

## EQUIVARIANT DOUBLE-SLICE GENUS

MALCOLM GABBARD

ABSTRACT. In this paper we define the equivariant double-slice genus and equivariant super-slice genus of a strongly invertible knot. We prove lower bounds for both the equivariant double-slice genus and the equivariant super-slice genus. Using these bounds we find a family of knots which are double-slice and equivariantly slice but have arbitrarily large equivariant double-slice genus. From this, we construct equivariantly knotted symmetric 3-balls as well as unknotted symmetric 2-spheres which do not bound equivariant 3-balls. Additionally, using double-slice and super-slice genus we construct properly embedded surfaces with large 1-handle stabilization distance distance rel boundary.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Given a knot  $K \subset S^3$  its *double-slice genus*  $g_{ds}(K)$  was first defined by Livingston and Meier in [16] as the minimal genus of an unknotted surface  $\Sigma \subset S^4$  such that  $\Sigma$  intersects an equatorial  $S^3$  transversely with intersection  $K$ . In 2021 Chen [6] was able to construct a lower bound for the double-slice genus using Casson-Gordon invariants which allowed him to prove that there are slice knots with arbitrarily large double-slice genus, a later result by Orson-Powell in [18] using a new lower bound for double-slice genus from signatures refined this result finding slice knots with double-slice genus exactly  $n$  for all  $n$ .

The discussion of equivariant genus of symmetric knots originates from Sakuma's work in [20] on the equivariant concordance group of strongly invertible knots. Specifically, a *strongly invertible knot*  $(K, \tau)$  is a knot  $K \subset S^3$  together with an involution  $\tau : S^3 \rightarrow S^3$  satisfying  $\tau(K) = K$  and  $fix(\tau) = S^1$  intersecting  $K$  in two points. The equivariant concordance group of strongly invertible knots has received considerable attention in recent years including [3, 5, 8, 9], providing many obstructions to strongly invertible knots being equivariantly slice, i.e. bounding a symmetric disk in  $B^4$ . A more general analysis was recently initiated by Boyle-Issa in [3] where they define for a strongly invertible knot  $(K, \tau)$  its *equivariant 4-genus*  $\tilde{g}_4(K, \tau)$  to be the minimal genus of a properly embedded surface  $\Sigma \subset B^4$  with  $\partial\Sigma = K$  such that for some extension of  $\bar{\tau} : B^4 \rightarrow B^4$  of  $\tau$ ,  $\bar{\tau}(\Sigma) = \Sigma$ . Using knot Floer homology, Dai-Mallick-Stoffregen [7] were able to find slice knots which, viewed as strongly invertible knots, have arbitrarily large equivariant 4-genus.

Combining these ideas, we define the *equivariant double-slice genus*  $\tilde{g}_{ds}(K, \tau)$  of a strongly invertible knot  $(K, \tau)$  to be the minimal genus of an equivariantly unknotted surface  $\Sigma \subset S^4$ , i.e.  $\Sigma$  bounds a handlebody  $H$  such  $\bar{\tau}(H) = H$  where  $\bar{\tau}$  is an extension of  $\tau$  to  $S^4$  defined explicitly in Section 2.3, such that  $\Sigma$  intersects  $S^3$  transversely with intersection  $K$ . In order to differentiate the equivariant double-slice genus from the equivariant 4-genus and the double-slice genus, we prove the following lower bound:

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $(K, \tau)$  be a strongly invertible knot and let  $K_0$  and  $K_1$  be the knots formed from an arc of  $K$  union the half-axis  $h_0$  and  $h_1$  respectively. Then:*

$$\min\{g_{ds}(K_0), g_{ds}(K_1)\} \leq \tilde{g}_{ds}(K, \tau).$$

This lower bound allows, to some extent, questions about the equivariant double-slice genus of a strongly invertible knot to be answered in terms of the non-equivariant double-slice genus of these other knots  $K_0$  and  $K_1$ , allowing us to make use of the well-studied bounds for double-slice knots. Using this lower bound we are able to prove that the equivariant double-slice genus of a knot  $(K, \tau)$  does not depend on a combination of its double-slice genus and equivariant 4-genus.

**Theorem 1.2.** *The knot  $(K_n, \tau)$  depicted in Figure 1 satisfies the following:*

- (1)  $K_n$  is double-slice,
- (2)  $(K_n, \tau)$  is equivariantly slice,
- (3)  $\tilde{g}_{ds}(K_n, \tau) \geq n$ .




FIGURE 1.  $(K_n, \tau)$

**1.1. Equivariantly super-slice knots.** Similar to double-slice genus, there is a notion of *super-slice* genus  $g_{ss}(K)$  defined by Chen in [6] as the minimal genus of a surface  $\Sigma \subset B^4$  with boundary  $K$  such that the double of  $\Sigma$  along  $K$  in  $S^4$  is unknotted. We extend this discussion to the equivariant setting by defining the *equivariant super-slice genus*  $\tilde{g}_{ss}(K, \tau)$  of a knot to be the minimal genus of a surface  $\Sigma \subset B^4$  such that  $\bar{\tau}(\Sigma) = \Sigma$  and the double of  $\Sigma$  is equivariantly unknotted. Using similar techniques to the double-slice setting we are able to prove the following:

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $(K, \tau)$  be a strongly invertible knot and let  $K_0$  and  $K_1$  be the knots formed from an arc of  $K$  union the half-axis  $h_0$  and  $h_1$  respectively. Then:*

$$\min\{g_{ss}(K_0), g_{ss}(K_1)\} \leq \tilde{g}_{ss}(K, \tau).$$

**1.2. Symmetric 2-Knots.** Similar to strongly invertible knots, one could ask what are the properties of 2-knots invariant under some symmetry of  $S^4$ . Using Theorem 1.3 we are able to construct interesting examples of symmetric 2-knots that distinguish them significantly from both non-equivariant 2-knots and strongly invertible knots. Namely, we are able to prove the following two results:

**Proposition 1.4.** *There exists an equivariant 3-ball in  $(S^4, \bar{\tau})$  which is not equivariantly isotopic to the standard equivariant 3-ball.*

**Proposition 1.5.** *There exists a symmetric 2-sphere in  $(S^4, \bar{\tau})$  which bounds a 3-ball but bounds no equivariant 3-ball.*

**1.3. Stabilization distance of disks rel boundary.** The internal stabilization distance of embedded surfaces in 4-manifolds is a well-studied area [1, 2, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 21], which generally asks the following: given two embedded surfaces  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$ , how many internal stabilizations (additions of 2-dimensional 1-handles to  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$ ) are necessary before  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$  are isotopic. In recent work of Miller and Powell [17], this question was extended to internal stabilization's of properly embedded surfaces rel boundary. In particular, they define the *1-handle stabilization distance*  $d_1(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2)$  between smoothly and properly embedded genus  $g$  surfaces  $\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2 \subset B^4$  with common boundary  $K$  to be the minimal  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$  become ambiently isotopic rel boundary after each has been stabilized at most  $n$  times.

Using basic properties of double-slice and super-slice genus we are able to prove the following lower bound for the 1-handle stabilization distance of surfaces satisfying certain conditions:

**Theorem 1.6.** *Let  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$  be properly embedded genus  $h$  surfaces with boundary  $K \subset S^3$  such that  $\Sigma_1 \cup_K \Sigma_2 \subset (B^4, \Sigma_1) \cup_{(S^3, K)} (B^4, \Sigma_2)$  is unknotted. Then  $d_1(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2) \geq g_{ss}(K) - h$ .*

By letting  $K$  be double-slice this immediately yields the following corollary:

**Corollary 1.7.** *Let  $K$  be double-slice with  $g_{ss}(K) = n$ , then  $K$  admits slice disks  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  such that  $d_1(D_1, D_2) \geq n$ .*

**1.4. Organization.** Section 2 provides an overview of notation and conventions, as well as necessary background on double-slice genus and equivariant 4-genus. Section 3 defines the equivariant double-slice genus and covers some properties of involutions on handlebodies arising in this setting. In Section 4 we bound the equivariant double-slice genus, proving Theorem 1.1 as well as 1.2. In Section 5 we define equivariant super-slice genus and prove analogous results to Section 4, as well as results about equivariantly knotted 2-spheres. In Section 6 we leave the equivariant setting and discuss stabilization of surfaces rel boundary.

## 2. BACKGROUND

In this section, we recall the necessary background pertaining to double-slice classical knots and equivariantly slice strongly invertible knots.

**2.1. Conventions and classical 4-genus.** A knot  $K$  will refer to a classical knot, namely the oriented image of a smooth embedding of  $S^1$  into  $S^3$ . From a given knot  $K$  we have the following related knots:

- $rK$  is the *reverse* of a knot  $K$ , that is,  $K$  with the opposite orientation,
- $mK$  is the *mirror* of a knot  $K$ , which is the image of  $K$  under a reflection of  $S^3$ ,
- $-K$  is the *inverse* of a knot  $K$ , and is the reverse of the mirror.

Recall the 4-genus  $g_4(K)$  of a knot  $K$  is the minimal genus of smooth properly embedded surface  $\Sigma \subset B^4$  with  $\partial\Sigma = K$ . If  $g_4(K) = 0$  we say  $K$  is *slice*. One well-known fact we will use consistently is that given a knot  $K$ ,  $K\# -K$  is slice.

**2.2. Double-slice genus.** The *double-slice genus* of a knot  $K$ , denoted  $g_{ds}(K)$ , was defined by Livingston and Meier [16] as the minimal genus of an unknotted smooth surface  $F \subset S^4$  such that the intersection of  $F$  with an equatorial  $S^3$  is  $K$ . By unknotted, we mean that the surface  $F$  bounds a smoothly embedded handlebody in  $S^4$ . If the double-slice genus of  $K$  is 0, i.e.  $K$  is the cross-section of an unknotted sphere, we say  $K$  is *double-slice*. One important fact we know from Sumners [26] is that given any knot  $K$  we have that  $K\# -K$  is double-slice.

There are many obstructions to knots being double-slice, a good survey of which is provided in [16]. In this paper, the primary bound for double-slice we will use is Theorem 1.1 of [18] from Orson and Powell which states

**Theorem 2.1** (Orson and Powell). *Let  $K$  be a knot in  $S^3$ , then:*

$$g_{ds}(K) \geq \max|\sigma_\omega(K)|$$

where  $\sigma_\omega(K)$  is the signature function. One important application of this theorem is the following example coming from Theorem 1.2 of [18] which we will refer back to in future constructions:

*Example 1.* Let  $L$  be the knot denoted  $8_{20}$  in Rolfsen's table [19] and let  $L_n = \#^n L$  as depicted in Figure 2. In [18] it is shown using the additivity of the knot signature function that  $g_{ds}(L_n) = n$ , despite the fact that  $L_n$  is slice.





FIGURE 2.  $L_n$ , i.e.  $n$  copies of  $8_{20}$  summed together.

**2.3. Equivariant 4-genus.** To define the equivariant 4-genus we first recall the definition of a strongly invertible knot. A *strongly invertible knot* is a pair  $(K, \tau)$  consisting of a classical knot  $K$  and an involution  $\tau$  acting on  $S^3$  such that  $\text{fix}(\tau) = S^1$  and  $\text{fix}(\tau) \cap K$  is two points. For a given strongly invertible knot  $(K, \tau)$  we refer to the fixed point set as the *axis* and refer to the two intervals of the axis separated by the intersection with  $K$  as *half-axis*.

As it will often be useful to work with a specified half-axis, we recall that a *directed strongly invertible knot* is a triple  $(K, \tau, h)$  consisting of a strongly invertible knot  $(K, \tau)$  and an oriented half-axis denoted by  $h$ . Given a directed strongly invertible knot  $(K, \tau, h)$ , its *antipode* is the knot  $a(K, \tau, h) = (K, \tau, h')$ , where  $h'$  is the other choice of half-axis; an example is shown in Figure 3.

FIGURE 3. A strongly invertible knot  $(9_{46}, \tau, h)$  and its antipode.

Given a strongly invertible knot  $(K, \tau)$ , Boyle and Issa define in [3] a notion of equivariant 4-genus  $\tilde{g}_4(K, \tau)$ , which we will re-introduce here. Before getting to the definition, we first discuss how we extend our action  $\tau$  to  $B^4$  and  $S^4$ . While exotic extensions of actions  $\tau$  from  $S^3$  to  $B^4$  are possible [10], we will define the extension  $\bar{\tau}$  to  $B^4$  be the cone of  $\tau$ . That is, constructing  $(B^4, \bar{\tau})$  as the cone of  $(S^3, \tau)$ . We similarly extend  $\tau$  to an action  $\bar{\tau}_{S^4}$  on  $S^4$  by taking  $(S^4, \bar{\tau}_{S^4})$  as the suspension of  $(S^3, \tau)$  (when clear from context we will call  $\bar{\tau}_{S^4}$  simply  $\bar{\tau}$ ). More explicitly, letting  $S^4 = \{x = (x_1, \dots, x_5) \subset \mathbb{R}^5 \mid \|x\| = 1\}$ ,  $B^4 = \{(x_1, \dots, x_5) \subset S^4 \mid x_5 \geq 0\}$  and  $S^3 = \partial B^4 = \{(x_1, \dots, x_5) \subset S^4 \mid x_5 = 0\}$ , then we take  $\bar{\tau}$  to be the action  $\bar{\tau}(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5) = (-x_1, -x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5)$ .

We now recall from [3] the definition of an *equivariant surface* for  $(K, \tau)$ :

**Definition 2.2.** Given a strongly invertible knot  $(K, \tau)$  in  $S^3$ , an *equivariant surface* for  $(K, \tau)$  is a connected, smoothly properly embedded surface  $F \subset B^4$  with  $\partial F = K \subset \partial B^4$  such that  $\bar{\tau}(F) = F$ , for  $\bar{\tau}$  as defined above.


Note that this definition differs slightly from [3] as we restrict our extension  $\bar{\tau}$  to be the cone of  $\tau$ . From here we are able to define the *equivariant 4-genus* as follows:

**Definition 2.3.** The *equivariant 4-genus* of a strongly invertible knot  $(K, \tau)$  is the minimal genus of an orientable equivariant surface for  $(K, \tau)$ , denoted  $\tilde{g}_4(K, \tau)$ . When clear from context, we may instead write  $\tilde{g}_4(K)$ .

Similar to slice and double-slice knots we have that, given a strongly invertible knot  $(K, \tau)$ ,  $K \# -K$  is equivariantly slice, where the connected sum is an equivariant connect sum banding together two directed strongly invertible knots with an equivariant band consistent with the orientations on the half-axis, for a more explicit description of the equivariant connect sum see [20]. Another common operation we will use to construct strongly invertible knots is the *equivariant double* of a knot  $K$ , denoted  $D(K)$ .

The double of a knot  $K$  is a strongly invertible knot  $(D(K), \tau)$  where  $D(K) = K \# rK$  and  $\tau$  is the involution taking  $K$  to  $rK$  and vice-versa, as shown in Figure 4. Of importance to our genus bounds is the following immediate result:

**Proposition 2.4.** *Given a knot  $K$  with 4-genus  $g_4(K) = n$ , its double  $(D(K), \tau)$  has equivariant 4-genus  $\tilde{g}_4(D(K)) \leq 2n$ .*

FIGURE 4. The equivariant double of  $8_{20}$ .

### 3. EQUIVARIANT DOUBLE-SLICE GENUS

Having defined both double-slice genus and equivariant 4-genus we can now define the logical combination of the two, which we call the *equivariant double-slice genus*. In order to do this, we first define an *equivariant slicing surface* and an *equivariant slicing handlebody*:

**Definition 3.1.** Given a directed strongly invertible knot  $(K, \tau, h) \subset S^3$  and the extension  $\bar{\tau}$  of  $\tau$  to  $S^4$  defined above, an *equivariant slicing handlebody* of  $(K, \tau, h)$  is a handlebody  $H \subset S^4$  such that  $\bar{\tau}(H) = H$  and  $H$  intersects the standard  $S^3$  containing  $K$  transversely with  $h \subset H$  and  $\partial H \cap S^3 = K$ . We call  $\partial H$  an *equivariant slicing surface* and say that  $(K, \tau, h)$  *divides*  $\partial H$ .

*Remark 1.* Since  $H \cap S^3$  contains an arc  $h$  of the fixpoint set,  $\bar{\tau}$  preserves the tangent vector to  $h$  at a point of  $h$ . Since it setwise fixes the hemispheres of  $S^4$ , it also fixes the normal vector to  $S^3$  at that point. Furthermore, the fixed point set is two-dimensional, so we conclude that  $\bar{\tau}|_H$  is orientation reversing.

*Remark 2.* Given the equivariant connect sum of two directed strongly invertible knots, as defined in the previous section, we get a natural equivariant connect sum of equivariant slicing surfaces which we will make use of in future constructions.

To see that an equivariant slicing surface exists we take an equivariant Seifert surface  $F \subset S^3$  for  $(K, \tau, h)$ , guaranteed to exist by [3], and consider  $F \times [-1, 1] \subset S^4$ , as in the non-equivariant setting in [16]. This is then an equivariant slicing handlebody for  $(K, \tau, h)$ . One important distinction in the equivariant case is that not all equivariant 3-balls are equivariant isotopic, as we will see in Section 5.2. Therefore it is important to note that we say a surface is *equivariantly unknotted* if it bounds an equivariant handlebody, but do not require the stronger condition that it is equivariant isotopic to some standard embedding. With this in mind, we define the *equivariant double-slice genus*:

**Definition 3.2.** The *equivariant double-slice genus* of a directed strongly invertible knot  $(K, \tau, h)$ , which we denote  $\tilde{g}_{ds}(K, \tau, h)$ , is the minimal genus of an equivariant slicing handlebody for  $(K, \tau, h)$ . If  $\tilde{g}_{ds}(K, \tau, h) = 0$ , we say  $(K, \tau, h)$  is *equivariantly double-slice*.

One obvious question is whether the choice of half-axis matters, i.e., given a directed strongly invertible knot and its antipode, does  $\tilde{g}_{ds}(K, \tau, h) = \tilde{g}_{ds}(a(K, \tau, h))$ ? We will show in Example 2 that the antipode of the knot  $(J_1, h, \tau)$  depicted in Figure 9 cannot be double-slice although later, in Section 5, we will show that  $(J_1, h, \tau)$

is in fact equivariantly double-slice. This means that the equivariant double-slice genus of a directed strongly invertible knot and its antipode need not be equal, in contrast to the equivariant 4-genus. For this reason, we define the *equivariant double-slice genus* of a non-directed strongly invertible knot  $(K, \tau)$  to be the minimum of  $\tilde{g}_{ds}(K, \tau, h)$  and  $\tilde{g}_{ds}(a(K, \tau, h))$ .

The basic lower bounds for the equivariant double-slice,  $\tilde{g}_{ds}(K, \tau) \geq g_{ds}(K)$  and  $\tilde{g}_{ds}(K, \tau) \geq 2\tilde{g}_4(K, \tau)$ , don't allow us to differentiate the equivariant double-slice genus from the double-slice genus and the equivariant 4-genus at the same time, as can be done with Theorem 1.1.

**3.1. Involutions of handlebodies.** Here we provide a brief discussion of the involutions of handlebodies and, more specifically, equivariant slicing handlebodies. We start by recalling a general result about involutions on handlebodies coming from the work of Kalliongis and McCullough in [15]. In their work, Kalliongis and McCullough discuss multiple decompositions of actions on handlebodies into simpler actions on smaller parts. We will make use of the first decomposition they discuss, called the vertical-horizontal decomposition. They define an involution on a bundle  $\Sigma \times I$  to be *vertical* if it is of the form  $1_\Sigma \times r$  and *horizontal* if it is of the form  $\sigma \times I$  for  $\sigma$  some involution of  $\Sigma$ , see Figure 5.




FIGURE 5. Example of vertical  $H_i$  components (left) and horizontal  $H_0$  components (right) with fixed point set in red.

**Theorem 3.3** (Theorem 5.1 in [15]). *Let  $\tau$  be an orientation reversing involution of a handlebody  $H$ , and suppose that some component of  $\text{fix}(h)$  is 2-dimensional. Then  $H$  has a decomposition  $H = H_0 \cup (\bigcup_{j=1}^r H_j)$ , where each piece is  $h$ -invariant, such that*

- (1)  $H_0$  is an  $I$ -bundle over a connected 2-manifold, and the restriction of  $h$  to  $H_0$  is horizontal. This action may be chosen to be a product action if and only if no component of  $\text{fix}(h)$  is a point or a Möbius band.
- (2) Each  $H_j$  is an  $I$ -bundle over a surface of negative Euler characteristic, which is a deformation retract of a component of  $\text{fix}(h)$ , and the restriction of  $h$  to  $H_j$  is vertical.
- (3)  $\{H_1, \dots, H_r\}$  are pairwise disjoint, and for  $1 \leq i \leq r$  each  $H_0 \cap H_i$  is a single 2-disk.

In the case of an equivariant slicing handlebody, we get added restrictions on the vertical-horizontal decomposition coming from our knowledge of  $\bar{\tau}_{S^4}$ .

**Lemma 3.4.** *The fixed point set of an equivariant slicing handlebody for a directed strongly invertible knot  $(K, \tau, h)$  is the disjoint union of some number of planar surfaces.*

*Proof.* Let  $H$  be an equivariant slicing handle body for  $(K, \tau, h)$ . By Remark 1,  $\tau$  must be orientation reversing on  $H$  with 2-dimensional fixed point set so, by [15], the fixed point set of  $\tau|_H$  is a collection of surfaces. However, the fixed point set of  $\tau|_H$  is a subset of the total fixed point set, a sphere. This means the surfaces are limited to planar surfaces. □

With this restriction on the fixed point set, we can now rewrite Theorem 3.3 for equivariant slicing handlebodies to give us better restrictions on the  $H_i$ 's.

**Proposition 3.5.** *Let  $H$  be an equivariant slicing handlebody for a directed strongly invertible knot  $(K, \tau, h)$ . Then  $H$  has a decomposition  $H = H_0 \cup (\bigcup_{j=1}^r H_j)$ , where each piece is  $\tau$ -invariant, such that*

- (1)  $H_0$  is an  $I$ -bundle over a connected planar surface, and the restriction of  $\tau$  to  $H_0$  is horizontal and a product action.
- (2) Each  $H_j$  is an  $I$ -bundle over a planar surface which is not a disk or annulus, which is a deformation retract of a component of  $\text{fix}(\tau)$ , and the restriction of  $\tau$  to  $H_j$  is vertical.
- (3)  $\{H_1, \dots, H_r\}$  are pairwise disjoint, and for  $1 \leq i \leq r$  each  $H_0 \cap H_i$  is a single 2-disk.

*Proof.* We begin by verifying that the assumptions of Theorem 3.3 hold for an arbitrary equivariant slicing handlebody  $H$ , i.e. that  $\tau|_H$  is orientation reversing and that  $\text{fix}(\tau|_H)$  contains a 2-dimensional component. The fact that  $\tau|_H$  is orientation reversing was discussed in Remark 1. The fact that  $\text{fix}(\tau|_H)$  contains a 2-dimensional component comes from the fact that it contains a half-axis of  $\text{fix}(\tau) \subset S^3$ . Since this subset is 1-dimensional, and since  $\tau|_H$  is orientation reversing, it must then be a subset of a 2-dimensional subset of  $\text{fix}(\tau|_H)$ . Thus we know that  $H$  has a vertical horizontal decomposition as in Theorem 3.3.

We now look at the changes to (1), namely that  $H_0$  is an  $I$ -bundle over a planar surface and that the restriction of  $h$  to  $H_0$  is horizontal and a product action. The fact that  $H_0$  is an  $I$ -bundle over a planar surface, as opposed to an arbitrary 2-manifold as in Theorem 3.3, is a direct result of Lemma 3.4. Similarly, by Lemma 3.4 no component of  $\text{fix}(\tau)$  is a point or Mobius band, so by (1) of Theorem 3.3 we have that the restriction of  $\tau$  to  $H_0$  is horizontal and is a product action.

For (2) the only change made from Theorem 3.3 is noting that the only surfaces that can appear are, by Lemma 3.4, planar surfaces. By (2) each has a negative Euler characteristic, hence is not a disk or annulus.

As there were no changes to (3), this completes the proof. □

With this, we now have an understanding of the  $\tau$  action on a slicing handlebody and can proceed to the next section, where we prove our main result.

## 4. BOUNDS ON EQUIVARIANT DOUBLE-SLICE GENUS

In this section we prove Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 and discuss relevant examples. We first prove a version of Theorem 1.1 for directed strongly invertible knots, from which Theorem 1.1 follows immediately.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $(K, \tau, h)$  be a directed strongly invertible knot and  $K_0$  be the union of  $h$  with an arc of  $K$  ending on the two fixed points. Then  $g_{ds}(K_0) \leq \tilde{g}_{ds}(K, \tau, h)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $H$  be a minimal equivariant slicing handlebody for  $(K, \tau, h)$ . We will start by creating a decomposition of  $H$  which allows us to construct a useful slicing handlebody for  $K_0$ .

We start by decomposing  $H$  into  $H = H_0 \cup (\bigcup_{j=1}^r H_j)$  as described in Proposition 3.5. Using this decomposition we will show that the fixed point set  $\tau|_H$ , which we will abuse notation and refer to as simply  $\tau$ , separates  $H$  into two identical components  $H^1$  and  $H^2 = \tau(H^1)$ . Smith proved that the fixed point set of an involution on a sphere is a  $\mathbb{Z}_2 - \check{C}ech$  homology sphere [22, 23, 24, 25]. This means an involution on a circle has zero or two fixed points. It follows by extending the involution on a planar surface  $\Sigma$ , to an involution on  $S^2$  that a 1-dimensional fixed point set of an involution on  $\Sigma$  is either  $S^1$  or a collection of properly embedded arcs, either of which separates the surface into identical components.


Thus, since  $\tau$  acts trivially on fibers of  $H_0$ , the fixed point set of  $\tau$  separates  $H_0$  into two identical components  $H_0^1$  and  $H_0^2$  satisfying  $g(H_0) \geq g(H_0^i)$  as shown in Figure 5. For the  $H_j$  the fixed point set is a planar surface separating the  $H_j$  into identical components  $H_j^1, H_j^2$  with  $H_j^1 = \tau(H_j^2)$  and  $g(H_j) = g(H_j^i)$  for  $i = 1, 2$  as shown in Figure 5. Note that all the attaching regions in both the  $H_0$  and  $H_j$  are disks containing an arc of the fixed point set which are identified. Since both fixed point sets separate, the fixed point set of  $H_0 \cup H_j$  separates. Iterating we get that the fixed point set of  $H$  separates it into two handle bodies  $H^1$  and  $H^2$  with decompositions given by connect sums of the  $H_j^1$  and  $H_j^2$  respectively. Thus we have:

$$g(H) = g(H_0) + \sum_{j=1}^r g(H_j) \geq g(H_0^i) + \sum_{j=1}^r g(H_j^i) = g(H^i).$$

By construction, the  $H^i$  are splitting handlebodies for the two ‘halves’ of  $K$  corresponding to the two different arcs.  $\square$

This allows us to partially reduce questions about the equivariant double-slice genus of a knot  $K$  to the non-equivariant double-slice genus of a different knot  $K_0$ .

*Example 2.* Consider the directed strongly invertible knot  $(J_1, \tau, h)$  depicted in Figure 9. Then, taking an arc of  $J_1$  union  $h$  as in Theorem 4.1 we get an unknot. This means the equivariant double-slice genus of  $(J_1, \tau, h)$  is at least 0, we will show in Corollary 5.6 that it is equal to 0. If instead we consider  $a(J_1, \tau, h)$  and construct a knot using an arc of  $J_1$  and a component of the fixpoint set which is not  $h$  we get the knot we call  $J_{1,0}$  depicted in Figure 11. A quick calculation shows that  $H_1(\Sigma_2(J_{1,0})) = \mathbb{Z}_{25}$ , where  $\Sigma_2(J_{1,0})$  is the double branch cover of  $S^3$  along  $J_{1,0}$ . Since any double-slice knot has the first homology of it’s double branch cover split as  $G \oplus G$  this means  $g_{ds}(J_{1,0}) \geq 1$ . Therefore we have that  $\tilde{g}_{ds}(a(J, \tau, h)) \geq 1$ .

FIGURE 6. The decomposition of  $(K_n, \tau)$  with both half-axis.


In fact, we are able to build a family of results with a slightly different construction which allows for an arbitrary distinction of equivariant 4-genus, double-slice genus, and equivariant double-slice genus.

**Theorem 4.2.** *For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  there is a directed strongly invertible knot  $(K_n, \tau)$  such that:*

- (1)  $K_n$  is double-slice
- (2)  $K_n$  is equivariantly slice
- (3)  $\tilde{g}_{ds}(K_n, \tau) \geq n$ .

*Proof.* We will show the knot  $K_n$  pictured in Figure 1 satisfies the desired properties. To see that  $K_n$  is double-slice we note that  $K_n = (\delta_{20} \# -\delta_{20})^{2n}$ . Since  $\delta_{20} \# -\delta_{20}$  is double-slice, so is the  $2n$  connect sum of it with itself, i.e.  $K_n$ . Now we show that it is equivariantly slice. First note that  $\delta_{20}$  is the pretzel knot  $(3, -3, 2)$  and so, by Sakuma [20], is equivariantly slice.

Lastly, we show that  $\tilde{g}_{ds}(K_n, \tau, h_n) \geq n$ , regardless of the choice of  $n$ . To do this, we first see in Figure 6 that, regardless of which half-axis we pick, the knot we get from taking an arc of  $K_n$  union the half-axis is  $\#^n \delta_{20}$ . Thus by Theorem 1.1 we have that, for either choice of half-axis,  $\tilde{g}_{ds}(K_n, \tau, h_n) \geq g_{ds}(\#^n \delta_{20})$ . As discussed in Example 1, using signature invariants and the work of Orson-Powell [18] we can see  $g_{ds}(\#^n \delta_{20}) = n$ . Thus, we get our last property, that  $\tilde{g}_{ds}(K_n, \tau) \geq n$ .  $\square$

FIGURE 7. The knot  $8_9 \# 8_9$ .

*Example 3.* For a slightly different construction, we will show that the hyperbolic knot  $(S, \tau, h)$  depicted in Figure 8 is double-slice, equivariantly slice but not equivariantly double-slice. We will do this by showing the knot  $(K, \tau, h)$  depicted in

Figure 7 is double-slice and equivariantly slice then identifying an invertible concordance from  $(S, \tau, h)$  to  $(K, \tau, h)$ . Because the constructed concordance will be symmetric, this will show that  $(S, \tau, h)$  is also double-slice and equivariantly slice. We will then apply Theorem 1.1 to see that it is not equivariantly double-slice.

Since  $K$  is the connect sum of the knot  $8_{20}$  with itself, and  $8_{20}$  is fully amphichiral (meaning  $8_{20} = -8_{20}$ ), we have that  $K = 8_{20} \# 8_{20}$  and is therefore double-slice. Additionally  $8_{20}$  is slice, and therefore by Proposition 2.4,  $K = D(8_{20})$  is equivariantly slice.

By adding symmetric grabbers to  $8_9 \# 8_9$  to construct  $S$  as in Figure 8 one gets a symmetric invertible concordance from  $(S, \tau, h)$  to  $(K, \tau, h)$ . Therefore  $(S, \tau, h)$  is double-slice and equivariantly slice.

Lastly, to see that  $(S, \tau, h)$  is not equivariantly double-slice, we apply Theorem 4.1. The knot we get by adding a half axis and deleting an arc is  $8_{20}$ , which has  $g_{ds}(8_{20}) = 1$ . Therefore  $\tilde{g}_{ds}(K, \tau, h) \geq 1$  and therefore not equivariantly double-slice.




FIGURE 8. A knot  $S$  invertibly concordant to  $8_9 \# 8_9$ .

## 5. EQUIVARIANT SUPER-SLICE GENUS AND EQUIVARIANTLY KNOTTED 2-SPHERES AND 3-BALLS

In this section, we define a notion of equivariant super-slice genus and construct bounds similar to those for equivariant double-slice genus in Theorem 1.1. Additionally, we will use these lower bounds to construct an interesting family of directed strongly invertible knots  $(J_n, \tau, h)$  which are equivariantly super-slice but whose antipodes have equivariant super-slice genus at least  $n$ . We will use this fact in Section 5.2 to provide examples of unknotted symmetric 2-spheres which are equivariantly knotted as well as equivariant 3-balls which are not equivariantly isotopic to a standard equivariant 3-ball.

**5.1. Equivariant super-slice genus.** Similar to the double-slice genus, there is a concept of *super-slice genus* first defined by Wenzhao Chen in [6]. The *super-slice genus* of a knot  $K$ , denoted  $g_{ss}(K)$ , is the minimal genus of a slicing surface  $\Sigma$  for  $K$  such that  $\Sigma$  is symmetric about  $K$ . We call  $\Sigma$  a *superslicing surface* for  $K$ , and the handlebody it bounds a *superslicing handlebody*. That is to say,  $\Sigma \subset S^4$  is the

double of a surface  $F \subset B^4$  along its boundary  $K \subset S^3$ . In the initial conception of super-slice genus by Wenzhao Chen in [6],  $g_{ss}(K)$  is the genus of  $F$  as opposed to  $\Sigma$ , meaning it is exactly half of our conception. This change is made to keep the numbers consistent with those of the double-slice genus. If  $g_{ss}(K) = 0$  we say  $K$  is *super-slice*.

While the double-slice genus is a clear lower bound for the super-slice genus of a knot, in our work we will make use of a stronger lower bound proved by Chen in [6]:

**Theorem 5.1** (Chen). *Given a knot  $K$  let  $\Sigma$  be the two-fold branched cover of  $S^3$  along  $K$ . Let  $n$  be the minimum number of generators for  $H_1(\Sigma; \mathbb{Z})$ . Then  $n \leq g_{ss}(K)$ .*

In the same way we were able to define equivariant slicing handlebodies and surfaces we now define *equivariant superslicing handlebodies* and *equivariant superslicing surfaces*.

**Definition 5.2.** Given a strongly invertible knot  $(K, \tau, h)$  an *equivariant superslicing handlebody*  $H$  of  $(K, \tau, h)$  is a superslicing handlebody which is also an equivariant slicing handlebody. We call  $\partial H$  an *equivariant superslicing surface* for  $(K, \tau, h)$ .

The construction used in Section 3 to guarantee the existence of an equivariant slicing handlebody also guarantees the existence of an equivariant superslicing handlebody. Thus, we can define the *equivariant super-slice genus* of a directed strongly invertible knot  $(K, \tau, h)$ , denoted  $\tilde{g}_{ss}(K, \tau, h)$ .

**Definition 5.3.** The *equivariant super-slice genus* of a strongly invertible knot  $(K, \tau, h)$  is the minimal genus of an equivariant superslicing surface for  $(K, \tau, h)$ . If  $\tilde{g}_{ss}(K, \tau, h) = 0$  we say  $(K, \tau)$  is *equivariantly super-slice*.

As in the equivariant double-slice case, when considering a non-directed strongly invertible knot  $(K, \tau)$  we define the *equivariant super-slice genus* of  $(K, \tau)$  to be the minimum of the equivariant super-slice genus of the two directed strongly invertible knots obtainable from  $(K, \tau)$ .

Our primary bound for  $\tilde{g}_{ss}(K, \tau, h)$  follows exactly as in the equivariantly double-slice case:

**Theorem 5.4.** *Let  $(K, \tau, h)$  be a directed strongly invertible knot and  $K_0$  be an arc of  $K$  union  $h$ . Then  $g_{ss}(K_0) \leq \tilde{g}_{ss}(K, \tau, h)$ .*

The proof of this is exactly the proof of Theorem 1.1, just taking the equivariant slicing handlebody to be an equivariant superslicing handlebody. Using this we are able to construct an example in the super-slice case where the choice of half-axis matters. We show that the difference in super-slice genus between a directed strongly invertible knot and its antipode can be arbitrarily large. Before we show this, however, we need a good way to construct directed strongly invertible knots  $(K, \tau, h)$  which are equivariantly super-slice. Our primary construction follows as in [16] where Livingston and Meier explain how to construct super-slice knots by banding together two unknots; for a detailed account see Proposition 4.3 of [16]. Their discussion extends immediately to the equivariant case as follows:

**Proposition 5.5.** *Let  $(K, \tau, h)$  be a directed strongly invertible knot obtained by attaching band  $v$  to an unlink of two components  $U_1$  and  $U_2$  such that  $\tau(U_1) = U_2$  and  $\tau(v) = v$  with  $h = \text{fix}(\tau) \cap v$  being the co-core of the band  $v$ . If the band is relatively equivariantly homotopic to a trivial band in the complement of a neighborhood of  $U_1$  and  $U_2$ , then  $(K, \tau, h)$  is equivariantly super-slice.*

With this we are now able to prove Corollary 5.6.




FIGURE 9. Super-slice knot  $(J_1, \tau, h)$ .

**Corollary 5.6.** *There is a family of equivariantly super-slice directed strongly invertible knots  $(J_n, \tau, h)$  such that  $\tilde{g}_{ss}(a(J_n, \tau, h)) \geq 2n$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $(J_1, \tau, h)$  be the directed strongly invertible knot in Figure 9 and  $(J_n, \tau, h)$  be the  $n$ -fold equivariant connect sum of it with itself, see Figure 10 for  $(J_2, \tau, h)$ .




FIGURE 10. Super-slice knot  $(J_2, \tau, h)$

First we show that  $(J_n, \tau, h)$  is equivariantly super-slice for all  $n$ , starting with  $(J_1, \tau, h)$ . This follows from Proposition 5.5, with the homotopy shown explicitly in Figure 12. Since  $(J_n, \tau, h)$  is the  $n$ -fold equivariant connect sum of  $(J_1, \tau, h)$  with itself we get that  $(J_n, \tau, h)$  is also equivariantly super-slice by taking the equivariant connect sum of each of their slicing spheres.

Now we show that  $\tilde{g}_{ss}(a(J_n, \tau, h)) \geq 2n$ . By Theorem 5.4 we have that  $\tilde{g}_{ss}(a(J_n, \tau, h)) \geq g_{ss}(J_{n,0})$  where  $J_{n,0}$  is an arc of  $J_n$  union the arc of the fixed point set which is not  $h$ ,  $J_{1,0}$  is depicted in Figure 11. Letting  $\Sigma_n$  be the two-fold branched cover of  $S^3$  along  $J_{n,0}$  we can calculate  $H_1(\Sigma_n, \mathbb{Z})$ . Since  $J_{n,0}$  is the  $n$ -fold connect sum of  $J_{1,0}$  with itself we have that  $H_1(\Sigma_n, \mathbb{Z}) = (H_1(\Sigma_1, \mathbb{Z}))^n$ . We can calculate  $H_1(\Sigma_1, \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}_5^2$ , meaning  $H_1(\Sigma_n, \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}_5^{2n}$ . By Theorem 5.1 this means  $g_{ss}(J_n) \geq 2n$ . By Theorem 5.4  $\tilde{g}_{ss}(a(J_n, \tau, h)) \geq g_{ss}(J_{n,0})$ , therefore we also have  $\tilde{g}_{ss}(a(J_n, \tau, h)) \geq 2n$ . □




FIGURE 11.  $J_{1,0}$  formed from half of  $(J_1, \tau, h)$  union the complement of  $h$  in the fixed point set.





FIGURE 12. An equivariant band homotopy from  $(J_1, h, \tau)$  (left) to a trivial equivariant band connecting two components  $U_1$  and  $U_2$  of an unlink (right).

### 5.2. Equivariant isotopy and equivariantly knotted 2-spheres and 3-balls.

In the non-equivariant setting any two 3-balls in  $S^4$  are ambient isotopic [4]. Similarly, in the case of strongly invertible knots, Marumoto [28] proves that any two strongly invertible knots which are isotopic to the unknot are equivariantly isotopic to each other. We will show that this does not extend to equivariantly unknotted 2-spheres in  $(S^4, \tau)$ . To do this, we first define two *standard equivariant 3-ball's*  $B_{\pm}^3 \subset S^4$  to be  $B_{\pm}^3 = \{(0, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5) \in S^4 \mid \pm x_4 \geq 0\}$ . While the choice of  $x_1 = 0$  as opposed to  $x_2 = 0$  and  $\pm x_4 \geq 0$  as opposed to  $\pm x_3 \leq 0$  is somewhat arbitrary, one can check that making different choices yields equivariantly isotopic results. These 3-disk's intersect the equatorial  $S^3$  transversely in 2-disk  $D_{\pm}^2$  with  $\tau(D_{\pm}^2) = D_{\pm}^2$ , i.e. they are slicing handlebodies for the strongly invertible unknot, each one intersecting a different half-axis.

**Proposition 5.7.** *There exists an equivariant 3-ball in  $(S^4, \bar{\tau})$  which is not equivariantly isotopic to the standard equivariant 3-ball.*

*Proof.* Let  $B_+^3$  and  $B_-^3$  be the standard equivariant 3-ball's described above and  $B_{J_1}^3$  be the equivariant slicing 3-ball for  $(J_1, \tau, h)$  described in Corollary 5.6. Suppose there exists an equivariant isotopy  $\phi$  taking  $B_+^3$  to  $B_{J_1}^3$ . Then  $\phi(B_-^3)$  must also be

FIGURE 13. The knot  $(J_1, \tau, h) \# a(J_1, \tau, h)$ .

an equivariant 3-ball  $B$ . We will show that  $\phi(B_-^3)$  would be an equivariant slicing disk for  $a(J_1, \tau, h)$ , contradicting Corollary 5.6. Since  $\partial(B_-^3) = \partial(B_+^3)$  we have that  $\partial(\phi(B_-^3)) = \phi(\partial(B_-^3)) = \phi(\partial(B_+^3)) = \partial(B_{J_1}^3)$ . Thus  $\partial(\phi(B_-^3)) = \partial(B_{J_1}^3)$ , meaning  $\partial(\phi(B_-^3))$  intersects  $S^3$  transversely with intersection  $J_1$  and that  $\text{fix}(\tau|_{\phi(B_-^3)}) = D^2$  also intersects  $S^3$  transversely in  $h'$ , the arc of the fixed point set in  $S^3$  that is not  $h$ . Thus we can perform an equivariant isotopy away from  $\partial(\phi(B_-^3))$  and  $h'$  so that  $\phi(B_-^3)$  intersects  $S^3$  transversely. This means that  $\phi(B_-^3)$  is an equivariant slicing 3-ball for  $a(J_1, \tau, h)$ , contradicting Corollary 5.6.  $\square$

This means that, in contrast to the non-equivariant case, we may consider equivariantly knotted 3-balls. To further distinguish the equivariant setting in dimension 4, we create equivariant 2-spheres that are unknotted in the classical sense (bound a 3-ball) however do not bound any equivariant 3-ball, contrasting with the properties of strongly invertible knots in  $S^3$ .

**Proposition 5.8.** *There exists an equivariant 2-sphere in  $(S^4, \bar{\tau})$  which bounds a 3-ball but bounds no equivariant 3-ball.*

*Proof.* Consider the knot  $(J, \tau) = (J_1, \tau, h) \# a(J_1, \tau, h)$  depicted in Figure 13. We will construct a slicing 2-sphere,  $S^2$ , for  $K$  such that  $\tau(S^2) = S^2$  is not an equivariant slicing sphere, i.e.  $S^2$  will be an equivariant 2-sphere bounding a 3-ball but bounding no equivariant 3-ball, as desired. Following as in the proof of Corollary 5.6 one can see that  $(J, \tau)$  is not equivariantly double-slice (with either half-axis), so any equivariant 2-sphere it appears as a cross section of cannot bound an equivariant 3-ball. Thus, to complete the proof all we need is an equivariant 2-sphere for  $(J, \tau)$  which we know is unknotted. To construct this, consider the equivariant super slicing sphere  $S$  for  $(J_1, \tau, h)$  constructed in Figure 12. Note that  $a(J_1, \tau, h)$  also appears as a cross section of  $S$ , in this case  $S$  is no longer an equivariant slicing sphere but is still symmetric and unknotted. Therefore, taking the equivariant connect sum of these two spheres we get another symmetric sphere,  $S^2$ , whose intersection with  $S^3$  is  $(J_1, \tau, h) \# a(J_1, \tau, h)$ . Since this  $S^2$  is the connect sum of two unknotted sphere, it itself is unknotted. Thus, this  $S^2$  is a symmetric sphere bounding a 3-ball which does not bound any equivariant 3-ball.  $\square$

## 6. INTERNAL STABILIZATION REL BOUNDARY

In this section, we will describe how to use super-slice genus to obstruct isotopy of surfaces rel boundary and bound their 1-handle stabilization distance. First, we must define some terms. Let  $\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2 \subset B^4$  be two properly embedded surfaces with common boundary  $K$ . The *1-handle stabilization distance*  $d_1(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2)$  from  $\Sigma_1$  to  $\Sigma_2$  is the minimum number of orientation preserving ambient 1-handles  $\{h_i\}$  and  $\{h'_i\}$  needed so that  $\Sigma_1 \cup \{h_i\}$  is smoothly isotopic rel boundary to  $\Sigma_2 \cup \{h'_i\}$ , as defined in [17].

**Proposition 6.1.** *Let  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$  be properly embedded genus  $h$  surfaces with boundary  $K$  such that  $\Sigma_1 \cup_K -\Sigma_2 \subset (B^4, \Sigma_1) \cup_{(S^3, K)} (B^4, \Sigma_2)$  is unknotted. Then  $d_1(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2) \geq \frac{g_{ss}(K)}{2} - h$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $d = d_1(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2)$  and let  $\Sigma'_1 = \Sigma_1 \cup \{h_{1,i}\}_{i=1}^d$  and  $\Sigma'_2 = \Sigma_2 \cup \{h_{2,i}\}_{i=1}^d$  be stabilized surfaces that are isotopic rel boundary. Since  $\Sigma_1 \cup_K -\Sigma_2 \subset (B^4, \Sigma_1) \cup_{(S^3, K)} (B^4, \Sigma_2)$  is unknotted, the stabilized surface  $\Sigma' = \Sigma'_1 \cup_K -\Sigma'_2 \subset (B^4, \Sigma'_1) \cup_{(S^3, K)} (B^4, \Sigma'_2)$  is also unknotted as it is an unknotted handlebody  $\Sigma_1 \cup_K -\Sigma_2$  union handles. Since  $\Sigma'_1$  is isotopic rel boundary to  $\Sigma'_2$  we can isotope  $\Sigma'$  in  $S^4$  rel  $B^4$  (the hemisphere containing  $\Sigma'_1$ ) to get the double of  $(B^4, \Sigma'_1)$ . This means that the double of  $(B^4, \Sigma'_1)$  is a superslicing surface for  $K$  and therefore  $h + d \geq \frac{g_{ss}(K)}{2}$ , i.e.  $d \geq \frac{g_{ss}(K)}{2} - h$  (note we have  $\frac{g_{ss}(K)}{2}$ , not  $g_{ss}(K)$ , because we want the genus of the surface bounded by the knot, not it's double). Thus  $d_1(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2) \geq \frac{g_{ss}(K)}{2} - h$ .  $\square$

Letting  $K$  be double-slice we are able to use this to obstruct certain slice disks of  $K$  from being isotopic rel boundary:

**Corollary 6.2.** *Let  $K$  be double-slice with  $g_{ss}(K) = n$ , then  $K$  admits slice disks  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  such that  $d_1(D_1, D_2) \geq \frac{n}{2}$ .*

In [16] a survey of double-slice knots with 12 or fewer crossings is conducted and they find 20 knots which are double-slice and provide explicit description of the double slicing via bands. Of these 20 knots, there are 17 with Alexander polynomial not equal to 1, and are therefore not super-slice. Thus, for these 17 knots the band diagrams given in [16] depict slice discs which are not isotopic rel boundary. This fact has been proven for the first of these 17 knots,  $9_{46}$ , in a few other instances including by Miller and Powell [17] and Sunderberg and Swann [27].

Moreover, of the 17 with Alexander polynomial not equal to 1, the following 15 knots

$$9_{46}, 10_{99}, 10_{123}, 10_{155}, 11n_{74}, 12a_{427}, 12a_{1105}, 12n_{268}, \\ 12n_{397}, 12n_{414}, 12n_{605}, 12n_{636}, 12n_{706}, 12n_{817}, 12n_{838}$$

have  $H_1(\Sigma, \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}_n^2$  for some  $n$ , where  $\Sigma$  is the 2-fold branch cover of  $S^3$  along one of the knots  $K$ . Thus, if you take the connect sum  $\#^m K$ , where  $K$  is any of the 15 knots, you get that  $H_1(\Sigma, \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}_n^{2m}$ . By Theorem 5.1 this means that  $g_{ss}(\#^m K) \geq 2m$ . Combining this fact with Proposition 6.1 we get that any two slice disks arising from the same double slicing of  $\#^m K$  have stabilization distance at least  $m$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] Dave Auckly et al. “Isotopy of surfaces in 4-manifolds after a single stabilization”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 341 (2019), pp. 609–615.
- [2] R. İnanç Baykur and Nathan Sunukjian. “Knotted surfaces in 4-manifolds and stabilizations”. In: *Journal of Topology* 9.1 (Dec. 2015), pp. 215–231. ISSN: 1753-8424. DOI: 10.1112/jtopol/jtv039. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1112/jtopol/jtv039>.
- [3] Keegan Boyle and Ahmad Issa. “Equivariant 4-genera of strongly invertible and periodic knots”. In: *Journal of Topology* 15.3 (2022), pp. 1635–1674.
- [4] Jean Cerf. “Topologie de certains espaces de plongements”. In: *Bulletin de la Société Mathématique de France* 89 (1961), pp. 227–380.
- [5] Jae Cha and Ki Ko. “On equivariant slice knots”. In: *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 127.7 (1999), pp. 2175–2182.
- [6] Wenzhao Chen. “A lower bound for the double slice genus”. In: *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 374.4 (2021), pp. 2541–2558.
- [7] Irving Dai, Abhishek Mallick, and Matthew Stoffregen. “Equivariant knots and knot Floer homology”. In: *Journal of Topology* 16.3 (2023), pp. 1167–1236.
- [8] Alessio Di Prisa. “Equivariant algebraic concordance of strongly invertible knots”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.11895* (2023).
- [9] Alessio Di Prisa and Giovanni Framba. “A new invariant of equivariant concordance and results on 2-bridge knots”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08794* (2023).
- [10] Charles H Giffen. “The generalized Smith conjecture”. In: *American Journal of Mathematics* 88.1 (1966), pp. 187–198.
- [11] Gary Guth. “For Exotic Surfaces with Boundary, One Stabilization is Not Enough”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.11847* (2022).
- [12] Kyle Hayden. *An atomic approach to Wall-type stabilization problems*. 2023. arXiv: 2302.10127 [math.GT].
- [13] Kyle Hayden, Sungkyung Kang, and Anubhav Mukherjee. “One stabilization is not enough for closed knotted surfaces”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.01504* (2023).
- [14] András Juhász and Ian Zemke. “Stabilization distance bounds from link Floer homology”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.09158* (2018).
- [15] John Kalliongis and Darryl McCullough. “Orientation-reversing involutions on handlebodies”. In: *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 348.5 (1996), pp. 1739–1755.
- [16] Charles Livingston and Jeffrey Meier. “Doubly slice knots with low crossing number”. In: *New York J. Math* 21 (2015), pp. 1007–1026.
- [17] Allison N Miller and Mark Powell. “Stabilization distance between surfaces”. In: *L’Enseignement Mathématique* 65.3 (2020), pp. 397–440.
- [18] Patrick Orson and Mark Powell. “A lower bound for the doubly slice genus from signatures”. In: *New York Journal of Mathematics* 27 (2021), pp. 379–392.
- [19] Dale Rolfsen. *Knots and links*. Vol. 346. American Mathematical Soc., 2003.
- [20] Makoto Sakuma. “On strongly invertible knots”. In: *Algebraic and Topological Theories. Papers from the Symposium Dedicated to the Memory of Dr.*

- Takehiko Miyata (Kinosaki, 1984)*, Kinokuniya Company Ltd., Tokyo. 1986, pp. 176–196.
- [21] Oliver Singh. “Distances between surfaces in 4-manifolds”. In: *Journal of Topology* 13.3 (2020), pp. 1034–1057.
  - [22] PA Smith. “Transformations of finite period: IV. Dimensional parity”. In: *Annals of Mathematics* (1945), pp. 357–364.
  - [23] Paul A Smith. “Transformations of finite period”. In: *Annals of Mathematics* (1938), pp. 127–164.
  - [24] Paul A Smith. “Transformations of finite period. II”. In: *Annals of Mathematics* (1939), pp. 690–711.
  - [25] Paul A Smith. “Transformations of finite period. III: Newman’s theorem”. In: *Annals of Mathematics* (1941), pp. 446–458.
  - [26] De Witt Sumners. “Invertible knot cobordisms”. In: *Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici* 46.1 (1971), pp. 240–256.
  - [27] Isaac Sundberg and Jonah Swann. “Relative Khovanov–Jacobsson classes”. In: *Algebraic & Geometric Topology* 22.8 (2023), pp. 3983–4008.
  - [28] Marumoto Yoshihiko. “Relations between some conjectures in knot theory”. In: *Mathematics seminar notes*. Vol. 5. 3. 1977, pp. 377–388.