COUNTING CURVES WITH LOCAL TANGENCY CONSTRAINTS

DUSA MCDUFF AND KYLER SIEGEL

Abstract. We construct invariants of any semipositive symplectic manifold which count rational curves satisfying multibranched tangency constraints to a local divisor. We also construct analogous invariants counting punctured curves with negative ends on a small skinny ellipsoid, and we prove that these counts coincide at least in dimension four. We then give a formula describing how tangency constraints arise as point constraints are pushed together, and we use this to recursively compute all invariants in dimension four in terms of Gromov–Witten invariants of blowups.

1. Introduction

1.1. Motivation. A prototypical problem in enumerative geometry asks to count the number of curves in a space satisfying some specified geometric constraints. These constraints are chosen so that one expects the answer to be a finite number, independent of any auxiliary choices. For example, an ancient observation is that there is exactly one
line passing through any two distinct points in the plane. A modern incarnation of this is the fact that there is a unique rational curve passing through any two distinct points in the complex projective plane $\mathbb{CP}^2$. This naturally extends to the following question: how many rational curves of degree $d$ pass through $3d - 1$ generic points in $\mathbb{CP}^2$? Note that $3d - 1$ is precisely the value needed to make the count a finite number $N_d$, and one can show that the answer does not depend on the locations of the points as long as they are in general position. We have $N_1 = 1$ and $N_2 = 1$, the latter expressing the also long-known fact that five generic points determine a unique conic. The computation $N_3 = 12$ was given by Steiner in 1848. The late 19th century brought enumerative geometry to a pinnacle and produced the number $N_4 = 620$ (see e.g. [19] for a more thorough history). The computation of $N_d$ for all $d$ remained out of reach until the mid 1990’s, when ideas from string theory began to infuse with algebraic geometry and symplectic topology, leading Kontsevich to discover the beautiful recursive formula

$$N_d = \sum_{d_A + d_B = d} N_{d_A} N_{d_B} d_A^2 d_B \left( d_B \left( \frac{3d-4}{3d_A-2} \right) - d_A \left( \frac{3d-4}{3d_A-1} \right) \right).$$

Using this formula we easily get $N_5 = 87304$, $N_6 = 26312976$, $N_7 = 14616808192$, and we can compute $N_d$ for any $d$ given enough computational power.

One of the key developments which catalyzed Kontsevich’s formula was the introduction of Gromov–Witten invariants. Gromov–Witten invariants are defined in terms of stable maps from Riemann surfaces into a given target space. In favorable cases these invariants coincide with corresponding classical curve counts, although in general they count “virtual” objects which may not have straightforward classical interpretations. At any rate, the gain is that Gromov–Witten invariants have highly robust structural properties, and in particular they depend only on the underlying symplectic structure (up to deformation) of the target space. Rational Gromov–Witten invariants are used to cook up the quantum cup product on the cohomology of any symplectic manifold, and Kontsevich’s formula follows rather directly from the observation that this product is associative.

Although Kontsevich’s formula is the model success story, there are many other important enumerative problems. We cannot possibly do this field justice in this introduction, but one natural extension is to consider a space together with a divisor, and to count curves which intersect the divisor in a specified number of points with specified tangency orders, plus possibly some additional constraints away from the divisor. For example, it follows from the Caporaso–Harris recursion formula [2] that there are 7 degree three curves in $\mathbb{CP}^2$ which intersect the line at infinity at a fixed point with tangency order 2, plus pass through 5 generic points away from the line at infinity. The corresponding extension of Gromov–Witten invariants are called relative Gromov–Witten invariants and were implicitly defined in [2] in the process of generalizing Kontsevich’s formula to higher genus. Relative Gromov–Witten invariants arise naturally even if one is a priori only interested in absolute counts, since they can be used to decompose the Gromov–Witten invariants of a symplectic manifold into simpler pieces via the degeneration or symplectic sum formula.

The starting point for this paper is a slightly different enumerative problem, namely the case of a local divisor rather than a global one. The basic idea is to pick a smooth divisor $D$ defined near a point $p$ and to count curves which pass through $p$ with specified
tangency order to $D$. In symplectic geometry this idea goes back at least to the work of Cieliebak–Mohnke [3] — we are not aware of any counterpart in the algebraic geometry literature. As we explain in §2.2, one can adapt standard symplectic techniques to get well-defined Gromov–Witten type invariants, independent of all auxiliary choices (e.g. generic almost complex structure). In particular, unlike the global divisor case, these counts do not depend on the precise choice of local divisor $D$ or point $p$. For a closed symplectic manifold $M$, we will denote the resulting count of closed curves in $M$ in homology class $A$ which are tangent to $D$ at $p$ to order $m$ by $N_{M,A}^T<T^m_p,A>$. It turns out that there are some advantages to replacing several distinct point constraints with a single $<T^m_p>$ constraint, stemming from the fact that the location of the constraint is more “controlled”. For instance, in [4] Cieliebak–Mohnke compute that there are $(n-1)!$ degree one curves in $\mathbb{CP}^n$ satisfying a $<T^n_p>$ constraint, i.e.

$$N_{\mathbb{CP}^n,[L]}<T^n_p> = (n-1)!,$$

and they use this to put strong restrictions on the pseudoholomorphic disks bounded by Lagrangians with nonpositive curvature in $\mathbb{CP}^n$. Their key idea is that one can stretch the neck along the boundary of a Weinstein neighborhood of such a Lagrangian, with $p$ contained inside that neighborhood, and then the curves counted by $N_{\mathbb{CP}^n,[L]}<T^n_p>$ must break into quite specific configurations. More recently, in [28] Tonkonog uses a similar neck-stretching idea to describe a relationship between closed curve counts with $<T^m_p>$ constraints and superpotentials of Lagrangian tori in symplectic manifolds, connecting to conjectures in mirror symmetry.

For us, another main motivation for considering curves with local tangency constraints stems from their connections to symplectic embedding problems. Indeed, curves with local tangency constraints play a central role in the capacities recently defined in [27]. It is explained there that, in contrast to the capacities defined with constraints at multiple points in the domain, the ones involving a single local constraint are dimensionally stable. This principle is closely related to the observation of [12] that punctured rational curves with precisely one negative end have stable Fredholm index, a fact exploited in [12, 13, 5, 6, 20] to give new obstructions for the stabilized ellipsoid embedding problem. As we explain, there is an alternative characterization of tangency constraints via negative ends on a sufficiently skinny ellipsoid $E_{sk}$, which suggests strong connections to the punctured curves considered in [12, 5, 6, 20]. In a followup paper [23] we focus on punctured curves with tangency constraints in open symplectic manifolds and use these to give new symplectic embedding obstructions.

1.2. Main results. In this paper, we define two sets of invariants for $J$-holomorphic curves in a semipositive symplectic manifold $(M,\omega)$ of arbitrary dimension; first invariants of the form

$$N_{M,A}^T<T^m_p,A> = N_{M,A}^T(m)$$

that count curves in the homology class $A$ satisfying a tangency constraint at $p$, and secondly invariants $N_{M,A}^E(m)$ that count curves with a single negative end on a skinny ellipsoid. As we describe below, we also define invariants of both types satisfying more elaborate constraints given by a partition $\mathcal{P}$ of $m = |\mathcal{P}|$. Although we establish
these definitions in arbitrary dimension, most of our subsequent results are proven only in dimension four.\footnote{However, see Remark 4.3.7 for a brief discussion of higher dimensional analogues.}

Here is more detail.

In §3 we define the invariants \(N_{M,A}<T^{m-1}p>\) for any semipositive symplectic manifold \(M\) and homology class \(A \in H_2(M;\mathbb{Z})\) in the spirit of symplectic Gromov–Witten theory, showing in Proposition 2.2.2 that they are independent of the point \(p\) and choice of almost complex structure \(J\). By definition these invariants count somewhere injective \(J\)-holomorphic curves for a generic tame almost complex structure \(J\), and in particular they take integer values. Our main result about them is the following.

**Theorem 1.2.1.** For any symplectic four-manifold \(M\) and homology class \(A \in H_2(M;\mathbb{Z})\), there is an explicit recursive algorithm to compute the numbers \(N_{M,A}<T^{m-1}p>\) in terms of Gromov–Witten invariants of blowups of \(M\).

In the special case of \(\mathbb{C}P^2\), let us introduce the shorthand

\[T_d := N_{\mathbb{C}P^2,d[L]<T^{3d-2}p>}.\]

We note that rational Gromov–Witten invariants of blowups of \(\mathbb{C}P^2\) are well-understood and can be computed using e.g. the recursive algorithm of Göttsche–Pandharipande \cite{GP}, Theorem 3.6. Combining this with a computer implementation of Theorem 1.2.1, we find (see §5.1 for more detailed computations):

**Corollary 1.2.2.** The first few values of \(T_d\) are

\[
T_1 = 1, \quad T_2 = 1, \quad T_3 = 4, \quad T_4 = 26, \\
T_5 = 217, \quad T_6 = 2110, \quad T_7 = 22744, \quad T_8 = 264057.
\]

**Remark 1.2.3.** As observed in \cite[Remark 5.5]{GP}, these invariants are closely related to but subtly different from the 1-point gravitational descendants Gromov–Witten invariants

\[
GW_{\mathbb{C}P^2,d[L]<\psi^{3d-2}p>} = \frac{1}{(d!)^3}.
\]

Indeed, in the analogous case of Gromov–Witten invariants relative to a global divisor, there are well-known discrepancy terms accounting for the difference between gravitational descendants and relative Gromov–Witten invariants (see e.g. \cite{GP}). It would be interesting to give a similar description of the discrepancies in the local divisor context. More precisely, by the heuristic in \cite[§2.2]{MS1} one expects the the count \(T_d\) to agree with

\[(3d-2)!GW_{\mathbb{C}P^2,d[L]<\psi^{3d-2}p>}\]

after taking into account appropriate discrepancy terms. See Table 5.1.3. \(\diamondsuit\)

Our recursion is based on a general principle that describes what happens when constraints at different points in the four dimensional target space \(M\) are “pushed together”. A special case of this appears in the work of Gathmann \cite{G}. For the basic heuristic suppose that \(q\) and \(p\) are two points in \(M\), and suppose we have a curve which is constrained to pass through both \(q\) and \(p\). Now consider what happens as we move \(q\) towards \(p\) along the tangent direction \(v \in T_qM\). In the limit as \(q\) approaches \(p\), there are two possibilities:
(1) the pre-images in the domain curve remain distinct, and the limiting curve ac-
quires a double point at \( p \).

(2) the pre-images in the domain curve collide, and the limiting curve still passes
through \( p \) but now with tangent space constrained to be the complex line spanned
by \( v \).

See Figure [7, p.41] for a cartoon. Using his algorithm for Gromov–Witten invariants
of blowups, Gathmann makes this heuristic precise by proving the following formula for
curve counts in \( \mathbb{CP}^2 \):

\[
\text{GW}_{\mathbb{CP}^2,d[L]} \ll q, P, \rightarrow = \text{GW}_{\mathbb{CP}^2,d[L]} \ll T \rightarrow + 2\text{GW}_{\text{Bl}^1 \mathbb{CP}^2,d[L]-2[E]} \ll \rightarrow. \quad (1.2.1)
\]

Here \( \text{Bl}^1 \mathbb{CP}^2 \) denotes the 1-point blowup of \( \mathbb{CP}^2 \), \( E \) denotes the exceptional divisor in
homology class \( [E] \), \( [L] \) is the homology class of the line, and the symbol \( \ll \) denotes some
additional evaluation class constraints which we suppress from the notation. Note that,
for generic \( J \), curves in \( \text{Bl}^1 \mathbb{CP}^2 \) in homology class \( d[L] - 2[E] \) correspond bijectively to
degree \( d \) curves in \( \mathbb{CP}^2 \) with a simple double point at the blowup point.\(^2\)

In §5 we present a generalization of Gathmann’s formula which describes what hap-
pens when more complicated geometric constraints at different points are pushed to-
gether. In order to formulate it, we first introduce invariants counting curves with
multibranched tangency constraints

\[
N_{M,A} \ll (T^{m_1-1} P_1, \ldots, T^{m_i-1} P_i), \ldots, (T^{m_r-1} P_r) \gg \in \mathbb{Z} \quad (1.2.2)
\]

for \( r \geq 1, b \geq 1, \) and \( m_j \geq 1 \). Heuristically this counts the number of rational curves in
\( M \) in homology class \( A \) which pass through each of the points \( p_i \) with \( b_i \) local branches,
such that the \( j \)th local branch is tangent to a local divisor \( D_i \) at \( p_i \) to order \( m_j - 1 \).\(^3\)

Note that with our notation we always assume that \( p_1, \ldots, p_r \in M \) are pairwise distinct
points. For instance, we show in Corollary 4.2.6 (ii) that the count

\[
N_{M,A} \ll p_1, \ldots, p_r \gg_{b_1, \ldots, b_r}
\]

coincides with the blowup Gromov–Witten invariant \( \text{GW}_{M,A-b_1[E_1] - \cdots - b_c[E_c]} \). We will
denote the invariant in (1.2.2) more concisely by

\[
N_{M,A}^T \ll P_1, \ldots, P_r := N_{M,A} \ll T^{P_1}, \ldots, T^{P_r}, \gg
\]

where we introduce partitions \( P_i := (m_1^i, \ldots, m_{b_i}^i) \). Further we define

\[
|P_i| := m_1^i + \cdots + m_{b_i}^i. \quad (1.2.4)
\]

and we assume without loss of generality that \( m_1^i \geq \cdots \geq m_{b_i}^i \). We will see in Example
5.1.5 that these invariants are rather different from the Caporaso–Harris invariants
mentioned earlier, even in the case of cubics in \( \mathbb{CP}^2 \).

\(^2\) Gathmann [7] also establishes an analogous formula that is valid in higher dimensions but it is
more elaborate because one must also take into account curves that are tangent to a subspace of the
divisor.

\(^3\) By construction for a semipositive symplectic manifold \( M \) these invariants are enumerative in the
sense that they count smooth somewhere injective curves. Moreover, in dimension four these counts
turn out to be nonnegative integers as a consequence of automatic transversality (see §4.2).
The following theorem describes what happens when two of the point constraints (which we can take to be $p_1, p_2$) are pushed together. As in the whole of this discussion we restrict to the case that $M$ is four-dimensional in order to exploit some powerful tools for studying pseudoholomorphic curves in symplectic four-manifolds.\footnote{We also expect analogues of Theorem 1.2.4 and Theorem 1.2.5 to hold in higher dimensions but we do not take this up in this paper.}

**Theorem 1.2.4.** Let $(M, \omega)$ be four dimensional and $A \in H_2(M; \mathbb{Z})$. For any partitions $\mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_r$, we have

$$N_{M,A}(\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \mathcal{P}_3, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_r) = \sum_{\mathcal{P} \in \text{Part}_{|\mathcal{P}|+|\mathcal{P}_2|}} \frac{\langle \mathcal{P}_1 \ast \mathcal{P}_2, \mathcal{P} \rangle |\text{Aut}(\mathcal{P})|}{|\text{Aut}(\mathcal{P}_1)| |\text{Aut}(\mathcal{P}_2)|} N_{M,A}(\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_3, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_r).$$

Here $\text{Part}_k$ denotes the set of all partitions of $k$, $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{P})$ is defined in Definition 4.3.2 and the combinatorial term $\langle \mathcal{P}_1 \ast \mathcal{P}_2, \mathcal{P} \rangle$ is defined by (4.3.2).

Observe that we can apply this formula iteratively to reduce constraints at $r$ different points to constraints at a single point. In order to prove Theorem 1.2.1, the idea (explained in §5) is to apply Theorem 1.2.4 “in reverse” in order to reduce curve counts with tangency constraints to curve counts without any tangency constraints, which in turn coincide with certain blowup Gromov–Witten invariants. In fact, our recursive algorithm computes all of the multibranched tangency invariants $N_{M,A}(\mathcal{T}^{p_1}p_1, \ldots, \mathcal{T}^{p_r}p_r)$ for a symplectic four-manifold $M$. In §5.1 we provide some detailed computations for the special case of $\mathbb{C}P^2$.

Although one might be able to prove Theorem 1.2.4 in the context of tangential constraints, it turns out to be illuminating to reformulate this theorem as a result about curves with ends on a “skinny ellipsoid”.\footnote{For additional context, see the last paragraph of §1.1.} More precisely, in §3 we count curves in the negative symplectic completion of $M \setminus \iota(E_{sk})$ with negative ends on the short orbit of the boundary $\partial E_{sk}$ of a “skinny ellipsoid”. Here $\iota : E_{sk} \to M$ is a symplectic embedding of

$$E_{sk} := E(\varepsilon, \varepsilon s, \ldots, \varepsilon s) = \{ z \in \mathbb{C}^n \mid |\pi z_1|^2 + \sum_{i>1} |\pi z_i|^2 / s \leq \varepsilon \}, \quad \varepsilon > 0, \ s \gg 0$$

into $M$.

We show in Proposition 3.1.1 and 3.1.6 that in any dimension there is a well defined count of curves with a single negative end on a skinny ellipsoid that in particular is independent of the shape parameter $s$ provided that this is sufficiently large. The proof here uses some recent results by Moreno–Siefring [24] about the writhe of a curve about a divisor. It may be that if these tools were further developed one could also prove that in any dimension the count of curves with several negative ends on a skinny ellipsoid is well defined. As it is, we use results from ECH (embedded contact homology) to prove such a result in dimension four, giving rise to invariants that we call

$$N^{E}_{M,A}(\mathcal{P}).$$

For a precise statement, see Proposition 3.2.1.

In §4.2 we show that in four dimensions these two approaches give the same count. More precisely, we have:
Theorem 1.2.5. Let \((M,\omega)\) be four dimensional and \(A \in H_2(M;\mathbb{Z})\). Then for every partition \(\mathcal{P}\) of \(m := c_1(A) - 1\) we have

\[ N_{T,M,A}^{\mathcal{P}} = N_{E,M,A}^{\mathcal{P}} = N_{M,A}^{\mathcal{P}}. \]

Further, if \(N_{M,A}\) denotes the number of \(A\)-curves\(^6\) through \(m\) generic points we have

\[ N_{M,A} = \sum_{\mathcal{P}' \in \text{Part}_m} \mathcal{P}'! N_{M,A}^{\mathcal{P}'} , \]

where \(\mathcal{P}'! := \frac{m!}{m_1! \ldots m_b!} \).

More generally, in dimension four one can also define invariants by removing \(r\) disjoint skinny ellipsoids, and we show in Corollary 4.2.6 that

\[ N_{T,M,A}^{\mathcal{P}_1,\ldots,\mathcal{P}_r} = N_{E,M,A}^{\mathcal{P}_1,\ldots,\mathcal{P}_r} =: N_{M,A}^{\mathcal{P}_1,\ldots,\mathcal{P}_r}. \]  

(1.2.5)

1.3. Structure of the paper. The structure of this paper is as follows:

- In §2 we define the invariants \(N_{M,A}^{T\mathcal{P}_1,\ldots,\mathcal{P}_r}\) for any semipositive symplectic manifold \(M\) and prove independence of all choices. After reviewing standard rational Gromov–Witten invariants in §2.1, we consider the case of a single tangency constraint in §2.2 and give the general case in §2.3. The main ingredients of the proof are detailed index calculations in the presence of tangency constraints and the transversality results from Cieliebak–Mohnke [3].

- In §3, we define the analogous invariants \(N_{E,M,A}^{\mathcal{P}_1,\ldots,\mathcal{P}_r}\) by removing \(r\) disjoint skinny ellipsoids \(E_{sk}^1,\ldots,E_{sk}^r\) from \(M\) and counting punctured curves with specified negative ends. In the case of a single negative end, we prove in §3.1 that in all dimensions these counts are independent of all choices (including the precise profile of the ellipsoids \(E_{sk}^1,\ldots,E_{sk}^r\)) by invoking the compactness theorem from symplectic field theory (SFT) and carefully ruling out bad degenerations. We also use new results about the writhe of a cylindrical end about a divisor by Moreno–Siefring [24]. In the case of several negative ends, we restrict to dimension four, ruling out bad degenerations in §3.2 by utilizing various tools from embedded contact homology (ECH), most notably the writhe bounds, relative adjunction formula, and obstruction bundle gluing (all reviewed briefly in §3.2).

- In §4.1 we show that in dimension four a version of automatic transversality holds so that every curve that contributes to \(N_{T,M,A}^{\mathcal{P}_1,\ldots,\mathcal{P}_r}\) counts positively. As an application, we show that invariants such as \(N_{M,A}^{T^{m-1}p}\) are almost always nonzero and that blowup Gromov–Witten invariants are indeed a special case of the invariants \(N_{M,A}^{\mathcal{P}_1,\ldots,\mathcal{P}_r}\). We then prove Theorem 1.2.5 in §4.2, showing in particular that the tangency and analogous ellipsoidal end constraints coincide in dimension four. The argument we give combines neck stretching and obstruction bundle gluing with Wendl’s automatic transversality theorem [29]. In §4.3, we combine the skinny ellipsoid framework with SFT neck stretching (and various other tools) to prove Theorem 1.2.4.

- Finally, in §5 we arrive at the recursive algorithm. After giving various computations and examples in §5.1, we discuss the algorithm in detail in §5.2.

\(^6\)For brevity we will sometimes refer to curves in the homology class \(A\) as “\(A\)-curves.”
2. Curves with local tangency constraints

In this section we define Gromov–Witten type invariants counting pseudoholomorphic curves with various types of tangency constraints in any semipositive symplectic manifold. After reviewing the symplectic approach to Gromov–Witten theory in the semipositive case in §2.1, we consider the case of a single tangency constraint at a point in §2.2. In §2.3, we generalize this to tangency constraints involving several branches of a curve passing through the same point in the target.

2.1. Review of symplectic Gromov–Witten theory. As a prelude to defining curve counts with local tangency constraints, in this subsection we give a brief review of Gromov–Witten theory for semipositive symplectic manifolds as in [21]. Let \((M^{2n}, \omega)\) be a closed symplectic manifold.\(^7\) We will denote its (primary) Gromov–Witten invariants by \(GW_{M,g,A}^<\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_k> \in \mathbb{Q}\), where \(A \in H_2(M; \mathbb{Z})\) is a homology class and \(\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_k \in H^*(M; \mathbb{Z})\) are cohomology classes. These numbers are independent of all choices made during the construction (most notably that of an almost complex structure) and are invariant under symplectomorphisms and a fortiori under symplectic deformation equivalences.\(^8\) Roughly, these invariants count (for a suitable meaning of “count”) the number of genus \(g\) pseudoholomorphic curves in \(M\) in the homology class \(A\) which pass through cycles in \(M\) representing the Poincaré dual homology classes of \(\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_k\). Although Gromov–Witten invariants have been defined in both the algebraic and symplectic categories in great generality, for concreteness we will restrict ourselves to the case that \((M, \omega)\) is semipositive, i.e. for any \(A \in H_2(M; \mathbb{Z})\) with \([\omega] \cdot A > 0\) and \(c_1(A) \geq 3 - n\) we have \(c_1(A) \geq 0\).\(^9\) We will also restrict throughout to the case of rational (i.e. genus zero) curves and hence we will omit \(g\) from the notation. The discussion here of Gromov–Witten invariants and the subsequent generalization to curve counts with tangency constraints can be extended to more general symplectic manifolds using various virtual perturbation schemes or e.g. the approach of [3], but we will not need to do so in this paper. Note that the class of semipositive symplectic manifolds is already quite large and includes all symplectic manifolds of dimension less than or equal to six.

Let \(J\) be an \(\omega\)-tame almost complex structure.\(^{10}\) We denote by \(\mathcal{M}_M^J_{M,A}\) the moduli space\(^{11}\) of rational \(J\)-holomorphic spheres in \(M\) representing the homology class \(A \in H_2(M; \mathbb{Z})\). As we will assume throughout this paper that \(n \geq 2\).

\(^7\)Recall that two symplectic manifolds \((M, \omega)\) and \((M', \omega')\) are said to be symplectic deformation equivalent if there is a diffeomorphism \(\Phi : M \to M'\) such that \(\Phi^*(\omega')\) can be joined to \(\omega\) by a 1-parameter family of symplectic forms on \(M\).

\(^8\)Recall that an almost complex structure is \(\omega\)-tame if \(\omega(v, Jv) > 0\) for all nonzero tangent vectors \(v \in TM\). An almost complex structure is furthermore called \(\omega\)-compatible if \(\omega(-, J-)\) is a Riemannian metric. Tameness tends to be sufficient for most purposes.

\(^9\)Recall that an almost complex structure is \(\omega\)-tame if \(\omega(v, Jv) > 0\) for all nonzero tangent vectors \(v \in TM\). An almost complex structure is furthermore called \(\omega\)-compatible if \(\omega(-, J-)\) is a Riemannian metric. Tameness tends to be sufficient for most purposes.

\(^{10}\)Recall that two symplectic manifolds \((M, \omega)\) and \((M', \omega')\) are said to be symplectic deformation equivalent if there is a diffeomorphism \(\Phi : M \to M'\) such that \(\Phi^*(\omega')\) can be joined to \(\omega\) by a 1-parameter family of symplectic forms on \(M\).

\(^{11}\)By default “moduli space” will mean that we have already quotiented out by the relevant group of biholomorphisms of the domain acting by reparametrizations.
That is, we put
\[ M_{M,A}^J := \{ u : S^2 \to M \mid du \circ j = J \circ du, \ [u] = A \} \mod \text{Aut}(S^2), \]
where \( j \) denotes the standard (integrable) almost complex structure on the Riemann sphere \( S^2 \) and \( \text{Aut}(S^2) = \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C}) \) is its biholomorphism group. We denote by
\[ M_{M,A}^{J,s} \subset M_{M,A}^J \]
the subspace of simple (or equivalently somewhere injective) curves, i.e. those not factoring through any branched cover of the domain. By a standard argument involving the Sard–Smale theorem, for generic \( \omega \)-tame \( J \) every curve in \( M_{M,A}^{J,s} \) is regular (i.e. its associated linearized Cauchy–Riemann operator is surjective), and hence \( M_{M,A}^{J,s} \) is a smooth (but not necessarily compact) manifold. Here and henceforth we say that a condition holds for generic \( \omega \)-tame \( J \) if the subset of all \( \omega \)-tame almost complex structures \( J \) for which the condition holds is Baire, i.e. is a countable intersection of dense open sets. Moreover, the (real) dimension of \( M_{M,A}^{J,s} \) is given by the Fredholm index of any representative curve \( u \), which can be shown (using say Riemann–Roch or Atiyah–Singer) to be
\[ \text{ind}(u) = 2n - 6 + 2c_1(A). \]

Similarly, we define the moduli space \( M_{M,A,k}^J \) of \( J \)-holomorphic spheres in \( M \) in the homology class \( A \) with \( k \) distinct (ordered) marked points, as well as the subspace \( M_{M,A,k}^{J,s} \subset M_{M,A,k}^J \) of simple curves. We have a natural evaluation map
\[ \text{ev} : M_{M,A,k}^J \to \underbrace{M \times \cdots \times M}_{k} =: M^\times k. \]

The key point of semipositivity is that it leads to the following result.

**Proposition 2.1.1.** ([21]) Let \((M, \omega)\) be a semipositive symplectic manifold, and let \( A \in H_2(M; \mathbb{Z}) \) be a homology class. Assume further that \( A \) is not of the form \( kB \) for \( B \in H_2(M; \mathbb{Z}) \) with \( c_1(B) = 0 \) and \( k > 1 \). For generic \( \omega \)-tame \( J \), the evaluation map \( \text{ev} \) defines a pseudocycle in \( M^\times k \) of dimension \( 2n - 6 + 2c_1(A) + 2k \). Moreover, this pseudocycle is independent of \( J \) up to pseudocycle bordism.

Recall (see [21, Ch.6]) that a \( d \)-dimensional pseudocycle in a smooth manifold \( Q \) is by definition a smooth map \( f : V \to Q \), with \( V \) an oriented \( d \)-dimensional smooth manifold, such that \( f(V) \subset Q \) is compact and \( \text{dim} \Omega_f \leq d - 2 \). Here \( \Omega_f \) is the limit set, defined by
\[ \Omega_f := \bigcap_{K \subset V, K \text{ compact}} f(V \setminus K), \]
and the inequality \( \text{dim} \Omega_f \leq d - 2 \) means that \( \Omega_f \) is contained in the image of a smooth map \( g : W \to Q \) for \( W \) a smooth manifold of dimension \( \text{dim} W \leq d - 2 \). A bordism between \( d \)-dimensional pseudocycles \( f_0 : V_0 \to Q \) and \( f_1 : V_1 \to Q \) is a smooth map \( F : W \to X \) with \( W \) a smooth manifold of dimension \( d + 1 \) such that \( \partial W = V_1 \cup (-V_0) \), \( F|_{V_0} = f_0 \), \( F|_{V_1} = f_1 \), and \( \text{dim} \Omega_F \leq d - 1 \).
**Proof sketch of Proposition 2.1.1.** The basic idea is to show that the evaluation map \(ev : \mathcal{M}^I_{M,A,k} \to M^{\times k}\) extends to a compactification \(\overline{\mathcal{M}}^I_{M,A,k}\) in such a way that the image of the added points has codimension at least two, i.e.

\[
\dim ev \left( \overline{\mathcal{M}}^I_{M,A,k} \setminus \mathcal{M}^I_{M,A,k} \right) \leq 2n - 8 + 2c_1(A) + 2k.
\]

We take \(\overline{\mathcal{M}}^I_{M,A,k}\) to be the usual stable map compactification of \(\mathcal{M}^I_{M,A,k}\), which is defined by allowing multiple covers and by adding various nodal configurations indexed by decorated graphs. First consider the curves \(u \in \mathcal{M}^I_{M,A,k} \setminus \mathcal{M}^I_{M,A,k}\), i.e. multiple covers with smooth domain in homology class \(A\). Since \(u\) is multiply covered, we cannot necessarily assume that it is regular for generic \(J\), so it might appear in a family with higher than expected dimension. However, note that the image of \(u\) under the evaluation map is the same as that of its underlying simple curve \(\overline{u}\), since the \(r\) marked points can vary freely. Since we can assume that the curve \(\overline{u}\) is regular and hence appears with its expected dimension, it suffices to show that we have \(\text{ind}(\overline{u}) \leq \text{ind}(u) - 2\). Say that \(u\) is a \(\kappa\)-fold cover of \(\overline{u}\) for some \(\kappa > 1\), so that \(\overline{u}\) lies in the homology class \(A/\kappa\). We can also assume that the curve \(u\) after forgetting the \(k\) marked points is regular, and hence its index is nonnegative, i.e. we have \(2c_1(A)/\kappa + 2n - 6 \geq 0\). Therefore by semipositivity we must have \(0 \leq \frac{1}{\kappa}c_1(A) \leq c_1(A)\). By the assumption on the homology class \(A\) we must in fact have strict inequalities \(0 < \frac{1}{\kappa}c_1(A) < c_1(A)\). This implies that we have \(\text{ind}(\overline{u}) \leq \text{ind}(u) - 2\), as desired.

Now we consider the nodal configurations \(u \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}^I_{M,A,k} \setminus \mathcal{M}^I_{M,A,k}\). Due to the presence of a node, the expected codimension of \(u\) is at least two, but since \(u\) may involve one or more multiply covered components, it could appear in a family with higher than expected dimension. Luckily, every nodal configuration has an underlying simple one with the same image under \(ev\), obtained by replacing each multiply covered component by its underlying simple curve and pruning components when two or more have the same image (see [21, §6.1] for more details). Each such simple configuration is regular for generic \(J\) and appears with its expected dimension, and, arguing as above, semipositivity guarantees that the codimension is least two.

As for the bordism statement, the argument is similar. Namely, given two generic \(\omega\)-tame almost complex structures \(J_0\) and \(J_1\), we can pick a family \(\{J_t : t \in [0,1]\}\) of \(\omega\)-tame almost complex structures interpolating between them. We can then consider the \(t\)-parametrized moduli space \(\mathcal{M}^{(J_t),s}_{M,A,k}\) consisting of all pairs \((t,u)\) with \(t \in [0,1]\) and \(u \in \mathcal{M}^{J_t,s}_{M,A,k}\). For a generic such family \(\{J_t\}\), this parametrized moduli space is a smooth manifold of dimension \(2n - 5 + 2c_1(A)\) and comes with a natural evaluation map to \(M^{\times k}\). Arguing exactly as above, this defines a pseudocycle bordism between the pseudocycles defined for the \(t = 0\) and \(t = 1\) data. \(\square\)

It was shown by Schwarz [25] that pseudocycles up to bordism are equivalent to integral homology classes. Thus we have get a well-defined integral homology class,

\[\text{dim ev} \left( \overline{\mathcal{M}}^I_{M,A,k} \setminus \mathcal{M}^I_{M,A,k} \right) \leq 2n - 8 + 2c_1(A) + 2k.\]
which we denote by
\[ \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{M,A,k} \in H_{2n-6+2c_1(A)+2k}(M^{xk};\mathbb{Z}). \]

Given cohomology classes \( \gamma_1, ..., \gamma_k \in H^*(M;\mathbb{Z}) \) of total summed degree \( 2n-6+2c_1(A)+2k \), we define Gromov–Witten invariants as per the usual prescription by
\[ GW_{M,A}(\gamma_1, ..., \gamma_k) := (\pi_1^*\gamma_1 \cup ... \cup \pi_k^*\gamma_k) \cdot \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{M,A,k} \in \mathbb{Z}, \]
where \( \pi_i : M^{xk} \to M \) denotes the projection to the \( i \)th factor. In the special case that we have \( c_1(A) = 3 - n \), we denote the corresponding invariant without any evaluation constraints simply by \( GW_{M,A} \in \mathbb{Z} \).

Remark 2.1.2. As explained in [21], one can also remove the assumption on the homology class \( A \) in Proposition 2.1.1 while still working in the realm of classical transversality techniques. This involves using domain-dependent almost complex structures and generally leads to rational (rather than integral) Gromov–Witten invariants. Also, note that in dimension four the Gromov–Witten invariant \( GW_{M,A} \) can only be nonzero if \( c_1(A) \geq 1 \), i.e. the situation \( c_1(A) = 0 \) does not arise for index reasons. \( \diamond \)

2.2. Curves with a single tangency constraint. Let \( (M,\omega) \) be a semipositive symplectic manifold. In this subsection we define the numbers \( N_{M,A,<T^{m-1}p>} \) counting pseudoholomorphic spheres in \( M \) in homology class \( A \) satisfying an order \( m - 1 \) local tangency constraint at a point \( p \in M \), where \( m = c_1(A) - 1 \). As in the case of Gromov–Witten invariants, these numbers are independent of all choices involved in the construction, including the point \( p \in M \) (but we find it helpful to nevertheless include it in the notation). Although these invariants could in principle be defined in much greater generality, in the semipositive case they are defined rather concretely as counts of somewhere injective curves and take values in the integers.

Following Cieliebak–Mohnke [3], let \( J \) be an \( \omega \)-tame almost complex structure on \( M \) which is integrable in a small neighborhood \( \mathcal{O}(p) \) of a point \( p \in M \), and let \( D \) be a smooth complex codimension one holomorphic submanifold in \( \mathcal{O}(p) \) which passes through \( p \). Given a Riemann surface \( \Sigma \) with a marked point \( z \) and a \( J \)-holomorphic map \( u : \Sigma \to M \) with \( u(z) = p \), we say that \( u \) has tangency order \( m - 1 \) (or equivalently contact order \( m \)) to \( (D,p) \) at the marked point \( z \) if we have
\[ \frac{d^j(g \circ u \circ f)}{d\zeta^j} \bigg|_{\zeta=0} = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad j = 1, ..., m - 1, \quad (2.2.1) \]
where \( f : \mathbb{C} \supset \mathcal{O}(0) \to \mathcal{O}(z) \subset \Sigma \) is a choice of local complex coordinates for \( \Sigma \) at \( z \), and \( g : M \supset \mathcal{O}(p) \to \mathbb{C} \) is a holomorphic function such that \( D = g^{-1}(0) \) and \( dg(p) \neq 0 \). As shown in [3], this notion is independent of the choice of \( f \) and \( g \), and it only depends on the germ of \( D \) near \( p \). Assuming \( m \) is maximal such that \( u \) is tangent to \( (D,p) \) to order \( m - 1 \) at \( z \), we will denote by
\[ \text{ord}(u, D; z) = m \quad (2.2.2) \]

\( ^{13} \)In general we will adopt Gromov’s convention that \( \mathcal{O}(p) \) denotes a small unspecified open neighborhood of \( p \).

\( ^{14} \)We note that by tangency order \( m - 1 \) we will always mean tangency order \( m - 1 \ or \ greater \), unless explicitly stated otherwise.
the local contact order of $u$ to $(D, p)$ at $z$. It is shown in [3, Prop 7.1] that \( \text{ord}(u, D; z) \)
can indeed be interpreted as the local intersection number of $u$ with $D$ in the following sense: if
$U$ is a small neighborhood of $z$ such that $u^{-1}(p) \cap U = \{z\}$, then any
small generic $J$-holomorphic perturbation of $u|_U$ has precisely \( \text{ord}(u, D; z) \) transverse
intersection points with $D$.

Let $\mathcal{M}^{J, s}_{M, A} < T^{m-1} p >$ denote the moduli space of simple rational curves in $M$
in homology class $A$ which are tangent to order $m - 1$ to $(D, p)$ at a marked point $z$. Let $\mathcal{J}_D$
denote the set of $\omega$-tame almost complex structures on $M$ which are integrable on $\mathcal{O}(p)$ and for
which $D$ is a holomorphic submanifold. We have:

**Lemma 2.2.1.** ([3, Prop. 6.9]) For generic $J \in \mathcal{J}_D$, the space $\mathcal{M}^{J, s}_{M, A} < T^{m-1} p >$
is a smooth (but not necessarily compact) manifold of dimension
\[
2(n - 3) + 2c_1(A) + (2 - 2n) - 2(m - 1) = 2c_1(A) - 2 - 2m.
\]

**Proposition 2.2.2.** Let $(M, \omega)$ be a semipositive symplectic manifold of dimension $2n$. Then,
for generic $J \in \mathcal{J}_D$, the evaluation map $ev : \mathcal{M}^{J, s}_{M, A} < T^{m-1} p > \to M \times k$
defines a pseudocycle of dimension $2c_1(A) - 2 - 2m + 2k$ which is independent of $J, p,$ and $D$
up to pseudocycle bordism.

**Proof.** We proceed along similar lines to the proof of Proposition 2.1.1. The basic strategy
is to show that the evaluation map $ev : \mathcal{M}^{J, s}_{M, A, k} < T^{m-1} p > \to M \times k$
extends to a compactification $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^I_{M, A, k} < T^{m-1} p >$ in such a way that the image of the added points
has codimension at least two, i.e.
\[
\dim ev \left( \overline{\mathcal{M}}^I_{M, A, k} < T^{m-1} p > \setminus \mathcal{M}^{J, s}_{M, A, k} < T^{m-1} p > \right) \leq 2c_1(A) - 4 - 2m + 2k.
\]

Note that there is a forgetful inclusion of $\mathcal{M}^{J, s}_{M, A, k} < T^{m-1} p >$ into $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^I_{M, A, k+1}$, where
the last marked point comes from the one satisfying the $< T^{m-1} p >$ constraint. We define the
compactification $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^I_{M, A, k}$ to be simply the closure of $\mathcal{M}^{J, s}_{M, A, k} < T^{m-1} p >$
in this ambient compact space.

Firstly, consider curves
\[
u \in \mathcal{M}^I_{M, A, k} < T^{m-1} p > \setminus \mathcal{M}^{J, s}_{M, A, k} < T^{m-1} p >,
\]
i.e. multiply covered curves with smooth domain. If $u$ is a $k$-fold cover of its underlying
simple curve $\overline{u}$, note that $\overline{u}$ lies in the homology class $A/\kappa$, satisfies the constraint
$< T^{m-1} p >$ for some $\overline{m} \geq m/\kappa$, and it inherits an additional $k$ marked points. Then by
regularity $\overline{u}$ appears with its expected dimension and it suffices to show that $\text{ind}(\overline{u}) \leq$

\[\text{This lemma slightly extends [3, Prop. 6.9] since our divisor $D$ is local rather than global and we}
\text{have fixed the intersection point $p$ on $D$. However, once $p$ is fixed the rest of the divisor is irrelevant,}
\text{and the extension to the case when $p$ is fixed is mentioned in the followup paper [4, Prop 3.1].}
ind(\(u\)) = 2. Since \(\overline{u}\) is simple and \(J\) is generic, we can further assume that the same curve \(\overline{u}\) after forgetting the \(k\) marked points is regular and hence has nonnegative index, so we have

\[
0 \leq 2c_1(A)/\kappa - 2 - 2m
\]

(2.2.4)

\[
\leq 2(c_1(A) - m)/\kappa - 2
\]

(2.2.5)

where the last inequality holds because \(0 \leq (c_1(A) - m)/\kappa - 1\) implies that \(c_1(A) - m \geq \kappa \geq 2\). We then have

\[
\text{ind}(u) = 2c_1(A)/\kappa - 2 - 2m + 2k
\]

\[
\leq 2c_1(A) - 4 - 2m + 2k
\]

\[
= \text{ind}(u) - 2,
\]

as desired.

Next, we must consider curves \(u \in \mathcal{M}_{M,A,k}^{J,T^{m-1}p} \setminus \mathcal{M}_{M,A,k}^{J,T^{m-1}p}\); i.e. nodal degenerations of curves with smooth domain satisfying the tangency constraint \(\langle T^{m-1}p \rangle\). We will refer to the component of \(u\) containing the last marked point \(z\) (i.e. the one satisfying the tangency constraint) as the “main” one. Firstly, consider the case that the main component of \(u\) is not constant. Although \(u\) might have one or more multiply covered components, as in the proof of Proposition 2.1.1 we can pass to the underlying simple configuration \(\overline{u}\). We can assume that \(\overline{u}\) is regular and hence appears in a family of the expected dimension. Moreover, as above, one easily checks using semipositivity that the expected codimension of \(\overline{u}\) is at least two.

Secondly, we must consider the possibility that the main component of \(u\) is a ghost (i.e. constant). This case is slightly more subtle because at first glance the tangency constraint appears to be lost, which makes it difficult to argue that \(u\) only appears with codimension at least two. Indeed, note that, according to the definition in (2.2.1), a constant map at \(p\) is automatically tangent to \((D, p)\) to all orders. On the other hand, it turns out that the tangency constraint \(\langle T^{m-1}p \rangle\) gets redistributed amongst the components of \(u\) which are “close to” the main one. More precisely, let \(u_1, \ldots, u_a\) (for \(a \geq 1\)) denote the nonconstant components of \(u\) which are adjacent to the main component \(u_0\), or more generally are adjacent to some ghost component of \(u\) which is connected to \(u_0\) through ghost components. For \(i = 1, \ldots, a\), let \(\tilde{z}_i \in \text{dom} u_i\) denote the relevant special point of \(u_i\) which participates in the node realizing this adjacency. Then at the marked point \(z_i\) we have \(u_i(\tilde{z}_i) = p\) and \(u_i\) has contact with \(D\) to some order \(\text{ord}(u, D; \tilde{z}_i) \geq 1\), where \(\text{ord}(u, D; \tilde{z}_i)\) is defined in (2.2.2). According to [3, Lemma 7.2], in this situation we have

\[
\sum_{i=1}^a \text{ord}(u, D; \tilde{z}_i) \geq m,
\]

(2.2.6)

i.e. the total local contact order to \(D\) is nondecreasing as a family of smooth curves in \(\mathcal{M}_{M,A,k}^{J,T^{m-1}p}\) degenerates to \(u\) (see Lemma 2.3.2 below for a slightly more general statement).

More precisely, let \(\overline{u}\) be the (nodal, possibly disconnected) curve obtained as follows:
(1) remove the main component of \( u \), along with all other ghost components which are connected to it through ghost components
(2) add a new marked point at each of the nearby special points \( \tilde{z}_i \) on a nonconstant component as above
(3) replace each multiply covered component by its underlying simple curve and prune components when two or more have the same image (as in the proof of Proposition 2.1.1).

Observe that \( \overline{u} \) has the same image under the evaluation map as \( u \) (technically we may have removed some of the original \( k \) unconstrained marked points but using the fact that they all map to \( p \) we recover the missing components of the evaluation map). If we assume that the maneuver (3) does not involve any components adjacent to the removed ghost components, then since \( \overline{u} \) satisfies the tangency constraint \( <T^{\text{ord}(u,D;\tilde{z}_i)-1}p> \) at each of the new marked points \( \tilde{z}_i \), the above inequality shows that steps (1) and (2) do not reduce the codimension of the constraint, so the index of \( \overline{u} \) is at most that of \( u \). To see that we in fact have \( \text{ind}(\overline{u}) \leq \text{ind}(u) - 2 \), observe that because, by stability, each ghost component has at least three special points, one of the following must occur:

(a) one or more of the unconstrained marked points \( z_1, ..., z_k \) maps to \( p \), or
(b) \( \overline{u} \) is disconnected (recall that the main component has been removed) and has \( a > 1 \) nonconstant components.

Case (a) clearly involves an additional constraint of codimension at least two, and so does case (b) by an easy index calculation. Since such curves \( \overline{u} \) are simple, we can assume that they are regular and hence appear with the expected dimension. It follows that the image under the evaluation map of the stratum containing \( u \) has codimension at least two.

It remains to check that the above claims still hold if one (or more) of the components \( u_i \) that carry some part of the tangency constraint is multiply covered. In this case, we replace \( u_i \) satisfying \( <T^{m_i-1}p> \) with \( \overline{u}_i \) satisfying \( <T^{\overline{m}_i-1}p> \) where \( u_i = \kappa_i t \) and \( m_i = \overline{m}_i \). The calculation in (2.2.4) shows that the contribution of the component \( \overline{u}_i \) to the total index is at least two less than that of \( u_i \). Hence again the image under the evaluation map of the stratum containing such curves has codimension at least two.

As for the bordism statement, the argument is similar. Namely, suppose we have local divisors \( D_0, D_1 \) at points \( p_0, p_1 \in M \) respectively, and let \( J_0, J_1 \) be corresponding generic almost complex structures on \( M \) such that \( J_t \) is integrable near \( p_1 \) and makes \( D_0 \) holomorphic. Then we can pick a path \( p_t \) from \( p_0 \) to \( p_1 \), a family \( D_t \) of local divisors at \( p_t \) interpolating between \( D_0 \) and \( D_1 \), and a family \( J_t \in \mathcal{J}_{D_t} \) of \( \omega \)-tame almost complex structures interpolating between \( J_0 \) and \( J_1 \) such that \( J_t \) is integrable near \( p_t \) and makes \( D_t \) holomorphic. We can then consider the \( t \)-parametrized moduli space \( \mathcal{M}_{M,A,k}^{J_t,s} <T^{m-1}p> \) consisting of all pairs \((t,u)\) with \( t \in [0,1] \) and \( u \in \mathcal{M}_{M,A,k}^{J_t,s} <T^{m-1}p> \). As in the case of a single almost complex structure, if we take the family \( J_t \) to be generic, we have that \( \mathcal{M}_{M,A,k}^{J_t,s} <T^{m-1}p> \) is a smooth manifold of dimension

\[
2c_1(A) - 1 - 2m + 2k,
\]

and it comes equipped with a natural evaluation map to \( M^{\times k} \). Arguing exactly above, this defines a pseudocycle bordism between the pseudocycles defined for the \( t = 0 \) and \( t = 1 \) data. \( \square \)
Remark 2.2.3. (i) We point out that, in contrast to Proposition 2.1.1, in Proposition 2.2.2 we do not need any assumption ruling out multiples of homology classes with vanishing first Chern class, since the presence of the point constraint at $p$ forces $c_1(A) > 0$.

(ii) When considering Gromov–Witten invariants relative to a global divisor $D$, various technical difficulties stem from the fact that a sequence of smooth curves not contained in $D$ can degenerate into a nodal curve with one or more components entirely contained in $D$. If $D$ is a local divisor the situation is somewhat nicer, since generically we only need to worry about constant components in $D$. Still, we expect nodal configurations with ghost components contained in $D$ to precisely account for the discrepancy between gravitational descendant counts and curves with genuine tangency constraints as in Table 5.1.3 (c.f. Remark 1.2.3).

It follows from Proposition 2.2.2 that we have a well-defined homology class

$$[\overline{M}_{M,A,k} < T^{m-1} p >] \in H_{2c_1(A) - 2 - 2m + 2k}(M^{x_k}; \mathbb{Z}).$$

Given cohomology classes $\gamma_1, ..., \gamma_k \in H^*(M; \mathbb{Z})$ with total summed degree $2c_1(A) - 2 - 2m + 2k$, we define numerical invariants by

$$N_{M,A} < T^{m-1} p, \gamma_1, ..., \gamma_k > := (\pi_1^* \gamma_1 \cup ... \cup \pi_k^* \gamma_k) \cdot [\overline{M}_{M,A,k} < T^{m-1} p >] \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

We are most interested in the special case that $k = 0$ and $c_1(A) = m - 1$. Although the invariants are not technically defined in this case since we need a nontrivial evaluation map to make sense of them, we may define them as follows:

$$N_{M,A} < T^{m-1} p > := \frac{1}{\gamma(A)} N_{M,A,1} < T^{m-1} p, \gamma > \in \mathbb{Z} \quad (2.2.7)$$

where $\gamma \in H^2(M, \mathbb{Z})$ is such that $\gamma(A) \neq 0$. The proof of the divisor axiom of Gromov–Witten theory easily adapts to show that this is independent of the choice of $\gamma$. Further, if we choose $\gamma$ so that its Poincaré dual is represented by a symplectic submanifold $V$ that is disjoint from $p$, we may choose $J$ so that $V$ is $J$-holomorphic. Then a generic $A$-curve will meet $V$ transversally in $\gamma(A)$ points, which easily implies that $N_{M,A} < T^{m-1} p >$ is an integer, as claimed above.

Given distinct points $p_1, ..., p_r \in M$ and corresponding local divisors $D_1, ..., D_r$, this construction also straightforwardly extends to define invariants

$$N_{M,A} < T^{m-1} p_1, ..., T^{m-1} p_r > \in \mathbb{Z} \quad (2.2.8)$$

and so on. In a slightly different direction, we can generalize the constraint $< T^{m-1} p >$ as follows. As above, let $J$ be an $\omega$-tame almost complex structure on $M^{2n}$ which is integrable near $p \in M$. Let $D_1, ..., D_n$ be smooth holomorphic local divisors near $p$ which are in general position in the sense that their normal bundles span the tangent space $T_p M$. For $c_1, ..., c_n \geq 1$, we denote by

$$\mathcal{M}_{M,A}^{J, s} < T^{c_1 - 1}_{D_1} ... T^{c_n - 1}_{D_n} >$$

the moduli space of simple $J$-holomorphic spheres $u : S^2 \to M$ in the homology class $A$ with a marked point $z$ such that $u$ is tangent to order $c_i - 1$ to $(D_i, p)$ at the marked point $z$ for $i = 1, ..., n$. Note that in the case $c_1 = m$, $D_1 = D$, and $c_2 = ... = c_n = 1,$
this reduces to the constraint $< T^{m-1} p >$ from earlier. On the other hand, in the case $n = 2$ and $c_1 = c_2 = 2$, the constraint $< T_{D_1} T_{D_2} p >$ is equivalent to having a cusp at $p$, i.e. $u(z) = p$ and $du$ vanishes at the marked point $z$. More generally, for any $n$ the constraint $< T_{D_1}^{c_1-1} ... T_{D_n}^{c_n-1} p >$ corresponds to having $u(z) = p$ and the first $k - 1$ derivatives of $u$ at $z$ identically equal to zero.

The moduli space $M_{M,A,k}^{J_1} < T_{D_1}^{c_1-1} ... T_{D_n}^{c_n-1} p >$ is defined in the same way, with an additional $k$ unconstrained marked points. Denote by $J_{D_1,...,D_n}$ the set of $\omega$-tame almost complex structures on $M$ which are integrable on $Op(p)$ and for which the local divisors $D_1,...,D_n$ are holomorphic submanifolds. In this setting, we have:

**Proposition 2.2.4.** For generic $J \in J_{D_1,...,D_n}$, the evaluation map

$$ev : M_{M,A,k}^{J_1} < T_{D_1}^{c_1-1} ... T_{D_n}^{c_n-1} p > \rightarrow M^{\times k}$$

defines a pseudocycle of dimension $2c_1(A) - 4 - 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} (c_i - 1) + 2k$ which is independent of $J,p,D_1,...,D_n$ up to pseudocycle bordism (provided that the divisors $D_1,...,D_n$ are in general position).

**Sketch of proof.** This follows by essentially the same argument used to prove Proposition 2.2.2. Although [3] only considers the case of one divisor per marked point, we may choose local coordinates $z_1,\ldots,z_n$ at $p$ so that the divisors $D_1,\ldots,D_n$ coincide with the coordinate planes $z_1 = 0,\ldots,z_n = 0$. Hence the derivatives in different directions are independent of each other, and the lower bound in (2.2.6) holds independently in each of the $n$ directions — see Lemma 2.3.2 for a more precise statement. The proof of Proposition 2.2.2 then applies without essential change. We leave further details to the reader.

Using this, we can define invariants of the form $N_{M,A} < T_{D_1}^{c_1-1} ... T_{D_n}^{c_n-1} > \in \mathbb{Z}$ and so on.

**Remark 2.2.5.** (i) We have stated Proposition 2.2.4 for the sake of completeness, making no direct use of it in our arguments below. However, it does imply that for generic $J$ the curves counted by $N_{M,A} < T^{m-1} >$ do not have vanishing derivative at the marked point $z$ satisfying the constraint $< T^{m-1} >$. To see this, note that such a curve would satisfy the stronger constraint $< T^{m-1} T_{D_2} \ldots T_{D_n} p >$, which increases the codimension by at least two. For more general curve counts, by adding an additional marked point and imposing the vanishing derivative condition at that point, one can show that cusps only occur in codimension at least two. This basic observation will be an essential ingredient in the proof that the multibranched tangency constraints considered in the next subsection are well defined. For a precise statement see Lemma 2.3.2 below. (ii) In principle, we could also use Proposition 2.2.4 to define other curve counts involving cusps, or by considering multidirectional vanishing conditions for derivatives in higher dimensions. However, we do not pursue this here. □

### 2.3. Curves with multibranched tangency constraints.

We now generalize the previous subsection by defining curve counts with constraints involving multiple branches through the same point in the target. For example, the simplest case will be denoted by $< p,p >$, which corresponds to a curve having a double point at $p \in M$. More generally, given a local divisor $D$ near $p$, we will define invariants of the form

$$N_{M,A} < T_{m_1-1} p,\ldots, T_{m_b-1} p > \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad m_1,\ldots,m_b \geq 1.$$
We will always assume without loss of generality that we have $m_1 \geq \ldots \geq m_b$, and we view $\mathcal{P} := (m_1, \ldots, m_b)$ as a partition of $|\mathcal{P}| := \sum_{i=1}^{b} m_i$. For brevity we will often use the shorthand notation
\[
<\mathcal{T}^P p> := <\mathcal{T}^{m_1-1}p, \ldots, \mathcal{T}^{m_b-1}p>.
\]
We will also occasionally write $\mathcal{T}^{m-1}D_p$ instead of $\mathcal{T}^{m-1}p$ if we wish to make the choice of local divisor more explicit.

Using a similar setup to the previous two subsections, let $(M^{2n}, \omega)$ be a semipositive symplectic manifold, let $D$ be a local divisor near a point $p \in M$, let $A \in H_2(M; \mathbb{Z})$ be a homology class, and pick an almost complex structure $J \in \mathcal{J}_D$. For $m_1 \geq \ldots \geq m_b \geq 1$, we define
\[
\mathcal{M}_{M,A,k}^{J,s} <\mathcal{T}^{m_1-1}p, \ldots, \mathcal{T}^{m_b-1}p>
\]
to be the moduli space of simple $J$-holomorphic spheres $u : S^2 \rightarrow M$ (modulo reparametrizations) in the homology class $A$ with

- $k$ marked points $z_1, \ldots, z_k \in S^2$
- an additional $b$ marked points $z_{k+1}, \ldots, z_{k+b} \in S^2$ such that $u$ is tangent to order $m_i - 1$ to $(D,p)$ at $z_{k+i}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, b$.

Note that as usual the marked points are all distinct and ordered. The main result of this subsection is:

**Proposition 2.3.1.** For generic $J \in \mathcal{J}_D$, the evaluation map
\[
\text{ev} : \mathcal{M}_{M,A,k}^{J,s} <\mathcal{T}^P p> \rightarrow M^{\times k}
\]
defines a pseudocycle of dimension
\[
2n + 2c_1(A) - 6 - 2 \sum_{i=1}^{b} (n + m_i - 1) + 2(k + b)
\]
which is independent of $J, p, D$ up to pseudocycle bordism.

Note that for $n = 2$, the above index depends on $|\mathcal{P}|$ but not on the specific partition $\mathcal{P}$. By contrast, for $n > 2$ the index depends on the number of parts $b$ in the partition.

In order to prove Proposition 2.3.1, we define the compactification $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{M,A,k}^{J,s} <\mathcal{T}^P p>$ by noting that there is a natural forgetful inclusion of $\mathcal{M}_{M,A,k}^{J,s} <\mathcal{T}^P p>$ into $\mathcal{M}_{M,A,k+b}^{J,s}$, and we take the closure in this ambient compact space. In order to show that we have a pseudocycle, it suffices to show that the image under the evaluation map of all of the strata added by this compactification have codimension two or greater. Compared to Proposition 2.2.2, we have the new complication that a constraint involving two or more branches could degenerate into a constraint involving a single branch. Therefore we need to prove that this type of degeneration can only occur in codimension two or greater. For example, given a double point singularity $<p, p>$, in principle the two marked points in the domain could collide, leaving a curve with only one branch through $p$. To deal with this, the key observation is that the limiting curve necessarily has a cusp at $p$. From the discussion at the end of the last subsection, we know that cusps appear with high codimension for generic $J$.

For example, suppose that in the situation considered above the corresponding two marked points, say $z_{k+1}, z_{k+2}$ lie together on a ghost component $u_0$. Suppose that $u_1$
is an adjacent nonconstant component, and let $\tilde{z}_1$ denote the special point of $u_1$ which participates in this adjacency. Then we may apply (2.2.6) at $\tilde{z}_1$ in each of the $n$ directions to conclude that

$$\text{ord}(u, D_i; \tilde{z}_1) \geq 2, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n.$$ 

Now observe that the condition of having two marked points both mapping to $p$ is codimension $2(2n - 2)$, whereas having a single marked point satisfying $<T_{D_1} \ldots T_{D_n} p>$ (i.e. a cusp at $p$) is codimension $2n - 2 + 2n$, which is two greater. The proof of Proposition 2.3.1 will generalize this idea to the case of more complicated cusp-type degenerations. The following lemma, which follows directly from [3, Lemma 7.2], describes more precisely the singularities arising as degenerations of $<T^P p>$ constraints.

**Lemma 2.3.2.** Let $D_1 = D, D_2, \ldots, D_n$ be local divisors at $p \in M$, and pick an almost complex structure $J \in J_{D_1, \ldots, D_n}$. Given a curve $u \in \overline{M}_{M,A,k}^J <T_{D_1}^{m_1 - 1} p, \ldots, T_{D_n}^{m_n - 1} p>$, suppose that at least one of its constrained marked points lies on a ghost component $u_0$ of $u$. Let $u_1, \ldots, u_a$ denote the nonconstant components of $u$ which are adjacent to $u_0$, or more generally are adjacent to some ghost component of $u$ which is connected to $u_0$ through ghost components, and suppose that $\{z_k + i : i \in I\}$ is the collection of constrained marked points\(^{16}\) that lie somewhere on this collection of ghost components. For $j = 1, \ldots, a$, let $\tilde{z}_j \in u_j$ denote the relevant special point of $u_j$ which participates in the node realizing this adjacency. Then we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{a} \text{ord}(u, D; \tilde{z}_j) \geq \sum_{i \in I} m_i,$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^{a} \text{ord}(u, D_r; \tilde{z}_j) \geq |I|, \quad r = 2, \ldots, n.$$

**Proof of Proposition 2.3.1.** We need to prove that the image under the evaluation map of the added points

$$\overline{M}_{M,A,k}^J <T^P p> \setminus \overline{M}_{M,A,k}^{J,s} <T^P p>$$

consists of a union of strata of codimension at least two. Firstly, consider the case of a multiply covered curve with smooth domain, i.e. $u \in \overline{M}_{M,A,k}^J <T^P p> \setminus \overline{M}_{M,A,k}^{J,s} <T^P p>$. Although $u$ is not necessarily regular, the underlying simple curve $\overline{u}$ is regular for generic $J$. Assuming that $u$ is a $\kappa$-fold cover of $\overline{u}$, it follows that $u$ satisfies the constraint

\(^{16}\)Recall that our ordering is such that the marked points $z_1, \ldots, z_k$ are unconstrained, while the map $u$ satisfies a tangency condition to $(D, p)$ at each of the marked points $z_k+1, \ldots, z_k+b$.\[\]
\[ \langle T^{m_1-1}p, \ldots, T^{m_b-1}p \rangle \text{ with } \overline{m}_i \geq m_i / \kappa \text{ for } i = 1, \ldots, b. \text{ As in the proof of Proposition 2.2.2 we then have} \]

\[
\text{ind}(\overline{m}) = 2c_1(A)/\kappa - 4 - 2 \sum_{i=1}^{b} (\overline{m}_i - 1) + 2k \\
\leq 2c_1(A)/\kappa - 4 - 2 \sum_{i=1}^{b} (m_i / \kappa - 1) + 2k \\
\leq 2c_1(A) - 6 - 2 \sum_{i=1}^{b} (m_i - 1) + 2k \\
= \text{ind}(u) - 2,
\]

where for the last inequality we have used that fact that the curve \( \overline{m} \) (after forgetting the \( k \) unconstrained marked points) has nonnegative index, so that we must have \( 2c_1(A)/\kappa \geq 4 \) since

\[
2c_1(A)/\kappa - 4 - 2 \sum_{i=1}^{b} (m_i - 1) \geq 0.
\]

Now consider a nodal curve \( u \in \overline{M}_{M,A,k}^{\langle T^p \rangle} \setminus \overline{M}_{M,A,k}^{\langle T^p \rangle} \). Note that because ghost components satisfy tangency constraints of arbitrarily large order they may well appear with higher than expected dimension. Therefore, in order to show that \( u \) lies in a stratum of codimension at least two, we will need to trade the constraints \( \langle T^{m_1-1}p, \ldots, T^{m_b-1}p \rangle \) for constraints on the nearby nonconstant components of \( u \). In more detail, similar to the proof of Proposition 2.2.2, let \( \overline{m} \) denote the (nodal, possibly disconnected) curve obtains as follows:

1. remove each ghost component of \( u \) with a constraint of the form
   \[
   \langle T^{m_1-1}p, \ldots, T^{m_b-1}p \rangle \text{ where } b' \geq 1, m_1', \ldots, m_b' \geq 1,
   \]
   as well as all other ghost components that are connected to it through ghost components
2. add a new marked point at each of the nearby special points on a nonconstant component
3. replace each multiply covered component by its underlying simple curve and prune components when two or more have the same image.

Then \( \overline{m} \) has the same image under the evaluation map as \( u \). Note that each of the removed ghost components belongs to some maximal tree of ghost components, and we denote these by \( T_1, \ldots, T_k \). For each \( T_i \), let \( \overline{z}_1^i, \ldots, \overline{z}_{a_i}^i \) denote the corresponding special points of the nonconstant components of \( u \) which are adjacent to \( T_i \). By Lemma 2.3.2, each new marked point \( \overline{z}_j^i \) satisfies a corresponding constraint

\[
\langle T_{D_{D_1 \cdots D_n}}^{\text{ord}(u,D;\overline{z}_j^i)}-1 T_{D_2}^{\text{ord}(u,D_2;\overline{z}_j^i)}-1 \ldots T_{D_n}^{\text{ord}(u,D_\overline{z}_j^i)}-1 \rangle p \rangle.
\]

By using Lemma 2.2.1 and arguing as in the proof of Proposition 2.2.2, it is now easy to check that the moduli space of curves of the same combinatorial type as \( \overline{m} \) and satisfying the same tangency constraints has dimension at most \( \dim \overline{M}_{M,A,k}^{\langle T^p \rangle} - 2 \). It follows
as before that ev$_k$, $k \geq 1$, defines a pseudocycle whose bordism class is independent of choices.

We will be most interested in the case $k = 0$, which, as in (2.2.7), gives rise to curve count invariants

$$\tilde{N}_{M,A} < T^p p > \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad N_{M,A} := \frac{1}{|\text{Aut}(P)|} \tilde{N}_{M,A},$$

(2.3.2)

where $\text{Aut}(P)$ is defined to be the automorphism group of $P$, that is, the group of permutations of the entries of $P = (m_1, \ldots, m_b)$ that preserve the inequalities $m_1 \geq m_2 \geq \cdots \geq m_b > 0$: see Definition 4.3.2. Thus $\tilde{N}_{M,A} < T^p p >$ counts the number of curves satisfying the multibranch constraint $T^p p$ where the branches that have the same order of tangency to $D$ are ordered, while $N_{M,A} < T^p p >$ is a similar count but without this ordering. We will sometimes also denote these invariants by simply $N^T_{M,A} < P >$ if the point $p$ is clear from the context or immaterial.

Given local divisors $D_1, \ldots, D_r$, distinct points $p_1, \ldots, p_r$, and partitions $P = (m^i_1, \ldots, m^i_b)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, r$, we can straightforwardly extend the above construction to define invariants

$$N_{M,A} < T^{p_1} p_1, \ldots, T^{p_r} p_r > \in \mathbb{Z}$$

(2.3.3)

which are independent of all choices. As we will see in §5, the recursive algorithm of Theorem 1.2.1 will involve invariants of this form even if we are only interested in counting curves with constraints at a single point in $M$.

For future reference, for a partition $P = (m_1, \ldots, m_b)$ with $m_1 \geq \ldots \geq m_b$, we introduce the notation

$$\delta(P) := \sum_{i=1}^{b} (i-1) m_i.$$  

(2.3.4)

As we show in the next lemma, in dimension four this number can be interpreted as the count of double points near $p$ that arise after a generic perturbation of a $C \in \mathcal{M}_{M,A}^{1,s} < P >$.

After replacing tangency constraints with ellipsoidal ends by the procedure described in §4.2, we will see in (3.2.9) that this number is also related to the total resulting writhe at the negative ends.

**Lemma 2.3.3.** Consider $C \in \mathcal{M}_{M,A}^{1,s} < P >$ where $M$ has dimension four. Then $\delta(P)$ is the number of double points near $p$ of a generic perturbation of $C$.

**Proof.** We prove this by induction on $b$, where $P := (m_1, \ldots, m_b)$. When $b = 1$, $C$ has a single immersed branch through $p$ and the claim holds because $\delta(P) = 0$. Suppose, inductively, that it holds for $b-1$ and consider $P$ with $m_1 \geq \cdots \geq m_b > 0$. The curve $C$ has $b$ branches through $p$, say $B_1, \ldots, B_b$, where $B_i$ has contact order $m_i$ with $D$. Because $m_b \leq m_i$ for all $i$, it follows that $B_b$ has contact of order $m_b$ with $B_i$ for all $i < b$. Hence one can perturb $B_b$ (without moving the other branches) to a curve $C'$ whose branch $B'_b$ has $m_b$ intersection points near $p$ with each of the other branches. Further $C'$ satisfies the constraint $< T^{p'} p >$, where $P' = (m_1, \ldots, m_{b-1})$. By the inductive hypothesis, a further perturbation of $C'$ yields $\delta(P')$ other double points near $p$. Therefore we have

$$(b-1)m_b + \delta(P') = \delta(P)$$
double points in all.

3. Curves with negative ends on skinny ellipsoids

In this section we consider another enumerative problem, defined in terms of curves with negative ends on a skinny ellipsoid. Namely, given a closed symplectic manifold \((M^{2n}, \omega)\), we remove a small neighborhood symplectomorphic to a skinny ellipsoid \(E^{2n}_{sk}\) (defined more precisely below) and consider punctured pseudoholomorphic curves in the symplectic completion of \(M \setminus E_{sk}\) with negative asymptotic ends à la SFT. We first show in §3.1 that, for \(M\) semipositive, the counts with one negative end on a skinny ellipsoid give well-defined invariants which are independent of all choices involved. Subsequently, in §3.2, we restrict to dimension four and define more general counts involving multiple negative ends on a skinny ellipsoid, which we also prove are independent of all choices involved. The reason we restrict to dimension four here is that more complicated degenerations can arise in the case of multiple negative ends, and our method is to rule these out using the relative adjunction formula and writhe estimates from embedded contact homology (these tools are briefly reviewed in §3.2). These counts also straightforwardly extend to the case of curves with negative ends on several disjoint skinny ellipsoids in \(M\).

The reader should note the formal parallels between curve counts with one negative end on a skinny ellipsoid and a single tangency constraint, and between several negative ends on a skinny ellipsoid and a multibranched tangency constraint. Indeed, in §4 we will prove that these analogous counts are indeed equivalent, at least in dimension four. This means that a posteriori we can think of tangency constraints and skinny ellipsoidal constraints as being essentially interchangeable. Even though tangency constraints are arguably more natural from an enumerative point of view, for various reasons it is fruitful to have both perspectives. For one, as we explain in more detail in §4, by working with skinny ellipsoidal constraints we can bypass some technical analytic questions about gluing curves satisfying tangency constraints and instead appeal to the obstruction bundle gluing framework of Hutchings–Taubes [18]. Also, on a more conceptual level, the ellipsoidal point of view places our enumerative invariants into a broader SFT framework and suggests various relationships between different types of curve constraints. This perspective plays a role in §4 and will be further developed in [23].

3.1. Curves with a single end on a skinny ellipsoid. Let \((M^{2n}, \omega)\) be a semipositive symplectic manifold. We consider the small skinny ellipsoid

\[
E(\varepsilon, \varepsilon s, \ldots, \varepsilon s) \subset \mathbb{C}^n,
\]

with \(s \gg 1\) sufficiently large and \(\varepsilon > 0\) sufficiently small. In the sequel we will often denote this ellipsoid simply by \(E^{2n}_{sk}\) when the precise values of \(\varepsilon\) and \(s\) are immaterial. We will denote by \(\eta_1\) the simple Reeb orbit of \(\partial E_{sk}\) of least action, and let \(\eta_2, \eta_3, \ldots\) denote its iterates. When discussing \(E_{sk}\) we will typically ignore the other Reeb orbits of \(\partial E_{sk}\), which all have action at least \(se\) and Conley–Zehnder index that is too large to be relevant. Let \(\alpha\) denote the standard contact form on \(\partial E_{sk}\) given by the restriction of the Liouville form \(\sum_{i=1}^{2n-1} \frac{1}{2}(x_i dy_i - y_i dx_i)\) on \(\mathbb{C}^n\). After picking a trivialization of the symplectic vector bundle \((\ker \alpha, d\alpha)\) restricted to \(\eta_1\), we can assign to each of the orbits
where we have CZ. When we wish to put more emphasis on its image rather than its parametrization. However, implicitly the homotopy trivialization \( \tau \) notation CZ = CZ\(_m\) case we will simply write \( \eta \). More generally, for any ellipsoid \( E(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \) with \( 1 \leq a_1 < \cdots < a_n \) rationally independent, we have precisely \( n \) simple Reeb orbits, which have actions \( a_1, \ldots, a_n \), and the Conley–Zehnder index of the \( m \)-fold iterate of the \( k \)th simple orbit is

\[
n - 1 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\lfloor \frac{m a_k}{a_i} \right\rfloor.
\]

In particular, note that the Conley–Zehnder indices of all Reeb orbits of an ellipsoid have the same parity.

Now suppose we have a symplectic embedding \( \iota : E_{sk} \hookrightarrow M \). Recall that the symplectic completion of \( M \setminus \iota(E_{sk}) \) is defined by gluing in the negative cylindrical end \( (\mathbb{R}_{\leq 0} \times \partial E_{sk}, d\rho^c) \), where \( r \) is the coordinate on \( (\mathbb{R}_{\leq 0}, 0] \). An almost complex structure \( J \) on the symplectic completion\(^{18} \) of \( M \setminus \iota(E_{sk}) \) is called admissible if it is compatible with the symplectic form and if on the cylindrical end it is \( r \)-translation invariant, preserves the contact hyperplanes \( \ker \alpha \), and sends \( \partial_r \) to the Reeb vector field for \( \alpha \). Given a generic such \( J \) and a homology class \( A \in H_2(M, \iota(E_{sk}); \mathbb{Z}) \cong H_2(M; \mathbb{Z}) \), let

\[
\mathcal{M}^{J,s}_{M \setminus \iota(E_{sk}), A}(\eta_m)
\]

denote the moduli space of simple \( J \)-holomorphic \( A \)-planes in the symplectic completion of \( M \setminus \iota(E_{sk}) \) with one negative end asymptotic to \( \eta_m \). This is a smooth (but not necessarily compact) oriented manifold of dimension

\[
\text{ind} \mathcal{M}^{J,s}_{M \setminus \iota(E_{sk}), A}(\eta_m) = 2c_1(A) - 2 - 2m.
\]

Notice that this is the same as the dimension given in (2.2.3) for curves satisfying the single tangency constraint \( <T^{m-1}p> \). More generally, recall from \([1]\) that the Fredholm index of an \( A \)-curve\(^{19} \) \( C \) of genus \( g \) with \( k \) positive ends asymptotic to Reeb orbits \( \gamma_1^+, \ldots, \gamma_k^+ \) and \( l \) negative ends asymptotic to Reeb orbits \( \gamma_1^-, \ldots, \gamma_l^- \) is given by

\[
\text{ind}(u) = (n - 3) \chi(C) + 2c_\tau(A) + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \text{CZ}_\tau(\gamma_i^+) - \sum_{i=1}^{l} \text{CZ}_\tau(\gamma_i^-).
\]

where \( \chi(C) = 2 - 2g - k - l \) is the Euler characteristic of the domain of \( C \). Here \( c_\tau(A) \) denotes the relative first Chern number of \( A \) with respect to the trivialization \( \tau \) along its ends, and one can check that the overall expression does not depend on the choice

\(^{17}\)We warn the reader that in the case of ellipsoids there is another natural trivialization \( \tau_{sp} \) for which we have \( \text{CZ}_\tau(\eta_m) = n - 1 \) for all \( m < s \). For more detail see \( \S 3.2 \).

\(^{18}\)Note that all punctured pseudoholomorphic curves will occur in symplectic completions, and therefore we will usually suppress the completion process from the terminology when no confusion should arise.

\(^{19}\)We often use the letter \( C \) to denote a \( J \)-holomorphic curve parametrized by a map \( u : \Sigma \to M \) when we wish to put more emphasis on its image rather than its parametrization. However, implicitly the notation \( C \) includes the parametrization.
of $\tau$. Moreover, if we use the trivialization $\tau_{\text{ex}}$ mentioned earlier, $c_\tau(A)$ is just the usual first Chern class, which explains (3.1.2).

In particular, for $m = c_1(A) - 1$,

$$\mathcal{M}_{M \setminus \iota(E_{sk}), A}^{J,s}(\eta_m)$$

is a discrete set of signed points. The following proposition, together with Proposition 3.1.6 below, shows that the signed count of points in this set is finite and independent of all choices. We will denote this count by $N_{M,A}^{\mathcal{E}_s}(m) \in \mathbb{Z}$.20 Here we are viewing $\mathcal{P} = (m)$ as a partition of length one (more general partitions will be considered in the next subsection).

**Proposition 3.1.1.** Let $(M, \omega)$ be a semipositive symplectic manifold of dimension $2n$. For $m = c_1(A) - 1$, the count of curves in $\mathcal{M}_{M \setminus \iota(E_{sk}), A}^{J,s}(\eta_m)$ is finite and independent of the choice of generic $J$, the embedding $\iota$ and the parameter $\varepsilon$, provided that $s$ is sufficiently large.

Note that we could also formulate a more general statement involving additional marked points and pseudocycles as in §2, but for simplicity we only consider the index 0 case here.

In the following, we will make heavy use of the SFT compactness theorem (see [1] for more details). In the case of punctured pseudoholomorphic curves in $M \setminus \iota(E_{sk})$, the compactification adds pseudoholomorphic buildings consisting of a top level in $M \setminus \iota(E_{sk})$, along with one or more levels in the symplectization $\mathbb{R} \times \partial E_{sk}$. For two consecutive levels, the negative Reeb orbit asymptotics of the upper level are paired with the positive Reeb orbit asymptotics of the lower level. The reader should keep in mind that the curves in each level can potentially be disconnected and/or nodal (although for us typically the total topological type of the building will be connected and genus zero). In addition to the usual stability condition appearing in the definition of the stable map compactification for closed curves, the buildings arising in the SFT compactification are forbidden from having any symplectization levels consisting entirely of trivial cylinders.21 Terminologically, we will say that a curve is “connected” if the domain parametrizing it is connected but possibly nodal, “smooth” if its domain is without nodes, and “irreducible” if its domain is both connected and smooth. By default, “component” of a curve means an irreducible component.

For the purpose of index arguments, it will also be convenient to adopt the terminology of “matched components” used for example in [6, Def 3.3.2]. Namely, in the context of a pseudoholomorphic building, a matched component is the result after formally gluing together some collection of curve components lying in various levels along a collection of paired ends. A matched component naturally has an overall domain which is a smooth punctured Riemann surface and is required to be connected (although it does not have a well-defined conformal structure unless we further pick gluing parameters). We define

---

20 We will also use the standard convention that all of our invariants are defined to be zero when they correspond to a count of curves of nonzero Fredholm index (after taking into account all relevant constraints).

21 Recall that a *trivial cylinder* in a symplectization $\mathbb{R} \times Y$ is an index zero pseudoholomorphic cylinder of the form $\mathbb{R} \times \gamma$, where $\gamma$ is a Reeb orbit in $Y$. 
the index of a matched component to be simply the sum of the (Fredholm) indices of each of the constituent curve components. The index of a matched component can computed as though it were an honest irreducible pseudoholomorphic curve in a single level with same overall topological type, homology class, and Reeb orbit asymptotics. The key point here is that each term in (3.1.3) is appropriately additive under such matching. The same remark applies to the energy\textsuperscript{22} of a matched component.

In this paper we are only considering pseudoholomorphic curves which satisfy a homogeneous version of the Cauchy–Riemann equation, i.e. without the Hamiltonian perturbations or virtual perturbations typically encountered in SFT or Floer theory. In this setting we can still apply the SFT compactness theorem to produce compactified moduli spaces of curves, but these will not typically be tranversely cut out for a generic almost complex structure, meaning that various boundary strata might appear with higher-than-expected dimension. In what follows, we will rule out such occurrences (at least in a semipositive context) by careful index arguments. Similar to §2, the basic idea is to use the fact that simple curves are indeed regular for generic $J$, and although multiply covered curves with negative index do potentially appear, we can assume their underlying simple curves have nonnegative index.

We will also utilize the neck stretching procedure from SFT to decompose symplectic cobordisms into simpler pieces (see [1, §3.4] for details). Recall that, given symplectic cobordisms $X^+, X^-$ such that the positive contact boundary of $X^+$ and the negative contact boundary of $X^-$ are both identified with a fixed contact manifold $Y$, we can glue along this common contact boundary to construct the concatenated symplectic cobordism $X^- \circledcirc X^+$.\textsuperscript{23} Conversely, given a symplectic cobordism $X$ containing a separating contact hypersurface $Y$, we can split along $Y$ to obtain two symplectic cobordisms $X^+, X^-$. Roughly, neck stretching along $Y$ proceeds by defining a one-parameter family of almost complex structures $J_t$ on $X$, $t \in [0, 1)$, such that in the limit as $t \to 1$ curves are forced to degenerate into pseudoholomorphic buildings in the split symplectic cobordism. In a context where transversality holds, one expects to get a cobordism of moduli spaces relating curves in $X$ to split buildings in $X^- \circledcirc X^+$. In our setting without perturbations, neck stretching can often give rise to degenerations with dimension that is higher than expected. At any rate, given regular curves in $X^-$ and $X^+$ with paired Reeb orbit asymptotics, we can perform a standard gluing along cylindrical ends to produce $J_t$-holomorphic curves in $X$ for all $t$ sufficiently close to 1. In §4.2 we will also consider more general obstruction bundle gluing problems which involve curves in $X^-$ and $X^+$ along with a branched cover of a trivial cylinder in $\mathbb{R} \times Y$.

The proof of Proposition 3.1.1 involves passing to the SFT compactification of the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{M \setminus \{E_{ab}\}, A}(\eta_m)$. In principle this compactification could add all sorts of complicated multilevel pseudoholomorphic buildings, but we will show that in fact it adds nothing. We begin with a few index calculations.

\textsuperscript{22}Here we using the same conventions for the energy of punctured curves as in [27, §3.1]. In particular, the energy of a pseudoholomorphic curve in a symplectization only measures the variation in the contact slice direction, and it vanishes for branched covers of trivial cylinders.

\textsuperscript{23}Technically, in order to say that the energy of curves decomposes as expected we should work with contact manifolds with fixed contact forms; see [27, §3.1] for a more detailed treatment.
Lemma 3.1.2. Let $C$ be a rational curve in $M \setminus \iota(E_{sk})$ with negative ends $\eta_{m_1}, \ldots, \eta_{m_b}$ for some $b, m_1, \ldots, m_b \geq 1$. Then we have $\text{ind}(C) \geq (4 - 2n)(b - 1)$. In particular, $\text{ind}(C) \geq 0$ if $b = 1$.

Proof. Suppose that $C$ is a $\kappa$-fold cover of its underlying simple curve $\overline{C}$, which we can assume to have nonnegative index. Suppose that $\overline{C}$ has negative ends $\eta_{m_1}, \ldots, \eta_{m_b}$ for some $b, m_1, \ldots, m_b \geq 1$. Note that we have $\sum_{i=1}^b m_i = \kappa \sum_{i=1}^b \overline{m_i}$. Letting $A$ denote the homology class of $\overline{C}$ (so that $A/\kappa$ is the homology class of $C$), we therefore have

$$\text{ind}(C) = (n - 3)(2 - b) + 2c_1(A) - \sum_{i=1}^b (n - 1 + 2m_i)$$

$$= (2n - 6) + (4 - 2n)b + 2c_1(A) - 2 \sum_{i=1}^b m_i$$

$$= \kappa \text{ind}(\overline{C}) + (2n - 6)(1 - \kappa) + (4 - 2n)(b - \kappa)$$

$$\geq 2n - 6 + \kappa(6 - 2n - \overline{b}(4 - 2n)) + (4 - 2n)b$$

$$\geq -\overline{b}(4 - 2n) + (4 - 2n)b$$

$$\geq (4 - 2n)(b - 1),$$

as claimed. \(\square\)

Lemma 3.1.3. Let $C$ be a matched component in $M \setminus \iota(E_{sk})$ which is connected, genus zero, and without punctures, and that is holomorphic for a generic $J$. Then we have $\text{ind}(C) \geq 2n - 6$, and a fortiori $\text{ind}(C) \geq 2n - 2$ provided that $C$ does not consist of a single curve component in $M \setminus \iota(E_{sk})$.

Proof. If $C$ is a single curve component in $M \setminus \iota(E_{sk})$, then we have

$$\text{ind}(C) = 2n - 6 + 2c_1(A) \geq 2n - 6$$

since $J$ is generic and $(M, \omega)$ is semipositive. Otherwise, let $C_1, \ldots, C_r$ denote the constituent curves components which lie in $M \setminus \iota(E_{sk})$, and let $D_1, \ldots, D_a$ denote the matched components in $R \times \partial E_{sk}$ obtained by formally gluing together all the constituent curves of $C$ which lie in a symplectization level. For each $i = 1, \ldots, r$, suppose that $C_i$ has negative ends $m_{i_1}^1, \ldots, m_{i_b}^i$. Note that, since the total topological type of $C$ is connected and genus zero, each component $D_i$ must be a disc with $\chi(D_i) = 1$ and we must have

---

24 That is, $C$ is given by formally gluing curves which live in $M \setminus \iota(E_{sk})$ and in some number of symplectization levels $R \times \partial E_{sk}$. Since it has no punctures, it is closed and hence cannot lie entirely in $R \times \partial E_{sk}$.
\sum_i \chi(D_i) = a = \sum_i b_i - r + 1. Using Lemma 3.1.2 and (3.1.3), we have

\begin{align*}
\text{ind}(C) &\geq \text{ind}(C) + \sum_i \text{ind}(D_i) \\
&\geq (4 - 2n)(\sum_i b_i - r) + (n - 3)(\sum_i b_i - r + 1) + \sum_{i,j} (n - 1 + 2m_j^i) \\
&\geq (4 - 2n)(\sum_i b_i - r) + (n - 3)(\sum_i b_i - r + 1) + (\sum_i b_i)(n + 1) \\
&\geq (\sum_i b_i)(2) + r(n - 1) + n - 3 \\
&\geq 2n - 2.
\end{align*}

\[\Box\]

**Lemma 3.1.4.** Let $C$ be a matched component in $M \setminus \iota(E_{sk})$ which is connected and genus zero with one negative end $\eta_m$. Then we have $\text{ind}(C) \geq 0$, and the inequality is strict provided that the total number of negative ends of the constituent curves in $M \setminus \iota(E_{sk})$ is at least two.

**Proof.** Similar to the proof of Lemma 3.1.3, let $C_1, \ldots, C_r$ denote the constituent curves of $C$ which lie in $M \setminus \iota(E_{sk})$, and let $D_1, \ldots, D_a$ denote the matched components in $\mathbb{R} \times \partial E_{sk}$ obtained by formally gluing together all the constituent curves of $C$ which lie in a symplectization level, excluding any matched components with negative ends. Note that we must have $a = \sum_i b_i - r$. Using Lemma 3.1.2, we have

\begin{align*}
\text{ind}(C) &\geq (4 - 2n)(\sum_i b_i - r) + (n - 3)(\sum_i b_i - r + 1) + \sum_{i,j} (n - 1 + 2m_j^i) \\
&\geq (4 - 2n)(\sum_i b_i - r) + (n - 3)(\sum_i b_i - r + 1) + (\sum_i b_i)(n + 1) \\
&\geq (\sum_i b_i)(2) + r(n - 1) + n - 3 \\
&\geq 0,
\end{align*}

and the inequality is strict provided that we have $\sum_i b_i > 1$. \[\Box\]

**Lemma 3.1.5.** Let $C$ be a rational curve in $\mathbb{R} \times \partial E_{sk}$ with one negative end $\eta_m$. Then we have $\text{ind}(C) \geq 0$, with equality if and only if $C$ is the trivial cylinder over $\eta_m$.

**Proof.** Suppose that the top ends of $C$ are $\eta_{m_1}, \ldots, \eta_{m_a}$ for some $a, m_1, \ldots, m_a \geq 1$. Using (3.1.3) one can check

\[\text{ind}(C) = 2(a - 1 + \sum_{i=1}^a m_i - m),\]

which we note is independent of $n$. Furthermore, by nonnegativity of energy we have $\sum_{i=1}^a m_i \geq m$, and hence this index is strictly positive unless $a = 1$. In the case $a = 1$, the energy of $C$ is zero, and this implies that $C$ is a (possibly branched) cover of a trivial cylinder. In fact, since its domain has genus zero $C$ is necessarily an unbranched cover, and hence it the trivial cylinder over $\eta_m$. \[\Box\]
Proof of Proposition 3.1.1. The setup is similar to the proof of Proposition 2.2.2, except that since our curves are punctured we must replace Gromov’s compactness theorem with the SFT compactness theorem [1]. To see that the count is finite, we consider the compactification \( \overline{M}_{M \setminus \iota(E_{sk})}, A(\eta_k) \) provided by the SFT compactness theorem, and we need to show that this compactification coincides with the uncompactified moduli space \( M_{M \setminus \iota(E_{sk})}, A(\eta_k) \). Let \( C \) denote an element of \( \overline{M}_{M \setminus \iota(E_{sk})}, A(\eta_k) \). Recall that in general \( C \) could be a multilevel pseudoholomorphic building, with top level consisting of a punctured pseudoholomorphic curve (with domain possibly disconnected and/or nodal) in \( M \setminus \iota(E_{sk}) \), plus some number of levels in the symplectization \( \mathbb{R} \times \partial E_{sk} \).

First, suppose that \( C \) has a single level. That is, \( C \) is a nodal curve in \( M \setminus \iota(E_{sk}) \), with one component \( C_0 \) a plane in \( M \setminus \iota(E_{sk}) \) with negative end \( \eta_0 \), and the remaining components spheres \( S_1, \ldots, S_r \) in \( M \setminus \iota(E_{sk}) \). As in §2, we can pass to the underlying simple configuration \( C \), and it is easy to show using semipositivity that \( \text{ind}(\overline{C}) \leq \text{ind}(C) \). Since each node increases the expected codimension by two, if \( k \geq 1 \) we must have \( \text{ind}(\overline{C}) \leq -2 \), so \( C \) (and hence \( C \)) does not appear for generic \( J \). (Compare with the discussion concerning (2.2.7).)

Now suppose that \( C \) is a building with two or more levels. Because the whole building has one negative end and genus zero, we can formally glue the components of \( C \) into matched components so that we have

- a matched component \( C_0 \) in \( \mathbb{R} \times \partial E_{sk} \) which is a punctured sphere with negative end \( \eta_0 \) and \( r \geq 1 \) positive ends
- matched components \( C_1, \ldots, C_r \) in \( M \setminus \iota(E_{sk}) \), each of which is a plane with one negative end
- matched components \( S_1, \ldots, S_a \) in \( M \setminus \iota(E_{sk}) \), each of which is an unpunctured sphere.

Since we are assuming that every element of \( M_{M \setminus \iota(E_{sk})}, A(\eta_m) \) has index zero, we must have

\[
\text{ind}(C_0) + \sum_{i=1}^{r} \text{ind}(C_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{a} \text{ind}(S_i) = a(2n - 6),
\]

where each factor \( 2n - 6 \) on the right is the part of \( \text{ind}(S_i) = 2n - 6 + c_1([S_i]) \) that has no correlate in the formula for \( \text{ind}(C) \). On the other hand, according to the preceding lemmas we have

\[
\text{ind}(C_0) + \sum_{i=1}^{r} \text{ind}(C_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{a} \text{ind}(S_i) \geq a(2n - 6),
\]

with the inequality strict unless each \( S_i \) is entirely contained in \( M \setminus \iota(E_{sk}) \) and \( C_0 \) is entirely composed of trivial cylinders. However, in this case the building \( C \) violates the SFT stability condition.

Next, to show that the count of curves in \( M_{M \setminus \iota(E_{sk})}, A(\eta_m) \) is independent of \( J \), suppose that \( J_0 \) and \( J_1 \) are two generic admissible almost complex structures (on the completion of) \( M \setminus \iota(E_{sk}) \), joined by a generic 1-parameter family \( J_t \). As in the proof of Proposition 2.2.2, we consider the associated \( t \)-parametrized moduli space \( M_{M \setminus \iota(E_{sk})}, A(\eta_m), t \)
which is a smooth one-manifold with boundary

$$\mathcal{M}_{M \setminus \iota(E_{sk}), A}(\eta_{t}) \cup \left(-\mathcal{M}_{M \setminus \iota(E_{sk}), A}(\eta_{t})\right).$$

We claim that the SFT compactification $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{M \setminus \iota(E_{sk}), A}(\eta_{t})$ does not add anything new. Indeed, a priori we must add pseudoholomorphic buildings consisting of a $J_{t}$-holomorphic top level in $M \setminus \iota(E_{sk})$ for some $t \in (0, 1)$, together with some number of symplectization levels in $\mathbb{R} \times \partial E_{sk}$. We can assume that $J_{t}$ is fixed near the negative cylinder end $(-\infty, 0] \times \partial E_{sk}$, so that all symplectization levels appear with the same almost complex structure, and hence the previous index considerations still apply. By genericity of the family $J_{t}$, we can also assume that all simple curves in $M \setminus \iota(E_{sk})$ have index at least $-1$. On the other hand, a closer inspection of the previous index argument in fact shows that any nontrivial building arising in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{M \setminus \iota(E_{sk}), A}(\eta_{t})$ would have to involve an underlying simple component of index at most $-2$. Hence we may conclude as before that such degenerations do not arise.

Now we consider the dependence on the parameter $\epsilon$. Suppose that $0 < \bar{\epsilon} < \epsilon$ and that $\bar{\iota}$ is the restriction of $\iota$ to $\bar{E}_{sk} = E(\bar{\epsilon}, \bar{\epsilon}s, ..., \bar{\epsilon}s)$. Then there is a natural symplectomorphism between the completions of $M \setminus \bar{\iota}(\bar{E}_{sk})$ and $M \setminus \iota(E_{sk})$, under which an admissible almost complex structure $J$ pulls back to an admissible almost complex structure $\bar{J}$ on $M \setminus \bar{\iota}(\bar{E}_{sk})$. This shows that counts of curves in $\mathcal{M}_{M \setminus \iota(E_{sk}), A}(\eta_{t})$ and $M_{M \setminus \bar{\iota}(\bar{E}_{sk}), A}(\eta_{t})$ coincide.

Similarly, if $\iota$ and $\bar{\iota}$ are two symplectic embeddings of skinny ellipsoids $E(\epsilon_{0}, \epsilon_{0}s, ..., \epsilon_{0}s)$ and $E(\epsilon_{1}, \epsilon_{1}s, ..., \epsilon_{1}s)$ respectively, then $\iota$ and $\bar{\iota}$ are Hamiltonian isotopic after possibly shrinking both $\epsilon$ and $\bar{\epsilon}$ to some common sufficiently small value $\epsilon$. Then we have a symplectomorphism between the completions of $M \setminus \bar{\iota}(\bar{E}_{sk})$ and $M \setminus \iota(E_{sk})$, and hence the corresponding counts again coincide.

We complete this subsection by discussing independence of the parameter $s$.

**Proposition 3.1.6.** For $m = c_{1}(A) - 1$, the count of curves in $\mathcal{M}_{M \setminus \iota(E_{sk}), A}(\eta_{t})$ is independent of the parameter $s$ (provided that it is sufficiently large).

**Proof.** Put

$$E_{sk} := E_{sk}^{2n} = E(\epsilon, \epsilon_{s}, ..., \epsilon_{s}), \quad \bar{E}_{sk} := \bar{E}_{sk}^{2n} = E(\bar{\epsilon}, \bar{\epsilon}s, ..., \bar{\epsilon}s)$$

for $0 < \bar{\epsilon} < \epsilon$ and $0 < \bar{\epsilon}s < \epsilon s$. We view $\bar{E}_{sk}$ as a subdomain of $E_{sk}$ in the obvious way, and denote by $\bar{\iota} : \bar{E}_{sk} \hookrightarrow M$ the restriction to $\bar{E}_{sk}$ of the symplectic embedding $\iota : E_{sk} \hookrightarrow M$. We now consider the result of neck stretching along $\partial E_{sk}$, which we realize by a family of almost complex structures $J_{t}$, $t \in [0, 1)$, on the symplectic completion of $M \setminus \iota(\bar{E}_{sk})$. We assume that these are generic outside the neck region (so that all $J_{t}$-holomorphic curves are regular), but are such that both inside and below the neck region the noncompact symplectic divisors $D_{i} := \{z_{i} = 0\}$ are holomorphic for $i = 1, \ldots, n$.

(Intermediate makes sense because these divisors in nbhd $(E_{sk})$ can be assumed invariant under neck stretching.)
For clarity, we will denote the Reeb orbits of $\partial E_sk$ by $\eta_i$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and the Reeb orbits of $\partial \tilde{E}_sk$ by $\tilde{\eta}_i$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. For $\tilde{s} > m^{25}$ and $\epsilon$ sufficiently close to $\epsilon$, by arguing exactly as in the proof of Proposition 3.1.1 we find that the only possible limiting configurations as $t \to 1$ are two-level pseudoholomorphic buildings with

- top level in $M \setminus \iota(E-sk)$ consisting of a plane with negative end $\eta_m$
- bottom level in $E_sk \setminus \tilde{E}_sk$ consisting of a cylinder with positive end $\eta_m$ and negative end $\tilde{\eta}_m$.

Indeed, the arguments involving formally gluing curve components work equally well if we replace the symplectization $\mathbb{R} \times \partial E_sk$ with the symplectic cobordism $E_sk \setminus \tilde{E}_sk$. The only place where some care is needed is in the analogue of Lemma 3.1.4, which is used to rule out index zero curves in $E_sk \setminus \tilde{E}_sk$ with more than one positive end, since this involves an energy argument. Specifically, note that an irreducible rational curve in $E_sk \setminus \tilde{E}_sk$ with positive ends $\eta_{m_1}, \ldots, \eta_{m_b}$ and negative end $\tilde{\eta}_m$ has index

$$2(b-1) + 2\left(\sum_{i=1}^{b} m_i - m\right).$$

This is positive provided that we have $\sum_{i=1}^{b} m_i - m \geq 0$. By nonnegativity of energy, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{b} \varepsilon m_i - \tilde{\varepsilon} m \geq 0,$$

which implies that $\sum_{i=1}^{b} m_i - m \geq 0$ provided that $\frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}}{\varepsilon} > \frac{m-1}{m}$.

In this case, we complete the argument as follows. The next lemma shows that we may choose $J$ so that all curves are regular and there is a unique cylinder in $E_sk \setminus \tilde{E}_sk$ with positive end $\eta_m$ and negative end $\tilde{\eta}_m$. Since we can uniquely glue this cylinder to any given regular curve in $M_s \setminus \iota(E_sk)$ to get a curve in $M_s \setminus \iota(E_sk)$ for $t$ sufficiently close to 1, this establishes a bijection between $M_s \setminus \iota(E_sk)(\eta_m)$ and $\tilde{M}_s \setminus \iota(\tilde{E}_sk)(\tilde{\eta}_m)$.

This completes the proof in the case $\tilde{\varepsilon} > \varepsilon \frac{m-1}{m}$. Now if $\tilde{s} < s$ we can always choose $\tilde{\varepsilon} < \varepsilon$ to satisfy this condition as well as $0 < \tilde{\varepsilon} s < \varepsilon s$. Otherwise, this is possible for $s < \tilde{s} < \frac{m}{m-1}s$. Therefore, by iterating, we get an equivalence for all $0 < \tilde{\varepsilon} < \varepsilon$. \qed

Lemma 3.1.7. Let $J$ be an almost complex structure on the symplectic completion of the symplectic cobordism $E_sk \setminus \tilde{E}_sk$ such that the symplectic divisors $D_i := \{z_i = 0\}$ are $J$-holomorphic for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Then there is a unique $J$-holomorphic cylinder which is positively asymptotic to $\eta_m$ and negatively asymptotic to $\tilde{\eta}_m$.

Proof. The basic idea is to use positivity of intersections to argue that any $J$-holomorphic curve $C$ with the given ends must be entirely contained in the divisor $D_p$. This inductively reduces the problem to the two-dimensional case, where the result easily follows by branched cover considerations. Observe, however, that this argument is complicated by the fact that both $C$ and $D$ are noncompact, and hence there is no canonical homological intersection number between them. Since $C$ is asymptotic to $D$, this necessitates

$^{25}$Note that the condition $\tilde{s} > m$ ensures that both $E_sk$ and $\tilde{E}_sk$ are both “skinny” for the purposes of the constraint $\mathcal{T}^{m-1} p$, i.e. the first $m$ Reeb orbits have the expected index.
a discussion of “intersections at infinity”, and one expects a well-defined homological intersection number after specifying the behavior at infinity. However, since the behavior of $C$ at infinity is a priori unknown, we need a way of controlling its asymptotic behavior in terms of known quantities.

We resolve these issues using the higher dimensional analogue of Siefring’s intersection theory [26] for punctured pseudoholomorphic curves, as described in [24]. If $C$ is not entirely contained in $D$ then by [24, Thm2.2] the set $C \cap D$ is compact. Therefore we may perturb $C$ by a compactly supported isotopy to obtain finitely many transverse intersection points whose signed count is denoted $C \cdot D$. Note that $C \cdot D \geq 0$ by positivity of intersections for pseudoholomorphic curves [21, App.E]. Now observe that $D$ is naturally identified with the symplectic completion of $E_{sk}^{2n-2} \setminus \overline{E}_{sk}^{2n-2}$. Moreover, $\partial E_{sk}^{2n-2}$ naturally sits inside $\partial E_{sk}^{2n}$ as a contact submanifold, and the restriction of the contact structure $\xi$ of $\partial E_{sk}^{2n}$ to $\partial E_{sk}^{2n-2}$ naturally splits as $\xi^T \oplus \xi^N$. Here $\xi^T$ denotes the contact structure on $\partial E_{sk}^{2n-2}$ and $\xi^N$ denotes its symplectic orthogonal. There is a natural trivialization $\tau$ of $\xi^N$ along $\eta_N$ coming from identifying it with the extra $\mathbb{C}$ factor of $E_{sk}^{2n}$ compared to $E_{sk}^{2n-2}$. Using this trivialization, any Reeb orbit $\gamma$ in

$$\partial E_{sk}^{2n-2} \times \{0\} \subset \partial E_{sk}^{2n}$$

has a normal Conley–Zehnder index $\text{CZ}_\tau^N(\gamma)$, which measures the rotation of the 2-dimensional symplectic vector spaces $\xi^N$ along $\gamma$. For $s$ sufficiently large compared to $m$, we have $\text{CZ}_\tau^N(\eta_m) = 0$ (c.f. the index computations in [11, §2.1]).

Following [24], let $C_\tau$ denote a perturbation of $C$ which at infinity is specified by the trivialization $\tau$. Then on the one hand we have $C_\tau \cdot D = 0$ since $C$ can be disjoined from $D$ by moving in the direction of the extra $\mathbb{C}$ factor. On the other hand, as explained after the statement of [24, Thm 2.5], we have the following formulas

$$C_\tau \cdot D = C \cdot D - \text{wind}_\tau(C,D),$$

$$\text{wind}_\tau(C,D) := \text{wind}_\tau^+(C,D) - \text{wind}_\tau^-(C,D),$$

where $\text{wind}_\tau^+(C,D)$ (resp. $\text{wind}_\tau^-(C,D)$) is defined to be the winding number at positive (resp. negative) infinity of $C$ about $D$ as measured by the trivialization $\tau$. Since $C \cdot D \geq 0$, we must have $\text{wind}_\tau(C,D) \geq 0$. But according to [24, Cor 2.4], we have the estimates

$$\text{wind}_\tau^+(C,D) \leq \lceil \text{CZ}_\tau^N(\eta_m)/2 \rceil$$

$$\text{wind}_\tau^-(C,D) \geq \lfloor \text{CZ}_\tau^N(\eta_m)/2 \rfloor,$$

which imply that $\text{wind}_\tau(C,D) \leq -1$. This contradiction shows that $C$ must be entirely contained in $D = D_\eta$, as desired. \qed

**Remark 3.1.8.** Since we have now shown that the invariants are independent of the inclusion $\iota$ and the parameters $s, \varepsilon$, we will often simplify notation by removing $\iota$ from the notation, writing $M \setminus E_{sk}$ instead of $M \setminus \iota(E_{sk})$ and so on. \copyright

### 3.2. Curves in dimension four with multiple ends on a skinny ellipsoid.

We now restrict to the case that $M$ is a four-dimensional symplectic manifold. As in §2.3, we consider partitions

$$\mathcal{P} = (m_1, \ldots, m_b), \quad m_1 \geq m_2 \geq \cdots \geq m_b \geq 1$$
of \(|P| := \sum_{i=1}^{b} m_i\), and we will define numbers
\[ N_{M,A}^{E} < P > \in \mathbb{Z} \]
as follows. As above, let \(\iota: E_{sk} \rightarrow M\) be a symplectic embedding of a small skinny ellipsoid \(E_{sk} = E(\varepsilon, \varepsilon s)\) for \(s > 1\) sufficiently large and \(\varepsilon\) sufficiently small, denote by \(\eta_1\) the minimal action simple Reeb orbit of \(\partial E_{sk}\), and by \(\eta_2, \eta_3, \ldots\) its iterates. Let \(J\) denote an admissible almost complex structure on (the symplectic completion of) \(M \setminus \iota(E_{sk})\). We define
\[ M_{M \setminus E_{sk}, A < P >}^{J,s} \]
to be the moduli space of simple genus zero \(J\)-holomorphic \(A\)-spheres in \(M \setminus \iota(E_{sk})\) with \(b\) negative punctures asymptotic to \(\eta_{m_1}, \ldots, \eta_{m_b}\) respectively. This moduli space is naturally oriented and, by (3.1.3), has dimension
\[ 2c_1(A) - 2 - 2 \sum_{i=1}^{b} m_i. \] (3.2.1)
In the case that this index is zero, for \(J\) generic \(M_{M \setminus E_{sk}, A < P >}^{J,s}\) is a smooth zero-dimensional manifold, and we will define \(N_{M,A}^{E} < P >\) to be the (signed) count of its elements. The following proposition shows that this count is well-defined and independent of all choices involved in its construction.

**Proposition 3.2.1.** Let \((M, \omega)\) be a symplectic four-manifold. For any partition \(P\) of \(c_1(A) - 1\), the count \(N_{M,A}^{E} < P >\) is finite and independent of the choice of generic \(J\). It is also independent of the embedding \(\iota\) and the parameters \(\varepsilon\) and \(s\), provided that \(s\) is sufficiently large and \(\varepsilon\) is sufficiently small.

We emphasize that the proof of Proposition 3.2.1 uses four-dimensional techniques in an essential way, as we explain below. In principle it might be possible to use intersection theory for punctured curves to bootstrap our arguments to higher dimensions (c.f. the proof of Proposition 3.1.6), but we will not attempt this.

**Remark 3.2.2.** One subtle point is that for generic \(J\) there may be nontrivial pseudo-holomorphic buildings in the SFT compactified moduli space \(\overline{M}_{M \setminus E_{sk}, A < P >}^{J}\). In such situations the compactification is not transversely cut out, and one expects to require a virtual perturbation scheme in order to extract counts. However, these buildings will not contribute to \(N_{M,A}^{E} < P >\), since this is defined in dimension four to be a count of curves in \(M_{M \setminus (E_{sk}), A < P >}^{J,s}\) and thereby excludes buildings and multiple covers. Notice that typically the closure of \(M_{M \setminus (E_{sk}), A < P >}^{J,s}\) in the SFT compactification \(\overline{M}_{M \setminus (E_{sk}), A < P >}\) will be a proper subspace. It is not a priori clear whether analogous counts can be defined in higher dimensions, since we rely on four dimensional technique to rule out various undesirable degenerations.

As a simple example, consider the moduli space \(M_{\mathbb{C}P^2 \setminus E_{sk}, [(L)]}^{J,s} < (1,1) >\) consisting of curves in the symplectic completion of \(\mathbb{C}P^2 \setminus \iota(E_{sk})\) in the class of a line with two negative ends both asymptotic to \(\eta_1\). One can use the methods of ECH (explained below) to conclude that this moduli space is empty. However, the full SFT compactification \(\overline{M}_{\mathbb{C}P^2 \setminus \iota(E_{sk})}^{J} < (1,1) >\) includes the two-level building whose top level lies in \(\mathbb{C}P^2 \setminus \iota(E_{sk})\).
and consists of a plane with one negative end on $\eta_2$, and whose bottom level is a pair of pants in the symplectization $\mathbb{R} \times \partial E_{sk}$ given by a double branched cover of the trivial cylinder over $\eta_1$.

Before giving the proof of Proposition 3.2.1, we recall some key facts about punctured pseudoholomorphic curves in dimension four. Together these tools play a central role in the theory of embedded contact homology (ECH). For a more detailed introduction see [16]; a shorter summary of relevant information can also be found in [6, §2.2].

- **Relative adjunction formula.** If $C$ is a somewhere injective punctured pseudoholomorphic curve in a completed four-dimensional symplectic cobordism with positive and negative Reeb orbit asymptotic ends, there is a relative adjunction formula

  $$c_\tau(C) = \chi(C) + Q_\tau(C) + w_\tau(C) - 2\delta(C).$$  

  (3.2.2)

Here $\tau$ is a choice of trivialization of the contact distribution $\xi$ over the ends of $C$, and the terms involved are as follows:

- $c_\tau(C)$ is the relative first Chern class of $C$
- $\chi(C)$ is the Euler characteristic of $C$
- $Q_\tau(C)$ is the “relative intersection pairing” of $C$ (a generalization of the homological self-intersection number $[C] \cdot [C]$ in the case that $C$ is closed)
- $w_\tau(C) = w^+_\tau(C) - w^-_\tau(C)$, where $w^+_\tau$ (resp. $w^-_\tau$) is the writhe of the asymptotic link determined by the positive (resp. negative) ends of $C$
- $\delta(C) \geq 0$ is an algebraic count of the singularities of $C$ (with each ordinary double point contributing $+1$).

It is useful to note that this is a topological formula, and so in particular it applies to any sufficiently large compact smooth subdomain of a curve in a symplectically complete manifold (sometimes called a “curve portion” below), since in that case the boundary components still correspond naturally to braids about Reeb orbits in the cylindrical ends and we can still make sense of all the terms in the formula. We will apply this idea in the context of a 1-parameter family of smooth curves degenerating to an SFT-type building. In this situation, by cutting a curve just above or below the neck region we can find a curve portion just before degeneration which approximates some matched component of the limiting building, and one can often use knowledge of the limiting building to estimate the terms above. For example, sometimes we can rule out certain degenerations by showing that the existence of the corresponding curve portion would violate the relative adjunction formula.

- **Rotation angles.** Let $Y^3$ be a contact three-manifold with a contact form $\alpha$ with nondegenerate Reeb orbits. We can associate to each Reeb orbit $\gamma$ a linearized return map $P_\gamma$ which is a symplectomorphism of the contact plane $(\xi_{|\gamma(0)}, d\alpha)$ without 1 as an eigenvalue. The Reeb orbit is **elliptic** if the eigenvalues of $P_\gamma$ lie on the unit circle, **positive hyperbolic** if the eigenvalues are real and positive, and **negative hyperbolic** if the eigenvalues are real and negative. As we traverse $\gamma$, we can view the eigenspaces of $P_\gamma$ as rotating with respect to a trivialization $\tau$ by a total amount $2\pi \theta$, where $\theta := \theta_\tau$ is the “rotation angle” measured with respect to $\tau$. Here $\theta$ is irrational in the elliptic case, an integer in the positive hyperbolic case, and an integer plus $1/2$ in the
negative hyperbolic case. Using this same trivialization $\tau$, we have the formula

$$CZ_\tau(\gamma) = [\theta_\tau] + [\theta_\tau].$$

- **Computations for ellipsoids.** In this paper we are mostly interested in either closed symplectic manifolds or symplectic cobordisms with one or more ends modeled on the boundary of an ellipsoid. Consider $Y = \partial E(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ with $a_1 \leq \cdots \leq a_n$ rationally independent. Let $\gamma_{k,m}$ be the $m$-fold iterate of the $k$th simple Reeb orbit, which has action $ma_k$. If we use the trivialization $\tau_{\text{ex}} = \tau_{\text{extend}}$ which extends over a spanning disk in $Y$ for $\gamma_{k,m}$, then as mentioned in §3.1 we have

$$CZ_{\tau_{\text{ex}}}(\gamma_{k,m}) = n - 1 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\lfloor \frac{ma_k}{a_i} \right\rfloor.$$

There is also another convenient trivialization $\tau_{\text{sp}} := \tau_{\text{split}}$ which comes from the observation that the $k$th simple Reeb orbit is identified with $Y \cap \{z_k = 0\}$, and therefore the contact distribution along it is naturally identified with the remaining $n - 1$ factors of $\mathbb{C}^n$. Since the latter trivialization respects the product structure on $\mathbb{C}^n$, the rotation angle of $\gamma_{k,m}$ in the $j$th factor is well defined for $j \neq k$, and is equal to $ma_k/a_j$, so that we have (see [11, §2.1])

$$CZ_{\tau_{\text{sp}}}(\gamma) = n - 1 + 2 \sum_{j \neq k} \left\lfloor \frac{ma_k}{a_j} \right\rfloor. \quad (3.2.3)$$

Now consider the special case of $X = M \setminus E_{sk}$ with $M^{2n}$ a closed symplectic manifold, and let $\eta_m$ be the $m$-fold iterate of the short orbit on $\partial E_{sk}$. Then by the above we have

$$CZ_{\tau_{\text{ex}}} (\eta_m) = n - 1 + 2m, \quad CZ_{\tau_{\text{sp}}} (\eta_m) = n - 1. \quad (3.2.4)$$

Further, given a curve $C$ in (the symplectic completion of) $X$ with negative ends $(\eta_{m_1}, \ldots, \eta_{m_b})$, we can naturally associate to $C$ a homology class $A \in H_2(M; \mathbb{Z})$, such that we have

$$c_1(C) := c_{\tau_{\text{ex}}}(C) = c_1(A), \quad Q_{\tau_{\text{ex}}}(C) = A \cdot A, \quad (3.2.5)$$

while with respect to the trivialization $\tau_{\text{sp}}$ and bottom partition $\mathcal{P}$, we have

$$c_{\tau_{\text{sp}}}(C) = c_1(A) - |\mathcal{P}| = c_1(A) - \sum_{i=1}^{b} m_i, \quad Q_{\tau_{\text{sp}}}(C) = A \cdot A.$$

- **Writhe bounds.** Now consider the 3-dimensional case. For a somewhere injective curve $C$ that is asymptotic at both ends to some Reeb orbits, the asymptotic writhe $w_\pm^\tau(C)$ are sums of contributions from each asymptotic orbit. In principle the asymptotic links arising at the ends of $C$ are not uniquely determined by the Reeb orbit asymptotics and homology class of $C$, making them difficult to control in practice. It turns out that each end of $C$ is approximately an eigenfunction for an associated “asymptotic operator” which depends only on the linearized Reeb flow (see [14]). This can be used to give bounds for $w_\pm^\tau(C)$ in terms of the multiplicities and rotation angles.
at each end. More precisely, if $C$ has several positive ends of multiplicities $m_1, \ldots, m_n$ on a given simple elliptic Reeb orbit with rotation angle $\theta(=\theta_1)$, then we have

$$w^+_\tau \leq \sum_{i,j=1}^n \max([m_i \theta]m_j, [m_j \theta]m_i) - \sum_{i=1}^n [m_i \theta]$$

(3.2.6)

Similarly, for negative ends, we have

$$w^-\tau \geq \sum_{i,j=1}^n \min([m_i \theta]m_j, [m_j \theta]m_i) - \sum_{i=1}^n [m_i \theta].$$

(3.2.7)

Moreover, these bounds are sharp if the end partition satisfies the ECH partition conditions: see [6, Remark 2.3.2(ii)], [17, §3], and the discussion below about the ECH index. Because they are topological in nature, they apply to curves whose boundary is sufficiently close to an asymptotic end, and they are also sharp for any individual end of a curve which taken on its own satisfies the ECH partition condition for its given multiplicity.

In particular, the writhe $w^-\tau(\eta_m)$ of any negative end on $\eta_m$ (the $m$-fold iterate of the short orbit on $\partial E_{sk}$) is given by

$$w^-\tau_{sp}(\eta_m) = m - 1.$$  

(3.2.8)

More generally, for a curve with negative ends $(\eta_{m_1}, \ldots, \eta_{m_b})$ on a skinny ellipsoid forming the partition $\mathcal{P} = (m_1, \ldots, m_b)$ with $m_1 \geq \cdots \geq m_b$, one can check that the writhe bound (3.2.7) gives

$$w^-\tau_{sp} \geq 2\delta(\mathcal{P}) + |\mathcal{P}| - b,$$

(3.2.9)

where $\delta(\mathcal{P})$ is as in (2.3.4). A key point in the proof of Claim B below is that the above bound is also sharp for generic $J$.

- **Automatic transversality.** Another key advantage of dimension four is the fact that pseudoholomorphic curves are sometimes automatically regular without any assumptions on the almost complex structure. The most general version due to Wendl [29] includes curves with punctures and singularities, although more basic versions for closed curves go back to Gromov, see [21]. The following simplified version will suffice for our purposes:

**Theorem 3.2.3 ([29], see also [17]).** Let $X$ be a four-dimensional symplectic cobordism with each contact boundary component having nondegenerate Reeb flow, and let $J$ be any admissible almost complex structure on the symplectic completion of $X$. Then any immersed $J$-holomorphic $C$ curve with Reeb orbit asymptotics is regular, provided that we have

$$2g(C) - 2 + h_+(C) < \text{ind}(u),$$

(3.2.10)

where $h_+(C)$ denotes the number of ends asymptotic to positive hyperbolic orbits.

In particular, note that the conditions of this theorem are satisfied whenever we have $g(C) = h_+(C) = \text{ind}(C) = 0$, which is the most relevant case for this paper. In this case, a standard corollary of automatic transversality states that all such curves

---

26 Note that the papers [16] and [6] typically list these multiplicities in increasing order.
count with positive sign (see [21, Rmk.3.2.5]). As we argue in §4.2, the same is true for index zero rational curves in dimension four which satisfy multibranched tangency constraints.

- **ECH index.** We also mention for completeness that any somewhere injective curve $C$ with Reeb orbit asymptotics has an ECH index of the form

$$I(C) := c_\tau(C) + Q_\tau(C) + CZ_\tau(I(C)),$$

where $CZ_\tau(I(C))$ is a certain sum of Conley–Zehnder index contributions at the ends of $C$. By combining the definition of the ECH index with the relative adjunction formula, the Fredholm index formula, and the writhe bounds, one can prove the following ECH index inequality, which is a cornerstone of embedded contact homology:

$$I(C) - \text{ind}(C) \geq 2\delta(C).$$

For any given simple Reeb orbit $\gamma$, by looking at all positive ends of $C$ which are asymptotic to some cover of $\gamma$, we get a partition $\mathcal{P} = (m_1, \ldots, m_b)$. In the case that $I(C) = \text{ind}(C)$ (e.g. if the ECH index is zero), this partition is uniquely determined by the total multiplicity $|\mathcal{P}|$ and the rotation angle $\theta$ of $\gamma$, and in this case we say that $C$ satisfies the ECH partition conditions. Indeed, there is a precise formula for this partition in terms of a certain lattice point count associated to the data $(|\mathcal{P}|, \theta)$ (see [16] for more details). A similar situation holds for the negative ends of $C$. In the general case with $I(C) > \text{ind}(C)$, one can think of $\delta(C)$ as giving an upper bound for how far the actual partitions can differ from the ECH partitions.

For the case most relevant for us, if $C$ has positive ends $(\eta_{m_1}, \ldots, \eta_{m_b})$ on $\partial E_{sk}$ with total multiplicity $k = \sum_{i=1}^{b} m_i$, the corresponding ECH partition condition is $m_1 = \cdots = m_b = 1$ with $b = k$. Similarly, if $C$ has negative ends $(\eta_{m_1}, \ldots, \eta_{m_b})$ on $\partial E_{sk}$ with total multiplicity $k = \sum_{i=1}^{b} m_i$, the corresponding ECH partition condition is $m_1 = k$ with $b = 1$.

**Proof of Proposition 3.2.1.** We break up the proof into two steps.

**Step 1:** If $J$ is a generic admissible almost complex structure on the symplectic completion of $M \setminus \iota(E_{sk})$, the number of elements in $\mathcal{M}_{M\setminus E_{sk}, A}^{J,s} < \mathcal{P}>$ is finite and independent of the choice of $J$.

**Proof.** Let $J_0, J_1$ be generic admissible almost complex structures, and let $J_t$, $t \in [0, 1]$ be a generic homotopy of admissible almost complex structures starting at $J_0$ and ending at $J_1$. Similar to before, by a standard Sard–Smale argument we can assume that all somewhere injective curves in $\mathcal{M}_{M\setminus E_{sk}, A}^{J_i,s} < \mathcal{P}>$ have nonnegative index for $i = 0, 1$ and that all somewhere injective curves in the $t$-parametrized moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{M\setminus E_{sk}, A}^{J_t}\langle \mathcal{P}\rangle$ have index at least $-1$. In order to prove both finiteness of $\mathcal{M}_{M\setminus E_{sk}, A}^{J,s} < \mathcal{P}>$ and independence of $J$, we need to show that the $t$-parametrized moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{M\setminus (E_{sk}), A}^{J_t}\langle \mathcal{P}\rangle$ is already compact. In light of the SFT compactness theorem, it suffices to show no sequence of curves in $\mathcal{M}_{M\setminus E_{sk}, A}^{J_t}\langle \mathcal{P}\rangle$ converges to a building in a boundary stratum of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{M\setminus E_{sk}, A}^{J_t}\langle \mathcal{P}\rangle$.

Observe that such a building would consist of
• a top level in $M \setminus \iota(E_{sk})$, possibly nodal and disconnected
• some nonnegative number of symplectization levels in $\mathbb{R} \times \partial E_{sk}$.

Let us formally glue together all the symplectization levels along paired Reeb orbit ends, resulting in a collection of matched components $C_1, \ldots, C_c$ in $\mathbb{R} \times \partial E_{sk}$.

The index of any component $C$ in $M \setminus \iota(E_{sk})$ is nonnegative, and strictly positive unless $C$ is simple. Indeed, if $C$ is a $\kappa$-fold cover of its underlying simple curve $\overline{C}$, then we have from (3.2.1) that

$$\text{ind}(C) = \kappa \text{ind}(\overline{C}) + 2\kappa - 2.$$  

We can assume that $\text{ind}(\overline{C}) \geq -1$ and hence $\text{ind}(\overline{C}) \geq 0$ since the index is necessarily even by (3.1.3). It follows that $\text{ind}(C)$ is nonnegative, and we can only have $\text{ind}(C)$ if $\kappa = 1$.

Similarly, the index of any matched component $C_i$ in $\mathbb{R} \times \partial E_{sk}$ is nonnegative, and strictly positive if $C_i$ has more than one positive end. Indeed, by (3.1.3) and (3.2.4), if $C_i$ has say positive ends $\eta_{m_1}, \ldots, \eta_{m_k}$ and negative ends $\eta'_{m'_1}, \ldots, \eta'_{m'_l}$ ends, then we have

$$\text{ind}(C_i) = 2k - 2 + 2\sum_{i=1}^{k} m_i - 2\sum_{j=1}^{l} m'_j.$$  

(3.2.11)

By nonnegativity of energy, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} m_i - \sum_{j=1}^{l} m'_j \geq 0,$$  

(3.2.12)

and hence we have $\text{ind}(C_i) \geq 0$, with equality only if $k = 1$.

Since by hypothesis we have $\text{ind}(M \setminus \iota(E_{sk})) = 1$, it follows from the above index considerations that we must have

• the top level in $M \setminus \iota(E_{sk})$ is smooth and connected with one end for each matched component $C_1, \ldots, C_c$;
• the matched components $C_i$ necessarily have zero energy, and at least one must have more than one negative end, since otherwise they are all trivial cylinders by Lemma 3.1.7, which would violate the stability condition of the SFT compactness theorem.

It therefore remains to rule out the case that a matched component $C_i$ has more than one negative end. For this we will appeal to the relative adjunction formula and the aforementioned writhe estimates. Note that these tools cannot be directly applied to the matched component $C_i$, but it turns out that they can be applied to an approximation of $C_i$ and this suffices. Namely, suppose that $C_i$ has say positive end $\eta_m$ and negative ends $\eta_{m_1}, \ldots, \eta_{m_k}$ where we must have $\sum_{i=1}^{k} m_i = m$ since $\text{ind}(C_i) = 0$. By hypothesis, the entire building is approximated by a sequence of somewhere injective curves in $M \setminus \iota(E_{sk})$. Thus, if we cut such an approximating curve just above the neck where it is asymptotic to a braid around $\eta_m$, one component of its lower part $C_-$ is a curve portion with boundary that is a close approximation to the matched component $C_i$ and has well-defined writhes $w_\alpha^+$ and $w_\alpha^-$ at its top and bottom. Moreover, its top writhe $w_\alpha^{sp}(C_-)$ is given by the writhe of a curve with negative end on $\eta_m$, and hence Equation (3.2.7)
gives the lower bound
\[ w^+_{\tau_{sp}}(C_-) \geq \lceil m\theta \rceil m - \lceil m\theta \rceil = m - 1, \]
where \( \theta \) is the rotation angle of \( \eta_m \) with respect to \( \tau_{sp} \) and so is arbitrarily small as in (3.2.3). In fact, by the explanation following Equation (3.2.7), this inequality is sharp, i.e. we have
\[ w^+_{\tau_{sp}}(C_-) = m - 1. \]
Similarly, we can use Equation (3.2.7) to estimate \( w^-_{\tau_{sp}}(C_-) \). Assuming without loss of generality that \( m_1 \geq m_2 \geq \cdots \geq m_k \) where \( k > 1 \), we have
\[ w^-_{\tau_{sp}}(C_-) \geq \sum_{i \leq j} m_j - k \]
\[ = m + 2 \sum_{i < j} m_j - k \]
\[ \geq m + 2 - k. \]
In this situation we have \( c_{\tau_{sp}}(C_-) = 0, Q_{\tau_{sp}}(C_-) = 0 \), and \( \chi(C_-) = 1 - k \), and hence the relative adjunction formula (3.2.2) gives
\[ 0 \leq 2\delta = \chi(C_-) + w^+_{\tau}(C_-) - w^-_{\tau}(C_-) \]
\[ \leq 1 - k + m - 1 - (m + 2 - k) = -2 \]
which is impossible. \( \square \)

**Step 2:** The number of elements in \( \mathcal{M}_{M \setminus \iota(E_{sk}), A < \mathcal{P}>} \) does not depend on the choice of embedding \( \iota \), scale factor \( \varepsilon \) and shape parameter \( s \).

**Proof.** The independence of the choice of \( \iota \) and \( \varepsilon \) follows exactly as in Proposition 3.1.1. As for the dependence on \( s \), put \( E_{sk} = E(\varepsilon, \varepsilon s) \) and \( \tilde{E}_{sk} = E(\tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{\varepsilon} s) \) for \( 0 < \tilde{\varepsilon} < \varepsilon \) and \( 0 < \varepsilon s < \varepsilon s \), and let \( \tilde{\iota} \) denote the restriction of \( \iota \) to \( \tilde{E}_{sk} \). As in the proof of Proposition 3.1.6, we consider the effect of stretching the neck of \( M \setminus \tilde{\iota}(\tilde{E}_{sk}) \) along \( \partial\tilde{E}_{sk} \).

For \( \tilde{s} > |\mathcal{P}| \) and \( \tilde{\varepsilon} > \frac{|\mathcal{P}| - 1}{|\mathcal{P}|} \), the analogue of Equation (3.2.12) still holds, and essentially the same argument as above shows that the only possible breaking is a two level building in \( (E_{sk} \setminus \tilde{E}_{sk}) \oplus (M \setminus \iota(E_{sk})) \) consisting of a connected somewhere injective top level \( C_{\text{top}} \) in \( M \setminus \iota(E_{sk}) \) and a union of cylinders in \( E_{sk} \setminus \tilde{E}_{sk} \). Below we prove the following claims:

(A) Each component in \( E_{sk} \setminus \tilde{E}_{sk} \) is necessarily the unique cylinder from \( \eta_k \) to \( \tilde{\eta}_k \) for some \( k \geq 1 \).

(B) If the almost complex structure \( J \) on \( M \setminus \iota(E_{sk}) \) is generic, then two different curves in \( M \setminus \tilde{\iota}(\tilde{E}_{sk}) \) cannot degenerate to the same building in \( (E_{sk} \setminus \tilde{E}_{sk}) \oplus (M \setminus \iota(E_{sk})) \).

Granted this, it follows that we have
\[ \# \mathcal{M}_{M \setminus \tilde{E}_{sk}, A < \mathcal{P}>} \leq \# \mathcal{M}_{M \setminus E_{sk}, A < \mathcal{P}>} \]  
(3.2.13)
in the case
\[ |\mathcal{P}| < \tilde{s}, s, \quad \frac{\varepsilon(|\mathcal{P}| - 1)}{|\mathcal{P}|} < \tilde{\varepsilon} < \min(\varepsilon, \frac{s\varepsilon}{\tilde{s}}) \]
In particular, if $\bar{s} \leq s$, then we can choose $\bar{\varepsilon} < \varepsilon$ sufficiently close to $\varepsilon$ to satisfy the lower bound. Hence because the counts are independent of the choice of $\varepsilon, \bar{\varepsilon}$ the inequality (3.2.13) holds in this case. Similarly, the inequality (3.2.13) holds if $s < \bar{s} < \frac{|P|}{|P|-1}$ since in this case we can also choose suitable $\varepsilon, \bar{\varepsilon}$. Hence by repeating this procedure, this inequality also holds for all $s < \bar{s}$. But then we must have equality in (3.2.13).

**Proof of Claim A:** This is a more general version of Lemma 3.1.7 that holds in dimension four and applies with no restriction on $J$ provided that it is admissible, i.e. is appropriately adapted to the structure at the ends of the manifold. First note that by Lemma 3.1.7 the signed count of cylinders in $E_{sk} \setminus \bar{E}_{sk}$ from $\eta_k$ to $\bar{\eta}_k$ is one. If there is more than one such cylinder when $k = 1$, we may apply the relative adjunction formula (3.2.2) to their union to get

$$w_{\tau} = w^+_{\tau} - w^-_{\tau} = 2\delta \geq 0,$$

while the writhe bounds (3.2.6) give

$$w^+_{\tau} \leq 0, \quad w^-_{\tau} \geq 2,$$

which is a contradiction. A similar argument rules out the existence of a somewhere injective cylinder in the symplectic completion of $E_{sk} \setminus \bar{E}_{sk}$ from $\eta_k$ to $\bar{\eta}_k$ for some $k \geq 2$: the relative adjunction formula would give

$$w_{\tau} = w^+_{\tau} - w^-_{\tau} = 2\delta \geq 0,$$

while the writhe bounds give

$$w^+_{\tau} \leq 0, \quad w^-_{\tau} \geq k - 1,$$

which is a contradiction for $k \geq 2$.

**Proof of Claim B:** Suppose by contradiction that two different curves in $M \setminus \bar{\imath}(\bar{E}_{sk})$ degenerate under neck stretching to the same building in $(E_{sk} \setminus \bar{E}_{sk}) \odot (M \setminus \bar{\imath}(E_{sk}))$. Then in particular we can find curve portions $C_1$ and $C_2$ which closely approximate the same top level $C$ in $M \setminus \bar{\imath}(E_{sk})$. If $\delta(C)$ denotes the count of singularities of $C$, we must have $C_1 \cdot C_2 \geq 2\delta(C)$ (this is most evident when $C_1$ and $C_2$ are immersed, which holds generically). We will show that this violates the relative adjunction formula applied to the pair $C_1 \cup C_2$.

Indeed, if $P = (m_1, \ldots, m_b)$ where $m_1 \geq m_2 \geq \cdots \geq m_b$ we have defined

$$|P| := \sum_{i=1}^b m_i, \quad \delta(P) := \sum_{i=1}^b (i-1)m_i.$$

Combining the adjunction inequality for a curve $C \in \mathcal{M}_{M \setminus \bar{\imath}(E_{sk}), A <P>}$ with the writhe bound (3.2.7), we get

$$2\delta(C) = \chi(C) + Q_{\tau_{sp}}(C) - c_{\tau_{sp}}(C) - w^-_{\tau_{sp}}(C) \leq (2-b) + A^2 - (c_1(A) - |P|) - (|P| - b + 2\delta(P))$$

$$= 2 + A^2 - c_1(A) - 2\delta(P).$$

The key point now is that when $J$ is generic the lower bound in (3.2.7) for $w^-_{\tau_{sp}}(C)$ for negative ends on a skinny ellipsoid is exact. We noted at the end of our discussion of
the ECH index that any end on $\eta_m$ (for $m < s$) satisfies the ECH partition condition for a negative end on $\partial E_{sk}$. Hence by [15, Prop 6.1] the writhe estimate for this single end is exact. In particular, it has the predicted winding number, namely $1 = [m/s]$. It is clearly explained in [15, §6.3] how to calculate the linking numbers of the different ends of $C$ and hence $w_{-\tau_p}(C)$. Each end has an asymptotic expansion in terms of eigenfunctions of the asymptotic operator $A$, and, by [14, §3], for each winding number there is a corresponding two-dimensional space $\mathbb{R}(\xi_1, \xi_2)$ of eigenfunctions (corresponding to the lowest two positive eigenvalues of $A$) that give rise to trajectories with that winding number. Therefore the lowest terms in the asymptotic expansions for the ends of $C$ must have the form $c_1\xi_1 + c_2\xi_2$ for some $(c_1, c_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$. The proof of [15, Lemma 6.9] shows that the lower bound for $w_{-\tau_p}(C)$ is exact if each end of $C$ gives rise to a different pair $(c_1, c_2)$. It remains to observe that since the family $(J_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$ is generic, we may assume that this condition is satisfied since it has codimension 2. Hence we may conclude that

$$2\delta(C) = 2 + A^2 - c_1(A) - 2\delta(\mathcal{P}).$$

Similarly, if $C_1, C_2$ are two distinct curves in $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{M} \setminus \{E_{sk}\}, A < \mathcal{P}>}$, the writhe bound (3.2.7) gives that

$$w_{-\tau_p}(C_1 \cup C_2) = 4|\mathcal{P}| - 2b + 8\delta(\mathcal{P})$$

so that

$$2\delta(C_1 \cup C_2) = 2(2 - b) + 4A^2 - 2(c_1(A) - |\mathcal{P}|) - (4|\mathcal{P}| - 2b + 8\delta(\mathcal{P}))$$

$$= 4 + 4A^2 - 2c_1(A) - 2|\mathcal{P}| - 8\delta(\mathcal{P}).$$

The count of singularities of the union is given by

$$\delta(C_1 \cup C_2) = \delta(C_1) + \delta(C_2) + C_1 \cdot C_2 = 2\delta(C) + C_1 \cdot C_2,$$

and therefore we have

$$C_1 \cdot C_2 = (2 + 2A^2 - c_1(A) - |\mathcal{P}| - 4\delta(\mathcal{P})) - (2 + A^2 - c_1(A) - 2\delta(\mathcal{P}))$$

$$= A^2 - |\mathcal{P}| - 2\delta(\mathcal{P}).$$

But this implies that $C_1 \cdot C_2 < 2\delta(C)$, which as we noted above is impossible if $C_1$ and $C_2$ are both very close to $C$. This completes the proof of Claim B and hence the proof of Proposition 3.2.1.

Given partitions $\mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_r$, we can also define the invariants

$$N^E_{\mathcal{M}, A < \mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_r>} \in \mathbb{Z}$$

(3.2.15)

in essentially the same way as $N_{\mathcal{M} \setminus E_{sk}, A < \mathcal{P}>}$, using a disjoint collection of small skinny ellipsoids $E_{sk}^1, \ldots, E_{sk}^r$ in $M$. We omit the proof that the corresponding curve counts are independent of all choices since it is essentially the same as the proof of Proposition 3.2.1 above, except with slightly more cumbersome notation.
4. Relationships between constraints

In this section we establish some fundamental relationships between the various curve counts defined in the previous two sections. Taken together these will form the backbone of the recursion algorithm in the next section. We begin by establishing an appropriate version of automatic regularity for the two types of invariants in dimension four, which allows us to calculate the invariants $N^T_{M,A}(\mathcal{P})$ in simple cases, and in particular to establish an equivalence between curve counts involving blowup constraints at a point and curve counts with constraints given by the partition $\mathcal{P} = (1, \ldots, 1)$. In §4.2 we prove an equivalence between curve counts with multibranched tangency constraints and curve counts with ends on a skinny ellipsoid. Our proof circumvents the gluing analysis for curves with tangency constraints via an argument which utilizes automatic transversality and obstruction bundle gluing, and hence is only valid in dimension four. Lastly, in §4.3 we give a formula which describes how to replace curve counts with ends on two disjoint skinny ellipsoids with curve counts with ends on a single skinny ellipsoid. In light of §4.2, this equivalently describes how to combine multibranched tangency constraints at two distinct points in the target into multibranched tangency constraints at a single point.

4.1. Positivity of the curve counts in dimension four. We now explain why curves in dimension four with multibranched tangency constraints count positively. As mentioned in §3.2, for curves without constraints, including with Reeb orbit asymptotics, this is a standard corollary of Wendl’s automatic transversality theorem. In the case of curves with tangency constraints, we reduce to the case of no constraints by a blowup argument, which also provides an alternative perspective on the tangency constraints.

**Lemma 4.1.1.** Let $M$ be a symplectic four-manifold and $A \in H_2(M; \mathbb{Z})$ a homology class. For any partition $\mathcal{P} \in \text{Part}_{c_1(A)}$, every curve contributing to the invariant $N^T_{M,A}(\mathcal{P})$ counts with positive sign, and similarly for $N^E_{M,A}(\mathcal{P})$.

**Proof.** In the case of $N^E_{M,A}(\mathcal{P})$, we first note that, for generic admissible $J$ on $M \setminus E_{sk}$, all of the representative curves in $M^I_{M \setminus E_{sk}, A}(\mathcal{P})$ are immersed. Indeed, it follows as in §2.3 that these curves cannot be multiply covered, and any non-immersed curve would have a cusp point (i.e. a point where the derivative vanishes). Since the condition of a curve having a cusp is codimension two and we are counting index zero curves, cusps will not appear for generic $J$. This means that condition (3.2.10) holds, so Wendl’s automatic transversality theorem applies, and it then follows as in [12, Prop 3.15] that all of the curves in $M^I_{M \setminus E_{sk}, A}(\mathcal{P})$ count positively. The rough idea here is that the space of almost complex structures $J$ for which the moduli space $M^I_{M \setminus E_{sk}, A}(\mathcal{P})$ is regular is path connected. Indeed, we can join any two almost complex structures $J_0, J_1$ by a generic family $J_t$, and the corresponding parametrized moduli space will induce a cobordism between $M^I_{M \setminus E_{sk}, A}(\mathcal{P})$ and $M^I_{M \setminus E_{sk}, A}(\mathcal{P})$. Typically this cobordism will undergo bifurcations at isolated values of $t$, but in the present situation automatic transversality implies that $M^I_{M \setminus E_{sk}, A}(\mathcal{P})$ is regular for all $t$ and hence that no bifurcations can occur.

---

27 As we saw in the discussion of Proposition 2.2.4, for a curve in a four-manifold to have a cusp at a prescribed point of its domain is (real) codimension four, and hence it is codimension two to have a cusp somewhere on the curve.
This means that this cobordism is in fact trivial, so we get a one-to-one correspondence between the curves in $\mathcal{M}^{I_0,s}_{M\setminus E_{sk},A}\langle \mathcal{P} \rangle$ and $\mathcal{M}^{I_1,s}_{M\setminus E_{sk},A}\langle \mathcal{P} \rangle$. From this it follows that the curves in the two moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}^{I_0,s}_{M\setminus E_{sk},A}\langle \mathcal{P} \rangle$ and $\mathcal{M}^{I_1,s}_{M\setminus E_{sk},A}\langle \mathcal{P} \rangle$ count with the same signs, and it is not hard to show that these signs must all be positive since we can deform $J$ so as to be integrable near any given curve $C$ provided that no more than two branches of $C$ intersect at any point; see also [21, Remark 3.2.5].

Similarly, in the case of $N^T_{M,A}\langle \mathcal{P} \rangle$, for generic $J \in J_D$ all representative curves in $\mathcal{M}_{M,A}\langle \mathcal{P} \rangle$ are immersed (here as usual $D$ denotes the local divisor at $p \in M$). In order to invoke automatic transversality as above, the idea is to trade curves with tangency constraints in $M$ for curves without any constraints in a prescribed homology class of a suitable blowup of $M$. For $j \geq 1$, we define a symplectic manifold $M^{(j)}$ as follows. Let $M^{(1)}$ denote the blowup of $M$ at the point $p$, with resulting exceptional divisor $E_1$, and let $D^{(1)}$ denote the proper transform of the local divisor $D$. Inductively, let $M^{(j)}$ denote the blowup of $M^{(j-1)}$ at the point $D^{(j-1)} \cap E_{j-1}$, with resulting exceptional divisor $E_j$, and let $D^{(j)}$ denote the proper transform of the local divisor $D^{(j-1)}$. Note that $M^{(j)}$ is just symplectomorphic to the $j$-fold blowup $Bl_j M$, and as such its homology naturally splits as $H_2(M^{(j)}; \mathbb{Z}) = H_2(M; \mathbb{Z}) \oplus \mathbb{Z}[\langle E_1 \rangle, \ldots, \langle E_j \rangle]$. On the other hand, since $J$ is integrable in $Op(p)$, we can arrange that all blowups take place within this neighborhood, and we denote by $J^{(j)}$ the induced almost complex structure on $M^{(j)}$.

Now put $a = \max_i m_i$, where we are assuming $\mathcal{P} = (m_1, \ldots, m_b)$. By slight abuse of notation, we denote by $E_1 - E_2 - E_3 - \ldots - E_{a-1} - E_a$ the proper transforms of $E_1, \ldots, E_{a-1}$ respectively in $M^{(a)}$ (the notation is justified by the fact that these lie in the homology classes $[E_1] - [E_2], \ldots, [E_{a-1}] - [E_a]$ respectively). Note that the $J^{(a)}$-holomorphic spheres $E_1 - E_2, E_2 - E_3, \ldots, E_{a-1} - E_a$ all have index $-2$ and hence are not regular, although $J^{(a)}$ is otherwise generic outside of the region where the blowups take place. Let $C^{(a)}$ denote the proper transform of $C$ in $M^{(a)}$. Since the local branches of $C$ through $p$ have precisely contact orders $m_1, \ldots, m_b$ with $D$, all of its intersection points with $D$ get resolved by the blowup procedure, i.e. we have $C^{(a)} \cap D^{(a)} = \emptyset$. Moreover, $C^{(a)}$ is immersed and lies in the homology class

$$\bar{A} := A - \sum_{j=1}^{a} n_j [E_j], \quad \text{where} \quad n_j = \# \{ i \mid m_i \geq j \}. \quad (4.1.1)$$

The identity $\sum_{j=1}^{a} n_j = \sum_{i=1}^{b} m_i$ implies that $c_1(\bar{A}) = 1$. Therefore the curve $C^{(a)}$ is immersed and has index zero, and therefore satisfies the conditions of automatic transversality. The previous argument then shows that $C^{(a)}$ counts with positive sign, and hence so does the original curve $C$ as an element of $\mathcal{M}^{I,s}_{M,A}\langle \mathcal{P} \rangle$.

\textbf{Remark 4.1.2.} Given a partition $\mathcal{P} = (m_1, \ldots, m_b)$, we define its \textbf{dual partition} $\mathcal{Q} = (n_1, \ldots, n_a)$ by $n_j = \# \{ i \mid m_i \geq j \}$. In the above proof, for a curve $C$ satisfying a tangency constraint $<\mathcal{T}_p \mathcal{P}>$, the curve $C^{(a)}$ in $M^{(a)}$ lies in the homology class $A - \sum_{j=1}^{a} n_j [E_j]$ determined by $\mathcal{Q}$. We note that in terms of the Young diagram representation of partitions discussed below, $\mathcal{Q}$ is simply the partition determined by the columns rather than the rows of the partition.

\textcircled{ }
The next corollary shows that in dimension four the invariants $N_{M,A}<T^{m-1}p>$ counting curves with a single tangency constraint of full codimension are almost always nonzero. This fact plays an important role in the closed curve upper bounds for the capacities defined in [27, §6.2.3], and by the equivalence between tangential and skinny ellipsoid constraints gives a different approach to the existence result proved in [13, 20] for degree $d$ curves in $\mathbb{CP}^2 - \iota(E(\varepsilon, \varepsilon x))$ with $x > 3d - 1$ and one negative end.\(^{28}\) The recursion algorithm of the next section will compute these numbers explicitly, although since the matrix $A_k^{-1}$ has negative entries the nontriviality of $N_{M,A}<T^{m-1}p>$ is not manifest.

**Corollary 4.1.3.** Let $M$ be a symplectic four-manifold, and $A \in H_2(M; \mathbb{Z})$ be a homology class with $c_1(A) > 0$ that can be represented by a symplectically immersed sphere with positive self-intersections. Then $N_{M,A}<T^{c_1(A)-2}p> > 0$.

**Proof.** Let $C \subset M$ be a symplectically immersed sphere with positive self-intersections in class $A$. After a slight perturbation, we may assume that no more than two branches of $C$ go through any point, and then choose an $\omega$-tame $J$ so that $C$ is $J$-holomorphic. Choose a point $p \in C$ with only one branch through it, and perturb $J$ so that it is holomorphic near $p$. Finally, choose a holomorphic local divisor $D$ through $p$ that is tangent to $C$ to order exactly $c_1(C) - 2$. Then the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{M,A}^{s}\langle T^{c_1(A)-2}p\rangle$ is nonempty and regular. Hence Lemma 4.1.1 implies that $\#\mathcal{M}_{M,A}^{s}\langle T^{c_1(A)-2}p\rangle > 0$, as claimed. □

**Remark 4.1.4.** (i) If an immersed curve $C$ represents $A$ as in the above corollary, a similar argument applies for any constraint $<T^p>$ that can be chosen so as to be satisfied by $C$. For example, if $C$ has $b$ transverse branches through some point $p$ and $\mathcal{P} = (m - b + 1, 1, \ldots, 1)$ (where $m = c_1(A) - 1$) then

$$N_{M,A}<T^p> > 0.$$  

For example, since degree $d$ curves of genus zero in $\mathbb{CP}^2$ have one double point, we may conclude that $N_{\mathbb{CP}^2,3[L]}<T^{(6)}p,p> > 0$.

(ii) One can use similar geometric ideas to show that certain counts must be zero. Here is a simple example. It follows from the adjunction formula (3.2.2) that the number of double points $\delta(A)$ of an immersed $J$-holomorphic $A$ curve is given

$$\delta(A) = \frac{1}{2}(A^2 - c_1(A)) + 1.$$  

(4.1.2)

On the other hand, if $C$ is a $J$-holomorphic curve that satisfies the constraint $<T^p>$ for some $\mathcal{P} = (m_1, \ldots, m_b) \in \text{Part}_{c_1(A)-1}$, then we saw in Lemma 2.3.3 that $C$ can be perturbed to have at least $\delta(\mathcal{P})$ double points. Thus $N_{M,A}<\mathcal{P}> = 0$ if $\delta(\mathcal{P}) > \delta(A)$. ◊

Although for simplicity we stated Lemma 4.1.1 for a single constraint $T^p$ it clearly also holds for invariants such as

$$N_{M,A}^T<T^p_1,T^p_2,\ldots,T^p_r>$$

with constraints at different points.

\(^{28}\) Notice that this ellipsoid is skinny for the given constraint.
Corollary 4.1.5. For partitions $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_r$ with $\mathcal{P}_1 = (1^{x_b})$, we have

$$N^T_{M,A} \langle \mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_r \rangle = N^T_{B_1 M,A - b[E]} \langle \mathcal{P}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_r \rangle.$$ 

Proof. If $\mathcal{P}_1 = (1^{x_b})$, the corresponding invariant $N^T_{M,A} \langle (1^{x_b}), \mathcal{P}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_r \rangle$ does not involve any tangency conditions at $p_1$ but simply counts curves with $b$ branches through $p_1$ and other tangency constraints at $p_2, \ldots, p_r$. If we blow up once at $p_1$, then for generic $J$ there is a bijective correspondence between these curves and the curves in class $A - b[E]$ that satisfy the constraints $\mathcal{T}^{p_2} p_2, \ldots, \mathcal{T}^{p_r} p_r$. Indeed, each curve counted by $N^T_{M,A} \langle (1^{x_b}), \mathcal{P}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_r \rangle$ is immersed and has $b$ branches through $p_1$. Hence when we blow up the intersection of the proper transform with the exceptional divisor $E$ is precisely $b$, so that this proper transform lies in the class $A - b[E]$. \hfill \qed

4.2. Equivalence of tangency and ellipsoidal constraints in dimension four. Let $M$ be a symplectic four-manifold and $A \in H_2(M; \mathbb{Z})$ a homology class. By the results of the previous two sections, for each partition $\mathcal{P} = (m_1, \ldots, m_b)$ of $c_1(A) - 1$ we have two enumerative invariants:

- $N^T_{M,A} \langle \mathcal{P} \rangle$ counts curves in $M$ that satisfy a multibranched tangency constraint $\langle T^{m_1 - 1} p, \ldots, T^{m_b - 1} p \rangle$ at a point
- $N^E_{M,A} \langle \mathcal{P} \rangle$ counts curves in $M \setminus E_{sk}$ with negative ends $\eta_{m_1}, \ldots, \eta_{m_b}$.

Our main goal in this subsection is to prove Theorem 1.2.5 which we restate here for the convenience of the reader. Note that the coefficient

$$\mathcal{P}! := \frac{|\mathcal{P}|!}{m_1! \cdots m_b!} = \frac{(m_1 + \cdots + m_b)!}{m_1! \cdots m_b!}$$

below represents the number of ways of decomposing an ordered set with $|\mathcal{P}|$ elements into $b$ unordered parts of sizes $m_1, \ldots, m_b$.

Proposition 4.2.1. Let $M$ be a symplectic four-manifold and $A \in H_2(M; \mathbb{Z})$ a homology class. For any partition $\mathcal{P} \in \text{Part}_{c_1(A) - 1}$, we have $N^T_{M,A} \langle \mathcal{P} \rangle = N^E_{M,A} \langle \mathcal{P} \rangle$. Further, the number $N_{M,A}$ of A-curves through $c_1(A) - 1$ generic points is given by:

$$N_{M,A} = \sum_{\mathcal{P} \in \text{Part}_{c_1(A) - 1}} \mathcal{P}! N^E_{M,A} \langle \mathcal{P} \rangle.$$ 

The basic heuristic reason why Proposition 4.2.1 holds is that essentially the only rigid punctured curves in a skinny ellipsoid which satisfy a $\langle T^{m-1} p \rangle$ constraint are $m$-fold covers of the plane passing through $p$ and positively asymptotic to the simple short Reeb orbit in $\partial E_{sk}$. As a consequence, given a $\langle T^{m-1} p \rangle$ constraint, surrounding it with $E_{sk}$ and neck stretching along $\partial E_{sk}$ should replace it with a negative $\eta_m$ end; conversely, gluing should fill in a negative $\eta_m$ end with a $\langle T^{m-1} p \rangle$ constraint in $E_{sk}$. A similar heuristic applies for the multibranched constraints. However, we note that this type of gluing problem is somewhat nonstandard, since it involves curves satisfying tangency constraints. In particular, in the situations of interest we often want to glue a curve in $M \setminus E_{sk}$ to a multiply covered curve in $E_{sk}$ with a branch point at $p$, which satisfies the tangency constraint $\langle T^{m-1} p \rangle$ but in a rather degenerate way. In order to sidestep such issues, we will instead give a somewhat indirect argument which utilizes automatic regularity in dimension four and obstruction bundle gluing. These ideas will be placed in a broader framework in §4.3.
In more detail, this subsection is structured as follows:

- In Lemma 4.2.2, we establish the inequality
  
  \[ N_{M,A} \leq \sum \mathcal{P}! N_{\mathcal{M},A}^{T} < \mathcal{P} >, \]

  where the sum is over all partitions \( \mathcal{P} = (m_1, \ldots, m_b) \in \text{Part}_m \) where \( m = c_1 \langle A \rangle - 1 \).

  The basic idea here is to push all of the points \( p_1, \ldots, p_m \) along \( D \) until they all coincide with the point \( p \). We argue that, after compactifying this parametrized moduli space, every curve degenerates into a curve with a multibranched tangency constraint, and moreover no two geometrically distinct curves can degenerate to the same limit.

- In Lemma 4.2.4, we establish the inequality
  
  \[ N_{\mathcal{M},A}^{T} < \mathcal{P} > \leq N_{\mathcal{M},A}^{E} < \mathcal{P} >. \]

  This essentially follows by a neck stretching argument after surrounding the point \( p \) by a small skinny ellipsoid \( E_{sk} \). Here we rule out undesirable degenerations using essentially the same techniques as in §3.2.

- Finally, in Lemma 4.2.5, we establish the inequality
  
  \[ \sum \mathcal{P}! N_{\mathcal{M},A}^{E} < \mathcal{P} > \leq N_{M,A}. \]

  Here the idea is that we can use obstruction bundle gluing as in [18] to fill in all of the negative ends by a collection of holomorphic planes in \( E_{sk} \), each of which passes through one of the points \( p_1, \ldots, p_m \).

**Proof of Proposition 4.2.1.** By combining the aforementioned lemmas, we have

\[ N_{M,A} \leq \sum \mathcal{P}! N_{\mathcal{M},A}^{T} < \mathcal{P} > \leq \sum \mathcal{P}! N_{\mathcal{M},A}^{E} < \mathcal{P} > \leq N_{M,A}. \]

Hence all of the inequalities are equalities; in particular, we must have \( N_{\mathcal{M},A}^{T} < \mathcal{P} > = N_{\mathcal{M},A}^{E} < \mathcal{P} > \) for each \( \mathcal{P} \).

**Lemma 4.2.2.** We have \( N_{M,A} \leq \sum \mathcal{P}! N_{\mathcal{M},A}^{T} < \mathcal{P} >, \) where the sum is over all partitions \( \mathcal{P} \in \text{Part}_{c_1 \langle A \rangle - 1} \).

**Proof.** Put \( m = c_1 \langle A \rangle - 1 \). Let \( D \) be a local divisor at \( p \in M \), and let \( p_1, p_2, p_3, \ldots \) be a sequence in \( D \times M \subset \mathcal{M}_m \) which converges to \( p_\infty := (p_1, \ldots, p) \). Consider the moduli space \( \mathcal{M}_{M,A,m}^{J,s} \) of simple \( A \)-curves with \( m \) marked points. By semipositivity, for generic \( J \in \mathcal{J}_D \) the evaluation map

\[ \text{ev}_m : \mathcal{M}_{M,A,m}^{J,s} \to M \times M \]

is a pseudocycle of dimension \( 4m \), and moreover we can assume that each of the points \( p_k \in M \times M \) is a regular value. Then the signed count of points in \( \text{ev}_m^{-1}(p_k) \) is \( N_{M,A} \) for each \( k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \), and in fact by automatic transversality (c.f. §4.1) this is also the unsigned count.

By forgetting the constraints, we have a natural inclusion map \( \text{ev}_m^{-1}(p_k) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_{M,A,m}^{J} \) for \( k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \). Let \( \lim_{k \to \infty} \text{ev}_m^{-1}(p_k) \) denote the set of limit points as \( k \to \infty \) in this ambient compact space. That is, each element of \( \lim_{k \to \infty} \text{ev}_m^{-1}(p_k) \) is a limit \( C_\infty = \lim_{k \to \infty} C_k \) of stable maps \( C_k \in \text{ev}_m^{-1}(p_k) \). Note that each marked point of \( C_\infty \) maps
to \( p \), although in general \( C_\infty \) will be a nodal configuration consisting of one or more ghost components. Since \( J \in \mathcal{J}_p \) is generic, by (2.2.6) and index considerations similar to those in the proof of Proposition 2.2.2, we can assume that \( C_\infty \) has exactly one nonconstant component, which must represent the homology class \( A \). Let us prune away all of the ghost components from \( C_\infty \) and mark the nearby special points on the nonconstant component as in steps (1) and (2) in the proof of Proposition 2.2.2. The resulting curve \( \overline{C}_\infty \) has marked points \( z_1, \ldots, z_a \) for some \( a \leq m \) (with some of these newly added) and satisfies the condition \( \sum_{i=1}^a \text{ord}(\overline{C}_\infty, D; z_i) = m \). In other words, \( \overline{C}_\infty \) defines an element of \( \bigcup_{\mathcal{P} \in \text{Part}^m} \mathcal{M}_{g, s}^J, \mathcal{P} < \mathcal{T}^P \).

Let \( N := N_{M,A} \), and choose a labelling \( (C_{k,i})_{i=1}^N \) of the \( N \) elements in \( \text{ev}_m^{-1}(p_k) \) for each \( k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \). By passing to a subsequence, we may assume that each sequence \( (C_{k,i})_{k \geq 1} \) converges to a limiting curve

\[
C_{\infty,i} \in \lim_{k \to \infty} \text{ev}_m^{-1}(p_k).
\]

Recall from (2.3.2) that \( N_{M,A} < \mathcal{P} > \) is the count of curves whose branches through \( p \) are unordered. Note each sequence \( C_{1,i}, C_{2,i}, C_{3,i}, \ldots \) determines not just a pruned limiting curve \( \overline{C}_{\infty,i} \), but also a decomposition \( \mathcal{Q}_i \) of \( \{1, \ldots, m\} \) into subsets whose sizes are given by a partition \( \mathcal{P} := (m_1, \ldots, m_b) \) of \( m \), where \( \mathcal{Q}_i \) is determined by recording which marked points of \( C_{k,i} \) coalesce into each branch of \( \overline{C}_{\infty,i} \) through \( p \). Since \( \mathcal{P}! \) is precisely the number of such decompositions \( \mathcal{Q}_i \) that correspond to a given partition \( \mathcal{P} \), it suffices to show that if \( \mathcal{Q}_i = \mathcal{Q}_j \) for some pair of sequences \( (C_{k,i})_{k \geq 1} \) and \( (C_{k,j})_{k \geq 1} \) with the same limiting curve \( C := \overline{C}_\infty \) then we must have \( i = j \).

To prove this last point, suppose by contradiction that we have \( i \neq j \), and let \( C' := C_{k,i}, C'' := C_{k,j} \) for some large \( k \). We will show that this is impossible by counting singularities and applying the adjunction formula.

According to the adjunction formula, the count \( \delta(C) \) of singularities of \( C \) is given by

\[
\delta(C) = \delta(A) = \frac{1}{2}(A^2 - c_1(A)) + 1,
\]

while the singularity at \( p \) gives a contribution to \( \delta(C) \) of \( \delta(\mathcal{P}) \) by Lemma 2.3.3. Therefore we can assume that \( C \) has an additional \( \delta(A) - \delta(\mathcal{P}) \) double points away from \( p \), and, since \( C', C'' \) are close approximations of \( C \), they therefore have at least \( 2(\delta(A) - \delta(\mathcal{P})) \) intersection points away from \( p \). We now claim that the singularity at \( p \) contributes at least \( |\mathcal{P}| + 2\delta(\mathcal{P}) \) intersection points between \( C' \) and \( C'' \) near \( p \). To see this, denote the local branches of \( C' \) and \( C'' \) near \( p \) by \( B'_\alpha, B''_\alpha \) and \( B'_\beta, B''_\beta \), respectively, where as usual we assume \( \mathcal{P} = (m_1, \ldots, m_b) \) with \( m_1 \geq \cdots \geq m_b \). By construction for each \( \beta \in \{1, \ldots, b\} \) the branches \( B'_\beta \) and \( B''_\beta \) go through the same subset of the tuple \( p_k \) of size \( m_\beta \), so that \( B''_\beta \cdot B'_\beta \geq m_\beta \). Further, if \( \alpha < \beta \) and \( k \) is sufficiently large, then \( B'_\alpha \) is very close to a curve that has contact order \( m_\alpha \geq m_\beta \) with \( D \) at \( p \) and so \( B''_\beta \), which by construction meets \( D \) in \( m_\beta \) points near \( p \), must also meet \( B'_\alpha \) in \( m_\beta \) points near \( p \).

---

29 Note that it is crucial here that all of the points involved in the sequence \( p_1, p_2, p_3, \ldots \) lie in \( D \), so that the total contact order with \( D \) is preserved by the limiting curve \( \overline{C}_\infty \). If we instead took an arbitrary sequence of points in \( M^{X/m} \) limiting to \( p_\infty \), the limiting curves could satisfy more complicated constraints which depend on the collision directions of the sequence and are unrelated to the divisor \( D \).

30 Note the analogy with the proof of Claim B of Proposition 3.2.1.
Therefore, for $\alpha < \beta$ we have $B'_\alpha \cdot B''_\beta \geq m_\beta$ and also $B''_\alpha \cdot B'_\beta \geq m_\beta$. Thus for sufficiently large $k$ there are at least
\[
\sum_\beta m_\beta + 2 \sum_\beta (\beta - 1)m_\beta = |P| + 2\delta(P)
\]
intersection points of $C'$ with $C''$ near $p$ as claimed. Therefore we have
\[
C' \cdot C'' \geq 2(\delta(A) - \delta(P)) + |P| + 2\delta(P) \\
\geq A^2 - c_1(A) + 2 + c_1(A) - 1 \\
\geq A^2 + 1,
\]
which is impossible.

Our next task is to understand what happens when we surround a multibranched tangency constraint by a skinny ellipsoid and stretch the neck. As a preliminary step, the next lemma shows that there are very few index zero punctured curves in a skinny ellipsoid satisfying a multibranched tangency constraint; indeed, if $C$ is connected it can satisfy only a single branched constraint. To see this, fix a local divisor $D$ near a point $p \in E_{sk}$, and let $J$ be a generic admissible almost complex structure on the completion of $E_{sk}$ which is integrable near $p$ and for which $D$ is $J$-holomorphic.

**Lemma 4.2.3.** Let $C$ be a $J$-holomorphic punctured sphere in $E_{sk}$ which has positive ends asymptotic to $\eta_{k_1}, \ldots, \eta_{k_a}$ for some $a, k_1, \ldots, k_a \geq 1$. Assume that $C$ has index zero and satisfies a multibranched tangency constraint $<P>$ for some partition $P$. Then we must have $a = 1$ so that $P = (k_1)$; further $C$ is a $k_1$-fold cover of the unique plane passing through $p$.

**Proof.** If $C$ is simple, we can estimate its writhe from Equation 3.2.6 as $w^+_\tau \leq 0$ since in this trivialization $\lfloor m\theta \rfloor = 0$ for all $m < s$. From the relative adjunction formula (3.2.2) we also have
\[
w^+_\tau = \sum_{i=1}^a k_i + (a - 2) + 2\delta \geq \sum_{i=1}^a k_i + a - 2.
\]
Combining these inequalities, we must have $a = 1$ and $k_1 = 1$ as claimed. A similar calculation applied to the union $\overline{C}$ of two distinct planes each with $a = k_1 = 1$ shows that in this case we would have $\delta(C) < 0$, which is impossible.

Now suppose that $C$ is a multiple cover, and let $\overline{C}$ be its underlying simple curve, which we can assume by the above has a single positive end asymptotic to $\eta_k$ for $k = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^a k_i$. If $C$ is a $k$-fold cover of $\overline{C}$, note that $\overline{C}$ satisfies a multibranched tangency constraint of the form $<P'>$ for some partition $P'$ with $|P'| \geq |P|/k$. We then have
\[
\text{ind}(C) = 2a - 2 + \sum_{i=1}^a k_i - 2|P'| \\
= 2a - 2 + \kappa\text{ind}(\overline{C}) \\
\geq 0,
\]
with equality only if $a = 1$. \hfill \Box

**Lemma 4.2.4.** For any $P \in \text{Part}_{c_1(A) - 1}$ we have $N^T_{M,A} <P> \leq N^E_{M,A} <P>$. 
Proof. Let $E_{sk} \subset M$ denote a small skinny ellipsoid containing the point $p$. We consider the effect of neck stretching along $\partial E_{sk}$. Note that we can assume that the family of almost complex structures $J_t$, $t \in [0, 1)$, realizing the neck stretching is constant near $p$, so that in particular $J_t$ is integrable near $p$ and $D$ is $J_t$-holomorphic. Moreover, we can assume that the limiting almost complex structure on $\hat{E}_{sk}$ is generic, such that Lemma 4.2.3 applies. A priori, a limiting configuration as $t \to 1$ is a multilevel pseudoholomorphic building in the split symplectic cobordism $E_{sk} \circlearrowleft (M \setminus E_{sk})$, consisting of

1. a top level in $M \setminus E_{sk}$
2. some number of levels in the symplectization $\mathbb{R} \times \partial E_{sk}$
3. a bottom level in the completion of $E_{sk}$.

Let us formally glue together the curves in the symplectization levels to get a collection of matched components in $\mathbb{R} \times \partial E_{sk}$. By Step 1 in the proof of Proposition 3.2.1, all of these matched components have nonnegative index, and in fact this is strictly positive if there is more than one positive end. Similarly, all of the components in the top level have nonnegative index, and this is strictly positive unless they are simple. Furthermore, observe that the constraint $<\mathcal{P}>$ gets distributed amongst the components in the bottom level, and, by Lemma 4.2.3, each of these components also has nonnegative index. Since the building has total index zero, it follows that all of these (matched) components must have index zero. In particular, each of the matched components in $\mathbb{R} \times \partial E_{sk}$ has exactly one positive end, each of the components in the top level are simple, and each component in the bottom level is the $k$-fold cover of the unique plane through $p$ with top asymptotic to $\eta_i$.

In fact, we cannot have matched components in $\mathbb{R} \times \partial E_{sk}$ with more than one negative end. Indeed, this follows by analyzing the corresponding curve portion of an approximating curve that is cut just above the neck and just prior to the breaking limit. After estimating the writhe of such a curve portion, we find exactly as in Step 1 of the proof of Proposition 3.2.1 that having more than one end would violate the relative adjunction formula. However, any matched component in $\mathbb{R} \times \partial E_{sk}$ with one positive and one negative end with index zero is necessarily a trivial cylinder, and therefore it follows from the SFT compactness stability property that there are no symplectization levels at all.

It follows that all of the limiting configurations under neck stretching are two level buildings in $E_{sk} \circlearrowleft (M \setminus E_{sk})$. By Lemma 4.2.3 the bottom level has one component for each element in the partition $\mathcal{P} = (m_1, \ldots, m_b)$, so that the top level must be connected and have negative ends asymptotic to $\eta_{m_1}, \ldots, \eta_{m_b}$ on $\partial E_{sk}$. Thus, neck stretching associates to each curve in $\mathcal{M}_{J_t,s}^{M,A}<\mathcal{P}>$ with $t$ close to 1 a curve in $\mathcal{M}_{J,s}^{M \setminus E_{sk},A}<\mathcal{P}>$. Moreover, this association is injective, since if two distinct curves were very close to the same building their union would violate the relative adjunction formula exactly as in Claim B in Step 2 of the proof of Proposition 3.2.1. \qed

Here is the final ingredient needed to prove Proposition 4.2.1:

**Lemma 4.2.5.** We have $\sum_{\mathcal{P}} N_{M,A}^E<\mathcal{P}> = N_{M,A}$, where the sum is over all partitions $\mathcal{P} \in \text{Part}_{c_1(A)}^{-1}$. 

Proof. Put $\mathcal{P} = (m_1, \ldots, m_b)$ so that each curve $C \in \mathcal{M}_{M\setminus E_{sk}}^{J_{s}}<\mathcal{P}>$ has precisely $b$ negative ends on $\partial E_{sk}$. At the $i$th end, consider a pseudoholomorphic building $B_i$ of the following form:

- top level in the symplectization $\mathbb{R} \times \partial E_{sk}$ consisting of a $m_i$-fold cover of the trivial cylinder over $\eta_{m_i}$, with a single positive end asymptotic $\eta_{m_i}$ and $m_i$ negative ends each asymptotic to $\eta_i$

- bottom level consisting of $m_i$ planes $P^i_1, \ldots, P^i_{m_i}$ in (the symplectic completion of) $E_{sk}$, each with positive end asymptotic to $\eta_i$, and collectively passing through $m_i$ of the constraints $p_1, \ldots, p_k$.

More precisely, note that there is a multi-dimensional family of such buildings, due to the moveable branch points of the multiple cover in $\mathbb{R} \times \partial E_{sk}$. After choosing a partition of the point constraints $p_1, \ldots, p_k$ into $b$ parts of sizes $m_1, \ldots, m_b$ (there are $\mathcal{P}!$ possible choices), the collection of planes $\{P^i_j : 1 \leq i \leq b, 1 \leq j \leq m_i\}$ is uniquely determined.

For each curve $C$ as above, since the ECH partition conditions are satisfied at each negative end, we can glue the building $B_i$ to the $i$th negative end of $C$ via obstruction bundle gluing as in [18, Thm 1.13] to produce a closed $A$-curve in $M$ passing through the points $p_1, \ldots, p_k$. In this situation, it follows from [18, Example 1.28] that the gluing coefficient is 1, so this gluing is unique. More precisely, this gluing procedure depends on a gluing parameter $\rho$ controlling the lengths of the necks, with associated almost complex structure $J_\rho$. By performing this gluing for each curve in $\mathcal{M}_{M\setminus E_{sk}}^{J_{s}}<\mathcal{P}>$ and taking the gluing parameter $\rho$ sufficiently large, this produces $\sum_{\mathcal{P}} N_{M,A}^{E}\mathcal{P}$ curves in $\mathcal{M}_{M,A}^{J_{s}}$. Since, for sufficiently large gluing parameter $\rho$, gluing sets up a bijective correspondence between the moduli space of unglued buildings and the moduli space of $J_\rho$-holomorphic glued curves we find that

$$\sum_{\mathcal{P}} N_{M,A}^{E}\mathcal{P} = N_{M,A}$$

as claimed. \hfill $\square$

**Corollary 4.2.6.** (i) For all partitions $\mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_r$ we have

$$N_{M,A}^{T}\mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_r = N_{M,A}^{E}\mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_r : = N_{M,A}<\mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_r>.$$

(ii) For partitions $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_r$ with $\mathcal{P}_1 = (1^b)$, we have

$$N_{M,A}<\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_r> = N_{\text{Br}_{M,A-b[L]}^{1}}<\mathcal{P}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_r>.$$

**Proof.** Claim (i) is the generalization of Proposition 4.2.1 to the case where constraints are imposed at $r$ different points $p_1, \ldots, p_r$, instead of just one point. The proof for $r > 1$ is essentially the same as that for $r = 1$. Further details are left to the reader. Claim (ii) follows by combining Proposition 4.2.1 with Corollary 4.1.5. \hfill $\square$

**Example 4.2.7.** Consider the case $M = \mathbb{C}P^2$ and $A = d[L]$. In this case, we abbreviate $(M, A)$ by the degree $d$ of $A$. Thus $N_d$, for example, is the number of genus zero degree $d$ curves in $\mathbb{C}P^2$ through $3d - 1$ points.

(i) If $d = 1, 2$ then the only partition with $N_d<\mathcal{P}> \neq 0$ is $\mathcal{P} := (3d - 1)$, and we have $N_d<(3d - 1)> = 1$.
(ii) If $d = 3$, $N_3 = 12$ is the number of degree 3 spheres through 8 generic points. Since
each such curve has one node, the only possible partitions $P$ have $\delta(P) \leq 1$. Hence $P$ is
(8) or (7, 1). Note that both $N_3^E(8)$ and $N_3^E(7, 1)$ are nonzero by Corollary 4.1.3
and Remark 4.1.4 (i). Further, Proposition 4.2.1 implies that $N_3^E(8) + N_3^E(7, 1) = 12$.
Hence we must have
\[ N_3^E(8) = 4, \quad N_3^E(7, 1) = 1. \]

Here is another noteworthy point. If $C$ is a nodal cubic curve that intersects $p$ with the
maximal order 8 then it satisfies the constraint $<8>$ unless the unique double point is at $P$, in which case it satisfies the constraint $<7,1>$. However, if $C$ has a cusp that happens to go through $p$ then it is not clear how to interpret the constraint since some perturbations satisfy $<7,1>$ while others satisfy $<8>$. As we point out in
Remark 2.2.5, this is not a problem since it does not happen for generic $J$.

**4.3. Combining constraints.** Our goal for this subsection is to prove Theorem 1.2.4
from the introduction. This result will form the centerpiece of the recursion algorithm
in §5.

In the sequel, it will sometimes be convenient to represent partitions by Young
diagrams (c.f. Example 4.3.1 below). Let $\mathcal{Y}_k$ denote the set of Young diagrams with $k$
bases. Thus we have $|\mathcal{Y}_1| = 1$, $|\mathcal{Y}_2| = 2$, $|\mathcal{Y}_3| = 3$, $|\mathcal{Y}_4| = 5$, $|\mathcal{Y}_5| = 7$, $|\mathcal{Y}_6| = 11$, and so on. For $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, let $\mathbb{Q}(\mathcal{Y}_k)$ denote the $|\mathcal{Y}_k|$-dimensional rational vector space spanned
by $\mathcal{Y}_k$. For $k, k' \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, we define a map
\[
* : \mathbb{Q}(\mathcal{Y}_k) \otimes \mathbb{Q}(\mathcal{Y}_{k'}) \to \mathbb{Q}(\mathcal{Y}_{k+k'})
\]
as follows. Suppose that $y$ corresponds to the partition $(m_1, \ldots, m_b)$ and $y'$ corresponds
to the partition $(m'_1, \ldots, m'_b')$. Choose subsets $S \subset \{1, \ldots, b\}$ and $S' \subset \{1, \ldots, b'\}$, both of
the same cardinality $|S| = |S'| = \ell$, which we can write as $S = \{j_1, \ldots, j_\ell\}$ for $j_1 < \ldots < j_\ell$
and $S' = \{j'_1, \ldots, j'_\ell\}$ for $j'_1 < \ldots < j'_\ell$. The tuples $(m_{j_1}, \ldots, m_{j_\ell})$ and $(m'_{j'_1}, \ldots, m'_{j'_\ell})$ give the
lengths of the corresponding rows of the Young diagrams $y$ and $y'$ respectively. Given
a permutation $\sigma \in \Sigma_\ell$, we now define $y \ast_{S,S'}^{\sigma} y'$ to be the diagram with $b + b' - \ell$ rows, such that
- for $i = 1, \ldots, \ell$, the $i$th row of $y \ast_{S, S'}^{\sigma} y'$ has $m_{j_i} + m'_{\sigma(j_i)}$ blocks
- the next $b - \ell$ rows are the remaining $b - \ell$ rows of $y$
- the next $b' - \ell$ rows are the remaining $b' - \ell$ rows of $y'$,

after which we reorder the rows if necessary to get a valid Young diagram. In other
words, we combine $\ell$ rows of $y$ with $\ell$ rows of $y'$, and vertically stack the remaining rows.

Now define
\[
y \ast y' := \sum \left\{ y \ast_{S,S'}^{\sigma} y' \bigg| \sigma \in \Sigma_\ell, S \subset \{1, \ldots, b\}, S' \subset \{1, \ldots, b'\}, |S| = |S'| = \ell, \ell \geq 0 \right\}
\]
(4.3.1)

We denote the coefficients of $*$ with respect to the natural bases of Young diagrams
by $\langle y \ast y, y'' \rangle$ for $y \in \mathcal{Y}_k$, $y' \in \mathcal{Y}_{k'}$, and $y'' \in \mathcal{Y}_{k+k'}$, or alternatively by $\langle \mathcal{P} \ast \mathcal{P}', \mathcal{P}'' \rangle$ if
$\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{P}', \mathcal{P}''$ are the partitions corresponding to $y, y', y''$ respectively. Thus,
\[
\mathcal{P} \ast \mathcal{P}' = \sum_{\mathcal{P}'' : |\mathcal{P}''| = |\mathcal{P}| + |\mathcal{P}'|} \langle \mathcal{P} \ast \mathcal{P}', \mathcal{P}'' \rangle.
\]
(4.3.2)
Example 4.3.1. The partitions \((3, 1, 1)\) and \((2, 2)\) correspond to Young diagrams \(y \in \mathcal{Y}_5\) and \(y' \in \mathcal{Y}_4\) given by
\[
y = \young(••, •, •), \quad y' = \young(••, •, •),
\]
and we have
\[
y \ast y' = \left(\begin{array}{c}
\young(••, •, •) \\
\end{array}\right) + \left(\begin{array}{c}
2 \young(••, •, •) + 4 \young(••, •, •) \\
\end{array}\right) + \left(\begin{array}{c}
4 \young(••, •, •) + 2 \young(••, •, •) \\
\end{array}\right).
\]
Here the terms in parentheses correspond to the subsets having lengths \(|S| = |S'| = 0, 1, 2\) respectively.

Definition 4.3.2. Given a partition \(P = (m_1, ..., m_b)\), we denote by \(\text{Aut}(P) \subset \Sigma_b\) the automorphism group of \(P\), i.e. those permutations of the rows which leave the diagram fixed, and write \(|\text{Aut}(P)|\) for its order.

For example, for the partitions \(P_1 = \), \(P_2 = \), \(P_3 = \), we have \(|\text{Aut}(P_1)| = 1\), \(|\text{Aut}(P_2)| = 4\), and \(|\text{Aut}(P_3)| = 6\). Our goal is to prove Theorem 1.2.4, which we restate here for the convenience of the reader.

Theorem 4.3.3. For any partitions \(P_1, ..., P_r\), we have
\[
N_{M,A}^{<P_1, P_2, P_3, ..., P_r>} = \sum_{P \in \text{Part} |P_1| + |P_2|} \frac{(P_1 \ast P_2, P) |\text{Aut}(P)|}{|\text{Aut}(P_1)| |\text{Aut}(P_2)|} N_{M,A}^{<P_1, P_2, P_3, ..., P_r>}.
\]

The idea for proving Theorem 4.3.3 is as follows. We will base our discussion on the invariant \(N_{M,A}^{E} <P_1, P_2, P_3, ..., P_r>\), although a similar argument could perhaps be given using \(N_{M,A}^{T} <P_1, P_2, P_3, ..., P_r>\) as well. We find it convenient to introduce slightly modified invariants by
\[
\tilde{N}_{M,A} <P_1, ..., P_r> := |\text{Aut}(P_1)| ... |\text{Aut}(P_r)| N_{M,A}^{<P_1, ..., P_r>} \quad (4.3.3)
\]
(with an added \(T\) or \(E\) superscript if we wish to emphasize which version of the right side we are using). Note that \(\tilde{N}_{M,A} <P_1, ..., P_r>\) can be interpret geometrically in the same way as \(N_{M,A}^{<P_1, ..., P_r>}\) except that we order all marked points satisfying the same constraint, or equivalently all punctures with the same asymptotic Reeb orbit.\(^{31}\)

In particular, if \(P_i = (m_{1_i}, ..., m_{b_i})\), the number
\[
\tilde{N}_{M,A}^{E} <P_1, ..., P_r>
\]
is the count of \(A\) curves in \(M \smallsetminus (\bigcup_{i=1}^r E_{sk}^{E_i})\) with ordered ends
\[
(\eta_{m_j}^{\ell_{m_j}}, 1 \leq j \leq m_i), \quad \text{on } \partial E_{sk}^{E_i},
\]
\(^{31}\)Since we always write \(P = (m_1, ..., m_b)\) with \(m_1 \geq m_2 \geq \cdots \geq m_b\) it suffices to order only the repeated entries in \(P\).
where the ordering only affects the ends on the same orbit $\eta_j^i$ on $\partial E^i_{sk}$.

To keep the notation simple, we will assume that $r = 2$ and prove the formula
\[
\widehat{N}_{E}^{M,A} < P_1, P_2 > = \sum_{\mathcal{P} \in \text{Part}} |P_1| + |P_2| \cdot \widehat{N}_{E}^{M,A} < P_2 >, \tag{4.3.4}
\]
the general argument being essentially the same.

We can assume without loss of generality that the union of the small skinny ellipsoids $E^1_{sk}, E^2_{sk}$ is contained in a third small skinny ellipsoid $E^{1,2}_{sk}$. We perform a neck-stretching along $\partial E^{1,2}_{sk}$ and analyze how the curves corresponding to $\widehat{N}_{E}^{M,A} < P_1, P_2 >$ degenerate. Roughly, this has the effect of converting negative ends in $\partial E^1_{sk}$ and $\partial E^2_{sk}$ into negative ends in $\partial E^{1,2}_{sk}$. A priori, the degenerations could be arbitrary pseudoholomorphic buildings in $(M \setminus (E^1_{sk} \cup E^2_{sk})) \circledast (\partial E^1_{sk} \cup \partial E^2_{sk})$ consisting of
\begin{itemize}
  \item [(a)] a top level in $M \setminus E^{1,2}_{sk}$;
  \item [(b)] some number of levels in the symplectization $\mathbb{R} \times \partial E^{1,2}_{sk}$;
  \item [(c)] a level in $E^1_{sk} \setminus (E^1_{sk} \cup E^2_{sk})$;
  \item [(d)] some number of levels in the symplectization $\mathbb{R} \times (\partial E^1_{sk} \cup \partial E^2_{sk})$.
\end{itemize}

It turns out that we can greatly narrow down the possibilities via action and index considerations, together with the relative adjunction formula and techniques from ECH. The next lemma describes the possible limiting buildings in more detail.

**Lemma 4.3.4.** We can arrange that the limiting building has the following properties:

- the top level (a) is a connected somewhere injective curve of index 0;
- each component of a symplectization level (b) is either a trivial cylinder or an index zero branched cover of a trivial cylinder which is a pair of pants with one positive end and two negative ends;
- each component of (c) is a cylinder; moreover there is a unique such cylinder between any pair of ends of the same index;
- there are no symplectization levels (d).

**Proof.** As in Step 1 of Proposition 3.2.1, we can assume that each component of the top level (a) has nonnegative index and is somewhere injective. We also proved there that the index each component of type (b) or (d) is nonnegative, and strictly positive unless it has one positive end.

Next, note that if we formally combine the levels (b),(c),(d) and view the result as a collection of matched components $C_1, ..., C_c$ in $E^{1,2}_{sk} \setminus (E^1_{sk} \cup E^2_{sk})$, it follows from (3.2.11) and the energy inequality that each of these matched components has nonnegative index. Here we use the fact that we can assume the skinny ellipsoids have any shape $E(\varepsilon, \varepsilon s)$, as long as $s$ is sufficiently large, so that we may suppose the energy of the orbits $\eta_j^1, \eta_j^2$ to be so close to that of $\eta_j^{1,2}$ that positivity of energy implies that (3.2.12) holds: see a similar argument in Step 2 of Proposition 3.2.1. Further, any connected component of type (b), (c) or (d) that has more than one positive end has positive index. We conclude as before that all components have zero index. Moreover all components of type (b), (c) or (d) have one positive end.
Next observe that the argument in the second part of Step 1 in Proposition 3.2.1 shows that components of type (d) must also have one negative end. Hence all these components must be trivial cylinders, and hence they do not occur.

Now consider a matched component $C_j$ that is a union of curves of types (b) and (c). We claim that $C_j$ has at most one negative end on each $\partial E_{sk}^i$ for $i = 1, 2$. To justify this, suppose by contradiction that $C_j$ has positive end $\eta_k$ and negative ends $\eta_{k_1}, ..., \eta_{k_b}$, where $b \geq 2$, both $\eta_{k_1}$ and $\eta_{k_2}$ are ends on the same $\partial E_{sk}^i$, and each of the remaining ends $\eta_{k_3}, ..., \eta_{k_b}$ lie on either $\partial E_{sk}^1$ or $\partial E_{sk}^2$. Arguing as in the proof of Proposition 3.2.1, we can approximate the total building by a somewhere injective curve in $M \setminus (E_{sk}^1 \cup E_{sk}^2)$, and find a portion of that curve corresponding to $C_j$. This curve portion has well-defined positive and negative writhes $w^+_\tau, w^-_\tau$, and since the positive end corresponds to a negative end of a somewhere injective curve in $M \setminus E_{sk}^{1,2}$, by (3.2.8) we have $w^+_\tau = k - 1$. Since the negative ends also correspond to negative ends of a somewhere injective curve in $M \setminus (E_{sk}^1 \cup E_{sk}^2)$, we have by (3.2.7) the lower bound

$$w^-_\tau \geq \sum_{i,j=1}^b \min(k_i, k_j) - b \geq k_1 + k_2 + 2 \min(k_1, k_2) - 2.$$ 

For this curve portion we have $c_1 = 0$, $\chi = 1 - b$, and $Q = 0$, so using the relative adjunction formula we have

$$w^+_\tau - w^-_\tau = b - 1 + 2\delta \leq k - 1 - k_1 - k_2 - 2 \min(k_1, k_2) + 2,$$

which is contradiction since $b \leq k$.

It follows that the matched component $C_j$ is either a cylinder or a pair of pants. We next claim that no component of type (c) (i.e. one entirely contained in the cobordism level) can be a pair of pants. As usual this follows by a writhe calculation. Suppose by contradiction that there exists such a curve with positive end $\eta_k^{1,2}$ and negative ends $\eta_{k_1}^{1,2}, \eta_{k_2}^{1,2}$ on $\partial E_{sk}^1, \partial E_{sk}^2$ respectively. By index considerations we can assume that $k_1 + k_2 = k$, and, after possibly passing to the underlying simple curve, we can also assume that this curve is somewhere injective. Such a curve has $c_1 = 0$, $\chi = -1$, $Q = 0$, and the writhe bounds from (3.2.6)ff give $w^+_\tau \leq 0$ and $w^-_\tau \geq k_1 + k_2 - 2$. The relative adjunction formula then gives

$$w_\tau = 1 + 2\delta \leq -k_1 - k_2 + 2,$$

which is a contradiction.

Finally, we observe that for each $i = 1, 2$ and $k \geq 1$ there is a unique cylinder from $\eta_k^{1,2}$ to $\eta_k^{1,2}$. This follows by Claim A of Proposition 3.2.1, since the proof given there is not affected by the presence of the second skinny ellipsoid. This completes the proof of the lemma. \hfill $\square$

Observe that each of the top components in Lemma 4.3.4 represents a summand of $\hat{\mathcal{N}}_{M,A}(\mathcal{P})$ for $\mathcal{P} \in \text{Part}_{|P_1|+|P_2|}$ with $\langle \mathcal{P}_1 \ast \mathcal{P}_2, \mathcal{P} \rangle \neq 0$. In fact, if it were true that each of the matched components $C_i$ existed uniquely as an honest pseudoholomorphic curve in $E_{sk}^{1,2} \setminus (E_{sk}^1 \cup E_{sk}^2)$, Theorem 4.3.3 would follow immediately by considering all possible ways of gluing a curve $C_{top}$ in $M \setminus E_{sk}^{1,2}$ to a configuration of curves in $E_{sk}^{1,2} \setminus (E_{sk}^1 \cup E_{sk}^2)$. Unfortunately, many of the matched components in $E_{sk}^{1,2} \setminus (E_{sk}^1 \cup E_{sk}^2)$ are necessarily
represented by two-level buildings, since as we saw in Lemma 4.3.4 there are no pair of pants of type (e). On the other hand, such a curve can be represented by a building, with top level a pair of pants \( \Sigma \) in \( \mathbb{R} \times \partial E_{sk}^{1,2} \) which is an index 0 branched cover of a trivial cylinder, and bottom level two cylinders in \( E_{sk}^{1,2} \setminus (E_{sk}^{1} \cup E_{sk}^{2}) \). Note that the index 0 branched cover \( \Sigma \) in \( \mathbb{R} \times \partial E_{sk}^{1,2} \) exists in a two-dimensional moduli space \( \mathcal{M}_{R} \) (essentially because the branched point can be moved around), and hence it appears with higher-than-expected dimension. This means we are not in a position to prove Theorem 4.3.3 by a standard gluing argument for regular moduli spaces.

Fortunately, we can use the method of obstruction bundle gluing as described by Hutching–Taubes in [18, §1.8]. As they explain, for each sufficiently large gluing parameter \( \rho \), there is a bundle \( \mathcal{O} \) over the moduli space \( \mathcal{M}_{\rho} \) of branched covers and a section \( s : \mathcal{M}_{\rho} \to \mathcal{O} \) such that the preglued curve formed by attaching the branched cover \( \Sigma \) to an appropriate end of a (regular, somewhere injective) top curve \( C_{\text{top}} \) and two bottom cylinders can be perturbed to an honest holomorphic curve exactly when \( s(\Sigma) = 0 \). The number of zeros of \( s \) is called the gluing coefficient of this problem. If \( C_{\text{top}} \) has many ends, one has to perform this gluing operation at each of its ends. The resulting gluing coefficient is the product of the coefficients at each end, i.e. the problem is local in the target, and also does not depend on the particular choice of \( C_{\text{top}} \). (Note that the cylinders are unique by Lemma 4.3.4.) Our current situation, though close to that considered in [18, Thm 1.13], is not precisely the same because the bottom cylinders are multiply covered in general.\(^{32}\) Hence we cannot use their calculation of the gluing coefficient. Nevertheless we can conclude that this coefficient does not depend on the choice of \( C_{\text{top}} \). Thus, we have the following result.

**Lemma 4.3.5.** For any partitions \( P_1, \ldots, P_r \), we have

\[
\hat{N}^{E}_{M,A}(P_1, P_2, P_3, \ldots, P_r) = \sum_{P \in \text{Part}(|P_1| + |P_2|)} C_{P_1, P_2}^{P} \cdot \hat{N}^{E}_{M,A}(P \setminus P_1, P \setminus P_2, P_3, \ldots, P_r)
\]

for some coefficients \( C_{P_1, P_2}^{P} \) which depend only on the partitions \( P_1, P_2, P \).

The upshot is that it suffices to show that each of the coefficients \( C_{P_1, P_2}^{P} \) is equal to \( (P_1 \ast P_2, P) \). Note that, by Lemma 4.3.4, all of the relevant gluings are either standard gluings along cylindrical ends or obstruction bundle gluing involving an index 0 branched cover which is a pair of pants. The following lemma is the main remaining ingredient for the proof of Theorem 4.3.3.

**Lemma 4.3.6.** For any \( m, m' \geq 1 \), we have

\[
\hat{N}^{E}_{M,A}(m, m') = \hat{N}^{E}_{M,A}(m, m') + \hat{N}^{E}_{M,A}(m + m').
\]

**Proof.** According to Lemma 4.3.5, we have

\[
\hat{N}^{E}_{M,A}(m, m') = C_{(m), (m')}^{(m, m')} \hat{N}^{E}_{M,A}(m, m') + C_{(m), (m')}^{(m, m')} \hat{N}^{E}_{M,A}(m + m').
\]

with the coefficients \( C_{(m), (m')}^{(m, m')} \) and \( C_{(m), (m')}^{(m, m')} \) a priori unknown. We saw in Lemma 4.3.4 that for \( i = 1, 2 \), there is a unique cylinder in \( E_{sk}^{1,2} \setminus (E_{sk}^{1} \cup E_{sk}^{2}) \) from \( \eta_{m}^{1,2} \) on \( \partial E_{sk}^{1,2} \) to \( \eta_{m}^{i} \)

\(^{32}\) However, the top of each cylinder on \( \eta_{m} \) does have a maximal partition, as is required by the definition of a gluing pair in [18, Def 1.8].
We claim that there is a unique curve in $GW$. To see this, consider the blowup $M$ on $\partial E$ as in the next paragraph. This coefficient is one by using a model example in order to produce a curve in $\partial E^1 \cup \partial E^2$. If $m \neq m'$ there is only one way to make this matching once the appropriate ends of $C_{top}$ are chosen. However, if $m = m'$ there are two ways to make this matching for each pair of ends of $C_{top}$. But if we order the ends of $C_{top}$ that have the same multiplicity, then again we can make a unique matching since the two ellipsoids $E^1, E^2$ are ordered. Hence there is a bijective correspondence between the curves $C_{top}$ (with ordered ends) counted by $\hat{N}_M < (m,m') >$ and the curves counted by $\hat{N}_E < (m), (m') >$. Thus the coefficient $C_{(m),(m')}$ is equal to 1.

As for the coefficient $C_{(m+1),(m')}$, we can determine it by using a model example. Pick $d$ such that $2d \geq m + m'$. Let $M$ denote the blow up $Bl^{2d+1-m-m'} CP^2$, and let $A$ denote the homology class

$$A := d[L] - (d-1)|E_1| - |E_2| - ... - |E_{2d+1-m-m'}| \in H_2(M;Z).$$

We claim that there is a unique curve in $M$ in the homology class $A$ passing through pairwise distinct points $p_1, ..., p_m, p'_1, ..., p'_m \in M$. i.e. we have

$$N_{M,A} < p_1, ..., p_m, p'_1, ..., p'_m > = 1.$$
(b) a symplectization level consisting of a branched cover of a trivial cylinder in $\mathbb{R} \times \partial E^1_{sk}$ with positive end $\eta_m$ and negative ends $(\eta_1^m)$, and a branched cover of a trivial cylinder in $\mathbb{R} \times \partial E^2_{sk}$ with positive end $\eta_{m'}$ and negative ends $(\eta_2^{m'})$

(c) a bottom level consisting of $m$ planes in $E^1_{sk}$, each passing through one of the points $p_i$, and a collection of $m'$ planes in $E^2_{sk}$, each passing through one of the points $p'_i$.

To see that there is a unique curve $C_{top}$ in the top level with the specified ends, suppose by contradiction that there were two distinct such curves. Then their union would satisfy

$$c_1 = 2, \quad \chi = 0, \quad Q = -4 + 4m + 4m',$$

and so the relative adjunction formula would give

$$w^- - \tau = -6 + 4m + 4m' - 2\delta.$$

On the other hand, the lower bound for $w^-$ from (3.2.7) gives $w^- \geq 4m + 4m' - 4$, which is a contradiction.

Finally, we consider how this curve $C_{top}$ degenerates as we stretch the neck along $\partial E^1_{sk}$.

According to Lemma 4.3.4, the limiting buildings have one of the following types:

- they have two levels, where the top curve in $M \setminus E^1_{sk}$ has two negative ends that are each joined to a cylinder in $E^1_{sk} \setminus (E^1_{sk} \cup E^2_{sk})$, or

- they have have three levels, where the top curve has negative end on $\eta_{m+m'}$, there is a pair of pants in $\mathbb{R} \times \partial E^1_{sk}$ with negative ends on $\eta_1^{m}, \eta_2^{m'}$, and then two cylinders in $E^1_{sk} \setminus (E^1_{sk} \cup E^2_{sk})$.

We claim that the first situation cannot occur, since there are no somewhere injective curves in $M \setminus E^1_{sk}$ in class $A$ with two negative ends $\eta_m$ and $\eta_{m'}$ on the same ellipsoid $\partial E^1_{sk}$. Indeed, for such a cylinder the relative adjunction formula would give

$$w^- = -2 + m + m' - 2\delta,$$

while the writhe bound from (3.2.7) would give

$$w^- \geq m + m' + 2 \min(m, m') - 2,$$

which is impossible.

It follows that the limiting building must have three levels. As before, we can show that this top level has a unique representative. Indeed, if two distinct such planes existed, the relative adjunction formula applied to their union would give

$$w^- = 4 + 4m + 4m' - 2\delta,$$

while the writhe bound would give

$$w^- \geq 4m + 4m' - 2,$$

which is again impossible. Thus the formula (4.3.5) reduces in this situation to

$$1 = C^{(m,m')}_{(m),(m')} \cdot 0 + C^{(m+m')}_{(m),(m')} \cdot 1,$$

from which it follows that $C^{(m+m')}_{(m),(m')} = 1$. \qed
Proof of Theorem 4.3.3. We saw above that it suffices to prove the identity
\[ \hat{N}_{M,A}^E \langle P_1, P_2 \rangle = \sum_{P \in \text{Part}([|P_1| + |P_2|])} \langle P_1 \ast P_2, P \rangle \cdot \hat{N}_{M,A}^E \langle P \rangle. \] (4.3.6)

Notice that this involves the invariants \( \hat{N}_{M,A}^E \) that count curves in which the negative ends on the same ellipsoid are ordered. By Lemma 4.3.5, it suffices to show that
\[ C_{P_1,P_2}^P = \langle P_1 \ast P_2, P \rangle \]
for all partitions \( P_1, P_2, P \). Note that it follows from Lemma 4.3.4 that we have \( C_{P_1,P_2}^P = 0 \) whenever \( \langle P_1 \ast P_2, P \rangle = 0 \).

In general, for each triple \( P, P_1, P_2 \) the number \( \langle P_1 \ast P_2, P \rangle \) is precisely the number of relevant configurations of matched components in \( E_{sk}^{1,2} \setminus (E_{sk}^1 \cup E_{sk}^2) \) with top end corresponding to the partition \( P \) and bottom ends in \( E_{sk}^{1,2} \) corresponding to the partition \( P_i \) for \( i = 1, 2 \). To see this, note that each such matched component is either a cylinder corresponding to a single level building or a pair of pants represented by a two level building. Thus each configuration of matched components pairs each entry \( m_i \) of \( P \) either with a pair \( (m, m') \in P_1 \times P_2 \) with \( m + m' = m_i \) or with a single entry \( m_i \) in either \( P_1 \) or \( P_2 \). Each such configuration of cylinders and pairs of pants uniquely determines the subsets \( S, S' \) of ends on \( \partial E_{sk}^1 \) and \( \partial E_{sk}^2 \) that are summed (since they are the ‘feet’ of the pairs of pants) and also the permutation \( \sigma \) that determines how the subsets \( S, S' \) are paired up. Further, because the configuration determines an injection from the set of ends on \( \partial E_{sk}^1 \) to those on \( \partial E_{sk}^{1,2} \), an ordering of the entries in \( P \) uniquely determines an ordering of the entries in \( P_i \) for \( i = 1, 2 \). Thus the sum on the right hand side of (4.3.6) is the number of buildings that when glued will yield the curves counted on the LHS.

It remains to note that each gluing coefficient is 1. Following Lemma 4.3.6, in the cylinder case we have a unique representative and are in the situation of standard gluing, while in the case of a pair of pants we have obstruction bundle gluing with gluing coefficient also equal to 1. \( \square \)

Remark 4.3.7 (on higher dimensional analogues). Although the local tangency invariants \( N_{M,A} < T^P p, \ldots, T^P p > \) are defined in §2.3 in any dimension, note that we have only stated and proved Theorem 4.3.3 in dimension four. It is important to keep in mind that point constraints behave quite differently in dimension four compared to higher dimensions. Indeed, in dimension \( 2n \), asking a curve to pass through a generic point \( p \) is a codimension \( 2n - 2 \) condition. For example, for \( M \) of dimension \( 2n \), the constraint \( < p, p > \) is codimension \( 4n - 4 \), while the constraint \( < T^p p > \) is codimension \( 2n \), so evidently the direct analogue of Theorem 4.3.3 cannot hold in higher dimensions. On the other hand, if we start with a curve satisfying a constraint \( < p_1, p_2 > \) and push together the points \( p_1, p_2 \to p \), in the limit we may find a curve satisfying a local tangency constraint to a curve \( F \) determined by the collision direction of \( p_1 \) and \( p_2 \). Indeed, if \( F \) denotes a local curve at \( p \), the constraint \( < T_F p > \) is codimension \( 4n - 4 \), so agrees with \( < p_1, p_2 > \). We expect the natural analogue of Theorem 4.3.3 to hold if we replace all tangencies to the local divisor \( D \) with tangencies to the local curve \( F \). Note that this condition only depends on the germ of \( F \) at \( p \) and can be formulated using constraints of the form \( < T_{D_1}^{n-1} \ldots T_{D_{n-1}}^{n-1} p > \) for \( F = D_1 \cap \ldots \cap D_{n-1} \) as in §2.3.
Moreover, note that the constraint \( \langle T^{m-1} p \rangle \) is codimension \( 2n - 2m - 4 \), which is the same as adding a puncture asymptotic to the Reeb orbit \( \eta_m \) on \( \partial E_{sk}^{2n} \). Similarly, one can try to define the analogue of \( N_{M,A}^{E} \langle \mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_r \rangle \) in higher dimensions. By arguing as in the proof of Lemma 3.1.7, we can arrange that the relevant curves in \( E_{sk} \) must be contained in a lower dimensional slice, and hence there are effectively no index zero curves in \( E_{sk} \) satisfying a \( \langle T^{m-1} p \rangle \) constraint apart from multiple covers of the unique plane bounding \( \eta \) which passes through \( p \). Then the same neck-stretching heuristic described at the start of §4.2 suggests the equivalence \( N_{M,A}^{E} \langle \mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_r \rangle = N_{M,A}^{T} \langle \mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_r \rangle \). However it is not clear whether one can combine constraints as in §4.3 since there is no immediate analog in the skinny ellipsoid language of the constraint \( \langle T_{FP} \rangle \). Note also that in higher dimensions many of the techniques from our proof (automatic transversality, obstruction bundle gluing, relative adjunction) cannot be directly applied.

5. A recursive algorithm

In this final section we discuss the recursive algorithm from the introduction. In §5.1 we discuss some basic properties of the recursion and present some example computations. Subsequently, in §5.2 we describe the algorithm in detail.

5.1. Overview and computations. Let \( M \) be a closed symplectic 4-manifold and let \( A \in H_2(M; \mathbb{Z}) \) be a homology class. By the results of §2.3, we have well-defined integer invariants

\[
N_{M,A} \langle (T^{m_1^{b_1}} p_1, \ldots, T^{m_1^{b_1}} p_1), \ldots, (T^{m_r^{b_r}} p_r, \ldots, T^{m_r^{b_r}} p_r) \rangle
\]

for all \( r \geq 0, b_1, \ldots, b_r \geq 1 \) and \( m_j^i \geq 1 \) with \( 1 \leq j \leq b_i \). For each \( i \), we will assume that we have \( m_1^i \geq \ldots \geq m_{b_i}^i \), and we write the corresponding partition as \( \mathcal{P}_i = (m_1^i, \ldots, m_{b_i}^i) \), so that the above invariant can also be written more succinctly as

\[
N_{M,A} \langle \mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_r \rangle \quad \text{or} \quad N_{M,A} \langle (m_1^1, \ldots, m_{b_1}^1), \ldots, (m_1^r, \ldots, m_{b_r}^r) \rangle
\]

Recall that for basic index reasons this invariant can only be nontrivial when we have

\[
-1 + c_1(A) - \sum_{i=1}^{r} \sum_{j=1}^{b_i} m_j^i = 0.
\]

The following theorem is proved in 5.2.

**Theorem 5.1.1.** There is explicit recursive algorithm which describes the invariant \( N_{M,A} \langle \mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_r \rangle \) as a linear combination of invariants of the form \( N_{M,A} \langle \mathcal{P}_1', \ldots, \mathcal{P}_r' \rangle \), where each of the partitions \( \mathcal{P}_i' \) is of the type \((1, \ldots, 1)\).

**Corollary 5.1.2.** The invariant \( N_{M,A} \langle \mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_r \rangle \) can be written as an explicit linear combination of blowup Gromov–Witten invariants of the form \( GW_{Bl^a M,A - n_1 [\mathcal{X}_1] - \ldots - n_a [\mathcal{X}_a]} \) for \( a, n_1, \ldots, n_a > 0 \).

**Proof.** This follows from Theorem 5.1.1 by repeatedly applying Corollary 4.2.6 (ii). \( \Box \)

In the case \( M = \mathbb{C}P^2 \), Göttsche–Pandharipande [10, Theorem 3.6] used associativity of the quantum cup product to give an explicit recursive algorithm for the rational blowup Gromov–Witten invariants \( GW_{Bl^a M,A - \sum_{i=1}^{r} n_i [\mathcal{X}_i]} \). More generally, Gathmann [7]...

...
also gave a recursive algorithm which computes the rational Gromov–Witten invariants of $B\Gamma M$ for any convex projective variety $M$ in terms of the rational Gromov–Witten invariants of $M$. One can combine this with our recursion from Theorem 5.1.1 to completely compute the invariants $N_{\mathbb{C}P^2,d[L]}<p_1,\ldots,p_r>$.

**Example 5.1.3 (Computations for $\mathbb{C}P^2$).** Table 5.1.3 shows the invariants $N_d<\mathcal{T}^{3d-2}p>$ for small values of $d$. For purposes of comparison, we also include the numbers $N_d<p_1,\ldots,p_{3d-1}>$ computed by Kontsevich’s recursion formula, as well as the analogous descendant invariant $GW_{\mathbb{C}P^2,d[L]}<\psi^{3d-2}>$ with a full gravitational descendant constraint at a point. Table 5.1.3 shows the nonzero invariants $N_d<\mathcal{T}^{m_1-1}p_1,\ldots,\mathcal{T}^{m_b-1}p_r>$ for small values of $d$. Note for most partitions $(m_1,\ldots,m_b)$ these invariants are zero by the adjunction inequality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$d$</th>
<th>$N_d&lt;\mathcal{T}^{3d-2}p&gt;$</th>
<th>$N_d&lt;p_1,\ldots,p_{3d-1}&gt;$</th>
<th>$(3d-2)!GW_{\mathbb{C}P^2,d[L]}&lt;\psi^{3d-2}&gt;$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>525/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>87304</td>
<td>18018/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2110</td>
<td>26312976</td>
<td>56056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>22744</td>
<td>14616808192</td>
<td>6651216/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>264057</td>
<td>13525751027392</td>
<td>68590665/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3242395</td>
<td>19385778269260800</td>
<td>2921454250/9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1. Counts of degree $d$ curves in $\mathbb{C}P^2$ with a full index tangency constraint. For comparison we also include the analogous counts with generic point constraints, and also with a full index gravitational descendant condition at a point. Note that we have $GW_{\mathbb{C}P^2,d[L]}<\psi^{3d-2}p> = (d!)^{-3}$ [9].

**Example 5.1.4 (Computations for $\mathbb{C}P^1 \times \mathbb{C}P^1$).** Another important example is the case of $M = \mathbb{C}P^1 \times \mathbb{C}P^1$, which is used in [27, §6.2.3] to give upper bounds (sometimes sharp) for symplectic capacities of polydisks. In the case of curves of bidegree $(d,0)$ with $d > 1$, all invariants $N_{\mathbb{C}P^1 \times \mathbb{C}P^1,d[L_1]}<p_1,\ldots,p_r>$ vanish because they count somewhere injective curves, while the class $d[L_1]$ has no such representatives. (Any somewhere injective curve in class $A = d[L]$ can be perturbed to be symplectically immersed, and hence would have normal line bundle of Chern class $2d - 2$ and thus $A \cdot A > 0$.) Thus, in this case all terms in the recursion vanish.

Next, note that all curves of bidegree $(d,1)$ are embedded. (This again follows from known properties of spheres in $\mathbb{C}P^1 \times \mathbb{C}P^1$.) Hence

$$GW_{B\Gamma M,A-n_1[\xi_1]-\ldots-n_a[\xi_a]} = 0$$

---

36 A Python implementation of the recursive algorithm is available by request or on the website of KS.
Table 5.2: The nonzero invariants of the form \( N_d(P) \) for curves of degree up to 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( N_d(2) )</th>
<th>( N_d(3, 1, 1) )</th>
<th>( N_d(11, 6) )</th>
<th>( N_d(12, 2) )</th>
<th>( N_d(13, 1) )</th>
<th>( N_d(12, 3, 2) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

unless \( n_1 \leq 1 \) for all \( i \). Further, \( N_{M,d[L_1]+[L_2]}(P_1, \ldots, P_r) = 0 \) whenever some \( P_i = (m_1^i, \ldots, m_{b_i}^i) \) has length \( b_i > 1 \) and hence \( \delta(P_i) > 0 \). Therefore, since there is a unique curve of bidegree \((d, 1)\) through any generic set of \( 2d + 1 \) points, the recursion formula shows that

\[
N_{M,d[L_1]+[L_2]}(m_1, \ldots, m_r) = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } \sum_i m_i = 2d + 1 \\
0 & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
\]

In general, recall that there is an symplectomorphism between the blowup of \( \mathbb{CP}^1 \times \mathbb{CP}^1 \) at \( a \geq 1 \) points and the blowup of \( \mathbb{CP}^2 \) at \( a+1 \) points. Indeed, let \([L]\) denote the line class in \( \text{Bl}^2 \mathbb{CP}^2 \) and let \([\mathcal{E}_1], [\mathcal{E}_2]\) denote the two exceptional divisor classes. Similarly, denote the two line classes in \( \text{Bl}^1(\mathbb{CP}^1 \times \mathbb{CP}^1) \) by \([L_1]\) and \([L_2]\) and the exceptional divisor class by \([\mathcal{E}]\). There is a symplectomorphism from \( \text{Bl}^1(\mathbb{CP}^1 \times \mathbb{CP}^1) \) to \( \text{Bl}^2 \mathbb{CP}^2 \) whose action on homology sends \([L_1]\) to \([L] - [\mathcal{E}_1]\), \([L_2]\) to \([L] - [\mathcal{E}_2]\) and \([\mathcal{E}]\) to \([L] - [\mathcal{E}_1] - [\mathcal{E}_2]\). Using this, we can reduce blowup Gromov–Witten invariants of \( \mathbb{CP}^1 \times \mathbb{CP}^1 \) to corresponding blowup Gromov–Witten invariants of \( \mathbb{CP}^2 \).

We now outline the main properties of the algorithm. Given two invariants of the form

\[
N_{M,A}(m_1^1, \ldots m_{b_1}^1, \ldots, m_1^r, \ldots m_{b_r}^r)
\]

(5.1.1)
with $m^i_j \geq 2$ for some $i, j$, we say that one has \textbf{strictly smaller complexity} than the other if the quantity
\[
\max_{i \in \{1, \ldots, r\}} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{b_i} m^i_j : m^i_j \geq 2 \text{ for some } j \in \{1, \ldots, b_i\} \right\}
\]
is smaller, or in the event of a tie if the number of indices $i$ achieving the maximum is smaller. The main ingredient for the recursion underlying Theorem 5.1.1 is the following formula, which is a special case of Theorem 4.3.3.
\[
\hat{N}_{M,A}(m, (m_1, \ldots, m_b), \rightarrow) = \hat{N}_{M,A}(m, m_1, \ldots, m_b), \rightarrow + \sum_{i=1}^{b} \hat{N}_{M,A}(m_1, m + m_i, \ldots m_b), \rightarrow.
\]
(5.1.2)

Notice that the statement involves the numbers $\hat{N}$ defined in (4.3.3) rather than the geometrically defined numbers $N$ considered above. (The reason why it is easiest to work with $\hat{N}$ should be clear from the proof of Lemma 4.3.6.) Here, as before, the symbol $\rightarrow$ denotes any given additional constraints taking place away from the first two points $q$ and $p$. By applying this formula "in reverse", we will show how to trade invariants involving tangency conditions at say $j$ distinct points in $M$ for invariants with strictly smaller complexity but now involving $j + 1$ distinct points in $M$. By iterating this finitely many times, we reduce down to invariants of the form
\[
\hat{N}(1^{n_1}, \ldots, 1^{n_a})
\]
for some $a, n_1, \ldots, n_a \geq 1$.

The resulting algorithm is fully described in §5.2. It is generally too computationally intensive to implement by hand except in simple cases. However, one can improve it by feeding in extra information as in the following examples.

\textbf{Example 5.1.5.} (Degree 3 curves in $\mathbb{CP}^2$) Since immersed rational curves of degree 3 have just one node, the only nonzero invariants of the form (5.1.1) have $b_i > 1$ for at most one $i$, say $i = 1$. Moreover we must have $\delta(\mathcal{P}_1) \leq 1$. (Recall from Lemma 2.3.3 that $\delta(\mathcal{P})$ is the number of double points of a generic perturbation of a curve satisfying the constraint $\langle \mathcal{P} \rangle$.) Thus the only partitions that can arise at a point are $(1), (m)$, or $(m - 1, 1)$ for some $1 \leq m \leq 8$. Applying (5.1.2) iteratively, and abbreviating $\hat{N}_{\mathbb{CP}^2, 3[L]}(\ldots) = \hat{N}_{\mathbb{CP}^2, 3[L]}(\ldots)$, gives
\[
12 = \hat{N}_3(1^{q_1}, \ldots, 1^{q_7}, p) = \hat{N}_3(q_1, \ldots, q_6, (p, p)) + \hat{N}_3(q_1, \ldots, q_6, (T p)) = 3 \hat{N}_3(q_1, \ldots, q_5, (T p, p)) + \hat{N}_3(q_1, \ldots, q_5, (T^2 p)) = 4 \hat{N}_3(q_1, \ldots, q_4, (T^2 p, p)) + \hat{N}_3(q_1, \ldots, q_4, (T^3 p)) = \ldots = 8 \hat{N}_3((T^6 p, p)) + \hat{N}_3(T^7 p) = 8 \hat{N}_3((7, 1)) + \hat{N}_3(8)).
\]
Next recall from Corollary 4.2.6 (ii) that
\[ \tilde{N}_3 < q_1, \ldots, q_6, (p, p) > = 2N_{\text{CF}^2,3[L]} < q_1, \ldots, q_6, (p, p) > = 2GW_{\text{Bl}^2\text{CF}^2,3[L]-[E_1]-\cdots-2[E_7]} = 2 \]
Hence the recursion formula gives
\[
2 = \tilde{N}_3 < q_1, \ldots, q_6, (p, p) > \\
= 2\tilde{N}_3 < q_1, \ldots, q_5, (Tp, p) > \\
= 2\tilde{N}_3 < q_1, \ldots, q_4, (T^2 p, p) > \\
\ldots \\
= 2\tilde{N}_3 < (T^6 p, p) > = 2\tilde{N}_3 < (7, 1) > .
\]
Thus
\[ N_3 < (8) > = 4, \]
as claimed in Table 5.1.3. This calculation should be compared with that in Example 4.2.7 which has more geometric input but is less systematic.

We now compare the above invariants with the Caporaso–Harris calculation that there are 7 rational cubics that are tangent to a given line \( L \) to order 2 at a given point \( p \in L \) and go through 5 other generic points. It is most natural to compare this count with our invariant \( \tilde{N}_3 < q_1, \ldots, q_5, (T^2 p) > \). The recursion formula shows that
\[
10 = \tilde{N}_3 < q_1, \ldots, q_6, Tp > \\
= \tilde{N}_3 < q_1, \ldots, q_5, (Tp, p) > + \tilde{N}_3 < q_1, \ldots, q_5, (T^2 p) > \\
= 1 + \tilde{N}_3 < q_1, \ldots, q_5, (T^2 p) > .
\]
Therefore, \( \tilde{N}_3 < q_1, \ldots, q_5, (T^2 p) > = 9 \). To understand why \( \tilde{N}_3 < q_1, \ldots, q_5, (T^2 p) > \) is larger than the Caporaso–Harris count, observe that the condition that the local divisor \( D \) extend to a \( J \)-holomorphic line \( L \) is not satisfied by a generic element in \( \mathcal{J}_D \). If \( J \in \mathcal{J}_D \) does have this property then some of the curves counted by \( \tilde{N}_3 < q_1, \ldots, q_5, (T^2 p) > = 9 \) could be degenerate. Indeed there is a unique conic \( Q \) through \( q_1, \ldots, q_5 \) and its union with a line can be parametrized as a degree three genus zero stable map in two essentially different ways, depending on which of the two intersection points \( Q \cap L \) is designated as the image of the unique node in the domain of the stable map. These two curves do contribute to \( \tilde{N}_3 < q_1, \ldots, q_5, (T^2 p) > \), however they do not contribute to the Caporaso–Harris count. This example clearly illustrates that considering tangency to a line \( L \) instead of to a generic local divisor \( D \) makes a real difference to the invariant. \( \Box \)

**Remark 5.1.6.** (Partitions \( \mathcal{P} \) with \( N_{M,A}(\prec \mathcal{P} \succ) = 1 \). It is not hard to check that if \( Q = (n_1, \ldots, n_a) \) is the dual partition to \( \mathcal{P} = (m_1, \ldots, m_b) \) in the sense of Remark 4.1.2 then
\[
\sum_{j=1}^{a} n_j^2 = |\mathcal{P}| + 2\delta(\mathcal{P}),
\]
where, by Lemma 2.3.3, \( \delta(\mathcal{P}) \) is the number of double points near \( p \) of an \( A \) curve that satisfies the constraint \( \prec T^p p \succ \). If \( \delta(\mathcal{P}) = \delta(A) = \frac{1}{2}(A^2 - c_1(A)) + 1 \) (where \( \delta(A) \) is
as in (4.1.2)), then the immersed \(A\)-curves that satisfy \(\langle TP, p \rangle\) have no other double points. Therefore \(\delta(A_P) = 0\), which implies that, if in addition \(|\mathcal{P}| = c_1(A) - 1\), the class \(A_P\) must be the class of an exceptional sphere. In such a case, if one puts all the blow up points lie inside a skinny ellipsoid and stretches the neck, then the arguments in §4.2 should adapt to show that the unique curve in class \(A_P\) must decompose into a building whose top in \(M \setminus E_{sk}\) has bottom partition \(\mathcal{P}\); in other words, one should have \(N_d(\langle \mathcal{P} \rangle) = 1\). Conversely, if one looks at Table 5.1.3, it turns out that for every partition \(\mathcal{P}\) with \(N_d(\langle \mathcal{P} \rangle) = 1\) the dual class \(A_P\) is an exceptional class.

Note that in general the number of \(A\)-curves satisfying the constraint \(\langle TP, p \rangle\) is different from the count of curves in the dual class \(A_P := A - \sum_{j=1}^a n_j[E_j]\). Indeed, if one blows up at a distinct points inside a single skinny ellipsoid and looks to see what happens to a curve in class \(A_P\) as one stretches the neck, the partition given by the ends of the top level of the split curve need not in general equal \(\mathcal{P}\) since some of the double points of the \(A_P\)-curve can move into the neck. (The possible partitions in this situation can be deduced from Theorem 4.3.3.) For example, if \(\mathcal{P} = (8)\) and \(A = 3[L]\) in \(\mathbb{C}P^2\) then

\[
N_3 \langle TP, p \rangle = 4, \quad \text{while} \quad GW_{3[L] - \sum_{i=1}^8 x_i} = 12.
\]

Explicit examples of this neck stretching process may be found in [6, §3.5], that discusses the case of degree \(d\) curves in \(\mathbb{C}P^2\) for \(d = 3, 4\) with end on the (skinny) ellipsoid \(E(1, x)\) for \(x > 3d - 1\).

Remark 5.1.7. (i) Since the formula (5.1.2) is based only on local considerations near the point \(p\), one could also formulate a version of Theorem 5.1.1 for punctured pseudo-holomorphic curves in four-dimensional symplectic cobordisms. However, in this case the statement is somewhat more involved, since in general such counts do not define numerical invariants but rather chain maps between chain complexes, which necessitates working in the framework of [27] except in special cases.

(ii) We do not know whether there is a natural analogue of Theorem 5.1.1 for higher dimensional symplectic manifolds. However, see [7] for a higher dimensional analogue of Formula (5.1.2) in the case of \(\mathbb{C}P^n\) and a single first order tangency constraint.

5.2. Existence of the algorithm. As in §4.3, it will be convenient to represent partitions by Young diagrams. We define a (total) ordering of \(\mathcal{Y}_k\) using the rule that for \(y, y' \in \mathcal{Y}_k\), we have \(y' > y\) if for some \(i\) the \(i\)th row (from the top) of \(y'\) has more boxes than the \(i\)th row of \(y\), and for all \(j < i\), the \(j\)th rows of \(y\) and \(y'\) have the same number of boxes. For example, the ordering of \(\mathcal{Y}_5\) is given by

\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{array}{c}
\vdots \\
\hline
\hline
\hline
\hline
\hline
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]

For some given \(k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}\), let \(y_1, \ldots, y_{|\mathcal{Y}_k|}\) denote the elements of \(\mathcal{Y}_k\) in increasing order. Let \(\mathcal{Y}_{\text{nonhor}}^k := \{y_1, \ldots, y_{|\mathcal{Y}_k| - 1}\}\) denote the subset of \(\mathcal{Y}_k\) consisting of all Young diagrams except for the horizontal one, and let \(\mathcal{Y}_{\text{nonver}}^k := \{y_2, \ldots, y_{|\mathcal{Y}_k|}\}\) denote the subspace of \(\mathcal{Y}_k\) consisting of all Young diagrams except for the vertical one. Let \(V_{\mathcal{Y}} := Q(\mathcal{Y}_{\text{nonhor}}^k)\)
denote the $(|\mathcal{Y}_k| - 1)$-dimensional rational vector space with basis $\mathcal{Y}^{\text{nonhor}}$, and similarly put $W_k := \mathbb{Q}(\mathcal{Y}_k^{\text{nonver}})$. We define a linear map $\Phi_k : W_k \rightarrow V_k$ as follows:

- For a Young diagram $y \in \mathcal{Y}_k^{\text{nonver}} \cap \mathcal{Y}_k^{\text{nonhor}}$, the matrix coefficient $\langle \Phi_k(y), y \rangle$ is 1.
- For distinct Young diagrams $y \neq y'$ with $y \in \mathcal{Y}_k^{\text{nonver}}$ and $y' \in \mathcal{Y}_k^{\text{nonhor}}$, the matrix coefficient $\langle \Phi_k(y), y' \rangle$ is the number of ways of removing the top row of $y'$ and adding it to the end of one of the lower rows of $y'$ such that the result is $y$ (after reordering the rows to obtain a valid Young diagram).

Using the natural bases of $W_k$ and $V_k$ by Young diagrams, we can also represent $\Phi_k$ by a $(|\mathcal{Y}_k| - 1) \times (|\mathcal{Y}_k| - 1)$ matrix, which we denote by $A_k$. Here the entry $\langle \Phi_k(y), y' \rangle$ occurs in the row labeled by $y'$ and the column labeled by $y$ (see the examples below). Observe that for each $y \in \mathcal{Y}_k^{\text{nonver}}$, $\Phi_k(y)$ is a linear combination of Young diagrams $y' \in \mathcal{Y}_k^{\text{nonhor}}$ with $y' \leq y$. This translates into the fact that the matrix $A$ is upper triangular modulo having nonzero entries on the lower off-diagonal. We will show below that, with respect to suitable choices of bases, the map $\Phi_k$ realizes the equation (5.1.2), with the rows of $A_k$ indexing constraints of the form $<(m_1, m_1, \ldots, m_b), ->$ and the columns of $A_k$ indexing constraints of the form $<(m, m_1, \ldots, m_b), ->$

Example 5.2.1. For $k = 4$, we have $|\mathcal{Y}_4| = 5$, and corresponding Young diagrams $y_1 \prec \ldots \prec y_5$, with $y_1$ the vertical Young diagram and $y_5$ the horizontal Young diagram. Then $A_4$ is the following $4 \times 4$ matrix:

$$
\begin{pmatrix}
3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 2 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 1
\end{pmatrix}
$$

One can easily check that $\det(A_4) = -6$, and in particular $A_4$ is invertible.

The following combinatorial lemma generalizes the above example to arbitrary positive integers $k$ and will be central for our recursion algorithm.

Lemma 5.2.2. For all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, we have $\det(A_k) = \pm (k - 1)!$. In particular, $A_k$ is invertible.

Taking Lemma 5.2.2 for granted for the moment, we now describe the recursion algorithm and prove Theorem 5.1.1.

Proof of Theorem 5.1.1. We will work with the invariants $\tilde{N}$ rather than $N$, since the recursion is more transparent in this notation. Consider an invariant of the form

$$
\tilde{N}_{M,A} <(m_1^1, \ldots, m^1_{b_1}), \ldots, (m^r_1, \ldots, m^r_{b_r})>.
$$
Assume that \( m_j^i \geq 2 \) for some \( i, j \). After rearranging the constraints so that the first one has a maximal sum \( \sum_{j=1}^{b} m_j^i \) we can write such an invariant more succinctly as

\[
\hat{N}_{M,A}^{<(m_1, \ldots, m_{b_1}), ->},
\]

where we also assume without loss of generality that we have \( m_1 \geq \ldots \geq m_b \). Our goal is to write any such invariant as a linear combination of invariants of strictly smaller complexity.

Put \( k = \sum_{i=1}^{b} m_i \). Note that the tuple \( (m_1, \ldots, m_b) \) naturally corresponds to a Young diagram \( y \in \mathcal{Y}_k \) such that the \( i \)th row has \( m_i \) blocks. As before, let \( y_1, \ldots, y_{|\mathcal{Y}_k|} \in \mathcal{Y}_k \) denote the ordered list of Young diagrams with \( k \) boxes. Now let \( w_1, \ldots, w_{|\mathcal{Y}_k|} \) denote all of the corresponding invariants of the form \( \hat{N}_{M,A}^{<P, ->} \) corresponding to some partition \( P \) of \( k \). Recall here that \( \hat{N}_{M,A}^{<P, ->} \) is defined to be simply \( N_{M,A}^{<P, ->} \) times the extra combinatorial factor \( |\text{Aut}(P)| \). We thus have

\[
w_1 = \hat{N}_{M,A}^{<(1), ->}^{k}, \quad w_2 = \hat{N}_{M,A}^{<(2), (1), ->}^{k-2}, \quad \ldots, \quad w_{|\mathcal{Y}_k|} = \hat{N}_{M,A}^{<(k), ->}.
\]

Similarly, let \( v_1, \ldots, v_k \) denote the analogous invariants given by replacing \( \hat{N}_{M,A}^{<(m_1, \ldots, m_b), ->} \) with \( \hat{N}_{M,A}^{<(m_1), (m_2, \ldots, m_b), ->} \).

That is, we have

\[
v_1 = \hat{N}_{M,A}^{<(1), (1), ->}^{k-1}, \quad v_2 = \hat{N}_{M,A}^{<(2), (1), ->}^{k-2}, \quad \ldots, \quad v_{|\mathcal{Y}_k|} = \hat{N}_{M,A}^{<(k), ->}.
\]

Note that we have \( v_{|\mathcal{Y}_k|} = w_{|\mathcal{Y}_k|} \), and that, because we are decomposing one of the constraints of maximal complexity, each of the invariants \( v_1, \ldots, v_{|\mathcal{Y}_k|-1} \) has strictly smaller complexity than each of the invariants \( w_2, \ldots, w_{|\mathcal{Y}_k|} \). By applying Formula (5.1.2) once for each of the invariants \( v_1, \ldots, v_{|\mathcal{Y}_k|-1} \), we find that the column vectors \( \vec{v} := (v_1, \ldots, v_{|\mathcal{Y}_k|-1})^T \) and \( \vec{w} := (w_2, \ldots, w_{|\mathcal{Y}_k|})^T \) are related by the following equation:

\[
\vec{v} = (w_1, 0, \ldots, 0)^T + A_k \vec{w}.
\]
lower rows to obtain (after rearrangement) the Young diagram for \(w_j\). Then, since \(A_k\) is invertible by Lemma 5.2.2, we have
\[
\vec{w} = A_k^{-1} \left( \vec{v} - (w_1, 0, ..., 0)^T \right),
\]
which gives the desired recursion. □

Remark 5.2.3. A noteworthy feature of the above recursion is that the coefficients of the relation (5.2.2) are not in general integers. However, all the invariants \(N_{M,A}^{<P_1>}\) are of course integers.

Example 5.2.4. In the case \(k = 4\) (c.f. Example 5.2.1), equation (5.2.1) amounts to the following system of equations:
\[
\begin{align*}
\tilde{N}_{M,A}^{<(q),(p,p,p),->} &= \tilde{N}_{M,A}^{<(p,p,p,p),->} + 3\tilde{N}_{M,A}^{<(Tp,p,p),->} \\
\tilde{N}_{M,A}^{<(Tq),(p,p),->} &= \tilde{N}_{M,A}^{<(Tp,p,p),->} + 2\tilde{N}_{M,A}^{<(T^2p,p),->} \\
\tilde{N}_{M,A}^{<(Tq),(Tp),->} &= \tilde{N}_{M,A}^{<(Tp,Tp),->} + \tilde{N}_{M,A}^{<(T^3p),->} \\
\tilde{N}_{M,A}^{<(T^2q),(p),->} &= \tilde{N}_{M,A}^{<(T^2p,p),->} + \tilde{N}_{M,A}^{<(T^3p),->}
\end{align*}
\]
The invariants on the right hand sides all have complexity four, apart from the blow up invariant \(\tilde{N}_{M,A}^{<(p,p,p,p),->}\) which is assumed known. Further, one can solve for
\[
\begin{align*}
\tilde{N}_{M,A}^{<(Tp,p,p),->} &= \tilde{N}_{M,A}^{<(T^2p,p),->} = \tilde{N}_{M,A}^{<(T^3p),->} = \tilde{N}_{M,A}^{<(Tp,Tp),->}
\end{align*}
\]
in turn in terms of other invariants that all have strictly smaller complexity. □

Proof of Lemma 5.2.2. Assume by induction that we have \(\det(A_{k-1}) = \pm (k - 2)!\). Let \(\iota : Y_{k-1} \rightarrow Y_k\) denote the injective order-preserving set map which sends a Young diagram \(y \in Y_{k-1}\) to the Young diagram \(\iota(y) \in Y_k\) obtained by adding a single box to the top row of \(y\). Thus the image of \(\iota\) consists of all diagrams in which the top row is strictly longer than the second row. Let \(A'_k\) denote the \(((|Y_{k-1}| - 1) \times (|Y_{k-1}| - 1))\) submatrix of \(A_k\) corresponding to rows from \(\iota(Y_{k-1}^{\text{nonhor}})\) and columns from \(\iota(Y_{k-1}^{\text{nonver}})\). It is not hard to check that \(A'_k\) coincides with the matrix \(A_{k-1}\), and in particular has determinant \(\pm (k - 2)!\) by our inductive hypothesis.

Also, one can readily check that the rows of \(A_k\) corresponding to \(\iota(Y_{k-1}^{\text{nonhor}})\) have nonzero entries only in the columns corresponding to \(\iota(Y_{k-1}^{\text{nonver}})\) as well as the column corresponding to \(y_2 \in Y_k^{\text{nonver}}\). Moreover, the row of \(A_k\) corresponding to \(y_1 \in Y_k^{\text{nonhor}}\) consists of the entry \(k - 1\) in the first column and zeroes elsewhere. This means that we can perform type III elementary row operations (i.e. adding a multiple of a row to another row) to transform \(A_k\) to a matrix \(B_k\) without creating any new nonzero entries, such that the first column of \(B_k\) consists of the entry \(k - 1\) in the first row and zeroes elsewhere. Note that in this process the submatrix \(A'_k\) remains unchanged. Next, since the rows of \(B_k\) corresponding to \(\iota(Y_{k-1}^{\text{nonhor}})\) have nonzero only in the columns corresponding to \(\iota(Y_{k-1}^{\text{nonver}})\), we can perform type III elementary row operations to transform \(B_k\) to a matrix \(C_k\) without creating any new nonzero entries, such that the columns of \(C_k\) corresponding to \(\iota(Y_{k-1}^{\text{nonver}})\) are nonzero only in the rows corresponding to \(\iota(Y_{k-1}^{\text{nonhor}})\). Here we use the fact that \(A'_k\) is invertible, and so can be assumed to be upper triangular.
For example, in Example 5.2.5 below we first clear the term 1 in the place (2,1) and then clear the terms in the third row and columns 4,5.

After we have done this the resulting matrix $C_k$ decomposes into a product. More precisely, let $C_k^\perp$ denote the $(|Y_k| - |Y_{k-1}| - 1) \times (|Y_k| - |Y_{k-1}| - 1)$ submatrix of $C_k$ with rows corresponding to $Y_k^{\text{nonhor}} \setminus (\iota(Y_k^{\text{nonhor}}) \cup \{y_1\})$ and columns corresponding to $Y_k^{\text{nonver}} \setminus (\iota(Y_k^{\text{nonver}}) \cup \{y_1\})$. Then $\det(A_k) = \pm k! \det(C_k^\perp)$. Moreover, we have that $C_k^\perp$ is upper triangular with all diagonal entries 1, and hence $\det(C_k^\perp) = 1$. □

**Example 5.2.5.** For $k = 5$, we have $|Y_5| = 7$ and corresponding Young diagrams $y_1 < \ldots < y_7$ as above, with $y_1$ the vertical Young diagram and $y_7$ the horizontal Young diagram. Then $A_5$ is the following $6 \times 6$ matrix:

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\
\end{pmatrix}
\]

Again, one can easily check that $\det(A_5) = \pm 4!$, and in particular $A_5$ is invertible. Here the boxed entries correspond to the submatrix $A_5'$, which one can check agrees with the matrix $A_4$ from Example 5.2.1 above. ◊
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