

# STABILITY OF KNOT EQUIVALENCE AT LOW REGULARITY, AND SYMMETRIC CRITICAL KNOTS FOR THE MÖBIUS ENERGY

SIMON BLATT, ALEXANDRA GILSBACH, PHILIPP REITER, AND HEIKO VON DER MOSEL

**ABSTRACT.** We present sufficient criteria for the equivalence of tame knots at low regularity. To this end, we introduce a localized version of Gromov's distortion for any closed path-connected subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . If two such sets have local Gromov distortion below a universal dimension-dependent constant  $g_n$  at some scale, and if their Hausdorff-distance is less than one quarter of that scale, we can show that the fundamental groups of their complements are isomorphic. In addition, we construct this isomorphism so that it restricts to the corresponding peripheral subgroups as an isomorphism as well.

Applied to the images of one-dimensional knots it follows that two knots are equivalent if their Hausdorff-distance is bounded in terms of the scale under which their local Gromov distortion is controlled. From that we deduce novel stability results for knot equivalence in the Lipschitz category, and in the setting of fractional Sobolev regularity below  $C^1$ . Moreover, we prove a compactness theorem of knot equivalence classes with respect to weak  $W^{3/2,2}$ -convergence.

As an application we show that the Möbius energy introduced by O'Hara [32] can be minimized within arbitrary prime knot classes under a symmetry constraint, and that these minimizers are in fact critical points and therefore smooth and even real analytic. In particular, in every torus knot class there are at least two distinct critical knots for the Möbius energy.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Motivation	1
1.2. Isomorphic fundamental groups via localized distortion	2
1.3. Stability of knot equivalence	3
1.4. Symmetric critical points for scale-invariant knot energies	4
1.5. Strategy and outline of the paper	5
2. Sets with local distortion below a quarter circle	6
3. Pseudo-gradient flow for the distance function	9
4. Isomorphisms of fundamental groups	12
5. Stability of knot equivalence	15
6. Harmonic substitution	17
7. Weak fractional compactness	23
8. Symmetric critical knots	29
Acknowledgements	31
References	31

## 1. INTRODUCTION

**1.1. Motivation.** The notion of *ambient isotopy* is used in classical knot theory to distinguish between different knot classes. It follows from a result of Fisher [20, Theorem 15] that two knots  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in C^0(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$  are ambiently isotopic if there exists an orientation preserving homeomorphism  $h : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  such that  $h \circ \gamma_1 = \gamma_2$ . In concrete applications it might be hard to come up with such a homeomorphism, but in the smooth category one has the following

useful stability theorem which to the best of our knowledge has first been explicitly stated and proven by Diao et al. who give also credit to Ken Millet.

**Theorem A** ( $C^1$ -isotopy stability [18, Lemma 3.2], [35], [16, Proposition 3.1]). *For any immersed embedded curve  $\gamma \in C^1(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$  there is some number  $\epsilon_\gamma > 0$  such that all curves  $\eta \in C^1(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$  with  $\|\gamma - \eta\|_{C^1} < \epsilon_\gamma$  are embedded and ambiently isotopic to  $\gamma$ .*

This result also follows from the fact that any  $C^1$ -isotopy can be extended to an ambient isotopy in arbitrary dimensions and co-dimensions which was proven<sup>1</sup> by the first author in [1]. The  $C^1$ -stability of isotopy is used quite frequently in *geometric knot theory* where one produces and investigates specific knot representatives as minimizers or critical points of so-called knot energies, to obtain more information about their knot classes; see, e.g., the surveys [4, 38–41] and the many references therein. However, for the most interesting and mathematically more challenging scale-invariant knot energies such as the Möbius energy<sup>2</sup> introduced by O’Hara [32] the underlying energy spaces do *not* embed into  $C^1$ . Therefore, one cannot expect, e.g., that minimizing sequences for these energies subconverge in  $C^1$ , so that it is a priori not clear if the limit curves still belong to the prescribed knot class. One of our goals in the present paper is therefore to develop criteria for stability of knot classes at low regularity.

For that we consider the slightly weaker notion of *knot equivalence* instead of ambient isotopy. Two knots  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in C^0(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$  are said to be *equivalent*, denoted by  $\gamma_1 \sim \gamma_2$ , if and only if there is a homeomorphism  $h : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  such that  $h(\gamma_1(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})) = \gamma_2(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})$ ; cf. [14, p. 4]. It is known, e.g., that the trefoil knot is not ambiently isotopic to its mirror image; see [9, Theorem 3.39 (b)]. The corresponding reflection, however, is an orientation reversing homeomorphism of  $\mathbb{R}^3$  mapping the image of the trefoil knot onto its mirror image, so that the two knots are equivalent. So, there are more (ambient) isotopy types than knot equivalence classes in knot space. On the other hand, if two tame arclength parametrized knots are equivalent, then one can show that they are either ambiently isotopic, or one is ambiently isotopic to the other one’s mirror image.

Gordon and Luecke studied in [24] the fundamental groups of the knots’ complements, also called *knot groups*, and their peripheral subgroups. Combining their work with results of Waldhausen [43] yields the following sufficient criteria for knot equivalence.

**Theorem B** (Knot equivalence via knot complements [24, 43]). *Let  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in C^0(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$  be two tame knots.*

- (i) *If their complements  $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \gamma_i(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , are homeomorphic, then  $\gamma_1 \sim \gamma_2$ .*
- (ii) *If  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$  are prime and their knot groups  $\pi_1(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \gamma_i(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}))$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , are isomorphic, then  $\gamma_1 \sim \gamma_2$ .*
- (iii) *If the knot groups  $\pi_1(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \gamma_i(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}))$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , are isomorphic and if this isomorphism induces isomorphic peripheral subgroups  $P_{\gamma_i}$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , then  $\gamma_1 \sim \gamma_2$  even if the  $\gamma_i$  are composite knots.*

Recall that for a set  $M \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  with path-connected complement  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M$  two closed loops  $c_1, c_2 \in C^0(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M)$  are equivalent if they are homotopic, and that the fundamental group  $\pi_1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M)$  consists of the respective equivalence classes. The group structure is induced by concatenation of closed loops containing a fixed base point in  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M$ . The peripheral subgroup  $P_M \subset \pi_1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M)$  then consists of all equivalence classes that possess representative loops arbitrarily close to  $M$ .

**1.2. Isomorphic fundamental groups via localized distortion.** In order to apply the results on knot equivalence, i.e., Theorem B, under low regularity assumptions we are going to

<sup>1</sup>For a proof in the simpler setting of the  $C^2$ -category see [26, Chapter 8].

<sup>2</sup>In addition to scale-invariance the Möbius energy is also invariant under Möbius transformations of the ambient Euclidean space [21, Theorem 2.1], which lent this energy that name.

use a localized version of Gromov's distortion [25]. For a closed, path-connected set  $M \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  its *distortion* is defined as the quantity

$$(1.1) \quad \delta(M) := \sup_{\substack{x, y \in M \\ x \neq y}} \frac{d_M(x, y)}{|x - y|} \geq 1,$$

where  $d_M(x, y)$  denotes the *intrinsic distance* between the points  $x, y$ , i.e., the length of the shortest curve in  $M$  connecting  $x$  with  $y$ . It is well-known that the circle  $c_{2\pi}$  satisfies  $\delta(c_{2\pi}) = \frac{\pi}{2}$  uniquely minimizing the distortion among all closed curves (see [29, Proposition 2.1] for a nice and short proof of that fact). Moreover, any non-trivial tame knot  $\gamma \in C^0(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$  has distortion at least  $\frac{5\pi}{3}$ , which was shown by Denne and Sullivan in [17]. So, distortion detects knottedness, but it is not useful to distinguish between different knots. For example, distortion cannot prevent the pull-tight phenomenon where knotted subarcs of a curve can be scaled down to vanish in the limit without any effect on the curve's distortion [31]. In addition, O'Hara constructed infinitely many different prime knots with a uniform upper bound on their distortion [33, Theorem 3.5]. On the other hand, Gromov asked if there is a universal bound on the distortion under which *every* knot type can be represented. This was answered to the negative by Pardon in [34, Theorems 1.1 & 1.2] who also points out [34, p. 638] that there are even wild knots with finite distortion such as [14, Figure 5].

Nevertheless, a universal bound on a localized version of distortion together with a comparable  $L^\infty$ -distance guarantees knot equivalence as we will see in Corollary 1.3 below.

**Definition 1.1.** *For a nonempty closed, path-connected set  $M \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $r > 0$  we define the local distortion of  $M$  at scale  $r$  as*

$$(1.2) \quad \delta(M, r) := \sup_{\substack{x, y \in M \\ 0 < |x - y| \leq 2r}} \frac{d_M(x, y)}{|x - y|}.$$

*We say that  $M$  has local distortion strictly below  $\varepsilon > 0$  if there is some  $r_M > 0$  such that  $\delta(M, r_M) < \varepsilon$ , and we call any such  $r_M > 0$  an admissible scale.*

Our first result on fundamental groups is stated for general subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and might therefore be of independent interest. Its formulation uses the dimension-dependent constant

$$(1.3) \quad g_n := \sqrt{\frac{2n-2}{n}} \arcsin \sqrt{\frac{n}{2n-2}} \quad \text{for } n \geq 3,$$

converging in a strictly decreasing manner to  $g_\infty := \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{8}}$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Notice that  $g_3 = \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} \arcsin \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} = \frac{\sqrt{32}}{\sqrt{27}} g_\infty$  equals the distortion of one third of a circle, whereas  $g_\infty$  is the distortion of a quarter circle.

**Theorem 1.2** (Isomorphic fundamental groups). *Let  $n \geq 3$ . If two nonempty closed, path-connected sets  $M_i \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  with path-connected complements  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_i$  have local distortion strictly below  $g_n$  at scales  $r_{M_i} > 0$  for  $i = 1, 2$ , and satisfy*

$$(1.4) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(M_1, M_2) < \frac{1}{4} \min\{r_{M_1}, r_{M_2}\},$$

*then there exists an isomorphism  $J : \pi_1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_1) \rightarrow \pi_1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_2)$  such that its restriction to the peripheral subgroup  $P_{M_1} \subset \pi_1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_1)$  maps  $P_{M_1}$  isomorphically onto  $P_{M_2} \subset \pi_1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_2)$ .*

**1.3. Stability of knot equivalence.** As an immediate consequence of Theorem 1.2 in combination with part (iii) of Theorem B we obtain a simple sufficient geometric criterion for knot equivalence.

**Corollary 1.3** (Knot equivalence via local distortion). *Two tame knots  $\gamma_i \in C^0(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$  with local distortion  $\delta(\gamma_i(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}), r_{\gamma_i}) < g_3$  at scales  $r_{\gamma_i} > 0$  for  $i = 1, 2$ , and  $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\gamma_1(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}), \gamma_2(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})) < \frac{1}{4} \min\{r_{\gamma_1}, r_{\gamma_2}\}$ , are equivalent.*

Notice that a small Hausdorff-distance, even an arbitrarily small  $L^\infty$ -distance  $\|\gamma_1 - \gamma_2\|_{L^\infty}$  *alone* does not guarantee knot equivalence: One can insert small knotted arcs at any scale to produce highly complex knots arbitrarily close to the round circle. Essential is the combination of controlled local distortion at some scales and the Hausdorff-distance bounded in terms of these scales. With Corollary 1.3 we can prove the following stability of knot equivalence in the Lipschitz category.

**Corollary 1.4** (Lipschitz stability of knot equivalence). *Let  $\gamma : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  be an arclength parametrized tame knot with local distortion  $\delta(\gamma(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}), r_\gamma) < g_3$  at scale  $r_\gamma > 0$ . Then for all  $h \in C^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$  there exists  $\epsilon_{\gamma,h} > 0$  such that  $\gamma_\epsilon := \gamma + \epsilon h$  is an immersed knot equivalent to  $\gamma$  for all  $|\epsilon| \leq \epsilon_{\gamma,h}$ .*

Note that Lipschitz continuous curves are differentiable a.e., and we call such curves *immersed* if  $v_\gamma := \text{essinf}_{u \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} |\gamma'(u)| > 0$ .

For  $C^1$ -knots  $\gamma$  one has, of course,  $\delta(\gamma(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}), r) \rightarrow 1$  as  $r \rightarrow 0$ , so that one finds a scale  $r_\gamma$  sufficiently small so that  $\gamma$  has local distortion strictly below  $g_3$ . In fact, this observation implies a weaker version of Theorem A where ambient isotopy is replaced by knot equivalence. But we will prove here that a fractional Sobolev regularity (below  $C^1$ ) suffices, which leads to the following fractional stability result for knot equivalence.

**Corollary 1.5** (Fractional stability of knot equivalence). *For any arclength parametrized knot  $\gamma \in W^{\frac{3}{2},2}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$  there exists  $\epsilon_\gamma > 0$  such that every arclength parametrized curve  $\eta \in B_{\epsilon_\gamma}(\gamma) \subset W^{\frac{3}{2},2}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$  is a knot equivalent to  $\gamma$ .*

The preceding statement can be shown to hold true also if  $\gamma$  and  $\eta$  are only immersed and not necessarily arclength parametrized, but we will not discuss the details here. Open at this point, however, is if the bound on local distortion in Corollaries 1.3 and 1.4 already implies tameness of the knots, or some improved regularity.

**1.4. Symmetric critical points for scale-invariant knot energies.** The fractional Sobolev space  $W^{\frac{3}{2},2}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$  is the natural energy space for the *Möbius energy*

$$(1.5) \quad E_{\text{Möb}}(\gamma) := \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \left( \frac{1}{|\gamma(s) - \gamma(t)|^2} - \frac{1}{d_\gamma(\gamma(s), \gamma(t))^2} \right) |\gamma'(s)| |\gamma'(t)| \, ds dt.$$

Indeed, an arclength parametrized curve  $\gamma : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  has finite Möbius energy if and only if  $\gamma$  is embedded and of class  $W^{\frac{3}{2},2}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$  as shown in [2] (see [23, Theorem 3.2 (i)] for an explicit a priori bound on the fractional seminorm in terms of the energy). Freedman et al. managed to use the Möbius invariance of  $E_{\text{Möb}}$  to find minimizing knots in any given prime knot class [21, Theorem 4.3]. Critical points of the Möbius energy were shown to be smooth and even real-analytic [5, 8] without using the invariance of  $E_{\text{Möb}}$  under Möbius transformations. But how can we find critical knots possibly different from the absolute minimizers? One option is to use symmetry as carried out in [23] for O'Hara's energies above scale-invariance whose energy spaces *do* embed into  $C^1$ .

As in that paper we consider here for the Möbius energy a discrete rotational symmetry. To be more precise, for  $p \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $p \geq 2$ , we call a curve  $\gamma \in C^0(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$  (*p-rotationally symmetric*) if and only if

$$(1.6) \quad \text{Rot}_{\frac{2\pi}{p}} \circ \gamma(s - \frac{1}{p}) = \gamma(s) \quad \text{for all } s \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z},$$

where  $\text{Rot}_\beta \in SO(3)$  denotes the rotation about a fixed axis, say, the  $e_3$ -coordinate axis, with rotation angle  $\beta$ . Define for a given knot equivalence class  $\mathcal{K}$  the (*p-rotationally symmetric subset*)

$$(1.7) \quad \Sigma_p(\mathcal{K}) := \{\eta \in C^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3) : |\eta'| > 0 \text{ a.e., } [\eta] = \mathcal{K}, \eta \text{ satisfies (1.6)}\}.$$

**Theorem 1.6** (Symmetric critical prime knots). *If the symmetric subset  $\Sigma_p(\mathcal{K})$  of a prime knot equivalence class  $\mathcal{K}$  contains a knot with finite Möbius energy or, equivalently, a  $W^{3/2,2}$ -knot, then there exists an arclength parametrized knot  $\gamma \in C^\omega(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3) \cap \Sigma_p(\mathcal{K})$  such that*

$$(1.8) \quad E_{\text{Möb}}(\gamma) = \inf_{\Sigma_p(\mathcal{K})} E_{\text{Möb}}(\cdot),$$

*and  $\gamma$  is a critical knot, i.e.,  $dE_{\text{Möb}}(\gamma)[h] = 0$  for all  $h \in W^{\frac{3}{2},2}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ . Moreover, all torus knot classes  $\mathcal{T}(a, b)$  for co-prime  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0, \pm 1\}$  contain at least two different critical knots for the Möbius energy.*

One may prove a similar result for other scale-invariant knot energies with energy spaces  $W^{1+1/p,p}$  such as those from O'Hara's family; cf. [6, 33].

It might be easier to check the symmetries for polygonal curves, so instead of a knot with finite Möbius energy we might require in Theorem 1.6 that  $\Sigma_p(\mathcal{K})$  contains a polygonal knot. Indeed, smoothing the corners such that the symmetry is preserved yields an immersed embedded smooth curve in  $\Sigma_p(\mathcal{K})$  which has finite Möbius energy due to [2] and the energy's invariance under reparametrization. We do not know, on the other hand, if it suffices to assume in Theorem 1.6 only that  $\mathcal{K}$  is tame and that  $\Sigma_p(\mathcal{K})$  is nonempty.

We mentioned before that two equivalent arclength parametrized tame knots  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  are either already ambiently isotopic, or  $\gamma_1$  is ambiently isotopic to the mirror image  $\gamma_2^*$  of  $\gamma_2$ . The  $O(3)$ -invariance of the Möbius energy therefore allows us to strengthen Theorem 1.6 to ambient isotopy classes.

**Corollary 1.7** (Symmetric critical prime knots in ambient isotopy classes). *Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be an ambient isotopy class of prime knots and  $\Sigma_p(\mathcal{K})$  be the class of  $p$ -rotationally symmetric regular Lipschitz curves whose ambient isotopy class equals  $\mathcal{K}$ . If  $\Sigma_p(\mathcal{K})$  contains a knot of finite Möbius energy, then there is an arclength parametrized minimizing real analytic knot in  $\Sigma_p(\mathcal{K})$  such that (1.8) holds, and this knot is  $E_{\text{Möb}}$ -critical. If, more specifically,  $\mathcal{K}$  equals the ambient isotopy class of torus knots,  $\mathcal{T}(a, b)$  for co-prime  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0, \pm 1\}$ , then there are at least two such  $E_{\text{Möb}}$ -critical knots.*

Kim and Kusner use in [27] symmetric criticality to construct  $E_{\text{Möb}}$ -critical torus knots (even with explicit formulas for their energy values). Their numerical experiments suggest, that for (co-prime) parameters  $a, b$  with  $|a|, |b| > 2$  these critical points seize to be stable. Analytically, this remains an open question.

**1.5. Strategy and outline of the paper.** In Section 2 we analyze the effects of the smallness condition on local distortion on general closed, path-connected subsets  $M \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ . For each  $x$  near (but not in)  $M$  we find a direction that “points away from  $M$ ”. These directions are glued together in Section 3 with a partition of unity to construct a kind of pseudo-gradient vector field for the distance function  $\text{dist}(\cdot, M)$ . We solve uniquely and globally two different flow equations with respect to this vector field to define homotopies in the complement  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M$  of  $M$ . These mappings are then used in Section 4 for  $M := M_1$  and  $M_2$  in combination with the sets' controlled local distortion to construct an isomorphism between the fundamental groups  $\pi_1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_1)$  and  $\pi_1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_2)$  as stated in Theorem 1.2.

We use in Section 5 the immediate Corollary 1.3 to prove the Lipschitz stability and fractional stability of knot equivalence, i.e., Corollaries 1.4 and 1.5. The first one relies on the fact that for curves the smallness condition on local distortion is stable with respect to Lipschitz perturbations. For the fractional stability we recall in Corollary 5.2 that a small local fractional semi-norm of the tangent implies a local bilipschitz estimate, which can be turned into a local distortion bound for embeddings.

More analytical work is required for the existence of symmetric  $E_{\text{Möb}}$ -critical prime knots as stated in Theorem 1.6. Since minimizing sequences converge only weakly in  $W^{\frac{3}{2},2}$  to a limit curve, we can *not* rely on the (strong)  $W^{\frac{3}{2},2}$ -stability of Corollary 1.5 to guarantee the prescribed knot equivalence class in the limit. Nevertheless, the limiting curve  $\gamma$  has finite Möbius energy



because of the energy's lower-semicontinuity, so that we have an arclength parametrized tame  $W^{\frac{3}{2},2}$ -knot  $\gamma$  as a limit. Exactly as in the proof of Corollary 1.5 we therefore find a scale at which  $\gamma$  has its local distortion strictly below the universal constant  $g_3$ . The same holds true for all members of the minimizing sequence, because each of them is an arclength parametrized  $W^{\frac{3}{2},2}$ -knot as well. But the  $L^\infty$ -convergence of that sequence towards  $\gamma$  might be too slow to satisfy the assumptions of Corollary 1.3 for any sequence member. In other words, the scales at which the members of the minimizing sequence have local distortion below  $g_3$  might decay to zero much faster than their  $L^\infty$ -distance to  $\gamma$ . The analytic reason for that behaviour lies in the fact that we do *not* have uniform absolute continuity of the integrals defining the fractional semi-norms of the tangents of the minimizing sequence. So, we are led to study possible concentrations in these semi-norms to cut them out, and replace the corresponding subarcs of the curves by straight segments. Since such a substitution generally destroys the  $W^{\frac{3}{2},2}$ -regularity<sup>3</sup>, a careful analytic investigation of that procedure based on some subtle BMO-type estimates is required in order to keep the local distortion of these modified curves under control. This analysis is carried out in Section 6.

In Section 7 we interpret the fractional semi-norms of sequences of  $W^{\frac{3}{2},2}$ -knots as Radon measures on  $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  to pass to a weak limiting Radon measure in order to analyze its set of concentration points. At a carefully chosen scale around these concentration points we apply the cutting procedure of Section 6 to members of the minimizing sequence with sufficiently large index. The result is a weak fractional compactness theorem in the set of symmetric, arclength parametrized  $W^{\frac{3}{2},2}$ -knots (see Theorem 7.1), which might be of independent interest. This is the main tool in the existence proof for symmetric  $E_{\text{Möb}}$ -minimizing knots in Section 8. A simple symmetrization argument which uses the invariance of the Möbius energy under rotations then leads to the fact that these minimizing knots are also critical points for  $E_{\text{Möb}}$ , and therefore are real analytic. This finalizes the proof of Theorem 1.6.

## 2. SETS WITH LOCAL DISTORTION BELOW A QUARTER CIRCLE

Let  $M \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  for  $n \geq 3$  be a nonempty closed path-connected set with local distortion strictly below the dimension-dependent constant  $g_n$  defined in (1.3). Let  $r_M = r_M(n)$  be an admissible scale. Since the function  $g(x) := \frac{x/2}{\sin(x/2)}$  is strictly increasing on  $[0, \pi]$  with  $\lim_{x \searrow 0} g(x) = 1$  and  $\lim_{x \nearrow \pi} g(x) = \frac{\pi}{2} > g_n > \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{8}} > 1$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}, n \geq 3$ , there exist unique angles  $0 < \alpha_M < \beta_n < \pi$  such that  $1 \leq g(\alpha_M) = \delta(M, r_M) < g_n = g(\beta_n) < \frac{\pi}{2}$ . We call  $\alpha_M$  (which depends on the (non-unique) scale  $r_M$ ) the *distortion angle* of  $M$ , and by direct computation,

$$(2.1) \quad \beta_n = 2 \arcsin \sqrt{\frac{n}{2n-2}}.$$

Our first lemma bounds the set of directions generated by a given point  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M$  with  $0 < d_x := \text{dist}(x, M) < r_M$  and all points  $z \in M$  close to  $x$ . More precisely, abbreviate for  $\epsilon > 0$  this nonempty set of directions by

$$(2.2) \quad \Sigma_\epsilon(x) := \left\{ \frac{x-z}{|x-z|} : z \in B_{(1+\epsilon)d_x}(x) \cap M \right\} \subset \mathbb{S}^{n-1}.$$

**Lemma 2.1** (Diameter bound on set of directions). *Let  $M \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be a non-empty, closed and path-connected set satisfying  $\delta(M, r_M) < g_n$  at some scale  $r_M > 0$  with distortion angle  $\alpha_M = g^{-1}(\delta(M, r_M)) \in (0, \beta_n)$ . Then for each  $\alpha \in (\alpha_M, \beta_n)$  there is some  $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(\alpha) \in (0, 1)$  such that*

$$(2.3) \quad \text{diam}_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \Sigma_\epsilon(x) < \alpha \quad \text{for all } \epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0), x \in B_{\frac{r_M}{1+\epsilon}}(M) \setminus M.$$

<sup>3</sup>For arclength parametrized embedded curves,  $W^{\frac{3}{2},2}$ -regularity is equivalent to finite Möbius energy according to [2]. Due to [21, Corollary 1.3], such a curve has a local bilipschitz constant (cf. Footnote 9), arbitrarily close to 1. However, replacing a subarc of a curve by a line is likely to produce sharp corners at its endpoints which results in a bilipschitz constant strictly larger than 1.

Before proving this notice that the spherical version of Jung's theorem [15, Theorem 2] implies that  $\Sigma_\epsilon(x)$  is contained in a geodesic ball of radius

$$(2.4) \quad R(\alpha) := \arcsin \left( \sqrt{\frac{2n-2}{n}} \sin \frac{\alpha}{2} \right) < \frac{\pi}{2}.$$

**Corollary 2.2** (Common direction away from  $M$ ). *Under the assumptions of Lemma 2.1 one finds for each  $\alpha \in (\alpha_M, \beta_n)$  and  $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0(\alpha))$  and for every  $x \in B_{\frac{r_M}{1+\epsilon}}(M) \setminus M$  some unit vector  $e_x \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  such that  $\Sigma_\epsilon(x)$  is contained in the geodesic ball on  $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  of radius  $R(\alpha)$  centered at  $e_x$ . In particular,*

$$(2.5) \quad \left\langle \frac{x-z}{|x-z|}, e_x \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n} \geq \cos R(\alpha) > 0 \quad \text{for all } z \in B_{(1+\epsilon)d_x}(x) \cap M.$$

*Proof of Lemma 2.1.* Assume that the assertion is wrong. Then there is some  $\alpha \in (\alpha_M, \beta_n)$  such that for any  $\epsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$  we may find some  $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0)$  and some  $x \in B_{\frac{r_M}{1+\epsilon}}(M) \setminus M$  such that  $\text{diam}_{\mathbb{S}^n} \Sigma_\epsilon(x) \geq \alpha$ . In particular,  $d_x = \text{dist}(x, M) > 0$ . Thus, we may find  $z_1, z_2 \in B_{(1+\epsilon)d_x}(x) \cap M$  with

$$(2.6) \quad \pi \geq \chi := \angle \left( \frac{x-z_1}{|x-z_1|}, \frac{x-z_2}{|x-z_2|} \right) \geq \alpha.$$

Since  $B_{d_x}(x) \cap M = \emptyset$ , the images of all curves  $c : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$  with  $c(0) = z_1$  and  $c(1) = z_2$  are contained in  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{d_x}(x)$  so that their lengths  $\mathcal{L}(c)$  satisfy by our assumption (2.6)

$$(2.7) \quad \mathcal{L}(c) \geq \mathcal{H}^1(c([0, 1])) \geq \mathcal{H}^1(P_{d_x} \circ c([0, 1])) \geq \text{dist}_{\partial B_{d_x}(x)}(P_{d_x}(c(0)), P_{d_x}(c(1))) \stackrel{(2.6)}{\geq} \chi d_x,$$

where  $P_{d_x}(z) := x + d_x(z - x)/|z - x|$  for  $z \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{d_x}(x)$  denotes the next-point projection onto the sphere  $\partial B_{d_x}(x)$ . Notice that this projection is Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant 1 on  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{d_x}(x)$ , thus decreasing the Hausdorff-measure, which leads to the second inequality in (2.7) due to [19, Theorem 2.8]. Now (2.7) implies  $d_M(z_1, z_2) \geq \chi d_x$ , whereas

$$\begin{aligned} |z_2 - z_1| &\leq d_x \left| \frac{x-z_1}{|x-z_1|} - \frac{x-z_2}{|x-z_2|} \right| + |x-z_1| \left| 1 - \frac{d_x}{|x-z_1|} \right| + |x-z_2| \left| 1 - \frac{d_x}{|x-z_2|} \right| \\ &\leq 2d_x \sin \frac{\chi}{2} + 2\epsilon d_x \leq 2(1+\epsilon)d_x < 2r_M, \end{aligned}$$

which for  $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$  for sufficiently small  $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(\alpha)$  leads to the contradiction

$$\delta(M, r_M) \geq \frac{d_M(z_1, z_2)}{|z_2 - z_1|} \geq \frac{\chi/2}{\sin \frac{\chi}{2} + \epsilon} \geq \frac{\alpha/2}{\sin \frac{\alpha}{2} + \epsilon} > \frac{\alpha_M/2}{\sin \frac{\alpha_M}{2}} = g(\alpha_M) = \delta(M, r_M),$$

where we also used that the function  $s \mapsto \frac{s/2}{\sin \frac{s}{2} + \epsilon}$  is non-decreasing on  $[0, \pi]$  for any  $\epsilon > 0$ .  $\square$

In Corollary 2.2 we established for every  $x \in B_{\frac{r_M}{1+\epsilon}}(M) \setminus M$  a common direction  $e_x \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  pointing away from  $M$ . This unit vector keeps this property under small perturbations of the base point  $x$ .

**Corollary 2.3** (Locally uniform common direction). *Let  $M \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be a non-empty, closed and path-connected set with  $g(\alpha_M) = \delta(M, r_M) < g_n$  at some scale  $r_M > 0$  with distortion angle  $\alpha_M \in (0, \beta_n)$  and  $\beta_n$  as in (2.1). Then for each  $\alpha \in (\alpha_M, \beta_n)$  there is  $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(\alpha) > 0$  such that the following holds: For all  $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0)$  and  $x \in B_{\frac{r_M}{1+\epsilon}}(M) \setminus M$  there exists  $e_x \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  and  $\sigma_0 = \sigma_0(\alpha, \epsilon) \in (0, 1)$  such that for all  $\sigma \in (0, \sigma_0]$  one has the inclusion*

$$(2.8) \quad B_{\sigma d_x}(x) \subset B_{r_M}(M) \setminus M,$$

and

$$(2.9) \quad \left\langle \frac{y-z}{|y-z|}, e_x \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n} \geq \frac{1}{2} \cos R(\alpha) > 0 \quad \text{for all } y \in B_{\sigma d_x}(x), z \in B_{(1+\sigma)d_y}(y) \cap M,$$

where  $R(\alpha)$  is given in (2.4).

*Proof.* Take  $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0)$  for  $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(\alpha)$  from Lemma 2.1. For all  $0 < \sigma \leq \frac{\epsilon}{4} < \frac{\epsilon_0}{4} < \frac{1}{4}$  and  $y \in B_{\sigma d_x}(x)$  one has

$$0 < (1 - \sigma)d_x < d_y = \text{dist}(y, M) < (1 + \sigma)d_x < \frac{1+\sigma}{1+\epsilon}r_M < r_M,$$

which implies (2.8). Moreover,

$$(2.10) \quad B_{(1+\sigma)d_y}(y) \subset B_{[(1+\sigma)^2+\sigma]d_x}(x) \subset B_{(1+4\sigma)d_x}(x) \subset B_{(1+\epsilon)d_x}(x).$$

Estimate for  $y \in B_{\sigma d_x}(x)$  and  $z \in B_{(1+\sigma)d_y}(y) \cap M$

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{x-z}{|x-z|} - \frac{y-z}{|y-z|} \right| &= \left| \frac{(x-z)|y-z| - (y-z)|x-z|}{|x-z||y-z|} \right| \leq \frac{1}{|x-z|} (|(x-z) - (y-z)| + ||y-z| - |x-z||) \\ &\leq 2 \frac{|x-y|}{|x-z|} < 2 \frac{\sigma d_x}{d_x} = 2\sigma, \end{aligned}$$

because  $|x-z| \geq d_x$  for all  $z \in M$ . Thus, by (2.10) and (2.5) in Corollary 2.2,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \frac{y-z}{|y-z|}, e_x \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n} &= \left\langle \frac{x-z}{|x-z|}, e_x \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n} - \left\langle \frac{x-z}{|x-z|} - \frac{y-z}{|y-z|}, e_x \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n} \\ &\stackrel{(2.10), (2.5)}{>} \cos R(\alpha) - 2\sigma \geq \frac{1}{2} \cos R(\alpha) > 0 \end{aligned}$$

if  $\sigma \leq \sigma_0(\alpha, \epsilon) := \frac{1}{4} \min\{\cos R(\alpha), \epsilon\}$ .  $\square$

By means of a suitable covering and a partition of unity we can use the unit vectors  $e_x \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  of Corollary 2.3 to construct a globally defined smooth vector field that near the set  $M$  points away from  $M$ .

**Proposition 2.4** (Vector field pointing away from  $M$ ). *For a non-empty, closed and path-connected set  $M \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  with  $\delta(M, r_M) < g_n$  at scale  $r_M > 0$  there exists a vectorfield  $V \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$  such that for all  $y \in B_{r_M}(M) \setminus M$*

$$(2.11) \quad \left\langle \frac{y-z}{|y-z|}, V(y) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n} \geq 1 \quad \text{for all } z \in M \text{ with } |z-y| = d_y = \text{dist}(y, M).$$

*Proof.* Let  $\delta(M, r_M) = g(\alpha_M) < g_n$  and fix  $\alpha := \frac{1}{2}(\alpha_M + \beta_n) \in (\alpha_M, \beta_n)$ , where  $\beta_n$  is given in (2.1). For this particular  $\alpha$  let  $\epsilon_0(\alpha) > 0$  be the number of Corollary 2.3. For any  $x \in U_0 := B_{r_M}(M) \setminus M$  there exists  $\varepsilon_x \in (0, \epsilon_0(\alpha))$  such that  $x \in U_{\varepsilon_x} := B_{\frac{r_M}{1+\varepsilon_x}}(M) \setminus M$ . According to Corollary 2.3 there exists  $e_x \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  and  $\sigma_0 = \sigma_0(\alpha, \varepsilon_x) > 0$  such that (2.9) holds true for all  $y \in B_{\sigma_0 d_x}(x)$  and  $z \in B_{(1+\sigma_0)d_y}(y) \cap M$ .

For the covering  $U_0 = \bigcup_{x \in U_0} B_{\sigma_0(\alpha, \varepsilon_x)d_x}(x)$  we choose<sup>4</sup> a locally finite refinement  $\mathcal{W} := \bigcup_{x \in Z} W(x) = U_0$ , where for each  $x \in Z \subset U_0$  the set  $W(x) \subset B_{\sigma_0(\alpha, \varepsilon_x)d_x}(x)$  is open and contains  $x$ . Since  $U_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is Hausdorff there is a partition of unity subordinate to the locally finite open covering  $\mathcal{W}$ , i.e., there are functions  $(\xi_x)_{x \in Z} \subset C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  with  $0 \leq \xi_x \leq 1$ ,  $\text{supp } \xi_x \subset W(x)$ ,  $\sum_{x \in Z} \xi_x(y) = 1$  for all  $y \in U_0$ , and, finally, for each  $y \in U_0$  there is an open neighborhood  $Y(y)$  of  $y$  such that we have  $\xi_x|_{Y(y)} \equiv 0$  for all but finitely many  $x \in Z$ . Setting  $w_x := \frac{2e_x}{\cos R(\alpha)}$ , where  $R(\alpha)$  is given by (2.4) for  $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}(\alpha_M + \beta_n)$ , we define

$$(2.12) \quad V : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n, \quad y \mapsto \sum_{x \in Z} \xi_x(y) w_x,$$

which is a smooth vector field since for each  $y \in U_0$  the sum is a finite sum on an open neighborhood  $Y(y)$ . For  $y \in \text{supp } \xi_x \subset W(x) \subset B_{\sigma_0(\alpha, \varepsilon_x)d_x}(x)$  for some  $x \in Z$ , and for  $z \in M$  with  $|z-y| = d_y$  one has by (2.9) in Corollary 2.3

$$\left\langle \frac{y-z}{|y-z|}, w_x \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n} = \frac{2}{\cos R(\alpha)} \left\langle \frac{y-z}{|y-z|}, e_x \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n} \stackrel{(2.9)}{\geq} 1,$$

because  $|z-y| = d_y < (1 + \sigma_0(\alpha, \varepsilon_x))d_y$  so that  $z \in B_{(1+\sigma_0(\alpha, \varepsilon_x))d_y}(y) \cap M$ . We conclude with

$$\left\langle \frac{y-z}{|y-z|}, V(y) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n} = \sum_{x \in Z} \xi_x(y) \left\langle \frac{y-z}{|y-z|}, w_x \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n} \geq \sum_{x \in Z} \xi_x(y) = 1$$

for all  $y \in U_0$ .  $\square$

<sup>4</sup>This is possible since each subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is a metric space with the inherited Euclidean metric, and therefore paracompact.



## 3. PSEUDO-GRADIENT FLOW FOR THE DISTANCE FUNCTION

The globally defined vector field  $V$  constructed in Proposition 2.4 for the set  $M \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  satisfying the local distortion bound induces geometric flows on the complement  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M$  increasing or decreasing the distance to  $M$ . To construct a *distance-increasing* flow  $h_M^+ : \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M$  take a cut-off function  $\varphi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  with

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{cases} \varphi \geq 0 & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n, \\ \varphi \equiv 1 & \text{on } B_{\frac{1}{2}r_M - \rho}(M), \\ \varphi \equiv 0 & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{\frac{1}{2}r_M}(M) \end{cases}$$

for some  $\rho \in (0, \frac{1}{2}r_M)$ . Now, define

$$(3.2) \quad \tilde{V} := \frac{1}{2}r_M\varphi \cdot V \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n),$$

and consider the initial value problem

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt}h(x, t) = \tilde{V}(h(x, t)) & \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M, t \in \mathbb{R}, \\ h(x, 0) = x. \end{cases}$$

According to the Picard-Lindelöf theorem (3.3) possesses a unique smooth solution for all times  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  with smooth dependence on the initial data. Define  $h_M^+ \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M \times [0, 1], \mathbb{R}^n)$  to be the restriction of that solution to the time interval  $[0, 1]$ .

**Theorem 3.1** (Distance-increasing flow). *Let  $M \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be a non-empty, closed and path-connected set with local distortion  $\delta(M, r_M) < g_n$  at scale  $r_M > 0$  for  $g_n$  as defined in (1.3). Then for every  $\rho \in (0, \frac{1}{2}r_M)$  there is a function  $h_{M, \rho}^+ \equiv h_M^+ \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M \times [0, 1], \mathbb{R}^n)$  with image  $h_M^+(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M \times [0, 1]) \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M$ , satisfying*

- (1+)  $h_M^+(\cdot, 0) = \text{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M}$ ,
- (2+)  $h_M^+(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M, 1) \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{\frac{1}{2}r_M - \rho}(M)$ ,
- (3+)  $h_M^+(\cdot, t)|_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{\frac{1}{2}r_M}(M)} = \text{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{\frac{1}{2}r_M}(M)}$  for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ .

Furthermore, the map  $h_M^+(\cdot, t) : \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is an embedding for every  $t \in [0, 1]$ , and the function  $t \mapsto \text{dist}(h_M^+(x, t), M)$  is non-decreasing on  $[0, 1]$  for each  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M$ .

*Proof.* We construct  $h_M^+$  as above as the smooth and unique solution to (3.3) restricted to  $[0, 1]$ . Uniqueness secures that  $h_M^+(\cdot, t) : \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is an embedding for each  $t \in [0, 1]$ . The prescribed initial value in (3.3) guarantees condition (1+). For  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{\frac{1}{2}r_M}(M)$  the constant function  $t \mapsto h_M^+(x, t) := x$  is the unique solution to (3.3) since  $\tilde{V}(h_M^+(x, t)) = \tilde{V}(x) = \frac{1}{2}r_M\varphi(x)V(x) = 0$  because of (3.1), which settles claim (3+).

As soon as we have proven that the function  $t \mapsto D(t) := \text{dist}(h_M^+(x, t), M)$  is non-decreasing for each  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M$ , we also know that  $h_M^+(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M \times [0, 1]) \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M$ . To prove this monotonicity it suffices to consider  $x \in B_{\frac{1}{2}r_M}(M) \setminus M$  because of (3+). Notice that the image  $H_x := h_M^+(x, [0, 1]) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is compact, so that by means of (1+)

$$(3.4) \quad \Delta_x := \max_{y \in H_x} \text{dist}(y, M) > 0 \quad \text{for any } x \in B_{\frac{1}{2}r_M}(M) \setminus M.$$

Therefore,

$$(*) \quad \text{dist}(y, M) = \inf_{z \in M} |y - z| = \min_{z \in K_x} |y - z| = \text{dist}(y, K_x) \quad \text{for all } y \in H_x$$

where we have set  $K_x := \overline{B_{2\Delta_x}(H_x)} \cap M$ . Since  $K_x$  is compact we may apply [10, Theorem 2.1(4)] and [12, Exercise 9.13, p. 99] to infer that the Clarke gradient  $\partial(\text{dist}(y, M))$  of the 1-Lipschitz function  $y \mapsto \text{dist}(y, M)$  is given by

$$(3.5) \quad \partial(\text{dist}(y, M)) = \text{conv}(\{ \frac{y-z}{|y-z|} : z \in \Gamma_{K_x}(y) \}) \quad \text{for all } y \in H_x \setminus M \stackrel{(3.4)}{=} H_x,$$

where  $\text{conv}(A)$  denotes the convex hull of a set  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , and  $\Gamma_A(y) := \{z \in A : \text{dist}(y, A) = |y - z|\}$ . (Notice that here,  $\Gamma_{K_x}(y) = \Gamma_M(y)$  for all  $y \in H_x \setminus M \stackrel{(3.4)}{=} H_x$ .<sup>5</sup>) Since  $h_M^+$  is smooth, the function  $D(t) = \text{dist}(h_M^+(x, t), M)$  is Lipschitz continuous on  $[0, 1]$ , and we can apply the non-smooth vectorial mean-value theorem [11, Proposition 2.6.5] to deduce for  $0 < t_1 < t_2 < 1$  that

$$(3.6) \quad D(t_2) - D(t_1) \in \text{conv}(\partial D([t_1, t_2])(t_2 - t_1)),$$

which means that the difference  $D(t_2) - D(t_1)$  is contained in the convex hull of the set  $\{Z(t_2 - t_1) : Z \in \partial D(u) \text{ for some } u \in [t_1, t_2]\}$ . To obtain information about the Clarke gradient  $\partial D(u)$  we apply Clarke's non-smooth chain rule [11, Theorem 2.3.9] which implies for  $u \in [t_1, t_2]$

$$(3.7) \quad \partial D(u) \subset \overline{\text{conv}}\left(\left\{\langle \alpha, \zeta \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n} : \zeta = \frac{d}{dt}|_{t=u} h_M^+(x, t), \alpha \in \partial(\text{dist}(y, M)), y = h_M^+(x, u)\right\}\right).$$

With (3.5) for  $y := h_M^+(x, u) \in H_x \setminus M$  and  $\alpha \in \partial(\text{dist}(y, M))$  we can represent  $\alpha$  as a convex combination (where the number  $J_u \in \mathbb{N}$  of summands depends on  $u$ )

$$\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^{J_u} \lambda_i \frac{y - z_i}{|y - z_i|}, \quad \lambda_i \in [0, 1] \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, J_u, \quad \sum_{i=1}^{J_u} \lambda_i = 1,$$

where  $z_i \in M$  satisfy  $d_y = \text{dist}(y, M) = |y - z_i|$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, J_u$ . Consequently, by (3.3) and (2.11) in Proposition 2.4

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle \alpha, \zeta \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n} &= \sum_{i=1}^{J_u} \lambda_i \left\langle \frac{y - z_i}{|y - z_i|}, \frac{d}{dt}|_{t=u} h_M^+(x, t) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n} \stackrel{(3.3)}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{J_u} \lambda_i \left\langle \frac{y - z_i}{|y - z_i|}, \tilde{V}(h_M^+(x, u)) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} r_M \varphi(y) \sum_{i=1}^{J_u} \lambda_i \left\langle \frac{y - z_i}{|y - z_i|}, V(y) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n} \stackrel{(2.11)}{\geq} \frac{1}{2} r_M \varphi(y) \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

if  $y = h_M^+(x, u) \in B_{r_M}(M) \setminus M$ , which is certainly the case if  $t_2 \ll 1$  by continuity of the flow and our initial condition  $h_M^+(x, 0) = x \in B_{\frac{1}{2}r_M}(M) \setminus M$ . So, combining (3.7) with (3.8) we obtain

$$(3.9) \quad \partial D(u) \subset [\tfrac{1}{2} r_M \varphi(h_M^+(x, u)), \infty),$$

which inserted into (3.6) yields

$$\begin{aligned} D(t_2) - D(t_1) &\in \text{conv}\left(\left\{Z \cdot (t_2 - t_1) : Z \in [\tfrac{1}{2} r_M \varphi(h_M^+(x, u)), \infty) \text{ for some } u \in [t_1, t_2]\right\}\right) \\ &\subset [\tfrac{1}{2} r_M \min_{u \in [t_1, t_2]} \varphi(h_M^+(x, u))(t_2 - t_1), \infty) \subset [0, \infty). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$(3.10) \quad D(t_2) - D(t_1) \geq \frac{1}{2} r_M \min_{u \in [t_1, t_2]} \varphi(h_M^+(x, u))(t_2 - t_1) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } 0 < t_1 < t_2 < 1,$$

as long as  $h_M^+(x, [0, t_2]) \subset B_{r_M}(M) \setminus M$ . This means that the distance  $D(t) = \text{dist}(h_M^+(x, t), M)$  is non-decreasing as long as  $h_M^+(x, t) \in B_{r_M}(M) \setminus M$ , and as soon as  $D(t) = \frac{1}{2} r_M$  it remains constant by means of the already established property (3+) and uniqueness of the solution to (3.3), so that  $D(t_2) - D(t_1) \geq 0$  for all  $0 \leq t_1 < t_2 \leq 1$  by continuity of  $D$ .

In order to settle claim (2+) it suffices to assume that the starting point  $h_M^+(x, 0) = x$  is contained in  $B_{\frac{1}{2}r_M}(M) \setminus M$  because of (3+). We have to show that  $D(1) = \text{dist}(h_M^+(x, 1), M) \geq \frac{1}{2} r_M - \rho$ . If  $D(t) \geq \frac{1}{2} r_M - \rho$  for some  $t \in [0, 1)$  then  $D(1) \geq D(t) \geq \frac{1}{2} r_M - \rho$  since  $D(\cdot)$  was just shown to be non-decreasing on  $[0, 1]$ . If, on the other hand,  $D(s) < \frac{1}{2} r_M - \rho$  for all  $s \in [0, 1)$  then by definition (3.1) of  $\varphi$  one has  $\varphi(h_M^+(x, s)) = 1$  for all  $s \in [0, 1)$  (even for  $s = 1$  by continuity of  $\varphi \circ h_M^+(x, \cdot)$ ), and we can apply (3.10) to all  $0 < t_1 < t_2 < 1$ , for example for  $t_1 := \sigma$  and  $t_2 := 1 - \sigma$  for any  $\sigma \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ . Hence,

$$D(1 - \sigma) \stackrel{(3.10)}{\geq} D(\sigma) + \frac{1}{2} r_M (1 - 2\sigma),$$

from which we deduce  $D(1) \geq D(0) + \frac{1}{2} r_M > \frac{1}{2} r_M - \rho$  also in this case, by sending  $\sigma$  to zero.  $\square$

<sup>5</sup>“ $\subset$ ” follows by  $K_x \subset M$  and (\*). “ $\supset$ ” follows by (\*) and  $\text{dist}(y, M) \leq \Delta_x$ , so any  $z \in M$  with  $\text{dist}(y, M) = |y - z|$  satisfies  $z \in \overline{B_{\Delta_x}(y)} \subset \overline{B_{\Delta_x}(H_x)}$ .

For future reference we draw the immediate conclusion, that having reached a certain distance from the set  $M$  at time  $t = 1$  according to property (2+) of Theorem 3.1, means that we have also moved away from sets  $A$  close to  $M$  with respect to the Hausdorff distance  $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}$ . More precisely, we can state the following assertion.

**Corollary 3.2** (Complements of nearby sets under  $h_M^+$ ). *Let  $M \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be a non-empty, closed and path-connected set with  $\delta(M, r_M) < g_n$  at some scale  $r_M > 0$ , and suppose a set  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  satisfies*

$$(3.11) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(M, A) < \frac{1}{2}r_M - \rho \quad \text{for some } \rho \in (0, \frac{1}{2}r_M).$$

*Then the image of the function  $h_M^+(\cdot, 1)$  in Theorem 3.1 for this  $\rho$  satisfies the inclusion*

$$(3.12) \quad h_M^+(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M, 1) \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus A.$$

*Proof.* Property (2+) in Theorem 3.1 implies by means of (3.11) for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M$

$$\text{dist}(h_M^+(x, 1), A) \geq \text{dist}(h_M^+(x, 1), M) - \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(M, A) \stackrel{(2+)}{\geq} \frac{1}{2}r_M - \rho - \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(M, A) \stackrel{(3.11)}{>} 0. \quad \square$$

In a similar fashion we can flow *towards*  $M$ .

**Theorem 3.3** (Distance-decreasing flow). *If  $M \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 3.1, then for every  $0 < \rho < \delta < r_M$  there is a function  $h_{M, \rho, \delta}^- \equiv h_M^- \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M \times [0, 1], \mathbb{R}^n)$  with  $h_M^-(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M \times [0, 1]) \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M$  such that*

- (1-)  $h_M^-(\cdot, 0) = \text{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M}$ ,
- (2-)  $h_M^-(B_\delta(M) \setminus M, 1) \subset B_\rho(M) \setminus M$ ,
- (3-)  $h_M^-(\cdot, t)|_{(B_{\frac{1}{2}\rho}(M) \setminus M) \cup (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{r_M}(M))} = \text{Id}_{(B_{\frac{1}{2}\rho}(M) \setminus M) \cup (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{r_M}(M))}$  for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ .

*Moreover, the map  $h_M^-(\cdot, t) : \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is an embedding for every  $t \in [0, 1]$ , and the function  $t \mapsto \text{dist}(h_M^-(x, t), M)$  is non-increasing on  $[0, 1]$  for each  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M$ .*

*Proof.* Choose a cut-off function  $\psi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  with  $\psi \geq 0$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\psi \equiv 0$  on  $B_{\frac{1}{2}\rho}(M) \cup (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{r_M}(M))$ , and  $\psi \equiv 1$  on  $B_\delta(M) \setminus B_\rho(M)$ . We take the unique smooth solution  $h \in C^\infty((\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M) \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n)$  of (3.3) with the vector field  $\tilde{V}$  replaced by  $\tilde{W} := -r_M \psi \cdot V$ , where  $V \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$  is the vector field constructed in Proposition 2.4. Define  $h_M^- \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M \times [0, 1], \mathbb{R}^n)$  as the restriction of  $h$  to the interval  $[0, 1]$ . Again (1-) immediately follows from the initial condition in (3.3), and uniqueness of the solution implies that  $h_M^-(\cdot, t) : \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is an embedding for each  $t \in [0, 1]$ . Property (3-) follows from the fact that  $\psi$  vanishes on  $B_{\frac{1}{2}\rho}(M) \cup (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{r_M}(M))$  since the constant function  $t \mapsto h_M^-(x, t) := x$  is the unique solution to (3.3) on regions where the right-hand side of (3.3) vanishes. This already implies that  $h_M^-(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M \times [0, 1]) \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M$ .

To show that  $D(t) := \text{dist}(h_M^-(x, t), M)$  is non-increasing on  $[0, 1]$  it suffices to consider  $x \in B_{r_M}(M) \setminus B_{\frac{1}{2}\rho}(M)$  since for all other  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M$  the distance  $D(t)$  is constant on  $[0, 1]$  by virtue of the already established property (3-). The characterization (3.5) of the Clarke gradient  $\partial(\text{dist}(y, M))$  for  $y \in h_M^-(x, [0, 1]) \setminus M$  continues to hold true, as well as the vectorial mean-value inclusion (3.6) for  $0 < t_1 < t_2 < 1$ , and the inclusion (3.7) for  $\partial D(u)$ ,  $u \in [t_1, t_2]$ . For  $y := h_M^-(x, u) \in h_M^-(x, [0, 1]) \setminus M$  we use (3.5) and the differential equation (3.3) with  $\tilde{W}$  instead of  $\tilde{V}$  to conclude by means of (2.11) for  $\alpha \in \partial \text{dist}(y, M)$  and  $\zeta = \frac{d}{dt}|_{t=u} h_M^-(x, t)$ ,

$$\langle \alpha, \zeta \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n} = \sum_{i=1}^{J_u} \lambda_i \left\langle \frac{y - z_i}{|y - z_i|}, \tilde{W}(y) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n} = -r_M \psi(y) \sum_{i=1}^{J_u} \lambda_i \left\langle \frac{y - z_i}{|y - z_i|}, V(y) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n} \leq -r_M \psi(y)$$

where  $\lambda_i \in [0, 1]$ ,  $\sum_{i=1}^{J_u} \lambda_i = 1$ ,  $z_i \in M$  such that  $d_y = \text{dist}(y, M) = |y - z_i|$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, J_u$ , if  $y = h_M^-(x, u) \in B_{r_M}(M) \setminus M$ , which holds true for sufficiently small  $t_2 \in (0, 1)$  by continuity. So, we obtain for such  $t_2$  and  $u \in [t_1, t_2]$

$$\partial D(u) \subset (-\infty, -r_M \psi(h_M^-(x, u))].$$

Inserting this into (3.6) yields

$$(3.13) \quad D(t_2) \leq D(t_1) - r_M \min_{u \in [t_1, t_2]} \psi(h_M^-(x, u))(t_2 - t_1) \leq D(t_1)$$

for all  $0 < t_1 < t_2 < 1$  subject to  $h_M^-(x, [0, t_2]) \subset B_{r_M}(M) \setminus M$ , which proves that  $D(\cdot)$  is non-increasing as long as the flow remains in  $B_{r_M}(M) \setminus M$ . But as soon as  $D(\cdot)$  reaches the value  $\frac{\rho}{2}$  it remains constant due to (3-) and uniqueness of the flow.

To finally establish (2-) we may assume that

$$(3.14) \quad \delta > D(0) \geq D(s) \geq \rho \quad \text{for all } s \in [0, 1],$$

since if  $D(s) < \rho$  for some  $s \in [0, 1]$ , then by the monotonicity we just proved we find  $D(1) < \rho$  as well, which settles (2-). So, with (3.14) we are in the situation that we can apply (3.13) for all  $0 < t_1 < t_2 < 1$  and that  $\psi(h_M^-(x, s)) = 1$  for all  $s \in [0, 1]$ . Consequently, by (3.13) for  $t_1 := \sigma$ ,  $t_2 := 1 - \sigma$ ,  $\sigma \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$  we find  $D(1 - \sigma) \leq D(\sigma) - r_M(1 - 2\sigma)$ . Upon  $\sigma \rightarrow 0$  we obtain by continuity and (3.14) the inequality  $0 \leq D(1) \leq D(0) - r_M < \delta - r_M < 0$ , a contradiction, so that the situation (3.14) can never occur.  $\square$

#### 4. ISOMORPHISMS OF FUNDAMENTAL GROUPS

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.2. To start with, notice that the mappings  $r \mapsto \delta(M_i, r)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , are non-decreasing, where  $M_i$  are the two non-empty, closed and path-connected sets with path-connected complement  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_i$ , such that

$$(4.1) \quad \delta(M_i, r_{M_i}) < g_n \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \quad \text{and} \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(M_1, M_2) < \frac{1}{4} \min\{r_{M_1}, r_{M_2}\},$$

as requested in Theorem 1.2. So, we set

$$(4.2) \quad r^* := \min\{r_{M_1}, r_{M_2}\},$$

and apply Theorem 3.1 to the set  $M := M_1$  but with respect to the (possibly smaller) scale  $r^*$  instead of  $r_{M_1}$ , and with the parameter  $\rho$  required in Theorem 3.1 chosen to satisfy

$$(4.3) \quad 0 < \rho < \frac{1}{4} \cdot \left( \frac{1}{4} \min\{r_{M_1}, r_{M_2}\} - \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(M_1, M_2) \right) = \frac{1}{4} \cdot \left( \frac{1}{4} r^* - \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(M_1, M_2) \right),$$

to obtain the smooth function  $h_1 := h_{M_1}^+ : \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_1 \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_1$  with all the properties listed in that theorem. Define the group homomorphism  $J : \pi_1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_1) \rightarrow \pi_1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_2)$  by means of

$$(4.4) \quad J([c]_1) := [h_1(\cdot, 1) \circ c]_2,$$

for any closed curve  $c$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_1$  representing the equivalence<sup>6</sup> class  $[c]_1 \in \pi_1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_1)$ . Corollary 3.2 for  $M := M_1$  and  $A := M_2$  implies that

$$(4.5) \quad h_1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_1, 1) \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_2,$$

because our assumption (4.3) on  $\rho$  clearly implies  $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(M_1, M_2) < \frac{1}{4} r^* < \frac{1}{2} r^* - \rho$ , that is, hypothesis (3.11) of Corollary 3.2 is satisfied for  $r_M := r^*$ . Inclusion (4.5) shows that the mapping  $J$  defined in (4.4) actually maps into  $\pi_1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_2)$ , but we need to verify that the definition does *not* depend on the particular choice of the loop  $c$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_1$ . Indeed, for any other representative loop  $\tilde{c}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_1$  with  $[\tilde{c}]_1 = [c]_1$  there is, by definition, a homotopy  $\psi \in C^0(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times [0, 1], \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_1)$  such that  $\psi(\cdot, 0) = c(\cdot)$  and  $\psi(\cdot, 1) = \tilde{c}(\cdot)$ . Then by (4.5) the map  $h_1(\cdot, 1) \circ \psi$  is a homotopy in  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_2$  connecting  $h_1(\cdot, 1) \circ \psi(\cdot, 0) = h_1(c(\cdot), 1)$  and  $h_1(\cdot, 1) \circ \psi(\cdot, 1) = h_1(\tilde{c}(\cdot), 1)$ , so that  $J([c]_1) = J([\tilde{c}]_1)$ . Hence  $J$  is well-defined.

**Lemma 4.1** ( $J$  injective). *The linear mapping  $J : \pi_1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_1) \rightarrow \pi_1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_2)$  as defined in (4.4) above is injective.*

<sup>6</sup>We choose the obvious notation  $[\cdot]_i$  to indicate equivalence classes of closed loops in the respective fundamental group  $\pi_1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_i)$  for  $i = 1, 2$ .

*Proof.* It suffices to show that for any null-homotopic loop in  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_2$  the preimage of its equivalence class under  $J$  only contains null-homotopic loops in  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_1$ . To that extent let  $[c]_1 \in \ker J \subset \pi_1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_1)$ , which means that there is a homotopy  $\Psi \in C^0(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times [0, 1], \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_2)$  such that  $\Psi(\cdot, 0) = h_1(\cdot, 1) \circ c(\cdot)$  and  $\Psi(\cdot, 1)$  is constant. By means of Theorem 3.1 for  $M := M_2$  (again with respect to the possibly smaller scale  $r^*$  instead of  $r_{M_2}$ ) we find the smooth function  $h_2 := h_{M_2}^+ \in C^\infty((\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_2) \times [0, 1], \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_2)$  with all the properties listed there, as well as

$$(4.6) \quad h_2(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_2, 1) \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_1$$

by means of Corollary 3.2 applied to  $M := M_2$  and  $A := M_1$ . This corollary is applicable since our assumption (4.3) implies the hypothesis (3.11) similarly as in our justification of (4.5) above. Consequently, the mapping  $(s, t) \mapsto h_2(\Psi(s, t), 1)$  is a homotopy in  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_1$ . By means of the monotonicity of  $t \mapsto \text{dist}(h_2(x, t), M_2)$  for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_2$  established in Theorem 3.1, we infer with the help of the properties (1+) and (2+) therein, and (4.3),

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(h_2(\cdot, t) \circ \Psi(s, 0), M_1) &\geq \text{dist}(h_2(\cdot, t) \circ \Psi(s, 0), M_2) - \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(M_1, M_2) \\ &\geq \text{dist}(h_2(\cdot, 0) \circ \Psi(s, 0), M_2) - \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(M_1, M_2) \\ &\stackrel{(1+)}{=} \text{dist}(\Psi(s, 0), M_2) - \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(M_1, M_2) \\ &\geq \text{dist}(\Psi(s, 0), M_1) - 2 \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(M_1, M_2) \\ &= \text{dist}(h_1(\cdot, 1) \circ c(s), M_1) - 2 \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(M_1, M_2) \\ &\stackrel{(2+), (4.3)}{>} \frac{1}{2}r^* - \rho - 2\left(\frac{1}{4}r^* - 4\rho\right) \\ &= 7\rho > 0 \quad \text{for all } s, t \in [0, 1]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the mapping  $(s, t) \mapsto h_2(\Psi(s, 0), t)$  is also a homotopy in  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_1$ , as well as  $(s, t) \mapsto h_1(c(s), t)$  with  $c(s) = h_1(c(s), 0)$  due to property (1+) in Theorem 3.1 for  $M := M_1$ . We now conclude with (1+) for  $M := M_2$ :

$$\begin{aligned} [c]_1 &= [h_1(c, 1)]_1 = [\Psi(\cdot, 0)]_1 \stackrel{(1+)}{=} [h_2(\Psi(\cdot, 0), 0)]_1 \\ &= [h_2(\Psi(\cdot, 0), 1)]_1 = [h_2(\Psi(\cdot, 1), 1)]_1 = [\text{const.}]_1, \end{aligned}$$

since  $\Psi(\cdot, 1)$  is constant. Here we have also used that  $(s, t) \mapsto h_2(\Psi(s, t), 1)$  is a homotopy in  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_1$  by means of (4.6). Thus, we have shown that  $J$  is injective.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.2** ( $J$  is surjective). *The injective linear mapping  $J : \pi_1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_1) \rightarrow \pi_1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_2)$  as defined in (4.4) is also surjective.*

*Proof.* For a given closed curve  $\tilde{c}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_2$  representing  $[\tilde{c}]_2 \in \pi_1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_2)$  consider the smooth functions  $h_i := h_{M_i}^+$  from Theorem 3.1 for  $M := M_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , but with respect to the common smaller scale  $r^*$  defined in (4.2) instead of  $r_{M_i}$ , and with  $\rho$  as in (4.3) with all the properties listed in that theorem, and satisfying (4.5), and (4.6), respectively. Then we can estimate, again using that  $t \mapsto \text{dist}(h_1(x, t), M_1)$  is non-decreasing, properties (1+) for  $h_1$  and (2+) for  $h_2$  and our smallness assumption (4.3),

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(h_1(\cdot, t) \circ h_2(\cdot, 1) \circ \tilde{c}, M_2) &\geq \text{dist}(h_1(\cdot, t) \circ h_2(\cdot, 1) \circ \tilde{c}, M_1) - \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(M_1, M_2) \\ &\geq \text{dist}(h_1(\cdot, 0) \circ h_2(\cdot, 1) \circ \tilde{c}, M_1) - \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(M_1, M_2) \\ &\stackrel{(1+)}{=} \text{dist}(h_2(\cdot, 1) \circ \tilde{c}, M_1) - \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(M_1, M_2) \\ (4.7) \quad &\geq \text{dist}(h_2(\cdot, 1) \circ \tilde{c}, M_2) - 2 \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(M_1, M_2) \\ &\stackrel{(2+), (4.3)}{>} \left(\frac{1}{2}r^* - \rho\right) - 2\left(\frac{1}{4}r^* - 4\rho\right) \\ &= 7\rho > 0, \end{aligned}$$

to infer that the mapping  $(s, t) \mapsto h_1(h_2(\tilde{c}(s), 1), t)$  is a homotopy in  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_2$ . Therefore, by definition (4.4) of  $J$  and property (1+) for  $h_1$

$$J([h_2(\cdot, 1) \circ \tilde{c}]_1) \stackrel{(4.4)}{=} [h_1(\cdot, 1) \circ h_2(\cdot, 1) \circ \tilde{c}]_2 = [h_1(\cdot, 0) \circ h_2(\cdot, 1) \circ \tilde{c}]_2 \stackrel{(1+)}{=} [h_2(\cdot, 1) \circ \tilde{c}]_2 = [\tilde{c}]_2,$$



where for the last equality we used the fact that also  $(s, t) \mapsto h_2(\tilde{c}(s), t)$  is a homotopy in  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_2$ .  $\square$

To investigate peripheral subgroups of the fundamental groups we first use the distance-decreasing flow of Theorem 3.3 to derive a quantified sufficient condition for loops  $c \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M$  to generate elements  $[c]$  in the peripheral subgroup of  $\pi_1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M)$ .

**Proposition 4.3** (Elements of peripheral subgroups). *Let  $M \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be a non-empty, closed and path-connected set with path-connected complement  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M$ , such that  $\delta(M, r_M) < g_n$  for some positive scale  $r_M$ . Then the equivalence class  $[c]$  of any loop  $c : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow B_{r_M}(M) \setminus M$  is an element of the peripheral subgroup  $P_M$  of  $\pi_1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M)$ .*

*Proof.* Fix a loop  $c \in C^0(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^n)$  with image  $c(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}) \subset B_{r_M}(M) \setminus M$ . We need to show that for arbitrary small  $\epsilon > 0$ , the closed curve  $c$  is homotopic to a loop  $\tilde{c}$  in  $B_\epsilon(M) \setminus M$ . If  $\epsilon > \delta := \max_{x \in c(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})} \text{dist}(x, M)$  the curve  $c$  itself is the desired loop, so we may restrict to  $\epsilon \in (0, \delta] \subset (0, r_M)$ . Apply Theorem 3.3 for  $\rho := \epsilon$  and  $\delta := \max_{x \in c(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})} \text{dist}(x, M) < r_M$  (assuming w.l.o.g. that  $\epsilon < \delta$ , otherwise increase  $\delta$  slightly), to obtain a smooth function  $h := h_M^- : \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M$  with all the properties listed in that theorem. Then the map  $(s, t) \mapsto h(c(s), t) = h(\cdot, t) \circ c(s)$  defines a homotopy in  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M$ , connecting the curve  $c(\cdot) = h(\cdot, 0) \circ c(\cdot)$  with the loop  $\tilde{c}(\cdot) := h(c(\cdot), 1)$ . Property (2-) of  $h$  implies that  $\tilde{c}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}) \subset B_\epsilon(M)$ .  $\square$

Now we are in the position to give the full proof of our first main result.

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.* The mapping  $J : \pi_1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_1) \rightarrow \pi_1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_2)$  defined in (4.4) is an isomorphism as shown in Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2. It remains to be checked that  $J$  restricted to the peripheral subgroup  $P_{M_1} \subset \pi_1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_1)$  maps  $P_{M_1}$  isomorphically onto the peripheral subgroup  $P_{M_2}$  of  $\pi_1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_2)$ . In the light of Lemma 4.1 it is sufficient to show  $J(P_{M_1}) = P_{M_2}$ .

“ $\subset$ ”: For  $p \in P_{M_1}$  take a representative loop  $c$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_1$ , i.e.,  $[c]_1 = p$ , with

$$(4.8) \quad \sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \text{dist}(c(s), M_1) < \frac{1}{2} \min\{r_{M_1}, r_{M_2}\} = \frac{1}{2} r^*,$$

where  $r^*$  was defined in (4.2). Let  $h_1 := h_{M_1}^+ : \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_1$  be the smooth function<sup>7</sup> of Theorem 3.1 for  $M := M_1$ , but using the scale  $r^*$  instead of  $r_{M_1}$  and  $\rho$  as in (4.3). Then, properties (2+) and (3+) of that theorem imply

$$(4.9) \quad 0 < \frac{1}{4} r^* < \frac{1}{2} r^* - \rho \stackrel{(2+)}{\leq} \text{dist}(h_1(c(s), 1), M_1) \leq \frac{1}{2} r^* \quad \text{for all } s \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z},$$

since if there were some  $s \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  such that  $\text{dist}(h_1(c(s), 1), M_1) > \frac{1}{2} r^*$  then by continuity of  $h_1$  we could find some  $t^* \in (0, 1)$  such that

$$\frac{1}{2} r^* = \text{dist}(h_1(c(s), t^*), M_1) \stackrel{(3+)}{=} \text{dist}(h_1(c(s), 1), M_1) > \frac{1}{2} r^*,$$

contradiction. Moreover, by Corollary 3.2 for  $M := M_1$  at scale  $r^*$  (instead of  $r_{M_1}$ ), and  $A := M_2$ , we have

$$(4.10) \quad h_1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_1, 1) \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_2,$$

since by means of (4.3),  $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(M_1, M_2) < \frac{1}{4} r^* - 4\rho < \frac{1}{2} r^* - \rho$ , so that hypothesis (3.11) of Corollary 3.2 is satisfied. In particular,  $h_1(c(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}), 1) \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_2$  so that by (4.9) and hypothesis (1.4)

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \text{dist}(h_1(c(s), 1), M_2) &\leq \text{dist}(h_1(c(s), 1), M_1) + \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(M_1, M_2) \\ &\stackrel{(4.9), (1.4)}{<} \frac{1}{2} r^* + \frac{1}{4} \min\{r_{M_1}, r_{M_2}\} = \frac{3}{4} \min\{r_{M_1}, r_{M_2}\} < r_{M_2} \end{aligned}$$

for all  $s \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ . Therefore,  $h_1(c(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}), 1) \subset B_{r_{M_2}}(M_2) \setminus M_2$ .

By definition (4.4) of the isomorphism  $J$  we find

$$J(p) = J([c]_1) \stackrel{(4.4)}{=} [h_1(\cdot, 1) \circ c]_2 \in P_{M_2} \subset \pi_1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_2)$$

<sup>7</sup>This function was the one used for the definition of the isomorphism  $J$  in (4.4).

by means of Proposition 4.3 applied to  $M := M_2$  and to the loop  $h_1(\cdot, 1) \circ c$ .

“ $\supset$ ”: We finally need to show that  $P_{M_2} \subset J(P_{M_1})$ . For  $q \in P_{M_2}$  there is a representative loop  $\tilde{c} : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_2$  with  $[\tilde{c}]_2 = q$  and  $\sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \text{dist}(\tilde{c}(s), M_2) < \frac{1}{2}r^*$ . According to Theorem 3.1 applied to  $M := M_2$  and the smaller scale  $r^* \leq r_{M_2}$  and to  $\rho$  as in (4.3), we find the smooth function  $h_2 := h_{M_2}^+ : \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_2$  with all the properties listed in that theorem but at scale  $r^*$  (instead of  $r_{M_2}$ ). Using properties (2+) and (3+) in the same way as for  $h_1$  above we obtain

$$(4.11) \quad 0 < \frac{1}{4}r^* < \frac{1}{2}r^* - \rho \stackrel{(2+)}{\leq} \text{dist}(h_2(\tilde{c}(s), 1), M_2) \leq \frac{1}{2}r^* \quad \text{for all } s \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}.$$

From Corollary 3.2 we deduce

$$(4.12) \quad h_2(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_2, 1) \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_1.$$

Consequently, by (4.11) and hypothesis (1.4),

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \text{dist}(h_2(\cdot, 1) \circ \tilde{c}, M_1) &\leq \text{dist}(h_2(\cdot, 1) \circ \tilde{c}, M_2) + \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(M_1, M_2) \\ &\stackrel{(4.11), (1.4)}{<} \frac{1}{2}r^* + \frac{1}{4}r^* = \frac{3}{4} \min\{r_{M_1}, r_{M_2}\} < r_{M_1}; \end{aligned}$$

hence  $h_2(\tilde{c}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}), 1) \subset B_{r_{M_1}}(M_1) \setminus M_1$ , which leads us to set  $p := [h_2(\cdot, 1) \circ \tilde{c}]_1 \in P_{M_1} \subset \pi_1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_1)$  by Proposition 4.3. Exactly<sup>8</sup> as in (4.7) in the proof of Lemma 4.2 we can show that the mapping  $(s, t) \mapsto h_1(h_2(\tilde{c}(s), 1), t)$  defines a homotopy in  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_2$ , connecting the loop

$$h_2(\cdot, 1) \circ \tilde{c} \stackrel{(1+)}{=} h_1(h_2(\cdot, 1) \circ \tilde{c}, 0)$$

with  $h_1(h_2(\cdot, 1) \circ \tilde{c}, 1)$  so that by definition (4.4) of  $J$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} J(p) &= J([h_2(\cdot, 1) \circ \tilde{c}]_1) \stackrel{(4.4)}{=} [h_1(\cdot, 1) \circ h_2(\cdot, 1) \circ \tilde{c}]_2 \\ &= [h_2(\cdot, 1) \circ \tilde{c}]_2 = [\tilde{c}]_2 = q, \end{aligned}$$

as desired. For the last equality we have used the fact that  $(s, t) \mapsto h_2(\tilde{c}(s), t)$  is a homotopy in  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_2$  connecting  $\tilde{c} = h_2(\tilde{c}, 0)$  with  $h_2(\cdot, 1) \circ \tilde{c}$ .  $\square$

## 5. STABILITY OF KNOT EQUIVALENCE

The equivalence of two tame knots  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in C^0(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$  with local distortion below  $g_3$  (or even below  $\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{8}}$ ) at some positive scales, such that the knots are sufficiently close in terms of these scales, was stated in Corollary 1.3. This was a direct consequence of Theorem 1.2 applied to the knots' images  $M_i := \gamma_i(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , in combination with Theorem B. We are going to apply Corollary 1.3 now to a knot and a small Lipschitz perturbation of that knot to prove the Lipschitz stability of knot equivalence, i.e., Corollary 1.4. For that we specify the local distortion at some scale  $r > 0$  as defined in (1.2) in Definition 1.1 to the image  $M := \eta(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})$  of a knot  $\eta \in C^0(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^n)$  by writing

$$(5.1) \quad \delta(\eta, r) \equiv \delta(\eta(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}), r) = \sup_{\substack{u, v \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, u \neq v \\ 0 < |\eta(u) - \eta(v)| \leq 2r}} \frac{d_\eta(\eta(u), \eta(v))}{|\eta(u) - \eta(v)|},$$

where the intrinsic distance  $d_\eta(\eta(u), \eta(v))$  reduces to the periodic parameter distance  $|u - v|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}$  in case of arclength parametrized curves  $\eta$ .

*Proof of Corollary 1.4.* By assumption there is a scale  $r_\gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$  such that  $\delta(\gamma, r_\gamma) < g_3$  (or even less than  $\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{8}}$ .) Our aim is to show that for a given function  $h \in C^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$  the perturbed curve  $\gamma_\epsilon = \gamma + \epsilon h$  has also local distortion  $\delta(\gamma_\epsilon, \hat{r}_\gamma) < g_3$  at a (possibly smaller) scale  $\hat{r}_\gamma > 0$  independent of  $0 < |\epsilon| \ll 1$ . Keeping that scale fixed we can then take  $|\epsilon|$  so small (depending on  $h$ ) that the  $L^\infty$ -distance is controlled in terms of the two scales  $r_\gamma$  and  $\hat{r}_\gamma$ .

<sup>8</sup>The only prerequisite for the estimate (4.7) was that  $\tilde{c}$  is a loop in  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M_2$  which we have in the present context as well.

To that extent consider  $x, y \in [0, 1]$  with  $x < y$  to estimate

$$(5.2) \quad |\gamma_\epsilon(x) - \gamma_\epsilon(y)| = |\gamma(x) - \gamma(y) + \epsilon(h(x) - h(y))| \geq |\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)| - |\epsilon| \|h'\|_{L^\infty} (y - x).$$

The intrinsic distance  $d_{\gamma_\epsilon}(\gamma_\epsilon(x), \gamma_\epsilon(y)) \equiv d_{\gamma_\epsilon}(x, y)$  on  $\gamma_\epsilon$  may be compared to  $d_\gamma(\gamma(x), \gamma(y)) \equiv d_\gamma(x, y)$  on  $\gamma$  by means of

$$(5.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \left| \int_x^y |\gamma'_\epsilon(u)| du - \int_x^y |\gamma'(u)| du \right| &= \left| \int_x^y (|\gamma'_\epsilon(u)| - |\gamma'(u)|) du \right| \leq \int_x^y ||\gamma'_\epsilon(u)| - |\gamma'(u)|| du \\ &\leq \int_x^y |\gamma'_\epsilon(u) - \gamma'(u)| du = \int_x^y |\epsilon h'(u)| du \leq |\epsilon| \|h'\|_{L^\infty} (y - x), \end{aligned}$$

whence

$$(5.4) \quad d_{\gamma_\epsilon}(x, y) \leq \int_x^y |\gamma'_\epsilon(u)| du \stackrel{(5.3)}{\leq} \int_x^y |\gamma'(u)| du + |\epsilon| \|h'\|_{L^\infty} (y - x) \leq (y - x)(1 + |\epsilon| \|h'\|_{L^\infty}).$$

Without loss of generality we may assume that  $0 < y - x \leq \frac{1}{2}$ , so  $d_\gamma(x, y) = y - x$ . Combining (5.2) with (5.4) we deduce supposing  $|\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)| < 2r_\gamma$

$$(5.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{d_{\gamma_\epsilon}(x, y)}{|\gamma_\epsilon(x) - \gamma_\epsilon(y)|} &\stackrel{(5.4), (5.2)}{\leq} \frac{d_\gamma(x, y)(1 + |\epsilon| \|h'\|_{L^\infty})}{|\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)| - |\epsilon| \|h'\|_{L^\infty} (y - x)} = \frac{d_\gamma(x, y)(1 + |\epsilon| \|h'\|_{L^\infty})}{|\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)| (1 - |\epsilon| \|h'\|_{L^\infty} \frac{d_\gamma(x, y)}{|\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)|})} \\ &\leq \delta(\gamma, r_\gamma) \cdot \frac{1 + |\epsilon| \|h'\|_{L^\infty}}{1 - |\epsilon| \|h'\|_{L^\infty} \delta(\gamma, r_\gamma)} < g_3, \end{aligned}$$

if

$$(5.6) \quad |\epsilon| \leq \epsilon_0 := \min \left\{ \frac{g_3 - \delta(\gamma, r_\gamma)}{\delta(\gamma, r_\gamma)(1 + g_3) \|h'\|_{L^\infty} + 1}, \frac{r_\gamma}{\|h'\|_{L^\infty} + 1} \right\} > 0.$$

Consequently, if  $|\gamma_\epsilon(x) - \gamma_\epsilon(y)| \leq 2\hat{r}_\gamma$  where  $\hat{r}_\gamma = \frac{1}{2}r_\gamma$  we infer  $|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)| \leq 2r_\gamma$ , so  $\delta(\gamma_\epsilon, \hat{r}_\gamma) < g_3$  for all  $|\epsilon| \leq \epsilon_0$  due to (5.5) and (5.6). It is important to notice that the scale  $\hat{r}_\gamma$  does *not* depend on  $\epsilon \in [-\epsilon_0, \epsilon_0]$ . With  $\|\gamma - \gamma_\epsilon\|_{L^\infty} = |\epsilon| \|h\|_{L^\infty}$  this allows us to choose

$$(5.7) \quad \epsilon_{\gamma, h} := \min \left\{ \epsilon_0, \frac{\hat{r}_\gamma}{8\|h\|_{L^\infty} + 1} \right\} < \frac{1}{4} \min\{r_\gamma, \hat{r}_\gamma\}$$

to also satisfy the hypothesis on the  $L^\infty$ -distance in Corollary 1.3 to conclude that  $\gamma \sim \gamma_\epsilon$  for all  $|\epsilon| \leq \epsilon_{\gamma, h}$ . In addition,  $\text{essinf}_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} |\gamma'_\epsilon| \geq \text{essinf}_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} |\gamma'| - |\epsilon| \|h'\|_{L^\infty} > \frac{1}{2}$  for all  $|\epsilon| \leq \epsilon_{\gamma, h}$ , since  $\epsilon_{\gamma, h} \leq \epsilon_0 \leq \frac{1}{2}(\|h'\|_{L^\infty} + 1)^{-1}$ .  $\square$

Before treating the stability of knot equivalence in the setting of fractional Sobolev regularity let us point out that bounding the bilipschitz constant<sup>9</sup>

$$(5.8) \quad \text{biLip}_I(\gamma) := \inf_{\substack{u, v \in I \\ u \neq v}} \frac{|\gamma(u) - \gamma(v)|}{|u - v|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}}$$

on an interval  $I \subset \mathbb{R}$  from below, is closely related to controlling the local distortion  $\delta(\gamma, \cdot)$  at some scale related to  $I$ , if the absolutely continuous parametrization  $\gamma$  has positive speed  $v_\gamma = \text{essinf}_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} |\gamma'|$ , i.e., if  $\gamma$  is an immersed curve.

The seminorm  $[\gamma']$  defining fractional Sobolev spaces allows us to bound  $\text{biLip}(\gamma)$  as in the following lemma, which is essentially contained in [2, Lemma 2.1]; see also [7, Lemma 2.1].

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $I \subset \mathbb{R}$  be an interval and  $\gamma : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  an absolutely continuous immersed curve with positive speed  $v_\gamma = \text{essinf}_I |\gamma'|$ . Then one has for all  $s, t \in I$  with  $s < t$*

$$(5.9) \quad |\gamma(t) - \gamma(s)|^2 \geq \left\{ v_\gamma^2 - \frac{1}{2} \int_s^t \int_s^t \frac{|\gamma'(u) - \gamma'(v)|^2}{|u - v|^2} du dv \right\} |t - s|^2.$$

As an immediate consequence one deduces

<sup>9</sup>In [21] a bilipschitz constant is defined as any number  $L > 0$  such that  $L^{-1}d_\gamma(u, v) \leq |\gamma(u) - \gamma(v)| \leq Ld_\gamma(u, v)$  holds for all  $u, v \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ . If  $\gamma$  is parametrized by arclength then the infimum of those  $L$  is  $\text{biLip}_I(\gamma)^{-1}$ .

**Corollary 5.2** (Fractional seminorm controls bilipschitz constant). *If  $\gamma \in W^{\frac{3}{2},2}(I, \mathbb{R}^n)$  is arc-length parametrized, then*

$$(5.10) \quad |\gamma(t) - \gamma(s)|^2 \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}[\gamma']_{\frac{1}{2},2,I}^2\right)|t - s|^2 \quad \text{for all } s, t \in I.$$

*Proof of Lemma 5.1.* For parameters  $s, t \in I$  with  $s < t$  estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |\gamma(s) - \gamma(t)|^2 &= \int_s^t \int_s^t \langle \gamma'(\sigma), \gamma'(\tau) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n} d\sigma d\tau = \frac{1}{2} \int_s^t \int_s^t (|\gamma'(\tau)|^2 + |\gamma'(\sigma)|^2 - |\gamma'(\tau) - \gamma'(\sigma)|^2) d\sigma d\tau \\ &\geq v_\gamma^2 |t - s|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \int_s^t \int_s^t |\gamma'(\tau) - \gamma'(\sigma)|^2 d\sigma d\tau \geq |t - s|^2 \left\{ v_\gamma^2 - \frac{1}{2} \int_s^t \int_s^t \frac{|\gamma'(\tau) - \gamma'(\sigma)|^2}{|\tau - \sigma|^2} d\sigma d\tau \right\}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

We observe in (5.10) that a small fractional seminorm yields a bilipschitz estimate, which is the key ingredient for the proof of the fractional stability of knot equivalence.

*Proof of Corollary 1.5.* Due to the absolute continuity of the double integral defining the fractional seminorm there is a radius  $\rho = \rho(\gamma) \in (0, \frac{1}{4}]$  such that  $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} [\gamma']_{\frac{1}{2},2,B_\rho(x)} < \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}$ . Therefore,

$$(5.11) \quad \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} [\eta']_{\frac{1}{2},2,B_\rho(x)} \leq \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} [\gamma']_{\frac{1}{2},2,B_\rho(x)} + [\eta' - \gamma']_{\frac{1}{2},2} < \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$$

for all  $\eta \in B_{\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}}(\gamma) \subset W^{\frac{3}{2},2}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ . By means of Corollary 5.2 we infer

$$(5.12) \quad \min \{ |\gamma(t) - \gamma(s)|, |\eta(t) - \eta(s)| \} > \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} |t - s| \geq \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} d_\gamma(t, s) = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} d_\eta(t, s)$$

for all arclength parametrized curves  $\eta \in B_{\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}}(\gamma) \subset W^{\frac{3}{2},2}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$  and all parameters  $s, t \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  with intrinsic distance  $d_\gamma(t, s) \equiv d_\gamma(\gamma(s), \gamma(t)) = |t - s|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} = d_\eta(\eta(s), \eta(t)) \equiv d_\eta(t, s) < 2\rho$ .

On the other hand,

$$\sigma_\gamma := \inf \{ |\gamma(t) - \gamma(s)| : d_\gamma(s, t) = |t - s|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \geq 2\rho \} \in (0, \frac{1}{2}].$$

By Sobolev embedding there is a constant  $C_E$  such that  $\|\zeta\|_{L^\infty} \leq C_E \|\zeta\|_{W^{\frac{3}{2},2}}$  for all  $\zeta \in W^{\frac{3}{2},2}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ , so that

$$(5.13) \quad \|\eta - \gamma\|_{L^\infty} < \frac{\sigma_\gamma}{16} \quad \text{for all } \eta \in B_{\epsilon_\gamma}(\gamma) \subset W^{\frac{3}{2},2}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3),$$

where we have set  $\epsilon_\gamma := \min \{ \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}, \frac{\sigma_\gamma}{16C_E} \}$ . Therefore, for all  $s, t \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  with  $d_\gamma(s, t) = d_\eta(s, t) \geq 2\rho$  one has

$$(5.14) \quad \min \{ |\gamma(t) - \gamma(s)|, |\eta(t) - \eta(s)| \} > \frac{7}{8} \sigma_\gamma > \frac{1}{2} \sigma_\gamma.$$

Defining the common scale  $r_\gamma := \frac{\sigma_\gamma}{4}$  we find in view of (5.12) and (5.14)

$$(5.15) \quad \max \{ \delta(\gamma, r_\gamma), \delta(\eta, r_\gamma) \} \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} < g_3$$

for all arclength parametrized curves  $\eta \in B_{\epsilon_\gamma}(\gamma) \subset W^{\frac{3}{2},2}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ , since  $g_3 = \frac{\sqrt{32}}{\sqrt{27}} \frac{\pi}{8} \in (\frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}, \frac{\pi}{2})$ . Inequality (5.13) allows us to apply Corollary 1.3 to conclude. Notice that we also used the fact that arclength parametrized  $W^{\frac{3}{2},2}$ -knots have finite Möbius energy according to [2, Theorem 1.1], and are therefore tame [21, Theorem 4.1], which is needed in Corollary 1.3.  $\square$

## 6. HARMONIC SUBSTITUTION

In this section we study the effects on the local distortion of a curve if we replace some subarcs of a curve by straight segments, since this is what we will do later to adequately modify minimizing sequences for the Möbius energy. By Blatt's characterization [2, Theorem 1.1] of the corresponding energy space we can assume arclength parametrized curves of class  $W^{\frac{3}{2},2}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ , but keep in mind that such a replacement by straight segments generally destroys this fractional Sobolev regularity.

We begin with a result that basically reflects the embedding of  $W^{\frac{3}{2},2}$  into the space of bounded mean oscillation (BMO). Denote the integral mean of a function  $f$  over a set  $A$  by

$$(f)_A \equiv \oint_A f(z) dz := \frac{1}{|A|} \int_A f(z) dz,$$

and abbreviate the annular region

$$(6.1) \quad A_{r,\theta}(x) := B_r(x) \setminus B_{\theta r}(x) \subset \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \quad \text{for } \theta \in (0, 1), x \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z},$$

with measure

$$(6.2) \quad |A_{r,\theta}(x)| = 2r(1 - \theta).$$

**Lemma 6.1** (Quantitative embedding  $W^{\frac{3}{2},2} \hookrightarrow \text{BMO}$ ). *Assume that for an arclength parametrized curve  $\eta \in W^{\frac{3}{2},2}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^n)$  there is a parameter  $x \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  and there exist constants  $\theta, r \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ , such that*

$$(6.3) \quad [\eta']_{\frac{1}{2}, 2, A_{r,\theta}(x)}^2 < \theta.$$

Then we have

$$(6.4) \quad \int_{B_r(x)} |\eta'(z) - (\eta')_{B_r(x)}|^2 dz < 8\theta,$$

and if  $\theta < \frac{1}{8}$  in addition, then  $|(\eta')_{B_r(x)}| > 0$  and

$$(6.5) \quad \int_{B_r(x)} |\eta'(z) - \nu|^2 dz < 32\theta,$$

where

$$(6.6) \quad \nu \equiv \nu_{B_r(x)} := \frac{(\eta')_{B_r(x)}}{|(\eta')_{B_r(x)}|} \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}.$$

*Proof.* We start with estimates for the mean quadratic deviation on the annulus  $A := A_{r,\theta}(x)$  with (6.2), Jensen's inequality, and (6.3):

$$\begin{aligned} \int_A |\eta'(z) - (\eta')_A|^2 dz &\stackrel{(6.2)}{=} \frac{1}{2r(1-\theta)} \int_A |\eta'(z) - \int_A \eta'(u) du|^2 dz \stackrel{(6.2)}{\leq} \frac{1}{4r^2(1-\theta)^2} \int_A \int_A |\eta'(z) - \eta'(u)|^2 du dz \\ (6.7) \quad &\leq \frac{1}{(1-\theta)^2} \int_A \int_A \frac{|\eta'(z) - \eta'(u)|^2}{|z-u|^2} du dz \stackrel{(6.3)}{<} \frac{\theta}{(1-\theta)^2} < 4\theta, \end{aligned}$$

since  $\theta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ . With  $|\eta'| = 1$  a.e. on  $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  we have the rough estimate  $|\eta'(\cdot) - (\eta')_A| \leq 2$  a.e., which implies for the mean deviation from  $(\eta')_A$  on the full ball  $B := B_r(x)$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_B |\eta'(z) - (\eta')_A|^2 dz &= \frac{1}{2r} \int_A |\eta'(z) - (\eta')_A|^2 dz + \frac{1}{2r} \int_{B_{\theta r}(x)} |\eta'(z) - (\eta')_A|^2 dz \\ &\stackrel{(6.2)}{=} \frac{2r(1-\theta)}{2r} \int_A |\eta'(z) - (\eta')_A|^2 dz + \frac{2\theta r}{2r} \int_{B_{\theta r}(x)} |\eta'(z) - (\eta')_A|^2 dz \\ (6.8) \quad &\stackrel{(6.7)}{<} (1-\theta)4\theta + 4\theta < 8\theta. \end{aligned}$$

This proves (6.4) since the function  $c \mapsto \int_B |\eta'(z) - c|^2 dz$  is minimized on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  by the mean value  $c^* := (\eta')_B \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .

If  $\theta \in (0, \frac{1}{8})$ , then take the integral mean of the inequality  $|(\eta')_B| \geq |\eta'(z)| - |\eta'(z) - (\eta')_B|$  over  $B = B_r(x)$  to obtain with (6.4) and Hölder's inequality  $|(\eta')_B| > 1 - \sqrt{8\theta} > 0$ , so that the vector  $\nu$  in (6.6) is well-defined. With the help of  $|b - \frac{b}{|b|}|^2 = |\frac{b|b|-b}{|b|}|^2 = ||b| - 1|^2$  for  $b := (\eta')_B \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$  we obtain

$$\int_B |(\eta')_B - \nu|^2 dz = \int_B |1 - |(\eta')_B||^2 dz = \int_B ||\eta'(z)| - |(\eta')_B||^2 dz \leq \int_B |\eta'(z) - (\eta')_B|^2 dz,$$

so that by means of (6.4)

$$\int_B |\eta'(z) - \nu|^2 dz \leq 2\left\{ \int_B |\eta'(z) - (\eta')_B|^2 dz + \int_B |(\eta')_B - \nu|^2 dz \right\} \stackrel{(6.4)}{<} 2\{8\theta + 8\theta\} = 32\theta. \quad \square$$



To find suitable subarcs to be replaced by straight segments on a given curve, we pick up an idea of Semmes [36] from his study of chord-arc surfaces with small constants.

Define for a fixed parameter  $x \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  and constants  $r \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$  and  $\theta \in (0, \frac{1}{20})$  the *localized excess function* on the ball  $B := B_r(x)$  as

$$(6.9) \quad e_B(z) := (\eta'(z) - \nu) \chi_B(z) \quad \text{for } z \in \mathbb{R},$$

where  $\nu \equiv \nu_B = \nu_{B_r(x)} \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  is the vector defined in (6.6) of Lemma 6.1, and  $\chi_A$  denotes the characteristic function of a set  $A \subset \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ . Moreover, we consider the Hardy–Littlewood maximal function of the excess,

$$(6.10) \quad (Me_B)(y) := \sup_{\rho > 0} \int_{B_\rho(y)} |e_B(z)| dz$$

satisfying the weak-type inequality (see, e.g., [37, Chapter 3, Theorem 1.1, p. 101])

$$\begin{aligned} |\{y \in \mathbb{R} : (Me_B)(y) > t\}| &\leq \frac{3}{t} \|e_B\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} = \frac{3}{t} \int_B |\eta'(z) - \nu| dz \\ &\leq \frac{6r}{t} \left( \int_B |\eta'(z) - \nu|^2 dz \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \stackrel{(6.5)}{<} \frac{6r}{t} \sqrt{32\theta} < 36\sqrt{\theta} \cdot \frac{r}{t} \quad \text{for all } t > 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we used Hölder's inequality and (6.5). Choosing  $t := \theta^{\frac{1}{4}}$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\{y \in \mathbb{R} : (Me_B)(y) \leq \theta^{\frac{1}{4}}\} \cap B_{\frac{r}{8}}(x \pm \frac{r}{2})| &\geq |B_{\frac{r}{8}}(x \pm \frac{r}{2})| - |\{y \in \mathbb{R} : (Me_B)(y) > \theta^{\frac{1}{4}}\}| \\ &> \frac{r}{4} (1 - 144 \cdot \theta^{\frac{1}{4}}) > 0 \end{aligned}$$

for

$$(6.11) \quad 0 < \theta < \theta_1 := \frac{1}{144^4} < \frac{1}{8}.$$

Consequently, the sets

$$(6.12) \quad G_{\pm}(x, \theta, r) := \{y \in \mathbb{R} : (Me_{B_r(x)})(y) \leq \theta^{\frac{1}{4}}\} \cap B_{\frac{r}{8}}(x \pm \frac{r}{2}) \subset B_r(x)$$

of *good* endpoints of replaceable subarcs near the two parameters  $x \pm \frac{r}{2}$  have positive measure if  $\theta \in (0, \theta_1)$ . The next lemma clarifies the term “good” in this context, by stating that difference quotients of the curve  $\eta$  rooted at points in the set  $G_{\pm}(x, \theta, r)$  can be approximated well by the unit vector  $\nu = \nu_{B_r(x)} \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ .

**Lemma 6.2** (Difference quotients close to  $\nu$ ). *Assume that the arclength parametrized curve  $\eta \in W^{\frac{3}{2},2}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^n)$  satisfies*

$$(6.13) \quad [\eta']_{\frac{1}{2},2,A}^2 < \theta \quad \text{for some } x \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \theta \in (0, \theta_1) \text{ and } r \in (0, \frac{1}{2}),$$

where  $\theta_1$  is defined in (6.11), and  $A := A_{r,\theta}(x) = B_r(x) \setminus B_{\theta r}(x)$ . Then one has for  $\nu := \nu_{B_r(x)}$  defined in (6.6)

$$(6.14) \quad 1 \geq \left\langle \frac{\eta(y) - \eta(x_0)}{y - x_0}, \nu \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n} \geq 1 - 2\theta^{\frac{1}{4}} \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \Pi_{(\mathbb{R}\nu)^\perp} \left( \frac{\eta(y) - \eta(x_0)}{y - x_0} \right) \right| \leq 2\theta^{\frac{1}{8}}$$

for all  $y \in B_r(x)$  and  $x_0 \in G_{\pm}(x, \theta, r)$  as defined in (6.12). Here,  $\Pi_V$  denotes the orthogonal projection of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  onto a linear subspace  $V \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ .

*Proof.* The very left inequality in (6.14) is obvious since  $\|\eta'\|_{L^\infty} = 1$  by assumption, and  $|\nu| = 1$ . The second inequality can be derived with the fundamental theorem of calculus as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \left\langle \frac{\eta(y) - \eta(x_0)}{y - x_0}, \nu \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n} &= \frac{1}{y - x_0} \int_{x_0}^y \langle \nu - \eta'(u), \nu \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n} du \\ &\leq \frac{1}{|y - x_0|} \int_{[x_0, y]} |\nu - \eta'(u)| du = \frac{1}{|y - x_0|} \int_{[x_0, y]} |e_{B_r(x)}(u)| du, \end{aligned}$$

since both  $y$  and  $x_0$  are contained in  $B_r(x)$ . The last integral may be bounded from above by

$$\frac{1}{|y - x_0|} \int_{B_{|y - x_0|}(x_0)} |e_{B_r(x)}(u)| du = 2 \int_{B_{|y - x_0|}(x_0)} |e_{B_r(x)}(u)| du \leq 2 (Me_{B_r(x)})(x_0) \leq 2\theta^{\frac{1}{4}},$$

because  $x_0 \in G_{\pm}(x, \theta, r)$ , which proves the first chain of inequalities in (6.14). The last inequality follows from the first via  $|\Pi_{(\mathbb{R}\nu)^\perp}(\zeta)|^2 = |\zeta - \langle \zeta, \nu \rangle \nu|^2 = |\zeta|^2 - \langle \zeta, \nu \rangle^2 \leq 1 - \langle \zeta, \nu \rangle^2 = (1 + \langle \zeta, \nu \rangle)(1 - \langle \zeta, \nu \rangle) \leq 2(1 - \langle \zeta, \nu \rangle)$  for all  $\zeta \in \overline{B_1(0)} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  (where we abbreviated  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n}$  by  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ ).  $\square$

Given a curve  $\eta : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $N$  distinct parameters  $x_1, \dots, x_N \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ , as well as  $\theta \in (0, \theta_1)$ ,

$$(6.15) \quad 0 < r < \frac{1}{2} \min \{|x_i - x_k|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} : i \neq k, i, k \in \{1, \dots, N\}\} \leq \frac{1}{4},$$

and good sets  $G_{\pm}^i := G_{\pm}(x_i, \theta, r)$  as defined in (6.12) for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , containing the parameters  $x_{\pm}^i \in G_{\pm}^i$ , we replace the  $N$  subarcs  $\eta([x_{-}^i, x_{+}^i])$  by straight segments to define the *modified curve*

$$(6.16) \quad \tilde{\eta}(z) := \begin{cases} \eta(x_{-}^i) + \frac{z - x_{-}^i}{x_{+}^i - x_{-}^i} (\eta(x_{+}^i) - \eta(x_{-}^i)) & \text{for } z \in [x_{-}^i, x_{+}^i], i = 1, \dots, N, \\ \eta(z) & \text{for } z \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^N [x_{-}^i, x_{+}^i]. \end{cases}$$

We call this procedure a *harmonic substitution* comparable to Courant's and Morrey's method in the theory of classic two-dimensional minimal surfaces [13, p. 25], [30, Theorem 4.3.2]. But in the present context, even if  $\eta$  were smooth, the modified curve  $\tilde{\eta}$  may not even be of class  $W^{\frac{3}{2},2}$ . Or, in terms of the Möbius energy,  $E_{\text{Möb}}(\tilde{\eta})$  may be infinite even if  $\tilde{\eta}$  is embedded and if the original curve  $\eta$  has finite energy. Nevertheless,  $\tilde{\eta}$  is  $L^\infty$ -close to  $\eta$ , and its distortion quotient remains under control.

**Lemma 6.3** (Distortion under harmonic substitution). *Let  $\eta \in W^{\frac{3}{2},2}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^n)$  be an arclength parametrized curve satisfying*

$$(6.17) \quad [\eta']_{\frac{1}{2}, 2, A_{r, \theta}(x_i)}^2 < \theta$$

for finitely many distinct parameters  $x_1, \dots, x_N \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  with  $r \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$  chosen as in (6.15), and  $\theta \in (0, \theta_2)$  for  $\theta_2 := 256^{-4}$ , and let  $\tilde{\eta}$  be the modified curve defined by harmonic substitution as in (6.16). Then

$$(6.18) \quad \|\eta - \tilde{\eta}\|_{L^\infty} < 6\theta^{\frac{1}{8}} r \quad \text{and} \quad \max \left\{ \sup_{\substack{y, z \in [x_{-}^i - r, x_{+}^i] \\ y \neq z}} \frac{d_{\tilde{\eta}}(\tilde{\eta}(y), \tilde{\eta}(z))}{|\tilde{\eta}(y) - \tilde{\eta}(z)|}, \sup_{\substack{y, z \in [x_{-}^i, x_{+}^i + r] \\ y \neq z}} \frac{d_{\tilde{\eta}}(\tilde{\eta}(y), \tilde{\eta}(z))}{|\tilde{\eta}(y) - \tilde{\eta}(z)|} \right\} < 1 + 4\theta^{\frac{1}{4}} \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, N.$$

*Proof.* Note that  $0 < \theta_2 = 256^{-4} < \theta_1 < \frac{1}{8}$  so that Lemmas 6.1 and 6.2 are applicable here. The first inequality in (6.14) for  $y := x_{+}^i \in G_{+}^i \subset B_r(x_i)$  and  $x_0 := x_{-}^i \in G_{-}^i$  for an arbitrary fixed  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  implies for  $\nu_i := \nu_{B_r(x_i)} \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  as in (6.6), and  $\Delta_i := \frac{\eta(x_{+}^i) - \eta(x_{-}^i)}{x_{+}^i - x_{-}^i} \in \overline{B_1(0)} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$

$$(6.19) \quad |\nu_i - \Delta_i|^2 = 1 + |\Delta_i|^2 - 2\langle \nu_i, \Delta_i \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n} \leq 2(1 - \langle \nu_i, \Delta_i \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n}) \stackrel{(6.14)}{\leq} 4\theta^{\frac{1}{4}}.$$

Therefore, by virtue of (6.5) in Lemma 6.1 for  $\nu := \nu_i$ ,  $x := x_i$ , and  $z \in [x_{-}^i, x_{+}^i] \subset B_r(x_i)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |\eta(z) - \tilde{\eta}(z)| &= |\eta(z) - \eta(x_{-}^i) + \tilde{\eta}(x_{-}^i) - \tilde{\eta}(z)| = \left| \int_{x_{-}^i}^z (\eta'(u) - \tilde{\eta}'(u)) du \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{x_{-}^i}^z (\eta'(u) - \Delta_i) du \right| \leq 2r \int_{B_r(x_i)} (|\eta'(u) - \nu_i| + |\nu_i - \Delta_i|) du \\ &\leq 2r \left( \int_{B_r(x_i)} |\eta'(u) - \nu_i|^2 du \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + 2r |\nu_i - \Delta_i| \\ &\stackrel{(6.5), (6.19)}{<} 2r (\sqrt{32\theta} + \sqrt{4\theta^{\frac{1}{4}}}) = 2r\theta^{\frac{1}{8}} (\sqrt{32\theta}^{\frac{3}{8}} + 2) < 6\theta^{\frac{1}{8}} r, \end{aligned}$$

which proves the first inequality in (6.18), since  $z \in [x_{-}^i, x_{+}^i]$  was arbitrarily chosen as well as the index  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ .

Before proving the second inequality in (6.18) let us insert an auxiliary result comparing the intrinsic distance on  $\eta$  with that on  $\tilde{\eta}$ , which turns out to be useful later, too. As in some proofs

before, we abbreviate the intrinsic distance  $d_\eta(\eta(y), \eta(z))$  on  $\eta$  as  $d_\eta(y, z)$ , analogously on the modified curve  $\tilde{\eta}$ .

**Lemma 6.4** (Comparison of intrinsic distances). *Under the assumptions of Lemma 6.3 one has*

$$(6.20) \quad \frac{7}{8}d_\eta(y, z) < (1 - 2\theta^{\frac{1}{8}})d_\eta(y, z) \leq d_{\tilde{\eta}}(y, z) \leq d_\eta(y, z) \quad \text{for all } y, z \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, y \neq z,$$

and the length  $\mathcal{L}(\tilde{\eta})$  of  $\tilde{\eta}$  is contained in the interval  $[1 - 2\theta^{\frac{1}{8}}, 1] \subset [\frac{7}{8}, 1]$ .

*Proof.* As in the previous proof we set  $\Delta_i := \frac{\eta(x_+^i) - \eta(x_-^i)}{x_+^i - x_-^i} \in \overline{B_1(0)} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\nu_i := \nu_{B_r(x_i)} \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  as in (6.6), for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . Use (6.19) to infer

$$|1 - |\Delta_i|| = ||\nu_i| - |\Delta_i|| \leq |\nu_i - \Delta_i| \stackrel{(6.19)}{\leq} 2\theta^{\frac{1}{8}},$$

so that the tangent vector of the modified curve  $\tilde{\eta}$  satisfies

$$(6.21) \quad |\tilde{\eta}'(z)| = \begin{cases} |\eta'(z)| = 1 & \text{f.a.e. } z \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^N (x_-^i, x_+^i), \\ |\Delta_i| \in [1 - 2\theta^{\frac{1}{8}}, 1] & \text{for all } z \in (x_-^i, x_+^i), i = 1, \dots, N. \end{cases}$$

Consequently, we can estimate the length of  $\tilde{\eta}$  as

$$(6.22) \quad \mathcal{L}(\tilde{\eta}) = \int_0^1 |\tilde{\eta}'(u)| du \in [1 - 2\theta^{\frac{1}{8}}, 1] \subset [\frac{7}{8}, 1].$$

For the proof of (6.20) we may assume  $0 \leq y < z < 1$ . If  $d_\eta(y, z) = \int_y^z |\eta'(u)| du$  then by (6.21),

$$d_{\tilde{\eta}}(y, z) \leq \int_y^z |\tilde{\eta}'(u)| du \stackrel{(6.21)}{\leq} d_\eta(y, z).$$

If, on the other hand,  $d_\eta(y, z) = 1 - \int_y^z |\eta'(u)| du = \int_z^{1+y} |\eta'(u)| du$ , then

$$d_{\tilde{\eta}}(y, z) \leq \int_z^{1+y} |\tilde{\eta}'(u)| du \stackrel{(6.21)}{\leq} d_\eta(y, z),$$

which proves the right inequality in (6.20).

Similarly, if  $d_{\tilde{\eta}}(y, z) = \int_y^z |\tilde{\eta}'(u)| du$ , then

$$d_{\tilde{\eta}}(y, z) \stackrel{(6.21)}{\geq} (1 - 2\theta^{\frac{1}{8}})|z - y|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \geq (1 - 2\theta^{\frac{1}{8}})d_\eta(y, z) > \frac{7}{8}d_\eta(y, z).$$

If  $d_{\tilde{\eta}}(y, z) = \mathcal{L}(\tilde{\eta}) - \int_y^z |\tilde{\eta}'(u)| du = \int_z^{1+y} |\tilde{\eta}'(u)| du$ , then

$$d_{\tilde{\eta}}(y, z) \stackrel{(6.21)}{\geq} (1 - 2\theta^{\frac{1}{8}}) \int_z^{1+y} |\eta'(u)| du \geq (1 - 2\theta^{\frac{1}{8}})d_\eta(y, z) > \frac{7}{8}d_\eta(y, z). \quad \square$$

Now we return to the

*Proof of Lemma 6.3.* It remains to establish the estimate for the distortion quotient in (6.18). Fix  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ , abbreviate  $x := x_i$ ,  $x_\pm := x_\pm^i$ , and consider the intervals  $\mathcal{A} := [x - r, x_-]$ ,  $\mathcal{B} := [x_-, x_+]$ , and  $\mathcal{C} := [x_+, x + r]$ . If  $y, z \in \mathcal{B}$  then  $d_{\tilde{\eta}}(y, z) = |\tilde{\eta}(y) - \tilde{\eta}(z)|$  due to  $r < \frac{1}{4}$ , which implies the right inequality in (6.18), since we are on the straight segment in that case.

So, we distinguish two remaining cases:

- I.  $(y, z) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}$ , (or  $(y, z) \in \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}$ ),
- II.  $(y, z) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$ , (or  $(y, z) \in \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{C}$ , or  $\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{B}$ , or  $\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{A}$ ).

It suffices in each case to treat the situation named first, the alternatives in brackets can then be proved analogously.

*Case I.* For any  $\zeta \in \mathcal{A}$  one has

$$|\zeta - x| \geq |x_- - x| = |x_- - (x - \frac{r}{2}) + (x - \frac{r}{2}) - x| \geq \frac{r}{2} - |x_- - (x - \frac{r}{2})| > \frac{r}{2} - \frac{r}{8} = \frac{3}{8}r > \theta r,$$

so that  $\mathcal{A} \subset A_{r,\theta}(x) = B_r(x) \setminus B_{\theta r}(x)$ . Therefore, our assumption (6.17) implies that we can apply Corollary 5.2 to the interval  $I := \mathcal{A}$ ,  $\gamma := \eta|_{\mathcal{A}}$ , to deduce from (5.10) by definition (6.16) of  $\tilde{\eta}$

$$(6.23) \quad \frac{d_{\tilde{\eta}}(y,z)}{|\tilde{\eta}(y) - \tilde{\eta}(z)|} \stackrel{(6.16)}{=} \frac{d_{\eta}(y,z)}{|\eta(y) - \eta(z)|} = \frac{|y-z|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}}{|\eta(y) - \eta(z)|} \stackrel{(5.10)}{<} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\frac{\theta}{2}}} < 1 + \theta^{\frac{1}{4}}.$$

*Case II.* For  $(y, z) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$  and  $\nu := \nu_{B_r(x)} \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  as defined in (6.6) we infer from the definition (6.16), (6.14) of Lemma 6.2, and (6.20) of Lemma 6.4

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{\eta}(z) - \tilde{\eta}(y)| &\geq \langle \tilde{\eta}(z) - \tilde{\eta}(y), \nu \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n} = \langle \tilde{\eta}(x_-) - \tilde{\eta}(y), \nu \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n} + \langle \tilde{\eta}(z) - \tilde{\eta}(x_-), \nu \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n} \\ &\stackrel{(6.16)}{=} \langle \tilde{\eta}(x_-) - \tilde{\eta}(y), \nu \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n} + \frac{z-x_-}{x_+-x_-} \langle \eta(x_+) - \eta(x_-), \nu \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n} \\ &\stackrel{(6.14)}{\geq} (1 - 2\theta^{\frac{1}{4}}) [(x_- - y) + (z - x_-)] = (1 - 2\theta^{\frac{1}{4}})(z - y) \\ &= (1 - 2\theta^{\frac{1}{4}})d_{\eta}(y, z) \stackrel{(6.20)}{\geq} (1 - 2\theta^{\frac{1}{4}})d_{\tilde{\eta}}(y, z), \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\frac{d_{\tilde{\eta}}(y,z)}{|\tilde{\eta}(y) - \tilde{\eta}(z)|} \leq \frac{1}{1-2\theta^{\frac{1}{4}}} = 1 + \frac{2\theta^{\frac{1}{4}}}{1-2\theta^{\frac{1}{4}}} < 1 + 4\theta^{\frac{1}{4}},$$

because  $0 < \theta < \theta_2 = 256^{-4}$ .  $\square$

Finally we show how to control the distortion quotient globally under harmonic substitution, which may be reinterpreted as controlling the bilipschitz constant of  $\tilde{\eta}$  measured in its intrinsic distance  $d_{\tilde{\eta}}(\cdot, \cdot)$ .

**Lemma 6.5** (Bilipschitz control under harmonic substitution). *Let  $\eta \in W^{\frac{3}{2},2}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^n)$  be an arclength parametrized curve satisfying (6.17) for finitely many distinct parameters  $x_1, \dots, x_N \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  with  $r \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$  as in (6.15) and  $\theta \in (0, \theta_3]$ , where*

$$(6.24) \quad \theta_3 := \frac{1}{4^{24}L^8} = \left(\frac{1}{64L}\right)^8,$$

with  $L \in [1, \infty)$  such that

$$(6.25) \quad |\eta(y) - \eta(z)| \geq \frac{1}{L}|y - z|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \quad \text{for all } y, z \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}.$$

If  $\tilde{\eta}$  is the modified curve obtained from  $\eta$  by harmonic substitution as in (6.16), then there exists some number  $\tilde{L} \in [L, 2L]$  such that

$$(6.26) \quad |\tilde{\eta}(y) - \tilde{\eta}(z)| \geq \frac{1}{\tilde{L}}d_{\tilde{\eta}}(y, z) \quad \text{for all } y, z \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}.$$

*Proof.* Note that the smallness assumption (6.24) implies  $0 < \theta \leq \theta_3 < \theta_2 = 256^{-4} < \theta_1 = 144^{-4}$ , so that all previous lemmas in the present section are applicable. We distinguish three (partly overlapping) cases:

- I.  $y, z \in [x_i - r, x_i^+]$  (or  $y, z \in [x_-^i, x_i + r]$ ) for some  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ ,
- II.  $y, z \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^N [x_-^i, x_i^+]$ ,
- III.  $y \in [x_-^i, x_i^+]$ ,  $z \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus [x_i - r, x_i + r]$  for some  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ .

*Case I.* We apply (6.18) of Lemma 6.3 to deduce for  $d_{\tilde{\eta}}(y, z) \equiv d_{\tilde{\eta}}(\tilde{\eta}(y), \tilde{\eta}(z))$

$$(6.27) \quad \frac{1024}{1025}d_{\tilde{\eta}}(y, z) \leq \frac{d_{\eta}(y,z)}{1+4\theta^{\frac{1}{4}}} \stackrel{(6.18)}{<} |\tilde{\eta}(y) - \tilde{\eta}(z)| \quad \text{for all } y, z \in [x_i - r, x_i^+](\text{or } [x_-^i, x_i + r]).$$

*Case II.* For  $y, z \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^N [x_-^i, x_i^+]$  we have by means of (6.20)  $d_{\tilde{\eta}}(y, z) \leq d_{\eta}(y, z)$  and  $|\tilde{\eta}(y) - \tilde{\eta}(z)| = |\eta(y) - \eta(z)|$ , so that by assumption (6.25)

$$(6.28) \quad \frac{1}{\tilde{L}}d_{\tilde{\eta}}(y, z) \leq \frac{1}{L}d_{\eta}(y, z) = \frac{1}{L}|y - z|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \stackrel{(6.25)}{\leq} |\eta(y) - \eta(z)| = |\tilde{\eta}(y) - \tilde{\eta}(z)|.$$

*Case III.* For  $y \in [x_-^i, x_+^i]$  and  $z \notin [x_i - r, x_i + r]$  we find by (6.20), the first inequality in (6.18) of Lemma 6.3, and assumptions (6.25) and (6.24)

(6.29)

$$\frac{d_{\tilde{\eta}}(y, z)}{|\tilde{\eta}(y) - \tilde{\eta}(z)|} \stackrel{(6.18), (6.20)}{<} \frac{d_{\eta}(y, z)}{|\eta(y) - \eta(z)| - 12\theta^{\frac{1}{8}} r} = \left( \frac{|\eta(y) - \eta(z)|}{|y - z|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}} - \frac{12\theta^{\frac{1}{8}} r}{|y - z|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}} \right)^{-1} \stackrel{(6.25)}{<} \left( \frac{1}{L} - \frac{12\theta^{\frac{1}{8}}}{3/8} \right)^{-1} \stackrel{(6.24)}{\leq} 2L,$$

since  $|y - z|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \geq |z - x|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} - \max\{|x - x_-^i|, |x - x_+^i|\} > r - \frac{5}{8}r = \frac{3}{8}r$ .  $\square$

## 7. WEAK FRACTIONAL COMPACTNESS

From the introduction we recall Definition (1.7) of the  $p$ -rotationally symmetric subset  $\Sigma_p(\mathcal{K})$  of a given knot equivalence class  $\mathcal{K}$  for  $p \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}$ . Consider now for given constants  $L \geq 1$  and  $R > 0$  the subset

(7.1)

$$\mathcal{F}_{p,L,R}(\mathcal{K}) := \{\eta \in \Sigma_p(\mathcal{K}) \cap W^{\frac{3}{2},2}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3) : |\eta'| = 1 \text{ a.e.}, \text{biLip}(\eta) \geq \frac{1}{L}, \max\{|\eta(0)|, [\eta']_{\frac{1}{2},2}^2\} \leq R\},$$

where  $\text{biLip}(\eta)$  denotes the bilipschitz constant defined in (5.8) in Section 5. Then we can prove the following compactness result which may be of independent interest in geometric knot theory.

**Theorem 7.1** (Weak fractional compactness). *For any tame prime knot equivalence class  $\mathcal{K}$  the set  $\mathcal{F}_{p,L,R}(\mathcal{K})$  is weakly sequentially compact in  $W^{\frac{3}{2},2}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$  in the restricted sense that for any sequence  $(\gamma_n)_n \subset \mathcal{F}_{p,L,R}(\mathcal{K}) \cap C^1(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$  there is a knot  $\gamma \in \mathcal{F}_{p,L,R}(\mathcal{K})$  and a subsequence  $\gamma_{n_k} \rightharpoonup \gamma$  in  $W^{\frac{3}{2},2}$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .*

Strictly speaking, the tameness requirement is superfluous since  $\mathcal{F}_{p,L,R}(\mathcal{K}) = \emptyset$  if  $\mathcal{K}$  is wild as pointed out at the end of the proof of Corollary 1.5. The additional smoothness assumption on the sequence  $(\gamma_n)_n$  guarantees that sequence members remain tame after the harmonic substitution described in Section 6. This assumption might be of purely technical nature and can possibly be omitted.

For our application in search of symmetric minimizing knots for the Möbius energy in Section 8, however, a mollification argument allows us to focus on smooth minimizing sequences satisfying all assumptions of Theorem 7.1 above.

*Proof of Theorem 7.1.* We proceed in several steps.

*Step 1. Subconvergence to a candidate curve  $\gamma$ .* Since  $|\gamma'_n| = 1$  a.e. on  $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  and  $|\gamma_n(t)| \leq |\gamma_n(t) - \gamma_n(0)| + R \leq 1 + R$  for a.e.  $t \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  one finds a constant  $C = C(R)$  independent of  $n$  such that

$$(7.2) \quad \|\gamma_n\|_{W^{\frac{3}{2},2}} \leq C \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

The space  $W^{\frac{3}{2},2}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$  is reflexive so that we may assume that there is some curve  $\gamma \in W^{\frac{3}{2},2}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$  such that (up to a subsequence)

$$(7.3) \quad \gamma_n \rightharpoonup \gamma \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

By the Poincaré inequality (cf. [28, Proposition A.3]) the seminorm  $[\cdot]_{\frac{1}{2},2}$  is a norm on the subspace  $\{f \in W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3) : \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} f(u) du = 0\}$  equivalent to  $\|\cdot\|_{W^{\frac{1}{2},2}}$ . Since  $\int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \eta'(u) du = 0$  for all  $\eta \in W^{\frac{3}{2},2}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$  we therefore have by (7.3),

$$(7.4) \quad [\gamma']_{\frac{1}{2},2} \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} [\gamma'_n]_{\frac{1}{2},2} \leq \sqrt{R}.$$

Moreover, due to the compact embeddings  $W^{\frac{3}{2},2} \hookrightarrow C^0$  and  $W^{\frac{3}{2},2} \hookrightarrow W^{1,1}$  and the theorem of Fischer–Riesz, we find (up to a further subsequence)

$$(7.5) \quad \gamma_n \rightarrow \gamma \quad \text{in } C^0, \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma'_n \rightarrow \gamma' \quad \text{a.e. on } \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$



This implies  $|\gamma(0)| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\gamma_n(0)| \leq R$  and  $|\gamma'| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\gamma'_n| = 1$  a.e. on  $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ . The uniform convergence in (7.5) leads to the bilipschitz estimate

$$|\gamma(u) - \gamma(v)| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\gamma_n(u) - \gamma_n(v)| \geq \frac{1}{L} |u - v|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \quad \text{for all } u, v \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z};$$

hence

$$(7.6) \quad \text{biLip}(\gamma) \geq \frac{1}{L},$$

and  $\gamma$  is embedded. Also the symmetry relation (1.6) is preserved in the uniform limit since

$$\gamma(s) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_n(s) \stackrel{(1.6)}{=} R_{\frac{2\pi}{p}} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_n(s - \frac{1}{p}) = R_{\frac{2\pi}{p}} \gamma(s - \frac{1}{p}) \quad \text{for all } s \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}.$$

So, the only requirement on the limiting knot  $\gamma$  to be checked, is that  $\gamma$  represents the prescribed knot equivalence class, i.e., that  $[\gamma] = \mathcal{K}$ .

*Step 2. Controlling the local distortion of the limiting knot  $\gamma$ .* Combining (5.10) in Corollary 5.2 with the absolute continuity of the double integral defining the seminorm  $[\gamma']_{\frac{1}{2},2} \leq \sqrt{R}$  yields a number  $\rho_\gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$  such that for  $d_\gamma(s, t) \equiv d_\gamma(\gamma(s), \gamma(t)) = |s - t|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}$

$$(7.7) \quad \sup \left\{ \frac{d_\gamma(s,t)}{|\gamma(s) - \gamma(t)|} : s, t \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, 0 < |s - t|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} = |s - t| \leq 2\rho_\gamma \right\} < g_3.$$

For parameters  $s, t \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  with  $d_\gamma(s, t) > 2\rho_\gamma$ , on the other hand, we infer from (7.6)

$$2\rho_\gamma < d_\gamma(s, t) = |s - t|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \leq L|\gamma(s) - \gamma(t)|.$$

This together with (7.7) leads to

$$(7.8) \quad \delta(\gamma, r_\gamma) < g_3 \quad \text{at scale } r_\gamma := \frac{\rho_\gamma}{L}.$$

Suppose we had  $\delta(\gamma_m, r_{\gamma_m}) < g_3$  for some  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  at some scale  $r_{\gamma_m} > 0$ , then we could conclude the knot equivalence  $\mathcal{K} = [\gamma_m] = [\gamma]$  from Corollary 1.3, if, in addition,  $\|\gamma_m - \gamma\|_{L^\infty} < \frac{1}{4} \min\{r_\gamma, r_{\gamma_m}\}$ . But as indicated in Section 1.5 of the introduction this might be too much to hope for because of possible concentrations in the seminorms  $[\gamma'_m]_{\frac{1}{2},2}$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore, we are going to carefully cut out possible concentrations of the curves  $\gamma_n$ , replace these subarcs by straight segments to obtain modified curves  $\tilde{\gamma}_n$ , and use the estimates of Section 6 to finally find a sequence member  $\tilde{\gamma}_m$  sufficiently  $L^\infty$ -close to  $\gamma$ , so that Corollary 1.3 indeed implies  $[\gamma] = [\tilde{\gamma}_m] = [\gamma_m] = \mathcal{K}$ . The details are presented in the remaining steps. This is where the assumptions  $\gamma_n \in C^1(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$  and  $\mathcal{K}$  prime come into play.

*Step 3. Localizing concentrations via weak convergence of measures.* Fix

$$(7.9) \quad \theta \equiv \theta_4 := \left(\frac{1}{6 \cdot 128L}\right)^8 < \theta_3 < \theta_2 < \theta_1 < \frac{1}{20},$$

such that we have Lemmas 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, and 6.5 of Section 6 at our disposal. In addition, set

$$(7.10) \quad \varepsilon := \frac{2}{3} - \frac{6}{\pi^2} > 0$$

and define the Radon measures<sup>10</sup>

$$(7.11) \quad \mu_n(A) := \iint_A \frac{|\gamma'_n(u) - \gamma'_n(v)|^2}{|u - v|^2} du dv \quad \text{for Lebesgue measurable } A \subset \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

By means of the assumed uniform bound  $[\gamma'_n]_{\frac{1}{2},2} \leq \sqrt{R}$  we find  $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu_n(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}) \leq R < \infty$ , so that there is a Radon measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  such that (up to a subsequence)

$$(7.12) \quad \mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

cf. [19, Theorem 1.41]. (Note that the limiting measure  $\mu$  might be different from  $[\gamma']_{\frac{1}{2},2}^2$ .) Since the mapping  $r \mapsto \mu(B_r(x) \times B_r(y))$  is non-negative and non-decreasing for fixed parameters  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ , its limit

$$(7.13) \quad \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \mu(B_r(x) \times B_r(y)) \text{ exists and is non-negative,}$$

<sup>10</sup>suitably extended to an outer measure; see, e.g., [42, pp. 13,14].

so that we can consider the set

$$(7.14) \quad W_\varepsilon := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} : \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \mu(B_r(x) \times B_r(y)) > \varepsilon\}.$$

We claim that concentrations take place only on the diagonal, i.e.,

$$(7.15) \quad W_\varepsilon = \bigcup_{x \in V_\varepsilon} \{x\} \times \{x\},$$

where  $V_\varepsilon := \{x \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} : \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \mu(B_r(x) \times B_r(x)) > \varepsilon\}$ . Indeed, for arbitrary fixed  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , distinct parameters  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ , and  $0 < r < \frac{1}{4}|x - y|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}$ , one has  $|u - v| \geq |x - y| - 2r > \frac{1}{2}|x - y|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}$  for all  $u \in B_r(x)$ ,  $v \in B_r(y)$ , so that (with  $|\gamma'_n| = 1$  a.e.)

$$(7.16) \quad \mu_n(B_r(x) \times B_r(y)) < \frac{4}{|x - y|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}^2} \cdot 4(2r)^2,$$

and therefore, by the characterization of weak convergence of measures [19, Theorem 1.40],

$$\mu(B_r(x) \times B_r(y)) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(B_r(x) \times B_r(y)) \stackrel{(7.16)}{\leq} \frac{64}{|x - y|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}^2} \cdot r^2 \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow 0.$$

Hence  $(x, y) \notin W_\varepsilon$ , which proves our claim (7.15).

We also claim that  $W_\varepsilon$  contains only finitely many elements, that is,

$$(7.17) \quad \#W_\varepsilon = \#V_\varepsilon \leq \lceil \frac{R}{\varepsilon} \rceil,$$

where  $\lceil a \rceil$  denotes the smallest integer greater or equal to  $a$ . For that take  $j$  parameters  $x_1, \dots, x_j \in V_\varepsilon$  and choose radii  $r_1, \dots, r_j > 0$  such that  $\mu(B_{r_k}(x_k) \times B_{r_k}(x_k)) > \varepsilon$  and  $B_{r_i}(x_i) \cap B_{r_l}(x_l) = \emptyset$  for all  $i, k, l \in \{1, \dots, j\}$  with  $i \neq l$ . Then

$$\varepsilon \cdot j < \sum_{k=1}^j \mu(B_{r_k}(x_k) \times B_{r_k}(x_k)) \leq \mu(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}) \leq R,$$

which establishes (7.17).

Our last claim in this step says that the measure  $\mu$  is uniformly small on small sets off  $W_\varepsilon$ . More precisely,

$$(7.18) \quad \text{There exists } \rho_\mu > 0, \text{ such that } \mu((B_{\rho_\mu}(z) \times B_{\rho_\mu}(z)) \setminus W_\varepsilon) \leq 2\varepsilon \text{ for all } z \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}.$$

To prove this define the restricted measures (cf. [19, Definition 1.2])  $\bar{\mu} := \mu \llcorner [(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}) \setminus W_\varepsilon]$  satisfying

$$(7.19) \quad \bar{\mu}(A) = \mu([( \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}) \setminus W_\varepsilon] \cap A) = \mu(A \setminus W_\varepsilon) \quad \text{for Lebesgue measurable } A \subset \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z},$$

and assume for contradiction, that for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  there is a parameter  $z_k \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  such that  $\bar{\mu}(B_{\frac{1}{k}}(z_k) \times B_{\frac{1}{k}}(z_k)) > 2\varepsilon$ . We may assume that  $z_k \rightarrow z_0 \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , so that for every  $r > 0$  there is an index  $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $|z_k - z_0| < \frac{r}{2}$  for all  $k \geq k_0$ , which implies for all  $k \geq \max\{k_0, \frac{2}{r}\}$

$$|u - z_0| \leq |u - z_k| + |z_k - z_0| < \frac{1}{k} + \frac{r}{2} \leq r \quad \text{for all } u \in B_{\frac{1}{k}}(z_k).$$

Consequently,

$$(7.20) \quad \bar{\mu}(B_r(z_0) \times B_r(z_0)) \geq \bar{\mu}(B_{\frac{1}{k}}(z_k) \times B_{\frac{1}{k}}(z_k)) > 2\varepsilon \quad \text{for all } r > 0, k \geq \max\{k_0, \frac{2}{r}\}.$$

*Case 1.* If  $z_0 \notin V_\varepsilon$  then by definition of  $W_\varepsilon$ , by (7.15), (7.19), and (7.20),

$$\varepsilon \geq \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \mu(B_r(z_0) \times B_r(z_0)) \stackrel{(7.19)}{\geq} \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \bar{\mu}(B_r(z_0) \times B_r(z_0)) \stackrel{(7.20)}{\geq} 2\varepsilon,$$

contradiction.

*Case 2.* If  $z_0 \in V_\varepsilon$ , then write  $\{z_0\} \times \{z_0\} = \bigcap_{r>0} (B_r(z_0) \times B_r(z_0))$  to obtain by virtue of (7.15), (7.19), [19, Theorem 1.2(iv)], and (7.20),

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \mu(\emptyset) \stackrel{(7.15)}{=} \mu((\{z_0\} \times \{z_0\}) \setminus W_\varepsilon) \stackrel{(7.19)}{=} \bar{\mu}(\bigcap_{r>0} (B_r(z_0) \times B_r(z_0))) \\ &= \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \bar{\mu}(B_r(z_0) \times B_r(z_0)) \stackrel{(7.20)}{\geq} 2\varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

again a contradiction. This completes the proof of our claim (7.18).

*Step 4. Identifying a suitable approximating knot  $\gamma_{n_0}$ .* For any fixed parameter  $x \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  we estimate the measure  $\mu$  on annuli  $A_{r,\theta}(x) = B_r(x) \setminus B_{\theta r}(x)$  as

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \mu(\overline{A_{r,\theta}(x)} \times \overline{A_{r,\theta}(x)}) \leq \mu((B_{2r}(x) \setminus B_{\theta r}(x)) \times (B_{2r}(x) \setminus B_{\theta r}(x))) \\ &= \mu(B_{2r}(x) \times B_{2r}(x)) - \mu(B_{\theta r}(x) \times B_{\theta r}(x)) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

by virtue of (7.13). Thus, there is a radius  $r_x > 0$  such that

$$(7.21) \quad \mu(\overline{A_{r,\theta}(x)} \times \overline{A_{r,\theta}(x)}) < \frac{\theta}{2} \quad \text{for all } r \in (0, r_x],$$

where  $\theta$  is given in (7.9). In particular, for the finitely many parameters in  $V_\varepsilon = \{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$ ,  $N \leq \lceil \frac{R}{\varepsilon} \rceil$  we find radii  $r_l := r_{x_l} > 0$  such that

$$(7.22) \quad \mu(\overline{A_{r,\theta}(x_l)} \times \overline{A_{r,\theta}(x_l)}) < \frac{\theta}{2} \quad \text{for all } r \in (0, r_l], \quad l = 1, \dots, N.$$

Now set

$$(7.23) \quad \bar{r} := \min \left\{ \rho_\mu, r_1, \dots, r_N, r_\gamma, \frac{1}{4p}, \frac{1}{4} \min\{|x_i - x_k| : i \neq k, i, k \in \{1, \dots, N\}\} \right\} > 0,$$

where  $\rho_\mu > 0$  is the radius such that (7.18) holds, and  $r_\gamma > 0$  is the scale at which  $\gamma$  satisfies the distortion estimate (7.8), and  $p \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}$  determines the prescribed rotational symmetry defined in (1.6). Inequality (7.22) implies in particular that

$$(7.24) \quad \mu(\overline{A_{r,\theta}(x_l)} \times \overline{A_{r,\theta}(x_l)}) < \frac{\theta}{2} \quad \text{for all } r \in (0, \bar{r}], \quad l = 1, \dots, N.$$

For the fixed radius  $r := \bar{r}$  we use the weak convergence (7.12) to find for each  $l \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  some index  $n_l \in \mathbb{N}$  such that by [19, Theorem 1.40]  $\mu_n(\overline{A_{\bar{r},\theta}(x_l)} \times \overline{A_{\bar{r},\theta}(x_l)}) < \theta$  for all  $n \geq n_l$ , so that

$$(7.25) \quad \mu_n(\overline{A_{\bar{r},\theta}(x_l)} \times \overline{A_{\bar{r},\theta}(x_l)}) < \theta \quad \text{for all } l = 1, \dots, N, \quad n \geq n_*,$$

where  $n_* := \max\{n_l : l = 1, \dots, N\}$ . By means of the uniform convergence in (7.5) we may choose  $n_{**} \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $n_{**} \geq n_*$  such that

$$(7.26) \quad \|\gamma_n - \gamma\|_{L^\infty} \leq \frac{1}{128} \cdot \frac{\bar{r}}{L} \quad \text{for all } n \geq n_{**}.$$

Now choose finitely many parameters  $y_1, \dots, y_K \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B_{\bar{r}}(V_\varepsilon)$ , such that

$$(7.27) \quad \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus \overline{B_{\frac{3}{4}\bar{r}}(V_\varepsilon)} \subset \bigcup_{k=1}^K B_{\frac{1}{4}\bar{r}}(y_k).$$

In particular, from  $y_1, \dots, y_K \notin B_{\bar{r}}(V_\varepsilon)$  we infer that

$$(7.28) \quad B_{\frac{5}{8}\bar{r}}(V_\varepsilon) \cap \bigcup_{k=1}^K B_{\frac{3}{8}\bar{r}}(y_k) = \emptyset.$$

Then use the weak convergence (7.12) again to find an index  $n_0 \geq n_{**}$  such that in view of (7.18)

$$(7.29) \quad \max_{k=1, \dots, K} \mu_{n_0}(\overline{B_{\frac{1}{2}\bar{r}}(y_k)} \times \overline{B_{\frac{1}{2}\bar{r}}(y_k)}) \leq 3\varepsilon,$$

which is possible, since by [19, Theorem 1.40] and by our choice of  $\bar{r}$  in (7.23) and of the parameters  $y_1, \dots, y_K \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B_{\bar{r}}(V_\varepsilon)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(\overline{B_{\frac{1}{2}\bar{r}}(y_k)} \times \overline{B_{\frac{1}{2}\bar{r}}(y_k)}) &\stackrel{(7.12)}{\leq} \mu(\overline{B_{\frac{1}{2}\bar{r}}(y_k)} \times \overline{B_{\frac{1}{2}\bar{r}}(y_k)}) \leq \mu(B_{\frac{3}{4}\bar{r}}(y_k) \times B_{\frac{3}{4}\bar{r}}(y_k)) \\ &= \mu(B_{\frac{3}{4}\bar{r}}(y_k) \times B_{\frac{3}{4}\bar{r}}(y_k) \setminus W_\varepsilon) \stackrel{(7.23)}{\leq} \mu((B_{\rho_\mu}(y_k) \times B_{\rho_\mu}(y_k)) \setminus W_\varepsilon) \stackrel{(7.18)}{\leq} 2\varepsilon \text{ for all } k = 1, \dots, K. \end{aligned}$$

Summarizing (7.25), (7.26), and (7.29), we arrive at

$$(7.30) \quad \begin{cases} \mu_{n_0}(\overline{A_{\bar{r},\theta}(x_l)} \times \overline{A_{\bar{r},\theta}(x_l)}) < \theta & \text{for all } l = 1, \dots, N, \\ \mu_{n_0}(B_{\frac{\bar{r}}{2}}(y_k) \times B_{\frac{\bar{r}}{2}}(y_k)) \leq 3\varepsilon & \text{for all } k = 1, \dots, K, \\ \|\gamma_{n_0} - \gamma\|_{L^\infty} \leq \frac{1}{128} \cdot \frac{\bar{r}}{L}. \end{cases}$$

*Step 5. Cutting out concentrations of  $\gamma_{n_0}$  and harmonic substitution.* Now we modify the knot  $\gamma_{n_0}$  in each ball  $B_{\bar{r}}(x_i) \subset \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $x_i \in V_\varepsilon$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , where  $\bar{r}$  is defined in (7.23). We do that as in (6.16) by choosing suitable truncation points  $x_\pm^i \in G_\pm^i := G_\pm(x_i, \theta, \bar{r})$ , where the sets  $G_\pm^i$  are defined as in (6.12) for  $x := x_i$ ,  $r := \bar{r}$ , and  $\theta := \theta_4 < \theta_3 = (64L)^{-8}$  (see (7.9)), to obtain the modified curve

$$(7.31) \quad \tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}(z) := \begin{cases} \gamma_{n_0}(x_-^i) + \frac{z - x_-^i}{x_+^i - x_-^i} (\gamma_{n_0}(x_+^i) - \gamma_{n_0}(x_-^i)) & \text{for } z \in [x_-^i, x_+^i], i = 1, \dots, N, \\ \gamma_{n_0}(z) & \text{for } z \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^N [x_-^i, x_+^i]. \end{cases}$$

If  $V_\varepsilon = \emptyset$  then simply set  $\tilde{\gamma}_{n_0} := \gamma_{n_0}$ . We infer from  $\text{biLip}(\gamma_{n_0}) \geq \frac{1}{L}$  (since  $\gamma_{n_0} \in \mathcal{F}_{p,L,R}(\mathcal{K})$ ) and (6.26) in Lemma 6.5 for  $\eta := \gamma_{n_0}$ , that there is a constant  $\tilde{L} \in [L, 2L]$  such that

$$(7.32) \quad |\tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}(y) - \tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}(z)| \geq \frac{1}{\tilde{L}} d_{\tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}}(y, z) \quad \text{for all } y, z \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}.$$

Thus,  $\tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}$  is embedded. Since  $\gamma_{n_0}$  is assumed to be of class  $C^1(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ , and we substituted the subarcs  $\gamma_{n_0}([x_-^i, x_+^i])$  by straight segments with small angles  $\angle(\gamma'_{n_0}(x_\pm^i), \frac{\gamma_{n_0}(x_+^i) - \gamma_{n_0}(x_-^i)}{x_+^i - x_-^i})$  for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , we can modify the arguments given by Crowell and Fox in [14, Appendix I] to show that the modified curve  $\tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}$  is still tame<sup>11</sup>. Let us briefly sketch their arguments and indicate the necessary modifications, the details are then left to the reader.

For a given arclength parametrized  $C^1$ -knot  $\eta$  and any angle  $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_0(\eta)]$ , where the threshold angle  $\alpha_0(\eta)$  depends on the modulus of continuity of the unit tangent  $\eta'$ , Crowell and Fox construct a necklace of double cones (see [14, Figure 62]) with apex angle  $\alpha$ , such that the finitely many apices of these double cones form a closed polygon  $P$  inscribed in  $\eta$ , and such that  $\eta$  intersects every circular cross-section of each double cone exactly once and is contained in that necklace. The inscribed polygon  $P$  does the same, which leads them to define a homeomorphism of  $\mathbb{R}^3$  which equals the identity outside the double cones, by mapping within each cross-section the unique curve point of  $\eta$  linearly to the respective unique point on  $P$  in that same cross-section; see [14, Figure 64]. This way they show that  $\eta$  and  $P$  are equivalent to conclude that any such  $C^1$ -curve  $\eta$  is tame. In our situation we proceed in the same way<sup>12</sup> with  $\tilde{\eta} := \tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^N [x_-^i, x_+^i]}$  obtaining  $N$  open polygonal lines with endpoints  $\tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}(x_\pm^i)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , forming the axes of  $N$  disjoint necklaces each consisting of mutually disjoint double cones (by choosing a suitably small apex angle  $\alpha$  and sufficiently small distances between neighboring apices). Taking the union of these  $N$  polygonal lines with the  $N$  straight segments  $\tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}([x_-^i, x_+^i])$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , defines a closed polygon  $P$  inscribed in  $\tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}$  (coinciding with  $\tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}$  in its straight segments). We will now show that for any  $\alpha \in (0, \frac{\pi}{4})$  one has

$$(7.33) \quad \beta := \max_{i=1, \dots, N} \max \left\{ \angle(\gamma'_{n_0}(x_-^i), \frac{\gamma_{n_0}(x_+^i) - \gamma_{n_0}(x_-^i)}{x_+^i - x_-^i}), \angle(\frac{\gamma_{n_0}(x_+^i) - \gamma_{n_0}(x_-^i)}{x_+^i - x_-^i}, \gamma'_{n_0}(x_+^i)) \right\} < \pi - 2\alpha,$$

<sup>11</sup>although  $\tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}$  is in general not in  $W^{\frac{3}{2},2}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$  anymore because of the harmonic substitution; cf. Footnote 3.

<sup>12</sup>Here it is important to let  $m = \text{biLip } \eta = \tilde{L}$  (not just  $L$ ) in [14, Eq. (6), p. 149].

to prevent intersections of any segment  $\tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}([x_-^i, x_+^i])$  with their neighboring double cones. Indeed, (7.33) is guaranteed by inequality (6.14) of Lemma 6.2, which implies for  $\nu_i := \nu_{B_{\bar{r}}(x_i)} \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  defined as in (6.6),

$$\cos \angle(\gamma'_{n_0}(x_{\pm}^i), \nu_i) = \langle \gamma'_{n_0}(x_{\pm}^i), \nu_i \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3} = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \left\langle \frac{\gamma_{n_0}(x_{\pm}^i + s) - \gamma_{n_0}(x_{\pm}^i)}{s}, \nu_i \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3} \stackrel{(6.14)}{\geq} 1 - 2\theta^{\frac{1}{4}},$$

and also

$$\cos \angle\left(\frac{\gamma_{n_0}(x_+^i) - \gamma_{n_0}(x_-^i)}{|\gamma_{n_0}(x_+^i) - \gamma_{n_0}(x_-^i)|}, \nu_i\right) = \left\langle \frac{\gamma_{n_0}(x_+^i) - \gamma_{n_0}(x_-^i)}{x_+^i - x_-^i}, \nu_i \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3} \cdot \frac{x_+^i - x_-^i}{|\gamma_{n_0}(x_+^i) - \gamma_{n_0}(x_-^i)|} \stackrel{(6.14)}{\geq} 1 - 2\theta^{\frac{1}{4}}.$$

With  $\theta < \theta_3 \leq 64^{-8}$  we find  $1 - 2\theta^{\frac{1}{4}} \geq 1 - \frac{1}{128} > \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$ , so that  $\beta < \frac{\pi}{3}$ , which implies (7.33). In order to show that no segment  $\tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}([x_-^i, x_+^i])$  interferes with other parts of the curve, we argue as in [14, (I.6), p. 150].

Notice that if  $V_\varepsilon \neq \emptyset$  with some point  $\xi_1 \in V_\varepsilon$ , then by symmetry of  $\gamma_{n_0}$  also the points  $\xi_j := \xi_1 + \frac{j-1}{p} \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  for  $j = 2, \dots, p$ , are contained in  $V_\varepsilon$ , so that  $\sharp V_\varepsilon \geq 2$ .

We are now going to employ the harmonic substitution. If we replace a part of a curve by a straight line, we may face both global and local effects. A global effect means that a strand of  $\gamma|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B_{\bar{r}}(x_i)}$  might interfere with the substitution. This means that there are some  $\xi \in [x_-^i, x_+^i]$ ,  $z \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B_{\bar{r}}(x_i)$  such that  $\gamma_{n_0}(z)$  lies on the closed segment with endpoints  $\gamma_{n_0}(\xi)$  and  $\tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}(\xi)$ . (We can disregard points in  $[x_i - \bar{r}, x_i^-]$  and  $[x_i^+, x_i + \bar{r}]$  due to small local distortion.) But in this case we find

$$\frac{3\bar{r}}{8L} \leq \frac{1}{L} d_{\gamma_{n_0}}(z, \xi) \leq |\gamma_{n_0}(z) - \gamma_{n_0}(\xi)| \leq |\tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}(\xi) - \gamma_{n_0}(\xi)| \leq \|\tilde{\gamma}_{n_0} - \gamma_{n_0}\| \leq 6\theta^{1/8}\bar{r}$$

which implies  $1 \leq \frac{8}{3}L \cdot 6\theta^{1/8} = \frac{1}{48}$ , a contradiction. It remains to consider local effects. So, if any of the subarcs  $\gamma_{n_0}([x_-^i, x_+^i])$  (trivially extended to infinity) were non-trivially knotted, then by symmetry of  $\gamma_{n_0}$  there are at least two such non-trivially knotted subarcs, which implies that  $\gamma_{n_0}$  is a composite knot, contradicting our assumption. Consequently, the subarcs  $\gamma_{n_0}([x_-^i, x_+^i])$  are topologically trivial for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , and these subarcs were replaced by the topologically trivial straight segments  $\tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}([x_-^i, x_+^i])$ , which implies that  $\gamma_{n_0}$  is equivalent to  $\tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}$ , i.e.,  $[\gamma_{n_0}] = [\tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}]$ .

*Step 6. The final local distortion estimate for the modified curve  $\tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}$ .* For any  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  one either has  $\xi \in B_{\frac{3}{4}\bar{r}}(V_\varepsilon)$ , in which case there exists  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  with  $x_i \in V_\varepsilon$ , such that

$$(7.34) \quad B_{\frac{1}{8}\bar{r}}(\xi) \subset B_{\bar{r}}(x_i),$$

or, by the covering (7.27), there exists  $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$  such that  $\xi \in B_{\frac{1}{4}\bar{r}}(y_k)$ , so that

$$(7.35) \quad B_{\frac{1}{8}\bar{r}}(\xi) \subset B_{\frac{3}{8}\bar{r}}(y_k).$$

If (7.34) holds true then  $B_{\frac{1}{8}\bar{r}}(\xi)$  is either contained in the interval  $[x_i - \bar{r}, x_+^i]$  or in  $[x_-^i, x_i + \bar{r}]$  so that we may apply (6.18) of Lemma 6.3 to the curve  $\eta := \gamma_{n_0}$ , to the parameters  $x_1, \dots, x_N \in V_\varepsilon$ , the radius  $r := \bar{r}$ , and  $\theta = \theta_4 \in (0, \theta_2)$  (see (7.9)), to obtain

$$(7.36) \quad \sup_{\substack{y, z \in B_{\frac{1}{8}\bar{r}}(\xi) \\ y \neq z}} \frac{d_{\gamma_{n_0}}(y, z)}{|\gamma_{n_0}(y) - \gamma_{n_0}(z)|} < 1 + 4\theta^{\frac{1}{4}} < \frac{\pi}{3} < \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{8}} < g_3 = \frac{\sqrt{32}}{\sqrt{27}} \cdot \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{8}}.$$

If, on the other hand, (7.35) is true, then we know from (7.28) and our construction of  $\tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}$ , which implies in particular that  $\tilde{\gamma}_{n_0} = \gamma_{n_0}$  on  $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B_{\frac{5}{8}\bar{r}}(V_\varepsilon)$ , that

$$(7.37) \quad \tilde{\gamma}_{n_0} = \gamma_{n_0} \quad \text{on} \quad B_{\frac{3}{8}\bar{r}}(y_k).$$

By means of (7.30) we infer

$$(7.38) \quad [\gamma'_{n_0}]_{\frac{1}{2}, 2, B_{\frac{3}{8}\bar{r}}(y_k)}^2 = \mu_{n_0}(B_{\frac{3}{8}\bar{r}}(y_k) \times B_{\frac{3}{8}\bar{r}}(y_k)) \leq 3\varepsilon,$$



which we combine with (5.10) in Corollary 5.2 for  $\gamma := \gamma_{n_0}$  to conclude

$$(7.39) \quad \sup_{\substack{y, z \in B_{\frac{1}{8}\bar{r}}(\xi) \\ y \neq z}} \frac{d_{\tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}}(y, z)}{|\tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}(y) - \tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}(z)|} \stackrel{(7.35), (7.37)}{\leq} \sup_{\substack{y, z \in B_{\frac{3}{8}\bar{r}}(y_k) \\ y \neq z}} \frac{d_{\gamma_{n_0}}(y, z)}{|\gamma_{n_0}(y) - \gamma_{n_0}(z)|} \stackrel{(5.10), (7.38)}{\leq} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{3}{2}\varepsilon}} \stackrel{(7.10)}{=} \frac{\pi}{3} < \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{8}} < g_3,$$

by our choice of  $\varepsilon$  in (7.10). In view of (7.36) and (7.39) we have shown that, by continuity of  $\tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}$ ,

$$(7.40) \quad \sup_{\substack{y, z \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \\ 0 < d_{\tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}}(y, z) \leq \frac{1}{4}\bar{r}}} \frac{d_{\tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}}(y, z)}{|\tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}(y) - \tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}(z)|} \leq \frac{\pi}{3} < g_3.$$

According to (7.32) we have for two parameters  $y, z \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  with intrinsic distance  $d_{\tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}}(y, z) > \frac{1}{4}\bar{r}$  the estimate

$$\frac{1}{4}\bar{r} < d_{\tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}}(y, z) \leq \tilde{L}|\tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}(y) - \tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}(z)| \leq 2L|\tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}(y) - \tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}(z)|.$$

Therefore, (7.40) implies for the local distortion of  $\tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}$

$$(7.41) \quad \delta(\tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}, r_{\tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}}) \leq \frac{\pi}{3} < \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{8}} < g_3$$

at scale  $r_{\tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}} := \frac{1}{16L}\bar{r}$ . In order to apply Corollary 1.3 to  $\gamma_1 := \gamma$  and  $\gamma_2 := \tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}$  it suffices to verify by means of (7.30) and (6.18) in Lemma 6.3 for  $\eta := \gamma_{n_0}$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\gamma - \tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}\|_{L^\infty} &\leq \|\gamma - \gamma_{n_0}\|_{L^\infty} + \|\gamma_{n_0} - \tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\stackrel{(7.30), (6.18)}{<} \frac{1}{128L}\bar{r} + 6\theta^{\frac{1}{8}}\bar{r} \stackrel{(7.9)}{=} \frac{1}{64L}\bar{r} \leq \frac{1}{4} \min\{r_\gamma, r_{\tilde{\gamma}_{n_0}}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we deduce  $\mathcal{K} = [\gamma_{n_0}] = [\gamma]$  by Corollary 1.3.  $\square$

## 8. SYMMETRIC CRITICAL KNOTS

In this section we are going to use our weak compactness result, Theorem 7.1, to prove the existence of rotationally symmetric critical knots for the Möbius energy.

*Proof of Theorem 1.6.* Since  $\Sigma_p(\mathcal{K})$  contains a knot with finite Möbius energy, the knot equivalence class  $\mathcal{K}$  is tame according to [21, Theorem 4.1], the infimum of the energy is finite, and there is a minimizing sequence  $(\gamma_m)_m \subset \Sigma_p(\mathcal{K})$  with

$$E_{\text{Möb}}(\gamma_m) \rightarrow \inf_{\Sigma_p(\mathcal{K})} E_{\text{Möb}}(\cdot) < \infty \quad \text{as } m \rightarrow \infty.$$

Due to parameter invariance of  $E_{\text{Möb}}$  and because rescaling to unit length and subsequent reparametrization to arclength preserves the knot equivalence class, and also the  $p$ -rotational symmetry (1.6) according to [23, Lemma 4.6]<sup>13</sup>, we may assume without loss of generality that  $|\gamma'_m| = 1$  a.e. on  $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  for all  $m$ . In order to apply Theorem 7.1 we use convolutions  $\gamma_{m, \epsilon_m} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ ,  $\epsilon_m \rightarrow 0$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ , their rescalings  $\hat{\gamma}_{m, \epsilon_m} := (\mathcal{L}(\gamma_{m, \epsilon_m}))^{-1}\gamma_{m, \epsilon_m}$ , and reparametrize  $\hat{\gamma}_{m, \epsilon_m}$  to arclength to obtain  $\Gamma_m \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$  with  $|\Gamma'_m| = 1$  a.e. on  $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , such that

$$E_{\text{Möb}}(\Gamma_m) \leq E_{\text{Möb}}(\gamma_m) + \frac{1}{m} \quad \text{for all } m \in \mathbb{N},$$

which is possible due to [3, Theorems 1.1, 1.3 & 1.4]. Especially [3, Theorem 1.3] in combination with Corollary 1.5 of the present paper allows us to assume that  $[\Gamma_m] = [\gamma_m] = \mathcal{K}$  for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . As before, this mollification, rescaling, and subsequent reparametrization to arclength preserves the  $p$ -rotational symmetry defined in (1.6), so that  $\Gamma_m \in \Sigma_p(\mathcal{K})$  for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ .

This new  $E_{\text{Möb}}$ -minimizing sequence  $(\Gamma_m)_m$  has equibounded Möbius energy, which yields a uniform bound on the seminorms  $[\Gamma'_m]_{\frac{1}{2}, 2}$  according to [2, Theorem 1.1] or [23, Theorem 3.2(i)], as well as a uniform bilipschitz constant  $L$  depending only on the uniform energy bound;

<sup>13</sup>see version 2 in [22, Lemma 4.6] for the corrected proof.

see [33, Theorem 2.3]. So, for each  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , the curve  $\Gamma_m$  is contained in the class  $\mathcal{F}_{R,L,p}$  as defined in (7.1) for  $R := \sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} [\Gamma'_m]_{\frac{1}{2},2}^2$ , where we assumed (by translational invariance of  $E_{\text{Möb}}$ ) that  $\Gamma_m(0) = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^3$  for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Consequently, Theorem 7.1 implies the existence of a limiting arclength parametrized knot  $\Gamma \in \mathcal{F}_{R,L,p}$  such that a subsequence (still denoted by  $\Gamma_m$ ) converges weakly in  $W^{\frac{3}{2},2}$  and uniformly to  $\Gamma$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ . The lower semicontinuity of  $E_{\text{Möb}}$  (see [21, Lemma 4.2]) implies

$$(8.1) \quad \inf_{\Sigma_p(\mathcal{K})} E_{\text{Möb}}(\cdot) \leq E_{\text{Möb}}(\Gamma) \leq \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} E_{\text{Möb}}(\Gamma_m) = \inf_{\Sigma_p(\mathcal{K})} E_{\text{Möb}}(\cdot);$$

hence  $\Gamma$  is the desired symmetric minimizing prime knot.

It remains to be verified that  $\Gamma$  is critical for the Möbius energy on its full domain, because then  $\Gamma \in C^\omega(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$  due to [8, Corollary 1.3]. For that notice first that we can proceed exactly as in the proof of Corollary 1.5 to find a scale  $r_\Gamma > 0$  for the arclength parametrized  $W^{\frac{3}{2},2}$ -knot  $\Gamma$ , such that  $\delta(\Gamma, r_\Gamma) < g_3$ . We symmetrize any variational vector  $h \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$  according to

$$(8.2) \quad h_{\text{sym}}(u) := \sum_{k=1}^p \text{Rot}_{-\frac{2\pi k}{p}} \circ h(u + \frac{k}{p}) \quad \text{for } u \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z},$$

to obtain by virtue of Corollary 1.4 a number  $\epsilon_{\Gamma,h} > 0$  such that the perturbed curves  $\Upsilon_\epsilon := \Gamma + \epsilon h_{\text{sym}}$  are immersed knots equivalent to  $\Gamma$  for all  $|\epsilon| \leq \epsilon_{\Gamma,h}$ . Regarding  $p$ -rotational symmetry we compute (using (1.6) for  $\Gamma$ )

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Rot}_{\frac{2\pi}{p}} \circ \Upsilon_\epsilon(u - \frac{1}{p}) &= \text{Rot}_{\frac{2\pi}{p}} \circ \Gamma(u - \frac{1}{p}) + \epsilon \text{Rot}_{\frac{2\pi}{p}} \circ h_{\text{sym}}(u - \frac{1}{p}) \\ &\stackrel{(1.6)}{=} \Gamma(u) + \epsilon \sum_{k=1}^p \text{Rot}_{-\frac{2\pi}{p}(k-1)} \circ h(u + \frac{k-1}{p}) = \Gamma(u) + \epsilon \sum_{k=1}^{p-1} \text{Rot}_{-\frac{2\pi k}{p}} \circ h(u + \frac{k}{p}) + \epsilon h(u) \\ &= \Gamma(u) + \epsilon \sum_{k=1}^p \text{Rot}_{-\frac{2\pi k}{p}} \circ h(u + \frac{k}{p}) = \Gamma(u) + \epsilon h_{\text{sym}}(u) = \Upsilon_\epsilon(u) \quad \text{for all } u \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, |\epsilon| \leq \epsilon_{\Gamma,h}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $\Upsilon_\epsilon \in \Sigma_p(\mathcal{K})$  and (8.1) implies

$$E_{\text{Möb}}(\Gamma) \leq E_{\text{Möb}}(\Upsilon_\epsilon) = E_{\text{Möb}}(\Gamma + \epsilon h_{\text{sym}}) \quad \text{for all } |\epsilon| \leq \epsilon_{\Gamma,h}.$$

Therefore, taking the first variation  $\delta E_{\text{Möb}}(\Gamma, \cdot)$ , which is linear in its second entry,

$$(8.3) \quad 0 = \delta E_{\text{Möb}}(\Gamma, h_{\text{sym}}) = \sum_{k=1}^p \delta E_{\text{Möb}}(\Gamma, \text{Rot}_{-\frac{2\pi k}{p}} \circ h(\cdot + \frac{k}{p})).$$

Furthermore, from the symmetry (1.6) of  $\Gamma$  and the invariance of  $E_{\text{Möb}}$  under rotations and reparametrizations one deduces for every  $k \in \{1, \dots, p\}$

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\text{Möb}}(\Gamma(\cdot) + \epsilon \text{Rot}_{-\frac{2\pi k}{p}} \circ h(\cdot + \frac{k}{p})) &\stackrel{(1.6)}{=} E_{\text{Möb}}(\text{Rot}_{-\frac{2\pi k}{p}} \circ \Gamma(\cdot + \frac{k}{p}) + \epsilon \text{Rot}_{-\frac{2\pi k}{p}} \circ h(\cdot + \frac{k}{p})) \\ &= E_{\text{Möb}}(\text{Rot}_{-\frac{2\pi k}{p}} \circ [\Gamma(\cdot + \frac{k}{p}) + \epsilon h(\cdot + \frac{k}{p})]) = E_{\text{Möb}}(\Gamma(\cdot + \frac{k}{p}) + \epsilon h(\cdot + \frac{k}{p})) = E_{\text{Möb}}(\Gamma + \epsilon h), \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\delta E_{\text{Möb}}(\Gamma, \text{Rot}_{-\frac{2\pi k}{p}} \circ h(\cdot + \frac{k}{p})) = \frac{d}{d\epsilon} \Big|_{\epsilon=0} E_{\text{Möb}}(\Gamma + \epsilon \text{Rot}_{-\frac{2\pi k}{p}} \circ h(\cdot + \frac{k}{p})) = \frac{d}{d\epsilon} \Big|_{\epsilon=0} E_{\text{Möb}}(\Gamma + \epsilon h) = \delta E_{\text{Möb}}(\Gamma, h)$$

for all  $k = 1, \dots, p$ . Therefore, by (8.3),

$$0 = \sum_{k=1}^p \delta E_{\text{Möb}}(\Gamma, \text{Rot}_{-\frac{2\pi k}{p}} \circ h(\cdot + \frac{k}{p})) = p \delta E_{\text{Möb}}(\Gamma, h),$$

which leads to the desired criticality, since by continuity of the first variation we may approximate an arbitrary variational vector field  $h \in W^{\frac{3}{2},2}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$  by smooth vector fields, for which the first variation has just been shown to vanish.

In the specific case of torus knot classes  $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{T}(a, b)$  for co-prime integers  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0, \pm 1\}$  we can proceed exactly as in the proof of [23, Theorem 1.2] to show that there are at least two different  $E_{\text{Möb}}$ -critical torus knots  $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2$  in  $\mathcal{T}(a, b)$  for each co-prime integers  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0, \pm 1\}$ . The only prerequisite for that proof is the existence of symmetric energy minimizers for different

rotational symmetries, which can be obtained as above for  $E_{\text{Möb}}$  on the symmetric subsets  $\Sigma_{p_i}(\mathcal{T}(a, b))$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , for  $p_1 = a$  and  $p_2 = b$ .  $\square$

**Acknowledgements.** S.B. was partially funded through FWF grant no. P 29487-N32 “Gradient flows of curvature energies”. A.G. gratefully acknowledges funding through an incoming grant of the University of Salzburg, and through the stipend “International Research Fellow of JSPS (Postdoctoral Fellowships for Research in Japan)”. Ph.R. has been partially supported by the German Research Foundation (DFG) through project number 289032105. H.v.d.M.’s work is partially funded by the Excellence Initiative of the German federal and state governments.

While working on an early draft of this paper, A.G. enjoyed the hospitality of the Department of Mathematics at the University of Georgia, Athens, GA.

We are indebted to the students who attended H.v.d.M.’s lectures on this topic in the winter term 2024–2025 at RWTH Aachen University for their valuable comments and corrections.

## REFERENCES

- [1] S. Blatt. Note on continuously differentiable isotopies. [Report 34](#), RWTH Aachen University, 2009.
- [2] S. Blatt. [Boundedness and regularizing effects of O’Hara’s knot energies](#). *J. Knot Theory Ramifications*, 21(1):1250010, 9, 2012.
- [3] S. Blatt. [Curves between Lipschitz and  \$C^1\$  and their relation to geometric knot theory](#). *J. Geom. Anal.*, 29(4):3270–3292, 2019.
- [4] S. Blatt and Ph. Reiter. [Modeling repulsive forces on fibres via knot energies](#). *Computational and Mathematical Biophysics*, 2(1):56–72, 2014.
- [5] S. Blatt, Ph. Reiter, and A. Schikorra. [Harmonic analysis meets critical knots. Critical points of the Möbius energy are smooth](#). *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 368(9):6391–6438, 2016.
- [6] S. Blatt, Ph. Reiter, and A. Schikorra. [On O’Hara knot energies I: Regularity for critical knots](#). *J. Differential Geom.*, 121(3):385–424, 2022.
- [7] S. Blatt, Ph. Reiter, A. Schikorra, and N. Vorderobermeier. [Scale-invariant tangent-point energies for knots](#). *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 27(5):1929–2035, 2025.
- [8] S. Blatt and N. Vorderobermeier. [On the analyticity of critical points of the Möbius energy](#). *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 58(1):Paper No. 16, 28, 2019.
- [9] G. Burde, H. Zieschang, and M. Heusener. *Knots*, volume 5 of *De Gruyter Studies in Mathematics*. De Gruyter, Berlin, extended edition, 2014.
- [10] F. H. Clarke. [Generalized gradients and applications](#). *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 205:247–262, 1975.
- [11] F. H. Clarke. [Optimization and nonsmooth analysis](#), volume 5 of *Classics in Applied Mathematics*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, second edition, 1990.
- [12] F. H. Clarke, Y. S. Ledyaev, R. J. Stern, and P. R. Wolenski. *Nonsmooth analysis and control theory*, volume 178 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998.
- [13] R. Courant. *Dirichlet’s principle, conformal mapping, and minimal surfaces*. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1977. With an appendix by M. Schiffer, Reprint of the 1950 original.
- [14] R. H. Crowell and R. H. Fox. [Introduction to knot theory](#). Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1977. Reprint of the 1963 original, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, No. 57.
- [15] B. V. Dekster. [The Jung theorem for spherical and hyperbolic spaces](#). *Acta Math. Hungar.*, 67(4):315–331, 1995.
- [16] E. Denne and J. M. Sullivan. [Convergence and isotopy type for graphs of finite total curvature](#). In *Discrete differential geometry*, volume 38 of *Oberwolfach Semin.*, pages 163–174. Birkhäuser, Basel, 2008.
- [17] E. Denne and J. M. Sullivan. [The distortion of a knotted curve](#). *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 137(3):1139–1148, 2009.
- [18] Y. Diao, C. Ernst, and E. J. Janse van Rensburg. [Thicknesses of knots](#). *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 126(2):293–310, 1999.
- [19] L. C. Evans and R. F. Gariepy. *Measure theory and fine properties of functions*. Textbooks in Mathematics. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, revised edition, 2015.
- [20] G. M. Fisher. [On the group of all homeomorphisms of a manifold](#). *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 97:193–212, 1960.
- [21] M. H. Freedman, Z.-X. He, and Z. Wang. [Möbius energy of knots and unknots](#). *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 139(1):1–50, 1994.
- [22] A. Gilsbach and H. von der Mosel. [Symmetric critical knots for O’Hara’s energies](#). *ArXiv e-prints*, Sept. 2017.
- [23] A. Gilsbach and H. von der Mosel. [Symmetric critical knots for O’Hara’s energies](#). *Topology Appl.*, 242:73–102, 2018.

- [24] C. M. Gordon and J. Luecke. [Knots are determined by their complements](#). *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 2(2):371–415, 1989.
- [25] M. Gromov. [Homotopical effects of dilatation](#). *J. Differential Geometry*, 13(3):303–310, 1978.
- [26] M. W. Hirsch. *Differential topology*, volume 33 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994. Corrected reprint of the 1976 original.
- [27] D. Kim and R. Kusner. [Torus knots extremizing the Möbius energy](#). *Experiment. Math.*, 2(1):1–9, 1993.
- [28] J. Knappmann, H. Schumacher, D. Steenebrügge, and H. von der Mosel. [A speed preserving Hilbert gradient flow for generalized integral Menger curvature](#). *Advances in Calculus of Variations*, Jan. 2022.
- [29] R. B. Kusner and J. M. Sullivan. Möbius energies for knots and links, surfaces and submanifolds. In *Geometric topology (Athens, GA, 1993)*, volume 2 of *AMS/IP Stud. Adv. Math.*, pages 570–604. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1997.
- [30] C. B. Morrey, Jr. *Multiple integrals in the calculus of variations*. Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 130. Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., New York, 1966.
- [31] C. A. S. Mullikin. [A class of curves in every knot type where chords of high distortion are common](#). *Topology Appl.*, 154(14):2697–2708, 2007.
- [32] J. O’Hara. [Energy of a knot](#). *Topology*, 30(2):241–247, 1991.
- [33] J. O’Hara. [Family of energy functionals of knots](#). *Topology Appl.*, 48(2):147–161, 1992.
- [34] J. Pardon. [On the distortion of knots on embedded surfaces](#). *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 174(1):637–646, 2011.
- [35] Ph. Reiter. All curves in a  $C^1$ -neighbourhood of a given embedded curve are isotopic. [Report 4](#), RWTH Aachen University, 2005.
- [36] S. Semmes. [Chord-arc surfaces with small constant. I](#). *Adv. Math.*, 85(2):198–223, 1991.
- [37] E. M. Stein and R. Shakarchi. *Real analysis*, volume 3 of *Princeton Lectures in Analysis*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2005. Measure theory, integration, and Hilbert spaces.
- [38] P. Strzelecki, M. Szumańska, and H. von der Mosel. [On some knot energies involving Menger curvature](#). *Topology Appl.*, 160(13):1507–1529, 2013.
- [39] P. Strzelecki and H. von der Mosel. [Menger curvature as a knot energy](#). *Physics Reports*, 530:257–290, 2013.
- [40] P. Strzelecki and H. von der Mosel. [How averaged Menger curvatures control regularity and topology of curves and surfaces](#). *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 544(1):012018, 2014.
- [41] P. Strzelecki and H. von der Mosel. [Geometric curvature energies: facts, trends, and open problems](#). In *New directions in geometric and applied knot theory*, Partial Differ. Equ. Meas. Theory, pages 8–35. De Gruyter, Berlin, 2018.
- [42] G. Teschl. *Topics in Real Analysis*. Graduate Studies in Mathematics. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI. To appear. Online available from <https://www.mat.univie.ac.at/~gerald/ftp/book-ra/index.html>.
- [43] F. Waldhausen. [On irreducible 3-manifolds which are sufficiently large](#). *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 87:56–88, 1968.

(Simon Blatt) PARIS LODRON UNIVERSITÄT SALZBURG, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, HELLBRUNNER STRASSE 34, 5020 SALZBURG, AUSTRIA

*Email address*, Simon Blatt: [simon.blatt@sbg.ac.at](mailto:simon.blatt@sbg.ac.at)

(Alexandra Gilsbach) RWTH AACHEN UNIVERSITY, INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICS, TEMPLERGRABEN 55, 52062 AACHEN, GERMANY

*Email address*: [gilsbach@instmath.rwth-aachen.de](mailto:gilsbach@instmath.rwth-aachen.de)

(Philipp Reiter) CHEMNITZ UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS, 09107 CHEMNITZ, GERMANY

*Email address*: [reiter@math.tu-chemnitz.de](mailto:reiter@math.tu-chemnitz.de)

(Heiko von der Mosel) RWTH AACHEN UNIVERSITY, INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICS, TEMPLERGRABEN 55, 52062 AACHEN, GERMANY

*Email address*: [heiko@instmath.rwth-aachen.de](mailto:heiko@instmath.rwth-aachen.de)