

Contact non-squeezing at large scale in $\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1$

Maia Fraser*

December 29, 2021

Abstract

We define a \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant version of the cylindrical contact homology used by Eliashberg-Kim-Polterovich (2006) to prove contact non-squeezing for prequantized integer-capacity balls $B(R) \times S^1 \subset \mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1$, $R \in \mathbb{N}$ and we use it to extend their result to all $R \geq 1$. Specifically we prove if $R \geq 1$ there is no $\psi \in \text{Cont}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1)$, the group of compactly supported contactomorphisms of $\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1$ which squeezes $\widehat{B}(R) = B(R) \times S^1$ into itself, i.e. maps the closure of $\widehat{B}(R)$ into $\widehat{B}(R)$. A sheaf theoretic proof of non-existence of corresponding $\psi \in \text{Cont}_0(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1)$, the identity component of $\text{Cont}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1)$, is due to Chiu (2014); it is not known if this is strictly weaker. Our construction has the advantage of retaining the contact homological viewpoint of Eliashberg-Kim-Polterovich and its potential for application in prequantizations of other Liouville manifolds. It makes use of the \mathbb{Z}_k -action generated by a vertical $1/k$ -shift but can also be related, for prequantized balls, to the \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant contact homology developed by Milin (2008) in her proof of orderability of lens spaces.

1 Introduction

Gromov's non-squeezing Theorem [12] identified a new rigidity phenomenon in symplectic geometry: the standard symplectic ball cannot be symplectically embedded (symplectically squeezed) into any cylinder of smaller radius.

By contrast, in the contact setting a ball of any radius can be contact embedded into an arbitrarily small neighbourhood of a point. Eliashberg-Kim-Polterovich [11] therefore studied, in the contact manifold $\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1$, prequantized balls $B^{2n} \times S^1$ and a more restrictive notion of squeezing: embedding via a compactly supported contact isotopy¹. In other words, the contact embedding in question is required to extend to a global contactomorphism, compactly supported and isotopic to the identity in this class. In their terminology, a

*Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Ottawa

¹In fact, a Darboux ball can be embedded into an arbitrarily small neighborhood of a point by a compactly supported contact isotopy, and $B^{2n} \times S^1$, $n > 1$ can be embedded into an arbitrarily small neighborhood of a point by a contactomorphism but in this case the embedding, while smoothly isotopic to the identity, is not compactly supported nor contact isotopic to the identity; see [11].

(*contact squeezing*) of an open set U_1 into an open set U_2 is a compactly supported contact isotopy $\{\phi_t\}_{t \in [0,1]}$ such that $\phi_1(\text{Closure}(U_1)) \subset U_2$. In their proofs of non-existence of a squeezing, however, Eliashberg-Kim-Polterovich prove a formally stronger statement, namely, non-existence of a compactly supported contactomorphism ψ (possibly not isotopic to the identity) such that $\phi_1(\text{Closure}(U_1)) \subset U_2$; we will call such a contactomorphism a coarse squeezing. It is not known in $\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1$ if this formally stronger non-squeezing statement is strictly stronger.

Eliashberg-Kim-Polterovich showed [11] contact squeezing is closely related to the concept of orderability² of a contact manifold introduced by Eliashberg-Polterovich in [10] and moreover, squeezing may be possible at one scale and not at another in the same manifold. More precisely, consider $\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1$ with contact structure $\ker(dt - \alpha_L)$ and Liouville form $\alpha_L = \frac{1}{2}(ydx - xdy)$ on \mathbb{R}^{2n} , $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$, $t \in S^1$. Let $\text{Cont}_0(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1)$ denote the identity component of the group $\text{Cont}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1)$ of compactly supported contactomorphisms. These are time-1 maps of compactly supported contact isotopies, so squeezing of U_1 into U_2 is equivalent to the existence of $\phi \in \text{Cont}_0(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1)$ such that $\phi(\text{Closure}(U_1)) \subset U_2$. For any positive R , let $B(R) := \{w \in \mathbb{R}^{2n} : \pi|w|^2 < R\}$ be the ball of symplectic capacity R , and $\widehat{B}(R) := B(R) \times S^1$ its prequantization. Eliashberg-Kim-Polterovich proved:

Theorem 1.1 (Eliashberg-Kim-Polterovich [11]). *Let $R < 1$. Then there is a contact squeezing of $\widehat{B}(R)$ into itself. By contrast, if $R \geq 1$ is an integer, there is no coarse contact squeezing of $\widehat{B}(R)$ into itself.*

It remained unknown for some time whether non-squeezing in this setting held also for non-integer $R > 1$. In 2010 Tamarkin [18] sketched a proof of the affirmative answer. This was recently proved by Chiu:

Theorem 1.2 (Chiu [7]). *Let $R \geq 1$. Then there is no contact squeezing of $\widehat{B}(R)$ into itself.*

Discussions with Tamarkin [18] also inspired our use of \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariance: we prove Theorem 1.2 by means of a \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant version of the cylindrical contact homology of Eliashberg-Kim-Polterovich [11]. In fact, as in [11], we prove a formally stronger statement:

Theorem 1.2'. *Let $R \geq 1$. Then there is no coarse contact squeezing of $\widehat{B}(R)$ into itself.*

In Section 4, we observe that Theorem 1.2 also has consequences for squeezings of $\widehat{B}(R)$ into itself when $R < 1$: in some cases they require a larger domain of support, i.e., *squeezing room*, than previously established. This is stated in Theorem 4.1.

²For readers already familiar with the terminology: given a Liouville domain (M, ω, L) with ideal contact boundary P , non-squeezing at arbitrarily small scales for “fiberwise star-shaped domains” in $M \times S^1$ implies orderability of P .

Remark 1.3. *Squeezing of $\widehat{B}(R)$ into itself is an open condition. Indeed, existence of a squeezing of $\widehat{B}(R)$ into itself implies existence of a squeezing of some larger $\widehat{B}(R_1)$ into a smaller $\widehat{B}(R_2)$ and this will in particular squeeze all intermediate prequantized balls into themselves. An equivalent³ formulation of Theorem 1.2 (resp. 1.2') is therefore : let $1 < R_2 < R_1$, then there is no squeezing (resp. coarse squeezing) of $\widehat{B}(R_1)$ into $\widehat{B}(R_2)$. Note the strict inequality $1 < R_2$ which can without loss of generality be imposed.*

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Squeezing vs. \mathbb{Z}_k-equivariant squeezing	3
3	\mathbb{Z}_k-equivariant contact homology $CH_*^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(-)$	5
3.1	Results for $\widehat{B}(R)$: application to non-squeezing	12
3.2	Computations for $\widehat{B}(R)$	14
4	Squeezing room and non-squeezing	21

2 Squeezing vs. \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant squeezing

We prove Theorem 1.2' by proving an alternate, equivalent statement, Theorem 2.1. To formulate this, let $\text{Cont}_0^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1)$ denote the identity component of the group $\text{Cont}^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1)$ of compactly supported \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant contactomorphisms for the \mathbb{Z}_k -action generated by a vertical shift $\nu : (x, y, t) \mapsto (x, y, t + 1/k)$. By analogy with the definition of contact squeezing [11], define a \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant (contact) squeezing of an open set U_1 into an open set U_2 as $\phi \in \text{Cont}_0^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1)$ such that $\phi(\text{Closure}(U_1)) \subseteq U_2$. Define a coarse \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant squeezing analogously but requiring only $\phi \in \text{Cont}^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1)$. Our main result is:

Theorem 2.1. *For any prime $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\ell < k$, if $R_2 < 1/\ell < R_1$, there is no \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant contact squeezing of $\widehat{B}(R_1)$ into $\widehat{B}(R_2)$, not even a coarse one.*

Remark 2.2. *Note that case $k = 2$ of Theorem 2.1 is implied by the non-existence of a squeezing of $\widehat{B}(1)$ into itself (proved by [11], see Theorem 1.1 above). It will therefore be sufficient for the purposes of proving Theorem 2.1 to establish the case $k > 2$ and we make this assumption in the computations of Section 3.2.*

³ Theorems 1.2 and 1.2' refer to existence of a squeezing only; the required squeezing room could in principle be greater the farther apart R_1 and R_2 are taken.

The equivalence of Theorems 2.1 and 1.2' follows from properties of the contact k -fold cover of $\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1$. Indeed, let $S^1 = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ and, as a manifold, define the k -fold cover of $\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1$ by the covering map

$$\begin{aligned} \tau : \mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1 &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1 \\ (z, t) &\mapsto (\sqrt{k}z, kt). \end{aligned}$$

Assuming the standard contact structure on both base and cover, one has that τ is a contactomorphism. Deck transformations in the cover are then also contactomorphisms; they form a cyclic group isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}_k , generated by ν . We have:

Lemma 2.3. $\text{Cont}_0^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1) = \{\tilde{\phi} : \phi \in \text{Cont}_0(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1)\}$ where $\tilde{\phi}$ is the unique lift (as a compactly supported diffeomorphism) of ϕ . Moreover, for any $R_1, R_2 > 0$, $\tilde{\phi}(\widehat{B}(R_1/k)) \subseteq \widehat{B}(R_2/k) \Leftrightarrow \phi(\widehat{B}(R_1)) \subseteq \widehat{B}(R_2)$.

Proof. Each $\phi \in \text{Cont}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1)$ has a unique lift⁴ to a compactly supported diffeomorphism $\tilde{\phi}$ of the k -fold cover and this $\tilde{\phi}$ is a contactomorphism since ϕ was one and the contact structure in the cover is the pullback by τ of its counterpart in the base. Moreover, $\tilde{\phi}$ is \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant by construction since ν is a deck transformation. Thus $\tilde{\phi} \in \text{Cont}_0^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1)$. On the other hand any element $\phi' \in \text{Cont}_0^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1)$ descends to a well-defined contactomorphism ϕ of the base since it commutes with ν , and so we have $\phi' = \tilde{\phi}$. The final statement of the Proposition is immediate because $\tilde{\phi}(\tau^{-1}(\mathcal{U})) \subseteq \tau^{-1}(\mathcal{V}) \Leftrightarrow \phi(\mathcal{U}) \subseteq \mathcal{V}$. \square

As a Corollary, we obtain the claimed equivalence of Theorems 1.2 and 2.1:

Corollary 2.4. $\widehat{B}(R)$ can be squeezed into itself by $\phi \in \text{Cont}_0(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1)$ if and only if $\widehat{B}(R/k)$ can be squeezed into itself by $\tilde{\phi} \in \text{Cont}_0^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1)$. Thus, Theorem 1.2 is equivalent to Theorem 2.1.

Proof. The first statement is immediate from Lemma 2.3. For the equivalence of Theorems note that, once k prime and $\ell < k$ are fixed, R_2 in the hypothesis of Theorem 2.1 can without loss of generality be specified to be arbitrarily close to $1/\ell$, in particular such that $1/k < R_2 < 1/\ell < R_1$ since squeezing $\widehat{B}(R_1)$ into a smaller $\widehat{B}(R_2)$ would imply squeezing $\widehat{B}(R_1)$ into all $\widehat{B}(R)$ for $R_2 \leq R < R_1$. Therefore, Theorem 2.1 is equivalent (putting $R'_i = kR_i$) to non-existence - under the hypothesis k prime, $\ell < k$, and $1 < R'_2 < k/\ell < R'_1$ - of $\phi \in \text{Cont}_0(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1)$ which squeezes $\widehat{B}(R'_1)$ into $\widehat{B}(R'_2)$. Since for every pair $R'_2 < R'_1$ there exist⁵ $k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$ with k prime such that $R'_2 < k/\ell < R'_1$

⁴For shorthand, write $\tau : C \rightarrow B$ where both cover C and base B are $\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1$ and $\phi : B \rightarrow B$ is a compactly supported diffeomorphism. Lift ϕ to the local diffeomorphism $\hat{\phi} : C \rightarrow C$ given by $\hat{\phi} := \phi \circ \tau$. Because $B = \mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1$ and ϕ has compact support, $\hat{\phi}$ acts trivially on $\pi_1(B)$ so $\hat{\phi}$ maps $\pi_1(C)$ to the same subgroup of $\pi_1(C)$ as does τ , namely $k\mathbb{Z} \subset \mathbb{Z} = \pi_1(C)$ and, hence, by the unique lifting property, lifts to $\tilde{\phi} : C \rightarrow C$ such that $\tau\tilde{\phi}(z) = \hat{\phi}(z) = \phi\tau(z)$ which is unique up to composition with deck transformations; of such lifts there is a unique one with compact support.

⁵ Put $\beta = R_1/R_2$ and consider intervals $I_\ell = (\ell R_2, \ell\beta R_2)$, $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\beta > 1$, for sufficiently large ℓ each I_ℓ overlaps with $I_{\ell+1}$ and so by the infinitude of primes $\exists \ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that I_ℓ contains a prime k ; i.e., $R_2 < k/\ell < R_1$.

the above can be restated as non-existence of a squeezing of $\widehat{B}(R'_1)$ into $\widehat{B}(R'_2)$ when $1 < R'_2 < R'_1$. By Remark 1.3 this is equivalent to Theorem 1.2. \square

Remark 2.5 (The implicit role of \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariance in [11]). *Eliashberg-Kim-Polterovich [11] use (non-equivariant) cylindrical contact homology to prove that $\widehat{B}(1)$ cannot be squeezed into itself. They then conclude by a covering space argument that $\widehat{B}(m)$ cannot be squeezed into itself for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Their two-part proof does not emphasize the inherent \mathbb{Z}_m -action; however, in the language of the present section, it amounts to first showing $\widehat{B}(1)$ cannot be squeezed into itself, noting this implies $\widehat{B}(1)$ cannot be squeezed into itself \mathbb{Z}_m -equivariantly, and then using the last statement of Lemma 2.3 to conclude $\widehat{B}(m)$ cannot be squeezed into itself. For the prequantized ball $\widehat{B}(1)$, both \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant squeezing and (non-equivariant) squeezing are impossible and, moreover, $\widehat{B}(1)$ is the only prequantized ball for which the contact homology of [11] can directly⁶ rule out squeezing. A priori, however, non-existence of a \mathbb{Z}_m -equivariant squeezing is a weaker notion than non-existence of a squeezing and could potentially be true in more situations. Indeed, this is the contribution of the present paper. For k prime, we use \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant contact homology to rule out \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant squeezing of any $\widehat{B}(1/\ell)$, $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ into itself when $\ell < k$ (Theorem 2.1), although such prequantized balls are known by [11] to be squeezable into themselves non-equivariantly (c.f. Theorem 1.1).*

3 \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant contact homology $CH_*^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(-)$

We now define $CH_*^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(-)$, a \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant analog of the (non-equivariant) cylindrical contact homology $CH_*(-)$ developed by Eliashberg-Kim-Polterovich [11] and Kim [15] for $\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1$, which also has similarities to a \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant version of $CH_*(-)$ developed by Milin [16] for a different \mathbb{Z}_k -action. Like these theories, it lies within the general framework of symplectic field theory proposed by Eliashberg-Givental-Hofer [9].

As we give the construction of $CH_*^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(-)$, we recall that of $CH_*(-)$ and explain how well-definedness of $CH_*^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(-)$ follows with only minor modifications from corresponding arguments for $CH_*(-)$ due to [4], [8], [3], [13] with, in addition, the construction of coherent orientations from Bourgeois-Mohnke [5]; these aspects are highlighted in boldface in the construction and addressed in the paragraph “Technical arguments”. Foundational issues with cylindrical contact homology which arise in the presence of multiply covered orbits (see for example [14] for a discussion) are avoided in both our setting and that of Eliashberg-Kim-Polterovich [11] by taking as generators only closed Reeb orbits in the free homotopy class $[\text{pt} \times S^1]$.

⁶The \mathbb{Z} -graded vector spaces $CH_*(\widehat{B}(R))$ are isomorphic for all $R > 1$ and differ from $CH_*(\widehat{B}(r))$ for $r < 1$. This makes the invariants suitable to directly rule out only squeezing of $\widehat{B}(R)$ into $\widehat{B}(r)$ (since we allow squeezings to have arbitrarily large support - see Remark 3.7).

In Section 3.1 we state our main results for $CH_*^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\widehat{B}(R))$, showing how they imply non-squeezing. In Section 3.2 we give proofs of these statements as well as a proof of analogous statements for $CH_*(\widehat{B}(R))$ with \mathbb{Z}_k -coefficients. Our aim is for the present paper to serve as an extension of Eliashberg-Kim-Polterovich [11] in which the reader familiar with [11] can view non-squeezing at large scale from the vantage point provided by contact homology.

Remark 3.1. *To keep our presentation compact: we assume $k > 2$ from now on. The construction below applies equally well to the case $k = 2$ but this would require specification of a different projective resolution to compute equivariant homology (see Remark 3.2) and result in slightly different⁷ chain complexes in equivariant computations. Since we do not need the case $k = 2$ (see Remark 2.2) we omit it.*

For the remainder of this Section, put $V = \mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1$ and recall that we endow V with the \mathbb{Z}_k -action on V generated by the vertical shift ν . An open domain $U \subset V$ with compact closure is said to be *fiberwise star-shaped* [11] if its boundary ∂U is transverse to the fibers $M \times \{t\}$, $t \in S^1$ and intersects them along hypersurfaces transverse to the Liouville vector field L determined by $\alpha_L = i_L \omega$. In particular prequantized balls $\widehat{B}(R)$ are fiberwise star-shaped. Let \mathcal{U} , resp. \mathcal{U}_k , be the class of domains $\psi(U)$ such that U is fiberwise star-shaped, resp. fiberwise star-shaped and \mathbb{Z}_k -invariant, and $\psi \in \text{Cont}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1)$, resp. $\psi \in \text{Cont}^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1)$.

Admissible forms. Given $U \in \mathcal{U}_k$, we construct the \mathbb{Z} -graded vector space $CH_*^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(U)$ as [11] constructed $CH_*(U)$ for $U \in \mathcal{U}$. Denote by $\mathcal{F}_{ad}(U)$ the set of all *admissible* contact forms on U , namely those λ which equal $K(dt - \alpha_L)$, K a constant, outside a compact set such that the Reeb flow of λ has no contractible closed orbits of action (i.e. period) $\leq K$. We will moreover impose the restriction $\lambda = F \cdot (dt - \alpha_L)$, where $F > 0$ is a positive Hamiltonian⁸ on V . Let $\mathcal{F}_{ad}(U, \epsilon) \subset \mathcal{F}_{ad}(U)$ consist of those forms which do not have ϵ as *critical value*, i.e. do not have a closed Reeb orbit γ of action $\mathcal{A}(\gamma) = \epsilon$. Denote by $\mathcal{F}_{ad}^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(U, \epsilon)$ those $\lambda \in \mathcal{F}_{ad}(U, \epsilon)$ which are \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant. As in [11], endow these spaces of contact forms with the “anti-natural” partial order \preceq :

$$\lambda'' \preceq \lambda' \Leftrightarrow \lambda'' \geq \lambda'.$$

An admissible contact form λ equal to $K(dt - \alpha_L)$ outside a compact set is said to be *regular* if all orbits γ in

$$\mathcal{P}_\lambda := \{\gamma : \mathcal{A}(\gamma) < K, [\gamma] = [\text{pt} \times S^1]\}$$

are *non-degenerate*. Here $[\gamma]$ denotes the free homotopy class of γ as a loop $S^1 \rightarrow V$ and non-degeneracy means the restriction of the Poincaré return map

⁷In all these complexes multiplication by $(T - 1)$ must be replaced with multiplication by $(T + 1)$.

⁸This is a stricter \mathcal{F}_{ad} than in [11]; it is sufficient for our purposes and streamlines the presentation.

for the Reeb flow of λ along γ to the contact hyperplane bundle does not have 1 as eigenvalue. By standard arguments generic admissible contact forms are regular.

For regular λ , \mathcal{P}_λ is graded by the Conley-Zehnder index $\mu_{CZ}(\gamma)$. We assume the definition in Robbin-Salamon [17] which differs by $-n$ from that in [11] (Note Erratum to [11]). Using λ , identify the symplectization W of V with $(V \times \mathbb{R}, d(s\lambda))$. Let ξ and τ denote the hyperplane bundles on W which are respectively pull-backs of the standard contact structure on S^{2n-1} and $\ker(\lambda)$ on V , via the obvious projections (here we view S^{2n-1} as the ideal contact boundary of \mathbb{R}^{2n} with standard contact structure inherited from α_L). Write R_λ for the Reeb vector field of λ . Consider almost complex structures J on $V \times \mathbb{R}$ which are *adjusted* to λ in the sense of [11]: J is invariant under translations in the \mathbb{R} -coordinate, $J\tau = \tau$ and $J|_\tau$ is compatible with $d\lambda$, $J(\frac{\partial}{\partial s}) = R_\lambda$, and finally, $J\xi = \xi$ outside the symplectization of a compact set in V . When λ is \mathbb{Z}_k -invariant, a J adjusted to λ which is also \mathbb{Z}_k -invariant is said to be \mathbb{Z}_k -*adjusted* to λ .

Chain complex. Given an almost complex structure J adjusted, resp. \mathbb{Z}_k -adjusted, to a regular admissible λ , let $C(\lambda, J)$, resp. $C^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\lambda, J)$, be the vector space generated over \mathbb{Z}_k by orbits in \mathcal{P}_λ and \mathbb{Z} -graded by μ_{CZ} . For a, b which are not critical values of λ , using the action filtration let

$$C^{(a,b)}(\lambda, J) = C(\lambda, J) \cap \text{span}\{\gamma : \mathcal{A}(\gamma) < b\} / \text{span}\{\gamma : \mathcal{A}(\gamma) > a\}$$

and define $C^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (a,b)}(\lambda, J)$ analogously. Now define a differential d exactly as in [11]. For this aspect of the construction we make no changes to the definition of [11], however arguments needed to establish **transversality** require a slight modification as explained below. Note: the definition of the differential in [11] is given in terms of generalized Floer homology; a more accessible, introductory source directly in terms of cylindrical contact homology is [2]. Roughly speaking, for both equivariant and non-equivariant theories we consider for closed Reeb orbits γ_\pm the moduli space $\hat{\mathcal{M}}(\gamma_+, \gamma_-)$ consisting of J -holomorphic cylinders

$$F = (f, a) : (\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1, j) \rightarrow (W, J)$$

asymptotic at the ends to γ_\pm , assuming standard complex structure j on $\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1$ and fixed, arbitrary, parametrization for γ_\pm . In the non-equivariant case, by the genericity of *regular* almost complex structures adjusted to λ - i.e., almost complex structures J such that the associated linearized $\bar{\partial}_J$ operator is surjective at every finite energy J -holomorphic cylinder - we assume the moduli space $\hat{\mathcal{M}}(\gamma_+, \gamma_-)$ forms a smooth oriented manifold. In the equivariant case, we allow only \mathbb{Z}_k -adjusted complex structures and must modify the usual genericity argument as explained below. This manifold $\hat{\mathcal{M}}(\gamma_+, \gamma_-)$, in both equivariant and non-equivariant cases, is acted on by the group $\mathbb{R} \times (\mathbb{R} \times S^1)$ of holomorphic re-parametrizations (of target, domain) and quotienting by these one obtains a smooth oriented manifold $\mathcal{M}(\gamma_+, \gamma_-)$ of dimension $\mu_{CZ}(\gamma_+) - \mu_{CZ}(\gamma_-) - 1$. Since J is standard at infinity and λ has no contractible closed Reeb orbits with action $\leq K$, **compactness** results of [4] show that $\mathcal{M}(\gamma_+, \gamma_-)$ compactifies to

a moduli space of “broken” J -holomorphic cylinders; this applies in both the equivariant and non-equivariant frameworks. In the case $\mu_{CZ}(\gamma_+) - \mu_{CZ}(\gamma_-) = 1$ this compactified moduli space is a compact, oriented 0-dimensional manifold and so consists of a finite number of points with sign. For this, one needs to have arranged a system of **coherent orientations** on moduli spaces in a way which is compatible with glueing, and, in the case of our \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant theory, invariant under the action of \mathbb{Z}_k . This extra property comes for free from the construction of [5] assuming the contact forms and almost complex structures used are \mathbb{Z}_k -invariant (see below). The differential on $C(\lambda, J)$, resp. $C^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\lambda, J)$ is then defined by counting, modulo k , all points in $\mathcal{M}(\gamma_+, \gamma_-)$ with signs. By construction of the compactification [13] it follows that $d^2 = 0$ so $(C(\lambda, J), d)$, resp. $(C^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\lambda, J), d)$, is a chain complex. Moreover, since $F \in \mathcal{M}(\gamma_+, \gamma_-)$ if and only if $\nu F \in \mathcal{M}(\nu\gamma_+, \nu\gamma_-)$ and signs of elements of $\mathcal{M}(\gamma_+, \gamma_-)$ are preserved by ν , it follows that $(C^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\lambda, J), d)$ comes equipped with a \mathbb{Z}_k -action, i.e., d is \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant for the \mathbb{Z}_k -action induced on spaces of Reeb orbits by ν . $CH_*^{(a,b)}(\lambda)$ is defined as the homology of $(C^{(a,b)}(\lambda, J), d)$ after showing it does not depend on J . Likewise we define $CH_*^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (a,b)}(\lambda)$ as the \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant homology of $(C^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (a,b)}(\lambda, J), d)$. Note that any contactomorphism, resp. \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant contactomorphism, ψ will set up a 1-1 correspondence between moduli spaces defined above so there is a chain map, resp. \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant chain map, $\psi_\#$ from the respective chain complex for λ to that for $\psi_*\lambda$ which is an isomorphism in all degrees and thus induces isomorphisms: $\psi_\# : CH_*^{(a,b)}(\lambda) \xrightarrow{\cong} CH_*^{(a,b)}(\psi_*\lambda)$ and $\psi_\# : CH_*^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (a,b)}(\lambda) \xrightarrow{\cong} CH_*^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (a,b)}(\psi_*\lambda)$.

Remark 3.2. (Equivariant homology computation) *In general, given a \mathbb{Z}_k -action on a chain complex (C_*, d) , \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant homology is defined as follows. Let $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{Z}_k[\mathbb{Z}_k] \cong \mathbb{Z}_k[T]/(T^k - 1)$ be the group ring of the group \mathbb{Z}_k with \mathbb{Z}_k -coefficients. Let \mathbb{Z}_k act on \mathbb{Z}_k trivially to make \mathbb{Z}_k into an \mathcal{R} -module. Let (E_*, δ) be any projective resolution of \mathbb{Z}_k (as an \mathcal{R} -module) and tensor (E_*, δ) with (C_*, d) over \mathcal{R} . The \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant homology of (C_*, d) is defined to be the usual homology of this tensor product; up to isomorphism this is independent of the choice of (E_*, δ) since all projective resolutions are quasi-isomorphic as \mathcal{R} -chain complexes (to $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{R} \rightarrow 0$ and so to each other) and thus the resulting tensor products are also quasi-isomorphic. In computations, we follow Milin [16] and - assuming $k > 2$ - use the projective resolution*

$$\dots \mathcal{R} \xrightarrow{\cdot(T-1)} \mathcal{R} \xrightarrow{\cdot(T^{k-1} + \dots + 1)} \mathcal{R} \xrightarrow{\cdot(T-1)} \mathcal{R} \xrightarrow{\cdot(T^{k-1} + \dots + 1)} \mathcal{R} \xrightarrow{\cdot(T-1)} \mathcal{R} \rightarrow 0.$$

Monotonicity morphisms. Given $\lambda_- < \lambda_+$, i.e., $\lambda_+ \preceq \lambda_-$, [11] define a monotonicity chain map $\text{mon} : C^{(a,b)}(\lambda_+, J) \rightarrow C^{(a,b)}(\lambda_-, J)$ by considering the moduli space $\hat{\mathcal{M}}(\gamma_+, \gamma_-)$ of J -holomorphic cylinders between γ_\pm which are closed Reeb orbits for λ_\pm respectively, where J is an almost complex structure J adjusted to an admissible concordance structure between λ_\pm . To define these⁹ terms assume $\lambda_\pm = F_\pm(dt - \alpha_L)$, $F_\pm > 0$ and let $W_{a_\pm}^+ = V \times [a_-, a_+]$ with

⁹(translated to contact structures from the language of Hamiltonian structures in [11])

coordinates (v, s) . A function $F : W_{a_-}^{a_+} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is an (admissible) *concordance* between λ_{\pm} if $\frac{\partial F}{\partial s} > 0$, and outside a compact subset of V F depends only on s , while near the respective boundaries $s = a_{\pm}$ F is linear in $\epsilon = \pm(a_{\pm} - s)$ of the form $F(v, s) = (1 \mp \epsilon)F_{\pm}(v)$. By extending the concordance linearly to open ends $V \times (0, a_-)$ and $V \times (a_+, +\infty)$, F provides a re-parametrization of the region $\{F_-(v) \leq s \leq F_+(v)\}$ and the symplectic form $\omega_F = d(F(dt - \alpha_L))$ gives $\overline{W} = V \times \mathbb{R}_+$ the structure of a symplectic cobordism between (V, λ_-) and (V, λ_+) . An almost complex structure on $W_{a_-}^{a_+}$ is *adjusted* to the concordance F if it tames ω_F , and is pseudoconvex at infinity. Standard arguments ([8], [3]) establish transversality so that a generic almost complex structure J adjusted to an admissible concordance is regular in the sense defined earlier. The space of J -holomorphic cylinders $\hat{\mathcal{M}}(\gamma_+, \gamma_-)$ is therefore a smooth oriented manifold (assuming once again a system of coherent orientations) and it is acted upon by the re-parametrization¹⁰ group $\mathbb{R} \times S^1$. After taking the quotient one obtains a smooth manifold $\mathcal{M}(\gamma_+, \gamma_-)$ of dimension $\mu_{CZ}(\gamma_+) - \mu_{CZ}(\gamma_-)$. In particular when $\mu_{CZ}(\gamma_+) = \mu_{CZ}(\gamma_-)$ this is a finite collection of points with sign which we count modulo k and the chain map $\text{mon} : C^{(a,b)}(\lambda_+, J) \rightarrow C^{(a,b)}(\lambda_-, J)$ is defined by setting $\text{mon}(\gamma_+)$ to be the sum over all γ_- weighted by this count $\#\mathcal{M}(\gamma_+, \gamma_-)$. Our definition of concordance is identical to that of [11] except that we require all ingredients to be \mathbb{Z}_k -invariant. More precisely, given \mathbb{Z}_k -admissible forms λ_{\pm} we consider between them \mathbb{Z}_k -concordances, namely concordances which are \mathbb{Z}_k -invariant. Then, given a \mathbb{Z}_k -concordance we say an almost complex structure adjusted to it is \mathbb{Z}_k -adjusted if it is \mathbb{Z}_k -invariant. Slight modifications of the usual transversality arguments (see below) apply in this equivariant version and we obtain, using the same definition as [11], a well-defined monotonicity morphism $\text{mon} : CH^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (a,b)}(\lambda_+, J) \rightarrow CH^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (a,b)}(\lambda_-, J)$. Three natural (iso)morphisms are important - those due to scaling invariance, contactomorphism invariance (ψ_{\sharp}) and window enlargement. We've given ψ_{\sharp} . The other two are also immediate in both equivariant and non-equivariant settings from the definitions. Assume $c > 1$, then there are chain maps

$$\begin{aligned} c_* &: C^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (0,cb)}(c\lambda, J_c) \xrightarrow{\cong} C^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (0,b)}(\lambda, J) \\ \text{win} &: C^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (0,b)}(\lambda, J) \rightarrow C^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (0,cb)}(\lambda, J) \end{aligned}$$

where the second map is an isomorphism in all gradings under the additional hypothesis that λ has no closed Reeb orbits of action in the window $[b, cb]$, and J_c denotes the re-scaled version of J adjusted to $c\lambda$. In general, the composition of c_* and win , in either order, gives mon (see Remark 4.40 in [11] which applies verbatim in our setting). In particular, this allows to extend the definition of mon to the case $\lambda_+ \geq \lambda_-$ by first scaling λ_+ by a suitably small factor $c > 1$. Moreover, by definition, concordances behave well under compactly supported contactomorphisms ψ since these preserve the contact forms at infinity and thus induce equivalent concordances, i.e. concordances F_1 and F_2 related by a diffeomorphism of the corresponding W_1 and W_2 . Indeed, given

¹⁰(there is no longer invariance of J in the s -direction)

Hamiltonians $F'_\pm = F_\pm \circ \psi$ and $\lambda'_\pm = F'_\pm(dt - \alpha_L)$, $\lambda_\pm = F_\pm(dt - \alpha_L)$, the lift of ψ to a diffeomorphism of W allows to pull-back every concordance of λ_\pm to a concordance of λ'_\pm establishing a 1-1 correspondence between these. This implies that mon commutes with ψ_\sharp . The identical argument applies in the equivariant setting assuming $\psi \in \text{Cont}^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1)$ and λ_\pm is \mathbb{Z}_k -admissible. These isomorphisms on chain level then pass to isomorphisms on the level of $CH_*(-)$, respectively $CH_*^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(-)$, so the morphism $\lambda_+ \preceq \lambda_-$ corresponds to $\text{mon} : CH_*(\lambda_+) \rightarrow CH_*(\lambda_-)$ and likewise in the equivariant case, in both cases, commuting with ψ_\sharp , for ψ in the respective group. In principle mon still depends on both the choice of concordance F and of adjusted almost complex structure J . Finally, by a homotopy argument (Proposition 4.30 of [11]) which goes through verbatim in our equivariant setting, [11] show that the functors $CH_*(-)$ and $CH_*^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(-)$ (i.e., not only the vector spaces mentioned before but also monotonicity morphisms mon) are independent of these choices. We omit J in the notation from now on.

Invariants of domains Let $U \in \mathcal{U}_k$. The morphisms mon make the family of vector spaces $\{CH^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (0, \epsilon)}(\lambda)\}_{\lambda \in \mathcal{F}_{ad}(U, \epsilon)}$ into a directed system over $\mathcal{F}_{ad}(U, \epsilon)$, \preceq and after taking its direct limit, the morphisms mon make resulting vector spaces $\{CH^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (0, \epsilon)}(U)\}_{\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ into an inverse system over \mathbb{R}_+ , \geq . Following [11] we define

$$CH^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(U) := \varprojlim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \varinjlim_{\lambda \in \mathcal{F}_{ad}(U, \epsilon)} CH^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (0, \epsilon)}(\lambda)$$

and make the same definition without superscripts \mathbb{Z}_k for $U \in \mathcal{U}$. Then given $U_1 \subset U_2$ there is an induced morphism $\iota_* : CH^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(U_1) \rightarrow CH^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(U_2)$ and the properties of mon and ψ_\sharp pass to the double limit yielding the following statement in terms of \mathcal{G} -functors¹¹, stated for the non-equivariant setting on p. 1650 of [11]:

Theorem 3.3. *$CH^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(-)$ is a \mathcal{G} -functor from \mathcal{U}_k to \mathbb{Z} -graded vector spaces, for $\mathcal{G} = \text{Cont}^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1)$.*

Technical arguments. Whereas Eliashberg-Kim-Polterovich [11] restricted to \mathbb{Z}_2 -coefficients in order to streamline their presentation avoiding the need for coherent orientations, these can be produced by the now-standard construction of Bourgeois-Mohnke [5] (see also Bourgeois-Oancea [6]) which pulls back orientations from the orientations of determinant line bundles over certain spaces of Fredholm operators. When all ingredients in the construction are \mathbb{Z}_k -invariant, the orientations on these bundles are as well, and hence so too their pull-backs. This means $CH_*(-)$ of [11] is well-defined with \mathbb{Z}_k -coefficients and we re-prove their results for $\widehat{B}(R)$ using \mathbb{Z}_k -coefficients, $k > 2$ in the next Section.

The compactification results used to define the differential in [11] are obtained as a consequence of the restriction on the action of closed contractible

¹¹Repeating footnote 3 of [11]: Given a group \mathcal{G} acting on category \mathcal{U} , a \mathcal{G} -functor on \mathcal{U} is a functor F and a family of natural transformations $g_\sharp : F \rightarrow F \circ g$, $g \in \mathcal{G}$, such that $(gh)_\sharp = g_\sharp \circ h_\sharp$ for all $g, h \in \mathcal{G}$; see also the reference to Jackowski and Slominska in [11]

Reeb orbits for admissible contact forms and the requirement that almost complex structures be standard outside the symplectization of a compact subset Ξ of V . This second condition means $S\Xi$ is foliated by weakly J -convex hypersurfaces so all J -holomorphic cylinders project to Ξ . Given this and the absence of contractible closed Reeb orbits in \mathcal{P}_λ , the results from [4] imply the needed compactification and glueing statements proving $d^2 = 0$. The above goes through verbatim in our equivariant setting as well.

The needed transversality arguments for J -holomorphic cylinders in both symplectizations and concordances are obtained in [11] by a version of standard arguments from Floer theory (appearing for the contact case in [11], [8], see also the version of this argument in [3]). In particular, in the language of [3], given an almost complex structure J adjusted to λ it suffices to find for every non-trivial, finite energy J -holomorphic cylinder $F = (f, a)$ in $W = V \times \mathbb{R}$ an *injective point* $p \in \mathbb{R} \times S^1$. This is a point p such that $Proj df|_p \neq 0$ and $f^{-1}(f(p)) = \{p\}$, where $Proj$ is the projection along R_λ . Existence of an injective point in each J -holomorphic cylinder is guaranteed by the fact that near the ends of each holomorphic cylinder f restricts to an embedding [13]. One injective point implies a neighbourhood of such and this allows to perturb the almost complex structure J to a regular one. In our \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant framework, we need to perturb while retaining \mathbb{Z}_k -invariance of the almost complex structure. For this it suffices to require existence of a \mathbb{Z}_k -injective point, namely an injective point in the above sense which also satisfies¹² $f^{-1}(\{f(p), \nu f(p), \dots, \nu^{k-1} f(p)\}) = \{p\}$. In fact, when $\mu_{CZ}(\gamma_+) - \mu_{CZ}(\gamma_-) = 1$ it is not possible for both γ_\pm to be fixed by the \mathbb{Z}_k -action and so applying [13] near the non-fixed orbit yields already a \mathbb{Z}_k -injective point; however, we need to handle the case $\mu_{CZ}(\gamma_+) = \mu_{CZ}(\gamma_-)$ in dealing with concordances and so give a general argument below. Transversality of almost complex structures J adjusted to concordances is obtained in [11]'s setting by the same argument with injective points as for J adjusted to a single contact form: it suffices to find for every finite energy J -holomorphic cylinder an injective point (accomplished as before by [13]). In our case, we perturb J in two steps and appeal to the fact that our \mathbb{Z}_k -action is a covering space action on $W_{a_-}^{a_+}$ (resp. W when proving transversality for cylinders in symplectizations). First, we find a \mathbb{Z}_k -invariant perturbation of J (re-denoted J) such that the linearized $\bar{\partial}_J$ operator is surjective at every finite energy J -holomorphic cylinder $G = (g, a)$ which is \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant for the \mathbb{Z}_k -action on $R \times S^1$ generated by a $1/k$ shift along S^1 (recall the standard almost complex structure on $R \times S^1$ is S^1 -invariant). Such cylinders do not exist when γ_\pm are not fixed by the \mathbb{Z}_k -action so for certain pairs of gradings this first step may be vacuous. It is accomplished by noting that every \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant J -holomorphic cylinder G is the lift to the k -fold cover of a J_0 -holomorphic cylinder G_0 from the base of $R \times S^1$ to the non- \mathbb{Z}_k -invariant base of $W_{a_-}^{a_+}$ (resp. W) with adjusted complex structure J_0 . By the usual argument with injective points there is a perturbation of J_0 which makes $\bar{\partial}_{J_0}$ surjective at all finite energy cylinders G_0 ; the lift of this perturbation yields a \mathbb{Z}_k -invariant

¹²This definition is due to [16], but our case is simpler since our \mathbb{Z}_k -action is a covering space action.

perturbation of J with the desired property. Now, as a second step we assume $\bar{\partial}_J$ is already surjective at all finite energy \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant J -holomorphic cylinders and consider an arbitrary J -holomorphic cylinder $G = (g, a)$. If the image of G is \mathbb{Z}_k -invariant, it must be that g and hence G is \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant (indeed g and νg must be related by a holomorphic re-parametrization of $(\mathbb{R} \times S^1, j)$, but this is necessarily a translation and amounts asymptotically along γ_{\pm} to a shift by $1/k$, hence is exactly a shift by $1/k$). Assume therefore that the image of G is not \mathbb{Z}_k -invariant so $\nu^j G(\mathbb{R} \times S^1) \neq G(\mathbb{R} \times S^1)$ for any $j \in U(k)$. Intersection points of holomorphic curves can accumulate only at critical points of both curves so taking a point p which is injective in the usual sense and has image $g(p)$ in the interior of $W_{a_{\pm}^+}$ (resp. an injective point near the ends of W) we consider a neighbourhood U of p consisting also of injective points (by openness of this condition). Since $G(U)$ can intersect the other holomorphic cylinders $\nu^j G(\mathbb{R} \times S^1)$, $j \in U(k)$ at only finitely many points, there is necessarily a point p' (and hence smaller neighbourhood $U' \ni p'$) which is \mathbb{Z}_k -injective.

3.1 Results for $\widehat{B}(R)$: application to non-squeezing

In this Section we state two results, Theorems 3.5 and 3.6, concerning \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant contact homology of prequantized balls and show that together they imply our main result, Theorem 2.1. For comparison, we also state Theorem 3.4, a non-equivariant version of Theorem 3.5 which is a direct analog with \mathbb{Z}_k -coefficients of Eliashberg-Kim-Polterovich's result for $CH_*(\widehat{B}(R))$ with \mathbb{Z}_2 -coefficients (Theorem 1.28 and page 1721 of [11], with different grading convention). Proofs of these results are then given in Section 3.2. We remark that our proof¹³ of Theorem 3.4 uses only contact homology, and does not pass to generalized Floer homology as did the proof of Eliashberg-Kim-Polterovich; it thus provides an alternative, more direct, proof of their result as well.

Theorem 3.4 (c.f. Theorem 1.28 and page 1721 [11]). *When $1/R \notin \mathbb{N}$*

$$CH_m(\widehat{B}(R)) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{Z}_k, & \text{if } m = -n - 2n[1/R] \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Moreover, if $[1/R_1] = [1/R_2]$ then the morphism induced by inclusion $\widehat{B}(R_2) \subset \widehat{B}(R_1)$ is an isomorphism in the grading $m = -n - 2n[1/R_1] = -n - 2n[1/R_2]$.

By comparison, for \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant contact homology we have:

Theorem 3.5. *When $R > 1/k$ and $1/R \notin \mathbb{N}$*

$$CH_m^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\widehat{B}(R)) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{Z}_k, & \text{if } m \geq -n - 2n[1/R] \\ 0, & \text{if } m < -n - 2n[1/R]. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, if $R_1 \geq R_2 > 1/k$ then the morphism induced by inclusion $\widehat{B}(R_2) \subset \widehat{B}(R_1)$ is an isomorphism in all gradings $m \geq -n - 2n[1/R_1]$.

¹³Though we have formally restricted to $k > 2$ to simplify the presentation of \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant proofs (see Remark 3.1) this non-equivariant argument goes through without change for \mathbb{Z}_2 -coefficients.

Broadly speaking, the basic computations for $CH_*(\widehat{B}(R))$ and $CH_*^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\widehat{B}(R))$ are similar in that - in both cases - we find dominating sequences of contact forms λ such that the chain complex $(C(\lambda)_*^{(0,\epsilon)}, d)$ is quasi-isomorphic to $0 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_k \rightarrow 0$ with non-trivial chain module in degree $m_0 = -n - 2n[1/R]$. A major difference in the two cases, however, is that non-equivariant homology $H_m(0 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_k \rightarrow 0)$ is non-trivial (equal to \mathbb{Z}_k) iff $m = m_0$, while \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant homology $H_m^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(0 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_k \rightarrow 0)$ is non-trivial (equal to \mathbb{Z}_k) iff $m \geq m_0$.

Not only can we conclude from Theorem 3.5 that the morphism $CH_*^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\widehat{B}(R)) \rightarrow CH_*^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\widehat{B}(R_\dagger))$ induced by an inclusion $\widehat{B}(R) \subset \widehat{B}(R_\dagger)$ is an isomorphism in all degrees for which both $CH_*^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\widehat{B}(R))$ and $CH_*^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\widehat{B}(R_\dagger))$ are non-trivial, a stronger, ψ -perturbed, result also holds:

Theorem 3.6. *Given $\psi \in \text{Cont}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1)$ and $R_\dagger, R > 1$ such that $\psi(\widehat{B}(R)) \subset \widehat{B}(R_\dagger)$, the inclusion morphism $CH_*^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\psi(\widehat{B}(R))) \rightarrow CH_*^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\widehat{B}(R_\dagger))$ is an isomorphism in all degrees for which both $CH_*^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\widehat{B}(R))$ and $CH_*^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\widehat{B}(R_\dagger))$ are non-trivial.*

Given the \mathcal{G} -functoriality of $CH_*^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(-)$ for $\mathcal{G} = \text{Cont}^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1)$ (Theorem 3.3), Theorems 3.5 and 3.6 together imply Theorem 2.1:

of Theorem 2.1. Suppose $\psi \in \text{Cont}_0^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1)$ squeezes $\widehat{B}(R_1)$ into $\widehat{B}(R_2)$ and $R_2 < 1/\ell < R_1$. By Remark 1.3 we may without loss of generality assume R_2 to be as close to $1/\ell$ as desired, in particular, assume $1/k < R_2$. By hypothesis $[\frac{1}{R_1}] < \ell < [\frac{1}{R_2}]$.

We have $\psi(\widehat{B}(R_2)) \subset \psi(\widehat{B}(R_1)) \subset \widehat{B}(R_2)$. By Theorem 3.6 the inclusion morphism $CH_{p,\mathbb{Z}_k}(\psi(\widehat{B}(R_2))) \rightarrow CH_{p,\mathbb{Z}_k}(\widehat{B}(R_2))$ is an isomorphism for p in the grading range $-n \geq p \geq -n - 2n[\frac{1}{R_2}]$.

Let $p = -n - 2n\ell$. Then $CH_{p,\mathbb{Z}_k}(\widehat{B}(R_1)) = 0$ by Theorem 3.5; hence, $CH_{p,\mathbb{Z}_k}(\psi(\widehat{B}(R_1))) = 0$ by Theorem 3.3. This is a contradiction, as the isomorphism $CH_{p,\mathbb{Z}_k}(\psi(\widehat{B}(R_2))) \rightarrow CH_{p,\mathbb{Z}_k}(\widehat{B}(R_2))$ must factor through $CH_{p,\mathbb{Z}_k}(\psi(\widehat{B}(R_1)))$ by Theorem 3.3. \square

Remark 3.7 (Comparison with the argument of [11]). *The proof just given for Theorem 2.1 is in the same general spirit as Eliashberg-Kim-Polterovich's proof that $\widehat{B}(R_1)$ cannot be squeezed into $\widehat{B}(R_2)$ for $R_2 < 1 < R_1$. Their argument (generalized in Proposition 1.26 of [11]) uses the non-vanishing of an inclusion morphism $CH_{-n}(\psi(\widehat{B}(R_1))) \rightarrow CH_{-n}(\widehat{B}(R_\dagger))$ for large¹⁴ R_\dagger and $CH_{-n}(\widehat{B}(R_2)) = 0$ both of which are given when $R_2 < 1 < R_1$. This strategy does not work verbatim in our setting because $R_2 < R_1$ implies $CH_m^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(R_1) \neq 0 \Rightarrow CH_m^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\widehat{B}(R_2)) \neq 0$ in all gradings $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. A squeezing ψ of $\widehat{B}(R_1)$ into $\widehat{B}(R_2)$ implies, however, multiple interleavings, $\psi(\widehat{B}(R_2)) \subset \psi(\widehat{B}(R_1)) \subset \widehat{B}(R_2) \subset \widehat{B}(R_1)$, so one is not confined to have the "smaller R_j " be the "monkey-in-the-middle": we use the first pair of inclusions, while [11] use essentially the final*

¹⁴They need $R_\dagger > 1$ such that $\widehat{B}(R_\dagger)$ contains the support of ψ .

pair. As we will see in Section 3.2, Theorem 3.6 which played a key role in our proof is also very much related to the isomorphism $CH_{-n}^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\psi(\widehat{B}(R_2))) \rightarrow CH_{-n}^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\widehat{B}(R_\dagger))$ which holds for large R_\dagger .

3.2 Computations for $\widehat{B}(R)$

of Theorems 3.4 and 3.5. To prove all parts of these Theorems (and later Theorem 3.6 as well) we use similar Hamiltonians. We first describe these in detail then give arguments for: (I) the first statements of both Theorems, (II) monotonicity morphisms when $[1/R_1] = [1/R_2]$, and (III) monotonicity morphisms when $[1/R_1] < [1/R_2]$.

Let $R > 0$, assume $\epsilon > 0$ and fix $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Let $m_0 := [1/R]$ (so $1/(m_0 + 1)R < 1 < 1/m_0R$) and consider a 1-dimensional family¹⁵ of piecewise-linear functions $F := F_c$, $c \in (1, \infty)$ as shown in Fig. 1 such that the value $b \in (0, 1)$ is determined by c as specified below, and F consists of three linear pieces:




Figure 1: Graphs of Hamiltonians $F(u) := F_c(u)$ on $\widehat{B}(R)$ whose smoothings define contact forms $(dt - \alpha_L)/F$ with a single closed Reeb orbit at $\{0\} \times S^1$ of action $1/c$ and no other closed Reeb orbits with action in the window $(0, \epsilon)$. Here m denotes $m_0 = [1/R]$ and we assume $1 < 1/\delta < 1/m_0R$ so there are no closed Reeb orbits corresponding to tangencies at $(a, F(a))$. Orbits for $(b, F(b))$ on the other hand do not contribute when ϵ is small since their action is bounded below by $1/c_m$.

a left-most linear piece of slope $-c\delta$ which passes through $(0, c)$ and $(1/\delta, 0)$, a middle linear piece of twice that slope which passes through $(b, 1)$, and a right-most piece, on the interval (b, ∞) which is horizontal. The parameter b is required to be an increasing function $b = f(c)$ of c such that $\lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} f(c) = 1$, and $f(c + 1) < f(c) + 1/2(c + 1)\delta$ for sufficiently large c . For example $f(c) =$

¹⁵These functions are similar to ones defined by [16] but we fix δ and make other simplifications.

$1 - 1/c$ satisfies this inequality for $c > 2\delta$. A quick computation shows that the conditions on the middle segment of F_c , namely its slope and choice of $b = f(c)$, imply $\frac{1}{2}F_{c+1} \leq F_c$. Abusing notation, we define the Hamiltonian F_c on \mathbb{R}^{2n} to be the above function of the variable $u = w/R$, for $w = \pi|z|^2$. This lifts to an S^1 -invariant Hamiltonian on $\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1$ equal to 1 outside $\widehat{B}(R)$; when clear from context we will use the same name to refer to F_c as a function of the real variable u or as a Hamiltonian on \mathbb{R}^{2n} or $\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1$. Now, consider only $c \in (C, \infty) =: \mathbb{R}_C$ for suitable $C > 2/\epsilon$ such that $f(c) > 1/(m_0 + 1)R$ for all $c > C$. The family of Hamiltonians just defined is non-decreasing in c . We consider the subsequence $\{F_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}_C}$ where $\mathbb{N}_C := \mathbb{N} \cap \mathbb{R}_C$. Note this is a dominating sequence of (non-smooth) Hamiltonians on $\widehat{B}(R)$.

We will now smooth each F_i in small neighbourhoods of its corners in such a way that the new tangent lines remain “sufficiently close” to those of the original F_i and the sequence of functions remains non-decreasing and dominating. To make these conditions precise, assume the smoothing operator A_Δ has one parameter $\Delta > 0$ which determines the fineness of the smoothing such that: (1) by decreasing Δ , $A_\Delta(F)$ becomes arbitrarily C^0 -close to F , (2) whenever F is linear on $(u - \Delta, u + \Delta)$ then $A_\Delta(F)(u) = F(u)$, and (3) when $(u - \Delta, u + \Delta)$ contains a single corner of F , $A_\Delta(F)(u) \geq F(u)$ with $A_\Delta(F)(u)$ convex in the case F is convex over the interval, and $A_\Delta(F)(u) \leq F(u)$ with $A_\Delta(F)(u)$ concave in the case of concavity. Consider $F := F_i$ for some $i \in \mathbb{N}_C$. For sufficiently small Δ , $F^A := A_\Delta(F)$ is a positive, non-increasing function with $F^A(u) = c(1 - \delta u)$ for small u and $F^A(u) \equiv 1$ for $u \geq 1$. It is easily verified the contact form $\lambda_{F^A} := (dt - \alpha_L)/F^A(u)$ has one closed Reeb orbit at $\{0\} \times S^1$ of action $1/F(0) = 1/c$ and spaces of closed Reeb orbits of action $1/c_m$ along spheres of constant u -value such that $-(F^A)'(u)/(F^A(u) - u(F^A)'(u)) = mR$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. We denote each such u -value by u_m and the sphere $\{u = u_m\}$ by S_m . In this case, $c_m = -mR/(F^A)'(u_m)$. On the other hand, for small Δ , tangent lines to F^A are well approximated by so-called “generalized tangent lines” to the original piecewise linear F : these are either true tangent lines at points p of linearity or else lines of slope $s \in [s_1, s_2]$ which pass through a corner point p where linear portions with slopes $s_1 < s_2$ meet. As a result, one can read off the closed Reeb orbits of λ_{F^A} and their approximate actions from the graph of the un-smoothed F (c.f. Remark 5.2 [16]): F^A has one isolated orbit at $\{0\} \times S^1$ with action $1/c$ where c is the vertical intercept of F , and it has an S^{2n-1} -family of orbits with action arbitrarily close to $1/c_m$ corresponding to each generalized tangent line to F at $(b, F(b))$ that is horizontal ($m = 0$) or has horizontal intercept $1/mR > 0$ ($m = 1, 2, \dots, m_0$) with c_m being in either case the vertical intercept of the generalized tangent line, always less than $1/(1 - m_0R)$.

If one imposes $1/\delta < 1/m_0R$ then (with $c > C$) this implies there are no generalized tangent lines at $(a, F(a))$ with horizontal intercept $1/mR$, $R \in \mathbb{N}$ and, thus, no corresponding closed Reeb orbits (see Fig. 1). Otherwise, in general, there will be Reeb orbits corresponding to $(a, F(a))$ and all have action greater than c (see Fig. 2). Let $u = \bar{u}_m$ respectively be the u -values where

such tangencies to the smoothing occur, and $S_m := \{u = \bar{u}_m\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ the corresponding spheres.

We now require the Δ_i which defines a smoothing of F_i , $i \in \mathbb{N}_C$ to be sufficiently small that the true vertical intercepts of the tangent lines to the smoothing have the same ordering and lie on the same side of $1/\epsilon$ as those of generalized tangent lines to F_i . Note we have fixed $\epsilon > 0$ while computing $\varinjlim_{\lambda' \in \mathcal{F}_{ad}(\widehat{B}(R), \epsilon)} CH^{(0, \epsilon)}(\lambda')$. In addition Δ_i should be sufficiently small that the Δ_i -windows centred at corners of F_i do not overlap. Finally because $\{F_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}_C}$ is non-decreasing we can take each Δ_i small enough that the smoothing $(F_i)^A := A_{\Delta_i}(F_i)$ will satisfy $(F_{i-1})^A \leq (F_i)^A \leq F_{i+1}$ and because $\frac{1}{2}F_i \leq F_{i-1} \leq F_i$ we can further reduce Δ_i if necessary so that $\frac{1}{2}(F_i)^A < (F_{i-1})^A \leq (F_i)^A$. Inductively, the first condition implies the sequence $\{(F_i)^A\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}_C}$ is non-decreasing; the second condition will be used to control monotonicity morphisms.

The above produces $SU(n)$ -invariant Morse-Bott functions $(F_i)^A$ on $\mathbb{R}^{2n} = \mathbb{C}^n$ with critical submanifolds $\{0\} \times S^1$ and the spheres S_m (if any). We now perturb each $(F_i)^A$ following the Morse-Bott computational framework of Bourgeois [1] in order to obtain a Morse function \widehat{F}_i on \mathbb{R}^{2n} which is \mathbb{Z}_k -invariant near each S_m (for a \mathbb{Z}_k -action to be specified) and for which we know certain parts of the associated contact homology chain complex $CH^{(0, \epsilon)}(\lambda_{\widehat{F}_i})$. The perturbing functions are constructed as follows. Choose an arbitrarily C^0 -small \mathbb{Z}_k -invariant Morse function $g : S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with k maxima M_1, \dots, M_{k-1} and k minima m_1, \dots, m_{k-1} , $M_j = e^{2j\pi i/k}$ and $m_j = e^{(2j+1)\pi i/k}$, for the \mathbb{Z}_k -action generated by rotation through $2\pi/k$. Now consider an arbitrarily C^0 -small Morse function $f : \mathbb{C}P^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with one critical point of each even index $2j$, $j = 0, \dots, (n-1)$ and its pullback $\pi^*f : S^{2n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ via the Hopf bundle map $\pi : S^{2n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}P^{n-1}$. This is a Morse-Bott function on S^{2n-1} with critical submanifolds which are isolated Hopf circles. Perturb π^*f by adding to it a radially attenuated extension of g supported in a small tubular neighbourhood of each critical Hopf circle. This produces a Morse function $h : S^{2n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with k critical points each of index $2j$ and $2j+1$ for $j = 0, \dots, n-1$ and whose Morse complex is

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{R} \xrightarrow{p(T)} \mathcal{R} \xrightarrow{(T-1)} \mathcal{R} \xrightarrow{p(T)} \dots \xrightarrow{(T-1)} \mathcal{R} \xrightarrow{p(T)} \dots \xrightarrow{(T-1)} \mathcal{R} \longrightarrow 0$$

where each arrow is multiplication by the specified polynomial $(T-1)$ or $p(T) = T^{k-1} + \dots + T + 1 \in \mathcal{R}$. The function h is \mathbb{Z}_k -invariant for any¹⁶ \mathbb{Z}_k -action on $S^{2n-1} \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ generated by multiplication by $e^{2\pi im/k}$, $m \in U(k)$. Fix a particular choice of m and re-label the $2k$ critical points in every index if necessary so that permutation of generators of the chain modules \mathcal{R} induced by the chosen \mathbb{Z}_k -action on S^{2n-1} is given by multiplication by T . Then the above chain complex is the \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant Morse complex for h for the chosen \mathbb{Z}_k -action on S^{2n-1} . Let \widehat{F}_i denote the Morse function on \mathbb{R}^{2n} which is obtained by adding to $(F_i)^A$ a

¹⁶The reader comparing with Milin's argument should note that she uses only $m = 1$; we need vary m because our \mathbb{Z}_k -action induces on each S_m a different \mathbb{Z}_k -action, namely that generated by multiplication by $e^{2\pi im/k}$.

radially attenuated extension of h supported in a small tubular neighbourhood \mathcal{N}_m of each critical sphere S_m of $(F_i)^A$. On each $S_m \times S^1$ there are then $2kn$ non-degenerate closed Reeb orbits for $\lambda_{\widehat{F}_i}$ which may be identified consistently with the $2kn$ critical points of \widehat{F}_i on S_m . The vertical shift contactomorphism ν on $\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1$ moreover permutes these orbits in $S_m \times S^1$ according to multiplication by $e^{2\pi im/k}$ of the corresponding critical points of \widehat{F}_i in S_m . Since $[1/R] < k$, the action is free, i.e., $m \in U(k)$ (this is important). As above, assume labeling of the k critical points of each index on S_m such that the associated permutation of these points as generators $1, T, \dots, T^{k-1}$ of the chain module \mathcal{R} is given by multiplication by T . On the small neighbourhood \mathcal{N}_m of each S_m , the function \widehat{F}_i is a \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant Morse function for the \mathbb{Z}_k -action given by multiplication by $e^{2\pi im/k}$. By [1] the Conley-Zehnder indices of closed Reeb orbits for the contact form $\lambda_{\widehat{F}_i}$ are determined by Morse indices of corresponding critical points of \widehat{F}_i and the differentials in the chain complex $(C^{(0,\epsilon)}, d)(\lambda_{\widehat{F}_i})$ corresponding to concordances between critical points in a common sphere S_m are the same as the corresponding differentials in the \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant Morse complex of \widehat{F}_i . When $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small, so that only closed Reeb orbits corresponding to $(0, F_i(0))$ and $(a, F_i(a))$ have action in the window $(0, \epsilon)$, then letting $m_0 = [1/\delta]$ (which may be greater than $[1/R]$) and $\ell \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ be such that $m_0 + \ell = [1/R]$, respective Conley-Zehnder indices of closed Reeb orbits for \widehat{F}_i are $-n - 2nm_0, 2n - 2n(m_0 + 1), \dots, 2n - 2n(m_0 + \ell)$ and the chain complex $(C^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (0,\epsilon)}, d)(\lambda_{\widehat{F}_i})$ is therefore $0 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_k \xrightarrow{d_{m_0}} C[-n - 2nm_0] \xrightarrow{d_{m_0+1}} C[-n - 2n(m_0 + 1)] \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow C[-n - 2n(m_0 + \ell)] \rightarrow 0$ where $C[j]$ denotes a sub-complex which is the Morse complex for h shifted in grading by j ; only the \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant differentials d_{m+1} corresponding to concordances between Reeb orbits on adjacent spheres S_m and S_{m+1} are not immediately known. We assume once again (as for the operator A_Δ) that the perturbations used to construct \widehat{F}_i are suitably C^0 -small and carried out successively on $(F_i)^A$, $i \in \mathbb{N}_C$.

(I) To simplify the notation put $\lambda_i := \lambda_{(F_i)^A}$. These contact forms, which are S^1 -invariant hence \mathbb{Z}_k -invariant, constitute a dominating sequence not only for $\mathcal{F}_{ad}^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\widehat{B}(R), \epsilon)$ but also for $\mathcal{F}_{ad}(\widehat{B}(R), \epsilon)$. Moreover, each Morse-Bott function $(F_i)^A$ has only one critical point, namely the origin, and so is already a \mathbb{Z}_k -invariant Morse function; thus, $\widehat{F}_i = (F_i)^A$ and we retain the name $(F_i)^A$. Since λ_i has only the closed Reeb orbit at $\{0\} \times S^1$ and this has Conley-Zehnder index $-n$, for all sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ the chain complex $(C^{(0,\epsilon)}, d)(\lambda_i)$ for each $i \in \mathbb{N}_C$ is $0 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_k \rightarrow 0$ with non-trivial chain module in degree $-n$ and hence $CH_*^{(0,\epsilon)}(\lambda_i)$ and $CH_*^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (0,\epsilon)}(\lambda_i)$ satisfy the formulae we want for $CH_*(\widehat{B}(R))$, resp. $CH_*^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\widehat{B}(R))$. It remains to check that monotonicity morphisms in both equivariant and non-equivariant contact homology are isomorphisms for chosen small $\epsilon > 0$; the above result for specific λ_i will then pass to the double-limit. We give the argument for the non-equivariant case to fix notation but the equivariant case is identical. Fix $i \in \mathbb{N}_C$, and recall that $\frac{1}{2}(F_{i+1})^A \leq (F_i)^A \leq (F_{i+1})^A$. To avoid excessive subscripts put $G = (F_{i+1})^A$. On the one hand, there is a window enlargement isomorphism $CH_*^{(0,\epsilon)}(\lambda_{\frac{1}{2}G}) \xrightarrow{\cong} CH_*^{(0,2\epsilon)}(\lambda_{\frac{1}{2}G})$ because $\frac{1}{2}G$ has no

closed Reeb orbits with action in the window $[\epsilon, 2\epsilon]$ (recall $2/c < \epsilon$). On the other hand, using scaling invariance, we also have an isomorphism $CH_*^{(0,2\epsilon)}(\lambda_{\frac{1}{2}G}) = CH_*^{(0,2\epsilon)}(2\lambda_G) \xrightarrow{\cong} CH_*^{(0,\epsilon)}(\lambda_G)$. Composing these we obtain the monotonicity morphism $\text{mon} : CH_*^{(0,\epsilon)}(\lambda_{\frac{1}{2}G}) \rightarrow CH_*^{(0,\epsilon)}(\lambda_G) = CH_*^{(0,\epsilon)}(\lambda_{i+1})$ is an isomorphism. Since it factors through $\text{mon} : CH_*^{(0,\epsilon)}(\lambda_i) \rightarrow CH_*^{(0,\epsilon)}(\lambda_{i+1})$ and all vector spaces $CH_m^{(0,\epsilon)}(\lambda_i)$ are either trivial or \mathbb{Z}_k this completes the proof of the first statements in Theorems 3.4 and 3.5.

(II) To prove the second statement of Theorem 3.4 we take essentially the same sequence of Hamiltonians for both $\widehat{B}(R_1)$ and $\widehat{B}(R_2)$, however, as functions of their respective canonical coordinates $u_1 := w/R_1$ and $u_2 := w/R_2$ where $w := \pi|z|^2$. Remark that $u_1 = 1/mR_1 \Leftrightarrow u_2 = 1/mR_2 \Leftrightarrow w = 1/m$ and the condition $m_0 = [1/R_1] = [1/R_2]$ implies $1/(m_0 + 1) < R_2 < R_1 < 1/m_0$ so $1/(m_0 + 1)R_j < 1 < 1/m_0R_j$ for both $j = 1, 2$. Now let $\delta_0 > m_0$ but still less than $1/R_1 < 1/R_2$ and put $\delta_1 = \delta_0R_1$, $\delta_2 = \delta_0R_2$. Then $1/\delta_j \in (1, 1/m_0R_j)$ for both $j = 1, 2$. Define Hamiltonians $F_c(u_1)$ for $\widehat{B}(R_1)$ using $\delta = \delta_1$, and Hamiltonians $H_c(u_2)$ for $\widehat{B}(R_2)$ using $\delta = \delta_2$. It follows that H_c and F_c both coincide near $\{0\} \times S^1$ with the Hamiltonian $c(1 - \delta_0u)$. On the other hand, assume the same function f is chosen to define $b = f(c)$ in both families, F_c and H_c . In the first case, f gives values of u_1 ; in the second case of u_2 . Since these are values at which lower corners of the respective Hamiltonian occur and $u = u_jR_j$, $j = 1, 2$ we see that F_c 's lower corner has larger u -value than H_c 's and so $H_c \leq F_c$ for all c . As in (I) we now consider only $c \in \mathbb{R}_C$ for suitable $C > \epsilon/2$ such that $f(c) > 1/(m_0 + 1)R_2$. This implies $f(c) > 1/(m_0 + 1)R_1$ and if necessary we adjust¹⁷ the definition of f so that at least the minimal $N \in \mathbb{N}_C$ satisfies $f(N) < R_2/R_1$. Now consider sequences F_i, H_i , $i \in \mathbb{N}_C$ and assume smoothings are done as above to yield $SU(n)$ -invariant Morse-Bott functions $(F_i)^A$ and $(H_i)^A$ respectively. These each have a single critical point and so are already \mathbb{Z}_k -invariant Morse-functions. Put $\lambda_i^F := \lambda_{(F_i)^A}$ and $\lambda_i^H := \lambda_{(H_i)^A}$. By the same argument as before, each λ_i^F and each λ_i^H has the desired equivariant and non-equivariant contact homology and these pass to the double limit. We claim that for fixed $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small and $i \in \mathbb{N}_C$ sufficiently large the monotonicity morphism induced by $\lambda_i^H \geq \lambda_i^F$ is an isomorphism, thus yielding the desired statement in the double limit. Indeed, $(F_N)^A \leq (H_i)^A$ for sufficiently large i because $\{(H_i)^A\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}_C}$ is a dominating sequence for $\widehat{B}(R_2)$ and $(F_N)^A(u_2) = 1$ for all $u_2 \geq f(N)$ with $f(N) < R_2/R_1$ (recall $u_2 = R_2/R_1$ corresponds to $u = R_2$). At the same time $\lambda_N^F \geq \lambda_i^F$ induces an isomorphism in contact homology for all $i \in \mathbb{N}_C$ by the arguments above so by functoriality and the fact that each $CH_m(\widehat{B}(R))$ is either trivial or 1-dimensional, the inclusion morphism $\iota_* : CH_m(\widehat{B}(R_2)) \rightarrow CH_m(\widehat{B}(R_1))$ is an isomorphism in all gradings m , in particular, the grading $m = -n$ where both vector spaces are non-trivial. Note chain maps $C^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (0,\epsilon)}(\lambda_i^H) \otimes E \rightarrow C^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (0,\epsilon)}(\lambda_i^F) \otimes E$ induced

¹⁷While f takes values between $1/(m_0 + 1)R_2$ and 1 we can re-parametrize it so that an integer value N yields $f(N)$ arbitrarily close to $1/(m_0 + 1)R_1 < R_2/R_1 < 1$ as desired.

by the \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant chain maps $C^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (0, \epsilon)}(\lambda_i^H) \xrightarrow{\cong} C^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (0, \epsilon)}(\lambda_i^F)$ are then also isomorphisms in all gradings so, taking the double limit, we obtain moreover the special case $[1/R_1] = [1/R_2]$ of the second statement of Theorem 3.5.

(III) Finally, to prove the second statement of Theorem 3.5 when $[1/R_1] < [1/R_2]$, consider once again Hamiltonians as above for $\widehat{B}(R_1)$ using $\delta = \delta_1$, and for $\widehat{B}(R_2)$ using $\delta = \delta_2$, where $\delta_1/R_1 = \delta_0 = \delta_2/R_2$ for some choice of δ_0 . Let $m_1 = [1/R_1]$, $m_2 = [1/R_2]$. Now, unlike before, we can no longer simultaneously




Figure 2: Graphs of Hamiltonians $H(u) := H_c(u)$ as in Fig. 1 but where we allow $1/\delta > 1/m_0R$, denoting $m_0 = [1/R]$ once again by m . Smoothings of such H define contact forms $\lambda = (dt - \alpha_L)/H$ which have not only the closed Reeb orbit $\{0\} \times S^1$ with action in the window $(0, \epsilon)$ as in Fig. 1, but additionally closed Reeb orbits corresponding to generalized tangent lines at $(a, H(a))$; unlike orbits for tangencies at $(b, H(b))$, these orbits have action in the window $(0, \epsilon)$.

- for H_c and F_c - prevent generalized tangent lines at the upper corners which have horizontal intercept of the form $1/mR$. Indeed, taking $\delta_0 > m_1$ (but less than $1/R_1$) and C sufficiently large we prevent such lines for F_c as in Fig. 1, but then we necessarily have $\delta_0 \not> m_2$ (because $1/R_1 < 1/R_2 < m_2$) so such tangent lines will occur for H_c as in Fig. 2. We can guarantee, however, that their horizontal intercepts $1/mR_2$ occur only for m such that $m_1 < m < m_2$ by taking $\delta_0 > m_1$ and restricting to $c \in \mathbb{R}_C$ for some $C > \epsilon/2$ such that $f(c) > 1/(m_2 + 1)R_2$. Note, for $m_1 = m_2$ these conditions reduce to those imposed in paragraph (II). As before, take sufficiently large C and now consider perturbed smoothings $\{\widehat{F}_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}_C}$ and $\{\widehat{H}_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}_C}$ which are \mathbb{Z}_k -invariant Morse functions. Note: unlike in (II), the functions $(H_i)^A$ were Morse-Bott with critical submanifolds S_m , $m_1 < m < m_2$. Note $m_2 < k$. Now, fix $\epsilon > 0$ and take $i \in \mathbb{N}_C$ sufficiently large that $F_i(0) = H_i(0) > 1/\epsilon$. Let $\eta > 0$ be a scaling factor such that the line $y = \eta(1 - \delta u)$ is tangent to and lies below \widehat{H}_i . Then $\eta \widehat{F}_i \leq \widehat{H}_i$ and since $1/\delta_1 < 1/m_1 R_1$, the action of all Reeb orbits corresponding to tangent lines to $\eta \widehat{F}_i$ at points near the former “lower corner” of \widehat{H}_i will

be strictly lower than $\eta\widehat{F}_i(0)$. Let $\epsilon_0 < \eta\widehat{F}_i(0)$ be greater than these actions. Note that $\text{mon} : C_*^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (0, \epsilon_0)}(\eta\widehat{F}_i) \rightarrow C_*^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (0, \epsilon_0)}(\widehat{F}_i)$ is then an isomorphism (by composing window enlargement and scaling invariance isomorphisms) and must factor through $C_*^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (0, \epsilon_0)}(\widehat{H}_i)$ by functoriality. This implies the monotonicity morphism $\text{mon} : C_j^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (0, \epsilon_0)}(\widehat{H}_i) \rightarrow C_j^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (0, \epsilon_0)}(\widehat{F}_i)$ is an isomorphism in grading $j = -n - 2nm_1$ since all three chain modules are \mathbb{Z}_k in that grading. Note that shrinking ϵ does not affect monotonicity morphisms except as generators of the respective chain modules appear or disappear. Since when we shrink $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ no closed Reeb orbits of Conley-Zehnder index $-n - 2nm_1$ appear or disappear in chain modules $C_j^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (0, \epsilon_0)}(\widehat{H}_i)$ and $C_j^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (0, \epsilon_0)}(\widehat{F}_i)$, $j = -n - 2nm_1$ we conclude that $\text{mon} : C_j^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (0, \epsilon)}(\widehat{H}_i) \rightarrow C_j^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (0, \epsilon)}(\widehat{F}_i)$ is an isomorphism too in this grading. Because $C_m^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (0, \epsilon)}(\widehat{F}_i) = 0$ in all other gradings m , j is the only grading in which the chain map mon is non-trivial and by reasoning as in (II), one checks that the induced chain map $C_*^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (0, \epsilon)}(\lambda_i^H) \otimes E \rightarrow C_*^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (0, \epsilon)}(\lambda_i^F) \otimes E$ consists of isomorphisms in row j of the double complex $C_*^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (0, \epsilon)}(\lambda_i^H) \otimes E$ and vanishes in all other rows. This implies $\text{mon} : CH_m^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (0, \epsilon)}(\widehat{H}_i) \rightarrow CH_m^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (0, \epsilon)}(\widehat{F}_i)$ is an isomorphism in all gradings $m \geq -n - 2nm_1$. Since this holds for all $\epsilon > 0$ and i sufficiently large it passes to the double limit, implying the inclusion morphism $\iota_* : CH_m^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\widehat{B}(R_2)) \rightarrow CH_m^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\widehat{B}(R_1))$ is an isomorphism for $m \geq -n - 2nm_1$. \square

To prove Theorem 3.6 we use the following:

Lemma 3.8. *Assume a \mathbb{Z}_k -chain map*

$$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{Z}_k & \xrightarrow{c_0^1 p} & \mathcal{R} & \xrightarrow{(T-1)} & \mathcal{R} & \xrightarrow{c_1^1 p} & \dots & \xrightarrow{(T-1)} & \mathcal{R} & \xrightarrow{c_N^1 p} & \dots & \xrightarrow{(T-1)} & \mathcal{R} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
& & a_0 \downarrow & & a_1 \downarrow & & a_2 \downarrow & & & & & & & & a_{2N} \downarrow & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{Z}_k & \xrightarrow{c_0^2 p} & \mathcal{R} & \xrightarrow{(T-1)} & \mathcal{R} & \xrightarrow{c_1^2 p} & \dots & \xrightarrow{(T-1)} & \mathcal{R} & \longrightarrow & 0 & & & &
\end{array}$$

where each arrow is multiplication by the specified field element $a_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_k$, or polynomial $(T-1) \in \mathcal{R}$, $a_j = a_j(T) \in \mathcal{R}$ or $c_i^j p \in \mathcal{R}$ for $p = p(T) = T^{k-1} + \dots + T + 1 \in \mathcal{R}$ and $c_i^j \in U(k)$, $N = nm_1$. Then, if a_0 is a unit of \mathbb{Z}_k , all a_j , $j \in \{1, \dots, 2N\}$ are units of \mathcal{R} . Moreover, the conclusion also holds if the direction of the vertical arrows is reversed but all other hypotheses are the same.

This follows by induction¹⁸ on $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ using the commutativity of \mathcal{R} and the fact that $(T-1)$, the maximal ideal of the local ring \mathcal{R} , contains all non-units and annihilates $p(T)$.

of Theorem 3.6. Fix $\epsilon > 0$. Let $R_0 > 1$ be greater than both R and R_\dagger and also sufficiently large that $\widehat{B}(R_0)$ contains the support of ψ . By Theorem 3.5 the monotonicity morphism $\text{mon} : CH_{-n}(\widehat{B}(R)) \rightarrow CH_{-n}(\widehat{B}(R_0))$ is an isomorphism. Therefore by functoriality (Theorem 3.3) $\text{mon} : CH_{-n}(\psi(\widehat{B}(R))) \rightarrow$

¹⁸The author first encountered this observation in Milin [16].

$\text{CH}_{-n}(\widehat{B}(R_0))$ is an isomorphism and hence, using the fact these vector spaces are all equal to \mathbb{Z}_k , $\text{mon} : \text{CH}_{-n}(\psi(\widehat{B}(R))) \rightarrow \text{CH}_{-n}(\widehat{B}(R_\dagger))$ is an isomorphism too.

Assume dominating sequences of smoothed, perturbed Hamiltonians $\{\widehat{H}_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$, $\{\widehat{H}'_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{\widehat{F}_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ for $\widehat{B}(R)$, $\widehat{B}(R_\dagger)$ and $\widehat{B}(R_0)$ respectively as in part (III) of the previous proof where now the role of R_1 is played by R_0 for which $0 = [1/R_0]$. All contact forms λ_i^H , $\lambda_i^{H'}$ and λ_i^F therefore have a closed Reeb orbit at $\{0\} \times S^1$ with Conley-Zehnder index $-n$; the forms λ_i^F have only this orbit, while the forms λ_i^H , $\lambda_i^{H'}$ have others as well. More precisely, from the discussion of Morse-Bott computations in the previous proof (c.f. Bourgeois [1]) the chain complexes $C_m^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (0, \epsilon)}(\lambda_i^H)$ and $C_m^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (0, \epsilon)}(\lambda_i^{H'})$ are of the form $0 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_k \rightarrow^{d_0} C[-n] \rightarrow^{d_1} C[-n-2n] \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow^{d_\ell} C[-n-2n\ell] \rightarrow 0$ for ℓ respectively given by $[1/R]$ or $[1/R_\dagger]$. Moreover, by \mathcal{G} -invariance, $\mathcal{G} = \text{Cont}^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1)$, $C_m^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (0, \epsilon)}(\psi_* \lambda_i^H)$ is of the same form. By comparison with the known non-equivariant contact homology of the respective domains one deduces that for sufficiently large i , all maps d_j are multiplication by $c^j p(T) \in \mathcal{R}$ for $p(T) = T^{k-1} + \dots + T + 1 \in \mathcal{R}$ and $c^j \in U(k)$.

By shifting the indexing of the sequence $\{H'_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}_C}$ if necessary we may assume that $H'_i \geq H_i \circ \psi$, i.e., $\lambda_i^{H'} \leq \psi_* \lambda_i^H$. There is thus a corresponding induced \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant chain map $\text{mon} : C_m^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (0, \epsilon)}(\psi_* \lambda_i^H) \rightarrow C_m^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (0, \epsilon)}(\lambda_i^{H'})$ which will be as shown in Lemma 3.8, but with all vertical arrows possibly directed upwards. Since $\text{mon} : \text{CH}_{-n}(\psi(\widehat{B}(R))) \xrightarrow{\cong} \text{CH}_{-n}(\widehat{B}(R_\dagger))$ is an isomorphism and the vector spaces $C_m^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (0, \epsilon)}(\lambda_i^{H'})$ and $C_m^{\mathbb{Z}_k, (0, \epsilon)}(\psi_* \lambda_i^H)$ are \mathbb{Z}_k for all sufficiently large i the chain map mon in degree $-n$ must be an isomorphism for all sufficiently large i and the result follows by applying Lemma 3.8 and passing to the double limit. \square

4 Squeezing room and non-squeezing

By using/extending two of the constructions in Eliashberg-Kim-Polterovich [11] - namely, the map $F_N : \mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1$ defined for $N \in \mathbb{Z}$ (see page 1649 of [11]),

$$(z, t) \mapsto (v(z)e^{2\pi N i t} z, t), \quad v(z) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + N\pi|z|^2}}$$

and the squeezing given in Theorem 1.19 of [11] by a positive contractible loop of contactomorphisms of the ideal contact boundary $P = S^{2n-1} \subset \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ - two observations follow.

First, that non-squeezing past $R = m/\ell > 1$ is equivalent to a “squeezing room” requirement for squeezing past $R = m/\kappa < 1$ which is in some cases stronger than what is proved in [11]¹⁹. Second, even this stronger requirement may not be tight.

¹⁹Statements in this Section for $R = m/\kappa$ are to be compared with statements in [11] for $R = m/k$; we have used the letter κ instead of k to avoid confusion with notation of preceding

To see the first observation, note that F_b maps $\widehat{B}(R)$ into $\widehat{B}(R/(1+bR))$ for all $R > 0$ and so in particular maps all of $\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1$ into $\widehat{B}(1/b)$, taking $\widehat{B}(R)$ with $R \in [1, \infty)$ to $\widehat{B}(R')$ with $\mathbb{R}' \in [\frac{1}{b+1}, \frac{1}{b})$. Thus, Theorem 1.2 is equivalent to

Theorem 4.1. *When*

$$\frac{1}{b+1} < \frac{m}{\kappa} < \frac{1}{b} \tag{1}$$

there can be no squeezing of $\widehat{B}(m/\kappa)$ into itself within $\widehat{B}(1/b)$.

In this sense, rigidity at large scale which completely precludes squeezing can be thought of as an infinite squeezing room requirement, and is equivalent to a form of rigidity at small-scale which requires squeezing room determined by the reciprocal integers. With this viewpoint, instead of a single cut-off between flexibility and rigidity of $\widehat{B}(R)$ as R grows, one sees rather a squeezing room requirement which jumps at each reciprocal integer, culminating in an infinite requirement when $R = 1$ is passed.

Theorem 1.5 of [11] established that there is no squeezing of $\widehat{B}(m/\kappa)$ into itself within $\widehat{B}(m/(\kappa - 1))$ but this bound depends on the particular m/κ . If equation (1) holds and m/κ is not too close to $1/b$ - more precisely, if

$$\frac{1}{b+1} < \frac{m}{\kappa} < \frac{1}{b+1/m} \tag{2}$$

then we will have $mb + 1 < \kappa$, i.e.,

$$\frac{m}{\kappa - 1} < \frac{1}{b}$$

so the squeezing room requirement of Theorem 4.1 will (for such m/κ) be strictly stronger than that of Theorem 1.5 of [11].

We now remark that even this stronger squeezing room requirement is not necessarily tight. If one applies Theorem 1.19 of [11] to $\widehat{B}(m/\kappa)$, $m < \kappa$ as done in Remark 1.23 of [11] to $\widehat{B}(1/\kappa)$, one obtains the more general:

Proposition 4.2. *There is a squeezing of $\widehat{B}(m/\kappa)$ into itself within an arbitrarily small neighborhood of $\widehat{B}(m/(\kappa - m))$.*

However, (1) implies $m/(\kappa - m) > 1/b$ so there remains a gap between the required squeezing room and that of known squeezings.

Future work It would be interesting to see if (coarse) squeezings of $\widehat{B}(R)$, $R = m/k < 1$ into itself within arbitrarily small neighborhoods of $\widehat{B}(1/b)$ are possible (or not), perhaps by means beyond the construction of [11] such as

Sections. Considering the effect of the map F_b , κ should be thought of as $\ell + bm$ in this sentence.

“wilder” compactly supported contact isotopies which do not deform the original fiberwise star-shaped domain through fiberwise star-shaped domains, or compactly supported contactomorphisms not isotopic to the identity.

Another direction for future work is extension of the framework of the present paper to prequantizations $M \times S^1$ of other Liouville manifolds M . When M is a sufficiently stabilized Liouville manifold, squeezing at small scale has already been established by Eliashberg-Kim-Polterovich (c.f. Theorems 1.16, 1.19 in [11] of which Theorem 1.1 in our paper re-states the special case $M = \mathbb{R}^{2n}$, $n \geq 2$). We conjecture, and our current work in progress aims to establish, that non-squeezing holds at large scale in some of these settings.

Acknowledgements I would like to express my deep gratitude to Leonid Polterovich for his mathematical guidance during several semesters of my studies (in Computer Science) at the University of Chicago, and for introducing me to the contact non-squeezing problem. None of the work in this paper would have started without the many discussions with him and this work became something of a second PhD for me, bringing me back into Mathematics. In particular the idea to tackle this problem by developing a \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant form of contact homology is due to him. I owe a second debt of gratitude to Isidora Milin whose PhD thesis on orderability of lens spaces was an invaluable resource to me in developing the \mathbb{Z}_k -equivariant theory in this paper and also revealed enlightening similarities between the seemingly unrelated non-squeezing phenomena considered in her setting and ours. I also thank Frédéric Bourgeois for very helpful technical discussions. Finally I thank Yasha Eliashberg. His constant support and encouragement kept this project going despite countless delays. A portion of the writing of this work was completed while visiting Tel Aviv University in May 2014 and the Université de Lyon in June-July 2014. I thank both Leonid Polterovich and Jean-Yves Welschinger for their hospitality and for stimulating discussions. Those visits were partially supported by TAU and the CNRS respectively.

References

- [1] F. Bourgeois, *A Morse-Bott approach to contact homology*. In “Symplectic and contact topology: interactions and perspectives”, eds. Y. Eliashberg, B. Khesin, F. Lalonde, Fields Inst. Commun. **35**, Amer. Math. Soc., 2003, pp. 55-77.
- [2] F. Bourgeois, *Introduction to Contact Homology*. Summer School in Berder: Holomorphic curves and contact topology, 2003.
- [3] F. Bourgeois, *Contact homology and homotopy groups of the space of contact structures*. Math. Res. Lett. **13**(1) (2006), 71-85.
- [4] F. Bourgeois, Y. Eliashberg, H. Hofer, K. Wysocki, and E. Zehnder, *Compactness results in symplectic field theory*, Geom. Topol. **7** (2003), 799-888.

- [5] F. Bourgeois, K. Mohnke, *Coherent orientations in symplectic field theory*. Math. Z. **248**(1) (2004), 123-146.
- [6] F. Bourgeois, A. Oancea, *Symplectic homology, autonomous Hamiltonians, and Morse-Bott moduli spaces*. arXiv:0704.1039 [math.SG] (2007).
- [7] S. Chiu, *Non-squeezing properties of contact balls*. arXiv:1405.1178 [math.SG] (2014).
- [8] D. Dragnev, *Fredholm theory and transversality for noncompact pseudoholomorphic maps in symplectizations*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **57** (2004), 726-763.
- [9] Y. Eliashberg, A. Givental, and H. Hofer, *Introduction to symplectic field theory*. GAFA 2000. In “Visions in Mathematics”, eds. N. Alon, J. Bourgain, A. Connes, M. Gromov, V. Milman, Birkhäuser, 2000, pp. 560-673.
- [10] Y. Eliashberg, L. Polterovich, *Partially ordered groups and geometry of contact transformations*. GAFA **10** (2000), 1448-1476.
- [11] Y. Eliashberg, S. S. Kim, L. Polterovich, *Geometry of contact transformations and domains: orderability versus squeezing*. Geom. Topol. **10** (2006), 1635-1747.
- [12] M. Gromov, *Pseudoholomorphic curves in symplectic manifolds*. Invent. Math. **82** (1985), 307-347.
- [13] H. Hofer, K. Wysocki, E. Zehnder, *Properties of pseudoholomorphic curves in symplectizations. III Fredholm theory*. In “Topics in nonlinear analysis”, Progr. Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl. **35**, Birkhäuser, 1999, pp. 381-475.
- [14] J. Nelson, *Automatic transversality in contact homology I: regularity* arXiv:1407.3993v2 [math.SG] (2015).
- [15] S. S. Kim, *Relative contact homology and contact nonsqueezing*, Ph.D. thesis, Stanford University, 2001.
- [16] I. Milin, *Orderability and Non-squeezing in Contact Geometry*. Ph.D. thesis, Stanford University, 2008.
- [17] J. Robbin and D. Salamon, *The Maslov index for paths*. Topol. **32**(4) (1993), 827-844.
- [18] D. Tamarkin, personal communication and talk, Geometry Seminar, University of Chicago, 2010.