

TWISTED GROMOV AND LEFSCHETZ INVARIANTS ASSOCIATED WITH BUNDLES

GILBERTO SPANO

ABSTRACT. Given a closed symplectic 4-manifold (X, ω) , we define a twisted version of the Gromov-Taubes invariants for (X, ω) , where the twisting coefficients are induced by the choice of a surface bundle over X . Given a fibered 3-manifold Y , we similarly construct twisted Lefschetz zeta functions associated with surface bundles: we prove that these are essentially equivalent to the Jiang's Lefschetz zeta functions of Y , twisted by the representations of $\pi_1(Y)$ that are induced by monodromy homomorphisms of surface bundles over Y . This leads to an interpretation of the corresponding twisted Reidemeister torsions of Y in terms of products of "local" commutative Reidemeister torsions. Finally we relate the two invariants by proving that, for any fixed closed surface bundle \mathcal{B} over Y , the corresponding twisted Lefschetz zeta function coincides with the Gromov-Taubes invariant of $S^1 \times Y$ twisted by the bundle over $S^1 \times Y$ naturally induced by \mathcal{B} .

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Review of the Gromov-Taubes invariants	4
3. Twisted Gromov-Taubes invariants	8
4. Mapping tori and twisted Lefschetz zeta functions	17
References	30

1. INTRODUCTION

To any given closed symplectic 4-manifold (X, ω) , endowed with an auxiliary generic ω -compatible almost complex structure J , it is possible to associate its Gromov-Taubes series $\text{GT}(X, \omega, J)$ (defined in [22]). Even if this depends a priori on the choice of J , Taubes directly showed that in fact it depends only on X and the isotopy class of ω . Furthermore he proved in [23] that if $b_2^+(X) > 1$ then its invariant is equivalent to the Seiberg-Witten invariant of X (see for example [19]), and so it depends only on the diffeomorphism class of X .

Briefly, $\text{GT}(X)$ can be defined in terms of a weighted count of certain embedded J -holomorphic surfaces C in (X, ω, J) . The weight of each C depends on a sign and its homology class $[C] \in H_2(X, \mathbb{Z})$, encoded by a formal variable $t_{[C]}$.

In the standard case, $\text{GT}(X)$ is related to other invariants. Of particular interest for us is the case of symplectic 4-manifolds of the form $S^1 \times Y$: by a result of Friedl and Vidussi ([7]) Y must be a fibered 3-manifold. In this case it is possible to directly prove (see for example Section 2.6 of [13]) that $\text{GT}(S^1 \times Y)$ coincides with the *Lefschetz zeta function* $\zeta(Y)$, which in turn is equivalent to the Reidemeister

Date: May 31, 2022

Key words: Gromov invariants, surface bundles, Lefschetz zeta functions, twisted Reidemeister torsion.

The author was supported by ERC LTDBud.

torsion of Y (also called Milnor or Turaev torsion), which is a topological invariant of Y . We remark that if $L \subset S^3$ is a link, then the Reidemeister torsion of $S^3 \setminus L$ is essentially equivalent to the Alexander polynomial of L .

There are several refinements of the Lefschetz zeta function. One of them is the *twisted Lefschetz zeta function* $\zeta_\rho(Y)$, defined by Jiang ([16], [17]), which is associated to a representation $\rho : \pi_1(Y) \rightarrow GL(n, R)$, where R is a commutative ring with unit. Jiang proved that if Y is fibered, then $\zeta_\rho(Y)$ is equivalent to *Lin's ρ -twisted Reidemeister torsion of Y* (see for example [18]). Roughly speaking, if Y is diffeomorphic to the mapping torus of a surface S with a diffeomorphism ϕ , $\zeta_\rho(Y)$ is a weighted count of periodic orbits of ϕ , where the weight of an orbit δ depends on its Lefschetz sign, a formal variable encoding the period of δ and the “non-commutative” weight $\text{tr}(\rho([\delta]))$, where $[\delta]$ is the conjugacy class in $\pi_1(Y)$ determined by δ .

The main motivations behind this paper are the following questions:

Question 1. There exist “twisted versions” of the Gromov-Taubes invariants that are related to the twisted Reidemeister torsion like the standard $\text{GT}(S^1 \times Y)$ is related to the standard Reidemeister torsion of the fibered manifold Y ?

Question 2. There is a purely topological interpretation of the twisting coefficients of Jiang and Lin? Said differently, what is the topological meaning of the information carried by $\zeta_\rho(Y)$ for a given choice of ρ ?

In order to try to answer to these (apparently unrelated) questions we introduce the concept of “bundled twistings” for both Gromov-Taubes invariants and Lefschetz zeta functions.

We start in Section 2 by briefly recalling the definition of the standard Gromov-Taubes invariants.

In Section 3 we define a *bundled twisted version of $\text{GT}(X, \omega, J)$* , where the aim of the twisting coefficient associated to a J -holomorphic curve $C \subset X$ is to read non-commutative informations about the homotopy class of C in X . Roughly speaking, a bundled twisting is obtained by choosing a smooth surface bundle

$$F \hookrightarrow W \xrightarrow{\pi} X$$

and then twisting the weight of C in $\text{GT}(X, \omega, J)$ by the Gromov-Taubes invariant $\text{GT}(\pi^*C)$ of the pull-back bundle over C , computed with respect to formal variables encoding the homology classes in the image of $H_2(\pi^*C, \mathbb{Z}) \xrightarrow{i_*} H_2(W, \mathbb{Z})$, where $i : \pi^*C \hookrightarrow W$ is the inclusion. Since the homeomorphism type of π^*C depends on the homotopy class of C , it is natural to expect to get a refinement of the standard $\text{GT}(X, \omega, J)$, where only the homology class of C is taken into account.

What we get is a *π -twisted Gromov-Taubes series $\text{GT}_\pi(X, \omega, J)$* , depending, a priori, on the symplectic form ω and the ω -compatible almost complex structure J on X . In Subsection 3.4 we will then prove the following:

Theorem 1.1. *Given a smooth oriented surface bundle (W, X, π, F) with F closed, the π -twisted Gromov-Taubes series $\text{GT}_\pi(X, \omega, J)$ is independent on a generic choice of J and depends only on the isotopy class of ω .*

In Section 4 we will define *π -twisted Lefschetz zeta functions $\zeta_\pi(Y)$* for a fibered 3-manifolds Y , where the twisting coefficients are induced by a smooth surface bundle

$$F \hookrightarrow V \xrightarrow{\pi} Y.$$

The definition of $\zeta_\pi(Y)$ is conceptually similar to that of $\text{GT}_\pi(X, \omega)$: morally, the latter is defined by counting holomorphic curves in the pull-back bundles over J -holomorphic curves, while the former is defined by counting periodic orbits in the pull-back bundles over periodic orbits. The key fact is that the pull-back bundle of π over any periodic orbit is again a mapping torus with fiber F and first return map determined by the *monodromy homomorphism*

$$\rho_\pi : \pi_1(Y) \longrightarrow \text{MCG}(F)$$

of the bundle: this “local” mapping torus has again a standard Lefschetz zeta function, that can be used as twisting weight for the underlying orbit in Y .

It turns out that our π -twisted Lefschetz zeta function is essentially equivalent to the Jiang’s Lefschetz zeta function, “algebraically” twisted with respect to the representation ρ_{π_*} of $\pi_1(Y)$ induced by ρ_π into $\text{GL}(H_*(F, \mathbb{Z}))$ (see Theorem 4.15 below). As a corollary we obtain that for any surface bundle (V, Y, π, F) , $\zeta_\pi(Y)$ is a *topological invariant*. In fact, since $\zeta_\pi(Y)$ is defined by counting orbits (in the total space V) just with sign and their homological weight, it can be seen as a purely geometrical interpretation of the corresponding twisted Reidemeister torsion of Lin. The intuitive idea behind this phenomenon is the following: using Lefschetz fixed point theorem, we can interpret the Jiang’s twisting coefficients $\text{tr}(\rho_{\pi_*}([\delta^n]))$ of the iterates an orbit δ as a signed sum of periodic points (orbits) in the mapping torus $\pi^*\delta$ of $(F, \rho_\pi([\delta]))$, which in turn gives (a version of) the Lefschetz zeta function of $\pi^*\delta$. This provides an answer to Question 2 for the family of *bundled representations* of $\pi_1(Y)$ of Definition 4.19 below (cf. Example 4.20 and Remark 4.23).

The reason for which the two motivational questions above are related is explained by the following:

Theorem 1.2. *Let Y be the mapping torus of a closed surface S and a diffeomorphism ϕ and let (V, Y, π, F) be a smooth oriented surface bundle with F closed. Let*

$$(S^1 \times V, S^1 \times Y, \text{Id} \times \pi, F)$$

be the natural bundle induced by the product by S^1 and consider a symplectic form $\omega = \Omega + ds \wedge dt$, where Ω is any symplectic form on S and t and s are parameters for $[0, 1]$ and, respectively, S^1 . Then:

$$\text{GT}_{\text{Id} \times \pi}(S^1 \times Y, \omega) = \zeta_\pi(Y).$$

By last theorem, and the relation between ζ_π and Lin’s twisted Reidemeister torsion, $\text{GT}_\pi(X, \omega)$ provides an answer to Question 1. Moreover it is natural to ask whether our twisted Gromov-Taubes invariants are in fact independent also on the choice of the symplectic form and how powerful they are in detecting generic closed symplectic 4-manifolds.

We remark that twisted Reidemeister torsions are in general much stronger invariants than the standard version. For example it has been proved that they detect fibered (non-necessarily closed) 3-manifolds ([7]), Thurston norms and genus of knots ([9]) and, very recently, the hyperbolic volume of knot exteriors ([11]). Also, they give useful tools in detecting sliceness and knot concordance: see [9] for these and other applications. One can then hope to find several useful applications also for the twisted Gromov-Taubes invariants.

Acknowledgements. The author is grateful to Paolo Ghiggini and András Stipsicz for many helpful suggestions and discussions. He also would like to thank Antonio Alfieri, Vincent Colin and Chris Wendl for the interest they showed about this work.

2. REVIEW OF THE GROMOV-TAUBES INVARIANTS

In this brief review of $\text{GT}(X, \omega)$ we will follow [13, Chapter 2], [14] and [22].

Fix (X, ω) and an ω -compatible almost complex structure J over X . A J -holomorphic curve in (X, J) is a smooth map $u : (\Sigma, j) \rightarrow (X, J)$ from a connected compact Riemann surface (Σ, j) such that

$$\bar{\partial}f := \frac{1}{2}(du \circ j - J \circ du) = 0$$

and considered up to the following equivalence relation: given $u_i : (\Sigma_i, j_i) \rightarrow (X, J)$, $i = 1, 2$, then u_1 and u_2 are equivalent if there exists a biholomorphism $\phi : (\Sigma_1, j_1) \rightarrow (\Sigma_2, j_2)$ such that $u_2 \circ \phi = u_1$. We will usually denote the image of u by C_u .

There are essentially two base types of holomorphic curves:

- *somewhere injective*, i.e. $\exists x \in \Sigma$ such that $u^{-1}(u(x)) = \{x\}$ and $d_x u$ is injective;
- *multiply covered*, i.e. u factors through a degree bigger than 1 branched cover over another holomorphic curve.

One can show that in the first case C_u is an embedded surface outside a finite number of *singularities*. A singularity is called a *node* of u if it sits on a transverse self-intersection of C_u with total multiplicity 2. In the rest of the paper we will always assume that every singular point is a node.

Holomorphic curves in dimension 4 have some nice properties. One of them is the *positivity of intersection*, which can be formulated as follows. Let u and v be two distinct holomorphic curves in (X, J) . If $P \in C_u \cap C_v$, then its contribution m_P to the algebraic intersection number $C_u \cdot C_v$ is strictly positive, and $m_P = 1$ if and only if u and v are embeddings near P that intersect transversely in P .

Note that the assumption that u_1 and u_2 are distinct is crucial: for example one can have embedded holomorphic spheres with negative autointersection.

Another relevant property is the following *adjunction formula*. Let $u : (\Sigma, j) \rightarrow (X, J)$ be a somewhere injective J -holomorphic curve. Then:

$$(2.1) \quad \langle c_1(TX), [C_u] \rangle = \chi(\Sigma) + [C_u] \cdot [C_u] - 2\delta(C_u)$$

where $\delta = \#\{\text{nodes of } C_u\} \geq 0$. In particular C_u must have genus

$$(2.2) \quad g_{C_u} = 1 + \frac{1}{2}([C_u] \cdot [C_u] - \langle c_1(TX), [C_u] \rangle - \delta(C_u))$$

which, of course, coincides also with the genus of Σ .

Definition 2.1. Given $A \in H_2(X, \mathbb{Z})$, we define g_A to be the genus of any embedded holomorphic curve in the homology class A as given by the adjunction formula:

$$g_A := 1 + \frac{1}{2}(A \cdot A - \langle c_1(TX), A \rangle).$$

In the definition of the Gromov-Taubes invariants a special role will be played by the homology classes A with $g_A = 0$ and $g_A = 1$. We define then the following subsets of $H_2(X, \mathbb{Z})$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_2(X) &:= \{A \in H_2(X, \mathbb{Z}) \mid g_A = 0, A \cdot A = 0\}; \\ \mathcal{T}_2(X) &:= \{A \in H_2(X, \mathbb{Z}) \mid g_A = 1, A \cdot A = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

To any $A \in H_2(X, \mathbb{Z})$ we can also associate the following crucial number:

$$d_A := A \cdot A + \langle c_1(TX), A \rangle.$$

This (even) number coincides with the expected dimension of the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_A(X, J)$ of connected embedded holomorphic curves in the homology class A , so that, whenever $d_A = 0$, we are able to count the elements of $\mathcal{M}_A(X, J)$. In general, if $d_A \geq 0$ it is possible to cut the dimension of $\mathcal{M}_A(X, J)$ by restricting the attention to the 0-dimensional subspace $\mathcal{M}_A(X, J, \Omega_{d_A})$ of $\mathcal{M}_A(X, J)$ consisting of those holomorphic curves that pass through a fixed set Ω_{d_A} of $d_A/2$ generic points in X . Obviously if $d_A = 0$ then $\mathcal{M}_A(X, J, \Omega_0) = \mathcal{M}_A(X, J, \emptyset) = \mathcal{M}_A(X, J)$.

The Gromov-Taubes invariant can be defined as a weighted formal sum over the points of $\{\mathcal{M}_A(X, J, \Omega_{d_A})\}_{A \in H_2(X, \mathbb{Z})}$. The weights are defined in terms of:

- (1) the sign $\epsilon(C_u)$ of the determinant of a complex operator associated to each C_u (see [20] or [22] for more details);
- (2) formal variables $t_A, A \in H_2(X)$ keeping track of the homology class of the curves and satisfying $t_{A+B} = t_A \cdot t_B$.

The invariant can then be seen as a series

$$\text{GT}(X) = \sum_A \text{GT}(X, A) t_A \in \mathbb{Z}[[\{t_A \mid A \in H_2(X)\}]].$$

Definition 2.2. For any A , let $\mathcal{D}(A)$ be the set of couples $(A_i, n_i) \in H_2(X) \times \mathbb{N}^*$ such that:

- (1) $A = \sum_i n_i A_i$;
- (2) $d_{A_i} \geq 0$;
- (3) the A_i 's are distinct and they are not *multiply toroidal* (i.e. of the form mB with $m \geq 2$ and $g_B = 1$);
- (4) $A_i \cdot A_j = 0$ when $i \neq j$;
- (5) if $A_i \cdot A_i \neq 0$ then $n_i = 1$;
- (6) if $A_i \cdot A_i = 0$ then n_i can be any positive integer;

Observe that if there exists a holomorphic curve in a class A_i with $d_{A_i} \geq 0$ and $A_i \cdot A_i = 0$, then the adjunction formula implies that A_i is either in $\mathcal{S}_2(X)$ or in $\mathcal{T}_2(X)$. Note moreover that $t_A = \sum_i t_{n_i A_i} = \sum_i t_{A_i}^{n_i}$ and $d_A = \sum_i n_i d_{A_i}$ (cf. [13, Lemma 2.4]).

Now, given A , fix $d_A/2$ generic points in X ; $\text{GT}(X, A)$ is then of the form:

$$\text{GT}(X, A) = \sum_{(A_i, n_i) \in \mathcal{D}(A)} d_A! \left(\prod_{A_i \notin \mathcal{T}_2(X)} \frac{\mathfrak{Ru}(A_i)^{n_i}}{d_{A_i}! n_i!} \cdot \prod_{A_i \in \mathcal{T}_2(X)} \Omega_u(A_i, n_i) \right).$$

Note that in the first product if $n_i \neq 1$ then $A_i \in \mathcal{S}_2(X)$. For any $B \in H_2(X)$, the quantity $\mathfrak{Ru}(B)$ is the *Ruan invariant* of (X, B) ([20]) and it is defined by:

$$(2.3) \quad \mathfrak{Ru}(B) := \sum_{C_u \in \mathcal{M}_B(X, J, \Omega_{d_B})} \epsilon(C_u).$$

It is important here to recall that each of the C_u is embedded and connected by definition.

The definition of $\mathfrak{Qu}(B, n)$ for a (non multiply) toroidal class $B \in \mathcal{T}_2(X)$ is a bit more complicated. It can be expressed in the form

$$(2.4) \quad \mathfrak{Qu}(B, m) := \sum_{\{(C_k, m_k)\}} \prod_k r(C_k, m_k)$$

where the sum is over the sets of couples $(C_k, m_k) \in \mathcal{M}_{c_k B}(X, J) \times \mathbb{N}^*$ with $c_k \geq 1$ and $\sum_k c_k m_k = m$. Observe that $B \in \mathcal{T}_2(X)$ if and only if $B \cdot B = \langle c_1(TX), B \rangle = 0$, so that also $cB \in \mathcal{T}_2(X)$ for any $c \geq 1$. Then all the C_k are (embedded) tori.

In [22], Taubes extended the definition of the sign ϵ also to the holomorphic double covers of embedded tori in X . The numbers $r(C, l)$ depend then on l and the signs of C and of its three connected double covers. These can be identified with the cohomology classes $\iota_1, \iota_2, \iota_3 \in H^1(C, \mathbb{Z}/2) \cong \text{Hom}(H_1(C, \mathbb{Z}/2), \mathbb{Z}/2)$ given by

$$(2.5) \quad \iota_1 := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \iota_2 := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \iota_3 := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

considered as matrices acting on the left on column vectors. If $C_\iota \xrightarrow{f_\iota} C$ is the double cover corresponding to ι , then the maps $f_{\iota_*} : H_1(C_\iota, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_1(C, \mathbb{Z})$ are given by the matrices:

$$(2.6) \quad f_{\iota_1*} = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad f_{\iota_2*} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad f_{\iota_3*} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The numbers $r(C, l)$ can be defined explicitly as in [22, Definition 3.2], but also via the *Taubes' generating functions*: given $s \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$, these are indicated by $P_{\pm, s}(z)$ and defined in terms of $P_{+, 0}(z)$ by:

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{aligned} P_{+, 1}(z) &:= \frac{P_{+, 0}(z)}{P_{+, 0}(z^2)}, & P_{+, 2}(z) &:= \frac{P_{+, 0}(z)P_{+, 0}(z^4)}{(P_{+, 0}(z^2))^2}, \\ P_{+, 3}(z) &:= \frac{P_{+, 0}(z)P_{+, 0}(z^4)}{(P_{+, 0}(z^2))^3}, & P_{-, s}(z) &:= \frac{1}{P_{+, s}(z)} \end{aligned}$$

and then normalized by choosing

$$(2.8) \quad P_{+, 0}(z) := \frac{1}{1-z}.$$

In Section 3.4 we will say something about where these generating functions come from.

Now, we say that a pseudo-holomorphic embedded torus C with homology class in $\mathcal{T}_2(X)$ is of *type* $(\epsilon, s) \in \{\pm\} \times \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ if $\epsilon(C) = \epsilon$ and exactly s of the connected double covers above have sign $-$. In this case we define

$$P(C, z) := P_{\epsilon(C), s}(z).$$

For any l , the number $r(C, l)$ can then be defined as the coefficient of z^l in the formal power series expansion (about 0) of $P(C, z)$. Then $\mathfrak{Qu}(B, m)$ in Equation

(2.4) is the coefficient of t_{mB} in

$$\prod_{C \text{ embedded} \mid [C] \in \mathcal{T}_2(X)} P(C, t_{[C]}).$$

Remark 2.3. Observe that in the definition of Taubes' generating functions there are terms that depend on z , z^2 and z^4 : intuitively the term in z^i counts (with signs) i -fold covers of the tori. Note moreover that using these functions, for any torus C we get $r(C, 1) = \epsilon(C)$ as expected.

2.1. About the symplectic invariance of GT.

The definition of GT depends strongly on the choice of the symplectic form ω , the ω -compatible almost complex structure and the sets Ω_d . In Sections 4 and 5 of [22], Taubes proves that, for a fixed ω , there exists a dense open subset \mathcal{U}_d of the set $\mathcal{A}_d \subset \{(J, \Omega_d)\}$ of "admissible" couples such that $\mathcal{M}_A(X, J, \Omega_d)$ (and so also both $\mathfrak{R}u$ and $\mathfrak{Q}u$) is independent on (J, Ω_d) whenever (J, Ω_d) varies within a small enough neighborhood of any point of \mathcal{U}_d . Moreover (see assertion 3 of [22, Proposition 5.2]):

Lemma 2.4. *For any smooth path $\{\omega_t \mid t \in [0, 1]\}$ of symplectic structures on X , there exists a smooth path $\{J_t \mid t \in [0, 1]\}$ of ω_t -compatible almost complex structures (with prescribed J_0 and J_1) such that the fibered product*

$$(2.9) \quad \mathcal{C}_A(X, \{J_t\}, \Omega_d) := \{(t, C_t) \mid t \in [0, 1], C_t \in \mathcal{M}_A(X, J_t, \Omega_d)\}$$

has the structure of 1-dimensional oriented manifold, which is also compact if A is not multiply toroidal.

This is enough to conclude that $\mathfrak{R}u$ is a symplectic invariant.

To prove that also $\mathfrak{Q}u$ is a symplectic invariant, Taubes needed to manage the case of multiply toroidal classes. The issue with these classes is the compactness: if $A \in \mathcal{T}_2(X)$ is not multiply toroidal and m is a positive integer, then it can happen that a sequence of embedded tori in $\mathcal{C}_{mA}(X, \{J_t\})$ has no limit in $\mathcal{C}_{mA}(X, \{J_t\})$ (we avoid to refer to $\Omega_0 = \emptyset$ in the notation). To solve the problem of the sequences that have no "true" limits, for any fixed n , Taubes considers the set

$$(2.10) \quad \mathcal{K}_{nA}(X, \{J_t\}) := \bigcup_{m \leq n} \mathcal{C}_{mA}(X, \{J_t\})$$

endowed with the topology induced by the disjoint union. Note that, by definition, every point in $\mathcal{K}_{nA}(X, \{J_t\})$ corresponds to an *embedded torus* whose homology class is some multiple of A . Taubes proves then the following Lemma ([22, Lemma 5.8]).

Lemma 2.5. *Even if a sequence $\{(t, C_t)\}_{t \rightarrow t_0}$ in $\mathcal{C}_{mA}(X, \{J_t\})$ has no limit in $\mathcal{C}_{mA}(X, \{J_t\})$, (t, C_t) still has a "weak limit" in $\mathcal{K}_{nA}(X, \{J_t\})$ for any $n \geq m$, i.e. there exist p and q positive integers with $pq = m$ such that $\{C_t\}_{t \rightarrow t_0}$ converges to a p -fold holomorphic cover of a torus belonging to $\mathcal{M}_{qA}(X, J_{t_0}) \subset \mathcal{C}_{qA}(X, \{J_t\}) \subset \mathcal{K}_{nA}(X, \{J_t\})$.*

If the path $\{\omega_t \mid t \in [0, 1]\}$ is "reasonable", Taubes proves that we can have only weak limits with $p = 2$ and that the total number of the corresponding "bifurcation points" (t_0, C_{t_0}) in $\mathcal{K}_{nA}(X, \{J_t\})$ is finite: here is where the double covers of the tori come into play (see Lemmas 5.8-5.11 in [22]). Taubes studies what happens at each bifurcation point to the signs of the tori and of their double covers and get that in order to produce a symplectic invariant by counting tori C , their weights $P(C)$ must satisfy certain relations induced by the path $\{\omega_t\}$ when it crosses bifurcation points.

These relations are exactly those in 2.7. The normalization (2.8) for $P_{+,0}$ has then been chosen by Taubes to make GT coincide with the Seiberg-Witten invariants.

3. TWISTED GROMOV-TAUBES INVARIANTS

Fix a closed symplectic 4-manifold (X, ω) endowed with an ω -compatible almost complex structure J and fix a smooth fiber bundle

$$(3.1) \quad F \hookrightarrow W \xrightarrow{\pi} X$$

where F is a closed oriented surface. Our aim is to define an analogue of $\text{GT}(X, \omega)$ in which the weight of each J -holomorphic embedded curve $C \subset X$ is (morally) twisted by the Gromov-Taubes invariant $\text{GT}(\pi^*C)$ of the total space π^*C of the restriction of π to C (here we prefer to use the notation π^*C instead of $\pi^{-1}(C)$).

Theorem 3.1 (Thurston, [24]). *Given a smooth surface bundle*

$$F \hookrightarrow N \xrightarrow{\pi} M$$

over a 2n-dimensional symplectic manifold (M, ω) , if the homology class of the fiber in $H_2(N, \mathbb{R})$ is non-zero, then there exists a closed 2-form α on N which is non-singular on each fiber and such that

$$(3.2) \quad \alpha + \pi^*\omega \in \Omega^2(N)$$

is symplectic.

In particular the 2-form (3.2) makes all the fibers symplectic. Moreover, we remark that the condition $[F] \neq 0$ in $H_2(N, \mathbb{R})$ is always satisfied when the genus of F is greater than 1. When the dimension of the base M is 2 we have also the following:

Lemma 3.2. *Assume that in last theorem (M, ω) is a symplectic surface and let ω_N and ω'_N be symplectic forms on N like in (3.2). Then the associated almost complex structures J_N and J'_N are homotopic.*

Proof. Since any two symplectic forms on an oriented surface are deformation equivalent we can assume that, up to homotopy, for any $x \in N$ the restrictions of J_N and J'_N to the tangent space of the fiber $T_x F \subset T_x N$ coincide. Let O_x and O'_x be the orthogonal complements of $T_x F$ in $T_x N$ with respect to the Riemannian metrics $\omega_N(\cdot, J\cdot)$ and, respectively, $\omega'_N(\cdot, J'\cdot)$. These give two distributions O and O' of (J - and, respectively, J' -holomorphic) tangent planes in TN , which are homotopic since the space of Riemannian metrics over N is contractible. This implies that there is a homotopy between the two decompositions $TF \oplus O$ and $TF \oplus O'$ of TN , which sends J to J' . \square

In order to define the π -twisted Gromov-Taubes invariants, we will define first π -twisted versions of \mathfrak{Ru} and \mathfrak{Qu} . For simplicity, from now on and if not stated otherwise, all the homology groups will be considered with coefficients in \mathbb{Z} . Moreover we will always implicitly assume that our surface bundles have non-trivial homology class of the fiber.

3.1. Twisted \mathfrak{Ru} .

Notation 3.3. If N is a manifold, $L \subset M$ a submanifold and $i \in \mathbb{N}$, given a homology class $A \in H_i(L)$ we will call A_M its image in $H_i(M)$ under the homomorphism induced by the inclusion $L \hookrightarrow M$. Moreover, given a group $(G, +)$ and a ring R , $R[[G]]$ will denote the polynomial ring $R[[\{t_g | g \in G\}]]$ with the usual relations

$t_g \cdot t_{g'} = t_{g+g'}$. When G will be given as a direct sum $G = H \oplus I$, in order to keep distinct the variables associated to elements in H and I , $\mathbb{Z}[[G]]$ will denote $\mathbb{R}[[\{t_h|h \in H\}][[\{t_i|i \in I\}]]$.

For the rest of this section we fix a closed symplectic 4-manifold (X, ω) endowed with an ω -compatible almost complex structure J and fix a smooth surface bundle (W, X, π, F) with $[F] \neq 0 \in H_2(W, \mathbb{R})$.

Given a surface $C \subset X$, consider the 4-manifold π^*C . The natural inclusion $\pi^*C \hookrightarrow W$ induces in homology the homomorphism $B \mapsto B_W$, where $B \in H_2(\pi^*C)$. Considering formal variables z_D , for $D \in H_2(W)$, analogue to the t_A 's of last section, we have then the ring homomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Z}[[H_2(\pi^*C)]] &\longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}[[H_2(W)]] \\ at_B &\longmapsto az_{B_W} \end{aligned}$$

Now, if $C \subset X$ is a J -holomorphic embedded surface, $\omega|_C$ is symplectic and by Theorem 3.1 there exists a closed $\alpha_C \in \Omega^2(\pi^*C)$ such that the 2-form

$$(3.3) \quad \omega_C := \alpha_C + \pi^*\omega|_C \in \Omega^2(\pi^*C)$$

is symplectic and makes the fibers symplectic as well. We can then consider the Gromov-Taubes invariants

$$(3.4) \quad \text{GT}(\pi^*C, \omega_C) = \sum_{B \in H_2(\pi^*C)} \text{GT}(\pi^*C, \omega_C, B)t_B \in \mathbb{Z}[[H_2(\pi^*C)]]$$

By the statement of the equivalence between Gromov-Taubes and Seiberg-Witten invariants, $\text{GT}(\pi^*C, \omega_C)$ depends on ω_C only through the Spin^c -structure of an ω_C -compatible almost complex structure (see [23]). Lemma 3.2, implies then that $\text{GT}(\pi^*C, \omega_C)$ does not depend on the particular ω_C given by Theorem 3.1.

Definition 3.4. Given (W, X, π, F) and a J -holomorphic embedded surface $C \subset X$ we define

$$\text{GT}_W(\pi^*C) := \sum_{B \in H_2(\pi^*C)} \text{GT}(\pi^*C, \omega_C, B)z_{B_W} \in \mathbb{Z}[[H_2(W)]]$$

where ω_C is a symplectic form given by (3.3).

Observe that $\text{GT}_W(\pi^*C)$ depends only on the isotopy class of C in X . Now, as in last section, for any $A \in (H_2(X) \setminus \mathcal{T}_2(X))$, fix a set Ω_{d_A} of $d_A/2$ generic points in X .

Definition 3.5. Given (W, X, π, F) with $[F] \neq 0 \in H_2(W, \mathbb{R})$ and a class $A \in (H_2(X) \setminus \mathcal{T}_2(X))$, we define the π -twisted Ruan invariant of (X, A) by:

$$(3.5) \quad \mathfrak{Ru}_\pi(A, \omega, J, \Omega_{d_A}) := \sum_{C \in \mathcal{M}_A(X, J, \Omega_{d_A})} \epsilon(C_u) \cdot \text{GT}_W(\pi^*C)$$

When ω , J and Ω_d are understood we will simply write $\mathfrak{Ru}_\pi(A)$ for $\mathfrak{Ru}_\pi(A, \omega, J, \Omega_d)$.

3.2. Twisted \mathfrak{Qu} .

As in the standard case, the count for homology classes in $\mathcal{T}_2(X)$ is more complicated. As recalled in last section, the weight in $\text{GT}(X)$ for a J -holomorphic embedded torus C with $[C] \in \mathcal{T}_2(X)$ depends on the signs $\epsilon(C_{\iota_i})$ of its connected double covers C_{ι_i} , $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.

We want to define π -twisted analogues of the Taubes' generating functions in (2.7). To do that we need to understand in more details the functions $P_{\pm, i}(z)$. In Remark

2.3, we said that intuitively the terms depending on z^i are associated to i -fold covers of the tori. In particular, the terms in z^4 are associated to double covers over the C_i 's, which in turn can be identified with the elements of $H^1(C_i, \mathbb{Z}/2)$ as in (2.5).

The 4-fold covers of C that interest us are associated to pairs of double covers (ι_i, ι_j) of C , with $\iota_i \neq \iota_j$. The cover ι_i induces the map

$$f_{\iota_i*} : H_1(C_{\iota_i}, \mathbb{Z}/2) \rightarrow H_1(C, \mathbb{Z}/2)$$

as defined in (2.6) (but with $\mathbb{Z}/2$ coefficients). Then the homomorphism

$$\iota_{j\circ i} := f_{\iota_i}^*(\iota_j) = \iota_j \circ f_{\iota_i*} : H_1(C_{\iota_i}, \mathbb{Z}/2) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}/2$$

defines a class in $H^1(C_{\iota_i}, \mathbb{Z}/2)$, and so a double cover $C_{\iota_{j\circ i}}$ of C_{ι_i} (cf. [22, Lemma 5.11]).

Lemma 3.6. *For every pair of double covers (ι_i, ι_j) of C with $\iota_i \neq \iota_j$, the 4-fold cover*

$$f_{\iota_i} \circ f_{\iota_{j\circ i}} : C_{\iota_{j\circ i}} \longrightarrow C$$

is the unique inducing in homology the matrix

$$(f_{\iota_i} \circ f_{\iota_{j\circ i}})_* = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$$

Proof. We show only the case (ι_1, ι_3) , leaving to the reader the analogue computations for the other cases. First we have

$$\iota_{3\circ 1} = \iota_3 \circ f_{\iota_1*} = (1 \ 1) \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \sim (0 \ 1) \in H^1(C_{\iota_1}, \mathbb{Z}/2).$$

Then $\iota_{3\circ 1}$ is the double cover ι_2 of C_{ι_1} and:

$$(f_{\iota_1} \circ f_{\iota_{3\circ 1}})_* = f_{\iota_1*} \circ f_{\iota_2*} = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

□

Observe in particular that the lemma implies that the 4-fold covers of C determined by (ι_i, ι_j) and (ι_j, ι_i) are the same. We will denote by ι_4 the 4-fold cover of C given by last lemma and by $f_{\iota_4} : C_{\iota_4} \rightarrow C$ the corresponding covering map.

When we defined GT_W we got a polynomial with formal variables z_{B_W} , where the B_W 's are homology classes in W induced by homology classes B on the pull-back bundles over the holomorphic curves. In the case of tori it will be convenient to keep track of the projection on X of the classes B_W .

Definition 3.7. Let $C \subset X$ be an embedded torus. We define

$$\text{GT}_X(\pi^*C) := \sum_{A \in H_2(X)} \text{GT}_X(\pi^*C, A) t_A \in \mathbb{Z}[[H_2(W) \oplus H_2(X)]]$$

where

$$\text{GT}_X(\pi^*C, A) = \sum_{\substack{B \in H_2(\pi^*C) \text{ s.t.} \\ \pi_*(B_W) = A}} \text{GT}(\pi^*C, \omega_C, B) z_{B_W} \in \mathbb{Z}[[H_2(W)]]],$$

where ω_C is a symplectic form given by (3.3).

Obviously the informations contained in $\text{GT}_X(\pi^*C)$ are exactly the same than $\text{GT}_W(\pi^*C)$ (which can be recovered just by setting $t_A = 1$ for all A). It is convenient to regard $\text{GT}_X(\pi^*C)$ as a series in the variables t_A and coefficients that are series in the variables z_{B_W} . Note finally that, by definition, if $\text{GT}_X(\pi^*C, A) \neq 0$ then A is a non-negative multiple of $[C]$.

Now, given an embedded torus $C \subset X$ and one of the four relevant covers $\iota : C_\iota \rightarrow C$ above, let us denote by π^*C_ι the total space of the bundle over C_ι and with fiber F obtained by pulling back via f_ι the bundle structure of π^*C . Then the smooth 4-manifold π^*C_ι is the total space of a (2- or 4-fold) cover of π^*C and we will call

$$\pi^*f_\iota : \pi^*C_\iota \longrightarrow \pi^*C$$

the corresponding covering map. Observe that, if ω_C is a symplectic form over π^*C given by Theorem 3.1, the pull-back $\omega_{C_\iota} := (\pi^*f_\iota)^*(\omega_C)$ is a symplectic over π^*C_ι that makes the fibers symplectic.

Definition 3.8. Let $C \subset X$ be an embedded torus and $\iota : C_\iota \rightarrow C$ one of the covers $\{\iota_1, \iota_2, \iota_3, \iota_4\}$. Define

$$\text{GT}_X(\pi^*C_\iota) := \sum_{A \in H_2(X)} \text{GT}_X(\pi^*C_\iota, A) t_A \in \mathbb{Z}[[H_2(W) \oplus H_2(X)]]$$

where

$$\text{GT}_X(\pi^*C_\iota, A) := \sum_{\substack{B \in H_2(\pi^*C_\iota) \text{ s.t.} \\ ((\pi^*f_\iota)_*(B))_W = B_W, \\ \pi_*(B_W) = A}} \text{GT}(\pi^*C_\iota, \omega_{C_\iota}, B) z_{B_W} \in \mathbb{Z}[[H_2(W)]].$$

In what follows, we will need to keep track not only of the type $(\epsilon(C), s) \in \{\pm 1\} \times \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ of C but also of the particular s double covers of C having negative sign. We will say then that C is of type $(\epsilon(C), I)$, where $I \subseteq \{\iota_1, \iota_2, \iota_3\}$ is the set of the s covers of C that have negative sign.

Definition 3.9. Given (W, X, π, F) , let C be an embedded holomorphic torus of type $(\epsilon(C), I)$ with homology class in $\mathcal{T}_2(X)$. We define the following Laurent series in the formal variables t_A , $A \in H_2(X)$ and coefficients that are series in the variables z_B , $B \in H_2(W)$:

$$P_\pi(C) := \begin{cases} (\text{GT}_X(\pi^*C))^{\epsilon(C)} & \text{if } I = \emptyset \\ \left(\frac{\text{GT}_X(\pi^*C)}{\text{GT}_X(\pi^*C_{\iota'})} \right)^{\epsilon(C)} & \text{if } I = \{\iota'\} \\ \left(\frac{\text{GT}_X(\pi^*C) \text{GT}_X(\pi^*(C_{\iota_4}))}{\text{GT}_X(\pi^*C_{\iota'}) \text{GT}_X(\pi^*C_{\iota''})} \right)^{\epsilon(C)} & \text{if } I = \{\iota', \iota''\} \\ \left(\frac{\text{GT}_X(\pi^*C) \text{GT}_X(\pi^*(C_{\iota_4}))}{\text{GT}_X(\pi^*C_{\iota_1}) \text{GT}_X(\pi^*C_{\iota_2}) \text{GT}_X(\pi^*C_{\iota_3})} \right)^{\epsilon(C)} & \text{if } I = \{\iota_1, \iota_2, \iota_3\} \end{cases}$$

Definition 3.10. Given $A \in \mathcal{T}_2(X)$ primitive, we define

$$(3.6) \quad \Omega_{\mathbf{u}_\pi}(A, m, \omega, J) := \sum_{\{(C_k, m_k)\}} \prod_k r_\pi(C_k, m_k)$$

where the sum is over the sets of couples $(C_k, m_k) \in \mathcal{M}_{c_k A}(X) \times \mathbb{N}^*$ with $c_k \geq 1$ and $\sum_k c_k m_k = m$ and $r_\pi(C_k, m_k)$ is defined to be the coefficient of $t_{m_k[C_k]}$ in the formal power series $P_\pi(C_k)$.

When ω and J are understood we will write $\mathfrak{Qu}_\pi(A, m)$ instead of $\mathfrak{Qu}_\pi(A, m, \omega, J)$.

Remark 3.11. Note that $\mathfrak{Qu}_\pi(A, m)$ is the coefficient of t_{m_A} in

$$\prod_{C \text{ embedded} \mid [C] \in \mathcal{T}_2(X)} P_\pi(C).$$

3.3. Twisted GT.

We can now define the π -twisted Gromov-Taubes invariants exactly like in the standard case. For any $A \in H_2(X)$, fix $d_A/2$ generic points in X .

Definition 3.12. Given (W, X, π, F) , we define the π -twisted Gromov-Taubes invariant of X by

$$\text{GT}_\pi(X, \omega, J) := \sum_{A \in H_2(X)} \text{GT}_\pi(X, A) t_A \in \mathbb{Z}[[H_2(W) \oplus H_2(X)]]$$

where

$$\text{GT}_\pi(X, A) = \sum_{(A_i, n_i) \in \mathcal{D}(A)} d_A! \left(\prod_{A_i \notin \mathcal{T}_2(X)} \frac{\mathfrak{Ru}_\pi(A_i)^{n_i}}{d_{A_i}! n_i!} \cdot \prod_{A_i \in \mathcal{T}_2(X)} \mathfrak{Qu}_\pi(A_i, n_i) \right)$$

and $\mathcal{D}(A)$ is the set of decompositions given in Definition 2.2.

At this point a clarification about the variables encoding the homology classes in W and X is due. Think first to a holomorphic curve $L \subset \pi^*C$ for some holomorphic curve $C \subset X$ with $g_{[C]} > 1$. Its total contribution to $\text{GT}_\pi(X, \omega, J)$ is

$$(3.7) \quad \epsilon(C) \epsilon(L) z_{[L]_W} t_{[C]}$$

where $z_{[L]_W}$ and $t_{[C]}$ are in general independent (and in particular we could have $\pi_*([L]_W) \neq [C]$). On the other hand, if $g_{[C]} = 1$, the total contribution of L is more complicated and in general it is not even of the form $ct_{[C]}$ for some Laurent series c with variables z_B , $B \in H_2(W)$. Roughly speaking the problem is that L could “appear” also in some cover \tilde{C} of π^*C , in which case we do not know on which $t_{[\tilde{C}]}$ the contribution of L should depend: the reason for which to set $t_{\pi_*([L]_W)}$ is a natural choice will appear more clear in Section 4.

3.4. Proof of the symplectic invariance.

In Subsection 2.1 we gave a short overview towards the proof of the symplectic invariance of the standard $\text{GT}(X)$. Since the signs of the weights associated to the holomorphic curves are the same of Taubes, to prove the symplectic invariance of twisted GT it will be enough to carefully analyze the purely topological part of Taubes’ proof. By this we mean the following: given (W, X, π, F) and a holomorphic curve $C \in \mathcal{M}_A(X, J, \Omega_{d_A})$, we want to understand what happens to π^*C and, eventually, its covers, when we change Ω_{d_A} , J or we follow a smooth path of symplectic structures. The answer is mostly completely contained in the proofs in [22, Section 5] and [20, Sections 4 and 5].

In what follows we will use the notations introduced in Subsection 2.1.

Lemma 3.13. *For any $A \in H_2(X)$ and $(J, \Omega_d) \in \mathcal{U}_d$ (where $d = d_A$), there is an open neighborhood $U = U(J, \Omega_d)$ of (J, Ω_d) in \mathcal{U}_d such that for any $(J', \Omega'_d) \in U$, there is an orientation preserving homeomorphism of (0-dimensional compact oriented) manifolds*

$$\mathcal{M}_A(X, J, \Omega_d) \cong \mathcal{M}_A(X, J', \Omega'_d)$$

that sends any $C \in \mathcal{M}_A(X, J, \Omega_d)$ to a $C' \in \mathcal{M}_A(X, J', \Omega'_d)$ which is isotopic and close to C in X .

Lemma 3.13 is essentially the Assertion 2 of [22, Proposition 5.2]. The ‘‘isotopic’’ part is not explicitly stated but follows from the Taubes’ proof. Briefly, $\mathcal{M}_A(X, J, \Omega_d)$ and $\mathcal{M}_A(X, J', \Omega'_d)$ are counter-images of regular values (J, Ω_d) and (J', Ω'_d) of a certain smooth function with image in \mathcal{A}_d . By the Sard-Smale theorem, the set of the regular values of this function must be an open and dense subset of \mathcal{A}_d and the inverse function theorem implies that if (J, Ω_d) and (J', Ω'_d) are close enough, then there is a trivial cobordism from $\mathcal{M}_A(X, J, \Omega_d)$ to $\mathcal{M}_A(X, J', \Omega'_d)$ that gives a homotopy in X between each C to a C' . For more details see the first steps of the proof of [22, Proposition 5.2] (and also [20, Section 5]).

The fact that we can actually get an isotopy comes by further restricting the choice for the couples (J, Ω_d) . Taubes observes in fact that, if A is not multiply toroidal, the values of the time of the homotopy above where it fails to give an embedding correspond to the degenerations appearing in the Gromov compactness theorem ([12]). On the other hand, Taubes proves (see step 5 of the proof of the aforementioned Taubes’ proposition) that there exists an open and dense subset (i.e. \mathcal{U}_d) of \mathcal{A}_d for which no such degeneration can occur, and the isotopy follows for $g_{[A]} > 1$. Finally, some local degenerations (like bifurcations) that could a priori still happen if A is multiply toroidal are excluded (for U small enough) in the final steps of the proof of Taubes’ proposition.

Corollary 3.14. *Let (W, X, π, F) be a surface bundle, $A \in H_2(X)$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $\mathfrak{R}u_\pi(A, \omega, J, \Omega_{d_A})$ and $\mathfrak{Q}u_\pi(A, m, \omega, J)$ do not depend on the choice of (J, Ω_{d_A}) in a small neighborhood U of (J, Ω_{d_A}) in \mathcal{A}_d .*

Proof. If C and C' are embedded isotopic surfaces in X with $g_{[C]} > 1$ then the two 4-manifolds π^*C and π^*C' are isotopic in W and $\text{GT}_W(\pi^*C) = \text{GT}_W(\pi^*C')$. Similarly, if $g_{[C]} = 1$, it is easy to check that $\text{GT}_X(\pi^*C) = \text{GT}_X(\pi^*C')$ and, for any ι , also $\text{GT}_X(\pi^*C_\iota) = \text{GT}_X(\pi^*C'_\iota)$. The result follows then from Lemma 3.13. \square

Corollary 3.15. *Let (W, X, π, F) be a surface bundle, $A \in H_2(X) \setminus \mathcal{T}_2(X)$ and $\{\omega_t \mid t \in [0, 1]\}$ a smooth path of symplectic structures on X . Then*

$$\mathfrak{R}u_\pi(A, \omega_0) = \mathfrak{R}u_\pi(A, \omega_1).$$

Proof. The proof is very similar to that of last corollary and uses the cobordism $\mathcal{C}_A(X, \{J_t\}, \Omega_d)$ given by Lemma 2.4. The main difference is that here the cobordism may be non-trivial since the projection $\mathcal{C}_A(X, \{J_t\}, \Omega_d) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ can have critical points (other degenerations are excluded by Taubes in Step 7 of the proof of Proposition 5.2 of [22]). These critical points correspond to births or deaths of couples of holomorphic curves C_1 and C_2 with $\epsilon(C_1) = -\epsilon(C_2)$ whose total contribution, in the non-twisted case, obviously does not affect $\mathfrak{R}u$. Furthermore C_1 and C_2 must be in the same connected component of $\mathcal{C}_A(X, \{J_t\}, \Omega_d)$, and this gives an isotopy in X between C_1 and C_2 so that their total contribution

$$\epsilon(C_1)\text{GT}_W(\pi^*C_1) + \epsilon(C_2)\text{GT}_W(\pi^*C_2)$$

to \mathfrak{Au}_π is also zero, since $\text{GT}_W(\pi^*C_1) = \text{GT}_W(\pi^*C_2)$. \square

The proof of the symplectic invariance for \mathfrak{Qu}_π is more delicate since, for a given $B \in \mathcal{T}_2(X)$, the 1-dimensional manifold $\mathcal{C}_B(X, \{J_t\})$ is not in general compact. As explained in Subsection 2.1, a sequence of tori in $\mathcal{C}_{2B}(X, \{J_t\})$ can converge, for $t \rightarrow t_0$, to a 2-fold cover of a holomorphic torus in $\mathcal{M}_B(X, J_{t_0})$ (the weak limit of the sequence).

Now, if $A \in \mathcal{T}_2(X)$ is primitive and the path $\{\omega_t \mid t \in [0, 1]\}$ is chosen carefully, then, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, these weak limits correspond to the bifurcation points of $\mathcal{K}_{nA}(X, \{J_t\})$ (defined in (2.10)) and these are exactly the points of $\mathcal{K}_{nA}(X, \{J_t\})$ where the latter fails to be compact (recall that $\mathcal{K}_{nA}(X, \{J_t\})$ has the topology induced by the disjoint union). Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and consider the natural projection

$$\begin{aligned} v_{nA} : \mathcal{K}_{nA}(X, \{J_t\}) &\longrightarrow [0, 1] \\ (t, C) &\longmapsto t. \end{aligned}$$

By [22, Lemma 5.8], $\mathcal{K}_{nA}(X, \{J_t\})$ is a 1-dimensional manifold and we can assume that its bifurcation points and the critical points of v_{nA} (births and deaths of pairs of tori with opposite signs) are finite and the corresponding values of $t \in [0, 1]$ are all distinct and in $(0, 1)$. Let us call $t \in (0, 1)$ a *bifurcation value* of v_{nA} if $v_{nA}^{-1}(t_0)$ contains a bifurcation point and, with a slight abuse of language, we will say that t_0 is a *regular value* of v_{nA} if it is neither a critical nor a bifurcation value.

By the aforementioned lemma of Taubes, if t is a regular value of v_{nA} and $C \in \mathcal{M}_{mA}(X, J_t)$ for some $m \leq n$ is an embedded torus, then $\epsilon(C)$ is defined and so we can compute the functions $P(C, \cdot)$ and $P_\pi(C)$.

Proposition 3.16. *Let (W, X, π, F) be a surface bundle and $\{\omega_t \mid t \in [0, 1]\}$ a smooth path of symplectic structures on X . Let $\{J_t \mid t \in [0, 1]\}$ be a path of ω_t -compatible almost complex structures given by Lemma 2.4. Then for any $A \in \mathcal{T}_2(X)$ primitive, if t is a regular value of v_{mA} for all m , the product*

$$\prod_{m>0} \left(\prod_{C \in \mathcal{M}_{mA}(X, J_t)} P_\pi(C) \right)$$

does not depend on the choice of t .

Proof. Let t_0 be either a critical or a bifurcation value of the map v_{nA} for some $n > 0$ and let $r > 0$ such that t_0 is the only non-regular value of v_{nA} in the interval $(t_0 - r, t_0 + r)$. We want to prove that for any $0 < s < r$

$$(3.8) \quad \prod_{m>0} \left(\prod_{C \in \mathcal{M}_{mA}(X, J_{t_0-s})} P_\pi(C) \right) = \prod_{m>0} \left(\prod_{C \in \mathcal{M}_{mA}(X, J_{t_0+s})} P_\pi(C) \right).$$

Note first that, since for any n $(t_0 - r, t_0) \cup (t_0, t_0 + r)$ contains only regular values of v_{nA} , the two sides of (3.8) do not depend on the choice of s .

Let us first check the case where t_0 corresponds to a critical point. As in the proof of Corollary 3.15, t_0 corresponds to the birth or a death of a pair of isotopic embedded tori C and C' both in $v_{nA}^{-1}(t_0 + s)$ or, respectively, $v_{nA}^{-1}(t_0 - s)$. By [22, Lemma 5.9]

$$\epsilon(C) = -\epsilon(C') \quad \text{and} \quad \epsilon(C_i) = \epsilon(C'_i)$$

where ι is any of the three connected double covers $\{\iota_1, \iota_2, \iota_3\}$, so that if C is of type (ϵ, I) then C' is of type $(-\epsilon, I)$. Moreover, since C and C' are isotopic, for any fixed ι , $\pi^*(C_\iota)$ and $\pi^*(C'_\iota)$ are diffeomorphic and

$$\mathrm{GT}_X(\pi^*(C_\iota)) = \mathrm{GT}_X(\pi^*(C'_\iota)).$$

It follows that the total contribution of C and C' to both sides of (3.8) is

$$\mathrm{GT}_X(\pi^*(C_\iota))^{\epsilon(C)} \cdot \mathrm{GT}_X(\pi^*(C'_\iota))^{\epsilon(C')} = 1$$

and we are done.

Let us prove now the equivalence in (3.8) for t_0 corresponding to a bifurcation point. This means that there exists $B = kA$ for some k and a sequence of tori in $\mathcal{C}_{2B}(X, \{J_t\})$ that converges to a double cover $\bar{\iota}$ of a torus $C_0 \in \mathcal{M}_B(X, J_{t_0}) \subset \mathcal{C}_B(X, \{J_t\})$. There are two possibilities, depending on whether the sequence converges to C_0 for increasing or decreasing t . We will assume t decreasing and we will leave the (completely analogue) proof for the other case to the reader.




FIGURE 1. Bifurcation.

The connected component of $\mathcal{C}_B(X, \{J_t\})$ containing C_0 gives an isotopy between the two embedded tori $C_- \subset \mathcal{M}_B(X, J_{t_0-s})$ and $C_+ \subset \mathcal{M}_B(X, J_{t_0+s})$ (since C_0 is the only non-regular point of v_{nA} in the interval $(t_0 - r, t_0 + r)$ we can choose any $s \in (0, r)$). See Figure 1. Then

$$(3.9) \quad \mathrm{GT}_X(\pi^*C_-) = \mathrm{GT}_X(\pi^*C_0) = \mathrm{GT}_X(\pi^*C_+)$$

and, for any $\iota \in \{\iota_1, \iota_2, \iota_3, \iota_4\}$,

$$(3.10) \quad \mathrm{GT}_X(\pi^*(C_-)_\iota) = \mathrm{GT}_X(\pi^*(C_0)_\iota) = \mathrm{GT}_X(\pi^*(C_+)_\iota).$$

By Lemma 5.10 of [22] we can recover the relative signs of C_- , C_+ and their double covers:

$$(3.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \epsilon(C_-) &= \epsilon(C_+); \\ \epsilon((C_-)_{\bar{\iota}}) &= -\epsilon((C_+)_{\bar{\iota}}); \\ \epsilon((C_-)_\iota) &= \epsilon((C_+)_\iota) \text{ for any double cover } \iota \neq \bar{\iota}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, let \bar{C} be the only torus in $\mathcal{M}_{2B}(X, J_{t_0+s})$ belonging to the relevant connected component of $\mathcal{C}_{2B}(X, \{J_t\})$. This connected component gives a homotopy between

\overline{C} and the double cover $(C_0)_{\bar{\iota}}$ (and so also with the double covers $(C_-)_{\bar{\iota}}$ and $(C_+)_{\bar{\iota}}$). Then, by isotopy invariance and (3.10), we have

$$(3.12) \quad \mathrm{GT}_X(\pi^*\overline{C}) = \mathrm{GT}_X(\pi^*((C_-)_{\bar{\iota}})) = \mathrm{GT}_X(\pi^*((C_+)_{\bar{\iota}})).$$

Moreover, observe that the 4-fold cover ι_4 of C_0 given by Lemma 3.6 naturally induces a double cover $\widehat{\iota}$ of \overline{C} . More in detail, as for $s \rightarrow 0$ \overline{C} converges to (the total space of) the double cover $\bar{\iota}$ of C_0 , we require that, for $s \rightarrow 0$, $\overline{C}_{\widehat{\iota}}$ converges to (the total space of) the double cover $f_{\bar{\iota}}^*(\iota)$ of $(C_0)_{\bar{\iota}}$ for any (non-trivial) $\iota \neq \bar{\iota}$. Since $f_{\bar{\iota}}^*(\iota)$ is exactly the cover ι_4 of C_0 , again by isotopy invariance, we have:

$$(3.13) \quad \mathrm{GT}_X(\pi^*(\overline{C}_{\widehat{\iota}})) = \mathrm{GT}_X(\pi^*((C_-)_{\iota_4})) = \mathrm{GT}_X(\pi^*((C_+)_{\iota_4})).$$

By Lemma 5.11 of [22] we can recover the signs of \overline{C} and of its double covers:

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \epsilon(\overline{C}) &= -\epsilon(C_+)\epsilon((C_+)_{\bar{\iota}}); \\ \epsilon(\overline{C}_{\bar{\iota}}) &= \prod_{\iota \neq \bar{\iota}} \epsilon((C_+)_{\iota}); \\ \epsilon(\overline{C}_{\iota}) &= +1 \text{ for } \iota \neq \widehat{\iota}. \end{aligned}$$

We are now ready to prove that the equivalence (3.8) holds also when we cross a bifurcation. To prove the result it is enough to show that

$$P_{\pi}(C_+) \cdot P_{\pi}(\overline{C}) = P_{\pi}(C_-).$$

We will check only the three cases below, corresponding to the three possible types $(+, I)$ of C_- with $\epsilon(C_-) = +$ and $\bar{\iota} \notin I$: if $\epsilon(C_-) = -$ each case will be the reciprocal of the corresponding case for $\epsilon(C_-) = +$, while the cases with $\bar{\iota} \in I$ do not give new relations and are left to the reader.

- $[I = \emptyset]$: C_+ is of type $(+, \{\bar{\iota}\})$ and \overline{C} is of type $(+, \emptyset)$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\pi}(C_+) \cdot P_{\pi}(\overline{C}) &= \frac{\mathrm{GT}_X(\pi^*C_+)}{\mathrm{GT}_X(\pi^*((C_+)_{\bar{\iota}}))} \cdot \mathrm{GT}_X(\pi^*\overline{C}) \\ &= \mathrm{GT}_X(\pi^*C_+) \\ &= \mathrm{GT}_X(\pi^*C_-) = P_{\pi}(C_-). \end{aligned}$$

- $[I = \{\iota'\}]$: C_+ is of type $(+, \{\bar{\iota}, \iota'\})$ and \overline{C} is of type $(+, \{\widehat{\iota}\})$, where $\widehat{\iota}$ is as above. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\pi}(C_+) \cdot P_{\pi}(\overline{C}) &= \frac{\mathrm{GT}_X(\pi^*C_+) \mathrm{GT}_X(\pi^*((C_+)_{\iota_4}))}{\mathrm{GT}_X(\pi^*((C_+)_{\bar{\iota}})) \mathrm{GT}_X(\pi^*((C_+)_{\iota'}))} \cdot \frac{\mathrm{GT}_X(\pi^*\overline{C})}{\mathrm{GT}_X(\pi^*\overline{C}_{\widehat{\iota}})} \\ &= \frac{\mathrm{GT}_X(\pi^*C_+)}{\mathrm{GT}_X(\pi^*((C_+)_{\iota'}))} \\ &= \frac{\mathrm{GT}_X(\pi^*C_-)}{\mathrm{GT}_X(\pi^*((C_-)_{\iota'})} = P_{\pi}(C_-). \end{aligned}$$

- $[I = \{\iota', \iota''\}]$: C_+ is of type $(+, \{\bar{\iota}, \iota', \iota''\})$ and \bar{C} is of type $(+, \emptyset)$ (since by (3.14) we have $\epsilon(\bar{C}_{\bar{\iota}}) = \epsilon((C_+)_{\iota'}) \cdot \epsilon((C_+)_{\iota''}) = (-1) \cdot (-1) = +1$). Then:

$$\begin{aligned} P_\pi(C_+) \cdot P_\pi(\bar{C}) &= \frac{\text{GT}_X(\pi^*C_+) \text{GT}_X(\pi^*((C_+)_{\iota_4})) \cdot \text{GT}_X(\pi^*\bar{C})}{\text{GT}_X(\pi^*((C_+)_{\bar{\iota}})) \text{GT}_X(\pi^*((C_+)_{\iota'})) \text{GT}_X(\pi^*((C_+)_{\iota''}))} \\ &= \frac{\text{GT}_X(\pi^*C_+) \text{GT}_X(\pi^*((C_+)_{\iota_4}))}{\text{GT}_X(\pi^*((C_+)_{\iota'})) \text{GT}_X(\pi^*((C_+)_{\iota''}))} \\ &= \frac{\text{GT}_X(\pi^*C_-) \text{GT}_X(\pi^*((C_-)_{\iota_4}))}{\text{GT}_X(\pi^*((C_-)_{\iota'})) \text{GT}_X(\pi^*((C_-)_{\iota''}))} = P_\pi(C_-). \end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 3.17. *Let (W, X, π, F) be a surface bundle, $A \in \mathcal{T}_2(X)$ and $\{\omega_t \mid t \in [0, 1]\}$ a smooth path of symplectic structures on X . Then*

$$\mathfrak{Qu}_\pi(A, m, \omega_0) = \mathfrak{Qu}_\pi(A, m, \omega_1).$$

Theorem 1.1 follows then from the definition of $\text{GT}_\pi(X, \omega, J)$ and corollaries 3.14, 3.15 and 3.17.

4. MAPPING TORI AND TWISTED LEFSCHETZ ZETA FUNCTIONS

In this section we first review the definition of standard and twisted Lefschetz zeta functions of surface diffeomorphisms. We define then bundled twistings for Lefschetz zeta functions and prove the equivalence with certain Jiang's twisted Lefschetz zeta functions. Finally we compute the twisted Gromov-Taubes invariants for symplectic closed 4-manifolds of the form $S^1 \times Y$ and give a proof of Theorem 1.2.

4.1. Commutative Lefschetz zeta functions.

Let S be an oriented compact connected surface and let $\phi : S \rightarrow S$ be an orientation preserving diffeomorphism. A point $x \in S$ is a *fixed point* of ϕ if $\phi(x) = x$. More in general, given $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, x is a *periodic point of period n* (or *n -periodic point*) of ϕ if $\phi^n(x) = x$. An n -periodic point x is said to be *non-degenerate* if

$$\det(\mathbb{1} - d_x \phi^n) \neq 0.$$

The diffeomorphism ϕ is *non-degenerate* if for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ there is only a finite number of n -periodic points, each of which is non-degenerate. Note in particular that in this case an n -periodic point x is, for every $p \in \mathbb{N}^*$, also a pn -periodic point, which is non-degenerate with respect to ϕ^{pn} . It is well known that every element of the mapping class group of S has a representative that is smooth and non degenerate. From now on we will then assume the non-degeneracy of ϕ .

The *Lefschetz sign* of an n -periodic point is

$$\varepsilon(x, n) := \text{sign}(\det(\mathbb{1} - d_x \phi^n)).$$

Observe that any n -periodic point of ϕ can be naturally interpreted as a fixed point of ϕ^n and that the Lefschetz signs given by the two interpretations are the same. On the other hand, we remark that in general $(\varepsilon(x, n))^p \neq \varepsilon(x, pn)$ for $p > 1$.

Let now

$$\mathbb{T}_\phi := \frac{S \times [0, +\infty)}{(x, t+1) \sim (\phi(x), t)}$$

be the *mapping torus* of (S, ϕ) . We will often use the identification $S = S \times \{0\} \subset \mathbb{T}_\phi$.

Let t be the coordinate of $[0, +\infty)$ in \mathbb{T}_ϕ . An *n -periodic orbit* of \mathbb{T} is a closed positively oriented orbit δ of the flow on \mathbb{T} of the vector field ∂_t , such that $\langle \delta, S \rangle = n$

and considered up to reparametrization. An orbit is *simple* if it is not a non-trivial cover of another closed orbit of the flow.

To any n -periodic simple orbit δ corresponds in a natural way the set $\{\delta \cap S\}$ of n periodic points, each of period n : the *Lefschetz sign of δ* is defined by

$$\varepsilon(\delta) := \varepsilon(x, n) \text{ for any } x \in \{\delta \cap S\}.$$

In general, given an integer $p > 0$, the Lefschetz sign of δ^p , denoting the n -periodic orbit δ covered p times, is

$$\varepsilon(\delta^p) := \varepsilon(x, pn) \text{ for any } x \in \{\delta \cap S\}.$$

Definition 4.1. Given a simple orbit δ of (S, ϕ) , the *local Lefschetz zeta function* of δ is the formal power series

$$\zeta_\delta(t) := \exp \left(\sum_{m \geq 1} \varepsilon(\delta^m) \frac{t^m}{m} \right) \in \mathbb{Z}[[t]].$$

Remark 4.2. For the following, we remark that it is possible to give more explicit formulas for $\zeta_\delta(t)$ depending on the *type* of δ . It is a standard result that there are essentially two types of non-degenerate periodic orbits: *elliptic* and *hyperbolic*. A simple n -periodic orbit δ is elliptic if, for any $x \in \delta \cap S$, the eigenvalues of $d_x \phi^n$ are complex conjugates and is hyperbolic if they are real. In the last case we can make a further distinction: δ is called *positive* (resp. *negative*) hyperbolic if the eigenvalues of $d_x \phi^n$ are both positive (resp. negative). It is then easy to prove that:

$$(4.1) \quad \varepsilon(\delta^m) = \begin{cases} +1 & \text{if } \delta \text{ elliptic;} \\ -1 & \text{if } \delta \text{ positive hyperbolic;} \\ (-1)^{m+1} & \text{if } \delta \text{ negative hyperbolic} \end{cases}$$

and the following expressions follow (see for example Lemma 3.15 of [21]):

$$(4.2) \quad \zeta_\delta(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{1-t} = 1 + t + t^2 + \dots & \text{if } \delta \text{ elliptic;} \\ 1 - t & \text{if } \delta \text{ positive hyperbolic;} \\ 1 + t & \text{if } \delta \text{ negative hyperbolic.} \end{cases}$$

Definition 4.3. The *Lefschetz zeta function* of ϕ is

$$\zeta(\phi) := \prod_{\delta \text{ simple}} \zeta_\delta \left(t^{(\delta, S)} \right) \in \mathbb{Z}[[t]]$$

where the product is meant to be over all the simple periodic orbits δ of ϕ .

We observe that in $\zeta(\phi)$ any periodic orbit of ϕ is counted exactly once and with weight depending only on its sign and its homology class in T_ϕ . The Lefschetz zeta function can be expressed also in terms of the *Lefschetz numbers* of the iterates of ϕ .

Definition 4.4. Given (S, ϕ) , for $i = 0, 1, 2$ let $\phi_i : H_i(S) \rightarrow H_i(S)$ be the induced isomorphisms in homology. The *Lefschetz number of ϕ* is:

$$L(\phi) := \sum_{i=0}^2 (-1)^i \text{tr}(\phi_i).$$

Lefschetz fixed point theorem. Let $\text{Fix}(\phi)$ denote the set of fixed points of ϕ . Then:

$$L(\phi) = \sum_{x \in \text{Fix}(\phi)} \varepsilon(x, 1).$$

Corollary 4.5. $\zeta(\phi) = \exp \left(\sum_{n \geq 1} L(\phi^n) \frac{t^n}{n} \right).$

The proof of last corollary is matter of express any n -periodic orbit of ϕ as a fixed point of ϕ^n , reorganize the product in the definition of $\zeta(\phi)$ as a product in $n \geq 1$ and then apply the Lefschetz fixed point theorem (see for example [5]).

Last corollary implies in particular that $\zeta(\phi)$ is a topological invariant of \mathbb{T}_ϕ . Moreover we have the following corollary (see for example [1]).

Corollary 4.6. *Let $\tau(\mathbb{T}_\phi) = \tau(\mathbb{T}_\phi, t)$ denote the Reidemeister torsion of \mathbb{T}_ϕ . Then:*

$$\zeta(\phi) = \prod_{i=0}^2 (\det(\mathbb{1} - t\phi_i))^{(-1)^{i+1}} \doteq \tau(\mathbb{T}_\phi)$$

where \doteq denotes the equivalence up to multiplications by monomials of the form $\pm t^m$.

For us, if not stated otherwise, all the Reidemeister torsions of mapping tori will be considered with the normalization given by the co-oriented 0-page S , so that the equivalence \doteq with the corresponding zeta functions will be in fact an equality.

There are various refinements of $\zeta(\phi)$: the richest Abelian that one can define is obtained by twisting the contribution of each orbit by its total homology class in \mathbb{T}_ϕ . By ‘‘Abelian’’ we mean that it can be obtained by using an Abelian representation of $\pi_1(\mathbb{T}_\phi)$. This refinement is obtained by encoding the elements $a \in H_1(\mathbb{T}_\phi)$ in formal variables t_a such that $t_a \cdot t_b = t_{a+b}$ like we did for the definition of GT and then considering the *total Abelian Lefschetz zeta function*:

$$(4.3) \quad \zeta_A(\phi) := \prod_{\delta \text{ simple}} \zeta_\delta \left(t_{[\delta]} \cdot t^{\langle \delta, S \rangle} \right) \in \mathbb{Z}[[H_1(\mathbb{T}_\phi)]][[t]].$$

The series $\zeta_A(\phi)$ should be thought of as a series in the formal variable t and coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}[[H_1(\mathbb{T}_\phi)]]$.

All the results above about $\zeta(\phi)$ can be generalized to $\zeta_A(\phi)$ introducing corresponding twisting coefficients for the Lefschetz numbers and the Reidemeister torsion (see [5], [6] or [10]). Briefly, instead of considering the matrix induced by ϕ in homology, one considers the homeomorphism

$$\tilde{\phi} : \tilde{S} \longrightarrow \tilde{S}$$

induced by ϕ on the universal Abelian cover \tilde{S} of S . Given a cellular decomposition of \tilde{S} obtained by lifting a cellular decomposition of S , we can assume that both ϕ and $\tilde{\phi}$ are cellular maps. Then, choosing basis and taking local $\mathbb{Z}[H_1(S)]$ -coefficients for $H_i(\tilde{S})$, $i = 0, 1, 2$, $\tilde{\phi}$ gives rise to non-singular $\mathbb{Z}[\text{coker}(\mathbb{1} - \phi_1)]$ -matrices $\tilde{\phi}_i$ of order $\text{rk}(H_i(S))$. The Mayer-Vietoris exact sequence implies that

$$(4.4) \quad H_1(\mathbb{T}_\phi) \cong \text{coker}(\mathbb{1} - \phi_1) \oplus \mathbb{Z}_\mu$$

so that the matrices $\tilde{\phi}_i$ can be interpreted as matrices with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}[H_1(\mathbb{T}_\phi)]$. The *total Abelian Lefschetz number* of ϕ is

$$(4.5) \quad L_A(\phi) := \sum_{i=0}^2 (-1)^i \text{tr}(t_\mu \tilde{\phi}_i) \in \mathbb{Z}[H_1(\mathbb{T}_\phi)].$$

where t_μ is a formal variable encoding the homology class of the generator μ of $H_1(\mathbb{T}_\phi)$. The *total Abelian Lefschetz fixed point Theorem* (cf. Theorem 1 of [6]) gives then

$$(4.6) \quad L_A(\phi) = \sum_{x \in \text{Fix}(\phi)} \varepsilon(x, 1)[\delta_x] \in \mathbb{Z}[H_1(\mathbb{T}_\phi)]$$

where δ_x is the unique 1-periodic orbit of ϕ with $\delta \cap S = \{x\}$. We have then the following analogue of Corollary 4.5:

$$(4.7) \quad \zeta_A(\phi) = \exp \left(\sum_{n \geq 1} L_A(\phi^n) \frac{t^n}{n} \right) \in \mathbb{Z}[[H_1(\mathbb{T}_\phi)]].$$

Similarly, the generalization to the total Abelian case of Corollary 4.6 gives:

$$(4.8) \quad \zeta_A(\phi) = \prod_{i=0}^2 \left(\det \left(\mathbb{1} - t(t_\mu \tilde{\phi}_i) \right) \right)^{(-1)^{i+1}} = \tau_A(\mathbb{T}_\phi, t).$$

where $\tau_A(\mathbb{T}(S, \phi, t))$ is the *total Abelian Reidemeister torsion* of \mathbb{T}_ϕ .

Example 4.7. Let $L = K_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup K_n$ be a fibered n -component link in a homology 3-sphere Y and let (S, ϕ) be the corresponding open book decomposition of Y (so that in particular $\mathbb{T}_\phi \cong Y \setminus L$). Let t_i , $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ be formal variables encoding the homology classes of the meridians of the K_i 's. Then we can express all the variables t_a , $a \in H_1(\mathbb{T}_\phi)$ in the definition of $\zeta_A(\phi)$ in terms of the t_i 's and:

$$(4.9) \quad \zeta_A(\phi)|_{t=1} = \tau_A(Y \setminus L) = \begin{cases} \frac{\Delta_L(t_1)}{1 - t_1} & \text{if } n = 1 \\ \Delta_L(t_1, \dots, t_n) & \text{if } n > 1 \end{cases}$$

where $\zeta_A(\phi)|_{t=1}$ is the evaluation in $t = 1$ of the series $\zeta_A(\phi)$ and Δ_L denotes the *multivariable Alexander polynomial* of L .

4.2. Non-commutative Lefschetz zeta functions.

In this subsection we recall the *twisted Lefschetz zeta functions* defined by Jiang in [16] (see [17]). Let (S, ϕ) be as before, let R be an Abelian ring with unity and $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$. Choose a base point $y_0 \in S \subset \mathbb{T}_\phi$ and consider a representation

$$\rho : \pi_1(\mathbb{T}_\phi) \longrightarrow \text{GL}(n, R)$$

of the fundamental group $\pi_1(\mathbb{T}_\phi)$ (for simplicity in the notation we will avoid to refer to y_0) into the linear group over R of order n . Then ρ extends to a representation (still denoted ρ)

$$\rho : \mathbb{Z}[\pi_1(\mathbb{T}_\phi)] \longrightarrow \text{M}(n, R)$$

of the group ring $\mathbb{Z}[\pi_1(\mathbb{T}_\phi)]$ into the algebra of $n \times n$ matrices over R .

For any simple orbit δ of \mathbb{T}_ϕ , choose a path γ_δ from y_0 to any point of δ . Then, for any $m \geq 0$, $\gamma_\delta * \delta^m * \gamma_\delta^{-1}$ can be regarded as a closed path based on y_0 .

Definition 4.8. Given a simple orbit δ of (S, ϕ) , the *local ρ -twisted Lefschetz zeta function* of δ is the formal power series

$$\zeta_\delta(\rho, t) := \exp \left(\sum_{m \geq 1} \varepsilon(\delta^m) \text{tr} \left(\rho([\gamma_\delta * \delta^m * \gamma_\delta^{-1}]) \right) \frac{t^m}{m} \right) \in R[[t]].$$

Observe that $\zeta_\delta(\rho, t)$ does not depend on the choice of the path γ_δ (since the trace is invariant under conjugation), and so it depends only on the free homotopy class of δ . By a slight abuse of notation we will omit the path γ_δ in the notation and we will write just

$$\zeta_\delta(\rho, t) = \exp \left(\sum_{m \geq 1} \varepsilon(\delta^m) \operatorname{tr}(\rho([\delta^m])) \frac{t^m}{m} \right).$$

Definition 4.9. The ρ -twisted Lefschetz zeta function of ϕ is

$$\zeta_\rho(\phi) := \prod_{\delta \text{ simple}} \zeta_\delta(\rho, t^{(\delta, S)}) \in R[[t]].$$

The ρ -twisted Lefschetz zeta functions enjoy similar properties to those of the commutative ones. In particular a result analogue to Corollary 4.6 holds:

$$(4.10) \quad \zeta_\rho(\phi) = \tau_\rho(\mathbb{T}_\phi)$$

where $\tau_\rho(\mathbb{T}_\phi) = \tau_\rho(\mathbb{T}_\phi, t)$ is the Lin's ρ -twisted Reidemeister torsion: see [17] and [18] for the details. In particular $\zeta_\rho(\phi)$ depends only on the isotopy class of ϕ and ρ . The set $\{\zeta_\rho(\phi)\}_\rho$ is then a topological invariant of \mathbb{T}_ϕ .

4.3. Twisted Lefschetz zeta functions associated with bundles.

Let F be an oriented compact connected surface and let

$$F \hookrightarrow V \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathbb{T}_\phi$$

be a smooth oriented fiber bundle. Let

$$(4.11) \quad \mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m}_\pi : \pi_1(\mathbb{T}_\phi) \longrightarrow \operatorname{MCG}^+(F)$$

be the *monodromy homomorphism* of the bundle into the oriented mapping class group $\operatorname{MCG}^+(F)$ of F . If δ is an orbit of ϕ and γ_δ is a path from the base point for $\pi_1(\mathbb{T}_\phi)$ to δ like in last subsection, then $\mathfrak{m}([\gamma_\delta \delta \gamma_\delta^{-1}])$ depends only on the free homotopy class of δ , so that we can write $\mathfrak{m}([\delta])$. For any simple orbit δ , let

$$\psi_\delta : F \longrightarrow F$$

be a smooth non-degenerate representative of $\mathfrak{m}([\delta])$ and, for any $n > 1$, set $\psi_{\delta^n} = \psi_\delta^n$. Now, the total space $\pi^*\delta$ of the restriction of π to δ naturally fibers over $\delta \cong S^1$ with fiber F and we have a diffeomorphism

$$\pi^*\delta \cong \mathbb{T}_{\psi_\delta}.$$

Remark 4.10. Given any simple orbit δ of \mathbb{T}_ϕ , by (4.4) it follows that

$$H_1(\pi^*\delta) \cong \operatorname{coker}(\mathbb{1} - \psi_{\delta_1}) \oplus \mathbb{Z}l$$

where the generator l can be chosen in a way that

$$\pi_* \circ i_*(l) = [\delta] \in H_1(\mathbb{T}_\phi)$$

where $i : \pi^*\delta \hookrightarrow V$ is the natural inclusion. Moreover

$$\ker(\pi_* \circ i_*|_{H_1(\mathbb{T}_{\psi_\delta})}) = \operatorname{coker}(\mathbb{1} - \psi_{\delta_1}).$$

In particular for any orbit γ in \mathbb{T}_{ψ_δ} :

$$\pi_* \circ i_*[\gamma] = \langle \gamma, F \rangle [\delta].$$

where $\langle \gamma, F \rangle$ denotes the algebraic intersection number in T_{ψ_δ} between γ and the surface $F = F \times \{0\} \subset T_{\psi_\delta}$. Then, for the usual formal variables t_a encoding classes $a \in H_1(T_\phi)$, there is a natural identification

$$t_{\pi_* \circ i_* [\gamma]} = t_{\langle \gamma, F \rangle [\delta]} = t_{[\delta]}^{\langle \gamma, F \rangle}.$$

Notation 4.11. Similarly to Notation 3.3, we will often regard $\pi^* \delta$ as a submanifold of V and if $b \in H_1(\pi^* \delta)$, b_V will denote the image of b in $H_1(V)$ under the homomorphism induced by the inclusion of $\pi^* \delta$ in V . Moreover we will often assume the identification $\pi^* \delta = T_{\psi_\delta}$ without mentioning it.

Definition 4.12. Let (V, T_ϕ, π, F) be a surface bundle as above and let δ be a simple periodic orbit of ϕ . We define the *local π -twisted Lefschetz zeta function*

$$\zeta_\delta(\pi, t) \in \mathbb{Z}[[H_1(V)]][[t]]$$

of δ by:

$$\zeta_\delta(\pi, t) := \prod_{\substack{\gamma \text{ simple} \\ \text{in } T_{\psi_\delta}}} \exp \left(\sum_{m \geq 1} \varepsilon(\delta^{\langle \gamma, F \rangle \cdot m}) \varepsilon(\gamma^m) z_{[\gamma^m]_V} \frac{t^{\langle \gamma, F \rangle \cdot m}}{m} \right).$$

where the variables z_b keep track of homology classes $b \in H_1(V)$.

Definition 4.13. Given (V, T_ϕ, π, F) , we define the *π -twisted Lefschetz zeta function*

$$\zeta_\pi(\phi) \in \mathbb{Z}[[H_1(V) \oplus H_1(T_\phi)]][[t]]$$

of ϕ by:

$$\zeta_\pi(\phi) := \prod_{\substack{\delta \text{ simple} \\ \text{in } T_\phi}} \zeta_\delta \left(\pi, t_{[\delta]} \cdot t^{\langle \delta, S \rangle} \right).$$

where the variables t_a keep track of homology classes $a \in H_1(T_\phi)$.

4.4. Relations with the algebraic twistings.

Given a surface bundle (V, T_ϕ, π, F) , we want the “richest representation” of $\pi_1(T_\phi)$ induced by \mathfrak{m}_π into a linear group over an Abelian ring. In what follows we will define this in the fibered case, but the construction can be carried on in a completely analogous way for a general 3-manifold (cf. Definition 4.19 below).

Given (V, T_ϕ, π, F) , the associated monodromy map $\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m}_\pi$ in (4.11) induces in homology an *algebraic monodromy of index $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$*

$$(4.12) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{m}_i = \mathfrak{m}_i^\pi & : & \pi_1(T_\phi) \longrightarrow \mathrm{GL}(r_i, \mathbb{Z}) \\ & & \alpha \longmapsto \mathfrak{m}_i(\alpha) \end{array}$$

where $r_i = \mathrm{rank}(H_i(F))$ and $\mathfrak{m}_i(\alpha)$ is a matrix (with respect to a fixed basis of $H_i(F)$) associated to the homomorphism induced in homology by (any representative of) $\mathfrak{m}(\alpha)$. In order to get all the Abelian information that we can, we proceed as in Subsection 4.1. Given a class $\alpha \in \pi_1(T_\phi)$, we have

$$\pi^* \alpha \stackrel{\text{homeo}}{\cong} T_{\mathfrak{m}(\alpha)}$$

where, with a slight abuse of notation, we keep to use α instead of taking a representative. Let l_α denote the generator of

$$H_1(\pi^* \alpha) \cong \mathrm{coker}(\mathbb{1} - \mathfrak{m}_1(\alpha)) \oplus \mathbb{Z}_{l_\alpha}$$

as in Remark 4.10 and satisfying in particular the relation $\pi_* \circ i_*(l_\alpha) = [\alpha] \in H_1(T_\phi)$.

Then, as we have seen recalling the definition of the total Abelian Lefschetz numbers, for $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, we can go to the universal Abelian cover of F and consider the *total Abelian algebraic monodromies*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_i & : & \pi_1(\mathbb{T}_\phi) \longrightarrow \mathrm{GL}(r_i, \mathbb{Z}[\mathrm{coker}(\mathbb{1} - \mathbf{m}_1(\alpha))]) \\ & & \alpha \longmapsto \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_i(\alpha) \end{array}$$

These induce representations

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_i^V & : & \pi_1(\mathbb{T}_\phi) \longrightarrow \mathrm{GL}(r_i, \mathbb{Z}[H_1(V)]) \\ & & \alpha \longmapsto z_{(l_{\alpha V})} \cdot i_*(\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_i(\alpha)) \end{array}$$

where i_* denotes the map induced by the natural inclusion $i : \pi^*\alpha \hookrightarrow V$ and we associate variables z_{c_V} (encoding classes in $H_1(V)$) to variables encoding classes $c \in H_1(\pi^*\alpha)$. Consider now the ring homomorphism

$$\begin{array}{ccc} p & : & \mathbb{Z}[H_1(V)] \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}[H_1(V) \oplus H_1(\mathbb{T}_\phi)] \\ & & az_b \longmapsto az_b \cdot t_{\pi_* b} \end{array}$$

and the induced representations

$$p : \mathrm{GL}(r_i, \mathbb{Z}[H_1(V)]) \longrightarrow \mathrm{GL}(r_i, \mathbb{Z}[H_1(V) \oplus H_1(\mathbb{T}_\phi)]).$$

Definition 4.14. Given the surface bundle $(V, \mathbb{T}_\phi, \pi, F)$, the *total Abelian representation of $\pi_1(\mathbb{T}_\phi)$ of index $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ induced by π* is

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \rho_i^\pi & : & \pi_1(\mathbb{T}_\phi) \longrightarrow \mathrm{GL}(r_i, \mathbb{Z}[H_1(V) \oplus H_1(\mathbb{T}_\phi)]) \\ & & \alpha \longmapsto p(\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_i^V(\alpha)) \end{array}$$

Theorem 4.15. *Given a surface bundle $(V, \mathbb{T}_\phi, \pi, F)$ with induced total Abelian representations ρ_i^π we have*

$$\zeta_\pi(\phi) = \prod_{i=0}^2 (\zeta_{\rho_i^\pi}(\phi))^{(-1)^i}$$

where $\zeta_{\rho_i^\pi}(\phi)$ is the ρ_i^π -twisted Lefschetz zeta function of ϕ .

Corollary 4.16. *The π -twisted Lefschetz zeta function of ϕ depends only on the homeomorphism class of \mathbb{T}_ϕ and the bundle isomorphism class of $(V, \mathbb{T}_\phi, \pi, F)$. In particular $\zeta_\pi(\phi)$ does not depend on the choice of the representatives ψ_δ of $\mathbf{m}([\delta])$.*

Proof of Theorem 4.15. Before going into the computations we give the basic idea behind the theorem. If δ is a simple orbit of ϕ , then the local π -twisted Lefschetz zeta function $\zeta_\delta(\pi, t)$ of δ can be interpreted as a kind of ‘‘global’’ total Abelian Lefschetz function of the manifold \mathbb{T}_{ψ_δ} for a fixed representative ψ_δ of $\mathbf{m}([\delta])$. Using the definition in (4.5) and the relations (4.6) and (4.7) it is possible to express the count of orbits in $\zeta_\delta(\pi, t)$ in terms of the traces of the powers of the matrices $\mathbf{m}_i([\delta])$.

The actual computation requires a bit of attention because we want to keep track also of the homology classes of the orbits in \mathbb{T}_{ψ_δ} and of their projection in $H_1(\mathbb{T}_\phi)$, which are counted by the more accurate representations ρ_i^π .

Let us begin by translating the orbit count in $\zeta_\delta(\pi, t^{(\delta, S)})$ in terms of fixed points of the iterates of the representative ψ_δ of $\mathbf{m}([\delta])$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\zeta_\delta(\pi, t_{[\delta]} \cdot t^{\langle \delta, S \rangle}) &= \\
&= \prod_{\substack{\gamma \text{ simple} \\ \text{in } T_{\psi_\delta}}} \exp \left(\sum_{m \geq 1} \varepsilon(\delta^{\langle \gamma, F \rangle \cdot m}) \varepsilon(\gamma^m) z_{[\gamma^m]_V} \frac{(t_{[\delta]} \cdot t^{\langle \delta, S \rangle})^{\langle \gamma, F \rangle \cdot m}}{m} \right) \\
&= \exp \left(\sum_{m \geq 1} \sum_{\substack{\gamma \text{ simple} \\ \text{in } T_{\psi_\delta}}} \varepsilon(\delta^{\langle \gamma, F \rangle \cdot m}) \varepsilon(\gamma^m) z_{[\gamma^m]_V} t_{\pi_*([\gamma^m]_V)} \frac{(t^{\langle \delta, S \rangle})^{\langle \gamma, F \rangle \cdot m}}{m} \right) \\
&= \exp \left(\sum_{n \geq 1} \sum_{x \in \text{Fix}(\psi_\delta^n)} \varepsilon(\delta^n) \varepsilon(x, n) (z_{[\gamma_x]_V} t_{\pi_*([\gamma_x]_V)}) \frac{t^{\langle \delta, S \rangle \cdot n}}{n} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Here γ_x is the unique n -periodic orbit in T_{ψ_δ} passing through x and has homology class $[\gamma_x] \in H_1(T_{\psi_\delta})$. Applying (4.7) and the definition of L_A in (4.5) we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
\zeta_\delta(\pi, t_{[\delta]} \cdot t^{\langle \delta, S \rangle}) &= \exp \left(\sum_{n \geq 1} \varepsilon(\delta^n) \sum_{i=0}^2 (-1)^i \text{tr}(\rho_i^\pi([\delta^n])) \frac{t^{\langle \delta, S \rangle \cdot n}}{n} \right) \\
&= \prod_{i=0}^2 \left(\exp \left(\sum_{n \geq 1} \varepsilon(\delta^n) \text{tr}(\rho_i^\pi([\delta^n])) \frac{t^{\langle \delta, S \rangle \cdot n}}{n} \right) \right)^{(-1)^i} \\
&= \prod_{i=0}^2 (\zeta_\delta(\rho_i^\pi, t))^{(-1)^i}.
\end{aligned}$$

The result follows then by multiplying over all the simple periodic orbits δ of ϕ . \square

In the proof of last theorem we regarded the contribution to $\zeta_\pi(\phi)$ of each simple periodic orbit δ of ϕ as a kind of total Abelian Lefschetz zeta function of the manifold $\pi^*\delta$ evaluated in the image in $H_1(V) \oplus H_1(T_\phi)$ of $H_1(\pi^*\delta)$ via the homomorphism $i_* \oplus (\pi \circ i)_*$, where $i : \pi^*\delta \hookrightarrow V$ is the inclusion. The only difference with the corresponding evaluation of the true total Abelian Lefschetz zeta function $\zeta_A(\pi^*\delta)$ is the sign of the contribution of each orbit γ of ψ_δ , now multiplied by the sign of the corresponding power of δ . Using the relation in (4.8) we can understand this difference by expressing $\zeta_\pi(\phi)$ in terms of the “local” Reidemeister torsions of (V, T_ϕ, π, F) near the orbits of ϕ . Denote by

$$\tau_V(\pi^*\delta, t) \in \mathbb{Z}[[H_1(V)]][[t]]$$

the series obtained from $\tau_A(\pi^*\delta, t)$ by replacing the variables keeping track of classes $c \in H_1(\pi^*\delta)$ with the corresponding variables z_{c_V} (using Notation 4.11) encoding classes in $H_1(V)$.

Proposition 4.17. *Given a surface bundle (V, T_ϕ, π, F) , we have*

$$\zeta_\pi(\phi) = \prod_{\substack{\delta \text{ simple} \\ \text{in } T_\phi}} \begin{cases} \tau_V(\pi^*\delta, t_{[\delta]} \cdot t^{\langle \delta, S \rangle}) & \text{if } \delta \text{ elliptic;} \\ \frac{1}{\tau_V(\pi^*\delta, t_{[\delta]} \cdot t^{\langle \delta, S \rangle})} & \text{if } \delta \text{ positive hyperbolic;} \\ \frac{1}{\tau_V(\pi^*\delta, -t_{[\delta]} \cdot t^{\langle \delta, S \rangle})} & \text{if } \delta \text{ negative hyperbolic.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. We prove here only the case of δ negative hyperbolic, leaving to the reader the analogue computations for the other two cases. For the case in hand, by (4.1) we have $\varepsilon(\delta^m) = (-1)^{m+1}$ and, as in the proof of Theorem 4.15, we get

$$\zeta_\delta(\pi, t_{[\delta]} \cdot t^{\langle \delta, S \rangle}) = \prod_{i=0}^2 \left(\exp \left(\sum_{m \geq 1} (-1)^{m+1} \text{tr}(\rho_i^\pi([\delta^m])) \frac{t^{\langle \delta, S \rangle \cdot m}}{m} \right) \right)^{(-1)^i}.$$

By definition, $\rho_i^\pi([\delta^m])$ is the matrix induced on $H_i(\tilde{F}, \mathbb{Z}[H_1(V) \oplus H_1(\mathbb{T}_\phi)])$ (via the evaluation induced by $i_* \oplus (\pi \circ i)_*$ on the variables) by a representative $\psi_{[\delta^m]}$ of $\mathfrak{m}([\delta^m])$. Then, using the Taylor series of the formal logarithm \log and the linear algebra relation $\exp(\text{tr}(\log(\cdot))) = \det(\cdot)$, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_\delta(\pi, t_{[\delta]} \cdot t^{\langle \delta, S \rangle}) &= \prod_{i=0}^2 \left(\exp \left(\sum_{m \geq 1} -\text{tr}(\rho_i^\pi([\delta^m])) \frac{(-t^{\langle \delta, S \rangle})^m}{m} \right) \right)^{(-1)^i} \\ &= \prod_{i=0}^2 \left(\exp \left(\text{tr} \left(- \sum_{m \geq 1} \frac{(\rho_i^\pi([\delta]) \cdot (-t^{\langle \delta, S \rangle}))^m}{m} \right) \right) \right)^{(-1)^i} \\ &= \prod_{i=0}^2 \left(\exp \left(\text{tr} \left(\log \left(\mathbb{1} - \rho_i^\pi([\delta]) \cdot (-t^{\langle \delta, S \rangle}) \right) \right) \right) \right)^{(-1)^i} \\ &= \prod_{i=0}^2 \left(\det \left(\mathbb{1} - \rho_i^\pi([\delta]) \cdot (-t^{\langle \delta, S \rangle}) \right) \right)^{(-1)^i} \\ &= \left(\tau_V(\pi^* \delta, -t_{[\delta]} \cdot t^{\langle \delta, S \rangle}) \right)^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

where the last equivalence follows by applying the relation (4.8) to $\pi^* \delta$ (with monodromy $\mathfrak{m}([\delta])$) and replacing as usual the variables encoding the classes $c \in H_1(\pi^* \delta)$ with the variables $z_{i_*(c)} \cdot t_{\pi_* \circ i_*(c)}$. \square

Observe that the weight with which we count a simple orbit δ is, up to eventually taking the reciprocal, just an evaluation of the standard total Abelian Reidemeister torsion of \mathbb{T}_{ψ_δ} .

Example 4.18 (The trivial example). Consider the disk bundle $(\mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{T}_\phi, \mathbb{T}_\phi, \pi, \mathbb{D})$. For any simple orbit δ , $\pi^* \delta$ is then a solid torus, whose Reidemeister torsion is

$$\tau(\mathbb{D} \times S^1, t) = \frac{1}{1-t}.$$

Since here $\pi_* : H_1(V) \rightarrow H_1(\mathbb{T}_\phi)$ is an isomorphism, we can set all the variables $z_b = 1$ in $\zeta_\pi(\phi)$ without losing information. Then Proposition 4.17 gives

$$\zeta_\pi(\phi) = \prod_{\substack{\delta \text{ simple} \\ \text{in } \mathbb{T}_\phi}} \begin{cases} \tau(\pi^* \delta, t_{[\delta]} \cdot t^{\langle \delta, S \rangle}) = \frac{1}{1-t_{[\delta]} \cdot t^{\langle \delta, S \rangle}} & \text{if } \delta \text{ ell.}; \\ \frac{1}{\tau(\pi^* \delta, t_{[\delta]} \cdot t^{\langle \delta, S \rangle})} = 1 - t_{[\delta]} \cdot t^{\langle \delta, S \rangle} & \text{if } \delta \text{ pos. hyp.}; \\ \frac{1}{\tau(\pi^* \delta, -t_{[\delta]} \cdot t^{\langle \delta, S \rangle})} = 1 + t_{[\delta]} \cdot t^{\langle \delta, S \rangle} & \text{if } \delta \text{ neg. hyp.} \end{cases}$$

which equals the total Abelian Reidemeister torsion of T_ϕ (cf. equations (4.2), (4.3) and (4.8)).

Definition 4.19. Given a 3-manifold Y , we say that a representation $\rho : \pi_1(Y) \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}(n, R)$ over an Abelian ring R is a (*surface*) *bundled representation* if there exists a smooth surface bundle (V, Y, π, F) and a group homomorphism

$$h : \mathbb{Z}[H_1(V) \oplus H_1(T_\phi)] \longrightarrow R$$

such that ρ is conjugate with $h(\rho_i^\pi)$ for some $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, where ρ_i^π is the total Abelian representation of $\pi_1(Y)$ of index i induced by π and defined exactly as in Definition 4.14.

Example 4.20. Given a surface bundle (V, Y, π, F) with F closed of genus g , the algebraic monodromy maps (cf. (4.12))

$$\mathfrak{m}_i^\pi : \pi_1(Y) \longrightarrow \mathrm{GL}(r_i, \mathbb{Z}).$$

with $r_i = \mathrm{rank}(H_i(F, \mathbb{Z}))$ are clearly bundled representations, since for any $\alpha \in \pi_1(Y)$, $\mathfrak{m}_i^\pi(\alpha) = h(\rho_i^\pi(\alpha))$ with

$$\begin{array}{ccc} h : \mathbb{Z}[H_1(V) \oplus H_1(Y)] & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{Z} \\ \text{nzbt}_a & \longmapsto & n \end{array}$$

for any $b \in H_1(V)$ and $a \in H_1(Y)$. On the other hand it is a classical result (see for example [4]) that the map

$$(V, Y, \pi, F) \longmapsto \mathfrak{m}_\pi \in \mathrm{MCG}^+(F)$$

that associates to a closed surface bundle the corresponding monodromy homomorphism (4.11) induces a bijection between the set of bundle isomorphism classes over Y with fiber F and the set of conjugacy classes of representation $\pi_1(Y)$ into $\mathrm{MCG}^+(F)$.

These facts, together with the well known surjection

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{MCG}^+(F) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{GL}(H_1(F, \mathbb{Z})), \\ \psi & \longmapsto & \psi_*|_{H_1(F, \mathbb{Z})} \end{array}$$

imply that, for any Y and $g \geq 1$ all representations of $\pi_1(Y)$ over $\mathrm{GL}(2g, \mathbb{Z})$ are bundled.

Observe that, by definition, the total Abelian Reidemeister torsion of T_ϕ as defined in 4.8 is the product of three factors. The i -th *total Abelian Alexander polynomial* of T_ϕ is

$$\Delta_i(T_\phi, t) = \det \left(\mathbb{1} - t(t_\mu \tilde{\phi}_i) \right).$$

Given an orbit δ of ϕ , define $\Delta_{iV}(\pi^*\delta, t) \in \mathbb{Z}[[H_1(V)]][[t]]$ by evaluating in $H_1(V)$ the variables (encoding elements in $H_1(\pi^*\delta)$) of $\Delta_i(T_\phi, t)$ as usual, so that

$$\tau_V(\pi^*\delta, t) = \prod_{i=0}^2 (\Delta_{iV}(T_\phi, t))^{(-1)^{i+1}}.$$

Corollary 4.21. *Let R be an Abelian ring and $\rho : \pi_1(T_\phi) \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}(n, R)$ be a bundled representation which is conjugate with $h(\rho_i^\pi)$ for some $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, bundle*

$(V, \mathbb{T}_\phi, \pi, F)$ and homomorphism h as in Definition 4.19. Then:

$$\tau_\rho(\mathbb{T}_\phi, t) = \prod_{\substack{\delta \text{ simple} \\ \text{in } \mathbb{T}_\phi}} \begin{cases} h(\Delta_{iV}(\pi^*\delta, t_{[\delta]} \cdot t^{(\delta, S)})) & \text{if } \delta \text{ ell.}; \\ \frac{1}{h(\Delta_{iV}(\pi^*\delta, t_{[\delta]} \cdot t^{(\delta, S)}))} & \text{if } \delta \text{ pos. hyp.}; \\ \frac{1}{h(\Delta_{iV}(\pi^*\delta, -t_{[\delta]} \cdot t^{(\delta, S)}))} & \text{if } \delta \text{ neg. hyp.} \end{cases}$$

Remark 4.22. Theorem 4.15, Proposition 4.17 and Corollary 4.21 give an answer to Question 2 of the introduction, at least for bundled representations of fibered 3-manifolds. Essentially, for a bundled representation ρ of $\pi_1(\mathbb{T}_\phi)$ there exists a surface bundle over \mathbb{T}_ϕ for which we can describe the corresponding Lin's non-Abelian Reidemeister torsion $\tau_\rho(\mathbb{T}_\phi)$ in terms of the ‘‘local’’ Alexander polynomials of the mapping tori above the simple orbits of ϕ induced by the bundle. Each of these mapping tori can be considered as a *local model* for the corresponding orbit δ that encodes in its topology informations about the free homotopy class of δ .

Remark 4.23. Here we do not completely study the family of the representations of $\pi_1(Y)$ which are bundled with respect to some surface bundle (V, Y, π, F) . Example 4.20 (and its analogue for bundles with fibers with boundary) gives a relatively big class of examples. We observe that this class can be easily enlarged by using the representations $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_i^V$ (and not just the weaker \mathbf{m}_i) and composing it with some representation of $H_1(V)$ that is non-trivial on $\ker(\pi_*|_{H_1(V)})$.

4.5. Twisted GT and Lefschetz zeta functions.

For this subsection, fix a closed surface (S, Ω) of genus g and a mapping class $\mathbf{m} \in \text{MCG}^+(S)$. Let ϕ be a symplectic representative of \mathbf{m} and consider the 4-manifold

$$X_\phi := S^1 \times \mathbb{T}_\phi.$$

X_ϕ naturally fibers over a torus with fiber S and can be endowed with a symplectic form ω given by Thurston's Theorem 3.1:

$$(4.13) \quad \omega := ds \wedge dt + \Omega_{X_\phi},$$

where:

- s and t are coordinates for S^1 and, respectively, $\frac{[0, +\infty)}{t \sim t+1}$ in \mathbb{T}_ϕ (with a slight abuse of notation, we identified the coordinates $(s, t) \in S^1 \times S^1$ of the base torus with the corresponding coordinates in X_ϕ);
- Ω_{X_ϕ} is a closed 2-form on X_ϕ that restricts to Ω over each fiber F .

We hope that the use of the letter t to denote both the coordinate along $[0, +\infty)$ and the formal variable of Lefschetz zeta functions and Reidemeister torsions will not induce confusion.

In this situation it is possible to directly prove the following result (see [15] or [13, Section 2.6]).

Theorem 4.24. *If the genus of S is $g \geq 2$ then*

$$\text{GT}(X_\phi, \omega) = \zeta_A(\phi)|_{t=1}.$$

Sketch of the proof. Let J be an ω -compatible almost complex structure on X_ϕ such that $J\partial_s = \partial_t$. Using the condition $g \geq 2$, one can show that, for any $A \in H_2(X_\phi)$,

$d_A \geq 0$ if and only if A is a Künneth product $A = [S^1] \times a$ for some $a \in H_1(\mathbb{T}_\phi)$, in which case $d_A = 0$.

If δ is any periodic orbit of ϕ , the surface $S^1 \times \delta$ is J -holomorphic and these are in fact all the J -holomorphic curves in (X_ϕ, J) that we need to consider (cf. [13, Lemma 2.6]). Clearly the curve

$$C_\delta := S^1 \times \delta$$

is embedded if and only if δ is simple and it is possible to prove that for any $n > 0$

$$\epsilon(C_{\delta^n}) = \epsilon(\delta^n).$$

We have then the following exhaustive correspondence:

$$(4.14) \quad \begin{aligned} C_\delta \text{ is of type } (+, 0) &\iff \delta \text{ elliptic,} \\ C_\delta \text{ is of type } (-, 0) &\iff \delta \text{ positive hyperbolic,} \\ C_\delta \text{ is of type } (+, 1) &\iff \delta \text{ negative hyperbolic} \end{aligned}$$

and it is easy to check that, with the normalization (2.8), we have

$$P(C_\delta, t) = \zeta_\delta(t).$$

Then, with the natural identification $t_{[C_\delta]} \equiv t_{[\delta]}$, we obtain:

$$\text{GT}(X_\phi, \omega) = \prod_{C_\delta \text{ embedded}} P(C_\delta, t_{[C_\delta]}) = \prod_{\delta \text{ simple}} \zeta_\delta(t_{[\delta]}) = \zeta_A(\phi)|_{t=1}.$$

□

The following is essentially Theorem 1.2 in introduction.

Theorem 4.25. *Let $(V, \mathbb{T}_\phi, \pi, F)$ be a smooth surface bundle with F closed and let $(S^1 \times V, X_\phi, \pi, F)$ be the natural bundle induced by the multiplication by S^1 , where X_ϕ is endowed with the symplectic form ω given in (4.13). Suppose that both F and S have genus greater than 1. Then:*

$$\text{GT}_\pi(X_\phi, \omega) = \zeta_\pi(\phi)|_{t=1}.$$

Proof. By definition of $\text{GT}_\pi(X_\phi, \omega)$ and the exhaustive correspondence (4.14) we have

$$\text{GT}_\pi(X_\phi, \omega) = \prod_{\delta \text{ simple}} P_\pi(C_\delta).$$

It is then enough to prove that, for any δ :

$$(4.15) \quad P_\pi(C_\delta) = \zeta_\delta(\pi, t_{[\delta]})$$

with the two identifications

$$(4.16) \quad \begin{aligned} t_{[S^1] \times a} &\equiv t_a && \text{for any } a \in H_1(\mathbb{T}_\phi) \\ z_{[S^1] \times b} &\equiv z_b && \text{for any } b \in H_1(\pi^*\delta). \end{aligned}$$

between the variables in the definitions 3.7 - 3.8 and those in definitions 4.12 - 4.13.

For any δ simple fix first a symplectic form Ω_δ on F and a symplectic representative $\psi_\delta : F \rightarrow F$ of $\mathfrak{m}_\pi(\delta) \in \text{MCG}^+(F)$. Then we can endow

$$\pi^*C_\delta = S^1 \times \pi^*\delta \cong X_{\psi_\delta}$$

with a symplectic form ω_δ like in (4.13) that, for what said in the beginning of this subsection, is also of the form (3.3).

We can check Equation (4.15) case by case using the correspondence in (4.14). If δ is elliptic the equivalence is satisfied since

$$P_\pi(C_\delta) = \text{GT}_{X_\phi}(\pi^*C_\delta) = \tau_V(\pi^*\delta, t_{[\delta]}) = \zeta_\delta(\pi, t_{[\delta]}),$$

where the second equality follows by applying Theorem 4.24 to $\pi^*C_\delta \cong X_{\psi_\delta}$ with the identifications (4.16) and the equivalence (4.8) between total Abelian Reidemeister torsion and Lefschetz zeta function and the last equality comes from (the proof of) Proposition 4.17. The proof for δ positive hyperbolic works in a completely analogous way by just taking the reciprocals in last equation.

Finally, suppose that δ is negative hyperbolic. Then the double cover ι of C_δ for which $\epsilon((C_\delta)_\iota) = -1$ “doubles C_δ in the t -direction of X_ϕ ”, so that

$$P_\pi(C_\delta) = \frac{\text{GT}_{X_\phi}(\pi^*C_\delta)}{\text{GT}_{X_\phi}(\pi^*C_{\delta^2})}.$$

Observing that $\pi^*C_{\delta^2} \cong X_{\psi_{\delta^2}}$, reasoning as in the elliptic case we get

$$P_\pi(C_\delta) = \frac{\tau_V(\pi^*\delta, t_{[\delta]})}{\tau_V(\pi^*\delta^2, t_{[\delta]}^2)}$$

where $\tau_V(\pi^*\delta^2, t)$ is obtained by $\tau_A(\mathbb{T}_{\psi_\delta^2}, t) = \tau_A(\pi^*\delta^2, t)$ by replacing the variables z_b , $b \in H_1(\pi^*\delta^2)$ with variables z_{b_V} where $b_V \in H_1(V)$ is the image of b via the composition of the homomorphisms $H_1(\pi^*\delta^2) \rightarrow H_1(\pi^*\delta)$ (induced by the double cover projection) and $H_1(\pi^*\delta) \rightarrow H_1(V)$ (induced by the inclusion). Then:

$$\begin{aligned} P_\pi(C_\delta) &= \frac{\prod_{i=1}^2 (\det(\mathbb{1} - t_{[\delta]}(\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_i^V)))^{(-1)^{i+1}}}{\prod_{i=1}^2 (\det(\mathbb{1} - t_{[\delta]}^2(\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_i^V)^2))^{(-1)^{i+1}}} \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^2 \left(\frac{\det(\mathbb{1} - t_{[\delta]}(\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_i^V))}{\det(\mathbb{1} - t_{[\delta]}(\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_i^V)) \cdot \det(\mathbb{1} + t_{[\delta]}(\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_i^V))} \right)^{(-1)^{i+1}} \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^2 \left(\frac{1}{\det(\mathbb{1} - (-t_{[\delta]})(\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_i^V))} \right)^{(-1)^{i+1}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\tau_V(\pi^*\delta, -t_{[\delta]})} = \zeta_\delta(\pi, t_{[\delta]}). \end{aligned}$$

□

Last theorem, together with Theorem 4.15 and Corollary 4.21, gives an answer to Question 1 in the introduction for twisted Reidemeister torsions associated with surface bundles or bundled representations. We end the paper with the following:

Questions. Given a 4-dimensional symplectic manifold (X, ω) , fix a smooth surface bundle (W, X, π, F) with F closed and $[F] \neq 0$ in $H_2(W, \mathbb{R})$.

- (1) is $\text{GT}_\pi(X, \omega)$ independent (eventually up to global shifts on the variables) on the choice of ω ?
- (2) observing that W can always be endowed with a symplectic form ω_W (given by Thurston’s theorem), is there any relation between $\text{GT}_\pi(X, \omega)$ and the higher-dimensional Gromov series (cf. [15]) of (W, ω_W) ?

REFERENCES

- [1] N. A'Campo: *La fonction zêta d'une monodromie*; Comment. Math. Helv. 50 (1975), 233–248.
- [2] R. I. Baykur, S. Friedl: *Virtually symplectic fibered 4-manifolds*; Indiana Univ. Math. J. 64 (2015), no. 4, 983–999.
- [3] R. I. Baykur, S. Kamada: *Classification of broken Lefschetz fibrations with small fiber genera*; J. Math. Soc. Japan 67 (2015), no. 3, 877–901.
- [4] B. Farb, D. Margalit: *A primer on mapping class groups*; Princeton Mathematical Series, 49. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2012.
- [5] D. Fried: *Homological identities for closed orbits*; Invent. Math. 71 (1983), no. 2, 419–442.
- [6] D. Fried: *Periodic points and twisted coefficients*; Geometric Dynamics, Lecture Notes in Math. 1007, 261–293, Springer Verlag, 1983.
- [7] S. Friedl, S. Vidussi: *Twisted Alexander polynomials detect fibered 3-manifolds*; Ann. of Math. (2) 173 (2011), no. 3, 1587–1643.
- [8] S. Friedl, S. Vidussi: *A survey of twisted Alexander polynomials*; The mathematics of knots, 45–94, Contrib. Math. Comput. Sci., 1, Springer, Heidelberg, 2011.
- [9] S. Friedl, S. Vidussi: *Thurston norm and twisted Alexander polynomials*; Journal für Reine und Angewandte Mathematik 707 (2015), 87–102.
- [10] R. Geoghegan, A. Nicas: *Trace and torsion in the theory of flows*; Topology 33 (1994), no. 4, 683–719.
- [11] H. Goda: *Twisted Alexander invariants and Hyperbolic volume*; preprint (2016), arXiv:1604.07490.
- [12] M. Gromov: *Pseudo-holomorphic curves in symplectic manifolds*; Invent. Math. 82 (1985) 307–347.
- [13] M. Hutchings: *Lecture notes on embedded contact homology*; arXiv:1303.5789, 2014.
- [14] E.-N. Ionel, T. H. Parker: *The Gromov invariants of Ruan-Tian and Taubes*; Math. Res. Lett. 4 (1997), no. 4, 521–532.
- [15] E.-N. Ionel, T. H. Parker: *Gromov invariants and symplectic maps*; Math. Ann. 314 (1999), no. 1, 127–158.
- [16] B. Jiang: *Reidemeister trace and Reidemeister torsion*; unpublished notes, 1987.
- [17] B. Jiang, S. C. Wang: *Twisted topological invariants associated with representations*; Topics in knot theory (Erzurum, 1992), 211–227, NATO Adv. Sci. Inst. Ser. C Math. Phys. Sci., 399, Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 1993.
- [18] X. S. Lin: *Representations of knot groups and twisted Alexander polynomials*; Acta Math. Sin. (Engl. Ser.) 17 (2001), no. 3, 361–380.
- [19] J. W. Morgan: *The Seiberg-Witten equations and applications to the topology of smooth four-manifolds*; Mathematical Notes, 44. Princeton University Press, 1996.
- [20] Y. Ruan: *Symplectic topology and complex surfaces*; Geom. Topology on Complex Manifolds, (T. Mabuchi, J. Noguchi and T. Ochiai, eds.), World Scientific Publ., Singapore, 1994.
- [21] G. Spano: *A categorification of the Alexander polynomial in embedded conatact homology*; preprint, arxiv.org/abs/1410.5081, 2014.
- [22] C. H. Taubes: *Counting pseudo-holomorphic submanifolds in dimension 4*; J. Diff. Geom. 44 (1996), 818–893.
- [23] C. H. Taubes: *Seiberg Witten and Gromov invariants for symplectic 4-manifolds*; First International Press Lecture Series, 2. International Press, 2000.
- [24] W. P. Thurston: *Some simple examples of symplectic manifolds*; Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 55 (1976), no. 2, 467–468.
- [25] C. Wendl: *From ruled surfaces to planar open books: Holomorphic curves in symplectic and contact manifolds of low dimension*, lecture notes, 2014.