

2016

Hidden Symmetries and Commensurability of 2-Bridge Link Complements

Christian Millichap
Linfield College

William Worden
Temple University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.linfield.edu/mathfac_pubs



Part of the [Geometry and Topology Commons](#)

DigitalCommons@Linfield Citation

Millichap, Christian and Worden, William, "Hidden Symmetries and Commensurability of 2-Bridge Link Complements" (2016). *Faculty Publications*. Published Version. Submission 9.

https://digitalcommons.linfield.edu/mathfac_pubs/9

This Published Version is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It is brought to you for free via open access, courtesy of DigitalCommons@Linfield, with permission from the rights-holder(s). Your use of this Published Version must comply with the [Terms of Use](#) for material posted in DigitalCommons@Linfield, or with other stated terms (such as a Creative Commons license) indicated in the record and/or on the work itself. For more information, or if you have questions about permitted uses, please contact digitalcommons@linfield.edu.

*Pacific
Journal of
Mathematics*

**HIDDEN SYMMETRIES AND COMMENSURABILITY
OF 2-BRIDGE LINK COMPLEMENTS**

CHRISTIAN MILLICHAP AND WILLIAM WORDEN

HIDDEN SYMMETRIES AND COMMENSURABILITY OF 2-BRIDGE LINK COMPLEMENTS

CHRISTIAN MILLICHAP AND WILLIAM WORDEN

In this paper, we show that any nonarithmetic hyperbolic 2-bridge link complement admits no hidden symmetries. As a corollary, we conclude that a hyperbolic 2-bridge link complement cannot irregularly cover a hyperbolic 3-manifold. By combining this corollary with the work of Boileau and Weidmann, we obtain a characterization of 3-manifolds with nontrivial JSJ-decomposition and rank-two fundamental groups. We also show that the only commensurable hyperbolic 2-bridge link complements are the figure-eight knot complement and the 6_2^2 link complement. Our work requires a careful analysis of the tilings of \mathbb{R}^2 that come from lifting the canonical triangulations of the cusps of hyperbolic 2-bridge link complements.

1. Introduction

Two manifolds are called *commensurable* if they share a common finite sheeted cover. Here, we focus on hyperbolic 3-manifolds, that is, $M = \mathbb{H}^3 / \Gamma$ where Γ is a discrete, torsion-free subgroup of $\text{Isom}(\mathbb{H}^3)$. We are interested in analyzing the set of all manifolds commensurable with M . Commensurability is a property of interest because it provides a method for organizing manifolds, and many topological properties are preserved within a commensurability class. For instance, Schwartz [1995] showed that two cusped hyperbolic 3-manifolds are commensurable if and only if their fundamental groups are quasi-isometric. In this paper, we restrict our attention to hyperbolic 2-bridge link complements; see Section 2 for the definition of a 2-bridge link. We use the word *link* to refer to a link in \mathbb{S}^3 with at least one component. We use the word *knot* to only mean a single component link.

A significant challenge in understanding the commensurability class of a hyperbolic 3-manifold $M = \mathbb{H}^3 / \Gamma$ is determining whether or not M has any *hidden symmetries*. To understand hidden symmetries, we first need to introduce some terminology. The *commensurator* of Γ is

$$C(\Gamma) = \{g \in \text{Isom}(\mathbb{H}^3) : |\Gamma : \Gamma \cap g\Gamma g^{-1}| < \infty\}.$$

MSC2010: 57M25, 57M50.

Keywords: 2-bridge links, hidden symmetries, commensurability.

It is a well known fact that two hyperbolic 3-manifolds are commensurable if and only if their corresponding commensurators are conjugate in $\text{Isom}(\mathbb{H}^3)$; see Lemma 2.3 of [Walsh 2011]. We denote by $C^+(\Gamma)$ the restriction of $C(\Gamma)$ to orientation-preserving isometries. We also denote by $N(\Gamma)$ the normalizer of Γ in $\text{Isom}(\mathbb{H}^3)$ and by $N^+(\Gamma)$ the restriction of $N(\Gamma)$ to orientation-preserving isometries. Note that $\Gamma \subset N(\Gamma) \subset C(\Gamma)$. A symmetry of M corresponds to an element of $N(\Gamma)/\Gamma$, and a hidden symmetry of M corresponds to an element of $C(\Gamma)$ that is not in $N(\Gamma)$. Geometrically, M admits a hidden symmetry if there exists a symmetry of a finite cover of M that is not a lift of an isometry of M . See Sections 2 and 3 of [Walsh 2011] for more details on commensurators and hidden symmetries.

In this paper, we give a classification of the hidden symmetries of hyperbolic 2-bridge link complements. Reid and Walsh [2008] used algebraic methods to determine that hyperbolic 2-bridge knot complements (other than the figure-eight knot complement) have no hidden symmetries. However, their techniques do not apply to hyperbolic 2-bridge links with two components. Here, we use a geometric and combinatorial approach to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1. *If $M = \mathbb{S}^3 \setminus K$ is a nonarithmetic hyperbolic 2-bridge link complement, then M admits no hidden symmetries (either orientation-preserving or orientation-reversing).*

The only arithmetic hyperbolic 2-bridge links are the figure-eight knot, the Whitehead link, the 6_2^2 link, and the 6_3^2 link. Though it will not be needed in what follows, we refer the interested reader to [Maclachlan and Reid 2003, Definition 8.2.1] for the definition of an arithmetic group $\Gamma \leq \text{Isom}(\mathbb{H}^3)$.

We prove Theorem 1.1 by using the canonical triangulation \mathcal{T} of a hyperbolic 2-bridge link complement, $M = \mathbb{H}^3/\Gamma = \mathbb{S}^3 \setminus K$. This triangulation was first described in [Sakuma and Weeks 1995]. Guéritaud in his thesis [2006a] proved that this triangulation is geometrically canonical, i.e., topologically dual to the Ford–Voronoi domain for equal volume cusp neighborhoods. In addition, Akiyoshi, Sakuma, Wada and Yamashita [2007] have announced a proof of this result where they analyze the triangulation \mathcal{T} via cone deformations of M along the unknotting tunnel. Futer also showed that this triangulation is geometric by applying Rivin’s volume maximization principle; see the appendix of [Guéritaud 2006b]. By [Goodman et al. 2008, Theorem 2.6], if any such M is nonarithmetic, then $C(\Gamma)$ can be identified with the group of symmetries of the tiling of \mathbb{H}^3 obtained by lifting \mathcal{T} , which we call $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$. We prove that any nonarithmetic hyperbolic 2-bridge link complement M does not admit hidden symmetries, by showing that any symmetry of $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ actually corresponds to a composition of symmetries of M and deck transformations of M . In other words, $C(\Gamma) = N(\Gamma)$.

Rather than analyze this tiling of \mathbb{H}^3 , we drop down a dimension and instead analyze the (canonical) cusp triangulation \tilde{T} of \mathbb{R}^2 , induced by $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$. By intersecting a cusp cross-section of M with its canonical triangulation \mathcal{T} , we obtain a canonical triangulation T of the cusp(s). If K has two components, we still end up with the same canonical triangulation on both components of T since there is always a symmetry exchanging the two components, and we take equal volume cusp neighborhoods. We can lift T to a triangulation \tilde{T} of \mathbb{R}^2 (or two copies of \mathbb{R}^2 if K has two components). We also place edge labels on \tilde{T} which record edge valences of corresponding edges in the three-dimensional triangulation. This labeling provides us with enough rigid structure in \tilde{T} to rule out any hidden symmetries. Goodman, Heard and Hodgson [2008, Theorem 3.1] use a similar approach to prove that nonarithmetic hyperbolic punctured-torus bundles do not admit hidden symmetries.

If a hyperbolic 3-manifold M admits no hidden symmetries, then M can not irregularly cover any *hyperbolic 3-orbifolds*. A hyperbolic 3-orbifold is any $N = \mathbb{H}^3 / \Gamma$, where Γ is a discrete subgroup of $\text{Isom}(\mathbb{H}^3)$, possibly with torsion. All of the previous statements about commensurability of hyperbolic 3-manifolds and the commensurator of Γ also hold for hyperbolic 3-orbifolds. Theorem 1.1 quickly gives us the following corollary about coverings of hyperbolic 3-orbifolds by hyperbolic 2-bridge link complements. For the arithmetic cases, volume bounds are taken into consideration to rule out irregular covers of manifolds.

Corollary 1.2. *Let M be any hyperbolic 2-bridge link complement. If M is nonarithmetic, then M does not irregularly cover any hyperbolic 3-orbifolds (orientable or nonorientable). If M is arithmetic, then M does not irregularly cover any orientable hyperbolic 3-manifolds.*

By combining Corollary 1.2 with the work of Boileau and Weidmann [2005], we get the following characterization of 3-manifolds with nontrivial JSJ-decomposition and rank-two fundamental groups. For a more detailed description of this decomposition see page 478.

Corollary 1.3. *Let M be a compact, orientable, irreducible 3-manifold which has $\text{rank}(\pi_1(M)) = 2$. If M has a nontrivial JSJ-decomposition, then one of the following holds:*

- (1) M has Heegaard genus 2.
- (2) M decomposes into a Seifert fibered 3-manifold and hyperbolic 3-manifold.
- (3) M decomposes into two Seifert fibered 3-manifolds.

The original characterization given by Boileau and Weidmann included a fourth possibility: a hyperbolic piece of M is irregularly covered by a 2-bridge link complement. Corollary 1.2 eliminates this possibility.

Ruling out hidden symmetries also plays an important role in analyzing the *commensurability class* of a hyperbolic 3-orbifold $M = \mathbb{H}^3 / \Gamma$. By the commensurability class of a hyperbolic 3-orbifold (or manifold) N , we mean the set of all hyperbolic 3-orbifolds commensurable with N . A fundamental result of Margulis [1991] implies that $C(\Gamma)$ is discrete in $\text{Isom}(\mathbb{H}^3)$ (and Γ is finite index in $C(\Gamma)$) if and only if Γ is nonarithmetic. Thus, in the arithmetic case, M will have infinitely many hidden symmetries. In the nonarithmetic case, this result implies that the hyperbolic 3-orbifold $\mathcal{O}^+ = \mathbb{H}^3 / C^+(\Gamma)$ is the unique minimal (orientable) orbifold in the commensurability class of M . So, in the nonarithmetic case, M and M' are commensurable if and only if they cover a common minimal orbifold. Furthermore, when M admits no hidden symmetries, $C^+(\Gamma) = N^+(\Gamma)$, and so, \mathcal{O}^+ is just the quotient of M by its orientation-preserving symmetries.

By using Theorem 1.1 and thinking about commensurability in terms of covering a common minimal orbifold, we obtain the following result about commensurability classes of hyperbolic 2-bridge link complements.

Theorem 1.4. *The only pair of commensurable hyperbolic 2-bridge link complements are the figure-eight knot complement and the 6_2^2 link complement.*

We prove Theorem 1.4 by analyzing the cusp of each minimal (orientable) orbifold, \mathcal{O}^+ , in the commensurability class of a nonarithmetic hyperbolic 2-bridge link complement. This orbifold always has one cusp since two component 2-bridge links always have a symmetry exchanging the components. The cusp of this orbifold inherits a canonical cellulation from the canonical triangulation T of the cusp(s) of M . By comparing minimal orbifold cusp cellulations, we establish this result.

We now describe the organization of this paper. In Section 2, we provide some background on 2-bridge links, including an algorithm for building any 2-bridge link from a word Ω in L s and R s. Section 3 describes how to build the canonical triangulation of a 2-bridge link complement and the corresponding cusp triangulation T based on this word Ω . In this section we also prove some essential combinatorial properties of \tilde{T} , the lift of T to \mathbb{R}^2 . Section 4 analyzes the possible symmetries of a 2-bridge link complement in terms of the word Ω , and describes the actions of these symmetries on \tilde{T} . In Section 5, we prove Theorem 1.1, Corollary 1.2, and Corollary 1.3. In Section 6, we prove Theorem 1.4.

2. Background on 2-bridge links

In order to describe 2-bridge links, we first need to define *rational tangles*. First, a *2-tangle* is a pair (B, t) , where t is a pair of unoriented arcs embedded in the 3-ball B so that t only intersects the boundary of B in four specified marked points: SW, SE, NW, and NE (if we think of ∂B as the unit sphere centered at the origin in \mathbb{R}^3 ,




Figure 1. Left: the link $K(\Omega)$, where $\Omega = R^2L^3R^2L$, read from S_1 inward to S_c . Right: the same link, with crossings labeled and 4-punctured spheres S_i shown (note that S_5 and S_6 are omitted for readability).

then SW is the southwest corner $(-1/\sqrt{2}, -1/\sqrt{2}, 0)$, SE is the southeast corner $(1/\sqrt{2}, -1/\sqrt{2}, 0)$, etc.). Rational tangles are a special class of 2-tangles. The simplest rational tangles are the 0-tangle and the ∞ -tangle. The 0-tangle consists of two arcs that don't twist about one another, with one arc connecting NW to NE, and the other arc connecting SW to SE. Similarly, the ∞ -tangle consists of two unknotted arcs, with one arc connecting NE to SE and the other arc connecting NW to SW. Both of these tangles admit an obvious meridian curve contained on ∂B that bounds an embedded disk in the interior of B . A rational tangle is constructed by taking one of these trivial tangles and alternating between twisting about the western endpoints (NW and SW) and twisting about the southern endpoints (SW and SE). This twisting process maps the meridian of the 0-tangle (∞ -tangle) to a closed curve with rational slope p/q , which determines this tangle, hence the name rational tangle. A 2-bridge link is constructed by taking a rational tangle, connecting its western endpoints by an unknotted strand, and connecting its eastern endpoints by an unknotted strand.

Here, we describe a 2-bridge link $K \subset S^3$ in terms of a word Ω , which is a sequence of L s and R s: $\Omega = R^{\alpha_1}L^{\alpha_2}R^{\alpha_3} \dots R^{\alpha_n}$, $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{N}$ (if n is odd and the starting letter is R). The sequence $[\alpha_1 + 1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_{n-1}, \alpha_n + 1]$ gives the continued fraction expansion for the rational tangle p/q used to construct a 2-bridge link. Each L corresponds to performing a left-handed half-twist about the NW and SW endpoints of a 0-tangle and each R corresponds to performing a right-handed half-twist about the SW and SE endpoints of an ∞ -tangle. Each syllable, i.e., each maximal subword L^{α_i} or R^{α_i} , corresponds to two strands wrapping around each other α_i times. This word Ω gives a procedure to construct an alternating 4-string braid between two 4-punctured spheres, S_1 and S_c , where S_1 is exterior to the braid and S_c is interior to the braid; see Figure 1. To construct a 2-bridge link, we add a single crossing

to the outside of S_1 , and we add a single crossing to the inside of S_c . There is a unique way to add these crossings so that the resulting link diagram is alternating. Any 2-bridge link can be constructed in this manner and we use the notation $K(\Omega)$ to designate the 2-bridge link constructed by the word Ω . The original source for this notation comes from the appendix of [Guéritaud 2006b], which contains more details of this construction.

The following are important facts about 2-bridge links that we will use. From now on, we will state results in terms of $K(\Omega)$ and we assume that any 2-bridge link has been constructed in the manner described above, unless otherwise noted.

- Given a 2-bridge link $K(\Omega)$, we obtain a mirror image of the same link (with orientations changed on \mathbb{S}^3) if we switch L s and R s in the word Ω . Since we will only be considering unoriented link complements, we consider such links equivalent.
- 2-bridge links (and their complements) are determined by the sequence of integers $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ up to inversion. Schubert [1956] gives this classification of 2-bridge knots and links, and Sakuma and Weeks [1995, Theorem II.3.1] give this classification of their complements by examining their (now known) canonical triangulations.
- A 2-bridge link $K(\Omega)$ is hyperbolic if and only if Ω has at least two syllables. This follows from Menasco's [1984] classification of alternating link complements.
- The *only* arithmetic hyperbolic 2-bridge links are those listed below. This classification was given by Gehring, Maclachlan and Martin [1998].
 - The figure-eight knot given by RL or LR ,
 - The Whitehead link given by RLR or LRL ,
 - The 6_2^2 link given by L^2R^2 or R^2L^2 , and
 - The 6_3^2 link given by RL^2R or LR^2L .

We care about distinguishing between nonarithmetic and arithmetic hyperbolic link complements because different techniques have to be used for analyzing hidden symmetries and commensurability classes.

Throughout this paper, we will always assume that $K(\Omega)$ is hyperbolic, i.e., Ω has at least two syllables. In Section 3, we will use the diagram of $K(\Omega)$ described above to build the canonical cusp triangulation of $\mathbb{S}^3 \setminus K(\Omega)$.

3. Cusp triangulations of 2-bridge link complements

Let $K = K(\Omega)$ be a 2-bridge link, defined as in Section 2, with Ω a word in R and L , and Ω_i its i^{th} letter. We may assume that $\Omega_1 = R$, as mentioned in Section 2. In this section we give a description of the construction of the triangulation \mathcal{T}




Figure 2. On the left (a), we see which edges of S_1 are identified to edges of S_2 , and what the region between S_1 and S_2 looks like. In the right figure (b), it is a little easier to see, with S_1 and S_2 unfolded, that the region between them is a pair of tetrahedra.

of $S^3 \setminus K$, and of the induced cusp triangulation T , and its lift \tilde{T} (if K has two components, then the two cusp triangulations are identical). We then describe an algorithmic approach for constructing \tilde{T} , and prove some facts about simplicial homeomorphisms $f : \tilde{T} \rightarrow \tilde{T}$. Our description of these triangulations follows that of [Guéritaud 2006b, Appendix A] and [Sakuma and Weeks 1995, Chapter II], to which we refer the reader for further details.

To build the triangulation \mathcal{T} , we first place a 4-punctured sphere S_i at each crossing Ω_i corresponding to a letter of Ω , so that every crossing Ω_j for $j \geq i$ is on one side of S_i , and the remaining crossings are on the other side; see Figure 1 (right). We will start by focusing on S_1 and S_2 . We triangulate both of them as shown in the first frame of Figure 2(a) (notice that the edge from the lower-left to upper-right puncture is in front for both). If we push S_1 along the link to the other side of the crossing Ω_1 , we see that some of its edges coincide with edges of S_2 (in particular, the horizontal edges coincide, and the diagonal edges of S_1 become vertical in S_2 , see Figure 2(a)). The vertical edges of S_1 , however, get pushed to diagonal edges that cannot be identified to the diagonal edges of S_2 . The top frame of Figure 2(b) shows S_1 and S_2 with appropriate edges identified, as seen lifted to $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathbb{Z}^2$ (i.e., cut along top, bottom, and left edges then unfold). If we lift S_1 to $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathbb{Z}^2$ in such a way that its triangulation has edge slopes $\frac{0}{1}, \frac{1}{1}, \frac{1}{0}$, this choice forces S_2 to have edge slopes $\frac{0}{1}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{1}$, as shown in the lower frame of Figure 2(b). This means that the triangulation of S_2 in $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathbb{Z}^2$ is obtained by applying the matrix $R = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ to the S_1 triangulation of $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathbb{Z}^2$. If the letter Ω_1 between S_1 and S_2 had been an L , we would have found by the same analysis that the matrix taking us from the triangulation of S_1 to the triangulation of S_2 must be $L = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$. This holds in general. If we know the edge slopes of the triangulation of S_i , we can apply the appropriate matrix, depending on whether Ω_i is an R or an L , to get the triangulation of S_{i+1} (see Figure 3).




Figure 3. We apply the transformations R or L as shown, depending on whether Ω_i is an R or an L , to obtain S_{i+1} from S_i .

Remark 3.1. Though we do not use this fact in what follows, the word Ω can be viewed as a path in the Farey tessellation, with each letter corresponding to making a right (for R) or left (for L) turn from one Farey triangle to the next. In this case each 4-punctured sphere S_i corresponds to a Farey triangle, and its slopes are given by the vertices of that triangle. For details of this approach, we again direct the interested reader to [Guéritaud 2006b] and [Sakuma and Weeks 1995].

Coming back to S_1 and S_2 , we see in Figure 2(b) that between the (red) triangulation of S_2 and the (blue) triangulation of S_1 is a layer of two tetrahedra, which we denote Δ_1 . Similarly, between the 4-punctured spheres S_i and S_{i+1} we get a layer Δ_i of tetrahedra. This construction results in a “product region” $S \times I$, where $S \times \{0\} = S_1$ and $S \times \{1\} = S_c$. We use quotation marks here because $S \times I$ is not a true product for $\Omega \in \{RL^k, LR^k, RL^kR, LR^kL\}$, since there will be an edge shared by all the S_i .

To obtain $\mathbb{S}^3 \setminus K$ from $S \times I$, we first “clasp” S_1 by folding along edges with slope $\frac{1}{1}$ and identifying pairs of triangles adjacent to those edges, as shown in Figure 4. We clasp S_c in the same way, this time folding along either the edge with greatest slope or the edge with least slope, depending on whether the final letter of Ω is R or L , respectively.

To understand the induced triangulation T of a cusp cross section, we first consider a neighborhood of a single puncture P in $S \times I$. For each layer of tetrahedra Δ_i between S_i and S_{i+1} , we get a pair of triangles D_i and D'_i going once around the puncture, as in Figure 5(a). In this figure vertices of $D_i \cup D'_i$ are labeled according to the edges of Δ_i that they are contained in, and edges of $D_i \cup D'_i$ are labeled according to the edge of Δ_i that they are across a face from. Notice in Figure 5(a) that D_i has a vertex (c_-) meeting an edge of S_i but not meeting S_{i+1} ,




Figure 4. The clasp of S_1 . The viewpoint of the reader is the “inside” of S_1 , i.e., the side containing the braid in Figure 1.




Figure 5. In (a), a layer Δ_i with a neighborhood of a cusp removed (left), and the triangles $D_i \cup D'_i$ that the layer Δ_i contributes to the cusp triangulation (right). Edges with the same slope have labels that differ by a \sim decoration. Figure (b) shows D_i and D'_i after being adjusted as prescribed in Figure 6, with \sim decorations removed so that edges with the same slope are labeled the same.

and D'_i has a vertex (\tilde{c}) meeting S_{i+1} but not meeting S_i . Thus D_i is distinguished from D'_i .

To see how $D_i \cup D'_i$ attaches to $D_{i-1} \cup D'_{i-1}$, we must consider how Δ_i attaches to Δ_{i-1} . Figure 6(a) shows Δ_i and Δ_{i-1} in $(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathbb{Z}^2) \times I$ (sandwiched between $S_{i-1} \cup S_i \cup S_{i+1}$) in the case where $\Omega_i = R$, and the corresponding triangles around the puncture. There is a unique edge e of $D_i \cup D'_i$, corresponding to an edge of S_i shared by both S_{i-1} and S_{i+1} , and with vertices $v_1 \in S_{i-1}$ and $v_2 \in S_{i+1}$. This means that the edge e moves us along the cusp cross-section in the longitudinal direction, so it will be part of a longitude in \tilde{T} . It makes sense then to adjust these edges to be horizontal, as we build the triangulation \tilde{T} (see Figure 6(a)). Figure 6(b) shows the analogous adjustment when $\Omega_i = L$.

When we clasp S_1 , an edge of D_1 is identified to an edge of D'_1 , and similarly for D'_c and D_c when S_c is clasped, as illustrated in Figure 7. We will call the triangles D_1 and D'_c *clasp triangles*. For $\Omega = R^2L^3R^2L$, the triangulation around a puncture before clasp and after clasp is shown in Figures 7(b) and 7(c), respectively.




Figure 6. Building the cusp triangulation. In (a), the left frame shows three layers of 4-punctured spheres, with a truncated puncture. Note the special edge e on the truncated puncture, also shown in the right frame, which connects S_{i-1} to S_{i+1} . Note that in the two figures on the right, the top and bottom vertices are identified, and in (b) we have rotated (vertically) by π to make the picture more clear.




Figure 7. The effect of clasp on the triangulation around a puncture. (a) shows Δ_1 , with S_1 below S_2 , and edge colors of S_1 corresponding to colors in Figure 4. On the right, (b) and (c) show the effect of clasp as seen from the cusp cross-section.

Before clasp, it is clear from the construction that the combinatorics around each of the four punctures is identical. Clasp identifies the punctures on $S_1 = S \times \{0\}$ in pairs, and identifies the punctures on $S_c = S \times \{1\}$ in pairs, in an orientation-preserving way. This means that for a 2-component link, a cusp triangulation is obtained by gluing two puncture triangulations (as in Figure 7(c)) along their front edges, and along their back edges, in an orientation-preserving way. For a knot, the situation is similar, except that we glue all four puncture triangulations, always identifying front edges to front edges, and back to back, with orientation preserved. In both cases the lifted triangulation \tilde{T} of \mathbb{R}^2 is the same,




Figure 8. Triangulation of $D' = [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. The word $\Omega = R^{\alpha_1} L^{\alpha_2} \dots L^{\alpha_n}$ can be read from the triangulation. Here, $c_j = \sum_{i=1}^j \alpha_i$.

except that the fundamental region for a knot is twice as large as for a link. Note that when $\Omega_1 \neq \Omega_c$, the clasp triangle on the right is offset vertically from the clasp triangle on the left (as in Figure 7(c)), whereas if $\Omega_1 = \Omega_c$ this will not be the case.

As a result of the above discussion, we can now give an algorithmic approach to constructing the lifted cusp triangulation \tilde{T} for an arbitrary word $\Omega = R^{\alpha_1} L^{\alpha_2} \dots L^{\alpha_n}$ (we will assume the last letter is L for concreteness; the case where $\Omega_c = R$ is similar). This follows the approach in [Sakuma and Weeks 1995, Section II.4], with some changes of notation. We start with a rectangle $D' = [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ divided into $c = \sum_i \alpha_i$ triangles, each corresponding to a letter of Ω , as in Figure 8. Vertices of D' are labeled as shown, with $c_j = \sum_{i=1}^j \alpha_i$ for $1 \leq j \leq n$, and $c_0 = 0$. To fill out \mathbb{R}^2 we first reflect D' in its top edge to get its mirror D , so that $D \cup D'$ is a triangulation of a puncture (with triangles D_i in D and triangles D'_i in D'), as in Figure 7(c). We then rotate $D \cup D'$ by π about $(0, 1)$ (i.e., about the vertex labeled -1), and translate the resulting double of $D \cup D'$ vertically and horizontally to fill \mathbb{R}^2 . Finally, we remove all edges $\overline{-1, 1}$ and $\overline{r, c_n}$, where $r = c_{n-2}$ if $\alpha_n = 1$, and $r = c_n - 1$ otherwise (i.e., all images of the red edges in Figure 8).

With this parametrization of the cusp triangulation in \mathbb{R}^2 , deck transformations are generated by $(x, y) \mapsto (x, y + 2)$ and $(x, y) \mapsto (x + k, y)$, where $k = 2$ if $K = K(\Omega)$ has two components, and $k = 4$ if it has one component. We observe that the long edge of each clasp triangle goes all the way around the meridian of the cusp, and these edges are unique in this respect. For this reason we call these edges *meridional edges* (whether we are referring to them in T or \tilde{T}), and we call each connected component of their union in \tilde{T} a *meridional line* (i.e., any line $x = c, c \in \mathbb{Z}$). A strip of adjacent nonclasp triangles that all meet the lines




Figure 9. Edge/vertex correspondence in \tilde{T} . Vertices and edges with the same slope (as edges in \tilde{T}), are labeled the same.

$y = m$ and $y = m + 1$ (in an edge or vertex), for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, is called a *horizontal strip* (see Figure 12).

We will now describe a correspondence between edges and vertices of \tilde{T} . Given an edge e in \tilde{T} , meaning a truncated tip of an ideal triangle in \tilde{T} , we have a corresponding edge in \tilde{T} : this is just the edge of \tilde{T} across from e in the ideal triangle, as in Figure 5(a). Similarly, a vertex of \tilde{T} corresponds to the edge in \tilde{T} that it is contained in. We say that an edge e and a vertex v of \tilde{T} *correspond* if their corresponding edges in \tilde{T} have the same slope (when viewed in $(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathbb{Z}^2) \times I$). Edge and vertex correspondence in \tilde{T} , for edges and vertices that do not come from S_1 or S_c , can be read off Figure 5(b), which shows the cusp cross-section of a layer Δ_i with vertices and edges of the same slope labeled the same.

As for edges and vertices affected by clasping, we can easily read the correspondences off the labellings in Figure 7 for the clasping of S_1 , and the S_c clasping works similarly. This gives edge/vertex correspondences for $D \cup D'$, as shown in Figure 9 (as usual, we assume $\Omega_1 = R$). A fundamental region of T is constructed by gluing together either two or four copies of $D \cup D'$ by orientation-reversing homeomorphisms $\{0\} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \{0\} \times [0, 1]$ and $\{1\} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \{1\} \times [0, 1]$, as previously discussed. Hence, the algorithmic construction of \tilde{T} by rotating $D \cup D'$ by π about $(0, 1)$ then translating to tile the plane respects edge valence, and so edge/vertex correspondence for all of \tilde{T} can be obtained in this way. From here forward we will consider the edges of \tilde{T} to be labeled by the valence of a corresponding vertex, and we will refer to this number as the *edge valence*.

We summarize the preceding discussion in the following lemma, part (d) of which corrects a minor error in the proof of Theorem II.3.1 in [Sakuma and Weeks 1995] (this error does not, however, affect the validity of their proof). Note that the relevant notation in [Sakuma and Weeks 1995] differs from ours in several ways: most importantly, what we call $val(i)$ they denote $d(i)$, and we follow a different indexing convention for vertices of \tilde{T} .

Lemma 3.2. *The lifted cusp triangulation \tilde{T} for the link given by a word $\Omega = R^{\alpha_1} L^{\alpha_2} R^{\alpha_3} \dots L^{\alpha_n}$ has the following description:*

(a) \tilde{T} is obtained from the triangulated rectangle $D' = [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, described by Figure 8, as follows: reflect in $[0, 1] \times \{1\}$ to get D , then rotate $D \cup D'$ about $(0, 1)$, and translate the resulting two copies of $D \cup D'$ by $(x, y) \mapsto (x + 2k, y + 2m)$, where $k, m \in \mathbb{Z}$, to tile \mathbb{R}^2 .

(b) The deck group of \tilde{T} is generated by $(x, y) \mapsto (x, y + 2)$ and $(x, y) \mapsto (x + \frac{4}{\epsilon}, y)$, where $\epsilon \in \{1, 2\}$ is the number of components of the link $K(\Omega)$.

(c) Edge/vertex correspondence in \tilde{T} is as follows (see Figure 9):

- If e is horizontal or e is a meridional edge, then e corresponds to the vertices across the two triangles adjacent to it.
- If the lower endpoint of e meets the line $y = k$, and the upper endpoint meets $y = k + 1$, with k even (resp. odd), then e corresponds to the vertex across the triangle to the left (resp. right) of e .

(d) If $\Omega \notin \{R^2 L^2, RL^m, RL^m R : m \geq 1\}$, then the vertices of \tilde{T} , labeled as in Figure 8, have valence as follows (recall that $r = c_{n-2}$ if $\alpha_n = 1$, and $r = c_n - 1$ otherwise):

$$val(c_i) = \begin{cases} 4\alpha_{i+1} + 4 & \text{for } i \in \{0, n - 1\}, \\ 2\alpha_{i+1} + 4 & \text{for } 2 \leq i \leq n - 3 \text{ or } i = 1, \alpha_1 > 1 \text{ or } i = n - 2, \alpha_n > 1, \\ 2\alpha_{i+1} + 3 & \text{for } i = 1, \alpha_1 = 1 \text{ or } i = n - 2, \alpha_n = 1, \end{cases}$$

$$val(1) = \begin{cases} 3 & \text{for } \alpha_1 > 1, \\ 2\alpha_2 + 3 & \text{for } \alpha_1 = 1, \end{cases}$$

$$val(r) = \begin{cases} 3 & \text{for } \alpha_n > 1, \\ 2\alpha_{n-1} + 3 & \text{for } \alpha_n = 1, \end{cases}$$

$$val(j) = 4 \text{ for } j \notin \{0, 1, c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n, r\}.$$

In particular, note that for all $\Omega \notin \{R^2 L^2, RL^m, RL^m R : m \geq 1\}$, $val(j)$ is odd if and only if $j \in \{1, r\}$. This fact is key to showing that nonarithmetic 2-bridge links cannot have hidden symmetries. Since a hidden symmetry restricts to an isometry of \tilde{T} , it is a *simplicial automorphism* of \tilde{T} (i.e., a homeomorphism $\tilde{T} \rightarrow \tilde{T}$ preserving the simplicial structure) and hence it is a simplicial automorphism of \tilde{T} that preserves edge valence.

Definition 3.3. We denote by $Aut_{ev}(\tilde{T})$ the group of simplicial automorphisms of \tilde{T} that preserve edge valence. Note that if we identify \tilde{T} with the horoball centered at p , then there is a natural injection $Stab_{Aut(\tilde{T})}(p) \hookrightarrow Aut_{ev}(\tilde{T})$.

By analyzing $\text{Aut}_{ev}(\tilde{T})$, which must preserve these odd valence vertices, we learn about the possible isometries of \tilde{T} . The first step in this process is the following lemma:

Lemma 3.4. *If $\Omega \notin \{RL, R^2L^2, RLR\}$, then $\text{Aut}_{ev}(\tilde{T})$ preserves clasping triangles and meridional edges.*

Proof. By the symmetry of the problem, we need only show that any triangle $\Delta_{1,0,0}$ with vertex labels $\{1, 0, 0\}$ maps to a clasping triangle. Let $f \in \text{Aut}_{ev}(\tilde{T})$, and let $\Delta_{a,b,b'}$ be the image of a triangle $\Delta_{1,0,0}$ under f , so that $1 \mapsto a$.

Case 1: $\Omega \notin \{R^kL^m, RL^mR^k\}$. Since $val(j)$ is odd if and only if $j \in \{1, r\}$, we must have $a \in \{1, r\}$. We will assume that $a = 1$; the case $a = r$ is proved similarly. Then $b \in \{0, c_1, c_2, c_3\}$ since $val(0) = 4\alpha_1 + 4 \geq 8$ and all other vertices that could share an edge with 1 have valence 4.

If $val(1) = 3$ (i.e., $\alpha_1 > 1$), then $b \in \{0, c_1\}$, since in this case no vertex c_2 or c_3 is connected to 1 by an edge. If $b = c_1$, then we must have $\alpha_1 = 2$, so that $val(0) = 4\alpha_1 + 4 = 12 = val(c_1) = 2\alpha_2 + 4 \implies \alpha_2 = 4$, which means that $c_1 + 1$ must have valence 4. But $b = c_1$ also implies that $c_1 + 1$ is the image of the valence 3 vertex of the clasping triangle that shares a meridional edge with $\Delta_{1,0,0}$, giving a contradiction. Thus $b = 0$, and by the same argument we must also have $b' = 0$.

If $val(1) \neq 3$, then $\alpha_1 = 1$ and $val(1) = val(c_1) = 2\alpha_2 + 3$, and we must have $b \in \{0, c_2, c_3\}$. Also, $val(0) = 4\alpha_1 + 4 = 8$.

If $b = c_2$, then $2\alpha_3 + 4 = val(c_2) = val(0) = 8$, so $\alpha_3 = 2$. This implies that $val(c_2 + 1) = 4 \neq 8$, so we must have $\Delta_{1,0,0} \mapsto \Delta_{1,c_2,0}$. This determines the image of the two nonclasping triangles Δ_{0,c_1,c_2} adjacent to $\Delta_{1,0,0}$, and we see that the c_2 vertex of one of these must be mapped to a $c_2 + 1$ vertex, which is impossible since $val(c_2 + 1) = 4 \neq 8 = val(c_2)$.

If $b = c_3$ then $1 = c_1$ and c_3 are connected by an edge, so $\alpha_3 = 1$, which forces the other 0-labeled vertex of $\Delta_{1,0,0}$ to map to c_2 , which is impossible by the above argument. Hence $b = 0$, and by the same argument we have $b' = 0$.

Since $\Omega \notin \{R^kL^m, RL^mR^k\}$ implies that clasping triangles have a unique odd valence vertex (i.e., the vertex not meeting a meridional edge), that meridional edges map to meridional edges is immediate.

Case 2: $\Omega = R^kL^m$ and $\Omega \notin \{RL, R^2L^2\}$. If $k = 1$, then clasping triangles either have vertices with valences 8, 8, $4m + 2$ or 3, $4m + 2$, $4m + 2$, and they are the only triangles in \tilde{T} with such a triple of valences. If $k \neq 1$ then clasping triangles either have vertices with valences 3, $4k + 4$, $4k + 4$ or 3, $4m + 4$, $4m + 4$, and they are the only triangles in \tilde{T} with such a triple of valences. Furthermore, in every case two of these vertices have equal valence and the third has distinct valence, so meridional edges must be preserved.




Figure 10. If H maps into more than one horizontal strip, then $f(\gamma)$ traverses more than $c - 2$ triangles, which is impossible.

Case 3: $\Omega = RL^m R^k$, $\Omega \neq RLR$. Then $\alpha_1 = 1 \implies val(0) = 8$. If $k > 1$ then $val(1) \neq val(r)$, so $1 \mapsto 1$ and we must have vertices labeled 0 mapping to vertices labeled 0 or $c_2 = c_{n-1}$. But $val(c_{n-1}) = 4k + 4 \neq 8$, so $0 \mapsto 0$. If $k = 1$ then clasping triangles all have vertices with valences 8, 8, $2m + 2$, and they are the only triangles in \tilde{T} with this triple of valences. Furthermore, meridional edges are preserved since even when $m = 3$ (so that $2m + 2 = 8$), the vertices labeled $1 = r$ are combinatorially distinct from the vertices labeled 0 and c_{n-1} : vertices labeled 1 have four edges connecting them to valence 4 vertices, while vertices labeled 0 and c_{n-1} have only two such edges. □

Corollary 3.5. *If $\Omega \notin \{RL, R^2L^2, RLR\}$, then $Aut_{ev}(\tilde{T})$ preserves horizontal strips of \tilde{T} .*

Proof. Let C be the clasping triangle in the first quadrant of \mathbb{R}^2 with a vertex at the origin. C is adjacent to two horizontal strips; let H be the one adjacent to the x -axis, and let C' be the other clasping triangle adjacent to H . Let γ be the path directly across H connecting the midpoints of the edges of adjacency with C and C' . Consider the image of γ under a simplicial automorphism $f : \tilde{T} \rightarrow \tilde{T}$. Since γ crosses exactly $c - 2$ triangles, so must $f(\gamma)$. By Lemma 3.4, f maps e and e' to edges of clasping triangles, which are adjacent to distinct meridional lines since C and C' are, and f maps triangles crossed by γ to nonclasping triangles, so γ must be mapped into some number of vertically stacked horizontal strips. Since γ crosses all triangles transversely, if $f(\gamma)$ jumps from one horizontal strip to another the number of triangles it crosses must be one more than if it did not make the jump, as shown in Figure 10. Hence $f(\gamma)$ must be contained in one horizontal strip, the image of H . □

Recall that in our algorithmic construction of \tilde{T} , we chose coordinates so that the rectangle D' shown in Figure 8 is identified with $[0, 1] \times [0, 1] \subset \mathbb{R}^2$.

Theorem 3.6. *If $\Omega \notin \{RL, R^2L^2, RLR\}$, then $\text{Aut}_{ev}(\tilde{T})$ is generated by the deck transformations and a subset of the following:*

- *Orientation-preserving: the rotations ρ_1, ρ_2 , and ρ_3 about $(1, 1)$, $(2, 1)$, and $(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, respectively, by an angle π .*
- *Orientation-reversing: the glide reflection g given by the reflection across $x = \frac{1}{2}$ composed with $(x, y) \mapsto (x, y + 1)$.*

Further, we always have $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \text{Aut}_{ev}^+(\tilde{T})$, and $\rho_3 \in \text{Aut}_{ev}^+(\tilde{T})$ (resp. $g \in \text{Aut}_{ev}(\tilde{T})$) if and only if ρ_3 (resp. g) is a simplicial automorphism.

Proof. Let $f \in \text{Aut}_{ev}(\tilde{T})$, and let E be the union of all edges of horizontal strips and clasping triangles, as shown in Figure 12. Since f maps clasping triangles to clasping triangles, and horizontal strips to horizontal strips, it must map E to itself. Since the simplicial structure of the triangulation within each horizontal strip must be preserved, and since we may assume all clasping triangles are congruent and triangles within each strip are uniformly sized, f is forced to be a Euclidean isometry of \mathbb{R}^2 . Let ρ_4 be the rotation by π about the point $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$, and let r_y be the reflection about the line $y = 1$. We first consider the possible Euclidean isometries preserving E :

Translations: Translations must preserve the integer lattice, so modulo deck transformations they have the form $\tau_{i,j} : (x, y) \mapsto (x + i, y + j)$, $i \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$, $j \in \{0, 1\}$. Since $\tau_{0,1}$, and $\tau_{2,1}$ do not preserve E , and $\tau_{0,0}$ is trivial, we are left with

$$\tau_{1,0} = \rho_1 \circ \rho_3; \quad \tau_{2,0} = \rho_2 \circ \rho_1; \quad \tau_{3,0} = \rho_2 \circ \rho_3; \quad \tau_{1,1} = \rho_1 \circ \rho_4; \quad \tau_{3,1} = \rho_2 \circ \rho_4,$$

and their inverses.

Rotations: Since meridional lines and integer lattice points must be preserved, any rotation must be by an angle π about a point $(\frac{k}{2}, \frac{m}{2})$, $k, m \in \mathbb{Z}$. The rotations about $(1, \frac{1}{2})$ and $(2, \frac{1}{2})$ do not preserve clasping triangles, so modulo deck transformations we are left with $\rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3, \rho_4$, and the rotations

$$\rho_4 \circ \rho_2 \circ \rho_1; \quad \rho_3 \circ \rho_2 \circ \rho_1,$$

about $(\frac{3}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ and $(\frac{3}{2}, 1)$, respectively.

Reflections: Reflections must preserve meridional lines and clasping triangles, so possible lines of reflection are $x = \frac{k}{2}$ or $y = k$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Modulo deck transformations, we get the reflection r_y across $y = 1$, and the reflections r_i across the lines $x = i$, $i \in \{\frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{3}{2}, 2\}$. We have

$$r_1 = r_y \circ \rho_1; \quad r_2 = r_y \circ \rho_2; \quad r_{\frac{1}{2}} = r_y \circ \rho_3; \quad r_{\frac{3}{2}} = r_{\frac{1}{2}} \circ \rho_2 \circ \rho_1.$$

Glide reflections: Since simplicial automorphisms preserve meridional lines and clasping triangles, the reflection component of the glide reflection must be across a

line $x = \frac{k}{2}$ or $y = k, k \in \mathbb{Z}$. If the reflection is across $x = k \in \mathbb{Z}$, then the translation must be $(x, y) \mapsto (x, y + 2n), n \in \mathbb{Z}$, so modulo deck transformations this is a pure reflection, and can be ruled out. Thus we are left with the glide reflection $g = \tau_{0,1} \circ r_{\frac{1}{2}}$, given by the reflection across $x = \frac{1}{2}$ followed by the translation $(x, y) \mapsto (x, y + 1)$, and the compositions

$$r_y \circ \tau_{1,0} = r_y \circ \rho_1 \circ \rho_3; \quad r_y \circ \tau_{2,0} = r_y \circ \rho_2 \circ \rho_1; \quad r_{\frac{3}{2}} \circ \tau_{0,1} = g \circ \rho_2 \circ \rho_1,$$

all others being obtained by composing with deck transformations.

We show that $r_y \notin \text{Aut}_{ev}(\tilde{T})$ by considering edge valences near a clasping triangle. Using the edge/vertex correspondences from Figure 9, we obtain the four pictures in Figure 11, which correspond to the cases $\alpha_1 \geq 3, \alpha_1 = 2, \alpha_1 = 1 \neq \alpha_2$, and $\alpha_1 = 1 = \alpha_2$, respectively (note that Ω nonarithmetic implies $\Omega \notin \{RL, RLR, R^2L^2\}$). For the first three pictures it is clear that r_y does not preserve edge valence. For the last picture, if $r_y \in \text{Aut}_{ev}(\tilde{T})$ then $c = d = 8$, so that $\alpha_3 = 2$, which implies $8 = d = a = 4$, a contradiction. Hence $r_y \notin \text{Aut}_{ev}(\tilde{T})$.

In order to rule out ρ_4 and the compositions above involving ρ_4 and r_y , we will first need to establish the last assertion of the theorem, namely that we always have $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \text{Aut}_{ev}(\tilde{T})$, and ρ_3 and g are in $\text{Aut}_{ev}(\tilde{T})$ if and only if they are simplicial automorphisms of \tilde{T} . To see this, first note that ρ_1 and ρ_2 are always simplicial automorphisms (by construction of \tilde{T}). Thus we need only show that if any of g, ρ_1, ρ_2 , or ρ_3 is a simplicial homeomorphism, then it is in $\text{Aut}_{ev}(\tilde{T})$. But this follows from the fact that each of g, ρ_1, ρ_2 , and ρ_3 preserve the edge/vertex correspondence given in Lemma 3.2(c) (shown graphically in Figure 9). In particular, each of these maps switches the parity of k in part (c) of the lemma, but also exchanges right and left. Thus, if g is simplicial, it preserves vertex valence, and since it also preserves edge/vertex correspondence, it must preserve edge valence, that is, $g \in \text{Aut}_{ev}(\tilde{T})$. The same holds for ρ_1, ρ_2 , and ρ_3 , so the assertion is proved.

Now, suppose that $\rho_4 \in \text{Aut}_{ev}(\tilde{T})$. First, observe that

$$g = \tau_{0,1} \circ r_{\frac{1}{2}} = r_{\frac{1}{2}} \circ \tau_{0,1} = (\rho_3 \circ r_y) \circ (\rho_3 \circ \rho_4) = (\rho_3 \circ r_y \circ \rho_3) \circ \rho_4 = r_y \circ \rho_4.$$

Since r_y is always a simplicial automorphism (by construction of \tilde{T}), $\rho_4 \in \text{Aut}_{ev}(\tilde{T})$ implies that g is a simplicial automorphism, so by the above paragraph, $g \in \text{Aut}_{ev}(\tilde{T})$. But $g, \rho_4 \in \text{Aut}_{ev}(\tilde{T})$ implies that $r_y \in \text{Aut}_{ev}(\tilde{T})$, a contradiction.

Thus we can rule out the compositions $\tau_{1,1}, \tau_{3,1}, \rho_4 \circ \rho_2 \circ \rho_1, r_1, r_2$, and $r_y \circ \tau_{2,0}$. For $r_{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $r_y \circ \tau_{1,0}$, since r_y is always a simplicial homeomorphism, the composition is simplicial if and only if ρ_3 is. But then by the above observation it follows that ρ_3 preserves edge valence, so the composition cannot preserve edge valence (because r_y does not). Last, $r_{\frac{3}{2}}$ can now be ruled out since $r_{\frac{1}{2}} \notin \text{Aut}_{ev}(\tilde{T})$.




Figure 11. Reflecting by r_y about $y = 1$, for the cases $\alpha_1 \geq 3$, $\alpha_1 = 2$, $\alpha_1 = 1 \neq \alpha_2$, and $\alpha_1 = 1 = \alpha_2$, from left to right respectively.




Figure 12. The union E of all edges of horizontal strips and clasp triangles, in the case where $\Omega_c = R$. If $\Omega_c = L$ then the clasp triangles adjacent to line $y = k$, k odd, will be shifted vertically by 1, and horizontal strips will be parallelograms.

Since the only compositions we have not ruled out are generated by ρ_1, ρ_2, ρ_3 , and g , and since compositions involving ρ_3 (resp. g) are in $\text{Aut}_{ev}(\tilde{T})$ if and only if ρ_3 (resp. g) is, the result follows. \square

Remark 3.7. In Theorem 3.6 we have described a set *containing* the generators of $\text{Aut}_{ev}(\tilde{T})$, but we do not know whether they are all in fact generators. We will easily obtain in Section 5 a complete description of this group.

4. Symmetries of 2-bridge link complements

Let $M = \mathbb{S}^3 \setminus K(\Omega)$, and let $\text{Sym}(M)$ denote the symmetries of M , i.e., $\text{Sym}(M)$ is the group of self-homeomorphisms of M up to isotopy. Here, we describe the action of $\text{Sym}(M)$ on the triangulation \tilde{T} . First, Theorem 4.1 gives a classification of the symmetries of M in terms of the word Ω . This theorem comes from combining Theorem II.3.2 and Lemma II.3.3 in [Sakuma and Weeks 1995] and translating from $[a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n]$ to the word Ω given by the following dictionary: $a_1 = \alpha_1 + 1$,

$a_i = \alpha_i$ for $i \leq 2 \leq n - 1$, and $a_n = \alpha_n + 1$. In [Sakuma and Weeks 1995], these symmetries are called automorphisms of the triangulation \mathcal{T} of M described in Section 3. Since by [Guéritaud 2006a] this triangulation is now known to coincide with the canonical triangulation of M , we know these automorphisms actually correspond to all of the symmetries of M .

We let $\text{Sym}^+(M)$ denote the subgroup of $\text{Sym}(M)$ consisting of orientation-preserving symmetries. We say that Ω is *palindromic* if $\alpha_i = \alpha_{n-i+1}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Theorem 4.1 [Sakuma and Weeks 1995; Guéritaud 2006a]. *Let $M = \mathbb{S}^3 \setminus K(\Omega)$ be any hyperbolic 2-bridge link complement. Then $\text{Sym}(M) = \text{Sym}^+(M) \cong Z_2 \oplus Z_2$ if and only if Ω is not palindromic. When Ω is palindromic, then we have the following possibilities:*

- If n is even, then $\text{Sym}(M) \cong D_4$ and $\text{Sym}^+(M) \cong Z_2 \oplus Z_2$.
- If n is odd and $\alpha_{\frac{n+1}{2}}$ is odd, then $\text{Sym}(M) = \text{Sym}^+(M) \cong D_4$.
- If n is odd and $\alpha_{\frac{n+1}{2}}$ is even, then $\text{Sym}(M) = \text{Sym}^+(M) \cong Z_2 \oplus Z_2 \oplus Z_2$.

Note that the 2-bridge link complements with orientation-reversing symmetries are exactly those with n even and Ω palindromic.

We would like to understand how these symmetries act on \tilde{T} . In order to accomplish this, we first show that $\text{Sym}(M) = \text{Sym}(\mathbb{S}^3, K(\Omega))$. Here, $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{S}^3, K(\Omega))$ denotes the symmetries of $(\mathbb{S}^3, K(\Omega))$, that is, the group of self-homeomorphisms of the pair $(\mathbb{S}^3, K(\Omega))$ up to isotopy. Mostow–Prasad rigidity implies that $\text{Sym}(M) \supseteq \text{Sym}(\mathbb{S}^3, K)$ for any hyperbolic link K . In fact, if K is a hyperbolic knot, then by the knot complement theorem of Gordon and Luecke [1989], $\text{Sym}(M) = \text{Sym}(\mathbb{S}^3, K)$. However, here we do not rely on the knot complement theorem, and in addition, we prove the desired equality for both hyperbolic 2-bridge knots and hyperbolic 2-bridge links with two components. Once we have established this correspondence, we can determine how these symmetries act on the cusp triangulation, T . From here, we just lift this action of $\text{Sym}(M)$ on T to the universal cover \mathbb{R}^2 , to get the corresponding action on \tilde{T} .

The following proposition is certainly known by the experts in the field. However, the authors were unable to find a reference in the literature.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $M = \mathbb{S}^3 \setminus K(\Omega)$ be a hyperbolic 2-bridge link complement. Then $\text{Sym}(M) = \text{Sym}(\mathbb{S}^3, K(\Omega))$.*

Proof. The work of Guéritaud [2006a] shows that \mathcal{T} is in fact the canonical triangulation of any such hyperbolic 2-bridge link complement M . Thus, $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{T})$, the group of combinatorial automorphisms of this triangulation, is isomorphic to $\text{Sym}(M)$. The description of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{T})$ in [Sakuma and Weeks 1995, pp. 415-416] implies that it preserves the meridian(s) of $K(\Omega)$, and therefore extends to an




Figure 13. Trisymmetric projections of a 2-bridge link with two components (left) and a 2-bridge knot (right). The axes of symmetry for σ_1 and σ_2 are given in both projections. Maxima are labeled M and minima are labeled m .




Figure 14. To the left is the standard projection of $K(\Omega)$ with Ω palindromic and n odd. To the right is a depiction of $K(\Omega)$ in \mathbb{R}^3 (with knot strands connecting at infinity) with Ω palindromic and n even. Both visuals show a symmetry σ_3 of $K(\Omega)$. Maxima are labeled M and minima are labeled m .

action on $(\mathbb{S}^3, K(\Omega))$. As a result, the natural inclusion from $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{S}^3, K(\Omega))$ into $\text{Sym}(M)$ is surjective, giving the desired isomorphism. \square

Since $\text{Sym}(M)$ is isomorphic to $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{S}^3, K(\Omega))$, we will no longer distinguish between symmetries of a hyperbolic 2-bridge link and its complement. Below, we provide visualizations of these symmetries, which will be useful in the proofs of Lemma 4.3 and Proposition 4.4. For more visualizations of 2-bridge link symmetries, see [Bleiler and Moriah 1988; Bonahon and Siebenmann 2010], and [Sakuma 1986].

Recall that any 2-bridge link $K(\Omega)$ can be isotoped so that its projection has exactly two maxima and two minima. In all four link diagrams given in Figure 13 and Figure 14 the corresponding maxima and minima are labeled. In what follows, we will examine how $\text{Sym}(M)$ acts on these maxima and minima, and “meridional edges” of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{T})$ that wrap around them. For an arbitrary link $L \subset \mathbb{S}^3$, this would be an issue since the maxima and minima don’t have to be preserved up to isotopy, and $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{S}^3, L)$ is a group of homeomorphisms up to isotopy. However, for a 2-bridge link, from the work of Schubert [1956] we know that the set of maxima and minima will be preserved up to isotopy, and so, we are justified in using different projections of $K(\Omega)$ to analyze how symmetries act on the maxima and minima.

Lemma 4.3. *Each “meridional edge” of T wraps around a maximum or minimum of $K(\Omega)$. These meridional edges alternate between ones that wrap around maxima and minima.*

Proof. In all cases, \mathcal{T} , the canonical triangulation of $\mathbb{S}^3 \setminus K(\Omega)$, has exactly four meridional edges, and $K(\Omega)$ has exactly four extrema. These meridional edges of \mathcal{T} result from claspings. See Section 3 for details on how claspings the innermost and outermost 4-punctured spheres, S_c and S_1 , affects \mathcal{T} . Specifically, claspings S_1 introduces two meridional edges, each one going around one of the strands of the outermost crossing of $K(\Omega)$. We get the other two meridional edges from claspings S_c , each one going around one of the strands of the innermost crossing. See Figure 4 for how claspings forms these meridional edges. The two meridional edges coming from claspings S_1 each go around a maximum of $K(\Omega)$, while the two meridional edges coming from claspings S_c each go around a minimum of $K(\Omega)$. Since there are exactly four meridional edges in \mathcal{T} and exactly four meridional edges in T , these sets must correspond with one another. Thus, each meridional edge of T wraps around a maximum or minimum of $K(\Omega)$. These meridional edges alternate between wrapping around maxima and minima since if we orient $K(\Omega)$, our path alternates between traversing maxima and minima. \square

We now consider the lifts of the meridional edges of T to \tilde{T} . In what follows, we shall call the lifts of meridional edges of T that wrap around a maximum of $K(\Omega)$ *maximal meridional edges*. Similarly, we shall call the lifts of the meridional edges of T that wrap around a minimum of $K(\Omega)$ *minimal meridional edges*.

We now describe how the symmetries of a hyperbolic 2-bridge link complement act on \tilde{T} . Recall that n is the number of syllables in the word Ω . If $K(\Omega)$ is a two component link, then we say $\tilde{T} = \tilde{T}_1 \cup \tilde{T}_2$, where \tilde{T}_1 and \tilde{T}_2 are identical triangulations of \mathbb{R}^2 , coming from lifting an equal volume cusp cross-section of $\mathbb{S}^3 \setminus K(\Omega)$.

Recall that σ_1, σ_2 , and σ_3 are the symmetries of $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{S}^3, K(\Omega))$ described above and shown in Figure 13 and Figure 14.

Proposition 4.4. $\text{Sym}(M) = \text{Sym}(\mathbb{S}^3, K(\Omega))$ acts on \tilde{T} (up to deck transformations) in the following manner:

If $K(\Omega)$ is a knot, then

- σ_1 acts as a rotation of π about $(1, 1)$, and
- σ_2 acts as a rotation of π about $(2, 1)$.

If $K(\Omega)$ is a two component link, then

- σ_1 acts as a rotation of π about $(1, 1)$ in both \tilde{T}_1 and \tilde{T}_2 , and
- σ_2 exchanges $(\mathbb{R}^2, \tilde{T}_1)$ and $(\mathbb{R}^2, \tilde{T}_2)$ by the identity map.

If Ω is palindromic, then

- if n is odd, σ_3 acts as a rotation of π about $(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, and
- if n is even, σ_3 acts as a glide reflection where we reflect across the line $x = \frac{1}{2}$ and translate by $(x, y) \rightarrow (x, y + 1)$ (possibly composed with the rotations σ_1 and σ_2).

Proof. First, we claim that any symmetry of M acts on $(\mathbb{R}^2, \tilde{T})$ by an isometry of \mathbb{R}^2 . A priori, a symmetry of M gives rise only to an element f of $\text{Aut}_{ev}(\tilde{T})$ since this triangulation is metrically distorted in our construction. By Theorem 3.6, any such simplicial homeomorphism (that preserves edge valences) of \tilde{T} is a composition of deck transformations (which are specific translations) and a specific set of rotations, reflections, and glide reflections. Thus, any such f must be a Euclidean isometry.

First, we consider the symmetries σ_1 and σ_2 of M that generate a subgroup of $\text{Sym}(M)$ isomorphic to $Z_2 \oplus Z_2$. By Theorem 4.1, these symmetries are always orientation-preserving, and so, we just need to consider rotations and translations of \mathbb{R}^2 . We do this in three cases.

Case 1: $K(\Omega)$ is a knot. In this case, we note the following properties of σ_1 and σ_2 . These properties come from examining the tri-symmetric projection given in Figure 13:

- σ_1 exchanges the maxima of $K(\Omega)$ while fixing the minima of $K(\Omega)$.
- σ_2 exchanges the minima of $K(\Omega)$ while fixing the maxima of $K(\Omega)$.
- σ_1 and σ_2 change the orientation of the longitude of $K(\Omega)$.

Since both σ_1 and σ_2 change the orientation of the longitude, they cannot be translations, and so, must be rotations. By Lemma 4.3, σ_1 must exchange the maximal meridional edges while fixing the two minimal meridional edges. Thus, up to deck transformations, σ_1 must be a rotation of π about $(1, 1)$. Similarly, up to deck transformations, σ_2 must be a rotation of π about $(2, 1)$.

Case 2: $K(\Omega)$ is a 2-component link. Here, we once again note several important features of σ_1 and σ_2 acting on $(\mathbb{S}^3, K(\Omega))$ which come from examining the tri-symmetric projection in Figure 13.

- σ_1 sends each component of $K(\Omega)$ to itself, with maxima mapping to maxima and minima mapping to minima.
- σ_2 exchanges the two link components, with maxima mapping to maxima and minima mapping to minima.
- σ_1 changes the orientations of both of the longitudes of $K(\Omega)$, while σ_2 preserves these orientations.

Since σ_1 is an orientation-preserving symmetry that switches the orientation of both of the longitudes, it must act as a rotation on both copies of \mathbb{R}^2 . Up to deck transformations, the only possible rotation that maps the two maximal meridional edges to themselves and maps the two minimal meridional edges to themselves is a rotation of π about $(1, 1)$ in both $(\mathbb{R}^2, \tilde{T}_1)$ and $(\mathbb{R}^2, \tilde{T}_2)$. Since σ_2 interchanges the cusps and preserves orientations of the longitudes, it must take \tilde{T}_1 to \tilde{T}_2 by a translation. Since the minimal meridional edge of \tilde{T}_1 must map to the minimal meridional edge of \tilde{T}_2 , σ_2 must be the identity map between these triangulations of \mathbb{R}^2 , up to deck transformations.

Case 3: Ω is palindromic. Now, consider any additional symmetries of $\text{Sym}(M)$, which occur only if Ω is palindromic. By examining the projections of $K(\Omega)$ given in Figure 14, we see that σ_3 has the following properties:

- σ_3 exchanges the maxima of $K(\Omega)$ with the minima of $K(\Omega)$.
- σ_3 changes the orientation of the longitude of $K(\Omega)$ (or both longitudes if $K(\Omega)$ is a two component link).

First, suppose that n is odd. By Theorem 4.1, σ_3 is an orientation-preserving symmetry, and since it changes the orientation of the longitude, it must be a rotation of \mathbb{R}^2 . Since σ_3 must exchange maximal meridional edges with minimal meridional edges, it must act as a rotation about $(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ on $(\mathbb{R}^2, \tilde{T})$, or rotations about $(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ in both $(\mathbb{R}^2, \tilde{T}_1)$ and $(\mathbb{R}^2, \tilde{T}_2)$, if $K(\Omega)$ has two components.

Now, suppose that n is even. By Theorem 4.1, σ_3 is an orientation-reversing symmetry of M , and so, σ_3 's action on \tilde{T} is also orientation-reversing. Theorem 3.6 tells us that σ_3 must either correspond with the glide reflection g or a composition of g with the rotations ρ_1 and ρ_2 (up to deck transformation). This gives the desired description of σ_3 . □

5. Hidden symmetries of 2-bridge link complements

Let the commensurator and normalizer of $M = \mathbb{H}^3 / \Gamma = \mathbb{S}^3 \setminus K(\Omega)$, be $C(\Gamma)$ and $N(\Gamma)$, respectively, as defined in Section 1. Now that we understand the

symmetries of M (Section 4), and the simplicial homeomorphisms of the canonical (lifted) cusp triangulation \tilde{T} (Section 3), we are ready to characterize the hidden symmetries of M , i.e., the elements of $C(\Gamma) \setminus N(\Gamma)$. Clearly, arithmetic links always have hidden symmetries, since in this case $C(\Gamma)$ is dense in $\text{Isom}(\mathbb{H}^3)$. But hidden symmetries of arithmetic links will not necessarily be symmetries of the canonical cusp triangulation \tilde{T} . We call a hidden symmetry *detectable* if it is also a symmetry of \tilde{T} . For nonarithmetic links, all hidden symmetries are detectable.

Recall that $\text{Aut}_{ev}(\tilde{T})$ is the group of simplicial automorphisms of \tilde{T} preserving edge valence, so that $\text{Aut}_{ev}^+(\tilde{T})$ is the subgroup consisting of those that preserve orientation.

Orientation-preserving hidden symmetries.

Theorem 5.1. *If $M = \mathbb{S}^3 \setminus K(\Omega)$ is a hyperbolic 2-bridge link complement, then we have the following classification of orientation-preserving hidden symmetries:*

- *If M is nonarithmetic, then M admits no hidden symmetries.*
- *If M is the figure-eight knot complement, then M admits an order 6 detectable hidden symmetry.*
- *If M is the Whitehead link complement, then M admits an order 4 detectable hidden symmetry.*
- *If M is the 6_2^2 link complement, then M admits an order 3 detectable hidden symmetry.*
- *If M is the 6_3^2 link complement, then M does not admit any detectable hidden symmetries.*

Proof. Case 1: M is nonarithmetic. Since the triangulation \mathcal{T} of M is canonical, it descends to a cellulation of the minimal (orientable) orbifold $\mathcal{O}^+ = \mathbb{H}^3 / C^+(\Gamma)$, where $C^+(\Gamma)$ is the orientable commensurator of M . Hence any orientation-preserving symmetry or hidden symmetry $h \in C^+(\Gamma) \leq \text{Isom}^+(\mathbb{H}^3)$ must preserve the lifted triangulation $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$, which we may assume has a vertex at $\infty \in S_\infty = \mathbb{R}^2 \cup \{\infty\}$. Since M either has one cusp or has a symmetry exchanging its cusps, $N^+(\Gamma)$ acts transitively on the set of vertices of $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$. Thus for some $g \in N^+(\Gamma)$, $h \circ g$ fixes $\infty \in S_\infty$. Since h is a symmetry of M if and only if $h \circ g$ is, we may assume that h fixes $\infty \in S_\infty$. Identifying $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ with a horosphere about ∞ , we see then that h restricts to a simplicial automorphism of $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$, and this restriction determines h (if K has two components, we understand $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ to mean a component of $\tilde{T}_1 \cup \tilde{T}_2$). It is enough, then, to show that any element of $\text{Aut}_{ev}^+(\tilde{\mathcal{T}})$ comes from a symmetry of M (possibly composed with deck transformations of $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$).

Let $G = \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}$ be the deck group of $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$. By Theorem 3.6, $\text{Aut}_{ev}^+(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}) / G$ is generated by $\{\rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3\}$ if ρ_3 is a simplicial automorphism, and is generated by $\{\rho_1, \rho_2\}$ if ρ_3




Figure 15. Lifted cusp triangulation \tilde{T} for the figure-eight knot, Whitehead link, and 6_2^2 link complements, from left to right. Edges/vertices with the same coloring (within each figure) have the same valence.

is not simplicial. Let $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3$ be the symmetries described in Proposition 4.4, and let H be the horizontal strip in the first quadrant with a vertex at the origin.

We first observe that $\rho_1 = \sigma_1$, and ρ_2 is either σ_2 , or σ_1 composed with a deck transformation, depending on whether K has one or two components. Hence ρ_1 and ρ_2 come from symmetries of M in both cases, and so for the case where ρ_3 is not simplicial, M cannot have hidden symmetries. If ρ_3 is simplicial, then since the reflection r_y across $y = 1$ is always a simplicial automorphism (by construction of \tilde{T}), the reflection $\rho_3 \circ r_y$ across $x = \frac{1}{2}$ is also simplicial. Hence in this case H is symmetric about the line $x = \frac{1}{2}$, and so Ω is palindromic with $\Omega_c = R$, and it follows that ρ_3 comes from the symmetry σ_3 of M . Again, we conclude that M has no hidden symmetries.

Case 2: M is arithmetic. There are exactly four arithmetic 2-bridge links: the figure-eight knot ($\Omega = RL$), the Whitehead link ($\Omega = RLR$), the 6_2^2 link ($\Omega = R^2L^2$), and the 6_3^2 link ($\Omega = RL^2R$).

Since $\Omega = RL^2R$ is not an excluded case in Lemma 3.4 and its corollaries, the arguments in Case 1 above show that, if M is the 6_3^2 link complement, then every $h \in \text{Aut}_{e_v}^+(\tilde{T})$ that preserves edge valence comes from a symmetry of M , i.e., M admits no detectable orientation-preserving hidden symmetries.

If M is the figure-eight knot, the Whitehead link complement, or the 6_2^2 link complement, then we can see by edge/vertex (valence) correspondences in \tilde{T} that if e and e' are two edges of a tetrahedron in \mathcal{T} which are opposite each other (i.e., they do not share a vertex), then $\text{val}(e) = \text{val}(e')$. This is evident in \tilde{T} by the fact that any edge and vertex of \tilde{T} that are across from each other (i.e., their convex hull is a single triangle of \tilde{T}) have the same valence. This makes it easy to identify the (unique) hyperbolic structure on \mathcal{T} . If an edge of a tetrahedron has valence k , then we make the dihedral angle at that edge $2\pi/k$. We just need to make sure that this gives a Euclidean

structure to the cusp cross-sections, but this is confirmed by Figure 15. It follows that the depictions of \tilde{T} in Figure 15 are actually metrically correct (up to scaling), so the rotations ρ_v indicated are isometries of \tilde{T} . Next we check that ρ_v extends to an isometry of the three-dimensional triangulation $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$. Viewing $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ as a horosphere about ∞ in the upper half-space model of \mathbb{H}^3 , the vertex v about which ρ_v rotates \tilde{T} corresponds to some edge e_v of $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ connecting ∞ to a point $p_v \in \partial\mathbb{H}^3 \setminus \{\infty\}$. The rotation of \mathbb{H}^3 about e_v that agrees with ρ_v on \tilde{T} induces a rotation of the lift \tilde{T}_v of T centered at p_v , which is an isometry since \tilde{T} and \tilde{T}_v are isometric and e_v appears in both as a vertex of the same valence. If v_1 is some other vertex of \tilde{T} , and $\rho_v(v_1) = v_2$, then since ρ_v differs from ρ_{v_1} by composition with symmetries of M and deck transformations of $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$, the rotation of \mathbb{H}^3 induced by ρ_v takes \tilde{T}_{v_1} to \tilde{T}_{v_2} isometrically. It follows that ρ_v induces an isometry on $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$, of the order indicated in the statement of the theorem. \square

Orientation-reversing hidden symmetries.

Theorem 5.2. *If $M = \mathbb{S}^3 \setminus K(\Omega)$ is a hyperbolic 2-bridge link complement, then we have the following classification of orientation-reversing hidden symmetries:*

- *If M is nonarithmetic, then M admits no orientation-reversing hidden symmetries.*
- *If M is the 6_3^2 link complement, then M admits no detectable orientation-reversing hidden symmetry.*
- *If M is the figure-eight knot complement, the Whitehead link complement, or the 6_2^2 link complement, then M admits an order 2 orientation-reversing hidden symmetry.*

Proof. Case 1: M is nonarithmetic. The proof will be analogous to the orientation-preserving case. As in that case, we need only show that any $h \in \text{Aut}_{ev}(\tilde{T})$ is in fact a symmetry of M . By Theorem 3.6, h must be a composition of ρ_1, ρ_2, ρ_3 , and g , where ρ_1, ρ_2 , and ρ_3 are the rotations by π about $(1, 1), (2, 1)$, and $(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, respectively, and g is the glide reflection given by the composition of $r_{\frac{1}{2}}$ with $(x, y) \mapsto (x, y + 1)$. If $g \notin \text{Aut}_{ev}(\tilde{T})$, then $\text{Aut}_{ev}(\tilde{T}) = \text{Aut}_{ev}^+(\tilde{T})$, and we are done. If $g \in \text{Aut}_{ev}(\tilde{T})$, then it is clear from the construction of \tilde{T} that we must have $\Omega_c = L$, and Ω must be palindromic. In this case, though, g corresponds to the symmetry σ_3 in the notation of Proposition 4.4, so the nonarithmetic case is proved.

Case 2: M is arithmetic. The proof is analogous to the orientation-preserving case. \square

Irregular coverings by hyperbolic 2-bridge link complements. Theorem 5.1 and Theorem 5.2 give us the following corollary about irregular coverings of 3-manifolds.

Corollary 5.3. *Let N be any hyperbolic 2-bridge link complement. If N is nonarithmetic, then N does not irregularly cover any hyperbolic 3-orbifolds (orientable or nonorientable). If N is arithmetic, then N does not irregularly cover any orientable hyperbolic 3-manifolds.*

Proof. By Theorem 5.1 and Theorem 5.2, any nonarithmetic hyperbolic 2-bridge link complement N does not have any hidden symmetries (orientation-preserving or orientation-reversing). Thus, if any such N covers a hyperbolic 3-orbifold, it must be a regular cover.

If N is arithmetic, then N is the complement of either the figure-eight knot, the Whitehead link, the 6_2^2 link, or the 6_3^2 link. If N irregularly covers some hyperbolic 3-manifold N' , then it must be at least a degree 3 covering. Here, we get a volume contradiction. Cao and Meyerhoff [2001] showed that the figure-eight knot complement and its sister are the orientable cusped hyperbolic 3-manifolds of minimal volume, with volume ≥ 2.029 . Therefore, $vol(N') \geq 2.029$, and so, $vol(N) \geq 3(2.029) = 6.087$. However, the volumes of any of the four arithmetic hyperbolic 2-bridge link complements are strictly smaller than 6.087. Thus, we can't have any such irregular coverings in the arithmetic case. \square

Boileau and Weidmann [2005] give a characterization of 3-manifolds that admit a nontrivial JSJ-decomposition and whose fundamental groups are generated by two elements. Their work shows that there are four possibilities for such manifolds, one of which is that the hyperbolic part of the JSJ decomposition admits a finite-sheeted irregular covering by a hyperbolic 2-bridge link complement. Corollary 5.3 immediately eliminates this possibility, giving the following revised characterization of such manifolds. In the following corollary, D stands for a disk, A for an annulus, and Mb for a Möbius band. For an orbifold, cone points are listed in parentheses after the topological type of the orbifold is given.

Corollary 5.4. *Let M be a compact, orientable, irreducible 3-manifold which has $rank(\pi_1(M)) = 2$. If M has a nontrivial JSJ-decomposition, then one of the following holds:*

- (1) M has Heegaard genus 2.
- (2) $M = S \cup_T H$ where S is a Seifert manifold with basis $D(p, q)$ or $A(p)$, H is a hyperbolic manifold and $\pi_1(H)$ is generated by a pair of elements with a single parabolic element. The gluing map identifies the fiber of S with the curve corresponding to the parabolic generator of $\pi_1(H)$.
- (3) $M = S_1 \cup_T S_2$ where S_1 is a Seifert manifold over Mb or $Mb(p)$ and S_2 is a Seifert manifold over $D(2, 2l + 1)$. The gluing map identifies the fiber of S_1 with a curve on the boundary of S_2 that has intersection number one with the fiber of S_2 .

6. Commensurability of 2-bridge link complements

In this section, we show that there is only one pair of commensurable hyperbolic 2-bridge link complements. We accomplish this by analyzing the cusp of the unique minimal orbifold in the commensurability class of a nonarithmetic hyperbolic 2-bridge link complement.

Let $M = \mathbb{S}^3 \setminus K(\Omega) = \mathbb{H}^3/\Gamma$ be any nonarithmetic hyperbolic 2-bridge link complement. By a theorem of Margulis [1991], there exists a unique minimal (orientable) orbifold in the commensurability class of M , specifically, $\mathcal{O}^+ = \mathbb{H}^3/C^+(\Gamma)$. By Theorem 5.1 we know that M admits no hidden symmetries, and therefore, $C^+(\Gamma) = N^+(\Gamma)$. Since $N^+(\Gamma)/\Gamma = \text{Sym}^+(M)$, we only have to quotient M by its orientation-preserving symmetries to obtain \mathcal{O}^+ .

We will analyze the commensurability class of M by considering the cusp of \mathcal{O}^+ . Recall that every 2-bridge link is either a knot or a link with two components. If K has two components, then there always exists a symmetry exchanging those components; see Section 4. Thus, the orbifold \mathcal{O}^+ admits a single cusp, C . If we quotient the cusp(s) of M along with the cusp triangulation T by the symmetries of M , then we obtain the cusp C of \mathcal{O}^+ , along with a canonical cellulation, T_C . Technically, T_C is not a triangulation, but just a quotient of a triangulation (hence we call it a cellulation). If M and M' are commensurable, then their corresponding minimal orbifolds must admit isometric cusps that have identical cusp triangulations. In this case, we say that the corresponding cusp cellulations, T_C and $T_{C'}$, are *equivalent*. We wish to determine when these cusps are equivalent. The following two lemmas take care of this classification.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $M = \mathbb{S}^3 \setminus K(\Omega)$ be a nonarithmetic hyperbolic 2-bridge link complement. Suppose Ω is not palindromic or n is even. Then $C \cong S^2(2, 2, 2, 2)$ and T_C determines the word Ω up to inversion and switching L s and R s.*

Proof. By Theorem 4.1, $\text{Sym}^+(M) \cong Z_2 \oplus Z_2$, and Proposition 4.4 tells us exactly how $\text{Sym}^+(M)$ acts on T and \tilde{T} . First, assume $K(\Omega)$ is a knot. Here, we choose the rectangle $[0, 4] \times [0, 2]$ in \tilde{T} as a fundamental domain for the torus T . In this case, $\sigma_1 \circ \sigma_2$ acts as a translation of \tilde{T} by $(x, y) \rightarrow (x+2, y)$. When we quotient our fundamental domain by the symmetry $\sigma_1 \circ \sigma_2$, we produce a fundamental domain for a torus given by the rectangle $[0, 2] \times [0, 2]$, with opposite sides identified. If $K(\Omega)$ is a link with two components, then our fundamental domain for T is given by two copies of $[0, 2] \times [0, 2]$. When we quotient by σ_2 , we just exchange the cusps. This again produces a fundamental domain for a (single) torus of the form $[0, 2] \times [0, 2]$ in \tilde{T} . In either case (a knot or a two component link), we just need to quotient by σ_1 , which acts as a rotation about $(1, 1)$, to obtain C along with T_C . This gives us a fundamental domain of the form $[0, 1] \times [0, 2]$, with identifications given in Figure 16. We can see that this resulting cusp is $S^2(2, 2, 2, 2)$.




Figure 16. This shows the cusp triangulation T_C for the word $\Omega = R^2L^3R^2L^2R$. The order two singularities are marked by solid black circles. The red line segment gives l_C .

To each such T_C we associate a labeled line segment, l_C , in the following manner, depicted in Figure 16. The two endpoints of this line segment come from vertices placed in the centers of the two clasping triangles of the fundamental domain of T_C . We also place a vertex in the center of each triangle in the top half of the triangulation of the fundamental domain for T_C . We connect two vertices by an edge if and only if the corresponding triangles in T_C share an edge. We label each vertex of l_C (including the endpoints) by L or R corresponding to the label of the triangle in T_C . We say that l_C is equivalent to another labeled line segment $l_{C'}$ if there exists a simplicial homeomorphism between the two that preserves labelings or switches L s and R s between labelings.

Now, T_C is equivalent to $T_{C'}$ if and only if l_C is equivalent to $l_{C'}$. This holds because l_C tells you exactly how to build T_C and vice versa. However, there are only two possibilities for how l_C can be equivalent to $l_{C'}$: either the left endpoint maps to the left endpoint, or the left endpoint maps to the right endpoint. In the first case, Ω must be the same as Ω' . In the second case, Ω' must be an inversion of Ω . □

Lemma 6.2. *Let $M = \mathbb{S}^3 \setminus K(\Omega)$ be a nonarithmetic hyperbolic 2-bridge link complement. Suppose Ω is palindromic and n is odd. Then $C \cong S^2(2, 2, 2, 2)$ and T_C determines the word Ω up to inversion and switching L s and R s.*

Proof. By Theorem 4.1, either $\text{Sym}^+(M) \cong Z_2 \oplus Z_2 \oplus Z_2$, or $\text{Sym}^+(M) \cong D_4$. Just as in the previous lemma, we can first quotient a fundamental domain for T in \tilde{T} by the $Z_2 \oplus Z_2$ subgroup of $\text{Sym}^+(M)$ to obtain a single $S^2(2, 2, 2, 2)$ cusp. To obtain C and T_C , we also quotient by the action of σ_3 , which is a rotation about $(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ in \tilde{T} by Proposition 4.4; see Figure 17.




Figure 17. This shows the cusp triangulation T_C for the word $\Omega = R^3 L^2 R L^2 R^3$. The order two singularities are marked by solid black circles. The red line segment gives l_C .

Similar to Lemma 6.1, we can associate a marked line segment l_C to each cusp T_C , as depicted in Figure 17. Once again, we see that this marked line segment determines T_C up to inversions and switching L s and R s. We leave the details for the reader. \square

Corollary 6.3. *Let $M = \mathbb{S}^3 \setminus K(\Omega)$ be a nonarithmetic hyperbolic 2-bridge link complement. Then $C \cong S^2(2, 2, 2, 2)$ and T_C is determined by the word Ω up to inversion and switching L s and R s.*

Proof. We claim that the two types of cusp cellulations coming from Lemma 6.1 and Lemma 6.2 can not be equivalent. First, note that the tiling T_C for an $S^2(2, 2, 2, 2)$ from Lemma 6.1 always has singularities located at vertices. Furthermore, any of these vertices with singularities have valence $\neq 2$. Now, the tiling coming from Lemma 6.2 either has a singularity that is not located at a vertex (this happens if $\alpha_{\frac{n+1}{2}}$ is odd) or it has a singularity located at a vertex of valence 2 (this happens if $\alpha_{\frac{n+1}{2}}$ is even). Thus, these two types of cusp cellulations can not be equivalent, and so, the previous two lemmas imply that any such T_C is determined by the word Ω up to inversion and switching L s and R s. \square

We can now prove our main theorem.

Theorem 6.4. *The only commensurable hyperbolic 2-bridge link complements are the figure-eight knot complement and the 6_2^2 link complement.*

Proof. It is a well known fact that cusped, arithmetic hyperbolic 3-manifolds are commensurable if and only if they have the same invariant trace field; see [Maclachlan and Reid 2003] for details. The figure-eight knot complement and the 6_2^2 link complement both have invariant trace field $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-3})$, while the Whitehead link complement has $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-1})$ and the 6_3^2 link complement has $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-7})$. Thus, among hyperbolic arithmetic 2-bridge link complements, only the figure-eight knot complement and the 6_2^2 link complement are commensurable. Now, a nonarithmetic hyperbolic 2-bridge link complement can not be commensurable with an arithmetic hyperbolic 2-bridge link complement. This is because their

commensurators determine their commensurability classes, and by a theorem of Margulis [1991], the commensurator of a hyperbolic 3-manifold is discrete if and only if it is nonarithmetic.

It remains to check that nonarithmetic hyperbolic 2-bridge link complements are pairwise incommensurable. Let $M = \mathbb{S}^3 \setminus K(\Omega)$ and $M' = \mathbb{S}^3 \setminus K(\Omega')$ be any two such manifolds. We use T_C and $T_{C'}$ to denote the cusp cellulations of the minimal orbifolds in the commensurability classes of M and M' respectively. Recall that if T_C is not equivalent to $T_{C'}$, then M and M' are not commensurable. By Corollary 6.3, T_C and $T_{C'}$ are equivalent only if Ω and Ω' differ by inversion or switching L s and R s. As noted in Section 2, both of these possibilities result in M and M' being isometric. Thus, M and M' are commensurable only if they are isometric, as desired. \square

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank David Futer for helpful conversations and guidance on this work. We would also like to thank the referee for making a number of helpful suggestions.

References

- [Akiyoshi et al. 2007] H. Akiyoshi, M. Sakuma, M. Wada, and Y. Yamashita, *Punctured torus groups and 2-bridge knot groups, I*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **1909**, Springer, 2007. MR 2330319 Zbl 1132.57001
- [Bleiler and Moriah 1988] S. A. Bleiler and Y. Moriah, “Heegaard splittings and branched coverings of B^3 ”, *Math. Ann.* **281**:4 (1988), 531–543. MR 958258 Zbl 0627.57007
- [Boileau and Weidmann 2005] M. Boileau and R. Weidmann, “The structure of 3-manifolds with two-generated fundamental group”, *Topology* **44**:2 (2005), 283–320. MR 2114709 Zbl 1082.57014
- [Bonahon and Siebenmann 2010] F. Bonahon and L. Siebenmann, “New geometric splittings of classical knots, and the classification and symmetries of arborescent knots”, preprint, 2010, <http://www-bcf.usc.edu/~fbonahon/Research/Preprints/BonSieb.pdf>.
- [Cao and Meyerhoff 2001] C. Cao and G. R. Meyerhoff, “The orientable cusped hyperbolic 3-manifolds of minimum volume”, *Invent. Math.* **146**:3 (2001), 451–478. MR 1869847 Zbl 1028.57010
- [Gehring et al. 1998] F. W. Gehring, C. Maclachlan, and G. J. Martin, “Two-generator arithmetic Kleinian groups, II”, *Bull. London Math. Soc.* **30**:3 (1998), 258–266. MR 1608106 Zbl 0930.30037
- [Goodman et al. 2008] O. Goodman, D. Heard, and C. Hodgson, “Commensurators of cusped hyperbolic manifolds”, *Experiment. Math.* **17**:3 (2008), 283–306. MR 2455701 Zbl 1338.57016
- [Gordon and Luecke 1989] C. M. Gordon and J. Luecke, “Knots are determined by their complements”, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **2**:2 (1989), 371–415. MR 965210 Zbl 0678.57005
- [Guéritaud 2006a] F. Guéritaud, *Géométrie hyperbolique effective et triangulations idéales canoniques en dimension trois*, Ph.D. thesis, Université Paris Sud, 2006, <https://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-00119465>.
- [Guéritaud 2006b] F. Guéritaud, “On canonical triangulations of once-punctured torus bundles and two-bridge link complements”, *Geom. Topol.* **10** (2006), 1239–1284. MR 2255497 Zbl 1130.57024

- [Maclachlan and Reid 2003] C. Maclachlan and A. W. Reid, *The arithmetic of hyperbolic 3-manifolds*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **219**, Springer, 2003. MR 1937957 Zbl 1025.57001
- [Margulis 1991] G. A. Margulis, *Discrete subgroups of semisimple Lie groups*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) **17**, Springer, 1991. MR 1090825 Zbl 0732.22008
- [Menasco 1984] W. Menasco, “Closed incompressible surfaces in alternating knot and link complements”, *Topology* **23**:1 (1984), 37–44. MR 721450 Zbl 0525.57003
- [Reid and Walsh 2008] A. W. Reid and G. S. Walsh, “Commensurability classes of 2-bridge knot complements”, *Algebr. Geom. Topol.* **8**:2 (2008), 1031–1057. MR 2443107 Zbl 1154.57001
- [Sakuma 1986] M. Sakuma, “On strongly invertible knots”, pp. 176–196 in *Algebraic and topological theories* (Kinosaki, 1984), edited by M. Nagata et al., Kinokuniya, Tokyo, 1986. MR 1102258 Zbl 0800.57001
- [Sakuma and Weeks 1995] M. Sakuma and J. Weeks, “Examples of canonical decompositions of hyperbolic link complements”, *Japan. J. Math. (N.S.)* **21**:2 (1995), 393–439. MR 1364387 Zbl 0858.57021
- [Schubert 1956] H. Schubert, “Knoten mit zwei Brücken”, *Math. Z.* **65** (1956), 133–170. MR 0082104 Zbl 0071.39002
- [Schwartz 1995] R. E. Schwartz, “The quasi-isometry classification of rank one lattices”, *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.* **82** (1995), 133–168. MR 1383215 Zbl 0852.22010
- [Walsh 2011] G. S. Walsh, “Orbifolds and commensurability”, pp. 221–231 in *Interactions between hyperbolic geometry, quantum topology and number theory*, edited by E. Loubeau and S. Montaldo, Contemp. Math. **541**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2011. MR 2796635 Zbl 1231.57017

Received January 5, 2016. Revised July 5, 2016.

CHRISTIAN MILLICHAP
DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
LINFIELD COLLEGE
MCMINNVILLE, OR 97128
UNITED STATES
cmillich@linfield.edu

WILLIAM WORDEN
DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
TEMPLE UNIVERSITY
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19122
UNITED STATES
william.worden@temple.edu

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

Founded in 1951 by E. F. Beckenbach (1906–1982) and F. Wolf (1904–1989)

msp.org/pjm

EDITORS

Don Blasius (Managing Editor)
Department of Mathematics
University of California
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1555
blasius@math.ucla.edu

Paul Balmer
Department of Mathematics
University of California
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1555
balmer@math.ucla.edu

Robert Finn
Department of Mathematics
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305-2125
finn@math.stanford.edu

Sorin Popa
Department of Mathematics
University of California
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1555
popa@math.ucla.edu

Vyjayanthi Chari
Department of Mathematics
University of California
Riverside, CA 92521-0135
chari@math.ucr.edu

Kefeng Liu
Department of Mathematics
University of California
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1555
liu@math.ucla.edu

Igor Pak
Department of Mathematics
University of California
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1555
pak.pjm@gmail.com

Paul Yang
Department of Mathematics
Princeton University
Princeton NJ 08544-1000
yang@math.princeton.edu

Daryl Cooper
Department of Mathematics
University of California
Santa Barbara, CA 93106-3080
cooper@math.ucsb.edu

Jiang-Hua Lu
Department of Mathematics
The University of Hong Kong
Pokfulam Rd., Hong Kong
jhlu@maths.hku.hk

Jie Qing
Department of Mathematics
University of California
Santa Cruz, CA 95064
qing@cats.ucsc.edu

PRODUCTION

Silvio Levy, Scientific Editor, production@msp.org

SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS

ACADEMIA SINICA, TAIPEI
CALIFORNIA INST. OF TECHNOLOGY
INST. DE MATEMÁTICA PURA E APLICADA
KEIO UNIVERSITY
MATH. SCIENCES RESEARCH INSTITUTE
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIV.
OREGON STATE UNIV.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY
UNIV. OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY
UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS
UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES
UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE
UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO
UNIV. OF CALIF., SANTA BARBARA

UNIV. OF CALIF., SANTA CRUZ
UNIV. OF MONTANA
UNIV. OF OREGON
UNIV. OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
UNIV. OF UTAH
UNIV. OF WASHINGTON
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY

These supporting institutions contribute to the cost of publication of this Journal, but they are not owners or publishers and have no responsibility for its contents or policies.

See inside back cover or msp.org/pjm for submission instructions.

The subscription price for 2016 is US \$440/year for the electronic version, and \$600/year for print and electronic. Subscriptions, requests for back issues and changes of subscriber address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, P.O. Box 4163, Berkeley, CA 94704-0163, U.S.A. The Pacific Journal of Mathematics is indexed by Mathematical Reviews, Zentralblatt MATH, PASCAL CNRS Index, Referativnyi Zhurnal, Current Mathematical Publications and Web of Knowledge (Science Citation Index).

The Pacific Journal of Mathematics (ISSN 0030-8730) at the University of California, c/o Department of Mathematics, 798 Evans Hall #3840, Berkeley, CA 94720-3840, is published twelve times a year. Periodical rate postage paid at Berkeley, CA 94704, and additional mailing offices. POSTMASTER: send address changes to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, P.O. Box 4163, Berkeley, CA 94704-0163.

PJM peer review and production are managed by EditFlow® from Mathematical Sciences Publishers.

PUBLISHED BY

 **mathematical sciences publishers**
nonprofit scientific publishing

<http://msp.org/>

© 2016 Mathematical Sciences Publishers

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

Volume 285 No. 2 December 2016

The $SU(N)$ Casson–Lin invariants for links	257
HANS U. BODEN and ERIC HARPER	
The $SU(2)$ Casson–Lin invariant of the Hopf link	283
HANS U. BODEN and CHRISTOPHER M. HERALD	
Commensurations and metric properties of Houghton’s groups	289
JOSÉ BURILLO, SEAN CLEARY, ARMANDO MARTINO and CLAAS E. RÖVER	
Conformal holonomy equals ambient holonomy	303
ANDREAS ČAP, A. ROD GOVER, C. ROBIN GRAHAM and MATTHIAS HAMMERL	
Nonorientable Lagrangian cobordisms between Legendrian knots	319
ORSOLA CAPOVILLA-SEARLE and LISA TRAYNOR	
A strong multiplicity one theorem for SL_2	345
JINGSONG CHAI and QING ZHANG	
The Yamabe problem on noncompact CR manifolds	375
PAK TUNG HO and SEONGTAG KIM	
Isometry types of frame bundles	393
WOUTER VAN LIMBEEK	
Bundles of spectra and algebraic K-theory	427
JOHN A. LIND	
Hidden symmetries and commensurability of 2-bridge link complements	453
CHRISTIAN MILLICHAP and WILLIAM WORDEN	
On seaweed subalgebras and meander graphs in type C	485
DMITRI I. PANYUSHEV and OKSANA S. YAKIMOVA	
The genus filtration in the smooth concordance group	501
SHIDA WANG	



0030-8730(201612)285:2;1-W