

# CONTACT INSTANTONS AND PROOFS OF WEINSTEIN'S CONJECTURE AND ARNOLD'S CHORD CONJECTURE

YONG-GEUN OH

ABSTRACT. The present paper is a continuation of the study of the interplay between the contact Hamiltonian dynamics and the moduli theory of (perturbed) contact instantons and its applications initiated in [Oh21b, Oh22a]. In this paper we prove Weinstein's conjecture and Arnold's chord conjecture in their full generalities.

The two key ingredients lying in the background of our proof of Arnold's chord conjecture are the existence of the fundamental class of the Legendrian contact instanton cohomology *modulo bubbling-off*, and the evaluation transversality of the moduli space of contact instantons against the level set of *conformal exponent function*. Our proof of Weinstein's conjecture also utilizes the existence scheme of translated points of a contactomorphism developed in [Oh22a], *especially associated to a contact Hamiltonian loop*, via the geometric construction of the *Legendrianization* of contactomorphisms of  $(Q, \lambda)$  in the contact product  $M_Q = Q \times Q \times \mathbb{R}$  and its usage of the  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  anti-contact involutive symmetry.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Weinstein's conjecture	2
1.2. Arnold's chord conjecture	5
1.3. The main scheme of the proof and its comparison with [Oh22a]	5
1.4. Generic evaluation transversality	7
1.5. Legendrianization	7
1.6. Discussion and future works to do	8
2. Preliminaries	9
2.1. Translated points and translated intersections	9
2.2. Developing Hamiltonians and their calculus	10
2.3. Tame contact manifolds	10

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 53D42; Secondary 58J32.

*Key words and phrases*. Weinstein's conjecture, Arnold's chord conjecture, contact manifolds, Legendrian submanifolds, translated points, contact Hamiltonian loop, (perturbed) contact instantons, evaluation transversality, conformal exponent.

This work is supported by the IBS project # IBS-R003-D1.

3.	Set-up of the deformation-cobordism moduli space	11
4.	A priori uniform energy bounds	13
4.1.	On the domain $\mathbb{R} \times [0, 1]$	14
4.2.	On the capped domains $\Theta_{2K_0+1}$	14
5.	Construction of the compactified deformation-cobordism moduli space	16
6.	Legendrianization, $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry and a priori $C^0$ estimates	17
6.1.	$\mathbb{Z}_2$ anti-invariant contact form and its Reeb vector field	17
6.2.	$\mathbb{Z}_2$ anti-equivariant lifting of the contact flows to the contact product	19
6.3.	$\mathbb{Z}_2$ anti-invariant lifted CR almost complex structures	20
6.4.	Anti-contact involutive symmetry and uniform $C^0$ estimates	21
7.	Wrap-up of the proofs of Main Theorems	22
7.1.	Evaluation transversalities	22
7.2.	The case $K = 0$ : $J \equiv J_0$ and $H \equiv 0$ .	24
7.3.	Convergence analysis of the moduli cobordism $\mathcal{M}^{\text{para}}$	25
8.	Epilogue: some quantitative contact topology	28
8.1.	Quantitative unorderability of contact manifolds	28
8.2.	A quantitative invariant of contact structures $\xi$	29
Appendix A.	Perturbed contact action functional	30
Appendix B.	Automatic interior evaluation transversality at constant maps	31
References		33

## 1. INTRODUCTION

A contact manifold  $(M, \xi)$  is an  $2n - 1$  dimensional manifold with a completely non-integrable distribution of rank  $2n - 2$ , a contact structure. When  $\xi$  is cooriented, complete non-integrability of  $\xi$  can be expressed by the non-vanishing property

$$\lambda \wedge (d\lambda)^{n-1} \neq 0$$

for a one-form  $\lambda$  which defines the distribution, i.e.,  $\ker \lambda = \xi$ . Such a one-form  $\lambda$  is called a contact form associated to  $\xi$ . Associated to the given contact form  $\lambda$ , we have the unique vector field  $R_\lambda$  determined by

$$R_\lambda \lrcorner \lambda \equiv 1, \quad R_\lambda \lrcorner d\lambda \equiv 0$$

which is called the Reeb vector field of the contact form  $\lambda$ . A closed curve  $\gamma : [0, T] \rightarrow M$  satisfying the ODE  $\dot{x} = R_\lambda(x)$  is called a closed Reeb orbit.

**1.1. Weinstein's conjecture.** A natural class of contact manifold equipped with a contact form in relation to classical mechanics is the star-shaped regular energy hypersurface of  $H$  in the classical phase space  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$  for a smooth function  $H$ . When  $R$  is a regular value of  $H$  and  $S = H^{-1}(R)$  is star-shaped, the one-form

$$\lambda = dH|_S$$

defines a contact form associated to the contact structure  $\xi = \ker \lambda$ . Furthermore it carries a natural Reeb vector field given by

$$X_\lambda = X_H / |\nabla H|^2 \Big|_S$$

where  $X_H$  is a Hamiltonian vector field. Around 1978, Weinstein [Wei78] (for the convex case) and Rabinowitz [Rab78] (for the star-shaped case) proved that there

exists at least one closed orbit of Hamilton's equation  $\dot{z} = X_H(z)$  on each regular energy hypersurface of  $H$ .

The main purpose of the present work is to give the proof of the following conjecture of Weinstein [Wei79] called the Weinstein conjecture in contact topology.

**Weinstein Conjecture** [Wei79]. *Any compact contact manifold  $(M, \lambda)$  contains a closed Reeb orbit.*

(In the original conjecture stated in [Wei79], the statement comes with the additional condition of  $H^1(M, \mathbb{R}) = 0$ .)

In [Vit87], Viterbo proved every compact *contact-type hypersurface*  $S$  in the standard symplectic manifold  $(\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \omega_0)$  has a closed characteristic. (See [Wei79] for the definition contact-type hypersurface which is by now a standard notion in symplectic topology.) Hofer [Hof93] proved the Weinstein conjecture for the over-twisted contact 3 manifold  $(M, \xi)$  using the theory of pseudo-holomorphic curves in the symplectization of the contact manifold. Taubes [Tau07] completely solved the conjecture for the 3 dimensional case utilizing the relationship between Gromov theory and Seiberg-Witten theory.

One of the main goals of the present paper is to prove the following Weinstein's conjecture [Wei79] in complete generality.

**Theorem 1.1.** *For any compact contact manifold  $(M, \lambda)$ , there exists a closed orbit of the Reeb vector field  $R_\lambda$ .*

The existence scheme similar to the proof of this theorem has been previously applied to the proof of Shelukhin's conjecture on the translated points of contactomorphisms by the present author in [Oh21b, Oh22a]. It is based on the theory of the *contact instanton* equation

$$\bar{\partial}^\pi w = 0, \quad d(w^* \lambda \circ j) = 0 \tag{1.1}$$

with the *Legendrian boundary condition* and its Hamiltonian-perturbed versions (1.5) and (1.9) below. The equation (1.1) itself for the closed Riemann surface was introduced by Hofer [Hof00], and applied to the study of planar contact structure in 3 dimensions by Abbas-Cieliebak-Hofer in [Abb04, ACH05].

The crucial a priori estimates and asymptotic convergence result of the equation under the  $C^1$ -bound on the punctured Riemann surfaces was first established by Wang and the present author [OW14, OW18], and the bubbling analysis and the relevant Fredholm theory in [Oh23] in the early 2010s for the *closed string* case. Importance of consideration of its boundary value problem with Legendrian boundary condition (the *open string* case) was more recently recognized by the present author in [Oh21a]. Then analytical foundation of the moduli theory of the boundary value problem has been established in a series of papers by the present author. (See [Oh22b] for the gluing theory, [Oha] for the mapping transversality and [Ohc] for the a priori elliptic estimates for the Hamiltonian perturbed equations.)

We denote by  $\text{Cont}(M, \xi)$  the set of contactomorphisms and by  $\text{Cont}_0(M, \xi)$  its identity component. To make further discussion, we also consider the sets of smooth paths and of smooth loops of  $\text{Cont}_0(M, \xi)$  based at the identity which we denote by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}(\text{Cont}_0(M, \xi)) &= \{\ell : [0, 1] \rightarrow \text{Cont}_0(M, \xi) \mid \ell(0) = \text{id}\} \\ \Omega(\text{Cont}_0(M, \xi)) &= \{\ell : [0, 1] \rightarrow \text{Cont}_0(M, \xi) \mid \ell(0) = \text{id} = \ell(1)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly we also consider  $\mathcal{P}(\text{Cont}(M, \xi))$  and  $\Omega(\text{Cont}(M, \xi))$  for the full contactomorphism group  $\text{Cont}(M, \xi)$  in the obvious way.

When the contact manifold  $(M, \xi)$  is equipped with a contact form  $\lambda$  with  $\xi = \ker \lambda$ , a diffeomorphism  $\psi$  is contact if and only if  $\psi^* \lambda = f \lambda$  with nowhere vanishing  $f$  called the *conformal factor*. If  $\psi$  is coorientation preserving, we can write  $f = e^g$  where we call the exponent function  $g = g_\psi^\lambda$  the *conformal exponent* of  $\psi$  relative to the contact form  $\lambda$ . For the simplicity of notation, we just write  $g_\psi$  for  $g_\psi^\lambda$  when  $\lambda$  is fixed.

Without loss of any generality, for the purpose of the present paper, we may and will assume that the path or the loop  $\ell$  is constant near  $t = 0, 1$ . We denote by

$$H \xrightarrow{\lambda} \ell, \quad (\text{or simply } H \mapsto \ell) \quad (1.2)$$

if  $\ell(t) = \psi_H^t$  or equivalently  $H = \text{Dev}_\lambda(\ell)$ .

**Definition 1.2.** We define the  $\lambda$ -length of  $\ell$  by

$$\text{leng}_\lambda(\ell) := \int_0^1 \text{osc}(H_t) dt = E_+(H) + E_-(H)$$

for  $H = \text{Dev}_\lambda(\ell)$ .

Here we define  $\text{osc}(H_t) = \max H_t - \min H_t$  and

$$E_+(H) := \int_0^1 \max H_t dt, \quad E_-(H) := \int_0^1 -\min H_t dt. \quad (1.3)$$

Here goes some outline of our strategy of the proof. Recall the statement of Shelukhin's conjecture [She17] proved by the present author in [Oh22a].

**Theorem 1.3** (Shelukhin's conjecture; Theorem 1.3 [Oh22a]). *Suppose that  $(M, \xi)$  is coorientable. Consider any pair  $(H, \lambda)$  such that*

$$\|H\| \leq T(M, \lambda), \quad H_t = \text{Dev}_\lambda(\ell)(t). \quad (1.4)$$

*Then there exists a translated point of  $\psi_H^1$ .*

We will apply the same kind of existence scheme utilizing the following observations.

**Key observations:**

- (1) *When  $H$  generates a loop, i.e.,  $\psi_H^1 = \text{id}$ , each translated point of  $\psi_H^1$  accompanies a Reeb trajectory that is in fact an isospeed closed Reeb trajectory  $(\gamma, T)$  for which the period  $T$  may not necessarily be zero, i.e.,  $\gamma$  is a genuine closed Reeb orbit.*
- (2) *If the Hamiltonian loop satisfies the inequality  $\|H\| < T(M, \lambda)$ , then no bubbling occurs.*

For the proof of Weinstein's conjecture, only the first observation is needed because bubbling is always good for the existence of Reeb orbits. But for the proof of Arnold's chord conjecture of the present paper or for the proof of the existence of two Reeb orbits or two Reeb chords in the sequel [Ohb], we need to avoid bubbling-off of sphere-type bubbles and so the second observation will also play a key role.

Our strategy then is to apply the existence scheme used in the proof of the aforementioned Shelukhin's conjecture to a contact Hamiltonian loop in [Oh21b, Oh22a]. The main additional arguments added are all natural geometric decedents

of those used therein, *except our new finding* of the link between the proof of the Weinstein conjecture (and of Arnold's chord conjecture) and the existence scheme used in *ibid.* In fact, except this new finding, the detail of the proof of Weinstein's conjecture is even simpler and easier than that of Shelukhin's conjecture. This is because we do not need to make the precise estimate of the untanglement energy required in the statement of Shelukhin's conjecture which turns out to be optimal by the recent preprint by Cant and Hedicke [CH].

**1.2. Arnold's chord conjecture.** There is the open-string version of the conjecture proposed by Arnold [Arn86] which reads as follows: *Let  $(M, \lambda)$  be a compact contact manifold. Then any compact Legendrian submanifold carries a Reeb chord.*

There are a few cases for which this conjecture is proved. For boundaries of subcritical Stein manifolds in any odd dimension, this was proved by Mohnke [Moh01]. In three dimensions, Abbas [Abb04] proved this for Legendrian unknots in tight contact 3-manifolds, and then Hutchings and Taubes completely solved this conjecture in 3 dimensions using the machinery of embedded contact homology and its relationship with the Seiberg-Witten Floer homology in [HT11] and [HT13].

In this regard, the method of our proof in fact proves the relative version of Theorem 1.1, and hence the proof of Arnold's chord conjecture, in a much easier way than the case of Weinstein's conjecture on closed orbits in that it does not need to handle *non-tame* contact manifolds or the  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -equivariant argument. Compare this situation with that of that of Shelukhin's conjecture [Oh22a] and its relative version [Oh21b].

**Theorem 1.4** (Arnold's chord conjecture). *Let  $(M, \xi)$  be a tame contact manifold and  $L \subset M$  be any compact Legendrian submanifold. Then  $R$  carries a Reeb chord.*

**1.3. The main scheme of the proof and its comparison with [Oh22a].** The present proof closely follows the scheme of our proof of Shelukhin's conjecture given in [Oh22a]. It is based on the following asymptotic convergence result.

Now we recall the *perturbed contact instanton equation* from [Oh21a] and [Ohc]

$$\begin{cases} (du - X_H \otimes dt)^{\pi(0,1)} = 0, \\ d(e^{g_{(H;u)}} u^*(\lambda + H dt) \circ j) = 0 \\ u(\tau, 0) \in R, \quad u(\tau, 1) \in R \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

when the domain surface  $\dot{\Sigma}$  is  $\mathbb{R} \times [0, 1]$ . Here the function  $g_{H,u}$  is defined by

$$g_{(H;u)}(\tau, t) := g_{(\psi_H^t)}^{-1}(u(\tau, t)) = g_{\psi_H^1(\psi_H^{1-t})}^{-1}(u(\tau, t)), \quad (1.6)$$

as used in [Oh21a, Oh21b].

The following subsequence convergence result is proved in [Ohc, Theorem 8.5], [OY24, Theorem 5.5] which exhibits the relationship between the asymptotic limit of a finite energy solution of (1.5) and the translated points of  $\psi_H^1$ .

**Theorem 1.5** (Subsequence Convergence). *Let  $u : [0, \infty) \times [0, 1] \rightarrow M$  satisfy the contact instanton equations (1.5) and have finite energy.*

*Then for any sequence  $s_k \rightarrow \infty$ , there exists a subsequence, still denoted by  $s_k$ , and a massless instanton  $u_\infty(\tau, t)$  (i.e.,  $E^\pi(u_\infty) = 0$ ) on the cylinder  $\mathbb{R} \times [0, 1]$  that satisfies the following:*

(1)  $\bar{\partial}_H^\pi u_\infty = 0$  and

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} u(s_k + \tau, t) = u_\infty(\tau, t)$$

in the  $C^l(K \times [0, 1], M)$  sense for any  $l$ , where  $K \subset [0, \infty)$  is an arbitrary compact set.

(2)  $u_\infty$  has vanishing asymptotic charge  $Q = 0$  and satisfies

$$u_\infty(\tau, t) = \psi_H^t \phi_{R_\lambda^T}(x_0)$$

for some  $x_0 \in R_0$ .

We note that at  $t = 1$ ,  $u_\infty(\tau, 1) = \psi_H^1 \phi_{R_\lambda^T}(x_0)$ . Therefore then the curve  $\gamma$  defined by

$$\gamma(t) = \psi_H^t \phi_{R_\lambda^T}(x_0) \tag{1.7}$$

satisfies  $\gamma(0) \in R_1$ ,  $\gamma(1) \in R_0$  and appears as the asymptotic limit of a finite energy solution  $u$  of (1.5). Therefore it will be enough produce a finite energy solution thereof *modulo bubbling-off*. (We will also show that bubbling-off is a good thing for the purpose of producing a closed Reeb orbit.)

For this purpose, we consider the family  $\{H^s\}_{0 \leq s \leq 1}$  of Hamiltonian  $H^s(t, x) = \text{Dev}_\lambda(t \mapsto \psi_{H^s}^t)$ . Then we consider the family of functions  $\rho_K : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_K(\tau) &= \begin{cases} 1 & |\tau| \leq K \\ 0 & |\tau| \geq K + 1 \end{cases} \\ \pm \chi'_K(\tau) &\leq 0 \quad \text{on } \tau \in [-K - 1, -K] \cup [K, K + 1] \end{aligned} \tag{1.8}$$

We then study the associated continuation map equation

$$\begin{cases} (du - X_{H^\times}(u) dt - X_G(u) ds)^{\pi(0,1)} = 0, \\ d(e^{g_{H^\times}(u)}(u^* \lambda + u^* H^\times dt + u^* G d\tau) \circ j) = 0, \\ u(\tau, 0) \in R, u(\tau, 1) \in R. \end{cases} \tag{1.9}$$

where  $G = G(\tau, t, x) = \text{Dev}_\lambda(\tau \mapsto \psi_{H^\times(\tau)}^t)(x)$ .

Then essentially the same scheme of the proof used in [Oh22a] applies to the following different circumstance in the study of the continuation map version of the perturbed contact instanton equation. In both cases, we utilize the kind of *curvature-free* family  $\{H^s\}_{0 \leq s \leq 1}$  for the family of Hamiltonian

$$H^s(t, x) = \text{Dev}_\lambda(t \mapsto \psi_H^{st}).$$

One big difference of the situation in the present paper from that of [Oh21b] is the standing hypothesis

$$\psi_H^1(R) = R \tag{1.10}$$

instead of (1.11). Here is the main difference between the two:

(1) [Shelukhin's conjecture [Oh22a]] We consider the Hamiltonian  $H = H(t, x)$  such that

$$\text{Fix } \psi_H^1 = \emptyset \tag{1.11}$$

with  $H = H(t, x)$ , which is a generic phenomenon.

(2) [Weinstein's conjecture] We consider  $H = H(t, x)$  such that

$$\psi_H^1 = \text{id}, \quad 0 \leq s \leq 1. \tag{1.12}$$

The standing hypothesis (1.12) prevents us from making a perturbation on the diffeomorphism  $\psi_H^1 = \text{id}$ . Because of this, if we had just repeated the argument from [Oh22a], the Legendrian Reeb constructed this way could become of a constant Reeb chord which a priori exist plenty as  $R_0 = R_1$ .

**1.4. Generic evaluation transversality.** To avoid such a trivial consequence, we consider the conformal exponent function of contactomorphism  $\psi$  and its associated hypersurface

$$\Sigma_\psi := g_\psi^{-1}(0) = \{x \in M \mid g_\psi(x) = 0\}. \quad (1.13)$$

We then consider the family thereof associated to the Hamiltonian  $H = H(t, x)$

$$\Sigma_{\psi_H} = \left\{ \Sigma_{\psi_H^t} \right\}_{t \in [0,1]}.$$

Then we put the interior constraint of requiring the image point of  $u$  at  $z_+ = (\tau(z_+), t(z_+)) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, 1]$  to satisfy

$$u(z_+) \in \Sigma_{\psi_H^{1/2}}, \quad (1.14)$$

which will guarantee the appearance of at least one non-constant self Reeb chord as the asymptotic limit of a non-constant (perturbed) contact instanton. Here enters the necessity of considering the parameterized evaluation transversality against the hypersurface  $\Sigma_{\psi_H^{1/2}}$  at an interior marked point in the line segment

$$\{(\tau, t) \mid \tau = 0, 0 < t < 1\} \subset \mathbb{R} \times [0, 1].$$

The moduli space with the constraint against  $\Sigma_{\psi_H}$  at an interior domain point from this line segment will play a crucial role in our proof.

**Remark 1.6.** We would like to highlight the fact that *adding an interior marked point lying on the line  $\tau = 0, 0 < t < 1$  increases the dimension by 1 and then putting the interior constraint (1.14) decreases the dimension by 1 and so that the two cancel out.* One would like to compare the current (real) situation with the (complex) situation of the *divisor axiom* in the Gromov-Witten theory [KM97].

We will also consider a  $C^\infty$ -small perturbation of  $H$  which firstly generates a Hamiltonian loop and secondly satisfies

$$\|H\| < T(M, \lambda). \quad (1.15)$$

Such a Hamiltonian loop can be always chosen by concatenating a  $C^\infty$ -small contact Hamiltonian path and its time reversal.

**1.5. Legendrianization.** We now apply the general study of the pair  $(M, (R_0, R_1))$  to the particular case of

$$(M_Q, (\Gamma_{\text{id}}, \Gamma_{\text{id}})), \quad M_Q = Q \times Q \times \mathbb{R}, \quad R_0 = R_1 = \Gamma_{\text{id}}$$

equipped with the contact form

$$\mathcal{A} = -e^{\frac{\eta}{2}} \pi_1^* \lambda + e^{-\frac{\eta}{2}} \pi_2^* \lambda$$

for the given contact manifold  $(Q, \lambda)$ . An immediate implication of the general study will be that for any nonconstant contact Hamiltonian loop  $\ell$  in  $\text{Cont}(Q, \lambda)$ , either there is a non-constant self  $\mathcal{A}$ -Reeb chord of  $\Gamma_{\text{id}} \subset M_Q$  or a closed  $\mathcal{A}$ -Reeb orbit. We will then show that either case gives rise to a closed  $\lambda$ -Reeb orbit of  $(Q, \lambda)$ .

In summary, for any given nonconstant contact Hamiltonian loop of  $(Q, \lambda)$ , the following two alternatives hold:

- (1) Either there must occur a bubbling off a nonconstant bubble which gives rise to a nonconstant self-Reeb chord of  $\Gamma_{\text{id}}$  as  $K \rightarrow \infty$  in the contact product  $M_Q := Q \times Q \times \mathbb{R}$ ,
- (2) or there arises a non-trivial (i.e., not  $t$ -independent) solution for the equation (1.5) in the limit as  $K \rightarrow \infty$  whose  $\pi$ -energy is less than the Hofer length  $e_+(\ell)$  of the Hamiltonian loop  $\ell$ . Then we show that such a chord gives rise to closed Reeb orbit. (See Section 7.3 for the details.)

More specifically, we go through the application of the following ingredients:

- We perform the same analysis of the limiting configurations as  $K \rightarrow \infty$  of the same moduli cobordism used in [Oh21b, Oh22a], *with a interior marked point added*.
- The usage of a *nonconstant Hamiltonian loop with small  $\|H\|$*  plays a fundamental role in our linking Sandon's notion of translated points [San12] and the closed Reeb orbits.
- The *evaluation transversality* against the level sets of the conformal exponent function is used to produce a nontrivial perturbed contact instanton as a limit as  $K \rightarrow \infty$ .

**1.6. Discussion and future works to do.** In 3 dimensions, Cristofaro-Gardiner and Hutchings [CGH16] indeed proved any compact contact manifold  $(M, \lambda)$  carries at least 2 different simple orbits. We would like to mention that our proofs actually prove the existence of at least two orbits *provided one can rule out the possibility that the two asymptotic limits  $(\gamma_-, \gamma_+)$  at  $\pm\infty$  of the nontrivial solution of (1.5) in the course of the proof of Arnold's chord conjecture consist of those such that one is a multiple cover of the other*. Indeed this can be achieved for a generic small perturbation of the Hamiltonian  $H$  of the given Hamiltonian loop. We postpone the details of this two orbit existence result in a sequel to this paper [Ohb].

The general existence phenomena of '*either infinitely many or of optimal number of*' in dynamical systems have been established by the various experts starting from Frank [Fra92] in 2 dimensional area-preserving dynamics, by Cristofaro-Gardner, Hutchings and Pomerleano [CGHP19] for the Reeb dynamics in 3 dimensions, by Shelukhin [She22] in symplectic Hamiltonian dynamics. It would be an interesting problem to investigate whether a similar phenomenon also holds for the Reeb dynamics in higher dimensions.

The organization of the paper is now in order. Section 2 - Section 5 are largely a duplication of the definitions and the analytical framework introduced in [Oh21b, Oh22a]. Section 6 establishes the key correspondence between closed  $\lambda$ -Reeb orbits in  $(Q, \lambda)$  and  $\mathcal{A}$ -Reeb chords of the contact diagonal  $\Gamma_{\text{id}} \subset Q \times Q \times \mathbb{R}$  and their periods. Section 7 contains the main argument of the proof of Weinstein's conjecture based thereon. Then Section 8 mentions some immediate consequence on the quantitative contact topology in relation to the unorderability of contact manifold the notion of which was introduced by Eliashberg and Polterovich [Eli00], and a new quantitative contact invariant of contact structure that does not depend on the choice of contact forms. There is an appendix that proves an automatic parameterized evaluation transversality of a constant map for the Hamiltonian-perturbed moduli space, which is the beginning of our deformation-cobordism analysis of the



parameterized interior marked moduli space of the Hamiltonian-perturbed contact instantons.

*As mentioned above, the materials of Section 2 - Section 5 are largely a duplication of those in [Oh21b, Oh22a]. Therefore we only state the main results used in the present but referring readers thereto for the details of the proofs of those borrowed therefrom, assuming the familiarity of the readers with the framework employed and with the proofs of those results provided in [Oh21b, Oh22a]. For those who are not familiar with the details thereof but would like to first see how the main ingredients outlined in this introduction are amalgamated into the existence scheme of (non-constant) Reeb orbits or Reeb chords, we strongly recommend them to immediately read Section 7 after reading this introduction, and then proceed to other relevant sections of the present paper and finally to [Oh21b, Oh22a].*

## 2. PELIMINARIES

In this section, we recall the notion of translated points introduced by Sandon [San12], transformation laws of the contact Hamiltonian under the basic algebraic operations and the notion of tameness of contact manifolds which play an important role in the proofs of the main results.

**2.1. Translated points and translated intersections.** We first recall the definition of translated points. For each given coorientation preserving contact diffeomorphism  $\psi$  of  $(M, \xi)$ , let  $g_\psi$  be its conformal exponent.

**Definition 2.1** (Sandon [San12]). Let  $(M, \xi)$  be a contact manifold equipped with a contact form  $\lambda$ . A point  $x \in M$  is called a  $\lambda$ -translated point of a contactomorphism  $\psi$  if  $x$  satisfies

$$\begin{cases} g_\psi(x) = 0 \\ \psi(x) = \phi_{R_\lambda}^\eta(x) \text{ for some } \eta \in \mathbb{R}. \end{cases}$$

We denote the set of  $\lambda$ -translated points of  $\psi$  by  $\text{Fix}_\lambda^{\text{trn}}(\psi)$ .

We would like to readers' attention that when  $\psi = id$ , all points are translated points.

We have the corresponding intersection theoretic counterparts in terms of the Legendrian submanifold and the associated Reeb chords. The following notion of isospeed Reeb chords is the corresponding counterpart which is used in [Oh21b].

**Definition 2.2** (isospeed Reeb chords). Let  $R_0, R_1$  be two Legendrian submanifolds, not necessarily disjoint, and consider a curve  $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$  fixed domain. We say a pair  $(T, \gamma)$  a *isospeed Reeb chord* from  $R_0$  to  $R_1$  if it satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\gamma}(t) = TR_\lambda(\gamma(t)) \\ \gamma(0) \in R_0, \quad \gamma(1) \in R_1. \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

We say an isospeed Reeb chord  $(T, \gamma)$  is *nondegenerate* if the associated Reeb chord is nondegenerate.

In this way, we can include and treat the constant paths as a special case of Reeb chords uniformly in the study of translated intersection points via contact instantons.

In this point of view, the set of constant isospeed Reeb chords (i.e., those with  $T = 0$ ) are nondegenerate in the Morse-Bott sense. This is the source of the

existence results of translated points under small energy hypothesis. (See [San11], [Oh21b, Oh22a].) Such a circumstance naturally occurs when one studies *contact Hamiltonian loops* which is precisely the one we are exploiting in the present paper.

**2.2. Developing Hamiltonians and their calculus.** In this subsection, we recall the contact counterparts of the developing map and the tangent map partially following the exposition given in [OM07] and [MS15] with slight amplification thereof.

Similarly as in the symplectic case [OM07], we recall the definition of the  $\lambda$ -*developing map*  $\text{Dev}_\lambda$ , the analog to the developing map introduced in [OM07] in the context of symplectic geometry. In the current contact case, the map strongly depends on the choice of contact form  $\lambda$ . We will just call them the developing map, when there is no need to highlight the  $\lambda$ -dependence of the contact Hamiltonian.

**Definition 2.3** (Developing map). Let  $T \in \mathbb{R}$  be given. Denote by

$$\mathcal{P}_0([0, T], \text{Cont}(M, \xi))$$

the set of contact isotopies  $\Psi = \{\psi_t\}_{t \in [0, T]}$  with  $\psi_0 = id$ . We define the  $\lambda$ -developing map  $\text{Dev}_\lambda : \mathcal{P}([0, T], \text{Cont}(M, \xi)) \rightarrow C^\infty([0, T] \times M)$  by the timewise assignment of Hamiltonians

$$\text{Dev}_\lambda(\Psi) := -\lambda(X), \quad \lambda(X)(t, x) := \lambda(X_t(x)).$$

We also state the following as a part of contact Hamiltonian calculus, which follows from a straightforward calculation. We refer readers to [MS15] for detailed proofs.

- (1) Let  $H = \text{Dev}_\lambda(\Psi)$ .  $\text{Dev}_\lambda(\tilde{\Psi})(t, x) = -H(1-t, x)$  for the time-reversal isotopy  $t \mapsto \psi^{1-t}$ ,
- (2)  $\text{Dev}_\lambda(t \mapsto \psi_H^t \psi_{H'}^t) = H_t + e^{g_{\psi_H^t}} F_t(\psi_H^t)^{-1}$  when  $H = \text{Dev}_\lambda(\Psi)$  and  $H' = \text{Dev}_\lambda(\Psi')$ ,
- (3)  $\text{Dev}(t \mapsto \psi^{-1} \psi_H^t \psi) = e^{-g_\psi} H_t \circ \psi$  for the conjugation  $t \mapsto \psi^{-1} \psi_H^t \psi$ .

**2.3. Tame contact manifolds.** We first recall the definition of the notion of *tame contact manifolds* from [Oh21b].

**Definition 2.4** (Definition 1.8 [Oh21b]). Let  $(M, \lambda)$  be contact manifold. A function  $\varphi : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is called  $\lambda$ -*tame* at infinity if  $\mathcal{L}_{R_\lambda} d\varphi = 0$  on  $M \setminus K$  for a compact subset  $K$ .

We will mostly just say ‘tame’ omitting ‘at infinity’ unless there is a need to emphasize the latter.

**Definition 2.5** (Contact  $J$  quasi-pseudoconvexity). Let  $J$  be a  $\lambda$ -adapted CR almost complex structure. We call a function  $\varphi : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  *contact  $J$  quasi-plurisubharmonic* on  $U$

$$-d(d\varphi \circ J) + kd\varphi \wedge \lambda \geq 0 \quad \text{on } \xi, \tag{2.2}$$

$$R_\lambda \lrcorner d(d\varphi \circ J) = g d\varphi \tag{2.3}$$

for some functions  $k, g$  on  $U$ . We call such a pair  $(\varphi, J)$  a *contact quasi-pseudoconvex pair* on  $U$ .

These properties of  $J$  enable us to apply the maximum principle in the study of the analysis of the moduli space of contact instantons associated to  $J$ . We refer readers to [Oh21b] for more detailed discussion on the analysis of contact instantons on tame contact manifolds.

**Definition 2.6** (Tame contact manifolds, Definition 1.12 [Oh21b]). Let  $(M, \xi)$  be a contact manifold, and let  $\lambda$  be a contact form of  $\xi$ .

- (1) We say  $\lambda$  is *tame on  $U$*  if  $(M, \lambda)$  admits a *contact  $J$ -quasi pseudoconvex pair* on  $U$  with a *proper* and  $\lambda$ -tame  $\varphi$ .
- (2) We call an end of  $(M, \lambda)$  *tame* if  $\lambda$  is tame on the end.

We say an end of contact manifold  $(M, \xi)$  is tame if it admits a contact form  $\lambda$  that is tame on the end of  $M$ .

The upshot of introducing this kind of barrier functions on contact manifold is the amenability of the maximum principle to the pair  $(\varphi, J)$  in the study of contact instantons.

### 3. SET-UP OF THE DEFORMATION-COBORDISM MODULI SPACE

In this section, we will closely follow the strategy of applying the deformation-cobordism analysis performed in [Oh21b, Part 2], and so will be brief in details referring readers thereto for full explanation.

Suppose that  $\ell : [0, 1] \rightarrow \text{Cont}_0(Q, \xi)$  is a contact Hamiltonian loop and let  $H$  be the Hamiltonian generating the loop. Obviously we have  $\psi_H^1 = id$  and so all points  $q \in M$  is a translated point in that  $(q, 0)$

We briefly recall the definition of the parameterized moduli spaces used in [Oh21b] where we put  $\psi_H^1(R) \cap R = \emptyset$  in [Oh21b] as the relevant standing hypothesis [Oh21b, Hypothesis 4.15]. *However, in the circumstance of the present paper, we need to put the standing hypothesis*

$$\psi_H^1(R) = R. \quad (3.1)$$

We start with the following crucial lemma whose proof we omit or refer readers to [Oh21b, Lemma 11.2].

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $H = H(t, x)$  be given. Consider the 2-parameter Hamiltonian  $H^s(t, x)$  defined by*

$$H^s(t, x) = \text{Dev}_\lambda(t \mapsto \psi_H^{st}). \quad (3.2)$$

*Then we have*

$$\text{Dev}_\lambda \left( t \mapsto \psi_H^{\chi_K(\tau)t} \right) (\tau, t, x) = \chi_K(\tau) H(\chi_K(\tau)t, x) \quad (3.3)$$

$$\text{Dev}_\lambda \left( \tau \mapsto \psi_H^{\chi_K(\tau)t} \right) (\tau, t, x) = \chi'_K(\tau) t H(\chi_K(\tau)t, x). \quad (3.4)$$

We then consider a two-parameter family of CR-almost complex structures and Hamiltonian functions:

$$J = \{J_{(s,t)}\}, H = \{H_t^s\} \text{ for } (s, t) \in [0, 1]^2.$$

We make the following specific choice of two-parameter Hamiltonians associated to each time-dependent Hamiltonian  $H = H(t, x)$  with a slight abuse of notations. This two-parameter Hamiltonian gives rise to the special property that *the  $\pi$ -energy estimates of our interest does not involve the conformal factor  $e^{g_H}$* . (See [OY] for a similar practice, especially Remark 1.13 in *ibid.* for the explanation on its

importance.) This independence plays an important role in our proof of Weinstein's conjecture.

Throughout the paper, we make the following standard hypothesis which can be always achieved by a reparameterization of contact isotopy.

**Hypothesis 3.2.** Without loss of generality, we may assume

$$H \equiv 0, \quad \text{near } t = 0, 1 \quad (3.5)$$

on  $[0, 1]$  by flattening the contact isotopy, and extend  $H_t$  periodically in time to whole  $\mathbb{R}$ .

**Choice 3.3.** Take the family  $H = H(s, t, x)$  given by

$$H^s(t, x) = \text{Dev}_\lambda(t \mapsto \psi_H^{st}) \quad (3.6)$$

We consider the 2-parameter family of contactomorphisms  $\Psi_{s,t} := \psi_{H^s}^t$ . Obviously we have the  $t$ -developing Hamiltonian  $\text{Dev}_\lambda(t \mapsto \Psi_{(s,t)}) = H^s$ . We then consider the elongated two parameter family

$$H_K(\tau, t, x) := \text{Dev}_\lambda\left(t \mapsto \psi_H^{X_K(\tau)t}\right) \quad (3.7)$$

and write the  $\tau$ -developing Hamiltonian

$$G_K(\tau, t, x) := \text{Dev}_\lambda\left(\tau \mapsto \psi_H^{X_K(\tau)t}\right). \quad (3.8)$$

Now we consider the domain defined by the union

$$\Theta_{K+1} := D^- \cup [-2K - 1, 2K + 1] \cup D^+ \quad (3.9)$$

where we denote

$$D^\pm = D_K^\pm := \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z| \leq 1, \pm \text{Im}(z) \leq 0\} \pm (2K + 1) \subset \mathbb{C} \quad (3.10)$$

respectively.

Then we consider the 2-parameter perturbed contact instanton equation for a map  $u : \Theta_{K_0+1} \rightarrow M$  given by

$$\begin{cases} (du - X_{H_K}(u) dt - X_{G_K}(u) ds)^{\pi(0,1)} = 0, \\ d(e^{g_K(u)}(u^* \lambda + u^* H_K dt + u^* G_K d\tau) \circ j) = 0, \\ u(\partial \Theta_{K_0+1}) \subset R \end{cases} \quad (3.11)$$

where  $g_K(u)$  is the function on  $\Theta_{K_0+1}$  defined by

$$g_K(u)(\tau, t) := g_{(\psi_{H_K}^t)^{-1}}(u(\tau, t)) \quad (3.12)$$

for  $0 \leq K \leq K_0$ .

Assuming suitable uniform energy bounds  $E_{J_K, H_K}(u) < C$  which will be made precise later in the course of the proof, we introduce the following moduli space of finite energy solutions.

**Definition 3.4.** For  $K \geq 0$ , we define

$$\mathcal{M}^K(M, R; J, H) = \{u : \mathbb{R} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow M \mid u \text{ satisfies (3.11) and } E_{J_K, H_K}(u) < \infty\}. \quad (3.13)$$

To perform a deformation-cobordism analysis, we also consider the parameterized moduli space

$$\mathcal{M}^{\text{para}}(M, R; J, H) = \bigcup_{K \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} \{K\} \times \mathcal{M}^K(M, R; J, H)$$

continued from  $\mathcal{M}_0(M, R; J, H) \cong R$ . We will also need its interior marked version

$$\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{para}}(M, R; J, H) := \bigcup_{K \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} \{K\} \times \mathcal{M}_1^K(M, R; J, H). \quad (3.14)$$

More explicitly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{M}_1^K(M, R; J, H) \\ &= \{(u, z^+) \mid u \in \mathcal{M}^K(M, R; J, H), z^+ = (0, t) \in \Theta_K, 0 < t < 1\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

According to the scheme of the proof given in [Oh21b, Part 2], [Oh22a], a crucial analytical ingredient that enters in the proof of the main theorem therein is the mapping and the *evaluation map transversality* for the moduli space of contact instantons. These transversality results are established in [Oha]. This makes the above moduli space an  $n + 1$  dimensional smooth manifold. (See Theorem 5.2 for the relevant transversality results.)

Next we recall the definition of the evaluation maps that enter in the study of transversality performed in [Oha]. We have the natural *fiberwise* evaluation maps

$$\text{Ev}^\partial : \mathcal{M}_{[0, K_0]}^{\text{para}}(M, R; J, H) \rightarrow \bigsqcup_{K \in \mathbb{R}_+} \{K\} \times R, \quad (3.16)$$

$$\text{Ev}^+ : \mathcal{M}_{[0, K_0]}^{\text{para}}(M, R; J, H) \rightarrow \bigsqcup_{K \in \mathbb{R}_+} \{K\} \times M : \quad (3.17)$$

Here we define

$$\text{Ev}^\partial = \sqcup_{K \in \mathbb{R}_+} \text{ev}_K^\partial, \quad \text{Ev}^+ = \sqcup_{K \in \mathbb{R}_+} \text{ev}_K,$$

where the evaluation maps

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ev}_K^\partial &: \mathcal{M}^K(M, R; J, H) \rightarrow R, \\ \text{ev}_K^+ &: \mathcal{M}^K(M, R; J, H) \rightarrow M \end{aligned}$$

are respectively defined by

$$\text{ev}_K^\partial(u, z^+) = u(0, 1), \quad (0, 1) \in \partial\Theta_K \quad (3.18)$$

$$\text{ev}_K^+(u, z^+) = u(0, t), \quad 0 < t < 1. \quad (3.19)$$

#### 4. A PRIORI UNIFORM ENERGY BOUNDS

In this section and henceforth, we simplify the notation  $E_{J_K, H_K}$  to  $E$  since the pair  $(J_K, H_K)$  will not be changed. And we will also highlight the domain almost complex structure dependence thereof by considering the pair  $(j, w)$  instead of  $w$ .

**Definition 4.1.** For a smooth map  $\dot{\Sigma} \rightarrow M$ , we define the  $\pi$ -energy of  $w$  by

$$E^\pi(j, w) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\dot{\Sigma}} |d^\pi w|^2. \quad (4.1)$$

Next we first recall the definitions of the energy  $E_{J_K, H_K}(u)$  used in this definition. We now split our discussion on the  $\pi$ -energy bound into the two cases of domain  $\Theta_{K_0+1}$  and  $\mathbb{R} \times [0, 1]$  as in [Oh21b].

4.1. **On the domain**  $\mathbb{R} \times [0, 1]$ . We start with the case of unparametrised case (i.e.,  $H_K \equiv H$ ). The following definition of  $\pi$ -energy introduced in [Oh21b].

**Definition 4.2** (Definition 6.1 [Oh21b]). Let  $u : \mathbb{R} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow M$  be any smooth map. We define

$$E_{J,H}^\pi(u) := \frac{1}{2} \int e^{g_H(u)} |(du - X_H(u) \otimes dt)^\pi|_J^2$$

call it the *off-shell*  $\pi$ -energy.

We apply the gauge transformation  $\Phi_H^{-1}$  to  $u$  and define  $\bar{u} := \Phi_H^{-1}(u)$  which has the expression

$$\bar{u}(\tau, t) = (\psi_H^t(\psi_H^1)^{-1})^{-1}(u(\tau, t)) = \psi_H^1(\psi_H^t)^{-1}(u(\tau, t)). \quad (4.2)$$

The following identity is also proved in [Oh21b]. (See Appendix A for the summary of the basic properties of the relevant *dynamical* version of the perturbed action functional.)

**Proposition 4.3** (Proposition 6.2 & 6.4 [Oh21b]). *Let  $u : \mathbb{R} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow M$  be any smooth map and  $\bar{u}$  be as above. Then*

$$\int (\bar{\gamma}_+)^* \lambda - \int (\bar{\gamma}_-)^* \lambda = E_{J,H}^\pi(u) = E_{J'}^\pi(\bar{u}). \quad (4.3)$$

Next, we consider the full parametrized case of  $H_K$  given before. For this purpose, we recall the definition of oscillation

$$\text{osc}(H_t) = \max H_t - \min H_t.$$

Then the relevant  $\pi$ -energy bound for  $E_{J,H}^\pi(u)$  is an immediate consequence of the following energy identity.

**Proposition 4.4** (Proposition 7.3 [Oh21b]). *Then for all  $K$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} E_{(J_K, H_K)}^\pi(u) &= \int_{-2K-1}^{-2K} -\chi'_K(\tau) H \left( \chi_K(\tau), \psi_H^{\chi_K(\tau)r}(u(\tau, 0)) \right) d\tau \\ &\quad \int_{2K}^{2K+1} -\chi'_K(\tau) H \left( \chi_K(\tau), \psi_H^{\chi_K(\tau)r}(u(\tau, 0)) \right) d\tau \\ &\quad + \int \gamma_+^* \lambda - \int \gamma_-^* \lambda \end{aligned}$$

on  $\mathbb{R} \times [0, 1]$ .

**Corollary 4.5.** *Under the same situation as in Proposition 4.4, we have*

$$E_{(J_K, H_K)}^\pi(u) \leq \|H\| + \int \gamma_+^* \lambda - \int \gamma_-^* \lambda. \quad (4.4)$$

4.2. **On the capped domains**  $\Theta_{2K_0+1}$ . Next, we consider the 2-parameter perturbed contact instanton equation (3.11). We note that if  $|\tau| \geq K+1$ , the equation becomes

$$\bar{\partial}^\pi u = 0, \quad d(u^* \lambda \circ j) = 0. \quad (4.5)$$

We consider the parameterized moduli space

$$\mathcal{M}_{[0, K_0]}^{\text{para}}(M, R; J, H) = \bigcup_{K \in [0, K_0]} \{K\} \times \mathcal{M}^K(M, R; J, H). \quad (4.6)$$

Let  $\dot{\Sigma} = \Theta_{K_0+1}$  which is a domain of disc-type without puncture. The relevant  $\pi$ -energy bound immediately follows from the following identity.

**Proposition 4.6** (Proposition 7.2 [Oh21b]). *Let  $u$  be any finite energy solution of (3.11). Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} E_{(J_K, H_K)}^\pi(u) &= \int_{-2K-1}^{-2K} -\chi'_K(\tau) H\left(\chi_K(\tau), \psi_H^{\chi_K(\tau)}(u(\tau, 0))\right) d\tau \\ &\quad + \int_{2K}^{2K+1} -\chi'_K(\tau) H\left(\chi_K(\tau), \psi_H^{\chi_K(\tau)}(u(\tau, 0))\right) d\tau. \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

**Corollary 4.7** (Proposition 7.8 [Oh21b]). *Let  $u$  be any finite energy solution of (3.11). Then we have*

$$E_{J'_K}^\pi(\bar{u}_K) \leq \|H\| \quad (4.8)$$

We also have the following vertical energy bound.

**Proposition 4.8** (Proposition 7.9 [Oh21b]). *Let  $u$  be any finite energy solution of (3.11). Then we have*

$$E_{J'_K}^\perp(\bar{u}_K) \leq \|H\|. \quad (4.9)$$

Let

$$E_{J'_K}(u) = E_{J'_K}^\pi(u) + E_{J'_K}^\perp(u)$$

be the total energy.

We also consider the gauge transformation of  $u$

$$\bar{u}_K(\tau, t) := (\psi_{H\rho_K(\tau)}^t)^{-1}(u(\tau, t)) \quad (4.10)$$

and make the choice of the family

**Choice 4.9** (Choice 9.6 [Oh21b]). We consider the following two parameter families of  $J'$  and  $\lambda$ :

$$J'_{(s,t)} = (\psi_{H^s}^t)_* J \quad (4.11)$$

$$\lambda'_{(s,t)} = (\psi_{H^s}^t)_* \lambda. \quad (4.12)$$

A straightforward standard calculation also gives rise to the following.

**Lemma 4.10** (Lemma 6.7 [Oh21b]). *For given  $J_t$ , consider  $J'$  defined as above. We equip  $(\Sigma, j)$  a Kähler metric  $h$ . Let  $g_H(u)$  be the function defined in (1.6). Suppose  $u$  satisfies (1.5) with respect to  $J_t$ . Then  $\bar{u}$  satisfies*

$$\begin{cases} \bar{\partial}_{J'}^\pi \bar{u} = 0, & d(\bar{u}^* \lambda \circ j) = 0 \\ \bar{u}(\tau, 0) \in \psi_H^1(R), & \bar{u}(\tau, 1) \in R \end{cases} \quad (4.13)$$

for  $J$ . The converse also holds. And  $J' = J'(\tau, t)$  satisfies  $J'(\tau, t) \equiv J_0$  for  $|\tau|$  sufficiently large.

Then  $\bar{u}_K$  also satisfies the energy identity

$$E_{(J_K, H)}^\pi(u) = E_{J'}^\pi(\bar{u}), \quad E_{(J_K, H)}^\perp(u) := E_{J'}^\perp(\bar{u}). \quad (4.14)$$

(See [Oh21b, Proposition 7.7].)

Similarly as in [Oh22a], we obtain the following  $\lambda$ -energy bound.

**Proposition 4.11.** *Let  $u$  be any finite energy solution of (3.11). Then we have*

$$E^\perp(\bar{u}_K) \leq E_+(H) \quad (4.15)$$

By combining the above, we have now established the fundamental a priori bound for the energy

$$E(\bar{u}_K) = E^\pi(\bar{u}_K) + E^\perp(\bar{u}_K)$$

where  $\bar{u}_K(\tau, t) = \psi_H^1(\psi_H^t)^{-1}(u(\tau, t))$ .

## 5. CONSTRUCTION OF THE COMPACTIFIED DEFORMATION-COBORDISM MODULI SPACE

With these energy bounds, we are now ready to make a deformation-cobordism analysis of  $\mathcal{M}^{\text{para}}(M, \lambda; R, H)$ . We consider the parameterized moduli space (3.14)

$$\mathcal{M}^{\text{para}}(M, R; J, H) = \bigcup_{K \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} \{K\} \times \mathcal{M}^K(M, R; J, H).$$

As usual, we denote by  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$  for the stable-map type compactification of the relevant  $\mathcal{M}$  that was constructed in [Oh21b, Part 3]. The following is a general compactification result established therein.

**Theorem 5.1.** *Consider the moduli space  $\mathcal{M}^{\text{para}}(M, R; J, H)$  under the assumption of uniform energy bound, i.e., there exists a constant  $C' > 0$  such that*

$$E_{J,H}(u) < C' < \infty$$

for all  $u \in \mathcal{M}^{\text{para}}(M, R; J, H)$ .

Then one of the following alternatives holds:

- (1) *There exists some  $C > 0$  such that*

$$\|du\|_{C^0; \mathbb{R} \times [0,1]} \leq C \quad (5.1)$$

where  $C$  depends only on  $(M, R; J, H)$  and  $\lambda$ .

- (2) *There exists a sequence  $u_\alpha \in \mathcal{M}_{K_\alpha}(M, R; J, H)$  with  $K_\alpha \rightarrow K_\infty \leq K_0$  and a finite set  $\{\gamma_j^+\}$  of closed Reeb orbits of  $(M, \lambda)$  such that  $u_\alpha$  weakly converges to the union*

$$u_\infty = u_{-,0} + u_0 + u_{+,0} + \sum_{j=1} v_j + \sum_k w_k$$

in the Gromov-Floer-Hofer sense, where

$$\begin{cases} u_{-,0} \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_-^{\text{para}}(M, R; J, H), \\ u_{+,0} \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_+^{\text{para}} K_+(M, R; J, H), \\ u_0 \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}(M, R; J, H), \end{cases}$$

$$v_j \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}(M, J'_{z_j}; \alpha_j); \quad \alpha_j \in \mathfrak{Reeb}(M, \lambda'_{z_j}),$$

and

$$w_k \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}(M, \psi_{z_j}(R), J'_{z_j}; \beta_k); \quad \beta_k \in \mathfrak{Reeb}(M, R; \lambda).$$

Here the domain point  $z_j \in \partial \dot{\Theta}_{K_\infty+1}$  is the point at which the corresponding bubble is attached.

The following general statement of the relevant mapping transversality result in the form that used in the present paper are established in [Oha].



**Theorem 5.2** (Generic mapping transversality [Oha]). *Let  $(T_{\pm}, \gamma_{\pm})$  and  $(T', \gamma')$  be nondegenerate Reeb chords for the pair  $(\psi(R), R)$ . Then the following moduli spaces are all transversal:*

- The original parameterized moduli space  $\mathcal{M}_{(0,1)}^{\text{para}}(M, R_1; \tilde{J}, \mathbb{H})$ ,
- The limiting moduli spaces  $\mathcal{M}(\psi(R), R; \gamma_-, \gamma')$ ,  $\mathcal{M}(\psi(R), R; \gamma', \gamma_+)$  of the above as  $K \rightarrow \infty$ ,
- The moduli space of bubbles

$$\mathcal{M}(M; \gamma'), \quad \mathcal{M}(M, R; \gamma').$$

(The generic mapping transversality had been also previously proved in [Oh23] for the closed string case even earlier.)

## 6. LEGENDRIANIZATION, $\mathbb{Z}_2$ SYMMETRY AND A PRIORI $C^0$ ESTIMATES

In this section, we convert the problem of contact Hamiltonian loops to that of Legendrian loops by applying the process of Legendrianization borrowing the exposition from [Oh22a, Section 9] on the definition of the parameterized moduli space and the relevant  $C^0$  estimates obtained by utilizing the  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -symmetry.

We assume further that  $(Q, \xi)$  is cooriented and consider the contact product.

**Proposition 6.1** (Proposition 4.7 [Oh22a]). *Assume further that  $(Q, \xi)$  is cooriented. Let  $\lambda$  be a contact form of  $(Q, \xi)$ . For each  $s \in [0, 1]$ , we consider the map*

$$i_{\frac{1}{2}} : Q \times Q \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow S^{\text{can}}Q \times S^{\text{can}}Q / \sim$$

defined by

$$i_{\frac{1}{2}}(x, y, \eta) = [(-e^{\frac{\eta}{2}} \lambda_x, e^{-\frac{\eta}{2}} \lambda_y)].$$

Then the map  $i$  is a diffeomorphism and satisfies  $\Lambda = \Psi^*(\pi_1^* \theta + \pi_2^* \theta)$ . In particular  $Q \times Q \times \mathbb{R}$  is contactomorphic to  $Q \star Q$ .

**6.1.  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  anti-invariant contact form and its Reeb vector field.** In this subsection, we recall the key construction which converts the problem of closed Reeb orbit on  $(Q, \lambda)$  to that of Reeb chords for its Legendrianization triple  $(M_Q, \Gamma_{id}, \mathcal{A})$ . For the readers convenience, we duplicate the exposition given in [Oh22a, Section 5.1].

For the purpose of exploiting the involutive symmetry of the contact product, following [Oh22a], we equip the product  $M_Q := Q \times Q \times \mathbb{R}$  with the contact form

$$\mathcal{A} = -e^{\frac{\eta}{2}} \pi_1^* \lambda + e^{-\frac{\eta}{2}} \pi_2^* \lambda \tag{6.1}$$

which satisfies  $\iota^* \mathcal{A} = -\mathcal{A}$  for the involution  $\iota(x, y, \eta) = (y, x, -\eta)$ .

**Lemma 6.2** (Lemma 5.1 [Oh22a]). *The Reeb vector field of  $\mathcal{A}$  is given by*

$$R_{\mathcal{A}} = \left( -\frac{1}{2} e^{-\frac{\eta}{2}} R_{\lambda}, \frac{1}{2} e^{\frac{\eta}{2}} R_{\lambda}, 0 \right). \tag{6.2}$$

In particular, the Reeb flow is given by

$$\phi_{\mathcal{A}}^t(x, y, \eta) = \left( \phi_{\lambda}^{-\frac{t}{2}} e^{-\frac{\eta}{2}}(x), \phi_{\lambda}^{\frac{t}{2}} e^{\frac{\eta}{2}}(y), \eta \right). \tag{6.3}$$

We note the fact that the Reeb vector field  $R_{\mathcal{A}}$  is tangent to the level set of the coordinate function  $\eta : M_Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

**Proposition 6.3.** *There is a one-to-one correspondence between the set of closed  $\lambda$ -Reeb orbits of  $Q$  and that of  $\mathcal{A}$ -Reeb chords of  $\Gamma_{\text{id}}$ . Furthermore this correspondence do not change their actions.*

*Proof.* The proof is essentially given in the course of the proof of [Oh22a, Lemma 5.3].

Let  $\gamma$  be a closed Reeb orbit of period  $T$  on  $Q$ . Then the associated time-dependent Hamiltonian over  $[0, 1]$  is  $H(t, \mathbf{x}) \equiv -T$ . It follows that

$$\tilde{\gamma}(t) = \left( \gamma \left( -\frac{tT}{2} \right), \gamma \left( \frac{(1-t)T}{2} \right), 0 \right)$$

is a Reeb chord of  $\Gamma_{\text{id}}$  and if  $\gamma$  is primary, so is  $\tilde{\gamma}$ .

Conversely suppose  $\mu : [0, T'] \rightarrow M_Q$  is a  $\mathcal{A}$ -Reeb chord of  $\Gamma_{\text{id}}$ . If we write  $\mu(t) = (\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t), \eta(t))$ , then we have

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\gamma}_1(t) = -\frac{1}{2}e^{-\frac{\eta(t)}{2}} R_\lambda(\gamma_1(t)) \\ \dot{\gamma}_2(t) = \frac{1}{2}e^{\frac{\eta(t)}{2}} R_\lambda(\gamma_2(t)) \\ \dot{\eta}(t) = 0 \end{cases} \quad (6.4)$$

and the boundary condition

$$\gamma_1(0) = \gamma_2(0), \quad \gamma_1(T') = \gamma_2(T'), \quad \eta(0) = 0 = \eta(T') \quad (6.5)$$

for some  $T' > 0$ . Therefore if  $\mu(0) \in \Gamma_{\text{id}}$ , then  $\eta(t) \equiv 0$  and

$$\dot{\gamma}_1(t) = -\frac{1}{2}R_\lambda(\gamma_1(t)), \quad \dot{\gamma}_2(t) = \frac{1}{2}R_\lambda(\gamma_2(t)).$$

Let  $x_0 = \gamma_1(0) = \gamma_2(0)$ . Then we have

$$\gamma_1(t) = \phi_{R_\lambda}^{-t/2}(x_0), \quad \gamma_2(t) = \phi_{R_\lambda}^{t/2}(x_0). \quad (6.6)$$

Therefore the concatenated curve  $\gamma : [0, T'] \rightarrow Q$  defined by

$$\gamma(t) = \begin{cases} \gamma_2(t) & t \in [0, T'/2] \\ \gamma_1(T' - t) & t \in [T'/2, T'] \end{cases}$$

is a  $\lambda$ -closed Reeb orbit of period  $T'$ . This proves the above correspondence is one-to-one correspondence.

Next direct calculation also shows  $\int_\gamma \lambda = \mathcal{A}(\tilde{\gamma})$ .  $\square$

However there could exist a *closed  $\mathcal{A}$ -Reeb orbit* in  $Q \times Q \times \mathbb{R}$ , instead of the aforementioned  $\mathcal{A}$ -Reeb chords: These may not a priori arise from a closed  $\lambda$ -Reeb orbit of  $Q$ . In this respect, we have the following for this case.

**Proposition 6.4.** *For each nonconstant closed  $\mathcal{A}$ -Reeb orbit, there are a pair of closed  $\lambda$ -orbit with their periods  $T_\pm$  that satisfies the relation*

$$\left( \int_{\gamma_1} \lambda \right) \left( \int_{\gamma_1} \lambda \right) = -\frac{1}{4} T_+ T_-, \quad T_+ + T_- \neq 0 \quad (6.7)$$

*Proof.* Any closed isospeed  $\mathcal{A}$ -orbit  $(\mu, T)$  is of the form

$$\mu(t) = (\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t), \eta(t))$$

which still satisfies (6.4), but with the boundary condition (6.5) replaced by

$$(\gamma_1(0), \gamma_2(0), \eta(0)) = (\gamma_1(T), \gamma_2(T), \eta(T)) \quad (6.8)$$

for some  $T$ . Since  $\dot{\eta} = 0$ , the function  $\eta$  is a constant function for which the condition  $\eta(0) = \eta(T)$  is automatic. We put the common constant to be  $\eta_0$ . Substituting this back into the first two equations of (6.4), we have constructed two isospeed  $\lambda$ -closed orbits  $(\gamma_1, T_+)$  and  $(\gamma_2, T_-)$  that satisfy

$$T_+ = -\frac{1}{2}e^{-\frac{\eta_0}{2}} \int_{\gamma_1} \lambda, \quad T_- = \frac{1}{2}e^{\frac{\eta_0}{2}} \int_{\gamma_2} \lambda$$

respectively. They can be rewritten as

$$\int_{\gamma_1} \lambda = -\frac{T_+}{2}e^{\frac{\eta_0}{2}}, \quad \int_{\gamma_2} \lambda = \frac{T_-}{2}e^{-\frac{\eta_0}{2}}$$

and hence

$$\left( \int_{\gamma_1} \lambda \right) \left( \int_{\gamma_2} \lambda \right) = -\frac{1}{4}T_+T_-.$$

On the other hand, since  $\mu$  is assumed to be not a constant map, we have

$$0 \neq T = \int_{\mu} \mathcal{A} = -e^{-\frac{\eta_0}{2}} \int_{\gamma_1} \lambda + e^{\frac{\eta_0}{2}} \int_{\gamma_2} \lambda = 2T_+ + 2T_-.$$

In particular,  $T_+ \neq -T_-$ , which proves that at least one of  $\gamma_{\pm}$  is not a constant loop and that  $\gamma_2$  is neither the time-reversal of  $\gamma_1$ .  $\square$

Therefore combination of Propositions 6.3 and 6.4 completes a conversion of the closed  $\lambda$ -orbit problem into that of  $\mathcal{A}$ -chords of  $\Gamma_{\text{id}}$ .

We now continue towards the proof of Weinstein's conjecture.

## 6.2. $\mathbb{Z}_2$ anti-equivariant lifting of the contact flows to the contact product.

In this section, we recall the exposition given in [Oh22a, Section 6]. We also recall the notation

$$\tilde{H}(t, x) = -H(1-t, x) \tag{6.9}$$

which generates the time-reversal flow

$$\psi_{\tilde{H}}^t = \psi_H^{1-t}(\psi_H^1)^{-1}. \tag{6.10}$$

We take the Hamiltonian  $\mathbb{H}$  on  $M_Q$  of the type  $\mathbb{H} = \pi^* F_t$

$$\begin{aligned} F(t, x, y) &= -\pi^* \tilde{H}(t, x) + \pi_2^* H(t, y) \\ &= -\tilde{H}(t, x) + H(t, y) = H(1-t, x) + H(t, y) \end{aligned} \tag{6.11}$$

for the given Hamiltonian  $H = H(t, x)$  on  $Q$ . Then the following is derived in [Oh22a, Section 6 & Appendix B].

**Proposition 6.5** (Corollary 6.3 [Oh22a]). *Let  $\mathbb{H}$  be as above. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_1(\psi_{\mathbb{H}}(t, x, y, \eta)) &= \psi_{e^{-\frac{\eta}{2}\tilde{H}}}^t(x), \\ \pi_2(\psi_{\mathbb{H}}(t, x, y, \eta)) &= \psi_{e^{\frac{\eta}{2}H}}^t(y), \\ \pi_3(\psi_{\mathbb{H}}(t, x, y, \eta)) &= \eta - g_{\left(\psi_{\left(e^{-\frac{\eta}{2}\tilde{H}}\right)}^t\right)}(x) - g_{\left(\psi_{\left(e^{\frac{\eta}{2}H}\right)}^t\right)}(y) \end{aligned} \tag{6.12}$$

where  $\pi_i$  is the natural projection to the  $i$ -th factor of  $Q \times Q \times \mathbb{R}$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ .

In fact we have the following formula for the associated Hamiltonian vector field.

**Proposition 6.6** (Proposition 6.4 [Oh22a]). *We have*

$$X_{\mathbb{H}}(x, y, \eta) = \left( X_{e^{-\frac{\eta}{2}\tilde{F}}}^t(t, x), X_{e^{\frac{\eta}{2}F}}^t(t, y), -2R_{\mathcal{A}}[\mathbb{H}] \right).$$

**6.3.  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  anti-invariant lifted CR almost complex structures.** In this subsection, we recall basic properties of  $\tilde{J}$  from [Oh22a].

We now consider the following  $\mathcal{A}$ -adapted almost complex structures instead of  $\mathcal{A}$ -adapted ones used in [Oh21b].

**Definition 6.7** (Lifted CR almost complex structure). Let  $J$  be any  $\lambda$ -adapted CR almost complex structure. Consider the  $\mathcal{A}$ -adapted CR almost complex structure  $\tilde{J}$  characterized by

$$\tilde{J}(X, 0, 0) = (-JX, 0, 0), \quad \tilde{J}(0, Y, 0) = (0, JY, 0) \quad (6.13)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \tilde{J}R_{\mathcal{A}} &= \tilde{J}\left(-\frac{1}{2}e^{-\frac{\eta}{2}}R_{\lambda}, \frac{1}{2}e^{\frac{\eta}{2}}R_{\lambda}, 0\right) \\ \tilde{J}S_{\mathcal{A}} &= -\frac{\partial}{\partial\eta}, \quad \tilde{J}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\eta}\right) = S_{\mathcal{A}} \end{aligned} \quad (6.14)$$

where we recall the definition of the vector field

$$S_{\mathcal{A}} = \left(\frac{1}{2}e^{-\frac{\eta}{2}}R_{\lambda}, \frac{1}{2}e^{\frac{\eta}{2}}R_{\lambda}, 0\right).$$

We call  $\tilde{J}$  a lifted CR almost complex structure of  $J$  from  $Q$ .

We mention that

$$\xi_{\mathcal{A}} = \{(X, Y, 0) \mid X, Y \in \ker \lambda, \lambda(Y) = e^{\eta}\lambda(X)\} \oplus \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}} \left\{S_{\mathcal{A}}, \frac{\partial}{\partial\eta}\right\} \quad (6.15)$$

and that the definition of  $\tilde{J}$  indeed satisfies  $\tilde{J}^2|_{\xi_{\mathcal{A}}} = -id|_{\xi_{\mathcal{A}}}$  and  $\tilde{J}(R_{\mathcal{A}}) = 0$  as it should by definition.

**Proposition 6.8.** *The lifted  $\tilde{J}$  on  $M_Q$  of any  $\lambda$ -adapted  $J$  on  $Q$  is  $\mathcal{A}$ -adapted and satisfies*

$$\iota^* \tilde{J} = -\tilde{J}. \quad (6.16)$$

*Proof.* This follows from the definition of lifted  $\tilde{J}$  since  $\mathcal{A}$  satisfies  $\iota^* \mathcal{A} = -\iota^* \mathcal{A}$ .  $\square$

The following tameness is proved in [Oh21b].

**Proposition 6.9** (Proposition 11.7 [Oh21b]). *The contact manifold  $(M_Q, \mathcal{A})$  is tame for the end  $\eta > 0$  in the sense of Definition 2.6.*

**Choice 6.10** (Choice of lifted CR almost complex structures  $\tilde{J}'$ ). We take the *domain-dependent* contact triad

$$(Q, \{J_z\}, \{\lambda_z\})$$

such that  $(J'_z, \lambda'_z) \equiv (J_0, \lambda)$  outside a compact subset near punctures of  $\dot{\Sigma}$  in Choice 4.9.

Then we lift them to a domain-independent one  $(M_Q, \tilde{J}', \mathcal{A})$  for the equation (6.19) and their gauge transformation  $(\{\tilde{J}'_z\}, \{\mathcal{A}_z\})$  so that the lift satisfies

(1) (4.11) on a compact neighborhood of

$$\bigcup_{(s,t) \in [0,1]^2} \Gamma_{\psi_H^{st}} \subset Q \times Q \times \mathbb{R},$$

- (2)  $(\{\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_z\}, \{\mathcal{A}_z\}) \equiv (\tilde{\mathcal{J}}, \mathcal{A})$  outside a possibly bigger compact subset thereof and so defines a (domain-dependent) tame pairs.

(We refer readers to [Oh22a, Remark 9.5] for some remark concerning how the above choices made are relevant to the study of  $C^0$ -estimates.)

We have achieved our goal of defining the natural class of CR almost complex structures satisfying (6.13) and (6.14).

Let  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}, \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$  and  $\mathbb{H}$  be as before. Denote  $\mathbf{x} = (x, y, \eta)$ . Then we consider

$$\mathbb{H}^s(t, \mathbf{x}) = \text{Dev}_{\mathcal{A}}(t \mapsto \psi_H^{st}(\mathbf{x}))$$

and

$$\mathbb{H}_K(\tau, t, \mathbf{x}) = \text{Dev}_{\mathcal{A}}(t \mapsto \psi_H^{t\rho_K(\tau)}(\mathbf{x}))$$

for the standard elongation function  $\chi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  used as in [Oh21b]. We define

$$G_K(\tau, t, \mathbf{x}) = \text{Dev}_{\mathcal{A}}(\tau \mapsto \Phi_{\tau, t}^K)$$

with  $\Psi_{\tau, t}^K = \Psi_{\rho_K(\tau), t}$  as before.

Now associated to  $(M_Q, \Gamma_{\text{id}})$ ,  $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$  and  $\mathbb{H}^s$ , we consider the equation

$$\begin{cases} (dU - X_{\mathbb{H}_K}(U) dt - X_{G_K}(U) ds)^{\pi(0,1)} = 0, \\ d(e^{\tilde{g}_K(U)}(U^* \Lambda + U^* \mathbb{H}_K dt + U^* G_K d\tau) \circ j) = 0, \\ U(\tau, 0), \quad U(\tau, 1) \in R_0. \end{cases} \quad (6.17)$$

For the choice of adapted CR almost complex structures for this equation, we utilize the contact form (6.1)

$$\mathcal{A} = -e^{\frac{\eta}{2}} \pi_1^* \lambda + e^{-\frac{\eta}{2}} \pi_2^* \lambda$$

which satisfies  $\iota^* \mathcal{A} = -\mathcal{A}$  for the involution  $\iota(x, y, \eta) = (y, x, -\eta)$ .

We then consider  $\mathcal{A}$ -adapted CR almost complex structures  $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$  and define the conjugate  $\tilde{U}$  of a map of  $U = U(\tau, t)$  by

$$\tilde{U}(\tau, t) = \iota(U(\tau, 1 - t)). \quad (6.18)$$

We first establish the following symmetry of the moduli space.

**Proposition 6.11** (Proposition 9.6 [Oh22a]). *If  $U$  is a solution (6.17), then so is  $\tilde{U}$  and vice versa.*

**6.4. Anti-contact involutive symmetry and uniform  $C^0$  estimates.** We first take the gauge transformation and convert (6.17) into its Reeb-chord version

$$\begin{cases} \bar{\partial}^{\pi} \bar{U} = 0, \quad d(\bar{U}^* \Lambda \circ j) = 0 \\ \bar{U}(\tau, 0) \in R_0^{\rho_K(\tau)}, \quad \bar{U}(\tau, 1) \in R_1 \end{cases} \quad (6.19)$$

for a map  $U : \dot{\Sigma} \rightarrow Q \times Q \times \mathbb{R}$  with respect to suitably chosen family of adapted CR almost complex structures and a moving boundary condition: Here  $R_1 = \Gamma_{\text{id}}$  and  $R_0^s = \psi_H^s(\Gamma_{\text{id}})$  for  $s \in [0, 1]$ . (We refer readers to [Oh21b] for the similar usage of moving boundary condition.)

We now establish this  $C^0$ -bound for any solution  $\bar{U}$  of (6.19) of the triad

$$(M_Q, \Lambda, \tilde{\mathcal{J}})$$

with Legendrian boundary conditions

$$\bar{U}(\tau, 0) \in R_0, \quad \bar{U}(\tau, 1) \in R_1$$

recalling that  $\bar{U}$  satisfies the maximum principle in the rest of the present subsection.

As mentioned in [Oh22a, Remark 9.7], we alert readers that the contact manifold  $Q \times Q \times \mathbb{R}$  which is of our main interest is tame only on the region  $\{\eta > 0\}$ , not on the region  $\{\eta < 0\}$ . However by considering the  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -symmetric Legendrianization of  $\psi$ , we can derive the  $C^0$ -estimates of the moduli space of our interest from the tameness on the region  $\{\eta > 0\}$ .

To concisely state the  $C^0$ -estimate, we introduce the following constant

$$C(\{H^s\}) := \max_{(s,t,x)} |g_{(H^s;\lambda)}(t,x)| = \max_{s \in [0,1]} \|g_{(H^s;\lambda)}\|_{C^0} \quad (6.20)$$

as in [Oh22a].

**Proposition 6.12** (Proposition 9.8 [Oh22a]). *Let  $W$  be any solution of (6.19). Then we have*

$$\|\eta \circ W\|_{C^0} \leq C(\{H^s\}).$$

In particular, Image  $W$  is precompact in  $M_Q = Q \times Q \times \mathbb{R}$ .

Once this  $C^0$ -bound is in our disposal, we can apply the whole package given in [Oh21b, Oh22a], and perform the deformation-cobordism analysis to the case of  $M_Q = Q \times Q \times \mathbb{R}$ .

## 7. WRAP-UP OF THE PROOFS OF MAIN THEOREMS

We would like to mention that the set-up for the present section is made towards the proof of Weinstein's conjecture which requires the usages of the operation of the Legendrianization and  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -symmetry arguments. Other than those, *the proof of the present section equally applies to the proof of Arnold's chord conjecture for any compact Legendrian submanifold on any tame contact manifold in an even easier way*. Therefore the proof in the present section will simultaneously finish the proofs of Weinstein's conjecture (Theorem 1.1) and Arnold's chord conjecture (Theorem 1.4).

We now apply the construction of the moduli space given in (3.14) to the pair  $(M_Q, \Gamma_{\text{id}})$  for a family of the data  $(\tilde{J}, \mathbb{H}_K)$  with lifted almost complex structures  $\tilde{J}$  and  $\mathbb{H} = \{\mathbb{H}_K\}$  lifted from the family of Hamiltonians  $H_K$  on  $(Q, \lambda)$  to the product  $(M_Q, \mathcal{A})$ . We then form the union

$$\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{para}}(M_Q, \Gamma_{\text{id}}, M; \tilde{J}, \mathbb{H}) := \bigcup_{K \geq 0} \{K\} \times \mathcal{M}_1^K(M_Q, \Gamma_{\text{id}}, M; \tilde{J}, \mathbb{H}).$$

Here the subindex '1' stands for the number of interior marked points. In fact, we will take the interior marked points from the line segment

$$\{(0, t) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, 1] \mid 0 < t < 1\} \quad (7.1)$$

which is a 1 dimensional subset of the domain  $\mathbb{R} \times [0, 1]$ .

**7.1. Evaluation transversalities.** Next we consider the evaluation map transversality. We consider the *universal* moduli space

$$\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{univ}}(M_Q, \Gamma_{\text{id}}) = \bigcup_{(\tilde{J}, \mathbb{H})} \{(J, H)\} \times \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{para}}(M_Q, \Gamma_{\text{id}}; \tilde{J}, \mathbb{H})$$

We consider the universal (0-jet) evaluation map

$$\text{Ev}^+ : \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{univ}}(M_Q, \Gamma_{\text{id}}) \rightarrow M.$$

We also consider the boundary evaluation map

$$\text{Ev}^\partial : \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{univ}}(M_Q, \Gamma_{\text{id}}) \rightarrow R_0 \amalg R_1.$$

(Recall the natural *fiberwise* evaluation maps given in (3.16) and (3.17).)

**Theorem 7.1** (Generic evaluation transversality [Oha]). *Let*

$$\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{univ}}(M_Q, \Gamma_{\text{id}}) \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}_1^{\text{univ}}(M_Q, \Gamma_{\text{id}})$$

*be as above. Then the following holds:*

- (1) *The evaluation map*

$$\text{Ev}^+ : \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{univ}}(M_Q, \Gamma_{\text{id}}) \rightarrow M$$

*is a submersion.*

- (2) *For a generic choice of  $\tilde{J}$ , the evaluation map*

$$\text{Ev}^\partial : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_1^{\text{para}}(M_Q, \Gamma_{\text{id}}; \tilde{J}, \mathbb{H}) \rightarrow R_1 \times \mathbb{R}_+ \quad (7.2)$$

*given by  $\text{Ev}^\partial((U, K, z^+) = U(0, 1) \in R_1$  is transversal to  $C$  for a generic choice of an embedded curve  $C : [0, 1] \rightarrow R_1 \times \mathbb{R}_+$ .*

**Remark 7.2.** The curve  $C$  here corresponds to the curve denoted by  $\Gamma$  in [Oh97], [Oh22a]. To avoid confusion with the notation  $\Gamma_{\text{id}}$  for the contact diagonal, we use the letter  $C$  instead here.

One of the important task is *to ensure non-triviality, i.e., the two dimensionality of the image of the contact instanton arising from the process of taking a limit of contact instanton bordered in  $\Gamma_{\text{id}}$ .* More specifically, we need to avoid the kind of degenerate solution of the type  $U(\tau, t) \equiv u(\tau)$  independent of  $t$ 's which would be entirely contained in  $\Gamma_{\text{id}}$ .

To ensure this, we require the interior constraint for  $(U, z^+)$  given by

$$\text{Ev}^+(U, z^+) = U(0, t) \in \Sigma_{\psi_{\mathbb{H}}^{1/2}}, \quad z^+ = (0, t), t \in [0, 1]. \quad (7.3)$$

We can adjust the Hamiltonian  $H$  keeping  $\psi_H^0 = \psi_H^1 = \text{id}$  fixed to satisfy the transversality  $\Sigma_{\psi_{\mathbb{H}}^{1/2}} \pitchfork \Gamma_{\text{id}}$  so that the intersection set  $\Sigma_{\psi_{\mathbb{H}}^{1/2}} \cap \Gamma_{\text{id}}$  is of codimension 1 in  $\Gamma_{\text{id}}$  and hence of codimension  $\dim Q + 2$  in  $M_Q$ . (See [Pol01, Chapter 5] for the relevant arguments of making such a perturbation.)

With the above generic transversality results given in our disposal, we define

$$\begin{aligned} N_\Sigma(\mathbb{H}) &:= (\text{Ev}^+)^{-1}(\Sigma_{\psi_{\mathbb{H}}^{1/2}}) \\ &= \left\{ (U, z^+) \mid U \in \mathcal{M}(M_Q, \Gamma_{\text{id}}; \tilde{J}, \mathbb{H}), U(0, t) \in \Sigma_{\psi_{\mathbb{H}}^{1/2}} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (7.4)$$

and its parameterized version

$$\pi_{\mathbb{R}_+} : N_\Sigma^{\text{para}}(\mathbb{H}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+. \quad (7.5)$$

where we have

$$N_\Sigma^{\text{para}}(\mathbb{H}) = \bigcup_{K \in \mathbb{R}_+} \{K\} \times N_{\Sigma; K}(\mathbb{H}).$$

(Here the subindex ' $\Sigma$ ' stands for the hypersurface  $\Sigma_{\psi_{\mathbb{H}}}$ .) It becomes a smooth manifold of its dimension given by

$$\dim \Gamma_{\text{id}} + 1 - 1 + 1 = \dim Q + 1,$$

where the first 1 comes from the dimension of  $\{(0, t) \mid 0 \leq t \leq 1\}$ , ‘-1’ from the codimension of the hypersurface  $\Sigma_{\psi_{\mathbb{H}}^t} \subset M_Q$  and the last ‘1’ from the number of parameter  $K$ . It defines a fibration over  $\mathbb{R}_+$  by the projection (7.5). We also note that  $\Gamma_{\text{id}}$  is of codimension  $\dim Q + 1 = 2n + 2$  in  $M_Q$  which has dimension  $2 \dim Q + 1 = 4n + 3$ .

Then a simple dimension counting argument proves the following.

**Lemma 7.3.** *For a generic choice of  $H$ , we have*

- (1)  $(\text{Ev}^+)^{-1}(\Gamma_{\text{id}}) \cap ((N_{\Sigma}^{\text{para}}(\mathbb{H})|_K) = \emptyset$  for all  $K > 0$  possibly except away from a discrete set of  $K$ 's.
- (2) Furthermore

$$(\text{Ev}^+)^{-1}(\Gamma_{\text{id}}) \cap N_{\Sigma}^{\text{para}}(\mathbb{H})$$

is a 0 dimensional manifold consisting of pairs  $(U, z^+)$ , if non-empty.

*Proof.* By the generic mapping transversality theorem, Theorem 5.2, we have

$$\dim N_{\Sigma}^{\text{para}}(\mathbb{H}) = \dim \Gamma_{\text{id}} + 1$$

for a generic choice of  $H$ . Further we also have

$$\dim N_{\Sigma}^{\text{para}}(\mathbb{H}) + \dim \Gamma_{\text{id}} = 2 \dim \Gamma_{\text{id}} + 1 = \dim M_Q$$

by Theorem 7.1. Then the lemma follows from the dimension counting.  $\square$

**7.2. The case  $K = 0$ :**  $J \equiv J_0$  and  $H \equiv 0$ . In this case, the equation (3.11) becomes

$$\begin{cases} \bar{\partial}^{\pi} U = 0, & d(U^* \mathcal{A} \circ j) = 0 \\ U(\tau, 0), U(\tau, 1) \in \Gamma_{\text{id}} \end{cases} \quad (7.6)$$

with  $E_{\bar{J}}(U) = E_{\bar{J}}^{\pi}(U) + E_{\bar{J}}^{\lambda}(U) < \infty$ .

The current case  $(M_Q, \Gamma_{\text{id}})$  is a special case of the general pair  $(M, R)$  of contact/Legendrian.

**Remark 7.4.** The remaining discussion of this subsection applies to the general pairs and so will treat the case of general pairs  $(M, R)$ . The reason is because the same detail is needed for the purpose of the proof of Arnold’s chord conjecture.

The following is proved in [Oh21b] for a general pair  $(M, R)$  of contact manifold  $(M, \xi)$  and a compact Legendrian submanifold  $R$ , which applies to  $(M_Q, \Gamma_{\text{id}})$ .

**Proposition 7.5** (Proposition 8.1 [Oh21b]). *Assume  $w : (\Sigma, \partial\Sigma) \rightarrow (M, R)$  is a smooth contact instanton from a compact connected Riemann surface  $(\Sigma, j)$  genus zero with one boundary component. Then  $w$  is a constant map.*

We have the following index formula from [Oh21b]. (See [Oh23, Section10-11] for the linearization and the full index formula for the closed string case, and [OY24] for the open string case.)

**Proposition 7.6** (Proposition 8.3 [Oh21b]). *Let  $w_p : (D^2, \partial D^2) \rightarrow (M, R)$  be the constant map valued at  $p \in R \subset M$  regarded as a constant solution to (7.6). Consider the map*

$$\Upsilon : w \mapsto (\bar{\partial}^{\pi} w, d(w^* \lambda \circ j))$$

and its linearization operator

$$D\Upsilon(w) : \Omega^0(w^* TM, (\partial w)^* TR) \rightarrow \Omega^{(0,1)}(w^* \xi) \oplus \Omega^2(\Sigma, \mathbb{R}).$$



Then we have

$$\ker D\Upsilon(w_p) = n (= \dim R), \quad \text{Coker } D\Upsilon(w_p) = 0.$$

In particular, we have

$$\text{Index } D\Upsilon(w) = n$$

for any element  $w \in \mathcal{M}_0(M, R; J_0, H_K)$  homotopic to a constant map relative to  $R$  for all  $K$ .

Finally, we also have the following general *automatic transversalities* of the constant map. The proof of this proposition follows the standard scheme similar to the one used in symplectic geometry. For readers' convenience, we give the details of its proof in Appendix B using the Sard-Smale theorem.

**Proposition 7.7.** *Let  $(M, R)$  be any contact/Legendrian pair with tame  $M$  and compact  $R$ . For a generic choice of  $H$ , the following holds: We consider the union*

$$N_{\Sigma}^{\text{univ}} := \bigcup_H \{H\} \times N_{\Sigma}^{\text{para}}(H)$$

and the associated universal evaluation map  $\text{Ev}^+$  thereon. Then:

- (1) The evaluation  $\text{Ev}^+ : N_{\Sigma}^{\text{univ}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times M$  given by

$$\text{Ev}^+(H, K, u, z^+) = (K, u(z^+))$$

is a submersion onto  $\mathbb{R} \times M$ .

- (2) We have

$$N_{\Sigma}^{\text{para}}(H)|_{K=0} = \{u = u_q \mid q \in R\}$$

for all  $H$  where  $u_q : \Theta_K \rightarrow R$  is the constant map valued at  $q \in R$ .

An immediate corollary of the above two propositions is the following description of the moduli space  $N_{\Sigma}^{\text{para}}(H)$ , which in particular shows that it is non-empty the proof of which was left undecided in Lemma 7.3.

**Corollary 7.8.** *The evaluation map  $\text{Ev}_{K=0}^{\partial} : N_{\Sigma}^{\text{para}}(H) \cap \{K = 0\} \rightarrow R$  is a diffeomorphism. In particular its  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -degree is nonzero.*

**7.3. Convergence analysis of the moduli cobordism  $\mathcal{M}^{\text{para}}$ .** We now go back to the case of  $(M_Q, \Gamma_{\text{id}})$ .

**Remark 7.9.** But the same argument applies to the general case of  $(M, R)$  with the same but easier argument as mentioned before because we do not need to consider the Legendrianization  $(M_Q, \Gamma_{\text{id}})$  and the lifting  $\mathbb{H}$  of the Hamiltonian, but directly work with the pair  $(M, R)$  with  $Q = M$  and with the Hamiltonian  $H$  itself.

We still have the boundary evaluation map  $\text{Ev}^{\partial}$  restricted to  $N_{\Sigma}^{\text{para}}$  which we denote by

$$\text{Ev}_{\Sigma}^{\partial} : N_{\Sigma}^{\text{para}}(\mathbb{H}) \rightarrow \Gamma_{\text{id}}.$$

We also choose an embedded curve  $C : [0, 1] \rightarrow \Gamma_{\text{id}}$ .

The rest of the proof is divided into two cases:

- (1) **Case 1:** There is some  $K_0 > 0$  such that  $(\text{Ev}_{\Sigma}^{\partial})^{-1}(C)|_{K > K_0} = \emptyset$ .  
(2) **Case 2:** There exists a sequence  $K_j \rightarrow \infty$  such that

$$(\text{Ev}_{\Sigma}^{\partial})^{-1}(C)|_{K_j} \neq \emptyset.$$

We fix one such  $K_0$ .

We start with the key energy bounds

$$E_{(\tilde{J}_K, \mathbb{H}_K)}^\pi(U), E_{\tilde{J}_K, \mathbb{H}_K}^\perp(U) \leq \|H\|$$

from Corollary 4.5 and Corollary 4.7 for the  $\pi$ -energy and Proposition 4.8 for the  $\lambda$ -energy, which are proved in [Oh22a].

*7.3.1. Analysis of Case 1.* The argument used in this case is similar to that of [Oh22a] which in turn follows the existence of even earlier paper [Oh97] in symplectic topology.

Then a standard cobordism analysis as in [Oh21b, Oh22a] implies that the moduli space

$$N_\Sigma^{\text{para}}(\mathbb{H})|_{[0, K_0]}$$

must bubble-off. One immediate implication of the existence of a bubble is that there must exist either a closed  $\mathcal{A}$ -Reeb orbit or a self-Reeb chord  $\gamma$  of  $\Gamma_{\text{id}}$  with action bound  $0 < \mathcal{A}(\gamma) \leq \|H\|$ . In particular, we must have

$$T(M, \lambda) \leq \|H\|.$$

But this contradicts to our requirement on the Hamiltonian  $H$  imposed in (1.15) and the energy estimate given in Corollary 4.7.

This concludes that no bubbling occurs so that  $N_\Sigma^{\text{para}}(\mathbb{H})|_{[0, K_0]}$  defines a compact cobordism whose boundary is given by

$$\partial N_\Sigma^{\text{para}}(\mathbb{H})|_{[0, K_0]} \rightarrow N_\Sigma^{\text{para}}(\mathbb{H})|_{[0, K_0]}$$

with

$$\partial N_\Sigma^{\text{para}}(\mathbb{H})|_{[0, K_0]} = N_\Sigma^{\text{para}}(\mathbb{H})|_{K=0}.$$

This in particular proves that the preimage  $(\text{Ev}^\partial)^{-1}(C)$  is a compact one dimensional manifold with a single boundary point, a contradiction.

Therefore we conclude that Case 1 cannot occur under the standing assumption  $0 < \|H\| < T(M, \lambda)$ , and hence Case 2 must occur.

*7.3.2. Analysis of Case 2.* This is the place where a new phenomenon appears which did not occur in our study of Sandon-Shelukhin's conjecture in [Oh21b, Oh22a].

By the hypothesis, there is a sequence  $K_j \rightarrow \infty$  so that  $N_\Sigma^{\text{para}}(\mathbb{H})|_{\{K=K_j\}} \neq \emptyset$  so that for each  $j$  there exists a solution  $U_j$  of the equation (6.17) for  $K = K_j$  that satisfies the evaluation constraint given in (7.3) and the boundary condition  $U(z_j) \in \Gamma_{\text{id}}$ . If a bubble occurs as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ , the same argument as in Case 1 gives rise to a closed Reeb orbit. Therefore we assume that there exists no bubble off. Then we have a uniform  $C^1$ -bound for  $U_j$  that

$$\|dU_j\|_{C^0} \leq C \tag{7.7}$$

for some constant  $C > 0$  independent of  $j$ 's. This implies that we are in the situation of Theorem 5.1 where no bubbling component appears so that the weak limit as  $K_j \rightarrow \infty$  must be of the form

$$u_\infty = u_{-,0} + u_0 + u_{+,0}.$$

More precisely, by letting  $j \rightarrow \infty$  (and so  $K_j \rightarrow \infty$ ) and considering (3.11) on  $[-K_j, K_j]$ , we apply the (weak) convergence result from Theorem 5.1 and obtain a solution to the equation

$$\begin{cases} (dU - X_{\mathbb{H}}(U)dt)^{\pi(0,1)} = 0, & d\left(e^{g_{\mathbb{H}}^t}(U^* \mathcal{A} + \mathbb{H} dt) \circ j\right) = 0, \\ U(\tau, 0), U(\tau, 1) \in \Gamma_{\text{id}} \end{cases} \quad (7.8)$$

on  $\mathbb{R} \times [0, 1]$  thanks to the standing requirement (7.3) on  $\{(\tau, t) \mid \tau = 0, 0 \leq t \leq 1\}$ . This corresponds to one of the irreducible component of  $u_0$ .

Then, thanks to the evaluation constraint given in (7.3) and the boundary condition  $U(z_j) \in \Gamma_{\text{id}}$ , the solution  $U$  must be  $t$ -dependent, i.e.,  $\frac{\partial U}{\partial t} \neq 0$ . The latter gives rise to two non-constant translated Hamiltonian chords as its asymptotic limits at  $\tau = \pm\infty$ . In other words, the two limits will be the curves of the form

$$\gamma_{\pm}(t) = \psi_{\mathbb{H}}^t \phi_{R_{\mathcal{A}}}^{tT_{\pm}}(x_{\pm}, x_{\pm}, 0)$$

satisfying the boundary condition

$$\gamma_{\pm}(0), \gamma_{\pm}(1) \in \Gamma_{\text{id}}.$$

Furthermore, we have the action equality

$$0 < \mathcal{A}(\overline{\gamma}_+) - \mathcal{A}(\overline{\gamma}_-) = E_{J, \mathbb{H}}^{\overline{\gamma}}(U) \leq \|H\|$$

from Proposition 4.3 for the asymptotic limits  $\gamma_{\pm}$  of a solution to (7.8) arising at  $\pm\infty$  respectively. In other words, we have  $T_+ - T_- > 0$  which implies that at least one of  $T_{\pm}$  is non-zero.

The above boundary condition is equivalent to the statement that there exists a point  $(y_{\pm}, y_{\pm}, 0)$  such that

$$\psi_{\mathbb{H}}^1 \phi_{R_{\mathcal{A}}}^{T_{\pm}}(x_{\pm}, x_{\pm}, 0) = (y_{\pm}, y_{\pm}, 0).$$

It follows from Proposition 6.5 that the latter is equivalent to

$$\psi_{\overline{H}}^1 \left( \phi_{\lambda}^{-T_{\pm}/2}(x_{\pm}) \right) = y_{\pm}, \quad \psi_{\overline{H}}^1 \left( \phi_{\lambda}^{T_{\pm}/2}(x_{\pm}) \right) = y_{\pm}, \quad -g_{\psi_{-\overline{H}}^1}(x_{\pm}) - g_{\psi_{\overline{H}}^1}(x_{\pm}) = 0.$$

Since  $\psi_{\overline{H}}^1 = \text{id}$ , we also have  $\psi_{\overline{H}}^1 = \text{id}$  and  $g_{\psi_{-\overline{H}}^1}(x_{\pm}) = 0 = g_{\psi_{\overline{H}}^1}(x_{\pm})$ . Combining these, we have derived

$$\phi_{\lambda}^{-T/2}(x_{\pm}) = y_{\pm}, \quad \phi_{\lambda}^{T/2}(x_{\pm}) = y_{\pm}$$

which implies  $\phi_{\lambda}^{T_{\pm}}(x_{\pm}) = x_{\pm}$ , i.e., the curve defined by  $\overline{\gamma}_{\pm}(t) := \phi_{\lambda}^t(x_{\pm})$  is a closed Reeb orbit with period  $T_{\pm}$ . In particular at least one of  $\gamma_{\pm}$  is not a constant isospeed Reeb chord of  $\Gamma_{\text{id}}$ , and so generates a closed Reeb orbit  $(Q, \lambda)$ . This completes the proof of Weinstein's conjecture.

As mentioned before, the same argument, which is even easier, applied to the general pair  $(M, R)$  for a compact Legendrian submanifold on any tame contact manifold also proves the Arnold chord conjecture. (Compare this with the relationship between [Oh21b] and [Oh22a].)

**Remark 7.10.** The scheme of our existence proof firstly relies on the existence of the fundamental cycle of  $\Gamma_{\text{id}} \cong Q$  on the contact product  $M_Q = Q \times Q \times \mathbb{R}$  modulo bubbling-off, and secondly the evaluation transversality of the moduli space of contact instantons against the hypersurface  $\Sigma_{\psi}$ . We note that bubbling-off is always good for the purpose of existence of closed Reeb orbit (or Reeb chord), and so we have only to ensure that even when there is no bubbling-off, the fundamental

cycle in the relevant complex involves at least one *nonconstant* Reeb chord. We achieve the latter by ensuring the possibility that some translated point of  $\psi = \psi_H^1$  accompanies a nonconstant isospeed Reeb chord of  $\Gamma_{\text{id}}$  utilizing the generic evaluation transversality result proved in [Oha, Theorem 4.1]. It seems to be an interesting problem to develop the bulk-boundary deformation theory in the context of Legendrian CI category constructed in [Ohe] as in the Lagrangian Floer theory as in [FOOO09a, FOOO09b] and [Oh24].

## 8. EPILOGUE: SOME QUANTITATIVE CONTACT TOPOLOGY

In this section, we state an immediate corollary of our existence scheme applied to the problem of unorderability of contact manifold.

**8.1. Quantitative unorderability of contact manifolds.** The following definition of a partial order is introduced by Eliashberg and Polterovich [Eli00].

**Definition 8.1.** For given two elements  $g_1, g_2 \in \widetilde{\text{Cont}}(M, \xi)$ , we say  $g_1 < g_2$  if  $g_1 g_2^{-1}$  is generated by a non-negative contact Hamiltonian, i.e.,

$$g_1 g_2^{-1} = \psi_H^1$$

for some nonnegative Hamiltonian  $H$ .

We warn the readers that the direction of the inequality is opposite to that of [Eli00] which is an artifact of the different sign conventions or ours from those thereof, especially due to our definition of contact Hamiltonian  $H = -\lambda(X)$  of a contact Hamiltonian vector field  $X$  [Oh21b, Oh22a].

Then starting from [EKP06], orderability or non-orderability of a contact manifold has been studied by many authors in the literature, using the existing tools of Hamiltonian Floer homology, contact homology, Rabinowitz Floer homology and Chekanov-Eliashberg DGA. See [San11], [Fra16], [Chi17], [AM13], [AFM15] and others.

Now we consider nonnegative Hamiltonian  $H = H(t, x)$  that generates a contractible loop  $\ell$ . We first observe that

$$\text{osc}(H) \leq E_+(H) \tag{8.1}$$

for any nonnegative Hamiltonian  $H$ .

**Definition 8.2.** Let  $\phi \in \text{Cont}_0(M, \xi)$  and denote by a  $\tilde{\phi} \in \widetilde{\text{Cont}}_0(M, \xi)$  a path homotopy class with  $\ell(0) = \text{id}$  and  $\ell(1) = \psi$  generated by a nonnegative Hamiltonian path  $\ell(t) = \psi_H^t$ . We define

$$E_+(\ell) := E_+(H). \tag{8.2}$$

and

$$e_+(\tilde{\phi}) = \inf_{H; [\psi_H] = \tilde{\phi}} E_+(H). \tag{8.3}$$

The following is an immediate corollary of the existence scheme utilized in the proof of Weinstein conjecture which is a quantitative refinement of the results in the literature on the Weinstein conjecture on the non-orderable contact manifolds.

**Theorem 8.3.** *Suppose that  $(M, \xi)$  be a contact manifold equipped with a contact form  $\lambda$ . Let  $\ell : [0, 1] \rightarrow \text{Cont}_0(M, \xi)$  be any non-constant contractible positive loop. Then there exists a closed Reeb orbit  $\gamma$  such that*

$$0 < \int \gamma^* \lambda \leq E_+(\ell)$$

The theorem can be rephrased as follows.

**Definition 8.4.** Suppose  $(M, \xi)$  is unorderable, and let  $\lambda$  be any contact form of  $\xi$ . Define the constant

$$\begin{aligned} & \varepsilon_0^+(\text{Cont}(M, \lambda)) \\ & := \inf_{\ell} \{E_+(\ell) \mid \ell \text{ is positive, } [\ell] = 1 \in \pi_1(\text{Cont}_0(M, \Xi))\}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.4)$$

We call  $\varepsilon_0^+(\text{Cont}(M, \lambda))$  the *bottle neck threshold* of  $\text{Cont}_0(M, \lambda)$ .

**Corollary 8.5.** *Let  $(M, \Xi)$  be a cooriented contact manifold and let  $\lambda$  be a positive contact form thereof. Then*

$$0 < T(M, \lambda) \leq \varepsilon_0^+(\text{Cont}(M, \lambda)).$$

*In particular, any unorderable contact manifold  $(M, \xi)$  carries a contractible Reeb orbit for any contact form  $\lambda$ .*

Similar existence result without this kind of universal bound was previously proved by Albers, Fuchs and Merry [AM13, AFM15, AFM17] using the machinery of spectral invariants derived from Rabinowitz Floer homology.

**8.2. A quantitative invariant of contact structures  $\xi$ .** Another interesting aspect of the inequality

$$\|H\| \leq T(M, \lambda) \quad (8.5)$$

appearing in statement of Shelukhin's conjecture is as follows. When a function  $H = H(t, x)$  is given the value  $\|H\|$  does not involve the contact form  $\lambda$ . Therefore we can always achieve the inequality (8.5) by conformally rescaling the given contact form  $\lambda$  to  $C\lambda$  for a sufficiently large constant  $C > 0$  which does not affect the existence question on a closed Reeb orbit of the given contact form  $\lambda$ . We recall readers that the system of data  $(H, \lambda)$  is the union of two independent *information systems* on the given contact manifold  $(M, \xi)$  in the sense of [DO].

This enables us to define the following invariant of the contact manifold  $(M, \xi)$ .

**Definition 8.6.** Let  $(M, \xi)$  be a compact coorientable contact manifold. Write

$$\mathfrak{U}(H, \lambda) := \frac{\|H\|}{T(M, \lambda)}$$

for each pair  $(H, \lambda)$ , and define

$$\mathfrak{U}(\lambda) = \sup_H \left\{ \frac{\|H\|}{T(M, \lambda)} \in \mathbb{R}_+ \mid \mathfrak{X}(H; \lambda) = \emptyset \right\}, \quad (8.6)$$

and

$$\mathfrak{U}(\xi) = \inf_{\lambda; \ker \lambda = \xi} \mathfrak{U}(\lambda) \quad (8.7)$$

which we call the *untanglement threshold* of  $\lambda$  and the *untanglement threshold* of  $\xi$ , respectively.

Theorem 1.3 implies  $\mathfrak{U}(\lambda) \geq 1$  for any contact form  $\lambda$ . On the other hand, for any given Hamiltonian  $H$  and contact form  $\lambda$ , we can always multiply some large constant  $C > 0$  so that the inequality

$$\frac{\|H\|}{T(C\lambda, M)} \leq 1 \iff \frac{\|H\|}{T(\lambda, M)} \leq C < \infty$$

holds.

**Theorem 8.7.** *For a coorientable contact structure  $(M, \xi)$  for compact  $M$ , we have*

$$1 \leq \mathfrak{U}(\lambda) < \infty$$

for any contact form  $\lambda$  of  $\xi$ . In particular, we have  $\mathfrak{U}(\xi) \geq 1$ .

On the other hand, combined with the recent work of Cant-Hedicke announced in [CH], which reads  $\mathfrak{U}(\lambda) \leq 1$  for the case of the standard contact form of  $S^{2n+1}$  with  $n \geq 1$ , we have the precise estimate

$$\mathfrak{U}(\lambda) = 1$$

for the standard contact form  $\lambda$  of the sphere. Combining the two, we have proved the following precise estimate for the standard contact structure.

**Corollary 8.8.** *Consider the standard contact sphere  $(S^{2n+1}, \xi)$ . Then  $\mathfrak{U}(\xi) = 1$ .*

The following is an interesting question to ask which we hope to address elsewhere.

**Question 8.9.** For which contact manifold  $(M, \xi)$ , do we have  $\mathfrak{U}(M, \xi) < \infty$ ? What does the finiteness imply to  $(M, \xi)$  in the point of view of contact topology of  $(M, \xi)$ ?

#### APPENDIX A. PERTURBED CONTACT ACTION FUNCTIONAL

In this section, for readers' convenience, we summarize the definition and the first variation formula for the *dynamical* version of the contact action functional borrowing the expositions from [Ohd, Oh22b, OY].

We start with the definition of perturbed action integrals associated to general contact Hamiltonian  $H = H(t, x)$ . We first recall the standard contact action functional

$$\mathcal{A}(\gamma) = \int \gamma^* \lambda$$

associated to the contact form  $\lambda$  (associated to  $H = 0$ ) in contact geometry.

Then we recall the crucial notion of the *perturbed action* of a path that is introduced in [Oh21a, Introduction] which is relevant to the global study of perturbed contact instantons (1.5).

**Definition A.1** (Perturbed action functional). Let  $H = H(t, x)$  be a contact Hamiltonian and recall  $\phi_H^t = \psi_H^t(\psi_H^1)^{-1}$ . We define a functional  $\mathcal{A}_H : \mathcal{L}(R_0, R_1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\mathcal{A}_H(\gamma) := \int_{\gamma} e^{g(\phi_H^t)^{-1}(\gamma(t))} \gamma^*(\lambda + H dt) \left( = \int_{\gamma} e^{g(\phi_H^t)^{-1}(\gamma(t))} \gamma^* \lambda_H \right) \quad (\text{A.1})$$

for any smooth path  $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ . When  $H = 0$ , we write  $\mathcal{A}_0 = \mathcal{A}$ .

Then we have the following first variation formula.

**Proposition A.2** (Proposition 2.3 [Ohd]). *For any vector field  $\eta$  along  $\gamma$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \mathcal{A}_H(\gamma)(\eta) &= \int_0^1 e^{g_{(\phi_H^t)^{-1}(\gamma(t))}} (d\lambda(\dot{\gamma} - X_H(t, \gamma(t)), \eta)) dt \\ &\quad + \lambda(\eta(1)) - e^{-g_{\psi_H^1((\psi_H^1)^{-1}(\gamma(0)))}} \lambda(\eta(0)). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

When we are given a pair  $(R_0, R_1)$  of Legendrian submanifolds, we can consider the path space

$$\mathcal{L}(R_0, R_1) = \mathcal{L}(M; R_0, R_1) := \{\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow M \mid \gamma(0) \in R_0, \gamma(1) \in R_1\}$$

and the restriction of  $\mathcal{A}$  thereto. An immediate corollary of this proposition is that the critical point equation of the action functional *under the Legendrian boundary condition* is precisely

$$(\dot{\gamma}(t) - X_H(t, \gamma(t)))^\pi = 0,$$

i.e.,  $\dot{\gamma}(t) - X_H(t, \gamma(t)) = a(t)R_\lambda(\gamma(t))$  for some function  $a = a(t)$ . (See Proposition 2.5 [Ohd] for some relevant discussion on the function  $a$ .)

Then the following identity

$$E_{H,J}^\pi(u) = \mathcal{A}_H(u(+\infty)) - \mathcal{A}_H(u(-\infty)) \quad (\text{A.3})$$

is proved in [Ohd, Theorem 3.10] for any finite energy perturbed contact instanton  $u$ .

## APPENDIX B. AUTOMATIC INTERIOR EVALUATION TRANSVERSALITY AT CONSTANT MAPS

In this section, we give the proof of Proposition 7.7 for the general pair  $(M, R)$  of compact Legendrian submanifold  $R$  in general contact manifold  $M$ .

Then essentially the same scheme of the proof used in [Oh15], which in turn follows that of [OZ09, Oh11], applies to the study of the continuation map version of the perturbed contact instanton equation

$$\begin{cases} (du - X_{H^\times}(u) dt - X_G(u) ds)^\pi(0,1) = 0, \\ d(e^{g_{H^\times}(u)}(u^* \lambda + u^* H^\times dt + u^* G d\tau) \circ j) = 0, \\ u(\tau, 0) \in R, u(\tau, 1) \in R. \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

given in (1.9) where we have

$$G = G(\tau, t, x) = \text{Dev}_\lambda \left( \tau \mapsto \psi_H^{\chi(\tau)t} \right) (x) = \chi'(\tau)tH(t, x).$$

Recall that we consider *curvature-free* family of the Hamiltonian given by

$$H^s(t, x) = \text{Dev}_\lambda(t \mapsto \psi_H^{st}).$$

with the standing hypothesis on  $H$  satisfying  $\psi_H^1(R) = R$ .

We need to study how the image of the universal parameterized evaluation map  $\text{Ev}^+$  map varies when  $H$  varies for given  $(J, j)$ . We will closely follow the off-shell framework and the argument of [OZ09], [Oh15] to which we refer readers for further details, *which considers the case when  $J$  varies but  $H$  is not involved*. In the present case, we vary  $H$  which is crucial to obtain the automatic transversality at an interior marked point.

Consider the marked deformation-cobordism moduli space  $\mathcal{M}^{\text{para}}(M, \lambda; R, H)$  from (3.14)

$$\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{para}}(M, R; J, H) := \bigcup_{K \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} \{K\} \times \mathcal{M}_{1;K}(M, R; J, H) \quad (\text{B.2})$$

with no boundary marked point, where

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{M}_{1;K}(M, R; J, H) \\ &= \{(u, z^+) \mid u \in \mathcal{M}^K(M, R; J, H), z^+ \in \{t = 1/2\}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Then we consider the union

$$\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{univ}}(M, R; J) := \bigcup_{H \in C^\infty([0,1] \times M, \mathbb{R})} \{K\} \times \mathcal{M}_{1;K}^{\text{para}}(M, R; J, H) \quad (\text{B.4})$$

and the map

$$\aleph_0^{\text{univ}} : \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{univ}}(M, R; J) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^{\pi(0,1)} \times M$$

given by

$$\aleph_0^{\text{univ}}(H, J, (j, u), z^+) = (\Upsilon(H, J, (j, u)), u(z^+)) \quad (\text{B.5})$$

where we define

$$d_{H,(j,J)}^\pi u := (du - X_{H^\times}(u) dt - X_G(u) ds)^\pi.$$

We consider the bundle

$$\mathcal{H}^{\pi(0,1)} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_1^{\text{univ}}(M, R; J).$$

More explicitly

$$\mathcal{H}^{\pi(0,1)} := \left\{ (\eta, H, J, (j, u), z^+) \mid \eta \in \mathcal{H}_{(H,J,(j,u))}^{\pi(0,1)} \right\}$$

Then we consider the product  $\mathcal{H}_{(H,J,(j,u))}^{\pi(0,1)} \times M$  regarding it as a bundle over  $\mathcal{F}_1^{\text{univ}}(M, R; J)$ ,

$$(\eta, q; H, J, (j, u), z^+) \mapsto (H, J, (j, u), z^+)$$

whose fiber at  $(H, J, (j, u), z^+)$  is given by

$$\mathcal{H}_{(H,J,(j,u))}^{\pi(0,1)} \times M.$$

Then the above map  $\aleph_0^{\text{univ}}$  defines a section the (fiber) product of the *section*  $\Upsilon$  of this vector bundle and the evaluation map  $\text{Ev}^+$ , i.e.,  $\aleph_0 = \Upsilon \times \text{Ev}^+$ .

Now assume that  $u = u_q$  is a constant map valued at  $q \in M$ . Then the above reduces to

$$\aleph_0^{\text{univ}}(H, J, (j, u_q), z^+) = \left( \left( A_J^{\pi(0,1)}(q), 0 \right), \psi_H^t(q) \right) \quad (\text{B.6})$$

where  $A_J^{\pi(0,1)}(q)$  is an element in  $\Lambda_J^{\pi(0,1)}(\Xi)$  given by the following explicit formula

$$A_J^{\pi(0,1)}(q) = (X_{H^\times}(q) dt - X_G(q) d\tau)^{\pi(0,1)}.$$

By linearizing  $\aleph_0$  at  $(J, H, (j, u = u_q), z^+)$ , we obtain

$$D\aleph_0^{\text{univ}}(H, J, (j, u_q), z^+)(h, B, (0, \xi_q), X_{h_t}(q)).$$

Then we obtain the subspace

$$W_q := \left\{ X_{h^\times}(q) \in T_q M \mid h \in C^\infty([0,1] \times M, \mathbb{R}), t = \frac{1}{2} \right\}.$$



As usual, we write  $h_t := h(t, \cdot)$ . By definition, at  $t = \frac{1}{2}$ , we have the expression

$$X_{h_{1/2}^{X_K(\tau)}}(q) = X_{h_{1/2}^{X_K(\tau)}}(q).$$

This reduces to  $X_h(q)$  on the region  $|\tau| \leq K$  of the domain  $\mathbb{R} \times [0, 1]$  where  $z^+ = (\tau^+, 1/2)$  is located. It follows from the ampleness of the set of contact Hamiltonian vector fields that  $W_q$  covers the whole space  $T_q M$  by varying the time-dependent Hamiltonian  $h = h(t, x)$ . This finishes the proof.

## REFERENCES

- [Abb04] C. Abbas, *The chord problem and a new method of filling by pseudoholomorphic curves*, Internat. Math. Res. (2004), no. 18, 913–927.
- [ACH05] C. Abbas, K. Cieliebak, and H. Hofer, *The weinstein conjecture for planar contact structures in dimension three*, Comment. Math. Helv. **80** (2005), 771–793.
- [AFM15] P. Albers, U. Fuchs, and W. J. Merry, *Orderability and the Weinstein conjecture*, Compos. Math. **151** (2015), no. 2, 2251–2272.
- [AFM17] ———, *Positive loops and  $L^\infty$ -contact systolic inequalities*, Selecta Math. (N.S.) **23** (2017), no. 4, 2491–2521.
- [AM13] P. Albers and W. J. Merry, *Translated points and Rabinowitz Floer homology*, J. Fixed Point Theory Appl. **13** (2013), no. 1, 201–214.
- [Arn86] V. I. Arnol'd, *The first steps of symplectic topology*, Uspekhi Mat. Nauk **41** (1986), no. 6(252), 3–18, 229. MR 890489 (89d:58034)
- [CGH16] Daniel Cristofaro-Gardiner and Michael Hutchings, *From one Reeb orbit to two*, J. Differential Geom. **102** (2016), no. 1, 25–36.
- [CGHP19] D. Cristofaro-Gardiner, M. Hutchings, and D. Pomerleano, *Torsion contact forms in three dimensions have two or infinitely many Reeb orbits*, Geom. Topol. **23** (2019), no. 7, 3601–3645.
- [CH] Dylan Cant and Jacob Hedicke, *On the rigidity of translated points*, preprint, 2024, arXiv:2409.08962.
- [Chi17] Sheng-Fu Chiu, *Nonsqueezing property of contact balls*, Duke Math. J. **166** (2017), no. 4, 605–655.
- [DO] Hyun-Seok Do and Y. G. Oh, *Thermodynamic reduction of contact dynamics*, submitted for the special issue of Entropy on “Hamiltonian Systems–Applications and Theory”, edited by A. Bravetti, M. de León, D. A. Garcia-Chung, and M. Seri, arXiv:2412.19319 [math.DS].
- [EKP06] Y. Eliashberg, S. S. Kim, and L. Polterovich, *Geometry of contact transformations and domains: orderability versus squeezing*, Geom. Topol. **10** (2006), 1635–1747.
- [Eli00] L. Eliashberg, Y.; Polterovich, *Partially ordered groups and geometry of contact transformations*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **10** (2000), no. 6, 1448–1476.
- [FOOO09a] K. Fukaya, Y.-G. Oh, H. Ohta, and K. Ono, *Lagrangian intersection Floer theory: anomaly and obstruction. part i.*, AMS/IP Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 46.1 & 46.2., American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI; International Press, Somerville, MA, 2009.
- [FOOO09b] ———, *Lagrangian intersection Floer theory: anomaly and obstruction. part ii.*, AMS/IP Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 46.1 & 46.2., American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI; International Press, Somerville, MA, 2009.
- [Fra92] J. Franks, *Geodesics on  $S^2$  and periodic points of annulus homeomorphisms*, Invent. Math. **108** (1992), 403–418.
- [Fra16] Maia Fraser, *Contact non-squeezing at large scale in  $\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1$* , Internat. J. Math. **27** (2016), no. 13, 1650107, 25 pp.
- [Hof93] H. Hofer, *Pseudoholomorphic curves in symplectizations with applications to the Weinstein conjecture in dimension three*, Invent. Math. **114** (1993), 515–563.
- [Hof00] ———, *Holomorphic curves and real three-dimensional dynamics*, Geom. Func. Anal. (2000), 674–704, Special Volume, Part II.
- [HT11] M. Hutchings and C. H. Taubes, *Proof of the Arnold chord conjecture in three dimensions 1*, Math. Res. Lett. **18** (2011), no. 2, 295–313.

- [HT13] ———, *Proof of the Arnold chord conjecture in three dimensions II*, *Geom. Topol.* **17** (2013), no. 5, 2601–2688.
- [KM97] M. Kontsevich and Yu. Manin, *Gromov-Witten classes, quantum cohomology, and enumerative geometry*, *AMS/IP Stud. Adv. Math.*, vol. 1, pp. 607–653, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1997.
- [Moh01] K. Mohnke, *Holomorphic disks and the chord conjecture*, *Ann. of Math. (2)* **154** (2001), no. 1, 219–222.
- [MS15] S. Müller and P. Spaeth, *Topological contact dynamics I: symplectization and applications of the energy-capacity inequality*, *Adv. Geom.* **15** (2015), no. 3, 349–380.
- [Oha] Y.-G. Oh, *Bordered contact instantons and their Fredholm theory and generic transversalities*, to appear in the proceedings of Bumsig Kim’s Memorial Conference, October 2021, KIAS, arXiv:2209.03548(v2).
- [Ohb] ———, *Existence of two in Weinstein’s conjecture and Arnold’s chord conjecture*, in preparation.
- [Ohc] ———, *Geometric analysis of perturbed contact instantons with Legendrian boundary conditions*, preprint, arXiv:2205.12351.
- [Ohd] ———, *Geometric analysis of perturbed contact instantons with Legendrian boundary conditions*, preprint, arXiv:2205-12351.
- [Ohe] ———, *Rational contact instantons and Legendrian Fukaya category*, preprint 2024, arXiv:2411.13830.
- [Oh97] ———, *Gromov-Floer theory and disjunction energy of compact Lagrangian embeddings*, *Math. Res. Lett.* **4** (1997), no. 6, 895–905.
- [Oh11] ———, *Higher jet evaluation transversality of J-holomorphic curves*, *J. Korean Math. Soc.* **48** (2011), no. 2, 341–365.
- [Oh15] ———, *Symplectic Topology and Floer Homology. vol. 1.*, *New Mathematical Monographs*, 28., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge., 2015.
- [Oh21a] ———, *Contact Hamiltonian dynamics and perturbed contact instantons with Legendrian boundary condition*, preprint, arXiv:2103.15390(v2), 2021.
- [Oh21b] ———, *Geometry and analysis of contact instantons and entanglement of Legendrian links I*, preprint, arXiv:2111.02597, 2021.
- [Oh22a] ———, *Contact instantons, anti-contact involution and proof of Shelukhin’s conjecture*, preprint, arXiv:2212.03557, 2022.
- [Oh22b] ———, *Gluing theories of contact instantons and of pseudoholomorphic curves in SFT*, preprint, arXiv:2205.00370, 2022.
- [Oh23] ———, *Analysis of contact Cauchy-Riemann maps III: energy, bubbling and Fredholm theory*, *Bulletin of Math. Sci.* **13** (2023), no. 1, Paper No. 2250011, 61 pp.
- [Oh24] ———, *Lagrangian Floer theory and its deformations—an introduction to filtered Fukaya category*, *KIAS Springer Ser. Math.*, vol. 2, Springer, Singapore, 2024, xvii+416 pp.
- [OM07] Y.-G. Oh and S. Müller, *The group of Hamiltonian homeomorphisms and  $C^0$ -symplectic topology*, *J. Symplectic Geom.* **5** (2007), no. 2, 167–219.
- [OW14] Y.-G. Oh and R. Wang, *Canonical connection on contact manifolds*, *Real and Complex Submanifolds*, *Springer Proceedings in Mathematics & Statistics*, vol. 106, 2014, (arXiv:1212.4817 in its full version), pp. 43–63.
- [OW18] ———, *Analysis of contact Cauchy-Riemann maps I: A priori  $C^k$  estimates and asymptotic convergence*, *Osaka J. Math.* **55** (2018), no. 4, 647–679.
- [OY] Y.-G. Oh and Seung Ook Yu, *Legendrian contact instanton homology and its spectral invariants on the one-jet bundle*, preprint, 2022.
- [OY24] ———, *Contact instantons with Legendrian boundary condition: a priori estimates, asymptotic convergence and index formula*, *Internat. J. Math.* **35** (2024), no. 7, Paper No. 2450019, 60 pp.
- [OZ09] Y.-G. Oh and Ke Zhu, *Embedding property of J-holomorphic curves in Calabi-Yau manifolds for generic J*, *Asian J. Math.* **13** (2009), no. 3, 323–340.
- [Pol01] Leonid Polterovich, *The geometry of the group of symplectic diffeomorphisms*, *Lectures Math. ETH Zürich*, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2001, xii+132 pp.
- [Rab78] Paul H. Rabinowitz, *Periodic solutions of Hamiltonian systems*, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **31** (1978), no. 2, 157.

- [San11] S. Sandon, *Contact homology, capacity and non-squeezing in  $\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1$  via generating functions*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **61** (2011), 145–185.
- [San12] ———, *On iterated translated points for contactomorphisms of  $\mathbb{R}^{2n+1}$  and  $\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times S^1$* , Internat. J. Math. **23** (2012), no. 2, 1250042, 14 pp.
- [She17] E. Shelukhin, *The Hofer norm of a contactomorphism*, J. Symplectic Geom. **15** (2017), no. 4, 1173–1208.
- [She22] ———, *On the Hofer-Zehnder conjecture*, Ann. of Math. (2) **195** (2022), no. 3, 775–839.
- [Tau07] C. H. Taubes, *The Seiberg-Witten equations and the Weinstein conjecture*, Geom. Topo. **11** (2007), 2117–2202.
- [Vit87] Claude Viterbo, *A proof of Weinstein's conjecture in  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$* , Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **4** (1987), no. 4, 337–356.
- [Wei78] Alan Weinstein, *Periodic orbits for convex Hamiltonian systems*, Ann. of Math. (2) **108** (1978), no. 3, 507–518.
- [Wei79] ———, *On the hypotheses of Rabinowitz' periodic orbit theorems*, J. Differential Equations **33** (1979), no. 3, 353–358.

CENTER FOR GEOMETRY AND PHYSICS, INSTITUTE FOR BASIC SCIENCE (IBS), 77 CHEONGAM-RO, NAM-GU, POHANG-SI, GYEONGSANGBUK-DO, KOREA 790-784 & POSTECH, GYEONGSANGBUK-DO, KOREA

*Email address:* yongoh1@postech.ac.kr