

EQUIVARIANT LAGRANGIAN FLOER HOMOLOGY VIA MULTIPLICATIVE FLOW TREES

GUILLEM CAZASSUS

ABSTRACT. We provide constructions of equivariant Lagrangian Floer homology groups, by constructing and exploiting an A_∞ -module structure on the Floer complex.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Background	1
1.2. Statement of results	2
1.3. Informal outline	2
2. Algebraic constructions	6
2.1. The Bar construction	6
2.2. The cobar construction	8
2.3. The Tate complex	11
3. The A_∞ -algebra and module structures in Morse theory	15
3.1. Abstract trees	15
3.2. Multiplicative trees and the A_∞ -algebra structure on $CM_*(G)$	17
3.3. The A_∞ -module structure on $CM_*(X)$	22
4. The A_∞ -module structure on the Floer complex	24
4.1. Geometric setting	24
References	28

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. **Background.** Equivariant homology of a G -space X is a rich invariant that is usually better behaved than the homology of the quotient, when the action is not free.

Likewise, if a symplectic manifold M admits a Lie group action, one can define equivariant versions of Floer homology [Fra04, Woo11, SS10, HLS16, HLS20a, BH21, CH17, HLS20b, KLZ19, LLL24] (see for example [Caz24] for a more detailed account of the existing approaches).

In particular, for a pair of Lagrangians L_0, L_1 in a symplectic manifold with an action of a Lie group, the first construction of equivariant Lagrangian Floer homology appeared in [HLS20b]. Compared to other approaches, this one is of algebraic nature, and relies on advanced constructions from the theory of $(\infty, 1)$ -categories.

This work was funded by EPSRC grant reference EP/T012749/1, the Simons Collaboration grant no. 994320, and the ERC-SyG project ReNewQuantum.

In this paper, we provide another construction. It is similar in nature with [HLS20b], in that our construction relies on an algebraic action of G on the (non-equivariant) Floer complex $CF(L_0, L_1)$. Though, the algebraic tools involved are comparatively simpler, and perhaps more standard to the symplectic topology community. While in [HLS20b] the algebraic object associated with G is a simplicial nerve, we instead use the Morse complex of G , endowed with a certain A_∞ -algebra structure built from the group multiplication.

On the other side of the Atiyah-Floer conjecture, namely instanton gauge theory, Miller Eismeier [Eis23] also constructed several versions of equivariant Floer homology groups. Exploiting a dga action on the Floer complex, he produced Borel, co-Borel and Tate homology groups, by applying some Bar constructions he developed.

1.2. Statement of results.

Theorem 1.1. *Under certain assumptions (see Section 4.1), if a compact Lie group G acts by symplectomorphisms on a symplectic manifold M , and $L_0, L_1 \subset M$ is a pair of G -invariant Lagrangians, then:*

- *the Morse complex $CM_*(G)$ can be endowed with an A_∞ -algebra structure,*
- *the Floer complex $CF(L_0, L_1)$ is an A_∞ -module over the former A_∞ -algebra.*

Transposing [Eis23, App. A] to the A_∞ setting, we then obtain:

Theorem 1.2. *For a certain dga A_G associated to G , we construct four dg modules respectively referred to as the Borel, co-Borel, twisted Borel, and Tate complexes:*

$$(1.1) \quad CF_G^+(L_0, L_1), CF_G^-(L_0, L_1), \widetilde{CF}_G^+(L_0, L_1), CF_G^\infty(L_0, L_1).$$

Furthermore, the three later fit into a short exact sequence of dg modules, inducing a long exact sequence of $H_(A_G)$ -modules in homology.*

Remark 1.3. Following [Eis23], the dga A_G should be equivalent to $C^*(BG)$, and the twisted version $\widetilde{CF}_G^+(L_0, L_1)$ to $CF_G^+(L_0, L_1)$, we will address these two points later.

1.3. Informal outline. The starting point of our construction is the following observation. Let X be a smooth compact manifold, acted on by a Lie group G . By definition, its equivariant homology is given by the homology of its homotopy quotient:

$$H_*^G(X) = H_*(X \times_G EG).$$

It follows from Gugenheim and May's work [GM74] that this can be rewritten as the homology of a (derived) tensor product of $C_*(G)$ -modules:

$$H_*^G(X) = H_*(C_*(X) \otimes_{C_*(G)} C_*(EG)).$$

It is tempting to define equivariant Lagrangian Floer homology by a similar formula. Namely, for a pair of Lagrangians L_0, L_1 in a symplectic G -manifold M , one would like to define

$$(1.2) \quad HF_G(L_0, L_1) = (CF(L_0, L_1) \otimes_{C_*(G)} C_*(EG)).$$

In order to do so, one needs an action of $C_*(G)$ on $CF(L_0, L_1)$: this is what we aim to construct.

Consider Morse homology first: pick Morse functions $f: G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $h: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. From the homotopy transfer theorem we know that the dg algebra and module structures of $C_*(G)$ and $C_*(X)$ induce respectively A_∞ -algebra and A_∞ -module structures on the Morse complexes $CM(G, f)$ and $CM(X, h)$. Though, it is instructive to construct such structures explicitly, in order to transpose them to the Floer setting.

At the homology level, these become the algebra and module structures induced by the multiplications and action maps

$$(1.3) \quad m_G: G \times G \rightarrow G,$$

$$(1.4) \quad m_X: G \times X \rightarrow X.$$

Therefore, to define the A_∞ -operations

$$(1.5) \quad \mu_G^2: CM(G, f) \otimes CM(G, f) \rightarrow CM(G, f),$$

$$(1.6) \quad \mu_X^{1|1}: CM(G, f) \otimes CM(X, h) \rightarrow CM(X, h),$$

a natural choice to consider are the Morse chain pushforwards of m_G and m_X [KM07, Sec. 2.8], i.e. by counting grafted lines as in Figure 1 (see also [ADE14], and [Caz24, Sec. 3.2] for the grafted line point of view). By




FIGURE 1. On the left, “grafted Morse flow lines” inducing the pushforwards of m_G and m_X . On the right, their corresponding “multiplicative Y’s”.

unfolding the components in the product parts, these can alternatively be viewed as “multiplicative Y’s”, as on the right of Figure 1. For example, the bottom right picture represents a triple of flowlines

$$(1.7) \quad \gamma_1: (-\infty, 0] \rightarrow G,$$

$$(1.8) \quad \gamma_2: (-\infty, 0] \rightarrow X,$$

$$(1.9) \quad \gamma_3: [0, +\infty) \rightarrow X,$$

limiting to given input and output critical points at the ends, and satisfying the condition

$$(1.10) \quad \gamma_1(0) \cdot \gamma_2(0) = \gamma_3(0).$$

These operations are not strictly associative in general, but they are up to homotopy. And the homotopies are given by counting flow trees with

3 inputs, as in Fukaya’s construction [Fuk93], except that vertices involve multiplicative conditions (1.10) as opposed to $\gamma_1(0) = \gamma_2(0) = \gamma_3(0)$, see Figure 2 for $\mu_X^{2|1} : CM(G, f)^{\otimes 2} \otimes CM(X, h) \rightarrow CM(X, h)$, which measures the defect of associativity of $\mu_X^{1|1}$.




FIGURE 2. Trees involved in $\mu_X^{2|1}$.

More generally, the operations μ_G^k and $\mu_X^{k|1}$ can be defined analogously, by counting similar trees with respectively k and $k + 1$ inputs.

We will construct these operations in Section 3, and prove that they satisfy the A_∞ -relations.

Going from Morse to Floer theory, flowlines in G and X respectively become holomorphic strips in T^*G and T^*X , grafted lines become quilted strips, and multiplicative trees become “pseudo-holomorphic foams” as in Figure 3.




FIGURE 3. Pseudo-holomorphic foams, Floer-theoretic counterparts of multiplicative trees.

Remark 1.4. Foams are generalizations of quilts [WW09], in quilt language these consist in several “patches” (pseudo-holomorphic curves) “seamed” together along Lagrangian multi-correspondences (i.e. Lagrangian submanifolds of products of several symplectic manifolds). These can be represented as singular surfaces, and we call them foams in analogy of the ones appearing in [Kup96, Kho04, KM19], though they are very different mathematical objects (in particular they do not correspond to singular surface in a given

ambient manifold. Likewise, our multiplicative trees don't look like actual trees in an ambient manifold.

Observe here that T^*X can be replaced by mostly any Hamiltonian G -manifold M (subject to standard Floer-theoretic assumptions). Indeed, recall that the action and moment maps can be encoded in Weinstein's Lagrangian correspondence

$$(1.11) \quad \Lambda_G(M) \subset T^*G \times M^- \times M \\ = \left\{ ((q, p), m, m') : m' = qm, R_{q^{-1}}^*p = \mu(m) \right\},$$

which is the relevant seam condition for the foams we would consider.

Observe finally that if one shrinks the strips in T^*G back to flowlines in G while keeping strips in M (i.e. by taking the Morse function on G smaller and smaller), one ends up with a "hybrid tree" as in Figure 4. These are collections of flowlines in G and strips in M , for which the seam conditions between G and M become

$$(1.12) \quad \gamma(0) \cdot u_-(0, t) = u_-(0, t) ; 0 \leq t \leq 1.$$

The advantage of hybrid trees is that the action need not be Hamiltonian




FIGURE 4. A hybrid tree. The red flowline should touch every point of the green seam, but this is difficult to draw.

anymore, therefore we will use them instead of foams.

We therefore obtain an A_∞ -module structure on $CF(L_0, L_1)$ over the A_∞ -algebra $CM(G, f)$, and can define versions of equivariant Floer Homology, by replacing formula (1.2) by the appropriate Bar constructions.

Acknowledgments. *This project greatly benefitted from conversations with Artem Kotelskiy, Paul Kirk, Mike Miller Eismeier and Wai-Kit Yeung, who declined authorship but deserve some credit. Special thanks to Mike Miller Eismeier for patiently explaining his constructions.*

We would also like to thank Paolo Ghiggini for pointing out a subtlety in an earlier attempt to transversality, and Fabian Haiden, Kristen Hendrick, Dominic Joyce, Ciprian Manolescu, Thibaut Mazuir, Alex Ritter, Sucharit Sarkar and Chris Woodward for helpful conversations.

2. ALGEBRAIC CONSTRUCTIONS

Throughout this paper we work over the field $k = \mathbb{F}_2$ for simplicity, and with ungraded complexes, but most of it should hold over more general rings, such as \mathbb{Z} , or Novikov rings. Our goal is to construct, starting with an A_∞ -algebra A and a left A_∞ -module M , the four complexes

$$(2.1) \quad C_A^+(M), C_A^-(M), \tilde{C}_A^+(M), C_A^\infty(M)$$

called respectively the Borel, co-Borel, twisted Borel and Tate complexes.

Applying these constructions to $A = CM(G)$ and $M = CF(L_0, L_1)$ will give four versions of equivariant Lagrangian Floer complexes

$$(2.2) \quad CF_G^+(L_0, L_1), CF_G^-(L_0, L_1), \widetilde{CF}_G^+(L_0, L_1), CF_G^\infty(L_0, L_1).$$

We essentially follow Miller Eismeier [Eis23, Appendix A] with minor adjustments, including:

- We work in the A_∞ -setting, as opposed to the differential graded one,
- In [Eis23], Miller Eismeier uses Bar constructions *reduced* with respect to an augmentation. In our setting, A is not strictly unital (though it should be homotopy unital), therefore we work with *unreduced* constructions, which should be equivalent.

2.1. The Bar construction. We recall some basic definitions about A_∞ algebras. For readability, we write A^k for $A^{\otimes k}$, and (a_1, \dots, a_k) for $a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_k$.

Definition 2.1. An A_∞ -algebra A is a vector space over k with a collection of operations

$$(2.3) \quad \mu_A = (\mu_A^1, \mu_A^2, \dots); \quad \mu_A^k: A^k \rightarrow A$$

satisfying the A_∞ -relations:

$$(2.4) \quad \forall k \geq 1, \quad \forall a_1, \dots, a_k \in A, \\ 0 = \sum_{k+1=k_1+k_2; 1 \leq i \leq k_1} \mu_A^{k_1}(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, \mu_A^{k_2}(a_i, \dots, a_{i+k_2}), a_{i+k_2+1}, \dots, a_k).$$

This can be understood graphically as in Figure 5.




FIGURE 5. The A_∞ -relations for A_∞ -algebras.

Such a structure can be encoded in a chain complex

Definition 2.2. Let A be a vector space over k . Let BA stand for the tensor coalgebra

$$(2.5) \quad BA = \bigoplus_{k \geq 0} A^k,$$

with coproduct

$$(2.6) \quad \Delta: BA \rightarrow BA \otimes BA,$$

$$(a_1, \dots, a_k) \mapsto \sum_{i=0}^k (a_1, \dots, a_i) \otimes (a_{i+1}, \dots, a_k).$$

Any family of maps (μ^1, μ^2, \dots) of the form $\mu^k: A^k \rightarrow A$, seen as a single map $\mu: BA \rightarrow A$, uniquely extends as a coalgebra morphism

$$(2.7) \quad \overline{\mu}: BA \rightarrow BA.$$

Furthermore, μ satisfies the A_∞ -relations if and only if $\overline{\mu}^2 = 0$. In this case, BA is a dg coalgebra.

Definition 2.3. Let (A, μ_A) be an A_∞ -algebra. A left A_∞ -module N is a k -vector space equipped with a collection of maps

$$(2.8) \quad \mu_N = (\mu_N^{0|1}, \mu_N^{1|1}, \dots); \quad \mu_N^{k|1}: A^k \otimes N \rightarrow N$$

satisfying A_∞ -relations similar to those of A (see Figure 6):

$$(2.9) \quad \forall k \geq 0, \quad \forall a_1, \dots, a_k \in A, n \in N$$

$$0 = \sum_{k=k_1+k_2; 1 \leq i \leq k_1+1} \mu_N^{k_1|1}(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, \mu(a_i, \dots), \dots, a_k, n),$$

where the inner μ either stands for $\mu_N^{k_2|1}$ or $\mu_A^{k_2+1}$, depending on whether $i = k_1 + 1$ or not.

Likewise, a right A_∞ -module M is a k -vector space with a collection of maps $\mu_M^{1|k}: M \otimes A^k \rightarrow M$ satisfying similar relations.




FIGURE 6. The A_∞ -relations for A_∞ -modules.

These structures can also be encoded in a chain complex.

Definition 2.4. Let (C, μ_A) be an A_∞ -algebra, and let (M, μ_M) , (N, μ_N) be respectively a right and a left A_∞ -module. Let their Bar complex be the chain complex

$$(2.10) \quad B(M, A, N) = M \otimes BA \otimes N,$$

equipped with the differential defined by (see Figure 7)

$$(2.11) \quad \partial(m, a_1, \dots, a_k, n) = \sum_{k_1, k_2, k_3} (m, a_1, \dots, a_{k_1}, \mu(\dots), a_{k_1+k_2+1}, \dots, a_k, n)$$

where $k = k_1 + k_2 + k_3$, with

- $k_1, k_3 \geq -1$, but not both equal to -1 ,
- $k_2 \geq 1$ is the number of inputs of the inner μ , which stands either for $\mu_M^{1|k_2-1}$, $\mu_A^{k_2}$ or $\mu_N^{k_2-1|1}$.

It follows from the A_∞ -relations that $\partial^2 = 0$.

The analogous operation of the coproduct of BA is

$$(2.12) \quad \Delta_{B(M,A,N)}: B(M, A, N) \rightarrow B(M, A, k) \otimes B(k, A, N),$$

with k standing respectively for the trivial left and right A_∞ A -module. It follows that $B(M, A, k)$ (resp. $B(k, A, N)$) is a right (resp. left) dg-comodule over BA .



FIGURE 7. The differential of $B(M, A, N)$.

We can now define the Borel complex of a left A -module M by

$$(2.13) \quad C_A^+(M) = B(k, A, M),$$

which is a left dg-comodule over BA .

2.2. The cobar construction. The following is the dual notion of an A_∞ -algebra

Definition 2.5. An A_∞ -coalgebra A is a vector space over k with a collection of operations

$$(2.14) \quad \delta_C = (\delta_C^1, \delta_C^2, \dots); \quad \delta_C^k: C \rightarrow C^k$$

satisfying the A_∞ -relation dual to (2.4):

$$\forall k \geq 1, \quad 0 = \sum_{k+1=k_1+k_2; 1 \leq i \leq k_1} (id_C^{\otimes i-1} \otimes \delta_C^{k_2} \otimes id_C^{\otimes k_1-i}) \circ \delta_C^{k_1}.$$

Example 2.6. If A is an A_∞ -algebra, let $C = A^* = \text{Hom}_k(A, k)$. It inherits an A_∞ -coalgebra structure δ_C dual to μ_A defined by

$$(2.15) \quad \left\langle \delta_C^k(c), (a_1, \dots, a_k) \right\rangle = \left\langle c, \mu_A^k(a_k, \dots, a_1) \right\rangle.$$

Notice that we identify duals of tensor products following the rule

$$(2.16) \quad (A \otimes B)^* \simeq B^* \otimes A^*.$$




FIGURE 8. The A_∞ -coalgebra structure on $C = A^*$.

As for A_∞ -algebras, there is a chain complex associated with an A_∞ -coalgebra.

Definition 2.7. Let C be a vector space over k . Let ΩC stand for the algebra

$$(2.17) \quad \Omega C = \prod_{l \geq 0} C^l,$$

with product

$$(2.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \Pi: \Omega C \otimes \Omega C &\rightarrow \Omega C, \\ (c_1, \dots, c_l) \otimes (c'_1, \dots, c'_l) &\mapsto (c_1, \dots, c_l, c'_1, \dots, c'_l). \end{aligned}$$

A family of maps $\delta = (\delta^1, \dots)$ of the form $\delta^k: C \rightarrow C^k$, seen as a single map $\delta: C \rightarrow \Omega C$, uniquely extends as an algebra morphism

$$(2.19) \quad \vec{\delta}: \Omega C \rightarrow \Omega C.$$

Furthermore, δ satisfies the A_∞ -relations if and only if $\vec{\delta}^2 = 0$. In this case, ΩC is a dg algebra.

Example 2.8. If $C = A^*$ is the dual of an A_∞ -algebra, then $\Omega C \simeq (BA)^*$.

Definition 2.9. Let (C, δ_C) be an A_∞ -coalgebra. A left A_∞ -comodule N is a k -vector space equipped with a collection of maps

$$(2.20) \quad \delta_N = (\delta_N^{0|1}, \delta_N^{1|1}, \dots); \quad \delta_N^{k|1}: N \rightarrow C^k \otimes N$$

satisfying A_∞ -relations similar to those of A :

$$\forall k \geq 1, \quad 0 = \sum_{k=k_1+k_2; 1 \leq i \leq k_1+1} (id_C^{\otimes i-1} \otimes \delta \otimes id_C^{\otimes k_1-i-1} \otimes id_N) \circ \delta_N^{k_1|1},$$

where the inner δ either stands for $\delta_N^{k_2|1}$ or $\delta_C^{k_2+1}$, depending on whether $i = k_1 + 1$ or not.

Likewise, a right A_∞ -comodule M is a k -vector space with a collection of maps $\delta_M^{1|k} : M \rightarrow M \otimes C^k$ satisfying similar relations.

FIGURE 9. The A_∞ -relations for A_∞ -comodules.

Example 2.10. If M is a left (resp. right) A_∞ -module over A , then it is also a left (resp. right) A_∞ -comodule over $C = A^*$.

As for A_∞ -modules, These structures can also be encoded in a chain complex:

Definition 2.11. Let (C, δ_C) be an A_∞ -coalgebra, and let (M, δ_M) , (N, δ_N) be respectively right and left A_∞ -comodules. Let their cobar complex be the chain complex

$$(2.21) \quad \Omega(M, C, N) = M \otimes \Omega C \otimes N,$$

with differential $\partial = \prod_{l \geq 0} \partial_l$ given by

$$(2.22) \quad \partial_l(m, c_1, \dots, c_k, n) = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq k+1} (m, c_1, \dots, \delta(c_i), \dots, c_k, n) \\ \in M \otimes C^l \otimes N$$

where

$$(2.23) \quad \delta(c_i) = \begin{cases} \delta_M^{1|l-k}(m) & \text{if } i = 0 \\ \delta_C^{l-k+1}(c_i) & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq k \\ \delta_N^{1|l-k}(n) & \text{if } i = k + 1 \end{cases}$$

It follows from the A_∞ -relations that $\partial^2 = 0$.

The operation analogous to the product of ΩC is

$$(2.24) \quad \Pi_{\Omega(M, C, N)} : \Omega(M, C, k) \otimes \Omega(k, C, N) \rightarrow \Omega(M, C, N),$$

with k standing respectively for the trivial left and right A_∞ C -comodule. It follows that $\Omega(M, C, k)$ (resp. $\Omega(k, C, N)$) is a right (resp. left) dg-module over ΩC .

Remark 2.12. The construction $\Omega(M, C, N)$ is dual to $B(M, A, N)$ in the sense that

$$(2.25) \quad B(M, A, N)^* \simeq \Omega(N^*, A^*, M^*).$$

Remark 2.13. In [Eis23], Miller Eismeier defines his cobar construction as $cB(M, A, N) = \text{Hom}_A(B(M, A, k), N)$ for an A_∞ -algebra A and a pair M, N of right A_∞ -modules. This corresponds to our $\Omega(N^*, A^*, M)$.

We can now define the co-Borel complex of a left A -module M by

$$(2.26) \quad C_A^-(M) = \Omega(k, A^*, M),$$

which, as $C_A^+(M)$, is a left dg-module over ΩA^* (and dually a left dg-comodule over BA). Its differential $\partial^- = \partial_1^- + \partial_2^-$ is drawn in Figure 10.

$$\partial^- = \partial_1^- + \partial_2^-$$

FIGURE 10. The two contributions to the differential of $C_A^-(M)$.

2.3. The Tate complex. For a G -space X , equivariant Borel and co-Borel homology respectively correspond to the homology of the homotopy quotient and the homotopy fixed points (which is a spectrum). Removing the word "homotopy", the fixed point set is included in the quotient. So one can consider the cone of this inclusion, and form a third homology group that will make the inclusion fit into a long exact sequence. This is roughly what Tate homology is supposed to be (though this is oversimplifying). It turns out that Tate homology usually enjoys nice properties, which makes the whole package more computable.

The actual homotopy construction is slightly more involved, and defining this inclusion map (the norm map) involves twisting the Borel construction by a dualizing object. To implement this, we follow [Eis23] construction, and adapt it to the A_∞ setting.

These constructions are best understood in the language of A_∞ bimodules. There are several kinds of these (see Figure 11):

Definition 2.14. Let A_1, A_2 be two A_∞ -algebras, and C_1, C_2 two A_∞ -coalgebras.

- An (A_1, A_2) -bimodule M is a vector space with a collection of operations

$$(2.27) \quad \mu_M^{k_1|1|k_2}: A_1^{k_1} \otimes M \otimes A_2^{k_2} \rightarrow M$$

- An (C_1, C_2) -bimodule M is a vector space with a collection of operations

$$(2.28) \quad \delta_M^{l_1|1|l_2}: M \rightarrow C_1^{l_1} \otimes M \otimes C_2^{l_2}$$

- An (A_1, C_2) -bimodule M is a vector space with a collection of operations

$$(2.29) \quad \nu_M^{k_1|1|l_2} : A_1^{k_1} \otimes M \rightarrow M \otimes C_2^{l_2}$$

- An (C_1, A_2) -bimodule M is a vector space with a collection of operations

$$(2.30) \quad \chi_M^{l_1|1|k_2} : M \otimes A_2^{k_2} \rightarrow C_1^{l_1} \otimes M$$

All these should satisfy the appropriate A_∞ -relations, best explained graphically in Figures 12 and 13.




FIGURE 11. The four kinds of A_∞ -bimodules.





FIGURE 12. The A_∞ -relations for (A_1, A_2) -bimodules.

Following Morita theory, it is helpful to think about bimodules as morphism between A_∞ -algebras or A_∞ -coalgebras. The Bar and cobar constructions then give a way to compose them:

Proposition 2.15. *(Composition of A_∞ -bimodules) Let G_1, G_2, G_3 stand for either A_∞ -algebras or A_∞ -coalgebras, let M be a (G_1, G_2) -bimodule and N be a (G_2, G_3) -bimodule. Then,*

- if G_2 is an A_∞ -algebra, then $B(M, G_2, N)$ is a (G_1, G_3) -bimodule,
- if G_2 is an A_∞ -coalgebra, then $\Omega(M, G_2, N)$ is a (G_1, G_3) -bimodule.

Example 2.16. An A_∞ -algebra A is an (A, A) -bimodule.

FIGURE 13. The A_∞ -relations for (A_1, C_2) -bimodules.

Example 2.17. An (A_1, A_2) -bimodule is also an (A_1^*, A_2) -bimodule and an (A_1, A_2^*) -bimodule.

From these two observations we get:

Definition 2.18. Let A be an A_∞ -algebra, its dualizing bimodule $D(A)$ is A , seen as an (A^*, A) -bimodule.

This bimodule can be used for twisting the definition of the Borel complex.

Definition 2.19. Let M be a left A_∞ -module over an A_∞ -algebra A , the twisted Borel complex is the dg ΩC -module defined as

$$(2.31) \quad \tilde{C}_A^+(M) = B(D(A), A, M)$$


$$(2.32) \quad = \bigoplus_{k \geq 0} \prod_{l \geq 0} C^l \otimes A \otimes A^k \otimes M.$$

In the pictures, we will color strands corresponding to C^l , A , A^k and M respectively in green, orange, red and blue.

The differential of this complex can be decomposed in four contributions

$$(2.33) \quad \tilde{\partial}^+ = \tilde{\partial}_1^+ + \tilde{\partial}_2^+ + \tilde{\partial}_3^+ + \tilde{\partial}_4^+,$$

as drawn in Figure 14.

FIGURE 14. The four contributions to the differential of $\tilde{C}_A^+(M)$.

To define the fourth complex, consider the following map.

Definition 2.20. The norm map

$$(2.34) \quad N_M: \tilde{C}_A^+(M) \rightarrow C_A^-(M)$$

is defined by combining all the maps

$$(2.35) \quad N_{\nu'}^{k,l}: C^l \otimes A \otimes A^k \otimes M \rightarrow C^{l'} \otimes M$$

drawn in Figure 15.




FIGURE 15. The maps $N_{\nu'}^{k,l}$ contributing to N_M .

Proposition 2.21. The norm map N_M is ΩC -equivariant, and commutes with the differentials $\partial^-, \tilde{\partial}^+$ of $C_A^-(M)$ and $\tilde{C}_A^+(M)$.

Proof. The fact that N_M is ΩC -equivariant is straightforward, and is explained in Figure 16.






FIGURE 16. The norm N_M commutes with the ΩC -module structures.

We have drawn the contributions to $\partial^- N_M$ and $N_M \tilde{\partial}^+$ respectively in Figures 17 and 18. Observe that $\partial_1^- N_M$ has two kinds of contributions, depending on whether the (green) δ_C operation collides with N_M or not. If they don't, their positions can be exchanged, and these contributions will cancel in pairs with those of $N_M \tilde{\partial}_1^+$. Putting altogether all the other contributions, removing the green vertical lines and dualizing the remaining green strands, one recognizes the A_∞ -relations for M . The claim follows. \square

We can then define the Tate complex as the ΩC dg-module:

$$(2.36) \quad C_A^\infty(M) = \text{Cone}(N_M).$$


 FIGURE 17. The contributions to $\partial^- N_M$.

 FIGURE 18. The contributions to $N_M \tilde{\partial}^+$.

3. THE A_∞ -ALGEBRA AND MODULE STRUCTURES IN MORSE THEORY

3.1. Abstract trees. We now recall some definitions on trees, and set our notation and terminology.

Definition 3.1. By a *tree* τ we will mean what is usually called a rooted ribbon tree, consisting in:

- A finite set of vertices $\text{Vert}(\tau)$,
- A finite set of edges of three kinds: internal edges, leaves, and (exactly one) root r_τ . Leaves and roots are also referred to as external, or semi-infinite edges.

$$(3.1) \quad \text{Edges}(\tau) = \text{IntEd}(\tau) \cup \text{Leaves}(\tau) \cup \text{Root}(\tau).$$

The set of leaves is supposed to be ordered (corresponding to the ribbon condition).

- Source and Target maps. Internal edges have a source and a target:

$$(3.2) \quad s, t: \text{IntEd}(\tau) \rightarrow \text{Vert}(\tau).$$

Leaves have a target and no source:

$$(3.3) \quad t: \text{Leaves}(\tau) \rightarrow \text{Vert}(\tau).$$

And the root has a source and no target (the root vertex $v_\tau = s(r_\tau)$)

$$(3.4) \quad s: \text{Root}(\tau) \rightarrow \text{Vert}(\tau).$$

These are such that:

- There are no cycles (i.e. a cyclic sequence of internal edges e_1, \dots, e_k with $t(e_i) = s(e_{i+1})$ and $t(e_k) = s(e_1)$).
- Each vertex is the source of exactly one edge, and the target of at least two edges. We will denote $\text{In}(v)$ and $\text{Out}(v)$ the sets of incoming and outgoing edges. $\text{Out}(v)$ consists in one element. The arity of v is the number of incoming edges $ar(v) = \#\text{In}(v) \geq 2$, and the valency $val(v) = 1 + ar(v)$ the number of adjacent edges. We say that a tree is trivalent if $val(v) = 3$ for each v .
- The order on $\text{Leaves}(\tau)$ defines an order on each $\text{In}(v)$ in the following way: if γ and γ' are two paths going from leaves l, l' to $e, e' \in \text{In}(v)$, then we order e and e' the same way as l, l' (i.e. we want this order to be independent on the choices of the “ancestors” l, l' of e, e').

Definition 3.2. For $n \geq 2$, let κ_n denote the set of isomorphism classes of trees with n inputs. Here we use the obvious isomorphism notion: bijections on vertices and edges preserving the order on leaves. This is the same as the set of n -bracketings.

Definition 3.3. A *metric tree* $T = (\tau, l)$ consists in a tree τ , with a length function on the set of internal edges:

$$(3.5) \quad l: \text{IntEd}(\tau) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$$

We will regard metric trees modulo equivalence.

Definition 3.4. Define the equivalence relation on metric trees generated by either:

- If $\tau \simeq \tau'$ and under this identification $l \simeq l'$, then we declare $(\tau, l) \sim (\tau, l)$.
- If $\tau \in \kappa_n$ and $e \in \text{IntEd}(\tau)$, let $\tau(e)$ consist in the tree obtained from τ by collapsing e (i.e. by removing e and merging $s(e)$ and $t(e)$). If $l(e) = 0$, then we declare $T = (\tau, l)$ to be equivalent to $T' = (\tau(e), l')$, with $l' = l$ on $\text{IntEd}(\tau') = \text{IntEd}(\tau) \setminus \{e\}$.

We say that T is *irreducible* if $l(e) > 0$ for every edge. Each metric tree can be put in a unique irreducible form.

Definition 3.5. The space K_n of equivalence classes of metric trees with n leaves is the (interior of the) associahedron.

If $\tau \in \kappa_n$, let

$$(3.6) \quad K_n^\tau \simeq [0, +\infty)^{\text{IntEd}(\tau)} \subset K_n$$

correspond to metric trees with given type τ . These form a stratification of K_n , each strata K_n^τ has codimension given by

$$(3.7) \quad \text{codim}\tau := \sum_{v \in \text{Vert}(\tau)} val(v) - 3.$$

Define $\kappa_n^k \subset \kappa_n$ to consist in trees of codimension k . We will mostly be interested in the codimension zero and one strata:

- $\text{codim}\tau = 0$ corresponds to trivalent trees, then we will refer to K_n^τ as a chamber.
- $\text{codim}\tau = 1$ corresponds to exactly one 4-valent vertex, and trivalent remaining vertices, then we will refer to K_n^τ as a wall.

3.2. Multiplicative trees and the A_∞ -algebra structure on $CM_*(G)$.

Let G be a compact Lie group, and fix a Morse function $f: G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

We will define the moduli spaces involved in the definition of the A_∞ -algebra structure on $CM_*(G, f)$.

Let $\mathfrak{X}(G)$ be the space of vector fields on G , and $\mathfrak{X}(G, f) \subset \mathfrak{X}(G)$ the spaces of *pseudo-gradients* for f , i.e. those $V \in \mathfrak{X}(G)$ such that $df \cdot V < 0$ outside $\text{Crit} f$, and such that V is a gradient of f for some metric, in a neighborhood of critical points.

We will consider moduli spaces of trees of gradient flow lines. In order for these to be transversally cut out, we will need to allow the vector fields not to be pseudo-gradients everywhere, as trees could have constant edges at critical points. We will perturb the vector fields near the vertices, as in Abouzaid [Abo11]. In order to perturb families consistently, the perturbations will be defined on the “universal tree”, analogously to Seidel’s construction for Fukaya categories [Sei08, Section 9].




FIGURE 19. The universal tree \mathcal{T}_4 .

Definition 3.6. Let $\tau \in \kappa_n$, and e an internal edge. Define the fibered product

$$(3.8) \quad \mathcal{T}_e = K_n^\tau \times_{[0, +\infty)} T,$$

where $K_n^\tau \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ corresponds to the length of e , and

$$(3.9) \quad T = \{(x, y) : 0 \leq y \leq x\},$$

with $T \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ the projection to the first coordinate. The space \mathcal{T}_e “fibers” over K_n^τ , and the fiber over (τ, l) corresponds to the interval $[0, l(e)]$.

If now e is a leaf of τ , let

$$(3.10) \quad \mathcal{T}_e = K_n^\tau \times (-\infty, 0],$$

and likewise, if e is a root,

$$(3.11) \quad \mathcal{T}_e = K_n^\tau \times [0, +\infty).$$

Define then the *universal tree over K_n^τ* to be

$$(3.12) \quad \mathcal{T}_n^\tau = \coprod_{e \in \text{Edges}(\tau)} \mathcal{T}_e,$$

and finally the *universal tree over K_n*

$$(3.13) \quad \mathcal{T}_n = \left(\coprod_{\tau \in \kappa_n} \mathcal{T}_n^\tau \right) / \sim,$$

where if a metric tree (τ, l) has an edge e with $l(e) = 0$, and $(\tau' = \tau(e), l')$ is its contraction, then we glue the fibre $(\mathcal{T}_n^{\tau'})_{(\tau', l')}$ to $(\mathcal{T}_n^\tau)_{(\tau, l)}$.

Let also $\mathcal{T}_{n, \leq 1}, \mathcal{T}_{n, \geq 1} \subset \mathcal{T}_n$ stand respectively for the points at distance smaller than 1 (resp. greater than 1) from the vertices.

Let $\mathcal{T} = \coprod_{n \geq 2} \mathcal{T}_n$, with subsets $\mathcal{T}_{\geq 1}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\leq 1}$.

Definition 3.7. Let the space of *universally perturbed treed pseudogradients* for (G, f)

$$(3.14) \quad \mathfrak{X}^\mathcal{T}(G, f) \subset \text{Maps}(\mathcal{T}, \mathfrak{X}(G))$$

consist in smooth maps V that are:

- (1) constant on $\mathcal{T}_{\geq 1}$ and equal to a pseudo-gradient $\widehat{V} \in \mathfrak{X}(G, f)$
- (2) coherent with respect to edge breaking, in the following sense. If $\tau \in \kappa_n$ and $\mathcal{E} \subset \text{IntEd}(\tau)$ is a subset of internal edges splitting τ into subtrees

$$(3.15) \quad \tau_1 \in \kappa_{n_1}, \dots, \tau_k \in \kappa_{n_k},$$

then gluing metric trees at edges of \mathcal{E} gives gluing maps, for $L \geq 2$:

$$(3.16) \quad K_{n_1} \times \dots \times K_{n_k} \times [L, +\infty)^{|\mathcal{E}|} \rightarrow K_n$$

Let ν_L stand for the image of this map, then restricted to this image, there is a map

$$(3.17) \quad \mathcal{T}_{n, \leq 1|_{\nu_L}} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{n_1, \leq 1} \sqcup \dots \sqcup \mathcal{T}_{n_k, \leq 1}$$

and we want that V factors through this map for L large enough.

$\mathfrak{X}^\mathcal{T}(G, f)$ is nonempty (it contains $\mathfrak{X}(G, f)$) and convex, and is equipped with a projection to the constant part:

$$(3.18) \quad \mathfrak{X}^\mathcal{T}(G, f) \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}(G, f),$$

$$(3.19) \quad V \mapsto \widehat{V}.$$

Definition 3.8. Pick $V \in \mathfrak{X}^\mathcal{T}(G, f)$, and let $T = (\tau, l)$ be a metric tree. With a slight abuse of notations we will denote the fibre of \mathcal{T} over T by T as well, and we will write it as a union of intervals

$$(3.20) \quad T = \coprod_{e \in \text{Edges}(T)} I_e,$$

with

$$(3.21) \quad I_e = \begin{cases} (-\infty, 0] & \text{if } e \text{ is a leaf,} \\ [0, l(e)] & \text{if } e \text{ is an internal edge,} \\ [0, +\infty) & \text{if } e \text{ is the root.} \end{cases}$$

Restricting V to T then gives a map $V_T: T \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}(G)$.

A *multiplicative tree* in G is a map $\gamma: T \rightarrow G$ such that:

- on each edge I_e , the restriction γ_e of γ is a flowline for V_T .
- at every vertex v , the multiplicative condition holds. Assume that the incoming edges at v are given in the following order:

$$(3.22) \quad \text{In}(v) = (e_1, \dots, e_k),$$

and let f be the outgoing edge. The condition is that

$$(3.23) \quad \gamma_{e_1}(v) \times \dots \times \gamma_{e_k}(v) = \gamma_f(v),$$

where $\gamma_e(v)$ stands for $\gamma(t)$, with t the endpoint of I_e corresponding to v .

Since the γ_e are flowlines, limits at external ends exist and are critical points. If, as an ordered set, $\text{Leaves}(\tau) = (l_1, \dots, l_n)$, let

$$(3.24) \quad \lim_{-\infty} \gamma = (\lim_{-\infty} \gamma_{l_1}, \dots, \lim_{-\infty} \gamma_{l_n}) \in (\text{Crit} f)^n,$$

and let

$$(3.25) \quad \lim_{+\infty} \gamma = \lim_{+\infty} \gamma_{r_\tau} \in \text{Crit} f,$$

with r_τ the root.

We want to form moduli spaces of trees parametrized by K_n : we first define moduli spaces over the chambers K_n^τ ; $\tau \in \kappa_n^0$, and glue these along the walls K_n^τ ; $\tau \in \kappa_n^1$.

Definition 3.9. Let $\underline{x} \in (\text{Crit} f)^n$, $y \in \text{Crit} f$, $\tau \in \kappa_n$ and $V \in \mathfrak{X}^T(G, f)$, define

$$(3.26) \quad \mathcal{M}^\tau(\underline{x}, y; V) = \left\{ (T, \gamma) : T \in K_n^\tau, \gamma: T \rightarrow G, \underline{x} = \lim_{-\infty} \gamma, y = \lim_{+\infty} \gamma \right\},$$

where γ is a multiplicative tree for V as above. Let its virtual dimension be defined as:

$$(3.27) \quad \text{vdim } \mathcal{M}^\tau(\underline{x}, y; V) := |\underline{x}| - |y| + \dim \tau,$$

where $|y|$ and $|\underline{x}|$ stand for the (sum of) Morse indices.

Proposition 3.10. *Given $\tau \in \kappa_n$, there exists a comeagre subset*

$$(3.28) \quad \mathfrak{X}_{\text{reg}, \tau}^T(G, f) \subset \mathfrak{X}^T(G, f)$$

such that, for $V \in \mathfrak{X}_{\text{reg}, \tau}^T(G, f)$:

- if $\text{vdim } \mathcal{M}^\tau(\underline{x}, y; V) < 0$, then $\mathcal{M}^\tau(\underline{x}, y; V)$ is empty,
- if $\text{vdim } \mathcal{M}^\tau(\underline{x}, y; V) = 0$, then $\mathcal{M}^\tau(\underline{x}, y; V)$ is a discrete finite set,
- if $\text{vdim } \mathcal{M}^\tau(\underline{x}, y; V) = 1$, then $\mathcal{M}^\tau(\underline{x}, y; V)$ is a smooth 1-manifold with boundary identified to

$$(3.29) \quad \partial \mathcal{M}^\tau(\underline{x}, y; V) \simeq \bigcup_{e \in \text{IntEd}(\tau)} \mathcal{M}^{\tau(e)}(\underline{x}, y; V^{\tau(e)}),$$

with $V^{\tau(e)}$ obtained from V by removing V_e (recall that $\tau(e)$ consists in the tree obtained from τ by collapsing e).

Proof. The proof involves a standard transversality argument that we sketch below for the reader's convenience, and refer for example to [ADE14] and [Abo11, Sec. 7] for more details.

The universal moduli space $\bigcup_V \mathcal{M}^\tau(\underline{x}, y; V)$ corresponds to the zero set of a section s of a Banach bundle

$$(3.30) \quad \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{B} \times \mathfrak{X}^\tau(G, f),$$

where \mathcal{B} is a space of multiplicative trees not subjects to the flowline equation, and $s(\gamma, V) = \dot{\gamma} - V(\gamma)$ is the flowline equation.

To prove this universal moduli space is smooth, one takes η in the cokernel of $D_{(\gamma, V)}s$: for all $(\xi, Y) \in T_\gamma \mathcal{B} \times T_V \mathfrak{X}^\tau(G, f)$ one has

$$(3.31) \quad \left\langle \frac{\partial s}{\partial \gamma} \cdot \xi, \eta \right\rangle = 0$$

$$(3.32) \quad \left\langle \frac{\partial s}{\partial V} \cdot Y, \eta \right\rangle = 0$$

Equation (3.31) implies that η satisfies a unique continuation principle, and Equation (3.32) with Y “bump vector fields” concentrated at points of $\mathcal{T}_{\leq 1}$ permits to show that η vanishes on $\mathcal{T}_{\leq 1}$, which intersect every connected components of the domain of η , implying $\eta = 0$. Notice that by definition of $\mathfrak{X}^\tau(G, f)$, V need not be a pseudogradient on $\mathcal{T}_{\leq 1}$. This is what enables one to take such “bump vector fields” Y , this would not have been possible otherwise, in the case where γ has a constant component at a critical point of f . From the smoothness of this universal moduli space, one gets a comeagre subset of regular V for which $\mathcal{M}^\tau(\underline{x}, y; V)$ is transversely cut out, by Sard-Smale's theorem.

What differs from Fukaya's Morse flow trees though is the dimension formula, the difference comes from the fact that we use different vertex conditions: for trivalent vertices our condition involves only one equation ($\gamma_1(v)\gamma_2(v) = \gamma_3(v)$) as opposed to two ($\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = \gamma_3$). Therefore we explain how to obtain it.

The moduli spaces project to K_n^τ , therefore the virtual dimension is the sum of $\dim K_n^\tau$ and the dimension of the fibre. Take the fiber over the center of K_n , i.e. (τ, l) with $l \equiv 0$. If V is a constant pseudogradient, the moduli space is identified with the intersection

$$(3.33) \quad p(\mathcal{U}_{x_1} \times \cdots \times \mathcal{U}_{x_n}) \cap \mathcal{S}_y \subset G,$$

where $p: G^n \rightarrow G$ is the product $p(g_1, \dots, g_n) = g_1 \cdots g_n$ and $\mathcal{U}_x, \mathcal{S}_x$ stand respectively for the unstable and stable manifolds of a critical point x . Now generically $p(\mathcal{U}_{x_1} \times \cdots \times \mathcal{U}_{x_n})$ will be of dimension $|\underline{x}|$ and \mathcal{S}_y of codimension $|y|$, therefore the expected dimension of the fiber will be $|\underline{x}| - |y|$.

Finally, we discuss the boundary formula (3.29), namely:

$$\partial \mathcal{M}^\tau(\underline{x}, y; V) \simeq \bigcup_{e \in \text{IntEd}(\tau)} \mathcal{M}^{\tau(e)}(\underline{x}, y; V^{\tau(e)}),$$

Observe first that boundary elements of $\partial \mathcal{M}^\tau(\underline{x}, y; V)$ project to boundary faces of K_n^τ , i.e. with an edge of length $l(e) = 0$. The corresponding interval I_e is then reduced to a point, and forgetting the value of γ at that point gives the corresponding element of $\mathcal{M}^{\tau(e)}(\underline{x}, y; V^{\tau(e)})$. Conversely, given an

element of $\mathcal{M}^{\tau(e)}(\underline{x}, y; V^{\tau(e)})$, the multiplicative condition at vertices (3.23) uniquely determines the value of γ at I_e . \square

The boundary formula (3.29) reads as the boundary of a moduli space defined over a chamber of K_n corresponds to the union of the moduli spaces over the boundary walls of that given chamber. Therefore, adjacent chambers can be glued along their common wall¹, and when glueing all the chambers together, one obtains a manifold without boundary.

Definition 3.11. Let

$$(3.34) \quad \mathfrak{X}_{\text{reg}}^{\mathcal{T}}(G, f) := \bigcap_{n, \tau \in \kappa_n} \mathfrak{X}_{\text{reg}, \tau}^{\mathcal{T}}(G, f) \subset \mathfrak{X}^{\mathcal{T}}(G, f).$$

Define for $V \in \mathfrak{X}_{\text{reg}}^{\mathcal{T}}(G, f)$ and $\underline{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n), y$ critical points such that $\text{vdim}(\underline{x}, y) = |\underline{x}| - |y| + n - 2$ either equals zero or one,

$$(3.35) \quad \mathcal{M}(\underline{x}, y; V) = \bigcup_{\tau \in \kappa_n^0} \mathcal{M}^{\tau}(\underline{x}, y; V),$$

where for $\text{vdim}(\underline{x}, y) = 0$ this is a disjoint union of finite sets, and for $\text{vdim}(\underline{x}, y) = 1$ the union is understood as a glueing along boundaries: if $\sigma \in \kappa_n^1$, there is exactly two $\tau, \tau' \in \kappa_n^0$ such that $\sigma = \tau(e) = \tau'(e')$, we then glue $\mathcal{M}^{\tau}(\underline{x}, y; V)$ and $\mathcal{M}^{\tau'}(\underline{x}, y; V)$ along the common part of their boundary $\mathcal{M}^{\sigma}(\underline{x}, y; V)$.

If $n = 1$, let $\mathcal{M}(\underline{x}, y; V)$ be the space of Morse trajectories for \widehat{V} involved in the Morse differential (i.e. the quotient by \mathbb{R} of the space of flowlines).

Proposition 3.12. *If $\text{vdim}(\underline{x}, y) = 1$, then $\mathcal{M}(\underline{x}, y; V)$ can be compactified to a compact 1-manifold with boundary $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(\underline{x}, y; V)$, with boundary given by:*

$$(3.36) \quad \partial \overline{\mathcal{M}}(\underline{x}, y; V) = \bigcup_{z; 1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} \mathcal{M}(\underline{x}_1, z; V) \times \mathcal{M}(\underline{x}_2, y; V),$$

where (see Figure 20): $\underline{x}_1 = (x_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_j)$, $z \in \text{Crit} f$ is such that $\text{vdim}(\underline{x}_1, z) = 0$, and $\underline{x}_2 = (x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, z, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_n)$ (and therefore $\text{vdim}(\underline{x}_2, y) = 0$).




FIGURE 20. Tree breaking.

¹The key property that allows this is associativity of the multiplication, which we implicitly use when writing (3.23).

Proof. These correspond to trees breaking either at internal or external edges. \square

We are now ready to define the A_∞ -algebra structure on the Morse complex of G .

Definition 3.13. Let $A = CM_*(G, f)$, and $V \in \mathfrak{X}_{\text{reg}}^{\mathcal{T}}(G, f)$. Define for all $n \geq 1$, an operation $\mu_A^n: A^{\otimes n} \rightarrow A$ by:

$$(3.37) \quad \mu_A^n(\underline{x}) = \sum_{y; \text{vdim}(\underline{x}, y)=0} \#\mathcal{M}(\underline{x}, y; V) \cdot y$$

It follows from Proposition 3.12 that the μ_A^n satisfy the A_∞ -relations, therefore $(A, \{\mu_A^n\}_n)$ is an A_∞ -algebra.

Remark 3.14. Even though we omit it in the notations, the maps μ_A^n depend on the perturbation V . One can show, following [Maz22], that different choices of perturbations and Morse functions will yield homotopy equivalent A_∞ -algebras.

3.3. The A_∞ -module structure on $CM_*(X)$. Let now G act on a closed smooth manifold X , and $h: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a Morse function. We now want to endow $CM(X, h)$ with an A_∞ -module structure over the previously constructed A_∞ -algebra $CM(G, f)$. The construction will be analogous, except that we will be counting multiplicative trees with edges both in G and X . We now do the few adjustments in order to do so.

Definition 3.15 (Left and top-right parts of a tree, see Figure 21). For a tree $\tau \in \kappa_n$, let

$$(3.38) \quad \text{TopRightEd}(\tau) \subset \text{Edges}(\tau)$$

stand for the maximal leaf (i.e. the maximal element of the ordered set $\text{Leaves}(\tau)$) and all its descendents, all the way down to the root. Let also

$$(3.39) \quad \text{LeftEd}(\tau) = \text{Edges}(\tau) \setminus \text{TopRightEd}(\tau).$$

Let also $\text{LeftEd}(\mathcal{T})$ and $\text{TopRightEd}(\mathcal{T})$ stand for the corresponding subsets of the universal tree \mathcal{T} .




FIGURE 21. We have drawn a tree τ with $\text{LeftEd}(\tau)$ in red, and $\text{TopRightEd}(\tau)$ in blue.

The sides $\text{LeftEd}(\mathcal{T})$ and $\text{TopRightEd}(\mathcal{T})$ will be mapped respectively to G and X . In order to define the moduli spaces of these corresponding

multiplicative trees, let us introduce the relevant space of perturbations, analogous to Definition 3.7.

Definition 3.16. Fix a $V \in \mathfrak{X}_{\text{reg}}^{\mathcal{T}}(G, f)$, and let

$$(3.40) \quad \mathfrak{X}^{\mathcal{T}}(G, f, V; X, h) \subset \text{Maps}(\mathcal{T}, \mathfrak{X}(G) \sqcup \mathfrak{X}(X))$$

consist in smooth maps W that:

- (1) map $\text{LeftEd}(\mathcal{T})$ to $\mathfrak{X}(G)$ and $\text{TopRightEd}(\mathcal{T})$ to $\mathfrak{X}(X)$,
- (2) are locally constant on $\mathcal{T}_{\geq 1}$ and equal to either $\widehat{V} \in \mathfrak{X}(G, f)$ or some pseudo-gradient $\widehat{W} \in \mathfrak{X}(X, h)$
- (3) are coherent with respect to edge breaking, in the following sense. If $\tau \in \kappa_n$ and $\mathcal{E} \subset \text{IntEd}(\tau)$ is a subset of internal edges splitting τ into subtrees

$$(3.41) \quad \tau_1 \in \kappa_{n_1}, \dots, \tau_k \in \kappa_{n_k},$$

then gluing metric trees at edges of \mathcal{E} gives gluing maps, for $L \geq 2$:

$$(3.42) \quad K_{n_1} \times \dots \times K_{n_k} \times [L, +\infty)^{|\mathcal{E}|} \rightarrow K_n$$

Let ν_L stand for the image of this map, then restricted to this image, there is a map

$$(3.43) \quad \mathcal{T}_{n, \leq 1|_{\nu_L}} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{n_1, \leq 1} \sqcup \dots \sqcup \mathcal{T}_{n_k, \leq 1}$$

and we want that W factors through this map for L large enough. Here, we map $\mathcal{T}_{n_1, \leq 1} \sqcup \dots \sqcup \mathcal{T}_{n_k, \leq 1}$ to $\mathfrak{X}(G) \sqcup \mathfrak{X}(X)$ by either W or V , depending on whether the corresponding subtrees intersect $\text{TopRightEd}(\mathcal{T})$ or not.

Just as for $\mathfrak{X}^{\mathcal{T}}(G, f)$, the space $\mathfrak{X}^{\mathcal{T}}(G, f, V; X, h)$ is nonempty and convex, and is equipped with a projection to the constant part in X :

$$(3.44) \quad \mathfrak{X}^{\mathcal{T}}(G, f, V; X, h) \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}(X, h),$$

$$(3.45) \quad W \mapsto \widehat{W}.$$

Definition 3.17. Pick $W \in \mathfrak{X}^{\mathcal{T}}(G, f, V; X, h)$, and let $T = (\tau, l)$ be a metric tree, written as before $T = \coprod_{e \in \text{Edges}(T)} I_e$.

Restricting W to T then gives a map $W_T: T \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}(G) \sqcup \mathfrak{X}(X)$.

A *multiplicative tree* in (G, X) is a map $\gamma: T \rightarrow G \sqcup X$ such that:

- it maps $\text{LeftEd}(T)$ to G and $\text{TopRightEd}(T)$ to X ,
- on each edge I_e , the restriction γ_e of γ is a flowline for W_T .
- at every vertex v , the multiplicative condition holds. Assume that the incoming edges at v are given in the following order:

$$(3.46) \quad \text{In}(v) = (e_1, \dots, e_k),$$

and let f be the outgoing edge. The condition is that

$$(3.47) \quad \gamma_{e_1}(v) \times \dots \times \gamma_{e_k}(v) = \gamma_f(v),$$

where $\gamma_e(v)$ stands for $\gamma(t)$, with t the endpoint of I_e corresponding to v . Here, the last \times either stands for the group multiplication $G \times G \rightarrow G$ or the action map $G \times X \rightarrow X$.

As before, if, as an ordered set, $\text{Leaves}(\tau) = (l_1, \dots, l_n)$, let

$$(3.48) \quad \lim_{-\infty} \gamma = (\lim_{-\infty} \gamma_{l_1}, \dots, \lim_{-\infty} \gamma_{l_n}) \in (\text{Crit} f)^{n-1} \times \text{Crit} h,$$

and let

$$(3.49) \quad \lim_{+\infty} \gamma = \lim_{+\infty} \gamma_{r_\tau} \in \text{Crit} h,$$

with r_τ the root.

Just as for the A_∞ -structure on $CM_*(G)$, for $\underline{x} \in (\text{Crit} f)^{n-1} \times \text{Crit} h$ and $y \in \text{Crit} h$, one can define moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}(\underline{x}, y; V, W)$ of multiplicative trees in (G, X) with limits \underline{x} and y at $\pm\infty$. For W in a comeagre subset $\mathfrak{X}_{\text{reg}}^T(G, f, V; X, h) \subset \mathfrak{X}^T(G, f, V; X, h)$, this space is smooth of dimension $|\underline{x}| - |y| + n - 2$. When of dimension 0 it is compact, and when of dimension 1, it can be compactified to $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(\underline{x}, y; V, W)$, with boundary

$$(3.50) \quad \partial \overline{\mathcal{M}}(\underline{x}, y; V, W) = \bigcup_{z \in \text{Crit} h; 1 \leq i \leq j = n} \mathcal{M}(\underline{x}_1, z; V, W) \times \mathcal{M}(\underline{x}_2, y; V, W), \\ \cup \bigcup_{z \in \text{Crit} f; 1 \leq i \leq j < n} \mathcal{M}(\underline{x}_1, z; V) \times \mathcal{M}(\underline{x}_2, y; V, W),$$

where (see Figure 20): $\underline{x}_1 = (x_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_j)$, z is such that $\text{vdim}(\underline{x}_1, z) = 0$, and $\underline{x}_2 = (x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, z, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_n)$ (and therefore $\text{vdim}(\underline{x}_2, y) = 0$).

Then, with $A = CM_*(G, f)$ and $M = CM_*(X, h)$, the zero-dimensional moduli spaces define maps

$$(3.51) \quad \mu_M^{n|1} : A^{\otimes n} \otimes M \rightarrow M,$$

and equation 3.50 shows that these are A_∞ -module structure maps.

4. THE A_∞ -MODULE STRUCTURE ON THE FLOER COMPLEX

4.1. Geometric setting. We will be working in the setting below, similar with [HLS20b, Hyp. 3.1] elegant assumptions (contain bot the exact and monotone setting), except that we want our group G compact.

Assumption 4.1. *Let:*

- G be a compact Lie group,
- (M, ω) be a symplectic manifold, on which G acts by symplectomorphisms,
- $L_0, L_1 \subset M$ be a pair of Lagrangians invariant by the G -action.

Such that:

- Any loop of paths from L_0 to L_1

$$(4.1) \quad u : (S^1 \times [0, 1]; S^1 \times \{0\}, S^1 \times \{1\}) \rightarrow (M; L_0, L_1)$$

has zero area and Maslov index.

- M is either compact or convex at infinity, for some fixed almost complex structure.
- L_0 and L_1 are either compact of cylindrical and disjoint at infinity.

As usual, we will need to use Hamiltonian perturbations and perturb almost complex structures to achieve transversality, we now define the relevant spaces of perturbations.

Definition 4.2. Let $\mathcal{H}_t(M)$ denote the space of smooth maps

$$(4.2) \quad H: [0, 1] \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

with compact support. For such maps, let $\phi_H^t: M \rightarrow M$ denote their associated Hamiltonian symplectomorphism, i.e. the time t flow of their symplectic gradient.

Let $\mathcal{J}(M)$ stand for the space of ω -compatible almost complex structures, and $\mathcal{J}_t(M) = C^\infty([0, 1], \mathcal{J}(M))$.

Given L_0, L_1 , a pair $\mathcal{F} = (H_t, J_t) \in \mathcal{H}_t(M) \times \mathcal{J}_t(M)$ such that $\phi_{H_t}^1(L_0)$ and L_1 intersect transversely a *Floer datum*.

For such datum, let $\mathcal{I}_{H_t}(L_0, L_1)$ (or sometimes $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{F}}(L_0, L_1)$) denote the set of H_t -perturbed intersection points, i.e. Hamiltonian chords $x: [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ of the symplectic gradient X_{H_t} with $x(0) \in L_0$ and $x(1) \in L_1$. These are in one to one correspondence with $\phi_{H_t}^1(L_0^N) \cap L_1^N$.

Let $Z = \{s + it : 0 \leq t \leq 1\} \subset \mathbb{C}$ be the strip, with its two boundary components $\partial_0 Z = \{t = 0\}$, $\partial_1 Z = \{t = 1\}$. For $\mathcal{F} = (H_t, J_t) \in \mathcal{H}_t(M) \times \mathcal{J}_t(M)$ and $x, y \in \mathcal{I}_{H_t}(L_0, L_1)$, let $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(x, y; \mathcal{F})$ be the moduli space of perturbed J_t -holomorphic strips

$$(4.3) \quad u: Z \rightarrow M$$

satisfying the *Floer equation*

$$(4.4) \quad \partial_s u + J_t(\partial_t u - X_{H_t}) = 0,$$

the Larangian boundary conditions $u|_{\partial_0 Z} \subset L_0$, $u|_{\partial_1 Z} \subset L_1$, and asymptotic to x and y when $s \rightarrow -\infty$ and $s \rightarrow +\infty$ respectively. Let then $\mathcal{M}(x, y; \mathcal{F})$ be its quotient by \mathbb{R} (modulo translations in the s -direction).

For $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, let $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(x, y; \mathcal{F})_i$ and $\mathcal{M}(x, y; \mathcal{F})_i$ denote the subsets of curves with Maslov index $I(u) = i + 1$.

Proposition 4.3. *Assume that $(M; L_0, L_1)$ satisfy the above assumptions. There exists a comeagre subset*

$$(4.5) \quad \mathcal{H}\mathcal{J}_t^{\text{reg}}(M) \subset \mathcal{H}\mathcal{J}_t(M) := \mathcal{H}_t(M) \times \mathcal{J}_t(M)$$

of regular perturbations such that, for $\mathcal{F} = (H_t, J_t) \in \mathcal{H}\mathcal{J}_t^{\text{reg}}(M)$, $\phi_{H_t}^1(L_0)$ intersects L_1 transversely; $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(x, y; \mathcal{F})_i$ and $\mathcal{M}(x, y; \mathcal{F})_i$ are smooth of dimension $i + 1$ and i respectively. When $i = 0$, $\mathcal{M}(x, y; \mathcal{F})_0$ is a finite set. In this case, define

$$(4.6) \quad CF(M; L_0, L_1; \mathcal{F}) = \bigoplus_{x \in \mathcal{I}(L_0, L_1; H_t)} \mathbb{Z}_2 x,$$

with differential $\partial = \mu^{0|1}$ defined by

$$(4.7) \quad \partial x = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{F}}(L_0, L_1)} \#\mathcal{M}(x, y; \mathcal{F})_0 y.$$

Now we define the space of perturbations for hybrid trees, analogous to $\mathfrak{X}^{\mathcal{T}}(G, f, V; X, h)$ in Definition 3.16.

Definition 4.4. Fix a $V \in \mathfrak{X}_{\text{reg}}^{\mathcal{T}}(G, f)$, and let

$$(4.8) \quad \text{Pert}^{\mathcal{T}}(G, f, V; L_0, L_1) \subset \text{Maps}(\mathcal{T}, \mathfrak{X}(G) \sqcup (\mathcal{H}\mathcal{J}_t(M)))$$

consist in smooth maps P that:

- (1) map $\text{LeftEd}(\mathcal{T})$ to $\mathfrak{X}(G)$ and $\text{TopRightEd}(\mathcal{T})$ to $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{J}_t(M)$,
- (2) are locally constant on $\mathcal{T}_{\geq 1}$ and equal to either $\widehat{V} \in \mathfrak{X}(G, f)$ or some pair $\widehat{P} \in \mathcal{H}\mathcal{J}_t(M)$
- (3) are coherent with respect to edge breaking, in the following sense. If $\tau \in \kappa_n$ and $\mathcal{E} \subset \text{IntEd}(\tau)$ is a subset of internal edges splitting τ into subtrees

$$(4.9) \quad \tau_1 \in \kappa_{n_1}, \dots, \tau_k \in \kappa_{n_k},$$

then gluing metric trees at edges of \mathcal{E} gives gluing maps, for $L \geq 2$:

$$(4.10) \quad K_{n_1} \times \dots \times K_{n_k} \times [L, +\infty)^{|\mathcal{E}|} \rightarrow K_n$$

Let ν_L stand for the image of this map, then restricted to this image, there is a map

$$(4.11) \quad \mathcal{T}_{n, \leq 1|_{\nu_L}} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{n_1, \leq 1} \sqcup \dots \sqcup \mathcal{T}_{n_k, \leq 1}$$

and we want that P factors through this map for L large enough. Here, we map $\mathcal{T}_{n_1, \leq 1} \sqcup \dots \sqcup \mathcal{T}_{n_k, \leq 1}$ to $\mathfrak{X}(G) \sqcup \mathcal{H}\mathcal{J}_t(M)$ by either P or V , depending on whether the corresponding subtrees intersect $\text{TopRightEd}(\mathcal{T})$ or not.

Just as for $\mathfrak{X}^{\mathcal{T}}(G, f)$, the space $\mathcal{P}ert^{\mathcal{T}}(G, f, V; L_0, L_1)$ is nonempty and convex, and is equipped with a projection to the constant part in \mathfrak{X} :

$$(4.12) \quad \mathcal{P}ert^{\mathcal{T}}(G, f, V; L_0, L_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}\mathcal{J}_t(M),$$

$$(4.13) \quad P \mapsto \widehat{P}.$$

Alternatively, one can think about perturbations of $\mathcal{P}ert^{\mathcal{T}}(G, f, V; L_0, L_1)$ as maps $h\mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}(G) \sqcup (\mathcal{H}(M) \times \mathcal{J}(M))$, with

$$(4.14) \quad h\mathcal{T} = \text{LeftEd}(T) \cup \text{TopRightEd}(T) \times [0, 1]$$

the universal hybrid tree.

If $T = (\tau, l)$ is a metric tree, recall that we still denote by T the fibre of \mathcal{T} at T :

$$(4.15) \quad T = \coprod_{e \in \text{Edges}(T)} I_e.$$

Likewise, let hT stand for the fibre of $h\mathcal{T}$ at T :

$$(4.16) \quad hT = \coprod_{e \in \text{LeftEd}(T)} I_e \sqcup \coprod_{e \in \text{TopRightEd}(T)} I_e \times [0, 1].$$

Definition 4.5. Pick $P \in \mathcal{P}ert^{\mathcal{T}}(G, f, V; L_0, L_1)$, and let $T = (\tau, l)$ be a metric tree.

Restricting P to hT then gives a map $P_T: hT \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}(G) \sqcup \mathcal{H}\mathcal{J}(M)$.

A *hybrid tree* in $(G; M, L_0, L_1)$ is a pair of maps

$$(4.17) \quad \gamma: \text{LeftEd}(T) \rightarrow G,$$

$$(4.18) \quad u: \text{TopRightEd}(T) \times [0, 1] \rightarrow (M; L_0, L_1),$$

(which we will write as $(\gamma, u): hT \rightarrow G \sqcup M$) such that:

- on each left edge I_e , the restriction γ_e of γ is a flowline for P_T .
- on each top-right strip $Z_e = I_e \times [0, 1]$, the restriction u_e of u satisfies the Floer equation for P_T .

- at every “left vertex” (i.e. those only touching flowlines $\text{LeftEd}(T)$), the usual multiplicative condition holds.
- at every “top-right vertex” v (i.e. the ones touching top-right strips), with the incoming edges at v :

$$(4.19) \quad \text{In}(v) = (e_1, \dots, e_k),$$

and f the outgoing edge, we have:

$$(4.20) \quad \forall t \in [0, 1], \quad \gamma_{e_1}(v) \times \dots \times u_{e_k}(v, t) = u_f(v, t).$$

If, as an ordered set, $\text{Leaves}(\tau) = (l_1, \dots, l_n)$, let

$$(4.21) \quad \lim_{-\infty} \gamma = (\lim_{-\infty} \gamma_{l_1}, \dots, \lim_{-\infty} u_{l_n}) \in (\text{Crit} f)^{n-1} \times \mathcal{I}_{\hat{P}}(L_0, L_1),$$

and let

$$(4.22) \quad \lim_{+\infty} \gamma = \lim_{+\infty} u_{r_\tau} \in \mathcal{I}_{\hat{P}}(L_0, L_1),$$

with r_τ the root.

For $\underline{x} \in (\text{Crit} f)^{n-1} \times \mathcal{I}_{\hat{P}}(L_0, L_1)$ and $y \in \mathcal{I}_{\hat{P}}(L_0, L_1)$, one can define moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}(\underline{x}, y; V, P)$ of hybrid trees in $(G; M, L_0, L_1)$ with limits \underline{x} and y at $\pm\infty$.

These are solutions of a Fredholm problem, and we denote $\mathcal{M}(\underline{x}, y; V, P)_i$ those of virtual dimension i (i.e. of Fredholm index i , except for the case of strips, where there is an additional quotient by \mathbb{R} , in which case the (Maslov) Fredholm index is $i + 1$).

For P in a comeagre subset

$$(4.23) \quad \mathcal{P}ert_{\text{reg}}^T(G, f, V; L_0, L_1) \subset \mathcal{P}ert^T(G, f, V; L_0, L_1),$$

this space is smooth of dimension given by its Fredholm index. When of dimension 0 it is compact, and when of dimension 1, it can be compactified to $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(\underline{x}, y; V, P)$, with boundary

$$(4.24) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial \overline{\mathcal{M}}(\underline{x}, y; V, P) = & \bigcup_{z \in \mathcal{I}_{\hat{P}}(L_0, L_1); 1 \leq i \leq j = n} \mathcal{M}(\underline{x}_1, z; V, P) \times \mathcal{M}(\underline{x}_2, y; V, P), \\ & \cup \bigcup_{z \in \text{Crit} f; 1 \leq i \leq j < n} \mathcal{M}(\underline{x}_1, z; V) \times \mathcal{M}(\underline{x}_2, y; V, P), \end{aligned}$$

where (see Figure 20):

- $\underline{x}_1 = (x_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_j)$, z is such that $\text{vdim}(\underline{x}_1, z) = 0$,
- $\underline{x}_2 = (x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, z, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_n)$ (and therefore $\text{vdim}(\underline{x}_2, y) = 0$).

In addition to sphere and disk bubbling (ruled out by our assumptions), another kind of bubble can possibly develop when energy concentrates at a seam point, while simultaneously a strip length goes to zero, see Figure 22. From Bottman’s removal of singularity theorem [Bot14], this will either be a figure 8 bubble, or possibly its disc counterpart. In either cases, if one denotes (b_0, b_1, b_2) the three components of the bubble, and g_0, g_1 the values of γ_0, γ_1 at the limit, then $(b_0, g_0 \cdot b_1, g_0 \cdot g_1 \cdot b_2)$ will be an actual sphere or disc in M . From our assumptions, it will have to be constant.



FIGURE 22. Figure 8 sphere and disc bubbling.

Then, with $A = CM_*(G, f)$ and $M = CF(L_0, L_1; \hat{P})$, the zero-dimensional moduli spaces define maps

$$(4.25) \quad \mu_M^{n|1} : A^{\otimes n} \otimes M \rightarrow M,$$

and equation 4.24 shows that these are A_∞ -module structure maps.

REFERENCES

- [Abo11] Mohammed Abouzaid. A topological model for the Fukaya categories of plumbings. *Journal of Differential Geometry*, 87(1):1–80, 2011.
- [ADE14] Michele Audin, Mihai Damian, and Reinie Ern . *Morse theory and Floer homology*, volume 2. Springer, 2014.
- [BH21] Erkao Bao and Ko Honda. Equivariant Lagrangian Floer cohomology via semi-global Kuranishi structures. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 21(4):1677–1722, 2021.
- [Bot14] N. Bottman. Pseudoholomorphic quilts with figure eight singularity. *ArXiv e-prints*, October 2014.
- [Caz24] Guillem Cazassus. Equivariant Lagrangian Floer homology via cotangent bundles of EG_N . *Journal of Topology*, 17(1):e12328, 2024.
- [CH17] Cheol-Hyun Cho and Hansol Hong. Finite group actions on Lagrangian Floer theory. *J. Symplectic Geom.*, 15(2):307–420, 2017.
- [Eis23] Mike Miller Eismeier. Equivariant instanton homology, 2023.
- [Fra04] Urs Frauenfelder. The Arnold-Givental conjecture and moment Floer homology. *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, (42):2179–2269, 2004.
- [Fuk93] K. Fukaya. *Morse Homotopy, A_∞ -category, and Floer Homologies*. MSRI preprint series: Mathematical Sciences Research Institute. Math. Sciences Research Inst., 1993.
- [GM74] Victor KAM Gugenheim and J Peter May. *On the theory and applications of differential torsion products*, volume 142. American Mathematical Soc., 1974.
- [HLS16] Kristen Hendricks, Robert Lipshitz, and Sucharit Sarkar. A flexible construction of equivariant Floer homology and applications. *J. Topol.*, 9(4):1153–1236, 2016.
- [HLS20a] Kristen Hendricks, Robert Lipshitz, and Sucharit Sarkar. Corrigendum: A flexible construction of equivariant Floer homology and applications. *J. Topol.*, 13(3):1317–1331, 2020.
- [HLS20b] Kristen Hendricks, Robert Lipshitz, and Sucharit Sarkar. A simplicial construction of g -equivariant floer homology. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, 121(6):1798–1866, 2020.
- [Kho04] Mikhail Khovanov. $sl(3)$ link homology. *Algebraic & Geometric Topology*, 4(2):1045–1081, 2004.
- [KLZ19] Yoosik Kim, Siu-Cheong Lau, and Xiao Zheng. T-equivariant disc potential and SYZ mirror construction, 2019.

- [KM07] Peter Kronheimer and Tomasz Mrowka. *Monopoles and three-manifolds*, volume 10 of *New Mathematical Monographs*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007.
- [KM19] Peter Kronheimer and Tomasz Mrowka. A deformation of instanton homology for webs. *Geometry & Topology*, 23(3):1491–1547, 2019.
- [Kup96] Greg Kuperberg. Spiders for rank 2 Lie algebras. *Communications in mathematical physics*, 180(1):109–151, 1996.
- [LLL24] Siu-Cheong Lau, Nai-Chung Conan Leung, and Yan-Lung Leon Li. Equivariant lagrangian correspondence and a conjecture of teleman, 2024.
- [Maz22] Thibaut Mazuir. Higher algebra of A_∞ and ΩBAs -algebras in morse theory II, 2022.
- [Sei08] Paul Seidel. *Fukaya categories and Picard-Lefschetz theory*, volume 10. European Mathematical Society, 2008.
- [SS10] Paul Seidel and Ivan Smith. Localization for involutions in Floer cohomology. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 20(6):1464–1501, 2010.
- [Woo11] Christopher T. Woodward. Gauged Floer theory of toric moment fibers. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 21(3):680–749, 2011.
- [WW09] K. Wehrheim and C. Woodward. Pseudoholomorphic Quilts. *ArXiv e-prints*, May 2009.

CENTRE FOR QUANTUM MATHEMATICS, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN DENMARK
Email address: `g.cazassus@gmail.com`