

AG
T

*Algebraic & Geometric
Topology*

Volume 23 (2023)

**Adequate links in thickened surfaces
and the generalized Tait conjectures**

HANS U BODEN
HOMAYUN KARIMI
ADAM S SIKORA



Adequate links in thickened surfaces and the generalized Tait conjectures

HANS U BODEN
HOMAYUN KARIMI
ADAM S SIKORA

We apply Kauffman bracket skein algebras to develop a theory of skein adequate links in thickened surfaces. We show that any alternating link diagram on a surface is skein adequate. We apply our theory to establish the first and second Tait conjectures for adequate links in thickened surfaces. Our notion of skein adequacy is broader and more powerful than the corresponding notions of adequacy previously considered for link diagrams in surfaces.

For a link diagram D on a surface Σ of minimal genus $g(\Sigma)$, we show that

$$\text{span}([D]_{\Sigma}) \leq 4c(D) + 4|D| - 4g(\Sigma),$$

where $[D]_{\Sigma}$ is its skein bracket, $|D|$ is the number of connected components of D , and $c(D)$ is the number of crossings. This extends a classical result of Kauffman, Murasugi and Thistlethwaite. We further show that the above inequality is an equality if and only if D is weakly alternating. This is a generalization of a well-known result for classical links due to Thistlethwaite. Thus, the skein bracket detects the crossing number for weakly alternating links. As an application, we show that the crossing number is additive under connected sum for adequate links in thickened surfaces.

[57K10](#), [57K12](#); [57K14](#), [57K31](#)

1 Introduction

The Kauffman bracket is a $\mathbb{Z}[A^{\pm 1}]$ -valued invariant of framed links in \mathbb{R}^3 determined by the skein relations

$$(1) \quad \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array} - A \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} - A^{-1} \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \bigcirc - \delta,$$

where $\delta = -A^2 - A^{-2}$.

It naturally extends to an invariant of framed links in an arbitrary oriented 3-manifold M (possibly with boundary), via the skein module construction: Let $\mathcal{L}(M)$ be the set of all unoriented, framed links in M , including the empty link \emptyset . The *skein module* $\mathcal{S}(M)$ of M is the quotient of the free $\mathbb{Z}[A^{\pm 1}]$ -module spanned by $\mathcal{L}(M)$ by the submodule generated by the Kauffman bracket skein relations (1); see Przytycki [44] and Turaev [50; 51].

By this construction, the bracket

$$[\cdot]: \mathcal{L}(M) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(M),$$

sending framed links to their equivalence classes in $\mathcal{S}(M)$, called the *skein bracket*, is the universal invariant of framed links in M satisfying (1).

Independently of this initial motivation, skein modules quickly began to play a much broader role in the development of quantum topology, for example in connection with $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ character varieties (see Bullock [12], Przytycki and Sikora [45], Frohman, Kania-Bartoszyńska and Lê [25], Turaev [51] and Bullock, Frohman and Kania-Bartoszyńska [13]), topological quantum field theory (see Blanchet, Habegger, Masbaum and Vogel [7] and Turaev [52]), (quantum) Teichmüller spaces and (quantum) cluster algebras (see Bonahon and Wong [11], Costantino [17], Fock and Goncharov [22], Fomin, Shapiro and Thurston [23] and Muller [42]), the AJ conjecture (see Frohman, Gelca and Lofaro [24] and Lê [36]), and many more.

Here we develop a general theory of skein adequacy (called *adequacy*, for short) for links in thickened surfaces with the aid of skein modules.

Let Σ be an oriented surface and $I = [0, 1]$ be the unit interval. The skein module of the thickened surface $\Sigma \times I$ comes naturally equipped with a product structure given by stacking, ie the product $L_1 \cdot L_2$ is defined by placing L_1 on top of L_2 in $\Sigma \times I$. With this product structure, the skein module $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma \times I)$ becomes an algebra over $\mathbb{Z}[A^{\pm 1}]$.

Let $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$ denote the set of all nontrivial unoriented simple loops on Σ up to isotopy and $\mathcal{MC}(\Sigma)$ denote the set of all nontrivial unoriented multiloops on Σ , ie collections of pairwise disjoint simple noncontractible loops, including \emptyset , up to isotopy. Then, by [44] (cf Sikora and Westbury [46]), the skein module $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma \times I)$ is a free $\mathbb{Z}[A^{\pm 1}]$ -module with basis $\mathcal{MC}(\Sigma)$. Consequently, via this identification, the skein bracket gives a map

$$(2) \quad [\cdot]_{\Sigma}: \mathcal{L}(\Sigma \times I) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\Sigma \times I) = \mathbb{Z}[A^{\pm 1}].\mathcal{MC}(\Sigma).$$

We use the association (2) to develop a theory of skein adequacy for links in $\Sigma \times I$ which extends that for classical links. This theory is broader and more powerful than the

corresponding notions of simple adequacy (see Lickorish and Thistlethwaite [38]) and homological adequacy (see Boden and Karimi [8]). For example, we will see that every weakly alternating link in $\Sigma \times I$ without removable nugatory crossings is skein adequate.

We will apply the skein bracket to establish the first and second Tait conjectures for skein adequate link diagrams on surfaces. The first one says that skein adequate diagrams have minimal crossing number, and the second one says that two skein adequate diagrams for the same oriented link have the same writhe. (The writhe of a link diagram D is denoted by $w(D)$ and is defined to be the sum of its crossing signs.) These results strengthen the earlier work of Adams, Fleming, Levin and Turner [3], who showed the minimal crossing number result for reduced alternating knot diagrams in surfaces. We also strengthen the minimality result of [8] for homologically adequate link diagrams in surfaces, and further show that any connected sum of two skein adequate link diagrams on surfaces is again skein adequate. This implies that the crossing number and writhe are essentially additive under connected sum of skein adequate links in thickened surfaces.

For any link diagram D on a surface Σ of minimal genus, we prove that

$$\text{span}([D]_{\Sigma}) \leq 4c(D) + 4|D| - 4g(\Sigma),$$

where $|D|$ is the number of connected components of D , $c(D)$ is the number of crossings and $g(\Sigma)$ is the genus of Σ . This inequality generalizes a result proved by Kauffman, Murasugi and Thistlethwaite for link diagrams on \mathbb{R}^2 [31; 43; 48], extending their nice geometric application of the Kauffman bracket. It also extends and strengthens an analogous recent result proved in [8] using the homological Kauffman bracket.

Additionally, we prove that the above inequality is an equality if and only if D is weakly alternating. Therefore, the skein bracket, together with the crossing number, distinguishes weakly alternating links. That generalizes the analogous result of Thistlethwaite for classical links.

Broader context and motivation

While the results presented here are new only for links in noncontractible surfaces, generalized link theory is of growing interest and has many potential connections to classical links and 3–dimensional geometry. We take a moment to discuss some of them.

One motivation for our results is their connection to the theory of virtual knots and links, which can be viewed as links in thickened surfaces, considered up to homeomorphisms

and stabilization; see Carter, Kamada and Saito [14]. By Kuperberg’s theorem [33], minimal genus realizations of virtual links are unique up to homeomorphism. Our theory of adequate and alternating links in thickened surfaces is invariant under surface homeomorphisms and, therefore, many of the results given here can be restated in the language of virtual links.

A second motivation involves potentially novel applications to classical link theory. The Turaev surface construction associates to any classical link diagram an alternating link in a thickened surface; see Turaev [49], Dasbach, Futer, Kalfagianni, Lin and Stoltzfus [18] and Champanerkar and Kofman [15]. Menasco [40] famously proved hyperbolicity for prime alternating (nontorus) links in S^3 , and his result has been extended to prime alternating links $L \subset \Sigma \times I$ by Adams, Albors-Riera, Haddock, Li, Nishida, Reinoso and Wang [1]. This result opens the door to using the hyperbolic geometry of alternating links in higher-genus surfaces to profitably study nonalternating classical links; eg see Adams, Eisenberg, Greenberg, Kapoor, Liang, O’Connor, Pacheco-Tallaj and Wang [2] and the many other papers cited below.

Dasbach and Lin [19] proved a remarkable result giving a bound on the volume of alternating link complements in terms of the second and penultimate coefficients of the Jones polynomial. Lackenby [34] established an equally remarkable bound on the volume of alternating link complements in terms of the diagrammatic *twist number*. For alternating hyperbolic links in S^3 , the results of [19] imply that the twist number is essentially an isotopy invariant of L , but this is not true in general.

These methods have been generalized to nonalternating hyperbolic links in S^3 (see Blair, Allen and Rodriguez [5; 6]) and to hyperbolic links in arbitrary compact oriented 3–manifolds by Howie and Purcell [27]. In general, there is a notion of weakly generalized alternating link diagrams on surfaces due to Howie [26], extended to links in compact oriented 3–manifolds via “generalized projection surfaces” by Howie and Purcell [27].

The volume bounds have been extended to alternating links in thickened surfaces by Bavier and Kalfagianni [4] and Will [53] and also to virtual alternating links by Champanerkar and Kofman [16]. In [16; 53], the volume bounds are expressed in terms of the Jones–Krushkal polynomial — see Krushkal [32] and Boden and Karimi [8] — and in [4] they are expressed in terms of a skein invariant derived from fully contractible smoothings. In [4, Corollary 1.3], they deduce that, for certain alternating links in thickened surfaces, the twist number is an isotopy invariant. Interestingly, this result is consistent with the generalized Tait flying conjecture.

2 State sum formula and the generalized Jones polynomial

We will assume throughout that Σ is an oriented surface with one or more connected components, which may also have boundary. Links in $\Sigma \times I$ will be represented as diagrams on Σ up to Reidemeister moves.

Every framed link in $\Sigma \times I$ can also be represented by a link diagram with framing given by the blackboard framing. Equivalence of framed links is given by regular isotopy, which includes the second and third Reidemeister moves, as well as the modified first Reidemeister move, which replaces $\text{\scriptsize \circlearrowleft}$ or $\text{\scriptsize \circlearrowright}$ with \scriptsize \sim.

Let D be a link diagram on a surface Σ . Given a crossing \times of D , we consider its A -type \scriptsize \succ and B -type \scriptsize \succ resolution, as in the Kauffman bracket construction. A choice of resolution for each crossing of D is called a *state*. Let $\mathfrak{S}(D)$ denote the set of all states of D . Thus, $|\mathfrak{S}(D)| = 2^{c(D)}$, where $c(D)$ is the crossing number of D .

For $S \in \mathfrak{S}(D)$, let $|S|$ denote the number of loops in S and $t(S)$ the number of contractible loops in S . Also let \hat{S} denote S with contractible loops removed. Hence, $\hat{S} \in \mathcal{MC}(\Sigma)$. Generalizing the usual formula for the classical Kauffman bracket, we get the following state sum formula as an immediate consequence of the definition:

$$(3) \quad [D]_{\Sigma} = \sum_{S \in \mathfrak{S}(D)} A^{a(S)-b(S)} \delta^{t(S)} \hat{S} \in \mathbb{Z}[A^{\pm 1}].\mathcal{MC}(\Sigma),$$

where $a(S)$ and $b(S)$ are the numbers of A - and B -smoothings in S and $\delta = -A^2 - A^{-2}$ as before. A similar formula appears in the paper of Dye and Kauffman on the surface bracket polynomial [21].

Any invariant of framed links in $\Sigma \times I$ satisfying (1) can be normalized to obtain a Jones-type polynomial invariant of oriented links. In the case of the skein bracket (2), one obtains the *generalized Jones polynomial*, an invariant for oriented links in $\Sigma \times I$ given by

$$(4) \quad J_{\Sigma}(D) = (-1)^{w(D)} t^{3w(D)/4} ([D]_{\Sigma})_{A=t^{-1/4}}.$$

3 Adequate link diagrams in surfaces

Given a link diagram D , let S_A be the pure A state and let S_B be the pure B state. Then S_A and S_B are the states which theoretically give rise to the terms of maximal and minimal degree in (3). The notion of adequacy of a link diagram is designed to

guarantee that the terms from S_A and S_B survive in the state sum formula. Therefore, when D is a skein adequate diagram, its skein bracket $[D]_\Sigma$ has maximal possible span.

Two states S and S' are said to be *adjacent* if their resolutions differ at exactly one crossing.

Definition 1 A link diagram D on a surface Σ is said to be *A-adequate* if $t(S) \leq t(S_A)$ or $\widehat{S} \neq \widehat{S}_A$ in $\mathcal{MC}(\Sigma)$ for any state S adjacent to S_A . It is said to be *B-adequate* if $t(S) \leq t(S_B)$ or $\widehat{S} \neq \widehat{S}_B$ for any state S adjacent to S_B . The diagram D is called *skein adequate* if it is both *A-* and *B-*adequate.

The notions of *A-* and *B-*adequacy are modeled on the notions of plus- and minus-adequacy for classical links [37]. Recall that a classical link diagram is said to be *plus-adequate* if $|S| = |S_A| - 1$ for any state S adjacent to S_A , and it is *minus-adequate* if $|S| = |S_B| - 1$ for any state S adjacent to S_B . This simpler notion of adequacy extends verbatim to link diagrams on surfaces. For link diagrams on surfaces, plus- and minus-adequacy is a special case of the notion of homological adequacy, which was introduced in [8] and will be reviewed in Section 4. We will see that adequacy as defined above is more general than simple or homological adequacy.

The following provides an alternative definition of adequacy:

Proposition 2 (1) A link diagram D on Σ is *A-adequate* if and only if $t(S) \leq t(S_A)$ or $|\widehat{S}| \neq |\widehat{S}_A|$ for any state S adjacent to S_A .
 (2) A link diagram D on Σ is *B-adequate* if and only if $t(S) \leq t(S_B)$ or $|\widehat{S}| \neq |\widehat{S}_B|$ for any state S adjacent to S_B .

Proof We begin with some general comments. Given a link diagram D and two adjacent states S and S' , the transition from S to S' is one of the following types:

- (i) $|S'| = |S| + 1$, ie one cycle of S splits into two cycles of S' .
- (ii) $|S'| = |S| - 1$, ie two cycles of S merge into one cycle of S' .
- (iii) $|S'| = |S|$, ie one cycle C of S rearranges itself into a new cycle C' of S' .¹

In cases (ii) and (iii), either $t(S') \leq t(S)$ or $\widehat{S}' \neq \widehat{S}$. Specifically, in case (ii), $t(S') > t(S)$ only when two nontrivial parallel cycles in S merge to form one trivial cycle in S' , which implies that $\widehat{S} \neq \widehat{S}'$. Likewise, in case (iii), we claim that neither C nor C' is

¹The transition $S \rightarrow S'$ in this case is called a *single cycle bifurcation*.

trivial and, consequently, $t(S') = t(S)$. To see that, note that, if S' is obtained from S by a smoothing change of a crossing x , then there are two simple closed loops $\alpha, \beta \subset \Sigma$ intersecting at x only and such that the two different smoothings of x yield C and C' . Assigning some orientations to α and β , we see that C and C' with some orientations equal $\pm(\alpha + \beta)$ and $\pm(\alpha - \beta)$ in $H_1(\Sigma)$. Since the algebraic intersection number of α and β is 1, we know that $\alpha \neq \pm\beta$ and, consequently, neither C nor C' is trivial.

Therefore, to verify that a given diagram is A - or B -adequate, it is enough to check that the conditions of Definition 1 hold in case (i).

We will now prove part (1). Suppose S is a state adjacent to S_A with $t(S) = t(S_A) + 1$. Then the transition from S_A to S must either be case (i) or (ii).

If it is case (i), then $|S| = |S_A| + 1$ and $t(S) = t(S_A) + 1$; therefore, $\widehat{S} = \widehat{S}_A$. Thus, D is not A -adequate and $|\widehat{S}| = |\widehat{S}_A|$. If it is case (ii), then $|S| = |S_A| - 1$, and two nontrivial cycles of S_A must merge into a trivial cycle of S . In this case, the conditions for A -adequacy are satisfied and $|\widehat{S}| \neq |\widehat{S}_A|$.

The proof of part (2) is similar and is left to the reader. □

For any diagram D , its bracket has a unique presentation

$$[D]_\Sigma = \sum_{\mu} p_{\mu}(D)\mu \in \mathcal{S}(\Sigma \times I),$$

where the sum is over all multiloops μ in Σ . Denote the maximal and minimal degrees (in the variable A) of the nonzero polynomials $p_{\mu}(D)$ in this expression by $d_{\max}([D]_\Sigma)$ and $d_{\min}([D]_\Sigma)$.

Proposition 3 For any link diagram D on Σ ,

- (1) $d_{\max}([D]_\Sigma) \leq c(D) + 2t(S_A)$, with equality if D is A -adequate;
- (2) $d_{\min}([D]_\Sigma) \geq -c(D) - 2t(S_B)$, with equality if D is B -adequate.

Proof (1) By (3), $[D]_\Sigma$ is given by a state sum with term $(-1)^{t(S_A)} A^{c(D)+2t(S_A)} \widehat{S}_A$ for the state S_A . Now the inequality of (1) follows from the fact that every change of a smoothing in S_A decreases $a(S) - b(S)$ by two and increases $t(S)$ by at most one.

The proof of equality in (1) when D is A -adequate follows immediately from part (1) of the lemma below.

The proof of (2) is analogous, and the proof of equality in (2) when D is B -adequate follows from part (2) of the lemma below. □

Lemma 4 (1) *If D is A -adequate and S is a state with at least one B -smoothing, then either*

$$a(S) - b(S) + 2t(S) < c(D) + 2t(S_A) \quad \text{or} \quad \widehat{S} \neq \widehat{S}_A.$$

(2) *If D is B -adequate and S is a state with at least one A -smoothing, then either*

$$a(S) - b(S) + 2t(S) > -c(D) - 2t(S_B) \quad \text{or} \quad \widehat{S} \neq \widehat{S}_B.$$

Proof We prove (1) by contradiction: Suppose to the contrary that S is a state with at least one B -smoothing such that $\widehat{S} = \widehat{S}_A$ and

$$a(S) - b(S) + 2t(S) = c(D) + 2t(S_A).$$

Clearly, S can be obtained from S_A by a sequence of smoothing changes from A to B , $S_A = S_0 \rightarrow S_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow S_k = S$. Further, each smoothing change must increase $t(\cdot)$ by one, ie $t(S_{i+1}) = t(S_i) + 1$ for $i = 0, \dots, k - 1$. Since each smoothing change increases the number of cycles in a state by at most one, none of these smoothing changes can add a new cycle to \widehat{S}_i for $i = 0, \dots, k$. Therefore, $|\widehat{S}_{i+1}| \leq |\widehat{S}_i|$ for $i = 0, \dots, k - 1$. However, since $\widehat{S} = \widehat{S}_A$, none of the smoothing changes can decrease $|\widehat{S}_i|$ either. It follows that $\widehat{S}_{i+1} = \widehat{S}_i$ for $i = 0, \dots, k - 1$. Thus, $|\widehat{S}_{i+1}| = |\widehat{S}_i|$ and

$$|S_{i+1}| = t(S_{i+1}) + |\widehat{S}_{i+1}| = t(S_i) + 1 + |\widehat{S}_i| = |S_i| + 1$$

for $i = 0, \dots, k - 1$. In particular, each transition $S_i \rightarrow S_{i+1}$ is of type (i), as discussed in the proof of [Proposition 2](#), ie one where a cycle of S_i splits into two cycles of S_{i+1} .

However, since D is A -adequate, the first smoothing change $S_A = S_0 \rightarrow S_1$ has either $t(S_1) \leq t(S_A)$ or $\widehat{S}_1 \neq \widehat{S}_A$, which is a contradiction.

This completes the proof of the first statement. The proof of the second one is similar and is left to the reader. □

The next result is an immediate consequence of [Proposition 3](#). Below, $\text{span}([D]_\Sigma)$ denotes the difference between the maximal and minimal A -degree of $[D]_\Sigma$.

Corollary 5 *If D is a link diagram on Σ , then*

$$\text{span}([D]_\Sigma) \leq 2c(D) + 2t(S_A) + 2t(S_B),$$

with equality if D is skein adequate.

The map $\Psi: \mathcal{MC}(\Sigma) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}[z]$ sending S to $z^{|S|}$ extends linearly to the skein module,

$$\Psi: \mathcal{S}(\Sigma \times I) = \mathbb{Z}[A^{\pm 1}].\mathcal{MC}(\Sigma) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}[A^{\pm 1}, z].$$

The composition $\Psi([D]_\Sigma)$ is called the *reduced homotopy Kauffman bracket*. Obviously,

$$\text{span}(\Psi([D]_\Sigma)) \leq \text{span}([D]_\Sigma),$$

where $\text{span}(\cdot)$ refers to the span in the A -degree.

Proposition 6 *If D is a skein adequate link diagram on Σ , then*

$$\text{span}(\Psi([D]_\Sigma)) = \text{span}([D]_\Sigma).$$

Proof Let S be a state with at least one B -smoothing such that $|\hat{S}| = |\hat{S}_A|$ and $a(S) - b(S) + 2t(S) = c(D) + 2t(S_A)$. As before, S can be obtained from S_A by a sequence of smoothing changes from A to B , and each smoothing change can increase $t(\cdot)$ by at most one, ie $S_A = S_0 \rightarrow S_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow S_k = S$. As in the proof of Lemma 4, we must have $t(S_{i+1}) = t(S_i) + 1$. Further, since a smoothing change can increase the number of cycles in S_i by at most one, we have $|\hat{S}_{i+1}| \leq |\hat{S}_i|$ for $i = 0, \dots, k - 1$. Now the assumption that $|\hat{S}| = |\hat{S}_A|$ then implies that $|\hat{S}_{i+1}| = |\hat{S}_i|$ for $i = 0, \dots, k - 1$. However, since D is adequate, for the first transition $S_A = S_0 \rightarrow S_1$, either $t(S_1) \neq t(S_0) + 1$ or $\hat{S}_1 \neq \hat{S}_0$. But $t(S_1) = t(S_0) + 1$ and $|\hat{S}_1| = |\hat{S}_0|$ imply that $\hat{S}_1 = \hat{S}_0$, which gives a contradiction.

Therefore, the term with maximum A -degree in $\Psi([D]_\Sigma)$ must survive. A similar argument applies to show that the term with minimum A -degree survives. It follows that

$$\text{span}(\Psi([D]_\Sigma)) = 2c(D) + 2t(S_A) + 2t(S_B) = \text{span}([D]_\Sigma). \quad \square$$

The next proposition shows that skein adequacy is inherited under passing to subsurfaces $\Sigma' \subset \Sigma$.

Proposition 7 *If a link diagram D on a subsurface Σ' of Σ is A - or B -adequate in Σ , then it is A - or B -adequate, respectively, in Σ' .*

Proof In the following, let $t(S, \Sigma)$ be the value of $t(S)$ when S is regarded as a state in Σ , and let $t(S, \Sigma')$ be its value when S is regarded as a state in Σ' .

Suppose D is not A -adequate in Σ' . By Proposition 2, there exists a state S adjacent to S_A with $t(S, \Sigma') = t(S_A, \Sigma') + 1$ and $|\hat{S}| = |\hat{S}_A|$ in Σ' . In particular, $|S| = |S_A| + 1$, and the transition from S_A to S must involve one cycle C of S_A splitting into two cycles C_1 and C_2 of S . At least one of C_1 and C_2 must be trivial in Σ' , for otherwise $t(S, \Sigma') \leq t(S_A, \Sigma')$. If, say, C_1 is trivial in Σ' , then it must also be trivial in Σ , because $\Sigma' \subset \Sigma$ is a subsurface.

As a cycle in Σ , C is either trivial or nontrivial. If it is trivial, then C_2 must also be trivial in Σ , and so in fact all three of C , C_1 and C_2 are trivial. This implies that $t(S, \Sigma) = t(S_A, \Sigma) + 1$ and $|\widehat{S}| = |\widehat{S}_A|$ in Σ , contradicting the assumption of A -adequacy of D .

If, on the other hand, C is nontrivial in Σ , then C_2 must also be nontrivial in Σ . This again implies that $t(S, \Sigma) = t(S_A, \Sigma) + 1$ and $|\widehat{S}| = |\widehat{S}_A|$ in Σ , leading to the same contradiction. Therefore, D must be A -adequate on Σ' .

The proof of B -adequacy of D is identical. □

4 Skein and homological adequacy

For completeness of discussion, in this section we compare Definition 1 of skein adequacy to two legacy versions, namely simple and homological adequacy. We will see that our notion of adequacy is broader and that the statements of Lemma 4 and Corollary 5 are strictly stronger than the corresponding statements for simple and homological adequacy. Henceforth, we will say a link diagram on a surface is adequate if it is skein adequate.

For any state $S \subset \Sigma$, let us denote the ranks of the kernel and the image of

$$i_* : H_1(S; \mathbb{Z}/2) \rightarrow H_1(\Sigma; \mathbb{Z}/2),$$

by $k(S)$ and $r(S)$, respectively.

The homological Kauffman bracket,

$$\langle D \rangle_\Sigma = \sum_{S \in \mathfrak{S}(D)} A^{a(S)-b(S)} \delta^{k(S)} z^{r(S)},$$

was introduced by Krushkal [32] and studied in [8].

Based on this invariant, Boden and Karimi [8] introduced the notion of homological adequacy for link diagrams in surfaces. A diagram D on Σ is homologically A -adequate if $k(S) \leq k(S_A)$ for any state S adjacent to S_A , and it is homologically B -adequate if $k(S) \leq k(S_B)$ for any state S adjacent to S_B . A diagram D is homologically adequate if it is both homologically A - and B -adequate.

It is not difficult to show that a diagram that is plus-adequate is homologically A -adequate, and one that is minus-adequate is homologically B -adequate. (For further details, see [8, Section 2.2].)




Figure 1: An alternating diagram on the torus.

Proposition 8 *Every homologically A -adequate link diagram is A -adequate and every homologically B -adequate link diagram is B -adequate.*

Proof Recall from the discussion at the beginning of the proof of Proposition 2 that there are the three possible cases and, to verify that a given diagram is A - or B -adequate, it is enough to check that the conditions of Definition 1 hold in case (i). Hence, it is enough to focus on states S adjacent to S_A or S_B with $|S| = |S_A| + 1$ or $|S| = |S_B| + 1$, respectively.

If D is not A -adequate, then there exists a state S adjacent to S_A with $|S| = |S_A| + 1$, $t(S) = t(S_A) + 1$ and $\widehat{S} = \widehat{S}_A$. (Notice that if $|S| = |S_A| + 1$ and $t(S) = t(S_A) + 1$, then $\widehat{S} = \widehat{S}_A$ automatically holds.) In this case, we have $k(S) = k(S_A) + 1$, and it follows that D is not homologically A -adequate. This proves the first statement in the proposition, and the proof of the second statement on B -adequacy is similar. \square

In summary, then, for a link diagram D on a surface Σ , it follows that

$$(5) \quad \text{plus-adequacy} \implies \text{homological } A\text{-adequacy} \implies A\text{-adequacy},$$

with similar statements relating minus-adequacy, homological B -adequacy, and B -adequacy.

In Example 20, we will see a knot diagram in a genus two surface which is adequate but not homologically adequate. On the other hand, it is easy to construct examples which are homologically adequate but not simply adequate. For instance, consider the alternating diagram D with three crossings on the torus in Figure 1. A straightforward calculation shows that it is homologically adequate but not simply adequate. These examples show that none of the reverse implications in (5) hold; therefore, the notion of adequacy in Definition 1 is strictly more general than either homological or simple adequacy.

In general, notice that

$$\text{span}(\langle D \rangle_\Sigma) \leq \text{span}([D]_\Sigma) \leq 2c(D) + 2t(S_A) + 2t(S_B) \leq 2c(D) + 2k(S_A) + 2k(S_B),$$

where $\text{span}(\cdot)$ is the span in the A -degree. Therefore, [Corollary 5](#) immediately implies an analogous inequality holds for homological adequacy; see [\[8, Corollary 2.7\]](#).

5 Alternating links and the Tait conjectures

When tabulating knots, Tait formulated three conjectures on alternating links. The first one states that any reduced alternating diagram of a classical link has minimal crossing number. The second one asserts that any two such diagrams representing the same link have the same writhe. The third one states that any two reduced alternating diagrams of the same link are related by flype moves. The first two conjectures were resolved almost 100 years later, independently by Kauffman [\[31\]](#), Murasugi [\[43\]](#) and Thistlethwaite [\[48\]](#), using the newly discovered Jones polynomial. The third conjecture was established shortly after by Menasco and Thistlethwaite [\[41\]](#). The first two Tait conjectures actually hold more generally for adequate links [\[38\]](#), and their proofs have been generalized to homologically adequate links in thickened surfaces in [\[8\]](#). Here, we generalize these results even further to adequate links in thickened surfaces.

Henceforth, all links in thickened surfaces will be unframed, unless stated otherwise. Given an oriented link diagram D , let $c_+(D)$ be the numbers of crossings of type \times_{\nearrow} , and let $c_-(D)$ be the number of crossings of type \times_{\searrow} . The proof of the following theorem can be found in [Section 7.1](#):

Theorem 9 *Let D and E be oriented link diagrams on Σ representing the same oriented unframed link in $\Sigma \times I$.*

- (i) *If D is A -adequate, then $c_-(D) \leq c_-(E)$.*
- (ii) *If D is B -adequate, then $c_+(D) \leq c_+(E)$.*

The *crossing number* $c(L)$ of a link $L \subset \Sigma \times I$ is defined as the minimal crossing number among all diagram representatives of L . A link $L \subset \Sigma \times I$ is said to be *adequate* if it admits an adequate diagram on Σ .

Using [Theorem 9](#), one can deduce the first and second Tait conjectures for adequate links in surfaces.

- Corollary 10** (i) Any adequate diagram of a link in $\Sigma \times I$ has $c(L)$ crossings.
- (ii) Any two adequate diagrams of the same oriented link in $\Sigma \times I$ have the same writhe.

Proof Statements (i) and (ii) are immediate consequences of [Theorem 9](#). In the case of (ii), if adequate diagrams D and E represent the same oriented link, then $c_+(D) = c_+(E)$ and $c_-(D) = c_-(E)$ by the above theorem and, hence,

$$w(D) = c_+(D) - c_-(D) = c_+(E) - c_-(E) = w(E). \quad \square$$

[Corollary 10](#) implies that for an adequate link $L \subset \Sigma \times I$, the writhe is a well-defined invariant of its oriented link type.

Let $g(\Sigma)$ be the sum of the genera of the connected components of Σ . A link diagram D on Σ is *minimally embedded* if it does not lie on a subsurface of Σ of smaller genus. In other words, the complement of D on Σ has no nonseparating loops. Let N_D be a neighborhood of D in Σ small enough that it is a ribbon surface retractable onto D . A diagram D is minimally embedded if and only if $g(N_D) = g(\Sigma)$.

Furthermore, note that, if D is connected and Σ is closed, then D is minimally embedded if and only if $\Sigma \setminus D$ is composed of disks. In that case, we say that D is *cellularly embedded*.

A link diagram D on a closed surface Σ is said to have *minimal genus* if it is minimally embedded within its isotopy class.

In [\[39\]](#), it is proved that any cellularly embedded knot diagram with minimal crossing number has minimal genus. This result was recently extended to link diagrams, and the following is a restatement of [\[10, Theorem 1\]](#):

Theorem 11 Any cellularly embedded link diagram with minimal crossing number has minimal genus.

A link diagram D on Σ is *alternating* if, when traveling along any of its components, its crossings alternate between over and under. A link $L \subset \Sigma \times I$ is *alternating* if it can be represented by an alternating link diagram.

A crossing x of D is *nugatory* if there is a simple loop in Σ which separates Σ and intersects D only at x .




Figure 2: An essential nugatory crossing.

As observed in [8], although nugatory crossings in diagrams in $\Sigma = \mathbb{R}^2$ can always be removed by rotating one side of the diagram 180° relative to the other, this is not always true for diagrams in noncontractible surfaces Σ ; see Figure 2. A nugatory crossing is said to be *removable* if the simple loop can be chosen to bound a disk, otherwise it is called *essential*. A link diagram is *reduced* if it does not contain any removable nugatory crossings. For example, the knot in Figure 6 contains an essential nugatory crossing.

The following strengthens [8, Proposition 2.8]. Its proof is given in Section 7.2.

Theorem 12 *Any reduced alternating diagram is adequate.*

Note that, unlike [8, Proposition 2.8], we do not assume here that D is cellularly embedded or checkerboard colorable, nor that D has no nugatory crossings.

A link diagram on Σ is called *weakly alternating* if it is a connected sum $D_0 \# D_1 \# \dots \# D_k$ of an alternating diagram D_0 in Σ and alternating diagrams D_1, \dots, D_k in S^2 (see Lemma 16). Theorem 12 can be generalized to show that weakly alternating diagrams are adequate. In fact, in the next section we will prove Proposition 17, showing that any diagram on a surface obtained as the connected sum of two adequate link diagrams is itself adequate.

Let us return to Tait conjectures now. By Corollary 10, any reduced alternating diagram D has the minimal crossing number for all diagrams representing the same unframed link L in $\Sigma \times I$. Furthermore, all such oriented diagrams representing the same link L have the same writhe.

The results of Kauffman, Murasugi and Thistlethwaite [31; 43; 48] imply that the span of the Kauffman bracket of any diagram $D \subset S^2$ satisfies

$$\text{span}([D]_{S^2}) \leq 4c(D) + 4,$$




Figure 3: Two knots in a genus two surface with the same homological Kauffman bracket.

or, equivalently, for the Jones polynomial, that $\text{span}(V_D(t)) \leq c(D)$, with equality if D is alternating. Furthermore, in [48], Thistlethwaite proved that, if $D \subset S^2$ is prime and nonalternating, then

$$\text{span}([D]_{S^2}) < 4c(D) + 4.$$

In [49], it is observed that the above results hold if $D \subset S^2$ is weakly alternating, namely if D is a connected sum of alternating diagrams. Thus, the Kauffman bracket $[D]_{S^2}$, together with $c(D)$, detects weakly alternating classical links.

The homological Kauffman bracket of [8] is not sufficiently strong to prove an analogous statement for links in thickened surfaces. Consider the two knots in the genus two surface in Figure 3. These knots have the same homological Kauffman bracket, namely

$$\langle D_1 \rangle_\Sigma = \langle D_2 \rangle_\Sigma = 3\delta z^2 - 4\delta^2 z + (A^4 + 3 + A^{-4})\delta,$$

but one of them is alternating and the other is not. Consequently, the homological Kauffman bracket does not detect alternating knots in thickened surfaces.

However, we are going to show that the Kauffman, Murasugi and Thistlethwaite statements hold for the Kauffman bracket $[\cdot]_\Sigma$ of diagrams in closed surfaces Σ after replacing 4 by $4|D| - 4g(\Sigma)$ on the right.

Let $|D|$ denote the number of connected components of D (which may be smaller than the number of connected components of the link in $\Sigma \times I$ represented by D).

Let $r(D)$ be the rank of the image of $i_*: H_1(D; \mathbb{Z}/2) \rightarrow H_1(\Sigma; \mathbb{Z}/2)$. If $D \subset \Sigma$ is minimally embedded, then i_* is surjective and $r(D) = 2g$.

The proof of the next result is given in Section 7.4.




Figure 4: Minimally embedded alternating diagram for which the equality of [Theorem 13\(ii\)](#) does not hold.

Theorem 13 (i) For any link diagram $D \subset \Sigma$,

$$\text{span}([D]_{\Sigma}) \leq 4c(D) + 4|D| - 2r(D).$$

(ii) If D is cellularly embedded, reduced, and weakly alternating, then

$$\text{span}([D]_{\Sigma}) = 4c(D) + 4|D| - 4g(\Sigma).$$

(iii) If D is not weakly alternating then

$$\text{span}([D]_{\Sigma}) < 4c(D) + 4|D| - 2r(D).$$

The assumptions of [Theorem 13\(ii\)](#) are necessary:

If D has a removable nugatory crossing, then eliminating it decreases the right-hand side of the above equality but not the left-hand side. Therefore, (ii) does not hold for diagrams with removable crossings.

It can also fail when D is not cellularly embedded. For example, consider the alternating link in [Figure 4](#). It has $t(S_A) = 4$ and $t(S_B) = 2$. Therefore, by [Corollary 5](#), we have $\text{span}([D]_{\Sigma}) \leq 16 + 12 = 28$, whereas $4c(D) + 4|D| - 4g(\Sigma) = 32$. Note that this diagram is minimally embedded but not cellularly embedded.

Although (ii) holds for weakly alternating diagrams, in the next section we will see that it does not hold generally for connected sums of alternating diagrams in arbitrary surfaces (see [Example 19](#)).

Corollary 14 Let L be a link in $\Sigma \times I$ with a reduced, weakly alternating diagram D which is cellularly embedded. Then any other cellularly embedded diagram E for L satisfies $c(D) \leq c(E)$. If E is not weakly alternating, then $c(D) < c(E)$.

Proof The first part is a direct consequence of Tait conjecture, [Corollary 10](#). Let us prove the full statement now: Any cellularly embedded link diagram on a connected

surface is itself connected. Therefore, it is enough to prove the statement under the assumption that Σ and D are both connected. [Theorem 13\(ii\)](#) then implies that $c(D) = \frac{1}{4} \text{span}([D]_{\Sigma}) + g(\Sigma) - 1$. If E is a second link diagram for L on Σ , then, since E is cellularly embedded, it must also be connected. [Theorem 13\(i\)](#) implies that

$$c(D) = \frac{1}{4} \text{span}([D]_{\Sigma}) + g(\Sigma) - 1 = \frac{1}{4} \text{span}([E]_{\Sigma}) + g(\Sigma) - 1 \leq c(E).$$

If E is not weakly alternating, then [Theorem 13\(iii\)](#) shows the last inequality is strict; therefore, it follows that $c(D) < c(E)$. □

Remark 15 The corollary gives an alternative proof of [Theorem 11](#) for nonsplit alternating links as follows. Let L be a nonsplit alternating link in $\Sigma \times I$, where Σ is closed oriented surface, and let $D \subset \Sigma$ a minimal crossing cellularly embedded diagram for L . Then [Corollary 14](#) implies that D is an alternating diagram. The argument is completed by appealing to [[9](#), Proposition 6], which shows that alternating link diagrams have minimal genus.

6 Crossing number and connected sums

In this section, we will study the behavior of the crossing number under connected sum of links in thickened surfaces. This problem is closely related to an old and famous conjecture for classical links, which asserts that, for any two links L_1 and L_2 ,

$$(6) \quad c(L_1 \# L_2) = c(L_1) + c(L_2).$$

This conjecture has been verified for a wide class of links, including alternating links, adequate links, and torus links [[20](#)]. Clearly, $c(L_1 \# L_2) \leq c(L_1) + c(L_2)$. In addition, in [[35](#)], Lackenby has proved that, in general, one has a lower bound of the form

$$c(L_1 \# L_2) \geq \frac{1}{152}(c(L_1) + c(L_2)).$$

The operation of connected sum is not so well behaved for arbitrary links in thickened surfaces.

Just as for classical links, it depends on the choice of components which are joined as well as their orientations. However, unless one of the links is in $S^2 \times I$, it also depends on the diagram representatives as well as the choice of basepoints $x_i \in D_i$ where the link components are joined. The issue is the fact that a Reidemeister move applied to either of the link diagrams may change the link type of their connected sum. We take a moment to quickly review its construction.

Suppose Σ_1 and Σ_2 are oriented surfaces and let $\Sigma_1 \# \Sigma_2$ denote their connected sum. It is obtained from the union $(\Sigma_1 \setminus \text{int } B_1) \cup (\Sigma_2 \setminus \text{int } B_2)$ by gluing $\partial B_1 \subset \Sigma_1$ to $\partial B_2 \subset \Sigma_2$ by an orientation-reversing homeomorphism $g: \partial B_1 \rightarrow \partial B_2$. For connected surfaces, $\Sigma_1 \# \Sigma_2$ is independent of the choice of disks $B_i \subset \Sigma_i$ and gluing map.

If $D_1 \subset \Sigma_1$ and $D_2 \subset \Sigma_2$ are link diagrams, we can choose cutting points $x_i \in D_i$ and disk neighborhoods B_i from Σ_i such that $B_i \cap D_i$ is an interval for $i = 1, 2$. Then the surface $\Sigma_1 \# \Sigma_2$ can be formed in such a way that $D = (D_1 \setminus \text{int } B_1) \cup (D_2 \setminus \text{int } B_2)$ is a link diagram in $\Sigma_1 \# \Sigma_2$. If D_1 and D_2 are oriented link diagrams, then we require the gluing to respect the orientations of the arcs. The resulting diagram is called a *connected sum* of D_1 and D_2 . In general, it depends on the choice of link diagrams D_1 and D_2 , components being joined, and points $x_i \in D_i$. However, it is independent of the choice of disk neighborhoods B_i containing x_i .

The next result shows that, when one of the diagrams lies in $S^2 \times I$, the operation of connected sum is well behaved.

Lemma 16 *Let $D_1 \subset \Sigma \times I$ and $D_2 \subset S^2 \times I$ be oriented diagrams, where Σ is an arbitrary surface. Then the connected sum of D_1 and D_2 is independent of the choice of the cutting points x_1 and x_2 on the selected components of D_1 and of D_2 .*

We will denote the connected sum in this case by $D_1 \# D_2$. The oriented link type of $D_1 \# D_2$ depends only on the link types of D_1 and D_2 and a choice of which components are joined.

Proof One can shrink the image of D_2 in the connected sum so that all its crossings lie in a small 3–ball B^3 in $\Sigma \times I$. By an isotopy, we can move the ball along arcs of D_1 representing the component to which D_1 is joined, and moving over or under the other arcs at any crossing that we encounter.

This shows that the connected sum is independent of the choice of the cut point x_1 on D_1 . The independence on the cut point x_2 on D_2 follows from the well-known fact that all long knots—or rather $(1, 1)$ tangles—obtained by cutting D_2 at different points x_2 of its specified component are isotopic (as $(1, 1)$ tangles). Shrinking D_2 into a small 3–ball also allows one to translate any Reidemeister move of D_1 or D_2 into a Reidemeister move on the connected sum $D_1 \# D_2$. This proves the last statement. \square

Proposition 17 *Any connected sum of two A – or B –adequate diagrams is itself A – or B –adequate, respectively.*

Proof Let D be a link diagram in $\Sigma_1 \# \Sigma_2$ obtained as the connected sum of A -adequate diagrams $D_1 \subset \Sigma_1$ and $D_2 \subset \Sigma_2$, and suppose to the contrary that D is not A -adequate. By Proposition 2, there is a state S for D adjacent to S_A with $t(S, \Sigma_1 \# \Sigma_2) = t(S_A, \Sigma_1 \# \Sigma_2) + 1$ and $|\hat{S}| = |\hat{S}_A|$ in $\Sigma_1 \# \Sigma_2$. In particular, $|S| = |S_A| + 1$, and the transition from S_A to S involves one cycle of S_A splitting into two cycles.

Let x be the crossing of D where the smoothing is changed in the transition from S_A to S . We can assume, without loss of generality, that x is a crossing from D_1 . Let C be the cycle of S_A that splits into two cycles, C' and C'' , under this transition. Since $t(S, \Sigma_1 \# \Sigma_2) = t(S_A, \Sigma_1 \# \Sigma_2) + 1$, one of the cycles C' and C'' , say C' , must be trivial.

If C is a cycle contained in $S_A(D_1)$, then the same is true for C' and C'' . However, this contradicts the assumption that D_1 is A -adequate.

Otherwise, $C = C_1 \# C_2$ must be a connected sum of a cycle C_1 in $S_A(D_1)$ with a cycle C_2 in $S_A(D_2)$. In the transition from S_A to S , by the previous argument, we may assume the cycle $C_1 \# C_2$ splits into $C'_1 \# C_2$ and C''_1 . Further, since $C' = C'_1 \# C_2$ is trivial, it follows that C'_1 must be trivial in Σ_1 and C_2 must be trivial in Σ_2 .

If $C_1 \# C_2$ is trivial, then $C''_1 \# C_2$ must also be trivial. That would imply that all three of C_1 , C'_1 and C''_1 are trivial in Σ_1 . This again contradicts the assumption that D_1 is A -adequate, and we take a moment to explain this point.

Let $S(D_1)$ be the corresponding state for D_1 . It is obtained from $S_A(D_1)$ by switching the smoothing at x . The transition from $S_A(D_1)$ to $S(D_1)$ involves C_1 splitting into C'_1 and C''_1 . Since all three of C_1 , C'_1 and C''_1 are trivial in Σ_1 , we have $t(S(D_1)) = t(S_A(D_1)) + 1$ and $|\hat{S}(D_1)| = |\hat{S}_A(D_1)|$ in Σ_1 , which contradicts the assumption of A -adequacy of D_1 .

The other possibility is that $C_1 \# C_2$ is nontrivial. Since C_2 is trivial in Σ_2 , the cycles C_1 and C''_1 must both be nontrivial in Σ_1 . The transition from $S_A(D_1)$ to $S(D_1)$ still involves C_1 splitting into C'_1 and C''_1 , only now C_1 and C''_1 are nontrivial and C'_1 is trivial in Σ_1 . Thus, $t(S(D_1)) = t(S_A(D_1)) + 1$ and $|\hat{S}(D_1)| = |\hat{S}_A(D_1)|$ in Σ_1 , which again contradicts the assumption of A -adequacy of D_1 . Therefore, $D = D_1 \# D_2$ must be A -adequate.

The proof of B -adequacy of D is similar. □




Figure 5: A connected sum of alternating diagrams.

Corollary 18 Suppose $L_1 \subset \Sigma_1 \times I$ and $L_2 \subset \Sigma_2 \times I$ are links represented by adequate diagrams $D_1 \subset \Sigma_1$ and $D_2 \subset \Sigma_2$. Then any link L in $(\Sigma_1 \# \Sigma_2) \times I$ admitting a diagram which is a connected sum of D_1 and D_2 is itself adequate. Further, the crossing number and writhe satisfy $c(L) = c(L_1) + c(L_2)$ and $w(L) = w(L_1) + w(L_2)$.

Proof Suppose L is represented by $D = D_1 \# D_2 \subset \Sigma_1 \# \Sigma_2$. Then D is adequate by Proposition 17. Further, by parts (i) and (ii) of Corollary 10, we see that

$$c(L) = c(D) = c(D_1) + c(D_2) = c(L_1) + c(L_2),$$

$$w(L) = w(D) = w(D_1) + w(D_2) = w(L_1) + w(L_2). \quad \square$$

Example 19 Figure 5 shows a knot diagram D in the genus two surface obtained as the connected sum of two alternating diagrams of the same knot in the torus. One can easily verify that D is reduced and cellularly embedded, but not alternating. Further, Proposition 17 implies that this diagram is adequate, and therefore a minimal crossing diagram for the knot type. Direct calculation reveals that $t(S_A) = 2$, $t(S_B) = 0$ and $|\hat{S}_A| = |\hat{S}_B| = 1$. Therefore, $\text{span}([D]_\Sigma) = 16$. On the other hand, since $4(c(D) + |D| - g(\Sigma)) = 20$, by Theorem 13(ii), it follows that D is not weakly alternating and, in fact, not equivalent to any weakly alternating knot in $\Sigma \times I$.

Example 20 Figure 6 shows a knot in a genus two surface with an essential nugatory crossing. Since it is reduced and alternating, Theorem 12 shows that it is adequate.




Figure 6: An alternating diagram with an essential nugatory crossing.




Figure 7: Adding twists to a connected sum to create essential nugatory crossings.

Note that this diagram is not homologically adequate. In fact, if S is the state with a B -smoothing at the nugatory crossing and A -smoothings at all the other crossings, then one can show that $|S| = |S_A| + 1$ and $k(S) > k(S_A)$.

Notice that this knot can also be obtained as the connected sum of two alternating knots K_1 and K_2 in $T^2 \times I$ with $c(K_i) = 3$, but after performing a Reidemeister one move on one of them to obtain a diagram with four crossings. In particular, this example shows that a connected sum of two diagrams $D_1 \subset \Sigma_1$ and $D_2 \subset \Sigma_2$ can be adequate even when one of them is not adequate.

Suppose $L_1 \subset \Sigma_1 \times I$ and $L_2 \subset \Sigma_2 \times I$ are two alternating links in thickened surfaces with $g(\Sigma_i) > 0$ for $i = 1, 2$. Suppose further that D_i is a link diagram on Σ_i representing L_i for $i = 1, 2$, and that D_1 and D_2 are both reduced and alternating.

Instead of forming the connected sum of D_1 and D_2 , take one of the diagrams and insert an arbitrary number (say n) of twists before forming the connected sum. See Figure 7.

The result will be a diagram D which is similar to a connected sum of D_1 and D_2 , but with n essential nugatory crossings in between. This construction can be carried out so that D is reduced and alternating. In particular, it will have crossing number $c(D) = c(D_1) + c(D_2) + n$. If L denotes the link type of D , and since D_1 and D_2 are alternating and have minimal crossing number, this shows that the analogue of (6) can fail arbitrarily badly for links in thickened surfaces other than $S^2 \times I$.

The reason (6) fails in general for connected sums of links in thickened surfaces is due to the use of nonminimal diagrams in forming the connected sum. However, if one restricts the connected sum operation to minimal crossing diagrams, then one gets a plausible generalization:

Conjecture 21 *Suppose $L_1 \subset \Sigma_1 \times I$ and $L_2 \subset \Sigma_2 \times I$ are links in thickened surfaces with minimal crossing representatives D_1 and D_2 , respectively. Then any link L in the thickening of $\Sigma_1 \# \Sigma_2$ arising as a connected sum of D_1 and D_2 satisfies*

$$c(L) = c(L_1) + c(L_2).$$

Note that the assumption that D_1 and D_2 are minimal crossing representatives implies immediately that

$$c(L) \leq c(L_1) + c(L_2).$$

In fact, the inequality may fail without that assumption. This is related to the fact that crossing number is not additive under connected sum for virtual knots. For example, the Kishino knot is the connected sum of two virtual unknots. As evidence, notice that [Corollary 18](#) confirms that the conjecture is true if L_1 and L_2 are adequate links in thickened surfaces. In particular, it holds for alternating and weakly alternating links.

7 Proofs of Theorems 9, 12 and 13

7.1 Proof of Theorem 9

Given a link diagram D on Σ and positive integer r , the r^{th} parallel of D is the link diagram D^r on Σ in which each link component of D is replaced by r parallel copies, with each one repeating the same “over” and “under” behavior of the original component.

Lemma 22 *If D is A -adequate, then D^r is also A -adequate. If D is B -adequate, then D^r is also B -adequate.*

Proof Let $S_A(D)$ and $S_A(D^r)$ be the pure A -smoothings of D and the pure A -smoothings of D^r , respectively. It is straightforward to check that $S_A(D^r)$ is the r -parallel of $S_A(D)$.

Suppose D^r is not A -adequate. Then there is a state S' obtained by switching one A -smoothing in $S_A(D^r)$ to a B -smoothing such that $t(S_A(D^r)) < t(S')$ and $\widehat{S}_A(D^r) = \widehat{S}'$. In the terminology of the proof of [Proposition 2](#), that can only happen for a smoothing change of type (i), more specifically when the smoothing change involves one of the innermost cycles in $S_A(D^r)$ which is self-abutting and which, when split, creates a new trivial cycle in S' . That is only possible if there is a self-abutting cycle in $S_A(D)$ which, when split, creates a new trivial cycle. Since D is A -adequate, this cannot happen.

An analogous argument proves the statement for B -adequate diagrams. □

Proof of Theorem 9 (i) Since

$$c(D) - w(D) = c_+(D) + c_-(D) - (c_+(D) - c_-(D)) = 2c_-(D),$$

we will prove that

$$c(D) - w(D) \leq c(E) - w(E).$$

Our argument is an adaptation of Stong’s proof [47] (see also [37, Theorem 5.13]).

Let L_1, \dots, L_m be the components of L and let D_i and E_i be the subdiagrams of D and E corresponding to L_i . For each $i = 1, \dots, m$, choose nonnegative integers μ_i and ν_i such that $w(D_i) + \mu_i = w(E_i) + \nu_i$. Let D' be composed of components D'_1, \dots, D'_m , where each D'_i is obtained from D_i by adding μ_i positive kinks to it. (These kinks do not cross with other components). Similarly, let E' be composed of components E'_1, \dots, E'_m , where each E'_i is obtained from E_i by adding ν_i positive kinks to it. Notice that D' is still A -adequate.

The writhes of the individual components satisfy

$$w(D'_i) = w(D_i) + \mu_i = w(E_i) + \nu_i = w(E'_i).$$

Further, the sum of the signs of the crossings of $D'_i \cap D'_j$ coincides with the sum of the signs of the crossings of $E'_i \cap E'_j$, since both are equal to the linking number of L_i and L_j . Thus, $w(D') = w(E')$.

For any r , consider the r^{th} parallels $(D')^r$ and $(E')^r$ now. Then $w((D')^r) = r^2 w(D')$, because each crossing of D' corresponds to r^2 crossings in $(D')^r$ of the same sign. The diagrams $(D')^r$ and $(E')^r$ are equivalent and have the same writhe; thus, their Kauffman brackets must be equal. In particular, we have $d_{\max}([(D')^r]_{\Sigma}) = d_{\max}([(E')^r]_{\Sigma})$.

Proposition 3 implies now that

$$d_{\max}([(D')^r]_{\Sigma}) = \left(c(D) + \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i \right) r^2 + 2 \left(t(S_A(D)) + \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i \right) r,$$

$$d_{\max}([(E')^r]_{\Sigma}) \leq \left(c(E) + \sum_{i=1}^m \nu_i \right) r^2 + 2 \left(t(S_A(E)) + \sum_{i=1}^m \nu_i \right) r.$$

Since this is true for all r , by comparing coefficients of the r^2 terms, we find that

$$(7) \quad c(D) + \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i \leq c(E) + \sum_{i=1}^m \nu_i.$$

Subtracting $\sum_{i=1}^m (\mu_i + w(D_i)) = \sum_{i=1}^m (\nu_i + w(E_i))$ from both sides of (7), we get that

$$(8) \quad c(D) - \sum_{i=1}^m w(D_i) \leq c(E) - \sum_{i=1}^m w(E_i).$$

Subtracting the total linking number of L from both sides of (8) gives the desired inequality.

The proof of (ii) is analogous. One adds negative kinks to D and E in this case. \square




Figure 8: A knot diagram in the torus which is not alternable.

7.2 Proof of Theorem 12

A link diagram D on Σ is *alternable* if it can be made alternating by inverting some of its crossings. Every classical link diagram is alternable, but the same is not true for link diagrams in arbitrary surfaces. For example, the knot diagram in the torus in Figure 8 is not alternable.

A link diagram D on Σ is *checkerboard colorable* if the components of $\Sigma \setminus D$ can be colored by two colors such that any two components of $\Sigma \setminus D$ that share an edge have opposite colors.

Proposition 23 *Any minimal embedding D on Σ is alternable if and only if it is checkerboard colorable.*

Proof Observe that filling the boundaries of Σ with disks does not affect alternability or checkerboard colorability. Likewise, removing disks from $\Sigma \setminus D$ also does not affect alternability or checkerboard colorability. This has two consequences:

- It is enough to prove this statement for surfaces Σ with all boundary components capped, ie for closed surfaces.
- Since Kamada proved that, if a diagram D is a deformation retract of Σ , then it is alternable if and only if it is checkerboard colorable [28, Lemma 7], our statement holds for cellularly embedded diagrams.

Our strategy is to reduce the proof to this case of cellular embeddings. Suppose that C is a nondisk component of $\Sigma \setminus D$. Then it contains a noncontractible simple closed loop α . Let Σ' be obtained by cutting Σ along α and by capping the boundary components. The loop α must be separating Σ , since otherwise $D \hookrightarrow \Sigma'$ would be a lower-genus embedding of D . Observe now that, since Σ is a connected sum of two surfaces $\Sigma_1 \# \Sigma_2$,

where $\Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_2 = \Sigma'$ and D is a disjoint union of $D \cap \Sigma_1$ and of $D \cap \Sigma_2$, it is enough to prove that $D \subset \Sigma_i$ is checkerboard colored for $i = 1, 2$.

By repeating this process as long as possible, we reduce the statement to cellularly embedded diagrams, which is covered by (b) above. □

Lemma 24 *Any alternable diagram can be extended by disjoint simple closed loops to a checkerboard colorable one.*

Proof The surface $N_D \subset \Sigma$, being a regular neighborhood of D , is checkerboard colorable by the earlier mentioned result of Kamada [28, Lemma 7]. The only reason that coloring does not extend to $D \subset \Sigma$ is that some connected components C of $\Sigma \setminus \text{int } N_D$ may have multiple connected components of their boundary whose neighborhoods are colored differently. However, that issue can be resolved by adding simple closed loops around those boundary components of C which are white. □

Proof of Theorem 12 Let D be alternating diagram without removable crossings. By Lemma 24, by adding disjoint simple closed loops to D , we obtain a diagram D' which is alternating and checkerboard colorable. Hence, it is enough to prove that D' is adequate. Let us assume for simplicity of notation that D is checkerboard colorable.

We will prove the A -adequacy of D only, as the proof of B -adequacy is identical. Let S be a state with all A -smoothings except for a B -smoothing at a crossing x of D . We will prove that D is A -adequate “at x ”, meaning that $t(S) \leq t(S_A)$ or $\hat{S} \neq \hat{S}_A$ in $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma \times I)$.

As in the proof of Proposition 2, there are three cases and, to check adequacy, it is enough to check that the conditions of Definition 1 hold in the first case, namely when $|S| = |S_A| + 1$. Therefore, S_A must contain a self-abutting cycle C and, in the transition from S_A to S , the cycle C splits into two cycles C_1 and C_2 of S . Since D is alternating and checkerboard colorable, S_A bounds a subsurface Σ' of Σ of a certain color, say white, which contains no crossings of D .

We claim that neither C_1 nor C_2 is trivial. Indeed, if, say, C_1 were trivial, then there would be a loop γ parallel to C_1 totally inside Σ' except for a little neighborhood of x , in which it would cross x . Such a curve would imply that the crossing x is removable, (see for example Figure 9), which is a contradiction. Therefore, neither C_1 nor C_2 is trivial, and it follows that $t(S) = t(S_A)$. Therefore, D is A -adequate at x , and this completes the proof of the theorem. □




Figure 9: A trivial cycle, resulting in a removable crossing.

7.3 Link diagrams and shadows

A *link shadow* in Σ is a 4-valent graph in Σ , possibly with loop components. In other words, a shadow is a link diagram with crossing types ignored. For that reason we refer to shadow vertices as crossings and the components of any link realization of a shadow as its link components. (Not to be confused with connected components of a shadow.)

Some properties of link diagrams are entirely determined by its link shadow. For example, we will say that a link shadow D on Σ is *checkerboard colorable* if the components of $\Sigma \setminus D$ can be colored by two colors such that any two components of $\Sigma \setminus D$ that share an edge have opposite colors. Clearly, a link diagram is checkerboard colorable if and only if its link shadow is. Similarly, a link shadow is *minimally embedded* if it does not lie in a subsurface of Σ of smaller genus, and it is immediate that a link diagram on Σ is minimally embedded if and only if its link shadow is.

Each shadow crossing has two smoothings, which cannot be differentiated as A - and B -type, as in the case of link diagrams. For that reason, for link shadows it is customary to place markers at the crossings indicating the smoothing as in Figure 10.

Two consecutive crossings can have identical or opposite smoothings; see Figure 11. An *alternating state* of a shadow is one with alternating crossing smoothings along all of its link components. In other words, a state is alternating if the smoothings at every pair of consecutive crossings are opposite.

Not all link shadows admit alternating smoothings, for example the shadow of the nonalternable knot in the torus in Figure 8. On the other hand, any link shadow of




Figure 10: Two types of markers for a state of a link shadow.




Figure 11: Two consecutive crossings with identical markers (left) and opposite markers (right).

an alternating link diagram admits two alternating smoothings, namely the shadow smoothings coming from S_A and S_B .

Given a state S for a link shadow D , the dual state is denoted by S^\vee and has opposite smoothing to S at each crossing of D . Notice that a state S is alternating if and only if its dual state S^\vee is alternating.

We say that a 2-disk D^2 is 2-cutting or, simply, cutting a shadow D if its boundary intersects D transversely at two points (which are not crossings) and $D^2 \cap D$ contains some but not all the crossings of D . A connected shadow D is said to be strongly prime if it has no cutting disk. More generally, a shadow D is strongly prime if all of its connected components are.

Lemma 25 *Every crossing of every strongly prime shadow $D \subset \Sigma$ has at least one smoothing producing a shadow which is again strongly prime. If D is connected, then the smoothing can be chosen so the resulting shadow is connected and strongly prime.*

For classical links, a proof of this statement can be found in [37]. That proof relies on checkerboard colorability of the diagram, which is of course true for classical links. Below, we give a proof that does not require the shadow to be checkerboard colorable.

Proof For the first part, it is enough to prove it for each of the connected components of D . Assume now that the smoothings of a crossing v in a strongly prime D produce diagrams D_1 and D_2 neither of which is strongly prime. Let B_1 and B_2 be cutting disks for D_1 and D_2 . Since D is strongly prime, we can assume that $v \in \partial B_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. We can also assume that ∂B_1 and ∂B_2 are in transversal position. Let C be the connected component of $B_1 \cap B_2$ containing v , as in Figure 12, left. The circles ∂B_1 and ∂B_2 are broken because they may intersect each other many times.

By modifying B_1 or B_2 slightly if necessary we can assume that D does not contain the second intersection point, w , of $\partial B_1 \cap \partial B_2$ in C .




Figure 12: The cutting disks B_1 and B_2 .

Let $\alpha_1 = \text{int}(C \cap \partial B_1)$ and $\alpha_2 = \text{int}(C \cap \partial B_2)$. (Note that $v \notin \alpha_1 \cup \alpha_2$.) Since D intersects $\partial B_i - \{v\}$ twice for $i = 1, 2$ and D intersects $\alpha_1 \cup \alpha_2$ at an odd number of points, we have the following possibilities:

- (1) $|D \cap \alpha_2| = 1$ and $D \cap \alpha_1 = \emptyset$.
- (2) $|D \cap \alpha_2| = 2$ and $|D \cap \alpha_1| = 1$.
- (3) One of the two cases above with α_1 interchanged with α_2 . We will ignore this case without loss of generality.

In the first case, D looks like in Figure 12, center, where S and T (in dashed circles) are shadow tangles. In that case, since neighborhoods of S and T are not cutting disks for D , the tangles S and T are crossingless. That means that B_2 is not a cutting disk for D_2 — a contradiction.

In the second case, D looks like in Figure 12, right, where R, S and T are shadow tangles. Note that all crossings of D , other than v , are contained in R, S or T , since otherwise a disk containing v, R, S and T but no other crossings of D would be cutting for D . Note also that, as in the first case, T is crossingless. That means that all crossings of D_1 are in R and S . Hence, B_1 is not cutting for D_1 — a contradiction.

For the second part, assume that D is connected. Then one of the smoothings of D at v will be connected. Let D' denote the connected shadow obtained from smoothing D , and assume the other smoothing is disconnected. We claim that D' is strongly prime.

Assume to the contrary that D' is not strongly prime. Then there is a cutting disk B containing some but not all the crossings of D' (see Figure 13). We can assume that




Figure 13: A cutting disk for D' .

$v \in \partial B$ and that D' is obtained by the smoothing of v tangential to ∂B . However, since the other smoothing of D at v is disconnected, the strands from the tangles R and T cannot cross each other. The neighborhoods of R and T give cutting disks for D unless the tangles R and T are crossingless, but then B would not be a cutting disk for D' , which is a contradiction. \square

Suppose $D \subset \Sigma$ is a link shadow. Let N_D denote a neighborhood of D in Σ small enough that it is a ribbon surface retractable onto D . A *local checkerboard coloring* of D is a checkerboard coloring of $D \subset N_D$. If one exists, we say that D is *locally checkerboard colorable*. (The pair (D, N_D) is the shadow of an abstract link diagram, or ALD for short [29]. This condition is equivalent to saying that (D, N_D) is the shadow of a checkerboard colorable ALD.)

Obviously, if $D \subset \Sigma$ is checkerboard colorable, then it is locally checkerboard colorable. The converse holds if $D \subset \Sigma$ is cellularly embedded, but, in general, a shadow can be locally checkerboard colorable without being checkerboard colorable.

Lemma 26 *Suppose $D \subset \Sigma$ is a link shadow. Then D is locally checkerboard colorable if and only if it admits an alternating state.*

Proof If D is locally checkerboard colorable, then let S be the state whose smoothings at each crossing join the white regions. Then S is an alternating state.

Conversely, suppose S is an alternating state. Let $\widehat{\Sigma}$ be the surface obtained from N_D by attaching disks to each of its boundary component. Then $D \subset \widehat{\Sigma}$ is cellularly embedded. We can color $\widehat{\Sigma} \setminus D$ so that each cycle in S bounds a black disk and each cycle in S^\vee bounds a white disk. To see this, notice that, at each smoothing of S , two local regions are joined. We can color the joined regions white and extend the coloring to the rest of $\widehat{\Sigma} \setminus D$. This determines a local checkerboard coloring of D . \square

If S and S' are adjacent states on a shadow D with $|S'| = |S|$, then the transition from S to S' is called a *single cycle bifurcation*.

Lemma 27 *A connected shadow D is locally checkerboard colorable if and only if there is no single cycle bifurcation in its cube of resolutions.*

Proof For one implication, we apply [30, Proposition 5.11] to see that, if D is locally checkerboard colorable, then its cube of resolutions does not contain any single cycle bifurcations.

The other implication is proved by induction on the crossing number. To start, we verify it for 1-crossing shadows, which can be classified into the *first type* \otimes or the *second type* \circledast . The shadows of the first type are locally checkerboard colorable and of the second type are not. The cubes of resolutions for these shadows are $\bullet \rightarrow \bullet$, and they have just one edge, which is a split/join for the shadow of the first type and a single cycle bifurcation for the shadow of the second type.

Now assume the lemma has been proved for all connected shadows with fewer than n crossings. Let D be a connected shadow with n crossings. We will show that, if D is not locally checkerboard colorable, then there is a single cycle bifurcation in its cube of resolutions. Pick a crossing x and let D' be the diagram obtained by smoothing D at x . (It does not matter which smoothing is chosen.)

Assume first that D' is not locally checkerboard colorable. By induction, the cube of resolutions for D' contains a single cycle bifurcation. Since the cube of resolutions of D' is a face of the cube of resolutions of D , the result follows.

On the other hand, if D' is locally checkerboard colorable, then, by Lemma 26, it admits an alternating state S' . We color $N_{D'} \setminus D'$ consistently, so that the smoothings of S' join white regions. Let S be a state of D which coincides with S' , and S^\vee its dual state. Switching the smoothing of x in S^\vee , we obtain S'^\vee , considered as a state of D .

The ribbon surface N_D is obtained by adding a 2-dimensional 1-handle (a band) to $N_{D'}$. Unless the transition from S'^\vee to S^\vee is a single cycle bifurcation, we can extend the coloring of $(N_{D'}, D')$ to (N_D, D) . Since D is not locally checkerboard colorable, the transition from S'^\vee to S^\vee must be a single cycle bifurcation. □

Recall that $r(D)$ denotes the rank of the image of $i_*: H_1(D; \mathbb{Z}/2) \rightarrow H_1(\Sigma; \mathbb{Z}/2)$. Any connected shadow is homotopy equivalent to a bouquet of circles. If D has $c(D)$ crossings, then $\chi(D) = -c(D)$. It follows that $0 \leq r(D) \leq c(D) + 1$ for connected shadows with $c(D)$ crossings.

Proposition 28 *Let D be a link shadow in Σ (not necessarily connected).*

(i) *If S is a state of D , then*

$$t(S) + t(S^\vee) \leq c(D) + 2|D| - r(D).$$

(ii) *If D is not locally checkerboard colorable, then, for any state S of D ,*

$$t(S) + t(S^\vee) < c(D) + 2|D| - r(D).$$

(iii) If D is strongly prime and S is nonalternating, then

$$t(S) + t(S^\vee) < c(D) + 2|D| - r(D).$$

Proof Let us write $\Sigma = \Sigma_1 \cup \dots \cup \Sigma_n$ as a disjoint union of connected components. Any component disjoint from D does not contribute to the terms in (i), (ii) and (iii), so it can be discarded. Therefore, we can assume that $D_i = D \cap \Sigma_i \neq \emptyset$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Since all terms of the inequalities of the statements are additive under taking disjoint unions of surfaces, it is enough to prove the statement for Σ connected.

On the other hand, if $D = D_1 \cup D_2$ is disconnected, then $r(D) \leq r(D_1) + r(D_2)$. Thus, $r(D)$ is subadditive, and, since the other terms on the right-hand side of (i), (ii) and (iii) are additive, it is enough to prove the proposition for connected shadows in connected surfaces. Assume henceforth that Σ is a connected surface.

Let us prove the statement for single crossing abstract shadows D now. Recall from the proof of Lemma 27 that single crossing shadows D are of two types. For both of them, $r(D) \leq 2$. If $r(D) = 0$, then $t(S) + t(S^\vee) = 2$. If $r(D) = 1, 2$, then $t(S) + t(S^\vee) \leq 1$. Therefore, statement (i) holds for 1-crossing shadows. Since shadows of the first type are locally checkerboard colorable and $t(S) = t(S^\vee) = 0$ for shadows of the second type, statements (ii) and (iii) hold as well.

The proof of (i) proceeds by induction on the crossing number $c(D)$. Let D be a connected shadow in Σ with $c(D) \geq 2$ crossings. We assume that statement (i) has been established for all connected shadows in Σ with fewer than $c(D)$ crossings.

Let D' be the shadow resulting from smoothing at a crossing x of D . We choose the smoothing so that D' is connected. Notice that

$$(9) \quad r(D) - 1 \leq r(D') \leq r(D).$$

Let S be a state of D . The chosen smoothing of x coincides with the smoothing of x either in S or in S^\vee and, without loss of generality, we can assume that it coincides with the smoothing of x in S . Then S induces a state on D' , denoted by S' . Clearly, $t(S') = t(S)$. The dual state S'^\vee to S' differs from S^\vee at x only. The states S^\vee and S'^\vee are adjacent in the cube of resolutions of D . Thus,

$$(10) \quad t(S'^\vee) - 1 \leq t(S^\vee) \leq t(S'^\vee) + 1.$$

Lemma 29 Either $r(D') = r(D)$ or $t(S^\vee) \leq t(S'^\vee)$.

Proof Assume that $t(S^\vee) > t(S'^\vee)$. Then, either two trivial loops in S^\vee join to make a trivial loop in S'^\vee , or a trivial and a nontrivial loop in S^\vee join to make a nontrivial loop in S'^\vee , or a trivial loop in S^\vee splits to make two nontrivial loops in S'^\vee . In each case, $r(D') = r(D)$. \square

We prove the inductive step for part (i). By Lemma 29, there are the two possibilities. If $r(D') = r(D)$, then (10) and the inductive assumption imply that

$$t(S) + t(S^\vee) \leq t(S') + t(S'^\vee) + 1 \leq c(D') + 2 - r(D') + 1 = c(D) + 2 - r(D).$$

On the other hand, if $r(D') \neq r(D)$, then $t(S^\vee) \leq t(S'^\vee)$, and (9) and the inductive assumption imply that

$$t(S) + t(S^\vee) \leq t(S') + t(S'^\vee) \leq c(D') + 2 - r(D') = c(D) + 2 - r(D).$$

This completes the proof in case (i).

We prove part (ii) also by induction on $c(D)$. Let D be a connected shadow in Σ with $c(D) \geq 2$ crossings, and assume D is not locally checkerboard colorable. We assume that statement (ii) has been established for all connected shadows in Σ with fewer than $c(D)$ crossings that are not locally checkerboard colorable. By Lemma 27, there is a single cycle bifurcation in the cube of resolutions of D .

Let D' be the shadow resulting from smoothing D at a crossing x , and we assume D' is connected and that the smoothing at x coincides with the smoothing of x in S .

If D' is locally checkerboard colorable, then the transition from S^\vee to S'^\vee must be a single cycle bifurcation, for otherwise the local checkerboard coloring would extend from D' to D .

Since the transition is a single cycle bifurcation, we have $t(S^\vee) = t(S'^\vee)$ and $r(D) = r(D')$. Therefore, applying part (i) to D' , we see that

$$t(S) + t(S^\vee) = t(S) + t(S'^\vee) \leq c(D') + 2 - r(D') < c(D) + 2 - r(D).$$

If D' is not locally checkerboard colorable, then we can apply the inductive hypothesis for part (ii) to D' and use it to deduce the desired strict inequality just as before. This completes the proof of (ii).

The last step is to prove statement (iii). We begin by verifying (iii) for connected shadows with one or two crossings. For a single crossing shadow D of the first type,




Figure 14: Connected shadow diagrams with 2-crossings.

both states are alternating, so (iii) is vacuously true. Single crossing shadow of the second type are not locally checkerboard colorable, and so the result follows from (ii).

All abstract connected 2-crossing shadows D are depicted in Figure 14. For a type 1 shadow D , its nonalternating states appear in Figure 15, left. Note that $0 \leq r(D) \leq 3$ and $0 \leq t(S), t(S^\vee) \leq 1$. If $r(D) = 0$ or 1, then $t(S) + t(S^\vee) \leq 2$ and $3 \leq c(D) + 2 - r(D)$. Thus, (iii) holds in this case. If $r(D) = 2$ or 3, then $t(S) = t(S^\vee) = 0$, and statement (iii) holds.

For a type 2 shadow D , its nonalternating states are shown in Figure 15, right. Note that $0 \leq r(D) \leq 3$ and $0 \leq t(S), t(S^\vee) \leq 2$. Since D is strongly prime, $r(D) > 0$ and $t(S), t(S^\vee) \leq 1$. If $r(D) = 1$, then $t(S) + t(S^\vee) \leq 2$; if $r(D) = 2$, then $t(S) + t(S^\vee) \leq 1$; and if $r(D) = 3$, then $t(S) + t(S^\vee) = 0$. In all three cases, statement (iii) is seen to hold.

Note that none of the shadows of the third, fourth and fifth types is locally checkerboard colorable. Therefore statement (iii) follows from (ii) in these cases.

The proof of (iii) proceeds by induction on the crossing number $c(D)$. Let D be a strongly prime connected shadow in Σ . By (ii), we can assume that D is locally




Figure 15: Nonalternating states on 2-crossing shadows of type 1 (left) and type 2 (right).

checkerboard colorable. We assume additionally that $c(D) \geq 3$ and that statement (iii) has been established for all strongly prime shadows in Σ with fewer than $c(D)$ crossings.

Let S be a nonalternating state for D . Then S has two consecutive smoothings that are identical, and we choose a third crossing x of D . By Lemma 25, one of the smoothings of x yields a shadow which is connected and strongly prime. Let D' be the resulting shadow. As before, we assume that the smoothing at x coincides with the smoothing of x in S . The state S induces a state on D' , denoted by S' , which is nonalternating. Since D' is connected, one can apply Lemma 29 as before and argue again by induction that (iii) holds for D . □

7.4 Proof of Theorem 13

Part (i) follows immediately by combining Corollary 5 and Proposition 28(i).

For parts (ii)–(iii), if D is a connected sum of $D_0 \subset \Sigma$ and $D_1, \dots, D_k \subset S^2$, then

$$(11) \quad [D]_{\Sigma} = \delta^{-k} [D_0]_{\Sigma} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^k [D_i]_{S^2}.$$

Therefore, it is enough to prove (ii)–(iii) for *prime* diagrams (alternating for (ii) and nonalternating for (iii)).

The condition that D is prime implies that it is not a nontrivial connected sum diagram as above. More precisely, a link diagram D on Σ is said to be *prime* if any contractible simple loop γ in Σ that meets D transversely at two points bounds a 2-disk that intersects D in an unknotted arc (possibly with self-crossings).

For the proof of part (iii), assume D is prime. If the shadow diagram of D is strongly prime, then the statement follows from Corollary 5 and Proposition 28(iii). If it is not strongly prime, then D must contain a self-crossing trivial arc. Let D' be obtained by replacing it by a simple trivial arc. Since $\text{span}([D]_{\Sigma})$ is invariant under Reidemeister moves and $r(D') = r(D)$,

$$\text{span}([D]_{\Sigma}) = \text{span}([D']_{\Sigma}) \leq 4c(D') + 4|D'| - 2r(D') < 4c(D) + 4|D| - 2r(D)$$

by part (i).

The proof of part (ii) follows that of [8, Theorem 2.9]. Since both sides of the equality in (ii) are additive under disjoint union of diagrams, it is enough to prove it for connected diagrams.

By [Proposition 23](#), D is checkerboard colorable. Then all regions of one color, say white, are enclosed by the cycles in the state S_A of D , and all regions of the other color, ie black, are enclosed by the cycles in the state S_B . Therefore, the numbers of white and black regions are $t(S_A)$ and $t(S_B)$, respectively. Since D defines a cellular decomposition of Σ into $c(D)$ 0–cells, $2c(D)$ 1–cells, and $t(S_A) + t(S_B)$ 2–cells,

$$2 - 2g(\Sigma) = \chi(\Sigma) = c(D) - 2c(D) + t(S_A) + t(S_B),$$

and

$$t(S_A) + t(S_B) = c(D) + 2 - 2g(\Sigma).$$

By [Proposition 3](#),

$$\begin{aligned} \text{span}([D]_{\Sigma}) &= d_{\max}([D]_{\Sigma}) - d_{\min}([D]_{\Sigma}), \\ &= 2c(D) + 2t(S_A) + 2t(S_B), \\ &= 4c(D) + 4 - 4g(\Sigma). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Acknowledgements We would like to express our thanks to the referee for their many helpful comments and suggestions. HB would also like to acknowledge funding through the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

References

- [1] **C Adams, C Albers-Riera, B Haddock, Z Li, D Nishida, B Reinoso, L Wang**, *Hyperbolicity of links in thickened surfaces*, *Topology Appl.* 256 (2019) 262–278 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [2] **C Adams, O Eisenberg, J Greenberg, K Kapoor, Z Liang, K O’Connor, N Pachecho-Tallaj, Y Wang**, *Turaev hyperbolicity of classical and virtual knots*, *Algebr. Geom. Topol.* 21 (2021) 3459–3482 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [3] **C Adams, T Fleming, M Levin, A M Turner**, *Crossing number of alternating knots in $S \times I$* , *Pacific J. Math.* 203 (2002) 1–22 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [4] **B Bavier, E Kalfagianni**, *Guts, volume and skein modules of 3–manifolds*, *Fund. Math.* 256 (2022) 195–220 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [5] **R C Blair**, *Alternating augmentations of links*, *J. Knot Theory Ramifications* 18 (2009) 67–73 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [6] **R Blair, H Allen, L Rodriguez**, *Twist number and the alternating volume of knots*, *J. Knot Theory Ramifications* 28 (2019) art. id. 1950016 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [7] **C Blanchet, N Habegger, G Masbaum, P Vogel**, *Topological quantum field theories derived from the Kauffman bracket*, *Topology* 34 (1995) 883–927 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)

- [8] **H U Boden, H Karimi**, *The Jones–Krushkal polynomial and minimal diagrams of surface links*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) 72 (2022) 1437–1475 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [9] **H U Boden, H Karimi**, *A characterization of alternating links in thickened surfaces*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A 153 (2023) 177–195 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [10] **H U Boden, W Rushworth**, *Minimal crossing number implies minimal supporting genus*, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. 53 (2021) 1174–1184 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [11] **F Bonahon, H Wong**, *Quantum traces for representations of surface groups in $SL_2(\mathbb{C})$* , Geom. Topol. 15 (2011) 1569–1615 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [12] **D Bullock**, *Rings of $SL_2(\mathbb{C})$ –characters and the Kauffman bracket skein module*, Comment. Math. Helv. 72 (1997) 521–542 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [13] **D Bullock, C Frohman, J Kania-Bartoszyńska**, *Understanding the Kauffman bracket skein module*, J. Knot Theory Ramifications 8 (1999) 265–277 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [14] **J S Carter, S Kamada, M Saito**, *Stable equivalence of knots on surfaces and virtual knot cobordisms*, J. Knot Theory Ramifications 11 (2002) 311–322 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [15] **A Champanerkar, I Kofman**, *A survey on the Turaev genus of knots*, Acta Math. Vietnam. 39 (2014) 497–514 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [16] **A Champanerkar, I Kofman**, *A volumish theorem for alternating virtual links*, New York J. Math. 28 (2022) 337–356 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [17] **F Costantino, T T Q Lê**, *Stated skein algebras of surfaces*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. 24 (2022) 4063–4142 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [18] **O T Dasbach, D Futer, E Kalfagianni, X-S Lin, N W Stoltzfus**, *The Jones polynomial and graphs on surfaces*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B 98 (2008) 384–399 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [19] **O T Dasbach, X-S Lin**, *A volumish theorem for the Jones polynomial of alternating knots*, Pacific J. Math. 231 (2007) 279–291 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [20] **Y Diao**, *The additivity of crossing numbers*, J. Knot Theory Ramifications 13 (2004) 857–866 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [21] **H A Dye, L H Kauffman**, *Minimal surface representations of virtual knots and links*, Algebr. Geom. Topol. 5 (2005) 509–535 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [22] **V Fock, A Goncharov**, *Moduli spaces of local systems and higher Teichmüller theory*, Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. 103 (2006) 1–211 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [23] **S Fomin, M Shapiro, D Thurston**, *Cluster algebras and triangulated surfaces, I: Cluster complexes*, Acta Math. 201 (2008) 83–146 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [24] **C Frohman, R Gelca, W Lofaro**, *The A –polynomial from the noncommutative viewpoint*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 354 (2002) 735–747 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [25] **C Frohman, J Kania-Bartoszyńska, T Lê**, *Unicity for representations of the Kauffman bracket skein algebra*, Invent. Math. 215 (2019) 609–650 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)

- [26] **J A Howie**, *Surface-alternating knots and links*, PhD thesis, University of Melbourne (2015) Available at <http://hdl.handle.net/11343/58991>
- [27] **J A Howie**, **J S Purcell**, *Geometry of alternating links on surfaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 373 (2020) 2349–2397 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [28] **N Kamada**, *On the Jones polynomials of checkerboard colorable virtual links*, Osaka J. Math. 39 (2002) 325–333 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [29] **N Kamada**, **S Kamada**, *Abstract link diagrams and virtual knots*, J. Knot Theory Ramifications 9 (2000) 93–106 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [30] **H Karimi**, *The Khovanov homology of alternating virtual links*, Michigan Math. J. 70 (2021) 749–778 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [31] **L H Kauffman**, *State models and the Jones polynomial*, Topology 26 (1987) 395–407 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [32] **V Krushkal**, *Graphs, links, and duality on surfaces*, Combin. Probab. Comput. 20 (2011) 267–287 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [33] **G Kuperberg**, *What is a virtual link?*, Algebr. Geom. Topol. 3 (2003) 587–591 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [34] **M Lackenby**, *The volume of hyperbolic alternating link complements*, Proc. London Math. Soc. 88 (2004) 204–224 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [35] **M Lackenby**, *The crossing number of composite knots*, J. Topol. 2 (2009) 747–768 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [36] **T T Q Lê**, *The colored Jones polynomial and the A -polynomial of knots*, Adv. Math. 207 (2006) 782–804 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [37] **W B R Lickorish**, *An introduction to knot theory*, Graduate Texts in Math. 175, Springer (1997) [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [38] **W B R Lickorish**, **M B Thistlethwaite**, *Some links with nontrivial polynomials and their crossing-numbers*, Comment. Math. Helv. 63 (1988) 527–539 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [39] **V O Manturov**, *Parity and projection from virtual knots to classical knots*, J. Knot Theory Ramifications 22 (2013) art. id. 1350044 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [40] **W Menasco**, *Closed incompressible surfaces in alternating knot and link complements*, Topology 23 (1984) 37–44 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [41] **W Menasco**, **M Thistlethwaite**, *The classification of alternating links*, Ann. of Math. 138 (1993) 113–171 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [42] **G Muller**, *Skein and cluster algebras of marked surfaces*, Quantum Topol. 7 (2016) 435–503 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [43] **K Murasugi**, *Jones polynomials and classical conjectures in knot theory*, Topology 26 (1987) 187–194 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)

- [44] **J H Przytycki**, *Fundamentals of Kauffman bracket skein modules*, Kobe J. Math. 16 (1999) 45–66 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [45] **J H Przytycki**, **A S Sikora**, *On skein algebras and $Sl_2(\mathbb{C})$ -character varieties*, Topology 39 (2000) 115–148 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [46] **A S Sikora**, **B W Westbury**, *Confluence theory for graphs*, Algebr. Geom. Topol. 7 (2007) 439–478 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [47] **R Stong**, *The Jones polynomial of parallels and applications to crossing number*, Pacific J. Math. 164 (1994) 383–395 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [48] **M B Thistlethwaite**, *A spanning tree expansion of the Jones polynomial*, Topology 26 (1987) 297–309 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [49] **V G Turaev**, *A simple proof of the Murasugi and Kauffman theorems on alternating links*, Enseign. Math. 33 (1987) 203–225 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [50] **V G Turaev**, *The Conway and Kauffman modules of a solid torus*, Zap. Nauchn. Sem. Leningrad. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov 167 (1988) 79–89 [MR](#) [Zbl](#) In Russian; translated in *J. Soviet Math.* 52 (1990) 2799–2805
- [51] **V G Turaev**, *Skein quantization of Poisson algebras of loops on surfaces*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. 24 (1991) 635–704 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [52] **V G Turaev**, *Algebras of loops on surfaces, algebras of knots, and quantization*, from “Braid group, knot theory and statistical mechanics, II” (CN Yang, ML Ge, editors), Adv. Ser. Math. Phys. 17, World Sci., River Edge, NJ (1994) 324–360 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [53] **DA Will**, *Homological polynomial coefficients and the twist number of alternating surface links*, Algebr. Geom. Topol. 22 (2022) 3939–3963 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, McMaster University
Hamilton, ON, Canada

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, McMaster University
Hamilton, ON, Canada

Department of Mathematics, University at Buffalo
Buffalo, NY, United States

boden@mcmaster.ca, karimih@mcmaster.ca, asikora@buffalo.edu

Received: 16 June 2021 Revised: 19 January 2022

ALGEBRAIC & GEOMETRIC TOPOLOGY

msp.org/agt

EDITORS

PRINCIPAL ACADEMIC EDITORS

John Etnyre
etnyre@math.gatech.edu
Georgia Institute of Technology

Kathryn Hess
kathryn.hess@epfl.ch
École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne

BOARD OF EDITORS

Julie Bergner	University of Virginia jeb2md@eservices.virginia.edu	Robert Lipshitz	University of Oregon lipshitz@uoregon.edu
Steven Boyer	Université du Québec à Montréal cohf@math.rochester.edu	Norihiko Minami	Nagoya Institute of Technology nori@nitech.ac.jp
Tara E. Brendle	University of Glasgow tara.brendle@glasgow.ac.uk	Andrés Navas	Universidad de Santiago de Chile andres.navas@usach.cl
Indira Chatterji	CNRS & Université Côte d'Azur (Nice) indira.chatterji@math.cnrs.fr	Thomas Nikolaus	University of Münster nikolaus@uni-muenster.de
Alexander Dranishnikov	University of Florida dranish@math.ufl.edu	Robert Oliver	Université Paris 13 bobol@math.univ-paris13.fr
Corneli Druţu	University of Oxford cornelia.drutu@maths.ox.ac.uk	Birgit Richter	Universität Hamburg birgit.richter@uni-hamburg.de
Tobias Ekholm	Uppsala University, Sweden tobias.ekholm@math.uu.se	Jérôme Scherer	École Polytech. Féd. de Lausanne jerome.scherer@epfl.ch
Mario Eudave-Muñoz	Univ. Nacional Autónoma de México mario@matem.unam.mx	Zoltán Szabó	Princeton University szabo@math.princeton.edu
David Futер	Temple University dfuter@temple.edu	Ulrike Tillmann	Oxford University tillmann@maths.ox.ac.uk
John Greenlees	University of Warwick john.greenlees@warwick.ac.uk	Maggy Tomova	University of Iowa maggy-tomova@uiowa.edu
Ian Hambleton	McMaster University ian@math.mcmaster.ca	Nathalie Wahl	University of Copenhagen wahl@math.ku.dk
Hans-Werner Henn	Université Louis Pasteur henn@math.u-strasbg.fr	Chris Wendl	Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin wendl@math.hu-berlin.de
Daniel Isaksen	Wayne State University isaksen@math.wayne.edu	Daniel T. Wise	McGill University, Canada daniel.wise@mcgill.ca
Christine Lescop	Université Joseph Fourier lescop@ujf-grenoble.fr		


See inside back cover or msp.org/agt for submission instructions.

The subscription price for 2023 is US \$650/year for the electronic version, and \$940/year (+ \$70, if shipping outside the US) for print and electronic. Subscriptions, requests for back issues and changes of subscriber address should be sent to MSP. Algebraic & Geometric Topology is indexed by [Mathematical Reviews](#), [Zentralblatt MATH](#), [Current Mathematical Publications](#) and the [Science Citation Index](#).

Algebraic & Geometric Topology (ISSN 1472-2747 printed, 1472-2739 electronic) is published 9 times per year and continuously online, by Mathematical Sciences Publishers, c/o Department of Mathematics, University of California, 798 Evans Hall #3840, Berkeley, CA 94720-3840. Periodical rate postage paid at Oakland, CA 94615-9651, and additional mailing offices. POSTMASTER: send address changes to Mathematical Sciences Publishers, c/o Department of Mathematics, University of California, 798 Evans Hall #3840, Berkeley, CA 94720-3840.

AGT peer review and production are managed by EditFlow[®] from MSP.

PUBLISHED BY

 **mathematical sciences publishers**
nonprofit scientific publishing

<http://msp.org/>

© 2023 Mathematical Sciences Publishers

ALGEBRAIC & GEOMETRIC TOPOLOGY

Volume 23 Issue 5 (pages 1935–2414) 2023

Splitting Madsen–Tillmann spectra, II: The Steinberg idempotents and Whitehead conjecture	1935
TAKUJI KASHIWABARA and HADI ZARE	
Free and based path groupoids	1959
ANDRÉS ÁNGEL and HELLEN COLMAN	
Discrete real specializations of sesquilinear representations of the braid groups	2009
NANCY SCHERICH	
A model for configuration spaces of points	2029
RICARDO CAMPOS and THOMAS WILLWACHER	
The Hurewicz theorem in homotopy type theory	2107
J DANIEL CHRISTENSEN and LUIS SCOCCOLA	
A concave holomorphic filling of an overtwisted contact 3–sphere	2141
NAOHIKO KASUYA and DANIELE ZUDDAS	
Modifications preserving hyperbolicity of link complements	2157
COLIN ADAMS, WILLIAM H MEEKS III and ÁLVARO K RAMOS	
Golod and tight 3–manifolds	2191
KOUYEMON IRIYE and DAISUKE KISHIMOTO	
A remark on the finiteness of purely cosmetic surgeries	2213
TETSUYA ITO	
Geodesic complexity of homogeneous Riemannian manifolds	2221
STEPHAN MESCHER and MAXIMILIAN STEGEMEYER	
Adequate links in thickened surfaces and the generalized Tait conjectures	2271
HANS U BODEN, HOMAYUN KARIMI and ADAM S SIKORA	
Homotopy types of gauge groups over Riemann surfaces	2309
MASAKI KAMEKO, DAISUKE KISHIMOTO and MASAHIRO TAKEDA	
Diffeomorphisms of odd-dimensional discs, glued into a manifold	2329
JOHANNES EBERT	
Intrinsic symmetry groups of links	2347
CHARLES LIVINGSTON	
Loop homotopy of 6–manifolds over 4–manifolds	2369
RUIZHI HUANG	
Infinite families of higher torsion in the homotopy groups of Moore spaces	2389
STEVEN AMELOTTE, FREDERICK R COHEN and YUXIN LUO	