

MERGING BOUNDARY CRITICAL POINTS OF A MORSE FUNCTION

MACIEJ BORODZIK AND MARCIN MIELNICZUK

ABSTRACT. In 2015, Borodzik, Némethi and Ranicki proved that an interior critical point can be pushed to the boundary, where it splits into two boundary critical points. In this paper, we show that two critical points at the boundary can be, under specific assumptions, merged into a single critical point in the interior. That is, we reverse the original construction.

1. INTRODUCTION

While the origins of the study of Morse functions for manifolds with boundary are in the seventies of the previous century, a systematic research of this subject was originated only in the first decade of the twenty-first century by Kronheimer and Mrowka [KM07]. Their analysis of the notions of boundary stable and unstable critical points and the Morse-Witten chain complex for manifolds with boundary is put in the context of Floer theory.

In 2015, Némethi, Ranicki and the first author proved that an interior critical point of a Morse function can be pushed to the boundary, where it splits into two boundary critical points; see [BNR16]. A precise statement of the result is the following (we refer to Section 2 for terminology):

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose M is a smooth manifold with boundary and $g: M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Morse function. Suppose that $z \notin \partial M$ is a critical point of g of index $k \neq 0$, $\dim M$. Suppose there is a path θ in the level set $g^{-1}(g(z))$ connecting z and ∂M .*

In this situation, there exists a Morse function f such that:

- (1) $f(x) = g(x)$ away from a neighborhood U of θ , where U might be chosen to be as small as we please;
- (2) $f(x)$ has precisely two critical points p and q in U . Both p and q belong to ∂M and have index k . The critical point p is boundary stable, while the critical point q is boundary unstable.
- (3) There is a gradient-like Morse–Smale vector field for f , such that there is precisely one trajectory γ connecting p to q .

An embedded analog of the result was proved in [BP16]. On the conceptual level, the result explains, why changing a Seifert surface for a knot by a single surgery results in changing the size of the associated Seifert matrix by 2.

In the present paper, we prove the reverse result. Namely, under suitable circumstances, a pair of critical points on the boundary can be merged into a single

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 57R40, 57R70, 57Q60.

Key words and phrases. manifold with boundary, cobordism, critical points.




FIGURE 1. Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 in dimension 2.

critical point in the interior. The precise statement follows. We refer to Figure 1 for explanation.

Theorem 1.2. *Let M be a manifold with boundary, $f: M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Morse function, and let ξ be a Morse–Smale gradient-like vector field for f . Suppose that $p, q \in \partial M$ are critical points of f , both of index k , where p is boundary stable and q is boundary unstable. Moreover, suppose there exists a single trajectory γ of the vector field ξ starting at p and terminating at q .*

Then for any neighborhood U of γ , there exists a Morse function $g: M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with the same critical points as f away from U , such that the properties (2) and (3) of Theorem 1.1 are satisfied.

Theorem 1.2 deals with the only remaining case of possible cancellations of boundary critical points as explained in the following corollary.

Corollary 1.3. *Suppose p and q are boundary critical points of f such that the indices of p and q computed on ∂M differ by 1 (with $f(p) < f(q)$ and q having larger index). Suppose ξ is a gradient-like Morse–Smale vector field for f , and such that there exists a single trajectory of ξ from p to q . Then:*

- *if p and q are both boundary stable or both boundary unstable, then they can be canceled (as in [BNR16, Theorem 5.1]);*
- *if p is boundary stable and q is boundary unstable, then the pair p and q can be merged and pushed into the interior as in Theorem 1.2;*
- *if p is boundary unstable and q is boundary stable, then $\text{ind } q = \text{ind } p + 2$, see the table in [BNR16, Section 4.3]. This means that p and q are usually connected by a 1-parameter family of trajectories. No simplification is possible.*

We remark that in the last case on the bullet list above, the non-cancellation theorem [BNR16, Lemma 5.7] can be applied as well.

The aim of the paper is to prove Theorem 1.2. The idea is to construct a suitable coordinate system in U , which might require replacing ξ with another gradient-like vector field $\tilde{\xi}$ for f . Then, we alter $\tilde{\xi}$ to obtain another vector field ξ' on M and show that we can construct a Morse function g for which ξ' is gradient-like.

The actual plan of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the necessary terminology and recall the relevant results from [BNR16]. In Section 3, we construct the suitable coordinate system. Finally, in Section 4, we give the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Acknowledgments. The paper is a part of the Master's thesis of MM under the supervision of MB. A part of the project was done while MB was visiting the Rényi Institute, whose hospitality he is grateful for. Both authors were supported by the NCN OPUS Grant 2019/B/35/ST1/01120.

2. MORSE THEORY FOR MANIFOLDS WITH BOUNDARY

Recall that a smooth function $f: M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where M is a closed smooth manifold, is called *Morse*, if any critical point x of f is non-degenerate, that is to say, the matrix of the second derivatives $D^2f(x)$ is non-degenerate, which turns out not to depend on the choice of the coordinate system around x .

This definition can be generalized to the case of manifolds with boundary; see [KM07, Section 2.4].

Definition 2.1 (Morse function). Let M be a manifold with boundary, and let $f: M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be smooth. We say that f is Morse if all critical points of f are non-degenerate and f restricted to ∂M is also Morse (in the usual sense).

Theorem 2.2 (Boundary Morse lemma, see [BNR16, Lemma 2.6]). *Let $p \in \partial M$ be a non-degenerate critical point of a Morse function $f: M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Then there exist an integer $k = 0, \dots, n-1$, $\epsilon = \pm 1$, and local coordinates x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, y , defined in an open neighbourhood $U \ni p$, such that*

- (1) $p = (0, \dots, 0)$;
- (2) $y \geq 0$ on U ;
- (3) $y = 0$ defines $\partial M \cap U$;
- (4) the following equality holds:

$$(2.3) \quad f(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, y) = f(p) - x_1^2 - \dots - x_k^2 + x_{k+1}^2 + \dots + x_{n-1}^2 + \epsilon y^2.$$

The next definition comes from [KM07], we refer to [BNR16, Section 2.4] for a detailed discussion.

Definition 2.4 (Boundary stable and unstable critical points). Let p be a boundary critical point of a Morse function f . We say that p is *boundary stable* (resp. *boundary unstable*) if $\epsilon = -1$ (resp. $\epsilon = +1$), where ϵ is defined as in (2.3).

In short, being a boundary stable critical point means that the flow of ∇f attracts toward the boundary in the vicinity of the critical point, while in the case of a boundary unstable critical point, the flow of f repels from the boundary.

We now define the index of a boundary critical point.

Definition 2.5 (Index of a critical point). Let p be a boundary critical point. The *index* of a critical point is the dimension of the negative definite subspace of $D^2f(p)$. Put differently, for a boundary stable critical point, the index is $k+1$, while for the boundary unstable critical point, the index is k . Here, k is defined as in Theorem 2.2.

We now recall the definition of a gradient like vector field.

Definition 2.6 (Gradient-like vector field). Let f be a Morse function on a manifold with boundary M . Let ξ be a vector field on M . We shall say that ξ is gradient-like with respect to f , if

- (1) ξ is tangent to ∂M at the boundary;
- (2) $\partial_\xi f > 0$ away from the critical points of f ;
- (3) for any critical point p of f , there exist local coordinates x_1, \dots, x_n around p , such that f and ξ admit the following form (called the Morse normal form):

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{aligned} f(\bar{x}) &= f(p) - x_1^2 - \dots - x_k^2 + x_{k+1}^2 + \dots + x_n^2 \\ \xi(\bar{x}) &= (-x_1, \dots, -x_k, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n) \end{aligned}$$

The model situation for ξ is that $\xi = \nabla f$, for a suitably chosen Riemannian metric on M . In [BNR16, Section 1.1], it is proved that each Morse function f admits a gradient-like vector field. We now recall the Morse–Smale condition; see [BNR16, Section 4.3].

Definition 2.8 (Morse–Smale vector field). A gradient-like vector field ξ for f is called *Morse–Smale*, if for any two critical points p and q , with $f(p) < f(q)$:

- the submanifolds of ∂M : $W^u(p) \cap \partial M$ and $W^s(q) \cap \partial M$ intersect transversally,
- the submanifolds of $\text{Int } M$: $W^u(p) \cap \text{Int } M$ and $W^s(q) \cap \text{Int } M$ intersect transversally.

Here W^s and W^u are, respectively, the stable and the unstable manifolds of a critical point of ξ .

We note that the Morse–Smale condition is open-dense among all gradient-like vector fields; see [BNR16, Section 4.3].

3. COORDINATE NEIGHBORHOOD

Throughout Section 3, we let f be a fixed Morse function satisfying the assumption of Theorem 1.2. All gradient-like vector fields are assumed to be gradient-like with respect to the function f .

The proof of the following result is completely analogous to the proof of [BNR16, Proposition 5.2], with the only difference being that the local behavior of the first coordinate is different.

Proposition 3.1. *There exists an open neighborhood U_1 of γ , a coordinate map $\varphi: U_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ (with coordinates denoted by (y, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})) and a gradient-like vector field ξ_1 for f agreeing with ξ away from U_1 , such that:*

- φ takes $U_1 \cap \partial M$ to $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$;
- $\varphi(p) = (0, 0, \dots, 0)$;
- $\varphi(q) = (0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$;
- the curve γ is mapped to the segment $(0, t, 0, \dots, 0)$, $t \in [0, 1]$, connecting p with q ;
- the map φ takes ξ_1 to a vector field on $\varphi(U_1) \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ given in the form

$$(3.2) \quad (yv(y, x_1, \dots), w(x_1), -x_2, \dots, -x_{k-1}, x_k, \dots, x_{n-1})$$

for some smooth functions v, w with the properties listed below.

- the function w is positive for $x_1 \in (0, 1)$ and negative for $x_1 \notin [0, 1]$;
- the function v is positive at $x_1 = 0$ and negative at $x_1 = 1$.

Remark 3.3. The convention in (3.2) is that the first coordinate of ξ_1 is the $\frac{\partial}{\partial y}$ -coordinate, while the next coordinates are directions of $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{n-1}}$.

From now on, we assume that such U_1 and φ have been chosen. We will now improve ξ_1 so that it still has the form (3.2), but the function v is better behaved.

Lemma 3.4. *There exists a smaller neighborhood $U_2 \subset U_1$ of γ and a gradient-like vector field ξ_2 , agreeing with ξ_1 away from U_1 , such that, on U_2 $D\varphi(\xi_2)$ is given by (3.2), but*

$$(3.5) \quad v(y, x_1, \dots) = 2x_1 - 1.$$

Proof. Define

$$\xi_v = (y(2x_1 - 1), w(x_1), -x_3, \dots, x_n).$$

Around the critical points, f is given by (2.3). By direct calculation, we obtain that $\partial_{\xi_v} f \geq 0$ in a neighborhood U_p of p and in a neighborhood U_q of q . Let U_γ be a neighborhood of γ .

The vector field ξ_1 is gradient-like for f and $\overline{U_\gamma \setminus (U_p \cup U_q)}$ does not contain any critical points of f , and so there exists $C > 0$ such that $\partial_{\xi_1} f > C$ everywhere on $\overline{U_\gamma \setminus (U_p \cup U_q)}$. As $y \equiv 0$ on γ , the second coordinate of both ξ_v and ξ_1 is small at points that are close to the boundary, that is, we may assume that U_γ is small enough that the following two conditions hold on U_γ :

$$\begin{aligned} \left| yv(y, x_1, \dots) \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \right| &< C/3; \\ \left| y(2x_1 - 1) \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \right| &< C/3. \end{aligned}$$

By the triangle inequality, we conclude that $\partial_{\xi_v} f > C/3$ everywhere on $U_\gamma \setminus (U_p \cup U_q)$, and so ξ_v is gradient-like for f on $U_\gamma \cup U_p \cup U_q$.

To define a global vector field ξ_2 , choose an open neighborhood U_2 of γ such that $\overline{U_2} \subset U_\gamma \cup U_p \cup U_q$. Let $\phi_2: M \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a smooth function supported on $U_\gamma \cup U_p \cup U_q$ and equal to 1 on U_2 . We finally define

$$\xi_2 = \phi_2 \xi_v + (1 - \phi_2) \xi_1.$$

This vector field clearly has the desired form on U_2 and is gradient-like as a convex combination of gradient-like vector fields. \square

The following result is a repetition of [Mil65, Assertion 1]. In the applications, we will set W to be an open set containing γ , whose closure is contained in U_2 .

Proposition 3.6. *Suppose $\tilde{\xi}$ is a gradient-like vector field for f . For any open subset W containing γ , there exists a neighborhood U of γ , $U \subset W$ such that if a trajectory of $\tilde{\xi}$ enters U and leaves W , then it never re-enters U .*

4. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM

We begin with the following auxiliary result.

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose ξ and f are as in Theorem 1.2. There exists a Morse function \tilde{f} having the same critical points as f , such that ξ is gradient-like for \tilde{f} and there is no critical point q' of \tilde{f} other than p and q such that $\tilde{f}(q') \in [\tilde{f}(p), \tilde{f}(q)]$.*

Proof. The result follows from the Global Rearrangement Theorem [BNR16, Proposition 4.6]. The rearrangement can be carried out by successively applying the Elementary Rearrangement Theorem [BNR16, Proposition 4.1]. Note that if one chooses the auxiliary function μ in the proof of [BNR16, Lemma 4.3] to be preserved by the gradient-like vector field ξ (instead of ∇F , as in [BNR16]), then ξ is a gradient-like vector field for the resulting Morse function \tilde{f} obtained by the Global Rearrangement Theorem.

The statement of Global Rearrangement Theorem implies that there are no critical points in between $\tilde{f}(p)$ and $\tilde{f}(q)$. If there are any other critical points on the level set of $\tilde{f}(p)$, we use the Elementary Rearrangement Theorem again to push them slightly below that level set. Likewise, any critical point on the level set of $\tilde{f}(q)$ other than q can be pushed slightly above that level set. As previously, ξ is ensured to be gradient-like for \tilde{f} .

The resulting function satisfies the statement of Proposition 4.1, as desired. \square

From now on, assume that such a rearrangement has been made. In Section 3 we fixed the coordinate system on a neighborhood U_2 of γ in which the gradient-like vector field ξ for f has the form described in Lemma 3.4. We choose now smaller neighborhood W of U_2 containing γ : properties of W will be specified later. As x_1 and y play a special role in the proof of Theorem 1.2, we will use a slightly different notation for coordinates. Namely, we will use the coordinates (y, x, \bar{u}) (where $\bar{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_{n-2})$), with x playing the role of x_1 and \bar{u} being the vector (x_2, \dots, x_n) . That is to say, inside U_2 (in particular, inside W), the vector field ξ has the form

$$(4.2) \quad (y(2x-1), w(x), -u_1, \dots, -u_{k-1}, u_k, \dots, u_{n-2}),$$

Set $a = \inf_{w \in W} f(w)$, $b = \sup_{w \in W} f(w)$. Upon possibly shrinking W , by using Proposition 4.1, we may assume that the following condition is satisfied.

Condition 4.3. There are no critical points q' of f such that $f(q') \in [a, b]$ and $q' \neq p, q$.

Possibly shrinking W even further we may assume that W has the form $W_{\text{II}} \times (-\delta, \delta)^{n-2}$ where W_{II} is a simply-connected open subset of \mathbb{R}^2 and $\delta > 0$. Recall that the function w is positive on $(0, 1)$ and negative away from $[0, 1]$. We choose $U \subset W$ as a neighborhood of γ such that a trajectory of ξ going through U and W never returns to U : existence of such U was proved in Proposition 3.6.

First perturb ξ by the formula.

$$\xi_c = \xi - c\eta(x, y, \bar{u}) \frac{\partial}{\partial x}$$

where $c > 0$ is a constant such that the x component of ξ_c is always negative on $W \cap \partial M$, and η is a suitable bump function supported in W . For convenience, we will take η of the form $\eta(x, y, \bar{u}) = \alpha(x)\beta(y)\delta(\bar{u})$, where α, β, δ are such that:

- η is equal to 1 in a neighborhood of γ ;
- the support of η is contained within U ;
- $\beta'(y) \neq 0$ for all y such that $\beta(y) \neq 0, 1$;
- $\alpha(x) = 1$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$;
- $\delta \equiv 1$ in a neighborhood of $(0, \dots, 0)$.

We will now study the properties of ξ_c .

Lemma 4.4. *The vector field ξ_c is tangent to ∂M .*

Proof. This follows from the fact that both ξ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ are tangent to ∂M . \square

Proposition 4.5. *The critical points of ξ_c away from W coincide with the critical points of ξ . In W , ξ_c has a single critical point $z = (y_0, x_0, 0, \dots, 0)$, where $x_0 = \frac{1}{2}$ and y_0 is uniquely specified by the condition*

$$(4.6) \quad \beta(y_0) = \frac{1}{c}w(x_0).$$

We recall that $w(x)$ is the function specified by Proposition 3.1; cf. (4.2).

Proof. Clearly, ξ and ξ_c coincide outside U ; in particular, ξ_c has no critical points inside $W \setminus U$. Note that ξ_c has a vanishing x coordinate on γ , hence neither p nor q are critical points of ξ_c .

Next, suppose $z = (y_0, x_0, \bar{u}_0)$ satisfies $\xi_c(z) = 0$. The vanishing of the \bar{u} components of $\xi_c(z)$ is equivalent to saying that $\bar{u}_0 = (0, \dots, 0)$. The vanishing of the y coordinate of $\xi_c(z)$ implies that $y_0(2x_0 - 1) = 0$. Now $y_0 = 0$ would mean that $z \in U \cap \partial M$, but then the x component of $\xi_c(z)$ is non-zero. Hence, $x_0 = \frac{1}{2}$. This implies that

$$\xi_c(z) = (0, w(x_0) - c\beta(y_0), 0, \dots, 0).$$

Consequently, y_0 satisfies (4.6). Since $w(x_0) > 0$, as per Proposition 3.1, and β is strictly decreasing on the set where it takes values between 0 and 1, such y_0 is unique. \square

We now study the critical point z in greater detail.

Lemma 4.7. *The critical point z is hyperbolic. The linearization $D_z \xi_c$ has k real negative eigenvalues and $n - k$ real positive eigenvalues.*

Proof. The \bar{u} -coordinates account for $k - 1$ real negative eigenvalues and $n - k - 1$ real positive eigenvalues. We have $\delta \equiv 1$ in a neighborhood of z_0 . We can now restrict our attention to the initial two coordinates of ξ_c :

$$(4.8) \quad \xi_2(y, x) = (y(2x - 1), w(x) - c\alpha(x)\beta(y)).$$

The derivative of ξ_c in these directions is given by

$$D_{y,x} \xi_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \xi_2}{\partial y} & \frac{\partial \xi_2}{\partial x} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 2x - 1 & 2y \\ -c\alpha(x)\beta'(y) & w'(x) - c\alpha'(x)\beta(y) \end{bmatrix}$$

For $z = (x_0, y_0)$, since $\alpha \equiv 1$ on $[0, 1]$, we get $\alpha(x_0) = 1, \alpha'(x_0) = 0$ and the above simplifies to:

$$(4.9) \quad D_z \xi_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2y_0 \\ -c\beta'(y_0) & w'(x_0) \end{bmatrix}$$

We know that $\beta'(y_0) < 0$ and $y_0 > 0$. That is, the matrix (4.9) has a negative determinant, and so, regardless of the sign of $w'(x_0)$, it has two real eigenvalues, one positive and one negative. \square

The vector field ξ_c has a hyperbolic critical point at z . We need to make sure that ξ_c has the form required by Definition 2.6 near z . The Grobman–Hartman theorem asserts that ξ_c can be linearized at z by a Hölder continuous map, which is insufficient for our purposes. Instead of pushing the regularity of this linearization map, we replace ξ_c near z by its linear part. The new vector field has the form (2.7) near z .

Proposition 4.10. *For any neighborhood $U_z \subset U$ of z , there exists a vector field ξ' , agreeing with ξ_c away from U_z , such that, in some system of coordinates on U_z , ξ' has the form (2.7). Moreover, ξ' and ξ_c might be as close in C^0 -norm as we please.*

Proof. Let ξ_{lin} be the linear part of ξ_c at z .

Let τ be a bump function supported on U_z , equal to 1 on a smaller neighborhood of z . Set

$$\xi' = \xi_c(1 - \tau) + \xi_{\text{lin}}\tau.$$

Then, as long as $\tau \equiv 1$, we have $\xi' = \xi_{\text{lin}}$, which means that in the system of coordinates corresponding to the eigenvectors of $\xi_c(z)$, the vector field ξ' has the form (2.7), as desired.

Note that the difference between ξ' and ξ_c at a point z' is of order $\|z - z'\|^2$. Therefore, choosing the support U_z sufficiently small, we make guarantee that the difference $\|\xi' - \xi_c\|_{C^0}$ can be made smaller than any predetermined positive constant. \square

We will now aim to construct a new Morse function, whose gradient-like vector field will be ξ' . The main step towards this result is the following lemma:

Lemma 4.11. *Any trajectory of ξ' that enters W , either converges to z or leaves W in finite time.*

Proof. The proof is done in three steps. In Step 1, we provide a proof in two-dimensional case for the vector field ξ_c . In Step 2, we will show that this argument works also for ξ' . In Step 3, we show that the higher-dimensional case can be reduced to the two-dimensional case.

Step 1. The case of ξ_c in two dimensions.

We proceed by analyzing the phase portrait. Recall that in the two-dimensional case, ξ_c is given by the formula (4.8). We denote the coordinates of ξ_c by

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_{c,x} &= w(x) - c\alpha(x)\beta(y) \\ \xi_{c,y} &= y(2x - 1) \end{aligned}$$




FIGURE 2. Proof of Lemma 4.11. Step 1.

Let

$$\Gamma_x = \xi_{c,x}^{-1}(0), \quad \Gamma_y = \xi_{c,y}^{-1}(0).$$

The latter is easily seen as $\Gamma_y = \left\{x = \frac{1}{2}\right\} \cup \{y = 0\}$.

In order to obtain a more explicit description of Γ_x , note that $\beta^{-1}(r)$ is well-defined for any $r \in (0, 1)$. Set

$$\kappa(x) = \beta^{-1}\left(\frac{w(x)}{c\alpha(x)}\right).$$

Since w is negative away from $[0, 1]$, all points of Γ_x satisfy $x \in [0, 1]$ and $\alpha(x) = 1$. Then $(x, \kappa(x))_{x \in (0,1)}$ parametrizes the subset

$$\Gamma_x^\kappa = \{(x, y) \in \Gamma_x \mid \beta(y) \neq 0, \beta(y) \neq 1\}.$$

However, if $\beta(y) = 1$, then

$$\xi_{c,x}(x, y) = w(x) - c < 0$$

by construction, so $\Gamma_x \cap \beta^{-1}(y)$ is empty. Similarly, if $(x, y) \in \Gamma_x$ and $\beta(y) = 0$, then

$$\xi_{c,x}(x, y) = w(x) = 0,$$

that is, $x \in \{0, 1\}$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_x &= \Gamma_x^\kappa \cup \Gamma_x^0, \text{ where} \\ \Gamma_x^\kappa &= \{(x, \kappa(x)) \mid x \in (0, 1)\} \\ \Gamma_x^0 &= \{(x, y) \mid x \in \{0, 1\}, \beta(y) = 0\} \end{aligned}$$

Noticing that $\beta'(y) = 0$ iff $\beta(y) \in 0, 1$, an analogous reasoning lets us conclude that

$$(4.12) \quad \kappa'(x) = \frac{1}{\beta'(\kappa(x))} \text{ is finite for } x \in (0, 1).$$

We will use this fact below.

The level sets Γ_x and Γ_y divide W into four regions $\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_4$, as in Figure 2. Let θ be a forward trajectory of ξ_c starting at p_s . Notice that θ cannot cross Γ_x^0 because ξ_c is tangent to Γ_x^0 . Now:

- if $p_s \in \Omega_1$, then $\xi_{c,y}$ remains positive and separated from 0 along θ , so θ leaves W to the right;
- if $p_s \in \Omega_3$, then $\xi_{c,x}$ remains negative and separated from 0 along θ , so θ always leaves W to the bottom;
- if $p_s \in \Omega_2$ or $p_s \in \Omega_4$, then θ either
 - hits the critical point z ;
 - leads to one of Ω_1 or Ω_3 , and, by the previous considerations, eventually leaves W .

In the light of (4.12), $\frac{\partial}{\partial y}$ always crosses Γ_x^κ transversally. Similarly, $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ always crosses Γ_y transversally. Therefore, it is clear from the phase portrait that each trajectory can cross Γ_x^κ or Γ_y only once.

In other words, any trajectory of ξ_c entering W either hits z or leaves W in finite time.

Step 2. The case of ξ^l in two dimensions.

We begin with the following observation. For any $U_0 \subset W$ containing z and sufficiently small, there exists another $U_1 \subset U_0$ being an open neighborhood of z , such that if the trajectory of ξ_c starts in U_1 and then leaves U_0 , then does not return to U_1 , unless it leaves W . To see this, we use an argument similar to the one used in the proof of Proposition 3.6 given in [Mil65].

Namely, if for all U_1 the trajectory of ξ_c leaves U_0 and subsequently returns to U_1 , upon passing to a limit, we would construct a trajectory both starting and terminating at z . It is clear from the phase portrait, that every trajectory starting at z leads either to Ω_1 or to Ω_3 . Similarly, every trajectory entering z , comes from either Ω_2 or Ω_4 . We already argued that the trajectory in Ω_1 and Ω_3 cannot enter Ω_2 or Ω_4 without leaving W , hence no trajectory starts and terminates at z without leaving W .

Before choosing an appropriate neighborhood U_0 , we need to provide some estimates. Let v_+ and v_- be length one eigenvectors of the matrix $D_z \xi_c$, where v_+ corresponds to the positive eigenvalue, while v_- corresponds to the negative eigenvalue. Let (s, t) be local coordinates near z such that v_+ and v_- correspond to $(1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$ respectively. In other words, in these coordinates, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_{\text{lin}}(s, t) &= (c_+s, c_-t) \\ \xi_c(s, t) &= (c_+s, c_-t) + O\left(\|(s, t)\|^2\right)\end{aligned}$$

for the eigenvalues c_+, c_- of $D_z \xi_c$, satisfying $c_+ > 0 > c_-$.

Consider the function

$$g(s, t) = \frac{1}{2} (s^2 - t^2).$$

With this definition, we have

$$\partial_{\xi_{\text{lin}}} g = c_+s^2 - c_-t^2 \geq 0$$

with equality only at $(0, 0)$. Moreover,

$$\partial_{\xi_c} g = c_+ s^2 - c_- t^2 + O(\|(s, t)\|^3).$$

In particular, there exists a neighborhood U_0 of z , such that $\partial_{\xi_c} g > 0$ everywhere except at z . Find a smaller $U_1 \subset U_0$ such that any trajectory of ξ_c entering U_1 leaving U_0 does not return to U_1 .

Let τ be a cut-off function supported in U_1 and let ξ' be the vector field constructed in Proposition 4.10 above using this function τ . As $\partial_{\xi_{\text{lin}}} g, \partial_{\xi_c} g > 0$ on $U_1 \setminus \{z\}$, the same inequality holds for a convex combination thereof. Let θ be a trajectory of ξ' .

- If θ stays forever in U_0 , then $\partial_{\xi'} g \geq 0$ implies that θ must hit z ;
- If θ does not enter U_1 , then it is actually a trajectory of ξ_c that does not hit z , so it must leave W .
- If θ starts in U_1 and does not hit z and eventually leaves U_0 , then it becomes a trajectory of ξ_c before leaving U_1 . Consequently, θ leaves W without returning to U_0 by the choice of U_1 .

These cases conclude the proof of Step 2.

Step 3. The general case. We assume that W has a product structure $W = W_{\text{II}} \times I^{n-2}$, where $I = (-\delta, \delta)$ and W_{II} is an open contractible subset of \mathbb{R}^2 . Consider the projection $\Pi: W \rightarrow W_{\text{II}}$ given by $\Pi(y, x, \bar{u}) = (y, x)$. As passing from ξ_c to ξ' affects only the first two coordinates, we conclude that ξ' has the form

$$\xi' = (\alpha_1(x, y), \alpha_2(x, y), -u_1, \dots, -u_{k-1}, u_k, \dots, u_{n-2}).$$

Let ξ'_2 be the vector field on W_{II} with coordinates

$$\xi'_2 = (\alpha_1(x, y), \alpha_2(x, y)).$$

Note that $D\Pi(\xi') = \xi'_2$. If θ is a trajectory of ξ' staying in W , then $\Pi(\theta)$ is a trajectory of ξ'_2 staying in W_{II} . By the previous step, any trajectory ξ'_2 either converges to the critical point (y_0, x_0) or leaves W_{II} . Therefore, if θ stays forever in W , $\Pi(\theta)$ has to converge to (y_0, x_0) . The \bar{u} components of ξ' are $(-u_1, \dots, -u_{k-1}, u_k, \dots, u_{n-2})$, that is, if θ stays forever in W , the \bar{u} -coordinates have to converge to $(0, \dots, 0)$. Consequently, if θ stays forever in W , then it terminates at z . \square

Remark 4.13. What we proved in Lemma 4.11 concerns forward behavior of a trajectory. However, the backward result is also true: if a trajectory stays forever in the past in W , it has to start at z . The proof is completely analogous.

As a corollary, we prove the following result.

Corollary 4.14. *Suppose a, b are such that $W \subset f^{-1}[a, b]$ and the only critical points of f in $f^{-1}[a, b]$ are p and q . If θ is a trajectory of ξ' , then:*

- *Either it exits $f^{-1}[a, b]$ through $f^{-1}(b)$, or it terminates at z .*
- *Either it enters $f^{-1}[a, b]$ through $f^{-1}(a)$, or it starts at z ;*

Proof. If θ does not intersect U , it is a trajectory of ξ . Any trajectory of ξ that does not hit U , flows from $f^{-1}(a)$ to $f^{-1}(b)$.

Suppose θ enters U . By Lemma 4.11, either it hits z , or it leaves W . If it hits z , we are done; if it leaves W , then by Proposition 3.6, it does never return to U , but then, as soon as θ leaves W , it actually becomes a trajectory of ξ , and so it must terminate at a critical point. As there are no critical points of f in $f^{-1}[a, b] \setminus W$, θ must hit a critical point with a critical value not in $[a, b]$. Since f increases along θ , we conclude that θ terminates above the level set $f^{-1}(b)$. This proves the first part of the corollary. The proof of the other is analogous. \square

As a final stage, we construct a Morse function g whose gradient-like vector field is ξ' . The construction follows from Vector Field Integration Lemma [BP16], which in turn generalizes [Mil65, Assertion 5, page 54]. Nevertheless, the proof in [BP16] has a small technical flaw (namely, the function that is constructed is not necessarily continuous unless the vector field is properly rescaled), therefore we give an independent construction. We note that in [BPT23], there will be given a more general statement of the Vector Field Integration Lemma. The following result concludes the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Proposition 4.15. *There exists a Morse function g whose gradient-like vector field is ξ' , such that $g = f$ away from $f^{-1}(a, b)$.*

Proof. The high-level idea is to define g by an explicit formula in a neighborhood of z and by interpolation elsewhere.

Set $c = \frac{1}{2}(a + b)$. Inside U_z (see Proposition 4.10) define a function

$$g_0(s, t, u_1, \dots, u_{n-2}) = c + s^2 - t^2 - u_1^2 - \dots - u_{k-1}^2 + u_k^2 + \dots + u_{n-2}^2.$$

Write $\alpha^2 := s^2 + u_k^2 + \dots + u_{n-2}^2$, $\beta^2 := t^2 + u_1^2 + \dots + u_{k-1}^2$. For $\rho > \varepsilon > 0$ define (cf. [BNR16, Section 2.4]) the subset of U_z :

$$H_{\rho, \varepsilon} := \{-\alpha^2 + \beta^2 \in [-\varepsilon^2, \varepsilon^2], \alpha^2 \beta^2 \leq (\rho^4 - \varepsilon^4)/4\}.$$

For sufficiently small ρ , the set $H_{\rho, \varepsilon}$ is compact (which is a formal way of saying that it is contained in the interior of U_z). Let us now define the following parts of the boundary of $H_{\rho, \varepsilon}$; see Figure 3.

$$(4.16) \quad \begin{aligned} X_{\text{in}} &= \partial H_{\rho, \varepsilon} \cap \{-\alpha^2 + \beta^2 = -\varepsilon^2\} \subset g_0^{-1}(c - \varepsilon^2) \\ X_{\text{out}} &= \partial H_{\rho, \varepsilon} \cap \{-\alpha^2 + \beta^2 = \varepsilon^2\} \subset g_0^{-1}(c + \varepsilon^2) \\ X_{\text{tan}} &= \partial H_{\rho, \varepsilon} \cap \{\alpha^2 \beta^2 = (\rho^4 - \varepsilon^4)/4\}. \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that ξ' is tangent to X_{tan} (cf. [BNR16, Lemma 2.31]). Choose sufficiently small values $\rho > \varepsilon_1 > \varepsilon_2 > 0$. For brevity, we will write $H_{\varepsilon_i} := H_{\rho, \varepsilon_i}$ and the corresponding subsets of $\partial H_{\varepsilon_i}$ will be denoted by $X_{\text{in}}^i, X_{\text{out}}^i, X_{\text{tan}}^i$, as in Figure 4.

Rescale the vector field ξ' by a positive factor in such a way that:

- if the flow of ξ' does not hit H_{ε_1} , then it takes precisely the time $b - a$ to get from $f^{-1}(a)$ to $f^{-1}(b)$.
- if the flow of ξ' starts from $f^{-1}(a)$ and hits X_{in}^1 , then it takes precisely time equal $c - \varepsilon - a$;
- if the flow of ξ' ends at $f^{-1}(b)$ and hits X_{out}^1 in the past, then it takes precisely time equal $b - c - \varepsilon$;



FIGURE 3. A schematic presentation of $H_{\rho, \varepsilon}$.

FIGURE 4. Proof of Proposition 4.15.

- The time to reach $X_{\text{out}}^1 \setminus X_{\text{out}}^2$ from $X_{\text{in}}^1 \setminus X_{\text{in}}^2$ is equal to 2ε .

Choose a point $x \in f^{-1}(a, b)$ and let γ_x be the trajectory of ξ' through x . We now define the function g_1 away from H_{ε_2} as follows:

- Suppose γ_x travels from $f^{-1}(a)$ to $f^{-1}(b)$ without hitting H_{ε_2} . Assume that $\gamma_x(0) \in f^{-1}(a)$, and so $\gamma_x(b-a) \in f^{-1}(b)$. We set $g_1(x) = a + t_x$, where t_x is defined by $\gamma_x(t_x) = x$.
- Suppose γ_x travels from $f^{-1}(a)$, passes through x , and then hits X_{in}^2 . Assume that $\gamma_x(0) \in f^{-1}(a)$. We set $g_1(x) = a + t_x$, where t_x is defined by $\gamma_x(t_x) = x$.
- Suppose γ_x travels from X_{out}^2 , passes through x , and then hits $f^{-1}(b)$. We assume $\gamma_x(0) \in X_{\text{out}}^2$. We set $g_1(x) = c + \varepsilon + t_x$, where t_x is defined by $\gamma_x(t_x) = x$.

With this definition, we have defined $g_1(x)$ everywhere in $f^{-1}[a, b]$ except for the interior of H_{ε_2} . For future reference, observe that the way the vector field ξ' leads to the following claim:

Lemma 4.17. *The function g_1 is equal to $c - \varepsilon$ on the whole of X_{in}^1 , and to $c + \varepsilon$ on the whole of X_{out}^1 . Moreover, f and g_1 coincide on $f^{-1}(b)$.*

Ideally, we would like to set g to be equal to g_0 on H_{ε_2} and to g_1 away from H_{ε_2} . However, this could potentially introduce a discontinuity at the boundary.

To avoid this, we choose a smooth cut-off function $\phi: X_{\text{in}}^1 \rightarrow [0, 1]$, equal to 1 on X_{in}^2 and supported on a compact subset of $\text{Int } X_{\text{in}}^1$. Extend ϕ to the whole of H_{ε_1} demanding that ϕ be invariant under the flow of ξ' . We set

$$(4.18) \quad g(z) = \begin{cases} g_1(z) & z \notin H_{\varepsilon_1}, \\ (\phi g_0 + (1 - \phi)g_1)(z) & z \in H_{\varepsilon_1}. \end{cases}$$

In particular $g = g_1$ outside H_{ε_1} . We only need to check continuity at $\partial H_{\varepsilon_1}$. By Lemma 4.17, g is continuous at X_{in}^1 and X_{out}^1 , the vanishing of ϕ on X_{tan}^1 implies that g is continuous at X_{tan}^1 , and so, g is continuous everywhere. Moreover, after a little technical amendment, that is, after rescaling ξ' , g can be assumed smooth, cf. [BNR16, Proof of Proposition 2.35]. By construction, $g = g_0$ in H_{ε_2} , in particular, it is Morse.

We claim that ξ' is gradient-like for g constructed in such a way. Since g and ξ' admit the Morse normal form near z (see (2.7)), we only need to check that $\partial_{\xi'} g \geq 0$ on $f^{-1}[a, b]$, with the sole equality at z . It is evident on H_{ε_2} , as $g = g_0$. Note that, by construction, $\partial_{\xi'} g_1 \equiv 1$ on $f^{-1}[a, b] \setminus H_{\varepsilon_2}$. In particular, $\partial_{\xi'} g > 0$ away from H_{ε_1} . Suppose $z \in H_{\varepsilon_1} \setminus H_{\varepsilon_2}$. The function ϕ was to be ξ' -invariant, hence $\partial_{\xi'} \phi = 0$. By (4.18):

$$\partial_{\xi'} g = \partial_{\xi'}(\phi g_0 + (1 - \phi)g_1) = \phi \partial_{\xi'} g_0 + (1 - \phi) \partial_{\xi'} g_1.$$

As $\partial_{\xi'} g_0(x) > 0$ on $H_{\varepsilon_1} \setminus H_{\varepsilon_2}$, and $\partial_{\xi'} g_1 \equiv 1$, we conclude that $\partial_{\xi'} g > 0$ on $H_{\varepsilon_1} \setminus H_{\varepsilon_2}$.

In this way, we finish the proof of Proposition 4.15, which was the last step in the proof of Theorem 1.2. \square

REFERENCES

- [BNR16] Maciej Borodzik, András Némethi, and Andrew Ranicki, *Morse theory for manifolds with boundary*, Algebraic & Geometric Topology **16** (2016), no. 2, 971–1023.
- [BP16] Maciej Borodzik and Mark Powell, *Embedded Morse theory and relative splitting of cobordisms of manifolds*, J. Geom. Anal. **26** (2016), no. 1, 57–87.
- [BPT23] Maciej Borodzik, Mark Powell, and Peter Teichner, *Immersed Morse theory*, 2023, in preparation.
- [KM07] Peter Kronheimer and Tomasz Mrowka, *Monopoles and three-manifolds*, New Mathematical Monographs, vol. 10, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007.
- [Mil65] John Milnor, *Lectures on the h-cobordism theorem*, Princeton University Press, December 1965.

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, POLISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, UL. SNIADKICH 8, 00-656 WARSAW, POLAND

Email address: mcboro@mimuw.edu.pl

INSTITUTE OF INFORMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW, UL. BANACHA 2, 02-097 WARSAW, POLAND

Email address: m.mielniczuk@uw.edu.pl