

Positivity of Intersections and Tameness of Almost Complex 4-manifolds

Spencer Cattalani*

February 1, 2024

Abstract

We prove that pseudoholomorphic curves intersect complex 2-cycles positively in almost complex 4-manifolds. This makes possible a general and conceptually simple proof that an almost complex 4-manifold with many curves admits a taming symplectic structure, as envisioned by Gromov. Furthermore, we prove that the positivity of intersections between pseudoholomorphic curves is stable, in a geometric sense.

1 Introduction

The geometry of $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$ is characterized by an abundance of holomorphic curves. Remarkably, the same is true for any almost complex structure on $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$ which is tamed by the Fubini-Study form, as demonstrated in [11, Example 2.4.B'₁]. This extends classical arguments from projective geometry to the much wider domain of tamed almost complex structures. Such arguments are particularly useful in dimension 4, where holomorphic curves are divisors. Can they be further extended? That is, is there an almost complex manifold which contains many pseudoholomorphic curves, but which is not tamed?

For 4-manifolds, the answer is proposed to be *no* in [11, Remark 2.4.A']. The argument presented therein comes from integral geometry. It is carried out in [17, Section 10]. Unfortunately, the argument requires the manifold to be swept out by smooth families of transversely intersecting curves. This is quite a strong assumption, which answers only the strictest interpretations of the above questions. We prove that Gromov's prediction holds in general. All notions appearing in the statement of Theorem 1 below are recalled in Section 4.

Theorem 1. *Let (X, J) be a closed almost complex 4-manifold such that every pair of points can be joined by a closed connected pseudoholomorphic curve C . Suppose (X, J) contains*

- (a) *a free pseudoholomorphic curve, or*
- (b) *an immersed pseudoholomorphic curve of genus g with n nodes and self-intersection number at least $2g + 2n$, or*
- (c) *an embedded rational curve with nonnegative self-intersection number, or*

*Partially supported by NSF grant DMS 1901979 and by the Simons Foundation

(d) uncountably many embedded rational curves.

Then (X, J) admits a taming symplectic form ω .

In case (c) or (d) holds, it follows from [15] and [24, Theorem A] that ω may be chosen so that (X, ω) is obtained by blowing up $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$ with the Fubini-Study form or a symplectic sphere bundle over a surface. We note that the curves C in Theorem 1 are not assumed to be immersed or irreducible. Neither are they assumed to lie in smooth families or to intersect transversely. The sharpness of Theorem 1 is discussed further in Section 2.

Theorem 1 is a consequence of the simple geometric principle of *positivity of intersections*. Classically, this states that two closed pseudoholomorphic curves which intersect either coincide on an irreducible component or have positive intersection number. We extend this theorem to include the case of a pseudoholomorphic curve intersecting a *complex cycle* in an almost complex 4-manifold. Complex cycles, which were introduced in [21] and are recalled in Section 3 of the present paper, are a generalization of pseudoholomorphic curves. They are studied in a similar context in [3]. Unlike pseudoholomorphic curves, they exist on any closed almost complex manifold; see Proposition 1.1 below. They have the remarkable property that their geometry precisely detects when a closed almost complex manifold admits a taming symplectic structure:

Proposition 1.1 ([21, Theorem III.2]). *Let (X, J) be a closed almost complex manifold. There are nonzero complex cycles on X . If $[T] \neq 0 \in H_2(X, \mathbb{R})$ for each nonzero complex cycle T on X , then (X, J) is tamed by a symplectic form.*

Therefore, if each nonzero complex cycle T on (X, J) has a positive intersection number with some curve, then (X, J) is tamed by a symplectic form. However, it is nontrivial to extend even the statement of positivity of intersections to this case, as the “irreducible components” of a complex cycle have not yet been defined in a suitable manner. To circumvent this difficulty, we use an alternative characterization in terms of a collection of test forms. Specifically, a 2-form ϕ on an almost complex manifold (X, J) is called *semipositive* if $\phi(v, Jv) \geq 0$ for any $v \in TX$. Hermitian forms, taming symplectic forms, and the form $idz_1d\bar{z}_1$ on \mathbb{C}^n are semipositive. They can be constructed locally quite easily, for instance by multiplying a Hermitian form by a nonnegative bump function. This makes them very good probes for the behavior of the tangent planes to holomorphic curves. For example, an irreducible curve C is an irreducible component of a curve S if and only if there is no semipositive form ϕ such that $\int_C \phi > 0$ and $\int_S \phi = 0$. The assumption in the following theorem is directly inspired by this fact.

Theorem 2. *Let (X, J) be a closed almost complex 4-manifold. Let C be a closed irreducible pseudoholomorphic curve in X and T be a complex cycle on X . If $C \cap \text{supp}(T) \neq \emptyset$ and there is a semipositive form ϕ such that*

$$\int_C \phi > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad T(\phi) = 0,$$

then $\langle [T], [C] \rangle > 0$.

If $C \not\subset \text{supp}(T)$, there is a nonnegative bump function f which is positive somewhere on C and is uniformly zero on $\text{supp}(T)$. If ω is a Hermitian form on X , then $f\omega$ is a semipositive form satisfying the assumption in Theorem 2. Therefore, the following corollary holds.

Corollary 1.2. *Let (X, J) be a closed almost complex 4-manifold. Let C be a closed irreducible pseudoholomorphic curve in X and T be a complex cycle on X . If $C \cap \text{supp}(T) \neq \emptyset$ and $C \not\subset \text{supp}(T)$, then $\langle [T], [C] \rangle > 0$.*

The difficulty in proving the positivity of intersections is that the curves can intersect at singular points. To resolve this issue, one deforms the curves locally to get a transverse intersection. The issues with singularities are magnified in the context of Theorem 2, as a complex cycle can be much more singular than any holomorphic curve. Therefore, we develop a refined deformation scheme, which is essentially founded on the *Oka principle* (alternatively, the *h-principle*). Our method also allows one to prove that the positivity of intersections is stable:

Theorem 3. *Let (X, J) be a closed almost complex 4-manifold, equipped with a metric. Let C be a closed irreducible pseudoholomorphic curve in X . For every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that if $S \subset X$ is a closed pseudoholomorphic curve,*

$$\langle [S], [C] \rangle \leq 0,$$

and at least one point of S is δ -close to C , then every point of C is ε -close to S .

If a pseudoholomorphic curve varies in a large family, then integration along the fiber allows one to define a well-behaved Poincaré dual 2-form, which would imply Theorems 1, 2, and 3. However, a pseudoholomorphic curve might not vary in a family of pseudoholomorphic curves. We resolve this issue by allowing the curves in the family to fail to be pseudoholomorphic on a small prescribed disk. This allows every pseudoholomorphic curve to vary in an arbitrarily large family, while retaining a great deal of control over the resulting Poincaré dual form.

In Section 2, we discuss possible extensions of the main results of this paper, as well as their connection to other work. In Section 3, we recall some basics from the theory of currents, particularly those concerning integration along the fiber. In Section 4, we recall the deformation theory of pseudoholomorphic curves and state Proposition 4.1, which describes the flexibility of pseudoholomorphic curves with boundary. It is proved in the appendix. In Section 5, we prove Proposition 5.3, which constructs a Poincaré dual to a pseudoholomorphic curve. Theorems 1, 2, and 3 follow quickly from Proposition 5.3 and are proved in Section 6.

Acknowledgements. The author is thankful to Eric Bedford, Dennis Sullivan, Dror Varolin, and Scott Wilson for helpful conversations and to Aleksey Zinger for his assistance with writing the appendix.

2 Discussion of results

Theorem 1 is not sharp, as there are many tamed almost complex manifolds which admit no pseudoholomorphic curves at all (e.g. a general complex torus). However, there are several ways in which it is quite general. First of all, it would not hold if X were assumed only to have a pseudoholomorphic curve passing through each point, as demonstrated by the following example.

Example 2.1. Let $S := (\mathbb{C}^2 - \{0\})/\{z \sim 2z\}$ be the Hopf surface. The Hopf surface S has a holomorphic curve through every point and satisfies (a) in Theorem 1, but $H^2(S, \mathbb{Z}) = 0$, so S is not tamed.

Although many almost complex manifolds contain no pseudoholomorphic curves, every tamed almost complex 4-manifold can be modified to contain pseudoholomorphic curves. Example 2.2 below shows that every almost complex 4-manifold satisfying the conclusion of Theorem 1 can be transformed into one which satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1. That is, Theorem 1 is sharp up to blowups and deformations.

Example 2.2. Let (X, J) be a closed tamed almost complex 4-manifold. There are a taming symplectic form ω on X , a symplectic manifold (X', ω') obtained by symplectically blowing up (X, ω) at a finite number of points, and an almost complex structure J' on X' tamed by ω' such that every pair of points of X' can be joined by a closed connected J' -holomorphic curve C and X' contains a free J' -holomorphic curve.

Proof. Taming J is an open and positive scaling invariant condition on symplectic forms. Therefore, if (X, J) is tamed, it admits a taming symplectic form ω such that $[\omega] \in H^2(X, \mathbb{R})$ is the reduction of an integer cohomology class. Therefore, by [6, Theorem 2], (X, ω) admits a Lefschetz pencil such that the fibers are Poincaré dual to a multiple of $[\omega]$. Since ω has positive self-intersection, the base locus is nonempty. It follows from the definition of Lefschetz pencil that the base locus is finite and the fibers intersect transversely. Symplectically blowing up along the base locus of the pencil yields a symplectic manifold (X', ω') which admits a Lefschetz fibration; see [24, Chapter 3] for a full exposition of this construction. An exceptional divisor of this blowup is an embedded symplectic sphere with self-intersection -1 . There is an almost complex structure on X' tamed by ω' in which the exceptional divisor is a pseudoholomorphic curve. As it is a rational curve with self-intersection -1 , it is regular by [13, Theorem 1]. Therefore, by Gromov's Compactness Theorem [11, Theorem 1.5.B], every almost complex structure on X' which is tamed by J has a pseudoholomorphic curve in the class of the exceptional divisor. There is an almost complex structure J' tamed by ω' on X' such that the fibers of the Lefschetz fibration are pseudoholomorphic curves; see the remark following Lemma 2.12 in [8]. The smooth fibers are free. Furthermore, there is an exceptional divisor intersecting each fiber, so every pair of points of X' can be joined by a closed connected J' -holomorphic curve. \square

One might hope that there is a topological condition on X or a geometric condition concerning just one pseudoholomorphic curve (e.g. that it be sufficiently free) that would guarantee that (X, J) is tamed. By Proposition 2.3 below, there is no such condition. That is, in order to demonstrate that (X, J) admits a taming structure, something must be assumed about the geometry of the almost complex structure J . Furthermore, this assumption must constrain the behavior of J on every open set.

Proposition 2.3. *Let (X, J) be an almost complex manifold of dimension at least 4. For any open $U \subset X$, there is an almost complex structure J' on X which is deformation equivalent to J , is equal to J outside of U , and admits no taming symplectic structure.*

Proof. First, we construct an almost complex structure J' on \mathbb{C}^n for $n \geq 2$ so that J' equals the standard complex structure outside the unit ball and \mathbb{C}^n contains a J' -holomorphic embedded torus. Let \mathbb{C}^n have complex coordinates $x_1 + iy_1, \dots, x_n + iy_n$ and \mathbb{R}^3 have real coordinates x_1, y_1 , and x_2 . Embed the 2-torus T^2 in the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^3 . By the Gauss-Bonnet Theorem, the Gauss map $\nu : T^2 \rightarrow S^2$, defined by taking the unit normal vector, has degree zero (see [18, Lemma 6.3]) and is thus null-homotopic. Therefore, one can extend the map ν to the rest of the unit ball in \mathbb{C}^n , so that it remains in the span of $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial y_1}$, and $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_2}$ and restricts to the constant vector field

$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_2}$ on the unit sphere. Extend it to the rest of \mathbb{C}^n as a constant vector field. Define a field of oriented planes π on \mathbb{C}^n by $v \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial y_2}$. Define an almost complex structure J' on \mathbb{C}^n via a rotation by a positive quarter turn in π , its orthogonal complement in the span of $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial y_1}$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_2}$, and $\frac{\partial}{\partial y_2}$, and in each plane spanned by $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial y_k}$ for $2 < k \leq n$. This J' equals the standard complex structure outside the unit ball and contains a J' -holomorphic embedded torus.

Now, we modify (X, J) using this local model. Deform J on a small open set $U' \subset U$ so that the resulting structure is integrable on U' . Replace J with the J' constructed above inside a complex coordinate chart. As J' is standard outside of the unit ball, this yields an almost complex structure J' on X . The manifold X contains a null-homologous nonconstant J' -holomorphic curve, so J' is not tamed by any symplectic structure. \square

Our proof of Theorem 1 via the positivity of intersections is quite robust. That is, many related statements can be proved in a similar manner. The main difficulty is in obtaining a closed semi-positive form with which one can use Theorem 2. In our case, we use free curves to produce such forms. However, they can arise in other ways, for example via pullbacks and limits of symplectic forms. In fact, it is quite difficult (perhaps impossible) to construct an almost complex 4-manifold with many curves which does not also have closed semipositive forms. Proposition 2.4 below is a somewhat sharper version of Theorem 1, albeit with a more technical statement.

Proposition 2.4. *Let (X, J) be a closed almost complex 4-manifold. Suppose there exists a closed semipositive 2-form ϕ such that, for every $x \in X$, there exist a closed connected pseudoholomorphic curve C_x passing through x such that $\int_{C_x} \phi > 0$. Then, (X, J) admits a taming symplectic structure.*

As in Example 2.2, the existence of a Lefschetz pencil shows that Proposition 2.4 is sharp up to deformation; blowing up is not required in this case. Ideally, one could avoid the assumption of semipositivity altogether and use only a *homological* positivity condition, as below. This means that the curves C_x lie in an open cone in $H_2(X, \mathbb{R})$.

Conjecture 2.5. *The word “semipositive” can be removed in Proposition 2.4.*

Our method of using complex cycles allows one to leverage other geometric information to construct symplectic forms. For example, as complex cycles are normal currents, they are supported on a set of Hausdorff dimension at least 2; see [9, Theorem 8.5]. It follows that sets of lower dimension can be ignored in Theorem 1. It is not clear how one would see this other than through the perspective of complex cycles. Their geometry is also studied in [3]. Ultimately, a full understanding of complex cycles would elucidate the role of symplectic structures in almost complex geometry. If one remains averse to complex cycles, we note that Proposition 5.3, which makes no mention of them, can be used to prove Theorem 1 directly, without passing through Theorem 2.

We now briefly remark on connections to other work. The method for constructing compatible symplectic structures in [22] is quite similar to the integral-geometric method proposed in [11, Remark 2.4.A']. By [25], this method can be used to show that almost complex 4-manifolds with sufficiently well-distributed curves admit *compatible* symplectic structures, a stronger condition than just taming. By deforming curves, we avoid having to assume that they are well-distributed (formally, that they can be used to form a *Taubes current*), but we do not produce a compatible symplectic structure. We hope that our method, enriched with analytic estimates as in [22],

could help produce compatible forms, and therefore make progress towards Donaldson’s “tamed-to-compatible” conjecture [7]. With respect to Theorem 2, one might wish to understand intersections between two complex cycles. This is akin to the intersection theory of positive $(1, 1)$ -currents in complex geometry, which is well-developed; see [1],[4], for example. Pluripotential theory is central to this development. Unfortunately, it seems that complex cycles do not always admit potential functions, which significantly hampers the use of pluripotential theory in our context.

3 Preliminaries: currents

Let X be a smooth n -manifold. For $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$, we denote by $\Omega_c^k(X)$ the space of compactly supported differential k -forms on X . A k -current on an n -manifold X is a linear functional on $\Omega_c^k(X)$ which is continuous in the strong C^∞ topology on $\Omega_c^k(X)$. A sequence of forms converges in the strong C^∞ topology if it converges in C^∞ and all the forms are supported in the same compact set. We let $(\Omega_c^k(X))^*$ denote the space of k -currents on X , equipped with the weak topology. A sequence of k -currents T_i converges to T in the weak topology if $T_i(\omega)$ converges to $T(\omega)$ for every k -form ω . The exterior derivative on forms induces a boundary operator on currents via the equation

$$\partial T(\alpha) := T(d\alpha).$$

The *support* of a k -current T on X , denoted $\text{supp}(T)$, is the complement of the largest open subset $U \subset X$ such that $T(\alpha) = 0$ for all $\alpha \in \Omega_c^k(U)$. If $\alpha \in \Omega_c^k(X)$ with $\text{supp}(\alpha) \cap \text{supp}(T)$ compact, then

$$T(\alpha) := T(\rho\alpha) \in \mathbb{R}$$

does not depend on the choice of $\rho \in C_c^\infty(X)$ such that ρ equals 1 on a neighborhood of $\text{supp}(\alpha) \cap \text{supp}(T)$.

Example 3.1. A dimension k oriented submanifold Y of X defines a k -current by $Y(\alpha) = \int_Y \alpha$ for $\alpha \in \Omega_c^k(X)$. In this case, $\text{supp}(Y) = Y$.

Example 3.2. If X is oriented, a degree $(n - k)$ differential form ω defines an k -current by $\omega(\alpha) = \int_X \omega \wedge \alpha$ for $\alpha \in \Omega_c^{n-k}(X)$. The support of a differential form is equal to its support when considered as a current. If X is closed, the inclusion

$$\iota : \Omega_c^k(X) \longrightarrow (\Omega_c^{n-k}(X))^*$$

induces an isomorphism from de Rham cohomology to the homology of currents; see [5, Chapter IV, Theorem 14].

Two k -currents T and T' on X are said to be equal on an open set $U \subset X$ if $T(\alpha) = T'(\alpha)$ for all $\alpha \in \Omega_c^k(U)$. A current on X is said to be smooth on an open set $U \subset X$ if it is equal to the current induced by a differential form on U .

The pullback operation on forms induces a pushforward on currents with compact support. For a smooth map $f : M \longrightarrow X$ and a compactly supported k -current T on M ,

$$f_*T : \Omega_c^k(X) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \{f_*T\}(\alpha) = T(f^*\alpha), \tag{3.1}$$

is a well-defined k -current on X . In special cases, the pushforward of a smooth current is smooth. Such cases are referred to as *integration along the fiber*; see [2, Section 6] and the proof of Lemma 3.3 below.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $f: M \rightarrow X$ be a smooth map from an oriented m -manifold M with boundary to an oriented n -manifold X and $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$. Then for any $\omega \in \Omega_c^{m-k}(M)$ and open subset $U \subset X - f(\partial M)$ consisting of regular values, $f_*\omega$ is smooth on U . Furthermore, for all points $x \in U$ and $v \in \bigwedge^{n-k} T_x X$,*

$$\{f_*\omega\}(v) = \int_{f^{-1}(x)} \omega(\tilde{v}), \quad (3.2)$$

where \tilde{v} is a lift of v along df to $f^{-1}(x)$ and $\omega(\tilde{v})$ is the contraction of ω with \tilde{v} in the last $n - k$ inputs.

Proof. We assume $m \geq n$ and show first that this result holds for the projection onto the last n coordinates, $\pi: \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$. Denote the first $m - n$ coordinates of \mathbb{R}^m by p_1, \dots, p_{m-n} and the last n coordinates by x_1, \dots, x_n . It suffices to prove the result for simple forms, i.e. those of the form $f dp_\alpha dx_\beta$, where α and β are multi-indices. Let $g dx_\gamma$ be a form on \mathbb{R}^n , where γ is a multi-index. By Fubini's theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} \{\pi_*(f dp_\alpha dx_\beta)\}(g dx_\gamma) &:= \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f dp_\alpha dx_\beta \pi^*(g dx_\gamma) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f dp_\alpha dx_\beta (g \circ \pi) dx_\gamma \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{m-n}} f dp_\alpha \right) dx_\beta (g dx_\gamma). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\pi_*(f dp_\alpha dx_\beta) = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{m-n}} f dp_\alpha \right) dx_\beta.$$

It is therefore a smooth differential form. Expressed in this form, it is also clear that it acts on multivectors as described in (3.2).

Now, we show the result in the general case. For $x \in U \subset X - f(\partial M)$, let ρ be a nonnegative function on X supported within U and equal to 1 on a neighborhood of x . Let $\omega' := (\rho \circ f)\omega$. This form is compactly supported and $f_*\omega = f_*\omega'$ on a neighborhood of x . As f is a submersion on $f^{-1}(U)$, for each $p \in f^{-1}(U) \subset M$, there are open neighborhoods $V_p \subset M$ of p and $U_p \subset U$ of $f(p)$ and diffeomorphisms

$$\phi: \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow V_p, \quad \psi: U_p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \quad \text{such that} \quad \psi \circ f \circ \phi = \pi: \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$$

is the projection onto the last n coordinates. By compactness, finitely many V_p cover $\text{supp}(\omega')$. Using a partition of unity, decompose ω' as a sum of forms ω'_p each supported in one of these V_p . Therefore, $f_*\omega'_p$ is smooth for all p , so $f_*\omega' = \sum_p f_*\omega'_p$ is as well. Furthermore, for all points $x \in U$ and $v \in \bigwedge^{n-k} T_x X$,

$$\{f_*\omega'\}(v) = \sum_p \{f_*\omega'_p\}(v) = \sum_p \int_{f^{-1}(x)} \omega'_p(\tilde{v}) = \int_{f^{-1}(x)} \omega'(\tilde{v}) = \int_{f^{-1}(x)} \omega(\tilde{v}).$$

As these conclusions are local, they also hold for ω . □

Below, we prove a special case of Theorem 1 to demonstrate the use of Lemma 3.3.

Example 3.4. Let (X, J) be a closed almost complex 4-manifold and G be a compact connected Lie group which acts transitively on X preserving J . Let $u : \Sigma \rightarrow X$ be a pseudoholomorphic map from a closed connected Riemann surface Σ . If $u_*[\Sigma]$ has positive self-intersection number, then (X, J) is tamed by a symplectic form ω which is G -invariant, J -invariant, and Poincaré dual to $u_*[\Sigma]$.

Proof. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{f} : G \times \Sigma &\longrightarrow G, & \mathfrak{f}(g, z) &= g, \\ \text{ev} : G \times \Sigma &\longrightarrow X, & \text{ev}(g, z) &= g(u(z)). \end{aligned}$$

Let $d\mu$ be an invariant volume form on G with $\int_G d\mu = 1$ (i.e. the Haar measure). As G acts transitively on X , ev is a submersion. By Lemma 3.3, $\omega := \text{ev}_* \mathfrak{f}^*(d\mu)$ is a well-defined 2-form on X . Let $\alpha \in \Omega^2(X)$. By (3.1),

$$\int_X \omega \wedge \alpha = \int_{G \times \Sigma} \mathfrak{f}^* d\mu \wedge \text{ev}^* \alpha = \int_{g \in G} \left(\int_{\Sigma} (gu)^* \alpha \right) d\mu.$$

By the G -invariance of $d\mu$, ω is G -invariant. By the pseudoholomorphicity of gu , ω is J -invariant and $\int_X \omega \wedge \alpha \geq 0$ if α is semipositive. Therefore, ω is semipositive. As G is connected, the maps gu are homotopic to u . Therefore, if α is closed,

$$\int_{g \in G} \left(\int_{\Sigma} (gu)^* \alpha \right) d\mu = \left(\int_{\Sigma} u^* \alpha \right) \left(\int_G d\mu \right) = \int_{\Sigma} u^* \alpha.$$

Therefore, ω is Poincaré dual to $u_*[\Sigma]$. Since $u_*[\Sigma]$ has positive self-intersection number, $\int_X \omega^2 > 0$, so ω has full rank at some point of X . As ω is G -invariant and G acts transitively on X , ω has full rank everywhere. Therefore, it is a symplectic form taming J . \square

In [5, Chapter III.15], de Rham defines a group of motions of the ball that smoothly taper down to the identity at the boundary of the ball. By taking a convolution with respect to this group of motions, he defines a family of smoothing operators. We recall some salient features of this construction in the next lemma. We use it in a similar manner to [21], where it is described geometrically. In light of 4 below, this construction can be understood as a type of integration along the fiber. Let $B_r \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open ball of radius r and $\overline{B_r}$ be its closure.

Lemma 3.5 ([5, Proposition III.15.2]). *Let $n \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$, and $\varepsilon > 0$. There are a family $\{s_w\}_{w \in \mathbb{R}^n}$ of diffeomorphisms of \mathbb{R}^n and a nonnegative n -form $d\mu_\varepsilon$ on \mathbb{R}^n with the following properties.*

- (1) *The form $d\mu_\varepsilon$ is compactly supported and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} d\mu_\varepsilon = 1$.*
- (2) *For each $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$, s_w is homotopic to the identity and $s_w|_{\mathbb{R}^n - \overline{B_2}}$ is the identity.*
- (3) *For each $w \in \text{supp}(d\mu_\varepsilon)$, s_w is ε -close in C^1 to the identity.*
- (4) *The map*

$$R_\varepsilon : (\Omega_c^k(\mathbb{R}^n))^* \longrightarrow (\Omega_c^k(\mathbb{R}^n))^*, \quad \{R_\varepsilon T\}(\alpha) := T \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} s_w^* \alpha d\mu_\varepsilon \right), \quad \forall \alpha \in \Omega_c^k(\mathbb{R}^n), \quad (3.3)$$

is a continuous linear operator on k -currents such that for every $T \in (\Omega_c^k(\mathbb{R}^n))^$,*

(4a) $R_\varepsilon T = T$ on $\mathbb{R}^n - \overline{B_2}$,

(4b) $R_\varepsilon T$ is smooth on every open set where T is smooth, and

(4c) $R_\varepsilon T$ is smooth on B_2 .

Definition 3.6. A 2-form α on an almost complex manifold is *strictly positive* if $\alpha(v, Jv) > 0$ for all $v \neq 0 \in T_x X$ and $x \in X$. A 2-current T on a compact almost complex manifold X is a *complex cycle* if $\partial T = 0$ and $T(\alpha) > 0$ for all strictly positive 2-forms.

Example 3.7. A closed pseudoholomorphic curve is a complex cycle. This family of examples is exceptionally well-behaved. See [12] for more pathological examples.

Lemma 3.8. Let α be a semipositive form on X and T be a complex cycle on X . If α is strictly positive somewhere on $\text{supp}(T)$, then $T(\alpha) > 0$.

Proof. Suppose that α is strictly positive at $x \in \text{supp}(T)$. Let $U \subset X$ be a precompact open neighborhood of x such that α is strictly positive on \overline{U} . Choose a semipositive form $\beta \in \Omega_c^2(U)$ with $T(\beta) > 0$. By the compactness of \overline{U} , there exists $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $\alpha - \epsilon\beta$ is a semipositive form on a neighborhood of $\text{supp}(T)$. Therefore,

$$T(\alpha) = \epsilon T(\beta) + T(\alpha - \epsilon\beta) > 0,$$

as claimed. □

4 Preliminaries: curves

In this section, we recall the necessary perturbation theory for pseudoholomorphic curves. Proposition 4.1 below collects the input on the local structure of moduli spaces of J -holomorphic curves needed for our purposes. It is a variation on [13, Theorem 2] and [14, Lemma 1.5.1]. We deduce it from [13, 14, 20] in Appendix A.

Let (X, J) be an almost complex manifold. We call a half-dimensional submanifold $Y \subset X$ *totally real* if $TY \cap J(TY) = Y$. By Carleman Similarity Principle [16, Theorem 2.3.5], a non-constant J -holomorphic map $u: \Sigma \rightarrow X$ from a connected Riemann surface, possibly with boundary, determines a complex line subbundle $\mathcal{T}u \subset u^*TX$ containing $du(T\Sigma)$. We denote by

$$\mathcal{N}u := \frac{u^*TX}{\mathcal{T}u} \rightarrow \Sigma$$

the *normal bundle* of u . If $u|_{\partial\Sigma}$ is an embedding with the image contained in a totally real submanifold $Y \subset X$, then the *normal bundle*

$$\mathcal{N}_Y(\partial u) := \frac{\{u|_{\partial\Sigma}\}^*TY}{du(T(\partial\Sigma))} \rightarrow \partial\Sigma$$

of $\partial u := u|_{\partial\Sigma}$ in Y is a real subbundle of $\mathcal{N}u|_{\partial\Sigma}$ (the embedding condition can be bypassed in general). If, in addition, Σ is compact, we denote by $\mu_Y^{\mathcal{N}}(u)$ the Maslov index of the bundle pair $(\mathcal{N}u, \mathcal{N}_Y(\partial u))$ over $(\Sigma, \partial\Sigma)$; see [16, Appendix C.3].

We define the *genus* $g(\Sigma)$ of a compact connected Riemann surface Σ with b boundary components by

$$2 - 2g(\Sigma) = \chi(\Sigma) + b.$$

If (X, J) is an almost complex manifold, $Y \subset X$ is a submanifold, and $g, b \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$, we denote

- by $\mathfrak{M}_{(g,b)}(X, Y)$ the moduli space of equivalence classes of non-constant J -holomorphic maps $u: \Sigma \rightarrow X$ from compact connected genus g Riemann surfaces with b boundary components such that $u(\partial\Sigma) \subset Y$,
- by $\mathfrak{M}_{(g,b),1}(X, Y)$ the moduli space of equivalence classes of pairs (u, z_0) with $u: \Sigma \rightarrow X$ as above and $z_0 \in \Sigma$, and
- by $\mathfrak{M}_{(g,b),1}^\circ(X, Y) \subset \mathfrak{M}_{(g,b),1}(X, Y)$ the subspace of pairs $[u, z_0]$ as above so that $z_0 \notin \partial\Sigma$.

Define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{f}: \mathfrak{M}_{(g,b),1}(X, Y) &\longrightarrow \mathfrak{M}_{(g,b)}(X, Y), & \mathfrak{f}([u, z_0]) &= [u], \\ \text{ev}: \mathfrak{M}_{(g,b),1}(X, Y) &\longrightarrow X, & \text{ev}([u, z_0]) &= u(z_0). \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose (X, J) is an almost complex 4-manifold, $Y \subset X$ is a totally real surface, $g, b \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$, and $[u: \Sigma \rightarrow X] \in \mathfrak{M}_{(g,b)}(X, Y)$. If $u|_{\partial\Sigma}$ is an embedding and $\mu_Y^{\mathcal{N}}(u) \geq 4g + 2b + 1$, then*

- (1) *a neighborhood \mathfrak{M}_0 of $[u]$ in $\mathfrak{M}_{(g,b)}(X, Y)$ is a smooth manifold;*
- (2) *the subspace $\mathfrak{M}_1 := \mathfrak{f}^{-1}(\mathfrak{M}_0)$ of $\mathfrak{M}_{(g,b),1}(X, Y)$ is a smooth manifold with boundary and the maps*

$$\mathfrak{f}: \mathfrak{M}_1 \longrightarrow \mathfrak{M}_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{ev}: \mathfrak{M}_1^\circ := \mathfrak{M}_1 \cap \mathfrak{M}_{(g,b),1}^\circ(X, Y) \longrightarrow X - Y \quad (4.1)$$

are smooth submersions;

- (3) *for every $x_0 \in X - Y$, the subspace $\mathfrak{M}_1^\circ(x_0) := \text{ev}^{-1}(x_0) \cap \mathfrak{M}_1^\circ$ of \mathfrak{M}_1° is a smooth submanifold with*

$$\dim \mathfrak{M}_1^\circ(x_0) = \dim \mathfrak{M} - 2; \quad (4.2)$$

- (4) *for every $x_0 \in X - Y$ and $v_0 \in T_{x_0}X$ nonzero, the subspace $\mathfrak{M}_1^\circ(v_0) \subset \mathfrak{M}_1^\circ(x_0)$ of pairs $[u', z_0]$ such that $v_0 \in \mathcal{T}u'|_{z_0}$ is a smooth submanifold with*

$$\dim \mathfrak{M}_1^\circ(v_0) = \dim \mathfrak{M} - 4.$$

Definition 4.2. Let (X, J) be an almost complex manifold. A pseudoholomorphic curve $C \subset X$ is *free* if it admits a pseudoholomorphic parameterization $u: \Sigma \rightarrow X$ which satisfies (1) and (2) of Proposition 4.1.

Example 4.3. The lines in $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$ and the smooth fibers of a surface bundle over a surface are free.

If an immersed surface S has n points of self-intersection, all of which are positive transverse double points, then S is said to have n nodes. An immersed surface S is said to have n nodes if an arbitrarily small perturbation of S has n nodes.

Example 4.4. Let (X, J) be an almost complex 4-manifold and $C \subset X$ be an immersed pseudoholomorphic curve of genus g with n nodes. Let $u: \Sigma \rightarrow X$ be a pseudoholomorphic parameterization of C . It follows from the proof of Proposition 4.1 that C is free if

$$4g - 1 \leq \mu_\emptyset^{\mathcal{N}}(u) = 2\langle c_1(\mathcal{N}u), [\Sigma] \rangle.$$

Therefore, if C has self-intersection number at least $2g + 2n$, it is free.

5 Construction of Poincaré dual

In this section, we use integration along the fiber to produce a well-behaved Poincaré dual to a pseudoholomorphic curve. The main result of this section is Proposition 5.3. Its proof is based on the proof of Lemma 5.1, but with additional complications. If the curve C fails to be sufficiently flexible, we have to vary it as a curve with boundary. Lemma 5.2 shows that boundary conditions can be chosen to make the curve as flexible as one wishes. Integration along the fiber then produces a current which is well-behaved away from a small set. To correct it on this small set, we first take a cone on it to produce a closed current and then use de Rham's smoothing procedure to produce a form. The last two steps are purely local and therefore can be done within a chart where the semipositive form ϕ of Proposition 5.3 is particularly nice.

Lemma 5.1. *Let (X, J) be a closed almost complex 4-manifold and C be a pseudoholomorphic curve on X . If C is free, then it is Poincaré dual to a semipositive form ω .*

Proof. Let $u_0 : \Sigma \rightarrow X$ be a pseudoholomorphic parameterization of C . With notation as in Proposition 4.1, let

$$f : \mathfrak{M}_1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{ev} : \mathfrak{M}_1 = \mathfrak{M}_1^\circ \rightarrow X$$

be the forgetful and evaluation maps, respectively. By assumption, \mathfrak{M}_0 and \mathfrak{M}_1° are smooth manifolds and ev is a submersion. Let $d\nu$ be a compactly supported nonnegative form on \mathfrak{M}_0 such that $\int_{\mathfrak{M}_0} d\nu = 1$. By Lemma 3.3 with $U = X$, we can define a form $\omega = \text{ev}_* f^* d\nu$ on X .

Let $\alpha \in \Omega^2(X)$. By (3.1),

$$\int_X \omega \wedge \alpha = \int_{\mathfrak{M}_1} (f^* d\nu) \text{ev}^* \alpha = \int_{[u] \in \mathfrak{M}_0} \left(\int_{\Sigma} u^* \alpha \right) d\nu.$$

As u' is pseudoholomorphic for every $[u'] \in \mathfrak{M}_0$, $\int_X \omega \wedge \alpha \geq 0$ if α is semipositive. It follows that ω is semipositive. Since u is homotopic to u_0 for all $[u'] \in \mathfrak{M}_0$,

$$\int_X \omega \wedge \alpha = \int_{[u] \in \mathfrak{M}_0} \left(\int_{\Sigma} u^* \alpha \right) d\nu = \left(\int_C \alpha \right) \left(\int_{\mathfrak{M}_0} d\nu \right) = \int_{\Sigma} u_0^* \alpha$$

if α is a closed 2-form on X . Therefore, ω is Poincaré dual to C . \square

Lemma 5.2. *Let (X, J) be a closed almost complex 4-manifold and $u : \Sigma \rightarrow X$ be a nonconstant pseudoholomorphic map from a closed connected Riemann surface. For any $M \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$ and open subset $U \subset X$ such that $u(\Sigma) \cap U \neq \emptyset$, there exists a totally real surface $Y \subset U$ and a curve γ bounding an open disk $D \subset \Sigma$ such that $u(\overline{D}) \subset U$, $u(\gamma) \subset Y$, and*

$$\mu_Y^{\mathcal{N}}(u|_{\Sigma-D}) \geq M. \tag{5.1}$$

Proof. Pick a simple closed curve $\gamma \subset u^{-1}(U)$ bounding an open disk $D \subset \Sigma$ so that $u|_{\overline{D}}$ is an embedding. The normal bundle $\mathcal{N}u$ trivializes over \overline{D} . Associate $\mathcal{N}u|_{\overline{D}}$ with a complement of $du(T\overline{D})$ in TX . Take a section ξ of $\mathcal{N}u$ along γ such that the winding number around the zero section is $2\langle c_1(\mathcal{N}u), [\Sigma] \rangle - M$. Since u is pseudoholomorphic, the subbundle of TX generated by ξ and $T\gamma$ is totally real. This is an open property, so flowing for a short time under the exponential map of ξ yields a totally real surface $Y \subset U$. By [16, Theorem C.3.5],

$$2\langle c_1(\mathcal{N}u), [\Sigma] \rangle = \mu_{\emptyset}^{\mathcal{N}}(u) = \mu_Y^{\mathcal{N}}(u|_{\Sigma-D}) + \mu_Y^{\mathcal{N}}(u|_{\overline{D}}) = \mu_Y^{\mathcal{N}}(u|_{\Sigma-D}) + (2\langle c_1(\mathcal{N}u), [\Sigma] \rangle - M).$$

This gives (5.1). \square

Lemma 5.2 readily generalizes to higher dimensional targets. By Proposition 4.1, it shows that boundary conditions on a pseudoholomorphic curve in a 4-manifold can be chosen so that the curve admits many deformations. This flexibility can be interpreted in complex geometric terms. An open Riemann surface is Stein; see [23, Theorem 8.1.1]. It follows from Cartan's Theorem B [19, Théorème B] that the obstruction bundle vanishes. Therefore, a holomorphic curve with boundary in an arbitrary complex manifold should deform in an arbitrarily large family. It seems likely that a related result would hold for pseudoholomorphic curves with boundary in an arbitrary almost complex manifold, but we restrict our attention to 4-manifolds.

Proposition 5.3. *Let (X, J) be a closed almost complex 4-manifold. Let C be a closed irreducible pseudoholomorphic curve in X and ϕ a semipositive form such that*

$$\int_C \phi > 0.$$

Then, there exist a closed 2-form ω_C and a constant $K > 0$ such that

- (1) ω_C is Poincaré dual to C ,
- (2) ω_C is J -invariant on $X - \text{supp}(\phi)$,
- (3) $\omega_C + K\phi$ is a semipositive form, and
- (4) $\omega_C + K\phi$ is strictly positive on a neighborhood of C .

Proof. We first show that there exist a closed 2-form ω'_C and a constant $K' > 0$ such that $\omega'_C + K'\phi$ is strictly positive on a neighborhood of $C - \text{supp}(\phi)$ and (1), (2), and (3) hold with ω_C and K replaced by ω'_C and K' , respectively.

Let $u : \Sigma \rightarrow X$ be a pseudoholomorphic parameterization of C . As C is irreducible, Σ is connected. By [16, Lemma 2.4.1, Proposition 2.5.1], u is a smooth embedding away from a finite set of points. Let $B_r \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ be the closed ball of radius r centered at the origin and \overline{B}_r denote its closure. For some $\delta > 0$, one can define a smooth embedding $\psi : \overline{B}_3 \rightarrow X$ such that $\psi^{-1}(C \cap \psi(\overline{B}_3))$ is the disk of radius 3 in the z_1 -plane and $\psi^*\phi(v) > 0$ for every bivector v δ -close to $-i\frac{\partial}{\partial z_1} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}_1}$.

Let g be the genus of Σ , $U = \psi(B_1)$, and $M = 4g + 3$. Let D and Y be as in Lemma 5.2. We denote $u|_{\Sigma-D}$ by u_0 . With notation as in Proposition 4.1, let

$$f : \mathfrak{M}_1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_0 \text{ and } \text{ev} : \mathfrak{M}_1 \rightarrow X$$

be the forgetful and evaluation maps, respectively. By Proposition 4.1(1), \mathfrak{M}_0 is a manifold. Without loss of generality, we can take \mathfrak{M}_0 to be \mathbb{R}^n for some n so that $[u_0] = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$. For $\varepsilon > 0$, let $d\nu_\varepsilon$ be a nonnegative n -form on \mathbb{R}^n supported on $B_\varepsilon \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} d\nu_\varepsilon = 1$. Define the 2-current $T_\varepsilon := \text{ev}_* f^* d\nu_\varepsilon$ on X . By (3.1),

$$T_\varepsilon(\alpha) = \int_{\mathfrak{M}_1} (f^* d\nu_\varepsilon) \text{ev}^* \alpha = \int_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left(\int_{\Sigma-D} u_y^* \alpha \right) d\nu_\varepsilon \quad \forall \alpha \in \Omega^2(X). \quad (5.2)$$

By Proposition 4.1(2), $\text{ev}|_{\mathfrak{M}_1^\circ}$ is a submersion. Therefore, by Lemma 3.3, T_ε is smooth on $X - \psi(B_1)$. Since each map u_y is J -holomorphic, (5.2) implies that T_ε is J -invariant.

Let $x_0 \in X - \psi(B_1)$ and $v_0 \in T_{x_0}X$. By (3.2),

$$T_\varepsilon(v_0, Jv_0) = \int_{\text{ev}^{-1}(x_0)} \mathfrak{f}^* d\nu_\varepsilon(\tilde{v}_0, \widetilde{Jv_0}).$$

The sign of $T_\varepsilon(v_0, Jv_0)$ depends on the orientation of the fiber, which we now describe. The manifold \mathfrak{M}_0 is oriented so $d\nu_\varepsilon$ is nonnegative and \mathfrak{M}_1 is oriented by giving the fibers of the forgetful map \mathfrak{f} their complex orientations as Riemann surfaces. The manifold X is oriented by its almost complex structure. The orientation of the fiber of ev is determined by requiring that the wedge product of the lift of an orientation form on X and an orientation form on $\text{ev}^{-1}(x_0)$ gives a form along $\text{ev}^{-1}(x_0)$ which agrees with the orientation on \mathfrak{M}_1 . It follows that $\mathfrak{f}^* d\nu_\varepsilon(\tilde{v}_0, \widetilde{Jv_0})|_{T_{\text{ev}^{-1}(x_0)}}$ at a point $[u_y, z] \in \text{ev}^{-1}(x_0)$ is zero if $v_0 \in \mathcal{T}u_y|_z$ and a positively oriented form in the top degree otherwise. Therefore, $T_\varepsilon(v_0, Jv_0) \geq 0$, i.e. T_ε is semipositive on $X - \psi(B_1)$.

Suppose, in addition, that $x_0 \in u_0(\text{int}(\Sigma - D))$. By the dimension counts in Proposition 4.1(3)(4), there then is a surface $[u_y] \in \mathfrak{M}_0$ arbitrarily close to $[u_0]$ passing through x transverse to $v_0 \wedge Jv_0$. Therefore, T_ε is a strictly positive form along $C - \psi(B_1)$.

The maps u_y are defined on $\Sigma - D$. We extend them to maps defined on Σ by forming cones on their boundaries. Given a map $\gamma : S^1 \rightarrow B_1$, define $\Lambda(\gamma) : D \rightarrow X$ in polar coordinates on the disk by $\Lambda(\gamma)(r, \theta) = r\gamma(\theta)$. Given a map $u_y : \Sigma - D \rightarrow X$ such that the image of ∂u_y lies in $\psi(B_1)$, define

$$\widehat{u}_y : \Sigma \rightarrow X, \quad \widehat{u}_y(z) = \begin{cases} u_y(z), & \text{if } z \in \Sigma - D; \\ \psi(\Lambda(\psi^{-1}\partial u_y))(z), & \text{if } z \in D. \end{cases}$$

The maps \widehat{u}_y are smooth on $\Sigma - (\partial D \cup 0)$, where 0 is the point $r = 0$ in polar coordinates on the disk. This is a very mild kind of singularity and does not affect what follows. If desired, one could either smooth \widehat{u}_y or consider it as a map on $\Sigma - (\partial D \cup 0)$. If $u_y, u'_y \in [u_y] \in \mathfrak{M}_0$, then the reparameterization of $\Sigma - D$ which takes u_y to u'_y can be extended to a reparameterization of Σ which takes \widehat{u}_y to \widehat{u}'_y . Therefore, $\int_\Sigma \widehat{u}_y^* \alpha$ is well-defined for $[u_y] \in \mathfrak{M}_0$ and $\alpha \in \Omega^2(X)$.

Define a current \widehat{T}_ε on X by

$$\widehat{T}_\varepsilon(\alpha) = \int_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left(\int_\Sigma \widehat{u}_y^* \alpha \right) d\nu_\varepsilon \quad \forall \alpha \in \Omega^2(X).$$

It follows from (5.2) that $\widehat{T}_\varepsilon = T_\varepsilon$ on $X - \psi(B_1)$. Therefore, on $X - \psi(B_1)$, \widehat{T}_ε is a semipositive form that is strictly positive on a neighborhood of $C - \psi(B_1)$.

Using the coordinates given by ψ , we can apply the smoothing operator R_ε from Lemma 3.5 to regularize \widehat{T}_ε on $\psi(B_1)$. By (3.3),

$$\{R_\varepsilon \widehat{T}_\varepsilon\}(\alpha) = \widehat{T}_\varepsilon \left(\int_{w \in \mathbb{R}^4} s_w^* \alpha d\mu_\varepsilon \right) = \int_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} \int_{w \in \mathbb{R}^4} \int_\Sigma (\widehat{u}_y^* s_w^* \alpha) d\mu_\varepsilon d\nu_\varepsilon \quad (5.3)$$

By Lemma 3.5(4b), $R_\varepsilon \widehat{T}_\varepsilon$ is smooth on $X - \psi(B_1)$. By Lemma 3.5(4c), $R_\varepsilon \widehat{T}_\varepsilon$ is smooth on $\psi(B_2)$. Therefore, $R_\varepsilon \widehat{T}_\varepsilon$ is smooth on X .

Let δ be as in the assumptions on ψ . For $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, the form $d\mu_\varepsilon d\nu_\varepsilon$ is supported on (w, y) such that $s_w \circ \widehat{u}_y$ is δ -close in C^1 (on the complement of the singular set) to u . Let $\omega'_C = R_\varepsilon \widehat{T}_\varepsilon$ for such ε sufficiently small. It follows from (5.3) that

$$\int_X \omega'_C \wedge f\phi = R_\varepsilon \widehat{T}_\varepsilon(f\phi) \geq 0$$

for every nonnegative function f on X . This implies that $\omega'_C \wedge \phi$ is nonnegative. The semipositivity of ϕ then implies that there exists $K' > 0$ such that $\omega'_C + K'\phi$ is a semipositive form. As $\omega'_C = T_\varepsilon$ on $X - \psi(\overline{B}_2)$ by Lemma 3.5(4a), $\omega'_C + K'\phi$ is a semipositive form on X which is strictly positive on a neighborhood of $C - \text{supp}(\phi)$ and J -invariant on $X - \text{supp}(\phi)$.

By Lemma 3.5(2), s_w is homotopic to the identity for all $w \in \mathbb{R}^4$. We recall that \widehat{u}_y is homotopic to u for all y . By (5.3),

$$\int_X \omega'_C \wedge \alpha = \int_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} \int_{w \in \mathbb{R}^4} \int_\Sigma (\widehat{u}_y^* s_w^* \alpha) d\mu_\varepsilon d\nu_\varepsilon = \left(\int_\Sigma u^* \alpha \right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} d\mu_\varepsilon d\nu_\varepsilon = \int_\Sigma u^* \alpha,$$

if α is a closed 2-form on X . Therefore, ω'_C is closed (because it integrates to 0 against exact forms) and Poincaré dual to C .

Given a semipositive form ϕ such that $\int_C \phi > 0$, we have constructed $K' > 0$ and ω'_C such that $\omega'_C + K'\phi$ is positive on a neighborhood of $C - \text{supp}(\phi)$ and (1), (2), and (3) hold. Now, given such a ϕ , one can express it as $\phi = \phi_1 + \phi_2 + \phi_3$, where ϕ_i is semipositive for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, $\int_C \phi_i > 0$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, and $\text{supp}(\phi_1) \cap \text{supp}(\phi_2) = \emptyset$. Construct ω'_1 and $K'_1 > 0$ with respect to ϕ_1 and ω'_2 and $K'_2 > 0$ with respect to ϕ_2 , as before. The form $\omega_C := \frac{1}{2}(\omega'_1 + \omega'_2)$ and positive constant $K := \frac{1}{2}(K'_1 + K'_2)$ satisfy (1), (2), (3), and (4), as claimed. \square

6 Proofs of the main theorems

In this section, we prove the results stated in Section 1. Proposition 5.3 implies Theorems 3 and 2. Theorem 2 then implies Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 3. As C is compact, there is a finite set of balls $B_i \subset X$ of diameter ε intersecting C such that $C \subset \bigcup B_i$. For each i , take a semipositive form ϕ_i supported inside B_i such that $\int_C \phi_i > 0$. By Proposition 5.3, for each i , there exist a closed 2-form ω_i , a positive constant K_i , and an open set $U_i \subset X$ containing C such that ω_i is Poincaré dual to C and $\omega_i + K_i\phi_i$ is a semipositive form which is strictly positive on U_i . The intersection $\bigcap U_i$ is an open set containing C . As C is compact, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that every point of X δ -close to C is contained in $\bigcap U_i$. Let S be a closed pseudoholomorphic curve such that $\langle [S], [C] \rangle \leq 0$ and some point of S is δ -close to C . Since S intersects each U_i ,

$$0 < \int_S (\omega_i + K_i\phi_i) = \langle [S], [C] \rangle + K_i \int_S \phi_i \leq K_i \int_S \phi_i.$$

Therefore, S intersects the support of each ϕ_i and thus each B_i . As the B_i cover C , each point of C is ε -close to S . \square

Proof of Theorem 2. By Proposition 5.3, there exist a closed 2-form ω_C Poincaré dual to C and a positive constant K such that $\omega_C + K\phi$ is a semipositive form with is strictly positive on C and therefore somewhere on $\text{supp}(T)$. By Lemma 3.8,

$$0 < T(\omega_C + K\phi) = T(\omega_C) + KT(\phi) = T(\omega_C) = \langle [T], [C] \rangle,$$

as claimed. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.4. Let T be a nonzero complex cycle on X . There exists a closed connected pseudoholomorphic curve C such that $C \cap \text{supp}(T) \neq \emptyset$ and $\int_C \phi > 0$. As C is closed and connected, there are irreducible components C_0, \dots, C_k of C such that

$$C_0 \cap \text{supp}(T) \neq \emptyset, \quad \int_{C_k} \phi > 0, \quad \text{and} \quad C_{i-1} \cap C_i \neq \emptyset \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, k. \quad (6.1)$$

Let $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$ be the largest integer such that $C_i \cap \text{supp}(T) \neq \emptyset$. If $i < k$, then $C_i \not\subset \text{supp}(T)$ by the last condition in (6.1) and thus $\langle [T], [C_i] \rangle \neq 0$ by Corollary 1.2. If $i = k$, then either $T(\phi) \neq 0$ or $\langle [T], [C_k] \rangle \neq 0$, by Theorem 2. Therefore, $[T] \neq 0 \in H_2(X, \mathbb{R})$ and (X, J) admits a taming symplectic structure by Proposition 1.1. \square

Proof of Theorem 1. We first show that $(d) \Rightarrow (c) \Rightarrow (b) \Rightarrow (a)$. Suppose X has uncountably many embedded rational curves. As X has only countably many integer homology classes, at least 2 of these curves lie in the same homology class, which thus has nonnegative self-intersection number by the positivity of intersections. Therefore, X has an embedded rational curve with nonnegative self-intersection number. That is, $(d) \Rightarrow (c)$. Trivially, $(c) \Rightarrow (b)$. It follows from Example 4.4 that $(b) \Rightarrow (a)$. Therefore, it suffices to consider the case when X contains a free curve, C_{free} . Let ϕ be a semipositive Poincaré dual to C_{free} as in Lemma 5.1. For every $x \in X$, there exists a closed connected pseudoholomorphic curve C_x passing through x and intersecting C_{free} positively. Therefore, $\int_{C_x} \phi > 0$ and the result follows from Proposition 2.4. \square

A Proof of Proposition 4.1

With the assumptions as in Proposition 4.1, let

$$q_u: u^*TX \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}u \quad \text{and} \quad S_u := \{z \in \Sigma: d_z u = 0\} \subset \Sigma - \partial\Sigma$$

be the quotient projection and the subset of the non-immersive points of u , respectively. For each $z \in S_u$, we define $\text{ord}_z u \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ to be the order of z as a zero of the section du of the complex line bundle $T^*\Sigma \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{T}u$ over Σ . Define

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(T\Sigma) &= \{\zeta \in \Gamma(\Sigma; T\Sigma): \zeta|_{\partial\Sigma} \in \Gamma(\partial\Sigma; T(\partial\Sigma))\}, \\ \Gamma(\mathcal{T}u; \partial\Sigma) &= \{\xi \in \Gamma(\Sigma; \mathcal{T}u): \xi|_{\partial\Sigma} \in \Gamma(\partial\Sigma; du(T(\partial\Sigma)))\}, \quad \text{and} \\ \Gamma(\mathcal{N}u; Y) &= \{\xi \in \Gamma(\Sigma; \mathcal{N}u): \xi|_{\partial\Sigma} \in \Gamma(\partial\Sigma; \mathcal{N}_Y(\partial u))\}. \end{aligned}$$

We denote by

$$\begin{aligned} D_{Y; J; u}: \Gamma(u; Y) &:= \{\xi \in \Gamma(\Sigma; u^*TX): \xi|_{\partial\Sigma} \in \Gamma(\partial\Sigma; \{\partial u\}^*TY)\} \\ &\longrightarrow \Gamma_J^{0,1}(u) = \Gamma(\Sigma; (T^*\Sigma)^{0,1} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} u^*TX) \end{aligned}$$

the linearization of the $\bar{\partial}_J$ -operator on the space of smooth maps from $(\Sigma, \partial\Sigma)$ to (X, Y) ; see [14, Section 1.2], for example. This is a real Cauchy-Riemann operator such that

$$\begin{aligned} D_{Y;J;u}(du(\Gamma(T\Sigma))) &\subset du(\Gamma(\Sigma; (T^*\Sigma)^{0,1} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} T\Sigma)) \quad \text{and} \\ D_{Y;J;u}(\Gamma(\mathcal{T}u; \partial\Sigma)) &\subset \Gamma(\Sigma; (T^*\Sigma)^{0,1} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{T}u); \end{aligned}$$

see [14, Section 1.3]. Thus, $D_{Y;J;u}$ induces linear operators

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{D}_{Y;J;u}: \Gamma(u; Y)/du(\Gamma(T\Sigma)) &\longrightarrow \Gamma_J^{0,1}(u)/du(\Gamma(\Sigma; (T^*\Sigma)^{0,1} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} T\Sigma)) \\ \text{and } D_{Y;J;u}^{\mathcal{N}}: \Gamma(\mathcal{N}u; Y) &\longrightarrow \Gamma(\Sigma; (T^*\Sigma)^{0,1} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{N}u). \end{aligned}$$

The projection q_u induces homomorphisms

$$\tilde{q}_{u;0}: \ker \bar{D}_{Y;J;u} \longrightarrow \ker D_{Y;J;u}^{\mathcal{N}} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{q}_{u;1}: \text{cok } \bar{D}_{Y;J;u} \longrightarrow \text{cok } D_{Y;J;u}^{\mathcal{N}}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

For $z_0 \in \Sigma$, let

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{-z_0}(T\Sigma) &= \{\zeta \in \Gamma(T\Sigma) : \xi(z_0) = 0\}, & \Gamma_{-z_0}(\mathcal{N}u; Y) &= \{\xi \in \Gamma(\mathcal{N}u; Y) : \xi(z_0) = 0\}, \\ \Gamma_{-z_0}(u; Y) &= \{\xi \in \Gamma(u; Y) : \xi(z_0) = 0\}, & \Gamma_{-2z_0}(\mathcal{N}u; Y) &= \{\xi \in \Gamma_{-z_0}(\mathcal{N}u; Y) : \nabla \xi|_{z_0} = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

We denote by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{D}_{Y;J;u;-z_0}: \Gamma(u; Y)/du(\Gamma_{-z_0}(T\Sigma)) &\longrightarrow \Gamma_J^{0,1}(u)/du(\Gamma(\Sigma; (T^*\Sigma)^{0,1} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} T\Sigma)) \quad \text{and} \\ \bar{D}_{Y;J;u;-z_0}: \Gamma_{-z_0}(u; Y)/du(\Gamma_{-z_0}(T\Sigma)) &\longrightarrow \Gamma_J^{0,1}(u)/du(\Gamma(\Sigma; (T^*\Sigma)^{0,1} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} T\Sigma)) \end{aligned}$$

the linear operators induced by $D_{Y;J;u}$.

Suppose the operator $\bar{D}_{Y;J;u}$ is surjective. By the Implicit Function Theorem for Banach manifolds, as in [16, Section 3.5], a neighborhood \mathfrak{M}_0 of $[u]$ in $\mathfrak{M}_{(g,b)}(X, Y)$ is then a smooth manifold. Furthermore, the subspace $\mathfrak{M}_1 := \mathfrak{f}^{-1}(\mathfrak{M}_0)$ of $\mathfrak{M}_{(g,b),1}(X, Y)$ is a smooth manifold with boundary so that

$$T_{[u', z_0]} \mathfrak{M}_1 = \ker \tilde{D}_{Y;J;u';-z_0} \quad \forall [u', z_0] \in \mathfrak{M}_1 \quad (\text{A.2})$$

and the first map in (4.1) is a fiber bundle so that the fiber over $[u'] \in \mathfrak{M}_0$ is the domain of u' . The second map in (4.1) is smooth and its differential is given by

$$d_{[u', z_0]} \text{ev}([\xi]) = \xi(z_0) \quad \forall [\xi] \in \ker \tilde{D}_{Y;J;u';-z_0}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

If the operator $\bar{D}_{Y;J;u}$ is surjective and the second map in (4.1) is a submersion, then the subspace $\mathfrak{M}_1^{\circ}(x_0) := \text{ev}^{-1}(x_0) \cap \mathfrak{M}_1$ of \mathfrak{M}_1° is a smooth submanifold satisfying (4.2) and

$$T_{[u', z_0]}(\mathfrak{M}_1^{\circ}(x_0)) = \ker \bar{D}_{Y;J;u';-z_0} \quad \forall [u', z_0] \in \mathfrak{M}_1^{\circ}(x_0). \quad (\text{A.4})$$

The differential $d_{z_0} u'$ induces a smooth map \mathfrak{d} from $\mathfrak{M}_1^{\circ}(x_0)$ to $T_{z_0}^* \Sigma \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} T_{x_0} X$ such that

$$q_u \circ \{d_{[u', z_0]} \mathfrak{d}([\xi])\} = q_u \circ \nabla \xi|_{z_0} \quad \forall [\xi] \in \ker \bar{D}_{Y;J;u';-z_0}. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

By [14, Lemma 1.5.1], the second homomorphism in (A.1) is an isomorphism, the first homomorphism is surjective, and so is the homomorphism

$$\ker(\tilde{q}_{u;0}) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{z \in S_u} \mathcal{T}u|_z, \quad \xi \longrightarrow (\xi(z))_{z \in S_u}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

The statement of [14, Lemma 1.5.1] is made for closed surfaces, but the proof applies to J -holomorphic maps from bordered surfaces as in the statement of Proposition 4.1. Alternatively, the statement of [14, Lemma 1.5.1] can be applied directly after doubling Σ , $T\Sigma$, u^*TX , and $\mathcal{N}u$ along $\partial\Sigma$ as in the proofs of [13, Theorem 2'] and [10, Section 3]. By [13, Theorem 2'(ii)], the operator $D_{Y;J;u}^{\mathcal{N}}$ is onto if $\mu_Y^{\mathcal{N}}(u) \geq 4g+2b-3$. This establishes Proposition 4.1(1), as well as the parts of (2) concerning the one-marked space \mathfrak{M}_1 and the forgetful morphism \mathfrak{f} .

We can assume $\mu_Y^{\mathcal{N}}(u') \geq \mu_Y^{\mathcal{N}}(u) \geq 4g+2b-3$ for all $[u'] \in \mathfrak{M}_0$ (i.e. the maps u' close to u are no more singular than u). Let $[u', z_0] \in \mathfrak{M}_1^{\circ}$ and Σ' be the domain of u' . Since

$$[du'(\zeta)] \in \ker \tilde{D}_{Y;J;u';-z_0} \quad \text{and} \quad d_{[u',z_0]}\text{ev}([du'(\zeta)]) = d_{z_0}u'(\zeta(z_0)) \quad \forall \zeta \in \Gamma(\Sigma'),$$

the image of (A.3) contains $\mathcal{T}u'|_{z_0}$ if $z_0 \notin S_{u'}$. If $z_0 \in S_{u'}$, then this is the case by the surjectivity of (A.6). By the surjectivity of the first homomorphism in (A.1), $d_{[u',z_0]}\text{ev}$ is thus surjective if the homomorphism

$$\ker D_{Y;J;u'}^{\mathcal{N}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}u'|_{z_0}, \quad \xi \longrightarrow \xi(z_0),$$

is surjective. This is the case if the restriction

$$D_{Y;J;u';-z_0}^{\mathcal{N}} : \Gamma_{-z_0}(\mathcal{N}u'; Y) \longrightarrow \Gamma(\Sigma; (T^*\Sigma')^{0,1} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{N}u')$$

of $D_{Y;J;u'}^{\mathcal{N}}$ is surjective. By the twisting construction of [20, Lemma 2.4.1], the kernel and cokernel of this operator are isomorphic to the kernel and cokernel of a real Cauchy-Riemann operator D as above with $\mathcal{N}u'$ replaced by the complex line bundle $\mathcal{N}u' \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{O}(-z_0)$, with the same boundary condition on the domain. The Maslov index of the resulting bundle pair is $\mu_Y^{\mathcal{N}}(u') - 2$. By [13, Theorem 2'(ii)], such an operator D is thus onto if $\mu_Y^{\mathcal{N}}(u') \geq 4g+2b-1$. This establishes the part of Proposition 4.1(2) concerning the evaluation morphism ev , as well as (3).

We now assume that $\mu_Y^{\mathcal{N}}(u') \geq \mu_Y^{\mathcal{N}}(u) \geq 4g+2b-1$ for all $[u'] \in \mathfrak{M}_0$. Let $[u', z_0] \in \mathfrak{M}_1^{\circ}(v_0)$ and Σ' be the domain of u' . By (A.4), (A.5), and the surjectivity of the first homomorphism in (A.1), the homomorphism

$$q_{u'} \circ d_{[u',z_0]}\mathfrak{D} : T_{[u',z_0]}(\mathfrak{M}_1^{\circ}(x_0)) \longrightarrow T_{z_0}^*\Sigma' \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{N}u'|_{z_0}$$

is surjective if the homomorphism

$$\ker D_{Y;J;u';-z_0}^{\mathcal{N}} \longrightarrow T_{z_0}^*\Sigma' \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{N}u'|_{z_0}, \quad \xi \longrightarrow \nabla \xi|_{z_0},$$

is surjective. This is the case if the restriction

$$D_{Y;J;u';-2z_0}^{\mathcal{N}} : \Gamma_{-2z_0}(\mathcal{N}u'; Y) \longrightarrow \Gamma(\Sigma; (T^*\Sigma')^{0,1} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{N}u')$$

of $D_{Y;J;u'}^{\mathcal{N}}$ is surjective. By the twisting construction of [20, Lemma 2.4.1], the kernel and cokernel of this operator are isomorphic to the kernel and cokernel of a real Cauchy-Riemann operator D as above with $\mathcal{N}u'$ replaced by the complex line bundle $\mathcal{N}u' \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{O}(-2z_0)$, with the same boundary

condition on the domain. The Maslov index of the resulting bundle pair is $\mu_Y^{\mathcal{N}}(u') - 4$. By [13, Theorem 2'(ii)], such an operator D is thus onto if $\mu_Y^{\mathcal{N}}(u') \geq 4g + 2b + 1$. This establishes Proposition 4.1(4).

Department of Mathematics, Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, NY 11794
spencer.cattalani@stonybrook.edu

References

- [1] E. Bedford and B.A. Taylor, *A new capacity for plurisubharmonic functions* Acta Math. 149 (1982), no.1-2, 1–40
- [2] R. Bott and L. Tu, *Differential Forms in Algebraic Topology*, Springer-Verlag, 1982
- [3] S. Cattalani, *Coarsely holomorphic curves and symplectic topology*, math/2311.08467
- [4] J.P. Demailly, *Regularization of closed positive currents and intersection theory*, J. Algebraic Geom. 1 (1992), no. 3, 361–409
- [5] G. de Rham, *Differential Manifolds: Forms, Currents, Harmonic Forms*, Springer-Verlag, 1984
- [6] S.K. Donaldson, *Lefschetz pencils on symplectic manifolds*, J. Differential Geom. 53 (1999), no. 2, 205–236
- [7] S.K. Donaldson, *Two-forms on four-manifolds and elliptic equations*, math/0607083
- [8] S.K. Donaldson and I. Smith, *Lefschetz pencils and the canonical class for symplectic four-manifolds*, Topology 42 (2003), no. 4, 743–785
- [9] H. Federer and H. Fleming, *Normal and integral currents*, Ann. of Math. 72 (1960), no. 3, 458–520
- [10] P. Georgieva and A. Zinger, *The moduli space of maps with crosscaps: Fredholm theory and orientability*, Comm. Anal. Geom. 23 (2015), no. 3, 81–140
- [11] M. Gromov, *Pseudoholomorphic curves in symplectic manifolds*, Invent. Math. 82 (1985), no. 2, 307–347
- [12] V. Guedj, *Courants extrémaux et dynamique complexe*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) 38 (2005), no. 3, 407–426
- [13] H. Hofer, V. Lizan, and J. Sikorav, *On genericity for holomorphic curves in four-dimensional almost-complex manifolds*, J. Geom. Anal. 7 (1997), no. 1, 149–159
- [14] S. Ivashkovich and V. Shevchishin, *Structure of the moduli space in a neighborhood of a cusp-curve and meromorphic hulls*, Invent. Math. 136 (1999), no. 3, 571–602
- [15] D. McDuff, *The structure of rational and ruled symplectic 4-manifolds*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 3 (1990), no. 3, 679–712

- [16] D. McDuff and D. Salamon, *J-holomorphic Curves and Symplectic Topology*, Colloquium Publications 52, AMS, 2012
- [17] B. McKay, *Smooth projective planes*, *Geom. Dedicata* 116 (2005), 157–202
- [18] J. Milnor, *Topology from the Differentiable Viewpoint*, University Press of Virginia, 1965
- [19] J.P. Serre, *Cohomologie et fonctions de variables complexes*, Séminaire Bourbaki, Vol. 2, Exp. No. 71, 213–218 Société Mathématique de France, 1995
- [20] V. Shevchishin, *Pseudoholomorphic curves and the symplectic isotopy problem*, math/0010262
- [21] D. Sullivan, *Cycles for the dynamical study of foliated manifolds and complex manifolds*, *Invent. Math.* 36 (1976), 225–255
- [22] C. Taubes, *Tamed to compatible: symplectic forms via moduli space integration*, *J. Symplectic Geom.* 9 (2011), no. 2, 161–250
- [23] D. Varolin, *Riemann Surfaces by Way of Complex Analytic Geometry*, AMS, 2011
- [24] C. Wendl, *Holomorphic Curves in Low Dimensions: From Symplectic Ruled Surfaces to Planar Contact Manifolds*, Springer, 2018
- [25] W. Zhang, *From Taubes currents to almost Kähler forms*, *Math. Ann.* 356 (2013), no. 3, 969–978