

A NOTE ON THE REPRESENTABILITY OF A CERTAIN HAMILTONIAN CAPACITY

DRAGOMIR L. DRAGNEV

ABSTRACT. In this note we establish a representation property for a certain Hamiltonian capacity on \mathbb{R}^{2n} with the standard symplectic structure. We demonstrate that the value of this capacity on an open set with a contact type boundary is an element of the action spectrum of the boundary.

1. INTRODUCTION

Consider \mathbb{R}^{2n} with the standard symplectic structure $\omega_0 = \sum_{j=1}^n dx_j \wedge dy_j$. Recall the definition of a symplectic capacity on $(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \simeq \mathbb{C}^n, \omega_0)$.

Definition 1. *A (normalized) symplectic capacity is a map which associates to a given set $U \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ a number $c(U)$ with the following properties,*

- (1) Monotonicity: *If $U \subset V$ then $c(U) \leq c(V)$,*
- (2) Symplectic invariance: *$c(\phi(U)) = c(U)$, for any symplectomorphism ϕ of \mathbb{C}^n ,*
- (3) Homogeneity: *$c(aU) = a^2c(U)$ for any real number a .*
- (4) Normalization: *$c(B^{2n}(1)) = c(Z(1)) = \pi$, where $B^{2n}(1)$ is the unit ball in \mathbb{C}^n , centered at the origin and $Z(1) = \{z = (z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n \mid |z_1| < 1\}$*

Notice that it is sufficient to define such a map c with the above properties on open and bounded subsets of \mathbb{C}^n , afterwards we can extend it to any open set as follows,

$$c(U) = \sup\{c(V) \mid V \text{ is bounded and connected and } V \subset U\}$$

and to any subset by:

$$c(E) = \inf\{c(U) \mid U \text{ is open and } E \subset U\}$$

The notion ‘‘symplectic capacity’’ was introduced by Ekeland and Hofer, [6, 7], although the first symplectic invariant, satisfying the axioms of Definition 1, was presented by Gromov in [13]. Now there are many capacity functions derived from various constructions in symplectic topology and for these we refer to the survey paper, [4].

Consider a bounded domain $U \subset \mathbb{R}^{2n} \simeq \mathbb{C}^n$ with smooth boundary $S = \partial U$. The restriction of the symplectic form ω_0 on S gives rise to a line bundle over S , $\mathcal{L}_S = \ker \omega_0|_S \subset TS$ that is,

$$\mathcal{L}_S = \{(x, \xi) \mid \omega_0(\xi, \eta) = 0 \text{ for all } \eta \in T_x S\}$$

The integral curves of the line bundle \mathcal{L}_S , are called *characteristics* of S . Let α be any primitive of ω_0 on \mathbb{C}^n . If γ is a closed characteristic on S we define its *action*

$A(\gamma) = \int_{\gamma} \alpha$ and we define the *action spectrum* of S to be the set:

$$\Sigma(S) = \{k|A(\gamma)| | k \in \mathbb{N}, \gamma \text{ is a closed characteristic of } S\}$$

We point out that if S is a regular level surface of autonomous Hamiltonian function $H = \text{const}$, then the Hamiltonian vector field X_H is a section of \mathcal{L}_S and so in this case the closed characteristics of S are the periodic orbits of X_H on S . The problem of the existence of closed characteristics on a hypersurface of \mathbb{R}^{2n} has been studied extensively and it depends on the symplectic properties of S . Indeed results of M. Hermann, [18] and V. Ginzburg, [12], show that one should not expect the existence of closed characteristics on an arbitrary hypersurface. On the other hand, the validity of Weinstein's conjecture in \mathbb{R}^{2n} , proved by C. Viterbo, [25], guarantees existence of closed characteristics provided that the hypersurface S is of *contact type*. We recall that a hypersurface S in \mathbb{C}^n is called *contact*, if there is a Liouville vector field X , i.e. $L_X \omega_0 = \omega_0$, which is defined in a neighborhood of S and is transversal to S . The hypersurface S is called of *restricted contact type* if the vector field X is globally defined on \mathbb{C}^n . We remark that S. Bates, [2] found examples of hypersurfaces which are of contact type, but not of restricted contact type.

There are several interesting questions to be answered regarding the capacities and one of them concerns their *representability* that is when $c(U) \in \Sigma(\partial U)$? There are several known results in this direction. Most of them concern open sets with restricted contact type (RCT) boundary. It is known that Ekeland-Hofer capacities, [6, 7], Hofer-Zehnder capacity, [19], Viterbo capacity, [27], the Floer-Hofer capacity and etc. enjoy this property for RCT open sets. In general the question of representability of the capacities is a delicate one. D. Hermann showed in [17], that not all symplectic capacities are representable even if U is a RCT open set. In a recent paper, [1], the main result implies the existence of dynamically convex star-shaped levels in \mathbb{R}^4 where the Gromov width is not representable as the action of a closed characteristic. On the other hand all of the above mentioned representable capacities fall in the class of Hamiltonian capacities in D. Hermann's terminology, [17]. In the same reference, [17], Question 1.2.2, he poses the question if all Hamiltonian capacities are representable on open sets with contact type boundary?

In this note we give positive answer to this question for the Floer-Hofer capacity in the terminology [15, 16, 5]. It falls in the class of Hamiltonian capacities. Our main theorem is:

Theorem 1. *Let c be the Floer-Hofer capacity and U be a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^{2n} with contact type boundary. Then $c(U) \in \Sigma(\partial U)$.*

We mention that there are similar representation theorems concerning the Viterbo capacity, and Ekeland-Hofer capacity, for particular open sets with contact type boundary, e.g. U is a tubular neighborhood of Lagrangian torus or a tubular neighborhood of hyperbolic Lagrangian submanifold, cf. [26, 2, 23].

As a consequence of the above theorem, we can strengthen a little bit Theorem 1.3 in view of Remark 1.4 in [5]. We have,

Corollary 1. *Let S be a compact hypersurface in $(\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \omega_0)$ of contact type. Let ϕ be the time-1 map of a compactly supported Hamiltonian H on $[0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ such that $E(\phi) \leq c(S)$. Then there exists $x \in S$ such that $\phi(x) \in \mathcal{L}_x S$.*

Next, we provide a brief description of the strategy of the proof of Theorem 1. It exploits ideas similar to the ones used in [25, 20, 6]. We thicken the boundary $S = \partial U$, i.e. using the contact definition we foliate a neighborhood of S , into diffeomorphic images of S , $\{S_\delta\}$, $\delta \in (0, \epsilon)$ for small $\epsilon > 0$ and $S = S_0$. Then we find a sequence of Hamiltonians $H_{\delta_k} \in \mathcal{H}_{ad}(U)$, (defined in the next section), and a sequence of critical points $\{x_{\delta_k}\}$ of $\mathcal{A}_{H_{\delta_k}}$, with the property that each x_{δ_k} is a closed characteristic of S_{δ_k} and

$$(1) \quad \sigma(H_{\delta_k}) = \mathcal{A}_{H_{\delta_k}}(x_{\delta_k})$$

where σ is an action selector coming from certain type of Morse homology for the Hamiltonian action functional \mathcal{A}_H , (see Section 2). Then under certain assumptions we would have that

$$(2) \quad c(U) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sigma(H_{\delta_k})$$

Now, if the lengths of the closed characteristics x_{δ_k} are uniformly bounded, we could find a subsequence which of $\{x_{\delta_k}\}$ converging to x_0 - a closed characteristic of $S = S_0$. Assuming that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} H_{\delta_k}(x_{\delta_k}) = 0$, we would get using, (1,2), that

$$(3) \quad c(U) = A(x_0) \in \Sigma(S)$$

This way, the crucial point is to establish the uniform boundedness of the lengths of the closed characteristics $\{x_{\delta_k}\}$. In case U is RCT open this is a consequence of the global definition of the Liouville vector field or equivalently, cf. [19], the existence of a 1-form α_0 on \mathbb{C}^n so that $d\alpha_0 = \omega_0$ on \mathbb{C}^n and $\alpha_0 \wedge (d\alpha_0)^{n-1}$ is a volume form on S . In case U is with contact type boundary we establish the boundedness by utilizing an elegant idea of Ph. Bolle, [3], which was successfully applied by the author in [5]. Namely using the fact that each x_{δ_k} is a deformation of a constant solution for H_{δ_k} , an application of Stokes' theorem implies the desired boundedness.

Acknowledgments. I would like to thank O. Cornea, D. Hermann, K. Honda, U. Hryniewicz and E. Kerman for the interest in this paper and their critical remarks and suggestions.

2. THE FLOER-HOFER CAPACITY.

The Hamiltonian capacity we are concerned here may be obtained by the so-called *action selector method*, cf. [19, 11]. We describe it briefly. The idea is to consider the set of *admissible* Hamiltonians for a given bounded domain U . In general these are functions which are bounded from below, (or above depending on the convention), on U , (usually by 0), which are allowed to grow rapidly near ∂U and have certain growth rate at infinity. We denote this set by $\mathcal{H}_{ad}(U)$. For $H \in \mathcal{H}_{ad}(U)$, we consider the Hamiltonian action functional $\mathcal{A}_H(x)$, $x \in C^\infty(S^1, \mathbb{R}^{2n})$,

$$(4) \quad \mathcal{A}_H(x) = \int_{S^1} x^* \lambda_0 - \int_0^1 H(t, x(t)) dt$$

where λ_0 is some primitive of ω_0 . Then one "selects", $\sigma(H)$ - a critical value of $\mathcal{A}_H(x_0)$ where x_0 is some "topologically visible" periodic orbit of the Hamiltonian vector field X_H and the capacity of U is defined by,

$$(5) \quad c(U) = \inf\{\sigma(H) | H \in \mathcal{H}_{ad}(U)\}$$

We would like to outline how the action selector method we just described, may be used to construct the Floer-Hofer capacity. For the sake of brevity we will just

present the important steps in the construction, to fix the notation. We omit some of the details for which, however, we present references. The Floer-Hofer capacity is based on the computations of the symplectic homology, [9] for balls in [10].

Define the set of admissible Hamiltonians, $\mathcal{H}_{ad}(U)$ for an open bounded set $U \subset \mathbb{C}^n$,

$$\mathcal{H}_{ad}(U) = \{H : S^1 \times \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid H(t, z) \leq 0 \text{ on } \bar{U} \text{ and} \\ H(t, z) = \mu|z|^2 \text{ outside of a compact set}\}$$

The Floer homology, [8, 21], can be thought as an infinite-dimensional version of Morse theory for the Hamiltonian action functional, (4). Choose a *compatible* almost complex structure J on \mathbb{C}^n , that is an almost complex structure, $J^2 = -1$, so that $\omega_0(\cdot, J\cdot) = g_J(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a Riemannian metric on \mathbb{C}^n . Then the gradient lines of (4), satisfy Cauchy-Riemann type PDE,

$$(6) \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial s} + J(t, u) \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \nabla H(t, u) = 0 \text{ for } u \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times S^1, \mathbb{C}^n)$$

Given two critical points x_+, x_- of \mathcal{A}_H , or equivalently periodic orbits for the Hamilton equations $\dot{x} = X_H(x); x(0) = x(1)$, consider the set of solutions, $\mathcal{M}(x_-, x_+, J, H)$, of (6), such that, $\lim_{s \rightarrow \pm\infty} u(s, t) = x_\pm(t)$. An element of $\mathcal{M}(x_-, x_+, J, H)$ is called a *Floer trajectory*. The difference of the actions between the ends of a Floer trajectory, u , is given by *the energy*, $E_J(u)$,

$$(7) \quad \mathcal{A}_H(x_+) - \mathcal{A}_H(x_-) = \int_{\mathbb{R} \times S^1} g_J\left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial s}, \frac{\partial u}{\partial s}\right) ds dt \equiv E_J(u) \geq 0$$

One can assign to each critical point, x of \mathcal{A}_H , under some non-degeneracy assumptions, an index, $\mu_{CZ}(x)$, called *the Conley-Zehnder index*, cf. [22]. Studying the combinatorics of the solutions of (6), yields the *Floer homology groups*, $HF_k^{[a,b]}(H, J)$, which are independent of J for generic choice of the almost complex structure. These groups consists of linear combinations with \mathbb{Z}_2 coefficients of critical points, x of \mathcal{A}_H , with $\mu_{CZ}(x) = k$, $a \leq \mathcal{A}_H(x) < b$. Now using the assumptions on $\mathcal{H}_{ad}(U)$ and the functoriality of the Floer homology, one defines, following [9], the Floer homology groups $HF_k^{[a,b]}(H, J)$ for $H \in \mathcal{H}_{ad}(U)$. Then the symplectic homology groups $S_k^{[a,b]}(U)$ are defined as direct limits of the Floer homology groups. In other words for an *exhausting (cofinal)* family, (H_λ, J_λ) , for $\mathcal{H}_{ad}(U)$, which is 1-parameter family such that if $K \in \mathcal{H}_{ad}(U)$, there exists λ' so that $H_\lambda \geq K$, whenever $\lambda > \lambda'$. Then,

$$(8) \quad S_*^{[a,b]}(U) = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} HF_*^{[a,b]}(H_\lambda, J_\lambda)$$

Recall from [10],

Lemma 1. *The symplectic homology groups of an open ball of radius R , $B_R = B^{2n}(R) \subset \mathbb{C}^n$, satisfy*

$$S_n^{[a,b]}(B^{2n}(R)) = \mathbb{Z}_2 \text{ for } a \leq 0 < b \leq \pi R^2, \text{ and } 0 \text{ otherwise.}$$

$$S_{n+1}^{[a,b]}(B^{2n}(R)) = \mathbb{Z}_2 \text{ for } 0 < a \leq \pi R^2 < b, \text{ and } 0 \text{ otherwise.}$$

$$S_k^{[a,b]}(B^{2n}(R)) = 0 \text{ for } k < n \text{ or } n < k < 3n$$

Let U be an open and bounded subset of \mathbb{C}^n . Without loss of generality we may assume that the origin, $0 \in U$. Let $r > 0$ be a number such that $B^{2n}(r) \subset U$. Pick numbers $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\varepsilon < \pi r^2$ and a number $b > \pi r^2$. Observe that for large b , the natural map,

$$\mathbb{Z}_2 = S_n^{[0,\varepsilon]}(B^{2n}(\rho)) \rightarrow S_n^{[0,b]}(B^{2n}(\rho))$$

vanishes, (see [24]). Let R be sufficiently large so that $B_r = B^{2n}(r) \subset U \subset B^{2n}(R) = B_R$, then we have

$$\mathbb{Z}_2 = S_n^{[0,\varepsilon]}(B_R) \xrightarrow{i_R} S_n^{[0,\varepsilon]}(U) \xrightarrow{i_r} S_n^{[0,\varepsilon]}(B_r) = \mathbb{Z}_2$$

Where i_r, i_R are the inclusion morphisms, cf. [15, 16]. Since the composition $i_R \circ i_r$ is an isomorphism, it follows that $0 \neq \alpha_U = i_R(1) \in S_n^{[0,\varepsilon]}(U)$. One then considers the natural map

$$i_U^b : S_n^{[0,\varepsilon]}(U) \rightarrow S_n^{[0,b]}(U)$$

and the Floer-Hofer (homological) capacity is defined as

$$(9) \quad c(U) = \inf\{b \mid i_U^b(\alpha_U) = 0\}$$

Next we present an alternative definition of the Floer-Hofer capacity utilizing the action selector method. We follow [16], Section 3.2. Let $x_0 \in U$ and $B_r(x_0) \subset U$, where $B_r(x_0)$ is the open ball centered at x_0 with radius r . Denote by $\mathcal{H}_{ad}^{x_0,r}(U)$ the subset of $\mathcal{H}_{ad}(U)$, consisting of functions H with unique minimum at x_0 so that $0 > \min H = H(x_0) > -\pi r^2$. Now given function $H \in \mathcal{H}_{ad}^{x_0,r}(U)$, we consider a function $K \in \mathcal{H}_{ad}(B_r(x_0))$, so that $\min K = K(x_0) = \delta < \pi r^2$ and $H \geq K$ on $S^1 \times \mathbb{C}^n$. For $\delta < \varepsilon < \pi r^2$, we have that

$$HF_n^{[0,\varepsilon]}(K) \simeq \mathbb{Z}_2$$

and the generator is x_0 . Consider the monotonicity morphism, [9],

$$m : HF_n^{[0,\varepsilon]}(K) \rightarrow HF_n^{[0,\varepsilon]}(H)$$

and denote by $\alpha_H = m(x_0)$. Consider the natural inclusion map,

$$i^b : HF_n^{[0,\varepsilon]}(H) \rightarrow HF_n^{[0,b]}(H)$$

and define the number

$$(10) \quad \sigma(H) = \inf\{b \mid i^b(\alpha_H) = 0\}$$

It is proven in [16], Proposition 3.3 that $\sigma(H)$ is a positive critical value of \mathcal{A}_H .

Remark 1. We remark that if $H \in \mathcal{H}_{ad}^{x_0,r}(U)$ as above, it follows from the definition of Floer homology groups that for some compatible almost complex structure J there exists a Floer trajectory for (H, J) , connecting x_0 and $x(t)$ where x_t is a 1-periodic orbit of X_H , so that $\mu_{CZ}(x) = n + 1$ and $\sigma(H) = \mathcal{A}_H(x)$.

The action selector σ , defined above can be extended for all $H \in \mathcal{H}_{ad}(U)$ and the Floer-Hofer capacity is defined as

$$c(U) = \inf\{\sigma(H) \mid H \in \mathcal{H}_{ad}(U)\}$$

We refer to [16], for the details.

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.

We recall the following lemma from [3], Lemma 1. Here we will use the version for \mathbb{R}^{2n} and $p = 1$.

Lemma 2. *Let U be a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^{2n} with contact type boundary $S = \partial U$. There exists $\epsilon > 0$, an open neighborhood V of S in \mathbb{R}^{2n} and a diffeomorphism $\psi : S \times (-\epsilon, \epsilon) \rightarrow V$ so that:*

- i) For all $x \in S$ we have $\psi(x, 0) = x$;*
- ii) $\psi^*\omega = (1+t)q^*(\omega_0|_S) + dt \wedge q^*(\alpha_0)$;*

where α_0 is a 1-form on S , such that, $d\alpha_0 = \omega_0$ and $\alpha_0 \wedge \omega_0^{n-1} \neq 0$ on S , $q : S \times (-\epsilon, \epsilon) \rightarrow S$ is the projection and t is a coordinate on $(-\epsilon, \epsilon)$.

Set

$$\begin{aligned} r &= q \circ \psi^{-1} : V \rightarrow S \\ \beta_0 &= r^*\alpha_0 \\ \Omega &= r^*(\omega_0|_S) \\ z &= t \circ \psi^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

then

$$\omega_0 = (1+z)\Omega + dz \wedge \beta_0$$

Denote the Hamiltonian vector field corresponding to z , by X_z , then we get

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_0(X_z) &= 1 \\ \Omega(X_z, \cdot) &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Let $\epsilon > 0$ be the number given by Lemma 2, we may assume in addition that $1 > \epsilon > 0$. Fix ϵ' such that $\epsilon > \epsilon' > 0$. For $0 < \tau \leq \epsilon$, denote by

$$V_\tau = \psi(N \times (-\tau, \tau)) = \{x \in V \mid z^2(x) < \tau^2\}$$

Consider the 1-form B_0 defined on \mathbb{C}^n by $B_0 = f\beta_0$, where f is a smooth function on \mathbb{C}^n such that $f = 1$ on $V_{\epsilon'}$ and $f = 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^{2n} \setminus V_\epsilon$. This way we get one-form defined on \mathbb{R}^{2n} such that

$$(11) \quad B_0 = \beta_0 \text{ on } V_{\epsilon'}$$

and

$$(12) \quad B_0 = 0 \text{ on } \mathbb{C}^n \setminus V_\epsilon$$

Our next task is to build exhausting family for the set U . Before we proceed we need, the following proposition.

Proposition 1. *The action spectrum $\Sigma(S)$ of a hypersurface S of contact type is a nowhere dense set.*

This proposition appears in many papers as a statement without a proof. B. Gürel has carried out the details of the proof and I thank her and V. Ginzburg for emailing me detailed outline of the proof, [14].

Consider, for sufficiently large $\lambda \notin \Sigma(S)$, smooth functions g and h on \mathbb{R}^+ so that.

- $h'(t) = \lambda$ for $t \in [3\lambda^{-1}, 2\lambda^{-1} + \lambda^{-1/2}]$,
- $h(t) = -\lambda^{-1}$ for $t \in [0, \lambda^{-1}]$,
- $h(t) = -\lambda^{-1} + \lambda^{1/2}$ for $t \geq 3\lambda^{-1} + \lambda^{-1/2}$,
- h is convex on $[\lambda^{-1}, 3\lambda^{-1}]$ and concave on $[2\lambda^{-1} + \lambda^{-1/2}, 3\lambda^{-1} + \lambda^{-1/2}]$,

- $h(2\lambda^{-1}) < 0$
- $g(t) = -\lambda^{-1} + \lambda^{1/2}$ for $t < (\lambda^{1/6} + 1)^2 - \lambda^{-1}$,
- $g'(t) = \mu/2$ for $t > (\lambda^{1/6} + 1)^2$,
- g is convex on $[(\lambda^{1/6} + 1)^2 - \lambda^{-1}, (\lambda^{1/6} + 1)^2]$.

Here $\mu \sim \lambda^{1/6}$ and $\mu \notin \pi\mathbb{Z}$. We remark that due to Proposition 1, we can perturb h slightly, if necessary, to assure that $h'(t) \notin \Sigma(S_t)$, for $t \in [3\lambda^{-1}, 2\lambda^{-1} + \lambda^{-1/2}]$. Now define H_λ as follows.

- $H_\lambda(x) = -\lambda^{-1}$ for $x \in U$,
- $H_\lambda(x) = h(z(x))$ for $x \in \bigcup_{0 \leq \nu < 3\lambda^{-1} + \lambda^{-1/2}} S_\nu$,
- $H_\lambda(x) = g(|x|^2)$ for $|x| > \lambda^{1/6}$,
- $H_\lambda(x) = -\lambda^{-1} + \lambda^{1/2}$ for $x \in B^{2n}(\lambda^{1/6}) \setminus \{U \cup \bigcup_{0 \leq \nu < 3\lambda^{-1} + \lambda^{-1/2}} S_\nu\}$.

It is clear that $\{H_\lambda\}$ is an exhausting family for U . Next perturb each $H_\lambda(x)$, for $x \in U \cup_{\tau \in [0, \lambda^{-1}]} S_\tau$, as in [15, 5], to get non-degenerate family with unique prescribed global minimum at the origin $0 \in U \setminus \bigcup_{\tau \in (-\epsilon, 0)} S_\tau$, which we assumed to be in U . Abusing the notation we call the new family again H_λ . We can arrange the perturbation in such a way, so that each H_λ , is bounded together with its derivatives by λ^{-1} on \bar{U} . In particular we choose a constant $C_3 > 0$ so that for $x \in \bar{U}$ we have,

$$|X_{H_\lambda}(x)| \leq C_3 \lambda^{-1}$$

Next couple each H_λ with a compatible non-degenerate almost complex structure J_λ .

Standard arguments as in [20, 15], show that for sufficiently large, but fixed λ , $0 < \sigma(H_\lambda) = \mathcal{A}_{H_\lambda}(x_{\tau(\lambda)})$, where $x_{\tau(\lambda)} \in S_{\tau(\lambda)}$ and $0 \leq \tau(\lambda) < 3\lambda^{-1} + \lambda^{-1/2}$. Moreover $x_{\tau(\lambda)}$ solves an equation of the form, $\dot{x} = \rho X_z(x)$, where $\rho = h'(\tau(\lambda))$. Our goal is to show that the length of $x_{\tau(\lambda)}$ is bounded independently of λ .

We know from Remark 1, that there is a Floer trajectory for H_λ, J_λ , u s.t. $\lim_{s \rightarrow -\infty} u = 0$ and $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} u = x_{\tau(\lambda)}(t)$. Then,

$$(13) \quad \mathcal{A}_{H_\lambda}(x_{\tau(\lambda)}) - \mathcal{A}_{H_\lambda}(0) = E_{J_\lambda}(u) = \int_{\mathbb{R} \times S^1} \omega_0(u_s, u_t - X_{H_\lambda}(u)) ds dt$$

Consider now holomorphic change of the variables $\sigma : \dot{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times S^1$, where $\dot{D} = D \setminus \{0\}$, and D is the unit disk in \mathbb{C} . Set $v(s, t) = u(\sigma(s, t))$, here, by abusing the notation we consider $s + it$ to be the holomorphic coordinate on D . Then we have that v , satisfies,

$$(14) \quad \frac{\partial v}{\partial s} + J_\lambda(t, v) \frac{\partial v}{\partial t} + \nabla H_\lambda(v) = 0$$

with $\lim_{s \rightarrow 0} v(s, t) = 0$ and $\lim_{s \rightarrow 1} v(s, t) = x_{\tau(\lambda)}(t)$. Moreover we have that,

$$E_{J_\lambda}(u) = E_{J_\lambda}(v) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\dot{D}} (|v_s|_{g_{J_\lambda}}^2 + |v_t - X_{H_\lambda}(v)|_{g_{J_\lambda}}^2) ds dt$$

Write $\int_{\dot{D}} = \int_D^I + \int_D^{II} + \int_D^{III}$, where \int_D^I , means that the integration is taken over (s, t) , for which $v(s, t) \in \bar{U}$, in \int_D^{II} , integration is over (s, t) for which $v(s, t) \in \overline{U \cup V_\epsilon} \setminus \bar{U}$, and in \int_D^{III} the integration is over the remaining values of $(s, t) \in \dot{D}$.

Consider the space of all almost complex structures J on \mathbb{C}^n , compatible with ω_0 . Denote, as before, by g_J the corresponding metric, i.e., $g_J(\cdot, \cdot) = \omega_0(\cdot, J\cdot)$.

Since the set $\overline{U \cup V_\epsilon}$ is a compact subset of \mathbb{C}^n , there is a constant $C_2 > 0$ so that on $\overline{U \cup V_\epsilon}$ we have that,

$$|\xi|_{g_J} \geq \sqrt{C_2} |\xi|_{g_{J_0}} = \sqrt{C_2} |\xi|$$

for any $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^n$. Here $J_0 = i$ is the standard complex structure on \mathbb{C}^n . Let $C_1 > 0$ be a constant such that,

$$C_1 |\xi| |\eta| \geq |dB_0(\xi, \eta)|$$

for all $\xi, \eta \in \mathbb{C}^n$. Observe that we can extend $X_{H_\lambda}(v)$ smoothly over the puncture $s = 0$ by setting it equal to 0. We have then,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\dot{D}} (|v_s|_{g_{J_\lambda}}^2 + |v_t - X_{H_\lambda}(v)|_{g_{J_\lambda}}^2) ds dt &\geq \frac{C_2}{2} \int_{\dot{D}} (|v_s|^2 + |v_t - X_{H_\lambda}(v)|^2) ds dt \\ &\geq \frac{C_2}{2} \int_{\dot{D}} (|v_s|^2 + |v_t|^2/2 - |X_{H_\lambda}(v)|^2) ds dt \\ &\geq C_2/\sqrt{2} \int_{\dot{D}} |v_s| |v_t| ds dt - C_2/2 \int_{\dot{D}} |X_{H_\lambda}(v)|^2 ds dt \\ &\geq C_2/(\sqrt{2}C_1) \int_{\dot{D}} |dB_0(v_s, v_t)| ds dt - C_2/2 \int_{\dot{D}} C_3^2 \lambda^{-2} ds dt \\ &\geq \frac{C_2}{\sqrt{2}C_1} \int_{\dot{D}} |dB_0(v_s, v_t)| ds dt - \pi C_2 C_3^2 \lambda^{-2}/2 \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\dot{D}} (|v_s|_{g_{J_\lambda}}^2 + |v_t - X_{H_\lambda}(v)|_{g_{J_\lambda}}^2) ds dt &\geq \frac{C_2}{2} \int_{\dot{D}} (|v_s|^2 + |v_t - X_{H_\lambda}(v)|^2) ds dt \\ &\geq \frac{C_2}{C_1} \int_{\dot{D}} |dB_0(v_s, v_t - X_{H_\lambda}(v))| ds dt = \frac{C_2}{C_1} \int_{\dot{D}} |dB_0(v_s, v_t)| ds dt \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows from the fact that $dB_0(X_{H_\lambda}(v), \cdot) = 0$, when $v \in \overline{U \cup V_\epsilon}$. Observe that $\int_{\dot{D}} |dB_0(v_s, v_t)| ds dt = 0$. In view of the inequalities above we conclude that,

$$E_{J_\lambda}(v) \geq \frac{C_2}{\sqrt{2}C_1} \int_{\dot{D}} |dB_0(v_s, v_t)| ds dt - \pi C_2 C_3^2 \lambda^{-2}/2$$

Further, applying Stokes' theorem, we get,

$$\int_{\dot{D}} |dB_0(v_s, v_t)| ds dt \geq \left| \int_{\dot{D}} dB_0(v_s, v_t) ds dt \right| = \left| \int_{S^1} x_{\tau(\lambda)}^* \beta_0 \right| = |h'(\tau(\lambda))|$$

And we obtain that

$$\sigma(H_\lambda) - H_\lambda(0) = \mathcal{A}_{H_\lambda}(x_{\tau(\lambda)}) - \mathcal{A}_{H_\lambda}(0) = E_{J_\lambda}(u) \geq \frac{C_2}{\sqrt{2}C_1} |h'(\tau(\lambda))| - \pi C_2 C_3^2 \lambda^{-2}/2$$

and this shows,

$$|\rho| = |h'(\tau(\lambda))| \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}C_1}{C_2} (c(H_\lambda) - H_\lambda(0) + \pi C_2 C_3^2 \lambda^{-2}/2)$$

Since $\sigma(H_\lambda)$ is bounded independently of λ , (it is less than the capacity of some large ball containing $\overline{U \cup V_\epsilon}$), we conclude that $|\rho|$ is bounded independently of λ , and therefore so is the length of $x_{\tau(\lambda)}$. Applying Arzela - Ascoli theorem, we can

find a sequence $\{\lambda_k \rightarrow \infty\}$, s.t., $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \tau(\lambda_k) = 0$, $c(U) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sigma(H_{\lambda_k})$, and $x_0 = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x_{\tau(\lambda_k)}$ is a closed characteristic on $S_0 = S$. Moreover

$$c(U) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_{S^1} x_{\tau(\lambda_k)}^* \lambda_0 - \int_0^1 H_{\lambda_k}(x_{\tau(\lambda_k)}) dt \right) = \int_{S^1} x_0^* \lambda_0 \in \Sigma(S)$$

REFERENCES

- [1] Abbondandolo, A.; Bramham, B.; Hryniewicz, U. L.; Salomão, P. A. S. Systolic ratio, index of closed orbits and convexity for tight contact structures on the three sphere. arXiv: math.SG/1710.06193.
- [2] Bates, S. A capacity representation theorem for some non-convex domains. *Math. Z.* 227 (1998), 571–581.
- [3] Bolle, Ph. A contact condition for p -codimensional submanifolds of a symplectic manifold ($2 \leq p \leq n$). *Math. Z.* 227 (1998), no. 2, 211–230.
- [4] Cieliebak, K.; Hofer, H.; Latschev, J.; Schlenk, F. Quantitative symplectic geometry. *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.*, 54, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge (2007), 144.
- [5] Dragnev, D. L. Symplectic rigidity, symplectic fixed points and global perturbations of Hamiltonian systems. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 61 (2008), no. 3, 346–370.
- [6] Ekeland, I.; Hofer, H. Symplectic topology and Hamiltonian dynamics. *Math. Z.* 200 (1989), no. 3, 355–378.
- [7] Ekeland, I.; Hofer, H. Symplectic topology and Hamiltonian dynamics. II. *Math. Z.* 203 (1990), no. 4, 553–567.
- [8] Floer, A. The unregularized gradient flow of the symplectic action. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 41 (1988), no. 6, 775–813.
- [9] Floer, A.; Hofer, H. Symplectic homology. I. Open sets in C^n . *Math. Z.* 215 (1994), no. 1, 37–88.
- [10] Floer, A.; Hofer, H.; Wysocki, K. Applications of symplectic homology. I. *Math. Z.* 217 (1994), no. 4, 577–606.
- [11] Frauenfelder, Urs; Ginzburg, Viktor; Schlenk, Felix Energy capacity inequalities via an action selector. *Geometry, spectral theory, groups, and dynamics*, 129–152, *Contemp. Math.*, 387, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2005.
- [12] Ginzburg, V. Hamiltonian dynamical systems without periodic orbits. *Northern California Symplectic Geometry Seminar*, 35–48, *Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2*, 196, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1999.
- [13] Gromov, M. Pseudoholomorphic curves in symplectic manifolds, *Invent. Math.* 83 (1985), 307–347.
- [14] Gürel, B. Email communication.
- [15] Hermann, D. Holomorphic curves and Hamiltonian systems in an open set with restricted contact-type boundary. *Duke Math. J.* 103 (2000), no. 2, 335–374.
- [16] Hermann, D. Inner and outer Hamiltonian capacities. *Bull. Soc. Math. France* 132 (2004), no. 4, 509–541.
- [17] Hermann, David Symplectic capacities and symplectic convexity, preprint 2006.
- [18] Herman, M. Exemples de flots hamiltoniens dont aucune perturbation en topologie C^∞ n’a d’orbites périodiques sur un ouvert de surfaces d’énergies. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sr. I Math.* 312 (1991), no. 13, 989–994.
- [19] Hofer, Helmut; Zehnder, Eduard Symplectic invariants and Hamiltonian dynamics. *Birkhäuser Advanced Texts: Basler Lehrbücher*. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1994. xiv+341 pp.
- [20] Hofer, H.; Zehnder, E. Periodic solutions on hypersurfaces and a result by C. Viterbo. *Invent. Math.* 90 (1987), no. 1, 1–9.
- [21] Salamon, D. Lectures on Floer homology. *Symplectic geometry and topology* (Park City, UT, 1997), 143–229, *IAS/Park City Math. Ser.*, 7, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1999.
- [22] Salamon, D.; Zehnder, E. Morse theory for periodic solutions of Hamiltonian systems and the Maslov index. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 45 (1992), no. 10, 1303–1360.
- [23] Théret, D. A Lagrangian camel. *Comment. Math. Helv.* 74 (1999), 591–614.
- [24] Viterbo, C. Functors and computations in Floer homology with applications. I. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 9 (1999), no. 5, 985–1033.

- [25] Viterbo, C. A proof of Weinstein's conjecture in \mathbb{R}^{2n} . *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré, Anal. Non Linéaire* 4 (1987), 337–356.
- [26] Viterbo, Claude Plongements lagrangiens et capacités symplectiques de tores dans R^{2n} . *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sr. I Math.* 311 (1990), no. 8, 487–490.
- [27] Viterbo, Claude Symplectic topology as the geometry of generating functions. *Math. Ann.* 292 (1992), no. 4, 685–710.