

Title	On knots whose points are fixed under a periodic transformation of the 3-sphere
Author(s)	Fox, R. H.
Citation	Osaka Mathematical Journal. 10(1) P.31-P.35
Issue Date	1958
Text Version	publisher
URL	<a href="https://doi.org/10.18910/7093">https://doi.org/10.18910/7093</a>
DOI	10.18910/7093
rights	
Note	

***Osaka University Knowledge Archive : OUKA***

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/repo/ouka/all/>

***On Knots whose Points are Fixed under a Periodic  
Transformation of the 3-Sphere***

By R. H. Fox

Let  $\Lambda$  be a simple closed curve in the 3-sphere  $\Sigma$  and let  $g$  be a positive integer greater than 1. If the knot type of  $\Lambda$  is trivial there are transformations of  $\Sigma$  of period  $g$  that leave fixed every point of  $\Lambda$ . An example of such a transformation is one that is equivalent to a rotation of  $\Sigma$ , or if  $g=2$ , one that is equivalent to a reflection. Furthermore [1] there exist transformations of period  $g$  that leave fixed every point of a wild knot  $\Lambda$ . However it is generally conjectured that *no such transformation is possible if the knot type of  $\Lambda$  is tame and non-trivial*. Although a complete proof may well turn out to be extremely difficult, it is possible, assuming, as we shall from now on, that the transformation is semi-linear, to verify this conjecture for certain integers  $g$  and knots  $\Lambda$  of certain tame non-trivial types.

Thus Montgomery and Samelson [2] proved a theorem that, together with the recently proved [3] Dehn lemma, shows that, for  $g=2$ ,  $\Lambda$  cannot be the boundary of any Möbius band. More recently Kinoshita proved [4], again for  $g=2$ , that, modulo the Poincaré conjecture,  $\Lambda$  cannot be any of the prime knots of fewer than 10 crossings except possibly  $8_9$  or  $8_{20}$ .

In this note I shall extend part of the Montgomery-Samelson result to a rather larger class of knots. The method is the same as that of Kinoshita, and is based on a formula to be found in [6]. Along the way I shall show that, by referring to Blanchfield's theorem [9], Kinoshita's argument is seen to be valid without assumption of Poincaré's conjecture.

§1. Let  $\Lambda$  be a simple closed curve in the 3-sphere  $\Sigma$  whose knot type is tame and non-trivial, and suppose that  $T$  is a semi-linear transformation of  $\Sigma$  of period  $g \geq 2$  such that  $T(p) = p$  for each point  $p$  of  $\Lambda$ . Then it follows from theorems of P. A. Smith [7] that (1) the points of  $\Lambda$  are the only points of  $\Sigma$  that are fixed under  $T$ , and (2)  $T$  preserves the orientation of  $\Sigma$ . The orbit space  $S$  is a simply connected 3-dimensional manifold and  $\Sigma$  is a  $g$ -fold cyclic covering of  $S$  ramified over the simply closed curve  $L$  that lies under  $\Lambda$ . I do not assume that  $S$  is necessarily the 3-sphere.

Denote by  $\Delta(\tau)$  and  $D(t)$  the Alexander polynomials of the fundamental groups  $\pi(\Sigma-L)$  and  $\pi(S-L)$  respectively. Then [6, p. 418]

$$\Delta(\tau) = \prod_{j=0}^{g-1} D(\omega^j t),$$

where  $\omega$  is a primitive  $g$ -th root of unity and  $t^g = \tau$ . (As Kinoshita remarked [4], the derivation of this formula is entirely valid if the hypothesis "S is a 3-sphere" is weakened to the hypotheses "S is simply connected".) If the roots of  $D(t) = 0$  are  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$  then

$$D(t) = c \prod_{i=1}^n (t - \alpha_i);$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\tau) &= c^g \prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{j=0}^{g-1} (\omega^j t - \alpha_i) \\ &= c^g \prod_{i=1}^n (\tau - \alpha_i^g). \end{aligned}$$

Thus

(1) *The leading coefficient of  $\Delta(\tau)$  is the  $g$ -th power of the leading coefficient of  $D(t)$ .*

(2) *The roots of  $\Delta(\tau)$  are the  $g$ -th powers  $\alpha_1^g, \dots, \alpha_n^g$  of the roots  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$  of  $D(t)$ ; in particular  $\Delta(\tau)$  and  $D(\tau)$  have the same degree.*

Condition (1) alone is sufficient to show that  $\Lambda$  cannot belong to any of the thirty four types  $5_2, 6_1, 7_2, 7_3, 7_5, 8_1, 8_4, 8_6, 8_8, 8_{11}, 8_{13}, 8_{14}, 8_{15}, 9_3, 9_4, 9_5, 9_6, 9_7, 9_8, 9_9, 9_{12}, 9_{14}, 9_{15}, 9_{16}, 9_{19}, 9_{21}, 9_{25}, 9_{35}, 9_{37}, 9_{38}, 9_{39}, 9_{41}, 9_{46}, 9_{49}$ , for any  $g$ , or to any of the seven types  $7_4, 8_3, 9_2, 9_{10}, 9_{13}, 9_{18}, 9_{23}$ , for any  $g \geq 3$ . It is also sufficient to show, for example, that  $\Delta(\tau)$  cannot, for any  $g$ , be a reducible quadratic. For  $\Delta(1) = \pm 1$  and  $\Delta(1/\tau) = \tau^{2g} \Delta(\tau)$  [8] show that a reducible quadratic  $\Delta(\tau)$  must be of the form

$$\Delta(\tau) = ((h+1)\tau - h)(h\tau - (h+1));$$

but, of course, for no integer  $h \neq 0, -1$  is  $h(h+1)$  ever a power.

§ 2. Since<sup>1)</sup>  $\pi(S-L)$  has a presentation in which the number of

1) *If  $M$  is any triangulated closed 3-dimensional manifold and  $K$  is a 1-dimensional subcomplex which has  $\mu$  components and whose 1-dimensional betti number is  $p$ , then  $\pi(M-K)$  has a presentation in which the number of generators exceeds the number of relators by  $p - \mu + 1$ .*

*Proof:* In  $K$  select  $p$  (open) edges  $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_p$  such that  $K - (\sigma_1 + \dots + \sigma_p)$  is a tree  $T^*$  and let  $T$  be a maximal tree that contains  $T^*$ . In  $T^*$  select  $\mu - 1$  edges  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{\mu-1}$  such that each of the  $\mu$  components of  $T' = T - (\tau_1 + \dots + \tau_{\mu-1})$  contains a component of  $K$ . Note that  $\pi(M-K) \approx \pi(M - (K + T'))$ .

Let  $C$  be a maximal cave in  $M$ , i.e. the dual of a maximal tree in the dual triangulation. Since the Euler characteristic of  $M$  is equal to zero, the number  $\alpha_1$  of edges of  $M$  that are not on  $T$  is equal to the number  $\alpha_2$  of faces of  $M$  that are not in  $C$ .

The group  $\pi(M - (K + T'))$  has a presentation  $(x_1, \dots, x_n; r_1, \dots, r_m)$  in which the generators  $x_j$  correspond to the faces of  $M$  that are not in  $C$ , and the relators  $r_i$  correspond to the edges that are not in  $K + T'$ . Thus  $n = \alpha_2 = \alpha_1$  and  $m = \alpha_1 + (\mu - 1) - p = n + \mu - 1 - p$ .

generators exceeds the number of relations by one, the first elementary ideal is the principal ideal [5] generated by  $\pm t^r D(t)$ . Since  $H(S-L)$  is infinite cyclic,  $D(1) = \pm 1$ . Therefore it follows from a theorem of Blanchfield [9] that  $t^u D(1/t) = \varepsilon D(t)$  where  $u$  is some integer and  $\varepsilon = \pm 1$ . Since  $\Delta(t)$  is a knot polynomial its degree is even, say  $2r$ . But  $D(t)$  must have the same degree. If we write  $D(t) = c \prod_{i=1}^{2r} (t - \alpha_i)$  we see that  $u$  must equal  $2r$ . Thus

$$c \prod_{i=1}^{2r} (1 - \alpha_i t) = \varepsilon c \prod_{i=1}^{2r} (t - \alpha_i) .$$

Denoting by  $\sigma_k$  the  $k$ -th symmetric function of the roots  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2r}$  we get (since  $c \neq 0$ )

$$1 - \sigma_1 t + \sigma_2 t^2 - \dots + \sigma_{2r} t^{2r} = \varepsilon (\sigma_{2r} - \sigma_{2r-1} t + \dots - \sigma_1 t^{2r-1} + t^{2r}) ,$$

whence

$$\sigma_{2r} = \varepsilon, \quad \sigma_{2r-1} = \varepsilon \sigma_1, \dots, \quad \sigma_{r+1} = \varepsilon \sigma_{r-1}, \quad \sigma_r = \varepsilon \sigma_r .$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} D(1) &= c(1 - \sigma_1 + \sigma_2 - \dots + \sigma_{2r}) \\ &= c(1 + \varepsilon)(1 - \sigma_1 + \sigma_2 - \dots + (-1)^{r-1} \sigma_{r-1}) - (-1)^r c \sigma_r = \pm 1 , \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$(-1)^r c \sigma_r \equiv 1 \pmod{2} \quad \text{hence } \sigma_r \neq 0 .$$

It follows now from  $\sigma_r = \varepsilon \sigma_r$  that  $\varepsilon = 1$ . Therefore  $t^{2r} D(1/t) = D(t)$ . Since  $D(1) = \pm 1$ , it follows [8] that there must be some knot in ordinary 3-space whose Alexander polynomial is  $D(t)$ . Thus  $D(t)$  is a knot polynomial.

In the proof of Kinoshita's theorem [4] the Poincaré conjecture is invoked solely for the purpose of showing that the polynomial  $D(t)$  is symmetric, i.e.  $t^{2r} D(1/t) = D(t)$ . Accordingly the above shows that it is not necessary to assume Poincaré's conjecture in that argument.

§ 3. Let the  $d$ -th cyclotomic polynomial be denoted by  $\Phi_d(t)$ . Its degree is  $\phi(d)$  and its roots are the primitive  $d$ -th roots of unity.  $\Delta(\tau)$  has a unique factorization of the form

$$\Delta(\tau) = \Phi_{a_1}^{m(a_1)}(\tau) \dots \Phi_{a_r}^{m(a_r)}(\tau) \cdot \Psi(\tau) ,$$

where  $a_1, \dots, a_r$  are distinct from one another, and no root of  $\Psi(\tau)$  is a root of unity.

**Theorem.** *If  $p$  is any prime divisor of  $(g, a_i)$  then  $m(a_i)$  must be divisible by the highest power of  $p$  that divides  $g$ .*

Proof. Suppose that  $\Phi_d(t) = \prod_{j=1}^{\phi(d)} (t - \omega_j)$  divides  $D(t)$ . Then the corresponding factor of  $\Delta(\tau)$  is  $\prod_{j=1}^{\phi(d)} (\tau - \omega_j^g)$ . Since each  $\omega_j$  is a primitive  $d$ -th root of unity, each  $\omega_j^g$  is a primitive  $d'$ -th root of unity, where  $d' = d/(g, d)$ . (For  $\omega_j^{g^x} = 1$  iff  $d|gx$ , i.e. iff  $d'|g'x$ , where  $g' = g/(g, d)$ ; since  $(d', g') = 1$  this holds iff  $d'|x$ .) Therefore

$$\prod_{j=1}^{\phi(d)} (\tau - \omega_j^g) = \Phi_{d'}^{n(d)}(\tau)$$

Furthermore, since  $\prod_{j=1}^{\phi(d)} (\tau - \omega_j^g)$  is of degree  $\phi(d)$  and  $\Phi_{d'}(\tau)$  is of degree  $\phi(d')$ , we have

$$n(d) = \phi(d)/\phi(d').$$

Clearly the exponent  $m(a)$  of the factor  $\Phi_a^{m(a)}(\tau)$  of  $\Delta(\tau)$  must therefore be of the form  $\sum v_a n(d)$ , where  $v_a$  are integers and the sum is extended over those integers  $d$  for which  $d' = a$ .

Let  $p$  range over the prime divisors of  $a$ , and let  $q$  range over the remaining primes. Write  $a = \Pi p^\alpha$ ,  $d = \Pi p^\delta \Pi q^\beta$  and  $g = \Pi p^\gamma \Pi q^\theta$ . If  $d' = a$  then we must have  $0 < \alpha = \gamma < \delta$  and  $\beta \leq \theta$ . It follows that  $d/d' = (g, d) = \Pi p^{\min(\delta, \gamma)} \Pi q^{\min(\beta, \theta)}$  must be divisible by  $p^\gamma$ , and hence that  $p^\gamma$  must divide  $n(d) = \phi(d)/\phi(d') = d \Pi \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \Pi_{q>0} \left(1 - \frac{1}{q}\right) / d' \Pi \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)$ . Since  $p^\gamma$  divides  $n(d)$  for each  $d$  for which  $d' = a$ , it follows that  $p^\gamma$  divides  $m(a)$ .

§ 4. **Corollary 1.** *If  $g$  and  $AB$  are not relatively prime then  $\Lambda$  cannot be a torus knot of type  $A, B$ .*

Proof. If  $\Lambda$  is a torus knot of type  $A, B$  then

$$\Delta(\tau) = \frac{(\tau^{AB} - 1)(\tau - 1)}{(\tau^A - 1)(\tau^B - 1)} = \Phi_{AB}(\tau) \dots$$

so that  $m(AB) = 1$ . It follows from the theorem that if  $p$  is any prime divisor of  $(g, AB)$  then  $p \nmid g$ ; consequently  $(g, AB) = 1$ .

**Corollary 2.** (MONTGOMERY-SAMELSON) *If  $g = 2$ ,  $\Lambda$  cannot be the boundary of a twisted<sup>2)</sup> Möbius band.*

Proof. If  $\kappa$  is the knot type of a Möbius band then [10]  $\Delta(\tau) = \Delta_\kappa(\tau^2) \cdot \frac{(\tau^2 - 1)(\tau^B - 1)}{(\tau^{2B} - 1)(\tau - 1)}$ , where  $\Delta_\kappa$  is the polynomial of  $\kappa$ . Let  $q$  be any prime divisor of  $B$ . Since  $(2, B) = 1$ ,  $q > 2$ . Thus

2) The twist  $\rho$  of Möbius band in 3-space was defined in [11] to be  $\varepsilon \cdot v(k, l)$ , where  $k$  is the boundary of the Möbius band,  $l$  is its meridian,  $v$  denotes linking number, and  $\varepsilon = \pm 1$ . By a twisted Möbius band I mean one for which  $|\rho| > 1$ .

$$\frac{(\tau^{2B}-1)(\tau-1)}{(\tau^2-1)(\tau^B-1)} = \Phi_{2q}(\tau) \dots$$

Now if  $\Phi_d(\tau)$  divides  $\Delta_\kappa(\tau)$  the corresponding factor of  $\Delta_\kappa(\tau^2)$  must be

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_d(\tau^2) &= \Phi_{2d}(\tau) && \text{if } d \text{ is even} \\ &= \Phi_{2d}(\tau) \Phi_d(\tau) && \text{if } d \text{ is odd.} \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $\Phi_{2q}(\tau) \mid \Delta_\kappa(\tau^2)$  only if  $\Phi_q(\tau) \mid \Delta_\kappa(\tau)$ .

But this last is impossible because  $\Delta_\kappa(1) = \pm 1$  and  $\Phi_q(1) = q$ . Thus we conclude that

$$\Delta(\tau) = \Phi_{2q}(\tau) \dots,$$

i.e. that  $m(2q) = 1$ . Therefore, by the theorem, 1 must be divisible by the highest power of  $p=2$  that divides 2. This is impossible.

(Received February 5, 1958)

---

#### References

- [ 1 ] Bing, R. H.: Decomposition of  $E^3$  into points and tame arcs. Summary of lectures and seminars at the summer institute on set-theoretic topology Madison (1955), 40-47.
- [ 2 ] Montgomery, D. and Samelson, H.: A theorem on fixed points of involutions in  $S^3$ . Canadian J. Math. **7** (1955), 208-220.
- [ 3 ] Papakyriakopoulos, C. D.: On Dehn's lemma and the asphericity of knots. Annals of Math. **66** (1957), 1-26.
- [ 4 ] Kinoshita, S.: Notes on knots and periodic transformations. Proc. Japan Acad. **33** (1957), 358-362.
- [ 5 ] Fox, R. H.: Free differential calculus II. Annals of Math. **59** (1954), 196-210.
- [ 6 ] Fox, R. H.: Free differential calculus III. Annals of Math. **64** (1956), 407-419.
- [ 7 ] Smith, P. A.: Transformations of finite period II. Annals of Math. **40** (1939), 690-711.
- [ 8 ] Seifert, H.: Über das Geschlecht von Knoten. Math. Ann. **110** (1934), 571-592.
- [ 9 ] Blanchfield, R. C.: Intersection theory of manifolds with operators with applications to knot theory. Annals of Math. **65** (1957), 340-356.
- [10] Reidemeister, K.: Knotentheorie, Berlin (1932).
- [11] Kyle, R. H.: Embeddings of Möbius bands in 3-dimensional space. Proc. Royal Irish Acad. **57** section A No. 7 (1935), 131-136.

