COMPLEX $K$-THEORY OF MIRROR PAIRS

DAVID TREUMANN

Abstract. We formulate some conjectures about the $K$-theory of symplectic manifolds and their Fukaya categories, and prove some of them in very special cases.

1. Introduction

Let $K^*(X) = K^0(X) \oplus K^1(X)$ denote the complex $K$-theory of a space $X$. I am not sure who first proposed that when $X$ and $\hat{X}$ are a mirror pair of compact Calabi-Yau 3-folds one should have isomorphisms

\begin{equation}
K^0(X) \cong K^1(\hat{X}) \quad \text{and} \quad K^1(X) \cong K^0(\hat{X})
\end{equation}

— it is an instance of the string-theoretical idea [MiMo, Moo1, Witt] that "$D$-branes have charges in $K$-theory." Rationally, (1.0.1) is a consequence of the usual Hodge-diamond flip, but the question of whether it holds becomes interesting if $K^*(X)$ or $K^*(\hat{X})$ has torsion, or if one and not the other group is known to be torsion-free. It might be interesting more generally if one searches for very natural isomorphisms, more on that in §3.

I believe that (1.0.1) is an open problem. Batyrev and Kreuzer in [BaKr] gave a case-by-case verification for the half-billion mirror pairs associated with 4d reflexive polytopes, actually obtaining isomorphisms in integral cohomology

\begin{equation}
tors(H^2(X, \mathbb{Z})) \cong tors(H^3(\hat{X}, \mathbb{Z})) \quad \text{and} \quad tors(H^4(X, \mathbb{Z})) \cong tors(H^5(\hat{X}, \mathbb{Z}))
\end{equation}

and deducing (1.0.1) from the Atiyah-Hirzebruch spectral sequence. But Addington [Addi] has given examples of derived equivalent 3-folds $\hat{X}$ and $\hat{X}'$ where $H^3(\hat{X}, \mathbb{Z})$ and $H^3(\hat{X}', \mathbb{Z})$ have different torsion subgroups, suggesting that (1.0.2) should not hold in general.

In §2, we will give an explicit example, by verifying (1.0.1) in one new case: a $T$-dual pair of flat 3-folds (for which holomological mirror symmetry is essentially known after [Abo1])

\[ X := X_{1,5} \quad \hat{X} := X_{2,12} \]

with $K^0(X) \cong K^1(\hat{X})$ but $tors(H^2(X, \mathbb{Z})) = (\mathbb{Z}/4)^3$ and $ tors(H^3(\hat{X}, \mathbb{Z})) = \mathbb{Z}/4$.

In §3 we will discuss conjectures — some of mine and one of Ganatra’s — about the $K$-theory of Fukaya categories.

2. 3-folds

2.1. The flat 3-manifold $B$. Let $B$ denote the quotient of $\mathbb{R}^3/\mathbb{Z}^3$ by the action of $\mathbb{Z}/2 \times \mathbb{Z}/2$ whose three nontrivial operators are

\begin{equation}
\begin{aligned}
\alpha(x_1, x_2, x_3) & := (x_1 + \frac{1}{2}, -x_2 + \frac{1}{2}, -x_3) \\
\beta(x_1, x_2, x_3) & := (-x_1 + \frac{1}{2}, -x_2, x_3 + \frac{1}{2}) \\
\gamma(x_1, x_2, x_3) & := (-x_1, x_2 + \frac{1}{2}, -x_3 + \frac{1}{2})
\end{aligned}
\end{equation}
It is the 3-manifold studied in [HW]. We regard it as having a basepoint at image of 0 ∈ \( \mathbb{R}^3 \), and as having a flat metric given by the usual dot product on \( \mathbb{R}^3 \). The fundamental group of \( B \) is one of the Fedorov-Schoenflies crystallographic groups, with presentation [Wolf, Th. 3.5.5]

\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha^2 &= t_1 \\
\alpha t_2 &= t_2^{-1} \alpha \\
\alpha t_3 &= t_3^{-1} \alpha \\
\beta t_1 &= t_1^{-1} \beta \\
\beta t_2 &= t_2^{-1} \beta \\
\beta^2 &= t_3 \\
\gamma t_1 &= t_1^{-1} \gamma \\
\gamma^2 &= t_2 \\
\gamma t_3 &= t_3^{-1} \gamma 
\end{align*}
\]

and

\[
[t_1, t_2] = [t_2, t_3] = [t_3, t_1] = \gamma \beta \alpha = 1
\]

The \( t_1, t_2, t_3 \) are translation operators on \( \mathbb{R}^3 \). Being flat, the holonomy group of \( B \) is a representation

\[
\pi_1(B) \to SO(3)
\]

Its image is isomorphic to \( \mathbb{Z}/2 \times \mathbb{Z}/2 \) (the group of diagonal matrices in \( SO(3) \)). Abelianizing (2.1.2) gives

\[
\begin{align*}
H_0(B) &= \mathbb{Z} \\
H_1(B) &= \mathbb{Z}/4 \oplus \mathbb{Z}/4 \\
H_2(B) &= 0 \\
H_3(B) &= \mathbb{Z}
\end{align*}
\]

2.2. Tri-elliptic 3-fold \( X_{0,4} \). Let \( \tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3 \) be complex numbers with positive imaginary part, and put

\[
E_i := \mathbb{C}/(\mathbb{Z} + \tau_i \mathbb{Z})
\]

Let \( X_{0,4} \) be the quotient of \( E_1 \times E_2 \times E_3 \) by the complexification of the operators (2.1.1), i.e.

\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha(z_1, z_2, z_3) &:= (z_1 + \frac{1}{2}, -z_2 + \frac{1}{2}, -z_3) \\
\beta(z_1, z_2, z_3) &:= (-z_1 + \frac{1}{2}, -z_2 + \frac{1}{2}, z_3 + \frac{1}{2}) \\
\gamma(z_1, z_2, z_3) &:= (-z_1, z_2 + \frac{1}{2}, -z_3 + \frac{1}{2})
\end{align*}
\]

(We follow [DoWe] for the name). The projections \( \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{R} : x_i + \tau_i y_i \mapsto x_i \) descend to a map

\[
X_{0,4} \to B
\]

which is split by the subset cut out by \( y_1 = y_2 = y_3 = 0 \). The translation action of

\[
V := \mathbb{R} \tau_1 \times \mathbb{R} \tau_2 \times \mathbb{R} \tau_3
\]

on \( \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \) descends to an action on \( E_1 \times E_2 \times E_3 \) and on \( X_{0,4} \). The action preserves the fibers of (2.2.3), and determines an identification of the fiber over \( b \) with the quotient of \( V \) by a lattice \( V_{\mathbb{Z}, b} \subset V \). We will denote the lattice over the basepoint by \( M_{0,4} \), i.e.

\[
M_{0,4} := V_{\mathbb{Z}, 0} = \mathbb{Z} \tau_1 \times \mathbb{Z} \tau_2 \times \mathbb{Z} \tau_3
\]

The action of \( \pi_1(B) \) on \( V \) and on \( M_{0,4} \) is through the holonomy \( \mathbb{Z}/2 \times \mathbb{Z}/2 \) (2.1.3).
2.3. More tri-elliptic 3-folds. On each $E_i$ we may define a biholomorphic action of $\mathbb{Z}/2 \times \mathbb{Z}/2 \times \mathbb{Z}/2$: the three generators act by

\[ \begin{align*}
& z \mapsto z + 1/2 \\
& z \mapsto z + \tau_i/2 \\
& z \mapsto -z
\end{align*} \]

Altogether this defines an action of $(\mathbb{Z}/2)^9$ on $E_1 \times E_2 \times E_3$. In [DoWe], Donagi and Wendland classified the subgroups that act freely. The quotient $X = (E_1 \times E_2 \times E_3)/G$ must factor as a product of a surface and an elliptic curve, or else be isomorphic to one of the foursome

\[ X_{0,4} \quad X_{1,5} \quad X_{1,11} \quad X_{2,12} \]

where $X_{0,4}$ is as in §2.2 and the other three are defined below. These 3-folds are part of a more general classification problem considered in [DoWe], which is reflected in the weird names. They also appear in [La], where they are called “hyperelliptic 3-folds of type (2,2).” Some older appearances are given in [DoSh].

Each of the 3-folds (2.3.1) is aspherical, and fits into a fiber sequence

\[ V/M_{I,J} \to X_{I,J} \to B \]

where $V$ is as in (2.2.4) and $M_{I,J}$ is a lattice in $V$.

2.4. Definition. Let $X_{1,5}$ denote the quotient of $X_{0,4}$ by the involution

\[ (z_1, z_2, z_3) \mapsto \left( z_1 + \frac{\tau_1}{2}, z_2 + \frac{\tau_2}{2}, z_3 + \frac{\tau_3}{2} \right) \]

Then

\[ M_{1,5} = M_{0,4} + \mathbb{Z} (\tau_1/2, \tau_2/2, \tau_3/2) \]

2.5. Definition. Let $X_{1,11}$ denote the quotient of $X_{0,4}$ by the involution

\[ (z_1, z_2, z_3) \mapsto \left( z_1 + \frac{\tau_1}{2}, z_2 + \frac{\tau_2}{2}, z_3 \right) \]

Then

\[ M_{1,11} = M_{0,4} + \mathbb{Z} (\tau_1/2, \tau_2/2, 0) \]

2.6. Definition. Let $X_{2,12}$ denote the quotient of $X_{0,4}$ by the $\mathbb{Z}/2 \times \mathbb{Z}/2$ group generated by the pair of involutions

\[ (z_1, z_2, z_3) \mapsto \left( z_1 + \frac{\tau_1}{2}, z_2 + \frac{\tau_2}{2}, z_3 \right) \quad \text{and} \quad (z_1, z_2, z_3) \mapsto \left( z_1, z_2 + \frac{\tau_2}{2}, z_3 + \frac{\tau_3}{2} \right) \]

Then

\[ M_{2,12} = M_{0,4} + \mathbb{Z} \{ (\tau_1/2, \tau_2/2, 0), (0, \tau_2/2, \tau_3/2) \} \]

2.7. $T$-duality. The $T$-dual fibration to $X_{I,J} \to B$, of Strominger-Yau-Zaslow, is the space of pairs $(b, L)$ where $b \in B$ and $L \in H^1(V/V_{\mathbb{Z}_b}, U(1))$ is the isomorphism class of a rank one unitary local system on the fiber above $b$. Let us denote it by $\hat{X}_{I,J}$. It is another split torus fibration

\[ V^*/\hat{M}_{I,J} \to \hat{X}_{I,J} \to B \]
where $V^* := \text{Hom}(V, u(1))$ and $\hat{M} \subset V^*$ is the dual lattice to $M$. As such $\hat{X}_{I,J}$ is determined up to homotopy equivalence by the dual $\pi_1(B)$-module (equivalently, the dual $\mathbb{Z}/2 \times \mathbb{Z}/2$-module) to $M_{I,J}$. $M_{04}$ and $M_{111}$ are self-dual, while $M_{15}$ and $M_{212}$ are dual to each other, and therefore we have homotopy equivalences

\begin{equation}
\hat{X}_{04} \simeq X_{04}, \quad \hat{X}_{15} \simeq X_{212}, \quad \hat{X}_{111} \simeq X_{111}
\end{equation}

The homotopy equivalences (2.7.2) can be taken to be natural diffeomorphisms, if $X_{I,J}$ has parameters $\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3$ and we take the corresponding parameters for $\hat{X}_{I,J}$ to be the purely imaginary numbers $(i|\tau_1|^{-1}, i|\tau_2|^{-1}, i|\tau_3|^{-1})$.

2.8. $K$-theory. Let $X = X_{I,J}$ and $\hat{X} = X_{I,J}$ be a dual pair of the 3-folds. We wish to prove (1.0.1), that $K^0(X) \cong K^4(\hat{X})$ and that $K^1(X) \cong K^0(\hat{X})$ — we will do so without actually computing $K^*(X)$ and $K^*(\hat{X})$, indeed I do not quite know what the $K$-theory of these manifolds is §2.14–2.15.

Let $K$ denote the complex $K$-theory spectrum. It is an $E_\infty$-ring spectrum. We write $\text{Mod}(K)$ for the symmetric monoidal $\infty$-category of module spectra over $K$, and we will study sheaves of $K$-module spectra on $X$, $\hat{X}$ and related spaces. These are stable $\infty$-categories — for an $\infty$-category we will write $\text{Maps}(c, d)$ for the space of maps and $[c, d]$ for the set of homotopy classes of maps between two objects. We write $\Sigma$ for the suspension functor in a stable $\infty$-categories.

If $U$ is a manifold we write $K_U$ for the constant sheaf of $K$-module spectra on $U$, and $\omega_U$ for the orientation sheaf.

2.9. Lemma. Each of the spaces $B, X, \hat{X}, X \times_B \hat{X}$ are $K$-orientable — that is, there are isomorphisms of sheaves

\begin{equation}
\Sigma^{-3}K_B \cong \omega_B \quad \Sigma^{-6}K_X \cong \omega_X \quad \Sigma^{-6}K_{\hat{X}} \cong \omega_{\hat{X}} \quad \Sigma^{-9}K_{X \times_B \hat{X}} \cong \omega_{X \times_B \hat{X}}
\end{equation}

Proof. Any Spin$^c$-structure on a manifold induces a $K$-orientation, and one way to endow an oriented flat manifold with a Spin$^c$ structure is to lift its holonomy representation

\begin{equation}
\pi_1 \to \text{SO}(n)
\end{equation}

along the natural homomorphism Spin$^c(n) \to \text{SO}(n)$. Each of $B, X, \hat{X}$ and $X \times_B \hat{X}$ fibers over $B$, and the holonomy around any loop in those fibers is trivial, so (2.9.2) factors through $\pi_1(B) \to \text{SO}(3)$ (2.1.3). The equations (2.1.2) can be solved in Spin$^c(3)$, for instance we may solve them in Spin$^c(3)$ by taking $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$ to be the usual unit quaternions. Then the lift of (2.9.2) can be taken to be the composite of $\pi_1 \to \pi_1(B) \to \text{Spin}(3)$ with any lift of Spin$^c(3) \to \text{SO}(3) \to \text{SO}(n)$ to Spin$^c(n)$. \qed

2.10. Local-on-$B$ identifications of $K$-theory. Write $K[U]$ for the $K$-homology spectrum and $K^U$ for the $K$-cohomology spectrum of a space $U$ — that is, $K[U]$ is the smash product of $K$ with the suspension spectrum of $U$ and $K^U$ is the internal mapping object from $K[U]$ to $K$. They are related to the $K$-homology and $K$-cohomology groups of $U$ by

$$[\Sigma^iK, K[U]] \cong K_i(U)$$

and

$$K^i(U) \cong [K[U], \Sigma^iK] \cong [\Sigma^{-i}K, K^U]$$

In terms of sheaf operations, we have

$$\Gamma_c(\omega_U) = K[U] \quad \Gamma(K_U) = K^U$$
We consider the fiber square
\[(2.10.1) \quad X \times_B \hat{X} \xrightarrow{g} X \xrightarrow{h} \hat{X} \xrightarrow{q} B\]
Factoring the maps \(X \to pt\) and \(\hat{X} \to pt\) through \(B\) gives canonical isomorphisms
\[(2.10.2) \quad K[X] \cong \Gamma_c(B, p_! \omega_X) = \Gamma(B, p_! \omega_X) \quad K^\hat{X} \cong \Gamma(B, q_* K^\hat{X})\]
where we replace \(\Gamma_c\) with \(\Gamma\) using the compactness of \(B\). The \(K\)-orientability of \(X\) gives an identification of \(K[X] \cong \Sigma^{-6} K^\hat{X}\). So to prove \((1.0.1)\) it suffices to produce an isomorphism between \(\Sigma^{-3} p_! \omega_X\) and \(q_* K^\hat{X}\).

To that end, let us study the sheaf of spaces on \(B\) whose sections over \(U \subset B\) are given by
\[(2.10.3) \quad \text{Maps} \left( (\Sigma^{-3} p_! \omega_X) |_U, (q_* K^\hat{X}) |_U \right)\]
where \(\text{Maps}\) is taken in the \(\infty\)-category of sheaves of \(K\)-modules over \(U\).

2.11. Lemma. If \(\pi = q \circ h = p \circ g\) denotes the projection \(X \times_B \hat{X} \to B\), and one fixes \(K\)-orientations of \(X, \hat{X}\), and \(X \times_B \hat{X}\), there are natural isomorphisms
\[(2.11.1) \quad \text{Maps} \left( (\Sigma^{-3} p_! \omega_X) |_U, (q_* K^\hat{X}) |_U \right) \cong \text{Maps}(K[\pi^{-1}(U)], K)\]
where the left-hand side is \((2.10.3)\) and on the right-hand side \(\text{Maps}\) is taken in the \(\infty\)-category of \(K\)-modules.

Proof.
\[(2.11.2) \quad \text{Maps} \left( (\Sigma^{-3} p_! \omega_X) |_U, (q_* K^\hat{X}) |_U \right) \cong \text{Maps} \left( (\Sigma^{-3} q^* p_! \omega_X) |_{q^{-1}(U)}, K_{q^{-1}(U)} \right)\]
\[(2.11.3) \quad \cong \text{Maps} \left( (\Sigma^{-3} h_! g^* \omega_X) |_{q^{-1}(U)}, K_{q^{-1}(U)} \right)\]
\[(2.11.4) \quad \cong \text{Maps} \left( (\Sigma^{-3} h_! g^* \Sigma^{-6} K_X) |_{q^{-1}(U)}, K_{q^{-1}(U)} \right)\]
\[(2.11.5) \quad \cong \text{Maps} \left( (\Sigma^{-9} h_! K_{X \times_B \hat{X}}) |_{q^{-1}(U)}, K_{q^{-1}(U)} \right)\]
\[(2.11.6) \quad \cong \text{Maps} \left( (h_! \omega_{X \times_B \hat{X}}) |_{q^{-1}(U)}, K_{q^{-1}(U)} \right)\]
\[(2.11.7) \quad \cong \text{Maps} \left( (h_! \omega_{X \times_B \hat{X}}) |_{q^{-1}(U)}, \Sigma^6 \omega_{q^{-1}(U)} \right)\]
\[(2.11.8) \quad \cong \text{Maps} \left( \Gamma_c \left( h_! \omega_{X \times_B \hat{X}} \right) |_{q^{-1}(U)}, \Sigma^5 K \right)\]
\[(2.11.9) \quad \cong \text{Maps}(K[(q \circ h)^{-1}(U)], \Sigma^6 K)\]
where \((2.11.2)\) is the \((q^*, q_*)\)-adjunction, \((2.11.3)\) is proper base-change, \((2.11.4)\) uses the \(K\)-orientation of \(X\), \((2.11.6)\) uses the \(K\)-orientation of \(X \times_B \hat{X}\), \((2.11.7)\) uses the \(K\)-orientation of \(q^{-1}(U) \subset \hat{X}\), \((2.11.8)\) uses the \((q^{-1}(U) \to pt)_!\), \((q^{-1}(U) \to pt)^!\) adjunction. Finally one applies the Bott isomorphism \(K \cong \Sigma^6 K\) to obtain the right-hand-side of \((2.11.1)\).

2.12. Poincaré bundle. When \(T\) and \(\hat{T}\) are dual tori, (for instance, if \(T = V/M\) \((2.3.2)\) and \(\hat{T} = V^*/\hat{M}\) \((2.7.1)\) are fibers above the basepoint of \(X \to B\) and \(\hat{X} \to B\)), there is a canonical pairing \(H_1(T) \otimes H_1(\hat{T}) \to \mathbb{Z}\), which determines a canonical element
\[(2.12.1) \quad \text{coev} \in H^1 (T; \mathbb{Z}) \otimes H^1 (\hat{T}; \mathbb{Z}) \subset H^2 (T \times \hat{T}; \mathbb{Z})\]
Let us say that a line bundle on $X \times_B \hat{X}$ is a “Poincaré bundle” if its restriction to a fiber is this canonical element.

The connected components of the right-hand side of (2.10.3) are virtual vector bundles on $\pi^{-1}(U)$. In particular, a line bundle on $X \times_B \hat{X}$ determines a homotopy class of maps

$$(2.12.2)\quad P_L : \Sigma^{-3}p^*\omega_X \to q_*K_{\hat{X}}$$

2.12.1. Lemma. If $L$ is a Poincaré bundle, $P_L$ is an isomorphism.

Proof. We prove that $P_L$ is an isomorphism on stalks. More generally we prove that if $T$ and $\hat{T}$ are dual tori, a line bundle whose Chern class is (2.12.1) exhibits $K^T$ and $K^{\hat{T}}$ as dual objects in the monoidal category $\text{Mod}(K)$. Such a line bundle determines a homotopy class of maps

$$(2.12.3)\quad K \to K^{T \times \hat{T}} \cong K^T \otimes_K K^{\hat{T}}$$

in $\text{Mod}(K)$, and we will show that for all $i$ the composite

$$(2.12.4)\quad [\Sigma^iK^T, K] \otimes^{K^T} [\Sigma^iK^T \otimes_K K^{\hat{T}}, K^\hat{T}] \xrightarrow{(2.12.3)} [\Sigma^iK, K^\hat{T}]$$

is an isomorphism.

In case $T = \hat{T} = U(1)$, we have canonically $K^T \cong K \oplus \Sigma K$, $K^{\hat{T}} \cong K \oplus \Sigma K$, and

$$(2.12.5)\quad K^{T \times \hat{T}} \cong K \oplus \Sigma K \oplus \Sigma K \oplus \Sigma^2 K.$$ 

Then (2.12.3) is the Bott isomorphism $K \cong \Sigma^2 K$ onto the last summand of (2.12.5), and one can check (2.12.4) directly.

In the general case, the domain of (2.12.4) is $K_i(T)$ and the codomain is $K^{-i}(\hat{T})$, and the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
K_1(U(1)) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \text{Hom}(U(1), T) & \longrightarrow & K_1(T) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow^{(2.12.4)} \\
K^{-1}(U(1)) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \text{Hom}(\hat{T}, U(1)) & \longrightarrow & K^{-1}(\hat{T})
\end{array}$$

commutes, where the left vertical arrow is (2.12.4) for $T = \hat{T} = U(1)$, tensored with the identification of cocharacters of $T$ with characters of $\hat{T}$. The horizontal arrows induce graded ring isomorphisms

$$(2.12.6)\quad \Lambda(\text{Hom}(U(1), T)) \otimes K^* \to K_*(T)\quad \Lambda(\text{Hom}(\hat{T}, U(1))) \otimes K^* \to K^*(T)$$

where the multiplication on $K_*(T)$ is defined using the group structure on $T$ (the Pontrjagin product), and the ring structure on $K^*(\hat{T})$ is tensor product of vector bundles. Thus we may complete the proof that (2.12.4) is an isomorphism by noting that it intertwines the Pontrjagin product on $K_*(T)$ with the tensor product on $K^*(\hat{T})$. A strong form of this is true but to make use of (2.12.6) we only need to note that (letting $m : T \times T \to T$ denote the multiplication and $\Delta : \hat{T} \to \hat{T} \times \hat{T}$ the diagonal) the following two elements of $K^0(T \times T \times \hat{T})$ are equal:

- The pullback of (2.12.1) along $m \times 1 : T \times T \to \hat{T} \to T \times \hat{T}$
- The pullback of (2.12.1) $\otimes$ (2.12.1) along the map $T \times T \times \hat{T} \to T \times \hat{T} \times T \times \hat{T}$ that carries $(t_1, t_2, \hat{t})$ to $(t_1, \hat{t}, t_2, \hat{t})$
In fact these are equal in $H^2(T \times T \times \hat{T}; \mathbb{Z})$. It follows that two maps from the upper left to the lower right corner of the evident square

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathbf{K}[T] \otimes_{\mathbf{K}} \mathbf{K}[T] & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{K}^\hat{r} \otimes_{\mathbf{K}} \mathbf{K}^\hat{r} \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\mathbf{K}[T] & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{K}^\hat{r}
\end{array}
\]

are homotopic, and therefore that (2.12.4) is a ring homomorphism. $\square$

2.13. **Theorem.** Let $X$ and $\hat{X}$ be as in (2.7.2). Then (1.0.1) holds, i.e.

\[\mathbf{K}^0(X) \cong \mathbf{K}^1(\hat{X}) \text{ and } \mathbf{K}^1(X) \cong \mathbf{K}^0(\hat{X})\]

**Proof.** After (2.10.2) and Lemma 2.12.1, it suffices to construct a Poincaré bundle on $X \times_B \hat{X}$. The fundamental group $\pi_1(B)$ acts on $H^2(T \times \hat{T}; \mathbb{Z}) = H^2(V/M \times V^*/M; \mathbb{Z})$, and the canonical class (2.12.1) is fixed by this action. We will prove the existence of a Poincaré bundle by showing that the map

\[H^2(X \times_B \hat{X}; \mathbb{Z}) \to H^2(T \times \hat{T}; \mathbb{Z})^{\pi_1(B)}\]  

is a surjection. As $X \times_B \hat{X}$ is a $K(\pi,1)$-space, the domain of (2.13.1) is isomorphic to the cohomology of the fundamental group $\pi_1(X \times_B \hat{X})$. To prove that it is a surjection is equivalent to showing that the differentials

\[d_2 : H^2(T \times \hat{T}; \mathbb{Z})^{\pi_1(B)} \to H^2(\pi_1(B); H^1(T \times \hat{T}; \mathbb{Z})\]

and

\[d_3 : \ker(d_2) \to H^3(B; \mathbb{Z})\]

vanish, in the Serre spectral sequence of the fibration $X \times_B \hat{X} \to B$. Let us denote this spectral sequence by $X^*E^\ast_r$. We similarly denote the Serre spectral sequence of $X \to B$ by $XE^\ast_r$ and of $\hat{X} \to B$ by $\hat{X}E^\ast_r$.

Since the fibration has a section, all of $H^3(B; \mathbb{Z})$ must survive to the $E_\infty$-page, so $d_3$ vanishes. The codomain of $d_2$ is

\[H^2(\pi_1(B), H^1(T; \mathbb{Z})) \oplus H^2(\pi_1(B), H^1(\hat{T}; \mathbb{Z}))\]  

The sections of $X \to B$ and $\hat{X} \to B$ induce maps $X \to X \times_B \hat{X}$ and $\hat{X} \to X \times_B \hat{X}$ that commute with the projections to $B$, which in turn induce maps of spectral sequences

\[X^*E^\ast_r \to \hat{X}E^\ast_r \quad \hat{X}E^\ast_r \to X^*E^\ast_r\]  

The direct sum decomposition (2.13.2) is induced by (2.13.3) on $E_2^{21}$, thus we can complete the proof by showing that $X^*E_2^{21}$ and $\hat{X}E_2^{21}$ survive to the $E_\infty$-pages, i.e. that

\[X^*E_2^{02} \to X^*E_2^{21} \quad \hat{X}E_2^{02} \to \hat{X}E_2^{21}\]

are both zero. Now $X^*E_2^{02} = H^0(\pi_1; H^2(T; \mathbb{Z})) = 0$ and $H^0(\pi_1; H^2(\hat{T}; \mathbb{Z})) = 0$: $H^2(T; \mathbb{Z}) \cong M \subset V$ and $H^2(\hat{T}; \mathbb{Z}) \cong M \subset V^*$ as $\pi_1$-modules, and $\pi_1$ acts on $V$ and $V^*$ without invariants ($V$ and $V^*$ split as the sum of the three nontrivial characters $\pi_1 \to \text{GL}_1(\mathbb{R})$). $\square$
2.14. **Cohomology of $X_{l,j}$**. The two-vertex regular cell complex structure on $S^1$, with vertices at 0 and $\pi$, is preserved by the action of $\mathbb{Z}/2 \times \mathbb{Z}/2$ generated by

$$\theta \mapsto \theta + \pi \quad \theta \mapsto -\theta$$

Each of the 3-folds (2.3.1) can be written as a quotient of a torus $T^6 = S^1 \times S^1 \times S^1 \times S^1 \times S^1 \times S^1$ by the free action of an elementary abelian 2-group that preserves the cell structure. The cellular cochain complex of $T^6$ is a complex of free $\mathbb{Z}[G]$-modules

$$(2.14.1) \quad \mathbb{Z}^6 \to \mathbb{Z}^{384} \to \mathbb{Z}^{640} \to \mathbb{Z}^{280} \to \mathbb{Z}^{360} \to \mathbb{Z}^{384} \to \mathbb{Z}^6$$

of $\mathbb{Z}[G]$-rank $2^6(6)/|G|$ in degree $i$. Passing to invariants gives a cochain complex for the cohomology of $T^6/J$, small enough to handle by computer — I used sage. Besides $H^0 = H^1 = \mathbb{Z}$ and $H^1 = 0$, we have

| $X_{6,4}$ | $\mathbb{Z}^4 \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/4)^2 \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/2)^3$ | $\mathbb{Z}^8 \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/2)^6$ | $(\mathbb{Z}/4)^2 \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/2)^3$ | $(\mathbb{Z}/4)^2 \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/2)^3$ |
| $X_{1,5}$ | $\mathbb{Z}^8 \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/4)^3$ | $\mathbb{Z}^8 \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/2)^6$ | $(\mathbb{Z}/4)^3$ |
| $X_{1,11}$ | $\mathbb{Z}^8 \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/4)^2 \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/2)^2$ | $\mathbb{Z}^8 \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/2)^6$ | $(\mathbb{Z}/4)^2 \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/2)^2$ |
| $X_{2,12}$ | $\mathbb{Z}^8 \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/4)^2 \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/2)^2$ | $\mathbb{Z}^8 \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/2)^6$ | $(\mathbb{Z}/4)^2 \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/2)^2$ |

The top row was previously computed in [BCDP], and the $H^5$ (equivalently, $H^2$) columns in [DoWe].

2.15. **Atiyah-Hirzebruch filtration.** Let $X$ be a connected closed manifold of real dimension 6. $K^*(X)$ carries the Atiyah-Hirzebruch filtration

$$(2.15.1) \quad K^0(X) = F^0K^0(X) \supset F^2K^0(X) \supset F^4K^0(X) \supset F^6K^0(X)$$

$$K^1(X) = F^1K^1(X) \supset F^3K^1(X) \supset F^5K^1(X)$$

where $F^k(K^*(X))$ consists of those classes that vanish when restricted to any $(k-1)$-dimensional submanifold. The associated graded pieces of this filtration are the groups at the last page of the Atiyah-Hirzebruch spectral sequence:

$$E_2^{st} = H^*(X, K^t(pt)) \implies E_\infty^{st} = E_\infty^{st} = F^{*+t}K^*(X)/F^{*+t+1}K^*(X)$$

If $X$ is oriented, then the spectral sequence degenerates immediately: $E_2^{st} = E_\infty^{st}$. The argument is given in [BrDi] — let us briefly repeat the argument here. Since $K^t(pt) = 0$ for $t$ odd, all the even differentials $d_{2p}$ vanish. In general, $d_{2p-1}$ vanishes on $H^i(X, \mathbb{Z})$ for $i \leq 2p-2$ [Atiy, §7], so on a 6-dimensional complex the only possible nonvanishing differential is $d_3 : H^3(X, \mathbb{Z}) \to H^6(X, \mathbb{Z})$. Even this differential must vanish if $H^6(X, \mathbb{Z})$ has no torsion [AtHi, §2.4], i.e. if $X$ is orientable.

Plausibly, whenever $X$ is a Calabi-Yau 3-fold, or even just admits a Spin structure, the Atiyah-Hirzebruch filtration might split; that is, there might be a $\mathbb{Z}/2$-graded isomorphism between

$$K^0(X) \oplus K^1(X)$$

This is claimed in [DoMo], but I believe the proof there has a gap (discussed in §2.16). I do not know whether the filtration on $K^*(X_{l,j})$ splits: if it does, one could conclude Theorem 2.13 directly from the computations in §2.14. On an oriented 6-manifold one necessary and sufficient condition for the filtration of $K^0(X)$ to split is the existence of a function $\varphi : H^2(X; \mathbb{Z}) \to H^4(X; \mathbb{Z})$ that obeys

$$\varphi(c + c') - \varphi(c) - \varphi(c') = c \cup c'$$
(For instance, we could take \( \varphi(c) = c^2/2 \) if we could divide by 2). The problem of computing the cup product on \( H^*(X_{I,J}; \mathbb{Z}) \) also arose in [BCDP]. Determining this by computer is more difficult — the problem is that, although the cup product on \( H^*(T^6) \) is induced by a (noncommutative) ring structure on the cochains (2.14.1), the groups \( G \) do not act by ring automorphisms. One can solve this by passing to the barycentric subdivision of \( S^1 \) (which induces a subdivision of \( (S^1)^6 \)), but the resulting chain complexes are too big to treat in a simple-minded way.

2.16. Chern classes. A virtual vector bundle has a well-defined Chern class, giving us maps

\[
(2.16.1) \quad c_i : K^0(X) \to H^{2i}(X, \mathbb{Z}) \quad c_i^0 : K^1(X) \to H^{2i-1}(X, \mathbb{Z})
\]

The second map \( c_i^0 \) is the composite of

\[
K^1(X) \cong K^2(\Sigma X) \cong K^0(\Sigma X) \xrightarrow{c_0} H^{2i}(\Sigma X, \mathbb{Z}) = H^{2i-1}(X, \mathbb{Z})
\]

Except for \( c_0 \), the functions \( c_i \) of (2.16.1) are not group homomorphisms, they instead obey the Cartan formula \( c_n(V + W) = c_n(V)c_0(W) + c_{n-1}(V)c_1(W) + \cdots + c_0(V)c_n(W) \). The \( i \)th Chern class becomes a group homomorphism on \( F^2 K^0(X) \), since \( c_2(E) = 0 \) for any \( j < i \) and \( E \in F^2 K^0(X) \). As all nontrivial cup products in \( H^*(\Sigma X; \mathbb{Z}) \) vanish, the Cartan formula shows that \( c_i^0 : K^1(X) \to H^{2i-1}(X, \mathbb{Z}) \) are group homomorphisms.

Lemma 4.1 of [DoMo] asserts that, when \( X \) is a closed oriented 6-manifold, the map

\[
(2.16.2) \quad (c_2, c_3) : F^1 K^0(X) \to H^4(X, \mathbb{Z}) \oplus H^6(X, \mathbb{Z})
\]

is an isomorphism onto

\[
(2.16.3) \quad \{(c_2, c_3) \mid Sq^2(c_2) = c_3\}
\]

where \( Sq^2 : H^4(X, \mathbb{Z}/2) \to H^6(X, \mathbb{Z}/2) \) is a Steenrod operation. Lemma 4.2 of [DoMo] asserts that the map

\[
(2.16.4) \quad (c_1, c_2, c_3) : F^2 K^0(X) \to H^2(X, \mathbb{Z}) \oplus H^4(X, \mathbb{Z}) \oplus H^6(X, \mathbb{Z})
\]

is an isomorphism onto

\[
(2.16.5) \quad \{(c_1, c_2, c_3) \mid Sq^2(c_2) = c_3 + c_1 c_2 + c_1^3\}
\]

I believe that (2.16.3) is correct, but (2.16.5) is not. For example, if \( X \) is the quintic 3-fold, the virtual vector bundle \( \mathcal{O}(1) - \mathcal{O} \) belongs to \( F^2 K^0(X) \) and has \( (c_1, c_2, c_3) = (h, 0, 0) \), where \( h \) is the hyperplane section of \( X \subset \mathbb{P}^4 \). But \( h^3 = 5 \in H^6(X, \mathbb{Z}) \), which is nonzero in \( H^6(X, \mathbb{Z}/2) \).

3. Conjectures

It should be possible to choose the isomorphisms (1.0.1) to intertwine additional structures on \( X \) and \( \hat{X} \).

3.1. \( K \)-homology. In fact (1.0.1) is expected for any mirror pair of Calabi-Yau manifolds of odd complex dimension. If \( X \) and \( \hat{X} \) have even complex dimension, then we expect \( K^i(X) \cong K^i(\hat{X}) \) for \( i = 0, 1 \). I think the right way to organize these expectations is as an equivalence of \( K \)-module spectra:

\[
(3.1.1) \quad \Sigma^{-n} K[X] \cong K^{\hat{X}}
\]

where \( n \) is the complex dimension of \( X \), \( \Sigma \) denotes suspension, \( K[? \] denotes the \( K \)-homology spectrum and \( K^? \) denotes the \( K \)-cohomology spectrum. The \( K \)-homology and \( K \)-cohomology
of a compact almost complex manifold are naturally identified, and $K$-theory is 2-periodic, so (3.1.1) implies (1.0.1) by taking homotopy groups. Two $K$-module spectra are isomorphic if and only if their homotopy groups are isomorphic, so the converse is true as well. But using $K$-homology in place of $K$-cohomology seems to go with the grain of homological mirror symmetry, in a way that we will explain.

### 3.2. The large volume and large complex structure limits

For the rest of the paper we will be treating the symplectic geometry of $X$ and the complex geometry of $\hat{X}$. And we will assume that the symplectic form on $X$ has integral cohomology class $[\omega] \in H^2(X; \mathbb{Z})$. The isomorphism class of line bundles whose Chern class is $[\omega]$ gives a unit in $K^0(X) := \pi_0(K^X)$, and (using the $K^X$-module structure on $K[X]$) a homotopy class of automorphisms of $K[X]$. The corresponding homotopy class of automorphisms of $K^X$ is a monodromy operator one obtains by putting $\hat{X}$ in a family $\hat{X}_t$, where $t$ runs through a punctured disk.

The Seidel strategy [Seid] for proving HMS is to prove it first in a limit — one takes a hyperplane section $D$ of the line bundle on $X$, and the special fiber $\hat{X}_0$ at the center of the family $\hat{X}_t$, so that there is a mirror relationship between $X - D$ and $\hat{X}_0$. $X - D$ is called the “large volume limit” and $\hat{X}_0$ is called the “large complex structure limit” of the mirror pair. In such a case I conjecture (I am not sure how originally) that

$$\Sigma^{-n}K[X - D] \cong K^\hat{X}_0$$

as $K$-modules. For the noncompact $X - D$ or the singular $\hat{X}_0$, it is now necessary to pay attention to the difference between $K$-homology and $K$-cohomology.

**Example.** The case when $\hat{X} \subset \mathbb{C}P^{n+1}$ is a degree $n + 2$ hypersurface furnishes a standard example. A mirror $X$ to $\hat{X}$ is obtained by resolving the singularities of an anticanonical hypersurface in a weighted projective $(n + 1)$-space. The limits $X - D$ and $\hat{X}_0$ can be described directly: $X - D \subset (\mathbb{C}^*)^{n+1}$ is any sufficiently generic hypersurface whose Newton polytope is the standard reflexive lattice simplex, e.g.

$$X - D := W^{-1}(0), \quad W : (x_0, \ldots, x_n) \mapsto x_0 + \cdots + x_n + \frac{1}{x_0 \cdots x_n} - 1$$

and $\hat{X}_0$ is the union of the coordinate hyperplanes

$$\hat{X}_0 := \{[x_0, \ldots, x_n] \in \mathbb{C}P^{n+1} \mid x_0 \cdots x_n = 0\}$$

For these examples, (3.2.1) can be deduced from a similar equivalence

$$\Sigma^{-n-1}K[(\mathbb{C}^*)^{n+1}, W^{-1}(0)] \cong K^{\mathbb{C}P^{n+1}}$$

and from the long exact sequence of a pair. The left-hand side of (3.2.4) denotes the $K$-homology of the pair $((\mathbb{C}^*)^{n+1}, W^{-1}(0))$, which has the same homotopy type as a bouquet of spheres — one $(n + 1)$-sphere for each critical point of $W$. Note that (3.2.4) can be seen as a third variant of (3.1.1), as $((\mathbb{C}^*)^{n+1}, W)$ is the Landau-Ginzburg mirror to projective space.

### 3.3. $T$-duality

Homotopy classes of maps $\Sigma^{-n}K[X] \to K^\hat{X}$ are naturally identified with classes in the $n$th $K$-cohomology group $K^n(X \times \hat{X})$. So if one wants to prove that $\Sigma^{-n}K[X]$ and $K^\hat{X}$ are isomorphic, one should investigate classes in $K^n(X \times \hat{X})$. §2.12 gives the...
example at the heart of SYZ — a distinguished isomorphism class of line bundles on \( T \times \hat{T} \)
that (regarded as an element of \( K^0(T \times \hat{T}) \)) induces an isomorphism

\[
(3.3.1) \quad K[T] \cong K^{\hat{T}}
\]

when \( T \) and \( \hat{T} \) are dual tori.

When \( X \) and \( \hat{X} \) are mirror Calabi-Yaus of real dimension \( 2n \), fibering over the same base \( B \) with dual torus fibers, this suggests that \( K[X] \) and \( K^{\hat{X}} \) could be identified by a virtual vector bundle on \( X \times_B \hat{X} \) whose restriction to each fiber gives (3.3.1) — a “Poincaré bundle.” The primary obstacle to doing this is that it is not clear what this virtual “bundle” should look like on singular fibers. Indeed it should not be a bundle at all, but a class in \( K \)-homology \( K_{3n}(X \times_B \hat{X}) \) — this group has a pushforward map to \( K_{3n}(X \times \hat{X}) \), which is isomorphic to \( K^n(X \times \hat{X}) \) using the \( K \)-orientations of \( X \) and \( \hat{X} \).

Even after discarding the singular fibers, or when they are just absent, there may be a Leray obstruction to finding the Poincaré bundle. In the flat cases of §2, this was simple but not exactly tautological. At the large volume/large complex structure limit, the singular fibers can disappear, so that every fiber is a smooth torus (though the dimensions of these tori can jump); more precisely one can in some cases \( \text{RSTZ} \) write \( X - D \) as the homotopy colimit of a diagram of commutative Lie groups and homomorphisms, and \( \hat{X}_0 \) as the homotopy colimit of the diagram of dual groups (perhaps orbifolds), in this generality the Leray obstruction might be interesting.

As to singular fibers, it’s been known for a long time what the necessary class in \( K_{3n} \) looks like when \( n = 2 \), by hyperkahler rotating until \( X \times_B \hat{X} \subset X \times \hat{X} \) is algebraic \( \text{[BBHM, BrMa]} \). For higher even \( n \), finding these Poincaré bundles is a more difficult algebraic geometry problem, even when the same hyperkahler techniques are available \( \text{[Arin, ADM]} \). In general, especially for \( n \) odd, the class in \( K_{3n}(X \times_B \hat{X}) \) cannot be algebraic; it would be interesting to describe it when \( X \to B \) and \( \hat{X} \to B \) are a dual pair of Gross’s “well-behaved” singular \( T^3 \)-fibrations \( \text{[Gros]} \).

3.4. Blanc’s invariant. In \( \text{[Blan]} \), Blanc showed how to compute the topological \( K \)-theory \( K^Y \) of a complex algebraic variety \( Y \) in a noncommutative fashion — that is, Blanc introduced an invariant \( K_{\text{Blanc}}(\mathcal{C}) \in \text{Mod}(K) \) for a \( C \)-linear dg category \( \mathcal{C} \), and showed

\[
(3.4.1) \quad K_{\text{Blanc}}(\text{Perf}(Y)) \cong K^Y
\]

It is desirable to understand Blanc’s invariant for categories arising from symplectic manifolds — Fukaya categories and microlocal sheaf categories. When \( X \) is compact, Kähler with integer Kähler class, and Calabi-Yau, then Ganatra has conjectured that \( K_{\text{Blanc}}(\text{Fuk}(X)) \) recovers the complex \( K \)-theory of \( X \) whenever \( \text{Fuk}(X) \) is smooth and proper. The last condition is motivated by results of \( \text{[ToVa]} \) (which state that when \( Y \) is a compact complex manifold, \( \text{Perf}(Y) \) is smooth and proper if and only if \( Y \) is algebraic) and the failure of (3.4.1) for complex analytic manifolds that are not algebraic.

There is a basic problem with formulating Ganatra’s conjecture precisely, or formulating any question about \( K_{\text{Blanc}}(\text{Fuk}(X)) \) at all. The Fukaya category of a symplectic manifold is not automatically defined over the complex numbers, but over a large Novikov field (we will call it \( \mathfrak{N} \)).
3.5. Achinger-Talpo and Blanc’s invariant for $C((t))$-linear categories. The $C$-linear structure on a dg category $C$ enters in Blanc’s construction in an essential way, but for a compact symplectic manifold it is not usually possible to reduce the linear structure of $\text{Fuk}(X)$ from $\mathcal{N}$ to $C$. Recent work of Achinger-Talpo, and also of Robalo and Antieau-Heller, allow for a definition of $K_{\text{Blanc}}(C)$ when $C$ is defined over $C((t))$ — this version is adapted to Seidel’s relative Fukaya category and to Ganatra’s conjecture.

If $O \subset C((t))$ is the coordinate ring of an affine curve, and $Y \to \text{Spec}(O)$ is a dominant map of algebraic varieties, then $K^Y_a$ has a local monodromy automorphism (call it $m$) at $t = 0$ whenever $Y_a$ is the fiber above a point $a$ close to $t = 0$. We seek a computation of the pair $(K^Y_a, m)$ that is both noncommutative and formal, in the sense that it depends only on the $C((t))$-linear category $\text{Perf}(Y \times_O C((t)))$. To define such a pair $(K^Y_a, m)$ is equivalent to defining a $K$-module object of the $\infty$-category $S/S^1$.

For any field $F$, let $\text{MV}_F$ denote the $\infty$-category underlying the Morel-Voevodsky model structure for $A^1$-homotopy theory [MoVo, Def. 2.1]. Let $\text{MV}_F[\mathbf{P}^1]^{-1}$ denote the stable $\infty$-category underlying the Morel-Voevodsky model category of motivic spectra over $F$ ([Voev, Def. 5.7] or [Roba, Def. 2.38]). If $D$ is an $F$-linear triangulated dg category, let $k_{\text{mot}}(D) \in \text{MV}_F[\mathbf{P}^1]^{-1}$ denote the motivic refinement of the algebraic $K$-theory spectrum (as in [AnHe, Prop. 3.2]. An embedding $F \to C$ induces a functor (preserving direct products and all small colimits)

$$b^* : \text{MV}_F \to S$$

where $S$ denotes the $\infty$-category of spaces, and a similar functor on spectra that we will also denote by $b^*$ (as “Betti”). When $F = C$, the Blanc $K$-theory of $D$ is $K_{\text{Blanc}}(D) := K \otimes_{\text{ku}} b^* k_{\text{mot}}(D)$, where $\text{ku}$ denotes the connective complex $K$-theory spectrum.

Theorem (Achinger-Talpo [AcTa]). There is a functor $\text{MV}_{C((t))} \to S/S^1$ making the following diagram commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{MV}_{C((t))} & \xrightarrow{b^*} & S \\
\times_{C((t))} & \downarrow & \downarrow \times S^1 \\
\text{MV}_{C((t))} & \xrightarrow{b^*} & S/S^1
\end{array}$$

The functor $b^*_t$ carries the Morel-Voevodsky space $Z \times \text{BGL} \in \text{MV}_{C((t))}$ [MoVo, p. 138] representing algebraic $K$-theory to $Z \times \text{BU} \times S^1$. It also carries $\mathbf{P}^1$ to $S^2 \times S^1$, and so induces a map to spectra in $S/S^1$. Thus one can define the Blanc $K$-theory of a $C((t))$-linear category $C$ to be

$$K \otimes_{\text{ku}} b^*_t k_{\text{mot}}(C)$$

3.6. Doing without Blanc’s invariant. Like any spectrum, $K^Y$ fits into Sullivan’s arithmetic square ([Sull, Prop. 3.20] or [Bous, Prop. 2.9])

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
K^Y & \longrightarrow & \prod_p L_p K^Y \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
L_q K^Y & \longrightarrow & L_q \prod_p L_p K^Y
\end{array}$$
which is homotopy Cartesian. Here $L_Q$ denotes the rationalization and $L_p$ the $p$-completion of a spectrum. Thomason’s descent theorem shows that, when $Y$ is a complex algebraic variety, $L_p K^Y$ can be recovered from the algebraic $K$-theory spectrum of $\text{Perf}(Y)$:

\[(3.6.2) \quad L_p K^Y \cong L_{K(1),p} K_{\text{alg}}(\text{Perf}(Y))\]

From this point of view, Blanc’s theorem is equivalent to a “noncommutative” construction of $L_Q K^Y$ and of the map $L_Q K^Y \to L_Q \prod_p L_{K(1),p} K_{\text{alg}}(\text{Perf}(Y))$. If one is merely interested in the isomorphism type of $K^Y$, then Thomason allows it to be recovered from $K_{\text{alg}}(\text{Perf}(Y))$ only.

If $C$ is linear over an algebraically closed extension of $\mathbb{C}$, and $p$ is any prime, then $L_{K(1),p} K_{\text{alg}}(C)$ is a $L_p K$-module in a natural way. So a weaker form of Ganatra’s conjecture can be formulated without invoking any form of Blanc’s construction, this way: if $X$ is a compact symplectic manifold of dimension $2n$, with a smooth and proper $\mathfrak{N}$-linear Fukaya category, then for every prime $p$ the pair of $L_p K$-module spectra

\[L_{K(1),p} K_{\text{alg}}(\text{Fuk}(X)) \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma^{-n} L_p K[X]\]

are isomorphic. Maybe it’s appropriate to call the desired equivalence of spectra a homological mirror analog of Thomason’s (3.6.2).

3.7. The Euler pairings. Let $\psi^{-1} : K \to K$ denote the natural $E_\infty$-ring map that carries a virtual vector space to its complex conjugate. It induces an autoequivalence on $\text{Mod}(K)$, the $\infty$-category of $K$-modules.

The $2n$-manifolds $X$ and $\hat{X}$ have distinguished $K$-orientations — that is, there is a distinguished class in $K_{2n}(X)$ and in $K_{2n}(\hat{X})$ that maps to a generator of $K_{2n}(X, X - x_0)$ and of $K_{2n}(\hat{X}, \hat{X} - x_0)$. Denote these classes by $[X]$ and $[\hat{X}]$ — one is determined by the complex structure on $X$ and the other by any choice of compatible almost complex structure on $X$. The action of the line bundle fixes $[X]$ and the action of the monodromy operator fixes $[\hat{X}]$. They induce a further structure on $\Sigma^{-n} K[X]$ and $K^X$, namely the “Euler pairings”

\[(3.7.1) \quad (\psi^{-1} \Sigma^{-n} K[X]) \otimes_K \Sigma^{-n} K[X] \to K \quad (\psi^{-1} K^X) \otimes_K K^X \to \Sigma^{-2n} K\]

Under (3.4.1) and the desired equivalence between $\Sigma^{-n} K[X]$ and the Blanc $K$-theory of $\text{Fuk}(X)$, these maps should be induced by the Hom structures on these categories, suggesting the purely topological problem of choosing (3.1.1) so that the pairings match. On $\pi_0$ this problem is closely related to Iritani’s $\Gamma$-conjectures, or to the rationality question of $[\text{KKP}, \S 2.2.7]$.

If $M_1$ and $M_2$ are $K$-module spectra, write $B_n(M_1, M_2)$ for the spectrum of maps from $(\psi^{-1} M_1) \otimes M_2$ to $\Sigma^{-n} K$. This is a nondegenerate symmetric bilinear spectrum-valued functor on $\text{Mod}(K)$, it would be interesting to know the $L$-theory of $B_n$.

3.8. Exact manifolds. If $X$ is a Weinstein manifold, a version of the Fukaya category generated by exact Lagrangian submanifolds is naturally defined over any coefficient ring (not just for $\mathfrak{N}$-algebras). The same is true for the category of sheaves with a microsupport condition (my comfort zone). In either case the coefficient ring can be taken to be $\mathbb{C}$ and one may apply Blanc’s construction without worrying about the Novikov parameter. I propose the following analogue of Ganatra’s conjecture:
Conjecture (Assembly). Let $Q$ be a $d$-dimensional Spin$^c$-manifold, let $\Lambda \subset T^*Q$ be a conic Lagrangian, and let $U$ be an open subset of $Q$. Let $\operatorname{Sh}_\Lambda^w(U, \mathbb{C}) \subset \operatorname{Sh}(U, \mathbb{C})$ be Nadler’s wrapped variant [Nadl] of the category of sheaves with microsupport in $\Lambda$.

1. There is a natural map

\begin{equation}
\Sigma^{-d}K[T^*U, T^*U - \Lambda] \to K_{\text{Blanc}}(\operatorname{Sh}_\Lambda^w(U, \mathbb{C})),
\end{equation}

that is covariantly functorial for open embeddings

2. Whenever $\operatorname{Sh}_\Lambda^w(U, \mathbb{C})$ is homologically smooth and proper, (3.8.1) is an isomorphism.

I expect that one can formulate a similar conjecture for the wrapped and partially wrapped Fukaya categories of a Weinstein manifold $X$ — a natural map

\[ \Sigma^{-d}K^\eta[X, X - \Lambda] \to K(\operatorname{Fuk}_\Lambda^w(X)) \]

where $\Lambda$ is the skeleton and $\eta$ is a twisting parameter, presumably trivialized on the cotangent bundle of a Spin$^c$-manifold.

3.9. String topology. Known results on homological mirror symmetry for toric varieties [Kuwa], combined with computations like (3.2.4) give an indirect route to equivalences

\begin{equation}
K_{\text{Blanc}}(\operatorname{Sh}_\Lambda^w(Q; \mathbb{C})) \cong \Sigma^{-d}K[T^*Q, T^*Q - \Lambda]
\end{equation}

in some examples where $Q$ is a compact torus. But the case where $Q$ is arbitrary and $\Lambda = Q$ is the zero section (we may call this the “string topology case” after [Abo2]) shows that (3.9.1) cannot hold in general. Let us discuss this class of examples in more detail.

If $\Lambda \subset T^*Q$ is the zero section, then $\operatorname{Sh}_\Lambda^w(Q; \mathbb{C})$ is naturally equivalent to the category of left dg-modules over

\begin{equation}
C[\Omega Q] := C_*(\Omega Q; \mathbb{C})
\end{equation}

the $\mathbb{C}$-valued chains on the based loop space of $Q$. This quasi-isomorphism type of this algebra knows the rational homotopy type of $Q$, but nothing more, so one cannot expect to recover from it the $K$-theory of $Q$.

Nevertheless, the algebraic $K$-theory of $C[\Omega Q]$ is a variant of Waldhausen’s $A$-theory of $Q$, and is the target of an assembly map [Wald, §3.2]. More generally, for any ring or ring spectrum $R$ there is a natural map

\begin{equation}
K_{\text{alg}}(R)[Q] \to K_{\text{alg}}(R[\Omega Q])
\end{equation}

Letting $R$ run through $\mathbb{C}$-algebras and taking realizations should produce a map $K[Q] \to K_{\text{Blanc}}(C[\Omega Q])$. A Spin$^c$-structure on $Q$ gives an identification of $K[Q]$ with $K[T^*Q, T^*Q - Q]$, the domain of (3.8.1).

In Waldhausen’s setting, the failure of the assembly map to be an isomorphism is very interesting. When $R$ is the sphere spectrum, the cone on (3.9.3) (whose codomain is called the $A$-theory of $Q$) is Hatcher’s “Whitehead spectrum” [Hatc] that encodes the higher simple homotopy of $Q$, see [Wald] and Lurie’s notes available at math.harvard.edu/~lurie/281.html. When $R$ is a $\mathbb{C}$-algebra, or anything else, I don’t know if there is a similar interpretation.
3.10. Speculation about the length filtration. I wonder whether one could recover the complex $K$-theory of an exact manifold from a suitable absolute version of the Fukaya category, even if this category is not homologically smooth. (“Absolute” means “not relative,” i.e. not defined over $C$ or $C(t)$ but only over the full Novikov field.) It would require a version of Blanc’s construction that treats the Novikov parameter in a more interesting way than §3.5–3.6, and one could hope that in this more interesting treatment the assembly map would become an isomorphism. I will explain what I mean by making an explicit string-topology-style conjecture along these lines. I have no evidence for it, but I will make some remarks after stating the conjecture.

Let $Q$ be a Riemannian manifold, and let $\Omega_{q_0}Q$ be the space of rectifiable loops in $Q$ that start and end at a basepoint $q_0$. We will treat the basepoint a little more carefully than at the end of §3.8, in order to make a point about it later. The metric endows the chain algebra $C[\Omega_{q_0}Q]$ (3.9.2) with an $\mathbb{R}$-indexed filtration: for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$ we let $F_{<t}\Omega_{q_0}Q \subset \Omega_{q_0}Q$ denote the space of loops of length less than $t$, and put

$$F_{<t}C[\Omega_{q_0}Q] := C[F_{<t}\Omega_{q_0}Q]$$

**Conjecture** (Length and $K$-theory). Let $(Q, q_0)$ and $(Q', q_0')$ be compact, pointed Riemannian manifolds and suppose that there is a quasi-isomorphism of dg algebras

$$C_*(\Omega_{q_0}Q; C) \cong C_*(\Omega_{q_0'}Q'; C)$$

that for all $t$ carries $F_{<t}C_*(\Omega_{q_0}Q; C)$ quasi-isomorphically to $F_{<t}C_*(\Omega_{q_0'}Q'; C)$

$$C_*(\Omega_{q_0}Q; C) \xrightarrow{\sim} C_*(\Omega_{q_0'}Q'; C)$$

Then $K_* (Q) \cong K_* (Q')$.

A suitable Rees construction on the filtered dg algebra $F_{\leq t}C[\Omega_{q_0}Q]$ might give an $\mathcal{R}$-algebra that generates the absolute wrapped Fukaya category of the unit disk bundle in $T^*Q$. The real conjecture, which I do not know how to formula precisely, is that there is a procedure similar to Blanc’s for extracting a $K$-module from such a category, and that on the Fukaya category of the disk bundle of a Riemannian (or merely Finsler?) $Q$, it outputs the $K$-homology of $Q$. (In particular, the notion of equivalence used in (3.10.1) is stronger than necessary: a Morita-style notion would be more appropriate. For instance if $q_0$ and $q_1$ are different points of $Q$, there is not likely to be any quasi-isomorphism between $C[\Omega_{q_0}Q]$ and $C[\Omega_{q_1}Q]$ that preserves lengths, but the length-filtered space of paths from $q_0$ to $q_1$ could provide the Morita equivalence.)

Let us give a reason to doubt the conjecture, followed by something more optimistic. If $Q$ is simply-connected, one recovers $C[\Omega_{q_0}Q]$, up to quasi-isomorphism, as the cobar construction of the coalgebra of chains on $Q$ [Moo2, §2]. The cobar construction has a natural filtration which seems to “coarsely” recover the length filtration on $C[\Omega_{q_0}Q]$, regardless of the metric. Under the identification with the cobar complex of $C[Q]$, the loops of metric length $m$ are sandwiched between the cobars of word length $b_1m$ and $b_2m$, where $b_1$ and $b_2$ are constants independent of $m$. So any way of recovering the $K$-theory of $Q$ would require knowledge of the exact numerical values of the breaks in the $\mathbb{R}$-indexed filtration.

These breaks in the length filtration are a kind of homological, based version of the length spectrum of the metric. The genuine length spectrum is known to recover the Laplace eigenvalues of $Q$, if the metric is generic [DuGu]. Bergeron and Venkatesh have observed that similar spectral data can see a little bit of the homotopy type of $Q$ beyond the rational
homotopy type \cite{BeVe}. Specifically the Cheeger-Muller theorem gives a formula for the alternating product

\[(3.10.3) \quad \prod_i \#\text{tors}H^i(Q; \mathbb{Z})^{(-1)^i}\]

in terms of the Laplace-de Rham eigenvalues and the volumes of the images of $H^i(Q; \mathbb{Z})$ in the spaces of harmonic $i$-forms. In another “coarse” sense, (perhaps a related one?) these eigenvalues are given by the Weyl law — it is their exact numerical values that are needed to recover (3.10.3).

**Example.** Let $Q$ be a nontrivial SU(2)-bundle over $S^4$. Any degree one map $Q \to S^7$ induces a quasi-isomorphism

\[(3.10.4) \quad C[\Omega_q Q] \cong C[\Omega_{x_0} S^7].\]

But if the Chern class of the bundle is $m \geq 2$, there is a little bit of torsion in the $K$-theory of $Q$: $K_1(Q) = \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}/m$ (while $K_0(Q) = \mathbb{Z}$, and $K_0(S^7) = K_1(S^7) = \mathbb{Z}$). The conjecture predicts that there is no metric on $Q$ for which (3.10.4) preserves the length filtration. The possibly spurious comparison made in the remarks above is that, since (3.10.3) = $m$, the Laplace-de Rham spectra of $Q$ and of $S^7$ are never exactly the same for any choice of metrics.
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