

FROM HEEGAARD DIAGRAMS TO SURGERY

JOVANA NIKOLIĆ AND ZORAN PETRIĆ

ABSTRACT. A procedure of going from Heegaard diagrams to framed link diagrams is explained in this note.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2020): 57-01, 57K30

Keywords: 3-manifolds, knots, links, Kirby's calculus

1. INTRODUCTION

By a *surface* we mean here a closed, connected and orientable surface and a *manifold* is a closed oriented three-dimensional manifold. Such manifolds are presentable in terms of diagrams in several ways, and we mention here the presentation in terms of Heegaard diagrams and in terms of framed links in S^3 . The latter is usually called *surgery presentation*. The aim of this note is to provide a precise steps in transforming Heegaard diagrams into surgery. The details of a reverse transformation are given, for example, in [1].

2. HEEGAARD DIAGRAMS AND SURGERY

Definition 2.1. Let Γ be a surface of genus g . A *system of attaching circles* for Γ is a set $\{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_g\}$ of simple closed curves in this surface such that:

- (1) the curves γ_i are mutually disjoint,
- (2) $\Gamma - \gamma_1 - \dots - \gamma_g$ is connected.

Let α and β be two systems of attaching circles for Γ . The triple (Γ, α, β) is a *Heegaard diagram* (see [7], [6] and [3]).

Remark 2.1. Let Γ and Δ be two surfaces of genus g . If $\{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_g\}$ and $\{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_g\}$ are systems of attaching circles for Γ and Δ , respectively, then there exists a homeomorphism from Γ to Δ , such that for every $1 \leq i \leq g$ it maps γ_i to δ_i . If Γ and Δ are oriented, one can choose this homeomorphism to be either orientation preserving, or orientation reversing.

Definition 2.2. Let H be a handlebody with g handles. A *meridional disk* is a properly embedded disk in H (its boundary belongs to the boundary of H) such that by removing its neighbourhood from H one obtains a handlebody with $g - 1$ handles. A *complete system of meridional disks* for H consists of g mutually disjoint disks such that by removing their neighbourhoods from H one obtains a ball.

Remark 2.2. The boundaries of a complete system of meridional disks for H make a system of attaching circles for ∂H . We call this system *meridians* of H .

From Remarks 2.1 and 2.2 we conclude the following.

Corollary 2.3. *Let $\{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_g\}$ be a system of attaching circles for a connected, orientable surface Γ . Let H be a handlebody with g handles and $\{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_g\}$ its complete system of meridional disks. Then there exists a homeomorphism $h: \Gamma \xrightarrow{\sim} \partial H$ such that for every $1 \leq j \leq g$ it maps γ_j to $\partial\mu_j$.*

Definition 2.3. Let M be a manifold and let Γ , H_1 and H_2 be respectively a surface, and two handlebodies embedded in M such that $\partial H_1 = \partial H_2 = \Gamma = H_1 \cap H_2$ and $M = H_1 \cup H_2$. The triple (Γ, H_1, H_2) is a *Heegaard splitting* of M . The genus of Γ is the *genus* of this splitting and the *genus* of M is the smallest possible genus of a splitting of this manifold.

Definition 2.4. A Heegaard diagram (Γ, α, β) is *compatible* with a Heegaard splitting (Γ, H_1, H_2) of a manifold, when α consists of meridians of H_1 , while β consists of meridians of H_2 .

Definition 2.5. A Heegaard diagram *presents* a manifold, when there exists a Heegaard splitting of this manifold, which is compatible with this diagram.

The following remark is analogous to [7, IV, Section 10.1, Theorem 10.2] (see also [6, Remark after Definition 2.3]).

Remark 2.4. Every Heegaard diagram presents a unique manifold.

Remark 2.5. A sufficient condition for (Γ, α, γ) , where Γ is of genus g , to present the sphere S^3 is that Γ is a connected sum $T_1^2 \# \dots \# T_g^2$ of g copies of tori, such that α_i and γ_i are two simple closed curves in T_i^2 that intersect transversally in a single point. This condition is equivalent to: for $i \neq j$, $\alpha_i \cap \gamma_j = \emptyset$, and for every i , α_i intersects transversally γ_i in a single point.

Remark 2.6. Let (Γ, α, β) be a Heegaard diagram of genus g that presents a manifold M and let the curves γ be introduced in this diagram according to Remark 2.5. Let H_1 and H_2 be two copies of a handlebody with g handles such that H_2 is standardly embedded in S^3 and the complement of its interior with respect to S^3 is H_1 . If Γ is identified with $\partial H_1 = \partial H_2$ so that α are the meridians of H_2 , then γ are the meridians of H_1 , witnessing that (Γ, α, γ) presents S^3 . If $h: \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$ is an orientation preserving homeomorphism that for every $1 \leq i \leq g$ maps γ_i to a curve isotopic to β_i , then M is homeomorphic to the manifold $(H_1 \sqcup H_2) / \sim$, where \sim is such that

$$\forall x \in \Gamma \quad (x, 1) \sim (h(x), 2).$$

We present Heegaard diagrams in the following form. By cutting Γ along the curves from α , one obtains a “sphere with $2g$ holes”. In this way every such curve appears as the boundary of two discs removed from the sphere. The curves from β intersecting the curves from α are presented by paths connecting some points on the boundaries of the removed discs. In this way, a Heegaard diagram is presented as a part of the sphere (projected to the plane) and is called *planar*. Such a diagram should provide an unambiguous identification of the endpoints of paths belonging to β . A system of attaching curves γ is introduced in this diagram according to Remark 2.5.

We assume that the sphere underlying Heegaard’s diagram (Γ, α, β) appears as the boundary of a ball and that identification of the discs whose

boundaries correspond to the same curve from α makes the forementioned handlebody H_2 .

A *surgery* is a link in S^3 whose components are labeled by integers (framings). A surgery is interpreted as a manifold by removing a tubular neighbourhood (a solid torus) of each link component and sewing it back according to the corresponding framing n —a meridian of the solid torus is sewed back so that it winds n times in the direction of the meridian and once in the direction of the longitude (see [7]).

3. DEHN TWISTS

Definition 3.1. Let l be a simple oriented closed curve in an oriented surface Γ . Consider an annulus in Γ around l . One of its boundary component is l , and the other is a *companion* curve l' determined by a normal bundle of l in Γ . We require that the pair (\vec{l}, \vec{n}) (the orientation of l and its chosen orthogonal vector) agrees with the orientation of Γ (in Figure 1 this orientation is clockwise).




FIGURE 1. Dehn twist and its inverse

Let $\theta_l: \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$ be defined in the following manner. It is the identity in the complement of the annulus, and inside the annulus it is defined by cutting Γ along l (obtaining two copies of this curve) and rotating the copy bounding the annulus for 360° in the direction of l , and then sewing it back with the remaining copy. It is evident that θ_l , called the *Dehn twist* along l , is a homeomorphism.

Remark 3.1. If l^+ and l^- are the same curve with opposite orientations, then the Dehn twists θ_{l^+} and θ_{l^-} are isotopic.

4. THE ALGORITHM

Let M be presented by a Heegaard diagram (Γ, α, β) in which the curves γ are introduced according to Remark 2.5, so that (Γ, α, γ) presents S^3 . The first step in transforming a Heegaard diagram into surgery consists in finding a composition of Dehn twists of Γ that maps curves $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_g$ to the curves isotopic to β_1, \dots, β_g , respectively. This could be done along the lines of the first part of the proof of [5, Theorem 1].

Our algorithm for finding a composition of Dehn twists of Γ that maps curves $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_g$ to the curves isotopic to β_1, \dots, β_g goes as follows.

Auxiliary steps (p and q are simple, closed, arbitrarily oriented curves in Γ):

- (D1) If p intersects q in a single point, then $\theta_p \circ \theta_q$ maps p to a curve isotopic to q . (See [5, Lemma 1].)
- (D2a) If q belongs to a system of attaching circles and p intersects q twice, with zero algebraic intersection, then there is an isotopy moving p away from q and leaving all the other curves from the system fixed. (See the second paragraph of the proof of [5, Lemma 3].)
- (D2b) Let A and B be two intersection points of p and q , which are adjacent on q . If p is oriented in the same direction at A and B with respect to the orientation of q , then consider the curve p_1 that consists of the part of p incoming to A , the segment AB of q , and the part of p outgoing from B . (See [5, Lemma 2, Case 1].) Let the orientation of p_1 be inherited from the orientation of p . If $(\overrightarrow{AB}, \vec{p})$ makes the orientation of Γ , then $\theta_{p_1}[p]$ is isotopic to a curve intersecting q in less points. Otherwise, apply $\theta_{p_1}^{-1}$ to obtain the same result.
- (D3) Let A , B and C be three intersection points of p and q , which are adjacent on q . If p is oriented in alternating directions at A , B and C with respect to the orientation of q , then consider the curve p_1 that consists of the part of p incoming to A , the segment ABC of q , and the part of p outgoing from C . (See [5, Lemma 2, Case 2].) Then proceed as in the last three sentences of D2b.

The isotopies mentioned in (D1), (D2b) and (D3) do not move points outside narrow neighbourhoods of p and q , so that the curves disjoint from p and q remain fixed.

The algorithm:

- (1) Suppose that for a fixed $0 \leq t < g$, we have a composition δ of Dehn twists such that for $1 \leq i \leq t$, $\delta[\gamma_i]$ is isotopic to β_i .
- (2) Find a curve $\beta'_{t+1} = \delta[\gamma_{t+1}]$. Since $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_t, \gamma_{t+1}$ are mutually disjoint, β'_{t+1} is disjoint from β_1, \dots, β_t .
- (3) If β'_{t+1} is isotopic to β_{t+1} , then we go back to (1) with $t = t + 1$ and $\delta = \delta$.
- (4) If β'_{t+1} does not intersect and is not isotopic to β_{t+1} , then try to find at most two curves l and m , disjoint from all β_i , for $1 \leq i \leq t$, such that in the sequence $\beta'_{t+1}, l, m, \beta_{t+1}$ the neighbours intersect in just one point and there are no other intersection points. Then iterating (D1), one finds a composition δ' of Dehn twists that maps β'_{t+1} to a curve isotopic to β_{t+1} , leaving all β_i , for $1 \leq i \leq t$ fixed. We go back to (1) with $t = t + 1$ and $\delta = \delta' \circ \delta$.

If there are no such l and m , then by using steps (D1), (D2a), (D2b) and (D3), one finds a composition δ'' of Dehn twists mapping β'_{t+1} into a curve isotopic to one that intersects less β curves than β'_{t+1} . Denote this curve by β''_{t+1} . Moreover, δ'' leaves all β_i , for $1 \leq i \leq t$, fixed. Then go back to the beginning of (4) with $\beta'_{t+1} = \beta''_{t+1}$ and $\delta = \delta'' \circ \delta$.

By reasoning as in the third paragraph of the proof of [5, Theorem 1], by repeating the procedure from the previous paragraph

- (when β''_{t+1} intersects no β curve), there must be at most two curves l and m satisfying the conditions listed in the initial paragraph of (4).
- (5) If β'_{t+1} intersects β_{t+1} , then by using steps (D2a), (D2b) and (D3), one finds a composition δ' of Dehn twists mapping β'_{t+1} into a curve isotopic to β''_{t+1} that either does not intersect β_{t+1} or intersects it in a single point. In the first case go back to (3), with $\beta'_{t+1} = \beta''_{t+1}$ and $\delta = \delta' \circ \delta$. In the second case go back to (1) with $t = t + 1$ and $\delta = \delta'' \circ \delta' \circ \delta$, where δ'' is a composition of Dehn twists obtained by (D1), which maps β''_{t+1} to a curve isotopic to β_{t+1} . It is evident that this composition and the isotopy leave all β_i , for $1 \leq i \leq t$ fixed.

EXAMPLE 1. Consider the following (planar) Heegaard diagram presenting RP^3 . The α curves are denoted by 1, 4, 7 and 12, while the β curves are denoted by 3, 6, 9, 10. The γ curves are introduced according to Remark 2.5, and are denoted by 2, 5, 8, 11.




FIGURE 2. Heegaard's diagram

We start our procedure with $t = 0$ and δ the identity (the empty composition of Dehn twists). The choice of matching γ and β curves could simplify the procedure. Our choice is $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_4) = (2, 5, 8, 11)$ and $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4) = (3, 6, 9, 10)$. With $\beta'_1 = \delta[\gamma_1] = \gamma_1 = 2$ we go to (4). Luckily, for the sequence of curves 2, 1, 3, the neighbours intersect in just one point and we have that the composition $\theta_1 \circ \theta_3 \circ \theta_2 \circ \theta_1$ maps the curve $\gamma_1 = 2$ into a curve isotopic to $\beta_1 = 3$. Then we go to (1) with $t = 1$ and $\delta = \theta_1 \circ \theta_3 \circ \theta_2 \circ \theta_1$.

With $\beta'_2 = \delta[\gamma_2] = \gamma_2 = 5$ we go to (4), and again in the sequence of curves 5, 4, 6, which are disjoint from 3, the neighbours intersect in just one point and we have that the composition $\theta_4 \circ \theta_6 \circ \theta_5 \circ \theta_4$ maps the curve $\delta[\gamma_2] = 5$ into a curve isotopic to $\beta_2 = 6$. Then we go to (1) with $t = 2$ and $\delta = \theta_4 \circ \theta_6 \circ \theta_5 \circ \theta_4 \circ \theta_1 \circ \theta_3 \circ \theta_2 \circ \theta_1$.

With $\beta'_3 = \delta[\gamma_3] = \gamma_3 = 8$ we go to (4), and again in the sequence of curves 8, 7, 9, which are disjoint from 3 and 6, the neighbours intersect in just one point and we have that the composition $\theta_7 \circ \theta_9 \circ \theta_8 \circ \theta_7$ maps the curve $\delta[\gamma_3] = 8$ into a curve isotopic to $\beta_3 = 9$. Then we go to (1) with $t = 3$ and $\delta = \theta_7 \circ \theta_9 \circ \theta_8 \circ \theta_7 \circ \theta_4 \circ \theta_6 \circ \theta_5 \circ \theta_4 \circ \theta_1 \circ \theta_3 \circ \theta_2 \circ \theta_1$.

With $\beta'_4 = \delta[\gamma_4] = \gamma_4 = 11$ we go to (5) since this curve intersects $\beta_4 = 10$ in a single point. The curves 10 and 11 are disjoint from 3, 6 and 9, and

the composition $\theta_{11} \circ \theta_{10}$ maps the curve $\delta[\gamma_4] = 11$ into a curve isotopic to $\beta_4 = 10$. Hence, the following composition of Dehn twists maps γ -curves onto β -curves

$$\theta_{11} \circ \theta_{10} \circ \theta_7 \circ \theta_9 \circ \theta_8 \circ \theta_7 \circ \theta_4 \circ \theta_6 \circ \theta_5 \circ \theta_4 \circ \theta_1 \circ \theta_3 \circ \theta_2 \circ \theta_1.$$

After transforming a Heegaard diagram into a composition $\theta_{\delta_n} \circ \dots \circ \theta_{\delta_1}$ of Dehn twists that maps γ -curves onto β -curves, the next step in our procedure transforms the curves $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n$ into a link in S^3 . We assume that these curves are placed in a sphere with $2g$ holes like in Figure 2. The curves $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n$ are immersed into the handlebody H_1 (by making their parallel copies) layer by layer, so that δ_1 is the deepest, or alternatively they could be immersed into H_2 so that δ_n is the deepest. In order to make a surgery diagram, one has to inspect the situation in every handle. In our Example 1, locally in the handle obtained by gluing the discs whose boundary is denoted by 1, we obtain a situation illustrated in Figure 3.




FIGURE 3. A handle

And after making parallel copies of the curves 1 (it has two copies), 2, 3, 6 and 10, the situation looks locally like in Figure 4




FIGURE 4.

In order to calculate the framing of each component of the link we rely on the following remark.

Remark 4.1. Let l be a curve on Γ whose parallel copy in H_1 makes a component μ of the link, and let $l' \subseteq \Gamma$ be a companion of l . If the Dehn twist corresponding to μ is θ_l , then the framing of μ is by 1 greater than the linking number of l and l' . If the Dehn twist corresponding to μ is θ_l^{-1} , then the framing of μ is less by 1 than the linking number of l and l' .

In our example all the components of the link, except the one corresponding to 10, have the framing equal to 1, and the component corresponding to 10 has the framing equal to 3 (see Figure 5). It is straightforward, by using




FIGURE 5. A surgery presentation for RP^3

Kirby's calculus (see [4] and [2]), to transform this surgery into an unknot with framing 2, justifying that the manifold in question is RP^3 .

Acknowledgements

The authors were supported by the Science Fund of the Republic of Serbia, Grant No. 7749891, Graphical Languages - GWORDS.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. ALFIERI, *Going between Heegaard diagrams and framed link diagrams*, available at <https://math.stackexchange.com/questions/2138942/going-between-heegaard-diagrams-and-framed-link-diagrams/2141225>, 2017
- [2] R.A. FENN and C. ROURKE, *On Kirby's calculus of links*, *Topology*, vol. 75 (1979), pp. 1-15
- [3] J. JOHNSON, *Notes on Heegaard splittings*, available at <http://www.math.ucdavis.edu/~jjohnson/notes.pdf>, 2007
- [4] R. KIRBY, *A calculus for framed links in S^3* , *Inventiones Mathematicae*, vol. 45 (1978), pp. 35-56
- [5] W.B.R. LICKORISH, *A Representation of Orientable Combinatorial 3-Manifolds*, *Annals of Mathematics*, vol. 76 (1962), pp. 531-540
- [6] P. OZSVÁTH and Z. SZABÓ, *An introduction to Heegaard Floer homology*, (D.A Ellwood et al editors) *Floer homology, gauge theory, and low-dimensional topology*, Clay Mathematics Proceedings 5, 2006, pp. 3-27
- [7] V.V. PRASOLOV and A.B. SOSINSKIĬ, *Knots, Links, Braids and 3-Manifolds*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs 154, American Mathematical Society, 1996

FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF BELGRADE, STUDENTSKI TRG 16, 11158 BELGRADE, SERBIA

Email address: jovana.nikolic@matf.bg.ac.rs

MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE SANU, KNEZ MIHAILOVA 36, P.F. 367, 11001 BELGRADE, SERBIA

Email address: zpetric@mi.sanu.ac.rs