

# THE EQUIVALENCE OF LATTICE AND HEEGAARD FLOER HOMOLOGY

IAN ZEMKE

ABSTRACT. We prove that if  $G$  is a plumbing tree and  $Y(G)$  is the corresponding plumbed 3-manifold, then the lattice homology of  $G$  coincides with the Heegaard Floer homology of  $Y(G)$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Heegaard Floer homology is a powerful invariant of 3-manifolds, introduced by Ozsváth and Szabó [OS04b] [OS04c]. To a closed 3-manifold  $Y$ , equipped with a  $\text{Spin}^c$  structure  $\mathfrak{s} \in \text{Spin}^c(Y)$ , Ozsváth and Szabó constructed an  $\mathbb{F}[U]$ -module denoted  $HF^-(Y, \mathfrak{s})$ . We define

$$HF^-(Y) = \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{s} \in \text{Spin}^c(Y)} HF^-(Y, \mathfrak{s}).$$

An important class of 3-manifolds are the *plumbed* 3-manifolds, which are obtained by plumbing  $S^1$ -bundles over surfaces. In this paper, we consider 3-manifolds obtained by plumbing  $S^1$ -bundles over the 2-sphere. To a tree  $G$  with integer weights at the vertices, there is an associated plumbed 3-manifold  $Y(G)$ . The manifold  $Y(G)$  has a convenient surgery description as integral surgery on a link  $L_G \subseteq S^3$ . The link  $L_G$  has one unknotted component for each vertex of  $G$ , and a clasp for each edge of  $G$ . The link  $L_G$  is an iterated connected sum of Hopf links. The weights give an integral framing  $\Lambda$  on  $L_G$ , and  $Y(G) \cong S^3_\Lambda(L_G)$ .

Much effort has gone into computing the Heegaard Floer complexes of plumbed 3-manifolds. Ozsváth and Szabó [OS03] computed the Heegaard Floer homology of 3-manifolds obtained by plumbing along a tree  $G$  when  $\Lambda$  is negative definite and the tree has at most one *bad vertex* (which is a vertex such that the weight exceeds minus the valence). This family includes the Seifert fibered spaces.

The computation of Ozsváth and Szabó was formalized by Némethi [Ném05] [Ném08], who defined an  $\mathbb{F}[U]$ -module  $\mathbb{H}F(Y(G))$  called *lattice homology*. Lattice homology is the homology of a combinatorially defined chain complex  $\mathbb{C}F(Y(G))$ . Némethi proved that for the family of *almost rational* graphs,  $HF^-(Y(G))$  and  $\mathbb{H}F(Y(G))$  are isomorphic. Ozsváth, Stipsicz and Szabó generalized this to a larger family called *type-2* graphs, and proved that for general  $G$  there is a spectral sequence from lattice homology to Heegaard Floer homology (almost rational graphs are *type-1* graphs in Ozsváth-Stipsicz-Szabó's terminology). In later work, Némethi proved using work of Hanselman, J. Rasmussen, S. Rasmussen and Watson [HRRW20] that if  $G$  is negative definite, then  $Y(G)$  is an L-space if and only if  $G$  is a rational graph [Ném17].

Némethi [Ném08] conjectured that lattice homology and Heegaard Floer homology coincide for all negative definite plumbing trees  $G$ . The conjecture is also open for more

general plumbing graphs. The aforementioned works [OS03] [Ném05] [OSS14] [Ném17] verify the conjecture for when  $G$  is a type-2 graph and for negative definite plumbings such that  $Y(G)$  is an L-space.

In recent work [Zem21], the author gave a complete computation of  $\mathbf{HF}^-(Y(G))$  for all plumbing trees  $G$ . The author proved that Heegaard Floer homology is a deformation of the lattice complex, i.e. that  $\mathbf{CF}^-(Y(G)) \cong (\mathbb{C}\mathbb{F}(Y(G)), \partial + E)$ , where  $E$  is an endomorphism of the lattice complex which decreases the cube filtration by at least 3, and gave a combinatorial description of the deformation. In [Zem21], it was not clear whether the deformation gave a different homology group.

In the above, we write  $\mathbf{HF}^-(Y)$  for the module obtained by completing  $HF^-(Y)$  with respect to the  $U$  action. If  $Y(G)$  is a rational homology 3-sphere, no information is lost by taking completions. The same holds if we restrict to torsion  $\text{Spin}^c$  structures on  $Y(G)$ .

Building off the techniques of [Zem21], we prove the conjecture:

**Theorem 1.1.** *If  $G$  is a plumbing tree, then there is an isomorphism of  $\mathbb{F}[[U]]$ -modules*

$$\mathbb{H}\mathbb{F}(G) \cong \mathbf{HF}^-(Y(G)).$$

*The isomorphism decomposes over  $\text{Spin}^c$  structures, and is relatively graded for torsion  $\text{Spin}^c$  structures.*

*Remark 1.2.* In the literature, there are several conventions regarding completions in the definition of lattice homology. In this paper, we follow the convention of Ozsváth-Stipsicz-Szabó [OSS14] and work with direct products instead of direct sums, and we work with the power series ring  $\mathbb{F}[[U]]$  instead of  $\mathbb{F}[U]$ .

**1.1. Aspects of the proof of Theorem 1.1.** Our proof makes use of several tools in Heegaard Floer homology. Firstly, we use the link surgery formula of Manolescu and Ozsváth [MO10]. We also use the description from [OSS14] of lattice homology in terms of the Manolescu-Ozsváth surgery formula. Additionally, we use recent work of the author [Zem21], which reinterprets the link surgery formula as a bordered theory over an algebra  $\mathcal{K}$ , in a similar spirit to (and inspired by) the bordered theory of Lipshitz, Ozsváth and Thurston [LOT18].

The developments that are unique to the present paper focus on an asymmetry in the construction of the link surgery formula of Manolescu-Ozsváth [MO10] and the knot surgery formulas of Ozsváth and Szabó [OS08b] [OS11]. We observe that the link surgery formula requires an auxiliary decoration of each link component. For each link component, there are two possible choices, which we refer to as being *alpha-labeled* or *beta-labeled*. The construction in [MO10] is for links where all components are beta-labeled.

The asymmetry is somewhat similar to the setting of bordered Heegaard Floer homology [LOT18], where one may choose to use either alpha arcs or beta arcs on each boundary component of a bordered manifold.

In [Zem21], the author computed the Hopf link surgery complex  $\mathcal{H}_\Lambda^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}}$  where both boundary components were beta-labeled. The author obtained a model for  $\mathbf{CF}^-(Y(G))$  by tensoring the Hopf link complexes together. The resulting model of  $\mathbf{CF}^-(Y(G))$  was a deformation of the lattice complex. In the present paper, we compute the module for the Hopf link where one component is alpha-labeled and one component is beta-labeled, which we denote by  $\overline{\mathcal{H}}_\Lambda^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}}$ . The computation is presented in Theorem 4.1. We

prove in Section 5 that the resulting model of  $\mathbf{CF}^-(Y(G))$  is homotopy equivalent to the lattice complex via a homological algebra argument.

**1.2. Acknowledgments.** The author would like to thank Antonio Alferi, Maciej Borodzik, Kristen Hendricks, Jennifer Hom, Robert Lipshitz, Beibei Liu, Ciprian Manolescu, Peter Ozsváth and Matt Stoffregen for helpful conversations.

## 2. BACKGROUND

**2.1. Background on knot and link Floer homology.** We recall presently the knot and link Floer complexes. For knots, these are due to Ozsváth and Szabó [OS04a] and independently Rasmussen [Ras03]. For links, they are due to Ozsváth and Szabó [OS08a]. We focus on the description in terms of a free chain complex over a 2-variable polynomial ring  $\mathbb{F}[\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}]$ .

To a Heegaard knot diagram  $(\Sigma, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, w, z)$  for  $K \subseteq Y$ , one considers the Lagrangian tori

$$\mathbb{T}_\alpha = \alpha_1 \times \cdots \times \alpha_g \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{T}_\beta = \beta_1 \times \cdots \times \beta_g,$$

inside of the symmetric product  $\text{Sym}^g(\Sigma)$ . The chain complex  $\mathcal{CFK}(Y, K)$  is the free  $\mathbb{F}[\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}]$ -module generated by intersection points  $\mathbb{T}_\alpha \cap \mathbb{T}_\beta$ . The differential counts Maslov index 1 pseudo-holomorphic disks  $u$  connecting intersection points, weighted by  $\mathcal{U}^{n_w(u)} \mathcal{V}^{n_z(u)}$ . Here,  $n_w(u)$  is the intersection number of the curve  $u$  with  $\{w\} \times \text{Sym}^{g-1}(\Sigma)$ , and  $n_z(u)$  is similar.

For an  $\ell$ -component link  $L \subseteq Y$ , we consider a  $2\ell$ -pointed Heegaard link diagram  $(\Sigma, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z})$  where  $|\mathbf{w}| = |\mathbf{z}| = \ell$ . We may similarly define  $\mathcal{CFL}(Y, L)$  to be the complex freely generated over the ring  $\mathbb{F}[\mathcal{U}_1, \dots, \mathcal{U}_\ell, \mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_\ell]$  by intersection points  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{T}_\alpha \cap \mathbb{T}_\beta$ . This version of link Floer homology was considered in [Zem19]. In the differential, a holomorphic disk  $u$  is weighted by the algebra element  $\mathcal{U}_1^{n_{w_1}(u)} \cdots \mathcal{U}_\ell^{n_{w_\ell}(u)} \mathcal{V}_1^{n_{z_1}(u)} \cdots \mathcal{V}_\ell^{n_{z_\ell}(u)}$ .

We now discuss Alexander gradings. For a knot  $K$  in a rational homology 3-sphere  $Y$ , there is a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -valued Alexander grading  $A$  on  $\mathcal{CFK}(Y, K)$ . When  $K$  is integrally null-homologous, the Alexander grading is  $\mathbb{Z}$ -valued. If  $s \in \mathbb{Q}$ , we write  $\mathcal{A}_s(Y, K) \subseteq \mathcal{CFK}(Y, K)$  for the subcomplex in Alexander grading  $s$ . Since  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  have non-zero Alexander grading, the subcomplex  $\mathcal{A}_s(Y, K)$  is not naturally an  $\mathbb{F}[\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}]$ -module, but rather an  $\mathbb{F}[U]$ -module, where  $U$  acts by  $\mathcal{U}\mathcal{V}$ . Similarly, if  $L$  is a link in a rational homology 3-sphere, there is an  $n$ -component Alexander grading on  $\mathcal{CFL}(Y, L)$ , which we denote  $A = (A_1, \dots, A_n)$ .

**2.2. Background on surgery formulas.** We now recall some basics of the Manolescu-Ozsváth link surgery formula [MO10], as well as the knot surgery formulas of Ozsváth and Szabó [OS08b] [OS11].

If  $K$  is a knot in an integer homology 3-sphere  $Y$ , then Ozsváth and Szabó [OS08b] proved a formula which relates  $HF^-(Y_n(K))$  with the knot Floer complex of  $K$ . They defined two chain complexes  $\mathbb{A}(Y, K)$  and  $\mathbb{B}(Y, K)$  over  $\mathbb{F}[[U]]$ , as well as two  $\mathbb{F}[[U]]$ -equivariant maps  $v, h_n: \mathbb{A}(Y, K) \rightarrow \mathbb{B}(Y, K)$  such that

$$HF^-(Y_n(K)) \cong H_* \text{Cone}(v + h_n: \mathbb{A}(Y, K) \rightarrow \mathbb{B}(Y, K)).$$

The modules  $\mathbb{A}(Y, K)$  and  $\mathbb{B}(Y, K)$  are identified (up to completions) with  $\mathcal{CFK}(Y, K)$  and  $\mathcal{V}^{-1}\mathcal{CFK}(Y, K)$ , respectively.

The map  $v$  is the canonical inclusion map, while  $h_n$  is defined by composing the canonical inclusion map of  $\mathcal{CFK}(Y, K)$  into  $\mathcal{U}^{-1}\mathcal{CFK}(Y, K)$ , and then composing with a homotopy equivalence of  $\mathbb{F}[U]$ -chain complexes  $\mathcal{U}^{-1}\mathcal{CFK}(Y, K) \simeq \mathcal{V}^{-1}\mathcal{CFK}(Y, K)$ . The map  $h_n$  shifts the Alexander grading by  $n$ .

Manolescu and Ozsváth extended the knot surgery formula to links in  $S^3$  [MO10]. To a link  $L \subseteq S^3$  with integral framing  $\Lambda$ , they constructed a chain complex  $\mathcal{C}_\Lambda(L)$  whose homology is  $\mathbf{HF}^-(S_\Lambda^3(L))$ . The chain complex  $\mathcal{C}_\Lambda(L)$  is built from the link Floer homology of  $L$ . The chain complex  $\mathcal{C}_\Lambda(L)$  is a *hypercube of chain complexes*. See [MO10, Section 5]. This means that as a group  $\mathcal{C}_\Lambda(L)$  decomposes as a direct sum of groups  $\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon$  where  $\varepsilon \in \{0, 1\}^\ell$ ,  $\ell = |L|$ . Furthermore, the differential only has non-trivial components from  $\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon$  to  $\mathcal{C}_{\varepsilon'}$  when  $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon'$ . (We write  $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon'$  if  $\varepsilon_i \leq \varepsilon'_i$  for all  $i$ ). Also, we will usually conflate the integral framing  $\Lambda$  with the symmetric framing matrix, which has  $\Lambda_{i,i}$  equal to the framing of  $L_i$ , and  $\Lambda_{i,j} = lk(L_i, L_j)$  if  $i \neq j$ .

The underlying group of  $\mathcal{C}_\Lambda(L)$  has a simple description in terms of link Floer homology. If  $\varepsilon \in \{0, 1\}^\ell$ , write  $S_\varepsilon$  for the multiplicatively closed subset of  $\mathbb{F}[\mathcal{U}_1, \dots, \mathcal{U}_\ell, \mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_\ell]$  generated by  $\mathcal{V}_i$  for  $i$  such that  $\varepsilon_i = 1$ . Then  $\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon$  is identified with a completion of  $\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon \cong S_\varepsilon^{-1} \cdot \mathcal{CFL}(L)$ . (This is a slight reformulation of Manolescu and Ozsváth's original description; see [Zem21, Lemma 5.7]).

Furthermore, the hypercube differential decomposes over sublinks of  $L$  which are oriented (possibly differently than  $L$ ). If  $\vec{M}$  is an oriented sublink of  $L$ , we write  $\Phi^{\vec{M}}$  for the corresponding summand of the differential. If  $\varepsilon < \varepsilon'$  and  $\varepsilon'$  and  $\varepsilon' - \varepsilon$  is the indicator function for the components of  $M$ , then  $\Phi^{\vec{M}}$  sends  $\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon$  to  $\mathcal{C}_{\varepsilon'}$ .

Furthermore, by using a *basic system of Heegaard diagrams* one may arrange so that  $\Phi^{\vec{M}} = 0$  unless either  $\vec{M}$  contains a single component, or  $\vec{M}$  has only negatively oriented components relative to the orientation on  $L$ . Furthermore, if  $K \subseteq L$  and  $K$  is oriented coherently with  $L$ , the  $\Phi^K$  is the canonical inclusion of subcomplexes. See [MO10, Section 8.7].

**2.3. Background on lattice homology.** Lattice homology is an invariant of plumbed 3-manifolds due to Némethi [Ném05] [Ném08], which is a formalization of Ozsváth and Szabó's computation of the Heegaard Floer homology of some plumbed 3-manifolds [OS03].

For our purposes, the description of Némethi is not the most convenient, and instead we use an alternate description given by Ozsváth, Stipsicz and Szabó [OSS14], which is more similar to Heegaard Floer homology. Ozsváth, Stipsicz and Szabó gave a description of  $\mathbb{CF}(Y(G))$  in terms of the link surgery formula for  $L_G \subseteq S^3$ , as follows. Let  $(\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon, D_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'})$  denote the link surgery hypercube for  $L_G$ . We may construct another hypercube  $(H_\varepsilon, d_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'})$  by setting  $H_\varepsilon = H_*(\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon)$ , and by setting  $d_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'} = (D_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'})_*$  if  $|\varepsilon' - \varepsilon|_{L^1} = 1$  and  $d_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'} = 0$  otherwise. Note that  $\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon$  is naturally a module over  $\mathbb{F}[[U_1, \dots, U_\ell]]$ , where  $\ell = |L_G|$ , however each  $U_i$  has the same action on homology, so we view  $H_*(\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon)$  as being an  $\mathbb{F}[[U]]$ -module, where  $U$  acts by one of the  $U_i$ . Ozsváth, Stipsicz and Szabó prove the following:

**Proposition 2.1** ([OSS14, Proposition 4.4]). *There is an isomorphism of hypercubes of chain complexes over  $\mathbb{F}[[U]]$ :*

$$(H_\varepsilon, d_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'}) \cong \mathbb{CF}(Y(G))$$

which is relatively graded on torsion  $\text{Spin}^c$  structures. In particular, the total homologies of the two sides coincide.

### 3. THE BORDERED PERSPECTIVE ON THE LINK SURGERY FORMULA

In this section, we now recall the bordered perspective on the knot and link surgery formulas described in [Zem21] and describe some new subtleties that are important for our present setting.

**3.1. The algebra  $\mathcal{K}$ , and surgery formulas as  $\mathcal{K}$ -modules.** The author described an associative algebra  $\mathcal{K}$ , as follows. The algebra  $\mathcal{K}$  is an algebra over the ring of two idempotents  $\mathbf{I}_0 \oplus \mathbf{I}_1$ . We have

$$\mathbf{I}_0 \cdot \mathcal{K} \cdot \mathbf{I}_0 = \mathbb{F}[\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}] \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{I}_1 \cdot \mathcal{K} \cdot \mathbf{I}_1 = \mathbb{F}[\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}^{-1}].$$

Furthermore  $\mathbf{I}_0 \cdot \mathcal{K} \cdot \mathbf{I}_1 = 0$ . Finally,  $\mathbf{I}_1 \cdot \mathcal{K} \cdot \mathbf{I}_0$  has two special algebra elements,  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$  which are subject to the relations

$$\sigma \cdot f = I(f) \cdot \sigma \quad \text{and} \quad \tau \cdot f = T(f) \cdot \tau,$$

for  $f \in \mathbb{F}[\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}] = \mathbf{I}_0 \cdot \mathcal{K} \cdot \mathbf{I}_0$ . Also,  $I: \mathbb{F}[\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}] \rightarrow \mathbb{F}[\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}^{-1}]$  is the canonical inclusion, while  $T: \mathbb{F}[\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}] \rightarrow \mathbb{F}[\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}^{-1}]$  is the algebra homomorphism satisfying  $T(\mathcal{U}) = \mathcal{V}^{-1}$  and  $T(\mathcal{V}) = \mathcal{U}\mathcal{V}^2$ .

The author also showed how to naturally view the knot and link surgery formulas of Ozsváth-Szabó [OS08b] [OS11] and Manolescu-Ozsváth [MO10] as certain types of  $\mathcal{K}$ -modules. The author used the framework of type- $A$  and type- $D$  modules of Lipshitz, Ozsváth and Thurston [LOT18] [LOT15], and showed that to a knot  $K$  in a rational homology 3-sphere, the Ozsváth-Szabó mapping cone formula may naturally be viewed as either a type- $D$  module over  $\mathcal{K}$ , denoted  $\mathcal{X}_\lambda(Y, K)^\mathcal{K}$ , or a type- $A$  module over  $\mathcal{K}$ , denoted  ${}_\mathcal{K}\mathcal{X}_\lambda(Y, K)$ . Similarly, the link surgery formula of Manolescu-Ozsváth [MO10] may naturally be viewed as a type- $D$  module over the tensor product algebra  $\mathcal{K}^{\otimes \ell}$ , where  $\ell = |L|$ . The author also described how to change any number of the type- $D$  algebra outputs into type- $A$  algebra inputs by tensoring an algebraically defined module (see [Zem21, Section 6.5]), though we mostly focus on the type- $D$  perspective in this paper.

We describe the correspondence for the case of the knot surgery formula for a knot  $K \subseteq S^3$ . The type- $D$  module  $\mathcal{X}_n(K)^\mathcal{K}$  is defined as follows. Let  $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$  be a free  $\mathbb{F}[\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}]$ -basis of  $\mathcal{CFK}(K)$ . Then  $\mathcal{X}_n(K) \cdot \mathbf{I}_0$  is generated over  $\mathbb{F}$  by copies of the basis elements  $\mathbf{x}_1^0, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n^0$ , and similarly  $\mathcal{X}_n(K) \cdot \mathbf{I}_1$  is generated by elements  $\mathbf{x}_1^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n^1$ . The structure map

$$\delta^1: \mathcal{X}_n(K) \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_n(K) \otimes_{\mathbf{I}} \mathcal{K}$$

has three types of summands: those arising from  $\partial$ , those arising from  $v$ , and those arising from  $h_n$ , as follows. If  $\partial(\mathbf{x}_i)$  has a summand of  $\mathcal{U}^n \mathcal{V}^m \cdot \mathbf{y}_j$ , then  $\delta^1(\mathbf{x}_i^\varepsilon)$  has a summand of  $\mathbf{y}_j^\varepsilon \otimes \mathcal{U}^n \mathcal{V}^m$ , for  $\varepsilon \in \{0, 1\}$ . Also, each  $\delta^1(\mathbf{x}_i^0)$  has a summand of the form  $\mathbf{x}_i^1 \otimes \sigma$ . Finally, if  $h_n(\mathbf{x}_i)$  has a summand of  $\mathcal{U}^n \mathcal{V}^m \mathbf{y}_j$ , then  $\delta^1(\mathbf{x}_i^0)$  has a summand of  $\mathbf{y}_j^1 \otimes \mathcal{U}^n \mathcal{V}^m \cdot \tau$ . It is verified in [Zem21, Lemma 6.2] that  $\mathcal{X}_n(K)^\mathcal{K}$  is a type- $D$  module over  $\mathcal{K}$ .

**3.2. An asymmetry in link surgery formulas.** In this section, we describe a subtle asymmetry in the construction of the link surgery hypercube from [MO10]. The asymmetry appears in the construction of the descent maps in the surgery hypercube.

One picks a collection  $\mathbf{c} = \{c_1, \dots, c_\ell\}$  called a *good set of trajectories* [MO10, Definition 8.26]. A good set of trajectories consists of a collection of arcs  $c_i: [0, 1] \rightarrow \Sigma$  such that  $c_i(0) = w_i$  and  $c_i(1) = z_i$ , and such that pushing  $c_i$  into the alpha handlebody  $U_\alpha$  yields an arc which is isotopic relative to  $\{0, 1\}$  to a subarc of  $L$ . In order to satisfy this latter condition, it is sufficient to assume that  $c_i$  is disjoint from the alpha curves.

Symmetrically, we may alternatively assume that each  $c_i$  is disjoint from the beta curves. This implies that the push-off of  $c_i$  into the beta handlebody  $U_\beta$  is isotopic to a subarc of  $L$ .

We may combine these two perspectives, and consider the link surgery complex where  $\mathbf{c} = \{c_1, \dots, c_\ell\}$  is a collection of pairwise disjoint arcs on  $\Sigma$ , such that  $c_i$  connects  $w_i$  to  $z_i$ , and such that  $c_i$  is either disjoint from the alpha curves, or disjoint from the beta curves. The proof of the surgery formula carries through without change to show that the resulting hypercube computes  $\mathbf{CF}^-(S_\Lambda^3(L))$ .

To illustrate the asymmetry, and also illustrate why the arcs  $c_i$  must pass through only the alpha curves, or only the beta curves, we consider the notationally simpler setting of Ozsváth and Szabó's knot surgery formula [OS08b] (which is the same as Manolescu and Ozsváth's link surgery formula [MO10] when the link has one component). We recall several elements of the proof of the knot surgery formula. Let  $K \subseteq S^3$  be a knot, let  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $m \gg 0$ . and let  $W$  be the 2-handle cobordism from  $S_{n+m}^3(K)$  to  $S^3$ .

Ozsváth and Szabó identify  $\text{Spin}^c(S_{n+m}^3(K))$  with  $\mathbb{Z}/(n+m)$ . If  $(n+m)/2 \leq s < (n+m)/2$ , they write  $\mathfrak{r}_s$  and  $\mathfrak{h}_s$  for the two  $\text{Spin}^c$  structures on  $W$  with the largest square which restrict to  $[s] \in \text{Spin}^c(S_{n+m}^3(K))$ . See [OS08b, Lemma 4.4] for more details.

To construct their quasi-isomorphism, they built two hypercubes of chain complexes as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
CF^-(S_{n+m}^3(K), [s]) & \xrightarrow{F_{W, \mathfrak{r}_s}} & CF^-(S^3) \otimes T^s & CF^-(S_{n+m}^3(K), [s]) & \xrightarrow{F_{W, \mathfrak{h}_s}} & CF^-(S^3) \otimes T^{s+n} \\
\downarrow \Gamma_s & & \downarrow \cong & \downarrow \Gamma_s & \dashrightarrow & \downarrow \cong \\
A_s(K) & \xrightarrow{v_s} & B_s(K) & A_s(K) & \xrightarrow{h_s} & B_{s+n}(K)
\end{array} \tag{3.1}$$

In the above, we are viewing  $CF^-(S^3) \otimes T^s$  as being a summand of a complex which is isomorphic to  $CF^-(S^3) \otimes \mathbb{F}[\mathbb{Z}]$ , where  $T$  is the generator of  $\mathbb{F}[\mathbb{Z}]$ . Also,  $\Gamma_s$  is a holomorphic triangle counting map, which counts holomorphic triangles representing  $\mathfrak{r}_s$  on  $W$ . Also,  $A_s(K)$  denotes the subcomplex of  $\mathcal{CFK}(K)$  in Alexander grading  $s$ , and  $B_s(K)$  is the subcomplex of  $\mathcal{V}^{-1}\mathcal{CFK}(K)$  in Alexander grading  $s$ . The map  $v_s$  is inclusion of chain complexes, whereas  $h_s$  is more complicated, and is described below.

Because the vertical maps on the diagrams in Equation (3.1) coincide, we may add the maps of the two hypercubes together to obtain a morphism from

$$\text{Cone}(F_{W, \mathfrak{r}_s} + F_{W, \mathfrak{h}_s}: CF^-(S_{n+m}^3(K), [s]) \rightarrow CF^-(S^3) \otimes T^s \oplus CF^-(S^3) \otimes T^{s+n})$$

to

$$\text{Cone}(v_s + h_s: A_s(K) \rightarrow B_s(K) \oplus B_{s+n}(K)).$$

This morphism may be viewed as a fundamental building block of the quasi-isomorphism between  $CF^-(S_n^3(K))$  and Ozsváth and Szabó's mapping cone formula.

The alpha/beta labeling asymmetry arises when we consider these hypercubes on the level of Heegaard diagrams. Ozsváth and Szabó considered a Heegaard triple of the form  $(\Sigma, \alpha, \beta, \beta', w, z)$ , such that  $(\Sigma, \alpha, \beta, w, z)$  represented an unknot in  $S_{n+m}^3(K)$ , and  $(\Sigma, \alpha, \beta', w, z)$  was a doubly pointed diagram for  $(Y, K)$ . On the diagram  $(\Sigma, \alpha, \beta, w, z)$  the basepoints  $w$  and  $z$  are immediately adjacent to each other, whereas on  $(\Sigma, \alpha, \beta', w, z)$ , they are separated only by the curves  $\beta'$ . Let  $c$  be a path on  $\Sigma$  which connects  $w$  and  $z$  and avoids  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ .

To construct the hypercube for  $\eta_s$ , one considers the naturality map which pushes  $z$  to  $w$  along  $c$ . One builds and compresses the following hypercube:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 CF^-(\alpha, \beta, w, [s]) & \xrightarrow{F_{W, \eta_s; w}} & CF^-(\alpha, \beta', w) \otimes T^{s+n} & \xrightarrow{=} & CF^-(\alpha, \beta', w) \otimes T^{s+n} \\
 \downarrow \phi_{w \rightarrow z} & \searrow & \downarrow \mathfrak{F}_{w \rightarrow z} & \searrow & \downarrow = \\
 CF^-(\alpha, \beta, z, [s]) & \xrightarrow{F_{W, \mathfrak{t}_s; z}} & CF^-(\alpha, \beta', z) \otimes T^s & \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{F}_{z \rightarrow w}} & CF^-(\alpha, \beta', w) \otimes T^{s+n} \quad (3.2) \\
 \downarrow \Gamma_s & & \downarrow = & & \downarrow = \\
 A_s(\alpha, \beta', w, z) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{v}_s} & \tilde{B}_s(\alpha, \beta', w, z) & \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{F}_{z \rightarrow w}} & B_{s+n}(\alpha, \beta', w, z)
 \end{array}$$

In the above,  $\tilde{B}_s$  denotes the subcomplex of  $\mathcal{U}^{-1}CFK$  in Alexander grading  $s$ . Also, the map  $\phi_{w \rightarrow z}$  denotes the point pushing isomorphism (not changing any alpha or beta curves). The map  $\mathfrak{F}_{w \rightarrow z}$  denotes the map obtained by doing the point pushing isomorphism, followed by a sequence of beta-handleslides and isotopies, and also overall multiplication by  $T^{-n}$ . The map  $\mathfrak{F}_{z \rightarrow w}$  is similar, but moves the point in the opposite direction, and multiplies by  $T^n$ . The map  $\tilde{v}_s$  is inclusion of chain complexes.

As we mentioned earlier, to be able to combine the compression of the hypercube in Equation (3.2) with the one involving  $F_{W, \mathfrak{t}_s}$  in Equation (3.1), it is important that the maps along the left hand side of the diagram coincide. For this to be the case, we require the map  $\phi_{w \rightarrow z}: CF^-(\alpha, \beta, w, [s]) \rightarrow CF^-(\alpha, \beta, z, [s])$  to be the identity on the level of intersection points. This is ensured by requiring that  $c$  be disjoint from  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , i.e. only pass through  $\beta'$ . We call such a configuration a *beta labeled component*.

Symmetrically, one could consider the situation where the surgery formula was proven using a triple  $(\Sigma, \alpha', \alpha, \beta, w, z)$  and the arc  $c$  intersects only  $\alpha'$ . This configuration corresponds to an *alpha-labeled component*, in our present paper.

*Remark 3.1.* The asymmetry described above is reminiscent of bordered Heegaard Floer homology [LOT18]. Therein, each component of the boundary must be designated as being alpha-bordered or beta-bordered. On the level of Heegaard diagrams, this amounts to deciding whether the non-closed attaching arcs are beta arcs or alpha arcs. One may choose to always work with (say) alpha arcs, however sometimes the bordered modules are more natural algebraically if one works with alpha arcs on some boundary components and beta arcs on others. See, for example, [Zar10], [Aur10] or [LOT11].

**3.3. Pairing theorems.** Suppose that  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  are two links in  $S^3$ . The author gave several descriptions of the link surgery formula for  $L_1 \# L_2$  in terms of the link surgery formulas for  $L_1$  and  $L_2$ , which we refer to as *pairing theorems*. See [Zem21, Theorem 10.1] for the main statement, and [Zem21, Section 10.2] for alternate formulations.

The most important formulation of the pairing theorem for our purposes is via a tensor product formula. Write  $\mathcal{C}_{\Lambda_1}(L_1) = (\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon(L_1), d_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'})$  and  $\mathcal{C}_{\Lambda_2}(L_2) = (\mathcal{C}_\nu(L_2), \delta_{\nu, \nu'})$  for the link surgery formulas of links  $L_1$  and  $L_2$ , with integral framings  $\Lambda_1$  and  $\Lambda_2$ . Write  $K_1$  and  $K_2$  for the distinguished components of  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  (along which we take the connected sum). We assume that  $K_1$  and  $K_2$  have the same alpha/beta designation.

If  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ , write  $\mathcal{C}^i(L_1)$  for the codimension one subcube of  $\mathcal{C}_{\Lambda_1}(L_1)$  where the  $K_1$  component has index  $i$ . Define  $\mathcal{C}^i(L_2)$  similarly. We may view  $\mathcal{C}_{\Lambda_1}(L_1)$  as a mapping cone from  $\mathcal{C}^0(L_1)$  to  $\mathcal{C}^1(L_1)$  as follows:

$$\mathcal{C}_{\Lambda_1}(L_1) = \text{Cone}(\mathcal{C}^0(L_1) \xrightarrow{\phi_1^+ + \phi_1^-} \mathcal{C}^1(L_1)).$$

In the above, and  $\phi_1^+$  is the sum of the hypercube maps of  $\mathcal{C}_{\Lambda_1}(L_1)$  ranging over all oriented sublinks  $\vec{M}$  of  $L$  such that  $+K_1 \subseteq \vec{M}$ . Similarly  $\phi_1^-$  is the sum of the hypercube maps such that  $-K_1 \subseteq \vec{M}$ . Each  $\mathcal{C}^i(L_1)$  has an internal differential consisting of the sum of the hypercube maps for sublinks  $\vec{M}$  which do not contain  $\pm K_1$ . We may view  $\mathcal{C}_{\Lambda_2}(L_2)$  similarly as a mapping cone from  $\mathcal{C}^0(L_2)$  to  $\mathcal{C}^1(L_2)$ . The pairing theorem asserts

$$\mathcal{C}_{\Lambda_1 + \Lambda_2}(L_1 \# L_2) \cong \mathcal{C}^0(L_1) \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathcal{W}, \gamma]} \mathcal{C}^0(L_2) \xrightarrow{\phi_1^+ \otimes \phi_2^+ + \phi_1^- \otimes \phi_2^-} \mathcal{C}^1(L_1) \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathcal{W}, \gamma, \gamma^{-1}]} \mathcal{C}^1(L_2). \quad (3.3)$$

In Equation (3.3), the framing  $\Lambda_1 + \Lambda_2$  is obtained by summing the framing on  $K_1$  and  $K_2$ , and using the other framings on  $L_1$  and  $L_2$ . See [Zem21, Lemma 10.3]. Note also that in the above formula, the differential on  $\mathcal{C}^i(L_1) \otimes \mathcal{C}^i(L_2)$  is the ordinary differential on the tensor product of two chain complexes. Note that in [Zem21], the author considered only the case where all components were beta-labeled. The adaptation of the proof to the case where some components are alpha-labeled and some are beta-labeled is mostly an extension of notation, as long as we take the connected sum of components which have same alpha/beta labeling. (See [Zem21, Section 10.3 and Remark 9.15]).

In [Zem21], the author also described how to reinterpret the above formula in terms of Lipshitz-Ozsváth-Thurston's box-tensor product of type- $D$  and type- $A$  modules [LOT18] over the algebra  $\mathcal{K}$ . In this paper, we focus on the tensor product statement in Equation (3.3) to keep the algebra approachable. We refer the reader to [Zem21, Section 10] for more perspectives on the pairing theorem.

#### 4. THE HOPF LINK COMPLEX

In this paper, we work with the negative Hopf link, whose link Floer complex takes the form

$$\mathcal{CFL}(H) \cong \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{a} \leftarrow \mathcal{W}_2 - \mathbf{b} & & \\ \uparrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{V}_1 & & \mathcal{W}_1 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbf{c} - \mathcal{V}_2 \rightarrow \mathbf{d}. & & \end{array} \quad (4.1)$$

In this section, we compute the alpha-beta model of the Hopf link surgery complex (i.e. the link surgery complex where one component is alpha-labeled and the other is beta-labeled). We denote this complex as  $\overline{\mathcal{H}}_\Lambda^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}}$ . Additionally, we recall that there

was an additional module  $\mathbb{H}_\Lambda^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}}$  from [Zem21], which was obtained from  $\mathcal{H}_{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}}$  by omitting some of the higher length arrows in the hypercube. The structure maps of  $\mathcal{H}_\Lambda^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}}$  and  $\mathbb{H}_\Lambda^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}}$  are reviewed in Section 4.1.

The main result of this section is the following:

**Theorem 4.1.** *There is an equivalence of type- $D$  modules*

$$\overline{\mathcal{H}}_{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}} \simeq \mathbb{H}_{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}}.$$

*Remark 4.2.* *A-priori*, there are two possible link surgery complexes for alpha-beta labeled Hopf link, depending on which component is alpha-labeled, and which is beta-labeled. As will be apparent in the proof, the corresponding type- $D$  modules are both  $\overline{\mathcal{H}}_\Lambda^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}}$ , so we do not distinguish them.

**4.1. The beta-beta model of the Hopf link.** In [Zem21, Proposition 12.1], the author computed the hypercube structure maps for the beta-beta labeled Hopf link. The maps are summarized as follows:

**Proposition 4.3.** *Suppose that  $\Lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$  is an integral framing on the Hopf link. The hypercube maps of the beta-beta labeled negative Hopf link complex are determined up to overall homotopy equivalence by the following formulas:*

- (1) *The map  $\Phi^{L_1}$  is the canonical inclusion of localization. The map  $\Phi^{-L_1}$  is given by the following formula:*

$$\Phi^{-L_1} = \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{a} \longmapsto \mathcal{V}_1^{\lambda_1-1} \mathbf{d} \\ \mathbf{b} \longmapsto 0 \\ \mathbf{c} \longmapsto \mathcal{V}_1^{\lambda_1+1} \mathbf{b} + \mathcal{V}_1^{\lambda_1} \mathcal{U}_2 \mathbf{c} \\ \mathbf{d} \longmapsto \mathcal{V}_1^{\lambda_1} \mathcal{U}_2 \mathbf{d}. \end{array}$$

- (2) *The maps  $\Phi^{L_2}$  is the canonical inclusion of localization, and  $\Phi^{-L_2}$  is given by the following formula:*

$$\Phi^{-L_2} = \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{a} \longmapsto \mathcal{U}_1 \mathcal{V}_2^{\lambda_2} \mathbf{a} \\ \mathbf{b} \longmapsto 0 \\ \mathbf{c} \longmapsto \mathcal{V}_2^{\lambda_2+1} \mathbf{b} + \mathcal{U}_1 \mathcal{V}_2^{\lambda_2} \mathbf{c} \\ \mathbf{d} \longmapsto \mathcal{V}_2^{\lambda_2-1} \mathbf{a}. \end{array}$$

- (3) *The length 2 map  $\Phi^{-L_1 \cup -L_2}$  is given by the following formula:*

$$\Phi^{-L_1 \cup -L_2} = \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{a} \longmapsto \mathcal{V}_1^{\lambda_1-2} \mathcal{V}_2^{\lambda_2-1} \mathbf{c} \\ \mathbf{b} \longmapsto 0 \\ \mathbf{c} \longmapsto \mathcal{V}_1^{\lambda_1-1} \mathcal{V}_2^{\lambda_2} \mathbf{d} \\ \mathbf{d} \longmapsto \mathcal{V}_1^{\lambda_1-1} \mathcal{V}_2^{\lambda_2-2} \mathbf{c}. \end{array}$$

*The length 2 maps for other orientations of the Hopf link vanish.*

The above formulas are stated only for the values of the maps on the generators  $\mathbf{a}$ ,  $\mathbf{b}$ ,  $\mathbf{c}$  and  $\mathbf{d}$ . Values on the rest of the complex are determined by the equivariance properties of the maps proven in [Zem21, Lemma 5.9]. The above data is algebraically equivalent to the type- $D$  module  $\mathcal{H}_{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}}$ . See [Zem21, Section 6.5].

In [Zem21], the author considered only the case that  $\lambda_2 = 0$ , though the general case is just a modification of notation.

Following the notation of [Zem21], we will write  $\mathbb{H}_{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}}$  for the bimodule obtained by dropping the term  $\mathbf{c} \mapsto \psi_1^{\lambda_1 - 1} \psi_2^{\lambda_2} \mathbf{d}$  from  $\Phi^{-L_1 \cup -L_2}$ . In [Zem21], the author showed this complex is related to lattice homology in a natural way. See [Zem21, Theorem 1.12].

**4.2. The alpha-beta model of the Hopf link.** In this Section, we prove Theorem 4.1, which states  $\overline{\mathcal{H}}_{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}} \simeq \mathbb{H}_{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}}$ .

We begin by considering the length 1 maps of the Hopf link complex  $\overline{\mathcal{H}}_{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}}$ . In [Zem21, Proposition 11.1], the author computed the length 1 maps for  $\mathcal{H}_{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}}$  by observing that they were uniquely determined uniquely by their grading and algebraic equivariance properties. (In fact, these maps are determined uniquely, not just up to chain homotopy). Since the length 1 maps of  $\overline{\mathcal{H}}_{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}}$  have the same constraints, we conclude that the length 1 maps of  $\overline{\mathcal{H}}_{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}}$  coincide with those of  $\mathbb{H}_{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}}$  and  $\mathcal{H}_{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}}$ .

We now consider the length 2 map of  $\overline{\mathcal{H}}_{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}}$ , which is the most interesting portion of the hypercube in our present setting.

We begin by normalizing some conventions. We assume that the arc  $c_1$  from  $z_1$  to  $w_1$  goes through no beta curves, and the arc  $c_2$  from  $z_2$  to  $w_2$  goes through no alpha curves.

We now consider the interaction of the surgery hypercube  $\overline{\mathcal{H}}_{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}}$  with the relative homology action of [Zem15, Section 5] (compare [Ni14]), which we recall presently. If  $(\Sigma, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{w})$  is a multi-pointed Heegaard diagram and  $\lambda$  is an arc which connects two basepoints  $w_1, w_2 \in \mathbf{w}$ , there is degree  $-1$  endomorphism

$$A_\lambda: CF^-(\Sigma, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{w}) \rightarrow CF^-(\Sigma, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{w})$$

which satisfies  $[A_\lambda, \partial] = (U_1 + U_2) \cdot \text{id}$ . See [Zem15, Lemma 5.1]. The map  $A_\lambda$  is defined by counting Maslov index 1 holomorphic disks which are weighted by the quantity  $\#(\partial_\alpha \mathcal{D}(\phi) \cap \lambda)$ . Here,  $\partial_\alpha \mathcal{D}(\phi)$  denotes the subset of the boundary of the domain of a class of disks  $\phi$  which lies in the curves  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ .

**Lemma 4.4.** *Consider the surgery hypercube  $\overline{\mathcal{H}}_\Lambda^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}}$  for the alpha-beta labeled negative Hopf link. Write  $\mathcal{C}$  for the link Floer complex of the negative Hopf link. There is a*





FIGURE 4.1. A planar diagram for the Hopf link (left) and a genus 2 stabilization (right). The arc  $c_1$  (not shown) is the shortest path from  $z_1$  to  $w_1$  on the right hand side. Similarly,  $c_2$  is the shortest path from  $z_2$  to  $w_2$ .

diagram with the following form:



Furthermore, the following are satisfied:

- (1)  $\tilde{\Phi}^{-L_i}$  and  $\tilde{\Phi}^{-L_1 \cup -L_2}$  are the maps on quotients induced by the structure maps of the surgery complex  $\overline{\mathcal{H}}_{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}}$ .
- (2) If we view the diagram as determining a morphism  $G$  from the back face to the front face, then

$$\partial_{\text{Mor}}(G) = (\mathcal{U}_1 \mathcal{V}_1 + \mathcal{U}_2 \mathcal{V}_2) \cdot \text{id},$$

where  $\text{id}$  denotes the identity morphism of hypercubes.

- (3) If  $F$  is a map which is  $\mathbb{F}[\mathcal{U}_1, \mathcal{V}_1]$ -equivariant, we write  $D_1(F)$  for the map  $\mathcal{U}_1 \partial_{\mathcal{U}_1}(F) + \mathcal{V}_1 \partial_{\mathcal{V}_1}(F)$ . (As an example, when  $F = \partial$ , the map  $D_1(\partial)$  is  $\mathcal{U}_1 \Phi_{\mathcal{U}_1} + \mathcal{V}_1 \Psi_{\mathcal{V}_1}$ , where  $\Phi_{\mathcal{U}_1}$  and  $\Psi_{\mathcal{V}_1}$  are the basepoint actions on  $\mathcal{C}$ ).
- (4) The map  $A_\lambda$  is the relative homology map for the path  $\lambda$  shown in Figure 4.1.
- (5) The maps labeled  $h_\lambda^{-L_1}$  are induced by a single map

$$h_\lambda^{-L_1} : \mathcal{C}/(\mathcal{U}_1 - 1) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}/(\mathcal{V}_1 - 1),$$

and similarly for  $h_\lambda^{-L_2}$ .

*Proof.* The front and back face of the above cube are constructed as part of the surgery complex  $\overline{\mathcal{H}}_{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}}$ , as we now describe.

We let  $\phi_1 : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$  denote a diffeomorphism which pushes  $z_1$  to  $w_1$  along the shortest path in Figure 4.1, and is the identity outside of a small neighborhood of this arc. We let  $\phi_2$  be a similar diffeomorphism which pushes  $z_2$  to  $w_2$ . Let  $(\Sigma, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z})$  be the Heegaard diagram shown on the right side of Figure 4.1.

We pick a 1-dimensional hyperbox of alpha attaching curves  $\mathcal{L}_\alpha$  whose initial alpha curves are  $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \mathbf{z})$ , and whose final set is  $(\phi_1^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}), \mathbf{z})$ . (See [MO10, Definition 8.4] for the definition of a hyperbox of attaching curves in slightly different notation, or [HHSZ20, Section 5.5] for notation that is more similar to our present setting). Similarly we pick a 1-dimensional hyperbox of beta attaching curves  $\mathcal{L}_\beta$  whose initial beta curves are  $(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{z})$  and whose final set is  $(\phi_2^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}), \mathbf{z})$ . To get the back face of the diagram in the statement, we pair these two hypercubes of attaching curves together (see [HHSZ20, Section 5.6] for pairing hypercubes of attaching curves), compress, and then compose with the tautological diffeomorphism maps  $(\phi_i)_*$  as in the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
CF^-(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, z_1, z_2) & \longrightarrow & CF^-(\phi_1^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}), \boldsymbol{\beta}, z_1, z_2) & \xrightarrow{(\phi_1)_*} & CF^-(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, w_1, z_2) \\
\downarrow & \searrow \text{dashed} & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
CF^-(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \phi_2^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}), z_1, z_2) & \rightarrow & CF^-(\phi_1^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}), \phi_2^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}), z_1, z_2) & \xrightarrow{(\phi_1)_*} & CF^-(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \phi_2^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}), w_1, z_2) \\
\downarrow (\phi_2)_* & & \downarrow (\phi_2)_* & & \downarrow (\phi_2)_* \\
CF^-(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, z_1, w_2) & \longrightarrow & CF^-(\phi_1^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}), \boldsymbol{\beta}, z_1, w_2) & \xrightarrow{(\phi_1)_*} & CF^-(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, w_1, w_2)
\end{array} \tag{4.2}$$

The unlabeled arrows are sums of compositions of holomorphic polygon counts (according to the compression operation).

Formally, we may view  $\lambda$  as morphism between two alpha Lagrangians, and extend the hypercube  $\mathcal{L}_\alpha$  to a generalized hypercube

$$\mathcal{L}_\alpha^\lambda = \text{Cone}(\mathcal{L}_\alpha \longrightarrow \mathcal{L}_\alpha)$$

The construction of the cube  $\mathcal{L}_\alpha^\lambda$  is described in greater generality in [HHSZ21b, Section 6.2], though we describe the construction presently for the reader. We focus on the case that  $\mathcal{L}_\alpha = \text{Cone}(\alpha \xrightarrow{\Theta_{\alpha',\alpha}} \alpha')$  where  $\alpha$  and  $\alpha'$  are related by a sequence of handleslides and isotopies, and  $\Theta_{\alpha',\alpha}$  is a cycle which represents the top degree generator of homology. In this case, the diagram  $\mathcal{L}_\alpha^\lambda$  takes the form:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \alpha & \xrightarrow{\Theta_{\alpha',\alpha}} & \alpha' \\
 \downarrow \lambda & \searrow \eta & \downarrow \lambda \\
 \alpha & \xrightarrow{\Theta_{\alpha',\alpha}} & \alpha'
 \end{array}$$

In the above diagram,  $\eta$  is any chain which is of homogeneous grading one higher than  $\Theta_{\alpha',\alpha}$  such that

$$A_\lambda(\Theta_{\alpha',\alpha}) + A'_\lambda(\Theta_{\alpha',\alpha}) = \partial\eta.$$

In the above,  $A_\lambda$  counts holomorphic disks of index 1 weighted by  $\#(\partial_\alpha \mathcal{D}(\phi) \cap \lambda)$  whereas  $A'_\lambda$  counts such disks weighted by  $\#(\partial_{\alpha'} \mathcal{D}(\phi) \cap \lambda)$ . The existence of such an  $\eta$  is verified in the proof of [Zem15, Lemma 5.10]. For a 1-dimensional hyperbox  $\mathcal{L}_\alpha$  of size greater than 1 where each morphism is a top degree cycle, we construct  $\mathcal{L}_\alpha^\lambda$  by performing the above argument to each constituent morphism.

We may formally pair the diagrams  $\mathcal{L}_\alpha^\lambda$  and  $\mathcal{L}_\beta$ . The construction of the paired hyperbox is essentially the same as the case without formal  $\lambda$  morphisms (cf. [MO10, Section 8.10], or [HHSZ20, Section 5.6]), and is described in greater detail in [HHSZ21b, Section 6.2]. The paired complex counts holomorphic polygons corresponding to a sequence of inputs which have sequences of inputs from  $\mathcal{L}_\alpha^\lambda$  and  $\mathcal{L}_\beta$ . The difference from the ordinary pairing construction is that if  $\lambda: \alpha_i \rightarrow \alpha_i$  is an input, we count holomorphic polygons as if  $\alpha_i$  appeared only once in the sequence, but we weight curves by  $\#(\partial_{\alpha_i} \mathcal{D}(\psi) \cap \lambda)$ . This extends the top left sub-cube of Equation (4.2) out of the page. This hypercube may be tautologically extended over the diffeomorphism maps  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$ . In doing so, however, we are forced to change the arc  $\lambda$  in several places. Write  $\lambda_1$ ,  $\lambda_2$  and  $\lambda_{1,2}$  for the images of  $\lambda$  under  $\phi_1$ ,  $\phi_2$  and  $\phi_1 \circ \phi_2$ , respectively.

We obtain a diagram of the following form:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\mathcal{C}/(\mathcal{U}_1 - 1, \mathcal{U}_2 - 1) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\Phi}^{-L_1}} & \mathcal{C}/(\mathcal{V}_1 - 1, \mathcal{U}_2 - 1) & & \\
\downarrow \tilde{\Phi}^{-L_2} & \searrow A_\lambda & \downarrow \tilde{\Phi}^{-L_1} & \searrow A_{\lambda_1} & \\
\mathcal{C}/(\mathcal{U}_1 - 1, \mathcal{U}_2 - 1) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\Phi}^{-L_1}} & \mathcal{C}/(\mathcal{V}_1 - 1, \mathcal{U}_2 - 1) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\Phi}^{-L_1}} & \mathcal{C}/(\mathcal{V}_1 - 1, \mathcal{U}_2 - 1) \\
\downarrow \tilde{\Phi}^{-L_2} & \searrow A_\lambda & \downarrow \tilde{\Phi}^{-L_1} & \searrow A_{\lambda_1} & \\
\mathcal{C}/(\mathcal{U}_1 - 1, \mathcal{V}_2 - 1) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\Phi}^{-L_1}} & \mathcal{C}/(\mathcal{V}_1 - 1, \mathcal{V}_2 - 1) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\Phi}^{-L_1}} & \mathcal{C}/(\mathcal{V}_1 - 1, \mathcal{V}_2 - 1) \\
\downarrow \tilde{\Phi}^{-L_2} & \searrow A_{\lambda_2} & \downarrow \tilde{\Phi}^{-L_1} & \searrow A_{\lambda_{12}} & \\
\mathcal{C}/(\mathcal{U}_1 - 1, \mathcal{V}_2 - 1) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\Phi}^{-L_1}} & \mathcal{C}/(\mathcal{V}_1 - 1, \mathcal{V}_2 - 1) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\Phi}^{-L_1}} & \mathcal{C}/(\mathcal{V}_1 - 1, \mathcal{V}_2 - 1)
\end{array}$$

$\tilde{\Phi}^{-L_1 \cup -L_2}$  (vertical arrows between middle and bottom rows)  
 $h_\lambda^{-L_2}$  (dashed arrows from top-left to middle-left)  
 $h_\lambda^{-L_1}$  (dashed arrows from top-left to middle-middle)  
 $h_{\lambda_1}^{-L_2}$  (dashed arrows from top-right to middle-right)  
 $h_{\lambda_1}^{-L_1}$  (dashed arrows from top-right to middle-middle)  
 $h_{\lambda_2}^{-L_1}$  (dashed arrows from middle-left to bottom-left)  
 $h_{\lambda_{12}}^{-L_1}$  (dashed arrows from middle-middle to bottom-middle)  
 $h_{\lambda_2}^{-L_2}$  (dashed arrows from middle-right to bottom-right)  
 $h_{\lambda_{12}}^{-L_2}$  (dashed arrows from middle-middle to bottom-right)  
 $\omega$  (dotted arrow from middle-middle to bottom-middle)

This is not identical to the diagram in the statement. To prove the claim in the statement, we must relate the different  $A_{\lambda_i}$ , and also the different homotopies on opposite faces.

We note that the arc  $\lambda_2$  is obtained by concatenating  $\lambda$  with the short arc connecting  $z_2$  to  $w_2$ . Note that this short arc does not intersect any alpha curves. Hence

$$A_{\lambda_2} = A_\lambda \quad \text{and} \quad A_{\lambda_{12}} = A_{\lambda_1},$$

since the maps count the same holomorphic curves with the same weights. On the other hand, the arc  $\lambda_1$  is obtained from  $\lambda$  by concatenating a small arc which only intersects the alpha curves. In particular if  $\phi$  is a class of disks, then

$$\#(\partial_\alpha \mathcal{D}(\phi) \cap \lambda_1) \equiv \#(\partial_\alpha \mathcal{D}(\phi) \cap \lambda) + n_{z_1}(\phi) + n_{w_1}(\phi).$$

The effect on the level of maps is that

$$A_{\lambda_1} = A_\lambda + \mathcal{U}_1 \Phi_{\mathcal{U}_1} + \mathcal{V}_1 \Psi_{\mathcal{V}_1} \quad \text{and} \quad A_{\lambda_{12}} = A_{\lambda_2} + \mathcal{U}_1 \Phi_{\mathcal{U}_1} + \mathcal{V}_1 \Psi_{\mathcal{V}_1}$$

on  $\mathcal{C}$ . This yields the statement for the length 1 morphisms.

It remains to consider the length 2 morphisms. The argument is similar, as we now describe. We consider first the left and right sides of the hypercube. Both of these maps are induced by maps from  $\mathcal{C}/(\mathcal{U}_2 - 1)$  to  $\mathcal{C}/(\mathcal{V}_2 - 1)$ , since  $w_1$  and  $z_1$  are not moved along this face. The diagonal maps involve counting holomorphic triangles which are weighted by either  $\#(\partial_\alpha \mathcal{D}(\psi) \cap \lambda)$  (for the left hand side) or  $\#(\partial_\alpha \mathcal{D}(\psi) \cap \lambda_1)$  (right the right hand side).

Similar to the length 1 maps, we claim that the difference between  $h_\lambda^{-L_2}$  and  $h_{\lambda_1}^{-L_2}$  is

$$(\mathcal{U}_1 \partial_{\mathcal{U}_1} + \mathcal{V}_1 \partial_{\mathcal{V}_1})(\tilde{\Phi}^{-L_2})$$

where we view  $\tilde{\Phi}^{-L_2}$  as a map from  $\mathcal{C}/(\mathcal{U}_2 - 1)$  to  $\mathcal{C}/(\mathcal{V}_2 - 1)$ . To see this, we recall that  $\tilde{\Phi}^{-L_2}$  is defined as a sequence of holomorphic triangle maps  $f_n \circ \dots \circ f_1$ , followed

by a point-pushing diffeomorphism map which moves  $z_2$  to  $w_2$ . Each of these holomorphic triangle maps is on a triple of the form  $(\Sigma, \alpha, \beta_i, \beta_{i+1})$ . For each  $f_i$ , there is a corresponding holomorphic triangle map  $f_i^\lambda$  which weights the count of a holomorphic triangle representing a class  $\psi$  by the quantity  $\#(\partial_\alpha \mathcal{D}(\psi) \cap \lambda)$ . The homotopy  $h_\lambda^{-L_2}$ , being obtained as the compression of a hypercube, is defined to satisfy the formula

$$h_\lambda^{-L_2} = \sum_{i=1}^n f_n \circ \cdots \circ f_i^\lambda \circ \cdots \circ f_1.$$

The map  $h_{\lambda_1}^{-L_2}$  is similar, except it uses the maps  $f_i^{\lambda_1}$  instead of  $f_i^\lambda$ . Since  $\lambda_1$  is obtained by concatenating  $\lambda$  with an arc which intersects only  $\alpha$ , the difference between the two homotopies is

$$\sum_{i=1}^n f_n \circ \cdots \circ f_i^{n_{w_1} + n_{z_1}} \circ \cdots \circ f_1$$

where  $f_i^{n_{w_1} + n_{z_1}}$  counts holomorphic triangles weighted by  $n_{w_1}(\psi) + n_{z_1}(\psi)$ . The Leibniz rule allows us to apply  $\partial_{\mathcal{W}_1}$  and  $\partial_{\mathcal{Y}_1}$  to the composition  $f_n \circ \cdots \circ f_1$ . The stated formula now follows.

Finally, we consider the difference between the top face of the hypercube and the bottom. Here, we view both as being induced by maps from  $\mathcal{C}/(\mathcal{W}_1 - 1)$  to  $\mathcal{C}/(\mathcal{Y}_1 - 1)$  since we are not moving the basepoints  $w_2$  or  $z_2$  on these faces. In the corresponding diagonal map of this hypercube, there is a contribution of triangle counts which are weighted by a quantity  $\#(\partial_{\alpha_i} \mathcal{D}(\psi) \cap \lambda)$ . Since  $\lambda_2$  is obtained by concatenating  $\lambda$  with a small arc which connects  $w_2$  to  $z_2$ , which is disjoint from all of the  $\alpha_i$ , we conclude that  $\#(\partial_{\alpha_i} \mathcal{D}(\psi) \cap \lambda) = \#(\partial_{\alpha_i} \mathcal{D}(\psi) \cap \lambda_2)$  so the maps are identical on the two faces.

From here, the remaining claims in the lemma are straightforward to verify.  $\square$

We now use Lemma 4.4 to prove Theorem 4.1:

*Proof of Theorem 4.1.* The strategy is the same as the computation of  $\mathcal{H}_{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}}$  from [Zem21, Section 11.1]. Therein, it is shown that up to homotopy, there are exactly two algebraically admissible choices for the length 2 map in the surgery hypercube for  $\mathcal{H}$ . These are the maps

$$H_{\mathbb{H}} := \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{a} \longmapsto \mathbf{c} \\ \mathbf{b} \longmapsto 0 \\ \mathbf{c} \longmapsto 0 \\ \mathbf{d} \longmapsto \mathbf{c}, \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad H_{\mathcal{H}} := \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{a} \longmapsto \mathbf{c} \\ \mathbf{b} \longmapsto 0 \\ \mathbf{c} \longmapsto \mathbf{d} \\ \mathbf{d} \longmapsto \mathbf{c}, \end{array} \quad (4.3)$$

As the notation suggests,  $H_{\mathcal{H}}$  is the map for  $\mathcal{H}_{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}}$  and  $H_{\mathbb{H}}$  is the map for  $\mathbb{H}_{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}}$ . The proof in [Zem21] that  $H_{\mathcal{H}}$  is the homotopy for  $\mathcal{H}$  proceeded by constructing a hypercube similar to the one in Lemma 4.4, for which  $H_{\mathcal{H}}$  gave satisfiable hypercube relations, whereas  $H_{\mathbb{H}}$  did not. In our present setting, we will show that the hypercube appearing in Lemma 4.4 is satisfiable for  $H_{\mathbb{H}}$ , but not for  $H_{\mathcal{H}}$ .

We begin by computing the map  $A_\lambda$ . The holomorphic disks on the two diagrams in Figure 4.1 are in bijection, and the map  $A_\lambda$  may be computed by counting bigons on

the left diagram to be

$$A_\lambda = \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{a} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{V}_2} & \mathbf{b} \\ \mathcal{U}_1 \downarrow & & \uparrow \mathcal{V}_1 \\ \mathbf{c} & \xrightarrow[\mathcal{U}_2]{\mathcal{V}_2} & \mathbf{d} \end{array} = \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{a} & \longmapsto & \mathcal{V}_2 \mathbf{b} + \mathcal{U}_1 \mathbf{c} \\ \mathbf{b} & \longmapsto & 0 \\ \mathbf{c} & \longmapsto & \mathcal{V}_2 \mathbf{d} \\ \mathbf{d} & \longmapsto & \mathcal{U}_2 \mathbf{c} + \mathcal{V}_1 \mathbf{b} \end{array}$$

(In [Zem21, Section 11], this map is called  $A_p$ , where  $p$  is the unique intersection point of  $\alpha$  and  $\lambda$ ).

We now consider the homotopy labeled  $h_\lambda^{-L_1}$ , appearing along the top and bottom of the cube. One may compute directly that

$$[A_\lambda, \tilde{\Phi}^{-L_1}] + D_1(\partial) \circ \tilde{\Phi}^{-L_1} = \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{a} & \longmapsto & 0 \\ \mathbf{b} & \longmapsto & 0 \\ \mathbf{c} & \longmapsto & \mathcal{U}_1 \mathbf{d} + \mathcal{U}_2 \mathbf{a} \\ \mathbf{d} & \longmapsto & 0. \end{array}$$

A null-homotopy of the above map is the map

$$j_\lambda^{-L_1} = \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{a} & \longmapsto & 0 \\ \mathbf{b} & \longmapsto & 0 \\ \mathbf{c} & \longmapsto & \mathbf{b} \\ \mathbf{d} & \longmapsto & 0. \end{array}$$

We recall that in [Zem21, Section 11], it is observed that  $\tilde{\Phi}^{-L_1}$  is the only non-zero chain from  $\mathcal{C}/(\mathcal{U}_1 - 1)$  to  $\mathcal{C}/(\mathcal{V}_1 - 1)$  which is  $\mathbb{F}[\mathcal{U}_2, \mathcal{V}_2]$  equivariant and sends  $\mathcal{V}_1$  to  $\mathcal{U}_1$ , and has the correct grading. Hence, the map  $h_\lambda^{-L_1}$  must satisfy

$$h_\lambda^{-L_1} = j_\lambda^{-L_1} + t \cdot \tilde{\Phi}^{-L_1}$$

for  $t \in \mathbb{F}$ .

Next, one computes that

$$[A_\lambda, \tilde{\Phi}^{-L_2}] = \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{a} & \longmapsto & 0 \\ \mathbf{b} & \longmapsto & 0 \\ \mathbf{c} & \longmapsto & \mathcal{U}_1 \mathbf{d} + \mathcal{U}_2 \mathbf{a} \\ \mathbf{d} & \longmapsto & 0 \end{array}$$

Hence, we may take  $h_\lambda^{-L_2} = s \cdot \tilde{\Phi}^{-L_2} + (\mathbf{c} \mapsto \mathbf{b})$  for some  $s \in \mathbb{F}$ .

Next, we claim that the satisfiability of the hypercube in Lemma 4.4 is independent of the choice of  $s$  and  $t$ . This is because changing  $s$  has the effect on the length 3 relation of adding  $[\tilde{\Phi}^{-L_1}, \tilde{\Phi}^{-L_2}]$ , which is easily checked to be null-homotopic. In particular, changing  $s$  does not affect whether the length 3 relation is satisfiable. The same comment holds for changing  $t$ . Hence, we may set  $s = t = 0$  without any loss of generality.

We now compute the sum of the terms in the length 3 relation of the hypercube, using the map  $H_{\mathbb{H}}$ . This is the chain

$$C_{\mathbb{H}} = [A_\lambda, H_{\mathbb{H}}] + D_1(\partial) \circ H_{\mathbb{H}} + [\tilde{\Phi}^{-L_1}, h_\lambda^{-L_2}] + [\tilde{\Phi}^{-L_2}, h_\lambda^{-L_1}] + D_1(\tilde{\Phi}^{-L_2}) \circ \tilde{\Phi}^{-L_1}.$$

We compute the above terms individually:

$$[H_{\mathbb{H}}, A_\lambda] = \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{a} \mapsto \mathbf{d} \\ \mathbf{b} \mapsto 0 \\ \mathbf{c} \mapsto \mathcal{U}_2 \mathbf{c} \\ \mathbf{d} \mapsto \mathbf{d}. \end{array}, \quad [\tilde{\Phi}^{-L_2}, h_\lambda^{-L_1}] = \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{a} \mapsto 0 \\ \mathbf{b} \mapsto 0 \\ \mathbf{c} \mapsto \mathbf{b} \\ \mathbf{d} \mapsto 0 \end{array}, \quad [\tilde{\Phi}^{-L_1}, h_\lambda^{-L_2}] = \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{a} \mapsto 0 \\ \mathbf{b} \mapsto 0 \\ \mathbf{c} \mapsto \mathbf{b} \\ \mathbf{d} \mapsto 0 \end{array}$$

$$D_1(\tilde{\Phi}^{-L_2}) \circ \tilde{\Phi}^{-L_1} = \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{a} \longmapsto 0 \\ \mathbf{b} \longmapsto 0 \\ \mathbf{c} \longmapsto \mathcal{U}_1 \mathbf{c} \\ \mathbf{d} \longmapsto 0 \end{array} \quad D_1(\partial) \circ H_{\mathbb{H}} = \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{a} \longmapsto \mathbf{a} \\ \mathbf{b} \longmapsto 0 \\ \mathbf{c} \longmapsto 0 \\ \mathbf{d} \longmapsto \mathbf{a} \end{array}$$

Summing, we obtain the formula

$$C_{\mathbb{H}} = \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{a} \longmapsto \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{d} \\ \mathbf{b} \longmapsto 0 \\ \mathbf{c} \longmapsto (\mathcal{U}_1 + \mathcal{U}_2) \mathbf{c} \\ \mathbf{d} \longmapsto \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{d} \end{array}$$

The map  $C_{\mathbb{H}}$  is null-homotopic, and a null-homotopy may be taken to be

$$\omega = \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{a} \longmapsto \mathbf{c} \\ \mathbf{b} \longmapsto 0 \\ \mathbf{c} \longmapsto 0 \\ \mathbf{d} \longmapsto \mathbf{c}. \end{array}$$

Hence, the hypercube in Lemma 4.4 is satisfiable with  $H_{\mathbb{H}}$ .

On the other hand, if we replace  $H_{\mathbb{H}}$  with  $H_{\mathcal{H}}$ , then the sum of the length 3-relations becomes

$$C_{\mathcal{H}} = \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{a} \longmapsto \mathbf{d} \\ \mathbf{b} \longmapsto 0 \\ \mathbf{c} \longmapsto \mathbf{b} + \mathcal{U}_1 \mathbf{c} \\ \mathbf{d} \longmapsto \mathbf{d} \end{array},$$

which is not null-homotopic, so the hypercube in Lemma 4.4 is not satisfiable with  $\tilde{\Phi}^{-L_1 \cup -L_2} = H_{\mathcal{H}}$ . Hence,  $\tilde{\Phi}^{-L_1 \cup -L_2} = H_{\mathbb{H}}$ , completing the proof.  $\square$

## 5. COMPLETING THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

In this section, we describe the proof of Theorem 1.1.

**5.1. Homological perturbation lemma for hypercubes.** In this section, we review a version of the homological perturbation lemma for hypercubes. This lemma is similar to work of Huebschmann-Kadeishvili [HK91]. A proof may be found in [HHSZ21a] using our present notation. See [Liu14, Section 5.6] for a similar though slightly less explicit result for transferring hypercube structure maps along homotopy equivalences.

**Lemma 5.1.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{C} = (C_\varepsilon, D_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'})$  is a hypercube of chain complexes, and  $(Z_\varepsilon, \delta_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon \in \{0,1\}^n}$  is a collection of chain complexes. Furthermore, suppose there are maps*

$$\pi_\varepsilon: C_\varepsilon \rightarrow Z_\varepsilon \quad i_\varepsilon: Z_\varepsilon \rightarrow C_\varepsilon \quad h_\varepsilon: C_\varepsilon \rightarrow C_\varepsilon,$$

*satisfying*

$$\pi_\varepsilon \circ i_\varepsilon = \text{id}, \quad i_\varepsilon \circ \pi_\varepsilon = \text{id} + [\partial, h_\varepsilon], \quad h_\varepsilon \circ h_\varepsilon = 0, \quad \pi_\varepsilon \circ h_\varepsilon = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad h_\varepsilon \circ i_\varepsilon = 0$$

*and such that  $\pi_\varepsilon$  and  $i_\varepsilon$  are chain maps. With the above data chosen, there are canonical hypercube structure maps  $\delta_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'}: Z_\varepsilon \rightarrow Z_{\varepsilon'}$  so that  $\mathcal{Z} = (Z_\varepsilon, \delta_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'})$  is a hypercube of chain complexes, and also there are morphisms of hypercubes*

$$\Pi: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}, \quad I: \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{C} \quad \text{and} \quad H: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$$

*such that*

$$\Pi \circ I = \text{id} \quad \text{and} \quad I \circ \Pi = \text{id} + \partial_{\text{Mor}}(H)$$

*and such that  $I$  and  $\Pi$  are chain maps.*

The structure maps  $\delta_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'}$  and the morphisms  $\Pi$  and  $I$  have a concrete formula. We begin with  $\delta_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'}$ . Suppose that  $\varepsilon < \varepsilon'$  are points in  $\{0,1\}^n$ . The hypercube structure maps  $\delta_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'}$  are given by the following formula:

$$\delta_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'} := \sum_{\varepsilon = \varepsilon_1 < \dots < \varepsilon_j = \varepsilon'} \pi_{\varepsilon'} \circ D_{\varepsilon_{j-1}, \varepsilon_j} \circ h_{\varepsilon_{j-1}} \circ D_{\varepsilon_{j-2}, \varepsilon_{j-1}} \circ \dots \circ h_{\varepsilon_2} \circ D_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2} \circ i_\varepsilon.$$

The component of the map  $I$  sending coordinate  $\varepsilon$  to coordinate  $\varepsilon'$  is given via the formula

$$I_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'} := \sum_{\varepsilon = \varepsilon_1 < \dots < \varepsilon_j = \varepsilon'} h_{\varepsilon_j} \circ D_{\varepsilon_{j-1}, \varepsilon_j} \circ \dots \circ h_{\varepsilon_2} \circ D_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2} \circ i_\varepsilon.$$

Similarly,  $\Pi$  is given by the formula

$$\Pi_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'} := \sum_{\varepsilon = \varepsilon_1 < \dots < \varepsilon_j = \varepsilon'} \pi_{\varepsilon'} \circ D_{\varepsilon_{j-1}, \varepsilon_j} \circ h_{\varepsilon_{j-1}} \circ D_{\varepsilon_{j-2}, \varepsilon_{j-1}} \circ \dots \circ D_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2} \circ h_{\varepsilon_1}.$$

**5.2. Completion of the proof of Theorem 1.1.** We now describe the proof of Theorem 1.1.

There is no loss of generality in assuming that  $G$  is connected, since if  $G = G_1 \sqcup G_2$  then  $Y(G) \cong Y(G_1) \# Y(G_2)$ , and both theories are tensorial under connected sum of 3-manifolds. We label each component of  $L_G$  as either alpha or beta, such that the labelings of any two adjacent vertices are opposite.

Parallel to [Zem21], we could decompose the link surgery complex as an iterated tensor product of  $DA$ -bimodules, and compare [Zem21, Theorem 1.12] with an analog of [Zem21, Theorem 1.11] using the modules  $\overline{\mathcal{H}}_\Lambda^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}}$ . Therein, the author showed that lattice homology could be computed by tensoring the  $\mathbb{H}_\Lambda^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}}$  modules together, and Heegaard Floer homology can be computed by tensoring the  $\mathcal{H}_\Lambda^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}}$  modules together. Using the fact that  $\overline{\mathcal{H}}_\Lambda^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}} \simeq \mathbb{H}_\Lambda^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}}$ , as proven in Theorem 4.1, the statement follows essentially immediately.

One drawback of this approach is that gradings were not considered in detail in [Zem21]. It also involves a substantial amount of technical work from [Zem21], which is actually unnecessary for the statement in Theorem 1.1. Hence, we opt to give a direct argument via the homological perturbation lemma.

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* Let  $\mathcal{C}(G) = (C_\varepsilon, D_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'})$  be the surgery hypercube obtained by tensoring the  $\overline{\mathcal{H}}$  models of the Hopf link surgery complex together, using Equation (3.3). We wish to show that  $\mathcal{C}(G)$  is homotopy equivalent as a hypercube to the lattice complex.

We note that the Hopf link Floer complex has the following filtration:

$$\mathcal{CFL}(H) = ( \text{Span}(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}) \xrightarrow{\partial} \text{Span}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{d}) ).$$

Let us first consider the subcomplex  $\mathcal{C}_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}$  of  $\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon$  which lies in a single Alexander grading  $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{H}(L_G)$ . The complexes  $\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon$  are obtained by localizing a tensor product of  $\ell$ -copies of  $\mathcal{CFL}(H)$  at some of the  $\mathcal{V}_i$  variables, and completing with respect to the  $U_i$  and taking the direct product over Alexander grading. In particular,  $\mathcal{C}_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}$  has a similar filtration. Write  $c_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}$  for the chain complex  $\mathcal{C}_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}$  before completing with respect to the  $U_i$  variables. The complex  $c_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}$  may be written as the following exact sequence:

$$c_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}} = 0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon^\ell \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon^1. \quad (5.1)$$

In Equation (5.1),  $\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon^i$  is generated over  $\mathbb{F}[U_1, \dots, U_\ell]$  by monomials which contain  $i - 1$  factors which are  $\mathbf{b}$  or  $\mathbf{c}$ , and  $\ell - i$  factors which are from  $\mathbf{a}$  or  $\mathbf{d}$ .

The homology group  $H_*(c_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}})$  is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{F}[U_1]$  by [OS03, Lemma 2.6] (see also [OSS14, Lemma 4.2]). Furthermore, the generator has only  $\mathbf{a}$  and  $\mathbf{d}$  factors (i.e. is supported in  $\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon^1$ ). It follows that the chain complex  $c_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}$  is a free resolution of its homology over  $\mathbb{F}[U_1, \dots, U_\ell]$ .

Since  $H_*(c_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}) \cong \mathbb{F}[U_1]$  is a projective module over  $\mathbb{F}[U_1]$ , it is a basic exercise in homological algebra to show that the above exact sequence may be split over  $\mathbb{F}[U_1]$ . That is, we may decompose each  $\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}^i$  over  $\mathbb{F}[U_1]$  into a direct sum of  $\mathbb{F}[U_1]$ -modules

$$\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}^i \cong \mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}^{i, l} \oplus \mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}^{i, r}$$

so that  $\partial$  maps each  $\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}^{i, r}$  isomorphically onto  $\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}^{i-1, l}$ , for  $1 < i < \ell$ , and  $\partial$  vanishes on  $\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}^{i, r}$ . Further,  $\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}^{\ell, l} = 0$  and  $\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}^{1, r}$  projects isomorphically into  $H_*(c_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}})$ . We may then define maps  $\pi_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}$ ,  $h_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}^i$  and  $i_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}$  as in the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & \xleftarrow{h_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}^{\ell-1}} & & \xleftarrow{h_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}^{\ell-2}} & & \xleftarrow{h_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}^2} & & \xleftarrow{h_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}^1} & & \xleftarrow{i_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}} \\ \mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}^{\ell, r} & \xrightarrow{\partial} & \mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}^{\ell-1, l} \oplus \mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}^{\ell-1, r} & \xrightarrow{\partial} & \cdots & \xrightarrow{\partial} & \mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}^{2, l} \oplus \mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}^{2, r} & \xrightarrow{\partial} & \mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}^{1, l} \oplus \mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}^{1, r} & \xrightarrow{\pi_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}} H_*(c_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}) \end{array}$$

The map  $\pi_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}$  is the canonical projection map, and  $i_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}$  is a section of the map  $\pi_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}$ , which we assume is compatible with the splitting described earlier. Similarly,  $h_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}^i$  is the inverse of  $\partial|_{\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}^{i, l}}$ . Note that  $i_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}$  and  $h_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}^i$  are not generally  $\mathbb{F}[U_1, \dots, U_\ell]$ -equivariant, and instead only  $\mathbb{F}[U_1]$ -equivariant.

We may define  $\mathbb{F}[[U_1]]$ -equivariant maps

$$\pi_\varepsilon: \mathcal{C}_\varepsilon \rightarrow H_*(\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon), \quad i_\varepsilon: H_*(\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_\varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad h_\varepsilon: \mathcal{C}_\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_\varepsilon$$

which give a homotopy equivalence over  $\mathbb{F}[[U_1]]$  between  $\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon$  and  $H_*(\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon)$ , by taking the direct product of the maps  $i_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}$ ,  $\pi_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}$  and  $h_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}} = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} h_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}^i$ , and then completing with respect to the variables  $U_1, \dots, U_\ell$ . To see that the maps  $i_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}$ ,  $\pi_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}$  and  $h_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{s}}$  induce well-defined maps after completing with respect to  $U_1, \dots, U_\ell$ , we argue as follows. The completion over  $U_1, \dots, U_\ell$  may be viewed as the completion with respect to the  $I$ -adic

topology on  $\mathbb{F}[U_1, \dots, U_\ell]$ , where  $I$  is the ideal  $(U_1, \dots, U_\ell)$ . See [AM69, Chapter 10]. Equivalently, since there are only finitely many generators over  $\mathbb{F}[U_1, \dots, U_\ell]$  and each  $U_i$  has Maslov grading  $-2$ , we may describe the completion as having a fundamental system of open sets given by  $M_i = \text{Span}\{x : \text{gr}(x) \leq i\}$  ranging over  $i < 0$ . The maps  $i_{\varepsilon, s}$  and  $h_{\varepsilon, s}$  are clearly continuous with respect to this topology, since they are homogeneously graded, and hence induce maps on the completion.

Applying the homological perturbation lemma for hypercubes, Lemma 5.1, we may transport the hypercube maps of  $(\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon, D_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'})$  to a hypercube with underlying groups  $H_*(\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon)$ . This coincides with the underlying group of the lattice complex by Proposition 2.1. To see that the resulting hypercube is the lattice complex, it is sufficient to show that there are no higher length hypercube maps when we apply the homological perturbation lemma. This is seen directly, as follows. The recipe from the homological perturbation lemma for hypercubes is to include via  $i_\varepsilon$ , then sequentially compose cube maps and the homotopies  $h_\varepsilon$ , and then finally apply  $\pi_{\varepsilon'}$ . Note that  $h_\varepsilon$  strictly increases the filtration level  $i$  in the sequence in Equation (5.1), and  $\pi_\varepsilon$  is non-vanishing on only the lowest filtration level. Additionally, using Proposition 4.3 and the tensor product formula in Equation (3.3), we see that the length 1 maps of  $\mathcal{C}(G)$  preserve the filtration level, while the higher length maps strictly increase the filtration level. In particular, the only way for a summand from Lemma 5.1 to contribute is for there to be no  $h_\varepsilon$  factors, and for the hypercube arrow to be length 1. Hence, the transported hypercube maps are exactly the maps induced on homology by the length one maps of  $\mathcal{C}(G)$ . This is exactly lattice homology by Proposition 2.1. The proof is complete.  $\square$

*Remark 5.2.* The above argument fails at the last step if we use the  $\mathcal{H}$ -models instead of the  $\overline{\mathcal{H}}$  models. This is because the length 2 map of  $\mathcal{H}$  decreases filtration level, so could potentially contribute to higher length terms in the hypercube structure maps obtained from the homological perturbation lemma.

## 6. THE ALPHA-TO-BETA TRANSFORMER BIMODULE

We now describe a  $DA$ -bimodule  ${}_{\mathcal{K}}\mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{K}}$  which can be used to relate  $\mathbb{H}_{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}}$  and  $\mathcal{H}_{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}}$ . We call this bimodule the *alpha-to-beta transformer*.

The bimodule  $\mathcal{T}$  has rank 1 over  $\mathbf{I}$ , and has  $\delta_1^1 = 0$ . The map  $\delta_2^1$  is the unique  $\mathbf{I}$ -linear map which satisfies

$$\delta_2^1(a, (i_0 + i_1)) = (i_0 + i_1) \otimes a,$$

for  $a \in \mathcal{K}$ . (This coincides with the identity bimodule).


Additionally, there is a  $\delta_4^1$  term, which is non-vanishing on terms of the form  $f\tau g|a|b|i_0$ , where  $f, g, a$  and  $b$  are concentrated in a single idempotent, and which vanishes on other elementary tensors. On such elements, we have the formula

$$\delta_4^1(f\tau g, a, b, i_0) = i_1 \otimes (f\tau g \cdot \partial_{\mathcal{W}}(a) \cdot \partial_{\mathcal{V}}(b)).$$

**Lemma 6.1.**  ${}_{\mathcal{K}}\mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{K}}$  satisfies the  $DA$ -bimodule relations.

*Proof.* The only interesting structure relations to be verified are the ones with 5 inputs. There are only two non-vacuous relations to be verified, which are those for sequences of the form  $(\tau, a, b, c, i_0)$  and those of the form  $(a, \tau, b, c, i_0)$ . The structure relations for sequences of the form  $(a, \tau, b, c, i_0)$  are straightforward, so we consider the tuple

$(\tau, a, b, c, i_0)$ . The structure diagrams with potentially non-trivial contribution are the following:



The vanishing of the above equation follows from the algebraic relation

$$a\partial_{\mathcal{U}}(b)\partial_{\mathcal{V}}(c) + \partial_{\mathcal{U}}(a)\partial_{\mathcal{V}}(bc) + \partial_{\mathcal{U}}(ab)\partial_{\mathcal{V}}(c) + \partial_{\mathcal{U}}(a)\partial_{\mathcal{V}}(b)c = 0,$$


which is straightforward to verify.  $\square$

**Proposition 6.2.** *The bimodules  $\overline{\mathcal{H}}_{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}}$  and  $\mathcal{H}_{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}^{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}}$  are related via the following tensor product:*

$$\overline{\mathcal{H}}_{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}^{\mathcal{K}_1 \otimes \mathcal{K}_2} \hat{\boxtimes}_{\mathcal{K}_1} \mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{K}_1} = \mathcal{H}_{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}^{\mathcal{K}_1 \otimes \mathcal{K}_2}.$$

In the above,  $\mathcal{K}_1$  and  $\mathcal{K}_2$  denote copies of the algebra  $\mathcal{K}$  (identified with the link components  $K_1$  and  $K_2$ ). The same holds if we switch the roles of  $K_1$  and  $K_2$ .

*Proof.* The proof is a direct computation. The diagram which adds the extra length 2 differential is the following:



In the above  $\mathbf{c}_{00}$  and  $\mathbf{d}_{11}$  denote the copies of  $\mathbf{c}$  and  $\mathbf{d}$  lying in idempotents  $\mathbf{I}_0 \otimes \mathbf{I}_0$  and  $\mathbf{I}_1 \otimes \mathbf{I}_1$ , respectively. The proof is complete.  $\square$

We conjecture that the bimodule  ${}_{\mathcal{K}}\mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{K}}$  corresponds to the  $DA$  bimodule for  $\mathbb{T}^2 \times [0, 1]$ , where one component of the boundary is alpha-labeled, and the other is beta-labeled.

## REFERENCES

- [AM69] M. F. Atiyah and I. G. MacDonald, *Introduction to commutative algebra*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Reading, Mass.-London-Don Mills, Ont., 1969.
- [Aur10] Denis Auroux, *Fukaya categories of symmetric products and bordered Heegaard-Floer homology*, J. Gökova Geom. Topol. GGT **4** (2010), 1–54.
- [HHSZ20] Kristen Hendricks, Jennifer Hom, Matthew Stoffregen, and Ian Zemke, *Surgery exact triangles and involutive Heegaard Floer homology*, 2020. e-print, [arXiv:2011.00113](#).
- [HHSZ21a] ———, *A dual knot mapping cone formula for involutive Heegaard Floer homology*, 2021. In preparation.
- [HHSZ21b] ———, *Naturality and functoriality in involutive Heegaard Floer homology*, 2021. In preparation.
- [HK91] Johannes Huebschmann and Tornike Kadeishvili, *Small models for chain algebras*, Math. Z. **207** (1991), no. 2, 245–280.
- [HRRW20] Jonathan Hanselman, Jacob Rasmussen, Sarah Dean Rasmussen, and Liam Watson, *L-spaces, taut foliations, and graph manifolds*, Compos. Math. **156** (2020), no. 3, 604–612.
- [Liu14] Yajing Liu, *Heegaard Floer homology of surgeries on two-bridge links*, 2014. e-print, [arXiv:1402.5727](#).
- [LOT11] Robert Lipshitz, Peter S. Ozsváth, and Dylan P. Thurston, *Heegaard Floer homology as morphism spaces*, Quantum Topol. **2** (2011), no. 4, 381–449.
- [LOT15] ———, *Bimodules in bordered Heegaard Floer homology*, Geom. Topol. **19** (2015), no. 2, 525–724.
- [LOT18] Robert Lipshitz, Peter S. Ozsvath, and Dylan P. Thurston, *Bordered Heegaard Floer homology*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **254** (2018), no. 1216, viii+279.
- [MO10] Ciprian Manolescu and Peter S. Ozsváth, *Heegaard Floer homology and integer surgeries on links*, 2010. e-print, [arXiv:1011.1317](#).
- [Ném05] András Némethi, *On the Ozsváth-Szabó invariant of negative definite plumbed 3-manifolds*, Geom. Topol. **9** (2005), 991–1042.
- [Ném08] ———, *Lattice cohomology of normal surface singularities*, Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **44** (2008), no. 2, 507–543.
- [Ném17] ———, *Links of rational singularities, L-spaces and LO fundamental groups*, Invent. Math. **210** (2017), no. 1, 69–83.
- [Ni14] Yi Ni, *Homological actions on sutured Floer homology*, Math. Res. Lett. **21** (2014), no. 5, 1177–1197.
- [OS03] Peter Ozsváth and Zoltán Szabó, *On the Floer homology of plumbed three-manifolds*, Geom. Topol. **7** (2003), 185–224.
- [OS04a] Peter Ozsváth and Zoltán Szabó, *Holomorphic disks and knot invariants*, Adv. Math. **186** (2004), no. 1, 58–116.
- [OS04b] ———, *Holomorphic disks and topological invariants for closed three-manifolds*, Ann. of Math. (2) **159** (2004), no. 3, 1027–1158.
- [OS04c] Peter S. Ozsváth and Zoltán Szabó, *Holomorphic disks and three-manifold invariants: properties and applications*, Ann. of Math. (2) **159** (2004), no. 3, 1159–1245.
- [OS08a] Peter Ozsváth and Zoltán Szabó, *Holomorphic disks, link invariants and the multi-variable Alexander polynomial*, Algebr. Geom. Topol. **8** (2008), no. 2, 615–692.
- [OS08b] Peter S. Ozsváth and Zoltán Szabó, *Knot Floer homology and integer surgeries*, Algebr. Geom. Topol. **8** (2008), no. 1, 101–153.
- [OS11] Peter Ozsváth and Zoltán Szabó, *Knot Floer homology and rational surgeries*, Algebr. Geom. Topol. **11** (2011), no. 1, 1–68.
- [OSS14] Peter Ozsváth, András I. Stipsicz, and Zoltán Szabó, *A spectral sequence on lattice homology*, Quantum Topol. **5** (2014), no. 4, 487–521.
- [Ras03] Jacob Rasmussen, *Floer homology and knot complements*, Ph.D. Thesis, 2003. [arXiv:math/0306378](#).
- [Zar10] Rumén Zarev, *Joining and gluing in sutured Floer homology*, 2010. e-print, [arXiv:1010.3496](#).

- [Zem15] Ian Zemke, *Graph cobordisms and Heegaard Floer homology*, 2015. e-print, [arXiv:1512.01184](#).
- [Zem19] ———, *Link cobordisms and functoriality in link Floer homology*, J. Topol. **12** (2019), no. 1, 94–220.
- [Zem21] ———, *Bordered manifolds with torus boundary and the link surgery formula*, 2021. e-print, [arXiv:2109.11520](#).

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, PRINCETON, NJ, USA  
*Email address:* `izenke@math.princeton.edu`