

ALGEBRAICALLY OVERTWISTED TIGHT 3-MANIFOLDS FROM +1 SURGERIES

YOULIN LI AND ZHENGYI ZHOU

ABSTRACT. We execute Avdek’s algorithm to find many algebraically overtwisted and tight 3-manifolds by contact +1 surgeries. In particular, we show that a contact $1/k$ surgery on the standard contact 3-sphere along any positive torus knot with the maximum Thurston–Bennequin invariant yields an algebraically overtwisted and tight 3-manifold, where k is a positive integer.

1. INTRODUCTION

It is a fundamental question to understand the boundary between flexibility and rigidity phenomena in symplectic and contact topology. An example in the context of contact structures is whether overtwisted contact structures can be characterized using holomorphic curves. One natural candidate is the contact Ozsváth–Szabó invariant in dimension 3 [OS05], as its vanishing is a necessary condition for overtwistedness. However, it is not a sufficient condition [GHvHM07]. Another natural candidate, which works for any dimension, is the vanishing of the contact homology, as Bourgeois and van Koert [BvK10] showed that contact homology vanishes for any overtwisted contact manifold. Therefore Bourgeois and Niederkrüger [BN10] introduced the concept of algebraically overtwisted manifolds to mean those contact manifolds with vanishing contact homology. The insufficiency of algebraic overtwistedness to determine tightness was obtained quite recently by Avdek [Avd23] in dimension 3 by showing that contact $1/k$ (k is a positive integer) surgery along a right-handed trefoil with maximum Thurston–Bennequin invariant is algebraically overtwisted, yet still tight by [LS04]. In this note, we execute Avdek’s algorithm to find more algebraically overtwisted tight 3-manifolds from contact +1 surgeries. Let Λ be a legendrian knot in (S^3, ξ_{std}) , we denote the contact 3-manifold obtained by contact $1/k$ surgery along Λ by $(S^3_{1/k}(\Lambda), \xi_{1/k}(\Lambda))$. At first, we consider the cases where the Legendrian knots are positive torus knots.

Theorem 1.1. *Let Λ be a Legendrian positive torus knot with the maximum Thurston–Bennequin invariant in (S^3, ξ_{std}) , then $(S^3_{1/k}(\Lambda), \xi_{1/k}(\Lambda))$ is algebraically overtwisted and tight for $k \in \mathbb{N}$.*

We also consider the cases where the Legendrian knots are rainbow closures of positive braids, see Figure 1 for an example.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_{p-1}$ be the generators of the p -strand braid group. Let Λ be a Legendrian knot which is the rainbow closure of a positive braid*

$$(\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_{p-2} \sigma_{p-1})^{q_1} (\sigma_{p-p_2+1} \cdots \sigma_{p-2} \sigma_{p-1})^{q_2} \cdots (\sigma_{p-p_N+1} \cdots \sigma_{p-2} \sigma_{p-1})^{q_N}, q_i > 0$$

and has the maximum Thurston–Bennequin invariant. Then $(S^3_{1/k}(\Lambda), \xi_{1/k}(\Lambda))$ is algebraically overtwisted and tight for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ when $q_1 \gg 0$. When $N = 2$ and $p_2 = p - 1$, $(S^3_{1/k}(\Lambda), \xi_{1/k}(\Lambda))$ is algebraically overtwisted and tight for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ if $q_1 > 1$.




FIGURE 1. A Legendrian knot which is the rainbow closure of the braid $(\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3)^3(\sigma_2\sigma_3)^3$.

All the knots discussed above, including the positive torus knots, are rainbow closures of positive braids with the maximum Thurston–Bennequin invariants. Based on this observation, we propose the following conjecture.

Conjecture 1.3. *Let Λ be a Legendrian knot which is the rainbow closure of a positive braid and has the maximum Thurston–Bennequin invariant, then $(S^3_{1/k}(\Lambda), \xi_{1/k}(\Lambda))$ is algebraically overtwisted and tight for $k \in \mathbb{N}$.*

To show the vanishing of contact homology after a contact $+1$ surgery, Avdek’s algorithm reduces the problem into showing a set of linear inequalities can only have the trivial solution. While this approach often leads to an algebraically overtwisted contact manifold, applying this algorithm to general knots can be challenging. Additionally, we show by explicit computations that contact $1/k$ surgeries along Chekanov’s Legendrian 5_2 knots also result in algebraically overtwisted and tight 3-manifolds.

Acknowledgments. We thank Russell Avdek for helpful comments on a preliminary version of the paper. Y.L. is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 12271349. Z.Z. is supported by the National Key R&D Program of China under Grant No. 2023YFA1010500, the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 12288201 and 12231010.

2. AVDEK’S ALGORITHM

In [Avd23], Avdek gave descriptions of homology classes, Conley-Zehnder indices, and mostly importantly, the intersection grading of Reeb orbits from the chords-to-orbits correspondence in contact ± 1 surgeries. The proof of [Avd23, Theorem 1.2] used all of this information. A key simplification used in [Avd23, Theorem 1.2] is that the Conley-Zehnder index in the chords-to-orbits correspondences is bounded below by the word length, which reduces to considering only those orbits from single chords. This property still holds for rainbow closures of positive braids, and Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 boil down to showing a system of inequalities does not have non-trivial solutions from the intersection grading only, while the additional consideration of homology in [Avd23, §12.5.3] is not necessary. In this section, we recall Avdek’s chords-to-orbits correspondence and its properties that are relevant to us.

2.1. Chords to orbits correspondence. Let $(\mathbb{R}^3_{\Lambda^+}, \xi_{\Lambda^+})$ ($(S^3_{\Lambda^+}, \xi_{\Lambda^+})$, resp.) be the contact 3-manifold obtained by contact $+1$ surgery on $(\mathbb{R}^3, \xi_{std})$ ((S^3, ξ_{std}) , resp.) along a Legendrian knot Λ .

Theorem 2.1 ([Avd23, Theorem 5.1 (1)]). *There exists a contact form α_ϵ on $(\mathbb{R}^3_{\Lambda^+}, \xi_{\Lambda^+})$, such that there exists a one-to-one correspondence¹ between closed orbits of R_ϵ (Reeb vector field for α_ϵ) with cyclic words of the Reeb chords of $\Lambda \subset (\mathbb{R}^3, \xi_{std})$. Here the Reeb chords are computed using the standard contact form $dz - ydx$.*

For chords c_i , we use (c_1, \dots, c_n) to denote the Reeb orbit corresponding to the cyclic word $c_1 \dots c_n$. On the other hand, given a Reeb orbit of R_ϵ , we use $\text{cw}(\gamma)$ to denote the corresponding cyclic word of Reeb chords. By $\text{wl}(\gamma)$, we mean the word length of $\text{cw}(\gamma)$. For Reeb orbit γ of R_ϵ and Reeb chords c_i of Λ , we define contact actions

$$\mathcal{A}(\gamma) := \int \gamma^* \alpha_\epsilon, \quad \mathcal{A}(c_1 \dots c_n) := \sum_{i=1}^n \int c_i^* (dz - ydx).$$

Proposition 2.2 ([Avd23, Proposition 5.13]). *For all Reeb orbit γ of R_ϵ we have*

$$|\mathcal{A}(\gamma) - \mathcal{A}(\text{cw}(\gamma))| < 3\epsilon \text{wl}(\gamma).$$

If we orient the Legendrian knot Λ and its meridian μ as in Figure 2, then μ is a generator of $H_1(\mathbb{R}^3_{\Lambda^+}; \mathbb{Z})$ and is subject to the relation $(\text{tb}(\Lambda) + 1)\mu = 0$.




FIGURE 2. Default orientations of meridians

Let $c_1 \dots c_n$ be a cyclic word of Reeb chords. We define the push-out loop $P(c_1 \dots c_n)$ in the complement $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus N_\epsilon(\Lambda)$, which is homotopic to the orbit $(c_1 \dots c_n)$. Here $N_\epsilon(\Lambda)$ is a tubular neighborhood of Λ , where the surgery applies. The push-out in the Lagrangian projection is described as follows: We start with the end point of the chord c_1 , then follow the direction of the Legendrian knot pushed to the left of the knot to the starting point of c_2 , then we follow the Reeb chord to the end point of c_2 and repeat the procedure until it is closed, see Figure 3. In the terminology of [Avd23, §9.4], our push-outs are the push-outs using positive capping paths $\eta_{j_k, j_{k+1}}$ for the +1 surgery (ref. [Avd23, Figure 19]).




FIGURE 3. Push-outs of the Reeb orbits.

¹Strictly speaking, this correspondence works for orbits with an action upper bound, which will go to infinity if $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. In practice, the argument in this note works for $\epsilon \ll 1$.

2.2. Intersection grading and holomorphic curves. The Lagrangian projection of the Legendrian knot divides \mathbb{R}^2 into several bounded regions and an unbounded region. We consider an ϵ neighborhood N_ϵ of Λ , such that the complement of the Lagrangian projection of N_ϵ has the same components with the complement of the Lagrangian projection of Λ . We order the components of the complement of the Lagrangian projection of N_ϵ by R_1, \dots, R_K and R_0 be the unbounded region. [Avd23, §11] defined an intersection index \mathcal{I}_Λ of null-homologous loops $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_p$ in $\mathbb{R}_{\Lambda^+}^3$ that is contained in $\mathbb{R}_{\Lambda^+}^3 \setminus (\cup_{i=0}^K \mathbb{R}_z \times R_i)$ as follows. Let $(x_i, y_i) \in R_i$ for $i > 0$, the intersection grading in $\mathbb{Z}\langle R_i \rangle$ of $\sum \gamma_i$ is given by

$$\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\sum \gamma_i) = \sum ((x_i, y_i) \times \mathbb{R}_z \cdot D) R_i \in \mathbb{Z}\langle R_1, \dots, R_K \rangle,$$

where D is singular chain in $\mathbb{R}_{\Lambda^+}^3$, such that $\partial D = \sum \gamma_i$, $(x_i, y_i) \times \mathbb{R}_z \cdot D$ is the intersection number, which is independent of D and (x_i, y_i) . Those intersection gradings do not change if boundary loops are cobordant in $\mathbb{R}_{\Lambda^+}^3 \setminus (\cup_{i=0}^K \mathbb{R}_z \times R_i)$. The intersection grading is clearly linear w.r.t. the union of loop collections with trivial homology classes, i.e.

$$\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\sum \gamma_i + \sum \delta_i) = \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\sum \gamma_i) + \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\sum \delta_i).$$

In the computation of contact homology, we will choose almost complex structure such that $\mathbb{R}_s \times (x_i, y_i) \times \mathbb{R}_z \in \mathbb{R}_s \times \mathbb{R}_{\Lambda^+}^3$ is holomorphic. As a consequence, we have the following constraint from positivity of intersection, which makes the intersection grading a useful tool to exclude certain holomorphic curves in the contact homology computation.

Here we fix our notion for contact homology for both closed manifolds and sutured manifolds. Let γ be a closed Reeb orbit, we use q_γ to denote the formal variable associated with γ . We use ∂_{CH} to denote the differential in contact homology.

Proposition 2.3 ([Avd23, Discussions before §12.5]). *If there is a contact homology differential from q_{γ_0} to $q_{\gamma_1} \dots q_{\gamma_m}$, then*

$$\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\gamma_0 - \sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_i) \geq 0.$$

The intersection grading is defined, as $\gamma_0 - \sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_i$ is null-homologous by the existence of contact homology differential.

Let μ and λ be the meridian and longitude of Λ following the orientation convention in Figure 2, where λ is induced by a Seifert surface. Then

$$\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\lambda) = \sum_i \text{wind}(\Lambda, R_i) R_i, \tag{2.1}$$

where $\text{wind}(\Lambda, R_i)$ is the winding number of Λ around the bounded region R_i . Since $\lambda + (tb(\Lambda) + 1)\mu$ is null-homologous in $\mathbb{R}_{\Lambda^+}^3 \setminus (\cup_{i=0}^K \mathbb{R}_z \times R_i)$, we have

$$\mathcal{I}_\Lambda((tb(\Lambda) + 1)\mu) = -\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\lambda) = -\sum_i \text{wind}(\Lambda, R_i) R_i. \tag{2.2}$$

2.3. Rational intersection grading. We assume $tb(\Lambda) \neq -1$, then every Reeb orbit in $(\mathbb{R}_{\Lambda^+}^3, \xi_{\Lambda^+})$ represents a torsion homology class. Therefore for any Reeb orbit γ (which is contained in $\mathbb{R}_{\Lambda^+}^3 \setminus (\cup_{i=0}^K \mathbb{R}_z \times R_i)$), there exists a positive integer d such that $d\gamma$ is null-homologous. Then we define

$$\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\gamma) := \frac{1}{d} \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(d\gamma) \in \mathbb{Q}\langle R_i \rangle.$$

It is straightforward to verify that $\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\gamma)$ is independent of d . This rational intersection grading is linear, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\gamma + \delta) = \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\gamma) + \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\delta), \quad \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(-\gamma) = -\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\gamma).$$

The meridian μ is also contained in $\mathbb{R}_{\Lambda^+}^3 \setminus (\cup_{i=0}^K \mathbb{R}_z \times R_i)$, and from (2.2), we have

$$\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\mu) = \frac{-1}{tb(\Lambda) + 1} \sum_i wind(\Lambda, R_i) R_i.$$

Let c be a Reeb chord, we define

$$\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(c) := \mathcal{I}_\Lambda((c)) = \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(P(c)).$$

Proposition 2.4. $\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(c) = \sum_i wind(P(c), R_i) R_i + lk(P(c), \Lambda) \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\mu)$.

Proof. By moving $P(c)$ up in the z -direction so that it stays above Λ to $P'(c)$, we see that $P(c) - P'(c)$ is homologous to $lk(P(c), \Lambda) \mu$ in $\mathbb{R}_{\Lambda^+}^3 \setminus (\cup_{i=0}^K \mathbb{R}_z \times R_i)$. Then the claim follows from that $\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(P'(c)) = \sum_i wind(P(c), R_i) R_i$. \square

In general, let $c_1 \dots c_n$ be a cyclic word of Reeb chords, we write

$$\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(c_1 \dots c_n) := \mathcal{I}_\Lambda((c_1 \dots c_n)) = \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(P(c_1 \dots c_n)).$$

From Example 5.1, we see that \mathcal{I}_Λ is not additive w.r.t. the concatenation of words, i.e. $\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(w_1 w_2) \neq \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(w_1) + \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(w_2)$ in general. However, the following proposition allows us to consider only $\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(c)$ for a single chord c for rainbow closures of positive braids.

Proposition 2.5. *Let Λ be a Legendrian rainbow closure of a positive braid, see the left of Figure 4 for its Lagrangian projection, then the Conley-Zehnder index of $(c_1 \dots c_n)$ is bounded below by n . In particular, the SFT degree of an orbit γ is at least $wl(\gamma) - 1$.*

Proof. We show that the rotation angle $\theta_{i,j}$ (ref. [Avd23, 3.3.1]) of any pair (c_i, c_j) is either $\frac{\pi}{2}$ or $\frac{3\pi}{2}$. The capping path (ref. [Avd23, 3.3]) of the pair (c_i, c_j) is denoted by $\eta_{i,j}$. Since Λ is a positive braid closure with Lagrangian projection from the braid representation, the capping path $\eta_{i,j}$ consists of three types of arcs as shown in Figure 4. The Type 1 arc contributes $\frac{\pi}{2}$ to the rotation angle. The Type 2 arc contributes $-\frac{3\pi}{2}$ to the rotation angle. The Type 3 arc contributes $\frac{3\pi}{2}$ to the rotation angle. If c_i belongs to the braid area, then $\eta_{i,j}$ consists of one Type 1 arc, m Type 2 arcs, and m Type 3 arcs, for some integer m . So the rotation angle $\theta_{i,j}$ of (c_i, c_j) is $\frac{\pi}{2}$. If c_i does not belong to the braid area, then $\eta_{i,j}$ consists of $m + 1$ Type 3 arcs and m Type 2 arcs, for some integer m . So the rotation angle $\theta_{i,j}$ of (c_i, c_j) is $\frac{3\pi}{2}$.

Therefore the rotation number $rot_{i,j} = \lfloor \frac{\theta_{i,j}}{\pi} \rfloor$ (ref. [Avd23, 3.3.1]) of the pair (c_i, c_j) is either 0 or 1. According to [Avd23, Theorem 7.1], the Conley-Zehnder index of $(c_1 \dots c_n)$ is $\sum_{k=1}^n (rot_{k,k+1} + 1) \geq n$. \square

2.4. Source of holomorphic planes. Let u be an embedded RSFT disk $u : \mathbb{D} \setminus \{p_k\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ for some positive boundary punctures $\{p_k\}$ that completely covers a component of $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \pi_{x,y}(\Lambda)$ as in Figure 5. Let c_1, \dots, c_n be the cyclic chords of the disk. These disks give rise to rigid (modulo translation) holomorphic disks in the symplectization \mathbb{R}^3 with boundary condition on the $\mathbb{R} \times \Lambda$ and positive asymptotic conditions given by $\{c_i\}$ by [Avd23, Corollary 11.2]. Such disks contribute to Ng's Rational symplectic field theory for Legendrian knots [Ng10].

Theorem 2.6 ([Avd23, Theorem 12.2]). *Given an embedded RSFT disk as above, the constant term of $\partial_{CH}(q_{(c_1 \dots c_n)})$ is ± 1 .*




FIGURE 4. The left part is a Legendrian rainbow closure of a positive braid. The right part contains three types of arcs in a capping path.




FIGURE 5. RSFT disks with only positive punctures.

3. TORUS KNOTS

We consider a Legendrian (p, q) torus knot Λ with maximal Thurston–Bennequin invariant $pq - p - q$, where p, q are coprime positive integers. By [EH01], there is a unique Legendrian (p, q) torus knot whose Thurston–Bennequin invariant is $pq - p - q$. The Legendrian (p, q) torus knot Λ is presented by its Lagrangian projection. See Figure 6 for an example. In the lower part of the Lagrangian projection, there is a braid area. We label the regions in the braid area by $R_{i,j}$ for $1 \leq i \leq p - 1$ and $1 \leq j \leq q - 1$. The remaining regions are labeled by $A_1, B_1, \dots, A_p, B_p$, where B_i is the small disk next to α_i and A_i is the region on the other side. The vertices of $R_{i,j}$ are $r_{i,j}, r_{i+1,j}, r_{i,j+1}, r_{i+1,j+1}$, if one of the indices exceed the bounds then $R_{i,j}$ degenerates to a triangle. We orient the knot such that in the braid area it is going from left to right.

From (2.2), we can compute

$$\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\mu) = \frac{-1}{(p-1)(q-1)} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{q-1} \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} (p-i)R_{i,j} + \sum_{i=1}^p ((p+1-i)A_i + (p-1-i)B_i) \right). \quad (3.1)$$

Now note that we can present the knot, such that the area of B_1 is much smaller than the areas of B_2, B_3, \dots, B_p . Thus in view of the period estimate in Proposition 2.2, $\partial_{CH}(q_{(\alpha_1)})$ only involves Reeb orbits from the $r_{i,j}$ chords. By Theorem 2.6, the constant term of $\partial_{CH}(q_{(\alpha_1)})$ is ± 1 . Moreover, by Proposition 2.5, the subalgebra with SFT degree 0 is generated by orbits from single chords. So the non-constant term of




FIGURE 6. Markings of regions and crossings.

$\partial_{CH}(q_{(\alpha_1)})$ is generated by orbits coming from single chords. Therefore, to prove $(\mathbb{R}_{\Lambda^+}^3, \xi_{\Lambda^+})$ has vanishing contact homology, it suffices to prove the following claim:

Claim 3.1. *The inequality*


$$\mathcal{I}_{\Lambda}(\alpha_1) - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq p-1, 1 \leq j \leq q} x_{i,j} \mathcal{I}_{\Lambda}(r_{i,j}) \geq 0, \quad x_{i,j} \geq 0 \quad (3.2)$$

has only the trivial solution $x_{i,j} = 0, \forall i, j$.

The claim implies that $\partial_{CH}(q_{(\alpha_1)})$ has no term in $\prod_{i,j} (r_{i,j})^{x_{i,j}}$ if some of $x_{i,j}$ are positive.

Proposition 3.2. $\mathcal{I}_{\Lambda}(\alpha_1) = B_1$.

Proof. In the terminology of [Avd23, §9.4], we use the negative push-out $\bar{\eta}$ as it traverses a smaller portion of the knot. Since the choice of capping path does not affect the intersection grading, the claim follows from Figure 7. \square

FIGURE 7. Push-out for (α_1) using the negative capping path.

We use $P_{i,j}$ to denote the push-off of the Reeb orbit corresponding to $r_{i,j}$. By a strand, we mean a piece of $P_{a,b}$ starts at the leftmost end of the braid area and goes around once back to the head of the braid area.

Lemma 3.3. *For all $1 \leq a \leq p-1, 1 \leq b \leq q$, we have*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{q-1} \mathcal{I}_{\Lambda}(r_{a,b})_{R_{1,j}} \geq 0.$$

Moreover, the above quantity is positive if and only if $P_{a,b}$ contains the most interior long overhead arc as shown in Figure 8.

Proof. We consider a strand in $P_{a,b}$. Each step-up (see Figure 8) of the strand, including the crossing at $r_{a,b}$, contributes a μ from linking. This contribution translates to $\frac{-1}{(p-1)(q-1)}((q-1)(p-1)) = -1$ for $\sum_{j=1}^{q-1} \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(r_{a,b})_{R_{1,j}}$. Each crossing at α_i , contributes $-\mu$, i.e. 1 to $\sum_{j=1}^{q-1} \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(r_{a,b})_{R_{1,j}}$. Furthermore, each horizontal piece (see Figure 8) of the strand in the braid area contributes 1 to $\sum_{j=1}^{q-1} \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(r_{a,b})_{R_{1,j}}$ if it follows by a step-up. Consequently, the total contribution is at least 0, as each horizontal piece that contributes is canceled with the step-up followed, and a positive contribution from α_i will cancel with the negative contribution from the step-up from the leftmost descending arc in the braid area if it exists. Therefore we have $\sum_{j=1}^{q-1} \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(r_{a,b})_{R_{1,j}} \geq 0$ and it is positive if there is no step-up at the leftmost descending arc in the braid area, which means $P_{a,b}$ contains the whole descending arc in the leftmost end of the braid area, hence $P_{a,b}$ contains the most interior long overhead arc. \square




FIGURE 8. In the push-off, 1 denotes a step-up, 2 denotes a horizontal piece, 3 denotes a complete descending arc, 4 denotes a piece near α_i , and 5 denotes the most interior long overhead arc.

By a complete descending arc, we mean an arc in $P_{a,b}$ within the braid area that descends from the top level to the bottom level and contains the two horizontal pieces at the ends. In other words, it does not contain the chord modification along the whole descending arc, see Figure 8.

Lemma 3.4. *If $P_{a,b}$ does not contain the most interior long overhead arc, then*

$$\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(r_{a,b})_{A_2} \geq 0.$$

Moreover, the above quantity is positive if and only if $P_{a,b}$ contains a complete descending arc.

Proof. Since $P_{a,b}$ does not contain the most interior long overhead arc, any strand in $P_{a,b}$ must cover the region A_2 positively, i.e. each strand in $P_{a,b}$ contributes 1 to $\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(r_{a,b})_{A_2}$. Each step-up in a strand within the braid area contributes one copy of μ to $\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(r_{a,b})_{A_2}$, while the crossing at α_i contributes $-\mu$ to $\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(r_{a,b})_{A_2}$. An occurrence of μ contributes $\frac{1-p}{(p-1)(q-1)} = \frac{-1}{q-1}$ to $\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(r_{a,b})_{A_2}$. Each strand of $P_{a,b}$ including the crossing at α_i contributes at most $q-1$ copies of μ . When the extremum is achieved, the strand has a step-up at each descending arc of the braid area, or equivalently, the strand does not contain a complete descending arc. Furthermore, the total contribution to $\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(r_{a,b})_{A_2}$ is 0. When the strand has a complete descending arc, the total contribution to $\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(r_{a,b})_{A_2}$ is positive as we do not have enough μ . \square

Proof of Theorem 1.1. To solve (3.2), by Lemma 3.3, we see that $x_{a,b} = 0$ if $P_{a,b}$ contains the most interior long overhead arc. Then by Lemma 3.4, $x_{a,b} = 0$ if $P_{a,b}$ does not contain the most interior long overhead arc and has no complete descending arc. As a consequence, we are left with $x_{a,b}$ such that $P_{a,b}$ contains no complete descending arc. First of all, $P_{a,b}$ must have only one strand otherwise it will contain a complete descending arc since $q > p$. Moreover, $\lfloor q/p \rfloor = 1$ for otherwise, it will contain a complete descending arc. There is at most one such $P_{a,b}$. To have both one-strand condition and no complete descending arc condition, we must have $p = a + 1, q = a$, contradiction. Therefore $x_{a,b} = 0$ for all a, b . Then by Proposition 2.3 and Theorem 2.6, we have $\partial_{CH}(q_{(\alpha_1)}) = \pm 1$. Hence contact homology of $(\mathbb{R}_{\Lambda^+}^3, \xi_{\Lambda^+})$ vanishes, so is the contact homology of $(S_{\Lambda^+}^3, \xi_{\Lambda^+})$.

Since $tb(\Lambda) = pq - p - q = 2g_s(\Lambda) - 1$, where $g_s(\Lambda)$ is the slice genus of Λ , according to the proof of [LS04, Theorem 1.1], $(S_{\Lambda^+}^3, \xi_{\Lambda^+})$ is tight. Moreover, the contact 3-manifold obtained by contact $1/k$ surgery along Λ is tight.

The contact $1/k$ surgery along Λ is equivalent to k contact $+1$ surgeries along k Legendrian push-offs of Λ [DG04]. So there exists a Liouville cobordism from the contact 3-manifold obtained by contact $1/k$ surgery along Λ to $(S_{\Lambda^+}^3, \xi_{\Lambda^+})$. By the Liouville functoriality of contact homology [Par19, BH23], the vanishing of the contact homology of $(S_{\Lambda^+}^3, \xi_{\Lambda^+})$ implies the vanishing of the contact homology of the contact 3-manifold obtained by contact $1/k$ surgery along Λ . \square

4. SOME OTHER RAINBOW CLOSURES OF POSITIVE BRAIDS

In this section, we consider some Legendrian knots which are the rainbow closures of positive braids of p -strands. The braids are generated by the generators $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_{p-1}$.

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose Λ is a Legendrian rainbow closure of positive braid with the maximum Thurston-Bennequin invariant. Then the contact 3-manifold $(S_{1/k}^3(\Lambda), \xi_{1/k}(\Lambda))$ is tight for $k \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. Suppose the closed positive braid representation of Λ has p strands and consists of w positive generators, then it follows from the Lagrangian projection that $tb(\Lambda) = w - p$. On the other hand, there is a Seifert surface of Λ whose Euler characteristic is $p - w$. So

$$w - p = tb(\Lambda) \leq 2g_s(\Lambda) - 1 \leq 2g_3(\Lambda) - 1 \leq w - p,$$

where $g_s(\Lambda)$ is the slice genus of Λ , and $g_3(\Lambda)$ is the Seifert genus of Λ . Thus Λ attains the maximal Thurston-Bennequin invariant $tb(\Lambda) = 2g_s(\Lambda) - 1$. By [LS04], $(S_{1/k}^3(\Lambda), \xi_{1/k}(\Lambda))$ is tight for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. \square

Let Λ be a knot which is the rainbow closure of positive braid

$$(\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_{p-2} \sigma_{p-1})^{q_1} (\sigma_{p-p_2+1} \cdots \sigma_{p-2} \sigma_{p-1})^{q_2} \cdots (\sigma_{p-p_N+1} \cdots \sigma_{p-2} \sigma_{p-1})^{q_N}.$$

Here $p_2 < p$ and $p_i \neq p_{i+1} \leq p$. The braid area can be divided into N blocks which correspond to $(\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_{p-2} \sigma_{p-1})^{q_1}, (\sigma_{p-p_2+1} \cdots \sigma_{p-2} \sigma_{p-1})^{q_2}, \dots, (\sigma_{p-p_N+1} \cdots \sigma_{p-2} \sigma_{p-1})^{q_N}$, respectively. See Figure 9 for an example. The knot Λ is the closure of a p -strand braid. Then we have

$$tb(\Lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^N (p_i - 1)q_i - p.$$

We label the regions above the braid area similar to the torus knot case by A_1, \dots, A_p and B_1, \dots, B_p , and crossings there by $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_p$. We order the first row of each block (including the first column before the first twist in the torus knots part except for the first one) by $R_1, \dots, R_{\sum_{s=1}^N q_s - 1}$, i.e. $R_1, \dots, R_{q_1 - 1}$ are from




FIGURE 9. A Legendrian knot which is the rainbow closure of the braid $(\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3)^3(\sigma_2\sigma_3)^3$.

the first block and $R_{q_1}, \dots, R_{q_1+q_2-1}$ are from the second block. The $R_{\sum_{i \leq s} q_i}$, i.e. the head of the $s+1$ -th block could stay above some of R_* before $R_{\sum_{i \leq s} q_i}$ if $p_{s+1} > p_s$. Then from (2.2), we have

$$\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\mu)_{R_j} = -\frac{p-1}{(p-1)(q_1-1) + \sum_{i=2}^N (p_i-1)q_i}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq q_1-1,$$

and

$$\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\mu)_{R_j} = -\frac{p_i-1}{(p-1)(q_1-1) + \sum_{i=2}^N (p_i-1)q_i}, \quad \sum_{s=1}^i q_s \leq j \leq \sum_{s=1}^{i+1} q_s - 1, \quad i \geq 1.$$

As a consequence, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\sum_{s=1}^N q_s - 1} \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\mu)_{R_i} = -1.$$

Similar to the proof of Lemma 3.3, we have:

Lemma 4.2. *Let P be the push-out of a chord in the braid area, then*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\sum_{s=1}^N q_s - 1} \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(P)_{R_i} \geq 0.$$

Moreover, the equality holds if and only if P does not contain the most interior long overhead arc.

Proposition 4.3. *If $q_1 \gg 0$, then $(S_{\Lambda^+}^3, \xi_{\Lambda^+})$ has vanishing contact homology.*

Proof. We consider those push-outs P that do not contain the most interior long overhead arc. Each strand contributes 1 to $\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(P)_{B_1}$. Note that

$$\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\mu)_{B_1} = -\frac{p-2}{(p-1)(q_1-1) + \sum_{i=2}^N (p_i-1)q_i}.$$

Since each strand has at most $\sum_{i=2}^N q_i + q_1 + 1 - \lfloor q_1/p \rfloor$ step-ups, each step-up contributes one μ . Along with the crossing at α_i , we see that the contribution of μ from linking to $\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(P)_{B_1}$ is at least

$$-\frac{(p-2)(\sum_{i=2}^N q_i + q_1 - \lfloor q_1/p \rfloor)}{(p-1)(q_1-1) + \sum_{i=2}^N (p_i-1)q_i}. \quad (4.1)$$

Since

$$\lim_{q_1 \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{(p-2)(\sum_{i=2}^N q_i + q_1 - \lfloor q_1/p \rfloor)}{(p-1)(q_1-1) + \sum_{i=2}^N (p_i-1)q_i} = -\frac{(p-2)(1 - \frac{1}{p})}{p-1} > -1.$$

Therefore for $q_1 \gg 1$, we have (4.1) > -1 .

We will show that $\partial_{CH}(q_{(\alpha_2)}) = \pm 1$. Arguing as in Theorem 1.1, because of Proposition 2.5, it suffices to establish the analogue of (3.2):

$$\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\alpha_2) - \sum_{\substack{\text{Reeb chord } r_i \\ \text{in the braid area}}} x_i \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(r_i) - \sum_{1 \leq j \leq p, j \neq 2} y_j \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\alpha_j), \quad x_i, y_j \geq 0,$$

has only a trivial solution $x_i = y_j = 0$. Since $\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\alpha_i) = B_i$, by Lemma 4.2, from looking at the sum of the coefficients of R_i , we have $x_i = 0$ if P_{r_i} contains the most interior long overhead arc. Then we can look at the coefficient of B_1 , the discussion above shows that each strand not containing the most interior long overhead arc will contribute positively to B_1 . Therefore we must have the rest $x_i = 0$ and $y_1 = 0$. Finally, we can look the coefficient of B_3, \dots, B_p to conclude that $y_3 = \dots = y_p = 0$. Therefore $\partial_{CH}(q_{(\alpha_2)})$ only has constant terms and the constant term is ± 1 by Theorem 2.6. \square

Proposition 4.4. *Let Λ be a knot which is the rainbow closure of the braid $(\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_{p-2} \sigma_{p-1})^q (\sigma_2 \cdots \sigma_{p-2} \sigma_{p-1})^r$. Then $(S_{\Lambda^+}^3, \xi_{\Lambda^+})$ has vanishing contact homology if $q > 1$.*

Proof. We consider those push-outs P that do not contain the most interior long overhead arc. Each strand contributes 1 to $\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(P)_{B_1}$. Note that

$$\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\mu)_{B_1} = -\frac{p-2}{(p-1)(q-1) + (p-2)r}.$$

Since each strand has at most $p+r$ step-ups, along with the crossing at α_i , we see that the contribution of μ from linking to $\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(P)_{B_1}$ is at least

$$-\frac{(p-2)(q+r-1)}{(p-1)(q-1) + (p-2)r} \geq -1 + \frac{q-1}{(p-1)(q-1) + (p-2)r}.$$

In particular, we have

$$\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(P)_{B_1} \geq \frac{q-1}{(p-1)(q-1) + (p-2)r} \geq 0.$$

Since $\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\alpha_i) = B_i$, we can argue as in Proposition 4.3 that $\partial_{CH}(q_{(\alpha_2)}) = \pm 1$ when $q > 1$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.2. By the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 1.1, it follows from Lemma 4.1, Proposition 4.3 and Proposition 4.4. \square

5. CHEKANOV'S LEGENDRIAN 5_2 KNOTS

We consider Chekanov's two Legendrian 5_2 knots [Che02, 4.4]. Both Legendrian knots have Thurston-Bennequin invariants 1 and rotation numbers 0, yet they are not Legendrian isotopic. Note that the 5_2 knot cannot be the closure of a positive braid. The Lagrangian projections of these two Legendrian knots are illustrated in Figure 10. One challenge for a general knot is that Proposition 2.5 fails in general, e.g.




FIGURE 10. Chekanov's two Legendrian 5_2 knots.

the 5_2 knots above. Therefore the subalgebra of SFT degree 0 may have more general generators and often infinitely many generators.

Example 5.1. We label the crossings and regions of the two Lagrangian projections according to Figure 10. For the left Legendrian 5_2 knot, we compute that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\mu) &= -\frac{1}{2}(-A_1 + A_2 + A_3 - A_4 + B_2 - B_3 - B_5 + B_6); \\ \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(a_8) &= -A_1 + A_3 + B_1 + B_2 - B_5 + \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\mu); \\ \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(a_9) &= A_2 - B_1 - B_3 + \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\mu) \\ \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(a_8) + \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(a_9) &= A_4 - B_6 \\ \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(a_8 a_9) &= A_4 - B_6 + \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\mu). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(a_8 a_9) \neq \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(a_8) + \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(a_9)$.

Because of the example above, computing $\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(c)$ for single chords is insufficient to determine the intersection grading on the subalgebra of SFT degree 0, which as mentioned above could have infinite generators. This poses serious challenges to execute Avdek's machinery in general.

Proposition 5.2. Let Λ be one of Chekanov's two Legendrian 5_2 knots in (S^3, ξ_{std}) , then $(S^3_{1/k}(\Lambda), \xi_{1/k}(\Lambda))$ is algebraically overtwisted and tight for $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Since $tb(\Lambda) = 1$ and $g_s(\Lambda) = 1$, $tb(\Lambda) = 2g_s(\Lambda) - 1$. By [LS04], $(S_{1/k}^3(\Lambda), \xi_{1/k}(\Lambda))$ is tight for $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

We label the crossings and regions of the two Lagrangian projections according to Figure 10. For the left Legendrian 5_2 knot in Figure 10, we have the following non-trivial constraints for the contact action of Reeb chords.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}(a_2) - \mathcal{A}(a_5) - \mathcal{A}(a_6) - \mathcal{A}(a_9) &= \text{Area}(B_3) > 0; \\ \mathcal{A}(a_1) - \mathcal{A}(a_5) - \mathcal{A}(a_6) - \mathcal{A}(a_7) &= \text{Area}(B_2) > 0; \\ \mathcal{A}(a_4) - \mathcal{A}(a_8) - \mathcal{A}(a_9) &= \text{Area}(B_6) > 0; \\ \mathcal{A}(a_3) - \mathcal{A}(a_8) - \mathcal{A}(a_7) &= \text{Area}(B_5) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

By arranging B_6 with small area ϵ , we can achieve

$$0 \ll \mathcal{A}(a_8) = \mathcal{A}(a_9) < \mathcal{A}(a_4) = 2\mathcal{A}(8) + \epsilon \ll \mathcal{A}(a_7) \ll \mathcal{A}(a_3) \ll \mathcal{A}(a_5) \ll \mathcal{A}(a_6) \ll \mathcal{A}(a_2) \ll \mathcal{A}(a_1).$$

Then by Proposition 2.2, $\partial_{CH}(q_{(a_4)})$ can have possibly nonzero coefficients only in $1, q_{(a_8)}, q_{(a_9)}, q_{(a_8^2)}, q_{(a_9^2)}, q_{(a_8a_9)}$. As we computed in Example 5.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(a_8) &= -\frac{1}{2}A_1 - \frac{1}{2}A_2 + \frac{1}{2}A_3 + \frac{1}{2}A_4 + B_1 + \frac{1}{2}B_2 + \frac{1}{2}B_3 - \frac{1}{2}B_5 - \frac{1}{2}B_6; \\ \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(a_9) &= \frac{1}{2}A_1 + \frac{1}{2}A_2 - \frac{1}{2}A_3 + \frac{1}{2}A_4 - B_1 - \frac{1}{2}B_2 - \frac{1}{2}B_3 + \frac{1}{2}B_5 - \frac{1}{2}B_6; \\ \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(a_8^2) &= 2\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(a_8); \\ \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(a_9^2) &= 2\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(a_9); \\ \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(a_8a_9) &= A_4 - B_6 + \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\mu). \end{aligned}$$

Each of them has a positive coefficient for a term that is not A_4 . Therefore in view of Proposition 2.3 and Theorem 2.6, we have $\partial_{CH}(q_{(a_4)}) = \pm 1$. Therefore the contact +1 surgery along Λ yields an algebraically overtwisted manifold.

For the right Legendrian 5_2 knot in Figure 10, we have the following non-trivial constraints for the contact action of Reeb chords.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}(a_2) - \mathcal{A}(a_5) - \mathcal{A}(a_6) - \mathcal{A}(a_9) &= \text{Area}(B_3) > 0; \\ \mathcal{A}(a_1) - \mathcal{A}(a_5) - \mathcal{A}(a_6) - \mathcal{A}(a_7) &= \text{Area}(B_2) > 0; \\ \mathcal{A}(a_4) - \mathcal{A}(a_8) - \mathcal{A}(a_9) &= \text{Area}(B_6) > 0; \\ \mathcal{A}(a_3) - \mathcal{A}(a_8) - \mathcal{A}(a_7) &= \text{Area}(B_5) > 0; \\ \mathcal{A}(a_6) + \mathcal{A}(a_7) + \mathcal{A}(a_8) + \mathcal{A}(a_9) - 2\mathcal{A}(a_4) &= \text{Area}(B_4) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

We can still arrange that

$$0 \ll \mathcal{A}(a_8) = \mathcal{A}(a_9) < \mathcal{A}(a_4) = 2\mathcal{A}(8) + \epsilon \ll \mathcal{A}(a_7) \ll \mathcal{A}(a_3) \ll \mathcal{A}(a_5) \ll \mathcal{A}(a_6) \ll \mathcal{A}(a_2) \ll \mathcal{A}(a_1).$$

Therefore $\partial_{CH}(q_{(a_4)})$ can have possibly nonzero coefficients only in $1, q_{(a_8)}, q_{(a_9)}, q_{(a_8^2)}, q_{(a_9^2)}, q_{(a_8a_9)}$ as before.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(a_8) &= -\frac{1}{2}A_1 - \frac{1}{2}A_2 + \frac{1}{2}A_3 + \frac{1}{2}A_4 + B_1 + \frac{1}{2}B_2 + \frac{1}{2}B_3 - \frac{1}{2}B_5 - \frac{1}{2}B_6; \\ \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(a_9) &= \frac{1}{2}A_1 + \frac{1}{2}A_2 - \frac{1}{2}A_3 + \frac{1}{2}A_4 - B_1 - \frac{1}{2}B_2 - \frac{1}{2}B_3 + \frac{1}{2}B_5 - \frac{1}{2}B_6; \\ \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(a_8^2) &= 2\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(a_8); \\ \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(a_9^2) &= 2\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(a_9); \\ \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(a_8a_9) &= A_4 - B_6 + \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\mu).\end{aligned}$$

Each of them has a positive coefficient for a term that is not A_4 , we can argue as before that the contact +1 surgery along Λ yields an algebraically overtwisted manifold. \square

REFERENCES

- [Avd23] Russell Avdek. Combinatorial reeb dynamics on punctured contact 3-manifolds. *Geom. Topol.*, 27:953–1082, 2023. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [7](#)
- [BH23] Erkao Bao and Ko Honda. Semi-global Kuranishi charts and the definition of contact homology. *Adv. Math.*, 414:Paper No. 108864, 148, 2023. [9](#)
- [BN10] Frédéric Bourgeois and Klaus Niederkrüger. Towards a good definition of algebraically overtwisted. *Expo. Math.*, 28(1):85–100, 2010. [1](#)
- [BvK10] Frédéric Bourgeois and Otto van Koert. Contact homology of left-handed stabilizations and plumbing of open books. *Commun. Contemp. Math.*, 12(2):223–263, 2010. [1](#)
- [Che02] Yuri Chekanov. Differential algebra of Legendrian links. *Invent. Math.*, 150(3):441–483, 2002. [12](#)
- [DG04] Fan Ding and Hansjörg Geiges. A Legendrian surgery presentation of contact 3-manifolds. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 136(3):583–598, 2004. [9](#)
- [EH01] John B. Etnyre and Ko Honda. Knots and contact geometry. I. Torus knots and the figure eight knot. *J. Symplectic Geom.*, 1(1):63–120, 2001. [6](#)
- [GHvHM07] Paolo Ghiggini, Ko Honda, and Jeremy van Horn-Morris. The vanishing of the contact invariant in the presence of torsion. *arXiv:0706.1602*, 2007. [1](#)
- [LS04] Paolo Lisca and András I. Stipsicz. Ozsváth-Szabó invariants and tight contact three-manifolds. I. *Geom. Topol.*, 8:925–945, 2004. [1](#), [9](#), [13](#)
- [Ng10] Lenhard Ng. Rational symplectic field theory for Legendrian knots. *Invent. Math.*, 182(3):451–512, 2010. [5](#)
- [OS05] Peter Ozsváth and Zoltán Szabó. Heegaard Floer homology and contact structures. *Duke Math. J.*, 129(1):39–61, 2005. [1](#)
- [Par19] John Pardon. Contact homology and virtual fundamental cycles. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 32(3):825–919, 2019. [9](#)

Youlin Li,
SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, SHANGHAI JIAO TONG UNIVERSITY, CHINA
E-mail address: liyulin@sjtu.edu.cn

Zhengyi Zhou,
MORNINGSIDE CENTER OF MATHEMATICS, CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES;
ACADEMY OF MATHEMATICS AND SYSTEMS SCIENCE, CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, CHINA
E-mail address: zhyzhou@amss.ac.cn