On a technical ingredient of Bifurcations of embedded curves & an extension of Taubes' Gromov invariant to CY 3-folds [Bai-Swaminathan, 2021, arXiv:2106.01206]

Paramjit Singh

December 6, 2021

 (X, ω) shall denote a *symplectic Calabi-Yau 3-fold*, i.e., a closed symplectic manifold of (real) dim 6 with $c_1(TX, \omega) = 0$.

 (X, ω) shall denote a symplectic Calabi-Yau 3-fold, i.e., a closed symplectic manifold of (real) dim 6 with $c_1(TX, \omega) = 0$.

Curves should mean simple pseudo-holomorphic curves, defined with respect to the choice of an ω -compatible almost complex structure $J \in \mathcal{J}(X, \omega)$.

 (X, ω) shall denote a symplectic Calabi-Yau 3-fold, i.e., a closed symplectic manifold of (real) dim 6 with $c_1(TX, \omega) = 0$.

Curves should mean simple pseudo-holomorphic curves, defined with respect to the choice of an ω -compatible almost complex structure $J \in \mathcal{J}(X, \omega)$.

For such a CY 3-fold (X, ω) , $g \ge 0$, $A \in H_2(X, \mathbb{Z})$, the moduli space $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g(X, J, A)$ has virtual dimension 0 (by Riemann-Roch). Hence, one can "count" curves, obtaining Gromov Witten invariants $GW_{A,g}(X) \in \mathbb{Q}$, independent of J.

 (X, ω) shall denote a symplectic Calabi-Yau 3-fold, i.e., a closed symplectic manifold of (real) dim 6 with $c_1(TX, \omega) = 0$.

Curves should mean simple pseudo-holomorphic curves, defined with respect to the choice of an ω -compatible almost complex structure $J \in \mathcal{J}(X, \omega)$.

For such a CY 3-fold (X, ω) , $g \ge 0$, $A \in H_2(X, \mathbb{Z})$, the moduli space $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g(X, J, A)$ has virtual dimension 0 (by Riemann-Roch). Hence, one can "count" curves, obtaining Gromov Witten invariants $GW_{A,g}(X) \in \mathbb{Q}$, independent of J.

Because of multiple covers and ghost components (which may have non-trivial automorphisms) these invariants are generally not \mathbb{Z} -valued.

Taubes '96 defined integer-valued invariants for symplectic 4-manifolds by counting *embedded* curves with \mathbb{Z} -weights. Using intersection theory in dim 4, his construction didn't require virtual techniques, but relied instead on *bifurcation analysis*.

Taubes '96 defined integer-valued invariants for symplectic 4-manifolds by counting *embedded* curves with \mathbb{Z} -weights. Using intersection theory in dim 4, his construction didn't require virtual techniques, but relied instead on *bifurcation analysis*.

For generic perturbations of J, there are only two types of bifurcations.

Taubes '96 defined integer-valued invariants for symplectic 4-manifolds by counting *embedded* curves with \mathbb{Z} -weights. Using intersection theory in dim 4, his construction didn't require virtual techniques, but relied instead on *bifurcation analysis*.

For generic perturbations of J, there are only two types of bifurcations.

Birth-death



Taubes '96 defined integer-valued invariants for symplectic 4-manifolds by counting *embedded* curves with \mathbb{Z} -weights. Using intersection theory in dim 4, his construction didn't require virtual techniques, but relied instead on *bifurcation analysis*.

For generic perturbations of J, there are only two types of bifurcations.

Birth-death



Taubes '96 defined integer-valued invariants for symplectic 4-manifolds by counting *embedded* curves with \mathbb{Z} -weights. Using intersection theory in dim 4, his construction didn't require virtual techniques, but relied instead on *bifurcation analysis*.

For generic perturbations of J, there are only two types of bifurcations.

Birth-death



Taubes '96 defined integer-valued invariants for symplectic 4-manifolds by counting *embedded* curves with \mathbb{Z} -weights. Using intersection theory in dim 4, his construction didn't require virtual techniques, but relied instead on *bifurcation analysis*.

For generic perturbations of J, there are only two types of bifurcations.

Birth-death



Taubes '96 defined integer-valued invariants for symplectic 4-manifolds by counting *embedded* curves with \mathbb{Z} -weights. Using intersection theory in dim 4, his construction didn't require virtual techniques, but relied instead on *bifurcation analysis*.

For generic perturbations of J, there are only two types of bifurcations.

Birth-death



Taubes '96 defined integer-valued invariants for symplectic 4-manifolds by counting *embedded* curves with \mathbb{Z} -weights. Using intersection theory in dim 4, his construction didn't require virtual techniques, but relied instead on *bifurcation analysis*.

For generic perturbations of J, there are only two types of bifurcations.

Birth-death



Taubes '96 defined integer-valued invariants for symplectic 4-manifolds by counting *embedded* curves with \mathbb{Z} -weights. Using intersection theory in dim 4, his construction didn't require virtual techniques, but relied instead on *bifurcation analysis*.

For generic perturbations of J, there are only two types of bifurcations.

Birth-death



Taubes '96 defined integer-valued invariants for symplectic 4-manifolds by counting *embedded* curves with \mathbb{Z} -weights. Using intersection theory in dim 4, his construction didn't require virtual techniques, but relied instead on *bifurcation analysis*.

For generic perturbations of J, there are only two types of bifurcations.

Birth-death



Taubes '96 defined integer-valued invariants for symplectic 4-manifolds by counting *embedded* curves with \mathbb{Z} -weights. Using intersection theory in dim 4, his construction didn't require virtual techniques, but relied instead on *bifurcation analysis*.

For generic perturbations of J, there are only two types of bifurcations.

Birth-death



Taubes '96 defined integer-valued invariants for symplectic 4-manifolds by counting *embedded* curves with \mathbb{Z} -weights. Using intersection theory in dim 4, his construction didn't require virtual techniques, but relied instead on *bifurcation analysis*.

For generic perturbations of J, there are only two types of bifurcations.

Birth-death



Taubes '96 defined integer-valued invariants for symplectic 4-manifolds by counting *embedded* curves with \mathbb{Z} -weights. Using intersection theory in dim 4, his construction didn't require virtual techniques, but relied instead on *bifurcation analysis*.

For generic perturbations of J, there are only two types of bifurcations.

Birth-death



Taubes '96 defined integer-valued invariants for symplectic 4-manifolds by counting *embedded* curves with \mathbb{Z} -weights. Using intersection theory in dim 4, his construction didn't require virtual techniques, but relied instead on *bifurcation analysis*.

For generic perturbations of J, there are only two types of bifurcations.





Just naively (sign) counting all embedded curves for a specific generic J cannot be expected to be independent of J (because there might be bifurcations and the parametric moduli space might not be compact).

Just naively (sign) counting all embedded curves for a specific generic J cannot be expected to be independent of J (because there might be bifurcations and the parametric moduli space might not be compact).

We need correction terms to keep our count invariant under each bifurcation. This can be achieved by assigning signs $\varepsilon(u) = \pm 1$ to each embedded curve and for genus g = 1, a *suitable* weight $w(u, 2) \in \mathbb{Z}$. And then defining the Gromov invariant as a sum of signs for curves in class 2A plus correction weights for curves in class A.

Just naively (sign) counting all embedded curves for a specific generic J cannot be expected to be independent of J (because there might be bifurcations and the parametric moduli space might not be compact).

We need correction terms to keep our count invariant under each bifurcation. This can be achieved by assigning signs $\varepsilon(u) = \pm 1$ to each embedded curve and for genus g = 1, a *suitable* weight $w(u, 2) \in \mathbb{Z}$. And then defining the Gromov invariant as a sum of signs for curves in class 2A plus correction weights for curves in class A.

A useful condition in dim 4 is that putting together the index formula with Riemann Hurwitz & the adjunction formula, one finds that a sequence of embedded 0-curves can never converge to a nodal curve, and it can converge to a multiple cover only in very specific situations. Likewise when the curves have genus 1, they end up converging to an unbranched cover of an embedded torus.

It has been conjectured that there should be Gromov invariants in dim 6, that give integer-valued counts of embedded curves, together with contributions from their multiple covers that are determined by bifurcation analysis.

- It has been conjectured that there should be Gromov invariants in dim 6, that give integer-valued counts of embedded curves, together with contributions from their multiple covers that are determined by bifurcation analysis.
- There's no adjunction formula in dim 6 and the index relations don't give us nice convergence behavior for lower genus curves. One needs to somehow exclude degenerations of embedded curves to nodal curves, especially nodal curves that contain constant ("ghost") components.

- It has been conjectured that there should be Gromov invariants in dim 6, that give integer-valued counts of embedded curves, together with contributions from their multiple covers that are determined by bifurcation analysis.
- There's no adjunction formula in dim 6 and the index relations don't give us nice convergence behavior for lower genus curves. One needs to somehow exclude degenerations of embedded curves to nodal curves, especially nodal curves that contain constant ("ghost") components.
- ► The representation theoretic result (there being only two faithful representations with K = R of the automorphism group of *d*-fold torus covers over all *d*) still helps us disregard covers of degree > 2, but doesn't help rule out nodal degenerations for tori.

- It has been conjectured that there should be Gromov invariants in dim 6, that give integer-valued counts of embedded curves, together with contributions from their multiple covers that are determined by bifurcation analysis.
- There's no adjunction formula in dim 6 and the index relations don't give us nice convergence behavior for lower genus curves. One needs to somehow exclude degenerations of embedded curves to nodal curves, especially nodal curves that contain constant ("ghost") components.
- ► The representation theoretic result (there being only two faithful representations with K = R of the automorphism group of *d*-fold torus covers over all *d*) still helps us disregard covers of degree > 2, but doesn't help rule out nodal degenerations for tori.
- [Bai-Swaminathan] explain how to define such invariants in situations where the multiple covers making contributions have degree at most 2.

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathsf{emb}} := \left\{ J \in \mathcal{J}(X, \omega) \right\}$$

∃ a simple & non-embedded curve or 2 simple curves with distinct but intersecting images

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathsf{emb}} := \left\{ J \in \mathcal{J}(X, \omega) \mid \begin{array}{c} \exists \text{ a simple \& non-embedded curve or 2 simple} \\ \mathsf{curves with distinct but intersecting images} \end{array} \right\}$$

It is known that this wall \mathcal{W}_{emb} is of codim 2 in $\mathcal{J}(X, \omega)$. Thus, along generic paths $\gamma \subseteq \mathcal{J}(X, \omega)$, we may assume that all simple curves are embedded and pairwise disjoint by appealing to the Sard-Smale theorem (i.e., paths can be chosen generically to avoid the walls).

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathsf{emb}} := \left\{ J \in \mathcal{J}(X, \omega) \mid \begin{array}{c} \exists \text{ a simple \& non-embedded curve or 2 simple} \\ \mathsf{curves with distinct but intersecting images} \end{array} \right\}$$

It is known that this wall \mathcal{W}_{emb} is of codim 2 in $\mathcal{J}(X, \omega)$. Thus, along generic paths $\gamma \subseteq \mathcal{J}(X, \omega)$, we may assume that all simple curves are embedded and pairwise disjoint by appealing to the Sard-Smale theorem (i.e., paths can be chosen generically to avoid the walls).

We know any non-constant curve $u: \Sigma' \to X$ with smooth Σ' factors uniquely as $\Sigma' \xrightarrow{\varphi} \Sigma \xrightarrow{v} X$ where φ is a holomorphic (branched) cover and v is simple.

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathsf{emb}} := \left\{ J \in \mathcal{J}(X, \omega) \mid \begin{array}{l} \exists \text{ a simple \& non-embedded curve or 2 simple} \\ \mathsf{curves with distinct but intersecting images} \end{array} \right\}$$

It is known that this wall \mathcal{W}_{emb} is of codim 2 in $\mathcal{J}(X, \omega)$. Thus, along generic paths $\gamma \subseteq \mathcal{J}(X, \omega)$, we may assume that all simple curves are embedded and pairwise disjoint by appealing to the Sard-Smale theorem (i.e., paths can be chosen generically to avoid the walls).

We know any non-constant curve $u: \Sigma' \to X$ with smooth Σ' factors uniquely as $\Sigma' \xrightarrow{\varphi} \Sigma \xrightarrow{v} X$ where φ is a holomorphic (branched) cover and v is simple.

The above then implies that we can assume v is embedded while u can be any arbitrary non-constant stable map.

Definition

 $J \in \mathcal{J}(X, \omega)$ is called *super-rigid* if, for all non-constant *J*-stable maps $\Sigma' \xrightarrow{\varphi} \Sigma \subseteq X$, we have $\ker \varphi^* D_{\Sigma,J}^N = 0$, where $D_{\Sigma,J}^N$ is the normal CR operator of the embedded curve $\Sigma \subseteq X$.

Definition

 $J \in \mathcal{J}(X, \omega)$ is called *super-rigid* if, for all non-constant *J*-stable maps $\Sigma' \xrightarrow{\varphi} \Sigma \subseteq X$, we have $\ker \varphi^* D_{\Sigma,J}^N = 0$, where $D_{\Sigma,J}^N$ is the normal CR operator of the embedded curve $\Sigma \subseteq X$.

If J is super-rigid, then given any sequence of embedded curves Σ_n ⊆ X (of bounded genus and ω-area), we can find a subsequence converging to an embedded curve Σ ⊆ X.

Definition

 $J \in \mathcal{J}(X, \omega)$ is called *super-rigid* if, for all non-constant *J*-stable maps $\Sigma' \xrightarrow{\varphi} \Sigma \subseteq X$, we have $\ker \varphi^* D_{\Sigma,J}^N = 0$, where $D_{\Sigma,J}^N$ is the normal CR operator of the embedded curve $\Sigma \subseteq X$.

- If J is super-rigid, then given any sequence of embedded curves Σ_n ⊆ X (of bounded genus and ω-area), we can find a subsequence converging to an embedded curve Σ ⊆ X.
- If u is a super-rigid curve, then the only possible sequences that converge to a nodal branched cover of u consist of other covers of u. In other words, M
 _h(d; u) is an open and closed subset of M
 _h(dA, J).

Definition

 $J \in \mathcal{J}(X, \omega)$ is called *super-rigid* if, for all non-constant *J*-stable maps $\Sigma' \xrightarrow{\varphi} \Sigma \subseteq X$, we have $\ker \varphi^* D_{\Sigma,J}^N = 0$, where $D_{\Sigma,J}^N$ is the normal CR operator of the embedded curve $\Sigma \subseteq X$.

- If J is super-rigid, then given any sequence of embedded curves Σ_n ⊆ X (of bounded genus and ω-area), we can find a subsequence converging to an embedded curve Σ ⊆ X.
- If u is a super-rigid curve, then the only possible sequences that converge to a nodal branched cover of u consist of other covers of u. In other words, M
 _h(d; u) is an open and closed subset of M
 _h(dA, J).
- There are only *finitely many* embedded curves with fixed genus and homology class if J is super-rigid.

Definition

 $J \in \mathcal{J}(X, \omega)$ is called *super-rigid* if, for all non-constant *J*-stable maps $\Sigma' \xrightarrow{\varphi} \Sigma \subseteq X$, we have $\ker \varphi^* D_{\Sigma,J}^N = 0$, where $D_{\Sigma,J}^N$ is the normal CR operator of the embedded curve $\Sigma \subseteq X$.

- If J is super-rigid, then given any sequence of embedded curves Σ_n ⊆ X (of bounded genus and ω-area), we can find a subsequence converging to an embedded curve Σ ⊆ X.
- If u is a super-rigid curve, then the only possible sequences that converge to a nodal branched cover of u consist of other covers of u. In other words, M
 _h(d; u) is an open and closed subset of M
 _h(dA, J).
- There are only *finitely many* embedded curves with fixed genus and homology class if J is super-rigid.

Theorem (Wendl '19)

Super-rigid almost complex structures are comeager in $\mathcal{J}(X,\omega)$ for $\dim X \ge 6$.

Counts of embedded curves of twice the primitive class

Call a homology class A primitive, if $\omega(A) > 0$ and we cannot write A = kB for any $B \in H_2(X, \mathbb{Z})$ and integer $k \ge 2$. The main result of [Bai-Swaminathan] is to define a virtual count of embedded curves of twice the primitive homology class for all genera.

Counts of embedded curves of twice the primitive class

Call a homology class A primitive, if $\omega(A) > 0$ and we cannot write A = kB for any $B \in H_2(X, \mathbb{Z})$ and integer $k \ge 2$. The main result of [Bai-Swaminathan] is to define a virtual count of embedded curves of twice the primitive homology class for all genera.

Theorem (†)

Fix primitive $A \in H_2(X, \mathbb{Z})$ and integer $h \ge 0$. For super-rigid $J \in \mathcal{J}(X, \omega)$, define the virtual count of embedded genus h curves of class 2A to be the integer

$$\operatorname{Gr}_{2A,h}(X,\omega,J) = \sum_{C':2A,h} \operatorname{sgn}(C') + \sum_{g \le h} \sum_{C:A,g} \operatorname{sgn}(C) \cdot w_{2,h}(D_{C,J}^N)$$

The above is, infact, independent of the choice of super-rigid J and defines a symplectic invariant $\operatorname{Gr}_{2A,h}(X,\omega)$ of (X,ω) .

Necessary condition for bifurcations

The first key ingredient in the proof of Theorem (†) is a *necessary* condition for the occurence of a bifurcation. Fix an even dimensional manifold X^{2n} (*n* arbitrary). Let $\mathcal{F}: V \to \mathcal{J}(X)$ be a smooth family of acs on X parametrized by a smooth finite dimensional manifold V. Given a curve C, denote by $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_h(C,k)$ the moduli space of genus h stable maps of degree k with target C.

Necessary condition for bifurcations

The first key ingredient in the proof of Theorem (†) is a *necessary* condition for the occurence of a bifurcation. Fix an even dimensional manifold X^{2n} (*n* arbitrary). Let $\mathcal{F}: V \to \mathcal{J}(X)$ be a smooth family of acs on X parametrized by a smooth finite dimensional manifold V. Given a curve C, denote by $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_h(C,k)$ the moduli space of genus h stable maps of degree k with target C.

Theorem (‡)

Let $x_{\nu} \to x$ be a convergent sequence in V, with $J_{\nu} := \mathcal{F}(x_{\nu})$ for $\nu \ge 0$ and $J := \mathcal{F}(x)$. Let $h \ge 0$ be an integer and suppose that we have a sequence $(J_{\nu}, \varphi_{\nu} : \Sigma'_{\nu} \to X)$ of simple J_{ν} -curves of genus h converging, in the Gromov topology, to a stable map $(J, C' \xrightarrow{\varphi} C \subseteq X)$ with C being a smooth embedded J-curve of genus $g \le h$ and $\varphi : C' \to C$ being an element of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_h(C, k)$ for some integer $k \ge 1$. Then, exactly one of the following must be true:

• We have
$$g = h$$
, $k = 1$ and $\varphi : C' \simeq C$.

The natural pullback map

$$\varphi^* : \ker D_{C,J}^N \to \ker \varphi^* D_{C,J}^N \tag{(\star)}$$

is injective but not surjective.

Consequence: Ruling out nodal degenerations

Theorem (‡) allows us to exclude the possibility of bifurcations from nodal curves (possibly with ghost components) into embedded curves once the path γ is chosen generically. When the homology class represented by $\varphi_k : \Sigma'_k \to X$ is primitive, the degree k is then necessarily equal to 1 and Theorem (‡) implies that the limit φ must be an isomorphism. In particular, the stable map $C' \xrightarrow{\varphi} C \subseteq X$ does not have any ghost irreducible component.

Consequence: Ruling out nodal degenerations

Theorem (‡) allows us to exclude the possibility of bifurcations from nodal curves (possibly with ghost components) into embedded curves once the path γ is chosen generically. When the homology class represented by $\varphi_k : \Sigma'_k \to X$ is primitive, the degree k is then necessarily equal to 1 and Theorem (‡) implies that the limit φ must be an isomorphism. In particular, the stable map $C' \xrightarrow{\varphi} C \subseteq X$ does not have any ghost irreducible component.

The full power of the above is that ultimately we just need to worry about bifurcations from (branched) double covers in order to check the invariance of $\operatorname{Gr}_{2A,h}(X,\omega)$. In particular, if $A \in H_2(X,\mathbb{Z})$ is primitive, then for any path γ in

$$\mathcal{J}_{\mathsf{emb}}(X,\omega) := \begin{cases} J \in \mathcal{J}(X,\omega) \end{cases}$$

all simple curves are unobstructed & have index ≥ 0 , those with index < 2n - 4 are embeddings; and any 2 such curves with combined index < 2n - 4 either have disjoint images or are related by reparametrization,

the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{h}^{\mathsf{emb}}(X, \gamma, A)$ of embedded genus h curves of class A is compact.

Proof idea

The proof is by a careful examination of the infinitesimal deformations and obstructions of the two moduli spaces

 $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M}_g^{\mathsf{emb}}(X,\gamma,[C]),d) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}_h(X,\gamma,d[C])$

at the point $(t, \Sigma \xrightarrow{\varphi} C \subseteq X)$. Here, the latter is the usual stable map moduli space along γ while the former consists of those stable maps which factor through an embedded genus g curve in class [C].

Proof idea

The proof is by a careful examination of the infinitesimal deformations and obstructions of the two moduli spaces

 $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M}_{g}^{\mathsf{emb}}(X,\gamma,[C]),d) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{h}(X,\gamma,d[C])$

at the point $(t, \Sigma \xrightarrow{\varphi} C \subseteq X)$. Here, the latter is the usual stable map moduli space along γ while the former consists of those stable maps which factor through an embedded genus g curve in class [C].

► The key assertion to prove is the following. The fibre of the normal bundle of the above inclusion, after suitably "thickening" both moduli spaces, at the point $(t, \Sigma \xrightarrow{\varphi} C \subseteq X)$ is canonically isomorphic to the vector space ker $\varphi^* D_{C,J}^N / \ker D_{C,J}^N$.

 $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{emb}}_g(X,\mathcal{F},A) \coloneqq \left\{ (y,\Sigma) \; \middle| \; \substack{y \in V, \Sigma \subseteq X \text{ is an embedded } \mathcal{F}(y)\text{-curve} \\ \text{of genus } g \text{ in class } A } \right\},$

(♠)

 $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{emb}}_g(X,\mathcal{F},A) \coloneqq \left\{ (y,\Sigma) \; \middle| \; \substack{y \in V, \Sigma \subseteq X \text{ is an embedded } \mathcal{F}(y)\text{-curve} \\ \text{of genus } g \text{ in class } A \end{array} \right\},$

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_h(X, \mathcal{F}, kA) := \left\{ (y, \varphi' : \Sigma' \to X) \middle| \begin{array}{l} y \in V, \varphi' \text{ is a stable } \mathcal{F}(y) \text{-holomorphic} \\ \text{map in } X \text{ of genus } h \text{ and class } k[C] \end{array} \right\} \& \quad (\clubsuit)$$

(♠)

 $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{emb}}_g(X,\mathcal{F},A) \coloneqq \left\{ (y,\Sigma) \; \middle| \; \substack{y \in V, \Sigma \subseteq X \text{ is an embedded } \mathcal{F}(y)\text{-curve} \\ \mathsf{of genus } g \text{ in class } A \end{array} \right\},$

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_h(X,\mathcal{F},kA) := \left\{ (y,\varphi':\Sigma' \to X) \middle| \begin{array}{l} y \in V, \varphi' \text{ is a stable } \mathcal{F}(y)\text{-holomorphic} \\ \text{map in } X \text{ of genus } h \text{ and class } k[C] \end{array} \right\} \&$$

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{h}(\mathcal{M}_{g}^{\mathsf{emb}}(X,\mathcal{F},A),k) \coloneqq \left\{ (y,\Sigma,\psi:\Sigma'\to\Sigma) \middle| \begin{array}{l} (y,\Sigma) \text{ lies in } (\bigstar) \text{ and} \\ (\Sigma',\psi) \text{ lies in } \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{h}(\Sigma,k) \end{array} \right\}. \quad (\bigstar)$$

(♠)

$$\mathcal{M}_{g}^{\mathsf{emb}}(X,\mathcal{F},A) := \left\{ (y,\Sigma) \middle| \begin{array}{l} y \in V, \Sigma \subseteq X \text{ is an embedded } \mathcal{F}(y)\text{-curve} \\ \mathsf{of genus } g \text{ in class } A \end{array} \right\}$$

٦

(♠)

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_h(X, \mathcal{F}, kA) := \left\{ (y, \varphi' : \Sigma' \to X) \middle| \begin{array}{l} y \in V, \varphi' \text{ is a stable } \mathcal{F}(y) \text{-holomorphic} \\ \text{map in } X \text{ of genus } h \text{ and class } k[C] \end{array} \right\} \&$$

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{h}(\mathcal{M}_{g}^{\mathsf{emb}}(X,\mathcal{F},A),k) := \left\{ (y,\Sigma,\psi:\Sigma' \to \Sigma) \middle| \begin{array}{c} (y,\Sigma) \text{ lies in } (\bigstar) \text{ and} \\ (\Sigma',\psi) \text{ lies in } \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{h}(\Sigma,k) \end{array} \right\}. \quad (\bigstar)$$

There is a natural inclusion of (\blacklozenge) inside (\clubsuit) , given by

$$(y, \Sigma, \psi: \Sigma' \to \Sigma) \mapsto (y, \Sigma' \xrightarrow{\psi} \Sigma \subseteq X),$$

and the proof of Theorem (‡) will follow by showing that codimension of (\blacklozenge) inside (\blacklozenge) at the point $(x, C' \xrightarrow{\varphi} C \subseteq X)$ is given by the dimension of the cokernel of (\star).

However, both (\blacklozenge) and (\blacklozenge) are not smooth in general, therefore the notion of codimension is not well-defined. To remedy the situation, we will need to thicken the moduli spaces (in the sense of [Pardon, 16]) compatibly so that the last inclusion becomes an inclusion of manifolds, at least near the point (x, φ) , whose codimension can then be computed.

However, both (\blacklozenge) and (\blacklozenge) are not smooth in general, therefore the notion of codimension is not well-defined. To remedy the situation, we will need to thicken the moduli spaces (in the sense of [Pardon, 16]) compatibly so that the last inclusion becomes an inclusion of manifolds, at least near the point (x, φ) , whose codimension can then be computed.

First the parameter space *F* is thickened to ensure that *M*^{emb}_g(*X*, *F*, *A*) is cut out transversally, and is hence a manifold of suitable dimension.

However, both (\blacklozenge) and (\blacklozenge) are not smooth in general, therefore the notion of codimension is not well-defined. To remedy the situation, we will need to thicken the moduli spaces (in the sense of [Pardon, 16]) compatibly so that the last inclusion becomes an inclusion of manifolds, at least near the point (x, φ) , whose codimension can then be computed.

- First the parameter space *F* is thickened to ensure that *M*^{emb}_g(*X*, *F*, *A*) is cut out transversally, and is hence a manifold of suitable dimension.
- ► Then suitable auxiliary data (like a Riemannian metric on X identifying a tubular neighborhood of it in X with a unit disc subbundle of N_C and marked points making the curve C stable) are chosen, to construct charts for the manifold structure on (♣) and (♠).

However, both (\blacklozenge) and (\blacklozenge) are not smooth in general, therefore the notion of codimension is not well-defined. To remedy the situation, we will need to thicken the moduli spaces (in the sense of [Pardon, 16]) compatibly so that the last inclusion becomes an inclusion of manifolds, at least near the point (x, φ) , whose codimension can then be computed.

- ► First the parameter space *F* is thickened to ensure that *M*^{emb}_g(*X*, *F*, *A*) is cut out transversally, and is hence a manifold of suitable dimension.
- ► Then suitable auxiliary data (like a Riemannian metric on X identifying a tubular neighborhood of it in X with a unit disc subbundle of N_C and marked points making the curve C stable) are chosen, to construct charts for the manifold structure on (♣) and (♠).
- The approach involves an analysis of λ-thickened Cauchy-Riemann equations and applying implicit function theorem to them.

Concluding proof of Theorem (‡)

Proof by contradiction. Assume that dim ker $\varphi^* D_{C,J}^N = \dim \ker D_{C,J}^N$. Then the map of compatibility of thickenings (Lemma 3.7) is an injective continuous map between topological manifolds of the same dimension and thus, by Brouwer's Invariance of Domain, its image must cover an open neighborhood of our target base point. Restricting this over $V \times 0 \times 0 \subseteq V' \times E \times E'$ (V, V' are domains of parametrization, E, E' are domain vector spaces of thickening data), we conclude that

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_h(\mathcal{M}_g^{\mathsf{emb}}(X,\mathcal{F},A),k) = \overline{\mathcal{M}}_h(X,\mathcal{F},kA)$$

in a neighborhood of $(x, \varphi : C' \to C \subseteq X)$. This is a contradiction to the existence of the sequence of simple curves $(J_{\nu}, \varphi_{\nu} : \Sigma'_{\nu} \to X)$ unless h = g and k = 1 (in which case φ must also be an isomorphism).

Consider a subset of $\mathcal{J}(X,\omega)$ of codim ≥ 3 (Lemma 5.20), involving

$$\mathcal{J}'_{A,g} := \left\{ J \in \mathcal{J}(X,\omega) \middle| \begin{array}{l} \text{there exists an embedded curve, a point } z \in C \& \\ 0 \neq \sigma \in \ker D_{C,J}^N \text{ with } \sigma(z) = 0. \end{array} \right\}, \&$$

$$\mathcal{W}_{w,h}(\mathcal{J}_{A,g}) := \begin{cases} J \in \mathcal{J}(X,\omega) \end{cases}$$

٢

 $\left|\begin{array}{c} \text{there exists an embedded curve, a holomorphic branched double}\\ \text{cover }\varphi:C'\to C \And 0\neq \sigma\in \ker D_{C,J\varphi}^{N-} \text{ such that the}\\ \text{corresponding }J_{D_{C,J}^{N}} \text{ -holomorphic map }\hat{\sigma}:C'\to N_{C} \text{ defined}\\ \text{using Lemma 5.9 (association of }CR_{\mathbb{R}}\text{-ops with acs on}\\ \text{total space of }N) \text{ is not an embedding.}\end{array}\right\}.$

Consider a subset of $\mathcal{J}(X,\omega)$ of codim ≥ 3 (Lemma 5.20), involving

$$\mathcal{J}'_{A,g} := \left\{ J \in \mathcal{J}(X,\omega) \middle| \begin{array}{l} \text{there exists an embedded curve, a point } z \in C \& \\ 0 \neq \sigma \in \ker D_{C,J}^N \text{ with } \sigma(z) = 0. \end{array} \right\}, \&$$

$$\mathcal{W}_{w,h}(\mathcal{J}_{A,g}) := \left\{ J \in \mathcal{J}(X,\omega) \right\}$$

there exists an embedded curve, a holomorphic branched double cover
$$\varphi: C' \to C \And 0 \neq \sigma \in \ker D_{C,J\varphi}^{N-}$$
 such that the corresponding $J_{D_{C,J}^{N}}$ -holomorphic map $\hat{\sigma}: C' \to N_{C}$ defined using Lemma 5.9 (association of $CR_{\mathbb{R}}$ -ops with acs on total space of N) is not an embedding.

Away from the above subset and away from walls (generically), for paths joining acs J_{\pm} and $0 \le g \le h$, the following holds.

Lemma

• Among the tuples of data
$$(t, \Sigma, \varphi : \Sigma' \xrightarrow{2:1} \Sigma)$$
, the ones with

$$\dim \ker D^N_{\Sigma,\gamma(t)} = 0, \qquad \dim \ker \varphi^* D^N_{\Sigma,\gamma(t)} = 1$$

form a finite set.

Lemma

Among the tuples of data $(t, \Sigma, \varphi : \Sigma' \xrightarrow{2:1} \Sigma)$, the ones with

$$\dim \ker D^N_{\Sigma,\gamma(t)} = 0, \qquad \dim \ker \varphi^* D^N_{\Sigma,\gamma(t)} = 1$$

form a finite set.

• Let $t_n \to t$ and suppose $\Sigma'_n \subseteq X$ is a sequence of embedded $\gamma(t_n)$ -curves of genus h in class 2A which converge to a $\gamma(t)$ -holomorphic stable map $\varphi : \Sigma' \to \Sigma \subseteq X$ in the Gromov topology with Σ being an embedded $\gamma(t)$ -curve of genus g in class 2A/d for some $d \in \{1,2\}$ and $\Sigma', \varphi) \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_h(\Sigma, d)$. Then Σ' is necessarily smooth. If d = 1, then φ is an isomorphism. If d = 2, then the operator $D^N_{\Sigma,\gamma(t)}$ is an isomorphism and we have dim ker $\varphi^* D^N_{\Sigma,\gamma(t)} = 1$.

Lemma

Among the tuples of data $(t, \Sigma, \varphi : \Sigma' \xrightarrow{2:1} \Sigma)$, the ones with

$$\dim \ker D^N_{\Sigma,\gamma(t)} = 0, \qquad \dim \ker \varphi^* D^N_{\Sigma,\gamma(t)} = 1$$

form a finite set.

▶ Let $t_n \to t$ and suppose $\Sigma'_n \subseteq X$ is a sequence of embedded $\gamma(t_n)$ -curves of genus h in class 2A which converge to a $\gamma(t)$ -holomorphic stable map $\varphi : \Sigma' \to \Sigma \subseteq X$ in the Gromov topology with Σ being an embedded $\gamma(t)$ -curve of genus g in class 2A/d for some $d \in \{1, 2\}$ and $\Sigma', \varphi) \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_h(\Sigma, d)$. Then Σ' is necessarily smooth. If d = 1, then φ is an isomorphism. If d = 2, then the operator $D^N_{\Sigma,\gamma(t)}$ is an isomorphism and we have dim ker $\varphi^* D^N_{\Sigma,\gamma(t)} = 1$.

The proof takes a section in cokernel of (*) and considers it's associated $J_{D_{\Sigma,\gamma(t)}^N}$ -holomorphic map. Then one looks at the irreducible components of Σ' on which φ is non-constant and behavior of sections in ker $D_{\Sigma,\gamma(t)}^N$ on these components. One then enforces the desired degenerations by ruling out exceptional behavior as generically avoidable.

THE END.