

# HAMILTONIAN SMOOTHING OF FOUR-VALENT POLYHEDRAL LAGRANGIAN SURFACES IN $(\mathbb{R}^4, \omega_{\text{st}})$

**ABSTRACT.** Let  $K \subset (\mathbb{R}^4, \omega_{\text{st}})$  be a finite 2-dimensional polyhedral complex which is a topological surface and whose 2-faces lie in affine Lagrangian planes. Assume that exactly four faces meet at every vertex. We prove that  $K$  admits a Lagrangian smoothing in the sense of the problem statement: there exists a Hamiltonian isotopy  $K_t$  of smooth embedded Lagrangian surfaces for  $t \in (0, 1]$  extending to a topological isotopy on  $[0, 1]$  with  $K_0 = K$ .

The proof has two ingredients. First, four-valence forces a rigid local symplectic splitting of every *generic* vertex cone into a product of planar corners; *fold* vertices (collinear opposite rays) are edge-type and are treated by the edge model. Second, edgewise gluing requires accommodating a nontrivial diagonal symplectic squeeze (holonomy) between transverse coordinate choices at edge endpoints; we construct an interpolating Lagrangian cylinder whose varying squeeze is compensated by a longitudinal conjugate-momentum shift. The resulting family is a Lagrangian isotopy, and we turn it into a Hamiltonian isotopy by an  $O(t^2)$  Liouville/flux correction realized as a graph of a small closed 1-form inside a quantitative Weinstein neighborhood. The correcting form is built from restrictions of fixed ambient closed 1-forms, avoiding metric blow-up.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Four-valent vertex cones: planar, generic, and fold	2
3. A planar corner smoothing curve	2
4. Local Lagrangian smoothing patches and edge holonomy	3
4.1. Generic vertex patches (product structure)	3
4.2. Edge normal form and diagonal squeezes	3
4.3. The interpolating Lagrangian edge patch (holonomy compensation)	4
5. Global Lagrangian smoothing	5
5.1. Choice of control scale	5
5.2. Definition of the Lagrangian smoothed surfaces $L_t$	5
6. Hamiltonian normalization	6
6.1. Liouville class and Hamiltonian criterion	6
6.2. Quadratic variation of periods	6
6.3. Ambient cohomology basis and a uniformly small correcting form	6
6.4. Quantitative Weinstein neighborhood and global definition of $K_t$	7
References	8

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Write  $(q_1, q_2, p_1, p_2)$  for the standard linear coordinates on  $\mathbb{R}^4$  and set

$$\omega_{\text{st}} := dq_1 \wedge dp_1 + dq_2 \wedge dp_2, \quad \lambda_{\text{st}} := p_1 dq_1 + p_2 dq_2, \quad d\lambda_{\text{st}} = \omega_{\text{st}}.$$

**Definition 1.1** (Polyhedral Lagrangian surface). A *Polyhedral surface*  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^4$  is a finite 2-dimensional polyhedral complex embedded in  $\mathbb{R}^4$  such that every 2-cell (face) is a compact convex polygon contained in an affine 2-plane and such that  $K$  is a topological submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}^4$  (every point has a neighborhood in  $K$  homeomorphic to an open disc).

We call  $K$  *Polyhedral Lagrangian* if the affine span of each face is an affine Lagrangian plane in  $(\mathbb{R}^4, \omega_{\text{st}})$ .

**Definition 1.2** (Four-valent vertices). A vertex  $v$  of  $K$  is *four-valent* if exactly four faces meet at  $v$  (equivalently, the link of  $v$  in  $K$  is a 4-cycle).

---

*Date:* February 13, 2026.

*2020 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 53D12, 57Q35, 57R52.

*Key words and phrases.* polyhedral Lagrangian surface, smoothing, Hamiltonian isotopy, Liouville class, Weinstein neighborhood, symplectic holonomy.

**Definition 1.3** (Lagrangian smoothing). Let  $K$  be polyhedral Lagrangian. A *Lagrangian smoothing* of  $K$  is a family  $\{K_t\}_{t \in (0,1]}$  of smooth embedded Lagrangian surfaces in  $\mathbb{R}^4$  such that:

- (i)  $\{K_t\}_{t \in (0,1]}$  is a *Hamiltonian isotopy*: there exists a smooth compactly supported time-dependent Hamiltonian  $H_t : \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  whose flow  $\Phi_t$  satisfies  $K_t = \Phi_t(K_{t_0})$  for all  $t, t_0 \in (0, 1]$ ;
- (ii)  $\{K_t\}$  extends to a *topological isotopy* on  $[0, 1]$  with  $K_0 = K$ .

**Theorem 1.4.** Let  $K \subset (\mathbb{R}^4, \omega_{\text{st}})$  be a polyhedral Lagrangian surface such that every vertex is four-valent. Then  $K$  admits a Lagrangian smoothing in the sense of Definition 1.3.

## 2. FOUR-VALENT VERTEX CONES: PLANAR, GENERIC, AND FOLD

Fix a vertex  $v$  of  $K$ . Since  $K$  is a topological surface and  $v$  is four-valent, there are four edge rays leaving  $v$ . Translate so  $v = 0$  and let  $r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4 \in \mathbb{R}^4$  be nonzero vectors along the four edges, ordered cyclically so that the four incident face cones lie in the planes

$$\Lambda_{12} := \text{span}(r_1, r_2), \quad \Lambda_{23} := \text{span}(r_2, r_3), \quad \Lambda_{34} := \text{span}(r_3, r_4), \quad \Lambda_{41} := \text{span}(r_4, r_1).$$

Each  $\Lambda_{ij}$  is Lagrangian, hence

$$\omega_{\text{st}}(r_1, r_2) = \omega_{\text{st}}(r_2, r_3) = \omega_{\text{st}}(r_3, r_4) = \omega_{\text{st}}(r_4, r_1) = 0. \quad (1)$$

**Proposition 2.1** (Vertex trichotomy). Assume (1). Exactly one of the following holds.

- (a) **Planar case.** One has  $\omega_{\text{st}}(r_1, r_3) = \omega_{\text{st}}(r_2, r_4) = 0$ . Then  $r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4$  lie in a single Lagrangian plane. In particular, the tangent cone is locally planar.
- (b) **Generic case.** After cyclic relabeling,  $\omega_{\text{st}}(r_1, r_3) \neq 0$  and  $r_2, r_4$  are linearly independent. Then

$$V_1 := \text{span}(r_1, r_3) \text{ is a symplectic 2-plane}, \quad V_2 := V_1^{\omega_{\text{st}}} = \text{span}(r_2, r_4),$$

so  $\mathbb{R}^4 = V_1 \oplus V_2$  is a symplectic orthogonal direct sum, and the vertex cone factors as a product of planar corners:

$$C_0 K = C_1 \times C_2 \subset V_1 \times V_2,$$

where  $C_1 = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} r_1 \cup \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} r_3 \subset V_1$  and  $C_2 = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} r_2 \cup \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} r_4 \subset V_2$ .

- (c) **Fold case.** After cyclic relabeling,  $\omega_{\text{st}}(r_1, r_3) \neq 0$  but  $r_2$  and  $r_4$  are collinear. Then  $V_1 := \text{span}(r_1, r_3)$  is symplectic and  $V_2 := V_1^{\omega_{\text{st}}}$  is symplectic, but the cone uses only a line  $\ell \subset V_2$  spanned by  $r_2$ :

$$C_0 K = C_1 \times \ell,$$

with  $C_1 = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} r_1 \cup \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} r_3 \subset V_1$  and  $\ell = \mathbb{R} r_2 = \mathbb{R} r_4 \subset V_2$ . Geometrically, 0 is edge-type: a corner crossed with a line.

*Proof.* If  $\omega_{\text{st}}(r_1, r_3) = \omega_{\text{st}}(r_2, r_4) = 0$ , then together with (1) we have  $\omega_{\text{st}}(r_i, r_j) = 0$  for all pairs  $(i, j)$ , so  $W := \text{span}(r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4)$  is isotropic. In a symplectic 4-space,  $\dim W \leq 2$ , hence the rays lie in a 2-plane. Since each  $\Lambda_{ij}$  is Lagrangian, this plane is Lagrangian. This is (a).

Otherwise at least one of  $\omega_{\text{st}}(r_1, r_3)$  or  $\omega_{\text{st}}(r_2, r_4)$  is nonzero. After cyclic relabeling assume  $\omega_{\text{st}}(r_1, r_3) \neq 0$ . Then  $V_1 := \text{span}(r_1, r_3)$  is symplectic. From (1),

$$\omega_{\text{st}}(r_2, r_1) = \omega_{\text{st}}(r_2, r_3) = 0 \Rightarrow r_2 \in V_1^{\omega_{\text{st}}}, \quad \omega_{\text{st}}(r_4, r_1) = \omega_{\text{st}}(r_4, r_3) = 0 \Rightarrow r_4 \in V_1^{\omega_{\text{st}}}.$$

Set  $V_2 := V_1^{\omega_{\text{st}}}$  (a symplectic plane). If  $r_2, r_4$  are independent then  $V_2 = \text{span}(r_2, r_4)$  and the cone is  $C_1 \times C_2$ , giving (b). If  $r_2, r_4$  are collinear then they span a line  $\ell \subset V_2$  and the cone is  $C_1 \times \ell$ , giving (c).  $\square$

**Remark 2.2.** Fold vertices are not essential 4-dimensional vertex singularities; they are points on an edge-type singular locus. In the smoothing construction we treat fold vertices by the edge model (no vertex patch).

## 3. A PLANAR CORNER SMOOTHING CURVE

A key feature used later is a planar rounding curve whose coordinate product vanishes identically outside the rounding region.

**Lemma 3.1** (A corner rounding with compactly supported product). Let  $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be smooth with  $\sigma(s) = 0$  for  $s \leq 0$ ,  $\sigma(s) = 1$  for  $s \geq 1$ , and  $\sigma$  flat at 0 (all derivatives vanish at 0). Fix  $T = \log 2$ . For  $\rho > 0$  define  $\gamma_\rho : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  by

$$x_\rho(t) := \rho e^t \sigma(t + T), \quad y_\rho(t) := \rho e^{-t} \sigma(T - t), \quad \gamma_\rho(t) := (x_\rho(t), y_\rho(t)).$$

Then  $\Gamma_\rho := \gamma_\rho(\mathbb{R})$  is a smooth properly embedded curve such that:

(a)  $\Gamma_\rho$  agrees exactly with the union of coordinate rays

$$\{(x, 0) : x \geq 2\rho\} \cup \{(0, y) : y \geq 2\rho\}$$

outside the Euclidean ball  $B_{2\rho}(0)$ ;

(b) the coordinate product  $x_\rho(t)y_\rho(t)$  is compactly supported in  $t \in [-T, T]$ ; equivalently,

$$x_\rho(t)y_\rho(t) = 0 \quad \text{for } |t| \geq T;$$

(c)  $\Gamma_\rho$  depends smoothly on  $\rho$  and converges (Hausdorff on compacts) to the union of coordinate rays as  $\rho \rightarrow 0$ .

Moreover,  $\Gamma_\rho$  is symmetric under swapping the coordinates  $(x, y) \mapsto (y, x)$ .

*Proof.* For  $t \geq T$  we have  $T - t \leq 0$ , hence  $\sigma(T - t) = 0$  and  $y_\rho(t) = 0$ , while  $t + T \geq 2T > 1$  so  $\sigma(t + T) = 1$  and  $x_\rho(t) = \rho e^t \geq \rho e^T = 2\rho$ . Thus  $\gamma_\rho([T, \infty)) = \{(x, 0) : x \geq 2\rho\}$ . Similarly, for  $t \leq -T$  we have  $t + T \leq 0$ , hence  $x_\rho(t) = 0$  and  $y_\rho(t) = \rho e^{-t} \geq 2\rho$ , so  $\gamma_\rho((-\infty, -T]) = \{(0, y) : y \geq 2\rho\}$ . This proves (a). Statement (b) follows because for  $|t| \geq T$  one of  $\sigma(t + T)$  or  $\sigma(T - t)$  is identically 0.

Smoothness at  $t = \pm T$  follows from flatness of  $\sigma$  at 0, which forces all derivatives of the cut-off coordinate to vanish at the transition and hence yields a smooth gluing to the axis rays. Proper embeddedness and smooth dependence on  $\rho$  are immediate. Symmetry follows from  $\gamma_\rho(-t) = (y_\rho(t), x_\rho(t))$ .  $\square$

#### 4. LOCAL LAGRANGIAN SMOOTHING PATCHES AND EDGE HOLONOMY

**4.1. Generic vertex patches (product structure).** Let  $v$  be a generic vertex. By Proposition 2.1(b),  $\mathbb{R}^4$  splits symplectically as  $V_1 \oplus V_2$  and the vertex cone is  $C_1 \times C_2$  with  $C_i \subset V_i$  a planar corner.

Choose linear symplectic identifications  $V_i \cong (\mathbb{R}^2, dq \wedge dp)$  sending  $C_i$  to the standard positive coordinate corner. Define the *vertex smoothing patch*

$$P_{v,\rho} := \Gamma_\rho \times \Gamma_\rho \subset V_1 \oplus V_2 \cong \mathbb{R}^4.$$

**Lemma 4.1.**  $P_{v,\rho}$  is a smooth embedded Lagrangian surface. Moreover,  $P_{v,\rho}$  agrees exactly with the cone  $C_0 K$  outside the product neighborhood  $(B_{2\rho} \subset V_1) \times (B_{2\rho} \subset V_2)$ . In particular, along any incident edge-ray direction it equals a constant-squeeze cylinder (a ray times  $\Gamma_\rho$ ) beyond distance  $2\rho$  from the vertex.

*Proof.* The tangent space of  $\Gamma_\rho \times \Gamma_\rho$  splits as a direct sum of two 1-dimensional spaces, so  $\omega_{st} = \omega_{V_1} \oplus \omega_{V_2}$  vanishes on it. Agreement with the cone follows from Lemma 3.1(a) in each factor. The final sentence is the same observation applied to one factor at a time.  $\square$

**4.2. Edge normal form and diagonal squeezes.** Let  $e$  be an edge whose interior points lie in the 1-skeleton of  $K$ . Exactly two faces meet along  $e$ ; let their affine spans be Lagrangian planes  $\Lambda^+, \Lambda^-$  intersecting along the line  $\ell$  containing  $e$ . We call  $e$  *singular* if  $\Lambda^+ \neq \Lambda^-$  (equivalently,  $K$  is not smooth along the interior of  $e$ ).

**Lemma 4.2** (Symplectic normal form along a singular edge). *Let  $e$  be a singular edge with line  $\ell$  and adjacent Lagrangian planes  $\Lambda^\pm$ . There exists an affine symplectic coordinate chart*

$$\Phi_e : (\mathbb{R}^4, \omega_{st}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^4, \omega_{st}), \quad (q_1, q_2, p_1, p_2) \text{ coordinates,}$$

sending  $\ell$  to the  $q_1$ -axis  $\{q_2 = p_1 = p_2 = 0\}$  and sending the two face planes to

$$\Phi_e(\Lambda^+) = \{p_1 = p_2 = 0\}, \quad \Phi_e(\Lambda^-) = \{p_1 = q_2 = 0\}.$$

In these coordinates, the transverse symplectic plane is  $W_e := \{q_1 = p_1 = 0\} \cong (\mathbb{R}^2, dq_2 \wedge dp_2)$ , and the two transverse face rays are the positive  $q_2$ -axis and the positive  $p_2$ -axis.

*Proof.* Choose a nonzero  $e_1 \in \ell$ . Choose  $e_2 \in \Lambda^+$  with  $\Lambda^+ = \text{span}(e_1, e_2)$ . Choose  $f_2 \in \Lambda^-$  with  $\Lambda^- = \text{span}(e_1, f_2)$  and scale so that  $\omega_{st}(e_2, f_2) = 1$ . Complete  $(e_1, e_2, f_2)$  to a symplectic basis  $(e_1, f_1, e_2, f_2)$  and send it to the standard basis; add a translation.  $\square$

At each endpoint of a singular edge  $e$ , any local coordinate identification of  $W_e$  that sends the two transverse face rays to the *positive* coordinate rays differs from the edge chart identification by a diagonal symplectic squeeze.

**Lemma 4.3** (Quadrant-preserving symplectic maps are diagonal squeezes). *Let  $A \in \text{Sp}(2, \mathbb{R}) \cong \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$  preserve the set*

$$(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} e_1) \cup (\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} e_2) \subset \mathbb{R}^2,$$

where  $e_1 = (1, 0)$  and  $e_2 = (0, 1)$ . Then

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{for some } \lambda > 0.$$

*Proof.* Since  $A$  is invertible, it permutes the two rays  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}e_1$  and  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}e_2$ . If  $A$  swapped them, then  $A(e_1) = ae_2$  and  $A(e_2) = be_1$  with  $a, b > 0$ , hence  $\det A = -ab < 0$ , contradicting  $\det A = 1$ . Therefore  $A$  preserves each ray:  $A(e_1) = \lambda e_1$  and  $A(e_2) = \mu e_2$  with  $\lambda, \mu > 0$ . Since  $\det A = \lambda\mu = 1$ , we have  $\mu = \lambda^{-1}$ .  $\square$

**4.3. The interpolating Lagrangian edge patch (holonomy compensation).** Let  $e$  be a singular edge and fix an edge chart  $\Phi_e$  as in Lemma 4.2. Let the  $q_1$ -coordinate range of the edge segment be  $[0, L_e]$ .

Fix  $\rho > 0$  and parametrize  $\Gamma_\rho \subset \mathbb{R}_{(q_2, p_2)}^2$  by  $u \mapsto (x(u), y(u))$  so that  $(x(u), y(u)) \in \Gamma_\rho$ . By Lemma 3.1(b), the product  $x(u)y(u)$  has compact support in  $u$ .

At each endpoint of  $e$ , the transverse identification induced by the local model sends  $\Gamma_\rho$  to a diagonally squeezed curve  $(q_2, p_2) = (\lambda x, \lambda^{-1}y)$  for some  $\lambda > 0$  (Lemma 4.3). Let  $\lambda_- = \lambda_e(0)$  and  $\lambda_+ = \lambda_e(L_e)$  denote the endpoint squeeze factors.

Choose a smooth function  $\lambda_e : [0, L_e] \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  such that:

- (a)  $\lambda_e(s) = \lambda_-$  for  $s$  near 0 and  $\lambda_e(s) = \lambda_+$  for  $s$  near  $L_e$  (hence  $\lambda'_e(s) = 0$  near endpoints);
- (b)  $\lambda_e$  is bounded above and below by positive constants depending only on the finite polyhedron  $K$ .

**Definition 4.4** (Interpolating edge patch). Define a map  $F_{e,\rho} : [0, L_e] \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{(q_1, q_2, p_1, p_2)}^4$  by

$$\begin{aligned} q_1(s, u) &:= s, \\ q_2(s, u) &:= \lambda_e(s)x(u), \\ p_2(s, u) &:= \lambda_e(s)^{-1}y(u), \\ p_1(s, u) &:= -\frac{\lambda'_e(s)}{\lambda_e(s)}x(u)y(u). \end{aligned}$$

Let  $P_{e,\rho} := \Phi_e^{-1}(F_{e,\rho}([0, L_e] \times \mathbb{R})) \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ .

**Lemma 4.5** (Lagrangian property and exact matching).  $P_{e,\rho}$  is a smooth embedded Lagrangian surface. Moreover:

- (a)  $p_1(s, u) \equiv 0$  for  $|u|$  sufficiently large, hence  $P_{e,\rho}$  agrees exactly with the original polyhedral faces away from a transverse neighborhood of radius  $O(\rho)$ ;
- (b) since  $\lambda'_e \equiv 0$  near  $s = 0$  and  $s = L_e$ , we have  $p_1 \equiv 0$  near the endpoints and the transverse profiles there are exactly the endpoint-squeezed curves  $(q_2, p_2) = (\lambda_\pm x(u), \lambda_\pm^{-1}y(u))$ .

*Proof.* Smoothness and embeddedness are immediate since  $q_1 = s$  separates  $s$ -levels and all functions are smooth; properness in  $u$  follows from properness of  $\Gamma_\rho$ .

To check Lagrangian, compute in the edge chart:

$$\omega_{st} = dq_1 \wedge dp_1 + dq_2 \wedge dp_2.$$

We have  $dq_1 = ds$ , and

$$dp_1 = -\left(\frac{\lambda'_e}{\lambda_e}\right)' xy \, ds - \frac{\lambda'_e}{\lambda_e} (x'y + y'x) \, du,$$

where primes on  $x, y$  denote derivatives in  $u$ . Hence

$$dq_1 \wedge dp_1 = -\frac{\lambda'_e}{\lambda_e} (x'y + y'x) \, ds \wedge du = -\frac{\lambda'_e}{\lambda_e} \frac{d}{du} (xy) \, ds \wedge du.$$

Next,

$$dq_2 = \lambda'_e x \, ds + \lambda_e x' \, du, \quad dp_2 = -\lambda_e^{-2} \lambda'_e y \, ds + \lambda_e^{-1} y' \, du,$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} dq_2 \wedge dp_2 &= (\lambda'_e x \, ds + \lambda_e x' \, du) \wedge (-\lambda_e^{-2} \lambda'_e y \, ds + \lambda_e^{-1} y' \, du) \\ &= (\lambda'_e \lambda_e^{-1} xy' + \lambda'_e \lambda_e^{-1} x' y) \, ds \wedge du \\ &= \frac{\lambda'_e}{\lambda_e} \frac{d}{du} (xy) \, ds \wedge du. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore  $dq_1 \wedge dp_1 + dq_2 \wedge dp_2 = 0$ , so  $F_{e,\rho}^* \omega_{st} = 0$  and  $P_{e,\rho}$  is Lagrangian.

For (a), Lemma 3.1(b) gives  $xy = 0$  for  $|u|$  large, hence  $p_1 = 0$  there and  $(q_2, p_2)$  lies on one of the coordinate rays; this is precisely the unmodified face model. Part (b) is immediate from  $\lambda'_e \equiv 0$  near endpoints.  $\square$

**Remark 4.6.** The diagonal squeeze factors  $\lambda_{\pm}$  need not be 1 and can have nontrivial holonomy along cycles in the 1-skeleton. The correction term  $p_1 = -(\lambda'_e/\lambda_e)xy$  compensates the transverse symplectic error created by varying the squeeze; compact support of  $xy$  ensures exact matching to faces and endpoint models.

## 5. GLOBAL LAGRANGIAN SMOOTHING

Let  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{gen}}$  be the set of generic vertices (Proposition 2.1(b)) and let  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{sing}}$  be the set of singular edges (those whose adjacent face planes are distinct).

**5.1. Choice of control scale.** Because  $K$  is a finite embedded polyhedral complex, there is a positive separation between disjoint closed cells. Fix  $\delta > 0$  sufficiently small so that:

- (a) closed balls  $\overline{B}_{10\delta}(v)$  around distinct vertices are disjoint;
- (b) tubular neighborhoods of radius  $10\delta$  around disjoint singular edges are disjoint, and any overlaps occur only in balls around shared endpoints;
- (c)  $\delta$  is smaller than half the minimum distance between disjoint closed cells of the complex (so local modifications at scale  $\leq 10\delta$  cannot create new intersections);
- (d)  $\delta$  is sufficiently small relative to the fixed geometric constants of the local models so that the Hamiltonian correction of Section 6 fits inside the Weinstein neighborhoods for all  $t \in (0, 1]$  (see Definition 6.7).

Define the smoothing scale

$$\rho(t) := \delta t, \quad t \in (0, 1].$$

**5.2. Definition of the Lagrangian smoothed surfaces  $L_t$ .** We define  $L_t$  by modifying  $K$  inside disjoint control neighborhoods around  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{gen}} \cup \mathcal{E}_{\text{sing}}$ .

**(i) Generic vertices.** For each  $v \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{gen}}$ , choose a symplectic affine chart  $\Phi_v$  identifying a neighborhood of  $v$  with a neighborhood of 0 in the product splitting  $V_1 \oplus V_2$  of Proposition 2.1(b), and set

$$L_t \cap B_{5\rho(t)}(v) := \Phi_v^{-1}(P_{v,\rho(t)}) \cap B_{5\rho(t)}(v),$$

where  $P_{v,\rho}$  is the vertex patch from Lemma 4.1.

**(ii) Singular edges.** Let  $e \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{sing}}$  have endpoints  $v_-, v_+$ . Define the truncated edge segment

$$e_t := e \setminus \bigcup_{v \in \{v_-, v_+\} \cap \mathcal{V}_{\text{gen}}} B_{3\rho(t)}(v). \quad (2)$$

(Thus we remove neighborhoods only around generic endpoints.) Choose an edge chart  $\Phi_e$  as in Lemma 4.2 on a neighborhood of  $e$  and define  $L_t$  inside the tube  $N_{5\rho(t)}(e_t)$  by the interpolating edge patch  $P_{e,\rho(t)}$  from Definition 4.4, where  $\lambda_e$  is chosen so that:

- (a) if an endpoint  $v \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{gen}}$  is truncated, then on the overlap with  $B_{5\rho(t)}(v)$  the patch matches the constant-squeeze cylinder determined by the vertex patch (Lemma 4.1);
- (b) if an endpoint is fold, the local geometry is edge-type (Proposition 2.1(c)), and the adjacent singular edges are collinear; we choose the edge charts consistently near such a fold point so that the corresponding edge patches glue smoothly there (this is possible because the two incident face planes on either side of the singular line agree).

**(iii) Away from the singular locus.** Set  $L_t = K$  outside the union of the above vertex balls and edge tubes.

**Proposition 5.1.** *For each  $t \in (0, 1]$ ,  $L_t$  is a smooth embedded Lagrangian surface. The family  $t \mapsto L_t$  is smooth for  $t \in (0, 1]$  and extends to a topological isotopy on  $[0, 1]$  with  $L_0 = K$ .*

*Proof.* Each local patch is smooth and Lagrangian (Lemmas 4.1 and 4.5). On overlaps between vertex neighborhoods and edge tubes, the vertex patch has stabilized to a constant-squeeze cylinder with  $p_1 = 0$  beyond radius  $2\rho(t)$ , while the edge patch has  $\lambda'_e \equiv 0$  near endpoints and uses the same squeezed transverse profile; hence the definitions agree by subset equality and glue smoothly. At fold points, the local model is edge-type, and consistent choice of edge charts ensures the edge patches meet smoothly.

Embeddedness follows from the choice of  $\delta$ : all modifications remain in disjoint control neighborhoods and cannot create new intersections. Smooth dependence on  $t$  follows from smooth dependence of  $\Gamma_{\rho(t)}$

and  $\lambda_e$  on  $\rho(t)$  and from the finiteness of the construction. As  $t \rightarrow 0$ , the modified regions shrink to the singular locus and  $L_t$  converges to  $K$  in Hausdorff distance; collapsing the rounded pieces gives a continuous isotopy of embeddings, hence the topological extension with  $L_0 = K$ .  $\square$

## 6. HAMILTONIAN NORMALIZATION

**6.1. Liouville class and Hamiltonian criterion.** For a smooth embedded Lagrangian surface  $L \subset (\mathbb{R}^4, \omega_{\text{st}})$  define its *Liouville class*

$$\mathfrak{a}(L) := [\lambda_{\text{st}}|_L] \in H^1(L; \mathbb{R}).$$

**Lemma 6.1** (Flux criterion in an exact symplectic manifold). *Let  $\iota_t : \Sigma \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^4, \omega_{\text{st}})$  be a smooth family of embeddings for  $t \in (0, 1]$  such that  $L_t := \iota_t(\Sigma)$  is Lagrangian for all  $t$ . Set*

$$a_t := [\iota_t^* \lambda_{\text{st}}] \in H^1(\Sigma; \mathbb{R}).$$

*Then the isotopy  $L_t$  is induced by a compactly supported Hamiltonian isotopy of  $\mathbb{R}^4$  if and only if  $a_t$  is constant in  $t$ .*

*Proof.* Differentiate:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \iota_t^* \lambda_{\text{st}} = \iota_t^*(\mathcal{L}_{\partial_t \iota_t} \lambda_{\text{st}}) = d(\dots) + \iota_t^*(\iota_{\partial_t \iota_t} \omega_{\text{st}}).$$

Thus  $\frac{d}{dt} a_t = [\iota_t^*(\iota_{\partial_t \iota_t} \omega_{\text{st}})]$ . If  $a_t$  is constant, the class vanishes, hence the closed form  $\iota_t^*(\iota_{\partial_t \iota_t} \omega_{\text{st}})$  is exact and can be extended to a compactly supported Hamiltonian producing the isotopy (using a Weinstein neighborhood and a cutoff). Conversely, Hamiltonian isotopy preserves  $[\lambda_{\text{st}}|_{L_t}]$ .  $\square$

**6.2. Quadratic variation of periods.** Let  $L_t$  be as in Proposition 5.1. Fix smooth embeddings  $\iota_t : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4$  with image  $L_t$  for  $t > 0$ , varying smoothly in  $t$  (possible since  $L_t$  is a smooth isotopy for  $t > 0$ ).

**Lemma 6.2** (Cauchy estimate for periods). *There exists  $C > 0$  such that for all  $0 < s < t \leq 1$  and every smooth loop  $\gamma \subset \Sigma$  transverse to the preimage of the singular locus of  $K$ , one has*

$$\left| \int_{\gamma} \iota_t^* \lambda_{\text{st}} - \int_{\gamma} \iota_s^* \lambda_{\text{st}} \right| \leq C(\rho(t)^2 - \rho(s)^2).$$

*In particular, the classes  $a_t := [\iota_t^* \lambda_{\text{st}}] \in H^1(\Sigma; \mathbb{R})$  converge as  $t \rightarrow 0$  to a limit  $a_0$ , with  $a_0 - a_t = O(\rho(t)^2)$ .*

*Proof.* Consider the annulus  $A = [s, t] \times S^1$  mapped by  $F(\tau, u) = \iota_{\tau}(\gamma(u))$ . By Stokes,

$$\int_{\gamma} \iota_t^* \lambda_{\text{st}} - \int_{\gamma} \iota_s^* \lambda_{\text{st}} = \int_A F^* \omega_{\text{st}}.$$

Thus the difference is bounded by  $\|\omega_{\text{st}}\|$  times the Euclidean area swept by  $F$ .

By construction,  $\iota_{\tau}$  is stationary outside the union of control neighborhoods around the singular locus, of transverse radius  $O(\rho(\tau))$ . Transversality of  $\gamma$  implies it meets these neighborhoods in finitely many arcs, each of length  $O(\rho(\tau))$ , uniformly in  $\tau$ . The deformation speed  $|\partial_{\tau} \iota_{\tau}|$  is  $O(\rho'(\tau)) = O(\delta)$  since the local models scale linearly with  $\rho$ . Hence the swept area is  $O(\rho(\tau)\rho'(\tau)) d\tau$ , and summing over finitely many neighborhoods yields

$$\text{Area}(F(A)) \leq C_1 \int_s^t \rho(\tau)\rho'(\tau) d\tau = C_2(\rho(t)^2 - \rho(s)^2),$$

proving the estimate. Convergence of  $a_t$  follows by evaluating on a homology basis represented by such transverse loops (general position).  $\square$

**6.3. Ambient cohomology basis and a uniformly small correcting form.** Let  $U \subset \mathbb{R}^4$  be a sufficiently small open neighborhood of  $K$  which deformation retracts onto  $K$  (a regular neighborhood in the PL sense). Then  $H^1(U; \mathbb{R}) \cong H^1(K; \mathbb{R})$ .

**Lemma 6.3** (Ambient closed forms dual to loops). *There exist smooth closed 1-forms  $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_b \in \Omega^1(U)$  whose classes form a basis of  $H^1(U; \mathbb{R})$  and loops  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_b \subset K$  representing a basis of  $H_1(K; \mathbb{Z})/\text{tors}$  such that*

$$\int_{\gamma_j} \beta_i = \delta_{ij}.$$

*Proof.* Choose any basis of  $H^1(U; \mathbb{R})$  and represent it by smooth closed forms by de Rham. Choose loops  $\gamma_j$  representing a basis of  $H_1(K; \mathbb{Z})/\text{tors}$ . The de Rham pairing gives a perfect duality between  $H^1(U; \mathbb{R})$  and  $H_1(U; \mathbb{R})$ ; replace the chosen forms by the dual basis to achieve the Kronecker normalization.  $\square$

For  $t > 0$  small we have  $L_t \subset U$  and the topological isotopy transports each loop  $\gamma_j \subset K$  to a loop  $\gamma_j(t) \subset L_t$  which is isotopic to  $\gamma_j$  inside  $U$ . Define real numbers

$$A_j(t) := \int_{\gamma_j(t)} \lambda_{\text{st}}, \quad A_j(0) := \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} A_j(t),$$

where the limit exists by Lemma 6.2. Set  $c_j(t) := A_j(0) - A_j(t)$ .

**Lemma 6.4** (Closed-form correction with ambient  $C^0$  control). *Define*

$$\alpha_t := \sum_{j=1}^b c_j(t) \beta_j \Big|_{L_t} \in \Omega^1(L_t).$$

*Then  $\alpha_t$  is closed,  $[\lambda_{\text{st}}|_{L_t}] + [\alpha_t]$  is independent of  $t$ , and there is a constant  $C_\alpha$  (independent of  $\delta$ ) such that*

$$\|\alpha_t\|_{C^0(L_t)} \leq C_\alpha \rho(t)^2,$$

*where the norm is computed using the ambient Euclidean metric on  $\mathbb{R}^4$ .*

*Proof.* Closedness follows from  $d\beta_j = 0$ .

Since  $\gamma_j(t)$  is isotopic to  $\gamma_j$  inside  $U$  and  $\beta_i$  is closed on  $U$ , Stokes' theorem implies the period is constant:

$$\int_{\gamma_j(t)} \beta_i = \int_{\gamma_j} \beta_i = \delta_{ij} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, 1].$$

Therefore, for each  $j$ ,

$$\int_{\gamma_j(t)} \alpha_t = \sum_{i=1}^b c_i(t) \int_{\gamma_j(t)} \beta_i = c_j(t) = A_j(0) - A_j(t).$$

Equivalently, the class  $[\alpha_t] \in H^1(L_t; \mathbb{R})$  is exactly the class difference between the limiting Liouville periods and the current ones, so  $[\lambda_{\text{st}}|_{L_t}] + [\alpha_t]$  has constant periods on the transported basis loops and hence is independent of  $t$ .

By Lemma 6.2,  $|c_j(t)| = |A_j(0) - A_j(t)| = O(\rho(t)^2)$  with a constant independent of  $\delta$  (it depends only on the scale-1 local models and finitely many charts). Since  $\beta_j$  are fixed smooth forms on the relatively compact set  $U$ ,  $\|\beta_j\|_{C^0(U)} < \infty$ . Thus

$$\|\alpha_t\|_{C^0(L_t)} \leq \sum_{j=1}^b |c_j(t)| \|\beta_j\|_{C^0(U)} \leq C_\alpha \rho(t)^2.$$

□

**6.4. Quantitative Weinstein neighborhood and global definition of  $K_t$ .** We require a Weinstein neighborhood large enough to contain the graph of  $\alpha_t$  for all  $t \in (0, 1]$ .

**Lemma 6.5** (Weinstein radius  $\gtrsim \rho(t)$ , uniformly in  $t$ ). *There exists a constant  $c_W > 0$  (independent of  $\delta$ ) such that for every  $t \in (0, 1]$  the Lagrangian surface  $L_t$  admits:*

- (a) *an embedded Euclidean tubular neighborhood of radius at least  $c_W \rho(t)$ ;*
- (b) *a Weinstein neighborhood symplectomorphism*

$$\Psi_t : (D_{c_W \rho(t)}^* L_t, d\theta) \longrightarrow (\mathbb{R}^4, \omega_{\text{st}})$$

*defined on the cotangent disk bundle of radius  $c_W \rho(t)$  (with the Euclidean dual norm), mapping the zero section to  $L_t$ . Moreover,  $\Psi_t$  can be chosen smoothly in  $t$  on  $(0, 1]$  in the sense that the induced map on the total space*

$$\{(t, x, \xi) : t \in (0, 1], x \in L_t, |\xi| < c_W \rho(t)\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4$$

*is smooth.*

*Proof.* On each face region  $L_t$  is planar, hence has zero second fundamental form. Inside each smoothing neighborhood,  $L_t$  is obtained by inserting one of finitely many smooth template patches whose geometry is fixed up to scaling by  $\rho(t)$  in transverse directions; therefore the norm of the second fundamental form is bounded by  $C/\rho(t)$  for a constant  $C$  depending only on the scale-1 templates. Consequently, the principal curvatures are bounded by  $C/\rho(t)$ .

For a smooth embedded submanifold of Euclidean space with principal curvatures bounded by  $\kappa$ , the normal exponential map is non-singular on normal disks of radius  $< 1/\kappa$ ; hence a tubular neighborhood

exists of radius  $\geq c_1/\kappa$ . Applying this gives a tubular radius  $\geq c_2\rho(t)$ . The choice of  $\delta$  in Section 5 ensures that  $c_2\rho(t) \leq c_2\delta$  is smaller than the separation scale between disjoint cell neighborhoods, so the tube is globally embedded. This proves (a) with  $c_W \leq c_2$ .

Given such a tubular neighborhood, the standard proof of the Weinstein neighborhood theorem identifies  $T^*L_t$  with the symplectic normal bundle using  $\omega_{st}$ , composes with the tubular embedding into  $\mathbb{R}^4$ , and then applies Moser's method on a sufficiently small disk bundle to correct the pulled-back symplectic form to  $d\theta$ . Since all bounds and domains are uniform after scaling by  $\rho(t)$  and only finitely many local templates are used, this yields a symplectomorphism defined at least on a disk bundle of radius  $c_W\rho(t)$ , with  $c_W$  independent of  $\delta$ . The parameter dependence is smooth on  $(0, 1]$  by the parameter-dependent Moser argument.  $\square$

**Lemma 6.6** (Liouville class shift on graphs). *Let  $L \subset (\mathbb{R}^4, \omega_{st} = d\lambda_{st})$  be a smooth embedded Lagrangian and let  $\Psi : (V, d\theta) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^4, \omega_{st})$  be a Weinstein neighborhood symplectomorphism, with  $\Psi$  restricting to the inclusion of the zero section. Then for any sufficiently small closed 1-form  $\alpha$  on  $L$  with  $\text{graph}(\alpha) \subset V$ , the Lagrangian  $L_\alpha := \Psi(\text{graph}(\alpha))$  satisfies*

$$[\lambda_{st}|_{L_\alpha}] = [\lambda_{st}|_L] + [\alpha] \in H^1(L; \mathbb{R}).$$

*Proof.* On  $T^*L$  the canonical 1-form  $\theta$  restricts to  $\alpha$  on  $\text{graph}(\alpha)$ . The closed form  $\Psi^*\lambda_{st} - (\theta + \pi^*(\lambda_{st}|_L))$  vanishes on the zero section and is exact on  $V$  (since  $V$  deformation retracts to the zero section). Restricting to  $\text{graph}(\alpha)$  gives the stated cohomology identity.  $\square$

**Definition 6.7** (Hamiltonian-normalized smoothing family). Let  $C_\alpha$  be as in Lemma 6.4 and  $c_W$  as in Lemma 6.5. These constants depend only on the fixed scale-1 local models and the fixed ambient forms  $\beta_j$ , and are independent of  $\delta$ . By the choice of  $\delta$  in Section 5(d), we may assume

$$C_\alpha \delta < \frac{1}{2}c_W. \quad (3)$$

Then for all  $t \in (0, 1]$ ,

$$\|\alpha_t\|_{C^0(L_t)} \leq C_\alpha \rho(t)^2 = C_\alpha \delta^2 t^2 \leq C_\alpha \delta \rho(t) < \frac{1}{2}c_W \rho(t),$$

so  $\text{graph}(\alpha_t) \subset D_{c_W \rho(t)}^* L_t$ .

Define

$$K_t := \Psi_t(\text{graph}(\alpha_t)) \subset \mathbb{R}^4, \quad t \in (0, 1],$$

with  $\Psi_t$  from Lemma 6.5.

**Proposition 6.8** (Constant Liouville class). *The family  $K_t$  has constant Liouville class:*

$$[\lambda_{st}|_{K_t}] \text{ is independent of } t \in (0, 1].$$

*Proof.* By Lemma 6.6,

$$[\lambda_{st}|_{K_t}] = [\lambda_{st}|_{L_t}] + [\alpha_t].$$

By Lemma 6.4, the right-hand side is independent of  $t$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 6.9** (Completion of Theorem 1.4). *The family  $\{K_t\}_{t \in (0, 1]}$  of Definition 6.7 is a Hamiltonian isotopy of smooth embedded Lagrangian surfaces. Moreover, it extends to a topological isotopy on  $[0, 1]$  with  $K_0 = K$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 6.5 and smooth dependence of  $\alpha_t$ , the family  $K_t$  is a smooth Lagrangian isotopy on  $(0, 1]$ . Proposition 6.8 shows its Liouville class is constant, hence Lemma 6.1 implies the isotopy is Hamiltonian.

As  $t \rightarrow 0$ ,  $L_t \rightarrow K$  by Proposition 5.1, and  $\|\alpha_t\|_{C^0} = O(\rho(t)^2) \rightarrow 0$ , so  $K_t$  remains within  $o(\rho(t))$  of  $L_t$  and also converges to  $K$ ; thus the topological isotopy extends with  $K_0 = K$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.4.* Combine Proposition 5.1 and Theorem 6.9.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] D. McDuff and D. Salamon, *Introduction to Symplectic Topology*, 3rd ed., Oxford Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 2017.
- [2] L. Polterovich, *The Geometry of the Group of Symplectic Diffeomorphisms*, Lectures in Mathematics ETH Zürich, Birkhäuser, 2001.
- [3] C. Rourke and B. Sanderson, *Introduction to Piecewise-Linear Topology*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, Springer, 1972.
- [4] A. Weinstein, *Symplectic manifolds and their Lagrangian submanifolds*, Adv. Math. **6** (1971), 329–346.