

TANGLE SOLUTIONS FOR A FAMILY OF  
DNA-REARRANGING PROTEINS

TO APPEAR IN

*MATHEMATICAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE CAMBRIDGE PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY*

DOROTHY BUCK AND CYNTHIA VERJOVSKY MARCOTTE

9 APRIL 2004

ABSTRACT

We study two systems of tangle equations that arise when modeling the action of the Integrase family of proteins on DNA. These two systems—direct and inverted repeats—correspond to two different possibilities for the initial DNA sequence. We present one new class of solutions to the tangle equations. In the case of inverted repeats we prove that any solution not in these, or 2 previously known classes, would have to belong to one specific class. In the case of direct repeats we prove that the three classes are the only solutions possible.

1. INTRODUCTION

We seek to mathematically model the action of a protein which changes the topology of DNA. By representing different regions of a DNA molecule as tangles, we can describe the protein's action as a change in one of the constituent tangles. We wish to find all tangle combinations that explain the protein's action.

Ernst and Summers [14], based on the biological work of Wasserman and Cozzarelli [31], [32], developed the tangle model to describe and make predictions about how the protein Tn3 interacts with DNA. The tangle model has since been used to describe other protein-DNA interactions (see for example, [9], [11], [17], [28] and [29]). Here, we focus on a particular family of proteins, the Integrase family of recombinases (reviewed by Grainge and Jayaram [18]). Members of the Integrase family are involved in a wide variety of biological activities, including integrating a virus' DNA into a host cell's DNA (hence the name).

Integrase proteins share a common mechanism of rearranging DNA sequences which can result in a change of DNA topology. Specifically, by harnessing varying numbers of DNA axis self-crossings (so-called *supercoils*), these proteins transform unknotted circular DNA into a variety of torus knots or links [18].

For proteins such as Tn3, which require a fixed number of DNA supercoils, before rearranging the DNA (often multiple times) and then releasing it, it has been possible to completely solve the model tangle equations (see [14] and [15]). Integrase proteins, however, can act on DNA with any number of supercoils, and act only once before releasing the DNA. The resulting DNA can thus take a variety of knotted or linked forms. To accurately model this varying supercoiling, and its effects on the resulting DNA, we must use a larger number of tangles than needed for Tn3. The increased complexity of the tangle model for the Integrase family has thus far prevented a full solution to the tangle model. Previous work, notably [9] and [17], have found solutions by making several assumptions which are thought to be biologically reasonable and which lead to considerable mathematical simplification.

The current work considers the tangle model, with no simplifying assumptions, for a generic member of the Integrase family. We use the protein Flp as an illustration, but the results are identical for other members of the Integrase family including  $\lambda$  Int and Cre.

We give three classes of solutions for each of the systems. Using Dehn Surgery techniques we eliminate all possibilities (for direct repeats) or all but one other possibility (for inverted repeats).

As discussed in more detail below, we represent a circular DNA molecule, before the protein action, by the numerator closure of the sum of three biologically determined tangles:  $O_f^k$ ,  $O_c$  and  $P$ . We represent a DNA molecule after the protein action as the numerator closure of the sum of  $O_f^k$ ,  $O_c$  and  $R$ . We have two systems of tangle equations, corresponding to two different initial types of DNA sequences:

$$\text{Before: } N(O_f^k + O_c + P) = b(1, 1)$$

$$\text{After: } N(O_f^k + O_c + R) = b(2k, 1) \text{ or } b(2k + 1, 1)$$

where  $N(T)$  is the numerator closure of the tangle  $T$ ,  $b(p, q)$  is the  $q/p$  four-plat, and  $k \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$ . When the products are of the form  $b(2k, 1)$  the system is called the *direct* case, and  $b(2k + 1, 1)$  it is called the *inverted* case. We use  $\{O_1, O_2\} = \{O_f^k, O_c\}$ ; *i.e.*, the use of  $O_1$  and  $O_2$  means that we are considering two cases:  $O_1 = O_f^k$  and  $O_2 = O_c$ , and viceversa. Our main result is the following:

**Theorem 1.** *There are three classes of solutions to the above equations, which are:*

1.  $P$  is the infinity tangle,  $O_c$  and  $O_f^k$  are integral tangles
  2.  $P$  and  $O_c$  are integral,  $O_f^k = (\infty)$  for at most 1 value of  $k$ , integral for at most 2 values of  $k$  and otherwise is a strictly rational tangle which is either vertical or the sum of a vertical and a horizontal tangle.
  3.  $P$  is strictly rational,  $O_c$  is integral, and  $O_f^k$  is integral for at most 1 value of  $k$  and strictly rational otherwise.
- In the direct case, these are the only solutions.*

*In the inverted case, these are the only solutions with the following possible exception: the double branched cover of  $O_c \cup O_f^k$  is a hyperbolic (or trefoil for  $k = 2$ ) knot complement,  $P$  is rational,  $O_1$  is integral and  $O_2$  is prime. If  $P$  is integral, then for at most one value of  $k$ ,  $O_f^k$  could be  $(\infty)$ . If in addition,  $O_c$  is also integral then  $O_f^k$  could be integral for at most 2 values of  $k$ , and prime otherwise.*

Theorem 1 is a consequence of the Theorems in Sections 6 and 7. See Table 1 for details.

From the biological point of view, the mechanism is expected to be identical in both cases (*i.e.*,  $P$  and  $R$  in the inverted case are the same as in the direct case) hence the putative fourth possibility in the inverted case could be ruled out as being biologically unfeasible. Whether there are mathematical solutions to this class remains an open question.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we recall some basic facts about tangles, four-plats and their corresponding double branched covers. In Section 3 we provide the biological motivation and background for our work: the action of the protein Flp on DNA with either inverted or direct repeats. We also recall Ernst and Sumners' mathematical model in terms of tangles and four-plats [14]. We present one novel class of solutions to these tangle equations, and contrast them to two classes of known solutions. In Section 4 we show that for direct repeats the tangles  $O_f^k$  are rational, which extends the results of [14]. We also give an alternative proof to [14] of the fact that  $R$  is rational. These proofs rely on Dehn Surgery arguments for the complements of strongly invertible knots and for Seifert Fibered Spaces. In Section 5, we prove a number of technical results, principally concerning annuli in the double branched covers of tangles. In Section 6, we use the results of Section 5 to eliminate all but one of the remaining possibilities for the tangles  $O_f^k$ ,  $O_c$  and  $P$ . In Section 7, we place further restrictions on the case that could not be entirely ruled out for inverted repeats. We conclude with some remarks on the biological relevance of our model and solutions, as well as comments on further questions of interest. Table 1 can be used as a guide to our results.

## 2. TANGLES, FOUR-PLATS AND THEIR DOUBLE BRANCHED COVERS

We begin by recalling a few elementary facts about tangles, and the conventions that we will follow, established by Ernst and Sumners in [14]. A *tangle*  $T$  is a pair  $(B^3, t)$ , where  $B^3$  is a 3-ball with a given boundary parametrization with four distinguished boundary points labeled NW, NE, SW, SE, and  $t$  is a pair of properly embedded unoriented arcs with endpoints NW, NE, SW and SE. See Figure 1 for examples.

We say two tangles  $A$  and  $B$  are *equivalent* if there exists a series of moves that takes the strands of  $A$  to the strands of  $B$ , leaving the endpoints fixed (*i.e.*, if there exists an isotopy from  $A$  to  $B$  rel  $\partial$ ).




FIGURE 1. Tangles. *Top Row:* Locally knotted, prime,  $(0)$ ,  $(\infty)$ ,  $(1)$   
*Bottom Row:*  $(-2)$ ,  $(1/2)$ ,  $(5/14)$ ,  $(-37/14)$ ,  $(-7/4)$   
 Note: The preferred biological sign convention (shown above) is opposite in sign to that of Conway.

Tangles can be divided into three mutually exclusive families: locally knotted, prime and rational, illustrated in Figure 1. A tangle is *locally knotted* if there exists a sphere in  $B^3$  meeting  $t$  transversely in 2 points such that the 2-ball bounded by the sphere meets  $t$  in a knotted spanning arc. A tangle is *prime* if its double branched cover branched over  $t$  is irreducible and not a solid torus, as shown by Lickorish [20]. All other tangles are *rational*, so called because their equivalence classes are in one-to-one correspondence with the set of rational numbers (and infinity) via a continued fraction expansion, as described by Conway [8]. A tangle whose corresponding rational number is  $p/q$  will be denoted by  $(p/q)$ . Rational tangles are formed by an alternating series of horizontal and vertical half-twists of two (initially untwisted) arcs. We say a rational tangle is *integral*, and write it as  $(n)$ , if it consists of a series of  $n$  horizontal half-twists, where  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ . We denote this class as  $\mathbb{Z}$ . Similarly, a rational tangle is *vertical* if it consists of a series of  $n$  vertical half-twists ( $|n| > 1$ ), and denote it by  $(1/n)$ . We say a tangle is *strictly rational*, and denote this class as  $\mathbb{Q}!$  if it is neither integral nor the infinity tangle, and so  $\mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{Q}! \cup \mathbb{Z} \cup \{(\infty)\}$ .

As Bleiler showed in [4], the minimal prime tangle has a projection with five crossings (shown in Figure 1). Hence for certain tangles whose strands represent very short DNA segments (*e.g.*, less than 50 base pairs), the most biologically relevant tangles are those that are rational (See Maxwell and Bates [21] for more details on the physical properties, including flexibility, of DNA.)

There are several operations one can perform on tangles. We concentrate on three (see Figure 2). Two of these operations form a knot or link from a given tangle  $A$ : the numerator closure,  $N(A)$  and the denominator closure,  $D(A)$ . The third operator, tangle summing, takes a pair of tangles  $A$  and  $B$  and (under certain restrictions) yields a third tangle,  $A + B$ . Note that the

(0) tangle is the identity under this operation:  $A + (0) = A$ . (See Conway [8] for more details.)




FIGURE 2. Three tangle operations. *Top*: tangle sum *Bottom*: numerator closure and denominator closure

The numerator or denominator closure of a rational tangle yields a *four-plat*, a knot or 2-component link that admits a projection consisting of a braid on 4 strings, with one strand free of crossings [1] (see Figure 3). Schubert showed that all four-plats are prime knots and prime 2-component links (except for the unknot and the unlink of two unknotted components) [26]. A four-plat can be specified by a pair of integers  $p$  and  $q$ , and is written as  $b(p, q)$ . For example, we write the unknot as  $b(1, 1)$ , and the trefoil as  $b(3, 1)$ .



FIGURE 3. The four-plats  $b(19, 8)$  and  $b(-9, 4)$ .

If  $T$  is a tangle, then we will write  $\tilde{T}$  to mean the double cover of  $B^3$ , branched over the tangles arcs of  $T$ . We will write  $\text{dbc}(K)$  to denote the three-manifold that is the double cover of  $S^3$  branched over the set  $K$ . We now turn our attention to the three-manifolds that arise as double branched covers of tangles or four-plats. In this work all three-manifolds are compact, connected and orientable.

If  $P$  is a rational tangle, then  $\tilde{P}$  is a solid torus, which we will denote by  $V_P$ . For notational simplicity we will use  $V_f^k$  and  $V_b$  for the double branched covers of  $O_f^k$  and  $O_c$  respectively when they are rational tangles. Schubert showed that  $\text{dbc}(b(p, q))$  is the lens space  $L(p, q)$ . Two four-plats  $b(p, q)$  and  $b(p', q')$  are equivalent iff their corresponding double branched covers, the lens spaces  $L(p, q)$  and  $L(p', q')$ , are homeomorphic [26]. (See Rolfsen [25] for more details on lens spaces.)

The interplay of tangles and four-plats with their corresponding double branched covers is the key to most of our results. When the sum and subsequent numerator closure of two tangles  $C$  and  $D$  yields a four-plat  $b(p, q)$ , this induces a gluing of the boundaries of their respective double branched covers  $\tilde{C}$  and  $\tilde{D}$  that results in the lens space  $L(p, q)$ :

$$N(C + D) = b(p, q) \Leftrightarrow \tilde{C} \cup_h \tilde{D} = L(p, q)$$

where  $h : \partial\tilde{C} \rightarrow \partial\tilde{D}$ . In particular, when  $C$  and  $D$  are both rational, their corresponding double branched covers are solid tori  $V_C$  and  $V_D$ .  $V_C$  and  $V_D$  form a Heegaard splitting of  $L(p, q)$ , where  $h$  is the map that takes  $\mu_{\partial\tilde{C}}$  to  $p\lambda_{\partial\tilde{D}} + q\mu_{\partial\tilde{D}}$ .

### 3. BIOLOGICAL MOTIVATION, MODEL AND SOLUTIONS

We illustrate our model with the protein *Flp* (pronounced ‘flip’), a member the Integrase family of recombinases. Roughly speaking, Flp recognizes two copies of a specific DNA sequence, binds at these sites, cuts the DNA, moves the strands, reseals the break, and releases the DNA. When acting on circular DNA, Flp can change the underlying knot type of the DNA, for example turning the unknot into the trefoil knot. The resulting knot type can vary, depending on the amount of supercoiling of the DNA at the time Flp binds. We call a DNA molecule that has not been acted on by Flp a *substrate*, and a molecule that has been acted on a *product*. In these terms then, the substrate is always an unknot and the products are torus knots or links.

We model each of the substrates and products as the numerator closure of the sum of three tangles,  $N(O_f^k + O_c + (P \text{ or } R))$ . Each tangle arc represents a segment of double-stranded DNA. In the tangle model developed by Ernst and Sumners [14], the cutting and joining of the DNA is assumed to be completely localized: two of the tangles are unchanged by the action of the protein. In the substrate, the first tangle,  $P$  (Parental), represents two short identical sites that Flp recognizes and to which it chemically binds and then cuts, rearranges and re-seals. This action can be thought of as removing  $P$  and replacing it with a new tangle,  $R$  (Recombinant) in the product. The second tangle,  $O_c$ , represents the part of the DNA that is physically constrained, but unchanged, by the protein ( $O$  stands for Outside and  $c$  for constrained). The last tangle,  $O_f^k$ , represents the part of the DNA that is free (hence the subscript  $f$ ) from protein binding constraints.  $O_f^k$  can vary depending on the amount of DNA writhe present at the time Flp acts. The superscript  $k$  indexes these different possibilities.

Thus, the action of the protein is modeled by replacing  $P$  in the substrate by  $R$  in the product (see Figure 4). In terms of tangles, this amounts to saying that our substrate and products can be modeled as:

$$N(O_f^k + O_c + P) = \text{substrate (before recombination)}$$

$$N(O_f^k + O_c + R) = \text{product (after recombination)}$$

where  $k \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$ .  $O_f^k$  varies as  $k$  varies, so we obtain different products, as described below. We use  $O^k$  to mean the part unchanged by Flp, that is,  $O_f^k \cup O_c$ . We use  $\{O_1, O_2\} = \{O_f^k, O_c\}$ ; *i.e.*, the use of  $O_1$  and  $O_2$  means that we are considering two cases:  $O_1 = O_f^k$  and  $O_2 = O_c$ , and viceversa.

The initial motivation for describing the action of Flp in terms of tangles stemmed from a biological question: When Flp binds to DNA at  $P$ , how are the two sites oriented with respect to one another? This was found to be antiparallel, by Grainge, Buck and Jayaram [17], through a combination of mathematical proofs and biological experiments. In terms of tangles, experimental work indicated that  $O_c = (1)$ . Mathematical arguments, based on a few additional biologically reasonable assumptions, then concluded that  $P = (\infty)$ , and thus the sites must oriented in antiparallel alignment. Subsequent crystal structures by Chen *et al.* confirmed this alignment [7].

In the tangle model, the ultimate goal is to determine precisely all tangles involved. Unlike in the paper described above or the work of Crisona *et al.* [9] or Sumners *et al.* [28], where biological considerations were taken into account, we will be looking exclusively at what the mathematics alone can say.




FIGURE 4. Tangle Surgery

Replacing one tangle by another is known as tangle surgery. If each of  $P$  and  $R$  is rational, then tangle surgery corresponds to replacing  $V_P$  with  $V_R$

in the double branched cover, and thus corresponds to Dehn Surgery on  $\widetilde{O}^k$ . Our strategy is to use restrictions on the type of Dehn Surgeries of  $S^3 = \text{dbc}(b(1, 1))$  that yield lens spaces. This in turn restricts the possible tangle solutions.

**3.1. Two Cases: Inverted and Direct.** Flp identifies two short identical sequences, called *repeats*, on a molecule of DNA. These sites have a natural chemical orientation, and hence on circular DNA, the strings can be in head to head (*inverted repeats*) or head to tail (*direct repeats*) orientation (Figure 5). When Flp acts on DNA it yields a variety of knots or links that depend on  $O_f^k$ . These products are torus knots for inverted repeats, and torus links for direct repeats. We consider each case separately.




FIGURE 5. *Direct (left) and Inverted Repeats.*

When Flp acts on a DNA molecule with inverted sites, experiments have shown that the resulting DNA can be an unknot, or a knot with up to 11 crossings [18]. Cozzarelli's lab has obtained images (using electron microscopy) of the simplest products, and has shown that they are the torus knots  $b(1, 1)$  (the unknot),  $b(3, 1)$  and  $b(5, 1)$  [9]. This experimental evidence indicates that Flp begins with an unknotted DNA substrate with inverted repeats,  $b(1, 1)$  and converts it via tangle surgery into a torus knot  $b(2k + 1, 1)$ , where  $k \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$ . We thus model the action of Flp on DNA with inverted repeats as:

| INVERTED |  |
|----------|--|
| Before:  | $N(O_f^k + O_c + P) = b(1, 1) = \text{unknot}, \text{ for } k \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$ |
| After:   | $N(O_f^0 + O_c + R) = b(1, 1) = \text{unknot}$                                       |
|          | $N(O_f^1 + O_c + R) = b(3, 1) = \text{trefoil}$                                      |
|          | $N(O_f^k + O_c + R) = b(2k + 1, 1) = \text{torus knot } T_{(2k+1, 2)}$               |

When Flp acts on a DNA molecule with direct sites, experiments have shown that the resulting DNA can be an unlink, or a 2-component link with up to 10 crossings [18]. Electrophoretic gels have determined that the simplest products are  $b(0, 1)$ ,  $b(2, 1)$  and  $b(4, 1)$  [18]. This experimental evidence indicates that Flp begins with an unknotted DNA substrate with direct repeats,  $b(1, 1)$  and converts it via tangle surgery into a torus link  $b(2k, 1)$ , where  $k \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$ . We thus model the action of Flp on DNA with direct repeats as:



| DIRECT  |  |
|---------|--|
| Before: | $N(O_f^k + O_c + P) = b(1, 1) = \text{unknot, for } k \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$ |
| After:  | $N(O_f^0 + O_c + R) = b(0, 1) = \text{unlink}$                               |
|         | $N(O_f^1 + O_c + R) = b(2, 1) = \text{Hopf link}$                            |
|         | $N(O_f^k + O_c + R) = b(2k, 1) = \text{torus link } T_{(2k, 1)}$             |

**3.2. Solutions.** When proteins in the Resolvase family of recombinases, such as Tn3 recombine unknotted DNA, they first fix  $O_f^k := (0)$ , then rearrange the DNA, often multiple times, before releasing it. The corresponding tangle equations:

$$\begin{array}{l}
 N(O_f + O_b + P) = K_0 \\
 N(O_f + O_b + R) = K_1 \\
 N(O_f + O_b + R + R) = K_2 \\
 \vdots \\
 N(O_f + O_b + \underbrace{R + \dots + R}_n) = K_n
 \end{array}
 \left. \begin{array}{l}
 \text{for the substrate} \\
 \\
 \\
 \\
 \\
 \text{for the products}
 \end{array} \right\}$$

have been solved by Ernst and Sumners [14].

Integrase proteins, however, do not fix the DNA writhe and act only once before releasing the DNA. The resulting DNA can thus take a variety of knotted or linked forms. To accurately model this varying writhe, and its effects on the resulting DNA products, we must use a larger number of tangles than needed for Tn3. We hence have not four tangles to find ( $P$ ,  $R$ ,  $O_f$  and  $O_c$ ), but 3 fixed tangles ( $P$ ,  $R$  and  $O_c$ ) together with the family of tangles  $O_f^k$ . This increased complexity of the tangle model for the Integrase family has thus far prevented a full solution to the tangle model.

Our ultimate aim, as mentioned above, is to describe all solutions to the systems of tangle equations that model the action of Flp. For reasons that will become apparent, we subdivide the possible tangles into the following categories: locally knotted, prime, integral, the  $(\infty)$  tangle, and strictly rational. As we shall see, the first category is easy to rule out, leaving the other four to consider.

We show there exists three classes of solutions.

Examples of one class of solutions was previously known [17]:  $P = (\infty)$  and the others are integral. The simplest example is when  $P = (\infty)$ ,  $R = (0)$  and  $O_f^k$  and  $O_c$  are such that  $O^k = (\pm(2k + 1))$  for inverted, or  $O^k = (\pm 2k)$  for direct [17].

A second class is  $P$  and  $O_c$  are integral, and  $O_f^k = (\infty)$  for at most value of  $k$ , integral for at most 2 values of  $k$  and strictly rational otherwise. The simplest example in this class is when  $P = (0)$ ,  $R = (\infty)$  and  $O^k = (\pm 1/(2k + 1))$  for inverted, or  $O^0 = (\infty)$  and  $O^{k>0} = (\pm 1/2k)$  for direct (see Figure 6), which is biologically equivalent to the first example. (See the

Conclusion for more details on biological equivalence.) Using biologically reasonable arguments that tightly constrain the mathematical possibilities (including the following: since DNA is negatively supercoiled, then  $O_f^k = (n)$  or  $(-n, 0)$ , and since  $P$  and  $R$  each represent short segments of DNA, they have at most 1 crossing) Crisona *et al* rule out solutions of this type [9].

Another example, which is biologically non-equivalent, is when  $P = (2)$  and  $R = (1)$ . In this case for direct repeats  $O_f^0 = (-1)$ ,  $O_f^1 = (-3)$  or  $(-\frac{5}{3})$ ,  $O_f^2 = (-\frac{9}{5})$ ,  $O_f^3 = (-\frac{13}{7})$  and  $O_f^4 = (-\frac{17}{9})$ . For inverted repeats  $O_f^0 = (\infty)$  or  $(-\frac{3}{2})$ ,  $O_f^1 = (-\frac{7}{4})$ ,  $O_f^2 = (-\frac{11}{6})$ ,  $O_f^3 = (-\frac{15}{8})$  and  $O_f^4 = (-\frac{19}{10})$ . See Figure 7.

In the second class  $O_1$  in Table 1 must be  $O_f^k$ . Further, if  $O_f^k$  is strictly rational, it must be a tangle that can be written as either vertical or the sum of a vertical and a horizontal tangle. (Note that if the vertical and the horizontal twists have opposite sign this is what is called a “non-canonical” form.)




FIGURE 6. Biological Conjectures

In the following two theorems, we use the fact that  $N(A+n+\infty) = D(A)$ .

**Theorem 3.1.** *If  $P$  and  $O_1$  are integral and  $O_2$  is strictly rational, then in fact  $O_1 = O_c$  and  $O_2 = O_f^k$ . In addition,  $O_f^k$  is either vertical, or the sum of a vertical and a horizontal tangle. The horizontal part must be equal to  $-(P + O_c)$ .*

**Proof.** If  $P$  and  $O_1$  are both integral then so is  $P + O_1$ , *i.e.*,  $P + O_1 = (m)$ . As  $O_2$  is strictly rational,  $O_2 + (m)$  is also a strictly rational tangle. Since  $N(O_2 + m)$  is the unknot, then  $O_2 + (m)$  must be vertical. This means that  $O_2 = (1/n) + (-m)$  where  $|n| > 1$  (if  $|n| = 1$  then  $O_2$  is integral). The proof is complete, if  $O_f^k = O_2$ .

Suppose instead  $O_c = O_2 = (1/n) + (-m)$ ,  $P = (s)$  and  $O_f^k = O_1 = (r_k)$ . Since  $O_f^k + O_c + P$  must be vertical, we have  $(1/n) + (-m) + (r_k) + (s) = (1/n)$ . Thus  $(r_k) = (m - s) = O_f^k$  is fixed, which can happen for at most 1 value of  $k$ , say  $k = j$ . For  $k \neq j$ , if  $O_f^k = (\infty)$ , then the substrate equation is  $N(\frac{1}{n} - m + s + \infty) = D(1/n) = b(1, 1)$ , and so  $|n| = 1$ . This contradicts  $|n| > 1$ . Additionally,  $O_f^k$  cannot be prime by Theorem 6.3, or strictly rational by Theorem 6.4. Hence there are no possibilities for  $O_f^k$  when  $k \neq j$ . Since the tangles equations for  $k = j$  and  $k \neq j$  must be solved simultaneously, this case cannot occur.




FIGURE 7. Solutions when  $P = (2)$  and  $R = (1)$ . *Direct repeats:*  $O_f^0 = (-1)$ ,  $O_f^1 = (-\frac{5}{3})$  or  $(-3)$ ,  $O_f^2 = (-\frac{9}{5})$  and  $O_f^3 = (-\frac{13}{7})$  *Inverted repeats:*  $O_f^0 = (-\frac{3}{2})$  or  $(\infty)$ ,  $O_f^1 = (-\frac{7}{4})$ ,  $O_f^2 = (-\frac{11}{6})$ ,  $O_f^3 = (-\frac{15}{8})$  and  $O_f^4 = (-\frac{19}{10})$ . Note that the  $O_f^k$ 's are in canonical form (all crossings of the same sign), and not in vertical plus horizontal form. The last figure shows how  $b(1, 1)$  becomes  $b(n, 1)$  for  $n$  horizontal twists.

In addition, in the second class, if a solution has  $O_f^k = (\infty)$  for one value of  $k$  and  $O_f^k$  integral for one other value of  $k$ , then we can say several things about the solution.

**Theorem 3.2.** *Given a solution in which  $O_c$  is integral, then*

- (i) *If  $O_f^i = (\infty)$  for one value  $i$  then  $R$  must be vertical or  $(\pm 1)$ .*

- (ii) If in addition  $P$  is integral and  $O_f^j$  is integral for one or two other values of  $k$ , then  $P \in \{0, \pm 2\}$ .

**Proof.**

- (i) Suppose  $O_c = (b)$  and  $O_f^i = (\infty)$  for some value  $i$ . Then the product is  $N(\infty + b + R) = D(R)$ , which must be a torus knot or link. As  $R$  is rational by Theorem A.2 for direct or [14] for inverted, this implies  $R$  must be vertical,  $R = (1/r)$  with  $|r| \geq 1$ .
- (ii) Suppose  $P = (p)$  and  $O_f^j = (n_j)$  for one value  $j$ ,  $j \neq i$ . Then the substrate equation is  $N(n_j + b + p) = b(1, 1)$  so  $p = -(n_j + b) \pm 1$ . The product is  $N(n_j + b + 1/r)$ , a torus knot or link. This means that  $n_j + b = \pm 1$ , hence  $P = 0$  or  $\pm 2$ .

The third and last class of solutions is where all tangles but one are strictly rational and the remaining tangle is integral. We note that if  $P$  and  $O_1$  are strictly rational, and  $O_2$  is integral, then  $O_f^k$  must be the strictly rational tangle,  $O_1$  as shown in the following:

**Theorem 3.3.** *If  $P$  and  $O_1$  are strictly rational and  $O_2$  is integral, then in fact  $O_1 = O_f^k$  and  $O_2 = O_c$ .*

**Proof.** Assume instead that  $O_c$  is strictly rational and that  $O_f^k$  is integral for all  $k$ . Then, by subsuming any horizontal twists of  $O_f^0$  into  $O_c$ , we can write  $O_f^0 = (0)$  and  $O_f^k = (n_k)$  where  $|n_k| > 0$  for all  $k \neq 0$ . So  $P = (x/y)$  and  $O_c = (u/v)$ , where  $y, v > 1$ .

So  $N(O_c + O_f^0 + P) = N(u/v + x/y) = b(1, 1)$  and  $N(O_c + O_f^k + P) = N(u/v + (u + n_k v)/v) = b(1, 1)$ . As in Ernst [12], we have  $|uy + xv| = 1$  and  $|uy + xv + n_k v y| = 1$ . Let  $\sigma_1 = \text{sign}(uy + xv)$ , and  $\sigma_2 = \text{sign}(uy + xv + n_k v y)$ .

If  $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$ , then  $uy + xv = uy + xv + n_k v y$  so  $n_k v y = 0$ . This implies  $n_k = 0$  for all  $k$ , contradicting  $|n_k| > 0$  for  $k \neq 0$ . So  $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$  for  $k = 0$  only. For  $k \neq 0$ ,  $O_f^k$  cannot be strictly rational nor  $(\infty)$  by Theorem 6.1(ii), nor prime by Theorem 6.1(iii). Since the tangle equations for all  $k$  must be solved simultaneously, this case cannot happen.

If  $\sigma_1 \neq \sigma_2$ , then  $-uy - xv = uy + xv + n_k v y$ , so  $n_k v y = -2(uy + xv) = -2\sigma_1 |uy + xv| = -2\sigma_1$ , i.e.,  $n_k v y = \pm 2$ . Recall, however, that  $v, y > 1$ , hence this is impossible.

An illustration of the last class of solutions is as follows: Suppose  $P$  is the rational tangle corresponding to some non-integer rational, say,  $(-\frac{2}{5})$  (see Figure 8). Then tangles of the form  $U_n = (\frac{1+2n}{3+5n})$  (for this value of  $P$ ) all satisfy  $N(-\frac{2}{5} + U_n) = \text{unknot}$ . Thus, all members of this class satisfy the first condition (before recombination) in both the inverted and direct cases. We must then find an  $R$  such that for each  $k$  there is a  $U_n$  such that  $N(R + U_n) = b(2k, 1)$  (in the direct case) or  $= b(2k + 1, 1)$  (in the inverted case). If  $R = (-\frac{1}{2})$ , then the condition  $N(R + U_n) = b(\alpha, 1)$  is satisfied,




FIGURE 8. Example of possible solutions for  $k = 0$  and 1 when  $P = (-\frac{2}{5})$ . In this case  $R = (-\frac{1}{2})$ . In the direct case  $O^0 = (\frac{1}{2})$  and  $O^1 = (\frac{5}{12})$  and in the inverted case  $O^0 = (\frac{3}{7})$  and  $O^1 = (\frac{7}{17})$ .

where  $\alpha = 2(1 + 2n) - 1(3 + 5n) = -(n + 1)$ . So for example, for  $b(0, 1)$  we take  $n = -1$ , for  $b(2, 1)$  we take  $n = -3$ , and so on.

We now turn our attention to reducing the number of other possibilities for the above tangles.

#### 4. RATIONALITY OF $O_f^k$ FOR DIRECT REPEATS

We first note that all tangles in our model, for both inverted and direct repeats, must be locally *unknotted*, since both the substrate and one product are unknotted. Therefore all double branched covers of the tangles in our model are irreducible, as are the double branched covers of their sums and numerator closures.

Ernst and Sumners [14] proved that  $P$ ,  $R$  and  $O^0$  (for both direct and inverted repeats) are rational tangles. In this section, we show that  $O^k = O_f^k + O_b$  rational for direct repeats, where  $k \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$ . In order to prove  $O^k$  is rational, we utilize the notion of strongly invertible knots. A knot  $K$  is *strongly invertible* if there exists an involution (*i.e.*, an order 2 orientation-preserving homeomorphism), of  $S^3$  which preserves  $K$  as a set and reverses the orientation of  $K$ . By a result of Waldhausen, such an involution is equivalent to a  $\pi$ -rotation whose axis is unknotted and which meets  $K$  in exactly two points [30].

We first establish some notation: Let  $V_{(\infty)}$  be the double branched cover of the  $(\infty)$  tangle, and  $r : V_{(\infty)} \rightarrow V_{(\infty)}$  be the involution corresponding to rotation by  $\pi$  about a vertical axis that punctures  $V_{(\infty)}$  in two arcs. The orbit space  $V_{(\infty)}/r$  is a 3-ball, and the induced projection  $V_{(\infty)} \rightarrow V_{(\infty)}/r$  is the branched covering of  $(\infty)$  branched over its arcs.

For any rational tangle  $P$ , and its solid torus double branched cover  $V_P$ , there exist the following two homeomorphisms:  $m : (\infty) \rightarrow P$  which takes

the tangle arcs of  $(\infty)$  to the tangle arcs of  $P$ , and  $\tilde{m} : V_{(\infty)} \rightarrow V_P$  be such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} r \curvearrowright V_{(\infty)} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{m}} & V_P \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow g \\ (\infty) & \xrightarrow{m} & P \end{array}$$

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $P$  be a rational tangle and  $O^k$  a tangle such that  $N(O^k + P) = b(1, 1)$ . Then  $J = \text{core}(V_P)$  is a strongly invertible knot in  $S^3$ .*

**Proof.** Recall that the double branched cover of  $S^3$  branched over the unknot  $b(1, 1)$  is  $S^3$ . Let  $p$  be the covering map. Then  $p$  gives rise to an order two homeomorphism  $i : S^3 \rightarrow S^3$ , where  $i(x) = x$  if  $x$  is in the branch locus  $p^{-1}(b(1, 1))$ , and  $i(x) = y$  if  $x \in S^3 \setminus p^{-1}(b(1, 1))$  and  $\{x, y\} = p^{-1}(p(x))$ . Then  $i$  is an orientation preserving map and hence is an involution. Note  $i|_{V_P} \cong h$ , where  $h$  is the homomorphism  $\tilde{m} \circ r \circ \tilde{m}^{-1} : V_P \rightarrow V_P$ . In fact,  $h$  is an involution of  $V_P$  such that  $V_P/h$  induces the covering  $g : V_P \rightarrow P$  branched over the two tangle arcs. Further, we can choose  $J' = \text{core}(V_{(\infty)})$  so that it intersects each branching arc exactly once and  $r(J') = J'$ . Thus, by choosing  $J = \tilde{m}(J') = \text{core}(V_P)$ , we ensure both that  $J$  can be isotoped to intersect each branching arc in  $V_P$  exactly once and that  $i(J) = J$ . Since  $r : V_{(\infty)} \rightarrow V_{(\infty)}$  is a rotation by  $\pi$ , it reverses the orientation on  $J'$ , and so  $h = i|_{V_P}$  does so on  $J$ . Hence  $J$  is a strongly invertible knot in  $S^3$ .

**Theorem 4.2.**  *$O^k = O_f^k + O_c$  is rational in the case of direct repeats.*

**Proof.** Suppose  $O^k$  is prime. If  $R$  is also prime, then  $\text{dbc}(N(O^k + R))$  must contain an incompressible torus by Lickorish [20], but  $\text{dbc}(N(O^k + R)) = L(p, q)$ , so we have a contradiction.

So if  $O_f^k$  is prime, then  $R$  must be rational. Now, by Lemma 4.1  $\widetilde{O}_f^k$  is the complement in  $S^3$  of a (nontrivial, as  $O^k$  is prime) strongly invertible knot  $J = \text{core}(V_P)$ . We then have  $\widetilde{O}^k \cup V_P = L(1, 1)$  for all  $k$ , and  $\widetilde{O}^2 \cup V_R = L(4, 1)$  and  $\widetilde{O}^3 \cup V_R = L(6, 1)$ . This contradicts a result by Hirasawa and Shimokawa [19]: there are no surgeries on nontrivial strongly invertible knots that yield lens spaces of the form  $L(2p, 1)$  for  $p$  prime. Hence,  $\widetilde{O}^k$  must be the complement of the trivial knot. In other words  $\widetilde{O}^k$  is a solid torus, and thus  $O^k$  is rational.

## 5. BACKGROUND FOR FURTHER RESULTS

Here we lay the necessary groundwork for Section 6, in which we eliminate all but one class of possible solutions.

If  $D$  is the gluing disc in the tangle sum  $T = O^k + P$ , then it is straightforward to see that the  $\widetilde{D} = \text{dbc}(D)$ , branched over 2 points, is an annulus in  $\partial\widetilde{P} = \partial\widetilde{O}^k$ . We now consider  $\partial\widetilde{D}$  in more detail.

**definition 5.1.** A curve on the boundary of a solid torus will be said to be **1-longitudinal**, **n-longitudinal**, or **meridional** if it wraps once,  $n$  times or 0 times, respectively, longitudinally around the solid torus boundary.

**Lemma 5.1.** *Given three rational tangles  $R$ ,  $S$  and  $T$  (and gluing disc  $D$  between  $S$  and  $T$ ), such that  $N(R + S + T) = b(1, 1)$  and hence  $V_R \cup V_S \cup_{\partial\tilde{D}} V_T = S^3$ , then:*

- (i)  $\partial\tilde{D}$  is meridional on  $\partial V_T$  iff  $T = (\infty)$ .
- (ii)  $\partial\tilde{D}$  is 1-longitudinal on  $\partial V_T$  iff  $T$  is integral.
- (iii)  $V_S \cup_{\tilde{D}} V_T$  is a solid torus  $W$  iff at least one of  $S$  and  $T$  is integral.
- (iv) Given 3 rational tangles  $R$ ,  $S$ , and  $T$ , such that  $N(R + S + T) = b(1, 1)$ , then one must be integral.
- (v) Given 3 rational tangles  $R$ ,  $S$ , and  $T$ , such that  $N(R + S + T) = b(1, 1)$ , then if one is  $(\infty)$  the other two must be integral

**Proof.**

(i & ii) It is simple to see that the lift of  $D$ , the gluing annulus for the  $(\infty)$  tangle, is a meridional annulus on  $\partial V_\infty$ . Every rational tangle can be obtained from the  $(\infty)$  tangle by an alternating series of vertical and horizontal twists. These correspond in  $\partial V_T$  to longitudinal and meridional Dehn twists: a summing disc  $D$  of  $(\infty)$  wraps equatorially around the 3-ball once for each of the first vertical half-twists of  $T$ . In  $V_T$ , each vertical half-twist of the strands of  $T$  corresponds to one longitudinal Dehn twist. The next horizontal half-twists wrap  $\tilde{D}$  meridionally around  $V_T$ , which does not change the number of longitudinal wraps.

Thus tangle  $T$  can contain at most one vertical half-twist (plus some number  $n$  of horizontal half-twists, *i.e.*,  $n + 1$  horizontal half-twists) for  $\partial\tilde{D}$  be 1-longitudinal on  $\partial V_T$ . Therefore  $T$  is integral. The converse is straightforward. (See Ernst [12] for a complete description of the construction of  $\text{dbc}(T)$ .)

(iii) If  $S = (\infty)$  then  $\partial\tilde{D}$  is meridional on  $V_S$  and so bounds a meridional disc  $\times I$ . Gluing this to a non-longitudinal curve would give a punctured lens space  $\not\cong S^3$ , and so from (ii),  $T$  must be integral. If  $S \neq (\infty)$ , gluing  $V_S$  and  $V_T$  together along annuli on their boundaries yields a Seifert Fiber Space over a disc with 0, 1 or 2 exceptional fibers, where  $\partial\tilde{D}$  induces the fibration. If  $\partial\tilde{D}$  wraps more than once longitudinally on both  $V_S$  and  $V_T$ , then the Seifert Fiber Space has 2 exceptional fibers and hence cannot be a solid torus. So  $\partial\tilde{D}$  is 1-longitudinal on at least one of  $\partial V_S$  or  $\partial V_T$ , and thus by (i) at least one of  $S$  and  $T$  is integral.

Note that if  $S$  (say) is integral, then by (ii),  $\partial\tilde{D}$  is 1-longitudinal on  $\partial V_S$ . It is straightforward to show that this implies that  $V_S \cup V_T$  is a solid torus.

- (iv) If  $V_R \cup V_S$  is a solid torus  $W$ , then by (iii)  $\partial\tilde{D}$  is 1-longitudinal on  $\partial V_R$  or  $\partial V_S$ , i.e.,  $R$  or  $S$  is integral. Otherwise, suppose that  $V_R \cup V_S = S^3 \setminus V_T$  is not a solid torus. Then  $S^3 \setminus V_T = V_R \cup V_S$  is a non-trivial knot complement, so  $V_T$  is a torus knot neighborhood, and so  $V_S \cup V_T$  and  $V_R \cup V_T$  are each solid tori. Thus  $\partial\tilde{D}$  is 1-longitudinal on  $\partial V_T$ , and so by (ii)  $T$  is integral.
- (v) Assume one of the three tangles, say  $R$ , is  $(\infty)$ . Then if  $S$  and  $T$  are strictly rational,  $N(S + \infty + T) = D(S + T) = D(S) \# D(T) = b(1, 1)$ . This means  $D(S)$  and  $D(T)$  must each be the unknot. Since for a rational tangle  $A$  we have  $D(A)$  is the unknot iff  $A$  is integral,  $S$  and  $T$  must both be integral.

In Section 6, we also will need the following result on surfaces in knot complements.

**Theorem 5.2** (Simon [27]). *If a knot  $J$  in  $S^3$  contains an essential annulus in its complement, then  $J$  is either a cable (possibly torus) knot or composite knot.*

Let  $X$  denote an essential annulus in  $S^3 \setminus N(K)$ . In the case of a composite knot,  $X$  comes from a sphere  $S$  that intersects the knot twice.  $S$  cuts  $K$  into two arcs  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , such that an arc joining the cut points on  $S$  together with either  $\alpha$  or  $\beta$  will yield a nontrivial knot. In this case  $\partial X$  is meridional on  $N(K)$ . If  $K$  is a cable knot, then each component of  $\partial X$  is  $n$ -longitudinal along  $N(K)$ .

## 6. ELIMINATING AND RESTRICTING SOLUTIONS

We now have that  $P$ ,  $R$  and  $O^0$  are rational for both direct and inverted repeats, and that  $O^k$  is rational for all  $k$  for direct repeats. In the theorems that follow we examine different possibilities for the tangles  $O_f^k$ ,  $O_c$  and  $P$ , and either eliminate or restrict each possibility in turn. These theorems hold for both direct and inverted repeats, unless explicitly stated otherwise.

For each of the theorems below, we use the fact that  $N(O_f^k + O_c + P) = b(1, 1)$ . Recall we use  $O_1$  and  $O_2$  in the cases where it is not necessary to distinguish between  $O_c$  and  $O_f^k$ . The first theorem follows from Lemma 5.1.

**Theorem 6.1.**

- (i) *At most one of  $O_f^k$ ,  $O_c$  and  $P$  can be  $(\infty)$ .*
- (ii) *The three tangles  $O_f^k$ ,  $O_c$  and  $P$  cannot all be strictly rational. Also, the case  $P$  and  $O_1$  are strictly rational and  $O_2 = (\infty)$  cannot occur.*
- (iii) *The case  $P = (\infty)$  or strictly rational,  $O_1$  strictly rational and  $O_2$  prime cannot occur.*
- (iv) *If  $P = (\infty)$  and both  $O_c$  and  $O_f^k$  are rational, then both  $O_c$  and  $O_f^k$  must be integral.*

**Proof.**



- (i) If there were two tangles that were  $(\infty)$ , the circular substrate would include 2 closed circles, or alternately would imply that  $S^3$  contains a punctured  $S^2 \times S^1$ , a contradiction.
- (ii) This is a direct consequence of Lemma 5.1(iv).
- (iii) If  $P$  and  $O_1$  be rational, then  $\widetilde{P} = V_P$  and  $\widetilde{O}_1 = V_{O_1}$  and  $V_{O_1} \cup V_P$  must be a solid torus, otherwise  $(\partial(V_{O_1} \cup V_P))$  would be incompressible. Hence by Lemma 5.1(iii), either  $P$  or  $O_1$  is integral.
- (iv) Since  $P = (\infty)$  this follows from Lemma 5.1(v).

**6.1. Restrictions on the knot core( $V_P$ ).** In the following three theorems, we show that, given certain tangle types,  $\text{core}(V_P)$  must be either a composite, cable or torus knot. We then use Dehn surgery results to obtain a contradiction.

**Theorem 6.2.**  $O_c$  and  $O_f^k$  cannot both be prime.

**Proof.** Suppose  $O_c$  and  $O_f^k$  are prime—i.e.,  $\widetilde{O}_c$  and  $\widetilde{O}_f^k$  have incompressible boundaries. Since  $O_c$  and  $O_f^k$  are glued along a disc  $D$ , then  $\widetilde{O}_c$  and  $\widetilde{O}_f^k$  are glued along this disc's lift, the annulus  $\widetilde{D}$ . Note this annulus must be incompressible. So  $S^3 \setminus V_P$  is a knot complement containing an incompressible annulus. Hence if  $\partial D$  on  $\partial V_P$  is meridional,  $S^3 \setminus V_P$  is composite, or if not  $S^3 \setminus V_P$  is cabled or torus (by Theorem 5.2).

If  $V_P$  is a cable or torus knot, then since  $S^3 \setminus \{\widetilde{D} \cup V_P\} \cong \text{int}(\widetilde{O}_f^k) \cup \text{int}(\widetilde{O}_c)$ , this implies that either  $\widetilde{O}_c$  or  $\widetilde{O}_f^k$  is a solid torus whose core is the companion of the cable knot. Thus either  $O_c$  or  $O_f^k$  must be rational, contradicting our assumption.

Hence  $S^3 \setminus V_P = \widetilde{O}_f^k \cup \widetilde{O}_c$  is a composite knot complement. This contradicts a result of Bing and Martin [3]: surgery on a composite knot never yields a lens space.

**Theorem 6.3.** The case where  $P$  is integral,  $O_1$  is strictly rational and  $O_2$  is prime cannot occur.

**Proof.** Given  $P$  is integral, then by Lemma 5.1 (iii),  $W = V_{O_1} \cup_{\widetilde{D}} V_P$  is a solid torus. Let  $D$  be the gluing disc in  $P + O_1$ , then  $\widetilde{D}$  is 1-longitudinal on  $\partial V_P$  and  $n$ -longitudinal ( $n > 1$ ) on  $\partial V_{O_1}$  by Lemma 5.1 (ii). Hence  $\text{core}(V_P)$  is isotopic to an  $n$ -longitudinal curve on  $\partial V_{O_1}$  and  $\text{core}(W)$  and  $\text{core}(V_{O_1})$  are isotopic. Thus,  $\text{core}(V_P)$  is a  $(m, n)$  cable of  $\text{core}(V_{O_1})$ . Therefore  $\widetilde{O}_2 \cong S^3 \setminus (V_{O_1} \cup V_P) \cong S^3 \setminus V_{O_1}$ , i.e.,  $\widetilde{O}_f^k$  is the (nontrivial, as  $O_2$  is prime) complement of the companion knot  $\text{core}(V_{O_1})$  of the cable knot  $\text{core}(V_P)$ .

$S^3 \setminus V_P = V_{O_1} \cup \widetilde{O}_2$  is the complement of a nontrivial cable knot. Removing  $V_P$  and replacing it with  $V_R$  to obtain a new four-plat  $b(p, q)$  is equivalent to surgery on  $\widetilde{O}_2 \cup V_{O_1}$  which yields a lens space  $L(p, q)$ . By a result of Bleiler and Litherland [5],  $p$  must be greater than or equal to 23, which contradicts the fact that all the products have  $p \leq 7$ .

**Theorem 6.4.** *The case where  $P$  is integral, and both  $O_c$  and  $O_f^k$  are strictly rational cannot occur.*

**Proof.** Since all three tangles are rational, we have  $V_f^k \cup_{\tilde{D}} V_b \cup_{\tilde{A}} V_P$ , where  $\partial\tilde{A} = \partial\tilde{D}$ . Since  $P$  is integral,  $\partial A$  is 1-longitudinal on  $\partial V_P$  (by Theorem 5.1(ii)),  $s$ -longitudinal on  $\partial V_b$  (with  $s > 1$ ) and  $t$ -longitudinal on  $\partial V_f^k$  (with  $t > 1$ ). Let  $W = V_P \cup V_b$ , a solid torus by Lemma 5.1(iii). Then  $W \cup V_f^k$  is a Heegaard splitting of  $S^3$ , and  $\text{core}(V_P)$  is isotopic to an  $s$ -longitudinal curve on  $\partial W$ . Similarly,  $W' = V_P \cup V_f^k$  is a solid torus, with  $\text{core}(V_P)$   $t$ -longitudinal on  $\partial W'$ . Thus  $\text{core}(V_P)$  is an  $(s, t)$  torus knot, such that surgery on its complement yields in particular  $L(2, 1)$  for direct or  $L(3, 1)$  for inverted repeats. This contradicts a corollary from Moser [22]: if surgery on a torus knot complement yield a lens spaces  $L(p, q)$ , then  $p \geq 5$ .

**Theorem 6.5.**

1. *For direct repeats, the following cases cannot occur:*
  - (i)  $O_1$  is integral and  $O_2$  is prime.
  - (ii)  $O_1$  and  $O_2$  are both strictly rational.
  - (iii)  $O_1$  is strictly rational and  $O_2 = (\infty)$ .
2. *For inverted repeats, we have the following restrictions:*
  - (i) if  $O_c$  is integral then  $O_f^0$  cannot be prime
  - (ii) if  $O_c$  is strictly rational then  $O_f^0$  must be integral
  - (iii) if  $O_c$  is prime, then  $O_f^0 = (\infty)$

**Proof.** We have shown in previous sections, that  $O_c + O_f^k$  is rational for direct repeats, and  $O^0 = O_f^0 + O_c$  is rational for inverted. The result then follows directly from a result of Quach [24]: the sum of 2 tangles is prime if either both subtangles are prime, one subtangle is prime and the other rational ( $\neq (\infty)$ ), or both are non-integral rational.

**6.2. Restrictions from the range of  $k$ .** We will need this lemma for the following theorem.

**Lemma 6.6.** *Suppose one of  $P$ ,  $O_c$ ,  $O_f^k$  is strictly rational and the other two are integral. Then the strictly rational tangle can be written as a rational tangle of length two, i.e., as one set of vertical twists followed by one set of (possibly zero) horizontal twists.*

**Proof.** Since a strictly rational tangle plus an integral tangle yields a rational tangle, we can write  $N(A + B) = b(1, 1)$ , such that, without loss of generality,  $A = (a/b)$  and  $B = (n)$ . Then by a result of Ernst and Sumners [14],  $|a + bn| = 1$ , and so  $\frac{a}{b} = \mp n + 1/\pm b$ , so  $A$  is composed of  $\pm b$  vertical twists and  $\mp n$  horizontal twists.

Note that the length two projection of the tangle may not be the canonical form, in which the projection of a rational tangle has all the crossings of the

same sign. In other words, a non-canonical form occurs when the horizontal and the vertical twists are of opposite sign.

The next theorem relies on the fact that for each  $k \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$ ,  $O_f^k$  must be distinct.

**Theorem 6.7.** *We have the following restrictions on  $O_f^k$ :*

- (i) *If  $P$  is strictly rational and  $O_c$  is integral, then  $O_f^k$  is integral for at most 1 value of  $k$ .*
- (ii) *If  $P$  and  $O_c$  are integral, then  $O_f^k$  is integral for at most 2 values of  $k$ .*

**Proof.**

- (i) If  $P$  is strictly rational, then by Lemma 6.6,  $P = (p + 1/q)$ ,  $O_c = (b)$  and  $O_f^k = (f_k)$ . Since  $N(f_k + b + p \pm 1/q) = b(1, 1)$ , then  $f_k = -(b + p)$ , a constant independent of  $k$ . This can occur for at most 1 value of  $k$ , since if  $i \neq j$ ,  $O_f^i \neq O_f^j$ .
- (ii) Similarly, if  $O_f^k = (f_k)$ ,  $O_c = (b)$  and  $P = (p)$ , then  $N(O_f^k + O_c + P) = N(f_k + b + p) = b(1, 1)$ . So  $f_k = -(b + p) \pm 1$ , *i.e.*, there are at most two choices for  $f_k$ .

The following theorem is based on the fact that the denominator or numerator closure of a single tangle cannot give rise to a spectrum of products. We also use the following facts:  $N(A + \infty) = D(A)$ ,  $D(A + n) = D(A)$  where  $(n)$  is an integral tangle, and  $D(A + B) = D(A) \# D(B)$ . For  $S$  rational,  $N(S) = b(1, 1)$  iff  $S$  is vertical, and  $D(S) = b(1, 1)$  iff  $S$  is integral.

**Theorem 6.8.** *The following cases cannot occur:*

- (i)  *$P$  strictly rational,  $O_1 = (\infty)$  and  $O_2$  integral.*
- (ii)  *$P$  integral,  $O_1 = (\infty)$  and  $O_2$  strictly rational.*
- (iii)  *$P$  strictly rational,  $O_1 = (\infty)$  and  $O_2$  prime.*
- (iv)  *$P$  integral,  $O_c = (\infty)$  and  $O_f^k$  integral.*
- (v)  *$P$  integral,  $O_c = (\infty)$  and  $O_f^k$  prime.*

*In addition, for direct repeats:*

- (vi) *The case  $P$  integral,  $O_c$  prime and  $O_f^k = (\infty)$  cannot occur.*
- (vii) *If  $P$  and  $O_c$  are integral and  $O_f^k = (\infty)$  for a value of  $k$ , then  $O_f^k$  may be integral for up to 2 values of  $k$  and must be strictly rational for all other values of  $k$ .*

*For inverted repeats:*

- (viii) *If  $P$  is integral,  $O_c$  is prime, and  $O_f^k = (\infty)$  for a value of  $k$ , then  $O_f^k$  must be integral for all other values of  $k$ .*

**Proof.**

- (i, ii & iii) Note first that the substrate equation for either inverted or direct is  $N(\infty + O_2 + P) = D(O_2 + P) = D(O_2) \# D(P) = b(1, 1)$ . Thus both  $D(O_2)$  and  $D(P)$  must be the unknot. Hence  $O_2$  must be

integral or prime. In addition, as  $P$  is rational,  $P$  must be integral. Therefore Cases (i), (ii) and (iii) are impossible.

- (iv) If  $O_c = (\infty)$ , and  $O_f^k = (n_k)$ , then the product is  $N(n_k + \infty + R) = D(R)$ , which is a unique four-plat. Hence  $O_f^k$  is integral for at most one value of  $k$ , say  $k = j$ . For  $k \neq j$ , then as mentioned above,  $O_f^k$  must be prime. The product equations are:  $N(\infty + O_f^k + R) = D(O_f^k) \# D(R) = b(2k+1, 1)$ . As noted above, given the substrate equation  $D(O_f^k)$  must be the unknot, and thus the product is  $D(R)$ , which is a fixed four-plat. Hence there can be only one value of  $k$ , say  $k = i$ , such that  $O_f^i$  is prime. Therefore this case cannot occur since this accounts for only 2 values of  $k$ , but  $k \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$ .
- (v) If  $O_c = (\infty)$ , and  $O_f^k$  is prime, then, arguing as in Case (iv),  $O_f^k$  can be prime for at most one value of  $k$ , say  $k = j$ . For  $k \neq j$ , then as shown in Cases (i), (ii) and (iii),  $O_f^k$  must be integral. As in Case (iv),  $O_f^k$  can be integral for at most 1 value of  $k$  as well, and so this case, as above, cannot occur.
- (vi) In the case of direct repeats, suppose  $P$  is integral and  $O_c$  is prime, and for some  $j$ ,  $O_f^j = (\infty)$ . Then for  $k \neq j$ ,  $O_f^k$  cannot be prime, by Theorem 6.2. In addition  $O_f^k$  cannot be strictly rational, by Theorem 6.3. Finally  $O_f^k$  cannot be integral by Theorem 6.5(i), and so this case cannot occur.
- (vii) In the case of direct repeats, if  $P$  and  $O_c$  are integral and for some  $j$ ,  $O_f^j = (\infty)$ , then for  $k \neq j$ ,  $O_f^k \neq (\infty)$ . If  $O_f^k$  is integral, then there can be at most two values of  $k$  such that  $O_f^k$  is integral by Theorem 6.7(ii). For direct repeats,  $O_f^k$  cannot be prime by Theorem 6.5(i). Thus  $O_f^k$  must be strictly rational for all other values of  $k$ . Note that if  $O_f^k$  is strictly rational then by Theorem 3.1  $O_f^k$  must be either a vertical tangle or the sum of a vertical and a horizontal tangle.
- (viii) In the case of inverted repeats, suppose  $P$  is integral and  $O_c$  is prime, and for some  $j$ ,  $O_f^j = (\infty)$ . Then for  $k \neq j$ ,  $O_f^k$  cannot be prime, by Theorem 6.2. In addition  $O_f^k$  cannot be strictly rational, by Theorem 6.3. Therefore, for  $k \neq j$ ,  $O_f^k$  must be integral.

## 7. RESTRICTIONS ON REMAINING INVERTED CASE

In Section 6 we eliminate all classes of solutions, other than the three classes given in Theorem 1, for direct repeats.

In the inverted case, these three classes of solutions are the only ones, with possible exception of the case where  $P$  is rational,  $O_1$  is integral and  $O_2$  is prime. If  $P$  is integral, then for at most one value of  $k$ ,  $O_f^k$  could be  $(\infty)$ . If in addition,  $O_c$  is also integral then  $O_f^k$  could be integral for at most

2 values of  $k$ , and strictly rational or prime otherwise. We now prove that  $\widetilde{O}^k$  is the complement of a hyperbolic knot or, for  $k = 2$ , possibly the trefoil knot.

**Theorem 7.1.** *For inverted repeats, if  $P$  is strictly rational,  $O_1$  is integral and  $O_2$  is prime, then  $\widetilde{O}^k$  cannot be a satellite knot complement. For  $k \neq 2$   $\widetilde{O}^k$  cannot be a torus knot complement. For  $k = 2$ , then if  $\widetilde{O}^k$  is a torus knot, it must be the trefoil knot complement.*

**Proof.** *Case 1:*  $\text{core}(V_P)$  is a satellite knot. For both inverted and direct repeats this contradicts a result of Bleiler and Litherland [5]: if surgery on  $\text{core}(V_P)$  yields a lens space  $L(p, q)$ , then  $p \geq 23$ .

*Case 2:*  $\text{core}(V_P)$  is a (non-trivial) torus knot,  $T_{(m,n)}$ , so  $(m, n) = 1$ , and as it is non-trivial  $m, n > 1$  and  $mn \geq 6$ . If  $T_{(m,n)}(r)$ , the manifold resulting from surgery along slope  $r$ , is a lens space, results of Moser [22] tell us that the lens space must be  $L(p, qn^2)$  where  $p$  and  $q$  are related to  $m$  and  $n$  by  $p = qmn \pm 1$ . Since for  $T_{(m,n)}$  nontrivial,  $mn \geq 6$ , it follows that  $p \geq 5$ . It is simple to check that the smallest lens spaces that can result are  $L(5, 4)$ ,  $L(7, 2)$ ,  $L(7, 4)$ ,  $L(9, 4)$  and  $L(9, 7)$ . By Brody [6], only  $L(5, 4)$  is homeomorphic to a product, namely  $L(5, 1)$  (the product when  $k = 2$ ).  $L(5, 1)$  can only be obtained by surgery on the trefoil knot complement. For the other products  $L(2k + 1, 1)$  ( $k \neq 2$ ), we obtain a contradiction.

A simple closed curve on a handlebody  $W$  is *primitive* if it is a free generator of  $\pi_1(W)$ . A curve on  $F = W_1 \cap W_2$ , a Heegaard splitting surface, is *doubly primitive* if it is primitive on both handlebodies  $W_1$  and  $W_2$ . A *Berge knot*,  $K$ , is a doubly primitive curve on a genus two Heegaard surface of  $S^3$ . Berge [2] showed that there is an integer surgery on  $K$  that yields a lens space. The Berge Conjecture states that this is the only type of non-trivial knots that have surgery yielding lens spaces.

In the current setting, from Theorem 7.1, for  $k \neq 2$ ,  $\widetilde{O}^k$  would have to be the complement of either a hyperbolic Berge knot or a knot that is a counterexample to the Berge conjecture.

## 8. CONCLUSION AND DIRECTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

We have given three families of solutions for the tangle equations that arise from the action of the protein Flp on DNA.

Recall in Section 3.2 we gave three classes of solutions. The second class included the example where  $O_f^k$  is strictly rational,  $O_c$  is integral,  $P = (0)$  and  $R = (\infty)$ . This example, however, is *biologically equivalent* to the solution introduced in [17]:  $P$  is the infinity tangle,  $O_c$  and  $O_f^k$  are integral tangles. That is to say, the two classes of solutions reflect identical models of protein action—tangle surgery interchanges the only two tangles with zero crossings ( $(\infty)$  and  $(0)$ ). The second example given of this class, however, is not biologically equivalent. The third class of solutions includes many different (biologically non-equivalent) possible actions.

We have eliminated all other classes of solutions in the case of direct repeats, and all but one in the case of inverted. Several open questions remain. The first two questions are directed towards biologists. Firstly, although experiments have determined the number of crossings of the product knots and links, for higher crossing products it has not been confirmed that they are in fact torus knots and links. Can we obtain experimental confirmation of this? Secondly, although the third class of solutions is mathematically possible, biological considerations such as DNA's stiffness impeding a high number of crossings, make them biologically unlikely. So can the third class of solutions be ruled out experimentally?

The third question is mathematical in nature, and is as follows: as noted in Section 7, one possibility remains open for the inverted case:  $P \in \mathbb{Q}$ ,  $O_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ , and  $O_2$  prime. It is therefore natural to ask whether this possibility can be eliminated. We plan to investigate whether there exist examples of  $\widetilde{O}^k$  that are the complement of a hyperbolic Berge knot or (for  $k = 2$ ) the trefoil knot. In addition, it may be possible to eliminate—or find solutions within—certain subclasses of prime tangles, such as Montesinos knots.

Again, although we have described the biology and tangle solutions in detail for the protein Flp, our results hold more generally. In particular, they can be applied to all proteins in the Integrase family, such as  $\lambda$  Int and Cre, whose products are torus knots or links.

**Acknowledgements.** We wish to thank Cameron Gordon and John Luecke for a number of illuminating discussions. We also would like to thank Makkuni Jayaram for introducing us to Flp. Finally, we wish to thank Mark Haskins for his careful reading of previous versions, and the reviewer for his/her careful reading and insightful comments. DB was supported by a grant from the Burroughs Wellcome Fund. CVM was supported in part by the Presidential Excellence Summer Scholarly Activity Grant from St. Edward's University.

#### REFERENCES

1. C. Bankwitz and H.G. Schumann, *Über Viergeflechte*, Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg **10** (1934), 263–284.
2. J. Berge, *Some knots with surgeries yielding lens spaces*, unpublished manuscript.
3. R.H. Bing and J.M. Martin, *Cubes with knotted holes*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **155** (1971), 217–331.
4. S. Bleiler, *Knots prime on many strings*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. (1) **282** (1984), 385–401.
5. S.A. Bleiler and R.A. Litherland, *Lens spaces and Dehn surgery*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **107** (189), 1127–1131.
6. E.J. Brody, *The topological classification of lens spaces*, Ann. of Math (2) **71** (1960), 163–184.
7. Y. Chen, U. Narendra, L.E. Iype, M.M. Cox and P.A. Rice, *Crystal structure of a Flp Recombinase - Holliday junction complex: assembly of an active oligomer by helix swapping*, Molecular Cell **6**, (2000), 885–897.
8. J. Conway, *On enumeration of knots and links and some of their related properties*, Computational Problems in Abstract Algebra. Pergamon Press (1970), 329–358.

9. N.J. Crisona, R.L. Weinberg, B.J. Peter, D.W. Sumners and N.R. Cozzarelli, *The topological mechanism of phage lambda integrase*, Journal of Molecular Biology (4) **289** (1999), 747–775.
10. M. Culler, C.McA. Gordon, J. Luecke and P.B. Shalen, *Dehn surgery on knots*, Ann. of Math. (2) **125** (1987), 237–300.
11. I.K. Darcy, *Biological distances on DNA knots and links: applications to Xer recombination*, Knots in Hellas '98, J. Knot Theory Ramifications, (2) **10** (2001), 269–294.
12. C. Ernst, PhD Thesis, Florida State University (1990).
13. ——— *Tangle equations I*, J. Knot Theory Ramifications **5** (1996).
14. C. Ernst and D.W. Sumners, *A calculus for rational tangles: Applications to DNA recombination*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc. **108** (1990), 489–515.
15. ——— *Solving tangle equations arising in a DNA recombination model*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc. **126** (1999), 23–36.
16. C.McA. Gordon, *Dehn surgery and satellite knots*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **275** (1983), no. 2, 687–708.
17. I. Grainge, D. Buck and M. Jayaram, *Geometry of site alignment during Int family recombination: Antiparallel synapsis by the Flp recombinase*, Journal of Molecular Biology (5) **298** (2000), 749–764.
18. I. Grainge and M. Jayaram, *Int family of recombinases: organization and function of the active site*, Molecular Microreviews **33** (1999), 449–456.
19. M. Hirasawa and K. Shimokawa, *Dehn surgeries on strongly invertible knots which yield lens spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. (11) **128** (2000), 3445–3451.
20. W.B.R. Lickorish, *Prime knots and tangles*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **267** (1981), 321–332.
21. A. Maxwell and A.D. Bates, DNA topology, Oxford University Press (1993).
22. L. Moser, *Elementary surgery along a torus knot*, Pacific J. Math. **38** (1971), 737–745.
23. P. Orlik, *Seifert Manifolds*, Cambridge Lecture Notes in Mathematics 291, Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1972).
24. T.C.V. Quach, *On a theorem on partially summing tangles by Lickorish*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc. **93** (1983), 63–66.
25. D. Rolfsen, Knots and links, Publish or Perish, Berkeley, CA (1971)
26. H. Schubert, *Über eine numerische Knoteninvariante*, Math. Z. **61** (1954), 245–288.
27. J. Simon, *An algebraic classification of knots in  $S^3$* , Ann. Math. (1) **97** (1973), 1–13.
28. D.W. Sumners, C. Ernst, S.J. Spengler and N.R. Cozzarelli, *Analysis of the mechanism of DNA recombination*, Quart. Rev. Biophys. (3) **28** (1995), 253–315.
29. M. Vazquez and D.W. Sumners, *Tangle analysis of  $G_{in}$  recombination*, Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. accepted September 2002.
30. F. Waldhausen, *Über Involutionen der 3-Sphäre*, Topology **8** (1969), 81–91.
31. S. Wasserman, J. Dungan and N.R. Cozzarelli, *Discovery of a predicted DNA knot substantiates a model for site-specific recombination*, Science **229** (1985), 171–174.
32. S.A. Wasserman and N. Cozzarelli, *Biochemical topology: Applications to DNA recombination and replication*, Science **232** (1986), 951–960.

| $P$           | $O_1$         | $O_2$         | Theorem where case is eliminated or restricted   | Solutions  |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|--|------------|
| $\infty$      | prime         | prime         | Theorem 6.2  |            |
|               | $\mathbb{Q}!$ | prime         | Theorem 6.1(iii)   |            |
|               |               | $\mathbb{Z}$  | Theorem 6.1(iv)  |            |
|               |               | $\mathbb{Q}!$ | Theorem 6.1(iv)  |            |
|               | $\mathbb{Z}$  | prime         | Theorem 6.5(i) for direct<br>Theorem 7.1 for inverted,<br>when $\widetilde{O}^k$ is a torus ( $k \neq 2$ )<br>or satellite knot complement |            |
|               |               | $\mathbb{Z}$  |  | SOLUTION 1 |
| $\mathbb{Z}$  | prime         | prime         | Theorem 6.2  |            |
|               | $\infty$      | prime         | Theorem 6.8(v) $O_c = O_1$<br>Theorem 6.8(vi) $O_c = O_2$ for direct   |            |
|               |               | $\mathbb{Z}$  | Theorem 6.8(iv) $O_c = O_1$  | SOLUTION 2 |
|               |               | $\mathbb{Q}!$ | Theorem 6.8(ii)  |            |
|               | $\mathbb{Q}!$ | prime         | Theorem 6.3  |            |
|               |               | $\mathbb{Q}!$ | Theorem 6.4  |            |
|               | $\mathbb{Z}$  | $\mathbb{Z}$  | Theorem 6.7(ii) for all but 2 values of $k$  | SOLUTION 2 |
|               |               | prime         | Theorem 6.5(i) for direct<br>Theorem 7.1 for inverted,<br>when $\widetilde{O}^k$ is a torus ( $k \neq 2$ )<br>or satellite knot complement |            |
|               |               | $\mathbb{Q}!$ | $O_c = O_1$ by Theorem 3.1   | SOLUTION 2 |
| $\mathbb{Q}!$ | prime         | prime         | Theorem 6.2  |            |
|               | $\infty$      | prime         | Theorem 6.8(iii)   |            |
|               |               | $\mathbb{Z}$  | Theorem 6.8(i)   |            |
|               |               | $\mathbb{Q}!$ | Theorem 6.1(ii)  |            |
|               | $\mathbb{Q}!$ | prime         | Theorem 6.1(iii)   |            |
|               |               | $\mathbb{Z}$  | $O_2 = O_c$ by Theorem 3.3   | SOLUTION 3 |
|               |               | $\mathbb{Q}!$ | Theorem 6.1(ii)  |            |
|               | $\mathbb{Z}$  | $\mathbb{Z}$  | Theorem 6.7(i) for all but 1 value of $k$  | SOLUTION 3 |
|               |               | prime         | Theorem 6.5(i) for direct<br>Theorem 7.1 for inverted,<br>when $\widetilde{O}^k$ is a torus ( $k \neq 2$ )<br>or satellite knot complement |            |

TABLE 1. All possible tangles classes for  $P$  and  $\{O_1, O_2\} = \{O_c, O_f^k\}$ .  $P$  is rational [14], and at most one of  $P$ ,  $O_1$  and  $O_2$  is  $(\infty)$  by Theorem 6.1.



APPENDIX A.  $R$  IS RATIONAL FOR DIRECT REPEATS

We provide an alternative proof to Ernst and Sumners' result [14] that  $R$  must be rational for direct repeats.

Our proof relies on the Cyclic Surgery Theorem, and Theorem A.1 below. In particular, it utilizes the products  $b(0, 1)$  and  $b(2, 1)$ . In contrast, the work of [14] requires the products  $b(p, q_1)$ ,  $b(p + 2, q_2)$  and  $b(p + 4, q_3)$  (in this setting,  $b(0, 1)$ ,  $b(2, 1)$  and  $b(4, 1)$ ). Since different protein systems can yield different products, these two theorems may be useful in complementary situations.

**Theorem A.1.** *Let  $M$  be an orientable Seifert Fiber Space with incompressible torus boundary. Then there are no slopes  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  on  $\partial M$  such that  $M(\alpha) = L(0, 1)$  and  $M(\beta) = L(2, 1)$ .*

**Proof.** We first claim that  $M$  must be a Seifert Fiber Space (abbreviated SFS) over  $D^2$  with exactly 2 exceptional fibers. Note first that  $M$  must have base space  $D^2$ . If the base space were orientable and not  $D^2$ , then fillings yield a SFS over a genus  $\geq 1$  surface, not lens spaces. If the base space were non-orientable then the fibers over an orientation-reversing curve on the base space would form a Klein Bottle (as  $M$  is orientable), a contradiction. Secondly, if  $M$  had 1 exceptional fiber  $M$  would be a solid torus, hence have compressible boundary. If  $M$  had 3 or more exceptional fibers, then  $M(r)$  would either be the connect sum of 3 or more lens spaces (if  $r$  was a fiber slope) or otherwise a SFS over  $S^2$  with at least 3 exceptional fibers. In neither case would  $M(r)$  be a lens space. (See Orlik [23] for more information on SFSs.) So  $M$  must be a SFS over  $D^2$  with 2 exceptional fibers.

Fillings along the fiber slope give the connect sum of two lens spaces, which can never be a lens space. All other fillings of  $M$  induce a Seifert fibration over  $S^2$  with at least the same two exceptional fibers. If the filling is to yield a lens space, then there can be only two exceptional fibers. Hence the induced fibration on the filling solid torus must be 1-longitudinal, as any other filling gives a SFS over  $S^2$  with 3 exceptional fibers.

So we must look at the possible Seifert fiberings of lens spaces  $L(2k, 1)$  for  $k \in \{0, 1\}$ . Assume that  $M$  has two fillings, one yielding  $L(0, 1)$  and the other  $L(2, 1)$ , and let us study their induced fibrations. We first examine in the general case the topological constraints that lens spaces place on their possible fibrations, and then return to the specific fillings above. Note from above that the induced fibrations would all have the same exceptional fiber multiplicities as  $M$ .

Suppose the two exceptional fibers of  $M$  have neighborhoods  $N_i$  fibered by fibers of slope  $\alpha_i = p_i/q_i$  respectively, where  $(p_i, q_i) = 1$  and  $p_i > 1$  and  $q_i \neq 0$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . The multiplicity of each exceptional fiber is  $p_i$ . Let  $\beta_1 = r_1/s_1$  be a slope on  $\partial N_1$  that intersects  $\alpha_1$  exactly once (so that together they form a basis for  $H_1(\partial N_1)$ ). In this case  $|p_1 s_1 - q_1 r_1| = 1$ . Let  $\tilde{R}(t_k) = L(2k, 1)$  have the Seifert fibering induced by the filling slope  $t_k$ .

Then there are Heegaard solid tori  $W_i$  which are fibered by the same slopes  $\alpha_i$ .

Let  $\beta_2^k = r_2^k/s_2^k$  be the image of  $\beta_1$  under the gluing map  $h : \partial W_1 \rightarrow \partial W_2$  (so we also have  $\alpha_2 = h(\alpha_1)$ ). Note that  $\beta_2^k$  depends on the filling  $t_k$ . We have that  $|p_2 s_2^k - q_2 r_2^k| = 1$ . The meridian  $\mu_1 = 0/1$  of  $W_1$  can be written as a linear combination  $m(p_1/q_1) + n(r_1/s_1)$ , which gives us two equations:  $mp_1 + nr_1 = 0$  and  $mq_1 + ns_1 = 1$ . By the second equation,  $m$  and  $n$  are relatively prime, and since the first equation gives  $mp_1 = -nr_1$ , we have that  $m = -r_1$  and  $n = p_1$ . Thus  $h(\mu_1) = h(-r_1\alpha_1 + p_1\beta_1) = -r_1\alpha_2 + p_1\beta_2^k$ . For the lens space  $L(2k, 1)$  we then have that:

$$\begin{aligned} -r_1 p_2 + p_1 r_2^k &= 2k \\ -r_1 q_2 + p_1 s_2^k &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

In the case  $L(0, 1)$  ( $= S^2 \times S^1$ ) we get that  $r_1 p_2 = p_1 r_2^0$  and as  $(p_i, r_i) = 1$  this gives us  $p_1 = p_2$  (so we will write  $p$  for  $p_1$  and  $p_2$ ). Thus  $r_1 = r_2^0$ . In other words the fibration must be the same (with an appropriate choice of longitudes) on both solid tori.

In the case  $L(2, 1)$  since the multiplicity must be the same we have  $p_1 = p_2 = p$  as above. Therefore we have that  $-r_1 p + p r_2^1 = 2$  which implies  $p|2$ , and as  $p > 1$ , this means  $p = 2$  and  $r_1 = r_2^1 - 1$ . Since we also have  $-r_1 q_2 + 2s_2^1 = 1$ , we get  $(2s_2^1 - q_2 r_2^1) + q_2 = 1$ . As  $(2s_2^1 - q_2 r_2^1) = \pm 1$  this implies  $q_2 = 0$  or  $\pm 2$ , which is impossible as  $q_2 \neq 0$  and  $(2, q_2) = 1$ . Hence it is impossible to have a SFS such that one filling yields  $L(0, 1)$  and the other  $L(2, 1)$

**Theorem A.2.**  *$R$  must be rational in the case of direct repeats.*

**Proof.** Assume  $R$  is not rational, so  $\tilde{R}$  is a manifold with incompressible torus boundary. Since  $O^k$  is rational for all  $k$  by the preceding theorem,  $\tilde{O}^k$  is a solid torus,  $V_k$ , for each  $k$ . Hence  $V_{O^0} \cup \tilde{R} = L(0, 1)$ ,  $V_{O^1} \cup \tilde{R} = L(2, 1)$ ,  $V_{O^2} \cup \tilde{R} = L(4, 1)$ , and  $V_{O^3} \cup \tilde{R} = L(6, 1)$ .

If  $\tilde{R}$  is not a Seifert Fiber Space, then we have a contradiction from the Cyclic Surgery Theorem [10]. In this case if  $\tilde{R}(r)$  and  $\tilde{R}(s)$  are cyclic then  $\Delta(r, s) = 1$ , and hence there are at most three such slopes. This contradicts the fact that we have four fillings which are cyclic.

If  $\tilde{R}$  is a SFS, then by Theorem A.1 it is impossible to have a SFS such that one filling yields  $L(0, 1)$  and the other  $L(2, 1)$  and so we get a contradiction since  $V_{O^0} \cup \tilde{R} = L(0, 1)$ ,  $V_{O^1} \cup \tilde{R} = L(2, 1)$ .  $\tilde{R}$  cannot be a SFS and thus,  $\tilde{R}$  must be a solid torus, and so  $R$  is rational.  $\square$

DIVISION OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS, BROWN UNIVERSITY  
 Current address: Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London  
 E-mail address: d.buck@imperial.ac.uk

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, ST. EDWARD'S UNIVERSITY  
 E-mail address: cynthm@admin.stedwards.edu