SOME TOPICS IN KNOT THEORY

A REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of the dual degree of

Bachelor of Science-Master of Science

in

MATHEMATICS

by

APOORV POTNIS

(18343)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH BHOPAL, BHOPAL - $462\ 066$

April 2023

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that **Apoorv Potnis**, BS-MS (Mathematics), has worked on the project entitled 'Some topics in knot theory' under my supervision and guidance. The content of this report is original and has not been submitted elsewhere for the award of any academic or professional degree.

Dı Prof. S	r. Dheeraj Kulkarni Subhash Chaturvedi
Signature	Date
	Prof. S

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AND COPYRIGHT DISCLAIMER

I hereby declare that this project is my own work and, to the best of my knowledge, it contains no materials previously published or written by another person, or substantial proportions of material which have been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma at IISER Bhopal or any other educational institution, except where due acknowledgement is made in the document.

I certify that all copyrighted material incorporated into this document is in compliance with the Indian Copyright Act (1957) and that I have received written permission from the copyright owners for my use of their work, which is beyond the scope of the law. I agree to indemnify and save harmless IISER Bhopal from any and all claims that may be asserted or that may arise from any copyright violation.

April 2023 IISER Bhopal **Apoorv Potnis**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Acknowledgement is here.

Apoorv Potnis

ABSTRACT

We shall study some selected topics in knot theory from the book *Knots and Physics*, 4th ed. by Louis Kauffman [1]. The basics of knot theory have been studied from the book *Knots and Links* by Peter Cromwell [2].

A knot is an embedding of the circle in three-dimensional space. We discuss the state model for bracket polynomial, Jones polynomial and some of its generalisations. One can apply these knot invariants to show that various knots are not ambient isotopic, which is the notion we shall use to distinguish knots. We shall see a resolution of some of the old conjectures in knot theory using the bracket polynomial. Vaughn Jones found the polynomial named after him while he was studying towers of von Neumann algebras. We shall follow a different route following Kauffman to understand the relation amongst braids, links, Temperley–Lieb algebras, which arose in statistical physics, and the Jones algebras.

Contents

Certificate	j
Academic Integrity and Copyright Disclaimer	i
Acknowledgement	iii
Abstract	iv
1 The Bracket Polynomial	2
1.1 State model	2

Chapter 1

The Bracket Polynomial

Given two links or knots, one desires a way to tell if the two links are distinct. Since we can represent knots faithfully on a paper using knot diagrams, one can ask for a way to distinguish knots based on their diagrams. A *link invariant* is a function of a link such that if the evaluation of the function on two links yields different outputs, then the links are distinct, i.e. they are not ambient isotopic to each other. A link invariant is said to be *complete* if it always gives different outputs for distinct links.

In this chapter, we shall a link invariant called the normalised bracket polynomial. It attaches each link a polynomial with coefficients from $\mathbb{Z}[A,A^{-1}]$, where A and A^{-1} are some commuting variables. This invariant is not complete. It was discovered by Louis Kauffman in 1987 [10, 11]. The normalised version of this polynomial is equivalent to the Jones polynomial, which was discovered by Vaughn Jones in 1985 while working on the theory of operator algebras [12]. The discovery of the Jones polynomial created a flurry of activity as relations between knot theory and mathematical physics were found. Several generalisations of the Jones/bracket polynomial were immediately found and some long standing problems in knot theory, such as the Tait conjectures were proved. The approaches of Jones and Kauffman are very different while defining their polynomials. While understanding the original route taken by Jones to define his polynomial requires the knowledge of the theory of von Neumann algebras, Kauffman takes an elementary, but powerful diagrammatic approach while defining his polynomial. In this chapter, we shall look at Kauffman's bracket polynomial using the so called $state\ model$, as expounded in his book [1].

1.1 State model

Consider a crossing of an unoriented link as shown in ??. We designate local regions around a crossing a label A or B based on the following scheme. Walk along the underpass towards a crossing. The area on the left is assigned the label A and the area on the right the label B. This assignment is unambiguous. We then 'resolve' or 'smoothen' or 'split' the crossing in two ways, one way which connects the A-regions and another way which connects the B-regions. If we resolve a crossing such that A-regions are connected, then we attach the label A to the resolved diagram. The same holds for B-regions. Note that the resolution of the crossing happens only locally, i.e. in an open ball around the crossing which does not intersect other crossings. Such an open ball exists due to the Hausdorff property of the plane.

We shall do this process recursively for all crossings to get a sets of Jordan curves in a plane with labels attached to them. Refer to ?? where we have carried this process for a trefoil.

Each of the individual diagrams shown in curly brackets in ?? is referred to as a state. To each state are the labels A and B attached to it. We can construct the original link unambiguously using the states (and labels attached to them). We shall construct invariants of links by 'averaging' over these states.

By averaging, we mean the following. Let L be a link and σ denote a particular state obtained after resolving all the crossings recursively. We denote the commutative product of the labels associated to that state by $\langle K|\sigma\rangle$. For example,

Let $\|\sigma\|$ denote one less than the number of loops in σ . Thus, for the above state, we have $\|\sigma\| = 1 - 1 = 0$.

We define the bracket polynomial $\langle L \rangle$ of a link L as follows.

$$\langle L \rangle = \sum_{\sigma} \langle L | \sigma \rangle d^{\|\sigma\|},$$

where A, B and d are commuting variables. The bracket polynomial is thus a function of A, B and d. σ runs over all the states of K.

Thus, we calculate $\langle L|s\rangle$ for each state for the trefoil to get

$$\begin{split} \langle L \rangle &= A^3 d^{2-1} + A^2 B d^{1-1} + A^2 B d^{2-1} + A^2 B d^{1-1} \\ &\quad + A B^2 d^{2-1} + A B^2 d^{2-1} + B^3 d^{3-1} \\ \langle L \rangle &= A^3 d + 3 A^2 B d^0 + 3 A B^2 d^1 + B^3 d^2. \end{split}$$

Theorem 1 (Skein relation).

$$\left\langle \bigvee \right\rangle = A \left\langle \bigvee \right\rangle + A^{-1} \left\langle \middle \right\rangle \left\langle \right\rangle.$$

The diagrams in the above theorem should be regarded as local diagrams. We make changes to a diagram locally near the crossing. There exists an open topological ball around each crossing such that the ball does not intersect any other crossing and the diagram remains the same outside this ball.

The proof of the above theorem follows from the definition of $\langle L \rangle$ and realizing that the states of a diagram are in one-to-one correspondence with the union of the diagrams with resolved crossings. The above identity is very important and we shall use it very often. For an example of a calculation of the bracket polynomial of a link, please refer to ??.

Theorem 2.

$$\left\langle \bigcirc \right\rangle = AB \left\langle \bigcirc \right\rangle + AB \left\langle \bigcirc \right\rangle + (A^2 + B^2) \left\langle \bigcirc \right\rangle.$$

Proof.

$$\left\langle \bigodot \right\rangle = A \left\langle \bigodot \right\rangle + B \left\langle \bigodot \right\rangle$$

$$\left\langle \bigodot \right\rangle = A \left[A \left\langle \bigodot \right\rangle + B \left\langle \bigodot \right\rangle \right] +$$

$$B \left[A \left\langle \bigodot \right\rangle + B \left\langle \bigodot \right\rangle \right]$$

$$\left\langle \bigodot \right\rangle = AB \left\langle \bigcirc \right\rangle + AB \left\langle \bigodot \right\rangle + (A^2 + B^2) \left\langle \bigcirc \right\rangle.$$

It is also clear that

$$\left\langle \bigcirc \middle \middle \right\rangle = (Ad+B) \langle \frown \!\!\! \smile \rangle$$

and

$$\left\langle \bigcirc \middle\backslash \right\rangle = (A+Bd)\langle \frown \!\!\!\! \smile \rangle.$$

We also see that

$$\left\langle \widecheck{\bigcirc} \right\rangle = d \left\langle \widecheck{\frown} \right\rangle.$$

Let $B=A^{-1}$ and $d=-A^2-A^{-2}$. We shall always use these substitutions from now on.

We see that

$$\langle \mathcal{S} \rangle = \langle \mathcal{S} \rangle$$
.

This illustrates the invariance under a type II move. But note that

$$\left\langle \bigcirc \right\rangle = (-A^{-3})\langle \frown \rangle$$

and

$$\left\langle \bigcirc \middle\backslash \right\rangle = (-A^3) \langle \frown \!\!\!\! - \rangle.$$

This follows from substituting $B=A^{-1}$ and $d=-A^2-A^{-2}$ in Ad+B to get $-A^3$. This illustrates that the bracket polynomial is *not* invariant under a type I move. Adding a twist multiplies the bracket by a factor of $-A^3$ or $-A^{-3}$, depending upon the type of the twist. This suggests that if we multiply by a compensatory factor, then we can possibly make it invariant under a type I move as well. We shall do this later using a normalisation factor.

Type II invariance of the bracket and the substitutions ensure that the bracket polynomial is invariant under a type III move as well.

Theorem 3.

$$\left\langle \right\rangle \left\langle \right\rangle = \left\langle \right\rangle \left\langle \right\rangle.$$

4

Proof.

$$\left\langle \middle\searrow \middle\rangle = A \left\langle \middle\searrow \middle\rangle + B$$



Bibliography

- [1] Louis H. Kauffman. *Knots and physics*. 4th ed. Knots and Everything 53. Singapore: World Scientific, 2013. ISBN: 978-981-4383-00-4.
- [2] Peter R. Cromwell. Knots and links. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004. ISBN: 0-521-83947-5.
- [3] Fredric D. Ancel. "Semi-isotopic knots". In: arXiv (2021). arXiv: 2112.13940 [math.GT].
- [4] Shijie Gu. Bing sling isotopy to unknot. Answer to the question "Bing sling isotopy to unknot" (version: 2022-12-27). MathOverflow, Dec. 26, 2022. URL: https://mathoverflow.net/q/437260.
- [5] Victor Guillemin and Alan Pollack. *Differential Topology*. Engelwood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1974. ISBN: 0-13-212605-2.
- [6] Kurt Reidemeister. "Elementare Begründung der Knotentheorie". In: Abhandlungen aus dem Mathematischen Seminar der Universität Hamburg 5.1 (Dec. 1927), pp. 24– 32. ISSN: 1865-8784. DOI: 10.1007/bf02952507.
- James W. Alexander and Garland B. Briggs. "On Types of Knotted Curves".
 In: The Annals of Mathematics 28.1/4 (1926), p. 562. ISSN: 0003-486X. DOI: 10.2307/1968399.
- [8] Kunio Murasugi. Knot Theory and Its Applications. Boston, USA: Birkhauser, 1996. ISBN: 978-0-8176-4718-6.
- [9] Kenneth A. Perko. "On the classification of knots". In: Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society 45.2 (1974), pp. 262–266.
- [10] Louis H. Kauffman. "State models and the Jones polynomial". In: Topology 26.3 (1987), pp. 395–407. ISSN: 0040-9383. DOI: 10.1016/0040-9383(87)90009-7.
- [11] Louis H. Kauffman. "An invariant of regular isotopy". In: Transactions of the American Mathematical Society 318.2 (1990), pp. 417–471.
- [12] F. R. Vaughan Jones. "A polynomial invariant for knots via von Neumann algebras". In: Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society 12.1 (1985), pp. 103–111. DOI: 10.1090/s0273-0979-1985-15304-2.
- [13] William Bernard Lickorish and Kenneth Millett. "The reversing result for the Jones polynomial". In: *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* 124.1 (Sept. 1986), pp. 173–176. DOI: 10.2140/pjm.1986.124.173.
- [14] Hugh R. Morton. "The Jones polynomial for unoriented links". In: *The Quarterly Journal of Mathematics* 37.1 (1986), pp. 55–60. DOI: 10.1093/qmath/37.1.55.

- [15] H. Neville V. Temperley and Eliott H. Lieb. "Relations between the 'percolation' and 'colouring' problem and other graph-theoretical problems associated with regular planar lattices: some exact results for the 'percolation' problem". In: *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences* 322.1549 (Apr. 1971), pp. 251–280. DOI: 10.1098/rspa.1971.0067.
- [16] Wikipedia contributors. *Partition algebra*. Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. URL: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Partition_algebra.
- [17] Emil Artin. "Theorie der zöpfe". In: Abhandlungen aus dem Mathematischen Seminar der Universität Hamburg 4.1 (Oct. 1925), pp. 47–72. ISSN: 1865-8784. DOI: 10.1007/bf02950718.
- [18] Emil Artin. "Theory of braids". In: *Annals of Mathematics* 1 (1947), pp. 101–126. ISSN: 0003486X. DOI: 10.2307/1969218.
- [19] Michael Friedman. "Mathematical formalization and diagrammatic reasoning: the case study of the braid group between 1925 and 1950". In: *British Journal for the History of Mathematics* 34.1 (2019), pp. 43–59. DOI: 10.1080/17498430.2018.1533298.
- [20] Kunio Murasugi and Bohdan I. Kurpita. A study of braids. Springer Science & Business Media, 1999. ISBN: 978-0-7923-5767-4.
- [21] H. Frederic Bohnenblust. "The algebraical braid group". In: *The Annals of Mathematics* 48.1 (Jan. 1947), p. 127. ISSN: 0003-486X. DOI: 10.2307/1969219.
- [22] James W. Alexander. "A lemma on systems of knotted curves". In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 9.3 (Mar. 1923), pp. 93–95. DOI: 10.1073/pnas. 9.3.93.
- [23] Andrei A. Markov Jr. "Über die freie äquivalenz der geschlossenen zöpfe". German. In: Recueil Mathématique. Nouvelle Série 1 (1936), pp. 73-78. URL: https://www.mathnet.ru/php/archive.phtml?wshow=paper&jrnid=sm&paperid=5479&option_lang=eng.
- [24] Joan S. Birman. Braids, links, and mapping class groups. Annals of Mathematics Studies 82. Princeton University Press, 1974. ISBN: 978-14-0088142-0.
- [25] H. R. Morton. "Threading knot diagrams". In: Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society 99.2 (1986), pp. 247–260. DOI: 10.1017/S0305004100064161.