



Math for the people, by the people.

proof of Scott-Wiegold conjecture

Canonical name	ProofOfScottWiegoldConjecture
Date of creation	2013-03-22 18:30:31
Last modified on	2013-03-22 18:30:31
Owner	whm22 (2009)
Last modified by	whm22 (2009)
Numerical id	5
Author	whm22 (2009)
Entry type	Proof
Classification	msc 20E06

Suppose the conjecture were false. Then we have some $w \in C_p * C_q * C_r$ with $N(w) = C_p * C_q * C_r$. Let a, b, c denote the of w onto C_p, C_q, C_r respectively. Then a, b, c are all non-trivial as otherwise $N(w)$ would be contained in the kernel of one of the .

For $0^\circ < \theta < 360^\circ$ we say that a spin through θ consists of a unit vector, $\vec{u} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ together with the rotation of \mathbb{R}^3 through the angle θ anticlockwise about \vec{u} . In we have a single spin through the angle 0° and a single spin through 360° . Thus the set of spins (usually denoted $\text{Spin}(3)$) naturally has the topology of a 3-sphere.

The spin through θ about a unit vector \vec{u} has the same underlying rotation as the spin through $360^\circ - \theta$ about $-\vec{u}$. Hence there are precisely two spins corresponding to each rotation of \mathbb{R}^3 about the origin.

is well defined on spins as you can compose the underlying rotations and continuity determines which of the two spins is the correct result. For example a 350° spin about \vec{u} composed with a 20° spin about \vec{u} is a 350° spin about $-\vec{u}$ (not a 10° spin about \vec{u} which would be at the other end of the 3-sphere).

Let \vec{n} denote the unit vector $(0, 0, 1)$. Fix an arc, I , on the unit sphere connecting \vec{n} and $-\vec{n}$. Let \vec{t} be a vector on this arc. Let \vec{u} be an arbitrary unit vector. We may define a homomorphism $\phi_{\vec{t}, \vec{u}}: F_{\{a, b, c\}} \rightarrow \text{Spin}(3)$ by:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{\vec{t}, \vec{u}}: a &\mapsto \text{the spin through } \left(\frac{p-1}{2}\right) \frac{360^\circ}{p} \text{ (or } 180^\circ \text{ if } p = 2) \text{ about } \vec{n} \\ \phi_{\vec{t}, \vec{u}}: b &\mapsto \text{the spin through } \left(\frac{q-1}{2}\right) \frac{360^\circ}{q} \text{ (or } 180^\circ \text{ if } q = 2) \text{ about } \vec{t} \\ \phi_{\vec{t}, \vec{u}}: c &\mapsto \text{the spin through } \left(\frac{r-1}{2}\right) \frac{360^\circ}{r} \text{ (or } 180^\circ \text{ if } r = 2) \text{ about } \vec{u} \end{aligned}$$

(Here $F_{\{a, b, c\}}$ denotes the free group on a, b, c).

So $\phi_{\vec{t}, \vec{u}}(a)$, $\phi_{\vec{t}, \vec{u}}(b)$ and $\phi_{\vec{t}, \vec{u}}(c)$ are spins of between 120° and 180° , all having non-trivial underlying rotations.

Let \tilde{w} be a word in $F_{\{a, b, c\}}$ representing w , such that a, b, c occur in it 1 Mod $(2p)$ times, 1 Mod $2q$ times and 1 Mod $(2r)$ times, respectively.

We have a homomorphism $\phi' : C_p * C_q * C_r \rightarrow SO(3)$ induced by ϕ . If $\phi_{\vec{t}, \vec{u}}(\tilde{w})$ has a trivial underlying rotation for some \vec{t} and \vec{u} , then $N(w)$ will only contain elements in the kernel of ϕ' . In particular, we would have $a, b, c \notin N(w)$. So we may assume we have a map:

$$h: I \times S^2 \rightarrow S^2$$

which maps (\vec{t}, \vec{u}) to the unit vector corresponding to $\phi_{\vec{t}, \vec{u}}(\tilde{w})$.

By we have $h(\vec{n}, R\vec{u}) = Rh(\vec{n}, \vec{u})$ for any rotation R about \vec{n} . Thus $h(\vec{n}, \cdot): S^2 \rightarrow S^2$ maps latitudes to latitudes (possibly rotating them and /

or moving them up or down).

Also $h(\vec{n}, \vec{n}) = -\vec{n}$, as $\phi_{\vec{n}, \vec{n}}(a)$, $\phi_{\vec{n}, \vec{n}}(b)$ and $\phi_{\vec{n}, \vec{n}}(c)$ are spins of between 120° and 180° anticlockwise about \vec{n} , so the sum of the angles will be greater than 360° . Similarly one may see that $h(\vec{n}, -\vec{n}) = \vec{n}$. Thus, as $h(n, _)$ maps latitudes to latitudes, it must be homotopic to a reflection of S^2 .

Again by (1) we have $h(-\vec{n}, R\vec{u}) = Rh(-\vec{n}, \vec{u})$ for all rotations R about \vec{n} . Hence $h(-\vec{n}, _): S^2 \rightarrow S^2$ also maps latitudes to latitudes.

Further, $h(-\vec{n}, \vec{n}) = \vec{n}$ and $h(-\vec{n}, -\vec{n}) = -\vec{n}$. Thus $h(-\vec{n}, _)$ is homotopic to the identity.

But h gives a homotopy from $h(\vec{n}, _)$ to $h(-\vec{n}, _)$, yielding the desired contradiction.