

Sets of moves for standard skeleta of 3-manifolds with marked boundary

Gennaro AMENDOLA

December 18, 2018

Abstract

A 3-manifold with marked boundary is a pair (M, X) , where M is a compact 3-manifold whose (possibly empty) boundary is made up of tori and Klein bottles, and X is a trivalent graph that is a spine of ∂M . A standard skeleton of a 3-manifold with marked boundary (M, X) is a standard sub-polyhedron P of M such that $P \cap \partial M$ coincides with X and with ∂P , and such that $P \cup \partial M$ is a spine of $M \setminus B$ (where B is a ball).

In this paper, we will prove that the classical set of moves for standard spines of 3-manifolds (*i.e.* the MP-move and the V-move) does not suffice to relate any two standard skeleta of a 3-manifold with marked boundary to each other. We will also describe a condition on the 3-manifold with marked boundary that tells whether the generalised set of moves, made up of the MP-move and the L-move, suffices to relate any two standard skeleta of the 3-manifold with marked boundary to each other.

For the 3-manifolds with marked boundary that do not fulfil this condition, we give two other moves: the CR-move and the T-move. The first one is local and, with the MP-move and the L-move, suffices to relate to each other any two standard skeleta of a 3-manifold with marked boundary fulfilling another condition. For the universal case, we will prove that the non-local T-move, with the MP-move and the L-move, suffices to relate to each other any two standard skeleta of a generic 3-manifold with marked boundary.

As a corollary, we will get that disc-replacements suffice to relate to each other any two standard skeleta of a 3-manifold with marked boundary.

Keywords

3-manifold, marked boundary, skeleton, calculus.

MSC (2000)

57M27 (primary), 57M20 (secondary).

This research has been supported by the school of graduate studies “Galileo Galilei” of the University of Pisa and afterward by the grant “Ennio De Giorgi” (2007-2008) from the Department of Mathematics of the University of Salento.

Introduction

In [6] Matveev defined for any compact 3-manifold M a non-negative integer $c(M)$, which he called the *complexity* of M . The complexity function c has the following remarkable properties: it is additive under connected sum, it does not increase when cutting along incompressible surfaces, and it is finite-to-one on the most interesting classes of 3-manifolds. Namely, among the compact 3-manifolds having complexity c there is only a finite number of closed \mathbb{P}^2 -irreducible ones and a finite number of finite-volume hyperbolic ones (with cusps and/or with compact geodesic boundary). If we concentrate on the closed \mathbb{P}^2 -irreducible case: the complexity of such an M is then precisely the minimal number of tetrahedra needed to triangulate it, except when $c(M) = 0$, *i.e.* when M is S^3 , $\mathbb{R}\mathbb{P}^3$ or $L_{3,1}$.

The problem of computing (or at least estimating) the complexity of M naturally arose. For the closed case, Martelli and Petronio developed a theory of decomposition of closed \mathbb{P}^2 -irreducible 3-manifolds [4]. The decomposition is made along tori and Klein bottles (as in the JSJ decomposition), in such a way that the complexity of the original manifold is the sum of the (suitably defined) complexities of the building blocks (called bricks). The bricks carry an extra structure given by a finite set of trivalent graphs, each contained in a boundary component so that the complement is a disc. These graphs are fundamental because they affect both the definition of the complexity of bricks and the reassembling of bricks.

This theory seems to be very useful for the computation/estimation process. Martelli and Petronio used the orientable version of it to list closed irreducible orientable manifolds of complexity up to 9 (in [3]), and then Martelli used it to get the list up to complexity 10 (in [2]). Moreover, in [5], Martelli and Petronio gave other estimations on the complexity of closed 3-manifolds. There are many reasons making this theory feasible, at least in the orientable case up to complexity 10: for instance, there are very few bricks with respect to closed manifolds, they must satisfy many topological restrictions (so the search of bricks is easier than that of closed manifolds), they can be assembled (to produce closed manifolds) in a finite (small) number of ways, and the decomposition into bricks is a refinement of the JSJ decomposition (so it is easy to give a “name” to the manifolds obtained assembling bricks).

The main objects of the decomposition theory are the 3-manifolds with marked boundary. A 3-manifold with marked boundary is a pair (M, X) , where M is a compact 3-manifold whose (possibly empty) boundary is made up of tori and Klein bottles, and X is a trivalent graph that is a spine of ∂M . The main tools used to work on 3-manifolds with marked boundary are the standard skeleta. A standard skeleton of a 3-manifold with marked boundary (M, X) is a standard sub-polyhedron P of M such that $P \cap \partial M$ coincides with X and with ∂P , and such that $P \cup \partial M$ is a spine of $M \setminus B$ (where B is a ball).

In this paper, we will deal with the problem of deciding how different standard skeleta of a 3-manifold with marked boundary are related to each other. We will prove that the classical set of moves for standard spines of 3-manifolds (*i.e.* the MP-move and the V-move) does not suffice to relate any two standard skeleta of a 3-manifold with marked boundary to each other. The reason is that these moves are very “local”, *i.e.* the portion of the skeleton involved in the move is contained in a “small” ball. A first solution to this problem is to

use the L-move, a generalisation of the V-move. However, this suffices only for a particular class of 3-manifolds with marked boundary. We will define an object for each standard skeleton of a 3-manifold with marked boundary that is invariant under MP-moves and L-moves. The object is the main point for giving a condition on the 3-manifold with marked boundary that tells whether the MP-move and the L-move suffice to relate any two standard skeleta of the 3-manifold with marked boundary to each other.

If M has n boundary components, an *octopus* o in M is the image of an embedding of the cone over n points, such that the preimage of each boundary component of M is exactly one endpoint of the cone. If P is a standard skeleton of (M, X) , we consider the ideal triangulation dual to $P \cup \partial M$; the edges dual to the regions in the boundary components of M form an octopus defined unambiguously from P . The main point is that the octopus of P is (easily seen to be) invariant under MP-moves and L-moves.

We will prove that if in a 3-manifold with marked boundary there is only one octopus, the MP-move and the L-move suffice to relate any two standard skeleta of the 3-manifold with marked boundary to each other. For the 3-manifolds with marked boundary that do not fulfil this condition, we give two other moves that can change the octopus: the CR-move and the T-move. The first one is “local” and allows us to change a crossing of the octopus. We will prove that if any two octopuses of a 3-manifold with marked boundary can be obtained from each other by changes of crossings, then any two standard skeleta of the manifold can be related to each other by MP-moves, L-moves and CR-moves.

For the universal case, we will use the non-local T-move, which allows us to change the octopuses arbitrarily, and we will prove that the MP-move, the L-move and the T-move suffice to relate to each other any two standard skeleta of a generic 3-manifold with marked boundary.

As a corollary, we will get that disc-replacements suffice to relate to each other any two standard skeleta of a 3-manifold with marked boundary. Here, by disc-replacements we refer to a particular set of disc replacement moves, which have been defined by Matveev [8].

1 Preliminaries

Throughout this paper, M will be a fixed compact connected 3-manifold with (possibly empty) boundary made up of tori and Klein bottles. Using the *Hauptvermutung*, we will freely intermingle the differentiable, piecewise linear and topological viewpoints.

1.1 Manifolds with marked boundary

Spines of surfaces If C is a connected surface, we call *spine* of C a trivalent graph X contained in C such that $C \setminus X$ is an open disc. If C has n connected components, a spine of C is a collection of n spines, one for each component of C . With an easy Euler-characteristic argument, it can be proved that if C is a torus T or a Klein bottle K , a spine of C must be a connected trivalent graph with two vertices. Note that there are precisely two such graphs: in Fig. 1 we have shown the two graphs, say θ and σ , and their embeddings in C . Note that θ is a spine of both the torus and the Klein bottle, while σ is a spine of the




Figure 1: The spines of the torus T and the Klein bottle K .




Figure 2: The five typical neighbourhoods in a quasi-standard polyhedron.

Klein bottle only. Note also that the image of the embedding of θ in the torus is not unique (also up to isotopy), while the images of the embeddings of both θ and σ in the Klein bottle are unique (up to isotopy) [4].

Manifolds with marked boundary A pair (M, X) is said a *manifold with marked boundary* if X is a spine of ∂M . Hence, we have $\partial M = \sqcup_{i=1}^n C_i$, where each C_i is a torus or a Klein bottle, and $X = \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$, where $X_i \subset C_i$ so that $C_i \setminus X_i$ is a disc. As said above, M is considered fixed, while X is viewed up to isotopy.

1.2 Spines and skeleta

Standard polyhedra A *quasi-standard* polyhedron P is a finite, connected and purely 2-dimensional polyhedron in which each point has a neighbourhood of one of the types shown in Fig. 2. The *boundary* ∂P of P is the trivalent graph made up of the points of type IV and V. The set of points of type II and III (the *singular points*) is denoted by $S(P)$. A quasi-standard polyhedron is called *standard* if it is cellularized by singularity and boundary. In a standard polyhedron, the points of type III are called *vertices*, the connected components of the set of the points of type II are called *edges*, and the connected components of the set of the points of type I (the *non-singular points*) are called *regions*. In the figures, the singular set and the boundary of the polyhedron are drawn thick, and the vertices are marked by a thick dot.

Spines and skeleta A sub-polyhedron P of a manifold M with non-empty boundary is called *spine* of M if M collapses to it. If M is closed, the boundary is created by puncturing M (*i.e.* by considering M minus a ball). It is by now well-known, after the work of Casler [1], that a standard spine determines uniquely M up to homeomorphism and that every M has standard spines. In the




Figure 3: The MP-move (on the left) and the V-move (on the right).

literature it is a customary convention that the spine should embed in $\text{Int}(M)$, but this is not essential, so we allow spines to embed in the whole of M .

A *skeleton* P of a manifold with marked boundary (M, X) is a quasi-standard sub-polyhedron P of M such that $P \cap \partial M$ coincides with X and with ∂P , and such that $P \cup \partial M$ is a spine of $M \setminus B$ (where B is a ball). Each skeleton of (M, X) is always viewed up to isotopy. Note that, if M is closed (*i.e.* $X = \emptyset$), a standard skeleton of (M, \emptyset) is just a standard spine without boundary of M . We will prove below that every manifold with marked boundary has standard skeleta (Lemma 5).

Remark 1. For the sake of clarity, we mention that our notion of skeleton is different from the one of [11]. Actually, our notion of skeleton is less general than the one of [4], but the notion of standard skeleton is equal to that of [4].

1.3 First moves

In this section, we will describe the moves giving the calculus for standard spines without boundary. These moves will be fundamental for the generalisation of this calculus to standard skeleta.

MP-move Let us start from the move shown in Fig. 3-left, which is called *MP-move*. Such a move will be called *positive* if it increases (by one) the number of vertices, and *negative* otherwise. Note that if we apply an MP-move to a standard skeleton of (M, X) , the result will be another standard skeleton of (M, X) . It is already known (see Theorem 2 below) that any two standard spines without boundary of the same M with at least two vertices can be transformed into each other by MP-moves.

V-move If one of the two standard spines without boundary of M (we want to transform into each other) has just one vertex, another move is required. The move shown in Fig. 3-right is called *V-move*. Note that if we apply such a move to a standard skeleton of (M, X) , the result will be another standard skeleton of (M, X) . As above, we have *positive* and *negative* V-moves.

If a positive V-move is applied to a standard spine without boundary with at least two vertices, the V-move is a composition of MP-moves. In Fig. 4 we show the three positive and the one negative MP-moves giving the V-move.

On the contrary, if a V-move is applied to a standard skeleton (also with many vertices), the fact that the V-move is a composition of MP-moves may not be true: in fact, the endpoints of the edges incident to the vertex on which we apply the V-move may not be vertices, because some edges may have one endpoint on ∂P .




Figure 4: If there is another vertex, each positive V-move is a composition of MP-moves.




Figure 5: The L-move.

The calculus for standard spines without boundary It is already known, after the work of Matveev [7] and Piergallini [10], that the moves described above give a calculus for standard spines without boundary. Namely, we have the following.

Theorem 2 (Matveev-Piergallini). *Any two standard spines without boundary of M can be obtained from each other via a sequence of V- and MP-moves. If moreover the two spines have at least two vertices, then they can be obtained from each other via a sequence of MP-moves only.*

L-move A generalisation of the V-move is the L-move, see Fig. 5. As above, we have *positive* and *negative* L-moves. As opposed to the V-move, this move is non-local, so it must be described with some care. A positive L-move, which increases by two the number of vertices, is determined by an arc γ disjoint to ∂P and properly embedded in a region R of P . The move acts on P as in Fig. 5, but, in order to define its effect unambiguously, we must specify which pairs of regions, out of the four regions incident to R at the endpoints of γ , will become adjacent to each other after the move. This is achieved by noting that R is a disc, so its regular neighbourhood in M is a product, and we can choose for R a transverse orientation. Using it, at each endpoint of γ we can tell from each other the two regions incident to R as being an upper and a lower one, and we can stipulate that the two upper regions will become adjacent after the move (and similarly for the lower ones).

For the negative case the situation is more complicated. A negative L-move can lead to a non-standard polyhedron. If R_1 and R_2 belong to the same region, after the negative L-move, the “region” R would not be a disc. To avoid this loss of standardness, we will call negative L-moves only those preserving standardness. So a negative L-move can be applied only if the regions R_1 and R_2 are different. With this convention, if we apply an L-move to a standard skeleton of (M, X) , the result will be another standard skeleton of (M, X) .

Remark 3. A region R of P that is a rectangle incident to two edges of ∂P cannot be modified via V- and MP-moves, so we will need L-moves.

If a positive L-move is applied to a standard spine without boundary P , the L-move is a composition of V- and MP-moves. First of all, note that the




Figure 6: Each positive L-move is a composition of V- and MP-moves (the case for R_1 with more than one vertex).




Figure 7: Each positive L-move is a composition of V- and MP-moves (the case for R_1 with only one vertex).

boundary of the region R divided by the L-move is made up of edges only. In Fig. 6 we show the positive V-move and the pairs of (one positive and one negative) MP-moves giving the L-move. Obviously, in order to apply these moves, R_1 must have at least two vertices. If R_1 has only one vertex, then R_2 has at least two vertices (because P is standard); so we can take the symmetric picture. We note that if R_1 has only one vertex, we can obtain the L-move also as a composition of only one V- and one pair of MP-moves, as shown in Fig. 7.

On the contrary, if an L-move is applied to a standard skeleton P , the fact that the L-move is a composition of V- and MP-moves may not be true: in fact, the boundary of the region divided by the L-move may be made up of not only edges, but also portions of X . If the boundary of R_1 or R_2 is made up of edges only, then the L-move is a composition of V- and MP-moves (see Fig. 6 and Fig. 7).

2 A partial calculus

Since a standard skeleton of a manifold with marked boundary (M, \emptyset) is actually a standard spine without boundary of the manifold M , a calculus for standard skeleta of (M, \emptyset) is already known, see Theorem 2. For this reason, we will consider only manifolds with non-empty boundary. From now on, (M, X) will be a manifold with marked boundary with $X = \{X_1, \dots, X_n\} \neq \emptyset$.

2.1 Octopus

We have already noted that both L- and MP-moves preserve the property of being a standard skeleton of (M, X) . But there is also an invariant of standard skeleta of (M, X) unchanged by L- and MP-moves. It is just this invariant the reason why L- and MP-moves are not enough to obtain all the standard skeleta




Figure 8: Portion of spine dual to a tetrahedron of an ideal triangulation.

of (M, X) from a fixed one. In this section we will define this invariant.

Ideal triangulations and duality We start describing a tool required to define the invariant. An *ideal triangulation* of a manifold M with non-empty boundary is a partition \mathcal{T} of $\text{Int}(M)$ into open cells of dimensions 1, 2 and 3, induced by a triangulation $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$ of the space \widehat{M} , where:

- \widehat{M} is obtained from M by collapsing to a point each component of ∂M ;
- $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$ is a triangulation only in a loose sense, namely self-adjacencies and multiple adjacencies of tetrahedra are allowed;
- the vertices of $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$ are precisely the points of \widehat{M} corresponding to the components of ∂M , so \widehat{M} minus those vertices can be identified with $\text{Int}(M)$.

It turns out [9, 8] that there exists a natural bijection between standard spines without boundary and ideal triangulations of a manifold. Given an ideal triangulation \mathcal{T} , the corresponding standard spine without boundary P is just the 2-skeleton of the dual cellularization, as illustrated in Fig. 8. The inverse of this correspondence is denoted by $P \mapsto \mathcal{T}(P)$, and $\mathcal{T}(P)$ is called the ideal triangulation *dual to* P .

Octopus An *octopus* o in M is the image of an embedding of the cone over n points, such that the preimage of each boundary component of M is exactly one endpoint of the cone. More precisely, o is the union $\cup_{i=1}^n \tau_i([0, 1])$ of simple arcs $\tau_i : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ such that the τ_i 's are disjoint except for an endpoint that is in common (*i.e.* $\tau_i([0, 1]) \cap \tau_j([0, 1]) = \{\tau_i(0)\}$, for $i \neq j$) and such that each τ_i has the other endpoint on the component C_i of ∂M minus X_i (*i.e.* $\tau_i([0, 1]) \cap \partial M = \{\tau_i(1)\} \subset C_i \setminus X_i$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$). Each τ_i will be called *tentacle of* o . As for skeleta, the octopuses are viewed up to isotopy.

Now, we are able to define the invariant. Let P be a standard skeleton of (M, X) . Recall that, by definition, $P \cup \partial M$ is a standard spine without boundary of $M \setminus B$, where B is a ball. Consider the ideal triangulation $\mathcal{T}(P \cup \partial M)$ of $M \setminus B$. The polyhedron $P \cup \partial M$ is obtained from P by adding n regions $C_i \setminus X_i$ (with $i = 1, \dots, n$). Let us call α_i the edge of $\mathcal{T}(P \cup \partial M)$ dual to the region $C_i \setminus X_i$. The union of the arcs α_i is an octopus, defined unambiguously from P (up to isotopy). It will be called *octopus of* P and will be indicated with $o(P)$. Note that P is a standard spine (with boundary) of $M \setminus N(o(P))$, where $N(o(P))$ is a regular neighbourhood of the octopus $o(P)$.

If M has only one boundary component (*i.e.* $n = 1$), there is only one octopus because there is only one arc (up to isotopy) with an endpoint on $\partial M \setminus X$ and the other endpoint free in $\text{Int}(M)$.

Remark 4. Let P be a standard skeleton of (M, X) with octopus $o(P)$. We have already noted (see Section 1.3) that if we apply an L- or an MP-move to P , we obtain another standard skeleton P' of (M, X) . Both P and P' are spines of $M \setminus N(o(P))$, so the octopuses $o(P)$ and $o(P')$ are equal. As a first result, we have that if (M, X) has more than one octopus, the L- and the MP-move do not suffice to give a set of moves for standard skeleta of (M, X) .

Existence of a standard skeleton for each octopus For each octopus o in (M, X) there exists a standard skeleton P of (M, X) such that $o = o(P)$. This fact can be obviously deduced from the following lemma which will be useful also afterwards.

Lemma 5. *Let o be an octopus in (M, X) and let $\varphi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \text{Int}(M)$ be a simple arc such that $\varphi([0, 1]) \cap o = \{\varphi(0), \varphi(1)\}$. Then, there exists a standard skeleton P of (M, X) such that $o = o(P)$ and $\varphi([0, 1])$ is an edge of the ideal triangulation $\mathcal{T}(P \cup \partial M)$ of M minus a ball.*

Proof. Let us consider regular neighbourhoods $N(o)$ of the octopus o and $N(\varphi)$ of $\varphi([0, 1])$, such that $N(o) \cup N(\varphi)$ is a regular neighbourhood of $o \cup \varphi([0, 1])$. Let Q be a standard spine without boundary of $M \setminus (N(o) \cup N(\varphi))$ contained in $\text{Int}(M \setminus (N(o) \cup N(\varphi)))$. Note that we have a retraction π of $M \setminus (N(o) \cup N(\varphi))$ onto Q . Let D be a disc properly embedded in $N(\varphi)$ intersecting $\varphi([0, 1])$ transversely in one point. Now, we can suppose that, by projecting ∂D and X to Q along π , we obtain $\partial D \times [0, 1]$ and $X \times [0, 1]$. Up to isotopy, we can also suppose that both $\pi(\partial D)$ and all $\pi(X_i)$ intersect $S(Q)$, and that $\pi(\partial D \cup X)$ is transverse to $S(Q)$ and to itself. Let us define P as the union of Q , the disc D , the annulus $\partial D \times [0, 1]$ and the $X_i \times [0, 1]$'s. The polyhedron P is the skeleton we are looking for: in fact, P is standard, $P \cap \partial M$ coincides with X and with ∂P , $P \cup \partial M$ is a standard spine of M minus a ball, and $\varphi([0, 1])$ coincides with the edge dual to the region $D \cup (\partial D \times [0, 1])$ of P . \square

2.2 Super-standard skeleta

Before describing a calculus for standard skeleta of (M, X) with the same octopus, in this section we will describe a result useful in the proof. A standard skeleton P of (M, X) will be called *super-standard* if $P = Q \cup (X \times [0, 1])$, where Q is a standard polyhedron without boundary and $X \times [0, 1]$ is made up of the regions of P incident to ∂P . For the sake of clarity, we note that our definition of super-standard skeleton is slightly different from the one of [4].

Lemma 6. *Each standard skeleton P of (M, X) can be transformed into a super-standard one via L- and MP-moves.*

Before proving the lemma, we describe another move on standard skeleta useful in the proof. We call *C-move* the move shown in Fig. 9. As for the other moves, we have *positive* and *negative* C-moves. Each positive C-move is a composition of V- and MP-moves: the V-move and the (four) MP-moves are shown in Fig. 10. Note also that 12 different positive C-moves can be applied at each vertex. We are now able to prove Lemma 6.

Proof of Lemma 6. We transform the standard skeleton P into a super-standard one in three steps.




Figure 9: The C-move.




Figure 10: Each positive C-move is a composition of V- and MP-moves.




Figure 11: A non-good adjacency.

1. We transform P , via L-moves, into a standard skeleton P' such that no region is incident to X along more than one edge of X .
2. We transform P' , via L- and MP-moves, into another standard skeleton $P'' = Q \cup Q'$, where Q is a quasi-standard polyhedron without boundary and $Q' \cong X \times [0, 1)$ is made up of the regions of P incident to X .
3. We transform P'' , via L- and MP-moves, into a super-standard skeleton.

Step 1 Suppose a region of P is incident to X along more than one edge of X (say m). We can divide this region into m regions, each of which is incident to exactly one edge of X , by applying $m - 1$ suitable L-moves. By repeating this procedure for each region of P incident to X along more than one edge of X , we transform P into the skeleton P' we are looking for.

Step 2 Let us call $R_i^{(j)}$, with $j = 1, 2, 3$, the three regions incident to X_i . Note that, by Step 1, we have $R_i^{(j)} \neq R_i^{(k)}$ if $i \neq l$ or $j \neq k$. Note also that each $R_i^{(j)}$ is adjacent to $R_i^{(k)}$, with $k \neq j$, along edges of P' with an endpoint on X_i . Let us call *good* these adjacencies. The adjacencies along edges between any $R_i^{(j)}$ and $R_i^{(k)}$ that are not good will be called *non-good*. Note that the condition on P'' is equivalent to the fact that there are only good adjacencies; hence, in order to obtain P'' , we eliminate the non-good adjacencies.

We eliminate the non-good adjacencies one by one. Let us consider a non-good adjacency between $R_i^{(j)}$ and $R_i^{(k)}$, see Fig. 11. We apply a C-move, an MP-move and an L-move, as shown in Fig. 12. The check that the non-good adjacency has been eliminated and that no new non-good adjacency has been created is straight-forward, so we leave it to the reader. By repeating this procedure for each non-good adjacency, we transform P' into the skeleton P'' we are looking for.

Step 3 First of all, we note that Q is connected: in fact P'' , which is connected, retracts by deformation onto Q . We will modify Q and Q' , but we will continue to call the polyhedra we get Q and Q' , for the sake of shortness. If Q is a surface, we create a singularity by applying a positive C-move on a vertex of P'' as shown in Fig. 13. Note that we have modified both Q and Q' , but we have left Q' homeomorphic to $X \times [0, 1)$. If Q has no vertex, we create one by applying a positive C-move as above.

We will now transform Q in order to have that all the 2-dimensional components of Q are discs. If Q has some 2-dimensional components that are not discs, we divide suitably such components: let us show how. Let $\beta = \{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_r\}$ be




Figure 12: Elimination of a non-good adjacency.




Figure 13: We “singularize” Q via a positive C-move (on the left, Q is drawn coloured).




Figure 14: How to divide the 2-dimensional components of Q that are not discs (on the left, Q is drawn coloured).

a collection of disjoint simple arcs that are contained in Q , that divide the 2-dimensional components of Q into discs and that are in general position with respect to Q' . For each β_i , we apply L-moves as shown in Fig. 14. As above, note that we have modified both Q and Q' , but we have left Q' homeomorphic to $X \times [0, 1)$. Now, the polyhedron Q is quasi-standard, has vertices and has 2-dimensional components being discs. It is very easy to prove that Q is standard, so we leave it to the reader. The skeleton just obtained is super-standard, and the proof is complete. \square

2.3 Calculus with fixed octopus

The following result gives a set of moves for standard skeleta of (M, X) with the same octopus.

Proposition 7. *Any two standard skeleta of (M, X) with the same octopus can be obtained from each other via a sequence of L- and MP-moves.*

Before turning into the proof, we state (as an obvious corollary of Proposition 7) that the classical set of moves suffices for particular manifolds.

Theorem 8. *If (M, X) has only one octopus, then any two standard skeleta of (M, X) can be obtained from each other via a sequence of L- and MP-moves.*

Proof of Proposition 7. We deduce the calculus from a result (due to Turaev and Viro) which relies on the Matveev-Piergallini theorem. For the sake of clarity, we describe the ideas of the proof, instead of only stating Theorem 3.4.B of [11]. Let P_1 and P_2 be two standard skeleta of (M, X) such that $o(P_1) = o(P_2)$. Let $N(o)$ be a regular neighbourhood of the octopus $o = o(P_1) = o(P_2)$. By Lemma 6, we can transform each skeleton P_i into a super-standard one, say P'_i , via L- and MP-moves. By virtue of Remark 4, we have $o(P_i) = o(P'_i) = o$.

In order to conclude the proof, it is enough to relate P'_1 to P'_2 via L- and MP-moves. We have $P'_i = Q_i \cup (\cup_{j=1}^n [X_j, \pi_i(X_j)])$, where Q_i is a standard spine of $M \setminus N(o)$, π_i is a retraction of $M \setminus N(o)$ onto Q_i , and $[X_j, \pi_i(X_j)]$ is made up of the three regions incident to X_j . Since both Q_1 and Q_2 are standard spines of $M \setminus N(o)$, by virtue of Theorem 2, we can transform Q_1 into Q_2 via a deformation Q_t (with $t \in [1, 2]$) with elementary accidents that are L- and MP-moves. Obviously, we can suppose that the elementary accidents occur at different times. Note that all Q_t 's are standard spines, except for a finite number of times, when the elementary accidents occur and hence quasi-standardness is lost.

Parallely, we have a deformation π_t of π_1 into π_2 , where each π_t is a retraction of $M \setminus N(o)$ onto Q_t . We can suppose that each annulus $[X_j, \pi_1(X_j)]$ is transformed into $[X_j, \pi_2(X_j)]$ via annuli $[X_j, \pi_t(X_j)]$. By a general position argument, we can suppose that the accidents occurring to $Q_t \cup (\cup_{j=1}^n [X_j, \pi_t(X_j)])$ are L-, MP- and false L-moves, where a *false* L-move is a negative L-move not preserving standardness (actually, it is not an L-move).

Now, we have obtained a sequence of L-, MP- and false L-moves transforming P'_1 into P'_2 . In order to eliminate the false L-moves, we can use the same technique used in the proof of Theorem 1.2.30 of [8], by obviously generalising the setting from spines to skeleta. Eventually, we obtain a sequence of L- and MP-moves only, transforming P'_1 into P'_2 . The proof is complete. \square

3 Changing the octopus

In the section above, we have made use only of moves that do not change the octopus. The aim of this section is to describe moves changing the octopus.

3.1 Disc-replacement

We start with a general move that may change the octopus. Let P be a standard skeleton of (M, X) . An *external disc* (for P) is a closed disc D such that $D \cap P = \partial D$, the boundary ∂D is in general position with respect to the singularities of P , and $D \setminus \partial D$ is embedded (in $\text{Int}(M) \setminus P$). The polyhedron $P \cup D \cup \partial M$ disconnects M in two components, say B_1 and B_2 . More precisely, the disc D divides the open ball $M \setminus (P \cup \partial M)$ into the balls B_1 and B_2 . Let now D' be a disc contained in $P \cup D$, adjacent to both B_1 and B_2 , and such that the polyhedron $P' = (P \cup D) \setminus D'$ is standard. Note that we have $\partial P' = \partial P$.




Figure 15: The change of crossing.




Figure 16: The CR-move.

We have that $M \setminus (P' \cup \partial M) = B_1 \cup B_2 \cup D'$ is a ball and that $P' \cap \partial M$ coincides with X and $\partial P'$, so P' is a standard skeleton of (M, X) . The move from P to P' is called *disc-replacement*. Note that if ∂D does not intersect the singularities of P , the skeleton P' coincides (up to isotopy) with P ; so the interesting case turns out when ∂D intersects the singularities of P (and, obviously, when D' is different from D).

Remark 9. Each L- and MP-move is a particular disc-replacement.

Remark 10. A more general version of disc-replacement has been already considered by Matveev for spines [8]. It is called *disc replacement move*.

In the sections below, we will show that two particular disc-replacements are enough to complete the sets of moves. Therefore, we will obtain the following corollary of Theorem 17 below and Remark 9.

Theorem 11. *Any two standard skeleta of (M, X) can be obtained from each other via a sequence of disc-replacements.*

3.2 Changing the crossings

In this section, we will describe a move (which is a particular disc-replacement) on standard skeleta which changes the octopus, but only “locally”: namely, this move will allow us to “change the crossings” of the octopuses. Let o be an octopus and let $\varphi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \text{Int}(M)$ be a simple arc such that $\varphi([0, 1]) \cap o = \{\varphi(0), \varphi(1)\}$. We call *change of crossing* the modification of o shown in Fig. 15. Namely, we have replaced the arc φ' with the arc φ'' . Note that, up to isotopy, the configuration before the change of crossing is exactly the one shown in Fig. 15-left, the change of crossing modifies only a little regular neighbourhood of $\varphi([0, 1])$, and the change of crossing does not depend on the orientation of φ .

CR-move Let P be a standard skeleton of (M, X) . We call *CR-move* the move shown in Fig. 16. Let us call P' the polyhedron obtained after the CR-




Figure 17: Unfolded version of R . The coloured cross is an unfolded version of the part of R drawn in Fig. 16.

move. Since this move is non-local, it must be described with some care. Let us consider a region D' incident to one vertex only, say v , and to one region only, say R , along the circle δ' . We suppose moreover that an unfolded version of R appears as in Fig. 17. Note that the folded version of the cross coloured in Fig. 17, say \bar{R} , is exactly the part of R involved in the move (see again Fig. 16). We suppose that the folded version is transversely orientable and that the little tongue T lies on the other side of \bar{R} with respect to D' . The folded version of the arc δ , which is a circle, bounds an external disc D lying on the other side of \bar{R} with respect to the little tongue T . The move consists in replacing the disc D' with the external disc D (see Fig. 16). Note that a CR-move can lead to a non-standard polyhedron. To avoid this loss of standardness, we will call CR-moves only those preserving standardness. With this convention, if we apply a CR-move to a standard skeleton of (M, X) , the result will be another standard skeleton of (M, X) . Note that each CR-move is a disc-replacement.

Changing the crossings The following result states that CR-moves are enough to change the crossings.

Proposition 12. *Let P_1 and P_2 be standard skeleta of (M, X) such that $o(P_2)$ is obtained from $o(P_1)$ via changes of crossings. Then P_2 can be obtained from P_1 via L-, MP- and CR-moves.*

Before turning into the proof, we state (as an obvious corollary of Proposition 7 and Proposition 12) that the CR-move, with the MP- and the L-move, suffices to relate to each other any two standard skeleta of particular manifolds.

Theorem 13. *If in (M, X) all the octopuses can be obtained from each other via changes of crossings, then any two standard skeleta of (M, X) can be obtained from each other via a sequence of L-, MP- and CR-moves.*

Proof of Proposition 12. Obviously, it is enough to prove that if $o(P_2)$ is obtained from $o(P_1)$ via one change of crossing, then P_2 can be obtained from P_1 via L-, MP- and CR-moves. Hence, let us suppose that $o(P_2)$ is obtained from $o(P_1)$ via one change of crossing. Let us call φ the arc defining the change of crossing. By Lemma 5 and Proposition 7, we can suppose, up to L- and MP-moves, that $\varphi([0, 1])$ is an edge of the ideal triangulation $\mathcal{T}(P_1 \cup \partial M)$: let us call R the region dual to $\varphi([0, 1])$. Moreover, up to L-moves, we can suppose




Figure 18: The local configuration near the region R dual to φ .




Figure 19: How to modify P_1 to be able to apply a CR-move (Step 1).

that R is a disc with closure embedded in M (namely, there is no self-adjacency along edges or vertices). The local configuration now is shown in Fig. 18. In Fig. 18 we have shown also the arc φ'' which replaces the arc φ' in the change of crossing. For the sake of simplicity, we continue to call P_1 the standard skeleton just obtained.

The aim is to modify P_1 to be able to apply a CR-move changing the crossing as desired. We modify P_1 in two steps.

Step 1. Let us concentrate on the part that, in Fig. 18, lies over R . Let us call $\overline{\varphi''}$ the part of φ'' that lies over R . Up to an isotopy of $\overline{\varphi''}$, we can suppose that, by projecting $\overline{\varphi''}$ to P_1 along π , we obtain a disc, say Φ , transverse to the singularities and to itself (see Fig. 19-left). Here π is the projection of $M \setminus N(o(P_1))$ onto P_1 . Consider a little regular neighbourhood $N(\overline{\varphi''})$ of $\overline{\varphi''}$, see Fig. 19-centre. The polyhedron $(P_1 \cup \Phi \cup N(\overline{\varphi''})) \cup \partial M$ is a spine of M minus a ball, but $P_1 \cup \Phi \cup N(\overline{\varphi''})$ is not a skeleton of (M, X) . It is not quasi-standard (because it is not purely 2-dimensional), but if we collapse it as shown in Fig. 19-right, we obtain a quasi-standard skeleton P'_1 of (M, X) such that $o(P'_1) = o(P_1)$. Up to a change of Φ , we can suppose that P is also standard. Let us call D' the little disc shown in Fig. 19-right.

Step 2. Now, we concentrate on the part that, in Fig. 18, lies under R , see Fig. 20. We consider the arc analogous to $\overline{\varphi''}$ under R and we project it to P'_1 . Let us call δ the arc just obtained. Up to a change of the projection, we can suppose that it does not intersect the portion of R near Φ . We apply L-moves along δ (see Fig. 20-left for an example), substituting the curve δ with another curve that intersects the singularity of P in one point only. Let us continue to call δ the curve just obtained. Let us call P''_1 the standard skeleton just obtained (obviously, $o(P''_1) = o(P'_1) = o(P_1)$) and D the disc shown in Fig. 20-right (whose boundary contains δ). Note that D is an external disc for P''_1 .




Figure 20: Left: How to modify P_1 to be able to apply a CR-move (Step 2), an example. Right: The external disc D .




Figure 21: A change of tentacle.

By virtue of Proposition 7, we have that P_1'' can be obtained from P_1 via L- and MP-moves.

Now, we are able to apply a CR-move. The substitution of the disc D' with the external disc D is exactly a CR-move (the check is straightforward, so we leave it to the reader). By applying this CR-move, we obtain a standard skeleton, say P_2' , changing the crossing as desired. In order to conclude the proof, it is enough to apply Proposition 7 to obtain P_2 from P_2' via L- and MP-moves. \square

3.3 Generic change of tentacles

In this section, we will describe a slight modification of the CR-move (another particular disc-replacement) and we finally give the set of moves for the general case. We need a generalisation because changes of crossings may not be enough to transform any two octopuses of (M, X) into each other. Let o be an octopus, let $\varphi' : [0, 1] \rightarrow o$ be a piece of a tentacle of o , and let $\varphi'' : [0, 1] \rightarrow \text{Int}(M)$ be a generic simple arc such that $\varphi''([0, 1]) \cap o = \{\varphi''(0), \varphi''(1)\}$ and that the endpoints of φ'' coincide with the endpoints of φ' . If we replace the arc φ' of o with the arc φ'' , we obtain another octopus o' . The transformation from o to o' is called *change of tentacle* (see Fig. 21). Note that the change of tentacle does not depend on the orientation of φ' and φ'' .

Remark 14. Changes of tentacles are enough to obtain any octopus of (M, X) from a fixed one. Namely, at most one change of tentacle for each tentacle is enough.

T-move Let P be a standard skeleton of (M, X) . We call *T-move* the move shown in Fig. 22. Let us call P' the polyhedron obtained after the T-move. Since




Figure 22: The T-move.




Figure 23: Unfolded version of R_1 and R_2 . The coloured cross is an unfolded version of the part of R_1 and R_2 drawn in Fig. 22.

this move is non-local, it must be described with some care. Let us consider a region D' incident to one vertex only, say v , and to two different regions, say R_1 and R_2 , along the circle δ' . We suppose moreover that an unfolded version of R_1 and R_2 appears as in Fig. 23. Note that the folded version of the cross coloured in Fig. 23, say \bar{R} , is exactly the part of R_1 and R_2 involved in the move (see again Fig. 22). We suppose that the folded version is transversely orientable and that the little tongues T and T' lie on the other side of \bar{R} with respect to D' . The folded version of the arc δ , which is a circle, bounds an external disc D lying on the other side of \bar{R} with respect to the little tongue T . The move consists in replacing the disc D' with the external disc D (see Fig. 22). Note that a T-move can lead to a non-standard polyhedron. To avoid this loss of standardness, we will call T-moves only those preserving standardness. With this convention, if we apply a T-move to a standard skeleton of (M, X) , the result will be another standard skeleton of (M, X) . Note that each T-move is a disc-replacement.

Remark 15. Each change of crossing is also a change of tentacle but the CR-move, which allows us to change the crossings, is not a T-move, which will allow us to change the tentacles. Actually, the difference between the two moves is deeper: the CR-move is local (*i.e.* if we look at Fig. 16, we note that there exists a horizontal disc which is an external disc for $P \cup D$, so the move modifies a portion of P contained in a ball), while the T-move may not be local.




Figure 24: An example of “strip”.




Figure 25: How to slightly move Φ_2 , so that the two strips Φ_1 and Φ_2 fit together.

Strips We will now describe a generalisation of the procedure described in Proposition 12-Step 1 being useful in the proof of the theorem below. Let us consider a standard skeleton P of (M, X) . Let $\varphi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \text{Int}(M)$ be a simple arc such that $\varphi([0, 1]) \cap P = \{\varphi(0), \varphi(1)\}$. Suppose moreover that $\varphi([0, 1]) \cap o(P) = \emptyset$. Let π be a retraction of $M \setminus N(o(P))$ onto P . Up to isotopy, we can suppose that $\pi(\varphi([0, 1]))$ both intersects at least twice $S(P)$ and is in general position with respect to $S(P)$ and to itself. Then, there exists a continuous $\Phi : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ obtained by projecting $\varphi([0, 1])$ along π , where $\Phi(1, 0)$ and $\Phi(1, 1)$ are the two intersection points mentioned above, and $\Phi(0, t) = \varphi(t)$ holds for each $t \in [0, 1]$. Such a Φ will be called *strip associated to φ* . Note that it may have self-intersections (see Fig. 24). We can suppose that Φ is in general position with respect to P and to itself.

Let us consider now a simple arc $\varphi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \text{Int}(M)$ such that $\varphi([0, 1]) \cap P = \{\varphi(0), \varphi(s), \varphi(1)\}$ with $0 < s < 1$, that $\varphi([0, 1]) \cap o(P) = \emptyset$, and that φ is in general position with respect to P . The arc φ can be divided in two arcs $\varphi_1 : [0, s] \rightarrow \text{Int}(M)$ and $\varphi_2 : [s, 1] \rightarrow \text{Int}(M)$ satisfying the hypotheses above, so there exist two strips $\Phi_1 : [0, 1] \times [0, s] \rightarrow M$ and $\Phi_2 : [0, 1] \times [s, 1] \rightarrow M$ associated to φ_1 and φ_2 , respectively. Now, perhaps Φ_1 and Φ_2 do not fit together to give a continuous $\Phi : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow M$. But, up to a slightly move of Φ_2 , we can suppose that such a Φ exists and is in general position with respect to P and to itself, see Fig. 25. As above, such a Φ will be called *strip associated to φ* . Obviously, we can generalise this technique to arcs with a generic (finite) number of intersections with P .

Changing the tentacles The following result states that T-moves are enough to change the tentacles.

Proposition 16. *Let P_1 and P_2 be standard skeleta of (M, X) such that $o(P_2)$ is obtained from $o(P_1)$ via changes of tentacles. Then P_2 can be obtained from P_1 via L-, MP- and T-moves.*

Before turning into the proof, we state (as an obvious corollary of Proposition 7, Proposition 16 and Remark 14) that the T-move, with the MP- and the




Figure 26: The starting situation.

L-move, suffices to relate to each other any two standard skeleta of the same manifold with marked boundary.

Theorem 17. *Any two standard skeleta of (M, X) can be obtained from each other via a sequence of L-, MP- and T-moves.*

Proof of Proposition 16. Obviously, it is enough to prove that if $o(P_2)$ is obtained from $o(P_1)$ via one change of tentacle, then P_2 can be obtained from P_1 via L-, MP- and T-moves. Hence, let us suppose that $o(P_2)$ is obtained from $o(P_1)$ via one change of tentacle. Let us call φ' and φ'' the arcs defining the change of tentacle: namely, $\varphi' \subset o(P_1)$ is replaced by $\varphi'' \subset o(P_2)$. Up to isotopy, we can suppose that φ'' intersects P_1 at least twice. Let us call t_i , with $t_1 < \dots < t_m$, the “times” at which φ'' intersects P_1 . Up to isotopy, we can suppose that the first and the last intersection ($\varphi''(t_1)$ and $\varphi''(t_m)$) belong to the same region (say R) and that φ'' appears, near φ' , as shown in Fig. 26. Moreover, up to L-moves, we can suppose that R is a disc with closure embedded in M (namely, there is no self-adjacency along edges or vertices).

The aim is to modify P_1 to be able to apply a T-move changing the tentacle as desired. We modify P_1 in two steps.

Step 1. We repeat the same technique used in Step 2 of the proof of Proposition 12 obtaining another standard skeleton P'_1 such that $o(P'_1) = o(P_1)$. We obtain a curve δ intersecting the singularities of P'_1 only in one point, and we call D the external disc shown in Fig. 20-right (see Step 2 of the proof of Proposition 12 for notation).

Step 2. Let us now concentrate on the arc $\varphi([t_1, t_m])$. We generalise the procedure described in Step 1 of the proof of Proposition 12. Let Φ be a strip associated to $\varphi([t_1, t_m])$. Up to an isotopy of $\varphi([t_1, t_m])$ (process that requires a modification of Φ), we can suppose that $\Phi([0, 1] \times [0, 1])$ does not intersect δ . Let us consider now a little regular neighbourhood $N(\varphi)$ of $\varphi([t_1, t_m])$; we have shown an example in Fig. 27. Up to a slight move of the vertical regions (as shown in Fig. 28), we can suppose that only one vertical region cuts $N(\varphi)$. The polyhedron $(P'_1 \cup \Phi \cup N(\varphi)) \cup \partial M$ is a spine of M minus a ball, but $P'_1 \cup \Phi \cup N(\varphi)$ is not a skeleton, because both it is not purely 2-dimensional and it has some points that are not of type I-V. If we collapse $N(\varphi)$ and we slightly move the vertical regions (see Fig. 29), we obtain a standard skeleton P''_1 of (M, X) such that $o(P''_1) = o(P'_1)$. Let us call D' the little disc shown in Fig. 29-right.

By virtue of Proposition 7, we have that P''_1 can be obtained from P_1 via L- and MP-moves.




Figure 27: A portion of the neighbourhood $N(\varphi)$ of $\varphi([t_1, t_m])$, an example.




Figure 28: How to move the vertical regions to have that only one vertical region cuts $N(\varphi)$.




Figure 29: How to “standardise” $P'_1 \cup \Phi \cup N(\varphi)$.

We are now able to apply a T-move. The substitution of the disc D' with the external disc D is exactly a T-move (the check is straightforward, so we leave it to the reader). By applying this T-move, we obtain a standard skeleton, say P'_2 , changing the crossing as desired (i.e. $o(P'_2) = o(P_2)$). In order to conclude the proof, it is enough to apply Proposition 7 to obtain P_2 from P'_2 via L- and MP-moves. \square

Acknowledgements I would like to thank Riccardo Benedetti and Carlo Petronio for the useful discussions, and the PhD school “Galileo Galilei” of Pisa. Moreover, I would like to thank the Department of Mathematics of the University of Salento for the nice welcome and, in particular, Prof. Giuseppe De Cecco for his willingness.

References

- [1] B. G. CASLER, *An imbedding theorem for connected 3-manifolds with boundary*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **16** (1965), 559–566.
- [2] B. MARTELLI, *Complexity of 3-manifolds*, Spaces of Kleinian groups, 91–120, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., 329, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2006.
- [3] B. MARTELLI – C. PETRONIO, *Three-manifolds having complexity at most 9*, Experiment. Math. **10** (2001), no. 2, 207–236.

- [4] B. MARTELLI – C. PETRONIO, *A new decomposition theorem for 3-manifolds*, Illinois J. Math. **46** (2002), no. 3, 755–780.
- [5] B. MARTELLI – C. PETRONIO, *Complexity of geometric three-manifolds*, Geom. Dedicata **108** (2004), 15–69.
- [6] S. V. MATVEEV, *The theory of the complexity of three-dimensional manifolds*, Akad. Nauk Ukrain. SSR Inst. Mat. Preprint (1988), no. 13, 32 pp.
- [7] S. V. MATVEEV, *Transformations of special spines, and the Zeeman conjecture*, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat. **51** (1987), no. 5, 1104–1116, 1119; translation in Math. USSR-Izv. **31** (1988), no. 2, 423–434.
- [8] S. V. MATVEEV, “Algorithmic topology and classification of 3-manifolds,” Algorithms and Computation in Mathematics, 9. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003. xii+478 pp.
- [9] S. V. MATVEEV – A. T. FOMENKO, *Isoenergetic surfaces of Hamiltonian systems, the enumeration of three-dimensional manifolds in order of growth of their complexity, and the calculation of the volumes of closed hyperbolic manifolds*, Uspekhi Mat. Nauk **43** (1988), no. 1 (259), 5–22, 247; translation in Russian Math. Surveys **43** (1988), no. 1, 3–24.
- [10] R. PIERGALLINI, *Standard moves for standard polyhedra and spines*, Third National Conference on Topology (Italian) (Trieste, 1986), Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo (2) Suppl. No. 18 (1988), 391–414.
- [11] V. G. TURAEV – O. YA. VIRO, *State sum invariants of 3-manifolds and quantum 6j-symbols*, Topology **31** (1992), no. 4, 865–902.

Department of Mathematics
 University of Salento
 Palazzo Fiorini, Via per Arnesano
 I-73100 Lecce, Italy
 amendola@mail.dm.unipi.it