

The Viterbo–Maslov Index in Dimension Two

Joel W. Robbin
University of Wisconsin

Dietmar A. Salamon*
ETH-Zürich

2 May 2012

Abstract

We prove a formula that expresses the Viterbo–Maslov index of a smooth strip in an oriented 2-manifold with boundary curves contained in 1-dimensional submanifolds in terms the degree function on the complement of the union of the two submanifolds.

1 Introduction

We assume throughout this paper that Σ is a connected oriented 2-manifold without boundary and $\alpha, \beta \subset \Sigma$ are connected smooth one dimensional oriented submanifolds without boundary which are closed as subsets of Σ and intersect transversally. We do not assume that Σ is compact, but when it is, α and β are embedded circles. Denote the standard half disc by

$$\mathbb{D} := \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid \operatorname{Im} z \geq 0, |z| \leq 1\}.$$

Let \mathcal{D} denote the space of all smooth maps $u : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \Sigma$ satisfying the boundary conditions $u(\mathbb{D} \cap \mathbb{R}) \subset \alpha$ and $u(\mathbb{D} \cap S^1) \subset \beta$. For $x, y \in \alpha \cap \beta$ let $\mathcal{D}(x, y)$ denote the subset of all $u \in \mathcal{D}$ satisfying the endpoint conditions $u(-1) = x$ and $u(1) = y$. Each $u \in \mathcal{D}$ determines a locally constant function $w : \Sigma \setminus (\alpha \cup \beta) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ defined as the degree

$$w(z) := \deg(u, z), \quad z \in \Sigma \setminus (\alpha \cup \beta).$$

*Partially supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation Grant 200021-127136

When z is a regular value of u this is the algebraic number of points in the preimage $u^{-1}(z)$. The function w depends only on the homotopy class of u . We prove that the homotopy class of u is uniquely determined by its endpoints x, y and its degree function w (Theorem 2.4). The main theorem of this paper asserts that the Viterbo–Maslov index of an element $u \in \mathcal{D}(x, y)$ is given by the formula

$$\mu(u) = \frac{m_x + m_y}{2}, \quad (1)$$

where m_x denotes the sum of the four values of w encountered when walking along a small circle surrounding x , and similarly for y (Theorem 3.4). The formula (1) plays a central role in our combinatorial approach [1, 7] to Floer homology [4, 5]. An appendix contains a proof that the space of paths connecting α to β is simply connected under suitable assumptions.

Acknowledgement. We thank David Epstein for explaining to us the proof of Proposition A.1.

2 Chains and Traces

Define a cell complex structure on Σ by taking the set of zero-cells to be the set $\alpha \cap \beta$, the set of one-cells to be the set of connected components of $(\alpha \setminus \beta) \cup (\beta \setminus \alpha)$ with compact closure, and the set of two-cells to be the set of connected components of $\Sigma \setminus (\alpha \cup \beta)$ with compact closure. (There is an abuse of language here as the “two-cells” need not be homeomorphs of the open unit disc if the genus of Σ is positive and the “one-cells” need not be arcs if $\alpha \cap \beta = \emptyset$.) Define a boundary operator ∂ as follows. For each two-cell F let $\partial F = \sum \pm E$, where the sum is over the one-cells E which abut F and the plus sign is chosen iff the orientation of E (determined from the given orientations of α and β) agrees with the boundary orientation of F as a connected open subset of the oriented manifold Σ . For each one-cell E let $\partial E = b - a$ where a and b are the endpoints of the arc E and the orientation of E goes from a to b . (The one-cell E is either a subarc of α or a subarc of β and both α and β are oriented one-manifolds.) For $k = 0, 1, 2$ a k -**chain** is defined to be a formal linear combination (with integer coefficients) of k -cells, i.e. a two-chain is a locally constant map $\Sigma \setminus (\alpha \cup \beta) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ (whose support has compact closure in Σ) and a one-chain is a locally constant map $(\alpha \setminus \beta) \cup (\beta \setminus \alpha) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ (whose support has compact closure in $\alpha \cup \beta$). It follows directly from the definitions that $\partial^2 F = 0$ for each two-cell F .

Each $u \in \mathcal{D}$ determines a two-chain w via

$$w(z) := \deg(u, z), \quad z \in \Sigma \setminus (\alpha \cup \beta). \quad (2)$$

and a one-chain ν via

$$\nu(z) := \begin{cases} \deg(u|_{\partial\mathbb{D} \cap \mathbb{R}} : \partial\mathbb{D} \cap \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \alpha, z), & \text{for } z \in \alpha \setminus \beta, \\ -\deg(u|_{\partial\mathbb{D} \cap S^1} : \partial\mathbb{D} \cap S^1 \rightarrow \beta, z), & \text{for } z \in \beta \setminus \alpha. \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Here we orient the one-manifolds $\mathbb{D} \cap \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{D} \cap S^1$ from -1 to $+1$. For any one-chain $\nu : (\alpha \setminus \beta) \cup (\beta \setminus \alpha) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ denote

$$\nu_\alpha := \nu|_{\alpha \setminus \beta} : \alpha \setminus \beta \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}, \quad \nu_\beta := \nu|_{\beta \setminus \alpha} : \beta \setminus \alpha \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}.$$

Conversely, given locally constant functions $\nu_\alpha : \alpha \setminus \beta \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ and $\nu_\beta : \beta \setminus \alpha \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$, denote by $\nu = \nu_\alpha - \nu_\beta$ the one-chain that agrees with ν_α on $\alpha \setminus \beta$ and agrees with $-\nu_\beta$ on $\beta \setminus \alpha$.

Definition 2.1 (Traces). Fix two (not necessarily distinct) intersection points $x, y \in \alpha \cap \beta$.

(i) Let $w : \Sigma \setminus (\alpha \cup \beta) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ be a two-chain. The triple $\Lambda = (x, y, w)$ is called an (α, β) -**trace** if there exists an element $u \in \mathcal{D}(x, y)$ such that w is given by (2). In this case $\Lambda =: \Lambda_u$ is also called the (α, β) -**trace of u** and we sometimes write $w_u := w$.

(ii) Let $\Lambda = (x, y, w)$ be an (α, β) -trace. The triple $\partial\Lambda := (x, y, \partial w)$ is called the **boundary of Λ** .

(iii) A one-chain $\nu : (\alpha \setminus \beta) \cup (\beta \setminus \alpha) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ is called an (x, y) -**trace** if there exist smooth curves $\gamma_\alpha : [0, 1] \rightarrow \alpha$ and $\gamma_\beta : [0, 1] \rightarrow \beta$ such that $\gamma_\alpha(0) = \gamma_\beta(0) = x$, $\gamma_\alpha(1) = \gamma_\beta(1) = y$, γ_α and γ_β are homotopic in Σ with fixed endpoints, and

$$\nu(z) = \begin{cases} \deg(\gamma_\alpha, z), & \text{for } z \in \alpha \setminus \beta, \\ -\deg(\gamma_\beta, z), & \text{for } z \in \beta \setminus \alpha. \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Remark 2.2. Assume Σ is simply connected. Then the condition on γ_α and γ_β to be homotopic with fixed endpoints is redundant. Moreover, if $x = y$ then a one-chain ν is an (x, y) -trace if and only if the restrictions $\nu_\alpha := \nu|_{\alpha \setminus \beta}$ and $\nu_\beta := -\nu|_{\beta \setminus \alpha}$ are constant. If $x \neq y$ and α, β are embedded circles and A, B denote the positively oriented arcs from x to y in α, β , then a one-chain ν is an (x, y) -trace if and only if $\nu_\alpha|_{\alpha \setminus (A \cup \beta)} = \nu_\alpha|_{A \setminus \beta} - 1$ and $\nu_\beta|_{\beta \setminus (B \cup \alpha)} = \nu_\beta|_{B \setminus \alpha} - 1$. In particular, when walking along α or β , the function ν only changes its value at x and y .

Lemma 2.3. *Let $x, y \in \alpha \cap \beta$ and $u \in \mathcal{D}(x, y)$. Then the boundary of the (α, β) -trace Λ_u of u is the triple $\partial\Lambda_u = (x, y, \nu)$, where ν is given by (3). In other words, if w is given by (2) and ν is given by (3) then $\nu = \partial w$.*

Proof. Choose an embedding $\gamma : [-1, 1] \rightarrow \Sigma$ such that u is transverse to γ , $\gamma(t) \in \Sigma \setminus (\alpha \cup \beta)$ for $t \neq 0$, $\gamma(-1), \gamma(1)$ are regular values of u , $\gamma(0) \in \alpha \setminus \beta$ is a regular value of $u|_{\mathbb{D} \cap \mathbb{R}}$, and γ intersects α transversally at $t = 0$ such that orientations match in

$$T_{\gamma(0)}\Sigma = T_{\gamma(0)}\alpha \oplus \mathbb{R}\dot{\gamma}(0).$$

Denote $\Gamma := \gamma([-1, 1])$. Then $u^{-1}(\Gamma) \subset \mathbb{D}$ is a 1-dimensional submanifold with boundary

$$\partial u^{-1}(\Gamma) = u^{-1}(\gamma(-1)) \cup u^{-1}(\gamma(1)) \cup (u^{-1}(\gamma(0)) \cap \mathbb{R}).$$

If $z \in u^{-1}(\Gamma)$ then

$$\text{im } du(z) + T_{u(z)}\Gamma = T_{u(z)}\Sigma, \quad T_z u^{-1}(\Gamma) = du(z)^{-1}T_{u(z)}\Gamma.$$

We orient $u^{-1}(\Gamma)$ such that the orientations match in

$$T_{u(z)}\Sigma = T_{u(z)}\Gamma \oplus du(z)_* T_z u^{-1}(\Gamma).$$

In other words, if $z \in u^{-1}(\Gamma)$ and $u(z) = \gamma(t)$, then a nonzero tangent vector $\zeta \in T_z u^{-1}(\Gamma)$ is positive if and only if the pair $(\dot{\gamma}(t), du(z)_*\zeta)$ is a positive basis of $T_{\gamma(t)}\Sigma$. Then the boundary orientation of $u^{-1}(\Gamma)$ at the elements of $u^{-1}(\gamma(1))$ agrees with the algebraic count in the definition of $w(\gamma(1))$, at the elements of $u^{-1}(\gamma(-1))$ is opposite to the algebraic count in the definition of $w(\gamma(-1))$, and at the elements of $u^{-1}(\gamma(0)) \cap \mathbb{R}$ is opposite to the algebraic count in the definition of $\nu(\gamma(0))$. Hence

$$w(\gamma(1)) = w(\gamma(-1)) + \nu(\gamma(0)).$$

In other words the value of ν at a point in $\alpha \setminus \beta$ is equal to the value of w slightly to the left of α minus the value of w slightly to the right of α . Likewise, the value of ν at a point in $\beta \setminus \alpha$ is equal to the value of w slightly to the right of β minus the value of w slightly to the left of β . This proves Lemma 2.3. \square

Theorem 2.4. (i) *Two elements of \mathcal{D} belong to the same connected component of \mathcal{D} if and only if they have the same (α, β) -trace.*

(ii) *Assume Σ is diffeomorphic to the two-sphere. Then $\Lambda = (x, y, w)$ is an (α, β) -trace if and only if ∂w is an (x, y) -trace.*

(iii) *Assume Σ is not diffeomorphic to the two-sphere and let $x, y \in \alpha \cap \beta$. If ν is an (x, y) -trace, then there is a unique two-chain w such that $\Lambda := (x, y, w)$ is an (α, β) -trace and $\partial w = \nu$.*

Proof. We prove (i). “Only if” follows from the standard arguments in degree theory as in Milnor [6]. To prove “if”, fix two intersection points

$$x, y \in \alpha \cap \beta$$

and, for $X = \Sigma, \alpha, \beta$, denote by $\mathcal{P}(x, y; X)$ the space of all smooth curves $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ satisfying $\gamma(0) = x$ and $\gamma(1) = y$. Every $u \in \mathcal{D}(x, y)$ determines smooth paths $\gamma_{u,\alpha} \in \mathcal{P}(x, y; \alpha)$ and $\gamma_{u,\beta} \in \mathcal{P}(x, y; \beta)$ via

$$\gamma_{u,\alpha}(s) := u(-\cos(\pi s), 0), \quad \gamma_{u,\beta}(s) = u(-\cos(\pi s), \sin(\pi s)). \quad (5)$$

These paths are homotopic in Σ with fixed endpoints. An explicit homotopy is the map

$$F_u := u \circ \varphi : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow \Sigma$$

where $\varphi : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ is the map

$$\varphi(s, t) := (-\cos(\pi s), t \sin(\pi s)).$$

By Lemma 2.3, the homotopy class of $\gamma_{u,\alpha}$ in $\mathcal{P}(x, y; \alpha)$ is uniquely determined by $\nu_\alpha := \partial w_u|_{\alpha \setminus \beta} : \alpha \setminus \beta \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ and that of $\gamma_{u,\beta}$ in $\mathcal{P}(x, y; \beta)$ is uniquely determined by $\nu_\beta := -\partial w_u|_{\beta \setminus \alpha} : \beta \setminus \alpha \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$. Hence they are both uniquely determined by the (α, β) -trace of u . If Σ is not diffeomorphic to the 2-sphere the assertion follows from the fact that each component of $\mathcal{P}(x, y; \Sigma)$ is contractible (because the universal cover of Σ is diffeomorphic to the complex plane). Now assume Σ is diffeomorphic to the 2-sphere. Then $\pi_1(\mathcal{P}(x, y; \Sigma)) = \mathbb{Z}$ acts on $\pi_0(\mathcal{D})$ because the correspondence $u \mapsto F_u$ identifies $\pi_0(\mathcal{D})$ with a space of homotopy classes of paths in $\mathcal{P}(x, y; \Sigma)$ connecting $\mathcal{P}(x, y; \alpha)$ to $\mathcal{P}(x, y; \beta)$. The induced action on the space of two-chains $w : \Sigma \setminus (\alpha \cup \beta)$ is given by adding a global constant. Hence the map $u \mapsto w$ induces an injective map

$$\pi_0(\mathcal{D}(x, y)) \rightarrow \{2\text{-chains}\}.$$

This proves (i).

We prove (ii) and (iii). Let w be a two-chain, suppose that

$$\nu := \partial w$$

is an (x, y) -trace, and denote

$$\Lambda := (x, y, w).$$

Let $\gamma_\alpha : [0, 1] \rightarrow \alpha$ and $\gamma_\beta : [0, 1] \rightarrow \beta$ be as in Definition 2.1. Then there is a $u' \in \mathcal{D}(x, y)$ such that the map $s \mapsto u'(-\cos(\pi s), 0)$ is homotopic to γ_α and $s \mapsto u'(-\cos(\pi s), \sin(\pi s))$ is homotopic to γ_β . By definition the (α, β) -trace of u' is $\Lambda' = (x, y, w')$ for some two-chain w' . By Lemma 2.3, we have

$$\partial w' = \nu = \partial w$$

and hence $w - w' =: d$ is constant. If Σ is not diffeomorphic to the two-sphere and Λ is the (α, β) -trace of some element $u \in \mathcal{D}$, then u is homotopic to u' (as $\mathcal{P}(x, y; \Sigma)$ is simply connected) and hence $d = 0$ and $\Lambda = \Lambda'$. If Σ is diffeomorphic to the 2-sphere choose a smooth map $v : S^2 \rightarrow \Sigma$ of degree d and replace u' by the connected sum $u := u' \# v$. Then Λ is the (α, β) -trace of u . This proves Theorem 2.4. \square

Remark 2.5. Let $\Lambda = (x, y, w)$ be an (α, β) -trace and define

$$\nu_\alpha := \partial w|_{\alpha \setminus \beta}, \quad \nu_\beta := -\partial w|_{\beta \setminus \alpha}.$$

(i) The two-chain w is uniquely determined by the condition $\partial w = \nu_\alpha - \nu_\beta$ and its value at one point. To see this, think of the embedded circles α and β as traintracks. Crossing α at a point $z \in \alpha \setminus \beta$ increases w by $\nu_\alpha(z)$ if the train comes from the left, and decreases it by $\nu_\alpha(z)$ if the train comes from the right. Crossing β at a point $z \in \beta \setminus \alpha$ decreases w by $\nu_\beta(z)$ if the train comes from the left and increases it by $\nu_\beta(z)$ if the train comes from the right. Moreover, ν_α extends continuously to $\alpha \setminus \{x, y\}$ and ν_β extends continuously to $\beta \setminus \{x, y\}$. At each intersection point $z \in (\alpha \cap \beta) \setminus \{x, y\}$ with intersection index $+1$ (respectively -1) the function w takes the values

$$k, \quad k + \nu_\alpha(z), \quad k + \nu_\alpha(z) - \nu_\beta(z), \quad k - \nu_\beta(z)$$

as we march counterclockwise (respectively clockwise) along a small circle surrounding the intersection point.

- (ii) If Σ is not diffeomorphic to the 2-sphere then, by Theorem 2.4 (iii), the (α, β) -trace Λ is uniquely determined by its boundary $\partial\Lambda = (x, y, \nu_\alpha - \nu_\beta)$.
- (iii) Assume Σ is not diffeomorphic to the 2-sphere and choose a universal covering $\pi : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \Sigma$. Choose a point $\tilde{x} \in \pi^{-1}(x)$ and lifts $\tilde{\alpha}$ and $\tilde{\beta}$ of α and β such that $\tilde{x} \in \tilde{\alpha} \cap \tilde{\beta}$. Then Λ lifts to an $(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta})$ -trace

$$\tilde{\Lambda} = (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{w}).$$

More precisely, the one chain $\nu := \nu_\alpha - \nu_\beta = \partial w$ is an (x, y) -trace, by Lemma 2.3. The paths $\gamma_\alpha : [0, 1] \rightarrow \alpha$ and $\gamma_\beta : [0, 1] \rightarrow \beta$ in Definition 2.1 lift to unique paths $\gamma_{\tilde{\alpha}} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \tilde{\alpha}$ and $\gamma_{\tilde{\beta}} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \tilde{\beta}$ connecting \tilde{x} to \tilde{y} . For $\tilde{z} \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (\tilde{A} \cup \tilde{B})$ the number $\tilde{w}(\tilde{z})$ is the winding number of the loop $\gamma_{\tilde{\alpha}} - \gamma_{\tilde{\beta}}$ about \tilde{z} (by Rouché's theorem). The two-chain w is then given by

$$w(z) = \sum_{\tilde{z} \in \pi^{-1}(z)} \tilde{w}(\tilde{z}), \quad z \in \Sigma \setminus (\alpha \cup \beta).$$

To see this, lift an element $u \in \mathcal{D}(x, y)$ with (α, β) -trace Λ to the universal cover to obtain an element $\tilde{u} \in \mathcal{D}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})$ with $\Lambda_{\tilde{u}} = \tilde{\Lambda}$ and consider the degree.

Definition 2.6 (Catenation). Let $x, y, z \in \alpha \cap \beta$. The **catenation of two (α, β) -traces** $\Lambda = (x, y, w)$ and $\Lambda' = (y, z, w')$ is defined by

$$\Lambda \# \Lambda' := (x, z, w + w').$$

Let $u \in \mathcal{D}(x, y)$ and $u' \in \mathcal{D}(y, z)$ and suppose that u and u' are constant near the ends $\pm 1 \in \mathbb{D}$. For $0 < \lambda < 1$ sufficiently close to one the **λ -catenation of u and u'** is the map $u \#_\lambda u' \in \mathcal{D}(x, z)$ defined by

$$(u \#_\lambda u')(\zeta) := \begin{cases} u\left(\frac{\zeta + \lambda}{1 + \lambda\zeta}\right), & \text{for } \operatorname{Re} \zeta \leq 0, \\ u'\left(\frac{\zeta - \lambda}{1 - \lambda\zeta}\right), & \text{for } \operatorname{Re} \zeta \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 2.7. *If $u \in \mathcal{D}(x, y)$ and $u' \in \mathcal{D}(y, z)$ are as in Definition 2.6 then*

$$\Lambda_{u \#_\lambda u'} = \Lambda_u \# \Lambda_{u'}.$$

Thus the catenation of two (α, β) -traces is again an (α, β) -trace.

Proof. This follows directly from the definitions. □

3 The Maslov Index

Definition 3.1. Let $x, y \in \alpha \cap \beta$ and $u \in \mathcal{D}(x, y)$. Choose an orientation preserving trivialization

$$\mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow u^*T\Sigma : (z, \zeta) \mapsto \Phi(z)\zeta$$

and consider the Lagrangian paths

$$\lambda_0, \lambda_1 : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}P^1$$

given by

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_0(s) &:= \Phi(-\cos(\pi s), 0)^{-1}T_{u(-\cos(\pi s), 0)}\alpha, \\ \lambda_1(s) &:= \Phi(-\cos(\pi s), \sin(\pi s))^{-1}T_{u(-\cos(\pi s), \sin(\pi s))}\beta. \end{aligned}$$

The **Viterbo–Maslov index** of u is defined as the relative Maslov index of the pair of Lagrangian paths (λ_0, λ_1) and will be denoted by

$$\mu(u) := \mu(\Lambda_u) := \mu(\lambda_0, \lambda_1).$$

By the naturality and homotopy axioms for the relative Maslov index (see for example [8]), the number $\mu(u)$ is independent of the choice of the trivialization and depends only on the homotopy class of u ; hence it depends only on the (α, β) -trace of u , by Theorem 2.4. The relative Maslov index $\mu(\lambda_0, \lambda_1)$ is the degree of the loop in $\mathbb{R}P^1$ obtained by traversing λ_0 , followed by a counterclockwise turn from $\lambda_0(1)$ to $\lambda_1(1)$, followed by traversing λ_1 in reverse time, followed by a clockwise turn from $\lambda_1(0)$ to $\lambda_0(0)$. This index was first defined by Viterbo [9] (in all dimensions). Another exposition is contained in [8].

Remark 3.2. The Viterbo–Maslov index is additive under catenation, i.e. if

$$\Lambda = (x, y, w), \quad \Lambda' = (y, z, w')$$

are (α, β) -traces then

$$\mu(\Lambda \# \Lambda') = \mu(\Lambda) + \mu(\Lambda').$$

For a proof of this formula see [9, 8].

Definition 3.3. Let $\Lambda = (x, y, w)$ be an (α, β) -trace and

$$\nu_\alpha := \partial w|_{\alpha \setminus \beta}, \quad \nu_\beta := -\partial w|_{\beta \setminus \alpha}.$$

Λ is said to satisfy the **arc condition** if

$$x \neq y, \quad \min |\nu_\alpha| = \min |\nu_\beta| = 0. \quad (6)$$

When Λ satisfies the arc condition there are arcs $A \subset \alpha$ and $B \subset \beta$ from x to y such that

$$\nu_\alpha(z) = \begin{cases} \pm 1, & \text{if } z \in A, \\ 0, & \text{if } z \in \alpha \setminus \overline{A}, \end{cases} \quad \nu_\beta(z) = \begin{cases} \pm 1, & \text{if } z \in B, \\ 0, & \text{if } z \in \beta \setminus \overline{B}. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Here the plus sign is chosen iff the orientation of A from x to y agrees with that of α , respectively the orientation of B from x to y agrees with that of β . In this situation the quadruple (x, y, A, B) and the triple $(x, y, \partial w)$ determine one another and we also write

$$\partial \Lambda = (x, y, A, B)$$

for the boundary of Λ . When $u \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\Lambda_u = (x, y, w)$ satisfies the arc condition and $\partial \Lambda_u = (x, y, A, B)$ then

$$s \mapsto u(-\cos(\pi s), 0)$$

is homotopic in α to a path traversing A and the path

$$s \mapsto u(-\cos(\pi s), \sin(\pi s))$$

is homotopic in β to a path traversing B .

Theorem 3.4. *Let $\Lambda = (x, y, w)$ be an (α, β) -trace. For $z \in \alpha \cap \beta$ denote by $m_z(\Lambda)$ the sum of the four values of w encountered when walking along a small circle surrounding z . Then the Viterbo–Maslov index of Λ is given by*

$$\mu(\Lambda) = \frac{m_x(\Lambda) + m_y(\Lambda)}{2}. \quad (8)$$

We first prove the result for the 2-plane and the 2-sphere (Section 4). When Σ is not simply connected we reduce the result to the case of the 2-plane (Section 5). The key is the identity

$$m_{g\tilde{x}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) + m_{g^{-1}\tilde{y}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) = 0 \quad (9)$$

for every lift $\tilde{\Lambda}$ to the universal cover and every deck transformation $g \neq \text{id}$.

4 The Simply Connected Case

A connected oriented 2-manifold Σ is called **planar** if it admits an (orientation preserving) embedding into the complex plane.

Proposition 4.1. *Equation (8) holds when Σ is planar.*

Proof. Assume first that $\Sigma = \mathbb{C}$ and $\Lambda = (x, y, w)$ satisfies the arc condition. Thus the boundary of Λ has the form

$$\partial\Lambda = (x, y, A, B),$$

where $A \subset \alpha$ and $B \subset \beta$ are arcs from x to y and $w(z)$ is the winding number of the loop $A - B$ about the point $z \in \Sigma \setminus (A \cup B)$ (see Remark 2.5). Hence the formula (8) can be written in the form

$$\mu(\Lambda) = 2k_x + 2k_y + \frac{\varepsilon_x - \varepsilon_y}{2}. \quad (10)$$

Here $\varepsilon_z = \varepsilon_z(\Lambda) \in \{+1, -1\}$ denotes the intersection index of A and B at a point $z \in A \cap B$, $k_x = k_x(\Lambda)$ denotes the value of the winding number w at a point in $\alpha \setminus A$ close to x , and $k_y = k_y(\Lambda)$ denotes the value of w at a point in $\alpha \setminus A$ close to y . We now prove (10) under the assumption that Λ satisfies the arc condition. The proof is by induction on the number of intersection points of B and α and has seven steps.

Step 1. *We may assume without loss of generality that*

$$\Sigma = \mathbb{C}, \quad \alpha = \mathbb{R}, \quad A = [x, y], \quad x < y, \quad (11)$$

and $B \subset \mathbb{C}$ is an embedded arc from x to y that is transverse to \mathbb{R} .

Choose a diffeomorphism from Σ to \mathbb{C} that maps A to a bounded closed interval and maps x to the left endpoint of A . If α is not compact the diffeomorphism can be chosen such that it also maps α to \mathbb{R} . If α is an embedded circle the diffeomorphism can be chosen such that its restriction to B is transverse to \mathbb{R} ; now replace the image of α by \mathbb{R} . This proves Step 1.

Step 2. *Assume (11) and let $\bar{\Lambda} := (x, y, z \mapsto -w(\bar{z}))$ be the $(\alpha, \bar{\beta})$ -trace obtained from Λ by complex conjugation. Then Λ satisfies (10) if and only if $\bar{\Lambda}$ satisfies (10).*

Step 2 follows from the fact that the numbers $\mu, k_x, k_y, \varepsilon_x, \varepsilon_y$ change sign under complex conjugation.

Step 3. Assume (11). If $B \cap \mathbb{R} = \{x, y\}$ then Λ satisfies (10).

In this case B is contained in the upper or lower closed half plane and the loop $A \cup B$ bounds a disc contained in the same half plane. By Step 1 we may assume that B is contained in the upper half space. Then $\varepsilon_x = 1$, $\varepsilon_y = -1$, and $\mu(\Lambda) = 1$. Moreover, the winding number w is one in the disc encircled by A and B and is zero in the complement of its closure. Since the intervals $(-\infty, 0)$ and $(0, \infty)$ are contained in this complement, we have $k_x = k_y = 0$. This proves Step 3.

Step 4. Assume (11) and $\#(B \cap \mathbb{R}) > 2$, follow the arc of B , starting at x , and let x' be the next intersection point with \mathbb{R} . Assume $x' < x$, denote by B' the arc in B from x' to y , and let $A' := [x', y]$ (see Figure 1). If the (α, β) -trace Λ' with boundary $\partial\Lambda' = (x', y, A', B')$ satisfies (10) so does Λ .




Figure 1: Maslov index and catenation: $x' < x < y$.

By Step 2 we may assume $\varepsilon_x(\Lambda) = 1$. Orient B from x to y . The Viterbo–Maslov index of Λ is minus the Maslov index of the path $B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}P^1 : z \mapsto T_z B$, relative to the Lagrangian subspace $\mathbb{R} \subset \mathbb{C}$. Since the Maslov index of the arc in B from x to x' is $+1$ we have

$$\mu(\Lambda) = \mu(\Lambda') - 1. \quad (12)$$

Since the orientations of A' and B' agree with those of A and B we have

$$\varepsilon_{x'}(\Lambda') = \varepsilon_{x'}(\Lambda) = -1, \quad \varepsilon_y(\Lambda') = \varepsilon_y(\Lambda). \quad (13)$$

Now let $x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_m < x$ be the intersection points of \mathbb{R} and B in the interval $(-\infty, x)$ and let $\varepsilon_i \in \{-1, +1\}$ be the intersection index of \mathbb{R} and B at x_i . Then there is an integer $\ell \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ such that $x_\ell = x'$ and $\varepsilon_\ell = -1$. Moreover, the winding number w slightly to the left of x is

$$k_x(\Lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i.$$

It agrees with the value of w slightly to the right of $x' = x_\ell$. Hence

$$k_x(\Lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \varepsilon_i = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell-1} \varepsilon_i - 1 = k_{x'}(\Lambda') - 1, \quad k_y(\Lambda') = k_y(\Lambda). \quad (14)$$

It follows from equation (10) for Λ' and equations (12), (13), and (14) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\Lambda) &= \mu(\Lambda') - 1 \\ &= 2k_{x'}(\Lambda') + 2k_y(\Lambda') + \frac{\varepsilon_{x'}(\Lambda') - \varepsilon_y(\Lambda')}{2} - 1 \\ &= 2k_{x'}(\Lambda') + 2k_y(\Lambda') + \frac{-1 - \varepsilon_y(\Lambda)}{2} - 1 \\ &= 2k_{x'}(\Lambda') + 2k_y(\Lambda') + \frac{1 - \varepsilon_y(\Lambda)}{2} - 2 \\ &= 2k_x(\Lambda) + 2k_y(\Lambda) + \frac{\varepsilon_x(\Lambda) - \varepsilon_y(\Lambda)}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves Step 4.

Step 5. Assume (11) and $\#(B \cap \mathbb{R}) > 2$, follow the arc of B , starting at x , and let x' be the next intersection point with \mathbb{R} . Assume $x < x' < y$, denote by B' the arc in B from x' to y , and let $A' := [x', y]$ (see Figure 2). If the (α, β) -trace Λ' with boundary $\partial\Lambda' = (x', y, A', B')$ satisfies (10) so does Λ .




Figure 2: Maslov index and catenation: $x < x' < y$.

By Step 2 we may assume $\varepsilon_x(\Lambda) = 1$. Since the Maslov index of the arc in B from x to x' is -1 , we have

$$\mu(\Lambda) = \mu(\Lambda') + 1. \quad (15)$$

Since the orientations of A' and B' agree with those of A and B we have

$$\varepsilon_{x'}(\Lambda') = \varepsilon_{x'}(\Lambda) = -1, \quad \varepsilon_y(\Lambda') = \varepsilon_y(\Lambda). \quad (16)$$

Now let $x < x_1 < x_2 < \cdots < x_m < x'$ be the intersection points of \mathbb{R} and B in the interval (x, x') and let $\varepsilon_i \in \{-1, +1\}$ be the intersection index of \mathbb{R} and B at x_i . Since the value of w slightly to the left of x' agrees with the value of w slightly to the right of x we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i = 0.$$

Since $k_{x'}(\Lambda')$ is the sum of the intersection indices of \mathbb{R} and B' at all points to the left of x' we obtain

$$k_{x'}(\Lambda') = k_x(\Lambda) + \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i = k_x(\Lambda), \quad k_y(\Lambda') = k_y(\Lambda). \quad (17)$$

It follows from equation (10) for Λ' and equations (15), (16), and (17) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\Lambda) &= \mu(\Lambda') + 1 \\ &= 2k_{x'}(\Lambda') + 2k_y(\Lambda') + \frac{\varepsilon_{x'}(\Lambda') - \varepsilon_y(\Lambda')}{2} + 1 \\ &= 2k_x(\Lambda) + 2k_y(\Lambda) + \frac{-1 - \varepsilon_y(\Lambda)}{2} + 1 \\ &= 2k_x(\Lambda) + 2k_y(\Lambda) + \frac{\varepsilon_x(\Lambda) - \varepsilon_y(\Lambda)}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves Step 5.

Step 6. Assume (11) and $\#(B \cap \mathbb{R}) > 2$, follow the arc of B , starting at x , and let y' be the next intersection point with \mathbb{R} . Assume $y' > y$. Denote by B' the arc in B from y to y' , and let $A' := [y, y']$ (see Figure 3). If the (α, β) -trace Λ' with boundary $\partial\Lambda' = (y, y', A', B')$ satisfies (10) so does Λ .

By Step 2 we may assume $\varepsilon_x(\Lambda) = 1$. Since the orientation of B' from y to y' is opposite to the orientation of B and the Maslov index of the arc in B from x to y' is -1 , we have

$$\mu(\Lambda) = 1 - \mu(\Lambda'). \quad (18)$$

Using again the fact that the orientation of B' is opposite to the orientation of B we have

$$\varepsilon_y(\Lambda') = -\varepsilon_y(\Lambda), \quad \varepsilon_{y'}(\Lambda') = -\varepsilon_{y'}(\Lambda) = 1. \quad (19)$$




Figure 3: Maslov index and catenation: $x < y < y'$.

Now let $x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_m$ be all intersection points of \mathbb{R} and B and let $\varepsilon_i \in \{-1, +1\}$ be the intersection index of \mathbb{R} and B at x_i . Choose

$$j < k < \ell$$

such that

$$x_j = x, \quad x_k = y, \quad x_\ell = y'.$$

Then

$$\varepsilon_j = \varepsilon_x(\Lambda) = 1, \quad \varepsilon_k = \varepsilon_y(\Lambda), \quad \varepsilon_\ell = \varepsilon_{y'}(\Lambda) = -1,$$

and

$$k_x(\Lambda) = \sum_{i < j} \varepsilon_i, \quad k_y(\Lambda) = - \sum_{i > k} \varepsilon_i.$$

For $i \neq j$ the intersection index of \mathbb{R} and B' at x_i is $-\varepsilon_i$. Moreover, $k_y(\Lambda')$ is the sum of the intersection indices of \mathbb{R} and B' at all points to the left of y and $k_{y'}(\Lambda')$ is minus the sum of the intersection indices of \mathbb{R} and B' at all points to the right of y' . Hence

$$k_y(\Lambda') = - \sum_{i < j} \varepsilon_i - \sum_{j < i < k} \varepsilon_i, \quad k_{y'}(\Lambda') = \sum_{i > \ell} \varepsilon_i.$$

We claim that

$$k_{y'}(\Lambda') + k_x(\Lambda) = 0, \quad k_y(\Lambda') + k_y(\Lambda) = \frac{1 + \varepsilon_y(\Lambda)}{2}. \quad (20)$$

To see this, note that the value of the winding number w slightly to the left of x agrees with the value of w slightly to the right of y' , and hence

$$0 = \sum_{i < j} \varepsilon_i + \sum_{i > \ell} \varepsilon_i = k_x(\Lambda) + k_{y'}(\Lambda').$$

This proves the first equation in (20). To prove the second equation in (20) we observe that

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i = \frac{\varepsilon_x(\Lambda) + \varepsilon_y(\Lambda)}{2}$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} k_y(\Lambda') + k_y(\Lambda) &= -\sum_{i<j} \varepsilon_i - \sum_{j<i<k} \varepsilon_i - \sum_{i>k} \varepsilon_i \\ &= \varepsilon_j + \varepsilon_k - \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i \\ &= \varepsilon_x(\Lambda) + \varepsilon_y(\Lambda) - \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i \\ &= \frac{\varepsilon_x(\Lambda) + \varepsilon_y(\Lambda)}{2} \\ &= \frac{1 + \varepsilon_y(\Lambda)}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the second equation in (20).

It follows from equation (10) for Λ' and equations (18), (19), and (20) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\Lambda) &= 1 - \mu(\Lambda') \\ &= 1 - 2k_y(\Lambda') - 2k_{y'}(\Lambda') - \frac{\varepsilon_y(\Lambda') - \varepsilon_{y'}(\Lambda')}{2} \\ &= 1 - 2k_y(\Lambda') - 2k_{y'}(\Lambda') - \frac{-\varepsilon_y(\Lambda) - 1}{2} \\ &= 2k_y(\Lambda) - \varepsilon_y(\Lambda) + 2k_x(\Lambda) + \frac{1 + \varepsilon_y(\Lambda)}{2} \\ &= 2k_x(\Lambda) + 2k_y(\Lambda) + \frac{1 - \varepsilon_y(\Lambda)}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Here the first equality follows from (18), the second equality follows from (10) for Λ' , the third equality follows from (19), and the fourth equality follows from (20). This proves Step 6.

Step 7. Equation (8) holds when $\Sigma = \mathbb{C}$ and Λ satisfies the arc condition.

It follows from Steps 3-6 by induction that equation (10) holds for every (α, β) -trace $\Lambda = (x, y, w)$ whose boundary $\partial\Lambda = (x, y, A, B)$ satisfies (11). Hence Step 7 follows from Step 1.

Next we drop the assumption that Λ satisfies the arc condition and extend the result to planar surfaces. This requires a further three steps.

Step 8. *Equation (8) holds when $\Sigma = \mathbb{C}$ and $x = y$.*

Under these assumptions $\nu_\alpha := \partial w|_{\alpha \setminus \beta}$ and $\nu_\beta := -\partial w|_{\beta \setminus \alpha}$ are constant. There are four cases.

Case 1. *α is an embedded circle and β is not an embedded circle.* In this case we have $\nu_\beta \equiv 0$ and $B = \{x\}$. Moreover, α is the boundary of a unique disc Δ_α and we assume that α is oriented as the boundary of Δ_α . Then the path $\gamma_\alpha : [0, 1] \rightarrow \Sigma$ in Definition 2.1 satisfies $\gamma_\alpha(0) = \gamma_\alpha(1) = x$ and is homotopic to $\nu_\alpha \alpha$. Hence

$$m_x(\Lambda) = m_y(\Lambda) = 2\nu_\alpha = \mu(\Lambda).$$

Here the last equation follows from the fact that Λ can be obtained as the catenation of ν_α copies of the disc Δ_α .

Case 2. *α is not an embedded circle and β is an embedded circle.* This follows from Case 1 by interchanging α and β .

Case 3. *α and β are embedded circles.* In this case there is a unique pair of embedded discs Δ_α and Δ_β with boundaries α and β , respectively. Orient α and β as the boundaries of these discs. Then, for every $z \in \Sigma \setminus \alpha \cup \beta$, we have

$$w(z) = \begin{cases} \nu_\alpha - \nu_\beta, & \text{for } z \in \Delta_\alpha \cap \Delta_\beta, \\ \nu_\alpha, & \text{for } z \in \Delta_\alpha \setminus \overline{\Delta_\beta}, \\ -\nu_\beta, & \text{for } z \in \Delta_\beta \setminus \overline{\Delta_\alpha}, \\ 0, & \text{for } z \in \Sigma \setminus \overline{\Delta_\alpha} \cup \overline{\Delta_\beta}. \end{cases}$$

Hence

$$m_x(\Lambda) = m_y(\Lambda) = 2\nu_\alpha - 2\nu_\beta = \mu(\Lambda).$$

Here the last equation follows from the fact Λ can be obtained as the catenation of ν_α copies of the disc Δ_α (with the orientation inherited from Σ) and ν_β copies of $-\Delta_\beta$ (with the opposite orientation).

Case 4. *Neither α nor β is an embedded circle.* Under this assumption we have $\nu_\alpha = \nu_\beta = 0$. Hence it follows from Theorem 2.4 that $w = 0$ and $\Lambda = \Lambda_u$ for the constant map $u \equiv x \in \mathcal{D}(x, x)$. Thus

$$m_x(\Lambda) = m_y(\Lambda) = \mu(\Lambda) = 0.$$

This proves Step 8.

Step 9. Equation (8) holds when $\Sigma = \mathbb{C}$.

By Step 8, it suffices to assume $x \neq y$. It follows from Theorem 2.4 that every $u \in \mathcal{D}(x, y)$ is homotopic to a catenation $u = u_0 \# v$, where $u_0 \in \mathcal{D}(x, y)$ satisfies the arc condition and $v \in \mathcal{D}(y, y)$. Hence it follows from Steps 7 and 8 that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\Lambda_u) &= \mu(\Lambda_{u_0}) + \mu(\Lambda_v) \\ &= \frac{m_x(\Lambda_{u_0}) + m_y(\Lambda_{u_0})}{2} + m_y(\Lambda_v) \\ &= \frac{m_x(\Lambda_u) + m_y(\Lambda_u)}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Here the last equation follows from the fact that $w_u = w_{u_0} + w_v$ and hence $m_z(\Lambda_u) = m_z(\Lambda_{u_0}) + m_z(\Lambda_v)$ for every $z \in \alpha \cap \beta$. This proves Step 9.

Step 10. Equation (8) holds when Σ is planar.

Choose an element $u \in \mathcal{D}(x, y)$ such that $\Lambda_u = \Lambda$. Modifying α and β on the complement of $u(\mathbb{D})$, if necessary, we may assume without loss of generality that α and β are mebedded circles. Let $\iota : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be an orientation preserving embedding. Then $\iota_*\Lambda := \Lambda_{\iota \circ u}$ is an $(\iota(\alpha), \iota(\beta))$ -trace in \mathbb{C} and hence satisfies (8) by Step 9. Since $m_{\iota(x)}(\iota_*\Lambda) = m_x(\Lambda)$, $m_{\iota(y)}(\iota_*\Lambda) = m_y(\Lambda)$, and $\mu(\iota_*\Lambda) = \mu(\Lambda)$ it follows that Λ also satisfies (8). This proves Step 10 and Proposition 4.1 \square

Remark 4.2. Let $\Lambda = (x, y, A, B)$ be an (α, β) -trace in \mathbb{C} as in Step 1 in the proof of Theorem 3.4. Thus $x < y$ are real numbers, A is the interval $[x, y]$, and B is an embedded arc with endpoints x, y which is oriented from x to y and is transverse to \mathbb{R} . Thus $Z := B \cap \mathbb{R}$ is a finite set. Define a map

$$f : Z \setminus \{y\} \rightarrow Z \setminus \{x\}$$

as follows. Given $z \in Z \setminus \{y\}$ walk along B towards y and let $f(z)$ be the next intersection point with \mathbb{R} . This map is bijective. Now let I be any of the three open intervals $(-\infty, x)$, (x, y) , (y, ∞) . Any arc in B from z to $f(z)$ with both endpoints in the same interval I can be removed by an isotopy of B which does not pass through x, y . Call Λ a **reduced** (α, β) -trace if $z \in I$ implies $f(z) \notin I$ for each of the three intervals. Then every (α, β) -trace is isotopic to a reduced (α, β') -trace and the isotopy does not effect the numbers $\mu, k_x, k_y, \varepsilon_x, \varepsilon_y$.




Figure 4: Reduced (α, β) -traces in \mathbb{C} .

Let Z^+ (respectively Z^-) denote the set of all points $z \in Z = B \cap \mathbb{R}$ where the positive tangent vectors in $T_z B$ point up (respectively down). One can prove that every reduced (α, β) -trace satisfies one of the following conditions.

Case 1: If $z \in Z^+ \setminus \{y\}$ then $f(z) > z$. **Case 2:** $Z^- \subset [x, y]$.

Case 3: If $z \in Z^- \setminus \{y\}$ then $f(z) > z$. **Case 4:** $Z^+ \subset [x, y]$.

(Examples with $\varepsilon_x = 1$ and $\varepsilon_y = -1$ are depicted in Figure 4.) One can then show directly that the reduced (α, β) -traces satisfy equation (10). This gives rise to an alternative proof of Proposition 4.1 via case distinction.

Proof of Theorem 3.4 in the Simply Connected Case. If Σ is diffeomorphic to the 2-plane the result has been established in Proposition 4.1. Hence assume

$$\Sigma = S^2.$$

Let $u \in \mathcal{D}(x, y)$. If u is not surjective the assertion follows from the case of the complex plane (Proposition 4.1) via stereographic projection. Hence assume u is surjective and choose a regular value $z \in S^2 \setminus (\alpha \cup \beta)$ of u . Denote

$$u^{-1}(z) = \{z_1, \dots, z_k\}.$$

For $i = 1, \dots, k$ let $\varepsilon_i = \pm 1$ according to whether or not the differential $du(z_i) : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow T_z \Sigma$ is orientation preserving. Choose an open disc $\Delta \subset S^2$ centered at z such that

$$\bar{\Delta} \cap (\alpha \cup \beta) = \emptyset$$

and $u^{-1}(\Delta)$ is a union of open neighborhoods $U_i \subset \mathbb{D}$ of z_i with disjoint closures such that

$$u|_{U_i} : U_i \rightarrow \Delta$$

is a diffeomorphism for each i which extends to a neighborhood of \bar{U}_i . Now choose a continuous map $u' : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow S^2$ which agrees with u on $\mathbb{D} \setminus \bigcup_i U_i$ and restricts to a diffeomorphism from \bar{U}_i to $S^2 \setminus \Delta$ for each i . Then z does not belong to the image of u' and hence equation (8) holds for u' (after smoothing along the boundaries ∂U_i). Moreover, the diffeomorphism

$$u'|_{\bar{U}_i} : \bar{U}_i \rightarrow S^2 \setminus \Delta$$

is orientation preserving if and only if $\varepsilon_i = -1$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\Lambda_u) &= \mu(\Lambda_{u'}) + 4 \sum_{i=1}^k \varepsilon_i, \\ m_x(\Lambda_u) &= m_x(\Lambda_{u'}) + 4 \sum_{i=1}^k \varepsilon_i, \\ m_y(\Lambda_u) &= m_y(\Lambda_{u'}) + 4 \sum_{i=1}^k \varepsilon_i. \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 4.1 equation (8) holds for $\Lambda_{u'}$ and hence it also holds for Λ_u . This proves Theorem 3.4 when Σ is simply connected. \square

5 The Non Simply Connected Case

The key step for extending Proposition 4.1 to non-simply connected two-manifolds is the next result about lifts to the universal cover.

Proposition 5.1. *Suppose Σ is not diffeomorphic to the 2-sphere. Let $\Lambda = (x, y, w)$ be an (α, β) -trace and $\pi : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \Sigma$ be a universal covering. Denote by $\Gamma \subset \text{Diff}(\mathbb{C})$ the group of deck transformations. Choose an element $\tilde{x} \in \pi^{-1}(x)$ and let $\tilde{\alpha}$ and $\tilde{\beta}$ be the lifts of α and β through \tilde{x} . Let $\tilde{\Lambda} = (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{w})$ be the lift of Λ with left endpoint \tilde{x} . Then*

$$m_{g\tilde{x}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) + m_{g^{-1}\tilde{y}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) = 0 \tag{21}$$

for every $g \in \Gamma \setminus \{\text{id}\}$.

Lemma 5.2 (Annulus Reduction). *Suppose Σ is not diffeomorphic to the 2-sphere. Let $\Lambda, \pi, \Gamma, \tilde{\Lambda}$ be as in Proposition 5.1. If*

$$m_{g\tilde{x}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) - m_{g\tilde{y}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) = m_{g^{-1}\tilde{y}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) - m_{g^{-1}\tilde{x}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) \quad (22)$$

for every $g \in \Gamma \setminus \{\text{id}\}$ then equation (21) holds for every $g \in \Gamma \setminus \{\text{id}\}$.

Proof. If (21) does not hold then there is a deck transformation $h \in \Gamma \setminus \{\text{id}\}$ such that $m_{h\tilde{x}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) + m_{h^{-1}\tilde{y}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) \neq 0$. Since there can only be finitely many such $h \in \Gamma \setminus \{\text{id}\}$, there is an integer $k \geq 1$ such that $m_{h^k\tilde{x}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) + m_{h^{-k}\tilde{y}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) \neq 0$ and $m_{h^\ell\tilde{x}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) + m_{h^{-\ell}\tilde{y}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) = 0$ for every integer $\ell > k$. Define $g := h^k$. Then

$$m_{g\tilde{x}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) + m_{g^{-1}\tilde{y}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) \neq 0 \quad (23)$$

and $m_{g^k\tilde{x}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) + m_{g^{-k}\tilde{y}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) = 0$ for every integer $k \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{-1, 0, 1\}$. Define

$$\Sigma_0 := \mathbb{C}/\Gamma_0, \quad \Gamma_0 := \{g^k \mid k \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

Then Σ_0 is diffeomorphic to the annulus. Let $\pi_0 : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \Sigma_0$ be the obvious projection, define $\alpha_0 := \pi_0(\tilde{\alpha})$, $\beta_0 := \pi_0(\tilde{\beta})$, and let $\Lambda_0 := (x_0, y_0, w_0)$ be the (α_0, β_0) -trace in Σ_0 with $x_0 := \pi_0(\tilde{x})$, $y_0 := \pi_0(\tilde{y})$, and

$$w_0(z_0) := \sum_{\tilde{z} \in \pi_0^{-1}(z_0)} \tilde{w}(\tilde{z}), \quad z_0 \in \Sigma_0 \setminus (\alpha_0 \cup \beta_0).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} m_{x_0}(\Lambda_0) &= m_{\tilde{x}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}} m_{g^k\tilde{x}}(\tilde{\Lambda}), \\ m_{y_0}(\Lambda_0) &= m_{\tilde{y}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}} m_{g^{-k}\tilde{y}}(\tilde{\Lambda}). \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 4.1 both $\tilde{\Lambda}$ and Λ_0 satisfy equation (8) and they have the same Viterbo–Maslov index. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \mu(\Lambda_0) - \mu(\tilde{\Lambda}) \\ &= \frac{m_{x_0}(\Lambda_0) + m_{y_0}(\Lambda_0)}{2} - \frac{m_{\tilde{x}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) + m_{\tilde{y}}(\tilde{\Lambda})}{2} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \neq 0} \left(m_{g^k\tilde{x}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) + m_{g^{-k}\tilde{y}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) \right) \\ &= m_{g\tilde{x}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) + m_{g^{-1}\tilde{y}}(\tilde{\Lambda}). \end{aligned}$$

Here the last equation follows from (22). This contradicts (23) and proves Lemma 5.2. \square

Lemma 5.3. *Suppose Σ is not diffeomorphic to the 2-sphere. Let $\Lambda, \pi, \Gamma, \tilde{\Lambda}$ be as in Proposition 5.1 and denote $\nu_{\tilde{\alpha}} := \partial\tilde{w}|_{\tilde{\alpha}\setminus\tilde{\beta}}$ and $\nu_{\tilde{\beta}} := -\partial\tilde{w}|_{\tilde{\beta}\setminus\tilde{\alpha}}$. Choose smooth paths*

$$\gamma_{\tilde{\alpha}} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \tilde{\alpha}, \quad \gamma_{\tilde{\beta}} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \tilde{\beta}$$

from $\gamma_{\tilde{\alpha}}(0) = \gamma_{\tilde{\beta}}(0) = \tilde{x}$ to $\gamma_{\tilde{\alpha}}(1) = \gamma_{\tilde{\beta}}(1) = \tilde{y}$ such that $\gamma_{\tilde{\alpha}}$ is an immersion when $\nu_{\tilde{\alpha}} \neq 0$ and constant when $\nu_{\tilde{\alpha}} \equiv 0$, the same holds for $\gamma_{\tilde{\beta}}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_{\tilde{\alpha}}(\tilde{z}) &= \deg(\gamma_{\tilde{\alpha}}, \tilde{z}) \quad \text{for } \tilde{z} \in \tilde{\alpha} \setminus \{\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}\}, \\ \nu_{\tilde{\beta}}(\tilde{z}) &= \deg(\gamma_{\tilde{\beta}}, \tilde{z}) \quad \text{for } \tilde{z} \in \tilde{\beta} \setminus \{\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$\tilde{A} := \gamma_{\tilde{\alpha}}([0, 1]), \quad \tilde{B} := \gamma_{\tilde{\beta}}([0, 1]).$$

Then, for every $g \in \Gamma$, we have

$$g\tilde{x} \in \tilde{A} \iff g^{-1}\tilde{y} \in \tilde{A}, \quad (24)$$

$$g\tilde{x} \notin \tilde{A} \text{ and } g\tilde{y} \notin \tilde{A} \iff \tilde{A} \cap g\tilde{A} = \emptyset, \quad (25)$$

$$g\tilde{x} \in \tilde{A} \text{ and } g\tilde{y} \in \tilde{A} \iff g = \text{id}. \quad (26)$$

The same holds with \tilde{A} replaced by \tilde{B} .

Proof. If α is a contractible embedded circle or not an embedded circle at all we have $\tilde{A} \cap g\tilde{A} = \emptyset$ whenever $g \neq \text{id}$ and this implies (24), (25) and (26). Hence assume α is a noncontractible embedded circle. Then we may also assume, without loss of generality, that $\pi(\mathbb{R}) = \alpha$, the map $\tilde{z} \mapsto \tilde{z} + 1$ is a deck transformation, π maps the interval $[0, 1)$ bijectively onto α , and $\tilde{x}, \tilde{y} \in \mathbb{R} = \tilde{\alpha}$ with $\tilde{x} < \tilde{y}$. Thus $\tilde{A} = [\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}]$ and, for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\tilde{x} + k \in [\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}] \iff 0 \leq k \leq \tilde{y} - \tilde{x} \iff \tilde{y} - k \in [\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}].$$

Similarly, we have

$$\tilde{x} + k, \tilde{y} + k \notin [\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}] \iff [\tilde{x} + k, \tilde{y} + k] \cap [\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}] = \emptyset$$

and

$$\tilde{x} + k, \tilde{y} + k \in [\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}] \iff [\tilde{x} + k, \tilde{y} + k] \subset [\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}] \iff k = 0.$$

This proves (24), (25), and (26) for the deck transformation $\tilde{z} \mapsto \tilde{z} + k$. If g is any other deck transformation, then we have

$$\tilde{\alpha} \cap g\tilde{\alpha} = \emptyset$$

and so (24), (25), and (26) are trivially satisfied. This proves Lemma 5.3. \square

Lemma 5.4 (Winding Number Comparison). *Suppose Σ is not diffeomorphic to the 2-sphere. Let $\Lambda, \pi, \Gamma, \tilde{\Lambda}$ be as in Proposition 5.1, and let $\tilde{A}, \tilde{B} \subset \mathbb{C}$ be as in Lemma 5.3. Then the following holds.*

- (i) *Equation (22) holds for every $g \in \Gamma$ that satisfies $g\tilde{x}, g\tilde{y} \notin \tilde{A} \cup \tilde{B}$.*
- (ii) *If Λ satisfies the arc condition then (21) holds for every $g \in \Gamma \setminus \{\text{id}\}$.*

Proof. We prove (i). Let $g \in \Gamma$ such that $g\tilde{x}, g\tilde{y} \notin \tilde{A} \cup \tilde{B}$ and let $\gamma_{\tilde{\alpha}}, \gamma_{\tilde{\beta}}$ be as in Lemma 5.3. Then $\tilde{w}(\tilde{z})$ is the winding number of the loop $\gamma_{\tilde{\alpha}} - \gamma_{\tilde{\beta}}$ about the point $\tilde{z} \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (\tilde{A} \cup \tilde{B})$. Moreover, the paths

$$g\gamma_{\tilde{\alpha}} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, \quad g\gamma_{\tilde{\beta}} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$$

connect the points $g\tilde{x}, g\tilde{y} \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (\tilde{A} \cup \tilde{B})$. Hence

$$\tilde{w}(g\tilde{y}) - \tilde{w}(g\tilde{x}) = (\gamma_{\tilde{\alpha}} - \gamma_{\tilde{\beta}}) \cdot g\gamma_{\tilde{\alpha}} = (\gamma_{\tilde{\alpha}} - \gamma_{\tilde{\beta}}) \cdot g\gamma_{\tilde{\beta}}.$$

Similarly with g replaced by g^{-1} . Moreover, it follows from Lemma 5.3, that

$$\tilde{A} \cap g\tilde{A} = \emptyset, \quad \tilde{B} \cap g^{-1}\tilde{B} = \emptyset.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{w}(g\tilde{y}) - \tilde{w}(g\tilde{x}) &= (\gamma_{\tilde{\alpha}} - \gamma_{\tilde{\beta}}) \cdot g\gamma_{\tilde{\alpha}} \\ &= g\gamma_{\tilde{\alpha}} \cdot \gamma_{\tilde{\beta}} \\ &= \gamma_{\tilde{\alpha}} \cdot g^{-1}\gamma_{\tilde{\beta}} \\ &= (\gamma_{\tilde{\alpha}} - \gamma_{\tilde{\beta}}) \cdot g^{-1}\gamma_{\tilde{\beta}} \\ &= \tilde{w}(g^{-1}\tilde{y}) - \tilde{w}(g^{-1}\tilde{x}) \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the fact that every $g \in \Gamma$ is an orientation preserving diffeomorphism of \mathbb{C} . Thus we have proved that

$$\tilde{w}(g\tilde{x}) + \tilde{w}(g^{-1}\tilde{y}) = \tilde{w}(g\tilde{y}) + \tilde{w}(g^{-1}\tilde{x}).$$

Since $g\tilde{x}, g\tilde{y} \notin \tilde{A} \cup \tilde{B}$, we have

$$m_{g\tilde{x}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) = 4\tilde{w}(g\tilde{x}), \quad m_{g^{-1}\tilde{y}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) = 4\tilde{w}(g^{-1}\tilde{y}),$$

and the same identities hold with g replaced by g^{-1} . This proves (i).

We prove (ii). If Λ satisfies the arc condition then $g\tilde{A} \cap \tilde{A} = \emptyset$ and $g\tilde{B} \cap \tilde{B} = \emptyset$ for every $g \in \Gamma \setminus \{\text{id}\}$. In particular, for every $g \in \Gamma \setminus \{\text{id}\}$, we have $g\tilde{x}, g\tilde{y} \notin \tilde{A} \cup \tilde{B}$ and hence (22) holds by (i). Hence it follows from Lemma 5.2 that (21) holds for every $g \in \Gamma \setminus \{\text{id}\}$. This proves Lemma 5.4. \square

The next lemma deals with (α, β) -traces connecting a point $x \in \alpha \cap \beta$ to itself. An example on the annulus is depicted in Figure 5.

Lemma 5.5 (Isotopy Argument). *Suppose Σ is not diffeomorphic to the 2-sphere. Let $\Lambda, \pi, \Gamma, \tilde{\Lambda}$ be as in Proposition 5.1. Suppose that there is a deck transformation $g_0 \in \Gamma \setminus \{\text{id}\}$ such that $\tilde{y} = g_0 \tilde{x}$. Then Λ has Viterbo–Maslov index zero and $m_{g\tilde{x}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) = 0$ for every $g \in \Gamma \setminus \{\text{id}, g_0\}$.*




Figure 5: An (α, β) -trace on the annulus with $x = y$.

Proof. By assumption, we have $\tilde{\alpha} = g_0 \tilde{\alpha}$ and $\tilde{\beta} = g_0 \tilde{\beta}$. Hence α and β are noncontractible embedded circles and some iterate of α is homotopic to some iterate of β . Hence, by Lemma A.4, α must be homotopic to β (with some orientation). Hence we may assume, without loss of generality, that $\pi(\mathbb{R}) = \alpha$, the map $\tilde{z} \mapsto \tilde{z} + 1$ is a deck transformation, π maps the interval $[0, 1)$ bijectively onto α , $\mathbb{R} = \tilde{\alpha}$, $\tilde{x} = 0 \in \tilde{\alpha} \cap \tilde{\beta}$, $\tilde{\beta} = \tilde{\beta} + 1$, and that $\tilde{y} = \ell > 0$ is an integer. Then g_0 is the translation

$$g_0(\tilde{z}) = \tilde{z} + \ell.$$

Let $\tilde{A} := [0, \ell] \subset \tilde{\alpha}$ and let $\tilde{B} \subset \tilde{\beta}$ be the arc connecting 0 to ℓ . Then, for $\tilde{z} \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (\tilde{A} \cup \tilde{B})$, the integer $\tilde{w}(\tilde{z})$ is the winding number of $\tilde{A} - \tilde{B}$ about \tilde{z} . Define the projection $\pi_0 : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by

$$\pi_0(\tilde{z}) := e^{2\pi i \tilde{z}/k},$$

denote $\alpha_0 := \pi_0(\tilde{\alpha}) = S^1$ and $\beta_0 := \pi_0(\tilde{\beta})$, and let $\Lambda_0 = (1, 1, w_0)$ be the induced (α_0, β_0) -trace in \mathbb{C} with $w_0(z) := \sum_{\tilde{z} \in \pi_0^{-1}(z)} \tilde{w}(\tilde{z})$. Then α_0 and β_0 are embedded circles and have the winding number ℓ about zero. Hence it follows from Step 8, Case 3 in the proof of Proposition 4.1 that Λ_0 has Viterbo–Maslov index zero and satisfies $m_{x_0}(\Lambda_0) + m_{y_0}(\Lambda_0) = 2\mu(\Lambda_0) = 0$. Hence $\tilde{\Lambda}$ also has Viterbo–Maslov index zero.

It remains to prove that $m_{g\tilde{x}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) = 0$ for every $g \in \Gamma \setminus \{\text{id}, g_0\}$. To see this we use the fact that the embedded loops α and β are homotopic with fixed endpoint x . Hence, by a Theorem of Epstein, they are isotopic with fixed basepoint x (see [2, Theorem 4.1]). Thus there exists a smooth map $f : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \Sigma$ such that

$$f(s, 0) \in \alpha, \quad f(s, 1) \in \beta, \quad f(0, t) = x,$$

for all $s \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ and $t \in [0, 1]$, and the map $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \Sigma : s \mapsto f(s, t)$ is an embedding for every $s \in [0, 1]$. Lift this homotopy to the universal cover to obtain a map $\tilde{f} : \mathbb{R} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $\pi \circ \tilde{f} = f$ and

$$\tilde{f}(s, 0) \in [0, 1], \quad \tilde{f}(s, 1) \in \tilde{B}_1, \quad \tilde{f}(0, t) = \tilde{x}, \quad \tilde{f}(s+1, t) = \tilde{f}(s, t) + 1$$

for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t \in [0, 1]$. Here $\tilde{B}_1 \subset \tilde{B}$ denotes the arc in \tilde{B} from 0 to 1. Since the map $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \Sigma : s \mapsto f(s, t)$ is injective for every t , we have

$$g\tilde{x} \notin \{\tilde{x}, \tilde{x} + 1, \dots, \tilde{x} + \ell\} \quad \implies \quad g\tilde{x} \notin \tilde{f}([0, \ell] \times [0, 1])$$

for every $g \in \Gamma$. Now choose a smooth map $\tilde{u} : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ with $\Lambda_{\tilde{u}} = \tilde{\Lambda}$ (see Theorem 2.4). Define the homotopy $F_{\tilde{u}} : [0, \ell] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by $F_{\tilde{u}}(s, t) := \tilde{u}(-\cos(\pi s/\ell), t \sin(\pi s/\ell))$. Then, by Theorem 2.4, $F_{\tilde{u}}$ is homotopic to $\tilde{f}|_{[0, \ell] \times [0, 1]}$ subject to the boundary conditions $\tilde{f}(s, 0) \in \tilde{\alpha} = \mathbb{R}$, $\tilde{f}(s, 1) \in \tilde{\beta}$, $\tilde{f}(0, t) = \tilde{x}$, $\tilde{f}(\ell, t) = \tilde{y}$. Hence, for every $\tilde{z} \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (\tilde{\alpha} \cup \tilde{\beta})$, we have

$$\tilde{w}(\tilde{z}) = \deg(\tilde{u}, z) = \deg(F_{\tilde{u}}, \tilde{z}) = \deg(\tilde{f}, \tilde{z}).$$

In particular, choosing \tilde{z} near $g\tilde{x}$, we find $m_{g\tilde{x}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) = 4 \deg(\tilde{f}, g\tilde{x}) = 0$ for every $g \in \Gamma$ that is not one of the translations $\tilde{z} \mapsto \tilde{z} + k$ for $k = 0, 1, \dots, \ell$. This proves the assertion in the case $\ell = 1$.

If $\ell > 1$ it remains to prove $m_k(\tilde{\Lambda}) = 0$ for $k = 1, \dots, \ell - 1$. To see this, let $\tilde{A}_1 := [0, 1]$, $\tilde{B}_1 \subset \tilde{B}$ be the arc from 0 to 1, $\tilde{w}_1(\tilde{z})$ be the winding number of $\tilde{A}_1 - \tilde{B}_1$ about $\tilde{z} \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (\tilde{A}_1 \cup \tilde{B}_1)$, and define $\tilde{\Lambda}_1 := (0, 1, \tilde{w}_1)$. Then, by what we have already proved, the $(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta})$ -trace $\tilde{\Lambda}_1$ satisfies $m_{g\tilde{x}}(\tilde{\Lambda}_1) = 0$ for every $g \in \Gamma$ other than the translations by 0 or 1. In particular, we have $m_j(\tilde{\Lambda}_1) = 0$ for every $j \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0, 1\}$ and also $m_0(\tilde{\Lambda}_1) + m_1(\tilde{\Lambda}_1) = 2\mu(\tilde{\Lambda}_1) = 0$. Since $\tilde{w}(\tilde{z}) = \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} \tilde{w}_1(\tilde{z} - j)$ for $\tilde{z} \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (\tilde{A} \cup \tilde{B})$, we obtain

$$m_k(\tilde{\Lambda}) = \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} m_{k-j}(\tilde{\Lambda}_1) = 0$$

for every $k \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0, \ell\}$. This proves Lemma 5.5. \square

The next example shows that Lemma 5.4 cannot be strengthened to assert the identity $m_{g\tilde{x}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) = 0$ for every $g \in \Gamma$ with $g\tilde{x}, g\tilde{y} \notin \tilde{A} \cup \tilde{B}$.

Example 5.6. Figure 6 depicts an (α, β) -trace $\Lambda = (x, y, w)$ on the annulus $\Sigma = \mathbb{C}/\mathbb{Z}$ that has Viterbo–Maslov index one and satisfies the arc condition. The lift satisfies $m_{\tilde{x}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) = -3$, $m_{\tilde{x}+1}(\tilde{\Lambda}) = 4$, $m_{\tilde{y}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) = 5$, and $m_{\tilde{y}-1}(\tilde{\Lambda}) = -4$. Thus $m_x(\Lambda) = m_y(\Lambda) = 1$.




Figure 6: An (α, β) -trace on the annulus satisfying the arc condition.

Since $g\tilde{x} \notin \tilde{B}$ and $g\tilde{y} \notin \tilde{B}$ it follows from Lemma 5.3 that $g^{-1}\tilde{y} \notin \tilde{B}$ and $g^{-1}\tilde{x} \notin \tilde{B}$ and hence, again by Lemma 5.3, we have

$$\tilde{B} \cap g\tilde{B} = \tilde{B} \cap g^{-1}\tilde{B} = \emptyset.$$

With $\gamma_{\tilde{\alpha}}$ and $\gamma_{\tilde{\beta}}$ chosen as in Lemma 5.3, this implies

$$\gamma_{\tilde{\beta}} \cdot (\gamma_{\tilde{\beta}} - k) = (\gamma_{\tilde{\beta}} + k) \cdot \gamma_{\tilde{\beta}} = 0. \quad (27)$$

Since $k, -k, \tilde{y} + k, \tilde{y} - k \notin \tilde{B}$, there exists a constant $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$-\varepsilon \leq t \leq \varepsilon \quad \implies \quad k + it, -k + it, \tilde{y} - k + it, \tilde{y} + k + it \notin \tilde{B}.$$

The paths $g\gamma_{\tilde{\alpha}} \pm 1\varepsilon$ and $g\gamma_{\tilde{\beta}} \pm 1\varepsilon$ both connect the point $g\tilde{x} \pm 1\varepsilon$ to $g\tilde{y} \pm 1\varepsilon$. Likewise, the paths $g^{-1}\gamma_{\tilde{\alpha}} \pm 1\varepsilon$ and $g^{-1}\gamma_{\tilde{\beta}} \pm 1\varepsilon$ both connect the point $g^{-1}\tilde{x} \pm 1\varepsilon$ to $g^{-1}\tilde{y} \pm 1\varepsilon$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{w}(g\tilde{y} \pm 1\varepsilon) - \tilde{w}(g\tilde{x} \pm 1\varepsilon) &= (\gamma_{\tilde{\alpha}} - \gamma_{\tilde{\beta}}) \cdot (g\gamma_{\tilde{\alpha}} \pm 1\varepsilon) \\ &= (\gamma_{\tilde{\alpha}} - \gamma_{\tilde{\beta}}) \cdot (\gamma_{\tilde{\alpha}} + k \pm 1\varepsilon) \\ &= (\gamma_{\tilde{\alpha}} + k \pm 1\varepsilon) \cdot \gamma_{\tilde{\beta}} \\ &= \gamma_{\tilde{\alpha}} \cdot (\gamma_{\tilde{\beta}} - k \mp 1\varepsilon) \\ &= (\gamma_{\tilde{\alpha}} - \gamma_{\tilde{\beta}}) \cdot (\gamma_{\tilde{\beta}} - k \mp 1\varepsilon) \\ &= (\gamma_{\tilde{\alpha}} - \gamma_{\tilde{\beta}}) \cdot (g^{-1}\gamma_{\tilde{\beta}} \mp 1\varepsilon) \\ &= \tilde{w}(g^{-1}\tilde{y} \mp 1\varepsilon) - \tilde{w}(g^{-1}\tilde{x} \mp 1\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Here the last but one equation follows from (27). Thus we have proved

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{w}(g\tilde{x} + 1\varepsilon) + \tilde{w}(g^{-1}\tilde{y} - 1\varepsilon) &= \tilde{w}(g^{-1}\tilde{x} - 1\varepsilon) + \tilde{w}(g\tilde{y} + 1\varepsilon), \\ \tilde{w}(g\tilde{x} - 1\varepsilon) + \tilde{w}(g^{-1}\tilde{y} + 1\varepsilon) &= \tilde{w}(g^{-1}\tilde{x} + 1\varepsilon) + \tilde{w}(g\tilde{y} - 1\varepsilon). \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} m_{g\tilde{x}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) &= 2\tilde{w}(g\tilde{x} + 1\varepsilon) + 2\tilde{w}(g\tilde{x} - 1\varepsilon), \\ m_{g\tilde{y}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) &= 2\tilde{w}(g\tilde{y} + 1\varepsilon) + 2\tilde{w}(g\tilde{y} - 1\varepsilon), \\ m_{g^{-1}\tilde{x}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) &= 2\tilde{w}(g^{-1}\tilde{x} + 1\varepsilon) + 2\tilde{w}(g^{-1}\tilde{x} - 1\varepsilon), \\ m_{g^{-1}\tilde{y}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) &= 2\tilde{w}(g^{-1}\tilde{y} + 1\varepsilon) + 2\tilde{w}(g^{-1}\tilde{y} - 1\varepsilon), \end{aligned}$$

Step 1 follows by taking the sum of the two equations in (28).

Step 2. Let $\tilde{A}, \tilde{B} \subset \mathbb{C}$ be as in Lemma 5.3 and let $g \in \Gamma$. Suppose that either $g\tilde{x}, g\tilde{y} \notin \tilde{A}$ or $g\tilde{x}, g\tilde{y} \notin \tilde{B}$. Then (22) holds.

If $g\tilde{x}, g\tilde{y} \notin \tilde{A} \cup \tilde{B}$ the assertion follows from Lemma 5.4. If $g\tilde{x} \in \tilde{A} \setminus \tilde{B}$ and $g\tilde{y} \notin \tilde{A} \cup \tilde{B}$ the assertion follows from Step 1. If $g\tilde{x} \notin \tilde{A} \cup \tilde{B}$ and $g\tilde{y} \in \tilde{A} \setminus \tilde{B}$ the assertion follows from Step 1 by interchanging \tilde{x} and \tilde{y} . Namely, (22) holds for $\tilde{\Lambda}$ if and only if it holds for the $(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta})$ -trace $-\tilde{\Lambda} := (\tilde{y}, \tilde{x}, -\tilde{w})$. This covers the case $g\tilde{x}, g\tilde{y} \notin \tilde{B}$. If $g\tilde{x}, g\tilde{y} \notin \tilde{A}$ the assertion follows by interchanging \tilde{A} and \tilde{B} . Namely, (22) holds for $\tilde{\Lambda}$ if and only if it holds for the $(\tilde{\beta}, \tilde{\alpha})$ -trace $\tilde{\Lambda}^* := (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, -\tilde{w})$. This proves Step 2.

Step 3. Let $\tilde{A}, \tilde{B} \subset \mathbb{C}$ be as in Lemma 5.3 and let $g \in \Gamma$ such that

$$g\tilde{x} \in \tilde{A} \setminus \tilde{B}, \quad g\tilde{y} \in \tilde{B} \setminus \tilde{A}.$$

(An example is depicted in Figure 8.) Then (21) holds for g and g^{-1} .




Figure 8: An (α, β) -trace on the annulus with $g\tilde{x} \in \tilde{A}$ and $g\tilde{y} \in \tilde{B}$.

Since $g\tilde{x} \notin \tilde{B}$ (and $g\tilde{y} \notin \tilde{A}$) we have $g \neq \text{id}$ and, since $\tilde{x}, g\tilde{x} \in \tilde{A} \subset \tilde{\alpha}$ and $\tilde{y}, g\tilde{y} \in \tilde{B} \subset \tilde{\beta}$, it follows that $g\tilde{\alpha} = \tilde{\alpha}$ and $g\tilde{\beta} = \tilde{\beta}$. Hence α and β are noncontractible embedded circles and some iterate of α is homotopic to some iterate of β . So α is homotopic to β (with some orientation), by Lemma A.4. Hence we may choose the universal covering $\pi : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \Sigma$ and the lifts $\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}, \tilde{\Lambda}$

such that $\pi(\mathbb{R}) = \alpha$, the map $\tilde{z} \mapsto \tilde{z} + 1$ is a deck transformation, π maps the interval $[0, 1)$ bijectively onto α , and $\tilde{\alpha} = \mathbb{R}$, $\tilde{x} = 0 \in \tilde{\alpha} \cap \tilde{\beta}$, $\tilde{y} > 0$. Thus $\tilde{A} = [0, \tilde{y}]$ is the arc in $\tilde{\alpha}$ from 0 to \tilde{y} and \tilde{B} is the arc in $\tilde{\beta}$ from 0 to \tilde{y} . Moreover, $\tilde{\beta} = \tilde{\beta} + 1$ and the arc in $\tilde{\beta}$ from 0 to 1 is a fundamental domain for β . By assumption and Lemma 5.3 there is an integer k such that $k \in \tilde{A}$ and $-k \in \tilde{B}$. Hence \tilde{A} does not contain any negative integers and \tilde{B} does not contain any positive integers. Choose $k_{\tilde{A}}, k_{\tilde{B}} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\tilde{A} \cap \mathbb{Z} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, k_{\tilde{A}}\}, \quad \tilde{B} \cap \mathbb{Z} = \{0, -1, -2, \dots, -k_{\tilde{B}}\}.$$

For $0 \leq k \leq k_{\tilde{A}}$ let $\tilde{A}_k \subset \tilde{\alpha}$ and $\tilde{B}_k \subset \tilde{\beta}$ be the arcs from 0 to $\tilde{y} - k$ and consider the $(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta})$ -trace

$$\tilde{\Lambda}_k := (0, \tilde{y} - k, \tilde{w}_k), \quad \partial \tilde{\Lambda}_k := (0, \tilde{y} - k, \tilde{A}_k, \tilde{B}_k),$$

where $\tilde{w}_k(\tilde{z})$ is the winding number of $\tilde{A}_k - \tilde{B}_k$ about $\tilde{z} \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (\tilde{A}_k \cup \tilde{B}_k)$. Note that $\tilde{\Lambda}_0 = \tilde{\Lambda}$ and

$$\tilde{B}_k \cap \mathbb{Z} = \{0, -1, -2, \dots, -k_{\tilde{B}} - k\}.$$

We prove that, for each k , the $(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta})$ -trace $\tilde{\Lambda}_k$ satisfies

$$m_j(\tilde{\Lambda}_k) + m_{\tilde{y}-k-j}(\tilde{\Lambda}_k) = 0 \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}. \quad (29)$$

If \tilde{y} is an integer, then (29) follows from Lemma 5.5. Hence we may assume that \tilde{y} is not an integer.

We prove equation (29) by reverse induction on k . First let $k = k_{\tilde{A}}$. Then we have $j, \tilde{y} + j \notin \tilde{A}_k$ for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence it follows from Step 2 that

$$m_j(\tilde{\Lambda}_k) + m_{\tilde{y}-k-j}(\tilde{\Lambda}_k) = m_{-j}(\tilde{\Lambda}_k) + m_{\tilde{y}-k+j}(\tilde{\Lambda}) \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (30)$$

Thus we can apply Lemma 5.2 to the projection of $\tilde{\Lambda}_k$ to the quotient \mathbb{C}/\mathbb{Z} . Hence $\tilde{\Lambda}_k$ satisfies (29).

Now fix an integer $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, k_{\tilde{A}} - 1\}$ and suppose, by induction, that $\tilde{\Lambda}_{k+1}$ satisfies (29). Denote by $\tilde{A}' \subset \tilde{\alpha}$ and $\tilde{B}' \subset \tilde{\beta}$ the arcs from $\tilde{y} - k - 1$ to 1, and by $\tilde{A}'' \subset \tilde{\alpha}$ and $\tilde{B}'' \subset \tilde{\beta}$ the arcs from 1 to $\tilde{y} - k$. Then $\tilde{\Lambda}_k$ is the catenation of the $(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta})$ -traces

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Lambda}_{k+1} &:= (0, \tilde{y} - k - 1, \tilde{w}_{k+1}), & \partial \tilde{\Lambda}_{k+1} &= (0, \tilde{y} - k - 1, \tilde{A}_{k+1}, \tilde{B}_{k+1}), \\ \tilde{\Lambda}' &:= (\tilde{y} - k - 1, 1, \tilde{w}'), & \partial \tilde{\Lambda}' &= (\tilde{y} - k - 1, 1, \tilde{A}', \tilde{B}'), \\ \tilde{\Lambda}'' &:= (1, \tilde{y} - k, \tilde{w}''), & \partial \tilde{\Lambda}'' &= (1, \tilde{y} - k, \tilde{A}'', \tilde{B}''). \end{aligned}$$

Here $\tilde{w}'(\tilde{z})$ is the winding number of the loop $\tilde{A}' - \tilde{B}'$ about $\tilde{z} \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (\tilde{A}' \cup \tilde{B}')$ and similarly for \tilde{w}'' . Note that $\tilde{\Lambda}''$ is the shift of $\tilde{\Lambda}_{k+1}$ by 1. The catenation of $\tilde{\Lambda}_{k+1}$ and $\tilde{\Lambda}'$ is the $(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta})$ -trace from 0 to 1. Hence it has Viterbo–Maslov index zero, by Lemma 5.5. and satisfies

$$m_j(\tilde{\Lambda}_{k+1}) + m_j(\tilde{\Lambda}') = 0 \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0, 1\}. \quad (31)$$

Since the catenation of $\tilde{\Lambda}'$ and $\tilde{\Lambda}''$ is the $(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta})$ -trace from $\tilde{y} - k - 1$ to $\tilde{y} - k$, it also has Viterbo–Maslov index zero and satisfies

$$m_{\tilde{y}-k-j}(\tilde{\Lambda}') + m_{\tilde{y}-k-j}(\tilde{\Lambda}'') = 0 \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0, 1\}. \quad (32)$$

Moreover, by the induction hypothesis, we have

$$m_j(\tilde{\Lambda}_{k+1}) + m_{\tilde{y}-k-1-j}(\tilde{\Lambda}_{k+1}) = 0 \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}. \quad (33)$$

Combining the equations (31), (32), and (33) we find

$$\begin{aligned} m_j(\tilde{\Lambda}_k) + m_{\tilde{y}-k-j}(\tilde{\Lambda}_k) &= m_j(\tilde{\Lambda}_{k+1}) + m_j(\tilde{\Lambda}') + m_j(\tilde{\Lambda}'') \\ &\quad + m_{\tilde{y}-k-j}(\tilde{\Lambda}_{k+1}) + m_{\tilde{y}-k-j}(\tilde{\Lambda}') + m_{\tilde{y}-k-j}(\tilde{\Lambda}'') \\ &= m_j(\tilde{\Lambda}_{k+1}) + m_j(\tilde{\Lambda}') \\ &\quad + m_{\tilde{y}-k-j}(\tilde{\Lambda}') + m_{\tilde{y}-k-j}(\tilde{\Lambda}'') \\ &\quad + m_{j-1}(\tilde{\Lambda}_{k+1}) + m_{\tilde{y}-k-j}(\tilde{\Lambda}_{k+1}) \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

for $j \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0, 1\}$. For $j = 1$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} m_1(\tilde{\Lambda}_k) + m_{\tilde{y}-k-1}(\tilde{\Lambda}_k) &= m_1(\tilde{\Lambda}_{k+1}) + m_1(\tilde{\Lambda}') + m_1(\tilde{\Lambda}'') \\ &\quad + m_{\tilde{y}-k-1}(\tilde{\Lambda}_{k+1}) + m_{\tilde{y}-k-1}(\tilde{\Lambda}') + m_{\tilde{y}-k-1}(\tilde{\Lambda}'') \\ &= m_1(\tilde{\Lambda}_{k+1}) + m_{\tilde{y}-k-2}(\tilde{\Lambda}_{k+1}) \\ &\quad + m_0(\tilde{\Lambda}_{k+1}) + m_{\tilde{y}-k-1}(\tilde{\Lambda}_{k+1}) \\ &\quad + m_{\tilde{y}-k-1}(\tilde{\Lambda}') + m_1(\tilde{\Lambda}') \\ &= 2\mu(\tilde{\Lambda}_{k+1}) + 2\mu(\tilde{\Lambda}') \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Here the last but one equation follows from equation (33) and Proposition 4.1, and the last equation follows from Lemma 5.5. Hence $\tilde{\Lambda}_k$ satisfies (29). This completes the induction argument for the proof of Step 3.

Step 4. Let $\tilde{A}, \tilde{B} \subset \mathbb{C}$ be as in Lemma 5.3 and let $g \in \Gamma$ such that

$$g\tilde{x} \in \tilde{A} \cap \tilde{B}, \quad g\tilde{y} \notin \tilde{A} \cup \tilde{B}.$$

Then (21) holds for g and g^{-1} .

Since $g\tilde{y} \notin \tilde{A} \cup \tilde{B}$ we have $g \neq \text{id}$. Since $g\tilde{x} \in \tilde{A} \cap \tilde{B}$ we have $\tilde{\alpha} = g\tilde{\alpha}$ and $\tilde{\beta} = g\tilde{\beta}$. Hence $\tilde{\alpha}$ and $\tilde{\beta}$ are noncontractible embedded circles, and they are homotopic (with some orientation) by Lemma A.4. Thus we may choose $\pi : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \Sigma$, $\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}, \tilde{\Lambda}$ as in Step 3. By assumption there is an integer $k \in \tilde{A} \cap \tilde{B}$. Hence \tilde{A} and \tilde{B} do not contain any negative integers. Choose $k_{\tilde{A}}, k_{\tilde{B}} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\tilde{A} \cap \mathbb{Z} = \{0, 1, \dots, k_{\tilde{A}}\}, \quad \tilde{B} \cap \mathbb{Z} = \{0, 1, \dots, k_{\tilde{B}}\}.$$

Assume without loss of generality that $k_{\tilde{A}} \leq k_{\tilde{B}}$. For $0 \leq k \leq k_{\tilde{A}}$ denote by $\tilde{A}_k \subset \tilde{A}$ and $\tilde{B}_k \subset \tilde{B}$ the arcs from 0 to $\tilde{y} - k$ and consider the $(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta})$ -trace

$$\tilde{\Lambda}_k := (0, \tilde{y} - k, \tilde{w}_k), \quad \partial\tilde{\Lambda}_k := (0, \tilde{y} - k, \tilde{A}_k, \tilde{B}_k).$$

In this case

$$\tilde{B}_k \cap \mathbb{Z} = \{0, 1, \dots, k_{\tilde{B}} - k\}.$$

As in Step 3, it follows by reverse induction on k that $\tilde{\Lambda}_k$ satisfies (29) for every k . We assume again that \tilde{y} is not an integer. (Otherwise (29) follows from Lemma 5.5). If $k = k_{\tilde{A}}$ then $j, \tilde{y} - j \notin \tilde{A}_k$ for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$, hence it follows from Step 2 that $\tilde{\Lambda}_k$ satisfies (30), and hence it follows from Lemma 5.2 for the projection of $\tilde{\Lambda}_k$ to the annulus \mathbb{C}/\mathbb{Z} that $\tilde{\Lambda}_k$ also satisfies (29). The induction step is verbatim the same as in Step 3 and will be omitted. This proves Step 4.

Step 5. We prove the proposition.

If both points $g\tilde{x}, g\tilde{y}$ are contained in \tilde{A} (or in \tilde{B}) then $g = \text{id}$ by Lemma 5.3, and in this case equation (22) is a tautology. If both points $g\tilde{x}, g\tilde{y}$ are not contained in $\tilde{A} \cup \tilde{B}$, equation (22) has been established in Lemma 5.4. Moreover, we can interchange \tilde{x} and \tilde{y} or \tilde{A} and \tilde{B} as in the proof of Step 2. Thus Steps 1 and 4 cover the case where precisely one of the points $g\tilde{x}, g\tilde{y}$ is contained in $\tilde{A} \cup \tilde{B}$ while Step 3 covers the case where $g \neq \text{id}$ and both points $g\tilde{x}, g\tilde{y}$ are contained in $\tilde{A} \cup \tilde{B}$. This shows that equation (22) holds for every $g \in \Gamma \setminus \{\text{id}\}$. Hence, by Lemma 5.2, equation (21) holds for every $g \in \Gamma \setminus \{\text{id}\}$. This proves Proposition 5.1. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.4 in the Non Simply Connected Case. Choose a universal covering $\pi : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \Sigma$ and let Γ , $\tilde{\alpha}$, $\tilde{\beta}$, and $\tilde{\Lambda} = (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{w})$ be as in Proposition 5.1. Then

$$m_x(\Lambda) + m_y(\Lambda) - m_{\tilde{x}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) - m_{\tilde{y}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) = \sum_{g \neq \text{id}} \left(m_{g\tilde{x}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) + m_{g^{-1}\tilde{y}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) \right) = 0.$$

Here the last equation follows from Proposition 5.1. Hence, by Proposition 4.1, we have

$$\mu(\Lambda) = \mu(\tilde{\Lambda}) = \frac{m_{\tilde{x}}(\tilde{\Lambda}) + m_{\tilde{y}}(\tilde{\Lambda})}{2} = \frac{m_x(\Lambda) + m_y(\Lambda)}{2}.$$

This proves (8) in the case where Σ is not simply connected. □

A The Space of Paths

We assume throughout that Σ is a connected oriented smooth 2-manifold without boundary and $\alpha, \beta \subset \Sigma$ are two embedded loops. Let

$$\Omega_{\alpha, \beta} := \{x \in C^\infty([0, 1], \Sigma) \mid x(0) \in \alpha, x(1) \in \beta\}$$

denote the space of paths connecting α to β .

Proposition A.1. *Assume that α and β are not contractible and that α is not isotopic to β . Then each component of $\Omega_{\alpha, \beta}$ is simply connected and hence $H^1(\Omega_{\alpha, \beta}; \mathbb{R}) = 0$.*

The proof was explained to us by David Epstein [3]. It is based on the following three lemmas. We identify $S^1 \cong \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$.

Lemma A.2. *Let $\gamma : S^1 \rightarrow \Sigma$ be a noncontractible loop and denote by*

$$\pi : \tilde{\Sigma} \rightarrow \Sigma$$

the covering generated by γ . Then $\tilde{\Sigma}$ is diffeomorphic to the cylinder.

Proof. By assumption, Σ is oriented and has a nontrivial fundamental group. By the uniformization theorem, choose a metric of constant curvature. Then the universal cover of Σ is isometric to either \mathbb{R}^2 with the flat metric or to the upper half space \mathbb{H}^2 with the hyperbolic metric. The 2-manifold $\tilde{\Sigma}$ is a

quotient of the universal cover of Σ by the subgroup of the group of covering transformations generated by a single element (a translation in the case of \mathbb{R}^2 and a hyperbolic element of $\mathrm{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ in the case of \mathbb{H}^2). Since γ is not contractible, this element is not the identity. Hence $\tilde{\Sigma}$ is diffeomorphic to the cylinder. \square

Lemma A.3. *Let $\gamma : S^1 \rightarrow \Sigma$ be a noncontractible loop and, for $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, define $\gamma^k : S^1 \rightarrow \Sigma$ by*

$$\gamma^k(s) := \gamma(ks).$$

Then γ^k is contractible if and only if $k = 0$.

Proof. Let $\pi : \tilde{\Sigma} \rightarrow \Sigma$ be as in Lemma A.2. Then, for $k \neq 0$, the loop $\gamma^k : S^1 \rightarrow \Sigma$ lifts to a noncontractible loop in $\tilde{\Sigma}$. \square

Lemma A.4. *Let $\gamma_0, \gamma_1 : S^1 \rightarrow \Sigma$ be noncontractible embedded loops and suppose that k_0, k_1 are nonzero integers such that $\gamma_0^{k_0}$ is homotopic to $\gamma_1^{k_1}$. Then either γ_1 is homotopic to γ_0 and $k_1 = k_0$ or γ_1 is homotopic to γ_0^{-1} and $k_1 = -k_0$.*

Proof. Let $\pi : \tilde{\Sigma} \rightarrow \Sigma$ be the covering generated by γ_0 . Then $\gamma_0^{k_0}$ lifts to a closed curve in $\tilde{\Sigma}$ and is homotopic to $\gamma_1^{k_1}$. Hence $\gamma_1^{k_1}$ lifts to a closed immersed curve in $\tilde{\Sigma}$. Hence there exists a nonzero integer j_1 such that $\gamma_1^{j_1}$ lifts to an embedding $S^1 \rightarrow \tilde{\Sigma}$. Any embedded curve in the cylinder is either contractible or is homotopic to a generator. If the lift of $\gamma_1^{j_1}$ were contractible it would follow that $\gamma_0^{k_0}$ is contractible, hence, by Lemma A.3, $k_0 = 0$ in contradiction to our assumption. Hence the lift of $\gamma_1^{j_1}$ to $\tilde{\Sigma}$ is not contractible. With an appropriate sign of j_1 it follows that the lift of $\gamma_1^{j_1}$ is homotopic to the lift of γ_0 . Interchanging the roles of γ_0 and γ_1 , we find that there exist nonzero integers j_0, j_1 such that

$$\gamma_0 \sim \gamma_1^{j_1}, \quad \gamma_1 \sim \gamma_0^{j_0}$$

in $\tilde{\Sigma}$. Hence γ_0 is homotopic to $\gamma_0^{j_0 j_1}$ in the free loop space of $\tilde{\Sigma}$. Since the homotopy lifts to the cylinder $\tilde{\Sigma}$ and the fundamental group of $\tilde{\Sigma}$ is abelian, it follows that

$$j_0 j_1 = 1.$$

If $j_0 = j_1 = 1$ then γ_1 is homotopic to γ_0 , hence $\gamma_0^{k_1}$ is homotopic to $\gamma_0^{k_0}$, hence $\gamma_0^{k_0 - k_1}$ is contractible, and hence $k_0 - k_1 = 0$, by Lemma A.3. If $j_0 = j_1 = -1$ then γ_1 is homotopic to γ_0^{-1} , hence $\gamma_0^{-k_1}$ is homotopic to $\gamma_0^{k_0}$, hence $\gamma_0^{k_0 + k_1}$ is contractible, and hence $k_0 + k_1 = 0$, by Lemma A.3. This proves Lemma A.4. \square

Proof of Proposition A.1. Orient α and β and choose orientation preserving diffeomorphisms

$$\gamma_0 : S^1 \rightarrow \alpha, \quad \gamma_1 : S^1 \rightarrow \beta.$$

A closed loop in $\Omega_{\alpha,\beta}$ gives rise to a map $u : S^1 \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \Sigma$ such that

$$u(S^1 \times \{0\}) \subset \alpha, \quad u(S^1 \times \{1\}) \subset \beta.$$

Let k_0 denote the degree of $u(\cdot, 0) : S^1 \rightarrow \alpha$ and k_1 denote the degree of $u(\cdot, 1) : S^1 \rightarrow \beta$. Since the homotopy class of a map $S^1 \rightarrow \alpha$ or a map $S^1 \rightarrow \beta$ is determined by the degree we may assume, without loss of generality, that

$$u(s, 0) = \gamma_0(k_0 s), \quad u(s, 1) = \gamma_1(k_1 s).$$

If one of the integers k_0, k_1 vanishes, so does the other, by Lemma A.3. If they are both nonzero then γ_1 is homotopic to either γ_0 or γ_0^{-1} , by Lemma A.4. Hence γ_1 is isotopic to either γ_0 or γ_0^{-1} , by [2, Theorem 4.1]. Hence α is isotopic to β , in contradiction to our assumption. This shows that

$$k_0 = k_1 = 0.$$

With this established it follows that the map $u : S^1 \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \Sigma$ factors through a map $v : S^2 \rightarrow \Sigma$ that maps the south pole to α and the north pole to β . Since $\pi_2(\Sigma) = 0$ it follows that v is homotopic, via maps with fixed north and south pole, to one of its meridians. This proves Proposition A.1. \square

References

- [1] Vin De Silva, *Products in the symplectic Floer homology of Lagrangian intersections*, PhD thesis, Oxford, 1999.
- [2] David Epstein, Curves on 2-manifolds and isotopies, *Acta Math.* **115** (1966), 83–107.
- [3] David Epstein, private communication, 6 April 2000.
- [4] Andreas Floer, The unregularized gradient flow of the symplectic action, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **41** (1988), 775–813.

- [5] Andreas Floer, Morse theory for Lagrangian intersections, *J. Diff. Geom.* **28** (1988), 513–547.
- [6] John Milnor, *Topology from the Differentiable Viewpoint*. The University Press of Virginia, 1969.
- [7] Joel Robbin, Dietmar Salamon, Vin de Silva, Combinatorial Floer homology, in preparation.
- [8] Joel Robbin, Dietmar Salamon, The Maslov index for paths, *Topology* **32** (1993), 827–844.
- [9] Claude Viterbo, Intersections de sous-variétés Lagrangiennes, fonctionnelles d’action et indice des systèmes Hamiltoniens, *Bull. Soc. Math. France* **115** (1987), 361–390.