

## CORRIGENDA

### Roll-spun knots

BY MASAKAZU TERAGAITO

(Volume 113 (1993), 91–96)

(Received 15 April 1993)

K. Motegi has kindly pointed out that the Lemma in Section 4 of the paper is incorrect. (The assertion in Case 1 on p. 95 that the sewing map of  $E(K)$  is periodic is false.) Hence Theorem 6 is unproven. However, we have a weaker result.

**THEOREM 6'.** *Let  $K$  be a knot in  $S^3$ , and suppose that  $K$  is not a torus knot. For any non-zero integer  $m$ , the  $m$ -roll spun knot  $\rho^m K$  of  $K$  cannot be obtained as  $\tau^n K$  for any integer  $n$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\rho^m K \sim \tau^n K$  for some  $n$ . We may assume that  $n \geq 0$ . By Theorem 3, we have  $n \neq 0$ . Also, by Theorem 2,  $n \neq 1$ . The argument given in the paper shows that  $K(0)$  is a Seifert fibred manifold with orientable orbit manifold. From the argument in the paper we then obtain that  $K$  is a fibred knot whose closed monodromy is isotopic to a periodic homeomorphism. Let  $F$  be a fibre of  $K$ . Then by Proposition 2,  $\rho^m K$  is a fibred knot with fibre  $\hat{W}$  (see Section 2). Note that the closed fibre  $\hat{W}$  is a Haken Seifert fibred manifold and  $H_1(\hat{W}; \mathbb{Z}) \cong Z^{2g(F)}$ . Let  $\Sigma_n(K)$  be the  $n$ -fold cyclic branched cover of  $K$ . Since  $\pi_1(S^4 - \rho^m K) \cong \pi_1(S^4 - \tau^n K)$ , we have  $\pi_1(\hat{W}) \cong \pi_1(\Sigma_n(K))$  by considering the commutator subgroup of both sides. Also,  $\Sigma_n(K)$  is irreducible since  $\pi_1(\hat{W})$  is indecomposable relative to free products. Hence, by [2], corollary 6.5,  $\hat{W} \cong \Sigma_n(K)$ .

Now we have  $n > 2$ , since  $H_1(\hat{W}; \mathbb{Z}) \cong Z^{2g(F)}$ . From the tables of Dunbar [1], if the  $n$ -fold cyclic branched cover of a knot is a Seifert fibred manifold for some  $n > 2$  then either the knot is a torus knot or it is the figure-eight knot and  $n = 3$ . But  $H_1(\Sigma_3(\text{figure-eight}); \mathbb{Z}) \cong Z_4 \oplus Z_4$ . Hence,  $K$  would be a torus knot, contradicting our assumption.

I am grateful to K. Motegi for his observations.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] W. DUNBAR. Geometric orbifolds. *Rev. Mat. U. Complutense Mad.* 1 (1988), 67–99.
- [2] F. WALDHAUSEN. On irreducible 3-manifolds which are sufficiently large. *Ann. of Math.* 87 (1968), 56–88.