

Characterising knots by their branched coverings

Luisa Paoluzzi

November 2025

Workshop *Branched Covers*
IMUS – Universidad de Sevilla

Abstract

These are the notes for a mini-course on the problem of determining knots by means of their cyclic branched coverings given at the *Workshop on Branched Covers* held at IMUS in Seville from November 17 to 21, 2025.

MSC2020: Primary 57M12; Secondary 57K10; 57K32; 57K35.

Keywords: knots, cyclic branched coverings

1 Introduction

Branched coverings are a convenient way to encode more complicated manifolds by means of simpler ones (e.g. the sphere) together with a subset (the branching locus, e.g. a knot, link or graph) and some combinatorial data (ramification locus and monodromy).

Recall that for X and Y topological spaces, if a map $p : X \rightarrow Y$ is a branched covering then (i) p is surjective and open, (ii) the subset $R \subset X$ where p is not a local homeomorphism is closed and nowhere dense, and (iii) the map induced by p from $X \setminus p^{-1}(p(R))$ to $Y \setminus p(R)$ is a genuine covering. With this notation Y is the *base*, X the *total space*, R the *ramification locus*, and $B = p(R)$ the *branching locus* of the covering. Depending on the context, one may require B to satisfy extra “regularity” conditions (for instance, a subcomplex of Y of codimension > 1 in the PL category, or a submanifold in the smooth category).

Here, however, we are not interested in describing manifolds and will adopt a different point of view: we want to look at branched coverings as invariants for knots in the 3-sphere. So the branching locus of the coverings we consider will be a knot¹ and the base of the covering the 3-sphere. Moreover, our coverings will be finite so that their total spaces will be closed, connected, oriented 3-manifolds. Other choices are of course possible, but we will focus on this setting. Before we proceed, though, it is necessary to make a few remarks in order to point out certain subtleties.

¹Other coverings will appear where the branching set is a link or a graph.

1.1 Be aware of an abuse of language

Branched coverings are maps. If $p : M \longrightarrow \mathcal{S}^3$ is branched over a knot K , then of course the covering is a complete invariant for K , as K is part of the information encoded in the map: K can be recovered as the image of the points where p is not a covering in the usual, unbranched sense. Such an invariant, however, does not have much interest as it is neither simpler than K itself, nor a totally different object that may shed some light on, say, possible ways to classify knots.

In the literature, by abuse of language, the expression *branched covering of a knot* refers to the total space of the covering, that is M for the covering p given above. In what follows we will also abuse language this way.

1.2 Choose coverings appropriately

In order to be advantageous, invariants should be easier to construct and tell apart than the objects they should distinguish, or, at least, of a very different nature, so that alternative tools and techniques can be exploited to analyse them. For instance, in our situation, invariants are manifolds, i.e. of a topological or geometric nature, while the objects themselves, knots, exhibit a more combinatorial nature, due to their usual presentation in terms of diagrams, for instance.

But what coverings would be appropriate invariants? A possibility might be to take the set of all of them (up to homeomorphism). However it is immediately clear that this option is definitely unbecoming: not only this set can be very large, but the existence of infinitely many knots that are *universal* shows that for infinitely many knots the set consists of all closed oriented 3-manifolds. This follows from work of Hilden, Lozano, and Montesinos who proved that every two-bridge, non torus knot (actually link) has the property [HLM].

It is thus advisable to choose a much smaller family of coverings that are easy to construct. Better still if there is a way to compare different elements in the family for distinct knots.

Keeping this in mind, (finite) regular coverings are among the simplest to describe, for the base space is just the space of orbits of a properly discontinuous action of a group on a manifold and the branching locus is the image of the set of points with non trivial stabilisers. Note also that branched coverings restrict to unbranched coverings of the complement of the knot, so that in order to construct them, one might start by considering (finite index) subgroups of the fundamental group of the knot or, in the case of regular ones when the subgroup is normal, (finite) quotients.

Even in this case, though, one might wonder what quotients of the fundamental group of the knot are best suited. Since all knot groups have infinite cyclic Abelianisation, for each integer $n \geq 2$ every knot K admits a unique n -fold cyclic branched covering (see the next section for details about how these are constructed). These are the coverings that we will consider here.

1.3 Branched coverings vs orbifolds

Regular coverings have also another advantage. Since the base of the covering is naturally endowed with an orbifold structure, most of the time the *geometry*

of the knot will be reflected in that of the total space. This will be discussed in detail later. For now just note that the geometry of their exteriors (that is, hyperbolic, Seifert fibred or toroidal) provides a very rough first classification of knots. We end this discussion by recalling that non-regular coverings in general cannot induce an orbifold structure on the base of the covering². In the other direction not all orbifolds come from branched coverings, since bad orbifolds exist. Moreover, depending on the adopted definition of branched coverings, the singular set of certain orbifolds cannot be the branched locus of a branched covering: this is for instance the case of reflection orbifolds, as the images of the reflection hyperplanes produce a topological “boundary” in the base of the covering.

2 Construction of cyclic branched coverings of knots and basic properties

Let now K be a knot in the 3-sphere and $n \geq 2$ be an integer. According to the discussion in the previous section, the n -fold cyclic covering of \mathbf{S}^3 branched along K is a closed, connected, orientable (even oriented) 3-manifold $M(K, n)$ that can be described in basically two ways.

The first description exploits the fact that the branched covering restricts to a genuine cover from the complement of the ramification locus \tilde{K} to the complement of the knot. $M(K, n) \setminus \tilde{K}$ is thus the total space of the unique n -fold cyclic cover of $\mathbf{S}^3 \setminus K$. Uniqueness comes from the fact that $H_1(\mathbf{S}^3 \setminus K) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ and there is a unique subgroup of index n in \mathbb{Z} . $M(K, n)$ is then simply the Dehn filling of such total space (after a $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ -equivariant open cusp is removed) with filling slope a lift of a meridian of K . As the covering is regular, the group $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ acts on $M(K, n) \setminus \tilde{K}$ with quotient $\mathbf{S}^3 \setminus K$. The action extends to the solid torus of the filling as a standard rotation about its core, so that the core of such solid torus in $M(K, n)$ maps to K in the quotient \mathbf{S}^3 .

As a side remark, from this first description it is also clear that cyclic branched coverings of links can only be unique if $n = 2$.

A different description can be found in Rolfsen’s book [Ro]. It has the advantage to offer a better visualisation of $M(K, n)$, but it cannot ensure uniqueness. One starts by cutting \mathbf{S}^3 along a Seifert surface for K . The resulting manifold has boundary consisting of two copies of the Seifert surface, say S_- and S_+ , that meet along K . It then suffices to take n copies of such manifold and glue them together so that the S_+ in the i th copy is glued to the S_- of the $i + 1$ st, with indices taken mod n . The $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ -action is now simply the cyclic permutation of the n copies of the manifold and the \mathbf{S}^1 which is the boundary of all the S_- and S_+ is fixed by construction. This construction is particularly neat for fibred knots, as the covering inherits an open book decomposition with monodromy the n th-power of the monodromy for the knot. Unlike the fibred case, however, Seifert surfaces, even minimal ones, need not be unique (up to isotopy) so in principle one might end up with different manifolds.

The above discussion may be summarised in the following result which is a characterisation of n -fold cyclic branched coverings for knots.

²A necessary condition for the base to have an orbifold structure is that the preimage of the branched locus coincides with the ramification locus.

Proposition 1. *The n -fold cyclic branched covering of a knot K in \mathcal{S}^3 is the unique closed, connected, orientable 3-manifold $M(K, n)$ admitting a periodic diffeomorphism ψ of order n such that*

- $\text{Fix}(\psi^k) \cong \mathcal{S}^1$ for all $k = 1, \dots, n-1$,
- $M(K, n)/\langle \psi \rangle \cong \mathcal{S}^3$ and
- $p(\text{Fix}(\psi)) = K$, where $p: M(K, n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}^3$ is the quotient map.

Question 1. The above discussion applies if \mathcal{S}^3 is replaced with an integral homology sphere. One may ask whether the results that will be stated in what follows make sense and have a chance to extend to this more general setting.³

Example 1. Let $n \geq 2$ be an integer and K be the trivial knot. Then $M(K, n) \cong \mathcal{S}^3$.

More interestingly one has the following result which is a consequence of the positive solution to Smith's conjecture⁴ [MB] and the proposition above.

Theorem 1. *Let $n \geq 2$ be an integer and K a knot. Assume that $M(K, n) \cong \mathcal{S}^3$. Then K is the trivial knot.*

This observation prompts the following definitions.

Definition 1. Let K be a knot and $n \geq 2$ an integer. We say that $M(K, n)$ *determines* K if for every knot K' such that $M(K, n)$ and $M(K', n)$ are homeomorphic, K and K' are equivalent.

Otherwise, if there is a knot K' non equivalent to K such that $M(K, n)$ and $M(K', n)$ are homeomorphic we say that K' is an n -*twin* of K .

Theorem 1 above says that for every integer $n \geq 2$, $M(K, n)$ determines the trivial knot, and the trivial knot has no n -twins. This can be rephrased by saying that cyclic branched coverings are strong invariants for the trivial knot. Unfortunately not all knots behave like the trivial one with respect to cyclic branched coverings and n -twins do exist. One might then hope to be able to determine a knot by considering several cyclic branched coverings at the time.

Definition 2. Let $F \subset \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1\}$ be a set of integers and K a knot. We say that K is *determined by the family* $(M(K, n))_{n \in F}$ *of its cyclic branched coverings* if whenever $M(K, n)$ and $M(K', n)$ are homeomorphic for all $n \in F$ then K and K' are equivalent.

It is thus natural to ask two different types of questions:

Question 2. • Can a knot be determined by its cyclic branched covers?
How many do we need?

- If K has an n -twin K' , how can one recover K' from K ?

In the sequel we will address these two questions and present what is known about them⁵.

³The positive solution to Smith's conjecture being a central tool in many arguments, it seems likely that most results will not hold for knots in homology spheres.

⁴The conjecture states that if the fixed-point set of a finite order diffeomorphism of the 3-sphere is a circle, then it is the trivial knot, that is the diffeomorphism is conjugate to a standard rotation of the same order.

⁵A substantial part of these notes is based on the survey [P5] where more examples can also be found.

3 Composite knots

The following easy result is a first instance of the general principle that the geometry (in a large sense) of the knot is reflected in that of its cyclic branched coverings.

Lemma 1. *Let K be a knot and $n \geq 2$ an integer. $M(K, n)$ is a prime manifold if and only if K is a prime knot.*

Proof. We will reason by contraposition. Assume that K is not prime and let S be an embedded sphere in \mathbf{S}^3 meeting K in two points and separating it into two non-trivial arcs realising K as the connected sum of two non trivial knots K_1 and K_2 , that is $K = K_1 \# K_2$. Such sphere lifts in $M(K, n)$ to a sphere separating the manifold in two submanifolds which are obtained from $M(K_1, n)$ and $M(K_2, n)$ by removing a ball, so that $M(K, n) = M(K_1, n) \# M(K_2, n)$. This shows that the branched covering is a non-trivial connected sum according to Theorem 1.

For the other implication, by the equivariant sphere theorem, one can assume to have a decomposition of $M(K, n)$ that is equivariant. Since every 2-sphere in \mathbf{S}^3 bounds a ball and \mathbf{S}^3 does not contain any essential real projective plane, every sphere of the decomposition of $M(K, n)$ is separating and its image in the quotient must intersect K . This shows that K is not prime. \square

It follows from the argument in the proof that the n -fold branched covering of a composite knot is the connected sum of the n -fold branched coverings of its components. The following essential observation is due to Viro [V1, V2].

Remark 1. There are two possible ways to define the connected sum of two knots, according to the possible orientations of the two knots and disregarding the orientation of the resulting ones. The latter are indeed distinct if their components are non invertible knots. On the other hand, the n -fold cyclic branched coverings of the resulting composite knots do not depend on the orientations of the original knots. As a consequence there are non equivalent composite knots that are n -twins for every $n \geq 2$. Moreover, the number of n -twins with this property can be arbitrarily large as it grows with the number of prime components of the knot.




Figure 1: Two composite knots that are n -twins for all $n \geq 2$.

Roughly speaking the above remark says that one can only hope to determine the components of a composite knot using cyclic branched coverings, but not the knot itself. As a consequence, from now on all knots will be assumed to be prime. Note that Lemma 1 assures that a prime knot cannot have a composite twin.

A result of Kojima [Ko] assures that cyclic branched coverings are reasonably good invariants for prime knots:

Theorem 2 (Kojima). *Let K and K' be prime knots. There exists an integer N , depending on K and K' , such that if $M(K, n) \cong M(K', n)$ for an $n \geq N$ then K and K' are equivalent.*

In other words, any two non-equivalent prime knots K and K' cannot be n -twins for n large enough.

4 How to build twins

It is natural to ask whether the N in Kojima's result can be chosen large enough to be made independent of K and K' . Nakanishi and Sakuma [N, S] answered this question in the negative by building the first examples of n -twins for arbitrary n . Their construction is as follows.

Take a two-component link L with trivial components L_1 and L_2 . We can consider the $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ branched covering of L to obtain a manifold M . Now, since $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ is Abelian, the covering can be obtained as a composition of two n -fold cyclic coverings in two different ways. One starts with taking the n -fold cyclic coverings of L_1 . Since this is a trivial knot, $M(L_1, n)$ is the 3-sphere. The preimage K_2 of L_2 in $M(L_1, n)$ is a link with $\text{GCD}(\text{lk}(L_1, L_2), n)$ components (as $\text{lk}(L_1, L_2)$ is precisely the image of L_2 in the Abelianisation of $\pi_1(\mathcal{S}^3 \setminus L_1)$). So, if $\text{GCD}(\text{lk}(L_1, L_2), n) = 1$ (in particular if $|\text{lk}(L_1, L_2)| = 1$), then K_2 is a knot and, by construction, one has $M(K_2, n) \cong M$. Exchanging the roles of L_1 and L_2 one obtains two knots, K_1 and K_2 , with the same n -fold cyclic branched covering. If L has no symmetries, one can expect K_1 and K_2 to be non-equivalent and so n -twins.




Figure 2: An example of Nakanishi and Sakuma's construction for $n = 3$

Note that by taking $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$ instead of $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ one can construct

manifolds that are cyclic branched coverings of knots for different degrees of the covering.

4.1 The case $n \geq 3$

This simple method is particularly remarkable as Zimmermann [Z2] showed that this is the only way for a hyperbolic knot to admit an n -twin⁶ for $n \geq 3$. Moreover, if such an n -twin exists, because of the positive solution to Smith's conjecture, the twin is unique in this case.

Theorem 3 (Zimmermann). *Let K be a hyperbolic knot and $n \geq 3$ an integer. K admits an n -twin K' if and only if K admits a period of order n with trivial quotient such that the two components of the quotient link are not exchangeable.*

Definition 3. Let K be a knot and $n \geq 2$. A *period of order n* of K is an orientation-preserving, order n , diffeomorphism ϕ of the pair (S^3, K) such that $\text{Fix}(\phi)$ is a circle disjoint from K . It has *trivial quotient* if the image of K in the quotient $S^3/\langle\phi\rangle$ is the trivial knot. The *quotient link* is the image of $K \cup \text{Fix}(\phi)$ in the quotient.

The ingredients in this result are basically two: cyclic branched coverings reflect the geometry of the knot and the isometry group of a hyperbolic manifold is finite. The first point is made precise in the following remark.

Remark 2. Let K be a prime knot and $n \geq 2$. If K is a torus knot then $M(K, n)$ is Seifert fibred. If K is a satellite knot, then $M(K, n)$ is toroidal (in fact admits a non trivial JSJ decomposition). If K is hyperbolic then, by Thurston's orbifold theorem [BLP], $M(K, n)$ is hyperbolic provided that either $n \geq 4$ or $n = 3$ and K is not the figure-eight knot. If $n = 2$, $M(K, n)$ can be hyperbolic, Seifert fibred, or admit a non trivial JSJ decomposition.

This remark says in particular that the twin K' in Zimmermann's result is also a hyperbolic knot.

Assuming now that a hyperbolic knot K has an n -twin K' for some $n \geq 3$, one starts by verifying that K cannot be the figure-eight knot, so that $M(K, n)$ is hyperbolic. In particular the automorphisms ψ and ψ' of the branched coverings for K and K' can be assumed to be hyperbolic isometries and so elements of the same finite group. Elementary finite group theory (namely, Sylow p -subgroups) and geometric considerations lead to the conclusion that, up to choosing appropriate conjugates, ψ and ψ' commute.

For prime satellite knots, one cannot hope to be able to choose ψ and ψ' so that they commute for all n -twins K and K' . Explicit examples of n -twins that do not behave like in Nakanishi and Sakuma's construction are known for n an odd prime number [BP]. Nonetheless one has the following result [BP].

Theorem 4 (Boileau-P.). *Let K be a prime knot and $n \geq 3$ a prime integer. K admits at most one n -twin and for at most two values of n .*

Corollary 1. *Let K be a prime knot. The family $(M(K, 3), M(K, 5), M(K, 7))$ determines K .*

⁶In [Z2] n is assumed not to be a power of 2, but a variation of the same argument applies also to the case $n = 2^k$ (see [P3]).

4.2 The case when $n = 2$

As one may guess from Remark 2 above, there is a plethora of possible ways to obtain 2-twins, even of hyperbolic knots. We will discuss different cases according to the geometry of $M(K, 2)$.

4.2.1 $M(K, 2)$ is hyperbolic.

In this case, just like in the previous section, the existence of a 2-twin for a hyperbolic knot entails the presence of symmetries of the knot. In this case, the symmetries need not be periods: strong involutions appear and the two-component link of the construction at the beginning of the section can be replaced with a theta-curve (examples of this type were first studied by Zimmermann [Z1]). Also, taking a single quotient by a symmetry need not be sufficient to “see” all the 2-twins of the knot. An accurate study of the Sylow 2-subgroup gives the following result [Re] (see [MR] for a more combinatorial approach by considering successive quotients).

Theorem 5 (Reni, Mecchia-Reni). *Let K be a hyperbolic knot and assume that $M(K, 2)$ is hyperbolic. K has at most eight 2-twins.*

Using Kawauchi’s strongly almost identical (AID) imitation theory one can show that nine 2-twins must exist [Ka], but explicit constructions are only known for sets of two, three, and four twins [RZ].




Figure 3: Three 2-twins related by strong inversions and having quotient a theta-curve.

4.2.2 $M(K, 2)$ is Seifert fibred.

In this case K is a Montesinos knot [M]. The number of 2-twins of a Montesinos knot can be arbitrarily large as two Montesinos knots having the same rational




Figure 4: A schematic picture of a Montesinos link obtained by stacking together rational tangles, on the left, and one of a rational tangle, on the right.




Figure 5: Two Montesinos knots that are 2-twins.

tangles have the same 2-fold branched covering regardless of the order in which their rational tangles are arranged. Indeed, each rational tangle lifts in $M(K, 2)$ to the neighbourhood of an exceptional fibre and $M(K, 2)$ is independent of their order.

If the Montesinos knot has precisely three rational tangles it does not have any hyperbolic 2-twins but may have a 2-twin which is a torus knot.

4.2.3 $M(K, 2)$ has a non-trivial JSJ decomposition.

Since the complement of K is atoroidal, the covering transformation must have a fixed-point set that intersect all essential tori of the JSJ decomposition of $M(K, 2)$ in four points and must act as an elliptic involution on each of them. Such tori give rise to essential Conway spheres for the knot. In this case there is a well-known method to produce 2-twins: Conway mutation. Conway mutation along a Conway sphere that separates two non-trivial non-symmetric tangles results in a 2-twin, as for the Conway and Kinoshita-Terasaka knots.

Note that two Montesinos knots that are 2-twins are also obtained by a sequence of Conway mutations.

Conway mutation is not the end of the story, though. In this case 2-twins can arise from a combination of the possibilities seen so far (mutation, permutation of rational tangles, symmetries that might be localised on some geometric part) and can even be satellite knots [P1]. The first examples of twins of this type can be found in a paper by Montesinos and Whitten [MW].




Figure 6: The Conway and Kinoshita-Terasaka knots and possible mutations along a Conway sphere.




Figure 7: Two Montesinos knots that are 2-twins in which the Conway mutation is shown.

4.3 The case of alternating knots.

In spite of the wide variety of constructions mentioned in this section, 2-twins of alternating knots only come from mutation if they are themselves alternating, as shown by Greene [G].

Theorem 6 (Greene). *If K and K' are prime alternating knots which are 2-twins, then K and K' are obtained by a sequence of Conway mutations.*

Greene conjectured something even more surprising, that is that a 2-twin of a prime alternating knot must be alternating.

4.4 Presence of symmetries as an indicator of the existence of twins

We have seen that the existence of a twin for a knot may imply that the knot is symmetric. In some instances the presence of symmetries is enough to ensure




Figure 8: Hyperbolic 2-twins obtained by mutations and local Nakanishi-Sakuma's method.

that the knot has a twin. A special class to consider is that of *tunnel-number-1 knots*. These are the knots whose exteriors admit a Heegaard splitting of genus 2. Because of this, as surfaces of genus 2 are hyperelliptic, they are all strongly invertible. We have the following [JP].

Theorem 7 (Jang-P). *Let K be a tunnel-number-1 knot. If K satisfies one of the following conditions, it has a 2-twin:*

- *the bridge index of K is ≥ 5 .*
- *the bridge index of K is 4 and K is a $(1,1)$ -knot⁷ (or $M(K, 2)$ has Heegaard genus equal to 2).*

5 Rigidity results

Although 2-fold branched coverings seem too flexible to be reasonable invariants for knots, sometimes they are enough to determine them.

⁷A $(1,1)$ -knot is a knot that can be put in 1-bridge position with respect to a genus-1 Heegaard splitting of the 3-sphere. Torus knots and 2-bridge knots are examples of $(1,1)$ -knots.

Theorem 8 (Hodgson-Rubinstein). *Let K be a 2-bridge knot. Then K has no 2-twins, that is $M(K, 2)$ determines K .*

This follows from Hodgson and Rubinstein's classification of involutions on lens spaces in [HR].

In the case of torus knots, a careful combinatorial analysis of the Seifert invariants of their cyclic branched coverings, which are Brieskorn manifolds and were classified by Neumann in his Ph.D. thesis, gives the following result.

Proposition 2. *A torus knot cannot be the twin of another torus knot.*

Corollary 2. *Let K be a torus knot and $n \geq 3$. Then K is determined by $M(K, n)$.*

This means that torus knots can only have n -twins (which are Montesinos knots) for $n = 2$ and this can only happen if they are not of type $T(2, 2a + 1)$. Note that in a couple of peculiar cases, the Montesinos knot is not hyperbolic and coincides with the torus knot which thus has no 2-twin.

We have seen that an arbitrary prime knot is determined by a family of three cyclic branched coverings, provided their degrees are odd prime numbers. If this requirement can be improved for torus knots as mentioned above, for hyperbolic knots one can relax the requirement on the degrees or reduce the size of the family by imposing conditions on the degrees. Indeed we have the following results.

Theorem 9 (P., Zimmermann). *Let $F \subset \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1\}$ and let K be a hyperbolic knot. The family $(M(K, n))_{n \in F}$ determines K if one of the following conditions is satisfied.*

1. *The cardinality of F is 3 [P3].*
2. *$F = \{n, m\}$ and*
 - (a) *$n, m \geq 3$ and are not coprime [Z2];*
 - (b) *$n > m = 2$ and*
 - *K is a Montesinos knot [P2] or*
 - *$M(K, 2)$ is hyperbolic and n is even [Z2] or*
 - *K has a unique Seifert surface, for instance K is fibred [P4].*
3. *$F = \{n\}$, $n \geq 3$, and K is alternating [P6].*

This result is best possible as for every pair of integers $n > m$ one can construct non-equivalent hyperbolic knots K and K' that are n -twins and m -twins provided that one of the following conditions hold:

1. *$m \geq 3$ and m and n are coprime [Z1];*
2. *$m = 2$ [P2, P4].*

Keeping in mind the construction to build pairs of n -twins, one realises that to obtain pairs of knots that are n -twins and m -twins for two coprime integers n and m , one can start with a three-component (hyperbolic) link such that all of its components are trivial, every two-component sublink is a Hopf link, and such that its three components can be cyclically permuted but no two can be exchanged. The knots are obtained as lifts of the third component of the link in the $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ branched coverings of the other two.

6 A different point of view and an application

We have seen that a manifold can be the n -fold cyclic branched covering of arbitrarily many n -twin knots. One might now ask whether there is a universal bound on the number of possible degrees n such that a manifold M not homeomorphic to \mathbf{S}^3 is the n -fold branched covering of some knot in the 3-sphere. The answer to this question is negative in general, however it is possible to provide bounds by imposing conditions on the geometry of the manifolds or on the degrees [BFM].

Theorem 10 (Boileau-Franchi-Mecchia-P.-Zimmermann). • *A hyperbolic manifold is the branched covering of some knot for at most nine different degrees.*

- *A manifold not homeomorphic to \mathbf{S}^3 is the branched covering of some knot for at most six odd prime degrees.*

Corollary 3. *A hyperbolic manifold is the branched covering of at most fifteen non-equivalent knots.*

The proof of this result relies on the classification of finite simple groups.

6.1 Two characterisations

The above result can be restated to provide a characterisation of the 3-sphere.

Corollary 4. *The following are equivalent:*

- *M is the 3-sphere;*
- *M is the cyclic branched covering of some knot in \mathbf{S}^3 for at least seven odd prime degrees;*
- *M admits a finite group of orientation-preserving diffeomorphisms which contains at least sixteen conjugacy classes of elements with connected fixed-point set and space of orbits homeomorphic to \mathbf{S}^3 .*

In a similar spirit one can prove that an integral homology sphere is \mathbf{S}^3 if and only if it is the cyclic cover branched over some knot in \mathbf{S}^3 for at least four odd prime degrees [BPZ]. In this situation the result is best possible as the Brieskorn sphere with three exceptional fibres of orders $p_1 > p_2 > p_3 \geq 3$, three prime integers, is the p_i -fold cyclic branched covering of the $T(p_j, p_k)$ -torus knot for $\{i, j, k\} = \{1, 2, 3\}$. The question to know whether the bound six in the previous general case is optimal remains open.

As we have seen, sometimes the existence of an n -twin for a knot induces an n -period with trivial quotient. As a by-product of this we have the following result [BP] whose proof is elementary when the periods commute.

Theorem 11 (Boileau-P.). *A knot is trivial if and only if it admits three periods with trivial quotients and pairwise distinct orders > 2 .*

Acknowledgement

The author would like to thank M. Kegel and M. Silvero for the invitation to speak and careful organisation, as well as all participants to the workshop for contributing to a stimulating research environment and friendly atmosphere.

References

- [BFM] M. Boileau, C. Franchi, M. Mecchia, L. Paoluzzi, B. Zimmermann, *Finite group actions and cyclic branched covers of knots in S^3* , J. Topol. **11**, (2018), 283-308.
- [BLP] M. Boileau, B. Leeb and J. Porti, *Geometrization of 3-dimensional orbifolds*, Annals of Math. **162**, (2005), 195-290.
- [BP] M. Boileau and L. Paoluzzi, *On cyclic branched coverings of prime knots*, J. Topol. **1**, (2008), 557-583.
- [BPZ] M. Boileau, L. Paoluzzi, B. Zimmermann, *A characterisation of S^3 among homology spheres*, The Zieschang Gedenkschrift. Geom. Topol. Monogr. **14**, Geom. Topol. Publ., Coventry, (2008), 83-103.
- [G] J. E. Greene, *Lattices, graphs, and Conway mutation*, Invent. Math. **192**, (2013), 717-750.
- [HLM] H. M. Hilden, M. T. Lozano, J. M. Montesinos, *On knots that are universal*, Topology **24**, (1985), 499-504.
- [HR] C. Hodgson, J. H. Rubinstein, *Involutions and isotopies of lens spaces*, In: Knot theory and manifolds (Vancouver, 1983). Ed. D. Rolfsen. Lecture Notes in Math. **1144**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, (1985), 60-96.
- [JP] Y. Jang, L. Paoluzzi, *Cyclic branched covers of tunnel number one knots*, Geom. Dedicata **211**, (2021), 129-143.
- [Ka] A. Kawachi, *Topological imitations and Reni-Mecchia-Zimmermann's conjecture*, Kyungpook Math. J. **46**, (2006), 1-9.
- [Ko] S. Kojima, *Determining knots by branched covers*, In: Low dimensional topology and Kleinian groups (Warwick and Durham, 1984). Ed. D. E. A. Epstein. London Math. Soc. Lecture Notes **112**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, (1986), 193-207.
- [MR] M. Mecchia, M. Reni, *Hyperbolic 2-fold branched coverings of links and their quotients*, Pacific J. Math. **202**, (2002), 429-447.
- [M] J. M. Montesinos, *Varietades de Seifert que son recubridores ciclicos ramificados de dos hojas*, Bol. Soc. Mat. Mexicana **18**, (1973), 1-32.
- [MW] J. M. Montesinos, W. Whitten, *Construction of two-fold branched covering spaces*, Pacific J. Math. **125**, (1986), 415-446.
- [MB] J. Morgan, H. Bass, *The Smith conjecture*, Academic Press, New York, 1984.
- [N] Y. Nakanishi, *Primeness of links*, Math. Sem. Notes Kobe Univ. **9**, (1981), 415-440.
- [P1] L. Paoluzzi, *On hyperbolic type involutions*, Rend. Ist. Mat. Univ. Trieste **32**, suppl. 1, (2001), 221-256.
- [P2] L. Paoluzzi, *Non-equivalent hyperbolic knots*, Topology Appl. **124**, (2002), 85-101.
- [P3] L. Paoluzzi, *Three cyclic branched covers suffice to determine hyperbolic knots*, J. Knot Theory Ramifications. **14**, (2005), 641-655.
- [P4] L. Paoluzzi, *Conway irreducible hyperbolic knots with two common covers*, Comment. Math. Helv. **80**, (2005), 643-653.
- [P5] L. Paoluzzi, *Hyperbolic knots and cyclic branched covers*, Publ. Mat. **49**, (2005), 257-284.
- [P6] L. Paoluzzi, *Cyclic branched covers of alternating knots*, Annales Henri Lebesgues **4**, (2021), 811-830.
- [Re] M. Reni, *On π -hyperbolic knots with the same 2-fold branched coverings*, Math. Ann. **316**, (2000), 681-697.
- [RZ] M. Reni, B. Zimmermann, *Isometry groups of hyperbolic 3-manifolds which are cyclic branched coverings*, Geom. Dedicata **74**, (1999), 23-35.
- [Ro] D. Rolfsen, *Knots and links*, Publish or Perish, Berkeley, 1976.
- [S] M. Sakuma, *Periods of composite links*, Math. Sem. Notes Kobe Univ. **9**, (1981), 445-452.

- [V1] O. J. Viro, *Links, two-sheeted branching coverings and braids*, Mat. Sb. **87**, (1972), 216-228.
- [V2] O. Ja. Viro *Non-projecting isotopies and knots with homeomorphic coverings*, Zap. Nauchn. Semin. LOMI **66**, (1976), 133-147. English transl. in J. Soviet Math. **12**, (1979), 86-96.
- [Z1] B. Zimmermann, *On hyperbolic knots with the same m -fold and n -fold cyclic branched coverings*. Topology Appl. **79**, (1997), 143-157.
- [Z2] B. Zimmermann, *On hyperbolic knots with homeomorphic cyclic branched coverings*. Math. Ann. **311**, (1998), 665-673.

AIX-MARSEILLE UNIV, CNRS, I2M UMR 7373, MARSEILLE, FRANCE
 luisa.paoluzzi@univ-amu.fr