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#### Abstract

For certain $(1,1)$-knots in lens spaces with a longitudinal surgery yielding the 3 -sphere, we determine a non-negative integer derived from its ( 1,1 )-splitting. The value will be an invariant for such knots. Roughly, it corresponds to a 'minimal' self-intersection number when one consider projections of a knot on a Heegaard torus. As an application, we give a necessary and sufficient condition for such knots to be hyperbolic.


## 1. Introduction

A lens space $L(p, q)$ is a 3-manifold obtained by the $p / q$-surgery on a trivial knot in the 3 -sphere $S^{3}$ and is homeomorphic neither to $S^{3}$ nor to $S^{2} \times S^{1}$. Throughout this paper, $-L(p, q)$ denotes the same manifold as $L(p, q)$ with reversed orientation.

A knot $K$ in a closed orientable 3-manifold $M$ is called a (1, 1)-knot if $(M, K)=$ $\left(V_{1}, t_{1}\right) \cup_{P}\left(V_{2}, t_{2}\right)$, where $\left(V_{1}, V_{2} ; P\right)$ is a genus one Heegaard splitting and $t_{i}$ is a trivial arc in $V_{i}(i=1$ and 2). (An arc $t$ properly embedded in a solid torus $V$ is said to be trivial if there is a disk $D$ in $V$ with $t \subset \partial D$ and $\partial D \backslash t \subset \partial V$.) Set $W_{i}=\left(V_{i}, t_{i}\right)(i=1$ and 2). We call the triplet $\left(W_{1}, W_{2} ; P\right)$ a (1, 1)-splitting of $(M, K)$. We regard $P$ as a torus with two specified points $P \cap K$. Let $E_{1}$ ( $E_{2}$ resp.) be a meridian disk of $V_{1}\left(V_{2}\right.$ resp.) disjoint from $t_{1}$ ( $t_{2}$ resp.). It is known that such a disk is unique up to isotopy on $V_{1} \backslash t_{1}\left(V_{2} \backslash t_{2}\right.$ resp.) (cf. [13, Lemma 3.4]). A ( 1,1 )-splitting ( $W_{1}, W_{2} ; P$ ) is said to be monotone if the signed intersection points of $\partial E_{1}$ and $\partial E_{2}$ have the same sign for some orientations of $\partial E_{1}$ and $\partial E_{2}$.

Berge's work [1] indicates that it is very important to study ( 1,1 )-knots. Which knots in $S^{3}$ admit Dehn surgeries yielding lens spaces? This problem is still open. In [1], Berge introduced the concept of doubly primitive knots and gave an integral surgery to obtain a lens space from any doubly primitive knot. In this paper, we call such a surgery Berge's surgery. He also gave a list of doubly primitive knots in $S^{3}$ (cf. Section 6). It is expected that Berge's list would be complete.

If a lens space $M$ comes from a Dehn surgery on a knot $K$ in $S^{3}$, then there is the dual knot $K^{*}$ in $M$ such that a Dehn surgery on $K^{*}$ yields $S^{3}$. It has been proved in [1] that when Berge's surgery on a doubly primitive knot yields a lens space, its


Fig. 1.
dual knot is isotopic to a $(1,1)$-knot defined as follows.

DEFINITION 1.1. Let $V_{1}$ be a standard solid torus in $S^{3}, m$ a meridian of $V_{1}$ and $l$ a longitude of $V_{1}$ such that $l$ bounds a disk in $\operatorname{cl}\left(S^{3} \backslash V_{1}\right)$. We fix an orientation of $m$ and $l$ as illustrated in Fig. 1. By attaching a solid torus $V_{2}$ to $V_{1}$ so that $[\bar{m}]=p[l]+$ $q[m](p>0)$ in $H_{1}\left(\partial V_{1} ; \mathbb{Z}\right)$, we obtain a lens space $L(p, q)$, where $\bar{m}$ is a meridian of $V_{2}$. The intersection points of $m$ and $\bar{m}$ are labelled $P_{0}, \ldots, P_{p-1}$ successively along the positive direction of $m$. For an integer $u$ with $0<u<p$, let $t_{i}^{u}$ be a simple arc in $D_{i}$ joining $P_{0}$ to $P_{u}(i=1,2)$. Then the notation $K(L(p, q) ; u)$ denotes the knot $t_{1}^{u} \cup t_{2}^{u}$ in $L(p, q)$.

Set $W_{i}=\left(V_{i}, t_{i}^{u}\right)(i=1,2)$, where $V_{i}$ and $t_{i}^{u}$ are those in Definition 1.1. Then the pair of $W_{1}$ and $W_{2}$ gives a $(1,1)$-splitting of $K=K(L(p, q) ; u)$ which is monotone. We will prove that any $(1,1)$-splitting of $(L(p, q), K)$ is monotone if $K$ admits a longitudinal surgery yielding $S^{3}$ (see Lemma 4.1).

In this paper, we prepare the following notations.

DEFINITION 1.2. Let $p$ and $q$ be coprime integers with $p>0$. Let $\left\{u_{j}\right\}_{1 \leq j \leq p}$ be the finite sequence such that $0 \leq u_{j}<p$ and $u_{j} \equiv q \cdot j(\bmod p)$. For an integer $u$ with $0<u<p, \Psi_{p, q}(u)$ denotes the integer $j$ with $u_{j}=u$, and $\Phi_{p, q}(u)$ denotes the number of elements of the following set:

$$
\left\{u_{j} \mid 1 \leq j<\Psi_{p, q}(u), u_{j}<u\right\}
$$

Also, $\tilde{\Phi}_{p, q}(u)$ denotes the following:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\Phi}_{p, q}(u)=\min & \left\{\Phi_{p, q}(u), \Phi_{p, q}(u)-\Psi_{p, q}(u)+p-u\right. \\
& \left.\Psi_{p, q}(u)-\Phi_{p, q}(u)-1, u-\Phi_{p, q}(u)-1\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

In Definition 1.1, let $t_{1}^{\prime \prime}$ ( $t_{2}^{\prime \prime}$ resp.) be a projection of $t_{1}^{u}$ ( $t_{2}^{u}$ resp.) on $P$ with $t^{\prime \prime}{ }_{1} \subset \partial D_{1}\left(t_{2}^{\prime \prime} \subset \partial D_{2}\right.$ resp. $)$. Set $t^{\prime \prime \prime}{ }_{1}=\operatorname{cl}\left(\partial D_{1} \backslash t_{1}^{\prime u}\right)$ and $t^{\prime \prime \prime}{ }_{2}=\operatorname{cl}\left(\partial D_{2} \backslash t^{\prime \prime}{ }_{2}\right)$. Each of $t^{\prime \prime}{ }_{1}$ and $t^{\prime \prime \prime}{ }_{1}^{\prime \prime}\left(t_{2}^{\prime \prime}\right.$ and $t^{\prime \prime \prime}{ }_{2}^{\prime}$ resp.) are called monotone projections of $t_{1}^{u}$ ( $t_{2}^{u}$ resp.). There are four projections of $K=K(L(p, q) ; u): t^{\prime \prime} \cup t^{\prime \prime}{ }_{2}, t^{\prime \prime \prime} \cup t^{\prime \prime \prime}{ }_{2}, t^{\prime \prime \prime}{ }_{1} \cup t^{\prime \prime}{ }_{2}$ and $t^{\prime \prime u} \cup t^{\prime \prime \prime}{ }_{2}$. These are called monotone projections of $K$ on $P$. We remark that $\tilde{\Phi}_{p, q}(u)$ corresponds to a self-intersection number of a monotone projection of $K$ on $P$ which is minimal among the four monotone projections. We will show that $\tilde{\Phi}_{p, q}(u)$ is an invariant for $K$ if $K$ admits a longitudinal surgery yielding $S^{3}$ (see Corollary 4.6). Hence, in this case $\tilde{\Phi}_{p, q}(u)$ will be denoted by $\Phi(K)$.

The following is our main result.

Theorem 1.3. Set $K=K(L(p, q) ; u)$. Suppose that $K$ admits a longitudinal surgery yielding $S^{3}$. Then we have the following:
(1) $\Phi(K)=0$ if and only if $K$ is a torus knot.
(2) $\Phi(K)=1$ if and only if $K$ contains an essential torus in its exterior.
(3) $\Phi(K) \geq 2$ if and only if $K$ is a hyperbolic knot.

In Section 5, we will give formulae to obtain representations of dual knots of Berge's examples. We remark that the arguments in Section 5 are almost restatements of those by Berge [1].

## 2. Preliminaries

Let $B$ be a sub-manifold of a manifold $A$. The notation $\eta(B ; A)$ denotes a regular neighborhood of $B$ in $A$. By $E(B ; A)$, we mean the exterior of $B$ in $A$, i.e., $E(B ; A)=$ $\operatorname{cl}(A \backslash \eta(B ; A))$.

For two curves $x$ and $y$ in a surface (i.e., connected compact 2-manifold), the notation $\sharp(x, y)$ denotes the number of transverse intersection points and the notation $\#_{G}(x, y)$ denotes a (minimal) geometric intersection number relative to the endpoints of $x$ and $y$. We say that $x$ and $y$ intersect essentially if $\sharp(x, y)=\sharp_{G}(x, y)$.

A triplet $\left(H_{1}, H_{2} ; S\right)$ is a genus $g$ Heegaard splitting of a closed orientable 3-manifold $N$ if $H_{i}\left(i=1\right.$ and 2) are genus $g$ handlebodies with $N=H_{1} \cup H_{2}$ and $H_{1} \cap H_{2}=$ $\partial H_{1} \cap \partial H_{2}=S$. The surface $S$ is called a Heegaard surface. A properly embedded disk $D$ in a genus $g$ handlebody $H$ is called a meridian disk of $H$ if a 3-manifold obtained by cutting $H$ along $D$ is a genus $g-1$ handlebody. The boundary of a meridian disk of $H$ is called a meridian of $H$. A collection of mutually disjoint $g$ meridians $\left\{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{g}\right\}$ of $H$ is called a complete meridian system of $H$ if $\left\{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{g}\right\}$ bounds mutually disjoint meridian disks of $H$ which cuts $H$ into a 3-ball.

Let $\left(H_{1}, H_{2} ; S\right)$ be a genus two Heegaard splitting of $S^{3}$. Let $\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}\right\}$ and $\left\{y_{1}, y_{2}\right\}$ be complete meridian systems of $H_{1}$ and $H_{2}$ respectively. A Heegaard diagram of $S^{3}$ is ( $S ;\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}\right\},\left\{y_{1}, y_{2}\right\}$ ). If $x_{1}, x_{2}, y_{1}$ and $y_{2}$ are isotoped on $S$ so that they intersect essentially, then we call ( $S ;\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}\right\},\left\{y_{1}, y_{2}\right\}$ ) a normalized Heegaard diagram. If
$\sharp\left(x_{1}, y_{1}\right)=1, \sharp\left(x_{2}, y_{2}\right)=1, x_{2} \cap y_{1}=\emptyset$ and $x_{1} \cap y_{2}=\emptyset$, then the Heegaard diagram is said to be standard. Let $\Sigma_{x}$ ( $\Sigma_{y}$ resp.) be the 2 -sphere with four holes obtained by cutting $S$ along $x_{1}$ and $x_{2}$ ( $y_{1}$ and $y_{2}$ resp.), and let $x_{i}^{+}$and $x_{i}^{-}$( $y_{i}^{+}$and $y_{i}^{-}$resp.) $(i=1,2)$ be the copies of $x_{i}$ ( $y_{i}$ resp.) in $\Sigma_{x}$ ( $\Sigma_{y}$ resp.). A wave $w$ associated with $x_{i}(i=1$ or 2 ) is a properly embedded arc in $\Sigma_{x}$ such that $w$ is disjoint from $\left(y_{1} \cup y_{2}\right) \cap \Sigma_{x}$, $w$ joins $x_{i}^{+}$or $x_{i}^{-}$to itself and $w$ does not cut off a disk from $\Sigma_{x}$. Similarly, a wave $w$ associated with $y_{i}(i=1$ or 2$)$ is a properly embedded arc in $\Sigma_{y}$ such that $w$ is disjoint from $\left(x_{1} \cup x_{2}\right) \cap \Sigma_{y}$, $w$ joins $y_{i}^{+}$or $y_{i}^{-}$to itself and $w$ does not cut off a disk from $\Sigma_{y}$. A Heegaard diagram $\left(S ;\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}\right\},\left\{y_{1}, y_{2}\right\}\right)$ contains a wave if there is a wave associated with $x_{i}\left(i=1\right.$ or 2 ) or $y_{i}(i=1$ or 2$)$. The following has been proved by Homma, Ochiai and Takahashi [8].

Theorem 2.1 ([8, Main Theorem]). A normalized genus two Heegaard diagram of $S^{3}$ is standard, or contains a wave.

Let $M$ be a closed orientable 3-manifold. A trivial knot in $M$ is a loop bounding an embedding disk in $M$. It is easy to see that a Dehn surgery on a trivial knot in a lens space cannot yield $S^{3}$. A torus knot in $M$ is a non-trivial knot which can be isotoped on a genus one Heegaard surface of $M$. The following has been proved in [13].

Theorem 2.2 ([13, Theorems 2.2-2.4]). Let $K$ be a non-trivial (1, 1)-knot in $M$ and $\left(W_{1}, W_{2} ; P\right)$ a $(1,1)$-splitting of $(M, K)$ with $W_{i}=\left(V_{i}, t_{i}\right)(i=1,2)$, where $V_{i}$ is a solid torus and $t_{i}$ is a trivial arc in $V_{i}$. Suppose that there are projections $t_{1}^{\prime}$ and $t_{2}^{\prime}$ of $t_{1}$ and $t_{2}$ respectively and there is an essential loop $z$ on $P \backslash K$ such that $z \cap\left(t_{1}^{\prime} \cup t_{2}^{\prime}\right)=\emptyset$. Then one of the following holds.
(1) $K$ is a torus knot.
(2) $E(K ; M)$ contains an essential torus.
(3) $K=K(\alpha, \beta ; r)$ for some $\alpha, \beta$ and $r$.

Here, $K(\alpha, \beta ; r)$ is a knot obtained by the following construction. Let $K_{1} \cup K_{2}$ be a 2-bridge link of type $(\alpha, \beta)$. Then $K(\alpha, \beta ; r)$ denotes the knot $K_{2}$ in $K_{1}(r)$, where $K_{1}(r)$ is the manifold obtained by the $r$-surgery on $K_{1}$ (cf. [12, Chapter 9]). By an argument similar to that in [10, Section 1], we can see that $K(\alpha, \beta ; r)$ is a $(1,1)$-knot in $K_{1}(r)$ for any 2-bridge link and surgery coefficient $r$.

We remark the following which has been essentially proved in [11].

Lemma 2.3. Set $K=K(\alpha, \beta ; r)$ for some $\alpha, \beta$ and $r$. If $K$ admits a Dehn surgery yielding $S^{3}$, then $K$ is a torus knot.

Proof. Recall that the exterior of $K$ is obtained from the exterior of a 2-bridge link by filling a single solid torus. It has been proved in [11] that any closed 3-manifold obtained by any non-trivial Dehn surgery on a 2-bridge link is not homeomorphic to
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$S^{3}$ unless the 2-bridge link is a torus link (cf. [11, Theorems 2 and 3]). This implies that if $K$ admits a Dehn surgery yielding $S^{3}$, then $K$ is a torus knot.

## 3. Dehn surgeries on $K(L(p, q) ; u)$

We use the notations in Definition 1.1. Let $D_{1}$ ( $D_{2}$ resp.) be a meridian disk of $V_{1}\left(V_{2}\right.$ resp.) with $\partial D_{1}=m$ and $\sharp\left(\partial D_{1}, \partial D_{2}\right)=\sharp_{G}\left(\partial D_{1}, \partial D_{2}\right)$. Let $t_{1}^{\prime \prime \prime}\left(t_{2}^{\prime \prime}\right.$ resp.) be the monotone projection of $t_{1}^{u}\left(t_{2}^{u}\right.$ resp.) whose initial point is $P_{0}$ and whose endpoint is $P_{u}$ passing in the positive direction of $m(l$ resp. $)$. Then $t_{1}^{\prime \prime}\left(t_{2}^{\prime \prime}\right.$ resp.) is called the positive projection of $t_{1}^{u}\left(t_{2}^{u}\right.$ resp.). Set $V_{1}^{\prime}=V_{1} \cup \eta\left(t_{2}^{u} ; V_{2}\right), V_{2}^{\prime}=\operatorname{cl}\left(V_{2} \backslash \eta\left(t_{2}^{u} ; V_{2}\right)\right)$ and $S^{\prime}=\partial V_{1}^{\prime}=\partial V_{2}^{\prime}$. Then $\left(V_{1}^{\prime}, V_{2}^{\prime} ; S^{\prime}\right)$ is a genus two Heegaard splitting of $M=L(p, q)$. Let $D_{2}^{\prime} \subset\left(D_{2} \cap V_{2}^{\prime}\right)$ be a meridian disk of $V_{2}^{\prime}$ with $\partial D_{2}^{\prime} \supset\left(t_{2}^{\prime \prime} \cap S^{\prime}\right)$. Let $m^{\prime}$ be a meridian of $K=t_{1}^{u} \cup t_{2}^{u}$ in the annulus $S^{\prime} \cap \partial \eta\left(t_{2}^{u} ; V_{2}\right)$. Let $l^{\prime}$ be an essential loop in $S^{\prime}$ which is a union of $t^{\prime \prime} \cap S^{\prime}$ and an essential arc in the annulus $S^{\prime} \cap \partial \eta\left(t_{2}^{u} ; V_{2}\right)$ disjoint from $\partial D_{2}^{\prime}$ (cf. Fig. 2).

Let $m^{*}$ be a meridian of $K$ in $\partial \eta\left(K ; V_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ and $l^{*}$ a longitude of $K$ in $\partial \eta\left(K ; V_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ such that $l^{\prime} \cup l^{*}$ bounds an annulus in $\operatorname{cl}\left(V_{1}^{\prime} \backslash \eta\left(K ; V_{1}^{\prime}\right)\right)$ and that $l^{*} \supset\left(\delta_{1} \cap \partial \eta\left(K ; V_{1}^{\prime}\right)\right)$, where $\delta_{1}$ is the disk in $V_{1}$ bounded by $t_{1}^{u} \cup t^{\prime \prime}{ }_{1}$. Note that $m^{*}$ and $l^{*}$ are oriented as illustrated in Fig. 1. Then $\left\{\left[m^{*}\right],\left[l^{*}\right]\right\}$ is a basis of $H_{1}\left(\partial \eta\left(K ; V_{1}^{\prime}\right) ; \mathbb{Z}\right)$. Let $V_{1}^{\prime \prime}$ be a genus two handlebody obtained from $\mathrm{cl}\left(V_{1}^{\prime} \backslash \eta\left(K ; V_{1}^{\prime}\right)\right)$ by attaching a solid torus $\bar{V}$ so that the boundary of a meridian disk $\bar{D}$ of $\bar{V}$ is identified with a loop represented by $r\left[m^{*}\right]+$ $s\left[l^{*}\right]$. Set $M^{\prime}=V_{1}^{\prime \prime} \cup_{S^{\prime}} V_{2}^{\prime}$. Then we say that $M^{\prime}$ is obtained by the $(r / s)^{*}$-surgery on $K$. If $r / s$ is an integer, the $(r / s)^{*}$-surgery is called a longitudinal surgery. A core loop of $\bar{V}$ in $M^{\prime}$ is called the dual knot of $K$ in $M^{\prime}$.

Example 3.1. In Definition 1.2, set $p=18, q=5$ and $u=7$. Then we have the finite sequence $\left\{u_{j}\right\}$ determined in Definition 1.2 as follows:

$$
\left\{u_{j}\right\}_{1 \leq j \leq 18}: 5,10,15,2,7,12,17,4,9,14,1,6,11,16,3,8,13,0 .
$$

Hence we see that $\Psi_{18,5}(7)=5$ and $\tilde{\Phi}_{18,5}(7)=\Phi_{18,5}(7)=2$.
Set $K=K(L(p, q) ; u)=K(L(18,5) ; 7)$. We use the same notations as the above and in Definition 1.1. Then we can regard $\partial D_{2}$ as an $(18,5)$-curve on $\partial V_{1}$. When one fixes $P_{0}$ as an initial point and follows $\partial D_{2}$ in the positive direction of $l, \partial D_{2}$ intersects $\partial D_{1}$ in the following order:

$$
\left(P_{0} \rightarrow\right) P_{u_{1}} \rightarrow P_{u_{2}} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow P_{u_{17}} \rightarrow P_{u_{18}} \rightarrow P_{0}
$$

Let $E_{1}$ ( $E_{2}$ resp.) be a meridian disk of $V_{1}$ ( $V_{2}$ resp.) disjoint from $t_{1}^{u}$ ( $t_{2}^{u}$ resp.). Recall that $t_{1}^{\prime \prime}\left(t_{2}^{\prime \prime}\right.$ resp. $)$ is the positive projection of $t_{1}^{u}\left(t_{2}^{u}\right.$ resp.). Then $\Psi_{p, q}(u)=$ $\Psi_{18,5}(7)$ represents the number of intersection points of $\partial E_{1}$ and $t_{2}^{\prime \prime}$, and $\Phi_{p, q}(u)=$ $\Phi_{18,5}(7)$ represents the number of intersection points of $t^{\prime u}$ and the interior of $t^{\prime \prime}{ }_{2}$.

We next calculate the fundamental group of $\bar{M}=E(K ; L(18,5))$. By the argument above, we see that $\left(S^{\prime} ;\left\{\partial E_{1}\right\},\left\{\partial E_{2}, \partial D_{2}^{\prime}\right\}\right)$ gives a Heegaard diagram of $E(K ; L(18,5))$. Set $\bar{x}_{1}=\partial E_{1}$. Let $y_{1}$ and $y_{2}$ be loops on $S^{\prime}$ with $y_{1} \cap \partial D_{2}^{\prime}=\emptyset, \sharp\left(y_{1}, \partial E_{2}\right)=1, y_{2} \cap$ $\partial E_{2}=\emptyset, \sharp\left(y_{2}, \partial D_{2}^{\prime}\right)=1$. Then we see that $\pi_{1}(\bar{M})$ has the following representation.

$$
\pi_{1}(\bar{M}) \cong\left\langle y_{1}, y_{2} \mid \bar{x}_{1}=1\right\rangle
$$

By using the sequence $\left\{u_{j}\right\}_{1 \leq j \leq 18}$, we see

$$
\begin{aligned}
\pi_{1}(\bar{M}) & \cong\left\langle y_{1}, y_{2} \mid \bar{x}_{1}=1\right\rangle \\
& \cong\left\langle y_{1}, y_{2} \mid y_{1} y_{2} y_{1}^{3} y_{2} y_{1}^{4} y_{2} y_{1}^{3} y_{2} y_{1} y_{2} y_{1}^{3} y_{2} y_{1}^{3} y_{2}=1\right\rangle
\end{aligned}
$$

In fact, the relation is obtained by changing $u_{j}$ to $y_{1} y_{2}$ if $u_{j}<u(=7)$ and changing $u_{j}$ to $y_{1}$ otherwise.

We finally consider the $0^{*}$-surgery on $K$. Let $M^{\prime}$ be a 3 -manifold obtained by the $0^{*}$-surgery on $K^{*}$. Set $\bar{y}_{1}=\partial E_{2}$ and $\bar{y}_{2}=\partial D_{2}^{\prime}$. Let $D_{1}^{\prime}$ be a meridian disk of $V_{1}^{\prime}$ with $D_{1}^{\prime} \supset \bar{D}$. Let $x_{1}$ and $x_{2}$ be loops on $S^{\prime}$ with $x_{1} \cap \partial D_{1}^{\prime}=\emptyset, \sharp\left(x_{1}, \partial E_{1}\right)=1, x_{2} \cap \partial E_{1}=\emptyset$, $\sharp\left(x_{2}, \partial D_{1}^{\prime}\right)=1$. Then we see

$$
\begin{aligned}
\pi_{1}\left(M^{\prime}\right) & \cong\left\langle x_{1}, x_{2} \mid \bar{y}_{1}=1, \bar{y}_{2}=1\right\rangle \\
& \cong\left\langle\begin{array}{l}
x_{1}, x_{2} \left\lvert\, \begin{array}{l}
x_{1} x_{2} x_{1}^{3} x_{2} x_{1}^{4} x_{2} x_{1}^{3} x_{2} x_{1} x_{2} x_{1}^{3} x_{2} x_{1}^{3} x_{2}=1, \\
x_{1} x_{2} x_{1}^{3} x_{2} x_{1}=1
\end{array}\right.
\end{array}\right\rangle \\
& \cong\left\langle x_{1}, x_{1} x_{2} \mid x_{1}=1, x_{1} x_{2}=1\right\rangle
\end{aligned}
$$

Since Poincaré conjecture is true for genus two 3-manifolds (cf. [3] and [5]), we see that $M^{\prime}$ is homeomorphic to $S^{3}$. We remark that $K \subset L(18,5)$ is the dual knot of the ( $-2,3,7$ )-pretzel knot.

## 4. An invariant of $K(L(p, q) ; u)$ with a longitudinal surgery yielding $S^{3}$

We first prove the following.

Lemma 4.1. Set $K=K(L(p, q) ; u)$. Suppose that $K$ admits a longitudinal surgery yielding $S^{3}$. Then any $(1,1)$-splitting of $(M, K)$ is monotone.

Proof. Let $\left(W_{1}, W_{2} ; P\right)$ be a $(1,1)$-splitting of $(M, K)$ with $W_{i}=\left(V_{i}, t_{i}\right)(i=1,2)$. Let $E_{1}$ ( $E_{2}$ resp.) be a meridian disk of $V_{1}$ ( $V_{2}$ resp.) disjoint from $t_{1}$ ( $t_{2}$ resp.). Let $D_{1}$ ( $D_{2}$ resp.) be a meridian disk of $V_{1}$ ( $V_{2}$ resp.) which contains $t_{1}$ ( $t_{2}$ resp.) and is disjoint from $E_{1}$ ( $E_{2}$ resp.). We may assume that $\partial D_{1} \backslash K$ intersects $\partial D_{2} \backslash K$ essentially in $P \backslash K$.

Let $t^{\prime}{ }_{1}\left(t^{\prime}{ }_{2}\right.$ resp.) be a projection of $t_{1}$ ( $t_{2}$ resp.) with $t^{\prime}{ }_{1} \subset \partial D_{1}\left(t^{\prime}{ }_{2} \subset \partial D_{2}\right.$ resp.). Set $V_{1}^{\prime}=V_{1} \cup \eta\left(t_{2} ; V_{2}\right), V_{2}^{\prime}=\operatorname{cl}\left(V_{2} \backslash \eta\left(t_{2} ; V_{2}\right)\right)$ and $S^{\prime}=\partial V_{1}^{\prime}=\partial V_{2}^{\prime}$. Then $\left(V_{1}^{\prime}, V_{2}^{\prime} ; S^{\prime}\right)$ is a genus two Heegaard splitting of $M$. Let $D_{2}^{\prime} \subset\left(D_{2} \cap V_{2}^{\prime}\right)$ be a meridian disk of $V_{2}^{\prime}$ with $\partial D_{2}^{\prime} \supset\left(t^{\prime}{ }_{2} \cap S^{\prime}\right)$.

We now consider a longitudinal surgery on $K$. Let $V_{1}^{\prime \prime}$ be a genus two handlebody obtained from $\operatorname{cl}\left(V_{1}^{\prime} \backslash \eta\left(K ; V_{1}^{\prime}\right)\right)$ by attaching a solid torus $\bar{V}$ so that $\partial \bar{D}$ intersects a meridian of $\eta\left(K ; V_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ transversely in a single point, where $\bar{D}$ is a meridian disk of $\bar{V}$. Let $D_{1}^{\prime}$ be a meridian disk of $V_{1}^{\prime \prime}$ with $D_{1}^{\prime} \supset \bar{D}$. Since we consider a longitudinal surgery on $K$, we may assume that $\operatorname{cl}\left(\partial D_{1}^{\prime} \backslash \eta\left(t_{2} ; V_{2}\right)\right)$ is equivalent to $t^{\prime}{ }_{1} \cap \partial V_{1}^{\prime \prime}$. Then ( $S^{\prime} ;\left\{\partial D_{1}^{\prime}, \partial E_{1}\right\},\left\{\partial D_{2}^{\prime}, \partial E_{2}\right\}$ ) is a Heegaard diagram of the manifold $M^{\prime}$ obtained by such a surgery on $K$.

Let $S_{1}^{\prime}\left(S_{2}^{\prime}\right.$ resp.) be the torus with two holes obtained by cutting $S^{\prime}$ along $\partial E_{1}$ ( $\partial E_{2}$ resp.). Let $\partial E_{1}^{+}$and $\partial E_{1}^{-}\left(\partial E_{2}^{+}\right.$and $\partial E_{2}^{-}$resp.) be the boundary components of $S_{1}^{\prime}$ ( $S_{2}^{\prime}$ resp.).

To prove Lemma 4.1, we suppose that $\left(W_{1}, W_{2} ; P\right)$ is not monotone. Then there are two arc components, say $\gamma_{1}$ and $\gamma_{1}^{\prime}$, of $\partial E_{1} \cap S_{2}^{\prime}$ such that $\gamma_{1}$ ( $\gamma_{1}^{\prime}$ resp.) joins $\partial E_{2}^{+}$ ( $\partial E_{2}^{-}$resp.) to itself. Since

$$
\partial E_{2}^{+} \cap\left(\partial E_{1} \cap S_{2}^{\prime}\right)=\partial E_{2}^{-} \cap\left(\partial E_{1} \cap S_{2}^{\prime}\right)
$$

we see that $\gamma_{1}\left(\gamma_{1}^{\prime}\right.$ resp.) separates the specified points in $P \backslash \partial E_{2}$. Similarly, there are two arc components, say $\gamma_{2}$ and $\gamma_{2}^{\prime}$, of $\partial E_{2} \cap S_{1}^{\prime}$ such that $\gamma_{2}$ ( $\gamma_{2}^{\prime}$ resp.) joins $\partial E_{1}^{+}$ ( $\partial E_{1}^{-}$resp.) to itself and separates the specified points in $P \backslash \partial E_{1}$.

Let $\Sigma_{1}\left(\Sigma_{2}\right.$ resp.) be the 2 -sphere with four holes obtained by cutting $S_{1}^{\prime}\left(S_{2}^{\prime}\right.$ resp.) along $\partial D_{1}^{\prime}\left(\partial D_{2}^{\prime}\right.$ resp.). Since $\gamma_{1}$ and $\gamma_{1}^{\prime}\left(\gamma_{2}\right.$ and $\gamma_{2}^{\prime}$ resp.) separates the specified points in $P \backslash \partial E_{2}\left(P \backslash \partial E_{1}\right.$ resp.), $\gamma_{1}$ and $\gamma_{1}^{\prime}\left(\gamma_{2}\right.$ and $\gamma_{2}^{\prime}$ resp.) assure that there are no waves in $\Sigma_{2}$ ( $\Sigma_{1}$ resp.). Hence it follows from Theorem 2.1 that $M^{\prime}$ is not homeomorphic to $S^{3}$.

This completes the proof of Lemma 4.1.


Fig. 3.
Lemma 4.2. Let $K$ be a (1, 1)-knot in a lens space $M$ and $\left(W_{1}, W_{2} ; P\right) a(1,1)$ splitting of $(M, K)$. If $\left(W_{1}, W_{2} ; P\right)$ is monotone, then there is a monotone projection of $K$ on $P$.

Proof. Recall that $W_{i}=\left(V_{i}, t_{i}\right)$, where $V_{i}$ is a solid torus and $t_{i}$ is a trivial arc in $V_{i}$. Let $E_{1}$ ( $E_{2}$ resp.) be a meridian disk of $V_{1}$ ( $V_{2}$ resp.) disjoint from $t_{1}$ ( $t_{2}$ resp.). Let $D_{1}$ be a parallel copy of $E_{1}$ which contains $t_{1}$. We suppose that $\left|\partial D_{1} \cap \partial E_{2}\right|$ is minimal among such all meridian disks of $V_{1}$. We first prove the following.

Claim. If $\partial D_{1}$ and $\partial E_{2}$ are oriented, then the signed intersection points of $\partial D_{1}$ and $\partial E_{2}$ have the same sign.

Proof. Suppose that the claim does not hold. Let $A_{P}$ be the annulus with two specified points $P \cap K$ which is obtained by cutting $P$ along $\partial E_{1}$. Let $\gamma$ be a component of $\partial E_{2} \cap A_{P}$. Since $\left(W_{1}, W_{2} ; P\right)$ is monotone, we see that $\gamma$ joins distinct boundary components of $A_{P}$. Let $D_{P}$ be the disk with the specified points which are obtained by cutting $A_{P}$ along $\gamma$.

Suppose that there are no components of $\partial E_{2} \cap D_{P}$ separating the specified points in $D_{P}$. Then this implies that each component of $\partial E_{2} \cap D_{P}$ is parallel to $\gamma$ in $A_{P} \backslash K$. Hence we can regard $D_{P}$ as a square $[0,1] \times[0,1]$ such that each component of $\partial E_{2} \cap$ $D_{P}$ is vertical, i.e., each component of $\partial E_{2} \cap D_{P}$ corresponds to $\{p\} \times[0,1]$. We may assume that the specified points are in $[0,1] \times\{1 / 2\}$. Let $\alpha$ be a loop on $P$ such that $\alpha$ corresponds to $[0,1] \times\{1 / 2\}$ in the square $D_{P}$. Then we see that $\alpha$ bounds a meridian disk $D_{\alpha}$ of $V_{1}$ and $t_{1}$ is isotoped into $D_{\alpha}$ relative to the endpoints (cf. [13, Section 3]). Since we suppose that the claim does not hold, we see that $\left|\partial D_{\alpha} \cap \partial E_{2}\right|<\left|\partial D_{1} \cap \partial E_{2}\right|$. This contradicts the minimality of $\left|\partial D_{1} \cap \partial E_{2}\right|$. Hence there is a component, say $\gamma^{\prime}$, of $\partial E_{2} \cap D_{P}$ separating the specified points in $D_{P}$ (cf. Fig. 3).

Let $D_{P}^{\prime}$ and $D_{P}^{\prime \prime}$ be the disks obtained by cutting $D_{P}$ along $\gamma^{\prime}$. Note that each of $D_{P}^{\prime}$ and $D_{P}^{\prime \prime}$ contains exactly one of the specified points. Then we can regard $D_{P}^{\prime}$
( $D_{P}^{\prime \prime}$ resp.) as a square $[0,1] \times[0,1]$ such that each component of $\partial E_{2} \cap D_{P}^{\prime}\left(\partial E_{2} \cap D_{P}^{\prime \prime}\right.$ resp.) is vertical and that the specified point is in $[0,1] \times\{1 / 2\}$. Let $\alpha^{\prime}$ be a loop on $P$ such that $\alpha^{\prime} \cap D_{P}^{\prime}\left(\alpha^{\prime} \cap D_{P}^{\prime \prime}\right.$ resp.) corresponds to $[0,1] \times\{1 / 2\}$ in the square $D_{P}^{\prime}$ ( $D_{P}^{\prime \prime}$ resp.). Then we see that $\alpha^{\prime}$ bounds a meridian disk $D_{\alpha^{\prime}}$ of $V_{1}$ and $t_{1}$ is isotoped into $D_{\alpha^{\prime}}$ relative to the endpoints. Since we suppose that the claim does not hold, we see that $\left|\partial D_{\alpha^{\prime}} \cap \partial E_{2}\right|<\left|\partial D_{1} \cap \partial E_{2}\right|$. This contradicts the minimality of $\left|\partial D_{1} \cap \partial E_{2}\right|$.

Hence we have the claim.

Let $D_{2}$ be a parallel copy of $E_{2}$ with $\partial D_{2} \supset(P \cap K)$. Then $t_{2}$ is isotoped into $D_{2}$ relative to the endpoints. Hence $D_{1}$ and $D_{2}$ imply that there is a monotone projection of $K$ on $P$.

This completes the proof of Lemma 4.2.
The following is well known.
Lemma 4.3 (cf. [4] and [7]). There is an orientation-preserving homeomorphism between two lens spaces $L(p, q)$ and $L\left(p^{\prime}, q^{\prime}\right)$ if and only if one of the following holds.
(1) $p^{\prime}=p$ and $q^{\prime} \equiv q(\bmod p)$, and
(2) $p^{\prime}=p$ and $q^{\prime} \equiv q^{-1}(\bmod p)$.

We note that the following is mentioned by Berge [1] (cf. [14, Section 6]).
Lemma 4.4 ([1, Theorem 3]). Set $K=K(L(p, q) ; u)$ and $K^{\prime}=K\left(L\left(p^{\prime}, q^{\prime}\right) ; u^{\prime}\right)$ for some integers $p, q, u, p^{\prime}, q^{\prime}$ and $u^{\prime}$. Suppose that $L(p, q)$ is homeomorphic to $L\left(p^{\prime}, q^{\prime}\right)$ and that both $K$ and $K^{\prime}$ admit a longitudinal surgery yielding $S^{3}$. Then $K$ is isotopic to $K^{\prime}$ if and only if $[K]= \pm\left[K^{\prime}\right]$ in $H_{1}(M ; \mathbb{Z})$, where $M \cong L(p, q) \cong L\left(p^{\prime}, q^{\prime}\right)$.

By using lemmata above, we show the following.
Proposition 4.5. Set $K=K(L(p, q) ; u)$ and $K^{\prime}=K\left(L\left(p^{\prime}, q^{\prime}\right) ; u^{\prime}\right)$ for some integers $p, q, u, p^{\prime}, q^{\prime}$ and $u^{\prime}$. Suppose that there is an orientation-preserving homeomorphism between $L(p, q)$ and $L\left(p^{\prime}, q^{\prime}\right)$ and that both $K$ and $K^{\prime}$ admit a longitudinal surgery yielding $S^{3}$. Then $K$ and $K^{\prime}$ are isotopic if and only if one of the following holds.
(1) In case of (1) of Lemma 4.3, $u^{\prime}=u$ or $u^{\prime}=p-u$.
(2) In case of (2) of Lemma 4.3, $u^{\prime}=\Psi_{p, q}(u)$ or $u^{\prime}=p-\Psi_{p, q}(u)$.

Proof. Note that it is easy to see that $K(L(p, q) ; u)$ and $K(L(p, q) ; p-u)$ are isotopic. It follows from Lemma 4.4 that $K$ and $K^{\prime}$ are isotopic if and only if $u^{\prime}=u$ or $u^{\prime}=p-u$ under the assumption $q^{\prime}=q$. By Lemma 4.3, we have the following two cases:

Claim 1. $q^{\prime} \equiv q(\bmod p)$. In this case, $K$ and $K^{\prime}$ are isotopic if and only if $u^{\prime}=u$ or $u^{\prime}=p-u$.

Proof. Set $q^{\prime}=q+n p$ for some integer $n$. Let $\left(V_{1}, V_{2} ; S\right)$ be a Heegaard splitting of $L(p, q)$ such that the boundary of a meridian disk of $V_{2}$ is a $(p, q)$-curve in $\partial V_{1}$. Let $\left(V_{1}^{\prime}, V_{2}^{\prime} ; S^{\prime}\right)$ be a Heegaard splitting of $L\left(p^{\prime}, q^{\prime}\right)$ such that the boundary of a meridian disk of $V_{2}^{\prime}$ is a $\left(p^{\prime}, q^{\prime}\right)$-curve in $\partial V_{1}^{\prime}$. Since genus one Heegaard surfaces of a lens space are isotopic, we may assume that $S^{\prime}=S$. Moreover, since $q^{\prime}=q+n p$, we see that $V_{1}^{\prime}=V_{1}$ and $V_{2}^{\prime}=V_{2}$ (cf. [4] and [7]) and $V_{1}^{\prime}$ is obtained by twisting $V_{1}$ along a meridian disk of $V_{1}$. Therefore we see that $[K]= \pm\left[K^{\prime}\right]$ in $H_{1}(L(p, q) ; \mathbb{Z})$ if and only if $u^{\prime}=u$ or $u^{\prime}=p-u$. Hence it follows from Lemma 4.4 that $K$ and $K^{\prime}$ are isotopic if and only if $u^{\prime}=u$ or $u^{\prime}=p-u$. Hence we have Claim 1 .

Claim 2. $q^{\prime} \equiv q^{-1}(\bmod p)$. In this case, $K$ and $K^{\prime}$ are isotopic if and only if $u^{\prime}=\Psi_{p, q}(u)$ or $u^{\prime}=p-\Psi_{p, q}(u)$.

Proof. Set $q^{\prime} q=n p$ for some integer $n$. Let $\left(V_{1}, V_{2} ; S\right)$ be a Heegaard splitting of $L(p, q)$ such that the boundary of a meridian disk of $V_{2}$ is a $(p, q)$-curve in $\partial V_{1}$. Let ( $V_{1}^{\prime}, V_{2}^{\prime} ; S^{\prime}$ ) be a Heegaard splitting of $L\left(p^{\prime}, q^{\prime}\right)$ such that the boundary of a meridian disk of $V_{2}^{\prime}$ is a $\left(p^{\prime}, q^{\prime}\right)$-curve in $\partial V_{1}^{\prime}$. Since genus one Heegaard surfaces of a lens space are isotopic, we may assume that $S^{\prime}=S$. Moreover, since $q^{\prime} q=n p$ for some integer $n$, we see that $V_{1}^{\prime}=V_{2}$ and $V_{2}^{\prime}=V_{1}$ (cf. [4] and [7]).

We now isotope $K$ so that $K \cap V_{1}=t_{1}^{u}$ ( $K \cap V_{2}=t_{2}^{u}$ resp.) is a trivial arc in $V_{1}$ ( $V_{2}$ resp.). Let $t_{1}^{\prime \prime}\left(t_{2}^{\prime \prime}\right.$ resp.) be a monotone projection of $t_{1}^{u}$ ( $t_{2}^{u}$ resp.). Since $\sharp\left(t^{\prime \prime \mu}, \partial E_{1}\right)=\Psi_{p, q}(u)$ or $p-\Psi_{p, q}(u)$, we see that $K$ is isotopic to $K\left(L\left(p^{\prime}, q^{\prime}\right) ; \Psi_{p, q}(u)\right)=$ $K\left(L\left(p^{\prime}, q^{\prime}\right) ; p-\Psi_{p, q}(u)\right)$. Hence $K$ and $K^{\prime}$ are isotopic if and only if $u^{\prime}=\Psi_{p, q}(u)$ or $u^{\prime}=p-\Psi_{p, q}(u)$. Hence we have Claim 2.

This completes the proof of Proposition 4.5.
As a corollary of Proposition 4.5, we have the following:
Corollary 4.6. Set $K=K(L(p, q) ; u)$ and $K^{\prime}=K\left(L\left(p^{\prime}, q^{\prime}\right) ; u^{\prime}\right)$ for some integers $p, q, u, p^{\prime}, q^{\prime}$ and $u^{\prime}$. Suppose that there is an orientation-preserving homeomorphism between $L(p, q)$ and $L\left(p^{\prime}, q^{\prime}\right)$ and that both $K$ and $K^{\prime}$ admit a longitudinal surgery yielding $S^{3}$. If $K$ and $K^{\prime}$ are isotopic, then $\tilde{\Phi}_{p, q}(u)=\tilde{\Phi}_{p^{\prime}, q^{\prime}}\left(u^{\prime}\right)$.

By this corollary we see that $\tilde{\Phi}_{p, q}(u)$ is an invariant for $K=K(L(p, q) ; u)$ if $K$ admits a longitudinal surgery yielding $S^{3}$. Hence we define the following:

Definition 4.7. Set $K=K(L(p, q) ; u)$ and suppose that $K$ admits a longitudinal surgery yielding $S^{3}$. Then $\tilde{\Phi}_{p, q}(u)$ is denoted by $\Phi(K)$.

## 5. Proof of Theorem 1.3

We first remark the following.
Lemma 5.1 ([6, Theorem C] and [9, Theorem 3]). Let $K$ be a torus knot in $M$ and $\left(W_{1}, W_{2} ; P\right) a(1,1)$-splitting of $(M, K)$. Then there is a projection $\bar{t}_{1}\left(\bar{t}_{2}\right.$ resp.) of $t_{1}\left(t_{2}\right.$ resp.) on $P$ such that $\bar{t}_{1}$ is disjoint from the interior of $\bar{t}_{2}$.

Proposition 5.2. Set $K=K(L(p, q) ; u)$. Suppose that $K$ admits a longitudinal surgery yielding $S^{3}$. Then $\Phi(K)=0$ if and only if $K$ is a torus knot.

Proof. Let $\left(W_{1}, W_{2} ; P\right)$ be a $(1,1)$-splitting of $(M, K)$ with $W_{i}=\left(V_{i}, t_{i}\right)(i=1,2)$, where $V_{i}$ is a solid torus and $t_{i}$ is a trivial arc in $V_{i}$. Since $K$ admits a longitudinal surgery yielding $S^{3}$, it follows from Lemma 4.1 that $\left(W_{1}, W_{2} ; P\right)$ is monotone. Let $t_{1}^{\prime}$ ( $t_{2}^{\prime}$ resp.) be a monotone projection of $t_{1}\left(t_{2}\right.$ resp.) such that $t_{1}^{\prime} \cup t_{2}^{\prime}$ gives the value $\Phi(K)$.

If $\Phi(K)=0$, then $t_{1}^{\prime}$ is disjoint from the interior of $t_{2}^{\prime}$. Hence we see that $K$ is a torus knot.

Suppose that $K$ is a torus knot. Then it follows from Lemma 5.1 that there is a projection $\bar{t}_{1}\left(\bar{t}_{2}\right.$ resp.) of $t_{1}$ ( $t_{2}$ resp.) on $P$ such that $\bar{t}_{1}$ is disjoint from the interior of $\bar{t}_{2}$. Let $x_{1}$ ( $y_{1}$ resp.) be the boundary of a meridian disk of $V_{1}$ ( $V_{2}$ resp.) disjoint from $t_{1}$ ( $t_{2}$ resp.). Note that it follows from [13, Lemma 3.4] that $x_{1}$ ( $y_{1}$ resp.) is unique up to isotopy on $P \backslash K$. Note also that we may assume that any projection of $t_{1}$ ( $t_{2}$ resp.) on $P$ is disjoint from $x_{1}$ ( $y_{1}$ resp.). Let $\Sigma_{x_{1}}\left(\Sigma_{y_{1}}\right.$ resp.) be the component obtained by cutting $P$ along $x_{1}$ ( $y_{1}$ resp.). We may assume that $\bar{t}_{1}$ ( $\bar{t}_{2}$ resp.) is isotoped so that $\bar{t}_{1}$ ( $\bar{t}_{2}$ resp.) intersects $y_{1}$ ( $x_{1}$ resp.) essentially. Let $x_{1}^{+}$and $x_{1}^{-}$be the boundary of $\Sigma_{x_{1}}$. Since ( $W_{1}, W_{2} ; P$ ) is monotone, we see that each component of $y_{1} \cap \Sigma_{x_{1}}$ is an arc joining $x_{1}^{+}$to $x_{1}^{-}$.

CASE $1 . \bar{t}_{2}$ is not a monotone projection of $t_{2}$.
Then there is a component, say $\bar{t}_{2}^{+}$, of $\bar{t}_{2} \cap \Sigma_{x_{1}}$ which joins $x_{1}^{+}$to itself. Then since

$$
x_{1}^{+} \cap\left(\bar{t}_{2} \cap \Sigma_{x_{1}}\right)=x_{1}^{-} \cap\left(\bar{t}_{2} \cap \Sigma_{x_{1}}\right),
$$

we see that there is also a component, say $\bar{t}_{2}^{-}$, of $\bar{t}_{2} \cap \Sigma_{x_{1}}$ which joins $x_{1}^{-}$to itself. This implies that it is impossible to obtain an arc which joins two specified points $P \cap K$ in $\Sigma_{x_{1}}$ and is disjoint from $\bar{t}_{2} \cap \Sigma_{x_{1}}$. Since $\bar{t}_{1}$ is contained in $A_{P}$, this implies that $\bar{t}_{1} \cap \bar{t}_{2} \neq \emptyset$, a contradiction.

CASE 2. $\bar{t}_{2}$ is a monotone projection of $t_{2}$.
To obtain the conclusion $\Phi(K)=0$, we further suppose that $\Phi(K) \neq 0$. Then there is a component, say $\bar{t}_{2}^{\prime}$, of $\bar{t}_{2} \cap \Sigma_{x_{1}}$ which joins $x_{1}^{+}$to $x_{1}^{-}$and intersects $t_{1}^{\prime}$ transversely in a single point. Also, there is a component, say $\bar{t}_{2}^{\prime \prime}$, of $\bar{t}_{2} \cap \Sigma_{x_{1}}$ which joins $x_{1}^{+}$to $x_{1}^{-}$ and is disjoint from $t_{1}^{\prime \prime}$. This implies that $\bar{t}_{2}^{\prime} \cup \bar{t}_{2}^{\prime \prime}$ separates two specified points $P \cap K$ in $\Sigma_{x_{1}}$. Since $\bar{t}_{1}$ is contained in $A_{P}$, this implies that $\bar{t}_{1} \cap \bar{t}_{2} \neq \emptyset$, a contradiction.

This completes the proof of Proposition 5.2.
Dehn surgeries on satellite knots in $S^{3}$ yielding lens spaces have been completely classified as the follows (cf. [2, 15, 16]).

Lemma 5.3 ([2, Theorem 1]). Let $K$ be a satellite knot in $S^{3}$ which admits a Dehn surgery yielding a lens space $M$. Then $K$ is the ( $2 p q \pm 1,2$ )-cable on the $(p, q)$ torus knot and $M=L\left(4 p q \pm 1,4 q^{2}\right)$.

Here, a knot $K \subset S^{3}$ is called the $(r, s)$-cable on a knot $K_{0} \subset S^{3}$ if $K$ is isotoped into $\partial \eta\left(K_{0} ; S^{3}\right)$ and is homologous to $r\left[l_{0}\right]+s\left[m_{0}\right]$ in $\partial \eta\left(K_{0} ; S^{3}\right)$, where $\left(l_{0}, m_{0}\right)$ is a standard meridian-longitude system of $K_{0}$ on $\partial \eta\left(K_{0} ; S^{3}\right)$.

Remark 5.4. (1) Let $K$ be the ( $2 p q \pm 1,2$ )-cable on the ( $p, q$ )-torus knot and $K^{\prime}$ be the $(2 p q \pm 1,2)$-cable on the $(q, p)$-torus knot. Then $K$ and $K^{\prime}$ are isotopic.
(2) Let $p$ and $q$ be coprime integers. Then we see that the following are equivalent:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(4 p q+1)(4 p q-1) \equiv 0 \quad(\bmod 4 p q \pm 1), \\
& 16 p^{2} q^{2}-1 \equiv 0 \quad(\bmod 4 p q \pm 1), \\
&\left(4 p^{2}\right)\left(4 q^{2}\right) \equiv 1 \quad(\bmod 4 p q \pm 1) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence we see that $\left(4 q^{2}\right)^{-1} \equiv 4 p^{2}(\bmod 4 p q \pm 1)$ and therefore

$$
\begin{aligned}
L\left(4 p q \pm 1,4 q^{2}\right) & =-L\left(4 p q \pm 1,-4 q^{2}\right) \\
& =-L\left(4 p q \pm 1,-4 p^{2}\right)=L\left(4 p q \pm 1,4 p^{2}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Lemma 5.5. Let $p$ and $q$ be coprime integers. Suppose that $p>1$ and $q \neq$ $0, \pm 1$. Set $K=K\left(L\left(|4 p q \pm 1|, \pm 4 q^{2}\right) ; 2|q|\right)$. Then $K$ admits a longitudinal surgery yielding $S^{3}$ and $\Phi(K)=1$.

Proof. Since the argument is similar (cf. Remark 5.6), we give a proof in case of $1<q<p$ and $K=K\left(L\left(4 p q-1,4 q^{2}\right) ; 2 q\right)$.

Claim 1. $\quad \tilde{\Phi}_{4 p q-1,4 q^{2}}(2 q)=1$.
Proof. For a pair of $4 p q-1$ and $4 q^{2}$, we consider the finite sequence $\left\{u_{j}\right\}$ determined in Definition 1.2. Since $4 q^{2} \cdot p-q \equiv 0(\bmod 4 p q-1)$, we see that $u_{p}=q$. Suppose that there are integers $p^{\prime}$ and $q^{\prime}$ with $0<p^{\prime}<p, 0<q^{\prime}<2 q$ and $u_{p^{\prime}}=q^{\prime}$. Then there is a non-negative integer $n$ such that $4 q^{2} \cdot p^{\prime}=n \cdot 4 p q^{2}+q^{\prime}$. This indicates that $4 q^{2}\left(p^{\prime}-n \cdot p\right)=q^{\prime}$. Since $0<p^{\prime}<p$ and $q^{\prime}>0$, we see that $n=0$ and hence $4 p^{\prime} q^{2}=q^{\prime}$. However, this contradicts that $0<q^{\prime}<2 q$. This implies that for each integer $j$ with $1 \leq j \leq p-1$, we see that $u_{j}>2 q$. Similarly, we see that $u_{2 p}=2 q$
and $u_{j}>2 q$ for each integer $j$ with $p+1 \leq j \leq 2 p-1$. Hence $\Phi_{4 p q-1,4 q^{2}}(2 q)=1$. Note that

$$
\tilde{\Phi}_{p, q}(u)=\min \{1,4 p q-2 p-2 q, 2 p-2,2 q-2\} .
$$

Since we assume that $1<q<p$, we see that $\tilde{\Phi}_{4 p q-1,4 q^{2}}(2 q)=1$. Therefore we have Claim 1.

Claim 2. The $0^{*}$-surgery on $K$ yields $S^{3}$.
Proof. We use an argument similar to that in Example 3.1 and hence we use the same notations as those in Example 3.1. Let $M^{\prime}$ be a 3-manifold obtained by the $0^{*}$-surgery on $K^{*}$. Recall that $x_{1}$ and $x_{2}$ are loops on $S^{\prime}$ with $x_{1} \cap \partial D_{1}^{\prime}=\emptyset$, $\sharp\left(x_{1}, \partial E_{1}\right)=1, x_{2} \cap \partial E_{1}=\emptyset, \sharp\left(x_{2}, \partial D_{1}^{\prime}\right)=1$. Recall also that $\bar{y}_{1}=\partial E_{2}$ and $\bar{y}_{2}=\partial D_{2}^{\prime}$. Then we see

$$
\begin{aligned}
\pi_{1}\left(M^{\prime}\right) & \cong\left\langle x_{1}, x_{2} \mid \bar{y}_{1}=1, \quad \bar{y}_{2}=1\right\rangle \\
& \cong\left\langle x_{1}, x_{2}^{\prime} \mid \bar{y}_{1}=1, \quad \bar{y}_{2}=1\right\rangle \quad\left(x_{2}^{\prime}:=x_{1} x_{2}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

It follows from the argument in the proof of Claim 1 that $y_{2}=x_{1}^{p} x_{2} x_{1}^{p}=x_{1}^{p-1} x_{2}^{\prime} x_{1}^{p}$. Since $y_{2}=1$, we see that $x_{2}^{\prime}=x_{1}^{1-2 p}$. This implies that $x_{1}$ and $x_{2}^{\prime}$ are commutative with each other and hence $\pi_{1}\left(M^{\prime}\right) \cong H_{1}\left(M^{\prime} ; \mathbb{Z}\right)$. We note that

$$
H_{1}\left(M^{\prime} ; \mathbb{Z}\right) \cong\left\langle x_{1}, x_{2}^{\prime} \left\lvert\, \begin{array}{l}
((4 p q-1)-2 q) \cdot x_{1}+2 q \cdot x_{2}^{\prime}=0, \\
(2 p-1) \cdot x_{1}+x_{2}^{\prime}=0
\end{array}\right.\right\rangle
$$

This implies that $H_{1}\left(M^{\prime} ; \mathbb{Z}\right)$ is trivial and hence $\pi_{1}\left(M^{\prime}\right)$ is trivial. Since Poincaré conjecture is true for genus two 3-manifolds (cf. [3] and [5]), we see that $M^{\prime}$ is homeomorphic to $S^{3}$ and hence we have Claim 2.

The conclusion of Lemma 5.5 follows from Claims 1 and 2.

REmARK 5.6. To prove Lemma 5.5 in other certain cases, we need to consider the sequence obtained by reversing the order of the sequence $\left\{u_{j}\right\}$.

Lemma 5.7. Let $K$ be the $(2 p q \pm 1,2)$-cable on the ( $p, q$ )-torus knot with $p>1$ and $q \neq 0, \pm 1$. Then the following holds.
(1) If $q>1$, then $K^{*}=K\left(L\left(4 p q \pm 1,4 q^{2}\right) ; 2 q\right)$ is the dual knot of $K$ in $L\left(4 p q \pm 1,4 q^{2}\right)$.
(2) If $q<-1$, then $K^{*}=K\left(L\left(|4 p q \pm 1|,-4 q^{2}\right) ; 2|q|\right)$ is the dual knot of $K$ in $L(|4 p q \pm 1|$, $-4 q^{2}$ ).

Proof. First we prove the case when $K$ is the $(2 p q-1,2)$-cable on the $(p, q)$-torus knot. The case when $K$ is the $(2 p q+1,2)$-cable on the $(p, q)$-torus knot will be proved similarly. Set $K^{*}=K\left(L\left(4 p q-1,4 q^{2}\right) ; 2 q\right)$. Let $\left(W_{1}, W_{2} ; P\right)$ be a ( 1,1 )-splitting of $\left(L\left(4 p q-1,4 q^{2}\right), K^{*}\right)$. Recall that $W_{i}=\left(V_{i}, t_{i}\right)(i=1,2)$, where $V_{1}\left(V_{2}\right.$ resp.) is a solid torus and $t_{1}\left(t_{2}\right.$ resp.) is a trivial arc in $V_{1}$ ( $V_{2}$ resp.). Let $E_{1}$ ( $E_{2}$ resp.) be a meridian disk of $V_{1}$ ( $V_{2}$ resp.) disjoint from $t_{1}$ ( $t_{2}$ resp.). Since $K^{*}$ admits a longitudinal surgery yielding $S^{3}$ (cf. Lemma 5.5), we see that ( $W_{1}, W_{2} ; P$ ) is monotone (cf. Lemma 4.1). Hence we may assume that $\partial E_{2}$ is a $\left(4 p q-1,4 q^{2}\right)$-curve on $\partial V_{1}$ (cf. Lemma 4.2). Let $t_{1}^{\prime}$ ( $t_{2}^{\prime}$ resp.) be a monotone projection of $t_{1}$ ( $t_{2}$ resp.) such that $t_{1}^{\prime} \cup t_{2}^{\prime}$ gives the value $\Phi(K)$. It follows from Lemma 5.5 that $\Phi(K)=1$. Let $v$ be the self-intersection point of $t_{1}^{\prime} \cup t_{2}^{\prime}$. Let $\bar{t}_{1}^{\prime}$ ( $\bar{t}_{2}^{\prime}$ resp.) be the subarc of $t_{1}^{\prime}\left(t_{2}^{\prime}\right.$ resp.) which joins $P_{0}$ to $v$. Let $z_{1}$ be a loop on $P$ obtained by moving $\bar{t}_{1}^{\prime} \cup \bar{t}_{2}^{\prime}$ slightly so that $\bar{t}_{1}^{\prime} \cup \bar{t}_{2}^{\prime}$ is disjoint from $t_{1}^{\prime} \cup t_{2}^{\prime}$. Then it follows from Claim 1 in the proof of Lemma 5.5 that $\sharp_{G}\left(z_{1}, \partial E_{1}\right)=p$ and $\sharp_{G}\left(z_{1}, \partial E_{2}\right)=q$.

Let $A_{1}$ ( $A_{2}$ resp.) be an annulus obtained by pushing the interior of $E\left(z_{1} ; \partial V_{1}\right)$ ( $E\left(z_{2} ; \partial V_{2}\right)$ resp.) into the interior of $V_{1}$ ( $V_{2}$ resp.) so that $A_{1}$ ( $A_{2}$ resp.) is disjoint from $t_{1}\left(t_{2}\right.$ resp.). Then $A_{1} \cup A_{2}$ cuts ( $\left.L\left(4 p q-1,4 q^{2}\right), K^{*}\right)$ into $\left(M_{1}, K^{*}\right)$ and ( $\left.M_{2}, \emptyset\right)$. Note that $M_{1}$ is a solid torus containing $K^{*}$. Since $\sharp_{G}\left(z_{1}, \partial E_{1}\right)=p$ and $\sharp_{G}\left(z_{1}, \partial E_{2}\right)=q$, we see that $M_{2}$ is homeomorphic to the exterior of the $(p, q)$-torus knot in $S^{3}$. Hence $A_{1} \cup A_{2}$ is an essential torus in $E\left(K^{*} ; L\left(4 p q-1,4 q^{2}\right)\right)$. Since $K^{*}$ admits a longitudinal surgery yielding $S^{3}$ (cf. Lemma 5.5), we see that $K^{*}$ is the dual knot of a cable of the $(p, q)$-torus knot in $S^{3}$. Hence it follows from Lemma 5.3 that $K^{*}$ is the dual knot of $K$.

Corollary 5.8. Set $K=K(L(p, q) ; u)$. Suppose that $K$ admits a longitudinal surgery yielding $S^{3}$. Then $\Phi(K)=1$ if and only if $E(K ; M)$ contains an essential torus.

Proof. Suppose first that $\Phi(K)=1$. Then by an argument similar to that in the proof of Lemma 5.7, we see that there exists a loop $z_{1}$ as in the proof of Lemma 5.7. This implies that a $(1,1)$-splitting of $(M, K)$ satisfies the assumption of Theorem 2.2. Hence it follows from Theorem 2.2 and Lemma 2.3 that $K$ is a torus knot or $E(K ; M)$ contains an essential torus. Since $\Phi(K)=1, K$ is not a torus knot (cf. Proposition 5.2) and hence $E(K ; M)$ contains an essential torus.

Suppose next that $E(K ; M)$ contains an essential torus. Then $K$ is the dual knot of the $(2 p q \pm 1,2)$-cable on the $(p, q)$-torus knot for some integers $p$ and $q$. Hence it follows from Lemmata 5.5 and 5.7 that $\Phi(K)=1$.

Theorem 1.3 immediately follows from Proposition 5.2 and Corollary 5.8.

## 6. Appendix

Here, we will recall Berge's argument [1] to obtain a relationship between Berge's examples and their dual knots. We first recall Berge's surgery on doubly primitive
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knots. Let $\left(H, H^{\prime} ; S\right)$ be a genus two Heegaard splitting of $S^{3}$. A knot $K \subset S$ is a doubly primitive knot if $K$ represents a free generator both of $\pi_{1}(H)$ and of $\pi_{1}\left(H^{\prime}\right)$. If $K$ is doubly primitive, then there are meridian disks $D$ and $E\left(D^{\prime}\right.$ and $E^{\prime}$ resp.) of $H\left(H^{\prime}\right.$ resp.) with $\sharp(\partial D, K)=1$ and $\partial E \cap K=\emptyset\left(\sharp\left(\partial D^{\prime}, K\right)=1\right.$ and $\partial E^{\prime} \cap K=\emptyset$ resp. $)$. Then it follows from [1, Theorem 1] that a Heegaard diagram ( $S ;\{\partial D, \partial E\},\left\{K, \partial E^{\prime}\right\}$ ) represents a lens space. We call such a surgery Berge's surgery on $K$. We remark that $\partial D^{\prime}$ corresponds to the dual knot of $K$.

Let $\left(H, H^{\prime} ; S\right)$ be a genus two Heegaard splitting of $S^{3}$ and $\left(S ;\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}\right\},\left\{y_{1}, y_{2}\right\}\right)$ its standard Heegaard diagram with $\sharp\left(x_{1}, y_{1}\right)=1, \sharp\left(x_{2}, y_{2}\right)=1, x_{2} \cap y_{1}=\emptyset$ and $x_{1} \cap y_{2}=\emptyset$. We fix orientation of $x_{1}, x_{2}, y_{1}$ and $y_{2}$ as in Fig. 4.

Then $\left\{\left[x_{1}\right],\left[x_{2}\right],\left[y_{1}\right],\left[y_{2}\right]\right\}$ is a basis of $H_{1}(\partial H ; \mathbb{Z})$. Let $K$ be an oriented doubly primitive knot on $S$ with $[K]=a\left[x_{1}\right]+b\left[x_{2}\right]+c\left[y_{1}\right]+d\left[y_{2}\right]$ in $H_{1}(\partial H ; \mathbb{Z})$. Let $h$ be an orientation-preserving homeomorphism of $H^{\prime}$ with $h\left(x_{1}\right)=K$. Then $h$ induces a symplectic transformation $\phi$ on $H_{1}\left(\partial H^{\prime} ; \mathbb{Z}\right)$ which satisfies the following:

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
\phi\left(x_{1}\right)=a\left[x_{1}\right]+b\left[x_{2}\right]+c\left[y_{1}\right]+d\left[y_{2}\right] \\
\phi\left(x_{2}\right)=s\left[x_{1}\right]+t\left[x_{2}\right]+u\left[y_{1}\right]+v\left[y_{2}\right] \\
\phi\left(y_{1}\right)= & t\left[y_{1}\right]-s\left[y_{2}\right] \\
\phi\left(y_{2}\right)= & -b\left[y_{1}\right]+a\left[y_{2}\right]
\end{array}
$$

where, $s, t, u$ and $v$ are integers with $a t-b s=1$ and $(a u+b v)-(c s+d t)=0$. Recall that since $K$ is doubly primitive, $[K]$ is a free generator of $H_{1}(H ; \mathbb{Z})$. Let [ $K^{\prime}$ ] be the other generator of $H_{1}(H ; \mathbb{Z})$. We now consider a projection $\varphi$ onto [ $K^{\prime}$ ]. Then we have:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \varphi\left(x_{2}\right)=(c v-d u)\left[K^{\prime}\right] \\
& \varphi\left(y_{1}\right)=(-c s-d t)\left[K^{\prime}\right] \\
& \varphi\left(y_{2}\right)=(a c+b d)\left[K^{\prime}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

where, we remark that $\varphi\left(x_{1}\right)=0$. Let $M=L(p, q)$ be a lens space obtained by Berge's
surgery on $K$ and $K^{*}=K(L(p, q) ; u)$ the dual knot of $K$. Let $V$ be a 3-manifold obtained from $H$ by attaching a 2 -handle along $K$. Since $K$ is doubly primitive, we see that $V$ is a solid torus and that $V$ and $V^{\prime}=E(V ; M)$ give a genus one Heegaard splitting of $M$. Note that a core of $V$ corresponds to a generator $\left[K^{\prime}\right]$ of $H_{1}(H ; \mathbb{Z})$, a meridian of $V^{\prime}$ corresponds to $\phi\left(y_{2}\right)$, a core of $V^{\prime}$ corresponds to $\phi\left(x_{2}\right)$ and $K^{*}$ corresponds to $\phi\left(y_{1}\right)$. Hence $p$ of $K(L(p, q) ; u)$ satisfies that $p=a c+b d$.

We divide the rest of the arguments into the following three cases.
Case 1. Knots of types (I)-(VI).
Each knots of types (I)-(VI) in Berge's examples satisfies that $a= \pm 1$. Since at $b s=1$, we see that $s$ and $t$ are coprime and hence we have $s=-1+a j$ and $t=$ $a(1-b)+b j$, where $j$ is an integer. Hence we have $c s+d t=-c+a d(1-b)$. Also, it follows from $(a u+b v)-(c s+d t)=0$ that $a u=(c s+d t-b v)$.

Let $m_{V}$ be a meridian of $V$. Recall that $\sharp_{A}\left(m_{V}, \phi\left(y_{2}\right)\right)=p=a c+b d$, where $\sharp_{A}(\cdot, \cdot)$ means an algebraic intersection number. Note that $q$ of $K(L(p, q) ; u)$ corresponds to $\sharp_{A}\left(m_{V}, \phi\left(x_{2}\right)\right)$. Hence we need to calculate the value $c v-d u$. Since we assume $a=$ $\pm 1$, we have:

$$
\begin{aligned}
q & =c v-d u \\
& =c v \mp d(c s+d t-b v) \\
& =(c \pm b d) v \mp d(c s+d t) \\
& \equiv-a d(c s+d t) \quad(\bmod p=a c+b d) \\
& \equiv a d(c+a d(b-1)) \quad(\bmod p=a c+b d) .
\end{aligned}
$$

We remark that $m_{V}$ is a ( $p, q$ )-curve on $\partial V^{\prime}$. Hence $V\left(V^{\prime}\right.$ resp.) corresponds to $V_{2}$ ( $V_{1}$ resp.), where $V_{1}$ and $V_{2}$ are those in Definition 1.1. Since $K^{*}$ corresponds to $\phi\left(y_{1}\right)$, we see that $\left[K^{*}\right]=(-c s-d t)\left[K^{\prime}\right]$. Hence we see that $u$ of $K(L(p, q) ; u)$ satisfies that $u \equiv c+a d(b+1)(\bmod p=a c+b d)(c f$. Claim 2 in the proof of Lemma 4.5). Therefore we have the following.

Theorem 6.1. Let $K$ be a doubly primitive knot with $[K]=a\left[x_{1}\right]+b\left[x_{2}\right]+c\left[y_{1}\right]+$ $d\left[y_{2}\right]$ in $H_{1}(\partial H ; \mathbb{Z})$. Let $L(p, q)$ be the lens space obtained by Berge's surgery on $K$ and $K^{*}$ the dual knot of $K$. If $a= \pm 1$, then $K^{*}$ admits a representation $K(L(p, q) ; u)$ with

$$
\begin{aligned}
& p=a c+b d \\
& q \equiv a d(c+a d(b-1)) \quad(\bmod p=a c+b d) \\
& u \equiv c+a d(b-1) \quad(\bmod p=a c+b d)
\end{aligned}
$$

Case 2. Knots on Seifert surfaces of genus one knots.
Let $g_{1}$ and $g_{2}$ be oriented loops on $\partial H$ illustrated in (a) or (b) of Fig. 5. Set $K_{0}=\partial \eta\left(g_{1} \cup g_{2} ; \partial H\right)$. Then $K_{0}$ is the right-hand trefoil knot in case of (a) and is the
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figure-eight knot in case of (b), and $\eta\left(g_{1} \cup g_{2} ; \partial H\right)$ is a genus one Seifert surface of $K_{0}$. Let $K$ be a knot in $\eta\left(g_{1} \cup g_{2} ; \partial H\right)$ with $[K]=a\left[g_{1}\right]+b\left[g_{2}\right]$, where $a$ and $b$ are coprime integers.

Suppose first that $K_{0}$ is the right-hand trefoil knot. Since $\left[g_{1}\right]=-\left[x_{1}\right]+\left[y_{1}\right]$ and $\left[g_{2}\right]=-\left[x_{1}\right]-\left[x_{2}\right]+\left[y_{2}\right]$ in $H_{1}(\partial H ; \mathbb{Z})$, we see that $[K]=-(a+b)\left[x_{1}\right]-b\left[x_{2}\right]+a\left[y_{1}\right]+$ $b\left[y_{2}\right]$ in $H_{1}(\partial H ; \mathbb{Z})$. In this case, we have $-(a+b) t+b s=1$ and $(-(a+b) u-b v)-$ $(a s+b t)=0$, where $s, t, u$ and $v$ are integers of $\phi\left(x_{2}\right)=s\left[x_{1}\right]+t\left[x_{2}\right]+u\left[y_{1}\right]+v\left[y_{2}\right]$. Hence we see that $p$ of $K(L(p, q) ; u)$ satisfies that $p=-a^{2}-a b-b^{2}$. Recall that $u$ of $K(L(p, q) ; u)$ corresponds to the value $-a s-b t$ and that $q$ of $K(L(p, q) ; u)$ corresponds to the value $a v-b u$. Since $-a(a+b) \equiv b^{2}\left(\bmod p=-a^{2}-a b-b^{2}\right)$, we have $-(a+b)(-a s-b t) \equiv-b(-(a+b) t+b s)\left(\bmod p=-a^{2}-a b-b^{2}\right)$. Hence we have $-(a+b)(-a s-b t) \equiv-b\left(\bmod p=-a^{2}-a b-b^{2}\right)$, because $-(a+b) t+b s=1$. Therefore we see that $u \equiv-a s-b t \equiv b(a+b)^{-1}\left(\bmod p=-a^{2}-a b-b^{2}\right)$. For $q$ of $K(L(p, q) ; u)$, we see that $q \equiv-u^{2}\left(\bmod p=-a^{2}-a b-b^{2}\right)$ by the following. (Recall that $-a(a+b) \equiv b^{2}\left(\bmod p=-a^{2}-a b-b^{2}\right)$.)

$$
\begin{aligned}
(-(a+b) u-b v) & =(a s+b t), \\
b(-(a+b) u-b v) & \equiv-b u \quad\left(\bmod p=-a^{2}-a b-b^{2}\right), \\
(a+b)(a v-b u) & \equiv-b u \quad\left(\bmod p=-a^{2}-a b-b^{2}\right), \\
a v-b u & \equiv-u^{2} \quad\left(\bmod p=-a^{2}-a b-b^{2}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Suppose next that $K_{0}$ is the figure-eight knot. Since $\left[g_{1}\right]=-\left[x_{1}\right]+\left[y_{1}\right]$ and $\left[g_{2}\right]=$ $-\left[x_{1}\right]+\left[x_{2}\right]+\left[y_{2}\right]$ in $H_{1}(\partial H ; \mathbb{Z})$, we see that $[K]=-(a+b)\left[x_{1}\right]+b\left[x_{2}\right]+a\left[y_{1}\right]+b\left[y_{2}\right]$ in $H_{1}(\partial H ; \mathbb{Z})$. By an argument similar to the above, we have the conclusion (2) of the following Theorem 6.2.

Theorem 6.2. Let $K$ be a doubly primitive knot and $L(p, q)$ a lens space obtained by Berge's surgery on $K$. Let $K^{*}$ be the dual knot of $K$. In the following, a and $b$ are coprime integers with $a>0$ and $b>0$.
(1) If $[K]=-(a+b)\left[x_{1}\right]-b\left[x_{2}\right]+a\left[y_{1}\right]+b\left[y_{2}\right]$ in $H_{1}(\partial H ; \mathbb{Z})$, then $K^{*}$ admits $a$ representation $K(L(p, q) ; u)$ with

$$
\begin{aligned}
p & =-a^{2}-a b-b^{2} \\
q & \equiv-b^{2}(a+b)^{-2} \quad\left(\bmod p=-a^{2}-a b-b^{2}\right) \\
u & \equiv b(a+b)^{-1} \quad\left(\bmod p=-a^{2}-a b-b^{2}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

(2) If $[K]=-(a+b)\left[x_{1}\right]+b\left[x_{2}\right]+a\left[y_{1}\right]+b\left[y_{2}\right]$ in $H_{1}(\partial H ; \mathbb{Z})$, then $K^{*}$ admits a representation $K(L(p, q) ; u)$ with

$$
\begin{aligned}
p & =-a^{2}-a b+b^{2} \\
q & \equiv-b^{2}(a+b)^{-2} \quad\left(\bmod p=-a^{2}-a b+b^{2}\right) \\
u & \equiv b(a+b)^{-1} \quad\left(\bmod p=-a^{2}-a b+b^{2}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

CASE 3. Sporadic cases.
By an argument similar to the above, we have the following.
Theorem 6.3. Let $K$ be a doubly primitive knot and $L(p, q)$ a lens space obtained by Berge's surgery on $K$. Let $K^{*}$ be the dual knot of $K$. In the following, $j$ is a non-negative integer.
(1) If $[K]=(6 j+1)\left[x_{1}\right]-j\left[x_{2}\right]+(4 j+1)\left[y_{1}\right]+(2 j+1)\left[y_{2}\right]$ in $H_{1}(\partial H ; \mathbb{Z})$, then $K^{*}$ admits a representation $K(L(p, q) ; u)$ with

$$
\begin{aligned}
& p=22 j^{2}+9 j+1 \\
& q \equiv-(22 j+5)^{2} \quad\left(\bmod p=22 j^{2}+9 j+1\right) \\
& u \equiv 22 j+5 \quad\left(\bmod p=22 j^{2}+9 j+1\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

(2) If $[K]=(4 j+1)\left[x_{1}\right]-j\left[x_{2}\right]+(6 j+2)\left[y_{1}\right]+(2 j+1)\left[y_{2}\right]$ in $H_{1}(\partial H ; \mathbb{Z})$, then $K^{*}$ admits a representation $K(L(p, q) ; u)$ with

$$
\begin{aligned}
& p=22 j^{2}+13 j+2 \\
& q \equiv-(22 j+7)^{2} \quad\left(\bmod p=22 j^{2}+13 j+2\right) \\
& u \equiv 22 j+7 \quad\left(\bmod p=22 j^{2}+13 j+2\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

(3) If $[K]=(-4 j-3)\left[x_{1}\right]+(j+1)\left[x_{2}\right]+(6 j+4)\left[y_{1}\right]+(2 j+1)\left[y_{2}\right]$ in $H_{1}(\partial H ; \mathbb{Z})$, then $K^{*}$ admits a representation $K(L(p, q) ; u)$ with

$$
\begin{aligned}
& p=22 j^{2}+31 j+11 \\
& q \equiv-(22 j+15)^{2} \quad\left(\bmod p=22 j^{2}+31 j+11\right) \\
& u \equiv 22 j+15 \quad\left(\bmod p=22 j^{2}+31 j+11\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

(4) If $[K]=(-6 j-5)\left[x_{1}\right]+(j+1)\left[x_{2}\right]+(4 j+3)\left[y_{1}\right]+(2 j+1)\left[y_{2}\right]$ in $H_{1}(\partial H ; \mathbb{Z})$, then $K^{*}$ admits a representation $K(L(p, q) ; u)$ with

$$
\begin{aligned}
& p=22 j^{2}+13 j+2, \\
& q \equiv-(22 j+17)^{2} \quad\left(\bmod p=22 j^{2}+13 j+2\right), \\
& u \equiv 22 j+17 \quad\left(\bmod p=22 j^{2}+13 j+2\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$
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