

THE MOD 2 SEIBERG–WITTEN INVARIANTS OF SPIN STRUCTURES AND SPIN FAMILIES

DAVID BARAGLIA

ABSTRACT. We completely determine the mod 2 Seiberg–Witten invariants for any spin structure on any closed, oriented, smooth 4-manifold X . Our computation confirms the validity of the simple type conjecture mod 2 for spin structures. Our proof also works for families of spin 4-manifolds and thus computes the mod 2 Seiberg–Witten invariants for spin families.

The proof of our main result uses $Pin(2)$ -symmetry to define an enhancement of the mod 2 Seiberg–Witten invariants. We prove a connected sum formula for the enhanced invariant using localisation in equivariant cohomology. Unlike the usual Seiberg–Witten invariant, the enhanced invariant does not vanish on taking connected sums and by exploiting this property, we are able to compute the enhanced invariant.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Seiberg–Witten invariant is an invariant of smooth 4-manifolds which has proven to be very effective in distinguishing smooth structures on homeomorphic 4-manifolds. In contrast it has been observed that in a number of cases, the mod 2 Seiberg–Witten invariant for spin-structures is a topological invariant [27, 32, 9, 25] and a similar “rigidity” phenomenon occurs for the families Seiberg–Witten invariants [21]. As we will show, when $b_+(X) \geq 3$ this rigidity will imply that the mod 2 Seiberg–Witten invariants of spin structures can not be used to distinguish smooth structures. When $b_+(X) = 1$ or 2 , we will show that the mod 2 Seiberg–Witten invariant is “essentially” a topological invariant in a sense that will be clarified below. Nevertheless, there are many good reasons for wanting to compute these invariants. Their vanishing can be used to obstruct the existence of symplectic structures. Their non-vanishing can be used to obstruct the existence of positive scalar curvature metrics and gives a lower bound for the genus of embedded surfaces through the adjunction inequality. Furthermore, using various operations such as blowup, rational blowdown [14] and Fintushel–Stern knot surgery [15], we can also calculate the mod 2 Seiberg–Witten invariants for various spin^c -structures that are not spin.

In this paper we completely determine the mod 2 Seiberg–Witten invariants for any spin structure and also the mod 2 families Seiberg–Witten invariants for spin families (under some mild assumptions on the family). Some consequences of these results and some related results are examined.

Date: July 27, 2023.

1.1. Main results. Let X be a closed, oriented, smooth 4-manifold with $b_+(X) > 1$ and $\mathfrak{s}$ a spin^c -structure. The mod 2 Seiberg–Witten invariant is a homomorphism

$$SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}} : \mathbb{A}(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2$$

where $\mathbb{A}(X) = \wedge^* H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})^* \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}[x]$ is the tensor product of the exterior algebra on $H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})^* = \text{Hom}(H^1(X; \mathbb{Z}), \mathbb{Z})$ with the polynomial ring $\mathbb{Z}[x] \cong H_{S^1}^*(pt; \mathbb{Z})$ on a single generator x (see eg. [30]). The Seiberg–Witten invariant is also defined when $b_+(X) = 1$ but depends in addition on the choice of a chamber. For our purposes it is convenient to recast this in the following form. Let $\text{Pic}^{\mathfrak{s}}(X)$ denote the space of gauge equivalence classes of spin^c -connections with curvature equal to a fixed 2-form representing $-2\pi ic(\mathfrak{s})$. This is a torsor over $\text{Pic}(X)$, the group of flat unitary line bundles on X and hence there are canonical isomorphisms

$$H^*(\text{Pic}^{\mathfrak{s}}(X); \mathbb{Z}_2) \cong H^*(\text{Pic}(X); \mathbb{Z}_2) \cong \wedge^* H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})^* \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}_2.$$

So $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}$ can be viewed as a map $H^*(\text{Pic}^{\mathfrak{s}}(X); \mathbb{Z}_2) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_2} H_{S^1}^*(pt; \mathbb{Z}_2) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2$, or as a map $H_{S^1}^*(pt; \mathbb{Z}_2) \rightarrow H^*(\text{Pic}^{\mathfrak{s}}(X); \mathbb{Z}_2)^*$. By Poincaré duality, $H^*(\text{Pic}^{\mathfrak{s}}(X); \mathbb{Z}_2)^* \cong H^*(\text{Pic}^{\mathfrak{s}}(X); \mathbb{Z}_2)$, so $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}$ is equivalent to a map

$$SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}} : H_{S^1}^*(pt; \mathbb{Z}_2) \rightarrow H^*(\text{Pic}^{\mathfrak{s}}(X); \mathbb{Z}_2).$$

This map has degree $-d(X, \mathfrak{s})$, where we set

$$d(X, \mathfrak{s}) = \frac{c(\mathfrak{s})^2 - \sigma(X)}{4} - b_+(X) - 1.$$

This is the form of the Seiberg–Witten invariants that most naturally emerges from from the Bauer–Furuta invariant and it is the form that we will use throughout this paper. Since $H_{S^1}^*(pt; \mathbb{Z}_2) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2[x]$, $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}$ is determined by the classes

$$SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}(x^m) \in H^{2m-d(X,\mathfrak{s})}(\text{Pic}^{\mathfrak{s}}(X); \mathbb{Z}_2)$$

where $m \geq 0$.

Let $D_{\mathfrak{s}} \rightarrow \text{Pic}^{\mathfrak{s}}(X)$ denote the families index of the family of spin^c Dirac operators parametrised by $\text{Pic}^{\mathfrak{s}}(X)$. Let $s_j(D_{\mathfrak{s}}) \in H^{2j}(\text{Pic}^{\mathfrak{s}}(X); \mathbb{Z})$ denote the j -th Segre class of $D_{\mathfrak{s}}$ (recall that the total Segre class $s(V) = 1 + s_1(V) + s_2(V) + \dots$ of a virtual bundle is defined by $c(V)s(V) = 1$, where $c(V) = 1 + c_1(V) + c_2(V) + \dots$ is the total Chern class). From the families index theorem (see Section 5 for details), it follows that $s_j(D_{\mathfrak{s}}) = 0$ for odd j and

$$s_{2j}(D_{\mathfrak{s}}) = \frac{1}{j!} s_2(D_{\mathfrak{s}}),$$

where

$$(1.1) \quad s_2(D_{\mathfrak{s}}) = \sum_{i_1 < i_2 < i_3 < i_4} \langle y_{i_1} y_{i_2} y_{i_3} y_{i_4}, [X] \rangle x_{i_1} x_{i_2} x_{i_3} x_{i_4}.$$

Here $y_1, \dots, y_{b_1(X)}$ is a basis for $H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})$ and $x_1, \dots, x_{b_1(X)}$ is a corresponding dual basis for $H^1(\text{Pic}^{\mathfrak{s}}(X); \mathbb{Z}) \cong H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})^*$.

To describe the Seiberg–Witten invariant in the cases $b_+(X) = 1$ or 2 , we need to introduce one more concept, namely functions

$$q_{\mathfrak{s}}^k : H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})^k \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2$$

for $k = 2, 3$ defined as follows. Let $a_1, \dots, a_k \in H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})$. Each class a_i is equivalent to specifying a homotopy class of map $X \rightarrow S^1$, hence we get a map

$f : X \rightarrow T^k$, where T^k is a k -dimensional torus. The level set $C = f^{-1}(t)$ of a regular value of f is a normally framed submanifold of X of dimension $4 - k$. The framing allows us to define the restriction $\mathfrak{s}|_C$ of $\mathfrak{s}$ to C and we define $q_{\mathfrak{s}}^k(a_1, \dots, a_k)$ to be the mod 2 index of $\mathfrak{s}|_C$. Cobordism invariance of the index implies that $q_{\mathfrak{s}}^k$ is a well-defined function (see Section 5.2 for further details).

Our first main result is a complete formula for $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}$ for spin structures. Note that in the case $b_+(X) = 1$, the mod 2 Seiberg–Witten invariant of a spin structure does not depend on the choice of chamber (Lemma 3.2).

Theorem 1.1. *Let X be a compact, oriented, smooth 4-manifold with $b_+(X) > 0$ and let $\mathfrak{s}$ be a spin-structure on X . Then $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}(x^m) = 0$ for all $m > 0$. Furthermore, we have:*

- (1) if $b_+(X) = 1$, then for any $a, b \in H^1(X; \mathbb{Z}) \cong H_1(\text{Pic}^{\mathfrak{s}}(X); \mathbb{Z})$,
$$\langle SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}(1), a \smile b \rangle = q_{\mathfrak{s}}^2(a, b) \pmod{2},$$
- (2) if $b_+(X) = 2$, then for any $a, b, c \in H^1(X; \mathbb{Z}) \cong H_1(\text{Pic}^{\mathfrak{s}}(X); \mathbb{Z})$,
$$\langle SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}(1), a \smile b \smile c \rangle = q_{\mathfrak{s}}^3(a, b, c) \pmod{2},$$
- (3) if $b_+(X) = 3$, then
$$SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}(1) = s_{2+\sigma(X)/8}(D_{\mathfrak{s}}) \pmod{2}$$

where we set $s_l(D_{\mathfrak{s}}) = 0$ if $l < 0$,
- (4) if $b_+(X) > 3$, then $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}(1) = 0$.

We note here that the Seiberg–Witten invariant $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}$ of a spin structure $\mathfrak{s}$ depends only on the underlying spin^c -structure associated to $\mathfrak{s}$. We will say that two spin structures are *equivalent* if they have the same underlying spin^c -structure.

Recall that if X is a compact, oriented, smooth spin 4-manifold with $b_+(X) = 3$, then $\sigma(X) = 0$ or -16 . When $\sigma(X) = -16$, Theorem 1.1 gives $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}(1) = 1 \pmod{2}$. The $b_1(X) = 0$ case of this result was proven by Morgan and Szabó [27]. When $\sigma(X) = 0$, Theorem 1.1 gives $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}(1) = s_2(D_{\mathfrak{s}}) \pmod{2}$. The $b_1(X) = 4$ case of this result was proven by Ruberman and Strle [32]. Other special cases of Theorem 1.1 were proven by Bauer [9] and Li [25]. The cases $b_+(X) = 1, 2$ appear to be new.

Example 1.2. We give examples illustrating cases (1)-(3) of Theorem 1.1. Interestingly these examples are all compact complex surfaces of Kodaira dimension 0.

1. Let $X = K3$ be a $K3$ -surface, then $b_+(X) = 3$, $\sigma(X) = -16$ and $b_1(X) = 0$. Hence by case (3) of Theorem 1.1, $SW_{K3,\mathfrak{s}}(1) = 1 \pmod{2}$ for the unique spin structure $\mathfrak{s}$.

2. Let $X = T^4$ be a 4-torus, then $b_+(X) = 3$, $\sigma(X) = 0$ and $b_1(X) = 4$. Hence by case (3) of Theorem 1.1, $SW_{T^4,\mathfrak{s}}(1) = s_2(D_{\mathfrak{s}}) \pmod{2}$ for the unique equivalence class of spin structure $\mathfrak{s}$. From Equation 1.1, it is easily seen that $s_2(D_{\mathfrak{s}})$ is the non-trivial element of $H^4(\text{Pic}^{\mathfrak{s}}(X); \mathbb{Z}_2) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$.

3. Let X be a primary Kodaira surface with $H_1(X; \mathbb{Z})$ torsion-free. Then X is diffeomorphic to $S^1 \times Y$, where $Y \rightarrow C$ is the total space of a degree 1 circle bundle over an elliptic curve C . We have $b_+(X) = 2$, $b_1(X) = 3$ and X has a

unique equivalence class $\mathfrak{s}$ of spin structure. Since C is an elliptic curve, TC has a translation invariant trivialisation. Then using a connection to split the tangent bundle of Y into horizontal and vertical components, we obtain a trivialisation of TY and hence a spin structure $\mathfrak{s}_Y$. Taking the product of $\mathfrak{s}_Y$ with any spin structure on S^1 defines a spin structure $\mathfrak{s}$ on X . Let a, b, c denote generators of $H^1(X; \mathbb{Z}) \cong \mathbb{Z}^3$. Then $a \smile b \smile c$ is Poincaré dual to a fibre F of $Y \rightarrow C$. By construction, the normal framing on F is translation invariant under the circle action on F and it follows that $\mathfrak{s}|_F$ is the unique translation invariant spin structure on the circle, which has index 1. Then by case (2) of Theorem 1.1, $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}(1)$ is the non-trivial element of $H^3(Pic^{\mathfrak{s}}(X); \mathbb{Z}_2) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$.

4. Let X be a hyperelliptic surface constructed as follows. Let Λ be the lattice in $\mathbb{C}^2$ with basis $e_1 = (1, 0)$, $e_2 = (i, 0)$, $e_3 = (0, 1)$, $e_4 = (0, \omega)$, where $\omega = e^{\pi i/3}$. Let T be the 4-torus $T = \mathbb{C}/\Lambda$. Then $\mathbb{Z}_6 = \langle g \rangle$ acts freely on T by $g(z_1, z_2) = (z_1 + 1/6, \omega z_2)$ and we set $X = T/\mathbb{Z}_6$. Then $b_+(X) = 1$, $b_1(X) = 2$ and X has a unique equivalence class $\mathfrak{s}$ of spin structure. Let C be the elliptic curve given by the quotient of $\mathbb{C}$ by the lattice spanned by $1/6$ and i and let $\pi : X \rightarrow C$ be the map induced by the projection $(z_1, z_2) \mapsto z_1$. This gives X the structure of an elliptic fibre bundle over C . Let a, b denote generators of $H^1(X; \mathbb{Z}) \cong \mathbb{Z}^2$. Then $a \smile b$ is Poincaré dual to a fibre F of $\pi : X \rightarrow C$. Using a similar argument to the previous case, we find that $\mathfrak{s}|_F$ is the unique translation invariant spin structure on the 2-torus, which has index 1. Then by case (1) of Theorem 1.1, $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}(1)$ is the non-trivial element of $H^2(Pic^{\mathfrak{s}}(X); \mathbb{Z}_2) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$.

Theorem 1.1 shows that when $b_+(X) \geq 3$, $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}(x^m)$ can be expressed in terms of the Segre class $s_2(D_{\mathfrak{s}})$, which in light of Equation (1.1) is a topological invariant. So we obtain:

Corollary 1.3. *For $b_+(X) \geq 3$, the mod 2 Seiberg–Witten invariant of a spin structure $\mathfrak{s}$ on a compact, oriented, smooth 4-manifold X depends only on the underlying topology of X .*

Strictly speaking, to say that $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}$ is a topological invariant requires a notion of spin structure on topological 4-manifolds. For details on how this is done, see for example [5, §4.2].

When $b_+(X) = 1$ or 2 , it is not immediately clear from Theorem 1.1 whether $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}$ depends on the smooth structure of X . However we can show that $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}$ is a topological invariant up to certain identifications, as described in the theorem below:

Theorem 1.4. *Let X_1, X_2 be two compact, oriented, smooth spin 4-manifolds which are homeomorphic to each other and with $b_+(X_1) = b_+(X_2) = 1$ or 2 . Let S_{X_1}, S_{X_2} denote the set of spin structures on X_1 and X_2 . Then there exists a bijection $\varphi : S_{X_1} \rightarrow S_{X_2}$ and an isomorphism $\psi : H^1(X_1; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H^1(X_2; \mathbb{Z})$ inducing an isomorphism $\psi : H^*(Pic^{\mathfrak{s}}(X_1)) \rightarrow H^*(Pic^{\varphi(\mathfrak{s})}(X_2))$ for any $\mathfrak{s} \in S_{X_1}$, such that*

$$\psi(SW_{X_1,\mathfrak{s}}) = SW_{X_2,\varphi(\mathfrak{s})}$$

for all $\mathfrak{s} \in S_{X_1}$.

We do not know whether the maps φ, ψ are induced by a homeomorphism $X_1 \rightarrow X_2$, however they are induced by a diffeomorphism $X_1 \# k(S^2 \times S^2) \rightarrow X_2 \# k(S^2 \times S^2)$ for some $k \geq 0$ (see Section 5.2).

For 4-manifolds with $b_1(X) = 0$, there is only one possible value of m for which $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}(x^m)$ can be non-zero, which is $m = d(X, \mathfrak{s})/2$, provided $d(X, \mathfrak{s})$ is even and non-negative. When $b_1(X) = 0$, $d(X, \mathfrak{s})$ is the dimension of the moduli space of solutions to the Seiberg–Witten equations, so m is half the dimension. In all cases where the Seiberg–Witten invariants have been computed and $b_+(X) > 1$, we have $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}(x^m) = 0$ unless $m = 0$, that is, unless the dimension of the moduli space is zero. This has become known as the *simple type conjecture*. One can also formulate a simple type conjecture for 4-manifolds with $b_1(X) > 0$. In this case one usually considers only the “pure” Seiberg–Witten invariant

$$SW(X, \mathfrak{s}) = \int_{Pic^s(X)} SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}(x^m) \in \mathbb{Z},$$

where $2m = d(X, \mathfrak{s}) + b_1(X)$ is the dimension of the moduli space. The simple type conjecture then states that $SW(X, \mathfrak{s}) = 0$ unless $m = 0$. From Theorem 1.1, we immediately see that the mod 2 simple type conjecture is true for spin structures:

Corollary 1.5. *Let X be a compact, oriented, smooth 4-manifold with $b_+(X) > 0$ and let $\mathfrak{s}$ be a spin structure on X . Then $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}(x^m) = 0 \pmod{2}$, unless $m = 0$. In particular the mod 2 simple type conjecture holds for spin structures.*

It is interesting to consider $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}(1)$ as a function of the spin structure $\mathfrak{s}$. Recall that the set of spin structures is a torsor for $H^1(X; \mathbb{Z}_2)$. If $\mathfrak{s}$ is a spin structure and $A \in H^1(X; \mathbb{Z}_2)$, then we denote the torsor structure by $(A, \mathfrak{s}) \mapsto A \otimes \mathfrak{s}$.

The following theorem shows that $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}(1)$ is quadratic, linear or constant as a function of $\mathfrak{s}$ according to whether $b_+(X)$ is 1, 2 or 3.

Theorem 1.6. *Let X be a compact, oriented, smooth spin 4-manifold with $b_+(X) > 0$.*

- (1) *If $b_+(X) = 1$, then for any spin structure $\mathfrak{s}$, $A, B \in H^1(X; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ and $a, b \in H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})$, we have:*

$$\langle SW_{X, A \otimes B \otimes \mathfrak{s}}(1), a \smile b \rangle + \langle SW_{X, A \otimes \mathfrak{s}}(1), a \smile b \rangle + \langle SW_{X, B \otimes \mathfrak{s}}(1), a \smile b \rangle + \langle SW_{X, \mathfrak{s}}(1), a \smile b \rangle = \langle [X], A \smile B \smile a \smile b \rangle.$$
- (2) *If $b_+(X) = 2$, then for any spin structure $\mathfrak{s}$, $A \in H^1(X; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ and $a, b, c \in H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})$, we have:*

$$\langle SW_{X, A \otimes \mathfrak{s}}(1), a \smile b \smile c \rangle + \langle SW_{X, \mathfrak{s}}(1), a \smile b \smile c \rangle = \langle [X], A \smile a \smile b \smile c \rangle.$$
- (3) *If $b_+(X) = 3$, then $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}(1)$ taken mod 2 does not depend on the choice of spin structure.*

From Theorems 1.1 and 1.6 we obtain a non-vanishing theorem concerning Seiberg–Witten invariants on spin 4-manifolds:

Corollary 1.7. *Let X be a compact, oriented, smooth spin 4-manifold.*

- (1) *If $b_+(X) = 1$ and if there exists classes $a, b \in H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})$ and classes $A, B \in H^1(X; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ such that $A \smile B \smile a \smile b \neq 0$, then there is a spin structure on X with non-zero mod 2 Seiberg–Witten invariant.*
- (2) *If $b_+(X) = 2$ and if there exists classes $a, b, c \in H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})$ and a class $A \in H^1(X; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ such that $A \smile a \smile b \smile c \neq 0$, then there is a spin structure on X with non-zero mod 2 Seiberg–Witten invariant.*

- (3) If $b_+(X) = 3$, $\sigma(X) = 0$ and if there exists classes $a, b, c, d \in H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})$ such that $a \smile b \smile c \smile d \neq 0 \pmod{2}$, then there is a spin structure on X with non-zero mod 2 Seiberg–Witten invariant.

One application of non-vanishing Seiberg–Witten invariants is the adjunction inequality:

Theorem 1.8. *Let X be a compact, oriented, smooth, spin 4-manifold and suppose one of the conditions (1)–(3) of Corollary 1.7 is satisfied. Let $\Sigma \subset X$ be a smooth, compact, oriented surface embedded in X and representing a non-torsion class $a \in H^2(X; \mathbb{Z})$. Then the genus g of Σ satisfies*

$$2g - 2 \geq |a^2|.$$

Proof. First of all note that if X satisfies one of the conditions of Corollary 1.7, then $\sigma(X) = 0$ and hence X with the opposite orientation also satisfies one of the conditions of Corollary 1.7. We choose the orientation on X for which the self-intersection of Σ is non-negative (and thus equals $|a^2|$). By Corollary 1.7, the Seiberg–Witten invariant of some spin structure on X is non-zero. The adjunction inequality (eg. [22, Theorem 11]) then gives $2g - 2 \geq |a^2|$. $\square$

Our techniques can also be used to compute the mod 2 families Seiberg–Witten invariants for spin families. Let B_0 be a compact, smooth manifold and $\pi : E \rightarrow B_0$ a smooth family of 4-manifolds parametrised by B_0 . This means that E is a fibre bundle with fibres given by a compact, oriented smooth 4-manifold X , with transition functions given by orientation preserving diffeomorphisms of X . Suppose that $\mathfrak{s}_E$ is a spin^c -structure on the vertical tangent bundle $T(E/B_0) = \text{Ker}((\pi)_* : TE \rightarrow TB_0)$. One can consider the Seiberg–Witten equations of the family E with respect to the spin^c -structure [4, 5, 24, 26, 28, 31, 33]. Let $B = \text{Pic}^{\mathfrak{s}_E}(E/B_0)$ denote the space of gauge equivalence classes of spin^c -connections on the fibres of E . This is a torus bundle over B_0 whose fibre over $b \in B_0$ is $\text{Pic}^{\mathfrak{s}_E|_{X_b}}(X_b)$, where $X_b = \pi_E^{-1}(b)$ is the fibre of E over b . If $b_1(X) > 0$, then for technical reasons we also need to assume there exists a section $s : B_0 \rightarrow E$ [5, Example 2.4]. A chamber for the family $E \rightarrow B_0$ is defined to be a homotopy class of non-vanishing section $\phi : B \rightarrow H^+$, where $H^+ \rightarrow B$ is the pullback to B of the fibre bundle on B_0 whose fibre over $b \in B_0$ is $H^+(X_b)$, the space of harmonic self-dual 2-forms (with respect to some given family of metrics on the fibres of E). Then we obtain the mod 2 families Seiberg–Witten invariant which is a homomorphism

$$SW_{E, \mathfrak{s}_E}^\phi : H_{S^1}^*(pt; \mathbb{Z}_2) \rightarrow H^*(B; \mathbb{Z}_2)$$

of degree $-d(X, \mathfrak{s})$, where X is a fibre of E and $\mathfrak{s}$ is the restriction of $\mathfrak{s}_E$ to X .

The following result completely determines the mod 2 families Seiberg–Witten invariants of spin families for even powers of x , under some mild assumptions on the family. The general result, Theorem 6.7, is slightly complicated to state so here we give the result only for $b_1(X) = 0$.

Theorem 1.9. *Let $E \rightarrow B_0$ be a spin family and suppose that $b_1(X) = 0$. Then for any chamber ϕ we have*

$$SW_{E, \mathfrak{s}_E}^\phi(x^{2m}) = w_{b_+(X)-3}(H^+(X)) s_{2(m+1+\sigma(X)/16)}(D_{\mathfrak{s}_E}).$$

In particular, Theorem 1.9 implies that the mod 2 invariants $SW_{E, \mathfrak{s}_E}^\phi(x^{2m})$ depend only on $b_+(X), \sigma(X)$ and the K -theory classes $[H^+] \in KO^0(B)$, $[D_{\mathfrak{s}_E}] \in K^0(B)$. This recovers and generalises the rigidity theorem of Kato–Konno–Nakamura [21], which deals with the case $b_1(X) = 0$, $m = 0$, $b_+(X) \geq \dim(B) + 2$.

In the course of proving Theorem 1.9, we also obtain some constraints that spin families must satisfy. We state the result here only for the case $b_1(X) = 0$.

Theorem 1.10. *Let $E \rightarrow B_0$ be a spin family and suppose that $b_1(X) = 0$. Then*

$$w_l(H^+(X))_{s_{2(j+1+\sigma(X)/16)}}(D) = 0.$$

for all $j \geq 0$ and $b_+(X) - 2 \leq l \leq b_+(X)$.

1.2. Outline of the proof of the main results. We give an outline of the main steps in our computation of the Seiberg–Witten invariants:

- (1) For spin structures, the Seiberg–Witten equations possess an additional symmetry j known as *charge conjugation*. Since $j^2 = -1$, no irreducible solution to the Seiberg–Witten equations can be fixed by j . If we could choose a j -invariant perturbation for which the Seiberg–Witten moduli space is smooth, then j could be used to pair off solutions, giving a mod 2 vanishing result.
- (2) Unfortunately, such a simple approach does not work as there are no non-zero j -invariant perturbations. One of the key ideas in this paper is to instead consider a j -invariant *family* of perturbations. Such families exist, in fact we can take the parameter space of the family to be the unit sphere $S(H^+(X))$ in $H^+(X)$ with j acting as the antipodal map on $S(H^+(X))$.
- (3) In light of point (2), it is possible to keep track of charge conjugation symmetry, but the price to pay is that we must now consider the Seiberg–Witten equations for a family. More precisely, we construct an enhancement of the usual Seiberg–Witten invariant $SW_{X, \mathfrak{s}}$ which takes the form of a map

$$SW_{X, \mathfrak{s}}^{Pin(2)} : H_{Pin(2)}^*(pt; \mathbb{Z}_2) \rightarrow H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^{*-d(X, \mathfrak{s})}(Pic^{\mathfrak{s}}(X) \times S(H^+(X)); \mathbb{Z}_2).$$

Moreover $SW_{X, \mathfrak{s}}^\phi$ can be recovered from $SW_{X, \mathfrak{s}}^{Pin(2)}$ in that we have a commutative square of the form

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H_{Pin(2)}^*(pt; \mathbb{Z}_2) & \xrightarrow{SW_{X, \mathfrak{s}}^{Pin(2)}} & H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^{*-d(X, \mathfrak{s})}(Pic^{\mathfrak{s}}(X) \times S(H^+(X)); \mathbb{Z}_2) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \phi^* \\ H_{S^1}^*(pt; \mathbb{Z}_2) & \xrightarrow{SW_{X, \mathfrak{s}}^\phi} & H^{*-d(X, \mathfrak{s})}(Pic^{\mathfrak{s}}(X); \mathbb{Z}_2) \end{array}$$

- (4) Now remains the task of computing $SW_{X, \mathfrak{s}}^{Pin(2)}$. At first this might seem no easier than computing $SW_{X, \mathfrak{s}}$. However, it turns out that $SW_{X, \mathfrak{s}}^{Pin(2)}$, unlike the ordinary Seiberg–Witten invariants, behaves well under taking connected sums. Exploiting this property of $SW_{X, \mathfrak{s}}^{Pin(2)}$ allows us to compute it, and in turn to compute $SW_{X, \mathfrak{s}}$.
- (5) We need to prove a connected sum formula for $SW_{X, \mathfrak{s}}^{Pin(2)}$. This is difficult if one chooses to work directly with moduli spaces, so instead we work throughout this paper with the Bauer–Furuta cohomotopy refinement of

the Seiberg–Witten invariants. For spin structures, the Bauer–Furuta invariant has $Pin(2)$ -symmetry and our enhanced Seiberg–Witten invariant $SW_{X,5}^{Pin(2)}$ can be recovered from the $Pin(2)$ Bauer–Furuta invariant.

- (6) The Bauer–Furuta invariant of a connected sum $X \# Y$ is the smash product of the Bauer–Furuta invariants for X and Y . Since the Bauer–Furuta invariants of X and Y are both equivariant, their smash product has $S^1 \times S^1$ -symmetry, or $Pin(2) \times Pin(2)$ in the spin case. The usual S^1 or $Pin(2)$ symmetry group is obtained by restricting to the diagonal subgroup. However, it is beneficial to retain the larger symmetry group. Another key idea of this paper to use localisation in equivariant cohomology with respect to the additional circle group of symmetry. This leads to a product formula for $SW_{X \# Y, 5}^{Pin(2)}$ which ultimately allows us to compute $SW_{X,5}^{Pin(2)}$ and $SW_{X,5}$.
- (7) When $b_+(X) \geq 3$ our formula shows that $SW_{X,5}$ can be expressed in terms of Segre classes of the families index D_5 and these are easily computed. When $b_+(X) = 1$ or 2 , $SW_{X,5}$ is given by a more subtle invariant of D_5 that depends on the class of D_5 in the Quaternionic K -theory group $KH(Pic^5(X))$. Further work is then required to identify this class in terms of the topology of X .

1.3. Structure of the paper. In Section 2 we recall the Bauer–Furuta invariant and how the Seiberg–Witten invariants of a 4-manifold or a family of 4-manifolds can be recovered from the Bauer–Furuta invariant. This leads us to consider more generally Seiberg–Witten type invariants associated to any S^1 -equivariant cohomotopy class. In Section 3 we consider the Seiberg–Witten invariants in the case of spin structures. In this case there is an additional symmetry, charge conjugation, which leads us to consider $Pin(2)$ -equivariant cohomotopy classes. We will see that in the $Pin(2)$ -equivariant case, the mod 2 Seiberg–Witten invariants admit an enhancement that we call the $Pin(2)$ -equivariant Seiberg–Witten invariants. In Section 4, we consider the Seiberg–Witten invariants or their $Pin(2)$ -equivariant enhancement for the smash product of two cohomotopy classes. Such a cohomotopy class has an additional circle of symmetry and by applying localisation in equivariant cohomology with respect to this extra symmetry, we arrive at a product formula for the Seiberg–Witten invariants or their $Pin(2)$ -equivariant enhancement of a smash product. In Section 5 we apply the product formula to arrive at a formula for the $Pin(2)$ -equivariant Seiberg–Witten invariants of spin 4-manifolds. From this we obtain the mod 2 Seiberg–Witten invariants of any spin structure. The cases $b_+(X) = 1, 2$ require further analysis and this is carried out in Section 5.2. Finally, in Section 6 we use the same approach to compute the Seiberg–Witten invariants for spin families.

1.4. Acknowledgements. We thank Hokuto Konno for comments on a draft of this paper.

2. MONOPOLE MAPS AND SEIBERG–WITTEN INVARIANTS

In this section we recall how the Seiberg–Witten invariants of a 4-manifold can be recovered from the Bauer–Furuta cohomotopy refinement. We will use a more

general framework that is suitable for constructing the Seiberg–Witten invariants for families of 4-manifolds.

We will be concerned with maps of sphere bundles over a base space B which is assumed to be a compact manifold. If V is a complex vector bundle over B and U a real vector bundle, we let $S^{V,U}$ denote the fibrewise compactification of $V \oplus U$, or equivalently the unit sphere bundle of $V \oplus U \oplus \mathbb{R}$. We let S^1 act on V by scalar multiplication and trivially on U . This determines an S^1 -action on $S^{V,U}$. We let $s_{V,U} : B \rightarrow S^{V,U}$ denote the section at infinity. Consider an S^1 -equivariant map of sphere bundles

$$f : S^{V,U} \rightarrow S^{V',U'},$$

where V, V' are complex vector bundles on B and U, U' are real vector bundles. Assume that f sends $s_{V,U}$ to $s_{V',U'}$ and that the restriction of f to S^U is homotopic to the map $S^U \rightarrow S^{U'}$ induced by an inclusion $U \rightarrow U'$ of vector bundles. We will refer to such a map of sphere bundles as a *monopole map*.

Suppose that X is a compact, oriented, smooth 4-manifold and that $\mathfrak{s}$ is a spin^c -structure on X . By taking a finite dimensional approximation of the Seiberg–Witten equations as in [7], we obtain a monopole map $f : S^{V,U} \rightarrow S^{V',U'}$ over $B = \text{Pic}^{\mathfrak{s}}(X)$, the space of gauge equivalence classes of spin^c -connections with curvature equal to a fixed 2-form representing $-2\pi ic(\mathfrak{s})$. This is a torsor over $\text{Pic}(X)$, the group of flat unitary line bundles on X and hence is a torus of dimension $b_1(X)$. The Bauer–Furuta invariant of $(X, \mathfrak{s})$ is the (twisted, equivariant) stable cohomotopy class of f .

We introduce some notation associated to a monopole map $f : S^{V,U} \rightarrow S^{V',U'}$. Let a, a' denote the complex ranks of V, V' and let b, b' denote the real ranks of U, U' . Further, set $d = a - a'$ and $b_+ = b' - b$. Let D denote the virtual vector bundle $D = V - V'$ and let $H^+ = U' - U$. Since $f|_U$ is homotopy equivalent to an inclusion, we have an isomorphism $H^+ \cong U'/U$, in particular H^+ is a genuine vector bundle. In the case that f is the Bauer–Furuta monopole map for a 4-manifold X and spin^c -structure $\mathfrak{s}$, $D \rightarrow \text{Pic}^{\mathfrak{s}}$ is the families index of the family of Dirac operators parametrised by $\text{Pic}^{\mathfrak{s}}(X)$ and H^+ is the trivial bundle with fibre $H^+(X)$, the space of harmonic self-dual 2-forms on X for some Riemannian metric.

In [5], we constructed cohomological invariants associated to a monopole map $f : S^{V,U} \rightarrow S^{V',U'}$, which in the case of the Bauer–Furuta monopole map for $(X, \mathfrak{s})$ recovers the Seiberg–Witten invariant. More generally, for a family of 4-manifolds this procedure recovers the families Seiberg–Witten invariants. We recall the construction of these invariants. Since our interest is in the mod 2 Seiberg–Witten invariants, we will work throughout with $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -coefficients. This has the benefit that we do not have to consider orientations.

Since the restriction of f to S^U is homotopic to an inclusion, we can identify U with a subbundle of U' and we can further assume that $f|_{S^U}$ is given by the inclusion map. The cohomological invariants of f depend on a choice of a *chamber* for f , which by definition is a homotopy class of section $\phi : B \rightarrow U' \setminus U$. Equivalently as chamber can be regarded as a homotopy class of non-vanishing section of $H^+ = U'/U$. Such a chamber determines a lift $\tau_{V',U'}^{\phi} \in H_{S^1}^{2a'+b'}(S^{V',U'}, S^U)$ of the Thom class $\tau_{V',U'} \in H_{S^1}^{2a'+b'}(S^{V',U'}, s_{V',U'})$ as follows. Let N_{ϕ} denote an S^1 -invariant tubular neighbourhood of $\phi(B)$ in $S^{V',U'}$. The Thom class $\tau_{N_{\phi}}$ of

$N_\phi \rightarrow \phi(B)$ is valued in $H_{S^1}^{2a'+b'}(N_\phi, N_\phi \setminus \phi(B))$ which by excision is isomorphic to $H_{S^1}^{2a'+b'}(S^{V',U'}, S^{V',U'} \setminus \phi(B))$. Then since $\phi(B)$ is disjoint from S^U we can map τ_{N_ϕ} to a class in $H_{S^1}^{2a'+b'}(S^{V',U'}, S^U)$, which is $\tau_{V',U'}^\phi$.

Pulling back the lifted Thom class by f gives $f^*(\tau_{V',U'}^\phi) \in H_{S^1}^{2a'+b'}(S^{V,U}, S^U)$. Let N^U denote a tubular neighbourhood of S^U in $S^{V,U}$ and let $\tilde{Y}^{V,U} = S^{V,U} \setminus N^U$ be the complement (alternatively one can construct $\tilde{Y}^{V,U}$ as the real blowup of $S^{V,U}$ along S^U). Then $\tilde{Y}^{V,U}$ is a manifold with boundary. Furthermore, the S^1 -action is free and we set $Y^{V,U} = \tilde{Y}^{V,U}/S^1$. By excision and homotopy invariance we have isomorphisms

$$H_{S^1}^*(S^{V,U}, S^U) \cong H_{S^1}^*(S^{V,U}, N^U) \cong H_{S^1}^*(\tilde{Y}^{V,U}, \partial\tilde{Y}^{V,U}) \cong H^*(Y^{V,U}, \partial Y^{V,U}).$$

Hence we can regard $f^*(\tau_{V,U}^\phi)$ as an element of $H^{2a'+b'}(Y^{V,U}, \partial Y^{V,U})$.

Let $\pi_{V,U} : Y^{V,U} \rightarrow B$ be the projection map. We have a pushforward map

$$(\pi_{V,U})_* : H^*(Y^{V,U}, \partial Y^{V,U}) \rightarrow H^{*-(2a+b-1)}(B),$$

which is obtained from the corresponding pushforward map in homology using Poincaré–Lefschetz duality. Now we define the *Seiberg–Witten invariant of f with respect to the chamber ϕ* to be the homomorphism

$$SW_f^\phi : H_{S^1}^*(pt) \rightarrow H^{*-2d+b_++1}(B)$$

given by

$$SW_f^\phi(\theta) = (\pi_{V,U})_*(\theta f^*(\tau_{V',U'}^\phi)).$$

Sometimes it is useful to consider a slightly more general invariant $SW_f^\phi : H_{S^1}^*(\tilde{Y}^{V,U}) \rightarrow H^{*-2d+b_++1}(B)$ by allowing θ to be an element of $H_{S^1}^*(\tilde{Y}^{V,U})$. However, this is not a stable invariant of f since the space $\tilde{Y}^{V,U}$ depends on V and U . As a special case, we can take any element in $H_{S^1}^*(B)$ and pull it back to $H_{S^1}^*(\tilde{Y}^{V,U})$ and in this case we do get a stable invariant.

Recall that $H_{S^1}^*(pt) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2[x]$, where $\deg(x) = 2$. Therefore SW_f^ϕ is completely determined by the collection of cohomology classes $SW_f^\phi(x^m) \in H^{2m-2d+b_++1}(B)$, where $m \geq 0$.

In the case that f is the monopole map associated to a 4-manifold X with spin^c -structure $\mathfrak{s}$, we have $d = (c(\mathfrak{s})^2 - \sigma(X))/8$, $b_+ = b_+(X)$ and $B = \text{Pic}^{\mathfrak{s}}(X)$. Since $\text{Pic}^{\mathfrak{s}}(X)$ is a torsor for $T_X = H^1(X; \mathbb{R})/H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})$, we have a canonical isomorphism $H^*(\text{Pic}^{\mathfrak{s}}(X)) \cong H^*(T_X)$. So the Seiberg–Witten invariant takes the form $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}^\phi : H_{S^1}^*(pt) \rightarrow H^{*-2d+b_++1}(T_X)$ and is equivalent to the collection of cohomology classes $SW_f^\phi(x^m) \in H^{2m-2d+b_++1}(T_X)$.

3. SPIN STRUCTURES AND $\text{Pin}(2)$ -SYMMETRY

For a spin-structure $\mathfrak{s}$, the Seiberg–Witten equations have an additional symmetry known as charge conjugation, which we denote by j . The corresponding monopole map is $\text{Pin}(2)$ -equivariant, where $\text{Pin}(2) = S^1 \cup jS^1$ with relations $je^{i\theta} = e^{-i\theta}j$, $j^2 = -1$. This motivates us to consider $\text{Pin}(2)$ -equivariant monopole maps more generally.

Let B be a compact manifold. Assume that B is equipped with an involution $\iota : B \rightarrow B$ and let $Pin(2)$ act on B , where $S^1 \subset Pin(2)$ acts trivially and j acts as ι . Let $E \rightarrow B$ be a complex vector bundle on B . Suppose that E is equipped with an antilinear endomorphism $J : E \rightarrow E$ covering ι and satisfying $J^2 = -1$. Then we make E into a $Pin(2)$ -equivariant vector bundle over B by letting $S^1 \subset Pin(2)$ act by scalar multiplication and j act by J . Let $F \rightarrow B$ be a real vector bundle and suppose F is equipped with an involutive endomorphism $J : F \rightarrow F$ covering ι . Then we make F into a $Pin(2)$ -equivariant vector bundle over B by letting $S^1 \subset Pin(2)$ act trivially and let j act by J .

Consider now a $Pin(2)$ -equivariant map $f : S^{V,U} \rightarrow S^{V',U'}$, where V, V' are complex vector bundles equipped with anti-linear endomorphisms covering ι and squaring to -1 and U, U' are real vector bundles equipped with involutive endomorphisms covering ι . Assume that f sends $s_{V,U}$ to $s_{V',U'}$ and that $f|_{S^U}$ is $Pin(2)$ -homotopic to the map $S^U \rightarrow S^{U'}$ induced by an inclusion of vector bundles $U \rightarrow U'$. We will refer to such a map as a *$Pin(2)$ -equivariant monopole map*.

In the case that f is the monopole map for a 4-manifold X and spin-structure $\mathfrak{s}$, recall that $B = Pic^{\mathfrak{s}}(X)$. A spin connection defines an origin in $Pic^{\mathfrak{s}}(X)$ and hence gives an identification $Pic^{\mathfrak{s}}(X) \cong H^1(X; \mathbb{R})/H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})$. The involution $\iota : B \rightarrow B$ acts on $H^1(X; \mathbb{R})/H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})$ as -1 (i.e. the inverse map of the group structure). Furthermore, U, U' are trivial vector bundles over B and j is the map $-\iota^*$, that is, a combination of pullback by ι and multiplication by -1 .

The construction of cohomological invariants given in Section 2 can be repeated for $Pin(2)$ -monopole maps but now keeping track of the additional symmetry. A chamber in the $Pin(2)$ sense is a $Pin(2)$ -equivariant homotopy class $\phi : B \rightarrow U' \setminus U$. This determines a lifted Thom class $\tau_{V',U'}^{\phi} \in H_{Pin(2)}^{2a'+b'}(S^{V',U'}, S^U)$ which pulls back to $f^*(\tau_{V',U'}^{\phi}) \in H_{Pin(2)}^{2a'+b'}(S^{V,U}, S^U)$. As before we have isomorphisms

$$H_{Pin(2)}^*(S^{V,U}, S^U) \cong H_{Pin(2)}^*(\tilde{Y}^{V,U}, \partial \tilde{Y}^{V,U}) \cong H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(Y^{V,U}, \partial Y^{V,U}).$$

Now the projection map $\pi_{V,U} : Y^{V,U} \rightarrow B$ is $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -equivariant and hence it determines a push-forward map $(\pi_{V,U})_* : H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(Y^{V,U}, \partial Y^{V,U}) \rightarrow H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^{*-(2a+b-1)}(B)$ in equivariant cohomology. This requires some justification since Poincaré–Lefschetz duality does not hold in equivariant cohomology. Consider more generally a compact Lie group G and a G -equivariant fibre bundle $\pi : E \rightarrow B$, where the fibre F is a compact n -manifold with boundary. The transition functions for the fibre bundle are homeomorphisms so they must send the boundary of F to itself. Hence we also have a fibre bundle $\partial E \rightarrow B$ whose fibres are the boundaries of the fibres of E . Replacing E and B by their Borel models $E_G = E \times_G EG$, $B_G = B \times_G BG$, we have a fibre bundle $\pi : E_G \rightarrow B_G$, with fibre F . Let ∂E_G denote the Borel model for ∂E and let E'_G be the space obtained by collapsing the boundary of each fibre to a distinct point. This is a fibre bundle over B_G with fibre $F/\partial F$. Consider the Leray–Serre spectral sequence $E_r^{p,q}$ for $E'_G \rightarrow B_G$. Since $H^k(F/\partial F) = 0$ for $k > n$, we have $E_r^{p,q} = 0$ for $q > n$ and hence there is a map

$$H^m(E'_G) \rightarrow E_2^{m-n,n} = H^{m-n}(B_G; H^n(F, \partial F)).$$

Here $H^n(F, \partial F)$ is to be understood as a local system on B . However, since we are working with $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -coefficients and F is a compact n -manifold, we have $H^n(F, \partial F) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$, the trivial local system with coefficient group $\mathbb{Z}_2$. So we have a well defined

map $H^m(E'_G) \rightarrow H^{m-n}(B_G)$. From the definition of E'_G , there is a quotient map $E'_G \rightarrow E_G/\partial E_G$ and hence a pullback map $H^m(E_G, \partial E_G) \rightarrow H^m(E'_G)$. Composing, we get a map

$$\pi_* : H^m(E_G, \partial E_G) \rightarrow H^m(E'_G) \rightarrow H^{m-n}(B_G)$$

or equivalently, a map in equivariant cohomology

$$\pi_* : H_G^m(E, \partial E) \rightarrow H_G^m(E) \rightarrow H_G^{m-n}(B).$$

Thus, to any $Pin(2)$ -monopole map f and chamber ϕ , we may define the $Pin(2)$ -equivariant Seiberg–Witten invariant of f with respect to ϕ to be the map

$$SW_{Pin(2),f}^\phi : H_{Pin(2)}^*(pt) \rightarrow H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^{*-2d+b_++1}(B)$$

given by

$$SW_{Pin(2),f}^\phi(\theta) = (\pi_{V,U})_*(\theta f^*(\tau_{V',U'}^\phi)).$$

Forgetting the additional symmetry recovers the usual Seiberg–Witten invariant in the sense that we have a commutative diagram

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} H_{Pin(2)}^*(pt) & \xrightarrow{SW_{Pin(2),f}^\phi} & H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^{*-2d+b_++1}(B) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ H_{S^1}^*(pt) & \xrightarrow{SW_f^\phi} & H^{*-2d+b_++1}(B) \end{array}$$

However there may be some loss of information in passing to the $Pin(2)$ -equivariant Seiberg–Witten invariant as the map $H_{Pin(2)}^*(pt) \rightarrow H_{S^1}^*(pt)$ is not surjective. In fact, we have $H_{Pin(2)}^*(pt) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2[u, q]/(u^3)$ where $\deg(u) = 1$, $\deg(q) = 4$ (eg. [6, §5]) and the map $H_{Pin(2)}^*(pt) \rightarrow H_{S^1}^*(pt)$ sends u to zero and q to x^2 .

The map $SW_{Pin(2),f}^\phi$ is a morphism of $H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(pt)$ -modules. Recall that $H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(pt) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2[u]$, where $\deg(u) = 1$. So we have, $SW_{Pin(2),f}^\phi(u\theta) = uSW_{Pin(2),f}^\phi(\theta)$.

As in the S^1 -equivariant case, it is sometimes convenient to regard the domain of $SW_{Pin(2),f}^\phi$ to be either $H_{Pin(2)}^*(\tilde{Y}^{V,U})$ or $H_{Pin(2)}^*(B)$

In the case that f is the Seiberg–Witten monopole map for a 4-manifold X with spin-structure $\mathfrak{s}$, we run into an immediate problem. There are no $Pin(2)$ -equivariant chambers because the action of j on $Pic^{\mathfrak{s}}(X)$ always has fixed points, while j acts on $H^+(X)$ as -1 . So it would appear that we can not take advantage of the $Pin(2)$ -symmetry in this situation. Fortunately there is a simple way to circumvent this difficulty, which we previously made use of in [4, §9.4]. The idea is to replace $Pic^{\mathfrak{s}}(X)$ with $B_{X,\mathfrak{s}} = Pic^{\mathfrak{s}}(X) \times S(H^+(X))$, where $S(H^+(X))$ is the unit sphere in $H^+(X)$. We define $\iota : B_{X,\mathfrak{s}} \rightarrow B_{X,\mathfrak{s}}$ to be the product of -1 on $Pic^{\mathfrak{s}}(X)$ with the antipodal map on $S(H^+(X))$. Then we simply pullback the monopole map from $Pic^{\mathfrak{s}}(X)$ to $B_{X,\mathfrak{s}}$. Then we have a tautological chamber $\phi^{taut} : B_{X,\mathfrak{s}} \rightarrow H^+(X) \setminus \{0\}$ which given by the projection $B_{X,\mathfrak{s}} \rightarrow S(H^+(X))$, followed by the inclusion $S(H^+(X)) \rightarrow H^+(X) \setminus \{0\}$. Hence to any 4-manifold X with $b_+(X) > 0$ and with spin structure $\mathfrak{s}$, we obtain a $Pin(2)$ -equivariant Seiberg–Witten invariant

$$SW_{Pin(2),f}^{\phi^{taut}} : H_{Pin(2)}^*(pt) \rightarrow H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B_{X,\mathfrak{s}}).$$

To simplify notation we write $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}^{Pin(2)}$ for $SW_{Pin(2),f}^{\phi^{taut}}$.

Recall that $H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(pt) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2[u]$, where $\deg(u) = 1$.

Proposition 3.1. *We have an isomorphism of $\mathbb{Z}_2[u]$ -algebras:*

$$H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B_{X,\mathfrak{s}}) \cong H^*(Pic^{\mathfrak{s}}(X))[u]/(u^{b_+(X)}).$$

Proof. Set $n = b_+(X) - 1$. Since the antipodal map acts freely on $S(H^+(X)) \cong S^n$, it follows that ι acts freely and that the quotient $B_{X,\mathfrak{s}}/\langle \iota \rangle$ has the structure of a fibre bundle over $\mathbb{RP}^n$ with fibre $Pic^{\mathfrak{s}}(X)$. Furthermore, the distinguished point of $Pic^{\mathfrak{s}}(X)$ determined by the spin-connection is fixed by -1 and hence defines a section $\mathbb{RP}^n \rightarrow B_{X,\mathfrak{s}}/\langle \iota \rangle$. Let $E_2^{p,q}$ denote the Leray–Serre spectral sequence for $p : B_{X,\mathfrak{s}}/\langle \iota \rangle \rightarrow \mathbb{RP}^n$. The existence of a section implies that $p^* : H^*(\mathbb{RP}^n) \rightarrow H^*(B_{X,\mathfrak{s}}/\langle \iota \rangle)$ is injective. Hence there are no differentials into $E_r^{p,0}$ for any p or r . This implies that the pullback map $H^1(B_{X,\mathfrak{s}}/\langle \iota \rangle) \rightarrow H^1(Pic^{\mathfrak{s}}(X))$ is surjective. But $Pic^{\mathfrak{s}}(X)$ is a torus so $H^*(Pic^{\mathfrak{s}})$ is generated by $H^1(Pic^{\mathfrak{s}}(X))$, hence the pullback map $H^k(B_{X,\mathfrak{s}}/\langle \iota \rangle) \rightarrow H^k(Pic^{\mathfrak{s}}(X))$ is surjective for all k . The result now follows from the Leray–Hirsch theorem, the fact that $H^*(\mathbb{RP}^n) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2[u]/(u^{n+1})$ and the isomorphism $H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B_{X,\mathfrak{s}}) \cong H^*(B_{X,\mathfrak{s}}/\langle \iota \rangle)$. $\square$

Let us write $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}^{\mathbb{Z},\phi}$ to distinguish the integral Seiberg–Witten invariant from the mod 2 Seiberg–Witten invariant $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}^{\phi}$.

Lemma 3.2. *If $b_+(X) = 1$ and $\mathfrak{s}$ is a spin-structure, then $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}^{\mathbb{Z},\phi}$ does not depend on the chamber ϕ .*

Proof. Since X is spin and $b_+(X) = 1$, we must have $b_-(X) = 1$ (by Donaldson’s Theorem B in the simply connected case [12], or the 10/8 inequality more generally [17]). The wall-crossing formula (eg. [5]) implies that $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}^{\mathbb{Z},\phi}(x^m) - SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}^{\mathbb{Z},-\phi}(x^m) = \pm s_{m+1}(D)$, where $s_j(D)$ denotes the j -th Segre class of the index bundle $D \rightarrow Pic^{\mathfrak{s}}(X)$. Since $b_+(X) = 1$ and $c(\mathfrak{s}) = 0$, the calculation in [5, §5.3] shows that $s_j(D) = 0$ for all $j > 0$, hence the result follows. $\square$

By Lemma 3.2, for a spin structure, $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}^{\mathbb{Z},\phi}$ and $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}^{\phi}$ do not depend on ϕ even when $b_+(X) = 1$ and so we will denote these invariants as $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ and $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}$.

Lemma 3.3. *Let X be a compact, oriented, smooth 4-manifold with $b_+(X) > 0$ and $\mathfrak{s}$ a spin-structure. If m is odd then $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}^{\mathbb{Z}}(x^m) = 0$. If m is even then $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}(x^m) = SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}^{Pin(2)}(q^{m/2})|_{u=0}$, where for a class $\alpha \in H^*(Pic^{\mathfrak{s}}(X))[u]/(u^{b_+(X)})$, $\alpha|_{u=0}$ denotes the class in $H^*(Pic^{\mathfrak{s}}(X))$ obtained from α by setting $u = 0$.*

Proof. Let $\iota : Pic^{\mathfrak{s}}(X) \rightarrow Pic^{\mathfrak{s}}(X)$ denote the inversion map. The charge conjugation symmetry of the Seiberg–Witten equations implies that $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}^{\mathbb{Z}}(x^m) = (-1)^{\sigma} \iota^* SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}^{\mathbb{Z}}(x^m)$, where $\sigma = m + d + b_+(X) + 1$. However $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}^{\mathbb{Z}}(x^m)$ has degree $2m - 2d + b_+(X) + 1$ so ι^* acts as $(-1)^{2m-2d+b_+(X)+1}$. So the formula simplifies to $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}^{\mathbb{Z}}(x^m) = (-1)^{m+d} SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}^{\mathbb{Z}}(x^m)$. Furthermore, $d = -\sigma(X)/8$ is even as $\sigma(X)$ is a multiple of 16. So $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}^{\mathbb{Z}}(x^m) = (-1)^m SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}^{\mathbb{Z}}(x^m)$ and hence $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}^{\mathbb{Z}}(x^m) = 0$ if m is odd, as $H^*(Pic^{\mathfrak{s}}(X); \mathbb{Z})$ has no torsion.

Now suppose m is even. Let $f : S^{V,U} \rightarrow S^{V',U'}$ be the Seiberg–Witten monopole map over $Pic^s(X)$. Pull this back to $B_{X,s} = Pic^s(X) \times S(H^+(X))$. Adapting the commutative diagram (3.1) to this setting, we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 H_{Pin(2)}^*(pt) & \xrightarrow{SW_{X,s}^{Pin(2)}} & H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^{*-2d+b_++1}(B_{X,s}) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & H^{*-2d+b_++1}(Pic^s(X))[u]/(u^{b_+(X)}) \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & \swarrow & \\
 H_{S^1}^*(pt) & \xrightarrow{SW_{X,s}} & H^{*-2d+b_++1}(Pic^s(X)) & \xleftarrow{|_{u=0}} &
 \end{array}$$

Then since $q^{m/2} \in H_{Pin(2)}^*(B_{X,s})$ gets sent to $x^m \in H_{S^1}^*(Pic^s(X))$, commutativity of the diagram gives $SW_{X,s}(x^m) = SW_{X,s}^{Pin(2)}(q^{m/2})|_{u=0}$. $\square$

By this lemma, the task of computing the mod 2 Seiberg–Witten invariants for spin structures is reduced to calculating $SW_{X,s}^{Pin(2)}|_{u=0}$. In fact, we will compute the whole invariant $SW_{X,s}^{Pin(2)}$, not just its evaluation at $u = 0$. However, before carrying this out we already obtain a strong vanishing theorem which implies that $SW_{X,s}$ for a spin structure is usually zero mod 2.

Theorem 3.4. *Let X be a compact, oriented, smooth 4-manifold with $b_+(X) > 0$ and s a spin-structure. If $b_+(X) > 3$, then $SW_{X,s}(\theta) = 0$ for all $\theta \in H_{S^1}^*(pt)$.*

Proof. Assume that $b_+(X) > 3$. By Lemma 3.3, it suffices to show that $SW_{X,s}^{Pin(2)}(q^m)|_{u=0} = 0$ for all $m \geq 0$. Recall that $SW_{X,s}^{Pin(2)}$ is a map

$$SW_{X,s}^{Pin(2)} : H_{Pin(2)}^*(pt) \rightarrow H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^{*-2d+b_+(X)+1}(B_{X,s}) \cong H^{*-2d+b_+(X)+1}(Pic^s(X))[u]/(u^{b_+(X)}).$$

Recall also that $u^3 = 0$ in $H_{Pin(2)}^*(pt)$. Hence

$$u^3 SW_{X,s}^{Pin(2)}(q^m) = SW_{X,s}^{Pin(2)}(u^3 \theta) = 0.$$

This means that $SW_{X,s}^{Pin(2)}(q^m)$ is divisible by $u^{b_+(X)-3}$ and hence $SW_{X,s}^{Pin(2)}(q^m)|_{u=0} = 0$. $\square$

Theorem 3.4 is a generalisation of the main result of [9] (see also [25]), which corresponds to the case that $-\sigma(X)/4 - b_+(X) - 1 + b_1(X) = 0$, or equivalently the case that the moduli space of the Seiberg–Witten equations is zero-dimensional.

4. A PRODUCT FORMULA FOR SEIBERG–WITTEN INVARIANTS

Suppose that we have two S^1 -equivariant monopole maps

$$f_i : S^{V_i, U_i} \rightarrow S^{V'_i, U'_i}, \quad i = 1, 2$$

over a common base B . Let $f = f_1 \wedge_B f_2 : S^{V,U} \rightarrow S^{V',U'}$ be the fibrewise smash product of f_1 and f_2 , where $V = V_1 \oplus V_2$ etc. It is S^1 -equivariant where S^1 acts on both factors. Our goal in this Section is to compute SW_f in terms of SW_{f_1} and SW_{f_2} .

Let $\phi : B \rightarrow H^+ \setminus \{0\}$ be a chamber for f . Since $H^+ = H_1^+ \oplus H_2^+$ we can write $\phi = (\phi_1, \phi_2)$, where ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 do not simultaneously vanish. Perturbing ϕ slightly, we may assume that ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 meet the zero sections of H_1^+, H_2^+ transversally. Let

$Z_1, Z_2 \subset B$ be the zero loci of ϕ_1, ϕ_2 . So Z_1, Z_2 are disjoint and Z_i is Poincaré dual to the Euler class $e(H_i^+) \in H^{b_i^+}(B)$, where b_i^+ denotes the rank of H_i^+ .

The key observation is that the map f is $S^1 \times S^1$ -equivariant, where the i -th copy of S^1 acts as scalar multiplication on V_i and V'_i . Keeping track of this extra symmetry, we will be able to compute SW_f^ϕ using localisation in equivariant cohomology. Carrying out all constructions with respect to this larger group, we get a lifted Thom class

$$\tau_{V,U}^\phi \in H_{S^1 \times S^1}^*(S^{V',U'}, S^U),$$

which pulls back to

$$f^*(\tau_{V,U}^\phi) \in H_{S^1 \times S^1}^*(\tilde{Y}^{V,U}, \partial \tilde{Y}^{V,U}) \cong H_{S^1}^*(Y^{V,U}, \partial Y^{V,U})$$

where on the right, we have identified the quotient of $S^1 \times S^1$ by the diagonal subgroup ΔS^1 with S^1 via

$$(S^1 \times S^1)/\Delta S^1 \cong S^1, \quad (a, b) \mapsto ab^{-1}.$$

The quotient map $S^1 \times S^1 \rightarrow S^1$ is split surjective with splitting map $S^1 \rightarrow S^1 \times S^1$ given by $a \mapsto (a, 1)$. Hence we can identify the quotient group with the subgroup $S^1 \times \{1\}$.

The projection map $\pi_{V,U} : Y^{V,U} \rightarrow B$ is S^1 -equivariant, where S^1 acts trivially on B , hence, as explained in Section 3, defines a push-forward map

$$(\pi_{V,U})_* : H_{S^1}^*(Y^{V,U}, \partial Y^{V,U}) \rightarrow H_{S^1}^{*(2a+b-1)}(B).$$

It follows that we can define an enhancement of SW_f^ϕ valued in S^1 -equivariant cohomology:

$$\begin{aligned} SW_{S^1 \times S^1, f}^\phi : H_{S^1 \times S^1}^*(pt) &\rightarrow H_{S^1}^{*-2d+b_++1}(B), \\ SW_{S^1 \times S^1, f}^\phi(\theta) &= (\pi_{V,U})_*(\theta f^*(\tau_{V,U}^\phi)). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, the map is compatible with SW_f^ϕ in the sense that we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H_{S^1 \times S^1}^*(pt) & \xrightarrow{SW_{S^1 \times S^1, f}^\phi} & H_{S^1}^{*-2d+b_++1}(B) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ H_{S^1}^*(pt) & \xrightarrow{SW_f^\phi} & H^{*-2d+b_++1}(B) \end{array}$$

where the vertical maps are the forgetful maps in equivariant cohomology obtained by restricting to the subgroups $\Delta S^1 \subset S^1 \times S^1$ and $\{1\} \subset S^1$. Moreover, since the map $H_{S^1 \times S^1}^*(pt) \rightarrow H_{S^1}^*(pt)$ is surjective, we see that $SW_{S^1 \times S^1, f}^\phi$ completely determines SW_f^ϕ .

Let us establish notation for various subgroups of $S^1 \times S^1$. Write S_i^1 for the subgroup given by the i -th copy of S^1 and ΔS^1 for the diagonal copy of S^1 . If we write S^1 without any further decoration, it will be understood as the quotient group $(S^1 \times S^1)/\Delta S^1$. We have $H_{\Delta S^1}^*(pt) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2[x]$ and $H_{S^1 \times S^1}^*(pt) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2[x_1, x_2]$, where x_i corresponds to the i -th copy of S^1 . More precisely, x_i is the pullback of the generator of $H_{S_i^1}^2(pt)$. The restriction map $H_{S^1 \times S^1}^*(pt) \rightarrow H_{\Delta S^1}^*$ is the map

$\mathbb{Z}_2[x_1, x_2] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2[x]$ which sends x_1 and x_2 to x . When thinking of S^1 as the quotient $(S^1 \times S^1)/\Delta S^1$, we write $H_{S^1}^*(pt) = \mathbb{Z}_2[y]$. Since the quotient map $S^1 \times S^1 \rightarrow S^1$ is given by $(a, b) \rightarrow ab^{-1}$, it follows that the pullback of y equals $x_1 - x_2$.

Let $(Y^{V,U})^{S^1}$ denote the fixed point set of the S^1 -action on $Y^{V,U}$ and $\iota : (Y^{V,U})^{S^1} \rightarrow Y^{V,U}$ the inclusion. Then $(Y^{V,U})^{S^1}$ is a manifold with boundary and the boundary of $(Y^{V,U})^{S^1}$ is the fixed point set of the S^1 -action on $\partial Y^{V,U}$. It is easily seen that $(Y^{V,U})^{S^1} = F_1 \cup F_2$, where $F_1 = Y^{V_2, U_1 \oplus U_2}$ and $F_2 = Y^{V_1, U_1 \oplus U_2}$. Let $\tilde{F}_i$ denote the preimage of F_i in $\tilde{Y}^{V,U}$. Then $\tilde{F}_i$ is the fixed point set of S_i^1 acting on $\tilde{Y}^{V,U}$. The normal bundle of $\tilde{F}_i$ in $\tilde{Y}^{V,U}$ is the pullback of V_i to $\tilde{F}_i$. Turning this around, the normal bundle of F_i is obtained by taking the normal bundle of $\tilde{F}_i$ and quotienting by the action of ΔS^1 . Since ΔS^1 acts on V_i with weight $+1$, we see that the normal bundle of F_i is $N_i = V_i \otimes L$, where $L \rightarrow Y^{V,U}$ is the line bundle associated to the circle bundle $\tilde{Y}^{V,U} \rightarrow Y^{V,U}$. Let $c = c_{1, S^1 \times S^1}(L)$ denote the $S^1 \times S^1$ -equivariant Chern class of L . The image of c in ΔS^1 -equivariant cohomology is x . If we restrict L to F_1 , then S_1^1 acts trivially, hence $c|_{F_1} = x_2$. Similarly, $c|_{F_2} = x_1$.

The localisation theorem [11, III (3.8)] says that the pullback

$$\iota^* : H_{S^1}^*(Y^{V,U}, \partial Y^{V,U}) \rightarrow H_{S^1}^*((Y^{V,U})^{S^1}, \partial(Y^{V,U})^{S^1})$$

is an isomorphism after localising with respect to y . Similarly, the pushforward map $\iota_* : H_{S^1}^*((Y^{V,U})^{S^1}, \partial(Y^{V,U})^{S^1}) \rightarrow H_{S^1}^*(Y^{V,U}, \partial Y^{V,U})$ is an isomorphism after localising with respect to y . At this point we should remark that since F_1 and F_2 will typically have different dimensions, the pushforward does not respect degrees, only the degree mod 2. In any case, since the map is an isomorphism in the localised rings, there exists a class $\mu \in y^{-1}H_{S^1}^*((Y^{V,U})^{S^1}, \partial(Y^{V,U})^{S^1})$ of mixed degree such that $\iota_*(\mu) = 1$. Since $\iota^*\iota_*(\mu) = e_{S^1}(N)\mu$, where N denotes the normal bundle of $(Y^{V,U})^{S^1}$ in $Y^{V,U}$ and $e_{S^1}(N)$ is the S^1 -equivariant Euler class, we must have $\mu = e_{S^1}(N)^{-1}$. We will make this more precise below.

Let N_i denote $N|_{F_i}$. We have already shown that $N_i = V_i \otimes L$. Identify the quotient group $(S^1 \times S^1)/\Delta S^1$ with S_1^1 . This acts with weight $+1$ on V_1 . It acts with weight -1 on V_2 because $(a, 1) \sim (1, a^{-1})$ modulo ΔS^1 . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} e_{S^1}(N_1) &= (y + x_2)^{a_1} + (y + x_2)^{a_1-1}c_1(V_1) + \cdots + c_{a_1}(V_1), \\ e_{S^1}(N_2) &= (-y + x_1)^{a_2} + (-y + x_1)^{a_2-1}c_1(V_2) + \cdots + c_{a_2}(V_2). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $y = x_1 - x_2$. Hence $y + x_2 = x_1$ and $-y + x_1 = x_2$, so the above expressions can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} e_{S^1}(N_1) &= x_1^{a_1} + x_1^{a_1-1}c_1(V_1) + \cdots + c_{a_1}(V_1), \\ e_{S^1}(N_2) &= x_2^{a_2} + x_2^{a_2-1}c_1(V_2) + \cdots + c_{a_2}(V_2). \end{aligned}$$

However, writing the Euler classes this way makes it less clear how to invert them. For this purpose, it is better to write $e_{S^1}(N_1), e_{S^1}(N_2)$ in the form

$$\begin{aligned} e_{S^1}(N_1) &= y^{a_1} + y^{a_1-1}c_1(V_1 \otimes L) + \cdots, \\ e_{S^1}(N_2) &= (-y)^{a_2} + (-y)^{a_2-1}c_1(V_2 \otimes L) + \cdots. \end{aligned}$$

We then have

$$\begin{aligned} e_{S^1}(N_1)^{-1} &= y^{-a_1} + y^{-a_1-1}s_1(V_1 \otimes L) + \cdots, \\ e_{S^1}(N_2)^{-1} &= (-y)^{-a_2} + (-y)^{-a_2-1}s_1(V_2 \otimes L) + \cdots \end{aligned}$$

where $s_j(V_1 \otimes L), s_j(V_2 \otimes L)$ are the Segre classes of $V_1 \otimes L, V_2 \otimes L$. Since F_i is finite dimensional, these are zero for all large enough j and hence the above expressions for $e_{S^1}(N_i)^{-1}$ have only finitely many terms.

For a complex vector bundle E of rank r , we have.

$$c_j(E \otimes L) = \sum_{l=0}^j c_l(E)c_1(L)^{j-l} \binom{r-l}{j-l}, \quad s_j(E \otimes L) = \sum_{l=0}^j s_l(E)c_1(L)^{j-l} \binom{-r-l}{j-l}$$

In fact, the same expressions hold even when E is a virtual vector bundle. Applying these expressions to D_1, D_2 , we find

$$\begin{aligned} e_{S^1}(N_1)^{-1} &= \sum_{j \geq 0} y^{-a_1-j} \sum_{l=0}^j x_1^{j-l} s_l(D_1) \binom{-d_1-l}{j-l} \in H^*(F_1)[y, y^{-1}], \\ e_{S^1}(N_2)^{-1} &= \sum_{j \geq 0} (-y)^{-a_1-j} \sum_{l=0}^j x_1^{j-l} s_l(D_1) \binom{-d_2-l}{j-l} \in H^*(F_2)[y, y^{-1}]. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\pi_1 : F_1 \rightarrow B, \pi_2 : F_2 \rightarrow B$ be the projections to B . The localisation theorem then gives

$$(4.1) \quad SW_{S^1 \times S^1, f}^\phi(\theta) = (\pi_1)_*(e_{S^1}(N_1)^{-1} \theta f^*(\tau_{V,U}^\phi)) + (\pi_2)_*(e_{S^1}(N_2)^{-1} \theta f^*(\tau_{V,U}^\phi)).$$

Let $j_i : S^{U_i} \rightarrow S^{V'_i, U'_i}$ denote the restriction of f_i to S^{U_i} . By the assumption that f_1, f_2 are monopole maps, we can assume that j_1, j_2 are given by inclusions $U_i \rightarrow U'_i$. Now to compute $(\pi_1)_*(e_{S^1}(N_1)^{-1} \theta f^*(\tau_{V,U}^\phi))$, note that we are restricting to $S^0 \subseteq S^{V_1}$, so f can be replaced by $j_1 \wedge f_2$.

Let $\iota_1 : S^0 \rightarrow S^{V_1, H_1^+}$ be the inclusion map. Then $j_1 \wedge f_2$ is a suspension of $\iota_1 \wedge f_2 : S^{V_2, U_2} \rightarrow S^{V'_1, H_1^+} \wedge S^{V'_2, U'_2}$, so they have the same Seiberg–Witten invariants (as shown in [5, Proposition 3.8]). It remains to compute the Seiberg–Witten invariants of $\iota_1 \wedge f_2$ (and similarly $f_1 \wedge \iota_2$).

Recall the chamber $\phi = (\phi_1, \phi_2)$ and recall that Z_1 is the zero locus of ϕ_1 . Recall also that ϕ_2 is non-vanishing on Z_1 . After a small perturbation, we may assume that $\phi_2|_{Z_1} : Z_1 \rightarrow S^{V'_2, U'_2}$ is transverse to $f_2|_{Z_1} : S^{V_2, U_2} \rightarrow S^{V'_2, U'_2}$ (the fact that this can be done for S^1 -equivariant monopole maps is explained in [5, Pages 522-523]). The same argument also works in the $Pin(2)$ -equivariant case, because the stabiliser of any point in $(f_2|_{Z_1})^{-1}(\phi_2|_{Z_1})$ is trivial). Let $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_2 \rightarrow Z_1$ denote the pre-image $(f_2|_{Z_1})^{-1}(\phi_2|_{Z_1})$ and $\mathcal{M}_2 = \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_2/S^1$ the quotient. Then $(\iota_1 \wedge f_2)^{-1}(\phi(B)) = \mathcal{M}_2$. This is a smooth manifold, however it is not cut out transversally. The technique of obstruction bundles (eg. [16, Section 3]) can be used to overcome this difficulty. The obstruction bundle on $\mathcal{M}_2$ is V'_1 . This descends to the bundle $V'_1 \otimes L$ on $\mathcal{M}_2$. Hence the Seiberg–Witten invariants of $f_2|_{Z_1}$ and $\iota_1 \wedge f_2$ are related by:

$$SW_{\iota_1 \wedge f_2}^\phi(\theta) = (j_1)_* SW_{f_2|_{Z_1}}^{\phi_2}(e(V'_1 \otimes L)\theta)$$

where $j_1 : Z_1 \rightarrow B$ is the inclusion map. To apply this to the localisation formula, we need the $S^1 \times S^1$ -equivariant extension of this formula,

$$SW_{S^1 \times S^1, \iota_1 \wedge f_2}^\phi(\theta) = (j_1)_* SW_{S^1 \times S^1, f_2|_{Z_1}}^{\phi_2}(e_{S^1}(V'_1 \otimes L)\theta).$$

Some care is required in interpreting the right hand side of this equation. First of all, we can identify $S^1 \times S^1$ with the product $S^1_1 \times \Delta S^1$ via the isomorphism $(a, b) \mapsto (ab^{-1}, b)$. Next, the argument $e_{S^1}(V'_1 \otimes L)\theta$ should be thought of as an element of

$$y^{-1}H_{S^1 \times S^1}^*(\tilde{Y}^{V_2, U_2}|_{Z_1}) \cong y^{-1}H_{S^1_1 \times \Delta S^1}^*(\tilde{Y}^{V_2, U_2}|_{Z_1}) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2[y, y^{-1}] \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_2} H_{\Delta S^1}^*(\tilde{Y}^{V_2, U_2}|_{Z_1}).$$

Let $\psi_2 : y^{-1}H_{S^1 \times S^1}^*(\tilde{Y}^{V_2, U_2}|_{Z_1}) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2[y, y^{-1}] \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_2} H_{\Delta S^1}^*(\tilde{Y}^{V_2, U_2}|_{Z_1})$ denote this isomorphism. Note in particular that $\psi_2(x_1) = y + x$, $\psi_2(x_2) = x$, where x is the generator of $H_{\Delta S^1}^2(pt)$ pulled back to $H_{\Delta S^1}^2(\tilde{Y}^{V_2, U_2}|_{Z_1})$. From this, it follows that we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} y^{-1}H_{S^1 \times S^1}^*(\tilde{Y}^{V_2, U_2}|_{Z_1}) & \xrightarrow{SW_{S^1 \times S^1, f_2|_{Z_1}}^{\phi_2}} & y^{-1}H_{S^1}^*(Z_1) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \cong \\ y^{-1}H_{S^1_1 \times \Delta S^1}^*(\tilde{Y}^{V_2, U_2}|_{Z_1}) & & \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbb{Z}_2[y, y^{-1}] \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_2} H_{\Delta S^1}^*(\tilde{Y}^{V_2, U_2}|_{Z_1}) & \xrightarrow{id \otimes SW_{f_2|_{Z_1}}^\phi} & \mathbb{Z}_2[y, y^{-1}] \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_2} H^*(Z_1) \end{array}$$

ψ_2 (curved arrow from top-left to bottom-left)

One similarly defines $\psi_1 : y^{-1}H_{S^1 \times S^1}^*(\tilde{Y}^{V_1, U_1}|_{Z_2}) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2[y, y^{-1}] \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_2} H_{\Delta S^1}^*(\tilde{Y}^{V_1, U_1}|_{Z_2})$ where $\psi_1(x_1) = x$, $\psi_1(x_2) = -y + x$. Exchanging the roles of f_1 and f_2 gives a similar formula relating the Seiberg–Witten invariants of $f_1|_{Z_2}$ and $f_1 \wedge \iota_2$. Substituting into (4.1) and noting that $e_{S^1}(V_i \otimes L)^{-1}e_{S^1}(V'_i \otimes L) = e_{S^1}(D_i \otimes L)^{-1}$ gives:

Theorem 4.1. *For all $\theta \in H_{S^1 \times S^1}^*(B)$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} SW_{S^1_1 \times S^1_2, f_1 \wedge f_2}^\phi(\theta) &= (j_1)_* \left(id \otimes SW_{f_2|_{Z_2}}^{\phi_2} \right) (\psi_2(e_{S^1}(D_1 \otimes L)^{-1}\theta)) \\ &\quad + (j_2)_* \left(id \otimes SW_{f_1|_{Z_1}}^{\phi_1} \right) (\psi_1(e_{S^1}(D_2 \otimes L)^{-1}\theta)). \end{aligned}$$

Some explanation of how to use the formula is required. Here

$$\begin{aligned} e_{S^1}(D_1 \otimes L)^{-1} &= y^{-d_1} + y^{-d_1-1}s_1(D_1 \otimes L) + \cdots, \\ e_{S^1}(D_2 \otimes L)^{-1} &= (-y)^{-d_2} + (-y)^{-d_2-1}s_1(D_2 \otimes L) + \cdots, \end{aligned}$$

where $s_j(D_i \otimes L)$ is the j -th Segre class of $D_i \otimes L$ and $L|_{\mathcal{M}_i}$ is the line bundle corresponding to $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_i$. Furthermore, since $\psi_i(c_1(L)|_{F_i}) = \psi_i(x_i) = x$, the Segre classes can be expanded as

$$\psi_i(s_j(D_i \otimes L)) = \sum_{l=0}^j s_l(D_i) x^{j-l} \binom{-d_i-l}{j-l}.$$

We now consider adapting Theorem 4.1 to the case of a smash product of $Pin(2)$ -equivariant monopole maps f_1, f_2 over a common base B . We assume that the two

involutions on B corresponding to f_1 to f_2 commute. In this case the smash product $f = f_1 \wedge_B f_2$ has $Pin(2) \times Pin(2)$ -symmetry. Since we are ultimately interested in the diagonal copy of $Pin(2)$, but want to retain the extra circle symmetry we consider the index 2 subgroup $G \subset Pin(2) \times Pin(2)$ generated by $S^1 \times S^1$ and (j, j) . The diagonal circle $\Delta S^1 \subset S^1 \times S^1$ is a normal subgroup of G and $G/\Delta S^1 \cong O(2)$. Carrying out the construction of the Seiberg–Witten invariant of f , but with respect to the larger group G gives a map

$$SW_{G,f}^\phi : H_G^*(pt) \rightarrow H_{O(2)}^{*-2d+b_++1}(B)$$

compatible with the $Pin(2)$ -equivariant Seiberg–Witten invariant in the sense that we have a commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H_G^*(pt) & \xrightarrow{SW_{G,f}^\phi} & H_{O(2)}^{*-2d+b_++1}(B) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ H_{Pin(2)}^*(pt) & \xrightarrow{SW_{Pin(2),f}^\phi} & H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^{*-2d+b_++1}(B) \end{array}$$

Let $p_i : G \rightarrow Pin(2)$ be the inclusion $G \rightarrow Pin(2) \times Pin(2)$, followed by projection to the i -th factor and let $p : G \rightarrow O(2)$ be the quotient map $G \rightarrow G/\Delta S^1 \cong O(2)$. For $i = 1, 2$, set $q_i = p_i^*(q) \in H_G^4(pt)$. Recall that $H_{O(2)}^*(pt) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2[u, y]$ where $\deg(u) = 1$, $\deg(y) = 2$. Abusing notation, we also write $y \in H_G^2(pt)$ for the class $p^*(y)$.

Proposition 4.2. *We have $H_G^*(pt) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2[u, y, q_1]/(u^3)$. Furthermore we have $q_2 + q_1 = y^2 + yu^2$.*

Proof. We have a short exact sequence $1 \rightarrow S_1^1 \rightarrow G \xrightarrow{p_1} Pin(2) \rightarrow 1$, where S_1^1 denotes the subgroup $S^1 \times \{1\} \subset S^1 \times S^1 \subset G$. The Lyndon–Hochschild–Serre spectral sequence for $H_G^*(pt)$ has $E_2^{*,*} = H_{Pin(2)}^*(H_{S_1^1}^*(pt)) \cong H_{Pin(2)}^*[y']$, where $\deg(y') = 2$ is the generator of $H_{S_1^1}^2$. The composition $S_1^1 \rightarrow G \xrightarrow{p_1} O(2)$ is easily seen to be the inclusion of the circle subgroup of $O(2)$. This implies that $p^*(y) \in H_G^2(pt)$ restricts to y' . This implies that the spectral sequence degenerates and $H_G^*(pt) \cong H_{Pin(2)}^*[y] \cong \mathbb{Z}_2[u, y, q_1]/(u^3)$.

It remains to prove the relation $q_1 + q_2 = y^2 + yu^2$. Since $H_G^4(pt)$ is spanned by q_1, y^2, yu^2 , we have that q_2 is a linear combination of q_1, y^2, yu^2 . Consider the subgroup $S^1 \times S^1 \subset G$ which has cohomology $\mathbb{Z}_2[x_1, x_2]$. The restriction map $H_G^*(pt) \rightarrow H_{S^1 \times S^1}^*$ sends q_i to x_i^2 , y to $x_1 + x_2$ and u to zero. This shows that q_2 must be either $q_1 + y^2$ or $q_1 + y^2 + yu^2$.

Next, we note that $Pin(2)$ acts freely on $S^3 \cong SU(2)$ via the inclusion $Pin(2) \rightarrow SU(2)$ and the left action of $SU(2)$ on itself. The quotient space is $\mathbb{RP}^2$, because the quotient of S^3 by the S^1 -subgroup of $Pin(2)$ is $S^3/S^1 \cong S^2$ and the remaining action of $Pin(2)/S^1 \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$ acts on S^2 as the antipodal map.

We also have that G acts freely on $S^3 \times S^3$ via the inclusion $G \rightarrow Pin(2) \times Pin(2)$ and the obvious product action of $Pin(2) \times Pin(2)$ on $S^3 \times S^3$. Let $M = (S^3 \times S^3)/G$ be the quotient. Clearly M is the quotient of $S^2 \times S^2$ by the involution which acts

as the antipodal map on both factors. Projecting to either factor of S^2 gives two fibrations

$$S^2 \rightarrow M \xrightarrow{\pi_i} \mathbb{RP}^2, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Both fibrations admit a section $s_i : \mathbb{RP}^2 \rightarrow M$ which the image under the quotient map $(S^2 \times S^2) \rightarrow M$ of the diagonal copy of S^2 . From this it follows easily that the Leray–Serre spectral sequences for both fibrations degenerate at E_2 . Then $H_G^*(S^3 \times S^3) \cong H^*(M)$ is a 6-dimensional space over $\mathbb{Z}_2$ with basis $1, u, u^2, c, cu, cu^2$, where $c \in H^2(M)$ restricts non-trivially to the fibres of $\pi_1 : M \rightarrow \mathbb{RP}^2$. The diagonal $S^2 \rightarrow S^2 \times S^2$ has normal bundle TS^2 and taking the quotient by the antipodal map on both factors, it follows that the normal bundle of the sections s_1, s_2 are both equal to $T\mathbb{RP}^2$. Since $w_2(T\mathbb{RP}^2) = u^2$, it follows that the mod 2 self-intersection of s_i is odd, but this can only happen if $c^2 \neq 0$, so $c^2 = cu^2$.

Let $\mathbb{H}_1$ be the standard representation of the i -th copy of $SU(2)$ in the product $SU(2) \times SU(2)$. By restriction, this defines a representation of G and we have that $q_i = w_4(\mathbb{H}_i)$. By taking the pullback of $\mathbb{H}_i$ to $S^3 \times S^3$ and quotienting by G , we have that $\mathbb{H}_i$ descends to a rank 4 vector bundle $\tilde{\mathbb{H}}_i \rightarrow M$. In fact, $\tilde{\mathbb{H}}_i$ is the pullback under $\pi_i : M \rightarrow \mathbb{RP}^2$ of a rank 4 vector bundle on $\mathbb{RP}^2$, because the G -action on $\mathbb{H}_i$ factors through $p_i : G \rightarrow Pin(2)$. Now since $\mathbb{RP}^2$ is 2-dimensional, we must have that $w_4(\tilde{\mathbb{H}}_i) = 0$. So the pullback of q_1, q_2 to $H_G^*(S^3 \times S^3) \cong H^4(M)$ are both zero.

Let R denote the standard 2-dimensional real representation of $O(2)$. We have that $y = w_2(R)$. By taking the pullback of R to $S^3 \times S^3$ and quotienting by G , we obtain a vector bundle $\tilde{R} \rightarrow M$ on M . The restriction of $\tilde{R}$ to any fibre of π_2 is isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}(1) \rightarrow S^2$. In particular, this means that $y = w_2(\tilde{R})$ equals either c or $c + u^2$. In either case, we then have $y^2 = cu^2 = yu^2$. So $y^2 + yu^2 = 0$, but $y^2 \neq 0$ in $H^*(M)$. Then since $q_1 + q_2 = 0$ in $H^*(M)$, we see that we must have $q_1 + q_2 = y^2 + yu^2$.

□

The above proposition implies in particular that $H_G^*(pt) \rightarrow H_{Pin(2)}^*(pt)$ is surjective, hence $SW_{Pin(2),f}^\phi$ is completely determined by $SW_{G,f}^\phi$.

Recall that we have homomorphisms $p_i : G \rightarrow Pin(2)$ for $i = 1, 2$ and also $p : G \rightarrow O(2)$.

Lemma 4.3. *Let M be a space on which $Pin(2)$ acts. Regard M as a G -space via $p_i : G \rightarrow Pin(2)$. Then we have an isomorphism*

$$p^* \otimes p_i^* : H_{O(2)}^*(pt) \otimes_{H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(pt)} H_{Pin(2)}^*(M) \cong H_G^*(M).$$

Proof. By symmetry, it suffices to prove this for $i = 2$. Since S_1^1 acts trivially on M , we get a fibration $BS_1^1 \rightarrow M_G \rightarrow M_{Pin(2)}$ and a Leray–Serre spectral sequence for $H_G^*(M)$ which has $E_2 = H_{Pin(2)}^*(M)[y]$, where $deg(y) = 2$.

The composition $S_1^1 \rightarrow G \rightarrow O(2)$ is the inclusion $S_1^1 \rightarrow O(2)$. Next, we observe that $H_{O(2)}^*(pt) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2[u, y]$, where $deg(u) = 1$, $deg(y) = 2$. Moreover the pullback of y to $H_{S_1^1}^2(pt)$ is a generator. Since $y \in H_{O(2)}^2(pt)$ can be pulled back to a class

in $H_G^2(M)$ whose restriction to the fibre is a generator of $H^2(BS^1)$, it follows that the spectral sequence degenerates at E_2 and we have an isomorphism

$$H_{O(2)}^*(pt) \otimes_{H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(pt)} H_{Pin(2)}^*(M) \cong H_{Pin(2)}^*(M)[y] \cong H_G^*(M)$$

and that this isomorphism is realised by the map $p^* \otimes p_i^*$. $\square$

Since $H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(pt) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2[u]$ and $H_{O(2)}^*(pt) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2[u, y]$, where $\deg(y) = 2$, Lemma 4.3 yields an isomorphism

$$\psi_i : y^{-1} H_G^*(B) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2[y, y^{-1}] \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_2} H_{Pin(2)}^*(B) \cong H_{Pin(2)}^*(B)[y, y^{-1}].$$

Furthermore, ψ_i is a morphism of $H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(pt)$ -modules. We have $\psi_i(q_i) = q$. Furthermore, Proposition 4.2 implies that $\psi_1(q_2) = q + y^2 + yu^2$ and $\psi_2(q_1) = q + y^2 + yu^2$. To simplify notation, we define

$$\mu = y^2 + yu^2$$

so that $\psi_1(q_2) = \psi_2(q_1) = q + \mu$. Since $y^4 = \mu^2$, there is essentially no difference between localising with respect to y or with respect to μ .

Repeating the localisation argument in G -equivariant cohomology gives:

Theorem 4.4. *For all $\theta \in H_G^*(B)$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} SW_{G, f_1 \wedge f_2}^\phi(\theta) &= (j_1)_* \left(id \otimes SW_{Pin(2), f_2|_{\mathbb{Z}_2}}^{\phi_2} \right) (\psi_2(e_G(D_1)^{-1}\theta)) \\ &\quad + (j_2)_* \left(id \otimes SW_{Pin(2), f_1|_{\mathbb{Z}_1}}^{\phi_1} \right) (\psi_1(e_G(D_2)^{-1}\theta)). \end{aligned}$$

The Euler classes on the right hand side of the formula should be understood as follows. First, V_i, V'_i are $Pin(2)$ -equivariant bundles over B . Then V_i, V'_i can be regarded as a G -equivariant vector bundles via the homomorphism $p_i : G \rightarrow Pin(2)$. Then $e_G(V_i), e_G(V'_i)$ are the images of $e_{Pin(2)}(V_i), e_{Pin(2)}(V'_i)$ under the map $p_i : H_{Pin(2)}^*(B) \rightarrow H_G^*(B)$ induced by p_i . We have that $e_G(V_1)$ is invertible in $y^{-1} H_G^*(\tilde{Y}^{V_1, U_1}|_{\mathbb{Z}_2})$ and so $e_G(D_1)^{-1} = e_G(V_1)^{-1} e_G(V_1)$ is defined. Similarly $e_G(D_2)^{-1}$ is defined.

We will mainly be interested in applying the product formula in situations where B satisfies the following assumptions:

- (1) B is a fibre bundle $B \rightarrow B_0$ such that $j : B \rightarrow B$ covers an involution $j_0 : B_0 \rightarrow B_0$.
- (2) j_0 does not act freely.
- (3) The bundles V_i, V'_i are pullbacks from B_0 and j_0 lifts to an antilinear endomorphism on V_i, V'_i squaring to -1 .
- (4) The map $u : H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B_0) \rightarrow H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^{*+1}(B_0)$ is injective.

For instance, in the case of the $Pin(2)$ -monopole map of a 4-manifold X with spin-structure $\mathfrak{s}$, we have $B = B_{X, \mathfrak{s}} = Pic^{\mathfrak{s}}(X) \times S(H^+(X))$. Then the above assumptions are satisfied if we take $B_0 = Pic^{\mathfrak{s}}(X)$ and $B \rightarrow B_0$ the projection.

Note that condition (4) actually implies condition (2), for if the action of j_0 were free, then $H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B_0)$ would be zero in degrees above $\dim(B_0)$.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $j_0 : B_0 \rightarrow B_0$ be an involution satisfying condition (4) above. Then j_0 acts trivially on $H^*(B_0)$ and the Leray–Serre spectral sequence for the Borel fibration $(B_0)_{\mathbb{Z}_2} \rightarrow B\mathbb{Z}_2$ degenerates at E_2 , giving an isomorphism $H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B_0) \cong H^*(B_0)[u]$.*

Proof. Suppose that A is a finite dimensional representation of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ over $\mathbb{Z}_2$. Any such A is a direct sum of copies of the trivial representation $\mathbb{Z}_2$ and the regular representation $R = \mathbb{Z}_2^2$. Since $H^*(\mathbb{Z}_2; \mathbb{Z}_2) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2[u]$, $H^0(\mathbb{Z}_2; R) \cong R^{\mathbb{Z}_2} \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$ and $H^p(\mathbb{Z}_2; R) = 0$ for $p > 0$, it follows that $u : H^p(\mathbb{Z}_2; A) \rightarrow H^{p+1}(\mathbb{Z}_2; A)$ is surjective for all p and an isomorphism for $p > 0$. It also follows that $u : H^0(\mathbb{Z}_2; A) \rightarrow H^1(\mathbb{Z}_2; A)$ is injective if and only if $A^{\mathbb{Z}_2} = A$.

Now consider the Leray–Serre spectral sequence for the Borel fibration $(B_0)_{\mathbb{Z}_2} \rightarrow B\mathbb{Z}_2$. This has $E_2^{p,q} = H^p(\mathbb{Z}_2; H^q(B_0))$. Injectivity of $u : H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B_0) \rightarrow H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^{*+1}(B_0)$ implies that the map $H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(pt) \rightarrow H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B_0)$ is an injection. Hence for all r there are no differentials mapping into the $q = 0$ row of E_r .

Consider the map $u : E_{\infty}^{0,1} \rightarrow E_{\infty}^{1,1}$. If this map is not injective, then $u : H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^1(B_0) \rightarrow H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^2(B_0)$ will also not be injective. So $u : E_{\infty}^{0,1} \rightarrow E_{\infty}^{1,1}$ is injective. But $E_{\infty}^{0,1} \cong H^0(\mathbb{Z}_2; H^1(B_0))$, $E_{\infty}^{1,1} \cong H^1(\mathbb{Z}_2; H^1(B_0))$. For this map to be injective, the action of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ on $H^1(B_0)$ must be trivial. This means $E_2^{p,1} \cong H^1(B_0)$ for all p . Injectivity of $u : H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B_0) \rightarrow H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^{*+1}(B_0)$ then implies that there can be no differentials mapping into the $q = 1$ row of E_r for any r .

Continuing row by row in the same manner, we see that the action of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ on $H^q(B_0)$ is trivial for all q and that there are no differentials in the spectral sequence. This gives the result. $\square$

Lemma 4.6. *Let $j_0 : B_0 \rightarrow B_0$ be an involution and suppose that conditions (2) and (4) in the above list are satisfied. Then there is a natural map $H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B_0) \rightarrow H_{Pin(2)}^*(B_0)$ which makes $H_{Pin(2)}^*(B_0)$ into a $H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B_0)$ module, and with respect to this module structure we have an isomorphism $H_{Pin(2)}^*(B_0) \cong H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B_0)[q]/(u^3)$.*

Proof. First of all, Lemma 4.5 gives an isomorphism $H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B_0) \cong H^*(B_0)[u]$. Next since $S^1 \subset Pin(2)$ acts trivially on B_0 , we see that the Borel model $(B_0)_{Pin(2)}$ is given by

$$(B_0)_{Pin(2)} = (B_0 \times EPin(2))/Pin(2) \cong (B_0 \times EPin(2)/S^1)/\mathbb{Z}_2.$$

Then since $EPin(2)/S^1 \cong BS^1$, we get a fibration $BS^1 \rightarrow (B_0)_{Pin(2)} \rightarrow (B_0)_{\mathbb{Z}_2}$. In particular, this makes $H_{Pin(2)}^*(B_0)$ into a $H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B_0)$ -module. Furthermore the associated Leray–Serre spectral sequence has $E_2 \cong H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B_0)[x] \cong H^*(B_0)[u, x]$, where $\deg(x) = 2$. By condition (2), there exists a fixed point $b \in B_0$. Since x has even degree, the spectral sequence has no differentials for even r and so $E_2 \cong E_3$. Restricting the fibration $(B_0)_{Pin(2)} \rightarrow (B_0)_{\mathbb{Z}_2}$ to $\{b\} \subseteq B_0$, we see that $d_3(x) = u^3 + \dots$, where $\dots$ denotes terms involving lower powers of u . But we also know that $u^3 = 0$ and since there are no other differentials mapping to $E_r^{3,0}$, the only way this can happen is if there are no lower powers of u in $d_3(x)$. So $d_3(x) = u^3$. It follows that $E_5 \cong H^*(B_0)[u, q]/(u^3) \cong H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B_0)[q]/(u^3)$, where $q = x^2$. There can be no further differentials since q can be identified with the pullback of $q \in H_{Pin(2)}^4(pt)$. $\square$

Suppose B_0 satisfies conditions (2) and (4). Let $E \rightarrow B_0$ be any complex vector bundle on B_0 and suppose there is an antilinear lift of j_0 to E squaring to -1 . This makes E into a $Pin(2)$ -equivariant vector bundle. Suppose E has complex rank a . The fibre of E over a fixed point of j_0 has a quaternionic structure, so a is even. Using Lemma 4.6, it follows that $e_{Pin(2)}(E)$ can be uniquely expressed in the form

$$e_{Pin(2)}(E) = \alpha_0(E)q^{a/2} + \alpha_1(E)q^{a/2-1} + \cdots + \alpha_{a/2}(E),$$

where $\alpha_j(E) \in H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^{4j}(B_0)/(u^3)$. Consider the restriction to $S^1 \subset Pin(2)$. Since S^1 acts trivially on B_0 , we have $H_{S^1}^*(B_0) \cong H^*(B_0)[x]$, where $\deg(x) = 2$. Under the forgetful map $H_{Pin(2)}^*(B_0) \rightarrow H_{S^1}^*(B_0)$, u is sent to zero and q is sent to x^2 . On the other hand, we have

$$e_{S^1}(E) = x^a + c_1(E)x^{a-1} + \cdots + c_a(E).$$

This implies that the image of $\alpha_j(E)$ under the map $H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B_0)/(u^3) \rightarrow H^*(B_0)$ is $c_{2j}(E)$. It also implies that the odd Chern classes of E are zero mod 2. Because of this, we will denote $\alpha_j(E)$ by $c_{2j, \mathbb{Z}_2}(E)$ and refer to them as the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -equivariant Chern classes of E . Note that this terminology is somewhat inaccurate. Since the lift of j_0 to E squares to -1 , we do not have a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -action on E and so we do not have $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -equivariant Chern classes in the usual sense. Note also that we have only defined the classes $c_{2j, \mathbb{Z}_2}(E)$ in cohomology with $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -coefficients.

Having defined the classes $c_{2j, \mathbb{Z}_2}(E)$, one can also define equivariant Segre classes $s_{2j, \mathbb{Z}_2}(E) \in H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B_0)/(u^3)$, characterised by the relation $c_{\mathbb{Z}_2}(E)s_{\mathbb{Z}_2}(E) = 1$, where $c_{\mathbb{Z}_2}(E) = 1 + c_{2, \mathbb{Z}_2}(E) + \cdots$ and $s_{\mathbb{Z}_2}(E) = 1 + s_{2, \mathbb{Z}_2}(E) + \cdots$ are the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -equivariant total Chern and total Segre classes. These classes are stable and so we can also define the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -equivariant Chern and Segre classes of a virtual bundle $E_1 - E_2$, where E_1, E_2 are complex vector bundles on B_0 both admitting an antilinear lift of j_0 squaring to -1 .

Suppose now that assumptions (1)-(4) hold. Then by the above discussion, $e_{Pin(2)}(V_i)$ has the form

$$e_{Pin(2)}(V_i) = \sum_{j=0}^{a_i/2} q^{a_i/2-j} c_{2j, \mathbb{Z}_2}(V_i)$$

and similarly for $e_{Pin(2)}(V'_i)$. Since $p_1^*(q) = q_1$ and $\psi_2(q_1) = q + \mu$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_2(e_G(V_1)) &= \sum_{j=0}^{a_1/2} (q + \mu)^{a_1/2-j} c_{2j, \mathbb{Z}_2}(V_1) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{a_1/2} \sum_{l=0}^{a_1/2-j} \binom{a_1/2-j}{l} \mu^{a_1/2-j-l} q^l c_{2j, \mathbb{Z}_2}(V) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{a_1/2} \mu^{a_1/2-k} \sum_{j=0}^k q^{k-j} c_{2j, \mathbb{Z}_2}(V) \binom{a_1/2-j}{k-j}. \end{aligned}$$

Similar expressions hold for $e_{Pin(2)}(V'_i)$. From this it follows that

$$\psi_2(e_G(D_1))^{-1} = \sum_{k \geq 0} \mu^{-d_1/2-k} \sum_{j=0}^k q^{k-j} s_{2j, \mathbb{Z}_2}(D_1) \binom{-d_1/2-j}{k-j}$$

and similarly

$$\psi_1(e_G(D_2))^{-1} = \sum_{k \geq 0} \mu^{-d_2/2-k} \sum_{j=0}^k q^{k-j} s_{2j, \mathbb{Z}_2}(D_2) \binom{-d_2/2-j}{k-j}.$$

Although these expressions appear to be infinite sums, they should really be regarded as elements of $H_{Pin(2)}^*(F_i)[y, y^{-1}]$. But $Pin(2)$ acts freely on F_i , so only finitely many terms are non-zero when pulled back to F_i .

5. SEIBERG–WITTEN INVARIANTS FOR SPIN STRUCTURES

In this section we will use the product formula to compute $SW_{X, \mathfrak{s}}^{Pin(2)}$ for any compact, oriented, smooth 4-manifold and any spin-structure $\mathfrak{s}$. The connected sum formula for the Bauer–Furuta invariant [8] says that the Seiberg–Witten monopole map $f_{X \# Y}$ for a connected sum $X \# Y$ is the external smash product of the monopole maps f_X, f_Y for X and Y . In other words $f_{X \# Y}$ is obtained by pulling back f_X and f_Y to the product $Pic^{\mathfrak{s}_X}(X) \times Pic^{\mathfrak{s}_Y}(Y)$ and then taking the fibrewise smash product.

To simplify notation we will often omit mention of the spin structures $\mathfrak{s}_X, \mathfrak{s}_Y$. Write $\widehat{f}_X$ for the pullback of f_X to $B_X = Pic^{\mathfrak{s}_X}(X) \times S(H^+(X))$ and similarly define $\widehat{f}_Y$ and $\widehat{f}_{X \# Y}$. Let $\phi = (\phi_1, \phi_2) : B_{X \# Y} \rightarrow S(H^+(X) \oplus H^+(Y))$ be the tautological chamber for $X \# Y$. The zero loci $Z_1, Z_2 \subset B_{X \# Y}$ are $Z_1 = Pic^{\mathfrak{s}_X}(X) \times B_Y$ and $Z_2 = B_X \times Pic^{\mathfrak{s}_Y}(Y)$, moreover $\phi_1|_{Z_2}$ is the tautological chamber for X (pulled back under the projection $Z_2 \rightarrow B_X$) and $\phi_2|_{Z_1}$ is the tautological chamber for Y (pulled back under $Z_1 \rightarrow B_Y$).

Let $j_i : Z_i \rightarrow B_{X \# Y}$ be the inclusions. Recall by Proposition 3.1 that we have isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B_X) &\cong H^*(Pic^{\mathfrak{s}_X}(X))[u]/(u^{b_+(X)}) \\ H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B_Y) &\cong H^*(Pic^{\mathfrak{s}_Y}(Y))[u]/(u^{b_+(Y)}) \\ H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B_{X \# Y}) &\cong H^*(Pic^{\mathfrak{s}_X}(X) \times Pic^{\mathfrak{s}_Y}(Y))[u]/(u^{b_+(X)+b_+(Y)}). \end{aligned}$$

By a similar argument, we have isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(Z_1) &\cong H^*(Pic^{\mathfrak{s}_X}(X) \times Pic^{\mathfrak{s}_Y}(Y))[u]/(u^{b_+(Y)}) \\ H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(Z_2) &\cong H^*(Pic^{\mathfrak{s}_X}(X) \times Pic^{\mathfrak{s}_Y}(Y))[u]/(u^{b_+(X)}). \end{aligned}$$

It is straightforward to see that the push-forward map

$$(j_1)_* : H^*(Pic^{\mathfrak{s}_X}(X) \times Pic^{\mathfrak{s}_Y}(Y))[u]/(u^{b_+(Y)}) \rightarrow H^*(Pic^{\mathfrak{s}_X}(X) \times Pic^{\mathfrak{s}_Y}(Y))[u]/(u^{b_+(X)+b_+(Y)})$$

is multiplication by $u^{b_+(X)}$ and similarly $(j_2)_*$ is multiplication by $u^{b_+(Y)}$. Therefore, Theorem 4.4 takes the form:

$$\begin{aligned} SW_{X \# Y}^G(\theta) &= u^{b_+(X)} \left(id \otimes SW_Y^{Pin(2)} \right) (\psi_2(e_G(D_X)^{-1}\theta)) \\ &\quad + u^{b_+(Y)} \left(id \otimes SW_X^{Pin(2)} \right) (\psi_1(e_G(D_Y)^{-1}\theta)). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5.1. *Let X be a compact, oriented, smooth 4-manifold with $b_1(X) = 0$ and let $\mathfrak{s}$ be a spin structure on X . Then $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}^{Pin(2)}(q^j) = 0$ unless $j = -\sigma(X)/16 - 1$. In particular, $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}^{Pin(2)} = 0$ unless $\sigma(X) < 0$.*

Proof. Observe that $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}^{Pin(2)}(q^j) \in H^*(\mathbb{RP}^{b_+(X)-1}) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2[u]/(u^{b_+(X)})$ has degree $4j + \sigma(X)/4 + b_+(X) + 1$. Furthermore, since $u^3 = 0$ in $H_{Pin(2)}^*(pt)$, we have $u^3 SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}^{Pin(2)}(q^j) = SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}^{Pin(2)}(u^3 q^j) = 0$. Hence $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}^{Pin(2)}(q^j)$ is zero unless $b_+(X) - 3 \leq 4j + \sigma(X)/4 + b_+(X) + 1 \leq b_+(X) - 1$. The only value of j satisfying this is $j = -\sigma(X)/16 - 1$. $\square$

For $m \geq 1$, let $mK3$ denote the connected sum of m copies of the $K3$ surface. This has a unique spin structure $\mathfrak{s}$ and so we will write $SW_{mK3}^{Pin(2)}$ for $SW_{mK3,\mathfrak{s}}^{Pin(2)}$.

Lemma 5.2. *For any $m \geq 1$, we have*

$$SW_{mK3}^{Pin(2)}(q^j) = \begin{cases} u^{3m-3} & j = m - 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. By Lemma 5.1, $SW_{mK3}^{Pin(2)}(q^j)$ is zero unless $j = m - 1$. So it remains to compute $SW_{mK3}^{Pin(2)}(q^{m-1})$ for each $m \geq 1$. We will prove the result by induction. In the case $m = 1$, $SW_{K3}^{Pin(2)}(1)$ has degree zero and by Lemma 3.3, $SW_{K3}^{Pin(2)}(1) = SW_{K3}(1)$ is the ordinary mod 2 Seiberg–Witten invariant of $K3$, which is 1.

Now assume $SW_{mK3}^{Pin(2)}(q^{m-1}) = 1$ for some $m \geq 1$. Writing $(m+1)K3 = K3 \# mK3$, we can apply Theorem 4.4. We have

$$\psi_1(e_G(D_1)^{-1}) = (\mu + q)^{-1}, \quad \psi_2(e_G(D_2)^{-1}) = (\mu + q)^{-m}.$$

Then, taking $\theta = q_1^m$, we find

$$SW_{K3 \# mK3}^G(q_1^m) = u^3 SW_{mK3}^{Pin(2)}((\mu + q)^{m-1}) + u^{3m} SW_{K3}^{Pin(2)}((\mu + q)^{-m} q^m).$$

Since $(\mu + q)^{-m} q^m$ is a multiple of q , the second term drops out. Expanding $(\mu + q)^{m-1}$ and using the inductive hypothesis then gives

$$SW_{K3 \# mK3}^G(q_1^m) = u^{3m}.$$

Lastly, the forgetful map $H_G^*(pt) \rightarrow H_{Pin(2)}^*(pt)$ sends q_1 to q and hence $SW_{(m+1)K3}^{Pin(2)}(q^m) = u^{3m}$, which completes the inductive step. $\square$

Theorem 5.3. *Let X be a compact, oriented, smooth 4-manifold with $b_+(X) > 0$ and let $\mathfrak{s}$ be a spin-structure on X . If $b_+(X) \geq 3$, then*

$$SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}^{Pin(2)}(q^j) = u^{b_+(X)-3} s_{2(j+1+\sigma(X)/16), \mathbb{Z}_2}(D)$$

where we set $s_{l, \mathbb{Z}_2}(D) = 0$ if $l < 0$.

If $b_+(X) < 3$, then $s_{2k, \mathbb{Z}_2}(D)$ is divisible by $u^{3-b_+(X)}$ for all $k > 0$ and

$$SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}^{Pin(2)}(q^j) = u^{b_+(X)-3} s_{2(j+1), \mathbb{Z}_2}(D).$$

Proof. Choose an $m > 0$ such that $16m \geq 4b_1(X) - \sigma(X)$. Let $M = X \# 22m(S^2 \times S^2)$ and let $\mathfrak{s}_M = (\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{s}_0)$, where $\mathfrak{s}_0$ is the unique spin-structure on $22m(S^2 \times S^2)$. We will compute $SW_{M, \mathfrak{s}_M}^{Pin(2)}$ in two different ways. First note that $SW_{M, \mathfrak{s}_M}^{Pin(2)}$ takes values in $H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(Pic^s(X) \times S^{b_+(X)+22m-1}) \cong H^*(Pic^s(X))[u]/(u^{b_+(X)+22m})$, by Proposition 3.1.

We write M as the connected sum $M = X \# 22(S^2 \times S^2)$ and apply Theorem 4.4. By Lemma 5.1, $SW_{22(S^2 \times S^2), \mathfrak{s}_0}^{Pin(2)}(q^j) = 0$ for all j and hence

$$SW_{X \# 22(S^2 \times S^2), \mathfrak{s} \# \mathfrak{s}_0}^G(q_1^j) = u^{22m} SW_{X, \mathfrak{s}}(q^j).$$

Restricting to $Pin(2) \subset G$, this reduces to

$$(5.1) \quad SW_{M, \mathfrak{s}_M}^{Pin(2)}(q^j) = u^{22m} SW_{X, \mathfrak{s}}(q^j).$$

Next, we recall that $22(S^2 \times S^2)$ is diffeomorphic to $K3 \# \overline{K3}$ [20]. Hence we can write $M = (X \# m\overline{K3}) \# mK3 = M_1 \# mK3$, where $M_1 = X \# m\overline{K3}$ and apply the product formula to this decomposition of M . Write $\mathfrak{s}_1$ for the spin-structure on M_1 which is the connected sum of $\mathfrak{s}$ with the unique spin-structure on $\overline{K3}$ and write $\mathfrak{s}_2$ for the unique spin-structure on $mK3$.

We claim that $SW_{M_1, \mathfrak{s}_1}^{Pin(2)}(q^j) = 0$ for all $j \geq 0$. In fact, $SW_{M_1, \mathfrak{s}_1}^{Pin(2)}(q^j) \in H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(Pic^s(X) \times S^{19m+b_+(X)-1})$ has degree

$$\begin{aligned} 4j + (\sigma(X) + 16m)/4 + 19m + b_+(X) + 1 \\ \geq \sigma(X)/4 + 4m + 19m + b_+(X) + 1 \\ \geq b_1(X) + 19m + b_+(X) + 1, \end{aligned}$$

by the assumption that $16m \geq 4b_1(X) - \sigma(X)$. But $H^*(Pic^s(X) \times S^{19m+b_+(X)-1})$ is non-zero only in degree at most $b_1(X) + 19m + b_+(X) - 1$, which proves the claim. Hence Theorem 4.4 gives:

$$SW_{M_1 \# mK3, \mathfrak{s}_1 \# \mathfrak{s}_2}^G(q_2^j) = u^{19m+b_+(X)} SW_{mK3}(\psi_2(e_G(D_{M_1})^{-1} q_2^j)).$$

Next, using $D_{M_1} = D_X - \mathbb{C}^{2m}$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_2(e_G(D_{M_1})^{-1} q_2^j) &= \sum_{k \geq 0} \mu^{m-d_X/2-k} \sum_{l=0}^k q^l s_{2(k-l), \mathbb{Z}_2}(D_{M_1}) \binom{m-d_X/2-k+l}{l} q^j \\ &= \sum_{k \geq 0} \mu^{m-d_X/2-k} \sum_{l=0}^k q^l s_{2(k-l), \mathbb{Z}_2}(D_X) \binom{m-d_X/2-k+l}{l} q^j \\ &= \sum_{k \geq 0} \mu^{m-d_X/2-k} \sum_{l=0}^k q^{j+l} s_{2(k-l), \mathbb{Z}_2}(D_X) \binom{m-d_X/2-k+l}{l} \end{aligned}$$

where $d_X = -\sigma(X)/8$. Hence by Lemma 5.2, and assuming m is chosen large enough that $j \leq m-1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} SW_{M_1 \# mK3, \mathfrak{s}_1 \# \mathfrak{s}_2}^G(q_2^j) \\ = u^{22m+b_+(X)-3} \sum_{k \geq m-j-1} \mu^{-d_X/2-k+m} s_{2(k+j-m+1), \mathbb{Z}_2}(D_X) \binom{2m-d_X/2-k-j-1}{m-j-1}. \end{aligned}$$

This is a Laurent polynomial in μ . Note that negative powers of μ can be written in terms of negative powers of y . In fact, from $\mu^2 = y^4$ one sees that $\mu^{-2r} = y^{-4r}$ and $\mu^{-2r-1} = y^{-4r-2} + y^{-4r-3}u^2$. Similarly positive powers of μ can be written in terms of positive powers of y . Since the left hand side of this equation is a polynomial in y , the terms with negative powers of μ must actually be zero. In any case, upon restricting to $Pin(2) \subset G$, only the μ^0 -coefficient survives, giving

$$(5.2) \quad SW_{M, \mathfrak{s}_M}^{Pin(2)}(q^j) = u^{22m+b_+(X)-3} s_{2(-d_X/2+j+1), \mathbb{Z}_2}(D_X),$$

where we set $s_l(D_X) = 0$ if $l < 0$. Equating (5.1) and (5.2) gives

$$u^{22m} SW_{X, \mathfrak{s}}(q^j) = u^{22m+b_+(X)-3} s_{2(-d_X/2+j+1), \mathbb{Z}_2}(D_X).$$

This is an equality in $H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(Pic^s(X) \times S^{22m+b_+(X)-1}) \cong H^*(Pic^s(X))[u]/(u^{22m+b_+(X)})$. The left hand side is divisible by u^{22m} , so the right hand side must also be. Hence if $b_+(X) < 3$, then $s_{2(-d_X/2+j+1), \mathbb{Z}_2}(D_X)$ is divisible by $u^{3-b_+(X)}$. Cancelling a common factor of u^{22m} gives

$$SW_{X, \mathfrak{s}}(q^j) = u^{b_+(X)-3} s_{2(-d_X/2+j+1), \mathbb{Z}_2}(D_X)$$

which holds in $H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(Pic^s(X) \times S^{b_+(X)-1}) \cong H^*(Pic^s(X))[u]/(u^{b_+(X)})$. Finally, note that if $b_+(X) < 3$ then $\sigma(X) = 0$ by the 10/8-inequality, so in this case $SW_{X, \mathfrak{s}}(q^j) = u^{b_+(X)-3} s_{2(j+1), \mathbb{Z}_2}(D_X)$. $\square$

Remark 5.4. Note that in the above proof, we do not really need to know that $K3\#\overline{K3} \cong 22(S^2 \times S^2)$, since the only property of $K3\#\overline{K3}$ we use is that it has the same Betti numbers and signature as $22(S^2 \times S^2)$.

Theorem 5.5. *Let X be a compact, oriented, smooth 4-manifold with $b_+(X) = 3$ and let $\mathfrak{s}$ be a spin structure with corresponding index bundle $D \rightarrow Pic^s(X)$. Then $s_{2j}(D) = 0 \pmod{2}$ for all $j > 1 + \sigma(X)/16$.*

Proof. We will make use of the mod 2 Seiberg–Witten invariants $SW_{X, \mathfrak{s}}(x^m) \in H^*(Pic^s(X) \mathbb{Z}_2)$. According to [5, Theorem 4.10], the second Steenrod square $Sq^2(SW_{X, \mathfrak{s}}(x^m))$ is given by

$$Sq^2(SW_{X, \mathfrak{s}}(x^m)) = (-\sigma(X)/8 + m)SW_{X, \mathfrak{s}}(x^{m+1}) + (s_1(D) + w_2(H^+(X)))SW_{X, \mathfrak{s}}(x^m).$$

This formula can be greatly simplified. First, since $Pic^s(X)$ is a torus, the Steenrod squares are trivial and the left hand side is zero. Second since X is spin, $\sigma(X)/8$ is even and $s_1(D) = 0$. Third, $H^+(X) \rightarrow Pic^s(X)$ is a trivial bundle, so $w_2(H^+(X)) = 0$. So we are left with $mSW_{X, \mathfrak{s}}(x^{m+1}) = 0$ for all $m \geq 0$. Taking $m = 2k - 1$, we see that $SW_{X, \mathfrak{s}}(x^{2k}) = 0$ for all $k > 0$.

Now since $b_+(X) = 3$, Lemma 3.3 and Theorem 5.3 give

$$0 = SW_{X, \mathfrak{s}}(x^{2k}) = SW_{X, \mathfrak{s}}^{Pin(2)}(q^k)|_{u=0} = s_{2(k+1+\sigma(X)/16)}(D)$$

for all $k > 0$. Hence $s_{2j}(D) = 0 \pmod{2}$ for all $j > 1 + \sigma(X)/16$. $\square$

5.1. **Case $b_+(X) \geq 3$.** Combined with Lemma 3.3, Theorems 5.3 and 5.5 yield a complete calculation of the mod 2 Seiberg–Witten invariant for spin-structures with $b_+(X) \geq 3$:

Theorem 5.6. *Let X be a compact, oriented, smooth 4-manifold with $b_+(X) \geq 3$ and let $\mathfrak{s}$ be a spin-structure on X . If $b_+(X) \neq 3$, then $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}(x^j) = 0$ for all $j \geq 0$. If $b_+(X) = 3$, then $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}(x^j) = 0$ for all $j > 0$ and*

$$SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}(1) = s_{2(1+\sigma(X)/16)}(D).$$

Remark 5.7. If $b_+(X) = 3$ and X is spin, then $\sigma(X) = 0$ or -16 by the 10/8-inequality. In the case $\sigma(X) = -16$, we get $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}(1) = s_0(D) = 1$ and in the case $\sigma(X) = 0$, we get $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}(1) = s_2(D) = c_2(D) \in H^4(Pin^s(X); \mathbb{Z}_2)$. When $\sigma(X) = 0$, our result is a generalisation of a result of Morgan–Szabó [27], who proved the $b_1(X) = 0$ case. When $\sigma(X) = -16$, our result is a generalisation of a result of Ruberman–Strle [32], who proved the $b_1(X) = 4$ case.

Theorems 5.6 and 5.3 give $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}$ and $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}^{Pin(2)}$ in terms of Segre classes of the index bundle $D \rightarrow Pic^s(X)$. These can be computed using the families index theorem, as we will now show.

Let $T_X = H^1(X; \mathbb{R})/H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})$ be the moduli space of flat unitary line bundles on X . Over $X \times T_X$ we have a universal line bundle with connection $L_X \rightarrow X \times T_X$ with the property that its restriction to $X \times p$ is the flat line bundle corresponding to $p \in T_X$. Let $\Omega \in H^2(X \times T_X; \mathbb{Z})$ be the first Chern class of L_X . We have that $\Omega = \sum_i x_i \smile y_i$, where $\{y_i\}$ is a basis of $H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})$ and $\{x_i\}$ is the corresponding dual basis of $H^1(T_X; \mathbb{Z}) \cong Hom(H^1(X; \mathbb{Z}), \mathbb{Z})$.

The spin connection gives an identification $Pic^s(X) \cong T_X$. Then the families index theorem gives:

$$Ch(D) = \int_X e^\Omega \wedge \left(1 - \frac{\sigma(X)}{8} vol_X\right),$$

where $\int_X$ means integration over the fibres of $X \times T_X \rightarrow T_X$ and vol_X is a 4-form on X such that $\int_X vol_X = 1$. Since each term in Ω has degree 1 in X , we have that $\Omega^5 = 0$ and that $\int_X \Omega^n \wedge vol_X = 0$ for any $n > 0$. It follows that

$$Ch(D) = -\frac{\sigma(X)}{8} + \frac{1}{24} \int_X \Omega^4.$$

For any subset $I \subset \{1, \dots, b_1(X)\}$ of size 4, let $c_I = \langle y_{i_1} y_{i_2} y_{i_3} y_{i_4}, [X] \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}$ where $I = \{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4\}$ ordered so that $i_1 < i_2 < i_3 < i_4$. Also set $x_I = x_{i_1} x_{i_2} x_{i_3} x_{i_4}$. Then we have

$$\frac{1}{24} \int_X \Omega^4 = \sum_{|I|=4} c_I x_I \in H^4(T_X; \mathbb{Z}).$$

Let $s = (1/24) \int_X \Omega^4$ and $d = -\sigma(X)/8$. Then $Ch(D) = d + s$. If we write $Ch(D) = \sum_{i \geq 0} Ch_i(D)$, where $Ch_i(D)$ has degree $2i$, then $Ch_0(D) = d$, $Ch_2(D) = s$ and all other terms are zero. Since $Ch_1(D) = c_1(D)$ and $Ch_2(D) = (c_1(D)^2 - 2c_2(D))/2 = -c_2(D)$, we see that $c_1(D) = 0$ and $s = Ch_2(D) = s_2(D)$ is the second Segre class of D .

Using the splitting principle, one can express the total Segre class of a virtual bundle V in terms of the Chern character as:

$$s(V) = \exp \left(\sum_{n \geq 1} (-1)^n (n-1)! Ch_n(V) \right).$$

Therefore, in the case $V = D$, we have $s(D) = e^{s_2(D)}$. Thus $s_j(D) = 0$ for odd j and

$$s_{2j}(D) = \frac{1}{j!} s_2(D)^j,$$

where, as shown above, $s_2(D)$ is given by

$$(5.3) \quad s_2(D) = \sum_{|I|=4} c_I x_I \in H^4(T_X; \mathbb{Z}).$$

Choose an arbitrary ordering of subsets of $\{1, \dots, b_1(X)\}$ of size 4. Then it follows that $s_{2j}(D)$ can be written as

$$s_{2j}(D) = \sum_{I_1 < \dots < I_j} c_{I_1} \cdots c_{I_j} x_{I_1} \cdots x_{I_j}.$$

Using the above formula, Theorem 5.6 gives a complete description of the mod 2 Seiberg–Witten invariant of any spin structure, depending only on $b_+(X)$, $\sigma(X)$ and the 4-fold cup products $\langle y_1 y_2 y_3 y_4, [X] \rangle$, $y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4 \in H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})$.

We note here a consequence of Theorem 5.5 that is of independent interest:

Theorem 5.8. *Let X be a compact, oriented, smooth spin 4-manifold with $b_+(X) = 3$ and $\sigma(X) = -16$. Then $\langle y_1 y_2 y_3 y_4, [X] \rangle$ is even for any $y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4 \in H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})$.*

Proof. Theorem 5.5 implies that $s_2(D) = 0 \pmod{2}$, which by Equation (5.3) implies that all 4-fold cup products $\langle y_1 y_2 y_3 y_4, [X] \rangle$ are even. $\square$

This result actually follows from a theorem of Furuta–Kametani [18, Theorem 5], proved by different means. See also [29, Theorem 4] for a related result.

Corollary 5.9. *Let M_{E_8} denote the compact, simply-connected topological 4-manifold with intersection form the negative definite E_8 lattice. Then $T^4 \# 2M_{E_8} \# n(S^1 \times S^3)$ does not admit a smooth structure for any $n \geq 0$.*

Proof. Suppose that $X = T^4 \# 2M_{E_8} \# n(S^1 \times S^3)$ admits a smooth structure. Since $H^2(X; \mathbb{Z})$ has no 2-torsion, the map $\mathfrak{s} \rightarrow c(\mathfrak{s})$ sending a spin^c -structure to its characteristic is a bijection. But the intersection form on $H^2(X; \mathbb{Z})$ is even, so X is spin. We also have that $\langle y_1 y_2 y_3 y_4, [X] \rangle = \pm 1$ for a basis y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4 of $H^1(T^4; \mathbb{Z}) \subseteq H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})$. But this contradicts Theorem 5.8. $\square$

5.2. Case $b_+(X) = 1$ or 2. We now address the case that $b_+(X) = 1$ or 2. By the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 5.5, we have that $SW_{X, \mathfrak{s}}(x^m) = 0 \pmod{2}$ for any $m > 0$, so we are reduced to the case $m = 0$. Since X is spin and $b_+(X) < 3$, we have that $\sigma(X) = 0$ and it follows that $SW_{X, \mathfrak{s}}(1) \in H^{b_1(X)+1}(Pic^5(X))$. Furthermore, Theorem 5.3 implies that $s_{2, \mathbb{Z}_2}(D)$ is divisible by $u^{3-b_+(X)}$ and that

$$(5.4) \quad SW_{X, \mathfrak{s}}(1) = u^{b_+(X)-3} s_{2, \mathbb{Z}_2}(D)|_{u=0}$$

where $a \mapsto a|_{u=0}$ denotes the map $H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(Pic^s(X))[u]/(u^3) \rightarrow H^*(Pic^s(X))$ given by setting u to zero. In order to evaluate $SW_{X,s}(1)$ we therefore need to understand the class $s_{2,\mathbb{Z}_2}(D)$ in more detail. For this purpose it will be convenient to make use of Real and Quaternionic K -theory as in [1, 13].

A *Real structure* on a topological space X is a continuous involution $j : X \rightarrow X$. A *Real vector bundle* on X is a complex vector bundle $E \rightarrow X$ together with a lift of j to an antilinear involution on E . Similarly a *Quaternionic vector bundle* on X is a complex vector bundle $E \rightarrow X$ together with a lift of j to an antilinear map $j : E \rightarrow E$ such that $j^2 = -1$. To a Real space one can define the Real and Quaternionic K -theories $KR^*(X), KH^*(X)$ with the property that $KR^0(X), KH^0(X)$ are the Grothendieck groups of Real and Quaternionic bundles. One also has canonical isomorphisms $KH^j(X) \cong KR^{j+4}(X)$.

Let V be an n -dimensional real vector space and $\Lambda \subset V$ a lattice. Let $T^n = V/\Lambda$ be the corresponding n -dimensional torus. Let T_-^n denote T^n equipped with the Real structure $j : T^n \rightarrow T^n$ given by $j(x) = -x$. Recall that we have defined the equivariant Segre and Chern classes $s_{2j,\mathbb{Z}}(D), c_{2j,\mathbb{Z}}(D) \in H^*(T_-^n)[u]/(u^3)$ associated to any Quaternionic virtual vector bundle on T_-^n . Since these classes depend only on the class of D in $KH(T_-^n)$, the total equivariant Segre class defines a map

$$s_{\mathbb{Z}_2} : KH(T_-^n) \rightarrow H^*(T_-^n)[u]/(u^3)$$

satisfying $s_{\mathbb{Z}_2}(E \oplus F) = s_{\mathbb{Z}_2}(E)s_{\mathbb{Z}_2}(F)$. In particular, it follows that the second equivariant Segre class is an additive homomorphism

$$s_{2,\mathbb{Z}_2} : KH(T_-^n) \rightarrow H^4(T_-^n)[u]/(u^3).$$

Recall that $s_{2,\mathbb{Z}_2}|_{u=0} = s_2$ is the ordinary Segre class. Then we can write

$$s_{2,\mathbb{Z}_2}(E) = s_2(E) + ut_2(E) + u^2r_2(E)$$

for some $t_2(E) \in H^3(T^n)$, $r_2(E) \in H^2(T^n)$. So we have homomorphisms

$$t_2 : KH(T_-^n) \rightarrow H^3(T^n), \quad r_2 : KH(T_-^n) \rightarrow H^2(T^n).$$

It then follows from Equation (5.4) that the Seiberg–Witten invariants in the case $b_+(X) = 1, 2$ are given by:

$$(5.5) \quad SW_{X,s}(1) = \begin{cases} r_2(D) & \text{if } b_+(X) = 1, \\ t_2(D) & \text{if } b_+(X) = 2, \end{cases}$$

where $D \in KH(Pic^s(X))$ is the families index of the Dirac operator equipped with its Quaternionic structure.

Since a degree k cohomology class $a \in H^k(T^n)$ of an n -torus is determined by its restriction to k -dimensional subtori, to compute $r_2(D), t_2(D)$, it suffices to compute their restriction to 2- or 3-dimensional subtori of $Pic^s(X)$. Now one can easily show that

$$KH(T_-^2) \cong \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2$$

where the $\mathbb{Z}$ -summand is generated by the trivial Quaternionic bundle $\mathbb{H}$. Since $s_{2,\mathbb{Z}_2}(\mathbb{H}) = 0$, it follows that the homomorphism $r_2 : KH(T_-^2) \rightarrow H^2(T^2) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$ is either identically zero, or is the projection to the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ summand. We claim that r_2 is not identically zero. To see this, it suffices to find a compact, oriented, spin 4-manifold $(X, \mathfrak{s})$ with $b_+(X) = 1$, $b_1(X) = 2$ and $SW_{X,s}(1) \neq 0 \pmod{2}$. For this we can take X to be a hyperelliptic surface of the form $T/\mathbb{Z}_6$ as in Example 1.2. We

will show that X has a non-trivial mod 2 Seiberg–Witten invariant for some spin structure without appealing to Theorem 1.1. In fact, since X is a Kähler manifold with $c_1(X) = 0$, the canonical spin^c -structure $\mathfrak{s}$ comes from a spin structure and $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}(1) \neq 0 \pmod{2}$ (for both chambers).

In the case $n = 3$, we have

$$(5.6) \quad KH(T_-^3) \cong \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2^3 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2.$$

The subgroup of $KH(T_-^3)$ given by the first and second summand in (5.6) is also the subgroup generated by pullbacks of projections $T_-^3 \rightarrow T_-^2$ to 2-dimensional quotients of T^3 . Since $t_2 : KH(T_-^3) \rightarrow H^3(T^3) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$ takes values in $H^3(T^3)$ and since t_2 commutes with pullbacks, it is clear that t_2 must vanish on the first two summands of (5.6). Therefore, t_2 is either identically zero or is given by projection to the third summand. To show that t_2 is not identically zero, it suffices to find a compact, oriented, spin 4-manifold $(X, \mathfrak{s})$ with $b_+(X) = 2$, $b_1(X) = 3$ and $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}(1) \neq 0 \pmod{2}$. As in Example 1.2, we can take X to be a primary Kodaira surface diffeomorphic to the product $S^1 \times Y$ where Y is the total space of a degree 1 circle bundle $Y \rightarrow C$ over an elliptic curve. Recall that X has a nowhere vanishing holomorphic 2-form Ω . Then $\omega = \text{Re}(\Omega)$ is a symplectic form on X and the projection $X \rightarrow C$ is a Lagrangian fibration with respect to ω . This implies that first Chern class of a compatible almost complex structure J is trivial and hence the canonical spin^c -structure $\mathfrak{s}$ associated to J comes from a spin structure. Then since X is symplectic, we have $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}(1) \neq 0 \pmod{2}$. This proves that t_2 is not identically zero.

The above calculations completely characterise the homomorphisms r_2, t_2 for any torus T_-^n and thus allow us to compute $SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}(1)$ in terms of the class $D \in KH(\text{Pic}^{\mathfrak{s}}(X))$. Our next task is to describe this class.

Let $A^n = V^*/\Lambda^*$ denote the dual torus of T^n . Equip A^n with the trivial involution. Let $L \rightarrow A^n \times T^n$ denote the Poincaré line bundle. This can be explicitly constructed, as follows [18]. First consider the trivial line bundle $\tilde{L} = V^* \times V \times \mathbb{C}$ on $V^* \times V$. Let $\Lambda^* \times \Lambda$ act on $\tilde{L}$ according to

$$(\mu, \lambda) \cdot (w, v, z) = (w + \mu, v + \lambda, e^{2\pi i \langle \mu, v \rangle} z).$$

The Poincaré line bundle L may be defined as the quotient line bundle $L = \tilde{L}/(\Lambda^* \times \Lambda) \rightarrow A^n \times T^n$. Then L is a Real line bundle with Real structure given by

$$j(w, v, z) = (w, -v, \bar{z}).$$

Fix an orientation on V . This induces orientations on T^n and A^n . Since A^n is a Lie group, it has a translation invariant trivialisation $\mathcal{F}_{A^n} \cong A^n \times SO(n)$ of the oriented frame bundle. This defines a distinguished spin structure whose principal $\text{Spin}(n)$ -bundle is the product $A^n \times \text{Spin}(n)$. We equip A^n with this spin structure. Next, let $p_2 : A^n \times T_-^n \rightarrow T_-^n$ be the projection to T_-^n and $p_1 : A^n \times T_-^n \rightarrow A^n$ the projection to A^n . Define the *Real Fourier–Mukai transform*

$$FM : KO^j(A^n) \rightarrow KR^{j-b_1(X)}(T_-^n)$$

by

$$FM(E) = (p_2)_*(L \otimes (p_1)^*(E)).$$

Let X be a compact, oriented, smooth 4-manifold. Let V be the vector space $V = H^1(X; \mathbb{R})$ and Λ the lattice $\Lambda = H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})$. Recall that the Jacobian torus of X is $T_X = V/\Lambda$. The *Albanese torus* of X is by definition the dual torus:

$$A_X = V^*/\Lambda^* = \text{Hom}(H^1(X; \mathbb{R}), \mathbb{R})/\text{Hom}(H^1(X; \mathbb{Z}), \mathbb{Z}).$$

Define the Albanese map $a : X \rightarrow A_X$ as follows. Choose a basepoint $x_0 \in X$ and choose a $b_1(X)$ -dimensional subspace $\tilde{V} \subset \Omega_{cl}^1(X)$ of closed 1-forms such that the projection to cohomology $\tilde{V} \rightarrow V$ is an isomorphism. Thus every isomorphism class in $H^1(X, \mathbb{R})$ has a unique representative in $\tilde{V}$. For example, we could fix a choice of Riemannian metric g and take $\tilde{V}$ to be the space of g -harmonic 1-forms. For $x \in X$ we define $a(x)$ as follows. Choose a path γ from x_0 to x . Then we obtain an element of $\text{Hom}(H^1(X; \mathbb{R}), \mathbb{R})$ given by $[\lambda] \mapsto \int_{x_0}^x \lambda$, where λ is the unique representative of $[\lambda]$ in $\tilde{V}$. If we choose a different path γ' from x_0 to x , then the difference $\lambda \mapsto \int_{\gamma} \lambda - \int_{\gamma'} \lambda$ is the $\mathbb{R}$ -linear extension of an element of $\text{Hom}(H^1(X; \mathbb{Z}), \mathbb{Z})$. Hence, we get a well-defined element $a(x) \in A_X$. More concretely, if $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_b$ is a basis for $H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})$, then we obtain an isomorphism $A_X \cong \mathbb{R}^b/\mathbb{Z}^b$ under which an element $(l_1, \dots, l_b) \in \mathbb{R}^b/\mathbb{Z}^b$ corresponds to the image in A_X of the homomorphism $H^1(X; \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which sends λ_i to l_i . Under this identification the Albanese map $a : X \rightarrow A_X \cong \mathbb{R}^b/\mathbb{Z}^b$ is given by $a(x) = (\int_{\gamma} \lambda_1, \dots, \int_{\gamma} \lambda_b)$, where γ is any path from x_0 to x . The Albanese map depends on the choice of basepoint x_0 and also on the choice of subspace $\tilde{V}$. Different choices can be smoothly interpolated, hence a is well defined up to homotopy. We abuse notation and speak of “the” Albanese map.

A spin structure $\mathfrak{s}$ on X determines a KO -orientation. As above, we give A_X the distinguished spin structure as a Lie group. Hence both X and A_X are KO -oriented. We define the *Albanese invariant* of $(X, \mathfrak{s})$ to be

$$A(X, \mathfrak{s}) = a_*(1) \in KO^{b_1(X)-4}(A_X) \cong KSp^{b_1(X)}(A_X)$$

where $a_* : KO(X) \rightarrow KO^{b_1(X)-4}(A_X)$ denotes the push-forward map in KO -theory with respect to the given spin structures. Given the spin structure $\mathfrak{s}$ on X we obtain a pushforward map

$$\pi_* : KR(X \times T_X) \rightarrow KR^{-4}(T_X) = KH(T_X)$$

where $\pi : X \times T_X \rightarrow T_X$ is the projection to T_X . The pullback $L_X = (a \times id_{T_X})^*(L)$ of the Poincaré line bundle L under the Albanese map is the universal line bundle on $X \times T_X$ which parametrises flat line bundles on X , as described in Section 5.1. By definition of the index bundle $D \in KH(T_X)$, we have

$$D = \pi_*((a \times id)^*(L)).$$

Proposition 5.10. *We have*

$$D = FM(A(X, \mathfrak{s})).$$

Proof. Observe that $\pi = p_2 \circ (a \times id)$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
 D &= \pi_*((a \times id)^*(L)) \\
 &= (p_2)_*((a \times id)_*((a \times id)^*(L))) \\
 &= (p_2)_*(L \otimes (a \times id)_*(1)) \\
 &= (p_2)_*(L \otimes (p_1)^*(a_*(1))) \\
 &= (p_2)_*(L \otimes (p_1)^*(A(X, \mathfrak{s}))).
 \end{aligned}$$

□

Fix a basis $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{b_1(X)}$ of $\Lambda = H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})$. For any subset $I \subset \{1, \dots, b_1(X)\}$ let $T(I) \subset T_X = V/\Lambda$ be the subtorus corresponding to the subspace $V(I)$ of $V = H^1(X; \mathbb{R})$ spanned by $\{\lambda_i\}_{i \in I}$. Let $\Lambda(I) = \Lambda \cap V(I)$ be the sublattice of Λ spanned by $\{\lambda_i\}_{i \in I}$, so $T(I) = V(I)/\Lambda(I)$. Corresponding to the inclusion $\iota_I : T(I) \rightarrow T_X$ there is a dual projection $\rho_I : A_X \rightarrow A(I)$, where $A(I) = V(I)^*/\Lambda(I)^*$. This is the map of tori induced by the linear map $V^* \rightarrow V(I)^*$ which is adjoint to the inclusion $V(I) \rightarrow V$. Let $FM_I : KO^j(A(I)) \rightarrow KR^{j-|I|}(T(I))$ denote the Real Fourier–Mukai transform for the pair $(A(I), V(I))$. Define the projected Albanese map $a_I : X \rightarrow A(I)$ to be the composition $a_I = \rho_I \circ a$.

Proposition 5.11. *We have a commutative diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 KO^j(A^n) & \xrightarrow{FM} & KR^{j-b_1(X)}(T^n) \\
 \downarrow (\rho_I)_* & & \downarrow \iota_I^* \\
 KO^{j-(b_1(X)-|I|)}(A(I)) & \xrightarrow{FM_I} & KR^{j-b_1(X)}(T(I)).
 \end{array}$$

Moreover, we have $\iota_I^*(D) = FM_I((a_I)_*(1))$.

Proof. Let $J = \{1, \dots, b_1(X)\} \setminus I$ be the complementary subset of $\{1, \dots, b_1(X)\}$. Then $T_X \cong T(I) \times T(J)$ and dually $A_X \cong A(I) \times A(J)$. In the calculations that follow we make use of various projection maps whose domain and codomain is the product of some subset of $\{T(I), T(J), A(I), A(J)\}$. To keep notation simple we set $A_1 = A(I)$, $A_2 = A(J)$, $A_3 = T(I)$, $A_4 = T(J)$ and if $R = \{i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k\}$ we set $A_R = A_{i_1} \times \dots \times A_{i_k}$. If $S \subseteq R$ then we write $\pi_S^R : A_R \rightarrow A_S$ for the projection and $\iota_S^R : A_S \rightarrow A_R$ for the inclusion. Let $L \rightarrow A_{1234}$, $L(I) \rightarrow A_{13}$, $L(J) \rightarrow A_{24}$ be the Poincaré line bundles. Then $L \cong (\pi_{13}^{1234})^*(L(I)) \otimes (\pi_{24}^{1234})^*(L(J))$. Let $a \in KO^*(A_X)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 \iota_I^* FM(x) &= \iota_I^*(\pi_{34}^{1234})_*(L \otimes (\pi_{12}^{1234})^*(a)) \\
 &= (\pi_3^{123})_*(\iota_{1234}^{123})^*(L \otimes (\pi_{12}^{1234})^*(a)) \\
 &= (\pi_3^{123})_*((\pi_{13}^{123})^*(L(I)) \otimes (\pi_2^{123})^*(\iota_{24}^2)^*(L(J)) \otimes (\pi_{12}^{123})^*(a)) \\
 &= (\pi_3^{123})_*((\pi_{13}^{123})^*(L(I)) \otimes (\pi_{12}^{123})^*(a)) \\
 &= (\pi_3^{13})_*(\pi_{13}^{123})_*((\pi_{13}^{123})^*(L(I)) \otimes (\pi_{12}^{123})^*(a)) \\
 &= (\pi_3^{13})_*(L(I) \otimes (\pi_1^{13})^*(\pi_1^{12})^*(a)) \\
 &= FM_I((\pi_1^{12})^*(a)) \\
 &= FM_I((\rho_I)_*(a)).
 \end{aligned}$$

Where we used that $(\iota_{24}^2)^*(L(J)) \cong 1$. This proves commutativity of the diagram. Then since $D = FM(a_*(1))$, it follows that

$$\iota_I^*(D) = \iota_I^*FM(a_*(1)) = FM_I((\rho_I)_*a_*(1)) = FM_I((a_I)_*(1)).$$

□

When $|I| = 2$, we can regard $r_2(\iota_I^*(D)) \in H^2(T(I)) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$ as an element of $\mathbb{Z}_2$. Similarly, when $|I| = 3$, we can regard $t_2(\iota_I^*(D)) \in H^3(T(I)) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$ as an element of $\mathbb{Z}_2$. We then have:

Proposition 5.12. *If $b_+(X) = 1$ and $|I| = 2$, then $r_2(\iota_I^*(D)) = \tau^*((a_I)_*(1))$, where $\tau^* : KO^{-2}(A(I)) \rightarrow KO^{-2}(pt) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$ is the map induced by the inclusion of a point $\tau : pt \rightarrow A(I)$. Similarly, if $b_+(X) = 2$ and $|I| = 3$, then $t_2(\iota_I^*(D)) = \tau^*((a_I)^*(1))$, where $\tau^* : KO^{-1}(A(I)) \rightarrow KO^{-1}(pt) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$ is the map induced by the inclusion of a point $\tau : pt \rightarrow A(I)$.*

Proof. We give the proof for the case $b_+(X) = 1$ and $|I| = 2$. The case $b_+(X) = 2$ and $|I| = 3$ is similar. Recall that for $|I| = 2$, $KH(T(I)) \cong \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2$ and that r_2 is the projection to the second factor. Since the rank of D as a virtual bundle is zero (by the families index theorem and the fact that $\sigma(X) = 0$), it follows that the rank of $D_I = \iota_I^*(D)$ is also zero, and hence D_I lies in the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ summand of $KH(T(I))$. In particular, the image of D_I under the restriction to a point $KH(T(I)) \rightarrow KH(pt) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ is zero. By Proposition 5.10, it follows that $\rho_*((a_I)_*(1)) = 0$, where $\rho_* : KO^{-2}(A(I)) \rightarrow KO^{-4}(pt) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ is the pushforward map to a point. But $KO^{-2}(A(I)) \cong \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2$, where the second summand is the kernel of the pushforward map. This means that $(a_I)_*(1)$ lies in the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ summand of $KO^{-2}(A(I))$.

Next, we observe that the map $\tau^* : KO^{-2}(A(I)) \rightarrow KO^{-2}(pt) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$ is given by projection to the second factor of $KO^{-2}(A(I))$. The composition

$$\mathbb{Z}_2 \rightarrow KO^{-2}(A(I)) \xrightarrow{FM_I} KH(T(I)) \xrightarrow{r_2} \mathbb{Z}_2$$

is either identically zero, or an isomorphism, where the first map is inclusion of the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ summand. To show that it is not identically zero, it suffices to give one example of a compact, oriented, smooth spin 4-manifold $(X, \mathfrak{s})$ for which $SW_{X, \mathfrak{s}}(1) \neq 0 \pmod{2}$. For this we can take X to be the hyperelliptic surface given in Example 1.2. This shows that $r_2 \circ FM_I = \tau^*$ on the subgroup $\mathbb{Z}_2 \subset KO^{-2}(A(I))$ and hence $r_2(D_I) = \tau^*((a_I)_*(1))$. □

Let $\mathfrak{s}$ be a spin structure on X . As in the introduction, we define maps $q_{\mathfrak{s}}^k : H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})^k \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2$, for $k = 2, 3$ as follows. Let $a_1, \dots, a_k \in H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})$. Each class a_i is equivalent to specifying a homotopy class of smooth map $f_i : X \rightarrow S^1$ for which $a_i = f_i^*(dt)$, where dt is the generator of $H^1(S^1; \mathbb{Z})$. Hence we get a map $f = (f_1, \dots, f_k) : X \rightarrow T^k$ from X to the k -dimensional torus. The level set $C = f^{-1}(t)$ of a regular value of f is a normally framed submanifold of X of dimension $4 - k$. The normal framing defines a map $\mathcal{F}_C \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_X|_C$ from the frame bundle of C to the restriction of the frame bundle of X to C . The spin structure $\mathfrak{s}$ on X is equivalent to specifying a double cover $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_X$ which on each fibre of $\mathcal{F}_X$ is isomorphic to the unique non-trivial double covering $Spin(4) \rightarrow SO(4)$. The pullback of the covering $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_X$ to $\mathcal{F}_C$ defines a spin structure on C which

we denote by $\mathfrak{s}|_C$. Then we define $q_s^k(a_1, \dots, a_k)$ to be the mod 2 index of $\mathfrak{s}|_C$. More precisely, the spin structure $\mathfrak{s}|_C$ defines a KO -orientation on C and hence a push-forward map $p_* : KO(C) \rightarrow KO^{k-4}(pt)$. Now since $k-4 \in \{-1, -2\}$, we have that $KO^{k-4}(pt) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$ and $p_*(1)$ is the mod 2 index of the Dirac operator on C [3]. The following proposition shows that q_s^k does not depend on the choice of C and hence is well-defined.

Proposition 5.13. *The mod 2 index of $\mathfrak{s}|_C$ does not depend on the choice of functions $f_1, \dots, f_k$ representing $a_1, \dots, a_k$ or on the choice of regular value t . Hence q_s^k is well-defined for $k = 2, 3$.*

Proof. The map $f : X \rightarrow T^k$ may be composed with the map $(S^1 \times \dots \times S^1) \rightarrow (S^1 \wedge \dots \wedge S^1) \cong S^k$, giving a map $g : X \rightarrow S^k$. The homotopy class of this map only depends on the cohomology classes $a_1, \dots, a_k$. The Pontryagin–Thom construction implies that the homotopy class of map $f : X \rightarrow S^k$ is equivalent a framed cobordism class of submanifold of X codimension k . The level set C of a regular value of f represents this cobordism class. Any two representatives C, C' are framed cobordant. If $\phi : Y \rightarrow [0, 1] \times X$ is a framed cobordism from C to C' , then using the normal framing we get an induced spin structure $\mathfrak{s}|_Y$. Hence C and C' are spin cobordant. This implies that the mod 2 indices of $\mathfrak{s}|_C$ and $\mathfrak{s}|_{C'}$ are the same, since the mod 2 index is a spin cobordism invariant [23, Chapter III, §16]. $\square$

Proof of cases (1) and (2) of Theorem 1.1. Suppose that $b_+(X) = 1$. Then by Equation (5.5), $SW_{X, \mathfrak{s}}(1) = r_2(D)$. To compute $r_2(D) \in H^2(T_X)$, it suffices to compute $\iota_I^* r_2(D) = r_2(\iota_I^*(D))$ for every subset $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, b_1(X)\}$ of size 2. By Proposition 5.11, $\iota_I^*(D) = FM_I((a_I)_*(1))$, where $a_I = \rho_I \circ a : X \rightarrow A(I)$ is the projection of the Albanese map, $(a_I)_*(1) \in KO^{-2}(A(I))$ and $FM_I : KO^{-2}(A(I)) \rightarrow KR^{-4}(T(I)) = KH(T(I))$ is the Fourier–Mukai transform. By Proposition 5.12, we have

$$r_2(\iota_I^* D) = r_2(FM_I((a_I)_*(1))) = \tau^*((a_I)_*(1)),$$

where $\tau : pt \rightarrow A(I)$ is the inclusion of a point. Let $I = \{i_1 < i_2\}$ and set $a = \lambda_{i_1}, b = \lambda_{i_2}$. Let $A, B \subset X$ be closed, oriented embedded submanifolds of X Poincaré dual to a, b . Moreover, we choose A, B so that they intersect transversally in an embedded surface $C = A \cap B$ which is Poincaré dual to $a \smile b$. Now choose closed differential forms α, β which represent a, b in de-Rham cohomology. We can choose α and β to be supported in neighbourhoods of A and B . Choose a basepoint $x_0 \in X$ away from the supports of α, β . The projected Albanese map $a_I : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2/\mathbb{Z}^2$ is given by $a_I(x) = (\int_\gamma \alpha, \int_\gamma \beta)$, where γ is a path from x_0 to x . Each time γ passes through A , $\int_\gamma \alpha$ winds once around the circle and similarly each time γ passes through B , $\int_\gamma \beta$ winds once around the circle. Furthermore, we can choose α, β such that $\int_\gamma \alpha \in (1/2) + \mathbb{Z}$ if and only if $x \in A$ and $\int_\gamma \beta \in (1/2) + \mathbb{Z}$ if and only if $x \in B$. This is easily achieved by using the explicit construction of Poincaré dual cohomology classes [10, Chapter I, §6]. We also choose α, β so that $(1/2, 1/2)$ is a regular value of a_I . Note further that $(a_I)^{-1}(1/2, 1/2) = A \cap B = C$.

Now consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{a_I} & A(I) \\ i \uparrow & & \uparrow \tau \\ C & \xrightarrow{p} & pt \end{array}$$

where τ is the inclusion map sending pt to $(1/2, 1/2) \in A(I)$. By commutativity, we have that

$$r_2(\iota_I^*(D)) = \tau^*((a_I)_*(1)) = p_*(i^*(1)) = p_*(1).$$

The spin structure $\mathfrak{s}$ restricts to a spin structure $\mathfrak{s}|_C$ and this is used to define the push-forward map $p_* : KO(C) \rightarrow KO^{-2}(pt) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$. Now we observe that $p_*(1) \in KO^{-2}(pt) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$ is precisely the mod 2 index of $\mathfrak{s}|_C$. So we have proven that for any subset $I = \{i_1 < i_2\}$ of size 2,

$$(5.7) \quad \langle SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}(1), \lambda_{i_1} \smile \lambda_{i_2} \rangle = r_2(\iota_I^*(D)) = q_{\mathfrak{s}}^2(\lambda_{i_1}, \lambda_{i_2}).$$

Since the choice of basis $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ of $H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})$ was arbitrary, we have in fact shown that (5.7) holds for any pair $\lambda_{i_1}, \lambda_{i_2} \in H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})$ which generate a primitive sublattice of $\Lambda = H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})$ (a sublattice $\Lambda' \subseteq \Lambda$ is primitive if Λ/Λ' is torsion-free).

We will show that (5.7) holds for any pair of elements $a, b \in H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})$ in place of $\lambda_{i_1}, \lambda_{i_2}$. Let $f_a, f_b : X \rightarrow S^1$ be maps to S^1 which represent a, b . If a, b are linearly dependent, then $a \smile b = 0$, so $\langle SW_{X,\mathfrak{s}}(1), a \smile b \rangle = 0$. On the other hand, if a and b are linearly independent, then the map $f = (f_a, f_b) : X \rightarrow T^2$ factors through a 1-dimensional torus and hence the pre-image $f^{-1}(t)$ of a generic $t \in T^2$ is empty, so $q_{\mathfrak{s}}^2(a, b) = 0$. This proves the result in the case that a and b are linearly dependent. Now suppose a, b are linearly independent. Let $\Lambda' = \{k\lambda = na + mb \text{ for some } k, n, m \in \mathbb{Z}, k > 0\}$. Then Λ' is a primitive sublattice of Λ . Let λ_1, λ_2 be a basis for Λ' . Then there exists an element $A = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ \gamma & \delta \end{bmatrix} \in SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ and non-zero integers d_1, d_2 such that

$$(5.8) \quad \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ \gamma & \delta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} d_1 \lambda_1 \\ d_2 \lambda_2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We claim this implies that $q_{\mathfrak{s}}^2(a, b) = q_{\mathfrak{s}}^2(d_1 \lambda_1, d_2 \lambda_2)$. To see this, note that the matrix A defines an orientation preserving diffeomorphism $A : T^2 \rightarrow T^2$. Then $(f_a, f_b) = A(f_{\lambda_1}^{d_1}, f_{\lambda_2}^{d_2})$, where $f_{\lambda_1}, f_{\lambda_2} : X \rightarrow S^1$ are maps representing λ_1, λ_2 . Let $t \in T^2$ be a regular value of $g = (f_{\lambda_1}, f_{\lambda_2})$. Then At is a regular value of f and we have an equality $f^{-1}(At) = g^{-1}(t)$. The normal framings on $C = f^{-1}(At)$ induced by f and g are different, but they are related by a constant change of basis given by the matrix A . Since $A \in SL(2, \mathbb{Z}) \subset SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ and $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ is connected, the two normal framings are isotopic. This proves the claim that $q_{\mathfrak{s}}^2(a, b) = q_{\mathfrak{s}}^2(d_1 \lambda_1, d_2 \lambda_2)$. Next, we claim that $q_{\mathfrak{s}}^2(d_1 \lambda_1, d_2 \lambda_2) = d_1 d_2 q_{\mathfrak{s}}^2(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$. To see this, let $A_1, A_2 \subset X$ be submanifolds Poincaré dual to λ_1, λ_2 intersecting transversally in $C = A_1 \cap A_2$. Since the normal bundles of A_1, A_2 are trivial, we can take $|d_1|$ parallel copies of A_1 representing $|d_1| \lambda_1$ and $|d_2|$ parallel copies of A_2 representing $|d_2| \lambda_2$ and intersecting in $|d_1 d_2|$ disjoint copies of C . Hence $q_{\mathfrak{s}}^2(|d_1| \lambda_1, |d_2| \lambda_2) = |d_1 d_2| q_{\mathfrak{s}}^2(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$. One can also see that $q_{\mathfrak{s}}^2(d_1 \lambda_1, d_2 \lambda_2)$ is insensitive to the signs of d_1 and d_2 and so we have

proven the claim that $q_s^2(d_1\lambda_1, d_2\lambda_2) = d_1d_2q_s^2(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$. Now from (5.8), we have that $a \smile b = d_1d_2\lambda_1 \smile \lambda_2$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \langle SW_{X,s}(1), a \smile b \rangle &= \langle d_1d_2SW_{X,s}(1), \lambda_1 \smile \lambda_2 \rangle \\ &= d_1d_2q_s^2(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \\ &= q_s^2(d_1\lambda_1, d_2\lambda_2) \\ &= q_s^2(a, b) \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows since λ_1, λ_2 generate a primitive sublattice of Λ . So we have proven the result for arbitrary $a, b \in H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})$.

The case $b_+(X) = 2$ is proven in an entirely similar manner. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.4. For a compact, oriented, smooth 4-manifold X with spin structure $\mathfrak{s}$, let us write $q_{X,s}^k$ instead of q_s^k in order to emphasize the dependence on X . Set $X' = X \# S^2 \times S^2$. Since $S^2 \times S^2$ is simply-connected it has a unique spin structure $\mathfrak{s}_{S^2 \times S^2}$ and there is a bijection $S_X \rightarrow S_{X'}$ between spin structures on X and X' which sends a spin structure $\mathfrak{s}$ on X to the spin structure $\mathfrak{s}' = \mathfrak{s} \# \mathfrak{s}_{S^2 \times S^2}$. We also have an isomorphism $H^1(X; \mathbb{Z}) \cong H^1(X'; \mathbb{Z})$ which may be described concretely as follows. Regard X' as the result of removing open balls $B_1 \subset X$, $B_2 \subset S^2 \times S^2$ and identifying their boundaries. Let $a \in H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})$. Choose a Poincaré dual submanifold $A \subset X$ supported away from the ball B_1 . Then A can be also be regarded as a submanifold of X' and it has a Poincaré dual class in $H^1(X'; \mathbb{Z})$. This gives the isomorphism $H^1(X; \mathbb{Z}) \cong H^1(X'; \mathbb{Z})$. We claim that under the isomorphisms $S_X \cong S_{X'}$ and $H^1(X; \mathbb{Z}) \cong H^1(X'; \mathbb{Z})$, we have an equality $q_{X,s}^k = q_{X',s'}^k$ for $k = 2, 3$. To see this, let $a_1, \dots, a_k \in H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})$. Let $A_1, \dots, A_k$ be Poincaré dual submanifolds which intersect transversally in C . We can choose $A_1, \dots, A_k$ supported away from the neck. Then C is supported away from the neck and the index of $\mathfrak{s}|_C$ agrees with the index of $\mathfrak{s}'|_C$.

Now let X_1, X_2 be as in the statement of Theorem 1.4. By a theorem of Wall in the simply-connected case [34] and Gompf in general [19], there exists a $k \geq 0$ and a diffeomorphism $f : X_1 \# k(S^2 \times S^2) \rightarrow X_2 \# k(S^2 \times S^2)$. Set $W_i = X_i \# k(S^2 \times S^2)$ for $i = 1, 2$. From what we have just shown there exists bijections $\varphi_i : S_{X_i} \rightarrow S_{W_i}$ and bijections $\psi_i : H^1(X_i; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H^1(W_i; \mathbb{Z})$ such that $\psi_i(q_{X_i,s}^k) = q_{W_i,\varphi_i(s)}^k$ for any $\mathfrak{s} \in S_{X_i}$. The diffeomorphism $f : W_1 \rightarrow W_2$ induces bijections $\varphi_f : S_{W_1} \rightarrow S_{W_2}$ and $\psi_f : H^1(W_1; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H^1(W_2; \mathbb{Z})$ such that $\psi_f(q_{W_1,s}^k) = q_{W_2,\varphi_f(s)}^k$ for any $\mathfrak{s} \in S_{W_1}$. Combining all of these isomorphisms yields isomorphisms $\varphi : S_{X_1} \rightarrow S_{X_2}$ and $\psi : H^1(X_1; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H^1(X_2; \mathbb{Z})$ such that $\psi(q_{X_1,s}^k) = q_{X_2,\varphi(s)}^k$ for any $\mathfrak{s} \in S_{X_1}$. Now the result follows from Theorem 1.1. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.6. The case that $b_+(X) = 3$ is immediate since $SW_{X,s}(1)$ can be expressed in terms of the second Segre class of the index bundle D , which by Equation (1.1) does not depend on the choice of spin structure.

Assume now that $b_+(X) = 2$. Then for any $a, b, c \in H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})$ and any $A \in H^1(X; \mathbb{Z}_2)$, Theorem 1.1 gives

$$\langle SW_{X,A \otimes \mathfrak{s}}(1), a \smile b \smile c \rangle + \langle SW_{X,s}(1), a \smile b \smile c \rangle = q_{A \otimes \mathfrak{s}}^3(a, b, c) + q_s^3(a, b, c).$$

Let $D \subset X$ be Poincaré dual to $a \smile b \smile c$. Then D is a union of finitely many embedded circles in X . Recall that the circle S^1 has two spin structures $\mathfrak{s}_0, \mathfrak{s}_1$ with the property that $\mathfrak{s}_0$ extends to a spin structure on the disc D^2 while $\mathfrak{s}_1$ does not. Furthermore the mod 2 index of $\mathfrak{s}_0$ is 0 and the mod 2 index of $\mathfrak{s}_1$ is 1. Now write $D = D_1 \cup \dots \cup D_m$, where $D_1, \dots, D_m$ are the connected components of D . Then $q_{A \otimes \mathfrak{s}}(a, b, c) + q_{\mathfrak{s}}(a, b, c)$ is equal to the mod 2 count of the number of components D_i for which $\mathfrak{s}|_{D_i}$ and $(A \otimes \mathfrak{s})|_{D_i}$ are different spin structures. Equivalently, this is the number of $i \bmod 2$ for which $A|_{D_i}$ is non-trivial, which in turn equals $\langle [X], A \smile a \smile b \smile c \rangle$.

Lastly, suppose that $b_+(X) = 1$. Then for any $a, b \in H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})$ and any $A, B \in H^1(X; \mathbb{Z}_2)$, Theorem 1.1 gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle SW_{X, A \otimes B \otimes \mathfrak{s}}(1), a \smile b \rangle + \langle SW_{X, A \otimes \mathfrak{s}}(1), a \smile b \rangle + \langle SW_{X, B \otimes \mathfrak{s}}(1), a \smile b \rangle + \langle SW_{X, \mathfrak{s}}(1), a \smile b \rangle \\ &= q_{X, A \otimes B \otimes \mathfrak{s}}^2(a, b) + q_{A \otimes \mathfrak{s}}^2(a, b) + q_{B \otimes \mathfrak{s}}^2(a, b) + q_{\mathfrak{s}}^2(a, b). \end{aligned}$$

Now let C be Poincaré dual to $a \smile b$. Then according to [2, Theorem 2], the mod 2 index on a compact oriented surface is a quadratic function on the set of spin structures, whose associated bilinear form is the intersection form on $H^1(C; \mathbb{Z}_2)$. From this it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} q_{X, A \otimes B \otimes \mathfrak{s}}^2(a, b) + q_{A \otimes \mathfrak{s}}^2(a, b) + q_{B \otimes \mathfrak{s}}^2(a, b) + q_{\mathfrak{s}}^2(a, b) &= \langle [C], A|_C \smile B|_C \rangle \\ &= \langle [X], A \smile B \smile a \smile b \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

□

6. SEIBERG–WITTEN INVARIANTS OF SPIN FAMILIES

By adapting the arguments of Section 5, we will obtain a general formula for the $Pin(2)$ -equivariant Seiberg–Witten invariants of spin families.

Let B be a compact manifold with $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -action defined by an involution $j : B \rightarrow B$ and $f : S^{V,U} \rightarrow S^{V',U'}$ a $Pin(2)$ -monopole map. Since f might not admit a $Pin(2)$ -equivariant chamber, we replace B by $\widehat{B} = S(H^+)$, the unit sphere bundle of H^+ over B and let $\pi : \widehat{B} \rightarrow B$. Consider the pullback $\widehat{f}$ of f to $\widehat{B}$. Then $\widehat{f}$ admits a tautological chamber $\phi^{taut} : \widehat{B} \rightarrow \pi^*(H^+)$ which is simply given by the inclusion $\widehat{B} = S(H^+) \rightarrow \pi^*(H^+)$. Using ϕ^{taut} we get a $Pin(2)$ -equivariant Seiberg–Witten invariant

$$SW_{\widehat{f}}^{Pin(2)} : H_{Pin(2)}^*(pt) \rightarrow H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^{*-2d+b_++1}(\widehat{B})$$

where we have written $SW_{\widehat{f}}^{Pin(2)}$ in place of $SW_{\widehat{f}}^{Pin(2), \phi^{taut}}$ to simplify notation. If $\phi : B \rightarrow S(H^+)$ is a $Pin(2)$ -equivariant chamber for f , then we clearly have the relation

$$SW_f^{Pin(2), \phi}(\theta) = \phi^*(SW_{\widehat{f}}^{Pin(2)}(\theta))$$

and hence it suffices to compute $SW_{\widehat{f}}^{Pin(2)}$.

We will make the following assumptions about the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -action on B which are satisfied for the Seiberg–Witten monopole map of a spin family, provided that the monodromy of the family acts trivially on $H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})$. Namely,

- (1) j does not act freely on B .

- (2) The map $u : H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B) \rightarrow H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^{*+1}(B)$ is injective.
- (3) Over each fixed point $b \in B$ of $j : B \rightarrow B$, the involution $j : H_b^+ \rightarrow H_b^+$ acts as -1 . Hence j acts freely on $S(H^+)$.

One motivation for assumption (2) is given by the following lemma:

Lemma 6.1. *Let $E_1, E_2 \rightarrow B$ be $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -vector bundles over B , $\pi_i : S(E_i) \rightarrow B$ the unit sphere bundles. Suppose that $\iota : E_1 \rightarrow E_2$ is a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -equivariant inclusion and that $E_2/\iota E_1 \cong \mathbb{R}_{-1}^k$, where $\mathbb{R}_{-1}$ denotes the trivial real line bundle where $\mathbb{Z}_2$ acts as multiplication by -1 . If $u : H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B) \rightarrow H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^{*+1}(B)$ is injective, then $\iota_* : H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(S(E_1)) \rightarrow H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^{*+k}(S(E_2))$ is also injective.*

Proof. The Gysin sequences for $S(E_1)$ and $S(E_2)$ are related through the following commutative diagram whose rows are exact:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 \cdots & \longrightarrow & H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^{*-r_1}(B) & \xrightarrow{e(E_1)} & H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B) & \xrightarrow{\pi_1^*} & H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(S(E_1)) \xrightarrow{(\pi_1)_*} H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^{*+1-r_1}(B) \longrightarrow \cdots \\
 & & \parallel & & \downarrow u^k & & \downarrow \iota_* \\
 \cdots & \longrightarrow & H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^{*-r_1}(B) & \xrightarrow{e(E_2)} & H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^{*+k}(B) & \xrightarrow{\pi_2^*} & H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^{*+k}(S(E_2)) \xrightarrow{(\pi_2)_*} H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^{*+1-r_1}(B) \longrightarrow \cdots
 \end{array}$$

where $r_1, r_2 = r_1 + k$ are the ranks of E_1, E_2 . The result follows by injectivity of $u^k : H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B) \rightarrow H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^{*+k}(B)$ and a diagram chase. $\square$

Now we are ready to repeat the argument of Theorem 5.3. Given a $Pin(2)$ -equivariant monopole map $f : S^{V,U} \rightarrow S^{V',U'}$ over a base B , we compute $SW_{\widehat{g}}^{Pin(2)}$ in two different ways, where $g = f \wedge f_{22m(S^2 \times S^2)}$ and $f_{22m(S^2 \times S^2)}$ is the Seiberg–Witten $Pin(2)$ -monopole map for $22m(S^2 \times S^2)$, for some sufficiently large m . First of all, let $\mathbb{R}_{-1} \rightarrow B$ denote the trivial real line bundle where $\mathbb{Z}_2$ acts as multiplication by -1 . Consider the inclusions

$$\iota_1 : S(H^+) \rightarrow S(H^+ \oplus \mathbb{R}_{-1}^{22m}), \quad \iota_2 : S(\mathbb{R}_{-1}^{3m}) \rightarrow S(H^+ \oplus \mathbb{R}_{-1}^{22m})$$

induced by the inclusions $H^+ \rightarrow H^+ \oplus \mathbb{R}_{-1}^{22m}$ and $\mathbb{R}_{-1}^{3m} \rightarrow (H^+ \oplus \mathbb{R}_{-1}^{19m}) \oplus \mathbb{R}_{-1}^{3m} \cong H^+ \oplus \mathbb{R}_{-1}^{22m}$ of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -vector bundles. Theorem 4.4 gives

$$(6.1) \quad SW_{\widehat{g}}^{Pin(2)}(\theta) = (\iota_1)_*(SW_{\widehat{f}}^{Pin(2)}(\theta)).$$

Now let $f_{mK3}, f_{m\overline{K3}}$ be the $Pin(2)$ Seiberg–Witten monopole maps for $mK3$ and $m\overline{K3}$. We can assume that $f_{22m(S^2 \times S^2)} = f_{m\overline{K3}} \wedge f_{mK3}$. We write $g = f \wedge f_{22m(S^2 \times S^2)}$ in the form $g = (f \wedge f_{m\overline{K3}}) \wedge f_{mK3}$ and apply Theorem 4.4. First of all, note that for any θ , $SW_{\widehat{f \wedge f_{m\overline{K3}}}}^{Pin(2)}(\theta) \in H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(S(H^+ \oplus \mathbb{R}_{-1}^{19m}))$ has degree

$$\begin{aligned}
 \deg(\theta) + \frac{\sigma(X)}{4} + 4m + 19m + b_+ + 1 &\geq \frac{\sigma(X)}{4} + 4m + 19m + b_+ + 1 \\
 &> \dim(B) + 19m + b_+ - 1
 \end{aligned}$$

provided m satisfies $m \geq \dim(B)/4 - \sigma(X)/16$. Our assumption on $j : H^+ \rightarrow H^+$ ensures that $\mathbb{Z}_2$ acts freely on $S(H^+ \oplus \mathbb{R}_{-1}^{19m})$ and hence the quotient $S(H^+ \oplus \mathbb{R}_{-1}^{19m})/\mathbb{Z}_2$ is a manifold of dimension $\dim(B) + 19m + b_+ - 1$. Hence the degree of $SW_{\widehat{f \wedge f_{m\overline{K3}}}}^{Pin(2)}(\theta)$ is greater than the highest degree in which $H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(S(H^+ \oplus \mathbb{R}_{-1}^{19m}))$ is

non-zero. So $SW_{\widehat{f \wedge f_{mK3}}}^{Pin(2)}(\theta) = 0$ for all θ . Together with Theorem 4.4, this implies that

$$SW_{\widehat{g}}^G(q_2^j) = (\iota_2)_*(SW_{mK3}^{Pin(2)}(\psi_2(e_G(D_1)^{-1}q_2^j)))$$

where $D_1 = D - \mathbb{C}^{2m}$ and $D = V - V'$. Expanding the Euler class $e_G(D_1)$, collecting μ^0 -terms and simplifying, exactly as in the proof of Theorem 5.3, we obtain

$$(6.2) \quad SW_{\widehat{g}}^{Pin(2)}(q_2^j) = (\iota_2)_*(u^{3m-3}s_{2(j+1-d/2),\mathbb{Z}_2}(D)).$$

Equating (6.1) and (6.2) yields

$$(6.3) \quad (\iota_1)_*(SW_{\widehat{f}}^{Pin(2)}(q^j)) = (\iota_2)_*(u^{3m-3}s_{2(j+1-d/2),\mathbb{Z}_2}(D)).$$

By Lemma 6.1, and the assumption that $u : H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B) \rightarrow H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^{*+1}(B)$ is injective, it follows that $(\iota_1)_*$ is injective and thus Equation (6.3) completely determines $SW_{\widehat{f}}^{Pin(2)}$.

Lemma 6.2. *If $u : H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B) \rightarrow H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^{*+1}(B)$ is injective then for any $\theta \in H_{Pin(2)}^*(pt)$, $SW_{\widehat{f}}^{Pin(2)}(\theta)$ is in the image of the pullback $\pi^* : H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B) \rightarrow H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(S(H^+))$, where $\pi : S(H^+) \rightarrow B$ is the projection. In particular, the invariants $SW_f^{Pin(2),\phi}(\theta)$ do not depend on the choice of a chamber.*

Proof. To simplify notation, set $\alpha = SW_{\widehat{f}}^{Pin(2)}(\theta) \in H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(S(H^+))$. Since $u^3 = 0$ in $H_{Pin(2)}^*(pt)$, we have $u^3\alpha = SW_{\widehat{f}}^{Pin(2)}(u^3\theta) = 0$. Consider the Gysin sequence

$$\cdots \rightarrow H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B) \xrightarrow{\pi^*} H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(S(H^+)) \xrightarrow{\pi_*} H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^{*-(b_+-1)}(B) \rightarrow \cdots$$

Now $u^3\alpha = 0$ implies $u^4\pi_*(\alpha) = 0$. But $u : H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B) \rightarrow H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^{*+1}(B)$ is injective, so $\pi_*(\alpha) = 0$. Hence by exactness of the Gysin sequence, $\alpha = \pi^*(\beta)$ for some $\beta \in H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B)$. Now suppose that $\phi : B \rightarrow S(H^+)$ is a chamber. Then $SW_f^{Pin(2),\phi}(\theta) = \phi^*(\alpha) = \phi^*\pi^*(\beta) = \beta$, which does not depend on the choice of ϕ (note that in general, β is only unique up to multiples of $e_{\mathbb{Z}_2}(H^+)$, but if a chamber exists then $e_{\mathbb{Z}_2}(H^+) = 0$). $\square$

Let $E_1 \rightarrow E_2$ be an inclusion of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -vector bundles on B and $\iota : S(E_1) \rightarrow S(E_2)$ the induced map of sphere bundles. Then for any $\beta \in H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B)$, we have

$$(6.4) \quad \iota_*(\pi_1^*(\beta)) = \pi_2^*(e_{\mathbb{Z}_2}(E_2/E_1)\beta),$$

where π_1, π_2 are the projections $\pi_i : S(E_i) \rightarrow B$. By Lemma 6.2, we have that $SW_{\widehat{f}}^{Pin(2)}(q^j) = \pi^*(\alpha_j)$ for some $\alpha_j \in H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B)/\langle e_{\mathbb{Z}_2}(H^+) \rangle$, where π is the projection $\pi : S(H^+) \rightarrow B$. Applying (6.4) to Equation (6.3) gives:

$$u^{22m}\alpha_j = e_{\mathbb{Z}_2}(H^+)u^{22m-3}s_{2(j+1-d/2),\mathbb{Z}_2}(D),$$

which holds as an equality in $H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B)/(u^{22m}e_{\mathbb{Z}_2}(H^+))$. Cancelling a common factor of u^{22m-3} gives

$$u^3\alpha_j = e_{\mathbb{Z}_2}(H^+)s_{2(j+1-d/2),\mathbb{Z}_2}(D)$$

in $H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B)/(u^3 e_{\mathbb{Z}_2}(H^+))$. Since $u : H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B) \rightarrow H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B)$ is injective, the right hand side must be a multiple of u^3 . Let $u^{-3} : u^3 H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B) \rightarrow H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^{*-3}(B)$ denote the inverse of u^3 on its image. Then

$$\alpha_j = u^{-3} e_{\mathbb{Z}_2}(H^+) s_{2(j+1-d/2), \mathbb{Z}_2}(D).$$

Pulling back to $H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(S(H^+))$, we obtain

$$SW_{\hat{f}}^{Pin(2)}(q^j) = \pi^*(u^{-3} e_{\mathbb{Z}_2}(H^+) s_{2(j+1-d/2), \mathbb{Z}_2}(D)).$$

We have proven the following:

Theorem 6.3. *Suppose that $u : H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B) \rightarrow H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^{*+1}(B)$ is injective and suppose that $j : H^+ \rightarrow H^+$ acts as -1 over the fixed points of $j : B \rightarrow B$. Then for each $j \geq 0$, $e_{\mathbb{Z}_2}(H^+) s_{2(j+1-d/2), \mathbb{Z}_2}(D)$ is a multiple of u^3 and*

$$SW_{\hat{f}}^{Pin(2)}(q^j) = \pi^*(u^{-3} e_{\mathbb{Z}_2}(H^+) s_{2(j+1-d/2), \mathbb{Z}_2}(D)).$$

Now suppose that $\pi_E : E \rightarrow B_0$ is a smooth spin family of 4-manifolds. This means that E is a fibre bundle with fibres given by a compact, oriented smooth 4-manifold X , with transition functions given by orientation preserving diffeomorphisms of X and in addition we are given a spin-structure $\mathfrak{s}_E$ on the vertical tangent bundle $T(E/B_0) = \text{Ker}((\pi_E)_* : TE \rightarrow TB_0)$. If $b_1(X) > 0$ then we need to assume also that there exists a section $s : B_0 \rightarrow E$. In this case we get a families Seiberg–Witten monopole map $f : S^{V,U} \rightarrow S^{V',U'}$ over B , where $B = \text{Pic}^{\mathfrak{s}_E}(E/B_0)$ is the moduli space of gauge equivalence classes of spin^c -connections on the fibres of E . See [5, Example 2.4] for details of the construction, including an explanation of why the section s is needed. Thus $B \rightarrow B_0$ is a fibre bundle whose fibre over $b \in B_0$ is $\text{Pic}^{\mathfrak{s}_E|_{X_b}}(X_b)$, where $X_b = \pi_E^{-1}(b)$ is the fibre of E over b . This is a torus bundle over B_0 . Moreover, since the family has a spin structure, there is a section $s : B_0 \rightarrow B$ given by the spin connection. Thus B is completely determined by the degree 1 monodromy representation $\pi_1(B_0) \rightarrow \text{Aut}(H^1(X; \mathbb{Z}))$.

The involution $j : B \rightarrow B$ acts as the identity on B_0 and as -1 on the fibres of $B \rightarrow B_0$. Assuming that the monodromy of the family $E \rightarrow B_0$ acts trivially on $H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})$, then $B \cong B_0 \times \text{Pic}^{\mathfrak{s}_E}(X)$ and it follows easily that $H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B) \cong H^*(B)[u]$. In particular, $u : H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B) \rightarrow H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^{*+1}(B)$ is injective. To each spin^c -connection, we have a corresponding Dirac operator. Thus B is the parameter space for a family of Dirac operators. The virtual bundle $D = V - V'$ is the families index of this family. The bundle $H^+ \rightarrow B$ is the pullback to B of the bundle $H^+(X) \rightarrow B_0$ whose fibre over a point $b \in B_0$ is the space $H^+(X_b)$ of self-dual harmonic 2-forms on X_b (with respect to a given family of metrics). The involution $j : H^+(X_b) \rightarrow H^+(X_b)$ acts as a combination of $j : B \rightarrow B$ on the base, together with multiplication by -1 on the fibres. Thus j acts as multiplication by -1 over the fixed points of $j : B \rightarrow B$. Our assumptions (1)-(3) are satisfied and hence Theorem 6.3 applies. To compute the equivariant Euler class $e_{\mathbb{Z}_2}(H^+)$, it is best to think of H^+ as being the tensor product $H^+(X) \otimes \mathbb{R}_{-1}$. Then the splitting principle gives

$$(6.5) \quad e_{\mathbb{Z}_2}(H^+) = \sum_{j=0}^{b_+(X)} u^j w_{b_+(X)-j}(H^+(X)) \in H^*(B)[u].$$

Since $e_{\mathbb{Z}_2}(H^+)$ is a monic polynomial in u , multiplication $e_{\mathbb{Z}_2}(H^+) : H^*(B)[u] \rightarrow H^{*+b_+(X)}(B)[u]$ is injective. Hence, by the Gysin sequence for $S(H^+) \rightarrow B$, we have an isomorphism

$$H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(S(H^+)) \cong H^*(B)[u]/(e_{\mathbb{Z}_2}(H^+)).$$

Write $SW_{E, \mathfrak{s}_E}^{Pin(2)}$ for the $Pin(2)$ -equivariant Seiberg–Witten invariants of $\widehat{f}$. This is a map

$$SW_{E, \mathfrak{s}_E}^{Pin(2)} : H_{Pin(2)}^*(pt) \rightarrow H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^{*-2d+b_+(X)+1}(S(H^+)).$$

Applying Theorem 6.3 gives

Theorem 6.4. *Let $E \rightarrow B_0$ be a spin family. If $b_1(X) > 0$, assume there exists a section $s : B_0 \rightarrow E$ and that the monodromy of the family acts trivially on $H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})$. Then for any $k \geq 1 + \sigma(X)/16$, we have*

$$(6.6) \quad (w_{b_+}(H^+(X)) + uw_{b_+-1}(H^+(X)) + u^2w_{b_+-2}(X))s_{2k, \mathbb{Z}_2}(D) = 0 \pmod{u^3}$$

In particular, if $\sigma(X) < 0$, then $w_l(H^+(X)) = 0$ for $b_+(X) \leq l \leq b_+(X) - 2$. Furthermore, we have

$$SW_{E, \mathfrak{s}_E}^{Pin(2)}(q^j) = \sum_{l=0}^{b_+(X)} u^{l-3} w_{b_+(X)-l}(H^+(X)) s_{2(j+1+\sigma(X)/16), \mathbb{Z}_2}(D).$$

Proof. According to Theorem 6.3, $e_{\mathbb{Z}_2}(H^+(X))s_{2(j+1+\sigma(X)/16), \mathbb{Z}_2}(D)$ is a multiple of u^3 for any $j \geq 0$. Using Equation (6.5), this gives

$$(w_{b_+}(H^+(X)) + uw_{b_+-1}(H^+(X)) + u^2w_{b_+-2}(X))s_{2(j+1+\sigma(X)/16), \mathbb{Z}_2}(D) = 0 \pmod{u^3}$$

for all $j \geq 0$. In particular, if $\sigma(X) < 0$, then taking $j = -1 - \sigma(X)/16$, gives $w_l(H^+(X)) = 0$ for $b_+(X) - 2 \leq l \leq b_+(X)$. Furthermore, Theorem 6.3 and Equation (6.5) give

$$SW_{E, \mathfrak{s}_E}^{Pin(2)}(q^j) = \sum_{l=0}^{b_+(X)} u^{l-3} w_{b_+(X)-l}(H^+(X)) s_{2(j+1+\sigma(X)/16), \mathbb{Z}_2}(D).$$

□

Remark 6.5. The condition that $w_l(H^+(X)) = 0$ for $b_+(X) - 2 \leq l \leq b_+(X)$ when $\sigma(X) < 0$ was also shown in [6, Theorem 1.2].

The vanishing condition (6.6) is somewhat difficult to use because of the presence of the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -equivariant Segre classes which could possibly have u and u^2 -terms. However, by looking at the lowest order term in u in (6.6), we obtain:

Corollary 6.6. *Let $E \rightarrow B_0$ be a spin family. If $b_1(X) > 0$, assume there exists a section $s : B_0 \rightarrow E$ and that the monodromy of the family acts trivially on $H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})$. Let $l \geq 0$ be the largest non-negative integer for which $w_l(H^+(X)) \neq 0$. If $l \geq b_+(X) - 2$, then*

$$w_l(H^+(X))s_{2(j+1+\sigma(X)/16)}(D) = 0.$$

for all $j \geq 0$.

Proof. If $w_k(H^+(X)) = 0$ for $k > l$ and $l \geq b_+(X) - 2$, then the left hand side of (6.6) has the form $u^{b_+(X)-l} w_l(H^+(X)) s_{2(j+1+\sigma(X)/16)}(D) + \dots$ where $\dots$ denotes terms of higher order in u . $\square$

Consider a spin family of 4-manifolds $E \rightarrow B_0$ with $Pin(2)$ -equivariant monopole map f . Restricting to the circle subgroup $S^1 \subset Pin(2)$, and choosing a chamber $\phi : B \rightarrow S(H^+)$, we may consider the S^1 -equivariant Seiberg–Witten invariants of f (taken as usual with $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -coefficients)

$$SW_{E, \mathfrak{s}_E}^\phi : H_{S^1}^*(pt) \rightarrow H^{*-2d+b_+(X)+1}(B).$$

The cohomology classes $SW_{E, \mathfrak{s}_E}(x^m) \in H^{2m-2d+b_+(X)+1}(B)$ are the (mod 2) *families Seiberg–Witten invariants* of the spin^c-family $(E, \mathfrak{s}_E)$, as defined for instance in [5]. Using Theorem 6.4, we obtain

Theorem 6.7. *Let $E \rightarrow B_0$ be a spin family. If $b_1(X) > 0$, assume there exists a section $s : B_0 \rightarrow E$ and that the monodromy of the family acts trivially on $H^1(X; \mathbb{Z})$. Then for any chamber ϕ , we have*

$$SW_{E, \mathfrak{s}_E}^\phi(x^{2j}) = \sum_{l=1}^3 (u^{l-3} w_{b_+(X)-l}(H^+(X)) s_{2(j+1+\sigma(X)/16), \mathbb{Z}_2}(D)) \Big|_{u=0}.$$

In particular if $\sigma(X) < 0$ or if $b_1(X) = 0$, then

$$SW_{E, \mathfrak{s}_E}^\phi(x^{2j}) = w_{b_+(X)-3}(H^+(X)) s_{2(j+1+\sigma(X)/16)}(D).$$

Proof. Let $\phi : B \rightarrow S(H^+(X))$ be a chamber. This defines a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -equivariant map $S^0 \times B = S(\mathbb{R}\phi) \rightarrow S(H^+(X))$, inducing a map

$$\phi^* : H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(S(H^+(X))) \rightarrow H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(S^0 \times B) \cong H^*(B).$$

By the same reasoning as in Lemma 3.3, we have that $SW_{E, \mathfrak{s}_E}(x^{2j}) = \phi^*(SW_{E, \mathfrak{s}_E}^{Pin(2)}(q^j))$, so it remains to describe the map ϕ^* . The existence of ϕ implies that $w_{b_+(X)}(H^+(X)) = 0$ and hence $e_{\mathbb{Z}_2}(H^+(X))$ is divisible by u , by Equation (6.5). Hence, the forgetful map $H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B) \rightarrow H^*(B)$ factors through $H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(S(H^+(X))) \rightarrow H^*(B)$, and it is clear that this gives the map ϕ^* , because $\phi^* \circ \pi^* : H_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^*(B) \rightarrow H^*(B)$ is the forgetful map, where $\pi : S(H^+(X)) \rightarrow B$ is the projection. It then follows that $\phi^*(SW_{E, \mathfrak{s}_E}^{Pin(2)}(q^j))$ is given by extracting the u^0 -term, giving

$$SW_{E, \mathfrak{s}_E}^\phi(x^{2j}) = \sum_{l=1}^3 (u^{l-3} w_{b_+(X)-l}(H^+(X)) s_{2(j+1+\sigma(X)/16), \mathbb{Z}_2}(D)) \Big|_{u=0}.$$

If $\sigma(X) < 0$, then Theorem 6.4 also gives $w_l(H^+(X)) = 0$ for $l > b_+(X) - 3$, so the formula simplifies to $SW_{E, \mathfrak{s}_E}^\phi(x^{2j}) = w_{b_+(X)-3}(H^+(X)) s_{2(j+1+\sigma(X)/16)}(D)$. If $b_1(X) = 0$, then j acts trivially on B and D is a quaternionic virtual bundle. Using the inclusion $Pin(2) \subset Sp(1)$, it follows easily that

$$e_{Pin(2)}(D)^{-1} = q^{d/2} + q^{d/2-1} s_2(D) + \dots + s_{d/2}(D).$$

Hence in this case the equivariant Segre classes of D are just equal to the usual Segre classes. So it follows that $SW_{E, \mathfrak{s}_E}^\phi(x^{2j}) = w_{b_+(X)-3}(H^+(X)) s_{2(j+1+\sigma(X)/16)}(D)$. $\square$

REFERENCES

1. M. F. Atiyah, K -theory and reality. *Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2)* **17** (1966), 367-386.
2. M. F. Atiyah, Riemann surfaces and spin structures. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)* **4** (1971), 47-62.
3. M. F. Atiyah, I. M. Singer, The index of elliptic operators. V. *Ann. of Math. (2)* **93** (1971), 139-149.
4. D. Baraglia, H. Konno, A gluing formula for families Seiberg-Witten invariants. *Geom. Topol.* **24** (2020) 1381-1456.
5. D. Baraglia, H. Konno, On the Bauer-Furuta and Seiberg-Witten invariants of families of 4-manifolds. *J. Topol.* Vol. **15** no. 2, (2022) 505-586.
6. D. Baraglia, Constraints on families of smooth 4-manifolds from Bauer-Furuta invariants. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.* **21** (2021) 317-349.
7. S. Bauer, M. Furuta, A stable cohomotopy refinement of Seiberg-Witten invariants. I. *Invent. Math.* **155** (2004), no. 1, 1-19.
8. S. Bauer, A stable cohomotopy refinement of Seiberg-Witten invariants. II. *Invent. Math.* **155** (2004), no. 1, 21-40.
9. S. Bauer, Almost complex 4-manifolds with vanishing first Chern class. *J. Differential Geom.* **79** (2008), no. 1, 25-32.
10. R. Bott, L. W. Tu, *Differential forms in algebraic topology*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 82. Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, (1982). xiv+331 pp.
11. T. tom Dieck, Transformation groups. De Gruyter Studies in Mathematics, 8. Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, (1987).
12. S. K. Donaldson, Connections, cohomology and the intersection forms of 4-manifolds. *J. Differential Geom.* **24** (1986), no. 3, 275-341.
13. J. L. Dupont, Symplectic bundles and KR -theory. *Math. Scand.* **24** (1969), 27-30.
14. R. Fintushel, R. J. Stern, Rational blowdowns of smooth 4-manifolds. *J. Differential Geom.* **46** (1997), no. 2, 181-235.
15. R. Fintushel, R. J. Stern, Knots, links, and 4-manifolds. *Invent. Math.* **134** (1998), no. 2, 363-400.
16. R. Friedman, J. W. Morgan, Obstruction bundles, semiregularity, and Seiberg-Witten invariants. *Comm. Anal. Geom.* **7** (1999), no. 3, 451-495.
17. M. Furuta, Monopole equation and the 11/8-conjecture. *Math. Res. Lett.* **8** (2001), no. 3, 279-291.
18. M. Furuta, Y. Kametani, Equivariant maps between sphere bundles over tori and KO-degree, arXiv:math/0502511 (2005).
19. R. E. Gompf, Stable diffeomorphism of compact 4-manifolds. *Topology Appl.* **18** (1984), no. 2-3, 115-120.
20. R. E. Gompf, Sums of elliptic surfaces. *J. Differential Geom.* **34** (1991), no. 1, 93-114.
21. T. Kato, H. Konno, N. Nakamura, Rigidity of the mod 2 families Seiberg-Witten invariants and topology of families of spin 4-manifolds. *Compos. Math.* **157** (2021), no. 4, 770-808.
22. T. Lawson, The minimal genus problem. *Exposition. Math.* **15** (1997), no. 5, 385-431.
23. H. B. Jr. Lawson, M.-L. Michelsohn, *Spin geometry*. Princeton Mathematical Series, 38. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, (1989). xii+427 pp.
24. T. J. Li, A.-K. Liu, Family Seiberg-Witten invariants and wall crossing formulas. *Comm. Anal. Geom.*, **9** (2001), no. 4, 777-823.
25. T.-J. Li, Quaternionic bundles and Betti numbers of symplectic 4-manifolds with Kodaira dimension zero. *Int. Math. Res. Not.* (2006), Art. ID 37385, 28 pp.
26. A.-K. Liu, Family blowup formula, admissible graphs and the enumeration of singular curves. I. *J. Differential Geom.* **56** (2000), no. 3, 381-579.
27. J. W. Morgan, Z. Z. Szabó, Homotopy K3 surfaces and mod 2 Seiberg-Witten invariants. *Math. Res. Lett.* **4** (1997), no. 1, 17-21.
28. N. Nakamura, The Seiberg-Witten equations for families and diffeomorphisms of 4-manifolds, *Asian J. Math.* **7** (2003), no. 1, 133-138.
29. N. Nakamura, $\text{Pin}^-(2)$ -monopole equations and intersection forms with local coefficients of four-manifolds. *Math. Ann.* **357** (2013), no. 3, 915-939.
30. P. Ozsváth, Z. Szabó, The symplectic Thom conjecture. *Ann. of Math. (2)* **151** (2000), no. 1, 93-124.

- 31. D. Ruberman, An obstruction to smooth isotopy in dimension 4. *Math. Res. Lett.* **5** (1998), no. 6, 743-758.
- 32. D. Ruberman, S. Strle, Mod 2 Seiberg-Witten invariants of homology tori. *Math. Res. Lett.* **7** (2000), no. 5-6, 789-799.
- 33. D. Ruberman, Positive scalar curvature, diffeomorphisms and the Seiberg-Witten invariants. *Geom. Topol.* **5** (2001), 895-924.
- 34. C. T. C. Wall, On simply-connected 4-manifolds. *J. London Math. Soc.* **39** (1964), 141-149.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, THE UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE, ADELAIDE SA 5005,
AUSTRALIA

Email address: david.baraglia@adelaide.edu.au