

AN UNKNOTTING INDEX FOR VIRTUAL LINKS

KIRANDEEP KAUR, MADETI PRABHAKAR, AND ANDREI VESNIN

ABSTRACT. Given a virtual link diagram D , we define its unknotting index $U(D)$ to be minimum among (m, n) tuples, where m stands for the number of crossings virtualized and n stands for the number of classical crossing changes, to obtain a trivial link diagram. By using span of a diagram and linking number of a diagram we provide a lower bound for unknotting index of a virtual link. Then using warping degree of a diagram, we obtain an upper bound. Both these bounds are applied to find unknotting index for virtual links obtained from pretzel links by virtualizing some crossings.

INTRODUCTION

Virtual knot theory was introduced by L.H. Kauffman [6] as a natural generalization of the theory of classical knots. Some knot invariants have been naturally extended to virtual knot invariants and, more generally, to virtual link invariants, as well. In the recent past, several invariants, like arrow polynomial [2], index polynomial [4], multi-variable polynomial [9] and polynomial invariants of virtual knots [8] and links [12] have been introduced to distinguish two given virtual knots or links. Another approach that can be extended from classical to virtual links to construct interesting invariant is based on unknotting moves. One of the unknotting moves for virtual knots is known as *virtualization*, which is a replacement of classical crossing by virtual crossing. Observe, that classical unknotting move, that is replacement of a classical crossing to another type of classical crossing, is not an unknotting operation for virtual knots.

In [7], K. Kaur, S. Kamada, A. Kawauchi and M. Prabhakar introduced an unknotting invariant for virtual knots, called an *unknotting index for virtual knots*. We extend the concept of unknotting index for the case of virtual links and present lower and upper bound for this invariant. To demonstrate the method, bases on these bounds, we provide the unknotting index for a large class of virtual links obtained from pretzel links by applying virtualization moves to some crossings.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 1 contains preliminaries that are required to prove the main results of the paper. Namely, we define unknotting index for virtual links and review the concept of Gauss diagram for n -component virtual links. To obtain a lower bound on unknotting index, we define span of the virtual link and for an upper bound, we define warping degree for virtual links. In Section 2, we provide a lower bound for the unknotting index, see Theorem 2.2, and for upper bound, see Theorem 2.3. Using these bounds, in Section 3 we determine unknotting index for large class of virtual links that are obtained from classical pretzel links by virtualizing some classical crossings.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 57M25; Secondary 57M90.

Key words and phrases. Virtual link, unknotting index, pretzel link, span value.

1. PRELIMINARIES

A diagram of virtual link has two type of crossings: (classical) crossings and virtual crossings. In pictures given below virtual crossings are encircled by a small circles. Two virtual link diagrams are said to be *equivalent* if one can be deformed into another by using a finite sequence of classical Reidemeister moves RI, RII, RIII, as shown in Fig. 1(a), and virtual Reidemeister moves VRI, VRII, VRIII, SV, as shown in Fig. 1(b).




FIGURE 1. Two kinds of Reidemeister moves.

Given a virtual link diagram D and an ordered pair (m, n) of non negative integers, the diagram D is said to be (m, n) -unknottable if, by virtualizing m classical crossings and by applying crossing change operation to n classical crossings of D , the resulting diagram can be deformed into a diagram of a trivial link. Obviously, if D has $c(D)$ crossings, then D is $(c(D), 0)$ -unknottable. We define *unknotting index* of D , denoted by $U(D)$, to be minimum among all such pairs (m, n) for which D is (m, n) -unknottable. Here the minimality is taken with respect to the dictionary ordering. In Fig. 2, we present examples of virtual link diagrams and their unknotting index, which are easy to compute.

Definition 1.1. The *unknotting index* $U(L)$ of a virtual link L is defined as $U(L) = \min U(D)$, where minimum is taken over all diagrams D of L .

It is easy to observe that a virtual link L is trivial if and only if $U(L) = (0, 0)$. For classical link L , it is obvious to see that $U(L) \leq (0, u(L))$, where $u(L)$ is the usual unknotting number of L .




FIGURE 2. Virtual link diagrams and their unknotting indices.

In general, it is a difficult problem to find the unknotting index for a given virtual link. In case of virtual knots, some lower bounds are provided on this unknotting index in [7] using n -th writhe invariant $J_n(K)$, introduced in [10], see definition 1.6.

Proposition 1.1. [7, Proposition 4.2], [10, Theorem 1.5] *Let K be a virtual knot. Then the following properties hold:*

- (1) *If $J_k(K) \neq J_{-k}(K)$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$, then $(1, 0) \leq U(K)$.*
- (2) *$(0, \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \neq 0} |J_k(K)|) \leq U(K)$.*

A *flat virtual knot diagram* is a virtual knot diagram with ignoring over/under information at crossings. A virtual knot diagram D can be deformed into unknot by applying crossing change operations if and only if the flat virtual knot diagram corresponding to D presents the trivial flat virtual knot. By Proposition 1.1, the flat virtual knot, corresponding to K , is non-trivial if there exists an integer k such that $J_k(K) \neq J_{-k}(K)$.


Now, let us turn to the case of virtual links. We will provide a lower bound on the unknotting index for a given virtual link. Namely, we will modify the lower bound given in Proposition 1.1 using span and linking number of diagram. We recall the definition of linking number and Gauss diagram and review span invariant, which we use to find the lower bound.

Definition 1.2. For an n -component virtual link $L = K_1 \cup K_2 \cup \dots \cup K_n$, the *linking number* $\text{lk}(L)$ is defined as

$$\text{lk}(L) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{c_k \in K_i \cap K_j, \text{with } i \neq j} \text{sgn}(c_k),$$

where $\text{sgn}(c_k)$ is the sign of c_k , defined as in Fig. 3.

In [1], Z. Cheng and H. Gao defined an invariant, called *span*, for 2-component virtual links using Gauss diagram. Remark that span is same as the absolute value of wriggle number provided by L. C. Folwaczny and L. H. Kauffman in [3]. Consider a diagram $D = D_1 \cup D_2$ of a virtual link $L = K_1 \cup K_2$. Let us traverse along D_1 and consider crossings of D_1 and D_2 . If r_+ (respectively, r_-) is the number of over linking crossings

FIGURE 3. Sign of crossing c .

with positive sign (respectively, negative sign) and ℓ_+ (respectively, ℓ_-) is the number of under linking crossings with positive sign (respectively, negative sign), then $\text{span}(D)$ of D is defined as

$$\text{span}(D) = |r_+ - r_- - \ell_+ + \ell_-|.$$

It is easy to see, that we will get the same result by traverse along D_2 . Since, due to [1], $\text{span}(D)$ of diagram D of a link L is an invariant for L , we denote it by $\text{span}(L)$. It is easy to see, that for a classical 2-component link L we get $\text{span}(L) = 0$.

Definition 1.3. For a virtual link $L = K_1 \cup K_2 \cup \dots \cup K_n$, we define span of L as

$$\text{span}(L) = \sum_{i \neq j} \text{span}(K_i \cup K_j).$$

Since $\text{span}(K_i \cup K_j)$ is a virtual link invariant, $\text{span}(L)$ is also a virtual link invariant.

The following property is obvious and we state it as Lemma for further references.

Lemma 1.1. *If D' is a diagram obtained from a 2-component virtual link diagram D by virtualizing one crossing, then $|\text{span}(D) - \text{span}(D')| \leq 1$.*

It is obvious that $\text{span}(L)$ leaves invariant under crossing change operation. Also, for two equivalent 2-component virtual link diagrams, $D = D_1 \cup D_2$ and $D' = D'_1 \cup D'_2$, their linking crossings are related as $r'_+ = r_+ + s$, $r'_- = r_- + s$ for some $s \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\ell'_+ = \ell_+ + t$, $\ell'_- = \ell_- + t$, for some $t \in \mathbb{Z}$.

The $\text{span}(L)$ of a virtual link L can be calculated through Gauss diagrams. We define Gauss diagram for an oriented n -component virtual link as follows.



Definition 1.4. *Gauss diagram $G(D)$ of an n -component virtual link diagram D consists of n oriented circles with over/under passing information in crossings be presented by directed chords and segments. For a given crossing $c \in D$ the chord (or segment) in $G(D)$ is directed from over crossing \bar{c} to under crossing \underline{c} .*

Fig. 4(b) depicts the Gauss diagram corresponding to the virtual link diagram presented in Fig. 4(a).

In [1], Z. Cheng and H. Gao assigned an integer value, called *index value*, to each classical crossing c of a virtual knot diagram using Gauss diagrams and denoted it by $\text{Ind}(c)$.

Definition 1.5. Let D be a virtual knot diagram and γ_c be a chord of Gauss diagram $G(D)$. Let r_+ (respectively, r_-) be the number of positive (respectively, negative) chords intersecting γ_c transversely from right to left as shown in Fig 5. Let l_+ (respectively, l_-) be the number of positive (respectively, negative) chords intersecting γ_c transversely from left to right. Then the *index* of γ_c is defined as

$$\text{Ind}(\gamma_c) = r_+ - r_- - l_+ + l_-.$$


 FIGURE 4. Virtual link diagram D and its Gauss diagram $G(D)$.

 FIGURE 5. Chords intersecting transversely to a chord γ_c

The *index value* $\text{Ind}(c)$ of a crossing c in D is given by the *index value* $\text{Ind}(\gamma_c)$ of the corresponding chord γ_c in $G(D)$.

Definition 1.6. For each $n \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$, the n -th writhe $J_n(D)$ of an oriented virtual knot diagram D is defined as the sum of signs of those crossings in D , whose index value is n . Hence,

$$J_n(D) = \sum_{c: \text{Ind}(c)=n} \text{sgn}(c).$$

By [10] the n -th writhe, $J_n(D)$, is a virtual knot invariant.

To obtain an upper bound on the unknotting index, we define warping degree for virtual links. In [11], A. Shimizu defined warping crossing points for a link diagram. Here we use the same terminology for virtual links. Let $D = D^1 \cup D^2 \cup \dots \cup D^n$ be an orientated virtual link diagram and $D_a = D_{a_1}^1 \cup D_{a_2}^2 \cup \dots \cup D_{a_n}^n$ denotes the based diagram of D with the base point sequence $a = \langle a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n \rangle$, where a_i is a non-crossing point on D^i for each $1 \leq i \leq n$. A self crossing c in $D_{a_i}^i$ is said to be a warping crossing point, if we encounter c first at under crossing point while moving from a_i along the orientation in $D_{a_i}^i$. A linking crossing c between $D_{a_i}^i$ and $D_{a_j}^j$ is said to be a warping crossing point, if c is an under crossing of $D_{a_i}^i$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq n$.

Then the *warping degree* of D_a , denoted by $d(D_a)$, is defined as the minimum number of crossing points that have to change in D_a from under to over starting from a_i in each $D_{a_i}^i$, such that the resulting based diagram with base point sequence $\langle a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n \rangle$ has no warping crossing point.

Definition 1.7. The *warping degree* of a virtual link diagram D is defined as

$$d(D) = \min\{d(D_a) \mid a \text{ is a base point sequence}\}.$$

If D is a classical link diagram with $d(D) = 0$, then D presents a trivial link. This is in general not true in case of virtual link diagrams. The warping degree is zero for the virtual link diagrams shown in Fig. 2(a) and Fig. 7(a), even though these diagrams does not present trivial link. Moreover, if D is diagram of classical link, then $u(D) \leq d(D)$. But this is in general not true for virtual links whose usual unknotting number exist. For virtual trefoil knot diagram shown in Fig. 6, we have $u(D) = 1$ and $d(D) = 0$, thus $u(D) \not\leq d(D)$. In Section 2, we will use warping degree to establish an upper bound on unknotting number for virtual links.




FIGURE 6. A diagram of virtual trefoil knot.

2. BOUNDS ON UNKNOTTING INDEX

In this section, we will provide bounds on unknotting index for virtual links.

Lemma 2.1. *Let D be a virtual link diagram. Then $\text{span}(D)$ is equal to the minimum number of crossings in D which should be virtualized to obtain a diagram D' such that $\text{span}(D') = 0$.*

Proof. Let $D = D^0 = D_1^0 \cup \dots \cup D_n^0$ be an n -component virtual link diagram, and $D^m = D_1^m \cup \dots \cup D_n^m$ be a diagram with $\text{span}(D^m) = 0$. Let $\{D^0, D^1, \dots, D^m\}$ be a sequence of n -components virtual link diagrams, where $D^{i+1} = D_1^{i+1} \cup \dots \cup D_n^{i+1}$ is obtained from $D^i = D_1^i \cup \dots \cup D_n^i$ by virtualizing exactly one crossing. Denote this crossing by c_i and suppose that $c_i \in D_{k(i)}^i \cup D_{\ell(i)}^i$ for some $k(i)$ and $\ell(i)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{span}(D) &= |\text{span}(D^0) - \text{span}(D^m)| = \left| \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} (\text{span}(D^i) - \text{span}(D^{i+1})) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} |\text{span}(D^i) - \text{span}(D^{i+1})| \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \left| \text{span}(D_{k(i)}^i \cup D_{\ell(i)}^i) - \text{span}(D_{k(i)}^{i+1} \cup D_{\ell(i)}^{i+1}) \right| = m, \end{aligned}$$

where for the last step we used Lemma 1.1.

To obtain the inverse inequality, let us start with virtual link diagram $D = D_1^0 \cup \dots \cup D_n^0$ and consider a pair of components $D_i^0 \cup D_j^0$, $i < j$, and traverse along D_i^0 . Let r_{ij+} (respectively, r_{ij-}) be the number of over linking crossings with positive sign (respectively,

negative sign) and l_{ij+} (respectively, l_{ij-}) be the number of under linking crossings with positive sign (respectively, negative sign). Then $\text{span}(D_i^0 \cup D_j^0) = |r_{ij+} - r_{ij-} - l_{ij+} + l_{ij-}|$. Now, in each $D_i^0 \cup D_j^0$, $i < j$, virtualize $\text{span}(D_i^0 \cup D_j^0)$ number of crossings as follows;

- If $r_{ij+} + l_{ij-} > r_{ij-} + l_{ij+}$, then we virtualize a crossing which is either a positive sign over crossing or a negative sign under crossing, and
- if $r_{ij+} + l_{ij-} < r_{ij-} + l_{ij+}$, then we virtualize a crossing which is either a negative sign over crossing or a positive sign under crossing.

After virtualizing $\sum_{i \neq j} \text{span}(D_i^0 \cup D_j^0)$ number of crossings in D , the resulting diagram has zero span value and $m \leq \text{span}(D)$. Hence $m = \text{span}(D)$. □

Corollary 2.1. *If L is an n -component virtual link, then $U(L) \geq (\text{span}(L), 0)$.*

Proof. Observe that $\text{span}(L)$ of virtual link L is invariant under crossing change operation. Thus, if $\text{span}(L) \neq 0$ then L is non-classical link. Hence by Lemma 2.1, $U(L) \geq (\text{span}(L), 0)$. □

Remark 2.1. If L is a virtual link with $U(L) = (m, n)$ and $\text{span}(L) = 0$, then m need not be zero. For example, span of the virtual link presented by the diagram given in Fig. 7(a) is zero, but the unknotting index is $(2, 0)$.




FIGURE 7. A virtual link and its labelling for an affine index polynomial.

Example 2.1. Let L be a virtual link represented by the diagram D as shown in Fig. 7(a). Observe that the affine index polynomial, $P_L(t)$, shown in Fig. 7(b) never reduces to zero by changing crossings in L . Therefore the flat virtual link corresponding to L is non trivial and at least one virtualization is needed to turn L to unlink. After one virtualization in D the resulting diagram, say L' , has $\text{span}(L') = 1$. Thus $(2, 0) \leq U(L)$ and by virtualizing crossing a and c , L can be deformed to trivial link.

Suppose that L is a virtual link with $U(L) = (m, n)$. From Corollary 2.1, $(\text{span}(L), 0)$ is a lower bound on (m, n) . By fixing $\text{span}(L)$ as a lower bound on m , we establish a lower bound on n using the concept of linking number. For this we introduce some notions as follows.

Let $C(D)$ be the set of all classical crossings in a virtual link diagram D and S be any subset of $C(D)$. Denote D_S as a diagram obtained from D by virtualizing all the crossings of S . Denote the cardinality of the set S by $|S|$. Now consider $\Lambda(D)$ defined by

$$\Lambda(D) = \{S \subseteq C(D) \mid |S| = \text{span}(D) \text{ and } \text{span}(D_S) = 0\}.$$

Let us consider $\ell_D = \min\{|\text{lk}(D_S)| \mid S \in \Lambda(D)\}$.

Example 2.2. *The value ℓ_D is not an invariant for L . It is shown in Fig. 8, that for two equivalent diagrams D and D' of a 3-component link L values ℓ_D and $\ell_{D'}$ are not equal.*




FIGURE 8. Diagrams D and D' with $\ell_D = 0$ and $\ell_{D'} = 1$.

But in case of 2-component virtual links, we observe that ℓ_D is a virtual link invariant.

Theorem 2.1. *If $D = D_1 \cup D_2$ is a virtual link diagram, then either $\ell_D = 0$ or*

$$\ell_D = |\text{lk}(D)| - \frac{1}{2} \text{span}(D).$$

Proof. Let $D = D_1 \cup D_2$ be a 2-component virtual link diagram. Without loss of generality consider traversing along D_1 . Recall that

$$\text{span}(D) = |r_+ + l_- - r_- - l_+|,$$

where r_+ (respectively, r_-) is the number of positive (respectively, negative) over linking crossings and l_+ (respectively, l_-) is the number of positive (respectively, negative) under linking crossings.

We will show that either $\ell_D = 0$ or $\ell_D = |\text{lk}(D)| - \frac{1}{2} \text{span}(D)$.

If $\text{span}(D) = 0$, then $\Lambda(D)$ contains only empty set and hence $\ell_D = |\text{lk}(D)|$.

Suppose $\text{span} D \neq 0$. Then $\Lambda(D) \neq \emptyset$. Let $S \in \Lambda(D)$, and n and m be number of positive and negative crossings, respectively, of D that belong to S . Then $n + m = \text{span}(D)$ and $\text{lk}(D_S) = \text{lk}(D) - (n - m)/2$.

Since $\text{span}(D) \neq 0$, we have either $r_+ + l_- > r_- + l_+$ or $r_+ + l_- < r_- + l_+$. It is easy to observe that when $r_+ + l_- > r_- + l_+$, the n positive crossings are over linking crossings and m negative crossings are under linking crossings, whereas in the case $r_+ + l_- < r_- + l_+$, the n positive crossings are under linking crossings and m negative crossings are over linking crossings.

Case 1. Assume $r_+ + l_- > r_- + l_+$. Then we have the following two subcases.

Subcase 1.1. Assume $\ell_+ > \ell_-$. Then $2\text{lk}(D) > \text{span}(D)$ and $r_+ > \text{span}(D)$.

Since $r_+ > \text{span}(D)$, we can ensure that there exist an $S \in \Lambda(D)$ such that the number of positive over linking crossings of D in S is $\text{span}(D)$, i.e., $n = \text{span}(D)$ and $m = 0$. Therefore,

$$\text{lk}(D_S) = \text{lk}(D) - \frac{1}{2}(n - m) = \text{lk}(D) - \frac{1}{2}\text{span}(D) > 0.$$

Hence $|\text{lk}(D_S)| = |\text{lk}(D) - \frac{1}{2}\text{span}(D)|$, which can be written as

$$(1) \quad |\text{lk}(D_S)| = \text{lk}(D) - \frac{1}{2}\text{span}(D),$$

since $\text{lk}(D) > 0$. To be specific, for every set $S \in \Lambda(D)$ we have $|\text{lk}(D_S)| > 0$. Indeed, if there exists a set $S' \in \Lambda(D)$ such that $|\text{lk}(D_{S'})| = 0$, then $n' + m' = \text{span}(D)$, where n' and m' are the number of positive and negative crossings of D that belongs to S' , and

$$\text{lk}(D_{S'}) = \text{lk}(D) - \frac{1}{2}(n' - m') = 0$$

implies

$$2\text{lk}(D) = n' - m' \leq n' + m',$$

whence

$$2\text{lk}(D) \leq \text{span}(D),$$

that gives a contradiction. Therefore for every set $S \in \Lambda(D)$ we have $|\text{lk}(D_S)| > 0$ and hence $\ell_D \neq 0$.

Now we need to show that $|\text{lk}(D)| - \text{span}(D)/2 \leq \ell_D$. For this let us assume that there exist a set $S'' \in \Lambda(D)$ such that $|\text{lk}(D_{S''})| < |\text{lk}(D)| - \text{span}(D)/2$. Then $n'' + m'' = \text{span}(D)$, where n'' and m'' are the number of positive and negative crossings of D that belongs to S'' , and

$$\text{lk}(D_{S''}) = \text{lk}(D) - \frac{(n'' - m'')}{2}.$$

Therefore,

$$|\text{lk}(D) - \frac{1}{2}(n'' - m'')| < |\text{lk}(D)| - \frac{1}{2}(n'' + m'').$$

Since $\text{lk}(D) > 0$, we can write

$$|\text{lk}(D) - \frac{1}{2}(n'' - m'')| < \text{lk}(D) - \frac{1}{2}(n'' + m''),$$

that implies

$$\text{lk}(D) - \frac{1}{2}(n'' - m'') < \text{lk}(D) - \frac{1}{2}(n'' + m''),$$

whence

$$(n'' - m'') > (n'' + m''),$$

which is not possible as both n'' and m'' are not equal to zero simultaneously. This contradiction implies

$$(2) \quad |\text{lk}(D)| - \frac{1}{2}\text{span}(D) \leq |\text{lk}(D_S)|$$

for any $S \in \Lambda(D)$. Using eq. (1) and eq. (2), we can say that $|\text{lk}(D)| - \text{span}(D)/2 = \ell_D$, where $\ell_D = \min\{|\text{lk}(D_S)| | S \in \Lambda(D)\}$.

Subcase 1.2. Assume $\ell_+ \leq \ell_-$. Then either $r_+ < r_-$ or $r_+ \geq r_-$.

Subcase 1.2a. If $r_+ < r_-$, then we have $\text{lk}(D) < 0$, $2|\text{lk}(D)| > \text{span}(D)$ and $\ell_- > \text{span}(D)$.

Since $\ell_- > \text{span}(D)$, we can ensure that there exists a set $S \in \Lambda(D)$ such that the number of negative under linking crossings of D in S is $\text{span}(D)$, i.e., $n = 0$ and $m = \text{span}(D)$. Therefore,

$$\text{lk}(D_S) = \text{lk}(D) - \frac{1}{2}(n - m) = \text{lk}(D) + \frac{1}{2}\text{span}(D) < 0,$$

and

$$(3) \quad |\text{lk}(D_S)| = -(\text{lk}(D) + \frac{1}{2}\text{span}(D)) = |\text{lk}(D)| - \frac{1}{2}\text{span}(D).$$

Suppose there exist $S' \in \Lambda(D)$ such that $|\text{lk}(D_{S'})| = 0$, then $n' + m' = \text{span}(D)$ and

$$\text{lk}(D_{S'}) = \text{lk}(D) - \frac{1}{2}(n' - m') = 0,$$

where n' and m' are the number of positive and negative crossings of D that belongs to S' . Therefore,

$$\text{lk}(D) = \frac{1}{2}(n' - m'),$$

hence

$$-2\text{lk}(D) = m' - n' \leq m' + n'$$

that implies

$$2|\text{lk}(D)| \leq \text{span}(D),$$

that gives a contradiction. Therefore $|\text{lk}(D_S)| > 0$ for every set $S \in \Lambda(D)$.

Now we need to show that $|\text{lk}(D)| - \text{span}(D)/2 \leq \ell_D$. For this let us assume that there exist a $S'' \in \Lambda(D)$ such that $|\text{lk}(D_{S''})| < |\text{lk}(D)| - \text{span}(D)/2$. Then $n'' + m'' = \text{span}(D)$, where n'' and m'' are the number of positive and negative crossings of D that belongs to S'' , and

$$\text{lk}(D_{S''}) = \text{lk}(D) - \frac{(n'' - m'')}{2}.$$

Therefore,

$$|\text{lk}(D) - \frac{1}{2}(n'' - m'')| < |\text{lk}(D)| - \frac{1}{2}(n'' + m'').$$

Since $\text{lk}(D) < 0$, we have

$$|\text{lk}(D) - \frac{1}{2}(n'' - m'')| < -\text{lk}(D) - \frac{1}{2}(n'' + m''),$$

that implies

$$-(-\text{lk}(D) - \frac{1}{2}(n'' + m'')) < \text{lk}(D) - \frac{1}{2}(n'' - m''),$$

whence

$$(n'' + m'') < (m'' - n''),$$

which is not possible as both n'' and m'' are not equal to zero simultaneously. This implies

$$(4) \quad |\text{lk}(D)| - \frac{1}{2}\text{span}(D) \leq |\text{lk}(D_S)|$$

for any $S \in \Lambda(D)$. Using eq. (3) and eq. (4), we can say that $|\text{lk}(D)| - \text{span}(D)/2 = \ell_D$.

Subcase 1.2.b. If $r_+ \geq r_-$, then we have $\ell_- \geq (\text{span}(D) - 2\text{lk}(D))/2$ and $r_+ \geq (\text{span}(D) + 2\text{lk}(D))/2$.

Since $\ell_- \geq (\text{span}(D) - 2\text{lk}(D))/2$ and $r_+ \geq (\text{span}(D) + 2\text{lk}(D))/2$, we can ensure that there exists a set $S \in \Lambda(D)$ such that $n = (\text{span}(D) + 2\text{lk}(D))/2$ and $m = (\text{span}(D) - 2\text{lk}(D))/2$. Then

$$\text{lk}(D_S) = \text{lk}(D) - \frac{1}{2}(n - m) = 0.$$

Observe that whenever there exists a set S in $\Lambda(D)$ such that $\text{lk}(D_S) = 0$, then $\ell_D = 0$.

Case 2. If $r_+ + \ell_- < r_- + \ell_+$, i.e., $\text{span}(D) = -(r_+ + \ell_- - r_- - \ell_+)$, then also we have the following two subcases.

Subcase 2.1. Assume $r_+ > r_-$. Then $2\text{lk}(D) > \text{span}(D)$ and $\ell_+ > \text{span}(D)$.

Since $\ell_+ > \text{span}(D)$, we can ensure that there exist a set $S \in \Lambda(D)$ such that the number of positive under linking crossings of D in S is $\text{span}(D)$, i.e., $n = \text{span}(D)$ and $m = 0$. Therefore,

$$\text{lk}(D_S) = \text{lk}(D) - \frac{1}{2}(n - m) = \text{lk}(D) - \frac{1}{2}\text{span}(D) > 0.$$

Hence $|\text{lk}(D_S)| = |\text{lk}(D) - \frac{1}{2}\text{span}(D)|$, which can be written as

$$(5) \quad |\text{lk}(D_S)| = \text{lk}(D) - \frac{1}{2}\text{span}(D),$$

since $\text{lk}(D) > 0$. To be specific, for every set $S \in \Lambda(D)$ we have $|\text{lk}(D_S)| > 0$. Otherwise, if there exist a set $S' \in \Lambda(D)$ such that $|\text{lk}(D_{S'})| = 0$, then $n' + m' = \text{span}(D)$, where n' and m' are the number of positive and negative crossings of D that belongs to S' , and

$$\text{lk}(D_{S'}) = \text{lk}(D) - \frac{1}{2}(n' - m') = 0,$$

that implies

$$2\text{lk}(D) = n' - m' \leq n' + m',$$

whence

$$2\text{lk}(D) \leq \text{span}(D),$$

that gives a contradiction. Therefore for every set $S \in \Lambda(D)$ we have $|\text{lk}(D_S)| > 0$, and hence $\ell_D \neq 0$.

Now we need to show that $|\text{lk}(D)| - \text{span}(D)/2 \leq \ell_D$. For this let us assume that there exist a $S'' \in \Lambda(D)$ such that $|\text{lk}(D_{S''})| < |\text{lk}(D)| - \text{span}(D)/2$. Then $n'' + m'' = \text{span}(D)$, where n'' and m'' are the number of positive and negative crossings of D that belongs to S'' , and $\text{lk}(D_{S''}) = \text{lk}(D) - (n'' - m'')/2$. Therefore,

$$|\text{lk}(D) - \frac{1}{2}(n'' - m'')| < |\text{lk}(D)| - \frac{1}{2}(n'' + m'').$$

Since $\text{lk}(D) > 0$, we can rewrite as

$$|\text{lk}(D) - \frac{1}{2}(n'' - m'')| < \text{lk}(D) - \frac{1}{2}(n'' + m''),$$

that implies

$$\text{lk}(D) - \frac{1}{2}(n'' - m'') < \text{lk}(D) - \frac{1}{2}(n'' + m'')$$

whence $(n'' - m'') > (n'' + m'')$, which is not possible as both n'' and m'' are not equal to zero simultaneously. This implies

$$(6) \quad |\text{lk}(D)| - \frac{1}{2} \text{span}(D) \leq |\text{lk}(D_S)|$$

for any $S \in \Lambda(D)$. Using eq. (5) and eq. (6), we can say that $|\text{lk}(D)| - \text{span}(D)/2 = \ell_D$.

Subcase 2.2. Assume $r_+ \leq r_-$. Then either $\ell_+ < \ell_-$ or $\ell_+ \geq \ell_-$.

Subcase 2.2.a. If $\ell_+ < \ell_-$, then we have $\text{lk}(D) < 0$, $2|\text{lk}(D)| > \text{span}(D)$ and $r_- > \text{span}(D)$.

Since $r_- > \text{span}(D)$, we can ensure that there exists a set $S \in \Lambda(D)$ such that the number of negative over linking crossings of D in S is $\text{span}(D)$, i.e., $n = 0$ and $m = \text{span}(D)$. Therefore,

$$\text{lk}(D_S) = \text{lk}(D) - \frac{1}{2}(n - m) = \text{lk}(D) + \frac{1}{2} \text{span}(D) < 0,$$

and

$$(7) \quad |\text{lk}(D_S)| = -(\text{lk}(D) + \frac{1}{2} \text{span}(D)) = |\text{lk}(D)| - \frac{1}{2} \text{span}(D).$$

Suppose there exists $S' \in \Lambda(D)$ such that $|\text{lk}(D_{S'})| = 0$, then $n' + m' = \text{span}(D)$ and

$$\text{lk}(D_{S'}) = \text{lk}(D) - \frac{1}{2}(n' - m') = 0,$$

where n' and m' are the number of positive and negative crossings of D that belongs to S' . Therefore,

$$\text{lk}(D) = \frac{1}{2}(n' - m'),$$

whence

$$-2 \text{lk}(D) = m' - n' \leq m' + n',$$

that implies

$$2|\text{lk}(D)| \leq \text{span}(D),$$

which gives a contradiction. Therefore $|\text{lk}(D_S)| > 0$ for every set $S \in \Lambda(D)$.

Now we need to show that $|\text{lk}(D)| - \text{span}(D)/2 \leq \ell_D$. For this let us assume that there exist a set $S'' \in \Lambda(D)$ such that $|\text{lk}(D_{S''})| < |\text{lk}(D)| - \text{span}(D)/2$. Then $n'' + m'' = \text{span}(D)$, where n'' and m'' are the number of positive and negative crossings of D that belongs to S'' , and $\text{lk}(D_{S''}) = \text{lk}(D) - (n'' - m'')/2$. Therefore,

$$|\text{lk}(D) - \frac{1}{2}(n'' - m'')| < |\text{lk}(D)| - \frac{1}{2}(n'' + m'').$$

Since $\text{lk}(D) < 0$, we can rewrite

$$|\text{lk}(D) - \frac{1}{2}(n'' - m'')| < -\text{lk}(D) - \frac{1}{2}(n'' + m''),$$

whence

$$-(-\text{lk}(D) - \frac{1}{2}(n'' + m'')) < \text{lk}(D) - \frac{1}{2}(n'' - m''),$$

that implies

$$(n'' + m'') < (m'' - n''),$$

which is not possible as both n'' and m'' are not equal to zero simultaneously. This implies

$$(8) \quad |\text{lk}(D)| - \frac{1}{2} \text{span}(D) \leq |\text{lk}(D_S)|$$

for any $S \in \Lambda(D)$. Using eq. (7) and eq. (8), we can say that $|\text{lk}(D)| - \text{span}(D)/2 = \ell_D$.

Subcase 2.2b. If $\ell_+ \geq \ell_-$, then we have $r_- \geq (\text{span}(D) - 2\text{lk}(D))/2$ and $\ell_+ \geq (\text{span}(D) + 2\text{lk}(D))/2$.

Since $r_- \geq (\text{span}(D) - 2\text{lk}(D))/2$ and $\ell_+ \geq (\text{span}(D) + 2\text{lk}(D))/2$, we can ensure that there exists a set $S \in \Lambda(D)$ such that $n = (\text{span}(D) + 2\text{lk}(D))/2$ and $m = (\text{span}(D) - 2\text{lk}(D))/2$, then

$$\text{lk}(D_S) = \text{lk}(D) - \frac{1}{2}(n - m) = 0.$$

Observe that whenever there exist a set S in $\Lambda(D)$ such that $\text{lk}(D_S) = 0$, then $\ell_D = 0$.

Thus, in all considered cases $\ell_D = 0$ or $\ell_D = |\text{lk}(D)| - \text{span}(D)/2$ and theorem is proved. \square

Fact 1. By changing one crossing in $D = D_1 \cup D_2$, the value ℓ_D either changes by ± 1 or remains same.

Proposition 2.1. *The following properties hold:*

(1) *If $D = D_1 \cup D_2$ is virtual link diagram with all linking crossings of same sign, then*

$$\ell_D = |\text{lk}(D)| - \frac{1}{2} \text{span}(D).$$

(2) *ℓ_D is an invariant for 2-component virtual links L .*

(3) *For a n -component virtual link $L = L_1 \cup L_2 \cup \dots \cup L_n$ the value $\sum_{i \neq j} \ell_{L_i \cup L_j}$ is an invariant.*

Proof. (1) Let $D = D_1 \cup D_2$ be a virtual link diagram with all linking crossings of same sign. Then $2|\text{lk}(D)| \geq \text{span}(D)$ and using Theorem 2.1, we have

$$\ell_D = |\text{lk}(D)| - \frac{1}{2} \text{span}(D).$$

(2) Let D and D' be two diagrams of $L = K_1 \cup K_2$. Since linking number and span are invariants, either $2|\text{lk}(D)| \geq \text{span}(D)$ and $2|\text{lk}(D')| \geq \text{span}(D')$ or $2|\text{lk}(D)| < \text{span}(D)$ and $2|\text{lk}(D')| < \text{span}(D')$.

Using the proof of Theorem 2.1, we have either $\ell_D = \ell_{D'} = 0$ or $\ell_D = |\text{lk}(D)| - \frac{1}{2} \text{span}(D)$ and $\ell_{D'} = |\text{lk}(D')| - \frac{1}{2} \text{span}(D')$. Hence $\ell_D = \ell_{D'}$.

(3) Since each $\ell_{L_i \cup L_j}$, $i \neq j$, is a positive quantity and an invariant, $\sum_{i \neq j} \ell_{L_i \cup L_j}$ is an invariant for L . \square

Theorem 2.2. *If $D = D_1 \cup D_2 \cup \dots \cup D_n$ is a diagram of a virtual link L , then*

$$\left(\text{span}(D), \sum_{i \neq j} \ell_{D_i \cup D_j} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}} |J_k(D_i)| \right) \leq U(L).$$

Proof. If $U(L) = (m, n)$, then by using Corollary 2.1, we can see that $m \geq \text{span}(D)$.

Now consider a set $S \in \Lambda(D)$ such that $\text{lk}(D'_i \cup D'_j) = \ell_{D'_i \cup D'_j}$, where $D_S = D'_1 \cup D'_2 \cup \dots \cup D'_n$ and $1 \leq i, j \leq n$. A necessary condition for a virtual link $L = K_1 \cup K_2 \cup \dots \cup K_n$ to be unlink is, $\text{lk}(K_i \cup K_j) = 0$ for each $i \neq j$ and each K_i is trivial. Using the Fact 1, Proposition 2.1(1) and Proposition 1.1, we have

$$n \geq \sum_{i \neq j} \ell_{D_i \cup D_j} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}} |J_k(D_i)|.$$

This completes the proof. \square

Theorem 2.3. *If D is a diagram of a virtual link L with v number of virtual crossings, then*

$$U(L) \leq (v, d(D)).$$

Proof. Consider a virtual link diagram D with v number of virtual crossings. Let D' be the diagram obtained from D by inserting v number of RII moves locally as shown in Fig. 9(b). Obtain a diagram D'' from D' by virtualizing v number of crossings and




FIGURE 9. Diagram transformations.

applying VR II moves as illustrated in Fig. 9(c) and Fig. 9(d). Since there are two kinds of RII moves, one can obtain 2^v classical link diagrams from D by replacing v virtual crossings to classical crossings. Out of these 2^v diagrams, there exists at least one diagram (say D_1) for which $d(D_1) = d(D)$. We can ensure existence of such a diagram from the fact that: corresponding to any based point a in D we can resolve the virtual crossings to non-warping crossing points with respect to based point a . Further as D_1 is a classical diagram, we have $U(D_1) \leq (0, d(D))$. Hence $U(D) \leq (v, d(D))$ and $U(L) \leq (v, d(D))$. \square

Corollary 2.2. *If D is a diagram of one-component virtual link L with v virtual crossings and n classical crossings, then*

$$U(L) \leq \left(v - 1, \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor \right).$$

Proof. Let D' be a diagram obtained from D by resolving $v - 1$ number of virtual crossings to classical crossings, as discussed in Theorem 2.3. Choose a based point p in the neighborhood of virtual crossing point of D' . By changing all the warping crossing points from under to over, while moving from p along the orientation, the resulting diagram presents a diagram of trivial knot. Hence $U(L) \leq U(D) \leq (v - 1, d(D_p)) \leq (v - 1, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor)$. \square

Theorem 2.3 implies the following observation.

Corollary 2.3. *If D is a diagram of virtual link L having v virtual crossings, which is minimum over all the diagrams of L , then $U(L) \leq U(D) \leq (v, d(D))$.*

3. UNKNOTTING INDEX FOR VIRTUAL PRETZEL LINKS

In this section we will provide unknotting index for a large class of virtual links obtained from pretzel links by virtualizing some of its classical crossings. For examples of computing unknotting numbers of certain virtual torus knots see [5].

Let D be the standard diagram of a pretzel link $L(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n)$ with labelling as illustrated in Fig. 10. For a reader convenience, whenever we virtualized some crossings in $L(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n)$, then labelling in the resulting diagram remains same. Also, we call the crossings at positions

$$\sum_{k=0}^{i-1} p_k + 1, \quad \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} p_k + 2, \quad \dots, \quad \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} p_k + p_i$$

as i -th strand crossings, where $p_0 = 0$.




FIGURE 10. Standard diagram of pretzel link $L(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n)$.

Theorem 3.1. *Let D be a diagram of a virtual link L obtained from labelled pretzel link $L'(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n)$ by virtualizing k crossings with n even. If k_1 is the number of virtual crossings among k having even labelling and each p_i is odd, then*

$$U(L) = \begin{cases} (|k - 2k_1|, \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n p_i - k + k_1), & \text{if } k > 2k_1, \\ (|k - 2k_1|, \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n p_i - k_1), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. Since each p_i is odd and n is even, $L'(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n)$ represents a 2-component link. Let C_1 and C_2 be the set of even and odd labellings, respectively. Let D be the virtual link obtained from $L'(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n)$ by virtualizing k_1 and k_2 crossings from the labelling set C_1 and C_2 , respectively. If D represents virtual link L and $k = k_1 + k_2$, then $\text{span}(L) = |k - 2k_1|$. Since all the linking crossings in D are of same sign and $|\text{lk}(D)| = \frac{1}{2}(\sum p_i - k)$, by using Theorem 2.2 and Proposition 2.1(a),

$$U(L) \geq \left(|k - 2k_1|, \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n p_i - \frac{1}{2}(k + |k - 2k_1|) \right).$$

Since $\text{span}(D) = |k - 2k_1|$, there exist a diagram D' obtained from D by virtualizing $|k - 2k_1|$ crossings such that $\text{span}(D') = 0$. Now diagram D' has $\sum_{i=1}^n p_i - k - |k - 2k_1|$ crossings, all of same sign and $\text{span}(D') = 0$. Therefore, number of under linking crossings and number of over linking crossings in D' are equal. More precisely, number of crossings in D' with the same parity of labelling is $\frac{1}{2}(\sum_{i=1}^n p_i - k - |k - 2k_1|)$.

By applying crossing change operation to all the crossings in D' with odd labelling, the resulting diagram becomes trivial. Hence

$$U(L) \leq \left(|k - 2k_1|, \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n p_i - \frac{1}{2}(k + |k - 2k_1|) \right).$$

It is easy to observe through Gauss diagram corresponding to D' . □

Example 3.1. Let L' be a virtual link diagram obtained from $L(7, 5, 9, 11)$ pretzel link by virtualizing 13 crossings as shown in Fig. 11(a). For this specific example, $k = 13$ and $k_1 = 10$. Thus $\text{span}(D) = 7$ and using Theorem 3.1, we have $U(L) \geq (7, 6)$. By virtualizing crossings labelled with 3, 5, 7, 11, 17 and 19 integers in D , the resulting diagram, say D' , has zero span. Let G be the Gauss diagram corresponding to D' as shown in Fig. 11(b). Now if we apply crossing change operations on the crossings 1, 13, 25, 27, 29 and 31 in D' , G becomes a Gauss diagram of trivial link. Hence $U(L) \leq (7, 6)$.

Corollary 3.1. *Let D be a diagram of virtual link L obtained from labelled pretzel link $L'(p_1, p_2)$ by virtualizing k crossings. If $p_1 + p_2$ is even, then*

$$U(L) = \begin{cases} \left(|k - 2k_1|, \frac{p_1 + p_2 - 2k + 2k_1}{2} \right), & \text{if } k > 2k_1, \\ \left(|k - 2k_1|, \frac{p_1 + p_2 - 2k_1}{2} \right), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where k_1 is the number of crossings virtualized that are labelled with even integers in L' .




FIGURE 11. Virtualization of a pretzel link diagram and Gauss diagram.

Proof. If $p_1 + p_2$ is even, then $L'(p_1, p_2)$ represents a diagram of $(2, p)$ torus link. Therefore, there exist two positive odd integers p'_1, p'_2 and a diagram D' of L , which is obtained from $L'(p'_1, p'_2)$ by virtualizing k crossings with the same parity of labelling. Now proof follows directly from Theorem 3.1. \square

Theorem 3.2. *Let D be a diagram of virtual link L obtained by virtualizing k classical crossings from the pretzel link $L'(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n)$. For an even n , if all p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n are also even, then*

$$U(L) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |k'_i - k_i|, \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{p_i - (k_i + k'_i) - |k'_i - k_i|}{2} \right),$$

where k'_i (respectively, k_i) is the number of crossings virtualized, that are labelled with odd (respectively, even) integers in i -th strand.

Proof. Let E_i and O_i denotes the set of crossings labelled with even and odd integers in the i -th strand, respectively. Suppose D is a virtual link diagram obtained from $L'(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n)$ by virtualizing k crossings at even labelling and k' crossings at odd labelling, respectively. Then $k = \sum_{i=1}^n k_i$ and $k' = \sum_{i=1}^n k'_i$, where k_i is the number of crossings from the labelling set E_i and k'_i is the number of crossings from the labelling set O_i , respectively.

Because each p_i and n are even, D is a n -component link. We can represent $D = D_1 \cup D_2 \cup \dots \cup D_n$, such that crossings of $D_1 \cup D_n$ and $D_{i-1} \cup D_i$, $2 \leq i \leq n$ are represented by crossings of 1-st strand and i -th strand, respectively. Since all the linking crossings of $D_i \cup D_j$, where $i \neq j$ and $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, are of the same sign and there is no crossing between D_i and D_j with $2 \leq |i - j| \neq n - 1$, span of D is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{span}(D) &= \text{span}(D_1 \cup D_n) + \sum_{i=2}^n \text{span}(D_{i-1} \cup D_i) \\ &= |k_1 - k'_1| + \sum_{i=2}^n |k_i - k'_i| = \sum_{i=1}^n |k_i - k'_i|. \end{aligned}$$

From Proposition 2.1(a) and Theorem 2.2, we have $\ell_D = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (p_i - (k_i + k'_i) - |k_i - k'_i|)$ and

$$U(L) \geq \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |k_i - k'_i|, \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (p_i - (k_i + k'_i) - |k_i - k'_i|) \right).$$

Since $\text{span}(D) = \sum_{i \neq j} |k_i - k'_i|$, there exists a diagram D' obtained from D by virtualizing $\sum_{i \neq j} |k_i - k'_i|$ crossings such that $\text{span}(D') = 0$.

It is obvious that number of crossing in $D'_1 \cup D'_n$ and $D'_{i-1} \cup D'_i$, $2 \leq i \leq n$, are $(p_1 - k_1 - k'_1 - |k_1 - k'_1|)$ and $p_i - (k_i + k'_i) - |k_i - k'_i|$, respectively.

Now with the similar argument given in Theorem 3.1, all the linking crossings of $D'_1 \cup D'_n$ and $D'_{i-1} \cup D'_i$, $2 \leq i \leq n$, can be removed by applying crossing change operation on $\frac{1}{2}(p_1 - k_1 - k'_1 - |k_1 - k'_1|)$ and $\frac{1}{2}(p_i - (k_i + k'_i) - |k_i - k'_i|)$ number of crossings, respectively. Since D' has no self-crossing and all the linking crossings in D' are removed by changing $\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{p_i - (k_i + k'_i) - |k_i - k'_i|}{2}$ crossings, hence

$$U(L) \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |k_i - k'_i|, \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{p_i - (k_i + k'_i) - |k_i - k'_i|}{2} \right).$$

The proof is completed. □

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The first and second named authors were supported by DST – RSF Project INT/RUS/RSF/P-2. The third named author was supported by the Russian Science Foundation (grant no. 16-41-02006). K. K. and M. P. would like to thanks to Prof. Akio Kawauchi and Prof. Seiichi Kamada for their valuable discussions and suggestions.

REFERENCES

- [1] Z. Cheng, H. Gao, A polynomial invariant of virtual links, *Journal of Knot Theory and Its Ramifications*, 22(12) (2013), paper number 1341002.
- [2] H.A. Dye, L.H. Kauffman, Virtual crossing number and the arrow polynomial, *Journal of Knot Theory and Its Ramifications*, 18(10) (2009), 1335–1357.
- [3] L.C. Folwaczny, L.H. Kauffman, A linking number definition of the affine index polynomial and applications, *Journal of Knot Theory and Its Ramifications*, 22(12) (2013), paper number 1341004.
- [4] Y.H. Im, K. Lee, S.Y. Lee, Index polynomial invariant of virtual links, *Journal of Knot Theory and Its Ramifications*, 19(05) (2010), 709–725.
- [5] M. Ishikawa, H. Yanagi, Virtual unknotting number of certain virtual torus knots, *Journal of Knot Theory and its Ramifications*, 26(11) (2017), paper number 1740070.
- [6] L.H. Kauffman, Virtual knot theory, *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 20(7) (1999), 663–691.
- [7] K. Kaur, S. Kamada, A. Kawauchi, M. Prabhakar, An unknotting index for virtual knots, to appear in *Tokyo Journal of Mathematics*. Preprint version is available at <http://www.sci.osaka-cu.ac.jp/kawauchi/unknotting20170824.pdf>
- [8] K. Kaur, M. Prabhakar, A. Vesnin, Two-variable polynomial invariants of virtual knots arising from flat virtual knot invariants, to appear in *Journal of Knot Theory and Its Ramification*. Preprint version is available at <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1803.05191.pdf>
- [9] V.O. Manturov, Multi-variable polynomial invariants for virtual links, *Journal of Knot Theory and Its Ramifications*, 12(08) (2003), 1131–1144.

- [10] S. Satoh, K. Taniguchi, The writhes of a virtual knot, *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 225 (2014), 327–341.
- [11] A. Shimizu, The warping degree of a link diagram, *Osaka Journal of Mathematics*, 48(1) (2011), 209–231.
- [12] D.S. Silver, S.G. Williams, Polynomial invariants of virtual links, *Journal of Knot Theory and its Ramifications*, 12(07) (2003), 987–1000.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY ROPAR, INDIA
E-mail address: `kirandeep.kaur@iitrpr.ac.in`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY ROPAR, INDIA
E-mail address: `prabhakar@iitrpr.ac.in`

TOMSK STATE UNIVERSITY, TOMSK, 634050, RUSSIA, AND SOBOLEV INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS,
NOVOSIBIRSK, 630090, RUSSIA
E-mail address: `vesnin@math.nsc.ru`