



Geometry & Topology

Volume 30 (2026)

Symplectomorphisms of some Weinstein 4-manifolds

PAUL HACKING AND AILSA KEATING

Symplectomorphisms of some Weinstein 4-manifolds

PAUL HACKING AND AILSA KEATING

Let M be a Weinstein four-manifold mirror to $Y \setminus D$ for (Y, D) a log Calabi–Yau surface; this is typically the Milnor fibre of a smoothing of a cusp singularity. We introduce two families of symplectomorphisms of M : Lagrangian translations, which we prove are mirror to tensors with line bundles; and nodal slide recombinations, which we prove are mirror to automorphisms of (Y, D) . The proof uses a detailed compatibility between the homological and SYZ viewpoints on mirror symmetry. Together with spherical twists, these symplectomorphisms are expected to generate all autoequivalences of the wrapped Fukaya category of M that are compactly supported in a categorical sense. A range of applications is given.

1. Introduction	645
2. Autoequivalences of $D^b \text{Coh}(Y)$ and $D^b \text{Coh}(U)$	653
3. Mirror symmetry for log Calabi–Yau surfaces: background	661
4. Lagrangian translations and tensors by line bundles	667
5. Lagrangian spheres mirror to (-2) curves	676
6. Nodal slide recombinations	680
7. Applications	689
Acknowledgements	695
References	696

1 Introduction

1.1 Context and main theorem

Consider a symplectic manifold M , possibly with boundary. Let $\text{Symp}_c(M)$ be its group of compactly supported symplectomorphisms (if $\partial M \neq \emptyset$, we ask for elements of $\text{Symp}_c(M)$ to be the identity on a collar neighbourhood of ∂M). We are interested in the symplectic mapping class group $\pi_0 \text{Symp}_c(M)$.

The best current source of symplectic mapping class group elements is Dehn twists in Lagrangian spheres. They admit modest generalisations: fibred twists, and twists in other Lagrangians with periodic geodesic flow [Seidel 2000; Perutz 2008; Wehrheim and Woodward 2016]. In the case where M is nonexact, there are sporadic examples of symplectomorphisms beyond these constructions, such as global symmetries (e.g., some Lie group actions on closed manifolds), and Shevchishin–Smirnov’s four-dimensional “elliptic twist” [2020], defined in the presence of a self-intersection (-1) symplectic two-torus. However, in the case where M is Weinstein, no further examples of symplectic mapping classes are known. Moreover, as the monodromy of complex Morse singularities, Dehn twists have long

MSC2020: 14J17, 53D05, 53D37.

© 2026 The Authors, under license to MSP (Mathematical Sciences Publishers). Distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (CC BY). Open Access made possible by subscribing institutions via [Subscribe to Open](#).

been regarded as particularly natural in the Weinstein setting. A longstanding folklore question is whether they generate, or generically generate, the symplectic mapping class group of a Weinstein manifold.

In this paper, we introduce new families of symplectic mapping classes for a large collection of four-dimensional Weinstein manifolds. The symplectic mapping classes are demonstrably not generated by Dehn twists. Heuristically, they should be thought of as “natural” rather than “exotic”; in particular, they are mirror to some basic operations on coherent sheaves.

Mirror symmetry context Here is the setting. On the A side, we have a four-dimensional Weinstein domain M . It should be thought of as any smoothing of a cusp or simply elliptic surface singularity; see [Looijenga 1981; Gross et al. 2015a; Engel 2018]. With a small number of exceptions, we get all possible total spaces of exact, two-dimensional Lagrangian torus fibrations with nondegenerate singularities. In particular, M can be described explicitly as a Weinstein handlebody, by starting with D^*T^2 and gluing on Weinstein two handles along the conormal Legendrian lifts of rational slope circles in T^2 ; see [Hacking and Keating 2022]. On the B side, we have a log Calabi–Yau surface (Y, D) . Whenever M is a smoothing of a cusp singularity, D is the cycle of the dual cusp singularity. Within its complex deformation class, (Y, D) has the complex structure which is distinguished by the fact that it induces the split mixed Hodge structure. Let U denote $Y \setminus D$. We can equip M with a superpotential $w : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$; see [Keating 2018; Hacking and Keating 2022]. Homological mirror symmetry then consists of a triple of compatible explicit equivalences, which we take to be fixed for the rest of the introduction:

$$\mathrm{Perf}(D) \simeq D^\pi \mathcal{F}(\Sigma), \quad D(Y) \simeq D^b \mathcal{F}(w), \quad D(U) \simeq D^b \mathcal{W}(M),$$

where $D^b \mathcal{F}(w)$ is the derived directed Fukaya category of w , $D^b \mathcal{W}(M)$ the derived wrapped Fukaya category of M , and $D^\pi \mathcal{F}(\Sigma)$ the split-closed derived Fukaya category of a smooth fibre of w near infinity; see [Hacking and Keating 2022, Theorem 1.1].

There are rich connections to cluster theory; see [Gross et al. 2018; Shende et al. 2016].

Categorical compact support Suppose $f \in \pi_0 \mathrm{Symp}_c M$ is a mapping class element mirror to an autoequivalence $\check{f} \in \mathrm{Auteq} D(Y)$. As f fixes the fibres of w outside a compact set, homological mirror symmetry implies that \check{f} respects restriction to $\mathrm{Perf} D$, i.e., $\iota_D^* \circ \check{f} = \iota_D^*$. By abuse of terminology, we say that an autoequivalence of $D(Y)$ satisfying this condition has “compact support on $Y \setminus D$ ”. (From the perspective of the geometry of Y , “asymptotically compactly supported” would perhaps be more accurate.)

Main theorem Our main results can be summarised as follows.

Theorem 1.1 *Let (Y, D) be an arbitrary log Calabi–Yau surface with maximal boundary and distinguished complex structure, and let M be the mirror Weinstein manifold, with superpotential $w : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$.*

- (1) **(Theorem 5.5)** *Suppose $\mathcal{L} \in \mathrm{Pic}(Y)$ is any line bundle such that $\mathcal{L}|_D = \mathcal{O}_D$. Then there exists a compactly supported symplectomorphism $\sigma_{\mathcal{L}}$ of M such that under homological mirror symmetry, $\otimes \mathcal{L} \in \mathrm{Auteq} D(U)$ is taken to $\sigma_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathrm{Auteq} D^b \mathcal{W}(M)$. We call $\sigma_{\mathcal{L}}$ a Lagrangian translation.*

(2) (**Theorem 6.1**) Suppose $\varphi \in \text{Aut}(Y)$ is any biholomorphic automorphism fixing D pointwise. Then there exists a compactly supported symplectomorphism $\check{\varphi}$ of M such that under homological mirror symmetry, $\varphi_* \in \text{Auteq } D(U)$, is taken to $\check{\varphi} \in \text{Auteq } D^b \mathcal{W}(M)$. (This also holds at the level of $\text{Auteq } D(Y)$ and $\text{Auteq } D^b \mathcal{F}(w)$.) We call $\check{\varphi}$ a nodal slide recombination.

The names will be self-explanatory from the constructions. The conditions on \mathcal{L} and ϕ are precisely the ones needed so that $\otimes \mathcal{L}$ and ϕ_* have compact support on $Y \setminus D$ in the sense introduced above. Both families on the B side are understood:

- The line bundles in (1) form the subgroup $Q = \langle D_1, \dots, D_k \rangle^\perp \subset \text{Pic}(Y)$, where the D_i are the irreducible components of D . We have $Q \simeq H_2(U)/\mathbb{Z}\langle \gamma \rangle$, where γ is the class of a linking torus for a node of D .
- For (2), the Torelli theorem in [Gross et al. 2015b] implies that the group of automorphisms fixing D pointwise is identified with Adm/W in Gross–Hacking–Keel’s notation [loc. cit., Definition 4.2], where Adm is the group of admissible lattice automorphisms of $\text{Pic}(Y)$, and W is the Weyl group.

Geometrically, our constructions are well-behaved with respect to composition: we get a faithful group homomorphism (**Theorem 7.1(1)**):

$$Q \rtimes \text{Adm}/W \hookrightarrow \pi_0 \text{Symp}_c(M).$$

Let $\langle \Phi \rangle \subset Q$ be the sublattice generated by classes of (-2) curves in $Y \setminus D$. For any $\mathcal{L} \in \Phi$, we’ll see that the symplectomorphism $\sigma_{\mathcal{L}}$ can be factorised as the product of two Dehn twists in Lagrangian spheres lifting these roots (**Lemma 6.13**). All other symplectomorphisms we construct are new, in the following sense. Denote by $\text{Br} \subset \pi_0 \text{Symp}_c M$ the subgroup generated by all Dehn twists, and by Q_{symp} , etc, the images of our groups in $\pi_0 \text{Symp}_c(M)$. **Theorem 7.1(2)** tells us that

$$(Q \rtimes \text{Adm}/W)_{\text{symp}} \cap \text{Br} = \langle \Phi \rangle_{\text{symp}} \rtimes \{1\} \subset \pi_0 \text{Symp}_c M.$$

Note that elements of Adm/W persist under blowups at points of D , which are precisely the ones which respect the log CY property; from that perspective, nontriviality of Adm/W should be thought of as generic. More generally, via Weinstein handle attachments, we get symplectic mapping classes of more general Weinstein 4-manifolds. As nongeneration by Dehn twists is detected at the level of the second homology lattice, one immediately gets verifiable sufficient criteria for it surviving under handle attachment.

Example 1.2 (Examples 6.11 and 7.4) The first examples of new symplectomorphisms are in relatively elementary manifolds. One example is the Weinstein manifold M given by $\mathbb{F}_1 \setminus E$, the complement of a smooth anticanonical divisor in \mathbb{F}_1 , the blowup of \mathbb{P}^2 at a point. The mirror is a log Calabi–Yau (Y, D) such that D is a cycle of eight (-2) curves. Then $Q \simeq \mathbb{Z}^2$, $\Phi = \emptyset$ and $\text{Adm}/W \simeq \mathbb{Z}$. (The latter consists of eighth powers of elements of the Mordell–Weil group of Y ; see **Section 2.2.2**.) This means we have a family of symplectomorphisms

$$\mathbb{Z}^3 \leq \pi_0 \text{Symp}_c(M).$$

This includes a \mathbb{Z} factor which acts trivially on the wrapped Fukaya category $D^b\mathcal{W}(M)$ (but not on the directed Fukaya category $D^b\mathcal{F}(w)$), which we expect to be generated by a boundary twist. In contrast, notice that following [Gromov 1985], $\text{Symp}(\mathbb{F}_1, \omega_{\text{FS}})$ is homotopy equivalent to $U(2)$, where ω_{FS} is the Fubini–Study form; in particular, its symplectic mapping class group is trivial.

For further examples, see Sections 6.3 and 7.1.

1.2 Construction sketches

Both constructions are most natural from the perspective of an almost-toric fibration $\pi : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$. This has connections with the Gross–Siebert programme, and should be thought of as an SYZ fibration on M . To describe it, pick a toric model for (Y, D) : possibly after blowing up corners of D , we can find a toric pair (\bar{Y}, \bar{D}) and a map $(Y, D) \rightarrow (\bar{Y}, \bar{D})$ given by iteratively blowing up smooth points on \bar{D} and its strict transforms. As Y has the distinguished complex structure, we (possibly iteratively) blow up a single favourite point on each \bar{D}_i , say m_i times. Let v_i be the ray in the fan for \bar{Y} corresponding to \bar{D}_i . The associated almost-toric fibration π has exactly m_i nodal fibres with invariant direction v_i , with all invariant lines concurrent [Hacking and Keating 2022, Theorem 1.2]. Changes of toric models give equivalent fibrations, which will be further exploited below.

Lagrangian translations Fix a reference Lagrangian section L_0 for the almost-toric fibration $\pi : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$. This should be thought of as mirror to \mathcal{O}_Y . Going back to early days of SYZ mirror symmetry, Lagrangian sections of π , up to suitable equivalence, are expected to correspond to line bundles on Y . Restricting to “compactly supported” subsets on both sides, we will see in Corollary 4.21 that there are one-to-one correspondences

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Lagrangian sections } L \text{ of } \pi \text{ equal to } L_0 \text{ near } \partial M \text{ up to} \\ \text{compactly supported fibre-preserving Hamiltonian isotopy} \end{array} \right\} \longleftrightarrow H_2(M)/\mathbb{Z}\langle\gamma^\vee\rangle$$

$$\begin{array}{c} \updownarrow \\ \text{line bundles in } Q \longleftrightarrow H_2(U)/\mathbb{Z}\langle\gamma\rangle \end{array}$$

where γ , as before, is a linking torus for a node of D , and γ^\vee , the “dual torus”, is the class of a fibre of π . The vertical equivalence is induced by an explicit diffeomorphism between M and U , the top one by taking L to $[L] - [L_0]$, and the bottom one by taking the first Chern class and Poincaré duality. To define a Lagrangian translation, fix a Lagrangian section L . Arnol’d–Liouville coordinates give a linear structure on each smooth fibre, and adding $L - L_0$ fibrewise can be checked to be locally a symplectomorphism. We show that this can be extended over the singular fibres to get an element of $\pi_0 \text{Symp}_c(M)$ (Proposition 4.11).

This is related to an early conjecture of Gross [1998, Conjecture 3.7] for monodromy diffeomorphisms associated to large complex structure limit points for compact Calabi–Yau manifolds. Related constructions on individual Lagrangian sections can be found in Subotic’s thesis [2010, Chapter 5] and the work of

Hanlon and Hicks [2022, Section 5.2], for fibrations without singular fibres. Finally, for some distinguished line bundles, the mirror Lagrangian translation is described as a monodromy diffeomorphism in [Engel and Friedman 2021]; see also Remark 1.10.

Nodal slide recombinations Suppose φ is an automorphism of Y preserving D pointwise. To construct the mirror $\check{\varphi}$, we use input from birational geometry. Fix a toric model for (Y, D) , say $f : (Y, D) \rightarrow (\bar{Y}, \bar{D})$. (We can, without loss of generality, ignore toric blowups.) It follows from the two-dimensional Sarkisov programme that the toric model $f \circ \varphi : (Y, D) \rightarrow (\bar{Y}, \bar{D})$ can be obtained by starting from $f : (Y, D) \rightarrow (\bar{Y}, \bar{D})$ and performing a sequence of elementary transformations; see Proposition 3.5 and [Corti and Kaloghiros 2016; Kollár et al. 2004]. Equivalently, φ restricts to a birational transformation of $(\mathbb{C}^*)^2$, say $\bar{\varphi}$, and the sequence of elementary transformations corresponds to a factorisation of $\bar{\varphi}$ into a composition of maps of the form $\psi \circ E \circ \psi^{-1}$, where $E : (x, y) \mapsto (x, y/(x+1))$ and $\psi \in \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$; see [Blanc 2013]. Readers may recognise E as the standard two-variable cluster transformation.

On the mirror side, each elementary transformation determines an operation on M . In terms of the almost-toric fibration, this is a nodal slide followed by a cut transfer [Symington 2003] (see Section 3.2.2); in terms of the Weinstein skeleton of M , a Lagrangian mutation (for which we will follow [Pascaleff and Tonkonog 2020]). The full sequence of transformations returns the same almost-toric fibration (or presentation of the Weinstein skeleton) as we started with, and determines a symplectomorphism of M . Independence of the choice of factorisation reduces to checking a symplectic incarnation of the “ A_2 cluster relation”; see Proposition 6.6; this uses Blanc’s description [2013] of the relations in the group of volume-preserving birational transformations of \mathbb{P}^2 .

From the cluster perspective, the symplectomorphisms are interesting in of their own right: they are associated to loops in the cluster graph for $Y \setminus D$. In terms of actions on Lagrangian submanifolds, the idea that elementary transformations are mirror to Lagrangian mutations has been widely explored in the wake of [Auroux 2007]; see [Vianna 2014, 2017; Shende et al. 2016; Pascaleff and Tonkonog 2020]. Finally, for integral affine bases of SYZ fibrations on K3 surfaces, Conjecture 7 of [Kontsevich and Soibelman 2006] considers similar operations.

Remark 1.3 Heuristically, we expect a symplectomorphism to preserve the SYZ fibration (up to Hamiltonian isotopy) if and only if the mirror autoequivalence preserves the collection of structure sheaves of points. On the other hand, by [Huybrechts 2006, Corollary 5.23], such autoequivalences are precisely given by $\mathrm{Pic}(Y) \rtimes \mathrm{Aut}(Y)$: this would mean that we have found all compactly supported symplectomorphisms respecting the SYZ fibration, up to equivalence in $\mathrm{Auteq} \mathcal{W}(M)$.

Notes on noncompactly supported maps Our constructions naturally extend to give examples of noncompactly supported symplectomorphisms:

- For Lagrangian translations, we can use a Lagrangian section L which does not agree with L_0 near infinity; see Lemma 4.3 and Proposition 4.14. We expect this to be mirror to $\otimes \mathcal{L}$ for a line bundle \mathcal{L} such that $\mathcal{L}|_D \not\cong \mathcal{O}_D$. One possible approach is to use the monomially admissible framework as developed in [Hanlon 2019; Hanlon and Hicks 2022; Hanlon and Ward \geq 2026].

- For nodal slide recombinations, we can add extra automorphisms of Y , which fix D setwise but not pointwise; see [Section 6.2.1](#). This corresponds to adding actions of elements of $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ on the base of the almost-toric fibration. We expect to get an action by symplectomorphisms of the cluster modular group introduced in [[Fock and Goncharov 2009](#)]. See also [[Keating and Ward 2024](#)].

1.3 HMS action

The proof that the symplectomorphisms we construct have the expected mirrors requires several sections. In particular, we establish tractable criteria for an autoequivalence of $D(Y)$ to be the identity: see [Proposition 2.14](#) or the proof of [Theorem 5.5](#). As part of applying this, we explicitly construct Lagrangian spheres mirror to $i_*\mathcal{O}_C(a)$ for any $C \subset U$ a (-2) curve, and $a \in \mathbb{Z}$; this may be of independent interest.

1.4 Spherical objects and full autoequivalence groups

Spherical objects Some corollaries on Lagrangian spheres may be of independent interest. In particular, [Corollary 7.6](#) shows that whenever there are infinitely many (-2) curves in $Y \setminus D$, we can construct a countably infinite family of Lagrangian spheres, none of which is contained in the subcategory of $D^b\mathcal{W}(M)$ split-generated by the others. This implies that there is a large collection of finite type Weinstein four-manifolds with this property. In contrast, for Milnor fibres of hypersurface singularities, all known Lagrangian spheres are split-generated by a finite collection of them (by Picard–Lefschetz theory).

In general, spherical objects in $D(Y)$ are not classified, and that problem is largely orthogonal to the focus of this article. The folklore expectation is as follows.

Conjecture 1.4 *Let \mathcal{A} be the collection of spherical objects*

$$\mathcal{A} := \{i_*\mathcal{O}_C(a) \mid C \text{ a } (-2) \text{ curve, } a \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

Let $T_{\mathcal{A}}$ be the group generated by spherical twists in objects of \mathcal{A} . Then any spherical object in $D(Y)$ is quasi-isomorphic to an element of $T_{\mathcal{A}} \cdot \mathcal{A}$.

Any spherical object in $D(Y)$ has support in Z , the union of all (-2) curves in Y , and the conjecture is known for all connected components of Z which are either chains or cycles of (-2) curves [[Ishii and Uehara 2005](#); [Uehara 2016](#)]; see [Lemma 2.1](#), and note the extra technical assumption in the case where the cycle of (-2) curves is D itself.

Autoequivalence groups A companion question is to understand the full group of autoequivalences of $D(Y)$. For compactly supported ones, the general expectation translates as follows.

Conjecture 1.5 (cf. [[Uehara 2019](#), Conjecture 1.2]) *Let $\mathrm{Auteq}_c D(U)$ denote compactly supported autoequivalences of $D(U)$ (see [Section 2.4](#)). Then*

$$\mathrm{Auteq}_c D(U) = \langle T_{\mathcal{A}'}, Q \rangle \rtimes \mathrm{Aut}(Y, D; \mathrm{pt})$$

where $\mathcal{A}' \subset \mathcal{A}$ is given by restricting to (-2) curves in $Y \setminus D$, Q is as before, and $\mathrm{Aut}(Y, D; \mathrm{pt})$ is the group of automorphisms of Y fixing D pointwise.

This too is known to hold whenever all connected components of $Z \cap (Y \setminus D)$ are chains or cycles of (-2) curves [Ishii and Uehara 2005; Uehara 2016, 2019]. Examples include the cases where D is semidefinite case with $k \geq 5$ (assuming D contains no (-1) curves). The difficulty is classifying autoequivalences of $D_Z(Y)$, the derived category of coherent sheaves with support on Z . Note that our results imply the following:

Theorem 1.6 (Proposition 5.2 and Theorem 7.1) *Assume that Conjecture 1.5 holds. Then any compactly supported autoequivalence of $D^b\mathcal{W}(M)$ can be represented by a compactly supported symplectomorphism of M . Moreover, the categorical symplectic mapping class group of M , i.e., the image of the (graded) symplectic mapping class group in $\text{Auteq } D^b\mathcal{W}(M)$, is generated by Lagrangians translations, nodal slide recombinations, and Dehn twists in Lagrangian spheres mirror to line bundles on (-2) curves.*

The theorem holds unconditionally whenever Conjecture 1.5 is known — for instance, for Example 1.2, for which $Z = \emptyset$.

1.5 Monodromy and moduli spaces of complex structures

We end with some further motivation. Why would one expect autoequivalences of $D(Y)$ to have mirrors realised by symplectomorphisms? For our families, we conjecture that all of these symplectomorphisms are induced by monodromy in the complex moduli space for M .

For the finite list of cases where the intersection pairing associated to D is semidefinite, M is the Milnor fibre of a simple elliptic singularity. It compactifies to a del Pezzo surface X , with $M = X \setminus E$, for $E \subset X$ a smooth anticanonical. The moduli space of pairs (X', E') , where X' is deformation equivalent to X and $E' \subset X'$ smooth anticanonical, is well understood. Aspects of this will be revisited in Section 7.3.

For now, focus on the case where D is negative definite. There is now no a priori reason to expect the Stein manifold M to be a variety. To get a precise “complex moduli space” for M , consider the smoothing component of the singularity for which M is a Milnor fibre, with the discriminant locus removed; call this \mathcal{S} . Note that one expects monodromy in a smoothing component to always induce compactly supported symplectomorphisms, whereas for the full complex moduli space in the semidefinite case this won’t always be true.

Conjecture 1.7 *Assume that D is negative definite. There is a natural isomorphism*

$$\mathcal{S} \simeq \left((Q_{\mathbb{R}} + i\mathcal{C}) \setminus \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Phi, k \in \mathbb{Z}} \{x \mid \langle x, \alpha \rangle = k\} \right) / (Q \rtimes \text{Adm}),$$

where $Q = (D_1, \dots, D_k)^\perp \subset \text{Pic } Y$, for D_1, \dots, D_k the irreducible components of D ; \mathcal{C} is the interior of $\overline{K(Y_{\text{gen}})} \cap Q \subset \text{Pic } Y \otimes \mathbb{R} = H_{\text{dR}}^2(Y; \mathbb{R})$, where $K(Y_{\text{gen}})$ is the generic Kaehler cone (i.e., the Kaehler cone for a generic Y' in the complex deformation space of Y); Φ is the set of all roots in Q ; and Adm is the subgroup of admissible lattice automorphisms of $\text{Pic } Y$, i.e., the ones preserving the $[D_i]$ and \mathcal{C} .

Remark 1.8 For the purpose of computing $\pi_1(\mathcal{S})$, we could replace \mathcal{C} by the larger cone given by one connected component of the positive square cone; heuristically, this is because we know that the strata of the hyperplane arrangements in these open sets are in bijection.

In the cases $k \leq 5$, [Conjecture 1.7](#) is a theorem of Looijenga [1981].

The intersection pairing on $\text{Pic } Y$ has hyperbolic signature, \mathcal{C} is contained in the positive square cone, and Adm acts by isometries, which implies that $Q \rtimes \text{Adm}$ acts properly discontinuously on its domain. This means the quotient is well-behaved.

We expect a representation of $\pi_1(\mathcal{S})$ in $\pi_0 \text{Symp}_c(M)$, and, on the mirror side, in $\text{Auteq}_c D(U)$. Loosely, $Q \rtimes \text{Adm}$ gives the action at the level of homology, with Q corresponding to Lagrangian translations ($\leftrightarrow \otimes \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{L})$), and Adm to the actions of nodal slide recombinations ($\leftrightarrow \text{Aut}(Y, D; \text{pt})$) and Dehn twists (\leftrightarrow Weyl group); and loops in the hyperplane complement should give Torelli elements. We expect an elementary loop around a single hyperplane to correspond to the square of a Dehn twist in a known Lagrangian sphere; on the B side, using the previous notation, these are $T_A \cdot \mathcal{A}$.

The action of $Q \rtimes \text{Adm}$ lifts to $\text{Hom}(K(U), \mathbb{C})$, where $K(U) = \mathbb{Z} \oplus \text{Pic}(U)$ is the K -theory of U . We can consider the space

$$\mathcal{S}' := \left(\text{Hom}(K(U), \mathbb{C})^\circ \setminus \bigcup_{\hat{\alpha} \in \hat{\Phi}} \{\hat{\alpha}^\perp = 0\} \right) / (Q \rtimes \text{Adm}),$$

where $\hat{\Phi}$ is the lift of $\Phi \subset Q$ to $K(U)^*$, and $^\circ$ denotes the restriction to the \mathbb{C}^* cover of \mathcal{S} , the moduli space of [Conjecture 1.7](#). Informally, \mathcal{S}' is the moduli space of complex structures on M equipped with a choice of holomorphic volume form Ω . (This could be made precise by compactifying the cusp to an Inoue surface, which fixes Ω up to a scalar; cf. [Looijenga 1981].) Monodromy about \mathbb{C}^* should correspond to the square of the shift.

Conjecture 1.9 *The universal cover $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}'$ of \mathcal{S}' is a connected component of the space of Bridgeland stability conditions on $D^b \text{Coh}(U)$. The natural map to the intermediate covering space which lies inside $\text{Hom}(K(U), \mathbb{C})$, before quotienting by $Q \rtimes \text{Adm}$, is given by mapping to the central charge.*

We expect that there are two connected components of the space of Bridgeland stability conditions, interchanged by the shift functor, mapping to $Q_{\mathbb{R}} \pm i\mathcal{C}$ via the central charge.

Remark 1.10 The reader may be interested in comparing with work of Engel and Friedman [2021, Section 5.1]. They construct monodromy diffeomorphisms of the Milnor fibre M of a smoothing of a cusp singularity associated to a negative definite log CY (Y, D) together with a choice of line bundle $\mathcal{L} \in \mathcal{C}$, describing in particular the action on homology. We expect that M is mirror to (Y, D) and these monodromy diffeomorphisms are the Lagrangian translations mirror to $(\cdot) \otimes \mathcal{L}$, associated to loops bounding a disc passing through the origin in the deformation space of the cusp (rather than an arbitrary closed loop).

Organisation of the paper

[Section 2](#) gathers background material on autoequivalences of the derived categories on the B side. [Section 3](#) contains the input we will use from mirror symmetry, including some refinements of results in [[Hacking and Keating 2022](#)]. [Section 4](#) sets up Lagrangian translations, including a proof of [Theorem 1.1\(1\)](#) at the K -theoretic level. [Section 5](#) constructs Lagrangian spheres mirror to line bundles on (-2) curves; this also allows us to complete the proof of [Theorem 1.1\(1\)](#) ([Theorem 5.5](#)). [Section 6](#) constructs nodal slide recombinations and proves [Theorem 1.1\(2\)](#), and the independence of choices mentioned above. Relations between symplectomorphisms from different families are established in [Section 6.4](#). Finally, [Section 7](#) contains a range of applications: first, the packaging of the new symplectomorphisms as [Section 7.1](#) and discussion of examples in [Section 7.1](#); applications of our constructions to questions about spherical objects in [Section 7.2](#); and it ends with extended discussion of the semidefinite case — further constructions from monodromy ([Section 7.3](#)) and connections with work of Collins, Jacob and Lin on hyperkaehler structures ([Section 7.4](#)).

Notation and conventions

While they will be introduced as we go along, we record standing notational conventions here for the reader's convenience.

B side: (Y, D) will denote a log Calabi–Yau pair, assumed to have maximal boundary unless otherwise specified; we use U to denote $Y \setminus D$, k for the number of irreducible components D_1, \dots, D_k of D , and (Y_e, D) for the surface in the deformation class of (Y, D) with the distinguished complex structure, i.e., such that the mixed Hodge structure on $Y_e \setminus D$ is split (see exposition in [[Hacking and Keating 2022](#), Section 2.2]). We say that D is negative definite, semidefinite or indefinite whenever the intersection form associated to the D_i is. (Abusing terminology, we use “semidefinite” to mean strictly semidefinite.) When D is semidefinite, Y_e is rational elliptic, and we denote by $\varpi : Y_e \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ the minimal rational elliptic fibration ($\varpi^{-1}(\infty) = D$).

A side: The mirror to (Y_e, D) is a Weinstein manifold M , which is the total space of a Lefschetz fibration $w : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. M is the total space of (the equivalence class of) an almost-toric fibration $\pi : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$. In the semidefinite case, $M = X \setminus E$, where X is a del Pezzo surface of degree k and $E \subset X$ a smooth anticanonical divisor (elliptic curve).

2 Autoequivalences of $D^b \text{Coh}(Y)$ and $D^b \text{Coh}(U)$

2.1 Weyl group and classes of spherical objects

In the wake of [[Seidel and Thomas 2001](#)], a well-studied class of autoequivalences of $D(Y)$ are spherical twists. In particular, given a (-2) curve $C \subset Y$, the sheaves $i_* \mathcal{O}_C(a)$, $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, are spherical objects. Let Z be the union of all (-2) curves in Y . (These are either components of D or disjoint from it.) Any spherical object in $D(Y)$ has support on Z , using the arguments in the proof of [[Uehara 2019](#), Claim 6.3].

Lemma 2.1 *Suppose that $\tilde{Z} \subset Z$ is either a type A chain of (-2) curves or a cycle of (-2) curves. In the latter case, we further assume that either $\tilde{Z} \neq D$ or $Y = Y_e$. Then the spherical objects with support on \tilde{Z} are the images of*

$$\{i_*\mathcal{O}_C(a) \mid a \in \mathbb{Z}, C \subset \tilde{Z} \text{ a } (-2) \text{ curve}\}$$

under spherical twists in themselves.

Proof When \tilde{Z} is a type A chain of (-2) curves, this is [Ishii and Uehara 2005, Proposition 1.6 and Lemma 4.1]. When \tilde{Z} is a cycle of (-2) curves, we want to use [Uehara 2016, Proposition 4.4]. This is stated for the case where \tilde{Z} (Z_0 in the notation in [Uehara 2016]) is a fibre of a relatively minimal rational elliptic fibration on Y . (Note this would imply that D is semidefinite; cf. start of Section 2.3.1.) However, inspecting the proof of [Uehara 2016, Proposition 4.4], one can check that relative minimality is not required for that statement: it’s enough to check that there exists an elliptic fibration $f : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ such that \tilde{Z} is a fibre of f . Say \tilde{Z} has components C_1, \dots, C_l .

First, by the adjunction formula, we have that $\omega_{\tilde{Z}} = \omega_Y \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(\tilde{Z})|_{\tilde{Z}}$. Also, the dualizing sheaf $\omega_{\tilde{Z}}$ is trivial, and $\omega_Y|_{\tilde{Z}} = K_Y|_{\tilde{Z}} = -D|_{\tilde{Z}} = 0$. (Here we use $Y = Y_e$ in the case where $\tilde{Z} = D$.) Thus the normal bundle $\mathcal{O}_Y(\tilde{Z})|_{\tilde{Z}}$ of \tilde{Z} in Y is trivial. It then follows from the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y(\tilde{Z}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y(\tilde{Z})|_{\tilde{Z}} \rightarrow 0$$

that $\dim H^0(\mathcal{O}_Y(\tilde{Z})) = 2$ (note $H^1(\mathcal{O}_Y) = 0$ because Y is rational). Thus the linear system $|\tilde{Z}|$ gives a rational map to \mathbb{P}^1 .

Next, we claim that $|\tilde{Z}|$ is basepoint-free. Write $\tilde{Z} = M + F$ for the moving and fixed parts of the divisor \tilde{Z} . Note that $M \neq 0$ since $\dim H^0(\mathcal{O}_Y(\tilde{Z})) = 2$. The lattice $\langle C_1, \dots, C_k \rangle$ is negative semidefinite with kernel $\langle \tilde{Z} \rangle$. Thus if $F \neq 0$, then $M^2 < 0$, which contradicts M moving. So $F = 0$ and $\tilde{Z} = M$ is moving. Now $\tilde{Z}^2 = 0$ implies that $|\tilde{Z}|$ is basepoint-free. Thus the linear system $|\tilde{Z}|$ gives a morphism to \mathbb{P}^1 , with one fibre equal to \tilde{Z} . (This is essentially the same as the proof of the analogous result for K3 surfaces.) □

Remark 2.2 In general, there could be infinitely many (-2) curves, and also other finite configurations — e.g., whenever $k = 3$, a nodal configuration with Y-shaped dual graph (mirror to the Milnor fibre of a hypersurface cusp).

When D is indefinite, the only possible configurations of (-2) curves are ADE configurations (and finitely many of them): there’s a birational morphism which contracts all the internal (-2) curves to ADE singularities and is an isomorphism elsewhere [Gross et al. 2015a, Lemma 6.9].

We can completely classify classes of sphericals in $K(D(Y))$. First recall that the set of roots Φ consists of classes in $\text{Pic}(Y)$ obtained by parallel transport from an internal (-2) curve in a deformation-equivalent pair (Y', D') . (Alternatively, consider the generic ample cone $\mathcal{A}_{\text{gen}} \subset \text{Pic } Y \otimes \mathbb{R}$; the roots are the (-2) classes δ such that $\langle \delta \rangle^\perp \cap \mathcal{A}_{\text{gen}} \neq \emptyset$; see [Friedman 2015].) The Weyl group, denoted by W , is the group

generated by reflections $s_\alpha(x) = x + \langle x, \alpha \rangle \alpha$ for $\alpha \in \Phi$, acting on $H^2(Y; \mathbb{Z}) = \text{Pic}(Y)$. The set of *simple roots* Δ consists of classes of (-2) curves $C \subset Y_e \setminus D$. By [Gross et al. 2015b], W is generated by the reflections in elements of Δ , and $\Phi = W \cdot \Delta$. As the spherical twist in $i_* \mathcal{O}_C(a)$ lifts the action of $s_{[C]}$, any root is the first Chern class of a spherical object in $D(Y)$. The converse also holds:

Lemma 2.3 *Suppose $E \in D(Y)$ is a spherical object with support disjoint from D . Then its first Chern class $c_1(E) \in H^2(Y; \mathbb{Z}) \simeq \text{Pic}(Y)$ is a root.*

Proof Let E be a spherical object in $D(Y)$ with support disjoint from D . Consider framed deformations of E with framing along D . These are controlled by $\text{Ext}^i(E, E(-D))$, with $i = 0, 1, 2$. (Note that, since the support of E is disjoint from D , the framed deformations are identified with ordinary deformations, and $\text{Ext}^i(E, E(-D)) = \text{Ext}^i(E, E)$; however, this is not true for deformations of the associated determinant line bundle considered below.)

Consider the trace map from $\text{Ext}^i(E, E(-D))$ to $H^i(\mathcal{O}_Y(-D))$. This corresponds to the map from framed deformations of E to framed deformations of the line bundle $\det E$. The map

$$\text{Ext}^2(E, E(-D)) \rightarrow H^2(\mathcal{O}_Y(-D))$$

is an isomorphism, that is, the obstruction spaces for deformations of E and framed deformations of $\det E$ are identified. Indeed, recalling that $-D = K_Y$, the map is Serre dual to the map $H^0(\mathcal{O}_Y) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(E, E)$, which is an isomorphism since E is spherical. (This is the usual argument for smoothness of moduli spaces of stable sheaves on Calabi–Yau surfaces due to Mukai, adapted to the log Calabi–Yau / framed case.)

This implies that if $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{D})/(0 \in S)$ is a deformation of (Y, D) over an analytic germ $(0 \in S)$, then E extends to an object \mathcal{E} in $D^b(\text{Coh } \mathcal{Y})$ if and only if there is a framed deformation of $\det E$ over S . Equivalently, writing \mathcal{L}_s for the line bundle on \mathcal{Y}_s obtained from $\det E$ by parallel transport (noting that $c_1: \text{Pic } \mathcal{Y}_s \rightarrow H^2(\mathcal{Y}_s, \mathbb{Z})$ is an isomorphism since \mathcal{Y}_s is rational), we have $\mathcal{L}_s|_{\mathcal{D}_s} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{D}_s}$ for all $s \in S$. In the terminology of [Gross et al. 2015b], after choosing a trivialization of the local system over S with fibres $H^2(\mathcal{Y}_s, \mathbb{Z})$, we require that the period point $\phi_{\mathcal{Y}_s}: H^2(Y, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$ satisfies $\phi_{\mathcal{Y}_s}(c_1(E)) = 1$ for all $s \in S$. (Moreover, in this case the extension \mathcal{E} is uniquely determined since $\text{Ext}^1(E, E) = 0$.) Write $\alpha = c_1(E) \in H^2(Y, \mathbb{Z})$. Note that $\alpha^2 = -2$ by the Riemann–Roch formula; in particular, $\alpha \in H^2(Y, \mathbb{Z})$ is primitive.

By the local Torelli theorem for log Calabi–Yau surfaces [Looijenga 1981], there is a small deformation $(\mathcal{Y}_s, \mathcal{D}_s)$ of (Y, D) such that $\ker \phi_{\mathcal{Y}_s} = \mathbb{Z} \cdot \alpha$. Thus E deforms to a spherical object \mathcal{E}_s on \mathcal{Y}_s . (A deformation of a spherical object is necessarily spherical by upper semicontinuity of coherent cohomology and the topological nature of the Euler characteristic.) Recall that any spherical object in $D(Y)$ has support a union of (-2) curves. Moreover, if $C \subset Y \setminus D$ is an internal curve, then $\phi_Y([C]) = 1$. Finally, the support of \mathcal{E}_s is disjoint from the boundary \mathcal{D}_s of \mathcal{Y}_s for all s (since this is an open condition and it holds for $s = 0$). It follows that $\mathcal{Y}_s \setminus \mathcal{D}_s$ contains a unique (-2) curve C with class $\pm\alpha = \pm c_1(E)$. Thus $c_1(E) \in H^2(Y, \mathbb{Z})$ is a root. □

Remark 2.4 The K -theory $K(\text{Coh } Y)$ is generated by the image of $\text{Coh}(Y)$ under the Chern character. Explicitly,

$$K(\text{Coh } Y) = \left\{ (r, c_1, \text{ch}_2) \in \mathbb{Z} \oplus H^2(Y, \mathbb{Z}) \oplus \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z} \mid \text{ch}_2 \equiv \frac{1}{2}c_1^2 \pmod{\mathbb{Z}} \right\}.$$

(As Y is rational, the algebraic and topological K -theories for Y agree.) The classes of the spherical objects in $K(\text{Coh } Y_e)$ are given by $(0, c_1, \text{ch}_2)$, where $c_1 \in \Phi$ is a root and $\text{ch}_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$. Above we only considered the first Chern class c_1 , but the same argument shows this stronger result. (Note that the spherical twist acts by the same formula on $K(\text{Coh } Y)$ and $\text{ch}(\mathcal{O}_C(n)) = \text{ch}(\mathcal{O}_C) + (0, 0, n)$ using the basis above.)

2.2 Automorphisms of Y

We collect relevant results from [Gross et al. 2015b; Friedman 2015].

2.2.1 Generalities and Torelli theorem We consider the following subgroups of the group of biholomorphic automorphisms $\text{Aut}(Y)$: let $\text{Aut}(Y, D)$ be the subgroup preserving D , $\text{Aut}(Y, D; \text{cpt})$, the subgroup preserving each component of D ; and $\text{Aut}(Y, D; \text{pt})$, the subgroup fixing D pointwise. ($\text{Aut}(Y, D; \text{cpt})$ clearly has (at worst) finite index in $\text{Aut}(Y, D)$.)

If D is negative definite, $\text{Aut}(Y) = \text{Aut}(Y, D)$; in the negative semidefinite case, $\text{Aut}(Y, D)$ has finite index in $\text{Aut}(Y)$. In either of these cases, provided D contains no (-1) curves, any automorphism of $U = Y \setminus D$ compactifies to an element of $\text{Aut}(Y)$: this is a straightforward exercise in the semidefinite cases, and follows from uniqueness of the minimal resolution of the corresponding cusp singularities for the negative definite ones. (Note that this is emphatically not true in the indefinite case; see for instance [Cantat and Loray 2009].)

Let Adm denote the subgroup of automorphisms of the lattice $\text{Pic}(Y)$ preserving the classes $[D_i]$ and the generic ample cone in $\text{Pic}(Y)$. (See [Gross et al. 2015b, Definition 1.7]; this is called $\Gamma(Y, D)$ in [Friedman 2015].) Adm is the monodromy group of pairs (Y, D) in the sense of [Gross et al. 2015b, Theorem 5.15]. We have $W \trianglelefteq \text{Adm}$.

Theorem 2.5 [Gross et al. 2015b, Theorem 5.1] *Assume Y has the distinguished complex structure within its deformation class. There is an exact sequence*

$$1 \rightarrow N \rightarrow \text{Aut}(Y, D; \text{cpt}) \rightarrow \text{Adm}/W \rightarrow 1,$$

where $N = \text{Hom}(N', \mathbb{G}_m)$, and N' is the cokernel of the evaluation map $\text{ev} : \text{Pic}(Y) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^k$ given by taking intersection numbers with the D_i . Equivalently, $N' = \pi_1(Y \setminus D)$, by considering the long exact sequence of the pair (Y, U) .

N is the subgroup of $\text{Aut}(Y, D; \text{cpt})$ which acts trivially on $H^2(Y; \mathbb{Z})$. It is finite whenever a toric model for Y involves interior blowups on components corresponding to (at least) two linearly independent toric rays; in particular, it is finite whenever D is negative semidefinite or negative definite. The action of N on (Y, D) can be described explicitly as follows: choose a toric model $(Y, D) \rightarrow (\bar{Y}, \bar{D})$.

Let $T \simeq (\mathbb{C}^*)^2$ be the big torus acting on \bar{Y} . Then N is the subgroup of T fixing the points we blow up to obtain (Y, D) , and the action of N on (\bar{Y}, \bar{D}) lifts to an action of N on (Y, D) .

Lemma 2.6 *Assume that $Y = Y_e$. The exact sequence of [Theorem 2.5](#) splits, and we have*

$$\mathrm{Aut}(Y, D; \mathrm{pt}) = \ker\{\mathrm{Aut}(Y, D; \mathrm{cpt}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Aut} D\} \simeq \mathrm{Adm}/W.$$

Proof From the discussion above, we get $N \subset T \subset \mathrm{Aut}^0(D) (\simeq (\mathbb{C}^*)^k)$. Now consider the restriction map $\mathrm{Aut}(Y, D; \mathrm{cpt}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Aut}^0(D)$. We claim that its image lies in N . This uses the fact that $Y = Y_e$: for any $L \in \mathrm{Pic}(Y)$, $L|_D = \mathcal{O}_D(\sum(L \cdot D_i)p_i)$ for some distinguished points $p_i \in D_i$. Now consider an arbitrary $\varphi \in \mathrm{Aut}(Y, D; \mathrm{cpt})$. It follows from the above that $\varphi|_D^*(L|_D) \simeq \varphi^*(L)|_D \simeq L|_D$. On the other hand, as this holds for an arbitrary L , we see that $\varphi|_D \in N$ by [[Gross et al. 2015b](#), Proposition 2.6], as required. Thus restriction gives a splitting $\mathrm{Aut}(Y, D; \mathrm{cpt}) \rightarrow N$, and we're done. \square

2.2.2 Negative semidefinite case Assume that D is negative semidefinite and does not contain a (-1) curve, i.e., D is a cycle of (-2) curves. Complex deformation classes of such pairs (Y, D) are completely understood:

Proposition 2.7 [[Friedman 2015](#), Propositions 9.15 and 9.16] *Suppose (Y, D) is a log CY surface, and that D is a cycle of k (-2) curves. Then $k \leq 9$, there is a unique deformation type for $k \neq 8$, and two deformation types for $k = 8$ distinguished by $\pi_1(Y \setminus D)$.*

Remark 2.8 $Y \setminus D$ is mirror to $X \setminus E$ where X is a del Pezzo surface of degree $K_X^2 = k$ and E is a smooth anticanonical divisor [[Auroux et al. 2006](#); [Hacking and Keating 2022](#)].

The various flavours of automorphism groups are also known explicitly. First, N is known (see [[Friedman 2015](#), Proposition 9.16(iii)]):

$$\pi_1(Y \setminus D) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{Z}/2 \text{ or } 0 & \text{when } k = 8, \\ \mathbb{Z}/3 & \text{when } k = 9, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Second, by [[Friedman 2015](#), Corollary 9.20], $\mathrm{Adm} = W$ except when $k = 7$, or $k = 8$ and $\pi_1(Y \setminus D) = 0$. In both of these cases, $\mathrm{Adm}/W \simeq \mathbb{Z}$; see [[Gross et al. 2015b](#), Examples 5.6 and 5.3; [Friedman 2015](#), Lemma 9.18(iii)].

Thus if $Y = Y_e$, in both of these cases, we get that $\mathrm{Aut}(Y, D; \mathrm{pt}) \simeq \mathbb{Z}$. We can describe these automorphisms explicitly using the Mordell–Weil group of Y . As $Y = Y_e$, it is the total space of a minimal rational elliptic fibration $\varpi : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$, with $D = \varpi^{-1}(\infty)$ cycle of (-2) curves. (The existence of such an elliptic fibration is codimension-one in the complex moduli space: it exists whenever the period map ϕ satisfies $\phi([D]) = 1$, which is certainly true for Y_e . For background on ϕ , see for instance [[Hacking and Keating 2022](#), Section 2.2].) The fibration ϖ is unique, and admits a holomorphic section. Recall that the Mordell–Weil group $\mathrm{MW}(Y, \mathbb{P}^1)$ is the group of holomorphic sections of ϖ , with identity element the reference section s . This acts by translation on each smooth fibre. As the fibration is relatively minimal,

this extends to an automorphism of Y ; see [Barth et al. 2004, Proposition III.8.4]. From [Shioda 1990, Theorem 1.3], we have

$$\text{MW}(Y, \mathbb{P}^1) \simeq \langle F \rangle^\perp / K,$$

where F is the class of a smooth fibre of ϖ , $\langle F \rangle^\perp$ is taken inside $\text{Pic}(Y) = H^2(Y; \mathbb{Z})$ with respect to the standard pairing, and K is the subgroup of $H^2(Y; \mathbb{Z})$ generated by all the irreducible components of fibres. One can calculate that $\text{MW}(Y, \mathbb{P}^1) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ when $k = 7$, or $k = 8$ and $\pi_1(Y \setminus D) = 0$, in which cases $\text{Aut}(Y, D; \text{pt}) = k \cdot \text{MW}(Y, \mathbb{P}^1)$. In other cases it's a finite group.

2.3 Autoequivalences of $D^b \text{Coh}(Y)$

2.3.1 D negative definite or indefinite

Lemma 2.9 [Uehara 2019] *Assume that D is negative definite or indefinite. Then any autoequivalence of $D(Y)$ has Fourier–Mukai kernel with two-dimensional support.*

Proof We claim that these cases both fall under (iii) of [Uehara 2019, Theorem 5.3]: namely that $K_Y \neq 0$, and Y does not admit a minimal elliptic fibration. The second part needs checking. Suppose that Y admits a minimal elliptic fibration. Since Y is rational, there is at most one multiple fibre, say of multiplicity $m \geq 1$, by the Kodaira canonical bundle formula. Then $D = -K_Y = (1/m)F$, where F is the class of a fibre. Now $D \cdot F = 0$ so D is contained in a fibre, and $D^2 = 0$ so D is equal to a fibre, and thus D is semidefinite, a contradiction. \square

As before, let Z be the union of all (-2) curves in Y , and let $D_Z(Y)$ be the full triangulated subcategory of $D(Y)$ consisting of objects supported on Z . By [Uehara 2019, Proposition 6.1], there is a well-defined group homomorphism

$$\text{Auteq } D(Y) \rightarrow \text{Auteq } D_Z(Y)$$

induced by restriction. Let $\text{Auteq}^\dagger D_Z(Y)$ denote the image of this map. (This is $\text{Auteq}_{K\text{-equiv}}^\dagger D_Z(Y)$ in [Uehara 2019], though in the case at hand all autoequivalences are of so-called K -equivalent-type.)

Theorem 2.10 [Uehara 2019, Theorems 6.6 and 6.8] *There is a short exact sequence*

$$(2.11) \quad 1 \rightarrow \text{Pic}_Z(Y) \rtimes \text{Aut}_Z(Y) \rightarrow \text{Auteq } D(Y) \rightarrow \text{Auteq}^\dagger D_Z(Y) \rightarrow 1,$$

where

$$\text{Pic}_Z(Y) = \{ \mathcal{L} \in \text{Pic}(Y) \mid \mathcal{L}|_Z \simeq \mathcal{O}_Z \},$$

acting by tensor product, and

$$\text{Aut}_Z(Y) = \{ \varphi \in \text{Aut}(Y) \mid \varphi|_Z = \text{id}_Z \},$$

acting by pushforward.

If Z is a disjoint union of cycles and chains of (-2) curves, and $Y = Y_e$ if D is a cycle of (-2) curves, then

$$\text{Auteq } D(Y) = \langle \text{Br}_Z(Y), \text{Pic}(Y) \rangle \rtimes \text{Aut}(Y) \times \mathbb{Z}[1]$$

by Lemma 2.1, where $\text{Br}_Z = \langle T_{\mathcal{O}_C(a)} \mid C \subset Z \text{ a } (-2) \text{ curve, } a \in \mathbb{Z} \rangle$, and $\mathbb{Z}[1]$ denotes shifts.

2.3.2 D negative semidefinite Assume that there is a rational elliptic fibration $\varpi : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ as above (e.g., if $Y = Y_e$), and let F denote any fibre of ϖ . Every element of $\text{Auteq } D(Y)$ induces an automorphism of $(K(Y), \chi)$, where χ is the Mukai pairing, and, via restriction, an automorphism of $(K(F), \chi)$: see the proof of [Uehara 2016, Theorem 3.11] and lemmas leading up to it. (For F we are referring to topological K -theory.) $K(F)$ is identified with $H^0(F, \mathbb{Z}) \oplus H^2(F, \mathbb{Z})$ by taking rank and degree, and, as an element of $\text{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$, an automorphism preserves χ precisely when it has determinant one. Thus we get a map $\Theta : \text{Auteq } D(Y) \rightarrow \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$.

Theorem 2.12 [Uehara 2016, Theorem 4.1] *Assume that all the reducible fibres of ϖ are of type I_m (i.e., cycles of (-2) curves). Then there is a short exact sequence*

$$(2.13) \quad 1 \rightarrow \langle \text{Br}_Z, \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y}(E) \mid E \cdot F = 0 \rangle \rtimes \text{Aut } Y \times \mathbb{Z}[2] \rightarrow \text{Auteq } D(Y) \xrightarrow{\Theta} \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow 1,$$

where $\text{Br}_Z = \langle T_{\mathcal{O}_C(a)} \mid C \subset Y \text{ is a } (-2) \text{ curve, } a \in \mathbb{Z} \rangle$, and $\mathbb{Z}[2]$ is even-degree shifts.

Note that all (-2) curves are contained in reducible fibres, and so Lemma 2.1 applies. When ϖ has singular fibres of other types, a similar short exact sequence is conjectured in [Uehara 2016], and known up to the same ambiguity as in the negative definite case: “extra” autoequivalences with Fourier–Mukai kernel with support on Z have not been ruled out.

The degree-one shift acts as -1 on K theory, and so is not in the kernel of the map to $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$. The sequence (2.13) doesn’t split; this will be clear from the perspective of moduli space monodromies: see Section 1.5. Explicit lifts of $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ elements can be given as follows. Use the basis $([\mathcal{O}_F], [\mathcal{O}_{\text{pt}}])$ for $K(F) \simeq \mathbb{Z}^2$, and let $t = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ and $s = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ be the usual generators for $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$. Let E_0 be a holomorphic section of ϖ . Then $\otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y}(E_0) \in \text{Auteq } D(Y)$ satisfies $\Theta(\otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y}(E_0)) = t$. Let $\Delta \subset Y \times_{\mathbb{P}^1} Y$ be the relative diagonal, $\pi_i : Y \times_{\mathbb{P}^1} Y \rightarrow Y$ be projection to the i -th factor, and let \mathcal{P} be the relative Poincaré bundle associated to E_0 :

$$\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{O}_{Y \times_{\mathbb{P}^1} Y}(\Delta - \pi_1^* E_0 - \pi_2^* E_0).$$

Let $\Phi^{\mathcal{P}}$ be the fibrewise Fourier–Mukai transform with kernel \mathcal{P} ; then $\Theta(\Phi^{\mathcal{P}}) = s$; see for instance [Bridgeland 1998].

2.3.3 Detecting the identity

Proposition 2.14 *Assume that (Y, D) is arbitrary negative definite or indefinite; or semidefinite admitting a rational elliptic fibration (e.g., $Y = Y_e$). Assume that $\psi \in \text{Auteq } D(Y)$ induces the identity on $K(Y)$, and that for each (-2) curve $C \subset Y$, ψ fixes $i_* \mathcal{O}_C(-1)$ and $i_* \mathcal{O}_C$ as objects of $D(Y)$. Then $\psi = \varphi_*$, where $\varphi \in N \leq \text{Aut}(Y, D; \text{cpt})$, up to an even shift if Z is empty. In particular, ψ must be the identity autoequivalence if in addition $\iota^* \circ \psi = \iota^*$, where ι is the inclusion $D \rightarrow Y$, and ι^* the derived pullback $D(Y) \rightarrow \text{Perf}(D)$.*

Proof Let’s first assume that D is either negative definite or indefinite. Let C be an arbitrary (-2) curve. The structure sheaves $i_* \mathcal{O}_p$ of points $p \in C$ are in one-to-one correspondence with cones on morphisms

from $i_*\mathcal{O}_C(-1)$ to $i_*\mathcal{O}_C$, so the second assumption implies that ψ permutes these structure sheaves. On the other hand, the proof of [Uehara 2019, Theorem 6.6] implies, for any $q \in Y \setminus Z$, that $i_*\mathcal{O}_q$ must be mapped to $i_*\mathcal{O}_{q'}$, for some $q' \in Y \setminus Z$. From [Huybrechts 2006, Corollary 5.23], it follows that ψ is in $\text{Pic}(Y) \rtimes \text{Aut}(Y)$. Now use the assumption on the K -theoretic action: first, considering the image of $[\mathcal{O}_Y] \in K(Y)$, we see that $\psi = \varphi_*$, for some $\varphi \in \text{Aut}(Y)$; second, the Torelli theorem (Theorem 2.5) then implies that $\varphi \in N$.

When D is negative semidefinite, as before, ψ must permute structure sheaves of points of Z . By the assumption on K -theory, $\psi \in \ker \Theta$. We want to show that ψ is in $\text{Pic } Y \rtimes \text{Aut } Y$. After composing with an automorphism of \mathbb{P}^1 , ψ restricts to an autoequivalence of $Y \setminus Z$ over $V = \mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \varpi(Z)$ (note here Z is the union of the reducible fibres). Now since $\psi \in \ker(\Theta)$ for any smooth fibre $F \subset Y \setminus Z$, the induced autoequivalence of $D(F)$ is a composition of an automorphism, tensor by a line bundle, and even shift by the description of autoequivalences of $D(F)$ for F an elliptic curve; in particular, for any $x \in Y \setminus Z$, $\psi(\mathcal{O}_x) = \mathcal{O}_y[2m]$ for some $y \in Y \setminus Z$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. Finally $m = 0$ if $Z \neq \emptyset$ (since $\psi(\mathcal{O}_x)$ is a sheaf for $x \in Z$ and openness of this property). The remainder of the argument is then similar to the first case.

The criterion for $\psi = \text{Id}$ is immediate from the characterisation of N in Lemma 2.6. □

We record relations between different categories of known autoequivalences, for later reference:

Lemma 2.15 *Assume that $\varphi \in \text{Aut}(Y)$, $\mathcal{L} \in \text{Pic}(Y)$, and \mathcal{S} is a spherical object in $D(Y)$. Let $T_{\mathcal{S}}$ denote the spherical twist in \mathcal{S} . Then*

- (1) $\varphi^* \circ T_{\mathcal{S}} = T_{\varphi^*\mathcal{S}} \circ \varphi^*$,
- (2) $(_ \otimes \mathcal{L}) \circ T_{\mathcal{S}} = T_{\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{L}} \circ (_ \otimes \mathcal{L})$,
- (3) $\varphi^* \circ (_ \otimes \mathcal{L}) = (_ \otimes \varphi^*\mathcal{L}) \circ \varphi^*$,
- (4) $T_{\mathcal{O}_C(a-1)} \circ T_{\mathcal{O}_C(a)} = _ \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(C)$, where C is a (-2) curve and $a \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Proof These are all immediate apart from the final one, for which the calculation is in [Ishii and Uehara 2005, Lemma 4.15(i)(2)]. □

Note also that

$$\text{Br}_Z \cap \text{Aut}(Y) = \text{Pic}(Y) \cap \text{Aut}(Y) = \{\text{Id}\} \in \text{Auteq}(Y).$$

See [Ishii and Uehara 2005, Lemma 4.14].

2.4 “Compactly supported” autoequivalences of $D^b \text{Coh}(U)$

Recall that $D(U)$ is equivalent to the derived wrapped Fukaya category of the mirror, $D^b\mathcal{W}(M)$. On that side, any compactly supported symplectomorphism of M induces an automorphism of $D^b\mathcal{F}^{\rightarrow}(w)$ (the mirror to $D(Y)$), and the identity on the fibre Σ of w , whose Fukaya category $\mathcal{F}(\Sigma)$ is mirror to $\text{Perf}(D)$. This motivates the following definition:

Definition 2.16 We say that $\psi \in \text{Auteq } D(U)$ has compact support if there exists $\tilde{\psi} \in \text{Auteq } D(Y)$ such that $\tilde{\psi}$ restricts to ψ on $D(U)$, i.e., we have commutative diagrams:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 D(Y) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\psi}} & D(Y) \\
 \downarrow i^* & & \downarrow i^* \\
 D(U) & \xrightarrow{\psi} & D(U)
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 D(Y) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\psi}} & D(Y) \\
 \searrow i^* & & \swarrow i^* \\
 & \text{Perf}(D) &
 \end{array}$$

Let $\text{Auteq}_c D(U)$ denote the subgroup of compactly supported autoequivalences.

Definition 2.17 Let $\gamma \in H_2(U, \mathbb{Z})$ be the class of a “crossing torus” at a node p of D : identifying the germ $(p \in D \subset Y)$ with $(0 \in (z_1 z_2 = 0) \subset \mathbb{C}_{z_1, z_2}^2)$, γ is the class of the 2-torus $(|z_1| = |z_2| = \epsilon)$ for $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$.

A choice of sign for γ is the same as a choice of generator of $H_1(D, \mathbb{Z})$. Note that γ generates the kernel of the map $i_*: H_2(U, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_2(Y, \mathbb{Z})$, where $i: U \rightarrow Y$ denotes the inclusion of U in Y .

Let $Q = \langle D_1, \dots, D_k \rangle^\perp \subset \text{Pic}(Y)$. Assuming $Y = Y_e$, we have that

$$Q = \{\mathcal{L} \in \text{Pic}(Y) \mid \mathcal{L}|_D \simeq \mathcal{O}_D\} \simeq \text{Im}(H_2(U) \rightarrow H_2(Y)) \simeq H_2(U)/\mathbb{Z} \cdot \gamma.$$

Let \bar{Q} be the image of Q in $\text{Pic}(U)$. This is isomorphic to Q unless D is semidefinite, in which case we have a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \langle D \rangle \rightarrow Q \rightarrow \bar{Q} \rightarrow 0.$$

Choosing (for instance) a section s of $\varpi: Y_e \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ determines a splitting of this sequence:

$$(2.18) \qquad Q \simeq \langle D \rangle \oplus (\langle D_1, \dots, D_k \rangle^\perp \subset \langle D, s \rangle^\perp).$$

Conjecture 2.19 $\text{Auteq}_c D(U)$ is generated by \bar{Q} , $\text{Aut}(Y, D; \text{pt})$ and $\text{Br}_{Z'}$, where $Z' = Z \cap U$.

Whenever Z consists of disjoint chains and cycles of (-2) curves, this follows from Theorems 2.10 and 2.12. In general, the conjecture is known up to ruling out “extra” autoequivalences with support on Z (i.e., restricting trivially to $Y \setminus Z$).

3 Mirror symmetry for log Calabi–Yau surfaces: background

3.1 Homological mirror symmetry

Recall the following.

Theorem 3.1 [Hacking and Keating 2022, Theorem 1.1] *Suppose (Y, D) is a log Calabi–Yau surface with maximal boundary, and distinguished complex structure. Then there exists a four-dimensional Weinstein domain M and a Lefschetz fibration $w: M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, with fibre Σ , such that:*

- (1) Σ is a k -punctured elliptic curve, where k is the number of irreducible components of D ; there is a quasi-equivalence $D^\pi \mathcal{F}(\Sigma) \simeq \text{Perf}(D)$, due to Lekili and Polishchuk [2017], where $\mathcal{F}(\Sigma)$ is the Fukaya category of Σ , with objects compact Lagrangian branes. (These are graded categories; in particular, there is a natural choice of line field on Σ .)
- (2) $D^b \mathcal{F}^\rightarrow(w) \simeq D(Y)$, where $\mathcal{F}^\rightarrow(w)$ is the directed Fukaya category of w .
- (3) $D^b \mathcal{W}(M) \simeq D(Y \setminus D)$, where $\mathcal{W}(M)$ is the wrapped Fukaya category of M .

Remark 3.2 When D is semidefinite, i.e., a cycle of k (-2) curves, M is the Milnor fibre of a rational elliptic singularity, and we have $M = X \setminus E$, where X is a degree k del Pezzo surface, and $E \subset X$ an anticanonical divisor given by a smooth elliptic curve. Auroux, Katzarkov and Orlov [Auroux et al. 2006] prove HMS for these spaces with the A and B sides reversed.

By [Gross et al. 2015a, Proposition 1.3], any log CY pair (Y, D) can be described by the data of a toric model. We follow [Hacking and Keating 2022, Definition 2.2]. A choice of toric model is given by

$$(\bar{Y}, \bar{D}) \leftarrow (\tilde{Y}, \tilde{D}) \rightarrow (Y, D),$$

where (\bar{Y}, \bar{D}) is a toric pair, the map $(\bar{Y}, \bar{D}) \leftarrow (\tilde{Y}, \tilde{D})$ is given by interior blowups, and $(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{D}) \rightarrow (Y, D)$ is given by blowing down a sequence of components of \tilde{D} (in other words, one goes from (Y, D) to (\tilde{Y}, \tilde{D}) by performing a sequence of “corner” blowups). Varying the blowup locus for interior blowups deforms the complex structure. For the distinguished one, we blow up a single favourite point on each component of \bar{D} , which is determined by the torus action. (See [Hacking and Keating 2022, Section 2.2]. Fixing a torus action, one can take the point $-1 \in \bar{D}_i \setminus \bigcup_{j \neq i} \bar{D}_j \simeq \mathbb{C}^*$.) When $(\tilde{Y}, D) = (\tilde{Y}_e, D)$, $(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{D}) \rightarrow (\bar{Y}, \bar{D})$ is entirely determined by numerical data:

- the self-intersection numbers of the \bar{D}_i , say n_1, \dots, n_k ;
- the number of interior blowups of each component, say m_1, \dots, m_k .

Note also that there’s a natural isomorphism $\tilde{Y}_e \setminus \tilde{D} \simeq Y_e \setminus D$; they have the same mirror M , with different choices of superpotential for the two different compactifications (these both give Lefschetz fibrations on M , which are related by a sequence of stabilisations mirror to the sequence of corner blowups; see [Hacking and Keating 2022, Proposition 3.11]).

Assume $\tilde{Y} = \tilde{Y}_e$. Given the data of a pair $f : (\tilde{Y}, \tilde{D}) \rightarrow (\bar{Y}, \bar{D})$, we have the following:

- (1) A full exceptional collection for $D(\tilde{Y})$, namely

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_k m_k}(\Gamma_k m_k), \dots, \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{k1}}(\Gamma_{k1}), \dots, \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1m_1}}(\Gamma_{1m_1}), \dots, \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{11}}(\Gamma_{11}), \mathcal{O}, f^* \mathcal{O}(\bar{D}_1), \\ \dots, f^* \mathcal{O}(\bar{D}_1 + \dots + \bar{D}_{k-1}), \end{aligned}$$

where Γ_{ij} is the pullback of the j -th exceptional curve over \bar{D}_i , for $i = 1, \dots, k$ and $j = 1, \dots, m_i$.

- (2) A Lefschetz fibration $w : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ with central fibre a k punctured elliptic curve, and distinguished collection of vanishing cycles

$$\{W_{ij}\}_{i=1, \dots, k, j=1, \dots, m_i}, \quad V_0, \dots, V_{k-1},$$

which correspond under Theorem 3.1 to the full exceptional collection above. We use the notation ϑ_{ij} for the Lefschetz thimble corresponding to W_{ij} .

- (3) A Weinstein deformation equivalence between M and the total space of an explicit almost-toric fibration, below.

Theorem 3.3 [Hacking and Keating 2022, Theorem 1.2] *Let (Y, D) be a log Calabi–Yau surface with maximal boundary and distinguished complex structure. Fix a toric model for (Y, D) , with notation as before. Let v_i be the primitive vector for the ray associated to \bar{D}_i in the fan of \bar{Y} . Then M , the mirror space in Theorem 3.1, is Weinstein deformation equivalent to the total space of an almost-toric fibration with base a two-dimensional integral affine space; smooth fibres Lagrangian two-tori; and a nodal fibre for each of the interior blowups on \bar{D}_i , with invariant line in direction v_i . All invariant lines are concurrent. (Note this implies they are cyclically ordered by the indices of the v_i .)*

Denote by γ^\vee the class of a fibre of the almost-toric fibration.

An explicit identification is constructed in [Hacking and Keating 2022, Section 5.2] for the exact torus mirror to the $(\mathbb{C}^*)^2$ chart “inherited” from $\bar{Y} \setminus \bar{D}$, and then [Hacking and Keating 2022, Sections 6.1–2] for the nodal fibres. We often refer to these as “Symington almost-toric fibrations”, owing to [Symington 2003]. One should think of them as SYZ fibrations. The integral affine bases already appear explicitly in [Gross et al. 2015a]. As a Weinstein handlebody, M is given by attaching two-handles to D^*T^2 ; there is one two-handle for each interior blowup of a component \bar{D}_i of \bar{D} . The attaching Legendrian in $S(D^*T^2)$ is given as follows: letting N denote the toric lattice, take the line $S^1 v_i \hookrightarrow T^2 = N \otimes S^1$ (given by quotienting $\mathbb{R} v_i \hookrightarrow T^2 = N \otimes \mathbb{R}$), and take its conormal Legendrian lift associated to the orientation induced by v_i . We denote this conormal lift by $S_{v_i}^1$.

Remark 3.4 Given a toric model for (Y, D) , we can also describe an almost-toric fibration with total space U by starting with the toric fibration $\bar{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$, and adding nodal edge cuts for each of the interior blowups on \bar{D} , following [Symington 2003, Section 5.4]. Topologically, the fibrations on U and M are readily dual to each other: in particular, there’s an obvious correspondence between nodal fibres, and with respect to the standard bases, the monodromy about one is the transpose of the monodromy about the other, with dual invariant lines. (The reader may recall that as well as being mirror, U and M are diffeomorphic; see for instance [Hacking and Keating 2022, Remark 1.4].)

3.2 Elementary transformations as almost-toric moves

In [Hacking and Keating 2022, Section 3], we prove that as a Lefschetz fibration, $w : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is independent of choices. In the present paper, we will later need a strengthening of [Hacking and Keating 2022, Section 6.1.3]: a suitably fine compatibility between changes of toric models for (Y, D) , mutations of the associated mirror Lefschetz fibration $w : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, and changes to the almost-toric fibration on the mirror M (itself also associated to a given choice of toric model for (Y, D)). We establish this in this subsection.

3.2.1 Change of toric model: B side

Proposition 3.5 [Hacking and Keating 2022, Proposition 3.27] *Given a pair (Y, D) , any two choices of toric models can be related by a sequence of moves of the following two types:*

- *Toric blowups [loc. cit., Definition 3.23]: These are given by performing a toric blowup on (\bar{Y}, \bar{D}) , and the corresponding blowup on (\tilde{Y}, \tilde{D}) .*

- Elementary transformations [[loc. cit.](#), Definition 3.24]: Suppose that there are two opposite toric rays in the fan for (\bar{Y}, \bar{D}) , say $v_i = -v_j$, and that $m_i > 0$. The elementary transformation replaces n_i with $n_i - 1$ and n_j with $n_j + 1$, and similarly for m_i and m_j . The other n_l and m_l are unchanged, and (Y, D) itself is unchanged. The toric pair changes, say to $(\bar{Y}^\natural, \bar{D}^\natural)$.

A toy model for an elementary transformation is between $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ (blown up at a point) and the Hirzebruch surface \mathbb{F}_1 (blown up at a point).

This follows from the two-dimensional Sarkisov programme, using the exposition in [[Kollár et al. 2004](#)]. It is also closely related to J Blanc’s work [[2013](#)] on birational automorphisms of $(\mathbb{C}^*)^2$.

3.2.2 Change of toric model: A side Toric blowups correspond to stabilisations of the Lefschetz fibration, with a natural compatibility of the respective full exceptional collections, worked out in [[Hacking and Keating 2022](#), Section 3.4.5]. They don’t change the almost-toric fibration.

Suppose that $\tilde{Y} = \tilde{Y}_e$, and that we have two different toric models for (\tilde{Y}, \tilde{D}) related by an elementary transformation. The two toric models give two different full exceptional collections for $D(\tilde{Y})$. We showed that these are related by a sequence of mutations (i.e., Hurwitz moves), and that the two mirror distinguished collections of vanishing cycles are related by the same sequence of mutations [[Hacking and Keating 2022](#), Section 3.4.8].

Assume for convenience that we have $m_j > 1$ and $v_j = -v_k$. (The mutations needed to allow the cyclic reordering of labels are described in [[Hacking and Keating 2022](#), Section 3.4.1].) On the symplectic side, the sequence of Hurwitz moves is encoded in [Figure 1](#), and goes as follows. First, mutate W_{jm_j} to the end of the list of vanishing cycles. (Note that by [[Hacking and Keating 2022](#), Proposition 3.15] on the total monodromy of the fibration, this leaves the vanishing cycle itself unchanged.) Then mutate V_{k-1}, \dots, V_j over it to get $V_{k-1}^\natural, \dots, V_j^\natural$. Then mutate W_{jm_j} over V_{j-1}, \dots, V_0 , which gives the vanishing cycle W_k . (We have that $V_l^\natural = V_l$ for $l < j$. This description also ignores trivial Hurwitz moves of meridians over each other.)




Figure 1: Base of the Lefschetz fibration $w : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, with vanishing paths for the initial distinguished basis (left), and for the one after the elementary transformation (right). \mathbb{W} denotes the collection of all the W_{il} .

We will use the following well-known moves on almost-toric fibrations:

- *Nodal slide*: This deforms the almost-toric fibration by sliding a node along its invariant line (without passing any other nodes that might be on that line); see [Symington 2003, Section 6.1]. Formally, we have a one-parameter family of exact symplectic manifolds $\{(M_t, \omega_t)\}_{t \in [0,1]}$, which agree outside a compact set, and are symplectically isotopic by Moser.
- *Cut transfers*: For a given node, instead of describing the almost-toric fibration using one invariant half-line, switch to using the other invariant half-line [Vianna 2014, Definition 2.1]. This should be thought of as changing the description of an almost-toric fibration rather than the fibration itself; it corresponds to a piecewise linear transformation of the base.

A nodal slide implicitly uses a choice of reference Lagrangian section in a neighbourhood of the nodal fibre. Up to fibrewise Hamiltonian isotopy, there is a unique one locally, and so this choice is usually suppressed. We will sometimes later need a global choice of Lagrangian section. Note that if we define an almost-toric fibration by starting with $T^*\mathbb{R}^2/\mathbb{Z}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ and introducing Symington cuts, we get a preferred zero-section, inherited from the zero section in $T^*\mathbb{R}^2$. Unless otherwise specified, we will work with these; they are taken to each other under nodal slides and cut transfers.

Following [Hacking and Keating 2022, Section 6.1.3], elementary transformations are “mirror” to nodal slides combined with cut transfers. We want to make this precise. First, notice that the combinatorics matches up.

Lemma 3.6 *Assume $\tilde{Y} = \tilde{Y}_e$. Suppose $(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{D}) \rightarrow (\bar{Y}, \bar{D})$ and $(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{D}) \rightarrow (\bar{Y}^{\natural}, \bar{D}^{\natural})$ are related by an elementary transformation as above: assume that $v_j = -v_k$ in the fan for \bar{Y} , and that $m_j > 0$, so that we’re replacing n_j with $n_j^{\natural} = n_j - 1$ and n_k with $n_k^{\natural} = n_k + 1$, and similarly for the m_l . Start with the mirror almost-toric fibration associated to the first toric model. The one for the second toric model can be obtained by sliding the “final” node (i.e., the one closest to the central fibre) with invariant direction v_j past the central fibre, and then transferring the cut to the $v_k = -v_j$ side.*

Proof Recall that all elementary transformations are obtained by toric blow ups on one of the “model” ones: the Hirzebruch surfaces \mathbb{F}_a and \mathbb{F}_{a-1} each blown up once for $a \geq 1$ (by convention $\mathbb{F}_0 = \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$) [Hacking and Keating 2022, Proposition 3.37]. This means that it’s enough to check these cases, which can be readily done by hand. \square

The two almost-toric fibrations determine two different Weinstein handlebody descriptions for M :

- For the original fibration, start with D^*T , where T is the original (exact) central fibre, i.e., the intersection point of the invariant lines; and, for each nodal fibre with invariant direction v_i , glue a Weinstein two-handle D^*D^2 with attaching Legendrian the half-conormal to $S_{v_i}^1 \subset T = \mathbb{R}^2/\mathbb{Z}^2$ with coorientation given by v_i . Call these D^*D_{il} , for $i = 1, \dots, k$ and $l = 1, \dots, m_i$. (For $m_i > 1$, we get an A_{m_i-1} chain of Lagrangian spheres.)
- For the new fibration, start with D^*T' , where T' is the new central fibre, and glue Weinstein two-handles similarly to above, say $D^*D_{il}^{\natural}$, for $i = 1, \dots, k$ and $l = 1, \dots, m_i^{\natural}$.




Figure 2: Visualising the Weinstein equivalence between M and the total space of the almost-toric fibration. Top: before the mutation. Middle: preparing for the mutation. Bottom: after mutation. We've isotoped the thimble ϑ_{k,m_k+1} relative to T' a little for legibility.

These are related by a Lagrangian mutation of T over $D_{j m_j}$. Recall Lagrangian mutations are surgery-type operations modelled on passing from a Clifford to a Chekanov torus; they change the Lagrangian skeleton of the Weinstein domain but not the space itself. These constructions go back to [Auroux 2007]; see [Pascaleff and Tonkonog 2020, Section 4.4] for a careful general description. (They were first systematically used in [Vianna 2014]; we are in the same setting as [Shende et al. 2016].) In particular, in

our case, we immediately have that T' is the mutation of T over D_{jm_j} , and under this mutation D_{jm_j} becomes $D_{km_k}^{\natural}$ (this reflects the fact that $v_j = -v_k$), and D_{il} just becomes D_{il}^{\natural} otherwise.

We're now ready to complete our discussion:

Lemma 3.7 *Suppose $(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{D}) \rightarrow (\bar{Y}, \bar{D})$ and $(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{D}) \rightarrow (\bar{Y}^{\natural}, \bar{D}^{\natural})$ are related by an elementary transformation as above. Then the two mirror operations are compatible: under the explicit identification in Theorem 3.3 between M as the total space of the Lefschetz fibration associated to the first (resp. second) toric model, and as the total space of the almost-toric fibration associated to the first (resp. second) toric model, the sequence of Hurwitz moves of Figure 1 induces the Lagrangian mutation described above.*

Proof T is given by iterated Polterovich surgery on the dual collection $V_{k-1}^*, \dots, V_1^*, V_0^* (= V_0)$ [Hacking and Keating 2022, Theorem 5.5]. Moreover, as all elementary transformations are pulled back from model ones between \mathbb{F}_{a-1} and \mathbb{F}_a , inspecting the proof of [loc. cit., Theorem 5.5], we see that the second of the two base cases considered therein always applies for us. Further, we see that the iterated Polterovich surgeries can be factored into gluing V_{k-1}^*, \dots, V_j^* and V_{j-1}^*, \dots, V_0^* , with each giving a cylinder, glued by the product of $W_j \sqcup W_k$ with a small interval. See Figure 2, top. In particular, from this perspective we readily see the handle $D^* D_{jm_j}$, which corresponds to W_{jm_j} under [loc. cit., Proposition 6.3].

Now notice that in the Lefschetz fibration picture, the thimble ϑ_{jm_j} (corresponding to W_{jm_j}) can be Hamiltonian isotoped relative to T to be viewed as the vanishing thimble above the vanishing path for $W_{k,m_k+1} = W_{k,m_k}^{\natural}$, which appears after the Hurwitz moves for the elementary transformation. This isotopy respects the Lefschetz fibration, but not the almost-toric fibration. See Figure 2, middle.

The torus T' is given, on the Lefschetz side, by iterated Polterovich surgery on the dual collection $(V_{k-1}^{\natural})^*, \dots, (V_1^{\natural})^*, (V_0^{\natural})^*$, which can be factored as with the description for T . On the other hand, there is a standard model for a Lagrangian mutation in a Lefschetz fibration: the local model for the mutation between a Clifford and Chekanov torus. This is carefully described in [Pascaleff and Tonkonog 2020, Section 4]. By considering that model together with the diagrams for T , T' and $\vartheta_{jm_j} = D_{jm_j}$, we now recognise that T' is given by mutating T over ϑ_{jm_j} . See Figure 2, bottom. (We've implicitly used the fact that $W_j \cap W_k = \emptyset$ to mutate both of the purple annuli on T in the figure, given by thickenings of the j -th and k -th meridians, over ϑ_{jm_j} — the second one doesn't change.) \square

4 Lagrangian translations and tensors by line bundles

Suppose M^4 is an exact symplectic manifold, and the total space of an almost-toric fibration $\pi : M \rightarrow B$, as defined in [Symington 2003], where B is an integral affine manifold homeomorphic to a disc. We will assume throughout that π only has nodal, i.e., focus–focus, singularities. We also assume that there is a unique nodal singularity in each critical fibre (by sliding along the invariant direction for the singularities, this is true without loss of generality). Finally, assume throughout that π is equipped with a reference Lagrangian section, say L_0 . (Recall that this is the case when M is the mirror to a log CY surface with one of the explicit almost-toric fibrations.)

4.1 Spaces of Lagrangian sections

Assume M and π are as above. By the Arnol’d–Liouville theorem on action-angle coordinates [Arnol’d 1989], any regular fibre F of π has an open neighbourhood that is fibre-preserving symplectomorphic to $(V \times T^2, \omega_0) \rightarrow V$, where $V \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. (Here ω_0 denotes the standard symplectic structure $\sum dp_i \wedge dq_i$ on $\mathbb{R}^2 \times T^2$, where the p_i are the standard coordinates on \mathbb{R}^2 and the q_i the ones on T^2 , normalised to have period 2π .) We’ll sometimes refer to patches $V \times T^2$ as above “Arnol’d–Liouville charts”. By Duistermaat [1980], these can be upgraded to global action-angle coordinates. We briefly recall the features we will use. Consider the map p_{L_0} given by

$$p_{L_0} : T^*B \rightarrow M, \quad (q, p) \mapsto H_{h_p, \pi}(L_0(q)),$$

where L_0 is viewed as a map $B \rightarrow M$, h_p is the germ of a smooth function $B(q) \subset B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ representing $p \in T_q^*B$, and H_f denotes the time-one Hamiltonian flow of a smooth function f . By construction, p_{L_0} intertwines the projection to B . If $q \in B$ is a smooth value of π , then $p_{L_0} : T_q^*B \rightarrow \pi^{-1}(q)$ is surjective; if $q \in B$ is a singular value, $p_{L_0} : T_q^*B \rightarrow \pi^{-1}(q)$ only misses the critical point. (This uses our assumption that π only has nodal singularities with a single node in each critical fibre.) The period lattice $\Lambda_q^* \subset T_q^*B$ is defined to be $p_{L_0}^{-1}(L_0(q))$. This has full rank of q is a smooth value of π , and rank one if q is a critical value. Let B^0 be the complement of the critical values of π in B . Then p_{L_0} induces a symplectomorphism $T^*B_0/\Lambda^* \simeq \pi^{-1}(B_0)$. For nodal fibres, we get local symplectomorphisms away from critical points of π .

We want to describe certain spaces of Lagrangian sections of π . Let’s start by working away from the critical fibres. As before, let B^0 be the complement of the critical values in B . Let $M^0 = \pi^{-1}(B^0)$ be the complement of the critical fibres, and let $\pi_0 = \pi|_{M^0}$. Let γ^\vee denote a fibre of π . By the Leray spectral sequence, there is a short exact sequence

$$(4.1) \quad 0 \rightarrow H^1(R^1(\pi_0)_*\mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H^2(M^0) \xrightarrow{f_{\gamma^\vee}} \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow 0,$$

which automatically splits. On the other hand, by [Aspinwall et al. 2009, Proposition 6.69], $H^1(R^1(\pi_0)_*\mathbb{Z})$ classifies Lagrangian sections of π_0 up to a fibre-preserving symplectic isotopy, i.e., the addition in T^*B^0 of the graph of a closed one-form on B^0 . In particular, this implies that we have a one-to-one correspondence

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Lagrangian sections } L \text{ of } \pi_0 \text{ up to} \\ \text{fibre-preserving symplectic isotopy} \end{array} \right\} \leftrightarrow \{ \ker(\frown \gamma^\vee : H_2(M^0, \partial M_0) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}) \}, \quad L \mapsto [L] - [L_0].$$

Let N_i be a small open neighbourhood of the i -th singular fibre, and $\partial_i = \partial N_i$ be its boundary; by construction, this is the mapping torus of the transformation $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ acting on γ , for some choice of basis for $H_1(\gamma; \mathbb{Z})$. In particular, $H_1(\partial_i; \mathbb{Z}) \simeq \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}$, where the first factor is generated by a loop about the critical point in the base, and the second factor is the class of a generator of $H_1(\gamma; \mathbb{Z})$ which intersects the vanishing cycle for this singularity at a single point. (Note that while the class in $H_1(\gamma; \mathbb{Z})$ isn’t well-defined, the one in $H_1(\partial_i; \mathbb{Z})$ is.) Projecting to the second factor gives a map $\epsilon_i : H_1(\partial_i; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$.

The Mayer–Vietoris exact sequence and Poincaré–Lefschetz duality imply that

$$(4.2) \quad H_2(M, \partial M) = \ker\left(\sum \epsilon_i : H_2(M^0, \partial M^0) \rightarrow \bigoplus_i \mathbb{Z}\right).$$

We’re now ready to fill the critical fibres back in.

Lemma 4.3 *There is a one-to-one correspondence*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Lagrangian sections } L \text{ of } \pi \text{ up to} \\ \text{fibre-preserving Hamiltonian isotopy} \end{array} \right\} \leftrightarrow \{\ker(\frown \gamma^\vee : H_2(M, \partial M) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z})\}, \quad L \mapsto [L] - [L_0].$$

As all closed forms on B are exact, fibre-preserving symplectic isotopies are necessarily Hamiltonian.

Remark 4.4 The Leray spectral sequence still implies that there is a short exact sequence

$$(4.5) \quad 0 \rightarrow H^1(R^1(\pi)_*\mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H^2(M) \xrightarrow{f_{\gamma^\vee}} \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow 0.$$

In particular, this characterisation of Lagrangian sections naturally generalises [Aspinwall et al. 2009, Proposition 6.69].

Proof of Lemma 4.3 If L is a section of π , then certainly $[L] - [L_0] \in \ker(\frown \gamma^\vee : H_2(M, \partial M) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z})$, and two isotopic sections give the same class. Thus the map is well-defined.

Surjectivity: By equation (4.2),

$$\ker(\frown \gamma^\vee : H_2(M, \partial M) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}) \simeq \ker\left(\left(\frown \gamma^\vee, \sum \epsilon_i\right) : H_2(M^0, \partial M^0) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \oplus \bigoplus_i \mathbb{Z}\right).$$

Fix an arbitrary class on the right-hand side. There exists a Lagrangian section L of π_0 such that $[L] - [L_0]$ represents that class. It’s enough to show that, possibly after a fibre-preserving symplectic isotopy, we can extend L to a section of π .

Let $B_i^0 \subset B^0$ be an open annulus about the i -th critical value. From the discussion above, Lagrangian sections of the fibration restricted to B_i^0 , up to fibre-preserving symplectic isotopy, are classified by $\mathbb{Z} = \ker(\frown \gamma^\vee : H_2(M_i^0, \partial M_i^0) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z})$; moreover, ϵ_i restricts to an isomorphism $\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$. It follows that there exist closed forms $\zeta_i \in \Omega^1(B_i^0)$ such that L and L_0 differ by the graph of ζ_i over B_i^0 . Now pick a closed form $\zeta \in \Omega^1(B^0)$ extending the ζ_i . Let $L' = L - \Gamma(\zeta)$, where $\Gamma(\zeta)$ is the graph of ζ . By construction, L' is symplectic isotopic to L over B^0 via a fibre-preserving map, and it agrees with L_0 on each of the B_i^0 . Now extend L' by L_0 over each of the punctures.

Injectivity: Suppose that L and L' are sections of π such that $[L] - [L_0]$ and $[L'] - [L_0]$ agree in $\ker(\frown \gamma^\vee : H_2(M, \partial M) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z})$. Then their restrictions to M^0 differ by the graph of a *closed* one-form on B^0 , say ζ . It’s enough to show that ζ must also be exact. Let $S_i^1 \subset B_i^0$ be a waist curve of the annulus. Let $V_i : S^1 \times [0, 1] \rightarrow T^*B^0$ be the annulus given by $(\theta, t) \rightarrow t\zeta(\theta)$, for $\theta \in S_i^1$, and let \bar{V}_i be its image in $T^*B^0/\Lambda^* = M$. Now notice that

$$\int_{S_i^1} \zeta = \int_{V_i} \omega = \int_{\bar{V}_i} \omega = \int_{L_0|_{B_i}} \omega - \int_{L|_{B_i}} \omega = 0,$$

where $B_i \subset B$ is a disc with boundary S_i^1 , and we are using Stokes' theorem together with the fact that \bar{V}_i , $L_0|_{B_i}$ and $L|_{B_i}$ glue to give a null-homologous two-cycle in M . \square

Remark 4.6 To what extent can we control the behaviour of a section near ∞ ? One can check that for a choice of Liouville form on M suitably adapted to the almost-toric fibration, any Lagrangian section of π can be arranged to be invariant under the Liouville flow outside a compact set, after a fibre-preserving Hamiltonian isotopy. We do not pursue this further here: we expect that a comprehensive treatment of the behaviour of Lagrangian sections near infinity will follow using a notion of monomial admissibility, introduced by Hanlon [2019].

We haven't yet used exactness of M . However, this is required to prove the next classification.

Proposition 4.7 *Suppose M is an exact symplectic manifold as above, and L_0 a reference Lagrangian section of π . Then we have a one-to-one correspondence*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Lagrangian sections } L \text{ of } \pi \text{ equal to } L_0 \text{ near } \partial M \text{ up to} \\ \text{compactly supported fibre-preserving Hamiltonian isotopy} \end{array} \right\} \leftrightarrow \{H_2(M)/(\mathbb{Z} \cdot \gamma^\vee)\}, \quad L \mapsto [L] - [L_0],$$

where the homology groups are taken with integer coefficients.

Proof The map is clearly well-defined: as L_0 and L_1 agree near ∂M , $[L_0] - [L_1]$ gives a class in $H_2(M)$, and a fortiori in $H_2(M)/(\mathbb{Z} \cdot \gamma^\vee)$. We will use the following algebrotopological features of the setup. Let A be the total monodromy of the fibration. Then ∂M is a 2-torus bundle over S^1 with monodromy A . We have, first, that $H_1(\partial M) \simeq \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}^2/(A - I)$; the first factor is given by the base S^1 , and the second by the image of $H_1(\gamma^\vee, \mathbb{Z})$; composing the boundary map with projection to the first factor precisely gives $\sim \gamma^\vee : H_2(M, \partial M) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$. Secondly, we have that $H_2(\partial M) \simeq H^1(\partial M)$ consists of a \mathbb{Z} factor generated by γ^\vee , and, when $\det(A - I) = 0$, either one or two extra \mathbb{Z} factors generated by tori fibred over the circle ∂B .

Injectivity: Suppose L and L_0 are Lagrangian sections which agree outside a compact set, and such that $[[L] - [L_0]] = 0 \in H_2(M)/(\mathbb{Z} \cdot \gamma^\vee)$. By the long exact sequence of the pair for $(M, \partial M)$, we have that $[L] - [L_0] = 0 \in H_2(M, \partial M)$. By Lemma 4.3, there certainly exists a fibrewise Hamiltonian isotopy taking one to the other: in other words, L and L_0 differ by the graph of an exact one-form on B , say df . By assumption, we have $df \in \Lambda^*$ outside a compact set. If 1 is not an eigenvalue of the monodromy matrix A , we immediately get that f must be constant outside a compact set, and the Hamiltonian isotopy can be taken to have compact support. In general, the possibilities for f outside a compact set are (up to constants) indexed by $H^1(\partial M)/\text{PD}[\gamma^\vee]$. As we have assumed that $[[L] - [L_0]] = 0 \in H_2(M, \partial M)/(\mathbb{Z} \cdot \gamma^\vee)$, we again get that f must be constant outside of a compact set. (Note that this would not have been the case if we had merely assumed that $[L] - [L_0]$ vanished in $H_2(M)/H_2(\partial M) \simeq \ker(H_2(M, \partial M) \rightarrow H_1(\partial M))$.)

Surjectivity: Suppose we are given a class l in $H_2(M)/(\mathbb{Z} \cdot \gamma^\vee)$. Let l' be its image in $H_2(M, \partial M)$. Whenever A does not have eigenvalue 1, the map $H_2(M)/(\mathbb{Z} \cdot \gamma^\vee) \rightarrow H_2(M, \partial M)$ is injective. Whenever A does have eigenvalue 1, by similar considerations to those at the end of the injectivity argument, we see for that a given class $l' \in H_2(M, \partial M)$, if we can find a section L agreeing with L_0 near ∂M and such that

$[L] - [L_0] \in H_2(M)/(\mathbb{Z} \cdot \gamma^\vee)$ is a lift of l' , then we can find Lagrangian sections giving representatives for all other lifts of l' . This is given by adding to L an exact one-form df , for some function f which near ∂M is nonconstant and such that $df \in \Lambda^*$.

Given l' , by Lemma 4.3, there is a Lagrangian section L of π such that $[L] - [L_0] = l'$. Mapping to $H_2(\partial M)$ and projecting, we get $[L] - [L_0] \mapsto 0 \in \mathbb{Z}^2/(A - I)$. Now proceed as before: first, notice that again applying the result for fibrations without singularities [Aspinwall et al. 2009, Proposition 6.69], the map to $\mathbb{Z}^2/(A - I)$ classifies Lagrangian sections of the restriction of the fibration to a neighbourhood of ∂B , up to addition of the graphs of closed one-forms. Thus L and L_0 differ by the graph of such a one-form, say ζ , near ∂B . Then proceed similarly to the end of the proof of Lemma 4.3: the obstruction to ζ being exact is the symplectic area of an annulus which can be capped off in M by two Lagrangian discs to give a closed cycle. In general, this cycle will no longer be null-homologous. However, by exactness of ω , the obstruction still vanishes. Thus after a fibre-preserving Hamiltonian isotopy (indeed, supported near ∂M), we can assume that L agrees with L_0 near ∂M . □

We note the following consequence of the arguments in our proof.

Corollary 4.8 *Suppose L_0, L_1 are Lagrangian sections on π which are smoothly isotopic as sections near ∂B . Then there is a fibre-preserving Hamiltonian isotopy of M , supported near ∂M , such that the image of L_1 agrees with L_0 on a tubular neighbourhood of ∂M .*

For completeness, we record the following.

Lemma 4.9 *Suppose M is mirror to a log CY2 surface (Y, D) as in Theorem 3.1. Then the monodromy matrix A has one as an eigenvalue if and only if $H^1(M, \mathbb{Z}) \neq 0$ or $(D_i \cdot D_j)$ is strictly negative semidefinite.*

Proof Let (Y, D) be a Looijenga pair. Let N be a tubular neighbourhood of D in Y and $U' = Y \setminus N$, an oriented smooth 4-manifold with boundary $\partial U'$. This is diffeomorphic to M , and $\partial U' \simeq \partial M$ is a 2-torus bundle over S^1 with monodromy matrix $A \in \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$.

By the Leray spectral sequence for the fibration $f: \partial U' \rightarrow S^1$ we have an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow H^1(S^1, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H^1(\partial U', \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H^0(R^1 f_* \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow 0,$$

and

$$H^0(R^1 f_* \mathbb{Z}) \simeq \mathbb{Z}^2/(A - I)\mathbb{Z}^2.$$

It follows that the monodromy matrix A has an eigenvector with eigenvalue 1 if and only if $H^1(\partial U')$ has rank > 1 . We have the exact sequence of cohomology for the pair $(U', \partial U')$:

$$\dots \rightarrow H^1(U') \rightarrow H^1(\partial U') \rightarrow H^2(U', \partial U') \rightarrow H^2(U') \rightarrow \dots .$$

The last arrow is $H_2(U') \rightarrow H^2(U')$ by Poincaré duality, with kernel the radical of the intersection form on $H_2(U')$. Recall that we have the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow H_2(U') \rightarrow Q \rightarrow 0,$$

where the \mathbb{Z} factor is generated by the fibre of $\partial U' \rightarrow S^1$, and

$$Q = \langle D_1, \dots, D_n \rangle^\perp \subset H_2(Y, \mathbb{Z}).$$

The lattice Q is nondegenerate unless $(D_i \cdot D_j)$ is strictly negative semidefinite by the Hodge index theorem. So $H^1(\partial U')$ has rank > 1 if and only if either $H^1(U') \neq 0$ or $(D_i \cdot D_j)$ is negative semidefinite. \square

Remark 4.10 Notice that $H^1(U') \neq 0$ if and only if there is a toric model for Y where all the nontoric blowups occur on the same boundary divisor. This is because $\pi_1(U') = N/\langle v_1, \dots, v_k \rangle$, where $N = \pi_1(T)$ is the fundamental group of the algebraic torus $T = \bar{Y} \setminus \bar{D}$ and the v_i are the primitive integral generators of the rays corresponding to boundary divisors of \bar{Y} containing the centres of the nontoric blowups. (Note also that blowups on the boundary divisors corresponding to v and $-v$ can be transferred to the boundary divisor corresponding to v by elementary transformations.)

4.2 Lagrangian translations

Proposition 4.11 Suppose M and π are as above, and L_0, L are Lagrangian sections of π . Let M^s be the smooth locus of π , and let $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{p}_{L_0} : T^*B \rightarrow M^s \subset M$ give global action-angle coordinates, chosen so that \mathfrak{p} takes the zero-section to L_0 . Consider the map

$$\sigma_L : M^s \rightarrow M^s, \quad x \mapsto \mathfrak{p}(\tilde{x} + \widetilde{L}|_{\pi(x)}),$$

where \tilde{y} denotes any preimage of $y \in M$ under p . (In words, we are using the linear structure on each fibre to add $L - L_0$.) Then

- (1) σ_L is well defined;
- (2) σ_L extends to a smooth map $M \rightarrow M$, which we also denote by σ_L ;
- (3) σ_L is a symplectomorphism of M ;
- (4) whenever L_0 and L agree near ∂M , σ_L has compact support.

We will refer to σ_L as a *Lagrangian translation*.

Proof The fact that σ_L is well-defined on M^s is immediate. Locally, L is $\mathfrak{p}(\Gamma(df))$, where f is a smooth real-valued function on a small disc in B ; now notice that σ_L is locally given by the time-one Hamiltonian flow of $f \circ \pi$. This description makes it clear that σ_L extends over the critical points of π , and that it is a symplectomorphism. The final point is immediate. \square

Remark 4.12 Assume that L_0 and L don't agree near ∂M . Following on [Remark 4.6](#), one could choose the Liouville form on M , and representatives for L_0 and L , so as to get a well-defined action of σ_L on the wrapped Fukaya category $\mathcal{W}(M)$. However, as before, we expect the monomially admissible framework currently being developed in [\[Hanlon and Ward \$\geq\$ 2026\]](#) to be best suited for this.

Let $\pi_0 \text{Symp}_c(M)$ denote the symplectic mapping class group of M . Fix a universal cover $\widetilde{\text{Lag}}$ of the Lagrangian Grassmannian over M . Let $\text{Symp}_c^{\text{gr}}(M)$ be the group of compactly supported, graded

symplectomorphisms [Seidel 2000, Section 2.b]. Here we assume both that the underlying diffeomorphism has compact support, and that the bundle map is the identity on $\widetilde{\text{Lag}}$ outside a compact set. (This is a distinguished subgroup of the group of graded symplectomorphisms for which we only require the support of the underlying diffeomorphism to be compact.) By [Seidel 2000, Remark 2.5], there is an exact sequence

$$(4.13) \quad 1 \rightarrow \pi_0 \text{Symp}_c^{\text{gr}}(M) \rightarrow \pi_0 \text{Symp}_c(M) \rightarrow H^1(M, \partial M; \mathbb{Z}),$$

where the final map is not a group homomorphism, but measures the difference between the original universal covering $\widetilde{\text{Lag}}$ and its pullback under an element of $\pi_0 \text{Symp}_c(M)$. (Note that in the cases we will consider, M is homotopy equivalent to a CW 2-complex, and in particular $H_3(M; \mathbb{Z}) = 0$, and so $H^1(M, \partial M; \mathbb{Z}) = 0$ by Lefschetz duality.)

We record the following properties of Lagrangian translations, the proofs of which are immediate.

Proposition 4.14 *We get the following:*

- Lagrangian translations by arbitrary Lagrangian sections give a subgroup of $\pi_0 \text{Symp}(M)$ isomorphic to $\ker(\frown \gamma^\vee : H_2(M, \partial M) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z})$.
- Lagrangian translations by Lagrangian sections which agree with L_0 near infinity give a subgroup of $\pi_0 \text{Symp}_c(M)$ isomorphic to $H_2(M)/(\mathbb{Z} \cdot \gamma^\vee)$. Moreover, this lifts to a subgroup of $\pi_0 \text{Symp}_c^{\text{gr}}(M)$.

The action of σ_L on $H_2(M, \partial M)$ is in either case determined by the fact that σ_L acts on Lagrangian sections by adding $[L] - [L_0]$, and fixes γ^\vee and hence the $\mathbb{Z} = \text{Im}(\frown \gamma^\vee)$. (Dually, we could use the action on $H^2(M)$; see equation (4.5).) In particular, with respect to the decomposition

$$(\mathbb{Z}, \ker(\frown \gamma^\vee : H_2(M, \partial M) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z})),$$

σ_L is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ [L] - [L_0] & \text{Id} \end{pmatrix}.$$

We will also want compatibility with nodal slides, which follows from standard Moser-type arguments:

Lemma 4.15 *Suppose that we perform a nodal slide and cut transfer using L_0 as the reference section. Formally, we get almost-toric fibrations $\pi^t : M^t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$, with an isotopy $h^t : M^0 \rightarrow M^t$ preserving the reference Lagrangian sections L_0^t . Suppose $\sigma_L^t \in \pi_0 \text{Symp}_c M^t$ is the Lagrangian translation associated to $[L - L_0^t] \in H_2(M^t)/(\mathbb{Z} \cdot \gamma^\vee)$; then*

$$\sigma_{h_*^t[L]}^t = h^t \circ \sigma_L^0 \circ (h^t)^{-1} \in \pi_0 \text{Symp}_c M^t.$$

Similarly for the noncompactly supported case.

4.3 Mirror symmetry for Lagrangian translations: K -theory

We want to show that Lagrangian translations are mirror to tensors with line bundles. We start by establishing this at the K -theoretic level.

Lemma 4.16 *Line bundles on U are in one-to-one correspondence, via the first Chern class, with $\ker(f_\gamma : H^2(U) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}) \simeq \ker(\wedge \gamma : H_2(U, \partial U) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z})$.*

Proof The long exact sequence for the pair (Y, D) and excision give

$$0 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^k \rightarrow H^2(Y) \rightarrow H^2(U) \xrightarrow{f_\gamma} \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow 0,$$

which in turn induces

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Pic}(U) \xrightarrow{c_1} H^2(U) \xrightarrow{f_\gamma} \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow 0. \quad \square$$

In the semidefinite case, let $F \subset \partial U$ be the class of a torus given by smoothing all the nodes of D . Note that

$$H_2(\partial U) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{Z}\langle \gamma \rangle & \text{in the negative definite case,} \\ \mathbb{Z}\langle \gamma \rangle \oplus \mathbb{Z}\langle F \rangle & \text{in the semidefinite case.} \end{cases}$$

Now assume $Y = Y_e$. As before, let $Q = \langle D_1, \dots, D_k \rangle^\perp \subset \text{Pic}(Y)$, and let \bar{Q} be the image of Q in $\text{Pic}(U)$.

Lemma 4.17 *The first Chern class gives an isomorphism*

$$\bar{Q} \simeq \ker(H^2(U) \rightarrow H^2(\partial U)) \simeq H_2(U)/H_2(\partial U).$$

Proof Consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & & 0 & & 0 & \\ & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & Q \cap \langle D_1, \dots, D_k \rangle & \longrightarrow & Q & \longrightarrow & \bar{Q} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \langle D_1, \dots, D_k \rangle & \longrightarrow & H^2(Y) & \longrightarrow & H^2(U) & \xrightarrow{f_\gamma} & \mathbb{Z} \\ & & \text{Id} \downarrow & & (\cdot D_i)_{i=1, \dots, k} \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \text{Id} \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & H_2(D) & \longrightarrow & H^2(D) \simeq H_2(\nu D, \partial U) \simeq \mathbb{Z}^k & \longrightarrow & H_1(\partial U) & \longrightarrow & H_1(D) \simeq \mathbb{Z} \end{array}$$

where νD denotes a small neighbourhood of $D \subset Y$ (this deformation-retracts onto D). All rows are exact; the bottom row is part of the long exact sequence for the pair $(\nu D, \partial \nu D) = (\nu D, \partial U)$. Also, all the columns apart from the one involving \bar{Q} are automatically exact; exactness of that final column, and our claim, then follow. □

Lemma 4.18 *$K(U) = K_0(D^b \text{Coh}(U))$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z} \oplus \text{Pic}(U)$ via (rk, c_1) .*

Proof There is an exact sequence

$$K(D) \rightarrow K(Y) \rightarrow K(U) \rightarrow 0,$$

using [Hartshorne 1977, Exercise 2.10.6 (b)]. We also have an isomorphism $K(Y) \rightarrow \text{Im}(\text{ch}(Y)) \subset H^{\text{even}}(Y; \mathbb{Q})$, where ch denotes the Chern character; as Y is a surface, this map is given by $(\text{rk}, c_1, \text{ch}_2)$. (This follows for instance from the existence of our exceptional collection for $D(Y)$.)

For each D_i , $K(D_i) \simeq \mathbb{Z}^2$, generated by, for instance, \mathcal{O}_{D_i} and \mathcal{O}_{p_i} , where $p_i \in D_i$ can be taken to be any interior point of $D_i \subset D$. Moreover, there is a surjection $\bigoplus_i K(D_i) \twoheadrightarrow K(D)$. Applying the Chern character, $\mathcal{O}_{D_i} \mapsto (0, [D_i], -\frac{1}{2}[D_i]^2)$; and all of the \mathcal{O}_{p_i} have the same image, of the form $(0, 0, 1)$. The claim is then clear. □

We note the following immediate consequence:

Lemma 4.19 *Let $\mathcal{L} \in \text{Pic}(U)$. The automorphism $\otimes \mathcal{L} : D^b \text{Coh}(U) \rightarrow D^b \text{Coh}(U)$ induces an automorphism $K(U) \rightarrow K(U)$, given on $\mathbb{Z} \oplus \text{Pic}(U)$ by*

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ c_1(\mathcal{L}) & \text{Id} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let's still assume that $Y = Y_e$, and let M be the mirror to $Y \setminus D$, with $\pi : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ an almost-toric fibration from Theorem 3.3; note that it only has focus–focus singularities. Let γ^\vee denote a smooth fibre of π , and on the mirror side, let γ denote the class of a crossing torus at a node of D .

Lemma 4.20 *Let $\mathcal{W}(M)$ denote the wrapped Fukaya category of M . Then there is an isomorphism $K_0(D^b \mathcal{W}(M)) \simeq H_2(M, \partial M)$, which takes a Lagrangian brane to \pm its class in relative homology, where the sign depends on the grading of the brane.*

Moreover, we have a commutative diagram of isomorphisms

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K(U) & \xrightarrow{\text{HMS}} & K_0(D^b \mathcal{W}(M)) \\ \downarrow (c_1, \text{rk}) & & \downarrow \\ \ker(\int_\gamma : H^2(U) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}) \oplus \mathbb{Z} & \xrightarrow{\iota_*} & \ker(\cap \gamma^\vee : H_2(M, \partial M) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}) \oplus \mathbb{Z} \simeq H_2(M, \partial M) \end{array}$$

where the first line is induced by the explicit homological mirror symmetry equivalence between $D^b \text{Coh } U$ and $D^b \mathcal{W}(M)$ in Theorem 3.1, and ι_* is induced by a preferred diffeomorphism $\iota : U \rightarrow M$ which takes γ to γ^\vee , together with Poincaré–Lefschetz duality.

Proof This follows from assembling previous results. From the description of M in Section 3.1, we see that Lagrangian cocores generate $H_2(M, \partial M)$; as they also generate the wrapped Fukaya category [Chantraine et al. 2024], the natural map $K_0(D^b \mathcal{W}(M)) \rightarrow H_2(M, \partial M)$ is clearly surjective.

On the other hand, by using the proof of Theorem 3.1(3) together with descriptions of M given by attaching handles to D^*T^2 along Legendrian (also recalled in Section 3.1), we get a diffeomorphism $\iota : U \rightarrow M$ such that the diagram in our statement above commutes. (This is checked inductively, starting with a toric pair and performing interior blowups / handle attachments. See also [Hacking and Keating 2022, Remark 1.4].) As the two horizontal maps and the left-hand vertical one are isomorphisms, the right-hand vertical one must be too. □

The following corollary is then immediate.

Corollary 4.21 *Suppose $(Y, D) = (Y_e, D)$ is a log Calabi–Yau surface with distinguished complex structure, with a choice of toric model, and $w : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ its mirror. Set $U = Y \setminus D$, and let $\pi : M \rightarrow B$ be the almost-toric fibration on M associated to that model, with reference Lagrangian section L_0 .*

(1) *The preferred diffeomorphism $\iota : U \rightarrow M$ above induces identifications:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Lagrangian sections } L \text{ of } \pi \text{ up to} \\ \text{fibre-preserving Hamiltonian isotopy} \end{array} \right\} & \longleftrightarrow & \{ \ker(\cap \gamma^\vee : H_2(M, \partial M) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}) \} \\
 & & \updownarrow \\
 \text{Pic}(U) & \longleftrightarrow & \{ \ker(\int_\gamma : H^2(U) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}) \} \\
 \\
 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Lagrangian sections } L \text{ of } \pi \text{ equal to } L_0 \text{ near } \partial M \\ \text{up to fibre-preserving Hamiltonian isotopy} \end{array} \right\} & \longleftrightarrow & H_2(M)/(\mathbb{Z} \cdot \gamma^\vee) \\
 & & \updownarrow \\
 \text{line bundles in } Q & \longleftrightarrow & H_2(U)/(\mathbb{Z} \cdot \gamma)
 \end{array}$$

(2) *Suppose that a section L corresponds to a line bundle \mathcal{L} in Q . As an element of $\pi_0 \text{Sym}_c^{\text{gr}}(M)$, σ_L acts on $\mathcal{W}(M)$, and the induced action on $K_0 D^b \mathcal{W}(M)$ naturally agrees with the homological action $[\sigma_L]_*$ on $H_2(M, \partial M; \mathbb{Z})$. Moreover, under the identification given by homological mirror symmetry (as in Lemma 4.20), the action of $\otimes \mathcal{L}$ on $K(U)$ agrees with the action of σ_L on $K_0 D^b \mathcal{W}(M)$.*

Remark 4.22 In (2), the action on $\mathcal{W}(M)$ only depends on the image of \mathcal{L} in \bar{Q} , or equivalently the image of L in $H_2(M)/H_2(\partial M) \simeq \ker(H_2(M, \partial M) \rightarrow H_1(\partial M))$.

Note that even in the noncompact case we can always make sense of the K -theoretic action up to a shift (depending on the choice of lift of σ_L to a graded Lagrangian), and that the shift can be chosen to get it to agree with the action of $\otimes \mathcal{L}$.

5 Lagrangian spheres mirror to (-2) curves

5.1 Mirrors to line bundles on (-2) curves: construction

Proposition 5.1 *Let (Y, D) be a log CY surface, and let $C \subset Y \setminus D$ be a (-2) curve. Then there exists a toric model for (Y, D) that contracts C : in other words, C is the strict transform of the exceptional divisor for an interior blowup.*

Proof This follows from the minimal model program for surfaces, and was noted by Corti, Filip and Petracci as [Corti et al. 2022, Lemma 3.7]. □

This can be combined with results from Section 3.1 to give the following.

Proposition 5.2 Assume that (Y, D) is a log CY surface with $Y = Y_e$, and M the mirror to $U = Y \setminus D$. Consider the explicit homological mirror symmetry equivalence between $D^b \text{Coh } U$ and $D^b \mathcal{W}(M)$ given by [Theorem 3.1\(3\)](#). Suppose $C \subset U$ is a (-2) curve. Then:

- (1) There exists an embedded Lagrangian sphere $s_C \subset M$ such that s_C is mirror to $i_* \mathcal{O}_C(-1)$. This can be explicitly described as a matching cycle for the Lefschetz fibration $w : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, and, for a suitable choice of almost-toric fibration on M , s_C lies above a segment joining two nodal critical points with the same invariant direction.
- (2) For any $E \subset Y$ such that $E \cdot C = 1$, let σ_E be the Lagrangian translation associated to $\otimes \mathcal{O}(E)$. Then for any $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\sigma_E^a s_C$ is mirror to $i_* \mathcal{O}_C(a-1)$.

Proof First, notice that the independence of choice of toric model of the mirror, as established in [\[Hacking and Keating 2022, Section 3.4\]](#), means that we are allowed to work with a different toric model for each (-2) curve.

Assume now that our (-2) curve $C \subset U$ arises as part of a toric model $f : (\tilde{Y}, \tilde{D}) \rightarrow (\bar{Y}, \bar{D})$ where (\bar{Y}, \bar{D}) is toric, and (\tilde{Y}, \tilde{D}) is obtained from (Y, D) by a sequence of corner blowups (so $U = Y \setminus D \simeq \tilde{Y} \setminus \tilde{D}$). Consider the usual exceptional collection on \tilde{Y} , namely

$$(5.3) \quad \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{km_k}}(\Gamma_{km_k}), \dots, \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{k1}}(\Gamma_{k1}), \dots, \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1m_1}}(\Gamma_{1m_1}), \dots, \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{11}}(\Gamma_{11}), \mathcal{O}, f^* \mathcal{O}(\bar{D}_1), \\ \dots, f^* \mathcal{O}(\bar{D}_1 + \dots + \bar{D}_{k-1}),$$

where Γ_{ij} is the pullback of the j -th exceptional curve over \bar{D}_i , for $i = 1, \dots, k$, $j = 1, \dots, m$.

Let's first prove the claim about $i_* \mathcal{O}_C(-1)$ in (1). Assume that C is the strict transform of the j -th exceptional curve over \bar{D}_i , for some fixed i, j . Then

$$i_* \mathcal{O}_C(-1) \simeq \{e : \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{i(j+1)}}(\Gamma_{i(j+1)}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{ij}}(\Gamma_{ij})\},$$

where e is a nontrivial constant in $\text{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{i(j+1)}}(\Gamma_{i(j+1)}), \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{ij}}(\Gamma_{ij})) \simeq \mathbb{C}$.

On the mirror side, $\mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{i(j+1)}}(\Gamma_{i(j+1)})$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{ij}}(\Gamma_{ij})$ correspond to consecutive thimbles $\vartheta_{i,j+1}$ and $\vartheta_{i,j}$ with the same vanishing cycle, namely the i -th meridian; see for instance [\[Hacking and Keating 2022, Section 3.3.2\]](#). The morphism e corresponds to a nontrivial degree-zero morphism in $H^1(S^1) \simeq HF(\vartheta_{i,j+1}, \vartheta_{i,j})$, where we are working in the directed Fukaya category of the superpotential. The cone over this element is the matching cycle given by gluing $\vartheta_{i,j+1}$ and $\vartheta_{i,j}$ together, by [\[Seidel 2008, Proposition 18.21\]](#). Let this be the Lagrangian sphere s_C .

The assertion about matching cycles for the Lefschetz fibration is satisfied by construction. For the one about almost-toric fibrations, consider the almost-toric fibration associated to the same choice of toric model. The fibration is described in [Theorem 3.3](#); inspecting the construction of the symplectomorphism between it and M in [\[Hacking and Keating 2022, Section 6\]](#), we see that s_C is a Lagrangian sphere lying above the j -th segment between the critical values with invariant direction the ray for \bar{D}_i . (See [\[Symington 2003, Section 7.1\]](#) for a more general discussion of such Lagrangians.)

We now want to prove the claim about $i_*\mathcal{O}_C(a-1)$ in (2). Set $f = f_2 \circ f_1$, where f_1 is given by starting (\bar{Y}, \bar{D}) and blowing up the i -th component of the divisor j times, to get the log CY pair (Y^\dagger, D^\dagger) , say, and f_2 is given by making all the remaining blowups. Now notice there is an isomorphism

$$i_*\mathcal{O}_C(a-1) \simeq \{e : \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{i(j+1)}}(\Gamma_{i(j+1)}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{ij}}(\Gamma_{ij}) \otimes f_2^*(\mathcal{O}(D^\dagger))^{\otimes a}\}.$$

On the other hand, $\mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{ij}}(\Gamma_{ij}) \otimes f_2^*(\mathcal{O}(D^\dagger))$ is given by mutating $\mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{ij}}(\Gamma_{ij})$ over the collection $f^*\mathcal{O}(\bar{D}_1), \dots, f^*\mathcal{O}(\bar{D}_1 + \dots + \bar{D}_{k-1})$: this follows from applying Corollary 2.10 of [Bridgeland and Stern 2010] to the exceptional collection for (Y^\dagger, D^\dagger) , and pulling everything back under f_2 . (We can ignore the $\Gamma_{i'j'}$ for $i' \neq i$.) This is the same as mutating it over the dual exceptional collection $f^*(\mathcal{O}(\bar{D}_1 + \dots + \bar{D}_{k-1})^*), \dots, f^*(\mathcal{O}(\bar{D}_1)^*), \mathcal{O}$. Let $\zeta_{k-1}, \dots, \zeta_0$ be the mirror thimbles. These can be glued together by iterative Polterovich surgery to get the exact Lagrangian torus in the copy of $(\mathbb{C}^*)^2$ mirror to $\bar{Y} \setminus \bar{D}$; see [Hacking and Keating 2022, Theorem 5.5]. Let $\vartheta_{i,j}$ be as above.

Now inspect the proof of [Hacking and Keating 2022, Proposition 6.3]: notice that the vanishing cycle $W_i = \partial(\vartheta_{i,j})$ intersects the vanishing cycle $\partial\zeta_{k-1}$ transversally at a single point; moreover, the Polterovich surgery $\partial(\vartheta_{i,j}) \# \partial\zeta_{k-1}$ intersects $\partial\zeta_{k-2}$ transversally at a single point, and the same remains true as one iterates. On the other hand, in the case where two thimbles intersect transversally at a single point, mutating one over the other is the same as performing Polterovich surgery [Seidel 1999; 2008, Section 18]; this also implies that the result of this iterative surgery has boundary a vanishing cycle which is still a copy of the i -th meridian, by applying the total monodromy of the part of the fibration that is mirror to (\bar{Y}, \bar{D}) ; see [Hacking and Keating 2022, Proposition 3.15]. It follows that $\mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{ij}}(\Gamma_{ij}) \otimes f^*(\mathcal{O}(D^\dagger))$ is mirror to a sphere given by performing an iterated Polterovich surgery on $\vartheta_{i,j}, \zeta_{k-1}, \dots, \zeta_0$, and then capping off the boundary of the resulting Lagrangian with $\vartheta_{i,j+1}$; topologically, this is clearly a Lagrangian sphere, call it s'_C . To relate s'_C to $\sigma_E(s_C)$, recall that we also know that iterated Polterovich surgery on the ζ_l gives an exact Lagrangian torus T which can be taken to be a fibre of the Symington almost-toric fibration; and $\vartheta_{i,j}$ and $\vartheta_{i,j+1}$ are locally given by half-conormals to $S^1_{v_i^\perp}$ in $D_\epsilon^*T^2$, where $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is the ray associated to \bar{D}_i in the fan for (\bar{Y}, \bar{D}) , and $S^1_{v_i^\perp}$ the image of $\mathbb{R}v_i^\perp$ in $T^2 = \mathbb{R}^2/\mathbb{Z}^2$ (Section 3.1). In particular, we see that s_C can be arranged to cleanly intersect T^2 along $S^1_{v_i^\perp}$, and that s'_C is the result of an S^1 Lagrangian surgery between them (with suitable sign). Now notice that $\sigma_E(s_C)$ can be described in precisely the same way.

For $\sigma_E^{-1}(s_C)$, one can proceed similarly, taking the Polterovich surgery (with the other ordering choice) of $\vartheta_{i,j}$ with ζ_0 , then ζ_1 , etc, which will correspond to twisting $\mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{ij}}(\Gamma_{ij})$ with $\mathcal{O}(-D)$, and taking the S^1 Lagrangian surgery between s_C and T^2 with the opposite sign to before. More generally, notice that one can iterate this process by using disjoint parallel copies of T^2 in $D_\epsilon^*(T^2)$. (At most one of them can be exact, but this doesn't matter after surgery to get a Lagrangian sphere.) □

Remark 5.4 While we won't need this in this paper, we expect that up to Hamiltonian isotopy, the Lagrangian sphere s_C constructed above is independent of the choice of toric model contracting C . This would follow, for instance, from a strengthening of Proposition 3.5: we expect that the sequence of moves

between any two toric models contracting C can be chosen so that C is contracted at each step. (For these purposes we consider any power of a fixed elementary transformation to be a single step.) Using the discussion of mirror moves in [Section 3.2.2](#), we would then get that under the corresponding sequence of nodal slides and cuts, s_C would remain a matching cycle between two nodal critical points at all times.

5.2 Full mirror symmetry for Lagrangian translations

Theorem 5.5 *Suppose $(Y, D) = (Y_e, D)$ is a log Calabi–Yau surface with distinguished complex structure, and $w : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ its mirror. Set $U = Y \setminus D$, let $\pi : M \rightarrow B$ be an almost-toric fibration on M , and L_0 a reference Lagrangian section of π . Assume that L is a Lagrangian section of π which agrees with L_0 near ∂M , and $\mathcal{L} \in Q \subset \text{Pic } Y$ the corresponding line bundle, as in [Corollary 4.21](#). Then under the homological mirror symmetry equivalence $D(U) \simeq D^b\mathcal{W}(M)$ of [Theorem 3.1\(3\)](#), $\otimes \mathcal{L}$ corresponds to σ_L .*

Proof As it is compactly supported, $\sigma_L \in \pi_0 \text{Sym}_c^{\text{gr}}(M)$ gives an autoequivalence of $D^b\mathcal{F}^{\rightarrow}(w)$ (using for instance the characterisation of $D^b\mathcal{F}^{\rightarrow}(w)$ in [\[Ganatra et al. 2020\]](#): we can define the category using exact Lagrangians with prescribed behaviour in a neighbourhood of the boundary but no conditions inside of this). Moreover, this restricts to the identity on $D^\pi\mathcal{F}(\Sigma)$, where Σ is a fibre of w near infinity. Under mirror symmetry, we get an autoequivalence of $D(Y)$ which restricts to the identity on $\text{Perf } D$, say $\check{\sigma}_L$. Consider $\check{\sigma}_L^{-1} \circ (_ \otimes \mathcal{L}) \in \text{Auteq } D(Y)$. First, [Corollary 4.21](#) implies that it acts as the identity on K -theory of $D(U)$; also, [Proposition 5.2](#), together with [Lemma 4.15](#), tells us that it acts as the identity on $\mathcal{O}_C(a)$ for any (-2) curve C in U and any $a \in \mathbb{Z}$. The proof of [Proposition 2.14](#), together with the classification result for chains of (-2) curves ([Lemma 2.1](#)), then constrains $\check{\sigma}_L^{-1} \circ (_ \otimes \mathcal{L})$ as an element of $\text{Auteq } D(Y)$: it could only be a product of spherical twists in objects $\mathcal{O}_{C'}(a)$ for $C' \subset D$ a (-2) curve. In particular, it restricts to the identity in $\text{Auteq } D(U)$. \square

Remark 5.6 If D is indefinite or negative definite, we have $Q = \bar{Q}$, and it follows from the proof above that $\otimes \mathcal{L}$ corresponds to σ_L under the equivalence $D(Y) \simeq D^b\mathcal{F}^{\rightarrow}(w)$. In the negative semidefinite case, there is an overall ambiguity of $\otimes \mathcal{O}(D)$, i.e., the action of the Serre functor. The mirror to this is well-understood, going back to [\[Kontsevich 1998\]](#): it's the action of the total monodromy of the Lefschetz fibration on the directed Fukaya category; see [\[Seidel 2017\]](#) and follow-up papers. In the toric case, this was also carefully studied by Hanlon [\[2019\]](#).

Remark 5.7 In the noncompactly supported case, if we knew that σ_L acted both on $\mathcal{W}(M)$ and $D^b\mathcal{F}^{\rightarrow}(w)$, then we would be able to apply [Proposition 5.2](#) to show that σ_L is mirror to tensoring with \mathcal{L} . (This would make use of case (2) of the proposition, by considering the action of σ_L on the central torus.) This crucially relies on having an action on $D^b\mathcal{F}^{\rightarrow}(w)$, as [Proposition 2.14](#) applies to autoequivalences of $D(Y)$. In order to do this, we need a condition on the behaviour of L near infinity that is more rigid than simply being Liouville adapted (reflecting the difference between $\text{Pic } Y$ and $\text{Pic } U$); we expect monomial admissibility to be well suited for this.

6 Nodal slide recombinations

Assume throughout this section that $(Y, D) = (Y_e, D)$.

6.1 Construction and mirror theorem

Fix a toric model $(\bar{Y}, \bar{D}) \leftarrow (\tilde{Y}, \tilde{D}) \rightarrow (Y, D)$. Suppose $\varphi \in \text{Aut}(Y, D; \text{pt})$ is an automorphism of Y fixing D pointwise; this induces an automorphism of \tilde{Y} fixing \tilde{D} pointwise, which we also denote by φ . Let $f : (\tilde{Y}, \tilde{D}) \rightarrow (\bar{Y}, \bar{D})$ denote the blow-down map. Now consider the map $f \circ \varphi : (\tilde{Y}, \tilde{D}) \rightarrow (\bar{Y}, \bar{D})$. This also gives a toric model for (\tilde{Y}, \tilde{D}) (and indeed, (Y, D)). By [Proposition 3.5](#), one can go between these via blowups and elementary transformations, determined by a factorisation of φ into elementary *birational* transformations of (\tilde{Y}, \tilde{D}) . After performing toric blowups to (\tilde{Y}, \tilde{D}) , we can assume without loss of generality that we’re only making elementary transformations, say $\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_r$. Notice that combinatorially, on the mirror side, we “get back” to the Lefschetz fibration, and almost toric fibration, that we started with: the n_i and m_i are the same at the start and at the end.

Theorem 6.1 *Fix $\varphi \in \text{Aut}(Y, D; \text{pt})$, and a factorisation of it into elementary transformations, say $\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_r$, as above. Then there exists a compactly supported symplectomorphism $\check{\varphi} \in \pi_0 \text{Symp}_c^{\text{gr}}(M)$ such that:*

- (1) *With respect to the Lefschetz fibration $w : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, $\check{\varphi}$ is induced by a compactly supported symplectomorphism of the base, relative to the singular values, determined by the full sequence of Hurwitz moves for $\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_r$.*
- (2) *With respect to the almost-toric fibration on M associated to our choice of toric model, $\check{\varphi}$ is induced by the sequence of nodal slides and cut transfers determined by $\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_r$ (using the standard reference Lagrangian section L_0 , itself fixed).*
- (3) *Under the homological mirror symmetry identification ([Theorem 3.1](#)(2) and (3)), the action of φ_* on the category $D(Y)$ (resp. $D(U)$) is mirror to the action of $\check{\varphi}$ on the category $D^b \mathcal{F}^{\rightarrow}(w)$ (resp. $D^b \mathcal{W}(M)$).*

Proof Let’s start with (1). Consider the explicit Lefschetz fibration associated to our choice of toric model. Using the same notation as before, it has a distinguished collection of vanishing cycles $\{W_{ij}\}_{i=1, \dots, k, j=1, \dots, m_i}, V_0, \dots, V_{k-1}$, with vanishing paths, say, $\{\gamma_{ij}\}, \varrho_0, \dots, \varrho_{k-1}$. Now perform the Hurwitz moves for $\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_r$. (This follows [Figure 1](#).) At then end, by our observation that the n_i and m_i are the same as at the start, the distinguished collection that we get has, again, ordered vanishing cycles $\{W_{ij}\}_{i=1, \dots, k, j=1, \dots, m_i}, V_0, \dots, V_k$. The vanishing *paths*, however, will have changed (indeed, the ordering of the critical points that they induce should in general also have changed). Call the new paths $\{\gamma'_{ij}\}, \varrho'_0, \dots, \varrho'_{k-1}$.

Up to compactly supported isotopy relative to the critical points, there exists a unique compactly supported orientation-preserving diffeomorphism of the base taking the γ_{ij} to γ'_{ij} , the ϱ_l to the ϱ'_l , and preserving a straight half-line going to $-\infty$ out of the central fibre. (Before requiring the latter, the map

is only defined up to the ambiguity of rotating by $2k\pi$ in a large radius annulus.) Call this map $f_{\tilde{\varphi}}$. Similarly to the construction in [Keating 2021, Proposition 2.5], this induces a compactly supported symplectomorphism $\tilde{\varphi}$ of the total space M , uniquely determined up to Hamiltonian isotopy, such that

- on a large compact set K with $f(K) \supset \text{Supp } f_{\tilde{\varphi}}$, it intertwines w , and lifts $f_{\tilde{\varphi}}$;
- in a neighbourhood of the vertical boundary of the Lefschetz fibration above $f(K_1)$, it interpolates back between $f_{\tilde{\varphi}}$ and the identity (recall that after forgetting the marked points, $f_{\tilde{\varphi}}$ is isotopic to the identity);
- it's the identity on fibres above points outside of $f(K)$.

This completes (1). (The reader may also be interested in the setup at the end of [Torricelli 2020, Section 3] in a related setting.)

From its definition, $\tilde{\varphi}$ maps the Lagrangian branes supported on the thimbles above $\{\gamma_{ij}\}, \varrho_0, \dots, \varrho_{k-1}$ to the ones above $\{\gamma'_{ij}\}, \varrho'_0, \dots, \varrho'_{k-1}$. On the other hand, under the HMS theorem, the former are mirror to

$$\mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{km_k}}(\Gamma_{km_k}), \dots, \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{k1}}(\Gamma_{k1}), \dots, \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{1m_1}}(\Gamma_{1m_1}), \dots, \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{11}}(\Gamma_{11}), \mathcal{O}, f^*\mathcal{O}(\bar{D}_1), \dots, f^*\mathcal{O}(\bar{D}_1 + \dots + \bar{D}_{k-1}),$$

where $f : (\tilde{Y}, \tilde{D}) \rightarrow (Y, D)$ is part of the toric model datum. On the other hand, using the fact that the elementary transformations $\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_r$ are factorising φ , the branes supported on the thimbles above $\{\gamma'_{ij}\}, \varrho'_0, \dots, \varrho'_{k-1}$ are mirror to

$$\mathcal{O}_{\varphi(\Gamma_{km_k})}(\varphi(\Gamma_{km_k})), \dots, \mathcal{O}_{\varphi(\Gamma_{k1})}(\varphi(\Gamma_{k1})), \dots, \mathcal{O}_{\varphi(\Gamma_{1m_1})}(\varphi(\Gamma_{1m_1})), \dots, \mathcal{O}_{\varphi(\Gamma_{11})}(\varphi(\Gamma_{11})), \mathcal{O}, f^*\mathcal{O}(\bar{D}_1), \dots, f^*\mathcal{O}(\bar{D}_1 + \dots + \bar{D}_{k-1}),$$

where we are using the fact that the \bar{D}_i are fixed by φ . This completes (3).

For (2), consider the sequence of nodal slides and cut transfers induced by $\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_r$. We claim that as the n_i and m_i at the end are the same as the ones we started with, the sequence of almost-toric moves naturally induces a compactly supported symplectomorphism of M . Formally, this can be defined as follows. Set $M = M_0$. The first nodal slide gives a one-parameter family of symplectic manifolds M_t , with $t \in [0, 1]$, naturally identified outside a compact set, with a smoothly varying family of symplectomorphisms $\tilde{\varphi}_t : M_0 \rightarrow M_t$, all compactly supported (this makes sense because of the natural identification), and such that $\tilde{\varphi}_0 = \text{Id}$. The first cut transfer simply takes M_1 to itself (no deformations). The second nodal slide extends our families to M_t and $\tilde{\varphi}_t$ with $t \in [1, 2]$. Iterating, we get smoothly varying families M_t and $\tilde{\varphi}_t$ for $t \in [0, r]$ (without loss of generality we reparametrise near integer points of $[0, r]$ to get smoothness everywhere). Now, after all r steps, the n_i and m_i are the same as we started with; thus M_r is naturally identified, as a symplectic manifold, with $M = M_0$; and $\tilde{\varphi}_r$ is a compactly supported symplectomorphism of M .

We claim that under our identification of M as the total space of the Lefschetz fibration w and as the total space of the (initial) almost-toric fibration, $\tilde{\varphi}$ and $\tilde{\varphi}_r$ agree up to compactly supported Hamiltonian isotopy. This readily follows from the two descriptions together with the discussion in Section 3.2.2 of the compatibility of the Hurwitz moves on the Lefschetz side and the nodal slides on the almost-toric side. \square




Figure 3: Deforming the base of the Lefschetz fibration to get the isotopy from M to M_1 .

Remark 6.2 Recall the short exact sequence from [Theorem 2.5](#):

$$1 \rightarrow N = \text{Hom}(\pi_1(Y_e \setminus D), \mathbb{C}^*) \rightarrow \text{Aut}(Y_e, D; \text{cpt}) \rightarrow \text{Adm}/W \rightarrow 1.$$

We’ve just seen that for any element of Adm/W , we can construct a mirror (graded) symplectomorphism $\check{\varphi}$. The autoequivalence of the Fukaya category mirror to an element of N is clear: it is given by the change of local systems encoded by the corresponding element of $\text{Hom}(\pi_1(M), \mathbb{C}^*)$.

Remark 6.3 On the Lefschetz side, we could construct the M_t and $\check{\varphi}_t$, for $t \in [0, r]$, by deforming the base of the Lefschetz fibration by dragging around critical values in the base in the way prescribed by the Hurwitz moves. See [Figure 3](#) for a single nodal slide.

6.2 Independence of choices

We want to prove that the map $\check{\varphi}$ constructed in [Theorem 6.1](#) is independent of choices. In order to do this, we start by understanding the mirrors to $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \subset \text{Aut}(\mathbb{C}^*)^2 \subset \text{Bir}((\mathbb{C}^*)^2)$.

6.2.1 Mirrors to $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ transformations The $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ action on $(\mathbb{C}^*)^2$ can be described as follows. The B side is standard: for a given arbitrary toric pair (\bar{Y}, \bar{D}) , any element g of $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ gives a birational transformation of \bar{Y} . After sufficiently many toric blowups, say to (\bar{Y}', \bar{D}') , g lifts to a biholomorphism from \bar{Y}' to, say, \bar{Y}'' . If (\tilde{Y}', \tilde{D}') is given by interior blowups on (\bar{Y}', \bar{D}') in m_1, \dots, m_k points, then g induces an automorphism from (\tilde{Y}', \tilde{D}') to $(\tilde{Y}'', \tilde{D}'')$, given by blowing up $(\tilde{Y}'', \tilde{D}'')$ according to the cyclic permutation of the m_i determined by g . (If g preserves the fan for (\bar{Y}', \bar{D}') and the m_i are cyclically symmetric, we get an automorphism of (\tilde{Y}', \tilde{D}') to itself.)

On the A side, let M be the mirror symplectic manifold to (\tilde{Y}', \tilde{D}') , and let M' be the mirror to $(\tilde{Y}'', \tilde{D}'')$. By assumption, we can set up the almost-toric fibrations on M and M' so that one base is mapped to the other by g , with critical points and invariant lines mapped to each other. This naturally lifts to a symplectomorphism from M to M' , say \check{g} .

By using suitable Liouville forms, one could arrange for \check{g} to induce a map from $\mathcal{W}(M)$ to $\mathcal{W}(M')$. If we knew that there was a compatible map of directed Fukaya categories, [Proposition 2.14](#) would apply

to show that \check{g} corresponds to g under homological mirror symmetry. (Note that this would not require a fine-level description of the action on those categories!) This should follow from [Hanlon and Ward \geq 2026], who consider a version of the directed Fukaya category defined in terms of sections of the almost-toric fibration. In the current paper, we only use this for conjugates of compactly supported maps by \check{g} , which as usual follows from Proposition 2.14 together with Propositions 5.1 and 5.2.

Lemma 6.4 *Let g and \check{g} be as above. Assume that $\check{h} \in \pi_0 \text{Sym}_c^{\text{gr}} M$ is a symplectomorphism of M mirror to an autoequivalence $h \in \text{Auteq } D(Y)$. Then $\check{g}^{-1} \circ \check{h} \circ \check{g} \in \pi_0 \text{Sym}_c M$ is mirror to $g^{-1} \circ h \circ g \in \text{Auteq } D(Y)$.*

Remark 6.5 Alternatively, to get a well-defined action on directed categories, we could set up a mirror \tilde{g} to g in terms of the Lefschetz fibration by combining the almost-toric / Lefschetz identification with [Hacking and Keating 2022, Proposition 3.19]. The map \tilde{g} would be a fibred symplectomorphism constructed by combining a rotation of the fibre near infinity with an automorphism of the base of w (similarly to the proof of Theorem 6.1). While this is less geometrically appealing, such a map \tilde{w} will by construction automatically act on $D^b \mathcal{F}^{\rightarrow}(w)$, and be mirror to $g \in \text{Auteq } D(Y)$ under our HMS correspondence. While conditions near infinity are different for \tilde{g} and \check{g} (heuristically, they are suited for different versions of the directed Fukaya category), they will agree on arbitrarily large compact sets. (In particular, they will be interchangeable for the purposes of conjugating a compactly supported map.)

6.2.2 Proof of independence of choices

Proposition 6.6 *The (equivalence class of) symplectomorphism $\check{\varphi} \in \pi_0 \text{Sym}_c^{\text{gr}}(M)$ constructed in Theorem 6.1 is independent of choices.*

In order to prove this, it is enough to show that two different factorisations of φ into elementary transformations induce mirror symplectomorphisms which agree up to a compactly supported Hamiltonian isotopy. (This also takes care of the choice of toric model.) This means that we need to check that relations in the group of birational automorphisms of $(\mathbb{C}^*)^2$ induce isotopic symplectomorphisms. We start with the most interesting one.

The “ A_2 cluster relation” There is a well-known order-five relation in the group of birational transformations of $(\mathbb{C}^*)^2$, which experts will recognise as corresponding to the fact that there are exactly five cluster charts for the A_2 quiver. To realise this relation (minimally) in terms of automorphisms of a log CY pair, take the model $(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{D}) \rightarrow (\bar{Y}, \bar{D})$ where (\bar{Y}, \bar{D}) is a corner blowup of $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, and (\tilde{Y}, \tilde{D}) is given by one interior blowup on each of the self-intersection-zero components. (This is a compactification of the A_2 cluster variety.) The mirror almost-toric fibration is given in the left-hand side of Figure 4; label the boundary components as in the figure. (Both the A and B side spaces, and the sequences of mutations, are carefully described in [Cheung and Vianna 2021].)

Let E be the elementary transformation at \bar{D}_5 , and let g be the $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ birational transformation which takes \bar{D}_i to \bar{D}_{i-1} . Let $P = gE$; this defines an automorphism of \tilde{Y} (rather than a mere birational




Figure 4: Almost toric fibration for the “ A_2 quiver relation”: initial configuration, and mirrors to E and then g . The cuts are in black, and dotted lines correspond to fan vectors (including ones with no interior blowups).

transformation), permuting the components of D ; we have $P^5 = \text{Id}$. Equivalently, setting $E_a = g^{-a} E g^a$, we have $E_4 \cdots E_0 = \text{Id}$ (note $g^{-4} = g$). On the symplectic side, we have the following.

Proposition 6.7 *Let $(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{D}) \rightarrow (\bar{Y}, \bar{D})$ be as above, and let M be its mirror. Let $\check{\varphi}$ be the compactly supported symplectomorphism of M associated to the factorisation of $\text{Id} \in \text{Aut}(\tilde{Y})$ into $E_4 \cdots E_0$; then $\check{\varphi}$ is isotopic to the identity through a compactly supported Hamiltonian.*

Symplectic incarnations of the five A_2 cluster charts have been extensively studied, going back to [Ekholm et al. 2016]; see for instance [Pan 2017; Shende et al. 2016; 2019; Treumann and Zaslow 2018; Gao et al. 2024; Cheung and Vianna 2021]. Nevertheless, Proposition 6.7 doesn’t readily follow from the existing literature, as the focus has instead largely been on proving that symplectic objects “mirror” to the five charts, such as Lagrangian fillings of the right-hand trefoil, are distinct. (Note that by Theorem 6.1 we already know that $\check{\varphi}$ acts as the identity on the Fukaya category.) We instead give a self-contained proof of Proposition 6.7, and comment further on the relation with the contact geometry literature in Remark 6.8.

Proof The isotopy between $\check{\varphi}$ and the identity is hard to see directly from the perspective of the almost-toric fibration. We work instead with the Lefschetz fibration $w : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$.

As described in Theorem 6.1, $\check{\varphi}$ is a fibred symplectomorphism with respect to w ; as before, let $f_{\check{\varphi}}$ be the automorphism of the base. We calculate this by hand. The key is to use, first, a more symmetric description of w , given in Figure 5.




Figure 5: Lefschetz fibration $w : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$: standard (left), cyclically symmetric viewpoint (centre), and in relation to the first mutation (same colour-coding as Figure 2).




Figure 6: Calculating $f_{\check{\varphi}}$ by applying the isotopies corresponding to $\check{\varepsilon}_0, \dots, \check{\varepsilon}_4$. We're using the same cyclically symmetric configuration as in Figure 5: T is given by gluing the blue and green thimbles along the purple arc.

We can now iteratively apply the isotopy corresponding to a single elementary transformation (in Figure 3), combined with [Hacking and Keating 2022, Proposition 3.19] for cycling the labels on components of \bar{D} , to get a description of $f_{\check{\varphi}}$; this is carried out in Figure 6.

The upshot is given in Figure 7: $f_{\check{\varphi}}$ is given by five half-twists between the critical points for W_5 and $\tau_{V_0}^{-1}W_1$. On the other hand, one can immediately check that these two vanishing cycles are in a local A_2 configuration; in particular, we can deform w so that these two critical points merge (along their vanishing paths) to give a single A_2 critical point, at which point the half-twists readily unravel to give an isotopy to the identity. (Alternatively, as the sub-Lefschetz fibration on which $\check{\varphi}$ has support is just a copy of the “standard” A_2 fibration, with total space \mathbb{C}^2 , one could quote [Gromov 1985].) \square

Remark 6.8 Intuitively, the key to Proposition 6.7 is to show that $\check{\varphi}(T)$ is Hamiltonian isotopic to T . This can be checked using tools from contact geometry, which we now sketch. In fact, a slightly stronger statement is true: we'll see that the statement holds relative to a disc on T (fixed pointwise under the five mutations and then the Hamiltonian isotopy), or, equivalently, we can work with a once-punctured torus. First, recall that the max-tb right-handed Legendrian trefoil knot $K \subset S^3 = \partial(B^4, \omega_0)$ has at least




Figure 7: Upshot: $f_{\check{\varphi}}$ is given by five half-twists between two vanishing cycles.

five exact Lagrangian fillings, all once-punctured tori; see [Ekholm et al. 2016, Example 8.4], and also [Pan 2017; Treumann and Zaslow 2018]. On the other hand, the Weinstein domain given by attaching a Weinstein 2-handle along K is precisely M ; see for instance [Casals and Murphy 2019, Section 4.1], or the later conceptual argument in [Casals 2022, Corollary 1.2]. One can then proceed, for instance, using the framework of weaves introduced in [Casals and Zaslow 2022]: first, the five Lagrangian fillings can be described in terms of 2-weaves, in this case trivalent graphs [Casals and Zaslow 2022, Section 7.1.3]; the fillings are given by the 2-weaves dual to the five triangulations of the pentagon. Second, Lagrangian mutations can be understood in that language: they are given by Whitehead moves on the trivalent graph, dual to flips in the triangulation [Casals and Zaslow 2022, Theorem 4.21]. Applying this, we get that starting with any of our five Lagrangian fillings and performing the sequence of five mutations gives a filling which is Hamiltonian isotopic, relative to the boundary K , to the filling we started with.

We can now conclude:

Proof of Proposition 6.6 Relations for the group of birational transformations of $(\mathbb{C}^*)^2$ were described by Blanc [2013, Theorem 2]. In our case, they consist of, first, relations in $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$. These are readily satisfied on the symplectic side: the conjugate by $g \in \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ of an elementary transformation with respect to ray v_j is the elementary transformation with respect to ray $g \cdot v_j$, and the mirror statement is automatic. Second, Blanc’s list gives us two relations involving elementary transformations which need checking on the symplectic side. The first one (“ $PCP = I$ ” in his notation) amounts to checking that mutating and then mutating back gives the identity, which is automatic geometrically; and the second relation (“ $P^5 = 1$ ” in his notation) was covered by Proposition 6.7. \square

6.3 Examples

We calculate the first few explicit examples of nodal slide recombinations.

Example 6.9 (B_2 cluster variety relation) Consider the mirror M to the pair (Y, D) given in Figure 8, top. (It has $k = 6$, with three interior blowups; experts will recognise a standard compactification of the B_2 cluster variety; see [Cheung and Vianna 2021].) M has a noncompactly supported symplectomorphism ρ described in the figure; this consists of a double nodal slide and cut transfer, followed by a single one, followed by an $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ map. By construction, ρ^3 has compact support; as $\mathrm{Adm}/W = \{1\}$ in this case, ρ^3 is Hamiltonian isotopic to the identity by Theorem 6.1. This gives a symplectic mirror to what is sometimes known as the “ B_2 cluster variety relation”.

Assume that (Y, D) is negative semidefinite, so that Y is a rational elliptic surface, and $M = X \setminus E$ the complement of a smooth anticanonical divisor in a del Pezzo surface. From Section 2.2.2, we know that $\mathrm{Auteq}(Y, D; \mathrm{pt})$ is infinite in two cases, and, in both, equal to $k \cdot \mathrm{MW}(Y, \mathbb{P}^1)$, where $\mathrm{MW}(Y, \mathbb{P}^1) \simeq \mathbb{Z}$ is the Mordell–Weil group of Y . For both of these cases, we can factorise a generator for $\mathrm{MW}(Y)$ and write down the mirror sequence of nodal slides, together with the $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ action corresponding to the permutation of the components of D .




Figure 8: Nodal slides for Examples 6.9, top, 6.10, middle, and 6.11, bottom. In Example 6.9, the SL_2 action is given by taking the i -th ray on the right-hand side to the $(i-2)$ -th, with indices mod 6. In Example 6.10, the SL_2 action is determined by taking the i -th ray in the right-hand side diagram to the $(i-1)$ -th. In Example 6.11, the SL_2 action is determined by taking the i -th ray in the right-hand side diagram to the $(i-1)$ -th.

Example 6.10 (mirror to Mordell–Weil for $Bl(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1) \setminus E$) Assume that $k = 7$; X is the blowup of $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ in a point. A generator φ for $MW(Y, \mathbb{P}^1)$ gives the symplectomorphism $\check{\varphi}$ of M described by the sequence of nodal slides in Figure 8, middle, postcomposed by the $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$ action encoded by the labelling of the invariant rays. The map $\check{\varphi}^7$ has compact support, and, by Theorem 6.1, is mirror to φ^7 .

Example 6.11 (mirror to Mordell–Weil for $\mathbb{F}_1 \setminus E$) Assume that $k = 8$ and $X = \mathbb{F}_1$. A generator φ for $MW(Y, \mathbb{P}^1)$ gives the symplectomorphism $\check{\varphi}$ of M described by the sequence of nodal slides in Figure 8, bottom, postcomposed by the $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$ action encoded by the labelling of the invariant rays. The map $\check{\varphi}^8$ has compact support, and, by Theorem 6.1, is mirror to φ^8 .

6.4 Relations between different families of symplectomorphisms

Homological mirror symmetry immediately hands us symplectic versions of Lemma 2.15 at the level of Fukaya categories. The first two relations automatically have geometric counterparts: given a Lagrangian sphere S and a symplectomorphism f , one has

$$\tau_f(S) = f \circ \tau_S \circ f^{-1} \in \pi_0 \text{Sym}_c^{\text{gr}} M.$$

We check the other two.

Lemma 6.12 Suppose that $\sigma_L \in \pi_0 \text{Symp}_c^{\text{gr}} M$ is the Lagrangian translation associated to the class $[L - L_0] \in H_2(M)/(\mathbb{Z} \cdot \gamma^\vee)$ and $\check{\varphi} \in \pi_0 \text{Symp}_c^{\text{gr}} M$ a nodal slide recombination. Then

$$\sigma_{\varphi_* L} = \varphi \circ \sigma_L \circ \varphi^{-1} \in \pi_0 \text{Symp}_c M.$$

Similarly with noncompactly supported Lagrangian translations.

Proof This follows from iteratively applying Lemma 4.15. Similarly with noncompactly supported Lagrangian translations. □

Suppose $C \subset Y \setminus D$ is a (-2) curve and $a \in \mathbb{Z}$. Recall that as autoequivalences of derived categories,

$$T_{\mathcal{O}_C(a-1)} \circ T_{\mathcal{O}_C(a)} = - \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(C).$$

We will prove a symplectic analogue of this relation in Lemma 6.13. Let’s start with the setup.

Choose an almost-toric fibration $\pi : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ as in Proposition 5.2, and let $s_a = \sigma_E^{a+1} s_C$ be the sphere mirror to $i_* \mathcal{O}_C(a)$ constructed therein; these all project to a segment γ between two critical points of π . This fibration comes with a preferred reference Lagrangian section L_0 ; using this, let σ_{L_C} be the Lagrangian translation mirror to tensoring with $\mathcal{O}_Y(C)$ from Theorem 5.5.

Let $B_{\text{loc}} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a small open neighbourhood of γ , and let $M_{\text{loc}} = \pi^{-1}(B_{\text{loc}})$. (This should be thought of as mirror to the formal neighbourhood of a (-2) curve, or to the resolution of an A_1 singularity; cf. [Chan and Ueda 2013].) M_{loc} is the total space of a Lefschetz fibration well-known to experts, which we briefly recall. First, consider

$$M'_{\text{loc}} = \{xy + (z - 1)(z - 2) = 0\} \subset \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^*$$

equipped with the Kaehler form with potential $|x|^2 + |y|^2 + (\log |z|)^2$. Let $f : M'_{\text{loc}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$ be projection to z , a conic Lefschetz fibration with two critical fibres. There is a symplectic S^1 action given by $(x, y, z) \mapsto (e^{i\theta} x, e^{-i\theta} y, z)$. Following [Auroux 2007, Section 5.1], let $\delta_{z_0}(x_0, y_0)$ be the signed symplectic area between the equator $\{|x| = |y|\} \subset f^{-1}(z_0)$ and the S^1 orbit of (x_0, y_0, z_0) . Then the map $\pi' : M'_{\text{loc}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ given by $\pi'(x, y, z) = (|z|, \delta_z(x, y))$ defines a singular Lagrangian torus fibration: symplectic parallel transport with respect to f is S^1 -equivariant and preserves δ . There are two nodal critical fibres, the preimages of $(1, 0)$ and $(2, 0)$, and one then readily gets that after suitably truncating, M'_{loc} agrees with M_{loc} . Moreover, the spheres s_a can be represented as matching cycles with respect to f , as in Figure 9.




Figure 9: Lagrangian spheres s_a : matching paths in the base of the Lefschetz fibration $f : M'_{\text{loc}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$. The matching path for s_a can be obtained from the one for s_{a-1} by applying a full negative twist in the segment from 0 to 1.




Figure 10: Action of $tw_{-1} \circ tw_0$ on the base of the Lefschetz fibration $f : M'_{loc} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$, with the images of s_0, s_{-1} , and a sample of circles γ_c .

Lemma 6.13 Suppose that we are given $\sigma_{LC} \in \pi_0 \text{Symp}_c(M)$ and Lagrangian spheres s_a , for $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, as above. Then

$$\tau_{s_{a-1}} \circ \tau_{s_a} = \sigma_{LC} \in \pi_0 \text{Symp}_c(M).$$

Proof It’s enough to prove this for $a = 0$. Set $\rho = \tau_{s_{-1}} \circ \tau_{s_0}$. The local model for the Dehn twist in the matching cycle s_a is well known: it is induced by the half-twist tw_a in the associated matching path (as an isotopy class of automorphism of \mathbb{C}^* relative to the marked points); see for instance [Seidel 2001, 2003; Auroux et al. 2005]. In the case at hand, recall that we have a two-parameter family of Lagrangian tori, with each one fibred over one of the concentric circles $\eta_c = \{|z| = c\}$, for some $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$. The family $\{\eta_c\}$ foliates the base of the Lefschetz fibration f . On the other hand, the image of the foliation under $tw_{-1} \circ tw_0$ is isotopic relative to marked points to the original one. See Figure 10. (This is familiar to experts; see [Seidel 2013, Remark 11.11] for the observation for a single η_c .) This implies that after postcomposing with a Hamiltonian isotopy, we can arrange for $\tau_{s_{-1}} \circ \tau_{s_0}$ to respect the almost-toric fibration $M_{loc} \rightarrow B_{loc}$. The Arnol’d–Liouville theorem then strongly constrains the map: it must be the Lagrangian translation determined by the image of a reference section L_0 (the argument extends over the nodal fibres similarly to the proof of Proposition 4.11). Reading off the action on homology is then enough to identify this translation with σ_{LC} . \square

7 Applications

7.1 New symplectomorphisms

Fix a log CY surface (Y_e, D) with mirror M . Let Q , Adm and W be as before, and let $Q_{\text{symp}}, \text{Adm}/W_{\text{symp}}$ and Br_{symp} be the subgroups of $\pi_0 \text{Symp}_c^{\text{gr}}(M)$ generated by respectively, compactly supported Lagrangian translations, nodal slide recombinations, and Dehn twists in arbitrary Lagrangian spheres. (For the latter we do not restrict ourselves to the “known” spheres constructed in Proposition 5.2.)

Theorem 7.1 Given the above setting, we have the following:

- (1) The map $Q \rtimes \text{Adm}/W \rightarrow \pi_0 \text{Symp}_c^{\text{gr}}(M)$ with image $Q_{\text{symp}} \rtimes \text{Adm}/W_{\text{symp}}$ is faithful.

(2) Let $\langle \Phi \rangle \leq Q$ be the sublattice generated by classes of roots. Then

$$\text{Br}_{\text{symp}} \cap (Q_{\text{symp}} \rtimes \text{Adm}/W_{\text{symp}}) = \langle \Phi \rangle_{\text{symp}} \rtimes \{1\}.$$

In particular, whenever $\text{Adm} \neq W$ or $Q \neq \langle \Phi \rangle$, we get elements of $\pi_0 \text{Symp}_c^{\text{gr}}(M)$ which are not products of Dehn twists.

Proof (1) We have a well-defined geometric action by Lemma 6.12; faithfulness holds at the level of the action on the homology group $H_2(M; \mathbb{Z})$.

(2) After the HMS identification, the K theory classes of Lagrangian spheres are the same as the ones in Remark 2.4. Also, recall that on the mirror side, $\text{Br}_{\mathbb{Z}} \cap \text{Aut}(Y) = \{\text{Id}\} \in \text{Auteq}(Y)$. The claim then follows from mirrors of the relations between autoequivalences in Lemma 2.15, notably Lemma 6.13. \square

Remark 7.2 The classification in Remark 2.4 allows us to exclude arbitrary spherical twists, irrespective of whether they are given geometrically by Dehn twists in embedded Lagrangian spheres. Twists in other Lagrangians with periodic geodesic flow are ruled out for cohomological and dimension reasons. Less is known in general about the categorical action of fibred twists; see, however, [Perutz 2008; Wehrheim and Woodward 2016; Mak and Wu 2018]. The only known fibred twists for our family of manifolds M are boundary twists in the semidefinite (simple elliptic) cases; these are given by a finite-time action of the Reeb flow on the boundary. (For hypersurface simple elliptic singularities, they are products of Dehn twists [Seidel 2000, Section 4.c].) In general, they act trivially on relative homology, and also on $\mathcal{W}(M)$. We expect them to correspond to elements of Q which vanish in \bar{Q} .

Example 7.3 Nodal slide recombinations: Adm/W is nontrivial in the following cases.

- Small values of k : for $k \leq 6$, Adm/W is always trivial, and there are no interesting nodal slide recombinations. On the other hand, for $k = 7$, Adm/W is always infinite; this is also true when $k = 8$ and $\pi_1(U) = 0$.
- In general, note that if Adm_Y/W_Y is nontrivial for a log CY pair (Y, D) , and a log CY pair (Y', D') is obtained from (Y, D) through any sequence of toric and interior blowups, then $\text{Adm}_{Y'}/W_{Y'}$ is also nontrivial — indeed, pullback gives an injection $\text{Adm}_Y/W_Y \rightarrow \text{Adm}_{Y'}/W_{Y'}$. In particular, the examples for small values of k can be used to generate many more.
- When $Y = Y_e$, $\text{Aut}(Y_e)$ acts with rational polyhedral domain on the nef cone [Li 2021]. This implies that Adm/W is infinite if and only if the nef cone is not rational polyhedral.

Example 7.4 \bar{Q} is not typically generated by classes of simple roots. Some specific examples include:

- Semidefinite cases with D a cycle of (-2) curves and $k \geq 7$, except when $k = 8$ and $\pi_1(M) = \mathbb{Z}/2$.
- Whenever the rank of Q is one and D is negative (semi)definite.
- Examples 4.3 and 4.4. in [Friedman 2013]. Both have the property that Q has rank 2 and the root system is empty.

Remark 7.5 In the semidefinite case, a compactly supported symplectomorphism of M induces a symplectomorphism of its compactification X , a del Pezzo surface with Kaehler anticanonical form. However, in our cases the induced symplectomorphisms of X act trivially on homology, and thus are isotopic to the identity [Gromov 1985; Lalonde and Pinsonnault 2004; Evans 2011].

7.2 Lagrangian spheres and symplectic Torelli group

For small values of k , a lot is explicitly known about (-2) curves in $Y \setminus D$; as soon as a toric model for (Y, D) involves two interior blowups on the same component of \bar{D} , there is at least one (-2) curve. Moreover, suppose that D is negative definite and does not contain a (-1) curve. Then for $k \leq 5$, there are finitely many (-2) curves on Y_e , which give a basis of \mathcal{Q} ; see [Looijenga 1981]. For $k = 6$, the (-2) curves span \mathcal{Q} , with exactly one relation between them; in particular, there's also finitely many of them [Li 2021; Simonetti 2021]. For $k = 7$, there are always infinitely many (-2) curves; for $k = 8$ there are infinitely many whenever the fundamental group of the complement U_e is trivial. (For $k \geq 9$ little has been done systematically, though individual cases can be done by hand.)

7.2.1 Infinitely many (-2) curves Assume that $Y \setminus D$ contains infinitely many (-2) curves (necessarily countable). This implies we are in the negative definite case.

Corollary 7.6 *Let $(Y, D) = (Y_e, D)$ be a log Calabi–Yau surface with distinguished complex structure, and let $w : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be its mirror, i.e., a Milnor fibre of the dual cusp of D . Assume that Y contains infinitely many (-2) curves. Then:*

- (1) *There is a countable infinite collection of Lagrangian spheres in M , none of which is contained in the subcategory of $D^b\mathcal{W}(M)$ split-generated by the others.*
- (2) *The Dehn twist in any one of them is not contained in the subgroup of $\pi_0 \text{Symp}_c(M)$ generated by any of the others; similarly with squares of Dehn twists.*

Proof Let C_i , with $i \in \mathbb{N}$, be an infinite collection of (-2) curves in Y ; without loss of generality they all lie in U . Let $S_i = s_{C_i}$ be the Lagrangian sphere mirror to $i_*\mathcal{O}_{C_i}(-1)$, from Proposition 5.2. Let $p_i \in C_i \setminus \bigcup_{j \neq i} C_j$. By considering morphisms with $i_*\mathcal{O}_{p_i}$, we see that $i_*\mathcal{O}_{C_i}(-1)$ cannot be contained by the subcategory split-generated by $\{i_*\mathcal{O}_{C_j}(-1)\}_{j \neq i}$. The homological mirror symmetry theorem then implies the first point. For the second one, one can proceed similarly, noting that $i_*\mathcal{O}_{p_i}$ is fixed by the spherical twist in $i_*\mathcal{O}_{C_j}(-1)$ for $j \neq i$, but not under the twist in $i_*\mathcal{O}_{C_i}(-1)$, nor its square. \square

Remark 7.7 Using [Sheridan and Smith 2020], the same statements and proofs hold for K3 surfaces whose mirror K3s containing infinitely many embedded (-2) curves.

Discussion All of the spheres in Corollary 7.6 can be thought of as vanishing cycles for the cusp singularity dual to the one with cycle D , with Dehn twists in them induced by monodromy maps in the moduli spaces from Section 1.5. In particular, Corollary 7.6 should be contrasted with the case of (arbitrary) hypersurface singularities, for which Picard–Lefschetz theory tells us that any distinguished collection of vanishing cycles generates all others as objects of the Fukaya category, and that Dehn twists

in them generate the monodromy group. (Note that the full compact Fukaya category of M can never be split generated by spherical objects: this is immediate by using HMS and by considering supports of mirror objects.) On the other hand, by [Li 2021], $\text{Aut}(Y)$ acts on the collection of (-2) curves with finitely many orbits (note that there's no a priori uniform bound); thus there are finitely many orbits of known Lagrangian spheres in $D^b\mathcal{W}(M)$ under the action of compactly supported symplectomorphisms. There could be more than one orbit: for instance, in the $k = 6$ semidefinite case, Y_e is the total space of elliptic fibration where the boundary D is a cycle of 6 (-2) curves, and the interior (-2) curves form an I_2 and an I_3 fibre, giving two orbits of Lagrangian spheres in $D^b\mathcal{W}(M)$, where M is mirror to $Y_e \setminus D$. (Note that $\text{Adm} = W$ here.)

7.3 Semidefinite case: monodromy and mirror to the $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ action

Assume that D is negative semidefinite, i.e., that M is the Milnor fibre of a simple elliptic singularity. We re-visit the monodromy perspective from the introduction in this case. We have that $M = X_0 \setminus E_0$, where X_0 is a del Pezzo surface, with E_0 smooth anticanonical. The natural moduli space of complex structures for M consists of pairs (X, E) where X is a del Pezzo surface deformation equivalent to X_0 , and $E \subset X$ a smooth anticanonical divisor.

First, we want to carefully check that any loop in this moduli space induces a symplectomorphism of M , well-behaved near ∂M in the cases where it's not compactly supported. Assume we have a smooth loop of pairs $\{(X_t, E_t)\}_{t \in [0,1]}$ where the X_t are del Pezzo surfaces, and $E_t \subset X_t$ are smooth anticanonical elliptic curves. M is equipped with ω_0 , the restriction of a Kaehler form Poincaré dual to E_0 ; by making coherent choices of global sections of a smoothly varying very ample line bundle, we get a smooth loop of triples $\{(X_t, E_t, \omega_t)\}_{t \in [0,1]}$, where $\omega_t \in \Omega^2(X_t)$ is a Kaehler form such that $[\omega_t] = P.D[E_t] \in H^2(X_t; \mathbb{Z})$. Let $f_t : X_0 \rightarrow X_t$ parametrise the family. Set $M_t := X_t \setminus E_t$, and $M = M_0 = M_1$. By assumption, $\omega_t|_{M_t}$ is exact, and using the tubular neighbourhood theorem for symplectic submanifolds, we can choose a primitive θ_t for $\omega_t|_{M_t}$ such that on a collar neighbourhood of ∂M_t , the corresponding Liouville vector field radially scales each fibre of the symplectic normal bundle of E_t (inwards with respect to the deleted zero-section E_t). Moreover, after isotopy, we can assume that $f_t^{-1}(E_t) = E_0$, and that $f_t^*\theta_t = \theta_0$ in a neighbourhood of E_t ; note that f_1 can be arranged to restrict to the identity on this neighbourhood precisely when it induces the identity on $H_1(E_0; \mathbb{Z})$. A Moser argument gives a symplectomorphism $f : M \rightarrow M$, smoothly isotopic to f_1 rel boundary, which is compactly supported whenever $(f_1)_*$ is the identity on $H_1(E_0; \mathbb{Z})$. Choosing a grading, the map f acts on the wrapped Fukaya category; using the framework of stops from [Sylvan 2019; Ganatra et al. 2024], we expect to arrange an action on the directed Fukaya category.

Consider $H_2(M; \mathbb{Z})$. The “tube over a cycle” map gives a primitive embedding $H_1(E; \mathbb{Z}) \subset H_2(M; \mathbb{Z})$. This sublattice can be characterised as the radical of the degenerate intersection form on $H_2(M; \mathbb{Z})$. Now suppose that g is an arbitrary symplectomorphism of M . It induces an automorphism of $H_2(M; \mathbb{Z})$ respecting the intersection form, and so restricts to an automorphism of $H_1(E; \mathbb{Z})$. If g is the result of a monodromy construction as above, we recover the original action on $H_1(E; \mathbb{Z})$. Dually, one could

start with the action of g on $H_2(M, \partial M; \mathbb{Z})$, and get the (dual) action on $H^1(E; \mathbb{Z})$ via cap products. Alternatively, if g induces an autoequivalence of the directed Fukaya category of M , this could be obtained by looking at the induced element of $\text{Aut } K(D^b \mathcal{F}^\rightarrow(w))$ and then considering the action on the radical to get an element in $\text{Aut } H^1(E; \mathbb{Z})$. Call the resulting map $\tilde{\Theta} : \text{Auteq } D^b \mathcal{F}^\rightarrow(w) \rightarrow \text{Aut } H^1(E; \mathbb{Z})$. The map $\tilde{\Theta}$ is surjective: by considering paths of smooth elliptic curves in \mathbb{P}^2 (or $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$) and blowing up points on those curves, we can arrange to get arbitrary elements of $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$; see [Keating 2015, Section 5.4].

Finally, recall that on the mirror side, we have the map $\Theta : \text{Auteq } D(Y) \rightarrow \text{End } K(F)$ of equation (2.13), where F denotes a smooth fibre of the elliptic fibration $\varpi : Y \setminus D \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. $K(F)$ is generated by $[\mathcal{O}_{\text{pt}}]$ and $[\mathcal{O}_F]$. Now the radical of the intersection pairing on $H_2(Y \setminus D; \mathbb{Z})$ is the primitive sublattice $\langle \gamma, [F] \rangle$, where γ is the “linking torus” for a node of D . Homological mirror symmetry induces an identification of this lattice with the sublattice $H_1(E; \mathbb{Z}) \subset H_2(M; \mathbb{Z})$; and by construction $\tilde{\Theta}$ is mirror to Θ . (On the B side, $K(F)$ should be thought of as dual to $\langle \gamma, [F] \rangle = H_1(E; \mathbb{Z}) \subset H_2(M; \mathbb{Z})$, with γ corresponding to $[\mathcal{O}_{\text{pt}}]$ and F to $[\mathcal{O}_F]$.) In particular, we expect that there is a noncompactly supported symplectomorphism mirror to the fibrewise Fourier–Mukai transform described in Section 2.3.2.

Remark 7.8 This should be compared with [Hicks 2021, Section 5]: in the case where $X = \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$, Hicks constructs a symplectomorphism g of $M = \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2 \setminus E$ (where E is smooth anticanonical), by using an automorphism of the Hesse pencil on $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$ which interchanges an SYZ fibre and a tropical Lagrangian torus, L_{T2} in his notation. The mirror log CY surface Y , denoted by \check{X}_{9111} in [loc. cit.], is the total space of a rational elliptic fibration with an I_9 fibre above infinity and three other singular fibres, all nodal. Section 5 of [loc. cit.] provides evidence that g is mirror to a fibrewise Fourier–Mukai transform on Y .

7.4 Semidefinite case: connection with the special Lagrangian viewpoint

We briefly discuss connections between our results and work of Collins, Jacob and Lin in the semidefinite case [Collins et al. 2021, 2020].

Suppose X is a del Pezzo surface, E a smooth anticanonical divisor, and $M = X \setminus E$. There exists a meromorphic volume form Ω on X with a simple pole along E ; this is unique up to scaling by a constant. Moreover, M has a complete Ricci flat metric [Tian and Yau 1990], say g_{TY} . Let ω_{TY} be the associated Kähler form (automatically exact).

Theorem 7.9 [Collins et al. 2021] *Fix any primitive homology class $\alpha \in H_1(E, \mathbb{Z})$. Then M admits a special Lagrangian fibration $\pi_\alpha : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ with respect to ω_{TY} , with special Lagrangian torus fibre the image of α under the tube map $H_1(E, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_2(M, \mathbb{Z})$.*

Note that once α has been specified, the (almost-)toric fibration underlying the special one should be unique up to nodal slides.

Let $(\alpha_\gamma, \alpha_F)$ be the basis of $H_1(E; \mathbb{Z})$ corresponding to $(\gamma, [F]) \subset H_2(Y \setminus U; \mathbb{Z})$ under the mirror identification. (As before, γ is the class of a linking torus for a node of D , and $[F]$ the class of a fibre of the elliptic fibration ϖ on the mirror Y_e .) Intuitively, exactly one of the fibrations above should be thought of as the SYZ fibration: the one π_γ with fibre in class $\text{Tube}(\alpha_\gamma) \in H_2(M; \mathbb{Z})$. Recall from

Section 7.3 that monodromy considerations give noncompactly supported symplectomorphisms inducing any $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ action on $H_1(E; \mathbb{Z})$. We expect that for arbitrary α , π_α can be obtained as a Lagrangian fibration by precomposing π_γ with a suitable noncompactly supported symplectomorphism. In the case of π_{α_F} , this should be the mirror to the fibrewise Fourier–Mukai transform.

Collins, Jacob and Lin also study properties of the hyperkaehler structure associated to these Ricci flat metrics. Assume that the holomorphic volume form on M is normalised so that the special torus fibres have argument zero. Hyperkaehler rotation on M (from the I -structures to the J -structures with the standard conventions) yields a complex manifold U_{HK} , and π induces a holomorphic fibration $\varpi_{\mathrm{HK}} : U_{\mathrm{HK}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$; by [Collins et al. 2021, Theorem 6.4], U_{HK} admits a compactification to a relatively minimal elliptic fibration to \mathbb{P}^1 with an I_k fibre at infinity, where k is the degree of the del Pezzo surface X . In particular, this implies that Y is in the deformation component of the homological mirror Y_e to M .

While hyperkaehler rotation should generally *not* be thought of as mirror symmetry, an analysis in this case shows that the two can be set up to agree for a distinguished moduli space point: following [Collins et al. 2020, Section 5] (and [McMullen 2007]), we can find a smooth del Pezzo surface X' deformation equivalent to X ; a smooth anticanonical elliptic curve $E \subset X'$; and a holomorphic volume form $\Omega^{M'}$ on M' such that:

- (1) Hyperkaehler rotation on M (from the I structures to the J ones) gives the distinguished complex structure $U_e = Y_e \setminus D$.
- (2) Under this hyperkaehler rotation, the special Lagrangian fibration on $M = X \setminus E$ with fibre class $\mathrm{Tube}(\alpha_F)$, say π_F , becomes an elliptic fibration $\varpi^0 : U_e \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, which compactifies to $\varpi : Y_e \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$.
- (3) The special Lagrangian fibration on M with fibre class $\mathrm{Tube}(\alpha_\gamma)$ has fibres with argument $\pi/2$. After hyperkaehler rotation, this gives a special Lagrangian fibration on U_e .

See [Collins et al. 2020, Theorem 5.4]. This setup can be used to obtain symplectomorphisms of M :

Lemma 7.10 [Collins et al. 2020, Proposition 5.10] *Suppose that we are in the setting above. Let $\psi \in \mathrm{MW}(Y_e, \mathbb{P}^1)$ be an element of the Mordell–Weil group of Y . Then as a diffeomorphism of M , with the symplectic form given by hyperkaehler rotation, ψ is in fact a symplectomorphism of M , say ρ_ψ .*

Proof This is essentially immediate from hyperkaehler identities. The map ψ is holomorphic on $U = U_e$ (whose complex structure is J), so it must at worst scale $\Omega_J = \Omega^U$. Moreover, the scaling factor must in fact be one: ψ acts by translation on each fibre, and uniformising the fibration near a smooth fibre one sees that the scaling factor must be one. (See [Huybrechts 2016, Lemma 15.4.4] for details on an analogous argument, or the proof of [Collins et al. 2020, Proposition 5.10] for a more analytic viewpoint.) Now split the equation $\psi^* \Omega_J = \Omega_J$ into real and imaginary parts to see that ψ preserves the symplectic form on M . □

Suppose that ψ is a k -th power in the Mordell–Weil group, where k still denotes the degree of the del Pezzo surface Y . The map ρ_ψ above doesn't have compact support: this is merely true asymptotically,

in a sense which could be made precise. However, we observe that the ideas of [Section 4](#) can be used in this setting to improve this. We first note the following:

Lemma 7.11 *Let s_0 be the choice of reference holomorphic section for the group law in $\text{MW}(Y_e, \mathbb{P}^1)$, and s_ψ the one for ψ . Then their images under hyperkaehler rotation are Lagrangian sections of π_F , say L_e and L_ψ , respectively. Moreover, away from critical fibres (and on fibres with a single critical point), ρ_ψ is precisely equal to the Lagrangian translation of $\pi_\varpi : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ which takes L_e to L_ψ .*

Proof Hyperkaehler identities imply that holomorphic sections of ϖ become Lagrangian sections of π_F . By [Lemma 7.10](#), the map ρ_ψ is a symplectomorphism of M , preserving the fibres of π_ϖ . By [[Symington 2003](#), Lemma 2.5], this implies that on any Arnol'd–Liouville chart $V \times T^2$, $V \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, it is of the form $(q, p) \mapsto (q, p + F(q))$, where F is the derivative of a smooth function $V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The claim is then immediate. \square

Corollary 7.12 *Let $\psi \in k \cdot \text{MW}(Y_e, \mathbb{P}^1)$ be an element of the Mordell–Weil group of Y_e fixing D pointwise, where k is the degree of the del Pezzo surface Y_e . Then ρ_ψ is Hamiltonian isotopic, via a fibre-preserving isotopy of $\pi_F : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$, to a compactly supported symplectomorphism, say ρ_ψ^c .*

Proof As $\psi \in k \cdot \text{MW}(Y_e, \mathbb{P}^1)$, the two sections s_0 and s_ψ defining ψ intersect at infinity, at an interior point of a component of $D = \varpi^{-1}(\infty)$. Thus the sections s_0 and s_ψ are smoothly isotopic near infinity; hence L_e and L_ψ are too. It then follows from [Corollary 4.8](#) that after a fibre-preserving Hamiltonian isotopy, L_e and L_ψ can be taken to agree outside a compact set. (Recall that the obstruction is the symplectic area of an annulus; one observes that it can be capped off with two Lagrangian discs, given by L_e and L_ψ , to get a closed chain; and as $\omega \in \Omega^2(M)$ is exact, the obstruction must thus vanish.) Lagrangian translation between L_e and the images of L_ψ under isotopy then gives the desired isotopy of ρ_ψ to a compactly supported symplectomorphism. \square

As before, this gives nontrivial symplectomorphisms for two cases: $k = 7$, or $k = 8$ with $X = \mathbb{F}_1$. By construction, the K -theory actions of ψ and ρ_ψ^c are mirror. For the $k = 8$ case, as there are no interior (-2) curves in Y_e , [Proposition 2.14](#) immediately implies that the maps are HMS mirrors. (For the $k = 7$ case, there is an interior I_2 fibre, and no a priori reason for the two maps not to differ by a Torelli autoequivalence generated by twists in the associated spherical objects.)

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Roger Casals for correspondence about [Remark 6.8](#); Alessio Corti and Wendelin Lutz for discussions related to [[Corti and Kaloghiros 2016](#); [Kollár et al. 2004](#)]; Abigail Ward for feedback on earlier versions of this article, including discussions around [Section 4.1](#); and Ivan Smith for explanations of [[Sheridan and Smith 2020](#)] and for detailed comments on an earlier draft.

Hacking was partially supported by NSF grants DMS-1901970, DMS-2200875 and DMS-2502339. Keating was partially supported by an award from the Isaac Newton Trust, by an EPSRC Fellowship EP/W001780/1, and the ERC starting grant SingSymp.

UKRI data access statement There is no dataset associated with this paper.

References

- [Arnol'd 1989] **VI Arnol'd**, *Mathematical methods of classical mechanics*, corrected reprint of 2nd edition, Graduate Texts in Mathematics 60, Springer (1989) [MR](#)
- [Aspinwall et al. 2009] **PS Aspinwall, T Bridgeland, A Craw, MR Douglas, M Gross, A Kapustin, G W Moore, G Segal, B Szendrői, P M H Wilson**, *Dirichlet branes and mirror symmetry*, Clay Mathematics Monographs 4, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI (2009) [MR](#)
- [Auroux 2007] **D Auroux**, *Mirror symmetry and T-duality in the complement of an anticanonical divisor*, J. Gökova Geom. Topol. GGT 1 (2007) 51–91 [MR](#)
- [Auroux et al. 2005] **D Auroux, V Muñoz, F Presas**, *Lagrangian submanifolds and Lefschetz pencils*, J. Symplectic Geom. 3:2 (2005) 171–219 [MR](#)
- [Auroux et al. 2006] **D Auroux, L Katzarkov, D Orlov**, *Mirror symmetry for del Pezzo surfaces: vanishing cycles and coherent sheaves*, Invent. Math. 166:3 (2006) 537–582 [MR](#)
- [Barth et al. 2004] **WP Barth, K Hulek, C A M Peters, A Van de Ven**, *Compact complex surfaces*, 2nd edition, Ergebnisse der Math. (3) 4, Springer (2004) [MR](#)
- [Blanc 2013] **J Blanc**, *Symplectic birational transformations of the plane*, Osaka J. Math. 50:2 (2013) 573–590 [MR](#)
- [Bridgeland 1998] **T Bridgeland**, *Fourier–Mukai transforms for elliptic surfaces*, J. Reine Angew. Math. 498 (1998) 115–133 [MR](#)
- [Bridgeland and Stern 2010] **T Bridgeland, D Stern**, *Helices on del Pezzo surfaces and tilting Calabi–Yau algebras*, Adv. Math. 224:4 (2010) 1672–1716 [MR](#)
- [Cantat and Loray 2009] **S Cantat, F Loray**, *Dynamics on character varieties and Malgrange irreducibility of Painlevé VI equation*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) 59:7 (2009) 2927–2978 [MR](#)
- [Casals 2022] **R Casals**, *Lagrangian skeleta and plane curve singularities*, J. Fixed Point Theory Appl. 24:2 (2022) art. id. 34 [MR](#)
- [Casals and Murphy 2019] **R Casals, E Murphy**, *Legendrian fronts for affine varieties*, Duke Math. J. 168:2 (2019) 225–323 [MR](#)
- [Casals and Zaslow 2022] **R Casals, E Zaslow**, *Legendrian weaves: N-graph calculus, flag moduli and applications*, Geom. Topol. 26:8 (2022) 3589–3745 [MR](#)
- [Chan and Ueda 2013] **K Chan, K Ueda**, *Dual torus fibrations and homological mirror symmetry for A_n -singularities*, Commun. Number Theory Phys. 7:2 (2013) 361–396 [MR](#)
- [Chantraine et al. 2024] **B Chantraine, G Dimitroglou Rizell, P Ghiggini, R Golovko**, *Geometric generation of the wrapped Fukaya category of Weinstein manifolds and sectors*, Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. 57:1 (2024) 1–85 [MR](#)
- [Cheung and Vianna 2021] **M-W M Cheung, R Vianna**, *Algebraic and symplectic viewpoint on compactifications of two-dimensional cluster varieties of finite type*, from “2019–20 MATRIX annals” (D R Wood, J de Gier, C E Praeger, T Tao, editors), MATRIX Book Ser. 4, Springer (2021) 567–602 [MR](#)
- [Collins et al. 2020] **T C Collins, A Jacob, Y-S Lin**, *The SYZ mirror symmetry conjecture for del Pezzo surfaces and rational elliptic surfaces*, preprint (2020) [arXiv 2012.05416](#)
- [Collins et al. 2021] **T C Collins, A Jacob, Y-S Lin**, *Special Lagrangian submanifolds of log Calabi–Yau manifolds*, Duke Math. J. 170:7 (2021) 1291–1375 [MR](#)
- [Corti and Kaloghiros 2016] **A Corti, A-S Kaloghiros**, *The Sarkisov program for Mori fibred Calabi–Yau pairs*, Algebr. Geom. 3:3 (2016) 370–384 [MR](#)
- [Corti et al. 2022] **A Corti, M Filip, A Petracci**, *Mirror symmetry and smoothing Gorenstein toric affine 3-folds*, from “Facets of algebraic geometry, I” (P Aluffi, D Anderson, M Hering, M Mustață, S Payne, editors), London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser. 472, Cambridge Univ. Press (2022) 132–163 [MR](#)
- [Duistermaat 1980] **J J Duistermaat**, *On global action-angle coordinates*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 33:6 (1980) 687–706 [MR](#)

- [Ekholm et al. 2016] **T Ekholm, K Honda, T Kálmán**, *Legendrian knots and exact Lagrangian cobordisms*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. 18:11 (2016) 2627–2689 [MR](#)
- [Engel 2018] **P Engel**, *Looijenga’s conjecture via integral-affine geometry*, J. Differential Geom. 109:3 (2018) 467–495 [MR](#)
- [Engel and Friedman 2021] **P Engel, R Friedman**, *Smoothings and rational double point adjacencies for cusp singularities*, J. Differential Geom. 118:1 (2021) 23–100 [MR](#)
- [Evans 2011] **JD Evans**, *Symplectic mapping class groups of some Stein and rational surfaces*, J. Symplectic Geom. 9:1 (2011) 45–82 [MR](#)
- [Fock and Goncharov 2009] **V V Fock, A B Goncharov**, *Cluster ensembles, quantization and the dilogarithm, II: The intertwiner*, from “Algebra, arithmetic, and geometry: in honor of Yu. I. Manin, I” (Y Tschinkel, Y Zarhin, editors), Progr. Math. 269, Birkhäuser, Boston, MA (2009) 655–673 [MR](#)
- [Friedman 2013] **R Friedman**, *On the ample cone of a rational surface with an anticanonical cycle*, Algebra Number Theory 7:6 (2013) 1481–1504 [MR](#)
- [Friedman 2015] **R Friedman**, *On the geometry of anticanonical pairs*, preprint (2015) [arXiv 1502.02560](#)
- [Ganatra et al. 2020] **S Ganatra, J Pardon, V Shende**, *Covariantly functorial wrapped Floer theory on Liouville sectors*, Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. 131 (2020) 73–200 [MR](#)
- [Ganatra et al. 2024] **S Ganatra, J Pardon, V Shende**, *Sectorial descent for wrapped Fukaya categories*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 37:2 (2024) 499–635 [MR](#)
- [Gao et al. 2024] **H Gao, L Shen, D Weng**, *Augmentations, fillings, and clusters*, Geom. Funct. Anal. 34:3 (2024) 798–867 [MR](#)
- [Gromov 1985] **M Gromov**, *Pseudo holomorphic curves in symplectic manifolds*, Invent. Math. 82:2 (1985) 307–347 [MR](#)
- [Gross 1998] **M Gross**, *Special Lagrangian fibrations, I: Topology*, from “Integrable systems and algebraic geometry” (Kobe/Kyoto, 1997) (M-H Saito, Y Shimizu, K Ueno, editors), World Sci., River Edge, NJ (1998) 156–193 [MR](#)
- [Gross et al. 2015a] **M Gross, P Hacking, S Keel**, *Mirror symmetry for log Calabi–Yau surfaces, I*, Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. 122 (2015) 65–168 [MR](#)
- [Gross et al. 2015b] **M Gross, P Hacking, S Keel**, *Moduli of surfaces with an anti-canonical cycle*, Compos. Math. 151:2 (2015) 265–291 [MR](#)
- [Gross et al. 2018] **M Gross, P Hacking, S Keel, M Kontsevich**, *Canonical bases for cluster algebras*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 31:2 (2018) 497–608 [MR](#)
- [Hacking and Keating 2022] **P Hacking, A Keating**, *Homological mirror symmetry for log Calabi–Yau surfaces*, Geom. Topol. 26:8 (2022) 3747–3833 [MR](#)
- [Hanlon 2019] **A Hanlon**, *Monodromy of monomially admissible Fukaya–Seidel categories mirror to toric varieties*, Adv. Math. 350 (2019) 662–746 [MR](#)
- [Hanlon and Hicks 2022] **A Hanlon, J Hicks**, *Aspects of functoriality in homological mirror symmetry for toric varieties*, Adv. Math. 401 (2022) art. id. 108317 [MR](#)
- [Hanlon and Ward \geq 2026] **A Hanlon, A Ward**, *Tropical Lagrangian sections and Looijenga pairs*, in preparation
- [Hartshorne 1977] **R Hartshorne**, *Algebraic geometry*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics 52, Springer (1977) [MR](#)
- [Hicks 2021] **J Hicks**, *Tropical Lagrangians in toric del Pezzo surfaces*, Selecta Math. 27:1 (2021) art. id. 3 [MR](#)
- [Huybrechts 2006] **D Huybrechts**, *Fourier–Mukai transforms in algebraic geometry*, Oxford Univ. Press (2006) [MR](#)
- [Huybrechts 2016] **D Huybrechts**, *Lectures on K3 surfaces*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics 158, Cambridge Univ. Press (2016) [MR](#)
- [Ishii and Uehara 2005] **A Ishii, H Uehara**, *Autoequivalences of derived categories on the minimal resolutions of A_n -singularities on surfaces*, J. Differential Geom. 71:3 (2005) 385–435 [MR](#)
- [Keating 2015] **A Keating**, *Lagrangian tori in four-dimensional Milnor fibres*, Geom. Funct. Anal. 25:6 (2015) 1822–1901 [MR](#)
- [Keating 2018] **A Keating**, *Homological mirror symmetry for hypersurface cusp singularities*, Selecta Math. 24:2 (2018) 1411–1452 [MR](#)
- [Keating 2021] **A Keating**, *Families of monotone Lagrangians in Brieskorn–Pham hypersurfaces*, Math. Ann. 380:3–4 (2021) 975–1035 [MR](#)

- [Keating and Ward 2024] **A Keating, A Ward**, *A universal mirror to (\mathbb{P}^2, Ω) as a birational object*, preprint (2024) [arXiv 2408.03764](#)
- [Kollár et al. 2004] **J Kollár, K E Smith, A Corti**, *Rational and nearly rational varieties*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics 92, Cambridge Univ. Press (2004) [MR](#)
- [Kontsevich 1998] **M Kontsevich**, *Lectures at ENS Paris*, set of notes taken by J. Bellaïche, J.-F. Dat, I. Marin, G. Racinet and H. Randriambololona (1998)
- [Kontsevich and Soibelman 2006] **M Kontsevich, Y Soibelman**, *Affine structures and non-Archimedean analytic spaces*, from “The unity of mathematics” (P Etingof, V Retakh, IM Singer, editors), Progr. Math. 244, Birkhäuser, Boston, MA (2006) 321–385 [MR](#)
- [Lalonde and Pinsonnault 2004] **F Lalonde, M Pinsonnault**, *The topology of the space of symplectic balls in rational 4-manifolds*, Duke Math. J. 122:2 (2004) 347–397 [MR](#)
- [Lekili and Polishchuk 2017] **Y Lekili, A Polishchuk**, *Arithmetic mirror symmetry for genus 1 curves with n marked points*, Selecta Math. 23:3 (2017) 1851–1907 [MR](#)
- [Li 2021] **J Li**, *A cone conjecture for log Calabi–Yau surfaces*, PhD thesis, University of Massachusetts, Amherst (2021) Available at <https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14394/18496>
- [Looijenga 1981] **E Looijenga**, *Rational surfaces with an anticanonical cycle*, Ann. of Math. 114:2 (1981) 267–322 [MR](#)
- [Mak and Wu 2018] **C Y Mak, W Wu**, *Dehn twist exact sequences through Lagrangian cobordism*, Compos. Math. 154:12 (2018) 2485–2533 [MR](#)
- [McMullen 2007] **C T McMullen**, *Dynamics on blowups of the projective plane*, Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. 105 (2007) 49–89 [MR](#)
- [Pan 2017] **Y Pan**, *Exact Lagrangian fillings of Legendrian $(2, n)$ torus links*, Pacific J. Math. 289:2 (2017) 417–441 [MR](#)
- [Pascaleff and Tonkonog 2020] **J Pascaleff, D Tonkonog**, *The wall-crossing formula and Lagrangian mutations*, Adv. Math. 361 (2020) 106850, 67 [MR](#)
- [Perutz 2008] **T Perutz**, *A symplectic Gysin sequence*, preprint (2008) [arXiv 0807.1863](#)
- [Seidel 1999] **P Seidel**, *Lagrangian two-spheres can be symplectically knotted*, J. Differential Geom. 52:1 (1999) 145–171 [MR](#)
- [Seidel 2000] **P Seidel**, *Graded Lagrangian submanifolds*, Bull. Soc. Math. France 128:1 (2000) 103–149 [MR](#)
- [Seidel 2001] **P Seidel**, *More about vanishing cycles and mutation*, from “Symplectic geometry and mirror symmetry” (Seoul, 2000) (K Fukaya, Y-G Oh, K Ono, G Tian, editors), World Sci., River Edge, NJ (2001) 429–465 [MR](#)
- [Seidel 2003] **P Seidel**, *A long exact sequence for symplectic Floer cohomology*, Topology 42:5 (2003) 1003–1063 [MR](#)
- [Seidel 2008] **P Seidel**, *Fukaya categories and Picard–Lefschetz theory*, Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich (2008) [MR](#)
- [Seidel 2013] **P Seidel**, *Lecture notes on Categorical Dynamics and Symplectic Topology*, lecture notes (2013) Available at <https://math.mit.edu/~seidel/texts/937-lecture-notes.pdf>
- [Seidel 2017] **P Seidel**, *Fukaya A_∞ -structures associated to Lefschetz fibrations, II*, from “Algebra, geometry, and physics in the 21st century” (D Auroux, L Katzarkov, T Pantev, Y Soibelman, Y Tschinkel, editors), Progr. Math. 324, Springer (2017) 295–364 [MR](#)
- [Seidel and Thomas 2001] **P Seidel, R Thomas**, *Braid group actions on derived categories of coherent sheaves*, Duke Math. J. 108:1 (2001) 37–108 [MR](#)
- [Shende et al. 2016] **V Shende, D Treumann, H Williams**, *On the combinatorics of exact Lagrangian surfaces*, preprint (2016) [arXiv 1603.07449](#)
- [Shende et al. 2019] **V Shende, D Treumann, H Williams, E Zaslow**, *Cluster varieties from Legendrian knots*, Duke Math. J. 168:15 (2019) 2801–2871 [MR](#)
- [Sheridan and Smith 2020] **N Sheridan, I Smith**, *Symplectic topology of $K3$ surfaces via mirror symmetry*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 33:3 (2020) 875–915 [MR](#)
- [Shevchishin and Smirnov 2020] **V Shevchishin, G Smirnov**, *Elliptic diffeomorphisms of symplectic 4-manifolds*, J. Symplectic Geom. 18:5 (2020) 1247–1283 [MR](#)

- [Shioda 1990] **T Shioda**, *On the Mordell–Weil lattices*, Comment. Math. Univ. St. Paul. 39:2 (1990) 211–240 [MR](#)
- [Simonetti 2021] **A Simonetti**, *Equivariant smoothings of cusp singularities*, PhD thesis, University of Massachusetts, Amherst (2021) Available at <https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14394/18675>
- [Subotic 2010] **A Subotic**, *A monoidal structure for the Fukaya category*, PhD thesis, Harvard University (2010) [MR](#) Available at <https://www.proquest.com/docview/614155983>
- [Sylvan 2019] **Z Sylvan**, *On partially wrapped Fukaya categories*, J. Topol. 12:2 (2019) 372–441 [MR](#)
- [Symington 2003] **M Symington**, *Four dimensions from two in symplectic topology*, from “Topology and geometry of manifolds” (Athens, GA, 2001) (G Matic, C McCrory, editors), Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. 71, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI (2003) 153–208 [MR](#)
- [Tian and Yau 1990] **G Tian, S-T Yau**, *Complete Kähler manifolds with zero Ricci curvature, I*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 3:3 (1990) 579–609 [MR](#)
- [Torricelli 2020] **B C Torricelli**, *Model projective twists and generalised lantern relations*, preprint (2020) [arXiv 2008.02758](#)
- [Treumann and Zaslow 2018] **D Treumann, E Zaslow**, *Cubic planar graphs and Legendrian surface theory*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. 22:5 (2018) 1289–1345 [MR](#)
- [Uehara 2016] **H Uehara**, *Autoequivalences of derived categories of elliptic surfaces with non-zero Kodaira dimension*, Algebr. Geom. 3:5 (2016) 543–577 [MR](#)
- [Uehara 2019] **H Uehara**, *A trichotomy for the autoequivalence groups on smooth projective surfaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 371:5 (2019) 3529–3547 [MR](#)
- [Vianna 2014] **R Vianna**, *On exotic Lagrangian tori in $\mathbb{C}P^2$* , Geom. Topol. 18:4 (2014) 2419–2476 [MR](#)
- [Vianna 2017] **R Vianna**, *Infinitely many monotone Lagrangian tori in del Pezzo surfaces*, Selecta Math. 23:3 (2017) 1955–1996 [MR](#)
- [Wehrheim and Woodward 2016] **K Wehrheim, C T Woodward**, *Exact triangle for fibered Dehn twists*, Res. Math. Sci. 3 (2016) art. id. 17 [MR](#)

PAUL HACKING hacking@math.umass.edu

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA, United States

AILSA KEATING amk50@cam.ac.uk

Department of Pure Mathematics and Mathematical Statistics, Centre for Mathematical Sciences
University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom

Proposed: Mohammed Abouzaid

Seconded: Ulrike Tillmann, András I Stipsicz

Received: March 29, 2024

Revised: April 23, 2025

GEOMETRY & TOPOLOGY

msp.org/gt

MANAGING EDITORS

Robert Lipshitz University of Oregon
lipshitz@uoregon.edu
András I Stipsicz Alfréd Rényi Institute of Mathematics
stipsicz@renyi.hu

BOARD OF EDITORS

Mohammed Abouzaid	Stanford University abouzaid@stanford.edu	Rob Kirby	University of California, Berkeley kirby@math.berkeley.edu
Dan Abramovich	Brown University dan_abramovich@brown.edu	Bruce Kleiner	NYU, Courant Institute bkleiner@cims.nyu.edu
Ian Agol	University of California, Berkeley ianagol@math.berkeley.edu	Sándor Kovács	University of Washington skovacs@uw.edu
Arend Bayer	University of Edinburgh arend.bayer@ed.ac.uk	Urs Lang	ETH Zürich urs.lang@math.ethz.ch
Agnès Beaudry	University of Colorado Boulder agnes.beaudry@colorado.edu	Marc Levine	University of Washington marc.levine@uni-due.de
Mark Behrens	University of Notre Dame mbehren1@nd.edu	Jianfeng Lin	Tsinghua University linjian5477@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn
Mladen Bestvina	University of Utah bestvina@math.utah.edu	Ciprian Manolescu	University of California, Los Angeles cm@math.ucla.edu
Martin R Bridson	University of Oxford bridson@maths.ox.ac.uk	Haynes R Miller	Massachusetts Institute of Technology hmr@math.mit.edu
Tobias H Colding	Massachusetts Institute of Technology colding@math.mit.edu	Aaron Naber	Institute for Advanced Studies anaber@ias.edu
Simon Donaldson	Imperial College, London s.donaldson@ic.ac.uk	Peter Ozsváth	Princeton University petero@math.princeton.edu
Yasha Eliashberg	Stanford University eliash-gt@math.stanford.edu	Leonid Polterovich	Tel Aviv University polterov@post.tau.ac.il
David M Fisher	Rice University davidfisher@rice.edu	Colin Rourke	University of Warwick gt@maths.warwick.ac.uk
Mike Freedman	Microsoft Research michaelf@microsoft.com	Roman Sauer	Karlsruhe Institute of Technology roman.sauer@kit.edu
David Gabai	Princeton University gabai@princeton.edu	Stefan Schwede	Universität Bonn schwede@math.uni-bonn.de
Stavros Garoufalidis	Southern U. of Sci. and Tech., China stavros@mpim-bonn.mpg.de	Natasa Sesum	Rutgers University natasas@math.rutgers.edu
Cameron Gordon	University of Texas gordon@math.utexas.edu	Gang Tian	Massachusetts Institute of Technology tian@math.mit.edu
Jesper Grodal	University of Copenhagen jg@math.ku.dk	Nathalie Wahl	University of Copenhagen wahl@math.ku.dk
Misha Gromov	IHES and NYU, Courant Institute gromov@ihes.fr	Kirsten Wickelgren	Duke University kirsten.wickelgren@duke.edu
Mark Gross	University of Cambridge mgross@dpms.cam.ac.uk	Anna Wienhard	Universität Heidelberg wienhard@mathi.uni-heidelberg.de

See inside back cover or msp.org/gt for submission instructions.

The subscription price for 2026 is US \$905/year for the electronic version, and \$1275/year (+\$80, if shipping outside the US) for print and electronic. Subscriptions, requests for back issues and changes of subscriber address should be sent to MSP. Geometry & Topology is indexed by [Mathematical Reviews](#), [Zentralblatt MATH](#), [Current Mathematical Publications](#) and the [Science Citation Index](#).

Geometry & Topology (ISSN 1465-3060 printed, 1364-0380 electronic) is published 9 times per year and continuously online, by Mathematical Sciences Publishers, 2000 Allston Way # 59, Berkeley, CA 94701-4004. Periodical rate postage paid at Oakland, CA 94615-9651, and additional mailing offices. POSTMASTER: send address changes to Mathematical Sciences Publishers, 2000 Allston Way # 59, Berkeley, CA 94701-4004.

GT peer review and production are managed by EditFLOW[®] from MSP.

PUBLISHED BY

 **mathematical sciences publishers**
nonprofit scientific publishing
<http://msp.org/>

© 2026 Mathematical Sciences Publishers

GEOMETRY & TOPOLOGY

Volume 30 Issue 2 (pages 389–833) 2026

Graph cobordisms and Heegaard Floer homology	389
IAN ZEMKE	
Trivalent vertices and bordered knot Floer homology in the standard basis	529
ANDREW MANION	
Symplectomorphisms of some Weinstein 4-manifolds	645
PAUL HACKING and AILSA KEATING	
A Weiss–Williams theorem for spaces of embeddings and the homotopy type of spaces of long knots	701
SAMUEL MUÑOZ-ECHÁNIZ	
Cables of the figure-eight knot via real Frøyshov invariants	781
SUNGKYUNG KANG, JUNGHWAN PARK and MASAKI TANIGUCHI	