

Biology of deformed Hamiltonian vector fields on Lagrangian fibrations

David S. Tourigny

*Department of Applied Mathematics & Theoretical Physics
University of Cambridge
Wilberforce Road
Cambridge CB3 0WA, United Kingdom*

Abstract

Two-component feedback loops are dynamical systems arising in mathematical biology that describe the time evolution of interacting molecules diffusing on a graph. These dynamical systems closely resemble a Hamiltonian system in \mathbb{R}^{2n} , but with the canonical equation for one of the variables in each conjugate pair rescaled by a ratio of the diffusion coefficients. The ratio therefore measures the obstruction preventing a two-component feedback loop from being Hamiltonian (where the ratio equals one). To generalise two-component feedback loops to symplectic manifolds in this paper we introduce and study the properties of deformed Hamiltonian vector fields on Lagrangian fibrations. We describe why these objects have some interesting applications to symplectic geometry and discuss how their biological interpretation motivates new problems in Floer theory, mirror symmetry, and the study of \mathbb{D} -Kähler manifolds.

Keywords: Two-component feedback loops, Lagrangian torus fibrations, Adiabatic limits

1. Introduction

Symplectic geometry arises as the natural generalisation of Hamiltonian mechanics to differentiable manifolds. The phase space of a Hamiltonian system is generalised to a symplectic manifold and the phase portrait is interpreted as the integral curve of a Hamiltonian vector field. Symplectic geometry therefore has its origins in classical physics, but more recent times have seen string theory play a role in the discovery of Gromov-Witten invariants and the birth of Floer theory. Together with mirror symmetry, these developments are some of the great success stories of symplectic geometry that can be partially attributed to mathematical physics. Very recently, dynamical systems arising in mathematical biology were also described from a sym-

Email address: `dst27@cam.ac.uk` (David S. Tourigny)

plectic viewpoint although not in the setting of differentiable manifolds [1]. The current paper grew out of an attempt to put these dynamical systems into the context of symplectic geometry and explain the biological interpretation associated with their generalisations.

Hamiltonian vector fields, which generalise dynamical systems appearing in classical mechanics, play a central role in several different versions of Floer theory for symplectic manifolds and Lagrangian submanifolds. In particular, the original motivation for Floer's work was to find a proof for Arnold's conjecture that the number of periodic solutions of a Hamiltonian system on a symplectic manifold is bounded below by the sum of its Betti numbers. Lagrangian Floer theory extends Hamiltonian Floer theory to pairs of Lagrangian submanifolds where Hamiltonian vector fields are used to ensure transverse intersection. This idea is further generalised by the Fukaya category, which associates to each symplectic manifold an A_∞ -category whose objects are its Lagrangian submanifolds. In this case Hamiltonian vector fields are required to make morphisms and higher compositions of the Fukaya category well-defined. Hamiltonian vector fields also generate a group of exact symplectomorphisms that is determined by the topology of a symplectic manifold. From a different viewpoint these mathematical abstractions provide a geometric interpretation for many physical arguments, such as preservation of the phase space distribution function in Liouville's theorem or conservation of energy along the integral curves of a Hamiltonian vector field. It is quite remarkable that Hamiltonian vector fields have such a clear physical interpretation whilst at the same time motivating (and being used as tools to solve) so many mathematical problems arising in symplectic geometry. Then again, perhaps this is not so surprising given that symplectic geometry was developed to accommodate Hamiltonian systems into a geometric setting. Can the same be achieved for the biological processes considered in [1]? This is the question that we attempt to answer here. The particular dynamical systems we shall study are closely related to Hamiltonian vector fields and a portion of this paper will be dedicated to explaining how they are related to the geometry of Lagrangian fibrations. This should not distract from the main objective however, which is to introduce these objects to the modern-day framework of symplectic geometry. Although simple in comparison to many dynamical processes appearing in biology, at the same time our model systems are realistic enough to provide a good description of real-life biological phenomena. Thus, we shall see several examples of how biological questions can motivate new problems in mathematics.

In \mathbb{R}^{2n} our dynamical systems closely resemble Hamilton's, but with the equation for one of

the variables in each conjugate pair of coordinates rescaled by a nonzero factor of $q \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\dot{x}_i = q^{-1} \frac{\partial H}{\partial y_i}, \quad \dot{y}_i = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial x_i}. \quad (1)$$

Here $H : \mathbb{R}^{2n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth function that might also depend on q . The biological interpretation of these systems as *two-component feedback loops* is described in section 2 where we also provide some mathematical background required to aid the inexperienced reader of this paper. It is clear that (1) becomes an ordinary Hamiltonian system in the limit $q \rightarrow 1$ and so to generalise these dynamical systems to symplectic manifolds we introduce the notion of a *deformed Hamiltonian vector field* in section 3. After proving some basic properties of deformed Hamiltonian vector fields we use them to define generalised two-component feedback loops on Lagrangian fibrations in section 4. We also relate two-component feedback loops to the geometry of Lagrangian torus fibrations since in this case it turns out that many constructions have a very nice biological interpretation. In turn, biological questions motivate new problems in mirror symmetry and the study of \mathbb{D} -Kähler manifolds. In section 5 we adapt a Morse-type argument to provide a lower bound on the number of equilibrium solutions of a generalised two-component feedback loop on a cotangent bundle.

2. Preliminaries

The purpose of this section is two-fold. Firstly, to provide some biological motivation for deformed Hamiltonian vector fields and their interpretation as two-component feedback loops. Secondly, to introduce the geometric objects that we will be studying throughout this paper, before fixing notation and conventions for the proceeding sections. The exposition in section 2.2 will be at a level suitable for those familiar with basic differential geometry and algebraic topology, and requires no previous exposure to symplectic geometry, mirror symmetry or Floer theory. Unfortunately, there is no way of including a self-contained introduction to these topics in a single paper and so in later sections we will often make the jump to assuming our reader knows a considerable amount of symplectic geometry. The hope is that by including this sort of introductory section, which may at some points seem unnecessary to the experienced reader, those unfamiliar with modern-day concepts may be able to pick up the key ideas and be motivated to learn the relevant material before coming back to other parts of the paper at a later date.

2.1. Biological motivation

We begin by outlining the biological motivation for introducing deformed Hamiltonian vector fields. Consider a pair of biological molecules X, Y whose *levels* or *concentrations* are denoted by $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, respectively (we allow negative concentrations). A typical example is that of a *protein* X and a *ribonucleic acid* Y , but the names are not important. What is important is that we assume X and Y to be part of a much larger collection of molecules that together form what is known as a *regulation network* [2]. The general principle of a regulation network is that the levels of X dynamically affect the levels of other components in the network, which ultimately feed back to affect the levels of Y . To model this process one studies the dynamical system

$$\dot{x} = \frac{\partial g(y)}{\partial y}, \quad \dot{y} = -\frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x}, \quad (2)$$

which just says that the infinitesimal change in the level of X is determined by the infinitesimal change in some function of the total concentration of Y (and vice versa, the sign is arbitrary). Functions f and g will be called *regulatory functions*. The reason that it is common to consider two molecules rather than three, four, etc., is that proteins and ribonucleic acids always come in pairs and so this choice is particularly natural from a biological point of view (coincidentally, it is also the natural choice from the perspective of symplectic or complex geometry). In this case the levels of Y affect the levels of X *directly*, i.e. there are no intermediary molecules in the direction $Y \rightarrow X$ although there almost certainly will be in the direction $X \rightarrow Y$ unless we are modelling an autoregulatory protein [2]. Therefore g is sometimes assumed to be quadratic meaning that x increases linearly with y so that these considerations imply (2) is a Hamiltonian system with Hamiltonian $H(x, y) = \frac{1}{2}y^2 + f(x)$. This is not the complete story however, since it is not only regulatory processes that affect the levels of molecules in a regulation network. Biological molecules also have the tendency to *degrade* and *diffuse* meaning additional terms must be included on the right-hand-side of the equations (2).

When one considers adding spatial dependence to a regulation network a convenient method for describing a collection of biological cells is to imagine one cell associated with each vertex of a combinatorial graph \mathcal{G} with n vertices. Edges between vertices represent the possibility of a molecule moving from one cell to another and in this way \mathcal{G} encodes topological information about the cellular arrangement. This procedure is often called *diffusive coupling* and introducing diffusive coupling to the regulation network described by (2) yields a dynamical system of the

form

$$\dot{x}_i = \frac{\partial g(y)}{\partial y_i} + q^{-1}(\Delta_{\mathcal{G}})_{ij}x_j, \quad \dot{y}_i = -\frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_i} - (\Delta_{\mathcal{G}})_{ij}y_j, \quad (3)$$

where $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and $\Delta_{\mathcal{G}}$ is the Laplacian matrix of \mathcal{G} . Molecules diffuse from an area of higher concentrations to an area of lower concentrations with a speed that depends on their size meaning X will not necessarily move between cells at the same rate as Y . This is accounted for by the parameter $q \in \mathbb{R}$ that can be interpreted as the ratio of the diffusion coefficient of X relative to that of Y . It is a simple matter to check that (3) can be written in the form (1) if one takes the Hamiltonian $H = f(x) + (\Delta_{\mathcal{G}})_{ij}x_iy_j + qg(y)$. Thus, q measures the extent to which (3) has been deformed from a conventional Hamiltonian system. Biologically there are three important limits to consider. The Hamiltonian limit $q \rightarrow 1$ is obtained when the diffusion coefficient of X becomes equal to minus that of Y . This means X and Y move in opposite directions with the same speed, which, although can sometimes occur through the action of a molecular pump, is unlikely to be realised in a simple biological system. This means that practically speaking (3) will almost never be Hamiltonian unless the graph \mathcal{G} is empty. Even so, taking this limit means that all the nice properties of Hamiltonian systems can be recovered from classical mechanics [1]. The second limit, $q \rightarrow -1$, is obtained when the diffusion coefficient of X becomes equal to that of Y . Although once again this limit almost never occurs in practice (unless both X and Y happen to have exactly the same diffusive properties) it is a more realistic limit to take if one wants to get some approximate understanding of the dynamics governed by (3). This is complementary to the third limit $q \rightarrow 0$, which describes the case when the diffusion coefficient of X becomes very large compared to that of Y . In some sense the limits $q \rightarrow 0$ and $q \rightarrow -1$ can be seen as the two natural extremes of the biological system described by (3). We shall see later on that both of these limits also have a very interesting geometric interpretation.

Systems of the form (3) are called *two-component feedback loops*. Assuming that regulatory functions have been fixed a two-component feedback loop is entirely determined by the graph \mathcal{G} and the value of q . By slight abuse of terminology we will also be interested in *uncoupled two-component feedback loops* that are not diffusively coupled, but have degradation rates that differ by a ratio of q

$$\dot{x}_i = \frac{\partial g(y)}{\partial y_i} + q^{-1}x_i, \quad \dot{y}_i = -\frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_i} - y_i. \quad (4)$$

If the regulatory functions of an uncoupled two-component feedback loop are of the form

$$f(x) = \sum_i f_i(x_i), \quad g(y) = \sum_i g_i(y_i), \quad (5)$$

for some f_i, g_i , then one really is considering n two-component feedback loops that do not interact with one-another. This is the simplest example of a two-component feedback loop and one can view all others as being built up from this template by adding diffusive coupling or more complicated cross-terms to f and g . Indeed, if one considers a time-dependent version of (3) then a natural starting point would be (4) with diffusive coupling evolving over time in a manner that describes a growing cellular network. The most general two-component feedback loops will have regulatory functions that also depend on time. For this reason we replace the Laplacian matrix Δ_G with the *modified Laplacian matrix* $\Delta_G^\epsilon \equiv \epsilon I_n + \Delta_G$ where I_n is the $n \times n$ identity matrix and $\epsilon \geq 0$ accounts for the difference between degradation and diffusion rates. This means a two-component feedback on the empty graph is of the form (4), and (3) with Δ_G^ϵ in place of Δ_G describes a two-component feedback loop with degradation *and* diffusion. The price we pay to keep the form (1) is to assume that the degradation and diffusion ratios are equal, but since degradation times can also scale with size this is not an totally unrealistic approximation to make. One advantage is that Δ_G^ϵ is invertible when $\epsilon > 0$, since the Laplacian is always singular but in this case the modified Laplacian never is (all eigenvalues of the Laplacian matrix are nonnegative).

As in the Hamiltonian case, where the Arnold conjecture asks about the existence of periodic solutions to Hamilton's equations, a natural problem is to provide a lower bound on the number of (equilibrium) periodic solutions to time (in)dependent two-component feedback loops. The number of equilibrium solutions of a two-component feedback loop is an important biological question because it determines the number of switch-like stable states that a regulatory network is able to access [3]. In turn, multistability increases the number of roles that a regulatory network is able to fulfil and determines to how many different inputs a two-component feedback loop such as the *lac operon* may respond [4]. Given the close relationship between two-component feedback loops and Hamiltonian systems one might hope that tools used to study the former may be adapted from the latter. The work in [1] went some way towards addressing this problem. In this paper we will be concerned with an alternative approach, which is to see how far one can get generalising two-component feedback loops to curved spaces in the same way that

Hamiltonian systems are generalised by Hamiltonian vector fields. Curved spaces could arise biologically in a number of ways, the most obvious example being when some external constraint is imposed on (x, y) -phase space. Introducing generalised two-component feedback loops as deformed Hamiltonian vector fields also raises specific questions in symplectic geometry and the existence of periodic solutions may be addressed using a modified version of Floer theory. In the next section we summarise some of the mathematical background that is required for the remainder of this paper.

2.2. Geometric background

By (M, ω) we will denote a differentiable manifold M of dimension $2n$ equipped with a closed and non-degenerate two-form ω called the symplectic form. Symplectic manifolds always admit an almost complex structure, i.e. an automorphism $J : TM \rightarrow TM$ of the tangent bundle satisfying $J^2 = -id$, and J is said to be *compatible* with ω if $G(\cdot, \cdot) = \omega(\cdot, J\cdot)$ is a Riemannian metric on M . We call G the *standard Riemannian metric associated with J* . If the Nijenhuis tensor associated with J vanishes then J is said to be *integrable* and (M, J) *complex*. If J is both integrable and compatible with ω then the triple (M, ω, J) is called *Kähler* and the induced metric G is called a *Kähler metric*. Equivalently, one may instead take as a starting point the pair (M, G) where M is a complex n -fold, defined as having an atlas of charts to the open disk in \mathbb{C}^n , and G the real part of a hermitian form (the complex analogue of a Riemannian metric on M). If the imaginary part of the hermitian form is a symplectic form on M then (M, G) is again said to be Kähler. Both viewpoints are equivalent in the sense that one can think of the triple (ω, J, G) on an equal footing or, as is more common when it comes to mirror symmetry, taking a Kähler metric as the starting point and varying the complex or symplectic structures independently. Hence, there are two natural types of local coordinates on a Kähler manifold: complex (holomorphic), where M is typically considered as a complex n -fold, and symplectic (Darboux) coordinates where M is considered as a real $2n$ -dimensional manifold [7]. For the first part of this paper we will concern ourselves with the symplectic viewpoint and not worry whether or not M is Kähler; later we will need to understand both viewpoints however, since mirror symmetry is conjectured to interchange the two.

Recall that a submanifold $L \subset M$ of a symplectic manifold (M, ω) is called *Lagrangian* if L is half the dimension of M and ω vanishes when restricted to L . A theorem of Weinstein

says that a sufficiently small neighbourhood of a Lagrangian submanifold $L \subset M$ can always be identified with a neighbourhood of the zero section in T^*L by a diffeomorphism that preserves the symplectic form (i.e., a symplectomorphism). By a Lagrangian fibration $\pi : (M, \omega) \rightarrow B$ we mean a smooth fibration $\pi : M \rightarrow B$ over an n -dimensional base manifold B such that at every point $x \in B$ the fibre $F_x = \pi^{-1}(x)$ is a Lagrangian submanifold of the symplectic manifold (M, ω) . The obvious noncompact examples are cotangent bundles $T^*B \rightarrow B$ where the zero section is canonically identified with B , but it is rare to find particularly exotic examples of compact Lagrangian fibrations without singular fibres. A theorem of Arnold and Louville says that locally a Lagrangian fibration with compact, connected fibre is affinely isomorphic to the product of an affine space with a torus. Indeed, each compact, connected fibre of a smooth Lagrangian fibration must necessarily be a torus and the base must have canonical *integral affine structure*. This means that B admits an atlas of coordinate charts whose transition functions are elements of the affine group $\mathbb{R}^n \rtimes GL(n, \mathbb{Z}^n)$. After choosing a compatible almost complex structure J on the total space of a Lagrangian fibration $\pi : (M, \omega) \rightarrow B$ the standard Riemannian metric G induces a decomposition of the tangent bundle TM into vertical and horizontal subspaces

$$TM = T^B M \oplus T^F M . \quad (6)$$

The subspace $T^F M$ is the tangent space to the fibres of $\pi : (M, \omega) \rightarrow B$ and $T^B M$ is its G -orthogonal complement. This in turn corresponds to a decomposition of the metric

$$G = G_B \oplus G_F , \quad (7)$$

where G_B can often be identified with the pull-back under the projection of some Riemannian metric on B (that we also call G_B when it is understood). G_F is the part that annihilates the orthogonal complement of the fibres. As above we prefer to speak of the choice of almost complex structure determining G , but it will sometimes be convenient to view the almost complex structure as being determined by a choice of metric on B . One such example is the Sasaki metric G^{Sas} [8] on the cotangent bundle T^*B of a Riemannian manifold (B, G_B) that uniquely determines an almost complex structure $J^{Sas} : G^{Sas}(\cdot, \cdot) = \omega(\cdot, J^{Sas}\cdot)$. Here $\omega = d\theta$ is the canonical symplectic form and the primitive θ is the tautological one-form on the cotangent bundle.

Alongside the decomposition of TM induced by the choice of J there is a corresponding

decomposition of the cotangent bundle

$$T^*M = (T^B M)^* \oplus (T^F M)^* , \quad (8)$$

where $(T^B M)^*$ is the annihilator of $T^F M$ and $(T^F M)^*$ is that of $T^B M$. This induces a bigrading on differential forms of degree a

$$\Omega^a(M) = \bigoplus_{b+c=a} \Omega^{b,c}(M) , \quad (9)$$

with $\Omega^{b,c}(M)$ denoting the space of sections of $\wedge^b(T^B M)^* \oplus \wedge^c(T^F M)^*$. Whenever there is such a splitting of differential forms the de Rham differential d can be written as a sum of four components

$$d = d_{1,0} + d_{0,1} + d_{2,-1} + d_{-1,2} , \quad (10)$$

where $d_{c,d} : \Omega^{a,b}(M) \rightarrow \Omega^{a+c,b+d}(M)$. We say that $\alpha \in \Omega^a(M)$ is of type (b,c) if $\alpha \in \Omega^{b,c}(M)$. The Lagrangian condition together with non-degeneracy of the symplectic form implies ω is of type $(1,1)$. Whilst commonplace in Kähler geometry, such decompositions of forms and exterior derivatives rarely have applications outside the world of complex manifolds because *a priori* they depend on the choice of almost complex structure and do not encode the same sort of topological information as the Dolbeault decomposition. However, this decomposition will provide us with an intuitive viewpoint for the construction presented in the following section. For integrability reasons the operator $d_{-1,2}$ vanishes when $\pi : M \rightarrow B$ is a smooth fibration so that after dropping the annoying indices by defining

$$\delta := d_{2,-1} , \quad \partial_+ := d_{1,0} \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_- := d_{0,1} \quad (11)$$

the exterior derivative reduces to

$$d = \partial_+ + \partial_- + \delta . \quad (12)$$

Using $d^2 = 0$ one obtains the relations

$$\partial_-^2 = \delta^2 = \partial_+ \partial_- + \partial_- \partial_+ = \partial_+ \delta + \delta \partial_+ = \partial_+^2 + \partial_- \delta + \delta \partial_- = 0 . \quad (13)$$

The identity $\partial_-^2 = 0$ is attributed to the fact we have an involutive distribution on M induced by the vertical directions of the fibration. Obstruction to the identity $\delta = 0$ comes down to the fact that the (G -orthogonal) complementary distribution might not necessarily be integrable.

If it were, M would admit a pair of transversal Lagrangian foliations that, although entirely possible, is a rather strict condition to impose. Manifolds with this property have been called *bi-Lagrangian*, *para-Kähler* or \mathbb{D} -*Kähler* in the literature [9, 10, 11]. In this paper however, we shall reserve the phrase *bi-Lagrangian* for integrability of the J -induced complementary distribution of an existing Lagrangian fibration, i.e. (M, ω, J) is bi-Lagrangian if and only if $\delta = 0$.

Given a smooth function $H : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the Hamiltonian vector field $X_H \in TM$ on (M, ω) is the unique vector field defined by

$$\omega(X_H, \cdot) = -dH . \quad (14)$$

By Liouville's theorem X_H generates an (exact) symplectomorphism of M because its flow preserves the symplectic form

$$L_{X_H}(\omega) = d(\omega(X_H, \cdot)) = -d^2H = 0 , \quad (15)$$

where L_ξ denotes the Lie derivative along the flow of the vector field ξ . X_H uniquely defines a gradient vector field because of the fact that

$$G(JX_H, \cdot) = \omega(X_H, \cdot) = -dH , \quad (16)$$

and so one may identify JX_H with $-\nabla H$, the gradient of $-H$ taken with respect to the standard Riemannian metric associated with J . If $H(t) = H(t+1) : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defines a 1-periodic family of functions parameterised by $t \in S^1$ then it generates a family of exact symplectomorphisms $\phi_t : M \rightarrow M$ via

$$\frac{d}{dt}\phi_t = X_{H(t)} \circ \phi_t , \quad \phi_0 = id . \quad (17)$$

The *Arnold conjecture* states that for M closed the number of non-degenerate 1-periodic solutions of the associated differential equation

$$\dot{z}(t) = X_{H(t)}(z(t)) , \quad (18)$$

is bounded below by the sum of the Betti numbers of M .

We now briefly outline the basics of Floer theory that lead to a proof of the Arnold conjecture for Hamiltonian flows [6]. For a given symplectic manifold (M, ω) let LM be the space of contractible loops in M and $\{J_t\}$ a 1-periodic family of almost complex structures compatible with ω for each value of $t \in S^1$. Define

$$\mathcal{P}(H) = \{\gamma \in LM \mid (18)\} . \quad (19)$$

The Arnold conjecture says that if the elements of $\mathcal{P}(H)$ are nondegenerate in the sense that

$$\det(1 - d\phi_1(\gamma(0))) \neq 0 , \quad (20)$$

then for M closed one has

$$\#\mathcal{P}(H) \geq \sum_{a=0}^{2n} \dim H_a(M) , \quad (21)$$

where $H_a(M)$ denotes the a th singular homology group of M . To prove (21) Floer considered smooth maps $u : \mathbb{R} \times S^1 \rightarrow M$ that satisfy the partial differential equation

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial s} + J_t(u) \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - X_{H(t)}(u) \right) = 0 , \quad (22)$$

with boundary conditions $u(s, 0) = u(s, 1)$ and

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \pm\infty} u(s, \cdot) = \gamma^\pm \in \mathcal{P}(H) . \quad (23)$$

In a certain sense this equation can be seen as the negative gradient flow of an action functional of the universal cover of LM and so extending Morse theory to an infinite-dimensional setting Floer constructed an invariant of M (now called Floer homology) involving counts of these solutions. The Floer chain complex $CF_*(H, J)$ has as its generators the periodic orbits $\mathcal{P}(H)$ and the differential counts *perturbed pseudo-holomorphic curves* (i.e. solutions to the Floer equation) between them. Under suitable conditions the associated Floer homology $HF_*(H, J)$ is independent of the choices made for H and J , and agrees with the singular homology $H_*(M)$. Since the number of periodic solutions generating $CF_*(H, J)$ is bounded below by the dimension of $HF_*(H, J)$ this proves the Arnold conjecture for closed manifolds.

Floer also introduced a related version of his chain complex that has as its generators the intersection points of two transversely intersecting Lagrangian submanifolds $L_1, L_2 \subset M$ [5]. Let $\mathcal{P}(L_1, L_2)$ be the space of paths

$$\mathcal{P}(L_1, L_2) = \{ \gamma \in C^\infty([0, 1], M) \mid \gamma(0) \in L_1, \gamma(1) \in L_2 \} , \quad (24)$$

and consider the *symplectic action functional*

$$\mathcal{A}(\gamma, [\Gamma]) = - \int_{\Gamma} \omega , \quad (25)$$

which is well-defined on the universal cover $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(L_1, L_2)$. Here $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(L_1, L_2)$ and $[\Gamma]$ is an equivalence class of a homotopy $[0, 1] \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$ between γ and a fixed base point in the connected

component of $\mathcal{P}(L_1, L_2)$ containing γ . One can easily show that the critical points of $\mathcal{A}(\gamma, [\Gamma])$ are just the constant paths that correspond to intersection points in $L_1 \cap L_2$. Introducing an infinite-dimensional analogue of Morse theory along the same lines as Hamiltonian Floer theory led Floer to consider solutions of the Cauchy-Riemann equation

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial s} + J_t(u) \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = 0 , \quad (26)$$

for pseudo-holomorphic curves $u : \mathbb{R} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ that satisfy boundary conditions $u(s, 0) \in L_1$, $u(s, 1) \in L_2$, and

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \pm\infty} u(s, \cdot) = \gamma^\pm \in \mathcal{P}(L_1, L_2) . \quad (27)$$

Floer proved that the Lagrangian version of his theory again gives rise to a well-defined chain complex $CF_*(L_1, L_2)$ provided appropriate conditions are imposed on the Lagrangians and ambient symplectic manifold (e.g. $\pi_2(M, L) = 0$ to avoid contributions from pseudo-holomorphic discs). In particular, he demonstrated that the associated homology, $HF_*(L_1, L_2)$, remains invariant under the action of a Hamiltonian symplectomorphism ϕ_H in the sense that $HF_*(L_1, L_2) \cong HF_*(L_1, \phi_H(L_2))$. He also proved that $HF_*(L, L) \equiv HF_*(L, \phi_H(L)) \cong H_*(L)$ when ϕ_H is chosen to ensure transverse intersection.

3. Deformed Hamiltonian vector fields

We are now in a position to define the objects of primary interest to this paper. As described in section 2.1, the initial motivation for introducing deformed Hamiltonian vector fields is to provide a geometric interpretation for dynamical systems of the form (3) with the modified Laplacian $\Delta_{\mathcal{G}}^\epsilon$ of a combinatorial graph \mathcal{G} , and $q \in \mathbb{R}$ the ratio of degradation and diffusion coefficients. These systems arise naturally in the biological sciences where they describe two-component feedback loops on \mathcal{G} [1]. We will give two equivalent definitions of a deformed Hamiltonian vector fields before discussing some subtleties that mean we must treat different classes of these objects with care.

As before, let $\pi : (M, \omega) \rightarrow B$ be a Lagrangian fibration of a symplectic manifold (M, ω) and pick a smooth function $H : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Choose an almost complex structure J on M compatible with ω and consider the natural decomposition of the tangent bundle and standard metric

$$T^*M = T^B M \oplus T^F M , \quad G = G_B \oplus G_F . \quad (28)$$

The one-parameter family of metrics $\{G_q\}$ is formed by rescaling the metric in the fibre direction so that for each fixed value of $q \in (0, 1]$ we have a Riemannian metric

$$G_q = G_B \oplus qG_F \quad (29)$$

(we postpone the discussion of what happens for negative q until the next section). Then $\{(M, G_q)\}$ defines a family of Riemannian manifolds with fibres whose volumes are monotonically decreasing as $q \rightarrow 0$. However, as before we prefer to view $\{G_q\}$ as being determined by the almost complex structures $\{J_q\}$ and consider the family $\{(M, \omega, J_q)\}$ defined by requiring that $G_q(\cdot, \cdot) = \omega(\cdot, J_q \cdot)$ for each $q \in (0, 1]$. Using the decomposition of the exterior derivative induced by the Lagrangian fibration we also introduce a family of operators $\{d_q\}$ to go alongside this family of degenerating symplectic manifolds.

Definition 1. For fixed $q \in (0, 1]$ the deformed exterior derivative d_q is given by

$$d_q := \partial_+ + q^{-1}\partial_- + q\delta . \quad (30)$$

The following proposition confirms that for each $q \in (0, 1]$ the operator d_q is a well-defined differential on $\Omega^*(M)$.

Proposition 1. $d_q^2 = 0$.

PROOF. We have $d_q^2 = \partial_+^2 + \partial_- \delta + \delta \partial_- + q(\partial_+ \delta + \delta \partial_+) + q^{-1}(\partial_- \partial_+ + \partial_+ \partial_-) + q^2 \delta^2 + q^{-2} \partial_-^2$ and by (13) every term multiplying a given power of q vanishes. \square

It must be emphasised that the definition of d_q is only possible because we have a decomposition of the exterior derivative (12) that depends on the Lagrangian fibration *and also the choice of almost complex structure J* . Therefore the two families $\{d_q\}$ and $\{J_q\}$ are not independent and when we refer to one element, d_q , say, we will always have a corresponding object, J_q , in the other family. It is important to bear this in mind since this leads to two equivalent definitions of a deformed Hamiltonian vector field.

Definition 2. The deformed Hamiltonian vector field generated by H is the unique vector field $X_H^q \in TM$ that satisfies

$$\omega(X_H^q, \cdot) = -d_q H . \quad (31)$$

This generalises the usual definition of a Hamiltonian vector field since q serves as a “deformation parameter” for the exterior derivative in the sense that we return to the classical definition in the limit $q \rightarrow 1$. Once more we have actually defined an entire family $\{X_H^q\}$ parameterised by $q \in (0, 1]$ and by writing X_H^q we are referring to the deformed Hamiltonian vector field corresponding to d_q and J_q . The next proposition provides an equivalent definition for X_H^q in terms of the metric G_q .

Proposition 2. *Given a deformed Hamiltonian vector field X_H^q , the vector field JX_H^q is the gradient of $-H$ defined using the metric G_q .*

PROOF. We want to show that $G_q(JX_H^q, Y) = -dH(Y)$ for all $Y \in TM$. Using the decomposition of TM we write the vector field $Y \in TM$ as $Y = Y_+ + Y_-$ where $Y_+ \in T^B M$ and $Y_- \in T^F M$. Note $\delta = 0$ when acting on functions so that

$$-d_q H(Y) = -\partial_+ H(Y_+) - q^{-1} \partial_- H(Y_-) \quad (32)$$

and using ω -compatibility of J we have

$$\omega(X_H^q, Y) = G_B(JX_H^q, Y_+) + G_F(JX_H^q, Y_-) . \quad (33)$$

We define the new vector field Y^q by setting $Y_+^q = Y_+$ and $Y_-^q = q^{-1}Y_-$ and after equating both of the expressions above obtain

$$-dH(Y^q) = G_B(JX_H^q, Y_+^q) + qG_F(JX_H^q, Y_-^q) = G_q(JX_H^q, Y^q) , \quad (34)$$

which proves the proposition. □

Thus, the vector field JX_H^q on the manifold (M, ω, J) is defined to be the vector field that would be a gradient with respect to the standard Riemannian metric on the manifold (M, ω, J_q) . That is to say, $JX_H^q = -\nabla_q H$ where ∇_q is the gradient associated with G_q . Although somewhat more convoluted, this definition makes explicit the choice of almost complex structure in the construction of a deformed Hamiltonian vector field.

The first definition of a deformed Hamiltonian vector field is more natural from the perspective of understanding the flow of X_H^q and also because geometric properties of the Lagrangian fibration $\pi : (M, \omega) \rightarrow B$ are reflected in the analytic properties of d_q . It turns out that these properties are tied up with the particular choice of function H used to generate the deformed Hamiltonian vector field. We will now describe what this means.

Definition 3. Functions $H : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying the property $\partial_- \partial_+ H = 0$ are called *simple*, whilst functions satisfying $\partial_+ H = 0$ are called *exceptionally simple*.

It is obvious that exceptionally simple implies simple, but the converse is not true. The exceptionally simple condition is intrinsic to the fibration whereas the simple condition depends on the choice of almost complex structure. Sometimes it will prove useful to decompose the function H as $H = H_+ + H_{ns} + H_-$ where $\partial_{\pm} H_{\mp} = 0$. The non-simple part H_{ns} is the part of H that is not necessarily simple nor exceptionally simple, and in particular one has that $\partial_+ \partial_- H = \partial_+ \partial_- H_{ns}$ since $H_+ + H_-$ is simple. Of course this decomposition is not unique, but we assume it is “maximal” in the sense that $H_{ns} = 0$ whenever possible. To get a feel for what the simple condition really means we choose a Darboux coordinate chart $\{x_i, y_j\}$ for $T^*\mathbb{R}^n$ as a model for the Lagrangian fibration (M, ω, J) in which $\{x_i\}$ are coordinates on the base \mathbb{R}^n and $\{y_j\}$ are coordinates on the fibres. A generic Hamiltonian takes the form

$$H(x, y) = f(x) + h(x, y) + g(y) \quad (35)$$

and one sees that

$$\partial_- \partial_+ H(x, y) = \frac{\partial^2 h}{\partial y_i \partial x_j} dy_i \wedge dx_j, \quad (36)$$

so H being simple is equivalent to $h \equiv h'(x) + h''(y)$. Likewise, H being exceptionally simple is equivalent to setting $H = H(y)$ to be a function of the fibre coordinates only. The following proposition describes how the flow of X_H^q depends on the choice of Hamiltonian H by answering the question of when a deformed Hamiltonian field generates a symplectomorphism.

Proposition 3. *When $q \neq 1$ and (M, ω, J) is bi-Lagrangian the flow of a deformed Hamiltonian vector field X_H^q is symplectic if and only if H is simple. When $q \neq 1$ and (M, ω, J) is not bi-Lagrangian then X_H^q is symplectic if $H = H_+ + H_-$ with $\partial_{\pm} H_{\mp} = 0$.*

PROOF. After a straightforward calculation it becomes clear that in general X_H^q does not generate a symplectomorphism unless $q = 1$ since the one-form $d_q H$ is not necessarily closed

$$L_{X_H^q}(\omega) = -dd_q H = (q^{-1} - 1)(\partial_+^2 + \partial_- \partial_+) H. \quad (37)$$

The two-forms $\partial_+^2 H$ and $\partial_- \partial_+ H$ are of different type and so we can not have $-\partial_+^2 H = \partial_- \partial_+ H$ unless both are zero, hence proving that H must be simple if $\partial_+^2 = 0$. If $H = H_+ + H_-$ then $\partial_+^2 H = \partial_+^2 H_+ = -\delta \partial_- H_+ = 0$ and so this condition is sufficient for when (M, ω, J) is not bi-Lagrangian. \square

We may also ask when a deformed Hamiltonian vector field generates a *conformally symplectic diffeomorphism* $\phi : M \rightarrow M$ that preserves the symplectic form up to some constant $1 \neq c \in \mathbb{R}$ (i.e. $\phi^*(\omega) = c\omega$). The conformal symplectomorphisms form a group that, like the group of symplectomorphisms, is one of Cartan's six classes of groups of diffeomorphisms on a manifold M . Conformal Hamiltonian vector fields have previously been used to generalise simple mechanical systems with dissipation [12]. The proposition below answers the question of when a deformed Hamiltonian vector field is conformally symplectic on a bi-Lagrangian manifold.

Proposition 4. *When (M, ω, J) is bi-Lagrangian the flow of a deformed Hamiltonian vector field X_H^q is conformally symplectic if and only if $q \neq 1$ and $\omega = c' \partial_- \partial_+ H$ for some nonzero constant $c' \in \mathbb{R}$.*

PROOF. When (M, ω, J) is bi-Lagrangian the condition that X_H^q generates a conformal symplectomorphism is that

$$L_{X_H^q}(\omega) = -dd_q H = (q^{-1} - 1) \partial_- \partial_+ H = c\omega \quad (38)$$

for some nonzero constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Clearly this implies $\omega = c^{-1}(q^{-1} - 1) \partial_- \partial_+ H$. \square

Thus, on a bi-Lagrangian manifold (M, ω, J) a deformed Hamiltonian vector field X_H^q is conformally symplectic whenever $\omega = \partial_- \partial_+ K$ is defined *globally* by the analogue of a Kähler potential $K : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $H = H_+ + H_- + K$ for some $H_{\pm} : \partial_{\pm} H_{\mp} = 0$. This is yet again a very strict condition to impose on a symplectic manifold since, as in the Kähler case, when (M, ω, J) is bi-Lagrangian ω is usually only determined by a potential *locally* [13]. Examples of these manifolds do exist however, and once two-component feedback loops have been defined in section 4 we shall see how these might be related to conformally symplectic deformed Hamiltonian vector fields. Note that because ω is necessarily of type $(1, 1)$ Proposition 4 breaks down when (M, ω, J) is not bi-Lagrangian unless we impose the additional condition that $\partial_+^2 H$ vanishes. We can not ask for H to be exceptionally simple however (our definition of a conformally symplectic vector field excludes the symplectic case), so H must be a non-simple Hamiltonian that satisfies $\partial_+^2 H = 0$ with $\omega = c' \partial_- \partial_+ H$. This further restricts the types of functions that may be considered.

Here is a good opportunity to introduce the different classes of deformed Hamiltonian vector fields that were mentioned at the beginning of this section. They are defined allowing the Hamiltonian to also depend on the deformation parameter by weighting the various components

of a decomposition of H by factors of q . In this case we write $H = H_q$, which is once again associated with d_q and J_q . The *class* of a Hamiltonian H_q will be denoted by (l, m, p) where $l, m, p \in \mathbb{Z}$ are integers denoting the power of q that multiplies H_+, H_{ns} , and H_- , respectively. For example, a Hamiltonian of class $(1, 0, 0)$ takes the form $H_q = qH_+ + H_{ns} + H_-$ and a Hamiltonian of class $(2, 0, -1)$ is $H_q = q^2H_+ + H_{ns} + q^{-1}H_-$. Although the differences between these classes appear subtle they will in fact turn out to play an essential role throughout later parts of this paper where we will be interested in taking various limits of objects depending on q . That being said, we will only really be concerned with Hamiltonians of class $(0, 0, 1)$ and it is certainly no coincidence that the motivating biological example is also generated by a function of this class. A detailed analysis of the relationships between different classes of deformed Hamiltonian vector fields would be the subject of a different paper since it invariably depends on the particular application to symplectic geometry that one might have in mind. It suffices to say that any algebra generated by these objects would certainly be very different from the algebra of Hamiltonian vector fields since there is no straightforward way of closing a single class (or combination of several) under the action of the Lie bracket. Whether or not a collection of deformed Hamiltonian vector fields would generate some deformed version of a Lie algebra, possibly involving quantum groups, remains an open question.

As in the Hamiltonian case, a deformed Hamiltonian vector field $X_H^q \in TM$ determines a differential equation

$$\dot{z}(t) = X_H^q(z(t)) , \quad (39)$$

which is the appropriate generalisation of (1). With a time-dependent Hamiltonian $H : S^1 \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ there is an associated two-parameter family of diffeomorphisms $\phi_t^q : M \rightarrow M$ generated via

$$\frac{d}{dt}\phi_t^q = X_{H(t)}^q \circ \phi_t^q , \quad \phi_0^q = id , \quad (40)$$

for each value of $q \in (0, 1]$. These are symplectomorphisms when $H(t) = H_+(t) + H_-(t)$ (or conformal symplectomorphisms when $H(t)$ and (M, ω, J) satisfy the requirements of Proposition 4), but in general they do not preserve ω unless $q = 1$. As already explained, once two-component feedback loops have been defined as a particular type of deformed Hamiltonian vector field the number of periodic solutions to a time-dependent version of (39) is an important biological question that describes the number of stable states of a regulation network. In light of the previous discussion it would not be prudent to formulate a deformed analogue of the Arnold

conjecture for solutions to a time-dependent version of (39) however, even with the assumption that $|1 - q|$ is sufficiently small. The diffeomorphisms generated by deformed Hamiltonian vector fields fail to form a group in the same way that Hamiltonian symplectomorphisms do, and it can not be ruled out that nice properties such as the existence of fixed points on closed manifolds are destroyed as soon as q moves infinitesimally away from 1. That being said, we can think of no explicit examples where this turns out to be the case. Moreover, when H is independent of time the Arnold conjecture follows trivially from the fact that the critical points of H are constant solutions of (39) and therefore 1-periodic. Non-degeneracy of the solutions implies H is a Morse function and the result follows from elementary Morse theory and its independence from the choice of metric on M . It therefore seems plausible to see how far one can get following the approach of Floer and studying solutions of the partial differential equation

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial s} + J_t(u) \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - X_{H(t)}^q(u) \right) = 0 , \quad (41)$$

for smooth maps $u : \Sigma \rightarrow M$ from a Riemann surface Σ with appropriate boundary conditions. Two remarks are in order before outlining the analytic complications that arise when working with this deformed Floer equation.

1) Solutions that do not depend on s satisfy

$$\frac{du}{dt} = X_{H(t)}^q(u) , \quad (42)$$

so are solutions of the time-dependent version of the differential equation (39). Naively one expects solutions of the deformed Floer equation to converge to orbits of $X_{H(t)}^q$ in the limit $|s| \rightarrow \infty$. This would mean that solutions could be interpreted as flow lines connecting these orbits as points in some infinite-dimensional space. The problem is that in order to prove convergence one requires a bound on the energy of a solution. In Floer theory this bound is obtained from a perturbed symplectic action functional, but this does not appear to exist for deformed Hamiltonian vector fields.

2) If H does not depend on time then time-independent solutions to the deformed Floer equation (41) satisfy

$$\frac{du}{ds} + \nabla_q H(u) = 0 . \quad (43)$$

These trajectories are flows of the gradient of $-H$ defined with respect to the deformed metric G_q . In the usual approach to the Arnold conjecture one first proves that Floer homology remains invariant under the choice of a time-independent Hamiltonian and that Floer trajectories are in bijection with gradient flow lines of $-H$. Thus, one proves that Morse and Floer differentials coincide. At first glance it looks as if a similar argument should apply to the deformed Floer equation (41) provided one could prove a homology defined by counts of its solutions remains invariant under a choice of time-independent Hamiltonian.

Besides the fact that there is no analogue of a perturbed symplectic action functional, readers who are familiar with Floer theory at the level of Salamon's lecture notes [14] will realise that proving transversality and compactness (which again relies on existence of an energy bound) for the deformed Floer equation is not straightforward at all. The operator obtained after linearising (41) in a trivialising chart is of the form

$$D_q = \frac{d}{ds} - A_q(s) , \tag{44}$$

where $A_q(s) : W^{1,p} \rightarrow L^p$ are a family of operators between appropriate Sobolev spaces that are not self-adjoint unless $q = 1$. Hence, the requisite analysis used to prove D_q is Fredholm with index expressed in terms of the Conley-Zehnder indices [15, 16] will not go through and one needs to understand the Fredholm property and spectral flow problem from the perspective hyperbolic operators [17]. Here the class of the Hamiltonian in (41) plays a significant role because for sufficiently large/small values of $|1 - q|$ the operator family $A_q(s)$ can behave very differently depending on the class of H_q . We will not elaborate upon this fact except to say that there is an additional complication that in general the spectral flow of $A_q(s)$, and hence the dimension of the corresponding moduli spaces, might also have a some dependence on q . It therefore seems that a Floer-type theory for deformed Hamiltonian vector fields is well beyond the scope of methods available to the field at present. In section 5 we resort to considering a model for deformed Floer theory that is designed to expand upon point 2 above. Namely, we consider a finite-dimensional gradient flow problem on a Lagrangian fibration equipped with the metric G_q .

4. Generalised two-component feedback loops

In this section we return to the original motivation for introducing deformed Hamiltonian vector fields and use them to define two-component feedback loops on Lagrangian torus fibrations. We study the local properties of a two-component feedback loop to provide a geometrical interpretation for the biological notion of diffusion/degradation ratios and the topology of a cellular arrangement. We also explain how their properties are related to the semi-flat model of the SYZ mirror conjecture [18]. The biological viewpoint raises several questions about the appearance of \mathbb{D} -Kähler (bi-Lagrangian) manifolds in mirror symmetry.

4.1. Two-component feedback loops on Lagrangian torus fibrations

Before defining two-component feedback loops using deformed Hamiltonian vector fields we first outline the key ideas behind Duistermaat's classification of Lagrangian torus fibrations. There are several excellent texts on this subject and so we try to be as brief as possible, stating just one main theorem and referring the reader to [19, 20] for proofs. From the Arnold-Liouville theorem a regular Lagrangian fibration $\pi : (M, \omega) \rightarrow B$ with connected compact fibres is necessarily a torus fibration over an integral affine manifold B . An associated \mathbb{Z}^n -bundle of first cohomology groups of the fibres may be identified with a subbundle $\Lambda^* \subset T^*B$ consisting of integral one-forms. Λ^* therefore determines a *symplectic affine structure* on B and the holonomy of Λ^* is called the *affine monodromy* of the Lagrangian torus fibration. Lagrangian torus fibrations with the same affine monodromy are classified by the Duistermaat-Chern class μ_C and Lagrangian Duistermaat-Chern class μ_L . This classification is provided by the following theorem.

Theorem 1. (Duistermaat [19]) *Suppose B is an affine manifold with fixed affine monodromy.*

1) *The following (i)-(iii) are equivalent*

(i) *$M \cong T^*B/\Lambda^*$ as torus fibrations.*

(ii) *$\pi : (M, \omega) \rightarrow B$ admits a global section $s : B \rightarrow M$.*

(iii) *The Duistermaat-Chern class of $\pi : (M, \omega) \rightarrow B$ vanishes.*

Moreover, if (ii) holds then the following (iv) - (vi) are equivalent

(iv) *$M \cong T^*B/\Lambda^*$ as Lagrangian torus fibrations.*

(v) *$\pi : (M, \omega) \rightarrow B$ admits a global Lagrangian section $s : B \rightarrow M$.*

(vi) The Lagrangian Duistermaat-Chern class of $\pi : (M, \omega) \rightarrow B$ vanishes.

2) Two torus fibrations are isomorphic if and only if they have the same Duistermaat-Chern class.

3) Two Lagrangian torus fibrations are symplectomorphic if and only if they have the same Lagrangian Duistermaat-Chern class.

The Duistermaat-Chern class, measuring obstruction to the existence of a global section $s : B \rightarrow M$, lies in $H^2(B, \Lambda^*)$ - a twisted sum of n copies of $H^2(B, \mathbb{Z})$. It follows that $\pi : M \rightarrow B$ is a principal torus bundle if and only if the affine monodromy is trivial, in which case μ_C coincides with the usual Chern class of a principal bundle. Although $M \cong T^*B/\Lambda^*$ if and only if $\mu_C = 0$, the Arnold-Louiville theorem ensures the existence of *local* isomorphisms $M \rightarrow T^*B/\Lambda^*$. Likewise, although M is symplectomorphic to T^*B/Λ^* if and only if the Lagrangian Duistermaat-Chern class vanishes, there always exists local symplectomorphisms $M \rightarrow T^*B/\Lambda^*$ that are in one-to-one correspondence with local Lagrangian sections of $\pi : (M, \omega) \rightarrow B$. Existence of these local sections is essential for our definition of two-component feedback loops on Lagrangian torus fibrations. From now on we assume (M, ω, J) is Kähler to make contact with the appearance of special Lagrangian torus fibrations in the SYZ mirror conjecture [18]. To do so we will exploit the fact that our spaces are locally symplectomorphic to those appearing in semi-flat mirror symmetry [21].

Two-component feedback loops will be defined using a particular choice of deformed Hamiltonian vector field on a Lagrangian torus fibration. Recall from section 2.1 that in \mathbb{R}^{2n} the system

$$\dot{x}_i = \frac{\partial g(y)}{\partial y_i} + q^{-1}(\Delta_{\mathcal{G}}^\epsilon)_{ij}x_j, \quad \dot{y}_i = -\frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_i} - (\Delta_{\mathcal{G}}^\epsilon)_{ij}y_j, \quad (45)$$

describes the time-evolution of concentrations of molecules X and Y diffusing on a combinatorial graph \mathcal{G} . Functions f and g govern the regulatory structure of the two-component feedback loop, and the modified graph Laplacian $\Delta_{\mathcal{G}}^\epsilon$ describes the diffusive coupling and degradation of X and Y with rates having ratio q (we shall henceforth assume that degradation is integer-valued, i.e. $\epsilon \in \mathbb{Z}_+$). It helps to work locally to determine the type of deformed Hamiltonian vector field required to define a two-component feedback loop on a Lagrangian torus fibration $\pi : (M, \omega, J) \rightarrow B$. In local coordinates provided by the symplectic affine structure on B the symplectic form is $\omega = dx_i \wedge dy_i$, where the x_i factor through π to local affine coordinates on

B and the y_i take values in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} . The metric G_B is a *Hessian metric* given by the Hessian of a convex function $K : B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ called the *symplectic potential* [21]; in symplectic affine coordinates its components are $(G_B)_{ij} = \partial^2 K / \partial x_i \partial x_j$. Moreover, the Kähler metric on the total space T^*B/Λ^* (which is just the standard Riemannian metric associated with J) is given by

$$ds^2 = (G_B)_{ij} dx_i \otimes dx_j + (G_B^{-1})_{ij} dy_i \otimes dy_j , \quad (46)$$

so that $\{dx_i\}$ provides a local basis for $\Omega^{1,0}(M)$ and $\{dy_i\}$ a local basis for $\Omega^{0,1}(M)$. The dx_i also provide a local basis for the \mathbb{Z}^n -bundle $\Lambda^* \subset T^*B$ meaning under an affine transformation of B different bases of Λ^* are related by a $GL(n, \mathbb{Z})$ transformation. In coordinates $\{x_i, y_i\}$ the dynamical system (39) associated with a deformed Hamiltonian vector field $X_H^q \in TM$ takes the form

$$\dot{x}_i = q^{-1} \frac{\partial H}{\partial y_i} , \quad \dot{y}_i = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial x_i} , \quad (47)$$

which we know resembles (45) if one chooses $H = H_q$ to be a class $(0, 0, 1)$ Hamiltonian given locally by

$$H_q(x, y) = f(x) + (\Delta_{\mathcal{G}}^\epsilon)_{ij} x_i y_j + qg(y) . \quad (48)$$

To introduce the coordinate-free notion of a two-component feedback loop we allow H_q to depend on an arbitrary Lagrangian section. This of course requires $\mu_L = 0$ so that $M \cong T^*B/\Lambda^*$ symplectically and Lagrangian sections are identified with closed (hence locally exact) one-forms on B . Furthermore, we require the existence of a symmetric, integer-valued bilinear form

$$\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{G}}^\epsilon : \Lambda^* \times \Lambda^* \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} , \quad (49)$$

which is represented by the matrix $\Delta_{\mathcal{G}}^\epsilon$ in our symplectic affine coordinate chart. A choice of $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{G}}^\epsilon$ extends to T^*B straightforwardly and descends to a \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} -valued bilinear form on the quotient space T^*B/Λ^* . Under an affine transformation of B we have $\Delta_{\mathcal{G}}^\epsilon \rightarrow A^T \Delta_{\mathcal{G}}^\epsilon A$ for some $A \in GL(n, \mathbb{Z})$ and so $\det(\Delta_{\mathcal{G}}^\epsilon)$ is an invariant of $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{G}}^\epsilon$ that is by definition the characteristic polynomial of $\Delta_{\mathcal{G}}$ evaluated at $-\epsilon$. Laplacian matrices of isomorphic graphs are related by matrix similarity meaning $\det(\Delta_{\mathcal{G}}^\epsilon)$ is also an invariant of \mathcal{G} . The determinant has many other interesting properties [22], and in particular

$$(-1)^n \chi_{\mathcal{G}}(-\epsilon) \leq \det(\Delta_{\mathcal{G}}^\epsilon) , \quad (50)$$

where $\chi_{\mathcal{G}}$ is the chromatic polynomial of \mathcal{G} . In the absence of degradation when $\epsilon = 0$ our chosen bilinear form is characterised by its rank, $n - c(\mathcal{G})$, where $c(\mathcal{G})$ is the number of connected components of \mathcal{G} . In this case cycle isomorphisms of \mathcal{G} are in direct correspondence with affine transformations of B since Laplacian matrices are related by $GL(n, \mathbb{Z})$ -transformations if and only if their graphs are cycle isomorphic [22]. Using the bilinear form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{G}}^{\epsilon}$ to pair $z \in T^*B/\Lambda^*$ with a Lagrangian section $s_h : B \rightarrow T^*B/\Lambda^*$ we may finally define a generalised two-component feedback loop on $(T^*B/\Lambda^*, \omega, J)$.

Definition 4. A *generalised two-component feedback loop* on a Lagrangian torus fibration $\pi : (T^*B/\Lambda^*, \omega, J) \rightarrow B$ is a deformed Hamiltonian vector field generated by a \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} -valued Hamiltonian of the form

$$H_q = H_+ + \langle z, s_h(\pi(z)) \rangle_{\mathcal{G}}^{\epsilon} + qH_- , \quad (51)$$

with $\partial_{\pm} H_{\mp} = 0$.

Whilst the definition of a deformed Hamiltonian vector field depends on the choice of almost complex structure we see that the definition of H_q does not. In symplectic coordinates where s_h is identified with the exact one-form dh we have

$$H_q(x, y) = f(x) + y_i (\Delta_{\mathcal{G}}^{\epsilon})_{ij} \frac{\partial h}{\partial x_j} + qg(y) , \quad (52)$$

and one recovers (48) by taking $h = \frac{1}{2}|x|^2$. More generally the equations (47) with $H = H_q$ determine dynamical systems similar to those used to study synchronisation of coupled oscillators on graphs [23].

We have successfully generalised two-component feedback loops to Lagrangian torus fibrations and are now able to provide a geometric interpretation for objects associated with their biological description. The local expression for the Lie derivative of the symplectic form along the direction of a generalised two-component feedback loop with $h = \frac{1}{2}|x|^2$ is

$$L_{X_{H_q}^q} (dx_i \wedge dy_i) = (q^{-1} - 1) (\Delta_{\mathcal{G}}^{\epsilon})_{ij} dx_i \wedge dy_j , \quad (53)$$

and when the system is uncoupled (i.e. the graph \mathcal{G} is empty) the flow of $X_{H_q}^q$ determines a local conformal symplectomorphism

$$L_{X_{H_q}^q} (dx_i \wedge dy_i) = (q^{-1} - 1) \epsilon dx_i \wedge dy_i . \quad (54)$$

If $1 > q > 0$ then the symplectic inner product of two elements in TM expands exponentially, otherwise it contracts for $q > 1$ and $q < 0$. This reflects the fact that uncoupled two-component feedback loops are dissipative in a way that depends on the ratio of degradation rates, which in turn serves as a measure for exponential contraction/expansion of symplectic area. Molecules X, Y having different degradation rates with the same sign will give rise to a contraction in symplectic area, whilst degradation rates of opposite signs (unlikely to arise in practice) can generate either scenario. This implies that uncoupled two-component feedback loops violate Liouville's theorem in a way that is closely related to the generalised dissipative mechanical systems studied in [12]. More interesting features arise when the graph \mathcal{G} is non-empty. Molecules are then allowed to diffuse between different cells and non-trivial topology of the cellular arrangement means that the local flow of a two-component feedback loop fails to remain conformally symplectic. Instead the graph describing the cellular arrangement determines a flow that resembles a local conformal symplectomorphism combined with an exchange of fiber coordinates $y_i \rightarrow (\Delta_{\mathcal{G}}^{\epsilon})_{ij} y_j$. Given that this transformation involves a graph Laplacian we shall call it a *diffusive twist* of the fibres. Since the matrix $\Delta_{\mathcal{G}}^{\epsilon}$ represents the integral bilinear form associated with \mathcal{G} we can interpret a diffusive twist as a consequence of replacing Λ^* with its dual bundle defined with respect to $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{G}}^{\epsilon}$. Non-trivial cellular topology corresponds to a diffusive twist that serves as an obstruction preventing a two-component feedback loop generating a local conformal symplectomorphism. Regulatory functions f and g do not contribute to symplectic aspects of the flow and so this obstruction provides a simple way to classify two-component feedback loops in terms of the pair (q, \mathcal{G}) governing the scale and direction of a diffusive twist. Assigning such a clear geometric interpretation to diffusion coefficients and cellular topology provides a new perspective on how the dynamics of feedback loops are known to be affected by varying these parameters (see [24, 25] and references therein). Clearly many other properties of a two-component feedback loop do still depend upon f and g however, and ultimately these regulatory functions determine the precise type of biological process taking place on the graph.

The problem with extending our definition of a generalised two-component feedback loop to an arbitrary Lagrangian torus fibration is the lack of a global section meaning we are forced to work locally where $M \cong T^*B/\Lambda^*$. It is unclear what the definition of a generalised two-component feedback loop should be when $\mu_C \neq 0$, but it is tempting to assume that it generates a global conformal symplectomorphism. In light of Proposition 4 however, there are huge re-

restrictions on the type of spaces that could admit such deformed Hamiltonian vector fields. One would only really be interested in bi-Lagrangian manifolds since otherwise the condition $\partial_+^2 H = 0$ poses an additional restriction on the types of regulatory functions f that may be considered (bi-Lagrangian manifolds are discussed in the next section). For these reasons we shall keep the global definition of a two-component feedback loop restricted to those Lagrangian torus fibrations symplectomorphic to T^*B/Λ^* . On any other Lagrangian torus fibration a generalised two-component feedback loop is locally well-defined using the existence of local Lagrangian sections. We have also not addressed the question of how the choice of bilinear form on Λ^* is related to the affine monodromy of the torus fibration, but it is clear that $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{G}}^\epsilon$ is well-defined if the affine monodromy is trivial or $\Delta_{\mathcal{G}}^\epsilon$ is invariant under conjugation by any element of the representation. Therefore a generalised two-component feedback loop on any graph is always locally well-defined since M is always locally a principal torus bundle. We see no reason why generalised two-component feedback loops should not be globally well-defined whenever $\mu_L = 0$.

Given the prevalence of special Lagrangian torus fibrations in the SYZ mirror conjecture we conclude this section with a remark on where two-component feedback loops fit into the constructions of semi-flat mirror symmetry [21]. From the symplectic viewpoint a two-component feedback loop generates a variation of the Kähler form within its cohomology class that by Moser's theorem is equivalent to keeping the Kähler form ω fixed and infinitesimally varying J in a fixed diffeomorphism class. Similarly, in mirror symmetry one expects these two roles to be interchanged. On the basis of the SYZ mirror conjecture we would like to identify the object corresponding to the mirror of a generalised two-component feedback loop. This should be a variation of the complex structure on the mirror manifold TB/Λ . Here the \mathbb{Z}^n -bundle $\Lambda \rightarrow B$ is the dual of Λ^* defined with respect to the restriction of the canonical fibre metric G_B^{-1} , not to be confused with the dual associated with the diffusive twist induced by \mathcal{G} . The principle of semi-flat mirror symmetry is beautiful yet simple: combine this fibrewise dualisation with an exchange of the symplectic affine structure for the *complex affine structure* on B [21]. In words, the infinitesimal variation of the Kähler form generated by an uncoupled two-component feedback loop is a multiple of ω so that when \mathcal{G} is empty the mirror variation is just the same multiple of the complex structure on TB/Λ . When the graph \mathcal{G} is nonempty the mirror variation is a multiple of the complex structure deformed by the diffusive twist induced by \mathcal{G} . Explicitly,

the mirror variation is given by

$$(q^{-1} - 1) \frac{\partial}{\partial w_i} \otimes d\bar{w}_i, \quad w_i = u_i + \sqrt{-1}(\Delta_{\mathcal{G}}^\epsilon)_{ij}v_j, \quad (55)$$

where $u_i + \sqrt{-1}v_i$ are local complex coordinates on TB/Λ determined by the complex affine structure on B . A vector field generating this variation could be interpreted as the mirror dual of a two-component feedback loop and the hope is that this provides an alternative way to study these dynamical systems.

4.2. Two-component feedback loops on bi-Lagrangian manifolds

In previous sections we often assumed that $q > 0$, but for the natural biological interpretation of a two-component feedback loop one expects to have $q < 0$. In this case the metric G_q is no longer Riemannian and instead a psuedo-Riemannian metric with neutral signature. In fact when $q = -1$ the metric

$$G_{-1} = G_B \oplus -G_F \quad (56)$$

is precisely the standard metric induced by a choice of *almost \mathbb{D} -complex structure* T on M (here we use the terminology of Harvey and Lawson [11] whilst others call T an *almost bi-Lagrangian structure* or *almost para-complex structure*). In analogy with the complex case an almost \mathbb{D} -complex structure T is an automorphism $T : TM \rightarrow TM$ satisfying $T^2 = id$ with $G_{-1}(\cdot, \cdot) = \omega(\cdot, T\cdot)$ the *standard psuedo-Riemannian metric associated with T* . Any Lagrangian fibration should in principle admit an almost \mathbb{D} -complex structure, but here the specific choice of T is determined by the choice of J . In particular, the decomposition (6) of TM induced by J coincides with the eigenspace decomposition of TM induced by T . Like J , T has an associated Nijenhuis tensor and its vanishing is equivalent to the almost \mathbb{D} -complex structure being integrable and (M, T) being *\mathbb{D} -complex*. Integrability of T corresponds to (M, ω, J) being bi-Lagrangian by our terminology or (M, ω, T) being *\mathbb{D} -Kähler* by that of Harvey and Lawson. Many of the standard constructions from Kähler geometry carry over to the \mathbb{D} -Kähler case and, just as one describes Kähler manifolds using complex coordinates, it is common to discuss these spaces in terms of \mathbb{D} -complex numbers (the 2-dimensional algebra \mathbb{D} generated by 1 and τ satisfying $\tau^2 = -1$). Notions of \mathbb{D} -complex conjugates, \mathbb{D} -holomorphic functions, and decompositions of forms and the exterior derivative are defined similarly (see [11] for details). For now we continue in the spirit of the previous section and assume that both J and T are integrable. This means

that (M, ω, J) is Kähler and (M, ω, T) is \mathbb{D} -Kähler (equivalently (M, ω, J) is bi-Lagrangian). By allowing negative values of q the family $\{J_q\}$ extended to the interval $q \in [-1, 1]$ traces out a path in the combined space of all ω -compatible (\mathbb{D} -)complex structures, the \mathbb{D} -complex structures compatible in the sense that $\omega(\cdot, T\cdot)$ is a metric of neutral signature on M . This path starts at the \mathbb{D} -complex structure T with $q = -1$ and ends at the complex structure J with $q = 1$. However, it must also pass through the singular point at $q = 0$ where the metric G_q degenerates on the fibres of $\pi : (M, \omega) \rightarrow B$. For $q > 0$ this point represents a boundary or cusp in the space of complex structures and the limit $q \rightarrow 0^+$ is precisely the *large complex structure limit* of mirror symmetry in which the SYZ conjecture is expected to hold [26, 27]. From the symplectic viewpoint this is often called the *adiabatic limit* [28] and in the next section we shall study the adiabatic limit of generalised two-component feedback loops on cotangent bundles.

From a biological perspective we know that q parameterises two-component feedback loops as a ratio of diffusion and degradation coefficients. The endpoints and singularity of the path $\{J_q\}$ therefore correspond to the biological limits described in section 2.1. In particular, when X and Y diffuse/degrade at the same rate a two-component feedback loop defines a gradient using the standard pseudo-Riemannian metric associated with T (recall Proposition 2). Likewise, the limit where the coefficient of X becomes very large compared to that of Y is associated with a degeneration of the metric in the large complex structure limit. Semi-flat mirror symmetry used to describe generalised two-component feedback loops in section 4.1 is also expected to describe the correspondence between Calabi-Yau mirror pairs in this limit [21, 27]. Allowing q to vary across the interval $[-1, 1]$ automatically extends semi-flat mirror symmetry to include a duality with \mathbb{D} -Kähler geometry and it turns out that analogues of special Lagrangian submanifolds have already been studied there [11]. Harvey and Lawson proved an equivalent theorem to the statement that the base of a (split) special Lagrangian torus fibration can be interpreted as the moduli space of (split) special Lagrangian submanifolds. In particular, it is the Ricci-flat, “affine” \mathbb{D} -Kähler manifolds that provide the natural duals of Calabi-Yau manifolds and because of their bi-Lagrangian structure these are also Lagrangian torus fibrations over an affine base equipped with Hessian metric. If suitably defined at the large complex structure limit the parametrisation $\{J_q\}$ should provide a deformation between Kähler and \mathbb{D} -Kähler torus fibrations, perhaps as submanifolds in a higher-dimensional ambient space. Then the idea would be that studying some version of Floer theory with deformed Hamiltonian fields (with $q > 0$) on the Kähler side

would be equivalent a different theory (with $q < 0$) on the \mathbb{D} -Kähler side. Mirror symmetry could be used to set up a quadrality involving mirror pairs of both types of geometry. It is nice to think that the biological interpretation of two-component feedback loops could motivate the problem of extending mirror symmetry to include such a construction. To the best of our knowledge nothing along these lines has appeared in the literature so far.

5. Adiabatic limits of generalised two-component feedback loops

In this final section we study the behaviour of a generalised two-component feedback loop as $q \rightarrow 0$ to obtain a lower bound on the number of their equilibrium solutions. As emphasised several times, this estimate has important consequences for multistability of the underlying biological network [3, 4]. The approach is more conjectural than in previous sections since we do not have at our disposal the analytic tools required for an in-depth study of the adiabatic limit. So far we have described two ways in which the limit $q \rightarrow 0$ is related to our study of deformed Hamiltonian vector fields. The first arises because it has a biological interpretation as the limit where the diffusion/degradation coefficient of molecule X becomes very large compared to that of Y . The second is because it describes a singularity in the space of all compatible (\mathbb{D} -)complex structures. The context in which we shall study the adiabatic limit is related to the discussion at the end of section 3. We consider a Morse-type model for Floer theory with generalised two-component feedback loops and attempt to improve the standard Morse estimate for the number of equilibrium solutions. In particular, we restrict to cotangent bundles T^*B where we find this number is bounded below by the sum of the Betti numbers of a submanifold $S \subset B$. This submanifold is determined by the generalised two-component feedback loop through an analogue of the Lagrangian section used in section 4.1. In section 5.2 we explain how this construction could be extended to describe the Fukaya category of cotangent bundles.

5.1. Adiabatic chain complex

In this section we argue that Morse theory with a generalised two-component feedback loop on T^*B yields the singular homology of a prescribed submanifold $S \subset B$. This would imply that the number of equilibrium solutions of the generalised two-component feedback loop is bounded below by the sum of Betti numbers of S . The starting point for obtaining information about S given data on T^*B is an extension of the Lagrange multiplier Morse theory developed in

[29, 30]. Frauenfelder (and Schechter-Xu for the rank one case) considered Morse theory on the trivial vector bundle $B \times V^* \rightarrow B$ using a smooth function $F : B \times V^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$F(x, v^*) = f(x) + v^*(h(x)) , \tag{57}$$

where $v^* \in V^*$, $f : B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $h : B \rightarrow V$. Here V^* is the dual of a finite dimensional vector space V . If 0 is a regular value of h , then it is a well-known fact that there exists a bijective correspondence $\lambda : \text{Crit}(F) \rightarrow \text{Crit}(f|_{h^{-1}(0)})$ between critical points of F and critical points of $f|_{h^{-1}(0)}$. Using several different approaches, both [29] and [30] prove the existence of a homotopy between the moduli spaces of gradient flow lines of F on $B \times V^*$ and those of $f|_{h^{-1}(0)}$ on $h^{-1}(0)$. Most relevant to us is the adiabatic limit method used in [30] to show that gradient flow lines of F converge to those of $f|_{h^{-1}(0)}$ as the volume of the fibre is taken to zero. There are two issues that arise when generalising this result to general Lagrangian fibrations $\pi : M \rightarrow B$.

1) It is natural to take the generalisation of h to be a section of the dual fibration whose zero locus, $h^{-1}(0)$, defines the submanifold $S \subset B$ of interest. The problem is that the concept of a dual fibration and zero locus (in the sense required for the Lagrange multiplier construction) becomes ambiguous in cases where the only condition on fibres is that they are related by homotopy. In particular, for most compact fibres there is no notion of a uniquely distinguished point at 0.

2) In general, $B \times V^*$ is of rank $k < n$ so that $h^{-1}(0) \subset B$ is a submanifold of dimension $n - k > 0$. For a Lagrangian fibration the fibres are always of dimension n however, which means that h must degenerate on certain fibre directions if we are to ensure $n - k$ is nonzero. Even if f is Morse this necessarily implies F can only ever be Morse-Bott so that something must be done to account for the “left over” directions of the fibration.

The second point is most easily addressed by perturbing F using a family of fibrewise Morse functions with support on the degenerate directions associated with critical submanifolds. Although F is Morse-Bott its perturbation becomes Morse [31]. It is precisely this approach that yields a non-simple Hamiltonian of class $(0, 0, 1)$ where q is interpreted as the small parameter of the perturbation, H_- the perturbing Morse function, and H_{ns} and H_+ can be identified with

the appropriate generalisations of $v^*(h(x))$ and $f(x)$, respectively. To address the first point we shall content ourselves with considering cotangent bundles $M = T^*B$ with B closed but not necessarily affine. Our choice of almost complex structure is $J = J^{Sas}$ induced by G^{Sas} after a choice of metric G_B on B .

To define generalised two-component feedback loops on cotangent bundles we first form a class $(0, 0, 1)$ Hamiltonian H_q using the existence of a global section of TB . Our choice of section is the vector field $h : B \rightarrow TB$ that has zero set $S \equiv h^{-1}(0) \subset B$ with $\text{codim}(S) = k$ as a closed submanifold of B . We use h_i to denote the n functions $h_i : B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by h in an appropriate trivialisation and impose that the vertical projection of dh has rank k . The Hamiltonian H_q is then constructed using a Morse function $f : B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ together with a function g whose domain will include the critical submanifolds of H_0 . We assume further that the restriction $f|_S$ is a Morse function on S and extending g to T^*B using cut-off functions set

$$H_q = f(\pi(z)) + \langle z, h(\pi(z)) \rangle + qg, \quad q \in (0, 1], \quad (58)$$

where $z \in T^*B$ and angled parentheses denote the Sasaki pairing of T^*B with TB . A generalised two-component feedback loop on T^*B is then defined to be a deformed Hamiltonian vector field generated by a Hamiltonian of this type. Comparing this with the definition given in section 4.1 we realise that h is Sasaki dual to a section of T^*B , but by considering arbitrary spaces B do not necessarily have any direct information pertaining to the graph \mathcal{G} . To illustrate how H_q can be viewed as a perturbed Morse-Bott function and define g properly we shall first consider the critical point set of

$$H_0 = f(\pi(z)) + \langle z, h(\pi(z)) \rangle, \quad (59)$$

which is the analogue of F in [29, 30]. The critical point set of H_0 consists of pairs (x, y) satisfying (in local coordinates)

$$h_i(x) = 0, \quad df(x) + y_i dh_i(x) = 0, \quad (60)$$

which by the assumptions on h is just the condition that $x \in S$ is a critical point of $f|_S$. The combination of the y_i spanning the vertical kernel of dh define a $(n - k)$ -dimensional fibre Z_x over x that we assume can be extended to a proper fibre bundle $Z \rightarrow S$. Because $f|_S$ is a Morse function with isolated critical points the critical point set of H_0 is a disjoint union of isolated critical submanifolds $V_x \cong Z_x$ that are identified with the fibres of Z over each critical point

$x \in \text{Crit}(f|_S)$,

$$\text{Crit}(H_0) = \coprod_{x \in \text{Crit}(f|_S)} V_x . \quad (61)$$

This shows that critical submanifolds of H_0 are in one-to-one correspondence with critical points of $f|_S$. Using an argument similar to Frauenfelder [29] we find that H_0 is Morse-Bott and for indices the following relation holds

$$\text{index}_{H_0}(V_x) = \text{index}_{f|_S}(x) + k . \quad (62)$$

Returning to the general case it is now straightforward to see that by choosing g to be a fiberwise function $g_x : Z_x \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ parameterised by $x \in S$ means that H_q is a Morse function on T^*B . Critical points p of H_q can be identified with pairs (x, y) where $x \in S$ is a critical point of $f|_S$ and y is a critical point of g_x . The index of a critical point $p = (x, y) \in \text{Crit}(H_q)$ is

$$\text{index}_{H_q}(p) = \text{index}_{f|_S}(x) + \text{index}_{g_x}(y) + k , \quad (63)$$

and these are equilibrium solutions of the generalised two-component feedback loop determined by $X_{H_q}^q$. We would like to obtain a lower bound on the number of these solutions and for that reason shall introduce a Morse-type complex generated by critical points of $X_{H_q}^q$. By Proposition 2, for fixed q we have that $JX_{H_q}^q$ is the negative gradient of H_q defined with respect to the metric G_q . Denote by $\phi_t^q : T^*B \rightarrow T^*B$ the flow of

$$\frac{du}{dt} = JX_{H_q}^q(u) , \quad (64)$$

and for each $p \in \text{Crit}(H_q)$ define the stable and unstable manifolds by

$$W_q^s(p) = \{z \in T^*B \mid \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \phi_t^q(z) = p\} , \quad (65)$$

and

$$W_q^u(p) = \{z \in T^*B \mid \lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \phi_t^q(z) = p\} , \quad (66)$$

respectively. For $q \in (0, 1]$ we assume the pair (H_q, G_q) satisfy the Morse-Smale condition so that for all $p^\pm \in \text{Crit}(H_q)$ the family of moduli spaces

$$\mathcal{M}_q(p^-, p^+) = W_q^u(p^-) \cap W_q^s(p^+) / \mathbb{R} , \quad (67)$$

is a family of smooth manifolds all of dimension

$$\dim(\mathcal{M}_q(p^-, p^+)) = \text{index}_{H_q}(p^-) - \text{index}_{H_q}(p^+) - 1 . \quad (68)$$

If we choose g to be defined by

$$g_x(z_x) = \langle z_x, z_x \rangle_x, \quad z_x \in Z_x, \quad (69)$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_x$ is the quadratic form associated with a metric on Z , this yields a bijection

$$\text{Crit}_*(H_q) \cong \text{Crit}_{*-k}(f|_S), \quad p = (x, 0) \mapsto x. \quad (70)$$

Here the notation implies that grading must be shifted by $-k$ in accordance with (63). Thus, we can define a family of Morse-Smale-Witten complexes, $\mathcal{C}_*(H_q, J)$, by counting flow lines of (64). The notation indicates choices of Hamiltonian and almost complex structure. One might hope that, since the generators are identical, it might be possible to relate the differentials of $\mathcal{C}_*(H_q, J)$ and the Morse complex $CM_*(f|_S, G_B|_S)$ on S . The problem is that flow lines of $JX_{H_q}^q$ may be very different to the gradient flow lines of $-f|_S$ that are required to construct $CM_*(f|_S, G_B|_S)$. In particular, it is certainly not true that flow lines of $JX_{H_q}^q$ must be constrained to the submanifold $S \subset M$. However, as q goes to zero the only flow lines of JX_H^q that contribute to the differential are those that converge to gradient flow lines on Z (to prove this rigorously we would need to appeal to a recent theorem by Eldering [32] on persistence of noncompact normally hyperbolic invariant manifolds). Moreover, using the fact that g is strictly decreasing along solutions of the gradient flow equation on Z we find that trajectories starting outside of S will not converge to a critical point of H_q in backwards time. This implies that in the adiabatic limit elements of $W_q^u(p^-) \cap W_q^s(p^+)$ are in bijection with maps $u : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow S$ satisfying

$$\frac{du}{dt} = -\nabla f|_S(u), \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} u(t) = x^\pm, \quad (71)$$

where x^\pm are the critical points of $f|_S$ corresponding bijectively to p^\pm . Thus, for q sufficiently small, we obtain an isomorphism of moduli spaces that means we can identify $\mathcal{C}_*(H_q, J)$ with $CM_*(f|_S, G_B|_S)$ in the adiabatic limit.

We call the chain complex obtained from $\mathcal{C}_*(H_q, J)$ in this way the *adiabatic chain complex*. By standard arguments in Morse theory the homology of $\mathcal{C}_*(H_q, J) \cong CM_*(f|_S, G_B|_S)$ is independent of the pair (f, G_B) when S is closed and isomorphic to the singular homology of S with grading shifted down by k

$$H_*(\mathcal{C}_*(H_q, J)) \cong H_{*-k}(S). \quad (72)$$

This describes how topological information about a submanifold $S \subset B$ is encoded by a choice of generalised two-component feedback loop on T^*B . In particular, it refines the lower bound on the number of equilibrium solutions of the generalised two-component feedback loop

$$\dot{z}(t) = X_{H_q}^q(z(t)) . \quad (73)$$

Conjecture 1. *Suppose H_q is constructed as above using the choice of section $h : B \rightarrow TB$ that has zero locus $S \equiv h^{-1}(0)$ with $k = \text{codim}(S)$ as a closed submanifold of B . Then for sufficiently small q the number of equilibrium solutions to (73) is bounded below by*

$$\sum_{a=0}^{n-k} \dim H_a(S) . \quad (74)$$

This statement must be taken as conjectural since the argument provided above is only the sketch of a mathematical proof. It implies that when the degradation/diffusion coefficient of X is very large compared to that of Y the minimal number of stable states of a generalised two-component feedback loop is given by a topological invariant encoded by an analogue of the graph on which it is defined. This could be used to explain how multistability in biological feedback loops is influenced by diffusion-based cell-cell communication [24, 25].

5.2. The Fukaya category

We end with some speculative remarks on using generalised two-component feedback loops to describe the Fukaya category of cotangent bundles. In the previous section we saw that to each generalised two-component feedback loop on T^*B there is an associated adiabatic chain complex, $\mathcal{C}_*(H_q, J)$, which is isomorphic to a Morse complex on $S \subset B$. From the work of Fukaya-Oh [28] we also know that in the adiabatic limit a subcategory of the Fukaya category generated by Lagrangian sections of T^*B degenerates into a Morse category on B . In this section we discuss how these two concepts are related and argue that generalised two-component feedback loops describe a complimentary subcategory of the Fukaya category of T^*B . We shall be concerned with a (possibly infinite) collection, $\mathcal{S}(B)$, of submanifolds $S_i \subset B$, $i \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$ having the property that

$$S_{i,j} \equiv S_i \cap S_j , \quad S_{i,j,l} \equiv S_i \cap S_j \cap S_l , \quad \dots , \quad S \equiv \bigcap_{i \in \{1,2,\dots\}} S_i \quad (75)$$

are all closed, connected, transverse intersections with nonzero dimension as submanifolds of B . We use the notation $H_q^{i,j}$ when referring to the Hamiltonian that is constructed as in the previous section with the vector field $h : B \rightarrow TB$ whose zero set is $S_{i,j}$. Then, using the generalised two-component feedback loops constructed in section 5.1, we will define morphisms and higher compositions that make $\mathcal{S}(B)$ into an A_∞ -category. Our conventions for A_∞ -categories are taken from [35]. In particular, let \mathcal{A} be a non-unital (where non-unital implies not necessarily unital) A_∞ -category consisting of a set of objects $Ob(\mathcal{A})$, a \mathbb{Z} -graded vector space $Hom_{\mathcal{A}}(A_i, A_j)$ for any pair of objects $A_i, A_j \in Ob(\mathcal{A})$, and composition maps

$$\mu_{\mathcal{A}}^d : Hom_{\mathcal{A}}(A_{i_{d-1}}, A_{i_d}) \otimes \cdots \otimes Hom_{\mathcal{A}}(A_{i_0}, A_{i_1}) \rightarrow Hom_{\mathcal{A}}(A_{i_0}, A_{i_d})[2-d] , \quad d \geq 1 . \quad (76)$$

The condition for \mathcal{A} to be an A_∞ -category is that composition maps must satisfy the A_∞ -associativity equations

$$\sum_{m,n} (-1)^{\spadesuit_n} \mu_{\mathcal{A}}^{d-m+1}(a_{i_d}, \dots, a_{i_{n+m+1}}, \mu_{\mathcal{A}}^m(a_{i_{n+m}}, \dots, a_{i_{n+1}}), a_{i_n}, \dots, a_{i_1}) = 0 , \quad (77)$$

where the sum is over all $1 \leq m \leq d$ and $0 \leq n \leq d - m$, and the sign is determined by $\spadesuit_n = \deg(a_{i_1}) + \dots + \deg(a_{i_n}) - n$. One can associate to \mathcal{A} its cohomological category $H(\mathcal{A})$ that has the same objects as \mathcal{A} with morphisms the cohomology groups $H(Hom_{\mathcal{A}}(A_i, A_j), \mu_{\mathcal{A}}^1)$, and composition defined by

$$[a_i] \cdot [a_j] = (-1)^{\deg(a_j)} [\mu_{\mathcal{A}}^2(a_i, a_j)] . \quad (78)$$

When \mathcal{A} is unital, $H(\mathcal{A})$ is an honest \mathbb{Z} -graded linear category. Likewise, if $\mu_{\mathcal{A}}^d = 0$ for all $d > 2$ then \mathcal{A} is called a non-unital differential graded category (dg-category).

To equip $\mathcal{S}(B)$ with the structure of an A_∞ -category, for any pair of submanifolds $S_i, S_j \in Ob(\mathcal{S}(B))$ we define the space of morphisms to be

$$Hom_{\mathcal{S}(B)}^*(S_i, S_j) \equiv \mathcal{C}^*(H_q^{i,j}, J) = \bigoplus_{p \in \text{Crit}(H_q^{i,j})} \mathbb{Z}\langle p \rangle , \quad (79)$$

where we have written $\mathcal{C}^*(H_q^{i,j}, J)$ for adiabatic cochains canonically identified with Morse cochains $CM^*(f|_{S_{i,j}}, G_B|_{S_{i,j}})$. Of course this is just the same thing as saying that the space of morphisms $Hom_{\mathcal{S}(B)}^*(S_i, S_j)$ can be identified with a Morse cochain complex on $S_i \cap S_j$, but here we have chosen to emphasise the role of two-component feedback loops. In particular, we want to remember that generators of $Hom_{\mathcal{S}(B)}^*(S_i, S_j)$ are equilibrium solutions of (39) and that

for $d = 1$ there is an identification of μ_S^1 with the codifferential of the adiabatic chain complex $\mathcal{C}_*(H_q^{i,j}, G_B)$. This in turn is defined by counting adiabatic flow lines of $JX_{H_q}^q$ generated by the Hamiltonian $H_q^{i,j}$ exactly as in the previous section. To simplify the discussion, from now on we assume that $\mathcal{S}(B)$ contains just two objects, S_1 and S_2 . In this case all the relevant analytic details have already been worked out by Abouzaid [34] and we expect that a generalisation to $|\text{Ob}(\mathcal{S}(B))| > 2$ poses no major problems. Using moduli spaces of $JX_{H_q}^q$ flow trees associated with a collection of $H_q^{i,j}$, we would like to define higher compositions

$$\mu_S^d : \mathcal{C}^*(H_q^{i_{d-1}, i_d}, G_B) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{C}^*(H_q^{i_0, i_1}, G_B) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^*(H_q^{i_0, i_d}, G_B)[2-d] , \quad d \geq 1 . \quad (80)$$

However, problems with transversality arise from repeated terms in the product on the right-hand-side and to prevent this from happening we must use moduli spaces of *perturbed* $JX_{H_q}^q$ flow trees [34]. More specifically, in the adiabatic limit a perturbed $JX_{H_q}^q$ flow tree converges to a continuous map whose restriction to each edge of a tree is solution of a perturbed negative gradient flow of the function $f|_{S_{i,j}}$ (the pair i, j specified by that edge). Thus, moduli spaces of perturbed $JX_{H_q}^q$ flow trees are isomorphic to those of Abouzaid in the adiabatic limit. This means higher compositions obey the A_∞ -relations (77) and $\mathcal{S}(B)$ satisfies the axioms of an A_∞ -category. We call $\mathcal{S}(B)$ the *adiabatic A_∞ -category*.

One problem in relating $\mathcal{S}(B)$ to the Fukaya category of T^*B is that there are several possible ways of treating noncompact Lagrangians and it is a little unclear which of these to choose (options are reviewed in [35]). Failure to specify a choice leaves the definition of the Fukaya category ambiguous. Perhaps most relevant to us is the approach of Nadler and Zaslow [36] where one interprets Lagrangian submanifolds of T^*B as constructible sheaves on B . In this version of the Fukaya category, $\mathcal{F}(T^*B)$, objects are formal sums

$$L_{S,F} = N^*S + \Gamma_{dF} \subset T^*B , \quad (81)$$

where N^*S is the conormal bundle of a submanifold $S \subset B$ and Γ_{dF} is the graph of the differential of a function $F : B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, i.e. an exact Lagrangian section. These are chosen to be invariant under rescaling of the cotangent fibres at infinity so that intersections can be dealt with by small Hamiltonian perturbations. Fukaya and Oh [28] have shown that the full subcategory generated by the Γ_{dF} is A_∞ -equivalent to a Morse category on B and so it is natural to ask whether a similar construction exists for the N^*S . Properly formulated our conjecture states that there

exists an A_∞ -equivalence between the adiabatic A_∞ -category $\mathcal{S}(B)$ generated by submanifolds $S_i \subset B$ and the full subcategory of the Fukaya category generated by the conormal bundles $N^*S_i \subset T^*B$. The condition that $S_i \pitchfork S_j$ holds for all $S_i, S_j \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{S}(B))$ means that the $N^*S_i \cap N^*S_j$ are *clean intersections* and so we call this subcategory the *Fukaya category of clean intersections*, $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{S}(T^*B)$. Obviously this subcategory does not contain enough objects to combine with the Fukaya-Oh category and generate the whole of $\mathcal{F}(T^*B)$, but it is one more step towards a Morse theoretic description for the Fukaya category of cotangent bundles. It is not hard to see that the conjecture holds as an isomorphism between the morphism spaces of categories $H(\mathcal{S}(B), \mu_{\mathcal{S}(B)}^1)$ and $H(\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{S}(T^*B), \mu_{\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{S}(T^*B)}^1)$ since it follows from example 1.2 in [35] that

$$HF^*(N^*S_i, N^*S_j) \cong H^{*-k_i}(S_{i,j}) . \quad (82)$$

6. Concluding remarks

This paper grew out of an attempt to find a place for two-component feedback loops in the setting of symplectic geometry. Along the way we have found that many biological features are naturally described by the structure of Lagrangian fibrations and this provides a new perspective on standard constructions in the field. The fact that two-component feedback loops are well-suited to symplectic geometry should come as no surprise given their definition in terms of deformed Hamiltonian vector fields. However, it is particularly nice to find that their biological interpretation has motivated several mathematical problems that do not seem to have appeared in the literature so far. Amongst them is the possibility of a deformed symplectomorphism group, an extension of mirror symmetry to include \mathbb{D} -Kähler manifolds, and the idea of Floer theory with deformed Hamiltonian vector fields. It is hoped that these sorts of ideas will bring two-component feedback loops to the attention of researchers working on differential geometry and mathematical physics.

Acknowledgements

I am indebted to S. Mescher, I. Smith and J. Smith for their useful comments and insightful suggestions. This work also benefitted from conversations with A. Abbondandolo, M. Abouzaid, M. Gross, W.J. Merry and F. Schmäschke. I am supported by a Research Fellowship from Peterhouse, Cambridge.

References

- [1] D. S. Tourigny, *Two-component feedback loops and deformed mechanics*, *Phys. Lett. A* **379** (2015) 342.
- [2] U. Alon, *Network motifs: theory and experimental approaches*, *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **8** (2007) 450.
- [3] J. Hasty, D. McMillen, F. Isaacs and J.J. Collins, *Computational studies of gene regulatory networks: in numero molecular biology*, *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **2** (2001) 268.
- [4] E.M. Ozbudak, M. Thattai, H.N. Lim, B.I. Sharaiman and A. van Oudenaarden. *Multistability in the lactose utilization network of Escherichia coli*, *Nature* **427** (2004) 737.
- [5] A. Floer, *Morse theory for Lagrangian intersections*, *J. Differential Geom.* **28** (1988) 513.
- [6] A. Floer, *Symplectic fixed points and holomorphic spheres*, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **120** (1989) 575.
- [7] M. Abreu, *Kähler geometry of toric manifolds in symplectic coordinates*, in *Symplectic and Contact Topology: Interactions and Perspectives*, Toronto, ON/Montreal, QC, (2001), 1-24. Fields Inst. Commun., vol. 35, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2003.
- [8] S. Sasaki, *On the differential geometry of tangent bundles of Riemannian manifolds*, *Tohoku Math. J.* **10** (1958) 338.
- [9] F. Etayo, R. Santamaria and U. R. Trías, *The geometry of a bi-Lagrangian manifold*, *Diff. Geom. Applic.* **24** (2006) 33.
- [10] V. Căruțanu, P. Fortuný and P.M. Gadea, *A survey on Paracomplex Geometry*, *Rocky Mount. J. Math.* **26** (1996) 83.
- [11] R. Harvey and H.B. Lawson, *Split special Lagrangian geometry*, in *Metric and differential geometry*, Progr. in Math., vol 297, Birkhäuser (2012).
- [12] R. McLachlan and M. Perlmutter, *Conformal Hamiltonian systems*, *J. Geom. Phys.* **39** (2001) 276.

- [13] V. Cortés, C. Mayer, T. Mohaupt and F. Saueressig, *Special geometry of euclidean supersymmetry, I. Vector multiplets*, *JHEP* **3** (2004) 28.
- [14] D. Salamon, *Lectures on Floer homology. Symplectic geometry and topology* (Park City, UT, 1997), 143-229. IAS/Park City Mathematical Series, 7. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1999.
- [15] A. Floer, H. Hofer and D. Salamon, *Transversality in elliptic Morse theory for the symplectic action*, *Duke Math. J.* **80** (1995) 251.
- [16] J. Robbin and D. Salamon, *The spectral flow and the Maslov index*, *Bull. London Math. Soc.* **27** (1995) 1.
- [17] A. Abbondandolo and P. Majer, *Ordinary differential operators in Hilbert spaces and Fredholm pairs*, *Math. Z.* **243** (2003) 525.
- [18] A. Strominger, S. T. Yau and E. Zaslow, *Mirror symmetry is T-duality*, *Nuclear Phys. B* **479** (1996) 243.
- [19] J. J. Duistermaat, *On global action-angle coordinates*, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **33** (1980) 687.
- [20] N. T. Zung, *Symplectic topology of integrable Hamiltonian systems. II. Topological classification*, *Compos. Math.* **138** (2003) 125.
- [21] P. S. Aspinwall, T. Bridgeland, A. Craw, M. Douglas, M. Gross, A. Kapustin, G. W. Moore, G. Segal, B. Szendrői and P. Wilson, *Dirichlet Branes and Mirror Symmetry*, *Clay mathematics monographs*, vol 4, American Mathematical Society, Clay Mathematics Institute, (2009).
- [22] R. Merris, *Laplacian matrices of a graph: a survey*, *Linear Algebra its Appl.* **197** (1994) 143.
- [23] L. M. Pecora and T. L. Carroll, *Master stability functions for synchronized coupled systems*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80** (1998) 2109.

- [24] A. Kuznetsov, M. Kaern and N. Kopell, *Synchrony in a population of hysteresis-based genetic oscillators*, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **65** (2004), 392.
- [25] E. Ullner, A. Zaikin, E.I. Volkov and J. García-Ojalvo, *Multistability and clustering in a population of synthetic genetic oscillators via phase-repulsive cell-to-cell communication*, *Phys. Rev. Lett* **99** (2007) 148103.
- [26] M. Gross and P. M. H. Wilson, *Large complex structure limits of K3 surfaces*, *J. Differential Geom.* **55** (2000) 475.
- [27] M. Kontsevich and Y. Soibelman, *Homological mirror symmetry and torus fibrations*, in *Symplectic geometry and mirror symmetry*, 203-263, World Sci. Publishing (2001).
- [28] K. Fukaya and Y. G. Oh, *Zero-loop open strings in the cotangent bundle and Morse homotopy*, *Asian J. of Math.* **1** (1998) 96.
- [29] U. Frauenfelder, *Vortices on the cylinder*, *Int. Math. Res. Notices* **42** (2006) 2179.
- [30] S. Schecter and G. Xu, *Morse theory for Lagrange multipliers and adiabatic limits*, *J. Diff. Eqns.* **257** (2014) 4277.
- [31] A. Banyaga and D. Hurtubise, *Cascades and perturbed Morse-Bott functions*, *Algebr. Geom. Topol.* **13** (2013) 237.
- [32] J. Eldering, *Normally Hyperbolic Invariant Manifolds –The noncompact Case*, Atlantis Series in Dynamical Systems, vol. 2, Atlantis Press, Paris (2013).
- [33] P. Seidel, *Fukaya categories and Picard-Lefschetz theory*, European Mathematical Society, Zürich (2008).
- [34] M. Abouzaid, *A topological model for the Fukaya categories of plumbings*, *J. Differential Geom.* **87** (2011) 1.
- [35] K. Fukaya, P. Seidel and I. Smith, *The symplectic geometry of cotangent bundles from a categorical viewpoint*, in *Homological mirror symmetry*, Lecture Notes in Phys., vol. 757, Springer, (2009).

- [36] D. Nadler and E. Zaslow, *Constructible sheaves and the Fukaya category*, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **22** (2009) 233.