MIRROR SYMMETRY: LECTURE 18

DENIS AUROUX

NOTES BY KARTIK VENKATRAM

1. DERIVED FUKAYA CATEGORY

Last time: derived categories for abelian categories (e.g. $D^b\mathrm{Coh}(X)$). This time: the derived Fukaya category. We start with an A_∞-category $\mathcal{A}$ and obtain a triangulated category via "twisted complexes". Recall that in an A_∞-category, $\hom_\mathcal{A}(X, Y)$ is a graded vector space equipped with maps

$$(1) \qquad m_k : \hom_\mathcal{A}(X_0, X_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \hom_\mathcal{A}(X_{k-1}, X_k) \to \hom_\mathcal{A}(X_0, X_k)[2 - k]$$

1) Additive enlargement: we define the category ΣA to be the category whose objects are finite sums $\bigoplus X_i[k_i]$, $X_i \in \mathcal{A}$, $k_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and whose maps are

$$(2) \qquad \hom_{\Sigma\mathcal{A}}(\bigoplus_i X_i[k_i], \bigoplus_j Y_j[\ell_j]) = \bigoplus_{i,j} \hom_\mathcal{A}(X_i, Y_j)[\ell_j - k_i]$$

Note that we have induced multiplication maps

$$(3) \qquad m_k(a_k, \dots, a_1)^{ij} = \sum_{i_1,\dots,i_{k-1}} m_k(a_k^{i_{k-1},j}, \dots, a_1^{i_1,j})$$

2) Twisted complexes: we define the category $\mathrm{Tw}\mathcal{A}$ to be the category whose objects are twisted complexes (X, δ_X),

$$(4) \qquad X = \bigoplus_i X_i[k_i] \in \Sigma\mathcal{A}, \delta_X = (\delta_X^{ij}) \in \hom_{\Sigma\mathcal{A}}^1(X, X)$$

(i.e. δ_X a degree 1 endomorphism) s.t.

- δ_X is strictly lower-triangular, and
- $\sum_{k=1}^\infty m_k(\delta_x, \dots, \delta_x) = 0$. It is a finite sum because δ_X is lower triangular, and generalizes $\delta_X \circ \delta_X = 0$.

Example. For a simple map $f : X_1 \to X_2, f \in \hom_\mathcal{A}^1(X_1, X_2)$, the condition is $m_1(f) = 0$. Now, for maps $X_1[2] \xrightarrow{f} X_2[1] \xrightarrow{g} X_3$ and $X_1[2] \xrightarrow{h} X_3$,

$$g \in \hom^0(X_2, X_3) = \hom^1(X_2[1], X_3)$$
$$(5) \qquad f \in \hom^0(X_1[1], X_2[1]) = \hom^1(X_1[2], X_2[1])$$
$$h \in \hom^{-1}(X_1, X_3) = \hom^1(X_1[2], X_3)$$

the condition is $m_1(f) = m_1(g) = 0$ and $m_2(g, f) + m_1(h) = 0$.

The morphisms in the category of twisted complexes are

$$\text{hom}_{\text{Tw}\mathcal{A}}((X, \delta_X), (Y, \delta_Y)) = \text{hom}_{\Sigma\mathcal{A}}(X, Y) \tag{6}$$

and

$$m_k^{\text{Tw}\mathcal{A}}(a_k, \ldots, a_1) = \sum_{i_0, \ldots, i_k} \pm m_{k+i_0+\cdots+i_k}^{\Sigma\mathcal{A}}(\underbrace{\delta_{X_k}, \ldots, \delta_{X_k}}_{i_k}, a_k, \underbrace{\delta_{X_{k-1}}, \ldots, \delta_{X_{k-1}}}_{i_{k-1}}, \\ \ldots, \underbrace{\delta_{X_1}, \ldots, \delta_{X_1}}_{i_1}, a_1, \underbrace{\delta_{X_0}, \ldots, \delta_{X_0}}_{i_0}) \tag{7}$$

$\text{Tw}\mathcal{A}$ is a *triangulated* A_∞-category, i.e. there are mapping cones satisfying the usual axioms.

Example. For $a \in \text{hom}(X, Y)$,

$$m_1^{\text{Tw}\mathcal{A}}(a) = m_1(a) \pm m_2(\delta_Y, a) \pm m_2(a, \delta_X) + \text{higher terms} \tag{8}$$

This is a generalization of being a chain map up to homotopy.

3) We now take the cohomology category $D(\mathcal{A}) := H^0(\text{Tw}\mathcal{A})$, which is an honest triangulated category. The objects of the two categories are the same, but now our morphisms are $\text{hom}^{D(\mathcal{A})}(X, Y) := H^0(\text{hom}^{\text{Tw}\mathcal{A}}(X, Y), m_1^{\text{Tw}(\mathcal{A})})$. Note that $\text{hom}^{D(\mathcal{A})}(X, Y[k]) = H^k(\text{hom}^{\text{Tw}\mathcal{A}}(X, Y), m_1^{\text{Tw}\mathcal{A}})$. The composition is induced by $m_2^{\text{Tw}\mathcal{A}}$ on cohomology.

Remark. There is a variant of this called a *split-closed derived category*. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a linear category, $X \in \mathcal{A}, p \in \text{hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(X, X)$ s.t. $p^2 = p$ (idempotent). Define the image of p to be an object Y, and add maps $u : X \to Y, v : Y \to X$ s.t. $u \circ v = \text{id}_Y, v \circ u = p$. That is, we enlarge $\mathcal{A}$ to add these objects and maps, and define the split closure to be the category whose objects are (X, p) with p idempotent, and morphisms $\text{hom}((X, p), (Y, p')) = p' \text{hom}(X, Y)p$. This is more complicated in the A_∞ setting.

Geometrically, some exact triangles in $D\text{Fuk}(M)$ are given by Lagrangian connected sums (FOOO) and Dehn twists (Seidel).

- For an example of the latter, given a cylinder with a Lagrangian circle S, we can obtain a symplectomorphism $\tau_S \in \text{Symp}(M, \omega)$ which is the identity outside a neighborhood of S and, within that neighborhood, twists the cylinder around (in higher dimensions, define this using the geodesic flow in a neighborhood of $S \cong T^*S$). If L is Lagrangian, then $\tau_S(L)$ is Lagrangian as well. By Seidel, there exists an exact triangle in

$D\mathrm{Fuk}(M)$:

(9)

$$HF^*(S,L) \otimes S \xrightarrow{\ \ \ t\ \ \ } L$$

$$[1] \qquad \tau_S(L)$$

These correspond to long exact sequences for $HF(L', -)$.

- In the former situation, for L_1, L_2 (graded) Lagrangians, $L_1 \cap L_2 = \{p\}$ of index 0, we can construct the connected sum $L_1 \#_p L_2$, which looks locally like $\tau_{L_1}(L_2)$ if L_1 is a sphere and is given by $\mathrm{Cone}(L_1 \xrightarrow{p} L_2)$ in general (consider this vs. "$L_1[1] \cup_p L_2 \simeq \mathrm{Cone}(L_1 \xrightarrow{0} L_2)$"). For instance, in the torus T^2, consider two independent loops α of degree 2 and β of degree 1, with two points of intersection p, q. Then $\mathrm{Cone}(\alpha \xrightarrow{p+q} \beta) \simeq \gamma_1 \oplus \gamma_2$ is disconnected, where γ_1, γ_2 are degree 1 loops. If we only started with α, β, the triangulated envelope contains $\gamma_1 \oplus \gamma_2$, but not γ_1, γ_2 separately. The split-closure does contain them.
- Now, if we start with two independent generators of the torus, successive Dehn twists give all the homotopy classes of loops in T^2, but each homotopy class contains infinitely many non-Hamiltonian isotopic Lagrangians. To generate $D\mathrm{Fuk}(T^2)$ as a triangulated envelope, we need (for instance) one horizontal loop and infinitely many vertical loops. On the other hand, α, β above are split generators. The key point is that $\mathrm{Cone}(\alpha \xrightarrow{p+T^q q} \beta)$ gives deformed loops, direct sums of which vary continuously within a homotopy class. But many cones and idempotents have no obvious geometric interpretation. For instance, the Clifford torus $T = \{|x| = |y| = |z|\} \subset \mathbb{CP}^2$ has idempotents in $HF(T,T)$ without any obvious geometric interpretation.