

HOFER GEOMETRY OF A_3 -CONFIGURATIONS

ADRIAN DAWID

ABSTRACT. Let $L_0, L_1, L_2 \subset M$ be exact Lagrangian spheres in a Liouville domain M with $2c_1(M) = 0$. If L_0, L_1, L_2 are in an A_3 -configuration, we show that $\mathcal{L}(L_0)$ and $\mathcal{L}(L_2)$ when endowed with the Hofer metric contain quasi-flats of arbitrary dimension. We then strengthen this result to show that $\mathcal{L}(L_0)$ and $\mathcal{L}(L_2)$ both contain quasi-isometric embeddings of $(\mathbb{R}^\infty, \|\cdot\|_\infty)$, i.e. infinite-dimensional quasi-flats. We also obtain as a corollary of the proof that $\text{Ham}_c(M)$ contains an infinite-dimensional quasi-flat if M contains an A_3 -configuration of exact Lagrangian spheres. Additionally, we show the same for the two zero-sections in an A_2 -plumbing. Along the way, we obtain the same result for $\mathcal{L}(F)$, where F is any fiber in the cotangent bundle of a sphere S^n . This gives an alternative proof of a result of Usher for $n \geq 3$ and Feng-Zhang for $n = 2$. Lastly, we use our method to show that for a Dehn twist $\tau : M \rightarrow M$ along L_1 the boundary depth of $HF(\tau^\ell(L_0), L')$ is unbounded in $L' \in \mathcal{L}(L_2)$ for any $\ell \in 2\mathbb{N}_0$.

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

The large-scale properties of the Hofer metric have been the object of intensive study. A classical question is for which symplectic manifolds the Hofer diameter of the Hamiltonian diffeomorphism group is infinite. A natural refinement of this question is the existence of quasi-flats for the Hofer metric. A (quasi-)flat is a (quasi-)isometric embedding of a normed vector space into any other metric space. For the Hofer metric, this question has been extensively studied in the Hamiltonian case. Numerous examples of finite and infinite-dimensional flats and quasi-flats have been constructed. There is a natural relative or *Lagrangian* version of the aforementioned classical question. Namely, one is tempted to ask for which symplectic manifolds M there exists a compact Lagrangian $L \subset M$ for which $\mathcal{L}(L) := \{\varphi(L) \mid \varphi \in \text{Ham}(M)\}$ contains a quasi-flat when endowed with the Lagrangian Hofer metric. There is a rich tapestry of partial results on this problem mainly focusing on cotangent bundles.

In this paper we will instead look at a different setting, namely that of a Liouville domain with an A_3 -configuration of exact Lagrangian spheres. This is a very large class of examples. Recall that a generic degree d hypersurface $X \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ with $n \geq 2$ and $d \geq 3$ contains an A_3 -configuration of Lagrangian spheres (see e.g. [Sei08, Sec. III.20]). In this setting we prove the following result:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $(M, \omega = d\lambda)$ be a Liouville domain with $2c_1(M) = 0$ and $L_0, L_1, L_2 \subset M$ exact Lagrangian spheres in an A_3 -configuration. Then there is a map*

$$\Phi : (\mathbb{R}^\infty, d_\infty) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{L}(L_2), d_{\text{Hofer}})$$

which is a quasi-isometric embedding with quasi-isometry constant 2, i.e. for any $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\frac{1}{2}d_\infty(v, w) \leq d_{\text{Hofer}}(\Phi(v), \Phi(w)) \leq 2 \cdot d_\infty(v, w).$$

Due to the way this theorem is proven, we actually even obtain the existence of a quasi-flat in the group $\text{Ham}_c(M)$. As mentioned before, the class of symplectic manifolds which contain an A_3 -configuration is quite large and contains many examples for which the metric properties of $(\text{Ham}_c(M), d_{\text{Hofer}})$ have not yet been closely studied. This includes the aforementioned generic degree d affine hypersurfaces in \mathbb{C}^n with $n \geq 2$ and $d \geq 3$. Since it is of independent interest, we record this fact in the following corollary:

Corollary 1.2. *Let $(M, \omega = d\lambda)$ be a Liouville domain with $2c_1(M) = 0$ that contains an A_3 -configuration of exact Lagrangian spheres. Then $(\text{Ham}_c(M), d_{\text{Hofer}})$ contains a quasi-isometric embedding of $(\mathbb{R}^\infty, d_\infty)$.*

There is a rich body of prior results about these questions in different settings. On the absolute side, Py showed in [Py08] that the group of Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms of certain symplectic manifolds contain Hofer flats of arbitrary finite dimension. Later Usher showed that the Hamiltonian diffeomorphism group of a closed symplectic manifold contains an infinite-dimensional quasi-flat if the manifold admits a nontrivial Hamiltonian vector field all of whose contractible closed orbits are constant [Ush13]. Further, Usher showed in [Ush14] that the compactly supported Hamiltonian diffeomorphism group of a cotangent bundle T^*N admits an infinite-dimensional quasi-flat in some cases. In particular, N has to be a closed Riemannian manifold which fulfills certain metric conditions. For example any S^n with $n \geq 3$ is allowed. Recently, Polterovich and Shelukhin have constructed infinite-dimensional quasi-flats in certain low-dimensional settings [PS23].

On the relative side, a quite general picture is known for the question of finite-dimensional quasi-flats when M is a tame symplectically aspherical manifold. Here Zapolsky showed in [Zap13], that quasi-flats¹ of finite dimension exist for the Lagrangian Hofer metric for specific configurations of weakly exact Lagrangians. Namely, when one has $L, L_1, \dots, L_k \subset M$ with L_1, \dots, L_k pairwise disjoint such that L intersects every L_1, \dots, L_k in a single transverse point, there exists a k -dimensional quasi-flat in $\mathcal{L}(L)$. We also know of several classes of examples of infinite-dimensional quasi-flats. The aforementioned paper by Zapolsky contains the construction of an infinite-dimensional quasi-flat for Lagrangians that fiber over S^1 . In [Ush13] infinite-dimensional quasi-flats are constructed for the Lagrangian Hofer metric on Lagrangians which are isotopic to the diagonal in the product of certain symplectic manifolds. Here some dynamic properties have to be fulfilled by the manifold.

For the special case of cotangent bundles much more is known. The related question of the finiteness of the Hofer diameter is known in full generality. This is due to Gong, who recently showed that the Hofer diameter of the space of Lagrangians which are Hamiltonian isotopic to a cotangent fiber in T^*N is infinite for any closed Riemannian manifold N [Gon23]. For the question of quasi-flats, Usher showed in [Ush14] that the space of Lagrangians which are Hamiltonian isotopic to a cotangent fiber in T^*N contains a quasi-flat of infinite dimension. Here N is a closed Riemannian manifold which fulfills certain metric conditions. In particular, any S^n with $n \geq 3$ is included in the result. Recently, an infinite-dimensional quasi-flat has also been constructed for a fiber in T^*S^2 and T^*S^1 by Feng and Zhang [FZ24].

In this paper, we follow an approach specifically tailored towards spheres $L_0, L_1, L_2 \subset M$ in an A_3 -configuration. Locally, a neighborhood of an A_3 -configuration looks like

¹Zapolsky actually constructs proper flats but with respect to an unconventional metric on \mathbb{R}^d . With respect to the Euclidean metric or $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ they are quasi-flats.

a sphere cotangent bundle with two preferred fibers to which handles are attached. Recall, that three Lagrangian spheres $L_0, L_1, L_2 \subset M$ in a Liouville domain M are in an A_3 -configuration if $L_0 \cap L_1$ and $L_1 \cap L_2$ contain each a single transverse point and $L_0 \cap L_2 = \emptyset$. We will use carefully constructed models of a Dehn twist along L_1 to mimic the behavior of wrapping in the cotangent bundle case. For any $d \in \mathbb{N}$, an \mathbb{R}^d -parametrized family of Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms φ_v is then constructed. Using spectral invariants associated to classes in $HF(\tau^{2k}(L_0), \varphi_v(L_2))$ for large $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we show that $\mathcal{L}(L_2)$ contains Hofer quasi-flats of dimension d . This first step of the proof is easier to handle geometrically. Then, by a slight variation of the argument we construct infinite-dimensional quasi-flats. All of this is possible due to the computational ease of working with spheres.

The method of our proof also applies in the case of A_2 -plumbings, i.e. the plumbing of two copies of T^*S^n . We denote this by A_2^n as it is the A_2 -Milnor fiber which can also be described as the affine variety

$$A_2^n = \{z_0^2 + \cdots + z_{n-1}^2 + z_n^3 = 1\} \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$$

with the restriction of the standard symplectic form $\omega_{\mathbb{C}^{n+1}} = \frac{i}{2\pi}(dz_0 \wedge d\bar{z}_0 + \cdots + dz_n \wedge d\bar{z}_n)$. The zero section of either cotangent bundle defines a Lagrangian sphere $S^n \hookrightarrow A_2^n$, which is identified with a cotangent fiber of the other cotangent bundle near the gluing point. The result from above can now be adapted to this setting as follows:

Corollary 1.3. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be arbitrary. Then there is a map*

$$\Phi : (\mathbb{R}^\infty, d_\infty) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{L}(S^n \subset A_2^n), d_{\text{Hofer}})$$

which is a quasi-isometric embedding with quasi-isometry constant 2, i.e. for any $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^\infty$

$$\frac{1}{2}d_\infty(v, w) \leq d_{\text{Hofer}}(\Phi(v), \Phi(w)) \leq 2 \cdot d_\infty(v, w).$$

For sake of completeness we note that our method also covers the case of cotangent bundles, even though this case is already known. The following result for cotangent bundles extends the result of Gong in [Gon23] in the case of spheres and recovers Usher's result in [Ush14] for sphere cotangent bundles when $n \geq 3$. Recently, this theorem has also been shown independently by Feng and Zhang in [FZ24] using a different proof.

Corollary 1.4 (Feng-Zhang 2024, Usher 2014). *Let $n \geq 2$ be arbitrary. Let $F \subset T^*S^n$ be any fiber. Then there exists a map*

$$\Phi : (\mathbb{R}^\infty, d_\infty) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{L}_c(F), d_{\text{Hofer}})$$

which is a quasi-isometric embedding with quasi-isometry constant 2, i.e. for any $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^\infty$

$$\frac{1}{2}d_\infty(v, w) \leq d_{\text{Hofer}}(\Phi(v), \Phi(w)) \leq 2 \cdot d_\infty(v, w).$$

*Here $\mathcal{L}_c(F) = \{\varphi(F) \mid \varphi \in \text{Ham}_c(T^*S^n)\}$.*

Lastly, we can obtain a result on the boundary depth with the same methods. The boundary depth β of a Floer complex was introduced by Usher in [Ush13]. From a persistence homology perspective, it measures the length of the longest finite bar in a barcode. For Floer homology, this can be thought of as the highest energy of a J -holomorphic strip that contributes non-trivially to the Floer differential. It is closely related to the Hofer norm and the spectral norm but can also be studied independently. The unboundedness of the boundary depth for two fibers in some cotangent bundles is

for example shown in [Ush14]. We can show the following analogous statement using the results which lead of up Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 1.5. *Let $(M, \omega = d\lambda)$ be a Liouville domain with $2c_1(M) = 0$ and $L_0, L_1, L_2 \subset M$ exact Lagrangian spheres in an A_3 -configuration. The boundary depth $\beta(L_0, L)$ is unbounded on $L \in \mathcal{L}(L_2)$. Let $\tau : M \rightarrow M$ be a Dehn twist along L_1 . Then for any $\ell \in 2\mathbb{N}$, the boundary depth $\beta(\tau^\ell(L_0), L)$ is unbounded on $L \in \mathcal{L}(L_2)$.*

1.1. Strategy of the proof. We will now give a very brief outline of the proof strategy for the aforementioned results. Since it is more natural, we only sketch the construction of finite-dimensional quasi-flats. The construction of infinite-dimensional quasi-flats in Section 7 is only a slight technical variant of this idea. The proof boils down to the usage of persistence data coming from a Floer complex. To obtain quasi-flats of any dimension, a neighborhood of the middle sphere is split into different radial shells. Each of these shells will give us one dimension of the quasi-flat. The shells come equipped with preferred models of a Dehn twist around L_1 such that the square of the Dehn twist is supported in the respective shell.

We will describe the proof strategy in the local model. This can be seen as a base case for the other results. In this local model the proof proceeds as follows: Let $M_I := \{\zeta \in T^*S^n \mid \|\zeta^\sharp\| \in I\}$. Further, set $L_0 := T_x^*S^n, L_2 := T_y^*S^n$ such that x and y are not antipodal. Further, denote $L_1 := 0 \subset T^*S^n$ and set $\delta := d(x, y)$. Choose $0 < \hat{h}_0 < \check{h}_1 < \hat{h}_1 < \dots < \check{h}_d < \hat{h}_d < 1$. For each $i \in \{0, \dots, d\}$ we construct a model Dehn twist τ_i around L_1 . This model is constructed in such a way that τ_i^2 is supported in $M_{[\hat{h}_i, \check{h}_{i+1}]}$.

To construct the flat, we associate to an element $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ a Hamiltonian diffeomorphism φ_v whose support lies in $M_{[\check{h}_1, \hat{h}_1]} \cup \dots \cup M_{[\check{h}_d, \hat{h}_d]}$. This is done by a reparametrization of the cogeodesic flow. The value v_i controls the behavior of φ_v in the radial band $M_{[\check{h}_i, \hat{h}_i]}$. See Section 3 for the details of the construction. For a generic $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have $\varphi_v(L_2) \pitchfork \tau_i^{2k}(L_0)$ for $i \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, we can define the Floer complex $CF(\tau_i^{2k}(L_0), \varphi_v(L_2))$ without a Hamiltonian perturbation. The idea here is that by applying an iterate of τ^2 to the second fiber we generate many intersection points in $M_{[\hat{h}_i, \check{h}_{i+1}]}$. Some of these intersection points will define homology classes which do not contain any of the intersection points generated by φ_v . The spectral invariants associated to these classes see what happens in $M_{[0, \hat{h}_i]}$. By comparing the spectral invariants obtained from τ_i and τ_{i+1} , we can isolate what happens in $M_{[\hat{h}_i, \hat{h}_{i+1}]}$. These differences then give rise to lower bounds on the Hofer distance between $\varphi_v(L_2)$ for different values of $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

To make things precise, we now give a sketch of the argument. Let $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be generic. It is a well-known result that $HF(\tau_i^{2k}(L_0), \varphi_v(L_2)) \cong HF(\tau_i^{2k}(L_0), L_2)$ is a \mathbb{Z}_2 -vector space of dimension $2k$ (see [FS05]). We show in Section 5 that if $k \geq 2(\max\{\|v\|_\infty, \|w\|_\infty\} + 3)$ there are preferred homology classes $\alpha_i \in HF(L_0, \varphi_v(L_2))$ for $i \in \{0, \dots, d\}$. These classes are picked in such a way that $\varphi_v^* \alpha_i \in HF(\tau_i^{2k}(L_0), \varphi_v(L_2))$ are supported at a single intersection point which lies in the support of τ_i^2 . To formalize the idea given above, we set

$$\begin{aligned} a_i(v) &:= c(\varphi_v^* \alpha_{i+1}; HF(\tau_i^{2k}(L_0), \varphi_v(L_2))) - c(\varphi_v^* \alpha_i; HF(\tau_i^{2k}(L_0), \varphi_v(L_2))) \\ a_i(w) &:= c(\varphi_w^* \alpha_{i+1}; HF(\tau_i^{2k}(L_0), \varphi_w(L_2))) - c(\varphi_w^* \alpha_i; HF(\tau_i^{2k}(L_0), \varphi_w(L_2))), \end{aligned}$$

to be the difference of the respective spectral invariants. See Figure 1 for a visualization of the geometric idea. Due to the fact that $\varphi_w^* \alpha_{i+1}$ is supported at a single generator,




FIGURE 1. Illustration of the Dehn twists used in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

this spectral invariant can be computed directly from the symplectic action functional. An index argument then allows us to conclude that any $\psi \in \text{Ham}_c(T^*S^n)$ must map α_i to itself. This is due to the fact that for $n \geq 2$ it is shown in [FS05] that $HF(\tau_i^{2k}(L_0), \varphi_v(L_2))$ has at most one class of a given degree. From this fact we can conclude that $|a_i(v) - a_i(w)| \leq 2d_{\text{Hofer}}(\varphi_v(L_2), \varphi_w(L_2))$. Due to the construction of φ_v and φ_w we can explicitly compute that $|a_i(v) - a_i(w)| = |v_{i+1} - w_{i+1}|$. Since this can be repeated for any $i \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$, we obtain that

$$\frac{1}{2} \|v - w\|_\infty \leq d_{\text{Hofer}}(\varphi_v(L_2), \varphi_w(L_2)).$$

The upper inequality can be obtained by an easy and direct computation. However, the resulting inequality is phrased in terms of the $\|\cdot\|_1$ -norm. A slightly more involved construction given in Section 7 allows us to obtain an upper bound with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ -norm.

This procedure is purely local. It can therefore be easily generalized to an A_2 -plumbing. To generalize further to an A_3 -configuration $L_0, L_1, L_2 \subset M$ in a Liouville domain $(M, d\lambda = \omega)$, some adjustments must be made. The computations above rely on explicit computations using primitives of the tautological 1-form. These have to be slightly amended in the more general setting. The argument also needs all Floer homology groups that show up to be \mathbb{Z} -graded. Thus, we need to assume $2c_1(M) = 0$ in general. With these minor changes made, the proof goes through as sketched.

We can reutilize the aforementioned index and action computations to show Theorem 1.5. Here we only need to use the case of $d = 1$. We consider $\varphi_{(k)}(L_2)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $L_0 \cap L_2 = 0$ we know that $HF(L_0, \varphi_{(k)}(L_2); \mathbb{Z}_2) \cong HF(L_0, L_2; \mathbb{Z}_2) = 0$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Even though the Floer homology vanishes, the barcode of $HF(L_0, \varphi_{(k)}(L_2))$ might still contain many finite bars. Indeed, an explicit computation given in Section 8 allows us to show that $\beta(CF(L_0, \varphi_{(k)}(L_2))) \rightarrow \infty$. See Figure 2 for a visualization of the way longer and longer bars arise. Under the presence of a Dehn twist, the argument remains unchanged, thus giving us Theorem 1.5.




FIGURE 2. Illustration of the sequence of Lagrangians used in the proof of Theorem 1.5 of the two-dimensional case.

1.2. Structure of the paper. The paper is organized as follows: The actual construction of the finite-dimensional quasi-flats is contained in Section 3. The lower bound for the quasi-isometry is proved in Section 5. Then, the upper bound for a finite-dimensional version of Theorem 1.1 is obtained in Section 6. In Section 7, the infinite-dimensional case is treated separately and the proof of Theorem 1.1 is given. The proof of Theorem 1.5 is given in Section 8. The action and index computations contained in Section 4 are used throughout these proofs. The purpose of Section 2 is to fix notation and conventions as the actual proofs are computational and rely on explicit choices of gradings and primitives. All the material contained in this section is standard. However, for the convenience of the reader we include this detailed review. An expert reader might wish to start with Section 3 instead and refer to Section 2 only as needed.

1.3. Acknowledgments. I would like to thank Paul Biran for supervising the Master's thesis out of which the idea for this paper originally grew and many illuminating conversations about the topics discussed therein. I would also like to thank Ivan Smith and Jack Smith for many invaluable conversations. Further, I would like to thank Wenmin Gong for discussing his work on the unboundedness of the Hofer norm on cotangent fibers with me. During the writing of this paper, I was supported by EPSRC grant EP/X030660/1.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Here we want to briefly recall the relevant concepts from persistent homology and Floer theory for this paper. We refer the reader to [Sei07, Sei08, FOOO10] for a detailed treatment of the Floer homology side and to [PRSZ20] and [Ush08] for a comprehensive overview of persistent homology theory. All results in this section are well-known in the field and are just restated to either fix conventions or for the convenience of the reader.

2.1. Persistent Homology. In the following section we will give a brief overview of persistence modules and persistent homology. The exposition follows [PRSZ20]. For the following we fix any field \mathbb{F} , even though we will later always work with $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{Z}_2$.

We will now quickly introduce the definition of a persistence module, as well as a metric on the space of (isomorphism classes of) persistence modules.

Definition 2.1. A persistence module is a pair (V, π) , where V is a collection $\{V_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ of finite-dimensional \mathbb{F} -vector spaces and π is a collection of linear maps $\{\pi_{s,t} : V_s \rightarrow V_t\}_{s \leq t}$ which fulfill these conditions:

- (1) For any $s \leq t \leq r$ the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \pi_{s,r} & & \\ & & \curvearrowright & & \\ V_s & \xrightarrow{\pi_{s,t}} & V_t & \xrightarrow{\pi_{t,r}} & V_r \end{array}$$

- (2) For any $t \in \mathbb{R}$ there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for any $t - \varepsilon \leq s \leq t$ the map $\pi_{s,t}$ is an isomorphism of \mathbb{F} -vector spaces.
 (3) The set $\text{Spec } V \subset \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Spec } V &:= \{t \in \mathbb{R} \mid \\ &\quad \forall \varepsilon > 0 \exists s, r \in [t - \varepsilon, t + \varepsilon] : \pi_{s,r} \text{ not an isomorphism}\} \end{aligned}$$

is closed, discrete and bounded from below.

Remark 2.2. The example which is most relevant for us is the following: Let $(C^\bullet, \partial_C^\bullet)$ be an \mathbb{R} -filtered finitely generated chain complex. For any $\lambda \leq \mu$, denote the natural inclusion of C^λ into C^μ by $i_{\lambda,\mu} : C^\lambda \rightarrow C^\mu$. Then we can set $V_s := H_*(C^s, \partial_C^s)$ for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $\pi_{s,t} := (i_{s,t})_* : H_*(C^s, \partial_C^s) \rightarrow H_*(C^t, \partial_C^t)$. Then (V, π) has the structure of a persistence module. We denote (V, π) by $H_*(C, \partial_C)^\bullet$.

Definition 2.3. Let (V, π) and (V', π') be persistence modules. Then a morphism of persistence modules $A : (V, \pi) \rightarrow (V', \pi')$ is a family $A_t : V_t \rightarrow V'_t$ of linear maps such that for any $s \leq t$ this diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} V_s & \xrightarrow{\pi_{s,t}} & V_t \\ A_s \downarrow & & \downarrow A_t \\ V'_s & \xrightarrow{\pi'_{s,t}} & V'_t \end{array}$$

Definition 2.4. Let (V, π) be a persistence module and let $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$. Then we define the δ -shift of V denoted by $(V[\delta], \pi[\delta])$ to be $V[\delta]_t = V_{t+\delta}$ and $\pi[\delta]_{s,t} = \pi_{s+\delta, t+\delta}$. Note that if $\delta \geq 0$ there is a canonical morphism $V \rightarrow V[\delta]$ given by $\pi_{t, t+\delta}$. Given a morphism $F : V \rightarrow W$ we denote by $F[\delta] : V[\delta] \rightarrow W[\delta]$ the corresponding morphism on the shifted persistence modules.

Definition 2.5. Let V, W be persistence modules. Given $\delta > 0$ a pair of morphism $F : V \rightarrow W[\delta], G : W \rightarrow V[\delta]$ is called δ -interleaving if the following diagrams commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \curvearrowright & \\ V & \xrightarrow{F} W[\delta] \xrightarrow{G[\delta]} & V[2\delta] \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} & \curvearrowright & \\ W & \xrightarrow{G} V[\delta] \xrightarrow{F[\delta]} & W[2\delta] \end{array}$$

Here the unlabeled arrows are the canonical morphism associated with a non-negative shift of a persistence module. We call V and W δ -interleaved.

Definition 2.6. Given two persistence modules V, W we define

$$d_{\text{int}}(V, W) = \inf\{\delta > 0 \mid V, W \text{ are } \delta\text{-interleaved}\}.$$

We call d_{int} the interleaving distance.

Another perspective on persistence modules is given by barcodes. Barcodes can be seen as a particularly useful representation of persistence modules.

Definition 2.7. A barcode \mathcal{B} is a countable collection of intervals $(a, b]$ with $-\infty < a < b \leq +\infty$, called bars, with multiplicities such that

- (1) for every $c \in \mathbb{R}$ there exists a neighborhood of c which intersects only finitely many bars when counted with multiplicities; and
- (2) the set of all endpoints of bars is a closed discrete subset of \mathbb{R} bounded from below.

Remark 2.8. It is possible to also consider *graded* barcodes. In that case any bar would come equipped with an integer grading, i.e. an integer associated to it. These barcodes are usually used when working with graded homology theories. While we will be considering the graded Floer homology later, we do not need this information on the barcodes.

Example 2.9. Let $-\infty < a < b \leq +\infty$ be a pair of real numbers. Then for any $m \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$ we can define the persistence module $\mathbb{F}^m(a, b]$ by

$$\mathbb{F}^m(a, b] = \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}^m & \text{if } t \in (a, b] \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and the maps $\pi_{s,t}$ are given by the identity for $s, t \in (a, b]$ and the zero map otherwise.

We can clearly see that we can define a persistence module based on any barcode. We can just take a direct sum of $\mathbb{F}^m(a, b]$ for all bars $(a, b]$ with m being the respective multiplicity. The conditions in Definition 2.7 will then exactly imply the conditions in Definition 2.1 that are necessary. The normal form theorem (cf. [PRSZ20, Theorem 2.1.2]) tells us that up to isomorphism any persistence module is represented by a barcode in this way. Henceforth, we will denote the barcode associated to a persistence module (V, π) by $\mathcal{B}(V)$. We now introduce a metric on barcodes, which is dual to the interleaving distance.

Definition 2.10. Let \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C} be barcodes. Then a matching μ of \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{C} is a collection of pairs $\{(A, B) \in \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{C}\}_{i \in I}$ where the number of occurrences of any interval is at most its multiplicity. Given intervals $A \in \mathcal{B}, B \in \mathcal{C}$ we call them matched if $(A, B) \in \mu$ and unmatched else. It is important that we count with multiplicities here, i.e. if $A \in \mathcal{B}$ has multiplicity n we treat it as n distinct copies for the purpose of it being matched.

To make the notion slightly more concise we say that a bar is matched in general if it is matched to any bar of the other barcode. Of course, we again have to treat a bar with multiplicity n as n distinct copies of itself for the purpose of it being matched.

Definition 2.11. Let \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C} be barcodes and μ a matching of \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{C} . Then μ is called a δ -matching for $\delta > 0$ if the following conditions are met:

- (1) For any intervals $(a, b] = I \in \mathcal{B}, (c, d] = J \in \mathcal{C}$ that are matched in μ we have $|a - c| \leq \delta$ and $|b - d| \leq \delta$.
- (2) For any interval $(a, b] = I \in \mathcal{B}$ that is unmatched in μ we have $b - a \leq 2\delta$.
- (3) For any interval $(a, b] = I \in \mathcal{C}$ that is unmatched in μ we have $b - a \leq 2\delta$.

Definition 2.12. Let \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C} be barcodes. We define

$$d_{\text{bot}}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}) := \inf\{\delta > 0 \mid \exists \delta\text{-matching of } \mathcal{B} \text{ and } \mathcal{C}\},$$

which we call bottleneck distance.

As mentioned before, the bottleneck distance can be seen as a version of the interleaving distance. This fact can be expressed as the following isometry theorem, a proof of which can be found in [PRSZ20, Ch. 3].

Theorem 2.13. *Let V, W be two persistence modules, then*

$$d_{\text{int}}(V, W) = d_{\text{bot}}(\mathcal{B}(V), \mathcal{B}(W)).$$

An intrinsic measurement for a barcode is to consider the length of its longest finite bar. This is precisely half the bottleneck distance between the barcode and its infinite bars. This notion was introduced (in a symplectic context) in [Ush13] but can be naturally phrased in the language of barcodes.

Definition 2.14. Let \mathcal{B} be a barcode. Then the *boundary depth* of \mathcal{B} , denoted $\beta(\mathcal{B})$, is given by the longest length of a finite bar in \mathcal{B} . If \mathcal{B} has no finite bars, we set $\beta(\mathcal{B}) = 0$. Let (V, π) be a persistence module. Then we use the shorthand $\beta(V) := \beta(\mathcal{B}(V))$ for the boundary depth of the associated barcode.

The concept of spectral invariants in Floer theory is much older and has been studied in various settings. See e.g. [Lec08, Oh05, Sch00, Ush08]. Our definition below is a pure persistence reformulation. We refer the reader to [PRSZ20] for more information on the abstract concept and to [Ush08] for more information on spectral invariants in Floer theory. To define spectral invariants, we first have to introduce the concept of the terminal vector space of a persistence module. Let (V, π) be a persistence module. Note that $\{V_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ together with $\{\pi_{s,t}\}_{s \leq t}$ form a direct system. We denote its limit by $V_\infty := \varinjlim V_t$, which is called the terminal vector space of (V, π) .

Definition 2.15. Let (V, π) be a persistence module and $\alpha \in V_\infty$. Then

$$c(\alpha) := \inf\{t \in \mathbb{R} \mid \alpha \in \text{im } V_t \rightarrow V_\infty\}$$

is called the spectral invariant of α .

Remark 2.16. The spectral invariant of $\alpha \in V_\infty$ can also be thought of naturally as the left endpoint of the infinite-length bar in $\mathcal{B}(V)$ that represents α .

2.2. Lagrangian Floer theory. Henceforth, all symplectic manifolds and their Lagrangian submanifolds will be implicitly assumed to be connected. We assume that Lagrangians are always properly embedded. All Hamiltonian functions will be implicitly assumed to be compactly supported away from the boundary. Given a Hamiltonian diffeomorphism φ on a symplectic manifold (M, ω) we will denote by $\mathcal{H}(\varphi)$ the set of Hamiltonian functions $H : [0, 1] \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that the time-1 flow of the Hamiltonian vector field X_H , given by $\omega(X_H, \cdot) = -dH$, is φ . The group of all compactly supported Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms on M is denoted by $\text{Ham}_c(M)$.

Definition 2.17. Let $H \in C^\infty([0, 1] \times M, \mathbb{R})$ be a Hamiltonian. Then the oscillation of H is given by

$$\text{osc}(H) := \int_0^1 \left[\max_{x \in M} H(t, x) - \min_{x \in M} H(t, x) \right] dt.$$

Definition 2.18. Let $\varphi : M \rightarrow M$ be a Hamiltonian diffeomorphism compactly supported away from the boundary. Then the Hofer norm of φ is given by

$$\|\varphi\|_{\text{Hofer}} := \inf_{H \in \mathcal{H}(\varphi)} \text{osc}(H).$$

Definition 2.19. Let $L_0, L_1 \subset M$ be Lagrangian submanifolds such that there exists a $\varphi \in \text{Ham}_c(M)$ such that $\varphi(L_0) = L_1$. In this case we call

$$d_{\text{Hofer}}(L_0, L_1) := \inf\{\|\varphi\|_{\text{Hofer}} \mid \varphi \in \text{Ham}_c(M), \varphi(L_0) = L_1\}$$

the Hofer distance between L_0 and L_1 . If such a φ does not exist, we set $d_{\text{Hofer}}(L_0, L_1) = \infty$.

We now fix some sign conventions. This is necessary since multiple conventions can be found, under the same names, in the literature.

Definition 2.20. Let $(M, \omega = d\lambda)$ be an exact symplectic compact manifold, then the vector field $X_\lambda \in \Gamma(TM)$ defined by $\omega(\cdot, X_\lambda) = \lambda$ is called the Liouville vector field on M .

Definition 2.21. An exact compact symplectic manifold $(M, \omega = d\lambda)$ with a compatible almost-complex structure $J : TM \rightarrow TM$ is called Liouville domain if the Liouville vector field X_λ points transversally inwards on the boundary ∂M .

After this quick recap of some basic notions, we will now lay out the version of Lagrangian Floer theory we use in this text. Our setup is almost completely identical to that of [Sei08, Section III.8] and closely follows [BC22, Section 2.2.2]. There are however two major differences:

- (1) We use *homological* rather than cohomological conventions, as are used in [Sei08].
- (2) We will not ignore the grading of the homology groups, as is done in [BC22].
We use graded Lagrangians for this purpose, as introduced in [Sei00].

Let $(M, \omega = d\lambda)$ be a Liouville domain with a fixed primitive λ . Further, assume that $2c_1(M) = 0$. Denote by \mathcal{J} the set of all ω -compatible almost-complex structures on M . Let $L_0, L_1 \subset M$ be compact exact Lagrangian submanifolds. Exactness is always taken to be with respect to the fixed primitive. A pair $H \in C^\infty([0, 1] \times M, \mathbb{R})$, $J \in C^\infty([0, 1], \mathcal{J})$ is called a *Floer datum* if $\varphi(L_0) \pitchfork L_1$, $\varphi(L_0) \cap L_1 \cap \partial M = \emptyset$, and $\text{supp } \varphi \Subset \text{int}(M)$, where φ is the time-1 flow of X_H . We make the further restriction that there should exist a compact set $K \subset M$ such that for any $t \in [0, 1]$ the function $H_t|_{M \setminus K}$ is constant. This implies that φ_H (the time-1 flow of X_H) has compact support. We further fix primitives

$$h_{L_k} : L_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

for $\lambda|_{L_k}$ for $k = 0, 1$. Then we can define the set

$$\mathcal{P}(L_0, L_1) = \{y \in C^\infty([0, 1], M) \mid y(0) \in L_0, y(1) \in L_1\}$$

of paths from L_0 to L_1 endowed with the C^∞ -topology. We focus on the subset

$$\mathcal{C}(L_0, L_1; H) = \{y \in \mathcal{P}(L_0, L_1) \mid \dot{y}(t) = X_H(t, y)\},$$

whose elements are called *Hamiltonian chords*. We usually denote this by $\mathcal{C}(L_0, L_1)$ if there is no confusion about the Hamiltonian H . Recall the *Floer equation* for a map $u \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times [0, 1], M)$:

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_s u + J(t, u) \partial_t u = J(t, u) X_H(t, u) \\ u(s, 0) \in L_0, u(s, 1) \in L_1 \end{cases} \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R}.$$

A solution to (2.1) is called a *Floer trajectory*. We define the energy of such a solution $u : \mathbb{R} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ as

$$(2.2) \quad E(u) = \int_{\mathbb{R} \times [0, 1]} \|\partial_s u\|^2 dt ds,$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is the norm induced by $\omega(\cdot, J(t)\cdot)$. We will only consider solutions with finite energy. Assume we have a solution u of (2.1) such that $u(s, \cdot)$ converges uniformly as $s \rightarrow \pm\infty$. Given a pair $y_0, y_1 \in \mathcal{C}(L_0, L_1)$ we denote the set of finite energy solutions of (2.1) with

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{cases} \lim_{s \rightarrow +\infty} u(s, t) = y_1 & \text{uniformly in } t \\ \lim_{s \rightarrow -\infty} u(s, t) = y_0 & \text{uniformly in } t \end{cases}$$

by $\mathcal{M}(y_0, y_1)$. If $y_0 \neq y_1$ the moduli space $\mathcal{M}(y_0, y_1)$ admits a free \mathbb{R} -action given by shifting the s -coordinate. We write

$$\mathcal{M}^*(y_0, y_1) := \mathcal{M}(y_0, y_1) / \mathbb{R}$$

for the quotient space under the aforementioned action. We also set $\mathcal{M}^*(y_0, y_0) = \emptyset$ as a matter of convention. It is a standard fact in the field — see e.g. [FOOO10, Ch. 2] —, that there is a dense subset $\mathcal{J}_{reg} \subset C^\infty([0, 1], \mathcal{J})$ of ω -compatible almost-complex structures for which $\mathcal{M}^*(y_0, y_1)$ is either the empty set or admits a Gromov-Floer compactification that is a smooth manifold (possibly with connected components of different dimensions) for any $y_0, y_1 \in \mathcal{C}(L_0, L_1)$. An almost-complex structure in this set is called regular. We extend the notion of regularity to Floer data. We say that a Floer datum $\mathcal{D} = (H, J)$ is *regular* if the almost-complex structure J is regular with respect to H in the above sense. Let us fix a regular Floer datum (H, J) and define

$$CF(L_0, L_1) := \bigoplus_{y \in \mathcal{C}(L_0, L_1)} \mathbb{Z}_2 \cdot y = \text{span}_{\mathbb{Z}_2} \{y \in \mathcal{C}(L_0, L_1)\},$$

which we call the *Floer complex*.

We will work with graded Floer homology. In order to do so, we want to grade both Lagrangians. We follow the framework of graded Lagrangians established in [Sei00]. Let us recall some notation: Denote by $\mathcal{L} \rightarrow M$ the Lagrangian Grassmannian bundle, i.e. the bundle whose fiber \mathcal{L}_x over $x \in M$ is the Lagrangian Grassmannian $\mathcal{L}(T_x M, \omega_x)$. An ∞ -fold Maslov covering is a covering $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^\infty \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ whose restriction over \mathcal{L}_x is isomorphic to the universal cover $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_x$ for all $x \in M$. Such a covering always exists if $c_1(M)$ is 2-torsion and the equivalence classes of such ∞ -fold Maslov coverings form an affine space over $H^1(M; \mathbb{Z})$, see e.g. [Sei00, Lemma 2.2].

In the following, fix an ∞ -fold Maslov covering $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^\infty \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$. An \mathcal{L}^∞ -grading (henceforth simply called grading) of a Lagrangian $L \subset M$ is a lift $\tilde{L} : L \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^\infty$ of the canonical section $s_L : L \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ given by $x \mapsto T_x L$. If the Lagrangian intersects the boundary, a lift away from the boundary is sufficient. Henceforth, we will assume that our Lagrangians $L_0, L_1 \subset M$ come equipped with gradings \tilde{L}_0, \tilde{L}_1 . Further, assume that $L_0 \pitchfork L_1$. We can now use the Maslov index for paths to fix an absolute grading of the Floer complex. For any $x \in L_0 \cap L_1$, we obtain $\tilde{L}_0(x), \tilde{L}_1(x) \in \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^\infty$. Now let $\tilde{\lambda}_0, \tilde{\lambda}_1 : [0, 1] \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^\infty$ be two paths with

$$\tilde{\lambda}_0(0) = \tilde{\lambda}_1(0) \quad \tilde{\lambda}_0(1) = \tilde{L}_0(x) \quad \tilde{\lambda}_1(1) = \tilde{L}_1(x).$$

Denote the projections of these paths to \mathcal{L} by λ_0, λ_1 . Then we define the index of x to be

$$(2.4) \quad \mu(x; \tilde{L}_0, \tilde{L}_1) := -\mu(\lambda_0, \lambda_1) + \frac{\dim M}{4},$$

where $\mu(\lambda_0, \lambda_1)$ is the Maslov index for paths as defined in [RS93]. From the properties of the Maslov index, it is easy to see that this is independent of all auxiliary choices (i.e.

the paths and an identification $T_x M \cong \mathbb{R}^{2n}$. We point an interested reader to [Sei00] for details.

Remark 2.22. The grading can also be defined in the presence of a Hamiltonian perturbation H . These details can be found in the literature but will only be used implicitly in this paper. We therefore skip them in this review.

Theorem 2.23 (Floer). *In the above setting we can define the boundary operator ∂ by linear extension of*

$$(2.5) \quad \partial y_0 = \sum_{\substack{y_1 \in \mathcal{C}(L_0, L_1) \\ \mu(y_1; \bar{L}_0, \bar{L}_1) = \mu(y_0; \bar{L}_0, \bar{L}_1) - 1}} \# \mathcal{M}^*(y_0, y_1) y_1 \pmod{2}$$

for any $y_0 \in \mathcal{C}(L_0, L_1)$. Then $\partial \circ \partial = 0$ holds.

Given this statement, $(CF(L_0, L_1), \partial)$ is a chain complex. We denote its homology by $HF(L_0, L_1) := H_*(CF(L_0, L_1), \partial)$. Since the almost-complex structure will not be important for us, we mostly suppress it from the notation. Therefore, if the Hamiltonian in the Floer datum vanishes we write $HF(L_0, L_1)$. Otherwise, we use $HF(L_0, L_1; \mathcal{D})$ or $HF(L_0, L_1; H)$.

2.3. Action filtration. We keep the setting of the previous section. We will now briefly review the natural persistence structure of the Floer complex. It is well-known that the symplectic action functional induces a filtration on $CF(L_0, L_1)$. Indeed, this filtration makes Floer homology a persistence module.

Definition 2.24. The functional

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A} : \mathcal{P}(L_0, L_1) &\rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ y &\mapsto \int_0^1 H(t, y(t)) dt - \int_0^1 y^* \lambda + h_{L_1}(y(1)) - h_{L_0}(y(0)) \end{aligned}$$

is called (symplectic) action functional. Note that this functional depends on the choice of primitives on L_0, L_1 .

Let $u \in \mathcal{M}(y_0, y_1)$ be arbitrary for some $y_0, y_1 \in \mathcal{C}(L_0, L_1; H)$. Recall that there is a bound on the energy (2.2) by the action: $E(u) = \mathcal{A}(y_0) - \mathcal{A}(y_1)$. Since clearly $0 \leq E(u)$ and equality occurs if and only if u is constant in the first variable, we obtain

$$\mathcal{M}^*(y_0, y_1) \neq \emptyset \implies \mathcal{A}(y_1) < \mathcal{A}(y_0).$$

By (2.5), this shows that the boundary map is “action decreasing”. It is convenient to extend \mathcal{A} to the whole chain complex $CF(L_0, L_1)$. We define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A} : CF(L_0, L_1) &\rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ \sum_{i=0}^k a_i y_i &\mapsto \max \{ \mathcal{A}(y_i) \mid a_i \neq 0 \}, \end{aligned}$$

where the left side is a sum of Hamiltonian chords with \mathbb{Z}_2 -coefficients. Clearly, the boundary is still action decreasing with respect to this extension.

This action now gives us a filtration of the chain complex. Formalizing this idea, for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ we can define

$$CF(L_0, L_1)^\lambda := \text{span}_{\mathbb{Z}_2} \langle y \in \mathcal{C}(L_0, L_1) \mid \mathcal{A}(y) < \lambda \rangle.$$

Our considerations from above imply that ∂ is compatible with the filtration of the Floer complex. Thus, $CF(L_0, L_1)$ is an \mathbb{R} -filtered complex and by Remark 2.2 we obtain

the persistence module $HF(L_0, L_1)^\bullet$. It is a well known result in Floer theory, that the particular choice of almost-complex structure is irrelevant for the definition of Floer theory. The filtration also does not depend on this choice. Thus, we can distill all of our setup into the following definition:

Definition 2.25. Let $(M, \omega = d\lambda)$ be a Liouville domain and $L_0, L_1 \subset M$ compact exact Lagrangian submanifolds with fixed primitives for λ as above. Further, let $\mathcal{D} = (H, J)$ be a regular Floer datum as described above. Then we denote by $HF(L_0, L_1; \mathcal{D})^\bullet$ the Floer persistence module associated to this data. We further denote its barcode by $\mathcal{B}(L_0, L_1; \mathcal{D})$.

Remark 2.26. We want to emphasize that in contrast to the setting of a Liouville or Weinstein manifold which is often found in the literature, we are working with a Liouville domain that has boundary in general (see Definition 2.21). Our Lagrangians $L_0, L_1 \subset M$ are also not necessarily closed. All Lagrangians are however assumed to be properly embedded submanifolds. Additionally, for a Floer datum $\mathcal{D} = (H, J)$ to be regular, $\varphi_H(L_0) \cap L_1 \cap \partial M = \emptyset$ must hold.

2.4. Filtered Continuation and Naturality Maps. As noted above for two regular Floer data $\mathcal{D}_0 = (H^0, J^0), \mathcal{D}_1 = (H^1, J^1)$ the Floer homology $HF(L_0, L_1)$ does not depend on the Floer datum used to define it. This is formalized by the existence of a chain map $\Psi_{\mathcal{D}_0, \mathcal{D}_1} : CF(L_0, L_1; \mathcal{D}_0) \rightarrow CF(L_0, L_1; \mathcal{D}_1)$. This is a quasi-isomorphism canonical up to chain homotopy and induces a (canonical) isomorphism on homology:

$$H(\Psi_{\mathcal{D}_0, \mathcal{D}_1}) : HF(L_0, L_1; \mathcal{D}_0) \rightarrow HF(L_0, L_1; \mathcal{D}_1).$$

The chain map $\Psi_{\mathcal{D}_0, \mathcal{D}_1} : CF(L_0, L_1; \mathcal{D}_0) \rightarrow CF(L_0, L_1; \mathcal{D}_1)$ is called *continuation map*. This construction is by now standard. A filtration aware version of the continuation map is given in [Ush13, Prop. 6.1]. Detailed computations for the energies involved are given in [FOOO11].

Lemma 2.27. Let $\mathcal{D}_0 = (G, J)$ and $\mathcal{D}_1 = (H, J')$ be two regular Floer data. Then we can choose a homotopy between \mathcal{D}_0 and \mathcal{D}_1 such that the continuation maps restrict to

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{\mathcal{D}_0, \mathcal{D}_1} &: CF^\lambda(L_0, L_1; \mathcal{D}_0) \rightarrow CF^{\lambda + \text{osc}(G-H)}(L_0, L_1; \mathcal{D}_1) \\ \Psi_{\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_0} &: CF^\lambda(L_0, L_1; \mathcal{D}_1) \rightarrow CF^{\lambda + \text{osc}(G-H)}(L_0, L_1; \mathcal{D}_0) \end{aligned}$$

for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ when taking into account the filtration.

Recall that in the setting of this lemma $\Psi_{\mathcal{D}_0, \mathcal{D}_1} \circ \Psi_{\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_0}$ and $\Psi_{\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_0} \circ \Psi_{\mathcal{D}_0, \mathcal{D}_1}$ are chain-isotopic to the identity. Thus, we obtain on homology that these two compositions are the same as the maps induced by the respective inclusions based on the action filtration. These maps form an interleaving of the respective persistence modules. By Theorem 2.13 this implies a bound on the bottleneck distance, as follows:

Corollary 2.28. Let $\mathcal{D}_0 = (G, J)$ and $\mathcal{D}_1 = (H, J')$ be two regular Floer data. Then the barcodes $\mathcal{B}(HF(L_0, L_1; \mathcal{D}_0)^\bullet)$ and $\mathcal{B}(HF(L_0, L_1; \mathcal{D}_1)^\bullet)$ are $(\text{osc } G - H)$ -matched.

Next, we want to look at another chain map called the *naturality map*. We only give a brief description, for more information on the filtered naturality map we refer the reader to [BC22, Section 2.2.3]. For this let $\mathcal{D} = (H, J)$ be a regular Floer datum and G another Hamiltonian. Denote by φ_G^t the time- t flow of the Hamiltonian vector field X_G . For any two Hamiltonians $F_1, F_2 : [0, 1] \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we denote by $F_1 \# F_2 : [0, 1] \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the map

$$F_1 \# F_2(t, x) := F_1(t, x) + F_2(t, (\varphi_{F_1}^t)^{-1}(x)).$$

Then there is a natural correspondence between $\mathcal{C}(L_0, L_1; H)$ and $\mathcal{C}(L_0, \varphi_G^1(L_1); G\sharp H)$ given by the following map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}(L_0, L_1; H) &\rightarrow \mathcal{C}(L_0, \varphi_G^1(L_1); G\sharp H) \\ y &\mapsto (t \mapsto \varphi_G^t(y(t))). \end{aligned}$$

In order to upgrade this to a chain map, we introduce the *push-forward Floer datum*

$$(\varphi_G)_* \mathcal{D} = (G\sharp H, t \mapsto D\varphi_G^t \circ J_t \circ D(\varphi_G^t)^{-1}).$$

Note that the Hamiltonian chords $\mathcal{C}(L_0, \varphi_G^1(L_1); G\sharp H)$ are generators of the Floer complex $CF(L_0, \varphi_G^1(L_1); (\varphi_G)_* \mathcal{D})$. We then define the chain map by linear extension:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}_G : CF(L_0, L_1; \mathcal{D}) &\rightarrow CF(L_0, \varphi_G^1(L_1); (\varphi_G)_* \mathcal{D}) \\ y &\mapsto (t \mapsto \varphi_G^t(y(t))), \end{aligned}$$

called the *naturality map*. It is a standard fact in the field, that this map is an isomorphism on the chain-level and thus also induces an isomorphism on homology:

$$H(\mathcal{N}_G) : HF(L_0, L_1; \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow HF(L_0, \varphi_G^1(L_1); (\varphi_G)_* \mathcal{D}).$$

Note that in order to define the filtration on the right-hand side, we have to make a specific choice of primitive for λ on $\varphi_G^1(L_1)$. However, all such choices agree up to adding a constant since L_1 is connected. After potential shifting the primitives, this map can be made action preserving. We can now combine naturality and continuation maps to obtain a useful result on Floer barcodes. For this let $L_0, L_1 \subset M$ be exact Lagrangians as always and further assume that $L_0 \pitchfork L_1$. Let $H \in C^\infty([0, 1] \times M, \mathbb{R})$ be a Hamiltonian such that $\varphi_H(L_1) \pitchfork L_0$, where φ_H is the time-1 flow of H . Then we can look at the following composition:

$$CF(L_0, L_1; 0) \xrightarrow{\Psi_{0, \bar{H}}} CF(L_0, L_1; \bar{H}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}_H} CF(L_0, \varphi_H(L_1); 0),$$

where $\bar{H}(t, x) := -H(t, \varphi_H^t(x))$. Here (and henceforth) we drop the almost-complex structures from the notation for continuation maps for the sake of readability: On homology this *per se* just gives us the standard fact that Floer homology is invariant under Hamiltonian isotopies. Now, by using Lemma 2.27 we obtain the following filtered result: for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ we have the following

$$\begin{array}{ccc} CF^\lambda(L_0, L_1; 0) & \xrightarrow{\Psi_{0, \bar{H}}} & CF^{\lambda + \text{osc}(H)}(L_0, L_1; \bar{H}) \\ & \searrow \mathcal{N}_H & \swarrow \\ & CF^{\lambda + \text{osc}(H)}(L_0, \varphi_H(L_1); 0) & \\ & \swarrow \mathcal{N}_{\bar{H}} & \searrow \\ & CF^{\lambda + \text{osc}(H)}(L_0, L_1; \bar{H}) & \xrightarrow{\Psi_{\bar{H}, 0}} CF^{\lambda + 2 \text{osc}(H)}(L_0, L_1; 0). \end{array}$$

Since this composition induces the map on homology that is induced by the natural inclusion map, we again obtain an interleaving of persistence modules. To summarize:

Lemma 2.29. *Let $L_0 \pitchfork L_1$ and let H be a compactly supported Hamiltonian such that $\varphi_H(L_1) \pitchfork L_0$. Then the barcodes $\mathcal{B}(HF(L_0, L_1; 0)^\bullet)$ and $\mathcal{B}(HF(L_0, \varphi_H(L_1); 0)^\bullet)$ are $(\text{osc } H)$ -matched.*

This implies the following well-known Lipschitz properties of the boundary depth and the spectral invariants:

Corollary 2.30. *Let $L_0 \pitchfork L_1$ and let φ be a compactly supported Hamiltonian diffeomorphism such that $\varphi(L_1) \pitchfork L_0$. Then*

$$|\beta(HF(L_0, L_1; 0)^\bullet) - \beta(HF(L_0, \varphi(L_1); 0)^\bullet)| \leq 2 \cdot \|\varphi\|_{\text{Hofer}}.$$

For any $\alpha \in HF(L_0, L_1)$ we have

$$|c(\alpha; HF(L_0, L_1; 0)^\bullet) - c(\varphi^*\alpha; HF(L_0, \varphi(L_1); 0)^\bullet)| \leq \|\varphi_H\|_{\text{Hofer}}.$$

Remark 2.31. In the following sections, we will drop the \bullet from the notation for Floer theoretic spectral invariants and the boundary depth. This is as not to clutter the notation needlessly.

3. SETUP

We will now define local models for the Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms and Dehn twists which we will later need for the proof of Theorem 1.1. Henceforth, we will always consider the sphere S^n as endowed with its standard round metric. In this section we will only look at the local model for an A_3 -configuration, i.e. the cotangent bundle of sphere S^n with two preferred fibers. We will assume throughout that $n \geq 2$. The construction will translate verbatim to the neighborhood of an A_3 -configuration of spheres in a Liouville manifold $(W, \omega = d\lambda)$.

Recall from the introduction that we set $M_I := \{\zeta \in T^*S^n \mid \|\zeta^\sharp\| \in I\}$. Further, set $L_0 := T_x^*S^n, L_2 := T_y^*S^n$ such that x and y are distinct and not antipodal. We also denote $L_1 := 0 \subset D^*S^n$ and set $\delta := d(x, y)$. Choose $0 < \hat{h}_0 < \check{h}_1 < \hat{h}_1 < \dots < \check{h}_d < \hat{h}_d < \check{h}_{d+1} < 1$. Then set $\check{h} := \min_{i \in \{1, \dots, d\}} |\check{h}_i - \hat{h}_i|$ and choose $\iota \in (0, \frac{\check{h}}{2})$. Let $\theta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}, [0, \infty))$ be a smooth bump function such that:

- (1) the support of θ is $[\iota, \check{h} - \iota]$;
- (2) $\theta(\frac{\check{h}}{2}) = 2\pi$ is a global maximum;
- (3) $\theta'|_{(\iota, \frac{\check{h}}{2})} > 0$ and $\theta'|_{(\frac{\check{h}}{2}, \check{h} - \iota)} < 0$;
- (4) $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \theta(t) dt = 1$.

Then we define θ_v as follows for any $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$:

$$\theta_v(t) = \sum_{i=1}^d v_i \cdot \theta(t - \check{h}_i)$$

The flow of the autonomous Hamiltonian

$$H_v : T^*S^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

$$(x, \zeta_x) \mapsto \int_0^{\|\zeta_x^\sharp\|} \theta_v(t) dt,$$

will be denoted by φ_v . We denote by $\sigma(t) : T^*S^n \setminus 0 \rightarrow T^*S^n \setminus 0$ the time- t normalized geodesic flow. Note that for any $\zeta \notin 0$, we have $\varphi_v(\zeta) = \sigma(\theta_v(\|\zeta^\sharp\|))(\zeta)$.

After defining this map $\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \text{Ham}_c(T^*S^n)$, we construct special representatives of the Dehn twist. These will later be used in the way sketched in Section 1.1. Let $\varepsilon = \min_{i \in \{0, \dots, d\}} |\check{h}_{i+1} - \hat{h}_i|$. Let $\rho : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a monotone smooth function that is equal to π on $(-\infty, \frac{1}{3}\varepsilon]$ and equal to 0 on $[\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon, \infty)$. We define for any $i \in \{0, \dots, d\}$ that

$$\rho_i(t) := \rho(t - \hat{h}_i).$$

Then we define the following models of a Dehn twist around L_1 :

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_i : D^*S^n &\rightarrow D^*S^n \\ (x, \xi) &\mapsto \sigma(\rho_i(\|\xi^\#\|))(x, \xi). \end{aligned}$$

By construction the supports of $\varphi_v, \tau_0^2, \dots, \tau_d^2$ are pairwise disjoint for any $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$. To be more precise,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{supp } \varphi_v &\subset M_{(\check{h}_1, \hat{h}_1)} \cup \dots \cup M_{(\check{h}_d, \hat{h}_d)} \\ \text{supp } \tau_i^2 &\subset M_{(\hat{h}_i, \check{h}_{i+1})} \end{aligned}$$

for any $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $i \in \{0, \dots, d\}$. For an A_3 -configuration $L_0, L_1, L_2 \subset M$ in an exact symplectic manifold $(M, d\lambda = \omega)$, there will be a neighborhood $U \subset M$ of L_1 which is symplectomorphic to the disk cotangent bundle D^*L_1 . Further, by making U smaller if necessary, we can assume that the intersections of L_0 and L_2 with U correspond to fibers under this identification. After rescaling, the construction above can be carried out in U . We denote the obvious extensions of the maps constructed above by $\varphi_v, \tau_0^2, \dots, \tau_d^2 : M \rightarrow M$. Note that $v \mapsto \varphi_v$ gives a group homomorphism $(\mathbb{R}^d, +) \rightarrow (\text{Ham}_c(M), \circ)$, which follows easily from the definition of the autonomous Hamiltonian H_v .

4. INDEX AND ACTION COMPUTATION

In the following, we will restrict ourselves to the case $n \geq 2^2$. In this section fix $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $(M^{2n}, d\lambda = \omega)$ be a Liouville domain with $2c_1(M) = 0$. Further, we assume that $L_0, L_1, L_2 \subset M$ is an A_3 -configuration of exact Lagrangian spheres. We further want L_1 to be a framed sphere in the sense of [Sei08, Section III.16a]. Thus, we equip L_1 with an auxiliary choice of diffeomorphism $v : S^n \rightarrow L_1$ from the standard unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} to L_1 . We call v the *framing* of L_1 . The choice of this diffeomorphism is immaterial for our result, but is used in the proof itself. Let U be a neighborhood of L_1 which is symplectomorphic to $D^*L_1 \cong D^*S^n$. This symplectomorphism is induced by the framing v . Without loss of generality we can assume that $L_0 \cap U$ and $L_2 \cap U$ are identified with fibers over non-antipodal points under this identification.

Alternatively, we allow $M = T^*S^n$ with L_0, L_1, L_2 as in the last section. This is the same as only considering the local neighborhood U discussed above.

Denote the tautological 1-form on U by λ_{taut} . Since the first cohomology of U vanishes, we can write λ in U as $\lambda = \lambda_{\text{taut}} + df$ where $f \in C^\infty(U, \mathbb{R})$. Assume $h_{L_0} : L_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $h_{L_2} : L_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are primitives for λ on L_0 and L_2 . These induce primitives for λ on $\tau_i^{2k}(L_0)$ and $\varphi_v(L_2)$. After possibly adding a constant to the primitives, we can assume h_{L_0} agrees with f on $L_0 \cap U$ and h_{L_2} agrees with f on $L_2 \cap U$. We can see the induced primitives explicitly inside U . A standard computation (see [MS98, Proposition 9.3.1])

²For $n = 1$ the proof would have to be considerably adapted. However, this case is already implied by [Zap13, Theorem 1.5].

gives us the following:

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\varphi_v(L_2)}(\varphi_v(\xi)) &= f(\xi) + \int_0^1 \lambda(\partial_t \varphi_v^t(\xi)) - H_v(\varphi_v^t(\xi)) dt \\ &= f(\xi) + \int_0^1 \lambda_{\text{taut}}(\partial_t \varphi_v^t(\xi)) + df(\partial_t \varphi_v^t(\xi)) dt - \int_0^1 H_v(\varphi_v^t(\xi)) dt \\ &= \theta_v(\|\xi^\sharp\|) \|\xi^\sharp\| + f(\varphi_v(\xi)) - \int_0^{\|\xi^\sharp\|} \theta_v(s) ds, \end{aligned}$$

where $\xi \in U \cap L_2$ is arbitrary. The norm used above is that induced by the round metric on L_1 . This is preserved by the (reparametrized) cogeodesic flow and thus also by φ_v . We thus obtain

$$(4.1) \quad h_{\varphi_v(L_2)}(\xi) = \theta_v(\|\xi^\sharp\|) \|\xi^\sharp\| + f(\xi) - \int_0^{\|\xi^\sharp\|} \theta_v(s) ds,$$

for any $\xi \in U \cap \varphi_v(L_2)$. Similarly, for all $\xi \in U \cap \tau_i^{2k}(L_0)$ we obtain

$$(4.2) \quad h_{\tau_i^{2k}(L_0)}(\xi) = 2k\rho_i(\|\xi^\sharp\|) \|\xi^\sharp\| + f(\xi) - 2k \int_0^{\|\xi^\sharp\|} \rho_i(s) ds.$$

After having established these primitives, we want to fix gradings on all relevant Lagrangians. Recall that $2c_1(M) = 0$, which means that M allows Lagrangians to be \mathbb{Z} -graded in principle. Since $H^1(S^n) = 0$ for $n \geq 2$, all spheres involved can be graded and different choices for such gradings will differ at most by an integer shift. Let \tilde{L}_0, \tilde{L}_2 be any gradings of L_0, L_2 . Possibly after an integer shift, we can arrange for these gradings to agree with the canonical gradings of $L_0 \cap U$ and $L_2 \cap U$ induced by the vertical distribution on U . By [Sei00] there is a grading on τ_i such that $\tilde{\tau}_i(\tilde{L}_j) = \tilde{L}_j[1-n]$ near L_1 and $\tilde{\tau}_i(\tilde{L}_j) = \tilde{L}_j$ near ∂U for $j = 0, 2$. For aesthetic reasons we choose a slightly less conventional grading: Namely, we grade τ_i such that $\tilde{\tau}_i(\tilde{L}_j) = \tilde{L}_j$ near L_1 and $\tilde{\tau}_i(\tilde{L}_j) = \tilde{L}_j[n-1]$ near ∂U for $j = 0, 2$. Since this simply amounts to an integer shift, it is a harmless deviation from [Sei00]. For φ_v we use the canonical grading. With these gradings in place, we can compute the degrees of the intersection points $\tau_i^{2k}(L_0) \cap \varphi_v(L_2)$ as generators of the Floer complex $CF(\tau_i^{2k}(L_0), \varphi_v(L_2))$.

Lemma 4.1. *Assume $c \in \tau^{2k}(L_0) \cap \varphi_v(L_2) \cap \text{supp } \varphi_v$. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(c; \tilde{\tau}_i^{2k}(\tilde{L}_0), \tilde{\varphi}_v(\tilde{L}_2)) &= \frac{\text{sign } \theta'_v(\|c\|)}{2} + \begin{cases} n - \frac{1}{2} + (n-1) \left\lfloor \frac{|\theta_v(\|c\|)|}{\pi} \right\rfloor & \text{if } \theta_v(\|c\|) < 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} - (n-1) \left(\left\lfloor \frac{|\theta_v(\|c\|)|}{\pi} \right\rfloor \right) & \text{if } \theta_v(\|c\|) > 0, \end{cases} \\ &+ \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \|c\| < \hat{h}_i \\ 2k(n-1) & \text{if } \|c\| > \check{h}_{i+1}, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where we identify c with the respective covector under $U \cong D^*S^n$.

Proof. First we consider the case where $\|c\| < \hat{h}_i$ holds. Then

$$\mu(c; \tilde{\tau}_i^{2k}(\tilde{L}_0), \tilde{\varphi}_v(\tilde{L}_2)) = \mu(c; \tilde{L}_0, \tilde{\varphi}_v(\tilde{L}_2)).$$

Thus, it merely remains to compute $\mu(c; \tilde{L}_0, \tilde{\varphi}_v(\tilde{L}_2))$. Let γ be the unit-speed geodesic from y to x extended to all times. We consider the paths $\lambda_0 \equiv \Lambda_c$ and $\lambda_1(t) = (D\varphi_v^t(\Lambda))_c$ of Lagrangian subspaces of $T_c T^*S^n$. Here $\Lambda \subset TT^*S^n$ denotes the vertical subbundle. Then we have

$$\mu(c; \tilde{L}_0, \tilde{\varphi}_v(\tilde{L}_2)) = \frac{n}{2} - \mu(\lambda_0, \lambda_1),$$

where $\mu(\lambda_0, \lambda_1)$ is the Maslov index of these two paths. The relationship between $\mu(\lambda_0, \lambda_1)$ in this setup and the conjugacy index of points along the geodesic γ on S^n containing x and y is by now standard in the literature. The essential argument is originally due to Duistermaat in [Dui76] and a proof in the above language can be found in [RS95, Prop. 6.38]. It remains to compute the number of conjugate points (which will all have conjugacy index $n - 1$). If $\theta_v(\|c\|) > 0$, then c corresponds to the geodesic $\gamma|_{[0, \theta_v(\|c\|)]}$. By construction (and if necessary a transversality argument to ensure $\tau_i^{2k}(\tilde{L}_0) \pitchfork \varphi_v(\tilde{L}_2)$ holds), $\gamma(0)$ and $\gamma(\theta_v(\|c\|))$ are never conjugate. The same applies, if $\theta_v(\|c\|) < 0$ and c corresponds to the geodesic $\gamma|_{[\theta_v(\|c\|), 0]}$. In both cases the following applies: The number of conjugate points along the relevant segment of γ is given by $\left\lfloor \frac{|\theta_v(\|c\|)|}{\pi} \right\rfloor$. In the latter case, the signs have to be reversed.

First, assume that $\theta_v(\|c\|) > 0$. Then, by a slight variation of the aforementioned proposition from [RS95],

$$\mu(\lambda_0, \lambda_1) = -\frac{\text{sign } \theta'_v(\|c\|) - (n-1)}{2} + (n-1) \left\lfloor \frac{|\theta_v(\|c\|)|}{\pi} \right\rfloor,$$

where the term $\frac{\text{sign } \theta'_v(\|c\|) - (n-1)}{2}$ appears because we have to take the reparametrization of the cogeodesic flow into account. This implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(c; \tilde{\tau}_i^{2k}(\tilde{L}_0), \tilde{\varphi}_v(\tilde{L}_2)) &= \frac{n}{2} + \frac{\text{sign } \theta'_v(\|c\|) - (n-1)}{2} - (n-1) \left\lfloor \frac{|\theta_v(\|c\|)|}{\pi} \right\rfloor \\ &= \frac{\text{sign } \theta'_v(\|c\|) + 1}{2} - (n-1) \left\lfloor \frac{|\theta_v(\|c\|)|}{\pi} \right\rfloor. \end{aligned}$$

If $\theta_v(\|c\|) < 0$, we instead obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(c; \tilde{\tau}_i^{2k}(\tilde{L}_0), \tilde{\varphi}_v(\tilde{L}_2)) &= \frac{n}{2} + \frac{\text{sign } \theta'_v(\|c\|) + (n-1)}{2} + (n-1) \left\lfloor \frac{|\theta_v(\|c\|)|}{\pi} \right\rfloor \\ &= \frac{\text{sign } \theta'_v(\|c\|) - 1}{2} + n + (n-1) \left\lfloor \frac{|\theta_v(\|c\|)|}{\pi} \right\rfloor. \end{aligned}$$

Note that essentially the same argument applies for the case of $\|c\| > \check{h}_{i+1}$. Merely the shift of the gradings has to be accounted for in this case. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(c; \tilde{\tau}_i^{2k}(\tilde{L}_0), \tilde{\varphi}_v(\tilde{L}_2)) &= \mu(c; \tilde{L}_0[2k(n-1)], \tilde{\varphi}_v(\tilde{L}_2)) = \mu(c; \tilde{L}_0, \tilde{\varphi}_v(\tilde{L}_2)) + 2k(n-1) \\ &= \frac{\text{sign } \theta'_v(\|c\|) + 1}{2} + (n-1) \left(2k - \left\lfloor \frac{|\theta_v(\|c\|)|}{\pi} \right\rfloor \right), \end{aligned}$$

for $\theta_v(\|c\|) > 0$ with the obvious analogue holding for $\theta_v(\|c\|) < 0$. \square

The remaining degrees obey the standard behavior for the Dehn twist, which we restate for the reader's convenience.

Lemma 4.2. *Assume $\xi \in \tau^{2k}(L_0) \cap \varphi_v(L_2)$ lies outside $\text{supp } \varphi_v$. Then we have*

$$\mu(\xi; \tilde{\tau}_i^{2k}(\tilde{L}_0), \tilde{\varphi}_v(\tilde{L}_2)) = n + m(n-1),$$

where m is chosen such that $2k\rho_i(\|\xi\|) = \pi \cdot m + \delta$ or $2k\rho_i(\|\xi\|) = \pi \cdot m - \delta$. The latter implies that m lies between 0 and $2k$.

Proof. This proof is almost the same as before. Since ξ lies outside the support of φ_v and φ_v is a Hamiltonian diffeomorphism,

$$\mu(\xi; \tilde{\tau}_i^{2k}(\tilde{L}_0), \tilde{\varphi}_v(\tilde{L}_2)) = \mu(\xi; \tilde{\tau}_i^{2k}(\tilde{L}_0), \tilde{L}_2).$$

Thus, it merely remains to compute $\mu(\xi; \tilde{\tau}_i^{2k}(\tilde{L}_0), \tilde{L}_2)$. Recall that $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \times T^*S^n \setminus 0 \rightarrow T^*S^n \setminus 0$ is the time-parametrized normalized cogeodesic flow. Then we define $\lambda_1 \equiv \Lambda_\xi$ and $\lambda_0(t) = (D(\sigma \circ (\xi \mapsto 2k\rho_i(\|\xi\|)t, \xi))(\Lambda))_{\tilde{\xi}}$. We have that

$$\mu(\xi; \tilde{\tau}_i^{2k}(\tilde{L}_0), \tilde{L}_2) = \frac{n}{2} - \mu(\lambda_0, \lambda_1).$$

Recall that $2k\rho_i(\|c\|) = \pi \cdot m + \delta$ or $2k\rho_i(\|c\|) = \pi \cdot m - \delta$. By [RS95, Prop. 6.38], we obtain

$$\mu(\lambda_0, \lambda_1) = -\frac{n}{2} - (n-1)m.$$

This implies

$$\mu(\xi; \tilde{\tau}_i^{2k}(\tilde{L}_0), \tilde{\varphi}_v(\tilde{L}_2)) = n + (n-1)m.$$

□

Remark 4.3. Note that by construction of θ_v , we have $\text{im}|\theta_v| \subset [0, \|v\|_\infty \cdot 2\pi]$. Thus, for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$ we get

$$\left\lfloor \frac{|\theta_v(t)|}{\pi} \right\rfloor \leq \lfloor 2\|v\|_\infty \rfloor \leq 2\|v\|_\infty.$$

Now, let us recap which degrees might have generators in them for some $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Due to the way we carefully constructed φ_v and τ_0, \dots, τ_d , we have

$$\tau_i^{2k}(L_0) \cap \varphi_v(L_2) = L_0 \cap \varphi_v(L_2) \amalg \tau_i^{2k}(L_0) \cap L_2.$$

All of these generators lie in U , and we use the identification of U with a neighborhood of the zero-section in T^*S^n when we talk about radial bands below. In each of these parts, we can describe the possible degrees of the generators:

- By Lemma 4.1, generators which lie in a radial band from 0 to \hat{h}_i can be at most one degree away from the following degrees:

$$\begin{array}{c} - \lfloor 2\|v\|_\infty \rfloor (n-1) \quad \left| \quad - (\lfloor 2\|v\|_\infty \rfloor - 1)(n-1) \quad \left| \quad \dots \quad \left| \quad \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \dots \\ n + \lfloor 2\|v\|_\infty \rfloor (n-1) \end{array} \right. \end{array}$$

Here, in the first row the actual degree might be higher by one and in the second row it might be lower by one.

- Generators which lie in the radial band from \hat{h}_i to \check{h}_{i+1} can appear only in the following degrees according to Lemma 4.2:

$$n \quad \left| \quad n + 2(n-1) \quad \left| \quad n + 3(n-1) \quad \left| \quad \dots \quad \left| \quad n + (2k-1)(n-1) \quad \left| \quad n + 2k(n-1) \right. \right. \right.$$

- By the other case of Lemma 4.1, generators with a norm higher or equal to \hat{h}_i can be at most one degree off from the following degrees:

$$\begin{array}{c} 2k(n-1) - \lfloor 2\|v\|_\infty \rfloor (n-1) \quad \left| \quad \dots \quad \left| \quad \begin{array}{c} 2k(n-1) \\ \dots \\ 2k(n-1) + n + \lfloor 2\|v\|_\infty \rfloor (n-1) \end{array} \right. \end{array}$$

Again, the actual degree might be higher by one in the first row and lower by one in the second row.

For us, the essential piece of information is this: Any generator $c \in \tau_i^{2k}(L_0) \cap \varphi_v(L_2)$ that lies in $\text{supp } \varphi_v$ — and thus outside the support of any τ_i^2 — either has a degree below or equal to $n + \lfloor 2\|v\|_\infty \rfloor (n-1)$ or has a degree above or equal to $(2k - \lfloor 2\|v\|_\infty \rfloor)(n-1)$.

5. SPECTRAL INVARIANTS

We keep the setting and notation of the last section. We will now define the spectral invariants which we will use to show one side of the quasi-isometry property in Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be generic. Then*

$$\frac{1}{2} \|v - w\|_\infty \leq d_{\text{Hofer}}(\varphi_v(L_2), \varphi_w(L_2)).$$

Proof. In keeping with the conventions of the last section, we will only treat the case of $n \geq 2$. The two-dimensional case (i.e. $n = 1$) is already implied by [Zap13, Theorem 1.5]³.

Since we can choose $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^d$ to be generic, we can assume $\varphi_v(L_2) \pitchfork L_0$ and $\varphi_w(L_2) \pitchfork L_0$. Then set

$$k := 2(\max\{\|v\|_\infty, \|w\|_\infty\} + 3).$$

Let $i \in \{0, \dots, d\}$ be arbitrary but fixed. Consider an intersection point $c \in \tau_i^{2k}(L_0) \cap \varphi_v(L_2)$ with $\|c\| \notin [\hat{h}_i, \check{h}_{i+1}]$. The latter implies that $c \notin \text{supp } \tau_i^{2k}$. By the results from the last section, we know that the corresponding generator of $CF(\tau_i^{2k}(L_0), \varphi_v(L_2))$ must either live in a degree lower or equal to

$$n + \lfloor 2\|v\|_\infty \rfloor (n - 1) < n + k(n - 1)$$

or a degree above or equal to

$$\begin{aligned} (2k - \lfloor 2\|v\|_\infty \rfloor)(n - 1) &\geq 2(k - (\|v\|_\infty + 1))(n - 1) \\ &> 2\left(\frac{k}{2} + 1\right)(n - 1) \geq k(n - 1) + n. \end{aligned}$$

Here we use that $(\|v\|_\infty + 1) < \frac{k}{2} - 1$ and $2(n - 1) \geq n$ since $n \geq 2$. By the choice of k the same holds true for such generators of $CF(\tau_i^{2k}(L_0), \varphi_w(L_2))$. Thus, there is a unique generator of degree $n + k(n - 1)$ in both $CF(\tau_i^{2k}(L_0), \varphi_v(L_2))$ and $CF(\tau_i^{2k}(L_0), \varphi_w(L_2))$ and this generator lies in the radial band from \hat{h}_i to \check{h}_{i+1} . The norm here should again be understood with respect to the local model in U .

Similarly, if we use the same gradings for $\tau_i^{2k}(L_0)$ and L_2 , the homology group $HF(\tau_i^{2k}(L_0), L_2)$ has a unique class of each of the following degrees [FS05]:

$$n \mid n + 2(n-1) \mid n + 3(n-1) \mid \dots \mid n + (2k-1)(n-1) \mid n + 2k(n-1)$$

The same is of course true for any $HF(\tau_i^{2k}(L_0), L)$ with $L \in \mathcal{L}(L_2)$. We had already established in the previous section, that the above degrees are the only possible degrees for the intersection points generated by the Dehn twist. We will now make use of this abundance of homology classes. We denote by α_i the unique class in degree $n + k(n - 1)$ of the Floer homology group $HF(\tau_i^{2k}(L_0), L_2)$. Note that this class exists because k is even. Then for any $i \in \{0, \dots, d - 1\}$ set

$$\begin{aligned} a_i(v) &:= c(\varphi_v^* \alpha_{i+1}; HF(\tau_i^{2k}(L_0), \varphi_v(L_2))) - c(\varphi_v^* \alpha_i; HF(\tau_i^{2k}(L_0), \varphi_v(L_2))) \\ a_i(w) &:= c(\varphi_w^* \alpha_{i+1}; HF(\tau_i^{2k}(L_0), \varphi_w(L_2))) - c(\varphi_w^* \alpha_i; HF(\tau_i^{2k}(L_0), \varphi_w(L_2))), \end{aligned}$$

³This theorem applies to a Lagrangian which fibers over S^1 and gives an infinite-dimensional Hofer quasi-flat.

where $c(\beta; HF(L, L'))$ denotes the spectral invariant of the class β in $HF(L, L')$. Due to the index considerations given above, we know that $\varphi_v^* \alpha_i$ and $\varphi_w^* \alpha_i$ are both supported at a single intersection point which lies in the radial band $[\hat{h}_i, \check{h}_{i+1}]$. Let us denote this point by $\xi_i \in \tau_i^{2k}(L_0)$. This implies that there is an easy formula for the above spectral invariants. They simply correspond to the symplectic action of ξ_i . Since we are looking at a Floer complex defined without a Hamiltonian perturbation, the action can be computed directly from the primitives. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} a_i(v) &= c(\varphi_v^* \alpha_{i+1}; HF(\tau_i^{2k}(L_0), \varphi_v(L_2))) - c(\varphi_v^* \alpha_i; HF(\tau_i^{2k}(L_0), \varphi_v(L_2))) \\ &= \mathcal{A}_v(\xi_{i+1}) - \mathcal{A}_v(\xi_i) \\ &= h_{\varphi_v(L_2)}(\xi_{i+1}) - h_{\tau_{i+1}^{2k}(L_0)}(\xi_{i+1}) + h_{\tau_i^{2k}(L_0)}(\xi_i) - h_{\varphi_v(L_2)}(\xi_i), \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{A}_v denotes the action functional associated to $CF(\tau_i^{2k}(L_0), \varphi_v(L_2))$.

We can now connect these spectral invariants to the Hofer distance in the usual way, i.e. by utilizing that the spectral invariants are 1-Lipschitz with respect to Hamiltonian perturbations of the Lagrangians (see Corollary 2.30). Assume $\psi \in \text{Ham}_c(T^*S^n)$ with $\psi(\varphi_v(L_2)) = \varphi_w(L_2)$. Then ψ induces a map $HF(\tau_i^{2k}(L_0), \varphi_v(L_2)) \rightarrow HF(\tau_i^{2k}(L_0), \varphi_w(L_2))$ on Floer homology that is an isomorphism of graded vector spaces. Thus, it has to map $\varphi_v^* \alpha$ to $\varphi_w^* \alpha$ for degree reasons. The Lipschitz property of the spectral invariants implies that for any class $\beta \in HF(\tau_i^{2k}(L_0), \varphi_v(L_2))$ we have

$$|c(\beta; HF(\tau_i^{2k}(L_0), \varphi_v(L_2))) - c(\psi^* \beta; HF(\tau_i^{2k}(L_0), \varphi_w(L_2)))| \leq \|\psi\|_{\text{Hofer}}.$$

Combining this with the fact that ψ was an arbitrary Hamiltonian diffeomorphism mapping $\varphi_v(L_2)$ to $\varphi_w(L_2)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |a_i(v) - a_i(w)| &\leq |c(\varphi_v^* \alpha_{i+1}; HF(\tau_i^{2k}(L_0), \varphi_v(L_2))) - c(\varphi_w^* \alpha_{i+1}; HF(\tau_i^{2k}(L_0), \varphi_w(L_2)))| \\ &\quad + |c(\varphi_v^* \alpha_i; HF(\tau_i^{2k}(L_0), \varphi_v(L_2))) - c(\varphi_w^* \alpha_i; HF(\tau_i^{2k}(L_0), \varphi_w(L_2)))| \\ &\leq 2d_{\text{Hofer}}(\varphi_v(L_2), \varphi_w(L_2)). \end{aligned}$$

We can compute the quantity on the left-hand side explicitly by using the construction of φ_v and φ_w . Namely, by using (4.1) we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} a_i(v) - a_i(w) &= (h_{\varphi_v(L_2)}(\xi_{i+1}) - h_{\tau_{i+1}^{2k}(L_0)}(\xi_{i+1}) + h_{\tau_i^{2k}(L_0)}(\xi_i) - h_{\varphi_v(L_2)}(\xi_i)) \\ &\quad - (h_{\varphi_w(L_2)}(\xi_{i+1}) - h_{\tau_{i+1}^{2k}(L_0)}(\xi_{i+1}) + h_{\tau_i^{2k}(L_0)}(\xi_i) - h_{\varphi_w(L_2)}(\xi_i)) \\ &= h_{\varphi_v(L_2)}(\xi_{i+1}) - h_{\varphi_v(L_2)}(\xi_i) - h_{\varphi_w(L_2)}(\xi_{i+1}) + h_{\varphi_w(L_2)}(\xi_i) \\ &= \int_0^{\|\xi_i^\sharp\|} \theta_v(s) ds - \int_0^{\|\xi_{i+1}^\sharp\|} \theta_v(s) ds + \int_0^{\|\xi_{i+1}^\sharp\|} \theta_w(s) ds - \int_0^{\|\xi_i^\sharp\|} \theta_w(s) ds \\ &= \int_{\|\xi_i^\sharp\|}^{\|\xi_{i+1}^\sharp\|} \theta_w(s) - \theta_v(s) ds = (w_{i+1} - v_{i+1}) \int_{\|\xi_i^\sharp\|}^{\|\xi_{i+1}^\sharp\|} \theta_{i+1}(s) \\ &= w_{i+1} - v_{i+1}, \end{aligned}$$

where we use that $\text{supp } \theta_{i+1} \subset [\|\xi_i^\sharp\|, \|\xi_{i+1}^\sharp\|]$. In the last step we use the normalization of θ . The above estimate together with $|a_i(v) - a_i(w)| \leq 2d_{\text{Hofer}}(\varphi_v(L_2), \varphi_w(L_2))$ this implies that

$$\frac{1}{2}|v_{i+1} - w_{i+1}| \leq d_{\text{Hofer}}(\varphi_v(L_2), \varphi_w(L_2)).$$

Since $i \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$ was arbitrary, this implies that

$$\frac{1}{2}\|v - w\|_\infty \leq d_{\text{Hofer}}(\varphi_v(L_2), \varphi_w(L_2)).$$

□

6. FINITE-DIMENSIONAL HOFER QUASI-FLATS

We will now prove a finite-dimensional version of Theorem 1.1. For this, we keep the setting of the previous sections. Recall, that this means that $(M^{2n}, \omega = d\lambda)$ is a Liouville domain with $2c_1(M) = 0$. Further, we assume that $L_0, L_1, L_2 \subset M$ is an A_3 -configuration of exact Lagrangian spheres. Alternatively, we allow $M = (T^*S^n, \lambda_{\text{taut}})$ with $L_0 = T_x^*S^n, L_1 = 0, L_2 = T_y^*S^n$, where $x, y \in S^n$ are distinct and not antipodal.

Lemma 5.1 already gives us one side of the inequality we need to obtain a Hofer quasi-flat. The following lemma, which can be proven by direct computation, gives the other:

Lemma 6.1. *Let $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be arbitrary. Then*

$$d_{\text{Hofer}}(\varphi_v(L_2), \varphi_w(L_2)) \leq 2\|v - w\|_1 \leq 2d\|v - w\|_\infty.$$

Proof. Let us consider the following family of autonomous Hamiltonians:

$$H_i^{v \rightarrow w} : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

$$(x, \xi_x) \mapsto \int_0^{\|\xi_x^\sharp\|} (w_i - v_i)\theta_i(t)dt,$$

for $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. They can be extended to all of M by a constant outside U . It is easy to check that

$$(\varphi_{H_d^{v \rightarrow w}} \circ \dots \circ \varphi_{H_1^{v \rightarrow w}})(\varphi_v(L_2)) = \varphi_w(L_2).$$

By the triangle inequality for the Hofer metric, this thus implies

$$(6.1) \quad d_{\text{Hofer}}(\varphi_v(L_2), \varphi_w(L_2)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^d \text{osc } H_i^{v \rightarrow w}.$$

We note that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{osc } H_i^{v \rightarrow w} &\leq 2 \max |H_i^{v \rightarrow w}| = 2 \max_{c>0} \left| \int_0^c (w_i - v_i)\theta_i(t)dt \right| \\ &\leq 2|w_i - v_i| \max_{c>0} \int_0^c \theta_i(t)dt = 2|v_i - w_i|. \end{aligned}$$

By plugging this into (6.1) we obtain

$$d_{\text{Hofer}}(\varphi_v(L_2), \varphi_w(L_2)) \leq 2\|v - w\|_1 \leq 2d\|v - w\|_\infty.$$

□

With this lemma in place, we can show the following finite-dimensional analogue of Theorem 1.1:

Theorem 6.2. *Let $(M, \omega = d\lambda)$ be a Liouville domain with $2c_1(M) = 0$ and $L_0, L_1, L_2 \subset M$ exact Lagrangian spheres in an A_3 -configuration. Further, let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ be arbitrary. Then there is a map*

$$\Phi : (\mathbb{R}^d, d_\infty) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{L}(L_2), d_{\text{Hofer}})$$

which is a quasi-isometric embedding with quasi-isometry constant $2d$, i.e. for any $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\frac{1}{2d}d_\infty(v, w) \leq d_{\text{Hofer}}(\Phi(v), \Phi(w)) \leq 2d \cdot d_\infty(v, w).$$

Proof. If $v, w \in \mathbb{R}$ are generic in the sense of Lemma 5.1, then we already obtain

$$\frac{1}{2d} \|v - w\|_\infty \leq d_{\text{Hofer}}(\varphi_v(L_2), \varphi_w(L_2)) \leq 2d \|v - w\|_\infty$$

from Lemma 5.1 and Lemma 6.1. For the general case we obtain the result by approximation. The assumption of being generic in Lemma 5.1 means that $\varphi_v(L_2) \pitchfork L_0$ and $\varphi_w(L_2) \pitchfork L_0$. Said condition can be interpreted geometrically using the construction of φ_v . It simply means that $2\pi v_i \neq \pm\delta \pmod{2\pi}$ and $2\pi w_i \neq \pm\delta \pmod{2\pi}$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. Thus, the set of exceptions is discrete. Assume $v^{(k)} \rightarrow v$ and $w^{(k)} \rightarrow w$ are sequences of generic points. Then by Lemma 6.1, $\varphi_{v^{(k)}}(L_2) \rightarrow \varphi_v(L_2)$ and $\varphi_{w^{(k)}}(L_2) \rightarrow \varphi_w(L_2)$ in the Hofer metric. Further,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2d} \|v - w\|_\infty &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2d} \|v^{(k)} - w^{(k)}\|_\infty \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} d_{\text{Hofer}}(\varphi_{v^{(k)}}(L_2), \varphi_{w^{(k)}}(L_2)) \\ &= d_{\text{Hofer}}(\varphi_v(L_2), \varphi_w(L_2)) \leq 2d \|v - w\|_\infty, \end{aligned}$$

where we apply Lemma 5.1 to all $(v^{(k)})_k$ and $(w^{(k)})_k$. \square

Remark 6.3. Given that we can find quasi-flats of any finite dimension, the question of a quasi-isometric embedding of \mathbb{R}^∞ into $\mathcal{L}(L_2)$ is natural to ask. The above construction does not give us such an embedding. Most obviously, it fails due to Lemma 6.1. Since the constant in Lemma 6.1 diverges as $d \rightarrow \infty$, the upper bound fails in the limit. However, even if we had a version of Lemma 6.1 with a constant independent of d , we would not obtain an infinite-dimensional Hofer flat by the method laid out above. Indeed, it is not possible to choose $0 < \hat{h}_0 < \check{h}_1 < \hat{h}_1 < \dots < 1$ in such a way that the construction from Section 3 applied to $0 < \hat{h}_0 < \check{h}_1 < \hat{h}_1 < \dots < \check{h}_d < \hat{h}_d < \check{h}_{d+1} < 1$ gives compatible results for all $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, it is not possible to pass to the limit. However, both of these problems can be fixed by using a slightly different geometric construction as shown in Section 7. One feature of this is, that we actually obtain two different families of finite-dimensional Hofer quasi-flats associated to the two methods of construction.

Remark 6.4. Finite-dimensional versions of Corollary 1.3 and Corollary 1.4 follow by the same proof as Theorem 6.2. Note that Corollary 1.4 is simply the local version and thus all arguments from Sections 4 and 5 apply. The case of the A_2 -plumbing can be obtained similarly directly. We can describe the plumbing A_2^n as the Liouville completion of the manifold obtained by attaching a handle to the boundary sphere of the fiber $D_y^* S^n \subset D^* S^n$ for some $y \in S^n$. We then let L_1 be the sphere resulting from this handle-attachment and L_0 a fiber over any point $x \in S^n \setminus \{y, -y\}$. Note that in the alternative — more standard — construction of gluing two disk cotangent bundles together via an identification that switches fiber and zero-section in a neighborhood of the gluing point, this L_1 corresponds to one of the zero-sections. The proof laid out above then gives the corresponding result for A_2^n , i.e. a finite-dimensional version of Corollary 1.3.

7. INFINITE-DIMENSIONAL HOFER QUASI-FLATS

We will now construct infinite-dimensional Hofer flats following up on Remark 6.3. For this we need to choose data as in Section 3 in a compatible way for all $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Choose $0 = \check{h}_0 < \hat{h}_0 < \check{h}_1 < \hat{h}_1 < \dots < 1$. In this case \hbar would be 0, so that we have to slightly modify the procedure given in Section 3. For any $i \in \mathbb{N}$ we choose a bump function $\theta_i \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}, [0, \infty))$ such that

- (1) the support of θ_i is contained in (\check{h}_i, \hat{h}_i) ;
- (2) the function θ_i has exactly one local maximum with value 2π and its derivative does not vanish elsewhere on the interior of its support;
- (3) $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \theta_i(t) dt = 1$.

For any $d \in \mathbb{N}$ we then construct a group homomorphism $\Phi^{(d)} : (\mathbb{R}^d, +) \rightarrow (\text{Ham}_c(M), \circ)$ as laid out in Section 3. By using compatible data as described above, we can achieve that for any $m > 0$, $\Phi^{(d+m)}((v_1, \dots, v_d, 0, \dots, 0)) = \Phi^{(d)}(v)$ for any $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Thus, by taking a direct limit, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi^{(\infty)} : \mathbb{R}^\infty &\hookrightarrow \text{Ham}_c(M) \\ v &\mapsto \varphi_v \end{aligned}$$

as a well-defined map. It remains to adapt the construction of our preferred Dehn twists. For this, we choose a function $\rho_i \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}, [0, \infty))$ for any $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that

- (1) ρ_i is monotone;
- (2) the function ρ_i is equal to π on an open interval that contains $(\infty, \check{h}_i]$;
- (3) the function ρ_i vanishes on an open interval that contains $[\hat{h}_{i+1}, \infty)$;

Then we denote the model Dehn twist defined using ρ_i by $\tau_i : M \rightarrow M$ for any $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$. As in Section 3, the supports of φ_v and τ_0^2, \dots are pairwise disjoint for any $v \in \mathbb{R}^\infty$.

Upon inspection of the proof of Lemma 5.1, we note that the above properties of $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_d$ and ρ_0, \dots, ρ_d are sufficient for the argument. Thus, since for any $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^\infty$ there is some $D \in \mathbb{N}$ with $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^D$, we can apply Lemma 5.1 to obtain the following corollary:

Corollary 7.1. *Let $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^\infty$ be generic. Then*

$$\frac{1}{2} \|v - w\|_\infty \leq d_{\text{Hofer}}(\Phi^{(\infty)}(v)(L_2), \Phi^{(\infty)}(w)(L_2)).$$

The proof of Lemma 6.1 however, as mentioned before, cannot be directly adapted since $\|\cdot\|_1$ and $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ are not equivalent norms on \mathbb{R}^∞ . The underlying reason is that the Hamiltonians used in the proof do not have disjoint supports. By using a trick, we can rectify this and give a — slightly different — construction for ∞ -dimensional flats. For this we first define the following map:

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma : \mathbb{R}^\infty &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\infty \\ v &\mapsto (v_1, -v_1, v_2, -v_2, \dots). \end{aligned}$$

We will later construct an explicit Hamiltonian isotopy from $(\Phi^{(\infty)} \circ \Sigma)(v)(L_2)$ to $(\Phi^{(\infty)} \circ \Sigma)(w)(L_2)$. Since neighboring radial bands are controlled by v_i and $-v_i$, we can decompose the Hamiltonian function generating this diffeomorphism into different Hamiltonians with pairwise disjoint support. See Figure 3 for a visualization of this idea. We also note that with Σ applied, the Hamiltonian diffeomorphism $(\Phi^{(\infty)} \circ \Sigma)(v)$ is similar to the reparametrizations of the geodesic flow used in [Ush14]. Using this strategy, we can show the following lemma, which directly implies Theorem 1.1. The proof of Corollary 1.3 and Corollary 1.4 is completely analogous in the respective setting.

Lemma 7.2. *For any $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^\infty$ we have*

$$\frac{1}{2} \|v - w\|_\infty \leq d_{\text{Hofer}}((\Phi^{(\infty)} \circ \Sigma)(v)(L_2), (\Phi^{(\infty)} \circ \Sigma)(w)(L_2)) \leq 2 \|v - w\|_\infty.$$




FIGURE 3. Sketch of Lagrangians obtained by applying $(\Phi^{(\infty)} \circ \Sigma)(v)$ to L_2 for different $v \in \mathbb{R}^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^\infty$. The support of the Hamiltonian function generating the diffeomorphism is marked in gray. Note that the different regions now have disjoint support (of the Hamiltonian not just the diffeomorphism) which was not the case for the earlier construction.

Proof. The left-hand side is easy to show. Note that $\|\Sigma v\|_\infty = \|v\|_\infty$. Thus, we can apply Corollary 7.1 together with an approximation argument as in the proof of Theorem 6.2.

It remains to show the right-hand inequality. For this we fix $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^\infty$ for the remainder of the proof. Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ be chosen such that $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Let us again start by considering the following family of autonomous compactly supported Hamiltonians:

$$H_i^{v \rightarrow w} : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

$$(x, \xi_x) \mapsto \int_0^{\|\xi_x\|} (w_i - v_i)\theta_{2i-1}(t) - (w_i - v_i)\theta_{2i}dt,$$

for $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. They can be extended to M by 0 outside U . Note that any $H_i^{v \rightarrow w}$ is supported in the interior of the radial band $[\hat{h}_{2i-1}, \hat{h}_{2i}]$, where the norm is taken with respect to the local model in U . We can explicitly compute the oscillation of $H_i^{v \rightarrow w}$ as

$$\text{osc } H_i^{v \rightarrow w} = |w_i - v_i|,$$

where we use that θ_{2i-1} and θ_{2i} have disjoint support and that $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \theta_{2i-1} = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \theta_{2i} = 1$. We can then define $H^{v \rightarrow w} := H_1^{v \rightarrow w} + \dots + H_d^{v \rightarrow w}$. By construction

$$\varphi_{H^{v \rightarrow w}}((\Phi^{(\infty)} \circ \Sigma)(v)(L_2)) = (\Phi^{(\infty)} \circ \Sigma)(w)(L_2).$$

Now since all $H_1^{v \rightarrow w}, \dots, H_d^{v \rightarrow w}$ have pairwise disjoint support, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{osc } H^{v \rightarrow w} &\leq 2 \max_{i \in \{1, \dots, d\}} (\text{osc } H_i^{v \rightarrow w}) = 2 \max_{i \in \{1, \dots, d\}} (|v_i - w_i|) \\ &= 2\|v - w\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $d_{\text{Hofer}}((\Phi^{(\infty)} \circ \Sigma)(v)(L_2), (\Phi^{(\infty)} \circ \Sigma)(w)(L_2)) \leq 2\|v - w\|_\infty$ and the proof is complete since $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^\infty$ were arbitrary. \square

Remark 7.3. To conclude Corollary 1.2 it is sufficient to notice two things. Firstly, the quasi-isometric embedding is of course given by $\Psi := \Phi^{(\infty)} \circ \Sigma : \mathbb{R}^\infty \hookrightarrow \text{Ham}_c(M)$. We notice immediately that for any $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^\infty$,

$$\frac{1}{2}\|v - w\|_\infty \leq d_{\text{Hofer}}(\Psi^{(\infty)}(v)(L_2), \Psi^{(\infty)}(w)(L_2)) \leq \|\Psi^{(\infty)}(w)(\Psi^{(\infty)}(v))^{-1}\|_{\text{Hofer}}.$$

Secondly, notice that the Hamiltonian $H^{v \rightarrow w}$ constructed above actually generates $\Psi^{(\infty)}(w)(\Psi^{(\infty)}(v))^{-1}$. Thus, by the computation from the last proof,

$$\|\Psi^{(\infty)}(w)(\Psi^{(\infty)}(v))^{-1}\|_{\text{Hofer}} \leq 2\|v - w\|_\infty,$$

which implies Corollary 1.2.

8. APPLICATIONS TO THE BOUNDARY DEPTH

Given that we computed all indices and actions for the generators of $CF(\tau_i^k(L_0), \varphi_v(L_2))$, we can also make some conclusions about the boundary depth of this complex. Here it suffices to work with $d = 1$ to obtain the desired conclusions. So, we fix some data as in Section 3 and keep the notation of the previous sections. We will now consider the specific Floer complex $CF(L_0, \varphi_{(k)}(L_2))$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. First, we want to note that we can describe the intersection points $L_0 \cap \varphi_{(k)}(L_2)$ explicitly. Indeed, they are characterized by the fact that for $\xi \in L_0 \cap \varphi_{(k)}(L_2)$ we have

$$(8.1) \quad k \cdot \theta_1(\|\xi^\sharp\|) = \delta + 2\pi \cdot m$$

$$(8.2) \quad k \cdot \theta_1(\|\xi^\sharp\|) = 2\pi - \delta + 2\pi \cdot m,$$

where the norms are again taken with respect to the round metric in the local model induced by the framing of L_1 . Note that both for (8.1) and (8.2) we want to allow $m = 0$. We consider both equations as equations in a formal variable. By the choice of θ we know that both equations will each have $2k$ solutions. Of those there will be k solutions with values below $\check{h}_1 + \frac{\hbar}{2}$ and k with values above $\check{h}_1 + \frac{\hbar}{2}$. Denote the solution to $k\theta_1(t) = \delta + 2\pi \cdot m$ with $t < \check{h}_1 + \frac{\hbar}{2}$ by $\check{t}_{k,m}^+$. Such a solution will exist for all $m \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}$. Similarly, we denote the solutions with $t > \check{h}_1 + \frac{\hbar}{2}$ by $\hat{t}_{k,m}^+$. Thus, we get

$$\check{t}_{k,0}^+ < \dots < \check{t}_{k,k-1}^+ < \check{h}_1 + \frac{\hbar}{2} < \hat{t}_{k,k-1}^+ < \dots < \hat{t}_{k,0}^+.$$

For the solutions of $k\theta_1(t) = 2\pi - \delta + 2\pi \cdot m$ we follow the same naming scheme. Namely, we obtain the solutions

$$\check{t}_{k,0}^- < \dots < \check{t}_{k,k-1}^- < \check{h}_1 + \frac{\hbar}{2} < \hat{t}_{k,k-1}^- < \dots < \hat{t}_{k,0}^-,$$

which satisfy $k\theta_1(\hat{t}_{k,m}^-) = k\theta_1(\check{t}_{k,m}^-) = 2\pi - \delta + 2\pi m$. See Figure 4 for a visualization.

After these preparatory remarks, we can show the following lemma which directly implies Theorem 1.5.

Lemma 8.1. *With the notation established above, $\beta(\text{HF}(\tau_1^\ell(L_2), \varphi_{(k)}(L_0))) \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ where $\ell \in 2\mathbb{N}_0$ is fixed.*




FIGURE 4. An illustration of the ordering of the $\check{t}_{k,m}^\pm$ and $\hat{t}_{k,m}^\pm$ for $k = 3$.

Proof. First, we note the following fact: Since $\theta'|_{(l, \frac{h}{2})} > 0$ and $\theta'|_{(\frac{h}{2}, h-l)} < 0$ we have $\check{t}_{k,0}^\pm > \check{t}_{k+1,0}^\pm$ and $\hat{t}_{k+1,0}^\pm > \hat{t}_{k,0}^\pm$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular, $\check{t}_{1,0}^\pm > \check{t}_{k,0}^\pm$ and $\hat{t}_{k,0}^\pm > \hat{t}_{1,0}^\pm$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Assume that $\partial\check{c}_{k,0}^+ = \hat{c}_{k,0}^+$ and $\partial\hat{c}_{k,0}^+ = 0$. Under our assumption the barcode of $HF(\tau_1^\ell(L_2), \varphi_{(k)}(L_0))$ must contain a bar of length $\mathcal{A}(\check{c}_{k,0}^+) - \mathcal{A}(\hat{c}_{k,0}^+)$. This implies that $\beta(HF(\tau_1^\ell(L_2), \varphi_{(k)}(L_0))) \geq \mathcal{A}(\check{c}_{k,0}^+) - \mathcal{A}(\hat{c}_{k,0}^+)$. Given that we have explicit primitives for λ on the relevant Lagrangians, we can compute this bound explicitly. By using (4.1) and (4.2) we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}(\check{c}_{k,0}^+) - \mathcal{A}(\hat{c}_{k,0}^+) &= h_{\varphi_{(k)}(L_0)}(\check{c}_{k,0}^+) - h_{\tau_1^\ell(L_2)}(\check{c}_{k,0}^+) - (h_{\varphi_{(k)}(L_0)}(\hat{c}_{k,0}^+) - h_{\tau_1^\ell(L_2)}(\hat{c}_{k,0}^+)) \\ &= h_{\varphi_{(k)}(L_0)}(\check{c}_{k,0}^+) - f(\check{c}_{k,0}^+) - (h_{\varphi_{(k)}(L_0)}(\hat{c}_{k,0}^+) - f(\hat{c}_{k,0}^+)) \\ &= \delta(\check{t}_{k,0}^+ - \hat{t}_{k,0}^+) + k \int_{\check{t}_{k,0}^+}^{\hat{t}_{k,0}^+} \theta_1(s) ds \end{aligned}$$

Note that by construction $\theta_1|_{[\check{t}_{k,0}^+, \hat{t}_{k,0}^+]} \geq \delta$. Thus, the last expression is always strictly positive. That is not quite enough for the desired conclusion yet. By using $\check{t}_{1,0}^\pm > \check{t}_{k,0}^\pm$ and $\hat{t}_{k,0}^\pm > \hat{t}_{1,0}^\pm$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we can make the following estimate:

$$\mathcal{A}(\check{c}_{k,0}^+) - \mathcal{A}(\hat{c}_{k,0}^+) = k \int_{\check{t}_{k,0}^+}^{\hat{t}_{k,0}^+} \theta_1(s) ds - \delta(\hat{t}_{k,0}^+ - \check{t}_{k,0}^+) \geq k \int_{\hat{t}_{1,0}^+}^{\hat{t}_{k,0}^+} \theta_1(s) ds - \delta(\hat{t}_{1,0}^+ - \check{t}_{1,0}^+).$$

Clearly, this implies the conclusion, i.e. $\beta(HF(\tau_1^\ell(L_2), \varphi_{(k)}(L_0))) \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Thus, it remains to show that $\partial\check{c}_{k,0}^+ = \hat{c}_{k,0}^+$ and $\partial\hat{c}_{k,0}^+ = 0$. By Lemma 4.1 we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\check{c}_{k,j}^+) &= 1 - (n-1) \cdot 2j & \mu(\hat{c}_{k,j}^+) &= -(n-1) \cdot 2j \\ \mu(\check{c}_{k,j}^-) &= 1 - (n-1) \cdot (2j+1) & \mu(\hat{c}_{k,j}^-) &= -(n-1) \cdot (2j+1). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4.2 further implies that all other intersection points have a degree above $n \geq 1$. We first consider the case $n = 1$. The possible pseudoholomorphic disks in that case are easy to understand. We can see from the open mapping theorem, that such disks can only connect $\hat{c}_{k,m}^+$ with $\check{c}_{k,m}^+$ and $\hat{c}_{k,m}^-$ with $\check{c}_{k,m}^-$ for $m \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}$. See Figure 5 for a visualization. By counting these disks, we directly see that $\partial\check{c}_{k,0}^+ = \hat{c}_{k,0}^+$.




FIGURE 5. Some holomorphic disks with boundary on L_0 and $\varphi_{(3)}(L_2)$. All other holomorphic disks are analogous.

Next, we assume that $n > 2$. In this case we obtain the result purely for degree reasons. By Lemma 4.1 we know that $\check{c}_{k,0}^+$ lives in degree 1. Compare the formula for all degrees given above. All terms appearing in $\partial\check{c}_{k,0}^+$ thus have to live in degree 0. Since the homology of the complex has to vanish in degree $1 < n$, this boundary must be non-trivial. Using the assumption that $n - 1 > 1$ and Lemma 4.1 we conclude that there is only a single generator of the correct degree, namely $\hat{c}_{k,0}^+$. Thus, $\partial\check{c}_{k,0}^+ = \hat{c}_{k,0}^+$ as claimed.

The last remaining case is $n = 2$. Here, the degrees are not sufficient to give us the result. We still get that $\partial\check{c}_{k,0}^+$ has to be non-zero for degree reasons. However, while the homologically non-trivial intersection points still live in other degrees (i.e. degrees $\geq n$), degree 0 no longer contains a single generator. The following table illustrates the situation:

degree	generators
1	$\check{c}_{k,0}^+$
0	$\hat{c}_{k,0}^+, \check{c}_{k,0}^-$
-1	$\hat{c}_{k,0}^-, \check{c}_{k,1}^+$
\vdots	\dots

Thus, $\partial\check{c}_{k,0}^+ = \hat{c}_{k,0}^+$, $\partial\check{c}_{k,0}^+ = \hat{c}_{k,0}^+ + \check{c}_{k,0}^-$ or $\partial\check{c}_{k,0}^+ = \check{c}_{k,0}^-$ could hold. Note that by the piecewise monotonicity of θ_1 and since $\delta < 2\pi - \delta$, we have $\check{t}_{k,0}^+ < \check{t}_{k,0}^-$. See Figure 4 for a visualization. By computing the action, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}(\check{c}_{k,0}^-) &= h_{\varphi_{(k)}(L_0)}(\check{c}_{k,0}^-) - f(\check{c}_{k,0}^-) = (2\pi - \delta)\check{t}_{k,0}^- - k \int_0^{\check{t}_{k,0}^-} \theta_1(s) ds \\
&= (2\pi - \delta)\check{t}_{k,0}^- - k \left(\int_0^{\check{t}_{k,0}^+} \theta_1(s) ds + \int_{\check{t}_{k,0}^+}^{\check{t}_{k,0}^-} \theta_1(s) ds \right) \\
&= \mathcal{A}(\check{c}_{k,0}^+) + \underbrace{(2\pi - \delta)\check{t}_{k,0}^- - \delta\check{t}_{k,0}^+ - k \int_{\check{t}_{k,0}^+}^{\check{t}_{k,0}^-} \theta_1(s) ds}_{\geq 0} \\
&\geq \mathcal{A}(\check{c}_{k,0}^+).
\end{aligned}$$

Here we use the piecewise monotonicity of θ_1 again, which implies that the image of $k \cdot \theta_1|_{[\check{y}_{k,0}^+, \check{y}_{k,0}^-]}$ lies in $[\delta, 2\pi - \delta]$. Since the boundary operator is action decreasing and $\check{c}_{k,0}^+$ is the only generator of degree 1, this implies $\check{c}_{k,0}^- \notin \text{im } \partial$. Thus, by the above, $\partial \check{c}_{k,0}^+ = \hat{c}_{k,0}^+$ and the proof is complete. \square

REFERENCES

- [BC22] Paul Biran and Octav Cornea. Bounds on the Lagrangian spectral metric in cotangent bundles. *Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici*, 96(4):631–691, January 2022.
- [Dui76] J. J Duistermaat. On the Morse index in variational calculus. *Advances in Mathematics*, 21(2):173–195, August 1976.
- [FOOO10] Kenji Fukaya, Yong-Geun Oh, Hiroshi Ohta, and Kaoru Ono. *Lagrangian Intersection Floer Theory, Part 1: Anomaly and Obstruction, Part I*, volume 46.1 of *AMS/IP Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, June 2010.
- [FOOO11] Kenji Fukaya, Yong-Geun Oh, Hiroshi Ohta, and Kaoru Ono. Displacement of polydisks and Lagrangian Floer theory, April 2011. arXiv:1104.4267.
- [FS05] U. Frauenfelder and F. Schlenk. Volume growth in the component of the Dehn–Seidel twist. *Geometric & Functional Analysis GAFA*, 15(4):809–838, August 2005.
- [FZ24] Qi Feng and Jun Zhang. Spectrally-large scale geometry in cotangent bundles, January 2024. arXiv:2401.17590.
- [Gon23] Wenmin Gong. On a variant of Viterbo’s conjecture, September 2023. arXiv:2307.02290.
- [Lec08] Rémi Leclercq. Spectral invariants in lagrangian floer theory. *Journal of Modern Dynamics*, 2(2):249–286, 2008.
- [MS98] Dusa McDuff and Dietmar Salamon. *Introduction to Symplectic Topology*. Oxford Mathematical Monographs. Oxford University Press, second edition edition, 1998.
- [Oh05] Yong-Geun Oh. Spectral invariants, analysis of the Floer moduli space, and geometry of the Hamiltonian diffeomorphism group. *Duke Math. J.*, 130(2):199–295, 2005.
- [PRSZ20] Leonid Polterovich, Daniel Rosen, Karina Samvelyan, and Jun Zhang. *Topological persistence in geometry and analysis*. University lecture series volume 74. American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island, 2020.
- [PS23] Leonid Polterovich and Egor Shelukhin. Lagrangian configurations and hamiltonian maps. *Compositio Mathematica*, 159(12):2483–2520, 2023.
- [Py08] Pierre Py. Quelques plats pour la métrique de hofer. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, 2008(620):185–193, 2008.
- [RS93] Joel Robbin and Dietmar Salamon. The Maslov index for paths. *Topology*, 32(4):827–844, 1993.
- [RS95] Joel Robbin and Dietmar Salamon. The Spectral Flow and the Maslov Index. *Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society*, 27(1):1–33, January 1995.
- [Sch00] Matthias Schwarz. On the action spectrum for closed symplectically aspherical manifolds. *Pacific J. Math.*, 193(2):419–461, 2000.
- [Sei00] Paul Seidel. Graded lagrangian submanifolds. *Bulletin de la Société Mathématique de France*, 128(1):103–149, 2000.
- [Sei07] Paul Seidel. A biased view of symplectic cohomology, April 2007. arXiv:0704.2055.
- [Sei08] Paul Seidel. *Fukaya categories and Picard-Lefschetz theory*. Zurich Lectures in Advanced Mathematics. European Mathematical Society, Zürich, 2008.
- [Ush08] Michael Usher. Spectral numbers in floer theories. *Compositio Mathematica*, 144(6):1581–1592, 2008.
- [Ush13] Michael Usher. Hofer’s metrics and boundary depth. *Annales scientifiques de l’École Normale Supérieure*, 46(1):57–129, 2013.
- [Ush14] Michael Usher. Hofer Geometry and cotangent fibers. *Journal of Symplectic Geometry*, 12(3):619 – 656, 2014.
- [Zap13] Frol Zapolsky. On the Hofer geometry for weakly exact Lagrangian submanifolds. *Journal of Symplectic Geometry*, 11(3):475–488, August 2013.

DEPARTMENT OF PURE MATHEMATICS AND MATHEMATICAL STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

Email address: apd55@cam.ac.uk