

Explicit concave fillings of contact three-manifolds

David T. Gay

Mathematics Department, University of Arizona

617 N. Santa Rita, P.O. Box 210089

Tucson AZ 85721, U.S.A.

email: dtgay@math.arizona.edu

October 26, 2018

1 Introduction

Suppose that (X, ω) is a symplectic manifold and that there exists a Liouville vector field V defined in a neighborhood of and transverse to $M = \partial X$. Then V induces a contact form $\alpha = \iota_V \omega|_M$ on M which determines the germ of ω along M . One should think of the contact manifold $(M, \xi = \ker \alpha)$ as controlling the behavior of ω “at infinity”. If V points out of X along M then we call (X, ω) a *convex filling* of (M, ξ) , and if V points into X along M then we call (X, ω) a *concave filling* of (M, ξ) .

Much attention has been given in recent years to constructions of convex fillings of contact 3-manifolds; see [11] for example. Etnyre and Honda [7] very recently began a careful investigation of concave fillings and proved that every compact, oriented, contact 3-manifold has (infinitely many) concave fillings, but their proof depends on a result of Lisca and Matic [14] that every Stein surface embeds as a domain in a closed Kähler manifold. This result is not explicitly constructive and in particular does not give handlebody decompositions of the concave fillings. In this paper we present a method to explicitly construct, handle by handle, concave fillings of contact 3-manifolds, without reference to the result of Lisca and Matic. The main theorem we prove is:

Theorem 1.1. *Every closed, oriented, contact 3-manifold has a concave filling and, furthermore, a handlebody decomposition of the filling can be given explicitly in terms of the contact structure.*

While the author was writing this paper Akbulut and Ozbagci [2] presented, using different techniques, a constructive proof of the fact that every Stein surface embeds in a closed symplectic 4-manifold. The reader will also find some common themes in an earlier paper by Akbulut and Ozbagci [1].

The author would like to thank Emmanuel Giroux for helpful correspondence regarding his recent results, Ichiro Torisu for pointing out Giroux's results to the author and the Nankai Institute of Mathematics for support and hospitality.

2 Tools and building blocks

Henceforth in this paper, unless explicitly stated otherwise, we adopt the following conventions: All manifolds are compact and oriented, and all 3-manifolds are closed. All contact structures are positive, and all symplectic manifolds are oriented by their symplectic structures. For the basic definitions in symplectic and contact topology the reader is referred to [15] and [16].

We will build our concave fillings by glueing together symplectic cobordisms, which we now define. Let (X, ω) be a symplectic 4-manifold and let M_1 and M_2 be two 3-manifolds with $\partial X = (-M_1) \amalg M_2$. Suppose there exists a Liouville vector field V defined on a neighborhood of and transverse to ∂X , pointing in along M_1 and out along M_2 , and let ξ_i be the induced contact structure on M_i . In this situation, following [6] and [7], we call (X, ω) a symplectic cobordism from (M_1, ξ_1) to (M_2, ξ_2) and we indicate the existence of such a cobordism with the notation $(M_1, \xi_1) \prec (M_2, \xi_2)$. Note that this relation is not reflexive, but it is transitive: If (X_i, ω_i) is a symplectic cobordism from (M_i, ξ_i) to (M_{i+1}, ξ_{i+1}) , for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, then it is possible to glue (X_1, ω_1) to (X_2, ω_2) (after attaching a symplectic collar on (X_1, ω_1) and possibly multiplying ω_2 by a positive constant) to form a symplectic cobordism from (M_1, ξ_1) to (M_3, ξ_3) .

A convex filling of (M, ξ) is thus a symplectic cobordism from \emptyset to (M, ξ) while a concave filling of (M, ξ) is a symplectic cobordism from (M, ξ) to \emptyset .

Given any contact 3-manifold (M, ξ) , the most basic building block is a cobordism (X, ω) from (M, ξ) to itself constructed as follows: Let α be any contact form for ξ and let $\omega = d(e^s \alpha)$ on $\mathbb{R} \times M$, where s is the \mathbb{R}

coordinate. Then ω is a symplectic form and ∂_s is a Liouville vector field inducing the contact form $e^f \alpha$ on the graph of any function $f: M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, so for any two functions $f < g$ on M we can construct a cobordism $X = \{(s, p) \mid f(p) \leq s \leq g(p)\} \subset \mathbb{R} \times M$. Use of this building block will often be assumed without explicit mention, but it is essential for all of our constructions, and in particular for the fact that cobordisms can be glued together.

Our main construction depends on the recent discovery of close connections between contact structures and open book decompositions, culminating in the work of Giroux [9]. To discuss open book decompositions, we begin with conventions regarding mapping class groups. If Σ is a compact surface with boundary, we take the mapping class group of Σ to be the group of orientation-preserving self-homeomorphisms of Σ fixing $\partial\Sigma$ pointwise, modulo isotopies fixing $\partial\Sigma$ pointwise. We denote this mapping class group by $\mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$. We multiply elements of $\mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$ in the same order in which we compose functions, and in fact we will generally blur the distinction between a homeomorphism $h: \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$ and its equivalence class $h \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$. If $\Sigma' \supset \Sigma$ is another compact surface, there is a natural inclusion $\mathcal{M}(\Sigma) \subset \mathcal{M}(\Sigma')$ given by extending $h \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$ to be the identity on $\Sigma' \setminus \Sigma$.

By “polar coordinates” on a solid torus $D^2 \times S^1$ we will mean coordinates (r, μ, λ) , where (r, μ) are polar coordinates on D^2 and $\lambda \in S^1$. By polar coordinates near a link L we will mean polar coordinates on a neighborhood of each component of L such that $L = \{r = 0\}$.

An open book decomposition of a 3-manifold M is a non-empty link $L \subset M$ and a fibration $p: M \setminus L \rightarrow S^1$ such that near L we can find polar coordinates (r, μ, λ) with respect to which $p = \mu$. The link L is called the “binding” and the union of a fiber with L is called a “page”. From such a structure we get the following data:

1. The topological type of a page, a compact, oriented surface Σ with $\partial\Sigma = L$.
2. The monodromy h , the element of $\mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$ represented by the return map for flow along any vector field V on $M \setminus L$ which is transverse to the pages and is meridional near L (i.e. $V = \partial_\mu$ in polar coordinates near L).

We will often refer to the pair (Σ, h) as the open book decomposition, and the manifold with this open book decomposition as $B(\Sigma, h)$. We identify $B(\Sigma, h)$ with $(\Sigma \times [0, 2\pi]) / \sim$ where $(p, 2\pi) \sim (h(p), 0)$ for all $p \in \Sigma$ and $(p, s) \sim (p, t)$

for all $p \in \partial\Sigma$ and all $s, t \in [0, 2\pi]$. The pages are $\Sigma \times \{t\}/\sim$ and the binding is $L = (\partial\Sigma \times \{t\})/\sim$. Notice that $B(\Sigma, h) = B(-\Sigma, h^{-1}) = -B(\Sigma, h^{-1})$.

A contact vector field for a contact structure ξ is a vector field V such that flow along V preserves ξ . A Reeb vector field for ξ is a contact vector field which is transverse to ξ . Every Reeb vector field V arises from a contact form α for ξ as the unique vector field satisfying $\iota_V d\alpha = 0$ and $\alpha(V) = 1$.

Definition 2.1. Let us say that a vector field V on M respects a given open book decomposition of M if V is transverse to the pages, tangent to the binding, and satisfies the following orientation condition: V co-orient and hence orients each page, and also orients the binding, and we require that this orientation of the binding agree with its orientation as the boundary of a page. A contact structure ξ on M is *supported* by a given open book decomposition if there exists a Reeb vector field for ξ which respects the open book decomposition

The first result below is due, in various versions, to Giroux [9], Torisu [18], and Thurston and Winkelnkemper [17]

Theorem 2.2. *Every open book decomposition of a 3-manifold M supports a unique (up to isotopy) contact structure on M .*

Thurston and Winkelnkemper proved existence without mentioning uniqueness. Torisu proved existence and uniqueness, but using a different relationship between the contact structure and the open book decomposition defined in terms of convex Heegaard splittings. We will discuss Torisu's version in section 4. Finally Giroux pointed out a simple argument for the uniqueness. This result becomes most powerful when coupled with the following theorem.

Theorem 2.3 (Giroux [9]). *Every contact structure on a 3-manifold M is supported by an open book decomposition of M .*

Given an open book decomposition (Σ, h) , we will refer to the unique supported contact structure on $B(\Sigma, h)$ as $\xi(\Sigma, h)$, and we will abbreviate with the notation $\mathfrak{B}(\Sigma, h) = (B(\Sigma, h), \xi(\Sigma, h))$.

Remark 2.4. If Σ is a disk and $h = 1$ then $B(\Sigma, h) = S^3$ and $\xi(\Sigma, h)$ is the standard contact structure ξ_0 on S^3 . The 4-ball with its standard symplectic form is a symplectic cobordism from \emptyset to (S^3, ξ_0) .

Remark 2.5. As a generalization, if Σ is any compact surface with $\partial\Sigma \neq \emptyset$ and $h = 1$, and if we let X be $\Sigma \times D^2$ with “rounded corners” and ω be the sum of a volume form on Σ and a volume form on D^2 , then (X, ω) is a symplectic cobordism from \emptyset to $\mathfrak{B}(\Sigma, h)$. We will call this the standard convex filling of $\mathfrak{B}(\Sigma, 1)$.

The strategy of this paper is to translate cobordism questions for contact 3-manifolds into questions about the relationship between mapping class group elements of various surfaces. We will rely on the following fundamental fact:

Theorem 2.6 (Dehn [3] and Lickorish [13]). *The mapping class group of a surface is generated by Dehn twists.*

It is important to distinguish between right-handed and left-handed Dehn twists. A right-handed Dehn twist about a simple closed curve C is the twist τ_C such that, if γ is an arc transverse to C and we travel along γ towards C , $\tau_C(\gamma)$ diverges from γ by forking off to the right, going around C and then rejoining γ on the other side of C . This distinction depends on the orientation of Σ but not of C . We will shorten the phrase “right-handed Dehn twist” to “right twist”. If we are given a single curve C , we will use the notation τ_C to refer to the right twist about C . If we are given a sequence of curves $\{C_i\}$, we will use the notation τ_i to refer to the right twist about C_i . It will also be important to distinguish between twists about homologically trivial and nontrivial curves. We will call a twist about a homologically nontrivial curve a homologically nontrivial twist.

We now present the fundamental building blocks for our constructions. Throughout, suppose we are given a pair (Σ, h) , where Σ is a compact surface with $\partial\Sigma \neq \emptyset$ and $h \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$.

The first two results below are more or less immediate consequences of results of Eliashberg [5] and Weinstein [20] on symplectic handlebodies, reinterpreted in the context of supporting open book decompositions. As stated here the results are probably well known to experts, but for completeness we will provide proofs in section 4.

Proposition 2.7. *Let Σ' be Σ with a 2-dimensional 1-handle attached (at points $p, q \in \partial\Sigma$). Then $\mathfrak{B}(\Sigma, h) \prec \mathfrak{B}(\Sigma', h)$, and the cobordism is diffeomorphic to $[-1, 0] \times B(\Sigma, h)$ with a 4-dimensional 1-handle attached to $\{0\} \times B(\Sigma, h)$ (at the corresponding points p and q in the binding).*

Note that this result is straightforward if we ignore the contact and symplectic structures; simply observe that the pages intersect the boundary S^2 of each foot of the 1-handle in longitudes running from the north to the south pole, and that these extend across the surgery as 2-dimensional 1-handles attached to each page

To discuss 2-handles, notice that a knot K lying in a page of an open book decomposition is given a framing by a vector tangent to the page and transverse to the knot; call this the page-framing of the knot and abbreviate it $\text{pf}(K)$.

Proposition 2.8. *Let $h' = h \circ \tau_C$, where τ_C is a right twist along a homologically nontrivial curve $C \subset \Sigma \setminus \partial\Sigma$. Then $\mathfrak{B}(\Sigma, h) \prec \mathfrak{B}(\Sigma, h')$, and the cobordism is diffeomorphic to $[-1, 0] \times B(\Sigma, h)$ with a 4-dimensional 2-handle attached along $C \subset \Sigma \times \{t\} \subset \{0\} \times B(\Sigma, h)$ with framing $\text{pf}(C) - 1$.*

Remark 2.9. This proposition without the contact structures is simply the familiar observation due to Lickorish [13] that surgery on a knot $C \subset M$ with framing -1 relative to a surface $F \supset C$ is equivalent to splitting M along F and reglueing with a right twist along C . The requirement that C be homologically nontrivial does not arise if we ignore the contact structures.

One should think of the above two propositions as giving two allowable moves on the set of pairs (Σ, h) . We will refer to the first move as “attaching a 1-handle” and to the second move as “appending a homologically nontrivial right twist”.

Remark 2.10. A standard fact about Dehn twists is that, if $g: \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$ is any orientation-preserving homeomorphism and $C \subset \Sigma$ is a simple closed curve, then $g \circ \tau_C \circ g^{-1} = \tau_{g(C)}$. Now suppose we are given a pair (Σ, h) , where $h = h_1 \circ h_2$ for $h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$, and let $D = h_2^{-1}(C)$. Then the operation of replacing (Σ, h) with $(\Sigma, h_1 \circ \tau_C \circ h_2)$ is the same as replacing (Σ, h) with $(\Sigma, h \circ \tau_D)$. Thus we can immediately generalize the second move to allow “inserting a homologically nontrivial right twist”. In other words, if $h' = h_1 \circ \tau_C \circ h_2$, then $\mathfrak{B}(\Sigma, h) \prec \mathfrak{B}(\Sigma, h')$.

The next result follows from earlier work by this author [8] on attaching symplectic 2-handles along transverse knots; here we will attach 2-handles along the binding of an open book decomposition. Notice that each component K of the binding is given a framing as a boundary component of a page;

call this the page-framing for the binding and again abbreviate it $\text{pf}(K)$. By a right twist about a component C of $\partial\Sigma$, we really mean a right twist about a curve parallel to C .

Proposition 2.11. *Let $h' = \delta \circ h^{-1}$, where δ is the product of one right twist around each component of $\partial\Sigma$. Then $(\mathfrak{B}(\Sigma, h) \amalg \mathfrak{B}(\Sigma, h')) \prec \emptyset$. The cobordism is diffeomorphic to $[-1, 0] \times B(\Sigma, h)$ with a 4-dimensional 2-handle attached to $\{0\} \times B(\Sigma, h)$ along each component K of the binding with framing $\text{pf}(K) + 1$.*

In section 4, we will show how this follows from the results in [8].

A key point in our construction will depend on a relation among right twists called the “chain relation” by Wajnryb [19]. A sequence of simple closed curves $\{C_1, \dots, C_n\}$ in a surface Σ is called a *chain* if each C_i intersects each C_{i+1} transversely in exactly one point.

Proposition 2.12 (Lemma 21 in [19]). *Let $\{C_1, \dots, C_n\}$ be a chain in a surface Σ and let N be a regular neighborhood of $C_1 \cup \dots \cup C_n$. If n is even then ∂N has one component. Let τ_i be a right twist about C_i and let δ be a right twist about ∂N . Then the following relation holds:*

$$(\tau_1 \circ \tau_2 \circ \dots \circ \tau_n)^{2n+2} = \delta$$

Remark 2.13. There is a similar relation when n is odd and ∂N has two components, which could be used here as well, but for simplicity we only work with the case where n is even.

Remark 2.14. Notice that the regular neighborhood N is actually a surface of genus $n/2$ with one disk removed. Any surface Σ of genus g with one boundary component contains a chain $\{C_1, \dots, C_{2g}\}$ such that Σ is a regular neighborhood of $C_1 \cup \dots \cup C_{2g}$. Given such a Σ and a fixed homologically nontrivial simple closed curve $C \subset \Sigma$, we may choose the chain so that $C = C_1$. Furthermore all the curves in such a chain are necessarily homologically nontrivial.

3 How to put the building blocks together

Lemma 3.1. *Given a pair (Σ, h) , where Σ is a compact surface with $\partial\Sigma \neq \emptyset$ and $h \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$, there exists a pair (Σ_1, h_1) obtained from (Σ, h) by adding 1-handles and inserting homologically nontrivial right twists (see remark 2.10) such that:*

- Σ_1 has one boundary component and,
- $h_1 = \delta \circ R^{-1}$, where δ is a right twist about $\partial\Sigma_1$ and R is a composition of homologically nontrivial right twists.

Proof. By attaching 1-handles, we can get from (Σ, h) to (Σ_0, h) where $\Sigma_0 \supset \Sigma$ has one boundary component. By theorem 2.6, h is equal to a product of right-handed and left-handed Dehn twists. First note that each homologically trivial right or left twist is equal to a product of homologically nontrivial right or left (respectively) twists, due to the chain relation (proposition 2.12). To see this, observe that any homologically trivial curve $C \subset \Sigma_0$ is the boundary of a compact subsurface of Σ_0 . Thus we may assume that all the twists are homologically nontrivial. Let a be the genus of Σ_0 and let δ_0 be a right twist about $\partial\Sigma_0$.

Now suppose we express h as $h = A \circ \tau_C \circ B$ where τ_C is a right twist about the homologically nontrivial curve C and A and B are arbitrary elements of $\mathcal{M}(\Sigma_0)$. Then we may find a chain $\{C_1, \dots, C_{2a}\}$ in Σ_0 , with $C = C_1$, such that:

$$\delta_0 = (\tau_1 \circ \dots \circ \tau_{2a})^{4a+2}$$

Thus by inserting homologically nontrivial right twists we can change h to $A \circ \delta_0 \circ B = \delta_0 \circ A \circ B$ (since boundary twists commute with interior twists). Repeating this process for every right twist in h , we can change h to $\delta_0^n \circ L$ where L is a product of homologically nontrivial left twists and n is some (possibly large) positive integer. Our task is to reduce n to 1. Note that, by inserting more right twists if necessary, we may assume that n is odd. We write $L = R^{-1}$ where R is the corresponding product of right twists.

Add more 1-handles to Σ_0 to get $\Sigma_1 \supset \Sigma_0$, with $\partial\Sigma_1$ connected and with the genus b of Σ_1 equal to $an + (n - 1)/2$, so that $(4a + 2)n = 4b + 2$. Fix a particular chain $\{C_1, \dots, C_{2b}\}$ in Σ_1 such that Σ_0 is a regular neighborhood of $\{C_1, \dots, C_{2a}\}$ and Σ_1 is a regular neighborhood of $\{C_1, \dots, C_{2b}\}$. Then we have:

$$\delta_0^n = (\tau_1 \circ \dots \circ \tau_{2a})^{(4a+2)n} = (\tau_1 \circ \dots \circ \tau_{2a})^{4b+2}$$

Thus, by inserting homologically nontrivial right twists we can change this expression to:

$$\delta = (\tau_1 \circ \dots \circ \tau_{2b})^{4b+2}$$

Finally this shows that $\delta_0^n \circ L = \delta_0^n \circ R^{-1}$ may be changed to $\delta \circ R^{-1}$ by inserting right twists. \square

Proof of theorem 1.1. Given a contact 3-manifold (M, ξ) , theorem 2.3 tells us that (M, ξ) is supported by an open book decomposition, with page Σ and monodromy h . Apply lemma 3.1 to get a new pair (Σ_1, h_1) with $h_1 = \delta \circ R^{-1}$ as in the lemma. Since we only added 1-handles and inserted right twists, propositions 2.7 and 2.8 tell us that $(M, \xi) = \mathfrak{B}(\Sigma, h) \prec \mathfrak{B}(\Sigma_1, h_1)$. Consider the pair $(\Sigma_1, \delta \circ h_1^{-1})$ as in proposition 2.11 and notice that $\delta \circ h_1^{-1} = R$, a composition of homologically nontrivial right twists. Let D be a disk and 1 the identity in $\mathcal{M}(D)$. Then we can get from the pair $(D, 1)$ to (Σ_1, R) by attaching 1-handles and inserting homologically nontrivial right twists, so that $\emptyset \prec (S^3, \xi_0) \prec \mathfrak{B}(\Sigma_1, R)$ (see remark 2.4). Thus we have the following cobordism:

$$(M, \xi) = (M, \xi) \amalg \emptyset \prec \mathfrak{B}(\Sigma_1, h_1) \amalg \mathfrak{B}(\Sigma_1, \delta \circ h_1^{-1})$$

Finally, apply proposition 2.11 to conclude that

$$\mathfrak{B}(\Sigma_1, h_1) \amalg \mathfrak{B}(\Sigma_1, \delta \circ h_1^{-1}) \prec \emptyset$$

and put the two cobordisms together to get a concave filling of (M, ξ) . \square

Remark 3.2. The reader familiar with Lefschetz pencils (see [12]) may notice that these building blocks can also be put together to give a symplectic structure on any topological Lefschetz pencil with homologically nontrivial vanishing cycles. A Lefschetz pencil is the result of blowing down a Lefschetz fibration over S^2 along $n > 0$ disjoint sections, which must therefore each have self-intersection -1 . A Lefschetz fibration over S^2 is completely determined by m vanishing cycles C_1, \dots, C_m in the (closed) fiber surface F , with the property that $\tau_1 \circ \dots \circ \tau_m = 1 \in \mathcal{M}(F)$, where τ_i is a right twist about C_i . The sections correspond to n points $p_1, \dots, p_n \in F$, disjoint from the vanishing cycles, such that in fact $\tau_1 \circ \dots \circ \tau_m$ is isotopic to the identity

via an isotopy fixing $\{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$ pointwise. The fact that the sections have self-intersection -1 means that, if we require the isotopy to fix a disk D_i around each point p_i , then $\tau_1 \circ \dots \circ \tau_n$ is isotopic to the product of one right twist around each ∂D_i .

Thus the Lefschetz pencil may be built as follows. Remove the interior of each D_i to get a compact surface Σ and let $h = \tau_1 \circ \dots \circ \tau_n = \delta \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$ (where δ is the product of one right twist about each component of $\partial\Sigma$). First build two copies of a symplectic cobordism from \emptyset to $\mathfrak{B}(\Sigma, 1)$ using remark 2.5. Then attach to one of them a cobordism from $\mathfrak{B}(\Sigma, 1)$ to $\mathfrak{B}(\Sigma, h)$ built using proposition 2.8 to get a cobordism from \emptyset to $\mathfrak{B}(\Sigma, h)$. Since $h = \delta$, proposition 2.11 gives us a cobordism from $\mathfrak{B}(\Sigma, h) \amalg \mathfrak{B}(\Sigma, 1)$ to \emptyset . Let H be the union of the 2-handles used in this last cobordism. These three cobordisms piece together to make a closed symplectic 4-manifold (X, ω) . Since we attached one 2-handle for each vanishing cycle to $\Sigma \times D^2$, with the appropriate framings, $X \setminus H$ is diffeomorphic to the Lefschetz pencil built with this data with a neighborhood of each section removed. Analysis of the framings involved in H shows that removing a neighborhood of each section and replacing them with H is equivalent to blowing down these sections.

4 Construction of the building blocks

For this section it will be useful to have an explicit model of the unique contact structure $\xi(\Sigma, h)$ supported by an open book decomposition (Σ, h) . The following construction is essentially the construction of Thurston and Winkelnkemper in [17], done with a little more care to keep track of a Reeb vector field.

Recall that we chose to measure the monodromy of an open book decomposition using a flow transverse to the pages which had closed meridional orbits near the binding. If instead we required closed longitudinal orbits, realizing the framing $+1$ relative to the page framing, we would change the monodromy by a single left-handed Dehn twist along each component of $\partial\Sigma$. Given (Σ, h) , let $h' = \delta^{-1} \circ h$, where δ is a right twist around each component of $\partial\Sigma$. We will construct $\mathfrak{B}(\Sigma, h)$ using h' as our return map, but arrange that the return flow orbits are $+1$ longitudes near the binding.

Given a contact form α , let $R(\alpha)$ denote the Reeb vector field for α .

Let (x, y) be coordinates on (each component of) a collar neighborhood ν of $\partial\Sigma$, with $x \in (a, b]$, $a > 0$, $y \in S^1$ and $\partial\Sigma = \{x = b\}$. Assume that

h' is the identity on ν . Now choose a 1-form β on Σ such that $d\beta > 0$ and $\beta = x dy$ on ν (this is where we need $a > 0$) and choose a smooth nonincreasing function $f: [0, 2\pi] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ which equals 1 on $[0, 2\pi - \epsilon]$ and 0 on $[2\pi - \epsilon/2, 2\pi]$. Let $\alpha = Kdt + f(t)\beta + (1 - f(t))(h')^*\beta$ on $\Sigma \times [0, 2\pi]$, where t is the $[0, 2\pi]$ coordinate and K is some positive constant. Notice that α descends to a smooth 1-form on $N = \Sigma \times [0, 2\pi] / \sim$, where $(p, 2\pi) \sim (h'(p), 0)$. For K large enough, $\alpha \wedge d\alpha > 0$ and $R(\alpha)$ is transverse to the fibers of the fibration $t: N \rightarrow S^1$. Also notice that, after choosing K , we may enlarge Σ to arrange that $x \in (a, K]$ with $\partial\Sigma = \{x = K\}$ and still have $\beta = x dy$ on $\nu = \{a < x \leq K\}$. Near ∂N , $R(\alpha) = (1/K)\partial_t$.

Now we construct M by Dehn fillings on N . For each component of $\partial N = \partial\Sigma \times S^1$, attach a solid torus $D^2 \times S^1$ to $N \setminus \partial N$ with a map $\phi: (D^2 \setminus \{0\}) \times S^1 \rightarrow N \setminus \partial N$ defined as follows: Use polar coordinates (r, μ, λ) on $D^2 \times S^1$ and coordinates (x, y, t) near ∂N ; let $x \circ \phi = (K - r^2)$, $y \circ \phi = -\mu + \lambda$ and $t \circ \phi = \mu$. This is exactly the right filling so that the t circles become $+1$ longitudes, so that we are producing the correct monodromy. Then $\phi^*\alpha = Kd\lambda + r^2(d\mu - d\lambda)$, which extends across $\{r = 0\}$, and $R(\phi^*\alpha) = (1/K)(\partial_\mu + \partial_\lambda)$. This is tangent to the binding and satisfies the orientation condition in definition 2.1.

Since any two contact structures supported by the same open book decomposition are isotopic (theorem 2.2), we may always assume that our contact structures are of the form described above. We will call this model of the contact structure supported by an open book decomposition “the standard model”.

Remark 4.1. A *Legendrian* knot is a knot K in a contact 3-manifold (M, ξ) which is everywhere tangent to ξ . A Legendrian knot K has a canonical framing $\text{tb}(K)$, the “Thurston-Bennequin” framing, given by any vector field in ξ transverse to K . If we are given a homologically nontrivial curve $C \subset \Sigma$, the standard model may be refined to arrange that $\beta = x dy$ in a neighborhood of C , where $x \in (-\epsilon, \epsilon)$, $y \in S^1$ and $C = \{x = 0\}$. Then $C \subset \Sigma \times \{t\} \subset M$ is Legendrian for $0 < t < 2\pi - \epsilon$, and furthermore $\text{tb}(C) = \text{pf}(C)$.

The construction of the 4-dimensional symplectic handles of proposition 2.7 and proposition 2.8 is due to Weinstein [20] and Eliashberg [5]; our task is to show that the contact surgeries associated with these handles behave well with respect to supporting open book decompositions. This can be shown by explicit calculations using Weinstein’s description of the handles, but here we give less computational proofs.

Proof of proposition 2.7. Here we essentially ignore Weinstein's construction of a symplectic 1-handle and instead build the 1-handle from scratch. Let (X, ω) be the standard convex filling of $\mathfrak{B}(\Sigma, 1)$ and let (X', ω') be the standard convex filling of $\mathfrak{B}(\Sigma', 1)$, as in remark 2.5. We can clearly construct (X, ω) and (X', ω') so that $(X, \omega) \subset (X', \omega')$ and so that $H = (X, \omega) \setminus (X', \omega')$ is a 4-dimensional symplectic 1-handle. From the standard model it is clear that there exists a contactomorphism from a neighborhood ν of the binding $L \subset \mathfrak{B}(\Sigma, h)$ to a neighborhood ν' of the binding $L' \subset \mathfrak{B}(\Sigma, 1)$. Furthermore we can arrange that the handle H is attached inside ν' . Thus H can just as well be attached to a cobordism from $\mathfrak{B}(\Sigma, h)$ to $\mathfrak{B}(\Sigma, h)$ to get a cobordism from $\mathfrak{B}(\Sigma, h)$ to $\mathfrak{B}(\Sigma', h')$. \square

To prove proposition 2.8, we will use Torisu's characterization in [18] of the unique contact structure supported by an open book decomposition. Suppose that an open book decomposition of a 3-manifold M has binding L and fibration $p: M \setminus L \rightarrow S^1$. Notice that the sets $M_+ = p^{-1}[0, \pi] \cup L$ and $M_- = p^{-1}[\pi, 2\pi] \cup L$ give a Heegard splitting of M . A surface $F \subset M$ is said to be *convex* if there exists a contact vector field V for ξ which is transverse to F . The set $D \subset F$ where V is tangent to ξ is called the *dividing set* of F . (See [10] for background on convexity.) We have the following result, given a Heegard splitting (M_+, M_-) of M coming from an open book decomposition as above:

Theorem 4.2 (Torisu [18]). *There exists a unique (up to isotopy) contact structure ξ on M such that ξ is tight on both M_+ and M_- and such that $F = \partial M_+ = \partial M_-$ is convex with dividing set equal to the binding L .*

Using the standard model of $(M, \xi) = \mathfrak{B}(\Sigma, h)$, one can show that the splitting surface $F = (\Sigma \times \{0\}) \cup (\Sigma \times \{\pi\})$ is convex with dividing set L . To see that ξ is tight on both M_+ and M_- , we note that (M_+, ξ) and (M_-, ξ) can both be contactomorphically embedded into $\mathfrak{B}(\Sigma, 1)$, again using the standard model. $\mathfrak{B}(\Sigma, 1)$ is tight because of the existence of the standard convex filling of $\mathfrak{B}(\Sigma, 1)$ (see remark 2.5), and Eliashberg [4] shows that any contact 3-manifold with a convex filling is tight. Putting together the uniqueness in Torisu's theorem with the uniqueness in theorem 2.2, we get the following corollary, which in particular shows that Torisu's theorem is actually equivalent to theorem 2.2.

Corollary 4.3. *Given an open book decomposition on M , let M_+ , M_- , F and L be as in the preceding paragraphs. A contact structure ξ on M is*

supported by this open book decomposition if and only if ξ is tight on both M_+ and M_- and F is convex with dividing set L .

Proof of proposition 2.8. Let $(M, \xi) = \mathfrak{B}(\Sigma, h)$. Use the standard model as described in remark 4.1, so that $C \subset \Sigma \times \{\pi/2\} \subset (M, \xi)$ is Legendrian, with $\text{pf}(C) = \text{tb}(C)$. Weinstein [20] shows that we can attach a symplectic handle along an arbitrarily small neighborhood of C with framing $\text{tb}(C) - 1 = \text{pf}(C) - 1$, so that we get a cobordism from (M, ξ) to a new contact 3-manifold (M', ξ') . As mentioned earlier, we know that $M' = B(\Sigma, h')$, and we need to show that ξ' is supported by this open book decomposition. Split (M, ξ) into the sets M_+ and M_- as above; since the surgery that produces (M', ξ') from (M, ξ) is localized near $C \subset M_+$, we get a corresponding Heegard splitting of M' into two handlebodies M'_+ and M'_- , with $(M'_-, \xi') = (M_-, \xi)$. Since ξ and ξ' also agree on a neighborhood of $F = \partial M_-$, we still have that the splitting surface $F = F' = \partial M'_+ = \partial M'_-$ is convex with dividing set equal to the binding L' . Thus, by corollary 4.3, we need only show that (M'_+, ξ') is tight to complete the proof. Let ϕ be the contactomorphic embedding of (M_+, ξ) into $\mathfrak{B}(\Sigma, 1)$. We can also attach a symplectic handle along $\phi(C)$ to the standard convex filling of $\mathfrak{B}(\Sigma, 1)$ to get a convex filling of a new contact 3-manifold (M'', ξ'') , which is therefore tight. Since the contact surgery along $\phi(C)$ must be the same as the surgery along C , we see that (M'_+, ξ') embeds contactomorphically in (M'', ξ'') . Therefore (M'_+, ξ') is tight. \square

Before proving proposition 2.11, we provide a summary of the relevant definitions and results from [8]. In that paper we made a definition very similar to definition 2.1, except that we worked with structures more general than open book decompositions. Suppose (M, ξ) is a contact 3-manifold, $L \subset M$ is a link and $p: M \setminus L \rightarrow S^1$ is a fibration.

Definition 4.4. The pair (L, p) is a nicely fibered link supporting ξ if there exists a Reeb field V for ξ with $dp(V) > 0$ and polar coordinates (r, μ, λ) near each component of L such that the following conditions are satisfied on each coordinate neighborhood of L :

- $\xi = \ker(f(r)d\lambda + g(r)d\mu)$ for some functions $f(r)$ and $g(r)$.
- $V = A\partial_\mu + B\partial_\lambda$ and $p = C\mu + D\lambda$, where A, B, C, D are constant near each component of L and B and C are positive.

Note that this definition implies that V is tangent to L . We may think of (L, p) as a “fake open book decomposition”, since the boundary of a “page” may multiply cover the “binding”. There appears to be much more stringent control of ξ near L than in definition 2.1 and the orientation condition (that B and C are positive) looks different. However the following lemma can be proved by direct computation using the standard model.

Lemma 4.5. *If the fibers of p meet L as longitudes so that we have an honest open book decomposition of M , then the condition that ξ is supported by the open book decomposition is equivalent, after an isotopy, to the condition that (L, p) is a nicely fibered link supporting ξ .*

Notice that we can compare framings of L to the fibration p . In terms of polar coordinates (r, μ, λ) near L , such a fibration p determines a “slope” $d\mu/d\lambda = s_p = -D/C \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$, while a framing f determines a family of parallel longitudes with “slope” $d\mu/d\lambda = s_f \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Definition 4.6. We say that the framing f is positive with respect to p if, on each component of L , $s_f > s_p$.

Remark 4.7. When p gives an honest open book decomposition, f is positive with respect to p if, on each component K of L , $f = \text{pf}(K) + k$ for some positive integer k .

Following is the main result we need from [8]. This is essentially theorem 1.2 and addendum 5.1 in [8], but we also include some points that are made in their proofs.

Theorem 4.8. *Suppose that (L, p) is a nicely fibered link in M supporting a contact structure ξ and that f is a framing of L which is positive with respect to p . Let X be $[-1, 0] \times M$ with a 2-handle attached along each component of L in $\{0\} \times M$ with framing f . Let $M = \{-1\} \times M$ and let M_1 be the other component of ∂X , both oriented opposite to the boundary orientation. Let $L_1 \subset M_1$ be the union of the ascending spheres of the 2-handles. Then X supports a symplectic structure ω and a Liouville vector field V defined near ∂X pointing in along both M and M_1 and inducing the given contact structure ξ on M . Let α and α_1 be the restrictions of $i_V \omega$ to M and M_1 , respectively. Then we have the following relation between α and α_1 :*

- There exist polar coordinates (r, μ, λ) on a neighborhood ν of L as in definition 4.4, a closed tubular neighborhood $\tau = \{r \leq \epsilon\} \subset \nu$ of L , a positive constant k , a function $h: M \setminus \tau \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ which is 1 outside ν and a function of r inside ν , and an orientation-reversing diffeomorphism $\phi: M \setminus \tau \rightarrow M_1 \setminus L_1$ such that: $\phi^*(\alpha_1) = k dp - h\alpha$
- The pair $(L_1, p_1 = (\phi^{-1})^*p)$ is a nicely fibered link supporting $\xi_1 = \ker \alpha_1$.

Here is the idea of the relationship between (M, ξ) and (M_1, ξ_1) : First we perform the topological surgery by removing the interior of τ from M and then collapsing each component of $\partial\tau$ to a circle, to get the new link $L_1 \subset M_1$. The theorem makes a judicious choice of k and h , so as to arrange that $k dp - e^h \alpha$ is a negative contact form on $M \setminus \nu$ and furthermore extends across L_1 to a contact form α_1 on M_1 . Then we reverse the orientation to treat $\xi_1 = \ker \alpha_1$ as a positive contact structure on M_1 .

Proof of proposition 2.11. Let $(M, \xi) = \mathfrak{B}(\Sigma, h)$, with binding L and fibration

$p: M \setminus L \rightarrow S^1$. Proposition 2.11 asks us to attach a handle along each component K of L with framing $\text{pf}(K) + 1$. Theorem 4.8 tells us that we get a symplectic cobordism from $(M, \xi) \amalg (M_1, \xi_1)$ to \emptyset . We must show that (M_1, ξ_1) is supported by the open book decomposition $(\Sigma, \delta \circ h^{-1})$. Because the framing of the surgery is $\text{pf}(K) + 1$ for each component K , the fibers of p_1 still meet L_1 as longitudes, so that we do have an honest open book decomposition of M_1 which supports ξ_1 and with pages diffeomorphic to Σ . To compute the monodromy, note that a meridian before the surgery becomes a longitude with framing $\text{pf}(L_1) - 1$, so that our original monodromy h is now measuring the monodromy via a flow which is longitudinal near L_1 . Correcting this flow to be meridional changes the monodromy by a left twist on each boundary component, so that, properly measured, the monodromy for $-M_1$ is $\delta^{-1} \circ h$. We should reverse the flow to get the monodromy for M_1 , which is thus $\delta \circ h^{-1}$. \square

References

- [1] S. AKBULUT and B. OZBAGCI. Lefschetz fibrations on compact Stein surfaces. *Geom. Topol.* **5** (2001), 319–334.

- [2] S. AKBULUT and B. OZBAGCI. On the topology of compact Stein surfaces. Preprint (2001), available at <http://arXiv.org>, arXiv:math.GT/0103106.
- [3] M. DEHN. Die Gruppe der Abbildungsklassen. *Acta Math.* **69** (1938), 135–206.
- [4] Y. ELIASHBERG. Filling by holomorphic discs and its applications. In *Geometry of low-dimensional manifolds, 2 (Durham, 1989)* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1990), pp.45–67.
- [5] Y. ELIASHBERG. Topological characterization of Stein manifolds of dimension > 2 . *Internat. J. Math.*, **1**(1) (1990), 29–46.
- [6] Y. ELIASHBERG, A. GIVENTAL, and H. HOFER. Introduction to symplectic field theory. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* GAFA 2000 (Tel Aviv, 1999), Special Volume, Part II (2000), 560–673. .
- [7] J. B. ETNYRE and K. HONDA. On symplectic cobordisms. Preprint, AIM 2001-8 (2001), available at <http://arXiv.org>, arXiv:math.SG/0102162.
- [8] D. T. GAY. Symplectic 2-handles and transverse links. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* To appear.
- [9] E. GIROUX. In preparation.
- [10] E. GIROUX. Convexité en topologie de contact. *Comment. Math. Helv.* **66**(4) (1991), 637–677.
- [11] R. E. GOMPF. Handlebody construction of Stein surfaces. *Ann. of Math. (2)* **148** (1998), 619–693.
- [12] R. E. GOMPF and A. I. STIPSICZ. *4-manifolds and Kirby calculus*. (American Mathematical Society, 1999).
- [13] W. B. R. LICKORISH. A representation of orientable combinatorial 3-manifolds. *Ann. of Math. (2)* **76** (1962), 531–540.
- [14] P. LISCA and G. MATIĆ. Tight contact structures and Seiberg-Witten invariants. *Invent. Math.* **129**(3) (1997), 509–525.

- [15] D. McDUFF and D. SALAMON. *Introduction to symplectic topology*. (Oxford University Press, 1998).
- [16] C. B. THOMAS, Y. ELIASHBERG, and E. GIROUX. 3-dimensional contact geometry. In *Contact and symplectic geometry (Cambridge, 1994)* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1996), pp.48–65.
- [17] W. P. THURSTON and H. E. WINKELNKEMPER. On the existence of contact forms. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **52** (1975), 345–347.
- [18] I. TORISU. Convex contact structures and fibered links in 3-manifolds. *Internat. Math. Res. Notices* **2000**(9) (2000), 441–454.
- [19] B. WAJNRYB. An elementary approach to the mapping class group of a surface. *Geom. Topol.* **3** (1999), 405–466.
- [20] A. WEINSTEIN. Contact surgery and symplectic handlebodies. *Hokkaido Math. J.* **20**(2) (1991), 241–251.