

THE COMPLEXITY OF SHAKE SLICE KNOTS

CHARLES RANSOME STINE

ABSTRACT. We define a notion of complexity for shake-slice knots which is analogous to the definition of complexity for h-cobordisms studied by Morgan-Szabó. We prove that for each framing $n \neq 0$ and complexity $c \geq 1$, there is an n -shake-slice knot with complexity at least c . Our construction makes use of dualizable patterns, and we include a crash course in their constructions and properties. We bound complexity by studying the behavior of the classical knot signature and the Levine-Tristram signature of a knot under the operation of twisting algebraically-one strands.

1. INTRODUCTION

Perhaps the most well known difficulty in the study of smooth 4-manifolds is the failure of the smooth h-cobordism theorem of Smale in 4-dimensions. The consequences of this fact include the plethora of exotic smooth structures which have been discovered on 4-manifolds as well as exotic diffeomorphisms and exotically knotted surfaces in such 4-manifolds. The proof breaks down in dimension four because one cannot gain sufficient control over the geometric intersection data of certain embedded 2-spheres from the algebraic intersection data assumed by the theorem. Essentially this boils down to the question: given two embedded spheres in a smooth simply connected 4-manifold with algebraic intersection number ± 1 , when can we find embedded spheres in the same homology classes with geometric intersection number exactly 1?

We study this question in what is perhaps the simplest possible context: the existence of shake-slice knots. These are knots with the property that for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ the associated knot trace $X_n(K)$ contains a smoothly embedded sphere which generates H_2 . If the knot K is smoothly slice then this condition is obviously satisfied by the sphere consisting of a slice disk for K in the 4-ball union the core of the attached 2-handle. Moreover if we consider the intersection data between this sphere and the cocore of the 2-handle, we see the algebraic and geometric intersection numbers between them are both one. If the answer to the previous question were yes then we would expect this type of sphere to be the only way this phenomenon could occur; in short that all shake-slice knots would be slice. Initial work of Akbulut [Akb77] showed that there were shake slice knots for framings $n = 1, 2$ which are not slice, and later work [Akb93], [CR16] showed that they exist for all non-zero n . It has remained an interesting question to try to quantify how far these knots are from being slice, and then to give examples of n -shake-slice knots which are arbitrarily far from being slice.

Some work on this question was completed in [FMN⁺21]. The authors show that in the case $n = \pm 1$, a knot is topologically shake-slice iff $\text{Arf}(K) = 0$. They define a notion of complexity, the *shaking-number*, which is a re-normalization of the notion we will introduce here, and show that it is bounded below by the signature. Since there are many examples of knots with $\text{Arf}(K) = 0$ and large signature, this provides a positive answer to the question. On the other hand, the surgery theoretic methods employed in [FMN⁺21] are not well suited to constructing or preserving smoothly embedded spheres, so it remains to be seen if there are similar smoothly (± 1) -shake-slice examples. We give such examples for all non-zero n in this paper.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 57K40 (Primary), 57K10 (Secondary); Date: December 14, 2021.
Key words and phrases. shake slice, complexity, knot trace.

A generic transversality argument tells us that any smoothly embedded sphere generating the homology of the trace of a shake-slice knot must intersect the 2-handle of the knot trace in some number of parallel copies of the core of the 2-handle. If the sphere can be isotoped into a position where it intersects the 2-handle in exactly one copy of the core then the lower part of the sphere slices the knot and we are in the situation described above. It is natural to consider a shake-slice knot to be far from being slice if it is such that any smoothly embedded sphere which generates the second homology of its trace must intersect the 2-handle in a large number of copies of the core. This is made precise as follows: any generating sphere must intersect the 2-handle in $1 + 2c$ parallel copies of the core for some $c \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Each copy of the core must intersect the cocore at exactly one point and so we see one positive or negative intersection between the sphere and the cocore and then c algebraically cancelling pairs of intersections. We define the complexity of an n -shake-slice knot to be the minimum number of algebraically cancelling pairs of transverse intersection points between the cocore of the 2-handle of its n -trace and a smoothly embedded sphere generating its homology. We prove the following theorem:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $n \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ and $c \in \mathbb{N}$ be given. There exists a knot $K_{n,c} \subset S^3$ such that $K_{n,c}$ is smoothly n -shake-slice, yet the complexity of $K_{n,c}$ is at least c . Moreover, the complexity bound applies to topologically-locally-flatly embedded spheres generating the homology of the n -trace as well as smoothly embedded ones.*

We construct $K_{n,c}$ as a satellite knot using two dualizable-patterns and we exploit the nice properties of dualizable patterns both in our proof that our knots are smoothly n -shake-slice and in our computation of a lower bound on complexity. Although dualizable patterns have been in the literature for awhile already, there is no systematic review of their construction and properties. We give such a review here, and we have ironed out a few kinks in the notation, so as to produce a symbolic calculus which one can use to manipulate them while preserving or changing certain of their properties in a controlled way. In particular, we append a one page cheat sheet ([page 32](#)) which contains a concise summary of the calculus, and may be used as a reference independently from the rest of this paper.

We give a topological argument following [FMN⁺21][Prop. 8.8] which shows that the complexity of an n -shake-slice knot is bounded below by its 4-ball genus (smoothly or topologically respectively) and thus any of the well known 4-genus bounds can be used to bound the complexity of an n -shake-slice knot. We give a compatibility criterion for any such invariant, which, if satisfied, allows us to compute the invariant for large families of knots constructed using dualizable patterns. We observe that the Levine-Tristram signature of a knot satisfies our compatibility criterion, and we give a general computation of the LT signature of our knots $K_{n,c}$. The main technical point ends up being an analysis of how the Levine-Tristram signature changes under the operation of adding n twists to $1 + 2c$ parallel strands of a knot, assuming that all but one of the strands come with an oppositely oriented partner.

As a slight aside to the main result of this paper, we give a reformulation of the Goeritz-Trotter method for computing the classical signature of a knot, which, if not algorithmically quicker than procedure as described in [Lit79], is we feel much easier to perform as a human looking at a diagram of a knot. Using this reformulation, we are able to give a different, somewhat simpler proof of the following theorem due to Tristram:

Theorem 1.2 ([Tri69], Cor. to Thm 3.2). *Let K be a knot in S^3 , and let U be an unknot embedded in the complement of K such that the oriented linking number $lk(K, U) = 1$. Let K_n be the result of applying n full twists to all the strands of K which pass through a spanning disk for U . Alternatively, K_n can be viewed as the knot in S^3 induced by K after doing $-\frac{1}{n}$ -surgery on U . For all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\sigma(K_n) = \sigma(K_{n+2})$, so the set $\{\sigma(K_n) \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ contains at most two values.*

This is in stark contrast to the behavior we see when we change the linking condition to be $lk(K, U) = 0$. Under this condition the signature of K_n decreases steadily until it hits a fixed, stable value and the number of times the signature decreases is roughly proportional to the

number of algebraically cancelling pairs of strands which pass through U . Instead, we see a totally determined oscillation, which is independent of the number of algebraically cancelling pairs of strands passing we are twisting. Tristram's original proof proceeds by constructing a family of very large Seifert forms for the knots K_n and then analyzing the behavior of the associated Hermitian forms. Our proof uses a much simpler family of non-orientable spanning surfaces for the knots K_n which leads to significantly simpler algebra; however our method cannot be generalized to the full signature function.

1.1. Organization. We start by reviewing the definition and properties of dualizable patterns. We give two different diagrammatic methods for computing the dual of a pattern. We give a universal, combinatorial method for constructing dualizable patterns, and we give a systematic notation for building and manipulating satellite knots with dualizable patterns. In section 3, we review the relevant aspects of shake-slice knots. We prove that 4-genus bounds complexity, and we give sufficient conditions on a dualizable pattern and a 4-genus invariant for the construction of knots $K_{n,c}$. In section 4, we digress to give our reformulation of Goeritz and Trotter's method for computing the signature. We use it to prove [Theorem 4.1](#) and then we use that to deduce a proof of [Theorem 1.1](#) for n odd, using the classical signature. Finally, in section 5, we verify the general sufficient conditions given in section 3 for a specific dualizable pattern and the Levine-Tristram signature function. The proof of [Theorem 1.1](#) then follows immediately from [Theorem 3.4](#) for both parities of n , independently from the work in section 4.

1.2. Acknowledgements. This project is deeply indebted to Danny Ruberman, who suggested the question and provided a great deal of support along the way, and Lisa Piccirillo for many helpful conversations. The author also thanks Joshua Wang for helping to fix an issue with the proof of [Theorem 4.1](#), and Allison Miller for her comments on an early draft.

2. THE CALCULUS OF DUALIZABLE PATTERNS

2.1. Definitions and Examples.

2.1.1. The Definition of a Dualizable Pattern. Let $V := D^2 \times S^1$ with preferred, oriented longitude $\lambda_V := \{pt\} \times S^1$ and oriented meridian $\mu_V := \partial D^2 \times \{pt\}$ marked in ∂V . A pattern is a smooth embedding $P : S^1 \hookrightarrow \text{Int } V$ of an oriented circle into the interior of V . We define the winding number, $w(P) := lk(\mu_V, P)$, where we identify P with its oriented image. We further define the wrapping number $wr(P) = |P \cap (D^2 \times \{pt\})|$, minimized over the oriented isotopy class of P . It is immediately clear that that for any pattern P we have that for some $c \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$wr(P) = |w(P)| + 2c$$

where we can interpret c as the number of pairs of algebraically cancelling intersection points between P and $\{pt\} \times D^2$. We define the complexity of the pattern, $c(P)$, to be the minimum such c over all patterns isotopic to P in V .

Given a pattern P we denote $V \setminus \nu(P)$ by V_P which comes with two boundary components: ∂V and $\partial \nu(P)$ both of which are tori. We call ∂V the 'outer torus' and $\partial \nu(P)$ the 'inner torus' associated to V_P . The outer torus comes with a preferred identification to $S^1 \times S^1$ given by the pair (μ_V, λ_V) . We can also construct a similar identification for the inner torus as follows: we glue V into the complement of the unknot in S^3 so that μ_V is glued to the meridian of the unknot, and λ_V is glued to the unique longitude which bounds a disk in the complement. This converts P into an embedding $P' : S^1 \hookrightarrow S^3$, thereby defining an oriented knot. We get a triple embedding,

$$\nu(P) \hookrightarrow V \hookrightarrow S^3$$

and there is a unique null-homologous longitude on $\partial \nu(P)$ which bounds an oriented surface in $S^3 \setminus \nu(P)$. We call this curve $\lambda_P \subset \partial \nu(P)$ and we orient it coherently with P so that $lk(\mu_V, \lambda_P) = lk(\mu_V, P)$. After choosing any identification of $D^2 \times S^1$ with $\nu(P)$, we define μ_P

to be the image of $\partial D^2 \times \{pt\}$ under this identification. It is a standard exercise in 3-manifold topology that this is well defined. We orient μ_P so that $lk(\mu_P, P) = +1$. Thus the pair (μ_P, λ_P) define an identification of the inner torus of V_P with the product of oriented circles, $S^1 \times S^1$.

Definition 2.1. [MP18, Def. 3.1] A pattern P is *dualizable* with dual pattern $P^* \subset V^*$ iff there exists an orientation preserving homeomorphism $*$: $V_P \rightarrow V_{P^*}^*$ such that,

- (i) $*$ maps the inner torus of V_P to the outer torus of $V_{P^*}^*$, and the outer torus to the inner torus.
- (ii) $(*(\mu_V), *(\lambda_V)) = (-\mu_{P^*}, \lambda_{P^*})$
- (iii) $(*(\mu_P), *(\lambda_P)) = (-\mu_{V^*}, \lambda_{V^*})$

Given a dualizable pattern P , we can obtain the dual pattern by Dehn filling with slope ∞ the outer boundary (only) of V_P . The existence of $*$ implies that this manifold is homeomorphic to $D^2 \times S^1$ so we call it V^* and we obtain P^* as the core of the new Dehn filling, oriented coherently with λ_{V^*} .

Whenever we draw explicit examples of patterns, their duals, and satellite constructions, we will adopt the orientation convention that knot complements in S^3 are oriented with the inward pointing normal first at the boundary, while solid tori are oriented with the outward pointing normal first at the boundary. Thus all our gluing maps are orientation preserving at the boundary. This fixes an orientation convention on the exterior of a pattern V_P . If we pick a random companion knot K and consider the decomposition of S^3 naturally associated to the satellite knot $P(K)$ we see S^3 split into three oriented, codimension-0 parts:

$$S^3 = \nu(P) \cup_{\partial\nu(P)} V_P \cup_{\partial V} E_K$$

Since orientations must agree at both boundary tori across all three pieces and we know that $\nu(P)$ is oriented outward-normal-first, while E_K is oriented inward-normal-first, we can deduce that V_P must be oriented inward-normal-first at $\partial\nu(P)$ and outward-normal-first at ∂V . This leads to the rather pleasant sounding convention that V_P is oriented outward-first at its outer boundary and inward-first at its inner boundary. In case this is confusing, we include a totally explicit picture of $Wh^-(3_1) \subset S^3$ with all longitudes, meridians, and orientation arrows drawn:

We now summarize some useful facts about dualizable patterns, all of which are stated and proven in [MP18]. Given a knot $K \subset D^2 \times S^1$, we can construct an associated knot, $\widehat{K} \subset S^2 \times S^1$, by doubling $D^2 \times S^1$ and letting \widehat{K} be the composition of the inclusions:

$$\widehat{K} : K \hookrightarrow D^2 \times S^1 \hookrightarrow S^2 \times S^1$$

Often K will be either a pattern, P , or one of the framing curves from ∂V_P , so that V is the copy of $D^2 \times S^1$ we are doubling to get $S^2 \times S^1$.

Proposition 2.2. [MP18, Prop 3.5] *A pattern P is dualizable iff \widehat{P} is oriented-isotopic to $\widehat{\lambda}_V = S^1 \times \{pt\}$ in $S^2 \times S^1$.*

Corollary 2.3. [MP18, Cor. 3.6] *A pattern P with $w(P) = 1$ is dualizable iff $\mu_P \in \langle\langle \mu_V \rangle\rangle$, the subgroup of $\pi_1(V_P)$ normally generated by μ_V .*

These statements are important because their proofs indicate both how to construct dualizable patterns and, given a dualizable pattern, how to compute its dual pattern. We will give a brief verbal description of these processes here and include an example. [Figure 2](#), [Figure 3](#), and [Figure 4](#) give the example in two different notations simultaneously. We highly encourage the reader to separate out the pages containing these figures so as to examine them side-by-side with the verbal description below.

The key to understanding both points is to study the copies of $S^2 \times S^1$ obtained by doubling the solid tori V and V^* containing dualizable patterns P and P^* . They decompose naturally into three pieces:

$$(2.4) \quad \text{double}(V) = \nu(P) \cup V_P \cup D^2 \times D^1$$

$$(2.5) \quad \text{double}(V^*) = \nu(P^*) \cup V_{P^*} \cup D^2 \times D^1$$

where we recall that the pair of curves (μ_P, λ_P) gives a natural identification $\nu(P) = D^2 \times S^1$, and similarly for $\nu(P^*)$. We can equivalently describe this as:

$$(2.6) \quad \text{double}(V) = (D^2 \times D^1)_{\text{Inner}} \cup V_P \cup (D^2 \times D^1)_{\text{Outer}}$$

$$(2.7) \quad \text{double}(V^*) = (D^2 \times D^1)_{\text{Inner}} \cup V_{P^*} \cup (D^2 \times D^1)_{\text{Outer}}$$

The homeomorphism $*$: $V_P \rightarrow V_{P^*}$, which swaps the inner and outer boundaries, carries meridians to meridians and longitudes to longitudes. We can extend it to a map, $\widehat{*}$: $\text{double}(V) \rightarrow \text{double}(V^*)$, swapping the two solid tori filling in the inner and outer boundaries. $\widehat{*}$ is clearly an orientation preserving self-homeomorphism of $S^2 \times S^1$, since both V and V^* come with preferred identifications to $D^2 \times D^1$, and thus their doubles have such identifications to $S^2 \times S^1$.

We are going to keep track of what happens to $\widehat{\lambda}_V$ and $\widehat{\lambda}_P$, considered as oriented curves in $S^2 \times S^1$, under the homeomorphism $\widehat{*}$. When we build $S^2 \times S^1$ by doubling V , we get one of two canonical handle-body diagrams for $S^2 \times S^1$. The first one, which we call the ‘2-ball diagram’, comes from viewing $S^2 \times S^1$ as surgery on a pair of disjointly embedded 3-balls. We draw the complement of the two B^3 ’s and we identify the two boundary S^2 ’s of the complement




FIGURE 1. Orientations and Surfaces in $Wh^-(3_1)$

by the map which reflects the complement across the sphere bisecting the line connecting the two boundary spheres perpendicularly. The S^1 factor in this picture is given by the line connecting the two balls in the diagram, and the S^2 factor is given by perpendicular bisector. For a more detailed description of this diagram consult [GS99, page 114-115]. The second diagram, which we will call the ‘dotted-circle diagram’, comes from viewing $S^2 \times S^1$ as the boundary of zero-surgery on the unknot. We draw a round, circular unknot in S^3 which we label with a $\langle 0 \rangle$ to indicate performing 0-surgery on it. Here, the S^1 factor is given by a small meridian to the surgered circle, while the S^2 factor is given by the disk which the surgered circle bounds. Consult [GS99, page 167-168] for more details.

It follows from work of Gluck [Glu62] that there are only two orientation preserving self-homeomorphisms of $S^2 \times S^1$ up to isotopy which are the identity and the Gluck twist. Since the Gluck twist fixes the isotopy class of any fixed copy of the S^1 -factor, it follows from the construction of $\widehat{\ast}$ that \widehat{P} must be oriented isotopic to $\{pt\} \times S^1$ in $S^2 \times S^1$ by an ambient isotopy. However this isotopy may change the framing of \widehat{P} since it may involve sliding \widehat{P} over the S^2 factor. The algebraic intersection number of \widehat{P} with the S^2 factor is $+1$ so each such slide will change the framing by ± 2 . After the ambient isotopy, apply Gluck twisting around \widehat{P} to correct the framing, and let \widehat{P}^* be the image of $\widehat{\lambda}_V$ under this isotopy and twisting. Lastly we recover V^* as $S^2 \times S^1 \setminus \widehat{\mu}_V$. This tells us how to dualize a pattern in practice. Given a dualizable pattern P , we can obtain P^* as follows:

- (1) Draw $\widehat{P}, \widehat{\mu}_V, \widehat{\lambda}_V$ in either of the standard diagrams of $S^2 \times S^1$ (2-ball or dotted-circle) and keep track of their framings.
- (2) Observe that removing a neighborhood of $\widehat{\mu}_V$ recovers $P \subset V$.
- (3) Draw an explicit, ambient isotopy of $S^2 \times S^1$ which moves \widehat{P} to an S^1 factor, fixes $\widehat{\mu}_V$, and keeps $\widehat{\lambda}_V$ disjoint from the final position of \widehat{P} in the diagram (what this means will become clear in the examples).
- (4) The ambient isotopy may change the framings of $\widehat{\lambda}_V$ and \widehat{P} , so apply the Gluck twist map to the diagram to correct them (again, what this means will become clear in the examples).
- (5) Let P^* be the image of $\widehat{\lambda}_V$ after the ambient isotopy and Gluck twisting, considered in the complement of μ_V .


The correctness of this process follows from the rough discussion proceeding it, with a little care. A completely detailed account is given in [MP18]. We will now give two examples of this computation which we will carry out in each of the two diagrams for $S^2 \times S^1$ respectively.

2.1.2. An Example of Dualizing a Pattern. The following sequence of diagrams describe how to construct the dual of a pattern using the method described in the previous subsection. The pattern in question, P , is the main ingredient we use, along with its dual, P^* , to construct the knots $K_{n,c}$ in Theorem 1.1. We do not actually include a diagram of any of these knots in this paper but we give complete instructions for how to draw them using the patterns P and P^* .

This sequence of diagrams shows the isotopy which takes \widehat{P} to $\widehat{\lambda}_V$ and then the Gluck twisting which we apply to correct the framings. We show the exact same isotopy and twisting in both ‘dotted-circle’ and ‘2-ball’ notation. The dotted-circle computation is given in the left-hand column and the 2-ball computation in the right hand column. We give both because different stages of the process are relatively easier in each of the two notations, and so it of great practical value to be familiar with both. Moreover there is currently no fully worked out example in dotted-circle notation in the literature, although there is a 2-ball example in [MP18].

Any isotopy of a curve in $S^2 \times S^1$ can be drawn in either of these diagrams as a sequence of planar isotopies, Reidemeister moves, and slides of the curve over the surgered regions of the diagram. We will not indicate the paths traced out by a curve during planar isotopies

or Reidemeister moves. We give the start and end diagrams instead. For slides, we use a purple arrow to indicate the band, which we assume to lie in the plane except where it crosses over/under other strands in the diagram. After every handle slide or diffeomorphism we will indicate the new framings of the slid curves by integers in parentheses. We use also use a purple arrow to indicate the rotation of an S^2 factor at the end when we are applying our Gluck twist diffeomorphism to correct the framings. The components corresponding to the surgery diagram of $S^2 \times S^1$ are drawn in red, \widehat{P} is drawn in blue, and $\widehat{\lambda}_V$ is drawn in green. Thus P^* may be obtained from the final dotted-circle diagram [Figure 4](#) (left) by erasing the blue curve and considering the green curve in the complement of the red curve.

FIGURE 2. Computing the dual of P , part I





FIGURE 3. Computing the dual of P , part II

FIGURE 4. Computing the dual of P , part III

2.1.3. A Universal Construction.

Proposition 2.8. *Any pattern, P , obtained from the following process is dualizable:*

- (1) *Pick an oriented knot K_0 in S^3 and draw a positively oriented meridian, m_0 , around K_0 .*
- (2) *Draw unoriented parallel copies of m_0 , labelled m_1, \dots, m_n , so that all $m_{0 \leq i \leq n}$ bound disjoint spanning disks.*
- (3) *Draw a band b_i connecting K_0 to m_i for each $1 \leq i \leq n$. The bands are allowed to link in any way with K_0 and m_0 , but they are not allowed to intersect each other.*
- (4) *Orient the new knot K' using the induced orientation from K_0 .*
- (5) *Let $P \subset V$ be the knot $K' \subset S^3 \setminus \nu(K_0)$.*

Moreover, given any dualizable pattern Q we can take K_0 to be the unknot and then choose bands so that the pattern, P , produced by this process is isotopic to Q . Although the unknot is sufficient to produce any dualizable pattern, it can be of great practical use to choose a non-trivial base knot K_0 .

Proof. Let P be obtained from the process of [Proposition 2.8](#). We start by showing that P is dualizable. It suffices to give an explicit isotopy from \widehat{P} to S^1 in $S^2 \times S^1$ by [Proposition 2.2](#). We consider this problem in ‘dotted-circle’ diagrams. We obtain a picture of $\widehat{P} \subset S^2 \times S^1$ by drawing $K' \cup m_0$ and doing 0-surgery on m_0 . Since the ends of the bands b_* are the parallel copies of m_0 , we can slide each end once over the 0-surgered component m_0 . Each band then retracts back onto the original knot \widehat{K}_0 so we see that \widehat{K}' is isotopic to \widehat{K}_0 in $S^2 \times S^1$. It follows from the classical light bulb theorem in $S^2 \times S^1$ that K' is isotopic to S^1 since $|\widehat{K}_0 \cap S^2| = 1$.

Let Q be any fixed dualizable pattern. We must find a collection of bands to attach to the unknot as in [Proposition 2.8](#) which recover Q . Consider \widehat{Q} in the ‘dotted circle’ diagram of $S^2 \times S^1$. We know there is an ambient isotopy $\mathcal{I} : S^2 \times S^1 \times [0, 1] \rightarrow S^2 \times S^1$ such that $\mathcal{I}_0 = \text{Id}_{S^2 \times S^1}$ and $\mathcal{I}_1(\widehat{Q}) = S^1$ by the characterization of dualizable patterns given in [Proposition 2.2](#). Using standard techniques from Kirby calculus applied in dimension 3 to \mathcal{I} , we see it can be represented in the ‘dotted circle’ diagram as an alternating sequence of slides over the 0-surgered region and isotopies in the complement of the 0-surgered region. The key observation is that we can modify the isotopy in $S^2 \times S^1$ so that all the handle-slides occur in sequence at the beginning, followed by an isotopy in the complement of the 0-surgered region.

We can assume the first move in the sequence associated to \mathcal{I} is a handle-slide without loss of generality. We proceed until we come to the first isotopy in the sequence, which we call I_1 . At the end of I_1 , there is a small arc on \widehat{P} where the next band for the next handle-slide, S_1 , is attached. We can pull this arc back along I_1 and keep track of the path it traces out in $S^2 \times S^1$.

It may be helpful to visualize this path as a ribbon. Since this path itself is contained in a neighborhood of an arc, we can modify I_1 so that the path intersects neither itself nor the knot \hat{P} . We create a new sequence, defining a new isotopy, by removing I_1 and proceeding directly to S_1 except we append to the band the path traced out by its attaching arc under I_1 thereby defining a different slide S'_1 . The result of S'_1 will be isotopic to the result of $S_1 \circ I_1$ by an isotopy called I'_1 . We now construct a new isotopy \mathcal{I}' by removing the subsequence I_1, S_1 from \mathcal{I} and replacing it with S'_1, I'_1 . By proceeding inductively in this manner, we can create a new isotopy which consists of a sequence of slides of \hat{P} over the 0-surgered region, followed by a single isotopy in the complement.

There is one more thing to check. We now have \mathcal{I}' , which consists of a sequence of handle-slides followed by an isotopy in the complement of the 0-surgered region. The trick is that, because the slides are done one after another and not simultaneously, it is possible that the band from the n th slide might intersect the bands from the slides $1, \dots, n - 1$. We can fix this by applying the band-finger-move described in Figure 5 to resolve the intersection of each band with all those of lower index. This makes the bands significantly more complicated but it ensures that they are disjoint. We can now play the isotopy backwards to see the S^1 factor of $S^2 \times S^1$ being simultaneously slid some number of times over the 0-surgered region to produce the pattern Q . This shows the existence of a sequence of bands b_1, \dots, b_n such that if we take K_0 to be the unknot (really we should think of it as the S^1 factor) and attach the bands as in Proposition 2.8 then we obtain Q . \square




FIGURE 5. Resolving intersections between bands with a finger move.

Since this construction happens in $S^2 \times S^1$, it is naturally compatible with the method we give for computing the dual pattern. Given K_0 and b_1, \dots, b_n , lift them to $S^2 \times S^1$, viewed as zero surgery on m_0 as before. Notice that λ_V appears as a small meridian of m_0 , but it does not link with the parallel copies m_1, \dots, m_n which make up the ends of the bands b_1, \dots, b_n . We slide each band over m_0 which causes the end of each band to link once, geometrically, with λ_V . We retract the bands back onto K_0 , which effectively attaches the same set of bands to λ_V . We slide K_0 over m_0 until it has become an unknot (possibly further tangling the bands now attached to λ_V). We slide every strand of λ_V which passes through K_0 over m_0 then apply the Gluck twist (spinning the sphere composed of the obvious spanning disk for m_0 with the core of the 0-surgery) to correct the framings. A very simple example of this is given in Figure 6.




FIGURE 6. Working out P^* from a base-knot-with-bands description of P . Going from bottom-middle to bottom-right is a simple isotopy of the three component link in the diagram. The framings of the blue and green components change because we are also applying the Gluck twisting map here, however, because each of the two components only intersects a spanning disk for the red circle at one point, we can spin blue clockwise and green counter-clockwise without causing them to twist together.

2.2. Properties of Dualizable Patterns. We will define all of the notation we need to manipulate dualizable patterns and knot invariants which are compatible with them in this section. These objects and their properties form a pleasing calculus which we wish to express in its entirety. We include a single-page cheat sheet at the end of the paper which can be printed out or clipped separately from the rest. We hope it may serve as a useful reference.

2.2.1. Definitions and Notation.

Definition 2.9. Let $K \subset S^3$ be a knot with exterior E_K and let $P \subset V$ be a dualizable pattern. Let E_K come with oriented meridian μ_K and oriented, null-homologous longitude λ_K on its boundary. Observe that $E_K \cup V$ is diffeomorphic to S^3 if we glue the pair (μ_K, λ_K) to (μ_V, λ_V) . Let the knot $P(K)$ be the image of P under this diffeomorphism. We call the knot $P(K)$ the *satellite knot* with *pattern* P and *companion* K .

If we have a sequence of patterns P_1, \dots, P_k , we can apply them iteratively to a companion knot K to obtain the knot, $P_1 \circ \dots \circ P_k(K)$. If we draw this knot in S^3 in the conventional way, we see that the leftmost pattern in the composition notation, P_1 , appears to be the innermost ‘shape’ in the diagram of the satellite knot. Conversely, the companion, K , appears to be the outermost ‘shape’.

Definition 2.10. Given a pattern P , let P_n denote the pattern obtained by taking the image of P under the self-diffeomorphism of V which twists a single D^2 factor n times in the direction specified by the orientation of μ_V .

Definition 2.11. Given a pattern P , let \overline{P} denote the pattern obtained by reversing the orientation of V , P , λ_V , and μ_V . We formally define the new orientation to be outward-normal-first just as P was. This is equivalent to reversing all the crossings and orientation arrows in a diagram for P .

Definition 2.12. Given a pattern P , let the same symbol, P , also denote the knot $P(U)$ in appropriate contexts. For example, if Q is another pattern then $Q(P)$ denotes the knot $Q \circ P(U)$.

Definition 2.13. Given a knot $K \subset S^3$, let $K_{\#}$, called ‘K pound’, denote the unique wrapping number one pattern such that $K(U) = K$.

We often combine this definition with the previous one, so that for a general pattern, P , $P_{\#}$ is the unique wrapping number one pattern such that $P_{\#}(U) = P = P(U)$. The action of a pound pattern is to take the connected sum of the companion knot with $P(U)$, which explains the notation.

Definition 2.14. Given a dualizable pattern P , let P^* denote the dual pattern with outward normal first orientation (as usual).

Definition 2.15. Given a pattern P , let P^n denotes the pattern P composed with itself n times.

Definition 2.16. Given a dualizable pattern P , let P^{-1} denote the pattern $\overline{P^*}$. The name comes from the fact that $P^{-1}(P)$ and $P(P^{-1})$ are always concordant to the unknot.

Since we often wish to combine one or more of these operations, we adopt the following conventions concerning their order in the absence of parentheses:

- (1) $P_n^* = (P^*)_n$ not $(P_n)^*$ (star goes inside twisting)
- (2) $\overline{P}_n = (\overline{P})_n$ not $\overline{(P_n)}$ (bar goes inside twisting)
- (3) $P_n^m = (P^m)_n$ not $(P_n)^m$ (composition goes inside twisting)
- (4) $P_{\#}^* = (P^*)_{\#}$ not $(P_{\#})^*$ (star goes inside pound)
- (5) $\overline{P}_{\#} = (\overline{P})_{\#}$ not $\overline{(P_{\#})}$ (bar goes inside pound)
- (6) $P_{\#}^m = (P^m)_{\#}$ not $(P_{\#})^m$ (composition goes inside pound)
- (7) These conventions are chosen so that if a pattern is written with a sequence of superscripts and a sequence of subscripts, then the operations should be applied in the order: superscripts from left to right followed by subscripts from left to right (bar counts as the leftmost superscript!).

Now that we have clearly established the notation we give several relations, all of which are proven, if not in this notation, in [MP18].

Proposition 2.17. *The following properties hold for all dualizable patterns P, Q , knots K, J , and $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}$:*

- (i) $K_{\#}(J) = K \# J = J \# K = J_{\#}(K)$, $P(K) = P(K_{\#}(U)) = (P \circ K_{\#})(U) = P \circ K_{\#}$
- (ii) $(P^*)^* = P$, $(P_n)_m = P_{(n+m)}$, $P = P_0$, $\overline{(\overline{P})} = P$
- (iii) $P_n^* = (P^*)_n = (P_{-n})^*$, $\overline{(P_n)} = (\overline{P})_{-n}$
- (iv) $P^{-1} = \overline{(P^*)} = \overline{P^*}$
- (v) $(P \circ P^{-1})(K) \sim K \sim (P^{-1} \circ P)(K)$
- (vi) $(P \circ Q)^* = Q^* \circ P^*$
- (vii) $(P \circ Q)_n = (P_n \circ Q_n)$
- (viii) *If the wrapping number of P is one, then:*

$$P^* = P, \quad P^{-1} = \overline{P}, \quad P_n = P, \quad P = P(U)_{\#}, \quad P(K) = P(U) \# K$$

This proposition shows that conventions (3) and (5) are actually unnecessary since the operations they govern commute. Nevertheless, we include these conventions for completeness.

2.2.2. Traces and Surgeries.

Definition 2.18. Let $K \subset S^3$ be an oriented knot, then let $X_n(K) := h_4^0 \cup h_4^2(K, n)$, the union of a 4-dimensional 0-handle and a 4-dimensional 2-handle attached along the knot K with n -framing. We denote the boundary of $X_n(K)$ in the usual way by $S_n^3(K)$.

Theorem 2.19. $X_0(P) \cong X_0(P^*)$ for any dualizable pattern P . It follows that $S_0^3(P) \cong S_0^3(P^*)$.

The proof consists of checking that both three manifolds can be obtained as fillings of V_P and V_{P^*} respectively, and that $*$ extends to these fillings. In fact this diffeomorphism extends to a diffeomorphism of the 4-dimensional traces. Understanding this is a good exercise for the reader, and the details are written in [MP18]. Once the reader understands the argument for $n = 0$, it should be reasonably clear how to adjust the result to arbitrary n . The stronger theorem is:

Theorem 2.20. $X_n(P) \cong X_n(P_n^*)$ for any dualizable pattern P and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Thus $S_n^3(P) \cong S_n^3(P_n^*)$.

The reader may be surprised that the left hand side is not $X_n(P_{-n}^*)$. The trick is that the sign of n changes twice during the natural process by which we construct the diffeomorphism. The first change comes from the fact that $*$: $V_P \rightarrow V_{P^*}$ reverses the orientations of the meridians but not the longitudes, which sends the framing $n \mapsto -n$. This shows $X_n(P) \cong X_n((P_{-n})^*)$. The second sign change comes from reversing the order of the twisting and the dualization.

Already, it should be clear that combining Proposition 2.8, Proposition 2.17, and Theorem 2.20 gives a formidable repertoire of tools with which we can construct pairs of knots (K, J) such that $X_n(K) \cong X_n(J)$ for some fixed $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. When (K, J) share this property, we will call J an n -retrace of K , and the act of constructing J from K will be called n -retracing K .

2.2.3. Compatible Invariants.

Definition 2.21. Let \mathcal{I} be a knot invariant taking values in an Abelian group \mathcal{A} (usually \mathbb{Z} in practice). We say \mathcal{I} is *compatible* with dualizable patterns iff

- (1) $\mathcal{I} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is a well-defined homomorphism from the smooth (or TOP) concordance group.
- (2) If $X_0(K) \cong X_0(J)$ then $\mathcal{I}(K) = \mathcal{I}(J)$.

for any two knots $K, J \subset S^3$.

The point is that these two properties combine to give a satellite formula for \mathcal{I} whenever the pattern used in the satellite construction is dualizable.

Theorem 2.22. Let \mathcal{I} be a knot invariant which is compatible with dualizable patterns then for any dualizable pattern P and companion knot K we have,

$$\mathcal{I}(P_n(K)) = \mathcal{I}(K) + \mathcal{I}(P_n)$$

in particular for $n = 0$ we have,

$$\mathcal{I}(P(K)) = \mathcal{I}(K) + \mathcal{I}(P)$$

where the pattern with no input should be interpreted as the pattern applied to the unknot.

Proof. Assume the hypotheses of the theorem. We begin by calculating:

$$\begin{aligned} X_0(P_n(K)) &\cong X_0(P_n \circ K_{\#}) \\ &\cong X_0((P_n \circ K_{\#})^*) \\ &\cong X_0(K_{\#}^* \circ (P_n)^*) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\cong X_0(K \# (P_n)^*) \\ &\cong X_0(K \# (P_n)^*) \end{aligned}$$

therefore $K \# (P_n)^*$ is a 0-retrace of $P_n(K)$, and it follows from the two properties included in the definition of compatibility that,

$$\mathcal{I}(P_n(K)) = \mathcal{I}(K \# (P_n)^*) = \mathcal{I}(K) + \mathcal{I}((P_n)^*) = \mathcal{I}(K) + \mathcal{I}(P_n)$$

The last equality comes from the fact that $X_0((P_n)^*) \cong X_0(P_n)$ so $\mathcal{I}((P_n)^*) = \mathcal{I}(P_n)$. Taking $n = 0$ recovers the second statement in the theorem. \square

So when is an invariant compatible with dualizable patterns? The best known example of such an invariant is the classical signature and, more generally, the Levine-Tristram signature at a root of unity, $\sigma_K(\omega)$. Both are compatible with dualizable patterns, which can be easily deduced from two of their many, equivalent definitions. That both are concordance homomorphisms comes from defining them as the signatures of certain branched covers of the knot K with coefficients computed in $\mathbb{Q}[\omega]$. One checks that connect-summing the knots corresponds to connect-summing the covers and then quotes Novikov additivity for signatures. That both are invariant under 0-retracing follows from defining the signature in terms of the ω -twisted cohomology of $S_0^3(K)$. The details can be found in the excellent survey article [Con21].

We end the section by encouraging the reader to make use of the one-page cheat sheet (page 32) which we have appended to this paper. It summarizes the whole calculus of dualizable patterns including the construction and dualization process. We recommend the reader to separate it from the rest of the paper and use it as a side-by-side reference to follow the calculations in the coming sections.

3. SHAKE GENUS AND COMPLEXITY BOUNDS

3.1. Definitions of the Shake-Genus and Complexity.

Definition 3.1. We define the n -shake-genus of a knot K , denoted $g_n^{sh}(K)$, to be the minimum genus over all orientable surfaces embedded in $X_n(K)$ representing the canonical generator of $H_2(K, \mathbb{Z})$ (we assume K is oriented). A knot is n -shake-slice iff its n -shake-genus is zero.

This definition is well known already in the literature and leads to other definitions in a similar spirit such as n -shake-concordance, see [CR16].

Definition 3.2. Let K be an n -shake-slice knot. We define the n -complexity of K , denoted by $c(K, n)$ or just $c(K)$ when n is understood from the context, to be the minimum non-negative integer, c , satisfying,

$$\left| S \cap \text{cocore}(h_4^2(K, n)) \right| = 1 + 2c$$

occurring among all smoothly embedded spheres, S , generating the second homology of $X_n(K)$. We can also distinguish between whether the sphere S is smoothly embedded or topologically-locally-flatly embedded, which allows us to define smooth and topological complexity respectively.

We note that this definition is a renormalization of the n -shaking-number [FMN⁺21]. Since the oriented intersection number $S \cdot D^2 = 1$ for all S we see that the extra intersections must occur in oppositely oriented pairs and c is normalized to count the number of pairs. This definition was inspired by the similar notion of complexity for h-cobordisms defined in [MS99].

3.2. 4-Genus Bounds Complexity.

Proposition 3.3. [FMN⁺21][Prop. 8.8] *Let K be an n -shake-slice knot then $g^4(K) \leq c(K)$. This holds both in the smooth and topological setting.*

Proof. The proof is identical in both the smooth and topological setting so pick one without loss of generality. Let K be as in the proposition and let S be an embedded sphere realizing the minimal complexity. Assume to the contrary that $c(K) < g(K)$. We will use S to construct a surface $\Sigma \subset B^4$ with boundary K and $g(\Sigma) = c(K)$ thereby creating a contradiction. By working in a chart which contains the 2-handle of $X_n(K)$ in its interior and applying general position to S and the cocore of the 2-handle, we can assume that after a small perturbation S intersects the 2-handle in $2c(K) + 1$ parallel copies of the core. The homological condition on S implies that exactly $c(K) + 1$ of these parallel copies must be oriented coherently with the core and the remaining $c(K)$ copies must be oriented oppositely to the core so that the oriented intersection number $S \cdot \text{cocore}(h_4^2(K, n)) = 1$. If we consider the boundary of the 4-ball to which the 2-handle is attached, we observe that the parallel copies of the core intersect the boundary of the 4-ball in parallel copies of the knot, twisted so that the linking number of each with the knot is $\pm n$ depending on the orientation of the copy (as unoriented parallels they all twist with the same handedness). Let this link be called $K_n^c \subset S^3$. Consider $S \cap B^4$. We know $S \cap h_4^2(K, n)$ is a disjoint union of $2c(K) + 1$ disks so it follows that $S \cap B^4$ is a $(2c(K) + 1)$ -times punctured sphere whose boundary is K_n^c . We can pair up all but one of the components of K_n^c into oppositely oriented pairs, with each pair bounding a disjoint annulus A_i for $1 \leq i \leq c(K)$ in the complement of the link. This is clear from Figure 7. Let $\Sigma := (S \cap B^4) \cup (\cup_i A_i)$. It is immediately clear that $\partial\Sigma = K$, that $\Sigma \subset B^4$, and that $g^4(\Sigma) = c(K)$.




FIGURE 7. Left: a schematic of the perturbed sphere, indicating its intersection with the 2-handle. Right: the link K_1^0 for $K = 4_1$. Notice that the green components of K_1^0 are coherently oriented while the orange are oppositely oriented. Clearly we could pair up the innermost green component with the orange component and draw the obvious oriented band which they cobound in the diagram. This is A_1 for this example.

□

3.3. A Sufficient Condition for High Complexity. We now give a general process for constructing n -shake-slice knots of arbitrary complexity using dualizable patterns and a compatible invariant.

Theorem 3.4. *Let \mathcal{I} be an integer-valued compatible invariant whose magnitude provides a lower bound on the 4-genus of a knot. Let Q be a dualizable pattern, let $n \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$, and let $c \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume:*

$$\mathcal{I}(Q_n) - \mathcal{I}(Q) \neq 0$$

It follows that the knot K defined by,

$$K := (\overline{Q_n^*})^c \circ Q^c$$

is smoothly n -shake-slice, and has smooth or topological complexity at least c depending on whether \mathcal{I} bounds the smooth or topological 4-genus.

Proof. Let K be given satisfying the hypotheses of the theorem. We will establish that K is n -shake-slice by showing that it is an n -retracing of a slice knot. We will bound the complexity of K by showing $|\mathcal{I}(K)| \geq c$ and then quoting [Proposition 3.3](#). Clearly the knot $(\overline{Q^c}) \# Q^c$ is smoothly slice since it is the connected sum of a knot with its mirror. Using the calculus of dualizable patterns we show that K is an n -retracing of it.

$$\begin{aligned} X_n(\overline{(Q^c)} \# Q^c) &\cong X_n(Q_{\#}^c \circ \overline{Q^c}) \\ &\cong X_n((Q_{\#}^c \circ \overline{Q^c})_n^*) \\ &\cong X_n((\overline{Q^c}^* \circ (Q_{\#}^c)^*)_n) \\ &\cong X_n((\overline{Q^*}^c \circ Q_{\#}^c)_n) \\ &\cong X_n(\overline{Q_n^*}^c \circ (Q_{\#}^c)_n) \\ &\cong X_n((\overline{Q_n^*})^c \circ Q^c) \\ &\cong X_n(K) \end{aligned}$$

Clearly $X_n(\overline{(Q^c)} \# Q^c)$ has a sphere generating its second homology group, which is given by capping off a slice disk for the knot with the core of the 2-handle. Taking the image of this sphere under the diffeomorphism to $X_n(K)$ shows that K is n -shake-slice. Next we compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}((\overline{Q_n^*})^c \circ Q^c) &= \mathcal{I}((\overline{Q_n^*})^c) + \mathcal{I}(Q^c) \\ &= c\mathcal{I}(\overline{Q_n^*}) + c\mathcal{I}(Q) \\ &= c\mathcal{I}((\overline{Q_{-n}})^*) + c\mathcal{I}(Q) \\ &= c\mathcal{I}(\overline{Q_{-n}}) + c\mathcal{I}(Q) \\ &= c\mathcal{I}(\overline{(Q_n)}) + c\mathcal{I}(Q) \\ &= -c\mathcal{I}(Q_n) + c\mathcal{I}(Q) \\ &= c(\mathcal{I}(Q) - \mathcal{I}(Q_n)) \\ \implies |\mathcal{I}(K)| &= c|\mathcal{I}(Q) - \mathcal{I}(Q_n)| \geq c \end{aligned}$$

and it follows from [Proposition 3.3](#) that $c \leq c(K)$. \square

Our main result will follow from taking \mathcal{I} to be the Levine-Tristram signature and the pattern Q to be P_1 where P is the pattern from the first example in section 2. The rest of the paper is concerned with verifying the condition that $\mathcal{I}(Q_n) - \mathcal{I}(Q) \neq 0$.

4. A THEOREM ABOUT CLASSICAL SIGNATURES

We digress for a moment in this section to prove the following theorem about the classical signature. We will apply it in the next section to verify the conditions of [Theorem 3.4](#) for our pattern $Q := P_1$ and n odd. The case of n even and non-zero will be handled by a different method.

Theorem 4.1. *Let K be a knot, and let U be an unknot embedded in the complement of K such that the oriented linking number $lk(K, U) = 1$. Let K_n be the result of applying n full twists to all the strands of K which pass through a spanning disk for U . For all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\sigma(K) = \sigma(K_2)$, so the set $\{\sigma(K_n) \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ contains at most two values.*

The proof will proceed by using the method of Goeritz and Trotter, as described in [GL78], to calculate the classical signature of K from a non-orientable spanning surface. We will show that there is a canonical way to convert a Seifert surface for K into a non-orientable spanning surface for K_2 . Moreover, the Goeritz form for K_2 can be computed from the Seifert form for K and then diagonalized in full generality. The correction term can be easily computed and we will show that the correction term and change of signature offset each other, which proves the result.

4.1. Goeritz Forms and the Correction Term. Let K be a knot and let F be a spanning surface, possibly non-orientable, for K . Let x_1, \dots, x_n be an oriented basis for $H_1(F, \mathbb{Z})$ and let x_i^τ denote the double cover of x_i obtained by locally parametrizing the normal bundle as $F \times [-1, 1]$ and lifting x_i to $x_i \times \{-1\} \cup x_i \times \{+1\}$ in each chart. If x_i is an orientation preserving loop in F then x_i^τ is the disjoint union of two parallel copies of x_i , one on either side of F , and both oriented coherently with x_i . If x_i is an orientation reversing loop then x_i^τ is a single circle which wraps twice around x_i just as the boundary of a Mobius band wraps around its central circle, and which is oriented coherently with x_i .

We define the Goeritz matrix associated to the pair (K, F) to be the form $\mathcal{G}_{ij} := lk(x_i, x_j^\tau)$. We observe that this form recovers the symmetrized Seifert form if F is orientable since,

$$lk(x_i, x_j^\tau) = lk(x_i, x_j^+) + lk(x_i, x_j^-) = lk(x_i, x_j^+) + lk(x_j, x_i^+)$$

For a proof that \mathcal{G} is symmetric when F is non-orientable see [GL78].

We define the correction term associated to (K, F) as follows. Let K_F denote a coherently oriented parallel copy of K which is chosen to be disjoint from F , and observe that there is a unique such choice up to isotopies supported in a neighborhood of K . The correction term associated to (K, F) is defined by $\eta := \frac{1}{2}lk(K, K')$ which is always an integer. The central theorem of [GL78] is:

Theorem 4.2. *Let K be a knot in S^3 and let F be a possibly non-orientable spanning surface for K with Goeritz form \mathcal{G} and correction term η . It follows that the classical knot signature of K can be computed from F by the formula:*

$$\sigma(K) = \text{sign}(\mathcal{G}) - \eta$$

We give the following example to demonstrate the practical utility of this theorem. The $(2, 2n + 1)$ -torus knot has an obvious spanning surface homeomorphic to the Mobius band. The Goeritz form associated to this surface is the one-by-one form $[2n + 1]$ and the correction term is also $2n + 1$, therefore,

$$\sigma(T_{2,2n+1}) = \text{sign}([2n + 1]) - (2n + 1) = 1 - 2n - 1 = \boxed{-2n}$$

The amazing brevity of this calculation will not be lost on those who have tried to compute the signature of torus knots using orientable spanning surfaces.

The most practical way to approach this calculation for a specific knot K is to perform an isotopy of the pair (K, F) in S^3 to make F look like a small disk in the plane with several bands attached. Of course the bands will twist and link with each other for a generic knot, but we can arrange them so that they lie in the same plane as the disk, except when one of them passes over another, or when one twists around its core arc. We label the bands $B_1, \dots, B_{2n}, N_1, \dots, N_m$ so that the B_* are the orientable bands and the N_* are the non-orientable bands. Each band yields a generator of $H_1(F, \mathbb{Z})$, obtained by orienting the core arc of the band and connecting the ends of the arc with a small, boundary-parallel arc in the disk. The orientation of the core arc can be chosen arbitrarily for the orientable bands, but for the non-orientable bands it is convenient

to choose the orientation to be coherent with the orientation of the edges of the band (which both point in the same direction because the band is non-orientable!). These generators are called $b_1, \dots, b_{2n}, n_1, \dots, n_m$ respectively and form a basis. We can compute the Goeritz form in this basis easily by defining the writhe, linking number, and twisting number of the bands then expressing the entries of the Goeritz form in terms of these numbers.

Definition 4.3. Let $F \subset S^3$ be a connected, possibly non-orientable surface with a single boundary component, K . Assume that F is embedded as a flat disk with bands, $B_1, \dots, B_{2n}, N_1, \dots, N_m$, attached to it and assume that all bands come with oriented core arcs as in the previous paragraph. We give the following definitions for any bands X_i, X_j of F :

- (1) The *writhe* of X_i , denoted $W(X_i)$, is twice the signed count of self-crossings of the band X_i where the sign is determined by the sign of the induced self-crossing of the core arc of X_i .
- (2) The *twisting number* of X_i , denoted $T(X_i)$ is the signed count of half twists in the band relative to the plane. The sign is determined by the handedness of the twisting as one travels along the core arc (note: this is independent of the orientation of the core arc!).
- (3) The *linking number* of X_i with X_j , denoted $Lk(X_i, X_j)$, is the signed count of crossings between the bands X_i and X_j with the signs determined by the orientations of their cores.

The linking number of X_i with itself is defined by $Lk(X_i, X_i) := W(X_i) + T(X_i)$. Note that this is twice what the reader might expect if we compare it to the standard definition of the linking number between knots.

These definitions yield the following:

Proposition 4.4. *In the setting of the previous definition, the Goeritz form and correction term associated to the pair (K, F) can be computed by the following formulas:*

$$\mathcal{G} = [Lk(X_i, X_j)]_{i,j=1}^{2n+m} \quad \eta = \sum_{i,j=1}^n Lk(N_i, N_j)$$

In particular, one can compute η directly from \mathcal{G} by summing all the entries in \mathcal{G} which correspond to a pair of non-orientable bands.

Proof. We will rely on the combinatorial definition of linking number in S^3 which says that if L, L' are disjoint, oriented links then we can compute the linking number $lk(L, L')$ as half the sum of the signed count of crossings between the components of L and the components of L' . We use links here because, in the case of a generator b_i , corresponding to an orientable band, we see b_i^τ is a disjoint union of two coherently oriented, parallel circles. We begin by verifying the formula for the Goeritz form in the basis given by the oriented cores of the bands union small arcs in the disk. By definition, $\mathcal{G}_{ij} = lk(x_i, x_j^\tau)$ so we must find a way to systematically locate and count the crossings between these two links. There are two different types of crossing. The first occurs when the band X_i passes over/under the band X_j , [Figure 8 \(A\)](#), in which case both strands of x_j^τ pass over/under x_i : this contributes ± 2 to the signed count of crossings between them and is exactly double the amount which it contributes to the computation of $Lk(X_i, X_j)$. In places where the band X_i crosses itself this same analysis holds, and each full twist in the band contributes ± 4 to the count of crossings between x_i and x_i^τ . It follows that the contributions to the computation of $lk(x_i, x_j^\tau)$ given by the bands is exactly double the contribution given to $Lk(X_i, X_j)$. What remains is to understand the contribution given by the points in the central disk of F where the curves x_i and x_j intersect each other on the surface F . By examining the local picture of x_i and x_j^τ near such an intersection, [Figure 8 \(B\)](#), we see that the two crossings always come with opposite signs and so the contribution is zero. Thus we can always assume both links have no crossings on the disk during the computation of $lk(x_i, x_j^\tau)$. It follows that $lk(x_i, x_j^\tau) = Lk(X_i, X_j) = \mathcal{G}_{ij}$.




FIGURE 8. (A) bands crossing each other, (B) arcs and their push-offs meeting in the disk, (C) a band with a half twist. The cores of the bands are orange, the push-offs of the cores in green. In (A), (C) red dots mark green-orange crossings, and purple dots mark orange-orange and blue-blue crossings respectively.

Next we analyze the correction term. Since K' is disjoint from F , it follows that K' is isotopic to the Seifert framed parallel K'' as K' runs around the base disk and the orientable bands. This means the signed count of the crossings between K and K' will agree with the count between K and K'' near the disk and orientable bands. This can be easily seen to be zero since we can clearly surger out the non-orientable bands from (K, F) which makes F into an orientable spanning surface and K' into a disjoint parallel which must therefore have linking number zero with the new knot. It follows that $lk(K, K')$ can be computed entirely from counting crossings between K' and the boundaries of the non-orientable bands. Where two non-orientable bands cross, the count changes by ± 4 and therefore the linking number changes by ± 2 and the correction term changes by ± 1 . This change is exactly the contribution the crossing makes to the linking number between the two bands. Wherever the band has a half twist, each of the strands of K' on either side of the band must cross over the band which adds four crossings of the same sign, so that the count changes again by ± 4 and thus the correction term changes by ± 1 , [Figure 8](#) (C). Again, this is exactly the contribution which the half twist makes to the writhe of the band and therefore to the band's linking number with itself. It follows that the correction term is exactly the sum of the entries of \mathcal{G} which correspond to pairs of non-orientable bands. \square

4.2. Adding Pairs of Twists. We will need the following lemma:

Lemma 4.5. *Let $K \subset Y^3$ be a null-homologous knot in an oriented 3-manifold. Let $D \subset Y^3$ be an embedded disk with oriented boundary U such that $U \cdot K = +1$ and therefore,*

$$|K \cap D| = 1 + 2c$$

for some $c \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. It follows that there exists an orientable spanning surface $F \subset Y^3$ for K such that $F \cap D$ consists of c arcs on D connecting oppositely oriented intersection points between K and D and one arc connecting the remaining positive intersection point to a point on $U = \partial D$. Thus the intersection of F with a neighborhood of D looks like the upper left of [Figure 10](#).




FIGURE 9. Resolving a ribbon intersection of a Seifert Surface.

Proof. We can pair up the strands of K which intersect D into oppositely oriented pairs, with one strand left over. We connect each pair of strands by an arc in D which connects their intersection points, ensuring that all the arcs are disjoint. We then connect the final intersection point to the boundary U by an arc disjoint from the rest. Each of the $c + 1$ arcs we have just defined can be projected slightly out of the disk, one copy on each side. We can then surger the knot by resolving each pair of strands which pass through the disk using the pair of arcs which we have constructed. This transforms the knot into a $(c + 1)$ -component oriented link and leaves one pair of projected arcs unused: the pair which come from the arc connected to the boundary U . Consider the corresponding ends of this pair which came from the point on the arc which touches U . We can connect these two ends with a small arc that goes around half a meridian to U and is therefore disjoint from D . We can then replace the portion of K which passes through D with this new arc we have defined. The reader may recognize this as the result of doing a finger move. This gives us an oriented link $L \subset Y^3 \setminus \nu(D)$. Clearly L is also null-homologous in $Y^3 \setminus \nu(D)$ and it follows that L has a connected, oriented spanning surface $F_0 \subset Y^3 \setminus \nu(D)$. We can recover K from L and simultaneously convert F_0 into an immersed spanning surface for K by attaching to F the obvious ribbons which undo the resolutions and the finger move we used to produce L . Let the new, immersed, spanning surface for K which we obtain by this process be called F_1 . Since F_1 was obtained from an embedded surface by attaching ribbons, it follows that the only self-intersections of F_1 with itself are ribbon intersections. These can be resolved according to the local model shown in Figure 9. Let F be the result of resolving the self-intersections of F_1 in this manner. It now follows that F satisfies the conditions of the lemma \square

We can now give the proof of Theorem 4.1:

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Consider a local neighborhood of the spanning disk for U and its intersection with K . We see U as a standard unknot and $2n + 1$ strands of K passing through it, $n + 1$ passing positively and n passing negatively. We can pair up each positive strand with a negative strand and we will have one positive left over. We can assume without loss of generality that there is a Seifert surface F for K such that each oppositely oriented pair of strands passing through U is the boundary of an orientable band of F by the lemma. We can further assume that the intersection between the disk and F is an arc connecting the left-over strand to U and several disjoint intervals corresponding to the bands. Now consider K_2 . We can see from Figure 10 that K_2 is equal to K outside a neighborhood of the spanning disk for U , and moreover there is a natural way to modify F to obtain a non-orientable spanning surface for K_2 which we




FIGURE 10. Adding two left-handed twists to K and modifying its spanning surface.

will call F_2 . Notice that the orientable bands of F_2 correspond to the bands of F in an obvious way, while exactly one non-orientable band has been added.

We will compare the Goeritz form \mathcal{G} of F to the form \mathcal{G}_2 of F_2 . Let's order the bands of F by putting the ones which don't pass through the spanning disk for U first then those that do. If B, B' are a bands with self-linking numbers b, b' which pass through the disk l, l' times, counted with sign, then the self-linking of the corresponding bands of F_2 will be $b + 4l^2, b + 4l'^2$ respectively. If $Lk(B, B') = p$ then the linking number of the corresponding bands in F_2 will be $p + 4ll'$. From the diagram, we can see that the self-linking of the new, non-orientable band, N , is $+1$ and of course its linking numbers with B, B' are $2l, 2l'$. Thus the intersection of the three rows and columns corresponding to B, B', N form the submatrix given on the left below. We can diagonalize this submatrix using the pairs of row and column operations indicated by the arrows below.

$$\begin{pmatrix} b + 4l^2 & p + 4ll' & 2l \\ p + 4l'l & b' + 4l'^2 & 2l' \\ 2l & 2l' & 1 \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{((2) - 2l' \cdot (3)) \mapsto (2)} \begin{pmatrix} b + 4l^2 & p & 2l \\ p & b' & 0 \\ 2l & 0 & +1 \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{((1) - 2l \cdot (3)) \mapsto (1)} \begin{pmatrix} b & p & 0 \\ p & b' & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Since B, B' could have been any two bands from F we see that this sequence of operations applied to each disjoint pair of corresponding bands in F_2 gives a matrix congruence from \mathcal{G}_2 to $\mathcal{G} \oplus [+1]$. It follows that $\text{sign}(\mathcal{G}_2) = \text{sign}(\mathcal{G}) + 1$. Since there is only one non-orientable band on F_2 , we see that the correction term is its self-intersection which gives $\eta = +1$. Thus,

$$\sigma(K_2) = \text{sign}(\mathcal{G}_2) - \eta = \text{sign}(\mathcal{G}) + 1 - 1 = \text{sign}(\mathcal{G}) + 0 = \sigma(K)$$

The result now follows from the obvious inductive argument on n . □

5. THE EXAMPLES; PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM

5.1. **The Diagrams.** Consider the pattern P defined in Figure 11.




FIGURE 11. The patterns P and P^* .

We computed P^* earlier. We will analyze the Levine-Tristram signatures of P_n for $n > 1$, although P will not be the base pattern for the construction of the knots. Rather we will use $Q := P_1$ as the base pattern, so that:

$$Q_n = P_{1+n}, \quad Q_n^* = (P_1)_n^* = P_{-1+n}^*$$

We will show that this pattern Q combined with the classical knot signature satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 3.4 for $n > 0$ and odd.

Proposition 5.1. *Let P be the pattern described in Figure 11 and let $Q := P_1$. Letting $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,*

$$\sigma(Q_{2k}) = 0, \quad \sigma(Q_{1+2k}) = 2$$

It follows that for $n = 2k + 1$,

$$\sigma(Q_n) - \sigma(Q) \neq 0$$

and so the pair (Q, σ) satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 3.4 for all odd integers n .




FIGURE 12. The Seifert forms for Q and Q_1 . The numbers correspond to the row/column of the Seifert form which corresponds to that basis element.

Proof. We apply Theorem 4.1 to obtain:

$$\sigma(Q_{2k}) = \sigma(Q) \quad \sigma(Q_{1+2k}) = \sigma(Q_1)$$

and so it will suffice to compute $\sigma(Q)$ and $\sigma(Q_1)$. We will do this explicitly by drawing Seifert surfaces for Q and Q_1 then writing down a Seifert form and computing the signature. We see from [Figure 12](#) that Q and Q_1 have Seifert forms A and A_1 respectively given by,

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

after symmetrizing and computing signatures we see,

$$\sigma(Q) = \sigma(A + A^T) = \sigma \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 3 & -1 \\ 2 & 3 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = 0$$

$$\sigma(Q_1) = \sigma(A_1 + A_1^T) = \sigma \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 3 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 2 & 3 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = 2$$

which concludes the proof. \square

This gives smoothly n -shake-slice knots with arbitrarily high topological complexity for any odd n . We need the greater generality of the Levine-Tristram signatures to tackle even n . The main thrust of our analysis will be the following. We will construct a family of Seifert surfaces F_n for P_n which yield Seifert forms A_n . We will be able to give a general formula for the matrix A_n and deduce a general formula for the symmetrized Alexander polynomial $\Delta_n(t)$ of the knot P_n . The Levine-Tristram signature is known to change exactly at those complex numbers on the unit circle where the symmetrized Alexander polynomial passes through zero. We will show explicitly that $\Delta_1(t) > 0$ for all $t \in S^1 \subset \mathbb{C}$ and therefore $\sigma(Q, \omega) \equiv 0$ (recall $Q := P_1$). Since $\sigma(-, \omega)$ is a compatible invariant for fixed root of unity ω , it will suffice to show that there exists a root of unity ω_n depending on n such that $\sigma(Q_n, \omega_n) \neq 0$. We know that the symmetrized Alexander polynomial of any knot has evaluates to $+1$ at $t = +1$, and we will show that for any $n > 1$ there is a value on the unit circle at which $\Delta_n(t)$ is negative. This shows that $\Delta_{n+1}(t)$ must pass through zero somewhere on the unit circle and so there is some ω_n such that $\sigma(Q_n, \omega_n) \neq 0$ for any fixed $n > 0$. This means that the pair $(Q, \sigma(-, \omega_n))$ satisfies the hypotheses of [Theorem 3.4](#).

5.2. Adding Twists around Algebraically One Strand.

We will now explain how to create a family of Seifert surfaces for Q_n starting from a given Seifert surface for $Q_{-1} = P$. We use the following extension of [Lemma 4.5](#).

Lemma 5.2. *Let $K \cup U \subset S^3$ be as in [Lemma 4.5](#), and let K_n be as in [Theorem 4.1](#). Let F be the Seifert surface for K obtained from [Lemma 4.5](#). We may convert the surface F into a new Seifert surface F_n for K_n by making a finite number of local modifications to F as indicated in [Figure 13](#).*

The proof of the lemma is obvious from the figure up to one small point. Since we are encoding the two sides of the Seifert surface by color (Indigo/Orange), the modification indicated in [Figure 13](#) only applies when all the bands passing through U have the same side facing out of the page as the portion of the surface which intersects U . This can always be achieved by putting a




FIGURE 13. The top two figures show how to locally modify the Seifert surface F without changing the knot K into a surface F' which is compatible with adding ± 1 twist. Switching all the band-over-band crossings on the (\pm) side of the red box adds ± 1 full twist to K . Concatenating n such modifications creates a Seifert surface for $K_{\pm n}$. This is demonstrated in the lower two figures for a knot with one band passing through D .

Reidemeister II move in each band which has the wrong side facing outwards (one of the new crossings goes on each side of the disk D then we shrink the neighborhood of D so that neither crossing appears). Applying the lemma to an appropriate Seifert surface for P yields surfaces for P_n and Q_n for all values of n . These surfaces are given in Figure 14 and we call them F_n . We orient the cores of all the handles of F_n as shown then connect the ends of the cores by arcs in the central disk of F_n . We obtain a basis for $H_1(F_n, \mathbb{Z})$ which we label b_1, \dots, b_{2n+2} .

which we describe in terms of the nine sub-matrices indicated in the figure:

- The central block of A_n is a $(2n-3) \times (2n-3)$ matrix consisting of ones down the diagonal connecting the $(2, 1)$ -position to the $(2n-3, 2n-4)$ -position and zeroes elsewhere (the positions are given relative to the central block not A_n).
- The top and right edge blocks consist of zeroes everywhere.
- The bottom and left edge blocks have a 1 in their upper-rightmost entry and zeroes elsewhere.
- The corner blocks are independent of n .

Note that the dimensions of the edge blocks are scaled appropriately to the center. The correctness of this description of A_n may take a moment to check directly from the figure, but it is clear that A_n will have this form for any $n \geq 1$. We give the cases $n = 1$ and $n = 6$ here for additional clarity:

$$A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_6 = \left(\begin{array}{cccc|cccccccc|c} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{array} \right)$$

We will use A_n to compute the symmetrized Alexander polynomial and Levine-Tristram signature function associated to the knots P_n . We briefly review the relationship between these two knot invariants before proceeding with the calculation.

Proposition 5.3. *Let K be a knot and A be a Seifert form for K . The symmetrized Alexander polynomial of K can be computed by the formula:*

$$\Delta_K(t) = t^{-\dim(A)/2} \det(tA - A^T) = \det(\sqrt{t}A - \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}A^T)$$

and $\Delta_K(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ for any $t \in \mathbb{C}$ satisfying $|t| = 1$. The Levine-Tristram signature of K at a unit-norm complex number t can be computed by the formula:

$$\sigma(K, t) = \sigma((1-t)A + (1 - \frac{1}{t})A^T)$$

Moreover, we have the following equality:

$$(t^{-1/2} - t^{1/2})^{\dim(A)} \Delta_K(t) = \det((1-t)A + (1 - \frac{1}{t})A^T)$$

from which it follows that the function $\sigma(K, -) : (S^1 \subset \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ is piecewise constant, changes at least wherever $\Delta_K(-) : (S^1 \subset \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ changes signs, and can only change at values where $\Delta_K(t) = 0$.

Proof. The content of this proposition is all well known already, nevertheless we will review the main ideas for completeness' sake. We know $\det(tA - A^T)$ computes $\Delta_K(t)$ up to normalization

by some power of t . We show our normalization factor is correct by showing the expression we give is invariant under the replacement $t \mapsto t^{-1}$:

$$\det(\sqrt{t}A - \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}A^T) = \det(-(\sqrt{t}A - \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}A^T)^T) = \det(\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}A - \sqrt{t}A^T)$$

since the dimension of A is even and determinants are unaffected by transposition. The relationship between $\Delta_K(t)$ and $\sigma(K, t)$ is explained in [GL15] although it was known much earlier. The key observation is that,

$$(\frac{1}{t} - 1)^{\dim(A)} \det(tA - A^T) = \det((\frac{1}{t} - 1)(tA - A^T)) = \det((1 - t)A + (1 - \frac{1}{t})A^T)$$

from which we can easily confirm our constant is correct and non-zero for $t \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{1\}$ and $|t| = 1$. We can interpret the right-hand side of the equation above as the product of the eigenvalues of the form $(1 - t)A + (1 - t^{-1})A^T$. The signature of this form can only change at values of t for which this product is zero. Moreover the signature is forced to change wherever an odd number of its eigenvalues change sign which must happen wherever the product changes sign. We can also deduce that both the normalization constant $(t^{-1/2} - t^{1/2})^{\dim(A)}$ and $\Delta_K(t)$ are real-valued for $t \in S^1 \subset \mathbb{C}$. These follow from the observation that $1/t = \bar{t}$ for any such t and that $\dim(A)$ is even. We compute:

$$\Delta_K(t) = a_0 + \sum_{k=1}^N a_k(t^k + \frac{1}{t^k}) = a_0 + \sum_{k=1}^N a_k(t^k + \bar{t}^k) = a_0 + \sum_{k=1}^N a_k(2\Re(t^k)) \in \mathbb{R}$$

for some sequence $\{a_0, \dots, a_N\} \subset \mathbb{Z}$ and,

$$(t^{-1/2} - t^{1/2})^{\dim(A)} = (\bar{t}^{1/2} - t^{1/2})^{\dim(A)} = (2\Re(t) - 2)^{\dim(A)/2} \in \mathbb{R}$$

□

Proposition 5.4. *Let $n \geq 0$ and let $\Delta_n(t)$ denote the symmetrized Alexander polynomial of P_n . It is given by the formula:*

$$\Delta_n(t) = \frac{1}{t^{n+1}} - \frac{2}{t^n} + \frac{1}{t^{n-1}} - \frac{1}{t} + 3 - t + t^{n-1} - 2t^n + t^{n+1}$$

Clearly $\Delta_n(1) = 1$, but for $t^n = 1$ and $2\Re(t) < 1$ we obtain $\Delta_n(t) < 0$. It follows that for $n > 0$ there exists some root of unity $t \in S^1 \subset \mathbb{C}$ which depends on n such that $\sigma(P_{n+1}, t) \neq 0$.

Proof. We will prove the formula for $\Delta_n(t)$ by giving a general process for reducing $tA_n - A^T$ into the block sum of a 4-by-4 matrix depending on n and the matrix $-\mathbb{1}_{2n-2}$. This process consists of a sequence of elementary row and column operations followed by cyclically permuting an odd number of rows and so the determinant remains unchanged. We will easily be able to compute the determinant of the 4-by-4 for general n and this will give us the formula for $\Delta_n(K)$. We will verify the remaining claims by direct computation.

Let $n \geq 1$ be fixed and let:

$$B_n := tA_n - A_n^T = \left(\begin{array}{cccc|cccccccc|cccc} t-1 & t & t-1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & t-2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -t \\ t-1 & 2t-1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -t & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & t & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & t & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & t & 0 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & t & 0 & -1 & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & t & 0 & \ddots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & t & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & t & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & t & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & t & 0 \end{array} \right)$$

We note that B_n is a $(2n+2) \times (2n+2)$ -matrix. Observe that the highest non-zero entry in columns (5) to $(2n+1)$ is a -1 . Starting with column $(2n+1)$ and working backwards to column (5) one column at a time, we can perform elementary row operations which use the -1 in each column to clear all the other non-zero entries below it. Notice that doing this in column (i) will create more non-zero entries in the column $(i-2)$; this is why we start with column $(2n+1)$ and work backwards. After completing this process we get the matrix B'_n given by:

$$B'_n := \left(\begin{array}{cccc|cccccccc|cccc} t-1 & t & t-1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & t-2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & -t & 0 \\ t-1 & 2t-1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -t & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & t & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -t^2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & t^2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -t^3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & t^3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & \ddots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -t^{n-1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & t^{n-1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & -t^n & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right)$$

Next, we consider the rows (5) to $(2n+1)$. The rightmost non-zero entry in each of these rows is a -1 , so we can perform an elementary column operation which uses the -1 to clear the power of t appearing in either the third or fourth entry of the row. We perform these column operations in order starting with the one for row $(2n+1)$ and ending with the one for row (5). After that, we perform a row operation which uses the -1 in the $(2n+1, 2n+2)$ -position to

clear the $-t$ in the $(2, 2n+2)$ -position. Thus we obtain the matrix B_n'' given by:

$$B_n'' := \left(\begin{array}{cccc|cccccccc|cc} t-1 & t & t-1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & t-2 & -t^n & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ t-1 & 2t-1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & \ddots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & -t^n & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right)$$

We finish by cyclically permuting rows $(4) - (2n+2)$, which is achieved by an even number of row transpositions, therefore leaving the determinant unchanged. This gives us the matrix B_n''' which clearly decomposes as a block sum in the way described earlier:

$$B_n''' := \left(\begin{array}{cccc|cccccccc|cc} t-1 & t & t-1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & t-2 & -t^n & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ t-1 & 2t-1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -t^n & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & \ddots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{array} \right)$$

We are now able to verify the formula for $\Delta_n(t)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \det(B_n) &= \det(B_n''') = \det \left(\left(\begin{array}{cccc} t-1 & t & t-1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & t-2 & -t^n \\ t-1 & 2t-1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & -t^n & 0 \end{array} \right) \oplus -\mathbb{1}_{2n-2} \right) \\ &= \det \left(\begin{array}{cccc} t-1 & t & t-1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & t-2 & -t^n \\ t-1 & 2t-1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & -t^n & 0 \end{array} \right) \\ &= t^{2n} + 3t^{n+1} - t^{n+2} - 2t^{2n+1} + t^{2n+2} - t^n + t^2 - 2t + 1 \\ \implies \Delta_n(t) &= \frac{1}{t^{n+1}} \det(B_n) = \frac{1}{t^{n+1}} - \frac{2}{t^n} + \frac{1}{t^{n-1}} - \frac{1}{t} + 3 - t + t^{n-1} - 2t^n + t^{n+1} \end{aligned}$$

which confirms the formula claimed in the proposition. We leave it to the reader to check that $\Delta_n(1) = 1$. It remains to show that for any $t \in S^1 \subset \mathbb{C}$ satisfying $t^n = 1$ and $2\Re(t) < 1$, we have $\Delta_n(t) < 0$. Assuming the hypotheses on t we compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_n(t) &= \frac{1}{t^{n+1}} - \frac{2}{t^n} + \frac{1}{t^{n-1}} - \frac{1}{t} + 3 - t + t^{n-1} - 2t^n + t^{n+1} \\ &= \frac{1}{t^n} \left(\frac{1}{t} - 2 + t \right) - \frac{1}{t} + 3 - t + t^n \left(\frac{1}{t} - 2 + t \right) \\ &= (2\Re(t) - 2) + (3 - 2\Re(t)) + (2\Re(t) - 2) \\ &= 2\Re(t) - 1 \\ 2\Re(t) < 1 &\implies 2\Re(t) - 1 < 0 \\ &\implies \Delta_n(t) < 0 \end{aligned}$$

Lastly we must check that for each $n > 0$ there is a root of unity $t \in S^1 \subset \mathbb{C}$ such that $\sigma(P_{n+1}, t) \neq 0$. Pick any $n > 0$ it follows that there is an $(n+1)$ -root of unity with real part less than $1/2$ and thus $\Delta_{n+1}(t)$ attains both positive and negative values on $S^1 \subset \mathbb{C}$. The intermediate value theorem guarantees there is some t_* at which Δ_{n+1} changes sign. [Proposition 5.3](#) guarantees that $\sigma(P_{n+1}, t)$ must have different values on either side of t_* and so $\sigma(P_{n+1}, t) \neq 0$ on at least one side of t_* . Since roots of unity are dense in S^1 , we can pick one arbitrarily close to t_* on the side at which $\sigma(P_{n+1}, t)$ is non-zero. \square

We are now in a position to complete the proof that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a root of unity ω_n such that $\sigma(Q_n, \omega_n) - \sigma(Q, \omega_n) \neq 0$. Recall that $Q := P_1$ so $Q_n = P_{1+n}$. We verify that $\sigma(Q, -) \equiv 0$. The proof of [Proposition 5.3](#) gives us:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(Q, t) = \Delta_1(t) &= t^2 + \frac{1}{t^2} - 3t - \frac{3}{t} + 5 \\ &= \left(t + \frac{1}{t} \right)^2 - 3 \left(t + \frac{1}{t} \right) + 3 \\ &= (2\Re(t))^2 - 3(2\Re(t)) + 3 \\ &= 4\Re(t)^2 - 6\Re(t) + 3 \\ &\implies \Delta(Q, t) > 0, \quad (\forall t \in S^1) \\ &\implies \sigma(Q, \omega) = 0, \quad (\forall \omega \in S^1) \end{aligned}$$

where the final implication follows from [Proposition 5.3](#). Finally, [Proposition 5.4](#) gives a root of unity ω_n such that $\sigma(Q_n, \omega_n) \neq 0$. We have now verified the hypotheses of [Theorem 3.4](#) for the pair (Q, σ) which proves that there exist smoothly n -shake-slice knots with arbitrary topological complexity for all $n \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$.

Let $K \subset S^3$. We adopt the convention that $E_K := S^3 \setminus \nu(K)$ is oriented INF at its boundary, while $D^2 \times S^1 (\cong \nu(K))$ is oriented ONF at its boundary.

Definitions of patterns and dual patterns:

$$\begin{aligned}
 P &\subset V (\cong D^2 \times S^1), & V_P &:= V \setminus \nu(P) \\
 V_P &\text{ is ort'd INF at } \partial\nu(P), & \text{ONF at } \partial V \\
 P^* &\subset V^* (\cong D^2 \times S^1), & V_{P^*} &:= V^* \setminus \nu(P^*) \\
 * &: V_P \rightarrow V_{P^*} \text{ (preserving orientation)} \\
 (\mu_P, \lambda_P, \mu_V, \lambda_V) &\xrightarrow{*} (-\mu_{V^*}, \lambda_{V^*}, -\mu_{P^*}, \lambda_{P^*})
 \end{aligned}$$

Ways to modify patterns:

- P^* — the dual pattern
- P_n — add n meridional twists
- \bar{P} — reverse all crossings and the orientation of P
- P^m — self-compose m times
- P^{-1} — ($:= \bar{P}^*$), the concordance inverse
- $P_{\#}$ — connect-sum pattern, $wr(P_{\#}) = 1$

Composition conventions:

- $P_n^* = (P^*)_n$ not $(P_n)^*$
- $\bar{P}_n = (\bar{P})_n$ not $\overline{(P_n)}$
- $P_n^m = (P^m)_n$ not $(P_n)^m$
- $P_{\#}^* = (P^*)_{\#}$ not $(P_{\#})^*$
- $\bar{P}_{\#} = (\bar{P})_{\#}$ not $\overline{(P_{\#})}$
- $P_{\#}^m = (P^m)_{\#}$ not $(P_{\#})^m$

These conventions are chosen so that if a pattern is written with a sequence of superscripts and a sequence of subscripts,

then the operations should be applied in the order: superscripts from left to right followed by subscripts from left to right (bar counts as the leftmost superscript!).

Basic Identities (P, Q dualizable patterns, J, K knots in S^3 , and $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$):

$$\begin{aligned}
 (P^*)^* &= P, & \overline{(\bar{P})} &= P, & P_0 &= P \\
 (P_n)^* &= P_{-n}^*, & \overline{(P_n)} &= \bar{P}_{-n}, & \overline{(P^*)} &= \bar{P}^* \\
 (P \circ P^{-1})(K) &\sim K \sim (P^{-1} \circ P)(K) \\
 (P \circ Q)^* &= Q^* \circ P^* \\
 (P \circ Q)_n &= (P_n \circ Q_n) \\
 (P_n)_m &= P_{(n+m)}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$K_{\#}(J) = K \# J = J \# K = J_{\#}(K)$$

$$P(K) = P(K_{\#}(U)) = (P \circ K_{\#})(U) = P \circ K_{\#}$$

For patterns satisfying $wr(P) = 1$:

$$P^* = P, \quad P^{-1} = \bar{P}, \quad P_n = P$$

$$P = P(U)_{\#}, \quad P(K) = P(U) \# K$$

Retracing Theorems (P dualizable):

$$X_0(P) \cong X_0(P^*), \quad X_n(P) \cong X_n(P_n^*)$$

$$X_n(P \# \bar{P}^*) \cong X_n(\bar{P}_n \circ P)$$

$$\implies (\bar{P}_n \circ P) \text{ is } n\text{-shake-slice!}$$

Let $\mathcal{I} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be a homomorphism from the smooth or TOP concordance group to an Abelian group \mathcal{A} (usually \mathbb{Z}). If \mathcal{I} is 0-trace invariant, meaning,

$$X_0(K) \cong X_0(J) \implies \mathcal{I}(K) = \mathcal{I}(J)$$

then, for any dualizable $P \subset V$, $K \subset S^3$, and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\mathcal{I}(P_n(K)) = \mathcal{I}(K) + \mathcal{I}(P_n)$$

We call such invariants *compatible* with dualizable patterns.




FIGURE 15. Constructing and dualizing a pattern via an isotopy in $S^2 \times S^1$. A number in parentheses indicates the new framing of a curve after a slide move or diffeomorphism.

REFERENCES

- [Akb77] Selman Akbulut. On 2-dimensional homology classes of 4-manifolds. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 82(1):99–106, July 1977. Publisher: Cambridge University Press.
- [Akb93] S. Akbulut. Knots and exotic smooth structures on 4 -manifolds. *Journal of Knot Theory and its Ramifications*, 2(1):1–10, 1993.
- [Con21] Anthony Conway. The Levine-Tristram signature: a survey. *2019-20 MATRIX Annals*, 4:31–56, 2021. arXiv: 1903.04477.
- [CR16] Tim D. Cochran and Arunima Ray. Shake slice and shake concordant knots. *Journal of Topology*, 9(3):861–888, September 2016. arXiv: 1502.06035.
- [FMN⁺21] Peter Feller, Allison N. Miller, Matthias Nagel, Patrick Orson, Mark Powell, and Arunima Ray. Embedding spheres in knot traces. *Compositio Mathematica*, 157(10):2242–2279, October 2021. Publisher: London Mathematical Society.
- [GL78] C. McA Gordon and R. A. Litherland. On the Signature of a Link. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 47:53–70, 1978.
- [GL15] Patrick Gilmer and Charles Livingston. Signature Jumps and Alexander Polynomials for Links. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 144, August 2015.
- [Glu62] Herman Gluck. The embedding of two-spheres in the four-sphere. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 104(2):308–333, 1962.
- [GS99] Robert E. Gompf and András Stipsicz. *4-manifolds and Kirby calculus*. Number v. 20 in Graduate studies in Mathematics. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1999.
- [Lit79] R. A. Litherland. Signatures of iterated torus knots. In Roger Fenn, editor, *Topology of Low-Dimensional Manifolds*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, pages 71–84, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1979. Springer.
- [MP18] Allison N. Miller and Lisa Piccirillo. Knot traces and concordance. *Journal of Topology*, 11(1):201–220, March 2018. arXiv: 1702.03974.
- [MS99] John W. Morgan and Zoltán Szabó. Complexity of 4-dimensional h-cobordisms. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 136(2):273–286, April 1999.
- [Tri69] A. G. Tristram. Some cobordism invariants for links. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 66(2):251–264, September 1969. Publisher: Cambridge University Press.

BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY
Email address: crt64@brandeis.edu