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## § 1. Introduction.

In this paper we shall treat special cases of genus 2 Poincaré conjecture.
Let $M$ be a closed orientable 3-manifold of genus $\leqq 2$. Then $M$ is obtained by a Heegaard splitting of genus 2. Let $(M ; V, W)$ be a Heegaard splitting of genus 2, where $V$ and $W$ are solid tori of genus 2 such that $M=V \cup W$ and $V \cap W=\partial V=\partial W^{*}$. We set $T=V \cap W$. (See the Figure】1.)


Figure 1.
We assume that $M$ (and hence $V$ and $W$ ) has a fixed orientation.
Let $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ be a system of meridian disks of $V$ and let $\{\gamma, \delta\}$ be a system of meridian disks of $W$. We set $a=\partial \alpha, b=\partial \beta, c=\partial \gamma$ and $d=\partial \delta$. $a, b, c, d$ are loops on $T$ and $\{a, b\}$ is called a system of meridian loops of $V$ and $\{c, d\}$ is called a system of meridian loops of $W$. We assume that $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$ and hence $a, b, c, d$ have fixed orientation. Without loss of generality we can assume that $a, b$ and $c, d$ intersect transversely only in a finite number of points. Moreover we can eliminate the intersections of the type as shown in Figure 2.


Figure 2.
*) $\partial V$ means the boundary of $V$.

So we assume that there are no such intersections.
We cut $V$ along $\alpha$ and $\beta$. Then we obtain a 3 -disk, on the surface of which four circles obtained by cutting $\alpha$ and $\beta$ (we name these $a^{+}, a^{-}, b^{+}, b^{-}$), and several fragments of the loops $c$ and $d$ are drawn. We call the chart drawn on the 3 -disk a Whitehead graph or simply a graph. If we ignore the loop $d$ then we obtain the graph of $c$, and if we ignore the loop $c$ then we obtain the graph of $d$.

If we interchange the role of $a, b$ and $c, d$ then we obtain another graph. This is called the dual graph.

A graph is one of the three types (Type I $\sim$ III) shown in Figure 3-1~3-3 (up to interchanging $a, b$ or $a, a^{-1}$ or $b, b^{-1}$ ).


Type I
Figure 3-1.


Type II
Figure 3-2.


Type III
Figure 3-3.

In these figures each of $x, y, z, u$ means the number of parallel paths.
If a graph is of the type III, then we can decrease the number of intersection points by changing meridian loops $a, b$ to $a^{\prime}, b$ as shown in Figure 4. ( $a^{\prime}$ is clearly a meridian loop.)


Figure 4.
So we mainly treat Type I and Type II.*)

[^0]Let $f$ be an arc on $\partial V$ connecting two loops $a$ and $b$. (We assume that one end point $P$ of $f$ is on $a$ and another end point $Q$ is on $b$ and any other point of $f$ is not on the loops $a$ or $b$.)

Let $U$ be a regular neighborhood (in $\partial V$ ) of $a \cup b \cup f$. Then $\partial U$ consists of three loops and one of these is isotopic to $a$ and one is isotopic to $b$. Let $\bar{f}$ be the third loop of these three loops.

Then $\bar{f}$ is also a meridian loop since there is a meridian disk $\eta$ in $V$ such that $\bar{f}=\partial \eta$. Moreover $\{a, \bar{f}\}$ (and also $\{b, \bar{f}\}$ ) is a system of meridian loops of $V$.

Changing the system from $\{a, b\}$ to $\{a, \bar{f}\}$ (or to $\{b, \bar{f}\}$ ) is called a band operation by $f$. Similarly a band operation by an arc on $\partial W$ connecting two loops $c$ and $d$ can be defined.

Since a band operation does not affect a Heegaard splitting, the resulting manifold $M$ does not change. (But the graph is changed.)

The fundamental group $\pi_{1}(M)$ of $M$ can be presented in the following way. We take $a$ and $b$ as generators and two relations $\tilde{c}=1$ and $d=1$ are defined as follows*) : When a point $P$ is moving on the loop $c$ (in the direction of the orientation) from a fixed base point, if it crosses $a$ or $b$ as shown in Figure $5-1,5-2,5-3,5-4$, then we read $a, a^{-1}, b, b^{-1}$, respectively.


Figure 5-1.


Figure 5-2.


Figure 5-3.


Figure 5-4.

When $P$ moves once around $c$, we get a word $\tilde{c}(a, b) . \quad d(a, b)$ is defined similarly.

Remark. More generally, if $l$ is a (not necessarily simple) path on $T$ from $P$ to $Q$, where $P$ and $Q$ are not on the loops $a$ and $b$, then $l$ defines a word $\tilde{l}(a, b)$ by the same way as above.

If $l^{\prime}$ is another path from $P$ to $Q$ and if $l$ and $l^{\prime}$ is homotopic in $T$ with $P, Q$ fixed, then $\tilde{l}(a, b)$ and $\tilde{l}^{\prime}(a, b)$ are the same word as elements of the free group generated by $a$ and $b$.

Now we have a presentation of the fundamental group of $M$ :

$$
\pi_{1}(M) \cong\langle a, b: \tilde{c}(a, b)=\tilde{d}(a, b)=1\rangle
$$

If we interchange the role of $a, b$ and $c, d$ we get another presentation of $\pi_{1}(M)$ :
*) The proof is by van Kampen theorem.

$$
\pi_{1}(M) \cong\langle c, d: \tilde{a}(c, d)=\tilde{b}(c, d)=1\rangle
$$

This is called the dual presentation.


Figure 6-1.


Figure 6-2.
For example, if $a, b, c, d$ are as shown in Figure 6 and if we start along $c$ from $P$ and along $d$ from $Q$, then the resulting word $\tilde{c}(a, b)$ is $a^{3} b^{5}$ and the word $\tilde{d}(a, b)$ is $a^{2} b a^{-1} b$. Similarly $\tilde{a}(c, d)=c d c d c d^{-1}$ and $\tilde{b}(c, d)=d^{2} c^{5}$. So

$$
\pi_{1}(M) \cong\left\langle c, d: c d c d c d^{-1}=d^{2} c^{5}=1\right\rangle
$$

is the dual presentation of

$$
\pi_{1}(M) \cong\left\langle a, b: a^{3} b^{5}=a^{2} b a^{-1} b=1\right\rangle .
$$

## § 2. The reverse development and Homma's theorem.

Let $M, V, W, a, b, c, d$, etc. be as in the introduction. Let $\Gamma$ be the
closure of a regular neighborhood of $\gamma$ in $W$ and let $N=V \cup \Gamma$. Then $N$ is the complement of a regular neighborhood of a knot $k$ in $M$. (See Figure 7.)


Figure 7.
By van Kampen theorem,

$$
\pi_{1}(N) \cong \pi_{1}(M-k) \cong\langle a, b: \tilde{c}(a, b)=1\rangle .
$$

We call this group the knot group of $c$.
Now the boundary of $N$ is a torus $T^{\prime}$ on which two circles $c^{+}$and $c^{-}$and several fragments of the loops $a$ and $b$ are drawn. We call this chart the reverse graph of $c$.

Theorem 1 (Homma [11]). Suppose that $c$ crosses $a$ or $b$ at least once. Then the reverse graph of $c$ consists of 6 groups $W_{0}, W_{0}^{\prime}, W_{1}, W_{2}, W_{3}, W_{4}$ of parallel paths (some of which may be empty) as shown in Figure 8. Suppose $p$ is an arc on $T^{\prime}$ which crosses $W_{0}$ once to the direction as shown in Figure 8 and does not cross any other paths of the graph and let $w_{0}=\tilde{p}(a, b)$. Let $w_{0}^{\prime}, w_{1}, w_{2}, w_{3}, w_{4}$ be similarly defined. Then $w_{1}, w_{2}, w_{3}, w_{4}$ are symmetric, that is, $w_{1}=w_{1}^{*}, w_{2}=w_{2}^{*}, w_{3}=w_{3}^{*}, w_{4}=w_{4}^{*}$, where $w^{*}$ is the word obtained by reading $w$ from the last to the first. Moreover $w_{0}^{\prime}=w_{0}^{*}$. Hence (if starting from a proper point) we have

$$
\tilde{c}(a, b)=w_{0} w_{1} w_{2} w_{0}^{-1} w_{3} w_{4} .
$$

Moreover $\tilde{c}(a, b)$ is freely symmetric.*
Now we consider the universal covering space $U$ of the torus $T^{\prime} . U$ is a plane. Let $p$ be the covering map $U \rightarrow T^{\prime}$. We introduce an orthogonal coordinate system $(x, y)$ to $U$ in such a way that

$$
p(x, y)=p\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right) \Leftrightarrow x-x^{\prime} \in \boldsymbol{Z} \quad \text { and } \quad y-y^{\prime} \in \boldsymbol{Z} .
$$

Now the reverse graph of $c$ drawn on $T^{\prime}$ induces an infinite graph on $U$. We call this infinite graph the reverse development of $c$. By Homma's theorem,
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Figure 8.
the reverse development of $c$ takes the form showm in Figure 9, where $p^{-1}\left(\gamma^{+}\right)=\left\{\gamma_{i, j}^{+}\right\}, p^{-1}\left(\gamma^{-}\right)=\left\{\gamma_{i, j}^{-}\right\}, c_{i, j}^{+}=\left\{\partial \gamma_{i, j}^{+}\right\}$and $c_{i, j}^{-}=\left\{\partial \gamma_{i, j}^{-}\right\}$.


Figure 9.
Moreover we can assume

$$
\left\{p^{-1}\left(\gamma^{+}\right) \cup p^{-1}\left(\gamma^{-}\right)\right\} \cap\{(x, y) \mid x \in Z \text { or } y \in Z\}=\emptyset .
$$

For example, if the Whitehead graph of $c$ is as shown in Figure 10, then the reverse development of $c$ is as shown in Figure 11.


$$
\tilde{c}(a, b)=a b^{3} a b a^{-3} b
$$

Figure 10.


Figure 11.
Let $d$ be another meridian loop on $T$. Then $d$ is a loop on $T^{\prime}$ not intersecting $c$. For simplicity's sake we assume that the point $O=p(0,0)$ is on $d$, and consider it as the base point of $d$.

Now $d$ induces a curve $\bar{d}$ on $U$ starting from ( 0,0 ) and ending at some ( $m, n$ ), where $m, n \in \boldsymbol{Z}$. Since $d$ is not homologous to 0 in $T^{\prime},(m, n) \neq(0,0)$. Since $d$ is a simple loop, $m$ and $n$ must be relatively prime.

Let $U^{\prime}=U-p^{-1}\left(\gamma^{+}\right)-p^{-1}\left(\gamma^{-}\right)$. By the same way as in the introduction, if $l$ is a (not recessarily simple) path on $U^{\prime}$, then $l$ reads a word $\tilde{l}(a, b)$.

We easily see that $\tilde{\tilde{d}}(a, b)=\tilde{d}(a, b)$, where $\tilde{\tilde{d}}$ is defined now and $\tilde{d}$ is defined in the introduction. (We assume that $d$ starts from $O$.)

Lemma. Let $l$ and $l^{\prime}$ be paths on $U^{\prime}$ from $(0,0)$ to $(m, n)$. Then $\hat{l}(a, b)$ $=\tilde{l}^{\prime}(a, b)$ is a consequence of $\tilde{c}(a, b)=1$.

Proof. If $l$ and $l^{\prime}$ are homotopic in $U^{\prime}$ then the result is obvious. If $l$ and $l^{\prime}$ are not homotopic in $U^{\prime}$, then $l^{\prime}$ is obtained from $l$ by crossing over some $\gamma_{i, j}^{+}$'s and $\gamma_{i, j}^{-}$'s in addition to homotopic deformation in $U^{\prime}$.

Suppose, for instance, $l^{\prime}$ is obtained from $l$ as shown in Figure 12.


Figure 12.
Then $\tilde{l}(a, b)$ and $\tilde{l}^{\prime}(a, b)$ are of the forms $\xi \eta$ and $\xi \tilde{c}(a, b) \eta$, respectively. Hence $\tilde{l}(a, b)=\tilde{l}^{\prime}(a, b)$ is a consequence of $\tilde{c}(a, b)=1$.
q. e. d.

Now let $l$ be the path composed of the segment joining ( 0,0 ) to ( $m, 0$ ) and the segment joining $(m, 0)$ to $(m, n)$. If the reverse development of $c$ is as shown in Figure 9, then

Since

$$
\tilde{l}(a, b)=\left(w_{0} w_{1} w_{0}^{*} w_{4}\right)^{m}\left(w_{3} w_{4}\right)^{n} .
$$

$$
\bar{d}(a, b)=\tilde{l}(a, b)
$$

is a consequence of $\tilde{c}(a, b)=1$ by the lemma,

$$
\tilde{d}(a, b)=\tilde{l}(a, b)
$$

is also a consequence of $\tilde{c}(a, b)=1$.
Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
\pi_{1}(M) & \cong\langle a, b: \tilde{c}(a, b)=\tilde{d}(a, b)=1\rangle \\
& \cong\langle a, b: \tilde{c}(a, b)=\tilde{l}(a, b)=1\rangle \\
& =\left\langle a, b: w_{0} w_{1} w_{2} w_{0}^{-1} w_{3} w_{4}=\left(w_{0} w_{1} w_{0}^{*} w_{4}\right)^{m}\left(w_{3} w_{4}\right)^{n}=1\right\rangle
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus we have proved the following:
Theorem 2 (Homma). If $M$ is a closed orientable 3-manifold of genus $\leqq 2$, then the fundamental group of $M$ is of the form

$$
\left\langle a, b: w_{0} w_{1} w_{2} w_{0}^{-1} w_{3} w_{4}=\left(w_{0} w_{1} w_{0}^{*} w_{4}\right)^{m}\left(w_{3} w_{4}\right)^{n}=1\right\rangle,
$$

for some relatively prime integers $m$ and $n$.

## § 3. Main theorems.

In this chapter we shall prove our main theorems (theorem 3, 4 and 5).
Theorem 3. If $\tilde{c}(a, b)$ is of the form $a^{p} b^{q}$, then the manifold $M$ cannot be a counterexample to Poincaré conjecture.*)

Proof. Without loss of generality we can assume that $p \geqq 0, q \geqq 0$. If $\tilde{c}(a, b)$ is of the form $a^{p} b^{q}$, then the graph of $c$ is one of the forms as shown in Figure 13-1 (case 1) or Figure 13-2 (case 2) (or 13-2 with $a, b$ interchanged) and the


Figure 13-1.


Figure 13-2.
reverse development of $c$ is one of the forms


Figure 14-1.


Figure 14-2.

[^2]as shown in Figure 14-1 (case 1) or Figure 14-2 (case 2), for some $r$ and $s$ with $p \geqq r \geqq 0, q \geqq s \geqq 0$.

In the case $1, p$ and $r$ are relatively prime since $a$ is a single loop. Similarly, $q$ and $s$ are relatively prime.

Now by theorem 2, we have a presentation of the fundamental group for $M$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\pi_{1}(M)=\left\langle a, b: a^{p} b^{q}=1, a^{p m}\left(a^{r} b^{s}\right)^{n}=1\right\rangle \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

for some $m$ and $n$ with ( $m, n$ )=1.
We prove the theorem by the induction on $p+q$.
If $M$ is not a homology sphere, then $M$ is not a counterexample to Poincaré conjecture. So we first examine the homology sphere condition for $M$. Since $\mathrm{H}_{1}(M)$ is the abelianization of $\pi_{1}(M)$, the homology sphere condition is

$$
\left|\begin{array}{cc}
p & p m+r n \\
q & s n
\end{array}\right|= \pm 1
$$

or,

$$
\begin{equation*}
(p s-q r) n-p q m= \pm 1 . \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

From this it follows that $(p, q)=1$ and $(m, n)=1$.
First assume $p=0$. Then by the homology sphere condition we have $q=1$. Then by repeating the band operation as shown in Figure 15,


Figure 15.
the graph is changed to the one in Figure 16. Hence

$$
\pi_{1}(M) \cong\left\langle a, b: a^{u}=1, b=1\right\rangle,
$$

for some $u$. But by the homology sphere condition $u= \pm 1$. In this case $M$ is obviously a sphere.



Figure 16.
Next assume $p=1$. Then we consider the graph of the loop c. Since $\tilde{c}=a b^{q}$, the graph is as shown in Figure 17-1 (case 1.1) or Figure 13-2 (case 1.2). Then we change the system $\{a, b\}$ of meridian loops to $\left\{a, b^{\prime}\right\}$ as shown in Figure 17-2. Then $\tilde{c}=a b^{\prime q-1}$. By the induction hypothesis $M$ is not a counterexample to Poincaré conjecture. Similarly for the case 1.2.


Figure 17-1.


Figure 17-2.

Since the cases $q=0$ and $q=1$ can be treated similarly, we next assume $p \geqq 2$ and $q \geqq 2$.

Let

$$
G \cong\left\langle a, b: a^{p}=1, b^{q}=1,\left(a^{r} b^{s}\right)^{n}=1\right\rangle .
$$

Then by comparing it with the presentation (1), there is an epimorphism $\pi_{1}(M) \rightarrow G$. Hence if $G$ is non-trivial so is $\pi_{1}(M)$.

Now $G$ is generated by $A=a^{r}$ and $B=b^{s}$ since $(p, r)=1$ and $(q, s)=1$, and we have

$$
G \cong\left\langle A, B: A^{p}=1, B^{q}=1,(A B)^{n}=1\right\rangle .
$$

But this group is well-known to be non-trivial if $p \geqq 2, q \geqq 2$ and $n \geqq 2$ or $n=0$. (See e.g. [9]).

Now the only remaining case is $n=1$. In this case by the homology sphere condition we have

$$
p s-q r-p q m= \pm 1
$$

or,

$$
m=\frac{s}{q}-\frac{r}{p} \mp \frac{1}{p q} .
$$

From this it follows that $-1<m<1$ and hence that $m=0$.
Then (1) becomes

$$
\pi_{1}(M) \cong\left\langle a, b: a^{p} b^{q}=1, a^{r} b^{s}=1\right\rangle .
$$

Since $p+q>r+s$ and the second relation is obtained from some loop $d^{\prime}$ such that $\left\{c, d^{\prime}\right\}$ constitutes the system of meridian loops, by the induction hypothesis $M$ is not a counterexample to Poincaré conjecture. In the case 2, the proof is the same as in the case 1.2. This completes the proof of the theorem.

Remark. In the theorem 1 , if $p s-q r= \pm 1$, then $M$ is obtained by a surgery along the torus knot of type ( $p, q$ ).

If $r=s=m=1$, then $M$ is homeomorphic to the Brieskorn manifold of type ( $p, q, n$ ).

Theorem 4. If $\tilde{c}(a, b)$ is of the form $a^{p} b^{q} a^{l} b^{k}$, then the manifold $M$ cannot be a counterexample to Poincaré conjecture.

Proof. By the free symmetricity of the word $a^{p} b^{q} a^{l} b^{k}$, we must have $p=l$ or $q=k$.

So without loss of generality we can assume $q=k>0$. There are two cases where $p l>0$ and where $p l<0$. Without loss of generality we only treat the case where $p>l>0$ (case 1) and the case where $p>0>l$ (case 2).

It is easily proved that, in the case 1 , if the graph of $c$ is of Type I, then the graph is as in Figure 18-1 (case 1.1) and if the graph is of Type II, then the graph is as in Figure 18-2 (case 1.2).

Similarly in the case 2, the graph of $c$ is one of the forms as shown in Figure 19-1 (case 2.1) and Figure 19-2 (case 2.2).

In the case 1.2, we have $q=k=1$ and we change the system of meridian loops from $\{a, b\}$ to $\left\{a^{\prime}, b\right\}$ where $a^{\prime}$ is the loop shown in Figure 20. Then, the graph becomes the case 1.1 type or the case 1.2 type with $p+l$ decreased, or the case of theorem 3.

Next we treat the case 1.1. In this case the reverse development of $c$


Figure 18-1.


Figure 19-1.


Figure 18-2.


Figure 19-2.


Figure 20.
must be as shown in Figure 21, for some $t(0<t<q)$.


Figure 21.
Then by Homma's theorem we have

$$
\pi_{1}(M)=\left\langle a, b: a^{p} b^{q} a^{l} b^{q}=1,\left(a^{p-l} b^{t}\right)^{m} b^{n q}=1\right\rangle .
$$

The homology sphere condition is

$$
((p+l) t-2(p-l) q) m+(p q+l q) n= \pm 1 .
$$

From this it follows that $(p, l)=1$ and $(q, t)=1$.
Similarly to the proof of theorem 1 , let

$$
G=\left\langle a, b: a^{p+l}=1, b^{q}=1,\left(a^{p-l} b^{t}\right)^{m}=1\right\rangle .
$$

There is an epimorphism $\pi_{1}(M) \rightarrow G$.
Now $p+l \geqq 2$. So if $q \geqq 2$ and $m \neq \pm 1$, then $G$ is non-trivial and so is $\pi_{1}(M)$. Let $q=1$. Then by some band operation the relation $a^{p} b a^{l} b=1$ reduces to $a^{\prime p-1} b a^{l l-1} b=1$. Repeating this process we have that $M$ is not a counterexample to Poincaré conjecture. Next let $m= \pm 1$. We can assume $m=1$. Then,

$$
\pi_{1}(M)=\left\langle a, b: a^{p} b^{q} a^{l} b^{q}=1, a^{p-l} b^{t+n q}=1\right\rangle .
$$

The second relation is obtained from some loop $d^{\prime}$ such that $\left\{c, d^{\prime}\right\}$ constitutes the system of meridian loops. So by the theorem 3 we have that $M$ is not a counterexample to Poincaré conjecture. This proves the theorem 4 for the case 1.

In the case 2.2, we have $q=1$ or $p=-l=1$. But if $p=-l=1$, then the homology sphere condition is never satisfied. If $q=1$, then, as in 1.2 , by a suitable choice of meridian loop $a^{\prime}$, the relation $a^{p} b a^{l} b=1$ reduces to
$a^{\prime p-1} b a^{\prime l-1} b=1$. Repeating this process we have finally the relation $b a^{\prime l-p} b=1$ or $\left(a^{\prime-1}\right)^{p-l} b^{2}=1$. So by the previous theorem $M$ is not a counterexample to Poincaré conjecture.

In the case 2.1, we can assume $p+l>0$. (Otherwise, change the orientations of $a$ and b.) Then the reverse development of $c$ is as shown in Figure 22 , for some $t(0 \leqq t \leqq q)$.


Figure 22.
Then by Homma's theorem, we have

$$
\pi_{1}(M) \cong\left\langle a, b: a^{p} b^{q} a^{l} b^{q}=1,\left(a^{p-l} b^{t}\right)^{m} b^{q n}=1\right\rangle .
$$

The homology sphere condition is

$$
\{(p+l) t-2 q(p-l)\} m+(p+l) q n= \pm 1
$$

Now let

$$
G \cong\left\langle a, b: a^{p+l}=1, b^{q}=1,\left(a^{p-l} b^{t}\right)^{m}=1\right\rangle,
$$

and

$$
G^{\prime} \cong\left\langle a, b: a^{p-l}=1, b^{t m+q n}=1,\left(a^{p} b^{q}\right)^{2}=1\right\rangle .
$$

$G$ is non-trivial if $p+l \geqq 2, q \geqq 2$ and $m \geqq 2$. In this case $\pi_{1}(M)$ is nontrivial since there is an epimorphism $\pi_{1}(M) \rightarrow G$. Similarly $G^{\prime}$ is non-trivial if $p-l \geqq 2$ and $|t m+q n| \geqq 2$, and also in this case $\pi_{1}(M)$ is non-trivial. But always we have

$$
p-l=p+|l| \geqq 2 .
$$

So the remaining cases are
(i) $p+l=1$ and $|t m+q n|=1$
(ii) $q=1 \quad$ and $\quad|t m+q n|=1$
(iii) $m=1$ and $|t m+q n|=1$.

In either case $|t m+q n|=1$ and so, by the homology sphere condition,

$$
(p+l)(t m+q n)-2 q(p-l) m= \pm(p+l)-2 q(p-l) m= \pm 1 .
$$

So in the case (i) we have

$$
2 q(p-l) m=0 \quad \text { or } \quad \pm 2
$$

But $2 q(p-l) m= \pm 2$ is impossible since $p-l \geqq 2$. So $2 q(p-l) m=0$ and we have $m=0$ since $q \neq 0$ and $p-l \neq 0$. Then the second relation of (3) becomes $b=1$, and hence by the preceding theorem $M$ is not a counterexample to Poincaré conjecture.

In the case (ii) we must have

$$
\begin{equation*}
m=\frac{ \pm(p+l) \pm 1}{2(p-l)} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $m$ is an integer and $p>0>l$, (4) is possible only when $m=0$ and $p+l=1$. But this case was already treated.

In the case (iii) we also have $p+l=1$.
This completes the proof of theorem 4.
Theorem 5. If $\tilde{c}(a, b)$ is of the length $\leqq 9$, then $M$ is not a counterexample to Poincaré conjecture.

PROOF. If $\tilde{c}(a, b)$ is of the length $\leqq 5$, then $\tilde{c}(a, b)$ is of the form $a^{p} b^{q}$ or $a^{p} b^{q} a^{l} b^{k}$. So by the theorems 3 and $4, M$ is not a counterexample to Poincaré conjecture.

Next suppose that $\tilde{c}(a, b)$ is of the length 6 or 7 and not of the form $a^{p} b^{q}$ or $a^{p} b^{q} a^{l} b^{k}$. Then the graph of $c$ must be one of the forms as shown in Figure 23. In each case we change the system of meridian loops from $\{a, b\}$ to $\left\{a^{\prime}, b\right\}$. Then the length of $\tilde{c}\left(a^{\prime}, b\right)$ is less than that of $\tilde{c}(a, b)$. So $M$ is not a counterexample to Poincaré conjecture.

Now suppose that (i) $\tilde{c}(a, b)$ is of the length 8 or 9 , (ii) $\tilde{c}(a, b)$ is not of the form $a^{p} b^{q}$ or $a^{p} b^{q} a^{l} b^{k}$, and (iii) the method used in the previous case does not apply. Then the graph of $c$ must be one of the forms as shown in Figure 24. In each case we examine all the possibility of pasting $a^{+}$to $a^{-}$ and $b^{+}$to $b^{-}$to obtain the simple loop $c$. This is shown in Figure 25. ( $\tilde{c}(a, b)$ is written under each graph.)

By considering the abelianization of $\tilde{c}(a, b)$ we see that except for cases $3-3,3-4,3-6,4-1,4-2$, a homology sphere cannot be obtained.

Next we show that by a change of meridian system, 3-4 is reduced to $4-1$, and $4-2$ is reduced to $3-3$. This is shown in Figure 26 and 27.

Moreover by a change of meridian system, 4-1 and 3-6 are reduced to the case of $a^{p} b^{q} a^{l} b^{k}$. This is shown in Figure 28 and 29.


Figure 23.
Hence it remains only the case $3-3$.
In this case we consider the reverse development of $c$. This is shown in Figure 30. Therefore,

$$
\pi_{1}(M) \cong\left\langle a, b: a^{3} b a^{-1} b^{-2} a^{-1} b=1,\left(b a^{4} b a^{-1}\right)^{m}\left(b^{-1} a^{-1}\right)^{n}=1\right\rangle .
$$

The homology sphere condition is $2 m-n= \pm 1$.
Now, in this group we add the relations $a^{4}=1$ and $b^{3}=1$. Then we have

$$
G=\left\langle a, b: a^{4}=b^{3}=\left(a^{-1} b\right)^{3}=\left(b^{-1} a^{-1}\right)^{m+n}=1\right\rangle .
$$

So there is an epimorphism $\pi_{1}(M) \rightarrow G$.
If we put $a^{-1} b=f^{-1}$, then

$$
G \cong\left\langle b, f: b^{3}=f^{3}=(b f)^{4}=\left(b^{-1} f\right)^{m+n}=1\right\rangle .
$$


(i)

(iii)

(ii)

(iv)

Figure 24.


1-1.
Figure 25.


$a b^{-1} a b a b a b^{-1}$
2-8.

$a^{2} b a b a^{2} b^{-2}$
3-2.

$a b^{-1} a^{-1} b a b a^{-1} b^{-1}$
2-7.


3-1.


Figure 25.


$$
\begin{array}{r}
a b^{-1} a^{-2} b^{-2} a^{-2} b^{-1} \\
3-4
\end{array}
$$


$a b^{-1} a b a^{2} b a b^{-1}$
4-3.
Figure 25.


Figure 26.


Figure 27.
This group is non-trivial if $|m+n| \geqq 3$ by [3], [8]. In this case $\pi_{1}(M)$ is also non-trivial.

The remaining case is $|m+n| \leqq 2$. We can assume $m \geqq 0$. So there are two cases (i) $m=0, n=1$, (ii) $m=1, n=1$, on account of the homology sphere condition $2 m-n= \pm 1$.

If $m=0$ and $n=1$, then $M$ is a sphere, for it can be reduced to the canonical form by some changes of meridian system.

If $m=1$ and $n=1$, then


4-1.
Figure 28.


3-6.
Figure 29.

$$
\pi_{1}(M) \cong\left\langle a, b: a^{3} b a^{-1} b^{-2} a^{-1} b=1, b a^{4} b a^{-1} b^{-1} a^{-1}=1\right\rangle
$$

From $a^{3} b a^{-1} b^{-2} a^{-1} b=1$ it follows that $a^{3} b a^{-1} b^{-1}=b^{-1} a b$ and from $b a^{4} b a^{-1} b^{-1} a^{-1}=1$ it follows that $a^{3} b a^{-1} b^{-1}=a^{-1} b^{-1} a$. So we have $b^{-1} a^{-1} b=a^{-1} b a$. Let $x=a b^{-1} a$ $=b^{-1} a b^{-1}$, and $y=a b^{-1}$. Then $x^{2}=y^{3}$, and $a=y^{-1} x, b=y x^{-1}$.

Hence

$$
\pi_{1}(M)=\left\langle x, y: x^{2}=y^{3}=\left(y^{-1} x\right)^{7}\right\rangle
$$

This is non-trivial and the proof of theorem 5 is complete.


Figure 30.
Remark. The length 10 case remains open. Indeed, if we apply the method used to prove theorem 5 to the length 10 case, we see that the theorem holds except the following fundamental groups. We are unable to prove that they are non-trivial.
(i) $\left\{\begin{array}{l}a^{3} b^{-1} a b^{3} a b^{-1}=1 \\ \left(a b^{-1} a^{2} b^{-1}\right)^{9 t+2}\left(a b^{2}\right)^{13 t+3}=1,\end{array}\right.$
(ii) $\left\{\begin{array}{l}a^{8} b^{2} a b^{-1} a b^{2}=1 \\ \left(a b^{-1} a b^{2} a b^{-1}\right)^{2 t+1}(a b)^{9 t+4}=1,\end{array}\right.$
(iii) $\left\{\begin{array}{l}a^{2} b a^{2} b^{2} a^{-1} b^{2}=1 \\ \left(b^{-2} a b^{-1} a\right)^{t}\left(a b^{2}\right)^{19 t+1}=1, \quad(t \neq 0)\end{array}\right.$
(iv) $\left\{\begin{array}{l}a^{3} b^{2} a^{-1} b a^{-1} b^{2}=1 \\ \left(a^{3} b a\right)^{8 t+3}\left(a^{2} b^{2}\right)^{-19 t-7}=1,\end{array}\right.$
where $t \in \boldsymbol{Z}$.

Note added in proof. Recently we obtain the non-triviality of the above four classes of fundamental groups by using representations to PGL(2, $\boldsymbol{C})$.
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[^0]:    *) Recently Ochiai [14] proved that a graph of Type II can be reduced to Type I without increasing the number of intersection points provided the manifold $M$ is a homology sphere.

[^1]:    *) A word is said to be freely symmmetric if there are words $u$ and $v$ such that $w=u v$ and $w^{*}=v u$. The last part of the Theorem is due to [4].

[^2]:    *) Theorem 3 and Theorem 4 below are also obtained in [20] by a different method.

