

Surgery, quantum cohomology and birational geometry

Yongbin Ruan¹

Department of Mathematics, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Madison, WI 84112

(To appear in Berkeley-Stanford-Santa Cruz symplectic geometry conference proceedings)

1 Introduction

Recently, some amazing relations between quantum cohomology and birational geometry have been discovered. Surgeries play an fundamental role in the recent discovery. This expository article surveys these new results.

In the early days of quantum cohomology theory, the author [R3] showed that Mori's extremal ray theory can be generalized to symplectic manifolds. This gave the first evidence of the existence of a link between quantum cohomology and birational geometry. Subsequently attention was diverted to establishing a mathematical foundation of quantum cohomology. The progress on this problem was slow. There are several papers ([Wi2],[Wi3] and others) to extend results of [R3] to Calabi-Yau 3-folds and crepant resolutions. It is time to rethink these mysterious connections again. The breakthrough was the paper of Li-Ruan [LR] where they calculated the change of quantum cohomology under flop and small extremal transition for 3-folds. Their results showed a surprising naturality property of quantum cohomology under these surgeries. At present, this naturality property is best understood in complex dimension three. The scope of this new naturality property is still unknown. The author believes that there are some very interesting mathematics hidden here and the general machinery of quantum cohomology can be very useful to uncover these interesting mathematics.

One of the goals of this paper is to attract more people to work on this topic. Hence, I shall try to make some conjectures-proposal for general cases to entertain the readers. Since it is a survey instead of a research paper, we will concentrate on the ideas and techniques. The main reference of this article is Li-Ruan's paper [LR]. The reader can find more details and more completed references there. The author apologizes for the lack of details.

¹partially supported by a NSF grant and a Sloan fellowship

This paper is organized as follows. We give a brief survey on quantum cohomology and naturality problem in section 2 to fix notation. Then, we will briefly outline Mori's minimal model program in birational geometry. We will discuss the relation between naturality problem and birational geometry in the section 4. The main theorem was proved by a degeneration technique, developed independently by Li-Ruan [LR] and Ionel-Parker [IP]. This survey presents Li-Ruan's approach only in the section 5. We will discuss the possible generalization of Mori's program in the last section. The author would like to thank H. Clemens for explaining his semi-stable degenerations. The author benefited from many interesting conversations with J. Kollar, An-Min Li, D. Morrison on the topics related to this article. He wishes to express his thanks to them.

2 Quantum cohomology and its naturality

After the efforts of many people, the mathematical theory of quantum cohomology has been well-understood. We refer to [R6] for a survey. This process was rather difficult and time-consuming. Naturally, we are looking for some applications to justify the time and energy we spent in building general machinery. If we expect quantum cohomology to be as useful as cohomology, the results so far are disappointing.

The fundamental reason that cohomology is very useful is its naturality. Namely, a continuous map induces a ring homomorphism on cohomology. A fundamental problem in quantum cohomology is

Quantum naturality problem: *Define "morphism" of symplectic manifolds so that quantum cohomology is natural.*

The author believes that our understanding of naturality of quantum cohomology will be essential for the future success of quantum cohomology theory.

It has been known for a while that quantum cohomology is not natural with respect to even holomorphic maps. A crucial calculation is the quantum cohomology of projective bundles by Qin-Ruan [QR]. The calculation clearly demonstrated that quantum cohomology is not natural for fibrations. This is very different from ordinary cohomology and severely limits our efforts to develop some nice consequences of cohomology theory, like characteristic classes. The Qin-Ruan result shows that possible "morphisms" must be very rigid. The existence of these rigid morphisms will set apart quantum cohomology from cohomology and gives it its own identity. The author does not know the full story at present. In this article, we will describe a class of "morphisms" of

symplectic manifolds related to birational geometry. This class of "morphisms" is certain class of surgery called "transition".

Let's briefly review quantum cohomology and naturality. We start from the definition of GW (Gromov-Witten) invariants. Suppose that (M, ω) is a symplectic manifold of dimension $2n$ and J is a tamed almost complex structure. Let $\mathcal{M}_A(J, g, k)$ be the moduli space of genus g J -holomorphic maps with fundamental class A and k -marked points in the stable range $2g + k \geq 3$. If $2g + k \leq 3$, we divide the space of J -holomorphic maps by automorphism group. When $g = 0$, we assume that $A \neq 0$. Consider the space of corresponding stable maps $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(J, g, k)$ which compactifies $\mathcal{M}_A(J, g, k)$. There are several methods to define GW-invariants ([FO], [LT3], [R5], [S]). One way ([R5],[S]) is to construct a "virtual neighborhood" (U_k, S_k, E_k) with following properties: (1) U_k is a smooth, oriented, open orbifold whose points are maps; (2) E_k is a smooth, oriented orbifold bundle over U_k ; (3) S_k is a proper section of E_k such that $S^{-1}(0) = \overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(J, g, k)$. There is a map

$$\Xi_k : U_k \rightarrow M^k$$

given by evaluating a map at its marked points. Let Θ be a Thom form of E_k supported in a small neighborhood of the zero section. We define

$$(2.1) \quad \Psi_{(A,k)}^M = \int_{U_k} S_k^* \Theta \wedge \Xi_k^* \prod_i \alpha_i$$

for $\alpha_i \in H^*(M, \mathbf{R})$. One can eliminate the divisor class $\alpha \in H^2(M, \mathbf{R})$ by the relation

$$(2.2) \quad \Psi_{(A,g,k+1)}^M(\alpha, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) = \alpha(A) \Psi_{(A,g,k)}^M(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k),$$

for $A \neq 0$.

The above invariants are only *primitive* GW-invariants. In general, we can also pull-back cohomology classes of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}$ and insert them into the formula (2.1). But these more general invariants are conjectured ([RT2]) to be computed by primitive invariants. When $A = 0$ and $g = 0$, we define $\Psi_{(A,0,k)}^M = 0$ except for $k = 3$ and $\Psi_{(A,0,3)}^M(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3) = \alpha_1 \cup \alpha_2 \cup \alpha_3[M]$.

Choose a basis A_1, \dots, A_k of $H_2(M, \mathbf{Z})$. For $A = \sum_i a_i A_i$, we define the formal product $q^A = (q_{A_1})^{a_1} \dots (q_{A_k})^{a_k}$. For each cohomology class $w \in H^*(M)$ we define a quantum 3-point function

$$(2.3) \quad \Psi_w^M(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3) = \sum_k \frac{1}{k!} \sum_A \Psi_{(A,0,k+3)}^M(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, w, \dots, w) q^A,$$

where w appears k -times. Here, we view Ψ^M as a power series in the formal variables $p_i = q^{A_i}$. Clearly, a homomorphism on H_2 will induce a change of variables p_i . To define the quantum

product, we need to fix a symplectic class $[\omega]$ to define q^A as an element of Novikov ring Λ_ω (see [RT1]). Formally, we can define quantum multiplication by the formula

$$(1.8) \quad \alpha \times_Q^w \beta \cup \gamma[M] = \Psi_w^M(\alpha, \beta, \gamma).$$

To define a homomorphism of the quantum product, we need to match Novikov rings and hence symplectic classes. Here, we view quantum cohomology as a theory of Gromov-Witten invariants instead of just quantum product. Since the GW-invariants are invariant under deformations, the symplectic class is not a fundamental ingredient of the quantum cohomology. In fact, the symplectic class often obstructs our understanding of quantum cohomology itself. Clearly, the quantum 3-point function contains the same information as quantum product. It is more convenient to work directly with the quantum 3-point function.

Definition 2.1: *Suppose that*

$$\varphi : H_2(X, \mathbf{Z}) \rightarrow H_2(Y, \mathbf{Z}), \quad H^{even}(Y, \mathbf{R}) \rightarrow H^{even}(X, \mathbf{R})$$

are group homomorphisms such that the maps over H_2, H^2 are dual to each other. We say φ is natural with respect to (big) quantum cohomology if $\varphi^ \Psi_0^X = \Psi_0^Y$ ($\varphi^* \Psi_{\varphi^* w}^X = \Psi_w^Y$) after change of formal variable $q^A \rightarrow q^{\varphi(A)}$. If φ is also an isomorphism, we say φ induces an isomorphism on (big) quantum cohomology or they have the same (big) quantum cohomology.*

Here, two power series F, G are treated as the same if $F = H + F', G = H + G'$ where F', G' are power series expansion for the same rational function at the different points. For example, we can expand $\frac{1}{1-t} = \sum_{i=0} t^i$ at $t = 0$ or $\frac{1}{1-t} = \frac{1}{-t(1-t^{-1})} = -\sum_{i=0} t^{-i-1}$ at $t = \infty$. Hence, we will treat $\sum_{i=0} t^i, \sum_{i=0} t^{-i-1}$ as the same power series.

When X, Y are 3-folds, such a φ is completely determined by maps on H_2 . For example, the dual map of $\varphi : H_2(X, \mathbf{Z}) \rightarrow H_2(Y, \mathbf{Z})$ gives a map $H^2(Y, \mathbf{R}) \rightarrow H^2(X, \mathbf{R})$. A map $H^4(Y, \mathbf{R}) \rightarrow H^4(X, \mathbf{R})$ is Poincare dual to a map $H_2(Y, \mathbf{R}) \rightarrow H_2(X, \mathbf{R})$. In the case of flop, the natural map $H_2(X, \mathbf{Z}) \rightarrow H_2(Y, \mathbf{Z})$ is an isomorphism. Therefore, we can take the map $H_2(Y, \mathbf{R}) \rightarrow H_2(X, \mathbf{R})$ as its inverse.

GW-invariants are symplectic deformation invariants. Hence, two symplectic deformation equivalent manifolds have isomorphic big quantum cohomology. For example, holomorphic symplectic varieties are such examples. But, these are trivial examples. The only nontrivial examples are given by the work of Li-Ruan [LR] (see section 4).

From physical point of view, it is also natural (perhaps better) to allow certain **Mirror Transformations**. The author does not know precisely what are these mirror transformations, but they appear naturally in mirror symmetry and in the quantum hyperplane section conjecture [Kim]. From known examples, they must include (1) nonlinear changes of coordinates of $H^*(X, \mathbf{R}), H^*(Y, \mathbf{R})$ and (2) scalings of the 3-point function. Readers can find more motivation of mirror transformations in next section section.

Definition 2.2: *Under the assumptions of Definition 2.1, we say ϕ is p -natural with respect (big) quantum cohomology if we allow a mirror transformation in the definition 2.1. In the same way, we call ϕ is a p -isomorphism of (big) quantum cohomology if ϕ is an isomorphism and p -natural with respect to (big) quantum cohomology.*

It is obvious that naturality (isomorphism) implies p -naturality (p -isomorphism). The author does not know any nontrivial example of p -naturality or p -isomorphism at this moment.

Another interesting formulation is the notion of Frobenius manifold by B. Dubrovin [D]. Here, we require that the bilinear form $\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle = \int_X \alpha \wedge \beta$ to be preserved under ϕ . This is the case for blow-down. But it may not be preserved for general transitions when we have nontrivial vanishing cycles (See next section). All three constructions (quantum products, Frobenius manifolds, quantum 3-point functions) contain the same quantum information. The difference is the classical information like symplectic class, bilinear form, which can be studied separately. However, the author believes that Frobenius manifolds may be useful to understand mirror transformations.

3 Birational geometry

In this section, we review Mori's minimal model program. There are several excellent reviews on this topics [K2],[K3]. We shall sketch the ideas mainly for non-algebraic geometers. In the process, we introduces the surgeries we need. Birational geometry is a central topic in algebraic geometry. The goal of birational geometry is to classify algebraic varieties in the same birational class. Two projective algebraic varieties are birational to each other iff there is a rational map such that its inverse is also rational. In this case, we call it *a birational map*. A birational map is an isomorphism between Zariski open sets. Note that a birational map is not necessarily defined everywhere. If it is defined everywhere, we call it a contraction. By the definition, a contraction changes a lower dimensional subset only. Hence, we can view a contraction as a surgery. Intuitively, a contraction simplifies a variety. For algebraic curves, birational equivalence is the same as isomorphism. In

the dimension two, any two birational algebraic surfaces are related by blow-up and blow-down. The blow-down is a contraction. If the surface is not rational nor ruled, one can always perform blow-down until reaching a "minimal model" where blow down stops. This is the essence of Mori's minimal model program. Namely, we want to factor a birational map as a sequence of contractions and find the minimal ones in the same birational class. In two dimensions, the minimal model is unique. In higher dimension, it is much more difficult to carry out the minimal model program. The first difficulty is that the contraction is not unique. To overcome this difficulty, Mori found a beautiful correspondence between contractions and some combinatoric information of algebraic manifold itself. This is Mori's extremal ray theory.

To define extremal ray, consider Mori's effective cone

$$(3.1). \quad \overline{NE}(X) = \left\{ \sum_i a_i A_i, a_i \geq 0 \text{ } A_i \text{ is represented by a holomorphic curve} \right\} \subset H_2(X, \mathbf{R})$$

By the definition, $\overline{NE}(X)$ is a closed cone. Let $K(X)$ be the ample cone. One of nice properties of projective geometry is

$$(3.2) \quad \overline{NE}(X) = \overline{K(X)}^*.$$

In symplectic geometry, we don't know if this is true. This is one of primary difficulties of symplectic geometry. An edge of $\overline{NE}(X)$ is called an extremal ray of X . Suppose that L is an extremal ray with $K_X \cdot L < 0$, Mori showed that an extremal ray is represented by rational curves. Each extremal ray L gives a nef class H_L such that $H_L \cdot C = 0$ if $[C] \in L$ and $H_L \cdot C > 0$ if $[C] \notin L$, where C is a holomorphic curve. In general, a class H is nef iff $H \cdot C \geq 0$ for any holomorphic curve C . Then, H_L defines a contraction $\phi_L : X \rightarrow Y$ by contracting every curve whose homology class is in L . Moreover, the Picard number $Pic(X) = Pic(Y) + 1$. ϕ_L is called a primitive contraction. We abuse the notation and say that ϕ_L contracts L . One can contract several extremal rays simultaneously. This corresponds to contracting an extremal face and so on. Conversely, if we have a contraction $\phi : X \rightarrow Y$ such that $Pic(X) = Pic(Y) + 1$. Then, $\phi = \phi_L$ for some extremal ray.

Once the contraction is found, an additional difficulty arises because Y could be singular even if X is smooth. Obviously, the topology of Y is simpler. However, if the singularities of Y become more and more complicated, we just trade one difficult problem with another equally difficult problem. The next idea is that we can actually fix the class of singularities. There are two commonly used classes of singularities: terminal and canonical. We refer readers to [K2] for the precise definitions. The terminal singularity is the minimal class of singularities in the minimal

model theory. It was shown that in the complex dimension three, the minimal model program can be indeed carried out. Other than a well-understood exceptional class of varieties (uniruled varieties), the minimal model exists. A minimal model is, by definition, an algebraic variety X such that (i) X has terminal singularities only, and (ii) the canonical bundle K_X is nef.

One should mention that contractions are not enough to find minimal model. A more difficult operation "flip" is need. We will not give any details about flip. However, its companion "flop" is very important to us because it resolves another difficulty of minimal model program. Unlike the dimension two, the minimal model is not unique in the dimension three or more. However, different minimal models are related by a sequence of flops [Ka], [K1].

Here is a local description of a "simple flop". Let Y_s be a three fold with a ordinary double point. Namely, the neighborhood of singular point is complex analytically equivalent to a hypersurface of \mathbf{C}^4 defined by the equation

$$(3.3) \quad x^2 + y^2 + z^2 + w^2 = 0.$$

The origin is the only singular point. When we blow up the origin to obtain Y_b , we obtain an exceptional divisor $E \cong \mathbf{P}^1 \times \mathbf{P}^1$. Then, we contract one ruling to obtain Y containing a rational curve with normal bundle $O(-1) + O(-1)$. We can also contract another ruling to obtain \tilde{Y} containing a rational curve with normal bundle $O(-1) + O(-1)$. Clearly, Y, \tilde{Y} are same locally. However, they could be different globally. The process from Y to \tilde{Y} is called a simple flop. For smooth threefolds, a general flop can be deformed locally to disjoint union of several simple flops.

Finally, Mori's minimal model program has only been carried out for complex dimension three. It is still an open problem for higher dimensions.

The fundamental surgeries in birational geometry are contractions, flips, and flops. Every smooth Calabi-Yau 3-fold is a minimal model by definition. For minimal models, we only have flops. But they are not enough to classify smooth Calabi-Yau 3-folds. We need to introduce another surgery called *extremal transition* or *transition*. As we mentioned previously, a contraction could lead to a singular manifold. Sometimes, it could go beyond the class of terminal singularities. In fact, flip was introduced precisely to deal with this problem, where it will improve the singularity. There is another well-known method to improve the singularity. This is the operation of smoothing. A smoothing is as follows. Consider

$$(3.4) \quad \pi : U \rightarrow D(0, \epsilon) \subset \mathbf{C}$$

where U is an analytic variety and π is holomorphic and of maximal rank everywhere except zero. Then $X_z = \pi^{-1}(z)$ is smooth except at the central fiber X_0 . In this situation, we say that X_z is a smoothing of X_0 . If π is also of maximal rank at zero, X_0 is smooth and X_z is deformation equivalent to X_0 . Hence, they have the same quantum cohomology. If U is also Kahler, we say (U, π) is a Kahler smoothing. *A transition is a composition of contraction and a Kahler smoothing.* We call a contraction *small* if the exceptional loci is of complex codimension two or more. We call a transition *small* if its corresponding contraction is small. A Flip-Flop is a small operation in the sense that it only changes a subset of codimension two. Incidentally, flip-flop has been completely classified in dimension three. In higher dimensions, it is still an open question. It was conjectured that any two Calabi-Yau 3-folds can be connected to each other by a sequence of flops or transitions and their inverses.

First, we study the change of topology of flop and transition. This is easy in dimension three. Suppose that $F : X \rightsquigarrow \tilde{X}$ is a flop, where X, \tilde{X} are 3-fold. In this case, the exceptional loci is of complex dimension one. Each $A \in H_2(X, \mathbf{Q})$ is represented by a pseudo-submanifold Σ . Using PL-transversality, we can assume that Σ is disjoint from the exceptional loci. Then, Σ can also be viewed as a pseudo-submanifold of \tilde{X} . We can also reverse this process. Therefore, F induces an isomorphism on $H_2(X, \mathbf{Z})$ and hence $H^2 = \text{Hom}(H_2, \mathbf{Q})$. Using Poincare duality, it induces an isomorphism on H^4 as well. The maps on H^0, H^6 are obvious. The first important theorem is

Theorem 3.1 (Li-Ruan): *Under the previous assumptions, F induces an isomorphism on quantum cohomology. In particular, any two three dimensional smooth minimal models have isomorphic quantum cohomology where the isomorphism is induced by flops.*

In the dimension ≥ 4 , flop is not completely understood. However, there are theorems of Batyrev [Ba], Wang [Wa] that any two smooth minimal models have the same Betti number. We conjecture that

Quantum Minimal Model Conjecture: *Any two smooth minimal models in any dimension have isomorphic quantum cohomology.*

The Quantum Minimal Model Conjecture is true for holomorphic symplectic varieties as well. In this case, two birational holomorphic symplectic varieties are deformation equivalent. Hence, there is an abstract isomorphism on big quantum cohomology. However, it is still an interesting question to give a geometric construction of the isomorphism.

For transition, let $c : X \rightarrow X_s$ be the contraction and $\pi : U \rightarrow D(0, \epsilon)$ be the Kahler smoothing such that X_s is the central fiber. There is a deformation retract $r : U \rightarrow X_s$. Therefore, there is a map $\delta : H^*(X_s, \mathbf{Q}) \rightarrow H^*(X_t, \mathbf{Q})$, where $X_z = \pi^{-1}(z)$ is the nearby smooth fiber. In the case of Kahler smoothing, the image of δ can be described in terms of monodromy. Readers can find more detailed references in [C]. The result is follows. We first blow up the singular points of U along central fiber to obtain a smooth complex manifold V whose central fibers are union of smooth complex submanifolds intersects transversally with each other. Then, we perform the base change (pull-back by a map $z \rightarrow z^k$ on the base) to obtain W . W has an additional property that every component of central fiber has multiplicity 1 in the sense that the function

$$(3.5) \quad \tilde{\pi} : W \rightarrow V \rightarrow U \rightarrow D(0, \epsilon)$$

vanishes to order one on each component. This process is called *semi-stable reduction*. The consequence of semi-stable reduction is that the monodromy r of $\tilde{\pi}$ is unipotent. In this case, we can define

$$(3.6) \quad \log(r) : H^*(X_z, \mathbf{Q}) \rightarrow H^*(X_z, \mathbf{Q}).$$

$\log(r)$ is a nilpotent matrix. $\ker \log(r)$ is precisely the space of r -invariant cocycles. The main result of Deligne-Schmid-Clemens [C] is that $im(\delta)^* = \ker \log(r)$. There is a natural decomposition

$$(3.7) \quad H^*(X_z, \mathbf{Q}) = \ker \log(r) + im \log(r).$$

$im \log(r)$ is Poincare dual to the space of vanishing cycles. Using the decomposition (3.7), we can define a map

$$(3.8) \quad H^*(X_z, \mathbf{Q}) \rightarrow H^*(X_s, \mathbf{Q}).$$

Let $\phi : H^*(X_s, \mathbf{Q}) \rightarrow H^*(X, \mathbf{Q})$ be its composition with c^* . Our second theorem is that

Theorem 3.2 (Li-Ruan) *Suppose that $T : X \rightarrow X_z$ is a small transition in complex dimension three as described previously. Then, $\phi : H^*(X_z, \mathbf{R}) \rightarrow H^*(X, \mathbf{R})$ is a natural map for big quantum cohomology.*

The author conjectured that

Quantum Naturality Conjecture: *Theorem 3.2 is true in any dimension.*

One corollary of Quantum Naturality Conjecture is follows: Suppose that α is Poincaré dual to a vanishing cycle, i.e., $\alpha \in im \log(r)$ such that the central fiber X_s admits a small resolution, then $\Psi_{(A,0,k)}^{X_s}(\alpha, \dots) = 0$.

The results above are not satisfactory because they don't say anything about the the easiest transition, blow-down. The calculation in [RT1] (Example 8.6) shows that blow-down is not natural for quantum cohomology. But this is not the end of the story. For Calabi-Yau 3-folds, there are two other types of transitions which are not small. These are blow-down type surgeries. By the Mirror Surgery Conjecture [LR], they should be corresponding operations on the Hodge structures. The operation on the Hodge structure is obviously natural at algebraic coordinates. To compare with quantum cohomology, we should change from algebraic coordinates to the flat coordinates near large complex limits (mirror transformation). This suggests

Quantum p-Naturality Conjecture: *Transition induces a p-natural map on big quantum cohomology.*

We hope to give first such an example of p-naturality in [LQR].

For the same reason, we also have

p-Quantum Minimal Model Conjecture: *Any two smooth minimal models have p-isomorphic quantum cohomology*

The Quantum Minimal Model Conjecture implies the p-Quantum Minimal Model Conjecture. However, p-Quantum Minimal Model Conjecture could still be true even if Quantum Minimal Model Conjecture fails.

In Mori's program, it is essential to consider varieties with terminal singularities. It would be an important problem to work out the singular case in complex dimension three to see if the same phenomenon holds in the category of varieties with terminal singularities. Fortunately, a complete description of flops is also available in this case [K3].

4 Relative Gromov-Witten invariants and degeneration formula

In this section, we describe the techniques used to prove Theorem 3.1, 3.2. There are two slightly different approaches by Li-Ruan [LR] and Ionel-Parker [IP]. Here, we present Li-Ruan's approach only. Readers should consult [IP] for their approach. Moreover, we use different terminology from the original paper to make it more familiar to readers who are not familiar to contact geometry. The

heart of the technique is a degeneration formula of GW-invariant under semi-stable degeneration such that central fiber has only two components. I have already given the definition of semi-stable degeneration in the last section. In the case that central fiber has only two components. The normal bundle of their intersection Z has opposite first Chern classes. During the last several years, semi-stable degeneration reappeared in symplectic geometry under the names “symplectic norm sum” and “symplectic cutting” and plays an important role in some of recent developments in symplectic geometry. The author should point out that the recent construction in symplectic geometry is independent from algebraic geometry. In fact, it is stronger because it shows that one can always produce a semi-stable degeneration with prescribed central fiber in the symplectic category. Of course, the similar thing is far from true in algebraic category. For the symplectic constructions, there are two of them, norm sum and cutting, which are inverse of each other. Let me present the construction of symplectic cutting due to E. Lerman [L].

Suppose that $H : M \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is a periodic Hamiltonian function such that the Hamiltonian vector field X_H generates a circle action. By adding a constant, we can assume that 0 is a regular value. Then, $H^{-1}(0)$ is a smooth submanifold preserved by circle action. The quotient $Z = H^{-1}(0)/S^1$ is the famous symplectic reduction. Namely, it has an induced symplectic structure.

For simplicity, we assume that M has a global Hamiltonian circle action. Once we write down the construction, we then observe that a local circle Hamiltonian action is enough to define symplectic cutting.

Consider the product manifold $(M \times \mathbf{C}, \omega \oplus -idz \wedge d\bar{z})$. The moment map $H - |z|^2$ generates a Hamiltonian circle action $e^{i\theta}(x, z) = (e^{i\theta}x, e^{-i\theta}z)$. Zero is a regular value and we have symplectic reduction

$$(4.1) \quad \overline{M}^+ = \{H = |z|^2\}/S^1.$$

We have decomposition

$$(4.2) \quad \overline{M}^+ = \{H = |z|^2\}/S^1 = \{H = |z|^2 > 0\}/S^1 \cup H^{-1}(0)/S^1.$$

Furthermore,

$$\phi^+ : \{H > 0\} \rightarrow \{H = |z|^2 > 0\}/S^1$$

by

$$(4.3) \quad \phi^+(x) = (x, \sqrt{H(x)}).$$

is a symplectomorphism. Let

$$(4.4) \quad M_b^+ = H^{-1}(\geq 0).$$

Then, M_b^+ is a manifold with boundary and there is a map

$$(4.5) \quad M_b^+ \rightarrow \overline{M}^+.$$

Clearly, \overline{M}^+ is obtained by collapsing the S^1 action of the $H^{-1}(0)$. It is obvious that we only need a local S^1 Hamiltonian action. To obtain \overline{M}^- , we consider circle action $e^{i\theta}(x, z) = (e^{i\theta}x, e^{i\theta}z)$ with the moment map $H + |z|^2$. $\overline{M}^+, \overline{M}^-$ are called symplectic cutting of M . We define M_b^- similarly. By the construction, $Z = H^{-1}(0)/S^1$ with induced symplectic structure embedded symplectically into \overline{M}^\pm . Moreover, its normal bundles have opposite first Chern classes.

Symplectic norm sum by Gompf is an inverse operation of symplectic cutting. Actually, it appeared first. It was an observation of E. Ionel that symplectic norm sum-symplectic cutting is the same as semi-stable degeneration such that $\overline{M}^+ \cup_Z \overline{M}^-$ is the central fiber.

The main result of this section is a degeneration formula of GW-invariant under semi-stable degeneration with the central fiber of two components-symplectic norm sum-symplectic cutting. To simplify the notation, we use the term-symplectic cutting only. The first step is to introduce relative GW-invariants of a pair (M, Z) where Z is a smooth codimension two symplectic submanifold. We can always choose an almost complex structure J such that Z is an almost complex submanifold. Hence, algebraic geometer should view Z as a smooth divisor. The process to define relative GW-invariant is similar to that of defining regular GW-invariants. First, we define relative stable maps. It is helpful to recall the definition of stable maps.

Definition 4.1 ([PW], [Ye], [KM]). *Let $(\Sigma, \{x_i\})$ be a stable Riemann surface. A stable holomorphic map (associated with $(\Sigma, \{x_i\})$) is an equivalence class of continuous maps f from Σ' to M such that f is smooth at smooth points of Σ' , where the domain Σ' is obtained by joining chains of \mathbf{P}^1 's at some double points of Σ to separate the two components, and then attaching some trees of \mathbf{P}^1 's. We call components of Σ principal components and others bubble components. Furthermore,*

- (1) *If we attach a tree of \mathbf{P}^1 at a marked point x_i , then x_i will be replaced by a point different from intersection points on some component of the tree. Otherwise, the marked points do not change.*
- (2) *The singularities of Σ' are normal crossing and there are at most two components intersecting at one point.*

- (3) If the restriction of f on a bubble component is constant, then it has at least three special points (intersection points or marked points). We call this component a ghost bubble [PW].
- (4) The restriction of f to each component is J -holomorphic.

Two such maps are equivalent if one is the composition of the other with an automorphism of the domain of f .

A stable map has two types of components which are either lying outside of Z or completely inside Z . We call the second type component a Z -component. Let N be the closure of normal bundle $E \rightarrow Z$, i.e., $N = P(E \oplus \mathbf{C})$. Then, N has a zero section Z_0 and an infinity section Z_∞ . We view Z in X as a zero section. Roughly speaking, a relative stable map is a stable map whose Z -component can be lifted to N in a prescribed way. More precisely,

Definition 4.2: A relative stable map f satisfies the definition of stable map with additional data: We associate an integer a_p to each special point p (marked point or intersection point) with following property. If f_μ is a Z -component, then f_μ can be lifted to a map \tilde{f}_μ into N such that (i) $\tilde{f}_\mu(p) \in Z_0$ with order a_p if $a_p > 0$; (ii) $\tilde{f}_\mu(p) \in Z_\infty$ with the order $|a_p|$ if $a_p < 0$; (iii) $\tilde{f}_\mu(p) \in N - Z_0 \cup Z_\infty$ if $a_p = 0$. Furthermore, a_p satisfies following properties

- (5) If p is a marked point, $a_p \geq 0$.
- (6) (compatibility) Suppose that f_μ, f_ν intersects at $f_\mu(p_i) = f_\nu(q_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq l$. Then (i) $a_{p_i} >, <, = 0$ simultaneously; (ii) $a_{p_i} = -a_{q_i}$.

We call such a system of a_p a compatible label.

Note that \tilde{f}_μ exists implies that

$$(4.6) \quad \sum a_{p_i} = C_1(E)([f_\mu]).$$

Therefore, not every stable map may have a compatible label such that the lifting \tilde{f}_μ exists. This accounts the difference between relative and absolute GW-invariants. However, it is easy to show that the lifting is unique if it exists.

By (5), there are two kinds of marked point from their value a_{x_i} . To simplify the notation, we distinguish two kinds of marked points. Suppose that marked points are $x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_m$ such that $a_{x_i} = 0$ and $a_{y_i} > 0$. We fix $\mathbf{k} = (a_{y_1}, \dots, a_{y_m})$ and let $\overline{M}_A(Z, g, k, \mathbf{k}, J)$ be the moduli space of relative stable maps with fixed g, k, \mathbf{k} . Intuitively, $\overline{M}_A(Z, g, k, \mathbf{k}, J)$ is the compactification of the

space of holomorphic map with prescribed tangency condition \mathbf{k} at Z . We can use $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(Z, g, k, \mathbf{k}, J)$ to define a relative GW-invariant $\Psi^{(M,Z)}$. This invariant counts the number of relatively stable maps intersecting Z at the finitely many points with prescribed tangency. More precisely, We have maps

$$(4.7) \quad \Xi_{g,k} : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(Z, g, k, \mathbf{k}, J) \rightarrow M^k,$$

$$(4.8) \quad P : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(Z, g, k, \mathbf{k}, J) \rightarrow Z^m$$

and

$$(4.9) \quad \chi_{g,k+m} : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(Z, g, k, \mathbf{k}, J) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k+m}.$$

Roughly, the relative GW-invariants are defined as

$$(4.10) \quad \Psi_{(A,g)}^{(M,Z)}(K; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k; \beta_1, \dots, \beta_m) = \int_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(Z, g, k, \mathbf{k}, J)} \chi_{g,k+m}^* K \wedge \Xi_{g,k}^* \prod_i \alpha_i \wedge P^* \prod_j \beta_j.$$

To be precise, the virtual techniques developed by Fukaya-Ono [FO], Li-Tian[LT3], Ruan[R5], Siebert [S] apply to this case. For example, we can construct a virtual neighborhood (7.1 [LR]) of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(Z, g, k, \mathbf{k}, J)$. Then, we take integrand (1.17) over the virtual neighborhood.

Clearly, there is a map

$$(4.11) \quad R : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(Z, g, k, \mathbf{k}, J) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(g, k+m, J).$$

But it may not be surjective even if $\mathbf{k} = (1, \dots, 1)$. Because of this reason, we remark that when $\mathbf{k} = \{1, \dots, 1\}$, $\Psi^{(M,Z)}$ is different from the ordinary or absolute GW-invariant in general. So $\Psi^{(M,Z)}$ is not a “generalized” GW-invariant. The relation between relative and absolute GW-invariants is one of main topics of [LQR].

Theorem 4.3 (Li-Ruan)(Theorem 7.6 [LR]):

- (i). $\Psi_{(A,g,k,\mathbf{k})}^{(M,Z)}(K; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k; \beta_1, \dots, \beta_m)$ is well-defined, multilinear and skew symmetry.
- (ii). $\Psi_{(A,g,k,\mathbf{k})}^{(M,Z)}(K; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k; \beta_1, \dots, \beta_m)$ is independent of the choice of forms $K; \alpha_i, \beta_j$ representing the cohomology classes $K; [\beta_j], [\alpha_i]$, and the choice of virtual neighborhoods.
- (iii). $\Psi_{(A,g,k,\mathbf{k})}^{(M,Z)}(K; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k; \beta_1, \dots, \beta_m)$ is independent of the choice of almost complex structures on M such that Z is an almost complex submanifold, and hence an invariant of (M, Z) .

If $K = 1$, we will drop K from the formula. This invariant is called *a primitive relative GW-invariants*. In this article, we will give a degeneration formula for primitive invariants and comment on how to modify it for non-primitive invariants.

Now, we explain the degeneration formula of GW-invariants under symplectic cutting. First of all, symplectic cutting defines a map

$$(4.12) \quad \pi : M \rightarrow \overline{M}^+ \cup_Z \overline{M}^-,$$

where the right hand side is the central fiber of the degeneration. By the construction, $\omega^+|_Z = \omega^-|_Z$. Hence, it defines a cohomology class of $\overline{M}^+ \cup_Z \overline{M}^-$, denoted by $\omega^+ \cup_Z \omega^-$. It is easy to observe that

$$(4.13) \quad \pi^*(\omega^+ \cup_Z \omega^-) = \omega.$$

π induces a map

$$(4.14) \quad \pi_* : H_2(M, \mathbf{Z}) \rightarrow H_2(\overline{M}^+ \cup_Z \overline{M}^-, \mathbf{Z}).$$

Let $B \in \ker(\pi_*)$. By (4.13), $\omega(B) = 0$. Define $[A] = A + \ker(\pi_*)$ and

$$(4.15) \quad \Psi_{([A], g, k)}^M = \sum_{B \in [A]} \Psi_{(B, g, k)}.$$

For any $B, B' \in [A]$, $\omega(B) = \omega(B')$. By Gromov compactness theorem, there are only finitely many such B to be represented by J -holomorphic stable maps. Therefore, the summation in (4.15) is finite. Moreover, the cohomology class α_i is only special kind of cohomology classes similar to ω . Namely, let $\alpha_i^\pm \in H^*(\overline{M}^\pm, \mathbf{R})$ such that $\alpha_i^+|_Z = \alpha_i^-|_Z$. It defines a class $\alpha_i^+ \cup_Z \alpha_i^- \in H^*(\overline{M}^+ \cup_Z \overline{M}^-, \mathbf{R})$. Suppose that $\alpha_i = \pi^*(\alpha_i^+ \cup_Z \alpha_i^-)$. The degeneration formula is a big summation

$$(4.16) \quad \Psi_{([A], g, k)}^M(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) = \sum_{?} \text{???????}.$$

Next, we give a procedure to write down the terms on the right hand side.

Step (1). We first write down a graph representing the topological type of a degenerate Riemann surface in $\overline{M}^+ \cup_Z \overline{M}^-$ with following properties: (i) Each component is completely inside either \overline{M}^+ or \overline{M}^- ; (ii) they only intersect each other long Z . (iii) No two components in $\overline{M}^+(\overline{M}^-)$ intersect each other; (iv) The arithmetic genus is g and the number of marked points is k ; (v) The total homology class is $\pi_*([A])$. (vi). Each intersection point carries an positive integer representing the

order of tangency. We use C to denote such a graph. C will be used as the index of summation and (4.16) can be written as

$$(4.17) \quad \Psi_{([A],g,k)}^M(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) = \sum_C \Psi_C.$$

Step (2). Suppose that C has components C_1, \dots, C_s and (A_{C_i}, g_{C_i}) be the homology classes and genus of C_i -component. Then,

$$(?) \quad \Psi_C = r_C \prod_i \Psi_{(A_{C_i}, g_{C_i})}^{(\overline{M}^?, Z)}(????),$$

where $\overline{M}^?$ is one of \overline{M}^\pm where C_i lies in and r_C is the product of certain numbers to be decided latter.

Step(3). Following two step decide the variables of each term in (4.18) and r_C . If a marked point x_i appears in some component C_t , then α_i^\pm should be in the variable of $\Psi_{(A_{C_t}, g_{C_t})}^{(\overline{M}^?, Z)}(???)$. \pm depends on if C_t lies in \overline{M}^+ or \overline{M}^- .

Step(4). $\Psi_{(A_{C_t}, g_{C_t})}^{(\overline{M}^?, Z)}(???)$ has other variables as well associated to intersection points. Suppose that y is an intersection point of C_i, C_j components with order of tangency k_y . Let β_a be a basis of $H^*(Z, \mathbf{R})$ and $\eta^{ab} = \int_Z \beta_a \beta_b$. Let (η_{ab}) be its inverse, which can be thought as the intersection matrix of Poincare dual of β_a, β_b . Then, y contributes a term β_a in $\Psi_{(A_{C_i}, g_{C_i})}$, β_b in $\Psi_{(A_{C_j}, g_{C_j})}$ and $k_y \eta_{ab}$ into r_C .

The four steps above will completely determine the formula (4.16)

Theorem 4.1 (Li-Ruan([LR], Theorem 7.9,7.10)) *There is a degeneration formula of GW-invariants under symplectic cutting described from Step (1)-Step (4).*

An important comment is that different α_i^\pm may define the same α_i . Then, we have different ways to express $\Psi^M(\dots, \alpha_i, \dots)$. This is very important in the application of degeneration formula (4.16). For example, The Pincare dual of a point can be chosen to have its support completely inside \overline{M}^+ or \overline{M}^- .

To derive a degeneration formula with class K , let's consider its Poincare dual K^* . Then we have to specify a degeneration K_∞^* of K^* and look what kind of graph C could appear in the degeneration of K^* . Namely, we look for these C where we obtain an element of K_∞^* after we contract all the unstable component of C . For example, suppose that $K^* = \{\Sigma\}$. We can require that Σ stays in the interior of $\overline{M}_{g,k}$. This will force C to have a component same as Σ in one of \overline{M}^\pm with other possible unstable rational components only.

Using Theorem 4.1, we can prove Theorem 3.1,3.2. Consider a simple flop $X \rightsquigarrow \tilde{X}$. They have the same blow-up X_b . Take a trivial family of X and blow up the central fiber along the the rational curve L . This is a semi-stable degeneration whose central fiber is a union of X and Y_L -closure of normal bundle $O(-1) + O(-1)$ of L intersecting along the projectivization of normal bundle $P(O(-1) + O(-1)) \cong \mathbf{P}^1 \times \mathbf{P}^1$. The crucial information is that $C_1(Y_L) = 3Z_\infty$. Then, an index calculation shows that only nonzero term in (4.16) is that C lies completely in X_b or Y_L . We repeat the same argument for \tilde{X} to express invariant of \tilde{X} in terms of that of X_b, Y_L . Then, we obtain a formula of the change of GW-invariants under a simply flop. To conclude the isomorphism of quantum cohomology, we need the calculation of the contribution of multiple cover maps to L to cancel the error from the change of classical trip product under a simple flop.

To prove Theorem 4.2, we consider the case that X_s has only a ordinary double point. Then, we do the semi-stable reduction to obtain a semi-stable degeneration. In this case, central fiber has again only two components X_b, Y_s (a fact I learnt from H. Clemens), where X_b is the blow-up along L again and Y_s is a quadratic 3-fold intersecting with X_b along a hyperplane H . This is completely consistent with the symplectic cutting description in section 2 of [LR]! Note that the first Chern class of a quadratic 3-fold is $3H$! This is precisely what we need in the case of flop. Using our degeneration formula, we conclude that only nonzero term in (4.16) is the case that C stays in either X_b, Y_s . But, there is no holomorphic curve in Y_s without intersecting H . Hence, it must be in X_b . Therefore, we get an expression (Theorem 8.1, [LR]) of invariant of X_z in terms of relative invariant of X_b and hence X by previous argument. The rest is just sorting out the formula for quantum 3-fold points.

For more general flops or small transitions, an argument of P. Wilson shows that one can reduce it to above case by an almost complex deformation. Hence, our previous argument actually works in all cases. For people looking for an algebraic proof of our theorem, it seems that one can generalize our degeneration formula to semi-stable degeneration with an arbitrary number of components. Then, one can use this more general degeneration formula to get around the almost complex deformation. It is clear that such a general degeneration formula should also contain relative GW-invariants. But the combinatorics will be much more complicated.

5 Generalization of minimal model program

After going over technical mathematics in the last section, it is time to have some fun and make some wild speculations. Mori's minimal model program can be viewed as a surgery theory of contractions and flip-flops. As we mentioned in the section three, transitions play a crucial role in the classification of Calabi-Yau 3-folds. The author hopes that he has convinced the reader that they also play a crucial role in quantum cohomology. It is natural that we speculate that there should be a minimal model theory with transitions as fundamental surgeries. We call this proposed theory the "moduli minimal model program" because it is concerned with the moduli space of complex structures by definition. The moduli minimal model program is no longer in the category of birational geometry. Instead, it concerns the important problem of connecting different moduli spaces of complex manifolds. Then, an interesting question is: what are the minimal models in the moduli minimal model program? Recall that in Mori theory a minimal model has nef K_X . We speculate that a minimal model in the moduli minimal model program should be either $Pic(X) = 1$ or K_X is ample. Like the case of minimal model, there are exceptional cases. Then it is of great interest to study these exceptional cases as well. Clearly, transition improves singularities. The author does not have any feeling what kind of singularities should be allowed in moduli minimal model program.

An interesting aspect of moduli minimal model program is its connection to symplectic geometry. Due the topological nature of symplectic form, symplectic geometry is an ideal place to study moduli problem. In my view, the guiding problem of symplectic geometry should be the classification of symplectic manifolds. The next question is how to classify them. In topology, it is pretty rare that we can actually label manifolds. An essential step is to establish some fundamental surgeries and classify a class of manifolds under such surgeries. These fundamental surgeries should simplify the manifolds. In dimension two, the fundamental surgery is connected sum. In dimension three, the fundamental surgeries are connected sum over spheres and tori. In dimension 4, people are still struggling to understand what are the fundamental surgeries. A natural question is "what are fundamental surgeries of symplectic manifolds?" I believe that transition is one of fundamental surgeries of symplectic manifolds. In fact, any surgeries which are natural with respect to quantum cohomology deserve our attention, if we believe that quantum cohomology is a fundamental invariant of symplectic manifolds. This line of thought is very appealing because transition has a beautiful interpretation in term of classical symplectic geometry.

In a neighborhood of a singularity, the boundary has a natural contact structure. It is known classically that there are two ways to "fill" a contact manifold. A contact manifold could bound a resolution of a singularity or a neighborhood of the zero section of a cotangent bundle. In the case of a singular point, transition is a local duality which interchanges these two fillings. In the general case, we need to consider a fiber-wise version of the above construction.

Therefore, it is natural to consider a "symplectic minimal model program" using transition as the fundamental surgery. As the author showed in [R3], one can generalize the Mori cone $NE(X)$ to symplectic manifolds. Transition simplifies a symplectic manifold X in the sense that it simplifies the Mori cone $NE(X)$. One important ingredient in Mori's program is the interpolation between the Mori cone and the ample cone which are related by $NE(X) = \overline{K(X)}^*$. In symplectic geometry, we no longer have such a relation. So we encounter severe difficulties at the first step of our symplectic minimal model program. It is probably a long shot to establish such a program. But I have no doubt that much interesting mathematics will come out of our investigation. We end our discussion with following question: "What is the minimal model in symplectic minimal model program"?

References

- [Ba] V. Batyrev, On the betti number of birationally isomorphic projective varieties with trivial canonical bundles, math.AG/9710020
- [C] H. Clemens, Degeneration of Kahler manifolds, Duke math. vol.44, no 2(1977)215-290
- [D] B. Dubrovin, Geometry and analytic theory of Frobenius manifolds, ICM98-proceedings vol II 315-327.
- [FO] K. Fukaya and K. Ono, Arnold conjecture and Gromov-Witten invariant, preprint.
- [Go2] R. Gompf, A new construction of symplectic manifolds, Ann. of Math. 142(1995) 527-595
- [Gr] M. Gromov, Pseudo holomorphic curves in symplectic manifolds, Invent. math., 82 (1985), 307-347.
- [IP] E. Ionel, T. Parker, Gromov-Witten invariants of symplectic sums, preprint, math.SG/9806063
- [Ka] Y. Kawamata, Crepant blowing ups of three dimensional canonical singularities and applications to degeneration of surfaces, Ann. Math. 119(1984)603-633

- [Kim] . B. Kim, Quantum hyperplane theorem for homogeneous spaces, alg-geom/9712008
- [K1] J. Kollar, Flops, Nagoya Math. J. 113 (1989), 15–36.
- [K2] J. Kollar, The structure of algebraic threefolds-an introduction to Mori’s program, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 17(1987) 211-273
- [K3] J. Kollar, Flips, flops, minimal models, ETC, Surveys in differential geometry, 1(1991)113-199
- [KM] M. Kontsevich and Y. Manin, GW-classes, quantum cohomology and enumerative geometry, Comm. Math.Phys, 164(1994) 525-562
- [L] E. Lerman, Symplectic cuts, Math Research Let 2(1985) 247-258
- [LQR] A. Li, Z. Qin and T. Ruan, Symplectic surgeries and GW-invariants of Calabi-Yau 3-folds II, in preparation.
- [LR] A. Li, Y. Ruan, Symplectic surgery and GW-invariants of Calabi-Yau 3-folds I, preprint, math.AG/9803036
- [LT3] J. Li and G. Tian, Virtual moduli cycles and Gromov-Witten invariants of general symplectic manifolds, preprint.
- [MW] G. McCarthy and J. Wolfson, Symplectic normal connect sum, Topology, 33(1994), 729-764.
- [Mo1] D. Morrison, Beyond the Kahler cone, Proc. of Hirzebruch 65 Conf in Alge. Geom 361-376. Israel Math. Conf. Proc 9
- [Mo2] D. Morrison, Through the looking glass, alg-geom/9705028
- [PW] T. Parker, J. Wolfson, A compactness theorem for Gromov moduli space, J. Geom. Analysis, 3(1993)63-98
- [QR] Z. Qin, Y. Ruan, Quantum cohomology of projective bundles over \mathbf{P}^n ,
- [R3] Y. Ruan, Symplectic topology and extremal rays, Geo. Fun. Anal, vol3, no4(1993) 395-430
- [R5] Y. Ruan, Virtual neighborhoods and pseudo-holomorphic curves, preprint.
- [R6] Y. Ruan, Quantum cohomology and its applications, Lecture on ICM98

- [RT1] Y. Ruan and G. Tian, A mathematical theory of quantum cohomology, *J. Diff. Geom.*, 42(1995) 259-367.
- [RT2] Y. Ruan and G. Tian, Higher genus symplectic invariants and sigma model coupled with gravity, *Invent. Math.* 130, 455-516(1997)
- [S] B. Siebert, Gromov-Witten invariants for general symplectic manifolds, preprint.
- [Wa] Chin-Lung Wang, On the topology of birational minimal models, [math.AG/9804050](#)
- [Wi2] P.M.H. Wilson, Symplectic deformations of Calabi-Yau threefolds, *J. Diff Geom.* 45(1997), 611-637
- [Wi3] P.M.H. Wilson, Flop, type III contractions and GW-invariants of Calabi-Yau 3-folds, [alg-geom/9707008](#)
- [Ye] R. Ye, Gromov's compactness theorem for pseudo-holomorphic curves, *Trans. Amer. math. Soc.* 1994