On smoothly superslice knots

Daniel Ruberman

ABSTRACT. We find smoothly slice (in fact doubly slice) knots in the 3-sphere with trivial Alexander polynomial that are not superslice, answering a question posed by Livingston and Meier.

1. Introduction

A recent paper of Livingston and Meier raises an interesting question about *superslice knots*. Recall [3] that a knot K in S^3 is said to be superslice if there is a slice disk D for K such that the double of D along K is the unknotted 2-sphere S in S^4. We will refer to such a disk as a *superslicing disk*. In particular, a superslice knot is slice and also doubly slice, that is, a slice of an unknotted 2-sphere in S^4. Livingston and Meier ask about the converse in the smooth category.

Problem 4.6 (Livingston–Meier [10]). *Find a smoothly slice knot K with $\Delta_K(t) = 1$ that is not smoothly superslice.*

The corresponding question in the topological (locally flat) category is completely understood [10, 12], for a knot K with $\Delta_K(t) = 1$ is topologically superslice.

In this note we give a simple solution to Problem 4.6, making use of Taubes' proof [16] that Donaldson's diagonalization theorem [5] holds for certain noncompact manifolds. For K a knot in S^3, we write $\Sigma_k(K)$ for a k-fold cyclic branched cover of S^3 branched along K. The same notation will be used for the corresponding branched cover along an embedded disk in B^4 or sphere in S^4.

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that J is a knot with Alexander polynomial 1, so that $\Sigma_k(J) = \partial W$, where W is simply connected and the intersection form on W is definite and not diagonalizable. Then the knot $K = J \# -J$ is smoothly doubly slice, but is not smoothly superslice.*

An unpublished argument of Akbulut says that the positive Whitehead double of the trefoil is a knot J satisfying the hypotheses of the theorem, with $k = 2$. The construction is given as [1, Exercise 11.4] and is also

---

documented, along with some generalizations, in the paper [4]. Hence J gives an answer to Problem 4.6. We remark that for the purposes of the argument, it doesn't matter if W is positive or negative definite, as one could replace J by $-J$ and change all the signs.

We need a simple and presumably well-known algebraic lemma.

Lemma 1.2. *Suppose that*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & B & \\
{\scriptstyle i_1}\nearrow & & \searrow{\scriptstyle j_1} \\
A & & C \\
{\scriptstyle i_2}\searrow & & \nearrow{\scriptstyle j_2} \\
 & B &
\end{array}$$

is a pushout of groups, and that $i_1 = i_2$. Then C surjects onto B.

Proof. This follows from the universal property of pushouts; the identity map id_B satisfies $\mathrm{id}_B \circ i_1 = \mathrm{id}_B \circ i_2$, and hence defines a homomorphism $C \to B$ with the same image as id_B.   □

Applying Lemma 1.2 to the decomposition of the complement of the unknot in S^4 into two disk complements, we obtain the following useful facts. (The first of these was presumably known to Kirby and Melvin; compare [8, Addendum, p. 58], and the second is due to Gordon and Sumners [6].)

Corollary 1.3. *If K is superslice and D is a superslicing disk, then*
$$\pi_1(B^4 - D) \cong \mathbb{Z} \quad and \quad \Delta_K(t) = 1.$$

Proof. The lemma says that there is a surjection
$$\mathbb{Z} \cong \pi_1(S^4 - S) \to \pi_1(B^4 - D).$$
Hence $\pi_1(B^4 - D)$ is abelian and so must be isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}$. This condition implies, using Milnor duality [13] in the infinite cyclic covering, that the homology of the infinite cyclic covering of $S^3 - K$ vanishes, which is equivalent to saying that $\Delta_K(t) = 1$.   □

Proof of Theorem 1.1. It is standard [15] that any knot of the form $J \#$ $-J$ is doubly slice. In fact, it is a slice of the 1-twist spin of J, which was shown by Zeeman [17] to be unknotted.

Suppose that K is superslice and let D be a superslicing disk, so $D \cup_K D = S$, an unknotted sphere. Then $S^4 = \Sigma_k(S) = V \cup_Y V$, where we have written $Y = \Sigma_k(K)$ and $V = \Sigma_k(D)$. By Corollary 1.3, the k-fold cover of $B^4 - D$ has $\pi_1 \cong \mathbb{Z}$, so the branched cover V is simply connected.

Note that $\Sigma_k(K) = \Sigma_k(J) \# -\Sigma_k(J)$. Since $\Delta_J(t) = 1$, the same is true for $\Delta_K(t)$, moreover this implies that both $\Sigma_k(J)$ and $\Sigma_k(K)$ are homology spheres. An easy Mayer-Vietoris argument says that $V = \Sigma_k(D)$ is a homology ball; in fact Claim 1.3 implies that it is contractible. Adding a

3-handle to V, we obtain a simply-connected homology cobordism V' from $\Sigma_k(J)$ to itself. By hypothesis, there is a manifold W with boundary $\Sigma_k(J)$ and nondiagonalizable intersection form. Stack up infinitely many copies of V', and glue them to W to make a definite periodic-end manifold M, in the sense of Taubes [16]. Since $\pi_1(V)$ is trivial, M is *admissible* (see [16, Definition 1.3]), and Taubes shows that its intersection form (which is the same as that of W) is diagonalizable. This contradiction proves the theorem. $\quad\square$

The fact that $\pi_1(B^4 - D) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ for a superslicing disk leads to a second obstruction to supersliceness, based on the Ozsváth–Szabó d-invariant [14]. Recall from [11] (for degree 2 covers) and [7] in general that for a knot K and prime p, that one denotes by $\delta_{p^n}(K)$ the d-invariant of a particular spin structure $\mathfrak{s}$ on $\Sigma_{p^n}(K)$ pulled back from the 3-sphere. The fact that a p^n fold branched cover of a slicing disk is a rational homology ball implies that if K slice then $\delta_{p^n}(K) = 0$. For a non-prime-power degree k, the invariant $\delta_k(K)$ might not be defined, because $\Sigma_k(K)$ is not a rational homology sphere. (One might define such an invariant using Floer homology with twisted coefficients as in [2, 9], but there's no good reason that it would be a concordance invariant.)

Theorem 1.4. *If K is superslice, then for any k, the d-invariant*

$$d(\Sigma_k(K), \mathfrak{s}_0)$$

is defined and vanishes.

Proof. Since by Corollary 1.3 the Alexander polynomial is trivial, so $\Sigma_k(K)$ is a homology sphere, and hence $d(\Sigma_k(K), \mathfrak{s}_0)$ is defined. (There is only the one spin structure.) As in the proof of Theorem 1.1, the branched cover $\Sigma_k(D)$ is contractible, and hence [14, Theorem 1.12], $d(\Sigma_k(K), \mathfrak{s}_0) = 0$. $\quad\square$

Sadly, we do not know any examples of a slice knot where Theorem 1.4 provides an obstruction to it being superslice. For such a knot would not be ribbon, so we would also have a counterexample to the slice-ribbon conjecture!

References

[1] Akbulut, Selman. 4-manifolds. *Oxford University Press*, to appear. Preprint `http://www.math.msu.edu/~akbulut/papers/akbulut.lec.pdf`.

[2] Behrens, Stefan; Golla, Marco. Heegaard Floer correction terms, with a twist. Preprint, 2015. arXiv:1505.07401.

[3] Brakes, W. R. Property R and superslices. *Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser.* (2) **31** (1980), no. 123, 263–281. MR0587091, Zbl 0408.57003, doi: 10.1093/qmath/31.3.263.

[4] COCHRAN, TIM D.; GOMPF, ROBERT E. Applications of Donaldson's theorems to classical knot concordance, homology 3-spheres and property P. *Topology* **27** (1988), no. 4, 495–512. MR0976591, Zbl 0669.57003, doi: 10.1016/0040-9383(88)90028-6.

[5] DONALDSON, S. K. An application of gauge theory to four-dimensional topology. *J. Differential Geom.* **18** (1983), no. 2, 279–315. MR0710056, Zbl 0507.57010.

[6] GORDON, C. MCA.; SUMNERS, D. W. Knotted ball pairs whose product with an interval is unknotted. *Math. Ann.* **217** (1975), no. 1, 47–52. MR0380816, Zbl 0293.57010, doi: 10.1007/BF01363239.

[7] JABUKA, STANISLAV. Concordance invariants from higher order covers. *Topology Appl.* **159** (2012), no. 10–11, 2694–2710. MR2923439, Zbl 1250.57011, arXiv:0809.1088, doi: 10.1016/j.topol.2012.03.014.

[8] KIRBY, ROBION; MELVIN, PAUL. Slice knots and property R. *Invent. Math.* **45** (1978), no. 1, 57–59. MR0467754, Zbl 0377.55002, doi: 10.1007/BF01406223.

[9] LEVINE, ADAM SIMON; RUBERMAN, DANIEL. Generalized Heegaard Floer correction terms. *Proceedings of the Gökova Geometry-Topology Conference, 2013*, 76–96, *Gkova Geometry/Topology Conference (GGT), Gkova*, 2014. MR3287799, Zbl 1333.57024, arXiv:1403.2464.

[10] LIVINGSTON, CHARLES; MEIER, JEFFREY. Doubly slice knots with low crossing number. *New York J. Math.* **21** (2015), 1007–1026. MR3425633, Zbl 1328.57009, arXiv:1504.03368.

[11] MANOLESCU, CIPRIAN; OWENS, BRENDAN. A concordance invariant from the Floer homology of double branched covers. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* **2007**, no. 20, Art. ID rnm077, 21 pp. MR2363303, Zbl 1132.57013, arXiv:math/0508065, doi: 10.1093/imrn/rnm077.

[12] MEIER, JEFFREY. Distinguishing topologically and smoothly doubly slice knots. *J. Topol.* **8** (2015), no. 2, 315–351. MR3356764, Zbl 1320.57027, arXiv:1401.1161, doi: 10.1112/jtopol/jtu027.

[13] MILNOR, JOHN W. Infinite cyclic coverings. *1968 Conference on the Topology of Manifolds* (Michigan State Univ., E. Lansing, Mich., 1967) pp. 115–133. *Prindle, Weber & Schmidt, Boston, Mass.* MR0242163, Zbl 0179.52302.

[14] OZSVÁTH, PETER; SZABÓ, ZOLTÁN. Absolutely graded Floer homologies and intersection forms for four-manifolds with boundary. *Adv. Math.* **173** (2003), no. 2, 179–261. MR1957829, Zbl 1025.57016, arXiv:math/0110170, doi: 10.1016/S0001-8708(02)00030-0.

[15] SUMNERS, D. W. Invertible knot cobordisms. *Comment. Math. Helv.* **46** (1971), 240–256. MR0290351, Zbl 0227.57007, doi: 10.1007/BF02566842.

[16] TAUBES, CLIFFORD HENRY. Gauge theory on asymptotically periodic 4-manifolds. *J. Differential Geom.* **25** (1987), no. 3, 363–430. MR0882829, Zbl 0615.57009.

[17] ZEEMAN, E. C. Twisting spun knots. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **115** (1965), 471–495. MR0195085, Zbl 0134.42902, doi: 10.2307/1994281.

(Daniel Ruberman) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, MS 050, BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY, WALTHAM, MA 02454
ruberman@brandeis.edu