

HYPERSYMPLECTIC STRUCTURES INVARIANT UNDER AN EFFECTIVE CIRCLE ACTION

JOEL FINE, WEIYONG HE, AND CHENGJIAN YAO

ABSTRACT. A hypersymplectic structure on a 4-manifold is a triple of symplectic forms for which any non-zero linear combination is again symplectic. In 2006 Donaldson conjectured that on a compact 4-manifold any hypersymplectic structure can be deformed through cohomologous hypersymplectic structures to a hyperkähler triple. We prove this under the assumption that the initial structure is invariant under an effective S^1 -action. In particular we show that the underlying 4-manifold is diffeomorphic to \mathbb{T}^4 .

1. INTRODUCTION

Let X be a 4-manifold. A *hypersymplectic structure* on X is a triple $\underline{\omega} = (\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3)$ of symplectic forms with the property that every non-zero linear combination $a^i \omega_i$ is again symplectic. (We use the summation convention throughout this article, summing repeated indices over 1,2,3.) In [3], Donaldson made the following conjecture (cf. [6, Conjecture 1.1]).

Conjecture 1.1. *Let $\underline{\omega} = (\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3)$ be a hypersymplectic structure on a compact 4-manifold X with $\int \omega_i \wedge \omega_j = 2\delta_{ij}$. Then $\underline{\omega}$ can be deformed through cohomologous hypersymplectic structures to the triple of Kähler forms coming from a hyperkähler metric on X . In particular, X is diffeomorphic to \mathbb{T}^4 or a K3 surface.*

This conjecture remains largely open. To place this conjecture in a broader context, note that a hypersymplectic manifold automatically has zero first Chern class (see, for example, the second page of [6]). The classification of symplectic 4-manifolds with $c_1 = 0$ is an important problem which, despite much progress, appears to be currently out of reach. Donaldson’s conjecture can be seen as a special and hopefully more tractable case of this much more difficult problem. In [6], the first and the third authors introduced a geometric flow, called the *hypersymplectic flow*, to attack Conjecture 1.1. The strategy is to evolve the given hypersymplectic structure in a canonical way towards a hyperkähler structure. The main problem is then to show that the flow exists for all time and converges to a hyperkähler structure. However, it is challenging to understand the long time existence and convergence of the flow in general, see [7]. To date, the flow has only been used to confirm the conjecture in very restricted and symmetric cases, with the main feature of either assuming an explicit \mathbb{T}^3 -symmetry on \mathbb{T}^4 [9, 5], or assuming the hypersymplectic structure is of “Kähler type” [11], as explained in [5, Section 1.3].

The main result of this paper is to prove Conjecture 1.1 in the special case when the hypersymplectic structure is invariant under an effective S^1 -action.

Theorem 1.2. *Let X be a compact smooth 4-manifold admitting a smooth hypersymplectic structure with $\int \omega_i \wedge \omega_j = 2\delta_{ij}$. Suppose moreover that $\underline{\omega}$ is invariant under an effective smooth*

S^1 -action. Then X is diffeomorphic to \mathbb{T}^4 . Moreover, there is a linear isotopy from $\underline{\omega}$ to a hyperkähler triple through a family of hypersymplectic structures in the same cohomology class.

Our proof does not rely on the sophisticated machinery of the hypersymplectic flow. One difficult point in the proof of Donaldson's conjecture is that X must be shown to be diffeomorphic to either \mathbb{T}^4 or a $K3$ surface. Assume for the moment that the S^1 -action preserving $\underline{\omega}$ is free. Our first observation is the invariant hypersymplectic structure on X induces a flat Riemannian metric on X/S^1 , which is subsequently identified as a flat torus \mathbb{T}^3 . A topological argument then implies that $X \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^3$ is a trivial S^1 -bundle and so X is diffeomorphic to \mathbb{T}^4 .

Next, by exploiting the S^1 -symmetry and using the idea of a multi-moment map and the generalized Gibbons-Hawking construction for hypersymplectic structure introduced by Donaldson in [4], we deform the hypersymplectic structure on \mathbb{T}^4 to a hyperkähler structure via *linear interpolation*. Finally, the assumption of *freeness* of the action is weakened to *effectiveness* by combining the known homological information for symplectic Calabi-Yau surfaces [10] and the observation that any possible zero of the generating vector field must be isolated.

Despite the fact we have confirmed Conjecture 1.1 in this symmetric case via a direct approach, we still believe the hypersymplectic flow is the most suitable method to attack the conjecture in general.

Funding. This work was supported by the ‘‘Excellence of Science’’ [40007524 to J.F.]; the Fund for Scientific Research [PDR T.0082.21 to J.F.]; and the National Natural Science Foundation of China [12401071 to C.Y.].

Acknowledgments. The third author would like to thank Andries Salm for useful discussions.

2. HYPERSYMPLECTIC STRUCTURE INVARIANT UNDER A FREE S^1 -ACTION

Let X be a compact smooth 4-manifold with a hypersymplectic structure $\underline{\omega} = (\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3)$. In this section we assume that $\underline{\omega}$ is invariant under a *free* S^1 -action, generated by the nowhere-vanishing vector field \mathbf{v} on X .

For any $(a^1, a^2, a^3) \in \mathbf{R}^3 \setminus \{0\}$, the 2-form $a^i \omega_i$ is non-degenerate at any point of X (by the definition of hypersymplectic structure). This implies that the 1-form $a^i \iota_{\mathbf{v}} \omega_i$ is nonzero at any point of X . The condition $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{v}} \omega_i = d\iota_{\mathbf{v}} \omega_i = 0$ now implies that the three 1-forms $\alpha^i := \iota_{\mathbf{v}} \omega_i$ (with $i = 1, 2, 3$) are closed on X . Following Donaldson [4], we use this triple of closed 1-forms to describe the triple $\underline{\omega}$ in a canonical way.

Lemma 2.1. *There exists a unique tuple $(\alpha, \sigma) = (\alpha, (\sigma_{ij})_{3 \times 3}) \in \Gamma(T^*X) \times \Gamma(\underline{\text{Sym}}^2 \mathbf{R}^3)$ satisfying $\alpha(\mathbf{v}) \equiv 1$ on X such that*

$$(2.1) \quad \omega_i = \alpha \wedge \alpha^i + \sum_{(pqr)=(123)} \sigma_{ip} \alpha^q \wedge \alpha^r, \quad i = 1, 2, 3,$$

where $\underline{\text{Sym}}^2 \mathbf{R}^3$ denotes the trivial bundle of symmetric 3×3 matrices on X .

Proof. Firstly, notice that $\alpha^i(\mathbf{v}) = \omega_i(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}) = 0$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Fix any $x \in X$, take any $\alpha_x \in T_x^* X$ such that $\{\alpha_x, \alpha_x^1, \alpha_x^2, \alpha_x^3\}$ is a basis of $T_x^* X$ and $\alpha_x(\mathbf{v}_x) = 1$. The set

$$\{\alpha_x \wedge \alpha_x^1, \alpha_x \wedge \alpha_x^2, \alpha_x \wedge \alpha_x^3, \alpha_x^2 \wedge \alpha_x^3, \alpha_x^3 \wedge \alpha_x^1, \alpha_x^1 \wedge \alpha_x^2\}$$

is then a basis of $\Lambda^2 T_x^* X$. There exists a 3×3 matrix $A = (A_{ij})$ such that

$$\omega_i|_x = \alpha_x \wedge \alpha_x^i + \sum_{(pqr)=(123)} A_{ip} \alpha_x^q \wedge \alpha_x^r.$$

Let $\sigma_{ip} = \frac{1}{2}(A_{ip} + A_{pi})$ and $C_k = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{ijk}A_{ij}$, then $A_{ip} = \sigma_{ip} + \epsilon_{ipq}C_q$ and as a consequence,

$$\omega_i|_x = \left(\alpha_x + C_k \alpha_x^k\right) \wedge \alpha_x^i + \sum_{(pqr)=(123)} \sigma_{ip} \alpha_x^q \wedge \alpha_x^r$$

with $\sigma_{ij} = \sigma_{ji}$ and $(\alpha_x + C_k \alpha_x^k)(\mathbf{v}_x) = 1$. This means we can write ω_i 's in the form claimed in the lemma.

Next, we show such decomposition is unique. Suppose $\tilde{\alpha}_x \in T_x^* X$ and $\tilde{\sigma} = (\tilde{\sigma}_{ij})$ satisfying $\tilde{\sigma}_{ij} = \tilde{\sigma}_{ji}$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_x(\mathbf{v}_x) = 1$ are another choice of data for which

$$\omega_i|_x = \tilde{\alpha}_x \wedge \alpha_x^i + \sum_{(pqr)=(123)} \tilde{\sigma}_{ip} \alpha_x^q \wedge \alpha_x^r, \quad i = 1, 2, 3.$$

Let $\tilde{\alpha}_x = \alpha_x + \tilde{C}_q \alpha_x^q$. Since $\{\alpha_x \wedge \alpha_x^1, \alpha_x \wedge \alpha_x^2, \alpha_x \wedge \alpha_x^3, \alpha_x^2 \wedge \alpha_x^3, \alpha_x^3 \wedge \alpha_x^1, \alpha_x^1 \wedge \alpha_x^2\}$ is a basis of $\Lambda^2 T_x^* X$, we have $\tilde{\sigma}_{ij} + \epsilon_{ijk} \tilde{C}_k = \sigma_{ij}$ which implies $\tilde{C}_k = 0$ and consequently $\tilde{\alpha} = \alpha, \tilde{\sigma} = \sigma$. \square

We will use the notation $\alpha^{ij} = \alpha^i \wedge \alpha^j$ and $\alpha^{123} = \alpha^1 \wedge \alpha^2 \wedge \alpha^3$. We recall from [6] that a hypersymplectic structure $\underline{\omega}$ determines a Riemannian metric $g_{\underline{\omega}}$ on X , via the formula

$$(2.2) \quad g_{\underline{\omega}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w}) \mu_{\underline{\omega}} = \frac{1}{6} \epsilon^{ijk} \iota_{\mathbf{u}} \omega_i \wedge \iota_{\mathbf{w}} \omega_j \wedge \omega_k.$$

We write $\mu_{\underline{\omega}}$ for the volume form of this metric. We also use the notation from [6] that $Q_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} g_{\underline{\omega}}(\omega_i, \omega_j)$. The metric is chosen so that the ω_i 's are all self-dual, which fixes the conformal structure. The fact that $\underline{\omega}$ is hypersymplectic implies that Q is positive-definite, and the volume form is chosen so that $\det Q = 1$.

Remark 2.2. Even though the hypersymplectic structure $\underline{\omega}$ naturally orients X^4 and the S^1 -action preserves this orientation, it is still possible that $\alpha, \alpha^1, \alpha^2, \alpha^3$ is a *negatively* oriented coframe. In this case, the hypersymplectic structure $\omega_2, \omega_1, \omega_3$, formed by swapping the first two symplectic forms, will be a new hypersymplectic structure (defining the same orientation on X^4 as the original one) that is invariant under the given S^1 -action, for which $\alpha, \alpha^1, \alpha^2, \alpha^3$ is *positively* oriented. We assume from now on that $\underline{\omega}$ has the property that $\alpha, \alpha^1, \alpha^2, \alpha^3$ is positively oriented.

With this in hand, we now relate $g_{\underline{\omega}}$, $\mu_{\underline{\omega}}$ and Q to the data (α, σ) from Lemma 2.1.

Lemma 2.3. Write $V = (\det \sigma)^{\frac{1}{3}}$. Then

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \mu_{\underline{\omega}} &= V \alpha \wedge \alpha^{123}, \quad Q_{ij} = V^{-1} \sigma_{ij}, \\ g_{\underline{\omega}} &= V^{-1} \alpha^2 + V Q_{ij}^{-1} \alpha^i \otimes \alpha^j, \end{aligned}$$

where Q_{ij}^{-1} is the (ij) -th entry of the matrix Q^{-1} . In particular, $V > 0$ and $(\sigma_{ij}) > 0$ on X .

Proof. These are direct computations. By Lemma 2.1,

$$(2.4) \quad \omega_i \wedge \omega_j = 2\sigma_{ij}\alpha \wedge \alpha^{123},$$

which, since $\underline{\omega}$ is hypersymplectic and $\alpha, \alpha^1, \alpha^2, \alpha^3$ is positively oriented, shows that $(\sigma_{ij}) > 0$. We now have that $Q_{ij} = V^{-1}\sigma_{ij}$ with $V = (\det \sigma)^{\frac{1}{3}}$ (so that $\det Q = 1$). It also follows that $\mu_{\underline{\omega}} = V\alpha \wedge \alpha^{123}$.

The 1-forms $\alpha, \alpha^1, \alpha^2, \alpha^3$ give a basis of the cotangent space of X at any point. We let $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{v}_3$ be its dual basis on the tangent space. We can directly compute the inner products between these vectors by the formula (2.2) for $g_{\underline{\omega}}$. This gives the claimed expression for $g_{\underline{\omega}}$. \square

At this stage we haven't checked that the data α, σ is actually smooth. We will do this in the next Lemma. First, we introduce some notation. Write $Y = X/S^1$. Since the S^1 -action is free, Y is a compact 3-manifold and the quotient map $X \rightarrow Y$ is a principal S^1 -bundle. We write $\mathcal{V} \leq TX$ for the vertical tangent bundle. We use the metric $g_{\underline{\omega}}$ to take the horizontal complement H of \mathcal{V} . Since H is S^1 -invariant (because the metric itself is) it defines an S^1 -connection in $X \rightarrow Y$.

Lemma 2.4. *The 1-forms $\alpha, \alpha^1, \alpha^2, \alpha^3$ and the 3×3 matrix-valued function (σ_{ij}) uniquely determined by $\underline{\omega}$ and \mathbf{v} are smooth.*

Proof. Since \mathbf{v} is smooth, the 1-forms $\alpha^i = \iota_{\mathbf{v}}\omega_i$ are also smooth for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Write $A_{\underline{\omega}}: TX \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ for the vertical projection map of the connection in $X \rightarrow Y$. Then, for $\mathbf{w} \in TX$,

$$(2.5) \quad A_{\underline{\omega}}(\mathbf{w}) = \alpha(\mathbf{w})\mathbf{v}.$$

This can be seen as follows: for $\mathbf{w} \in H_{\underline{\omega}}$, $g_{\underline{\omega}}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}) = V^{-1}\alpha(\mathbf{w}) = 0$ by Lemma 2.3 and the fact that $\alpha^i(\mathbf{v}) = 0$; for $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{v}$, $A_{\underline{\omega}}(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{v} = \alpha(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{v}$. Now since \mathbf{v} is smooth and nowhere vanishing, and A is smooth, it follows that α is smooth as well.

The formula $\mu_{\underline{\omega}} = V\alpha \wedge \alpha^{123}$ shows that V is smooth and now the formula for Q implies that $\sigma = VQ$ is also smooth. \square

Definition 2.5 (The structural data). The tuple $\{\alpha, \alpha^i, (\sigma_{ij})\}$, uniquely associated to $\underline{\omega}$ in Lemma 2.1, is called the *structural data* of $\underline{\omega}$.

Lemma 2.6. *We have $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{v}}\alpha = 0 = \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{v}}\alpha_i$.*

Proof. Recall that $\alpha^i = \iota_{\mathbf{v}}\omega_i$. So $\iota_{\mathbf{v}}\alpha^i = 0$. Since $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{v}}\omega_i = 0$ we see that $d\alpha_i = 0$ and hence $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{v}}\alpha^i = 0$. Next note that, since α is a connection 1-form in $X \rightarrow Y$, $d\alpha$ is pulled back from Y . It follows that $\iota_{\mathbf{v}}d\alpha = 0$. At the same time, $\iota_{\mathbf{v}}\alpha = 1$ so $d(\iota_{\mathbf{v}}\alpha) = 0$ and hence $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{v}}\alpha = 0$. \square

Remark 2.7. If $P \in \mathrm{SL}(3, \mathbf{R})$ is a constant matrix, then $\tilde{\omega}_i = P_{ij}\omega_j$ is a new hypersymplectic structure on X whose structural data is related to that of $\underline{\omega}$ by

$$\tilde{\omega}_i = \alpha \wedge \tilde{\alpha}^i + \sum_{(pqr)=(123)} \tilde{\sigma}_{ip}\tilde{\alpha}^q \wedge \tilde{\alpha}^r$$

with

$$\tilde{\alpha}^i = P_{ij}\alpha^j, \quad \tilde{\sigma}_{ip} = (P\sigma P^T)_{ip}.$$

Example 2.8. In [5], a special type of hypersymplectic structure was introduced on \mathbb{T}^4 , which is invariant under a \mathbb{T}^3 -action. Using affine coordinates $(x^0, x^1, x^2, x^3) \mapsto (e^{ix_0}, e^{ix_1}, e^{ix_2}, e^{ix_3})$ on \mathbb{T}^4 , such structures have the shape

$$\omega_i = dx^0 \wedge \alpha_{ip} dx^p + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{ijk} dx^j \wedge dx^k,$$

where (α_{ij}) is a symmetric 3×3 positive definite matrix-valued function of x^0 . This structure is \mathbb{T}^3 -invariant where \mathbb{T}^3 acts as

$$(e^{it_1}, e^{it_2}, e^{it_3}) \cdot (e^{ix_0}, e^{ix_1}, e^{ix_2}, e^{ix_3}) = (e^{ix_0}, e^{i(t_1+x_1)}, e^{i(t_2+x_2)}, e^{i(t_3+x_3)}).$$

The structure $\underline{\omega}$ is S^1 -invariant, for three different S^1 -actions, acting in the obvious way on the three S^1 factors of \mathbb{T}^4 . It fits into the current framework. For instance, if we take the action generated by $\mathbf{v} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^3}$, then the structural data of $\underline{\omega}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= dx^3 + \frac{\alpha_{13}}{\alpha_{33}} dx^1 + \frac{\alpha_{23}}{\alpha_{33}} dx^2, \\ \alpha^1 &= -dx^2 - \alpha_{13} dx^0, \\ \alpha^2 &= dx^1 - \alpha_{23} dx^0, \\ \alpha^3 &= -\alpha_{33} dx^0, \\ \sigma_{ij} &= \frac{\alpha_{ij}}{\alpha_{33}}. \end{aligned}$$

3. LINEAR INTERPOLATION OF HYPERSYMPLECTIC STRUCTURES

3.1. Uniformizing hypersymplectic structures invariant under a free S^1 -action. We begin by showing that, when the circle action is free, the 4-manifold X is diffeomorphic to \mathbb{T}^4 .

Theorem 3.1. *Let X^4 be a compact smooth 4-manifold admitting a smooth hypersymplectic structure which is invariant under a free smooth S^1 -action, then $Y^3 := X^4/S^1$ is diffeomorphic to \mathbb{T}^3 and X^4 is S^1 -equivariantly diffeomorphic to \mathbb{T}^4 , where S^1 acts on \mathbb{T}^4 by rotation on the first circle factor.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.6, the forms α_i are S^1 -invariant and so are pulled back to X from Y . This means that the symmetric $(0, 2)$ tensor

$$g := \alpha^1 \otimes \alpha^1 + \alpha^2 \otimes \alpha^2 + \alpha^3 \otimes \alpha^3$$

defines a Riemannian metric on the compact manifold Y . The fact $d\alpha^i = 0$ implies g is a flat Riemannian metric and $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3\}$ is a global parallel coframe. This means (Y^3, g) has trivial holonomy group. By the classical theorems of Bieberbach and Auslander-Kuranish [2] (which imply $\pi_1(Y)$ is generated by three linearly independent pure translations of \mathbb{R}^3), or the classification of compact flat Riemannian 3-manifolds [12], we conclude that Y is diffeomorphic to \mathbb{T}^3 .

We now rule out the possibility that $X \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^3$ is a non-trivial S^1 -bundle. We first show that $b_1(X) = 4$. For this we use a deep result from 4-dimensional symplectic topology, proved in [10] which states that for a compact symplectic 4-manifold with $c_1 = 0$,

- $b^+ \leq 3$

- $b_1 \leq 4$
- The signature τ is -16 , -8 or 0 .

The ω_i 's are 3 linearly independent closed self-dual 2-forms and so we see that $b^+ = 3$. Since ν is nowhere vanishing, $0 = \chi = 2 - 2b_1 + b_2$ and so from $b_1 \leq 4$ we conclude $b_2 \leq 6$. This means that $\tau = 0$ and so $b^- = 3$, hence $b_2 = 6$ and so $b_1 = 4$.

We now complete the proof by showing that the first Chern class of the principal S^1 -bundle $X \rightarrow Y$ vanishes. Applying the Gysin sequence of cohomology groups (with integral coefficients) to the principal bundle $\pi: X \rightarrow Y$ we obtain the following long exact sequence

$$(3.1) \quad H^1(Y) \xrightarrow{\pi^*} H^1(X) \xrightarrow{\pi_*} H^0(\mathbb{T}^3) \xrightarrow{c_1 \cup \cdot} H^2(\mathbb{T}^3) \xrightarrow{\pi^*} H^2(X) \rightarrow \dots$$

where $c_1 = c_1(X \rightarrow Y) \in H^2(Y)$. If $c_1 \neq 0$, then the map $c_1 \cup \cdot : H^0(\mathbb{T}^3) \rightarrow H^2(\mathbb{T}^3)$ is injective which implies the previous map $\pi_* : H^1(X) \rightarrow H^0(\mathbb{T}^3)$ is zero. This leads to a contradiction since $\pi^* : H^1(\mathbb{T}^3) \rightarrow H^1(X)$ is surjective and $b_1(\mathbb{T}^3) = 3$ but $b_1(X) = 4$. \square

Remark 3.2. It is shown by Friedl and Vidussi [8, Theorem 3] that a compact 4-manifold admitting a free S^1 -action supports a symplectic structure with trivial canonical class if and only if it is a \mathbb{T}^2 -bundle over \mathbb{T}^2 . The above theorem can be seen as a refinement of this in the special case of an invariant hypersymplectic structure.

3.2. Linear interpolation to a hyperkähler structure. We now explain how to interpolate between an S^1 -invariant hypersymplectic structure on \mathbb{T}^4 to a hyperkähler structure. We will show later how to ensure this can be done without changing the cohomology classes of the ω_i 's.

Let S^1 act on \mathbb{T}^4 in the standard way that rotates the first factor, giving a trivial principal S^1 -bundle $\pi: \mathbb{T}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^3$. We use the coordinate θ on the first factor of \mathbb{T}^4 . Let $\underline{\omega}$ be a hypersymplectic structure invariant under this S^1 -action, with canonical decomposition

$$(3.2) \quad \omega_i = \alpha \wedge \alpha^i + \sum_{(pqr)=(123)} \sigma_{ip} \alpha^q \wedge \alpha^r, \quad i = 1, 2, 3,$$

and $\alpha, \alpha^1, \alpha^2, \alpha^3$ being positively oriented. We have $\alpha = d\theta + \beta$ for some 1-form β pulled back from \mathbb{T}^3 .

Consider any constant (3×3) -matrix \mathbf{B} with positive-definite symmetric part $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}$, and with its skew-symmetric part denoted by $\check{\mathbf{B}}$. The S^1 -invariant triple $\underline{\omega}^{\mathbf{B}} = (\omega_1^{\mathbf{B}}, \omega_2^{\mathbf{B}}, \omega_3^{\mathbf{B}})$ with

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \omega_i^{\mathbf{B}} &:= d\theta \wedge \alpha^i + \sum_{(pqr)=(123)} \mathbf{B}_{ip} \alpha^q \wedge \alpha^r \\ &= (d\theta + \check{\mathbf{B}}_{23} \alpha^1 + \check{\mathbf{B}}_{31} \alpha^2 + \check{\mathbf{B}}_{12} \alpha^3) \wedge \alpha^i + \sum_{(pqr)=(123)} \widehat{\mathbf{B}}_{ip} \alpha^q \wedge \alpha^r, \end{aligned}$$

satisfies

$$\omega_i^{\mathbf{B}} \wedge \omega_j^{\mathbf{B}} = 2\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_{ij} \alpha^{\mathbf{B}} \wedge \alpha^1 \wedge \alpha^2 \wedge \alpha^3$$

where $\alpha^{\mathbf{B}} = d\theta + \check{\mathbf{B}}_{23} \alpha^1 + \check{\mathbf{B}}_{31} \alpha^2 + \check{\mathbf{B}}_{12} \alpha^3$, and therefore $\underline{\omega}^{\mathbf{B}}$ is a hyperkähler structure on \mathbb{T}^4 . This is because the Q -matrix for $\underline{\omega}^{\mathbf{B}}$ is $\widehat{\mathbf{B}} / (\det \mathbf{B})^{\frac{1}{3}}$ is a constant matrix on \mathbb{T}^4 . So after acting on the $\omega_i^{\mathbf{B}}$ by a constant matrix $P \in \mathrm{SL}(3, \mathbf{R})$ we obtain a triple $\tilde{\omega}_i^{\mathbf{B}} = P_{ij} \omega_j^{\mathbf{B}}$ for which $\tilde{\omega}_i^{\mathbf{B}} \wedge \tilde{\omega}_j^{\mathbf{B}} = 2\delta_{ij} \mu$ for some volume form μ . It is a standard fact that this implies that $(\tilde{\omega}_1^{\mathbf{B}}, \tilde{\omega}_2^{\mathbf{B}}, \tilde{\omega}_3^{\mathbf{B}})$ is a hyperkähler triple. (See, for example, [6, Propositions 3.7 and 3.9].)

Proposition 3.3. *The linear interpolation*

$$(3.4) \quad \underline{\omega}^{\mathbf{B}}(s) := (1-s)\underline{\omega} + s\underline{\omega}^{\mathbf{B}}, \quad s \in [0, 1],$$

is a path of hypersymplectic structures joining $\underline{\omega}$ to the hyperkähler structure $\underline{\omega}^{\mathbf{B}}$.

Proof. The path $\underline{\omega}^{\mathbf{B}}(s)$ is explicitly given by

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \omega_i^{\mathbf{B}}(s) &= ((1-s)\alpha + s(d\theta + \check{\mathbf{B}}_{23}\alpha^1 + \check{\mathbf{B}}_{31}\alpha^2 + \check{\mathbf{B}}_{12}\alpha^3)) \wedge \alpha^i \\ &+ \sum_{(pqr)=(123)} \left((1-s)\sigma_{ip} + s\hat{\mathbf{B}}_{ip} \right) \alpha^q \wedge \alpha^r, \end{aligned}$$

which is a path of triples of S^1 -invariant closed 2-forms on \mathbb{T}^4 . Notice that

$$\omega_i^{\mathbf{B}}(s) \wedge \omega_j^{\mathbf{B}}(s) = 2\sigma_{ij}^{\mathbf{B}}(s)\alpha^{\mathbf{B}}(s) \wedge \alpha^1 \wedge \alpha^2 \wedge \alpha^3,$$

where $\sigma^{\mathbf{B}}(s) := (1-s)\sigma + s\hat{\mathbf{B}} > 0$ as σ and $\hat{\mathbf{B}}$ are both symmetric and positive-definite everywhere and $\alpha^{\mathbf{B}}(s) := (1-s)\alpha + s(d\theta + \check{\mathbf{B}}_{23}\alpha^1 + \check{\mathbf{B}}_{31}\alpha^2 + \check{\mathbf{B}}_{12}\alpha^3)$ satisfy

$$\alpha^{\mathbf{B}}(s) \wedge \alpha^1 \wedge \alpha^2 \wedge \alpha^3 = d\theta \wedge \alpha^1 \wedge \alpha^2 \wedge \alpha^3 > 0$$

with respect to the orientation determined by $\underline{\omega}$. \square

3.3. Preserving the cohomology classes. In order for $\underline{\omega}^{\mathbf{B}}(s)$ to stay inside the cohomology class of $\underline{\omega}$, we need to choose \mathbf{B} suitably.

Definition 3.4 (Period of hypersymplectic structure). The *period* of a hypersymplectic structure $\underline{\omega} = (\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3)$ on X^4 is defined to be $([\omega_1], [\omega_2], [\omega_3]) \in H^2(X^4; \mathbf{R}) \otimes \mathbf{R}^3$.

In the particular case $X^4 = \mathbb{T}^4$, let

$$g_0 = d\theta \otimes d\theta + \alpha^1 \otimes \alpha^1 + \alpha^2 \otimes \alpha^2 + \alpha^3 \otimes \alpha^3$$

be a flat Riemannian metric on X , then

$$d\theta \wedge \alpha^1, d\theta \wedge \alpha^2, d\theta \wedge \alpha^3, \alpha^2 \wedge \alpha^3, \alpha^3 \wedge \alpha^1, \alpha^1 \wedge \alpha^2$$

forms a basis for the space of real harmonic 2-forms which can be seen by considering the matrix of their cup-products. We now compute:

$$\begin{aligned} ([\omega_i] \cup [d\theta \wedge \alpha^j], [\mathbb{T}^4]) &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^4} \sigma_{ij} d\theta \wedge \alpha^{123} + \int_{\mathbb{T}^4} d\theta \wedge \alpha \wedge \alpha^i \wedge \alpha^j, \quad i, j = 1, 2, 3, \\ ([\omega_i^{\mathbf{B}}] \cup [d\theta \wedge \alpha^j], [\mathbb{T}^4]) &= \mathbf{B}_{ij} \int_{\mathbb{T}^4} d\theta \wedge \alpha^{123}, \quad i, j = 1, 2, 3, \\ ([\omega_i] \cup [\alpha^q \wedge \alpha^r], [\mathbb{T}^4]) &= \delta_{ip} \int_{\mathbb{T}^4} d\theta \wedge \alpha^{123}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \quad (pqr) = (123), \\ ([\omega_i^{\mathbf{B}}] \cup [\alpha^q \wedge \alpha^r], [\mathbb{T}^4]) &= \delta_{ip} \int_{\mathbb{T}^4} d\theta \wedge \alpha^{123}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \quad (pqr) = (123). \end{aligned}$$

These computations (together with the non-degeneracy of the cup product on H^2) show that we can ensure that

$$([\omega_1], [\omega_2], [\omega_3]) = ([\omega_1^{\mathbf{B}}], [\omega_2^{\mathbf{B}}], [\omega_3^{\mathbf{B}}])$$

if we simply set

$$(3.6) \quad \mathbf{B}_{ij} = \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^4} \sigma_{ij} d\theta \wedge \alpha^{123} + \int_{\mathbb{T}^4} d\theta \wedge \alpha \wedge \alpha^i \wedge \alpha^j \right) / \int_{\mathbb{T}^4} d\theta \wedge \alpha^{123}.$$

Moreover, the matrix $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}$ is positive definite since

$$2\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_{ij} = \mathbf{B}_{ij} + \mathbf{B}_{ji} = 2 \int_{\mathbb{T}^4} \sigma_{ij} d\theta \wedge \alpha^{123} / \int_{\mathbb{T}^4} d\theta \wedge \alpha^{123}$$

and $(\sigma_{ij}) > 0$ on \mathbb{T}^4 .

At this point, we have proved Theorem 1.2 in the case when the S^1 -action is free.

Remark 3.5. One hypersymplectic structure may be invariant under more than one free S^1 -actions (as shown in the Example 2.8 of hypersymplectic structures in symmetric normal form). The construction above will lead to isotopies to possibly different hyperkähler structures (in the fixed cohomology class) if we are using different actions.

3.4. An effective action must be free. Let X be a smooth compact 4-manifold with an effective circle action $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{T}^1}$, i.e., there exists an injective homomorphism $\Phi : \mathbb{T}^1 \rightarrow \text{Diff}(X)$ sending t to Φ_t , and $\underline{\omega}$ is a smooth hypersymplectic structure invariant under this circle action. Let \mathbf{v} be the vector field generating such action.

Lemma 3.6. *The zeros of \mathbf{v} are isolated, and the index of each zero is 1.*

Proof. Let p be a zero of \mathbf{v} , then $d\Phi_t|_p : T_p X \rightarrow T_p X$ is isometry for any $t \in \mathbb{T}^1$ when $T_p X$ is equipped with the metric $g_{\underline{\omega}}|_p$. Moreover, $T_p X$ is naturally oriented by $\underline{\omega}$ and $d\Phi_t|_p$ must preserve the orientation. Since $d\Phi_t|_p$ preserves $\underline{\omega}|_p$, it must also preserve the triple

$$\theta_i|_p = Q_{ij}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \omega_j|_p$$

which is hyperkähler at p . This further implies that $\{d\Phi_t|_p\}_{t \in \mathbb{T}^1}$ is a subgroup of $\text{SU}(2)$. It follows that there is an integer $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and an isomorphism $T_p X \cong \mathbb{C}^2$ of $\text{SU}(2)$ -representations, in which

$$d\Phi_t|_p = \begin{pmatrix} t^n & 0 \\ 0 & t^{-n} \end{pmatrix}.$$

To prove the Lemma we must show that $n = 1$. If $n \neq 1$ then there is some $t \neq id$ with $d\Phi_t|_p = id$. So Φ_t fixes both p and the tangent space at p and so it fixes all geodesics emanating from p . This forces $\Phi_t = id$ (by a continuity argument) contradicting the effectiveness of the action. \square

Proposition 3.7. *Let X be a smooth compact 4-manifold, with a hypersymplectic structure $\underline{\omega}$ which is invariant under an effective S^1 -action. Then in fact the action is free.*

Proof. Theorem 7.7 of [10] shows that the compact symplectic 4-manifold with $c_1 = 0$ has the same rational homology as one of: a \mathbb{T}^2 -bundle over \mathbb{T}^2 ; an Enriques surfaces or a $K3$ surface. The existence of a hypersymplectic structure implies $b_+ = 3$ and thus the Enriques surfaces is ruled out. Meanwhile, a theorem of Atiyah–Hirzebruch [1] asserts that a spin 4-manifold with an effective S^1 -action has vanishing signature. This rules out the case of a $K3$ surface. So X must have the same rational homology as a \mathbb{T}^2 -bundle over \mathbb{T}^2 and in particular it must have

zero Euler characteristic. In view of Lemma 3.6, the Poincaré-Hopf Index Theorem implies that \mathbf{v} has no zeros and so the action is free as claimed. \square

This Proposition completes the proof of Theorem 1.2.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Atiyah and F. Hirzebruch, *Spin-manifolds and group actions*. Essays on Topology and Related Topics (Mémoires dédiés à Georges de Rham), Springer, New York, 1970, pp. 18-28.
- [2] L. Auslander and M. Kuranishi, *On the holonomy group of locally Euclidean spaces*. Ann. of Math. (2) **65** (1957), 411-415.
- [3] S. K. Donaldson, *Two-forms on four-manifolds and elliptic equations, in Inspired by S. S. Chern*. Volume **11** of Nankai Tracts. Math., 153-172. World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ, 2006.
- [4] S. K. Donaldson, *Boundary Value Problems in Dimensions 7, 4 and 3 Related to Exceptional Holonomy*. In Andrew Dancer, Jørgen Ellegaard Andersen, and Oscar García-Prada (eds), Geometry and Physics: Volume I: A Festschrift in honour of Nigel Hitchin, 2018.
- [5] J. Fine, W.-Y. He, C.-J. Yao, *Convergence of the hypersymplectic flow on \mathbb{T}^4 with \mathbb{T}^3 -symmetry*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.15016v1>.
- [6] J. Fine and C.-J. Yao, *Hypersymplectic 4-manifolds, the G_2 -Laplacian flow, and extension assuming bounded scalar curvature*. Duke Mathematical Journal **167** (2018), no. 18, 3533–3589.
- [7] J. Fine and C.-J. Yao, *A report on the hypersymplectic flow*. Pure and Applied Mathematics Quarterly **15** (2019), no. 4, 1219-1260.
- [8] S. Friedl and S. Vidussi, *A vanishing theorem for twisted Alexander polynomials with applications to symplectic 4-manifolds*. Journal of the European Mathematical Society, Vol. **15**, No. 6, 2027-2041.
- [9] H.-N. Huang, Y.-Q. Wang and C.-J. Yao, *Cohomogeneity-one G_2 -Laplacian flow on the 7-torus*. Journal of the London Mathematical Society, Second Series **98** (2018), no. 2, 349–368.
- [10] T.-J. Li, *Symplectic Calabi-Yau surfaces*. Handbook of geometric analysis, No. 3231-356. Adv. Lect. Math. (ALM), **14**, International Press, Somerville, MA, 2010. Adv. Math. **289** (2016), 114–141.
- [11] S. Picard and C. Suan, *Flows of G_2 -Structures Associated to Calabi-Yau Manifolds*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.03411>, to appear in Math Research Letters.
- [12] P. Scott, *The geometries of 3-manifolds*. Bull. London Math. Soc. **15** (1983), no. 5, 401-487.

DÉPARTEMENT DE MATHÉMATIQUES, UNIVERSITÉ LIBRE DE BRUXELLES, BRUSSELS, BELGIUM
 Email address: joel.fine@ulb.be

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, EUGENE, OR 97403, USA
 Email address: whe@uoregon.edu

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, SHANGHAI TECH UNIVERSITY, PUDONG NEW DISTRICT, SHANGHAI, 201210, CHINA.
 Email address: yaochj@shanghaitech.edu.cn