

Upper bounds for the minimal number of singular fibers in a Lefschetz fibration over the torus

Noriyuki Hamada

Abstract

In this paper, we give some relations in the mapping class groups of oriented closed surfaces in the form that a product of a small number of right hand Dehn twists is equal to a single commutator. Consequently, we find upper bounds for the minimal number of singular fibers in a Lefschetz fibration over the torus.

1 Introduction

Lefschetz fibrations were originally introduced for studying topological properties of smooth complex projective varieties, and afterwards generalized to differentiable category. Furthermore Donaldson and Gompf revealed the close relationship between Lefschetz fibrations and 4-dimensional symplectic topology in the late 1990s, and since then they have been extensively studied.

The information about the number of singular fibers in a Lefschetz fibration provides us important information about the topological invariants of its total space such as the Euler number, the signature, the Chern numbers, and so on. In addition, it has been known that the number of singular fibers in a Lefschetz fibration cannot be arbitrary, so it makes sense to ask what the minimal number of singular fibers in a Lefschetz fibration is. We denote by $N(g, h)$ the minimal number of singular fibers in a non-trivial relatively minimal genus g Lefschetz fibration over the oriented closed surface of genus h . This minimal number has been studied by various authors. Table 1 shows previous studies about $N(g, h)$. Korkmaz and Ozbagci proved that (1) $N(g, h) = 1$ if and only if $g \geq 3$ and $h \geq 2$, (2) $N(1, h) = 12$ for all $h \geq 0$, and (3) $5 \leq N(2, h) \leq 8$ for all $h \geq 0$ ([6]). The upper bound for $N(2, h)$ in (3) follows from the existence of a genus 2 Lefschetz fibration over the sphere with eight singular fibers, which was constructed by Matsumoto ([8]). In addition, for $g = 2$ Monden showed that (1) $N(2, h) = 5$ for all $h \geq 3$, (2) $N(2, 2) \leq 6$, and (3) $6 \leq N(2, 1) \leq 7$ ([9]). Ozbagci proved that the number of singular fibers in a genus 2 Lefschetz fibration over the sphere cannot be equal to 5 or 6 ([10]) and Xiao constructed a genus 2 Lefschetz fibration over the sphere with seven singular fibers ([12]); hence, $N(2, 0) = 7$. For $h = 0$ some estimates for $N(g, 0)$ are known. Cadavid and Korkmaz independently generalized Matsumoto's genus 2 Lefschetz fibration

7	$6 \leq N \leq 24$	$2 \leq N \leq 24$	1	1	1	1	1
6	$6 \leq N \leq 16$	$2 \leq N \leq 16$	1	1	1	1	1
5	$5 \leq N \leq 20$	$2 \leq N \leq 20$	1	1	1	1	1
4	$4 \leq N \leq 12$	$2 \leq N \leq 12$	1	1	1	1	1
3	$3 \leq N \leq 16$	$2 \leq N \leq 16$	1	1	1	1	1
2	7	6 or 7	5 or 6	5	5	5	5
1	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
g h	0	1	2	3	4	5	6

Table 1: Previous results for $N = N(g, h)$

as above to genus g Lefschetz fibrations over the sphere with $2g + 10$ singular fibers for g odd, or with $2g + 4$ singular fibers for g even ([1, 4]). This fact shows $N(g, 0) \leq 2g + 10$ for g odd and $N(g, 0) \leq 2g + 4$ for g even. Stipsicz ([11]) proved that for any $g \geq 2$, the number of irreducible singular fibers in a genus g Lefschetz fibration over the sphere is bounded below by $(4g + 2)/5$. Therefore, we have

$$\frac{1}{5}(4g + 2) \leq N(g, 0).$$

In particular, there is no universal upper bound for $N(g, 0)$ which is independent of g .

In the case of $h = 1$, it has been known that $2 \leq N(g, 1) \leq N(g, 0)$. The former inequality follows by [6]. The latter inequality comes from the following observation. If a genus g Lefschetz fibration over the sphere is given, then by taking the fiber sum of it and $\Sigma_g \times \Sigma_1$ the trivial Σ_g -bundle over the torus, we can construct a genus g Lefschetz fibration over the torus without changing the number of the singular fibers. However, non-trivial upper bounds for $N(g, 1)$ have not been given explicitly as far as the author knows. The present paper aims at giving new upper bounds for $N(g, 1)$, i.e. in the case of Lefschetz fibrations over the torus. The main theorem of this paper is the following.

Theorem 1.1. *For the minimal number of singular fibers in a Lefschetz fibration over the torus, the following holds:*

- (1) $N(g, 1) \leq 6$ for all $g \geq 3$.
- (2) $N(g, 1) \leq 5$ for all $g \geq 7$.

In particular, there is a universal upper bound for $N(g, 1)$ which does not depend on g .

We will prove Theorem 1.1 by concretely constructing a genus g Lefschetz fibration over the torus with six or five singular fibers for arbitrary $g \geq 3$ or

$g \geq 7$, respectively. This will be done by providing new relations in the mapping class group of the surface of genus g , which are in the form that a product of five or six right hand Dehn twists is equal to a single commutator.

The contents of this paper are as follows. Section 2 consists of the fundamental concepts on Lefschetz fibrations. In particular, we will illustrate the fact that Lefschetz fibrations can be obtained from a certain type of relations in the mapping class groups of fiber surfaces. In Section 3 we will introduce Matsumoto's relation and the 7-holed torus relation in the mapping class groups of holed surfaces, which will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.1. Finally, in Section 4 we will prove Theorem 1.1. We will regard Matsumoto's relation and the 7-holed torus relation as relations in the mapping class groups of other closed surfaces by embedding the original holed surfaces into the closed surfaces. Then we will transform the relations to new ones, which will prove Theorem 1.1.

Acknowledgement. The author would like to thank Hisaaki Endo, Kenta Hayano, Susumu Hirose, Yukio Matsumoto, Naoyuki Monden and Yoshihisa Sato for helpful comments and invaluable advice on Lefschetz fibrations or on the surface mapping class groups. In particular, the author would like to thank Naoyuki Monden for several discussions on $N(g, h)$. Finally, the author would like to express his deepest gratitude to his supervisor Osamu Saeki for his constant encouragement and many useful discussions.

2 Lefschetz fibrations

We recall some basic definitions and facts about Lefschetz fibrations (for details, see [3]). Let X^4 be a connected, oriented and closed smooth 4-dimensional manifold, and Σ_g be the connected, oriented and closed smooth 2-dimensional manifold with genus g . A smooth map $f : X^4 \rightarrow \Sigma_h$ is called a *Lefschetz fibration over Σ_h* if f has only finitely many critical points p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n , around each of which f is expressed as $(z_1, z_2) \mapsto z_1^2 + z_2^2$ by local complex coordinates compatible with the orientations of the manifolds. We assume the critical values $b_i = f(p_i)$ are distinct. The inverse image of a regular value (or a critical value) is called a *regular fiber* (resp. a *singular fiber*). We will also assume that the regular fibers are connected. Since f is a submersion on the complement of singular fibers, the restriction $f : X^4 \setminus (f^{-1}(b_1) \cup f^{-1}(b_2) \cup \dots \cup f^{-1}(b_n)) \rightarrow \Sigma_h \setminus \{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n\}$ is a Σ_g -bundle over $\Sigma_h \setminus \{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n\}$ for some Σ_g . The *genus* of the Lefschetz fibration is defined to be the genus of a regular fiber. Furthermore, in this paper, we assume the relative minimality and the non-triviality. A Lefschetz fibration is said to be *relatively minimal* if there is no fiber which contains a (-1) -sphere (embedded sphere with self-intersection -1), and *non-trivial* if it has at least one singular fiber. The singular fiber $f^{-1}(b_i)$ is obtained by “crushing” a simple closed curve c_i , called the *vanishing cycle*, on a nearby regular fiber to a point. If the vanishing cycle is separating (or non-separating), then the corresponding singular fiber is said to be *reducible* (resp. *irreducible*). Two Lefschetz fibrations $f : X \rightarrow \Sigma_h$ and $f' : X' \rightarrow \Sigma_h$ are said to




Figure 1: The oriented loop γ_i on Σ_h




Figure 2: Right hand Dehn twist t_{c_i} along the simple closed curve c_i

be *isomorphic* if there are orientation-preserving diffeomorphisms $\Psi : X \rightarrow X'$ and $\psi : \Sigma_h \rightarrow \Sigma_h$ such that $f' \circ \Psi = \psi \circ f$.

There is a good relation between Lefschetz fibrations and the surface mapping class groups (for details, see [8]). We fix a regular value $b_0 \in \Sigma_h$ and an identification ι between the regular fiber $f^{-1}(b_0)$ and the model surface Σ_g . Let γ be a smooth loop in Σ_h based at b_0 . Then the pull-back bundle $\gamma^*(f)$ is described as $\Sigma_g \times [0, 1]$ with $\Sigma_g \times 0$ and $\Sigma_g \times 1$ being identified via an orientation-preserving diffeomorphism ϕ from Σ_g to itself: $f^{-1}(\gamma) \cong \Sigma_g \times [0, 1] / (x, 1) \sim (\phi(x), 0)$. Let \mathcal{M}_g be the mapping class group of genus g which consists of all isotopy classes of orientation-preserving diffeomorphisms of Σ_g . Then the map $\Phi : \pi_1(\Sigma_g \setminus \{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n\}, b_0) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_g$ which maps γ to ϕ is well-defined, and becomes an anti-homomorphism. Here we do not distinguish a curve or a diffeomorphism from its homotopy or isotopy class, respectively, and we will use this convention throughout this paper. We call the map Φ the *monodromy representation* of the Lefschetz fibration f . Let γ_i be a loop on $\Sigma_g \setminus \{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n\}$ based at b_0 which surrounds exclusively b_i with the orientation as depicted in Figure 1. The monodromy representation Φ maps γ_i to the right hand Dehn twist t_{c_i} along the corresponding vanishing cycle c_i : $\Phi(\gamma_i) = t_{c_i}$ (see Figure 2). If we change the identification $\iota : f^{-1}(b_0) \rightarrow \Sigma_g$ to another one, then the mon-




Figure 3: The generators of $\pi_1(\Sigma_h \setminus \{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n\}, b_0)$

odromy representation Φ changes to $\rho\Phi\rho^{-1}$ for some $\rho \in \mathcal{M}_g$. A Lefschetz fibration determines the monodromy representation up to such a conjugation. Conversely, if an anti-homomorphism $\Phi : \pi_1(\Sigma_h \setminus \{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n\}, b_0) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_g$ which maps each γ_i to a right hand Dehn twist is given, then one can construct a relatively minimal genus g Lefschetz fibration over Σ_h with its monodromy representation Φ . Moreover, if $g \geq 2$, then such a Lefschetz fibration is determined uniquely up to an isomorphism.

Furthermore, Lefschetz fibrations correspond to a certain type of relations in the mapping class groups. The fundamental group $\pi_1(\Sigma_h \setminus \{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n\}, b_0)$ has the finite presentation

$$\pi_1(\Sigma_h \setminus \{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n\}, b_0) = \langle \alpha_j, \beta_j, \gamma_i \mid \prod_{j=1}^h [\alpha_j, \beta_j] = \prod_{i=1}^n \gamma_i \rangle,$$

where α_j, β_j ($j = 1, 2, \dots, h$) and γ_i ($i = 1, 2, \dots, n$) are the loops as indicated in Figure 3, and $[\alpha_j, \beta_j] = \alpha_j\beta_j\alpha_j^{-1}\beta_j^{-1}$ represents the commutator of α_j and β_j . Thus, a monodromy representation Φ satisfies $\prod_j [\Phi(\alpha_j), \Phi(\beta_j)] = \prod_i t_{c_i}$ and $t_{c_i} = \Phi(\gamma_i)$ are right hand Dehn twists. We call this relation the *global monodromy* or the *monodromy factorization* of the Lefschetz fibration corresponding to Φ . Conversely, if there is a relation in the form that “a product of n right hand Dehn twists is equal to a product of h commutators in \mathcal{M}_g ”,

$$\prod_{j=1}^h [\phi_j, \psi_j] = \prod_{i=1}^n t_{c_i},$$

then we can define the anti-homomorphism $\Phi : \pi_1(\Sigma_h \setminus \{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n\}, b_0) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_g$ by setting $\Phi(\alpha_j) = \phi_j$, $\Phi(\beta_j) = \psi_j$ and $\Phi(\gamma_i) = t_{c_i}$. Consequently, we can construct a genus g Lefschetz fibration over Σ_h with n singular fibers such that its vanishing cycles are the simple closed curves c_i .




Figure 4: The curves for Matsumoto's relation




Figure 5: The curves for Matsumoto's relation with boundary

3 Mapping class groups of holed surfaces

We will use the following notations:

$\Sigma = \Sigma_g^k$: the compact oriented surface of genus g with k boundary components,

$\text{Diff}^+(\Sigma, \partial\Sigma)$: the group of orientation preserving self-diffeomorphisms of Σ that are the identity on the boundary,

$\text{Diff}_0^+(\Sigma, \partial\Sigma)$: the normal subgroup of $\text{Diff}^+(\Sigma, \partial\Sigma)$ consisting of all elements isotopic to the identity relative to the boundary,

$\mathcal{M}(\Sigma) = \text{Diff}^+(\Sigma, \partial\Sigma) / \text{Diff}_0^+(\Sigma, \partial\Sigma)$: the mapping class group of Σ ,

$$\mathcal{M}_g^k = \mathcal{M}(\Sigma_g^k), \quad \Sigma_g = \Sigma_g^0, \quad \mathcal{M}_g = \mathcal{M}_g^0.$$

We will use the functional notation for the product of \mathcal{M}_g^k , namely, for two elements ϕ and ψ in \mathcal{M}_g^k the product $\psi\phi$ means that we first apply ϕ and then ψ . In the following, for a simple closed curve α , the right hand Dehn twist t_α along α will often be written as α , and the left hand Dehn twist t_α^{-1} as $\bar{\alpha}$, for simplicity.




Figure 6: The curves filling up Σ_2^2

3.1 Matsumoto's relation

Matsumoto [8] constructed a genus 2 Lefschetz fibration over the sphere on $(S^2 \times T^2) \# 4\overline{CP}_2$ with eight singular fibers. The global monodromy of the Lefschetz fibration is

$$1 = (B_0 B_1 B_2 C)^2,$$

where the curves are as indicated in Figure 4.

In [5] Korkmaz mentioned that the relation

$$\delta_1 \delta_2 = (B_0 B_1 B_2 C)^2$$

holds in \mathcal{M}_2^2 , where δ_1 and δ_2 are as depicted in Figure 5, without proof. For completeness, we give a proof here.

Lemma 3.1. *We have $\delta_1 \delta_2 = (B_0 B_1 B_2 C)^2$ in \mathcal{M}_2^2 .*

Proof. Here we use the symbol t_α for the right hand Dehn twist along a simple closed curve α in order to distinguish maps from curves. We can determine whether two diffeomorphisms of a surface belong to the same mapping class or not by looking at their actions on a well-chosen collection of oriented curves which fill up the surface and which satisfies some technical assumptions (for details, see [2] in which this method is called the *Alexander method*). We choose such a collection of curves $\{\gamma_i\}$ filling up Σ_2^2 as in Figure 6. If the actions of $t_{\delta_1} t_{\delta_2}$ and $(t_{B_0} t_{B_1} t_{B_2} t_C)^2$ on this system coincide, then they also coincide as mapping classes. Indeed, their actions are identical as shown in Figures 7 – 11. (In the figures the orientations of the surfaces are the same as that indicated in Figure 5.) \square




Figure 7: $t_{\delta_1 t_{\delta_2}}(\gamma_1) = (t_{B_0} t_{B_1} t_{B_2} t_C)^2(\gamma_1)$




Figure 8: $t_{\delta_1 t_{\delta_2}}(\gamma_2) = (t_{B_0 t_{B_1} t_{B_2} t_C})^2(\gamma_2)$




Figure 9: $t_{\delta_1} t_{\delta_2}(\gamma_3) = (t_{B_0} t_{B_1} t_{B_2} t_C)^2(\gamma_3)$. Note that $t_{B_0} t_{B_1} t_{B_2} t_C(\gamma_3) = \gamma_5$ and $t_{B_0} t_{B_1} t_{B_2} t_C(\gamma_5) = \gamma_3$.




Figure 10: $t_{\delta_1 t_{\delta_2}}(\gamma_4) = (t_{B_0} t_{B_1} t_{B_2} t_C)^2(\gamma_4)$




Figure 11: $t_{\delta_1 t_{\delta_2}}(\gamma_5) = (t_{B_0} t_{B_1} t_{B_2} t_C)^2(\gamma_5)$. Compare with Figure 9.




Figure 12: 1-holed torus




Figure 13: 2-holed torus

3.2 k -holed torus relations

Korkmaz and Ozbagci [7] systematically constructed k -holed torus relations, which represent the product of the right hand Dehn twists along the simple closed curves δ_i parallel to the boundary components of the k -holed torus Σ_1^k as the product of the right hand Dehn twists along certain essential simple closed curves α_j , in the form

$$\delta_1 \delta_2 \cdots \delta_k = \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \cdots \alpha_l \quad \text{in } \mathcal{M}_1^k.$$

For example, they started with the well-known 1-holed torus relation

$$\delta_1 = (\alpha\beta)^6,$$

where the curves are as depicted in Figure 12. By combining the 1-holed torus relation with the lantern relation, they obtained the 2-holed torus relation

$$\delta_1 \delta_2 = (\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \beta)^4,$$

which is also well-known, where the curves are as depicted in Figure 13. They successively constructed the $(k + 1)$ -holed torus relation by combining the k -holed torus relation with the *lantern relation* (see, also [7]) until they obtained the 9-holed torus relation. However, for some reason, we will use the 7-holed




Figure 14: 7-holed torus

torus relation

$$\delta_1 \delta_2 \delta_3 \delta_4 \delta_5 \delta_6 \delta_7 = \alpha_3 \alpha_4 \alpha_1 \beta \sigma_5 \alpha_2 \beta_5 \sigma_3 \sigma_6 \alpha_6 \beta_3 \sigma_4,$$

where $\delta_1, \delta_2, \dots, \delta_7, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_7, \beta, \sigma_3, \sigma_4, \sigma_5$ and σ_6 are as depicted in Figure 14, and $\beta_3 = \alpha_3 \beta \bar{\alpha}_3$ and $\beta_5 = \alpha_5 \beta \bar{\alpha}_5$.

4 Proof of the upper bounds

Now, we prove Theorem 1.1 by constructing Lefschetz fibrations with the claimed number of singular fibers. Matsumoto's relation will be used for the proof of Theorem 1.1 (1), and the 7-holed torus relation will be used for (2). It is convenient to recall the following well-known lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *Let α and β be simple closed curves in Σ_g^k .*

(1) *If $\alpha \cap \beta = \emptyset$, then $t_\alpha t_\beta = t_\beta t_\alpha$.*

(2) *For any $\phi \in \mathcal{M}_g^k$, we have $t_{\phi(\alpha)} = \phi t_\alpha \phi^{-1}$.*

In particular, a conjugate of a right hand Dehn twist is also a right hand Dehn twist.

Proof of Theorem 1.1 (1). We embed the surface Σ_2^2 into Σ_{3+k} ($k \geq 0$) as in Figure 15. Then, by Lemma 3.1 we have




Figure 15: Embedding Σ_2^2 in Σ_{3+k}




Figure 16: $\Sigma_{3+k} \setminus (B_2 \cup \delta_1)$ and $\Sigma_{3+k} \setminus (B_1 \cup \delta_2)$ are both connected.

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_1 \delta_2 &= (B_0 B_1 B_2 C)^2 \\
&= B_0 B_1 B_2 C B_0 B_1 B_2 C \\
&= B_1 B_2 (\overline{B_2} \overline{B_1} B_0 B_1 B_2) C B_0 B_1 B_2 C \\
&= B_1 B_2 B'_0 C B_0 B_1 B_2 C,
\end{aligned}$$

where $B'_0 = \overline{B_2} \overline{B_1} B_0 B_1 B_2$ is a right hand Dehn twist by Lemma 4.1 (2). Multiplying $\overline{B_2} \overline{B_1}$ to the both sides, we obtain

$$\overline{B_2} \overline{B_1} \delta_1 \delta_2 = B'_0 C B_0 B_1 B_2 C.$$

Then the term on the left hand side is a commutator. To see this, by using Lemma 4.1 (1) we first rearrange it as

$$\overline{B_2} \overline{B_1} \delta_1 \delta_2 = (\overline{B_2} \delta_1) (\overline{B_1} \delta_2).$$

We observe that if one cuts Σ_{3+k} along B_2 and δ_1 , then the resulting surface is still connected. If one cuts Σ_{3+k} along B_1 and δ_2 , then the resulting surface is also connected (see Figure 16). By the classification of surfaces, this observation implies that there exists an element $\phi \in \mathcal{M}_{3+k}$ such that $\phi(\delta_1) = B_1$ and




Figure 17: Embedding Σ_1^7 in Σ_{7+k}

$\phi(B_2) = \delta_2$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\overline{B_2\delta_1})(\overline{B_1\delta_2}) &= \overline{B_2\delta_1\phi(\delta_1)}\phi(B_2) \\
 &= \overline{B_2\delta_1\phi\overline{\delta_1}\phi^{-1}\phi B_2\phi^{-1}} \\
 &= (\overline{B_2\delta_1})\phi(\overline{\delta_1}B_2)\phi^{-1} \\
 &= [\overline{B_2\delta_1}, \phi].
 \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we obtain

$$[\overline{B_2\delta_1}, \phi] = \underbrace{B'_0 C B_0 B_1 B_2 C}_6.$$

As we have mentioned before, this relation enables us to construct, for all $g = k + 3 \geq 3$, a genus g Lefschetz fibration over the torus with six singular fibers, i.e., $N(g, 1) \leq 6$ for all $g \geq 3$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.1 (2). For the 7-holed torus relation, the same procedure as above works well as follows. (In fact, the k -holed torus relations ($2 \leq k \leq 7$) can be used similarly to prove $N(g, 1) \leq 12 - k$ for all $g \geq k$.)

Embed the 7-holed torus Σ_1^7 into Σ_{7+k} ($k \geq 0$) as in Figure 17. Then we rewrite the 7-holed torus relation as

$$\begin{aligned}
 \delta_1\delta_2\delta_3\delta_4\delta_5\delta_6\delta_7 &= \alpha_3\alpha_4\alpha_1\beta\sigma_5\alpha_2\beta_5\sigma_3\sigma_6\alpha_6\beta_3\sigma_4 \\
 &= \alpha_3\alpha_4\alpha_1\sigma_5\alpha_2\sigma_6\alpha_6(\overline{\alpha_6\sigma_6\alpha_2\sigma_5})\beta(\sigma_5\alpha_2\sigma_6\alpha_6) \\
 &\quad (\overline{\alpha_6\sigma_6})\beta_5(\sigma_6\alpha_6)(\overline{\alpha_6\sigma_6})\sigma_3(\sigma_6\alpha_6)\beta_3\sigma_4 \\
 &= \alpha_3\alpha_4\alpha_1\sigma_5\alpha_2\sigma_6\alpha_6\beta'\beta'_5\sigma'_3\beta_3\sigma_4,
 \end{aligned}$$

where $\beta' = (\overline{\alpha_6\sigma_6\alpha_2\sigma_5})\beta(\sigma_5\alpha_2\sigma_6\alpha_6)$, $\beta'_5 = (\overline{\alpha_6\sigma_6})\beta_5(\sigma_6\alpha_6)$ and $\sigma'_3 = (\overline{\alpha_6\sigma_6})\sigma_3(\sigma_6\alpha_6)$ are right hand Dehn twists. Multiplying the inverse of $\alpha_3\alpha_4\alpha_1\sigma_5\alpha_2\sigma_6\alpha_6$




Figure 18: $\Sigma_{7+k} \setminus (\alpha_6 \cup \delta_1 \cup \alpha_1 \cup \delta_4 \cup \alpha_2 \cup \delta_5 \cup \alpha_3)$ and $\Sigma_{7+k} \setminus (\delta_2 \cup \sigma_5 \cup \delta_3 \cup \sigma_6 \cup \delta_6 \cup \alpha_4 \cup \delta_7)$ are both connected. Note that the boundary components of Σ_1^7 are connected in Σ_{7+k} .

to the both sides, and rearranging the left hand side by using Lemma 4.1 (1), we obtain

$$(\bar{\alpha}_6 \delta_1 \bar{\alpha}_1 \delta_4 \bar{\alpha}_2 \delta_5 \bar{\alpha}_3)(\delta_2 \bar{\sigma}_5 \delta_3 \bar{\sigma}_6 \delta_6 \bar{\alpha}_4 \delta_7) = \beta' \beta'_5 \sigma'_3 \beta_3 \sigma_4.$$

We observe that if one cuts Σ_{7+k} along $\alpha_6, \delta_1, \alpha_1, \delta_4, \alpha_2, \delta_5$ and α_3 , then the resulting surface is still connected. If one cuts Σ_{7+k} along $\delta_2, \sigma_5, \delta_3, \sigma_6, \delta_6, \alpha_4$ and δ_7 , then the resulting surface is also connected (see Figure 18). Therefore there exists an element $\phi \in \mathcal{M}_{7+k}$ such that $\phi(\alpha_3) = \delta_2, \phi(\delta_5) = \sigma_5, \phi(\alpha_2) = \delta_3, \phi(\delta_4) = \sigma_6, \phi(\alpha_1) = \delta_6, \phi(\delta_1) = \alpha_4$ and $\phi(\alpha_6) = \delta_7$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (\bar{\alpha}_6 \delta_1 \bar{\alpha}_1 \delta_4 \bar{\alpha}_2 \delta_5 \bar{\alpha}_3)(\delta_2 \bar{\sigma}_5 \delta_3 \bar{\sigma}_6 \delta_6 \bar{\alpha}_4 \delta_7) \\ &= \bar{\alpha}_6 \delta_1 \bar{\alpha}_1 \delta_4 \bar{\alpha}_2 \delta_5 \bar{\alpha}_3 \phi(\alpha_3) \overline{\phi(\delta_5)} \phi(\alpha_2) \overline{\phi(\delta_4)} \phi(\alpha_1) \overline{\phi(\delta_1)} \phi(\alpha_6) \\ &= \bar{\alpha}_6 \delta_1 \bar{\alpha}_1 \delta_4 \bar{\alpha}_2 \delta_5 \bar{\alpha}_3 \phi \alpha_3 \phi^{-1} \phi \bar{\delta}_5 \phi^{-1} \phi \alpha_2 \phi^{-1} \phi \bar{\delta}_4 \phi^{-1} \phi \alpha_1 \phi^{-1} \phi \bar{\delta}_1 \phi^{-1} \phi \alpha_6 \phi^{-1} \\ &= (\bar{\alpha}_6 \delta_1 \bar{\alpha}_1 \delta_4 \bar{\alpha}_2 \delta_5 \bar{\alpha}_3) \phi(\alpha_3 \bar{\delta}_5 \alpha_2 \bar{\delta}_4 \alpha_1 \bar{\delta}_1 \alpha_6) \phi^{-1} \\ &= [\bar{\alpha}_6 \delta_1 \bar{\alpha}_1 \delta_4 \bar{\alpha}_2 \delta_5 \bar{\alpha}_3, \phi]. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we obtain

$$[\bar{\alpha}_6 \delta_1 \bar{\alpha}_1 \delta_4 \bar{\alpha}_2 \delta_5 \bar{\alpha}_3, \phi] = \underbrace{\beta' \beta'_5 \sigma'_3 \beta_3 \sigma_4}_5.$$

This relation implies the existence of a genus g Lefschetz fibration over the torus with five singular fibers, for all $g \geq 7$, i.e., $N(g, 1) \leq 5$ for all $g \geq 7$. \square

Remark 4.1. (1) If we could apply the same procedure as above to the 8-holed torus relation or the 9-holed torus relation, then we would obtain $N(g, 1) \leq 4$ for all $g \geq 8$ or $N(g, 1) \leq 3$ for all $g \geq 9$, respectively. However, it is impossible

to do that, since the simple closed curves appearing in these relations are so complicated that we cannot choose two disjoint collections of these curves such that the surface obtained by cutting along each collection of curves is connected. (2) There is a possibility that the monodromy of Xiao's fibration [12] can be used to prove $N(g, 1) \leq 5$ for all $g \geq 3$. As we mentioned in Section 1, Xiao has discovered a genus 2 Lefschetz fibration over the sphere with seven singular fibers. Although the exact monodromy of Xiao's fibration has not been known yet, by the existence of such a Lefschetz fibration we know that there exists a relation in \mathcal{M}_2 such as

$$c_1 c_2 c_3 c_4 c_5 c_6 c_7 = 1,$$

where the curves c_i are essential simple closed curves in Σ_2 . Moreover, from the information of the abelianization of \mathcal{M}_2 , we can deduce that four of c_i are non-separating and the other three are separating. In addition, let us assume that the relation can be lifted in \mathcal{M}_2^2 in a form

$$\tilde{c}_1 \tilde{c}_2 \tilde{c}_3 \tilde{c}_4 \tilde{c}_5 \tilde{c}_6 \tilde{c}_7 = \delta_1 \delta_2,$$

where the curves \tilde{c}_i are simple closed curves in Σ_2^2 such that $P(\tilde{c}_i) = c_i$ for the natural homomorphism $P : \mathcal{M}_2^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_2$, and δ_1 and δ_2 are the simple closed curves in Σ_2^2 parallel to the boundary components. Then our technique used to prove Theorem 1.1 can be applied to the above relation by embedding Σ_2^2 into Σ_{3+k} ($k \geq 0$). This argument would imply $N(g, 1) \leq 5$ for all $g \geq 3$. Note that the assumption of the existence of $\{\tilde{c}_i\}$ is equivalent to the existence of a genus 2 Lefschetz fibration over the sphere with seven singular fibers and two disjoint (-1) -sections (cf. [7]).

References

- [1] C. Cadavid, *On a remarkable set of words in the mapping class group*, Thesis (Ph.D.), The University of Texas at Austin, 1998.
- [2] B. Farb and D. Margalit, *A primer on mapping class groups*, version 4.08. <http://www.math.utah.edu/~margalit/primer/>
- [3] R. E. Gompf and A. I. Stipsicz, *4-manifolds and Kirby calculus*, Graduate Studies in Math., Vol. 20, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1999.
- [4] M. Korkmaz, *Noncomplex smooth 4-manifolds with Lefschetz fibrations*, Internat. Math. Res. Notices **2001** (2001), 115–128.
- [5] M. Korkmaz, *Lefschetz fibrations and an invariant of finitely presented groups*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN **2009** (2009), 1547–1572.
- [6] M. Korkmaz and B. Ozbagci, *Minimal number of singular fibers in a Lefschetz fibration*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **129** (2001), 1545–1549.
- [7] M. Korkmaz and B. Ozbagci, *On sections of elliptic fibrations*, Michigan Math. J. **56** (2008), 77–87.

- [8] Y. Matsumoto, *Lefschetz fibrations of genus two – a topological approach*, Topology and Teichmüller spaces, Proceedings of the 37th Taniguchi Symposium, pp. 123–148, World Scientific, River Edge, NJ, 1996.
- [9] N. Monden, *On minimal number of singular fibers in a genus-2 Lefschetz fibration*, Tokyo J. Math., to appear.
- [10] B. Ozbagci, *Signatures of Lefschetz fibrations*, Pacific J. Math. **202** (2002), 99–118.
- [11] A. I. Stipsicz, *On the number of vanishing cycles in Lefschetz fibrations*, Math. Res. Lett. **6** (1999), 449–456.
- [12] G. Xiao, *Surfaces fibrées en courbes de genre deux*, Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 1137, Springer-Verlag, 1985.