

# COUNTING BARE CURVES

TOBIAS EKHOLM AND VIVEK SHENDE

ABSTRACT. We construct a class of perturbations of the Cauchy-Riemann equation for maps from curves to a Calabi-Yau threefold, allowing Maslov zero Lagrangian boundary conditions. Our perturbations vanish on components of zero symplectic area. For generic 1-parameter families of perturbations, the locus of solution curves without zero-area components is compact, transversely cut out, and satisfies certain natural coherence properties. In short, we construct an ‘adequate perturbation scheme’ with the needed properties to set up the skein-valued curve counting, as axiomatized in our previous work [8].

The main technical content is the construction, over the Hofer-Wysocki-Zehnder Gromov-Witten configuration spaces, of perturbations to which the ‘ghost bubble censorship’ argument can be applied. Certain local aspects of this problem were resolved in our previous work [11]. The key remaining difficulty is to ensure inductive compatibilities, despite the non-existence of marked-point-forgetting maps for the configuration spaces.

---

TE is supported by the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation and the Swedish Research Council.

V.S. is supported by Villum Fonden Villum Investigator grant 37814, Novo Nordisk Foundation grant NNF20OC0066298, and Danish National Research Foundation grant DNRF157.

# Contents

<b>1.</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	3
<b>2.</b>	<b>Methods and difficulties</b>	6
<b>3.</b>	<b>Curves, maps, and regularity conditions</b>	8
3.1.	Notation for functional analytic norms . . . . .	8
3.2.	Bordered, noded, surfaces . . . . .	9
3.3.	Stable curves and maps . . . . .	10
3.4.	Ghosts and bare maps . . . . .	10
3.5.	Holomorphic polar coordinates . . . . .	11
3.6.	Regularity conditions . . . . .	12
<b>4.</b>	<b>The configuration space of maps from curves with boundary</b>	14
4.1.	Gluing . . . . .	14
4.2.	Stable map moduli . . . . .	17
4.3.	The bundle of complex anti-linear differentials and the $\bar{\partial}_J$ -section . . . . .	18
4.4.	Gluing and anti-gluing for sections . . . . .	20
4.5.	Index bundles and orientations of $\mathbf{W}$ . . . . .	21
<b>5.</b>	<b>Basic perturbations</b>	22
<b>6.</b>	<b>Transversality and genericity at bare maps</b>	24
6.1.	Transversality at one map . . . . .	24
6.2.	Transversality on the bare locus . . . . .	25
6.3.	Additional Fredholm problems . . . . .	26
6.4.	Generic 0- and 1-parameter families . . . . .	28
6.5.	Stability of transverse solutions . . . . .	29
<b>7.</b>	<b>Ghost bubble censorship</b>	29
7.1.	Control near ghosts and ghost bubble formation . . . . .	29
7.2.	Constructing sections controlled near ghosts . . . . .	32
7.3.	Forgetful mismatch . . . . .	34
7.4.	Error estimate . . . . .	35
<b>8.</b>	<b>Extensions of basic perturbations</b>	35
8.1.	Cutoff adapted to a stratification . . . . .	36
8.2.	Coordinate corner structures and versal families of curves . . . . .	36
8.3.	Marked curves . . . . .	38
8.4.	Compatible choices of disks for gluing . . . . .	39
8.5.	Extending basic perturbations, I . . . . .	40
8.6.	Asymptotic constant charts . . . . .	41
8.7.	Extending basic perturbations, II: cutoffs . . . . .	42
<b>9.</b>	<b>Main results</b>	45
	<b>References</b>	48

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The moduli of pseudo-holomorphic stable maps from possibly nodal Riemann surfaces is not the closure of the locus of maps from smooth surfaces. There are other components, and, for enumerative problems, it is natural to ask whether contributions from the different components can be meaningfully separated, or, more generally, whether contributions from maps with various other geometric properties can be separated. In particular, a holomorphic map  $u: S \rightarrow X$  leads to infinitely many others obtained by composition with some ramified cover  $S' \rightarrow S$ , and/or attaching new irreducible components collapsed by the map (we call the latter *ghost bubbles*, and say that a map without ghost bubbles is *bare*). Of particular interest is the case of Calabi-Yau 3-folds, where many authors have been interested in separating these two contributions out of the Gromov-Witten invariants, leaving some more primitive invariant [13, 23, 20, 3, 28].

A starting point for approaching this problem is to ask whether, as the almost complex structure  $J$  varies in a 1-parameter families, a family of  $J$ -holomorphic curves without any multiple covers or ghost bubbles can limit to a curve with these behaviors. In fact, multiple covers do generically appear in such families; see for instance [20, 1], and more sophisticated ideas are required to account for their contributions. However, in situations where multiple covers are excluded a priori, e.g., for topological reasons, it is possible to exclude ghost bubble formation, as has been observed and used by many authors [19, 38, 24, 8, 5].

In [8], we used this idea in the context of a study of the wall-crossing behavior of counts of pseudoholomorphic curves in a Calabi-Yau 3-fold with Maslov zero Lagrangian boundary conditions. Let us recall the “ghost bubble censorship” argument in this context.

It is well known that, for generic  $J$ , all generically immersed (non multiply covered) holomorphic curves in a Calabi-Yau threefold  $X$  with Lagrangian boundary  $L$  are in fact embedded in  $X$  and have interior disjoint from  $L$  (we call them *0-generic*). Similarly, for 1-parameter families in general position there are isolated instances of non-embeddings with the following codimension one degeneracies (we call them *1-generic*): boundary nodes, or general position double points at the boundary or interior crossings with  $L$ . Consider a family of maps  $u_t: S_t \hookrightarrow X$ , say  $J_t$ -holomorphic, that has Gromov limit some  $J_0$ -holomorphic map  $u_0: S_0 \rightarrow X$ . It can be shown that if  $S_0$  has a ghost component, then the non-ghost part must exhibit some codimension  $> 1$  singular behavior at the attaching point(s) of the ghost component. On the other hand, as we have chosen  $J_t$  generically and have (by hypothesis) no possibility of multiple covers, the non-ghost part is 1-generic and then does in fact *not* have such high codimension degeneracies.

That is, the ghost bubble censorship excludes the potential wall-crossing where a smooth curve degenerates to a curve with a (boundary) ghost bubble attached. Using this, we showed in [8] that the wall crossings which do appear can be identified with the framed HOMFLYPT skein relations from quantum topology, and, consequently, that there is a deformation invariant count of open curves *valued in the skein module* of the Lagrangian boundary. This is a rigorous mathematical shadow of the idea that Lagrangian branes in the topological A-model should carry the Chern-Simons quantum field theory where holomorphic curves ending on them should introduce line defects [35]. We used this result to establish a prediction of Ooguri and Vafa [25]: the HOMFLYPT invariant of a knot is equal to a count of curves on a certain Lagrangian (depending on the knot) in the resolved conifold. This was possible because the relevant curves for this problem were somewhere-injective for topological reasons.

More precisely, in [8] we set up the skein-valued curve counting conditional on the existence of a class of perturbations satisfying certain axiomatics, and checked that in the somewhere-injective setting, choosing generic  $J$  already provided the desired perturbations. By now, some further works using the (hitherto conditional) setup of [8] have appeared, in particular our [9, 10] establishing the full Ooguri-Vafa conjecture relating curve counts and all colored HOMFLYPT invariants, and [31, 32, 17] concerning the appearance of skein-valued cluster algebra associated to Legendrian mutations.

The main result of the present article is a generalization of the bubble censorship argument to the situation where holomorphic curves may be multiply covered. We show that, for any fixed curve class in a Calabi-Yau threefold  $X$ , with (possibly empty) Maslov zero Lagrangian boundary condition  $L$ , it is possible to construct perturbations so that the moduli of solutions to the perturbed equation  $\bar{\partial}_J u = \lambda(u)$  separate into two kinds: (1) embedded, transversely cut out solutions, with interior disjoint from  $L$  and (2) solutions with ghost bubbles. Moreover, our perturbations will still permit a version of the ghost bubble censorship argument, and so ensure that the separation between these two classes is preserved in 1-parameter families.

We work in the Hofer-Wysocki-Zehnder ‘polyfold’ setting, which we review in Section 4. The main result of the paper is the following:

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $X$  be a Calabi-Yau 3-fold, and  $L \subset X$  a (possibly empty) Lagrangian submanifold of Maslov index zero. Fix a class  $d \in H_2(X, L)$ , and choose some integer  $\chi_{\min}$ . We write  $\mathbf{Z}$  for the [15] configuration space of maps realizing class  $d$  with possibly disconnected domain of formal Euler characteristic  $\geq \chi_{\min}$  and  $\mathbf{W}$  for the bundle of formal complex anti-linear differentials over  $\mathbf{Z}$ .*

*Then there is a (weighed multi-)section  $\lambda$  of  $\mathbf{W} \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$  with the following properties. For any stable map  $(u, S)$ ,  $\lambda(u)$  vanishes on any irreducible component of  $S$  with zero symplectic area and there is a neighborhood  $N(L)$  of  $L \subset X$  such that  $\lambda(u)$  vanishes at any point mapping to  $N(L)$ . All bare solutions to  $\bar{\partial}_J u = \lambda(u)$  are 0-generic and transversely cut out, and the locus of bare solutions is compact.*

*Moreover, amongst the sections constructed in this manner, any two may be connected by a 1-parameter family of sections, again vanishing on components of zero symplectic area and in  $N(L)$ , such that all bare solutions are 1-generic and transversely cut out, the locus of bare solutions is compact, and a bare curve is a solution if and only if its normalization is.*

The construction of the multisection  $\lambda$  is carried out in Sections 5 and 8. Theorem 1.1 is proved in Section 9.

*Remark 1.2.* Let us emphasize that Theorem 1.1 concerns maps of fixed degree and makes no claims whatsoever about how the solutions which arise from perturbing multiply covered curves relate with the original unperturbed multiple cover, or whether or not they stay together in families, etc.

Questions around multiple covers have been studied in many other works, most notably in the work of Ionel and Parker [20] where they established the Gopakumar-Vafa integrality conjecture. Note however that their proof does not (as one might have naively hoped) show how to identify the GV invariants with some count of simpler embedded curves and does not separate in families the contributions from embedded curves and multiple covers. We refer to [1] for further discussion and a detailed study in the case of double covers.

*Remark 1.3.* Restricting attention to the case of closed curves, Theorem 1.1 provides a differential-geometric definition of an all-genus version of Zinger’s ‘reduced’ Gromov-Witten invariants, which were conjectured to exist in [22] following the genus one work of [37, 36].

The desired properties of the reduced invariants are that they (1) in some sense count only the contributions of the component of the stable map moduli space arising as the closure of maps from smooth curves and (2) are related to usual Gromov-Witten invariants by counting a ‘reduced’ map from a domain of Euler characteristic  $\chi$  by  $(e^{g_s/2} - e^{-g_s/2})^{-\chi}$ , where  $g_s$  is the usual Gromov-Witten genus counting variable. There is an existing algebraic approach [18, 29], which provides an all-genus definition for complete intersections that meaningfully satisfies (1), but is only known to satisfy (2) in genus 1, by the earlier works of Zinger. (We refer also to [29] for a recent collection of references to other works in this direction.)

We discard all contributions from curves with ghost components, making contact with (1). Let us explain why we do not yet know how to establish (2) for our invariants.

While Theorem 1.1 does not make any assertion regarding the solutions with ghost components, we do show in the process of the proof that any such solution has bare part very near to (but not generally identical with) a unique bare solution. The most straightforward way to establish (2) would be if we could show that the (well defined) moduli space of solutions-with-ghosts associated to some given bare curve  $C$  is in fact obtained by taking a section  $\lambda_C$  such that  $\bar{\partial} - \lambda_C$  vanishes with Bott degeneracies along the locus of maps obtained by attaching ghosts to  $C$ , and then perturbing further. It would then follow from [26] that the closed Gromov-Witten count of curves is given by counting each bare solution by the expected formula  $(e^{g_s/2} - e^{-g_s/2})^{-\chi}$ .

Note however that such a perturbation  $\lambda_C$  does not in fact appear in our inductive procedure, proximally because of e.g. the second term in Equation (2.1) in Example 2.1 below, which was introduced ultimately because of the non-existence of marked-point-forgetting maps in the [15] setup.

*Remark 1.4.* Doan and Walpulski have proposed a ‘symplectic Donaldson-Thomas theory’ [4], where one studies pairs of holomorphic curves and solutions to the abelian vortex equations on them. Using the ghost bubble censorship argument, they showed that the result is well defined when multiple covers can be excluded a priori. They envision cancelling multiple cover issues by using higher rank vortices. We note that with perturbations as described here, one can avoid multiple covers altogether. It would follow from a substantiation of the previous remark that the resulting count agrees with the Gromov-Witten count under the GW/DT change of variable of [23].

It would then follow from the (now established [28]) GW/DT correspondence that the resulting ‘symplectic DT invariant’ agrees with the usual DT invariant, when the latter is defined. This is, of course, a morally circular argument: one main reason to define the symplectic DT invariant was in the hope that one could prove a priori its agreement with the usual DT theory, and then use the freedom of symplectic geometry to deform to a situation where the GW/DT correspondence could be more readily established. Here, we are saying that, now that the GW/DT correspondence is known, one can compare a ‘symplectic DT’ theory to the usual DT theory by going to GW theory on both sides.

**Acknowledgements.** We thank Shaoyun Bai, Kenji Fukaya, Penka Georgieva, Melissa Liu, Cristina Manolache, John Pardon, Jake Solomon, and Aleksey Zinger for helpful discussions.

## 2. METHODS AND DIFFICULTIES

This section gives brief motivations and context for, and outlines of, several of the constructions in our perturbation scheme.

As explained in Section 1, we will have to perturb the Cauchy-Riemann equations in the presence of multiple covers. Various setups were developed for this purpose [30, 15, 12, 27]; we will work in the Hofer-Wysocki-Zehnder ‘polyfold’ framework [16]. Here, the moduli spaces of interest are cut out of infinite dimensional ‘configuration’ spaces  $\mathbf{Z}$ , parameterizing not-necessarily-holomorphic maps from complex curves, by sections of infinite dimensional bundles  $\mathbf{W} \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$ , with fiber at  $u: S \rightarrow X$  being an appropriate functional-analytic space of sections of  $u^*TX \otimes \Omega_S^{0,1}$ . While the configuration spaces are built from Banach spaces, the notion of differentiability is *not* the classical notion. Instead, the Banach spaces are equipped with a filtration (typically the Banach space is of some functional analytic origin and the filtration is by regularity of functions) and, at each filtration level, differentiability is required only with respect to functions of strictly greater regularity. This notion is called ‘sc-differentiability’, and satisfies usual properties of calculus.

The use of the sc-calculus to study holomorphic curve theory leads to two key points. The first is that reparameterization of holomorphic curves is a sc-smooth action, hence one can form good quotients. The second is that one can construct a configuration space of maps from a versal deformation of a nodal domain which is a retract of a sc-smooth space [14]. (We recall some aspects of this procedure in Section 4 below.) Unlike in the usual calculus, sc-Banach spaces may admit retracts which are not themselves locally modeled on sc-Banach spaces; by idempotent completion, the operations of calculus may be extended to such retracts [16]. E.g., the tangent space to a retract is by definition the image of the differential of the retraction.

These properties allow the construction of a configuration space  $\mathbf{Z}$  of maps which has already built in the analysis of Gromov compactness and Floer gluing [14, 15]. In fact this configuration space is a groupoid in the category of sc-smooth retracts; the groupoidal aspects do not essentially differ from working with groupoids in other categories, and we will not emphasize them in the discussion here.

To construct transversely cut out moduli spaces, one needs also a sufficiently large class of perturbations to which elliptic bootstrapping applies (‘sc<sup>+</sup>-sections’). Then, as the Cauchy-Riemann operator is a Fredholm section of sc-Banach bundles, the zero set of the the perturbed operator consists of smooth functions. Such perturbations are also provided by [15].

For our purposes here, it is necessary to adapt the methods of [15] in two ways.

The first, in view of our desired applications, is that we must generalize the constructions of [15] to allow for Lagrangian boundary conditions. This can be done in a fairly straightforward manner using standard techniques for adapting holomorphic curve arguments to allow boundary conditions (see e.g., [6, Section 5.2]). With these modifications the original arguments of [15] may be repeated verbatim in the presence of boundary conditions. We give the statements and explain the necessary modifications to the proofs in Section 4 below.

The second, and more fundamental, is that we are not in fact interested in transverse sections  $\lambda$  of  $\mathbf{W} \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$ . Instead, we want to produce a (multi)section  $\lambda$  with the property that for a map  $u: S \rightarrow X$ , the value of  $\lambda(u)$  (recall,  $\lambda(u)$  is a section of a bundle over  $S$ ) vanishes on all components of  $S$  with zero symplectic area and at points mapping into a neighborhood  $N(L)$  of  $L$ . For such  $\lambda(u)$ , any solution to  $\bar{\partial}_J u = \lambda(u)$  will contract all zero

area components and the tangent spaces to  $u$  along any boundary component are  $J$ -complex lines.

To obtain the contradiction in the ghost bubble censorship argument, discussed in Section 1, we also need two additional properties of the section  $\lambda$ : if a sequence of bare solutions to  $\bar{\partial}_J u = \lambda(u)$  converges to a solution with ghost bubbles, the bare part of the limit has some singular behavior (that makes it non 1-generic) and bare parts of solutions in 0- and 1-parameter families in general position are 0-generic and 1-generic, respectively.

Here, the notions of singular (and 0- and 1-generic) is necessarily more subtle than previously: since we are solving a perturbed equation  $\bar{\partial}_J u = \lambda(u)$ , in general with  $\lambda(u)$  supported where the bubble is forming, we cannot expect  $du = 0$  at this point. We have however shown in [11] that, at least locally in moduli, there is a class of perturbations for which bare curves at which a ghost bubbled off are non 1-generic, with the singularity condition imposed only on the holomorphic derivative  $\partial_J u$ . The main work of the present article consists in showing that the perturbations of [11] can be constructed globally over the configuration space  $\mathbf{Z}$ , in such a way as to guarantee that ghost bubble censorship holds.

Underwriting the ghost bubble argument in the holomorphic case is the fact that if  $u: S \rightarrow X$  is holomorphic, then the normalization (separate all nodes)  $\tilde{u}: \tilde{S} \rightarrow X$  is also holomorphic. Unfortunately, it is not clear how to produce sections  $\lambda$  of  $\mathbf{W} \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$  so that the solutions to  $\bar{\partial}_J u = \lambda(u)$  have the same property. The basic problem is that the configuration spaces of [15] *do not* admit maps which ‘forget a marked point’, which, together with the maps which glue two marked points to form a node (which do exist), are what one would most naturally use to ensure such consistency properties between moduli spaces of maps from domains of different Euler characteristics.

The most basic reason for the absence of forgetful maps is in fact not specific to the [15] setup, and will necessarily occur in any setting where one perturbs constant maps (as one must if one wishes to have transversality), and restricts attention to formally stable maps, i.e., requires any component with vanishing symplectic area to have finite automorphism group. The issue concerns perturbed constant spheres. Let  $S$  be a sphere with three marked points  $0, 1, \infty$ , and consider a map  $u: S \rightarrow X$  with vanishing symplectic area  $\int_S u^* \omega = 0$ , but where  $\bar{\partial}_J u \neq 0$  (i.e. it solves perturbed equation  $\bar{\partial}_J u = \lambda$ , where  $\lambda$  is not identically zero). Assume that the images  $u(0)$ ,  $u(1)$ , and  $u(\infty)$  are distinct points. Consider other maps  $v_0: C_0 \rightarrow X$  and  $v_1: C_1 \rightarrow X$ , where the image of  $v_j(C_j)$  passes through  $u(j)$ ,  $j = 0, 1$ . Assume now that coherence holds. On the one hand, we should be able to glue  $u$  with  $v_0$  and  $v_1$  to get a map  $w: (C_0 \cup_0 S \cup_1 C_1) \rightarrow X$ , where the domain is regarded as a curve with a single marked point  $\infty$ . On the other hand, we should be able to forget the marked point  $\infty$  for  $w$ . However, the domain resulting from forgetting  $\infty$  is unstable, because of the irreducible area zero sphere component  $S$  with only two marked points, and yet we cannot collapse  $S$ , since the points  $0, 1 \in S$  where  $C_0$  and  $C_1$  are attached have different images.

The absence of forgetful maps for  $\mathbf{Z}$ , along with an approach to route around them, is discussed in detail in [33]. We do not use the methods therein, although it would be interesting to compare our approach.

Our method to construct perturbations is as follows. Consider a locus in  $\mathbf{Z}$  with some fixed topological type of map; in particular, where the ghost components have some fixed topology, and are attached to the bare components in some topologically fixed manner. *On this stratum* there is a well defined forgetful map which forgets all nodes and ghost

components.<sup>1</sup> So, given a perturbation defined already in higher Euler characteristics, we can ‘extend’ it in some neighborhood of such a stratum as follows. On the stratum itself, we take the perturbation defined previously on the bare part, and zero on the ghost components. To extend to a neighborhood, we use (a version of) the gluing of perturbations defined in [15], and then cut off. We do this along each stratum of nodal curves, and cut off using some function restricting to a partition of unity along the boundary.

This construction does not directly confront the issue of non-existence of forgetting-a-marked-point maps, but does meet what is presumably a different incarnation of the same problem. Let us explain in a simple example.

*Example 2.1.* Begin with some bare map  $u: S \rightarrow X$ . Form a map  $v: T \rightarrow X$  by attaching a rational ghost bubble at some  $p \in S$ , and then some further (higher genus) ghost components to the bubble. Consider a map  $\tilde{v}: \tilde{T} \rightarrow X$  obtained by smoothing the node at  $p$ . Note the bare part of the domain of  $\tilde{v}$  is again just  $S$ , to which some higher genus ghost bubbles have been attached near  $p$ .

Now suppose we had begun with some perturbation defined at Euler characteristic  $\chi(S)$ , so that  $\lambda(u)$  is nonvanishing in a neighborhood of  $p \in S$ . We write  $\tilde{u} := \tilde{v}|_S$ . Now the extension method from the previous paragraph gives *two different contributions* to  $\lambda(\tilde{v})|_S$ . One, corresponding to  $\tilde{v}$  being obtained from  $\tilde{u}$  by just attaching ghosts, is just  $\lambda(\tilde{u})$ . The second, corresponding to  $\tilde{v}$  being a smoothing of  $v$ , will be obtained by gluing  $\lambda(u)$  to the zero perturbation on the rational bubble, which has the effect of cutting  $\lambda(u)$  off to zero in a neighborhood of  $p$ , with radius (some monotonic function of) the gluing parameter  $\epsilon$  at  $p$ . Let us write this result (just here) as  $\lambda^\bullet(\tilde{u})$ . Then we have

$$(2.1) \quad \lambda(\tilde{v})|_S = (1 - \kappa(\epsilon))\lambda(\tilde{u}) + \kappa(\epsilon)\lambda^\bullet(\tilde{u})$$

where  $\kappa$  is a cutoff function in the gluing parameter at  $p$ . In the region where  $\kappa(\epsilon) \neq 0$ , this differs from  $\lambda(\tilde{u})$ , the perturbation we had seen before when we considered this map, so we cannot (yet) argue for ghost bubble censorship by induction.

Our resolution to this difficulty is the following. Since the bare solutions in higher Euler characteristic were transversely cut out, their genericity properties are preserved by sufficiently small perturbation. That is, it is enough to ensure that  $\lambda(\tilde{v})|_S$  can be made to be sufficiently close to  $\lambda(\tilde{u})$ . Now the point is that the norm of the difference is controlled by the radius of the disk where the perturbation is cut off, and consequently by  $\epsilon$ . Thus it is enough that  $\kappa(\epsilon)$  goes to zero soon enough. From this sort of argument, we establish our main result (Theorem 1.1).

### 3. CURVES, MAPS, AND REGULARITY CONDITIONS

In this section we fix notation: for domains, Riemann surfaces that may have boundary and may be disconnected, for stable maps, and for boundary degenerations. We largely follow [15].

**3.1. Notation for functional analytic norms.** For a section of an orthogonal vector bundle over a Riemannian manifold  $f: M \rightarrow E$ , we write  $\|f\|$  for the  $L^2$  norm, and more generally  $\|f\|_k$  for the sum of the  $L^2$  norms of the (weak) derivatives of order up to  $k$ . We sometimes use this notation in more general situations. For example, for maps  $M \rightarrow N$

---

<sup>1</sup>Strictly speaking, forgetting the nodes is only defined on a locus in  $\mathbf{Z}$  of maps satisfying certain stronger regularity conditions at nodes, but in our applications this will not prove to be a serious issue.



between Riemannian manifolds we pick an isometric embedding  $N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  and consider the trivial  $\mathbb{R}^n$  bundle over  $M$  to define functional analytic norms. The precise value of such norms depends on choices of Riemannian metric on  $M$  and the fibers of  $E$ . For our purposes such choices are either immaterial or made explicitly by working in local coordinates and will therefore not be discussed.

We will also have reason to consider weighting the  $L^2$  norm by some function on  $M$ , which we indicate by notations like  $\|f\|_{k,\delta}$ , to be explained later. When  $f \in C^k(M, E)$ , we also write  $\|f\|_{C^k}$  for the supremum of the pointwise operator norms of the derivatives of order up to  $k$ .

We make frequent use of the Sobolev embedding theorem to conclude that functions on a two-dimensional domain, with  $k$  weak derivatives locally in  $L^2$ , are in fact  $k - 2$  times continuously differentiable. We also use the corresponding Sobolev inequality  $\|f\|_{C^{k-2}} < K \cdot \|f\|_k$ , where  $K$  is a constant depending only on the two-dimensional domain.

**3.2. Bordered, noded, surfaces.** By a (smooth) Riemann surface, we mean a pair  $(S, j)$  where  $S$  is a two-dimensional compact real manifold, and  $j$  is a smooth almost complex structure. We do *not* require that  $S$  is connected. When we want to allow or emphasize that  $S$  may have boundary, we say that it is a *bordered* Riemann surface.

For a connected Riemann surface, the topological Euler characteristic  $\chi$  is related to the genus  $g$  and number of holes (boundary components)  $h$  by  $\chi = 2 - 2g - h$ . In the disconnected case, we have  $\chi = 2c - 2g - h$ , where  $c$  denotes the number of connected components. We will typically use the Euler characteristic as our measure of the complexity of a surface. Note that more complex surfaces have smaller (more negative) Euler characteristics.

Our *definition* of a nodal surface will be just the data of a smooth surface, plus the data of which points are identified to form nodes. More precisely, we have the following.

**Definition 3.1.** A noded, bordered Riemann surface is a tuple  $(S, j, M_{\text{in}}, M_{\text{bd}}, D_{\text{in}}, D_{\text{hy}}, D_{\text{el}})$  where  $(S, j)$  is a bordered Riemann surface,  $M_{\text{in}}$  and  $M_{\text{bd}}$  are finite sets of points in the interior and boundary respectively (which may be ordered or unordered),  $D_{\text{in}}$  is a finite set of unordered pairs of interior points,  $D_{\text{hy}}$  a finite set of unordered pairs of boundary points, and  $D_{\text{el}}$  is a finite set of interior points. There are no coincidences among the points in  $M_{\text{in}}$ ,  $M_{\text{bd}}$ ,  $D_{\text{in}}$ ,  $D_{\text{hy}}$ , and  $D_{\text{el}}$ .

The points in  $M_{\text{in}}$  and  $M_{\text{bd}}$  we regard as interior and boundary marked points, respectively. The pairs in  $D_{\text{in}}$  are interior points which we think of as being joined to form a single interior node. Likewise the pairs in  $D_{\text{hy}}$  are joined to form ‘hyperbolic’ boundary nodes. Finally, the points in  $D_{\text{el}}$  are regarded as ‘elliptic’ boundary nodes, i.e., boundary circles which have shrunk to radius zero. For simpler notation, we sometimes abbreviate  $(S, j, M_{\text{in}}, M_{\text{bd}}, D_{\text{in}}, D_{\text{hy}}, D_{\text{el}})$  to  $(S, j, M, D)$  or just  $S$ .

We write  $\chi(S)$  for the topological Euler characteristic of a smoothing of  $S$ . The topology on any moduli space of curves or maps is such that  $\chi(S)$  is locally constant.

*Remark 3.2.* Let us record how to compute  $\chi(S)$  in terms of the data defining  $S$ . If  $\tilde{S}$  is the disjoint union of smooth curves underlying  $S$ , then  $\chi = \chi(\tilde{S}) - 2|D_{\text{in}}| - |D_{\text{hy}}| - |D_{\text{el}}|$  (Recall that  $D_{\text{in}}$  and  $D_{\text{hy}}$  are sets of pairs, and in the above formula  $|D_{\text{in}}|$  and  $|D_{\text{hy}}|$  count the number of pairs.) Indeed, smoothing an interior node either decreases the number of components by one or increases the genus by one, smoothing a hyperbolic boundary node either decreases the number of connected components by one or increases the number of

holes by one, and that smoothing a boundary elliptic node increases the number of holes by one. Finally, we may express  $\chi(\tilde{S})$  in terms of the genus  $\tilde{g}$ , number of holes  $\tilde{h}$ , and number of components  $\tilde{c}$  as  $\chi(\tilde{S}) = 2\tilde{c} - 2\tilde{g} - \tilde{h}$ .

**3.3. Stable curves and maps.** A smooth or nodal curve is *stable* if it has no continuous family of automorphisms preserving its marked points. For a smooth connected curve, with genus  $g$  and  $h$  boundary components, and  $m$  interior and  $b$  boundary marked points, this amounts to requiring  $4g + 2h + 2m + b \geq 5$ . The unstable connected smooth curves are tori without marked points, and spheres with at most two marked points. In addition, there are the following unstable connected smooth bordered curves: cylinders without marked points, and disks with either no marked points, or a single interior marked point, or one or two boundary marked points.

Note that a disconnected curve is stable if and only if its connected components all are, and that a nodal curve is stable if the underlying smooth curve, with all node data regarded as marked points, is stable.

We consider continuous maps of bordered Riemann surfaces  $(S, \partial S) \rightarrow (X, L)$  into a symplectic manifold  $X$  with symplectic form  $\omega$  and a Lagrangian submanifold  $L \subset X$ . The precise definition is as follows.

**Definition 3.3.** Let  $S = (S, j, M_{\text{in}}, M_{\text{bd}}, D_{\text{in}}, D_{\text{hy}}, D_{\text{el}})$  be a nodal, bordered Riemann surface. A map of  $S$  is a continuous map  $u: (S, \partial S) \rightarrow (X, L)$  with the following additional properties:

- if  $\{x, y\} \in D_{\text{in}}$  or  $\{x, y\} \in D_{\text{hy}}$  then  $u(x) = u(y)$ , and
- if  $x \in D_{\text{el}}$  then  $u(x) \in L$ .

We say two maps  $u$  and  $u'$  of nodal Riemann surfaces  $(S, j)$  and  $(S', j')$  are equivalent if there is a  $(j, j')$ -holomorphic isomorphism  $\phi: (S, j) \rightarrow (S', j')$ , which respects the nodal decorations and marked points, such that  $u' = u \circ \phi$ .

**3.4. Ghosts and bare maps.** We introduce notation for the components of stable maps that are our main objects of study. Let  $u: (S, \partial S) \rightarrow (X, L)$  be a map.

**Definition 3.4.** We say that  $(u, S)$  is *numerically symplectic* if for each component  $C$  of  $S$ ,  $\int_C u^* \omega \geq 0$ . A numerically symplectic map is *stable* if  $\int_C u^* \omega > 0$  for each unstable irreducible component  $C$  of the curve  $S$ . (Here nodes of  $S$  on  $C$  are regarded as marked points on  $C$ .) When  $\int_C u^* \omega = 0$ , we say that  $C$  is a *ghost component* or *ghost bubble*.

**Definition 3.5.** We say that  $(u, S)$  is *bare* if it has no ghost components. We say that  $(u, S)$  has *constant ghosts* if the restriction of  $u$  to any of its ghost components is constant.

We will often want to separate our maps into a ‘bare part’ and the rest. In our conventions for disconnected maps, it will be useful to allow the unique map from the empty domain to  $(X, L)$ .

**Definition 3.6.** For a numerically symplectic map  $u: (S, \partial S) \rightarrow (X, L)$ , we use the following notation.

- We write  $u_+: (S_+, \partial S_+) \rightarrow (X, L)$  for the restriction of  $u$  to the union  $S_+$  of the irreducible components  $C$  of  $S$  for which  $\int_C u^* \omega > 0$ , where  $S_+$  has nodes and marked points induced from  $S$ . We call  $(u_+, S_+)$  the *bare part* of  $u$ .

- We write  $u_0: (S_0, \partial S_0) \rightarrow (X, L)$  for the restriction of  $u$  to the union  $S_0$  of irreducible components  $C$  of  $S$  with  $\int_C u^* \omega = 0$ , with nodes and marked points on  $S_0$  induced from  $S$ . We call  $(u_0, S_0)$  the *ghost part* of  $u$ .

**Lemma 3.7.** *Let  $(u, S)$  be a stable numerically symplectic map, and  $(u_+, S_+)$  its bare part. Then  $\chi(S) \leq \chi(S_+)$  with equality if and only if  $S = S_+$  (i.e., if and only if  $u$  was bare to begin with).*

*Proof.* By stability, deleting a component of symplectic area zero will increase the Euler characteristic of the domain.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.8.** *Consider an integer homology class  $\beta \in H_2(X, L)$  such that  $\int_\beta \omega > 0$ . There exists an Euler characteristic  $\chi_{\max}(\beta)$  such that any stable numerically symplectic map  $(u, S)$  in homology class  $\beta$ ,  $[u(S)] = \beta$ , has  $\chi(S) \leq \chi_{\max}(\beta)$ . If  $(u, S)$  saturates the inequality, then  $u$  is bare and  $S$  has no nodes.*

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.7, it suffices to consider bare maps. Passing to the normalization only increases the Euler characteristic of the domain, so we may as well assume that the domain is a disjoint union of smooth curves  $S = S_1 \cup \cdots \cup S_m$ . Let  $a_0$  be the minimum positive value of  $\omega$  on the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module  $H_2(X, L)$ . Then each component  $u(S_k)$  has symplectic area  $\geq a_0$  and Euler characteristic  $\leq 2$ . Thus,

$$\int_\beta \omega = \int_S u^* \omega = \sum_{k=1}^m \int_{S_k} u^* \omega \geq m a_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \chi(S) = \sum_{k=1}^m \chi(S_k) \leq 2m.$$

Therefore,

$$\chi(S) \leq \frac{2}{a_0} \int_\beta \omega$$

and we can take  $\chi_{\max}(\beta)$  as the smallest integer larger than  $\frac{2}{a_0} \int_\beta \omega$ .  $\square$

For an almost complex structure  $J$  on  $X$ , we say as usual that a map  $u$  is  *$J$ -holomorphic* if it satisfies the Cauchy-Riemann equation,  $\bar{\partial}_J u = \frac{1}{2}(du + J \circ du \circ j) = 0$ . So long as  $J$  is tamed by  $\omega$ , any  $J$ -holomorphic map  $(u, S)$  is numerically symplectic and the ghost part  $(u_0, S_0)$  of any  $J$ -holomorphic map is constant.

**3.5. Holomorphic polar coordinates.** In this section we discuss local coordinate conventions and associated elementary regularity properties that will be used when building polyfold neighborhoods of stable maps in later sections.

The domains of our maps are (disconnected, nodal) bordered Riemann surfaces  $(S, \partial S)$  in the sense of Definition 3.1. We will often want to work in local coordinates. Following [16] we fix two parameterizations of the punctured unit disk:

$$\mathbb{D}^\circ = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : 0 < |z| \leq 1\},$$

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{array}{ll} [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}^\circ, & (-\infty, 0] \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}^\circ, \\ (s, t) \mapsto e^{-2\pi(s+it)} & (s, t) \mapsto e^{2\pi(s+it)}. \end{array}$$

Restricting the maps to  $[0, \infty) \times [0, \frac{1}{2}]$  and  $(-\infty, 0] \times [-\frac{1}{2}, 0]$ , respectively, we get parameterizations of the punctured half-disk  $\mathbb{D}_+^\circ = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : 0 < |z| < 1, \text{Im}(z) \geq 0\}$ . For convenient notation below we will often write

$$(3.2) \quad I = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \quad I = [0, \frac{1}{2}], \quad \text{or} \quad I = [-\frac{1}{2}, 0],$$

to cover all these cases simultaneously.

Consider an interior (respectively boundary) point  $p \in S$  where  $S$  is a Riemann surface. By *holomorphic polar coordinates around  $p$*  we mean the choice of a holomorphic map  $(\mathbb{D}, 0) \rightarrow (S, p)$  (respectively  $(\mathbb{D}_+, \partial\mathbb{D}_+0) \rightarrow (S, \partial S, p)$ ), which is composed with one of the parameterizations in (3.1) to give a map  $[0, \infty) \times I \rightarrow S \setminus p$ , or  $(-\infty, 0] \times I \rightarrow S \setminus p$ .

**3.6. Regularity conditions.** We will eventually impose regularity conditions following [16, Definition 1.1] using the following weighted  $L^2$ -spaces.

**Definition 3.9.** We say a map  $u: (S, \partial S) \rightarrow (X, L)$  is:

- of class  $m$  at a point  $z \in S$  if it has  $m$  weak derivatives in  $L^2_{\text{loc}}$  near  $z$ .
- of class  $(m, \delta)$  at a point  $z \in S$  if, in holomorphic polar coordinates in some punctured neighborhood of  $z$  and smooth local coordinates  $(\mathbb{R}^{2n}, 0) \rightarrow (X, u(z))$ , the map  $u: [0, \infty) \times I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  has  $m$  weak derivatives in  $L^2_\delta$ , where  $L^2_\delta$  is  $L^2$  weighted by  $e^{\delta s}$ , i.e.

$$\int_{[0, \infty) \times I} |D^{\mathbf{k}} u|^2 e^{2\delta s} ds dt < \infty,$$

for all multi-indices  $\mathbf{k}$  with  $|\mathbf{k}| \leq m$ .

For the marked points on  $S$ , we will further distinguish them into two types: *marked points* where we require the map to be of class  $m$ , and *punctures* where we require the map to be of regularity  $(m, \delta)$ . We say that a map  $u$  is of class  $(m, \delta)$  if it is of class  $(m, \delta)$  at nodes and punctures, and of class  $m$  elsewhere.

*Remark 3.10.* The Sobolev embedding theorem implies that wherever a map  $u$  is of class  $m \geq 3$ , it is continuously differentiable. This is one reason why  $m \geq 3$  is used in applications, in particular in [15] which we will later follow. For class  $(3, \delta)$  maps, we note below in Lemma 3.15 that at the puncture (or node) itself, one retains some Hölder continuity  $C^{0, \alpha}$ ,  $\alpha < \frac{\delta}{2\pi}$ .

*Remark 3.11.* The asymptotic operator at an interior node of a holomorphic germ is  $i\frac{\partial}{\partial t}$  with eigenvalues  $2\pi k$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ , which are then the critical weights for the (linearized)  $\bar{\partial}$ -operator. Our convention for parameterization at boundary nodes means that the eigenvalues for the asymptotic operator  $i\frac{\partial}{\partial t}$ , with boundary values in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  is  $2\pi k$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  there as well (rather than  $\pi k$  as in some other references). Because of this, we will take our weights  $\delta \in (0, 2\pi)$  below, unless otherwise stated.

We next compare the regularity requirements  $m$  and  $(m, \delta)$ . Let  $s + it \in [0, \infty) \times I$ . The case  $(-\infty, 0] \times I$  is directly analogous and obtained by the change of variables  $s + it \mapsto -(s + it)$  in what follows below.

Let  $z = e^{-2\pi(s+it)}$  as in (3.1) be coordinates in a neighborhood  $D$  of  $p \in S$ . Consider a map  $u: D \setminus \{p\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  and let  $u_\infty: [0, \infty) \times I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  and  $u_0: \mathbb{D}^\circ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  be the corresponding maps in local coordinates. Take the weight  $\delta \in (0, 2\pi)$ . We have the following basic relations between regularity requirements.

**Lemma 3.12.** *The integral norms are related as follows:*

$$(3.3) \quad \int_D |u_0|^2 dx dy = \int_{[0, \infty) \times I} |u_\infty|^2 e^{-4\pi s} ds dt,$$

$$(3.4) \quad \int_{[0, \infty) \times I} |u_\infty|^2 ds dt = \int_D |z|^{-2} |u_0|^2 dx dy.$$

and

$$\int_D |D^{(k)}u_0|^2 dx dy \asymp \sum_{j=1}^k \int_{[0,\infty) \times I} |D^{(j)}u_\infty|^2 e^{4\pi(j-1)s} ds dt,$$

$$\int_{[0,\infty) \times I} |D^{(k)}u_\infty|^2 ds dt \asymp \sum_{j=1}^k \int_D |z|^{j-2} |Du_0^{(j)}|^2 dx dy,$$

where for positive functions  $a, b$ , we write  $a \asymp b$  to mean that there exists constants  $c, C > 0$  such that  $ca(x) < b(x) < Ca(x)$  for all  $x$ .

**Lemma 3.13.** *Assume that  $u_\infty$  and  $Du_\infty$  both lie in  $L^2_\delta$  then the following hold.*

- (i)  $u_0$  and  $Du_0$  both lie in  $L^2$ .
- (ii) For any  $|\alpha| \geq 2$ , if  $D^\beta u_0$  lies in  $L^2$  for  $|\beta| < |\alpha|$  then  $D^\alpha u_\infty$  lies in  $L^2_\delta$ .

*Proof.* This is straightforward. We have

$$d \log z = \frac{dz}{z} = -2\pi(ds + idt), \quad z\partial_z = -\frac{1}{2\pi}(\partial_s - i\partial_t),$$

$$\partial_s = -2\pi(z\partial_z + \bar{z}\partial_{\bar{z}}), \quad \partial_t = -2\pi i(z\partial_z - \bar{z}\partial_{\bar{z}}),$$

Also  $|z| = e^{-2\pi s}$  and so  $e^{\delta s} = |z|^{-\delta/2\pi}$ . Thus,

$$\int_{[0,\infty) \times I} |u_\infty|^2 e^{2\delta s} ds dt \sim \int_{|z| < 1} |u_0|^2 |z|^{-2(\frac{\delta}{2\pi})} |z|^{-2} dz d\bar{z}$$

and, if  $|\alpha| > 0$ ,

$$\int_{[0,\infty) \times I} |D_{s,t}^\alpha u_\infty|^2 e^{2\delta s} ds dt \sim \sum_{|\beta|=1}^{|\alpha|} \int_{|z| < 1} |z|^{2|\beta|} |D_{z,\bar{z}}^\beta u_0|^2 |z|^{-2(\frac{\delta}{2\pi})} |z|^{-2} dz d\bar{z},$$

where  $\sim$  means up to multiplication by constant. The result follows.  $\square$

Using the Sobolev embedding theorem we get more information.

**Lemma 3.14.** *Let  $m \geq 3$ . If  $u_0$  has  $m$  derivatives in  $L^2$  then  $u_\infty$  has  $m$  derivatives in  $L^2_\delta$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.13 (ii), it suffices to estimate the  $L^2_\delta$ -norm of  $u_\infty$  and  $Du_\infty$ . By Sobolev embedding,  $u_0$  lies in  $C^1(\mathbb{D})$  and we have  $|Du_0| < C$  for some constant  $C$ . Therefore,  $|u_0(z)| < C|z|$  and thus,

$$\int |u_\infty(s + it)|^2 e^{2\delta s} ds dt < \int C e^{-4\pi s} e^{2\delta s} ds dt = C \int e^{2(\delta - 2\pi)s} ds dt < \infty$$

and

$$\int |Du_\infty|^2 e^{2\delta s} ds dt \sim \int (|z\partial_z u_0| + |\bar{z}\partial_{\bar{z}} u_0|)^2 e^{2\delta s} ds dt \sim \int e^{-4\pi s} e^{2\delta s} ds dt < \infty.$$

$\square$

Lemma 3.14 implies that (once  $m \geq 3$ , as will always be the case in our applications) a stable map  $(S, u)$  of class  $m$  with a marked point at some  $z \in S$  is always also a stable map of class  $(m, \delta)$  with a puncture at  $z \in S$ . To indicate that we will regard a stable map  $(S, u)$  with a marked point in the second way rather than the first, we say that we *consider the marked point as a puncture*.

In the direction opposite to that of Lemma 3.14 we have the following.

**Lemma 3.15.** *Let  $m \geq 3$ . If  $u_\infty$  has  $m$  derivatives in  $L^2_\delta$  then  $u_0$  has two derivatives in  $L^2$ . Furthermore, if  $u_0$  is extended by  $u_0(0) = 0$ , then  $u_0 \in C^{0,\alpha}$  (i.e.,  $u_0$  is Hölder continuous with exponent  $\alpha$ ) for any  $\alpha < \frac{\delta}{2\pi}$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $u_\infty(s+it) \cdot e^{\delta s}$  has three derivatives in  $L^2$ , it lies in  $C^1$  and  $|D(u_\infty(s+it) \cdot e^{\delta s})| < C$ . Let  $0 < \epsilon < \delta$ . Then for all  $s$  sufficiently large, if  $|u_\infty(s+it) \cdot e^{\delta s}|^2 > e^{2\epsilon s}$  then

$$\int_{[s,s+1] \times S^1} |u_\infty|^2 e^{2\delta} ds dt \sim e^{2\epsilon s} \rightarrow \infty.$$

We conclude that for  $s$  such that  $e^{\epsilon s} > C$  we have  $|u_\infty(s+it) \cdot e^{\delta s}| \leq e^{\epsilon s}$  and hence

$$|u_0(z)| = \mathcal{O}\left(|z|^{\frac{1}{2\pi}(\delta-\epsilon)}\right).$$

The lemma follows. □

#### 4. THE CONFIGURATION SPACE OF MAPS FROM CURVES WITH BOUNDARY

Hofer, Wysocki, and Zehnder have explained in [15] how to construct the closed Gromov-Witten moduli spaces in their general ‘polyfold’ framework.

In this section we review some aspects of their construction and explain how to adapt their arguments to the case of curves with boundary in a Lagrangian. We concern ourselves mostly with describing the local models of gluing at nodes, in part because this is one of the more fundamental and novel parts of the approach, but also because our construction of perturbations will rely on the coordinate charts introduced by this description.

It is our impression that the adaptation of the [15] to the case of curves with boundary is straightforward, and as such we have been very brief in our treatment and indicated only the (rather minor) modifications needed to the original arguments. The reader wanting a detailed treatment may be interested to consult [21].

**4.1. Gluing.** Let us recall how, in the [15] formalism, one describes normal coordinates to a stratum of nodal curves in Deligne-Mumford space. For a nodal curve  $S$ , choose holomorphic polar coordinates near each node. Fix attention on one such node, where the charts are  $C^\pm = \mathbb{R}^\pm \times S^1$ .

To describe domain curves near  $S_0$ , one fixes once and for all the ‘gluing profile’ (choice of parameterization of the gluing length)  $\varphi(r) = e^{\frac{1}{r}-1}$ . For  $a = re^{i\theta}$ , one writes  $R = R(a) = \phi(r)$ , and defines  $Z_a^+ = [0, R] \times S^1 \subset \mathbb{R}^+ \times S^1 = C^+$  and  $Z_a^- = [-R, 0] \times S^1 \subset \mathbb{R}^- \times S^1 = C^-$ . We fix an identification  $Z_a^+ \sim Z_a^-$  by  $(s, t) \sim (s' + R, t' + \theta)$ .

One defines the gluing of domains:

$$(4.1) \quad S_a := (S_0 \setminus (C^\pm \setminus Z_a^\pm)) / (Z_a^+ \sim Z_a^-)$$

This construction defines a parametrization of the normal direction to the locus where the node persists by  $a \in \mathbb{D}$ .

We now recall from [14, 15] the corresponding description of gluing maps, or in other words, of normal coordinates to the space of maps from nodal curves. Consider a map  $u_0: S_0 \rightarrow X$  and a point  $\zeta_0 \in S_0$ . In suitably chosen holomorphic polar coordinates around  $\zeta_0$  and local coordinate system in the target  $X$ , one arrives at a local description near a node as a pair of maps from semi-infinite cylinders:

$$u^\pm: C^\pm \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2n}.$$

By definition of maps from a nodal curve, these maps should have well defined and common asymptotic constant  $c \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ :

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} u^+(s, t) = c = \lim_{s \rightarrow -\infty} u^-(s, t).$$

In the eventual application to giving charts on moduli, the maps will be taken to be of class  $(3, \delta)$ , i.e.,  $u^+ - c \in H^{3, \delta}(C^+, \mathbb{R}^{2n})$ , and similarly for  $u^-$ , where the topology of the mapping space is given by  $H^{3, \delta}(C^\pm) \times \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ . We write  $C_0 = C^+ \sqcup C^-$ .

We (temporarily) simplify notation and write for  $a \in \mathbb{D}$ ,  $\text{Maps}(S_a, X)$  for the space of maps  $S_a \rightarrow X$  with topology as above with respect to some weighted Sobolev norm. The identification (4.1) presents  $\text{Maps}(S_a, X)$  as a subquotient of  $\text{Maps}(S_0, X)$ : take the subset of maps which match under the identification  $Z_a^+ \sim Z_a^-$ , and forget what the map does along  $C^\pm \setminus Z_a^\pm$ . The gluing map is an endomorphism  $\oplus_a$  of  $\text{Maps}(S_0, X)$  which is a linear idempotent projection to a subset which maps bijectively to said subquotient. The map is the identity outside the region described in coordinates, and also is the identity for  $a = 0$ . It is given by interpolating between  $u^+$  and  $u^-$  along  $Z^+ \sim Z^-$ , and cutting off to zero outside.

Let us recall the formula for  $\oplus_a$ . Make a universal choice of cut off function  $\beta: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  with the following properties:  $\beta(s) = 1$  for  $s < -1$ ,  $\beta'(s) \leq 0$  for  $-1 \leq s \leq 1$ , and  $\beta(s) + \beta(-s) = 1$ . We denote a translate of this cut-off function by  $\beta_a(s) = \beta(s - \frac{1}{2}R)$ , where  $R = \varphi(a)$ . Then

$$(4.2) \quad (u^+ \oplus_a u^-)(s, t) := \beta_a(s)u^+(s, t) + (1 - \beta_a(s))u^-(s, t)$$

Here,  $(s, t)$  are the coordinates on  $Z_a^+$ ; recall these are identified by coordinate on  $Z_a^-$  by  $(s, t) = (s' + R, t' + \theta)$ . The function  $(u^+ \oplus_a u^-)$  vanishes outside  $Z_a^+ \sim Z_a^-$ , either by definition, or by continuing the coordinates  $(s, t)$  on the regions  $C^\pm$  in the natural way.

By this construction, one can define what the neighborhood in moduli of a given map from a nodal curve is: all maps which are obtained by taking the image of  $\oplus_a$  and reinterpreting the resulting map having as domain  $S_a$ .

The following result is fundamental:

**Theorem 4.1.** [14, Theorem 1.28] *For appropriate spaces of maps, the idempotent*

$$\begin{aligned} \pi : D \times H^{3, \delta}(C_0, \mathbb{R}^{2n}) &\rightarrow D \times H^{3, \delta}(C_0, \mathbb{R}^{2n}) \\ (a, (u^+, u^-)) &\mapsto (a, u^+ \oplus_a u^-) \end{aligned}$$

*is sc-smooth.*

Theorem 4.1 asserts that the image of  $\pi$  is a ‘sc-retract’ (in fact, of a special class of such called ‘sc-splicings’), which is the sort of space to which the methods of [16] have extended the differential calculus. This result is the key local ingredient in the construction of the ‘configuration spaces’ of [15]. Theorem 4.1 is proven by direct estimates in terms of the formula for  $\oplus_a$ . (The real content of the assertion is at  $a = 0$ .)

By taking correspondingly disk neighborhoods around all nodes of  $S_0$ , and working in families as the complex structure on the underlying curve of  $S_0$  and location of nodes is varied, one correspondingly gets an sc-retract which describes a ‘neighborhood’ of maps from a (family of) *parameterized* nodal domain curves.

To generalize Theorem 4.1 to the bordered case, it suffices to define an analogous map  $\oplus_a$  by similar formulas; afterwards, the proof in [14] can be repeated verbatim. We now give the formulas.

4.1.1. *Hyperbolic nodes.* The gluing setup for hyperbolic boundary nodes is almost identical to the case of interior nodes. We parameterize a standard neighborhood of a hyperbolic node by

$$C^+ \sqcup C^- = \mathbb{R}^+ \times [0, 1] \sqcup \mathbb{R}^- \times [0, 1].$$

We define the loci  $Z_a^+ = [0, R(a)] \times [0, 1]$ , and similarly  $Z_a^-$ ; we identify coordinates  $(s, t)$  on  $Z_a^+$  with coordinates  $(s', t')$  on  $Z_a^-$  by  $(s, t) = (s' + R, t')$ .

Given a pair of maps  $(u^+, u^-)$ ,

$$u^\pm: (\mathbb{R}^\pm \times [0, 1], \partial(\mathbb{R}^\pm \times [0, 1])) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \mathbb{R}^n),$$

we define  $u^+ \oplus_a u^-$  again to be the identity when  $a = 0$ , and by the formula (4.2) otherwise. Note the result defines a map  $(Z_a, \partial Z_a) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \mathbb{R}^n)$

The analogous result to Theorem 4.1 then holds by an identical proof.

4.1.2. *Elliptic nodes.* We next consider the case of an elliptic node. As in the case of an interior node we consider a map  $u_0: S_0 \rightarrow X$  and a point  $\zeta_0 \in S_0$ , but here we assume that  $u(\zeta_0) \in L$ . In order to get normal coordinates near an elliptic node we consider also an auxiliary map of a disk  $u'_0: (\mathbb{D}, \partial D) \rightarrow (X, L)$  such that  $u'_0(0) = u(\zeta_0) \in L$ .

Then, in suitably chosen holomorphic polar coordinates around  $\zeta_0$  and local coordinate system in  $(X, L)$ , one arrives at a local description as a pair of maps from semi-infinite cylinders:

$$u^-: C^- \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2n}, \quad u^{[+]}: (C^{[+]}, \partial C^{[+]}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \mathbb{R}^n),$$

that have well defined and common asymptotic constant  $c \in \mathbb{R}^n \subset \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ . Here  $\mathbb{R}^n$  corresponds to  $L$  in the local coordinates and we take  $C^{[+]} = [-1, \infty) \times S^1$  rather than  $C^+$  for convenient notation (to conform with the conventions above without making domain identifications on the boundary).

Write  $\mathbb{R}^{[+]} = [-1, \infty)$  and let

$$Z_0 = \mathbb{R}^{[+]} \times S^1 \sqcup \mathbb{R}^- \times S^1.$$

If  $0 \leq a \leq 1$ , define the gluing length  $R$  as  $R = \varphi(a)$ . For  $a > 0$ , consider the infinite cylinder  $C_a$  obtained by taking  $\mathbb{R}^+ \times S^1 \subset \mathbb{R}^{[+]} \times S^1$  and identifying the points  $(s, t) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times S^1$  with the points  $(s', t') \in \mathbb{R}^- \times S^1$  if they satisfy  $(s, t) = (s' + R, t')$ . Continue the coordinates  $(s, t)$  and  $(s', t')$  to all of  $C_a$  in the natural way. Let  $Z_a \subset \mathbb{R}^{[+]} \times S^1$  be the subset  $-1 \leq s \leq R$ , which can also be thought of as gluing  $[-1, 0] \times S^1$  to the subset  $-R \geq s' \geq 0$  of  $C_a$ . For  $a = 0$  take  $C_0 = \emptyset$ .

Consider now a pair of maps  $(u^{[+]}, u^-)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} u^{[+]}: (\mathbb{R}^{[+]} \times S^1, \partial(\mathbb{R}^{[+]} \times S^1)) &\rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \mathbb{R}^n), \\ u^-: (\mathbb{R}^- \times S^1) &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2n}, \end{aligned}$$

such that there is a common asymptotic constant  $c \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  for which  $u^{[+]} - (1 - \beta(s))c \in H^{3,\delta}(\mathbb{R}^+ \times S^1)$  and  $u^- - \beta(s)c \in H^{3,\delta}(\mathbb{R}^- \times S^1)$ . We then define  $u^{[+]} \oplus_a u^-: (Z_a, \partial_{[+]} Z_a) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ , where  $\partial_{[+]} Z_a = \partial Z_a \cap \partial(\mathbb{R}^{[+]} \times S^1)$  as follows

$$u^{[+]} \oplus_a u^-(s, t) = \begin{cases} (u^{[+]}(s, t), u^-(s, t)) & \text{for } a = 0, \\ \beta_a(s)u^{[+]}(s, t) + (1 - \beta_a)u^-(s, t) & \text{for } a > 0. \end{cases}$$

Consider next a pair of vector fields  $(h^{[+]}, h^-)$  that are first order variations of the maps  $(u^{[+]}, u^-)$ . In the local model this simply means that  $(h^{[+]}, h^-)$  live in the same functional



analytic spaces as  $(u^{[+]}, u^-)$ . With the definition above we then note that for any  $a \in [0, 1]$ ,  $h^{[+]} \oplus_a h^-$  is naturally a vector field along  $u^{[+]} \oplus_a u^-$  that is tangent to  $\mathbb{R}^n$  along  $\partial_{[+]Z_a}$ , i.e.,  $h^{[+]} \oplus_a h^-$  is a first order variation of  $u^{[+]} \oplus_a u^-$ . The operation  $\oplus_a$  is the *gluing* operation.

Then the analogue of Theorem 4.1 again holds by an identical proof.

*Remark 4.2.* Note that the elliptic nodal maps themselves form a codimension one subset in the polyfold chart, unlike the interior nodal maps that have codimension two. To see the difference, consider the twist parameter in [15], see e.g. [15, Definition 2.3]. For the elliptic node, the twist is defined over the whole domain  $\mathbb{R}^{[+]} \times S^1$ . Therefore, in the corresponding formulas  $h^+(s + i(t - \vartheta))$  is globally defined. We write it  $\tilde{h}^{[+]}(s + it)$  and view it as our standard gluing (depending only on the real neck length parameter) of a different map.

**4.2. Stable map moduli.** We study moduli spaces of stable maps. The maps parameterized have domains which are (disconnected, nodal) bordered Riemann surfaces  $(S, \partial S)$  in the sense of Definition 3.1. The maps are numerically symplectic in the sense of Definition 3.4, and satisfy regularity conditions as described in Definition 3.9.

**Definition 4.3.** We write  $\mathbf{Z}^{(k, \delta)} = \mathbf{Z}^{(k, \delta)}(X, L, \omega)$  for the set of stable maps of regularity  $(k, \delta)$ . We write  $\mathbf{Z}_{A, g, h, m, b} = \mathbf{Z}_{A, g, h, m, b}^{(k, \delta)}(X, L, \omega)$  for the subset consisting of maps with image  $A \in H_2(X, L)$ , domain of genus  $g$  with  $h$  boundary components,  $m$  interior marked points, and  $b$  boundary marked points.

The results [15, Theorem 1.6, 1.7] generalize readily to the boundary case:

**Theorem 4.4.** (Compare [15, Theorem 1.6]) *For any  $\delta \in (0, 2\pi)$ , the space  $\mathbf{Z}^{(3, \delta)}(X, L, \omega)$  admits a second countable paracompact Hausdorff topology. In this topology, the loci  $\mathbf{Z}_{A, g, h, m, b}(X, L, \omega)$  are open and closed.*

**Theorem 4.5.** (Compare [15, Theorem 1.7]) *For any sequence  $\delta_0 < \delta_1 < \dots < 2\pi$ , the sequence*

$$\mathbf{Z}^{(3, \delta_0)} \subset \mathbf{Z}^{(4, \delta_1)} \subset \dots \subset \mathbf{Z}^{(3+k, \delta_m)} \subset \dots$$

*underlies a polyfold structure on  $\mathbf{Z}$ .*

*Proof.* Let us outline the argument of [15, Section 3.5] and indicate one necessary adaptation. Local charts centered around smooth maps from parameterized smooth (not nodal) curves are entirely straightforward to construct. Indeed, if  $u$  is such a map, the space of sections of  $H^{3, \delta}(S, u^*TX)$  has a standard sc-structure; this space can be identified with a space of maps to  $X$  using the exponential map for a metric. The sole necessary modification in the case of bordered Riemann surfaces is that we should use a Riemannian metric  $g$  with the following two properties:  $L$  is totally geodesic in  $g$  and  $J$  takes Jacobi-fields in  $g$  along  $L$  to Jacobi-fields, as in [6, Section 5.2]. The first condition is used to ensure that the exponential map preserves the boundary condition, the second is used in Section 4.3.

The fundamental fact that coordinate change in the domains acts sc-smoothly on spaces of maps provides the compatibility of such charts. Coordinate charts defining ‘neighborhoods’ for maps from parameterized nodal curves are obtained in [15] from [14, Theorem 1.28] (recalled above as Theorem 4.1), which we need only replace with the analogous results above for the similar gluings in the bordered case.

The forgoing discussion explains how to construct local charts around *parameterized* maps. It remains to explain how to use these to give an orbifold cover of  $\mathbf{Z}$ , whose points correspond to *unparameterized* maps. Since stable holomorphic curves have already only finitely many

automorphisms, the main point is to explain what to do about maps with (positive symplectic area but) unstable domains.

In [15], given such a map, a (locally defined) hypersurface in  $X$  transverse to the map is chosen. Then points on the domain which meet the hypersurface are marked. Here the hypersurface is chosen so that the resulting marked domain curve is stable. One then considers the space of maps from such nearby marked curves which remain transverse to the hypersurface.<sup>2</sup>

This method of constructing ‘good uniformizing families’ is detailed in [15, Theorem 3.13, Proposition 3.19, 3.20]. These go through verbatim in the case of curves with boundary and show that there is a countable and locally finite cover of  $\mathbf{Z}$  by such good uniformizing families centered at smooth maps. The construction of the polyfold is then obtained from a word by word repetition of [15, Theorems 3.35–37].  $\square$

*Remark 4.6.* Although not strictly necessary, in the context of bordered stable maps it is natural to modify [15, Definition 3.6] to add also certain boundary charts and allow for stabilization by boundary marked points for curves with Lagrangian boundary conditions. This would lead to the following extensions of [15, Definition 3.6] (numbers in parenthesis refers to the numbering in [15, Definition 3.6]): In (1) we allow also for additional boundary marked points  $\Theta$  (that are analogous to the additional interior marked points  $\Sigma$  already considered). In (4) we require every point  $w \in \Theta$  to lie in an  $(n-1)$ -dimensional submanifold  $N_w \subset L$  and the tangent space to  $N_w$  is a complement to  $du(z)|_{\partial S}$ . In (6) we use half-disks at the boundary marked points and in (7) the restriction to the boundary is transverse to  $N_m$  and (8) is modified accordingly.

As in the closed case there are evaluation maps, and a forgetful map to Deligne-Mumford space.

**Theorem 4.7.** (Compare [15, Theorem 1.8]) *If  $4g + 2h + 2m + b \geq 5$  then the natural evaluation maps  $ev_j: \mathbf{Z}_{g,h,m,b} \rightarrow X$ , at interior points,  $ev_k: \mathbf{Z}_{g,h,m,b} \rightarrow L$ , at boundary points,  $ev_r^{(0,1)}: \mathbf{Z}_{g,h,m,b} \rightarrow L^{(0,1)}(T_{z_r}S, T_{u(z_r)}X)$  (the complex linear part of the differential) and the forgetful map (forgetting the map and unstable domain components)  $\gamma: \mathbf{Z}_{g,h,m,b} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,h,m,b} = \mathbf{Z}_{g,h,m,b}(\text{point})$  are sc-smooth.*  $\square$

**4.3. The bundle of complex anti-linear differentials and the  $\bar{\partial}_J$ -section.** [15, Section 1.2] describes a bundle  $\mathbf{W} \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$  with fiber over  $(u, S) \in \mathbf{Z}$  the complex anti-linear formal differentials  $TS^{0,1} \rightarrow u^*(TX^{0,1})$  to the map  $u$ . Then  $u \mapsto \bar{\partial}_J u$  is a section of  $\mathbf{W}$ , with zero locus that corresponds to the  $J$ -holomorphic maps.

Here we give the necessary adaptations to the case of maps with boundary conditions. Fix an almost complex structure  $J$  on  $X$  compatible with  $\omega$ . We write  $(S, j, M, D, u)$  for a stable map in  $\mathbf{Z}$ . Here  $S$  is the Riemann surface which is the domain of the map,  $j$  is the complex structure on  $S$ ,  $M$  the marked points,  $D$  the nodal points, and  $u: (S, \partial S) \rightarrow (X, L)$  the actual map. Elements in  $\mathbf{W}$  are then of the form

$$(S, j, M, D, u, \xi),$$

---

<sup>2</sup>To ask for transversality to a hypersurface, one must speak of the derivatives of the map at points; to expect that nearby maps should remain transverse, one should have continuity of the derivative. Note that  $H^3$  ensures these properties by Sobolev embedding.

where  $\xi$  is a complex anti-linear formal differential that respects the boundary condition. More precisely, for  $z \in S$

$$\xi(z): T_z S \rightarrow T_{u(z)} X$$

is a complex anti-linear map:  $J \circ \xi = -\xi \circ j$  and if  $z \in \partial S$  then

$$\xi(z)(T_z \partial S) \subset T_{u(z)} L \subset T_{u(z)} X.$$

We say that two tuples  $(S, j, M, D, u, \xi)$  and  $(S', j', M', D', u', \xi')$  are equivalent if there is a  $(j, j')$ -holomorphic isomorphism  $\phi: S \rightarrow S'$  that takes  $(M, D)$  to  $(M', D')$  and such

$$u = u' \circ \phi, \quad \xi = \xi' \circ d\phi.$$

We demand the same regularity properties of  $\xi$  as in [15]:  $\xi$  is in  $H_{\text{loc}}^2$  at general and at marked points, and in  $H_{\delta}^2$  at punctures. As in [15], this space can be topologized:

**Theorem 4.8.** (Compare [15, Theorem 1.9]) *The space  $\mathbf{W}$  has a natural second countable paracompact Hausdorff topology so that the projection map  $p: \mathbf{W} \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$ , forgetting the  $\xi$ -component, is continuous.*

Recall that in the scale calculus of [16], spaces carry filtrations (in practice, by the regularity of functions), and that for vector bundles, it is natural to filter both base and fiber separately, with the fiber filtration going up to one larger than the base.

Recall the levels  $m = 0, 1, \dots$  of the filtration on  $\mathbf{Z}$  correspond to maps of regularity  $(m + 3, \delta_m)$  where  $0 < \delta_0 < \delta_1 < \dots < 2\pi$  is some sequence fixed once and for all. For maps  $u$  of regularity  $(m + 3, \delta_m)$ , the notion of the complex anti-linear map  $\xi$  along  $u$  having regularity  $(k + 2, \delta_k)$  makes sense for  $0 \leq k \leq m + 1$  and one says that an element  $(S, u, \xi)$  in  $\mathbf{W}$  has bi-regularity  $((m + 3, \delta_m), (k + 2, \delta_k))$  if  $u$  is of class  $(m + 3, \delta_m)$  and  $\xi$  of class  $(k + 2, \delta_k)$  along  $u$ .

**Theorem 4.9.** (Compare [15, Theorem 1.10]) *Consider the polyfold  $\mathbf{Z}^{(3, \delta)}$  of stable maps. The bundle  $p: \mathbf{W}^{(2, \delta)} \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}^{(3, \delta)}$  has the structure of a strong polyfold bundle in which the  $(m, k)$ -bi-level (for  $0 \leq k \leq m + 1$ ) consists of elements of base regularity  $(m + 3, \delta_m)$  and fiber regularity  $(k + 2, \delta_k)$ .*

*Proof.* The topology and polyfold structure on  $\mathbf{W}$  is constructed as in [15, Section 3.6]. Note that one begins with a set-theoretic map  $\mathbf{W} \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$ , immediately from the definitions. One proceeds by producing a chart for  $\mathbf{W}$  covering the preimage of each chart used in the construction of  $\mathbf{Z}$ . One must prove that above each chart,  $\mathbf{W}$  is a scale retract of a trivial vector bundle, and that this structure is compatible with change of charts, see [15, Proof of Proposition 3.39 on p. 123].

Constructing the charts for  $\mathbf{W}$  is straightforward along maps from smooth domains. For a neighborhood of the maps from nodal domains, one again shows that  $\mathbf{W}$  is a retract of the corresponding bundle on the nodal locus, using a gluing formula. We give the corresponding formula for the nodal case in the next subsection.

The sole refinement of the discussion in [15] which is necessary concerns the trivialization of the bundle  $\mathbf{W}$  on local charts. In [15, p. 118], this is done using parallel transport. Here we must ensure the parallel transport is compatible with the boundary condition; this is guaranteed by our choice of metric (recall that  $L$  was totally geodesic), using the property of Jacobi-fields along  $L$  being  $J$ -complex linear, compare [7, Sections 3.2 and 3.3].  $\square$

The  $\bar{\partial}_J$ -operator gives a natural section  $\bar{\partial}_J: \mathbf{Z} \rightarrow \mathbf{W}$ ,

$$(S, j, M, D, u) \mapsto (S, j, M, D, u, \frac{1}{2}(du + J \circ du \circ j)).$$

The properties of this section are directly analogous to the closed case, studied in [15, Section 4]. As there, the key result for the polyfold set up is suitable smoothness near nodes. This uses various properties of Cauchy-Riemann operators on cylinders  $\mathbb{R} \times S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ . In the case of boundary, we use similar results for strips  $\mathbb{R} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ . The regularity and gluing estimates of [15, Section 4] are then obtained as in the closed case from the open counterparts of the results in [15, Section 5].

These can be obtained from the same arguments as in the closed case after application of standard tools, e.g., the Seeley extension theorem [34].

As in the case of closed curves we then have the following result that describes the basic properties of the  $\bar{\partial}_J$ -operator in the polyfold setting.

**Theorem 4.10.** (Compare [15, Theorem 1.11]) *The Cauchy-Riemann section  $\bar{\partial}_J$  of the strong polyfold bundle  $\mathbf{W} \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$  is an sc-smooth component-proper Fredholm section. On the component  $\mathbf{Z}_{A,g,m,b}$  of the polyfold  $\mathbf{Z}$ , the Fredholm index of  $\bar{\partial}_J$  is equal to*

$$\text{index}(\bar{\partial}_J) = (n - 3)(2 - 2g - h) + 2m + b + 2c_1^{\text{rel}}(A),$$

where  $\dim X = 2n$ ,  $g$  the arithmetic genus of the noded Riemann surfaces,  $h$  the number of boundary components,  $m$  the number of interior marked points,  $b$  the number of boundary marked points, and  $A \in H_2(X, L)$ .

*Proof.* After the discussion above, adapting the constructions in the case of closed curves to open curves, it remains only to compute the index. This is well known, see e.g. [2, Theorem A.1].  $\square$

**4.4. Gluing and anti-gluing for sections.** Here we give the gluing formula for sections of  $\mathbf{W}$ . This is used both in the construction of the polyfold structure on  $\mathbf{W}$ , and, since it gives a trivialization near the locus of maps from nodal curves in  $\mathbf{Z}$ , also for the purpose of extending sections from this locus.

The starting point is a pair of complex anti-linear maps with zero asymptotic constant anti-linear operator that are glued according to the above formulas. We take these anti-linear maps  $\xi^\pm$  to lie in

$$(4.3) \quad H^{2,\delta_0}(\mathbb{R}^\pm \times [0, 1], \text{Hom}^{(0,1)}(T\mathbb{R}^\pm \times [0, 1], u^*(T^*\mathbb{R}^{2n})))$$

in the hyperbolic case and in

$$(4.4) \quad H^{2,\delta_0}(\mathbb{R}^{[+]} \times S^1, \text{Hom}^{(0,1)}(T\mathbb{R}^{[+]} \times S^1, u^*(T^*\mathbb{R}^{2n})))$$

and

$$(4.5) \quad H^{2,\delta_0}(\mathbb{R}^- \times S^1, \text{Hom}^{(0,1)}(T\mathbb{R}^- \times S^1, u^*(T^*\mathbb{R}^{2n})))$$

in the elliptic case.

More precisely, in the hyperbolic (resp. elliptic) case we have complex anti-linear maps  $\xi^+$  (resp.  $\xi^{[+]}$ ) and  $\xi^-$  over  $u^+$  (resp.  $u^{[+]}$ ) and  $u^-$  and we define

$$\begin{aligned}\xi^+ \widehat{\oplus}_a \xi^- (s, t) &= \begin{cases} (\xi^+(s, t), \xi^-(s, t)) & \text{for } a = 0, \\ \beta_a(s) \xi^+(s, t) + (1 - \beta_a) \xi^-(s, t) & \text{for } a > 0. \end{cases} \\ \xi^{[+]} \widehat{\oplus}_a \xi^- (s, t) &= \begin{cases} (\xi^{[+]}(s, t), \xi^-(s, t)) & \text{for } a = 0, \\ \beta_a(s) \xi^{[+]}(s, t) + (1 - \beta_a) \xi^-(s, t) & \text{for } a > 0. \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

Again, the arguments of [14] may be repeated to show that the projection  $\widehat{\oplus}_a$  is sc-smooth.

**4.5. Index bundles and orientations of  $\mathbf{W}$ .** In this section we discuss orientations and associated structures for the bundle of complex anti-linear formal differentials. Here the bordered case differs from the closed: over closed curves the linearization of the Cauchy-Riemann operator is complex linear and hence its kernel and cokernel canonically oriented, in the bordered case there is orientation input also from the boundary condition and coherent orientations exist only provided certain global conditions are met.

Consider an sc-smooth Fredholm section  $F: \mathbf{Z} \rightarrow \mathbf{W}$ , in our application we will have  $F = \bar{\partial}_J - \lambda$ , where  $\lambda$  is an sc<sup>+</sup>-section  $\mathbf{Z} \rightarrow \mathbf{W}$ . Then the vertical component of the linearization of  $F$ ,  $dF: T_{(u,S)}\mathbf{Z} \rightarrow \mathbf{W}_{(u,S)}$  is a Fredholm operator. Similarly,  $F$  gives families of Fredholm operators as follows. If  $C \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$  is a continuous map of a compact CW-complex  $C$ , we pull back the family of operators. By compactness of  $C$ , we can stabilize the pull-back bundle and extend the family of Fredholm operators so that all operators over  $C$  are surjective. In this way we obtain an index bundle over  $\mathbf{Z}$ , that is defined as a stable bundle when pulled back over any compact CW-complex and which depends only on the homotopy class of the map of the CW-complex. To see the last statement we repeat the construction of the bundle over a map over a homotopy of maps.

Our moduli spaces are zero-sets of  $\bar{\partial}_J - \lambda$ , so we may orient them given an orientation of the index bundle over  $\bar{\partial}: \mathbf{Z} \rightarrow \mathbf{W}$ . In the case of curves with boundary, orienting the index bundle requires more care than in the closed case. This has been discussed by many authors, following Fukaya, see e.g., [12]. Existing discussions happen in other perturbation setups (not using polyfolds), but as the problem is topological in nature there is no essential difference. We briefly recall here the idea of constructing the orientation.

In cases relevant to our study here, the ambient symplectic manifold  $X$  is spin. In this case coherent (i.e., compatible with gluing) orientations exist provided the Lagrangian boundary condition  $L$  is spin and equipped with an orientation and a spin structure. More precisely we equip the relevant index bundle with the Fukaya orientation as follows. Consider first closed curves. As mentioned above, over a closed curve the index bundle is a complex linear bundle and receives an induced orientation from the orientation of the complex numbers. Consider next a disk. Using the spin structure, the bundle and the linearized  $\bar{\partial}_J$ -operator can be trivialized in a homotopically unique way outside a small neighborhood of the origin. After further homotopy, the bundle can be expressed as a sum of a standard  $\bar{\partial}$ -bundle on a trivialized bundle over the disk with constant  $\mathbb{R}^n$ -boundary conditions (kernel constant  $\mathbb{R}^n$ -valued functions, cokernel trivial) and a complex bundle over the sphere attached at the origin of the disk. This then induces an orientation.

Over general curves with boundary (higher genus and any number of boundary components) an orientation is defined as follows. Express the curve as a closed curve with marked

points at which disks with marked point at the origin are glued in. The orientations of the index bundles of the closed curve (even index) and the disks with an ordering (index  $\dim L - 1$ ) then induces an orientation of the glued curve. In this paper  $\dim L = 3$ , the orientation is independent of boundary ordering and we obtain a coherent orientation of the index bundle associated to  $\mathbf{W} \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$ .

## 5. BASIC PERTURBATIONS

The map  $u \mapsto \bar{\partial}_J u$  provides a section of the bundle  $\mathbf{W} \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$ ; solutions to the Cauchy-Riemann equation are just the zeros of this section. To perturb the Cauchy-Riemann equation, one should specify some other (multi-)section  $\lambda: \mathbf{Z} \rightarrow \mathbf{W}$  and consider the equation  $\bar{\partial}_J u = \lambda$ . The general theory of [16] includes the existence of a rich class of perturbations (proper,  $\text{sc}^+$ ) which guarantee that the space of solutions to  $\bar{\partial}_J u = \lambda$  will be compact. Their perturbations also build in the elliptic bootstrapping theory.

We will not appeal to this general construction, and instead construct our class essentially by hand. One reason for this is we need perturbations satisfying the estimates in [11] in order to appeal to the ghost bubble censorship result established there.

In this section we describe the basic building blocks of our perturbations. The perturbations we construct here will be supported over the locus  $\mathbf{B} \subset \mathbf{Z}$  of bare maps, and in fact in a neighborhood of one such map.

Consider a stable map with smooth domain  $(u, S)$ , and corresponding chart on  $\mathbf{Z}$  parameterized by

$$(5.1) \quad \mathbf{U}(u, S) = \mathbf{j} \times H^3(S, u^*TX)$$

around  $(u, S)$ , where  $\mathbf{j}$  parameterizes deformations of the complex structure of the domain. For an element  $v \in H^3(S, u^*TX)$ , we write  $\tilde{v}$  for the corresponding map  $\tilde{v}: S \rightarrow X$  given by composition with the exponential map. For  $(j, v) \in \mathbf{U}(u, S)$ , it thus makes sense to write  $\bar{\partial}_J \tilde{v}$ . Let  $D \subset S$  be a compact surface with boundary.

- *Domain differential and cut-offs:* Let  $\alpha$  be a smooth complex anti-linear differential  $\alpha \in C^\infty(D, T^*D^{0,1})$  supported in the interior of  $D$ . We extend  $\alpha$  by 0 to the rest of  $S$  and consider it as a differential along domains in  $\mathbf{j}$ , which is in particular supported away from the boundary  $\partial S$ .
- *Target vector fields:* Let  $V: X \rightarrow TX$  be a smooth vector field supported inside a coordinate ball which lies at distance  $> \delta$  from  $L$ .
- *Conformal structure cut-offs:* Let  $\gamma: \mathbf{j} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be a smooth cut-off function supported inside  $\mathbf{j}$ .
- *Map cut-off:* Let  $\beta_0, \beta_1: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , be smooth cut-off functions with compact support equal to 1 in a neighborhood of 0 and equal to 0 outside a larger neighborhood. We will use cut-offs in the  $H^3(S, u^*TX)$ -direction of the form

$$\beta(v) := \beta_0(\|v\|)\beta_1(\|\bar{\partial}_J \tilde{v}\|_2)$$

We recall from [16, Theorems 13.7–9] that we may obtain multi-sections of polyfold bundles by appropriately symmetrizing a section which is supported in the interior of an appropriate sort of open chart, and extending by zero. In [15] it is shown that the  $\mathbf{U}(u, S)$  charts are of the correct sort.

Consider the following sections over  $\mathbf{U}(u, S)$ :

$$(5.2) \quad \widehat{\lambda}(j, v) = \gamma(j)(\widetilde{v}^*V \otimes \alpha)$$

$$(5.3) \quad \lambda(j, v) = \beta(v)\widehat{\lambda}(j, v)$$

We show that  $\beta(v)$  controls the 3-norm of  $v$ . Our perturbations will be supported near the original moduli space, so we assume that  $\|\bar{\partial}_J u\| < \epsilon$ .

**Lemma 5.1.** *There exists  $\epsilon_0 > 0$  and  $C > 0$ , independent of  $\epsilon > 0$ , such that for all  $v$  with  $\|v\|_3 < \epsilon_0$ , and all  $r > C\epsilon$  there exist  $\delta > 0$  such that if*

$$\|v\| + \|\bar{\partial}_J \widetilde{v}\| < \delta$$

then

$$\|\widetilde{v}\|_3 < r.$$

*Proof.* We pick a finite cover of  $S$  by local coordinate disks  $D$  such that  $\widetilde{v}$  maps each  $D$  into some coordinate ball in  $X$ . (Here we use the  $\epsilon_0$ -bound.) We have, from the elliptic estimate,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widetilde{v} - u\|_3 &\leq C(\|\bar{\partial}_J(\widetilde{v} - u)\|_2 + \|\widetilde{v} - u\|) \\ &\leq C(\|\bar{\partial}_J \widetilde{v}\|_2 + \|\bar{\partial}_J u\|_2 + \|\widetilde{v} - u\|) \end{aligned}$$

Since  $v = F(u, v) = \exp_u^{-1}(\widetilde{v} - u)$  is a smooth map with  $G(u, 0) = 0$  and  $\partial_v F(0) = v$  we find by Taylor expansion (compare the proof of Lemma 5.3) that there exists a constant  $C_0$  (depending on  $u$ ) such that  $\|v\|_3 \leq K\|\widetilde{v} - u\|_3$ . Also,  $\widetilde{v} = \exp_u(v)$  is smooth and similarly  $\|\widetilde{v} - u\| \leq C_1\|v\|$ . We get

$$\|v\|_3 \leq C'(\|\bar{\partial}_J \widetilde{v}\|_2 + \|\bar{\partial}_J u\|_2 + \|v\|).$$

The lemma follows.  $\square$

Lemma 5.1 show that if the supports of  $\beta_0$  and  $\beta_1$  are sufficiently small, then  $\lambda$  is supported in the interior of  $\mathbf{U}(u, S)$ . We use (5.3) as our basic perturbations, or more formally:

**Definition 5.2.** A *basic perturbation* centered at  $(u, S)$  is a multi-section obtained from appropriately symmetrizing (5.3).

In the [16] setup, much of the elliptic regularity arguments is axiomatized into the notion of  $sc^+$ -section.

**Lemma 5.3.** *The basic perturbation  $\lambda$  is a smooth  $sc^+$ -section.*

*Proof.* The cut-off functions and the norms are smooth, so are  $V$  and  $\alpha$ . The smoothness of  $\lambda$  follows.

To check that  $\lambda$  is  $sc^+$  we need to show that  $\lambda(v, S)$  has the same Sobolev regularity as  $v$ . This follows from the smoothness of  $V$  and  $\alpha$  by a standard argument. We give a brief description of the key points. The order  $k$  derivative of  $\lambda$  is a linear combination of terms of the form

$$\tau(m; j_1, \dots, j_m) = D^{(m)}V(u) \cdot \prod_{r=1}^m (du^{(j_r)}),$$

where  $\sum_{r=1}^m j_r = k$ . The required smoothness will then follow if we show that  $\tau(m; j_1, \dots, j_m)$  lies in  $L^2$  if  $u$  has  $k$  derivatives in  $L^2$ . By assumption all our maps have at least  $k \geq 3$  derivatives in  $L^2$  so we assume  $k \geq 3$ . For  $j_r \leq k - 2$ ,  $d^{(j_r)}u$  lies in  $C^0$ . Hence  $|d^{(j_r)}u|$  is

bounded and the  $L^2$ -norm of  $\tau(m; j_1, \dots, j_m)$  is easy to control if all  $j_r \leq k - 2$ . If some  $j_r = k$  then

$$\tau(m; j_1, \dots, j_m) = \tau(1; k) = D^{(1)}(u) \cdot (d^{(k)}u),$$

which lies in  $L^2$  since  $u$  has  $k$  derivatives in  $L^2$ . If  $j_r = k - 1$  then

$$\tau(m; j_1, \dots, j_m) = \tau(2; k - 1, 1) = D^{(2)}(u) \cdot (du)(d^{(k-1)}u),$$

which lies in  $L^2$  since  $du$  is bounded and  $u$  has  $k$  derivatives in  $L^2$ . It follows that  $\lambda(u, S)$  is an  $\text{sc}^+$ -section.  $\square$

*Remark 5.4.* We point out that the proof above is simplified by our assumption of basic regularity in  $H^3$ . If one starts instead in  $H^2$  then in the first step one has to estimate the  $L^2$ -norm of  $D^{(2)}v(u) \cdot (du)(du)$ . The desired estimate is obtained from the limiting case of the Sobolev inequality which shows that  $du$  having two derivatives in  $L^2$  implies that it lies in  $L^4$  (in fact in  $L^p$  for all  $p > 2$ , though not uniformly in  $p$ ).

*Remark 5.5.* The notion of  $\text{sc}^+$  is used together with elliptic regularity to bootstrap solutions to  $\bar{\partial}_J u = \lambda(u)$ . Starting with  $u$  in  $H^3$ , the  $\text{sc}^+$ -property of  $\lambda$  says  $\lambda(u)$  also in  $H^3$ , but then, by elliptic regularity for  $\bar{\partial}_J$ ,  $u$  in fact lies in  $H^4$ , etc.

## 6. TRANSVERSALITY AND GENERICITY AT BARE MAPS

In this section we show that basic perturbations suffice to achieve transversality along the locus of bare maps, and moreover to ensure that solutions are ‘1-generic’, i.e., that in 0- and 1-dimensional families of solutions, one does not meet phenomena of expected codimension  $\geq 1$ . The arguments proceed along standard lines.

Below will sometimes consider maps which forget marked points. While such maps do not exist globally over  $\mathbf{Z}$ , they do exist, and behave well, on the locus where the marked points stay off the ghost components, and in particular, do not collide or run into nodes. We will only be using the forgetful maps on this locus.

Recall from Definition 3.5 that a stable numerically symplectic map is bare if it has no ghost components. We write  $\mathbf{B} \subset \mathbf{Z}$  for the subset of bare maps and  $\mathbf{B}^\chi \subset \mathbf{Z}^\chi$  for bare maps of Euler characteristic  $\chi$ .

**6.1. Transversality at one map.** Consider an  $\text{sc}^+$ -section  $\theta: \mathbf{B}^\chi \rightarrow \mathbf{W}^\chi$  and a map  $u: S \rightarrow X$  satisfying  $\bar{\partial}_J u = \theta(u)$ . The condition that  $\theta$  is  $\text{sc}^+$  ensures that the operator  $\bar{\partial}_J - \theta$  is Fredholm.

**Lemma 6.1.** *Let the irreducible components of  $S$  be  $S_r$ ,  $r = 1, 2, \dots, m$ , and choose a disk  $D_r \subset S_r$  for each  $r$ . Then the (finite dimensional) cokernel of the linearization  $L_u(\bar{\partial}_J - \theta)$  at  $u$  is spanned by sections of  $\text{Hom}^{0,1}(TS, u^*TX)$  supported in  $\bigcup_{r=1}^m D_r$  that, furthermore, can be chosen as the values at  $u$  of basic perturbations centered at  $(u, S)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\xi$  be a non-trivial element in the cokernel of  $L_u(\bar{\partial}_J - \theta)$ . Fix  $r$  so that  $\xi|_{S_r} \neq 0$ . We claim that  $\xi$   $L^2$ -pairs non-trivially with some section of the form  $V(u(z))\alpha(z)$ , where  $V$  is a vector field around  $u(z)$  and  $\alpha(z)$  is a  $(0, 1)$ -form supported around  $z \in D_r$ . If not, then by continuity of  $\xi$ , it must vanish throughout  $D_r$ . This means that  $\xi$  is a solution to the conjugate equation  $(L\bar{\partial}_J - \theta)^*\xi = 0$  that vanishes identically on an open set, but then it vanishes throughout  $S_r$  by unique continuation. (Here unique continuation follows from Carleman estimates for the operator  $\partial - A$ , for the  $L^\infty$  zero order term  $A$  determined by a (local) frame for  $u^*TX$  and the  $\text{sc}^+$ -section  $\theta$ .) This contradicts  $\xi|_{S_r} \neq 0$ . Pick a section



$\tau_1 = V_1(u(z))\alpha_1(z)$  with  $\langle \tau_1, \xi \rangle_{L^2} \neq 0$  and repeat the argument for  $L_u(\bar{\partial}_J - \theta)$  followed by the projection to the  $L^2$ -complement of  $\tau_1$ . This operator has Fredholm index and cokernel dimension one less than the original operator, applying this inductively we find finitely many sections  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_m$ ,  $\tau_k = V_k(u(z))\alpha_k(z)$  with required properties that span the cokernel. By definition of basic sections, there are basic sections that agree with  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_m$  at  $(u, S)$ . The lemma follows.  $\square$

**6.2. Transversality on the bare locus.** Let  $\mathbf{B}^{x;0} \subset \mathbf{B}^x$  denote the space of stable maps from smooth domains. Let  $\mathbf{B}^{x;1}$  denote the space of stable maps from domains with at most one boundary node, i.e., domains of maps in  $\mathbf{B}^x$  are smooth except for *one* boundary node.

**Definition 6.2.** A (parameterized)  $\text{sc}^+$ -multisection  $\theta: \mathbf{B}^{x;0} \rightarrow \mathbf{W}^x$  ( $\theta_t: \mathbf{B}^{x;1} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbf{W}^x$ ) is *bare-compact* if the space of solutions to  $\bar{\partial}_J = \theta^x$  in  $\mathbf{B}^{x;0}$  (to  $\bar{\partial}_J = \theta_t^x$  in  $\mathbf{B}^{x;1} \times [0, 1]$ ) is compact.

It is far from obvious how to produce bare-compact sections. They will be constructed below using the bubble censorship lemma of [11]. However, given a bare-compact section, it is straightforward to see that we may perturb it:

**Lemma 6.3.**

- (0) *Suppose given a bare-compact multisection  $\theta: \mathbf{B}^{x;0} \rightarrow \mathbf{W}^x$ . Then there are finitely many basic perturbations  $\lambda_\alpha: \mathbf{B}^{x;0} \rightarrow \mathbf{W}^x$ ,  $\alpha \in A$  of arbitrarily small norm and supported around bare maps  $(u_\alpha, S_\alpha)$  such that all solutions to*

$$\bar{\partial}_J u = \theta(u) + \sum \lambda_\alpha(u)$$

*are transversely cut out (in particular, solutions have smooth domains) and the space of such solutions is compact.*

- (1) *Suppose given a parameterized bare-compact multisection  $\theta_t: \mathbf{B}^{x;1} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbf{W}^x$  such that all solutions to  $\bar{\partial}_J = \theta_\tau$ , over the boundary  $\tau = 0, 1 \in \partial[0, 1]$  are transversely cut out and such that all solutions in the locus of maps with one boundary node are germs of transversely cut out standard elliptic or hyperbolic node family. Then there are finitely many parameterized basic sections  $\lambda_{\alpha,t}: \mathbf{B}^{x;1} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbf{W}^x$ ,  $\alpha \in A$  of arbitrarily small norm and supported around  $((u_\alpha, S_\alpha), t_\alpha)$  where  $(u_\alpha, S_\alpha)$  is a bare map from a smooth domain (without boundary nodes) and where  $t_\alpha$  lies in the interior of  $[0, 1]$  (i.e., parameterized basic sections supported in  $\mathbf{B}^{x;0} \times (0, 1)$ ) such that the following holds. All solutions to*

$$(6.1) \quad \bar{\partial}_J u = \theta_t(u) + \sum \lambda_{\alpha;t}(u)$$

*agree with the solutions of the unperturbed equation for  $t$  in some neighborhood of  $\partial[0, 1]$  and in some neighborhood of the locus of maps in  $\mathbf{B}^{x;1} \times [0, 1]$  with one boundary node. The space of solution to (6.1) is a transversely cut out 1-parameter family (in particular, new solutions have smooth domains) and the space of solutions is compact.*

*Proof.* We first consider (0). By hypothesis the moduli space of solutions  $\mathcal{M}^x$  to  $\bar{\partial}_J u = \theta(u)$  in  $\mathbf{B}^x$  is compact. Cover  $\mathcal{M}^x$  by coordinate neighborhoods inside  $\mathbf{B}^x$  for which Lemma 6.1 holds. Passing to a finite cover we find finitely many basic sections  $\lambda(u_\alpha, S_\alpha)$ ,  $\alpha \in A$ , such that the operator  $F: \mathbf{B}^x \times [0, 1]^{|A|} \rightarrow \mathbf{W}^x$ ,

$$F(u, \epsilon) = \bar{\partial}_J(u) - \theta^x(u) - \sum_{\alpha \in A} \epsilon_\alpha \lambda(u_\alpha, S_\alpha)$$

has surjective differential at any solution  $(u, 0)$ . By the Sard-Smale theorem, we then have transversality of solutions to the equation  $\bar{\partial}_J(u) - \theta^x(u) - \sum_{\alpha \in A} \epsilon_\alpha \lambda(u_\alpha, S_\alpha)$  for an open dense set of  $\epsilon = (\epsilon_\alpha)$  in a neighborhood of  $0 \in [0, 1]^{|A|}$ . Take  $\lambda_\alpha(u, S) = \epsilon_\alpha \lambda(u_\alpha, S_\alpha)$  for  $\epsilon$  in this subset. Since the restriction of  $\bar{\partial}_J$  to the locus of nodal maps in  $\mathbf{B}^x$  has Fredholm index  $-2$  transversality implies there are no solutions there and consequently solutions have smooth domains.

For compactness, note that the sections  $\lambda_j$  are  $\text{sc}^+$  by Lemma 5.3. Compactness then follows from [15, Lemma 3.4].

The argument for (1) is the same after observing that the desired transversality holds already near  $\partial[0, 1]$  and the locus of maps with a boundary node and that the Fredholm index  $-2$  is still sufficiently small that there are no solutions in generic 1-parameter families.  $\square$

*Remark 6.4.* The two initial transversality conditions in (1) are of different nature. The condition at  $\partial[0, 1]$  is natural when one tries to connect two perturbations by a 1-parameter family. The condition at the locus of maps with one boundary node is of a different nature. In our application below we get a perturbation along the one boundary node locus by pulling back perturbations via a forgetful map. The pulled back perturbations meets the transversality condition by gluing and general position properties of the perturbation that was pulled back. We study such properties in the remainder of this section.

**6.3. Additional Fredholm problems.** In this section, we list the Fredholm sections we will use in the sequel. For simpler notation, we let  $\mathbf{B}^x = \mathbf{B}^{x;0}$  and write  $\mathbf{B}_n^x$  to indicate the locus of bare maps from smooth domains whose domain has  $n$  marked points (and no punctures). We indicate in context whether the marked points should be interior or boundary. Recall the bundle of complex anti-linear differentials  $\mathbf{W}^x \rightarrow \mathbf{B}^x$ . In the presence of marked points we have the analogous bundle  $\mathbf{W}_n^x \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_n^x$ .

**6.3.1. The Cauchy-Riemann operator.** Consider the polyfold bundle  $\mathbf{W}^x \rightarrow \mathbf{B}^x$ . Our basic Fredholm section is just the Cauchy-Riemann operator,  $\bar{\partial}_J$ . By Theorem 4.10 its index is

$$\text{index}(\bar{\partial}_J) = 0.$$

**6.3.2. The complex linear differential.** Consider the polyfold bundle  $\mathbf{W}_1^x \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_1^x$ . We extend the bundle to

$$\mathbf{W}_1^x \oplus \text{Hom}^{0,1}(T_p S, T_{u(p)} X) \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_1,$$

by adding the space of  $(J, j)$ -complex linear maps from the tangent space of the surface at the marked point  $p$  to the tangent space of the target at its image  $u(p)$ . In this setting we will study the extended  $\bar{\partial}_J$  section  $\bar{\partial}_J \oplus \partial_J(p)$  given by

$$(\bar{\partial}_J \oplus \partial_J(p))(u) = \bar{\partial}_J u \oplus \partial_J u(p),$$

where  $\partial_J u(p)$  denotes the complex linear part of the differential at  $p$ :  $\partial_J u = \frac{1}{2}(du - J \circ du \circ j)$ . Since  $u \in H_{\text{loc}}^3$ , the differential of  $u$  is continuous and the evaluation described is well defined.

In the case of an interior marked point  $p$ , the Fredholm index of  $\bar{\partial}_J \oplus \partial_J(p)$  is

$$(6.2) \quad \text{index}(\bar{\partial}_J \oplus \partial_J(p)) = \text{index}(\bar{\partial}_J) + 2 - 6 = -4,$$

and in the case of a boundary marked point  $q$ ,

$$(6.3) \quad \text{index}(\bar{\partial}_J \oplus \partial_J(q)) = \text{index}(\bar{\partial}_J) + 1 - 3 = -2.$$

We will also consider an analogous problem in the case of boundary marked points  $q$  where we fix a vector field  $\xi$  in  $L$  and let  $\pi_\xi$  denote the projection to the orthogonal complement of  $\xi$ . Here we use the operator

$$\bar{\partial}_J \oplus \pi_\xi \circ \partial_J(q).$$

This operator has index

$$(6.4) \quad \text{index}(\bar{\partial}_J \oplus \pi_\xi \circ \partial_J(q)) = \text{index}(\bar{\partial}_J) + 1 - 2 = -1.$$

6.3.3. *Interior crossings.* Consider the polyfold bundle  $\mathbf{W}_2^\chi \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_2^\chi$  where  $\mathbf{B}_2^\chi$  is the space of stable maps with two interior marked points  $p_1$  and  $p_2$ . We extend the bundle to

$$\mathbf{B}_2 \times X \times X \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_2.$$

In this setting we will study the extended  $\bar{\partial}_J$ -section  $\bar{\partial}_J \times \text{ev}_{12}$  given by

$$\bar{\partial}_J \times \text{ev}_{12}(u) = \bar{\partial}_J u \times (u(p_1), u(p_2)).$$

We then consider  $(\bar{\partial}_J \times \text{ev}_{12})^{-1}(0 \times \Delta_X)$ , where  $\Delta_X$  is the diagonal in  $X \times X$ . The Fredholm index  $\text{index}(\bar{\partial}_J \times \text{ev}_{12}, 0 \times \Delta_X)$  of this problem is

$$\text{index}(\bar{\partial}_J \times \text{ev}_{12}, 0 \times \Delta_X) = \text{index}(\bar{\partial}_J) + 4 - 6 = -2.$$

6.3.4. *Boundary crossings.* Consider the polyfold bundle  $\mathbf{W}_2^\chi \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_2^\chi$  where  $\mathbf{B}_2^\chi$  is the space of stable maps with two boundary marked points  $p_1$  and  $p_2$ . We extend the bundle to

$$\mathbf{B}_2^\chi \times L \times L \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_2^\chi.$$

In this setting we will study the extended  $\bar{\partial}_J$ -section  $\bar{\partial}_J \times \text{ev}_{12}$  given by

$$\bar{\partial}_J \times \text{ev}_{12}(u) = \bar{\partial}_J u \times (u(p_1), u(p_2)).$$

We then consider  $(\bar{\partial}_J \times \text{ev}_{12})^{-1}(0 \times \Delta_L)$ , where  $\Delta_L$  is the diagonal in  $L \times L$ . The Fredholm index  $\text{index}(\bar{\partial}_J \times \text{ev}_{12}, 0 \times \Delta_L)$  of this problem is

$$\text{index}(\bar{\partial}_J \times \text{ev}_{12}, 0 \times \Delta_L) = \text{index}(\bar{\partial}_J) + 2 - 3 = -1.$$

This means that for generic 1-parameter families of perturbations there are isolated instances when the boundary curve has a self-intersection and at such instances the two tangent vectors together with the tangent vector of the deformation at the intersection point spans the tangent space of  $L$ .

6.3.5. *Intersecting  $C$  and crossing  $L$ .* Consider the polyfold bundle  $\mathbf{W}_1^\chi \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_1^\chi$  where  $\mathbf{B}_1^\chi$  is the space of stable maps with one interior marked point  $p$ . We extend the bundle to

$$\mathbf{W} \times X \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_1.$$

In this setting we will study the extended  $\bar{\partial}_J$ -section  $\bar{\partial}_J \times \text{ev}$  given by

$$(\bar{\partial}_J \times \text{ev})(u) = \bar{\partial}_J u \times (u(p)).$$

We then consider  $\bar{\partial}_J \times \text{ev}^{-1}(C)$ , where  $C$  is a smooth stratified 4-chain. The Fredholm index  $\text{index}(\bar{\partial}_J \times \text{ev}, 0 \times C)$  of this problem is then

$$\text{index}(\bar{\partial}_J \times \text{ev}, 0 \times C) = \text{index}(\bar{\partial}_J) + 2 - 2 = 0.$$

This means that for generic perturbation, solutions intersect  $C$  transversely at interior points.

Similarly if we substitute  $C$  with  $L$  above we find

$$\text{index}(\bar{\partial}_J \times \text{ev}, 0 \times L) = \text{index}(\bar{\partial}_J) + 2 - 3 = -1.$$

This means that for generic 1-parameter families there are isolated instances where a curve meets  $L$  at an interior point and at such instances the image of the differential of the map together with the tangent space of  $L$  and the tangent vector of the deformation spans the tangent space to  $X$ .

**6.4. Generic 0- and 1-parameter families.** Using the extended Fredholm problems in Section 6.3 we can refine Lemma 6.3 as follows.

**Lemma 6.5.** *Let  $\theta: \mathbf{B}^{x;0} \rightarrow \mathbf{W}^x$  be a bare-compact multisection as in Lemma 6.3 (0). Then there are finitely many basic perturbations  $\lambda_\alpha: \mathbf{B}^{x;0} \rightarrow \mathbf{W}^x$ ,  $\alpha \in A$  of arbitrarily small norm and supported around bare maps  $(u_\alpha, S_\alpha)$  such that all solutions to*

$$\bar{\partial}_J u = \theta(u) + \sum \lambda_\alpha(u)$$

*have properties as in Lemma 6.3 (0) and in addition are embeddings with everywhere non-zero complex linear differential and with interior disjoint from  $L$ .*

*Proof.* To see that there are basic perturbations so that solutions are injective in the interior we consider the operator  $\bar{\partial}_J \times \text{ev}_{12}$  as in Section 6.3.3 and consider the compact inverse image of  $0 \times \Delta_X$ . Arguing as the proof of Lemma 6.3 (0), we find a finite number of basic sections that span the cokernel of this operator at every solution and then apply the Sard-Smale theorem to find finitely many basic perturbations so that solutions are transverse and injective in the interior. Repeating the argument with the operators in Sections 6.3.2, 6.3.4, and 6.3.5 we find similarly that after possibly adding more basic perturbations, solutions have injective complex linear differential, are injective on the boundary, and miss  $L$  in the interior. The lemma follows.  $\square$

For 1-parameter families we have the following.

**Lemma 6.6.** *Let  $\theta_t^x: \mathbf{B}^{x;1} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbf{W}^x$  be a parameterized bare-compact multisection with properties as in Lemma 6.3 (1). Then there are finitely many parameterized basic perturbations  $\lambda_{\alpha,t}: \mathbf{B}^{x;1} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbf{W}^x$ ,  $\alpha \in A$  of arbitrarily small norm and supported around  $((u_\alpha, S_\alpha), t_\alpha)$ , where  $(u_\alpha, S_\alpha)$  are bare maps without boundary nodes and  $t_\alpha$  lies in the interior of  $[0, 1]$  such that all solutions to*

$$\bar{\partial}_J u = \theta_t(u) + \sum \lambda_{\alpha;t}(u)$$

*have the properties as in Lemma 6.3 (1) and in addition satisfies the following: The map in the 1-parameter families intersected with  $\mathbf{B}^{x;0}$  are embeddings except for isolated instances where they have one of the following two generic degenerations:*

- (a) *A transverse boundary crossing, where tangent vectors at the intersecting branches are linearly independent and where the difference of the tangent vectors to the parameterizing interval at the crossing points does not lie in the plane they span.*
- (b) *A transverse intersection with  $L$ , where the image of the tangent plane to the curve together with the tangent space to the Lagrangian spans a codimension one subspace of  $TX$  and where the tangent vector to the parameterizing interval at the intersection point does not lie in this hyperplane.*

*Proof.* The proof is directly analogous to the proof of Lemma 6.3 (1), we find an open cover of the solution space in the complement of maps over  $\partial[0, 1]$  and the locus of nodal maps and basic sections that span the cokernel of the augmented operators associated to  $\bar{\partial}_J$  in

Sections 6.3.5, 6.3.2, 6.3.3, 6.3.4, and 6.3.5. Using compactness of the solution space we pass to a finite cover and use the Sard-Smale theorem to get transversality. The Fredholm index calculations in Section 6.3 then implies the lemma.  $\square$

**6.5. Stability of transverse solutions.** In this section we record general properties of transversely cut out solutions that we will use below. The properties are direct consequences of the implicit function theorem.

**Lemma 6.7.** *Suppose given an equation  $\bar{\partial}_J(u) = \eta$ , and assume  $u$  is a bare, 0-generic, transversely cut out solution. Fix a chart around  $u$ ; in this chart we consider the distance between perturbations  $\eta$  and  $\eta'$ . Then there is  $\delta = \delta(u, \eta) > 0$  such that for any  $\eta'$  with  $|\eta' - \eta| < \delta$ , the equation  $\bar{\partial}(u') = \eta'$  has a unique solution  $u'$  in the chart around  $u$ , which is bare, 0-generic, and transversely cut out.*

*Proof.* This is a consequence of the inverse function theorem.  $\square$

We also have the 1-parametric counterpart.

**Lemma 6.8.** *Suppose given a parameterized equation  $\bar{\partial}_J(u) = \eta_t$ ,  $t \in [0, 1]$  and assume  $u_{t_0}$  is a bare, 1-generic solution that belongs to a transversely cut out 1-parameter family  $u_t$ . Fix a chart on  $\mathbf{G}^x \times [0, 1]$  around  $(u_{t_0}, t_0)$ ; in this chart we consider the distance between perturbations  $\eta_t$  and  $\eta'_t$ . Then there is  $\delta = \delta(u, \eta_t) > 0$  such that for any  $\eta'_t$  with  $|\eta'_t - \eta_t| < \delta$ , the equation  $\bar{\partial}_J(u') = \eta'_t$  has 1-parameter family of solution  $u'_t$  in the chart around  $u_{t_0}$ , which is conjugated by diffeomorphism to the family  $u_t$  in some neighborhood of  $(u_{t_0}, t_0)$ . In particular, the family is 1-generic, and transversely cut out.*

*Proof.* Again a consequence of the inverse function theorem.  $\square$

## 7. GHOST BUBBLE CENSORSHIP

We turn to the problem of how to produce perturbations of the holomorphic curve equation with the property that the locus of bare solutions is compact. The main tool is the ghost bubble censorship principle [11], which we now review and adapt. Let  $X$  be a symplectic manifold,  $L \subset X$  a Lagrangian, and  $J$  an almost complex structure such that  $L$  is locally the fixed locus of an anti-holomorphic involution.

### 7.1. Control near ghosts and ghost bubble formation.

**Definition 7.1.** Consider a sequence of bare maps  $u_\alpha: (S_\alpha, \partial S_\alpha) \rightarrow (X, L)$  which Gromov converges to a stable map  $u: (S, \partial S) \rightarrow (X, L)$  with ghost components. Let  $u_+ : S_+ \rightarrow X$  be the restriction of  $u$  to the components of positive symplectic area, and let  $S^- = \overline{S} \setminus S_+$ . Let  $S_\alpha^- \subset S$  be the corresponding subset of  $S_\alpha$ , and assume  $\bar{\partial}_J u_\alpha|_{S_\alpha^-} = 0$ .

We say such a sequence is *controlled* if, around each node separating  $S^-$  from  $S \setminus S^-$ , there exist neck coordinates  $[-\rho_\alpha, \rho_\alpha] \times I \subset S_\alpha$ , constants  $\xi_{\alpha,p}, \xi_{\alpha,n} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  and exponential weights  $\delta' > 0$  and  $\delta > \pi$ , such that

$$(7.1) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|(\bar{\partial}_J u_{\alpha,p} - \xi_{\alpha,p} \otimes d\bar{z})|_{[-\rho_\alpha+1,0] \times I}\|_{2,2\pi+\delta'} \\ & + \|(\bar{\partial}_J u_{\alpha,n} - \xi_{\alpha,n} \otimes d\bar{z})|_{[0,\rho_\alpha-1] \times I}\|_{2,2\pi+\delta'} = \mathcal{O}(1). \end{aligned}$$

$$(7.2) \quad \|\bar{\partial}_J u_\alpha|_{[-1,1] \times I}\|_0 = \mathcal{O}(e^{-2\pi\rho_\alpha}).$$

$$(7.3) \quad \|\bar{\partial}_J u_\alpha|_{[-1,1] \times I}\|_2 = \mathcal{O}(e^{-\delta\rho_\alpha}).$$

**Definition 7.2.** We say that a map  $u: S \rightarrow X$  is a  $\partial_J$ -generic immersion if  $\partial_J u$  never vanishes, the two values of  $\partial_J u$  are linearly independent at double points, and there are no triple points.

**Theorem 7.3.** [11, Theorems 1.5, 1.8, 1.10] *Given a controlled ghost bubble formation as in Definition 7.1, the bare part of the map  $u_+: S_+ \rightarrow X$  is not a  $\partial_J$ -generic immersion.*

Recall that a standard chart  $\mathbf{U} \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$  centered around some map  $u_0$  is determined in terms of the data of fixed coordinate charts  $\mathbb{R}^{2n} \rightarrow X$  around each node of  $u_0$ , and neck parameterizations  $[-\rho, \rho] \times I \rightarrow S$  for nearby curves, and in particular neck length functions  $\rho: \mathbf{U} \rightarrow (0, \infty]$ .

**Definition 7.4.** In a standard chart  $\mathbf{U}$  centered around a map  $(w, T)$  with constant ghosts, we say a section  $\lambda: \mathbf{U} \rightarrow \mathbf{W}|_{\mathbf{U}}$  is *controlled near ghosts* if for any  $(u, S) \in \mathbf{U}$   $\lambda(u)$  vanishes on all ghost components of  $S$ , and for each neck separating the ghost locus of  $(w, T)$  from the bare locus, there exists functions  $\xi_p, \xi_n: \mathbf{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  and exponential weights  $\delta' > 0$  and  $\delta > \pi$ , such that

$$(7.4) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|(\lambda(u)_p - \xi_p(u) \otimes d\bar{z})|_{[-\rho+1, 0] \times I}\|_{2, 2\pi+\delta'} \\ & + \|(\lambda(u)_n - \xi_n(u) \otimes d\bar{z})|_{[0, \rho-1] \times I}\|_{2, 2\pi+\delta'} = \mathcal{O}(1). \end{aligned}$$

$$(7.5) \quad \|\lambda(u)|_{[-1, 1] \times I}\|_0 = \mathcal{O}(e^{-2\pi\rho}).$$

$$(7.6) \quad \|\lambda(u)|_{[-1, 1] \times I}\|_2 = \mathcal{O}(e^{-\delta\rho}).$$

Here the implicit constants in the estimates are allowed to depend on the section  $\lambda$ , but of course not on  $\rho$ .

Note that the space of sections over  $\mathbf{U}$  that are controlled near ghosts admit a projection to the finite dimensional space consisting of their asymptotic differentials  $u \mapsto \prod_{j=1}^m (\xi_{p;j}(u)d\bar{z}, \xi_{n;j}(u)d\bar{z})$  where the product ranges over all gluing necks.

**Lemma 7.5.** *The space of sections controlled near ghosts is closed under multiplication by continuous functions  $\mathbf{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ . Furthermore, projecting to the asymptotic differentials  $u \mapsto (\xi_p(u), \xi_n(u))$  the space of controlled sections fibers with fiber  $\mathbf{W}'|_{\mathbf{U}}$ , where the fiber over  $u$  is  $H^{2, 2\pi+\delta}(TS, u^*TX)^{0,1}$ , i.e., the Sobolev space with weight increased by  $2\pi$  at each puncture corresponding to a neck connected to the bare part.*

*Proof.* Immediate from the definition. □

Let  $\mathbf{U}$  and  $\mathbf{V}$  be standard charts around  $(w, T)$  with constant ghosts. Consider  $\lambda|_{\mathbf{U}}: \mathbf{U} \rightarrow \mathbf{W}|_{\mathbf{U}}$ . Then  $\lambda|_{\mathbf{U}}$  induces a section  $\tilde{\lambda}|_{\mathbf{V} \cap \mathbf{U}} \rightarrow \mathbf{W}|_{\mathbf{V} \cap \mathbf{U}}$ , where we think of  $\mathbf{U} \cap \mathbf{V} \subset \mathbf{V}$ , so that  $\tilde{\lambda}$  is a section in the local coordinates determined by  $\mathbf{V}$ , defined over a subset.

**Lemma 7.6.** *If  $\lambda|_{\mathbf{U}}$  is controlled near ghosts then  $\tilde{\lambda}|_{\mathbf{U} \cap \mathbf{V}}$  is controlled near ghosts.*

*Proof.* This is straightforward, the change of coordinates determines a conformal equivalence between ends  $\psi: [0, \infty) \times I \rightarrow [\rho_0, \infty) \times I$  which is a translation and a rotation if  $I = S^1$ . Let  $\Phi: \mathbb{R}^{2n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  be the change of coordinates around the node corresponding to  $\mathbf{U}$  and  $\mathbf{V}$ . Then

$$d\tilde{u} = d\Phi(u) \circ du \circ d\psi$$

and the section induced from  $\xi_{\bullet} \otimes d\bar{z}$ ,  $\bullet = p$  or  $\bullet = n$  is

$$d\Phi(u)(\xi_{\bullet}) \otimes d\psi d\bar{z}.$$

It follows by boundedness of  $d\Phi$  and its derivatives that (7.2) and (7.3) hold and also that

$$(7.7) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|(\tilde{\lambda}(u)_p - d\Phi(u)(\xi_p) \otimes d\bar{z})|_{[-\rho+1,0] \times I}\|_{2,2\pi+\delta'} \\ & + \|(\tilde{\lambda}(u)_n - d\Phi(u)(\xi_n) \otimes d\bar{z})|_{[0,\rho-1] \times I}\|_{2,2\pi+\delta'} = \mathcal{O}(1). \end{aligned}$$

Then, if  $\tilde{\xi}_{\bullet} = d\Phi(u(\infty))\xi_{\bullet}$  we have,

$$\|(d\Phi(u)(\xi_{\bullet}) \otimes d\bar{z} - \tilde{\xi}_{\bullet} \otimes d\bar{z})|_{[-\rho+1,0] \times I}\|_{2,2\pi+\delta'} = \mathcal{O}(1),$$

by Taylor expansion of  $d\Phi$ . The lemma follows.  $\square$

**Definition 7.7.** We say that a section  $\lambda: \mathbf{Z} \rightarrow \mathbf{W}$  is *controlled near ghosts* if  $\lambda$  vanishes on all ghost components, and is controlled near ghosts when restricted to some (equivalent any by Lemma 7.6) chart centered around each map with constant ghosts.

It is obvious from the definition that if  $\lambda$  is sufficiently controlled near ghosts, then any sequence of solutions to  $\bar{\partial} = \lambda$  will satisfy the hypothesis, hence the conclusion, of Theorem 7.3.

It is also obvious from the definition that the space of sections which are controlled near ghosts is linear, and that, among continuous sections  $\lambda$  which vanish on all ghost components, the property of being controlled near ghosts depends only on the germ of  $\lambda$  along the locus  $\mathbf{G}_0 \subset \mathbf{Z}$  of maps with constant ghosts.

We will need the following slight generalization of Theorem 7.3. Let  $\theta: \mathbf{Z} \rightarrow \mathbf{W}$  be a section which is a finite linear combination  $\theta = \sum_{k=1}^m \lambda_k$ , where all  $\lambda_k$  are controlled near ghosts. Let  $(u_{\alpha}, S_{\alpha})$  be a sequence of bare solutions to  $\bar{\partial}_J(u_{\alpha}, S_{\alpha}) = \theta$  that Gromov converges to a nodal solution  $\bar{\partial}_J(u, S) = \theta$ .

**Proposition 7.8.** *Let  $(u_{\alpha}, S_{\alpha})$  be a sequence of bare solutions to  $\bar{\partial}_J(u_{\alpha}, S_{\alpha}) = \theta$  that Gromov converges to a nodal solution  $\bar{\partial}_J(u, S) = \theta$ . Then the bare part  $(u_+, S_+)$  of  $(u, S)$  is not a  $\partial_J$ -generic immersion.*

*Proof.* The proof is a small extension of the proof of Theorem 7.3. We explain the modifications needed.

Consider a neck region  $[-\rho_{\alpha}, \rho_{\alpha}] \times I$ ,  $\rho_{\alpha} \rightarrow \infty$  as  $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$  near the node in the limit. In these coordinates there are sharp cut-off regions  $[\kappa_{\alpha;j}, \kappa_{\alpha;j} + 1]$  where the perturbation  $\lambda_j$  is cut off, where  $\kappa_{\alpha;j}$  are uniformly bounded as  $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ . After a bounded translation of coordinates we assume that the largest  $\kappa_{\alpha;j}$  satisfies  $\kappa_{\alpha;j} = 0$  and that the smallest is the uniformly bounded  $\kappa < 1$ .

The solutions to  $\bar{\partial}_J(u_{\alpha}, S_{\alpha}) = \theta$  satisfy the main hypothesis of [11, Proposition 9.1], i.e.,  $\|u_{\alpha}\|_{C^0} \leq \epsilon$  and  $\|\bar{\partial}_J u_{\alpha}\|_{1,\delta} \leq \epsilon$  in the neck-region. The proposition is then a consequence of the arguments in [11] once we show that solutions  $\bar{\partial}_J(u_{\alpha}, S_{\alpha}) = \theta$  have +-reasonable necks, see [11, Definition 1.3]. Here the only difference when considering a finite linear combination as compared to only one perturbation appears in [11, Lemma 4.2]. In this lemma, the  $\bar{\partial}$ -equation is explicitly solved in the neck region and it is shown that the cut-off decay condition (i.e., the sharp cut-off) leads to only a small change in the Fourier coefficient corresponding to the complex derivative. For a linear combination of perturbations, we have  $m$  such regions in the uniformly bounded interval  $[\kappa, 1]$ . The total change in (rescaled) Fourier coefficient is then the sum of these (rescaled) changes and we conclude that the complex linear derivative

Fourier coefficient in the region  $\rho > 1$ , where the map is unperturbed holomorphic transfers to the region  $\rho < \kappa$  where it converges to the perturbed solution on the compact disk. The proposition follows.  $\square$

To see the effect of bubble censorship on the solution spaces let  $\mathbf{G} \subset \mathbf{Z}$  denote the locus of stable maps for which all ghost components are constant. We think of it as constructed from bare maps of higher Euler characteristic with constant ghosts attached.

**Corollary 7.9.** *Assume  $\bar{\partial}_J - \theta$  is proper, see [16, Section 5.2], where  $\theta$  is a finite sum of perturbations that are sufficiently controlled near ghosts. Assume all non-bare solutions of  $\bar{\partial}_J = \theta$  are  $\partial_J$ -generic immersions on their bare loci. Then all solutions to  $\bar{\partial}_J = \theta$  have constant ghosts, and there is a punctured neighborhood of the locus  $\mathbf{G}$  which contains no solutions to  $\bar{\partial}_J = \theta$ . In particular, the locus of bare solutions is compact (for bounded Euler characteristic).*

*The same statement holds over  $\mathbf{Z} \times \mathbb{R}^n$  for an  $n$ -parameter family of perturbations  $\theta_t$  which is a finite sum of one parameter families of perturbations that are sufficiently controlled near ghosts.*

*Proof.* The condition of the summands being sufficiently controlled near ghosts implies that  $\theta$  vanishes on any ghost component, which is therefore  $J$ -holomorphic, hence maps to a point; thus ghosts are constant. Now suppose every neighborhood of  $\mathbf{G}$  contains a solution to  $\bar{\partial}_J = \theta$ . By compactness, there is some sequence converging to a non-bare solution,  $u: S \rightarrow X$ . Theorem 7.3 then asserts that  $u_+: S_+ \rightarrow X$  is not a  $\partial_J$ -generic immersion, contradicting the hypothesis.  $\square$

**7.2. Constructing sections controlled near ghosts.** We discuss how to produce sections which are controlled near ghosts. Recall that the gluing operation  $\oplus$  serves to provide coordinates on collar neighborhoods of the nodal strata of configuration spaces  $\mathbf{Z}$ , and the hat-gluing operations  $\hat{\oplus}$  (reviewed in Sec. 4.4 above) then serve to extend sections from the nodal locus to the collar neighborhood.

We require a variant of the hat-gluing operation from [15] (recalled in Section 4.4 above), which differs from the original solely in the choice of cut-off, where we pick a cut-off so that the perturbations we construct are controlled near ghosts, see in particular (7.2).

More precisely, recall that in [15] and Section 4.4 there is a choice of cut-off function  $\beta: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is a smooth function with derivative with support in  $(-1, 1)$ . We will use a family of such functions  $\beta^R$  that goes from 1 to 0 over the shorter interval  $(-\frac{1}{R}, \frac{1}{R})$ . We then define gluing  $\hat{\oplus}_a^R$  by replacing  $\beta$  with  $\beta^R$  for  $R = \varphi(a) = e^{\frac{1}{a}} - e$ . These gluings respect the regularity conditions:

**Lemma 7.10.** *If  $\xi^+$  and  $\xi^-$  lie in  $H^{k,\delta}(\mathbb{R}^\pm \times I)$  then the sharp gluing  $\hat{\oplus}_a^R$  still produces  $sc^+$  sections of  $\mathbf{W}$ .*

*Proof.* To see this we note that the effect of replacing  $\beta$  by  $\beta^R$  on the  $k^{\text{th}}$  derivative of the hat-glued map is multiplication by a linear combination of terms of the form

$$\varphi^{(j)}(R(a)) \frac{d^{k_1} R}{da^{k_1}} \cdots \frac{d^{k_j} R}{da^{k_j}},$$

where  $\sum k_j = k$ . Such factors can be estimated as

$$(e^{\frac{1}{a}})^{2k} P_k\left(\frac{1}{a}\right),$$



where  $P_k$  is a polynomial. Using the fact that  $e^{\delta(e^{\frac{1}{a}})}$  goes to infinity faster than such terms the statement follows.  $\square$

When constructing extensions of basic perturbations below, weighted norms that separate out asymptotic constants will be used, see Section 8.6. We next describe the infinite dimensional component of such norms and show how they interact with that sharp hat gluing.

Consider gluing at a node as in Section 4.1. The gluing region

$$Z_a := \{0 \leq s \leq R\} = \{-R \geq s' \geq 0\}$$

has natural weight functions  $w_{a;\delta}: Z_a \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  induced from the weight functions  $e^{\delta|s|}$  of the semi-infinite cylinders  $C_{\pm}$  from which it is glued:

$$w_{a;\delta}(s, t) = e^{\delta|s - \frac{1}{2}R|}, \quad 0 < \delta < 2\pi, \quad s \in [0, R].$$

This means that  $w_{a;\delta}(s, t)$  is simply the restriction of the weight functions  $e^{\delta|s|}$  on the end  $C_+$  for  $s \in [0, \frac{1}{2}R]$  and on the end  $C_-$  for  $s \in [\frac{1}{2}R, R]$ . We write  $H^{3,\delta}(Z_a)$  and  $H_0^{3,\delta}(Z_a)$  for the corresponding Sobolev spaces weighted by  $w_{\delta}$ , and we denote the weighted Sobolev norm  $\|\cdot\|_{k;\delta}$ . We point out that as (sc) Banach spaces  $H^{3,\delta}(Z_a) \approx H^3(Z_a)$ , but the isomorphism is not uniform in  $a$ . We call the norms in  $H^{3,\delta}(Z_a)$  *restricted weight norms*.

The proof of Lemma 7.10 shows that sharp gluing is uniform in restricted weight norms provided we decrease the exponential weight.

**Corollary 7.11.** *If  $\xi^+$  and  $\xi^-$  lie in  $H^{k,\delta}(\mathbb{R}^{\pm} \times I)$  and  $\delta > \delta'$  then  $\xi^+ \widehat{\oplus}_a^R \xi^-$  lies in  $H^{k,\delta'}(Z_a)$  uniformly as  $R \rightarrow \infty$ .*

*Proof.* This follows from the proof of Lemma 7.10 once we observe that terms of the form  $(e^{\frac{1}{a}})^{2k} P_k(\frac{1}{a})$  are dominated also by  $e^{(\delta-\delta')(e^{\frac{1}{a}})}$ , if  $\delta' < \delta$ .  $\square$

More generally, let  $\mathbf{U}$  be a local chart centered around some particular  $(u, S)$ . Fix some subset  $N$  of the nodes of  $S$ , and let  $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{S})$  be the corresponding map from the partial normalization of  $S$  along  $N$  (leaving punctures where the nodes were), and let  $\mathbf{U}_{\tilde{N}}$  be a corresponding local chart around  $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{S})$ .

Let  $\mathbf{U}_N \subset \mathbf{U}$  be the locus along which the nodes  $N$  remain nodal, and let  $n: \mathbf{U}_N \hookrightarrow \mathbf{U}_{\tilde{N}}$  be the natural embedding. There is a canonical identification  $n^* \mathbf{W} = \mathbf{W}$ . As with the usual hat-gluing, we have

**Corollary 7.12.** *The sharp hat gluing defines a map*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sc}^+(\mathbf{U}_{\tilde{N}}, \mathbf{W}) &\rightarrow \text{sc}^+(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}) \\ \lambda &\mapsto \widehat{\oplus}_a^R n^* \lambda \end{aligned}$$

In [11], we showed (translated into our present terminology):

**Proposition 7.13.** [11, Prop. 10.2] *If, in the setting above, the set of nodes  $N$  consists of those separating the bare and ghost parts of  $(u, S)$ , and the section  $\lambda$  is a basic perturbation (Def. 5.2) on the bare part and zero on the ghost part, then  $\widehat{\oplus}_a^R n^* \lambda$  is controlled near ghosts.*

**7.3. Forgetful mismatch.** This subsection is a pause for some exposition regarding our general strategy and why certain estimates will be required. It contains no results and can in principle be skipped by the reader.

Our basic strategy to construct perturbations will be inductive in Euler characteristic. Having fixed some basic perturbations above some Euler characteristic  $\chi$ , we begin at step  $\chi$  as follows: first, consider the locus of maps with constant ghosts which, after forgetting ghosts and nodes, corresponds to the map at the center of some basic perturbation. Extend the perturbation from these by the above sharp hat-gluing with zero perturbations on the (constant) ghosts, and then cut off at some distance from the locus of nodal domains (and some distance from the locus of constant ghosts). Suppose we can show:  $(\star)$  the resulting perturbation has the property that there is a neighborhood of the locus of curves-with-constant-ghosts containing no solutions. This property, along with the usual Gromov compactness, implies the ‘bare compactness’ required by the transversality results of Section 6. These transversality results then assert that to arrive at our desired properties, we can add some basic perturbations centered around bare maps of Euler characteristic  $\chi$ . We could then proceed to the next step of the induction.

Let us discuss  $(\star)$ . By Proposition 7.13, the sharp hat-gluing extension described is controlled near ghosts, hence we may apply the above ghost bubble censorship results (Theorem 7.3, Proposition 7.8, and Corollary 7.9) to conclude that if some sequence of bare solutions (to the perturbed equation) converges to a solution with ghosts, then the bare part of the limit solution must not be a  $\partial_J$ -generic immersion.

We would like to derive a contradiction for 0- and 1- parameter families, where one expects (as discussed in Section 6) that all solutions are  $\partial_J$ -generic immersions. Let us recall that in the unperturbed setting of [8], such a contradiction was immediate: the bare part must have already been a solution (of higher Euler characteristic) to the unperturbed  $\bar{\partial}_J$ -equation, and we had inductively chosen  $J$  so that all solutions of higher Euler characteristic had the desired genericity properties.

In the perturbed situation, we have a new problem: the hat-glued perturbation on the bare part may not agree with the perturbations we have seen at higher Euler characteristic. This is due to the following forgetful mismatch situation:

Consider a basic perturbation  $\lambda$  supported in some  $\mathbf{U}(u, S)$ , see Definition 5.2. Consider the map  $(w, T)$  with bare part  $(w_+u, S_+) \in \mathbf{U}(u, S)$ , and ghosts given by attaching first a rational (sphere or disk) bubble to one point in  $S$ , and then to the rational bubble, higher genus bubbles at  $n \geq 2$  points, ensuring stability.

Apply the procedure above: take the sharp hat-gluing extension of the sum of the aforementioned basic perturbation on  $(u, S)$  with the zero perturbation on the ghost part. Let us denote the resulting perturbation  $\lambda^*$ . The basic problem occurs when the gluing parameter at the node on  $S$  is  $a \neq 0$ , but the gluing parameters at the higher genus bubbles remain zero. Let  $(\tilde{v}_a, \tilde{T}_a)$  be the corresponding map. Observe that the bare part  $\tilde{T}_{a,+}$  has the same Euler characteristic as  $S$ , and indeed  $(\tilde{v}_{a,+}, \tilde{T}_{a,+})$  is near  $(u, S)$  in configuration space. Thus on  $\tilde{T}_{a,+}$ , we may compare  $\lambda$  and  $\lambda^*$ .

They are obviously not equal:  $\lambda$  is supported on a disk in  $\tilde{T}_{a,+}$ , whereas  $\lambda^*$  is supported on an annulus, since we have glued in the zero perturbation on a rational bubble attached to a point in the disk.

Thus, we will not literally have already seen the perturbation  $\lambda^*$  in our inductive construction, and so not have ensured that solutions to  $\bar{\partial}_J - \lambda^*$  have the desired genericity properties.

However, genericity is an open condition: we have genericity of solutions to perturbations in some neighborhood of those we have seen before. Thus it will ultimately suffice to estimate the distance between  $\lambda^*$  and  $\lambda$ . This is the task of Lemma 7.14 below.

**7.4. Error estimate.** Consider a basic perturbation  $\lambda$  supported in  $\mathbf{U}(u, S)$ , we think of domains in  $\mathbf{U}(u, S)$  as the surface  $S$  with a complex structure varying in  $\mathbf{j}$ . Consider a marked point  $\zeta \in S$  with a disk neighborhood  $\zeta \in D_0 \subset S$  and attach constant rational curve  $\mathbb{C}P^1_{m+1}$  with  $m+1 > 2$  distinct marked points  $\zeta_r$ ,  $r = 0, 1, \dots, m$  to  $S$  by joining  $\zeta$  and  $\zeta_0$  to a node. Consider a cylindrical neighborhood  $S^1 \times [0, \infty)$  of  $\zeta$ . Let  $a_0$  be a gluing parameter at  $\zeta$  and  $R_0$  the corresponding gluing length in the cylindrical neighborhood. Similarly, fix disk neighborhoods  $D_r$  around  $\zeta_r$ , gluing parameters  $a_k$ , and corresponding gluing lengths  $R_r$   $r = 1, \dots, m$ , at the marked points of  $\mathbb{C}P^1$ .

If  $a_0 \neq 0$  and  $a_r = 0$ ,  $r > 0$ , we get the domain  $S_{a_0}$  with marked points  $\zeta_r$ ,  $r = 1, \dots, m$  that we view as punctures. On  $S_{a_0}$  we have two perturbations. First, the original basic perturbation  $\lambda$  (written in the natural coordinates on  $S_{a_0}$  obtained by gluing and adding punctures). Second, the perturbation  $\lambda^*$  obtained by sharp gluing of  $\lambda$  over  $S$  and 0 over  $\mathbb{C}P^1_{m+1}$ . We write  $\|\cdot\|_{3,\delta}$  for the weighted Sobolev norm on  $S_{a_0}$ .

**Lemma 7.14.** *For any  $\eta > 0$ , we have the following estimate for perturbations on  $S_{a_0}$*

$$\|\lambda - \lambda^*\|_{3,\delta} = \mathcal{O}(e^{-(2\pi+\eta)R_0}),$$

where  $R_0$  is the gluing length corresponding to  $a_0$ . In particular,  $\|\lambda - \lambda^*\|_{3,\delta} \rightarrow 0$  on  $S_{a_0}$  as  $a_0 \rightarrow 0$ .

*Proof.* Recall the form of the basic perturbation  $\lambda(\tilde{v}) = V(\tilde{v})\alpha(z)$ , where  $V$  is a smooth vector field and  $\alpha = A(z)d\bar{z}$  a smooth  $(0,1)$ -form on  $S$ . We have  $\lambda = \lambda^*$  in  $S \setminus D_0$ . Consider the perturbations inside  $D_0$  in the cylindrical coordinates  $S^1 \times [0, \infty)$ . Here the perturbations agree on  $S^1 \times [0, R_0)$  and it remains to estimate the difference in  $[R_0, \infty) \times S^1$ . Let  $s + it \in [R_0, \infty) \times S^1$  be coordinates then  $dz = e^{-2\pi(s+it)}(ds + idt)$  and we have:

$$\lambda(s, t) = V(s, t)A(s, t)e^{-2\pi(s-it)}(ds - idt)$$

and

$$\lambda^*(s, t) = \beta(s)V(s, t)A(s, t)e^{-2\pi(s-it)}(ds - idt),$$

where  $V(s, t) = V(\tilde{v}(s, t))$ ,  $A(s, t) = A(e^{-2\pi(s+it)})$ , and  $\beta$  is the sharp cut off function equal to 1 on  $\{R_0\} \times S^1$  and equal to 0 on  $[R_0 + R_0^{-1}, \infty) \times S^1$ . Then by smoothness of  $V$  and  $\alpha$  and properties of the sharp cut-off (see the calculations in the proofs of Lemmas 5.3 and 7.10) it follows that

$$\|\lambda - \lambda^*\|_{3,\delta} = \mathcal{O}(e^{-(2\pi+\eta)R_0})$$

for any  $\eta > 0$ . □

## 8. EXTENSIONS OF BASIC PERTURBATIONS

In this section we describe how to extend a basic perturbation supported in  $\mathbf{U}(u, S)$  to a neighborhood of the locus of maps whose bare part lies  $\mathbf{U}(u, S)$ . To do this, we will stratify this locus according to the number of points where ghosts are attached to  $S$ . As

discussed in Sections 2 and 7.3 induced perturbations are not unique but, as we show here, this non/uniqueness can be controlled.

**8.1. Cutoff adapted to a stratification.** Let  $M$  be a smooth compact manifold (possibly with boundary and corners), equipped with some closed locus  $M_*$  carrying a decomposition into smooth locally closed submanifolds  $M_* = \bigsqcup_{i \geq 0} M_i$ . We assume that the stratification satisfies the following weak frontier property:

$$\overline{M}_n \setminus M_n \subset \bigsqcup_{m < n} M_m$$

Compatibly with this we write  $M_\infty := M \setminus M_*$ .

We write  $\nu_i$  for the normal bundle to  $M_i$ , and assume given a tubular neighborhood parameterization near the zero section  $\exp_i: \nu_i \rightarrow M$ , and a (fiberwise) metric on the  $\nu_i$ .

Let  $\sigma: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be some fixed cutoff function, taking the value 1 in some neighborhood of 0, and 0 in a neighborhood of 1. We write  $\sigma_\epsilon$  for the rescaling of the domain to  $[0, \epsilon]$ .

Note that by hypothesis,  $M_0$  is closed, so for some sufficiently small  $\epsilon_0$ , the map  $\exp_0$  is defined on the neighborhood of radius  $\epsilon_0$ . While  $M_1$  is not closed, the locus

$$(8.1) \quad M_1^\circ := M_1 \setminus \exp_0(\text{Interior}((\sigma_{\epsilon_0} \circ \|\cdot\|)^{-1}(1)))$$

is closed, so on this locus we may choose some  $\epsilon_1$  so that  $\exp_1$  is defined on the neighborhood of radius  $\epsilon_1$  in  $\nu_1$ , etc. Fix such a sequence of  $\epsilon_i$ .

We define  $\kappa_0 = \sigma_{\epsilon_0} \circ \|\cdot\| \circ \exp_0^{-1}$  on image of  $\exp_0$ , and 0 elsewhere. By construction it is a smooth function on  $M$  supported in a neighborhood of  $M_0$  and equal to 1 on  $M_0$ .

We define inductively  $\beta_i$  to be zero where  $\exp_i^{-1}$  is not defined, and on this locus to be given by

$$(8.2) \quad \kappa_i = \left(1 - \sum_{j < i} \kappa_j\right) \cdot (\sigma_{\epsilon_i} \circ \|\cdot\| \circ \exp_i^{-1})$$

We summarize the properties of this construction as follows:

**Lemma 8.1.** *Each  $\kappa_i$  is smooth, and  $\sum_{j \leq i} \kappa_j$  restricts to a partition of unity on a neighborhood of  $\bigsqcup_{j \leq i} M_j$ , and is supported on the complement of  $\bigsqcup_{i < k} M_k^\circ$ .*

Another important property (directly visible from the definition) is that the  $\kappa_j$  functions depend only on the  $\epsilon_i$  parameters, the  $\exp_i$  maps, and the norm on the normal bundle. (We will use this later to justify some compatibility assertions.)

We will define cutoff functions by the same formula (8.2) in the infinite dimensional but finite codimensional case. Since the codimension of strata is finite, the above construction carries over verbatim.

**8.2. Coordinate corner structures and versal families of curves.** In this subsection we give a pedantically precise meaning to the following assertion: “the gluing parameters at nodes give compatible parameterizations of the normal directions along the nodal locus”.

Let  $M = \bigsqcup M_\alpha$  be a stratified space. By a *coordinate corner structure*, we mean the following data:

- (1) A cosheaf of finite sets  $\mathbf{n}$  over  $M$ , constructible with respect to the stratification. We will always discuss this in terms of the exit path presentation: a locally constant bundle of finite sets over each stratum, along with maps for specialization of strata, compatible for iterated specializations. We will require all these maps to be injective. On a given stratum  $M_\alpha$ , the  $\mathbf{n}_\alpha := \mathbf{n}|_{M_\alpha}$  is to be understood as a set of coordinates on the normal bundle; in our setting we ask for a splitting  $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{n}_\mathbb{C} \sqcup \mathbf{n}_\mathbb{R}$  for real and complex coordinates.

Over a stratum  $M_\alpha$ , we write  $\pi_\alpha: \Delta_\alpha \rightarrow M_\alpha$  for the bundle with fiber  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\mathbf{n}_\alpha, \mathbb{R}} \oplus \mathbb{C}^{\mathbf{n}_\alpha, \mathbb{C}}$ .

- (2) Over each stratum of  $M_\alpha$ , a neighborhood of the zero section  $T_\alpha \subset \Delta_\alpha$  and an embedding  $\exp_\alpha: T_\alpha \rightarrow M$  which is ‘the identity’ on  $M_\alpha$ .

We require this data to satisfy the following compatibility conditions.

- (3)  $\Delta_\alpha$  itself carries a stratification by coordinate hyperplanes, and a corresponding cosheaf of sets  $\mathbf{n}_\alpha^{\text{can}} = \mathbf{n}_{\alpha, \mathbb{C}}^{\text{can}} \sqcup \mathbf{n}_{\alpha, \mathbb{R}}^{\text{can}}$  given by the normal coordinates. Note that  $\mathbf{n}_\alpha^{\text{can}}$  is canonically a sub-sheaf of  $\pi_\alpha^* \mathbf{n}_\alpha$ . So too is  $\exp_\alpha^*(\mathbf{n})$ . We require that  $\exp_\alpha^*(\mathbf{n}) = \mathbf{n}_\alpha^{\text{can}}$ .
- (4) Over  $\Delta_\alpha$ , there is a natural exponential map  $\exp_\alpha^{\text{can}}$  for  $\mathbf{n}_\alpha^{\text{can}}$ . Indeed,  $\mathbf{n}_\alpha^{\text{can}}$  along any given stratum is just the coordinates which vanish along that stratum; we may everywhere identify  $\Delta_\alpha^{\text{can}}$  with  $\pi_\alpha^* \Delta_\alpha$  and the projection  $\pi_\alpha^{\text{can}}$  with forgetting the appropriate coordinates. Then we may choose the exponential by sending fiber to base coordinates.

Now suppose given some stratum  $M_\beta$  in the closure of  $M_\alpha$ . Then over  $M_\beta \cap \exp(T_\alpha)$ , we require that  $\exp_\alpha$  identifies  $\exp_\beta$  with  $\exp_\alpha^{\text{can}}$ .

We have the following:

**Lemma 8.2.** *Suppose  $(M, \mathbf{n}, \exp)$  is a stratified manifold with coordinate corner structure. Suppose  $\mathbf{n}' \subset \mathbf{n}$  is a subcosheaf. Then there is a coordinate corner structure  $(M, \mathbf{n}', \exp)$ , whose strata are the loci in  $M$  where  $\mathbf{n}'$  is locally constant (note these are unions of strata for  $\mathbf{n}$ ). In particular, these loci are smooth.*

*Proof.* This is easy to see for  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \times \mathbb{C}^m$ , and immediately globalizes via the coordinate corner structure.  $\square$

Consider now a family of nodal curves over a smooth base  $M$ . Then  $M$  may be given a stratification according as to the number and type of nodes of the curve in question. If the family is versal, then the stratification is locally diffeomorphic the coordinate stratification on some  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m \times \mathbb{C}^n$ . Over each connected component  $M^{i;\alpha}$  of the stratum  $M^i$ , there is a smooth bundle of gluing parameters  $\Delta^{i;\alpha} \rightarrow M^{i;\alpha}$ . We may also, over  $M^{i;\alpha}$ , choose a (smoothly varying) choice of disk coordinates around the nodes of the corresponding curves. Having fixed a gluing profile, this data determines a family of curves over the total space of  $\Delta^{i;\alpha}$ . By a *versality region*, we mean a neighborhood  $T^{i;\alpha}$  of the zero section in  $\Delta^{i;\alpha}$ , and a diffeomorphism  $\exp: T^{i;\alpha} \rightarrow M$ , covered by a fiberwise holomorphic diffeomorphism of the corresponding families of curves.

Suppose now given versality regions for all strata. Note that the family of glued curves over total space of  $\Delta_{i,\alpha}$  comes with a tautological versality regions, not just at the zero section, but at all strata. Thus if  $M^{j;\beta} \subset \overline{M^{i;\alpha}}$ , then on the intersection  $M^{i;\alpha} \cap \exp(T^{j;\beta})$ , we have two versality regions: the one associated to  $M^{i;\alpha}$  and the one transported from  $\Delta^{j;\beta}$  via the versality region for  $M^{j;\beta}$ . We say our versality regions form a compatible system if these two possibilities agree for every such overlap.

Note the standard charts on moduli of curves or configuration spaces of maps come with such compatible systems of versality regions, by construction. In fact, any versal family admits such a compatible system, essentially by the defining property of versality.

It should be clear from the above discussion that a compatible system of versality regions determines a coordinate corner structure: the cosheaf  $\mathbf{n}$  is the cosheaf of nodes, and the compatible system of versality regions is the data of the exponential maps.

**8.3. Marked curves.** For our purposes, we have families of curves with an additional important piece of data, namely which components have positive symplectic area and which are ghost components.

By a *marked curve*, we mean a (possibly nodal) curve, together with a subgraph of its dual graph. We understand this subgraph as indicating the “positive area” components of the curve, along with their “original” nodes. We impose the usual notion of stability on the unmarked components. We refer to the unmarked graph edges which are adjacent to a marked vertex as Ploutonion edges, and the corresponding nodes as Ploutonion nodes.

Recall that a family of nodal curves gives a stratification of the base by loci along which the dual graph is locally constant, such that the generization maps off strata give edge contractions. That is, it defines a morphism from the exit path category of the stratification to the category whose objects are graphs and morphisms are edge contractions.

We say such a family is a family of marked curves if each curve is marked, and the edge contractions respect the marking, in that if  $\pi: \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma'$  is an edge contraction, and the markings are given by the subgraphs  $G \subset \Gamma$  and  $G' \subset \Gamma'$ , then  $G' = \pi(G)$ . (This encodes the fact that if one joins various components, the resulting curve has positive symplectic area if any of the components do.)

Suppose now  $M$  carries a family of marked nodal curves. We will be interested in phenomena having to do with the unmarked nodes, so we write  $\mathbf{n}_0 \subset \mathbf{n}$  for the (sub-cosheaf of) unmarked nodes, and can use the coordinate corner structure coming from  $\mathbf{n}_0$  via Lemma 8.2. We write  $\mathbf{p} \subset \mathbf{n}_0$  for the Ploutonian nodes. Note that  $\mathbf{p}$  is *not* a sub-cosheaf, i.e., is not preserved by specialization maps.

We will be interested in the locus  $M^{\max}$  of curves whose marked part has maximal Euler characteristic. This is a closed subset of  $M$ , stratified compatibly with  $\mathbf{n}_0$ .

*Example 8.3.* Let us describe a typical model scenario for  $M^{\max}$ . Begin with a curve  $S$ , attach at a point a sphere, and on two other points on the sphere, attach tori. Mark only  $S$ , and take  $M$  to be the versal deformation. Then  $M$  is some neighborhood of the origin in  $\mathbb{C}^3$  (assuming these were interior points), where the coordinates are the gluing parameters for the nodes. We use the  $x, y$  coordinates for the nodes where the tori are attached, and the  $z$  coordinate for the node on  $S$ . Then  $M^{\max}$  is the union of the  $xy$ -plane with the  $z$ -axis. In this example,  $\mathbf{n}_0 = \mathbf{n}$ , and  $\mathbf{p}$  is  $\{z\}$  on the  $xy$ -plane, and whatever subset of  $\{x, y\}$  are nonvanishing coordinates off of it.

We write  $M_{2i+b}^{\max} \subset M^{\max}$  for the locus where the marked part has  $i$  un-marked half-edges corresponding to interior nodes, and  $b$  un-marked half-edges corresponding to boundary nodes. In Example 8.3,  $M_2^{\max}$  is the  $xy$  plane, and  $M_4^{\max}$  is the interior of the  $z$ -axis. In particular, we see that in that example that while the  $M_n^{\max}$  give a smooth decomposition, they do not satisfy the frontier property.

*Example 8.4.* Another model scenario: suppose on  $S$  there are two boundary marked points on different components; we attach a disk at these two marked points, and attach a genus

one surface with boundary at a third boundary of the disk. We mark only  $S$ , and consider the versal deformation over base  $M = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^3$ . We use  $x, y$  for the nodes on  $S$ , and  $z$  for the node connecting the sphere to the torus. Then  $M^{\max}$  is the union of the axes. Moreover,  $M_1^{\max}$  is the empty set, and  $M_2^{\max}$  is the  $z$ -axis (including 0), and  $M_3^{\max}$  is the remainder of the  $x$  and  $y$  axes.

In general, one has:

**Lemma 8.5.** *Assuming  $M$  is versal,  $M_n^{\max}$  is a smooth manifold (with corners).*

$$\overline{M_n^{\max}} \setminus M_n^{\max} \subset \coprod_{m < n} M_m^{\max}.$$

*A tubular neighborhood to  $M_n$  is parameterized by coordinates corresponding to the gluing parameters at Ploutonian nodes.*

Note that the codimension is determined by counting the unmarked edges meeting the marked locus, whereas the subscript is given by counting the corresponding half-edges. Thus in general the codimension of  $M_n$  can be less than  $n$ .

Note that the tubular neighborhood parameterizations are compatible on overlaps as in (4) for coordinate corner structures.

**8.4. Compatible choices of disks for gluing.** We now discuss certain charts on configuration space  $\mathbf{Z}$  that we will use. Such charts will have underlying families of marked curves (mark the positive area part), and the gluing maps provide the versality regions. The point of the present subsection is to explain an additional compatibility property which will be important in our further considerations.

Recall that in our standard charts, we begin with (a family of maps from) nodal curves, and get a map parameterizing a neighborhood in moduli by using the gluing maps. This gives our ‘versality region’ above; here we emphasize it depends on two kinds of choices, some universal (choice of gluing profile, etc.), and the remainder being concerned only with the choice of coordinates in the target and the parameterized disk neighborhoods of the nodes in the domain.

For our purposes we will want to choose these disk neighborhoods and target coordinates compatibly in a sense to be explained now.

We begin by fixing attention on some family  $M^{(\chi_{\max})}$  of curves with bare maps from domains of Euler characteristic  $\chi_{\max}$ . (In practice, the  $\mathbf{U}(u, S)$  of (5.1) as it appears in Definition 5.2.) Let  $\pi: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow M^{(\chi_{\max})}$  be the tautological family of curves. For each  $p \in \mathcal{C}$  we fix once and for all a parameterized disk neighborhood  $\eta_p: (D, 0) \rightarrow (\mathcal{C}_{\pi(p)}, p)$ , smoothly in  $p$ , and similarly coordinates at the image of  $p$  under the map.

We will be interested in standard charts obtained in the following manner: (1) Take the curves of  $M^{(\chi_{\max})}$ . (2) Attach constant ghosts of some (fixed) topological type. (3) Vary the ghost maps. (4) Smooth all nodes and maps by the gluing construction. Then (1) – (4) is just a particular class of standard charts.

The standard versality region for such charts would be the following. Choose disk neighborhoods around all nodes of domains in (3), i.e., for the curves with maximally many nodes. Gluing transports these disk neighborhoods to curves where some nodes have been smoothed.

The above is *not* how we will produce our disks. Instead, we do the following. The families  $M^{(x)}$  in question now have the property that the curves in  $M^{(x)\max}$  are obtained by attaching

ghost maps to maps from  $M^{(\chi_{\max})}$ . We demand that the node neighborhood disks on the non-ghost part of the curves are the original disks  $\eta_p: (D, 0) \rightarrow (\mathcal{C}_{\pi(p)}, p)$  fixed above.

This choice of disks is evidently smooth over each stratum  $M_n^{(\chi)_{\max}}$ . We do not require any continuity as the strata intersect; the purpose of these disk neighborhoods is that we use the gluing adapted to them to define the  $\exp_i$  functions as in Section 8.1 for cutoffs and we use the cut-offs to interpolate between perturbations defined near different strata.

*Example 8.6.* Let us discuss specifically how the difference between the two ways of choosing disks arises. Begin as above with  $M^{(\chi_{\max})}$ , with fixed disk neighborhoods of the corresponding curves. Fix attention on some particular  $u: S \rightarrow X$  in the family.

Consider attaching a ghost bubble at some particular point  $p \in S$ , consisting of a  $\mathbb{P}^1$  with  $\infty \in \mathbb{P}^1$  attached to  $p \in S$ , and then further stable components attached at various finite points  $z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n$  of the  $\mathbb{P}^1$ . Fix parameterized disk neighborhoods  $\nu_i: (D_i, 0) \rightarrow (z_i, \mathbb{P}^1)$ .

Consider a neighborhood of this map in the configuration space. In particular, we meet maps obtained by smoothing only the node at  $p$ . The bare part of the map will have domain some  $\tilde{S}_+$  which has the same genus as the original  $S$ , hence should be already in the original family  $M^{(\chi_{\max})}$ . The standard choice of disk neighborhoods around the  $z_i \in \tilde{S}_+$  would use (the images of) the  $\nu_i$  maps. Instead, for this purpose we will use the original  $\eta_{z_i}$  maps chosen at the beginning, and not use the maps  $\nu_i$ .

So far, we have described how to choose disk neighborhoods on the marked (positive area) part of our curves. For the unmarked (ghost) parts, the curves are stable, so we can and will always decide to take the radial part of the gluing parameter to measure the distance from the center in the hyperbolic metric. For our purposes, the choice of angular parameter will be irrelevant (and so can be made arbitrarily) since we ultimately apply this to a situation which is invariant under change of angular parameter, namely the hat-gluing with the zero perturbation on the ghost parts.

**8.5. Extending basic perturbations, I.** Consider a basic perturbation  $\lambda$  supported in  $\mathbf{U}(u, S)$ . For the remainder of this section, we will construct related perturbations on lower Euler characteristic moduli spaces which are supported near the locus of curves obtained by attaching constant ghosts to maps in  $\mathbf{U}(u, S)$ . These new perturbations should in particular vanish on ghost components, and, when it makes sense, approximately agree with  $\lambda$  on the bare part. (In fact, agreement with  $\lambda$  on the bare part is only relevant for curves with  $\bar{\partial}u$  sufficiently small that they might possibly give solutions to  $\bar{\partial}u = \lambda(u)$ , and correspondingly only on this locus will we ensure this agreement).

Let  $\hat{\lambda}$  be the version of the basic perturbation  $\lambda$  that is not yet cut off in the function direction, see (5.2). Let  $(w, T)$  be a map with the property that the positive area components of its normalization  $(w_+, T_+)$  lies in  $\mathbf{U}(u, S)$ , which means that  $T_+$  is the domain  $S$  with some complex structure  $j \in \mathbf{j}$  and that  $w_+ = \exp_u(v_+)$  for some  $v_+ \in H^3(S, u^*T^*X)$ . Assume also that the zero area components of the normalization of  $(w, T)$  are constant maps (attached to  $(w_+, T_+)$ ). Consider a standard chart  $\mathbf{V}(w, T)$  centered around  $T$ .

We mark the positive symplectic area vertices of the dual graph of  $T$ . We write  $\mathbf{V}'(w, T)$  for the dense subset of maps with the property that the positive area part has the stronger regularity  $H_{\text{loc}}^3$  (rather than  $H^{3,\delta}$ ) at Ploutonian nodes.

The maximum Euler characteristic of the positive area part of a domain in  $\mathbf{V}(w, T)$  is  $\chi(S)$ , and we choose the neighborhood  $\mathbf{V}(w, T)$  small enough so that for any such map in  $\mathbf{V}'(w, T)^{(\chi(S))}$ , the restriction to the positive part is in  $\mathbf{U}(u, S)$ .



Then on  $\mathbf{V}'(w, T)^{(x(S))}$ , we may define a perturbation  $\widehat{\lambda}_*$  by taking the perturbation  $\widehat{\lambda}$  on the positive area part, and zero on the ghost parts. It is clear from the formula (5.3) for  $\lambda$  that this perturbation extends to  $\mathbf{V}(w, T)^{(x(S))}$  (necessarily uniquely, and indeed just by the same formula).

Consider the stratification by number of Ploutonian nodes:

$$\mathbf{V}(w, T)^{(x(S))} = \bigsqcup_k \mathbf{V}(w, T)_k^{(x(S))}.$$

Along each stratum, we use sharp hat-gluing of the differential ( $\alpha$  in (5.2)) at Ploutonian nodes to extend  $\widehat{\lambda}_*$  to some  $\widehat{\lambda}_{*,k}$  defined on some tubular neighborhood of the stratum. In formulas, if  $\mathbf{N}_k$  is a gluing parameter tubular neighborhood of  $\mathbf{V}(w, T)_k^{(x(S))}$  and if  $a = (a_1, \dots, a_k)$  denotes the gluing parameters then

$$\widehat{\lambda}_{*,k} = \widehat{\lambda} \widehat{\oplus}_a 0.$$

Using the partition of unity (8.2) to define

$$(8.3) \quad \widehat{\lambda}_o[\epsilon] := \sum \kappa_i \widehat{\lambda}_{*,i}$$

we obtain a perturbation defined in a neighborhood of the locus of curves in  $\mathbf{U}(u, S)$  with ghosts attached, vanishing on ghost components. The desired approximate agreement follows from Lemma 7.14.

However, we have as yet no control on the support of  $\widehat{\lambda}_o[\epsilon]$ , so have as yet no way to extend it by zero to the rest of the configuration space. We perform this cutoff in the next subsections.

**8.6. Asymptotic constant charts.** It will be convenient to express our cutoff after a certain change of variables in the chart, designed to preserve the ‘asymptotic constant’ term over the whole chart, not just at the nodal moments. Consider the gluing region

$$Z_a := \{0 \leq s \leq R\} = \{-R \geq s' \geq 0\}$$

For a function  $h$  on  $Z_a$ , we will write

$$\langle h \rangle_0 = \begin{cases} \int h(\frac{1}{2}R, t) dt, & \text{(interior),} \\ \int \pi_{\mathbb{R}^n}(h(\frac{1}{2}R, t)) dt, & \text{(boundary).} \end{cases}$$

Note these integrals are well defined continuous functionals on  $H_{\text{loc}}^3$ . We write  $H^3(Z_a)_0 \subset H^3(Z_a)$  for the locus of  $h$  with  $\langle h \rangle_0 = 0$ .

Let  $\gamma_a: Z_a \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  equal to 1 in  $[1, R-1]$  and equal to 0 outside  $[\frac{1}{2}, R-\frac{1}{2}]$ . Obviously the following is an (sc) isomorphism:

$$\begin{aligned} H^{3,\delta}(Z_a, \mathbb{R}^{2n})_0 \oplus \mathbb{R}^{2n} &\rightarrow H^3(Z_a, \mathbb{R}^{2n}) \\ (h, v) &\mapsto w_{a,\delta}(s, t) \cdot h + \gamma_a v. \end{aligned}$$

with inverse  $h \mapsto (w_{a,\delta}^{-1}(h - \gamma_a \langle h \rangle_0), \langle h \rangle_0)$ .

By such isomorphisms, we use modified building blocks for standard polyfold charts around nodes, e.g. in the case of interior nodes we replace the standard

$$G^a = H^3(Z_a, \mathbb{R}^{2n}) \oplus H^{3,\delta_0}(C_a, \mathbb{R}^{2n})$$

with

$$G^a = H^{3,\delta}(Z_a, \mathbb{R}^{2n})_0 \oplus \mathbb{R}^{2n} \oplus H^{3,\delta_0}(C_a, \mathbb{R}^{2n}),$$

where the first factor in the right hand side is the Sobolev space with the restricted weight norm, see Section 7.2, and similarly for elliptic and hyperbolic boundary nodes, where instead the asymptotic constant lies in  $\mathbb{R}^n \subset \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ . We call charts as above (with the asymptotic constants singled out and with the restricted weight norm in gluing regions) *asymptotic constant charts*.

**8.7. Extending basic perturbations, II: cutoffs.** Recall that the basic perturbation  $\lambda$  is obtained from  $\widehat{\lambda}$  by cutting off in the map direction,

$$\lambda(v) = \beta(v)\widehat{\lambda}(v), \quad \beta(v) = \beta_0(\|v\|)\beta_1(\|\bar{\partial}_J\tilde{v}\|_2),$$

where  $\beta_k$ ,  $k = 0, 1$  are functions equal to 1 in some neighborhood of 0 and equal to 0 outside a larger neighborhood, see (5.3).

We point out the different roles of the cut off factors  $\beta_0(\|v\|)$  and  $\beta_1(\|\bar{\partial}_J\tilde{v}\|_2)$ . If  $\|\bar{\partial}_J\tilde{v}\|_2$  increases, we move away from the original moduli space of solutions (i.e., away from the locus  $\bar{\partial}_J = 0$ ) and if  $\widehat{\lambda}$  is of sufficiently small compared to the support of  $\beta_1$  all solutions to the perturbed equation lies in the region where  $\beta_1(\|\bar{\partial}_J\tilde{v}\|_2) = 1$ . This means that the exact size of the support of  $\beta_1$  will not be important as long as it is sufficiently large compared to  $\widehat{\lambda}$ . In contrast to this, the  $L^2$ -norm  $\|v\|$  may well increase as we move along the original moduli space and it will be important that our extensions of the perturbation to neighborhoods of maps with constant ghosts attached changes compatibly. This compatibility is the main subject of this section. We will use the asymptotic constant polyfold charts, see Section 8.6.

As in Section 8.5, consider a basic perturbation  $\lambda$  supported in  $\mathbf{U}(u, S)$  and let  $(w, T)$  be a map with constant ghosts with underlying bare map  $(w_+, T_+) \in \mathbf{U}(u, S)$ , where  $w_+ = \exp_u(v_+)$ ,  $v_+ \in H^3(S, u^*TX)$ . We write  $\mathbf{V}(w, T)$  for the standard neighborhood of  $(w, T)$  and  $\mathbf{V}(w, T)_r^{\chi(S)}$  for the subset of maps with  $r$  Pluotonian nodes.

We will use three functions defined on the gluing parameter neighborhood  $\mathbf{N}_r$  of  $\mathbf{V}^{\chi(S)}(w, T)_r$ . Consider  $T_+$  as the domain  $S$  with complex structure  $j \in \mathbf{j}$  and  $r$  punctures  $\boldsymbol{\zeta} = (\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_r)$ . Let  $T_0$  be the ghost part of  $T$ . If  $(w', T') \in \mathbf{N}_r$  we let  $a_k(T')$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, r$  denote the gluing parameters at the Pluotonian nodes determined by  $T'$ .

Recall that  $w = \exp_u(v_+)$  for some vector field along  $u$ . Shifting the origin of the exponential map along  $v_+$ , maps with domain  $T'$  are parameterized by the image under  $\oplus$  of

$$\mathbf{v} = (v, v_k, c_l) \in H^{3,\delta}(S_{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}, u^*TX) \times H^{3,\delta}(T_0) \times C,$$

where  $C$  denote the space of asymptotic constants. Here  $H^{3,\delta}(T_0)$  denotes  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ -valued maps, using some identification of the neighborhoods of the images the  $\zeta_i$ . Below we will use norms of such maps where the domains vary over all possible ghosts. We define such norms by covering the compact space of domains by finitely many standard charts used to define norms in  $H^{3,\delta}(T_0)$  and then add them weighted by a partition of unity. To simplify notation, if  $v_k$  is a vector field along  $T_0$ , we will simply write  $\|v_k\|_{m,\delta}$  for its norm (even though it may be a linear combination of norms in a finite number of charts). We write  $G(\mathbf{v})$  for the map corresponding to  $\mathbf{v}$ .

As with the original basic perturbation, we will cut off the extensions  $\widehat{\lambda}_k$  in  $\mathbf{N}_k$  by a product of cut-off functions, one standard that depend on the size of the 2-norm of  $\bar{\partial}_J$  and another that depends on an  $L^2$ -norm. In order for the cut-off to be compatible with the original basic perturbation we use an  $L^2$ -norm which is a sum of the standard weighted  $L^2$ -norm on the ghost part and the original unweighted norm on the parts of the domain corresponding

to the original bare curve. For this latter part we must then consider the effect on the norm of replacing a marked point by a puncture and show two things: smoothness of the norm function and the fact that the total cut off is actually supported inside  $\mathbf{N}_k$ .

We first introduce the  $L^2$ -norm along the bare part of the surface.

**Definition 8.7.** Let  $S_a$ ,  $a = (a_1, \dots, a_r)$  denote domain  $S$  with disks and half disks of radius determined by the gluing parameter  $a_k$  around  $\zeta_k$  removed. (Note that  $S_{+,a}$  is a compact subset of  $S$ .) Define

$$(8.4) \quad N_{0+}(\mathbf{v}) := \left\| (v + \sum_l c_l)|_{S_{+,a}} \right\|_+^2,$$

where  $v + \sum_l c_l$  denotes the sum of the vector field  $v \in H^{3,\delta}(S_\zeta; u^*TX)$  and cut-off asymptotic constants at punctures, and where the norm  $\|\cdot\|_+$  refers to the usual  $L^2$ -norm on  $S$ .

We check that the function  $N_{0+}$  is smooth as a function on the asymptotic constant polyfold chart. Consider  $\mathbf{v} = (v, v_k, c_l)$  as above and a map from a domain  $T'$ . Here  $N_{0+}(\mathbf{v})$  depends only on  $v \in H^{3,\delta}(S_\zeta, u^*TX)$  and  $c \in C$ . More precisely,  $N_{0+}(\mathbf{v})$  is obtained by restricting  $v + c$  to the part of  $S_\zeta$  that lies in  $T'$  and then taking its  $L^2$ -norm. Thus to show that  $N_{0+}$  is smooth we must compare the weighted  $L^2$ -norm on the punctured domain with cylindrical ends with the usual ‘compact domain’  $L^2$ -norm.

**Lemma 8.8.** *The function  $N_{0+}$  is smooth.*

*Proof.* Consider a disk or half disk neighborhood  $D$  of nodal point  $\zeta_k \in S$ . The corresponding neighborhood of  $\zeta_k$  considered as a puncture is  $[0, \infty) \times I$  in the notation of Lemma 3.12. Furthermore, in this notation the vector field  $v + c$ , where  $c$  is the asymptotic constant at  $\zeta$ , is  $v_\infty \in H^{3,\delta}([0, \infty) \times I, \mathbb{R}^{2n})$  and the contribution to the function  $N_{0+}$  from  $v$  in  $D$  is

$$\int_D |v_0|^2 dx dy.$$

Lemma 3.12 (3.3) says that

$$\int_D |v_0|^2 dx dy = \int_{[0, \infty) \times I} |v_\infty|^2 e^{-4\pi s} dx dy.$$

The lemma follows.  $\square$

Second, we introduce the standard asymptotic constant  $L^2$ -norm of the ghost part:

**Definition 8.9.** Let  $T$  be the domain obtained by gluing  $S$  and  $T_0$  according to the gluing parameters  $a = (a_1, \dots, a_r)$  and let  $T_{0,a}$  denote the part of  $T$  that is a subset of  $T_0$ . Define

$$(8.5) \quad N_{00}(\mathbf{v}) = \sum_k \|v_k|_{T_{0,a}}\|_\delta^2 + \sum_l |c_l|^2,$$

where  $\|\cdot\|_\delta$  denotes the restricted weight  $L^2$ -norm.

Third, we use the restricted weight  $(2, \delta)$ -norm of the complex anti-linear derivative of  $G(\mathbf{j})$ :

**Definition 8.10.** With  $T$  and  $\mathbf{v} = (v, c_k, c_l)$  as above define

$$(8.6) \quad N_{\bar{1}}(\mathbf{v}) = \|\bar{\partial}_J G(\mathbf{v})\|_{2,\delta}^2,$$

where the norm is the restricted weight norm on  $T$ .

The functions  $N_{00}$  and  $N_{\bar{1}}$  are smooth by inspection, they are (parts of) function norms used in the definition of the polyfold charts in Section 8.6.

We next show that the three functions  $N_{0+}$ ,  $N_{00}$ , and  $N_{\bar{1}}$  together give rough control on the overall norm in the asymptotic constant chart. Let  $\mathbf{v} = (v, v_k, c_l)$  be as above in a neighborhood system  $\mathbf{V}^{x(S)}(w, T)$ , assume that  $\|\bar{\partial}_J w\|_{2,\delta} = \epsilon$ , and write  $\tilde{v}$  for the gluing of  $v$  and  $v_k$  shifted by the asymptotic constants  $c_l$ .

**Lemma 8.11.** *There exists  $\epsilon_0 > 0$  and  $C > 0$ , independent of  $\epsilon$ , such that for all  $\mathbf{v}$  with  $\|v\|_{3,\delta} + \sum_k \|v_k\|_{3,\delta} + \sum_l |c_l| < \epsilon_0$ , and all  $r > C\epsilon$  there exist  $\delta > 0$  such that if*

$$N_{0+}(\mathbf{v}) + N_{00}(\mathbf{v}) + N_{\bar{1}}(\mathbf{v}) < \delta$$

then

$$\|\tilde{v}\|_{3,\delta} < r.$$

*Proof.* We pick a finite cover of  $S$  by local coordinate disks  $D$  of two types, those that contain punctures  $\zeta_k$  and those that do not, such that  $G(\mathbf{v})$  maps each  $D$  maps into some coordinate ball in  $X$ . (Here we use the  $\epsilon_0$ -bound.)

For domains without punctures we repeat the argument from Lemma 5.1 and conclude that

$$\|v\|_3 \leq C'(\|\bar{\partial}_J G(\mathbf{v})\|_2 + \|\bar{\partial}_J u\|_2 + \|v\|).$$

Along the ghost components the argument is identical using instead Sobolev norms and asymptotic constants of the asymptotic constant charts.

For disks that contain punctures we need an estimate using the norm  $N_{0+}$ , which is not the standard norm for elliptic estimates. Consider a cylindrical end  $[0, \infty) \times I$  where the vector field is  $v$  and the asymptotic constant  $c$ , represented as  $\gamma \cdot c$ , for some cut-off function with derivative supported in  $[1, 2] \times I$ . Here we have from the weighted elliptic estimate on  $\mathbb{R} \times I$  using a cut-off function supported in  $[0, 1] \times I$ ,

$$\|v\|_{3,\delta} \leq C(\|\bar{\partial}_J v\|_{2,\delta} + \|v|_{[0,1] \times I}\|).$$

The contribution to  $N_{0+}(\mathbf{v})$  is

$$\int_D |v_0 + \gamma c|^2 d\sigma = \int_A |v_0|^2 d\sigma + \int_{D \setminus A} |v_0 + \gamma c|^2 d\sigma,$$

where  $A$  corresponds to  $[0, 1] \times I$ . Here the first term in the right hand side controls  $\|v|_{[0,1] \times I}\|$  and we get an estimate on  $\|v\|_{3,\delta}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{area}(D \setminus A)|c|^2 &\leq \int_{D \setminus A} |v_0 + \gamma c|^2 d\sigma + \int_D |v_0|^2 d\sigma \\ &= \int_{D \setminus A} |v_0 + \gamma c|^2 d\sigma + \int_{[0,\infty) \times I} |v|^2 e^{-4\pi s} ds dt \\ &\leq \int_{D \setminus A} |v_0 + \gamma c|^2 d\sigma + \|v\|_\delta^2 \end{aligned}$$

and hence also the size of the asymptotic constant  $|c|$  is controlled. The lemma follows.  $\square$

We then define the extension of the basic perturbation  $\lambda$  to  $\mathbf{N}_k$  as the previously defined perturbation  $\widehat{\lambda}_{\star,k}$  cut off:

$$\lambda_{\star,k} = \beta_0(\|N_{0+}(\mathbf{v}) + N_{00}(\mathbf{v})\|)\beta_{k;1}(N_{\bar{1}}(\mathbf{v}))\widehat{\lambda}_{\star,k},$$

where  $\beta_{k,1}$  is a cut-off function with sufficiently large support compared to the size of  $\widehat{\lambda}_{*,k}$  as discussed above and where  $\beta_0$  is the cut-off function used in the definition of the original basic perturbation. The restriction of  $\lambda_{*,k}$  to the locus  $\mathbf{V}(u, S)_k^{\chi(S)}$  with constant ghost components then agrees with  $\lambda$  along the positive area components since in the region where  $\beta_{k,1}(N_{\bar{1}}(\mathbf{v})) = 1$  and where  $\beta_1(\|\bar{\partial}_J \tilde{v}\|_{+,2}) = 1$  for the positive area curve, since here

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_0(\|N_{0+}(\mathbf{v}) + N_{00}\mathbf{v}\|)\beta_{k,1}(N_{\bar{1}}(\mathbf{v})) &= \beta_0(\|N_{0+}(\mathbf{v}) + N_{00}\mathbf{v}\|) \\ &= \beta_0(\|v\|_+ + 0) = \beta_0(\|v\|_+)\beta_1(\|\bar{\partial}_J \tilde{v}\|_{+,2}). \end{aligned}$$

We next define the full extension of  $\lambda$  as an interpolation of the extensions along the gluing parameter neighborhoods. For small enough  $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots)$ , we define

$$(8.7) \quad \lambda_\circ[\epsilon] := \sum \kappa_i \lambda_{*,i}$$

where the  $\kappa_i$  are defined as in (8.2). Lemmas 8.1 and 8.11 shows that the support of  $\lambda_{*,k}$  is contained in  $\mathbf{N}_k$

**Lemma 8.12.** *For any  $\eta > 0$ , for all sufficiently small  $\epsilon > 0$  we have  $\|\lambda_\circ[\epsilon] - \lambda_{*,i}\|_{3,\delta} < \eta$  on  $\mathbf{V}(w, T)_i^{\chi(S)}$ .*

*Proof.* The restriction of the extension  $\lambda_\circ[\epsilon]|_{\mathbf{V}(w, T)_i^{\chi(S), \circ}}$  agrees by construction with  $\lambda_{*,i}$ . (Recall the definition of the  $\circ$  regions from (8.1).) The complements  $\mathbf{V}(w, T)_i^{\chi(S)} \setminus \mathbf{V}(w, T)_i^{\chi(S), \circ}$  are the regions in moduli where two or more of the points where ghosts meet  $S$  collide and move onto a rational bubble. In such regions, we see from Lemma 7.14 that the difference  $\lambda_\circ[\epsilon] - \lambda_{*,i}$  is controlled by the gluing parameters at Ploutonian nodes. The result follows because  $\kappa$  is defined by cutting off in precisely these parameters.  $\square$

Finally, let us note the chart independence of the  $\lambda_\circ[\epsilon]$ . Indeed, suppose now given some  $(w, T)$  and  $(w', T')$ , both of whose normalization is  $(w_+, T_+)$  plus some constant maps. We claim that if the standard neighborhoods of  $(w, T)$  and  $(w', T')$  overlap, then on this overlap, the respective  $\lambda_\circ[\epsilon]$  defined using  $(w, T)$  or using  $(w', T')$  agree. This is because the extension and cut off used depends *only* on the gluing parameters of the Ploutonian nodes, and the fixed disk neighborhoods on  $S$  which were fixed at the outset. (It is possible that the range of possible  $\epsilon$  for which the construction makes sense depend on the chart, but in any fixed Euler characteristic, the space of such possible  $(w, T)$  is compact, and we will later fix a bound on the Euler characteristic.) Thus, for sufficiently small  $\epsilon$ , there is a well defined section, henceforth denoted  $\lambda_\circ[\epsilon]$ , supported in a neighborhood of the locus of maps whose underlying bare part is in  $\mathbf{U}(u, S)$ .

## 9. MAIN RESULTS

In this section we prove two results, Theorem 9.1 and 9.2, which are respectively the 0-parameter and 1-parameter parts of Theorem 1.1.

Fix a symplectic Calabi-Yau threefold  $(X, \omega, J)$ , and a Maslov zero Lagrangian  $L \subset X$ . We consider either  $(X, L)$  compact or with appropriate assumptions to ensure Gromov compactness of holomorphic maps.

We study the [15] configuration space  $\mathbf{Z}$  of maps of some fixed positive symplectic area  $d$ , possibly from disconnected domains. Note that such maps have Euler characteristic bounded above by some  $\chi_{\max} = \chi_{\max}(d)$ .

**Theorem 9.1.** *Fix  $\chi_{\min}$ . Then there is a (weighed multi-)section  $\theta$  of  $\mathbf{W} \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$  supported outside a neighborhood of  $L$  and defined on the components corresponding to domains of Euler characteristic  $\geq \chi_{\min}$ , such that all bare solutions to  $\bar{\partial}_J - \theta = 0$  are 0-generic and transversely cut out. Moreover, the locus of bare solutions is compact.*

*Proof.* We proceed by induction in Euler characteristic. At Euler characteristic  $\chi$ , we suppose we have already collected finitely many basic perturbations  $\lambda^\alpha$  centered at domains with  $\chi(S^\alpha) > \chi$  and  $\epsilon^\alpha = (\epsilon_1^\alpha, \epsilon_2^\alpha, \dots)$  such that if  $\theta_{>\chi} := \sum \lambda^\alpha[\epsilon^\alpha]$ , then the following inductive hypotheses on solutions to  $\bar{\partial}_J - \theta_{>\chi}$  hold:

- (1) All bare solutions of Euler characteristic  $> \chi$  are 0-generic and transversely cut out.
- (2) Given a solution  $(v, T)$ , if the bare part  $T_+$  has  $\chi(T_+) > \chi$ , then  $(v_+, T_+)$  is 0-generic. (It will in fact be a transversely cut out solution to some induced equation, but we do not use this.)
- (3) If  $(v, T)$  and  $(v', T')$  are two solutions whose bare parts agree and have Euler characteristic  $\leq \chi$ , then  $\theta_{>\chi}$  takes the same value on these bare parts.

The inductive hypothesis holds vacuously at  $\chi = \chi_{\max} + 1$ . Once we establish the induction, compactness of bare solutions follows by ghost bubble censorship.

We perform the inductive step. The inductive hypothesis along with the ghost bubble censorship results imply that there is a solution free neighborhood of the locus of non-bare solutions of Euler characteristic  $\chi$  to  $\bar{\partial}_J u - \theta_{>\chi} = 0$ . Thus the locus of bare solutions of Euler characteristic  $\chi$  is compact. We may then choose basic perturbations  $\lambda^\beta$  centered around a finite collection  $(u^\beta, S^\beta)$  of maps from smooth domains with Euler characteristic  $\chi(S^\beta) = \chi$ , such that all Euler characteristic  $\chi$  bare solutions to  $\bar{\partial}_J - \theta_{>\chi} - \sum \lambda^\beta = 0$  are 0-generic and transversely cut out.

To complete the inductive step we must show it is possible to choose the  $\epsilon^\beta$  defining the extensions  $\lambda^\beta[\epsilon^\beta]$  such that

$$\theta_{>\chi-1} := \theta_{>\chi} + \sum \lambda^\beta[\epsilon^\beta]$$

also satisfies (2) and (3) of the induction hypothesis. It is clear from the construction that  $\theta_{>\chi-1}$  does not differ from  $\theta_{>\chi}$  on curves whose bare parts have Euler characteristic  $> \chi$ , so it remains to check that (2) holds for  $\chi(T_+) = \chi$  and that (3) holds for pairs of solutions with parts of Euler characteristics  $< \chi$ .

Let us consider first (2). Recall we have already ensured that all bare solutions in Euler characteristic  $\chi$  are transversely cut out and 0-generic. Thus, there is some  $\delta$  so that if whenever  $\chi(T_+) = \chi$  we know that  $\lambda^\beta[\epsilon^\beta]|_{T_+}$  is within  $\delta$  of  $\lambda^\beta|_{T_+}$ , we may conclude that the  $T_+$  are 0-generic and transversely cut out as well. By Lemma 8.12, this holds for any small enough  $\epsilon^\beta$ .

Now let us consider (3). So let  $(v, T)$  and  $(v', T')$  be two solutions with bare parts  $(v_+, T_+) = (v'_+, T'_+)$  of Euler characteristic  $< \chi$ . Fix some  $\beta$  so that  $\lambda^\beta[\epsilon^\beta]$  contributes non-trivially. By construction, this means that  $(v_+, T_+)$  and  $(v'_+, T'_+)$  is obtained from  $(u^\beta, S^\beta)$  by attaching some constant ghosts and then gluing.

Let us explain first of all how it could happen that the contribution of  $\lambda^\beta[\epsilon^\beta]$  could be different to  $(v_+, T_+) = (v'_+, T'_+)$ . Say  $(v, T) = (v_+, T_+)$  is obtained from  $(u^\beta, S^\beta)$  by attaching some ghost at  $p \in S^\beta$ , which moreover lies in the support of the basic perturbation, and then smoothing with smoothing parameter  $c$ . Suppose  $(v'_+, T'_+)$  is obtained by attaching two genus one curves at points  $p', p'' \in S$  which are in the support of the perturbation, and also very near each other, specifically, closer together than  $\epsilon_2^\beta$ . Suppose in addition that

$c < \epsilon_1^\beta, \epsilon_2^\beta$ . Then the cutoff functions  $\kappa_1$  and  $\kappa_2$  are both nonzero at  $(v', T')$ , meaning that the perturbation at  $(v'_+, T'_+)$  is some linear combination of the perturbation at  $(v_+, T_+)$  and, because  $\kappa_2$  is nonvanishing, the same perturbation but cutoff at a disk containing  $p', p''$ , coming from smoothing a map with a rational ghost attached a point near  $p', p''$ , on top of which are attached the genus one curves.<sup>3</sup>

By construction, the above sort of situation and its generalization with more attaching points is in fact the only way (3) can fail. To avoid it, it suffices to make sure, e.g. in the above example, that  $\epsilon_2^\beta < c$ . In fact, it is possible to ensure this, by another use of ghost bubble censorship.

More precisely,  $(v_+, T_+)$  is obtained by attaching rational ghosts at  $r > 0$  Pluotonian nodes  $p_1, \dots, p_r$  at gluing parameters  $c_1, \dots, c_r$  and  $(v'_+, T'_+)$  is obtained by attaching ghosts at punctures  $p_k^{l_1}, \dots, p_k^{l_k}$ , where  $l_k \geq 2$  and where the domain with punctures at  $p_k^l$  is in the image of the gluing at  $c_1, \dots, c_r$ . The required property would then follow provided

$$(9.1) \quad \epsilon_{r'} < \min\{c_1, \dots, c_r\}, \text{ for every } r' > r.$$

To arrange this, first choose the  $\epsilon_1^\beta$  for all  $\beta$ . Consider the extension

$$\theta_{>\chi-1,(1)} := \theta_{>\chi} + \sum \kappa_1^\beta \lambda_{*,1}^\beta$$

The ghost bubble censorship argument implies that there is a solution-free neighborhood around curves with ghosts attached *at a single point*. We fixed at the outset a bound below of Euler characteristics. Thus, there is some constant  $c_1 > 0$  such that any solution to  $\bar{\partial}_J - \theta_{>\chi-1,(1)} = 0$ , which can be described by attaching a ghost *at a single point* to a curve of Euler characteristic  $\chi$  and then smoothing, has gluing parameter  $> c_1$ .

Then we choose  $\epsilon_2^\beta < c_1$  for all  $\beta$ , and continue in this manner to determine all the  $\epsilon_r$  so that (9.1) holds.  $\square$

**Theorem 9.2.** *Fix  $\chi_{\min}$  and let  $\theta_0, \theta_1: \mathbf{W} \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$  be sections defined on the components corresponding to domains of Euler characteristic  $\geq \chi_{\min}$  for which Theorem 9.1 holds. Then there is a 1-parameter family of sections  $\theta_t$  of  $\mathbf{W} \rightarrow \mathbf{Z} \times [0, 1]$ , supported outside a neighborhood of  $L$ , connecting  $\theta_0$  to  $\theta_1$  such that the (1-parameter families of) of bare solutions to  $\bar{\partial}_J - \theta_t$  of Euler characteristic  $> \chi$  are 1-generic and transversely cut out. Moreover, a bare curve is a solution if and only if its normalization is and the parameterized moduli space of solutions is compact.*

*Proof.* The proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 9.1. Here we use instead the following inductive hypothesis. At Euler characteristic  $\chi$ , we suppose we have already collected finitely many 1-parameter families of basic perturbations  $\lambda_t^\alpha$  centered at domains with  $\chi(S^\alpha) > \chi$  and  $\epsilon^\alpha = (\epsilon_1^\alpha, \epsilon_2^\alpha, \dots)$  such that if  $\theta_{t;>\chi} := \sum \lambda_t^\alpha[\epsilon^\alpha]$ , then the following inductive hypotheses on solutions to  $\bar{\partial}_J - \theta_{t;>\chi} = 0$  hold:

- (1) All families of bare solutions of Euler characteristic  $> \chi$  are 1-generic and transversely cut out and a bare curve is a solution if and only if its normalization is.
- (2) Given a solution  $(v_t, T_t)$ , if the bare part  $T_{t,+}$  has  $\chi(T_{t,+}) > \chi$ , then  $(v_{t,+}, T_{t,+})$  is 1-generic and the corresponding 1-parameter family transversely cut out.

---

<sup>3</sup>This would be a problem because, while we can control the radius of this disk by choosing  $\epsilon_2$ , we would only learn at a later stage of the induction the appropriate Newton constant which controls how close we need to be to an existing transverse solution.

- (3) If  $(v_t, T_t)$  and  $(v'_t, T'_t)$  are two solutions whose bare parts agree and have Euler characteristic  $\leq \chi$ , then  $\theta_{t;>\chi}$  takes the same value on these bare parts.

Again the inductive hypothesis holds vacuously at  $\chi = \chi_{\max} + 1$  and once we establish the induction, compactness of bare solutions follows by ghost bubble censorship.

The proof of the inductive step parallels the proof of Theorem 9.1 and we will give details only where the proofs differ. The inductive hypothesis along with the ghost bubble censorship results imply that there is a solution free neighborhood of the locus of non-bare solutions of Euler characteristic  $\chi$  to  $\bar{\partial}_J u - \theta_{>\chi} = 0$  and that near any solution with an (elliptic or hyperbolic) boundary the space of solutions is a transversely cut out family conjugated to a standard node family. To see the latter property, we use the fact that the basic perturbations are supported away from  $L$  and uniqueness of gluing of transverse boundary crossings or interior crossings with  $L$  to get standard solutions near curves with boundary nodes.

It follows that the locus of bare solutions of Euler characteristic  $\chi$  intersected with a small neighborhoods is compact and transverse near the locus of curves with boundary nodes. We then choose 1-parameter families of basic perturbations  $\lambda_t^\beta$  centered around a finite collection  $(u_t^\beta, S_t^\beta)$  of maps from smooth domains with Euler characteristic  $\chi(S^\beta) = \chi$ , and with support disjoint from maps with nodes such that all Euler characteristic  $\chi$  bare solutions to  $\bar{\partial}_J - \theta_{t;>\chi} - \sum \lambda_t^\beta = 0$  are 1-generic and transversely cut out.

The proof of properties (2) and (3) of the inductive step are directly analogous to the corresponding steps in the proof of Theorem 9.1.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] Shaoyun Bai and Mohan Swaminathan. Bifurcations of embedded curves and towards an extension of Taubes' Gromov invariant to Calabi-Yau 3-folds. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.01206*, 2021.
- [2] Kai Cieliebak, Tobias Ekholm, and Janko Latschev. Compactness for holomorphic curves with switching Lagrangian boundary conditions. *J. Symplectic Geom.*, 8(3):267–298, 2010.
- [3] Aleksander Doan, Eleny-Nicoleta Ionel, and Thomas Walpuski. The Gopakumar-Vafa finiteness conjecture. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.08221*, 2021.
- [4] Aleksander Doan and Thomas Walpuski. On counting associative submanifolds and Seiberg-Witten monopoles. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.08383*, 2017.
- [5] Aleksander Doan and Thomas Walpuski. Counting embedded curves in symplectic 6-manifolds. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.12338*, 2019.
- [6] Tobias Ekholm, John Etnyre, and Michael Sullivan. The contact homology of Legendrian submanifolds in  $\mathbb{R}^{2n+1}$ . *J. Differential Geom.*, 71(2):177–305, 2005.
- [7] Tobias Ekholm, John Etnyre, and Michael Sullivan. Legendrian contact homology in  $P \times \mathbb{R}$ . *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 359(7):3301–3335, 2007.
- [8] Tobias Ekholm and Vivek Shende. Skeins on branes. *arXiv:1901.08027*, 2019.
- [9] Tobias Ekholm and Vivek Shende. Skein recursion for holomorphic curves and invariants of the unknot. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.15366*, 2020.
- [10] Tobias Ekholm and Vivek Shende. Colored HOMFLYPT counts holomorphic curves. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00619*, 2021.
- [11] Tobias Ekholm and Vivek Shende. Ghost bubble censorship. *arXiv:2212.05835*, 2022.
- [12] Kenji Fukaya, Yong-Geun Oh, Hiroshi Ohta, and Kaoru Ono. *Lagrangian intersection Floer theory: anomaly and obstruction*. American Mathematical Soc., 2010.
- [13] Rajesh Gopakumar and Cumrun Vafa. M-theory and topological strings, II. *arXiv preprint hep-th/9812127*, 1998.
- [14] Helmut Hofer, Kris Wysocki, and Eduard Zehnder. Sc-smoothness, retractions and new models for smooth spaces. *Discrete & Continuous Dynamical Systems-A*, 28(2):665, 2010.
- [15] Helmut Hofer, Kris Wysocki, and Eduard Zehnder. *Applications of polyfold theory I: the polyfolds of Gromov–Witten theory*. American Mathematical Society, 2017.



- [16] Helmut Hofer, Krzysztof Wysocki, and Eduard Zehnder. *Polyfold and Fredholm theory*. Springer Nature, 2021.
- [17] Mingyuan Hu, Gus Schrader, and Eric Zaslow. Skeins, clusters and wavefunctions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.10186*, 2023.
- [18] Yi Hu and Jun Li. Derived resolution property for stacks, Euler classes and applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1009.5109*, 2010.
- [19] Eleny Ionel. Genus 1 enumerative invariants in  $\mathbb{P}^n$  with fixed  $j$  invariant. *Duke mathematical journal*, 94(2):279–324, 1998.
- [20] Eleny-Nicoleta Ionel and Thomas Parker. The Gopakumar-Vafa formula for symplectic manifolds. *Annals of Mathematics*, 187(1):1–64, 2018.
- [21] Michael Louis Jemison Jr. *Polyfolds of Lagrangian Floer theory in all genera*. PhD thesis, Princeton University, 2020.
- [22] Jun Li and Aleksey Zinger. On the genus-one Gromov-Witten invariants of complete intersections. *Journal of Differential Geometry*, 82(3):641–690, 2009.
- [23] Davesh Maulik, Nikita Nekrasov, Andrei Okounkov, and Rahul Pandharipande. Gromov–Witten theory and Donaldson–Thomas theory, I. *Compositio Mathematica*, 142(5):1263–1285, 2006.
- [24] Jingchen Niu. *Refined convergence for genus-two pseudo-holomorphic maps*. PhD thesis, State University of New York at Stony Brook, 2016.
- [25] Hiroshi Ooguri and Cumrun Vafa. Knot invariants and topological strings. *Nucl.Phys.*, B577:419–438, 2000, hep-th/9912123.
- [26] Rahul Pandharipande. Hodge integrals and degenerate contributions. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 208(2):489–506, 1999.
- [27] John Pardon. An algebraic approach to virtual fundamental cycles on moduli spaces of pseudo-holomorphic curves. *Geometry & Topology*, 20(2):779–1034, 2016.
- [28] John Pardon. Universally counting curves in Calabi-Yau threefolds. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.02948*, 2023.
- [29] Alberto Cobos Rabano, Etienne Mann, Cristina Manolache, and Renata Picciotto. Desingularizations of sheaves and reduced invariants. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06727*, 2023.
- [30] Yongbin Ruan and Gang Tian. Higher genus symplectic invariants and sigma models coupled with gravity. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 130(3):455–516, 1997.
- [31] Matthias Scharitzer and Vivek Shende. Quantum mirrors of cubic planar graph legendrians. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.01872*, 2023.
- [32] Matthias Scharitzer and Vivek Shende. Skein valued cluster transformation in enumerative geometry of legendrian mutation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.10625*, 2023.
- [33] Wolfgang Schmalz. The Gromov-Witten axioms for symplectic manifolds via polyfold theory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.13374*, 2019.
- [34] Robert Seeley. Extension of  $C^\infty$  functions defined in a half space. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 15:625–626, 1964.
- [35] Edward Witten. Chern-Simons gauge theory as a string theory. *Prog.Math.*, 133:637–678, 1995, hep-th/9207094.
- [36] Aleksey Zinger. The reduced genus 1 Gromov-Witten invariants of Calabi-Yau hypersurfaces. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 22(3):691–737, 2009.
- [37] Aleksey Zinger. Reduced genus-one Gromov-Witten invariants. *Journal of differential geometry*, 83(2):407–460, 2009.
- [38] Aleksey Zinger. A sharp compactness theorem for genus-one pseudo-holomorphic maps. *Geometry & Topology*, 13(5):2427–2522, 2009.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UPPSALA UNIVERSITY, BOX 480, 751 06 UPPSALA, SWEDEN AND  
 INSTITUT MITTAG-LEFFLER, AURAV 17, 182 60 DJURSHOLM, SWEDEN

*Email address:* tobias.ekholm@math.uu.se

CENTER FOR QUANTUM MATHEMATICS, SYDDANSK UNIV., CAMPUSVEJ 55 5230 ODENSE DENMARK  
 AND DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UC BERKELEY, 970 EVANS HALL, BERKELEY CA 94720 USA

*Email address:* vivek.vijay.shende@gmail.com