

AN ENUMERATIVE MIN-MAX THEOREM FOR MINIMAL SURFACES

ADRIAN CHUN-PONG CHU, YANGYANG LI, ZHIHAN WANG

ABSTRACT. We prove an enumerative min-max theorem that relates the number of genus g minimal surfaces in 3-manifolds of positive Ricci curvature to topological properties of the set of embedded surfaces of genus $\leq g$, possibly with finitely many singularities. This completes a central component of our program of using topological methods to enumerating minimal surfaces with prescribed genus [CL24; Chu25; CLW26].

As an application, we show that every 3-sphere of positive Ricci curvature contains at least 4 embedded minimal surfaces of genus 2.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	5
3. Enumerative min-max theorem	7
4. Existence of four genus 2 minimal surfaces	10
5. Properties of the family Ψ	15
6. Topology of \mathcal{X}	25
7. Properties of the family Ξ	27
Appendix A. Metric perturbation	36
Appendix B. A lemma on cap product	37
Appendix C. Poincaré dual of cohomology classes via group action	38
Appendix D. Differential of real and imaginary part of complex polynomials	39
Appendix E. Unknotted genus 1 surfaces and Hopf links	40
References	45

1. INTRODUCTION

Enumerative problems in differential geometry have a long history. Here are some well-known conjectures.

- Every Riemannian 2-sphere has at least 3 simple closed geodesics (Poincaré, 1905).
- Every Riemannian 3-sphere has at least 4 embedded minimal spheres (S.-T. Yau [Yau82]).
- Every Riemannian 3-sphere has at least 5 embedded minimal tori (B. White [Whi89]).

Among these three conjectures, only the first one was fully solved: Building on the work of Lyusternik-Schnirelmann [LS47], M. Grayson gave a proof [Gra89] using curve shortening flow (see also [Lus47; Kli77; Bal78; Jos89; Tař92]). Yau's conjecture was solved in the case of bumpy metric and the case of positive Ricci curvature by Wang-Zhou [WZ23]: They developed a multiplicity one theorem for Simon-Smith min-max theory, using regularity results in [WZ25], and [SS23a] by Sarnataro-Stryker (see also [Smi82; Whi91; HK19]). Recently, the first two authors proved B. White's conjecture for 3-spheres with positive Ricci curvature [CL24]. Regarding more works on the construction of minimal submanifolds of controlled topological types under general metrics,

see also [Str84; GJ86; Gra89; Whi91; Zho16; HK19; BP23; HK23; Ko23a; Ko23b; BP24; LW24; LWY25].

In a series of papers [CL24; Chu25; CLW26]¹, the authors proposed a program that constructs minimal surfaces with prescribed genus based on the topological structure of the set of genus g embedded surfaces, possibly with finitely many singularities. Here is the setting: Let M be any closed orientable 3-manifold, and g a non-negative integer. Let $\mathcal{S}(M)$ denote the set of all orientable, separating, finite-area surfaces in M that are smoothly embedded except at possibly finitely many points (see §2 for the precise definition). Then, we consider the subset $\mathcal{S}_{\leq g}(M) \subset \mathcal{S}(M)$ of elements with genus $\leq g$. In [CLW26], we showed that given any closed orientable Riemannian 3-manifold (M, \mathbf{g}) of positive Ricci curvature, if there exists some map $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\leq g}(M)$ that *cannot be deformed via pinch-off processes* to become a map into $\mathcal{S}_{\leq g-1}(M)$ (see §2 therein), then (M, \mathbf{g}) contains *at least one* minimal surface of genus g .

In this paper we generalize the above result. Namely, by further utilizing the relative topological structure of the pair $(\mathcal{S}_{\leq g}(M), \mathcal{S}_{\leq g-1}(M))$, we produce *multiple* minimal surfaces of genus g . This completes a central component of our program to develop a topological machinery for enumerating minimal surfaces with prescribed genus.

Below, we consider homology groups and cohomology groups under \mathbb{Z}_2 -coefficients. Note, the cap product \smile in item (1) is indeed well-defined, as we show in Lemma 3.1. Readers may refer to Figure 1 for a schematic.

Theorem 1.1 (Enumerative min-max theorem). *Let (M, \mathbf{g}) be a closed orientable Riemannian 3-manifold with positive Ricci curvature, and let g be a positive integer. Let*

$$\Phi : (X, Z) \rightarrow (\mathcal{S}_{\leq g}(M), \mathcal{S}_{\leq g-1}(M))$$

be a Simon-Smith family, where X is a finite simplicial complex and $Z \subset X$ a subcomplex. Suppose there exist some homology class $w \in H_k(X, Z)$ and p cohomology classes $\lambda_i \in H^{k_i}(X \setminus Z)$, $i = 1, \dots, p$, with the following properties.

(1) *Let $(Y, \partial Y) \subset (X, Z)$ be any relative $(k - k_1 - \dots - k_p)$ -subcomplex such that*

$$[Y] = w \smile (\lambda_1 \smile \dots \smile \lambda_p) \in H_{k-k_1-\dots-k_p}(X, Z).$$

Then the subfamily $\Phi|_Y$ cannot be deformed via pinch-off processes to a map into $\mathcal{S}_{\leq g-1}(M)$.

(2) *For any embedded smooth genus g surface $S \subset M$, there exists some $r > 0$ such that: For each $i = 1, \dots, p$, if $C \subset X \setminus Z$ is any k_i -cycle such that $\lambda_i([C]) \neq 0$, then $\Phi|_C$ cannot be deformed via pinch-off processes to a family r -close to S under the \mathbf{F} -distance.*

Then (M, \mathbf{g}) contains at least $p + 1$ orientable embedded minimal surfaces with genus g and area at most $\max_{x \in X} \text{area}(\Phi(x))$.

Importantly, it can be readily checked that assumptions (1) and (2) above are purely topological: No geometric information about the ambient metric \mathbf{g} is needed. Note, the \mathbf{F} -distance is the borrowed from the space $\mathcal{Z}_2(M; \mathbf{F}; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ of mod 2 cycles, which is the sum of the flat distance and the varifold distance. The proof of this theorem crucially relies on [CLW26, Theorem 1.4], which states that in a generic metric with positive Ricci curvature, every Simon-Smith family can be deformed via pinch-off processes into a certain “topologically optimal family” [CLW26, Theorem 1.4]. This result is based on numerous previous foundational works on min-max theory [Smi82; CD03; DP10; Ket19; Zho20; MN21; SS23b; WZ23]. We note that in [LW24] Xingzhe Li and Zhichao Wang also utilized certain relative cohomology groups to construct minimal tori.

¹The current paper and [CLW26] together supersede [CLW25].




FIGURE 1. On the left is an example where X is the annulus, Z is the two boundary circles, Y is the blue path, w is the fundamental class $[X]$, $p = 1$, and λ_1 is the Poincaré dual of $[Y]$, meaning $[Y] = [X] \frown \lambda_1$. Note the pairing of λ_1 with the red loop is 1. On the right, we have a schematic where the graphical surface represents $\mathcal{S}_{\leq g}(M)$, with the two boundary circles being $\mathcal{S}_{\leq g-1}(M)$. The blue path is the family $\Phi|_Y$, and the two red critical points are the minimal surfaces we are searching for.

Remark 1.2. Let us compare Theorem 1.1 with the previous work [CL24], in which we constructed 5 minimal tori in any 3-spheres with positive Ricci curvature. There we relied crucially on the non-existence of a 5-sweepout on S^3 that consists of only genus 0 elements. However, this line of argument is unavailable in the higher genus case.

Next, we apply the above enumerative min-max theorem to the case of 3-spheres of positive Ricci curvature to construct multiple minimal surfaces of genus 2. The main challenge is to find a suitable map $\Phi : (X, Z) \rightarrow (\mathcal{S}_{\leq 2}(S^3), \mathcal{S}_{\leq 1}(S^3))$, together with homology and cohomology classes, that satisfy the conditions of Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 1.3. *Every Riemannian 3-sphere of positive Ricci curvature contains at least 4 embedded, orientable minimal surfaces of genus 2.*

Let us record the known results in this direction. Denote by $\mathbf{n}_g(S^3)$ the optimal number such that every Riemannian 3-sphere of positive Ricci curvature must contain at least $\mathbf{n}_g(S^3)$ orientable, embedded minimal surfaces of genus g . Then we have:

$\mathbf{n}_0(S^3)$	$\mathbf{n}_1(S^3)$	$\mathbf{n}_2(S^3)$	$\mathbf{n}_g(S^3)$ for $g \geq 3$
4 [WZ23]	≥ 5 [CL24]	≥ 4 (Theorem 1.3)	≥ 1 [Chu25]

Conjecturally $\mathbf{n}_1(S^3) = 5$. It will be very interesting to know the exact value of $\mathbf{n}_g(S^3)$ for any particular $g \geq 2$. We believe that Theorem 1.1 is general enough to be used as a “black box” for exploring the higher genus cases: It reduces the problem of lower bounding $\mathbf{n}_g(S^3)$ to finding suitable maps into $\mathcal{S}_{\leq g}(S^3)$.

The family we use to prove Theorem 1.3 is inspired by the symmetry of the Lawson surfaces $\xi_{2,1}$ [Law70], which is the only known genus 2 embedded minimal surface in the standard 3-sphere \mathbb{S}^3 . To speculate the $g = 3$ case, we recall that there are two known genus 3 minimal surfaces in \mathbb{S}^3 : The Lawson surface $\xi_{3,1}$ and the Karcher-Pinkall-Sterling genus 3 surface [KPS88]. We expect that to get a good lower bound for $\mathbf{n}_3(S^3)$, the family for which we apply Theorem 1.1 to should encompass surfaces that resemble both of these two minimal surfaces, and also neck-pinch phenomenon from them.

1.1. Sketch of proof.

1.1.1. *Theorem 1.1.* We first recall that, when the ambient metric is generic with positive Ricci curvature, [CLW26, Theorem 1.4] shows that every family of surfaces in $\mathcal{S}(M)$ can be deformed into some topologically optimal family. We first perturb the ambient metric such that [CLW26, Theorem 1.4] is applicable, *while fixing the number of orientable genus g minimal surfaces*. Applying this

theorem to the given family Φ , we obtain some minimal surfaces Γ_i of genus $\leq g$ and subcomplexes $D_i \subset X$ satisfying the following properties.

Suppose that m orientable genus g were produced. We can divide the subcomplexes D_i into two collections: Those that correspond to orientable genus g minimal surfaces, and the other ones. We denote the first collection by D_1, \dots, D_m , and take the union of the second collection to obtain some subcomplex D . Hence, we have

- m orientable minimal surfaces of genus g , $\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_m$ with area $\leq \max_x \text{area}(\Phi(x))$,
- and associated subcomplexes $D_1, D_2, \dots, D_m \subset X$ that, together with D , cover X ,

such that:

- (1) $\Phi|_D$ can be deformed via pinch-off processes to become some map into $\mathcal{S}_{\leq g-1}(M)$.
- (2) For each $j = 1, \dots, m$, $\Phi|_{D_j}$ can be deformed via pinch-off processes to become some family $\Xi_j : D_j \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_g(M)$ such that each member of Ξ_j is close to Γ_j and has genus g .

Then to prove Theorem 1.1 it suffices to show $m \geq p + 1$. Suppose by contradiction $m \leq p$. By (2), we know that for every $j = 1, \dots, m$ we have $\lambda_i|_{D_j} = 0$, for otherwise item (2) of Theorem 1.1 would be contradicted. Thus, together with $m \leq p$, we know

$$(\lambda_1 \smile \dots \smile \lambda_p)|_{D_1 \cup \dots \cup D_m} = 0.$$

Then by some elementary algebraic topology one can deduce that D must detect the class

$$(1.1) \quad w \smile (\lambda_1 \smile \dots \smile \lambda_p) \in H_{k-k_1-\dots-k_p}(X, Z).$$

More precisely, we can find some $[Y] \in H_{k-k_1-\dots-k_p}(D, D \cap Z)$ that gets pushforwarded to the class (1.1) under the inclusion $(D, D \cap Z) \hookrightarrow (X, Z)$. Then by item (1) above, $\Phi|_D$, and thus $\Phi|_Y$ in particular, can be deformed via pinch-off processes to become a map into $\mathcal{S}_{\leq g-1}(M)$. This contradicts Theorem 1.1 (1).

1.1.2. Theorem 1.3. In order to construct 4 minimal surfaces of genus 2 using Theorem 1.1, we need a suitable map into $\mathcal{S}_{\leq 2}(S^3)$. We first define in the unit 3-sphere $S^3 \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ a 7-parameter family as follows. We introduce a coordinate system (x_1, x_2, α) for S^3 (on the complement of a great circle $\{x_3 = x_4 = 0\}$), defined by the relation

$$(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) = (x_1, x_2, \sqrt{1 - x_1^2 - x_2^2} \cos \alpha, \sqrt{1 - x_1^2 - x_2^2} \sin \alpha),$$

where (x_1, x_2) lies in the open unit disc in \mathbb{R}^2 and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$. Note that $(0, 0, \alpha)$ parametrizes the great circle $C = \{x_1 = x_2 = 0\}$. Now, we define a family $\Psi : \mathbb{RP}^5 \times \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\leq 2}(S^3)$ by sending each pair $a = [a_0 : a_1 : \dots : a_5] \in \mathbb{RP}^5$ and $(r, \theta) \in \mathbb{D}$ to the zero set

$$\{a_0 + a_1 x_1 + a_2 x_2 + a_3 x_3 + a_4 x_4 + a_5 [x_1 x_2 + \epsilon(r \cos(\theta + 2\alpha) + (1-r) \cos 3\alpha)] = 0\} \subset S^3,$$

where $\epsilon > 0$ is some small number (in our actual argument, this should be some small function). Geometrically, this family should be viewed as a desingularization of the \mathbb{RP}^5 -family Φ_5 given by

$$\Phi_5(a) := \{a_0 + a_1 x_1 + a_2 x_2 + a_3 x_3 + a_4 x_4 + a_5 x_1 x_2 = 0\} \subset S^3,$$

such that all members have at most finitely many singularities. Notably, the surface $\Psi([0 : \dots : 0 : 1], 0)$ has the same symmetry group as the genus 2 Lawson minimal surface $\xi_{2,1}$, which is the dihedral group D_{24} of 24 elements.

Then, we define a 13-parameter family $\bar{\Xi} : \mathbb{RP}^5 \times \mathbb{D} \times SO(4) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\leq 2}(S^3)$ by rotating all members of Ψ : We set $\bar{\Xi}(a, z, R) := R \cdot \Psi(a, z)$ where $R \cdot \Psi(a, z)$ denotes the image of $\Psi(a, z) \subset S^3$ under the rotation $R \in SO(4)$. This family has a lot of symmetry, allowing us to take quotient. Namely, we will define a certain D_{24} -action on $\mathbb{RP}^5 \times \mathbb{D} \times SO(4)$ such that $\bar{\Xi}((a, z, R) \cdot g) = \bar{\Xi}(a, z, R)$ for all $g \in D_{24}$ and (a, z, R) . Hence, letting $\mathcal{X} := (\mathbb{RP}^5 \times \mathbb{D} \times SO(4))/D_{24}$, $\bar{\Xi}$ induces a family $\Xi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\leq 2}(S^3)$. Note, by the definition of Ψ , $\Xi|_{\partial \mathcal{X}}$ maps into $\mathcal{S}_{\leq 1}(S^3)$.

In order to apply Theorem 1.1, let us understand the topology of \mathcal{X} . It can be checked that the natural projection map π from \mathcal{X} onto $B := SO(4)/D_{24}$ is a fiber bundle. By some standard topological argument, $B \cong S^3/Q_{48} \times S^3$ where Q_{48} is the dicyclic group of order 48. We then introduce two cohomology classes in \mathcal{X} :

- It is known that there exists some element $\hat{\alpha} \in H^1(S^3/Q_{48})$ for which $\hat{\alpha}^3 \neq 0$. Let $\alpha \in H^1(\mathcal{X})$ be the pullback of $\hat{\alpha}$ under $\Pi_1 \circ \pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow S^3/Q_{48}$ where $\Pi_1 : B \rightarrow S^3/Q_{48}$ is the projection onto the first factor.
- Fix some $p \in S^3$, and let $B_0 := S^3/Q_{48} \times \{p\} \subset S^3/Q_{48} \times S^3 \cong B$. Let $\beta \in H^3(\mathcal{X})$ be the pullback $\pi^*(\beta_B)$, where $\beta_B \in H^3(B)$ is the Poincaré dual of $[B_0] \in H_3(B)$.

Then, it is easy to see that the relative homology class $[\mathcal{X}] \smallfrown (\alpha^3 \smallfrown \beta) \in H_7(\mathcal{X}, \partial\mathcal{X})$ is induced by the fibers of $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow B$.

Finally, let $\mathcal{X}_0 := \pi^{-1}(B_0) \subset \mathcal{X}$. Note $\partial\mathcal{X}_0 = \mathcal{X}_0 \cap \partial\mathcal{X}$. We apply Theorem 1.1 to the subfamily

$$\Xi|_{\mathcal{X}_0} : (\mathcal{X}_0, \partial\mathcal{X}_0) \rightarrow (\mathcal{S}_{\leq 2}(S^3), \mathcal{S}_{\leq 1}(S^3)),$$

with $p = 3$ and the three cohomology classes all being $\alpha|_{\mathcal{X}_0} \in H^1(\mathcal{X}_0)$. To finish the proof, it suffices to verify condition (1) and (2) in Theorem 1.1.

For (1), let $[Y] = [\mathcal{X}_0] \smallfrown (\alpha_0)^3 \in H_7(\mathcal{X}_0, \partial\mathcal{X}_0)$ and Φ' be obtained from $\Xi|_Y$ by deformation via pinch-off processes. We need to show that Φ' must still contain some genus 2 element. Observe that, when restricted onto any \mathbb{RP}^5 -factor, Ξ gives an Almgren-Pitts 5-sweepout, which thus cannot be deformed via pinch-off processes into $\mathcal{S}_0(S^3)$ (see [CL24, §3.5]). From this, together with some algebraic topology, it can be shown that there exists some relative 2-cycle $(D, \partial D) \subset (Y, Y \cap \partial\mathcal{X}_0)$ such that D is homologous to the \mathbb{D} factor in \mathcal{X} and *every member of $\Phi'|_D$ has genus 1 or 2*. Finally, we analyze the boundary family $\Phi'|_{\partial D}$, and show that it is, in certain sense, homologically non-trivial in the set $\mathcal{S}_1(S^3)$ of all genus 1 surfaces in S^3 , and thus does not admit a fill in. Hence, $\Phi'|_D$ must contain some genus 2 element, as desired. (This step requires Hatcher's resolution of the Smale conjecture and certain descriptions of the space of all Hopf links in S^3 .)

As for item (2), we shall show that any such 1-cycle C must correspond to a 1-sweepout under Ξ in the Almgren-Pitts sense, so that $\Xi|_C$ cannot be deformed into any r -ball if r is small enough.

1.2. Organization. In §2, we recall some preliminary results from our previous works [CL24; CLW26]. A crucial result needed is [CLW26, Theorem 1.4]. Based on that, in §3 we prove the enumerative min-max theorem, Theorem 1.1. In §4, we apply this theorem to construct 4 minimal surfaces of genus 2 in 3-spheres of positive Ricci curvature, proving Theorem 1.3. Then the three remaining sections contain the proof of some results used in §4. Namely, in §4, the 4 genus 2 minimal surfaces are obtained by applying the enumerative min-max theorem, using a certain 13-parameter family $\Xi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\leq 2}(S^3)$. The construction and the properties of this family will be studied in detail in §5 and §7. In §6, we examine the topology of the parameter space of Ξ .

Acknowledgment. We would like to thank Chi Cheuk Tsang and Boyu Zhang for numerous discussions on topology, and Giada Franz for the discussions on min-max theory. We also want to thank Ryan Budney, André Neves, Daniel Stern, Shmuel Weinberger, and Xin Zhou for their interests. The first author was supported by the NSF grant DMS-1928930 while in SLMath in Fall 2024. The first and the second author was partially supported by the AMS-Simons travel grant.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Notations. Throughout this paper, all simplicial complexes are assumed to be finite. Moreover, a *pure* simplicial k -complex is a simplicial complex X in which every simplex of dimension less than k is a face of some simplex in X of dimension exactly k .

Let (M, \mathbf{g}) be a closed orientable Riemannian 3-manifold. Below we briefly recall the terminologies from [CLW26, §2].

Definition 2.1 (Punctate surface). Let M be a closed orientable 3-manifold. A closed subset $S \subset M$ is a *punctate surface* in M provided that:

- (1) The 2-dimensional Hausdorff measure $\mathcal{H}^2(S)$ is finite.
- (2) There exists a (possibly empty) finite set $P \subset S$ such that $S \setminus P$ is a smooth, orientable, embedded surface.
- (3) (Separating) Let S_{iso} be the set of isolated points of S . Then the complement of $S \setminus S_{\text{iso}}$ is a disjoint union of two open regions of M , each having $S \setminus S_{\text{iso}}$ as its topological boundary.

Any such set P is called a *punctate set* for S . We denote by $\mathcal{S}(M)$ the set of all punctate surfaces in M .

Recall that $\mathcal{S}(M)$ can be viewed as a subset of the cycle space $\mathcal{Z}_2(M; \mathbf{F}; \mathbb{Z}_2)$. In particular, we can put on $\mathcal{S}_g(M)$ the \mathbf{F} -distance, which is the sum of the flat distance and the varifold distance. Moreover, we can define the notion of *genus* for punctate surfaces as in [CLW26, Definition 2.5]. We denote by $\mathcal{S}_g(M) \subset \mathcal{S}(M)$ (resp. $\mathcal{S}_{\leq g}(M)$) the subset of elements with genus g (resp. $\leq g$).

Definition 2.2 (Simon–Smith family). Let X be a cubical or simplicial complex. A map $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(M)$ is called a *Simon–Smith family* with parameter space X if the following hold.

- (1) The map $x \mapsto \mathcal{H}^2(\Phi(x))$ is continuous.
- (2) (Closedness) The family Φ is “closed” in the sense that $\{(x, p) \in X \times M : p \in \Phi(x)\}$ is a closed subset of $X \times M$.
- (3) (C^∞ -continuity away from singularities) For each $x \in X$, we can choose a finite set $P_\Phi(x) \subset \Phi(x)$ such that:
 - $\Phi(x) \setminus P_\Phi(x)$ is a smooth embedded orientable surface, i.e. $P_\Phi(x)$ is a punctate set for $\Phi(x)$.
 - For any $x_0 \in X$ and within any open set $U \subset\subset M \setminus P_\Phi(x_0)$, $\Phi(x) \rightarrow \Phi(x_0)$ smoothly whenever $x \rightarrow x_0$.
 - $N(P_\Phi) := \sup_{x \in X} |P_\Phi(x)| < \infty$.

It follows from [CL24, §2] that every Simon–Smith family is \mathbf{F} -continuous.

The notion of *pinch-off process* will also be important. Roughly speaking, it refers to a family $\{\Gamma(t)\}_{t \in [a, b]}$ of elements in $\mathcal{S}(M)$ given by any combination of isotopy, neck-pinches, and the shrinking of some connected components into points. The rigorous definition is stated in [CLW26, §2]. Now, let $\Phi, \Phi' : X \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(M)$ be Simon–Smith families. Suppose we have a Simon–Smith family $H : [0, 1] \times X \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(M)$ such that:

- $H(0, \cdot) = \Phi$ and $H(1, \cdot) = \Phi'$.
- For each $x \in X$, $t \mapsto H(t, x)$ is a pinch-off process.

Then H is called a *deformation via pinch-off processes* from Φ to Φ' .

2.2. Preliminary results. First, for readers’ convenience, we recall Theorem 1.4 in [CLW26].

Theorem 2.3 (Existence of a topologically optimal family). *Let (M, \mathbf{g}) be a closed orientable Riemannian 3-manifold of positive Ricci curvature, and $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(M)$ be a Simon–Smith family of genus $\leq g$ with $g \geq 1$, and the min-max width $L := \mathbf{L}(\Lambda(\Phi)) > 0$. Assume Condition A (which automatically holds if \mathbf{g} is a generic metric with positive Ricci curvature). Then for any $r > 0$, there exist:*

- *a deformation via pinch-off processes, $H : [0, 1] \times X \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\leq g}(M)$,*
- *distinct, orientable, multiplicity one, embedded minimal surfaces $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \dots, \Gamma_l$ of genus $\leq g$ and area $\leq L$,*
- *subcomplexes D_0, D_1, \dots, D_l of X (after refinement) that cover X ,*

such that:

- (1) $H(0, \cdot) = \Phi$.

- (2) The family $\Phi' := H(1, \cdot)$ is such that $\Phi'|_{D_i}$ is of genus $\leq \mathfrak{g}(\Gamma_i)$ for every $i = 1, \dots, l$, and $\Phi'|_{D_0}$ is of genus 0.
- (3) For each $i = 1, \dots, l$, there is some smooth function $f_i : D_i \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that for every $x \in D_i$,

$$H(f_i(x), x) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{g}(\Gamma_i)}(M) \cap \mathbf{B}_r^{\mathbf{F}}(\Gamma_i).$$

Below is the definition of Condition A. Let $\mathcal{O}_{g, \leq L}(M, \mathbf{g})$ (resp. $\mathcal{N}_{g, \leq L}(M, \mathbf{g})$) be the set of all orientable (resp. non-orientable) embedded minimal surfaces in (M, \mathbf{g}) with genus g and area $\leq L$. Analogously, we define the sets $\mathcal{O}_{\leq g, \leq L}(M, \mathbf{g})$ and $\mathcal{N}_{\leq g, \leq L}(M, \mathbf{g})$ in which the genus of the minimal surfaces concerned is $\leq g$.

Condition A. Given a closed Riemannian 3-manifold (M, \mathbf{g}) , a positive integer g , and a real number $L > 0$, we say that *Condition A* holds if the following holds:

- The set $\mathcal{O}_{\leq g, \leq L}(M, \mathbf{g})$ is finite.
- Every element in $\mathcal{O}_{\leq g-1, \leq L}(M, \mathbf{g})$ is non-degenerate.
- For every $\Gamma \in \mathcal{O}_{g, \leq L}(M, \mathbf{g})$, numbers in the set

$$\{\text{area}(\Gamma') : \Gamma' \in \mathcal{O}_{\leq g-1, \leq L}(M, \mathbf{g}) \cup \mathcal{N}_{\leq g+1, \leq L}(M, \mathbf{g})\} \cup \{\text{area}(\Gamma)\}$$

are linearly independent over \mathbb{Z} .

We remark that, for a generic Ricci-positive metric \mathbf{g} , Condition A must hold for all g and L .

To guarantee that a metric satisfies the nondegeneracy assumption and the linear independence assumption of the previous theorem, the perturbation theorem below will be instrumental.

Proposition 2.4. *Given $g_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $L \in \mathbb{R}^+$, suppose that (M, \mathbf{g}) is a Riemannian 3-manifold with $\#\mathcal{O}_{g_0, \leq L}(M, \mathbf{g}) < \infty$ and it admits no degenerate stable embedded minimal surface. Then for any $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $g_1 > g_0$, there exists $\mathbf{g}' \leq \mathbf{g}$ satisfying:*

- (1) $\#\mathcal{O}_{g_0, \leq L}(M, \mathbf{g}') = \#\mathcal{O}_{g_0, \leq L}(M, \mathbf{g})$.
- (2) $\#\mathcal{O}_{\leq g_1, \leq L}(M, \mathbf{g}') < \infty$, $\#\mathcal{N}_{\leq g_1, \leq L}(M, \mathbf{g}') < \infty$, and the set

$$(2.1) \quad \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{g}'} := (\mathcal{O}_{\leq g_1, \leq L}(M, \mathbf{g}') \cup \mathcal{N}_{\leq g_1, \leq L}(M, \mathbf{g}')) \setminus \mathcal{O}_{g_0, \leq L}(M, \mathbf{g}')$$

consists of strongly non-degenerate minimal surfaces.

- (3) For any $\Sigma \in \mathcal{O}_{g_0, \leq L}(M, \mathbf{g}')$,

$$\{\text{area}_{\mathbf{g}'}(\Sigma') : \Sigma' \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{g}'}\} \cup \{\text{area}_{\mathbf{g}'}(\Sigma)\}$$

forms a \mathbb{Z} -linearly independent set.

This proposition generalizes [CL24, Proposition 6.1] to arbitrary genus, and we will prove it in Appendix A. Here, a minimal surface is called *strongly non-degenerate* if its double cover is non-degenerate, and $\mathbf{g}' \leq \mathbf{g}$ means that $\mathbf{g} - \mathbf{g}'$ is non-negative definite pointwise. Note, the conclusion of “strong” non-degeneracy is not needed in this paper (mere non-degeneracy suffices), but we record it nonetheless for possible future usage.

3. ENUMERATIVE MIN-MAX THEOREM

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.1. We use \mathbb{Z}_2 -coefficients throughout this section unless specified otherwise.

3.1. Preparation. We first state a lemma explaining why the cap product in Theorem 1.1 is well-defined.

Lemma 3.1. *Given a simplicial complex X , a subcomplex $Z \subset X$, and integers $k \geq l \geq 0$, there is a well-defined cap product*

$$H_k(X, Z) \times H^l(X \setminus Z) \rightarrow H_{k-l}(X, Z).$$

Proof. By the definition of simplicial subcomplex, we can take some open neighborhood $U(Z)$ of Z such that the pairs (X, Z) and $(X, \overline{U(Z)})$ are homotopy equivalent. So $H_k(X, Z) = H_k(X, \overline{U(Z)})$, which is equal to $H_k(X \setminus U(Z), \partial U(Z))$ by excision. Thus, since there is a well-defined cap product

$$H_k(X \setminus U(Z), \partial U(Z)) \times H^l(X \setminus U(Z)) \rightarrow H_{k-l}(X \setminus U(Z), \partial U(Z))$$

(see for example Hatcher [Hat02, p.240]), there is also a well-defined cap product

$$H_k(X, Z) \times H^l(X \setminus U(Z)) \rightarrow H_{k-l}(X, Z).$$

But since $X \setminus U(Z)$ and $X \setminus Z$ are homotopy equivalent, the lemma follows. \square

Now, let (M, \mathbf{g}) be the closed orientable 3-manifold with positive Ricci curvature given in Theorem 1.1, and we begin to prove that (M, \mathbf{g}) has at least $p+1$ orientable minimal surfaces of genus g and area $\leq L_0 := \max_{x \in X} \text{area}_{\mathbf{g}} \Phi(x)$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that (M, \mathbf{g}) has only finitely many such minimal surfaces, i.e. $\#\mathcal{O}_{g, \leq L_0}(M, \mathbf{g}) < \infty$.

3.2. Perturbation of metric. Since (M, \mathbf{g}) is Ricci-positive, it contains no degenerate stable minimal surfaces. Hence, we apply Proposition 2.4 to (M, \mathbf{g}) with $g_0 := g, g_1 := g+1, \epsilon := 1$, and $L := L_0$, and obtain a metric $\mathbf{g}' \leq \mathbf{g}$ satisfying the properties therein. In particular,

$$L'_0 := \sup_x \text{area}_{\mathbf{g}'} \Phi(x) \leq \sup_x \text{area}_{\mathbf{g}} \Phi(x) \leq L_0$$

as $\mathbf{g}' \leq \mathbf{g}$, and $\#\mathcal{O}_{g, L_0}(M, \mathbf{g}') = \#\mathcal{O}_{g, L_0}(M, \mathbf{g})$. As a result, to prove Theorem 2.3, it suffices to show $\#\mathcal{O}_{g, \leq L'_0}(M, \mathbf{g}') \geq p+1$.

3.3. Applying the optimal family. Applying Theorem 2.3 to (M, \mathbf{g}') , g , Φ , and some $r > 0$ to be specified, we obtain the optimal family Φ' , subcomplexes D_0, D_1, \dots, D_l , and minimal surfaces $\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_l$ as stated. Suppose for the sake of contradiction there are only $\leq p$ minimal surfaces of genus g and area $\leq L_0$. We relabel $\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_l$ such that $\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_m$ have genus g and $\Gamma_{m+1}, \dots, \Gamma_l$ have genus $< g$, where $m \leq p$ by assumption. Of course, we should relabel the subcomplexes D_1, \dots, D_l accordingly.

Recall that we are given some homology class $w \in H_k(X, Z)$ and p cohomology classes $\lambda_i \in H^{k_i}(X \setminus Z), i = 1, \dots, p$, such that the statements (1) and (2) in Theorem 1.1 hold: Note these two statements are independent of the ambient metric.

Proposition 3.2. *For each $i = 1, \dots, p$ and $j = 1, \dots, m$, we have $\lambda_i|_{D_j \setminus Z} = 0$. Thus,*

$$(\lambda_1 \smile \dots \smile \lambda_p)|_{(D_1 \cup \dots \cup D_m) \setminus Z} = 0.$$

Proof. Suppose by contradiction $\lambda_i|_{D_j \setminus Z} \neq 0$ for some $i = 1, \dots, p$ and $j = 1, \dots, m$. Then there exists some k_i -cycle $C \subset D_j \setminus Z$ such that $\lambda_i([C]) \neq 0$. Recall, from item (3) of Theorem 2.3, that $\Phi|_{D_i}$ can be deformed via pinch-off processes to become some map into $\mathcal{S}_g(M) \cap \mathbf{B}_r^F(\Gamma_j)$, and thus so can $\Phi|_C$. Hence, if we take r to be sufficiently small (depending on $\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_m$), then this contradicts with item (2) in the assumption of Theorem 1.1, as desired. The second statement of Proposition 3.2 then follows by elementary algebraic topology. \square

We can now easily finish the proof of Theorem 1.1. Denote $D := D_0 \cup D_{m+1} \cup D_{m+2} \cup \dots \cup D_l$. To obtain a contradiction, it suffices to prove:

Proposition 3.3. *Consider the inclusion map $i : (D, D \cap Z) \rightarrow (X, Z)$, and the induced map*

$$i_* : H_{k-k_1-\dots-k_p}(D, D \cap Z) \rightarrow H_{k-k_1-\dots-k_p}(X, Z).$$

There exists some relative subcomplex $(Y, \partial Y) \subset (D, D \cap Z)$ such that

$$i_*([Y]) = w \smile (\lambda_1 \smile \dots \smile \lambda_p) \in H_{k-k_1-\dots-k_p}(X, Z).$$

Indeed, suppose we know this proposition is true. Hence, $\Phi|_Y$ cannot be deformed via pinch-off processes to become a map into $\mathcal{S}_{\leq g-1}(M)$ due to Condition 1 of Theorem 1.1. However, since $Y \subset D$, we know using the defining properties of D_i (namely Theorem 2.3 (2)) that each member of $\Phi'|_Y$ has genus at most $\max\{\mathfrak{g}(\Gamma_{m+1}), \dots, \mathfrak{g}(\Gamma_l)\}$. And since $\Gamma_{m+1}, \dots, \Gamma_l$ all have genus $< g$, we know that $\Phi'|_Y$ maps into $\mathcal{S}_{\leq g-1}(M)$. Contradiction arises.

So it suffices to prove the above proposition.

3.4. Proof of Proposition 3.3. In the lemma below, we fix an arbitrary commutative ring for the coefficients of homology and cohomology. Readers may refer to [Hat02, p.240] for the following relative version of cup product.

Lemma 3.4. *Let X' be a (not necessarily finite) simplicial complex, and $A, B \subset X'$ be open subsets. Let $p \geq q \geq 0$ be natural numbers and $p > 0$. Let C be a union of p -subcomplexes in X' with $\partial C \subset A \cup B$ (so that $[C] \in H_p(X', A \cup B)$), and $\omega \in H^q(X', A)$. Suppose that:*

- C is a union of two open subsets $W_1, W_2 \subset C$.
- $W_2 \cap A = \emptyset$.
- The pullback of ω under the inclusion $(W_1, W_1 \cap A) \hookrightarrow (X', A)$ is zero.

Then there exists some $\theta \in H_{p-q}(W_2, W_2 \cap B)$ such that the pushforward of θ under the inclusion $(W_2, W_2 \cap B) \hookrightarrow (X', B)$ is equal to $[C] \frown \omega \in H_{p-q}(X', B)$.

We postpone the proof of Lemma 3.4 to Appendix B: It just uses standard algebraic topology. In this paper we will only use the case $A = \emptyset$, but we choose to state this general version for possible future usage.

In addition, it is easy to check that the above lemma is also valid if $A, B \subset X'$ and $W_1, W_2 \subset C$ are subcomplexes instead. Hence, we apply this lemma to our situation as follows.

- Take some open neighborhood $U(Z) \subset X = \text{dmn}(\Phi)$ of Z such that the inclusion map $(X, Z) \hookrightarrow (X, \overline{U(Z)})$ and is a homotopy equivalence between the pairs, and $X' := X \setminus U(Z)$ is homotopy equivalent to $X \setminus Z$. We shall use these homotopy equivalence to identify homology or cohomology groups.
- Put $A := \emptyset$ and $B := X' \cap \overline{U(Z)}$. Note, by excision, we can identify the homology groups of (X', B) and (X, Z) . Without loss of generality we can assume B is a subcomplex.
- Let $r := k = \deg(w)$ and $s := k_1 + \dots + k_p = \deg(\lambda_1 \frown \dots \frown \lambda_p)$.
- Let $C \subset X'$ be some k -subcomplex, with $\partial C \subset B$, that represents w , viewed as an element of $H_k(X', B)$.
- Let $W_1 := ((D_1 \cup \dots \cup D_m) \setminus U(Z)) \cap C$ and $W_2 := (D \cup \overline{U(Z)}) \cap C$. Note W_1 and W_2 cover C , and can be assumed to be subcomplexes.
- Let $\omega := \lambda_1 \frown \dots \frown \lambda_p$, viewed as an element of $H_{k_1+\dots+k_p}(X')$. Note, since the pullback of $\lambda_1 \frown \dots \frown \lambda_p$ under $(D_1 \cup \dots \cup D_m) \setminus Z \hookrightarrow X \setminus Z$ is zero by Proposition 3.2, we can ensure the pullback of ω under $W_1 \hookrightarrow X'$ is zero by choosing $U(Z)$ to be a sufficiently thin neighborhood of Z .

Then, by the above lemma, there exists some $\theta \in H_{k-k_1-\dots-k_p}(W_2, W_2 \cap B)$ such that the pushforward of θ under the inclusion $(W_2, W_2 \cap B) \hookrightarrow (X', B)$ is equal to

$$[C] \frown (\lambda_1 \frown \dots \frown \lambda_p) \in H_{k-k_1-\dots-k_p}(X', B).$$

Then it is easy to see, there exists some $\theta_1 \in H_{k-k_1-\dots-k_p}(D, D \cap Z)$ such that the pushforward of θ_1 under the inclusion $(D, D \cap Z) \hookrightarrow (X, Z)$ is equal to

$$w \frown (\lambda_1 \frown \dots \frown \lambda_p) \in H_{k-k_1-\dots-k_p}(X, Z).$$

Letting Y be a representative of θ_1 , we finish the proof of Proposition 3.3, and also Theorem 1.1.

4. EXISTENCE OF FOUR GENUS 2 MINIMAL SURFACES

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.3 in the following steps:

- (1) Construct a 7-parameter family $\Psi : \mathbb{RP}^5 \times \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\leq 2}(S^3)$.
- (2) Rotate Ψ by $SO(4)$, and then the symmetry of Ψ would allow us to define a family

$$\Xi : (\mathbb{RP}^5 \times \mathbb{D} \times SO(4))/D_{24} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\leq 2}(S^3).$$

- (3) Verify the applicability of Theorem 1.1 to Ξ , and produce four genus 2 minimal surfaces.

Let $S^3 := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^4 \mid \sum_{i=1}^4 x_i^2 = 1\}$, let C denote the great circle $\{x \in S^3 \mid x_3 = x_4 = 0\}$. For each $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \in S^3 \setminus C$, we can write

$$(4.1) \quad (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) = (x_1, x_2, \sqrt{1 - x_1^2 - x_2^2} \cos \alpha, \sqrt{1 - x_1^2 - x_2^2} \sin \alpha),$$

with (x_1, x_2) in the open unit disc $\text{int}(\mathbf{D})$ and $\alpha \in \mathbf{S}^1 := \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$. This yields a parametrization (x_1, x_2, α) of S^3 by $\mathbf{D} \times \mathbf{S}^1$, although the parametrization is not injective along the locus $x_1^2 + x_2^2 = 1$, where distinct α are mapped to the same point.

4.1. A 7-parameter family Ψ . Let $\mathbb{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be the closed unit 2-disc centered at the origin. We define a 7-parameter Simon-Smith family $\Psi : \mathbb{RP}^5 \times \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\leq 2}(S^3)$ as follows.

For each $a = [a_0 : a_1 : \dots : a_5] \in \mathbb{RP}^5$ and $(r, \theta) \in \mathbb{D}$ (in polar coordinates), Ψ sends $(a, (r, \theta))$ to the zero set in S^3

$$(4.2) \quad \left\{ (x_1, x_2, \alpha) \in S^3 \mid a_0 + a_1 x_1 + a_2 x_2 + a_3 x_3 + a_4 x_4 + a_5 [x_1 x_2 + \rho(a, x) (r \cos(\theta + 2\alpha) + (1 - r) \cos 3\alpha)] = 0 \right\}.$$

Here, $\rho : \mathbb{RP}^5 \times S^3 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a cut-off function determined below. We fix a non-increasing cut-off function $\zeta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\zeta|_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq 1/2}} = 1$, $\zeta|_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}} = 0$, and then define ρ as follows:

- (I) For every $[a_0 : a_1 : \dots : a_4 : 1] \in \mathbb{RP}^5$ with $a_1^2 + a_2^2 < 1$, let

$$(4.3) \quad \rho(a, x) := \zeta \left(64 \cdot \frac{(x_1 + a_2)^2 + (x_2 + a_1)^2}{(1 - a_1^2 - a_2^2)^2} \right) \zeta \left(\frac{a_3^2 + a_4^2 + (a_0 - a_1 a_2)^2}{\delta(a_1^2 + a_2^2)} \right) \delta(a_1^2 + a_2^2)$$

where $\delta \in C^\infty([0, \infty))$ is 0 on $[1, +\infty)$, and positive but very small on $[0, 1)$. Equivalently, for every $a \in \mathbb{RP}^5$ with $a_5 \neq 0$ and $a_1^2 + a_2^2 < a_5^2$,

$$(4.4) \quad \rho(a, x) := \zeta \left(64 a_5^2 \cdot \frac{(a_5 x_1 + a_2)^2 + (a_5 x_2 + a_1)^2}{(a_5^2 - a_1^2 - a_2^2)^2} \right) \zeta \left(\frac{(a_3^2 + a_4^2) a_5^2 + (a_0 a_5 - a_1 a_2)^2}{a_5^4 \delta((a_1^2 + a_2^2)/a_5^2)} \right) \delta \left(\frac{a_1^2 + a_2^2}{a_5^2} \right)$$

- (II) Otherwise, set $\rho(a, x) = 0$.

Remark 4.1. As mentioned in §1.1.2, the family Ψ should be viewed as a desingularization of the \mathbb{RP}^5 -family Φ_5 given by

$$\Phi_5(a) := \{a_0 + a_1 x_1 + a_2 x_2 + a_3 x_3 + a_4 x_4 + a_5 x_1 x_2 = 0\} \subset S^3,$$

such that only finitely many desingularities are left. Namely, for any $a \in \mathbb{RP}^5$ in the set

$$A_{\text{sing}} := \{[a_1 a_2 : a_1 : a_2 : 0 : 0 : 1] \in \mathbb{RP}^5 : a_1^2 + a_2^2 < 1\},$$

$\Phi_5(a) = \{(x_1 + a_2)(x_2 + a_1) = 0\}$ contains the singular circle $C(a_1, a_2) := \{x_1 = -a_2, x_2 = -a_1\}$. The feature of the above ρ is that:

- When $a \in \mathbb{RP}^5$ is near A_{sing} , the function $\rho(a, \cdot) : S^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a bump function supported near the circle $C(a_1, a_2)$.

- When a is away from A_{sing} , the function $\rho(a, \cdot) \equiv 0$.

Theorem 4.2. *With the functions δ, ζ appropriately chosen, (4.2) gives a Simon-Smith family*

$$\Psi : \mathbb{RP}^5 \times \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\leq 2}(S^3)$$

with the following properties.

- (1) For every $(a, z) \in \mathbb{RP}^5 \times \mathbb{D}$, if $\rho(a, \cdot) : S^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the constant zero function, then $\Psi(a, z)$ has genus 0.
- (2) $\Psi|_{\mathbb{RP}^5 \times \partial \mathbb{D}}$ is of genus ≤ 1 .

We shall prove this theorem in §5.

4.2. Symmetry group of genus 2 Lawson surface. While the Lawson surface $\xi_{2,1}$ does not actually appear in the family Ψ , we remark that the element $\Psi([0 : \dots : 0 : 1], 0)$ in fact has the same symmetry as $\xi_{2,1}$, and it will be helpful to understand its symmetry.

By Kapouleas–Wiygul [KW22, Lemma 3.10, Lemma 3.11] (see also Lawson [Law70]), the genus 2 Lawson surface $\xi_{2,1}$ associated to a 4-segment partition of the great circle C and a 6-segment partition of the complementary orthogonal great circle $C^\perp = \{x_1 = x_2 = 0\} \cap S^3$ has an orientation-preserving symmetry group G of order 24. By [KW22, Lemma 3.11 (ii)], $G = \mathcal{G}^C = D_{24} \subset SO(4)$, generated by 2 group elements g_1 and g_2 satisfying the relations

$$(4.5) \quad (g_1)^{12} = (g_2)^2 = (g_2 g_1)^2 = \text{id}.$$

Hence, the space of genus 2 Lawson surfaces is

$$\{R(\xi_{2,1}) : R \in SO(4)\} \cong SO(4)/\langle g_1, g_2 \rangle.$$

The fact that G is dihedral is not explicitly stated in [KW22]. For completeness and convenience, we therefore rewrite G in an equivalent form below.

For our purpose, in the construction of the Lawson surface $\xi_{2,1}$, we shall use on C^\perp (resp. C) the partition whose endpoints contain $(0, 0, \cos(\pi/6), \sin(\pi/6))$ (resp. $(0, 1, 0, 0)$).

Since \mathbb{R}^4 can be identified with the quaternion space \mathbb{H} via $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \mapsto x_1 + ix_2 + jx_3 + kx_4$, we will henceforth express the group G in quaternion coordinates. Let $\mathbb{S}^3 \subset \mathbb{H}$ denote the unit quaternion group, and each element $(q_1, q_2) \in \mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^3$ acts on $\mathbb{S}^3 \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ isometrically by

$$(4.6) \quad (q_1, q_2) : \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4, \quad p \mapsto q_1 p q_2^{-1}.^2$$

The induced group homomorphism $\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^3 \rightarrow SO(4)$ is a double cover. Let \hat{G} denote the subgroup of $\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^3$ generated by

$$\hat{g}_1 := \left(e^{i5\pi/12}, e^{-i\pi/12} \right), \quad \hat{g}_2 := (j, -j).$$

It can be checked that \hat{G} is the dicyclic group Q_{48} of order 48. Note that the kernel of the above double cover map is $\{\pm(1, 1)\} \subset \hat{G}$.

Under the group homomorphism induced by (4.6), \hat{g}_1 and \hat{g}_2 are mapped to some elements g_1 and g_2 in $SO(4)$, and we let $G < SO(4)$ be the subgroup generated by g_1 and g_2 , which must be of order 24 by the previous paragraph. Then g_1 corresponds to a rotation in \mathbb{R}^4 by $\pi/2$ in the $x_1 x_2$ -plane and by $\pi/3$ in the $x_3 x_4$ -plane, as

$$\begin{aligned} (4.7) \quad & g_1(x_1 + ix_2 + jx_3 + kx_4) \\ &= e^{i5\pi/12}((x_1 + ix_2) + (x_3 + ix_4)j)e^{i\pi/12} \\ &= e^{i\pi/2}(x_1 + ix_2) + e^{i\pi/3}(x_3 + ix_4)j, \\ &= (-x_2 + ix_1) + \left(\left(x_3 \cos \frac{\pi}{3} - x_4 \sin \frac{\pi}{3} \right) + \left(x_3 \sin \frac{\pi}{3} + x_4 \cos \frac{\pi}{3} \right) i \right) j; \end{aligned}$$

²The expression $q_1 p q_2^{-1}$ (as opposed to $q_1^{-1} p q_2$) is compatible with the left $SO(4)$ -action on \mathbb{R}^4 .

g_2 corresponds to a reflection about the 2-plane $\{x_1 = x_3 = 0\}$, as

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{aligned} g_2(x_1 + ix_2 + jx_3 + kx_4) &= j((x_1 + ix_2) + (x_3 + ix_4)j)(-j)^{-1} \\ &= (-x_1 + ix_2) + (-x_3 + ix_4)j. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, on $S^3 \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ and under the (x_1, x_2, α) coordinate, the above actions are:

$$(4.9) \quad g_1(x_1, x_2, \alpha) = (-x_2, x_1, \alpha + \pi/3), \quad g_2(x_1, x_2, \alpha) = (-x_1, x_2, \pi - \alpha),$$

which preserve the orientation of S^3 .

Using (4.9), we can check that g_1 and g_2 satisfy the relations (4.5), so G is the dihedral group D_{24} of order 24. Since g_1 and g_2 preserve $\xi_{2,1}$, and the orientation preserving symmetry group of $\xi_{2,1}$ is of order 24 [KW22, Lemma 3.11 (ii)], G is indeed this group.

4.3. A 13-parameter family Ξ . First, we define a 13-parameter Simon-Smith family $\bar{\Xi} : \mathbb{RP}^5 \times \mathbb{D} \times SO(4) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\leq 2}(S^3)$ by

$$(4.10) \quad \bar{\Xi}(a, z, R) := R \cdot \Psi(a, z),$$

where Ψ is the 7-parameter family defined in the previous subsection, and $R \cdot \Psi(a, z)$ denotes the image of $\Psi(a, z) \subset S^3$ under the rotation $R \in SO(4)$ acting from the left.

Then, we define a *left* G -action σ on $\mathbb{RP}^5 \times \mathbb{D}$ by³:

$$(4.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \sigma(g_1^{-1}) : ([a_0 : \dots : a_5], z) &\mapsto ([a_0 : a_2 : -a_1 : a_3 \cos \frac{\pi}{3} + a_4 \sin \frac{\pi}{3}, -a_3 \sin \frac{\pi}{3} + a_4 \cos \frac{\pi}{3}, -a_5], e^{-i\pi/3}z), \\ \sigma(g_2^{-1}) : ([a_0 : \dots : a_5], z) &\mapsto ([a_0 : -a_1 : a_2 : -a_3 : a_4 : -a_5], -\bar{z}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $G < SO(4)$, this induces a *right* G -action on $\mathbb{RP}^5 \times \mathbb{D} \times SO(4)$ by:

$$(4.12) \quad (a, z, R) \cdot g = (\sigma(g^{-1})(a, z), R \cdot g).$$

Remark 4.3. The right quotient $\mathcal{X} := (\mathbb{RP}^5 \times \mathbb{D} \times SO(4))/G$ is the same as the total space $SO(4) \times_{\sigma} \mathcal{Y}$ of the *associated bundle to $SO(4) \rightarrow SO(4)/G$ with fiber \mathcal{Y}* ; See Notation 7.3.

Note, a direct calculation shows that ρ has the following symmetry:

$$(4.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \rho([a_0 : a_1 : \dots : a_5], g_1 x) \\ = \rho([a_0 : a_2 : -a_1 : a_3 \cos \frac{\pi}{3} + a_4 \sin \frac{\pi}{3}, -a_3 \sin \frac{\pi}{3} + a_4 \cos \frac{\pi}{3} : -a_5], x), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(4.14) \quad \rho([a_0 : a_1 : \dots : a_5], g_2 x) = \rho([a_0 : -a_1 : a_2 : -a_3 : a_4 : -a_5], x).$$

Proposition 4.4. For each $g \in G$ and each $(a, z, R) \in \mathbb{RP}^5 \times \mathbb{D} \times SO(4)$,

$$\bar{\Xi}((a, z, R) \cdot g) = \bar{\Xi}(a, z, R).$$

In other words, the family $\bar{\Xi}$ also has certain G -symmetry. It follows straightforwardly from the definition, and we postpone the proof to §5.4. Note that the facts that G acts on $SO(4)$ from the right while $SO(4)$ acts on \mathbb{R}^4 from the left would be important for the proof.

Hence, letting

$$\mathcal{X} := (\mathbb{RP}^5 \times \mathbb{D} \times SO(4))/G,$$

$\bar{\Xi}$ induces a well-defined 13-parameter Simon-Smith family

$$\Xi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\leq 2}, (a, z, R) \cdot G \mapsto \bar{\Xi}(a, z, R).$$

³We show the form of $\sigma(g_i^{-1})$ instead of $\sigma(g_i)$, for convenience in later calculation.

4.4. Topology of \mathcal{X} . Let $B := SO(4)/G$, which is a closed smooth manifold. Since by definition, the natural projection onto the third factor $\mathbb{RP}^5 \times \mathbb{D} \times SO(4) \rightarrow SO(4)$ is G -equivariant, it naturally descends to fiber bundles

$$\mathbb{RP}^5 \times \mathbb{D} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{X} \xrightarrow{\pi} B \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{RP}^5 \times \partial\mathbb{D} \hookrightarrow \partial\mathcal{X} \xrightarrow{\pi} B.$$

By § 4.2, we can also write $B = (\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^3)/\hat{G}$. Let $\hat{\Pi}_1 : \mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^3 \subset \mathbb{H}$ be the projection map onto the first factor. Hence, $\hat{\Pi}_1(\hat{g}_1) = e^{i5\pi/12}$ and $\hat{\Pi}_1(\hat{g}_2) = j$, so $\hat{\Pi}_1(\hat{G})$ is also isomorphic to Q_{48} .

Lemma 4.5. *The projection map $\hat{\Pi}_1$ induces a well-defined map*

$$\Pi_1 : B \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^3/\hat{\Pi}_1(\hat{G}), \quad (q_1, q_2) \cdot \hat{G} \mapsto q_1 \cdot \hat{\Pi}_1(\hat{G}).$$

Moreover, this yields a trivial \mathbb{S}^3 -bundle $\mathbb{S}^3 \hookrightarrow B \xrightarrow{\Pi_1} \mathbb{S}^3/\hat{\Pi}_1(\hat{G})$.

We postpone this topological proof to §6.1.

By the previous lemma, $B \cong \mathbb{S}^3/Q_{48} \times \mathbb{S}^3$. Now, note the universal cover $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ of \mathcal{X} is $S^5 \times \mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^3$. Let $\tilde{G} := \mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \hat{G} \cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus Q_{48}$, which is generated by

$$\tilde{g}_0 := (1, 0), \quad \tilde{g}_1 := (0, \hat{g}_1), \quad \tilde{g}_2 := (0, \hat{g}_2).$$

We define a *right* \tilde{G} -action on $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ as follows: For every $(a, z, \mathbf{q}) \in S^5 \times \mathbb{D} \times (\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^3)$,

$$(4.15) \quad \begin{aligned} (a, z, \mathbf{q}) \cdot \tilde{g}_0 &:= ((-a_0, -a_1, -a_2, -a_3, -a_4, -a_5), z, \mathbf{q}), \\ (a, z, \mathbf{q}) \cdot \tilde{g}_1 &:= ((a_0, a_2, -a_1, a_3 \cos \frac{\pi}{3} + a_4 \sin \frac{\pi}{3}, -a_3 \sin \frac{\pi}{3} + a_4 \cos \frac{\pi}{3}, -a_5), e^{-i\frac{\pi}{3}} z, \mathbf{q} \hat{g}_1), \\ (a, z, \mathbf{q}) \cdot \tilde{g}_2 &:= ((a_0, -a_1, a_2, -a_3, a_4, -a_5), -\bar{z}, \mathbf{q} \hat{g}_2), \end{aligned}$$

where for any $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, q_2)$, the product $(q_1, q_2)\hat{g}_i$ refers to a componentwise quaternionic multiplication. It is straightforward to check that this \tilde{G} -action on $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ descends to the G -action on $\mathbb{RP}^5 \times \mathbb{D} \times SO(4)$. Hence, \tilde{G} acts on $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ freely, and $\mathcal{X} = \tilde{\mathcal{X}}/\tilde{G}$. This implies that $\pi_1(\mathcal{X}) = \tilde{G} = \mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus Q_{48}$ and $H_1(\mathcal{X}; \mathbb{Z}_2) = \mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2$.

In summary, we have:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & \text{---} & \text{---} & \text{---} & \\ & \text{---} & \text{---} & \text{---} & \\ \tilde{\mathcal{X}} & \xrightarrow{\text{dmn}(\bar{\Xi})} & \xrightarrow{G=D_{24}} & \mathcal{X} & \\ \text{---} & \text{---} & \text{---} & \text{---} & \\ & \text{---} & \text{---} & \text{---} & \\ \mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^3 & \xrightarrow{\hat{G}=Q_{48}} & B = (\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^3)/Q_{48} & & \\ \hat{\Pi}_1 \downarrow & & \downarrow \Pi_1 & & \\ \mathbb{S}^3 & \xrightarrow{\hat{\Pi}_1(\hat{G})=Q_{48}} & \mathbb{S}^3/Q_{48} & & \end{array}$$

We now fix a base point $\tilde{x}_0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$:

$$(4.16) \quad \tilde{x}_0 := ((0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1), 0, (1, 0, 0, 0), (1, 0, 0, 0)).$$

Then the generators \tilde{g}_0, \tilde{g}_1 , and \tilde{g}_2 can be viewed as elements in $\pi_1(\mathcal{X})$, and thus they induce three elements c_0, c_1 , and c_2 in $H_1(\mathcal{X}; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ respectively. *From now on, we will always use \mathbb{Z}_2 -coefficients, unless specified otherwise.* We define three cohomology classes $\lambda, \alpha \in H^1(\mathcal{X})$ and $\beta \in H^3(\mathcal{X})$:

- Let $\lambda := c_0^* + c_1^* + c_2^* \in H^1(\mathcal{X})$, where $\{c_0^*, c_1^*, c_2^*\} \subset H^1(\mathcal{X}) \cong \text{Hom}(H_1(\mathcal{X}); \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is the dual basis of $\{c_0, c_1, c_2\} \subset H_1(\mathcal{X})$.
- Let $\alpha := c_1^* + c_2^* \in H^1(\mathcal{X})$.
- Fix some $p \in \mathbb{S}^3$, and let $B_0 := \mathbb{S}^3/Q_{48} \times \{p\} \subset \mathbb{S}^3/Q_{48} \times \mathbb{S}^3 \cong B$. Let β be the pullback $\pi^*(\beta_B)$, where $\beta_B \in H^3(B)$ is the Poincaré dual of $[B_0] \in H_3(B)$.

Denote the 2-dimensional disc

$$(4.17) \quad \tilde{D}_0 := (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1) \times \mathbb{D} \times (1, 0, 0, 0) \times (1, 0, 0, 0) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{X}},$$

and let $D_0 \subset \mathcal{X}$ be its image under the quotient map $\tilde{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$. Below is an important topological feature of \mathcal{X} .

Theorem 4.6. *In $H_2(\mathcal{X}, \partial\mathcal{X})$, $[\mathcal{X}] \frown (\lambda^5 \frown \alpha^3 \frown \beta) = [D_0]$.*

Here, \frown is the cup product in $H^*(\mathcal{X})$, and \frown is the relative cap product for $(\mathcal{X}, \partial\mathcal{X})$. The proof is postponed to §6.2.

Now, let us record some crucial features of the family Ξ .

Theorem 4.7. *By appropriately choosing the functions δ, ζ in the definition (4.4) for the cut-off function ρ , the Simon-Smith family $\Xi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\leq 2}(S^3)$ satisfies the following.*

- (1) *For any $x \in (\{\rho = 0\} \times \mathbb{D} \times SO(4)) / G \subset \mathcal{X}$, $\Xi(x)$ has genus 0.*
- (2) *For any $x \in \partial\mathcal{X}$, $\Xi(x)$ has genus ≤ 1 .*
- (3) *For any 1-cycle $C \subset \mathcal{X}$ such that $\alpha([C]) \neq 0$ and $\Xi|_C$ maps into $\mathcal{S}_2(S^3)$, $\Xi|_C$ is a 1-sweepout in the Almgren-Pitts sense.*
- (4) *For any 5-cycle $C \subset \mathcal{X}$ such that $\lambda^5([C]) \neq 0$, $\Xi|_C$ is a 5-sweepout.*
- (5) *For any closed 1-subcomplex C homologous to ∂D_0 in $\partial\mathcal{X}$, if $\Xi|_C$ maps into $\mathcal{S}_1(S^3)$ then $\Xi|_C$ is “homologically non-trivial in $\mathcal{S}_1(S^3)$ ” in the following sense. There does not exist a Simon-Smith family $\Phi : W \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_1(S^3)$, where W is a pure simplicial 2-complex, such that (i) $\partial W = C$ and (ii) $\Phi|_{\partial W} = \Psi|_C$.*

We postpone the proof to §7. It will be checked in the proof that in item (1) the set defined by $\rho = 0$ is indeed G -equivariant and thus we can take the quotient by G .

4.5. Proof of Theorem 1.3 via Theorem 1.1. Let (S^3, \mathbf{g}) be the 3-sphere of positive Ricci curvature given in Theorem 1.3. Let $\mathcal{X}_0 \subset \mathcal{X}$ be the preimage of $B_0 := \mathbb{S}^3/Q_{48} \times \{p\} \subset B$ under the bundle projection $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow B$, and $\alpha_0 \in H^1(\mathcal{X}_0)$ be the restriction $\alpha|_{\mathcal{X}_0}$. Clearly, $\partial\mathcal{X}_0 = \mathcal{X}_0 \cap \partial\mathcal{X}$.

Theorem 1.3 would follow immediately from applying Theorem 1.1, to the 10-dimensional family $\Xi_0 := \Xi|_{\mathcal{X}_0} : (\mathcal{X}_0, \partial\mathcal{X}_0) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\leq 2}(S^3)$, with $p = 3$ and $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = \alpha_0$. Thus, it now suffices to verify the two assumptions in Theorem 1.1.

We first verify assumption (2) of Theorem 1.1. Let $S \subset M$ be any smooth embedded genus g surface. Pick any 1-cycle $C \subset \mathcal{X}_0$ such that $\alpha_0([C]) \neq 0$. We let $r > 0$ be small enough such that every $S' \in \mathcal{S}(M)$ that is r -close to S in the \mathbf{F} -distance must have genus at least g : See [CLW26, Lemma 2.6]. Thus, to verify Theorem 1.1 (2), we can assume without loss of generality that $\Xi|_C$ maps into $\mathcal{S}_2(S^3)$. Then by Theorem 4.7 (3), $\Xi|_C$ must be a 1-sweepout. In particular, it cannot be deformed via pinch-off processes to become r -close to S , as desired.

To verify Theorem 1.1 (1), we let $(Y, \partial Y) \subset (\mathcal{X}_0, \partial\mathcal{X}_0)$ be an arbitrary relative 7-subcomplex such that

$$(4.18) \quad [Y] = [\mathcal{X}] \frown (\alpha_0)^3 \in H_7(\mathcal{X}_0, \partial\mathcal{X}_0).$$

By (4.18) and Theorem 4.6, we have

$$[Y] \frown \lambda^5 = [\mathcal{X}] \frown \lambda^5 \frown \alpha^3 \frown \beta = [D_0] \in H_2(\mathcal{X}, \partial\mathcal{X}).$$

Suppose by contradiction that there exists a deformation via pinch-off processes,

$$(4.19) \quad H : [0, 1] \times Y \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\leq 2}(S^3),$$

where $H(0, \cdot) = \Xi|_Y$, and $\Xi' := H(1, \cdot)$ maps into $\mathcal{S}_{\leq 1}(S^3)$. For $k = 0, 1$, let $Z_k := \{x \in Y : \mathbf{g}(\Xi'(y)) = k\}$. We can derive a contradiction by finding a relative 2-subcomplex $(D, \partial D) \subset (Z_1, Z_1 \cap \partial\mathcal{X})$ such that $[\partial D] = [\partial D_0] \in H_1(\partial\mathcal{X})$. Indeed, with such a D , we can concatenate

$H|_{[0,1] \times \partial D}$ and $\Xi'|_D$ along $\Xi'|_{\partial D}$ to obtain a family Φ . In this construction, the boundary of the domain of Φ is $\{0\} \times \partial D$, on which Φ agrees with $\Xi|_{\partial D}$, contradicting Theorem 4.7 (5).

Using [CLW26, Proposition 2.23], we take a *subcomplex* $\tilde{Z}_0 \subset Y$ slightly larger than Z_0 such that $\Xi|_{\tilde{Z}_0}$ can also be deformed via pinch-off processes to become a map into $\mathcal{S}_0(S^3)$. Now, recall that there does not exist a Simon-Smith family in $\mathcal{S}_0(S^3)$ that is 5-sweepout in the Almgren-Pitts sense: This was proven in [CL24, §3.5]. Hence, $\Xi|_{\tilde{Z}_0}$ cannot be a 5-sweepout, and therefore, by Theorem 4.7 (4), $\lambda^5|_{\tilde{Z}_0} = 0$. Now, we apply Lemma 3.4 with

- Let $X := \mathcal{X}$, $A := \emptyset$. Slightly thickened $\partial \mathcal{X}$ to make it open, and let B be that.
- $p := 7$, $q := 5$, $C := Y$. $\omega := \lambda^5$,
- $W_1 := \text{int}(\tilde{Z}_0)$, $W_2 := Z_1$.

Note that the assumptions Lemma 3.4 are satisfied, and so we immediately obtain some relative 2-subcomplex $(D, \partial D) \subset (Z_1, Z_1 \cap \partial \mathcal{X})$ for which, when viewed in $H_2(\mathcal{X}, \partial \mathcal{X})$, $[D] = [D_0]$. In particular, $[\partial D] = [\partial D_0]$ in $H_1(\partial \mathcal{X})$, as desired. This finishes the proof of Theorem 1.3.

5. PROPERTIES OF THE FAMILY Ψ

In this section, we specify the cut-off functions ρ, ζ, δ in the definition of family Ψ in (4.2) and (4.4) and prove Theorem 4.2. This section is organized as follows. We first study in §5.1 zero sets of the form

$$\{x \in S^3 : a_0 + a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 + a_3x_3 + a_4x_4 + a_5x_1x_2 = 0\}.$$

This corresponds to an \mathbb{RP}^5 -family of cycles which (if nonempty) are either punctate surfaces with genus 0, or a union of two transversely intersecting round spheres. §5.2 contains some abstract lemmas discussing zeros of functions on \mathbf{S}^1 , which help to understand in Lemma 5.7 the genus and other geometric behavior of the zero sets of a special class of functions of the form (4.2). Using them, we specify the choice of the cut-off functions ρ, ζ, δ in §5.3 and discuss the basic properties of the family Ψ in Lemma 5.9. Theorem 4.2 will be proved at the end of §5.3 based on Lemma 5.9. Finally, in §5.4 we prove Proposition 4.4.

Let us recall the coordinate system we use on S^3 . First, we view S^3 as the set of points $x \in \mathbb{R}^4$ of unit distance to the origin. Let $C \subset S^3$ be the great circle $\{x \in S^3 : x_3 = x_4 = 0\}$. We parametrize S^3 by

$$(5.1) \quad \mathbf{D} \times \mathbf{S}^1 \rightarrow S^3, \quad (x, \alpha) \mapsto (x_1, x_2, \varsigma(x) \cos \alpha, \varsigma(x) \sin \alpha),$$

where $\varsigma(x) := \sqrt{1 - x_1^2 - x_2^2}$, \mathbf{D} is the closed unit disk in \mathbb{R}^2 , and $\mathbf{S}^1 := \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$. For later reference in this section, we also let $\mathbf{D}_\kappa(b)$ be the closed disc of radius κ centered at b . Recall that (4.1) is a diffeomorphism from $\text{int}(\mathbf{D}) \times \mathbf{S}^1$ to $S^3 \setminus C$, and it is a smooth \mathbf{S}^1 fiber bundle when restricted to $\partial \mathbf{D} \times \mathbf{S}^1$, mapping $\{z\} \times \mathbf{S}^1$ to a point on C . Note also that here we use the symbol \mathbf{D} in order to distinguish it from the disc \mathbb{D} in $\text{dmn}(\Psi) = \mathbb{RP}^5 \times \mathbb{D}$.

5.1. The canonical \mathbb{RP}^5 family. We first consider the \mathbb{RP}^5 family: for every $a = [a_0 : a_1 : a_2 : a_3 : a_4 : a_5]$, define

$$(5.2) \quad \tilde{\Phi}_5(a) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^4 : a_0 + a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 + a_3x_3 + a_4x_4 + a_5x_1x_2 = 0\} \subset \mathbb{R}^4;$$

$$(5.3) \quad \Phi_5(a) := S^3 \cap \tilde{\Phi}_5(a) \subset S^3.$$

Note that $\tilde{\Phi}_5(a)$ is either the union of two orthogonal hyperplanes (in which case $a = [a_1a_2 : a_1 : a_2 : 0 : 0 : 1]$), or an empty set (in which case $a = [1 : 0 : 0 : 0 : 0 : 0]$) or a smooth hypersurface in \mathbb{R}^4 . And $\tilde{\Phi}_5(a)$ varies smoothly in a in their regular parts. We say that $\tilde{\Phi}_5(a)$ is *transverse* to S^3 at $x \in S^3 \cap \tilde{\Phi}_5(a)$ if x is a regular point of $\tilde{\Phi}_5(a)$ and the tangent spaces $T_x S^3$ and $T_x \tilde{\Phi}_5(a)$ span \mathbb{R}^4 .

It is easy to check that Φ_5 gives a 5-sweepout in the Almgren-Pitts setting, but it is not a Simon-Smith family. However, we still have genus bound when $\Phi_5(a)$ does not contain a singular curve:

Lemma 5.1. *Let*

$$A_{\text{sing}} := \{[a_1 a_2 : a_1 : a_2 : 0 : 0 : 1] \in \mathbb{RP}^5 : a_1^2 + a_2^2 < 1\},$$

Then,

- (i) *for every $a \in A_{\text{sing}}$, $\Phi_5(a)$ is the union of two round (but not necessarily equatorial) spheres that intersect transversely along the circle $\{x \in S^3 : x_1 = -a_2, x_2 = -a_1\}$;*
- (ii) *for a dense subset of $a \in \mathbb{RP}^5 \setminus A_{\text{sing}}$, $\tilde{\Phi}_5(a)$ is transverse to S^3 , and hence $\Phi_5(a)$ is smooth;*
- (iii) *for every $a \in \mathbb{RP}^5 \setminus A_{\text{sing}}$, $\tilde{\Phi}_5(a)$ is transverse to S^3 at all but at most 9 points; and $\mathbf{g}(\Phi_5(a)) = 0$.*

Proof. (i) follows by noticing that when $a \in A_{\text{sing}}$, $\tilde{\Phi}_5(a) = \{(x_1 + a_2)(x_2 + a_1) = 0\}$ is the union of two orthogonal hyperplanes $\{x_1 = -a_2\}$ and $\{x_2 = -a_1\}$ whose intersection transversely intersects S^3 along the circle described in (i).

To prove (ii) and (iii), consider an arbitrary $a \in \mathbb{RP}^5 \setminus A_{\text{sing}}$. If $a_5 = 0$, then $\tilde{\Phi}_5(a)$ is either empty or an affine hyperplane in \mathbb{R}^4 , hence (iii) holds for such a ; if not, then we write $a = [a_0 : \dots : a_4 : 1]$. If $a_0 = a_1 a_2$ and $a_3 = a_4 = 0$, then by $a \notin A_{\text{sing}}$, we have $a_1^2 + a_2^2 \geq 1$, hence $\Phi_5(a)$ is the union of at most two 2-spheres (possibly degenerated to points), either disjoint or tangent to each other, which also satisfies the assertion in (iii). For the remaining case,

$$\tilde{\Phi}_5(a) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^4 : (x_1 + a_2)(x_2 + a_1) + (a_3 x_3 + a_4 x_4) + a_0 - a_1 a_2 = 0\}.$$

where $(a_3, a_4, a_0 - a_1 a_2) \neq (0, 0, 0)$. Hence there exists $\mathcal{R} \in SO(4)$, $b \in \mathbb{R}^4$ and $\lambda > 0$ such that

$$\eta(\tilde{\Phi}_5(a)) = \begin{cases} \{x \in \mathbb{R}^4 : x_1 x_2 = 1\}, & \text{if } (a_3, a_4) = (0, 0), \\ \{x \in \mathbb{R}^4 : x_1 x_2 = x_3\}, & \text{if } (a_3, a_4) \neq (0, 0); \end{cases}$$

where $\eta(x) = \eta_{\mathcal{R}, b, \lambda}(x) := \lambda \cdot \mathcal{R}x + b$ is a diffeomorphism of \mathbb{R}^4 . Also notice that $\eta(S^3) = \partial B_\lambda^4(b)$, hence $\eta(\tilde{\Phi}_5(a)) = (P \times \mathbb{R}) \cap \partial B_\lambda^4(b)$, where P is the smooth surface described in Lemma 5.2 below.

Write $b = (\check{b}, b_4) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}$, $\varrho_{\check{b}}(\check{x}) := |\check{x} - \check{b}|^2$ is a function on \mathbb{R}^3 . Notice that $P \times \mathbb{R}$ intersects non-transversely with $\partial B_\lambda^4(b)$ at $x = (\check{x}, x_4)$ if and only if $x_4 = b_4$ and $\check{b} - \check{x} \perp T_{\check{x}} P$, i.e. $\varrho_{\check{b}}(\check{x}) = \lambda^2$ and \check{x} is a critical point of $\varrho_{\check{b}}|_P$. Also notice that if λ^2 is a regular value of $\varrho_{\check{b}}|_P$, then the smooth surface $(P \times \mathbb{R}) \cap \partial B_\lambda^4(b)$ is homeomorphic to the following. Consider the smooth surface with boundary $P \cap \overline{B_\lambda^3(\check{b})}$, take two copies of it, and glue them together along their boundaries: Let us call the resulting surface (without boundary) the *double of $P \cap \overline{B_\lambda^3(\check{b})}$* .

Therefore, (ii) follows by Sard Theorem, as the regular value of $\varrho_{\check{b}}|_P$ is dense; (iii) follows from Lemma 5.2 below, where the genus control is immediate when the intersection of $\tilde{\Phi}_5(a)$ and S^3 is transverse, since the double of finitely many disks is finitely many spheres; when the intersection is not transverse, the genus control follows from the approximation of regular $\Phi_5(a_j)$ guaranteed by (ii) and the lower-semi-continuity of genus \mathbf{g} under C_{loc}^∞ convergence away from finitely many points. \square

Lemma 5.2. *Let P be one of the following two smooth surfaces in \mathbb{R}^3*

$$\{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x_1 x_2 = 1\}, \quad \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x_1 x_2 = x_3\}.$$

Then for every $b \in \mathbb{R}^3$, let $\varrho_b(x) := |x - b|^2$, we have,

- (a) *$\varrho_b|_P$ has at most 9 critical points;*
- (b) *if r^2 is a regular value of $\varrho_b|_P$, then $\overline{B_r^3(b)} \cap P$ is diffeomorphic to a finite collection (possibly empty) of disjoint disks.*

Proof. We only focus on the case when $P = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x_1 x_2 = x_3\}$, the other surface can be treated in a similar (actually even simpler) way.

For every $x \in P$, x is a critical point of $\varrho_b|_P$ if and only if $2(x_1 - b_1, x_2 - b_2, x_3 - b_3) = \nabla \varrho_b(x) \perp T_x P$, which is equivalent to

$$(5.4) \quad \begin{cases} x_1 - b_1 = -x_2(x_3 - b_3), \\ x_2 - b_2 = -x_1(x_3 - b_3). \end{cases}$$

When $(x_3 - b_3)^2 \neq 1$, (5.4) has solution

$$x_1 = \frac{b_1 - b_2(x_3 - b_3)}{1 - (x_3 - b_3)^2}, \quad x_2 = \frac{b_2 - b_1(x_3 - b_3)}{1 - (x_3 - b_3)^2}$$

Plugging back to the defining equation $x_1 x_2 = x_3$ for P gives a 5-th order polynomial equation in x_3 , so there are at most 5 solutions for (x_1, x_2, x_3) .

When $x_3 - b_3 = \pm 1$, by (5.4), $x_1 \pm x_2 = b_1 = \pm b_2$. Combining with $x_1 x_2 = x_3 = b_3 \pm 1$ gives at most 4 solutions for (x_1, x_2, x_3) . In summary, there are at most $5 + 4 = 9$ solutions x to $x \in P$ and $\nabla \varrho_b \perp T_x P$, which proves (a).

To prove (b), we can first take a smooth perturbation of $\varrho_b|_P$ to get a Morse function $\bar{\varrho} \in C^\infty(P)$ such that $\text{spt}(\bar{\varrho} - \varrho_b|_P)$ is compact and that $\bar{\varrho}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}_{\leq r^2})$ is diffeomorphic to $\varrho_b^{-1}(\mathbb{R}_{\leq r^2}) \cap P = \overline{B_r^3(b)} \cap P$. Also, since the second fundamental form A_P of P is everywhere indefinite,

$$\nabla^2(\varrho_b|_P) = \nabla^2 \varrho_b + (\nabla^\perp \varrho_b) \cdot A_P = 2 \text{id}_{T_x P} + (\nabla^\perp \varrho_b) \cdot A_P$$

has at least 1 strictly positive eigenvalue everywhere on P . Thus we can further require the smooth perturbation $\bar{\varrho}$ to have no local maximum, i.e. every critical point of $\bar{\varrho}$ has Morse index 0 or 1. Therefore, the first betti number function $\lambda \mapsto \dim H_1(\bar{\varrho}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}_{\leq \lambda}))$ is monotone non-decreasing in regular value λ of $\bar{\varrho}$. When $\lambda \gg 1$, $\bar{\varrho}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}_{\leq \lambda}) = \varrho_b^{-1}(\mathbb{R}_{\leq \lambda}) \cap P = \overline{B_{\sqrt{\lambda}}^3(b)} \cap P$ is a single disk, so we conclude that

$$\dim H_1(\overline{B_r^3(b)} \cap P) = \dim H_1(\bar{\varrho}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}_{\leq r^2})) = 0.$$

Also, since P is a graph over the $x_1 x_2$ -plane and hence diffeomorphic to \mathbb{R}^2 , as a compact subdomain with first betti number 0, $\overline{B_r^3(b)} \cap P$ is diffeomorphic to a finite disjoint union of disks. \square

5.2. Some abstract lemmas. We list some useful abstract lemmas in this subsection for later application. Readers may skip the proofs in this subsection in a first reading.

For $f \in C^\infty(\mathbf{S}^1; \mathbb{R})$, let $\alpha \in f^{-1}(0)$. Define the order of f at α to be

$$\text{ord}_f(\alpha) := \sup\{l \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} : f(\alpha) = f^{(1)}(\alpha) = \cdots = f^{(l-1)}(\alpha) = 0\}.$$

Also for $E \subset \mathbf{S}^1$, let

$$\text{ord}(f; E) := \sum_{\alpha \in f^{-1}(0) \cap E} \text{ord}_f(\alpha);$$

and we may omit E if $E = \mathbf{S}^1$.

Lemma 5.3. *For $N \in \mathbb{N}^+$, $f \in C^\infty(\mathbf{S}^1)$ and $\alpha \in f^{-1}(0)$ with $\text{ord}_f(\alpha) \leq N$, suppose that a sequence $f_j \in C^\infty(\mathbf{S}^1)$ C^N -converges to f as $j \rightarrow \infty$, and $U_1 \supset U_2 \supset \dots$ are closed intervals containing α that shrink to α as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Then for all $j \gg 1$, $\text{ord}(f_j; U_j) \leq \text{ord}_f(\alpha)$.*

Proof. Notice that by the intermediate value theorem, any closed interval $U \subset \mathbf{S}^1$ ended by two zeros of f contains a zero of f' in its interior. Hence, inductively, we have,

$$\text{ord}(f; U) \leq \text{ord}(f^{(1)}; U) + 1 \leq \cdots \leq \text{ord}(f^{(N)}; U) + N.$$

Suppose now for contradiction $\text{ord}(f_j; U_j) > \text{ord}_f(\alpha) =: N'$ for infinitely many j . Then after passing to a subsequence, for every j , and every $k \leq N'$,

$$\text{ord}(f_j^{(k)}, U_j) \geq \text{ord}(f_j, U_j) - k > 0,$$

i.e. there exists $\alpha_{j,k} \in U_j$ such that $f_j^{(k)}(\alpha_{j,k}) = 0$. For $j \rightarrow \infty$, we get $\alpha_{j,k} \rightarrow \alpha$ and $f^{(k)}(\alpha) = 0$ for all $0 \leq k \leq N'$. This forces $\text{ord}_f(\alpha) \geq N' + 1$, which gives a contradiction. \square

Associated to each $f \in C^\infty(\mathbf{S}^1; \mathbb{R})$ with $0 < \text{ord}(f) < +\infty$, we define:

$$(5.5) \quad \mathcal{Z}(f) := \sum_{\alpha \in f^{-1}(0)} \text{ord}_f(\alpha) \cdot \alpha;$$

$$(5.6) \quad \mathcal{Z}^-(f) := \sum_{\alpha \in \mu(\{f < 0\})} \alpha + \sum_{\alpha \in f^{-1}(0)} \frac{1}{2} (\text{ord}_f(\alpha) - \mathbf{n}_f(\alpha)) \cdot \alpha.$$

Here, when given a disjoint union J of intervals on \mathbf{S}^1 , $\mu(J)$ denotes the set consisting of the midpoint of each connected component of J ; and $\mathbf{n}_f(\alpha) \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ denotes the number of connected components of $\{f < 0\}$ whose closure contains α . Note that since $\alpha, \mu(I) \in \mathbf{S}^1 = \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$ and $\text{ord}_f(\alpha) - \mathbf{n}_f(\alpha)$ is always even, we have $\mathcal{Z}(f), \mathcal{Z}^-(f)$ also take value in $\mathbf{S}^1 = \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$. When $\text{ord}(f) = 0$, we set as a convention that $\mathcal{Z}(f) = \mathcal{Z}^-(f) := 0 \bmod 2\pi$.

Lemma 5.4. *For every $f \in C^\infty(\mathbf{S}^1; \mathbb{R})$ with $\text{ord}(f) < +\infty$, we have $\mathcal{Z}(f) = 2\mathcal{Z}^-(f)$ in \mathbf{S}^1 . Moreover, if $f_j \in C^\infty(\mathbf{S}^1, \mathbb{R})$ such that $f_j \rightarrow f_\infty$ in C^n and $\text{ord}(f_j) = \text{ord}(f_\infty) = n < +\infty$ for all $j \geq 1$, then $\mathcal{Z}^-(f_j) \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}^-(f_\infty)$.*

Proof. The first assertion follows directly from the definition and that for an open interval $I \subset \mathbf{S}^1$ with end points α^-, α^+ , we have $2\mu(I) = \alpha^- + \alpha^+$ in \mathbf{S}^1 .

To prove the second assertion, notice that we can view each $\alpha \in f^{-1}(0)$ with $\text{ord}_f(\alpha) - \mathbf{n}_f(\alpha) > 0$ as $(\text{ord}_f(\alpha) - \mathbf{n}_f(\alpha))/2$ degenerate intervals in $\{f \leq 0\}$, so that (5.6) is the sum of midpoints of all (possibly degenerate) $n/2$ intervals in $\{f \leq 0\}$. By Lemma 5.3, if the total order is preserved under taking the limit $f_j \rightarrow f_\infty$, then the zeros of f_∞ must be the limits of the zeros of f_j . In particular, the corresponding (possibly degenerate) intervals in $\{f_j \leq 0\}$ vary continuously under convergence. $\mathcal{Z}^-(f_j) \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}^-(f_\infty)$ thus follows from this. \square

For every integer $k > 0$, a *trigonometric polynomial* of degree k is a function on \mathbf{S}^1 of the form

$$(5.7) \quad T(\alpha) := b_0 + b_1 \cos(\alpha + \theta_1) + \cdots + b_k \cos(k\alpha + \theta_k),$$

where $b_j \in \mathbb{R}$, $b_k \neq 0$, and $\theta_j \in \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$. (We use the convention that the zero function has degree -1 .) We let

$$\|T\| := \left(b_0^2 + b_1^2 + \cdots + b_k^2 \right)^{1/2},$$

and let \mathcal{T}_k be the space of all trigonometric polynomial of degree $\leq k$, which is a vector space of dimension $2k + 1$.

Lemma 5.5. *For every nonzero $T \in \mathcal{T}_k$, $\text{ord}(T) \leq 2k$. Furthermore, if T has the form (5.7) and $\text{ord}(T) = 2k$, then $b_k \neq 0$, $\mathcal{Z}(T) = -2\theta_k$ and*

$$\mathcal{Z}^-(T) = \begin{cases} -\theta_k + k\pi, & \text{if } b_k > 0; \\ -\theta_k + (k+1)\pi, & \text{if } b_k < 0. \end{cases}$$

Proof. By induction, without loss of generality, we can assume that T has the form (5.7) where $b_k \neq 0$. By possibly replacing (b_k, θ_k) by $(-b_k, \theta_k - \pi)$ and multiplying T by a positive constant (which does not change $\mathcal{Z}^-(T)$), we can even assume that $b_k = 1$.

Notice that $\alpha \in T^{-1}(0)$ if and only if $z := e^{i\alpha}$ is a root, with multiplicity $\text{ord}_T(\alpha)$, of the following polynomial:

$$q_T(z) := z^k \left(b_0 + \frac{b_1}{2} (e^{i\theta_1} z + e^{-i\theta_1} z^{-1}) + \cdots + \frac{1}{2} (e^{i\theta_k} z^k + e^{-i\theta_k} z^{-k}) \right).$$

Hence, $\text{ord}(T)$ is no more than the total number of roots of q_T , counting multiplicity, which is $2k$ by the fundamental theorem of algebra.

Moreover, if $\text{ord}(T) = 2k$, then all roots of q_T are sitting on the unit circle, and $e^{i\mathcal{Z}(T)}$ is the product of all roots of q_T , which is equal to $q_T(0)$ divided by the leading coefficient of q_T . Hence, $e^{i\mathcal{Z}(T)} = e^{-2i\theta_k}$, and then $\mathcal{Z}(T) = -2\theta_k$, which yields by Lemma 5.4 that $\mathcal{Z}^-(T) \in \{-\theta_k, -\theta_k + \pi\}$.

To determine $\mathcal{Z}^-(T)$ precisely, notice that any trigonometric polynomial of form

$$(5.8) \quad T(\alpha) = b_0 + b_1 \cos(\alpha + \theta_1) + \cdots + b_{k-1} \cos((k-1)\alpha + \theta_{k-1}) + \cos(k\alpha + \theta_k)$$

with order $2k$ is uniquely determined by its zeros and θ_k . More precisely, if $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2k} \in \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$ are the zeros of the above T (counting the orders) such that $\sum \alpha_j = -2\theta_k$, then

$$q_T(z) = \frac{e^{i\theta_k}}{2} (z - e^{i\alpha_1})(z - e^{i\alpha_2}) \cdots (z - e^{i\alpha_{2k}})$$

and therefore

$$T(\alpha) = e^{-ik\alpha} q_T(e^{i\alpha}) = \frac{1}{2} e^{i(-k\alpha + \theta_k)} (e^{i\alpha} - e^{i\alpha_1})(e^{i\alpha} - e^{i\alpha_2}) \cdots (e^{i\alpha} - e^{i\alpha_{2k}}).$$

Also, any α_j and θ_k as above give a trigonometric polynomial of the form (5.8) with order $2k$. Therefore, the space $\mathcal{T}_k^{\text{top}}$ of trigonometric polynomial of form (5.8) with order $2k$ is path connected (and clearly contains $\cos(k\alpha + \theta_k)$). Moreover by Lemma 5.4, $T \mapsto \mathcal{Z}^-(T)$ is continuous on $\mathcal{T}_k^{\text{top}}$, hence combined with the fact that $\mathcal{Z}^-(T) \in \{-\theta_k, -\theta_k + \pi\}$, we see that

$$\mathcal{Z}^-(T) = \mathcal{Z}^-(\cos(k\alpha + \theta_k)) = -\theta_k + k\pi.$$

□

Corollary 5.6. *For every integer $k > 0$ and $\varepsilon_1 > 0$, there exists $\delta_1(k, \varepsilon_1) > 0$ with the following property. For any $T \in \mathcal{T}_k$ in the form (5.7), and any $f \in C^\infty(\mathbf{S}^1)$ such that*

$$\|f - T\|_{C^{2k}} \leq \delta_1 \|T\|,$$

we have $\text{ord}(f) \leq 2k$; and if in fact $\text{ord}(f) = 2k$ and $b_k > 0$, then $\text{dist}_{\mathbf{S}^1}(\mathcal{Z}^-(f), -\theta_k + k\pi) \leq \varepsilon_1$.

Proof. We may argue by contradiction and apply Lemma 5.4 and 5.5. □

Lemma 5.7. *For every $b = (b_1, b_2) \in \mathbf{D}$ and $\kappa > 0$ such that $|b| + 2\kappa < 1$, there exists $\delta_2(\kappa) \in (0, \kappa/4)$ with the following property.*

Suppose $F \in C^\infty(\mathbf{D} \times \mathbf{S}^1; \mathbb{R})$ and $\mathbf{x} \in C^\infty(\mathbf{S}^1; \mathbf{D}_{\kappa/4}(b))$ satisfy the following:

- (a) $\Sigma := F^{-1}(0)$ agrees with $\Phi_5(a)$ (see section 5.1) in $(\mathbf{D} \setminus \mathbf{D}_\kappa(b)) \times \mathbf{S}^1$ for some $a = [a_0 : a_1 : a_2 : a_3 : a_4 : 1] \in \mathbb{RP}^5$ with

$$|a_0 - a_1 a_2| + |a_1 + b_2| + |a_2 + b_1| + |a_3| + |a_4| < \delta_2;$$

- (b) $f(\alpha) := F(\mathbf{x}(\alpha), \alpha)$ has $\text{ord}(f) < +\infty$;
- (c) in $\mathbf{D}_\kappa(b) \times \mathbf{S}^1$, $\nabla_x F(x, \alpha) = 0$ if and only if $x = \mathbf{x}(\alpha)$; and

$$\left| \nabla_x^2 F - \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right| < \delta_2.$$

Then

- (1) Under the parametrization (5.1), Σ is a smooth surface in S^3 with isolated singularities in $\{(\mathbf{x}(\alpha), \alpha) : \alpha \in f^{-1}(0), \text{ord}_f(\alpha) \geq 2\}$.

(2) For every $\alpha \in \mathbf{S}^1$,

$$F(\cdot, \alpha) \begin{cases} > 0 & \text{on } \{\mathbf{x}(\alpha) + (t, t) \in \mathbf{D} : 0 \neq t \in \mathbb{R}\}, & \text{if } f(\alpha) \geq 0; \\ < 0 & \text{on } \{\mathbf{x}(\alpha) + (t, -t) \in \mathbf{D} : 0 \neq t \in \mathbb{R}\}, & \text{if } f(\alpha) \leq 0; \end{cases}$$

(3) the genus of Σ satisfies

$$g(\Sigma) \leq \max \left\{ 0, \frac{1}{2} \#\{\alpha \in f^{-1}(0) : \text{ord}_f(\alpha) \text{ is odd}\} - 1 \right\}.$$

and equality holds if every zero of f has order 1.




FIGURE 2. An example of the surface Σ : It shows a portion of a surface Σ near the circle $\{x_1 = -b_2, x_2 = -b_1\} \subset S^3$, which is represented by the z -axis in the figure, parametrized by α . Those α satisfying $F(\mathbf{x}(\alpha), \alpha) = 0$ correspond to the points on the surface with horizontal tangent planes.

Proof. To prove (1), by (a) and assuming $\delta_2 \ll 1$, $\Sigma = \Phi_5(a)$ is smooth outside $\mathbf{D}_\kappa(b) \times \mathbf{S}^1$. Hence it suffices to show that for every $(x, \alpha) \in \Sigma \cap \mathbf{D}_\kappa(b) \times \mathbf{S}^1$,

$$(5.9) \quad \nabla F(x, \alpha) = 0 \Leftrightarrow x = \mathbf{x}(\alpha) \text{ and } \text{ord}_f(\alpha) \geq 2.$$

To see this, note that by (c), $\nabla_x F(x, \alpha) = 0$ if and only if $x = \mathbf{x}(\alpha)$; while by definition of f ,

$$f'(\alpha) = \nabla_x F(\mathbf{x}(\alpha), \alpha) \cdot \mathbf{x}'(\alpha) + \partial_\alpha F(\mathbf{x}(\alpha), \alpha) = \partial_\alpha F(\mathbf{x}(\alpha), \alpha).$$

Combining these proves (5.9).

To prove (2), for $0 \neq v = (v_1, v_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $\mathbf{x}(\alpha) + v \in \mathbf{D}_\kappa(b)$, let $h(t) := F(\mathbf{x}(\alpha) + tv, \alpha)$. Note that by (b) and (c),

$$h(0) = f(\alpha), \quad h'(0) = 0, \quad |h''(t) - 2v_1 v_2| \leq \delta_2 |v|^2.$$

Hence $\pm h''(t) > 0$ if $v = (t, \pm t)$. Combined this with the fact

$$F(\mathbf{x}(\alpha) + v) = f(\alpha) + \int_0^1 (1-t)h''(t) dt$$

proves (2) in $\mathbf{D}_\kappa(b)$. Moreover, by (a) (assuming $\delta_2 \ll 1$) and a compactness argument, in $(\mathbf{D} \setminus \mathbf{D}_\kappa(b)) \times \mathbf{S}^1$ we know $\Sigma = \Phi_5(a)$ does not intersect $\{(\mathbf{x}(\alpha) + (t, \pm t), \alpha) \in \mathbf{D} \times \mathbf{S}^1 : 0 \neq t \in \mathbb{R}, \alpha \in \mathbf{S}^1\}$, so the sign of $F(\cdot, \alpha)$ on the corresponding line segments are not changing outside $\mathbf{D}_\kappa(b)$.

To prove (3), we first further assume that every zero of f has order 1 (hence Σ is smooth everywhere by (1)). Consider the Killing vector field ∂_α on $\mathbf{D} \times \mathbf{S}^1$ (which is also a Killing vector field on the round S^3 under parametrization (5.1)). For $(x_0, \alpha_0) \in \mathbf{D}_\kappa(b) \times \mathbf{S}^1 \cap \Sigma$, the orthogonal projection ∂_α^Σ of ∂_α onto $T\Sigma$ is zero at (x_0, α_0) if and only if $\nabla F(x_0, \alpha_0)$ and ∂_α are parallel, or equivalently, $\nabla_x F(x_0, \alpha_0) = 0$, which is equivalent to $x_0 = \mathbf{x}(\alpha_0)$ (and $\alpha_0 \in f^{-1}(0)$) by (c).

Moreover, near such (x_o, α_o) , viewing α as a single valued function on $\mathbf{D} \times \mathbf{S}^1$, we have $\partial_\alpha^\Sigma = \nabla(\alpha|_\Sigma)$. And if we set $\partial_\alpha|_{(x_o, \alpha_o)} = c_o \nabla F(x_o, \alpha_o)$ for some nonzero constant $c_o \in \mathbb{R}$, then at (x_o, α_o) ,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^2(\alpha|_\Sigma) &= \nabla^2\alpha|_{T\Sigma \otimes T\Sigma} + \vec{A}_\Sigma \cdot \partial_\alpha = c_o \vec{A}_\Sigma \cdot \nabla F(x_o, \alpha_o) \\ &= c_o (\nabla^2(F|_\Sigma) - \nabla^2 F(x_o, \alpha_o)|_{T\Sigma \otimes T\Sigma}) \\ &= -c_o \nabla_x^2 F(x_o, \alpha_o) \end{aligned}$$

is indefinite and nondegenerate by (c) if δ_2 is chosen small enough. Hence, the Poincaré-Hopf index of the vector field ∂_α^Σ at its zero (x_o, α_o) is -1 .

On the other hand, set $\hat{a} := [a_1 a_2 : a_1 : a_2 : 0 : 0 : 1] \in A_{\text{sing}}$. By (a) with δ_2 chosen even smaller, Σ is isotopic to some smooth surface Σ' which agrees with Σ in $\mathbf{D}_\kappa(b) \times \mathbf{S}^1$, agrees with $\Phi_5(\hat{a})$ outside $\mathbf{D}_{2\kappa}(b) \times \mathbf{S}^1$, and such that $\partial_\alpha^{\Sigma'}$ is nonzero on $(\mathbf{D}_{2\kappa}(b) \setminus \mathbf{D}_{\kappa/2}(b)) \times \mathbf{S}^1$. In particular, each zero of $\partial_\alpha^{\Sigma'}$ is either

- one of $\{(\mathbf{x}(\alpha_o), \alpha_o) : \alpha_o \in f^{-1}(0)\}$, each of which has Poincaré-Hopf index -1 ; or
- one of zeros of $\partial_\alpha^{\Phi_5(\hat{a})}$, whose index sum is equal to $2\chi(S^2) = 4$ by Poincaré-Hopf theorem.

Therefore, applying Poincaré-Hopf theorem to $\partial_\alpha^{\Sigma'}$ we find

$$\chi(\Sigma) = \chi(\Sigma') = 4 + (-1) \cdot \#f^{-1}(0).$$

Then (3) follows from the fact that Σ' has at most two connected components, and is connected when $f^{-1}(0) \neq \emptyset$.

Finally, when f has zeros of higher order, let Z_{ev} and Z_{od} be the set of zeros of f with even order and odd order respectively. We can construct another smooth function $h \in C^\infty(\mathbf{S}^1)$ such that

- $h^{-1}(0) = Z_{od}$ and each zero of h has order 1;
- $fh \geq 0$ everywhere on \mathbf{S}^1 .

Then, let $\xi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbf{D}_\kappa(b), [0, 1])$ be a cut-off such that $\xi|_{\mathbf{D}_{\kappa/2}(b)} = 1$, we can consider

$$F_\epsilon(x, \alpha) := F(x, \alpha) + \epsilon \xi(x) h(\alpha).$$

It is easy to check that when $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$, F_ϵ also satisfies (a)-(c) with f replaced by $f_\epsilon := f + \epsilon h$. By the construction above, f_ϵ only has zeros of order 1, and $f_\epsilon^{-1}(0) = Z_{od}$. Therefore, as $F_\epsilon^{-1}(0)$ locally smoothly converges to Σ in the regular part, we have

$$\mathfrak{g}(\Sigma) \leq \liminf_{\epsilon \searrow 0} \mathfrak{g}(F_\epsilon^{-1}(0)) = \max \left\{ 0, \frac{1}{2} \#Z_{od} - 1 \right\}.$$

□

5.3. Construction of Ψ . Recall that \mathbb{D} denotes the closed 2-dimensional unit disc in the second factor of $\text{dmn}(\Psi) = \mathbb{RP}^5 \times \mathbb{D}$. We will often use polar coordinate $z = re^{i\theta}$ for \mathbb{D} , and we parametrize S^3 by (4.1). Under this parametrization, the family $\Psi : \mathbb{RP}^5 \times \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(S^3)$ takes the form

$$(5.10) \quad \Psi(a, z) := \begin{cases} \Phi_5(a), & \text{if } a_5 = 0; \\ \{(x, \alpha) \in \mathbf{D} \times \mathbf{S}^1 : F_{a,z}(x, \alpha) = 0\}, & \text{if } a_5 \neq 0 \end{cases}$$

where for $(a, z) \in (\mathbb{RP}^5 \times \mathbb{D}) \cap \{a_5 \neq 0\}$ (recall $\varsigma(x) := \sqrt{1 - x_1^2 - x_2^2}$),

$$(5.11) \quad \begin{aligned} F_{a,z}(x, \alpha) &:= a_5^{-1} \left(a_0 + a_1 x_1 + a_2 x_2 + \varsigma(x)(a_3 \cos \alpha + a_4 \sin \alpha) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + a_5 \left[x_1 x_2 + \rho(a, x)(r \cos(\theta + 2\alpha) + (1 - r) \cos(3\alpha)) \right] \right). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that the cut-off function $\rho : \mathbb{RP}^5 \times S^3 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is chosen as in (4.4):

(I) When $a = [a_0 : a_1 : a_2 : a_3 : a_4 : a_5] \in \mathbb{RP}^5$ with $a_1^2 + a_2^2 < a_5^2$, let

$$\rho(a, x) := \zeta \left(64a_5^2 \cdot \frac{(a_5x_1 + a_2)^2 + (a_5x_2 + a_1)^2}{(a_5^2 - a_1^2 - a_2^2)^2} \right) \zeta \left(\frac{(a_3^2 + a_4^2)a_5^2 + (a_0a_5 - a_1a_2)^2}{a_5^4 \delta((a_1^2 + a_2^2)/a_5^2)} \right) \delta \left(\frac{a_1^2 + a_2^2}{a_5^2} \right)$$

where $\zeta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ is a fixed non-increasing cut-off such that $\zeta|_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq 1/2}} = 1$, $\zeta|_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}} = 0$; $\delta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}; [0, 1])$ is 0 outside $(-1, 1)$, positive and very small in $(-1, 1)$, to be specified in Lemma 5.9 below.

(II) When $a \in \mathbb{RP}^5$ does not take the form above, we set $\rho(a, x) = 0$.

Remark 5.8. The following facts can be verified directly from the definition:

- (i) ρ is a well-defined continuous function on $\mathbb{RP}^5 \times S^3$ and is C^∞ in x variable.
- (ii) For $a \in \mathbb{RP}^5$ that is not in a small neighborhood of A_{sing} , $\rho(a, \cdot) \equiv 0$, hence (under the parametrization (4.1)) by Lemma 5.1, $\Psi(a, z) = \Phi_5(a)$ is a surface with at most 9 singular points and genus 0.
- (iii) When $\rho(a, x) \neq 0$ and $a_5 = 1$,

$$(x_1 + a_2)^2 + (x_2 + a_1)^2 \leq \frac{1}{64}(1 - a_1^2 - a_2^2)^2 < \frac{1}{16} \left(1 - \sqrt{a_1^2 + a_2^2} \right)^2,$$

hence $|x| \leq (1 + 3\sqrt{a_1^2 + a_2^2})/4 < 1$. As a consequence, $\Psi(a, z)$ agrees with $\Phi_5(a)$ in a small neighborhood of $\partial \mathbf{D} \times \mathbf{S}^1$ (whose image under parametrization (4.1) is a neighborhood of C in S^3). We shall establish the smoothness of $\Psi(a, z)$ away from at most 3 points in the interior of $\mathbf{D} \times \mathbf{S}^1$, which then implies the regularity of $\Psi(a, z)$ in the whole S^3 .

- (iv) When $a \in A_{\text{sing}}$, $\rho(a, x) = \delta(a_1^2 + a_2^2)$ is a nonzero constant for (x, α) close to the singular circle of $\Phi_5(a)$. Heuristically, this means $\Psi(a, z)$ is a desingularization of $\Phi_5(a)$ using some *trigonometric polynomials* in α variable, whose number of zeros bounds the genus of $\Psi(a, z)$ as in Lemma 5.7.

Lemma 5.9. *There exists some function $\delta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, which vanishes outside $(-1, 1)$ and is positive and small enough in $(-1, 1)$, such that $\Psi(a, z)$ and $F_{a,z}$ (defined at the beginning of this subsection) satisfy the following⁴. For every $a = [a_0 : a_1 : \dots : a_4 : 1] \in \mathbb{RP}^5$ with $\rho(a, \cdot)$ not constantly zero, if we let $\kappa(a) := (1 - \sqrt{a_1^2 + a_2^2})/4$, then we have:*

- (a) *There is a unique $\mathbf{x}_a \in C^\infty(\mathbf{S}^1; \mathbf{D}_{\kappa(a)/4}(-a_2, -a_1))$ so that for $(x, \alpha) \in \mathbf{D}_{\kappa(a)}(-a_2, -a_1) \times \mathbf{S}^1$,*

$$\nabla_x F_{a,z}(x, \alpha) = 0, \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad x = \mathbf{x}_a(\alpha).$$

And for some constant $C = C(a_1^2 + a_2^2) > 0$ we have,

$$|\mathbf{x}_a(\alpha) - (-a_2, -a_1)| \leq C \cdot (|a_3| + |a_4|)$$

- (b) *Let $f_{a,z} \in C^\infty(\mathbf{S}^1)$ be given by $f_{a,z}(\alpha) := F_{a,z}(\mathbf{x}_a(\alpha), \alpha)$. Then*

$$\#f_{a,z}^{-1}(0) \leq \begin{cases} 4, & \text{if } |z| = 1; \\ 6, & \text{if } |z| < 1. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, if the equality holds when $z = e^{i\theta}$ (hence $|z| = 1$), then each zero of $f_{a,z}$ has order 1, and

$$\text{dist}_{\mathbf{S}^1}(\mathcal{Z}^-(f_{a,z}), -\theta) \leq 1000^{-1}.$$

⁴ a_5 is set to be 1, so the domains $\{\pm F_{a,z} > 0\}$ are well-defined for such a .

(c) For every $z \in \mathbb{D}$, $\Psi(a, z)$ is a smooth surface in S^3 away from at most 3 points, with the genus estimate

$$\mathfrak{g}(\Psi(a, z)) \leq \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } |z| = 1; \\ 2, & \text{if } |z| < 1. \end{cases}$$

And equality holds when $|z| = 1$ if and only if $\#f_{a,z}^{-1}(0) = 4$.

Proof of Lemma 5.9. To prove (a), in the following $\Lambda_i > 1$ will be absolute constants changing from line to line, and $C(a_1^2 + a_2^2) > 0$ also changes from line to line. Recall that

$$\begin{aligned} F_{a,z}(x, \alpha) &= (x_1 + a_2)(x_2 + a_1) + (a_0 - a_1 a_2) + \varsigma(x)(a_3 \cos \alpha + a_4 \sin \alpha) \\ &\quad + \rho(a, x)(r \cos(\theta + 2\alpha) + (1 - r) \cos(3\alpha)) \end{aligned}$$

where $\rho(a, \cdot)$ is constant for $x \in \mathbf{D}_{\kappa(a)/4}(-a_2, -a_1)$, $\rho(a, \cdot) = 0$ for $x \notin \mathbf{D}_{\kappa(a)}(-a_2, -a_1)$ and in general,

$$|\nabla_x \rho| \leq \Lambda_1 (1 - a_1^2 - a_2^2)^{-2} \cdot \delta(a_1^2 + a_2^2).$$

Also since $\rho(a, \cdot) \neq 0$, we have

$$(5.12) \quad a_3^2 + a_4^2 + (a_0 - a_1 a_2)^2 \leq \delta(a_1^2 + a_2^2).$$

And in $\mathbf{D}_{\kappa(a)}(-a_2, -a_1)$,

$$|\varsigma| + |\nabla \varsigma| + |\nabla^2 \varsigma| \leq \Lambda_2 \kappa(a)^{-4}.$$

Hence, in $\mathbf{D}_{\kappa(a)}(-a_2, -a_1) \setminus \mathbf{D}_{\kappa(a)/4}(-a_2, -a_1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_x F_{a,z}(x, \alpha) &= (x_2 + a_1, x_1 + a_2) + O\left(|a_3| + |a_4| + \delta(a_1^2 + a_2^2)\right) \kappa(a)^{-4} \\ &= (x_2 + a_1, x_1 + a_2) + O\left(\delta(a_1^2 + a_2^2)^{1/2}\right) \kappa(a)^{-4} \\ &\neq 0 \end{aligned}$$

as long as $\delta(a_1^2 + a_2^2) \leq \Lambda_3^{-1} \kappa(a)^{10}$. While in $\mathbf{D}_{\kappa(a)/4}(-a_2, -a_1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_x F_{a,z}(x, \alpha) &= (x_2 + a_1, x_1 + a_2) + (a_3 \cos \alpha + a_4 \sin \alpha) \nabla \varsigma(x); \\ \nabla_x F_{a,z}(-a_2, -a_1, \alpha) &= O(|a_3| + |a_4|) \kappa(a)^{-4} = O(\delta(a_1^2 + a_2^2)^{1/2}) \kappa(a)^{-4}; \end{aligned}$$

$$(5.13) \quad \nabla_x^2 F_{a,z}(x, \alpha) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + O(|a_3| + |a_4|) \kappa(a)^{-4}.$$

Hence consider

$$\varpi : (y_1, y_2) \mapsto - \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \nabla_x F_{a,z}(-a_2 + y_1, -a_1 + y_2, \alpha) + (y_1, y_2)$$

By taking $\delta(a_1^2 + a_2^2) \leq \Lambda_4^{-1} \kappa(a)^{10}$, we can see that ϖ has small Lipschitz constant and is a contraction map from $\mathbf{D}_{\kappa(a)/4}$ to itself, and by the Banach fixed-point theorem, it has a unique fixed point (which corresponds to zero of $\nabla_x F_{a,z}$) with length no more than

$$|\varpi(0, 0)| + \|\nabla \varpi\|_{C^0(\mathbf{D}_{\kappa(a)/4})} \leq C(a_1^2 + a_2^2)(|a_3| + |a_4|).$$

This finishes the proof of (a). Moreover, since $\nabla_x F_{a,z}(\mathbf{x}_a(\alpha), \alpha) = 0$, by chain rule we have,

$$(5.14) \quad \|\mathbf{x}_a - (-a_2, -a_1)\|_{C^6(\mathbf{S}^1)} \leq C(a_1^2 + a_2^2)(|a_3| + |a_4|).$$

To prove (b), notice that

$$\begin{aligned} T_{a,z}(\alpha) &:= F_{a,z}(-a_2, -a_1, \alpha) \\ &= (a_0 - a_1 a_2) + \varsigma(-a_2, -a_1)(a_3 \cos \alpha + a_4 \sin \alpha) \\ &\quad + \rho(a, (-a_2, -a_1))(r \cos(\theta + 2\alpha) + (1-r) \cos(3\alpha)) \end{aligned}$$

is a trigonometric polynomial of degree ≤ 3 for every (a, z) , and it is of degree 2 if $z \in \partial\mathbb{D}$. And since $\rho(a, \cdot)$ is a constant in $\mathbf{D}_{\kappa(a)/4}$,

$$\begin{aligned} f_{a,z}(\alpha) - T_{a,z}(\alpha) &= (\mathbf{x}_a(\alpha)_1 + a_2)(\mathbf{x}_a(\alpha)_2 + a_1) \\ &\quad + (\varsigma(\mathbf{x}_a(\alpha)) - \varsigma(-a_2, -a_1))(a_3 \cos \alpha + a_4 \sin \alpha). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_{a,z} - T_{a,z}\|_{C^6(\mathbf{S}^1)} &\leq C(a_1^2 + a_2^2) \left(\|\mathbf{x}_a - (-a_2, -a_1)\|_{C^6(\mathbf{S}^1)}^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (|a_3| + |a_4|) \|\mathbf{x}_a - (-a_2, -a_1)\|_{C^6(\mathbf{S}^1)} \right) \\ &\leq C(a_1^2 + a_2^2)(|a_3| + |a_4|)^2 \\ &\leq \bar{C}(a_1^2 + a_2^2)(|a_3| + |a_4|) \|T_{a,z}\|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence by taking $\delta(a_1^2 + a_2^2) \ll 1$ such that $\bar{C}(a_1^2 + a_2^2)(|a_3| + |a_4|) \leq \delta_1(3, 1000^{-1})$ from Corollary 5.6, (b) follows directly by Corollary 5.6.

To prove (c), by (5.12) and (5.13), we can further assume $\delta(a_1^2 + a_2^2)$ to be small such that assumptions (a)-(c) of Lemma 5.7 hold for $F_{a,z}$, $(-a_2, -a_1)$, $\kappa(a)$, \mathbf{x}_a in place of F , b , κ , \mathbf{x} therein. Hence, (c) follows immediately from (b) proved above together with Lemma 5.7 (1) and (3). \square

Proof of Theorem 4.2. The construction of Ψ has been carried out above with the choice of δ fixed by Lemma 5.9. The assertion that Ψ takes value in the set of punctate surfaces of genus ≤ 2 and (1), (2) of Theorem 4.2 follow from (c) of Lemma 5.9 and (ii) of Remark 5.8. \square

5.4. Symmetry of $\bar{\Xi}$ and Ψ . In this section, we prove Proposition 4.4. Recall that in (5.10), $\Psi(a, z)$ is defined using $\Phi_5(a)$ in (5.3) when $a_5 = 0$, and using $F_{a,z}$ in (5.11) when $a_5 \neq 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} (5.15) \quad F_{a,re^{i\theta}}(x, \alpha) &:= a_5^{-1} \left(a_0 + a_1 x_1 + a_2 x_2 + a_3 x_3 + a_4 x_4 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + a_5 \left[x_1 x_2 + \rho(a, x) (r \cos(\theta + 2\alpha) + (1-r) \cos 3\alpha) \right] \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Proposition 4.4 is a direct consequence of the following lemma.

Lemma 5.10. *Recall the left- G action σ on $\mathbb{RP}^5 \times \mathbb{D}$ is defined in (4.11). For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, we have*

$$F_{\sigma(g_i^{-1})(a,z)}(p) = -F_{a,z}(g_i \cdot p), \quad \forall (a, z) \in \{a_5 \neq 0\} \times \mathbb{D}, \quad \forall p \in S^3,$$

where the G -action on S^3 was given in (4.9). In particular, the 7-parameter family $\Psi : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\leq 2}(S^3)$ is G -equivariant, where the G -action on $\mathcal{S}_{\leq 2}(S^3)$ is induced by (4.9).

Proof. For g_1 , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{a,z}(g_1 \cdot p) &= a_5^{-1}(a_0 + a_1(-x_2) + a_2x_1 + (a_3 - a_4) \begin{pmatrix} \cos \frac{\pi}{3} & -\sin \frac{\pi}{3} \\ \sin \frac{\pi}{3} & \cos \frac{\pi}{3} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_3 \\ x_4 \end{pmatrix}) \\
&\quad + a_5 \left[(-x_2)x_1 + \rho(a, g_1 \cdot x) (r \cos(\theta + 2(\alpha + \pi/3)) + (1-r) \cos 3(\alpha + \pi/3)) \right] \\
&= a_5^{-1}(a_0 + a_2x_1 + (-a_1)x_2 + \left(a_3 \cos \frac{\pi}{3} + a_4 \sin \frac{\pi}{3} \right) x_3 + \left(-a_3 \sin \frac{\pi}{3} + a_4 \cos \frac{\pi}{3} \right) x_4 \\
&\quad + (-a_5) \left[x_1x_2 + \rho(g_1^{-1} \cdot a, x) (r \cos((\theta - \pi/3) + 2\alpha) + (1-r) \cos 3\alpha) \right]) \\
&= -F_{\sigma(g_1^{-1})(a,z)}(p),
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality uses (4.7) and (4.9), the second uses (4.13), and the third uses (4.11). Note, the notation $g_i^{-1} \cdot a$ involves an obvious abuse of notation: It refers to the G -action on \mathbb{RP}^5 induced by (4.13) and (4.14). Similarly, by (4.8), (4.9), (4.14), and (4.11),

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{a,z}(g_2 \cdot p) &= a_5^{-1}(a_0 + a_1(-x_1) + a_2x_2 + a_3(-x_3) + a_4x_4 \\
&\quad + a_5 \left[(-x_1)x_2 + \rho(a, g_2 \cdot x) (r \cos(\theta + 2(\pi - \alpha)) + (1-r) \cos 3(\pi - \alpha)) \right]) \\
&= a_5^{-1}(a_0 + (-a_1)x_1 + a_2x_2 + (-a_3)x_3 + a_4x_4 \\
&\quad + (-a_5) \left[x_1x_2 + \rho(g_2^{-1} \cdot a, x) (r \cos((\pi - \theta) + 2\alpha) + (1-r) \cos 3\alpha) \right]) \\
&= -F_{\sigma(g_2^{-1})(a,z)}(p).
\end{aligned}$$

□

6. TOPOLOGY OF \mathcal{X}

In this section, we prove Lemma 4.5 and Theorem 4.6.

6.1. Proof of Lemma 4.5.

First, the map

$$\Pi_1 : B = (\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^3)/\hat{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^3/\hat{\Pi}_1(\hat{G}), \quad (q_1, q_2) \cdot \hat{G} \mapsto q_1 \cdot \hat{\Pi}_1(\hat{G}),$$

is clearly well-defined, where $(q_1, q_2) \cdot \hat{G}$ and $q_1 \cdot \hat{\Pi}_1(\hat{G})$ denote the left cosets. This gives a principal \mathbb{S}^3 -bundle via the fiberwise right action

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau : ((\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^3)/\hat{G}) \times \mathbb{S}^3 &\rightarrow (\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^3)/\hat{G}, \\
((q_1, q_2) \cdot \hat{G}, q') &\mapsto (q_1, q'^{-1}q_2) \cdot \hat{G}
\end{aligned}$$

Since the base of this bundle has dimension 3, by the obstruction theory, it admits a smooth global section $\mathfrak{s} : \mathbb{S}^3/\hat{\Pi}_1(\hat{G}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^3)/\hat{G}$, i.e., $\pi \circ \mathfrak{s} = \text{id}_{\mathbb{S}^3/\hat{\Pi}_1(\hat{G})}$. Alternatively, we extend $(\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^3)/\hat{G}$ to a real vector bundle \mathbf{V} over $\mathbb{S}^3/\hat{\Pi}_1(\hat{G})$ of rank 4, in which $(\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^3)/\hat{G} \subset \mathbf{V}$ is the unit sphere bundle. By a perturbation of the zero section, there exists a section $\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}$ of \mathbf{V} transverse to the zero section $\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_0$ in \mathbf{V} , and thus, doesn't intersect $\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_0$ by counting dimensions; in other words, $\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}$ is nonvanishing everywhere. Then $\mathfrak{s} := \tilde{\mathfrak{s}}/|\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}|$ is a global section of $(\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^3)/\hat{G}$.

The triviality of this \mathbb{S}^3 -bundle follows from this global section \mathfrak{s} , which induces a diffeomorphism

$$\mathbb{S}^3 \times (\mathbb{S}^3/\hat{\Pi}_1(\hat{G})) \rightarrow (\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^3)/\hat{G}, \quad (q', q \cdot \hat{\Pi}_1(\hat{G})) \mapsto \tau(\mathfrak{s}(q \cdot \hat{\Pi}_1(\hat{G})), q').$$

6.2. Proof of Theorem 4.6. Recall that $\mathcal{X} = \tilde{\mathcal{X}}/\tilde{G}$, where $\tilde{\mathcal{X}} := S^5 \times \mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^3$, parametrized by $(a, z, z_1 + z_2 j, w_1 + w_2 j)$, and $\tilde{G} = \mathbb{Z}_2 \times Q_{48}$, with generators \tilde{g}_0, \tilde{g}_1 , and \tilde{g}_2 acting on $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ by (4.15). Here, we view $\mathbb{S}^3 \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ as the group of unit quaternions, and write any point $(w_1, w_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ as the quaternion $w_1 + w_2 j$.

We shall apply Appendix C with $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}, \tilde{G}$ in place of \tilde{X}, H therein to construct Poincaré duals of first cohomology classes.

We first construct \tilde{G} -equivariant functions on $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$, concentrating on its first \mathbb{S}^3 factor.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $\epsilon := 2026^{-1}$. Define $v_1, v_2, v_3 \in C^\infty(\tilde{\mathcal{X}}, \mathbb{R})$ (that only depend on (z_1, z_2)) by*

$$v_1 := \operatorname{Re}(z_1^{12} - z_2^{12}), \quad v_2 := \operatorname{Im}(z_1^{12} - z_2^{12}), \quad v_3 := \operatorname{Re}\left(e^{i\epsilon\pi}(z_1 z_2^{13} + z_1^{13} z_2)\right).$$

Then they satisfy the following:

- (i) *For each $\ell \in \{1, 2, 3\}$,*

$$-v_\ell(p\tilde{g}_0) = v_\ell(p\tilde{g}_1) = v_\ell(p\tilde{g}_2) = -v_\ell(p), \quad \forall p \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}.$$

- (ii) $\{v_1 = v_2 = v_3 = 0\} = S^5 \times \mathbb{D} \times Z_{\alpha^3} \times \mathbb{S}^3$, where $Z_{\alpha^3} \subset \mathbb{S}^3$ consists of 48×7 points;
 (iii) *At each $p \in \{v_1 = v_2 = v_3 = 0\}$, $\{\nabla v_1(p), \nabla v_2(p), \nabla v_3(p)\}$ are linear independent in $T_p \tilde{\mathcal{X}}^3$.*

Proof. Note that by (4.15) and the definitions of \hat{g}_1, \hat{g}_2 in §4.2,

$$(z_1 + z_2 j, w_1 + w_2 j) \hat{g}_1 = (z_1 e^{i5\pi/12} + (z_2 e^{-i5\pi/12}) j, w_1 e^{-i\pi/12} + (w_2 e^{i\pi/12}) j);$$

$$(z_1 + z_2 j, w_1 + w_2 j) \hat{g}_2 = (-z_2 + z_1 j, w_2 - w_1 j).$$

(i) thus follows from a direct calculation. For the rest, it suffices to only work with (z_1, z_2) variables.

To prove (ii), first notice that $v_1(z_1, z_2) = v_2(z_1, z_2) = 0$ is equivalent to $z_2^{12} = z_1^{12}$, and since $|z_1|^2 + |z_2|^2 = 1$, this is to say, $z_1 = 2^{-1/2} e^{i\theta}$ and $z_2 = 2^{-1/2} e^{i(\theta+l\pi/6)}$, for some $l \in \{0, 1, \dots, 11\}$. For each such l , plugging this into $v_3 = 0$ yields

$$0 = 2\operatorname{Re}(e^{i\epsilon\pi} z_1^{13} z_2) = 2^{-6} \operatorname{Re}(e^{i(14\theta+\epsilon\pi+l\pi/6)});$$

which has 28 solutions for $\theta \bmod 2\pi$ for each l . Therefore, $\{v_1 = v_2 = v_3 = 0\}$ consists of $12 \times 28 = 48 \times 7$ points in \mathbb{S}^3 . We denote them by

(6.1)

$$Z_{\alpha^3} = \left\{ 2^{-1/2}(e^{i\theta}, e^{i(\theta+l\pi/6)}) : 14\theta + (\epsilon + \frac{l}{6})\pi = (\frac{1}{2} + m)\pi, l \in \{0, \dots, 11\}, m \in \{0, \dots, 27\} \right\}.$$

To prove (iii), first note that each v_ℓ naturally extends to a homogeneous polynomial V_ℓ on $\mathbb{C}^2 = \mathbb{R}^4$. Hence at every $p \in \{v_1 = v_2 = v_3 = 0\}$, $p \cdot \nabla_{\mathbb{R}^4} V_\ell(p) = 0$ and hence $\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^4} V_\ell(p) = \nabla v_\ell(p)$. By Lemma D.1, it suffices to verify that at p , $\partial_z(z_1^{12} - z_2^{12})$ and $\partial_z(z_1 z_2^{13} + z_1^{13} z_2)$ are \mathbb{C} -linearly independent in \mathbb{C}^2 . A direct calculation proves this. \square

Another class of \tilde{G} -equivariant functions comes from $S^5 \times \mathbb{S}^3$ directions.

Lemma 6.2. *Define $f_0, \dots, f_4 \in C^\infty(\tilde{\mathcal{X}}, \mathbb{R})$ by*

$$f_0 = a_0, \quad f_1 + i f_2 = (\bar{z}_1^6 + z_2^6)(a_1 + ia_2), \quad f_3 + i f_4 = (\bar{z}_1^4 + z_2^4)(a_3 + ia_4).$$

They satisfy the following properties:

- (i) *For every $p \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$, $0 \leq \ell \leq 4$ and $0 \leq m \leq 2$, $f_\ell(p\tilde{g}_m) = \phi_\ell(\tilde{g}_m) f_\ell(p)$ for some $\phi_\ell(\tilde{g}_m) \in \{\pm 1\}$ determined by the following list,*

	ϕ_0	ϕ_1	ϕ_2	ϕ_3	ϕ_4
\tilde{g}_0	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1
\tilde{g}_1	1	-1	-1	1	1
\tilde{g}_2	1	-1	1	-1	1

(ii) For every $(z_1, z_2) \in Z_{\alpha^3}$ from Lemma 6.1,

$$\{a \in S^5 : f_\ell(a, z, z_1 + z_2 j, w_1 + w_2 j) = 0, \forall 0 \leq \ell \leq 4\} = \{(0, 0, 0, 0, 0, \pm 1)\}$$

and at each point in this set, $\{\nabla_{S^5} f_\ell\}_{0 \leq \ell \leq 4}$ are linearly independent.

Proof. Similar to Lemma 6.1, (i) follows by a straightforward verification. To prove (ii), notice that for fixed (z_1, z_2) , f_ℓ are restrictions on S^5 of linear functions on \mathbb{R}^6 that are independent of a_5 -variable. Thus, it suffices to show that

$$(\bar{z}_1^6 + z_2^6) \neq 0, \quad (\bar{z}_1^4 + z_2^4) \neq 0$$

for every $(z_1, z_2) \in Z_{\alpha^3}$ from Lemma 6.1. This also follows from a direct calculation using (6.1). \square

Proof of Theorem 4.6. We apply Corollary C.2 to $v_1, v_2, v_3, f_0, \dots, f_4 \in C^\infty(\tilde{\mathcal{X}})$. Note that Lemma 6.1 (iii) and Lemma 6.2 (ii) together imply the linear independence assumptions in Corollary C.2. Also, by Lemma 6.1 (i) and Lemma 6.2 (i), cohomology classes corresponding to v_1, v_2, v_3 are all $c_1^* + c_2^* = \alpha$, while the cohomology class corresponding to f_ℓ has form $c_0^* + d_\ell^*$ for some $d_\ell^* \in \text{span}\{c_1^*, c_2^*\}$. Thus, Corollary C.2 yields that the Poincaré dual of $(\cup_{\ell=0}^4 (c_0^* + d_\ell^*)) \cup \alpha^3 \in H^8(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is

$$Z := \{v_1 = v_2 = v_3 = f_0 = \dots = f_4 = 0\}/\tilde{G} = (\{(0, \dots, 0, \pm 1)\} \times \mathbb{D} \times Z_{\alpha^3} \times \mathbb{S}^3)/\tilde{G} \subset \mathcal{X}.$$

Also recall that $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow B := (\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^3)/\hat{G}$, $(a, z, z_1 + z_2 j, w_1 + w_2 j) \cdot \tilde{G} \mapsto (z_1 + z_2 j, w_1 + w_2 j) \cdot \hat{G}$ is a fiber bundle; while by Lemma 4.5, $\Pi_1 : B \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^3/\hat{\Pi}_1(\hat{G})$, $(q_1, q_2) \cdot \hat{G} \mapsto q_1 \cdot \hat{\Pi}(\hat{G})$ is a trivial \mathbb{S}^3 -bundle, and $\beta = \pi^* \beta_B$ where $\beta_B \in H^3(B, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is the Poincaré dual of a section B_0 of the fiber bundle Π_1 . Set \hat{B}_0 be the inverse image of B_0 under $\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^3 \rightarrow B$. Thus, the Poincaré dual of $(\cup_{\ell=0}^4 (c_0^* + d_\ell^*)) \cup \alpha^3 \cup \beta \in H^{11}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is

$$Z \cap \pi^{-1}(B_0) = \left(\{(0, \dots, 0, \pm 1)\} \times \mathbb{D} \times (Z_{\alpha^3} \times \mathbb{S}^3 \cap \hat{B}_0) \right) / \tilde{G},$$

which consists of $(2 \times 48 \times 7)/(\#\tilde{G}) = 7$ copies of \mathbb{D} in the fibers of $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow B$, each homologous to D_0 defined above Theorem 4.6. Therefore, we have

$$[\mathcal{X}] \cup (\cup_{\ell=0}^4 (c_0^* + d_\ell^*)) \cup \alpha^3 \cup \beta = 7[D_0] = [D_0], \quad \text{in } H_2(\mathcal{X}, \partial\mathcal{X}; \mathbb{Z}_2).$$

Finally, we claim that $(\cup_{\ell=0}^4 (c_0^* + d_\ell^*)) \cup \alpha^3 \cup \beta = \lambda^5 \cup \alpha^3 \cup \beta$ in $H^{11}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{Z}_2)$, and this will complete the proof of Theorem 4.6. To see this, notice that by definition $\lambda = c_0^* + c_1^* + c_2^*$, and there exist $c_{1,B}^*, c_{2,B}^* \in H^1(B, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ such that $\pi^* c_{l,B}^* = c_l^*$, $l = 1, 2$. Thus, $\alpha^3 \cup \beta = \pi^*(\alpha_B^3 \cup \beta_B)$ and there are some $d_{\ell,B} \in H^1(B, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ such that

$$(\cup_{\ell=0}^4 (c_0^* + d_\ell^*)) \cup \alpha^3 \cup \beta = (\cup_{\ell=0}^4 (\lambda + \pi^* d_{\ell,B})) \cup \pi^*(\alpha_B^3 \cup \beta_B) = \lambda^5 \cup \pi^*(\alpha_B^3 \cup \beta_B),$$

where the last equality follows from that $d_{\ell,B} \cup (\alpha_B^3 \cup \beta_B) = 0$ for every ℓ , since $\dim B = 6 < 7$. This finishes the proof of the claim. \square

7. PROPERTIES OF THE FAMILY Ξ

In this section, we prove Theorem 4.7.

First, Theorem 4.7 (1) and (2) follow immediately from the definition and Theorem 4.2.

For (3), since $\Xi|_C$ maps into $\mathcal{S}_2(S^3)$, we know by (1) that C must lie in the subset $(\{\rho \neq 0\} \times \mathbb{D} \times SO(4))/D_{24}$. Thus, $[C] \in H_1(\mathcal{X})$ has no c_0 component (recall the notation in §4.4). Then, since $\alpha := c_1^* + c_2^*$, we have $[C] = c_1$ or c_2 . Now, choose an embedded path $\bar{\sigma}_1(t)$ (resp. $\bar{\sigma}_2(t)$) in $SO(4)$, with $t \in [0, 1]$, that starts at id and ends at the point g_1 (resp. g_2): See §4.2 for the definitions of $g_i \in SO(4)$. Then the path $t \mapsto ([0 : \dots : 0 : 1], 0, \bar{\sigma}_i(t))$ in $\mathbb{RP}^5 \times \mathbb{D} \times SO(4)$ descends to a *loop* in \mathcal{X} , which we denote as σ_i . Let $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ be the image of \tilde{x}_0 (defined by (4.16)) under the map $\tilde{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$. Note, both loops σ_1, σ_2 are based at x_0 , and σ_i induces the class $c_i \in H_1(\mathcal{X})$.

Notice $\Xi(x_0)$ takes the form $\{x_1x_2 + \rho([0 : \dots : 0 : 1], x) \cos 3\alpha = 0\}$, which can be readily shown to be of genus 2 using Lemma 5.7 (3). Then since all members in the loops $\Xi|_{\sigma_1}$ and $\Xi|_{\sigma_2}$ are just rotations of $\Xi(x_0)$, they all have genus 2. Thus, recalling that the property of a loop in $\mathcal{Z}_2(S^3; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ being an Almgren-Pitts 1-sweepout depends only on its homology class, without loss of generality we can assume that C is exactly the loop σ_1 or σ_2 . Hence, it suffices to check that $\Xi|_{\sigma_i}$ is a 1-sweepout for $i = 1, 2$. That is, if we continuously choose inside and outside regions for $\Xi(\sigma_i(t))$ for each t , then the inside region for $\Xi(\sigma_i(0))$ should coincide with the *outside* region of $\Xi(\sigma_i(1))$. To see this, recall that as in (4.10), (5.10) and (5.11),

$$\Xi(\sigma_i(t)) = \bar{\sigma}_i(t) \cdot \Psi([0 : \dots : 1], 0) = \partial \left(\bar{\sigma}_i(t)(\{F_{[0:\dots:1],0} > 0\}) \right) = \partial \{F_{[0:\dots:1],0} \circ \bar{\sigma}_i(t) > 0\}.$$

Hence $t \mapsto \Omega_i(t) = \{F_{[0:\dots:1],0} \circ \bar{\sigma}_i(t) > 0\}$ is a continuous family of regions bounded by $\Xi|_{\sigma_i}$. But by Lemma 5.10 and (4.11),

$$F_{[0:\dots:1],0} \circ \bar{\sigma}_i(1) = F_{[0:\dots:1],0} \circ g_i = -F_{\sigma(g_i^{-1})([0:\dots:1],0)} = -F_{[0:\dots:1],0} \circ \bar{\sigma}_i(0).$$

Therefore, $\Omega_i(1) = \text{int}(S^3 \setminus \Omega_i(0))$. This shows that $\Xi|_{\sigma_i}$ is an Almgren-Pitts 1-sweepout for $i = 1, 2$.

For (4), it suffices to prove that $\lambda := c_0^* + c_1^* + c_2^*$ is equal to $\Xi^*(\bar{\lambda})$, where $\bar{\lambda}$ is the generator of the cohomology ring of the cycle space, $H^*(\mathcal{Z}_2(S^3; \mathbb{Z}_2); \mathbb{Z}_2)$. Hence, since c_0, c_1, c_2 generate $H_1(\mathcal{X})$, it suffices to show that for each i , if $C \subset \mathcal{X}$ is some loop representing c_i , then $\Xi|_C$ is a 1-sweepout. For c_0 , we pick the loop that lies in the fiber $\mathcal{X}|_{[\text{id}]} \cong \mathbb{RP}^5 \times \mathbb{D}$ and is given by

$$C = \{[a_0 : a_1 : 0 : \dots : 0] : a_0^2 + a_1^2 = 1\} \times \{0\}.$$

Then $\Xi|_C$ is the family $\{x \in S^3 : a_0 + a_1x_1 = 0\}$, which is clearly a 1-sweepout. Moreover, the cases of c_1 and c_2 are already done above in the proof of item (3). This finishes the proof of item (4).

To prove Theorem 4.7 (5), we first need to introduce the *Hopf links* in S^3 . Let $L := \beta_+^H \sqcup \beta_-^H \subset S^3$ be the *standard Hopf link* in S^3 , which consists of two great circles

$$\beta_+^H := \{(x_1, x_2, 0, 0) : x_1^2 + x_2^2 = 1\}, \quad \beta_-^H := \{(0, 0, x_3, x_4) : x_3^2 + x_4^2 = 1\}.$$

Denote $\mathcal{E}(L, S^3) := \text{Diff}(S^3)/\text{Diff}(S^3, L)$, where $\text{Diff}(S^3, L)$ denotes the subgroup of all diffeomorphisms $\phi \in \text{Diff}(S^3)$ such that $\phi(L) = L$ (see Appendix E.1 for a discussion on the topology of $\mathcal{E}(L, S^3)$). Without causing confusion, we can view each element of $\mathcal{E}(L, S^3)$ as a link in S^3 , which we call a *smooth Hopf link*. We will also sometimes consider Hopf links made up of piecewise smooth segments: The set of all *piecewise smooth Hopf links* will be denoted $\check{\mathcal{E}}(L, S^3)$.

Next, let $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{S}_1(S^3)$ be the set of all elements $S \in \mathcal{S}_1(S^3)$ that are *unknotted* in the following sense: Let $\Omega, \Omega' \subset S^3$ be the two open regions with topological boundary S (such that $\Omega \sqcup \Omega' = S^3 \setminus S$). Then there exist smooth embedded loops $\alpha \subset \Omega$ and $\beta \subset \Omega'$ that form a Hopf link. In this case, we say that S *bounds the Hopf link* $\alpha \cup \beta$. The following fact will be helpful, and its proof is included in Appendix E.2.

Proposition 7.1. *Let $\Phi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_1(S^3)$ be a Simon-Smith family such that $\Phi(0) \in \mathcal{U}$. Then $\Phi(t) \in \mathcal{U}$ for every $t \in [0, 1]$.*

The key to Theorem 4.7 (5) is the following proposition. Let $\partial_1 \mathcal{X} := \{y \in \partial \mathcal{X} : \mathbf{g}(\Xi(y)) = 1\}$.

Proposition 7.2. *There exists a continuous map $\Upsilon : \partial_1 \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(L, S^3)$ with the following properties.*

- (i) *For every $y \in \partial_1 \mathcal{X}$, $\Xi(y) \in \mathcal{U}$ and $\Upsilon(y)$ is a Hopf link bounded by $\Xi(y)$.*
- (ii) *$\Upsilon_*[\partial D_0] \neq 0$ in $H_1(\mathcal{E}(L, S^3), \mathbb{Z}_2)$ (recall (4.17) regarding D_0).*
- (iii) *If $\vartheta \in H_1(\partial_1 \mathcal{X}, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is such that $\iota_* \vartheta = 0$ in $H_1(\partial \mathcal{X}, \mathbb{Z}_2)$, where $\iota : \partial_1 \mathcal{X} \hookrightarrow \partial \mathcal{X}$ is the natural inclusion, then $\Upsilon_* \vartheta = 0$ in $H_1(\mathcal{E}(L, S^3), \mathbb{Z}_2)$.*

Assuming this proposition, we can finish the proof of Theorem 4.7 (5) easily: Suppose $C \subset \partial\mathcal{X}$ is a closed 1-subcomplex homologous to ∂D_0 in $\partial\mathcal{X}$ and (since C is mapped into $\mathcal{S}_1(S^3)$ by Ξ) $C \subset \partial_1\mathcal{X}$. Then by Proposition 7.2, we have

$$(7.1) \quad \Upsilon_*[C] = \Upsilon_*[\partial D_0] \neq 0, \quad \text{in } H_1(\mathcal{E}(L, S^3), \mathbb{Z}_2).$$

Now, we suppose for contradiction that there exists a Simon-Smith family $\Phi : W \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_1(S^3)$ for some pure simplicial 2-complex W such that $\partial W = C$ and $\Phi|_{\partial W} = \Xi|_C$. Due to Proposition 7.1, by possibly subtracting components of W that do not intersect C , we may assume without loss of generality that $\Phi(W)$ only consists of unknotted elements, so that $\Phi(W) \subset \mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{S}_1(S^3)$. Then, in fact, $\Upsilon|_{\partial W}$ can be extended to a continuous map $\bar{\Upsilon} : W \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(L, S^3)$: See Lemma E.4 in the appendix, whose proof is an elementary argument using the basic properties of Simon-Smith family and the topology of the space $\mathcal{E}(L, S^3)$. Thus, $\Upsilon_*[C] = \Upsilon_*[\partial W] = 0$ in $H_1(\mathcal{E}(L, S^3), \mathbb{Z}_2)$, which contradicts (7.1). So we have obtained Theorem 4.7 (5).

The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of Proposition 7.2. The map Υ will be constructed first along $\partial_1\mathcal{Y} := (\mathbb{RP}^5 \times \partial\mathbb{D}) \cap \Psi^{-1}(\mathcal{S}_1(S^3))$, and then extended to $\partial_1\mathcal{X}$ by rotations (see Lemma 7.12 and the discussion above it). Before diving into details, let us sketch the main picture here. We will define certain spaces $\bar{\tau}$ and $\widehat{\text{UConf}}_4(\tau)$, and some maps between them:

$$(7.2) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \partial\mathcal{X} & \xrightarrow{\Theta_\tau} & \bar{\tau} \\ \iota \uparrow & & \uparrow \mathcal{P}_\tau \\ \partial_1\mathcal{X} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{M}_\tau} & \widehat{\text{UConf}}_4(\tau) \xrightarrow{\Upsilon'_\tau} \mathcal{E}(L, S^3) \end{array}$$

All these spaces, except for $\mathcal{E}(L, S^3)$, are fiber bundles over $B := SO(4)/D_{24}$, and the maps are all constructed first along individual fibers, and then extended to the whole bundle via rotation by $SO(4)$. The maps will be constructed such that the following is satisfied.

- $(\mathcal{P}_\tau)_* : H_1(\widehat{\text{UConf}}_4(\tau); \mathbb{Z}_2) \rightarrow H_1(\bar{\tau}; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is injective (Lemma 7.6).
- $\Theta_\tau \circ \iota \simeq \mathcal{P}_\tau \circ \mathcal{M}_\tau$ as maps $\partial_1\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \bar{\tau}$ (Lemma 7.10), where \simeq means the two maps concerned are homotopic.
- $\Upsilon'_\tau \circ \mathcal{M}_\tau \simeq \Upsilon$ as maps $\partial_1\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(L, S^3)$ (Lemma 7.12).

Based on these facts, (iii) of Proposition 7.2 then follows from a formal chase of diagram, which will be done in §7.5.

Throughout this section, we let $G \subset SO(4)$ be the dihedral subgroup of order 24 generated by g_1, g_2 defined in section 4.2 (see (4.7), (4.8) for an explicit description of the action on \mathbb{R}^4).

Notation 7.3. If $\eta : G \rightarrow \text{Diff}(F)$ is a *left* action of G on a manifold F , we write $SO(4) \times_\eta F := (SO(4) \times F)/G$, where the *right* G -action on $SO(4) \times F$ is given by,

$$(R, v) \cdot g := (Rg, \eta(g)^{-1}v), \quad \forall g \in G.$$

This gives a fiber bundle over $B := SO(4)/G$ with fiber F with total space $SO(4) \times_\eta F$: This is called the *associated bundle* to $SO(4) \rightarrow B$ with fiber F . We shall use $(R, v) \cdot G$ to denote the element in $SO(4) \times_\eta F$ represented by $(R, v) \in SO(4) \times F$.

7.1. Configuration space. We start by introducing some terminology related to the configuration space of $\mathbf{S}^1 := \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$. Define the unordered configuration space of 4 points in \mathbf{S}^1 by

$$\text{UConf}_4(\mathbf{S}^1) := \{Z \subset \mathbf{S}^1 : \#Z = 4\}.$$

It is better for us to work with the space $\widehat{\text{UConf}}_4(\mathbf{S}^1)$, which would be its double cover, that consists of all triples $(Z; \mu^+, \mu^-)$ with the following properties:

- $Z \in \text{UConf}_4(\mathbf{S}^1)$, and μ^+ and $\mu^- \subset \mathbf{S}^1$ both consist of 2 points;

- $\mu^+ \cap \mu^- = \emptyset$, $\mu^+ \cup \mu^-$ contains the midpoint of each of the 4 connected components of $\mathbf{S}^1 \setminus Z$;
- for $i \in \{\pm\}$, the two points in μ^i lie on 2 non-adjacent connected components of $\mathbf{S}^1 \setminus Z$.

Clearly, from the definition, $(Z; \mu^+, \mu^-) \mapsto Z$ gives a double cover $\widehat{\text{UConf}}_4(\mathbf{S}^1) \rightarrow \text{UConf}_4(\mathbf{S}^1)$. We endow a topology on $\widehat{\text{UConf}}_4(\mathbf{S}^1)$ by this cover.

Remark 7.4. It is well-known that the $\text{UConf}_n(\mathbf{S}^1)$ is homeomorphic to an open $(n-1)$ -ball bundle over S^1 [Mor67], where the projection map $\text{UConf}_n(\mathbf{S}^1) \rightarrow \mathbf{S}^1$ is given by summing the n points (recall $\mathbf{S}^1 := \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$).

Lemma 7.5. *For any $(Z; \mu^+, \mu^-) \in \widehat{\text{UConf}}_4(\mathbf{S}^1)$, $\sum \mu^+ = \pi + \sum \mu^-$.*

Here $\sum A$ denotes the sum of the elements in $A \subset \mathbf{S}^1$, which is a well-defined element in \mathbf{S}^1 .

Proof. It follows from definition that $2\sum \mu^+ = 2\sum \mu^-$, so $\sum \mu^+ = \sum \mu^-$ or $\pi + \sum \mu^-$. Then, using the path-connected of $\widehat{\text{UConf}}_4(\mathbf{S}^1)$ explained in Remark 7.4 and a continuity argument, it suffices to check $\sum \mu^+ = \pi + \sum \mu^-$ for any one choice of $(Z; \mu^+, \mu^-)$, which is a trivial task. \square

We shall consider the left G -action ϱ on \mathbf{S}^1 generated by

$$(7.3) \quad \varrho(g_1) : \alpha \mapsto \alpha + \pi/3, \quad \varrho(g_2) : \alpha \mapsto \pi - \alpha.$$

It induces a G -action on $\widehat{\text{UConf}}_4(\mathbf{S}^1)$ generated by

$$(7.4) \quad \hat{\varrho}(g_i) : (Z; \mu^+, \mu^-) \mapsto (\varrho(g_i)(Z); \varrho(g_i)(\mu^-), \varrho(g_i)(\mu^+)), \quad i \in \{1, 2\}.$$

It is easy to check that this is a well-defined G -action on $\widehat{\text{UConf}}_4(\mathbf{S}^1)$. We shall also let $\bar{\varrho}$ be the left G -action on \mathbf{S}^1 generated by

$$(7.5) \quad \bar{\varrho}(g_1) : \alpha \mapsto \alpha - \pi/3, \quad \bar{\varrho}(g_2) : \alpha \mapsto \pi - \alpha.$$

Then, define the following bundles over B :

$$\tau := SO(4) \times_{\varrho} \mathbf{S}^1, \quad \bar{\tau} := SO(4) \times_{\bar{\varrho}} \mathbf{S}^1, \quad \widehat{\text{UConf}}_4(\tau) := SO(4) \times_{\hat{\varrho}} \widehat{\text{UConf}}_4(\mathbf{S}^1).$$

Lemma 7.6. *The map*

$$(7.6) \quad \mathcal{P}_\circ : \widehat{\text{UConf}}_4(\mathbf{S}^1) \rightarrow \mathbf{S}^1, \quad (Z; \mu^+, \mu^-) \mapsto \sum \mu^-,$$

is G -equivariant (note the sum is well-defined modulo 2π), where G acts on the left hand side by $\hat{\varrho}$, and on the right hand side by $\bar{\varrho}$.

Thus it induces a well-defined map

$$(7.7) \quad \mathcal{P}_\tau : \widehat{\text{UConf}}_4(\tau) \rightarrow \bar{\tau}, \quad (R, (Z; \mu^+, \mu^-)) \cdot G \mapsto (R, \mathcal{P}_\circ(Z; \mu^+, \mu^-)) \cdot G.$$

Moreover, $(\mathcal{P}_\tau)_* : H_1(\widehat{\text{UConf}}_4(\tau), \mathbb{Z}_2) \rightarrow H_1(\bar{\tau}, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is injective.

Proof. The G -equivariance of \mathcal{P}_\circ follows by a direct calculation: Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_\circ \hat{\varrho}(g_1)(Z; \mu^+, \mu^-) &= \mathcal{P}_\circ(Z + \pi/3; \mu^- + \pi/3, \mu^+ + \pi/3) = 2\pi/3 + \sum \mu^+, \\ \bar{\varrho}(g_1) \mathcal{P}_\circ(Z; \mu^+, \mu^-) &= \bar{\varrho}(g_1)(\sum \mu^-) = -\pi/3 + \sum \mu^-. \end{aligned}$$

By Remark 7.4, these two expressions are the same. For g_2 , the calculation is analogous. Therefore the map \mathcal{P}_τ is well-defined, and we are left to show the injectivity of $(\mathcal{P}_\tau)_*$.

Here and below, we work with \mathbb{Z}_2 -coefficients. First, consider the diagram.

$$(7.8) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} H_1(\widehat{\text{UConf}}_4(\mathbf{S}^1)) & \xrightarrow{\hat{i}_*} & H_1(\widehat{\text{UConf}}_4(\bar{\tau})) & \xrightarrow{\hat{\pi}^*} & H_1(B) \\ \downarrow (\mathcal{P}_o)_* & & \downarrow (\mathcal{P}_{\bar{\tau}})_* & & \downarrow \text{id} \\ H_1(\mathbf{S}^1) & \xrightarrow{i_*} & H_1(\bar{\tau}) & \xrightarrow{\pi^*} & H_1(B) \end{array}$$

Note, by construction we see that $\widehat{\text{UConf}}_4(\bar{\tau})$ is a $\widehat{\text{UConf}}_4(\mathbf{S}^1)$ -bundle over B , so the map \hat{i} just denotes an inclusion map into some fixed fiber while $\hat{\pi}$ the projection map, and similarly for i and π . By the G -equivariance of \mathcal{P}_o , it is easy to see that the above diagram. Moreover, we claim that

- (a) $\widehat{\text{UConf}}_4(\mathbf{S}^1)$ is path-connected, and $(\mathcal{P}_o)_* : H_1(\widehat{\text{UConf}}_4(\mathbf{S}^1)) \rightarrow H_1(\mathbf{S}^1)$ is bijective.
- (b) $i_* : H_1(\mathbf{S}^1) \rightarrow H_1(\bar{\tau})$ is injective;

Let us first finish the proof assuming these two claims. Since B is path-connected, the following Lemma 7.7 yields that the horizontal sequences are exact. Therefore, if $a \in \ker(\mathcal{P}_{\bar{\tau}})_*$, then by $\hat{\pi}_* a = 0$, there exists $v \in H_1(\widehat{\text{UConf}}_4(\mathbf{S}^1))$ such that $\hat{i}_* v = a$. Since $i_* \circ (\mathcal{P}_o)_* v = (\mathcal{P}_{\bar{\tau}})_* a = 0$, by the injectivity assertions in the two claims we see that $v = 0$ and hence $a = \hat{i}_* v = 0$. This finishes the proof of the lemma.

Lemma 7.7. *Let $F \hookrightarrow E \xrightarrow{\pi} B$ be a fiber bundle such that both B and F are path-connected. Then the inclusion and the projection induce an exact sequence*

$$H_1(F, \mathbb{Z}_2) \rightarrow H_1(E, \mathbb{Z}_2) \rightarrow H_1(B, \mathbb{Z}_2) \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. Consider the Serre spectral sequence with \mathbb{Z}_2 -coefficients for the fibration. By the five-term exact sequence [DK01, Corollary 9.14], we have the exact sequence:

$$H_0(B; H_1(F)) \rightarrow H_1(E) \xrightarrow{\pi_*} H_1(B) \rightarrow 0.$$

Moreover, denoting by F_b the fiber at any $b \in B$,

$$H_0(B; H_1(F)) \cong H_1(F_b)_{\pi_1(B)} := H_1(F_b) / \langle g \cdot x - x \mid g \in \pi_1(B, b), x \in H_1(F_b) \rangle;$$

and the composition of the surjection $H_1(F_b) \rightarrow H_0(B; H_1(F))$ with the map $H_0(B; H_1(F)) \rightarrow H_1(E)$ is the homomorphism induced by the inclusion $F_b \hookrightarrow E$. This proves the lemma. \square

Now let us prove the two claims.

Proof of (a). The path-connectedness follows easily from Remark 7.4. Let $\gamma \subset \widehat{\text{UConf}}_4(\mathbf{S}^1)$ be the loop that consists of all possible triples $(Z; \mu^+, \mu^-)$ where Z is formed by 4 equidistant points on \mathbf{S}^1 . Note, by the discussion in Remark 7.4, it follows easily that $\widehat{\text{UConf}}_4(\mathbf{S}^1)$ can be deformation retracted onto γ . On the other hand, it is straightforward to check from definition that $\mathcal{P}_o \circ \gamma$ generates $H_1(\mathbf{S}^1)$. Therefore $(\mathcal{P}_o)_*$ is bijective, as desired. \square

Proof of (b). Consider the subgroup H of $\text{Diff}((\mathbf{S}^3 \times \mathbf{S}^3) \times \mathbb{R})$ generated by

$$h_0 : (\mathbf{q}, \tilde{\alpha}) \mapsto (\mathbf{q}, \tilde{\alpha} + 2\pi), \quad h_1 : (\mathbf{q}, \tilde{\alpha}) \mapsto (\mathbf{q}\hat{g}_1^{-1}, \tilde{\alpha} - \pi/3), \quad h_2 : (\mathbf{q}, \tilde{\alpha}) \mapsto (\mathbf{q}\hat{g}_2^{-1}, \pi - \tilde{\alpha}).$$

(Recall the definition of \hat{g}_i in §4.2.) This yields a natural right action of H on $(\mathbf{S}^3 \times \mathbf{S}^3) \times \mathbb{R}$, and clearly,

$$\bar{\tau} = SO(4) \times_{\bar{\varrho}} \mathbf{S}^1 := (SO(4) \times \mathbf{S}^1) / (R, v) \sim (Rg, \bar{\varrho}(g)^{-1}v) = (\mathbf{S}^3 \times \mathbf{S}^3 \times \mathbb{R}) / H.$$

We will check that H acts freely on $(\mathbf{S}^3 \times \mathbf{S}^3) \times \mathbb{R}$ and that the abelianization $H_{ab} = \mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2$ with generators induced by h_0, h_1, h_2 . Once we have this, we know $\pi_1(\bar{\tau}) = H$, and since h_0 clearly




FIGURE 3. The cylinder, after suitable boundary identification, is S^3 . Then the red pieces form a loop, and so do the blue pieces. Together they form a link of the form $\Upsilon'_o(Z; \mu^+, \mu^-)$.

represents a loop in a fiber \mathbf{S}^1 of τ which generates $\pi_1(\mathbf{S}^1)$, we would obtain the injectivity of $i_* : H_1(\mathbf{S}^1, \mathbb{Z}_2) \rightarrow H_1(\bar{\tau}, \mathbb{Z}_2)$. First, from definitions, it's easy to check that

$$h_1^{24}h_0^4 = \text{id}, \quad h_1^{12}h_0^2 = h_2^2, \quad h_1h_2 = h_2h_1^{-1}, \quad h_0h_1 = h_1h_0, \quad h_0h_2 = h_2h_0^{-1}.$$

These are all the relations that determine H as the quotient of the free group generated by h_0, h_1, h_2 , since any other relation can be reduced by switching h_0, h_1, h_2 and cancellation to $h_0^a h_1^b h_2^c = 1$ for some $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $0 \leq b \leq 23$, $c \in \{0, 1\}$. But one can directly check from the definition of h_i that this forces $a = b = c = 0$. Now from the relation, it's clear that the map

$$H_{ab} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2, \quad [h_0] \mapsto (1, 0, 0), \quad [h_1] \mapsto (0, 1, 0), \quad [h_2] \mapsto (0, 0, 1),$$

is a well-defined isomorphism.

Also, a general element in H takes the form $h_0^a h_1^b h_2^c$ for some $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $0 \leq b \leq 23$, $c \in \{0, 1\}$. If it has a fix point, then $\hat{g}_1^b \hat{g}_2^c$ has a fixed point on $\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^3$, which forces $b = c = 0$; and then h_0^a has a fixed point, forcing $a = 0$. Thus, H acts freely on $(\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^3) \times \mathbb{R}$. \square

This completes the proof of Lemma 7.6. \square

7.2. Hopf links through midpoints I: the map Υ'_τ . We are going to define a map Υ'_τ from $\widehat{\text{UConf}}_4(\mathbf{S}^1)$ to the space $\check{\mathcal{E}}(L, S^3)$ of piecewise smooth Hopf links, and then smoothen it to become a map Υ'_τ into $\mathcal{E}(L, S^3)$. We will continue to use the parametrization of S^3 by (5.1). Notice the G -action on S^3 induces a G -action on $\mathcal{E}(L, S^3)$ by rotating the Hopf links, and recall G acts on $\widehat{\text{UConf}}_4(\mathbf{S}^1)$ by (7.4).

Lemma 7.8. *The following gives a well-defined G -equivariant map:*

$$(7.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \Upsilon'_o : \widehat{\text{UConf}}_4(\mathbf{S}^1) &\rightarrow \check{\mathcal{E}}(L, S^3), \\ (Z; \mu^+, \mu^-) &\mapsto \{(t, t, \alpha) : |t| \leq 1, \alpha \in \mu^+\} \cup \{(t, -t, \alpha) : |t| \leq 1, \alpha \in \mu^-\} \end{aligned}$$

(see Figure 3). As a corollary, it induces a well-defined map

$$(7.10) \quad \check{\Upsilon}'_\tau : \widehat{\text{UConf}}_4(\tau) \rightarrow \check{\mathcal{E}}(L, S^3), \quad (R, (Z; \mu^+, \mu^-)) \cdot G \mapsto R(\Upsilon'_o(Z; \mu^+, \mu^-)).$$

Proof. By the definition of $\hat{\varrho}$ and (7.9),

$$\check{\Upsilon}'_o(\hat{\varrho}(g_1)(Z; \mu^+, \mu^-)) = \{(t, t, \alpha) : |t| \leq 1, \alpha \in \varrho(g_1)(\mu^-)\} \cup \{(t, -t, \alpha) : |t| \leq 1, \alpha \in \varrho(g_1)(\mu^+)\},$$

while using (4.9) we have

$$g_1(\check{\Upsilon}'_o(Z; \mu^+, \mu^-)) = \{(-t, t, \alpha + \pi/3) : |t| \leq 1, \alpha \in \mu^+\} \cup \{(t, t, \alpha + \pi/3) : |t| \leq 1, \alpha \in \varrho(g_1)(\mu^-)\},$$

and it is easy to see these two expressions are the same. For the action by g_2 , the verification is similar. \square

Finally, we smoothen all the Hopf links defined by (7.9) in a G -equivariant way to obtain a map $\widehat{\text{UConf}}_4(\tau) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(L, S^3)$.

7.3. Configuration determined by zeros. Recall the 7-parameter family $\Psi : \mathbb{RP}^5 \times \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\leq 2}(S^3)$ specified in §4.1. Denote $\mathcal{Y} := \mathbb{RP}^5 \times \mathbb{D}$. Let $\partial_1 \mathcal{Y} \subset \partial \mathcal{Y}$ be the subset of \mathcal{Y} such that $\mathfrak{g}(\Psi(y)) = 1$. Recall that there is a left G -action on \mathcal{Y} defined in (4.11) which makes Ψ G -equivariant (see Lemma 5.10). Note, the sets $\partial \mathcal{Y}$, $\partial_1 \mathcal{Y}$ are both preserved under this action.

Now, recall from §5.4 that for each $(a, z) = (a, re^{i\theta}) \in \mathcal{Y}$ in $\{a_5 \neq 0\} \times \mathbb{D} \subset \mathbb{RP}^5 \times \mathbb{D}$, we considered the real function $F_{a,z}$ on S^3 (parametrized by (x, α)) given by

$$(7.11) \quad \begin{aligned} F_{a,re^{i\theta}}(x, \alpha) := a_5^{-1} & \left(a_0 + a_1 x_1 + a_2 x_2 + a_3 x_3 + a_4 x_4 \right. \\ & \left. + a_5 \left[x_1 x_2 + \rho(a, x) (r \cos(\theta + 2\alpha) + (1-r) \cos 3\alpha) \right] \right), \end{aligned}$$

and the zero set of $F_{a,z}$ defines $\Psi(a, z)$ under (4.2). Note $\partial_1 \mathcal{Y} \subset \{a_5 \neq 0\} \times \partial \mathbb{D}$. In Lemma 5.9, for each $(a, z) \in \mathcal{Y}$ such that function $\rho(a, \cdot)$ is not constantly zero, we obtained a map $\mathbf{x}_a \in C^\infty(\mathbf{S}^1, \mathbf{D})$ with the following properties:

•

$$(7.12) \quad \nabla_x F_{a,z}(x, \alpha) = 0 \iff x = \mathbf{x}_a(\alpha).$$

- Consider the map

$$(7.13) \quad f : \mathcal{Y} \cap \{\rho(a, \cdot) \neq 0\} \rightarrow C^\infty(\mathbf{S}^1), \quad (a, z) \mapsto (f_{a,z}(\alpha) := F_{a,z}(\mathbf{x}_a(\alpha), \alpha)).$$

Then, from Lemma 5.9 (c),

$$\partial_1 \mathcal{Y} = \{(a, z) \in \partial \mathcal{Y} : \rho(a, \cdot) \neq 0, \#f_{a,z}^{-1}(0) = 4\}.$$

Notice $\partial_1 \mathcal{Y}$ is an open subset of $\partial \mathcal{Y}$. This enables us to define a map

$$(7.14) \quad \mathcal{M}_o : \partial_1 \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \widehat{\text{UConf}}_4(\mathbf{S}^1), \quad (a, z) \mapsto (f_{a,z}^{-1}(0); \mu(\{f_{a,z} > 0\}), \mu(\{f_{a,z} < 0\})),$$

where for a disjoint union J of open intervals in \mathbf{S}^1 , $\mu(J)$ denotes the set of midpoints of the connected components of J .

Lemma 7.9. *The map \mathcal{M}_o is G -equivariant, where G acts on $\widehat{\text{UConf}}_4(\mathbf{S}^1)$ by $\hat{\varrho}$ described in (7.4), and acts on $\partial_1 \mathcal{Y}$ by σ defined in (4.11). As a corollary, it induces a well-defined map from $\partial_1 \mathcal{X} := SO(4) \times_\sigma \partial_1 \mathcal{Y}$ into $\widehat{\text{UConf}}_4(\tau)$:*

$$(7.15) \quad \mathcal{M}_\tau : \partial_1 \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \widehat{\text{UConf}}_4(\tau), \quad (R, (a, z)) \cdot G \mapsto (R, \mathcal{M}_o(a, z)) \cdot G.$$

Proof. By Lemma 5.10, for all $(a, z) \in \partial_1 \mathcal{Y}$, for $i = 1, 2$, we have $F_{\sigma(g_i)(a,z)}(p) = -F_{a,z}(g_i^{-1} \cdot p)$ for every $p \in S^3$. Differentiate this equation with respect to the (x_1, x_2) . Then using the definition (7.12) of \mathbf{x}_a and the action (4.9) on S^3 , we can check that

$$(7.16) \quad \mathbf{x}_{g_1 a}(\alpha) = g_1 \mathbf{x}_a(\alpha - \pi/3), \quad \mathbf{x}_{g_2 a}(\alpha) = g_2 \mathbf{x}_a(\pi - \alpha).$$

Note here we abused notation: $g_i a$ denotes the \mathbb{RP}^5 component in (4.11), while $g_i(x_1, x_2)$ denotes the first two components in $g_i(x_1, x_2, \alpha)$ under (4.9). Thus, putting this into the definition (7.13) of $f_{a,z}$, we see that

$$(7.17) \quad f_{\sigma(g_1)(a,z)} = -f_{a,z}(\alpha - \pi/3), \quad f_{\sigma(g_2)(a,z)} = -f_{a,z}(\pi - \alpha).$$

This implies the zero set $f_{\sigma(g_i)(a,z)}^{-1}(0)$ is the image of $f_{(a,z)}^{-1}(0)$ under g_i under the action (7.3), and that

$$\mathcal{M}_\circ(\sigma(g_i)(a,z)) = \left(\varrho(g_i)(f_{a,z}^{-1}(0)); \varrho(g_i)(\mu(\{f_{a,z} < 0\})), \varrho(g_i)(\mu(\{f_{a,z} > 0\})) \right).$$

But then according to (7.4) this is exactly $\hat{\varrho}(g_i)(f_{a,z}^{-1}(0); \mu(\{f_{a,z} > 0\}), \mu(\{f_{a,z} < 0\}))$. \square

Another important fact about $f_{a,z}$ is the following consequence of Lemma 5.9 (b).

Lemma 7.10. *The map $\Theta_\circ : \partial\mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbf{S}^1$ given by $\Theta_\circ(a, e^{i\theta}) \mapsto -\theta$ is G -equivariant, where G acts on $\partial\mathcal{Y}$ by σ and on \mathbf{S}^1 by $\bar{\varrho}$. Thus, it induces a well-defined map*

$$(7.18) \quad \Theta_\tau : \partial\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \bar{\tau}, \quad (R, (a, z)) \cdot G \mapsto (R, \Theta_\circ(a, z)) \cdot G.$$

Moreover,

$$(7.19) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathbf{S}^1}(\mathcal{P}_\circ \circ \mathcal{M}_\circ(a, e^{i\theta}), -\theta) \leq 1000^{-1}, \quad \forall (a, e^{i\theta}) \in \partial_1\mathcal{Y}.$$

and hence the maps $\Theta_\tau \circ \iota$ and $\mathcal{P}_\tau \circ \mathcal{M}_\tau : \partial_1\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \bar{\tau}$ are homotopic.

Proof. For the G -equivariance, by definition (and abusing notation by writing $g_i a$)

$$\Theta_\circ(g_1(a, (r, \theta))) = \Theta_\circ(g_1 a, (r, \theta + \pi/3)) = -(\theta + \pi/3) = \bar{\varrho}(g_1)(-\theta),$$

and

$$\Theta_\circ(g_2(a, (r, \theta))) = \Theta_\circ(g_2 a, (r, \pi - \theta)) = -(\pi - \theta) \sim \pi - (-\theta) = \bar{\varrho}(g_2)(-\theta),$$

as desired.

For any $(a, z) \in \partial_1\mathcal{Y}$ (so that $\Psi(a, z)$ has genus 1), we have $\#f_{a,z}^{-1}(0) = 4$ by Lemma 5.9 (c). Therefore by Lemma 5.7 (3), every zero of $f_{a,z}$ is of order 1. Hence, the expression $\text{ord}_{f_{a,z}}(\alpha) - \mathfrak{n}_{f_{a,z}}(\alpha)$ must be zero in the definition (5.6) of \mathcal{Z}^- . In other words, $\mathcal{Z}^-(f_{a,z}) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mu(\{f_{a,z} < 0\})} \alpha$, which is equal to $\mathcal{P}_\circ \circ \mathcal{M}_\circ(a, z)$ by definitions (7.6) and (7.14). Together with Lemma 5.9 (b), we obtain (7.19), and the fact $\Theta_\tau \circ \iota \simeq \mathcal{P}_\tau \circ \mathcal{M}_\tau$ follows as the two maps are pointwise close by (7.19). \square

7.4. Hopf links through midpoints II: the map Υ . Finally, we define a map $\Upsilon : \partial_1\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(L, S^3)$. We will first construct a map $\check{\Upsilon} : \partial_1\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \check{\mathcal{E}}(L, S^3)$, and then smoothen the Hopf links to obtain Υ . By (2) of Lemma 5.7,

$$(7.20) \quad \beta_{a,z}^+ := \left\{ (\mathbf{x}_a(\alpha) + (t, t), \alpha) : t \in \mathbb{R}, \alpha \in \mu(\{f_{a,z} > 0\}) \right\} \cap (\mathbf{D} \times \mathbf{S}^1)$$

is the union of two line segments contained in $\{F_{a,z} > 0\}$. The picture here is similar to Figure 3, except that now the four end points of $\beta_{a,z}^+$ may be distinct. However, the four end points naturally come in two pairs, in which each pair consists of two points close to each other. Then for each pair, we bridge the two points by adding a segment on the great circle $C \subset S^3$ (which is the image of $\partial\mathbf{D} \times \mathbf{S}^1$ under the parametrization (5.1)), and form a loop $\bar{\beta}_{a,z}^+ \subset \{F_{a,z} > 0\} \subset S^3$. Similarly,

$$\beta_{a,z}^- := \left\{ (\mathbf{x}_a(\alpha) + (t, -t), \alpha) : t \in \mathbb{R}, \alpha \in \mu(\{f_{a,z} < 0\}) \right\} \cap (\mathbf{D} \times \mathbf{S}^1)$$

also extends to a loop $\bar{\beta}_{a,z}^-$ in $\{F_{a,z} < 0\} \subset S^3$. As a result $\Psi(a, z)$ is unknotted and bounds the Hopf link $\bar{\beta}_{a,z}^+ \cup \bar{\beta}_{a,z}^-$ (we introduced this notion before Proposition 7.1).

Lemma 7.11. *Under the notations above, the map $\check{\Upsilon}_\circ : \partial_1\mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \check{\mathcal{E}}(L, S^3)$ given by $(a, z) \mapsto \bar{\beta}_{a,z}^+ \cup \bar{\beta}_{a,z}^-$ is G -equivariant. Thus, it induces a well-defined map*

$$(7.21) \quad \check{\Upsilon} : \partial_1\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(L, S^3), (R, (a, z)) \cdot G \mapsto R(\check{\Upsilon}_\circ(a, z)).$$

Proof. For the action by g_1 , by (7.16) and (7.17) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_{g_1(a,z)}^+ &= \left\{ (\mathbf{x}_{g_1(a)}(\alpha) + (t, t), \alpha) : t \in \mathbb{R}, \alpha \in \mu(\{f_{g_1(a,z)} > 0\}) \right\} \cap (\mathbf{D} \times \mathbf{S}^1) \\ &= \left\{ (g_1 \mathbf{x}_a(\alpha - \pi/3) + (t, t), \alpha) : t \in \mathbb{R}, \alpha \in \mu(\{\alpha : -f_{a,z}(\alpha - \pi/3) > 0\}) \right\} \cap (\mathbf{D} \times \mathbf{S}^1) \\ &= g_1 \left\{ (\mathbf{x}_a(\alpha) + (t, -t), \alpha) : t \in \mathbb{R}, \alpha \in \mu(\{\alpha : f_{a,z}(\alpha) < 0\}) \right\} \cap (\mathbf{D} \times \mathbf{S}^1)\end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_{g_1(a,z)}^- &= \left\{ (\mathbf{x}_{g_1(a)}(\alpha) + (t, -t), \alpha) : t \in \mathbb{R}, \alpha \in \mu(\{f_{g_1(a,z)} < 0\}) \right\} \cap (\mathbf{D} \times \mathbf{S}^1) \\ &= g_1 \left\{ (\mathbf{x}_a(\alpha) + (-t, -t), \alpha) : t \in \mathbb{R}, \alpha \in \mu(\{\alpha : f_{a,z}(\alpha) > 0\}) \right\} \cap (\mathbf{D} \times \mathbf{S}^1).\end{aligned}$$

As a result, the set $\beta_{g_1(a,z)}^+ \cup \beta_{g_1(a,z)}^-$ is equal to $g_1(\beta_{a,z}^+ \cup \beta_{a,z}^-)$, so that $\bar{\beta}_{g_1(a,z)}^+ \cup \bar{\beta}_{g_1(a,z)}^-$ is equal to $g_1(\bar{\beta}_{a,z}^+ \cup \bar{\beta}_{a,z}^-)$. The calculation for the action by g_2 is similar, so the G -equivariance follows. \square

Hence, we smoothen the Hopf links given by $\check{\Upsilon}$ in a G -equivariant way, to define a map $\Upsilon : \partial_1 \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(L, S^3)$.

Lemma 7.12. *Regarding the map Υ , we can guarantee that:*

- (i) *for every $q \in \partial_1 \mathcal{X}$, $\Upsilon(q)$ is a Hopf link bounded by $\Xi(q)$;*
- (ii) *$\Upsilon_*[\partial D_0] \neq 0$ in $H_1(\mathcal{E}(L, S^3), \mathbb{Z}_2)$;*
- (iii) *$\Upsilon'_\tau \circ \mathcal{M}_\tau$ and $\Upsilon : \partial_1 \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(L, S^3)$ are homotopic.*

Proof. As for the second paragraph, item (i) follows from the fact that $\bar{\beta}_{a,z}^+ \cup \bar{\beta}_{a,z}^-$ is a Hopf link bounded by $\Psi(a, z)$, which is unknotted. To prove (ii), it suffices to show that the loop $\Upsilon_\circ|_{\partial D_0} : \partial D_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(L, S^3)$ is homologically trivial in \mathbb{Z}_2 -coefficients. First, we label the two loops in $\Upsilon_\circ|_{\partial D_0}$ as β_+ and β_- , and orient them both. Now, viewing ∂D_0 as $[0, 2\pi]$ with end points identified, we can obtain via $\Upsilon_\circ|_{\partial D_0}$ a $[0, 2\pi]$ -family of labeled, oriented Hopf links, $\beta_+(t) \cup \beta_-(t)$. Due to the explicit description of the topology of $\mathcal{E}(L, S^3)$ by Boyd-Bregman [BB25] (see Lemma E.1), to prove that $[\Upsilon_\circ|_{\partial D_0}] = 0$ in $H_1(\mathcal{E}(L, S^3); \mathbb{Z}_2)$, it suffices to show that $\beta_+(0)$ and $\beta_+(2\pi)$ are the same loop *with opposite orientations*.

To show that $\beta_+(0)$ and $\beta_+(2\pi)$ have opposite orientations, we first recall that the family $\Psi|_{\partial D_0}$ is given by the zero sets

$$\{x_1 x_2 + \rho([0 : \dots : 0 : 1], (1, \theta)) \cos(\theta + 2\alpha) = 0\} \subset S^3,$$

where θ parametrizes ∂D_0 . Now, this is just an isometric family of smooth tori in S^3 . Let us fix a continuous choice of inside region for each torus such that they contain the loops $\beta_+(t)$. It can be easily checked that as θ varies from 0 to 2π , the inside regions of $\Psi([0 : \dots : 0 : 1], (1, 0))$ and $\Psi([0 : \dots : 0 : 1], (1, 2\pi))$ (both are solid tori) are not exchanged, but the associated isometry map between the starting solid torus and the ending one in fact induces the $-\text{id}$ map on π_1 . As a result, considering the core loops of the solid tori, we see that $\beta_+(0)$ and $\beta_+(2\pi)$ necessarily have different orientations, as desired.

Finally, for item (iii), it suffices to construct a homotopy $H : [0, 1] \times \partial_1 \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \check{\mathcal{E}}(L, S^3)$ such that $H(0, \cdot) = \check{\Upsilon}'_\circ \circ \mathcal{M}_\circ$, $H(1, \cdot) = \check{\Upsilon}_\circ$, and H is G -equivariant: After that we can apply smoothening to conclude $\Upsilon'_\tau \circ \mathcal{M}_\tau \simeq \Upsilon$. To this end, for each $s \in [0, 1]$, we define

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_{a,z}^+(s) &:= \left\{ (s \mathbf{x}_a(\alpha) + (t, t), \alpha) : t \in \mathbb{R}, \alpha \in \mu(\{f_{a,z} > 0\}) \right\} \cap (\mathbf{D} \times \mathbf{S}^1) \\ \beta_{a,z}^-(s) &:= \left\{ (s \mathbf{x}_a(\alpha) + (t, -t), \alpha) : t \in \mathbb{R}, \alpha \in \mu(\{f_{a,z} < 0\}) \right\} \cap (\mathbf{D} \times \mathbf{S}^1),\end{aligned}$$

and then, as in the paragraph containing (7.20), close up $\beta_{a,z}^+(s) \cap \beta_{a,z}^-(s)$ to form a Hopf link $\bar{\beta}_{a,z}^+(s) \cap \bar{\beta}_{a,z}^-(s)$. Now, define $H(s, (a, z))$ as this Hopf link. It is clear by definition that $H(0, \cdot) =$

$\check{\Upsilon}'_\circ \circ \mathcal{M}_\circ$, $H(1, \cdot) = \check{\Upsilon}_\circ$, and similar to the above we can check that H is indeed G -equivariant, as desired. \square

7.5. Proof of Proposition 7.2. Item (i) and (ii) were stated in Lemma 7.12 already. As for (iii), let $\vartheta \in H_1(\partial_1 \mathcal{X}, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ be such that $\iota_* \vartheta = 0$ in $H_1(\partial \mathcal{X}; \mathbb{Z}_2)$. Since $\Theta_\tau \circ \iota \simeq \mathcal{P}_\tau \circ \mathcal{M}_\tau$ by Lemma 7.10, we know $(\mathcal{P}_\tau \circ \mathcal{M}_\tau)_* \vartheta = 0$. Hence, since $(\mathcal{P}_\tau)_* : \widehat{H_1(\text{UConf}_4(\tau); \mathbb{Z}_2)} \rightarrow H_1(\bar{\tau}; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is injective by Lemma 7.6, we in fact know $(\mathcal{M}_\tau)_* \vartheta = 0$ in $H_1(\widehat{\text{UConf}_4(\tau)}; \mathbb{Z}_2)$. Finally, since $\Upsilon'_\tau \circ \mathcal{M}_\tau \simeq \Upsilon$ by Lemma 7.12, we know that $\Upsilon'_* \vartheta = 0$ in $H_1(\mathcal{E}(L, S^3), \mathbb{Z}_2)$, as desired.

APPENDIX A. METRIC PERTURBATION

In this section we prove Proposition 2.4. Let (M, \mathbf{g}) be as in Proposition 2.4. Fix an integer $g_1 > g_0$. For each metric \mathbf{g}' on M , let $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{\leq g_1, \leq L}(M, \mathbf{g}')$ denote the set of immersed minimal surfaces obtained as the double cover of those in $\mathcal{N}_{\leq g_1, \leq L}(M, \mathbf{g}')$. And we extend (2.1) to

$$\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{\mathbf{g}'} := \left(\mathcal{O}_{\leq g_1, \leq L}(M, \mathbf{g}') \cup \mathcal{N}_{\leq g_1, \leq L}(M, \mathbf{g}') \cup \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{\leq g_1, \leq L}(M, \mathbf{g}') \right) \setminus \mathcal{O}_{g_0, \leq L}(M, \mathbf{g}').$$

Lemma A.1. *There exist $\varepsilon > 0$, and some open set $U \subset S^3$ of the form $U = \bigcup_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{O}_{g_0, \leq L}(M, \mathbf{g})} B_\delta^\mathbf{g}(\Sigma)$ for some $\delta > 0$, such that for any metric \mathbf{g}' with $\|\mathbf{g}' - \mathbf{g}\|_{C^\infty} < \varepsilon$, no \mathbf{g}' -minimal surface in $\mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{g}'}$ (defined in (2.1)) is contained in U .*

Proof. Suppose by contradiction that such ε and U do not exist. Then, by [Whi87, Theorem 3], there exist $\Sigma \in \mathcal{O}_{g_0, \leq L}(M, \mathbf{g})$, a sequence $\mathbf{g}_j \rightarrow \mathbf{g}$ in C^∞ , and a sequence $\{\Sigma_j \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{g}_j}\}$ such that in the varifold sense, $|\Sigma_j| \rightarrow k|\Sigma|$. Moreover, there is a finite set Z such that Σ_j converges to Σ multi-graphically in any compact subset of $M \setminus Z$. In addition, we may assume that $\Sigma_j \in \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{\mathbf{g}_j}$, since each $\tilde{\Sigma}_j \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{\mathbf{g}_j}$.

If $k = 1$, by Allard's regularity [All72], $Z = \emptyset$ and for sufficiently large j , Σ_j has the same diffeomorphic type as Σ , contradicting the definition of $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{\mathbf{g}_j}$. Otherwise, $k \geq 2$, and by [Sha17, Claim 5 and Claim 6], Σ is degenerate stable, contradicting the assumption on (M, \mathbf{g}) . \square

Clearly, the lemma also holds with $\mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{g}'}$ replaced by $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{\mathbf{g}'}$.

Lemma A.2. *Fix ε and U from Lemma A.1. There exists $\varepsilon' \in (0, \varepsilon)$, such that for any metric \mathbf{g}' with $\|\mathbf{g}' - \mathbf{g}\|_{C^\infty} < \varepsilon$, if $\mathbf{g}'|_U = \mathbf{g}|_U$, then $\mathcal{O}_{g_0, \leq L}(M, \mathbf{g}') = \mathcal{O}_{g_0, \leq L}(M, \mathbf{g})$.*

Proof. Suppose by contradiction that such an ε' does not exist, and then by [Whi87, Theorem 3] again, there exist $\Sigma \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{g}}$, a sequence $\mathbf{g}_j \rightarrow \mathbf{g}$ in C^∞ with $\mathbf{g}'|_U = \mathbf{g}|_U$, and a sequence $\{\Sigma_j \in \mathcal{O}_{g_0, \leq L}(M, \mathbf{g}_j)\}$, such that $|\Sigma_j| \rightarrow k|\Sigma|$ in the varifold sense.

Following the same argument in the previous proof, if $k = 1$, then for sufficiently large j , Σ_j has the same diffeomorphic type as Σ , a contradiction; otherwise, $k \geq 2$ and Σ is degenerate stable, also a contradiction. \square

Fix ε , U , and ε' from the previous two lemmas. For $3 \leq q \leq \infty$, we set

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma^q &:= \{C^q\text{-metric } \mathbf{g}' \text{ on } M\}, \quad \Gamma_{U^c}^q := \{\mathbf{g}' \in \Gamma^q : \mathbf{g}'|_U = \mathbf{g}|_U\}, \\ \mathcal{M}_{U^c, \tilde{\mathcal{K}}}^q &:= \{(\mathbf{g}', \Sigma') : \mathbf{g}' \in \Gamma_{U^c}^q, \Sigma' \in \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{\mathbf{g}'}\}. \end{aligned}$$

The topology of $\mathcal{M}_{U^c, \tilde{\mathcal{K}}}^q$ is induced by the product topology of the C^q -topology and $C^{2,\alpha}$ -topology for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

Following the proof of [CL24, Proposition 6.1, Lemma 6.5] verbatim, we can conclude that for $3 \leq q < \infty$, $\mathcal{M}_{U^c, \tilde{\mathcal{K}}}^q$ is a separable C^{q-2} Banach manifold and $\Pi : \mathcal{M}_{U^c, \tilde{\mathcal{K}}}^q \rightarrow \Gamma_{U^c}^q$ is a C^{q-2} Fredholm map with index 0. Let $\Gamma_{U^c, \text{bumpy}}^q \subset \Gamma_{U^c}^q$ be the subset of regular values of Π . Then $\mathbf{g}' \in \Gamma_{U^c, \text{bumpy}}^q$

if and only if for every $(\mathbf{g}', \Sigma') \in \mathcal{M}_{U^c, \tilde{\mathcal{K}}}^q$, Σ' is non-degenerate. In this case, every $\Sigma' \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{g}'}$ is strongly non-degenerate. In addition, $\Gamma_{U^c, \text{bumpy}}^q \cap \Gamma^\infty$ is a generic set in Γ^∞ .

Fix $\hat{\mathbf{g}} \in \Gamma_{U^c, \text{bumpy}}^q \cap \Gamma^\infty$ with $\|\hat{\mathbf{g}} - \mathbf{g}\|_{C^\infty} < \varepsilon'$ and $\hat{\mathbf{g}} \leq \mathbf{g}$. Then by the previous arguments, conclusions (1) and (2) hold. Moreover, since $\#\mathcal{K}_{\hat{\mathbf{g}}} < \infty$, there is a neighborhood $\mathcal{U} \subset \subset \Gamma^\infty$ of $\hat{\mathbf{g}}$ such that (1) and (2) also hold.

Finally, applying [CL24, Lemma 6.6] to the area of minimal surfaces in $\mathcal{O}_{g_0, \leq L}(M, \hat{\mathbf{g}})$ and following the proof [CL24, Proposition 6.1], we can find \mathbf{g}' near $\hat{\mathbf{g}}$ such that $\mathbf{g}' \leq \hat{\mathbf{g}}$ and all the statements (1), (2) and (3) hold.

APPENDIX B. A LEMMA ON CAP PRODUCT

In this section we prove Lemma 3.4. We consider the following diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 H_p(X, A \cup B) & \times & H^q(X, A) & \longrightarrow & H_{p-q}(X, B) \\
 \uparrow & & \downarrow & & \uparrow \\
 H_p(C, C \cap (A \cup B)) & \times & H^q(C, C \cap A) & \longrightarrow & H_{p-q}(C, C \cap B) \\
 \parallel & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \\
 H_p(C, C \cap (A \cup B)) & \times & H^q(C, W_1 \cap (A \cup B)) & \longrightarrow & H_{p-q}(C, W_2 \cap (A \cup B)) \\
 \downarrow & & \uparrow & & \downarrow \\
 H_p(C, C) & \times & H^q(C, W_1) & \longrightarrow & H_{p-q}(C, W_2)
 \end{array}
 \tag{B.1}$$

Here, all four horizontal arrows are given by cap products, and all the vertical arrows are induced by inclusions: Note that the inclusion

$$(C, C \cap A) \hookrightarrow (C, W_1 \cap (A \cup B))$$

(for the middle arrow in the middle column) and

$$(C, W_2 \cap (A \cup B)) \hookrightarrow (C, C \cap B)$$

(for the middle arrow in the right column) are well-defined because $W_2 \cap A = \emptyset$ by assumption. Moreover, this diagram satisfies the naturality property for relative cap products (see [Hat02, p.241]).

To prove Lemma 3.4, we need to “pull $[C] \curvearrowright \omega$ backward” along this chain of arrows induced by inclusions

$$\tag{B.2} H_{p-q}(W_2, W_2 \cap B) \rightarrow H_{p-q}(C, W_2 \cap (A \cup B)) \rightarrow H_{p-q}(C, C \cap B) \rightarrow H_{p-q}(X, B).$$

More precisely, we need to find some element $\theta \in H_{p-q}(W_2, W_2 \cap B)$ whose pushforward under this three maps is $[C] \curvearrowright \omega$. Hence, there are three steps.

Step 1: Observe that $[C] \curvearrowright \omega$ has $[C] \curvearrowright \omega|_C \in H_{p-q}(C, C \cap B)$ (in the latter expression we treat $[C] \in H_p(C, C \cap (A \cup B))$ as a preimage, using the naturality for the first two rows of (B.1)).

Step 2: Then, noting $C \cap A = W_1 \cap A \subset W_1 \subset C$, we consider the exact sequence for this triple:

$$\tag{B.3} H^q(C, W_1) \rightarrow H^q(C, C \cap A) \rightarrow H^q(W_1, C \cap A).$$

Since the pullback $\omega|_{W_1}$ of ω under the inclusion $(W_1, W_1 \cap A) \hookrightarrow (X, A)$ is zero by assumption, we know that $\omega|_C$ gets mapped to zero under the map $H^q(C, C \cap A) \rightarrow H^q(W_1, C \cap A)$ (recall $C \cap A = W_1 \cap A$). Hence, using the exact sequence (B.3), we know that under the map $H^q(C, W_1) \rightarrow H^q(C, C \cap A)$, there exists some μ that gets mapped to $\omega|_C$. Thus, there exists some μ' that gets mapped to $\omega|_C$ under the map $H^q(C, W_1 \cap (A \cup B)) \rightarrow H^q(C, C \cap A)$ (namely, we define μ' as the image of μ under the bottom arrow in the middle column of (B.1)). Hence, using the second and

the third row of (B.1) and by naturality, we know $[C] \frown \omega|_C$ has $[C] \frown \mu'$ as a preimage, under the map

$$H_{p-q}(C, W_2 \cap (A \cup B)) \rightarrow H_{p-q}(C, C \cap B).$$

Step 3: Finally, based on the inclusions $W_2 \cap B \subset W_2 \subset C$, we consider the exact sequence

$$H_{p-q}(W_2, W_2 \cap B) \rightarrow H_{p-q}(C, W_2 \cap B) \rightarrow H_{p-q}(C, W_2).$$

Note the middle term here is the same as $H_{p-q}(C, W_2 \cap (A \cup B))$ as $W_2 \cap A = \emptyset$. Thus, in order to obtain the desired $\theta \in H_{p-q}(W_2, W_2 \cap B)$ that gets mapped to $[C] \frown \mu'$ under the first arrow of (B.2), it suffices to show that $[C] \frown \mu'$ gets mapped to 0 under the map

$$(B.4) \quad H_{p-q}(C, W_2 \cap B) \rightarrow H_{p-q}(C, W_2).$$

But now note that this map (B.4) is precisely the map at the bottom of the right column of (B.1). So we can deduce that $[C] \frown \mu'$ would indeed get mapped to 0 from these facts:

- By definition μ is sent to μ' under the map $H^q(C, W_1) \rightarrow H^q(C, W_1 \cap (A \cup B))$.
- $H_p(C, C) = 0$.
- The last two rows of (B.1) satisfy the naturality for cup product.

This completes the proof of Lemma 3.4.

APPENDIX C. POINCARÉ DUAL OF COHOMOLOGY CLASSES VIA GROUP ACTION

In this appendix, let \tilde{X} be a compact simply connected manifold (possibly with boundary), H be a finite group acting freely on \tilde{X} from the right, and $X := \tilde{X}/H$. By Hurewicz's theorem, there is a natural isomorphism $H_{ab} \otimes \mathbb{Z}_2 = \pi_1(X)_{ab} \otimes \mathbb{Z}_2 \rightarrow H_1(X, \mathbb{Z}_2)$, called the Hurewicz map, where $H_{ab} = H/[H, H]$ denotes the abelianization of H .

We recall the following construction of the Poincaré dual of any cohomology class in $H^1(X, \mathbb{Z})$ via H -equivariant functions on \tilde{X} .

Lemma C.1. *Given any group homomorphism $\phi : H \rightarrow O(1) = \{\pm 1\}$, one can associate a real line bundle to ϕ over X :*

$$E_\phi := \tilde{X} \times_\phi \mathbb{R} := (\tilde{X} \times \mathbb{R}) / \left((p, v) \sim (ph, \phi(h^{-1})v) \right).$$

A smooth function $u \in C^\infty(\tilde{X}, \mathbb{R})$ descends to a section of $E_\phi \rightarrow X$ if and only if

$$(C.1) \quad u(ph) = \phi(h^{-1})u(p), \quad \forall p \in \tilde{X}, \forall h \in H.$$

Moreover, for any such u , if in addition $du \neq 0$ at every point in $u^{-1}(0)$ and $d(u|_{\partial \tilde{X}}) \neq 0$ at every point in $u^{-1}(0) \cap \partial \tilde{X}$, then $Z_u := u^{-1}(0)/H$ is a smooth hypersurface of X transverse to ∂X , whose Poincaré dual $\Omega_u \in H^1(X, \mathbb{Z}_2) \cong \text{Hom}(H_1(X, \mathbb{Z}_2); \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is determined by

$$(C.2) \quad (-1)^{\langle \Omega_u, [h] \rangle} = \phi(h), \quad \forall h \in H;$$

here $[h] \in H_1(X, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is the image of $h \in H = \pi_1(X)$ under the Hurewicz map.

Proof. We only need to prove (C.2), which is a consequence of standard theory of vector bundle and Euler class. For the sake of completeness, we include a quick proof here.

For every $h \in H$, let $\tilde{\gamma} = \tilde{\gamma}_h : [0, 1] \rightarrow \tilde{X}$ be a smooth path such that $\tilde{\gamma}(1) = \tilde{\gamma}(0)h$. Hence $\tilde{\gamma}$ descends to a loop γ in X , and the induced homology $[\gamma] = [h]$ in $H_1(X, \mathbb{Z}_2)$. By a small perturbation, we may further assume that γ is transverse to Z_u and $\gamma(0) = \gamma(1) \notin Z_u$. Hence, $u \circ \tilde{\gamma} \in C^\infty([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$ satisfies:

- $(u \circ \tilde{\gamma})'(t) \neq 0$ for every $t \in (u \circ \tilde{\gamma})^{-1}(0)$;
- $u \circ \tilde{\gamma}(1) = u(\tilde{\gamma}(0)h) = \phi(h) \cdot u \circ \tilde{\gamma}(0) \neq 0$, where $\phi(h) \in \{\pm 1\}$;
- by Poincaré duality, $\langle \Omega_u, [h] \rangle = \#(Z_u \cap \gamma) = \#(u \circ \tilde{\gamma})^{-1}(0) \bmod 2$.

Considering the number of end points of the disjoint intervals $\{u \circ \tilde{\gamma} > 0\}$, we see that

$$\phi(h) = (-1)^{\#(u \circ \tilde{\gamma})^{-1}(0)} = (-1)^{\langle \Omega_u, [h] \rangle}.$$

□

Corollary C.2. *For $\ell = 1, \dots, m$, let $\phi_\ell : H \rightarrow O(1) = \{\pm 1\}$ be a group homomorphism, $\Omega_\ell \in H^1(X, \mathbb{Z}_2) = H_1(X, \mathbb{Z}_2)^*$ be the cohomology class determined by*

$$(-1)^{\langle \Omega_\ell, [h] \rangle} = \phi_\ell(h), \quad \forall h \in H,$$

and let $u_\ell \in C^\infty(\tilde{X}, \mathbb{R})$ be satisfying

$$u_\ell(ph) = \phi_\ell(h^{-1})u_\ell(p), \quad \forall p \in \tilde{X}, \forall h \in H.$$

Suppose that

- $\{du_\ell(p)\}_{\ell=1}^m$ are linearly independent in $T_p \tilde{X}$ for every $p \in \{u_1 = \dots = u_m = 0\}$;
- $\{d(u_\ell|_{\partial \tilde{X}})(p)\}_{\ell=1}^m$ are linearly independent in $T_p \partial \tilde{X}$ for every $p \in \{u_1 = \dots = u_m = 0\} \cap \partial \tilde{X}$.

Then $Z := \{u_1 = \dots = u_m = 0\}/H \subset X$ is a smooth submanifold of codimension m transverse to ∂X , and $[(Z, \partial Z)] \in H^{\dim \mathcal{X} - m}(X, \partial X; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is the Poincaré dual of $\Omega_1 \cup \dots \cup \Omega_m$.

Proof. Since by Lemma C.1, each u_ℓ descends to sections of a line bundle, we can perturb them to \check{u}_ℓ which are still H -equivariant and such that

- $\{\check{u}_1 = \dots = \check{u}_m = 0\} = \{u_1 = \dots = u_m = 0\}$;
- for every ℓ , $d\check{u}_\ell \neq 0$ along $\{\check{u}_\ell = 0\}$, $d(\check{u}_\ell|_{\partial \tilde{X}}) \neq 0$ along $\{\check{u}_\ell = 0\} \cap \partial \tilde{X}$;
- $\{d\check{u}_\ell(p)\}_{\ell=1}^m$ are linearly independent in $T_p \tilde{X}$ for every $p \in \{u_1 = \dots = u_m = 0\}$;
- $\{d(\check{u}_\ell|_{\partial \tilde{X}})(p)\}_{\ell=1}^m$ are linearly independent in $T_p \partial \tilde{X}$ for every $p \in \{u_1 = \dots = u_m = 0\} \cap \partial \tilde{X}$.

Thus we can apply Lemma C.1 to get smooth hypersurfaces $Z_\ell := \{\check{u}_\ell = 0\}/H \subset X$ transverse to ∂X , whose Poincaré duals are Ω_ℓ . Hence $Z = Z_1 \cup \dots \cup Z_m$ has Poincaré dual $\Omega_1 \cup \dots \cup \Omega_m$. □

APPENDIX D. DIFFERENTIAL OF REAL AND IMAGINARY PART OF COMPLEX POLYNOMIALS

In §6.2, we introduced some functions on $\mathbb{S}^3 \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ under complex coordinates. The following lemma helps justify the surjectivity of their differentials.

Lemma D.1. *For $n \geq 1$, we parametrize $\mathbb{C}^n = \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ by $(z_1, \dots, z_n) = (x_1, y_1, \dots, x_n, y_n)$. For $f \in C^1(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathbb{C})$, its differential is a \mathbb{C}^{2n} -valued function,*

$$(D.1) \quad \nabla \operatorname{Re}(f) + i \nabla \operatorname{Im}(f) = ((\partial_{z_1} + \bar{\partial}_{z_1})f, i(\partial_{z_1} - \bar{\partial}_{z_1})f, \dots, (\partial_{z_n} + \bar{\partial}_{z_n})f, i(\partial_{z_n} - \bar{\partial}_{z_n})f).$$

In particular, if $1 \leq k \leq n$ and $f_1, \dots, f_k \in C^1(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathbb{C})$ satisfy $\bar{\partial}_z f_\ell = 0$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, k$, then for every $p \in \mathbb{C}^n$, the following are equivalent:

- $\{\nabla \operatorname{Re}(f_\ell)|_p, \nabla \operatorname{Im}(f_\ell)|_p\}_{\ell=1}^k$ are \mathbb{R} -linearly independent in \mathbb{R}^{2n} ;
- $\{(\partial_z f_\ell)|_p\}_{\ell=1}^k$ are \mathbb{C} -linearly independent in \mathbb{C}^n , where $\partial_z f := (\partial_{z_1} f, \dots, \partial_{z_n} f)$.

Proof. (D.1) follows from the fact that $\partial_{x_\ell} = \partial_{z_\ell} + \bar{\partial}_{z_\ell}$, $\partial_{y_\ell} = i(\partial_{z_\ell} - \bar{\partial}_{z_\ell})$.

When $\bar{\partial}_z f = 0$, by taking real and imaginary parts of (D.1), we have

$$\nabla \operatorname{Re}(f) = (\operatorname{Re}(\partial_{z_1} f), -\operatorname{Im}(\partial_{z_1} f), \dots, \operatorname{Re}(\partial_{z_n} f), -\operatorname{Im}(\partial_{z_n} f)),$$

$$\nabla \operatorname{Im}(f) = (\operatorname{Im}(\partial_{z_1} f), \operatorname{Re}(\partial_{z_1} f), \dots, \operatorname{Im}(\partial_{z_n} f), \operatorname{Re}(\partial_{z_n} f)).$$

Hence we see that $J \nabla \operatorname{Re}(f) = \nabla \operatorname{Im}(f)$, where $J : \mathbb{R}^{2n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ is the standard almost complex structure given by $J(x_1, y_1, \dots, x_n, y_n) := (-y_1, x_1, \dots, -y_n, x_n)$.

When $\bar{\partial}_z f_\ell = 1$ for all $\ell \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, the equivalence of the two bullet points then follows from (D.1) and the standard fact that for vectors $u_1, \dots, u_k \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$, the following are equivalent:

- $\{u_\ell, Ju_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^k$ are \mathbb{R} -linearly independent in \mathbb{R}^{2n} ;

- $\{u_\ell + \mathbf{i}Ju_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^k$ are \mathbb{C} -linearly independent in \mathbb{C}^{2n} .

□

APPENDIX E. UNKNOTTED GENUS 1 SURFACES AND HOPF LINKS

E.1. An extension lemma of Hopf links. For a closed manifold M , we denote

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma(M) &:= \{\text{unoriented embedded loops in } M\}; \\ \tilde{\Gamma}(M) &:= \{\text{oriented embedded loops in } M\}.\end{aligned}$$

And let $p : \tilde{\Gamma}(M) \rightarrow \Gamma(M)$ be the orientation forgetting map (which is a double cover). Also, let $L := \beta_+^H \sqcup \beta_-^H \subset S^3$ be the standard Hopf link in S^3 , which consists of two great circles

$$\beta_+^H := \{(x, y, 0, 0) : x^2 + y^2 = 1\}, \quad \beta_-^H := \{(0, 0, x, y) : x^2 + y^2 = 1\}.$$

And let

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}(L, S^3) &:= \{\text{unparametrized Hopf links in } S^3\} = \text{Diff}(S^3)/\text{Diff}(S^3, L), \\ \mathcal{E}(\hat{L}, S^3) &:= \{\text{unparametrized labeled Hopf links in } S^3\} = \text{Diff}(S^3)/\text{Diff}(S^3, \hat{L}),\end{aligned}$$

where $\text{Diff}(S^3, L)$ denotes the subgroup of all diffeomorphisms $\phi \in \text{Diff}(S^3)$ such that $\phi(L) = L$, and $\text{Diff}(S^3, \hat{L})$ denotes that of all $\phi \in \text{Diff}(S^3)$ such that $\phi(\beta_\pm^H) = \beta_\pm^H$, which constitutes a subgroup of $\text{Diff}(S^3, L)$. Thus, every element of $\mathcal{E}(\hat{L}, S^3)$ can be represented by an ordered pair (β_+, β_-) whose union forms a Hopf link in S^3 . Let $q : \mathcal{E}(\hat{L}, S^3) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(L, S^3)$ be the label-forgetting map (which is a double cover); and $r_\pm : \mathcal{E}(\hat{L}, S^3) \rightarrow \Gamma(S^3)$ be the map given by $(\beta_+, \beta_-) \mapsto \beta_\pm$.

The topology of $\mathcal{E}(L, S^3)$ has been studied by Boyd-Bregman in [BB25]. We collect a key consequence of it:

Lemma E.1. *The fundamental group $\pi_1(\mathcal{E}(L, S^3)) = \mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2$. Moreover, a loop $\gamma : \mathbf{S}^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(L, S^3)$ is trivial in $\pi_1(\mathcal{E}(L, S^3))$ if and only if it lifts to a loop $\hat{\gamma} : \mathbf{S}^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(\hat{L}, S^3)$ and $r_+ \circ \hat{\gamma}$ lifts to a loop $\tilde{\gamma} : \mathbf{S}^1 \rightarrow \tilde{\Gamma}(S^3)$.*

Proof. If $[\gamma] = 0$ in $\pi_1(\mathcal{E}(L, S^3))$, let $f : D^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(L, S^3)$ be a continuous extension of γ . Then by the contractibility of D^2 , there is a lift $\hat{f} : D^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(\hat{L}, S^3)$ of f and a lift $\tilde{f} : D^2 \rightarrow \tilde{\Gamma}(S^3)$ of $r_+ \circ \hat{f}$. Restricting to $\partial D^2 = \mathbf{S}^1$ gives the desired lifts $\hat{\gamma}$ and $\tilde{\gamma}$.

Conversely suppose the lifts $\hat{\gamma}$ and $\tilde{\gamma}$ exist. Let $\Gamma_o(S^3) \subset \Gamma(S^3)$ be the subspace of unoriented great circles in S^3 , and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{R}(L, S^3) &:= \{R(L) : R \in O(4)\} \subset \mathcal{E}(L, S^3), \\ \mathcal{R}(\hat{L}, S^3) &:= q^{-1}(\mathcal{R}(L, S^3)) \subset \mathcal{E}(\hat{L}, S^3).\end{aligned}$$

By [BB25, Theorem 5.2], $\mathcal{R}(L, S^3) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{E}(L, S^3)$ is a homotopy equivalence; by [Hat83, Appendix (7)], $\Gamma_o(S^3) \hookrightarrow \Gamma(S^3)$ is also a homotopic equivalence. Then by chasing the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}\Gamma_o(S^3) & \xleftarrow{r_+} & \mathcal{R}(\hat{L}, S^3) & \xrightarrow{q} & \mathcal{R}(L, S^3) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Gamma(S^3) & \xleftarrow{r_+} & \mathcal{E}(\hat{L}, S^3) & \xrightarrow{q} & \mathcal{E}(L, S^3)\end{array}$$

there exists $\hat{\gamma}_o : \mathbf{S}^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{R}(\hat{L}, S^3)$ such that $q \circ \hat{\gamma}_o$ is homotopic to γ and $r_+ \circ \hat{\gamma}_o : \mathbf{S}^1 \rightarrow \Gamma_o(S^3)$ admits a lift into $p^{-1}(\Gamma_o(S^3)) \subset \tilde{\Gamma}(S^3)$. Notice that $p^{-1}(\Gamma_o(S^3))$ is isomorphic to the space of oriented 2-planes in \mathbb{R}^4 , which is diffeomorphic to $S^2 \times S^2$ and hence is simply connected. Hence $r_+ \circ \hat{\gamma}_o : \mathbf{S}^1 \rightarrow \Gamma_o(S^3)$ is homotopically trivial in $\Gamma_o(S^3)$. Noticing that $r_+|_{\mathcal{R}(\hat{L}, S^3)}$ is an isomorphism

between $\mathcal{R}(\hat{L}, S^3)$ and $\Gamma_o(S^3)$, we conclude that $\hat{\gamma}_o$ is homotopically trivial in $\mathcal{R}(\hat{L}, S^3)$, so $\gamma \simeq q \circ \hat{\gamma}_o$ is also homotopically trivial in $\mathcal{E}(L, S^3)$. \square

In the following, we study the relation between unknotted punctate surfaces of genus 1 and Hopf links. We recall that the notion of a Hopf link *bounded by* an unknotted element $S \in \mathcal{S}_1(S^3)$ was described in §7 (before Proposition 7.1). The following lemma shows that the space of Hopf links bounded by any given such *smooth* S is path-connected.

Lemma E.2. *Let $T \in \mathcal{S}_1(S^3)$ be a smooth surface of genus 1 that is unknotted, and U_{\pm} be the two open regions bounded by T (i.e. $S^3 \setminus T = U_+ \sqcup U_-$ such that $\partial U_{\pm} = T$). Suppose for $i = 0, 1$, $\beta_i^{\pm} \subset U_{\pm}$ are embedded loops such that $\beta_i^+ \cup \beta_i^-$ forms a Hopf link. Then there exists an isotopy $t \mapsto \beta^{\pm}(t)$ of embedded loops over $t \in [0, 1]$ such that*

- $\beta^{\pm}(i) = \beta_i^{\pm}$, $i = 0, 1$;
- for every $t_{\pm} \in [0, 1]$, $\beta^{\pm}(t_{\pm}) \subset U_{\pm}$ and $\beta^+(t_+) \cup \beta^-(t_-)$ is also a Hopf link.

Proof. By the Schoenflies theorem in S^3 , every connected component of U_{\pm} whose boundary is a 2-sphere must be contractible, and hence cannot contain either of β_i^{\pm} . Also, any isotopy of closed curves in a region U can be deformed to avoid any given 3-dimensional ball in U . Hence by inductively subtracting all the inner-most or outer-most spherical components (which still does not affect the assumptions on β_i^{\pm}), we may assume without loss of generality that T is diffeomorphic to a smooth torus and U_{\pm} are connected.

By the van Kampen theorem, one of the homomorphisms $\iota^{\pm} : \pi_1(T) \rightarrow \pi_1(U_{\pm})$ induced by natural inclusion is not injective: Say ι^+ is not injective. Then by Dehn's Lemma, there exists an embedded nontrivial loop $\gamma \subset T$ which bounds an embedded disc $D \subset \overline{U}_+$. When $\epsilon \ll 1$, after smoothing the corners, $\overline{U}_+ \setminus B_{\epsilon}(D)$ is a smooth domain with boundary diffeomorphic to S^2 , hence by Schoenflies theorem in S^3 , $\overline{U}_+ \setminus B_{\epsilon}(D)$ (after smoothing out corners) is diffeomorphic to B^3 . Therefore, \overline{U}_+ is diffeomorphic to B^3 attached with a 1-handle, which is a solid torus $D^2 \times S^1$. In summary, U_+ is diffeomorphic to the tubular neighborhood of some knot $K \subset U_+ \subset S^3$.

Claim. For every $i = 0, 1$ and every map from the disc $f : D \rightarrow \overline{U}_+ \setminus \beta_i^+$ such that $f(\partial D) \subset \partial U_+ = T$, we have $f_*[\partial D] = 0$ in $H_1(T)$.

Proof of Claim. Since U_+ is diffeomorphic to a tubular neighborhood of K , $H_1(U_+)$ is generated by $[K]$. Set $[\beta_i^+] = m_i[K]$ in $H_1(U_+)$ for some integer m_i . By the Mayer–Vietoris sequence

$$0 = H_2(S^3) \rightarrow H_1(T) \rightarrow H_1(U_-) \oplus H_1(U_+) \rightarrow H_1(S^3) = 0,$$

so there exists a loop $\lambda \subset T$ such that $[\lambda] \in H_1(T)$ is mapped to $(0, [K]) \in H_1(U_-) \oplus H_1(U_+)$. Hence, $m_i \lambda$ is homologous to β_i^+ in U_+ , and there is some map $\Sigma \rightarrow U_-$ from some surface Σ such that $\partial \Sigma$ is mapped to λ . Therefore,

$$\pm 1 = \text{link}(\beta_i^-, \beta_i^+) = \text{algebraic intersection of } \beta_i^- \text{ and } m_i \Sigma.$$

Thus $m_i = \pm 1$.

Now since $f(D) \cap \beta_i^+ = \emptyset$, the algebraic intersection of $f(D)$ and K is also 0. This forces $f_*[\partial D] = 0$ in $H_1(T)$ by Poincaré duality. \square

Now that with this claim, by the Hurewicz theorem, the natural inclusion $T \hookrightarrow \overline{U}_+ \setminus \beta_i^+$ induces an injective map $\pi_1(T) \rightarrow \pi_1(U_+ \setminus \beta_i^+)$, hence by the van Kampen theorem, the homomorphism induced by inclusion

$$\pi_1(U_- \setminus \beta_i^-) \rightarrow \pi_1(S^3 \setminus (\beta_i^+ \cup \beta_i^-))$$

is also injective. Since $\beta_i^+ \cup \beta_i^-$ forms a Hopf link, the right hand side is an abelian group, and so is the left hand side. And since U_+ is diffeomorphic to a tubular neighborhood of K , we know

$$\pi_1(S^3 \setminus (K \cup \beta_i^-)) = \pi_1(U_- \setminus \beta_i^-)$$

is also an abelian group. By [XZ23, Remark 1.7] (see also [Kaw96, Section 6.3]), $K \cup \beta_i^-$ is also a Hopf link, and then K is an unknot, forcing $U^- = S^3 \setminus \overline{U_+}$ to be also diffeomorphic to the tubular neighborhood of some (unknotted) embedded loop. Therefore, for each i , there exist $\varepsilon > 0$ and an embedded disc $D_i \subset S^3$ with boundary β_i^- such that $D_i \cap B_\varepsilon(K)$ is an ε -disc D'_i whose boundary is a meridian of $B_\varepsilon(K)$. We can then construct isotopy from β_0^- to $\partial D'_0$ in D_0 , from $\partial D'_0$ to $\partial D'_1$ in $\partial B_\varepsilon(K)$ and from $\partial D'_1$ to $\partial D_1 = \beta_1^-$ in D_1 . Since all these isotopies are not intersecting $B_{\varepsilon/2}(K)$, they can be concatenated and deformed to an isotopy from β_0^- to β_1^- in U_- . In summary, there exists an isotopy $[0, 1] \ni t \mapsto \beta^-(t) \subset U_-$ such that $\beta^-(i) = \beta_i^-$ for every $i = 0, 1$. The same process also produces an isotopy $[0, 1] \mapsto \beta^+(t) \subset U_+$ such that $\beta^+(i) = \beta_i^+$ for every $i = 0, 1$. These isotopies satisfy the desired properties. \square

When S is not smooth, the lemma above may not be true. The following lemma allows us to perturb a punctate surface to a smooth one that still bounds a compact family of Hopf links.

Lemma E.3. *Let $T \in \mathcal{S}_1(S^3)$ be a punctate surface of genus 1 that is unknotted, and U_\pm be the two open regions bounded by T (i.e. $S^3 \setminus T = U_+ \sqcup U_-$ such that $\partial U_\pm = T$). Suppose K is a compact metric space and $\beta^\pm : K \rightarrow \Gamma(S^3)$ are continuous maps such that $\beta^\pm(q) \subset U_\pm$ and $\beta^+(q) \cup \beta^-(q)$ forms a Hopf link for every $q \in K$. Then there exists a smooth surface $\tilde{T} \in \mathcal{S}_1(S^3)$ which bounds two open regions \tilde{U}_\pm such that $\beta^\pm(q) \subset \tilde{U}_\pm$ for every $q \in K$.*

Proof. Since K is compact and punctate set of T is finite, sufficiently small balls B_ϵ centered at the punctate set P do not intersect any $\beta^\pm(q)$. Hence by subtracting these small balls and filling in the boundary by discs in these balls, we obtain a smooth genus 1 surface $\tilde{T} \subset S^3$ that bounds open regions \tilde{U}_\pm which agree with U_\pm outside $B_\epsilon(P)$. Therefore for every $q \in K$,

$$\beta^\pm(q) \subset U_\pm \setminus B_\epsilon(P) = \tilde{U}_\pm \setminus B_\epsilon(P) \subset \tilde{U}_\pm.$$

\square

The following extension lemma of Hopf links is crucial in the proof of Theorem 4.7.

Lemma E.4. *Suppose W is a pure simplicial 2-complex, $\Phi : W \rightarrow \mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{S}_1(S^3)$ is a Simon-Smith family of unknotted punctate surfaces of genus 1. Suppose $\Upsilon : \partial W \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(L, S^3)$ is a continuous map such that for every $q \in \partial W$, $\Upsilon(q)$ is a Hopf link bounded by $\Phi(q)$. Then there exists a continuous map $\tilde{\Upsilon} : W \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(L, S^3)$ such that $\tilde{\Upsilon}|_{\partial W} = \Upsilon$.*

Proof. The extension will be constructed cell by cell.

Claim. After refining W , there exists a map that associates to each 2-cell σ of W a Hopf link $\mathfrak{H}(\sigma)$ such that,

- (i) for every $q \in \partial W$ and $q' \in W$ in the same 2-cell of q , we have $\Upsilon(q)$ is bounded by $\Phi(q')$;
- (ii) for every 2-cell σ such that $\sigma \cap \partial W \neq \emptyset$, there exists $q_\sigma \in \sigma \cap \partial W$ such that $\mathfrak{H}(\sigma) = \Upsilon(q_\sigma)$;
- (iii) for every 2-cell σ , and for every point q' in σ or some adjacent 2-cell of σ , we have $\mathfrak{H}(\sigma)$ is bounded by $\Phi(q')$.

Proof of Claim. By the definition of \mathcal{U} , for every point $q \in W$, there exists a Hopf link $\tilde{\Upsilon}(q) \subset S^3$ bounded by $\Phi(q)$ (of course, $q \mapsto \tilde{\Upsilon}(q)$ need not be a continuous map), and when $q \in \partial W$, we can just choose $\tilde{\Upsilon}(q) = \Upsilon(q)$. By the closedness of Φ (in Definition 2.2), there exists $\delta_q > 0$ such that $\tilde{\Upsilon}(q)$ is bounded by $\Phi(q')$ for every $q' \in B_{\delta_q}(q) \subset W$. Since $q \mapsto \tilde{\Upsilon}(q)$ is continuous on ∂W , we can even ask $\delta_{\partial W} := \inf_{q \in \partial W} \delta_q > 0$.

We can then choose a finite subset $J \subset W$ such that $\{B_{\delta_q/10}(q)\}_{q \in J}$ forms a cover of W . Hence, possibly after refining W ,

- every 2-cell σ of W is contained in $B_{\delta_{q(\sigma)}/4}(q(\sigma))$ for some $q(\sigma) \in J$;
- every 2-cell σ that intersects ∂W is contained in $B_{\delta_{\partial W}/4}(\partial W)$.

For every 2-cell σ of W , define

$$\mathfrak{H}(\sigma) := \begin{cases} \Upsilon(q) & \text{if } \sigma \cap \partial W \neq \emptyset, \text{ where } q \text{ is some point in } \sigma \cap \partial W; \\ \check{\Upsilon}(q(\sigma)) & \text{if } \sigma \cap \partial W = \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to verify from the definition that (i) - (iii) in Claim hold. \square

Now we are ready to construct the extension $\bar{\Upsilon}$.

Step 1 (0-cells). For every 0-cell $q \in W$, define⁵

$$\bar{\Upsilon}(q) := \begin{cases} \Upsilon(q), & \text{if } q \in \partial W; \\ \mathfrak{H}(\sigma), & \text{if } q \notin \partial W, \text{ where } \sigma \text{ is a 2-cell that contains } q. \end{cases}$$

And for each $q \in W$, since by (i) and (iii)

$$\mathcal{L}(q) := \{\bar{\Upsilon}(q') : q' \in \partial W \cap \sigma, \text{ 2-cell } \sigma \ni q\} \cup \{\mathfrak{H}(\sigma') : \sigma' \text{ or its adjacent 2-cell contains } q\}$$

is a compact family of Hopf links bounded by the punctate surface $\Phi(q)$, by Lemma E.3 there exists a smooth genus 1 surface $\tilde{\Phi}(q)$ that also bounds every Hopf links in $\mathcal{L}(q)$ ⁶.

Step 2 (1-cells). For every 1-cell $e \subset \partial W$, define $\bar{\Upsilon}|_e = \Upsilon_+|_e$.

If $e \not\subset \partial W$, let $q_1, q_2 \in W$ be the end points of e (which are 0-cells of W) and $q \in W$ be the midpoint of e . By connectedness of the space of Hopf links bounded by $\tilde{\Phi}(q)$ (see Lemma E.2), there exists a continuous isotopy $\bar{\Upsilon}|_e : e \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(L, S^3)$ extending $\bar{\Upsilon}|_{q_i}$, such that $\bar{\Upsilon}(q')$ is bounded by $\tilde{\Phi}(q)$ for every $q' \in e$.

Step 3 (2-cells). For every fixed 2-cell σ of W , Step 2 produces a map $\bar{\Upsilon}|_{\partial\sigma} : \partial\sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(L, S^3)$ which agrees with Υ on ∂W when $\partial\sigma \cap \partial W \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, if we fix a lift $(\beta_+(\sigma), \beta_-(\sigma)) \in \mathcal{E}(\hat{L}, S^3)$ of $\mathfrak{H}(\sigma)$, then by Claim 1 (iii), there is a unique pair of maps $U_{\pm} : \sigma \rightarrow \{\text{open subsets of } S^3\}$ such that for every $q' \in \sigma$,

$$S^3 \setminus \Phi(q') = U_+(q') \sqcup U_-(q'), \quad \partial U_{\pm}(q') = \Phi(q'); \quad \beta_{\pm}(\sigma) \subset U_{\pm}(q').$$

For every 0-cell $q_0 \in \sigma$, this then determines a unique lift $(\bar{\Upsilon}_+(q_0), \bar{\Upsilon}_-(q_0)) \in \mathcal{E}(\hat{L}, S^3)$ of $\bar{\Upsilon}(q_0)$ such that

$$\bar{\Upsilon}_{\pm}(q_0) \subset U_{\pm}(q'), \quad \forall q' \in \sigma.$$

In particular for every 1-cell $e \subset \sigma$ with midpoint q_e , there exist two regions $\tilde{U}_{\pm}(q_e)$ bounded by $\tilde{\Phi}(q_e)$ such that

$$(E.1) \quad \beta_{\pm}(\sigma) \subset \tilde{U}_{\pm}(q_e), \quad \bar{\Upsilon}_{\pm}(q_0) \subset \tilde{U}_{\pm}(q_e), \quad \forall 0\text{-cell } q_0 \in \sigma.$$

Since $\bar{\Upsilon}|_e$ are bounded by $\tilde{\Phi}(q_e)$, we see that

$$\bar{\Upsilon}_{\pm}(q_1) := \bar{\Upsilon}(q_1) \cap \tilde{U}_{\pm}(q_e), \quad q_1 \in e$$

defines a continuous lift $(\bar{\Upsilon}_+, \bar{\Upsilon}_-) : e \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(\hat{L}, S^3)$ of $\bar{\Upsilon}|_e$, which agrees with (E.1) on the end points.

Putting them together, we conclude that there exists a lift $(\bar{\Upsilon}_+, \bar{\Upsilon}_-) : \partial\sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(\hat{L}, S^3)$ of $\bar{\Upsilon}|_{\partial\sigma}$, and by (E.1) and Lemma E.2, $\bar{\Upsilon}_+(q_1) \cup \beta_-(\sigma)$ forms a Hopf link for every $q_1 \in \partial\sigma$. Since the linking number is never zero, this forces that $\bar{\Upsilon}_+|_{\partial\sigma} : \partial\sigma \rightarrow \Gamma(S^3)$ lifts to a map $\partial\sigma \rightarrow \tilde{\Gamma}(S^3)$. Then by Lemma E.1, $\bar{\Upsilon}|_{\partial\sigma}$ is trivial in $\pi_1(\mathcal{E}(L, S^3))$, and hence there exists a continuous map $\bar{\Upsilon} : \sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(L, S^3)$ extending $\bar{\Upsilon}|_{\partial\sigma}$. This finishes the construction of $\bar{\Upsilon}$. \square

⁵The choice is not unique, but any such choice works for later purpose.

⁶We do not ask $\tilde{\Phi}(q)$ to vary continuously in q .

E.2. Unknotted elements in $\mathcal{S}_1(S^3)$. In this section, we prove Proposition 7.1.

Let us recall the notion of “neck-pinch surgery” first. Let $S \in \mathcal{S}(M)$ and γ be a smooth embedded loop that lies on the smooth part of S . Suppose γ bounds a smooth embedded disc D whose interior lies entirely in $S^3 \setminus S$. We can *perform a neck-pinch surgery along γ , using the disc D* : Namely, we remove a short cylinder on S around γ (whose geometry is like $\gamma \times [-\epsilon, \epsilon]$), glue back two discs, each being close to D graphically, and finally smoothen it near the two gluing curves to obtain an element in $\mathcal{S}(S^3)$.

Lemma E.5. *Let $S \in \mathcal{S}_1(S^3)$ and let S' be obtained from S by performing a neck-pinch surgery, such that S' still has genus 1. Then $S \in \mathcal{U}$ if and only if $S' \in \mathcal{U}$.*

Proof. For the “if” part, by definition there exist some loops $\alpha \subset \text{in}(S')$ and $\beta \subset \text{out}(S')$ that form a Hopf link. When we undo the neck-pinch surgery, we can first deform the two loops to avoid the surgery region, so that after gluing back the 1-handle to obtain S , we still have $\alpha \subset \text{in}(S)$ and $\beta \subset \text{out}(S)$. So $S \in \mathcal{U}$.

To prove the “only if” part, we first choose some loops $\alpha \subset \text{in}(S)$ and $\beta \subset \text{out}(S)$ that form a Hopf link. Let $\gamma \subset S$ be the smooth embedded loop along which the surgery is performed, and suppose γ bounds a disc D in $S^3 \setminus S$. Without loss of generality, we choose an inward direction for S , and assume that the interior of D lies in $\text{in}(S)$. Let S' be obtained from S by performing a neck-pinch surgery along γ , using the disc D .

Step 1: First, by definition, S has at most finitely many singularities. We let $B_1, \dots, B_n \subset S^3$ be sufficiently small balls centered at these singularities such that:

- Each B_i avoids α and β .
- $S \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^n B_i$ is still a genus 1 surface with boundary.
- Each ∂B_i intersects S on the smooth part, and transversely.
- Each B_i avoids some neighborhood of D such that the surgery process would leave each B_i intact.

For each ball B_i , the intersection $S \cap \partial B_i$ consists of a finite union of smooth loops $\{\gamma_k\}_k$. We then perform neck-pinch surgery along these loops one-by-one: Namely, whenever such a loop γ_k bounds a disc on ∂B_i that does not contain any other loop $\gamma_{k'}$, we perform a surgery along γ_k using the disc it bounds on ∂B_i , and then repeat the process for all γ_k , and for all balls B_i . Then we *remove all components lying within $\bigcup_i B_i$* , and denote the resulting surface at the end by \tilde{S} . Note that by assuming the balls B_i to be sufficiently small, \tilde{S} is a smooth genus one surface: This follows from $\mathbf{g}(S) = 1$ and the definition of genus for elements in $\mathcal{S}(M)$ in [CLW26, Definition 2.5].

Step 2: Now, by the way we chose the balls B_i , we would still have $\alpha \subset \text{in}(\tilde{S})$ and $\beta \subset \text{out}(\tilde{S})$. Hence, since $\alpha \cup \beta$ is a Hopf link, \tilde{S} is a genus one Heegaard surface. Then, using the assumption $\mathbf{g}(S') = 1$, we know that the surface obtained from \tilde{S} by performing a surgery along γ , using the disc D , has genus 1. Hence, the disc D can be “pushed” (i.e. deformed via smooth embeddings) within $\text{in}(\tilde{S})$ to become a disc $\tilde{D} \subset \tilde{S}$, while keeping the boundary γ fixed. Then, we can use the reverse of this pushing procedure to deform α , and obtain a loop $\tilde{\alpha} \subset \text{in}(\tilde{S})$ that does not intersect D . As a result, when we perform surgery on \tilde{S} along γ using the disc D , the loops $\tilde{\alpha}$ and β would be left intact. Call this surface \tilde{S}' .

Step 3: Finally, on the new surface \tilde{S}' , we *undo* the procedure described in Step 1. Namely, for \tilde{S}' , we put back the connected components discarded, and undo all the neck-pinch surgeries (near the balls B_i), by gluing back the 1-handles, so that we obtain the surface S' with singularities: This S' is precisely the surface of interest S' in Lemma E.5. It is easy to see that $\alpha \subset \text{in}(S')$ and $\beta \subset \text{out}(S')$, and $\alpha \cup \beta$ is a Hopf link, so we have $S' \in \mathcal{U}$, as desired. \square

We now prove Proposition 7.1. Suppose by contradiction there exists some $\Phi(t) \notin \mathcal{U}$. Let

$$T := \inf\{t \in [0, 1] : \Phi(t) \notin \mathcal{U}\}.$$

First, we claim that $\Phi(T) \notin \mathcal{U}$. Indeed, if $\Phi(T) \in \mathcal{U}$, then we can find embedded loops $\alpha \subset \text{in}(\Phi(T))$ and $\beta \subset \text{out}(\Phi(T))$ such that they form a Hopf link: Note that we can consistently choose an inward direction for each $\Phi(t)$. Then using the definition of Simon–Smith family, for any t sufficiently close to T , we have $\alpha \subset \text{in}(\Phi(t))$ and $\beta \subset \text{out}(\Phi(t))$, and thus $\Phi(t) \in \mathcal{U}$ for such t . This contradicts the definition of T .

As a result, $T > 0$, since $\Phi(0) \in \mathcal{U}$ by assumption. Take $t_1, t_2, \dots \uparrow T$. By the definition of Simon–Smith family, we can choose finitely many small open balls $B_j \subset S^3$ such that $\Phi(t_i) \rightarrow \Phi(T)$ smoothly outside $B := \cup_j B_j$. Without loss of generality, we can assume also that:

- The boundary of each B_j intersects each $\Phi(t_i)$ on the smooth part only, and such intersection is transverse, for each t_i .
- $\Phi(T) \setminus B$ is a genus 1 surface with boundary.

Now, to derive a contradiction, we just need to show that for any sufficiently large i , we can choose some embedded loops $\alpha_{t_i} \subset \text{in}(\Phi(t_i)) \setminus B$ and $\beta_{t_i} \subset \text{out}(\Phi(t_i)) \setminus B$ that form a Hopf link. Indeed, once we have that, for some large i , we can ensure $\alpha_{t_i} \subset \text{in}(\Phi(T)) \setminus B$ and $\beta_{t_i} \subset \text{out}(\Phi(T)) \setminus B$ through slight deformation, using the fact that $\Phi(t_i) \rightarrow \Phi(T)$ smoothly outside $B = \cup_j B_j$. This shows that $\Phi(T) \in \mathcal{U}$, which contradicts the claim $\Phi(T) \notin \mathcal{U}$ we obtained from the previous paragraph.

Now, we fix t_i . We will modify the surface $\Phi(t_i)$ such that it avoids ∂B as follows. For each ball B_j , the intersection $\Phi(t_i) \cap \partial B_j$ consists of a finite union of smooth loops $\{\gamma_k\}_k$. We then perform neck-pinch surgery along these loops one-by-one: Namely, whenever such a loop γ_k bounds a disc on ∂B_j that does not contain any other loop $\gamma_{k'}$, we perform a surgery along γ_k , using the disc it bounds on ∂B_j , and then repeat this for all γ_k , for all ball B_j . We denote the resulting surface at the end by $\Phi(t_i)'$. As a result, $\Phi(t_i)'$ avoids ∂B , and is smooth outside B .

By Lemma E.5 and $\Phi(t_i) \in \mathcal{U}$, we know $\Phi(t_i)' \in \mathcal{U}$. Thus there exist some embedded loops $\alpha_{t_i} \subset \text{in}(\Phi(t_i)')$ and $\beta_{t_i} \subset \text{out}(\Phi(t_i)')$ that form a Hopf link. Now, by the fact that $\Phi(T) \setminus B$ has genus 1, and the smooth convergence $\Phi(t_i) \rightarrow \Phi(T)$ outside B , we know that for i large, $\Phi(t_i)' \setminus B$ is a genus 1 surface with boundary and all the components of $\Phi(t_i)'$ inside B have genus 0. Thus, we can further assume that $\alpha_{t_i} \subset \text{in}(\Phi(t_i)') \setminus B$ and $\beta_{t_i} \subset \text{out}(\Phi(t_i)') \setminus B$: In each ball B_i , we for a moment ignore the genus 0 components, and then either push α_{t_i} to avoid B_i (in the case $\partial B_i \subset \text{in}(\Phi(t_i)')$) or push β_{t_i} to avoid B_i (in the case $\partial B_i \subset \text{out}(\Phi(t_i)')$). As a result, undoing all the neck-pinch surgeries by gluing back the 1-handles, we in fact have $\alpha_{t_i} \subset \text{in}(\Phi(t_i)) \setminus B$ and $\beta_{t_i} \subset \text{out}(\Phi(t_i)) \setminus B$. This is exactly what we need for a contradiction, as explained before.

This finishes the proof of Proposition 7.1.

REFERENCES

- [All72] William K. Allard. “On the First Variation of a Varifold”. In: *Annals of Mathematics* 95.3 (1972), pp. 417–491. ISSN: 0003-486X. DOI: 10.2307/1970868.
- [Bal78] Werner Ballmann. “Der Satz von Lusternik und Schnirelmann”. In: *Beiträge zur Differentialgeometrie, Heft 1*. Vol. 102. Bonner Math. Schriften. Univ. Bonn, Bonn, 1978, pp. 1–25.
- [BP23] Renato G Bettoli and Paolo Piccione. “Bifurcations of Clifford tori in ellipsoids”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.13758* (2023).
- [BP24] Renato G. Bettoli and Paolo Piccione. “Nonplanar minimal spheres in ellipsoids of revolution”. In: *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa - Classe di Scienze* (2024).
- [BB25] Rachael Boyd and Corey Bregman. “The embedding space of a Hopf link”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.21806* (2025).
- [Chu25] Adrian Chun-Pong Chu. “Minimal surfaces with arbitrary genus in 3-spheres of positive Ricci curvature”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.06019* (2025).
- [CL24] Adrian Chun-Pong Chu and Yangyang Li. “Existence of 5 minimal tori in 3-spheres of positive Ricci curvature”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.09315* (2024).

- [CLW25] Adrian Chun-Pong Chu, Yangyang Li, and Zhihan Wang. “Existence of genus 2 minimal surfaces in 3-spheres. I”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.23239v1* (2025).
- [CLW26] Adrian Chun-Pong Chu, Yangyang Li, and Zhihan Wang. “Min-max theory and minimal surfaces with prescribed genus”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.23239v2* (2026).
- [CD03] Tobias Colding and Camillo De Lellis. “The min-max construction of minimal surfaces”. In: *Surveys in Differential Geometry* 8.1 (2003), pp. 75–107.
- [DK01] James F. Davis and Paul Kirk. *Lecture notes in algebraic topology*. Vol. 35. Graduate Studies in Mathematics. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001, pp. xvi+367. ISBN: 0-8218-2160-1. DOI: 10.1090/gsm/035.
- [DP10] Camillo De Lellis and Filippo Pellandini. “Genus bounds for minimal surfaces arising from min-max constructions”. In: *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik (Crelles Journal)* 2010.644 (2010), pp. 47–99.
- [Gra89] Matthew A. Grayson. “Shortening embedded curves”. In: *Ann. of Math. (2)* 129.1 (1989), pp. 71–111. ISSN: 0003-486X,1939-8980. DOI: 10.2307/1971486.
- [GJ86] M. Grüter and J. Jost. “On embedded minimal disks in convex bodies”. In: *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* 3.5 (1986), pp. 345–390. ISSN: 0294-1449.
- [HK19] Robert Haslhofer and Daniel Ketover. “Minimal 2-spheres in 3-spheres”. In: *Duke Math. J.* 168.10 (2019), pp. 1929–1975. ISSN: 0012-7094,1547-7398. DOI: 10.1215/00127094-2019-0009.
- [HK23] Robert Haslhofer and Daniel Ketover. *Free boundary minimal disks in convex balls*. 2023. arXiv: 2307.01828 [math.DG].
- [Hat83] Allen Hatcher. “A proof of the Smale conjecture”. In: *Annals of Mathematics* (1983), pp. 553–607.
- [Hat02] Allen Hatcher. *Algebraic Topology*. Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- [Jos89] Jürgen Jost. “A nonparametric proof of the theorem of Lusternik and Schnirelman”. In: *Arch. Math. (Basel)* 53.5 (1989), pp. 497–509. ISSN: 0003-889X,1420-8938. DOI: 10.1007/BF01324725.
- [KW22] Nikolaos Kapouleas and David Wiygul. “The Lawson surfaces are determined by their symmetries and topology”. In: *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 786 (2022), pp. 155–173. ISSN: 0075-4102,1435-5345. DOI: 10.1515/crelle-2021-0087.
- [KPS88] Hermann Karcher, Ulrich Pinkall, and Ivan Sterling. “New minimal surfaces in S^3 ”. In: *Journal of Differential Geometry* 28.2 (1988), pp. 169–185.
- [Kaw96] Akio Kawauchi. *Survey on knot theory*. Springer Science & Business Media, 1996.
- [Ket19] Daniel Ketover. “Genus bounds for min-max minimal surfaces”. In: *Journal of Differential Geometry* 112.3 (2019), pp. 555–590.
- [Kli77] Wilhelm Klingenberg. *Lectures on closed geodesics*. Third. Universität Bonn, Mathematisches Institut, Bonn, 1977, 210 pp. (not consecutively paged).
- [Ko23a] Dongyeong Ko. *Existence and Morse Index of two free boundary embedded geodesics on Riemannian 2-disks with convex boundary*. 2023. arXiv: 2309.09896 [math.DG].
- [Ko23b] Dongyeong Ko. *Morse Index bound of simple closed geodesics on 2-spheres and strong Morse Inequalities*. 2023. arXiv: 2303.00644 [math.DG].
- [Law70] H Blaine Lawson. “Complete minimal surfaces in S^3 ”. In: *Annals of Mathematics* (1970), pp. 335–374.
- [LWY25] Xingzhe Li, Tongrui Wang, and Xuan Yao. “Minimal surfaces with low genus in lens spaces”. In: *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik (Crelles Journal)* 2025.828 (2025), pp. 175–218.
- [LW24] Xingzhe Li and Zhichao Wang. “Existence of embedded minimal tori in three-spheres with positive Ricci curvature”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.10391* (2024).
- [Lus47] L. Lusternik. “Topology of functional spaces and calculus of variations in the large”. In: *Trav. Inst. Math. Stekloff* 19 (1947), p. 100.

- [LS47] Lazar Aronovich Lyusternik and Lev Genrikhovich Shnirel'man. “Topological methods in variational problems and their application to the differential geometry of surfaces”. In: *Uspekhi Matematicheskikh Nauk* 2.1 (1947), pp. 166–217.
- [MN21] Fernando Codá Marques and André Neves. “Morse index of multiplicity one min-max minimal hypersurfaces”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 378 (2021), p. 107527.
- [Mor67] Hugh R Morton. “Symmetric products of the circle”. In: *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*. Vol. 63. 2. Cambridge University Press. 1967, pp. 349–352.
- [SS23a] Lorenzo Sarnataro and Douglas Stryker. *Optimal regularity for minimizers of the prescribed mean curvature functional over isotopies*. 2023. arXiv: 2304.02722 [math.DG].
- [SS23b] Lorenzo Sarnataro and Douglas Stryker. “Optimal regularity for minimizers of the prescribed mean curvature functional over isotopies”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.02722* (2023).
- [Sha17] Ben Sharp. “Compactness of minimal hypersurfaces with bounded index”. In: *Journal of Differential Geometry* 106.2 (2017), pp. 317–339.
- [Smi82] Francis Smith. “On the existence of embedded minimal 2-spheres in the 3-sphere, endowed with an arbitrary Riemannian metric”. In: *Doctoral dissertation* (1982).
- [Str84] M. Struwe. “On a free boundary problem for minimal surfaces”. In: *Invent. Math.* 75.3 (1984), pp. 547–560. ISSN: 0020-9910,1432-1297. DOI: 10.1007/BF01388643.
- [Tař92] I. A. Tařmanov. “On the existence of three nonintersecting closed geodesics on manifolds that are homeomorphic to the two-dimensional sphere”. In: *Izv. Ross. Akad. Nauk Ser. Mat.* 56.3 (1992), pp. 605–635. ISSN: 1607-0046,2587-5906. DOI: 10.1070/IM1993v040n03ABEH002177.
- [WZ23] Zhichao Wang and Xin Zhou. “Existence of four minimal spheres in S^3 with a bumpy metric”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.08755* (2023).
- [WZ25] Zhichao Wang and Xin Zhou. “Improved $C^1, 1$ Regularity for Multiple Membranes Problem”. In: *Peking Mathematical Journal* (2025), pp. 1–57.
- [Whi87] Brian White. “Curvature estimates and compactness theorems in 3-manifolds for surfaces that are stationary for parametric elliptic functionals”. In: *Invent. Math.* 88.2 (1987), pp. 243–256. ISSN: 0020-9910,1432-1297. DOI: 10.1007/BF01388908.
- [Whi89] Brian White. “Every three-sphere of positive Ricci curvature contains a minimal embedded torus”. In: *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)* 21.1 (1989), pp. 71–75. ISSN: 0273-0979,1088-9485. DOI: 10.1090/S0273-0979-1989-15765-0.
- [Whi91] Brian White. “The space of minimal submanifolds for varying Riemannian metrics”. In: *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* 40.1 (1991), pp. 161–200. ISSN: 0022-2518,1943-5258. DOI: 10.1512/iumj.1991.40.40008.
- [XZ23] Yi Xie and Boyu Zhang. “On meridian-traceless $SU(2)$ –representations of link groups”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 418 (2023), p. 108947.
- [Yau82] Shing-Tung Yau. *Seminar on differential geometry*. 102. Princeton University Press, 1982.
- [Zho16] Xin Zhou. “On the free boundary min-max geodesics”. In: *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* 5 (2016), pp. 1447–1466. ISSN: 1073-7928,1687-0247. DOI: 10.1093/imrn/rnv184.
- [Zho20] Xin Zhou. “On the multiplicity one conjecture in min-max theory”. In: *Annals of Mathematics* 192.3 (2020), pp. 767–820.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY, ITHACA, NY 14853, USA
Email address: cc2938@cornell.edu

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME, NOTRE DAME, IN 46556, USA
Email address: yangyangli@nd.edu

CORNELL UNIVERSITY, ITHACA, NY 14853, USA
Email address: zw782@cornell.edu