

Calabi-Yau Caps and Uniruled Caps

Tian-Jun Li, Cheuk Yu Mak and Kouichi Yasui*

November 21, 2015

Abstract

We introduce symplectic Calabi-Yau caps to obtain new obstructions to exact fillings. In particular, it implies that any exact filling of the standard unit cotangent bundle of a hyperbolic surface has vanishing first Chern class and has the same integral homology and intersection form as its disk cotangent bundle. This gives evidence to a conjecture that all of its exact fillings are diffeomorphic to the disk cotangent bundle. As a result, we also obtain the first infinitely family of Stein fillable contact 3-manifolds with uniform bounds on the Betti numbers of its exact fillings but admitting minimal strong fillings of arbitrarily large b_2 .

Moreover, we introduce the notion of symplectic uniruled/adjunction caps and uniruled/adjunction contact structures to present a unified picture to the existing finiteness results on the topological invariants of exact/strong fillings of a contact 3-manifold. As a byproduct, we find new classes of contact 3-manifolds with the finiteness property and extend Wand's obstruction of planar contact 3-manifolds to uniruled/adjunction contact structures with complexity zero.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Calabi-Yau caps	3
1.2	Uniruled/Adjunction caps	4
1.3	Genus invariants	5

*The first and second author are supported by NSF-grant DMS 1065927. The third author was partially supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 25800048.

2	General discussion	7
2.1	Uniruled manifolds and Calabi-Yau manifolds	7
2.2	Relative cohomology pairing	9
2.3	Neck-stretching basic	12
2.4	A general property for Betti finiteness	13
3	Calabi-Yau caps and exact fillings	15
3.1	Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4	15
3.2	Calabi-Yau caps via Lefschetz fibration	20
3.3	Calabi-Yau caps as divisor caps	23
4	Uniruled caps and adjunction caps	24
4.1	Theorem 1.8 and basic properties	25
4.2	Genus invariants and complexity	26
4.2.1	Relation to some previous Betti finite examples	27
4.2.2	Explicit bounds for strong fillings	28
4.2.3	Explicit bounds for Stein fillings	30
4.3	Adjunction caps	31
4.4	Construction	32
4.4.1	Examples with open book description	33
4.4.2	Realizing pairs $(g_{\max}(P), g_{\min}(P))$	35

1 Introduction

Understanding symplectic fillings of a given contact 3-manifold (Y, ξ) is a very active research area. An ultimate goal is to classify all the Stein, exact or minimal strong symplectic fillings of a given contact manifold (Y, ξ) . The first step towards this goal is to understand whether the given (Y, ξ) has finitely many or infinitely many fillings. Some families of contact 3-manifolds that admit finitely many Stein fillings are found ([38], [52], [55], [27], [23], [34], etc). For minimal strong fillings, Ohta, Ono and others have systematically investigated the links of isolated singularities ([44], [45], [46], [47], [10] etc), and established uniqueness/finiteness/infiniteness for different classes of singularities.

Instead of understanding the diffeomorphism types, one can ask whether topological quantities for fillings are bounded. It was conjectured by Stipsicz in [56] that all possible Euler characteristics and signatures of Stein fillings of a fixed (Y, ξ) are bounded. However, it was disproved by Baykur and Van Horn-Morris in [7]. Based on the work of many people ([51], [4], [3], [7], [8],

[9], [5], [15], [65], etc) , we now know that many contact 3-manifolds have infinitely many Stein fillings up to diffeomorphism.

Even though Stipsicz's conjecture is not true in general, it is important to know for what contact 3-manifolds the boundedness does hold. The focus of the current paper is to address when the Betti numbers are bounded.

Definition 1.1. A contact 3-manifold (Y, ξ) is of **Stein** (resp. **exact**, **strong**) **Betti finite type** if there are only finitely many possible values of the tuple (b_1, b_2, b_3) of Betti numbers for all of its Stein (resp. exact, minimal strong) fillings.

Note that this finiteness of Betti numbers guarantees the finiteness of e and σ . Planar contact 3-manifolds (i.e. contact 3-manifolds supported by open books of page genus zero) give a class of Stein Betti finite type examples ([26]), but they are not all.

To study this question, we introduce three kinds of caps, namely Calabi-Yau caps, uniruled caps and adjunction caps. Calabi-Yau caps give surprising new restrictions to exact fillings and in particular, we apply it to study exact fillings of unit cotangent bundles. Uniruled and adjunction caps unify several known finiteness results into a single picture. Along the way, we will give some alternative proofs for these known results and strengthen them. All contact manifolds in this paper are assumed to be closed, three dimensional and have co-oriented contact structures.

1.1 Calabi-Yau caps

Definition 1.2. A **Calabi-Yau cap** of a contact 3-manifold (Y, ξ) is a compact symplectic manifold (P, ω) which is a strong concave filling of (Y, ξ) such that $c_1(P)$ is torsion.

Theorem 1.3. *Suppose (Y, ξ) admits a Calabi-Yau cap (P, ω_P) . Then (Y, ξ) is of exact Betti finite type.*

If, moreover, (P, ω_P) cannot be embedded in a uniruled manifold, then all exact fillings of (Y, ξ) have torsion first Chern class.

This has the following surprising consequence.

Theorem 1.4. *Let Y be the unit cotangent bundle of a closed orientable surface Σ_g of genus g , equipped with the standard contact structure. Then any exact filling of Y has the same integral homology and intersection form as $T^*\Sigma_g$ and has vanishing first Chern class.*

We remark that when $g = 0, 1$, Y has unique exact filling up to symplectic deformation equivalent given by the disk cotangent bundle (See. [25], [61]). We heard from Chris Wendl the following conjecture.

Conjecture 1.5. *The diffeomorphism types of Stein/exact fillings of Y is unique and given by the disk cotangent bundle for any g .*

Therefore, Theorem 1.4 gives strong evidence to Conjecture 1.5. As an immediate application, we obtain Corollary 1.6. This subtle difference between exact Betti finite type and strong Betti finite type is an interesting phenomena that we do not find in the literature. It also implies that Theorem 1.3 cannot be strengthened to strong Betti finite type.

Corollary 1.6. *There exist infinitely many Stein fillable contact 3-manifolds such that each of them is of exact Betti finite type but not of strong Betti finite type.*

1.2 Uniruled/Adjunction caps

For any symplectic cap (symplectic concave filling) (P, ω) of (Y, ξ) , there is Liouville vector field V defined near Y pointing inward along Y . The induced one form $\alpha = \iota_V \omega$ is a contact one form on ∂P such that $(\partial P, \ker(\alpha))$ is contactomorphic to (Y, ξ) . For any choice of V , we call the induced one form α a **Louville one form**. Given a Louville one form α , $[(\omega, \alpha)]$ is a relative cohomology class in $H^2(P, \partial P, \mathbb{R})$.

Definition 1.7. A **uniruled cap** of a contact 3-manifold (Y, ξ) is a symplectic concave filling (P, ω) of (Y, ξ) such that $c_1(P) \cdot [(\omega, \alpha)] > 0$ for some Louville one form α .

Since $[(\omega, \alpha)]$ is a relative class, $c_1(P) \cdot [(\omega, \alpha)]$ is well-defined and it is further explained in Subsection 2.2. We call a contact 3-manifold admitting uniruled caps a **uniruled contact manifold**. A contact 3-manifold strong symplectic cobordant to a uniruled contact manifold is also uniruled (see Lemma 4.2). The class of uniruled contact manifolds is strictly larger than the planar class (see Lemma 4.8 and note that (T^3, ξ_{std}) is non-planar but admits a uniruled cap).

Some contact 3-manifolds (Y, ξ) admit both Calabi-Yau caps and uniruled caps but there are also some that admit only one of the two kinds of caps. In the case that (Y, ξ) admits a uniruled cap, one can derive strictly stronger restriction.

Theorem 1.8. *Suppose a contact 3-manifold (Y, ξ) admits a uniruled cap (P, ω_P) . Then (Y, ξ) is of strong Betti finite type.*

Remark 1.9. We would like to point out that to the best of our knowledge, most previously known exact/strong Betti finite type contact 3-manifolds have a uniruled cap.

We also introduce another type of caps which we call **adjunction caps**. It is based on an observation that existence of a **smoothly** embedded surface in a closed symplectic manifold with sufficiently large self-intersection number relative to the genus implies that the symplectic manifold is uniruled (Proposition 4.18). Adjunction caps have similar properties as uniruled caps, including Theorem 1.8. Similarly, every planar contact 3-manifold also has an adjunction cap (see [19], cf. Lemma 4.8 and Corollary 4.20) and we call a contact manifold admitting adjunction cap an **adjunction contact manifold**.

1.3 Genus invariants

There are genus type invariants for uniruled/adjunction caps. These invariants induce a complexity invariant for uniruled/adjunction contact manifolds, which is similar to the Seifert genus of knots. All strongly fillable planar contact 3-manifolds are uniruled and adjunction of complexity zero.

We can give explicit bounds to the topological invariants in Theorem 1.8 in terms of the genus invariants of the caps. These bounds give an alternative proof of the following obstruction of planarity and generalize it to a larger class of contact 3-manifolds, namely, uniruled/adjunction contact manifolds with complexity zero (See Corollary 4.14).

Corollary 1.10 (Wand [60]). *For a given planar contact 3-manifold, $e + \sigma$ of any two strong symplectic convex fillings of the contact 3-manifold are equal to each other.*

On the other hand, we construct various uniruled/adjunction contact manifolds with positive complexity. For many of them, we also construct the open books supporting the concave boundary. Contrary to Corollary 1.10, $e + \sigma$ of fillings of some of these examples are not constant even for Stein fillings (see Example 4.23).

We illustrate in Remark 4.12 that many previously known Betti finite type examples have complexity zero.

We expect that uniruled/adjunction contact manifolds with positive complexity have tight relation to spinal planar contact manifolds [39]. On the

other hand, it is interesting to explore the relation between uniruled/adjunction contact manifolds with the results in [62], [63] and [64].

The remaining of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 review some knowledge of uniruled/CY manifolds, relative de Rham theory and J -holomorphic neck-stretching. Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4 are proved in Section 3. We also construct many Calabi-Yau caps with explicit open book description as well as some plumbing Calabi-Yau caps. The proof of Theorem 1.8 together with its adjunction analogue are contained in Section 4. We introduce genus invariants and the complexity invariant for uniruled/adjunction caps as well as illustrating its relation to planar contact manifolds and give explicit topological bounds for fillings based on these invariants in Subsection 4.2. We end with giving explicit construction of some uniruled/adjunction caps.

This is a revised version of the one posted on arXiv in December, 2014. We were informed that there are substantial overlap of Proposition 3.4 and Proposition 4.22 with recent results by Baykur, Monden and Van Horn-Morris in [9], which were obtained earlier and from different point of view. After posting the first version of this paper on arXiv where we proved that unit cotangent bundle of orientable surfaces are Stein Betti finite, we heard Conjecture 1.5 from Chris Wendl in the ‘Geometry and topology of symplectic 4-manifolds’ conference in the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, in April 2015. When we were finalizing this second version, we learned of the paper [54] by Sivek and Van Horn Morris, where part of Theorem 1.4 is obtained independently, also using the idea of Calabi-Yau cap. They also derive the beautiful result that the Stein version of Conjecture 1.5 is true up to s-cobordism relative to boundary.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to R. Inanc Baykur for his interest in our work and sharing with us his results in [9] with Naoyuki Monden and Jeremy Van Horn-Morris. They also thank Anar Akhmedov for his discussion, Chris Wendl for informing them Conjecture 1.5 and anonymous referee for careful reading. The third author would like to thank Selman Akbulut for fruitful conversations. He also thanks Michigan State university and University of Minnesota, where this work was mainly done, for their hospitality. The second author gave a talk about the new results in this version in the Harvard Gauge theory seminar and appreciate the discussion with Daniel Cristofaro-Gardiner and Peter Kronheimer.

2 General discussion

2.1 Uniruled manifolds and Calabi-Yau manifolds

Let X be a closed, oriented smooth 4-manifold. Let \mathcal{E}_X be the set of cohomology classes whose Poincaré dual are represented by smoothly embedded spheres of self-intersection -1 . X is said to be (smoothly) minimal if \mathcal{E}_X is the empty set. Equivalently, X is minimal if it is not the connected sum of another manifold with $\overline{\mathbb{CP}^2}$.

Suppose ω is a symplectic form compatible with the orientation. (X, ω) is said to be (symplectically) minimal if \mathcal{E}_ω is empty, where

$$\mathcal{E}_\omega = \{E \in \mathcal{E}_X \mid E \text{ is represented by an embedded } \omega\text{-symplectic sphere}\}.$$

We say that (Z, τ) is a minimal model of (X, ω) if (Z, τ) is minimal and (X, ω) is a symplectic blow up of (Z, τ) . A basic fact proved using Taubes SW theory is: \mathcal{E}_ω is empty if and only if \mathcal{E}_X is empty. In other words, (X, ω) is symplectically minimal if and only if X is smoothly minimal.

For minimal (X, ω) , the Kodaira dimension of (X, ω) is defined in the following way:

$$\kappa^s(X, \omega) = \begin{cases} -\infty & \text{if } K_\omega \cdot [\omega] < 0 \text{ or } K_\omega \cdot K_\omega < 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } K_\omega \cdot [\omega] = 0 \text{ and } K_\omega \cdot K_\omega = 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } K_\omega \cdot [\omega] > 0 \text{ and } K_\omega \cdot K_\omega = 0, \\ 2 & \text{if } K_\omega \cdot [\omega] > 0 \text{ and } K_\omega \cdot K_\omega > 0. \end{cases}$$

Here K_ω is defined as the first Chern class of the cotangent bundle for any almost complex structure compatible with ω .

κ^s is well defined since there does not exist a minimal (X, ω) with

$$K_\omega \cdot [\omega] = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad K_\omega \cdot K_\omega > 0.$$

This again follows from Taubes SW theory. Moreover, κ^s is independent of ω , so it is an oriented diffeomorphism invariant of X .

The Kodaira dimension of a non-minimal manifold is defined to be that of any of its minimal models. This definition is well-defined and independent of choice of minimal model so $\kappa^s(X, \omega)$ is well-defined for any (X, ω) .

Definition 2.1. Let (X, ω) be a not necessarily minimal closed symplectic four manifold. We call (X, ω) a **symplectic Calabi-Yau** (resp. **symplectic uniruled manifold**) if $\kappa^s(X, \omega) = 0$ (resp. $\kappa^s(X, \omega) = -\infty$).

We sometimes simply call a symplectic Calabi-Yau a Calabi-Yau and a symplectic uniruled manifold a uniruled manifold. A minimal symplectic Calabi-Yau has torsion first Chern class. The first author proved in [33] the following theorem for symplectic Calabi-Yau.

Theorem 2.2. *[Theorem 1.1 of [33]] If (X, ω) is a minimal symplectic Calabi-Yau, then its rational homology is the same as a K3 surface, an Enriques surface or a torus bundle over torus.*

Remark 2.3. If the first homology of a rational homology K3 symplectic Calabi-Yau is not trivial, it admits finite cover which is also a symplectic Calabi-Yau but with Euler characteristic larger than that of K3. Hence, Theorem 2.2 implies that a rational homology K3 symplectic Calabi-Yau is an integral homology K3.

For uniruled manifold, Liu and independently Ohta and Ono proved the following.

Theorem 2.4. *[See [37] or [43]] If (X, ω) is a minimal uniruled manifold, X is \mathbb{CP}^2 , $S^2 \times S^2$ or an S^2 -bundle over a Riemann surface of positive genus.*

For a minimal uniruled manifold (X, ω) , the base genus is defined to be zero if X is \mathbb{CP}^2 or $S^2 \times S^2$, otherwise it is defined to be the genus of the base as a S^2 -bundle. For a general uniruled manifold (X, ω) , the base genus is defined to be the base genus of its minimal model, which is well-defined.

In some sense, Calabi-Yau manifolds and uniruled manifolds capture most of the rigidity results for closed symplectic four manifolds. This point of view motivates the definitions of Calabi-Yau caps and uniruled caps to obtain rigidity results for fillings in this paper.

We end this subsection with the following lemmas.

Lemma 2.5. *Let (X, ω) be a uniruled manifold and Σ_g be an immersed oriented surface of genus g in X with $[\Sigma_g]^2 > 0$. Then the base genus of X is less than or equal to g .*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we can assume that X is not minimal and not of genus 0. Then X can be obtained from r -times blow-ups of a product manifold $S^2 \times \Sigma_h$ for some genus h surface. Let f be the class of $[S^2 \times p]$ for some $p \in \Sigma_h$ and s the class of $[p \times \Sigma_h]$ for some $p \in S^2$. By abuse of notation, $H_2(X, \mathbb{Z})$ is generated by f, s, e_1, \dots, e_r , where e_i are the classes of the exceptional spheres. Since $(a_0 f + a_1 e_1 + \dots + a_r e_r)^2 \leq 0$ for all $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$[\Sigma_g]$ has non-zero coefficient in s when written as a linear combination over the basis $\{f, s, e_1, \dots, e_r\}$. As a result, the projection of Σ_g to the base Σ_h has non-zero degree and hence $g \geq h$. \square

Lemma 2.6. ([36]) *Let (X, ω) be a non-minimal uniruled manifold and D a symplectic submanifold with positive genus. If $[D] \cdot e > 0$ for all exceptional classes e in X , then $(K_\omega + [D])^2 \geq 0$.*

Proof. If $[D]$ represents a section class and $[D] \cdot e > 0$ for all exceptional classes e in X , then X is minimal. Therefore, we can assume $[D]$ is not a section class. The result follows from Proposition 3.14 of [36]. \square

2.2 Relative cohomology pairing

In this subsection, we recall the relative de Rham theory and illustrate the well-definedness of several pairings.

Given a smooth manifold with boundary X , the cochain \mathcal{C}_k consists of pairs (β, α) , where β is a k -form on X and α is a $(k-1)$ -form on ∂X . The differential d is defined as $d(\beta, \alpha) = (d\beta, \beta|_{\partial X} - d\alpha)$. It is easy to see that $d \circ d = 0$ and it forms a cohomology isomorphic to the usual relative cohomology $H^*(X, \partial X; \mathbb{R})$.

We assume that X has dimension 4 and is connected, oriented. Consider the following pairing:

$$H^2(X; \mathbb{R}) \times H^2(X, \partial X; \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow H^4(X, \partial X; \mathbb{R}) = \mathbb{R}$$

$$([A], [(B, b)]) \rightarrow \int_X A \wedge B - \int_{\partial X} A \wedge b,$$

where the integral on ∂X is taken with the Stokes boundary orientation. To see it is independent of A , we check that by Stokes Theorem applied to X ,

$$\int_X du \wedge B - \int_{\partial X} du \wedge b = \int_X d(du \wedge b) - \int_{\partial X} du \wedge b = 0.$$

To see it is independent of (B, b) , we check that by Stokes Theorem applied to both X and ∂X ,

$$\int_X A \wedge d\beta - \int_{\partial X} A \wedge (\beta - d\alpha) = \int_{\partial X} A \wedge d\alpha = \int_{\partial X} d(A \wedge \alpha) = 0.$$

Notice that, by Lefschetz duality, this pairing is **Non-Degenerate**.

Consider the following portion of the long exact sequence

$$\cdots H^1(\partial X; \mathbb{R}) \xrightarrow{\partial} H^2(X, \partial X; \mathbb{R}) \xrightarrow{f} H^2(X; \mathbb{R}) \xrightarrow{r} H^2(\partial X; \mathbb{R}) \cdots, \quad (1)$$

where at the form level, f sends (A, a) to A , and r sends B to $B|_{\partial X}$. Via the forgetful map f , we also have the pairing

$$H^2(X, \partial X; \mathbb{R}) \times H^2(X, \partial X; \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow H^4(X, \partial X; \mathbb{R}) = \mathbb{R}.$$

However, this pairing in general has a kernel.

Lemma 2.7. *The pairing $[(A, a)] \cdot [(B, b)]$ is independent of a and b .*

Proof. If b' is another primitive of B , then $b - b'$ is closed. Hence

$$\int_{\partial X} A \wedge (b - b') = \int_{\partial X} da \wedge (b - b') = 0.$$

The same argument applies to the choice of a . □

The kernel is contained in the image of the boundary homomorphism $\partial : H^1(\partial X; \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow H^2(X, \partial X; \mathbb{R})$ by the non-degeneracy of the pairing $H^2(X; \mathbb{R})$ and $H^2(X, \partial X; \mathbb{R})$. Actually, the kernel is exactly the image because it is easy to see that it pairs everything to be zero.

This formalization of relative cohomology can be translated to compactly supported cohomology of $X - \partial X$. For (β, α) a cochain in \mathcal{C}_k , we consider a collar $(0, 1] \times \partial X$ of ∂X in X . We choose a cutoff function $\chi : (0, 1] \times \partial X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We want $\chi(r, x) = \chi(r)$ for $(r, x) \in (0, 1] \times \partial X$ such that $\chi(r) = 0$ near $r = 0$ and $\chi(r) = 1$ near $r = 1$. Extending by 0, $\chi\alpha$ is a $k - 1$ -form on X which we also denote as α^c . Then $(\beta, \alpha) - d(\chi\alpha, 0) = (\beta - d(\chi\alpha), 0)$ is another chain level representative of $[(\beta, \alpha)]$ which has compact support in $X - \partial X$. One can show that this translation induce an isomorphism from relative cohomology $H^k(X, \partial X, \mathbb{R})$ to the compactly supported cohomology $H_{cpt}^k(X - \partial X, \mathbb{R})$.

From now on, we use P or N instead of X to denote a manifold with boundary, depending on whether it is a cap or a filling. The following simple lemma is the key to relate the caps with the closed manifold.

Lemma 2.8. *Let (P, ω_P) be a symplectic cap of (Y, ξ) with a Liouville one form α_P . and (N, ω_N) be a symplectic filling of (Y, ξ) with a Liouville one form α_N . Let $X = N \cup_Y P$ which is a closed manifold. Then for sufficiently large $t > 0$, there is a symplectic form ω on X such that $c_1(X) \cdot \omega = c_1(N) \cdot [(\omega_N, \alpha_N)] + c_1(P) \cdot t[(\omega_P, \alpha_P)]$ and $\omega|_N = \omega_N$.*

Proof. We identify $(\partial N, \ker(\alpha_N))$ and $(\partial P, \ker(\alpha_P))$ by a contactomorphism Φ . There is a global positive function $f_{\alpha_P} : \partial N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\Phi^*\alpha_P = f_{\alpha_P}\alpha_N$. When $t > 0$ is large, $\Phi^*t\alpha_P = f_{t\alpha_P}\alpha_N$ is such that $f_{t\alpha_P}(x) > 1$

for all $x \in \partial N$. We fix such a choice of t . Consider the symplectization $(\mathbb{R} \times \partial N, d(e^r \alpha_N), e^r \alpha_N)$ where $r \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $SY = \{(r, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \partial N | 1 \leq e^r \leq f_{t\alpha_P}(x)\}$. We equip it with the restricted symplectic form and one form and call it $(SY, \omega_{SY}, \alpha_{SY})$. We can glue (N, ω_N, α_N) and $(P, t\omega_P, t\alpha_P)$ by inserting $(SY, \omega_{SY}, \alpha_{SY})$, see [18]. Notice that α_{SY} is a globally defined primitive of ω_{SY} on SY and coincide with α_N and $t\alpha_P$ on its two boundary components, respectively. Let the resulting manifold be (X, ω) , which is the union of N , SY and P . By multiplying a cutoff function and by abuse of notation, we can extend α_{SY} to be a one form supported in a neighborhood of $SY \subset X$ such that $\alpha_{SY}|_N = \alpha_N^c$ and $\alpha_{SY}|_P = t\alpha_P^c$, where α_N^c and $t\alpha_P^c$ are defined as in the paragraph before Lemma 2.8. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_1(X) \cdot [\omega] &= c_1(X) \cdot [\omega - d\alpha_{SY}] \\ &= c_1(X) \cdot [\omega_N - d\alpha_N^c] + c_1(X) \cdot t[\omega_P - d\alpha_P^c] \\ &= c_1(N) \cdot [(\omega_N, \alpha_N)] + c_1(P) \cdot t[(\omega_P, \alpha_P)] \end{aligned}$$

which is simply the sum of the pairings from the cap and the filling. This is clearly true for any t sufficiently large. It completes the proof. \square

The following properties are also useful.

Lemma 2.9. *Let (P, ω) be a symplectic cap and α a choice of Liouville one form. Let $\Sigma \subset P$ be a compact embedded surface with boundary $\partial\Sigma \subset \partial P$. Then the followings are true.*

- $[(\omega, \alpha)]^2 > 0$,
- $[\Sigma] \cdot PD([\omega, \alpha]) = \int_\Sigma \omega - \int_{\partial\Sigma} \alpha$, where $\partial\Sigma$ is equipped with Stokes orientation.
- if $c_1(P) \cdot [(\omega, \alpha)] = 0$ and $c_1(P) \neq 0 \in H^2(P, \mathbb{R})$, then there is a small perturbation (ω', α') of (ω, α) such that (P, ω') is a cap, α' is a Liouville one form of ω' and $c_1(P) \cdot [(\omega', \alpha')] > 0$.

Proof. For the first one, we have $[(\omega, \alpha)]^2 = \int_P \omega^2 - \int_{\partial P} \alpha \wedge \omega$. The first term is positive because the orientation of P is always chosen to be compatible with ω^2 . On the other hand, $\int_{\partial P} \alpha \wedge \omega < 0$ because the orientation of ∂P as a contact manifold is determined by $\iota_V(\omega^2) = 2\alpha \wedge \omega$ for an inward pointing vector field V , while the Stokes orientation of ∂P is determined by $\iota_{V_{Stoke}}(\omega^2)$ for an outward pointing vector field V_{Stoke} . Therefore, $[(\omega, \alpha)]^2 > 0$.

The second one follows from definition.

For the last one, if $c_1(P) \neq 0$ we can find a relative cohomology class $[(A, a)]$ pairs positively with $c_1(P)$ by the non-degeneracy of the pairing between absolute cohomology and relative cohomology. Let (A, a) be a chain level representative of $[(A, a)]$. The result follows by adding $c(A, a)$ to (ω, α) for some small $c > 0$. \square

We could have define Calabi-Yau cap by the equation $c_1(P) \cdot [(\omega, \alpha)] = 0$ instead of $c_1(P) = 0 \in H^2(P, \mathbb{R})$. In this case, the second bullet of Lemma 2.9 implies that if $c_1(P)$ is not torsion, then we can deform the cap to a uniruled cap which gives strictly stronger restriction to fillings. Therefore, we stick to our definition of Calabi-Yau caps.

2.3 Neck-stretching basic

Let (X, ω) be a closed symplectic four manifold and \mathcal{J} the space of ω -compatible almost complex structure. We recall some basic Gromov-Witten theory and neck-stretching techniques (See [11],[41] for more comprehensive account). For any $J \in \mathcal{J}$ and a (connected) tree T with $|T|$ many (finite) vertices, we call $u = (u_i)_{i=1}^{|T|}$ a **closed genus 0 nodal J -holomorphic map** modeled on T if for each vertex v_i of T , there exists a J -holomorphic map $u_i : \mathbb{C}P^1 \rightarrow (X, \omega, J)$ such that the intersection pattern of $\{u_i(\mathbb{C}P^1)\}$ is given by the tree T (i.e. an edge joining two vertices corresponds to an intersection between the corresponding $u_i(\mathbb{C}P^1)$). A closed genus 0 nodal J -holomorphic map u is one that modeled on some tree T . In this case, we also call u a closed genus 0 nodal J -holomorphic representative for the homology class $[u] = \sum u_{i*}[\mathbb{C}P^1]$. The following Proposition is well-known and readers are referred to [41] and the references therein.

Proposition 2.10. *Let e be an exceptional class of (X, ω) . Then for any $J \in \mathcal{J}$, there is a closed genus 0 nodal J -holomorphic representative u of e .*

Let (Y, ξ) be a separating contact hypersurface in (X, ω) . Here, we mean that there is a Liouville vector V defined near Y such that V is transversal to Y . We denote the Liouville one form α and $\xi = \ker(\alpha)$. Let $(P, \omega|_P)$ be the cap and $(N, \omega|_N)$ be the fillings of Y . Let $Int(P)$ and $Int(N)$ be the corresponding interior. We call an $\omega|_P$ -compatible almost complex structure J^∞ is **cylindrical** if there is a collar $([0, \epsilon) \times Y, \omega = d(e^r \alpha), \alpha)$ of Y in P such that $J^\infty(\xi) = \xi$, $J^\infty(\partial_r) = \partial_{Reeb}$, $J^\infty(\partial_{Reeb}) = -\partial_r$, where $r \in [0, \epsilon)$ and ∂_{Reeb} is the Reeb vector field of α . For a cylindrical J^∞ , we call $u^\infty = (u_i^\infty)$ a **genus 0 top building** if u_i^∞ are J^∞ -holomorphic maps (finitely many and possibly empty) from genus 0 unpunctured Riemann surfaces Σ_i to $Int(P)$

with punctures asymptotic to Reeb orbits of ∂P . Similarly, we can think of $u_{i*}^\infty([\Sigma_i]) \in H_2(P, \partial P)$ and we denote $\sum u_{i*}^\infty([\Sigma_i])$ as $[u^\infty]$.

Proposition 2.11. *(See [11] and cf. [41]) Let $[D]$ be a homology class in $H_2(P, \mathbb{Z})$. For a tubular neighborhood \mathcal{N} of Y in X , there is a sequence $J^k \in \mathcal{J}$ and an $\omega|_P$ -compatible cylindrical almost complex structure J^∞ on P such that the following holds.*

- $J = J^k$ outside N for all k and $J|_{P-\mathcal{N}} = J^\infty|_{P-\mathcal{N}}$,
- if, for all k , $u^k = (u_i^k)$ is a closed genus 0 nodal J^k -holomorphic map representing the same homology class in X , then there is a genus 0 top building $u^\infty = (u_i^\infty)$ to P , and
- $[D] \cdot [u^k] = [D] \cdot [u^\infty]$, where the first pairing takes place in $H_2(X)$ (ie. $[D]$ represents its image to $H_2(X)$) and the second is the pairing between $H_2(P)$ and $H_2(P, \partial P)$.

Corollary 2.12. *Let (P, ω_P) be a symplectic cap of (Y, ξ) . Assume that $[(\omega, \alpha)]$ is a rational class and let $[D] \in H_2(P, \mathbb{Z})$ be the Lefschetz dual of $c[(\omega, \alpha)]$ for some $c > 0$. Then for any minimal strong symplectic filling N of (Y, ξ) and any exceptional class e in X , we have $[D] \cdot e > 0$.*

Proof. By Proposition 2.10, there is a closed genus 0 nodal representative for u for any $J \in \mathcal{J}$. We apply Proposition 2.10 to the choice of J^k in Proposition 2.11, then we get a J^∞ genus 0 top building $u^\infty = (u_i^\infty)$. Notice that, u_i^∞ are J^∞ for all i and they have punctures asymptotic to Reeb orbits. For a small circle C sufficiently close to a puncture of Σ_i , $u_i^\infty(C)$ is close to a Reeb orbit and hence $\int_C \alpha < 0$, where the orientation of C is taken to be the Stoke orientation with respect to Σ_i . Therefore, as in the calculation of first bullet of Lemma 2.9 and by the second bullet of Lemma 2.9, we must have $u_{i*}^\infty[\Sigma_i] \cdot [D] > 0$. Therefore, Proposition 2.11 implies $[D] \cdot e > 0$. \square

2.4 A general property for Betti finiteness

For any contact 3-manifold of Stein (resp. exact, strong) Betti finite type, we have the following restriction for simply connected fillings.

Proposition 2.13. *If (Y, ξ) is of Stein (resp. exact/strong) Betti finite type, then (Y, ξ) has at most finitely many simply connected Stein (resp. exact/minimal strong) fillings up to homomorphism.*

To prove this proposition, we introduce necessary definitions and a lemma. For an integral symmetric bilinear form $Q : \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$, let M_Q be a matrix presentation of Q , and let G_Q be the group presented by the matrix M_Q (i.e. the cokernel of the homomorphism $\mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^n$ given by M_Q). Note that G_Q is independent of the choice of M_Q . Let r_Q, d_Q be rank G_Q and the number of elements of $\text{Tor}(G_Q)$, respectively.

Though the lemma below might be known to experts, we give a proof since we could not find any reference.

Lemma 2.14. *For any finitely generated abelian group G and any positive integer n , there exist at most finitely many isomorphism types of integral symmetric bilinear forms such that their matrix presentations present G and have the size n .*

Proof. Let d denote the number of elements of $\text{Tor}(G)$, and put $r = \text{rank } G$. We prove the claim by induction on the number $r \geq 0$. The $r = 0$ case follows from the finiteness of isomorphism types of intersection forms with non-zero determinant. For this fact, see Theorem 1.1 in Chapter 9 of [13]. Note that $d_Q = \det(M_Q)$ in this case.

Assuming the $r = k \geq 0$ case, we prove the $r = k + 1$ case. The condition $r \geq 1$ implies $\det(M_Q) = 0$ for any intersection form Q with $G_Q \cong G$. Therefore, there exist integral square matrixes A, B with size n and $|\det(A)| = |\det(B)| = 1$ such that AM_QB is a diagonal matrix which has a zero in a diagonal component. Using this fact, we easily see that there exists a primitive element $x \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ satisfying $Q(x, y) = 0$ for any $y \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. As a consequence, Q has the orthogonal sum decomposition $Q = Q|_{\langle x \rangle} \oplus Q|_H$ for some subgroup H of \mathbb{Z}^n . Since $G_Q \cong G_{Q|_{\langle x \rangle}} \oplus G_{Q|_H}$, we see $r_{Q|_H} = k$. Therefore, the assumption on the induction shows the $r = k + 1$ case. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.13. Let (Y, ξ) be a contact 3-manifold of Betti finite type (resp. strong Betti finite type). The intersection form Q of any simply connected compact 4-manifold with the boundary Y satisfies $G_Q \cong H_1(Y; \mathbb{Z})$ (cf. [24]). By the assumption, there are only finitely many possible values of b_2 for Stein (resp. minimal strong) fillings of (Y, ξ) . Therefore, according to Lemma 2.14, there are only finitely many possible intersection forms of such Stein (resp. minimal strong) fillings. According to a theorem of Boyer (Corollary 0.4 in [12]), for a given connected oriented closed 3-manifold and an intersection form, there are at most finitely many topological types of simply connected 4-manifolds which realize the given boundary and the intersection form. Therefore the desired claim follows. \square

3 Calabi-Yau caps and exact fillings

3.1 Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4

We prove Theorem 1.3, Theorem 1.4 and Corollary 1.6 in this subsection.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Let (P, ω_P) be a Calabi-Yau cap with a Liouville contact form α_P . In particular, we have $c_1(P) \cdot [(\omega_P, \alpha_P)] = 0$. For an exact symplectic filling (N, ω_N) of (Y, ξ) , we also have a Liouville contact form α_N on ∂N making $c_1(N) \cdot [(\omega_N, \alpha_N)] = 0$. By Lemma 2.8, the glued closed symplectic manifold (X, ω) has $c_1(X) \cdot [\omega] = 0$. If X is not minimal, we can blow down the exceptional spheres to obtain a minimal model. Since blow-down increases $c_1(X) \cdot [\omega]$, we must have X being non-minimal uniruled or minimal symplectic Calabi-Yau.

First we assume X is non-minimal uniruled. We want to give Betti number bounds for X . Since $[(\omega_P, \alpha_P)]^2 > 0$ by Lemma 2.9, we have $b_2^+(P) = 1$ and $b_2^+(N) = 0$. On the other hand, we can find a closed oriented embedded surface S in P with genus g and homology class being the Lefschetz dual of $c[(\omega_P, \alpha_P)]$ for some constant c , by possibly perturbing $[(\omega_P, \alpha_P)]$ to a rational class (cf. [24], Remark 1.2.4). Then $[S]^2 > 0$ and one should think that S is chosen before gluing with N . By Lemma 2.5, the base genus of X is less than or equal to g and this gives an upper bound for $b_1(X)$ and hence $b_3(X)$.

We observe that S can be chosen such that $[S]^2 \geq g - 1$, by possibly choosing a larger c . The reason is, once S is chosen as above, we consider ν distinct copies of embedded surfaces representing $[S]$ by local perturbation of S . We assume each pair of these ν copies are transversally intersecting each other. After resolving all the transversal intersection points for these ν copies, we get an embedded surface of genus $\nu g + \frac{(\nu-1)\nu}{2}[S]^2 - (\nu-1)$ with self-intersection $\nu^2[S]^2$. When ν is large, we get an embedded surface with homology class being a positive multiple of $cPD[(\omega_P, \alpha_P)]$ such that the self-intersection number is greater than the genus. We hence assume $[S]^2 \geq g - 1$ and define $s = [S]^2$.

To bound $b_2(X)$, it suffices to bound the number of exceptional spheres in X . Since ω_N is exact, the $\omega_P - d\alpha_P^c$ in Lemma 2.8 viewed as a closed two form on X represents the same cohomology class as ω . Therefore, S is the Poincaré dual of $c[\omega]$ and any exceptional class pairs positively with $[S]$ in X . By [31], there is a symplectic surface $\tilde{S} \subset X$ representing $[S]$ and the genus \tilde{g} of \tilde{S} is less than or equal to g . We may assume $\tilde{g} > 0$. We may also assume X is not minimal, otherwise there is nothing to prove. By Lemma 2.6, we have $(-c_1(X) + [\tilde{S}])^2 \geq 0$. Notice that $(-c_1(X) + [\tilde{S}])^2 =$

$c_1(X)^2 + 2(-c_1(X) \cdot [S] + [S]^2) - [S]^2 = c_1(X)^2 + 2(2\tilde{g} - 2) - s$, where the second equality is by adjunction. Therefore, $c_1(X)^2 \geq s - 2(2\tilde{g} - 2) \geq s - 2(2g - 2)$. Since g and s are independent of N and only depend on $S \subset P$, the lower bound of $c_1(X)$ is independent of N . As a result, $b_2(X)$ is bounded. Since the bounds of $b_1(X), b_2(X), b_3(X)$ are independent of N , we get uniform bounds of $b_1(N), b_2(N), b_3(N)$ independent of N .

Next, we assume X is a minimal symplectic Calabi-Yau, Theorem 2.2 give a uniform bound on the Betti numbers of X . Hence, $b_1(N), b_2(N), b_3(N)$ are clearly bounded. It finishes the proof of the first statement. The second statement is trivial because X must be minimal symplectic Calabi-Yau. \square

To prove Theorem 1.4, we start with a lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *There is a symplectic K3 surface which has g disjoint copies of embedded Lagrangian tori representing the same class and each of which intersects transversally to an embedded Lagrangian sphere at a point.*

Proof. We first recall a construction of a K3 surface [24]. Let (T^4, ω_T) be the four torus equipped with the quotient Kahler form induced by the standard Kahler form on \mathbb{C}^2 quotient by \mathbb{Z}^4 . There is an involution $I : T^4 \rightarrow T^4$ defined by $I(z, w) = (-z, -w)$ which has 16 fixed points. The quotient $X' = T^4 / ((z, w) \sim I(z, w))$ has 16 singular points. After resolving these 16 singular points, which results in 16 spheres of self-intersection -2 , we get our K3 surface (X, ω_X) .

We can write ω_T as $dx \wedge dy + du \wedge dv$. Then there is a family of Lagrangian tori corresponding to x, u coordinates (ie. tangent space spanned by ∂_x, ∂_u) and another family corresponding to y, v coordinates. We call them xu -tori and yv -tori.

For any $g > 1$, pick g disjoint xu -tori. One can choose these g Lagrangian xu -tori in a way that they avoids the 16 fixed points and such that they descend to disjoint embedded Lagrangian tori in the quotient X' . These 16 tori in X' can then be lifted to X .

We consider a yv -torus that passes through 4 of the 16 fixed points. When descended to X' , the image of this Lagrangian torus becomes a orbitfold Lagrangian sphere with four orbitfold points. We call the orbitfold sphere yv -orbitfold sphere. We claim that we can resolve the 16 orbitfold points of X' in a way that yv -orbitfold sphere lifts to an embedded Lagrangian sphere in X . Once we established the claim, it is clear that this Lagrangian sphere together with the g Lagrangian tori are the Lagrangians in X we want.

To prove the claim, it suffices to understand the local model for the symplectic resolution at the orbitfold points. It turns out that the resolution is symplectically the same as replacing a neighborhood of an orbitfold point and gluing back a neighborhood of zero section of T^*S^2 , where the yv -orbitfold sphere near the orbitfold point is identified with a fiber of T^*S^2 after the gluing. Hence, the yv -orbitfold sphere can be lifted to X by extending the fibers across the zero section of T^*S^2 .

After explaining the effect of the resolution and why the claim follows from it, we now explain how the surgery goes, which turns out to be a routine calculation. We start with a model for T^*S^2 . Let $U_1 = U_2 = \mathbb{C}$ and $\phi_{12} : U_1 \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow U_2 \setminus \{0\}$ be $\phi_{12}(z) = \frac{1}{z}$. Then $\Phi_{12} = (\phi_{12}^*)^{-1} : T^*(U_1 \setminus \{0\}) \rightarrow T^*(U_2 \setminus \{0\})$ is given by $\Phi_{12}(z, w) = (\frac{1}{z}, -\bar{z}^2 w)$, where $z \in U_1$ and $w \in \mathbb{C}$. The standard Liouville one form on T^*U_1 is given by $\lambda_1 = p_1 dq_1 + p_2 dq_2 = \frac{1}{2}(wd\bar{z} + \bar{w}dz)$, where the identification is $z = q_1 + iq_2, w = p_1 + ip_2$. The Liouville form on T^*U_2 is similar. These give the description of T^*S^2 .

We define a double covering $\rho_j : U_j \times (\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}) \rightarrow (T^*U_j \setminus U_j)$ by

$$\rho_j(\tilde{z}, \tilde{w}) = (\tilde{z}, i\overline{\tilde{w}^2})$$

for $j = 1, 2$. This double covering can be globalized using the transition map $\tilde{\Phi}_{12} : (U_1 \setminus \{0\}) \times (\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}) \rightarrow (U_2 \setminus \{0\}) \times (\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\})$ given by

$$\tilde{\Phi}_{12}(\tilde{z}, \tilde{w}) = (\frac{1}{\tilde{z}}, i\tilde{z}\tilde{w})$$

in the sense that $\rho_2 \circ \tilde{\Phi}_{12} = \Phi_{12} \circ \rho_1$ over $(U_1 \setminus \{0\}) \times (\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\})$. Clearly, $U_j \times (\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\})$ together with $\tilde{\Phi}_{12}$ are charts and transition function of the $O(1)$ bundle over \mathbb{CP}^1 away from the zero section. Moreover, ρ_j determines a double covering to $T^*S^2 \setminus S^2$. The pull-back one form is given by

$$\tilde{\lambda}_1 = \rho_1^* \lambda_1 = \frac{1}{2}(i(\overline{\tilde{w}})^2 d\tilde{z} - i\tilde{w}^2 d\tilde{z})$$

We define diffeomorphisms $\Psi_1 : (\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}) \times \mathbb{C} \rightarrow U_1 \times (\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\})$ by

$$\Psi_1(\hat{z}, \hat{w}) = (\frac{\hat{w}}{\hat{z}}, \hat{z})$$

and $\Psi_2 : \mathbb{C} \times (\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}) \rightarrow U_2 \times (\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\})$ by

$$\Psi_2(\hat{z}, \hat{w}) = (\frac{\hat{z}}{\hat{w}}, i\hat{w})$$

which satisfy $\tilde{\Phi}_{12} \circ \Psi_1 = \Psi_2$ over $(\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}) \times (\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\})$. Hence Ψ_1, Ψ_2 together give a diffeomorphism from $\mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ to $O(1)$ -bundle of \mathbb{CP}^1 away from zero section. The differential of the pull-back one form is given by

$$d(\Psi_1^* \tilde{\lambda}_1) = -i(d\hat{z} \wedge d\hat{w} - d\bar{\hat{z}} \wedge d\bar{\hat{w}})$$

By letting $\hat{z} = u + ix, \hat{w} = y + iv$, we get $d(\Psi_1^* \tilde{\lambda}_1) = 2(dx \wedge dy + du \wedge dv)$ which is the standard symplectic form up to a constant multiple. In particular, it coincide with the ω_T on T^4 near a fixed point. The yv -torus near a fixed point corresponds to $\hat{z} = 0$, which can be identified as a fiber of $U_2 \times (\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\})$ under Ψ_2 . Finally, note that the involution on T^4 satisfies $\rho_j \circ \Psi_j \circ I = \rho_j \circ \Psi_j$ for both $j = 1, 2$, which tells us that the yv -orbitfold sphere near a orbitfold point correspond to a fiber of $T^*U_2 \setminus U_2$ as claimed.

□

Proof of Theorem 1.4. By Lemma 3.1, we have g Lagrangian tori representing the same class A such that each of which transversally intersect a Lagrangian sphere in a symplectic $K3$ surface X . Let the homology class of the sphere be B . We smooth out the intersection points by local Lagrangian surgery and result in an embedded Lagrangian genus g surface L .

Let U be the unit cotangent disk bundle and identify it with a Weinstein neighborhood of L . Then, the complement of the interior of U gives a Calabi-Yau cap P for Y . Notice that $[L]$ is spanned by A and B and the intersection form restricted to the subspace spanned by A and B is given by

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

which is equivalent to a hyperbolic plane H . As a result, the orthogonal complement of this subspace has intersection matrix $-2E_8 \oplus 2H$. On the other hand, $A - (g - 2)B$ is orthogonal to $[L] = A + gB$. In other word, the bilinear form $-2E_8 \oplus 2H \oplus (2 - 2g)$ embeds into the intersection form of P , where $2 - 2g$ corresponds to the direction spanned by the class $A - (g - 2)B$, which has self-intersection $2 - 2g$.

Note that $H_2(Y; \mathbb{Z}) = H^1(Y; \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}^{2g}$. As a circle bundle, the generators of $H_2(Y; \mathbb{Z})$ are given by a loop from the base L times the circle fibers. It is the boundary of the same loop of the base times the disk fiber in U , which means that $H_2(Y; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_2(U; \mathbb{Z})$ is a zero map. From the long exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow H_2(Y; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_2(U; \mathbb{Z}) \oplus H_2(P; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_2(X; \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}^{22}$$

we see that $H_2(Y; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_2(P; \mathbb{Z})$ is an injection. Since $H_2(X; \mathbb{Z})$ has no torsion and $H_2(Y; \mathbb{Z})$ is free, both $H_2(U; \mathbb{Z})$ and $H_2(P; \mathbb{Z})$ do not have torsion. Hence we know that $H_2(P; \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}^{2g+22}$ and the intersection matrix of P is given by $-2E_8 \oplus 2H \oplus (2-2g) \oplus (0)^{2g}$, where $(0)^{2g}$ corresponds to the subspace spanned by the image of $H_2(Y; \mathbb{Z})$.

From the intersection form of P , we see that P cannot embed into any uniruled manifold or minimal SCY other than a homology $K3$. Let N be any exact filling of Y , the glued symplectic manifold $P \cup N$ has to be a minimal integral homology $K3$ denoted as \overline{X} , by Theorem 1.3 and Remark 2.3. It implies that N has Euler characteristic $e(N) = 2 - 2g$ and signature $\sigma(N) = 1$. In particular, $b_2(N) \geq 1$.

By the long exact sequence

$$H_4(\overline{X}; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_3(Y; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_3(N; \mathbb{Z}) \oplus H_3(P; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow 0$$

and the fact that the first map is always an isomorphism, we have $H_3(N; \mathbb{Z}) = H_3(P; \mathbb{Z}) = 0$. Next the long exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow H_2(Y; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_2(N; \mathbb{Z}) \oplus H_2(P; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{22}$$

tell us that $H_2(N; \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}$ or $H_2(N; \mathbb{Z}) = 0$ because $H_2(P; \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}^{2g+21}$ and $H_2(Y; \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}^{2g}$. The latter one is ruled out by the fact that $b_2(N) \geq 1$ so $H_2(N; \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}$.

Note that the $-2E_8 \oplus 2H$ lattice from P embed into the intersection form of \overline{X} . Also, both the generator $[S_N]$ of $H_2(N; \mathbb{Z})$ and the $A - (g-2)B$ class in P lies in the orthogonal complement of $-2E_8 \oplus 2H$ in \overline{X} . By the classification of unimodular bilinear form, the orthogonal complement of $-2E_8 \oplus 2H$ in \overline{X} is H . This together with the fact that $[S_N]$ is orthogonal to $A - (g-2)B$ in H imply that $[S_N]$ has self-intersection $k^2(2g-2)$ for some positive integer k (because the primitive class orthogonal to $A - (g-2)B$ has self-intersection $2g-2$).

Finally, we want to determine $H_1(N; \mathbb{Z})$ using the fact that $[S_N]^2 = k^2(2g-2)$. From the long exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow H^3(N; \mathbb{Z}) \oplus H^3(P; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H^3(Y; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H^4(\overline{X}; \mathbb{Z})$$

and the fact that the last morphism is an isomorphism, we have $H_1(N, Y; \mathbb{Z}) = H^3(N; \mathbb{Z}) = 0$. Since we already know $H_2(N; \mathbb{Z})$ and $H_3(N; \mathbb{Z})$, the Euler characteristic of N implies the rank of $H_1(N; \mathbb{Z})$ is $2g$. On the other hand, since $H_2(N; \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}$ is of rank one, we have that $H_2(N, Y; \mathbb{Z})$ is of rank one. In the long exact sequence

$$H_2(N; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_2(N, Y; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_1(Y; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_1(N; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow 0$$

the map $f : H_2(N; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_2(N, Y; \mathbb{Z})$ is given by multiplication by $[S_N]^2 = k^2(2g-2)$ on the free generators of $H_2(N; \mathbb{Z})$ and $H_2(N, Y; \mathbb{Z})$. The cokernel of f contributes to a $\mathbb{Z}/(k^2(2g-2))\mathbb{Z}$ torsion to $H_1(Y; \mathbb{Z})$. Since $H_1(Y; \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}^{2g} \oplus \mathbb{Z}/(2g-2)\mathbb{Z}$, the torsion $\mathbb{Z}/(2g-2)\mathbb{Z}$ comes purely from the cokernel of f and $k = 1$. It also implies that $H_2(N, Y; \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}$ and $H_1(N; \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}^{2g}$. We have now established the integral homology type as well as the intersection form for any exact filling N of Y and hence finished the proof. \square

Proof of Corollary 1.6. Let Y_g be the standard unit cotangent bundle of an orientable surface of genus g . We note that Y_g admits a Weinstein filling (See Example 11.12 (2) of [14]) and hence a Stein (See Theorem 13.5 of [14]) filling.

However, Y_g has a semi-filling for $g > 1$, call it W_g , with disconnected contact boundaries (Theorem 1.1 in [40]). We can cap off the other boundary of W_g by caps with arbitrarily large b_2^+ (See e.g. [20]). Hence, after blowing down the exceptional spheres, W_g and these various caps can be glued together to give minimal strong fillings of Y_g with arbitrarily large b_2^+ . Thus, Y_g is not of strong Betti finite type. \square

3.2 Calabi-Yau caps via Lefschetz fibration

For practical use, we want to have families of Calabi-Yau caps examples with concrete descriptions in terms of Lefschetz fibration and open book decompositions. We refer to [24] and [50] for basics of Lefschetz fibrations, open books and their relations to Stein fillings and contact structures. For constructions of caps, the readers can consult [49].

Throughout the whole paper, we use the following notation. Let Σ_g^k be a compact connected oriented surface of genus g with k boundary components, and let $\text{Map}(\Sigma_g^k)$ be the mapping class group of Σ_g^k , i.e. the set of isotopy classes of self-diffeomorphisms of Σ_g^k which preserve orientations and fix the boundary $\partial\Sigma_g^k$ pointwise. We put $\Sigma_g = \Sigma_g^0$. We denote by $\delta_1, \delta_2, \dots, \delta_k$ the boundary parallel curves of Σ_g^k . For a curve C in Σ_g^k , let us denote the positive (i.e. right handed) Dehn twist along C by t_C .

We recall how to construct a closed Lefschetz fibration of genus g over S^2 by attaching some smooth 4-manifold to a Lefschetz fibration over D^2 with bounded fiber (cf. [24]). Let X be a Lefschetz fibration over D^2 with fiber Σ_g^k whose induced open book on the boundary ∂X is $(\Sigma_g^k, t_{\delta_k}^{i_k} \circ t_{\delta_{k-1}}^{i_{k-1}} \circ \dots \circ t_{\delta_1}^{i_1})$ ($i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k \geq 1$). By attaching a 2-handle to each binding component of the open book with page framing 0, we get a Lefschetz fibration X' over D^2

with closed fiber Σ_g . By gluing $\Sigma_g \times D^2$ to X' , we obtain a closed Lefschetz fibration \tilde{X} of genus g over S^2 .

In terms of handles, the last gluing corresponds to the following operation. We first attach a 2-handle to X' along a meridian of the attaching circle of the each 2-handle attached to X . The Seifert framings of these 2-handles are $-i_1, -i_2, \dots, -i_k$, respectively. We then attach k 3-handles and one 4-handle to the resulting 4-manifold.

Let $LF_{g,k,I}$ be the smooth 4-manifold $\tilde{X} - \text{int } X$ for $I = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k)$, and put $LF_{g,k} = LF_{g,k,(1,1,\dots,1)}$. This is the neighborhood of a regular fiber and pairwise disjoint sections of \tilde{X} . In particular, $LF_{g,k,I}$ is a plumbing of $\Sigma_g \times D^2$ and D^2 -bundles over S^2 with Euler numbers $-i_1, -i_2, \dots, -i_k$.

Let $(Y_{g,k,I}, \xi_{g,k,I})$ be the contact 3-manifold supported by the open book decomposition $(\Sigma_g^k, t_{\delta_k}^{i_k} \circ t_{\delta_{k-1}}^{i_{k-1}} \circ \dots \circ t_{\delta_1}^{i_1})$ of the boundary of X , and put $(Y_{g,k}, \xi_{g,k}) = (Y_{g,k,(1,1,\dots,1)}, \xi_{g,k,(1,1,\dots,1)})$. We see a symplectic structure on $LF_{g,k}$ compatible with this contact structure using Gay's cap.

Lemma 3.2 (cf. Gay [21], [22]). *For any $g \geq 0$ and $k \geq 1$, $LF_{g,k}$ admits a symplectic structure such that the contact structure on the concave boundary is isomorphic to $(Y_{g,k}, \xi_{g,k})$. Furthermore, the surface of genus g and the spheres in the plumbing are symplectic submanifolds.*

Proof. Gay (See [21], [22]) constructed a symplectic cap structure on the D^2 -bundle over Σ_g such that the boundary contact structure is supported by the open book $(\Sigma_{g,k}, t_{\delta_k} \circ t_{\delta_{k-1}} \circ \dots \circ t_{\delta_1})$. Furthermore, it contains a symplectic surface of genus g with the self-intersection number k . From his construction, it is easy to see that Gay's cap (say $G_{g,k}$) is obtained from $Y_{g,k} \times [0, 1]$ by attaching a 2-handle to $Y_{g,k} \times \{1\}$ along each binding component of the open book with page framing $+1$ and then attaching 3-handles and a 4-handle to the resulting boundary. By blowing up this cap at k points, we obtain a plumbing of symplectic surface of genus g with self-intersection 0 and k spheres with self-intersection -1 . By sliding the aforementioned each 2-handle of $G_{g,k}$ over the -1 -framed unknot corresponding to the 2-handle of each $\overline{\mathbb{CP}^2}$, we easily see that $G_{g,k} \#_k \overline{\mathbb{CP}^2}$ has the same handle decomposition as $LF_{g,k}$, since 3- and 4-handles are attached uniquely. \square

Remark 3.3. This proof tells that 2-handles of $LF_{g,k}$ and $G_{g,k} \#_k \overline{\mathbb{CP}^2}$ are attached to $Y_{g,k}$ along the same framed link.

A simple family of examples of Calabi-Yau caps are the D^2 -bundle over Σ_g with Euler number $2g - 2$ ($g \geq 2$) which is the Gay's cap $G_{g,2g-2}$, and the concave boundary contact structure is supported by the open book

$(\Sigma_g^{2g-2}, t_{\delta_{2g-1}} \circ \cdots \circ t_{\delta_1})$. Note that $G_{g,2g-2}$ contains a symplectic surface of genus g with the self-intersection number $2g - 2$.

The next proposition gives us many examples of Calabi-Yau caps P (with $b_1(P) \leq 1$). One can construct many examples of Stein fillable open books satisfying the assumption below by using monodromy descriptions of a Lefschetz fibration structure on $K3\#2\overline{\mathbb{C}P^2}$ (see [24], [53] and [59]).

Proposition 3.4. *Let (Y, ξ) be a contact 3-manifold supported by an open book (Σ_g^k, φ) with $g \geq 1$ and $k \geq 1$, where $\varphi = t_{C_n} \circ t_{C_{n-1}} \circ \cdots \circ t_{C_1}$ for some homotopically non-trivial simple closed curves C_1, \dots, C_n in Σ_g^k . Suppose that there exist (possibly empty set of) homotopically non-trivial simple closed curves $C_{n+1}, C_{n+2}, \dots, C_m$ ($m \geq n$) in Σ_g^k satisfying the following conditions.*

- $t_{C_m} \circ t_{C_{m-1}} \circ \cdots \circ t_{C_1} = t_{\delta_k} \circ t_{\delta_{k-1}} \circ \cdots \circ t_{\delta_1}$.
- The genus g Lefschetz fibration over S^2 with monodromy factorization $t_{C_m} \circ t_{C_{m-1}} \circ \cdots \circ t_{C_1}$ is diffeomorphic to a symplectic Calabi-Yau 4-manifold blown up at k points. Here we regard C_1, \dots, C_m as in Σ_g through the natural inclusion $\Sigma_g^k \hookrightarrow \Sigma_g$.

Then (Y, ξ) admits a Calabi-Yau cap whose fundamental group is the quotient group $\pi_1(\Sigma_g) / \langle C_{n+1}, C_{n+2}, \dots, C_m \rangle$, where $\langle C_{n+1}, C_{n+2}, \dots, C_m \rangle$ is the normal closure of the subgroup generated by these curves (More precisely, a base point of Σ is fixed and these curves are isotoped so that they pass through the base point.).

Proof. By the assumption, the genus g Lefschetz fibration Z over S^2 has k sections with self-intersection -1 . Let X denote the blow down of Z along these sections. Since Z is diffeomorphic to the blow up of a symplectic Calabi-Yau 4-manifold, and sections are a symplectic submanifold of some symplectic structure on Z , the uniqueness of minimal model shows that $c_1(X)$ of the symplectic structure on X is torsion.

Here we construct a Calabi-Yau cap. Let $(W = Y \times [0, 1], \omega)$ be a symplectization of (Y, ξ) . We note that $Y \times \{0\}$ and $Y \times \{1\}$ are concave and convex boundary of W , respectively. By the Legendrian realization principle and folding, we may assume that C_{n+1} is a Legendrian knot in a page of the open book (Σ_g^k, φ) of $Y \times \{1\}$ (see [1], [51]). We then attach a symplectic 2-handle to W along C_{n+1} with the framing -1 relative to the page framing. The resulting convex boundary is supported by the open book $(\Sigma_g^k, t_{C_{n+1}} \circ \varphi)$. Repeating this process, we obtain a compact symplectic 4-manifold W' such that the concave boundary is (Y, ξ) and that the convex

boundary (Y', ξ') is supported by the open book $(\Sigma_g^k, t_{C_m} \circ \cdots \circ t_{C_{n+1}} \circ \varphi)$. By Lemma 3.2 and the assumption, we can glue the cap $LF_{g,k}$ to W' so that the resulting symplectic manifold W'' is a cap of (Y, ξ) . By blowing down k sections with self-intersection -1 contained in $LF_{g,k} \subset W''$, we obtain a symplectic cap P . Since $c_1(X)$ is torsion, $c_1(P)$ is also torsion. Hence P is a Calabi-Yau cap of (Y, ξ) . By the proof of Lemma 3.2 and this construction, it is easy to see that W'' is obtained from $LF_{g,k}$ by attaching 2-handles along each vanishing cycle C_i ($n+1 \leq i \leq m$) in $\Sigma_g^k \times \partial D^2 (\subset \Sigma_g \times \partial D^2)$ with page framing -1 . Therefore $\pi_1(W'')$ is isomorphic to $\pi_1(\Sigma_g)/\langle C_{n+1}, \dots, C_m \rangle$. Since the blowing down preserves the fundamental group, P also has the same fundamental group. \square

3.3 Calabi-Yau caps as divisor caps

A *symplectic divisor* $D = C_1 \cup \cdots \cup C_k$ in a symplectic manifold (X, ω) is a collection of closed embedded symplectic surfaces C_i such that every intersection between any two C_i 's are positive and transversal and no three of the distinct C_i 's intersect at a common point. If every intersection is also ω -orthogonal, then we call D an ω -orthogonal divisor. To each symplectic divisor, one can associate its augmented graph. The augmented graph (Γ, g, s, a) (or simply denoted as (Γ, a) if no confusion would arise) is a weighted finite graph with vertices representing the surfaces and each edge joining two vertices representing an intersection between the two surfaces corresponding to the two vertices. Moreover, each vertex v_i is weighted by its genus (a non-negative integer g_i), its self-intersection number (an integer s_i) and its symplectic area (a positive real number a_i). The intersection matrix associated to (Γ, g, s, a) is denoted by Q_Γ .

Definition 3.5. Suppose (Γ, a) is an augmented graph with k vertices with $a = (a_1, \dots, a_k)$. Then, we say that (Γ, a) satisfies the positive (resp. negative) **GS criterion** if there exist $z \in (0, \infty)^k$ (resp. $(-\infty, 0]^k$) such that $Q_\Gamma z = a$. In either case, we say that (Γ, a) satisfies the GS criterion.

For a symplectic divisor D in (X, ω) , the associated augmented graph is denoted by (Γ_D, a) . We call that (D, ω) has a concave (resp. convex) neighborhood $P(D)$ if $P(D)$ is a strong capping (resp. strong filling) of its boundary. If in every neighborhood N of (D, ω) , there is a concave (resp. convex) neighborhood $P(D) \subset N$, then we call (D, ω) a concave (resp. convex) divisor.

We recall two Theorems in [34].


Theorem 3.6. *Let $D \subset (X, \omega)$ be an ω -orthogonal symplectic divisor. Then, $D \subset (X, \omega)$ is a concave (resp. convex) divisor if and only if (Γ_D, a) satisfies the positive (resp. negative) GS criterion.*

Theorem 3.7. *Let $D \subset (X, \omega_0)$ be a symplectic divisor. If the intersection form of D is not negative definite and ω_0 restricted to the boundary of plumbing of D is exact, then ω_0 can be deformed through a family of symplectic form ω_t making D a symplectic divisor for each t and such that (D, ω_1) is a concave divisor. Moreover, the contact structure constructed on the boundary of the concave neighborhood depends only on the graph of D .*

Remark 3.8. Suppose (D, ω) is a symplectic divisor. If the intersection form Q_D of D is non-degenerate, then ω is exact on the boundary (cf. Lemma 2.4 of [34]). In particular, D is concave or convex possibly after a symplectic deformation.

Having the Theorems above, to determine whether a neighborhood of a symplectic divisor gives a uniruled cap is a purely linear algebraic computation. Example 3.9 represent a symplectic divisor with genus of central vertex being g and genera of the other being 0. They have self-intersection numbers $2g - 2$, -2 , -2 and -2 , respectively. If $g \geq 1$, the intersection matrix is not negative definite and hence there is a choice of symplectic form making is a concave divisor by Theorem 3.7. By adjunction formula, it is easy to see that this concave neighborhood is a Calabi-Yau cap. This configuration can be found in a rational manifold so the boundary of this cap is strongly fillable. In fact, it is not hard to show that this configuration is the support of an effective ample line bundle in an irrational ruled manifold and hence the contact structure is Stein fillable but we will not pursue further here.

Example 3.9.



4 Uniruled caps and adjunction caps

To motivate the definition of a uniruled cap, we recall a Theorem in [37] and [43].

Theorem 4.1. *Let (X, ω) be a closed symplectic manifold with $c_1(X) \cdot [\omega] > 0$. Then, X is uniruled (i.e. rational or ruled).*

Therefore, uniruled caps are the counterpart of uniruled manifolds for compact symplectic manifolds with boundary.

4.1 Theorem 1.8 and basic properties

Proof of Theorem 1.8. Let (P, ω_P) be a uniruled cap with a Liouville contact form α_P making $c_1(P) \cdot [(\omega_P, \alpha_P)] > 0$. For a strong symplectic filling (N, ω_N) of (Y, ξ) , we have a Liouville contact form α_N on ∂N making $(\partial N, \ker(\alpha_N))$ contactomorphic to (Y, ξ) . By Lemma 2.8, when t is taken to be sufficiently large, $c_1(X) \cdot [\omega_X] > 0$ and hence X is uniruled, by Theorem 4.1.

Following the proof of Theorem 1.3, we have $b_2^+(P) = 1$ and $b_2^+(N) = 0$. Moreover, there is a bound depending only on P for base genus of X .

The next step is to give a bound depending only on P for the number of exceptional curves in X . Similar to the proof of Theorem 1.3, we perturb $[(\omega_P, \alpha_P)]$ a little bit such that there is a positive number c and an embedded surface S representing $cPD([(\omega_P, \alpha_P)])$ and $[S]^2 \geq g(S) - 1$. This time, an exceptional class in X does not have to pair positively with $[S]$ in a priori because $[S]$ is not Poincaré dual to multiple of ω_X in general. However, by Corollary 2.12, we know that any exceptional class indeed pairs positively with $[S]$. After this point, the remaining of the proof is the same as the proof of Theorem 1.3. □

We have the following sufficient criterion for uniruled caps.

Lemma 4.2. *Let (W, ω_W) be a strong cobordism with negative end $(\partial_- W, \ker(\alpha_W^-))$ and positive end $(\partial_+ W, \ker(\alpha_W^+))$. If $(\partial_+ W, \ker(\alpha_W^+))$ is uniruled, then $(\partial_- W, \ker(\alpha_W^-))$ is uniruled.*

Proof. Let (P, ω_P) be a uniruled cap for $(\partial_+ W, \ker(\alpha_W^+))$. By an analogue of Lemma 2.8, (W, ω_W) and $(P, t\omega_P)$ can be glued symplectically by inserting part of the symplectization of $(\partial_+ W, \ker(\alpha_W^+))$ for some large t . This glued symplectic manifold is a uniruled cap when t is sufficiently large. □

Lemma 4.3. *Suppose (P, ω_P) is a cap for (Y, ξ) with a closed embedded symplectic surface S not intersecting ∂P , $[S]^2 \geq 0$ and $c_1(P)[S] > 0$. Then, after a symplectic deformation, (P, ω'_P) is a uniruled cap for (Y, ξ) .*

Proof. Since S is smoothly embedded symplectic surface with non-negative self-intersection, we can do inflation (See [30], [35]) along S to deform the symplectic form. This gives a family of symplectic form ω_t on P such that

$[\omega_t] = [\omega] + t\iota_*(PD[S])$, where $\iota_* : H^2(P, \partial P; \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow H^2(P; \mathbb{R})$ is the natural map and PD denotes the Lefschetz dual. Let α be a choice of Liouville contact form on ∂P with respect to ω . Then, α is also a Liouville contact form on ∂P with respect to ω_t since inflation is local. Then, $c_1(P) \cdot [(\omega_t, \alpha)] = c_1(P) \cdot ([(\omega, \alpha)] + tPD[S]) > 0$ for sufficiently large t . Hence, we can find ω'_P such that (P, ω'_P) is a uniruled cap for (Y, ξ) . \square

Theorem 1.8 together with an argument of [19] gives the following byproduct. The reader should compare this with Corollary 1.4 in Albers-Bramham-Wendl [6].

Corollary 4.4. *If a contact 3-manifold is uniruled, then any strong semifilling of the contact manifold has connected boundary.*

Proof. Suppose, to the contrary, that (Y, ξ) admits a semifilling W with disconnected boundary. Since every contact 3-manifold has a cap with arbitrarily large b_2^+ (See [20]), by capping off the boundary components of W , we can obtain a strong filling N of (Y, ξ) satisfying $b_2^+(N) > 0$. This contradicts Theorem 1.8. \square

4.2 Genus invariants and complexity

We define the following genus invariants for uniruled caps.

Definition 4.5. For a uniruled cap P , its **maximal** (resp. **minimal**) **base genus** $g_{\max}(P)$ (resp. $g_{\min}(P)$) is the maximal (resp. minimal) base genus (i.e. $\frac{b_1(X)}{2}$) of the closed uniruled manifolds X obtained by gluing strong fillings to the boundary of P . The **base genus difference** $g_{\Delta}(P)$ is defined to be $g_{\max}(P) - g_{\min}(P)$. If there is no strong filling for the boundary of the cap, $g_{\max}(P)$, $g_{\min}(P)$ and $g_{\Delta}(P)$ are defined to be $-\infty$. The **surface genus** $g_s(P)$ of P is the minimal genus of an immersed oriented surface in P whose self-intersection number is positive.

Immediately, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 4.6. *For any uniruled cap (P, ω_P) , $g_s(P)$ is finite and we have $g_s(P) \geq g_{\max}(P) \geq g_{\min}(P)$.*

Proof. The bounds $g_{\max}(P) \leq g_s(P) < \infty$ of $g_s(P)$ is contained in the proof of Theorem 1.8. \square

Definition 4.7. Given a uniruled contact manifold (Y, ξ) , we define the **uniruled complexity** $c_u(Y, \xi)$ of (Y, ξ) to be the infimum of $g_{\max}(P)$ over all possible uniruled caps (P, ω_P) of (Y, ξ) .

4.2.1 Relation to some previous Betti finite examples

We illustrate here that many previous known contact manifolds of Betti finite type are of complexity zero.

Lemma 4.8. *Every strongly fillable planar contact 3-manifold (Y, ξ) admits a uniruled cap (P, ω_P) with $g_s(P) = 0$. In particular, we have $c_u(Y, \xi) = g_{\max}(P) = g_{\min}(P) = 0$.*


Proof. In [19], it is observed that every planar open book has a cap with an embedded self-intersection 0 symplectic sphere S inside. By Lemma 4.3, it has a uniruled cap. Moreover, the construction in [19] gives another smoothly embedded sphere S_2 of self-intersection k intersecting S positively transversally once. Therefore, by resolving n disjoint representatives of $[S]$ and S_2 , we get a sphere of positive self-intersection in the cap, when n is sufficiently large. \square

Lemma 4.9. *(T^3, ξ_{std}) admits a uniruled cap (P, ω_P) with $g_s(P) = g_\Delta = 0$ and hence $c_u(T^3, \xi_{std}) = 0$*

Proof. Notice that (T^3, ξ_{std}) is the unit circle cotangent bundle (with respect to some metric) of T^2 with contact structure induced by the canonical Liouville flow in T^*T^2 . We can embed a Lagrangian torus in \mathbb{CP}^2 as a fibre of a toric moment map. Then the complement of a Weinstein neighborhood of the Lagrangian toric fiber is a plumbing of three complex lines and hence a uniruled cap, by Lemma 4.3. \square

Remark 4.10. By Lemma 4.8, $c_u(Y, \xi) = 0$ if (Y, ξ) is planar and strongly fillable. On the other hand, (T^3, ξ_{std}) is not planar (the unique Stein filling is not negative definite) but $c_u(T^3, \xi_{std}) = 0$ by Corollary 4.9. Therefore, the class of contact manifolds having $c_u = 0$ is strictly larger than that of supporting genus being zero.

Example 4.11.



We can form an augmented graph as in Subsection 3.3 with the numbers above the vertices being the self-intersection numbers. Genera are zero and symplectic area are not specified. In particular, the boundary of the plumbing is a rational homology sphere and we can identify the absolute

second homology group with the relative second homology group. Since each vertex represents a symplectic surface, the first Chern class can be calculated using adjunction formula. In this case, $c_1 = PD(2[v_1] + [v_2] + [v_3] + [v_4])$, where $[v_i]$ are the homology classes of the corresponding spheres labeled in the graph and PD stands for the Lefschetz dual.

When $n = 3, 4, 5$, the intersection form associated to the symplectic divisor is not negative definite and non-degenerate. Therefore, Theorem 3.7 implies this symplectic divisor is concave for some choice of ω . Moreover, $c_1 \cdot [\omega] > 0$ and hence it gives a uniruled cap.

On the other hand, it is easy to find a surface of genus 1 with self-intersection $6 - n$ by repeating blowing down so $g_s(P) \leq 1$. If we choose an almost complex structure J making the configuration J -holomorphic, then we get a $(2, 3)$ -cusp curve with self-intersection $6 - n$ by repeating blowing down. This is the image of a sphere so we can perturb it to be an immersed sphere and hence $g_s(P) = 0$.

Remark 4.12. Now, we are ready to see how uniruled cap fits in the picture of some known Betti finite type contact manifolds. In [19], [38], [52], [27], [26], [55] and [34], those Betti finite type manifolds have symplectic caps with a non-negative self-intersection symplectic sphere. These are uniruled caps after a symplectic deformation, by Lemma 4.3. In [46], Ohta and Ono give some Betti finite type contact manifolds, which is the boundary of the ones in Example 4.11. In [61], Wendl shows that minimal strong filling of (T^3, ξ_{std}) is unique up to symplectic deformation. We have seen in Corollary 4.9 that (T^3, ξ_{std}) also admits a uniruled cap. In [45], their cap has a symplectic genus g surface ($g \geq 1$) with self-intersection greater than $2g - 2$, hence can be deformed to be a uniruled cap (Lemma 4.3). The caps used in [10] also belong to one of the above families.

4.2.2 Explicit bounds for strong fillings

In this subsection, we give explicit Betti number bounds for fillings of uniruled contact 3-manifolds in terms of genus invariants.

Lemma 4.13. *Let P be a uniruled cap of a contact 3-manifold (Y, ξ) , and let N be a strong filling of (Y, ξ) . Then the following hold.*

- (1) $(e + \sigma)(N) \in [\alpha(P) - 4g_{\max}(P), \alpha(P) - 4g_{\min}(P)]$, where $\alpha(P) = 4 - (e + \sigma)(P)$.
- (2) $(b_1 + b_3)(N) \in [0, 4g_{\max}(P) + 2b_1(Y) - (b_1 + b_3)(P)]$.

If P_2 is any other uniruled cap of (Y, ξ) , then $g_{\Delta}(P) = g_{\Delta}(P_2)$. Consequently, $c_u(Y, \xi) \geq g_{\Delta}(P)$.

Proof. We continue to use the notation from the proof of Theorem 1.8. Since X is ruled, $(e + \sigma)(X)$ only depends on the base genus of X , and hence $(e + \sigma)(X) \in [-4g_{\max}(P) + 4, -4g_{\min}(P) + 4]$. By Novikov additivity,

$$\begin{aligned} & (e + \sigma)(N) \\ &= (e + \sigma)(X) - (e + \sigma)(P) \\ &\in [-4g_{\max}(P) - (e + \sigma)(P) + 4, -4g_{\min}(P) - (e + \sigma)(P) + 4] \end{aligned}$$

Here note that $b_2^0(Z) \leq b_1(\partial Z)$ for any compact connected oriented 4-manifold Z with boundary, where $b_2^0(Z)$ denotes the maximal dimension of subspaces of $H_2(Z; \mathbb{R})$ whose intersection form is represented by the zero matrix (This can be seen from the long exact sequence for the pair $(Z, \partial Z)$ as follows. By the argument of Solution of Exercise 5.3.13(f) in [24], it follows that $b_2^0(Z)$ is the rank of the kernel of the homomorphism $H_2(Z; \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow H_2(Z, \partial Z; \mathbb{R})$. The exact sequence thus gives $b_2^0(Z) \leq b_2(\partial Z) = b_1(\partial Z)$). Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (b_1 + b_3)(N) \\ &= -(e + \sigma)(N) + 1 + 2b_2^+(N) + b_2^0(N) \\ &\leq 4g_{\max}(P) + (e + \sigma)(P) - 4 + 1 + b_1(Y) \\ &\leq 4g_{\max}(P) + (1 - (b_1 + b_3)(P) + 2b_2^+(P) + b_2^0(P)) - 3 + b_1(Y) \\ &\leq 4g_{\max}(P) + 2b_1(Y) - (b_1 + b_3)(P) \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, let P_2 be another uniruled cap of (Y, ξ) . Let N_{\min} and N_{\max} be two strong fillings of (Y, ξ) such that the glued manifolds $P \cup N_{\min}$ and $P \cup N_{\max}$ realize $g_{\min}(P)$ and $g_{\max}(P)$, respectively. One can easily see that difference of the base genus between the glued manifolds $P_2 \cup N_{\min}$ and $P_2 \cup N_{\max}$ equals $g_{\max}(P) - g_{\min}(P)$. Therefore, $g_{\Delta}(P_2) \geq g_{\Delta}(P)$. By symmetry, $g_{\Delta}(P) = g_{\Delta}(P_2)$. The fact that $c_u(Y, \xi) \geq g_{\Delta}(P)$ follows by definition. \square

We remark that Lemma 4.13 implies that $g_{\Delta}(P)$ is an invariant of (Y, ξ) so we also denote it as $g_{\Delta}(Y, \xi)$ and call it the base genus difference. Since $c_u(Y, \xi) = 0$ for strongly fillable planar manifolds, we also have $g_{\Delta}(Y, \xi) = 0$ and one can regard the base genus difference as a planar obstruction. For example, the contact boundaries for the uniruled caps that we construct later in Example 4.23 and Lemma 4.28 are non-planar. It is interesting to find examples with $g_{\Delta}(Y, \xi) = 0$ but $c_u(Y, \xi) \neq 0$.

Corollary 4.14. *Let (Y, ξ) be a uniruled contact 3-manifold. Then $g_{\Delta}(Y, \xi) = 0$ is equivalent to $e(N) + \sigma(N)$ being a constant for any strong fillings N of (Y, ξ) . In particular, if $c_u(Y, \xi) = 0$ then $e(N) + \sigma(N)$ is a constant.*

Proof. It follows directly from Lemma 4.13. \square

Corollary 4.14 can be viewed as an extension of the aforementioned Wand's result.

Alternative proof of Corollary 1.10. It follows directly from Corollary 4.14 and Lemma 4.8. \square

4.2.3 Explicit bounds for Stein fillings

For Stein fillings, we can also define the corresponding g_{\max}^{Stein} , g_{\min}^{Stein} and $g_{\Delta}^{\text{Stein}}$, analogous to g_{\max} , g_{\min} and g_{Δ} . Clearly,

$$g_{\min}^{\text{Stein}}(P) \geq g_{\min}(P), \quad g_{\max}^{\text{Stein}}(P) \leq g_{\max}(P), \quad g_{\Delta}^{\text{Stein}}(P) \leq g_{\Delta}(P).$$

We obtain concrete bounds on $e + \sigma$ of Stein fillings, which might be helpful to classify Stein fillings.

Lemma 4.15. *Suppose (Y, ξ) admits a uniruled cap P . Then for any Stein filling N of (Y, ξ) , the following inequalities hold.*

$$g_{\max}^{\text{Stein}}(P) \leq \lfloor \frac{b_1(P)}{2} \rfloor$$

$$\alpha(P) - 4g_{\max}^{\text{Stein}}(P) \leq (e + \sigma)(N) \leq \alpha(P) - 4g_{\min}^{\text{Stein}}(P),$$

where $\alpha(P) = 4 - (e + \sigma)(P)$, and $\lfloor r \rfloor$ denotes the maximal integer less than or equal to r .

Proof. Let N be a Stein filling of (Y, ξ) , and let X be the closed uniruled 4-manifold obtained by gluing X and P along (Y, ξ) . Since any Stein filling has a handle decomposition which consists of 0-, 1- and 2-handles, and b_1 of any uniruled manifold is even, we obtain $b_1(X) \leq 2\lfloor \frac{b_1(P)}{2} \rfloor$. Therefore, the claim follows from the fact $(e + \sigma)(N) = (e + \sigma)(X) - (e + \sigma)(P)$. \square

In particular, we have the following extension of Corollary 1.10.

Corollary 4.16. *Suppose (Y, ξ) has a cap P which is uniruled. Assume further $b_1(P) \leq 1$. Then $e + \sigma$ of a Stein filling of (Y, ξ) does not depend on the choice of the Stein filling.*

Proof. This clearly follows from Lemma 4.15. \square

4.3 Adjunction caps

Definition 4.17. An **adjunction cap** of a contact 3-manifold (Y, ξ) is a compact symplectic 4-manifold (P, ω) with strong concave boundary contactomorphic to (Y, ξ) such that there exist a smoothly embedded (not necessarily symplectic) genus g surface S in P with $[S] \cdot [S] \geq \max\{2g - 1, 0\}$. If $[S]^2 = 0$, we further require that $[S] \in H_2(P, \mathbb{Q})$ does not lie in the image of $H_2(Y, \mathbb{Q})$ under the natural map induced by inclusion.

Similar to uniruled caps, any strong filling glued with an adjunction cap gives rise to a closed uniruled manifold (Baykur informed us that he is aware of this statement but we can not find an explicit reference so we present an argument here).

Proposition 4.18. *Let (X, ω) be a closed symplectic manifold with a smoothly embedded (not necessarily symplectic) genus g surface S having self-intersection $[S]^2 \geq \max\{2g - 1, 0\}$. If $[S]^2 = 0$, we also assume that $[S]$ represents a non-trivial class in $H_2(X, \mathbb{Q})$. Then (X, ω) is uniruled.*

Proof. If S is a sphere with $[S]^2 = 0$ and $[S]$ represents a non-trivial class in $H_2(X, \mathbb{Q})$. Then X is uniruled, by Corollary 2 of [32].

If $[S]^2 \neq 0$, by Theorem A in [31], there is a positive integer n such that $n[S]$ is represented by an embedded connected ω' -symplectic surface C , which minimizes the genus, for some symplectic form ω' . The genus g_C of C is given by

$$2g_C - 2 = (n[S])^2 - c_1(X)([C]) = n^2s - c_1(X) \cdot [C].$$

Notice that $n[S]$ has another smooth representative T given by taking $n - 1$ perturbation of S with positive distinct intersections and smoothing out the intersection points. The genus of T is given by $g_T = ng + \frac{n(n-1)[S]^2}{2} - (n - 1)$. Therefore,

$$2g_T - 2 = 2ng + n(n - 1)s - 2n = n^2s + n(2g - 2 - s) < n^2s.$$

If X is not uniruled, we have $c_1(X) \cdot [C] < 0$ and thus $g_T < g_C$. Contradicting to C minimizing the genus. Therefore X is uniruled. \square

Theorem 4.19. *Any adjunction contact manifold is of strong Betti finite type.*

Proof. Let the glued manifold bwtween P and N be (X, ω) as before. Let S be the smoothly embedded surface in P such that $s = [S]^2 \geq \max\{2g-1, 0\}$. If S is a sphere and $[S]^2 = 0$, we have that $[S]$ represents a non-trivial class in $H_2(X, \mathbb{Q})$ by the Mayer-Vietoris sequence. Hence, X is uniruled, by Proposition 4.18.

Once we know that X is uniruled, we use the same reasoning as in the proof of Theorem 1.8 to conclude our result. \square

One can define genus invariants for an adjunction cap and the complexity of an adjunction contact manifold in the obvious way. These notions coincide when a cap (resp. contact manifold) is both uniruled and adjunction.

Corollary 4.20. *The analogue of Lemma 4.2, Lemma 4.3, Corollary 4.4, Lemma 4.6, Lemma 4.8, Lemma 4.9 Lemma 4.13, Corollary 4.14, Lemma 4.15 and Corollary 4.16 hold for adjunction caps.*

Proof. For Lemma 4.3, the S in the assumption makes the cap adjunction by adjunction formula. The reasoning for the other proofs are similar to those for uniruled caps. \square

Remark 4.21. Here we give an alternative proof of the Wand's result Corollary 1.10. This proof can be extended to contact 3-manifolds Y admitting adjunction cap P with $b_1(P) \leq 1$. We note that any minimal strong filling of a planar contact 3-manifold is a Stein filling (See [61]).

By [19], it is easy to see that any planar contact 3-manifold has a simply connected adjunction cap. Therefore, the closed symplectic 4-manifold obtained by gluing the cap to a given Stein filling is simply connected. Since this manifold violates the Seiberg-Witten adjunction inequality with $b_2^+ \geq 2$ (See [29], [42]), this closed manifold has $b_2^+ = 1$. Therefore, $e + \sigma$ of the closed manifold is independent of the choice of the Stein filling. Since $e + \sigma$ of the closed manifold is the sum of those of the Stein filling and the cap, the desired claim follows.

As far as the examples we have seen, all uniruled caps are adjunction and vice versa. This continue to hold for all the examples given in the next subsection. It is possible that these are in fact the same notion. For topologists, adjunction caps are often easier to find than uniruled caps.

4.4 Construction

We provide two constructions for uniruled/adjunction caps. The first one is equipped with explicit open book descriptions and the second one comes

from symplectic divisors. In particular, these examples provide many contact manifolds of strong Betti finite type. All uniruled caps are adjunction and vice versa in this subsection.

4.4.1 Examples with open book description

The following result provides us many examples of uniruled/adjunction caps P (with $b_1(P) \leq 1$). We thus obtain many contact 3-manifolds of Betti finite type (such that $e + \sigma$ of their Stein fillings are constant, by Corollary 4.16).

Proposition 4.22. *Let (Y, ξ) be a contact 3-manifold supported by an open book (Σ_g^k, φ) with $g \geq 1$ and $k \geq 2g - 1$. If there exist (possibly empty set of) homotopically non-trivial simple closed curves C_1, C_2, \dots, C_n in Σ_g^k such that $t_{C_n} \circ t_{C_{n-1}} \circ \dots \circ t_{C_1} \circ \varphi = t_{\delta_k} \circ t_{\delta_{k-1}} \circ \dots \circ t_{\delta_1}$ in $\text{Map}(\Sigma_g^k)$, then (Y, ξ) admits a cap which is uniruled and adjunction. Furthermore, the fundamental group of the cap is the quotient group $\pi_1(\Sigma_g)/\langle C_1, C_2, \dots, C_n \rangle$.*

Note that the relations in $\text{Map}(\Sigma_g^k)$ obtained by [28], [48] and [57] give us many concrete examples of Stein fillable contact structures satisfying the above assumption. Furthermore, there are non-planar contact 3-manifolds satisfying the assumption (e.g. the Stein fillable contact structure on T^3 . See [58]. cf. [65])

Proof of Proposition 4.22. Similarly to Proposition 3.4, we obtain a symplectic cap W'' of (Y, ξ) which contains $LF_{g,k}$. Let P be a cap obtained from W'' by blowing down k sections with self-intersection -1 in $LF_{g,k}$. Due to Lemma 3.2, P contains a symplectic surface of genus g with self-intersection $k(> 2g - 2)$. The adjunction formula and Lemma 4.3 thus implies that P is both uniruled and adjunction. Similarly to Proposition 3.4, we see that $\pi_1(P)$ is isomorphic to $\pi_1(\Sigma_g)/\langle C_1, C_2, \dots, C_n \rangle$. \square

Using our building blocks $LF_{g,k,I}$ and $(Y_{g,k,I}, \xi_{g,k,I})$, we can construct more interesting examples. The next example tells us that $e + \sigma$ of Stein fillings of a fixed contact 3-manifold are not necessarily constant even if it is the concave boundary of an uniruled, adjunction cap.

Example 4.23. There exists a uniruled and adjunction cap of a contact 3-manifold (Y, ξ) satisfying the following: (Y, ξ) admits two Stein fillings whose $e + \sigma$ are not equal to each other. In particular, $c_u(Y, \xi) > 0$ and (Y, ξ) is non-planar.

To find this example, we observe the following Lemma.

Lemma 4.24. *For each $g \geq 0$ and $k \geq 1$, there exists a Stein filling $N_{g,k}$ of $(Y_{g,k}, \xi_{g,k})$ such that the glued symplectic 4-manifold $N_{g,k} \cup LF_{g,k}$ is a closed uniruled 4-manifold with $b_1 = 2g$.*

Proof. Let $N_{g,k}$ be the Lefschetz fibration over D^2 with fiber Σ_g^k whose monodromy factorization is $t_{\delta_k} \circ \cdots \circ t_{\delta_1}$. Then $N_{g,k}$ is a Stein filling of $(Y_{g,k}, \xi_{g,k})$ (see [2], [1], [51]). It is easy to see that the glued closed 4-manifold is smoothly diffeomorphic to the genus g Lefschetz fibration over S^2 whose vanishing cycles are all trivial curves. Therefore, the closed manifold is uniruled and has $b_1 = 2g$. \square

We can now easily construct the desired example. Tanaka [57] gave a factorization of $t_{\delta_{4g+4}} \circ t_{\delta_{4g-3}} \circ \cdots \circ t_{\delta_1}$ into a product of positive Dehn twists in $\text{Map}(\Sigma_g^{4g+4})$ for each $g \geq 1$. Furthermore, he proved that the factorization in $\text{Map}(\Sigma_g)$ is a monodromy factorization of a genus g Lefschetz fibration over S^2 whose total space is diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{CP}^2 \# (4g+5)\overline{\mathbb{CP}^2}$. Since the vanishing cycles of the Lefschetz fibration are non-separating in Σ_g , the curves appearing in Tanaka's factorization are all homotopically non-trivial in Σ_g^{4g+4} . By capping off boundary components, we immediately get such a factorization of $t_{\delta_k} \circ t_{\delta_{k-1}} \circ \cdots \circ t_{\delta_1}$ in $\text{Map}(\Sigma_g^k)$ for each $1 \leq k \leq 4g+4$.

Let $X_{g,k}$ be the Lefschetz fibration over D^2 with fiber Σ_g^k which has this monodromy factorization. By these observations, we see that $X_{g,k}$ is a Stein filling of $(Y_{g,k}, \xi_{g,k})$ and that the glued symplectic 4-manifold $X_{g,k} \cup LF_{g,k}$ is diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{CP}^2 \# (4g+5)\overline{\mathbb{CP}^2}$. Since $(e + \sigma)(LF_{g,k}) = 3 - 2g$ and $(e + \sigma)(\mathbb{CP}^2 \# (4g+5)\overline{\mathbb{CP}^2}) = 4$, it follows $(e + \sigma)(X_{g,k}) = 1 + 2g$. On the other hand, direct computation shows that the Stein filling of $(Y_{g,k}, \xi_{g,k})$ in Lemma 4.24 satisfies $e + \sigma = 1 - 2g$. Since $(Y_{g,k}, \xi_{g,k})$ admits a uniruled/adjunction cap in the case $k \geq 2g - 1$, the desired claim follows.

Remark 4.25. It seems to be unknown whether $LF_{g,k,I}$ ($I \neq (1, 1, \dots, 1)$) can be a symplectic cap of $(Y_{g,k,I}, \xi_{g,k,I})$. As seen from the constructions in this section, such a symplectic structure on $LF_{g,k,I}$ is very useful for constructions of various caps via Lefschetz fibrations. We remark that, in the case where the intersection form of $LF_{g,k,I}$ has non-zero determinant, $LF_{g,k,I}$ becomes a symplectic cap of some strongly fillable contact structure on $Y_{g,k,I}$. This follows from Theorem 3.7 and Theorem 10.2.18 in [24], since each $LF_{g,k,I}$ is the neighborhood of a regular fiber and pairwise disjoint sections of a Lefschetz fibration.

The example below tells us that a cap which is symplectically embedded into a uniruled 4-manifold is not necessarily uniruled or adjunction.

Example 4.26. There exists a cap P of a contact 3-manifold (Y, ξ) satisfying the following: (Y, ξ) admits two Stein fillings N_1 and N_2 such that the glued symplectic closed 4-manifold $N_1 \cup P$ (resp. $N_2 \cup P$) is uniruled (resp. not uniruled). Consequently, the cap P is neither uniruled nor adjunction.

To construct such an example we use the following fact: for each $g \geq 2$, $t_{\delta_1} \in \text{Map}(\Sigma_g^1)$ has a factorization into positive Dehn twists along non-separating (thus homologically non-trivial) curves such that the genus g Lefschetz fibration over S^2 given by this factorization satisfies $b_2^+ > 1$ (e.g. $M_{C_{II}}$ in Section 4 of [16]). Therefore, the factorization gives a Stein filling $X_{g,1}$ of $(Y_{g,1}, \xi_{g,1})$ ($g \geq 2$) such that the glued symplectic closed 4-manifold $X_{g,1} \cup LF_{g,1}$ is not uniruled, since $X_{g,1} \cup LF_{g,1}$ is diffeomorphic to the above Lefschetz fibration. The claim thus follows from Lemma 4.24.

4.4.2 Realizing pairs $(g_{\max}(P), g_{\min}(P))$

It is natural to ask when a non-negative integer pair can be realized by $(g_{\max}(P), g_{\min}(P))$. First Chern class and the class of symplectic form are completely understood if the cap is a symplectic divisor cap, from which we construct many examples realizing different pairs $(g_{\max}(P), g_{\min}(P))$.

- Examples with $g_{\max}(P) = g_{\min}(P) > 0$

Lemma 4.27. *Let $D \subset (X, \omega)$ be a symplectic divisor with a symplectic sphere C_1 of self-intersection 0 and a symplectic genus g surface C_2 intersecting C_1 once. Suppose X is a closed symplectic manifold and ω is exact on the boundary of a plumbing. Then there exists a plumbing $(P(D), \omega)$ which is a uniruled cap with $g_{\max}(P(D)) = g_{\min}(P(D)) = g$, possibly after a symplectic deformation.*

Proof. By [30], X is ruled and C_1 represent a fiber. Since C_2 intersect C_1 transversally and positively once (See the Definition of symplectic divisor above), the projection from C_2 to the base is degree 1. Therefore, the genus of the base is the same as that of C_2 , which is g . Moreover, D has a concave neighborhood $P(D)$ by Theorem 3.7 and Remark 3.8, possibly after a symplectic deformation. Furthermore, $P(D)$ can be chosen to be uniruled by Lemma 4.3, possibly after a symplectic deformation. \square

It is easy to give examples satisfying the assumption in Lemma 4.27. We can take D to be the union of a fiber and a section of an S^2 -bundle. A more general construction is taking X to be blown up of an S^2 -bundle and D can be taken to be the proper transform (or total transform, or mixed) of the union of a fiber and a section.

- Examples with $g_{\max}(P) > g_{\min}(P) = 0$

It is also interesting to have examples with $g_{\max}(P) > g_{\min}(P) = 0$. A tubular neighborhood of a symplectic genus g ($g > 0$) surfaces with appropriate self-intersection greater than $2g - 2$ give a family of examples (cf. Lemma 4.3 and Theorem 3.7). Another family of examples is given in the proof of the following lemma.

Lemma 4.28. *For any non-negative integer n , there exist a uniruled cap (P, ω_P) such that it can be symplectically embed in a ruled manifold with base genus j for all $0 \leq j \leq n$. Moreover, one has $g_{\max}(P) = n$ and $g_{\min}(P) = 0$.*

Proof. Let (X_j, ω_j) be a family of closed symplectic manifolds for $j = 0, 1, \dots, n$ that to be determined. Let $C_1^j \subset X_j$ be a symplectic sphere of self-intersection 0. Let $C_2^j \subset X_j$ be a symplectic surface of genus $2n$ which intersects C_1^j at distinct two points positively and transversally with self-intersection $K \leq 4$. By Theorem 3.7 and Remark 3.8, $D^j = C_1^j \cup C_2^j$ is a concave divisor after possibly deforming ω_j .

To prove the lemma, the first step is to find a family of symplectic ruled manifolds (X_j, ω_j) with base genus j such that each X_j has a symplectic divisor with the graph the same as D^j . We first take $(\overline{X}_j, \overline{\omega}_j)$ to be the product manifolds $(S^2 \times \Sigma_j, \omega_j)$ with a product symplectic structure, where Σ_j is a symplectic genus j surface. Let \overline{C}_1^j be $S^2 \times \{p_j\}$ for some $p_j \in \Sigma_j$. For each j , take two disjoint copies of $\{\text{point}\} \times \Sigma_j$ and $2(n - j) + 1$ disjoint copies of $S^2 \times \{\text{point}\}$ different from \overline{C}_1^j . By resolving this configuration, we get a symplectic surface \overline{C}_2^j of genus $2n$ intersecting \overline{C}_1^j positively transversally twice with self-intersection $8(n - j) + 4$. Since K is assumed to be less than or equal to 4, by blowing up \overline{C}_2^j at $8(n - j) + 4 - K$ regular points different from its intersections with \overline{C}_1^j , the blown-up manifold and the proper transform of \overline{C}_1^j and \overline{C}_2^j are our desired (X_j, ω_j) , C_1^j and C_2^j . Now, by possibly deforming the symplectic form ω_j , $D^j = C_1^j \cup C_2^j$ admits concave neighborhood $P(D^j)$ capping its contact boundary. Therefore, there exist a sufficiently large t such that we can cut out $(P(D^j), \omega^j)$ from (X_j, ω_j) and glue it back $(P(D_0), t\omega_0)$ for any j by inserting part of a symplectization. Hence, $(P(D_0), t\omega)$ can be embedded in a ruled manifold of genus j , for any $0 \leq j \leq n$. As a result, the first half of the Lemma follows.

To show that $g_{\max}(P) = n$, we recall that if P is embedded in a closed symplectic manifold (X, ω) , then X is ruled and C_1 represents a fiber class (See [30]). Therefore, the fact that $[C_2] \cdot [C_1] = 2$ implies the projection of

C_2 to the base has degree 2. Hence, the base genus is less than $n + 1$ by Riemann-Hurwitz's formula. \square

References

- [1] S. Akbulut. 4-manifolds. book in preparation, available at <http://www.math.msu.edu/~akbulut/>
- [2] S. Akbulut and B. Ozbagci. Lefschetz fibrations on compact Stein surfaces. *Geom. Topol.* 5: 319–334, 2001.
- [3] S. Akbulut and K. Yasui. Infinitely many small exotic Stein fillings. arXiv:1208.1053, to appear in *Journal of Symplectic Geometry*.
- [4] A. Akhmedov, J. Etnyre, T. Mark, and I. Smith. A note on Stein fillings of contact manifolds. *Math. Res. Letters* 15(6): 127–133, 2008.
- [5] A. Akhmedov and B. Ozbagci. Exotic Stein fillings with arbitrary fundamental group arXiv:1212.1743v1, 2014.
- [6] P. Albers, B. Bramham, and C. Wendl. On nonseparating contact hypersurfaces in symplectic 4-manifolds. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.* 10(2): 697–737, 2010.
- [7] R.I. Baykur and J. Van Horn-Morris. Families of contact 3-manifolds with arbitrarily large Stein fillings, with an appendix by S. Lisi and C. Wendl *Journal of Differential Geometry*, 101(3):423–465, 2015.
- [8] R.I. Baykur and J. Van Horn-Morris. Topological complexity of symplectic 4-manifolds and Stein fillings. arXiv:1212.1699, 2012. (to appear in *J. Symp. Geom.*)
- [9] R.I. Baykur, N. Monden and J.V. Horn-Morris. Positive factorizations of mapping classes. arXiv:1412.0352, 2014.
- [10] M. Bhupal and K. Ono, Symplectic fillings of quotient surface singularities. *Nagoya Math. J.* 204 (2011), 1–45
- [11] F. Bourgeois, Y. Eliashberg, H. Hofer, K. Wysocki and E. Zehnder. Compactness results in symplectic field theory. *Geom. Topol.*, 7:799–888, 2003.
- [12] S. Boyer, Simply-connected 4-manifolds with a given boundary. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 298 no. 1: 331–357, 1986.

- [13] J.W.S. Cassels. Rational quadratic forms. London Mathematical Society Monographs, 13. Academic Press, Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], London-New York, 1978
- [14] K. Cieliebak and Y. Eliashberg. From Stein to Weinstein and back: symplectic geometry of affine complex manifolds. *Amer. Math. Soc.* 2012.
- [15] E. Dalyan, M. Korkmaz and M. Pamuk. Arbitrarily Long Factorizations in Mapping Class Groups, arXiv:1309.3778, 2013.
- [16] H. Endo. A generalization of Chakiris' fibrations. Groups of diffeomorphisms, 251-282, Adv. Stud. Pure Math., 52, Math. Soc. Japan, Tokyo, 2008
- [17] Y. Eliashberg. Filling by holomorphic discs and its applications. *Geometry of low-dimensional manifolds*, 2 (Durham 1989), volume 151 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.* pages 45-67 Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1990.
- [18] J. Etnyre. Symplectic convexity in low-dimensional topology. *Topol. and its Appl.* 88: 3-25, 1998.
- [19] J. Etnyre Planar open book decompositions and contact structures. *Int. Math. Res. Not.* 79: 4255-4267, 2004.
- [20] J. Etnyre and K. Honda. On symplectic cobordisms. *Math. Ann.* 323: 31-39, 2002.
- [21] D.T. Gay. Open books and configurations of symplectic surfaces. *Alg. Geom. Top.* 3: 569-586, 2003.
- [22] D.T. Gay. Correction to "Open books and configurations of symplectic surfaces". *Alg. Geom. Top.* 3: 1275-1276, 2003.
- [23] M. Golla and P. Lisca. On Stein fillings of contact torus bundles. arXiv:1412.0828, 2014.
- [24] R.E Gompf and A.I. Stipsicz. 4-manifolds and Kirby calculus. Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 20. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1999.
- [25] R. Hind. Holomorphic filling of RP^3 . *Commun. Contemp. Math.* 2(3): 349-363, 2000.

- [26] A. Kaloti Stein fillings of planar open books. arXiv:1311.0208, 2013.
- [27] A. Kaloti and Y. Li. Stein fillings of contact 3-manifolds obtained as Legendrian surgeries. arXiv:1307.4726, 2013.
- [28] M. Korkmaz and B. Ozbagci. On sections of elliptic fibrations. *Michigan Math. J.* 56(1): 77-87, 2008.
- [29] P.B. Kronheimer and T.S. Mrowka. The genus of embedded surfaces in the projective plane. (English summary) *Math. Res. Lett.* 1(6): 797-808, 1994.
- [30] F. Lalonde and D. McDuff. The classification of ruled symplectic 4-manifolds. *Math. Res. Lett.* 3: 769-778, 1996.
- [31] B-H. Li and T-J. Li. Symplectic genus, minimal genus and diffeomorphisms. *Asian J. Math.* 6(1): 123-144, 2002.
- [32] T-J. Li. Smoothly embedded spheres in symplectic 4-manifolds. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 127(2): 609-613, 1999.
- [33] T-J. Li Quaternionic bundles and Betti numbers of symplectic 4-manifolds with Kodaira dimension zero *Int. Math. Res. Not.* Art.ID 37385:1-28, 2006.
- [34] T-J. Li and C.Y. Mak. Symplectic Divisorial Capping in Dimension 4. arXiv:1407.0564.
- [35] T-J. Li and M. Usher. Symplectic forms and surfaces of negative square. *J. Symplectic Geom.* 4(1): 71-91, 2006
- [36] T-J. Li and W. Zhang. Additivity and relative Kodaira dimensions. Geometric and Analysis, Vol II (Yau's 60th birthday conference), 103–135, Advanced Lectures in Mathematics, No. 18.
- [37] A. Liu. Some new applications of general wall crossing formula, Gompf's conjecture and its applications. *Math. Res. Lett.* 3(5): 569-585, 1996.
- [38] P. Lisca. On symplectic fillings of lens spaces. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 360(2): 765-799, 2008.
- [39] S. Lisi, J. Van Horn-Morris and C. Wendl. On symplectic fillings of spinal open book decomposition. In preparation.

- [40] D. McDuff. Symplectic manifolds with contact type boundaries. *Invent. Math.* 103(3): 651-671, 1991.
- [41] M. McLean. Reeb orbits and the minimal discrepancy of an isolated singularity. arXiv:1404.1857, 2014.
- [42] J.W. Morgan, Z. Szabó and C.H. Taubes. A product formula for the Seiberg-Witten invariants and the generalized Thom conjecture. *J. Differential Geom.* 44(4): 706-788, 1996.
- [43] H. Ohta and K. Ono. Notes on symplectic 4-manifolds with $b^+ = 1$, II. *Int. J. Math.* 7: 755-770, 1996.
- [44] H. Ohta and K. Ono. Simple singularities and topology of symplectically filling 4-manifolds. *Comment. Math. Helv.* 74: 575-590, 1999.
- [45] H. Ohta and K. Ono. Symplectic fillings of the link of simple elliptic singularities. *J. Reine. Angew. Math.* 565: 183-205, 2003.
- [46] H. Ohta and K. Ono. Simple singularities and symplectic fillings. *J. Diff. Geom.* 69(1): 1-42, 2005.
- [47] H. Ohta and K. Ono. Example of isolated surface singularities whose links have infinitely many symplectic fillings *J. Fixed Point Theory Appl.* 3: 51-56, 2008.
- [48] S.C. Onaran. On sections of genus two Lefschetz fibrations. *Pacific J. Math.* 248(1): 203-216, 2010.
- [49] B. Ozbagci. Embedding fillings of contact 3-manifolds. *Expo. Math.* 24(2): 161-183, 2006.
- [50] B. Ozbagci and A.I. Stipsicz. Surgery on contact 3-manifolds and Stein surfaces. Bolyai Society Mathematical Studies, 13. Springer-Verlag, Berlin; Janos Bolyai Mathematical Society, Budapest, 2004.
- [51] B. Ozbagci and A.I. Stipsicz. Contact 3-manifolds with infinitely many Stein fillings. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 132(5): 1549-1558, 2004.
- [52] O. Plamenevskaya and J. Van Horn-Morris. Planar open books, monodromy factorizations and symplectic fillings. *Geom. Topol.* 14(4): 2077-2101, 2010.
- [53] Y. Sato. Canonical classes and the geography of nonminimal Lefschetz fibrations over S^2 . *Pacific J. Math.* 262(1): 191-226, 2013.

- [54] S. Sivek and J. Van Horn-Morris. Fillings of unit cotangent bundles
arXiv:1510.06736, 2015.
- [55] L. Starkston. Symplectic fillings of Seifert fibered spaces.
arXiv:1304.2420v3, 2013
- [56] A.I. Stipsicz On the geography of Stein fillings of certain 3-manifolds.
Michigan Math J. 51(2): 327-337, 2003.
- [57] S. Tanaka On sections of hyperelliptic Lefschetz fibrations. *Algebr.*
Geom. Topol. 12(4): 2259-2286, 2012.
- [58] J. Van Horn-Morris Constructions of open book decompositions. Thesis
(Ph.D.), The University of Texas at Austin, 2007.
- [59] B. Wajnryb An elementary approach to the mapping class group of a
surface. *Geom. Topol.* 3: 405-466, 1999.
- [60] A. Wand Mapping class group relations, Stein fillings, and planar open
book decompositions. *J. Topol.* 5(1): 1-14, 2012.
- [61] C. Wendl Strongly fillable contact manifolds and J-holomorphic folia-
tions. *Duke Math. J.* 151(3): 337-384, 2010.
- [62] C. Wendl A hierarchy of local symplectic filling obstructions for contact
3-manifolds. *Duke Math. J.* 162(12): 2197-2283, 2013.
- [63] C. Wendl Non-exact symplectic cobordisms between contact 3-
manifolds. *J. Differential Geom.* 95(1): 121-182, 2013.
- [64] C. Wendl Contact hypersurfaces in uniruled symplectic manifolds al-
ways separate. *J. London Math. Soc.* doi: 10.1112/jlms/jdu003, 2014
- [65] K. Yasui Partial twists and exotic Stein fillings. arXiv:1406.0050, 2014

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55455
E-mail address, Tian-Jun Li: tjli@math.umn.edu

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55455
E-mail address, Cheuk Yu Mak: makxx041@math.umn.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SCIENCE, HIROSHIMA UNI-
VERSITY, 1-3-1 KAGAMIYAMA, HIGASHI-HIROSHIMA, 739-8526, JAPAN
E-mail address, Kouichi Yasui: kyasui@hiroshima-u.ac.jp