

A PROOF OF KOSNIOWSKI CONJECTURE

ZHI LÜ

ABSTRACT. Let M be a unitary S^1 -manifold with only isolated fixed points such that M is not a boundary. We show that $4\chi(M) > \dim M$, where $\chi(M)$ is the Euler characteristic of M . This gives an affirmative answer of Kosniowski conjecture.

1. INTRODUCTION

A unitary manifold is a smooth closed manifold with a stably complex structure on its tangent bundle. With respect to smooth S^1 -actions on unitary manifolds, there is a standing more than 40-year-old conjecture, posed by Kosniowski in his 1979's paper [10, Conjecture A]. Specifically speaking, suppose that M is a unitary S^1 -manifold with isolated fixed points such that M is not a boundary. Kosniowski conjectured that the number of fixed points is greater than $f(\dim M)$ where f is some (linear) function. He further noted that the most likely function is $f(x) = \frac{x}{4}$. We know from [1, Chapter 1, (1.5)] that $\chi(M) = \chi(M^{S^1})$ where $\chi(\cdot)$ denotes the Euler characteristic and M^{S^1} is the fixed point set. So $\chi(M)$ is equal to the number of fixed points. With this result together, Kosniowski conjecture is stated as follows.

Conjecture 1.1 (Kosniowski). *Suppose that M is a nonbounding unitary S^1 -manifold with isolated fixed points. Then*

$$4\chi(M) > \dim M.$$

Remark 1. *It is well-known that if M is a unitary S^1 -manifold with isolated fixed points, then $\dim M$ must be even. Write $\dim M = 2n$, then Conjecture 1.1 becomes $2\chi(M) > n$.*

Unitary manifolds form a class of nice behaved geometric objects, including complex manifolds, almost complex manifolds and symplectic manifolds etc. Thus, Kosniowski conjecture will probably play an important role on the various areas, such as topology, complex geometry, symplectic geometry, transformation groups and so on.

When $\chi(M) = 2$, in his thesis Kosniowski first proved the conjecture and determined that the possible value of n is 1 or 3 (also see [9, 10]). Under the condition that the S^1 -action on M^{2n} can be extended to the T^n -action on M^{2n} , Lü–Tan in [14] proved the conjecture. Ma–Wen in [16] also discussed the case in which the S^1 -action on M^{2n} can be extended to the T^{n-1} -action on M^{2n} . When $\chi(M) = 3$ and M is assumed to be almost complex, Jang showed in [7] that only $n = 2$ happens, so the conjecture holds in this case. In the setting of compact symplectic manifolds with symplectic circle actions fixing isolated points, Pelayo–Tolman showed

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 58J26, 57S25, 32Q55, 37C25.

Key words and phrases. Kosniowski conjecture, unitary S^1 -manifold, rigid $T_{x,y}$ -genus.

The author is partially supported by the NSFC grant No. 11971112.

in [19] that if the weights satisfy some subtle condition, then the action has at least $n + 1$ isolated fixed points. In the setting of almost complex manifolds with circle actions, Li–Liu showed in [13] that if an almost complex manifold M has some nonzero Chern number, then any S^1 -action on M must have at least $n + 1$ fixed points. All these provide the evidence to support the conjecture.

The main tool used here is the localization formula of rigid $T_{x,y}$ -genus of M in terms of the fixed point data, essentially due to Krichever [11], which is a generalization of Atiyah–Hirzebruch formula for the χ_y -genus of a complex S^1 -manifold ([2]). We will see that this formula plays an essential role on our work. We first read out a system of equations from the localization formula of the $T_{x,y}$ -genus of M . Then using Newton’s formula, we further change this system into a new system such that its coefficient matrix is a Vandemonde matrix, from which we induce some cyclic equalities if $\chi(M) < [\frac{n}{2}] + 1$, giving a contradiction. This establishes $\chi(M) \geq [\frac{n}{2}] + 1 > \frac{n}{2}$, thus obtaining the affirmative answer of Kosniowski conjecture. The result is stated as follows.

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose that M is a nonbounding unitary S^1 -manifold with isolated fixed points. Then $4\chi(M) > \dim M$.*

Making use of the localization formula of rigid L -genus, our approach is automatically applied to the case of oriented S^1 -manifolds, so we also have that

Theorem 1.3. *Suppose that M is a nonbounding oriented closed smooth S^1 -manifold with isolated fixed points. Then $2\chi(M) > \dim M$.*

This note is organized as follows. In Section 2 we review the relative work with respect to genera and rigidity, especially for $T_{x,y}$ -genus and its rigidity, and state a useful lemma. In Section 3 we give the proof of Theorem 1.2. Finally we carry out a simple investigation on the relation between the Euler characteristic and the top Chern number of a unitary S^1 -manifold in Section 4.

2. THE $T_{x,y}$ -GENUS OF UNITARY S^1 -MANIFOLDS

First let us review the relative work with respect to genera and rigidity.

2.1. Genera and rigidity. In his seminar book [5], Hirzebruch introduced various multiplicative genera. A genus which is an invariant of unitary bordism classes can be defined by a homomorphism $\phi : \Omega_*^U \rightarrow R$ where Ω_*^U is the complex bordism ring and R is a commutative ring with unit. If we assume that R has no additive torsion, then ϕ is completely determined by $\phi \otimes \mathbb{Q} : \Omega_*^U \otimes \mathbb{Q} \rightarrow R \otimes \mathbb{Q}$. Using universal R -valued characteristic classes of special type, Hirzebruch gave the explicit description of $\phi \otimes \mathbb{Q}$. For any multiplicative genus ϕ , there always exists a multiplicative sequence $\{K_i(c_1, \dots, c_i)\}$ of polynomials given by a characteristic series such that $\phi(M) = K_n(c_1, \dots, c_n)[M]$ where c_i is the i -th Chern class of a unitary manifold M of $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} M = n$ and $[M]$ is the fundamental homology class of M .

It is well-known that a multiplicative genus $\phi : \Omega_*^U \rightarrow R$ can induce an equivariant genus $\phi^G : \Omega_*^{U,G} \rightarrow K(BG) \otimes R$, where $\Omega_*^{U,G}$ is the ring of complex bordisms of unitary manifolds with actions of a connected compact Lie group G . A multiplicative genus ϕ is called *rigid* if $\phi^G(M) = \phi(M)$ for any connected compact group G , i.e., $\phi(M) \in R$. The rigidity for S^1 implies the rigidity for G (also see

[2, 3, 11]), so the former one is more essential. When $G = S^1$, the universal classifying space BS^1 is $\mathbb{C}P^\infty$, so the ring $K(BS^1) \otimes R$ is isomorphic to the ring of formal power series $R[[u]]$, where R is often chosen as \mathbb{Q} .

In [2], Atiyah–Hirzebruch proved that L -genus (i.e., signature) is rigid for oriented S^1 -manifolds and χ_y -genus is rigid for complex S^1 -manifolds, and gave the corresponding localization formulae. In [11], Krichever introduced the equivariant $T_{x,y}$ -genus. He proved the rigidity of $T_{x,y}$ -genus of an almost S^1 -manifold M and established the localization formula of $T_{x,y}$ -genus of M . As noted in [3, Page 382, Remark], Krichever carried out his work by implicitly assuming manifolds to be almost complex. However, actually his proof automatically extends to the unitary case. For more details, see [3, 4, 11]. In addition, Musin also showed in [18] that if a genus is rigid, then it is $T_{x,y}$ -genus. In the view points of complex analysis and number-theoretic abstraction, $T_{x,y}$ -genus was further discussed in [15].

2.2. Localization formula of $T_{x,y}$ -genus. Throughout the following, assume that M is a unitary manifold with an action of S^1 preserving the unitary structure and fixing only isolated points p_1, \dots, p_m . Choose a fixed point p_i , the tangent space $\mathcal{T}_{p_i}M$ at p_i is a complex S^1 -representation, so this forces $\dim M = \dim \mathcal{T}_{p_i}M$ to be even. Let $\dim M = 2n$. Then $\mathcal{T}_{p_i}M$ can be decomposed into the sum of n irreducible S^1 -representations

$$\mathcal{T}_{p_i}M = \bigoplus_{j=1}^n T_{p_i,j}$$

where the action of S^1 on each $T_{p_i,j}$ is given by $(g, z) \mapsto g^{w_{i,j}} z$ for $z \in T_{p_i,j}$, $g \in S^1$ and some nonzero integer $w_{i,j}$. The collection $\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i,n}\}$, denoted by \mathbf{w}_i , gives the weight set of the complex S^1 -representation $\mathcal{T}_{p_i}M$. The orientation of M and the orientation of the unitary structure on the tangent bundle $\mathcal{T}M$ naturally induce two orientations on $\mathcal{T}_{p_i}M$. Thus, the equivariant Euler class of the normal bundle ν_{p_i} to p_i in M is

$$\chi^{S^1}(\nu_{p_i}) = \varepsilon_i \chi^{S^1}(\mathcal{T}_{p_i}M)$$

where $\varepsilon_i = +1$ if two orientations agree, and $\varepsilon_i = -1$ otherwise.

Let $T_{x,y}(M)$ be the $T_{x,y}$ -genus of M . Its S^1 -equivariant version is denoted by $T_{x,y}^{S^1}(M)$, corresponding to the characteristic series

$$H_{x,y}(u) = \frac{u(xe^{u(x+y)} + y)}{e^{u(x+y)} - 1}.$$

As mentioned as before, the $T_{x,y}$ -genus of M is rigid, so $T_{x,y}(M) = T_{x,y}^{S^1}(M)$. Then the localization formula of $T_{x,y}^{S^1}(M)$ is

$$T_{x,y}^{S^1}(M) = \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i \prod_{j=1}^n \frac{H_{x,y}(w_{i,j}u)}{w_{i,j}u}$$

Write $q^{-1} = e^{(x+y)u}$. Then $T_{x,y}^{S^1}(M)$ becomes

$$(2.1) \quad T_{x,y}^{S^1}(M) = \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i \prod_{j=1}^n \frac{x + yq^{w_{i,j}}}{1 - q^{w_{i,j}}} \in \mathbb{Z}[x, y][[q]]$$

due to Krichever (also see [3, Theorem 9.4.8]). Let \mathbf{w}_i^+ (resp. \mathbf{w}_i^-) denote the collection of all positive weights (resp. all negative weights) in \mathbf{w}_i at the fixed point p_i . By $|\mathbf{w}_i^\pm|$ we mean the number of weights in \mathbf{w}_i^\pm , so $|\mathbf{w}_i^+| + |\mathbf{w}_i^-| = n$. Furthermore, as $q \rightarrow 0$, we have that

Theorem 2.1 (Generalized Atiyah–Hirzebruch formula [11]).

$$T_{x,y}(M) = T_{x,y}^{S^1}(M) = \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i \prod_{j=1}^n \frac{x + yq^{w_{i,j}}}{1 - q^{w_{i,j}}} = \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i x^{|\mathbf{w}_i^+|} (-y)^{|\mathbf{w}_i^-|} \in \mathbb{Z}[x, y].$$

Remark 2. As $q \rightarrow \infty$, there is also another expression of $T_{x,y}(M)$

$$T_{x,y}(M) = \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i x^{|\mathbf{w}_i^-|} (-y)^{|\mathbf{w}_i^+|}.$$

Clearly $T_{x,y}(M) = T_{x,y}^{S^1}(M)$ does not depend on q and (2.1) is actually a Laurant polynomial in q .

Combining with the same terms in $\sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i x^{|\mathbf{w}_i^+|} (-y)^{|\mathbf{w}_i^-|}$, we may write

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i x^{|\mathbf{w}_i^+|} (-y)^{|\mathbf{w}_i^-|} = \sum_{l=0}^n \chi^l(M) x^{n-l} y^l$$

where each $\chi^l(M)$ is an integer. Compare with two sides of the following equation

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i \prod_{j=1}^n \frac{x + q^{w_{i,j}} y}{1 - q^{w_{i,j}}} = \sum_{l=0}^n \chi^l(M) x^{n-l} y^l,$$

an easy observation gives the following formula

$$(2.2) \quad \chi^l(M) = \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i \frac{\sigma_l(q^{w_{i,1}}, \dots, q^{w_{i,n}})}{\prod_{j=1}^n (1 - q^{w_{i,j}})}$$

for $0 \leq l \leq n$, where σ_l is the l -th elementary symmetric function. As far as the author knows, the formula (2.2) without signs ε_i first appeared in [8, (2.3) of Theorem, page 45] and was used very well in [9, page 172].

Remark 3. When $x = 1$, it is well-known that $T_{1,y}(M)$ is exactly the Atiyah–Hirzebruch χ_y -genus

$$T_{1,y}(M) = \chi_y(M) = \sum_{l=0}^n \chi^l(M) y^l.$$

Moreover,

- (1) The signature of M is $\text{Sign}(M) = T_{1,1}(M) = \sum_{l=0}^n \chi^l(M)$;
- (2) The top Chern number of M is $c_n[M] = T_{1,-1}(M) = \sum_{l=0}^n (-1)^l \chi^l(M)$;
- (3) The Todd-genus of M is $\text{Todd}(M) = T_{1,0}(M) = \chi^0(M)$.

The following result can be found in [6] for a complex manifold and in [12] for an almost complex manifold. Actually it can be extended to the unitary situation automatically. Here a simple proof is included for a local completeness.

Lemma 2.2. For $0 \leq l \leq n$,

$$\chi^l(M) = (-1)^n \chi^{n-l}(M).$$

Proof. Using the rigidity of $T_{x,y}$ -genus and replacing q by $\frac{1}{q}$, the formula (2.2) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \chi^l(M) &= \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i \frac{\sigma_l(q^{w_{i,1}}, \dots, q^{w_{i,n}})}{\prod_{j=1}^n (1 - q^{w_{i,j}})} = \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i \frac{\sigma_l(q^{-w_{i,1}}, \dots, q^{-w_{i,n}})}{\prod_{j=1}^n (1 - q^{-w_{i,j}})} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i \frac{\sigma_l(q^{-w_{i,1}}, \dots, q^{-w_{i,n}})}{(-1)^n \left(\prod_{j=1}^n q^{-w_{i,j}} \right) \prod_{j=1}^n (1 - q^{w_{i,j}})} \\ &= (-1)^n \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i \frac{\frac{\sigma_l(q^{-w_{i,1}}, \dots, q^{-w_{i,n}})}{\left(\prod_{j=1}^n q^{-w_{i,j}} \right)}}{\prod_{j=1}^n (1 - q^{w_{i,j}})} = (-1)^n \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i \frac{\sigma_{n-l}(q^{w_{i,1}}, \dots, q^{w_{i,n}})}{\prod_{j=1}^n (1 - q^{w_{i,j}})} \\ &= (-1)^n \chi^{n-l}(M) \end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

Corollary 2.3. If n is odd, then $\text{Sign}(M) = 0$.

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

Let M^{2n} be a unitary manifold with an action of S^1 preserving the unitary structure and fixing only isolated points p_1, \dots, p_m . Suppose further that M^{2n} is not a boundary. Following the notations of Section 2, let $f_i(q) = \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^n (1 - q^{w_{i,j}})}$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$.

Then for $0 \leq l \leq n$, we rewrite the formula (2.2) into the following

$$(3.1) \quad \chi^l(M) = \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i \sigma_l(q^{w_{i,1}}, \dots, q^{w_{i,n}}) f_i(q).$$

We know by Lemma 2.2 that $\chi^l(M) = (-1)^n \chi^{n-l}(M)$. This implies that essentially there are $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor + 1$ different formulae of the form (3.1), where

$$\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor + 1 = \begin{cases} k + 1 & \text{if } n = 2k \\ k + 1 & \text{if } n = 2k + 1. \end{cases}$$

Thus it suffices to consider $k + 1$ formulae of $\chi^l(M)$, $l = 0, 1, \dots, k$. This gives the following system of $k + 1$ equations:

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{cases} \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i \sigma_0(q^{w_{i,1}}, \dots, q^{w_{i,n}}) f_i(q) = \chi^0(M) \\ \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i \sigma_1(q^{w_{i,1}}, \dots, q^{w_{i,n}}) f_i(q) = \chi^1(M) \\ \vdots \\ \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i \sigma_k(q^{w_{i,1}}, \dots, q^{w_{i,n}}) f_i(q) = \chi^k(M). \end{cases}$$

Note that $\sigma_0(q^{w_{i,1}}, \dots, q^{w_{i,n}}) = 1$ for all i . By the Newton's formula (see [17, Problem 16-A])

$$s_l - \sigma_1 s_{l-1} + \dots + (-1)^{l-1} \sigma_{l-1} s_1 + (-1)^l l \sigma_l = 0,$$

we can induce

$$l \sigma_l = (-1)^l \sigma_1^l + F_l$$

for $l \geq 2$, where F_l is a symmetric polynomial. For example, when $l = 2$, we have $2\sigma_2 = \sigma_1^2 - s_2$ so $F_2 = -s_2$. When $l = 3$, we have

$$3\sigma_3 = (-1)^3 \sigma_1^3 + 3\sigma_1 \sigma_2 + s_3$$

so $F_3 = 3\sigma_1 \sigma_2 + s_3$. Then for $l \geq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} l \chi^l(M) &= \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i l \sigma_l(q^{w_{i,1}}, \dots, q^{w_{i,n}}) f_i(q) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i (-1)^l \sigma_1^l(q^{w_{i,1}}, \dots, q^{w_{i,n}}) f_i(q) + \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i F_l(q) f_i(q) \end{aligned}$$

where $F_l(q)$ is a certain function in q . Set $\mathcal{F}_l(q) = \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i F_l(q) f_i(q)$. Then we can further change the system (3.2) of equations into

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{cases} \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i f_i(q) &= \chi^0(M) \\ \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i \sigma_1(q^{w_{i,1}}, \dots, q^{w_{i,n}}) f_i(q) &= \chi^1(M) \\ \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i \sigma_1^2(q^{w_{i,1}}, \dots, q^{w_{i,n}}) f_i(q) &= 2\chi^2(M) - \mathcal{F}_2(q) \\ \vdots &\vdots \\ \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i \sigma_1^k(q^{w_{i,1}}, \dots, z^{w_{i,n}}) f_i(q) &= (-1)^k (k\chi^k(M) - \mathcal{F}_k(q)). \end{cases}$$

Obviously, we can regard

$$\mathbf{x}(q) = (\varepsilon_1 f_1(q), \varepsilon_2 f_2(q), \dots, \varepsilon_m f_m(q))^\top$$

as a nonzero solution of the equation system (3.3) with the following coefficient matrix

$$A(q) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \dots & 1 \\ \sigma_1(q^{w_{1,1}}, \dots, q^{w_{1,n}}) & \dots & \sigma_1(q^{w_{m,1}}, \dots, q^{w_{m,n}}) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \sigma_1^k(q^{w_{1,1}}, \dots, q^{w_{1,n}}) & \dots & \sigma_1^k(q^{w_{m,1}}, \dots, q^{w_{m,n}}) \end{pmatrix}.$$

For a convenience, we simply write

$$\sigma_{1,i} = \sigma_1(q^{w_{i,1}}, \dots, q^{w_{i,n}}) \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, m$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{b}(q) &= (b_0(q), b_1(q), b_2(q), \dots, b_k(q))^\top \\ &= (\chi^0(M), \chi^1(M), 2\chi^2(M) - \mathcal{F}_2(q), \dots, (-1)^k (k\chi^k(M) - \mathcal{F}_k(q)))^\top. \end{aligned}$$

Then the system (3.3) can be written as the following simple form

$$(3.4) \quad A(q)\mathbf{x}(q) = \mathbf{b}(q).$$

Next we are going to prove the following key lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *It is impossible that $k + 1 > m$.*

Proof. Suppose that $k + 1 > m$. Let us look at the system (3.4). Since M^{2n} has been assumed to be not a boundary, without a loss of generality, we may assume that all $\sigma_{1,i}, i = 1, \dots, m$ are mutually distinct. In fact, if there are some two σ_{1,i_1} and σ_{1,i_2} that are both equal, then their weight sets are the same, too. When $\varepsilon_{i_1} \neq \varepsilon_{i_2}$, we can do a simple surgery to delete two fixed points p_{i_1} and p_{i_2} . This will unchange the S^1 -manifold M up to unitary bordism. When $\varepsilon_{i_1} = \varepsilon_{i_2}$, we can move those terms corresponding to the i_2 -th column of $A(q)$ in the left side of the system (3.4) into its right side. Whichever of above cases happens, we can always modify the system (3.4) into a new system, satisfying that all $\sigma_{1,i}$'s appearing in the new coefficient matrix are distinct. Actually this will reduce the number of polynomials in $\mathbf{x}(q)$ to be smaller, but this smaller number can not become zero since M^{2n} is nonbounding. So the above distinct assumption for all $\sigma_{1,i}$'s will not produce any essential influence on our further argument.

Since $k + 1 > m$, we have $k + 1 \geq m + 1$. Without a loss of generality, we may assume that $k = m$, so the system (3.4) is formed by $m + 1$ equations. Then the system (3.4) can produce $m + 1$ systems, each of which consists of m equations, stated as follows:

$$(3.5) \quad V_l(q)\mathbf{x}(q) = \mathbf{b}_l(q)$$

for $l = 0, 1, \dots, m$, where

$$\mathbf{b}_l(q) = (b_0(q), b_1(q), \dots, b_{l-1}(q), \widehat{b_l(q)}, b_{l+1}(q), \dots, b_m(q))^T$$

means that the $(l + 1)$ -th element is deleted in $\mathbf{b}(q)$, and

$$V_l(q) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \cdots & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ \sigma_{1,1} & \cdots & \sigma_{1,i} & \cdots & \sigma_{1,m} \\ \vdots & \cdots & & \cdots & \vdots \\ \sigma_{1,1}^{l-1} & \cdots & \sigma_{1,i}^{l-1} & \cdots & \sigma_{1,m}^{l-1} \\ \sigma_{1,1}^{l+1} & \cdots & \sigma_{1,i}^{l+1} & \cdots & \sigma_{1,m}^{l+1} \\ \vdots & \cdots & & \cdots & \vdots \\ \sigma_{1,1}^m & \cdots & \sigma_{1,i}^m & \cdots & \sigma_{1,m}^m \end{pmatrix}$$

is a Vandermonde matrix obtained by deleting the $(l + 1)$ -th row of $A(q)$. It is easy to see that $\mathbf{b}_0(q), \mathbf{b}_1(q), \dots, \mathbf{b}_m(q)$ are linearly dependent.

Now suppose that

$$(3.6) \quad u_0(q)\mathbf{b}_0(q) + u_1(q)\mathbf{b}_1(q) + \cdots + u_m(q)\mathbf{b}_m(q) = \mathbf{0}$$

where all $u_l(q)$'s are functions in q . More explicitly, (3.6) can be written as

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{cases} u_0(q)b_1(q) + (u_1(q) + \cdots + u_m(q))b_0(q) & = 0 \\ (u_0(q) + u_1(q))b_2(q) + (u_2(q) + \cdots + u_m(q))b_1(q) & = 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ (u_0(q) + \cdots + u_{m-2}(q))b_{m-1}(q) + (u_{m-1}(q) + u_m(q))b_{m-2}(q) & = 0 \\ (u_0(q) + \cdots + u_{m-2}(q) + u_{m-1}(q))b_m(q) + u_m(q)b_{m-1}(q) & = 0. \end{cases}$$

Our next task is to determine the precise expressions of all functions $u_l(q)$'s. We proceed our argument as follows.

Combining with (3.5) and (3.6), we have that

$$(3.8) \quad \left(\sum_{l=0}^m u_l(q)V_l(q) \right) \mathbf{x}(q) = \mathbf{0}$$

whose coefficient matrix $\sum_{l=0}^m u_l(q)V_l(q)$ is explicitly written as follows:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{1,1}u_0(q) + \sum_{j=1}^m u_j(q) & \sigma_{1,2}u_0(q) + \sum_{j=1}^m u_j(q) & \cdots & \sigma_{1,m}u_0(q) + \sum_{j=1}^m u_j(q) \\ \sigma_{1,1}^2 \sum_{j=0}^1 u_j(q) + \sigma_{1,1} \sum_{j=2}^m u_j(q) & \sigma_{1,2}^2 \sum_{j=0}^1 u_j(q) + \sigma_{1,2} \sum_{j=2}^m u_j(q) & \cdots & \sigma_{1,m}^2 \sum_{j=0}^1 u_j(q) + \sigma_{1,m} \sum_{j=2}^m u_j(q) \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \sigma_{1,1}^l \sum_{j=0}^{l-1} u_j(q) + \sigma_{1,1}^{l-1} \sum_{j=l}^m u_j(q) & \cdots & & \sigma_{1,m}^l \sum_{j=0}^{l-1} u_j(q) + \sigma_{1,m}^{l-1} \sum_{j=l}^m u_j(q) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \sigma_{1,1}^m \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} u_j(q) + \sigma_{1,1}^{m-1} u_m(q) & \cdots & & \sigma_{1,m}^m \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} u_j(q) + \sigma_{1,m}^{m-1} u_m(q) \end{pmatrix}.$$

In order to give the precise expressions of all functions $u_l(q)$'s, we consider m diagonal elements of the matrix $\sum_{l=0}^m u_l(q)V_l(q)$, which are expressed in $u_l(q)$. We let these m expressions in $u_l(q)$ become zero, so that we obtain the following system of m equations

$$(3.9) \quad W(q)\mathbf{u}(q) = \mathbf{0}$$

where $\mathbf{u}(q) = (u_0(q), u_1(q), \dots, u_m(q))^\top$ and the coefficient matrix

$$W(q) = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{1,1} & 1 & 1 & \cdots & \cdots & 1 & 1 \\ \sigma_{1,2} & \sigma_{1,2} & 1 & \cdots & \cdots & 1 & 1 \\ \sigma_{1,3} & \sigma_{1,3} & \sigma_{1,3} & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \sigma_{1,m-1} & \cdots & \cdots & \sigma_{1,m-1} & \sigma_{1,m-1} & 1 & 1 \\ \sigma_{1,m} & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \sigma_{1,m} & \sigma_{1,m} & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

By a direct calculation, we obtain that

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{cases} u_1(q) & = \frac{\sigma_{1,1}-\sigma_{1,2}}{\sigma_{1,2}-1}u_0(q) \\ u_1(q) + u_2(q) & = \frac{\sigma_{1,1}-\sigma_{1,3}}{\sigma_{1,3}-1}u_0(q) \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ u_1(q) + \cdots + u_{m-1}(q) & = \frac{\sigma_{1,1}-\sigma_{1,m}}{\sigma_{1,m}-1}u_0(q) \\ u_1(q) + \cdots + u_{m-1}(q) + u_m(q) & = -\sigma_{1,1}u_0(q). \end{cases}$$

Taking $u_0(q) = 1$, from (3.10) we obtain the precise expressions of all $u_l(q)$ in (3.6), which are stated as follows:

$$(3.11) \quad \begin{cases} u_0(q) & = 1 \\ u_1(q) & = \frac{\sigma_{1,1}-\sigma_{1,2}}{\sigma_{1,2}-1} \\ u_2(q) & = \frac{\sigma_{1,1}-\sigma_{1,3}}{\sigma_{1,3}-1} - \frac{\sigma_{1,1}-\sigma_{1,2}}{\sigma_{1,2}-1} = \frac{(\sigma_{1,1}-1)(\sigma_{1,2}-\sigma_{1,3})}{(\sigma_{1,2}-1)(\sigma_{1,3}-1)} \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ u_{m-1}(q) & = \frac{\sigma_{1,1}-\sigma_{1,m}}{\sigma_{1,m}-1} - \frac{\sigma_{1,1}-\sigma_{1,m-1}}{\sigma_{1,m-1}-1} = \frac{(\sigma_{1,1}-1)(\sigma_{1,m-1}-\sigma_{1,m})}{(\sigma_{1,m-1}-1)(\sigma_{1,m}-1)} \\ u_m(q) & = \frac{\sigma_{1,m}-\sigma_{1,1}}{\sigma_{1,m}-1} - \sigma_{1,1} = \frac{\sigma_{1,m}(1-\sigma_{1,1})}{\sigma_{1,m}-1}. \end{cases}$$

Since all $\sigma_{1,i}$'s are distinct, it is easy to see that all $u_l(q)$'s are nonzero. Putting (3.11) into (3.7), we conclude that

$$(3.12) \quad \begin{cases} b_1(q) & = \sigma_{1,1}b_0(q) \\ b_2(q) & = \sigma_{1,2}b_1(q) \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ b_{m-1}(q) & = \sigma_{1,m-1}b_{m-2}(q) \\ b_m(q) & = \sigma_{1,m}b_{m-1}(q) \end{cases}$$

which gives cyclic equalities among $b_0(q), b_1(q), \dots, b_m(q)$. This implies that all $b_0(q), b_1(q), \dots, b_m(q)$ must be nonzero. In fact, if one of them is zero, then the cyclic equalities in (3.12) will induce that they are all zero. Moreover, we can yield from the system (3.4) that $\mathbf{x}(q) = \mathbf{0}$, which is impossible.

Now, from the equation system (3.12) we easily read out a contradiction equation

$$b_1(q) = \sigma_{1,1}b_0(q)$$

since $b_0(q) = \chi^0(M)$ and $b_1(q) = \chi^1(M)$ are only nonzero integers.

It remains to prove that the equation system (3.9) established beforehand and all expressions of $u_l(q)$ in (3.11) are compatible with the system (3.8).

First we check the first equation in the system (3.8), which has a little bit difference from the general case. Since we have assumed that $\sigma_{1,1}u_0(q) + \sum_{j=1}^m u_j(q) = 0$, it suffices to check that

$$\sum_{i=2}^m (\sigma_{1,i}u_0(q) + \sum_{j=1}^m u_j(q))\varepsilon_i f_i(q)$$

must be zero. Using the equations in (3.10), (3.11) and (3.12), we directly calculate as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=2}^m (\sigma_{1,i}u_0(q) + \sum_{j=1}^m u_j(q))\varepsilon_i f_i(q) \\
&= (\sigma_{1,2} - \sigma_{1,1})\varepsilon_2 f_2(q) + \cdots + (\sigma_{1,m} - \sigma_{1,1})\varepsilon_m f_m(q) \\
&= \sigma_{1,2}\varepsilon_2 f_2(q) + \cdots + \sigma_{1,m}\varepsilon_m f_m(q) - \sigma_{1,1}(\varepsilon_2 f_2(q) + \cdots + \varepsilon_m f_m(q)) \\
&= \sigma_{1,2}\varepsilon_2 f_2(q) + \cdots + \sigma_{1,m}\varepsilon_m f_m(q) - \sigma_{1,1}(b_0(q) - \varepsilon_1 f_1(q)) \\
&= \sigma_{1,1}\varepsilon_1 f_1(q) + \sigma_{1,2}\varepsilon_2 f_2(q) + \cdots + \sigma_{1,m}\varepsilon_m f_m(q) - \sigma_{1,1}b_0(q) \\
&= b_1(q) - \sigma_{1,1}b_0(q) \\
&= 0
\end{aligned}$$

as desired.

Next let us check the l -th equation in the system (3.8), where $l \geq 2$. We need to show that

$$\sum_{i \neq l} \left(\sigma_{1,i}^l \sum_{j=0}^{l-1} u_j(q) + \sigma_{1,i}^{l-1} \sum_{j=l}^m u_j(q) \right) \varepsilon_i f_i(q)$$

is equal to zero. From the equations in (3.11), we see easily that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{l-1} u_j(q) = 1 + \frac{\sigma_{1,1} - \sigma_{1,l}}{\sigma_{1,l} - 1} = \frac{\sigma_{1,1} - 1}{\sigma_{1,l} - 1}$$

and

$$\sum_{j=l}^m u_j(q) = -\sigma_{1,1} - \frac{\sigma_{1,1} - \sigma_{1,l}}{\sigma_{1,l} - 1} = -\frac{\sigma_{1,l}(\sigma_{1,1} - 1)}{\sigma_{1,l} - 1}.$$

So

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i \neq l} \left(\sigma_{1,i}^l \frac{\sigma_{1,1} - 1}{\sigma_{1,l} - 1} - \sigma_{1,i}^{l-1} \frac{\sigma_{1,l}(\sigma_{1,1} - 1)}{\sigma_{1,l} - 1} \right) \varepsilon_i f_i(q) \\
&= \frac{\sigma_{1,1} - 1}{\sigma_{1,l} - 1} \left(\sigma_{1,1}^l \varepsilon_1 f_1(q) + \cdots + \sigma_{1,l-1}^l \varepsilon_{l-1} f_{l-1}(q) + \sigma_{1,l+1}^l \varepsilon_{l+1} f_{l+1}(q) + \cdots + \sigma_{1,m}^l \varepsilon_m f_m(q) \right) \\
&\quad - \frac{\sigma_{1,l}(\sigma_{1,1} - 1)}{\sigma_{1,l} - 1} \left(\sigma_{1,1}^{l-1} \varepsilon_1 f_1(q) + \cdots + \sigma_{1,l-1}^{l-1} \varepsilon_{l-1} f_{l-1}(q) + \sigma_{1,l+1}^{l-1} \varepsilon_{l+1} f_{l+1}(q) + \cdots \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sigma_{1,m}^{l-1} \varepsilon_m f_m(q) \right) \\
&= \frac{\sigma_{1,1} - 1}{\sigma_{1,l} - 1} (b_l(q) - \sigma_{1,l}^l \varepsilon_l f_l(q)) - \frac{\sigma_{1,l}(\sigma_{1,1} - 1)}{\sigma_{1,l} - 1} (b_{l-1}(q) - \sigma_{1,l}^{l-1} \varepsilon_l f_l(q)) \\
&= \frac{\sigma_{1,1} - 1}{\sigma_{1,l} - 1} (b_l(q) - \sigma_{1,l} b_{l-1}(q)) \\
&= 0
\end{aligned}$$

as desired.

Together with all arguments as above, we complete the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. By Lemma 3.1, we must have

$$m \geq k + 1 = \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor + 1 > \frac{n}{2}$$

as desired. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2. \square

Corollary 3.2. *The coefficient matrix of the system (3.2) has rank $k + 1$.*

4. AN OBSERVATION

Suppose that M^{2n} is a unitary S^1 -manifold fixing isolated points, where M^{2n} is not necessarily assumed to be nonbounding.

First assume that $w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i,|\mathbf{w}_i^-|}$ are all negative weights in the weight set \mathbf{w}_i . Now, using the same way as in [9, (*), page 172], we change the expression of $\chi^l(M)$ into

$$(4.1) \quad \chi^l(M) = \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i (-1)^{|\mathbf{w}_i^-|} \frac{\sigma_l(q^{w_{i,1}}, \dots, q^{w_{i,n}}) q^{-\sum_{j \leq |\mathbf{w}_i^-|} w_{i,j}}}{\prod_{j \leq |\mathbf{w}_i^-|} (1 - q^{-w_{i,j}}) \prod_{j > |\mathbf{w}_i^-|} (1 - q^{w_{i,j}})}.$$

Since $\chi^l(M)$ is an integer, to calculate $\chi^l(M)$ is enough to determine the constant term in the right side of (4.1). Obviously, only those terms with $|\mathbf{w}_i^-| = l$ in the right side of (4.1) can produce the constant term. An easy argument shows that

$$\chi^l(M) = (-1)^l (n_l^+ - n_l^-)$$

where n_l^+ (resp. n_l^-) denotes the number of those fixed points p_i with $|\mathbf{w}_i^-| = l$ and $\varepsilon_i = +1$ (resp. $\varepsilon_i = -1$). Then the top Chern number

$$c_n[M] = T_{1,-1}(M) = \sum_{l=0}^n (-1)^l \chi^l(M) = \sum_{l=0}^n (n_l^+ - n_l^-).$$

On the other hand, since the Euler characteristic $\chi(M)$ is exactly equal to the number of all fixed points, we have

$$\chi(M) = \sum_{l=0}^n (n_l^+ + n_l^-).$$

Furthermore, we conclude that

$$(4.2) \quad \chi(M) = c_n[M] + 2 \sum_{l=0}^n n_l^-$$

and

$$(4.3) \quad \chi(M) + c_n[M] = 2 \sum_{l=0}^n n_l^+.$$

As in the case of almost complex, we see that all signs ε_i of fixed points are positive if and only if $\chi(M) = c_n[M]$. A classical result of Thomas [20] tells us that $\chi(M^{2n}) = c_n[M]$ is sufficient for a unitary manifold to be almost complex. Whether $\chi(M^{2n}) = c_n[M]$ holds or not completely does depend upon the choices of all signs ε_i of fixed points. It seems to be not easy to determine when ε_i is chosen as $+1$ or -1 . Both (4.2) and (4.3) only tell us that $\chi(M) \equiv c_n[M] \pmod{2}$. As a result, it is stated as follows.

Corollary 4.1. *Let M be a unitary S^1 -manifold fixing isolated points. Then $\chi(M)$ and $c_n[M]$ have the same parity.*

As a consequence, it is not difficult to see that when $\chi(M) = 2$, both (4.2) and (4.3) force all n_i^- to be zero, so $\chi(M) = c_n[M]$ and then M is almost complex, as seen in [9, 10].

Acknowledgements. The author would like to thank Taras Panov for the information of the reference [20], and also to thank Wei Wang for his interest.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Allday and V. Puppe, *Cohomological methods in transformation groups*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics **32**, Cambridge Univ. Press (1993).
- [2] M. F. Atiyah and F. Hirzebruch, *Spin-manifolds and group actions*. Essays on Topology & Related Topics Memoires Dedies A Georges De Rham, 1970, 18–28.
- [3] V. Buchstaber and T. Panov, *Toric Topology*. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, **204**, AMS, Providence, RI, 2015.
- [4] V. Buchstaber, T. Panov, N. Ray, *Toric genera*. Internat. Math. Research Notices, **16** (2010), 3207–3262.
- [5] F. Hirzebruch, *Topological methods in algebraic geometry*. Third edition. Springer, Berlin-Heidelberg, 1966.
- [6] F. Hirzebruch, T. Berger, and R. Jung, *Manifolds and modular forms*. Aspects of Mathematics, vol. **E20**, Vieweg, Braunschweig, (1992).
- [7] D. Jang, *Circle actions on almost complex manifolds with isolated fixed points*, Journal of Geometry and Physics, **119** (2017), 187–192.
- [8] C. Kosniowski, *Applications of the holomorphic Lefschetz formula*. Bull. London Math. Soc. **2** (1970), 43–48.
- [9] C. Kosniowski, *Holomorphic vector fields with simple isolated zeros*. Math. Ann. **208** (1974), 171–173.
- [10] C. Kosniowski, *Some formulae and conjectures associated with circle actions*. Topology Symposium, Siegen 1979 (Proc. Sympos., Univ. Siegen, Siegen, 1979), 331–339, Lecture Notes in Math., **788**, Springer, Berlin, 1980.
- [11] I. M. Krichever, *Formal groups and the Atiyah–Hirzebruch formula*, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat., **38** (1974), 1289–1304.
- [12] P. Li, *The rigidity of Dolbeault-type operators and symplectic circle actions*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **140** (2012), 1987–1995.
- [13] P. Li and K. F. Liu, *Some remarks on circle action on manifolds*. Mathematical Research Letters, **18** (2011), 437–446.
- [14] Z. Lü and Q. B. Tan, *Equivariant Chern numbers and the number of fixed points for torus manifolds*, Mathematical Research Letter, **18** (2011), 1319–1325.
- [15] Z. Lü and O. R. Musin, *Rigidity of powers and Kosniowski’s conjecture*. Sib. Élektron. Mat. Izv. **15** (2018), 1227–1236.
- [16] J. Ma and S. Y. Wen, *Number of fixed points for unitary T^{n-1} -manifolds*, Front. Math.. China, **14** (2019), 819–831.
- [17] J. Milnor and J. Stasheff, *Characteristic Classes*, Ann. of Math. Studies **76**, 1974.
- [18] O. R. Musin, *On rigid Hirzebruch genera*, Mosc. Math. J., **11** (2011), 139–147.
- [19] A. Pelayo and S. Tolman, *Fixed points of symplectic periodic flows*, Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems, **31** (2011), 1237–1247.
- [20] E. Thomas, *Complex structures on real vector bundles*, Amer. J. Math., **89** (1967), 887–908.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, FUDAN UNIVERSITY, SHANGHAI 200433, P. R. CHINA
Email address: zlu@fudan.edu.cn