

# FURTHER SMALL CORRECTIONS AND EXPLANATIONS FOR “A CYLINDRICAL REFORMULATION OF HEEGAARD FLOER HOMOLOGY”

ROBERT LIPSHITZ

This document contains further mild corrections and explanations for [Lip06], beyond those corrected in [Lip14].

**Page 26 of [Lip14].** In the proof of Proposition 4.2', the instances to  $\pi_{\mathbb{D}} \circ u$  should be  $\pi_{\Sigma} \circ u$ . (Thanks to Morgan Weiler for pointing out this typo.)

**Page 1001 of [Lip06]** In Proposition 8.6, the proof that  $A_{\zeta}$  induces an action of the exterior algebra is incorrect: the moduli spaces  $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{K,2}^A$  have an unaccounted for end where  $p_1 \rightarrow p_2$ . To correct the proof, we first show that for any  $\zeta, \eta \in H_1(Y)$ , the map  $A_{\zeta} \circ A_{\eta} + A_{\eta} \circ A_{\zeta} = 0$  on  $\widehat{HF}$ ,  $HF^+$ ,  $HF^-$ , and  $HF^{\infty}$ . To see this, choose disjoint knots  $K_{\zeta}, K_{\eta} \subset \Sigma \times [0, 1]$  representing  $\zeta$  and  $\eta$ , and consider the index 2 moduli space of holomorphic curves with one point mapped to  $\zeta$  and a second point mapped to  $\eta$ . The ends of this moduli space show that  $A_{\zeta} \circ A_{\eta} + A_{\eta} \circ A_{\zeta}$  is chain homotopic to the zero map. Next, to see that  $A_{\zeta}^2 = 0$  on Floer homology it suffices to consider the case that  $\zeta$  is represented by a chain  $K$  in  $\Sigma$  which is dual to some  $\alpha_i$ , i.e.,  $K$  intersects  $\alpha_i$  in one point and is disjoint from  $\alpha_j$  for  $j \neq i$ . Let  $K'$  be a small isotopic translate of  $K$ , and consider the moduli space of holomorphic curves

$$\{u: (S, p, q) \rightarrow \Sigma \times [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R} \mid \pi_{\Sigma}(u(p)) \in K, \pi_{\Sigma}(u(q)) \in K', \pi_{\mathbb{R}}(u(p)) - \pi_{\mathbb{R}}(u(q)) > 0\}$$

(and with  $u$  satisfying the conditions (M0)–(M6) from the paper). This moduli space has no end with  $\pi_{\mathbb{R}}(u(p)) - \pi_{\mathbb{R}}(u(q)) \rightarrow 0$  because  $K$  and  $K'$  are disjoint and intersect the  $\alpha$ -circles in a single point. Then, it is easy to see that the ends of the moduli space imply that  $A_{\zeta}^2$  is chain homotopic to 0.

(Thanks to Ian Zemke for pointing out this mistake.)

**Page 1005 of [Lip06].** In the proof of Lemma 9.3, the fact that the ends of  $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_1(\vec{x}^1, \vec{y}^2, k)$  correspond to height 2 holomorphic buildings in which the  $\mathbb{R}$ -invariant level has  $\text{ind} = 1$  and the non- $\mathbb{R}$ -invariant level has  $\text{ind} = 0$  is not sufficiently justified, because Proposition 4.2 was only proved with respect to  $\mathbb{R}$ -invariant almost complex structures. The easiest solution is to define  $\Phi$  to only count embedded, rigid holomorphic curves in homology classes with  $\text{ind} = 0$ . (This is, in some sense, three conditions: the combinatorial index  $\text{ind}(A) = e(A) + n_{\vec{x}}(A) + n_{\vec{y}}(A) = 0$ , the curve must be embedded, and the curve must lie in a 0-dimensional moduli space. Presumably the condition that  $\text{ind}(A) = 0$  implies the other two, but that has not been shown for non- $\mathbb{R}$ -invariant almost complex structures.) Similarly, define  $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_1(\vec{x}^1, \vec{y}^2, k)$  to consist of  $\text{ind}(A) = 1$ , 1-dimensional moduli spaces of embedded curves with  $n_3 = k$ . Since  $\text{ind}(A)$  agrees with the dimension of the moduli space of curves

for  $\mathbb{R}$ -invariant levels and is additive under gluing, if a sequence of curves in  $\overline{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_1(\vec{x}^1, \vec{y}^2, k)}$  converges to a 2-story holomorphic building then the  $\mathbb{R}$ -invariant level must have  $\text{ind}(A) = 1$ , so the non- $\mathbb{R}$ -invariant level must have  $\text{ind}(A) = 0$ . Note also that gluing preserves (non-)embeddedness. It follows that the ends of  $\bigcup_k \overline{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_1(\vec{x}^1, \vec{y}^2, k)}$  correspond to the terms in  $\partial \circ \Phi + \Phi \circ \partial$ , as desired. (Thanks to Cagatay Kutluhan for pointing out this gap.)

## REFERENCES

- [Lip06] Robert Lipshitz, *A cylindrical reformulation of Heegaard Floer homology*, *Geom. Topol.* **10** (2006), 955–1097, arXiv:math.SG/0502404.
- [Lip14] ———, *Correction to the article: A cylindrical reformulation of Heegaard Floer homology [mr2240908]*, *Geom. Topol.* **18** (2014), no. 1, 17–30.