Legendrian Lens Space Surgeries

HANSJÖRG GEIGES & SINEM ONARAN

ABSTRACT. We show that every tight contact structure on any of the lens spaces $L(ns^2 - s + 1, s^2)$ with $n \geq 2$ and $s \geq 1$ can be obtained by a single Legendrian surgery along a suitable Legendrian realisation of the negative torus knot $T(s, -(sn - 1))$ in the tight or an overtwisted contact structure on the 3-sphere.

1. Introduction

A knot K in the 3-sphere S^3 is said to admit a *lens space surgery* if, for some rational number r, the 3-manifold obtained by Dehn surgery along K with surgery coefficient r is a lens space. Moser [17] showed that all torus knots admit lens space surgeries. More precisely, $-(ab \pm 1)$-surgery along the negative torus knot $T(a, -b)$ results in the lens space $L(ab \pm 1, a^2)$; cf. [21]; for positive torus knots, we take the mirror of the knot and the surgery coefficient of opposite sign, resulting in a negatively oriented lens space. Contrary to a conjecture by Moser, there are surgeries along other knots that produce lens spaces. The first example belongs to Bailey and Rolfsen [1], who constructed the lens space $L(23, 7)$ by integral surgery along an iterated cable knot.

The question which knots admit lens space surgeries is still open and the subject of much current research. The fundamental result in this area belongs to Culler, Gordon, Luecke, and Shalen [2], who proved as a corollary of their cyclic surgery theorem the following result: if K is not a torus knot, then at most two surgery coefficients, which must be successive integers, can correspond to a lens space surgery. For more recent work, relating this question to Floer theory, see, for instance, [12; 14; 18; 20].

The converse question of which lens spaces can be obtained by a single surgery on the 3-sphere is of course trivial in the topological setting: the lens space $L(p, q)$, as an oriented manifold, is the result of a $(-p/q)$-surgery along the unknot.

In the present note, we consider this converse question for contact manifolds: which tight contact structures on a given lens space can be obtained by a single contact (-1)-surgery (also known as Legendrian surgery) along a Legendrian knot in S^3 with some contact structure? Here the topological restrictions become relevant in the search for contact structures on lens spaces that cannot be constructed in this way.

Rasmussen [20, Corollary 4] proved that the only integral surgery on S^3 that produces the lens space $L(4m + 3, 4)$ is surgery along the negative torus knot $T(2, -(2m + 1))$ with coefficient $-(4m + 3)$. (The statement about the surgery coefficient is not contained in [20], but this follows immediately from [17], because other surgery coefficients lead to a different lens space or a Seifert manifold with three multiple fibers.) Beware that Rasmussen uses the opposite orientation convention for lens spaces.

Based on Rasmussen's result, Plamenevskaya [19, Proposition 5.4] claimed that only one of the three, up to isotopy, (positive) tight contact structures on $L(7, 4)$ can be obtained via Legendrian surgery on some contact structure on S^3. This assertion, as we shall see, is erroneous. The main result of this note is the following:

THEOREM 1.1. *For any pair of integers $n \geq 2$, $s \geq 1$, every tight contact structure on the lens space $L(ns^2 - s + 1, s^2)$ can be obtained by a single Legendrian surgery along a suitable Legendrian realisation of the negative torus knot $T(s, -(sn - 1))$ in some contact structure on S^3.*

REMARK 1.2. (1) On the lens space $L(ns^2 - s + 1, s^2)$, there are, for $s \geq 2$, precisely $(s + 1)(n - 1)$ distinct tight contact structures *up to isotopy;* for $s = 1$ the number is $n - 1$. (One reason why we restrict our attention to these lens spaces is that the arithmetic for determining the number of tight structures is simple.) As we will realize these structures by different contact surgery diagrams, it may not seem to be clear how to distinguish nonisotopic but diffeomorphic structures. However, those different contact surgery diagrams correspond to the same topological surgery diagram, and this fixes the resulting manifold, so that the notion of isotopy becomes meaningful.

(2) There is a more fundamental reason for considering only the lens spaces $L(ns^2 - s + 1, s^2)$: a major share of the tight contact structures stem from *exceptional* realisations of the torus knot $T(s, -(sn - 1))$ (i.e., as Legendrian knots $L \subset (S^3, \xi_{ot})$ in an overtwisted contact structure with $\xi_{ot}|_{S^3 \setminus L}$ tight), and systematically we can only produce them for those particular torus knots. We can expect that the lens spaces $L(ns^2 + s + 1, s^2)$, coming from surgery along the torus knots $T(s, -(sn + 1))$, may be treated in the same fashion.

(3) The maximal Thurston–Bennequin number of Legendrian realizations of the negative torus knot $T(a, -b)$ in the tight (S^3, ξ_{st}) equals $-ab$, so the maximal topological surgery coefficient for a Legendrian surgery is $-(ab + 1)$. It seems reasonable to conjecture that the theorem holds for all lens spaces $L(ab + 1, a^2)$.

We assume that the reader is familiar with the elements of contact topology on the level of [7]. In particular, our argument depends on the presentation of contact 3-manifolds in terms of contact (± 1)-surgery diagrams; see [4] and [7, Section 6.4].

2. **Contact Structures on Lens Spaces**

As explained in the Introduction, lens spaces come with a natural orientation. When we speak of a "contact structure" ξ on an oriented 3-manifold, we always mean a positive oriented contact structure, that is, $\xi = \ker \alpha$ with $\alpha \wedge d\alpha > 0$, and α is given up to multiplication by a positive function.

The number of tight contact structures on lens spaces has been determined independently by Giroux [9] and Honda [13].

THEOREM 2.1 (Giroux, Honda). *On the lens space $L(p, q)$ with $p > q > 0$ and $\gcd(p, q) = 1$, the number of tight contact structures is given by*

$$(a_0 - 1) \cdots (a_k - 1),$$

where the $a_i \geq 2$ are the terms in the negative continued fraction expansion

$$\frac{p}{q} = a_0 - \cfrac{1}{a_1 - \cfrac{1}{a_2 - \cdots - \cfrac{1}{a_k}}} =: [a_0, \ldots, a_k].$$

For our family of lens spaces, this number is easy to compute.

COROLLARY 2.2. *The number of tight contact structures on $L(ns^2 - s + 1, s^2)$ is $n - 1$ for $s = 1$ and $(s + 1)(n - 1)$ for $s \geq 2$.*

Proof. The case $s = 1$ is clear. For $s \geq 2$, we claim that

$$\frac{ns^2 - s + 1}{s^2} = [n, s + 2, \underbrace{2, \ldots, 2}_{s-2}].$$

The result then follows from Theorem 2.1.

Inductively, we see that

$$[\underbrace{2, \ldots, 2}_{s-2}] = \frac{s - 1}{s - 2}.$$

Then

$$[n, s + 2, \underbrace{2, \ldots, 2}_{s-2}] = n - \cfrac{1}{s + 2 - \cfrac{1}{[2, \ldots, 2]}}$$

$$= \frac{ns^2 - s + 1}{s^2},$$

as claimed. $\qquad\square$

Our aim is to find Legendrian realizations of the torus knot $T(s, -(sn-1))$ in some contact structure on S^3 such that Legendrian surgery on the knot produces a tight contact structure on the lens space $L(ns^2 - s + 1, s^2)$. This requires, first of all, that the Thurston–Bennequin invariant tb of these realizations equals $-s(sn-1)$, so that, topologically, we perform a surgery with framing $-(ns^2 - s + 1)$. Secondly, a necessary condition for the contact structure on the surgered manifold to be tight is that we start with the standard tight contact structure ξ_{st} on S^3 or with an exceptional realisation of $T(s, -(sn-1))$ in an overtwisted contact structure; see Remark 1.2(2) for the definition of exceptional Legendrian knots—these are also referred to as nonloose Legendrian knots.

We will represent $T(s, -(sn-1))$ as a Legendrian knot L in a contact surgery diagram of some contact structure on S^3. We will then see directly that Legendrian surgery on this knot produces a contact surgery diagram for a tight contact structure on $L(ns^2 - s + 1, s^2)$. Thus, with hindsight the contact structure on the complement of L was tight.

To distinguish the contact structures obtained in this fashion, we need two well-known homotopical invariants of tangent 2-plane fields on 3-manifolds. The first is the Euler class, which modulo 2-torsion detects homotopy over the 2-skeleton; the second is the so-called d_3-invariant.

EXAMPLE 2.3. The Euler class suffices to settle the case $s = 1$ of the theorem. In (S^3, ξ_{st}), there are $n - 1$ Legendrian realizations of the (oriented) unknot with tb $= -n + 1$ and rotation numbers in the range

$$\text{rot} \in \{-n+2, -n+4, \ldots, n-4, n-2\},$$

given by adding $n - 2$ zigzags, distributed on the left and the right, to the standard front projection picture of an unknot with tb $= -1$ and rot $= 0$. Legendrian surgery on these knots produces the lens space $L(n, 1)$. The almost complex structure on the corresponding symplectic handlebody X, which has cohomology $H^2(X) \cong \mathbb{Z}$, has the first Chern class equal to rot, and by [15, Theorem 1.2], this distinguishes the $n - 1$ contact structures on $L(n, 1)$ up to isotopy.

Recall from [10, Section 4] that with any oriented tangent 2-plane field η on a closed orientable 3-manifold Y, we can associate a homotopy invariant $d_3(\eta) \in \mathbb{Q}$, provided that the Euler class $e(\eta)$ is a torsion class. This is the homotopy obstruction over the 3-skeleton of Y in the sense that two such 2-plane fields that are homotopic over the 2-skeleton are homotopic over Y if and only if they have the same d_3-invariant.

Suppose the contact 3-manifold (Y, ξ) is given in terms of a surgery presentation $\mathbb{L} = \mathbb{L}_+ \sqcup \mathbb{L}_- \subset (S^3, \xi_{st})$, that is, $\mathbb{L}$ is a Legendrian link, and (Y, ξ) is the result of performing contact (± 1)-surgery along the components of the sublinks $\mathbb{L}_\pm$. In this situation, the d_3-invariant can be computed as follows; see [4, Corollary 3.6], where X is the four-dimensional handlebody determined by the surgery description, $\chi(X)$ its Euler characteristic, and $\sigma(X)$ its signature.

Figure 1 The left-handed trefoils in (S^3, ξ_{st}) with $\mathtt{tb} = -6$

PROPOSITION 2.4. *Suppose that the Euler class $e(\xi)$ is torsion and $\mathtt{tb}(L_i) \neq 0$ for each $L_i \in \mathbb{L}_+$. Then*

$$d_3(\xi) = \frac{1}{4}(c^2 - 3\sigma(X) - 2\chi(X)) + q, \tag{1}$$

where q denotes the number of components of $\mathbb{L}_+$, and $c \in H^2(X)$ is the cohomology class determined by $c(\Sigma_i) = \mathtt{rot}(L_i)$ for each $L_i \subset \mathbb{L}$.

For the computation of the rational number c^2, write M for the linking matrix of the link $\mathbb{L}$, with diagonal entries given by the topological surgery framings. Let $\underline{\mathtt{rot}}$ be the vector of rotation numbers of the link components. Solve the linear system $M\mathbf{x} = \underline{\mathtt{rot}}$ over $\mathbb{Q}$. Then $c^2 = \mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{t}} M \mathbf{x}$.

3. The Lens Space $L(7, 4)$

To see where the error occurs in [19], we begin with Plamenevskaya's example $L(7, 4)$, that is, the case $n = 2$, $s = 2$. This lens space admits three tight contact structures.

According to Rasmussen's result cited in the Introduction, the only way to obtain $L(7, 4)$ by an integral surgery on S^3 is a (-7)-surgery along a left-handed trefoil knot $T(2, -3)$. We therefore need to look for Legendrian realizations of the left-handed trefoil with $\mathtt{tb} = -6$ either in (S^3, ξ_{st}) or as an exceptional knot in an overtwisted contact structure on S^3.

By [6, Section 4.1], -6 is the maximal Thurston–Bennequin number for Legendrian realizations of the left-handed trefoil knot in (S^3, ξ_{st}), and there are precisely two realizations (as oriented Legendrian knots) with this maximal $\mathtt{tb}$, distinguished by their rotation numbers $\mathtt{rot} = \pm 1$. They are shown in Figure 1.

An exceptional realisation $L \subset S^3$ of the left-handed trefoil is shown in Figure 2. We shall check in a moment that $\mathtt{tb}(L) = -6$; Legendrian surgery along L then produces $L(7, 4)$.

The Kirby moves to verify the topological part of this statement are shown in Figures 3 and 4. The latter shows how to separate L from the surgery link by $1 + 2$ handle slides (where in the first step we slide both strands simultaneously), turning it into a left-handed trefoil in S^3. The two-component surgery link does indeed represent the 3-sphere, since surgery along the 0-framed meridian cancels the (-2)-surgery; for instance, we can use a slam-dunk [11, Figure 5.30].

Figure 2   An exceptional left-handed trefoil L with $\mathtt{tb} = -6$

Figure 3   Kirby moves for Figure 2

To see that L is exceptional, observe that—by the cancellation lemma [3] (see [7, Proposition 6.4.5])—contact (-1)-surgery along L in Figure 2 cancels one of the contact $(+1)$-surgeries. Then the remaining surgery diagram contains only a

Figure 4 The final handle slides

single contact $(+1)$-surgery along a standard Legendrian unknot, which by [4] produces the unique tight (and Stein fillable) contact structure on $S^1 \times S^2$, and the further contact (-1)-surgeries then produce a Stein fillable and hence tight contact structure.

On the other hand, the contact structure on S^3 given by the surgery diagram in Figure 2 (without any surgery along L) is overtwisted, since its d_3-invariant is $3/2$ (recall that $d_3(\xi_{st}) = -1/2$). Indeed, the linking matrix (ordering the knots from bottom to top) is

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & -1 & -1 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & -3 & -1 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & -1 & -3 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & -2 \end{pmatrix}$$

with signature $\sigma = -1$ (instead of computing σ from the matrix, we can see this from the Kirby moves in Figure 3 by keeping track of the blow-ups and blow-downs). Since we are adding five 2-handles to the 4-ball, the Euler characteristic of the handlebody is $\chi = 6$. The vector of rotation numbers is $\underline{rot} = (0, 0, 1, 1, 0)^t$, and the solution of $M\mathbf{x} = \underline{rot}$ is $\mathbf{x} = (-7, -7, 3, 4, -2)^t$. This gives $c^2 = \mathbf{x}^t M \mathbf{x} = 7$, and hence $d_3 = 3/2$ with formula (1).

We still need to check that $\mathtt{tb}(L) = -6$. For this, we may use the formula from [16, Lemma 6.6]; see also [8, Lemma 3.1] and [5]. Consider the extended linking matrix

$$M_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & 0 & -1 & -1 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & -1 & -3 & -1 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -3 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & -2 \end{pmatrix},$$

which now includes L as the first link component, with the first diagonal entry set to zero. Write $\mathtt{tb}_0$ for the Thurston–Bennequin invariant of L as a knot in the unsurgered copy of S^3, that is, here $\mathtt{tb}_0 = -1$. Then, in the surgered manifold (which here is another copy of S^3), we have

$$\mathtt{tb}(L) = \mathtt{tb}_0 + \frac{\det M_0}{\det M} = -1 + \frac{5}{-1} = -6.$$

REMARK 3.1. Alternatively, we can determine $\mathtt{tb}(L)$ by keeping track of the framing of L during the Kirby moves. Start with a Legendrian push-off L' of L in the original diagram, which has linking -1 with L. In the last diagram of Figure 3, we then have linking number $\mathtt{lk}(L, L') = 2$ (as knots in the unsurgered S^3). After the handle slides in Figure 4, the parallel knot L' will likewise pass twice through the (-2)-box, so two strands of L' will each receive a (-2)-twisting relative to two strands of L, resulting in $\mathtt{tb}(L) = 2 - 2^3 = -6$.

PROPOSITION 3.2. *Legendrian surgery along the three left-handed trefoil knots in Figures 1 and 2 produces the three tight contact structures on $L(7,4)$.*

REMARK 3.3. A word of clarification is in order. The result of a surgery along a knot does not depend on the orientation of the knot. In what sense, then, can the two knots in Figure 1 be said to correspond to two nonisotopic contact structures on a given copy of the lens space $L(7,4)$?

In an integral surgery diagram, read as a Kirby diagram for a four-dimensional handlebody X, a choice of orientation on a knot K amounts to a choice of positive generator in the corresponding $\mathbb{Z}$-summand of $H_2(X)$, represented by an oriented Seifert surface for K glued with the core disc in the handle.

The left-handed trefoil, like all torus knots, is a reversible knot, that is, it is isotopic to itself with reversed orientation. This means that the two oriented knots in Figure 1 are topologically isotopic. The time-1 map of this isotopy gives us an identification of the two handlebodies such that either knot corresponds to the positive generator of $H_2(X)$. It is with respect to this identification that we compare the resulting contact structures; likewise for the contact structure coming from Figure 2.

The same comments apply to the general case discussed in the subsequent sections. In particular, once an orientation of the torus knot has been fixed, we

can use the Euler class to distinguish contact structures on the lens space resulting from surgery, without any need to consider the action of diffeomorphisms on the second cohomology group.

Proof of Proposition 3.2. First of all, observe that Legendrian surgery along the examples in Figure 1 produces Stein fillable and hence tight contact structures on $L(7, 4)$. The tightness of the contact structure obtained by surgery along the exceptional left-handed trefoil in Figure 2 was explained previously; this was our argument for seeing that the Legendrian knot L is indeed exceptional.

For the examples in Figure 1, we compute $d_3 = -2/7$ from $M = (-7)$, $\chi = 2$, $\sigma = -1$, and $c^2 = -1/7$. By [10, Proposition 2.3] the first Chern class of the Stein surface (X, J) described by the respective diagram evaluates to $\mathtt{rot} = \pm 1$ on the positive generator of $H_2(X)$. The Euler class of the respective contact structure induced on the boundary $\partial X = L(7, 4)$ then equals $\pm 1 \in H^2(L(7, 4)) = \mathbb{Z}_7$, so the two contact structures are nonisotopic.

For the example in Figure 2, Legendrian surgery cancels one of the contact $(+1)$-surgeries. The remaining diagram has linking matrix (ordering the knots from bottom to top)

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & -1 & 0 \\ -1 & -3 & -1 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & -3 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & -2 \end{pmatrix}$$

with signature $\sigma = -2$. The Euler characteristic of the handlebody is $\chi = 5$, and the vector of rotation numbers is $\underline{\mathtt{rot}} = (0, 1, 1, 0)^{\mathtt{t}}$. The solution of $M\mathbf{x} = \underline{\mathtt{rot}}$ is given by $\mathbf{x} = (-1, 0, 0, 0)^{\mathtt{t}}$, and hence $c^2 = \mathbf{x}^{\mathtt{t}} M \mathbf{x} = 0$ and $d_3 = (0 + 6 - 10)/4 + 1 = 0$, which distinguishes this contact structure from the other two. $\square$

REMARK 3.4. For Legendrian surgery diagrams of the three tight structures on $L(7, 4)$ involving two-component links, see [19, Figure 6]. The error in [19] occurs in the computation of the d_3-invariant for the contact structure coming from the examples in Figure 1; Plamenevskaya obtains $d_3 = 0$ and then argues, correctly, that the two structures with $d_3 = -2/7$ cannot come from an exceptional trefoil.

4. The Lens Spaces $L(4m + 3, 4)$

As a first generalization, we now prove Theorem 1.1 for $s = 2$ but arbitrary n. Here we distinguish the contact structures by their Euler classes. For notational convenience, we set $m = n - 1$, so instead of $L(4n - 1, 4)$, we consider the lens spaces $L(4m + 3, 4)$ with $m \geq 1$.

The lens space $L(4m + 3, 4)$ is obtained by $-(4m + 3)$-surgery on the torus knot $T(2, -(2m + 1))$, so we need to find Legendrian realizations of this torus knot with $\mathtt{tb} = -(4m + 2)$.

The following result belongs to Etnyre and Honda [6, Section 4.1], where the reader can also find explicit front projection diagrams of the knots in question.

Figure 5 Exceptional realizations of $T(2, -(2m+1))$, $m = k + l + 1$

PROPOSITION 4.1 (Etnyre–Honda). *The maximal Thurston–Bennequin invariant of Legendrian realizations of $T(2, -(2m+1))$ in (S^3, ξ_{st}) is $-(4m+2)$. Up to Legendrian isotopy, there are $2m$ realizations with this maximal* tb, *with rotation number in the range*

$$\text{rot} \in \{-2m+1, -2m+3, \ldots, 2m-3, 2m-1\}.$$

Legendrian surgery on these knots yields $2m$ tight contact structures on the lens space $L(4m+3, 4)$, distinguished by their Euler class in $H^2(L(4m+3, 4)) = \mathbb{Z}_{4m+3}$, which, as before, is given by the reduction of the rotation number modulo $4m+3$.

The remaining m tight contact structures on $L(4m+3, 4)$ have to come from exceptional realisations of the torus knot $T(2, -(2m+1))$ in some overtwisted contact structure on S^3.

PROPOSITION 4.2. *For $(k, l) \in \mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}_0$ with $k + l = m - 1$, the Legendrian knot L shown in the contact surgery diagram of Figure 5 is an exceptional realization of $T(2, -(2m+1))$ in S^3 with* tb $= -(4m+2)$.

REMARK 4.3. Exceptional realizations of the torus knots $T(2, -(2m+1))$ have previously been described in [16]. The Kirby moves in Figure 3 are those of [16, Figure 18]. However, the purported exceptional realizations in [16, Figure 17] do not actually correspond to this Kirby diagram.

Proof of Proposition 4.2. The Kirby moves in Figures 3 and 4 once again confirm the topological part of the statement. Simply replace the (-2)-framing in the first diagram of Figure 3 by $-(m+1) = -n$, which remains unchanged throughout the moves, and instead of the $1 + 2$ slides in Figure 4, perform $1 + n$ slides. Likewise, the argument that surgery along L in Figure 5 produces a tight contact structure is as before.

For the computation of $\mathtt{tb}(L)$ in the surgered S^3, observe that only the last diagonal entry -2 in the matrices M and M_0 (before Proposition 3.2) needs to be replaced by $-(m+1)$. By expanding the respective determinants along the last row, we find that $\det M = -1$ remains unchanged and $\det M_0 = -3 + 4(m+1) = 4m + 1$. This gives $\mathtt{tb}(L) = -(4m+2)$, as desired.

Next, we compute the d_3-invariant of the surgered S^3. As before, we have $\sigma = -1$ and $\chi = 6$. We have

$$\underline{\mathtt{rot}} = (0, 0, 1, 1, l - k)^{\mathtt{t}},$$

and the solution of $M\mathbf{x} = \underline{\mathtt{rot}}$ is given by

$$\mathbf{x} = (-6k - 2l - 7, -6k - 2l - 7, 3k + l + 3, 3k + l + 4, -2)^{\mathtt{t}}.$$

It follows that $d_3 = 2k + 3/2$, so the contact structure is overtwisted, and L is exceptional. $\qquad\square$

The following proposition shows that Legendrian surgery along these exceptional knots produces the required m tight structures on $L(4m + 3, 4)$, distinct from the $2m$ we found previously.

PROPOSITION 4.4. *Legendrian surgery along the knot L shown in Figure 5 (for the various choices of k, l) produces m tight contact structures on $L(4m + 3, 4)$ with Euler class in $H^2(L(4m + 3, 4)) = \mathbb{Z}_{4m+3}$ in the range*

$$-2m + 2, -2m + 6, \ldots, 2m - 6, 2m - 2 \quad \mathrm{mod}\ 4m + 3.$$

Proof. We compute the Euler class of the contact structures on $L(4m + 3, 4)$ obtained via Legendrian surgery along these exceptional knots. To this end, we need to compute the rotation number of L as a knot in the overtwisted S^3 obtained by surgery along the link in Figure 5. According to [16, Lemma 6.6] (cf. [8, Lemma 3.1]), this rotation number is given by

$$\mathtt{rot}(L) = \underline{\mathtt{rot}}_0 - \langle \underline{\mathtt{rot}}, M^{-1}\underline{\mathtt{lk}} \rangle,$$

where $\underline{\mathtt{rot}}_0$ denotes the rotation number of L in the unsurgered copy of S^3 (here $\underline{\mathtt{rot}}_0 = 0$), and $\underline{\mathtt{lk}}$ is the vector of linking numbers of L with the components of the surgery link. We give L the clockwise orientation in the diagram. Then

$$\underline{\mathtt{lk}} = (-1, -1, -1, -1, 0)^{\mathtt{t}}$$

and

$$M^{-1}\underline{\mathtt{lk}} = (-4m - 2, -4m - 2, 2m + 1, 2m + 2, -2)^{\mathtt{t}}.$$

This yields

$$\mathrm{rot}(L) = -(4m+3) + 2(l-k) \equiv 2(l-k) \mod 4m+3.$$

Hence, modulo $4m+3$, the rotation number can take m distinct values in the range

$$\mathrm{rot} \in \{-2m+2, -2m+6, \ldots, 2m-6, 2m-2\}. \qquad \square$$

Here is an alternative way to compute the Euler class of the contact structure on $L(4m+3,4)$ obtained by surgery on the link in Figure 5 (including a contact (-1)-surgery along L), which is more direct than computing $\mathrm{rot}(L)$ in the surgered S^3.

Write X for the four-dimensional handlebody described by this diagram, so that $\partial X = L(4m+3,4)$. The first homology group $H_1(\partial X) = \mathbb{Z}_{4m+3}$ is generated by the classes of the meridians $[\mu_L], [\mu_1], \ldots, [\mu_5]$, and the relations are given by the linking matrix, cf. [4]. For ease of notation, we change all signs in that matrix:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & m+1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} [\mu_L] \\ [\mu_1] \\ [\mu_2] \\ [\mu_3] \\ [\mu_4] \\ [\mu_5] \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

This yields the relations

$$(4m+3)[\mu_4] = 0,$$
$$-[\mu_L] = [\mu_1] = [\mu_2] = 2[\mu_4],$$
$$[\mu_3] = -[\mu_4],$$
$$[\mu_5] = -4[\mu_4],$$

so that, indeed, $H_1(\partial X) = \mathbb{Z}_{4m+3}$, generated by the class $[\mu_4]$. The class $[\mu_L]$ can likewise be taken as a generator, since $-2(m+1)[\mu_L] = (4m+4)[\mu_4] = [\mu_4]$.

Now, as discussed in [4], the Poincaré dual of the Euler class $e(\xi)$ of the contact structure on ∂X is given by the vector of rotation numbers of the link components, expressed in terms of the classes of meridians, that is,

$$e(\xi) = [\mu_3] + [\mu_4] + (l-k)[\mu_5]$$
$$= 2(l-k)[\mu_L],$$

which confirms the calculation in the foregoing proof.

5. The Lens Spaces $L(ns^2 - s + 1, s^2)$

Finally, we deal with the general case $n \geq 2$, $s \geq 2$ of Theorem 1.1. The relevant result from [6] can now be phrased as follows.

Figure 6 Exceptional realizations of $T(s, -(sn - 1))$

PROPOSITION 5.1 (Etnyre–Honda). *The maximal Thurston–Bennequin invariant of Legendrian realisations of $T(s, -(sn - 1))$ in (S^3, ξ_{st}) is $-s(sn - 1)$. Up to Legendrian isotopy, there are $2(n - 1)$ realizations with this maximal* tb, *with the rotation number in the range*

$$\{-(n - 1)s + 1, -(n - 3)s \pm 1, \ldots, (n - 3)s \pm 1, (n - 1)s - 1\}.$$

As in the case $s = 2$, Legendrian surgery along these knots gives us $2(n - 1)$ tight contact structures on $L(ns^2 - s + 1, s^2)$. It remains to find $(s - 1)(n - 1)$ exceptional realizations of $T(s, -(sn - 1))$ in S^3, which will give us the remaining tight structures on the lens space.

PROPOSITION 5.2. *For $(k, l) \in \mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}_0$ with $k + l = n - 2$ and $(p, q) \in \mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}$ (sic!) with $p + q = s - 1$, the Legendrian knot L shown in Figure 6 is an exceptional realization of $T(s, -(sn - 1))$ in S^3 with* tb $= -s(sn - 1)$.

Proof. For the topological aspect of the statement, see the Kirby moves in Figure 7. The effect of the final $1 + n$ handle slides is now shown in Figure 8. Before, we explained that the cancellation of the two surgeries (after the handle slides)

Figure 7   Kirby moves for Figure 6

can be interpreted as a slam-dunk of the 0-framed meridian, which turns the $(-n)$-framed unknot into an unknot with surgery framing $-n - 1/0 = \infty$. Alternatively, we can actually interpret the complete move (handle slides and cancellation of the surgeries) as a slam-dunk of the $(-n)$-framed meridian to the 0-framed unknot. This turns the latter into an unknot with framing $0 - 1/(-n) = 1/n$ and leaves L unchanged. The $(1/n)$-surgery along the unknot is equivalent to removing a tubular neighborhood of the unknot, twisting the neck $-n$ times, and then regluing the solid torus with the identity map. This results in the diagram on the right of Figure 8.

Figure 8 The final handle slides as a slam-dunk

The linking matrix, which we need for the computation of various invariants, is now

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & \overbrace{-1}^{s-1} & -1 & \cdots & -1 & -1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & -1 & -1 & \cdots & -1 & -1 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & -3 & -2 & \cdots & -2 & -1 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & -2 & -3 & \cdots & -2 & -1 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ -1 & -1 & -2 & -2 & \cdots & -3 & -1 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & \cdots & -1 & -s-1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & -n \end{pmatrix}.$$

To verify that L is exceptional, we compute the d_3-invariant of the contact structure on S^3 described by the surgery diagram in Figure 6. The number of 2-handles in this Kirby diagram is $s+3$, so the Euler characteristic of the handle-body is $\chi = 4 + s$. The signature is $\sigma = -1 - (s-2) = 1 - s$, since, compared with with the diagram in Figure 5, we have $s-2$ additional (-1)-framed unknots from the blow-downs shown in Figure 7.

The vector of rotation numbers is

$$\underline{\text{rot}} = (0, 0, \underbrace{1, \ldots, 1}_{s-1}, q-p, l-k)^{\mathsf{t}},$$

and the solution $\mathbf{x}$ of $M\mathbf{x} = \underline{\text{rot}}$ is given by

$$(-1-su, -1-su, \underbrace{u, \ldots, u}_{s-1}, u+1, -2q)^{\mathsf{t}},$$

where $u := k - l + 2qn - 1$. It follows that

$$c^2 = \mathbf{x}^{\mathsf{t}} M \mathbf{x} = 4nq^2 + 4q(k-l) - s + 1$$

and

$$d_3 = nq^2 + q(k-l) - \frac{1}{2}.$$

For $q \geq 1$, as assumed in the proposition, we have $d_3 > -1/2 = d_3(\xi_{\text{st}})$, so this diagram does indeed define an overtwisted contact structure on S^3.

For the computation of $\mathtt{tb}(L)$ in the surgered S^3, we determine the determinants of M and the extended matrix M_0 by a simple row reduction. We find $\det M = (-1)^{s-1}$ and $\det M_0 = (-1)^{s-1}(1 - s(sn-1))$. The formula from Section 3 then yields $\mathtt{tb}(L) = -s(sn-1)$. $\square$

REMARK 5.3. Analogous to Remark 3.1, we can alternatively compute $\mathtt{tb}(L)$ from the effects of the Kirby moves on the framing given by a Legendrian push-off L' of L in the original diagram. After the moves in Figure 7, we have $\mathtt{lk}(L, L') = s$ (as knots in the unsurgered S^3). After the slam-dunk in Figure 8, s strands of the parallel knot L' receive a $(-n)$-twist relative to each of the s strands of L, so we arrive at $\mathtt{tb}(L) = s - ns^2 = -s(sn-1)$.

The final lemma tells us that the tight contact structures on $L(ns^2 - s + 1, s^2)$ obtained by Legendrian surgery on these $(s-1)(n-1)$ Legendrian realizations of $T(s, -(sn-1))$ in S^3 can be distinguished from one another—and from the ones coming from Proposition 5.1—by their Euler class. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

LEMMA 5.4. *The Euler class of the tight contact structure $\xi = \xi_{k,l,p,q}$ on the lens space $L(ns^2 - s + 1, s^2)$ obtained by surgery on the link in Figure 6, including a contact (-1)-surgery along L, is*

$$e(\xi) = (p - q + 1)ns + (l - k)s \mod ns^2 - s + 1.$$

REMARK 5.5. Notice that $l - k$ takes values in the range

$$l - k \in \{-n + 2, -n + 4, \ldots, n - 4, n - 2\};$$

for $p - q + 1$, the range is

$$\{-s + 2, -s + 4, \ldots, s - 4, s - 2\}.$$

So the first summand in the expression $e(k, l, p, q)$ for $e(\xi)$ varies in steps of size $2ns$, whereas the second summand ranges between $\pm(n-2)s$. This means that there are no duplications in this list of Euler numbers, at least before reducing modulo $ns^2 - s + 1$.

In $\mathbb{Z}$ we have

$$e_{\min} := -ns^2 + (n + 2)s \leq e(k, l, p, q) \leq ns^2 - (n + 2)s =: e_{\max},$$

so $e_{\max} - e_{\min} < 2(ns^2 - s + 1)$. When we bring the negative $e(k, l, p, q)$ modulo $ns^2 - s + 1$ into the range $(0, ns^2 - s + 1)$, they are congruent to 1 modulo s, whereas the positive $e(k, l, p, q)$ are divisible by s, so there are no duplications even modulo $ns^2 - s + 1$. Moreover, we have

$$e_{\min} + ns^2 - s + 1 = (n + 1)s + 1 > (n - 1)s - 1$$

and

$$-(n - 1)s + 1 + ns^2 - s + 1 = ns^2 - ns + 2 > e_{\max},$$

which implies that there are also no duplications with the Euler numbers (modulo $ns^2 - s + 1$) coming from Proposition 5.1.

Proof of Lemma 5.4. We label the meridional classes corresponding to the knots in Figure 6 from bottom to top as

$$[\mu_L], [\mu_1], [\mu_2], [\nu_1], \ldots, [\nu_{s-1}], [\alpha_s], [\beta_n].$$

We then compute the relations between these generators from the matrix M as in Section 4 to obtain

$$[\mu_1] = -[\mu_L], \qquad [\mu_2] = -[\mu_L], \qquad [\nu_1] = \cdots = [\nu_{s-1}] = (1 - ns)[\mu_L],$$
$$[\alpha_s] = -ns[\mu_L], \qquad [\beta_n] = s[\mu_L], \qquad (ns^2 - s + 1)[\mu_L] = 0.$$

From the vector `rot` we then compute

$$e(\xi) = [\nu_1] + \cdots + [\nu_{s-1}] + (q - p)[\alpha_s] + (l - k)[\beta_n]$$
$$= ((p - q + 1)ns + (l - k)s)[\mu_L],$$

as claimed. $\qquad\qquad\square$

REMARK 5.6. In the proofs of Propositions 4.2 and 5.2, we used the d_3-invariant to show that L lives in an overtwisted contact structure on S^3, and hence L is exceptional, since Legendrian surgery along L produces a tight contact structure. The information that L is exceptional was not actually necessary for proving Theorem 1.1. Rather, the converse is true: the fact that the resulting tight contact structure on $L(ns^2 - s + 1, s^2)$ is different from any structure obtained from a Legendrian realization of $T(s, -(sn - 1))$ in (S^3, ξ_{st}) gives an alternative criterion for establishing the exceptional character of L.

References

[1] J. Bailey and D. Rolfsen, *An unexpected surgery construction of a lens space,* Pacific J. Math. 71 (1977), 295–298.

[2] M. Culler, C. M. Gordon, J. Luecke, and P. B. Shalen, *Dehn surgery on knots,* Ann. of Math. (2) 125 (1987), 237–300.

[3] F. Ding and H. Geiges, *A Legendrian surgery presentation of contact 3-manifolds,* Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 136 (2004), 583–598.

[4] F. Ding, H. Geiges, and A. I. Stipsicz, *Surgery diagrams for contact 3-manifolds,* Turkish J. Math. 28 (2004), 41–74.

[5] S. Durst and M. Kegel, *Computing rotation and self-linking numbers in contact surgery diagrams,* Acta Math. Hungar. 150 (2016), 524–540.

[6] J. B. Etnyre and K. Honda, *Knots and contact geometry I: torus knots and the figure eight knot,* J. Symplectic Geom. 1 (2001), 63–120.

[7] H. Geiges, *An introduction to contact topology,* Cambridge Stud. Adv. Math., 109, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2008.

[8] H. Geiges and S. Onaran, *Legendrian rational unknots in lens spaces,* J. Symplectic Geom. 13 (2015), 17–50.

[9] E. Giroux, *Structures de contact en dimension trois et bifurcations des feuilletages de surfaces,* Invent. Math. 141 (2000), 615–689.

[10] R. E. Gompf, *Handlebody construction of Stein surfaces,* Ann. of Math. (2) 148 (1998), 619–693.

[11] R. E. Gompf and A. I. Stipsicz, 4-*Manifolds and Kirby calculus,* Grad. Stud. Math., 20, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1999.

[12] M. Hedden, *On Floer homology and the Berge conjecture on knots admitting lens space surgeries,* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 363 (2011), 949–968.

[13] K. Honda, *On the classification of tight contact structures I,* Geom. Topol. 4 (2000), 309–368.

[14] P. Kronheimer, T. Mrowka, P. Ozsváth, and Z. Szabó, *Monopoles and lens space surgeries,* Ann. of Math. (2) 165 (2007), 457–546.

[15] P. Lisca and G. Matić, *Tight contact structures and Seiberg–Witten invariants,* Invent. Math. 129 (1997), 509–525.

[16] P. Lisca, P. Ozsváth, A. I. Stipsicz, and Z. Szabó, *Heegaard Floer invariants of Legendrian knots in contact three-manifolds,* J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) 11 (2009), 1307–1363.

[17] L. Moser, *Elementary surgery along a torus knot,* Pacific J. Math. 38 (1971), 737–745.

[18] P. Ozsváth and Z. Szabó, *On knot Floer homology and lens space surgeries,* Topology 44 (2005), 1281–1300.

[19] O. Plamenevskaya, *On Legendrian surgeries between lens spaces,* J. Symplectic Geom. 10 (2012), 165–181.

[20] J. Rasmussen, *Lens space surgeries and L-space homology spheres,* arXiv:0710.2531.

[21] M. Tange and Y. Yamada, *Four-dimensional manifolds constructed by lens space surgeries along torus knots,* J. Knot Theory Ramifications 21 (2012), 1250111.

H. Geiges
Mathematisches Institut
Universität zu Köln
Weyertal 86–90
50931 Köln
Germany

geiges@math.uni-koeln.de

S. Onaran
Department of Mathematics
Hacettepe University
06800 Beytepe-Ankara
Turkey

sonaran@hacettepe.edu.tr