U$. Let us note that the corresponding morphism

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(1_{M^2 \times [-b, -a]}, \mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}^*(\mathcal{K}(\varphi^{H_{\alpha}})|_1, \mathcal{K}(\mathrm{id}))) \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(1_{M^2 \times [-b, -a]}, \mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}^*(\mathcal{K}(\mathrm{id}), \mathcal{K}(\mathrm{id})))$$

is, in terms of the RHS of Equation (20), induced by the map the map $\mathcal{K}(\mathrm{id}) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(\varphi^{H_{\alpha}})|_1$ associated to the positivity of H_{α} .

To pass to cohomology, we need the following finiteness result in the case that $\mathbf{k} = \mathbb{F}\text{-Mod}$ for a field \mathbb{F} .

Proposition 6.18. *Set $\mathbf{k} = \mathbb{F}\text{-Mod}$. For a compactly supported Hamiltonian function H and the constant map $\pi : M^2 \rightarrow *$. There exists an at most countable family \mathcal{I} (which is finite if we assume φ_1^H intersect with id transversely inside the support of H) such that*

$$\pi_*^{\mathcal{T}} \mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}^*(\mathcal{K}(\varphi^H)|_1, \mathcal{K}(\mathrm{id})) = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathcal{I}} 1_{[a_i, b_i]}[-n_i] \in \mathcal{T},$$

where for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$, $n_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, $a_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b_i \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$.

Proof. Proof is same as [23, Proposition A.1]. Be careful that, inside the support H , we can apply the argument therein directly; outside of support of H , it was explained in [23, Section 4] that $\mathcal{K}(\varphi^H)|_1$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{K}(\mathrm{id}) = 1_{\Delta_{T^*M}}$, so at most finitely many direct summand are added in the decomposition. \square

Remark 6.19. In [23], the decomposition of $a_*^{\mathcal{T}} \mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}^*(\mathcal{K}(\varphi^H)|_1, \mathcal{K}(\mathrm{id}))$ is in $\mathrm{Sh}(\mathbb{R})$, so $1_{\mathbb{R} < a}[1]$ is allowed. Here, we work in \mathcal{T} , and we have $1_{\mathbb{R} < a}[1] \simeq 1_{\mathbb{R} \geq a}$.

Corollary 6.20. *Set $\mathbf{k} = \mathbb{F}\text{-Mod}$. We assume that, in the wrapping formula $Q_U \simeq \varinjlim_{\alpha} \mathcal{K}(\varphi^{H_{\alpha}})|_1$, Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms $\varphi_1^{H_{\alpha}}$ intersect with id transversely inside the support of H_{α} . Then, for $-\infty \leq a < b < \infty$, we have*

$$\mathrm{Ext}_{\mathcal{T}}^*(1_{M^2 \times [-b, -a]}, \mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}^*(\mathcal{K}(\varphi^{H_{\alpha}})|_1, \mathcal{K}(\mathrm{id})))$$

is finite dimensional for all α .

In particular, we have

$$H^* \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\bullet}(\mathrm{Sh}_{U^c}(M; \mathcal{T}), (a, b]) = \varprojlim_{\alpha} \mathrm{Ext}_{\mathcal{T}}^*(1_{M^2 \times [-b, -a]}, \mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}^*(\mathcal{K}(\varphi^{H_{\alpha}})|_1, \mathcal{K}(\mathrm{id}))). \quad (21)$$

Proof. The first statement follows from the non-degenerate assumption of H_α and that

$$\mathrm{Ext}_{\mathcal{T}}^*(1_{M^2 \times [-b, -a]}, \mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}^*(\mathcal{K}(\varphi^{H_\alpha})|_1, \mathcal{K}(\mathrm{id}))) = \mathrm{Ext}_{\mathcal{T}}^*(1_{[-b, -a]}, a_*^{\mathcal{T}} \mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}^*(\mathcal{K}(\varphi^{H_\alpha})|_1, \mathcal{K}(\mathrm{id}))). \quad (22)$$

The second statement follows from that inverse systems of finite dimensional vector spaces satisfy the Mittag-Leffler condition. \square

Using equation (21), we can compare the generating function (GF) homology for U , defined by [47] based on the work of [48], with $H^* \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbb{F}}^\bullet(\mathrm{Sh}_{U^c}(M; \mathcal{T}), (a, b))$.

Let us recall the definition of GF homology, we will follow construction of [14, Section 4] (the $k = 1$ case therein). For any compactly supported Hamiltonian function H , one can associate a 1-parameter family of generating function quadratic at infinity (GFQI) $S_z : S^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for a twisted graph of φ_z^H and $z \in [0, 1]$. Here, GFQI means that outside of a compact set of $S^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}^N$, S_z equals a quadratic form on the fiber direction of index ι . Then the generating function homology of φ^H is defined as

$$G_*^{(a, b]}(\varphi^H; \mathbb{F}) := H_{*- \iota}(\{S_1 \leq b\}, \{S_1 \leq a\}; \mathbb{F}).$$

It is proven in [14, Proposition 4.1] that for two 1-parameter family of GFQI for φ^H the homology group $G_*^{(a, b]}(\varphi^H; \mathbb{F})$ is unique upto an unique isomorphism.

Next, we are able to construct a monotonic morphism $G_*^{(a, b]}(\varphi^H; \mathbb{F}) \rightarrow G_*^{(a, b]}(\varphi^K; \mathbb{F})$ if $H \geq K$ (we will explain the construction in the proof of the following theorem). Hence, for a cofinal sequence H_α supported in U , we can define

$$G_*^{(a, b]}(U; \mathbb{F}) := \varprojlim_{\alpha} G_*^{(a, b]}(\varphi^{H_\alpha}; \mathbb{F}).$$

Actually, similar to Remark 6.5, the limit is taken over a directed Hamiltonian functions supported in U , and can be computed by a cofinal sequence. Using results from [23, Section 5.2], we can prove:

Theorem 6.21. *Let \mathbb{F} be a field. For an open set $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ and $b > a$, we have*

$$G_*^{(a, b]}(U; \mathbb{F}) \simeq H^* \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbb{F}}^\bullet(\mathrm{Sh}_{U^c}(M; \mathcal{T}), (a, b)).$$

Sketch of proof. For an \mathbb{R} -family of generating function S_z of φ^H , we set $F_S := \underline{p}_1 1_{\{S \leq t\}}$ where $p : S^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow S^{2n}$. Here we remind that F_S only depends on φ^H by the 1-parameter version of Viterbo-Th  ret uniqueness theorem of GFQIs (cf. [14, Lemma 2.2]).

In [23, Section 5.2], the authors constructed a \mathcal{T} -linear equivalence between fully \mathcal{T} -linear subcategories C_1 of $\mathcal{T}(T^*(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n))$ and C_2 of $\mathcal{T}(T^*S^{2n})$, such that $\mathcal{K}(\varphi^H)|_1 \in C_1$ is mapped to $F_S|_1 \in C_2$. In particular, we have that $\mathcal{K}(\mathrm{id})|_1$ is mapped to $1_{S^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$. Consequently, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Ext}_{\mathcal{T}}^*(1_{\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times [-b, -a]}, \mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}^*(\mathcal{K}(\varphi^H)|_1, \mathcal{K}(\mathrm{id}))) \\ & \simeq \mathrm{Ext}_{\mathcal{T}}^*(1_{S^{2n} \times [-b, -a]}, \mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}^*(F_S|_1, 1_{S^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}})) \\ & \simeq H_{*- \iota}(\{S \leq b\}, \{S \leq a\}; \mathbb{F}) = G_*^{(a, b]}(\varphi; \mathbb{F}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, in virtue of Equation (21), we only need to compare the monotonicity map on GF homology and sheaves cohomology. In both case, we reduce to C^1 -small Hamiltonians (see Remark 5.18 for sheaves and [47, Proposition 5.3] for GF.) Then we are able to see that monotonicity maps are induced by certain closed inclusions. Moreover, upto the equivalence constructed [23, Section 5.2], which is also given by a half-space of a hypersurface, the two closed inclusion are the same. Therefore, we match the monotonicity maps, and the conclusion follows. \square

6.7 \mathbf{k} -linear Hochschild cohomology

The purpose of this subsection is to prove the following result:

Theorem 6.22. *If $U \subseteq T^*M$ has a RCT boundary, then for $\epsilon \geq 0$ smaller than the minimal period of ∂U , we have*

$$\mathrm{HH}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{T}(U); \mathbb{T}_{\epsilon^*}) \simeq \Gamma_{2n-*}^{BM}(U, \mathbf{k}), \quad \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\bullet}(\mathrm{Sh}_{U^c}(M; \mathcal{T}); \mathbb{T}_{\epsilon^*}) \simeq \Gamma_{2n-*}^{BM}(U^c, \mathbf{k}).$$

Remark 6.23. If we assume U is \mathbf{k} -orientable, which is automatically true if $\mathbf{k} = R\text{-Mod}$ for a complex oriented E_{∞} ring spectrum R (for example discrete rings or the complex cobordism MU), we have $\Gamma_{2n-*}^{BM}(U, R) \simeq \Gamma(\overline{U}, \partial U, R)$ by Poincaré duality.

We will work in the embedding $\mathcal{T}(T^*(M^2)) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Sh}(M^2 \times \mathbb{R})$, recall that $1_{\Delta_{T^*M}}$ is then identified as $1_{\Delta_M \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$.

Before the proof, let us prepare some lemmas. As U has contact boundary, we take a cofinal sequence H_{α} as Subsection 6.4.

The first one is an application of the Sato-Sabloff fiber sequence [31, Corollary 4.4], whose prototype also appears in [20, Theorem 12.4.7] and [27, Section 4.3]. We identify $J^1(M^2)$ with $T^*(M^2 \times \mathbb{R}) \cap \{\tau = 1\}$.

Lemma 6.24. *For all compactly support Hamiltonian function H on T^*M and small enough $\epsilon \geq 0$, we have*

$$\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{K}(\varphi^H)|_1, 1_{\Delta_M \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq \epsilon}}) \simeq \Gamma(J^1(M^2), \mu\mathrm{hom}(\mathcal{K}(\varphi^H)|_1, 1_{\Delta_M \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}})).$$

The isomorphism is functorial with respect to $\mathcal{K}(\varphi^H)|_1$.

Proof. We would like to use the Sato-Sabloff fiber sequence of [31, Proposition 4.3, Corollary 4.4] to $F = \mathcal{K}(\varphi^H)|_1$ and $G = 1_{\Delta_M \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$. In this case, $c(\widehat{\Lambda}_{\varphi^H}, \widehat{\Lambda}_{\mathrm{id}})$ is given by the minimal action of non-constant 1-periodic orbits of H , so it is positive and we can take $c(\widehat{\Lambda}_{\varphi^H}, \widehat{\Lambda}_{\mathrm{id}})/2 > \epsilon \geq 0$. However, the sheaves here do not have necessary compactness therein. We adapt the idea from [27, Proposition 4.10.] to cut-off the support of $\mathcal{K}(\varphi^H)|_1, 1_{\Delta_M \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq \epsilon}}$ since $\mathcal{K}(\varphi^H)|_1$ is isomorphic to $1_{\Delta_M \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$ outside a compact set of $M^2 \times \mathbb{R}$. Consequently, we have the Sato-Sabloff fiber sequence,

$$\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{K}(\varphi^H)|_1, 1_{\Delta_M \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq -\epsilon}}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{K}(\varphi^H)|_1, 1_{\Delta_M \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq \epsilon}}) \rightarrow \Gamma(J^1(M^2), \mu\mathrm{hom}(\mathcal{K}(\varphi^H)|_1, 1_{\Delta_M \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}})).$$

However, we already proved in Lemma 6.14 (combined with Remark 6.15) that

$$\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{K}(\varphi^H)|_1, 1_{\Delta_M \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq -\epsilon}}) \simeq 0$$

for $\epsilon > 0$, and the case of $\epsilon = 0$ follows directly from [31, Proposition 4.3]. Therefore, the desired isomorphism follows. \square

Remark 6.25. A different proof of Lemma 6.24 can be obtained by modifying the proof of [20, Theorem 12.4.7].

As a corollary, we have

Corollary 6.26. *We have the commutative diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Hom}(Q_U, 1_{\Delta_M \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq \epsilon}}) & \xrightarrow{\simeq} & \varprojlim_{\alpha} \Gamma(J^1(M^2), \mu\mathrm{hom}(\mathcal{K}(\varphi_{H_{\alpha}})|_1, 1_{\Delta_M \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}})) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathrm{Hom}(1_{\Delta_M \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}, 1_{\Delta_M \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq \epsilon}}) & \xrightarrow{\simeq} & \Gamma(J^1(M^2), \mu\mathrm{hom}(1_{\Delta_M \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}, 1_{\Delta_M \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}})). \end{array}$$

Proof. We apply Lemma 6.24 to the morphism $1_{\Delta_M \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} \rightarrow Q_U \cong \varinjlim_{\alpha} \mathcal{K}(\varphi^{H_\alpha})|_1$ \square

Next, we are going to compute μhom involved.

Lemma 6.27. *For a compactly supported Hamiltonian function H , and we set*

$$Z_H := \{(q, -p, q, p, 0) : (q, p) \text{ form a constant 1-periodic orbit of } X_H\} \subseteq J^1(M^2),$$

and $i_H : Z_H \rightarrow J^1(M^2)$ the closed inclusion. Then we have

$$\mu\text{hom}(\mathcal{K}(\varphi^H)|_1, 1_{\Delta_M \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}})|_{J^1(M^2)} \simeq i_{H*} \omega_{Z_H}[-2n].$$

Proof. This is a local computation, then we can assume H is C^1 -small and we follow the computation of [27, Theorem 4.14., Proposition 4.15.]. Noticed that, as explained in the proof of Lemma 6.24, we do not have the Assumption 4.12 in *loc.cit.*, but we have a similar compactness conditions. Therefore, the result follows from their computation. \square

Proof of Theorem 6.22. By virtue of Equation (18) and Poincaré duality, we only need to compute $\text{HH}_{\mathbf{k}}^*(\text{Sh}_{U^c}(M; \mathcal{T}); \mathbb{T}_{\epsilon^*})$.

By Lemma 6.27, we have

$$\Gamma(J^1(M^2), \mu\text{hom}(\mathcal{K}(\varphi_{H_\alpha})|_1, 1_{\Delta_M \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}})) \simeq \Gamma_{Z_{H_\alpha}}(J^1(M^2), \mathbf{k})[-2n].$$

So, since $\cap_\alpha Z_{H_\alpha} = U^c \times \{0\}$ by our construction of H_α , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(Q_U, 1_{\Delta_M \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}) &\simeq \varprojlim_{\alpha} \Gamma(J^1(M^2), \mu\text{hom}(\mathcal{K}(\varphi_{H_\alpha})|_1, 1_{\Delta_M \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}})) \simeq \varprojlim_{\alpha} \Gamma_{Z_{H_\alpha}}(J^1(M^2), \mathbf{k})[-2n] \\ &\simeq \Gamma_{U^c \times \{0\}}(J^1(M^2), \mathbf{k})[-2n] \simeq \Gamma_{2n-*}^{BM}(U^c, \mathbf{k}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the diagram appear in Corollary 6.26 is given by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(Q_U, 1_{\Delta_M \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq \epsilon}}) & \xrightarrow{\simeq} & \Gamma_{2n-*}^{BM}(U^c, \mathbf{k}) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(1_{\Delta_M \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}, 1_{\Delta_M \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq \epsilon}}) & \xrightarrow{\simeq} & \Gamma_{2n-*}^{BM}(T^*M, \mathbf{k}). \end{array}$$

The result follows. \square

By Corollary 6.8, we have

Corollary 6.28. *Under the same condition of Proposition 6.22, we assume further that M is \mathbf{k} -orientable, then we have*

$$C_\epsilon(U, \mathbf{k}) \simeq \Gamma_{2n-*}^{BM}(U, \mathbf{k}), \quad C_\epsilon^{\text{out}}(U, \mathbf{k}) \simeq \Gamma_{2n-*}^{BM}(U^c, \mathbf{k}).$$

7 Comparison to symplectic cohomology

In this section, we take $\mathbf{k} = \mathbb{F}\text{-Mod}$ for a field \mathbb{F} . Noticed that $T(T^*M) \simeq \pi^*TM \oplus \pi^*T^*M$, where $\pi : T^*M \rightarrow M$ is the projection. Then we have $c_1(T(T^*M)) = 0$, $w_2(T(T^*M)) = 0$, and there is no grading obstruction. For the open set $U \subseteq T^*M$, we assume that \overline{U} is a closed manifold with boundary, and the restriction of the canonical 1-form to ∂U is a contact form. In particular, \overline{U} is a Liouville domain. In this case we say ∂U is *restricted contact type (RCT)*. For any open interval $(a, b) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ with $a, b \notin \mathcal{A}(\partial U)$, there is a graded abelian group $SH_{(a,b)}^*(\overline{U})$.

We want to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 7.1. *For an open set $U \subseteq T^*M$ with RCT boundary. If $L \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{A}(\partial U)$, we have an isomorphism*

$$\mathrm{HH}_{\mathbb{R}}^*(\mathcal{T}(U); \mathbb{T}_{L^*}) \simeq SH_{(-\infty, L)}^*(\overline{U}).$$

Remark 7.2. When ∂U has good dynamics in the sense that all Reeb orbits are non-degenerated, the action spectrum $\mathcal{A}(\partial U)$ is discrete. Then, the theorem is still true for $L \in \mathcal{A}(\partial U)$ by passing to limits.

The tool we ultimately use to connect Floer homology with sheaves is the following comparison result of Guillermou and Viterbo:

Theorem 7.3 ([23, Theorem E.1]⁵). *For a compactly supported Hamiltonian function H and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, denote φ^H the Hamiltonian flow of H , we have*

$$\mathrm{Ext}_{\mathcal{T}}^*(1_{M^2 \times [a, b]}, \mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}^*(\mathcal{K}(\varphi^H)|_1, \mathcal{K}(\mathrm{id}))) \simeq HF^*(\widehat{\Lambda}_{\varphi_1^H}, \widehat{\Lambda}_{\mathrm{id}}; [a, b]). \quad (23)$$

Remark 7.4. Here, $\widehat{\Lambda}_{\varphi_1^H}$ is a Legendrian graph we define in (12), so we should think $\widehat{\Lambda}_{\varphi_1^H}$ in corresponding Lagrangian Floer theory as the corresponding exact Lagrangian brane with the primitive given by the composition $T^*M \rightarrow \widehat{\Lambda}_{\varphi_1^H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_t$, i.e. S_H^1 .

7.1 Floer theory review (and some lemmas)

7.1.1 Symplectic cohomology

We follow the definition of [12] for the filtered symplectic (co)homology⁶. We recall it in some detail, in particular to fix conventions for gradings and filtrations.

On T^*M we take the standard symplectic form $\omega = dp \wedge dq = d\lambda$, where $\lambda = pdq$. For a Hamiltonian function $H : I \times T^*M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, its Hamiltonian vector field is given by $\iota_{X_H}\omega = -dH$.

The action functional for loops $x : S^1 \rightarrow T^*M$ is given by

$$\mathcal{A}_H(x) = \int_0^1 [x^*\lambda - H(z, x(z))]dz.$$

Its critical points are 1-periodic orbits of X_H . Note that if x is a 1-periodic orbit of X_H with $x(0) = (q, p)$, we have $\mathcal{A}_H(x) = S_H^1(q, p)$, where the right hand side was defined in Equation (10).

For a non-degenerate 1-periodic orbit x of X_H , the degree $|x|$ is define by $|x| = n - \mathrm{CZ}(x)$, where $\mathrm{CZ}(x)$ is the Conley-Zehnder index of x ([40, 41]). As $c_1(T(T^*M)) = 0$, the Conley-Zehnder index takes values in \mathbb{Z} .

For an almost complex structure J on T^*M , we say J is compatible with ω if $g(v, w) = \omega(v, Jw)$ is a Riemannian metric. Then we have $X_H = J\nabla_g H$, and the positive gradient flow of \mathcal{A}_H gives the Floer equation

$$u_s + J(u_t - X_H) = u_s + Ju_t + \nabla H = 0.$$

For two non-degenerate 1-periodic orbits x_{\pm} of X_H , we define $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(x_-, x_+)$ to be the space of solutions of the Floer equation with $\lim_{s \rightarrow \pm\infty} u(s, t) = x_{\pm}(t)$. The space admit a \mathbb{R} -action by $a \cdot u(s, t) = u(s + a, t)$, and its quotient is denoted by $\mathcal{M}(x_-, x_+) = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}(x_-, x_+)/\mathbb{R}$. Then for generic convex at infinity J_t , we have that $\mathcal{M}(x_-, x_+)$ is a manifold of dimension $|x_-| - |x_+| - 1$.

⁵The current arxiv version has a misprint; we thank Claude Viterbo for communicating to us the correct statement, reproduced here.

⁶We follow most of the conventions therein except we use a cohomological grading as in [16].

For $u \in \mathcal{M}(x_-, x_+)$, the energy $E(u) = \int |\partial_s u|^2 ds \wedge dt$ satisfies:

$$E(u) = \mathcal{A}_H(x_+) - \mathcal{A}_H(x_-) \geq 0.$$

We write $\mathcal{S}(H) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ for the action spectrum – values of \mathcal{A}_H on 1-periodic orbits. For $-\infty \leq a < b \leq \infty$, and we denote $\mathcal{H}^{(a,b)}$ the set of all Hamiltonian functions H on T^*M such that $a, b \notin \mathcal{S}(H)$, and all 1-periodic orbits of X_H with action $a < \mathcal{A}(x) < b$ are non-degenerate.

For $H \in \mathcal{H}^{(a,b)}$, the Floer complex $CF_{<b}^*(H)$ is the graded \mathbb{F} -vector space generated by all 1-periodic orbits of X_H with action $\mathcal{A}(x) < b$. One writes:⁷

$$CF_{(a,b)}^*(H) := CF_{<b}^*(H)/CF_{<a}^*(H)$$

As usual, the Floer differential $\delta : C_{(a,b)}^q \rightarrow C_{(a,b)}^{q+1}$ counts holomorphic strips:

$$\delta x_+ = \#\mathcal{M}(x_-, x_+)x_-.$$

The standard argument shows that $\delta^2 = 0$; we write

$$HF_{(a,b)}^*(H) := H^*(CF_{(a,b)}^*(H), \delta).$$

Remark 7.5. So long as $0 \notin (a, b)$, we may and will make the same definition for compactly supported H . (There may be degenerate orbits of action 0, but they do not enter into the definition of the complex.)

It is immediate from the definition that for $a < b < c$ such that corresponding Floer cohomology can be defined, we have a long exact sequence

$$HF_{(a,b)}^*(H) \rightarrow HF_{(a,c)}^*(H) \rightarrow HF_{(b,c)}^*(H) \xrightarrow{+1} . \quad (24)$$

If $H_- \leq H_+$, then a monotone increasing homotopy induces a chain map,

$$(CF_{(a,b)}^*(H_-), \delta) \rightarrow (CF_{(a,b)}^*(H_+), \delta),$$

which is independent with the homotopy on cohomology.

We write $\mathcal{H}_\infty^{a,b}(U) \subseteq \mathcal{H}^{a,b}$ for the Hamiltonians which are linear at the boundary of \bar{U} . One takes by definition:

$$SH_{(a,b)}^*(\bar{U}) = \varinjlim_{H \in \mathcal{H}_\infty^{a,b}(U)} HF_{(a,b)}^*(H).$$

Lemma 7.6 ([49, Proposition 1.4.]). *For $\delta, \epsilon > 0$ and small enough, we have*

$$SH_{(-\delta, \epsilon)}^*(\bar{U}) \simeq H^*(\bar{U}, \partial U, \mathbb{F}).$$

Now let us take $L > \epsilon > 0 > -\delta$. Taking direct limits in (24) yields:

$$H^*(\bar{U}, \partial U, \mathbb{F}) \rightarrow SH_{(-\delta, L)}^*(\bar{U}) \rightarrow SH_{(\epsilon, L)}^*(\bar{U}) \xrightarrow{+1} . \quad (25)$$

On the other hand, for a, b with $0 \notin (a, b)$, we write $\mathcal{H}_c^{a,b}(U) \subseteq \mathcal{H}^{a,b}$ for the Hamiltonians compactly supported in U , and

$$\widetilde{SH}_{(a,b)}^*(\bar{U}) = \varinjlim_{H \in \mathcal{H}_c^{a,b}(U)} HF_{(a,b)}^*(H).$$

We thank Kai Cieliebak and Alexandru Oancea for explaining the following, which is a finite action window version of [12, Proposition 2.5]:

⁷It might be more reasonable to denote this as $CF_{[a,b]}^*(H)$. We have nevertheless followed the notation in [12]; the difference being immaterial as a and b are anyway forbidden from being in the action spectrum.


Proposition 7.7. For $L > \epsilon > 0$, we have

$$\widetilde{SH}_{(\epsilon, L]}^{*+1}(\overline{U}) \simeq SH_{(\epsilon, L]}^*(\overline{U}).$$

Proof. First, for a big-enough β , we have

$$\widetilde{SH}_{(a, b)}^*(\overline{U}) = \varprojlim_{\alpha} HF_{(\epsilon, L]}^*(-H_{\alpha}) = HF_{(\epsilon, L]}^*(-H_{\beta}).$$

Consider the following function K . The function below 0, K equals to $-H_{\beta}$; above 0, K is linear



at infinity with a big enough slope.

Closed orbits if φ_1^K could be classified in the following types:

In bottom of the function, action of orbits will big enough, so non-of them contributes to Floer homology. Inside the red circle, they contribute closed orbits generates $CF_{(\epsilon, L]}^*(K)$ that comes from $\varphi_1^{-H_{\beta}}$, we call them type I; inside the blue circle, they contribute closed orbits generates $CF_{(\epsilon, L]}^*(K)$ that give $SH_{(\epsilon, L]}^*(\overline{U})$, we call them type II.

Let us denote subcomplexes generated by corresponding orbits as C_I^*, C_{II}^* . Then we have

$$H^*(C_I^*) \simeq H_{(\epsilon, L]}^*(-H_{\beta}), \quad H^*(C_{II}^*) \simeq SH_{(\epsilon, L]}^*(\overline{U}).$$

On the other hand, they form a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow C_I^* \rightarrow CF_{(\epsilon, L]}^*(K) \rightarrow C_{II}^* \rightarrow 0.$$

It remains to show that $CF_{(\epsilon, L]}^*(K)$ is acyclic. This can be done by comparing with the symplectic homology as computed by the Hamiltonians indicated by the dashed line, as in [12, Prop. 2.5] \square

7.1.2 Lagrangian Floer cohomology

We now fix conventions for Lagrangian Floer theory, following [51]. Fix two transversely intersecting compact exact Lagrangians, L_0 and L_1 . We fix primitives: $f_i : L_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $df_i = \lambda|_{L_i}$. We also fix Maslov and spin structure on the Lagrangians.

We write $f_{01}(p) := f_1(p) - f_0(p)$ for $p \in L_0 \cap L_1$. The Maslov class enables us to define a \mathbb{Z} -grading $|p| \in \mathbb{Z}$ for $p \in L_0 \cap L_1$. We fix the sign of the grading as follows. If x is a non-degenerate 1-periodic orbit of X_H for of a Hamiltonian function H , then there is a corresponding intersection point for L_0 the graph of the time-1 return map, and L_1 the diagonal. We ask that the degree of the intersection point agrees with the degree in Hamiltonian Floer cohomology, as given above.

For a compatible almost complex structure J and intersection points p_{\pm} , one considers the moduli space $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(p_-, p_+)$ of solutions of the J -holomorphic curve equation: $u_s + Ju_t = 0$ with $u(s, i) \in L_i$ and $\lim_{s \rightarrow \pm\infty} u(s, t) = p_{\pm}$; quotient by the translation action to get the moduli space $\mathcal{M}(p_-, p_+) = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}(p_-, p_+)/\mathbb{R}$. For generic convex-at-infinity J_t , one has that $\mathcal{M}(p_-, p_+)$ is a manifold of dimension $|p_-| - |p_+| - 1$.

For $-\infty \leq a < b \leq \infty$, the Floer complex $CF_J^*(L_0, L_1; a)$ is the graded \mathbb{F} -vector space generated by $p \in L_0 \cap L_1$ with $f_{01}(x) \geq a$. One writes

$$CF_J^*(L_0, L_1; [a, b]) := CF_J^*(L_0, L_1; a)/CF_J^*(L_0, L_1; b)$$

We define the Floer differential $\delta : CF_J^*(L_0, L_1; [a, b]) \rightarrow CF_J^*(L_0, L_1; [a, b])$ such that

$$\delta p_+ = \#\mathcal{M}(p_-, p_+)p_-.$$

The standard argument shows that $\delta^2 = 0$, and we denote the homology as:

$$HF^*(L_0, L_1; [a, b]) := H^*(CF_J^*(L_0, L_1; [a, b]), \delta).$$

In $T^*(M \times M)$, the graph of a compactly supported Hamiltonian φ_1^H defines an exact Lagrangian embedding whose primitive is S_H^1 . We abuse notation $\widehat{\Lambda}_{\varphi_1^H}$ to represent both Legendrian we defined in (12), and corresponding exact Lagrangian. Since T^*M has trivial c_1 and w_2 , we have that $\widehat{\Lambda}_{\text{id}}$ define an exact Lagrangian brane, then also $\widehat{\Lambda}_{\varphi_1^H}$ as it is a Hamiltonian deformation of $\widehat{\Lambda}_{\text{id}}$. We also use $\widehat{\Lambda}_{\varphi_1^H}$ to denote the corresponding exact Lagrangian brane. However, as $\widehat{\Lambda}_{\varphi_1^H}$ always have degenerate intersection at infinity, we need to define $HF^*(\widehat{\Lambda}_{\varphi_1^H}, \widehat{\Lambda}_{\text{id}}; [a, b])$ ($HF^*(\widehat{\Lambda}_{\text{id}}, \widehat{\Lambda}_{\varphi_1^H}; [a, b])$) by taking a C^2 -small perturbation on Lagrangians and an almost complex structure convex at infinity as [23, Appendix E], which also explains well-definedness when a, b are finite.

On the other hand, we will only use $HF^*(\widehat{\Lambda}_{\varphi_1^H}, \widehat{\Lambda}_{\text{id}}; [a, b])$ in the case that 0 is not in the action window (a, b) (we also assume a, b are not in the action spectrum of X_H), and the non-constant 1-periodic points of X_H are non-degenerate. The definition in this situation is compatible with $HF^*(L_0, L_1; [a, b])$ we defined for compact exact Lagrangian branes intersect transversely.

Let us recall the relation between Lagrangian and Hamiltonian Floer cohomology:

Proposition 7.8 ([50, lemma 3.2], [3, Section 5.2.]). *Fix a compactly supported function $H : T^*M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Let ϕ_1^H be the time-1 map. Fix any a, b such that a, b are not in the action spectrum of H , and the interval $[a, b)$ does not containing 0. Then*

$$HF^*(\widehat{\Lambda}_{\text{id}}, \widehat{\Lambda}_{\varphi_1^H}; [a, b]) \simeq HF_{(-b, -a)}^*(H).$$

Remark 7.9. The assumption that 0 is not in the action window is only required for the trivial free homotopy class of loops (cf. [3, Remark 4.4.2]). The sign in Hamiltonian Floer homology comes from a difference of our action filtration conventions between the two sides.

Corollary 7.10. *For a compactly supported Hamiltonian functions H , and $L > \epsilon > 0$ such that L, ϵ are not in the action spectrum of $-H$, we have*

$$HF^*(\widehat{\Lambda}_{\varphi_1^H}, \widehat{\Lambda}_{\text{id}}; [-L, -\epsilon]) \simeq HF_{(\epsilon, L]}^*(-H).$$

Proof. The compactly support Hamiltonian flow $\text{id} \times \varphi_1^H$ on $T^*(M \times M)$ induces an isomorphism

$$HF^*(\widehat{\Lambda}_{\varphi_1^H}, \widehat{\Lambda}_{\text{id}}; [-L, -\epsilon]) \simeq HF^*(\widehat{\Lambda}_{\text{id}}, \widehat{\Lambda}_{\varphi_1^{-H}}; [-L, -\epsilon]). \quad \square$$

7.2 Proof of Theorem 7.1

Now, we first take $L > \epsilon > 0 > -\delta$ with $\epsilon, \delta > 0$ small enough. Recall the 9-diagram in Lemma 6.16. Its cohomology diagram is

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
H^* \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\bullet}(\mathrm{Sh}_{U^c}(M; \mathcal{J}), (-\delta, \epsilon]) & \longrightarrow & H^* \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\bullet}(\mathrm{Sh}_{U^c}(M; \mathcal{J}), (-\delta, L]) & \longrightarrow & H^* \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\bullet}(\mathrm{Sh}_{U^c}(M; \mathcal{J}), (\epsilon, L]) \xrightarrow{+1} \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
H^*(T^*M, \mathbb{F}) & \xrightarrow{\simeq} & H^*(T^*M, \mathbb{F}) & \longrightarrow & 0 \xrightarrow{+1} \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\mathrm{HH}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{J}(U), (-\delta, \epsilon]) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{J}(U), (-\delta, L]) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{J}(U), (\epsilon, L]) \xrightarrow{+1} \\
\downarrow +1 & & \downarrow +1 & & \simeq \downarrow +1
\end{array}$$

We will now substitute various now-established results into the diagram.

Corollary 6.28 determines the first column (note U is \mathbb{F} -orientable): we showed that

$$H^* \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{J}(U), (-\delta, \epsilon]) \simeq H^* \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{J}(U), \mathbb{T}_{\epsilon*}) \simeq H_{2n-*}^{BM}(U, \mathbb{F}) \simeq H^*(\overline{U}, \partial U, \mathbb{F}). \quad (26)$$

Now, we use Theorem 7.3 and Corollary 6.20. For all $a < b$,

$$H^* \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\bullet}(\mathrm{Sh}_{U^c}(M; \mathcal{J}), (\epsilon, L]) = \varprojlim_{\alpha} HF^*(\widehat{\Lambda}_{\varphi_1^{H_\alpha}}, \widehat{\Lambda}_{\mathrm{id}}; [-b, -a]).$$

In particular, for $L > \epsilon > 0$, we use Corollary 7.10 to see that

$$H^* \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\bullet}(\mathrm{Sh}_{U^c}(M; \mathcal{J}), (\epsilon, L]) \simeq \widehat{SH}_{(\epsilon, L]}^*(\overline{U}).$$

Then the third column of the 9-diagram together with Proposition 7.7 gives:

$$H^* \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{J}(U), (\epsilon, L]) \simeq H^{*+1} \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\bullet}(\mathrm{Sh}_{U^c}(M; \mathcal{J}), (\epsilon, L]) = \widehat{SH}_{(\epsilon, L]}^{*+1}(\overline{U}) \simeq SH_{(\epsilon, L]}^*(\overline{U}). \quad (27)$$

Then we plug results of (26) and (27) into the third row, we have a long exact sequence

$$H^*(\overline{U}, \partial U, \mathbb{F}) \rightarrow H^* \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{J}(U), (-\delta, L]) \rightarrow SH_{(\epsilon, L]}^*(\overline{U}) \xrightarrow{+1}. \quad (28)$$

On the other hand, the isomorphism of Theorem 7.3 is compatible with filtration. Then, the long exact sequence (28) is compatible with filtration long exact sequence (25) of symplectic cohomology:

$$H^*(\overline{U}, \partial U, \mathbb{F}) \rightarrow SH_{(-\delta, L]}^*(\overline{U}) \rightarrow SH_{(\epsilon, L]}^*(\overline{U}) \xrightarrow{+1}.$$

Then we conclude by comparing the long exact sequence (28) with the action-filtration long exact sequence of symplectic cohomology. That is, for $L > 0$, we have

$$H^* \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{J}(U), \mathbb{T}_{L*}) \simeq H^* \mathrm{HH}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{J}(U), (-\delta, L]) \simeq SH_{(-\delta, L]}^*(\overline{U}) \simeq SH_{(-\infty, L]}^*(\overline{U}),$$

where the last isomorphism follows from the fact that no 1-periodic orbit for X_{H_α} with action $< -\delta$ with $\delta \gg 0$ for the choice cofinal sequence H_α (cf. [49, p. 993]). For the same reason, both sides vanish if $L < 0$. This completes the proof. \square

Remark 7.11. We could have also argued for Equation (26) by applying Theorem 7.3 to the action window $(-\delta, \epsilon]$. But now, since $0 \in (-\delta, \epsilon]$, we should be careful that we need to take a C^2 -small Morse perturbation of the diagonal $\widehat{\Lambda}_{\mathrm{id}}$ outside of U to define Lagrangian Floer theory. In this case, one can conclude by adapting a result of Poźniak [3, Theorem 5.2.2.], [39, Theorem 3.4.11]. One advantage of this argument is that it is easy to see that (28) is compatible with the action window long exact sequence of symplectic cohomology.

References

- [1] Mohammed Abouzaid. A geometric criterion for generating the Fukaya category. *Publications Mathématiques de l’IHÉS*, 112:191–240, 2010.
- [2] David Ben-Zvi, John Francis, and David Nadler. Integral transforms and Drinfeld centers in derived algebraic geometry. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 23(4):909–966, 2010.
- [3] Paul Biran, Leonid Polterovich, and Dietmar Salamon. Propagation in Hamiltonian dynamics and relative symplectic homology. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 119(1), 2003.
- [4] Andrew J Blumberg, David Gepner, and Gonçalo Tabuada. A universal characterization of higher algebraic K-theory. *Geometry & Topology*, 17(2):733–838, apr 2013.
- [5] Christopher Brav and Tobias Dyckerhoff. Relative Calabi-Yau structures II: Shifted Lagrangians in the moduli of objects. *Selecta Mathematica*, 27(4), 2021.
- [6] Christopher Brav and Nick Rozenblyum. The cyclic Deligne conjecture and Calabi-Yau structures. *arXiv preprint: 2305.10323*, 2023.
- [7] Baptiste Chantraine, Georgios Dimitroglou Rizell, Paolo Ghiggini, and Roman Golovko. Geometric generation of the wrapped Fukaya category of Weinstein manifolds and sectors. *arXiv preprint: 1712.09126*, 2017.
- [8] Sheng-Fu Chiu. Nonsqueezing property of contact balls. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 166(4):605–655, 2017.
- [9] Sheng-Fu Chiu. Microlocal projector for complete flow. *arXiv preprint: 2112.00483*, 2021.
- [10] Merlin Christ. Relative calabi-yau structures and perverse schobers on surfaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.16597*, 2023.
- [11] Kai Cieliebak, Andreas Floer, and Helmut Hofer. Symplectic homology II: A general construction. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 218:103–122, 1995.
- [12] Kai Cieliebak, Urs Frauenfelder, and Alexandru Oancea. Rabinowitz Floer homology and symplectic homology. *Annales scientifiques de l’École normale supérieure*, 43(6):957–1015, 2010.
- [13] Andreas Floer and Helmut Hofer. Symplectic homology I: Open sets in \mathbb{C}^n . *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 215:37–88, 1994.
- [14] Maia Fraser, Sheila Sandon, and Bingyu Zhang. Contact non-squeezing at large scale via generating functions. *arXiv preprint: 2310.11993*, 2023.
- [15] Dennis Gaiitgory and Nick Rozenblyum. *A study in derived algebraic geometry. Vol. I. Correspondences and duality*, volume 221 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2017.
- [16] Sheel Ganatra. Symplectic cohomology and duality for the wrapped Fukaya category. *arXiv preprint:1304.7312*, 2013.
- [17] Sheel Ganatra. Cyclic homology, S^1 -equivariant Floer cohomology and Calabi–Yau structures. *Geometry & Topology*, 27(9):3461–3584, December 2023.

- [18] Sheel Ganatra, John Pardon, and Vivek Shende. Microlocal Morse theory of wrapped Fukaya categories. *To appear in Annals of Mathematics*, 2023.
- [19] Sheel Ganatra, John Pardon, and Vivek Shende. Sectorial descent for wrapped Fukaya categories. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 2023.
- [20] Stéphane Guillermou. *Sheaves and symplectic geometry of cotangent bundles*, volume 440 of *Astérisque*. Société mathématique de France, 2023.
- [21] Stéphane Guillermou, Masaki Kashiwara, and Pierre Schapira. Sheaf quantization of Hamiltonian isotopies and applications to nondisplaceability problems. *Duke Math. J.*, 161(2):201–245, 2012.
- [22] Stéphane Guillermou and Pierre Schapira. Microlocal theory of sheaves and tamarkin’s non displaceability theorem. In *Homological mirror symmetry and tropical geometry*, pages 43–85. Springer, 2014.
- [23] Stéphane Guillermou and Claude Viterbo. The singular support of sheaves is γ -coisotropic. *arXiv preprint: 2203.12977*, 2022.
- [24] Jean Gutt and Michael Hutchings. Symplectic capacities from positive S^1 -equivariant symplectic homology. *Algebraic & Geometric Topology*, 18(6):3537–3600, 2018.
- [25] Marc Hoyois. K-theory of dualizable categories (after A. Efimov). Preprint, available at <https://hoyois.app.uni-regensburg.de/research.html>, 2018.
- [26] Marc Hoyois, Sarah Scherotzke, and Nicolò Sibilla. Higher traces, noncommutative motives, and the categorified Chern character. *Advances in Mathematics*, 309:97–154, 2017.
- [27] Yuichi Ike. Compact exact Lagrangian intersections in cotangent bundles via sheaf quantization. *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.*, 55(4):737–778, 2019.
- [28] Masaki Kashiwara and Pierre Schapira. *Sheaves on manifolds*, volume 292 of *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994. With a chapter in French by Christian Houzel, Corrected reprint of the 1990 original.
- [29] Masaki Kashiwara and Pierre Schapira. Persistent homology and microlocal sheaf theory. *Journal of Applied and Computational Topology*, 2(1-2):83–113, 2018.
- [30] Christopher Kuo. Wrapped sheaves. *Advances in Mathematics*, 415, 2023.
- [31] Christopher Kuo and Wenyan Li. Duality and spherical adjunction from microlocalization – an approach by contact isotopies. *arXiv preprint: 2210.06643*, 2022.
- [32] Jacob Lurie. *Higher topos theory*, volume 170 of *Annals of Mathematics Studies*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2009.
- [33] Jacob Lurie. Spectral algebraic geometry. Preprint, available at <https://www.math.ias.edu/lurie>, 2018.
- [34] David Nadler. Wrapped microlocal sheaves on pairs of pants. *arXiv preprint: 1604.00114*, 2016.

- [35] David Nadler and Eric Zaslow. Constructible sheaves and the Fukaya category. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 22(1):233–286, 2009.
- [36] Amnon Neeman. On the derived category of sheaves on a manifold. *Documenta Mathematica*, 6:483–488, 2001.
- [37] Amnon Neeman. *Triangulated categories*. Number 148 in Annals of Mathematics Studies. Princeton University Press, 2001.
- [38] Kate Ponto and Michael Shulman. Traces in symmetric monoidal categories. *Expositiones Mathematicae*, 32(3):248–273, 2014.
- [39] Marcin Poźniak. Floer homology, Novikov rings and clean intersections. In *Northern California Symplectic Geometry Seminar*, page 119–181. American Mathematical Society, 1999.
- [40] Joel Robbin and Dietmar Salamon. The Maslov index for paths. *Topology*, 32(4):827–844, 1993.
- [41] Dietmar Salamon. Lectures on Floer homology. *Symplectic geometry and topology (Park City, UT, 1997)*, 7:143–229, 1999.
- [42] Peter Scholze. Six-functor formalisms. Lecture Notes, 2022.
- [43] Paul Seidel. Fukaya categories and deformations. *arXiv preprint math/0206155*, 2002.
- [44] Paul Seidel. A biased view of symplectic cohomology. *Current developments in mathematics*, 2006(1):211–254, 2006.
- [45] Dmitry Tamarkin. Microlocal category. *arXiv preprint: 1511.08961*, 2015.
- [46] Dmitry Tamarkin. Microlocal condition for non-displaceability. In Michael Hitrik, Dmitry Tamarkin, Boris Tsygan, and Steve Zelditch, editors, *Algebraic and Analytic Microlocal Analysis*, pages 99–223. Springer, 2018.
- [47] Lisa Traynor. Symplectic homology via generating functions. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, 4(6):718–748, November 1994.
- [48] Claude Viterbo. Symplectic topology as the geometry of generating functions. *Mathematische Annalen*, 292(1):685–710, March 1992.
- [49] Claude Viterbo. Functors and computations in Floer homology with applications, I. *Geometric & Functional Analysis GAFA*, 9(5):985–1033, 1999.
- [50] Claude Viterbo. Functors and computations in Floer homology with applications, II. *arXiv preprint: 1805.01316*, 2018.
- [51] Claude Viterbo. Sheaf quantization of Lagrangians and Floer cohomology. *arXiv preprint: 1901.09440*, 2019.
- [52] Marco Volpe. The six operations in topology. *arXiv preprint: 2110.10212*, 2021.
- [53] Bingyu Zhang. Capacities from the Chiu-Tamarkin complex. *arXiv preprint: 2103.05143v5*, 2021.

- [54] Bingyu Zhang. *Sheaf techniques and symplectic geometry*. PhD thesis, Université Grenoble Alpes, 2022.
- [55] Bingyu Zhang. Idempotence of microlocal kernels and S^1 -equivariant Chiu-Tamarkin invariant. *arXiv preprint: 2306.12316*, 2023.
- [56] Jun Zhang. *Quantitative Tamarkin Theory*. CRM Short Courses, Virtual Series on Symplectic Geometry. Springer International Publishing, 2020.