

# Horizontal decompositions, I

Paolo Lisca

Andrea Parma

## Abstract

We show that every smooth, closed, orientable 4-manifold  $X$  admits a special kind of handlebody decomposition that we call *horizontal*. We classify the closed 4-manifolds with the simplest horizontal decompositions and we describe all such decompositions of  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$ , showing that they give rise to infinitely many of the known embeddings of rational homology balls in the complex projective plane.

## 1 Introduction

Let  $p > q \geq 1$  be coprime integers and  $B_{p,q}$  the rational homology ball smoothing of the quotient singularity  $\frac{1}{p^2}(pq-1, 1)$  used by Fintushel and Stern in the rational blow-down construction [6]. We were led to the results to this paper by the realization that the smooth embeddings  $B_{p,q} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$  constructed in [16] were obtained using certain special handlebody decompositions of  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$  and that every smooth, closed, orientable 4-manifold admits such decompositions. The purpose of this paper is to define horizontal decompositions, prove the general existence result just mentioned, study the simplest cases and illustrate their potential applications by showing how to recover infinitely many of the known embeddings of the  $B_{p,q}$ 's into  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$  in a “systematic” way.

Let  $X : \partial_- X \rightarrow \partial_+ X$  be a smooth, oriented, 4-dimensional cobordism, i.e. a smooth, oriented 4-manifold with oriented boundary  $\partial X = \partial_+ X \cup -\partial_- X$ . We always assume that  $\partial_- X$  and  $\partial_+ X$  are non-empty and connected. By e.g. [8, Proposition 4.2.13],  $X$  admits a handlebody decomposition relative to  $\partial_- X$  without 0- nor 4-handles. Suppose such a decomposition has  $u$  1-handles and  $h$  3-handles. The 1-handles give a cobordism  $\partial_- X \rightarrow \partial_-^u X := \partial_- X \#^u S^1 \times S^2$ , and the 3-handles a cobordism  $\partial_+^h X := \partial_+ X \#^h S^1 \times S^2 \rightarrow \partial_+ X$ . The cobordism  $\partial_-^u X \rightarrow \partial_+^h X$  given by the 2-handles determines and is determined by a framed link  $L \subset \partial_-^u X$ . We denote it by  $X_L$ .

**Definition 1.1.** Let  $Y$  be a closed, oriented 3-manifold and  $L = \cup_{i=1}^k L_i \subset Y$  a  $k$ -component framed link. We say that  $L$  is a *horizontal link of type  $g$*  if  $g > 0$  and there is a decomposition  $Y = H_g \cup \Sigma_g \times [0, 1] \cup H_g$ , where  $H_g$  is three-dimensional genus- $g$  handlebody, and real numbers  $0 < t_1 < \dots < t_k < 1$  such that, for each  $i = 1, \dots, k$ :

- $L_i$  is a non-separating simple closed curve on  $\mathfrak{S}_i := \Sigma_g \times \{t_i\}$ ;
- $|\text{fr}(L_i) - \text{fr}_{\mathfrak{S}_i}(L_i)| = 1$ , where  $\text{fr}(L_i)$  is the given framing of  $L_i$  and  $\text{fr}_{\mathfrak{S}_i}(L_i)$  the framing induced on  $L_i$  by  $\mathfrak{S}_i$ .

We call the difference  $\text{fr}(L_i) - \text{fr}_{\mathfrak{S}_i}(L_i)$  the *relative framing* of  $L_i$ .

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 57K40 (Primary), 57R40 (Secondary).

Keywords: rational homology balls, smooth embeddings, handlebody decompositions.

**Definition 1.2.** When  $L \subset \partial_-^u X$  is a horizontal link of type  $g$  and  $X_L : \partial_-^u X \rightarrow \partial_+^h X$ , we call a handlebody decomposition of an oriented cobordism  $X : \partial_- X \rightarrow \partial_+ X$  as above a *horizontal decomposition* of  $X$  of type  $(g, h)$ , or simply a  $(g, h)$ -*decomposition* of  $X$ . We say that a smooth, closed 4-manifold  $\hat{X}$  has a horizontal decomposition of type  $(g, h)$  if  $X := \hat{X} \setminus \{B^4 \cup B^4\}$  has one as a cobordism  $S^3 \rightarrow S^3$ .

Since the Heegaard genus is additive [9], the Heegaard genus of  $\partial_-^u X$  is at least  $u$ , so that  $g \geq u$ . Moreover, it is not difficult to check that if a link  $L \subset \partial_-^u X$  is horizontal of type  $g$ , then  $\partial_+^h X$  has a genus- $g$  Heegaard splitting obtained from the Heegaard splitting of  $\partial_-^u X$  with respect to which  $L$  is horizontal, by cutting along  $\Sigma_g$  and regluing via a diffeomorphism – see Lemma 3.1. In particular, the Heegaard genus of  $\partial_+^h X$  is at most  $g$ . By additivity, the same number cannot be less than the Heegaard genus of  $\#^h S^1 \times S^2$ , which is  $h$ . This shows that *for every horizontal decomposition of type  $(g, h)$  the number  $u$  of 1-handles is at most  $g$  and the inequality  $g \geq h$  holds.*

**Example 1.3.** The following simple example illustrates the above definitions. View the 0-framed unknot in Figure 1 as a surgery description of  $S^1 \times S^2$ . The torus  $T$  visible in Figure 1 is a Heegaard surface, the framed link  $L$  given by the three framed knots is framed isotopic to several type-1 horizontal links  $L$ , and in each case  $X_L : S^1 \times S^2 \rightarrow S^3$ . By [12], there is a




Figure 1: A type-1 framed link giving  $(1, 0)$ -decompositions of  $S^2 \times S^2$

canonical way to obtain a closed 4-manifold  $\hat{X}_L$  gluing  $S^1 \times D^3$  to  $X_L$  along  $S^1 \times S^2$  and a 4-ball along  $S^3$ . An easy application of Kirby calculus shows that  $\hat{X}_L = S^2 \times S^2$ .

The following establishes a basic existence result for horizontal decompositions.

**Theorem 1.4.** *Every smooth, oriented 4-dimensional cobordism  $X : \partial_- X \rightarrow \partial_+ X$  with  $\partial_- X, \partial_+ X$  non-empty and connected admits a horizontal decomposition.*

We prove Theorem 1.4 by showing that any handlebody decomposition of  $X$  can be made horizontal by adding  $(1, 2)$ -cancelling pairs and sliding 2-handles – see Section 2. Our proof bears some resemblance with John Harer’s argument showing that any 4-dimensional 2-handlebody admits an achiral Lefschetz fibration with bounded fibers over  $S^2$  ([10], see also [4, Theorem 7]). Theorem 1.4 may also be compared to the main result in [4], where Etnyre and Fuller combine Harer’s result with Giroux’s correspondence [7] to prove that the complement of a smoothly embedded circle in a closed 4-manifold admits an achiral fibration over  $S^2$ . Nevertheless, the two results appear to us genuinely different, and in any case we do not rely on Giroux’s correspondence.

**Remark 1.5.** Note that, in view of Definition 1.2 and Theorem 1.4, it makes sense to define the *genus* of a smooth, oriented cobordism or closed 4-manifold  $X$  as the smallest  $g \geq 1$  such that  $X$  admits a  $(g, h)$ -decomposition. It is easy to check that a cobordism (or closed 4-manifold)  $X$  with genus  $g(X) = 1$  and first Betti number  $b_1(X) = 0$  must have finite cyclic fundamental

group. This implies that there are many smooth, closed 4-manifolds  $X$  with  $b_1(X) = 0$ ,  $g(X) > 1$  and  $\chi(X) = 2$  or  $3$ , which are the smallest possible values of the Euler characteristic under these assumptions. In fact, for example the rational homology 4-spheres constructed in [17], [19] and the fake projective planes classified in [2] all have infinite fundamental groups.

In order to get the first classification results for cobordisms with horizontal decompositions we introduce some simplifying assumptions. A natural choice is to look at cobordisms  $X : S^3 \rightarrow S^3$ . In this case type  $(g, h)$  means that the number  $u$  of 1-handles is at most  $g$  and the number of 3-handles is  $h$ . The following result deals with the simplest cases of  $(1, 0)$ -decompositions. In a forthcoming paper [14] we deal with the simplest  $(1, 1)$ -decompositions.

**Theorem 1.6.** *Let  $X : S^3 \rightarrow S^3$  be an oriented cobordism with a  $(1, 0)$ -decomposition. Then, after possibly reversing the orientation of  $X$ , we have*

$$X \cong \begin{cases} S^3 \times [0, 1] & \text{if } \chi(X) = 0, \\ \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2 \setminus \{B^4 \cup B^4\} & \text{if } \chi(X) = 1. \end{cases}$$

A key fact used in the proof of Theorem 1.6 is that to a horizontal framed link  $L \subset \Sigma_g \times [0, 1]$  one can naturally associate an element of the mapping class group  $\text{Map}(\Sigma_g)$  factorized as a product of Dehn twists. In fact, suppose  $L = \bigcup_{i=1}^k L_i$ , with

$$L_i \subset \mathfrak{S}_i := \Sigma_g \times \{t_i\}, \quad 0 < t_1 < \dots < t_k < 1.$$

Since each  $\mathfrak{S}_i$  is naturally identified with  $\Sigma_g$ , one can associate to each component  $L_i$  the Dehn twist

$$\tau_i := \tau_{\pi(L_i)} \in \text{Map}(\Sigma_g),$$

where  $\pi : \Sigma_g \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \Sigma_g$  is the projection onto the first factor. We define the *factorization* of  $L$  to be the  $k$ -tuple

$$F_L = (\tau_k^{\delta_k}, \tau_{k-1}^{\delta_{k-1}}, \dots, \tau_1^{\delta_1}),$$

where the exponent  $\delta_i := \text{fr}_{\mathfrak{S}_i}(L_i) - \text{fr}(L_i) \in \{\pm 1\}$  is equal to *minus* the relative framing of  $L_i$  for each  $i$ . The product  $m_L = \tau_k^{\delta_k} \dots \tau_1^{\delta_1} \in \text{Map}(\Sigma_g)$  will be called the *monodromy* of  $L$ . Sometimes, when the horizontal link  $L$  is clear from the context, we will abuse of language and talk about the factorization or the monodromy of the decomposition of the associated cobordisms  $X_L$  or  $X$ .

**Example 1.7.** The concept of factorization can be exemplified via the link  $\mathfrak{L}$  of Example 1.3. As we already observed,  $\mathfrak{L}$  is framed isotopic to several type-1 horizontal links  $L = \bigcup_{i=1}^3 L_i \subset S^1 \times S^2$ . For example, we can arrange that the 1-framed unknot becomes the component  $L_1 \subset \Sigma_g \times \{t_1\}$  at the "lowest level". In that case the horizontal link  $L$  has factorization  $(\tau_\mu, \tau_\mu, \tau_\mu^{-1})$ , where  $\mu \subset T$  is the meridian of the 0-framed unknot. If we replace  $\mathfrak{L}$  with any sublink  $\mathfrak{L}' \subset \mathfrak{L}$  consisting of two components of  $\mathfrak{L}$ , depending on the choice of  $\mathfrak{L}'$  and the isotopies the corresponding horizontal link  $L'$  has factorization  $(\tau_\mu^{-1}, \tau_\mu)$ ,  $(\tau_\mu, \tau_\mu^{-1})$  or  $(\tau_\mu, \tau_\mu)$ .

In the proof of Theorem 1.6 we determine the factorizations of all  $(1, 0)$ -decompositions of  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$  minus two disjoint balls, viewed as an oriented cobordism  $S^3 \rightarrow S^3$ . We do that by relating such factorizations with the solutions of certain degree-two Diophantine equations. We exploit a certain structure of the solutions of those equations to show that any horizontal decomposition of  $X$  can be simplified in a "systematic" way. For this approach to the proof of Theorem 1.6 we took inspiration from Denis Auroux's paper [1].

As we mentioned above, we discovered horizontal decompositions while trying to construct smooth embeddings of the rational balls  $B_{p,q}$  into  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$ . Hence, it should not be surprising that the proof of Theorem 1.6 yields such embeddings, leading to Theorem 1.8 below. In order to give some motivation we provide the following brief survey of results about embeddings of rational homology balls in  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$ .

It is well-known that  $\partial B_{p,q}$  is the lens space  $L(p^2, pq - 1)$ . Moreover,  $B_{p,p-q}$  is orientation-preserving diffeomorphic to  $B_{p,q}$  by [5, Remark 2.8]. Using results by Khodorovskiy [11] it is not hard to show [5, Section 2.1] that if the positive integers  $p_1, p_2$  and  $p_3$  form a *Markov triple*, that is  $p_1^2 + p_2^2 + p_3^2 = 3p_1p_2p_3$ , then there is a symplectic embedding of the disjoint union  $\cup_{i=1}^3 B_{p_i, q_i}$  into  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$ , where  $q_i = \pm 3p_j/p_k \pmod{p_i}$  with  $\{i, j, k\} = \{1, 2, 3\}$ . Conversely, Evans and Smith [5, Theorem 1.2] showed that if  $B_{p_i, q_i} \subset \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , is a collection of pairwise disjoint symplectic embeddings, then  $N \leq 3$  and the  $p_i$ 's and the  $q_i$ 's satisfy some constraints which coincide with the ones above when  $N = 3$ . In particular, if  $B_{p,q} \subset \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$  is a symplectic embedding then  $p$  must belong to a Markov triple and divide  $q^2 + 9$ . Let  $\{F_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$  be the classical Fibonacci sequence defined by  $F_{-1} = 1, F_0 = 0$  and  $F_{m+1} = F_m + F_{m-1}$ . Owens [18, Theorem 1] recently proved the existence of smooth embeddings  $B_{F_{2m+1}, F_{2m-1}} \subset \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$  for each  $m \geq 1$ . He also observed that  $F_{2m+1}$  divides  $F_{2m-1}^2 + 9$  only if  $m = 1$ , so it follows from [5] that  $B_{F_{2m+1}, F_{2m-1}}$  does not embed *symplectically* in  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$  for  $m > 1$ . Moreover, Owens used Donaldson's Theorem A [3] to show that it is not possible to embed in  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$  a disjoint union of two or more of the rational homology balls  $B_{F_{2m+1}, F_{2m-1}}$  with  $m > 1$ . In [16] we extend Owens' family of smooth embeddings to a two-parameter family  $\{B(k, m)\} \subset \{B_{p,q}\}$  such that  $B(k, m)$  cannot be symplectically embedded in  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$ . Moreover, in [15] we prove the non-existence of almost complex embeddings  $B(k, m) \subset \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$  without relying on [5].

The proof of Theorem 1.6 shows that when  $\chi(X) = 1$  most of the horizontal decompositions of  $X$  contain one 1-handle and two 2-handles. This implies that many  $(1, 0)$ -decompositions of  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$  yield a smooth embedding of a disjoint union of  $B_{p,q}$ 's into  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$ . In fact, the associated factorization is of the form  $(\tau_2^{\delta_2}, \tau_1^{\delta_1})$  and each 2-handle  $h_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , is attached along  $\gamma_i \times \{t_i\} \subset \Sigma_1 \times \{t_i\} \subset S^1 \times S^2$ , with  $0 < t_1 < t_2 < 1$ . We may clearly assume that the attaching loci of the handles are disjoint. Since  $\partial(S^1 \times D^3) \approx \partial(H_1 \times [0, 1])$ , a moment's reflection shows that the disjoint union  $(B^4 \cup X_{\gamma_1}) \cup (B^4 \cup X_{\gamma_2})$  admits a smooth orientation-preserving embedding in  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$ . On the other hand, by Proposition 3.2 below each  $\hat{X}_{\gamma_i} := B^4 \cup X_{\gamma_i}$  is diffeomorphic to a  $B_{p,q}$  rational ball when  $b_1(\partial X_{\gamma_i}) = 0$ . In Section 4.4 we use this fact to prove the following Theorem 1.8. Note that  $F_{2m+1} > 0$  for each  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$  and see Theorem 5.1 for a more precise version of the statement.

**Theorem 1.8.** *The  $(1, 0)$ -decompositions of  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$  give rise to smooth, orientation-preserving embeddings into  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$  of the disjoint unions*

$$B_{m+1} \cup B_m \quad \text{and} \quad B'_{m+1} \cup B'_m$$

for each  $m \geq 0$  where  $B_m = B_{F_{2m-1}, F_{2m-5}}$  and  $B'_m = (-1)^m B_{F_{m+1}, F_m}$ .

**Remark 1.9.** The rational balls  $B_m$  form a subfamily of the  $B_{p,q}$ 's that embed symplectically in  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$ . More precisely, for any  $m \geq 0$  the triple  $(1, F_{2m-1}, F_{2m+1})$  is a Markov triple producing a symplectic embedding of  $B^4 \cup B_m \cup B_{m+1}$ . On the other hand, the balls  $B'_{2k} = B_{F_{2k+1}, F_{2k}} \cong B_{F_{2k+1}, F_{2k+1}-F_{2k}} = B_{F_{2k+1}, F_{2k-1}}$  are exactly the rational balls shown by Owens to embed smoothly but not symplectically.

In [14] we use horizontal decompositions to prove the existence of many more smooth embeddings of the rational balls  $B_{p,q}$  into  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$ .

A few questions are naturally raised by our results. First of all, it is natural to wonder about the relationship between the various horizontal decompositions of a given cobordism. More precisely, one can ask whether there exists a uniqueness result for horizontal decompositions, perhaps up to the Hurwitz moves of Section 4.3 combined with some kind of “horizontal stabilizations”. Secondly, we could ask what are the possible generalizations of Theorem 1.6. For instance, we are planning to establish the analogue of Theorem 1.6 for the simplest cobordisms  $S^3 \rightarrow S^3$  with a  $(1, 1)$ -decomposition [14]. Finally, we expect that the techniques of the present paper can be applied to find new smooth embeddings of rational balls and/or 3-manifolds in  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$  and/or other smooth 4-manifolds with small Euler characteristic.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we prove Theorem 1.4, in Sections 3 and 4 we prove Theorem 1.6 and in Section 5 we prove Theorem 5.1, which implies Theorem 1.8.

**Acknowledgments.** The authors acknowledge financial support by Ministero dell’Università e della Ricerca (grant 2017JZ2SW5).

## 2 Proof of Theorem 1.4

We start from any handle decomposition of a smooth 4-dimensional cobordism  $X : \partial_- X \rightarrow \partial_+ X$  and we modify it so that the framed link  $L$  consisting of the attaching curves of the 2–handles satisfies the conditions of Definition 1.2.

It is well known that a handle decomposition can be modified by handle slides and by adding or removing cancelling pairs. In the following we will give a more detailed description of these moves and exhibit a sequence of moves that transform the starting handle decomposition into a horizontal one.

Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a handle decomposition of  $X$  without 0- nor 4-handles,  $u$  1-handles and  $s$  3-handles. Attaching the 1-handles gives a cobordism  $\partial_- X \rightarrow \partial_-^u X$ . A  $(1, 2)$ -cancelling pair consists of a 1-handle and a 2-handle. This operation changes  $\mathcal{H}$  into a new handlebody decomposition, so that attaching the 1-handles gives a cobordism from  $\partial_- X$  to the 3-manifold obtained from  $\partial_-^u X$  by removing the interior of two disjoint 3-balls  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  and gluing to each other the two boundary 2-spheres  $\partial B_1$  and  $\partial B_2$  via an orientation-reversing diffeomorphism. The result is diffeomorphic to  $\partial_-^{u+1} X$ . The cancelling 2–handle is attached along any arbitrarily framed curve in  $\partial_-^u X \setminus (B_1 \cup B_2)$  that connects two identified points of  $\partial B_1$  and  $\partial B_2$ . Such a curve determines a component of the new framed link in  $\partial_-^{u+1} X$ .

Let  $\Sigma \subset \partial_-^u X$  be a genus- $g$  Heegaard surface. Since we can always add a  $(1, 2)$  cancelling pair, from now on we assume  $g > 0$  without loss of generality. The complement  $\partial_-^u X \setminus \Sigma$  of the Heegaard surface is a disjoint union  $H_g \cup H'_g$  of two genus- $g$  handlebodies. Moreover, the handlebodies  $H_g$  and  $H'_g$  are regular neighborhoods of graphs  $G \subset H_g$  and  $G' \subset H'_g$ , and  $\partial_-^u X \setminus \{G \cup G'\}$  is diffeomorphic to the product of  $\Sigma$  with an open interval. Up to framed isotopy we may assume  $L$  disjoint from  $G \cup G'$ , thus contained in a closed regular neighbourhood  $N$  of  $\Sigma$ . After fixing a diffeomorphism between  $N$  and  $\Sigma \times [0, 1]$  and consequently a projection  $\pi : N \rightarrow \Sigma$ , we may also assume that the restriction  $\pi|_L : L \rightarrow \Sigma$  is an immersion, and that each self-intersection of  $\pi(L) \subset \Sigma$  is a transverse double point. Hence, we can represent  $L$  using its diagram  $D_L \subset \Sigma$  consisting of  $\pi(L)$  together with the over-under information at each point of self-intersection. Recall that, for any framed, simple closed curve  $\gamma \subset N$  contained in a horizontal copy of  $\Sigma$ , i.e. a surface of the form  $\Sigma \times \{t\} \subset \Sigma \times [0, 1]$ , the relative framing of  $\gamma$  is the integer  $\text{fr}(\gamma) - \text{fr}_{\Sigma \times \{t\}}(\gamma)$ . Observe that a framed link  $L = \cup_{i=1}^k L_i \subset N$  is horizontal if and only if each connected component  $L_i \subset L \subset N$  sits on a horizontal copy of  $\Sigma$  and:

- (1) the relative framing of  $L_i$  is  $\pm 1$ ;

- (2) the diagram  $D_{L_i}$  of  $L_i$  has no crossings and is therefore a simple closed curve in  $\Sigma$ ;
- (3)  $D_{L_i}$  is non-separating in  $\Sigma$ ;

moreover, for each  $i < j$ :

- (4) at each crossing between  $D_{L_i}$  and  $D_{L_j}$  the overpassing arc belongs to  $D_{L_j}$ .

We say that a crossing of  $D_L$  is *bad* if it involves a diagram  $D_{L_i}$  which violates either (2) or (4). We are going to change the handle decomposition  $\mathcal{H}$  into a horizontal decomposition of  $X$  via a finite sequence of steps. At each step we shall either eliminate a bad crossing or adjust the framing of some  $L_i$ , making sure that at the last step Conditions (1) through (4) above are satisfied.

In the process of changing  $\mathcal{H}$  we will add (1,2) cancelling pairs using the following *stabilization* procedure for each pair:

- choose two disks  $\Delta_1$  and  $\Delta_2$  in  $\Sigma$ , disjoint from each other and from the projections of  $L_1, \dots, L_n$ , as well as an orientation-reversing diffeomorphism  $\varphi$  between their boundaries;
- let  $B_i \subset \partial_-^u X$ , for  $i = 1, 2$ , be disjoint 3-balls such that  $B_i \cap N$  corresponds to  $\Delta_i \times [0, 1]$  under the identification of  $N$  with  $\Sigma \times [0, 1]$ ;
- attach a 1-handle  $D^3 \times [0, 1]$  to  $\partial_-^u X$  along  $B_1$  and  $B_2$ , giving a cobordism from  $\partial_-^u X$  to  $\partial_-^{u+1} X$ , with the latter viewed as the quotient of  $\partial_-^u X \setminus (B_1 \cup B_2)$  obtained by gluing  $\partial B_1$  to  $\partial B_2$  via a diffeomorphism which looks like  $\varphi \times id_{[0,1]}$  when restricted to  $N$ ;
- attach the 2-handle along a curve contained in a horizontal copy of  $\Sigma$  inside  $N$ .

Note that the image  $N'$  of  $N \setminus (B_1 \cup B_2)$  inside  $\partial_-^{u+1} X$  is diffeomorphic to  $\Sigma' \times [0, 1]$ , where  $\Sigma'$  is the quotient of  $\Sigma \setminus (\Delta_1 \cup \Delta_2)$  obtained by gluing  $\partial \Delta_1$  to  $\partial \Delta_2$  via the diffeomorphism  $\varphi$ . Also, we have a projection  $\pi' : N' \rightarrow \Sigma'$  induced by the restriction of  $\pi$  to  $N \setminus (B_1 \cup B_2)$  and  $\Sigma' \subset \partial_-^{u+1} X$  is a Heegaard surface of genus  $g(\Sigma) + 1$ .

We are now going to start the modification of  $\mathcal{H}$ . Suppose that  $i < j$  and let  $c$  be a bad crossing between  $D_{L_i}$  and  $D_{L_j}$  inside  $\Sigma$ . Then, the over-passing arc at  $c$  belongs to  $L_i$ , as in the left picture of Figure 2. By a stabilization as above we introduce a cancelling pair near  $c$ ,




Figure 2: Elimination of a bad crossing

so that the attaching circle of the new 2-handle, which we call  $L_{k+1}$ , has relative framing 0 and passes over  $L_j$  once, as in the center picture of Figure 2. Sliding  $L_i$  over  $L_{k+1}$  we eliminate

the bad crossing between  $L_i$  and  $L_j$ , replacing it with a good crossing between  $L_j$  and  $L_{k+1}$ , as in the right picture of Figure 2. The same argument works for self intersections, i.e. when  $i = j$ . We can repeat this procedure until we get a diagram with no bad crossings, so that each component of  $L$  can be assumed to sit on a horizontal copy of  $\Sigma$ .

Now we proceed to adjust the framings. Figure 3 illustrates the fact that a 360-degree twist of one of the two attaching spheres of a 1-handle changes the relative framings  $s$  of the 2-handles going over it. If we do this for all the 1-handles of the cancelling pairs introduced to




Figure 3: Twisting a 1-handle. The relative framing of a knot can be represented by either an integer or a longitude: in the first and last step we are just switching from a notation to the other, while in the middle we are twisting a sphere as indicated by the arrow. Of course, the twist can also be performed in the opposite direction: in that case, the new framings would be  $f + 1$  and  $-1$ .

eliminate bad crossings, we can change the relative framings  $s$  of the cancelling 2-handles from 0 to  $\pm 1$ . At that point, if 2-handles with relative framing not equal to  $\pm 1$  are still present, we can first perform more stabilizations and handle slides as in Figure 2 – just imagine removing  $L_j$  from the pictures. Then, apply twists with suitable signs as in Figure 3. Every time, we introduce a new  $\pm 1$ -framed 2-handle and change by  $\mp 1$  the relative framing of an already existing 2-handle. We can clearly keep going like this until all the relative framings  $s$  are  $\pm 1$ , therefore so far we have ensured that  $D_L$  satisfies properties (1), (2) and (4) above. If a component of the diagram happens to be homologically trivial, we can make it homologically non-trivial with a single stabilization. In fact, consider the first two pictures from the left in Figure 2 without the component  $L_i$  and choosing the framing on  $L_{k+1}$  so that its relative framing is  $\pm 1$ . If  $L_j$  is homologically trivial in the first picture, it is certainly not so in the second picture, and its relative framing has not changed. This shows that after possibly performing a few more stabilizations Conditions (1) – (4) can all be satisfied and concludes the proof of Theorem 1.4.

### 3 Proof of theorem 1.6 – case $\chi(X) = 0$

We state and prove Lemma 3.1 below in slightly greater generality than needed, for possible future use. Write a generic genus- $g$  Heegaard decomposition of a 3-manifold  $N$  as  $N = H_g \cup (\Sigma_g \times [0, 1]) \cup H'_g$ . Then, there are  $g$ -tuples  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_g)$  and  $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_g)$  of simple closed curves in  $\Sigma_g$  bounding compressing discs in  $H_g, H'_g$  respectively, such that  $(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$  is a

Heegaard diagram for  $N$ . Given a horizontal framed link  $L \subset \Sigma_g \times [0, 1]$ , denote by  $m_L(\mu)$  the  $g$ -tuple  $(m_L(\mu_1), \dots, m_L(\mu_g))$ .

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $L \subset \Sigma_g \times [0, 1]$  be a horizontal framed link with monodromy  $m_L \in \text{Map}(\Sigma_g)$  and associated cobordism  $X_L : \partial_- X_L \rightarrow \partial_+ X_L$ . Then,  $(m_L(\mu), \lambda)$  is a Heegaard diagram for  $\partial_+ X_L$ .*

*Proof.* Given any orientation-preserving diffeomorphism  $f : \Sigma_g \rightarrow \Sigma_g$  we can glue  $\Sigma_g \times [0, 1]$  to  $H_g$  via  $f$ :

$$H_g \cup_f (\Sigma_g \times [0, 1]) := H_g \cup (\Sigma_g \times [0, 1]) / (x \in \partial H_g = \Sigma_g \sim f(x) \in \Sigma_g \times \{0\}).$$

The result is diffeomorphic to  $H_g$  via the map

$$\psi = id_{H_g} \cup (f^{-1} \times id_{[0,1]}): H_g \cup_f (\Sigma_g \times [0, 1]) \rightarrow H_g \cup_{id_{\Sigma_g}} (\Sigma_g \times [0, 1]) \cong H_g.$$

Let  $\Delta_i \subset H_g$  be a compressing disk with  $\partial \Delta_i = \lambda_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, g$ . Then,

$$\partial_+ X_L = H_g \cup_{m_L} (\Sigma_g \times [0, 1]) \cup_{id_{\Sigma_g}} H'_g$$

and  $\Delta'_i = \Delta_i \cup m_L(\mu_i) \times [0, 1]$  is a compressing disk in  $H_g \cup_{m_L} (\Sigma_g \times [0, 1]) \cong H_g$  with  $\partial \Delta'_i = m_L(\mu_i)$ . Therefore  $(m_L(\mu), \lambda)$  is a Heegaard diagram for  $\partial_+ X_L$ .  $\square$

Consider a cobordism  $X : S^3 \rightarrow \partial_+ X$  having Euler characteristic  $\chi(X) = 0$ ,  $b_1(\partial_+ X) = 1$  and a horizontal decomposition of type  $(1, 0)$ . The decomposition of  $X$  consists of a 1-handle and a 2-handle attached along a simple closed curve  $\gamma \subset \partial(S^1 \times D^3) = S^1 \times S^2$  sitting on the standard genus-1 Heegaard torus  $T$ . In this case the monodromy is simply  $\tau_\gamma^\delta$  with  $\delta \in \{\pm 1\}$  and it coincides with its factorization. After choosing a suitable orientation we may assume that  $\gamma$  supports the homology class  $p\mu + q\lambda \in H_1(T; \mathbb{Z})$  with  $p \geq 0$  and  $p, q$  coprime, where  $(\mu, \lambda)$  is a pair of oriented, simple closed curves such that  $\mu \cdot \lambda = 1$ . Moreover, we can choose  $\lambda$  as the boundary of a compressing disc in the solid torus  $H_1$  and we are free to replace  $\mu$  with  $\mu + h\lambda$  for any  $h \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Therefore, we may assume either  $p > q > 0$  or  $(p, q) \in \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\}$ . Clearly, if  $(p, q) = (1, 0)$  then  $\gamma = \mu$  and  $X \cong B^4 \cong B_{1,0}$ , while if  $(p, q) = (0, 1)$  then  $\gamma = \lambda$  and by Lemma 3.1  $\partial_+ X = S^1 \times S^2$ , therefore  $b_1(\partial_+ X) \neq 1$ . The following proposition yields the first part of Theorem 1.6.

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let  $X : S^3 \rightarrow \partial_+ X$  be a smooth, oriented cobordism with Euler characteristic  $\chi(X) = 0$ , having a  $(1, 0)$ -decomposition with monodromy  $\tau^\delta$ . Suppose that  $b_1(\partial_+ X) = 0$ . Then,  $X$  is orientation-preserving diffeomorphic to  $\pm B_{p,q} \setminus B^4$ , with the plus sign occurring if and only if  $\delta = 1$  and either  $(p, q) = (1, 0)$  or  $p > q > 0$ . In particular,  $\partial_+ X = S^3$  if and only if  $X$  is diffeomorphic to  $S^3 \times [0, 1]$ .*

*Proof.* We already saw that if  $(p, q) = (1, 0)$  then  $X \cong B^4 \cong B_{1,0}$ . Therefore, we may assume  $p > q > 0$ . Then, the framing induced by  $T$  on  $\gamma$  is easily computed to be  $\text{fr}_T(\gamma) = pq$ . Assuming that  $X_L$  has factorization  $(\tau_\gamma^\delta)$ , the Seifert framing of  $\gamma$  is  $\text{fr}(\gamma) = pq - \delta$ . Note that taking the mirror image of the resulting Kirby calculus picture changes the sign of  $\text{fr}(\gamma)$  and  $\text{fr}_T(\gamma)$ , therefore the sign of  $\delta$  as well. Thus, up to changing the orientation of  $X$  we may assume  $\delta = 1$ , in which case by [13, Section 3.2] we conclude that the  $X$  is orientation-preserving diffeomorphic to  $B_{p,p-q} \setminus B^4$  and therefore to  $B_{p,q} \setminus B^4$ . The last portion of the statement follows from the fact that  $\partial B_{p,p-q} = \partial B_{p,q}$  is  $S^3$  if and only if  $B_{p,q} = B_{1,0} = B^4$ .  $\square$



## 4 Proof of Theorem 1.6 – case $\chi(X) = 1$

The proof is organized as follows. In Section 4.1 we start the analysis of a smooth, oriented, cobordism  $X : S^3 \rightarrow S^3$  having Euler characteristic  $\chi(X) = 1$ . We show that each decomposition determines a triple of integers which is a solution of a Diophantine equation satisfying certain extra constraints. In Section 4.2 we completely determine the sets of all such triples. In Section 4.3 we show that applying Hurwitz moves to the factorization of a horizontal framed link, the associated horizontal decomposition changes by a sequence of handle slides while staying horizontal. Finally, in Section 4.4 we put everything together to finish the proof.

### 4.1 First step

In this section we start the analysis of a smooth, oriented, cobordism  $X : S^3 \rightarrow S^3$  with Euler characteristic  $\chi(X) = 1$  having a horizontal decomposition of type  $(1, 0)$ . Since the number  $u$  of 1-handles satisfies  $u \leq g = 1$ , there is either one or no 1-handle and no 3-handles. If the decomposition contains no 1-handles then  $\chi(X) = 1$  implies that there is a single 2-handle attached along a simple closed curve  $\gamma \subset S^3$  sitting on a genus-1 Heegaard torus  $T$ . Suppose that, with a suitable orientation,  $\gamma$  supports the homology class  $p\mu + q\lambda \in H_1(T; \mathbb{Z})$  with  $p \geq 0$  and  $p, q$  coprime, where  $(\mu, \lambda)$  is a pair of oriented, simple closed curves such that  $\mu \cdot \lambda = 1$ . We can choose  $\lambda$  as the boundary of a compressing disc in the solid torus  $H_1$  and we are free to replace  $\mu$  with  $\mu + h\lambda$  for any  $h \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Therefore, we may assume either  $p > q > 0$  or  $(p, q) \in \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\}$ . Since the 2-handle is attached to  $S^3$  with framing  $\pm 1$  with respect to the framing  $pq$  induced by  $T$  and  $H_1(S^3; \mathbb{Z}) = 0$ , we must have  $|pq \pm 1| = 1$ . The only possibilities are  $(2, 1)$ ,  $(1, 0)$  and  $(0, 1)$  and in every case we clearly have  $X \cong \pm \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2 \setminus \{B^4 \cup B^4\}$ . This concludes the proof when  $\chi(X) = 1$  if there are no 1-handles. From now on, we assume that the  $(1, 0)$ -decomposition contains one 1-handle. In the notation of Section 1, the 2-handles define a cobordism  $X_L : S^1 \times S^2 \rightarrow S^3$ , where  $L \subset S^1 \times S^2$  is a link horizontal with respect to the standard genus-1 Heegaard decomposition. The assumption  $\chi(X) = 1$  implies that  $L$  has two components  $L_1, L_2$  sitting on parallel copies of the standard Heegaard torus  $T \subset S^1 \times S^2$ . Let  $N \cong T \times [0, 1]$  be a regular neighbourhood of  $T$  containing  $L$ , so that  $S^1 \times S^2 = H_1 \cup N \cup -H_1$ , and let  $\pi : N \rightarrow T$  the projection map. Let  $\gamma_1 = \pi(L_1)$  and  $\gamma_2 = \pi(L_2)$ . By definition of horizontal decomposition,  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  are non-separating simple closed curves. Setting  $\tau_i := \tau_{\gamma_i}$ , the factorization of  $L$  is given by

$$F_L = (\tau_2^{\delta_2}, \tau_1^{\delta_1}), \quad (4.1)$$

where  $\delta_i \in \{\pm 1\}$  is equal to minus the relative framing of  $L_i$  and the monodromy of  $L$  is  $m_L = \tau_2^{\delta_2} \tau_1^{\delta_1}$ .

Let  $\lambda \subset T = \partial H_1$  be a simple closed curve which bounds a disc in  $H_1$ . We are going to show that, assuming the curves are oriented, the integers  $\gamma_1 \cdot \lambda$ ,  $\gamma_2 \cdot \lambda$  and  $\gamma_2 \cdot \gamma_1$  satisfy a certain Diophantine equation. In Section 4.2 we determine the solutions of the equation and in Section 4.4 we use that knowledge together with the results of Section 4.3 to finish the proof of Theorem 1.6.

We want to apply the Lemma 3.1 to our cobordism  $X_L : S^1 \times S^2 \rightarrow S^3$ . As before, let  $\lambda \subset T = \partial H_1$  be the arbitrarily oriented boundary of a compressing disc in  $H_1$ . Then,  $(\lambda, \lambda)$  is a Heegaard diagram for  $S^1 \times S^2$  and it follows from Lemma 3.1 that  $(m_L(\lambda), \lambda)$  is a Heegaard diagram for  $\partial_+ X_L = S^3$ , which immediately implies

$$|\lambda \cdot m_L(\lambda)| = 1. \quad (4.2)$$

From now on we assume  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  oriented and we abuse notation by denoting with  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  also the corresponding homology classes in  $H_1(T; \mathbb{Z})$ . Define

$$x := \gamma_1 \cdot \lambda, \quad y := \gamma_2 \cdot \lambda \quad \text{and} \quad n := \gamma_2 \cdot \gamma_1.$$

Note that  $\tau_1$  and  $\tau_2$  do not depend on the orientations of  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$ . Since

$$m_L(\lambda) = \tau_2^{\delta_2}(\tau_1^{\delta_1}(\lambda)) = \tau_2^{\delta_2}(\lambda + \delta_1 x \gamma_1) = \lambda + \delta_1 x \gamma_1 + \delta_2 y \gamma_2 + \delta_1 \delta_2 n x \gamma_2,$$

taking the intersection product of both sides with  $\delta_1 \delta_2 \lambda$  yields

$$\delta_2 x^2 + \delta_1 y^2 + nxy = \varepsilon, \tag{4.3}$$

where  $\varepsilon = \delta_1 \delta_2 m_L(\lambda) \cdot \lambda$  and by Condition (4.2)  $|\varepsilon| = 1$ . Note that  $\varepsilon$  is independent of the orientations of  $\lambda$ ,  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$ .

**Definition 4.1.** Define  $S_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1}$  to be the set of triples  $(x, y, n) \in \mathbb{Z}^3$  such that  $(x, y)$  is a solution of Equation (4.3) and satisfies the extra condition

$$n = ay - bx \quad \text{for some } a, b \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ with } (x, a) = (y, b) = 1. \tag{4.4}$$

Observe that a triple  $(x, y, n)$  associated to a horizontal decomposition must satisfy Condition (4.4), because if  $(\mu, \lambda)$  is a symplectic basis of  $H_1(T; \mathbb{Z})$  with  $\mu \cdot \lambda = 1$  we can write  $\gamma_1 = x\mu + a\lambda$ ,  $\gamma_2 = y\mu + b\lambda$ , so we must have  $(x, a) = (y, b) = 1$  and  $n = \gamma_2 \cdot \gamma_1 = ay - bx$ . We analyze the sets  $S_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1}$  in Section 4.2 to prove Theorem 1.6 and in Section 5 to prove Theorem 5.1.

## 4.2 Second step

In this section we determine the set  $S_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1}$  of Definition 4.1. Note that if  $x$  and  $y$  solve Equation (4.3) then they are necessarily coprime. Fix a symplectic basis  $(\mu, \lambda)$  of  $H_1(T; \mathbb{Z})$  with  $\mu \cdot \lambda = 1$ . Then, we have

$$\gamma_1 = p_1 \mu + q_1 \lambda, \quad \gamma_2 = p_2 \mu + q_2 \lambda$$

for some  $p_i, q_i$  with  $(p_i, q_i) = 1$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Then,

$$x = \gamma_1 \cdot \lambda = p_1, \quad y = \gamma_2 \cdot \lambda = p_2 \quad \text{and} \quad n = \gamma_2 \cdot \gamma_1 = p_2 q_1 - p_1 q_2.$$

**Remark 4.2.** Observe that if  $x = 0$  then Equation (4.3) implies  $|y| = |p_2| = 1$ , and since  $\gamma_1 = \pm \lambda$  we have  $|q_1| = 1$ , therefore  $|n| = |\gamma_2 \cdot \gamma_1| = |p_2 q_1| = 1$ . Similarly,  $y = 0$  implies  $|n| = 1$ .

Given  $(x, y, n) \in S_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1}$ , define

$$\hat{x} := -x - n\delta_2 y \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{y} := -y - n\delta_1 x. \tag{4.5}$$

We call the triples  $(\hat{x}, y, n)$  and  $(x, \hat{y}, n)$  *mutations* of  $(x, y, n)$ . Moreover, let  $m_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1} \in \mathbb{N}$  be the minimum of the function  $S_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  given by  $(x, y, n) \mapsto |xy|$ . We define the *bottom subset*  $b(S_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1}) \subset S_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1}$  as the set of triples  $(x, y, n)$  where the minimum  $m_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1}$  is attained:

$$b(S_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1}) := \left\{ (x, y, n) \in S_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1} \mid |xy| = m_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1} \right\} \subset S_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1}.$$

**Lemma 4.3.** *If  $(x, y, n) \in S_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1}$ , both mutations of  $(x, y, n)$  belong to  $S_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1}$ . Moreover,*

(1) there is a finite sequence of mutations which sends  $(x, y, n)$  into  $b(S_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1})$ ;

(2) if  $S_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1} \neq \emptyset$  then  $|n| \in \{1, 3\}$  and  $m_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1} = (|n| - 1)/2$ .

*Proof.* The proof that  $(\hat{x}, y, n) \in S_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1}$  is symmetric to the proof that  $(x, \hat{y}, n) \in S_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1}$ , so we only provide the argument only for  $(\hat{x}, y, n)$ . One can easily check that if  $(x, y, n) \in S_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1}$  then  $(\hat{x}, y, n)$  is a solution of Equation (4.3). Let  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$  be as in (4.4). Setting

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - b\delta_2 y & \delta_2 y^2 \\ -b^2 \delta_2 & 1 + b\delta_2 y \end{pmatrix} \in SL(2; \mathbb{Z}),$$

it follows using (4.4) that

$$A \begin{pmatrix} x \\ a \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -\hat{x} \\ a + b\delta_2 n \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since  $\begin{pmatrix} x \\ a \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{Z}^2$  is a primitive vector, this implies that  $(\hat{x}, a + b\delta_2 n) = 1$ . Since

$$n = ay - bx = ay - b(-\hat{x} - n\delta_2 y) = (a + nb\delta_2)y - (-b)\hat{x},$$

$(\hat{x}, y, n)$  satisfies (4.4) and therefore  $(x, \hat{y}, n) \in S_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1}$ . This proves the first part of the statement.

Now observe that if  $(x, y, n) \in S_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1}$  and  $|x| = |y|$  then

$$x^2(\delta_2 + \delta_1 \pm n) = \varepsilon,$$

which implies  $|x| = |y| = 1$  and  $|n| \in \{1, 3\}$ . Hence, if  $(x, y, n) \in S_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1}$  and  $|xy| > 1$  we must have  $|x| \neq |y|$ . To prove (1) we are going to use infinite descent to reduce to the case  $|xy| \leq 1$ . We claim that if  $|x| > |y|$  then  $|\hat{x}| < |x|$ , while if  $|x| < |y|$  then  $|\hat{y}| < |y|$ . Since the arguments in the two cases are similar, we only go through the case  $|x| > |y|$ . In this case it suffices to observe that if  $|\hat{x}| \geq |x|$  then, using (4.3) we get

$$y^2 + 1 \geq |\delta_1 \delta_2 y^2 - \delta_2 \varepsilon| = |x\hat{x}| \geq x^2 \geq (|y| + 1)^2 = y^2 + 2|y| + 1,$$

which is impossible because  $y \neq 0$ . Therefore  $|\hat{x}| < |x|$  and the claim is established. Inducting on  $|xy|$  we can apply a sequence of mutations until we obtain a solution  $(x_0, y_0, n)$  with  $|x_0 y_0| \leq 1$ . If  $|x_0 y_0| = 0$  clearly  $(x_0, y_0, n) \in b(S_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1})$ , and by Remark 4.2 we have  $(x_0, y_0) \in \pm\{(1, 0), (0, 1)\}$  and  $|n| = 1$ . If  $|x_0 y_0| = 1$  then we saw above that  $|n| \in \{1, 3\}$ . Moreover, if  $|n| = 3$  then  $|\hat{x}_0| = |-x_0 - n\delta_2 y_0| \geq 2$ , and similarly  $|\hat{y}_0| \geq 2$ . This shows that if  $|n| = 3$  then  $(x_0, y_0, n) \in b(S_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1})$  and  $m_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1} = (|n| - 1)/2 = 1$ . If  $|n| = 1$  and  $m_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1} = 1$ , then necessarily  $\hat{x}_0 \neq 0$  and  $\hat{y}_0 \neq 0$ , therefore  $x_0 = n\delta_2 y_0$  and  $y_0 = n\delta_1 x_0$ , which easily implies  $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = nx_0 y_0$  and is inconsistent with Equation (4.3). Thus, if  $|n| = 1$  we have  $m_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1} = 0$  and the proof is complete.  $\square$

Observe that the map  $(x, y, n) \mapsto (x, -y, -n)$  defines a bijection between  $S_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1}$  and  $S_{-n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1}$ , while the map  $(x, y, n) \mapsto (x, -y, n)$  defines a bijection between  $S_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1}$  and  $S_{n,-\varepsilon}^{-\delta_2, -\delta_1}$ . Therefore, it will suffice to determine  $S_{n,-1}^{\delta_2, \delta_1}$  for  $n \in \{1, 3\}$ .

**Lemma 4.4.** *Let  $\pi : S_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^2$  be restriction of the projection map to the first two coordinates, given by  $\pi(x, y, n) = (x, y)$ . Then, the following hold:*

(1) if  $S_{3,-1}^{\delta_2, \delta_1} \neq \emptyset$  then  $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = 1$  and  $\pi(b(S_{3,-1}^{\delta_2, \delta_1})) = \pm\{(1, -1)\}$ ;

(2) if  $S_{1,-1}^{\delta_2, \delta_1} \neq \emptyset$  then  $\delta_1 + \delta_2 \in \{0, -2\}$ ;

$$(3) \quad \pi(b(S_{1,-1}^{-1,1})) = \pm\{(1, 0)\};$$

$$(4) \quad \pi(b(S_{1,-1}^{1,-1})) = \pm\{(0, 1)\};$$

$$(5) \quad \pi(b(S_{1,-1}^{-1,-1})) = \pm\{(1, 0), (0, 1)\}.$$

*Proof.* By Lemma 4.3, if  $S_{n,-1}^{\delta_2, \delta_1} \neq \emptyset$  then  $b(S_{n,-1}^{\delta_2, \delta_1}) \neq \emptyset$  and  $m_{n,-1}^{\delta_2, \delta_1} = (|n| - 1)/2$ . If  $n = 3$  then  $m_{3,-1}^{\delta_2, \delta_1} = 1$ , therefore there is  $(x, y) \in S_{3,-1}^{\delta_2, \delta_1}$  with  $|xy| = 1$ . Then, Equation (4.3) reads

$$\delta_1 + \delta_2 = -(1 + 3xy),$$

which forces  $xy = -1$ ,  $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = 1$  and  $\pi(b(S_{3,-1}^{1,1})) = \pm\{(1, -1)\}$ . This proves (1). If  $n = 1$  then  $m_{3,-1}^{\delta_2, \delta_1} = 0$  and there is  $(x, y) \in S_{1,-1}^{\delta_2, \delta_1}$  with  $|xy| = 0$ . If  $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = -1$  Equation (4.3) implies  $x^2 + y^2 = 1$  and (5) holds. If  $\delta_1 \delta_2 = -1$ , either  $(x, y) = \pm(0, 1)$  and  $(\delta_1, \delta_2) = (1, -1)$  or  $(x, y) = \pm(1, 0)$  and  $(\delta_1, \delta_2) = (-1, 1)$ . Hence, (2), (3) and (4) hold.  $\square$

### 4.3 Hurwitz moves and handle slides

In the last step of the proof of Theorem 1.6, Section 4.4, we will repeatedly use the following Proposition 4.5, which shows that if one applies a Hurwitz move to the factorization of a horizontal framed link  $L$ , the associated horizontal decomposition changes by a sequence of handle slides while staying horizontal. This result is essentially an adaptation and an extension of [20, Lemma 5.1]. In the following we use notation from Section 1.

**Proposition 4.5.** *Let  $L = \bigcup_{i=1}^k L_i \subset \Sigma_g \times [0, 1]$  be a horizontal link with  $L_i \subset \mathfrak{S}_i := \Sigma_g \times \{t_i\}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ . Let  $F_L = (\tau_k^{\delta_k}, \dots, \tau_1^{\delta_1})$  be the factorization of  $L$ . Define the horizontal link  $L' = \bigcup_{i=1}^k L'_i$  by setting  $L'_j = L_j$  as framed knots for  $j \neq i, i+1$  and*

$$\begin{aligned} L'_i &:= L_{i+1} \times \{t_i\}, & \text{fr}(L'_i) &:= \text{fr}_{\mathfrak{S}_i}(L'_i) - \delta_{i+1}, \\ L'_{i+1} &:= \tau_{i+1}^{\delta_{i+1}}(\pi(L_i)) \times \{t_{i+1}\}, & \text{fr}(L'_{i+1}) &:= \text{fr}_{\Sigma_{i+1}}(L'_{i+1}) - \delta_i. \end{aligned}$$

Then, the factorization  $F_{L'}$  is obtained from  $F_L$  by the Hurwitz move

$$F_L = (\dots, \tau_{i+1}^{\delta_{i+1}}, \tau_i^{\delta_i}, \dots) \rightarrow F_{L'} = (\dots, \tau_{i+1}^{\delta_{i+1}} \tau_i^{\delta_i} \tau_{i+1}^{-\delta_{i+1}}, \tau_{i+1}^{\delta_{i+1}}, \dots).$$

If we set, instead,  $L'_j = L_j$  for  $j \neq i, i+1$  and

$$\begin{aligned} L'_i &:= \tau_i^{\delta_i}(\pi(L_{i+1})) \times \{t_i\}, & \text{fr}(L'_i) &:= \text{fr}_{\mathfrak{S}_i}(L'_i) - \delta_{i+1}, \\ L'_{i+1} &:= L_i \times \{t_{i+1}\}, & \text{fr}(L'_{i+1}) &:= \text{fr}_{\Sigma_{i+1}}(L'_{i+1}) - \delta_i, \end{aligned}$$

the factorization  $F_{L'}$  is obtained from  $F_L$  by the Hurwitz move

$$F_L = (\dots, \tau_{i+1}^{\delta_{i+1}}, \tau_i^{\delta_i}, \dots) \rightarrow F_{L'} = (\dots, \tau_i^{\delta_i} \tau_{i+1}^{-\delta_i} \tau_{i+1}^{\delta_{i+1}} \tau_i^{\delta_i}, \dots).$$

In both cases, let  $X$  and, respectively,  $X'$  be cobordisms having horizontal decompositions having associated horizontal links  $L$  and, respectively,  $L'$ . Then, the handlebody decomposition of  $X_{L'}$  is obtained from the one induced on  $X_L$  by a sequence of handle slides. In particular,  $X$  and  $X'$  are orientation-preserving diffeomorphic.

*Proof of Proposition 4.5.* Given simple closed curves  $a, b \subset \Sigma_g$ , it is a well-known and easily checked fact that  $\tau_{\tau_a(b)} = \tau_a \tau_b \tau_a^{-1}$ . From this and the definition of  $L'$  it follows immediately that the factorization of  $L'$  is obtained from that of  $L$  as described. Therefore, we only need to check that the horizontal decomposition of  $X_{L'}$  is obtained from that of  $X_L$  by a sequence of handle slides. It clearly suffices to show this for a link with two components, so we may assume  $L = L_1 \cup L_2$ , with  $L_i \subset \mathfrak{S}_i := \Sigma_g \times \{t_i\}$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  and  $t_1 < t_2$ . Suppose first that  $\text{fr}(L_2) = \text{fr}_{\Sigma_2}(L_2) - 1$ . After an isotopy, the diagram of the projection of  $L$  to  $\Sigma_g$  will appear inside a disk  $D \subset \Sigma_g$  as in as in Figure 4, and will have no crossings outside of  $D$ . Because of our assumption




Figure 4: The local configuration of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$

on the framings, indicated by the label  $-1$  in the picture, the factorization of  $L$  is given by  $(\tau_{L_2}, \tau_{L_1}^{\pm 1})$ . Assuming there are  $c$  crossings in Figure 4, the left-hand side of Figure 5 shows  $c$  pushed-off copies of  $L_2$ . The right-hand side of Figure 5 shows the framed link obtained




Figure 5: The result of  $n$  handle slides

by sliding  $c$  times the 2-handle of  $X_L$  attached along  $L_1$  over the 2-handle attached along  $L_2$ . It is easy to check that such framed link is framed isotopic to the horizontal framed link  $L' = L_2 \times \{t_1\} \cup \tau_{L_2}(\pi(L_1)) \times \{t_2\}$ , with  $\text{fr}(L_2 \times \{t_1\}) = \text{fr}_{\Sigma_1}(L_2 \times \{t_1\}) - 1$  and  $\text{fr}(L_1 \times \{t_2\}) = \text{fr}_{\Sigma_2}(L_1 \times \{t_2\}) - \text{fr}_{\Sigma_1}(L_1) + \text{fr}(L_1)$ . The factorization of  $L'$  is  $(\tau_{L_2} \tau_{L_1}^{\pm 1} \tau_{L_2}^{-1}, \tau_{L_2})$ . This concludes the argument in the case  $\text{fr}(L_2) = \text{fr}_{\Sigma_2}(L_2) - 1$ . The case  $\text{fr}(L_2) = \text{fr}_{\Sigma_2}(L_2) + 1$  can be treated similarly or reduced to the previous case by mirroring, therefore the proof is complete.  $\square$

As an illustration of Proposition 4.5 we show how to use Hurwitz moves to show the existence of an orientation-preserving diffeomorphism between the 4-manifolds  $X$  and  $X'$  described by pictures of Figure 6. The diffeomorphism can of course be easily established also by Kirby calculus.

Both pictures of Figure 6 can be viewed as describing 4-component horizontal framed links inside  $S^2 \times S^1$ , giving  $(1, 0)$ -decompositions of  $X \setminus \{B^4 \cup B^4\}$  and  $X' \setminus \{B^4 \cup B^4\}$  viewed as cobordisms  $S^3 \rightarrow S^3$ . Let  $\mu$  and  $\lambda$ , respectively, be the meridian and the Seifert longitude




Figure 6: The diffeomorphic 4-manifolds  $X$  and  $X'$

of the dotted unknot  $U$ . If we view  $\mu$  and  $\lambda$  as simple closed curves on the boundary of a standard neighborhood of  $U$ , then we see that the link  $L$  on the left-hand side can be isotoped to become horizontal, with factorization  $F_L = (\tau_\lambda, \tau_\mu, \tau_\mu^{-1}, \tau_\mu)$ . On the other hand, the link  $L'$  on the right-hand side has factorization  $F_{L'} = (\tau_\lambda, \tau_\mu, \tau_\lambda, \tau_\lambda^{-1})$ . We shall use the known fact that, given a diffeomorphism  $f : \Sigma_g \rightarrow \Sigma_g$  and a simple closed curve  $a \subset \Sigma_g$ , we have  $\tau_{f(a)} = f \tau_a f^{-1}$ . Denoting with  $\overset{H}{\sim}$  Hurwitz equivalence, we have

$$F_L \overset{H}{\sim} (\tau_\mu, \tau_{\tau_\mu^{-1}(\lambda)}, \tau_\mu^{-1}, \tau_\mu) \overset{H}{\sim} (\tau_\mu, \tau_\mu^{-1}, \tau_\lambda, \tau_\mu) \overset{H}{\sim} (\tau_\mu, \tau_\lambda, \tau_{\tau_\lambda^{-1}(\mu)}, \tau_\mu) \overset{H}{\sim} (\tau_\mu, \tau_\lambda, \tau_\mu, \tau_{\tau_\mu^{-1}\tau_\lambda^{-1}(\mu)})$$

while

$$F_{L'} \overset{H}{\sim} (\tau_\mu, \tau_{\tau_\mu^{-1}(\lambda)}, \tau_\lambda, \tau_\lambda^{-1}) \overset{H}{\sim} (\tau_\mu, \tau_\lambda, \tau_{\tau_\lambda^{-1}\tau_\mu^{-1}(\lambda)}, \tau_\lambda^{-1}) = (\tau_\mu, \tau_\lambda, \tau_\mu, \tau_{\tau_\mu^{-1}\tau_\lambda^{-1}(\mu)}),$$

because  $\tau_\lambda^{-1}\tau_\mu^{-1}(\lambda)$  is isotopic to  $\mu$  and  $\tau_\mu^{-1}\tau_\lambda^{-1}(\mu)$  to  $\lambda$ . This shows  $F_L \overset{H}{\sim} F_{L'}$ , and therefore  $X$  and  $X'$  are diffeomorphic by Proposition 4.5.

#### 4.4 Last step

In this section we conclude the proof of Theorem 1.6. We assume familiarity with the notation introduced in the previous sections. Let  $X : S^3 \rightarrow S^3$  be the cobordism of Section 4.1, and  $L$  the horizontal two-component link associated to a  $(1, 0)$ -decomposition of  $X$ . We assume that  $L$  has factorization  $F_L = (\tau_2^{\delta_2}, \tau_1^{\delta_1})$  for some  $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in \{\pm 1\}$ . The oriented curves  $\lambda, \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \subset T$  determine  $(x, y, n) \in S_{n, \varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1}$  for some  $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$ .

By Proposition 4.5 we know that applying Hurwitz moves to  $F_L$  we obtain factorizations of links associated to  $(1, 0)$ -decompositions of  $X$ . Therefore, our plan will be to show that via Hurwitz moves we can change  $F_L$ , and consequently  $(x, y, n)$ , until we get a triple  $(x', y', n)$  with  $|x' y'|$  minimal. If we succeed, to determine the diffeomorphism type of  $X$  will suffice to do it when the triple  $(x, y, n)$  is minimal. We start with a couple of observations showing that we may assume  $n \in \{1, 3\}$  and  $\varepsilon = -1$ .

First observe that, since reversing the orientation of a component of  $L$  changes the sign of  $n$  without altering  $X_L$ , from now on we may (and will) assume without loss  $n > 0$ . In view of Lemma 4.3, the number  $n$  will be either 3 or 1. Next, observe that if we represent  $S^1 \times S^2$  as a dotted unknot  $U \subset S^3$ , we may assume that  $T$  is the boundary of a regular neighbourhood of  $U$ . We may also assume that the curves  $\mu$  and  $\lambda$  of the symplectic basis used to define  $x$  and  $y$  are, respectively, a meridian and a Seifert longitude of  $U$ . Taking the union with  $L$  gives a Kirby diagram for  $\hat{X} := B^4 \cup_{\partial_- X} X$ . Note that taking the mirror image of such a diagram amounts to replacing the curves  $\gamma_i = p_i \mu + q_i \lambda$  with  $p_i \mu - q_i \lambda$  and changing the signs of their relative framings. The result is a diagram of a  $(1, 0)$ -decomposition of  $-X$  with associated

triple  $(-x, -y, -n)$ . If we also reverse the orientation of  $\gamma_2$  we obtain a bijection between  $S_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2,\delta_1}$  and  $S_{n,-\varepsilon}^{-\delta_2,-\delta_1}$  given by  $(x, y, n) \leftrightarrow (x, -y, n)$ . This means that, up to reversing the orientation of  $X$  we may assume  $\varepsilon = -1$ .

Let  $\pi$  be the map defined in Lemma 4.4 and let  $U, V : \pi(S_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2,\delta_1}) \rightarrow \pi(S_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2,\delta_1})$  be given by  $U(x, y) = (\hat{x}, y)$  and  $V(x, y) = (x, \hat{y})$ , where

$$\begin{pmatrix} \hat{x} \\ y \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & -n\delta_2 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{pmatrix} x \\ \hat{y} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -n\delta_1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix}.$$

We warn the reader that, to avoid heavy notation, we are writing  $U$  instead of  $U_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2,\delta_1}$ , and similarly for  $V$ . Define  $S : \pi(S_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2,\delta_1}) \rightarrow \pi(S_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_1,\delta_2})$  by  $S(x, y) = (y, x)$ . Then,  $U, V$  and  $S$  act on  $\pi(S_{3,-1}^{1,1})$  and  $\pi(S_{1,-1}^{-1,1}) \cup \pi(S_{1,-1}^{1,-1})$  and satisfy the relations  $US = SV$  and  $VS = SU$ .

We now check what happens to the quantities  $x, y$  and  $n$  when we apply a Hurwitz move to  $F_L$ . The two possible Hurwitz moves are:

$$(\tau_2^{\delta_2}, \tau_1^{\delta_1}) \rightarrow (\tau_1^{\delta_1}, \tau_1^{-\delta_1} \tau_2^{\delta_2} \tau_1^{\delta_1} = \tau_{-\gamma_2 - n\delta_1 \gamma_1}^{\delta_2}) \quad \text{and} \quad (\tau_2^{\delta_2}, \tau_1^{\delta_1}) \rightarrow (\tau_2^{\delta_2} \tau_1^{\delta_1} \tau_2^{-\delta_2} = \tau_{-\gamma_1 - n\delta_2 \gamma_2}^{\delta_1}, \tau_2^{\delta_2}).$$

So we get, respectively,

$$(x, y, n) \rightarrow (-y - n\delta_1 x, x, n) = (\hat{y}, x, n) \quad \text{and} \quad (x, y, n) \rightarrow (y, -x - n\delta_2 y, n) = (y, \hat{x}, n). \quad (4.6)$$

Thus, a Hurwitz move transforms  $F_L$  into  $F_{L'}$ , where the triple  $(x', y', n')$  associated to  $L'$  satisfies  $n' = n$  and, using notation from Section 4.2, either  $(x', y') = SU(x, y)$  or  $(x', y') = SV(x, y)$ . In particular, if  $(x, y, n) \in S_{n,-1}^{\delta_2,\delta_1}$  then  $(x', y', n') \in S_{n,-1}^{\delta_1,\delta_2}$ .

**Case  $n = 3$ :** since  $\varepsilon = -1$ , in view of Lemma 4.4(1) we may assume that the triple  $(x, y, n)$  associated to  $L$  is in  $S_{3,-1}^{1,1}$ , which is preserved by both  $SU$  and  $SV$ . By Lemma 4.4, a sequence of Hurwitz moves transforms  $F_L$  into  $F_{L'}$ , where  $L'$  is a horizontal framed link whose associated triple is  $(1, -1, 3)$  and by Proposition 4.5 we have  $X_L \cong X_{L'}$ . Thus, it suffices to show that if the triple is  $(1, -1, 3) \in S_{3,-1}^{1,1}$  then  $X$  is diffeomorphic to  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2 \setminus (B^4 \cup B^4)$ . From  $x = \gamma_1 \cdot \lambda = 1$  we deduce that  $\gamma_1 = \mu + c\lambda$  for some  $c \in \mathbb{Z}$ . We can simplify further the handlebody decomposition as follows. Any self-diffeomorphism  $T \rightarrow T$  of the form  $\tau_\lambda^m$ ,  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ , extends to a diffeomorphism  $\tilde{\tau} : H_1 \rightarrow H_1$  and therefore to  $\tilde{\tau} \times id : H_1 \times [0, 1] \rightarrow H_1 \times [0, 1]$ . We can extend  $\tilde{\tau} \times id$  over the two 2-handles  $h_1$  and  $h_2$  attached along  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  to an orientation-preserving diffeomorphism

$$\tilde{\tau} : (H_1 \times [0, 1]) \cup h_1 \cup h_2 \xrightarrow{\cong} (H_1 \times [0, 1]) \cup \tilde{\tau}(h_1) \cup \tilde{\tau}(h_2),$$

where the 2-handles  $\tilde{\tau}(h_i)$  are attached along  $L' = \tilde{\tau}(L)$ . The factorization of  $F_{L'}$  is obtained by conjugating the elements of  $F_L$  by  $\tau_\lambda^m$  and the triple associated to  $L'$  is still  $(x, y, n)$ . This shows that we may assume  $\gamma_1 = \mu$  without loss of generality. Now  $y = \gamma_2 \cdot \lambda = -1$  and  $n = \gamma_2 \cdot \gamma_1 = 3$  force  $\gamma_2 = -\mu - 3\lambda$ . The associated Kirby diagram is isotopic to the one given in Figure 7. It




Figure 7: Kirby diagram in the case  $n = 3$

can be transformed into the standard diagram of  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$  by sliding the 2-framed handle first over the  $-1$ -framed handle, then sliding it again over the 1-handle and finally applying a  $(1, 2)$ -pair cancellation.

**Case  $n = 1$ :** since  $\varepsilon = -1$ , in view of Lemma 4.4 we may assume that the triple  $(x, y, 1)$  associated to  $L$  is either in  $S_{1,-1}^{1,-1} \cup S_{1,-1}^{-1,1}$  or  $S_{1,-1}^{-1,-1}$ . In the latter case a sequence of Hurwitz moves transforms  $F_L$  into  $F_{L'}$ , where  $L'$  is a horizontal framed link whose associated triple is  $(x, y, 1)$  with  $(x, y) \in \pm\{(1, 0), (0, 1)\}$  and by Proposition 4.5 we have  $X_L \cong X_{L'}$ . If  $(x, y)$  is, up to sign, equal to  $(1, 0)$  then, since  $\gamma_2$  is non-separating it must be parallel to  $\lambda$ . Moreover,  $x = \gamma_1 \cdot \lambda = 1$  and  $n = 1 = \gamma_2 \cdot \gamma_1$  imply  $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) = \pm(\mu, \lambda)$ . Since  $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = -1$ , a Kirby calculus picture is given by a cancelling  $(1, 2)$ -pair with  $+1$ -framed meridian 2-handle together with an unlinked  $+1$ -framed unknot. Therefore in this case  $X \cong \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2 \setminus (B^4 \cup B^4)$ . If  $(x, y) = (0, 1)$  we deduce  $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) = \pm(\lambda, \mu)$  and reach the same conclusion as before. Now suppose  $(x, y, 1) \in S_{1,-1}^{1,-1} \cup S_{1,-1}^{-1,1}$ . By Lemma 4.4, a sequence of Hurwitz moves transforms  $F_L$  into  $F_{L'}$ , where  $L'$  is a horizontal framed link with associated triple equal to either  $(\pm 1, 0, 1) \in S_{1,-1}^{-1,1}$  or  $(0, \pm 1, 1) \in S_{1,-1}^{1,-1}$ . In the first case we deduce as before  $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) = \pm(\mu, -\lambda)$ , in the second case  $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) = \pm(\lambda, \mu)$ . In both cases the associated Kirby diagram is easily shown to represent  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$ . This concludes the proof of Theorem 1.6.

**Remark 4.6.** The above proof shows that when the triple  $(x, y, n)$  associated to the  $(1, 0)$ -decomposition of  $X$  and the oriented curves  $\lambda, \gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  belongs to  $S_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1}$  with  $n \in \{1, 3\}$  and  $\varepsilon = -1$ , then  $X$  is *orientation-preserving* diffeomorphic to  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2 \setminus (B^4 \cup B^4)$ . Since the quantity  $\varepsilon = \delta_1 \delta_2 m_L(\lambda) \cdot \lambda$  is invariant under orientation changes of  $\lambda, \gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  and Hurwitz moves, while it changes sign if the orientation of  $X$  is reversed, we conclude that  $\varepsilon = -\sigma(X)$ . This fact can be also established directly, applying Wall's non-additivity formula [21].

## 5 Proof of Theorem 1.8

In this section we determine the smooth embeddings  $B_{p,q} \subset \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$  implicit in our proof of Theorem 1.6. Let  $L \subset Y_1$  be the horizontal two-component link with factorization  $(\tau_2^{\delta_2}, \tau_1^{\delta_1})$  associated to a  $(1, 0)$ -decomposition of  $X = \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2 \setminus (B^4 \cup B^4)$  of type  $(1, 0)$ . As explained in Section 1, the disjoint union  $(B^4 \cup X_{\gamma_1}) \cup (B^4 \cup X_{\gamma_2})$  admits a smooth orientation-preserving embedding in  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$ . Hence, to prove Theorem 1.8 we need to identify the 4-manifolds  $\hat{X}_{\gamma_i} := B^4 \cup_{\partial_- X_{\gamma_i}} X_{\gamma_i}$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . Note that  $X_{\gamma_i} : S^3 \rightarrow \partial_+ X_{\gamma_i}$  is a cobordism having  $\chi(X_{\gamma_i}) = 0$  and a  $(1, 0)$ -decomposition. Therefore, if  $b_1(\partial_+ X_{\gamma_i}) = 1$  it follows from Proposition 3.2 that  $\hat{X}_{\gamma_i}$  is diffeomorphic to either  $B^4$  or  $\delta_i B_{p,q}$  for some  $p > q > 0$ . The following result clearly implies Theorem 1.8.

**Theorem 5.1.** *Suppose that a horizontal decomposition of  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2 \setminus (B^4 \cup B^4)$  has type  $(1, 0)$ , factorization  $(\tau_2^{\delta_2}, \tau_1^{\delta_1})$  and that  $b_1(\partial \hat{X}_{\gamma_1}) = b_1(\partial \hat{X}_{\gamma_2}) = 1$ . Then, the set  $\{\hat{X}_{\gamma_1}, \hat{X}_{\gamma_2}\}$  is one of the following:*

- (1)  $\{B_{m+1}, B_m\}$  for some  $m \geq 0$ , where  $B_m = B_{F_{2m-1}, F_{2m-5}}$  if  $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = 1$ ;
- (2)  $\{B'_{m+1}, B'_m\}$  for some  $m \geq 0$ , where  $B'_m = (-1)^m B_{F_{m+1}, F_m}$  if  $\delta_1 + \delta_2 = 0$ ;
- (3)  $\{B^4\}$  if  $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = -1$ .

Moreover, in Case (1) we have  $|\gamma_1 \cdot \gamma_2| = 3$ , in Cases (2) and (3) we have  $|\gamma_1 \cdot \gamma_2| = 1$ .

For the proof of Theorem 5.1 we need the following Lemma 5.2. Note that the involutions  $S$  and minus the identity  $-I$  generate  $G$ -actions on  $\pi(S_{3,-1}^{1,1})$  and  $\pi(S_{1,-1}^{-1,1}) \cup \pi(S_{1,-1}^{1,-1})$ , where



$G = \langle S, -I \rangle \cong \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ . We denote by  $H = \{I, -I\} \cong \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$  the subgroup of  $G$  generated by  $-I$ .

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let  $\{F_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \subset \mathbb{Z}$  be the Fibonacci sequence, given by  $F_{-1} = 1$ ,  $F_0 = 0$  and  $F_{m+1} = F_m + F_{m-1}$ . Then, we have*

$$\pi(S_{3,-1}^{1,1}) = G \cdot \mathcal{S}, \quad \pi(S_{1,-1}^{-1,1}) = H \cdot (\mathcal{T}_1 \cup \mathcal{T}_2), \quad \pi(S_{1,-1}^{1,-1}) = S \cdot \pi(S_{1,-1}^{-1,1})$$

$$\text{and } \pi(S_{1,-1}^{-1,-1}) = \pm\{(1,0), (0,1), (1,1)\},$$

where

$$\mathcal{S} = \{(-F_{2k-1}, F_{2k+1}) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \mid k \geq 0\}$$

$$\mathcal{T}_1 = \{(F_{2k+1}, F_{2k}) \mid k \geq 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{T}_2 = \{(F_{2k+1}, -F_{2k+2}) \mid k \geq 0\}$$

*Proof. First case:*  $n = 3$ ,  $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = 1$ . By Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4, each  $(x, y, 3) \in S_{3,-1}^{1,1}$  is sent to either  $(1, -1, 3)$  or  $(-1, 1, 3)$  by a sequence of mutations. Then,  $(x, y)$  is obtained from either  $(1, -1)$  or  $(-1, 1)$  applying a map of the form  $\cdots UVU$  or  $\cdots VUV$ . Since  $S: \pi(S_{3,-1}^{1,1}) \rightarrow \pi(S_{3,-1}^{1,1})$  is an involution which intertwines the actions of  $U$  and  $V$  and  $(1, -1) = S(-1, 1)$ , if  $(x, y, 3) \in S_{3,-1}^{1,1}$  then  $(x, y)$  belongs to the  $G$ -orbit of either  $(VU)^h(-1, 1)$  or  $U(VU)^h(-1, 1)$  for some  $h \geq 0$ . Since  $VU = (VS)^2 = (-VS)^2$  and  $U = S^2V = S(VS)$ , we can rephrase the condition on  $(x, y)$  by saying that  $(x, y)$  belongs to the  $G$ -orbit of  $(-VS)^k(-1, 1)$  for some  $k \geq 0$ . The map  $-VS$  acts as multiplication by  $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$ , therefore  $(x, y)$  belongs to the  $G$ -orbit of  $\{(x_k, y_k) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \mid k \geq 0\}$ , where

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_k \\ y_k \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 3 \end{pmatrix}^k \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The relation  $(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}) = (-YS)(x_k, y_k)$  is equivalent to  $x_{k+1} = -y_k$  and  $y_{k+1} = x_k + 3y_k$ , which imply  $x_{k+2} = 3x_{k+1} - x_k$ . Since  $(x_0, y_0) = (-1, 1)$  and  $(x_1, y_1) = (-1, 2)$ , we have  $x_k = -F_{2k-1}$  and  $y_k = F_{2k+1}$  for each  $k \geq 0$ , therefore  $(x, y)$  belongs to  $G \cdot \mathcal{S}$ . This shows  $\pi(S_{3,-1}^{1,1}) \subset G \cdot \mathcal{S}$ . Conversely, since  $V, S$  and  $-I$  preserve  $\pi(S_{3,-1}^{1,1})$  and the latter contains  $(-1, 1)$ , we have  $G \cdot \mathcal{S} \subset \pi(S_{3,-1}^{1,1})$ .

**Second case:**  $n = 1$ ,  $\delta_1 + \delta_2 = 0$ . By Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4, a sequence of mutations sends each  $(x, y, 1) \in S_{1,-1}^{-1,1}$  to  $(1, 0, 1)$  or  $(-1, 0, 1)$  and each  $(x, y, 1) \in S_{1,-1}^{1,-1}$  to  $(0, 1, 1)$  or  $(0, -1, 1)$ . Since  $S: \pi(S_{1,-1}^{-1,1}) \rightarrow \pi(S_{1,-1}^{1,-1})$  defines a bijection intertwining  $U$  and  $V$  and commuting with  $-I$ , it will suffice to determine the elements of  $\pi(S_{1,-1}^{-1,1})$ . Since  $U(1, 0) = (-1, 0)$ , if  $(x, y, 1) \in S_{1,-1}^{-1,1}$  then  $(x, y)$  belongs to the  $H$ -orbit of either  $(UV)^h(1, 0)$  or  $V(UV)^h(1, 0)$  for some  $h \geq 0$ . Moreover,

$$UV = -\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^2$$

and we have

$$(UV)^h = (-1)^h \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^{2h},$$

therefore  $(UV)^h(1, 0) = (-1)^h(x_{2h}, y_{2h})$ , where the sequence  $\{(x_k, y_k)\}$  is defined by  $(x_0, y_0) = (1, 0)$  and

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_{k+1} \\ y_{k+1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_k \\ y_k \end{pmatrix}, \quad k \geq 0.$$

But this is equivalent to  $y_k = x_{k-1}$  and  $x_{k+1} = x_k + x_{k-1}$ , therefore  $x_k = F_{k+1}$ , where  $F_k$  is the  $k$ -th Fibonacci number. We conclude that  $(UV)^h(1, 0) = (-1)^h(F_{2h+1}, F_{2h})$ . Since  $V(F_{2h+1}, F_{2h}) = (F_{2h+1}, -F_{2h+1} - F_{2h}) = (F_{2h+1}, -F_{2h+2}) \in \pi(S_{1,-1}^{-1,1})$ , the proof of this case is finished.

**Third case:**  $n = 1$ ,  $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = -1$ . By Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4, a sequence of mutations sends each  $(x, y, 1) \in S_{1,-1}^{-1,-1}$  to  $(\pm 1, 0, 1)$  or  $(0, \pm 1, 1)$ . But it is easy to check that acting with  $U$  and  $V$  on  $(\pm 1, 0)$  and  $(\pm 0, 1)$  the only other pairs one can get are  $(\pm 1, 1)$ . This concludes the proof.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 5.1.* In view of Proposition 3.2, identifying the possible  $X_{\gamma_1}$  and  $X_{\gamma_2}$  amounts to identifying (up to sign) the possible homology classes of the curves  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$ . Using the notation of Section 4, let us fix a symplectic basis  $(\mu, \lambda)$  of  $H_1(T; \mathbb{Z})$  with  $\mu \cdot \lambda = 1$ , so that  $\gamma_i = p_i \mu + q_i \lambda$  for some  $p_i, q_i$  with  $(p_i, q_i) = 1$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . Note that by Proposition 3.2 the assumption  $b_1(\partial \hat{X}_{\gamma_i} = \partial_+ X_{\gamma_i}) = 1$  implies  $p_1 p_2 \neq 0$ . We have already observed that the map  $(x, y, n) \mapsto (x, -y, -n)$  defines a bijection between  $S_{n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1}$  and  $S_{-n,\varepsilon}^{\delta_2, \delta_1}$ . Therefore, to list the possible  $(|p_1|, |p_2|)$  it suffices to assume  $n \in \{1, 3\}$ . Moreover, by Remark 4.6 we have  $\varepsilon = -\sigma(X) = -1$ . Then, by Lemma 5.2 each pair  $(|p_1|, |p_2|)$  is one of the following:

- $(F_{2k+1}, F_{2k-1})$  or  $(F_{2k-1}, F_{2k+1})$  for some  $k \geq 0$  when  $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = 1$  and  $n = 3$ ;
- $(F_{2k+1}, F_{2k})$  or  $(F_{2k+1}, F_{2k+2})$  for some  $k \geq 0$  when  $(\delta_1, \delta_2) = (1, -1)$  and  $n = 1$ ;
- $(F_{2k}, F_{2k+1})$  or  $(F_{2k+2}, F_{2k+1})$  for some  $k \geq 0$  when  $(\delta_1, \delta_2) = (-1, 1)$  and  $n = 1$ .

Recall that the Fibonacci numbers satisfy Vajda's identity:

$$F_r F_{m+j} - F_m F_{r+j} = (-1)^{r+1} F_{m-r} F_j.$$

Choosing  $j = 4$ ,  $m = 2k - 3$  and  $r = 2k - 5$  we obtain the relation

$$(\pm F_{2k-5}) F_{2k+1} - (\pm F_{2k-3}) F_{2k-1} = \pm 3,$$

which implies

- $q_1 \equiv \pm F_{2k-3} \pmod{p_1}$  and  $q_2 \equiv \pm F_{2k-5} \pmod{p_2}$  when  $(|p_1|, |p_2|) = (F_{2k+1}, F_{2k-1})$ ;
- $q_1 \equiv \pm F_{2k-5} \pmod{p_1}$  and  $q_2 \equiv \pm F_{2k-3} \pmod{p_2}$  when  $(|p_1|, |p_2|) = (F_{2k-1}, F_{2k+1})$ .

Since  $B_{p,q} \cong B_{p,p-q}$ , when  $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = 1$  and  $|n| = 3$  by Proposition 3.2 the 4-manifolds  $\hat{X}_{\gamma_1}$  and  $\hat{X}_{\gamma_2}$  are

$$B_{F_{2k+1}, F_{2k-3}} = B_{k+1} \quad \text{and} \quad B_{F_{2k-1}, F_{2k-5}} = B_k, \quad k \geq 0.$$

Choosing  $j = 1$ ,  $m = 2k$  and  $r = 2k - 1$  in Vajda's identity we obtain the relation

$$(\pm F_{2k-1}) F_{2k+1} - (\pm F_{2k}) F_{2k} = \pm 1,$$

which provides us with

- $q_1 \equiv \pm F_{2k} \pmod{p_1}$  and  $q_2 \equiv \pm F_{2k-1} \pmod{p_2}$  when  $(|p_1|, |p_2|) = (F_{2k+1}, F_{2k})$ ;
- $q_1 \equiv \pm F_{2k-1} \pmod{p_1}$  and  $q_2 \equiv \pm F_{2k} \pmod{p_2}$  when  $(|p_1|, |p_2|) = (F_{2k}, F_{2k+1})$ .

In view of Proposition 3.2, the corresponding rational balls are

$$B_{F_{2k+1}, F_{2k}} = B'_{2k} \quad \text{and} \quad -B_{F_{2k}, F_{2k-1}} = B'_{2k-1}, \quad k > 0.$$

Choosing  $j = 1$ ,  $m = 2k + 1$  and  $r = 2k$  in Vajda's identity we obtain the relation

$$(\pm F_{2k}) F_{2k+2} - (\pm F_{2k+1}) F_{2k+1} = \mp 1,$$

which gives

- $q_1 \equiv \pm F_{2k} \pmod{p_1}$  and  $q_2 \equiv \pm F_{2k+1} \pmod{p_2}$  when  $(|p_1|, |p_2|) = (F_{2k+1}, F_{2k+2})$ ;
- $q_1 \equiv \pm F_{2k+1} \pmod{p_1}$  and  $q_2 \equiv \pm F_{2k} \pmod{p_2}$  when  $(|p_1|, |p_2|) = (F_{2k+2}, F_{2k+1})$ .

The rational balls are

$$B_{F_{2k+1}, F_{2k}} = B'_{2k} \quad \text{and} \quad -B_{F_{2k+2}, F_{2k+1}} = B'_{2k+1}, \quad k \geq 0.$$

Finally, if  $(x, y, n) \in S_{1, -1}^{-1, -1}$  then by Lemma 5.2 we have  $(p_1, p_2) = \pm(1, 1)$  and the statement follows. This concludes the proof of Theorem 5.1.  $\square$

## References

- [1] D. Auroux, “Factorizations in  $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$  and simple examples of inequivalent Stein fillings,” *Journal of Symplectic Geometry*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 261–277, 2015.
- [2] D. I. Cartwright and T. Steger, “Enumeration of the 50 fake projective planes,” *Comptes Rendus Mathématique*, vol. 348, no. 1-2, pp. 11–13, 2010.
- [3] S. K. Donaldson *et al.*, “An application of gauge theory to four-dimensional topology,” *Journal of Differential Geometry*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 279–315, 1983.
- [4] J. B. Etnyre and T. Fuller, “Realizing 4-manifolds as achiral Lefschetz fibrations,” *International Mathematics Research Notices*, vol. 2006, no. 9, pp. 70 272–70 272, 2006.
- [5] J. Evans and I. Smith, “Markov numbers and lagrangian cell complexes in the complex projective plane,” *Geometry & Topology*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 1143–1180, 2018.
- [6] R. Fintushel, R. J. Stern, *et al.*, “Rational blowdowns of smooth 4-manifolds,” *Journal of Differential Geometry*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 181–235, 1997.
- [7] E. Giroux, “Geometrie de contact: De la dimension trois vers les dimensions superieures,” in *Proceedings of the international congress of mathematicians, ICM 2002*, Beijing: Higher Education Press, 2002, pp. 405–414.
- [8] R. E. Gompf and A. I. Stipsicz, *4-manifolds and Kirby calculus*, ser. Graduate Studies in Mathematics 20. American Mathematical Soc., 1999.
- [9] W. Haken, “Various aspects of the three-dimensional Poincaré problem,” in *Topology of Manifolds (Proc. Inst., Univ. of Georgia, Athens, Ga., 1969)*, 1970, pp. 140–152.
- [10] J. L. Harer, *Pencils of curves on 4-manifolds*. Ph.D. thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 1979.
- [11] T. Khodorovskiy, “Symplectic rational blow-up,” arXiv:1303.2581, 2013.
- [12] F. Laudenbach and V. Poénaru, “A note on 4-dimensional handlebodies,” *Bulletin de la Société Mathématique de France*, vol. 100, pp. 337–344, 1972.
- [13] Y. Lekili and M. Maydanskiy, “The symplectic topology of some rational homology balls,” *Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici*, vol. 89, no. 3, pp. 571–596, 2014.
- [14] P. Lisca and A. Parma, “Horizontal decompositions, II,” In preparation.
- [15] —, “On almost complex embeddings of rational homology balls,” arXiv:2011.01784.
- [16] —, “On Stein rational balls smoothly but not symplectically embedded in  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$ ,” arXiv:2010.01613, to appear in *Bull. London Math. Soc.*

- [17] F. Luo, “The existence of  $K(\pi,1)$  4-manifolds which are rational homology 4-spheres,” *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, pp. 1315–1321, 1988.
- [18] B. Owens, “Smooth, nonsymplectic embeddings of rational balls in the complex projective plane,” *The Quarterly Journal of Mathematics*, vol. 71, no. 3, pp. 997–1007, 2020.
- [19] J. G. Ratcliffe and S. T. Tschantz, “Some examples of aspherical 4-manifolds that are homology 4-spheres,” *Topology*, vol. 44, no. 2, pp. 341–350, 2005.
- [20] M. Tange and Y. Yamada, “Four-dimensional manifolds constructed by lens space surgeries along torus knots,” *Journal of Knot Theory and Its Ramifications*, vol. 21, no. 11, p. 1 250 111, 2012.
- [21] C. T. C. Wall, “Non-additivity of the signature,” *Inventiones mathematicae*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 269–274, 1969.

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, LARGO BRUNO PONTECORVO 5, 56127 PISA, ITALY  
*E-mail addresses:* `paolo.lisca@unipi.it`, `andrea.parma94@gmail.com`