

Generalizing symplectic topology from 1 to 2 dimensions

Ronen Brilleslijper and Oliver Fabert

Abstract

In symplectic topology one uses elliptic methods to prove rigidity results about symplectic manifolds and solutions of Hamiltonian equations on them, where the most basic example is given by geodesics on Riemannian manifolds. Harmonic maps from surfaces are the natural 2-dimensional generalizations of geodesics. In this paper, we give the corresponding generalization of symplectic manifolds and Hamiltonian equations, leading to a class of partial differential equations that share properties similar to Hamiltonian (ordinary) differential equations. Two rigidity results are discussed: a non-squeezing theorem and a version of the cup-length result for quadratic Hamiltonians on cotangent bundles. The proof of the latter uses a generalization of Floer curves, for which the necessary Fredholm and compactness results will be proven.

Contents

I	Introducing the formalism	5
1	Polysymplectic geometry	5
2	An alternative Hamiltonian formulation using Dirac operators	7
3	Holomorphic Hamiltonian systems and a Darboux theorem	10
4	The Lagrange formalism	13
5	The best of both worlds	15

II	Rigidity results	18
6	Polysymplectic non-squeezing	18
7	The action functional and a cuplength result	19
8	C^0 -bounds and Floer maps	21
9	Fredholm theory and transversality	26
10	Compactness	29
A	Proof of proposition 7.1	31
B	Proof of lemma 10.3	33

Introduction

In topology one uses Morse theory to prove lower bounds for the number of 0-dimensional objects, namely critical points of smooth functions on smooth manifolds. In symplectic topology one uses Floer theory, an infinite-dimensional generalisation of Morse theory, to prove lower bounds for the number of 1-dimensional objects, like time-periodic orbits of (Hamiltonian) functions on symplectic manifolds. Despite the infinite-dimensionality one finds that Floer theory for Hamiltonian orbits has properties very similar to Morse theory for critical points: in the case of closed (symplectic) manifolds the lower bound is given by the sum of the Betti numbers. This naturally leads to the question whether the results of (symplectic) topology can be generalised to prove topological bounds for the number of 2-dimensional or even higher dimensional objects in a finite-dimensional manifold.

We will give an affirmative answer for the case of 2 dimensions.ⁱ There are two natural candidates for the generalisation of symplectic geometry from 1 to 2 dimensions: holomorphic symplectic geometry and polysymplectic (or multi-/2-symplectic) geometry.

Holomorphic symplectic geometry is a complex version of (real) symplectic geometry in the sense that one considers a complex manifold with a holomorphic

ⁱFor specific results on the 3-dimensional version, see [BF24].

symplectic 2-form; in the similar way one considers complex-valued Hamiltonian functions which are assumed to be holomorphic. It is already known, see e.g. the work of Doan-Rezchikov and Kontsevich-Soibelman on holomorphic Floer theory, that the elliptic methods for proving rigidity results in symplectic geometry have a natural analogue in holomorphic symplectic geometry: the role of 2-dimensional holomorphic curves in symplectic geometry is taken over by 3-dimensional Fueter maps in holomorphic symplectic geometry (see [DR22, KS24]). However, it is not possible to formulate a non-linear Laplace equation, the natural higher-dimensional generalisation of Newton's equation, as a holomorphic Hamiltonian system. In particular, while geodesics are the basic examples of solutions of Hamilton's equations in the real case, there is no holomorphic Hamiltonian system whose solution leads to harmonic maps, the natural 2-dimensional generalisation of geodesics. Moreover, there is no canonical real-valued action functional defined, but rather choices have to be made in order to find an action functional whose gradient-lines may be studied.

Polysymplectic geometry (and its multisymplectic and k -symplectic variants) is a geometric framework that has been developed to generalise symplectic geometry from classical mechanics to classical field theory, that is, to the case where the time coordinate is replaced by multiple (space-)time coordinates. In contrast to holomorphic symplectic geometry, it provides a framework in which non-linear Laplace equations (in particular harmonic maps) can be studied as generalised Hamiltonian systems. Here we would like to stress that the underlying Hamiltonian function is always real-valued. The central geometric object is the polysymplectic form, which is an \mathbb{R}^2 -valued real 2-form. Surprising at first glance, there does not exist anything like polysymplectic topology; in particular, there are no analogues of Gromov's non-squeezing theorem as well as of Floer's proof of the Arnold conjecture. Indeed, as we have already discussed in our previous papers [BF23, BF24], it is not possible to generalise the elliptic methods of symplectic geometry to the standard polysymplectic setting: The corresponding generalisation of Hamilton's equations, called De Donder-Weyl equations, are not elliptic due to the presence of an infinite-dimensional kernel.

In this paper we discuss a geometric framework, that we call *complex-regularized polysymplectic geometry*, which is designed in order to combine the benefits of both candidates. It is possible to formulate non-linear Laplace equations, in particular harmonic maps, as Hamiltonian systems in our framework just like in polysymplectic geometry. At the same time, the elliptic methods of symplectic geometry generalise to our framework along the lines of holomorphic symplectic geometry. The central idea is the observation that a holomorphic 2-form ω on a complex manifold M can be used to equip M with an $\mathbb{R}^2 = \mathbb{C}$ -valued polysymplectic form. While we give an intrinsic definition, we prove an analogue of the Darboux theorem stating that our complex-regularized polysymplectic manifolds are locally standard. Since the polysymplectic structure builds on the holomorphic symplectic one, we can show that the holomorphic Hamiltonian functions and holomorphic Lagrangians of holomorphic symplectic geometry

become part of our polysymplectic framework alongside the real Hamiltonian functions used to describe non-linear Laplace equations and harmonic maps. However, it turns out that this framework still shares rigidity properties similar to symplectic geometry. We discuss a non-squeezing result as well as a version of the cuplength result for quadratic Hamiltonians, which in particular provides a lower bound to the number of harmonic maps. Since it is apparent that both the polysymplectic as well as the holomorphic symplectic picture simultaneously play a central role in the rigidity result, we hope that the reader is convinced that our new geometric framework is the natural candidate for the generalization of symplectic geometry from 1 to 2 dimensions. At the end of part I of the paper, we give examples of problems from both holomorphic symplectic as well as polysymplectic geometry that naturally lead to questions in the other. Both problems can be studied within our complex-regularized polysymplectic framework.

Overview of the article

This article contains both an expository part to introduce the framework in which we work, and a technical part providing proofs of the rigidity results. We start by introducing polysymplectic geometry, with the non-linear Laplace equation as the main example of a Hamiltonian system. In section 2 we discuss a different Hamiltonian formulation of the Laplace equation using Dirac operators, leading to the definition of complex-regularized polysymplectic manifolds. Consequently, the correspondence with holomorphic symplectic geometry is explained in section 3 and we find a Darboux theorem for complex-regularized polysymplectic manifolds. Section 4 describes the Lagrange formalism corresponding to this new Hamiltonian framework. To finish the expository part of the paper, section 5 describes two problems that highlight the interplay between holomorphic symplectic and polysymplectic geometry. The first problem is obstruction theory to holomorphic Lagrangian embeddings, a problem from holomorphic symplectic geometry, which may be answered using the study of harmonic maps. The second one is the existence of harmonic maps with specified boundary. This problem in polysymplectic geometry, may be formulated as a Hamiltonian PDE, whose boundary condition is given by a complex Lagrangian in a holomorphic symplectic manifold. Both problems discussed can be studied within the complex-regularized polysymplectic framework.

Subsequently, we turn to the rigidity results. In section 6, a non-squeezing result is discussed which in particular implies that morphisms between complex-regularized polysymplectic manifolds are stable under taking C^0 -limits. Section 7 discusses the action functional and formulates a version of the cuplength result for quadratic Hamiltonians, which is proven in sections 8 to 10 by analysing a moduli space of Floer maps. While section 8 proves the necessary C^0 -bounds and discusses the general proof strategy, sections 9 and 10 cover the

Fredholm and compactness theories respectively.

Acknowledgment. The authors would like to thank Gabriele Benedetti, Luca Asselle and Alberto Abbondandolo for helpful discussions.

Part I

Introducing the formalism

1 Polysymplectic geometry

In its most basic form, symplectic geometry studies maps $q : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, where M is either \mathbb{R} or S^1 , satisfying Newton's equation

$$-\partial_t^2 q = \frac{dV}{dq}, \tag{1}$$

for some potential $V : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The Hamiltonian form of this equation can be described using a non-degenerate 2-form, called the symplectic form, that maps Hamiltonians on phase space \mathbb{R}^{2n} to vector fields. The flow of these Hamiltonian vector fields then yield first-order ODEs that generalize equation (1). For example, when the Hamiltonian is chosen to be purely quadratic in the momentum variable, the flow of the Hamiltonian vector field describes the geodesic equation ([Hil21]). Since all the geometric information is stored in the symplectic form, this Hamiltonian formalism can be extended to any manifold admitting a non-degenerate 2-form.

As mentioned in the introduction, the polysymplectic formalism, in its most basic form, studies the non-linear Laplace equation

$$-\Delta q := -\sum_{l=1}^d \partial_{t_l}^2 q = \frac{dV}{dq}, \tag{2}$$

where in this case $M = \mathbb{R}^d$. When M is a surface, one would hope that the corresponding Hamiltonian formalism would be capable of describing harmonic maps, just like for $d = 1$ it can describe the geodesic equation.

The standard way of transforming equation (2) into a first-order system is by introducing momentum variables for the different 'time'-directions.ⁱⁱ This yields

ⁱⁱFrom here on out $d = 2$.

the so-called De Donder-Weyl equations

$$\begin{aligned} -\partial_1 p_1 - \partial_2 p_2 &= \partial_q H \\ \partial_1 q &= \partial_{p_1} H \\ \partial_2 q &= \partial_{p_2} H, \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where $\partial_l := \partial_{t_l}$. Note that for $H(q, p_1, p_2) = \frac{1}{2}p_1^2 + \frac{1}{2}p_2^2 + V(q)$, indeed equation (3) reduces to the nonlinear Laplace equation (2). We will denote by Z the map $Z = (q, p_1, p_2) : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$.

The De Donder-Weyl equations form the basis of the different extensions of symplectic geometry to formalisms that can deal with PDEs. However, for the purpose of extending elliptic methods, they are unsuitable. The most apparent problem is that even though the Laplace equation is elliptic, equation (3) is not. As pointed out in previous articles (e.g. [Bri06]), the differential operator that defines equation (3) has an infinite-dimensional kernel. This can be easily seen as follows. Take q to be a constant and $p_1 = \partial_2 \psi$, $p_2 = -\partial_1 \psi$ for any function $\psi : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Then $-\partial_1 p_1 - \partial_2 p_2 = 0$ and also $\partial_1 q = \partial_2 q = 0$, so that indeed (q, p_1, p_2) satisfies equation (3) for $H \equiv 0$. This fact makes the extension of elliptic methods to the polysymplectic setting impossible. We refer to our previous articles [BF23, BF24] for more explanation on why this forms a problem in the specific context of Floer theory. Fortunately, it is possible to formulate a different Hamiltonian version of the Laplace equation (2) using Dirac operators. In order to do so, we need to have complex structures on the spaces we are working with. These equations will lead to the notion of complex-regularized polysymplectic geometry. Before diving into this formalism in section 2, we discuss the geometric picture behind equation (3).

Definition 1.1 ([Gün87]). *An \mathbb{R}^d -valued 2-form $\Omega \in \bigwedge^2 T^*W \otimes \mathbb{R}^d$ on a manifold W is called polysymplectic if it is closed and non-degenerate in the following sense:*

$$\Omega(X, \cdot) = 0 \Rightarrow X = 0 \text{ for all } X \in TW.$$

Note that Ω is given by a collection of d closed 2-forms η_α on W . The non-degeneracy condition is equivalent to the requirement that $\bigcap_\alpha \ker \eta_\alpha = \{0\}$. For example, on \mathbb{R}^3 with coordinates (q, p_1, p_2) we may define the \mathbb{R}^2 -valued form

$$\Omega_{DW} = \eta_1 \otimes \partial_1 + \eta_2 \otimes \partial_2,$$

where \mathbb{R}^2 is spanned by the basis vectors ∂_1 and ∂_2 and

$$\eta_1 = dp_1 \wedge dq \qquad \eta_2 = dp_2 \wedge dq.$$

Note that neither η_1 nor η_2 is non-degenerate, but their kernels have trivial intersection.

Whereas on symplectic manifolds there is a unique notion of a Hamiltonian, on a polysymplectic manifold there are actually two types of Hamiltonians, both

of whom serve a different purpose. On the one hand, in symplectic geometry, a Hamiltonian gives rise to a vector field whose flow describes a differential equation. Since a polysymplectic form is \mathbb{R}^2 -valued, its pairing with a vector field gives an element of \mathbb{R}^2 . Thus, only for functions $W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ there is a chance of relating them to the flow of a vector field. In the polysymplectic world, we call these functions currents. On the other hand, the polysymplectic language is actually designed in order to deal with PDEs, whereas a flow of a vector field gives an ODE. In order to describe PDEs, we need to study Hamiltonians $W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The following definition describes both of these types of functions.

Definition 1.2. *Let (W, Ω) be a polysymplectic manifold.*

- (i) *A function $F : W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ is called a current, if there exists a vector field X_F on W such that $\Omega(X_F, \cdot) = dF$.*
- (ii) *A function $H : W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called a Hamiltonian.*

As mentioned, any current F induces a flow along the trajectories of its associated vector field X_F . This flow preserves the polysymplectic form. In order to relate a Hamiltonian H to a PDE, note that for any vector $v \in TW$ and any map $Z : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow W$, the map $\Omega(v, dZ \cdot)$ is a linear map from \mathbb{R}^2 to itself. Therefore, we can take its trace and denote it by $\Omega^\#(dZ)(v)$. Note that when $\Omega = \eta_1 \otimes \partial_1 + \eta_2 \otimes \partial_2$ it follows that $\Omega^\#(dZ) = \eta_1(\cdot, \partial_1 Z) + \eta_2(\cdot, \partial_2 Z)$. The map $Z : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow W$ is called a solution of the polysymplectic Hamiltonian equation if

$$dH = \Omega^\#(dZ) = \eta_1(\cdot, \partial_1 Z) + \eta_2(\cdot, \partial_2 Z). \quad (4)$$

In the example of $W = \mathbb{R}^3$ and $\Omega = \Omega_{DW}$ equation (3) is equivalent to equation (4).

For Hamiltonians H and currents F , one can define their Poisson bracket as $\{H, F\} := -dH(X_F)$. The flow of X_F preserves H if and only if $\{H, F\} = 0$. In other words, currents describe symmetries of Hamiltonians. We will see in section 3 that in the complex-regularized polysymplectic framework there is a remarkable connection between currents and holomorphic Hamiltonian systems.

2 An alternative Hamiltonian formulation using Dirac operators

Assume M is either \mathbb{R}^2 or \mathbb{T}^2 , so that $\{\partial_1, \partial_2\}$ forms a global frame of TM . As pointed out in section 1, we are looking for a Hamiltonian formulation of the nonlinear Laplace equation (2), that preserves its elliptic structure. Unfortunately, this is not possible for the Laplace equation on all spaces. However,

when our space comes equipped with a complex structure, we may use it to define a regularized version of the polysymplectic form.

To this extent, we now assume that $q : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ maps to even-dimensional Euclidean space equipped with its standard complex structure $i = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. We will write $q = (q_1, q_2) : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$. The Laplace equation for q can now be formulated as

$$-\Delta q = -4\partial_{\bar{t}}\partial_t q = \nabla V(q), \quad (5)$$

where $\partial_t = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_1 - i\partial_2)$ and $\partial_{\bar{t}} = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_1 + i\partial_2)$ are the holomorphic and anti-holomorphic derivatives and $V : \mathbb{R}^{2n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

To get to the De Donder-Weyl equations, we would introduce all four of the momentum vectors $p_\beta^\alpha = \partial_\alpha q_\beta$, corresponding to the four different partial derivatives. However, we see from equation (5) that the only combinations of partial derivatives we need, are given by the holomorphic derivative. Thus we may reduce the number of momentum variables to the number of coordinates q . Indeed, we define $p = 2\partial_t q$, meaning

$$\begin{aligned} p_1 &= \partial_1 q_1 + \partial_2 q_2 \\ p_2 &= \partial_1 q_2 - \partial_2 q_1, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

and get equation (5) back by requiring $-2\partial_{\bar{t}}p = \nabla V(q)$. That is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial V}{\partial q_1} &= -\partial_1 p_1 + \partial_2 p_2 \\ \frac{\partial V}{\partial q_2} &= -\partial_1 p_2 - \partial_2 p_1. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Combined, we see that equation (5) is equivalent to

$$\not\partial Z := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -2\partial_{\bar{t}} \\ 2\partial_t & 0 \end{pmatrix} Z = \nabla H(Z), \quad (8)$$

where $Z = (q, p) : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{4n}$ and $H : \mathbb{R}^{4n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by $H(q, p) = \frac{1}{2}|p|^2 + V(q)$.

In contrast to equation (3), equation (8) is actually elliptic. One way to see that is by noting that $\not\partial$ is a Dirac operator (clearly $\not\partial^2 = -\Delta$). Therefore, this Hamiltonian formulation is much more likely to be suitable for the generalization of elliptic methods from symplectic geometry. Indeed, in part II of this paper, rigidity results will be proven based on these equations.

Remark 2.1. *We should note that equations (6) and (7) were already introduced by Bridges and Derks in [BD99]. In [Bri06], Bridges views the variable that we call q_2 as a 'higher-momentum' variable. As was noted also by the authors of the present article in [BF24], there is a symmetry between the even and odd higher momenta, which leads to the viewpoint we chose for this article.*

Just like the De Donder-Weyl equations, equation (8) can be formulated in terms of a polysymplectic form. Define $\omega_1 = dp_1 \wedge dq_1 + dp_2 \wedge dq_2$ and $\omega_2 = dp_1 \wedge dq_2 - dp_2 \wedge dq_1$ and let

$$\Omega = \omega_1 \otimes \partial_1 + \omega_2 \otimes \partial_2.$$

By a straightforward check, Ω defines a polysymplectic form on \mathbb{R}^{4n} and equation (8) is equivalent to the polysymplectic equation

$$dH = \Omega^\#(dZ) = \omega_1(\cdot, \partial_1 Z) + \omega_2(\cdot, \partial_2 Z).$$

Note that in this case, not only Ω is non-degenerate, but so are its components ω_1 and ω_2 . In fact, these components both define symplectic forms that are related by $\omega_2 = -\omega_1(\cdot, I\cdot)$, where

$$I = \begin{pmatrix} i & 0 \\ 0 & i^* \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} i & 0 \\ 0 & -i \end{pmatrix}$$

is the standard complex structure on $\mathbb{R}^{4n} = \mathbb{R}^{2n} \times (\mathbb{R}^{2n})^*$.

Remark 2.2. *As a preparation for the next section in which we will explain the relation with holomorphic symplectic geometry, we want to note that Ω can be written also in a different way. Let $\omega^{\mathbb{C}} = d(p_1 - ip_2) \wedge d(q_1 + iq_2)$ be the holomorphic symplectic formⁱⁱⁱ on $\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times (\mathbb{R}^{2n})^*$ and $\bar{\omega}^{\mathbb{C}}$ its complex conjugate. Then we can rewrite*

$$\Omega = \omega^{\mathbb{C}} \otimes \partial_t + \bar{\omega}^{\mathbb{C}} \otimes \partial_{\bar{t}}.$$

This correspondence between the polysymplectic and holomorphic symplectic viewpoints holds in more generality and will be spelled out in proposition 3.1.

The only geometric properties of \mathbb{R}^{4n} that are essential for the definition of the regularized version of the De Donder-Weyl equations are its complex structure and the polysymplectic form Ω . Thus we can extend to manifolds sharing these two structures.

Definition 2.3. *A complex-regularized polysymplectic structure on a complex manifold (W, I) is an \mathbb{R}^2 -valued polysymplectic form $\Omega = \omega_1 \otimes \partial_1 + \omega_2 \otimes \partial_2$ such that $\omega_2 = -\omega_1(\cdot, I\cdot)$. The triple (W, I, Ω) is called a complex-regularized polysymplectic manifold.*

Example 2.4. *Our main example of a complex-regularized polysymplectic manifold is the cotangent bundle of a complex manifold. Let (Q, i) be a complex manifold and equip $W = T^*Q$ with a complex structure I by*

$$I = \begin{pmatrix} i & 0 \\ 0 & i^* \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{on} \quad T_{(q,p)}W \cong T_q Q \oplus T_q^* Q.$$

ⁱⁱⁱThe minus sign for p_2 comes from the fact that $i^* = -i$.

Note that the projection $\pi : W \rightarrow Q$ is holomorphic. Then for $Z = (q, p) \in W$ and $X \in T_Z W$, we may define

$$\begin{aligned}(\lambda_1)_Z(X) &= p \circ d\pi(X) \\ (\lambda_2)_Z(X) &= p \circ d\pi(IX).\end{aligned}$$

Then $\Omega = d\lambda_1 \otimes \partial_1 - d\lambda_2 \otimes \partial_2$ is a complex-regularized polysymplectic structure on (W, I) , as can be checked in local coordinates.

For the complex-regularized polysymplectic structure on \mathbb{R}^{4n} defined above, we saw that both components are actually symplectic. We would like to prove a similar result in this more general setting.

Proposition 2.5. *Let $(W, I, \Omega = \omega_1 \otimes \partial_1 + \omega_2 \otimes \partial_2)$ be a complex-regularized polysymplectic manifold, then both ω_1 and ω_2 are symplectic.*

Proof. By definition $\ker \omega_1^b \cap \ker \omega_2^b = 0$ as Ω is a polysymplectic form. Suppose $X \in \ker \omega_1^b$. Then

$$\omega_2(X, Y) = -\omega_1(X, IY) = 0,$$

for all $Y \in TW$. So $X \in \ker \omega_1^b \cap \ker \omega_2^b = 0$, yielding $X = 0$. This proves ω_1 is symplectic. A similar proof shows ω_2 is symplectic as well. \square

Corollary 2.6. *Let $\psi : (W, I, \Omega) \rightarrow (W', I', \Omega')$ be a diffeomorphism between complex-regularized polysymplectic manifolds, such that $\psi^* \Omega' = \Omega$. Then ψ is holomorphic with respect to I and I' .*

Proof. A simple calculation shows

$$\begin{aligned}\omega'_1(d\psi \cdot, I' \circ d\psi \cdot) &= -\omega'_2(d\psi \cdot, d\psi \cdot) \\ &= -\omega_2 \\ &= \omega_1(\cdot, I \cdot) \\ &= \omega'_1(d\psi \cdot, d\psi \circ I \cdot).\end{aligned}$$

As $d\psi$ is bijective and ω'_1 is non-degenerate we get $I' \circ d\psi = d\psi \circ I$. \square

3 Holomorphic Hamiltonian systems and a Darboux theorem

Recall from remark 2.2, that the polysymplectic form on \mathbb{R}^{4n} defined in section 2 can be written in terms of a holomorphic symplectic form. In this section we

will elaborate more on the relation between complex-regularized polysymplectic and holomorphic symplectic geometry. For an introduction to holomorphic symplectic geometry, see [Wag23].

Recall that a holomorphic symplectic form on a complex manifold (W, I) is a holomorphic 2-form on W that is closed and whose restriction to the holomorphic tangent bundle $T^{(1,0)}W$ is non-degenerate. A holomorphic Hamiltonian system is a triple $(W, \omega^{\mathbb{C}}, F)$ where $F : W \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is holomorphic. In this case F induces a holomorphic vector field \mathcal{X}_F by $\omega^{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{X}_F, \cdot) = dF$. Our first result is that regularized polysymplectic structures are in one-to-one correspondence with holomorphic symplectic structures.

Proposition 3.1. *For a complex manifold (W, I) define the following two sets*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{RegPol}(W, I) &:= \{\Omega \mid \Omega \text{ is a complex-regularized polysymplectic form}\} \\ \text{HolSimp}(W, I) &:= \{\omega^{\mathbb{C}} \mid \omega^{\mathbb{C}} \text{ is a holomorphic symplectic form}\}. \end{aligned}$$

There is a bijection $\alpha : \text{RegPol}(W, I) \rightarrow \text{HolSimp}(W, I)$ given by

$$\alpha(\omega_1 \otimes \partial_1 + \omega_2 \otimes \partial_2) = \omega_1 + i\omega_2$$

with inverse given by

$$\omega^{\mathbb{C}} \mapsto \omega^{\mathbb{C}} \otimes \partial_t + \bar{\omega}^{\mathbb{C}} \otimes \partial_{\bar{t}},$$

where as always $\partial_t = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_1 - i\partial_2)$ and $\partial_{\bar{t}}$ is its conjugate.

Proof. Let Ω be a complex-regularized polysymplectic structure on (W, I) and define $\omega^{\mathbb{C}} = \alpha(\Omega)$. Let $X^{\pm} \in T_{\mathbb{C}}W$ such that $IX^{\pm} = \pm iX^{\pm}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \omega^{\mathbb{C}}(\cdot, X^{\pm}) &= \omega_1(\cdot, X^{\pm}) + i\omega_2(\cdot, X^{\pm}) \\ &= \omega_1(\cdot, X^{\pm}) - i\omega_1(\cdot, IX^{\pm}) \\ &= \omega_1(\cdot, X^{\pm}) \pm \omega_1(\cdot, X^{\pm}). \end{aligned}$$

Indeed we see that $\iota_X \omega^{\mathbb{C}} = 0$ for $X \in T^{(0,1)}W$ and $\omega^{\mathbb{C}}$ is non-degenerate on $T^{(1,0)}W$. At this point, $\omega^{\mathbb{C}}$ could still be any smooth (not necessarily holomorphic) section of $\Lambda^{2,0}W$. However, note that since $\omega^{\mathbb{C}}$ is closed it must be holomorphic for the following reason. The closedness means that $0 = d\omega^{\mathbb{C}} = \partial\omega^{\mathbb{C}} + \bar{\partial}\omega^{\mathbb{C}}$. Since $\partial\omega^{\mathbb{C}}$ is a section of $\Lambda^{3,0}W$, whereas $\bar{\partial}\omega^{\mathbb{C}}$ is a section of $\Lambda^{2,1}W$ they both must vanish. We conclude that $\omega^{\mathbb{C}}$ is a holomorphic symplectic form, yielding that α is well-defined.

Vice versa, if $\omega^{\mathbb{C}}$ is a holomorphic symplectic form then its real and imaginary parts are real symplectic forms and satisfy $\text{Im}(\omega^{\mathbb{C}}) = -\text{Re}(\omega^{\mathbb{C}})(\cdot, I\cdot)$, since $\omega^{\mathbb{C}}(\cdot, I\cdot) = i\omega^{\mathbb{C}}$ (see [Wag23]). So the map $\omega^{\mathbb{C}} \mapsto \omega^{\mathbb{C}} \otimes \partial_t + \bar{\omega}^{\mathbb{C}} \otimes \partial_{\bar{t}}$ is well-defined and is clearly the inverse of α . \square

From this proposition it might seem like complex-regularized polysymplectic geometry is equivalent to holomorphic symplectic geometry. However, even

though the manifolds that both frameworks allow are the same, the equations that they study are different. While in polysymplectic geometry Hamiltonians are real-valued and yield PDEs, in holomorphic symplectic geometry one studies holomorphic Hamiltonians, giving rise to holomorphic vector fields. As it turns out, the holomorphic Hamiltonians from holomorphic symplectic geometry correspond precisely to the currents in complex-regularized polysymplectic geometry.

Recall from definition 1.2 that a function $F : W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ on a polysymplectic manifold (W, Ω) is called a current if dF_w lies in the image $\Omega_w^b(T_w W)$ for every $w \in W$. In this case we define X_F by $X_F(w) = (\Omega_w^b)^{-1}(dF_w)$. Heuristically, currents describe symmetries of polysymplectic systems. On the other hand, holomorphic Hamiltonians describe symmetries of holomorphic symplectic systems. Given the correspondence in proposition 3.1 between complex-regularized polysymplectic and holomorphic symplectic forms, it should come as no surprise that currents in our polysymplectic setting correspond to holomorphic Hamiltonians. This is the content of the next lemma, which will be proven at the end of this section.

Lemma 3.2. *Let (W, I, Ω) be a complex-regularized polysymplectic manifold and $\omega^{\mathbb{C}} = \alpha(\Omega)$. When we identify $\mathbb{R}^2 \cong \mathbb{C}$ and $TW \cong T^{(1,0)}W$, we get that $F : W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2 \cong \mathbb{C}$ is a current if and only if it is a holomorphic function and in that case $X_F = \mathcal{X}_F$.*

As a nice corollary of proposition 3.1, we get a Darboux theorem for complex-regularized polysymplectic manifolds.

Corollary 3.3 (Darboux theorem). *Let (W, I, Ω) be a complex-regularized polysymplectic manifold. Around every point $w \in W$ there are coordinates $q_1^i, q_2^i, p_1^i, p_2^i$ such that*

$$I \frac{\partial}{\partial q_1^i} = \frac{\partial}{\partial q_2^i} \qquad I \frac{\partial}{\partial p_1^i} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial p_2^i}$$

and

$$\omega_1 = \sum_i (dp_1^i \wedge dq_1^i + dp_2^i \wedge dq_2^i) \qquad \omega_2 = \sum_i (dp_1^i \wedge dq_2^i - dp_2^i \wedge dq_1^i).$$

Proof. This follows immediately from proposition 3.1 and the Darboux theorem in [Wag23]. \square

Proof of lemma 3.2. As these statements are local in nature, we may use the Darboux theorem above to compute in local coordinates. Note the minus sign in the complex structure on the p -coordinates. An easy computation shows that the image of Ω_w^b is spanned by

$$\{dq_1^j \otimes \partial_1 + dq_2^j \otimes \partial_2, dq_2^j \otimes \partial_1 - dq_1^j \otimes \partial_2, dp_1^j \otimes \partial_1 - dp_2^j \otimes \partial_2, dp_2^j \otimes \partial_1 + dp_1^j \otimes \partial_2\}.$$

That means that dF lies in this image precisely when

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial F_1}{\partial q_1^j} &= \frac{\partial F_2}{\partial q_2^j} \\ -\frac{\partial F_1}{\partial q_2^j} &= \frac{\partial F_2}{\partial q_1^j} \\ -\frac{\partial F_1}{\partial p_1^j} &= \frac{\partial F_2}{\partial p_2^j} \\ \frac{\partial F_1}{\partial p_2^j} &= \frac{\partial F_2}{\partial p_1^j}, \end{aligned}$$

which are precisely the Cauchy-Riemann equations.

We also see that for currents F the corresponding vector field X_F is given by

$$X_F = \begin{pmatrix} -\partial_{p_1^j} F_1 \\ -\partial_{p_2^j} F_1 \\ \partial_{q_1^j} F_1 \\ \partial_{q_2^j} F_1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_{p_2^j} F_2 \\ -\partial_{p_1^j} F_2 \\ \partial_{q_2^j} F_2 \\ -\partial_{q_1^j} F_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

On the other hand, the holomorphic vector field \mathcal{X}_F is given by $(\mathcal{X}_F)_{q^j} = -\partial_{p^j} F = -\partial_{p_1^j} F_1 - i\partial_{p_2^j} F_1$ and $(\mathcal{X}_F)_{p^j} = \partial_{q^j} F = \partial_{q_1^j} F_1 - i\partial_{q_2^j} F_1$. The identification between the real and holomorphic tangent bundle of W takes place by taking $\mathcal{X}_{q^j} = X_{q_1^j} + iX_{q_2^j}$ and $\mathcal{X}_{p^j} = X_{p_1^j} - iX_{p_2^j}$. The formulas above easily show that indeed X_F and \mathcal{X}_F coincide. \square

4 The Lagrange formalism

The Hamiltonian formalism from section 2 has a Lagrangian counterpart. Let (Q, i) be a complex manifold and $L : \mathbb{T}^2 \times TQ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a Lagrangian on its tangent bundle depending on "time" $t \in \mathbb{T}^2$. To a map $q : \mathbb{T}^2 \rightarrow Q$ we can assign its action^{iv}

$$\mathcal{L}(q) := \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} L(t, q, 2\partial_t q) d\mathcal{V},$$

where as before $\partial_t = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_1 - i\partial_2)$ and $d\mathcal{V}$ is the volume form on the torus.

When L is convex in the fibers, we can make the Legendre transformation

$$H(t, q, p) = \max_{v \in T_q Q} (\langle p, v \rangle - L(t, q, v))$$

^{iv}The factor of 2 is just put here in order to avoid dealing with extra factors of $\frac{1}{2}$ throughout.

By standard arguments the maximum is attained precisely when $p = \frac{\partial L}{\partial v}$, where $\frac{\partial L}{\partial v}$ denotes the derivative of L in the direction of the fiber. This defines a function $H : \mathbb{T}^2 \times T^*Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

Lemma 4.1. *In local coordinates, the Euler-Lagrange equations for \mathcal{L} correspond to the Hamiltonian equations (8) for H .*

Proof. We may assume $Q = \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ with its standard complex structure i . An element of Q will be denoted by (q_1, q_2) with $q_1, q_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then the action is given by

$$\mathcal{L}(q) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} L(t, q_1, q_2, \partial_1 q_1 + \partial_2 q_2, \partial_1 q_2 - \partial_2 q_1) d\mathcal{V}.$$

Let q^s denote a family of maps $\mathbb{T}^2 \rightarrow Q$, such that $q^0 = q$ and $\frac{d}{ds} q^s|_{s=0} = \dot{q}$. Then

$$d\mathcal{L}_q(\dot{q}) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \left(\dot{q}_1 \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial q_1} - \partial_1 \frac{\partial L}{\partial v_1} + \partial_2 \frac{\partial L}{\partial v_2} \right) + \dot{q}_2 \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial q_2} - \partial_1 \frac{\partial L}{\partial v_2} - \partial_2 \frac{\partial L}{\partial v_1} \right) \right) d\mathcal{V},$$

where it is implied that L and its derivatives are evaluated at $(t, q, 2\partial_t q)$. Thus the Euler-Lagrange equations become

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial L}{\partial q_1}(t, q, 2\partial_t q) &= \partial_1 \frac{\partial L}{\partial v_1}(t, q, 2\partial_t q) - \partial_2 \frac{\partial L}{\partial v_2}(t, q, 2\partial_t q) \\ \frac{\partial L}{\partial q_2}(t, q, 2\partial_t q) &= \partial_1 \frac{\partial L}{\partial v_2}(t, q, 2\partial_t q) + \partial_2 \frac{\partial L}{\partial v_1}(t, q, 2\partial_t q). \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Noting that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial H}{\partial q_1} &= -\frac{\partial L}{\partial q_1} & \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_1} &= \partial_1 q_1 + \partial_2 q_2 \\ \frac{\partial H}{\partial q_2} &= -\frac{\partial L}{\partial q_2} & \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_2} &= \partial_1 q_2 - \partial_2 q_1 \end{aligned}$$

and using that $p_i = \frac{\partial L}{\partial v_i}(t, q, 2\partial_t q)$ we get the equivalence with equation (8). \square

Example 4.2. *Our main example is a quadratic Lagrangian $L : \mathbb{T}^2 \times TQ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by $L(t, q, v) = \frac{1}{2}|v|_g^2 - V(q)$, where g is a Riemannian metric on Q . It follows that $p = 2\partial_t q$ and $H(t, q, p) = \frac{1}{2}|p|_g^2 + V(q)$. The Euler-Lagrange equations for this Lagrangian describe harmonic maps from \mathbb{T}^2 into Q . As we can see, this is indeed a natural generalization of the Lagrangian formalism for geodesics to the $d = 2$ case.*

Without referring to coordinates, the equivalence between the Hamilton and Lagrange formalisms can also be seen by a variational principle.

Proposition 4.3. *Suppose $L : \mathbb{T}^2 \times TQ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is fibrewise convex and $H : \mathbb{T}^2 \times T^*Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is its Legendre transform as above. Then a map $q : \mathbb{T}^2 \rightarrow Q$ is an extremum of \mathcal{L} if and only if $Z = (q, p) : \mathbb{T}^2 \rightarrow T^*Q$, given by $p = \frac{\partial L}{\partial v}(t, q, 2\partial_t q)$ is an extremum of the action functional*

$$\mathcal{A}_H(Z) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (\langle p, 2\partial_t q \rangle - H(t, q, p)) dt_1 \wedge dt_2.$$

Proof. The proof is analogous to the corresponding statement for $d = 1$ (see for example [Cie10]). The idea is that when Z is extremal for \mathcal{A}_H , fiberwise p must be an extremum of the function

$$p \mapsto \langle p, 2\partial_t q \rangle - H(t, q, p).$$

Since the Legendre transform is a projection operator on the space of convex functions, this happens precisely when $p = \frac{\partial L}{\partial v}(t, q, 2\partial_t q)$ and $\langle p, 2\partial_t q \rangle - H(t, q, p) = L(t, q, p)$. \square

Note that the term $\langle p, 2\partial_t q \rangle$ in the action functional may also be defined intrinsically by using the 1-forms λ_1 and λ_2 on T^*Q that were defined in example 2.4. Indeed

$$\langle p, 2\partial_t q \rangle = p \circ d\pi(\partial_1 Z - I\partial_2 Z) = \lambda_1(\partial_1 Z) - \lambda_2(\partial_2 Z).$$

In section 7, we will see a more general definition of the action functional on polysymplectic manifolds.

5 The best of both worlds

The motivation given at the start of this article for introducing the complex-regularized polysymplectic language, was to take advantage of "ellipticity" of holomorphic symplectic geometry, whilst at the same time keep the connection with PDEs and harmonic maps from polysymplectic geometry. In this section we want to give examples of two problems in which we can clearly see the use for connecting these two worlds. This section is not meant to give rigorous proofs, but rather aims to describe the ideas involved.

Obstructions to holomorphic Lagrangian embeddings

Given a holomorphic symplectic manifold W of dimension $4n$ and a closed complex manifold L of dimension $2n$, a natural question to ask is whether there exists a holomorphic Lagrangian embedding $L \hookrightarrow W$, i.e. a holomorphic embedding

such that the pullback of the holomorphic symplectic form on W vanishes on L . Without going into details, we will argue that this question is related to Morse theory of harmonic maps and therefore naturally connects to the polysymplectic world.

The analogous question for $d = 1$ is whether an n -dimensional manifold \mathcal{L} has a Lagrangian embedding into a $2n$ -dimensional symplectic manifold \mathcal{W} . It is well-known that obstructions to the existence of such a Lagrangian embedding stem from the Morse theory of geodesics on \mathcal{L} (see for example [Lat14]). When a Lagrangian embedding $\mathcal{L} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{W}$ exists one can define the evaluation map from the moduli space of holomorphic disks with boundary in \mathcal{L} to the loop space $\Lambda\mathcal{L} = \{\ell : S^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{L}\}$ of \mathcal{L}

$$\text{ev} : \mathcal{M} = \{u : (D^2, \partial D^2 = S^1) \rightarrow (\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{L}) \mid u \text{ is holomorphic}\} \rightarrow \Lambda\mathcal{L}.$$

This gives a homology chain $\text{ev}_*[\mathcal{M}] \in C_*(\Lambda\mathcal{L})$. The homology of $\Lambda\mathcal{L}$ can in turn be described using the Morse theory of closed geodesics in \mathcal{L} . The situation is depicted in section 5. The dotted lines denote a Morse gradient flow line from a closed geodesic γ to the boundary of a holomorphic disk $(D^2, \partial D^2) \rightarrow (\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{L})$.




Figure 1: Lagrangian embedding $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{W}$ with holomorphic disk $(D^2, S^1) \rightarrow (\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{L})$ and geodesic γ .

Going back to the situation for $d = 2$, it is natural to consider a similar construction. The role of holomorphic disks is now taken over by Fueter disks $f : (D^3, \partial D^3 = S^2) \rightarrow (W, L)$, where W is the holomorphic symplectic manifold and L is an embedded holomorphic Lagrangian. This means that the evaluation map now takes values in the space of maps $S^2 \rightarrow L$. The homology of this space can be described using the Morse theory of harmonic spheres. The situation is depicted in section 5.

Remark 5.1. *Note that for this construction a theory of harmonic spheres is required, whereas so far we only dealt with harmonic tori. As the polysymplectic language requires a base manifold with trivial tangent bundle, harmonic spheres cannot be described by it. They can however be defined in the multisymplectic*




Figure 2: Complex Lagrangian embedding $L \subseteq W$ with Fueter disk $(D^3, S^2) \rightarrow (W, L)$ and harmonic sphere Z .

framework, which studies the 3-form

$$\tilde{\Omega} = \omega_1 \wedge dt_2 - \omega_2 \wedge dt_1$$

coming from contracting Ω with the volume-form on the time-manifold (note that a primitive of this 3-form is used in the definition of the action functional in section 7). The multisymplectic formalism can be defined for maps from any surface and even extends to sections of non-trivial bundles over a surface. See [DLsVf15] for the translation between the poly- and multisymplectic formalisms.

Harmonic maps with boundary

The second problem we want to highlight is the study of harmonic maps with prescribed boundary conditions. This is actually a problem that is natural to ask in the polysymplectic framework, but as we shall see holomorphic symplectic geometry will pop up naturally here.

First, let's look again at the $d = 1$ case. For a Riemannian manifold (Q, g) one can study the existence of geodesics with prescribed boundary points $q_0, q_1 \in Q$. Geodesics arise as solution to the Hamiltonian equations on T^*Q for $H(q, p) = \frac{1}{2}|p|_g^2$. The boundary conditions amount to fixing the ends of the Hamiltonian path to the Lagrangian submanifolds $T_{q_0}^*Q$ and $T_{q_1}^*Q$ in T^*Q . Existence results then follow from studying the Lagrangian Floer homology.

For $d = 2$, we start with a Kähler manifold (Q, i, g) and ask for the existence of a harmonic map $\Sigma \rightarrow Q$ with boundary $\partial\Sigma$ on some disjoint union of loops $\gamma : \coprod_l S^1 \rightarrow Q$. As seen before, the equation describing harmonic maps can be described by the complex-regularized polysymplectic Hamiltonian

$H(q, p) = \frac{1}{2}|p|_g^2$ on T^*Q with its standard complex structure I . Now, the boundary conditions translate into fixing the boundary of $Z : \Sigma \rightarrow T^*Q$ to the conormal bundle $N^*\gamma$ of γ . Already on $Q = \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ this problem is non-trivial. Note that in this case $T^*\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ is a hyperkähler space with complex structures I, J, K such that $\omega_1 = g(\cdot, J\cdot)$ and $\omega_2 = g(\cdot, K\cdot)$. In this notation, $N^*\gamma$ is a K -complex I, J -Lagrangian. We can see this as follows. Put coordinates (q_1, q_2, p_1, p_2) on $T^*\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ like before. Assume that locally around some point $\gamma(s) = (s, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$. Then $T_{\gamma(s)}N^*\gamma$ is spanned by $\frac{\partial}{\partial q_1}$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial p_2}$. Note that the complex structures are given by

$$I = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad K = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

so that indeed $\text{span}\{\frac{\partial}{\partial q_1}, \frac{\partial}{\partial p_2}\}$ is closed under the action of K , whereas $\langle \cdot, I \cdot \rangle$ and $\langle \cdot, J \cdot \rangle$ vanish.

Part II

Rigidity results

6 Polysymplectic non-squeezing

The first rigidity result we want to present in this context is Gromov's non-squeezing. Note that a diffeomorphism $\psi : W \rightarrow W$ of a complex-regularized polysymplectic manifold preserves Ω if and only if it preserves both of the symplectic forms ω_i . This yields the following non-squeezing result.

Theorem 6.1. *Let $\psi : \mathbb{R}^{4n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{4n}$ be a diffeomorphism preserving the standard complex-regularized polysymplectic form on \mathbb{R}^{4n} . Also, let $B_r^{4n} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{4n}$ be the ball of radius r and $B_R^2 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ the ball of radius R in the (q_α^j, p_β^j) -plane for some $\alpha, \beta \in \{1, 2\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. If*

$$\psi(B_r^{4n}) \subseteq B_R^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{4n-2},$$

then $r \leq R$.

Proof. Note that the (q_1^j, p_1^j) and (q_2^j, p_2^j) -planes are symplectic with respect to ω_1 and the (q_1^j, p_2^j) and (q_2^j, p_1^j) -planes are symplectic with respect to ω_2 . The result follows immediately from Gromov's non-squeezing. \square

Even though this non-squeezing result follows immediately from the known theory for symplectic forms, it is important to note that this result definitely does not hold for general polysymplectic forms. To the authors' knowledge, this is the first version of non-squeezing that is formulated for a class of polysymplectic manifolds. It is also worth mentioning that for $n = 1$, this result coincides with the lowest dimensional case of a non-squeezing conjecture by Oh for holomorphic volume preserving maps ([Oh02]).

As a consequence, it is now possible to study C^0 -limits of polysymplectomorphisms.

Corollary 6.2. *Let (W, I, Ω) be a complex-regularized polysymplectic manifold and let $\psi_\nu : W \rightarrow W$ be a sequence of diffeomorphisms preserving Ω . Assume that the ψ_ν converge to a diffeomorphism $\psi : W \rightarrow W$ in the C^0 -topology. Then $\psi^*\Omega = \Omega$.*

Proof. This follows immediately from the analogous statement for symplectomorphisms. For a proof see [MS17]. \square

Remark 6.3. *By corollary 2.6 the limit diffeomorphism ψ in corollary 6.2 is holomorphic. In general, it is already well-known that C^0 -limits of holomorphic functions are holomorphic (see [SS03]).*

7 The action functional and a cuplength result

Given a complex-regularized polysymplectic form there is a natural action functional on maps $\mathbb{T}^2 \rightarrow W$. Assume that $\Omega = d\Theta$ is exact and let $d\mathcal{V} = dt_1 \wedge dt_2 = -\frac{1}{2i}dt \wedge d\bar{t}$ be the volume form on \mathbb{T}^2 . We may contract $\Theta = \theta_1 \otimes \partial_1 + \theta_2 \otimes \partial_2$ with $d\mathcal{V}$ to give

$$\tilde{\Theta} := \theta_1 \wedge dt_2 - \theta_2 \wedge dt_1 \in \Lambda^2(W \times \mathbb{T}^2).$$

For $Z : \mathbb{T}^2 \rightarrow W$, define $\tilde{Z} = Z \times \text{id} : \mathbb{T}^2 \rightarrow W \times \mathbb{T}^2$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}(Z) &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \tilde{Z}^* \tilde{\Theta} \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (\theta_1(\partial_1 Z) + \theta_2(\partial_2 Z)) d\mathcal{V}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathcal{A}_H(Z) = \mathcal{A}(Z) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} H(Z) d\mathcal{V}$. The critical points of \mathcal{A}_H are precisely the solutions to the polysymplectic equation $dH = \Omega^\sharp(dZ)$. Note that this action functional is real-valued, making it possible to study gradient lines, whereas in holomorphic symplectic geometry one needs to make choices in order to get a real-valued action. Also, when $W = T^*Q$ and Ω is the complex-regularized

polysymplectic form defined in example 2.4, this action functional coincides with the one given in proposition 4.3.

To study gradient lines of the action functional, we need to put a metric on the space of maps from \mathbb{T}^2 to W . Just as in Floer theory, we will put an L^2 -metric on this space, coming from a metric on W . The next proposition asserts the existence of the type of metric that we want to use.

Proposition 7.1. *For every complex-regularized polysymplectic manifold $(W, I, \omega_1 \otimes \partial_1 + \omega_2 \otimes \partial_2)$ there exists a Riemannian metric g and anti-commuting almost complex structures J and K on W , such that*

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_1 &= g(\cdot, J\cdot) \\ \omega_2 &= g(\cdot, K\cdot) \\ K &= IJ.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. See appendix appendix A. □

Pick a metric g on W as in proposition 7.1. Then the L^2 -gradient of \mathcal{A} is given by

$$\text{grad } \mathcal{A}(Z) = J\partial_1 Z + K\partial_2 Z =: \not\partial Z,$$

meaning that its negative gradient lines are described by the Fueter equation

$$I\partial_s Z + K\partial_1 Z - J\partial_2 Z = 0.$$

Thus we may expect the role of holomorphic curves in symplectic geometry to be replaced by Fueter maps in complex-regularized polysymplectic geometry. The Fueter equation is the quaternionic analogue of the Cauchy-Riemann equations. Just as for holomorphic curves, there are compactness and Fredholm theories developed for Fueter maps (see e.g. [HNS09, Wal17]).

Gradient lines of the action functional above may be used to prove a cuplength result for solutions of equation (8) in the same spirit as Arnold's conjecture.

Theorem 7.2. *Let $Q = \mathbb{T}^{2n}$ with its standard complex structure i and $W = T^*Q$ with the standard complex-regularized polysymplectic form Ω . Denote elements of W by $Z = (q, p)$. If $H : \mathbb{T}^2 \times W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given by $H(t, q, p) = \frac{1}{2}|p|^2 + h(t, q, p)$, where $h : \mathbb{T}^2 \times W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth function with finite C^3 -norm, then the complex-regularized polysymplectic equation*

$$dH = \Omega^\#(dZ) \tag{10}$$

has at least $(2n+1)$ solutions. In particular when $V : Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ has finite C^3 -norm, the non-linear Laplace equation

$$-\Delta q = \nabla V(q)$$

has at least $(2n + 1)$ solutions.

In the next sections, theorem 7.2 will be proven using a Floer theoretic argument along the lines of [Sch98, AH16]. Note that similar results have been proven in [GH12, GH13] for closed target manifolds that arise as smooth compact quotients of a vector space. Also for three-dimensional time manifolds similar results have been proven in [HNS09] (for closed target manifolds) and [BF24] (for cotangent bundles of tori). In the latter article, the proof was given as a corollary of results from [GH12] after establishing the necessary C^0 -bounds. This proof does not use Floer theoretic arguments. In the present article we aim to establish a connection to the Floer theory of these systems and will prove the necessary Fredholm and compactness results (see sections 9 and 10 respectively).

In theorem 7.2, we restrict to cotangent bundles of tori for simplicity and because it already highlights much of the necessary analysis. The reason to prove this theorem using Floer theory though is that we expect this proof to generalize to cotangent bundles of more general Kähler manifolds. As noted in [HNS09], the bubbling off analysis becomes more involved than it is in the $d = 1$ case, since we now have to deal with compactness of Fueter curves. A different strategy for proving the existence of solutions to the non-linear Laplace equation, would be to apply Morse theory to the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(q) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (\frac{1}{2}|dq|^2 - V(q)) dV$. However, note that \mathcal{L} is defined on $H^1(\mathbb{T}^2, Q)$ which is not a Banach manifold for general Q . Therefore, Morse theory is not suitable to prove these existence result, whereas the proof using Floer curves is not affected by this.

Remark 7.3. *Note that in theorem 7.2 it is essential to study real-valued Hamiltonians rather than holomorphic Hamiltonian (i.e. currents). To the authors' knowledge there is no version of the Arnold conjecture for holomorphic Hamiltonian systems. Observe in particular that the maximum principle prohibits the existence of bounded holomorphic non-linearities.*

8 C^0 -bounds and Floer maps

First, we will prove the necessary C^0 -bounds. The proofs are analogous to the ones given in [BF24], but as the setting is slightly different, the proofs will briefly be repeated below. We denote

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}(H) &= \{Z : \mathbb{T}^2 \rightarrow T^*\mathbb{T}^{2n} \mid Z \text{ is nullhomotopic and satisfies equation (10)}\} \\ \mathcal{P}_a(H) &= \{Z \in \mathcal{P}(H) \mid a \geq \mathcal{A}_H(Z)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 8.1. *Let $H_t(Z) = \frac{1}{2}|p|^2 + h_t(Z)$, where h is smooth, real-valued and has finite C^2 -norm. Then for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$ the set $\mathcal{P}_a(H)$ is bounded in L^∞ .*

Proof. We start by proving that $\mathcal{P}_a(H)$ is bounded in L^2 . Recall that for solutions of equation (10) we get $2\partial_t q = \frac{\partial H}{\partial p} = p + \frac{\partial h}{\partial p}$. Therefore, if Z is a solution,

we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_H(Z) &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \left(\langle p, p + \frac{\partial h_t}{\partial p}(Z) \rangle - H_t(Z) \right) d\mathcal{V} \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \left(\frac{1}{2}|p|^2 + \langle p, \frac{\partial h}{\partial p}(Z) \rangle - h_t(Z) \right) d\mathcal{V} \\
&\geq c_0 \|p\|_{L^2}^2 - c_1,
\end{aligned}$$

for some $c_0 > 0$ and $c_1 \geq 0$. The last inequality comes from the boundedness of h and its derivatives. The assumption $a \geq \mathcal{A}_H(Z)$ now yields a uniform L^2 -bound on p . As q maps into \mathbb{T}^{2n} it is L^2 -bounded by construction. So indeed $\mathcal{P}_a(H)$ is bounded in L^2 .

We now proceed by a bootstrapping argument. For $Z \in \mathcal{P}_a(H)$ we have^v

$$\begin{aligned}
\|dZ\|_{L^2}^2 &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \left(|2\partial_t q|^2 + |2\partial_{\bar{t}} p|^2 \right) d\mathcal{V} \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \left(\left| \frac{\partial H}{\partial p} \right|^2 + \left| \frac{\partial H}{\partial q} \right|^2 \right) d\mathcal{V} \\
&\leq \|p\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \left(\left| \frac{\partial h}{\partial q} \right|^2 + \left| \frac{\partial h}{\partial p} \right|^2 \right) d\mathcal{V}.
\end{aligned}$$

As the first derivatives of h are bounded and p is uniformly bounded in L^2 this induces a uniform L^2 -bound on dZ . Therefore $\mathcal{P}_a(H)$ is bounded in H^1 . A similar argument shows that the H^1 -norm of dZ is bounded by the H^1 -norm of Z and the C^2 -norm of h . Thus, we get that $\mathcal{P}_a(H)$ is bounded in H^2 . As $2 \cdot 2 > 2$ we get boundedness in L^∞ by Sobolev's embedding theorem. \square

From lemma 8.1 it follows that we can actually use a cut-off version of h . Let $\chi_\rho : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a smooth cut-off function such that $\chi_\rho \equiv 1$ on $[0, \rho - 1]$ and $\chi_\rho \equiv 0$ on $[\rho, \infty)$. We can define the cut-off Hamiltonian as $\tilde{H}_t^\rho(Z) := \frac{1}{2}|p|^2 + \tilde{h}_t^\rho(Z) := \frac{1}{2}|p|^2 + \chi_\rho(|p|^2)h_t(Z)$.

Corollary 8.2. *For any $a \in \mathbb{R}$ there exists some $\rho > 0$ such that $\mathcal{P}_a(H) = \mathcal{P}_a(\tilde{H}^\rho)$.*

Floer maps

Now that we have the necessary bounds on the orbits, we turn to Floer maps. A Floer map is defined as a negative L^2 -gradient flow line of the action and is given by

$$\partial_s Z + J\partial_1 Z + K\partial_2 Z = \nabla \tilde{H}^\rho(Z) \tag{11}$$

^vIn the first line we use partial integration, using that Z is nullhomotopic.

where we have taken the Hamiltonian to be \tilde{H}^ρ in view of corollary 8.2. Note that the standard metric on $T^*\mathbb{T}^{2n}$ is compatible with both ω_1 and ω_2 and yields

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\text{Id}_{2n} \\ \text{Id}_{2n} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad K = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ -i & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore the Floer maps are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_s q - 2\partial_{\bar{t}} p &= \frac{\partial \tilde{H}^\rho}{\partial q} \\ \partial_s p + 2\partial_t q &= \frac{\partial \tilde{H}^\rho}{\partial p}. \end{aligned}$$

The following lemma shows that the image of a Floer map actually sits within a compact subset of $T^*\mathbb{T}^{2n}$ (compare with Lemma 3.4 from [BF24]).

Lemma 8.3. *Let $Z : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^2 \rightarrow T^*\mathbb{T}^{2n}$ be a solution to equation (11) which converges to critical points of $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{H}^\rho}$ for $|s| \rightarrow \infty$. Then $|p(s, t)|^2 \leq \rho$ for any $(s, t) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^2$.*

Proof. Suppose $|p(s_0, t_0)|^2 > \rho$ for some $(s_0, t_0) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^2$. Locally around (s_0, t_0) the Hamiltonian reduces to $\tilde{H}^\rho(Z(s, t)) = \frac{1}{2}|p(s, t)|^2$. Therefore, on this neighborhood

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_s^2 p &= \partial_s p - 2\partial_s \partial_t q \\ &= \partial_s p - 4\partial_t \partial_{\bar{t}} p. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$(\partial_s^2 + \Delta)p = \partial_s^2 p + 4\partial_t \partial_{\bar{t}} p = \partial_s p.$$

Define $\phi = \frac{1}{2}|p|^2$. Then

$$(\partial_s^2 + \Delta)\phi \geq \partial_s \phi.$$

The maximum principle now tells us that ϕ cannot attain a maximum in the neighbourhood of (s_0, t_0) , contradicting the assumption that the Floer map converges as $|s| \rightarrow \infty$. \square

Having established the C^0 -bounds we can prove theorem 7.2. The necessary Fredholm and compactness results will be deferred to sections 9 and 10. For the proof we will follow the lines of the paper [AH16].

Proof of theorem 7.2. To start the proof, assume there are finitely many solutions to equation (10), since otherwise we would be done. Then their action is

necessarily bounded. Corollary 8.2 implies that we may replace H by \tilde{H}^ρ for some ρ and by lemma 8.3 also the Floer maps will take value in some compact set $\mathbb{T}^{2n} \times B \subseteq T^*\mathbb{T}^{2n}$. Let $M \subseteq C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{T}^{2n} \times B)$ be the subset of nullhomotopic maps. Just like in [AH16, §3.1] we define a smooth family of functions $\beta_r : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ for $r \geq 0$ such that

- $\beta_r(s) = 0$ for $s \leq -1$ and $s \geq (2n+1)r + 1$ for all $r \geq 0$,
- $\beta_r|_{[0, (2n+1)r]} \equiv 1$ for $r \geq 1$,
- $0 \leq \beta_r'(s) \leq 2$ for $s \in (-1, 0)$ and
 $0 \geq \beta_r'(s) \geq -2$ for $s \in ((2n+1)r, (2n+1)r + 1)$,
- $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \beta_r = 0$ in the strong topology on C^∞ .

See [AH16] for the precise conditions on β_r and figure 3 for an idea of what they look like. We will use the functions β_r to interpolate between the quadratic Hamiltonian with and without non-linearity. To this extent define

$$\tilde{H}_{s,t}^{\rho,r}(Z) = \frac{1}{2}|p|^2 + \beta_r(s)\tilde{h}_t^\rho(Z).$$

One can see the Hamiltonian $\tilde{H}^{\rho,r}$ as the quadratic Hamiltonian $H^0(Z) = \frac{1}{2}|p|^2$ with the non-linearity \tilde{h}^ρ switched on just on an interval whose length is determined by r . Correspondingly, we have the action $G_{r,s} := \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{H}^{\rho,r}}$, interpolating between the actions \mathcal{A}_{H^0} and $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{H}^\rho}$.




Figure 3: The functions β_r . Source: [AH16]. In our case we take $k = \text{cl}(\mathbb{T}^{2n}) = 2n$.

With this setup we can introduce the moduli space

$$\mathcal{M} = \{(r, Z) \mid r \geq 0, Z : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M, (\star 1) - (\star 3)\}, \quad (12)$$

where $(\star 1) - (\star 3)$ are given below. Note that we can view Z as a contractible map $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^{2n} \times B$. The condition $(\star 1)$ is that Z is a negative gradient line of $G_{r,s}$, meaning a Floer map for $\tilde{H}^{\rho,r}$. Condition $(\star 2)$ is finiteness of energy

$$E(Z) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} |\partial_s Z(s, t)|^2 d\mathcal{V} ds < +\infty \quad (\star 2)$$

and the final condition is convergence of the p -coordinates

$$p(s, t) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } |s| \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\star 3)$$

We also introduce the subspaces

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{[0,R]}(\mathbb{T}^{2n}) &:= \{(r, Z) \in \mathcal{M} \mid 0 \leq r \leq R \text{ and } \lim_{s \rightarrow \pm\infty} Z(s) \in \mathbb{T}^{2n} \times \{0\}\} \\ \mathcal{M}_R(\mathbb{T}^{2n}) &:= \{Z \mid (R, Z) \in \mathcal{M}_{[0,R]}(\mathbb{T}^{2n})\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{T}^{2n} \times \{0\} \subseteq M$ denotes the set of constant maps. This coincides with the set of critical points of \mathcal{A}_{H^0} . Note that for $R = 0$ we get that $\mathcal{M}_0(\mathbb{T}^{2d})$ is equal to this set of critical points.

It follows from theorem 9.1 and theorem 10.5 that \mathcal{M} is a compact 1-dimensional manifold, possibly after a small perturbation of h . Also the spaces $\mathcal{M}_{[0,R]}(\mathbb{T}^{2n})$ and $\mathcal{M}_R(\mathbb{T}^{2n})$ will then be compact manifolds (again after possibly perturbing h , see [AH16]). We have an evaluation map

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ev}_R : \mathcal{M}_R(Z) &\rightarrow (\mathbb{T}^{2n} \times B)^{2n} \\ Z &\mapsto (Z(R, t_0), Z(2R, t_0), \dots, Z(2nR, t_0)), \end{aligned}$$

where $t_0 \in \mathbb{T}^2$ is some basepoint. For $R = 0$ this gives the diagonal embedding $\mathbb{T}^{2n} \hookrightarrow (\mathbb{T}^{2n} \times B)^{2n}$.

The rest of the proof goes analogously to [AH16]. Take Morse functions f_1, \dots, f_{2n}, f_* on \mathbb{T}^{2n} and extend to Morse functions \bar{f}_α for $\alpha = 1, \dots, 2n$ on $\mathbb{T}^{2n} \times B$ using a positive definite quadratic form on a tubular neighbourhood of \mathbb{T}^{2n} in the direction normal to \mathbb{T}^{2n} . We also choose Riemannian metrics g_1, \dots, g_{2n}, g_* on $\mathbb{T}^{2n} \times B$. For critical points $x_\alpha \in \mathbb{T}^{2n}$ of f_α and $x_*^\pm \in \mathbb{T}^{2n}$ of f_* we define

$$\mathcal{M}(R, x_1, \dots, x_{2n}, x_*^-, x_*^+) := \left\{ Z \in \mathcal{M}_R(\mathbb{T}^{2n}) \mid (\star 4) - (\star 6) \right\},$$

where

$$\text{ev}_R \in \prod_{\alpha} W^s(x_\alpha, \bar{f}_\alpha, g_\alpha) \quad (\star 4)$$

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow -\infty} Z(s) \in W^u(x_*^-, f_*, g_*) \quad (\star 5)$$

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow +\infty} Z(s) \in W^s(x_*^+, f_*, g_*). \quad (\star 6)$$

Here, W^u and W^s denote the unstable and stable manifolds of the critical points for the gradient flows of the indicated Morse functions. Again, by choice of perturbations, we may assume these are all smooth manifolds. Note that $\mathcal{M}(0, x_1, \dots, x_{2n}, x_*^-, x_*^+) = \bigcap_{\alpha} W^s(x_\alpha, f_\alpha, g_\alpha) \cap W^u(x_*^-, f_*, g_*) \cap W^s(x_*^+, f_*, g_*)$.

Define the following operation on Morse co-chain groups

$$\theta_R : \bigotimes_{\alpha} CM^*(f_{\alpha}) \otimes CM_*(f_*) \rightarrow CM_*(f_*)$$

$$x_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_{2n} \otimes x_*^- \mapsto \sum_{x_*^{\pm} \in \text{Crit}(f_*)} \#_2 \mathcal{M}(R, x_1, \dots, x_{2n}, x_*^-, x_*^+) \cdot x_*^+.$$

Here, $\#_2$ denotes the parity of the set if it is discrete and 0 if it is not. For generic choices of Morse functions and Riemannian metrics, the map θ_0 realizes the usual cup-product in cohomology (see [AM10]). This map does not vanish as the cuplength of \mathbb{T}^{2n} is $2n$. Moreover, θ_R is chain homotopic to θ_0 and can therefore not vanish either. Thus there have to be critical points x_{α} of f_{α} and x_*^{\pm} of f_* of index at least 1 such that the moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}(m, x_1, \dots, x_{2n}, x_*^-, x_*^+)$ are non-empty for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let $Z_m \in \mathcal{M}(m, x_1, \dots, x_{2n}, x_*^-, x_*^+)$ and

$$Z^{(\alpha)} = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} Z_m(\cdot + m\alpha),$$

for $\alpha = 1, \dots, 2n$. By the compactness discussed in section 10 these limits exist in $C_{loc}^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}, M)$. The $Z^{(\alpha)}$ satisfy the Floer equation (11) for the Hamiltonian \tilde{H}^{ρ} and they converge to critical points y_{α}^{\pm} of $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{H}^{\rho}}$ for $s \rightarrow \pm\infty$ such that

$$\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{H}^{\rho}}(y_1^-) \geq \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{H}^{\rho}}(y_1^+) \geq \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{H}^{\rho}}(y_2^-) \geq \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{H}^{\rho}}(y_2^+) \geq \dots \geq \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{H}^{\rho}}(y_{2n}^-) \geq \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{H}^{\rho}}(y_{2n}^+).$$

The only thing left to do is show that at least $2n+1$ of these points are different, by showing that the inequalities $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{H}^{\rho}}(y_{\alpha}^-) > \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{H}^{\rho}}(y_{\alpha}^+)$ are strict.

Note that since $\text{Crit}(\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{H}^{\rho}})$ is finite by assumption, we may assume critical points of $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{H}^{\rho}}$ do not intersect the stable manifolds $W^s(x_{\alpha}, \bar{f}_{\alpha}, g_{\alpha})$. If $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{H}^{\rho}}(y_{\alpha}^-) = \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{H}^{\rho}}(y_{\alpha}^+)$, then $Z^{(\alpha)}$ is constant and therefore a critical point of $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{H}^{\rho}}$. Also note that by definition $Z_m(m\alpha) \in W^s(x_{\alpha}, \bar{f}_{\alpha}, g_{\alpha})$ for any m . Therefore $Z^{(\alpha)}(0) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} Z_m(m\alpha)$ lies in the closure of a stable manifold, which itself is a union of stable manifolds. This is in contradiction with $Z^{(\alpha)}$ being a critical point of $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{H}^{\rho}}$. Thus indeed the inequalities $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{H}^{\rho}}(y_{\alpha}^-) > \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{H}^{\rho}}(y_{\alpha}^+)$ are strict and we get that $y_1^-, y_2^-, \dots, y_{2n}^-$ and y_{2n}^+, \dots, y_1^+ form $2n+1$ different critical points of $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{H}^{\rho}}$. These correspond to $2n+1$ distinct solutions of equation (10) \square

9 Fredholm theory and transversality

In this section we will prove the following theorem.

Theorem 9.1. *The moduli space \mathcal{M} from equation (12) is a 1-dimensional manifold for generic choice of h .*

As is usual in Floer theory, this will be proven by describing \mathcal{M} as the zero set of a Fredholm map. The results are standard, so we will not go into full detail. However, we would like to give the proof of the Fredholmness, to stress that in our setting elementary Fourier arguments can be used.

We let \mathcal{F} denote the Floer map

$$\mathcal{F}(r, Z) = \mathcal{F}^r(Z) = \partial_s Z + \not\partial Z - \nabla \tilde{H}^{\rho, r}(Z).$$

This means that $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(0)$, when \mathcal{F} is viewed as a map on the right function spaces. We start by proving \mathcal{F} is a nonlinear Fredholm map.

Let r be fixed. Then the linearization of \mathcal{F}^r at Z is given by

$$(d\mathcal{F}^r)_Z = D - \beta_r(s)S_Z, \quad (13)$$

where $D = \partial_s + \not\partial - P$,

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad S_Z = \text{Hess}_Z \tilde{h}^\rho.$$

By H^k we denote the Sobolev space $W^{k,2}$. Note that for $k > \frac{3}{2}$ we have an embedding $H^k(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{R}^{4n}) \hookrightarrow C^0(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{R}^{4n})$.

Lemma 9.2. *The operator $D : H^k(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{R}^{4n}) \rightarrow H^{k-1}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{R}^{4n})$ is a bijection for $k > \frac{3}{2}$.*

Proof. For $Y \in H^k := H^k(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{R}^{4n})$ consider the Fourier expansion

$$Y(s, t) = \int \sum_{m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{Z}} \hat{Y}(\xi, m_1, m_2) e^{i\xi s} e^{im_1 t_1} e^{im_2 t_2} d\xi.$$

Then on the Fourier coefficients the operator D acts as

$$\hat{D}(\xi, m_1, m_2) = i\xi + i \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -m_1 & m_2 \\ 0 & 0 & -m_2 & -m_1 \\ m_1 & m_2 & 0 & 0 \\ -m_2 & m_1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} - P.$$

We compute $\det(\hat{D}(\xi, m_1, m_2)) = (m_1^2 + m_2^2 + \xi^2 + i\xi)^2$. This means only constant functions can be in the kernel of D , however the only constant function that is square-integrable on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^2$ is the zero function. So $\ker D = 0$.

Now, for surjectivity let $W \in H^{k-1}$ and define

$$\hat{Y}(\xi, m_1, m_2) = \begin{cases} \hat{D}(\xi, m_1, m_2)^{-1} \hat{W}(\xi, m_1, m_2) & (\xi, m_1, m_2) \neq (0, 0, 0) \\ 0 & (\xi, m_1, m_2) = (0, 0, 0). \end{cases}$$

Note that by the calculation of the determinant above $\hat{D}(\xi, m_1, m_2)^{-1}$ exists. Now by definition we have that $DY = W$ provided $Y \in H^k$. To see this, note that the eigenvalues of $\hat{D}(\xi, m_1, m_2)$ are

$$\lambda^\pm(\xi, m_1, m_2) = \frac{1}{2}i \left(i + 2\xi \pm i\sqrt{1 + 4m_1^2 + 4m_2^2} \right).$$

For $m_1^2 + m_2^2$ large enough the norms of these eigenvalues can be bounded from below. In other words, there exists some N such that for $m_1^2 + m_2^2 > N$, we have

$$|\lambda^\pm(\xi, m_1, m_2)|^2 \geq \xi^2 + \frac{1}{2}m_1^2 + \frac{1}{2}m_2^2.$$

Let pr denote the projection onto the subspace where $m_1^2 + m_2^2 > N$. Then the H^k -norm of $\text{pr} Y$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \|\text{pr} Y\|_{H^k}^2 &= \int \sum_{m_1^2 + m_2^2 > N} (1 + \xi^2 + m_1^2 + m_2^2)^k |\hat{Y}(\xi, m_1, m_2)|^2 d\xi \\ &\leq \int \sum_{m_1^2 + m_2^2 > N} \frac{(1 + \xi^2 + m_1^2 + m_2^2)^k}{\xi^2 + \frac{1}{2}m_1^2 + \frac{1}{2}m_2^2} |\hat{W}(\xi, m_1, m_2)|^2 d\xi \\ &\leq \|W\|_{H^{k-1}}^2 \sup_{\substack{m_1^2 + m_2^2 > N \\ \xi \in \mathbb{R}}} \frac{1 + \xi^2 + m_1^2 + m_2^2}{\xi^2 + \frac{1}{2}m_1^2 + \frac{1}{2}m_2^2} < +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Here, the third line follows from Hölders inequality. Thus $Y \in H^k$, proving that D is surjective. \square

Corollary 9.3. *The Floer map \mathcal{F} is a Fredholm map of index 1.*

Proof. Note that the operator $\beta_r(s)S_Z$ is compact as a map $H^k \rightarrow H^{k-1}$. Thus, by equation (13) and lemma 9.2 the differential of \mathcal{F}^r is Fredholm of index 0. Varying r as well, we see that $(d\mathcal{F})_{(r,Z)}$ must be Fredholm of index 1. \square

Transversality

Left to prove is that for generic choice of non-linearity the differential of the Floer map is surjective. Combined with corollary 9.3 this yields theorem 9.1.

Note that the moduli space \mathcal{M} depends on the chosen non-linearity $\beta_r(s)\tilde{h}_t^\rho$. By varying these non-linearities for each l , we get the universal moduli space

$$\tilde{\mathcal{M}} := \bigcup_{h \in \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{M}(h_{s,t}),$$

where $\mathcal{S} = C_c^l(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{T}^{2n} \times B, \mathbb{R})$ is the space of compactly supported smooth functions $h_{s,t}$ on $\mathbb{T}^{2n} \times B \subseteq T^*\mathbb{T}^{2n}$. We denote by $\mathcal{M}(h_{s,t})$ the moduli space \mathcal{M} of equation (12), where the non-linearity $\beta_r(s)\tilde{h}_t^\rho$ is replaced by $h_{s,t}$. Note that in this case $h_{s,t}$ is not necessarily the product of a function in s , with a time-dependent non-linearity on $\mathbb{T}^{2n} \times B$.

This universal moduli space can be seen as the zero set of the map

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(r, Z, h) = \tilde{\mathcal{F}}^r(Z, h) = \partial_s Z + \not\partial Z - \nabla H_{s,t}^h(Z),$$

where $H_{s,t}^h(Z) = \frac{1}{2}|p|^2 + h_{s,t}(Z)$ and h vanishes for $s \notin [-1, (2n+1)r+1]$. The result would follow from Sard-Smale's theorem, if we know that the differential of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^r$ is surjective at every $(Z, h) \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}$. Let $(Z, h) \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ and take a variation $(Y, G) \in H^k(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{R}^{4n}) \times C_c^l(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{T}^{2n} \times B, \mathbb{R})$. Then the linearization of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^r$ at (Z, h) can be decomposed as

$$(d\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^r)_{(Z,h)} \cdot (Y, G) = D_h^1 G + D_Z^2 Y.$$

Assume we have some non-zero $W \in H^{k-1}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{R}^{4n})$ in the orthogonal complement of the image of $(d\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^r)_{(Z,h)}$. Then $\langle W, D_Z^2 Y \rangle = 0$ for all Y , so that $W \in \ker((D_Z^2)^*)$. Note that for $s \notin [-1, (2n+1)r+1]$ the non-linearity $h_{s,t}$ vanishes so that $(D_Z^2)^* = -\partial_s + \not\partial - P$. This operator satisfies a maximum principle, similar to the one used in lemma 8.3. Therefore, by standard arguments $W(s, t) \neq 0$ for some $(s, t) \in [-1, (2n+1)r+1] \times \mathbb{T}^2$. Thus, we can find some variation G with support for $s \in [-1, (2n+1)r+1]$, such that $\langle W, D_h^1 G \rangle \neq 0$. This contradicts the assumption that $\langle W, (d\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^r)_{(Z,h)} \cdot (Y, G) \rangle = 0$ for any (Y, G) . We must conclude $(d\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^r)_{(Z,h)}$ is surjective. This finishes the proof of theorem 9.1. \square

10 Compactness

In this section we will prove compactness of the moduli space (12) that is needed in the proof of theorem 7.2. We start by proving a uniform energy bound, using a standard argument.

Lemma 10.1. *For all $(r, Z) \in \mathcal{M}$ we have*

$$E(Z) \leq 2\|\tilde{h}^\rho\|_{\text{Hofer}} := 2 \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \left(\sup_{Z' \in T^*\mathbb{T}^{2n}} \tilde{h}_t^\rho(Z') - \inf_{Z' \in T^*\mathbb{T}^{2n}} \tilde{h}_t^\rho(Z') \right) d\mathcal{V}.$$

Proof. By definition

$$E(Z) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} |\partial_s Z(s, t)|^2 d\mathcal{V} ds = - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \langle \text{grad } \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{H}^\rho, r}(Z), \partial_s Z \rangle ds,$$

since Z is a negative gradient line of $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{H}^{\rho,r}}$. Writing this out further we get

$$\begin{aligned} E(Z) &= - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (d\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{H}^{\rho,r}})_{Z_s} (\partial_s Z) ds \\ &= - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d}{ds} (\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{H}^{\rho,r}}(Z_s)) ds + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\partial \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{H}^{\rho,r}}}{\partial s} (Z_s) ds \\ &= - \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{H}^{\rho,r}}(Z_s) + \lim_{s \rightarrow -\infty} \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{H}^{\rho,r}}(Z_s) - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \beta'_r(s) \tilde{h}_t^\rho(Z_s) d\mathcal{V} ds. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the first two terms on the last line vanish. Also, β'_r vanishes everywhere outside $[-1, 0] \cup [(2n+1)r, (2n+1)r+1]$ and is positive and negative respectively on those two intervals. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} E(Z) &= - \int_{-1}^0 \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \beta'_r(s) \tilde{h}_t^\rho(Z_s) d\mathcal{V} ds - \int_{(2n+1)r}^{(2n+1)r+1} \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \beta'_r(s) \tilde{h}_t^\rho(Z_s) d\mathcal{V} ds \\ &\leq 2 \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \left(\sup_{Z' \in T^* \mathbb{T}^{2n}} \tilde{h}_t^\rho(Z') - \inf_{Z' \in T^* \mathbb{T}^{2n}} \tilde{h}_t^\rho(Z') \right) d\mathcal{V} \\ &=: 2 \|\tilde{h}^\rho\|_{\text{Hofer}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Now we want to relate the energy to the L^2 -norm of the derivatives of Z . To this end we define the energy density

$$e_Z(s, t) = \frac{1}{2} |dZ(s, t)|^2 = \frac{1}{2} (|\partial_s Z(s, t)|^2 + |\partial_1 Z(s, t)|^2 + |\partial_2 Z(s, t)|^2).$$

Lemma 10.2. *Let $K = [-\mu, \mu] \times \mathbb{T}^2 \subseteq \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^2$. Then there exists a constant $C = C(K)$ such that for any $(r, Z) \in \mathcal{M}$*

$$\int_K e_Z(s, t) d\mathcal{V} ds \leq E(Z) + C(K).$$

Proof. We calculate^{vi}

$$\begin{aligned} \int_K e_Z(s, t) d\mathcal{V} ds &= \frac{1}{2} \int_K (|\partial_s Z|^2 + |2\partial_t q|^2 + |2\partial_{\bar{t}p}|^2) d\mathcal{V} ds \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_K \left(|\partial_s Z|^2 + \left| \frac{\partial \tilde{H}^{\rho,r}}{\partial p} - \partial_s p \right|^2 + \left| \partial_s q - \frac{\partial \tilde{H}^{\rho,r}}{\partial q} \right|^2 \right) d\mathcal{V} ds \\ &\leq E(Z) + \frac{1}{2} \int_K \left(\left| \frac{\partial \tilde{H}^{\rho,r}}{\partial q} \right|^2 + \left| \frac{\partial \tilde{H}^{\rho,r}}{\partial p} \right|^2 \right) d\mathcal{V} ds \end{aligned}$$

^{vi}The first equality follows from partial integration, using that Z is nullhomotopic.

$$\leq E(Z) + \frac{1}{2} \int_K \left(|p|^2 + \left| \beta_r(s) \frac{\partial \tilde{h}^\rho}{\partial q} \right|^2 + \left| \beta_r(s) \frac{\partial \tilde{h}^\rho}{\partial p} \right|^2 \right) d\mathcal{V} ds.$$

Now, as in lemma 8.3 we have that $|p(s, t)|^2 < \rho$ for all $(s, t) \in K$. Combined with the C^1 -boundedness of h , we can estimate the right-hand side purely in terms of $E(Z)$ and the volume of K . This proves the lemma. \square

In order to get point-wise bounds on the derivatives, we want to use the Heinz trick (theorem 10.4). We first need to show that the energy density satisfies an appropriate inequality.

Lemma 10.3. *The energy density $e := e_Z$ satisfies the inequality*

$$(\partial_s^2 + \Delta)e \geq -c(1 + e^{\frac{3}{2}}), \quad (14)$$

for some $c > 0$.

Proof. See appendix B. \square

Theorem 10.4 (Heinz trick, see [HNS09]). *Let M be an $(m + 1)$ -dimensional Riemannian manifold for $\frac{3}{2} < \frac{m+3}{m+1}$ and $e : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ a smooth function satisfying equation (14). Then for $K \subseteq M$ compact $\sup_K e$ is bounded by $\int_K e$.*

Now we are ready to prove the desired compactness theorem.

Theorem 10.5. *The moduli space \mathcal{M} is relatively compact in the C_{loc}^∞ -topology.*

Proof. Let $(r_n, Z_n) \in \mathcal{M}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $K = [-\mu, \mu] \times \mathbb{T}^2 \subseteq \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^2$. By lemma 8.3 the sequence $Z_n|_K$ is a bounded family of smooth functions on K . By combining lemmas 10.1 and 10.2 we find a uniform bound on $\int_K e_{Z_n}$. Then the Heinz trick (theorem 10.4) combined with the density estimate in lemma 10.3 yields a uniform pointwise bound on $e_{Z_n}(s, t)$ for all $(s, t) \in K$. By the mean-value theorem it follows that the sequence (Z_n) is uniformly equicontinuous. The theorem of Arzelà-Ascoli then yields a converging subsequence in the C_{loc}^0 -topology. Finally, the ellipticity of the Floer operator yields convergence of the subsequence in C_{loc}^∞ . \square

A Proof of proposition 7.1

Let us start by proving the corresponding statement on linear space.

Lemma A.1. *Let $(V^{4n}, I, \omega_1 \otimes \partial_1 + \omega_2 \otimes \partial_2)$ be a complex-regularized polysymplectic vector space, meaning that ω_1 and ω_2 are two linear symplectic forms on V related by $\omega_2 = -\omega_1(\cdot, I\cdot)$. There exists an inner product g on V , such that*

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_1 &= g(\cdot, J\cdot) \\ \omega_2 &= g(\cdot, K\cdot)\end{aligned}$$

for two anti-commuting linear complex structures J, K satisfying $IJ = K$.

Proof. First we fix an auxiliary inner product (\cdot, \cdot) on V for which I is an isometry and agree that transposes of linear maps on V are taken with respect to this product. In particular $I^T = -I$. By non-degeneracy of ω_1 and ω_2 , we find skew-symmetric isomorphisms $A_1, A_2 : V \rightarrow V$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_1 &= (\cdot, A_1\cdot) \\ \omega_2 &= (\cdot, A_2\cdot).\end{aligned}$$

Note that for $X, Y \in V$

$$(X, A_2Y) = \omega_2(X, Y) = -\omega_1(X, IY) = -(X, A_1IY),$$

so that $A_2 = -A_1I$. Also

$$\begin{aligned}(X, A_1IY) &= -\omega_2(X, Y) = \omega_2(Y, X) \\ &= -\omega_1(Y, IX) = \omega_1(IX, Y) \\ &= (IX, A_1Y) \\ &= -(X, IA_1Y),\end{aligned}$$

which yields $A_1I = -IA_1$.

To write down the polar decomposition of A_1 , we define the positive-definite symmetric matrix $B = \sqrt{A_1A_1^T}$ and define J by $A_1 = BJ$. Note that

$$A_1A_1^T = (A_2I)(A_2I)^T = A_2II^TA_2^T = A_2A_2^T.$$

Therefore the polar decomposition of A_2 is $A_2 = BK$. Then both A_1 and A_2 commute with B and therefore both J and K commute with B as well. To prove that J and K are complex structures, we compute for $i = 1, 2$

$$(B^{-1}A_i)^T = A_i^TB^{-1} = -A_iB^{-1} = -B^{-1}A_i$$

and

$$(B^{-1}A_i)(B^{-1}A_i)^T = B^{-1}A_iA_i^TB^{-1} = \text{Id}_V.$$

This shows that both J and K are skew-symmetric isometries of (\cdot, \cdot) , so that indeed

$$J^2 = -JJ^T = -\text{Id}_V \qquad K^2 = -KK^T = -\text{Id}.$$

Also, since $A_2 = -A_1I$, we get

$$JI = -B^{-1}A_2 = -K$$

and

$$-\text{Id} = K^2 = JIJI,$$

so that $K = -JI = IJ$. It follows that indeed J and K are anti-commuting linear complex structures. The metric g may be defined as $g(X, Y) = (X, BY)$. \square

Proof of proposition 7.1. We may globally fix an auxiliary metric (\cdot, \cdot) on W for which I is an isometry. The pointwise construction in the proof above is canonical after this choice and carries through smoothly, just like it does for the corresponding statement on symplectic manifolds. \square

B Proof of lemma 10.3

For any (r, Z) in \mathcal{M} , it holds that Z satisfies the Floer equation

$$\partial_s Z + \not\partial Z = \nabla \tilde{H}^{\rho, r}(Z). \quad (15)$$

For notational convenience we denote s by t_0 and $\xi_i := \partial_i Z$ for $i = 0, 1, 2$. From the identity

$$(\partial_s - \not\partial)(\partial_s + \not\partial) = \mathcal{L} := \sum_{i=0}^2 \partial_i^2$$

we see that the ξ_i satisfy the equation

$$\mathcal{L}\xi_i = (\partial_s - \not\partial)(\sigma_Z \xi_i), \quad (16)$$

where σ_Z is the Hessian of $\tilde{H}^{\rho, r}$ at Z .

Note that in this notation the energy density is given by

$$e(s, t) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=0}^2 |\xi_i(s, t)|^2.$$

We calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}e &= \sum_{i,j=0}^2 |\partial_j \xi_i|^2 + \sum_{i=0}^2 \langle \xi_i, \mathcal{L}\xi_i \rangle \\ &= \sum_{i,j=0}^2 |\partial_j \xi_i|^2 + \sum_{i=0}^2 \langle \xi_i, (\partial_s - \not\partial)(\sigma_Z \xi_i) \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used equation (16) in the second equality. Now note that the chain rule gives that

$$\partial_j(\sigma_Z \xi_i) = T\sigma_Z \cdot \xi_j \cdot \xi_i + \sigma_Z \partial_j \xi_i.$$

Denote $J_0 = -\text{Id}$, $J_1 = J$ and $J_2 = K$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}e &= \sum_{i,j=0}^2 \left(|\partial_j \xi_i|^2 - \langle (J_j \sigma_Z)^T \xi_i, \partial_j \xi_i \rangle - \langle \xi_i, J_j T \sigma_Z \cdot \xi_j \cdot \xi_i \rangle \right) \\ &= \sum_{i,j=0}^2 \left(\left| \partial_j \xi_i - \frac{1}{2} (J_j \sigma_Z)^T \xi_i \right|^2 - \frac{1}{4} \left| (J_j \sigma_Z)^T \xi_i \right|^2 - \langle \xi_i, J_j T \sigma_Z \cdot \xi_j \cdot \xi_i \rangle \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that since h is C^3 -bounded, we have that both σ_Z and $T\sigma_Z$ are bounded. Thus

$$\left| (J_j \sigma_Z)^T \xi_i \right|^2 \leq c_1 |\xi_i|^2 \leq c_2 e$$

and

$$\left| \langle \xi_i, J_j T \sigma_Z \cdot \xi_j \cdot \xi_i \rangle \right| \leq c_3 |\xi_i|^2 |\xi_j| \leq c_4 e^{\frac{3}{2}}.$$

Combined we get that

$$\mathcal{L}e \geq -c_5 \left(e + e^{\frac{3}{2}} \right).$$

Finally, Young's inequality with $p = 3$, $q = \frac{3}{2}$ gives that

$$e \leq \frac{1}{3} + \frac{2}{3} e^{\frac{3}{2}},$$

so that

$$\mathcal{L}e \geq -c(1 + e^{\frac{3}{2}}).$$

□

References

- [AH16] Peter Albers and Doris Hein. Cuplength estimates in Morse cohomology. *Journal of Topology and Analysis*, 8(02):243–272, 2016.
- [AM10] Peter Albers and Al Momin. Cup-length estimates for leaf-wise intersections. In *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, volume 149, pages 539–551. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- [BD99] Thomas J Bridges and Gianne Derks. Unstable eigenvalues and the linearization about solitary waves and fronts with symmetry. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 455(1987):2427–2469, 1999.

- [BF23] Ronen Brilleslijper and Oliver Fabert. Regularized polysymplectic geometry and first steps towards Floer theory for covariant field theories. *Journal of Geometry and Physics*, 183:104703, 2023.
- [BF24] Ronen Brilleslijper and Oliver Fabert. From Euclidean field theory to hyperkahler Floer theory via regularized polysymplectic geometry. *Communications in Contemporary Mathematics*, 2024.
- [Bri06] Thomas J Bridges. Canonical multi-symplectic structure on the total exterior algebra bundle. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 462(2069):1531–1551, 2006.
- [Cie10] Kai Cieliebak. Symplectic geometry. *Lecture notescript (unpublished)*, 2010.
- [DLSsVf15] Manuel De León, Modesto Salgado-seco, and Silvia Vilarino-fernandez. *Methods of differential geometry in classical field theories: k-symplectic and k-cosymplectic approaches*. World Scientific, 2015.
- [DR22] Aleksander Doan and Semon Rezchikov. Holomorphic Floer theory and the Fueter equation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.12047*, 2022.
- [GH12] Viktor L Ginzburg and Doris Hein. Hyperkähler Arnold conjecture and its generalizations. *International Journal of Mathematics*, 23(08):1250077, 2012.
- [GH13] Viktor L Ginzburg and Doris Hein. The Arnold conjecture for Clifford symplectic pencils. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 196:95–112, 2013.
- [Gün87] Christian Günther. The polysymplectic Hamiltonian formalism in field theory and calculus of variations. I. The local case. *Journal of differential geometry*, 25(1):23–53, 1987.
- [Hil21] Victor Hildebrandsson. The Hamiltonian formulation of geodesics, 2021.
- [HNS09] Sonja Hohloch, Gregor Noetzel, and Dietmar A Salamon. Hypercontact structures and Floer homology. *Geometry & Topology*, 13(5):2543–2617, 2009.
- [KS24] Maxim Kontsevich and Yan Soibelman. Holomorphic Floer theory I: exponential integrals in finite and infinite dimensions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.07343*, 2024.
- [Lat14] Janko Latschev. Fukaya’s work on Lagrangian embeddings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.6474*, 2014.

- [MS17] Dusa McDuff and Dietmar Salamon. *Introduction to symplectic topology*, volume 27. Oxford University Press, 2017.
- [Oh02] Yong-Geun Oh. Holomorphic volume preserving maps and special Lagrangian submanifolds. *Contemporary mathematics*, 314:199–208, 2002.
- [Sch98] Matthias Schwarz. A quantum cup-length estimate for symplectic fixed points. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 133(2):353–397, 1998.
- [SS03] Elias M Stein and Rami Shakarchi. *Complex analysis*, volume 2. Princeton University Press, 2003.
- [Wag23] Luiz Frederic Wagner. Pseudo-Holomorphic Hamiltonian Systems. *arXiv preprint 2303.09480*, 2023.
- [Wal17] Thomas Walpuski. A compactness theorem for Fueter sections. *Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici*, 92(4):751–776, 2017.