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#### Abstract

The doubly slice genus of a knot in the 3 -sphere is the minimal genus among unknotted orientable surfaces in the 4 -sphere for which the knot arises as a cross-section. We use the classical signature function of the knot to give a new lower bound for the doubly slice genus. We combine this with an upper bound due to C. McDonald to prove that for every nonnegative integer $N$ there is a knot where the difference between the slice and doubly slice genus is exactly $N$, refining a result of W . Chen which says this difference can be arbitrarily large.


## 1 Introduction

In what follows all manifolds are topological, compact, and oriented, and embeddings are locally flat, although our results also hold in the smooth category. A basic 4-dimensional measurement for the complexity of a knot $K \subset S^{3}$ is the slice genus $g_{4}(K)$, defined as the minimal genus among connected properly embedded surfaces in $D^{4}$ that have the knot as boundary. Doubling such a surface along its boundary produces a closed connected surface in $S^{4}$ for which the knot appears as a cross section. This doubled surface will be genus minimising among surfaces in $S^{4}$ for which the knot appears as a cross section, but will in general be a knotted surface embedding.
A connected surface in $S^{4}$ is unknotted if it bounds an embedded 3-dimensional handlebody in $S^{4}$. Unknotted surfaces with the knot $K$ as cross section are easily produced by doubling a Seifert surface for $K$ that has been pushed in to $D^{4}$. The doubly slice genus $g_{d s}(K)$, first defined in $[8, \S 5]$, is the minimal genus among unknotted surfaces in $S^{4}$ for which the knot arises as a cross-section. Writing $g_{3}(K)$ for the minimal genus among Seifert surfaces for $K$, it is immediate from the above discussion that

$$
2 g_{4}(K) \leq g_{d s}(K) \leq 2 g_{3}(K) .
$$

Further comparison of these quantities is fairly subtle, but we will show in this article that classical abelian knot invariants can be employed for this purpose.
A choice of Seifert surface for a knot $K \subset S^{3}$ and a choice of basis for the first homology gives rise to a Seifert matrix $V$. Then given $\omega \in S^{1} \subset \mathbb{C}$ the $\omega$-signature of $K$ is defined as the signature of the complex hermitian matrix

$$
\sigma_{\omega}(K):=\operatorname{sgn}\left((1-\omega) V+\left(1-\omega^{-1}\right) V^{T}\right) .
$$

Theorem 1.1 Let $K$ be a knot in $S^{3}$. The doubly slice genus of $K$ is at least

$$
g_{d s}(K) \geq \max _{\omega \in S^{1} \backslash\{1\}}\left|\sigma_{\omega}(K)\right| .
$$

Let $\Delta_{K}(t)$ denote the Alexander polynomial of $K$. A classical lower bound for the slice genus is that for every $\omega \in S^{1}$ such that $\Delta_{K}(\omega) \neq 0$, we have $\left|\sigma_{\omega}(K)\right| \leq 2 g_{4}(K)$ [4]. It follows that $\left|\sigma_{\omega}(K)\right| \leq g_{d s}(K)$ for these $\omega$. Our theorem refines this, since it also applies when $\omega$ is a root of the Alexander polynomial of $K$. Given a slice knot $K$, in other words a knot with $g_{4}(K)=0$, and for $\omega \in S^{1}$ such that $\Delta_{K}(\omega) \neq 0$, we have $\sigma_{\omega}(K)=0$. Therefore the classical bound contains no information on the doubly slice genus for slice knots.

On the other hand, for every $\nu \in S^{1} \backslash\{1\}$ that is the root of some Alexander polynomial there exists a slice knot $K$ for which $\sigma_{\omega}(K)$ is nontrivial exactly at $\omega=\nu, \bar{\nu}$ [1, Corollary 2.1]. For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, Theorem 1.1 applied to the $N$-fold connected sum of such a knot with itself immediately produces a slice knot with doubly slice genus at least $N$, recovering a theorem of Chen [2], which we discuss below. In the following result we obtain a refinement of such examples.

Theorem 1.2 For each $N \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a slice knot $K_{N}$ with $g_{d s}\left(K_{N}\right)=N$. In fact, we may take $K_{N}=\#^{N} J$, the $N$-fold connected sum of $J$ with itself for some

$$
\begin{aligned}
J \in & \left\{8_{20}, 10_{87}, 10_{140}, 11 a 28,11 a 58,11 a 165,12 a 189,12 a 377,12 a 979,12 n 56,\right. \\
& \quad 2 n 57,12 n 62,12 n 66,12 n 87,12 n 106,12 n 288,12 n 501,12 n 504,12 n 582,12 n 670,12 n 721\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Here we use the notation of KnotInfo [9].

Proof The 21 knots listed are slice knots, found by searching the KnotInfo tables, of at most 12 crossings, whose $\omega$-signature equals 1 for some $\omega \in S^{1}$ with $\Delta_{J}(\omega)=0$. As the lower bound of Theorem 1.1 is additive under connected sum we therefore have $g_{d s}\left(K_{N}\right) \geq N$.

We will show in Proposition 4.2 that each of these knots admits a slice disc on which the radial Morse function has two minima and one saddle point i.e. $J$ arises from one band move on the 2-component unlink. The following theorem of Clayton McDonald therefore shows that each of the knots $J$ has doubly slice genus at most 1 , and that $K_{N}$ therefore has $g_{d s}\left(K_{N}\right) \leq N$.

Theorem 1.3 (McDonald [10, Theorem 3.2]) Let $K \subset S^{3}$ be a knot and let $\Sigma$ be a smoothly embedded surface in $D^{4}$ such that the radial Morse function restricts to a Morse function on $\Sigma$ with $b$ saddle points and no maxima. Then $g_{d s}(K) \leq b$.

Corollary 1.4 (to Theorem 1.2) Let $M, N$ be nonnegative integers with $M$ even and $M \leq N$. There exists a knot $K$ with $M=2 g_{4}(K)$ and $N=g_{d s}(K)$.

Proof Let $J$ be the mirror image of the knot $5_{2}$. This has $g_{4}(J)=g_{3}(J)=g_{d s}(J)=1$, and $\sigma_{\omega}(J)=2$ for $\omega:=e^{\pi i / 3}$, which is not a root of the Alexander polynomial. The knot $L:=8_{20}$ has $g_{4}(L)=0$, but $\sigma_{\omega}(L)=1$ and $g_{d s}(L)=1$. Taking

$$
K:=\left(\#^{M / 2} J\right) \#\left(\#^{N-M} L\right)
$$

yields a knot with $2 g_{4}(K) \leq M$ and $g_{d s}(K) \leq N$. Then $\sigma_{\omega}(K)=N$, so $g_{d s}(K)=N$ by Theorem 1.1. Since $\left|\sigma_{\rho}(K)\right| \leq 2 g_{4}(K)$ except for finitely many values of $\rho \in S^{1}$, the averaged signature function defined by

$$
\bar{\sigma}_{e^{i \pi \theta}}(K):=\frac{1}{2}\left(\lim _{\varphi \rightarrow \theta^{+}} \sigma_{e^{i \pi \varphi}}(K)+\lim _{\varphi \rightarrow \theta^{-}} \sigma_{e^{i \pi \varphi}}(K)\right)
$$

satisfies $\left|\bar{\sigma}_{\rho}(K)\right| \leq 2 g_{4}(K)$ for all $\rho \in S^{1}$. Then $\bar{\sigma}_{\omega}(K)=M$ so $2 g_{4}(K)=M$.

## Connections to previous work

A knot $K$ is doubly slice if $g_{d s}(K)=0$, and the doubly slice genus is a measure of how far a knot is from being doubly slice. The first detailed study of doubly slice knots, and the related algebra, was made by Sumners [13]. Further foundational algebraic studies, related to the work in this article, are those of Stoltzfus [12] and Levine [7].

Instead of the doubly slice genus, a different measure of the failure of a knot to be doubly slice was studied by Cherry Kearton [5]. Given a slice knot $K$, he considered the minimal complex dimension of $H_{1}\left(S^{4} \backslash J ; \mathbb{C}\left[t, t^{-1}\right]\right)$ among all knotted 2-spheres $J \subset S^{4}$ with crosssection $K$. He gave lower bounds for his invariant arising from signature obstructions. The signatures he considered are the ( $p, i$ )-signatures of the Blanchfield form (see [7]), and it is known that these signatures can be used to compute the $\omega$-signatures of $K$ [7, Theorem 2.3], tempting one to imagine a connection to the results of this paper. But despite the similar flavour of the invariants he uses, Kearton's complexity measure appears to be independent of the doubly slice genus, so there is no clear dependency between his work and ours.

This article was partly inspired by work of Wenzhao Chen [2], who ingeniously applied Casson-Gordon invariants to show that for every $N \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a slice knot $K$ with $g_{d s}(K) \geq N$. In particular he proved that $g_{d s}(K)-2 g_{4}(K)$ can be arbitrarily large. CassonGordon invariants rely on the existence of interesting metabelian representations of the knot group $\pi_{1}\left(S^{3} \backslash K\right)$ and are thus less basic than the $\omega$-signatures in this paper, which can be thought of as arising from the abelianisation of the knot group $\pi_{1}\left(S^{3} \backslash K\right) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$. While our method refines Chen's theorem, with a more elementary invariant, we cannot recover Chen's examples. These examples, as the original Casson-Gordon examples, are constructed using the Stevedore's knot. With rational coefficients the Stevedore's knot shares a Seifert matrix with $9_{46}$, which is doubly slice. This means Chen's examples have hyperbolic Seifert matrices over the rational numbers, and so for all $\omega \in S^{1} \backslash\{1\}$ the $\omega$-signature of his knots vanish.

## Outline

The paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we recall the signature defect invariants of a 3 -manifold with a map to $B \mathbb{Z}$, associated with a cobounding 4 -manifold. We equate the signature defect invariant with $\omega$-signatures. In Section 3 we use this to prove Theorem 1.1. In Section 4 we establish the upper bounds for the examples listed in Theorem 1.2.
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## 2 Signature defects

Let $R$ be either the ring $\mathbb{C}$ with the involution given by complex conjugation, or the ring of finite complex Laurent polynomials $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}] \cong \mathbb{C}\left[t, t^{-1}\right]$ with involution given by $\sum a_{k} t^{k} \mapsto$ $\sum \overline{a_{k}} t^{-k}$. An $R$-module will mean a left $R$-module unless otherwise stated, and ${ }^{-}$will denote the use of the involution to switch a left $R$-module to a right $R$-module or viceversa.

A CW pair of connected topological spaces $(X, Y)$ is over $\mathbb{Z}$ if $X$ is equipped with a homomorphism $\varphi: \pi_{1}(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$. We write $(X, Y, \varphi)$ for these data, or $(X, \varphi)$ if $Y=\emptyset$. Write $p: \widetilde{X} \rightarrow X$ for the cover corresponding to $\varphi$ and $\widetilde{Y}=p^{-1}(Y)$ for the corresponding cover of $Y$. Given a map of rings with involution $\alpha: \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}] \rightarrow R$, the ring $R$ becomes an $(R, \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}])$ bimodule, and there are associated twisted homology and cohomology modules over $R$

$$
\begin{aligned}
H_{r}(X, Y ; \alpha) & :=H_{r}\left(R \otimes_{\alpha} C_{*}(\widetilde{X}, \tilde{Y} ; \mathbb{C})\right), \\
H^{r}(X, Y ; \alpha) & :=H_{r}\left(\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]}\left(\overline{\left(C_{*}(\tilde{X}, \tilde{Y} ; \mathbb{C})\right.}, R\right)\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Note we are abusing notation in suppressing the particular $\varphi$ being used, but for all applications in this article the choice of $\varphi$ will be understood, so this should cause no confusion.

Setting $\alpha$ to be the identity map Id: $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]$ returns the ordinary complex coefficient homology and complex coefficient cohomology with compact support of the cover $(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{Y})$. We denote these by $H_{r}(X, Y ; \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}])$ and $H^{r}(X, Y ; \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}])$ respectively.
For each $\omega \in S^{1} \backslash\{1\}$ there is a map of rings with involution

$$
\alpha_{\omega}: \mathbb{C}\left[t, t^{-1}\right] \rightarrow \mathbb{C} ; \quad \alpha_{\omega}(t)=\omega .
$$

The map $\alpha_{\omega}$ induces a $(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}])$-bimodule structure on $\mathbb{C}$ and we will write $\mathbb{C}_{\omega}$ when we wish to emphasise this structure is being used. We will write

$$
H_{r}\left(X, Y ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right):=H_{r}\left(X, Y ; \alpha_{\omega}\right), \quad H^{r}\left(X, Y ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right):=H_{r}\left(X, Y ; \alpha_{\omega}\right) .
$$

Now consider $(X, \varphi)$ where $X$ is a compact, oriented $n$-dimensional manifold with (possibly empty) boundary. Let $P D: H^{n-k}\left(X ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right) \rightarrow H_{k}\left(X, \partial X ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)$ denote the Poincaré duality isomorphism. Define a map of complex vector spaces

$$
\lambda_{\omega}(X): H_{k}\left(X ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right) \rightarrow H_{k}\left(X, \partial X ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right) \xrightarrow{P D^{-1}} H^{n-k}\left(X ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right) \xrightarrow{\text { ev }} \overline{\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}\left(H_{n-k}\left(X ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right), \mathbb{C}\right)},
$$

where ev denotes the evaluation map given by $\operatorname{ev}([f])([z \otimes x])=z \cdot \overline{f(x)}$. The map $\lambda_{\omega}(X)$ determines a pairing

$$
H_{n-k}\left(X ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right) \times H_{k}\left(X ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right) \rightarrow \mathbb{C} ; \quad(x, y) \mapsto \lambda_{\omega}(X)(y)(x),
$$

which is hermitian and sesquilinear but in general is degenerate. In particular, when $n=2 k$, we may take the signature of this complex hermitian pairing, denoted $\sigma\left(\lambda_{\omega}(X)\right) \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Definition 2.1 For $W$ a compact, oriented 4 -manifold with (possibly empty) boundary, over $\mathbb{Z}$, the (middle dimensional) $\mathbb{C}_{\omega}$-coefficient intersection form is the hermitian sesquilinear form $\left(H_{2}\left(W ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right), \lambda_{\omega}(W)\right)$.

Definition 2.2 Let $(M, \varphi)$ be a closed, connected, oriented 3-manifold over $\mathbb{Z}$. A nullbordism of $(M, \varphi)$ is a pair $(W, \psi)$ consisting of a compact, connected, oriented 4-manifold $W$ with boundary $\partial W=M$ and a homomorphism $\psi: \pi_{1}(W) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\left.\psi\right|_{\partial W}=\varphi$.

Given a null-bordism $(W, \psi)$ of $(M, \varphi)$, we define the $\omega$-signature defect

$$
\sigma_{\omega}(M):=\sigma\left(\lambda_{\omega}(W)\right)-\sigma(W) .
$$

(We are abusing notation in suppressing the particular $\varphi$ and $\psi$.)
Proposition 2.3 Given a closed, connected, oriented 3-manifold $(M, \varphi)$ over $\mathbb{Z}$, and any $\omega \in S^{1} \backslash\{1\}$, the $\omega$-signature defect $\sigma_{\omega}(M)$ is defined and well-defined, independent of the choice $(W, \psi)$.

Proof Because $\Omega_{3}(B \mathbb{Z})=0$, there always exists a null-bordism $(W, \psi)$ for $(M, \varphi)$. The proof that the resultant $\omega$-signature defect is independent of the choice of $(W, \psi)$ is a well-known Novikov additivity argument, as we now outline. First, write $i: H_{2}\left(M ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right) \rightarrow$ $H_{2}\left(W ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)$ for the inclusion induced map. The image of $i$ lies in the kernel of $\lambda_{\omega}(X)$ by exactness of the long exact sequence of the pair $(W, M)$. The restriction of $\lambda_{\omega}(X)$ to the quotient $H_{2}\left(W ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right) / i\left(H_{2}\left(M ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)\right)$ determines a nonsingular pairing [11, Proposition 5.3 (i)]. Thus the signature of $\lambda_{\omega}(W)$ and the signature of its restriction to $H_{2}\left(W ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right) / i\left(H_{2}\left(M ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)\right)$ agree. We now refer the reader to the proof of [11, Proposition 5.3 (ii)] for the completion of the argument.

Example 2.4 The main example we are interested in is the closed, oriented 3-manifold $M_{K}$ obtained by 0-framed Dehn surgery on $S^{3}$ along an oriented knot $K$. The orientation on the knot determines a natural map $\varphi_{K}: \pi_{1}\left(M_{K}\right) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ via abelianisation.

The associated $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]$-coefficient homology $H_{*}\left(M_{K} ; \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]\right)$ is torsion; that is there exists a Laurent polynomial $p \in \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]$ such that $p \cdot H_{*}\left(M_{K} ; \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]\right)=0$.

Example 2.5 Let $G \subset D^{4}$ be a properly embedded, connected genus $g$ surface with one boundary component, homeomorphic to $\overline{\Sigma_{g} \backslash D^{2}}=: \Sigma_{g, 1}$. Let $\nu G$ be an open tubular neighbourhood extending an open tubular neighbourhood of the boundary knot $K \subset S^{3}$.

Let $H_{g}$ denote the 3-dimensional handlebody of genus $g$ and let $\Sigma_{g}$ be its boundary. By choosing a disc $D^{2} \subset \partial H_{g}$, decompose the boundary of $H_{g} \times S^{1}$ as

$$
\partial\left(H_{g} \times S^{1}\right)=\left(\Sigma_{g, 1} \times S^{1}\right) \cup_{S^{1} \times S^{1}}\left(D^{2} \times S^{1}\right)
$$

Glue the exterior of $G$ to $H_{g} \times S^{1}$, along $\Sigma_{g, 1} \times S^{1}$ to form

$$
W:=\left(D^{4} \backslash \nu G\right) \cup_{G \times S^{1}}\left(H_{g} \times S^{1}\right)
$$

a compact, connected, oriented 4-manifold with boundary $M_{K}$, the 0 -surgery on $K$. MayerVietoris calculations give

$$
H_{k}(W ; \mathbb{Z}) \cong\left\{\begin{array}{ll}
\mathbb{Z} & k=0 \\
\mathbb{Z} & k=1, \\
\mathbb{Z}^{2 g} & k=2 \\
0 & \text { otherwise }
\end{array} \quad \text { generated by a meridian of } G\right.
$$

In particular, the abelianisation of $\varphi: \pi_{1}\left(M_{K}\right) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ extends to $\psi: \pi_{1}(W) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ so that $(W, \psi)$ is a null-bordism of $\left(M_{K}, \varphi\right)$. Note that the homology is independent of the choice of identification of $G$ with $\Sigma_{g, 1} \subset \partial H_{g}$.

Lemma 2.6 Let $K \subset S^{3}$ be an oriented knot and let $M_{K}$ be the 0 -surgery manifold. For any $\omega \in S^{1} \backslash\{1\}$ and there is equality

$$
\sigma_{\omega}\left(M_{K}\right)=\sigma_{\omega}(K)
$$

Proof As the $\omega$-signature is well-defined, independent of choice of null-bordism, it suffices to find a single null-bordism of $M_{K}$ over $\mathbb{Z}$ such that the signature of the $\mathbb{C}_{\omega}$-coefficient intersection form agrees with $\sigma_{\omega}(K)$. Perform the construction of Example 2.5 on a pushed in Seifert surface $F$ for $K$. In this case it is shown in shown by Ko [6, pp. 538-9] (see also Cochran-Orr-Teichner [3, Lemma 5.4]) that in some basis the resultant $\mathbb{C}_{\omega}$-coefficient intersection form of $W_{F}$ has matrix $(1-\omega) V+\left(1-\omega^{-1}\right) V^{T}$, where $V$ is a Seifert matrix associated to $F$. Moreover the ordinary signature $\sigma\left(W_{F}\right)=0$, so the defect satisfies

$$
\sigma_{\omega}\left(M_{K}\right)=\sigma\left(\lambda_{\omega}\left(W_{F}\right)\right)-\sigma\left(W_{F}\right)=\sigma_{\omega}(K)
$$

## 3 A lower bound on $g_{d s}$

Let $K \subset S^{3}$ be an oriented knot, let $G_{1}, G_{2} \subset D^{4}$ be locally flat, connected, compact, orientable, embedded surfaces with boundary $K$, such that $S=G_{1} \cup_{K} G_{2}$ is an unknotted surface in $S^{4}$ of genus $g$.

Perform the construction described in Example 2.5 on each of $G_{1}$ and $G_{2}$ to obtain $W_{1}$ and $W_{2}$ respectively. Define

$$
V:=W_{1} \cup_{M_{K}}-W_{2}
$$

Observe that $V=\left(S^{4} \backslash \nu S\right) \cup_{\Sigma_{g} \times S^{1}}\left(H_{g} \times S^{1}\right)$, where $H_{g}$ denotes the 3-dimensional handlebody of genus $g$ and $\Sigma_{g}=\partial H_{g}$.

A straightforward Seifert-Van Kampen argument shows that $\pi_{1}(V) \cong \mathbb{Z}$. Various MayerVietoris calculations give

$$
H_{k}(V ; \mathbb{Z}) \cong\left\{\begin{array}{ll}
\mathbb{Z} & k=0, \\
\mathbb{Z} & k=1, \\
\mathbb{Z}^{2 g} & k=2, \\
0 & \text { otherwise } .
\end{array} \quad \text { generated by a meridian of } \Sigma_{g}\right.
$$

We now derive a series of technical lemmas we will use in the proof of Theorem 1.1
Lemma 3.1 Let $T$ be a finitely generated, torsion $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]$-module, and let $\omega \in S^{1} \backslash\{1\}$. Then $\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{C}} \operatorname{Tor}_{1}^{\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]}\left(T, \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)=\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{C}}\left(\mathbb{C}_{\omega} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]} T\right)$.

Proof By the structure theorem for finitely generated modules over a principal ideal domain, there exists an injective map $A: P_{1} \hookrightarrow P_{0}$ such that $T \cong P_{0} / A\left(P_{1}\right)$ and so that $P_{1}, P_{0}$ are free $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]$-modules of the same rank. The functor $\mathbb{C}_{\omega} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]}$ - induces an exact sequence

$$
\operatorname{Tor}_{1}^{\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]}\left(P_{0}, \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right) \rightarrow \operatorname{Tor}_{1}^{\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]}\left(T, \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_{\omega} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]} P_{1} \xrightarrow{\operatorname{Id} \otimes A} \mathbb{C}_{\omega} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]} P_{0} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_{\omega} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]} T \rightarrow 0 .
$$

The leftmost term is 0 because $P_{0}$ is free. As $P_{1}$ and $P_{0}$ have the same free rank, $\mathbb{C}_{\omega} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]} P_{1}$ and $\mathbb{C}_{\omega} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]} P_{0}$ have the same complex dimension. The sequence has vanishing Euler characteristic because it is exact, so the claimed result follows.

Lemma 3.2 For a space $X$ over $\mathbb{Z}$ with $H_{0}(X ; \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]) \cong \mathbb{C}$, and for $\omega \in S^{1} \backslash\{1\}$ we have

$$
H_{0}\left(X ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)=0 \quad \text { and } \quad H_{1}\left(X ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right) \cong \mathbb{C}_{\omega} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]} H_{1}(X ; \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]) .
$$

Proof First, $\mathbb{C} \cong \mathbb{C}\left[t, t^{-1}\right] /(t-1)$ as a $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]$-module, so that $\mathbb{C}_{\omega} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}}[\mathbb{Z}] \mathbb{C}=0$ since $\omega \neq 1$. This immediately gives $\mathbb{C}_{\omega} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]} H_{0}(X ; \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}])=0$ and by Lemma 3.1 we also have $\operatorname{Tor}_{1}^{\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]}\left(H_{0}(X ; \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]), \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)=0$. The result now follows from the Universal Coefficient Theorem.

Lemma 3.3 With $V=W_{1} \cup_{M_{K}}-W_{2}$ as described above and $\omega \in S^{1} \backslash\{1\}$,

$$
H_{1}\left(V ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)=0, \quad H_{3}\left(V ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)=0, \quad \text { and } \quad \operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{C}} H_{2}\left(V ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)=2 g
$$

so that the Mayer-Vietoris sequence for $V$ with $\mathbb{C}_{\omega}$ coefficients becomes

$$
0 \rightarrow H_{2}\left(M_{K}\right) \rightarrow H_{2}\left(W_{1}\right) \oplus H_{2}\left(W_{2}\right) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{2 g} \rightarrow H_{1}\left(M_{K}\right) \rightarrow H_{1}\left(W_{1}\right) \oplus H_{1}\left(W_{2}\right) \rightarrow 0 .
$$

Proof Consider that $\mathbb{C}_{\omega} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]} H_{1}(V ; \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}])=0$ since $\pi_{1}(V) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ implies $H_{1}(V ; \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}])=0$. Since $H_{0}(V ; \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]) \cong \mathbb{C}$ and $\omega \neq 1$, this combines with Lemma 3.2 to give $H_{1}\left(V ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)=0$.
Next, we have $H_{3}\left(V ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right) \cong H^{1}\left(V ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)$ by Poincaré duality. By the Universal Coefficient Theorem for cohomology, $H^{1}\left(V ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right) \cong \operatorname{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]}^{1}\left(H_{0}(V ; \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]), \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)$. The projective $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]$ module resolution

$$
0 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}] \xrightarrow{f} \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}] \rightarrow H_{0}(V ; \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]) \rightarrow 0
$$

where $f: p(t) \mapsto(t-1) p(t)$, can be used to compute

$$
\operatorname{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]}^{1}\left(H_{0}(V ; \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]), \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)=\operatorname{coker}\left(\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]}\left(\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}], \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right) \xrightarrow{f^{*}} \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]}\left(\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}], \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)\right) .
$$

But $f^{*}(\varphi)=(\omega-1) \varphi$, and $\omega \neq 1$, so this module vanishes as required.
Using the integral homology of $V$, we compute the Euler characteristic $\chi(V)=2 g$. We shall compute it again with $\mathbb{C}_{\omega}$-coefficients in order to find the dimension of $H_{2}\left(V ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)$. By Lemma 3.2 we have $H_{0}\left(V ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)=0$, so also $H_{4}\left(V ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)=0$ by Poincaré duality and the Universal Coefficient Theorem. Therefore $H_{i}\left(V ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)=0$ for $i \neq 2$, and we have

$$
2 g=\chi(V)=\chi^{\mathbb{C}_{\omega}}(V)=\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{C}} H_{2}\left(V ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right) .
$$

Lemma 3.4 For $i=1,2$ there is equality

$$
\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{C}} \operatorname{Im}\left(H_{2}\left(M_{K} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right) \rightarrow H_{2}\left(W_{i} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)\right)=\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{C}} H_{2}\left(M_{K} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)-\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{C}} H_{1}\left(W_{i} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)
$$

Proof The map $H_{1}\left(M_{K} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right) \rightarrow H_{1}\left(W_{i} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)$ is surjective by Lemma 3.3. This implies $H_{1}\left(W_{i}, M_{K} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)=0$, since $H_{0}\left(M_{K} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)=0$ by Lemma 3.2. Therefore

$$
H_{3}\left(W_{i} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right) \cong H^{1}\left(W_{i}, M_{K} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right) \cong H_{1}\left(W_{i}, M_{K} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)=0
$$

by Poincaré duality and the Universal Coefficient Theorem. For the same reasons, we have

$$
H_{3}\left(W_{i}, M_{K} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right) \cong H^{1}\left(W_{i} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right) \cong H_{1}\left(W_{i} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)
$$

Since $H_{3}\left(W_{i} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)=0$, the long exact sequence of the pair $\left(W_{i}, M_{K}\right)$ takes the form

$$
0 \rightarrow H_{3}\left(W_{i}, M_{K} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right) \rightarrow H_{2}\left(M_{K} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right) \rightarrow H_{2}\left(W_{i} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right) \rightarrow \cdots
$$

We deduce that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{C}} \operatorname{Im}\left(H_{2}\left(M_{K} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right) \rightarrow H_{2}\left(W_{i} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)\right) & =\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{C}} H_{2}\left(M_{K} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)-\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{C}} H_{3}\left(W_{i}, M_{K} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right) \\
& =\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{C}} H_{2}\left(M_{K} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)-\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{C}} H_{1}\left(W_{i} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

as desired.

We are now in a position to prove Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1 Fix $\omega \in S^{1} \backslash\{1\}$ and let $W_{1}, W_{2}$ be as above. Define for $i=1,2$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\beta & :=\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{C}} H_{2}\left(M_{K} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right), \\
n_{i} & :=\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{C}}\left(\mathbb{C}_{\omega} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]} H_{2}\left(W_{i} ; \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]\right)\right), \\
m_{i} & :=\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{C}} \operatorname{Tor}_{1}^{\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]}\left(H_{1}\left(W_{i} ; \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]\right), \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

By the Universal Coefficient Theorem

$$
n_{i}+m_{i}=\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{C}} H_{2}\left(W_{i} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right) \quad \text { and } \quad \beta=\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{C}} \operatorname{Tor}_{1}^{\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]}\left(H_{1}\left(M_{K} ; \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]\right), \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right),
$$

where the latter equality also uses the fact that $H_{2}\left(M_{K} ; \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]\right)=0$.

The module $H_{1}\left(M_{K} ; \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]\right)$ is $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]$-torsion. As $H_{1}(V ; \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}])=0$, the map $H_{1}\left(M_{K} ; \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]\right) \rightarrow$ $H_{1}\left(W_{1} ; \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]\right) \oplus H_{1}\left(W_{2} ; \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]\right)$ in the Mayer-Vietoris sequence is surjective. Hence $H_{1}\left(W_{i} ; \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]\right)$ is torsion for $i=1,2$. By Lemma 3.1 we deduce

$$
\begin{aligned}
\beta & =\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{C}}\left(\mathbb{C}_{\omega} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]} H_{1}\left(M_{K} ; \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]\right)\right), \\
m_{i} & =\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{C}}\left(\mathbb{C}_{\omega} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]} H_{1}\left(W_{i} ; \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]\right)\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

For each of the spaces $X=M_{K}, W_{1}, W_{2}$, Lemma 3.2 implies $\mathbb{C}_{\omega} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]} H_{1}(X ; \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]) \cong$ $H_{1}\left(X ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)$ so that we furthermore obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\beta & =\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{C}} H_{1}\left(M_{K} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right), \\
m_{i} & =\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{C}} H_{1}\left(W_{i} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

By Lemma 2.6 we have $\left|\sigma_{\omega}(K)\right| \leq \operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{C}} H_{2}\left(W_{i} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)$. However, recall that the image of $H_{2}\left(M_{K} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right) \rightarrow H_{2}\left(W_{i} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)$ lies in the kernel of $\lambda_{\omega}\left(W_{i}\right)$, so that moreover

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\sigma_{\omega}(K)\right| & \leq \operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{C}} H_{2}\left(W_{i} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)-\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{C}} \operatorname{Im}\left(H_{2}\left(M_{K} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right) \rightarrow H_{2}\left(W_{i} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)\right) \\
& =\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{C}} H_{2}\left(W_{i} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)-\left(\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{C}} H_{2}\left(M_{K} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)-\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{C}} H_{1}\left(W_{i} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)\right) \\
& =\left(n_{i}+m_{i}\right)-\left(\beta-m_{i}\right) \\
& =n_{i}+2 m_{i}-\beta
\end{aligned}
$$

where in the second line we have used Lemma 3.4. Taking the sum for $i=1,2$ we obtain:

$$
\begin{equation*}
2\left|\sigma_{\omega}(K)\right| \leq n_{1}+n_{2}+2 m_{1}+2 m_{2}-2 \beta . \tag{*}
\end{equation*}
$$

We saw in Lemma 3.3 that $H_{1}\left(M_{K} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right) \rightarrow H_{1}\left(W_{1} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right) \oplus H_{1}\left(W_{2} ; \mathbb{C}_{\omega}\right)$ is surjective, so that

$$
m_{1}+m_{2} \leq \beta .
$$

It follows that $2 m_{1}+2 m_{2}-2 \beta \leq 0$, so combining this with (*) we have

$$
2\left|\sigma_{\omega}(K)\right| \leq n_{1}+n_{2}+2 m_{1}+2 m_{2}-2 \beta \leq n_{1}+n_{2} .
$$

Finally, we calculate the Euler characteristic for the section of the Mayer-Vietoris sequence of $V=W_{1} \cup_{M_{K}}-W_{2}$ obtained in Lemma 3.3 as

$$
0=\beta-\left(n_{1}+m_{1}+n_{2}+m_{2}\right)+2 g-\beta+\left(m_{1}+m_{2}\right),
$$

so that $2 g=n_{1}+n_{2}$. Substituting into ( $\dagger$ ) yields $2\left|\sigma_{\omega}(K)\right| \leq 2 g$ and hence $\left|\sigma_{\omega}(K)\right| \leq g$.
Since this is true for all $\omega \in S^{1} \backslash\{1\}$ and all pairs of slice surfaces that glue to be unknotted, the claimed result follows.

## 4 Examples of band moves

A ribbon surface for a knot $K \subset S^{3}$ is a smoothly embedded surface $\Sigma \subset D^{4}$ with $\partial \Sigma=K$, such that the radial function $D^{4} \rightarrow[0,1]$ restricts to a Morse function on $\Sigma$ whose critical points are of index either 0 or 1 .

Definition 4.1 The ribbon surface band number $b(K)$ of a knot $K$ is the minimal number of index 1 critical points, among all ribbon surfaces $\Sigma$ for $K$.

The following proposition, combined with Theorem 1.3 of McDonald , gives the promised upper bounds on $g_{d s}$ that complete the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Proposition 4.2 The ribbon surface band number $b(J)=1$ for each of the knots
$J \in\left\{8_{20}, 10_{87}, 10_{140}, 11 a 28,11 a 58,11 a 165,12 a 189,12 a 377,12 a 979,12 n 56\right.$,
$12 n 57,12 n 62,12 n 66,12 n 87,12 n 106,12 n 288,12 n 501,12 n 504,12 n 582,12 n 670,12 n 721\}$.
Proof It suffices to exhibit a single band move on $J$ that produces a 2-component unlink. The required band moves are shown in the diagrams of Figure 1 and Figure 2.
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Figure 1: Band moves for the proof of Proposition 4.2.


Figure 2: More band moves for the proof of Proposition 4.2.

