

FILTERED FUKAYA CATEGORIES

GIOVANNI AMBROSIONI

ABSTRACT. We upgrade the natural weakly-filtered structure of Fukaya categories discussed in [BCS21] to a genuinely filtered one. The main tools are a Morse-Bott, or ‘cluster’, model for Fukaya categories and a particular choice of class of perturbation data. We also include the construction of continuation A_∞ -functors following [Syl19] in the context of filtered Fukaya categories.

INTRODUCTION

Background. The application of the methods of persistence homology to symplectic geometry, in particular Floer theory, has led to many important results. The basic fact is that in many cases Floer complexes naturally admit the structure of filtered chain complexes, meaning that the standard Floer differential preserves a filtration induced by the action functional, so that Floer persistence homology is a well-defined object, both in the closed string (or Hamiltonian) case as well as in the open (or Lagrangian) one. However, defining an adequate filtered structure on the A_∞ -categorification of Lagrangian Floer homology, the so called Fukaya category of a symplectic manifold, has been proven to be difficult, as discussed at length in [BCS21], due to the presence of domain dependent Hamiltonian perturbations in the definition of the A_∞ -maps. On the other hand, in [BCS21], the authors showed that Fukaya categories naturally admit the structure of a homologically unital *weakly*-filtered A_∞ -category, meaning that the A_∞ -maps are filtered up to a uniform error depending on the order (which may eventually diverge) and representatives of the identities generally lie at positive filtration levels. If the uniform errors vanish and the representatives of units lie at filtration level zero, we say that the A_∞ -category is filtered. In this paper we explain how to construct filtered Fukaya categories by slightly modifying the definition of the A_∞ -maps to count Floer ‘clusters’ instead of Floer polygons, and by constructing adequate Hamiltonian perturbations. In particular, via our construction the derived Fukaya category of a symplectic manifold inherits the structure of a triangulated persistence category in the sense of [BCZ23].

Main results. Let (M, ω) be a closed or convex at infinity symplectic manifold, and denote by $\mathcal{L}^*(M)$ a family of closed Lagrangian submanifolds of M belonging to some class $*$ (e.g. $*$ = m for monotone Lagrangians, $*$ = $w\text{-}ex$ for weakly exact Lagrangians, $*$ = ex for exact Lagrangians). In this paper we will work with monotone Lagrangians, but our construction works for weakly exact Lagrangians and exact Lagrangians in Liouville manifolds too.

We will refer to the model of the Fukaya category developed in Seidel’s book [Sei08] as the *standard model for the Fukaya category of M* (see also e.g. [BC13; BC14; BCS21] for this model adapted to the monotone setting). In this standard model, morphism sets are Floer complexes $CF(L, L')$ where $L, L' \in \mathcal{L}^*(M)$ and the A_∞ -maps

$$\mu_d : CF(L_0, L_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes CF(L_{d-1}, L_d) \rightarrow CF(L_0, L_d)$$

are defined for any $d \geq 1$ and any tuple (L_0, \dots, L_d) of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^*(M)$ by counting Hamiltonian perturbed pseudoholomorphic polygons with Lagrangian boundary conditions, so-called Floer polygons. The representatives of homological units are constructed by counting Floer ‘1-gons’. The action functional (defined in Section 2.6) induces an increasing real filtration on Floer complexes, that is a choice of subspaces $CF^{\leq \alpha}(L, L')$ for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$CF^{\leq \alpha}(L, L') \subset CF^{\leq \beta}(L, L') \text{ for any } \alpha \leq \beta.$$

Date: June 26, 2023.

The author was partially supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation (grant number 200021-204107).

It is well-known that μ_1 preserves the above defined filtration, while in general higher order maps do not, and representatives of the units lie at positive filtration levels (cfr. [BCS21]). Our main result, Theorem 3.1, asserts that it is possible to construct a model for the Fukaya category admitting filtration-preserving A_∞ -maps as well as units lying in filtration level ≤ 0 . The following is a rough version of our main result.

Theorem A. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$. There is a class E_{reg}^ε of perturbation data, which depends on ε , such that associated to any $p \in E_{reg}^\varepsilon$ there is a strictly unital filtered A_∞ -category $\mathcal{Fuk}(M; p)$, whose set of objects is $\mathcal{L}^*(M)$ and which is quasi-equivalent to the standard Fukaya category.*

To prove Theorem A we have to tackle two problems: define A_∞ -maps that do not shift filtration, and find representatives of the unit lying at vanishing filtration levels. To solve the first problem we will construct the special class E^ε of perturbation data. The construction of such classes is very simple and we sketch it here. The idea is to pick ‘flat enough’ Hamiltonian Floer data for any couple of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^*(M)$ and use coordinates induced by strip-like ends on Floer polygons to interpolate between the Hamiltonian Floer datum and the zero function by a particular class of monotone homotopies, while asking that the Hamiltonian perturbation data vanish away from the strip-like ends. The definition of the classes E^ε of so-called ε -perturbation data is given in Section 3. However, even when working with perturbation data from some family E^ε , the Fukaya category of M may still be not filtered, because of the second problem listed above. Indeed, in Section 3.3 we argue that it is not possible to find representatives of the units at zero filtration levels by using the standard model for the Fukaya category. To cope with this fact, we use a Morse-bott, or ‘cluster’, model for Fukaya categories, by defining a new A_∞ -category whose self-morphisms spaces are pearl complexes (in the sense of [BC09; BC08]), instead of Floer ones, and by considering ‘clusters’ of pearly-Morse trees and Floer polygons. This model was outlined in [BCZ23] in the exact case; we work out more details of this model in Section 2.

After developing the machinery of ε -perturbation data and the associated filtered Fukaya categories we introduce continuation A_∞ -functors, an A_∞ -extension of continuation chain maps, in Appendix A following [Sy19]. The main result from Appendix A may be roughly stated as follows.

Theorem B. *Let $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 > 0$, $p \in E_{reg}^{\varepsilon_1}$ and $q \in E_{reg}^{\varepsilon_2}$. There is a unital A_∞ -quasi equivalence*

$$\mathcal{F}^{p,q}: \mathcal{Fuk}(M; p) \rightarrow \mathcal{Fuk}(M; q)$$

canonical up to quasi-isomorphism of A_∞ -functors which shifts filtration by $\leq \varepsilon_2 - \frac{\varepsilon_1}{2}$.

The construction of the classes $E_{reg}^{p,q,f}$ is based on the same principles as the construction of the classes E^ε .

Relation to previous work. The weakly-filtered structure of Fukaya categories in the closed monotone case has been discussed in [BCS21], which, for the application contained in that paper, did not need to be refined to a genuine filtered structure. The cluster model for the Fukaya category has been discussed in [Cha12] in the case of a single Lagrangian, in [BCZ23] in the case of a finite family of transversely intersecting exact Lagrangians, and in [She11] in the exact case. The difference between our cluster model and that contained in [She11], which was not motivated by the study of filtrations on Fukaya categories, is that we work in the monotone case and do not pick Hamiltonian perturbations for smooth discs, as those would interfere with the filtered structure. Our approach generalizes the methods in [BCZ23] by introducing ε -perturbation data and hence allowing to get rid of the restrictive finiteness and transversality assumptions.

Future work. As it will be clear from the construction, the filtered equivalence class of our Fukaya categories depends on the choice of perturbation data (and in particular on the choice of the parameter $\varepsilon > 0$). In many applications it is an interesting question to investigate the behaviour of invariants constructed via the filtered structure when $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. In Appendix A we define continuation functors

between Fukaya categories adapting previous work of Sylvan [Syl19] to our setting, which we plan to exploit in future work to introduce quantitative invariants of Fukaya categories.

A first, immediate consequence of our construction is clear: working with filtered A_∞ -categories is handier than with categories that are only weakly-filtered; in particular this simplifies many proofs of statements that appeal to the weakly-filtered structure of Fukaya categories as in [BCS21]. For these applications, our construction is not an absolutely necessary tool. However, most importantly, our genuinely filtered Fukaya category allows one to state new results about the structure of the Fukaya category itself, mainly due to two reasons: our model is what one would call a ‘minimal energy’ model (due to the fact that we define self-Floer complexes via the pearl model, which carries no Hamiltonian perturbations at all), and it allows nice control over the (positive or negative) shifts in filtration of maps that are defined on the Fukaya category, and some of its associated invariants, such as Hochschild homology, or the so-called open-closed maps.

Organization of the paper. In Section 1 we recall the definition of (weakly)-filtered A_∞ -categories and functors. We also go over monotone Lagrangians and introduce the combinatorial objects that we will use to describe compactifications of moduli spaces of Floer clusters. In Section 2 we work out the ‘cluster’ model for Fukaya categories and in Section 2.6 we adapt the work of [BCS21] to show that our Fukaya categories naturally inherit the structure of weakly-filtered A_∞ -categories with filtered unit. In Section 3 we construct the classes of ε -perturbation data, which ensure that the associated Fukaya categories are genuinely filtered. In Section 3.3 we argue why the cluster model seems necessary to have a filtered Fukaya category. In Appendix A we develop the machinery of continuation functors between filtered Fukaya categories, building on [Syl19].

Acknowledgments. I would like to thank Paul Biran for numerous discussions about filtrations and Fukaya categories, and for mentioning the idea of a cluster model to me.

CONTENTS

1. Preliminaries	4
1.1. Filtered A_∞ -categories	4
1.2. Monotone Lagrangians	4
1.3. Tuples of Lagrangians	5
1.4. Trees	6
1.5. Trees with Lagrangian labels	6
2. A Morse-Bott model for $\mathcal{Fuk}(X)$ and its weakly filtered structure	10
2.1. Source spaces: moduli spaces of clusters	10
2.2. Perturbation data for clusters	13
2.3. Moduli spaces of Floer clusters with Lagrangian boundary	15
2.4. Transversality for Floer clusters	17
2.5. Definition of $\mathcal{Fuk}(M)$	20
2.6. Weakly-filtered structure on $\mathcal{Fuk}(M)$	22
3. ε -Perturbation data and filtered structure on $\mathcal{Fuk}(M)$	26
3.1. ε -Perturbation data for $d^R \leq 2$	26
3.2. ε -Perturbation data for $d^R > 2$	29
3.3. Observation: the case of the unit in the standard model of Fukaya categories	32
Appendix A. Continuation functors	34
A.1. Colored trees	34
A.2. Stacked discs	35
A.3. Source spaces: moduli spaces of stacked clusters	41
A.4. Interpolation data	42
A.5. Moduli spaces of stacked Floer clusters with Lagrangian boundary	44
A.6. Definition of continuation functors	46
A.7. $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -Continuation functors and filtrations	47
References	49

1. PRELIMINARIES

1.1. Filtered A_∞ -categories. In this section we recall the basics about weakly-filtered A_∞ -categories and weakly-filtered A_∞ -functors as introduced in [BCS21].

Let (C, d) be a chain complex. A filtration on (C, d) is a choice of subspaces $C^{\leq \alpha} \subset C$ for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $C^{\leq \alpha} \subset C^{\leq \beta}$ for any $\alpha \leq \beta$ and $d(C^{\leq \alpha}) \subset C^{\leq \alpha}$ for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. We refer to the second property by saying that the differential d preserves filtration. A chain complex endowed with a filtration is called a filtered chain complex. Consider two filtered chain complexes (C, d) and (\bar{C}, \bar{d}) , a chain map $\varphi : (C, d) \rightarrow (\bar{C}, \bar{d})$ between them and a non-negative real number $r \geq 0$. We say that φ shifts filtration by $\leq r$ if $\varphi(C^{\leq \alpha}) \subset \bar{C}^{\alpha+r}$ for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. If φ shifts filtration by ≤ 0 we say that it is a filtered chain map.

Consider now a homologically unital A_∞ -category $(\mathcal{A}, \mu = (\mu_d)_{d \geq 1})$. We will use homological notation as in [BCS21]. Given objects $X, Y \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{A})$ we write $\mathcal{A}(X, Y) := \text{hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(X, Y)$ for the morphism space between X and Y . We recall that for any $d \geq 1$ the map μ_d is, for any tuple X_0, \dots, X_d of objects of \mathcal{A} , a linear map

$$\mu_d : \mathcal{A}(X_0) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{A}(X_{d-1}, X_d) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(X_0, X_d)$$

satisfying the A_∞ -equations

$$\mu^1 \circ \mu^d + \sum_{\substack{i+j=d-1 \\ i, j \geq 0}} \mu^d(id^i \otimes \mu^1 \otimes id^j) = \sum_{\substack{i+j+k=d+1 \\ i, j \geq 0, k \geq 1}} \mu^{i+j+1}(id^i \otimes \mu^k \otimes id^j) \quad (1.1)$$

Let $u^A \geq 0$ be a non-negative real number and $\varepsilon^A = (\varepsilon_d^A)_{d \geq 2}$ be a sequence of non-negative real numbers. A weakly filtered structure on (\mathcal{A}, μ) with discrepancy (ε^A, u^A) is a choice of filtration on the chain complexes $(\mathcal{A}(X, Y), \mu^1)$ for any two objects $X, Y \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{A})$ such that:

- (1) for any $d \geq 2$, any tuple (X_0, \dots, X_d) of objects of \mathcal{A} and any real numbers $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d \in \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$\mu_d \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^d \mathcal{A}^{\leq \alpha_i}(X_{i-1}, X_i) \right) \subset \mathcal{A}^{\leq \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i + \varepsilon_d^A}(X_0, X_d)$$

- (2) for any object $X \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{A})$ there exists a representative $e_X \in \mathcal{A}(X, X)$ of the unit of X such that

$$e_X \in \mathcal{A}^{\leq u^A}(X, X)$$

An A_∞ -category endowed with a weakly-filtered structure will be called a weakly-filtered A_∞ -category. A weakly-filtered category (\mathcal{A}, μ_d) is said to be filtered if we can take $u^A = 0$ and $\varepsilon_d^A = 0$ for any $d \geq 2$.

Let (\mathcal{A}, μ_d^A) and (\mathcal{B}, μ_d^B) be filtered A_∞ -categories, $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ be an A_∞ -functor between them and $\varepsilon^{\mathcal{F}} := (\varepsilon_i^{\mathcal{F}})_{i \geq 1}$ be a sequence of non-negative real numbers. We say that \mathcal{F} is a weakly-filtered A_∞ -functor with discrepancy $\varepsilon^{\mathcal{F}}$ if for any $d \geq 1$, any tuple (X_0, \dots, X_d) of objects of \mathcal{A} and any real numbers $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d \in \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$\mathcal{F}_d \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^d \mathcal{A}^{\leq \alpha_i}(X_{i-1}, X_i) \right) \subset \mathcal{B}^{\leq \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i + \varepsilon_d^{\mathcal{F}}}(\mathcal{F}(X_0), \mathcal{F}(X_d))$$

A weakly-filtered functor \mathcal{F} is said to be filtered if we can take $\varepsilon_i^{\mathcal{F}} = 0$ for any $d \geq 1$. \mathcal{F} is said to shift filtration by $\rho \geq 0$ if we can take $\varepsilon_d^{\mathcal{F}} = d\rho$ for any $d \geq 1$. In [Fuk21], such functors are called ‘with energy loss ρ ’.

1.2. Monotone Lagrangians. Let (M, ω) be a closed symplectic manifold, fixed for the rest of the paper. Let L be a Lagrangian submanifold of M . The Maslov class of L induces a map

$$\mu : \pi_2(M, L) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}.$$

We say that L is monotone if there is a positive constant $\tau > 0$ such that

$$\omega = \tau\mu,$$

where we see ω as a map on $\pi_2(M, L)$, and if $N_L \geq 2$ where N_L generates the image of μ in \mathbb{Z} . We refer to τ as the monotonicity constant of L .

We will denote the standard Novikov field over \mathbb{Z}_2 as

$$\Lambda := \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k T^{\lambda_k} : a_k \in \mathbb{Z}_2, \lambda_k \in \mathbb{R} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_k = \infty \right\}$$

and by Λ_0 the positive Novikov field over \mathbb{Z}_2 , that is

$$\Lambda_0 := \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k T^{\lambda_k} : a_k \in \mathbb{Z}_2, \lambda_k \geq 0, \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_k = \infty \right\}$$

Let L be a monotone Lagrangian and assume in addition that it is closed. Then for a generic choice of J the count of J -holomorphic discs with Maslov index equal to 2 passing through a generic point $p \in L$ weighted by symplectic area is well-defined, and independent from J and the point $p \in L$, and we denote it by $\mathbf{d}_L \in \Lambda_0$ (see [Laz11]). Let $\mathbf{d} \in \Lambda_0$, then we define $\mathcal{L}^{m, \mathbf{d}}(M, \omega)$, where the m stands for monotone, as the set of closed, connected and monotone Lagrangians L of M with $\mathbf{d}_L = \mathbf{d}$. Note that if $\mathbf{d} \neq 0$ all Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m, \mathbf{d}}(M, \omega)$ share the same monotonicity constant.

1.3. Tuples of Lagrangians. We introduce the following notations. Let $d \geq 1$ and pick a tuple (L_0, \dots, L_d) of Lagrangians in M . We say that it is made of cyclically different Lagrangians (or, simply, is a cyclically different tuple) if $L_i \neq L_{i+1}$ for each $i \in \{0, \dots, d\}$ ¹, while we say that the tuple (L_0, \dots, L_d) is made of almost cyclically different Lagrangians (or, simply, is an almost cyclically different tuple) if $L_i \neq L_{i+1}$ for any $i \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$ but $L_0 = L_d$. Assume that (L_0, \dots, L_d) is not cyclically different: each time there are consecutive indices $i, i+1, \dots, i+k$ indexing the same Lagrangian, we subtract k from all the indices bigger than $i+k+1$ and write the new tuple as $L_0, \dots, L_{i-1}, (\bar{L}_i, k), \bar{L}_{i+1}, \dots, \bar{L}_{d-k}$, with $L_{i-1} \neq \bar{L}_i \neq \bar{L}_{i+1}$ (we always work modulo $d+1$); we repeat this process until we get a tuple

$$\left((\bar{L}_0, m_0), \dots, (\bar{L}_{d^R}, m_{d^R}) \right)$$

of cyclically different Lagrangians with multiplicities $m_i \geq 1$, which we will call the *reduced tuple* of (L_0, \dots, L_d) . Notice that the number $m_0 \geq 1$ can be split as a sum $m_0 = m_0^b + m_0^e$ where $m_0^b \geq 1$ is the number of subsequent Lagrangians equal to L_0 at the beginning of the tuple (L_0, \dots, L_d) , while $m_0^e \geq 0$ is the number of subsequent Lagrangians equal to L_0 at the end of the tuple. For notational convenience we will write $\bar{m}_0 := m_0^b, \bar{m}_i := m_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, d^R$ and $\bar{m}_{d^R+1} := m_0^e$. In the following we will often omit multiplicities from the notation of the reduced tuple. We will often write a tuple by \vec{L} and its reduced tuple by \vec{L}_{red} . We also define the tuple $\vec{L}^F = (L_0^F, \dots, L_{d^F}^F)$ as follows: $L_0^F := L_0$ while $L_k^F := \bar{L}_m$, where

$$m := \min\{l \in \{k, \dots, d^R - 1\} : \bar{L}_l \neq L_j^F \forall j \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}\}$$

until there is no Lagrangian left to index. We call \vec{L}^F the *fundamental tuple* of \vec{L} . Of course it holds that $d^F \leq d^R \leq d$. In words, given a tuple \vec{L} , the reduced tuple \vec{L}_{red} is the tuple obtained by merging pairs of equal subsequent Lagrangians in \vec{L} , while the fundamental tuple \vec{L}^F is obtained by keeping geometrically different Lagrangians only (for an example see Figure 1.5).

Consider a tuple $\vec{L} = (L_0, \dots, L_d)$ of Lagrangians in M . We will write

$$\pi_2(M, \vec{L}) := \pi_2 \left(M, \bigcup_{i=0}^d L_i \right)$$

Notice that for any subtuple $(\tilde{L}_0, \dots, \tilde{L}_k)$ of \vec{L} of any length we have a map

$$\pi_2 \left(M, \bigcup_{i=0}^k \tilde{L}_i \right) \rightarrow \pi_2(M, \vec{L})$$

¹Here and in the following definitions like these have to be taken modulo d . In this case this means $L_d \neq L_{d+1} = L_0$.

induced by the inclusion $\cup \tilde{L}_i \rightarrow \cup L_i$. In the rest of the paper, we will see each possible $\pi_2(M, \cup \tilde{L}_i)$ as a subset of $\pi_2(M, \vec{L})$ and omit the inclusions above.

1.4. Trees. Let $d \geq 2$. We define, as in [Sei08], a d -leafed tree to be a properly embedded planar tree $T \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ with $d+1$ semi-infinite edges, which we call exterior edges, one of which is distinguished and called the root of T , denoted e_T , while the others are numbered clockwise starting from the root and denoted

$$e_0(T) = e_T, e_1(T), \dots, e_d(T)$$

For us, all leafed trees are oriented from the non-root leaves to the root. Note that, as in [Sei08] but contrary to most of the literature, we do not consider leaves to be vertices. For $d = 1$, a leafed tree is just an infinite edge, oriented from leaf to root. Notice that a d -leafed tree cuts \mathbb{R}^2 in $d+1$ connected components, which we number clockwise, starting from the one nearest to the root when moving clockwise. We abuse notation and denote those connected components also by $e_0(T), \dots, e_d(T)$. Given a d -leafed tree T we denote by $V(T)$ the set of its vertices, by $E(T)$ the set of its edges and by $E^{\text{int}}(T) \subset E(T)$ the subset of edges which are not exterior, and which we call interior. The unique vertex attached to the root will be called the root vertex and denoted by v_T . We write $|v|$ for the number of edges which are attached to a vertex $v \in V(T)$, and call it the valency of v , $|v|_i$ for the number of interior edges attached to v and $|v|_e := |v| - |v|_i$ for the number of exterior edges attached to v . We denote by $V^i(T) \subset V(T)$ the subset of vertices of T having valency i . A tree T is called stable if the minimal valency of a vertex of T is 3, and it is called binary if each vertex has valency equal to 3. Notice that a vertex $v \in V(T)$ touches $|v|$ connected components of $\mathbb{R}^2 - T$: we number them clockwise starting from the one associated to the edge attached to v which is nearest to the root and denote them by

$$e_0(v), \dots, e_{|v|-1}(v)$$

A flag of T is a couple $(v, e) \in V(T) \times E(T)$ such that e is attached to v . Given a vertex $v \in V(T)$ we denote by $f_0(v) \in E(T)$ the unique edge that exits from v , and by $f_1(v), \dots, f_{|v|-1}(v) \in E(T)$ the remaining edges attached to v , ordered in clockwise order starting from $f_0(v)$. Conversely, given an edge $e \in E(T)$ we define $t(e) \in V(T)$ as the start-vertex of e (following the above defined orientation) and by $h(e) \in V(T)$ the end-vertex of e (of course, one between h or t is not defined for exterior edges). We denote by \mathcal{T}^{d+1} the space of stable d -leafed trees, where two trees are identified if there exists an isomorphism of planar trees between them. We denote by $\mathcal{T}_B^{d+1} \subset \mathcal{T}^{d+1}$ the subset of *binary* d -leafed trees. We denote by $F(T)$ the set of flags of T and by $F^{\text{int}}(T) \subset F(T)$ the subset of flags made of interior edges.

Let T be a d -leafed tree. A metric on T is a map $\lambda : E(T) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ such that

$$\lambda(e_i(T)) = \infty \text{ for any } i = 0, \dots, d \text{ and } \lambda(e) < \infty \text{ for any } e \in E^{\text{int}}(T)$$

We call a couple (T, λ) a metric tree and we denote by $\lambda(T)$ the space of metrics of T . We also define the space $\overline{\lambda(T)}$ of maps $\lambda : E(T) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ such that

$$\lambda(e_i(T)) = \infty \text{ for any } i = 0, \dots, d$$

Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, then we define $\lambda^k(T) \subset \overline{\lambda(T)}$ to be the space of metrics with k interior edges of infinite length. Note that if $T \in \mathcal{T}^{d+1}$ then $\lambda^k(T) = \emptyset$ for any $k > d - 1$.

If $T' \subset T$ is a subtree of T and $\lambda \in \lambda(T)$ is a metric on T , then λ induces a metric on T' , which we still denote by λ , and call (T', λ) a metric subtree of (T, λ) , even if T' itself is not leafed or unstable. We denote by $\lambda(T')$ the space of metrics on T' in the sense above, and by $\overline{\lambda(T')}$ the obvious analogous of $\overline{\lambda(T)}$.

1.5. Trees with Lagrangian labels. Let $\vec{L} = (L_0, \dots, L_d)$ be a tuple of lagrangian submanifolds in $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$. Given a d -leafed tree T , the assignment $L_i \mapsto e_i(T)$, where $e_i(T)$ is seen as the i th connected component of $\mathbb{R}^2 - T$ in the sense of Section 1.4, is called a labelling by L for T . We denote by $\mathcal{T}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ the space of stable d -leafed trees labelled by \vec{L} . If $\vec{L}^F = L$, i.e. \vec{L} contains the same Lagrangian $d+1$ times, we simply write $\mathcal{T}^{d+1}(L)$ for $\mathcal{T}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$.

Let $T \in \mathcal{T}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ be a labelled tree. Any vertex $v \in V(T)$ naturally inherits a labelling \vec{L}_v by the conventions above. Any edge $e \in E(T)$ also inherits a labelling by a couple of Lagrangians in an obvious way, and an edge $e \in E(T)$ is said to be unlabelled if it is labelled by a couple of equal Lagrangians. Denote by $E_U(T) \subset E(T)$ the set of unlabelled edges of T , by $E_F(T) := E(T) \setminus E_U(T)$ the set of non-unlabelled edges of T and by $E_i(T) \subset E(T)$ the set of edges of T that are (uni)labelled by L_i^F for any $i \in \{0, \dots, d^F\}$. Set also $E_U^{\text{int}}(T) := E_U(T) \cap E^{\text{int}}(T)$, $E_F^{\text{int}} := E_F(T) \cap E^{\text{int}}(T)$ and $E_i^{\text{int}}(T) := E_i(T) \cap E^{\text{int}}(T)$ for any $i \in \{0, \dots, d^F\}$. We define $\mathcal{T}_U^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ to be the set of stable trees labelled by \vec{L} with only unlabelled interior edges, i.e. $E_U^{\text{int}}(T) = E^{\text{int}}(T)$. A metric $\lambda \in \lambda(T)$ is said to be unlabelled if $\lambda(e) = 0$ for any non-unlabelled interior edge $e \in E^{\text{int}}(T)$. We denote by $\lambda_U(T)$ the space of unlabelled metrics on T , and we denote by $\overline{\lambda_U(T)}$ its closure in $\overline{\lambda(T)}$. Note that if $T \in \mathcal{T}_U^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ then $\lambda_U(T) = \lambda(T)$. We set $\lambda_U^k(T) := \lambda_U(T) \cap \lambda^k(T)$.

Given a labelled tree $T \in \mathcal{T}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ we define T_{red} to be T with unlabelled edges removed. T_{red} may not be connected and its connected components may be unstable leafed trees. Notice that if T lies in $\mathcal{T}_U^{d+1}(\vec{L})$, then T_{red} obviously does not have any interior edges. Anyway, the fact that T is a planar connected tree implies that the numbering of leaves of T induces a unique numbering

$$e_0(T_{\text{red}}), \dots, e_{d^R}(T_{\text{red}})$$

of the leaves of (the subtrees of) T_{red} , even if the latter is not connected. Assume now that $T \in \mathcal{T}_U^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ then the connected components (i.e. the vertices) of T_{red} induce a splitting

$$\{0, \dots, d^R\} = \bigcup_{v \in V(T_{\text{red}})} \Lambda_v$$

where $i \in \Lambda_v$ if and only if $\overline{L_i} \in \vec{L}_v$. Note that the above union is not disjoint in general. We have the following decomposition of $T \setminus T_{\text{red}}$ indexed by the fundamental tuple of \vec{L} :

$$T \setminus T_{\text{red}} = \bigcup_{i=0}^{d^F} T_j^F$$

where for any $j \in \{0, \dots, d^F\}$, T_j^F is the union of all the subtrees of $T \setminus T_{\text{red}}$ with edges unlabelled by L_j^F . We call the decomposition

$$T = T_{\text{red}} \cup \bigcup_{i=0}^{d^F} T_j^F$$

the fundamental decomposition of the labelled tree T . We define T_{uni} as the union of the trees T_j^F from the fundamental decomposition of T . Although T_{uni} is not a leafed tree in general, the planar structure of T induces the following ordering of edges of T_{uni} which are exterior edges of T : we denote by $e_j^i(T_{\text{uni}})$ as the j th edge (in clockwise order) of the subtree with label \overline{L}_i , that is

$$e_j^i(T_{\text{uni}}) := e_{\sum_{k=0}^{i-1} \overline{m}_k + j}(T)$$

In Figure 1.5 we sketched an example of a labelled tree and of its reduced tree (cfr. Figure ??).

We define $\lambda^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ as the space of metric trees (T, λ) , where $T \in \mathcal{T}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ and $\lambda \in \lambda(T)$, up to the relation that identifies identical metric trees, i.e. $(T_1, \lambda_1) \sim (T_2, \lambda_2)$ if and only if there is a planar isomorphism

$$\varphi : T_1 \setminus \{e \in E(T_1) : \lambda_1(e) = 0\} \rightarrow T_2 \setminus \{e \in E(T_2) : \lambda_2(e) = 0\}$$

such that $\lambda_2(\varphi(e)) = \lambda_1(e)$ for any remaining edge. We will often write elements of $\lambda^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ simply as (T, λ) . Note that $\lambda^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ has an obvious conformal structure. We define $\lambda_U^{d+1}(\vec{L}) \subset \lambda^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ as the subspace containing metric trees which can be represented by a tuple (T, λ) with $\lambda \in \lambda_U(T)$, or equivalently $T \in \mathcal{T}_U^{d+1}(\vec{L})$. Notice that the space $\lambda_U^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ may of course have boundary, depending on the nature of the tuple \vec{L} .




FIGURE 1.1. An element $T \in \mathcal{T}^7(\vec{L})$ for $\vec{L} = (L_0, L_0, L_2, L_3, L_2, L_1, L_0)$. We colored in orange the components of T_{red} . Note that in this case $L_{\text{red}} = ((L_0, 2+1), L_2, L_3, L_2, L_1)$ and $\vec{L}^F = (L_0, L_2, L_3, L_1)$.

We introduce system of ends (originally introduced in a different form in [Cha12]). Let $T \in \mathcal{T}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ and consider a metric $\lambda \in \lambda_U(T)$. A system of ends for (T, λ) is a map

$$s_{T,\lambda} : E(T) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$$

such that $s_{T,\lambda}(e) < \frac{\lambda(e)}{2}$ if $\lambda(e) > 0$ and $s_{T,\lambda} = 0$ otherwise. A system of ends for T is a map

$$s_T : E(T) \times \lambda_U(T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

such that $s_{T,\lambda} := s_T(\lambda)$ is a system of ends for (T, λ) and $s_T(e) : \lambda_U(T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is smooth for any $e \in E_U(T)$. A universal choice of system of ends for \vec{L} is a choice of a smooth map²

$$s : \lambda_U^{d+1}(\vec{L}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d-2}$$

such that $s_{T,\lambda} := s(T, \lambda)$ is a system of ends for any $(T, \lambda) \in \lambda^{d+1}$.

Let $T \in \mathcal{T}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$. Recall that we defined the space $\overline{\lambda(T)}$ by allowing metrics to take infinite value also away from exterior edges. We will see an interior edge of T with infinite length as a ‘breaking’ of T into two leafed trees as we explain in the followings. First, let \vec{L}_1 and \vec{L}_2 be tuples of Lagrangians of length $d_1 + 1$ and $d_2 + 1$ respectively and pick $T_1 \in \mathcal{T}^{d_1+1}(\vec{L}_1)$ and $T_2 \in \mathcal{T}^{d_2+1}(\vec{L}_2)$. Assume first that $m_0^e(\vec{L}_1) = 0$ and that there is $i \in \{1, \dots, d_2\}$ such that

$$L_0^1 = L_i^2 \text{ and } L_{i+1}^2 = L_{d_1}^1$$

²Here the map s is well-defined if we think of any element of λ_U^{d+1} as represented by a tree with $d - 2$ internal edges, which is possible by definition.

then we define $T_1 \#_i T_2$ as the tree obtained by gluing the root $e_0(T_1)$ of T_1 to the i th exterior edge $e_i(T_2)$ of T_2 . Assume now that $m_0^\varepsilon(\vec{L}) > 0$, that is in particular $L_0^1 = L_{d_1}^1$, and assume there is $i \in \{1, \dots, d_2\}$ such that

$$L_0^1 = L_i^2 = L_{i+1}^2 = L_{d_1}^1$$

then we define $T_1 \#_i T_2$ as the tree obtained by gluing the root $e_0(T_1)$ of T_1 to the i th exterior edge $e_i(T_2)$ of T_2 . Note that in both cases we have $T_1 \#_i T_2 \in \mathcal{T}^{d_1+d_2+1}(\vec{L}_1 \#_i \vec{L}_2)$, where

$$\vec{L}_1 \#_i \vec{L}_2 := (L_0^2, \dots, L_i^2, L_1^1, \dots, L_{d_1-1}^1, L_{i+1}^2, \dots, L_{d_2}^2)$$

Moreover, we can see $T_1 \setminus e_0(T_1)$ and $T_2 \setminus e_i(T_2)$ as subsets of $T_1 \#_i T_2$ in an obvious way; the new edge resulting from gluing will be denote by $e_g \in E(T_1 \#_i T_2)$.

Let now $\lambda_1 \in \lambda(T_1)$ and $\lambda_2 \in \lambda(T_2)$ and consider $\rho \in [-1, 0)$. Suppose that \vec{L}_1 and \vec{L}_2 satisfy one of the compatibility conditions in the definition of gluing of labelled trees above. Then we can define a metric $\gamma^{T_1, T_2; i}(\rho, \lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in \lambda(T_1 \#_i T_2)$ via

$$\gamma^{T_1, T_2; i}(\rho, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)|_{T_1 \setminus e_0(T_1)} := \lambda_1, \quad \gamma^{T_1, T_2; i}(\rho, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)|_{T_2 \setminus e_i(T_2)} := \lambda_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma^{T_1, T_2; i}(\rho, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)(e_g) := -\ln(-\rho)$$

This way we defined for any admissible $i \in \{0, \dots, d_2\}$ a map

$$\gamma^{T_1, T_2; i} : [-1, 0) \times \lambda(T_1) \times \lambda(T_2) \rightarrow \lambda(T_1 \#_i T_2)$$

Note that such maps extend to maps

$$\overline{\gamma^{T_1, T_2; i}} : [-1, 0] \times \lambda(T_1) \times \lambda(T_2) \rightarrow \overline{\lambda(T_1 \#_i T_2)}$$

by declaring $\overline{\gamma^{T_1, T_2; i}}|_{0 \times \lambda(T_1) \times \lambda(T_2)}$ to be the trivial gluing. This explains what we meant above by seeing interior edges of infinite length as ‘broken edges’.

Let now \vec{L} be a tuple of Lagrangians of length $d+1$. By considering all the decompositions of all trees $T \in \mathcal{T}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ into two and more leafed trees and by packing all the maps of the form $\overline{\gamma^{T_1, T_2; i}}$ as above we get boundary charts for $\lambda^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ by looking at ‘small enough neighbourhoods of the trivial gluing’, similarly to what is done for moduli spaces of punctured discs in [Sei08]. We skip the details of this construction. As it will be apparent from the constructions in Section 2 we are particularly interested in $\overline{\lambda_U^{d+1}(\vec{L})}$, that is the closure of $\lambda_U^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ in $\overline{\lambda^{d+1}(\vec{L})}$, which inherits conformal structure and boundary charts from $\overline{\lambda^{d+1}(\vec{L})}$.

We can now introduce the notion of consistency for system of ends: a system of ends s on \vec{L} is said to be consistent if it extends smoothly to a map \bar{s} on $\overline{\lambda_U^{d+1}(\vec{L})}$. Note that the fact that our trees are labelled is not of central importance for the notion of consistency. In particular, the following result can be proved by constructing an explicit system of ends as in [Cha12].

Lemma 1.1. *Consistent choices of system of ends exist.*

Proof. An example is constructed in [Cha12, Section 1.3]. □

Lastly, Given a metric labelled tree $T \in \mathcal{T}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ and a metric $\lambda \in \overline{\lambda(T)}$ on it, we will identify edges with intervals according to the metric and the orientation described above, that is:

- The non-root leaves will be identified with $(-\infty, 0]$, while the root with $[0, \infty)$;
- interior edges $e \in E^{\text{int}}(T)$ with $\lambda(e) < \infty$ will be identified with $[0, \lambda(e)]$;
- interior edges $e \in E^{\text{int}}(T)$ with $\lambda(e) = \infty$ will be identified with the disjoint union $[0, \infty) \sqcup (-\infty, 0]$.

Given $e \in E(T)$ we will often write the point t in the interval representation of e as $e(t)$ for notational convenience. Given a system of ends s on \vec{L} , we will abuse notation and often identify $s_T(e) \in \mathbb{R}$ as an interval in the following way: $s_T(e) = [\frac{\lambda(e)}{2} - s_T(e), \frac{\lambda(e)}{2} + s_T(e) \subset e$ if e has finite length, and $s_T(e) = [s_T(e), \infty) \subset e$ resp. $(-\infty, -s_T(e)] \subset e$ otherwise.

2. A MORSE-BOTT MODEL FOR $\mathcal{Fuk}(X)$ AND ITS WEAKLY FILTERED STRUCTURE

In this section, we construct a Morse-Bott model for the Fukaya category. Similar constructions have appeared in [She11; Cha12]. The idea of using such a model to construct filtered Fukaya categories already appeared in [BCZ23]. We fix once and for all a closed and connected symplectic manifold (M, ω) . Recall that given $d \in \Lambda_0$ the class $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$ consists of closed, connected and monotone Lagrangians $L \subset M$ with $d_L := d$.

2.1. Source spaces: moduli spaces of clusters. Let $d \geq 2$. We recall the definition of moduli spaces of (configurations of) discs with d boundary marked points \mathcal{R}^{d+1} .

We set $D := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \leq 1\}$ and $\partial D := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| = 1\}$. We define

$$\text{conf}_{d+1}(\partial D) \subset (\partial D)^{d+1}$$

as the space of ordered tuples of $d+1$ distinct points on ∂D . An element of $\text{conf}_{d+1}(\partial D)$ will be usually denoted as (z_0, \dots, z_d) . We then define

$$\mathcal{R}^{d+1} := \frac{\text{conf}_{d+1}(\partial D)}{\text{Aut}(D)}$$

which is a smooth manifold of dimension $d-2$, and admits a compactification into a manifold with corners $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{d+1}}$ which realizes Stasheff's associahedron.

Let $\vec{L} = (L_0, \dots, L_d)$ be a tuple of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$. We denote by $\mathcal{R}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ the space of discs $r \in \mathcal{R}^{d+1}$ equipped with the Lagrangian label \vec{L} , i.e. for any $i = 0, \dots, d$ we view the boundary arc of r between z_i and z_{i+1} as labelled by L_i . The difference between $\mathcal{R}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ and \mathcal{R}^{d+1} is hence purely formal, but the a-priori specification of Lagrangian labels will be of help when defining moduli spaces of clusters. Let $r \in \mathcal{R}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$: the marked point z_i will be called of type I if $L_{i-1} \neq L_i$, and of type II otherwise.

Over $\mathcal{R}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ we have a bundle

$$\pi^{d+1}(\vec{L}) : \mathcal{S}^{d+1}(\vec{L}) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$$

where the fiber $S_r := (\pi^{d+1}(\vec{L}))^{-1}(r)$ over $r \in \mathcal{R}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ is a (equivalence class of) punctured disc representing the configuration r , with punctures at points of type I and smooth marked points at points of type II (see [Sei08] for the formal definition of disc with punctures). We call the family $(\pi^{d+1}(\vec{L}))_{d, \vec{L}}$ over all tuples of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$ of any length a universal family of discs.

In the following we will describe a partial compactification for $\pi^{d+1}(\vec{L})$, which requires the notion of strip-like ends. We briefly recall what are strip-like ends from [Sei08]. Let S be a punctured disc and let z be either a point on ∂S or a puncture (viewed in the compactification of S). A positive strip-like end for S at z is a proper holomorphic embedding $\epsilon : [0, \infty) \times [0, 1] \rightarrow S$ such that $\epsilon^{-1}(\partial S) = [0, \infty) \times \{0, 1\}$ and

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon(s, \cdot) = z$$

A negative strip-like end is a strip-like end modeled on $(-\infty, 0]$. A choice of strip-like ends for $\pi^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ consists of proper embeddings $\epsilon_0 : \mathcal{R}^{d+1}(\vec{L}) \times [0, \infty) \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{S}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ and $\epsilon_i : \mathcal{R}^{d+1}(\vec{L}) \times (-\infty, 0] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{S}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ that restrict to strip-like ends on fibers at the associated $z_i(r)$ such that the images are pairwise disjoint. Given a choice $(\epsilon_0, \dots, \epsilon_d)$ of strip-like ends on $\pi^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ we denote by $(\bar{\epsilon}_1, \dots, \bar{\epsilon}_d)$ the set of negative strip-like ends at the points z_i of type I (i.e. at punctures). We will often omit strip-like ends from the notation and identify half-strips as subsets of discs. Moreover, for any $c \geq 0$ we will write $|s| \geq c$ for the subset $[c, \infty) \times [0, 1]$ resp. $(-\infty, -c] \times [0, 1]$. There is a notion of consistency for a universal choice of strip-like ends on the universal family $(\pi^{d+1}(\vec{L}))$ which requires strip-like ends to be compatible with breaking and gluing of discs (see [Sei08, Section 9g]). We do not recall here the definition but require any of our choices of strip-like ends to be consistent.

Let $T \in \mathcal{T}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ be a stable d -leafed tree labeled by \vec{L} . A T -disc configuration is a tuple

$$\left((r_v)_{v \in V(T)}, (z_{h(e)}, z_{t(e)})_{e \in E^{\text{int}}(T)} \right)$$

where $r_v \in \mathcal{R}^{|v|}(\vec{L}_v)$ and $z_{h(e)}$ (resp. $z_{t(e)}$) is a distinguished point in the tuple $r_{h(e)}$ (resp. $r_{t(e)}$). We denote \mathcal{R}^T the space of T -disc configurations and we set

$$\overline{\mathcal{R}^{d+1}(\vec{L})} := \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}^{d+1}(\vec{L})} \mathcal{R}^T$$

The following result is Lemma 9.2 in [Sei08].

Lemma 2.1. *The space $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{d+1}(\vec{L})}$ admits the structure of a smooth manifold with corners. Moreover, it realizes Stasheff's $(d-2)$ -associahedron.*

The partial compactification of π^{d+1} is

$$\overline{\pi^{d+1}(\vec{L})} : \overline{\mathcal{S}^{d+1}(\vec{L})} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{R}^{d+1}(\vec{L})}$$

where fibers are disjoint unions of nodal discs representing elements of the base.

We mimic an idea contained in [Cha12] in order to construct moduli spaces of cluster of punctured discs with marked points. Basically, what we do to define source spaces for the Floer maps defining the A_∞ -maps of our Fukaya category is adding a collar neighbourhood to certain boundary components of $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{d+1}(\vec{L})}$. Recall from Section 1.5 that

$$\lambda_U(T) = \{ \lambda \in \lambda(T) : \lambda(e) = 0 \text{ for any unilabelled } e \in E^{\text{int}}(T) \}$$

and that $\mathcal{T}_U^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ is the set of labelled trees with no non unilabelled interior vertices. We define

$$\mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L}) := \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}_U^{d+1}(\vec{L})} \mathcal{R}^T \times \lambda(T)$$

Notice that $\mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ is the interior of

$$\bigsqcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}^{d+1}(\vec{L})} \mathcal{R}^T \times \lambda_U(T)$$

We also define

$$\overline{\mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})} := \bigsqcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}^{d+1}(\vec{L})} \mathcal{R}^T \times \overline{\lambda_U(T)}$$

We define the bundle of clusters discs labelled by \vec{L}

$$\pi_C^{d+1}(\vec{L}) : \mathcal{S}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L}) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})}$$

where the fiber $S_{r,T,\lambda} := (\pi_C^{d+1}(\vec{L}))^{-1}(r, T, \lambda)$ over an element $(r, T, \lambda) \in \overline{\mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})}$ is obtained by modifying $S_r \in \mathcal{S}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ in the following way: any nodal point of S_r is replaced by a line segment of length $\lambda(e)$ oriented as e , while at any marked point (of type II) we attach a semi-infinite line segment $(-\infty, 0]$ or $[0, \infty)$ depending on whether the marked point is an entry or an exit.

To describe partial compactifications of the universal families $\pi_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})$, we introduce strip-like ends for clusters and then define gluing. Let $d \geq 2$ and $\vec{L} = (L_0, \dots, L_d)$ be a tuple of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$. A choice of strip-like ends on $\pi_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ is a choice of strip-like ends on each $\pi^{|v|+1}(\vec{L}_v)$ for any $T \in \mathcal{T}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ and any $v \in V(T)$, which is smooth in the following sense: if $(r, T, \lambda) \in \overline{\mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})}$ is a configurations such that there is an interior edge $e \in E^{\text{int}}(T)$ of T such that $\lambda(e) = 0$, then both marked points $z_{h(e)} \in S_{r,T,\lambda}(h(e))$ and $z_{t(e)} \in S_{r,T,\lambda}(t(e))$ do not lie in the image of a strip-like end. A universal choice of strip-like ends for clusters is a choice of strip-like ends on $\pi^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ for any tuple of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$ of any finite length $d+1$. We will always assume that our universal

choices of strip-like ends for clusters are consistent, that is, vertex-wise consistent.

We can now adapt the gluing procedure for punctured discs described in [Sei08, Section (9e)] to the case of clusters of discs. The aim of the following is not really to precisely describe gluing, but more to set the necessary notation for what's to come.

Let $d_1, d_2 \geq 2$ and consider two tuples

$$\vec{L}^1 = (L_0^1, \dots, L_{d_1}^1) \text{ and } \vec{L}^2 = (L_0^2, \dots, L_{d_2}^2)$$

of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$, whose reduced tuples we denote by \vec{L}_{red}^1 and \vec{L}_{red}^2 . Consider

$$(r_1, T_1, \lambda_1) \in \mathcal{R}^{d_1+1}(\vec{L}^1) \text{ and } (r_2, T_2, \lambda_2) \in \mathcal{R}^{d_2+1}(\vec{L}^2)$$

and let $\rho \in [-1, 0)$.

First, we assume $m_0^e(\vec{L}^1) = 0$, that is $L_0^1 \neq L_0^d$. Assume that there is $i \in \{1, \dots, d_2\}$ such that

$$L_0^1 = L_i^2 \text{ and } L_d^1 = L_{i+1}^2$$

and denote by $j \in \{1, \dots, d_2'\}$ the index such that $L_i^2 = \overline{L_j^2}$. The gluing of (r_1, T_1, λ_1) with (r_2, T_2, λ_2) at i with length ρ is defined as the tuple

$$(r, T_1 \#_i T_2, \gamma^{T_1, T_2, i}[-1, \lambda_1, \lambda_2])$$

where $\gamma^{T_1, T_2, i}$ is defined in Section 1.5 and r is defined as the configuration representing the cluster whose disc at the vertex of $T_1 \#_i T_2$ where gluing of trees happened³ is obtained by gluing the exit of $S_{r_1, T_1, \lambda_1}(v_1)$, where $v_1 \in V((T_1)_{\text{red}})$ is the only vertex such that $0, d^R \in \Lambda_{v_1}$, to the i th entry of the disc S_{r_2, T_2, λ_2} , where $v_2 \in V((T_2)_{\text{red}})$ is the only vertex such that $j, j+1 \in \Lambda_{v_2}$, with gluing length ρ (see [Sei08]), while it agrees with r_1 on the rest of the T_1 -part of $T_1 \#_i T_2$ and with r_2 on the rest of the T_2 -part of $T_1 \#_i T_2$.

Assume now $m_0^e(\vec{L}^1) > 0$, that is $L_0^1 = L_{d_1}^1$. Assume there is $i \in \{1, \dots, d_2\}$ such that

$$L_i^2 = L_0^1 = L_{d_1}^1 = L_{i+1}^2$$

and denote by $j \in \{1, \dots, d_2^R\}$ the index such that $L_i^2 = \overline{L_j^2}$. The gluing of (r_1, T_1, λ_1) with (r_2, T_2, λ_2) at i with length ρ is defined as the tuple

$$(r, T_1 \#_i T_2, \gamma^{T_1, T_2, i}(-\ln(-\rho), \lambda_1, \lambda_2))$$

where r agrees with r_1 on $T_1 \setminus e_0(T_1) \subset T_1 \#_i T_2$ and agrees with r_2 on $T_2 \setminus e_0(T_2) \subset T_1 \#_i T_2$. Note that in both cases, $(r, T_1 \#_i T_2, \gamma^{T_1, T_2, i}(0, \lambda_1, \lambda_2))$ lies in $\mathcal{R}_C^{d_1+d_2}(\vec{L}^1 \#_i \vec{L}^2)$, so that we defined maps

$$\gamma^{\vec{L}^1, \vec{L}^2, i} : [-1, 0) \times \mathcal{R}^{d_1+1}(\vec{L}^1) \times \mathcal{R}^{d_2+1}(\vec{L}^2) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_C^{d_1+d_2}(\vec{L}^1 \#_i \vec{L}^2)$$

for any tuples of Lagrangians as above and any admissible index i . It is easy to see that those maps extend to maps

$$\overline{\gamma^{\vec{L}^1, \vec{L}^2, i}} : [-1, 0] \times \mathcal{R}^{d_1+1}(\vec{L}^1) \times \mathcal{R}^{d_2+1}(\vec{L}^2) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{R}_C^{d_1+d_2}(\vec{L}^1 \#_i \vec{L}^2)}$$

by trivial gluing.

Let now $\vec{L} := (L_0, \dots, L_d)$ be a tuple of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$, and pick $T \in \mathcal{T}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ and $k \in \{0, \dots, d-2\}$. We define a gluing map

$$\gamma^{T, k} : [-1, 0)^{|E_F^{\text{int}}(T)|+k} \times \mathcal{R}^T \times \lambda_U^k(T) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})$$

where $E_F^{\text{int}}(T)$ is the set of non-unilabelled edges of T and $\lambda_U^k(T)$ is the set of unilabelled metrics on T such that exactly k interior edges have infinite length (see Section 1.5), by composing various maps of the form $\gamma^{\vec{L}^1, \vec{L}^2, i}$ for $k-1$ admissible tuples of Lagrangian decomposing \vec{L} . For instance, if $T \in \mathcal{T}_U^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ is unilabelled, then there are tuples \vec{L}_1 , of length d_1+1 , and \vec{L}_2 , of length d_2+1 , of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$ such that $d_1+d_2 = d+2$ and an index $i \in \{0, \dots, d_2\}$ such that

³The gluing in question produced an edge of vanishing length, i.e. it identified a vertex of T_1 with a vertex of T_2 .

$$\gamma^{T,1} = \gamma^{\vec{L}_0, \vec{L}_1, i}.$$

Note that the maps $\gamma^{T,k}$ are well-defined since we are working with consistent choices of strip-like end and of system of ends, and the two are independent concepts. Each of these maps extends to maps of the form

$$\overline{\gamma^{T,k}} : [-1, 0]^{|E_F^{\text{int}}(T)|+k} \times \mathcal{R}^T \times \lambda_U^k(T) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})}$$

again by trivial gluing.

By obvious considerations and repeatedly applying [Sei08, Lemma 9.2] we see that for any $(d+1)$ -tuple \vec{L} of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$ there are maps $\gamma^{\vec{L}^1, \vec{L}^2, i}$ whose restriction to small enough neighbourhood of the trivial gluing in the domain define boundary charts for $\mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})$.

Lemma 2.2. *The space $\mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ admits the structure of a smooth manifold of dimension $d-2$. Moreover, $\overline{\mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})}$ admits the structure of a smooth manifold with corners which realizes Stasheff's associahedron.*

Notice that the fact that our moduli spaces realize the associahedra comes for free from the fact that we just added some collar neighbourhoods to the compactified moduli spaces of punctured discs with Lagrangian labels. We remark that for $T \in \mathcal{T}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ and $k \in \{0, \dots, d-2\}$, the subspace $\mathcal{R}^T \times \lambda^k(T) \subset \overline{\mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})}$ is a boundary component of codimension $|E_F(T)| + k$.

We now introduce the following piece of notation which will be useful later on. Given $(r, T, \lambda) \in \mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ we define

$$\partial S_{r,T,\lambda} = \partial_F S_{r,T,\lambda} \cup \partial_M S_{r,T,\lambda}$$

where $\partial_F S_{r,T,\lambda}$ is the union of the boundaries of the disc components of $S_{r,T,\lambda}$, while $\partial_M S_{r,T,\lambda}$ is the union of all the line components in $S_{r,T,\lambda}$. Moreover, we denote by $S_{r,T,\lambda}(v)$ the disc with punctures and marked points corresponding to the vertex $v \in V(T)$, define

$$S_{r,T,\lambda}^p := \bigsqcup_{v \in V(T)} S_{r,T,\lambda}(v)$$

and for any $i \in \{0, \dots, d^R\}$ we denote by $\partial_i S_{r,T,\lambda}(v)$ to be the i th boundary component of $S_{r,T,\lambda}(v)$, that is the one corresponding to the boundary component $e_i(v)$ (see Section 1.4), and hence labelled by \vec{L}_i^v (here we are again differentiating between \vec{L}_i and \vec{L}_j for $i \neq j$ even if they agree as Lagrangians).

A universal choice of strip-like ends for $\pi_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ is the pullback from $\overline{\pi^{d+1}(\vec{L})}$ of the compactification of a universal and consistent choice of strip-like ends on $\pi^{d+1}(\vec{L})$. Hence, consistency of strip-like ends for clusters comes for free by definition. Given a choice of strip-like ends on $S_{r,T,\lambda}$ we number the strip-like ends following the numbering of the exterior edges of T_{red} and denote them by $\epsilon_0, \dots, \epsilon_{d^R}$ or $\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_{d^R}$ depending on whether or not T_{red} has a root or not (i.e. whether $L_0 \neq L_d$ or $L_0 = L_d$). $\pi_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ admits a partial compactification

$$\overline{\pi_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})} : \overline{\mathcal{S}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})}$$

defined by allowing line segments between discs to have infinite length. Those edges will be identified with broken edges following the conventions defined in Section 1.4.

2.2. Perturbation data for clusters. We define the concept of perturbation data in our cluster-setup. Fix coherent choices of strip-like ends and of system of ends $(s_T)_T$ (see page 8). Let (L_0, L_1) be a couple of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$. A Floer data for (L_0, L_1) consists of:

- if $L_0 = L_1 = L$: a triple (f^L, g^L, J^L) where (f^L, g^L) is a Morse-Smale pair on L such that f^L has a unique maximum and J^L is an ω -compatible almost complex structure on M ;
- if $L_0 \neq L_1$: a couple $(H^{L_0, L_1}, J^{L_0, L_1})$ where $H : M \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a time dependent Hamiltonian on M such that

$$\varphi_1^{L_0, L_1}(L_0) \pitchfork L_1$$

where $\varphi_t^{L_0, L_1}$ is the flow of the Hamiltonian vector field generated by H^{L_0, L_1} , and J is a $[0, 1]$ -family of ω -compatible almost complex structures on M which equals J^{L_0} near 0 and J^{L_1} near 1.

Given $L \in \mathcal{L}^{m, \mathbf{d}}(M, \omega)$ we denote by $\text{Crit}(f^L)$ the (finite) set of critical points of a Morse function $f^L : L \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ on L , and given $x \in \text{Crit}(f^L)$ we denote by $|x|$ its Morse index. Given a couple (L_0, L_1) of different Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m, \mathbf{d}}(M, \omega)$ with a choice H^{L_0, L_1} of Hamiltonian Floer datum we denote by $\mathcal{O}(H^{L_0, L_1})$ the (finite) set of orbits $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ of the Hamiltonian vector field of H^{L_0, L_1} such that

$$\gamma(0) \in L_0 \text{ and } \gamma(1) \in L_1$$

In order to state the following definition in an easier way, we write choose the 0 Hamiltonian for any couple of equal Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m, \mathbf{d}}(M, \omega)$, i.e. $H^{L, L} := 0$ for any $L \in \mathcal{L}^{m, \mathbf{d}}(M, \omega)$ and set $J^{L, L} := J^L$. Fix a choice of Floer data for any couple of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m, \mathbf{d}}(M, \omega)$. Let $\vec{L} = (L_0, \dots, L_d)$ be a tuple of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m, \mathbf{d}}(M, \omega)$ and let $(r, T, \lambda) \in \mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})$. A perturbation datum for \vec{L} on $S_{r, T, \lambda}$ consists of the following data:

- For any $i = 0, \dots, d^F$ (see page 5 for the definition of d^F) a choice of tuple

$$\left(f_{(T_i^F, \lambda_i)}^{r, T, \lambda}, g_{(T_i^F, \lambda_i)}^{r, T, \lambda} \right)$$

where the (T_i^F, λ_i) 's are the metric subtrees of T induced by \vec{L} (see Section 1.4) and:

- $f_{(T_i^F, \lambda_i)}^{r, T, \lambda} : T_i^F \times \bar{L}_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a map smooth on edges and continuous on vertices such that

$$f_{(T_i^F, \lambda_i)}^{r, T, \lambda}(\tau) : \bar{L}_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

is Morse for any⁴ $\tau \in T_i^F$ and

$$f_{(T_i^F, \lambda_i)}^{r, T, \lambda}(\tau) = f^{\bar{L}_i}$$

for any $\tau \in s_{T_i^F}$;

- $g_{(T_i^F, \lambda_i)}^{r, T, \lambda}$ assigns to any $\tau \in T_i^F$ a Riemannian metric $g_{(T_i^F, \lambda_i)}^{r, T, \lambda}(\tau)$ on L such that the pair

$$\left(f_{(T_i^F, \lambda_i)}^{r, T, \lambda}(\tau), g_{(T_i^F, \lambda_i)}^{r, T, \lambda}(\tau) \right)$$

is Morse-Smale for every $\tau \in T_i^F$ and

$$g_{(T_i^F, \lambda_i)}^{r, T, \lambda}(\tau) = g^{\bar{L}_i}$$

for any $\tau \in s_{T_i^F}$.

- For any $v \in V(T)$ a choice of couples

$$\left(K_v^{r, T, \lambda}, J_v^{r, T, \lambda} \right)$$

such that:

- $K_v^{r, T, \lambda} \in \Omega^1(S_{r, T, \lambda}(v), C^\infty(M))$ is an Hamiltonian-valued one-form which vanishes identically if $v \notin T_{\text{red}}$ (i.e. if $S_{r, T, \lambda}$ does not have any punctures), while for $v \in T_{\text{red}}$ is such that for any $i = 0, \dots, d^R$ it satisfies

$$K_v^{r, T, \lambda}(\xi)|_{\bar{L}_i} = 0 \text{ for any } \xi \in T(\partial_i S_{r, T, \lambda}(v))$$

and for any $i = 0, \dots, d$ on the strip-like ϵ_i we have⁵

$$K_v^{r, T, \lambda} = H^{L_i, L_{i+1}} dt \text{ for any } |s| \geq 1.$$

⁴Here we identify system of ends as subintervals of edges via the convention introduced at the end of Section 1.4.

⁵See page 10 for the definition of $|s| \geq 1$.

- $J_v^{r,T,\lambda}$ is a domain-dependent ω compatible almost complex structure which, if $v \in T_i^F \subset T \setminus T_{\text{red}}$ for some $i \in \{0, \dots, d^F\}$ (see Section 1.5) it is identical to $J^{L_i^F}$, while if $v \in T_{\text{red}}$, it is such that on the i th strip-like end ϵ_i we have

$$J_v^{r,T,\lambda} = J^{L_i, L_{i+1}} \text{ for any } |s| \geq 1$$

for any $i = 0, \dots, d$.

We define a perturbation datum for \vec{L} as a smooth choice of perturbation data for \vec{L} on $\mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ and denote it by

$$((f^{\vec{L}}, g^{\vec{L}}), (K^{\vec{L}}, J^{\vec{L}})).$$

The couple $(f^{\vec{L}}, g^{\vec{L}})$ will be called the Morse part of the perturbation datum, while $(K^{\vec{L}}, J^{\vec{L}})$ will be called its Floer part. A universal choice of perturbation data is a choice of perturbation datum for any tuple \vec{L} .

We have the following consistency conditions for perturbation data (see [Mes18; She11]). Fix a universal choice of perturbation data. We say that this choice is consistent if for any tuple \vec{L} of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$, say of length $d+1$, we have:

- (1) for any $T \in \mathcal{T}(\vec{L})$ and $k \in \{0, \dots, d-2\}$, there is a subset

$$U \subset \mathcal{R}^T \times \lambda_U^k(T) \times [-1, 0)^{|E_F^{\text{int}}(T)|+k}$$

whose closure is a neighbourhood of the trivial gluing where the gluing parameters are small such that the perturbation data for clusters over U agree with perturbation data induced by gluing on thin parts;

- (2) all perturbation data extend smoothly to $\overline{\partial \mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})}$ and agree there with perturbation data coming from (trivial) gluing.

We define the space E of consistent universal choices of perturbation data for clusters (with respect to a fixed choice of strip-like ends and of system of ends). Given $p \in E$ and a tuple \vec{L} of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$ we will often write the perturbation data on \vec{L} induced by p as

$$\mathcal{D}_p^{\vec{L}} = ((f^{\vec{L}}, g^{\vec{L}}), (K^{\vec{L}}, J^{\vec{L}})).$$

Moreover, given $(r, T, \lambda) \in \mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ we will write the associated perturbation datum for \vec{L} on $S_{r,T,\lambda}$ as $\mathcal{D}_p^{\vec{L}}(r, T, \lambda)$.

2.3. Moduli spaces of Floer clusters with Lagrangian boundary. Let $p \in E$ be a consistent universal choice of perturbation data for clusters. In the following, given a disc $u : D \rightarrow M$ in M we write $[u] \in \pi_2(M, L)$ for the image of the fundamental class of D under the pushforward of u .

First, we define moduli spaces of pearly-edges (see [BC09]). Let L be a monotone Lagrangian in $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$ and $d \geq 1$. Pick $T \in \mathcal{T}^{d+1}(L)$, an interior edge $e \in E^{\text{int}}(T)$, points $a, b \in L \setminus \text{Crit}(f^L)$ and a class $A \in \pi_2(M, L)$. We define the moduli space

$$\mathcal{P}(a, b; p; e; A)$$

of so-called pearly trajectories in the class A modeled on the edge e and joining a to b as the space of tuples

$$(\lambda(e), (u_1, \dots, u_k))$$

where

- (1) $\lambda \in \lambda(T)$,
- (2) for any $i = 1, \dots, k$, $u_i : D \rightarrow M$ is a non-constant J -holomorphic disc such that $u_i(\partial D) \subset L$,
- (3) we have $\sum_{i=1}^k [u_i] = A$,
- (4) there are $t_0, \dots, t_k \in [0, \infty)$ such that $\sum_{i=0}^k t_i = \lambda(e)$ and we have the relations

$$\varphi_{f_{(T,\lambda)|e}^L, g_{(T,\lambda)|e}^L}^{t_0}(a) = u_1(-1) \text{ and } \varphi_{f_{(T,\lambda)|e}, g_{(T,\lambda)|e}^L}^{-t_k}(b) = u_k(1)$$

as well as

$$\varphi_{f_{(T,\lambda)}^L|_e, g_{(T,\lambda)}^L|_e}^{t_i}(u_i(1)) = u_{i+1}(-1)$$

for any $i = 1, \dots, k-1$, where $\varphi_{f_{(T,\lambda)}^L|_e, g_{(T,\lambda)}^L|_e}^t$ is the time t flow map of the negative gradient of the time dependent map $f_{(T,\lambda)}^L|_e$ with respect to the time dependent Riemannian metric $g_{(T,\lambda)}^L|_e$, where $f_{(T,\lambda)}^L$ and $g_{(T,\lambda)}^L$ are Morse data associated to $p \in E$, as defined in Section 2.2.

up to reparametrization, i.e. $(\lambda(e), u_1, \dots, u_k)$ is identified with $(\lambda'(e), u'_1, \dots, u'_l)$ if and only if $k = l$, $\lambda(e) = \lambda'(e)$ and there are automorphisms $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k \in \text{Aut}(D^2)$ fixing -1 and 1 such that $u'_i = \sigma_i \circ u_i$ for any $i = 1, \dots, k$. The virtual dimension of $\mathcal{P}(a, b; p; e; A)$ is $n + \mu(A) - 1$, where μ denotes the Maslov index. Moreover, we define $\mathcal{P}(a, a; p; e; A) = \emptyset$ for any choice of parameters. The definition of $\mathcal{P}(a, b; p; e; A)$ extends also to the case where a, b are critical points of the function f_L in a standard way: if for instance $a \in \text{Crit}(f_L)$, then we ask that $t_0 = \infty$ (i.e. $u_1(-1) \in W^u(a)$) and $\sum_{i=1}^k t_i \in [0, \infty)$. If both a and b are critical points, then the virtual dimension of $\mathcal{P}(a, b; p; e; A)$ is $|a| - |b| + \mu(A) - 1$, where $|\cdot|$ denotes the Morse index.

Consider now a tuple $\vec{L} = (L_0, \dots, L_d)$ of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m, \mathbf{d}}(M, \omega)$. We define moduli spaces of Floer clusters with boundary on \vec{L} .

Assume first $L_0 \neq L_d$. Pick $\vec{x}_i := (x_1^i, \dots, x_{m_i-1}^i)$ for any $i = 0, \dots, d^R$, where $x_j^i \in \text{Crit}(f^{\vec{L}^i})$ are critical points, orbits $\gamma_j \in \mathcal{O}(H^{\vec{L}_{j-1}, \vec{L}_j})$ for any $j = 1, \dots, d^R$ and $\gamma_+ \in \mathcal{O}(H^{\vec{L}_0, \vec{L}_{d^R}})$ and a class $A \in \pi_2(M, \vec{L})$. Recall that we defined $\pi_2(M, \vec{L}) := \pi_2(M, \cup_i L_i)$ in Section 1.3. We define the moduli space

$$\mathcal{M}^{d+1}(\vec{x}_0, \gamma_1, \vec{x}_1, \dots, \gamma_{d^R}, \vec{x}_{d^R}; \gamma^+; A; p)$$

of Floer clusters joining $\vec{x}_0, \gamma_1, \vec{x}_1, \dots, \gamma_{d^R}, \vec{x}_{d^R}$ to γ^+ in the class A as the space of tuples $((r, T, \lambda), u)$ where

$$u = \left((u_v)_{v \in V(T)}, (u_e)_{e \in E(T)} \right) : S_{r, T, \lambda} \rightarrow M$$

satisfies

- (1) for any vertex $v \in V(T)$, $u_v : S_{r, T, \lambda}(v) \rightarrow M$ satisfies the (K^v, J^v) -Floer equation and the boundary conditions $u(\partial_i S_{r, T, \lambda}) \subset \vec{L}_i$,
- (2) for any $i = 1, \dots, d^R$ we have

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} u_{h(e_i(T_{\text{red}}))}(\bar{\epsilon}_i(s, t)) = \gamma_i(t)$$

and

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} u_{h(e_0(T_{\text{red}}))}(\epsilon_0(s, t)) = \gamma^+(t),$$

- (3) for any $i = 0, \dots, d^R$ and any interior edge $e \in E_i^{\text{int}}(T)$ (uni)labelled by \vec{L}_i there is a class $B_e \in \pi_2(M, L)$ such that

$$u_e \in \mathcal{P}(u_{t(e)}(z_{t(e)}), u_{h(e)}(z_{h(e)}); p; e; B_e),$$

- (4) for any $i = 0, \dots, d^R$ and any $j = 1, \dots, m_i$ (see page 5) there is a class $B_j^i \in \pi_2(M, \vec{L}_i)$ such that

$$u_{e_j^i(T_{\text{uni}})} \in \mathcal{P}(x_j^i, u_{h(e_j(T_i^F))}(z_{h(e_j(T_i^F))})); p; e_j^i(T_{\text{uni}}); B_j^i,$$

- (5) We have the relation

$$A = \sum_{v \in V(T)} [u_v] + \sum_{e \in E^{\text{int}}(T)} B_e + \sum_{i=0}^{d^R} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} B_j^i$$

on $\pi_2(M, \vec{L})$.

⁶Recall that we ignore inclusions on π_2 , see Section 1.3.

Assume now $L_0 = L_d$. Pick $x^+ \in \text{Crit}(f^{\overline{L}_0})$, $\vec{x}_i := (x_1^i, \dots, x_{m_i}^i)$ for $i = 0, \dots, d^R + 1$, where $x_j^i \in \text{Crit}(f^{\overline{L}_i})$ are critical points⁷, orbits $\gamma_j \in \mathcal{O}(H^{\overline{L}_{j-1}, \overline{L}_j})$ for any $i = 1, \dots, d^R + 1$ and a class $A \in \pi_2(M, \vec{L})$. We define the moduli space

$$\mathcal{M}^{d^R+1}(\vec{x}_0, \gamma_1, \vec{x}_2, \dots, \gamma_{d^R+1}, \vec{x}_{d^R+1}; x^+; A; p)$$

of Floer clusters joining $\vec{x}_0, \gamma_1, \vec{x}_2, \dots, \gamma_{d^R+1}, \vec{x}_{d^R+1}$ to x^+ in the class A as the space of tuples $((r, T, \lambda), u)$ where

$$u = ((u_v)_{v \in V(T)}, (u_e)_{e \in E(T)}) : S_{r, T, \lambda} \rightarrow M$$

satisfies

- (1) for any vertex $v \in V(T)$, $u_v : S_{r, T, \lambda}(v) \rightarrow M$ satisfies the (K^v, J^v) -Floer equation and the boundary conditions $u(\partial_i S_{r, T, \lambda}) \subset \overline{L}_i$,
- (2) for any $i = 1, \dots, d^R$ we have

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} u_{h(e_i(T_{\text{red}}))}(\overline{e}_i(s, t)) = \gamma_i(t),$$

- (3) for any $i = 0, \dots, d^R$ and any interior edge $e \in E_i^{\text{int}}(T)$ (uni)labelled by \overline{L}_i there is a class $B_e \in \pi_2(M, L)$ such that

$$u_e \in \mathcal{P}(u_{t(e)}(z_{t(e)}), u_{h(e)}(z_{h(e)}); p; e; B_e),$$

- (4) for any $i = 0, \dots, d^R$ and any $j = 1, \dots, m_i$ there is a class $B_j^i \in \pi_2(M, \overline{L}_i)$ such that

$$u_{e_j^i(T_{\text{uni}})} \in \mathcal{P}(x_j^i, u_{h(e_j^i(T_{\text{uni}}))}(z_{h(e_j^i(T_{\text{uni}}))})); p; e_j^i(T_{\text{uni}}); B_j^i)$$

and there is a class $B_0^0 \in \pi_2(M, \overline{L}_0)$ such that

$$u_{e_0(T)} \in \mathcal{P}(u_{t(e_0(T))}, x^+; p; e_0(T); B_0^0),$$

- (5) We have the relation

$$A = \sum_{v \in V(T)} [u_v] + \sum_{e \in E^{\text{int}}(T)} B_e + \sum_{i=0}^{d^R} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} B_j^i + B_0^0$$

on $\pi_2(M, \vec{L})$.

A schematic representation of a Floer cluster in the case $L_0 = L_d$ is depicted in Figure 2.1.

Given a Floer cluster (r, T, λ, u) we write $u_F := (u_v)_{v \in V(T_{\text{red}})}$ for the collection of curves contributing to u which are not purely pseudoholomorphic, and

$$\omega(u) := \sum_{v \in V(T)} \omega(u_v) + \sum_{e \in E(T)} \omega(u_e) = \omega(A) + \omega(u_F)$$

for its total symplectic area.

2.4. Transversality for Floer clusters. We set some notation first. Let \vec{L} be a tuple of different Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m, d}(M, \omega)$, i.e. with $\vec{L}^F = \vec{L}$ in the notation introduced in Section 1.3. Consider Hamiltonian orbits $\gamma_i \in \mathcal{O}(H^{L_{i-1}, L_i})$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ and $\gamma^+ \in \mathcal{O}(H^{L_0, L_d})$ as well as a class $A \in \pi_2(M, \vec{L})$. Then, associated to any Floer polygon connecting $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_d$ to γ^+ in the class A there is a polygonal Maslov index $\mu(u) \in \mathbb{Z}$ (see [Fuk+09] or [Oh15, Chapter 13]). It is known that this index only depends on the elements $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_d, \gamma^+$ and on the class A , and hence will be denoted by $\mu(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_d, \gamma^+; A)$. Moreover, it is additive under breaking and bubbling of Floer polygons and bubbling of pseudoholomorphic discs (and in this case reduces to the standard Maslov index). In particular, it follows directly that the Maslov index is defined for clusters too.

⁷Recall that we work modulo d^R , so that $\overline{L}_{d^R+1} = \overline{L}_0$.




FIGURE 2.1. A schematic representation of a Floer cluster in the moduli space $\mathcal{M}^8(x_1^0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_4, \gamma_5, x_1^{4+1}; x^+; A)$ for some class $A \in \pi_2(M, \vec{L})$ for the tuple $\vec{L} = (L_0, L_0, L_1, L_2, L_3, L_2, L_0, L_0)$. Morse trajectories and smooth discs are colored in orange, critical points in green and Floer polygons in red. Note that in this case $\vec{L}_{\text{red}} = ((L_0, 2 + 2), L_1, L_2, L_3, L_2)$ and $\vec{L}^F = (L_0, L_1, L_2, L_3)$.

In this section we sketch the proof of the following result.

Proposition 2.3. *There exists a residual subset $E_{\text{reg}} \subset E$ such that for any $p \in E_{\text{reg}}$ and any tuple $\vec{L} = (L_0, \dots, L_d)$ of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m, \mathbf{d}}(M, \omega)$ of any length $d \geq 1$ the following hold:*

- (1) *if $L_0 \neq L_d$ then for any $\vec{x}_i := (x_1^i, \dots, x_{m_i-1}^i)$, $i = 0, \dots, d^R$, where $x_j^i \in \text{Crit}(f^{\vec{L}_i})$ are critical points, any orbits $\gamma_j \in \mathcal{O}(H^{\vec{L}_{j-1}, \vec{L}_j})$, $i = 1, \dots, d^R$ and $\gamma^+ \in \mathcal{O}(H^{\vec{L}_0, \vec{L}_{d^R}})$ and any class $A \in \pi_2(M, \vec{L})$ satisfying*

$$d_A^{(\vec{x}_i)_i, (\gamma_j)_j, \gamma^+} := \mu(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_d, \gamma^+, A) + \sum_{i=0}^{d^R} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i-1} |x_j^i| - n(d - d^R - 1) + d - 2 \leq 1 \quad (2.1)$$

then the moduli space

$$\mathcal{M}^{d+1}(\vec{x}_0, \gamma_1, \vec{x}_1, \dots, \gamma_{d^R}, \vec{x}_{d^R}, \gamma^+; A; p)$$

is a smooth manifold of dimension $d_A^{(\vec{x}_i)_i, (\gamma_j)_j, \gamma^+}$.

- (2) if $L_0 = L_d$ then for any $x^+ \in \text{Crit}(f^{\overline{L}_0})$, $\vec{x}_i := (x_1^i, \dots, x_{m_i}^i)$ for $i = 0, \dots, d^R + 1$, where $x_j^i \in \text{Crit}(f^{\overline{L}_i})$, any orbits $\gamma_j \in \mathcal{O}(H^{\overline{L}_{j-1}, \overline{L}_j})$, $i = 1, \dots, d^R$ and any class $A \in \pi_2(M, \vec{L})$ satisfying

$$d_A^{(\vec{x}_i)_{i=0}, (\gamma_j)_{j=1}, x^+} := \mu(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_d, \gamma^+, A) + \sum_{i=0}^{d^R} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i-1} |x_j^i| - |x^+| - n(d - d^R - 1) + d - 2 \leq 1 \quad (2.2)$$

then the moduli space

$$\mathcal{M}^{d+1}(\vec{x}_0, \gamma_1, \vec{x}_1, \dots, \gamma_{d^R+1}, \vec{x}_{d^R+1}; x^+; A; p)$$

is a smooth manifold of dimension $d_A^{(\vec{x}_i)_{i=0}, (\gamma_j)_{j=1}, x^+}$.

The idea to prove Proposition 2.3 is to decompose clusters into ‘smaller’ pure ones and then exploit previous results from [Sei08; Cha12; Mes18] to conclude. We will not dive into details, but we explain how to reduce the problem into smaller ones.

Definition 2.4. Let $p \in E$, $(r, T, \lambda) \in \mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ and pick a Floer polygon $u : S_{r,T,\lambda} \rightarrow M$ defined via the perturbation datum p . We say that u is regular if:

- (1) for any $v \in V(T_{\text{red}})$, u_v is a regular Floer polygon in the sense that the extended linearised Floer operator at u_v is surjective (see [Sei08, Chapter 9h]),
- (2) for any $v \in V(T \setminus T_{\text{red}})$, u_v is a simple pseudoholomorphic disc, i.e. it has a dense subset of injective points (see [MS12]),
- (3) for any $e \in E^{\text{int}}(T)$ and any $i = 0, \dots, d^R$ and $j = 1, \dots, m_i$ the pearly trajectories u_e and $u_{e_j^i(T_{\text{uni}})}$ are made of simple discs,
- (4) the discs $((u_v)_{v \in V(T \setminus T_{\text{red}})}, (u_e^j)_{e,j}, (u_i^j)_{i,j})$ are absolutely distinct,
- (5) the map $u|_{\partial_M S_{r,T,\lambda}}$ is made of absolutely distinct Morse flowlines,
- (6) for any $v \in V(T)$, the maps $f_{(T,\lambda)}^L|_{f_i(v)}$, $i = 0, \dots, |v| - 1$, have transverse gradients away from a finite set.

We sketch the proof of Proposition 2.3.

Assume for a moment that $\vec{L} = \vec{L}^F$, i.e. $L_i \neq L_j$ for any $i \neq j$, and pick orbits $\gamma_i \in \mathcal{O}(H^{L_{i-1}, L_i})$ for any $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, $\gamma^+ \in \mathcal{O}(H^{L_0, L_d})$ and a class $A \in \pi_2(M, \vec{L})$. Then the virtual dimension of $\mathcal{M}^{d+1}(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_d; \gamma^+; A; (K, J))$, where (K, J) is some choice of (Floer) perturbation datum for \vec{L} , is $\mu(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_d, \gamma^+; A) + d - 2$ (see for instance [Oh15]). Moreover, it is nowadays well-known that for a generic choice of (Floer) perturbation data, such moduli spaces only contain regular Floer polygons (see for instance [Sei08]).

Now assume $\vec{L}^F = L$, i.e. $L = L_i$ for any i , and pick critical points x_1, \dots, x_d, x^+ of f^L and a class $A \in \pi_2(M, \vec{L}) = \pi_2(M, L)$. Then the virtual dimension of

$$\mathcal{M}^{d+1}(x_1, \dots, x_d; x^+; A; ((f_T^L, g_T^L)_T, J^L))$$

where $(f_T^L, g_T^L)_T$ is some choice of (Morse) perturbation datum for L (and the notation makes sense as $d^F = 1$) and J^L is part of the Floer data for L , is

$$\mu(A) + \sum_{i=1}^d (|x_i| - n) - |x^+| + d - 2$$

(see [Cha12]). Moreover, assuming that the virtual dimension is ≤ 1 , then for a generic choice of the almost complex structure J^L and (Morse) perturbation data, the Morse functions have transverse gradients at vertices of leafed trees, and such moduli spaces only contain configurations made of simple and absolutely distinct discs joined by absolutely distinct Morse flowlines (see [Mes18] for the Morse part, and [Cha12] for simpleness of holomorphic discs, proved applying the results contained in [Laz11]). In this case, it is crucial that the minimal Maslov number N_L of L is at least 2, as we assumed.

The general situation is essentially a mix of the two cases above. Let $p \in E$. Consider \vec{L} such that

$m_0^e(\vec{L}) = 0$, i.e. $L_0 \neq L_d$. Pick $\vec{x}_i := (x_1^i, \dots, x_{m_i-1}^i)$, $i = 0, \dots, d^R$, $\gamma_j \in \mathcal{O}(H^{\overline{L_{j-1}}, \overline{L_j}})$, $i = 1, \dots, d^R$, $\gamma_+ \in \mathcal{O}(H^{\overline{L_0}, \overline{L_{d^R}}})$ and $A \in \pi_2(M, \vec{L})$ such that $d_A^{(\vec{x}_i)_i, (\gamma_j)_j, \gamma^+} \leq 1$. Then, due to the fact that the Maslov index for polygonal maps respects breaking and disc bubbling (see [Oh15]), it follows from Estimate 2.1 for any $i \in \{0, \dots, d^F\}$ we have

$$\mu \left(\sum_{v \in V(T_i^F)} [u_v] + \sum_{e \in E_i^{\text{int}}(T)} B_e + \sum_{\substack{k \in \{0, \dots, d^R\} \\ k^F = i}} \sum_{j=1}^{\overline{m_k}} B_j^k \right) + \sum_{\substack{k \in \{0, \dots, d^R\} \\ k^F = i}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\overline{m_k}} (|x_j^k| - 1) + m_k \right) - 2 \leq 1$$

In particular, we can apply the results of Mescher and Charest [Mes18; Cha12] to any configuration associated to any connected component of T_i^F . We conclude that the reduction to known cases makes sense for our construction. In particular, there is a residual subset $E_{\text{reg}} \subset E$ such that for any $p \in E_{\text{reg}}$ and any choice of critical points, orbits and classes as in the first part of Proposition 2.3, any Floer cluster contained in

$$\mathcal{M}^{d+1}(\vec{x}_0, \gamma_1, \vec{x}_1, \dots, \gamma_{d^R}, \vec{x}_{d^R}; \gamma^+; A; p)$$

is simple in the sense of Definition 2.4. By applying standard methods from [MS12] we can conclude the proof of Proposition 2.3 for tuples \vec{L} with $m_0^e(\vec{L}) = 0$. The case $m_0^e(\vec{L}) > 0$ is analogous.

Definition 2.5. Elements of $E_{\text{reg}} \subset E$ will be called regular perturbation data.

We can now move on and define Fukaya categories.

2.5. Definition of $\mathcal{F}uk(M)$. Let $p \in E_{\text{reg}}$ be a regular perturbation datum. Given a couple (L_0, L_1) of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m, \mathbf{d}}(M, \omega)$ we define its p -Floer vector spaces $CF(L_0, L_1; p)$ as follows:

(1) if $L_0 \neq L_1$ we define

$$CF(L_0, L_1; p) := \bigoplus_{\gamma \in \mathcal{O}(H_p^{L_0, L_1})} \Lambda \cdot \gamma$$

where $H_p^{L_0, L_1}$ is part of the Floer datum for (L_0, L_1) prescribed by p ;

(2) if $L_0 = L_1 =: L$ we define

$$CF(L_0, L_1; p) := \bigoplus_{x \in \text{Crit}(f_p^L)} \Lambda \cdot x$$

where f_p^L is part of the Floer datum for (L_0, L_1) prescribed by p .

We will often suppress p from the notation when there is no risk of confusion.

Let $d \geq 1$ and consider a tuple $\vec{L} = (L_0, \dots, L_d)$ of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m, \mathbf{d}}(M, \omega)$. In the following we define a map

$$\mu_d : CF(L_0, L_1) \otimes \dots \otimes CF(L_{d-1}, L_d) \rightarrow CF(L_0, L_d)$$

which depends on the choice of p . First, we assume $L_0 \neq L_d$. Let $\vec{x}_i := (x_1^i, \dots, x_{m_i-1}^i)$, $i = 0, \dots, d^R$, where $x_j^i \in \text{Crit}(f^{\overline{L_i}})$ are critical points, $\gamma_j \in \mathcal{O}(H^{\overline{L_{j-1}}, \overline{L_j}})$, $i = 1, \dots, d^R$ are orbits (see page 5 for the definition of d^R and m_i). Then we define

$$\mu_d(\vec{x}_0, \gamma_1, \vec{x}_1, \dots, \gamma_{d^R}, \vec{x}_{d^R}) := \sum_{\gamma^+, A} \sum_u T^{\omega(u)} \cdot \gamma^+$$

where the first sum runs over orbits $\gamma^+ \in \mathcal{O}(H^{L_0, L_d})$ and classes $A \in \pi_2(M, \vec{L})$ such that

$$d_A^{(\vec{x}_i)_i, (\gamma_j)_j, \gamma^+} = 0,$$

and second sum runs over Floer clusters

$$u \in \mathcal{M}^{d+1}(\vec{x}_0, \gamma_1, \vec{x}_1, \dots, \gamma_{d^R}, \vec{x}_{d^R}; \gamma^+; A; p).$$

Assume now $L_0 = L_d =: L$. Let $\vec{x}_i := (x_1^i, \dots, x_{m_i}^i)$ for $i = 0, \dots, d^R + 1$, where $x_j^i \in \text{Crit}(f^{\overline{L}_i})$ are critical points, orbits $\gamma_j \in \mathcal{O}(H^{\overline{L}_{j-1}, \overline{L}_j})$ for any $i = 1, \dots, d^R$. Then we define

$$\mu_d(\vec{x}_0, \gamma_1, \vec{x}_1, \dots, \gamma_{d^R}, \vec{x}_{d^R}) := \sum_{x^+, A} \sum_u T^{\omega(u)} \cdot x^+$$

where the first sum runs over critical points $x^+ \in \text{Crit}(f^{L_0})$ and classes $A \in \pi_2(M, \vec{L})$ such that

$$d_A^{(\vec{x}_i)_i, (\gamma_j)_j, x^+} = 0,$$

and the second sum runs over Floer clusters

$$u \in \mathcal{M}^{d+1}(\vec{x}_0, \gamma_1, \vec{x}_1, \dots, \gamma_{d^R}, \vec{x}_{d^R}; x^+; A; p).$$

Before defining the p -Fukaya category of M , we show that the maps μ_d above are well-defined and satisfy the expected properties. Let $d \geq 1$ and consider a tuple $\vec{L} = (L_0, \dots, L_d)$ of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m, d}(M, \omega)$. We have the following standard compactness result (see [Sei08; Cha12; BC08]).

Proposition 2.6. *Let $p \in E^{\text{reg}}$. Then:*

- (1) *assume $L_0 \neq L_d$ and consider generators $\vec{x}_i := (x_1^i, \dots, x_{m_i}^i)$, $i = 0, \dots, d^R$, $\gamma_j \in \mathcal{O}(H^{\overline{L}_{j-1}, \overline{L}_j})$, $i = 1, \dots, d^R$ and $\gamma_+ \in \mathcal{O}(H^{\overline{L}_0, \overline{L}_{d^R}})$ and a class $A \in \pi_2(M, \vec{L})$ as in Proposition 2.3, then:*

- (a) *if $d_A^{(\vec{x}_i)_i, (\gamma_j)_j, \gamma^+} = 0$, the moduli space*

$$\mathcal{M}^{d+1}(\vec{x}_0, \gamma_1, \vec{x}_1, \dots, \gamma_{d^R}, \vec{x}_{d^R}; \gamma^+; A; p)$$

is compact,

- (b) *if $d_A^{(\vec{x}_i)_i, (\gamma_j)_j, \gamma^+} = 1$ it admits a compactification into a manifold with boundary*

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{d+1}(\vec{x}_0, \gamma_1, \vec{x}_1, \dots, \gamma_{d^R}, \vec{x}_{d^R}; \gamma^+; A; p)$$

whose boundary points are in one-to-one correspondence with the terms in the A_∞ -equation 1.1 for $(\vec{x}_0, \gamma_1, \vec{x}_1, \dots, \gamma_{d^R}, \vec{x}_{d^R}; \gamma^+)$

- (2) *assume $L_0 = L_d$ and consider generators $x^+ \in \text{Crit}(f^{L_0})$, $\vec{x}_i := (x_1^i, \dots, x_{m_i}^i)$ for $i = 0, \dots, d^R + 1$, $\gamma_j \in \mathcal{O}(H^{\overline{L}_{j-1}, \overline{L}_j})$, $i = 1, \dots, d^R$ and a class $A \in \pi_2(M, \vec{L})$ as in Proposition 2.3, then:*

- (a) *if $d_A^{(\vec{x}_i)_i, (\gamma_j)_j, x^+} = 0$, the moduli space*

$$\mathcal{M}^{d+1}(\vec{x}_0, \gamma_1, \vec{x}_1, \dots, \gamma_{d^R}, \vec{x}_{d^R}; x^+; A; p)$$

is compact,

- (b) *if $d_A^{(\vec{x}_i)_i, (\gamma_j)_j, x^+} = 1$ it admits a compactification into a manifold with boundary*

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{d+1}(\vec{x}_0, \gamma_1, \vec{x}_1, \dots, \gamma_{d^R}, \vec{x}_{d^R}; x^+; A; p)$$

whose boundary points are in one-to-one correspondence with the terms in the A_∞ -equation 1.1 for $(\vec{x}_0, \gamma_1, \vec{x}_1, \dots, \gamma_{d^R}, \vec{x}_{d^R}; x^+)$.

Remark 2.7. The statement about the boundary of 1-dimensional components of moduli spaces of Floer clusters is not presented in the most accurate form to avoid notational complexity. However, the meaning should be clear as results of this kind are very standard in various construction of Fukaya categories (see for instance [Sei08, Section 9]). \triangle

The proof of Proposition 2.6 is a mix of standard arguments (for Morse trees [Abo11; Mes18] and for Floer polygons [Sei08]) and the structure of the boundary of 1-dimensional components comes from the fact that compactification of sources spaces for Floer clusters realize associahedra (see Section 2.1) and from breaking of Morse flowlines along leaves as well as concentration of energy along strip-like ends. Notice that we do not have to care about shrinking of Morse trajectories between pseudoholomorphic discs as in [BC07], as by construction the limit lies in the interior of our moduli spaces. There is just one case of bubbling that may a priori happen in 1-dimensional case but we

want to avoid in order for the boundary to look ‘at it should be’ (that is, so that it realizes A_∞ -operations): what in [BC07] is referred to as ‘side bubbling’, that is bubbling of pseudoholomorphic discs away from marked points. This can’t happen in our situation because of our assumption on the minimal Maslov number of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$, and because the polygonal Maslov index respects bubbling and breaking, as it would give rise to a Floer cluster lying in a smooth manifold of negative dimension (exactly as in [BC07]).

We define the p -Fukaya category $\mathcal{Fuk}^{\mathbf{d}}(M, \omega; p)$ of (M, ω) as follows: the objects are monotone Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$, the morphism space between any two objects $L_0, L_1 \in \mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$ is its p -Floer complex $CF(L_0, L_1; p)$ and the μ_d -maps are those defined above. When there is no risk of confusion we will drop \mathbf{d} , ω and p from the notation. The following is the main result of this section.

Proposition 2.8. *For any $p \in E_{\text{reg}}$, $\mathcal{Fuk}^{\mathbf{d}}(M, \omega; p)$ is a strictly unital A_∞ -category.*

Proof. The fact that $\mathcal{Fuk}^{\mathbf{d}}(M, \omega; p)$ is an A_∞ -category directly follows from Proposition 2.6. We show that it is a strictly unital one. Let $L \in \mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$ and denote by $e_L \in \text{Crit}(f_p^L)$ the (unique) maximum of the Morse function f_p^L . Note that for any $x^+ \in \text{Crit}(f_p^L)$ and any $0 \neq A \in \pi_2(M, L)$ the moduli space $\mathcal{M}^2(e_L, x^+; A; p)$ is at least one dimensional. From this and the well-known fact that the top Morse homology of L is isomorphic to Λ it follows that e_L is a cycle.

Let now $x^- \in \text{Crit}(f_p^L)$. Assume there is $0 \neq A \in \pi_2(M, L)$ and $x^+ \in \text{Crit}(f_p^L)$ such that

$$|e_L| + |x^-| - |x^+| + \mu(A) - n = 0 \text{ and } \mathcal{M}^3(e_L, x^-, x^+; A; p) \neq \emptyset$$

Notice that this implies in particular that $\mu(A) + |x^-| - |x^+| = 0$ since $|e_L| = n$. However, the existence of a trajectory in $\mathcal{M}^3(e_L, x^-, x^+; A; p)$ implies the existence of a trajectory in $\mathcal{M}^2(x^-, x^+; A; p)$ which in turn implies $\mu(A) + |x^-| - |x^+| - 1 = 0$, a contradiction. Consider now a trajectory in $\mathcal{M}^3(e_L, x^-, x^+; 0; p)$, the existence of which implies in particular that $|x^-| = |x^+|$ and there is a Morse trajectory from x^- to x^+ , so that $x^- = x^+$. We hence proved $\mu_2(e_L, x^-) = x^-$ for any $x^- \in \text{Crit}(f_p^L)$.

Let now $L_1 \neq L$ and $\gamma^- \in \mathcal{O}(H_p^{L, L_1})$. Assume there is some orbit $\gamma^+ \in \mathcal{O}(H_p^{L, L_1})$ and some class $A \in \pi_2(M, \vec{L})$ such that

$$\mu(\gamma^-, \gamma^+; A) + |e_L| - n = 0 \text{ and } \mathcal{M}_0^3(e_L, \gamma^-, \gamma^+; A; p) \neq 0$$

This implies in particular the existence of an unparametrized Floer $(H_p^{L, L_1}, J_p^{L, L_1})$ -strip of zero index from γ^- to γ^+ , which is possible if and only if $\gamma^- = \gamma^+$. We hence proved $\mu_2(e_L, \gamma^-) = \gamma^-$ for any $\gamma^- \in \mathcal{O}(H_p^{L, L_1})$. In particular, e_L is a strict unit for L , as claimed. \square

The following result, whose proof we omit, can be proved in the same way as the analogous result for standard Fukaya categories in [Sei08, Chapter 10]. Notice that it may be proved also by slightly extending the construction of continuation functors developed in Appendix A.

Lemma 2.9. *Let $p, q \in E_{\text{reg}}$. Then $\mathcal{Fuk}(M; p)$ is quasi equivalent to $\mathcal{Fuk}(M; q)$.*

It can moreover be proved that our construction of the Fukaya category is quasi-equivalent to the standard one contained in [Sei08]. This may be proved as in [She11] or via the machinery of PSS functors, which will appear on the author’s PhD thesis.

2.6. Weakly-filtered structure on $\mathcal{Fuk}(M)$. The content of this subsection is an adaptation of [BCS21, Section 3.3] to the cluster setting. Let (L_0, L_1) be a tuple of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$. We define the p -action functional

$$\mathbb{A}_p : CF(L_0, L_1; p) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

for (L_0, L_1) as follows: consider a generator $g \in CF(L_0, L_1; p)$ and a Novikov series $P := \sum a_i T^{\lambda_i} \in \Lambda$ with $a_i \neq 0$ for all i , ordered in such a way that $\lambda_0 < \lambda_i$ for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, then we set

$$\mathbb{A}_p(Pg) := -\lambda_0 + \int_0^1 H^{L_0, L_1} \circ g \, dt, \quad \mathbb{A}_p(0) := -\infty$$

and extend it for $\sum P_i g_i \in CF(L_0, L_1; p)$ as

$$\mathbb{A}_p\left(\sum P_i g_i\right) := \max_i \mathbb{A}_p(P_i g_i)$$

We use \mathbb{A}_p to define an increasing \mathbb{R} -filtration on $CF(L_0, L_1; p)$ via

$$CF^{\leq \alpha}(L_0, L_1; p) := \mathbb{A}_p^{-1}(-\infty, \alpha]$$

for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. It is well-known that this structure endows $(CF(L_0, L_1; p), \mu_1)$ with the structure of a filtered chain complex (see for instance [BCS21]) in the case $L_0 \neq L_1$, and is trivial to see that it does also in the case $L_0 = L_1$, as in this case all generators lie at filtration level 0 since we set $H^{L,L} = 0$. We have the following central result.

Proposition 2.10. *There is a subset $E_{\text{reg}}^{\text{wf}} \subset E_{\text{reg}}$ such that for any $p \in E_{\text{reg}}^{\text{wf}}$ the filtrations described above on p -Floer complexes induce on $\mathcal{Fuk}(M; p)$ the structure of a weakly-filtered A_∞ -category with units at filtration level ≤ 0 .*

Remark 2.11. The above result is the analogous of [BCS21, Proposition 3.1] in the cluster setting. The main difference is that we get units at vanishing filtration level. \triangle

In the remaining of this section, we sketch a proof of why in general the action functional only induces a weakly-filtered structure instead of a genuine filtered one. Central to this kind of results are energy computations for Floer-like curves with asymptotic conditions. Recall that the energy of a Floer like curve $u : S \rightarrow M$ (where S is some Riemann surface with punctures) is defined via

$$E(u) := \int_S |Du - X^K|^2 \sigma$$

where K is some Hamiltonian perturbation datum on S and σ is some area form on S (from the choice of which the value of E is independent, see [MS12]) and the norm involved is defined on the space of linear maps $TS \rightarrow u^*TM$ as

$$|L| := \sqrt{\frac{\omega(L(v), J(L(v))) + \omega(L(jv), J(L(jv)))}{\sigma(v, jv)}}$$

where j is the almost complex structure on S (from which E definitely depends). Given a Floer cluster (r, T, λ, u) (in some moduli space of clusters) we write

$$E(u) := \sum_{v \in V(T)} E(u_v) + \sum_{e \in E(T)} E(u_e) = A + E(u_F)$$

where u_F is defined on page 17.

We start by showing that μ_1 preserves filtration. Let (L_0, L_1) be a couple of different Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$. Notice that for the standard strip $\mathbb{R} \times [0, 1]$, the norm in the definition of the energy is defined with respect to the Riemannian metric $g := g_{\omega, J_p^{L_0, L_1}}$ induced by ω and $J_p^{L_0, L_1}$. Consider two orbits $\gamma_-, \gamma_+ \in \mathcal{O}(H_p^{L_0, L_1})$, a class $A \in \pi_2(M, L_0 \cup L_1)$ such that $\mu(\gamma_-, \gamma_+; A) - 1 = 0$ and a Floer strip $u \in \mathcal{M}^2(\gamma_-, \gamma_+; A; p)$, then:

$$\begin{aligned} E(u) &= \int_{\mathbb{R} \times [0, 1]} |\partial_s u|^2 ds dt = \int_{\mathbb{R} \times [0, 1]} g(\partial_s u, J_p^{L_0, L_1} (-J_p^{L_0, L_1} \partial u - \nabla H_p^{L_0, L_1}(u))) ds dt \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R} \times [0, 1]} \omega(\partial_s u, \partial_t u) ds dt + \int_0^1 H_p^{L_0, L_1}(t, u(s, t)) dt \Big|_{s=-\infty}^{s=+\infty} \\ &= \omega(u) - \int_0^1 H_p^{L_0, L_1} \circ \gamma_+ dt + \int_0^1 H_p^{L_0, L_1} \circ \gamma_- dt \\ &= \mathbb{A}_p(\gamma_-) - \mathbb{A}_p(T^{\omega(u)} \gamma_+). \end{aligned}$$

From this and the definition on the filtration on Floer complexes it follows that

$$\mathbb{A}_p(\mu_1(\gamma_-)) \leq \mathbb{A}_p(\gamma_-)$$

as claimed.

Consider now a couple (L, L) of identical Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$. Consider critical points $x_-, x_+ \in \text{Crit}(f_p^L)$ and a class $A \in \pi_2(M, L)$ such that $\mu(A) + |x_-| - |x_+| - 1 = 0$ and consider a pearly trajectory $u \in \mathcal{M}^2(x_-; x_+; A; p)$. Then

$$0 \leq E(u) = \omega(u) = \mathbb{A}_p(x_-) - \mathbb{A}_p(T^{\omega(u)}x_+)$$

and hence $\mathbb{A}_p(\mu_1(x_-)) \leq \mathbb{A}_p(x_-)$.

We perform similar calculations in the case of higher operations (see [Sei08; BC14]). Let $d \geq 2$ and consider first the $(d+1)$ -tuple $\vec{L} := (L, \dots, L)$ where $L \in \mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$. Consider critical points $x_1, \dots, x_d, x^+ \in \text{Crit}(f_p^L)$ and a class $A \in \pi_2(M, L)$ such that $d_A^{(x_i)_i, x^+} = 0$ and pick a Floer cluster

$$(r, T, \lambda, u) \in \mathcal{M}^{d+1}(x_-^1, \dots, x_-^d; x^+; A; p).$$

This case is very similar to the case of a couple of equal Lagrangians above: we have

$$0 \leq E(u) = \omega(u) = \omega(A) = \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{A}_p(x_-^i) - \mathbb{A}_p(T^{\omega(u)}x^+)$$

by definition of the action functional, and hence

$$\mathbb{A}_p(\mu^d(x_-^1, \dots, x_-^d)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{A}_p(x_-^i)$$

that is, μ^d restricted to tuples made of equal Lagrangians preserves filtration.

Let $d \geq 2$ and $\vec{L} = (L_0, \dots, L_d)$ be an arbitrary tuple of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$. Assume $L_0 \neq L_d$ first and consider $\vec{x}_i := (x_1^i, \dots, x_{m_i-1}^i)$, $i = 0, \dots, d^R$, where $x_j^i \in \text{Crit}(f_p^{L_i})$ are critical points, orbits $\gamma_j \in \mathcal{O}(H^{\overline{L_{j-1}}, L_j})$, $i = 1, \dots, d^R$ and $\gamma_+ \in \mathcal{O}(H_p^{L_0, L_d})$ and a class $A \in \pi_2(M, \vec{L})$ such that $d_A^{(\vec{x}_i)_i, (\gamma_j)_j, \gamma^+} = 0$ (see page 18). Pick a Floer cluster

$$(r, T, \lambda, u) \in \mathcal{M}_0^{d+1}(\vec{x}_0, \gamma_1, \vec{x}_1, \dots, \gamma_{d^R}, \vec{x}_{d^R}; \gamma^+; A; p).$$

For any $v \in V(T)$ choose conformal coordinates (s, t) on $S_{r,T,\lambda}(v)$ and write the area form as $\sigma_{r,T,\lambda}(v) = \rho_{r,T,\lambda}(v) ds \wedge dt$ in those coordinates. Locally, we can write the Hamiltonian term of the perturbation datum on v induced by p (see page 14) as

$$K_{r,T,\lambda}^p(v) = F_{r,T,\lambda}(v) ds + G_{r,T,\lambda}(v) dt$$

for domain dependent functions of the form

$$F_{r,T,\lambda}(v)_{s,t}, G_{r,T,\lambda}(v)_{s,t} : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

for local coordinates (s, t) . Recall that $F_{r,T,\lambda}(v) = G_{r,T,\lambda}(v) = 0$ for $v \notin V(T_{\text{red}})$ by definition of perturbation data for Floer clusters (see page 14). For any $v \in V(T_{\text{red}})$ we have that on conformal patches

$$\begin{aligned} \int |du_v - X^{K_{r,T,\lambda}^p(v)}|^2 \rho_{r,T,\lambda} ds dt &= \int \omega(\partial_s u_v, \partial_t u_v) + \omega(X^{F_{r,T,\lambda}(v)}, X^{G_{r,T,\lambda}(v)}) + \\ &\quad + dF_{r,T,\lambda}(v)(\partial_t u_v) - dG_{r,T,\lambda}(v)(\partial_s u_v) ds dt \end{aligned}$$

holds. With a couple more calculations and summing over different patches it can be shown that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq E(u_v) &= \int_{S_{r,T,\lambda}(v)} |du_v - X^{K_{r,T,\lambda}^p(v)}|^2 \rho_{r,T,\lambda} ds dt = \\ &= \omega(u_v) + \int_{S_{r,T,\lambda}(v)} d(u_v^* K_{r,T,\lambda}^p(v)) + \int_{S_{r,T,\lambda}(v)} R_{r,T,\lambda}^p(v) \circ u_v \end{aligned}$$

where $R_{r,T,\lambda}^p(v) \in \Omega^2(S_{r,T,\lambda}(v), C^\infty(M))$ is the so called *curvature form* of $K_{r,T,\lambda}^p(v)$ which in conformal coordinates can be written as

$$R_{r,T,\lambda}^p(v) = \left(\partial_s G_{r,T,\lambda}(v) - \partial_t F_{r,T,\lambda}(v) + \omega \left(X^{F_{r,T,\lambda}(v)}, X^{G_{r,T,\lambda}(v)} \right) \right) ds \wedge dt$$

From this it follows

$$0 \leq E(u_F) = \omega(u_F) - \int_0^1 H_p^{L_0, L_d} \circ \gamma_+ dt + \sum \int_0^1 H_p^{L_{i-1}, L_i} \circ \gamma_-^i dt + \sum_{v \in V(T)} \int_{S_{r, T, \lambda}(v)} R_{r, T, \lambda}^p(v) \circ u_v$$

and hence

$$0 \leq E(u) = \omega(u) - \int_0^1 H_p^{L_0, L_d} \circ \gamma_+ dt + \sum \int_0^1 H_p^{L_{i-1}, L_i} \circ \gamma_-^i dt + \sum_{v \in V(T)} \int_{S_{r, T, \lambda}(v)} R_{r, T, \lambda}^p(v) \circ u_v$$

by what above.

We call the integral $\int_{S_{r, T, \lambda}(v)} R_{r, T, \lambda}^p(v) \circ u_v$ the *curvature term of the Floer disk* u_v , while the sum

$$\sum_{v \in V(T)} \int_{S_{r, T, \lambda}(v)} R_{r, T, \lambda}^p(v) \circ u_v$$

will be called the *curvature term of the Floer cluster* u .

Applying the arguments contained in the proof of Proposition 3.1 in [BCS21] vertexwise, we get that there is a subset $E_{\text{reg}}^{\text{wf}} \subset E_{\text{reg}}$ of regular perturbation data such that for any $p \in E_{\text{reg}}^{\text{wf}}$, any $d \geq 2$, any tuple of Lagrangians $\vec{L} = (L_0, \dots, L_d)$ and any possible Floer cluster u on \vec{L} of index 0, the curvature term of u can be absolutely bounded by a term $\epsilon_d = \epsilon_d(p) \in \mathbb{R}$ which does only depend on the number d and on the perturbation data $p \in E_{\text{reg}}^{\text{wf}}$. Hence we conclude

$$\mathbb{A}_p(\mu_d(\vec{x}_0, \gamma_1, \vec{x}_1, \dots, \gamma_{d^R}, \vec{x}_{d^R})) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{d^R} \mathbb{A}_p(\gamma_-^i) + \sum_{i=0}^{d^R} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \mathbb{A}_p(x_j^i) + \epsilon_d$$

as desired. For tuples with $L_0 = L_d$ the result follows by analogous means. As the (strict) units lie at filtration level ≤ 0 by definition, this shows that the above defined action functional endows $\mathcal{F}uk(M; p)$ with the structure of weakly-filtered A_∞ -category.

Remark 2.12. (1) As we will show in Section 3, by choosing the perturbation data carefully we can arrange that the curvature term of a Floer clusters are non-positive.

(2) Proposition 2.10 applies to the standard (i.e. without Morse trees, see [Sei08]) construction of Fukaya categories too. What is not apparent from the statement of the proposition, but is the reason for which we developed the Morse-Floer model for $\mathcal{F}uk(M)$ is the following trivial but crucial observation: in our case, units lie at filtration level ≤ 0 , while this is not true in the standard case, due to the presence of Hamiltonian perturbation data, see Section 3. More about this will be explained in Section 3.3.

△

3. ϵ -PERTURBATION DATA AND FILTERED STRUCTURE ON $\mathcal{Fuk}(M)$

Recall that, fixed a symplectic manifold (M, ω) and the family of monotone Lagrangians $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$, we denote by E the space of perturbation data for the cluster model of $\mathcal{Fuk}(M)$. In this section we construct families of perturbation data $E_{\text{reg}}^\epsilon \subset E_{\text{reg}}$, one for any positive real number $\epsilon > 0$, such that for any $\epsilon > 0$ and any $p \in E_{\text{reg}}^\epsilon$ the A_∞ -category $\mathcal{Fuk}(M, p)$ is filtered, i.e. the discrepancies $\epsilon_d(p)$ (defined in Section 2.6) of the maps μ_d can be taken to be zero (see Section 1.1). The following theorem, which is a more accurate version of Theorem A, summarizes the results and constructions contained in this section. Recall from Section 2.4 that $E_{\text{reg}} \subset E$ denotes the subfamily of regular perturbation data in the sense of Definition 2.4.

Theorem 3.1. *For any $\epsilon > 0$ there is a family of perturbation data $E_{\text{reg}}^\epsilon \subset E_{\text{reg}}$ such that for any $p \in E_{\text{reg}}^\epsilon$ the associated Fukaya category $\mathcal{Fuk}(M; p)$ developed in Section 2 is a filtered A_∞ -category.*

The idea for the proof of Theorem 3.1 is to construct ϵ -perturbation data for strips and triangles first, and then extend the construction to more complicated clusters via gluing.

Note that the filtered structure of $\mathcal{Fuk}(M, p)$ (and hence the structure of triangulated persistence category [BCZ23] of the derived Fukaya category) will depend on the choice of $\epsilon > 0$ and $p \in E_{\text{reg}}^\epsilon$, although in a quantifiable way. However, even without a category whose filtered structure does not depend on choices, the filtered structure on $\mathcal{Fuk}(M, p)$ for some fixed choice of perturbation data already gives us informations about M and $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$ and the limit for $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ can be computed for some invariants arising from filtrations, as we will show in forthcoming work.

3.1. ϵ -Perturbation data for $d^R \leq 2$. Fix $\epsilon > 0$ and $\delta \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$. The basic idea for the definition of our class E^ϵ of perturbation data is to construct homotopies on strip-like ends between Floer data and the zero form, similarly to the case of continuation maps. Note that, as mentioned in Section 2, since Morse flowlines and homomomorphic disks do not carry Hamiltonian perturbations, we just have to choose special Floer data for couples made of different Lagrangians and special perturbation data for Floer polygons, which, via gluing, amounts to choose perturbation data for what we will call ‘fundamental’ polygons: strips and 3-punctured discs (with marked points).

Remark 3.2. From their definition in Section 2.2, it is clear that perturbation data on some universal family depend on the a priori choice of (consistent) strip-like ends and system of ends on such family. However, the (explicit or inductive) definition of such perturbation data does not really depend on the choice of ends on a formal level, but only on the fact that such a choice has been done. In other words, if we perturb strip-like ends, then perturbation data change, although their formal definition doesn’t. \triangle

Let \mathcal{F} be the set of smooth and increasing functions $\beta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $\beta|_{(-\infty, 0]} = 0$ and $\beta|_{[1, \infty)} = 1$.

Let $L_0, L_1 \in \mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$ such that $L_0 \neq L_1$. An (ϵ, δ) -Floer datum for (L_0, L_1) is a choice of Floer datum $(H^{L_0, L_1}, J^{L_0, L_1})$ as in Section 2.2 such that

$$\text{image}(H^{L_0, L_1}) \subset (\delta\epsilon, \epsilon)$$

Meanwhile, an (ϵ, δ) -Floer datum for a couple (L, L) of identical Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$ is just a choice of Floer datum as in Section 2.2. Fix a choice of (ϵ, δ) -Floer datum for any couple of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$; all the perturbation data we will define in the following are to be taken with respect to this choice of Floer data.

Let $d \geq 2$ and consider a tuple $\vec{L} = (L_0, \dots, L_d)$ of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$ such that $d^R \leq 2$. We split the definition of (ϵ, δ) -perturbation data for this case in five subcases. Recall that given a universal choice of strip-like ends and an element $(r, T, \lambda) \in \mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ we denote by $\epsilon_i = \epsilon_i^{r, T, \lambda}$ for $i = 0, \dots, d$ the induced strip-like ends on $S_{r, T, \lambda}$ and by $\bar{\epsilon}_i$ for $i = 0, \dots, d^R$ the strip-like ends at positive marked points of type I (i.e. near punctures).

Case 1 Assume first that $L_{\text{red}}^{\vec{L}} = (L_0)$, i.e. $\vec{L} = (L_0, \dots, L_0)$. Then a choice of (ε, δ) -perturbation datum for \vec{L} is just a choice of perturbation datum for \vec{L} .

Case 2 Assume now that $L_{\text{red}}^{\vec{L}} = (\overline{L_0}, \overline{L_1})$ and $m_0^\varepsilon(\vec{L}) = 0$ (see page 5 for the definition of the numbers m_i , m_0^b and m_0^ε). Then a choice of (ε, δ) -perturbation datum for \vec{L} is just a choice of perturbation datum for \vec{L} .

Case 3 Assume now that $L_{\text{red}}^{\vec{L}} = (\overline{L_0}, \overline{L_1})$ and $m_0^\varepsilon(\vec{L}) > 0$. Then a choice of (ε, δ) -perturbation datum for \vec{L} is a choice $((f^{\vec{L}}, g^{\vec{L}}), (K^{\vec{L}}, J^{\vec{L}}))$ of perturbation datum for \vec{L} such that for any $(r, T, \lambda) \in \mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ and for the unique vertex $v \in V(T_{\text{red}})$ of T_{red} we have that:

- (1) $K_v^{r, T, \lambda}$ vanishes away from the strip-like end $\overline{\varepsilon}_i$ for any $i \in \{0, 1\}$;
- (2) On the i th ($i = 0, 1, 2$) negative strip-like end $\overline{\varepsilon}_i$ we have

$$K_v^{r, T, \lambda} = \overline{H_{r, T, \lambda}^{L_{i-1}, L_i}}(s, t) dt$$

where

$$\overline{H_{r, T, \lambda}^{L_{i-1}, L_i}} : (-\infty, 0] \times [0, 1] \times M \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

is of the form

$$\overline{H_{r, T, \lambda}^{L_{i-1}, L_i}}(s, t) = (1 - \beta_{r, T, \lambda}^{L_{i-1}, L_i}(s+1)) H_t^{L_{i-1}, L_i}$$

for some $\beta_{r, T, \lambda}^{L_{i-1}, L_i} \in \mathcal{F}$.

Case 4 Assume now that $L_{\text{red}}^{\vec{L}} = (\overline{L_0}, \overline{L_1}, \overline{L_2})$ and $m_0^\varepsilon(\vec{L}) = 0$. A choice of (ε, δ) -perturbation for \vec{L} is a choice $((f^{\vec{L}}, g^{\vec{L}}), (K^{\vec{L}}, J^{\vec{L}}))$ of perturbation datum for \vec{L} such that for any $(r, T, \lambda) \in \mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ and for the unique vertex $v \in V(T_{\text{red}})$ of T_{red} we have that:

- (1) $K_v^{r, T, \lambda}$ vanishes away from the strip-like end $\overline{\varepsilon}_i$ for any $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$;
- (2) On the i th ($i = 1, 2$) negative strip-like end $\overline{\varepsilon}_i$ we have

$$K_v^{r, T, \lambda} = \overline{H_{r, T, \lambda}^{L_{i-1}, L_i}}(s, t) dt$$

where

$$\overline{H_{r, T, \lambda}^{L_{i-1}, L_i}} : (-\infty, 0] \times [0, 1] \times M \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

is of the form

$$\overline{H_{r, T, \lambda}^{L_{i-1}, L_i}}(s, t) = (1 - \beta_{r, T, \lambda}^{L_{i-1}, L_i}(s+1)) H_t^{L_{i-1}, L_i}$$

for some $\beta_{r, T, \lambda}^{L_{i-1}, L_i} \in \mathcal{F}$;

- (3) On the unique positive strip-like end we have

$$K_v^r = \overline{H_{r, T, \lambda}^{L_0, L_d}} dt$$

where

$$\overline{H_{r, T, \lambda}^{L_0, L_d}} : [0, +\infty) \times [0, 1] \times M \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

is of the form

$$\overline{H_{r, T, \lambda}^{L_0, L_d}}(s, t) = \beta_{r, T, \lambda}^{L_0, L_2}(s) H_t^{L_0, L_2}$$

for some $\beta_{r, T, \lambda}^{L_0, L_2} \in \mathcal{F}$.

Case 5 Assume now that $L_{\text{red}}^{\vec{L}} = (\overline{L_0}, \overline{L_1}, \overline{L_2})$ and $m_0^\varepsilon(\vec{L}) > 0$. A choice of (ε, δ) -perturbation for \vec{L} is a choice $((f^{\vec{L}}, g^{\vec{L}}), (K^{\vec{L}}, J^{\vec{L}}))$ of perturbation datum for \vec{L} such that for any $(r, T, \lambda) \in \mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ and for the unique vertex $v \in V(T_{\text{red}})$ of T_{red} we have that:

- (1) $K_v^{r, T, \lambda}$ vanishes away from the strip-like ends $\overline{\varepsilon}_i$ for $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$;
- (2) On the i th ($i = 0, 1, 2$) negative strip-like $\overline{\varepsilon}_i$ end we have

$$K_v^{r, T, \lambda} = \overline{H_{r, T, \lambda}^{L_{i-1}, L_i}} dt$$

where

$$\overline{H_{r, T, \lambda}^{L_{i-1}, L_i}} : (-\infty, 0] \times [0, 1] \times M \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$$




FIGURE 3.1. **Case 4:** A schematic representation of the Hamiltonian part a choice of (ε, δ) -perturbation datum on a punctured disc in $\mathcal{R}_C^3(\vec{L})$ for a triple $\vec{L} = (L_0, L_1, L_2)$ made of different Lagrangians. White corresponds to vanishing Hamiltonian perturbation.

is of the form

$$\overline{H_{r,T,\lambda}^{L_{i-1}, L_i}}(s, t) = (1 - \beta_{r,T,\lambda}^{L_{i-1}, L_i}(s+1))H_t^{L_{i-1}, L_i}$$

for some $\beta_{r,T,\lambda}^{L_{i-1}, L_i} \in \mathcal{F}$.

Before defining (ε, δ) -perturbation data for tuples of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$ with reduced tuple of length greater than 4, we stop for a moment to explain why the above construction is useful for the filtration point of view. Until the end of this subsection we assume transversality of all Floer and perturbation data. The map μ_d associated with tuples of Lagrangians as in **Case 1** and **Case 2** above preserves action filtrations, as discussed in Section 2.6. Let \vec{L} be a tuple of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$ as in **Case 4** above. As it will be apparent from the following computations, this is the most delicate case of the three remaining ones, as it is the only one with a positive contribution to the curvature term coming from the (unique) positive strip-like end. For simplicity, we will assume that $d^R = d = 3$; the treatment of the general case is similar to this one, the only complication is a pure formalism: the presence of quantum-Morse trees, which do not interfere with curvature terms of Floer polygons.

Let $(K^{\vec{L}}, J^{\vec{L}})$ be a choice of (ε, δ) -perturbation data for \vec{L} . We show that the associated map

$$\mu_2 : CF(L_0, L_1) \otimes CF(L_1, L_2) \rightarrow CF(L_0, L_2)$$

preserves filtrations. Consider orbits $\gamma_1 \in \mathcal{O}(H^{L_0, L_1})$, $\gamma_2 \in \mathcal{O}(H^{L_1, L_2})$ and $\gamma^+ \in \mathcal{O}(H^{L_0, L_2})$ and a class $A \in \pi_2(M, \vec{L})$, and assume there is a Floer polygon with respect to the above chosen (ε, δ) -perturbation data connecting γ_1^- and γ_2^- to γ^+ in the class A . Note that $\mathcal{R}_C^3(\vec{L}) = \mathcal{R}^3(\vec{L})$ is a singleton (made of a 3-punctured disc with no marked points), say $\{pt\}$ we write $K^{\vec{L}} = K_v^{pt}$ and omit $pt \in \mathcal{R}^3(\vec{L})$ from the notation from now on. We estimate the curvature term $\int_S R^{K^{\vec{L}}} \circ u$ of $K^{\vec{L}}$ on u . For any $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ we denote by $\int_i R^{K^{\vec{L}}} \circ u$ the integral over the strip-like end \bar{e}_i of $S := S_{pt}$. By

definition of (ε, δ) -perturbation data, we have the equality

$$\int_S R^{K\bar{L}} \circ u = \sum_{i=0}^3 \int_i R^{K\bar{L}} \circ u$$

Consider $i \in \{1, 2\}$ first, then with respect to the coordinates on the respective strip-like ends (which are the negative one) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_i R^{K\bar{L}} \circ u &= \int_0^1 \int_{-\infty}^0 R^{K\bar{L}} \circ u = \int_0^1 \int_{-1}^0 R^{K\bar{L}} \circ u = \int_0^1 \int_{-1}^0 \overline{\partial_s H_{s,t}^{L_0, L_1}} \circ u \, ds dt \\ &= - \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \partial_s \beta^{L_0, L_1} H_t^{L_0, L_1} \circ u \, ds dt \leq - \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \partial_s \beta^{L_0, L_1} \, ds \min_M H_t^{L_0, L_1} \, dt \\ &< -\delta\varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, for $i = 0$, i.e. the unique positive end, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0 R^{K\bar{L}} \circ u &= \int_0^1 \int_0^{+\infty} R^{K\bar{L}} \circ u = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 R^{K\bar{L}} \circ u = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \overline{\partial_s H_{s,t}^{L_0, L_2}} \circ u \, ds dt \\ &= \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \partial_s \beta^{L_0, L_2} H_t^{L_0, L_2} \circ u \, ds dt \leq \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \partial_s \beta^{L_0, L_2} \, ds \max_M H_t^{L_0, L_2} \, dt \\ &< \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we conclude

$$\int_S R^{K\bar{L}} \circ u < \varepsilon(1 - 2\delta) < 0$$

as $\delta > \frac{1}{2}$ by assumption. By the computations carried out in Section 2.6 and the definition of the filtrations on Floer complexes via the action functional we conclude that μ_2 is a filtration preserving map. As explained above, this implies that the μ_d -maps defined for tuples of Lagrangians as in **Case 4** via (ε, δ) -perturbation data are filtered (if we assume transversality). Moreover, similar (but easier) computations to the ones presented above show that the μ_d -maps for tuples of Lagrangians as in **Case 3** and **Case 5** defined via (ε, δ) -perturbation data are filtered too, because Floer polygons for such tuples only have entries and no exit (the exit will be a Morse flowline).

3.2. ε -Perturbation data for $d^R > 2$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$, $\delta \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ and $d^R > 2$. We assume that (ε, δ) -perturbation data have been defined for any tuple of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m, \mathbf{d}}(M, \omega)$ such that its reduced tuples has length $< d^R + 1$. Let $\vec{L} = (L_0, \dots, L_d)$ be a tuple of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m, \mathbf{d}}(M, \omega)$ such that its reduced tuple $L_{\text{red}}^{\vec{L}}$ has length $d^R + 1$. Near the boundary $\partial \mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ of $\mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})$, more precisely on an union of neighbourhoods of boundary strata where the associated gluing maps are diffeomorphisms onto their image, we define (ε, δ) -perturbation data to be images of lower order (ε, δ) -perturbation data for different tuples of Lagrangians under the gluing maps. In particular, near vertices of $\mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ (ε, δ) -perturbation data are obtained by gluing of ‘fundamental’ (ε, δ) -perturbation data, i.e. those we explicitly defined in Section 3.1 for strips and 3-punctured discs with marked points. Note that consistency of strip-like ends and of system of ends implies that this construction is well-defined. Before extending the definition to the whole $\mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ we make the following (obvious) remark, which is however fundamental from the point of view of our aim to achieve a filtered Fukaya category.

Remark 3.3. A first trivial observation is that Floer clusters defined on clusters lying near vertices of $\partial \mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ are the most problematic from the filtration point of view, as they are the ones with most inherited positive strip-like ends on thin parts (which contribute positively to the total curvature term). The further we go from vertices, the less positive contributions to the total curvature term a Floer cluster will inherit. In this remark, we want to show that, although being the most problematic case, cluster near vertices have negative curvature term. Assume first $L_0 \neq L_d$. For simplicity we will assume that \vec{L} is cyclically different, but the following generalizes to any tuple with $L_0 \neq L_d$,

as Morse flowlines and holomorphic discs do not contribute to curvature terms. Let $T \in \mathcal{T}_U^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ such that $|V(T_{\text{red}})| = 1$ (note that in this case T_{red} has $d^R + 1 = d + 1$ exterior edges, with exactly one which is outgoing), and assume that $(r, T, \lambda) \in \mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ lies near $\partial\mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ in the sense above. Then $S_{r,T,\lambda}$ has at most $2d - 1$ thin parts ($d + 1$ ‘exterior’ ones plus $d - 2$ ‘interior’ ones, one for each codimension of $\mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})$). Indeed, $S_{r,T,\lambda}$ has $2d - 1$ thin parts exactly when (r, T, λ) lies near a vertex of $\overline{\mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})}$. In this case (assuming transversality), a Floer polygon defined on $S_{r,T,\lambda}$ endowed with the above defined (ε, δ) -perturbation data carries a curvature term strictly bounded above by

$$\varepsilon - d\delta\varepsilon + (d - 2)(\varepsilon - \delta\varepsilon) = (d - 1)\varepsilon(1 - 2\delta) < 0$$

as $\delta > \frac{1}{2}$ (the $\varepsilon - \delta\varepsilon$ term coming from thin parts in the interior). Note that the last term goes to 0 as $\delta \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}$.

Assume now $L_0 = L_d$. For simplicity we will assume that \vec{L} is almost cyclically different, i.e. $L_i \neq L_{i+1}$ for any $i \in \{0, \dots, d - 1\}$, but the following generalizes to any tuple with $L_0 = L_d$, as Morse flowlines and holomorphic discs do not contribute to curvature terms. As evident from the discussion in Section 3.1, this case is less problematic from a filtration point of view. Let $T \in \mathcal{T}_U^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ such that $|V(T_{\text{red}})| = 1$ (note that in this case T_{red} has $d^R = d$ exterior edges, all of which are oriented towards the only vertex of T_{red}), and assume that $(r, T, \lambda) \in \mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ lies near $\partial\mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})$. Then $S_{r,T,\lambda}$ has at most $2(d - 1) - 1 = 2d - 3$ thin parts. Indeed, $S_{r,T,\lambda}$ has $2d - 3$ thin parts exactly when (r, T, λ) lies near a vertex of $\overline{\mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})}$. In this case (assuming transversality), a Floer polygon defined on $S_{r,T,\lambda}$ endowed with the above defined (ε, δ) -perturbation data carries a curvature term bounded above by

$$-d\delta\varepsilon + (d - 3)(\varepsilon - \delta\varepsilon) = (d - 3)\varepsilon(1 - 2\delta) - 3\delta\varepsilon < 0$$

Note that the last term goes to $-\frac{3}{2}\delta\varepsilon$ as $\delta \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}$. We conclude that all Floer clusters resulting from gluing carry negative curvature terms. \triangle

In view of the above remark, after having defined (ε, δ) -perturbation data near the boundary of $\mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})$, we interpolate on the whole $\mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ while keeping the requirement that the total curvature term is non-positive.

Remark 3.4. Ideally, the Hamiltonian part of an (ε, δ) -perturbation datum in the ‘deep’ interior of $\partial\mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ vanishes away from strip-like ends. \triangle

Summing things up, we just defined a family $E^{\varepsilon, \delta} \subset E$ of consistent perturbation data for any positive real $\varepsilon > 0$ and any $\delta \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$. Indeed, notice that the inductive definition of (ε, δ) -perturbation data implies that we get consistency for free. Moreover, our discussions above imply that, assuming transversality, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, any $\delta \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ and any $p \in E^{\varepsilon, \delta}$ the associated Fukaya category $\mathcal{Fuk}(M; p)$ is a strictly unital and filtered A_∞ -category. We set

$$E^\varepsilon := \bigcup_{\frac{1}{2} < \delta < 1} E^{\varepsilon, \delta}$$

and refer to elements of E^ε as ε -perturbation data. In the remaining of the section we discuss transversality of our perturbation data, which is the last ingredient missing in the proof of Theorem 3.1. We recall that a perturbation datum $p \in E$ is regular if all possible Floer clusters of index 0 and 1 defined via p are regular in the sense of Definition 2.4. Regularity of quantum trees is generic for (ε, δ) -perturbation data, exactly as explained in the general case in Section 2.4. It only remains to deal with regularity of Floer polygons defined via (ε, δ) -perturbation data.

Let $d \geq 2$, $\vec{L} = (L_0, \dots, L_d)$ be a tuple of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m, \mathbf{d}}(M, \omega)$ and (K, J) the Hamiltonian part of p restricted to $\mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})$. We generalize [Sei08, Chapter 9k] and define an admissible deformation of (K, J) as a couple

$$(\Delta K, \Delta J) \in \left(\Omega^1(S_{r,T,\lambda}(v), C^\infty(M)) \times C^\infty(S_{r,T,\lambda}(v), T_J \mathcal{J}) \right)_{v \in V(T_{\text{red}}), (r,T,\lambda) \in \mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})}$$

(where \mathcal{J} is the space of ω -compatible almost complex structures on M) smooth in the $\mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ direction and such that $(\Delta K_v^{r,T,\lambda}, J_v^{r,T,\lambda})$ (that is, the couple $(\Delta K, \Delta J)$ restricted to the polygon corresponding to the vertex $v \in V(T_{\text{red}})$ on the cluster $S_{r,T,\lambda}$) is supported on the thick parts of the polygons $S_{r,T,\lambda}(v)$ and $\Delta K_v^{r,T,\lambda}$ vanishes along vectors tangent to the boundary of $S_{r,T,\lambda}(v)$. The deformation of (K, J) via $(\Delta K, \Delta J)$ is defined on $S_{r,T,\lambda}(v)$, for $(r, T, \lambda) \in \mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ and $v \in V(T_{\text{red}})$ as

$$\left(K_v^{r,T,\lambda} + \Delta K_v^{r,T,\lambda}, J_v^{r,T,\lambda} \exp(-J_v^{r,T,\lambda} \Delta J_v^{r,T,\lambda}) \right).$$

This way we defined the concept of admissible Hamiltonian deformation for the elements of E . Note that the requirement that $(\Delta K, \Delta J)$ is supported on thick parts of polygons is fundamental in order to keep consistency for the deformed Hamiltonian perturbation datum.

Definition 3.5. We define $E_{\text{reg}}^{\varepsilon, \delta} \subset E_{\text{reg}}$ to be the space of regular perturbation data $p \in E_{\text{reg}}$ such that the Hamiltonian part of p is obtained via an admissible deformation of the Hamiltonian parts of some (ε, δ) -perturbation datum $q \in E^{\varepsilon, \delta}$ and such that the associated (well-defined) Fukaya category $\mathcal{Fuk}(M; p)$ is filtered. Moreover, we define

$$E_{\text{reg}}^{\varepsilon} := \bigcup_{\frac{1}{2} < \delta < 1} E_{\text{reg}}^{\varepsilon, \delta}$$

and refer to its elements as regular ε -perturbation data.

It is not hard to see that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ the space $E_{\text{reg}}^{\varepsilon}$ is non-empty. Let $q \in E^{\varepsilon, \delta}$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$. Let $d \geq 2$, $\vec{L} = (L_0, \dots, L_d)$ be a tuple of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m, d}(M, \omega)$ and (K, J) the Hamiltonian part of p restricted to $\mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})$. As proved⁸ in [Sei08, Chapter 9k], a generic admissible deformation $(\Delta K, \Delta J)$ of (K, J) turns (K, J) into a regular Hamiltonian perturbation datum on $\mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})$. Thus we can choose a generic Hamiltonian 1-form ΔK supported on the thick parts of punctured discs such that the associated function

$$(r, T, \lambda) \in \mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L}) \mapsto \sum_{v \in T_{\text{red}}} \int_{S_{r,T,\lambda}(v)} \max_{x \in M} R_{r,T,\lambda}^{\Delta K}(v)$$

is bounded above by

$$(d-1)\varepsilon(2\delta-1)$$

implying that the deformed Hamiltonian $K + \Delta K$ has a negative curvature term overall, as the supports of K and ΔK are disjoint. In particular, the map μ_d defined via $K + \Delta K$ is filtered. The case $L_0 = L_d$ is analogous.

Remark 3.6. (1) The above recipe for transversality allows us to define μ_d -maps shifting filtration by ≤ 0 . By restricting the possible choice of deformations to the ΔK with arbitrary small curvature, say with curvature function bounded by a small number $\eta > 0$, we obtain for any $d \geq 2$ that the map μ_d shifts filtration by

$$\leq (d-1)\varepsilon(1-2\delta) + \eta.$$

This control over the negative shift might be useful in some situations.

(2) Note that in general $E_{\text{reg}}^{\varepsilon, \delta} \not\subset E^{\varepsilon, \delta}$. However, it might be possible to modify the above transversality argument to define a residual subset $\tilde{E}_{\text{reg}}^{\varepsilon, \delta} \subset E^{\varepsilon, \delta}$ of regular (ε, δ) -perturbation data. The idea is to fix the Hamiltonian part of the perturbation data and, via an extension of the arguments contained in [MS12], to show that there are adequate deformations of the almost complex structures turning (ε, δ) -perturbation data into regular ones. Moreover, in that case we could define (ε, δ) -perturbation data for $\delta = \frac{1}{2}$ too.

△

⁸To see that Seidel's proof keep on working in the cluster setting it is enough to apply it to any vertex of T_{red} .

3.3. Observation: the case of the unit in the standard model of Fukaya categories. Recall that in the standard or Floer model of the Fukaya category *all* Floer chain complexes are defined via Hamiltonian perturbations (also the ones associated to couple of identical Lagrangians) and the μ_d -maps are defined by counting Floer polygons joining Hamiltonian orbits (and no Morse trees). Note that the construction of the space E^ε of ε -perturbation data generalizes without much effort to this standard model and it is easy to see that the associated maps μ_d are filtered in this case too. However, the difference between our previously defined hybrid Floer-Morse model and the standard one is that the definition of the (representatives of) the units in the latter involves counting homomorphisms disks with Hamiltonian perturbations, and this may a priori lead to curvature terms taking positive values and hence representatives of units that do not lie at vanishing filtration levels. In fact, in the following we sketch a proof of the fact that one cannot define representative of the units lying at filtration level 0 using ε -perturbation data on the standard model of $\mathcal{Fuk}(M)$. The same proof can be expanded to show that it is not possible to have a filtered Fukaya category via the standard model. Note that one can construct perturbation data for the standard model of $\mathcal{Fuk}(M)$ such that the units lie at filtration level 0, but then compatibility of perturbation data will force some of the maps μ_d to have positive discrepancies.

Remark 3.7. Not having filtered units may seem a marginal fact compared to not having filtered μ_d -maps. However, upcoming work will show why filtration-zero units are desirable, leading to a ‘minimal energy’ Fukaya category and interesting results. Moreover, for the derived Fukaya category to fit the definition of a triangulated persistence category (TPC) [BCZ23], vanishing filtration levels for units are crucial. \triangle

We briefly recall how representatives of the units are constructed in [Sei08]. Let $\varepsilon > 0$, $\delta \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ and $L \in \mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$ be a monotone Lagrangian. Choose a Floer datum $(H^{L,L}, J^{L,L})$ for (L, L) in the sense of Seidel, i.e. a time-dependent Hamiltonian $H^{L,L}$ on M such that $\varphi_H^1(L) \pitchfork L$, where φ_H^t denoted the Hamiltonian flow of H , and an ω -compatible time dependent almost complex structure $J^{L,L}$ on M . We assume that $(H^{L,L}, J^{L,L})$ is an (ε, δ) -Floer datum, i.e. $\text{image}(H^{L,L}) \subset (\delta\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$. We define

$$CF^S(L, L) := \bigoplus_{\gamma \in \mathcal{O}(H^{L,L})} \Lambda \cdot \gamma$$

where the superscript S stands for ‘standard’. We further assume that $(H^{L,L}, J^{L,L})$ is regular, i.e. $CF^S(L, L)$ is a chain complex when endowed with the standard differential counting Floer strips. Consider the standard unit disk $D \subset \mathbb{C}$, define $D_1 := D \setminus \{1\}$ and pick a positive strip-like end on it near 1. We define ε -perturbation data for L on D_1 analogously to perturbation data for $(d+1)$ -punctured disks where $d \geq 2$. The notion of curvature term is also defined analogously. Let (K^L, J^L) be such a perturbation datum. Let $\gamma \in \mathcal{O}(H^{L,L})$ and $A \in \pi_2(M, L)$ such that $\mu(\gamma; A) = 0$ and consider the space $\mathcal{M}(\gamma; A)$ of (K^L, J^L) -perturbed Floer 1-gons $u : D_1 \rightarrow M$ such that on the unique strip-like end of D_1 we have

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} u(s, t) = \gamma(t)$$

We assume regularity of the perturbation datum (K^L, J^L) , so that $\mathcal{M}(\gamma; A)$ is a smooth manifold of dimension 0 for any orbit $\gamma \in \mathcal{O}(H^{L,L})$ and any class $A \in \pi_2(M, L)$ as above. Standard Gromov-compactness arguments show that in such cases $\mathcal{M}(\gamma; A)$ is compact. We define

$$e_L := \sum_{\gamma, A} \sum_u T^{\omega(u)} \gamma \in CF^S(L, L)$$

where the first sum runs over classes $\gamma \in \mathcal{O}(H^{L,L})$ and classes $A \in \pi_2(M, L)$ such that $\mu(\gamma; A) = 0$ and the second sum runs over Floer 1-gons $u \in \mathcal{M}(\gamma; A)$. It is well-known that e_L is a representative of the homological unit of L in the standard model of $\mathcal{Fuk}(M)$ (see [Sei08, Section 8d]).

Assume that $\mathbb{A}(e_L) \leq 0$. Then by definition of the action functional we have

$$C := \max_{u \in \mathcal{M}_0(\gamma)} \int_{D_1} R^{K^L} \circ u \leq 0$$

Let $\tilde{H}^{L,L}$ be another Hamiltonian on M such that $\varphi_{\tilde{H}^{L,L}}(L) \pitchfork L$ and assume that $0 < \tilde{H} < H$. It is well known that then (assuming regularity) the Floer homology defined using $(H^{L,L}, J^{L,L})$ is isomorphic as a chain complex to the one defined using $(\tilde{H}^{L,L}, J^{L,L})$. However, those two homologies are *not* isomorphic as persistence modules, as the filtrations at the chain level may differ dramatically. However we sketch a proof of the fact that given our assumption on $\mathbb{A}(e_L)$ we can construct an isomorphism of persistence modules, leading to a contradiction.

It is easy to see that there is a filtration preserving chain map $CF(L, L, H) \rightarrow CF(L, L, \tilde{H})$ (e.g. by choosing a monotone homotopy from H to \tilde{H} , see [BPS01]). We construct a filtration preserving map $\psi : CF(L, L, \tilde{H}) \rightarrow CF(L, L, H)$. Pick D_1 and puncture it in -1 to get $D_{-1,1} \cong \mathbb{R} \times [0, 1]$. Then, we can see K^L as a one-form on $\mathbb{R} \times [0, 1]$ such that $K^L = 0$ (on a strip-like end) near $-\infty$. We define ψ as the continuation map defined by counting strips with a Hamiltonian perturbation defined as the concatenation of a monotone homotopy from \tilde{H} to 0 , and K^L seen as a one-form on the strip. Standard methods show that ψ is a chain map. Moreover, as \tilde{H} is positive, the monotone homotopy has negative curvature term, and as K has non-positive curvature term, energies identities similar to the ones in Section 3.1 tell us that the map ψ is a filtered chain map. hence it follows that $HF(L, L, H)$ and $HF(L, L, \tilde{H})$ are isomorphic as persistence modules. This contradicts the assumption $\tilde{H} < H$. This proves that we must have $\mathbb{A}(e_L) > 0$, as claimed.

APPENDIX A. CONTINUATION FUNCTORS

It is well known that between two Floer complexes of the same objects (ambient symplectic manifold or couple of Lagrangians) defined using different Floer data one can construct chain maps, called continuation maps, defined counting strips which homotope between the different data. Moreover these chain maps are quasi-isomorphisms. In particular, this shows that Floer homology is a well-defined object. In [Syl19], Sylvan extended continuation maps to A_∞ -functors on (partially wrapped) Fukaya categories. In particular, he geometrically showed that Fukaya categories do not depend on choices up to quasi-equivalence of A_∞ -categories. This approach differs from the well-known proof of this fact contained [Sei08, Chapter 10], which heavily relies on algebraic machineries. In this section we will construct continuation functors for monotone Fukaya categories defined using the Morse-Bott model developed in Section 2 following the main ideas contained in Sylvain's work. For us, the main purpose of continuation functors will not be showing that our model for the Fukaya category does not depend on choices, but rather to estimate the 'distance' (see [Fuk21]) between filtered Fukaya categories defined with different perturbation data. Moreover, continuation functors allow to define choice-independent filtered Fukaya categories. The main results of this section are summarized in the following theorem, which is an expanded version of Theorem B.

Theorem A.1. *Consider two regular perturbation data $p, q \in E_{\text{reg}}$, and assume that they share the same Morse perturbation data. Then there is a family $E^{p,q}$ of so-called interpolation data and a residual subset $E_{\text{reg}}^{p,q} \subset E^{p,q}$ such that for any $h \in E_{\text{reg}}^{p,q}$ there is a weakly-filtered A_∞ -functor*

$$\mathcal{F}_h^{p,q}: \mathcal{Fuk}(M; p) \rightarrow \mathcal{Fuk}(M; q)$$

called the continuation functor from $\mathcal{Fuk}(M; p)$ to $\mathcal{Fuk}(M; q)$ associated to h , which is a quasi-equivalence canonical up to quasi-isomorphism of A_∞ -functors. Moreover, if $p \in E_{\text{reg}}^{\varepsilon_1, \delta_1}$ and $q \in E_{\text{reg}}^{\varepsilon_2}$ for some $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 > 0$ are ε -perturbation data sharing the same Morse part, then there is a subset $E_{\text{reg}}^{p,q,f} \subset E_{\text{reg}}^{p,q}$ such that for any $h \in E_{\text{reg}}^{p,q,f}$ the associated functor $\mathcal{F}_h^{p,q}$ shifts filtration by $\leq \varepsilon_2 - \delta_1 \varepsilon_2$, in the sense of the definition appearing on page 4. In particular if $\varepsilon_2 \leq \delta_1 \varepsilon_1$, then $\mathcal{F}_h^{p,q}$ is filtered for any choice of $h \in E_{\text{reg}}^{p,q,f}$.

Note that we define continuation functors only between Fukaya categories defined using the same Morse part of the perturbation data. This assumption may be easily dropped by defining Morse interpolation data, whose construction we omit to avoid notational complexity. In any case, Morse interpolation data play no role from the filtration point of view.

A.1. Colored trees. We introduce the notion of colored leafed tree following [MW10]. Let T be a d -leafed tree with no vertices of valency equal to 1 and finitely many interior edges. Given a metric $\lambda \in \lambda(T)$ and a vertex $v \in V(T)$ we define the distance $\lambda(v)$ of v from the root vertex v_T as the sum of the length $\lambda(e)$ of the edges $e \in E^{\text{int}}(T)$ in the geodesic from v to v_T .

A coloring on T is a choice of a subset $V^{\text{col}}(T) \subset V(T)$ of vertices, which we call colored vertices, and of a metric $\lambda \in \lambda(T)$ such that:

- (1) for any $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, if we flow along the geodesic from $e_i(T)$ to the root $e_0(T)$ we meet exactly one colored vertex;
- (2) each vertex of valency equal to 2 is colored;
- (3) each colored vertex lies at the same distance from the root vertex v_T of T .

Two coloring are said to be equivalent if they carry the same set of colored vertices $V^{\text{col}}(T)$ (and hence the metric is there only to make point (3) well-defined). A d -colored tree is a d -leafed tree T as above together with an equivalence class of colorings, which we denote by only writing the subset of colored vertices. We denote by $\mathcal{T}_{\text{col}}^{d+1}$ the space of d -colored trees. Note that the notation might be a bit confusing, as $\mathcal{T}_{\text{col}}^{d+1}$ contains non-stable trees, whereas \mathcal{T}^{d+1} does not by definition. Notice that there is a natural partition

$$V(T) = V^l(T) \sqcup V^{\text{col}}(T) \sqcup V^r(T)$$

on colored trees by setting $V^l(T)$ to be the set of vertices of T lying at distance strictly smaller than vertices in $V^{\text{col}}(T)$ from v_T (this notion does not depend on the choice of metric) and $V^r(T)$ to be the set of vertices of T lying at distance strictly larger than vertices in $V^{\text{col}}(T)$ from v_T . Let $V^{\text{col}}(T) \subset V(T)$, then we denote by $\lambda(T, V^{\text{col}}(T))$ the space of metrics $\lambda \in \lambda(T)$ such that $(V^{\text{col}}(T), \lambda)$ is a coloring for T . The following lemma is proved in [MW10].

Lemma A.2. *For any choice of $V^{\text{col}}(T) \subset V(T)$ the space $\lambda(T, V^{\text{col}}(T))$ is a polyhedral set of dimension $|E^{\text{int}}(T)| + 1 - |V^{\text{col}}(T)|$.*

Let $d \geq 2$ and $\vec{L} = (L_0, \dots, L_d)$ be a tuple of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m, \mathbf{d}}(M, \omega)$. We define by $\mathcal{T}_{\text{col}}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ the set of colored trees labelled by \vec{L} and by $\mathcal{T}_{U, \text{col}}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ the set of colored trees labelled by \vec{L} which can be represented by an unlabelled tree.

Remark A.3. As said above, our trees will be defined only between Fukaya categories constructed via perturbation data which share the same Morse part. As it will be apparent from the discussion below, this simplifies the definition of system of ends for colored labelled trees. The definition of universal system of ends for \vec{L} , as well as that of consistency, readily translate to the case of colored labelled trees, as condition (3) in the definition implies that there are finitely many of those. We skip the details. \triangle

A.2. Stacked discs. To define the source spaces for continuation functors, we will adopt the same strategy as in Section 2.1: consider primitive source spaces consisting of some configuration of discs, compactify the moduli spaces of those and add a collar neighbourhood. The primitive source spaces in this case will be ‘stacked’ discs, whose moduli spaces will simply be a stack of the same moduli spaces of marked discs indexed by a positive real parameter.

We start from the case $d = 1$. Let (L_0, L_1) be a couple of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m, \mathbf{d}}(M, \omega)$. We define $\mathcal{R}^{2,2}(L_0, L_1) = \{pt\}$ to be a singleton and $\mathcal{S}^{2,2}(L_0, L_1) = \{S^{2,2}\}$, where $S^{2,2}$ is a strip if $L_0 \neq L_1$ and a disc with marked points in -1 and $+1$ if $L_0 = L_1$. In both cases we assume that $S^{2,2}$ is endowed with two numbers $\varepsilon_- < 0$ and $\varepsilon_+ > 0$. We think of ε_- and ε_+ as two strip-like ends coming from conformal embeddings, and which may be positive or negative depending on the context.

Let now $d \geq 2$ and pick a tuple $\vec{L} = (L_0, \dots, L_d)$ of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m, \mathbf{d}}(M, \omega)$. We define

$$\mathcal{R}^{d+1,2}(\vec{L}) := \mathcal{R}^{d+1}(\vec{L}) \times (0, \infty)$$

Over $\mathcal{R}^{d+1,2}(\vec{L})$ we have a fiber bundle

$$\pi^{d+1,2}(\vec{L}): \mathcal{S}^{d+1,2}(\vec{L}) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^{d+1,2}(\vec{L})$$

where the fiber $S_{r,w} := (\pi^{d+1,2}(\vec{L}))^{-1}(r, w)$ over $(r, w) \in \mathcal{R}^{d+1,2}(\vec{L})$ equals (S_r, w) , where $S_r \in \mathcal{S}^{d+1,2}(\vec{L})$ was defined in Section 2.1.

We fix a consistent choice of strip-like ends for the universal family $(\pi^{d+1}(\vec{L}))_{d, \vec{L}}$ for the rest of this section. A universal choice of strip-like ends on the universal family $(\pi^{d+1,2}(\vec{L}))_{d, \vec{L}}$ is said to be compatible with the above fixed universal choice of strip-like ends on $(\pi^{d+1}(\vec{L}))_{d, \vec{L}}$ if for any d , any \vec{L} and any $(r, w) \in \mathcal{R}^{d+1,2}(\vec{L})$ the induced choice of strip-like ends on (S_r, w) agrees up to a shift with that on S_r .

Fix a tuple $\vec{L} = (L_0, \dots, L_d)$ of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m, \mathbf{d}}(M, \omega)$. For any colored labelled tree $T \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{col}}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ we write

$$\mathcal{R}^{T,2} := \prod_{v \notin V^{\text{col}}(T)} \mathcal{R}^{|v|}(\vec{L}_v) \times \prod_{v \in V^{\text{col}}(T)} \mathcal{R}^{|v|,2}(\vec{L}_v)$$

That is, to each uncolored vertex we associate a family of marked discs, while to each colored vertex we associate a family of stacked marked discs. We then define

$$\overline{\mathcal{R}^{d+1,2}(\vec{L})} := \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{col}}^{d+1}(\vec{L})} \mathcal{R}^{T,2}$$

We have the following standard-looking result.

Lemma A.4. $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{d+1,2}(\vec{L})}$ admits the structure of a generalized manifold with corners of dimension $d - 1$ which realizes Stasheff's multiplihedron.

As the definition of $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{d+1,2}(\vec{L})}$ involves two kind of moduli spaces the construction of boundary charts is more delicate than in the standard case of $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{d+1}(\vec{L})}$.

We split the construction of th boundary charts for $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{d+1,2}(\vec{L})}$ in three cases. A colored labelled tree is called:

- (1) a lower tree if the root has valency equal to 2, and is hence in particular the only colored vertex;
- (2) a middle tree if the root is colored and has valency greater than 2;
- (3) an upper tree if the root is not colored.

We will see that constructing boundary charts near lower and middle trees is easy, while upper trees are more delicate to handle as there are multiple simultaneous splittings.

(1) Lower trees. First, we consider the colored labelled tree $T^2 \in \mathcal{T}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ with only two vertices and two-valent root. Notice that $\mathcal{R}^{T^2,2} = \mathcal{R}^{2,2}(L_0, L_d) \times \mathcal{R}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ and recall that we defined $\mathcal{R}^{2,2}(L_0, L_d)$ to be a singleton. We define a map

$$\gamma^{T^2,2}: (-1, 0) \times \mathcal{R}^{T^2,2} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^{d+1,2}(\vec{L})$$

as follows: given $r \in \mathcal{R}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ and $\rho \in (-1, 0)$ we set

$$\gamma^{T^2,2}(\rho, pt, r,) := (\tilde{r}, -\rho)$$

where $\tilde{r} \in \mathcal{R}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ represents the surface obtained by gluing $pt \in \mathcal{R}^{2,2}(L_0, L_d)$ to the 0th marked point of r with length ρ . Notice that $r = \tilde{r}$ as elements of $\mathcal{R}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$, but they may come with different choices of strip-like ends.

Let now $T \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{col}}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ be an arbitrary colored labelled tree with 2-valent root. Notice that $\mathcal{R}^{T,2} = \mathcal{R}^{2,2}(L_0, L_d) \times \mathcal{R}^{T'}$, where T' is obtained by collapsing the positive pointing edge attached to the root of T and can hence be viewed as an element of $\mathcal{T}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$, as all the non root vertices of T are stable by definition of colored tree. We define a map

$$\gamma^{T,2}: (-1, 0) \times (-1, 0)^{|E^{\text{int}}(T)|-1} \times \mathcal{R}^{T,2} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^{d+1,2}(\vec{L})$$

as follows: given $(r_v)_{v \in V(T')} \in \mathcal{R}^{T'}$, $\rho \in (-1, 0)$ and $\rho_e \in (-1, 0)$ for any $e \in E^{\text{int}}(T')$ we set

$$\gamma^{T,2}(\rho, (\rho_e)_e, (pt, (r_v)_v)) := \gamma^{T^2,2}(\rho, pt, \gamma^{T'}((\rho)_e, (r_v)))$$

where

$$\gamma^{T'}: (-1, 0)^{|E^{\text{int}}(T')|} \times \mathcal{R}^{T'} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$$

is the gluing map defined in [Sei08]. Notice that by considering trivial gluing $\gamma^{T,2}$ extends to a map

$$\overline{\gamma^{T,2}}: (-1, 0] \times (-1, 0)^{|E^{\text{int}}(T)|-1} \times \mathcal{R}^{T,2} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{R}^{d+1,2}(\vec{L})}.$$

Remark A.5. All these charts will correspond to genuine boundary charts in the sense of manifolds with corners. The only codimension one face arising in this subcase is parametrized by T_2 , and in general, codimension k faces arising here are parametrized by bicolored trees with two-valent root and k uncolored vertices. \triangle

(2) Middle trees. Let $T \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{col}}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ be a colored labelled tree with colored stable root. Notice that

$$\mathcal{R}^{T,2} = \prod_{v \neq v_T} \mathcal{R}^{|v|} \times \mathcal{R}^{|v_T|,2}.$$

Since the valency of v_T is at least 3 by assumption and v_T is colored (hence there are no two-valent vertices in T), we may see T as an element of $\mathcal{T}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ by forgetting the coloring. In particular, \mathcal{R}^T is well-defined. We define a map

$$\gamma^{T,2}: (-1, 0)^{|E^{\text{int}}(T)|} \times \mathcal{R}^{T,2} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^{d+1,2}(\vec{L})$$

as follows: given $\rho_e \in (-1, 0)$ for any $e \in E^{\text{int}}(T)$, $r_v \in \mathcal{R}^{|v|}$ for any $v \neq v_T$ and $(r_{v_T}, w) \in \mathcal{R}^{|v_T|,2}$ we set

$$\gamma^{T,2}((\rho_e)_e, (r_{v_T}, w), (r_v)_v) := \left(\gamma^T((\rho_e)_e, (r_v)_{v \in V(T)}), w \right).$$

By considering trivial gluing $\gamma^{T,2}$ extends to a map

$$\overline{\gamma^{T,2}}: (-1, 0]^{|E^{\text{int}}(T)|} \times \mathcal{R}^{T,2} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{R}^{d+1,2}(\vec{L})}.$$

Remark A.6. All these charts will correspond to genuine boundary charts in the sense of manifolds with corners. The codimension one faces arising in this subcase are parametrized by colored trees with colored root and one uncolored vertex, and in general, codimension k faces arising here are parametrized by bicolored trees with colored root and k uncolored vertices. \triangle

(3) Upper trees. As soon as the coloring of a tree leaves a root, there may be complications in the choice of gluing lengths, basically due to the fact that the coloring distance is unique, so that *colored vertices should remember what came before them* (where the concept of before is determined by the aforedefined orientation on trees).

Example A.7. Consider the colored 3-tree labeled by the cyclically different (see page 5) tuple $\vec{L} = (L_0, L_1, L_2, L_3)$ of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$ and the associated stacked disk configuration in $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{4,2}(\vec{L})}$ depicted in Figure A.1.




FIGURE A.1. The colored tree we are discussing and the associated disks configuration in $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{4,2}(\vec{L})}$ for a cyclically different tuple $\vec{L} = (L_0, L_1, L_2, L_3)$. Black configurations correspond to elements of $\mathcal{R}^{k,1}$, while red configurations correspond to elements of $\mathcal{R}^{l,2}$ for some k, l .

The definition of colored tree forces $\rho_1 = \rho_2$ and $\rho_0 + \rho_1 = \rho_3$. Gluing the two non-colored disks following the only interior edge which does not touch colored vertices we get the tree/configuration depicted in Figure A.2.




FIGURE A.2

In this case, the definition of colored tree forces $\rho'_1 = \rho_3 = \rho_0 + \rho_1$. On the other hand, if, starting again with the configuration from Figure A.1, we glue along the interior edges touching a colored vertex, we get the tree/configuration depicted in Figure A.3.




FIGURE A.3. The colored tree we are discussing and the associated disks configuration in $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{3+1,2}}(\vec{L})$ for a cyclically different (see Page 5) tuple $\vec{L} = (L_0, \dots, L_3)$. Black configurations correspond to elements of $\mathcal{R}^{k,1}$, while red configurations correspond to elements of $\mathcal{R}^{l,2}$ for some k, l .

Again the definition of colored tree forces $\rho_1'' = \rho_3 = \rho_0 + \rho_1$. Performing one more gluing in both cases with length $\rho_1' = \rho_1''$ in order to get to an interior configuration in $\mathcal{R}^{3+1,2}$, we will in general get two different stacked disks, as in the first case it is ρ_0 that contributed to both gluings, while in the second one is ρ_1 . \triangle

It follows from Example A.7 that we have to refine the gluing process a bit, in order for non-root colored vertices to recall the gluing lengths that were associated to preceedings (uncolored) vertices. The following definition comes from [Sy19].

Definition A.8 ([Sy19]). An intrinsic width function for the universal family $(\pi^{d+1}(\vec{L}))_{d,\vec{L}}$ consists of a family $\{w_i^{d,\vec{L}}\}$, $d \geq 2$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, of functions $w_i^{d,\vec{L}}: \mathcal{R}^{d+1}(\vec{L}) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that:

- (1) w_1^2 and w_2^2 are the zero function;
- (2) let $S^{k+1} \in \mathcal{S}^{k+1}(\vec{L}_1)$ and $S^{l+1} \in \mathcal{S}^{l+1}(\vec{L}_2)$; if $S^{d+1} \in \mathcal{S}^{d+1}(\vec{L}_1 \#_n \vec{L}_2)$ is the disk⁹ (diffeomorphic to the surface) obtained by gluing the root of S^{l+1} to the n th puncture of S^{k+1} with length ρ (assuming this gluing is admissible), then

$$w_i^{d,\vec{L}_1 \#_n \vec{L}_2}(S^{d+1}) = \begin{cases} w_i^{k,\vec{L}_1}(S^{k+1}), & \text{if } i < n \\ w_{i-n+1}^{l,\vec{L}_2}(S^{l+1}) + \rho, & \text{if } n \leq i < n+l \\ w_{i-l+1}^{k,\vec{L}_1}(S^{k+1}), & \text{if } n+l \leq i \end{cases}$$

Lemma A.9. *There is a unique choice of intrinsic width function.*

Proof. Build it by induction on d ; the fact that the definition requires a fixed choice of function for $d = 2$ implies uniqueness of the construction. See [Sy19]. \square

Back to the construction of boundary charts for $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{d+1,2}(\vec{L})}$ near upper trees. Let $k \geq 3$ and consider first a colored labelled tree $T^k \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{col}}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ with only one non-colored vertex, the root, of valency k . In particular, T^k has k colored vertices. Notice that in this case we have

$$\mathcal{R}^{T^k,2} = \mathcal{R}^k \times \prod_{v \neq v_T} \mathcal{R}^{|v|,2}.$$

We define a map

$$\gamma^{T^k,2}: (-1, 0) \times \mathcal{R}^{T^k,2} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^{d+1,2}(\vec{L})$$

as follows: given $\rho \in (-1, 0)$, $r \in \mathcal{R}^k$ and $(r_v, w_v) \in \mathcal{R}^{|v|,2}$ for any $v \neq v_T$ we set

$$\gamma^{T^k,2}(\rho, r, (r_v, w_v)_v) := (\tilde{r}, e^{-\frac{1}{\rho}})$$

where \tilde{r} corresponds to the configuration obtained by gluing the i th marked point of r to the negative marked point of $S_{r_{v_i}}$, where $v_i \in V(T^k)$ is the i th colored vertex of T^k in counterclockwise order starting from the root, with gluing length

$$l_i := e^{-\frac{1}{\rho}} - w_{v_i} - w_i^k(S_r)$$

for any $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$.

Let now $T \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{col}}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ be a colored labelled tree with uncolored root. Consider the decomposition $V(T) = V^l(T) \sqcup V^{\text{col}}(T) \sqcup V^r(T)$ of the set of vertices of T introduced in Section A.1: we define T^l to be the (uncolored) tree generated by $V^l(T)$ and the interior edges attached to those vertices (some of which become leaves), and by T_1^r, \dots, T_n^r the connected components of the colored tree generated by $V^r(T) \sqcup V^{\text{col}}(T)$ (this involves a slight change in the induced metrics, but it is a nuance). Note that each T_i^r is either a lower or a middle tree. Since by construction the tree T_i^r has a colored root for any $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, it is either a lower or a middle tree. In particular any tree $T_i^r \setminus V^{\text{col}}(T)$ is a union of uncolored trees $T_{i,j}^r$, $j \in \{0, \dots, k_i\}$ for some k_i . Notice that we have

$$\mathcal{R}^{T,2} = \mathcal{R}^{T^l} \times \prod_{i=0}^n \mathcal{R}^{T_i^r,2} = \mathcal{R}^{T^l} \times \prod_{v \in V^{\text{col}}(T)} \mathcal{R}^{|v|,2} \times \prod_{i,j} \mathcal{R}^{T_{i,j}^r}$$

⁹See page 9 for the definition of the operation $\#$ on tuples of Lagrangians.

Remark A.10. At this point, we would like to define a map

$$\gamma^{T,2}: (-1,0)^{|E^{\text{int}}(T^l)|} \times (-1,0) \times (-1,0)^{\sum_i |E^{\text{int}}(T_i^r)|} \times \mathcal{R}^{T,2} \longrightarrow \mathcal{R}^{d+1,2}(\vec{L})$$

however, in this case, there may be colored trees parametrizing generalized corners, e.g. the colored 4-tree associated to the configuration depicted in Figure A.4 (cfr. [MW10]).




FIGURE A.4. The singularity in the space $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{5,2}}$.

The codimension one faces arising in this subcase are parametrized by colored trees with the root as the only uncolored vertex, and, in general, codimension k faces are parametrized by colored trees with uncolored root and k total uncolored vertices. \triangle

Let T be a d -leafed tree with no vertices of valency 1 and finitely many interior edges, and let $V^{\text{col}}(T) \subset V(T)$ be a subset of vertices. Recall that by Lemma A.2 the space $\lambda(T, V^{\text{col}}(T))$ is a polyhedral cone. For each $\lambda \in \lambda(T, V^{\text{col}}(T))$ define the map $\rho^\lambda: E^{\text{int}}(T) \rightarrow (-1,0)^{|E^{\text{int}}(T)|}$ by

$$\rho^\lambda := -e^{-\lambda}$$

and let $\rho(T, V^{\text{col}}(T))$ to be the space of all such maps; it is easy to see that $\rho(T, V^{\text{col}}(T))$ is a polyhedral cone in $(-1,0)^{|E^{\text{int}}(T^l)|} \times (-1,0) \times (-1,0)^{\sum_i |E^{\text{int}}(T_i^r)|}$, as by the decomposition above we get

$$|E^{\text{int}}(T)| - |V^{\text{col}}(T)| = |E^{\text{int}}(T^l)| + \sum_i |E^{\text{int}}(T_i^r)|.$$

We remark that the manifold $\mathcal{R}^{T,2}$ does not depend on the choice of the metric $\lambda \in \lambda(T, V^{\text{col}}(T))$ but only on the choice of the subset $V^{\text{col}}(T)$ by definition of colored tree. We hence define a map

$$\gamma^{T,2}: \rho(T, V^{\text{col}}(T)) \times \mathcal{R}^{T,2} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^{d+1,2}(\vec{L})$$

as follows: let

$$\begin{cases} (r_v^l)_{v \in V^l(T)} \in \mathcal{R}^{T^l}, \\ \left((r_{v_i}^r, w_i), (r_{i,v}^r)_{v \neq v_i \in V(T_i^r)} \right) \in \mathcal{R}^{T_i^r,2} = \mathcal{R}^{|v_i|,2}(\vec{L}_{v_i}) \times \prod_{v \neq v_i \in V(T_i^r)} \mathcal{R}^{|v|}(\vec{L}_v) \text{ for any } i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \end{cases}$$

and write

$$\vec{r} := \left((r_v^l)_{v \in V^l(T)}, \left((r_{v_1}^r, w_1), (r_{1,v}^r)_{v \neq v_1} \right), \dots, \left((r_{v_n}^r, w_n), (r_{n,v}^r)_{v \neq v_n} \right) \right)$$

and consider $\rho \in \rho(T, V^{\text{col}}(T))$, which we can write as

$$\rho = \left(\vec{\rho}^l, \tilde{\rho}, \vec{\rho}_1^r, \dots, \vec{\rho}_n^r \right) \in (-1, 0)^{|E^{\text{int}}(T^l)|} \times (-1, 0) \times \prod_{i=1}^n (-1, 0)^{|E^{\text{int}}(T_i^r)|}$$

then we set

$$\gamma^{T,2}(\rho, \vec{r}) := \gamma^{T^n,2} \left(\rho, \gamma^{T^l}(\vec{\rho}^l, (r_v^l)_v), \gamma^{T_1^r,2}(\vec{\rho}_1^r, (r_{v_i}^r, w_i), (r_{1,v}^r)_{v \neq v_1}), \dots, \gamma^{T_n^r,2}(\vec{\rho}_n^r, (r_{v_n}^r, w_i), (r_{n,v}^r)_{v \neq v_n}) \right)$$

In short, first we glue the all the uncolored disks, then we glue the resulting root with the colored disks following the receipt outlined just here above, and then we glue what's remaining, which is represented by a middle tree. Again, exactly as before, we extend $\gamma^{T,2}$ to a map

$$\overline{\gamma^{T,2}}: \mathcal{R}^{T,2} \times \overline{\rho(T)} \longrightarrow \overline{\mathcal{R}^{d+1,2}}$$

by considering trivial gluing.

We conclude this section with the following Lemma (cfr. [MW10; Syl19]).

Lemma A.11. *The space $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{d+1,2}(\vec{L})}$ admits the structure of generalized manifold with corners by declaring the maps $\gamma^{T,2}$, $T \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{col}}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$, to be boundary charts for small enough choice of parameters. Moreover, $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{d+1,2}(\vec{L})}$ realizes Stasheff's $(d-1)$ -multiplihedron.*

A.3. Source spaces: moduli spaces of stacked clusters. In this section we define moduli spaces of stacked clusters of discs starting from (the compactification of) moduli spaces of stacked discs, similarly to how we constructed moduli spaces of clusters of discs from (the compactification of) moduli spaces of discs in Section 2.1. We will skip some details where the construction are the same.

Let $d \geq 1$ and pick a tuple $\vec{L} = (L_0, \dots, L_d)$ of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$. We define the moduli space of clusters of stacked discs (or stacked clusters of discs) with marked points as

$$\mathcal{R}_C^{d+1,2}(\vec{L}) := \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}_{U, \text{col}}^{d+1}(\vec{L})} \mathcal{R}^{T,2} \times \lambda(T)$$

and also set

$$\overline{\mathcal{R}_C^{d+1,2}(\vec{L})} := \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{col}}^{d+1}(\vec{L})} \mathcal{R}^{T,2} \times \overline{\lambda_U(T)}$$

We will write elements of $\mathcal{R}_C^{d+1,2}(\vec{L})$ as (r, w, T, λ) .

The following Lemma is the analogous of Lemma 2.2 for stacked clusters. Its proofs combines the construction from Section A.2 with gluing of line segments as in Section 2.1.

Lemma A.12. *The space $\overline{\mathcal{R}_C^{d+1,2}(\vec{L})}$ admits the structure of smooth manifold of dimension $d-1$. Moreover, the space $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{d+1,2}(\vec{L})}$ admits the structure of generalized manifold with corners and realizes Stasheff's $(d-1)$ -multiplihedron.*

As in the case of Lemma 2.2, the fact that $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{d+1,2}(\vec{L})}$ realizes the multiplihedron comes for free from its construction.

We define bundles

$$\pi_C^{d+1,2}(\vec{L}): \mathcal{S}_C^{d+1,2}(\vec{L}) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_C^{d+1,2}(\vec{L})$$

where fibers are defined as in Section 2 by replacing nodal points by line segments of length controlled by the metric part of $\mathcal{R}_C^{d+1,2}(\vec{L})$.

A universal choice of strip-like ends for the universal family $(\pi_C^{d+1,2}(\vec{L}))_{d, \vec{L}}$ is the pullback of a universal choice of strip-like ends for the universal family $(\pi^{d+1,2}(\vec{L}))_{d, \vec{L}}$. A system of ends for (the trees involved in the definition of) $(\pi_C^{d+1,2}(\vec{L}))_{d, \vec{L}}$ is just a choice of system of ends for (the trees involved in the definition of) $(\pi^{d+1,2}(\vec{L}))_{d, \vec{L}}$ by forgetting about two valent vertices. This last definition relies on the fact that we will not construct continuation functors between perturbation data with different Morse

parts (in particular, continuation maps between Floer complexes for a couple of identical Lagrangians will be the identity, so that we do not need system of ends for that case).

A.4. Interpolation data. We define the concept of interpolation datum, which is nothing else than the analogous of a perturbation datum but for stacked discs.

Fix a universal and consistent choice of strip-like ends for the universal family of cluster of discs $(\pi_C^{d+1}(\vec{L}))_{d,\vec{L}}$ and a universal, consistent and compatible choice of strip-like ends for the universal family of stacked clusters of discs $(\pi_C^{d+1,2}(\vec{L}))_{d,\vec{L}}$. We fix Floer data (f^L, g^L, J^L) for any couple (L, L) of identical Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$ and associated Morse perturbation data for the universal family $(\pi_C^{d+1}(\vec{L}))_{d,\vec{L}}$ (in practice, for the family $(\mathcal{T}_U^{d+1}(\vec{L}))_{d,\vec{L}}$), which we denote by $(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) = (f^{\vec{L}}, g^{\vec{L}})_{d,\vec{L}}$. We denote by $E_{\text{reg}}^{(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g})} \subset E_{\text{reg}}$ the subfamily of regular perturbation data whose Morse part agrees with (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) . Note that for a generic choice of (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) this subfamily is non-empty, and we actually assume it is for our choice. We construct continuation functors between Fukaya categories defined via elements of $E_{\text{reg}}^{(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g})}$.

Fix two perturbation data $p, q \in E_{\text{reg}}^{(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g})}$. Let $d \geq 1$ and consider a tuple $\vec{L} = (L_0, \dots, L_d)$ of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$ and an element $(r, w, T, \lambda) \in \mathcal{R}_C^{d+1,2}(\vec{L})$. An interpolation datum between the perturbation data $\mathcal{D}_p^{\vec{L}}(r, T, \lambda)$ and $\mathcal{D}_q^{\vec{L}}(r, T, \lambda)$ associated to p and q on $S_{r,T,\lambda}$ consists of a family of couples

$$(K_v^{r,w,T,\lambda}, J_v^{r,w,T,\lambda})$$

indexed by vertices $v \in V(T)$ such that:

- if $v \in V^l(T)$ then:
 - $K_v^{r,w,T,\lambda} \in \Omega^1(S_{r,T,\lambda}(v), C^\infty(M))$ is an Hamiltonian-valued one-form which vanishes identically if $v \notin T_{\text{red}}$, while for $v \in T_{\text{red}}$ is such that for any $i \in \{0, \dots, |v|\}$ it satisfies

$$K_v^{r,w,T,\lambda}|_{L_i^v} = 0 \text{ for any } \xi \in T(\partial_i S_{r,T,\lambda}(v)),$$

and for any $i \in \{0, \dots, |v|\}$ on the strip-like end ϵ_i^v of $S_{r,T,\lambda}(v)$ we have¹⁰

$$K_v^{r,w,T,\lambda} = H_p^{L_{i-1}, L_i} dt \text{ for any } |s| \geq 1,$$

- $J_v^{r,w,T,\lambda}$ is a domain-dependent ω -compatible almost complex structure such that if¹¹ $v \in T_i^F \subset T \setminus T_{\text{red}}$ for some $i \in \{0, \dots, d^F\}$ it is identical to $J_p^{L_i^F} = J_q^{L_i^F}$, while if $v \in T_{\text{red}}$ it is such that for any $i \in \{0, \dots, |v|\}$ on the i th strip-like end ϵ_i^v of $S_{r,T,\lambda}(v)$ we have

$$J_v^{r,w,T,\lambda} = J_p^{L_{i-1}, L_i};$$

- if $v \in V^{\text{col}}(T)$, then:
 - $K_v^{r,w,T,\lambda} \in \Omega^1(S_{r,T,\lambda}(v), C^\infty(M))$ is an Hamiltonian-valued one-form which vanishes identically if $v \notin T_{\text{red}}$, while for $v \in T_{\text{red}}$ is such that for any $i \in \{0, \dots, |v|\}$ it satisfies

$$K_v^{r,w,T,\lambda}|_{L_i^v} = 0 \text{ for any } \xi \in T(\partial_i S_{r,T,\lambda}(v)),$$

and for any $i \in \{1, \dots, |v|\}$ on the strip-like end ϵ_i^v of $S_{r,T,\lambda}(v)$ we have

$$K_v^{r,w,T,\lambda} = H_p^{L_{i-1}, L_i} dt \text{ for any } |s| \geq 1$$

while on the 0th strip-like end we have

$$K_v^{r,w,T,\lambda} = H_q^{L_0, L_d} dt,$$

- $J_v^{r,w,T,\lambda}$ is a domain-dependent ω -compatible almost complex structure such that if $v \in T_i^F \subset T \setminus T_{\text{red}}$ for some $i \in \{0, \dots, d^F\}$ it is identical to $J_p^{L_i^F} = J_q^{L_i^F}$, while if $v \in T_{\text{red}}$ it is such that for any $i \in \{1, \dots, |v|\}$ on the i th strip-like end ϵ_i^v of $S_{r,T,\lambda}(v)$ we have

$$J_v^{r,w,T,\lambda} = J_p^{L_i, L_{i+1}},$$

¹⁰Recall that we set $H_p^{L,L} = H_q^{L,L} = 0$ and $J_p^{L,L} = J_q^{L,L} = J^L$ for any $L \in \mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$.

¹¹See page 7 for the definition of the subtrees T_i^F .

while on the 0th strip-like end we have

$$J_v^{r,w,T,\lambda} = J_q^{L_0,L_d};$$

• if $v \in V^r(T)$ then:

- $K_v^{r,w,T,\lambda} \in \Omega^1(S_{r,T,\lambda}(v), C^\infty(M))$ is an Hamiltonian-valued one-form which vanishes identically if $v \notin T_{\text{red}}$, while for $v \in T_{\text{red}}$ is such that for any $i \in \{0, \dots, |v|\}$ it satisfies

$$K_v^{r,w,T,\lambda}|_{L_i^v} = 0 \text{ for any } \xi \in T(\partial_i S_{r,T,\lambda}(v)),$$

and for any $i \in \{0, \dots, |v|\}$ on the strip-like end ϵ_i^v of $S_{r,T,\lambda}(v)$ we have

$$K_v^{r,w,T,\lambda} = H_q^{L_{i-1}, L_i} dt \text{ for any } |s| \geq 1,$$

- $J_v^{r,w,T,\lambda}$ is a domain-dependent ω -compatible almost complex structure such that if $v \in T_i^F \subset T \setminus T_{\text{red}}$ for some $i \in \{0, \dots, d^F\}$ it is identical to $J_p^{L_i^F} = J_q^{L_i^F}$, while if $v \in T_{\text{red}}$ it is such that for any $i \in \{0, \dots, |v|\}$ on the i th strip-like end ϵ_i^v of $S_{r,T,\lambda}(v)$ we have

$$J_v^{r,w,T,\lambda} = J_q^{L_{i-1}, L_i}.$$

Remark A.13. The above definition is long but intuitive. Assume $T = T_{\text{red}}$ for simplicity: interpolation data are just p - or q -perturbation data on uncolored vertices (depending on how far from the root the vertex lies), while on colored vertices interpolation data interpolate from Floer data with respect to p to a Floer datum with respect to q . \triangle

Remark A.14. Notice that although we want to interpolate between the *perturbation data* p and q , the definition of interpolation data between them makes no explicit mention of any perturbation datum, but only Floer ones. The connection to perturbation data will appear in the definition of the consistency condition for interpolation data which we introduce below. \triangle

We define an interpolation datum between p and q for \vec{L} as a smooth choice of interpolation data on $\mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ and denote. A universal choice of interpolation data from p to q is a choice of interpolation datum between p and q for any tuple \vec{L} of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$ of any length.

Similarly to the case of perturbation data, give a universal choice of interpolation data from p to q , we might encounter some consistency problems (see Section 2.2). In this case, those problems are a bit more subtle compared to the case of perturbation data, as in the gluing process for stacked discs involves gluing of two kinds of clusters (in particular, discs and stacked discs, see Section A.2). Fix a universal choice of interpolation data from p to q on $(\pi_C^{d+1,2}(\vec{L}))_{d,\vec{L}}$. We say that this choice is consistent if for each $d \geq 1$ and for any tuple $\vec{L} = (L_0, \dots, L_d)$ of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$ we have:

- (1) for any $T \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{col}}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$ and any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ there is a subset

$$U \subset \mathcal{R}^{T,2} \times \lambda_U^k(T) \times [-1, 0]^{|E_F^{\text{int}}(T)|+k}$$

whose closure is a neighbourhood of the trivial gluing, where the gluing parameter are small such that the interpolation data for stacked clusters over U agree with interpolation data induced by gluing on thin parts;

- (2) all interpolation data extend smoothly to $\overline{\partial \mathcal{R}_C^{d+1,2}(\vec{L})}$ and agree there with perturbation data coming from (trivial) gluing.

Assume for a brief moment that \vec{L} is made of different Lagrangians, i.e. $\vec{L} = \vec{L}^F$ in the notation of Section 1.3. In more detail, point (1) of the above definition means in this case the following: let $T \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{col}}^{d+1}(\vec{L})$, (r, w) in the image of $\gamma^{T,2}$ restricted to a subset where the gluing parameters are small, and consider $e \in E^{\text{int}}(T)$ (of course, e is not unlabelled) and the summand $\varepsilon_{f+(e)}([0, -\ln(-\rho_e)] \times [0, 1])$ of the thin part of $(S_r, w) \in \mathcal{S}^{d+1,2}(\vec{L})$, then

- if $f^+(e) = (v, e)$ for some $v \in V^l(T)$, then here we do want interpolation data restricted to (S_r, w) to match the perturbation data on $S_{r_v} \in \mathcal{S}^{|v|}(\vec{L}_v)$ as prescribed by the universal choice p ;
- if $f^+(e) = (v, e)$ for some $v \in V^{\text{col}}(T)$, then here we do want interpolation data restricted to (S_r, w) to match the interpolation data on $(S_{r_v}, w_v) \in \mathcal{S}^{|v|,2}(\vec{L}_v)$;
- if $f^+(e) = (v, e)$ for some $v \in V^r(T)$, then here we do want interpolation data restricted to (S_r, w) to match the perturbation data on $S_{r_v} \in \mathcal{S}^{|v|}(\vec{L}_v)$ as prescribed by the universal choice q .

The following result, whose proof we omit, is an extension to stacked clusters of a result contained in [Sy19].

Lemma A.15. *Consistent choices of interpolation data exist.*

For any $p, q \in E_{\text{reg}}^{(f,g)}$, we define the space $E^{p,q}$ of consistent universal choices of interpolation data for stacked clusters.

A.5. Moduli spaces of stacked Floer clusters with Lagrangian boundary. Fix regular perturbation data $p, q \in E_{\text{reg}}^{(f,g)}$ sharing the same Morse part and an interpolation datum $h \in E^{p,q}$ between them. Let $d \geq 1$ and $\vec{L} = (L_0, \dots, L_d)$ be a tuple of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$. We define moduli spaces of stacked Floer clusters with boundary on \vec{L} with respect to h . Assume first $L_0 \neq L_d$. Pick $\vec{x}_i := (x_1^i, \dots, x_{m_i-1}^i)$ for any $i = 0, \dots, d^R$ (see page 1.3 for the definition of the numbers m_i), where $x_j^i \in \text{Crit}(f^{\vec{L}^i})$ are critical points, orbits $\gamma_j \in \mathcal{O}(H_p^{\vec{L}_{j-1}, \vec{L}_j})$ for any $i = 1, \dots, d^R$ and $\gamma_+ \in \mathcal{O}(H_q^{\vec{L}_0, \vec{L}_{d^R}})$ and a class $A \in \pi_2(M, \vec{L})$. We define the moduli space

$$\mathcal{M}^{d+1,2}(\vec{x}_0, \gamma_1, \vec{x}_1, \dots, \gamma_{d^R}, \vec{x}_{d^R}; \gamma_+; A; h)$$

of stacked Floer clusters joining $\vec{x}_0, \gamma_1, \vec{x}_1, \dots, \gamma_{d^R}, \vec{x}_{d^R}$ to γ_+ in the class A as the space of tuples $((r, w, T, \lambda), u)$ where

$$u = \left((u_v)_{v \in V(T)}, (u_e)_{e \in E(T)} \right) : S_{r,T,\lambda} \rightarrow M$$

satisfies

- (1) for any vertex $v \in V(T)$, $u_v : S_{r,T,\lambda}(v) \rightarrow M$ satisfies the $(K_v^{r,w,T,\lambda}(h), J_v^{r,w,T,\lambda}(h))$ -Floer equation and the boundary conditions $u(\partial_i S_{r,T,\lambda}) \subset \vec{L}_i$,
- (2) for any $i = 1, \dots, d^R$ we have

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} u_{h(e_i(T_{\text{red}}))}(\bar{\epsilon}_i(s, t)) = \gamma_i(t)$$

and

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} u_{h(e_0(T_{\text{red}}))}(\epsilon_0(s, t)) = \gamma^+(t),$$

- (3) for any $i = 0, \dots, d^R$ and any interior edge $e \in E_i^{\text{int}}(T)$ (uni)labelled by \vec{L}_i there is a class $B_e \in \pi_2(M, L)$ such that

$$u_e \in \mathcal{P}(u_{t(e)}(z_{t(e)}), u_{h(e)}(z_{h(e)}); (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}); e; B_e),$$

- (4) for any $i = 0, \dots, d^R$ and any $j = 1, \dots, m_i$ there is a class $B_j^i \in \pi_2(M, \vec{L}_i)$ such that

$$u_{e_j^i(T_{\text{uni}})} \in \mathcal{P}(x_j^i, u_{h(e_j(T_i^F))}(z_{h(e_j(T_i^F))})); (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}); e_j^i(T_{\text{uni}}); B_j^i,$$

- (5) We have the relation

$$A = \sum_{v \in V(T)} [u_v] + \sum_{e \in E^{\text{int}}(T)} B_e + \sum_{i=0}^{d^R} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} B_j^i$$

on $\pi_2(M, \vec{L})$.

Assume now $L_0 = L_d$. Pick $x^+ \in \text{Crit}(f^{\overline{L_0}})$, $\vec{x}_i := (x_1^i, \dots, x_{m_i}^i)$ for $i = 0, \dots, d^R + 1$, where $x_j^i \in \text{Crit}(f^{\overline{L_i}})$ are critical points, orbits $\gamma_j \in \mathcal{O}(H_p^{\overline{L_{j-1}}, \overline{L_j}})$ for $i = 1, \dots, d^R + 1$ and a class $A \in \pi_2(M, \vec{L})$. We define the moduli space

$$\mathcal{M}^{d+1,2}(\vec{x}_0, \gamma_1, \vec{x}_2, \dots, \gamma_{d^R+1}, \vec{x}_{d^R+1}; x^+; A; h)$$

of stacked Floer clusters joining $\vec{x}_0, \gamma_1, \vec{x}_1, \dots, \gamma_{d^R+1}, \vec{x}_{d^R+1}$ to x^+ in the class A as the space of tuples $((r, w, T, \lambda), u)$ where

$$u = ((u_v)_{v \in V(T)}, (u_e)_{e \in E(T)}): S_{r,T,\lambda} \rightarrow M$$

satisfies

- (1) for any vertex $v \in V(T)$, $u_v: S_{r,T,\lambda}(v) \rightarrow M$ satisfies the $(K_v^{r,w,T,\lambda}(h), J_v^{r,w,T,\lambda}(h))$ -Floer equation and the boundary conditions $u(\partial_i S_{r,T,\lambda}) \subset \overline{L_i}$,
- (2) for any $i = 1, \dots, d^R$ we have

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} u_{h(e_i(T_{\text{red}}))}(\overline{\epsilon}_i(s, t)) = \gamma_i(t),$$

- (3) for any $i = 0, \dots, d^R$ and any interior edge $e \in E_i^{\text{int}}(T)$ (uni)labelled by $\overline{L_i}$ there is a class $B_e \in \pi_2(M, L)$ such that

$$u_e \in \mathcal{P}(u_{t(e)}(z_{t(e)}), u_{h(e)}(z_{h(e)}); (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}); e; B_e),$$

- (4) for any $i = 0, \dots, d^R$ and any $j = 1, \dots, m_i$ there is a class $B_j^i \in \pi_2(M, \overline{L_i})$ such that

$$u_{e_j^i(T_{\text{uni}})} \in \mathcal{P}(x_j^i, u_{h(e_j^i(T_{\text{uni}}))}(z_{h(e_j^i(T_{\text{uni}}))})); p; e_j^i(T_{\text{uni}}); B_j^i)$$

and there is a class $B_0^0 \in \pi_2(M, \overline{L_0})$ such that

$$u_{e_0(T)} \in \mathcal{P}(u_{t(e_0(T))}, x^+; (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}); e_0(T); B_0^0),$$

- (5) We have the relation

$$A = \sum_{v \in V(T)} [u_v] + \sum_{e \in E^{\text{int}}(T)} B_e + \sum_{i=0}^{d^R} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} B_j^i + B_0^0$$

on $\pi_2(M, \vec{L})$.

We have the following transversality result for stacked Floer clusters.

Proposition A.16. *Let (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) be a choice of a Morse perturbation data in the sense of Section A.4 and $p, q \in E_{\text{reg}}^{(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g})}$. Then there is a generic subset $E_{\text{reg}}^{p,q} \subset E^{p,q}$ such that for any $h \in E_{\text{reg}}^{p,q}$ and any tuple $\vec{L} = (L_0, \dots, L_d)$ of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$ of any length $d \geq 1$ the following hold:*

- (1) if $L_0 \neq L_d$ then for any $\vec{x}_i := (x_1^i, \dots, x_{m_i-1}^i)$, $i = 0, \dots, d^R$, where $x_j^i \in \text{Crit}(f^{\overline{L_i}})$ are critical points, any orbits $\gamma_j \in \mathcal{O}(H_p^{\overline{L_{j-1}}, \overline{L_j}})$, $i = 1, \dots, d^R$, and $\gamma_+ \in \mathcal{O}(H_q^{\overline{L_0}, \overline{L_{d^R}}})$ and any class $A \in \pi_2(M, \vec{L})$ satisfying

$$d_A^{(\vec{x}_i)_i, (\gamma_j)_j, \gamma_+} + 1 \leq 1$$

then the moduli space

$$\mathcal{M}^{d+1,2}(\vec{x}_0, \gamma_1, \vec{x}_1, \dots, \gamma_{d^R}, \vec{x}_{d^R}; \gamma^+; A; h)$$

is a smooth manifold of dimension $d_A^{(\vec{x}_i)_i, (\gamma_j)_j, \gamma^+} + 1$.

- (2) if $L_0 = L_d$ then for any $x^+ \in \text{Crit}(f^{\overline{L_0}})$, $\vec{x}_i := (x_1^i, \dots, x_{m_i}^i)$. $i = 0, \dots, d^R + 1$, where $x_j^i \in \text{Crit}(f^{\overline{L_i}})$ are critical points, any orbits $\gamma_j \in \mathcal{O}(H_p^{\overline{L_{j-1}}, \overline{L_j}})$, $i = 1, \dots, d^R + 1$ and any class $A \in \pi_2(M, \vec{L})$ satisfying

$$d_A^{(\vec{x}_i)_i, (\gamma_j)_j, x^+} + 1 \leq 1$$

then the moduli space

$$\mathcal{M}^{d+1,2}(\vec{x}_0, \gamma_1, \vec{x}_2, \dots, \gamma_{d^R+1}, \vec{x}_{d^R+1}; x^+; A; h)$$

is a smooth manifold of dimension $d_A^{(\vec{x}_i)_i, (\gamma_j)_j, x^+} + 1$

We will not prove Proposition A.16. The idea is to decompose stacked clusters into Morse trees, stacked discs and discs and prove that each part is regular.

Remark A.17. Let $h \in E_{\text{reg}}^{p,q}$ and assume \vec{L} is made of $d + 1$ identical Lagrangians, i.e. $\vec{L}^F = (L)$, and pick \vec{x} , x^+ and $A \in \pi_2(M, L)$ as above such that $d_A^{\vec{x}, x^+} + 1 = 0$. Then by a simple dimension argument all the moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}^{d+1,2}(\vec{x}, x^+; A; h)$ are empty except if $d = 1$, $x = x^+$ and $A = 0$, in which case $\mathcal{M}^{2,2}(x^+; x^+) = \mathcal{M}^2(x^+, x^+) = \{x^+\}$, as hidden in the definition of interpolation data there is the fact that we do not perturb Morse perturbation data. \triangle

A.6. Definition of continuation functors. Fix regular perturbation data $p, q \in E_{\text{reg}}^{(f,g)}$ sharing the same Morse part and a regular interpolation datum $h \in E_{\text{reg}}^{p,q}$ between them. By the results of Section 2 associated to p and q there are strictly unital A_∞ -categories $\mathcal{Fuk}(M; p)$ and $\mathcal{Fuk}(M; q)$ which have the same set of objects. In this section we construct an A_∞ -functor

$$\mathcal{F}^{p,q}: \mathcal{Fuk}(M; p) \rightarrow \mathcal{Fuk}(M; q)$$

which will depend on the choice of h .

First, we declare $\mathcal{F}^{p,q}$ to be the identity on objects.

Let $d \geq 1$ and $\vec{L} = (L_0, \dots, L_d)$ be a tuple of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$. We define

$$\mathcal{F}_d^{p,q}: CF(L_0, L_1; p) \otimes \dots \otimes CF(L_{d-1}, L_d; p) \rightarrow CF(L_0, L_d; q)$$

as follows. First, we assume $L_0 \neq L_d$. Let $\vec{x}_i := (x_1^i, \dots, x_{m_i}^i)$, $i = 0, \dots, d^R$, where $x_j^i \in \text{Crit}(f^{\vec{L}_i})$ are critical points, $\gamma_j \in \mathcal{O}(H^{\vec{L}_{j-1}, \vec{L}_j})$, $i = 1, \dots, d^R$ are orbits. Then we define

$$\mathcal{F}_d^{p,q}(\vec{x}_0, \gamma_1, \vec{x}_1, \dots, \gamma_{d^R}, \vec{x}_{d^R}) := \sum_{\gamma^+, A} \sum_u T^{\omega(u)} \cdot \gamma^+$$

where the first sum runs over orbits $\gamma^+ \in \mathcal{O}(H^{L_0, L_d})$ and classes $A \in \pi_2(M, \vec{L})$ such that

$$d_A^{(\vec{x}_i)_i, (\gamma_j)_j, \gamma^+} + 1 = 0$$

and the second sum runs over stacked Floer clusters

$$(r, w, T, \lambda, u) \in \mathcal{M}^{d+1,2}(\vec{x}_0, \gamma_1, \vec{x}_1, \dots, \gamma_{d^R}, \vec{x}_{d^R}; \gamma^+; A; h)$$

Assume now $L_0 = L_d$. Let $\vec{x}_i := (x_1^i, \dots, x_{m_i}^i)$ for $i = 0, \dots, d^R + 1$, where $x_j^i \in \text{Crit}(f^{\vec{L}_i})$ are critical points, orbits $\gamma_j \in \mathcal{O}(H^{\vec{L}_{j-1}, \vec{L}_j})$ for any $i = 1, \dots, d^R$. Then we define

$$\mathcal{F}_d^{p,q}(\vec{x}_0, \gamma_1, \vec{x}_1, \dots, \gamma_{d^R}, \vec{x}_{d^R}) := \sum_{x^+, A} \sum_u T^{\omega(u)} \cdot x^+$$

where the first sum runs over critical points $x^+ \in \text{Crit}(f^{L_0})$ and classes $A \in \pi_2(M, \vec{L})$ such that

$$d_A^{(\vec{x}_i)_i, (\gamma_j)_j, x^+} + 1 = 0$$

and the second sum runs over Floer clusters

$$(r, w, T, \lambda, u) \in \mathcal{M}^{d+1,2}(\vec{x}_0, \gamma_1, \vec{x}_2, \dots, \gamma_{d^R+1}, \vec{x}_{d^R+1}; x^+; A; h)$$

Hidden in the next Proposition there is a compactness-type statement which follows from standard Gromov-compactness arguments up to the case where two or more configurations break simultaneously: this case is a bit more delicate and is handled in [Lemma 3.28][Sy19].

Proposition A.18. *Let (f, g) as above and $p, q \in E_{\text{reg}}^{(f,g)}$. Then, for any $h \in E_{\text{reg}}^{p,q}$, $\mathcal{F}^{p,q}$ is a weakly-filtered unital A_∞ -functor.*

Unitality of $\mathcal{F}^{p,q}$ is obvious since by dimension arguments $\mathcal{F}_1^{p,q}$ applied to a couple (L, L) of identical Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$ is the identity. The fact that $\mathcal{F}^{p,q}$ is weakly-filtered comes from energy-action identities involving curvature terms identical to those carried out in Section 2.6 and uniform bounds can be found as in [BCS21]. The functor $\mathcal{F}^{p,q}$ will be called a continuation functor between the Fukaya categories $\mathcal{Fuk}(M; p)$ and $\mathcal{Fuk}(M; q)$.

Since, as it is well-known, continuation maps (that is, linear parts of continuation functors) induce isomorphisms in homology, we have the following result.

Proposition A.19. *Let (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) as above and $p, q \in E_{\text{reg}}^{(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g})}$. Then, for any $h \in E_{\text{reg}}^{p,q}$, $\mathcal{F}^{p,q}$ is a quasi-equivalence between $\mathcal{Fuk}(M; p)$ and $\mathcal{Fuk}(M; q)$. Moreover, $\mathcal{F}^{p,q}$ does not depend on h up to quasi-isomorphism of functors.*

The last part of the proposition has been proved in [Syl19] by constructing ‘continuation homotopies’. As we mentioned above, Proposition A.19 can be generalized to continuation functors between *any* two perturbation data, not only those sharing the same Morse part (see Proposition 2.9). Given the above machinery, this is not hard to achieve, but goes beyond our aim to use continuation functors to estimate ‘distances’ between filtered Fukaya categories.

A.7. $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -Continuation functors and filtrations. Consider two positive real numbers $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 > 0$ and $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ and two perturbation data $p \in E^{\varepsilon_1, \delta_1}$ and $q \in E^{\varepsilon_2, \delta_2}$. Recall that by the main result of this paper, Theorem 3.1, the Fukaya categories $\mathcal{Fuk}(M; p)$ and $\mathcal{Fuk}(M; q)$ are strictly unital and filtered. Note that an arbitrary continuation functor defined via an element of $E^{p,q}$ might shift filtration in a way that is not controlled by the parameters $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \delta_1$ and δ_2 . In this section, we will construct a subclass $E^{p,q;f} \subset E^{p,q}$ of so called $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -interpolation data such that the associated continuation functors are still weakly-filtered, but with discrepancies controlled by the above parameters. Moreover, we describe choices of parameters such that the associated continuation functors are genuinely filtered. The construction of $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -interpolation data is almost identical to the construction of ε -perturbation data, as all the Hamiltonian perturbation will still lie on strip-like ends as in Section 3, hence we will only explicitly define $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -interpolation data for cyclically different tuples of Lagrangians of length 2 and 3, as the general case follows by obvious modifications and gluing. Let $\vec{L} = (L_0, L_1)$ be a couple of different Lagrangians on $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$ and consider the strip $S^{2,2}$ over $\mathcal{R}^{2,2}(\vec{L})$ coming with strip-like ends ϵ_1, ϵ_2 . A choice of $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -interpolation datum between p and q for \vec{L} on the strip is a choice of interpolation datum (K, J) as defined in Section A.4 but subject to the following restrictions:

- (1) K vanishes away from the strip-like ends;
- (2) On the negative strip-like end we have

$$K = \overline{H^{L_{i-1}, L_i}}(s, t) dt$$

where

$$\overline{H^{L_{i-1}, L_i}}: (-\infty, 0 \times [0, 1] \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

is of the form

$$\overline{H^{L_{i-1}, L_i}}(s, t) = (1 - \beta^{L_{i-1}, L_i}(s+1)) H_p^{L_{i-1}, L_i}(t)$$

for some $\beta^{L_{i-1}, L_i} \in \mathcal{F}$;

- (3) On the positive strip-like end we have

$$K = \overline{H^{L_0, L_2}}(s, t) dt$$

where

$$\overline{H^{L_0, L_2}}: [0, \infty) \times [0, 1] \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

is of the form

$$\overline{H^{L_0, L_2}}(s, t) = \beta^{L_0, L_2}(s) H_q^{L_0, L_2}(t)$$

for some $\beta^{L_0, L_2} \in \mathcal{F}$.

Let now $\vec{L} := (L_0, L_1, L_2)$ be a tuple of cyclically different monotone Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$. Notice that $\mathcal{R}_C^{3,2}(\vec{L}) = \{pt\} \times (0, \infty)$. A choice of $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -interpolation datum between p and q for \vec{L} over $(pt, w) \in \mathcal{R}_C^{3,2}(\vec{L})$ is a choice of interpolation datum $(K^{pt,w}, J^{pt,w})$ as defined in Section A.4 but subject to the following restrictions:

- (1) $K^{pt,w}$ vanishes away from the strip-like ends;
- (2) On the i th ($i \in \{1, 2\}$) strip-like end we have

$$K^{pt,w} = \overline{H_{pt,w}^{L_{i-1}, L_i}}(s, t) dt$$

where

$$\overline{H_{pt,w}^{L_{i-1}, L_i}} : (-\infty, 0 \times [0, 1] \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

is of the form

$$\overline{H_{pt,w}^{L_{i-1}, L_i}}(s, t) = (1 - \beta_{pt,w}^{L_{i-1}, L_i}(s+1)) H_p^{L_{i-1}, L_i}(t)$$

for some $\beta_{pt,w}^{L_{i-1}, L_i} \in \mathcal{F}$;

- (3) On the unique positive strip-like end we have

$$K^{pt,w} = \overline{H_{pt,w}^{L_0, L_2}}(s, t) dt$$

where

$$\overline{H_{pt,w}^{L_0, L_2}} : [0, \infty) \times [0, 1] \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

is of the form

$$\overline{H_{pt,w}^{L_0, L_2}}(s, t) = \beta_{pt,w}^{L_0, L_2}(s) H_q^{L_0, L_2}(t)$$

for some $\beta_{pt,w}^{L_0, L_2} \in \mathcal{F}$.

$(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -interpolation data for longer tuples of Lagrangians are constructed by gluing interpolation data for tuples \vec{L} with reduced tuple of length 2 and 3. Assuming transversality, it follows by the construction of continuation functors that the d th term of a continuation functor defined via an interpolation datum with parameters $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \delta_1$ and δ_2 shifts filtration by at most¹²

$$(d-1)\varepsilon_2(1-2\delta_2) + d(\varepsilon_2 - \delta_1\varepsilon_1)$$

since the least filtration preserving configurations are those endowed with interpolation data lying near the boundary part of $\partial\mathcal{R}^{d+1,2}(\vec{L})$ corresponding to

$$\mathcal{R}_C^{d+1}(\vec{L}) \times \prod_{i=1}^d \mathcal{R}^{2,2}(L_{i-1}, L_i).$$

Similarly to the case of ε -perturbation data in Section 3.2, we define regular $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -interpolation data.

Definition A.20. We define $E_{\text{reg}}^{p,q;f} \subset E_{\text{reg}}^{p,q}$ to be the space of regular interpolation data h such that the Hamiltonian parts of h is obtained via a deformation of the Hamiltonian parts of some $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -interpolation datum $h' \in E^{p,q;f}$ in the sense of [Sei08, Chapter 9k] (that is, by deformation with support on the thick parts of the polygons, to keep consistency) and such that the associated (well-defined) continuation functor $\mathcal{F}_h^{p,q}$ shifts filtration by $\leq \varepsilon_2 - \delta_1\varepsilon_1$ in the sense introduced in Section 1.1.

We show that $E_{\text{reg}}^{p,q;f}$ is non-empty. Pick an interpolation datum $h \in E^{p,q;f}$. It is well-known that there is no need to perturb the induced interpolation data on strips in order to get regularity for $d = 1$. Let $d \geq 2$, $\vec{L} = (L_0, \dots, L_d)$ be a tuple of Lagrangians in $\mathcal{L}^{m,d}(M, \omega)$ and $(K^{\vec{L}}, J^{\vec{L}})$ the Hamiltonian part p restricted to $\mathcal{R}_C^{d+1,2}(\vec{L})$. As a generic deformation $(\Delta K^{\vec{L}}, \Delta J^{\vec{L}})$ (vanishing on

¹²In the case $L_d \neq L_0$, while in the case $L_0 = L_d$ we can refine the estimate to $(d-3)$

thin parts) turns $(K^{\vec{L}}, J^{\vec{L}})$ into a regular perturbation datum $(K^{\vec{L}} + \Delta K^{\vec{L}}, J^{\vec{L}} \exp(-J^{\vec{L}} \Delta J^{\vec{L}}))$ we can choose a generic Hamiltonian deformation $\Delta K^{\vec{L}}$ such that the associated function

$$(r, w, T, \lambda) \in \mathcal{R}_C^{d+1,2}(\vec{L}) \mapsto \sum_{v \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{red}}} \int_{S_{r,w,T,\lambda}(v)} \max_{x \in M} R_{r,w,T,\lambda}^{\Delta K^{\vec{L}}}(v)$$

is bounded above by the positive number

$$(d-1)\varepsilon(2\delta_2 - 1).$$

It follows that for any $h \in E_{\text{reg}}^{p,q;f}$ and any $d \geq 1$ the d th term $(\mathcal{F}_h^{p,q})^d$ shifts filtration by $\leq d(\varepsilon_2 - \delta_1 \varepsilon_1)$, that is, $\mathcal{F}^{p,1}$ shifts filtration by $\leq \varepsilon_2 - \delta_1 \varepsilon_1$.

REFERENCES

- [Abo11] Mohammed Abouzaid. “A Topological Model for the Fukaya Categories of Plumbings”. In: *J. Differential Geometry* 87 (2011), pp. 1–80. DOI: [10.4310/jdg/1303219772](https://doi.org/10.4310/jdg/1303219772).
- [BC07] Paul Biran and Octav Cornea. *Quantum Structures for Lagrangian Submanifolds*. Aug. 2007. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/0708.4221>.
- [BC08] Paul Biran and Octav Cornea. “Rigidity and uniruling for Lagrangian submanifolds”. In: *Geometry & Topology* 13 (2008), pp. 2881–2989. DOI: [10.2140/gt.2009.13.2881](https://doi.org/10.2140/gt.2009.13.2881). URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/0808.2440>.
- [BC09] Paul Biran and Octav Cornea. “Lagrangian Quantum Homology”. In: *New perspectives and challenges in symplectic field theory* 29 (2009), pp. 1–44.
- [BC13] Paul Biran and Octav Cornea. “Lagrangian Cobordism. I”. In: *Journal of the American Mathematical Society* 26.2 (2013). DOI: [10.1090/S0894-0347-2012-00756-5](https://doi.org/10.1090/S0894-0347-2012-00756-5).
- [BC14] Paul Biran and Octav Cornea. “Lagrangian cobordism and Fukaya categories”. In: *Geometric and Functional Analysis* 24.6 (Dec. 2014), pp. 1731–1830. ISSN: 14208970. DOI: [10.1007/s00039-014-0305-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00039-014-0305-4).
- [BCS21] Paul Biran, Octav Cornea, and Egor Shelukhin. “Lagrangian Shadows and Triangulated Categories”. In: *Astérisque* 426 (June 2021). DOI: [10.24033/ast.1148](https://doi.org/10.24033/ast.1148).
- [BCZ23] Paul Biran, Octav Cornea, and Jun Zhang. *Triangulation, Persistence, and Fukaya categories*. Apr. 2023. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2304.01785>.
- [BPS01] Paul Biran, Leonid Polterovich, and Dietmar Salamon. “Propagation In Hamiltonian Dynamics And Relative Symplectic Homology”. In: *Duke Mathematical Journal* 119 (Mar. 2001). DOI: [10.1215/S0012-7094-03-11913-4](https://doi.org/10.1215/S0012-7094-03-11913-4).
- [Cha12] Francois Charest. “Source Spaces and Perturbations for Cluster Complexes”. PhD thesis. Université de Montréal, 2012.
- [Fuk+09] Kenji Fukaya et al. *Lagrangian Intersection Floer Theory. Anomaly and Obstruction, Part I*. American Mathematical Society, 2009.
- [Fuk21] Kenji Fukaya. “Gromov-Hausdorff distance between filtered A_{∞} categories 1: Lagrangian Floer theory”. In: (June 2021). URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2106.06378>.
- [Laz11] Laurent Lazzarini. “Relative frames on J-holomorphic curves”. In: *Journal of Fixed Point Theory and Applications* 9.2 (June 2011), pp. 213–256. DOI: [10.1007/s11784-010-0004-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11784-010-0004-1).
- [Mes18] Stephan Mescher. *Perturbed Gradient Flow Trees and A_{∞} -algebra Structures in Morse Cohomology*. Springer, 2018. URL: <http://www.springer.com/series/11155>.
- [MS12] Dusa McDuff and Dietmar Salamon. *J-holomorphic Curves and Symplectic Topology*. American Mathematical Society, 2012. DOI: [10.1090/coll/052](https://doi.org/10.1090/coll/052).
- [MW10] S. Mau and C. Woodward. “Geometric realizations of the multiplihedra”. In: *Compositio Mathematica* 146.4 (July 2010), pp. 1002–1028. ISSN: 0010437X. DOI: [10.1112/S0010437X0900462X](https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X0900462X).
- [Oh15] Yong-Geun Oh. *Symplectic Topology and Floer Homology*. Vol. 2. Cambridge University Press, 2015.

- [Sei08] Paul Seidel. *Fukaya categories and Picard-Lefschetz theory*. European Mathematical Society, 2008, p. 326. DOI: [DOI:10.4171/063](https://doi.org/10.4171/063).
- [She11] Nick Sheridan. “On the homological mirror symmetry conjecture for pairs of pants”. In: *J. Differential Geometry* 89 (2011), pp. 271–367. DOI: [10.4310/jdg/1324477412](https://doi.org/10.4310/jdg/1324477412).
- [Syl19] Zachary Sylvan. “On partially wrapped Fukaya categories”. In: *Journal of Topology* 12.2 (June 2019), pp. 372–441. ISSN: 17538424. DOI: [10.1112/topo.12088](https://doi.org/10.1112/topo.12088).

GIOVANNI AMBROSIONI, ETH ZÜRICH

Email address: giovanni.ambrosioni@math.ethz.ch