

Integral virtual fundamental chains

via finer virtual structures on moduli spaces

Dingyu Yang

Oct 6, 2017

Symplectic geometry

(M^{2m}, ω) is a symplectic manifold, if $\omega \in \Omega^2(M)$ is closed, and nondegenerate $\omega_x^m \neq 0$. From definitions:

Symplectic geometry

(M^{2m}, ω) is a symplectic manifold, if $\omega \in \Omega^2(M)$ is closed, and nondegenerate $\omega_x^m \neq 0$. From definitions:

1. No local invariant:

$$(\mathbb{R}^{2m}, \omega_0 = dx_1 \wedge dx_2 + \cdots + dx_{2m-1} \wedge dx_{2m}).$$

Symplectic geometry

(M^{2m}, ω) is a symplectic manifold, if $\omega \in \Omega^2(M)$ is closed, and nondegenerate $\omega_x^m \neq 0$. From definitions:

1. No local invariant:

$$(\mathbb{R}^{2m}, \omega_0 = dx_1 \wedge dx_2 + \cdots + dx_{2m-1} \wedge dx_{2m}).$$

2. (i) Homotopically ! **almost complex structure** (90° rotation)
 $J: TM \rightarrow TM$ with $J^2 = -1$ and $\omega(\cdot, J\cdot)$ Riemannian metric.
- (ii) $u: (S, j, \mathbf{x}) \rightarrow (M, J)$ is a **J -curve**, if $(du)^{0,1} = 0$.
- (iii) Counting J -curves u with markings $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \cdots, x_n)$ constrained on cycles of M gives **Gromov-Witten invariant**.

Symplectic geometry

(M^{2m}, ω) is a symplectic manifold, if $\omega \in \Omega^2(M)$ is closed, and nondegenerate $\omega_x^m \neq 0$. From definitions:

1. No local invariant:

$$(\mathbb{R}^{2m}, \omega_0 = dx_1 \wedge dx_2 + \cdots + dx_{2m-1} \wedge dx_{2m}).$$

2. (i) Homotopically ! **almost complex structure** (90° rotation)
 $J: TM \rightarrow TM$ with $J^2 = -1$ and $\omega(\cdot, J\cdot)$ Riemannian metric.
- (ii) $u: (S, j, \mathbf{x}) \rightarrow (M, J)$ is a **J -curve**, if $(du)^{0,1} = 0$.
- (iii) Counting J -curves u with markings $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ constrained on cycles of M gives **Gromov-Witten invariant**.
3. (i) $H: M \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ give **vector field** X_H by $dH =: \omega(X_H, \cdot)$.
- (ii) Morse theory of $A_H([x, \hat{x}]) := -\int_D \hat{x}^* \omega - \int_0^1 H(x(t), t) dt$ gives **Floer homology**.
- (iii) Differential counts **perturbed J -cylinders**, or **(J, H) -cylinders**
 $(du - X_H \otimes dt)^{0,1} = 0$.

Global invariants via moduli spaces, geom. transversality

Global invariants, GW invariant & Floer homology, are defined:

- * Using moduli spaces $X := \{(\text{perturbed } J\text{-curves})/\text{symmetry}\}$.
- * Via pulling back the evaluation map $\text{ev} : X \rightarrow Y$, where Y is a manifold: $M^{\times n}$, or $\{\text{closed orbits of } X_H\}$, respectively.

Global invariants via moduli spaces, geom. transversality

Global invariants, GW invariant & Floer homology, are defined:

- * Using moduli spaces $X := \{(\text{perturbed}) J\text{-curves}\}/\text{symmetry}$.
- * Via pulling back the evaluation map $ev : X \rightarrow Y$, where Y is a manifold: $M^{\times n}$, or $\{\text{closed orbits of } X_H\}$, respectively.

Moduli spaces are not nice spaces in the usual sense:

- (1) Non-regular: (McDuff:) Simple J -curves \pitchfork by generic J .
(Floer-Hofer-Salamon:) (J, H) -cylinders \pitchfork by generic t -dep H .

Global invariants via moduli spaces, geom. transversality

Global invariants, GW invariant & Floer homology, are defined:

- * Using moduli spaces $X := \{(\text{perturbed}) J\text{-curves}\}/\text{symmetry}$.
- * Via pulling back the evaluation map $ev : X \rightarrow Y$, where Y is a manifold: $M^{\times n}$, or $\{\text{closed orbits of } X_H\}$, respectively.

Moduli spaces are not nice spaces in the usual sense:

- (1) Non-regular: (McDuff:) Simple J -curves \nmid by generic J .
(Floer-Hofer-Salamon:) (J, H) -cylinders \nmid by generic t -dep H .
- (2) Noncompact: J -curves can bubble off. Consider $\{\text{nodal curves}\}$.

Global invariants via moduli spaces, geom. transversality

Global invariants, GW invariant & Floer homology, are defined:

- * Using moduli spaces $X := \{(\text{perturbed}) J\text{-curves}\}/\text{symmetry}$.
- * Via pulling back the evaluation map $ev : X \rightarrow Y$, where Y is a manifold: $M^{\times n}$, or $\{\text{closed orbits of } X_H\}$, respectively.

Moduli spaces are not nice spaces in the usual sense:

- (1) Non-regular: (McDuff:) Simple J -curves \nmid by generic J .
(Floer-Hofer-Salamon:) (J, H) -cylinders \nmid by generic t -dep H .
- (2) Noncompact: J -curves can bubble off. Consider $\{\text{nodal curves}\}$.
- (3) (2) \Rightarrow multiple-covers, never \nmid by perturbing structures on M .

Global invariants via moduli spaces, geom. transversality

Global invariants, GW invariant & Floer homology, are defined:

- * Using moduli spaces $X := \{(\text{perturbed } J\text{-curves})/\text{symmetry}\}$.
- * Via pulling back the evaluation map $\text{ev} : X \rightarrow Y$, where Y is a manifold: $M^{\times n}$, or $\{\text{closed orbits of } X_H\}$, respectively.

Moduli spaces are not nice spaces in the usual sense:

- (1) Non-regular: (McDuff:) Simple J -curves \nmid by generic J .
(Floer-Hofer-Salamon:) (J, H) -cylinders \nmid by generic t -dep H .
- (2) Noncompact: J -curves can bubble off. Consider $\{\text{nodal curves}\}$.
- (3) (2) \Rightarrow multiple-covers, never \nmid by perturbing structures on M .
- (4) Domain-dep pertⁿ makes curve simple, but its compactification leads (3). Ok if (3) only happens in codim-2 (semi-positivity).

Global invariants via moduli spaces, geom. transversality

Global invariants, GW invariant & Floer homology, are defined:

- * Using moduli spaces $X := \{(\text{perturbed } J\text{-curves})/\text{symmetry}\}$.
- * Via pulling back the evaluation map $\text{ev} : X \rightarrow Y$, where Y is a manifold: $M^{\times n}$, or $\{\text{closed orbits of } X_H\}$, respectively.

Moduli spaces are not nice spaces in the usual sense:

- (1) Non-regular: (McDuff:) Simple J -curves \nmid by generic J .
(Floer-Hofer-Salamon:) (J, H) -cylinders \nmid by generic t -dep H .
- (2) Noncompact: J -curves can bubble off. Consider $\{\text{nodal curves}\}$.
- (3) (2) \Rightarrow multiple-covers, never \nmid by perturbing structures on M .
- (4) Domain-dep pertⁿ makes curve simple, but its compactification leads (3). Ok if (3) only happens in codim-2 (semi-positivity).
- (5) Divide domain-reparam sym (topology/cptness). X orbifold-based.

Outside of special cases of semi-positivity, what can we do?

Abstract transversality

One major approach is **abstract perturbation**:

Abstract transversality

One major approach is **abstract perturbation**:

* **Polyfold approach** (Hofer-Wysocki-Zehnder, ...)

- (a) From a space \mathcal{B} of all candidates, $\{J\text{-curves}\}/\text{iso}$ is cut out by a section \mathbf{f} of Fredholm nature in a bundle $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$.
- (b) Brand new smoothness, local models (of jumping dimensions), and local implicit function theorem.
- (c) Easily globalize: patch over diffeos, usual genericity argument.

Abstract transversality

One major approach is **abstract perturbation**:

- * **Polyfold approach** (Hofer-Wysocki-Zehnder, ...)
 - (a) From a space \mathcal{B} of all candidates, $\{J\text{-curves}\}/\text{iso}$ is cut out by a section \mathbf{f} of Fredholm nature in a bundle $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$.
 - (b) Brand new smoothness, local models (of jumping dimensions), and local implicit function theorem.
 - (c) Easily globalize: patch over diffeos, usual genericity argument.
- * **Kuranishi-type approach** (By early 2014, Fukaya-Oh-Ohta-Ono, Joyce, McDuff-Wehrheim, Pardon, Y., ...)
 - (a) (Easy local model) X locally cut out by a section s_I in a f.d. bdl.
 - (b) Coordinate change can increase dimension. \Rightarrow No **precompact open neighborhood** of patched zero sets in patched ambient bases.
 - (c) Global topological/algebraic solution for (b), when charts patch.

Abstract transversality

One major approach is **abstract perturbation**:

- * **Polyfold approach** (Hofer-Wysocki-Zehnder, ...)
 - (a) From a space \mathcal{B} of all candidates, $\{J\text{-curves}\}/\text{iso}$ is cut out by a section \mathbf{f} of Fredholm nature in a bundle $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$.
 - (b) Brand new smoothness, local models (of jumping dimensions), and local implicit function theorem.
 - (c) Easily globalize: patch over diffeos, usual genericity argument.
- * **Kuranishi-type approach** (By early 2014, Fukaya-Oh-Ohta-Ono, Joyce, McDuff-Wehrheim, Pardon, Y., ...)
 - (a) (Easy local model) X locally cut out by a section s_l in a f.d. bdl.
 - (b) Coordinate change can increase dimension. \Rightarrow No **precompact open neighborhood** of patched zero sets in patched ambient bases.
 - (c) Global topological/algebraic solution for (b), when charts patch.

As of Oct 5, 2017, the output from the above is a virtual fund. chain/cycle **over** \mathbb{Q} , which is a regular replacement of bad compact zero set $\mathbf{f}^{-1}(0)$ or $\bigsqcup_l s_l^{-1}(0)/\Upsilon$. Υ is the patching identification.

Because the symmetry and transversality don't get along \Rightarrow

Need symmetric \mathbb{Q} -weighted branchwise \curvearrowright multi-sections, or equiv.

Integral virtual fundamental chains (joint w/ Guangbo Xu)

Example: 2-sphere S w/ an orbifold point $\{z\} := S^{\mathbb{Z}_3}$ of symm. \mathbb{Z}_3 .

1. It fits as a special case of the previous polyfold/Kuranishi theories, and it is already regular and no room in the 0-bundle to do much else (like perturbation). Euler char. rational.
2. But we know it has no hole, whose information can be captured, and indeed, $S \setminus \{z\}$ is a pseudocycle, and we count 2 for this “virtual” (pseudo-)cycle.
3. The subspace of points with nontrivial stabilizers being of codimension 2 (in the base) is not enough: We still need to regularize, and face incompatibility of symm. & transversality.
4. Another aspect is that the normal bundle $N_{S^{\mathbb{Z}_3}} S$ has a complex structure in this example, which generalizes.

A good coordinate system GCS (of 2 charts)

Any Kuranishi-type theory, you can get a finitely many charts covering moduli X , a **good coordinate system**. Consider 2 charts (4 generalizes).

$C_I := (s_I : U_I \rightarrow E_I, \underline{\psi}_I : s_I^{-1}(0)/\Gamma_I \rightarrow X; \Gamma_I\}$ and one for J .

A good coordinate system GCS (of 2 charts)

Any Kuranishi-type theory, you can get a finitely many charts covering moduli X , a **good coordinate system**. Consider 2 charts (4 generalizes).

$C_I := (s_I : U_I \rightarrow E_I, \underline{\psi_I} : s_I^{-1}(0)/\Gamma_I \rightarrow X; \Gamma_I)$ and one for J .

A **coordinate change** $C_I \rightarrow C_J$ says:

- (2) (Enough) open part $C_I|_{U_{JI}}$ of C_I embeds in C_J , intertwining all the data. So $s_I|_{U_{JI}}$ sits in as part of s_J . Images denoted by $\check{\cdot}$.
- (2) U_J can have larger dimension. The extra direction is 'cancelled out' by ds_J **matching normals** of \check{U}_{JI} in U_J **with fiber normals** of \check{E}_I in E_J , a canonical condition at zeros $s_J|_{\check{U}_{JI}}$.

A good coordinate system GCS (of 2 charts)

Any Kuranishi-type theory, you can get a finitely many charts covering moduli X , a **good coordinate system**. Consider 2 charts (4 generalizes).

$C_I := (s_I : U_I \rightarrow E_I, \psi_I : s_I^{-1}(0)/\Gamma_I \rightarrow X; \Gamma_I)$ and one for J .

A **coordinate change** $\overline{C}_I \rightarrow C_J$ says:

- (2) (Enough) open part $C_I|_{U_{JI}}$ of C_I embeds in C_J , intertwining all the data. So $s_I|_{U_{JI}}$ sits in as part of s_J . Images denoted by $\check{\cdot}$.
- (2) U_J can have larger dimension. The extra direction is 'cancelled out' by ds_J **matching normals** of \check{U}_{JI} in U_J **with fiber normals** of \check{E}_I in E_J , a canonical condition at zeros $s_J|_{\check{U}_{JI}}$.

One way to go up dimension is by improving (2) into condition over W_{JI} , a tubular neighborhood projecting onto \check{U}_{JI} (remembering the fiber linear structure, containing no extra zeros), and extend \check{E}_J to \tilde{E}_{JI} over W_{JI} , and asking $s_J|_{W_{JI}}/\tilde{E}_{JI} \pitchfork 0$. A \pitchfork perturbation of s_I is immediately **lifted** to a \pitchfork perturbation over W_{JI} . **After things are in the same setting in E_J** , one can use relative transversality.

A good coordinate system GCS (of 2 charts)

Any Kuranishi-type theory, you can get a finitely many charts covering moduli X , a **good coordinate system**. Consider 2 charts (4 generalizes).

$C_I := (s_I : U_I \rightarrow E_I, \psi_I : s_I^{-1}(0)/\Gamma_I \rightarrow X; \Gamma_I)$ and one for J .

A **coordinate change** $\overline{C}_I \rightarrow C_J$ says:

- (2) (Enough) open part $C_I|_{U_{JI}}$ of C_I embeds in C_J , intertwining all the data. So $s_I|_{U_{JI}}$ sits in as part of s_J . Images denoted by $\check{\cdot}$.
- (2) U_J can have larger dimension. The extra direction is 'cancelled out' by ds_J **matching normals** of \check{U}_{JI} in U_J **with fiber normals** of \check{E}_I in E_J , a canonical condition at zeros $s_J|_{\check{U}_{JI}}$.

One way to go up dimension is by improving (2) into condition over W_{JI} , a tubular neighborhood projecting onto \check{U}_{JI} (remembering the fiber linear structure, containing no extra zeros), and extend \check{E}_J to \tilde{E}_{JI} over W_{JI} , and asking $s_J|_{W_{JI}}/\tilde{E}_{JI} \pitchfork 0$. A \pitchfork perturbation of s_I is immediately **lifted** to a \pitchfork perturbation over W_{JI} . **After things are in the same setting in E_J** , one can use relative transversality.

Theorem (Y., Feb 2014)

*Can do it globally on GCS via \exists (! up to refinem't) of **level-1 str.***

Between two group-fixed parts in a chart

After considering dimension changes, we focus on **group changes**.

Between two group-fixed parts in a chart

After considering dimension changes, we focus on **group changes**.

Fix a chart $C := C_I$ and the group action Γ is effective.

$L < H < \Gamma_I$ subgroups. U^H fixed by H . Thus $U^H \subset U^L$.

Between two group-fixed parts in a chart

After considering dimension changes, we focus on **group changes**.

Fix a chart $C := C_I$ and the group action Γ is effective.

$L < H < \Gamma_I$ subgroups. U^H fixed by H . Thus $U^H \subset U^L$.

- * $C|_{U^H} \rightarrow C|_{U^L}$ is like coordinate change before, except no **normal matching**. In fact, no relation of expected dimensions.

Between two group-fixed parts in a chart

After considering dimension changes, we focus on **group changes**.

Fix a chart $C := C_I$ and the group action Γ is effective.

$L < H < \Gamma_I$ subgroups. U^H fixed by H . Thus $U^H \subset U^L$.

- * $C|_{U^H} \rightarrow C|_{U^L}$ is like coordinate change before, except no **normal matching**. In fact, no relation of expected dimensions.
- * Suppose normal bundle N of U^H in U^L , and also normal bundle \tilde{N} of E^H in $E^L|_{U^H}$ both have **complex structures**.

Between two group-fixed parts in a chart

After considering dimension changes, we focus on **group changes**.

Fix a chart $C := C_I$ and the group action Γ is effective.

$L < H < \Gamma_I$ subgroups. U^H fixed by H . Thus $U^H \subset U^L$.

- * $C|_{U^H} \rightarrow C|_{U^L}$ is like coordinate change before, except no **normal matching**. In fact, no relation of expected dimensions.
- * Suppose normal bundle N of U^H in U^L , and also normal bundle \tilde{N} of E^H in $E^L|_{U^H}$ both have **complex structures**.
- * $s|_{U^L}$ has two part: $s|_{U^H}$ lifted to $W^{LH} \subset U^L$ near U^H as last page, but also the normal part \mathfrak{s} which is a map $N \rightarrow \tilde{N}$ over U^H between \mathbb{C} bundles. Group is $G := \Gamma^L/L$ with Γ^L normalizer of L .

Between two group-fixed parts in a chart

After considering dimension changes, we focus on **group changes**.

Fix a chart $C := C_I$ and the group action Γ is effective.

$L < H < \Gamma_I$ subgroups. U^H fixed by H . Thus $U^H \subset U^L$.

- * $C|_{U^H} \rightarrow C|_{U^L}$ is like coordinate change before, except no **normal matching**. In fact, no relation of expected dimensions.
- * Suppose normal bundle N of U^H in U^L , and also normal bundle \tilde{N} of E^H in $E^L|_{U^H}$ both have **complex structures**.
- * $s|_{U^L}$ has two part: $s|_{U^H}$ lifted to $W^{LH} \subset U^L$ near U^H as last page, but also the normal part \mathfrak{s} which is a map $N \rightarrow \tilde{N}$ over U^H between \mathbb{C} bundles. Group is $G := \Gamma^L/L$ with Γ^L normalizer of L .
- * ('99 Fukaya-Ono, for 1 chart, 2 groups H and $L = \{Id\}$, $G = \Gamma$) \mathfrak{s} can be **fiberwise G -equivariant \mathbb{C} -polynomially** perturbed s.t. over N^{free} , G -free part, transversality can be achieved. When virtual $dim \leq 1$, for "generic" such perturbation $\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}$, G -free part of zero set $\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}^{-1}(0)$ is a manifold and **closed** (does not meet U^H).

Between two group-fixed parts in a chart

After considering dimension changes, we focus on **group changes**.

Fix a chart $C := C_I$ and the group action Γ is effective.

$L < H < \Gamma_I$ subgroups. U^H fixed by H . Thus $U^H \subset U^L$.

- * $C|_{U^H} \rightarrow C|_{U^L}$ is like coordinate change before, except no **normal matching**. In fact, no relation of expected dimensions.
- * Suppose normal bundle N of U^H in U^L , and also normal bundle \tilde{N} of E^H in $E^L|_{U^H}$ both have **complex structures**.
- * $s|_{U^L}$ has two part: $s|_{U^H}$ lifted to $W^{LH} \subset U^L$ near U^H as last page, but also the normal part \mathfrak{s} which is a map $N \rightarrow \tilde{N}$ over U^H between \mathbb{C} bundles. Group is $G := \Gamma^L/L$ with Γ^L normalizer of L .
- * ('99 Fukaya-Ono, for 1 chart, 2 groups H and $L = \{Id\}$, $G = \Gamma$) \mathfrak{s} can be **fiberwise G -equivariant \mathbb{C} -polynomially** perturbed s.t. over N^{free} , G -free part, transversality can be achieved. When virtual $\dim \leq 1$, for "generic" such perturbation $\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}$, G -free part of zero set $\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}^{-1}(0)$ is a manifold and **closed** (does not meet U^H). We improve this to the **whole GCS** covering moduli space X , prove **vastly strengthened statements below for all virtual dims**.

Integral virtual fundamental chains/pseudocycles

Need notion of compatible structure involving $W_{Jl}^{LH} \rightarrow U_{Jl}^{LH}$ called **group-normal str.** providing a **common setting** at each inductive layer, & a canonical notion of **group-normal complex cond./str.** \mathcal{J} .

Integral virtual fundamental chains/pseudocycles

Need notion of compatible structure involving $W_{JI}^{LH} \rightarrow U_{JI}^{LH}$ called **group-normal str.** providing a **common setting** at each inductive layer, & a canonical notion of **group-normal complex cond./str.** \mathcal{J} .

Theorem (Guangbo Xu - Y.)

- * *Given a group-normal complex \mathcal{J} , a \mathcal{J} -compatible group-normal structure exists, ! up to cobordism/refinement.*

Integral virtual fundamental chains/pseudocycles

Need notion of compatible structure involving $W_{JI}^{LH} \rightarrow U_{JI}^{LH}$ called **group-normal str.** providing a **common setting** at each inductive layer, & a canonical notion of **group-normal complex cond./str.** \mathcal{J} .

Theorem (Guangbo Xu - Y.)

- * *Given a group-normal complex \mathcal{J} , a \mathcal{J} -compatible group-normal structure exists, ! up to cobordism/refinement.*
- * *\exists (! up to cob) a **single-valued** equivariant fiberwise polyn. pertn $\{\tilde{s}_I\}_I$ with zero set $\tilde{X} := \bigsqcup_I \tilde{s}_I^{-1}(0)/\gamma$, s.t. space $\mathring{\tilde{X}}^{[L]}$ of points with exact $[L]$ -stabilizers is a manifold (with compactification $\tilde{X}^{[L]}$), $\tilde{X}^{[L]} \setminus \mathring{\tilde{X}}^{[L]}$ has $\text{codim}_{\mathbb{R}} \geq 2$ (even) and is covered by maps from manifolds fibering over $\mathring{\tilde{X}}^{[H]}$ for all $L \not\subseteq H$ (up to conj. & ident.)*

Integral virtual fundamental chains/pseudocycles

Need notion of compatible structure involving $W_{J|I}^{LH} \rightarrow U_{J|I}^{LH}$ called **group-normal str.** providing a **common setting** at each inductive layer, & a canonical notion of **group-normal complex cond./str.** \mathcal{J} .

Theorem (Guangbo Xu - Y.)

- * Given a group-normal complex \mathcal{J} , a \mathcal{J} -compatible group-normal structure exists, ! up to cobordism/refinement.
- * \exists (! up to cob) a **single-valued** equivariant fiberwise polyn. pertn $\{\tilde{s}_I\}_I$ with zero set $\tilde{X} := \bigsqcup_I \tilde{s}_I^{-1}(0)/\Upsilon$, s.t. space $\mathring{\tilde{X}}^{[L]}$ of points with exact $[L]$ -stabilizers is a manifold (with compactification $\tilde{X}^{[L]}$), $\tilde{X}^{[L]} \setminus \mathring{\tilde{X}}^{[L]}$ has $\text{codim}_{\mathbb{R}} \geq 2$ (even) and is covered by maps from manifolds fibering over $\mathring{\tilde{X}}^{[H]}$ for all $L \not\leq H$ (up to conj. & ident.)
- * “Floer chain”- and GW-moduli spaces for **general symplectic mflds** have group-normal complex str. \mathcal{J} , ! up to quasi-iso/cob.

Integral virtual fundamental chains/pseudocycles

Need notion of compatible structure involving $W_{J|I}^{LH} \rightarrow U_{J|I}^{LH}$ called **group-normal str.** providing a **common setting** at each inductive layer, & a canonical notion of **group-normal complex cond./str.** \mathcal{J} .

Theorem (Guangbo Xu - Y.)

- * Given a group-normal complex \mathcal{J} , a \mathcal{J} -compatible group-normal structure exists, ! up to cobordism/refinement.
- * \exists (! up to cob) a **single-valued** equivariant fiberwise polyn. pertn $\{\tilde{s}_I\}_I$ with zero set $\tilde{X} := \bigsqcup_I \tilde{s}_I^{-1}(0)/\Upsilon$, s.t. space $\mathring{\tilde{X}}^{[L]}$ of points with exact $[L]$ -stabilizers is a manifold (with compactification $\tilde{X}^{[L]}$), $\tilde{X}^{[L]} \setminus \mathring{\tilde{X}}^{[L]}$ has $\text{codim}_{\mathbb{R}} \geq 2$ (even) and is covered by maps from manifolds fibering over $\mathring{\tilde{X}}^{[H]}$ for all $L \not\leq H$ (up to conj. & ident.)
- * “Floer chain”- and GW-moduli spaces for **general symplectic mflds** have group-normal complex str. \mathcal{J} , ! up to quasi-iso/cob.
- * Using the stabilizer-free moduli spaces $\mathring{\tilde{X}}^{\{\text{Id}\}}$ with $L = \{\text{Id}\}$, the **\mathbb{Z} -VFC**, Floer homology and GW are **well-defined** over \mathbb{Z} .

Some further directions

Other part worth exploring:

1. How to make use of $\check{M}^{[L]}$ for other groups $[L]$ with $L \neq \{Id\}$. Maybe use pseudocycle stratification to relate to homotopy quotient defined using universal family-dependent J in certain situations.
2. Since multiple branch-covers can be stabilizer-free, so integral GW (defined for all, not just for CY3) is not GV. What is the geometric meaning on the curve counting side?
3. Define \mathbb{Z}_p -version of equivariant p -products, p prime, possibly encoding quantum chain-level commutativity.

Some further directions

Other part worth exploring:

1. How to make use of $\check{M}^{[L]}$ for other groups $[L]$ with $L \neq \{Id\}$. Maybe use pseudocycle stratification to relate to homotopy quotient defined using universal family-dependent J in certain situations.
2. Since multiple branch-covers can be stabilizer-free, so integral GW (defined for all, not just for CY3) is not GV. What is the geometric meaning on the curve counting side?
3. Define \mathbb{Z}_p -version of equivariant p -products, p prime, possibly encoding quantum chain-level commutativity.
4. Do it for SFT, relative(/Leg.) SFT, and LG.
5. Use forgetful functor (Y.), one gets a polyfold version, but one should be able to directly with some simplification (soon).

Some further directions

Other part worth exploring:

1. How to make use of $\check{M}^{[L]}$ for other groups $[L]$ with $L \neq \{Id\}$. Maybe use pseudocycle stratification to relate to homotopy quotient defined using universal family-dependent J in certain situations.
2. Since multiple branch-covers can be stabilizer-free, so integral GW (defined for all, not just for CY3) is not GV. What is the geometric meaning on the curve counting side?
3. Define \mathbb{Z}_p -version of equivariant p -products, p prime, possibly encoding quantum chain-level commutativity.
4. Do it for SFT, relative(/Leg.) SFT, and LG.
5. Use [forgetful functor](#) (Y.), one gets a polyfold version, but one should be able to directly with some simplification (soon).
6. Find alternative condition (to group-normal complex) applicable to other moduli spaces of geometric PDE.

Thank you!