

IDEAL TURAEV–VIRO INVARIANTS

SIMON A. KING

ABSTRACT. A Turaev–Viro invariant is a state sum, i.e., a polynomial that can be read off from a special spine or a triangulation of a compact 3-manifold. If the polynomial is evaluated at the solution of a certain system of polynomial equations (Biedenharn–Elliott equations) then the result is a homeomorphism invariant of the manifold (“numerical Turaev–Viro invariant”). The equation system defines an ideal, and actually the coset of the polynomial with respect to that ideal is a homeomorphism invariant as well (“ideal Turaev–Viro invariant”).

It is clear that ideal Turaev–Viro invariants are at least as strong as numerical Turaev–Viro invariants, and we show that there is reason to expect that they are strictly stronger. They offer a more unified approach, since many numerical Turaev–Viro invariants can be captured in a singly ideal Turaev–Viro invariant. Using computer algebra, we obtain computational results on some examples of ideal Turaev–Viro invariants.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let M_1, M_2 be compact 3-manifolds, represented by special spines P_1, P_2 (Definition 1). If M_1 is homeomorphic to M_2 , then P_1 and P_2 are related by a finite sequence of certain local transformations. Turaev–Viro invariants, originally formulated for triangulations rather than special spines [16], can be read off from any special spine of a compact 3-manifold: One computes the state sum, i.e. a polynomial whose summands correspond to different “colourings” of the special spine. This polynomial is a homeomorphism invariant, provided its variables satisfy the so-called Biedenharn–Elliott equations known from quantum physics [8]. It is difficult to find solutions of the Biedenharn–Elliott equations, but an important class of solutions is provided by the representation theory of Quantum Groups [17]. We call this a “numerical Turaev–Viro invariant”.

The starting point of this paper is the observation that the coset of the state sum with respect to the ideal generated by the Biedenharn–Elliott equations is a homeomorphism invariant of compact 3-manifolds. Hence it is not needed to find explicit solutions of the equations. We call this an “ideal Turaev–Viro invariant”. We also define an invariant that captures *all* numerical invariants obtained from evaluating an ideal Turaev–Viro invariant, without the need to compute any explicit solution. We give reasons why one should expect that ideal Turaev–Viro invariants are strictly stronger than all their associated numerical invariants together. Using software for the computation of Gröbner bases, we computed some examples of ideal Turaev–Viro invariants for closed orientable irreducible manifolds of complexity up to 9.

The paper is organised as follows. In Section 2, we recall some basic facts about special spines of compact 3-manifolds. In Section 3 we define the state sum associated to a special 2-polyhedron. In Section 4 we define ideal and numerical


Date: September 8, 2005.

Partially supported by INTAS project CALCOMET-GT ref. 03-51-3663.

Turaev–Viro invariants, construct an invariant that captures all numerical Turaev–Viro invariant associated to an ideal invariant, and observe a lower bound for the complexity of a manifold in terms of the ideal Turaev–Viro invariant (unfortunately, the bound turned out to be trivial in all examples that we computed). In Section 5 we come to the problem of how to explicitly compute ideal Turaev–Viro invariants, based on implemented algorithms of commutative algebra. The computation of ideal Turaev–Viro invariants can be pretty complex, hence it seems reasonable to introduce simplifying assumptions. We suggest different types of simplification in Section 6. In Section 7, we present four examples of ideal Turaev–Viro invariants in more detail. In the final Section 8 we report our computational results on these examples.

2. SPECIAL SPINES OF COMPACT 3-MANIFOLDS

Definition 1. A **simple 2-polyhedron** P is a compact connected hausdorff space such that any point has an open neighbourhood of one of the following three homeomorphism types (where the point under consideration is marked by a thick dot):



The connected components of points of type (i) are the **2-strata** of P , the connected components of points of type (ii) are the **true edges** of P , and the points of type (iii) are the **true vertices** of P . The 4-valent graph $S(P) \subset P$ formed by true edges and true vertices is the **singular graph** of P . The set of 2-strata of P is denoted by $\mathcal{C}(P)$, the set of true edges of P is denoted by $\mathcal{E}(P)$, and the set of true vertices of P is denoted by $\mathcal{V}(P)$.

A simple 2-polyhedron is special, if it has a true vertex, its singular graph is connected, and its 2-strata are homeomorphic to open discs. Let M be a compact 3-manifold. A special 2-polyhedron P embedded in M is a **special spine** of M , if $\partial M = \emptyset$ and $M \setminus P$ is homeomorphic to a 3-ball, or if $\partial M \neq \emptyset$ and $M \setminus P \approx (\partial M) \times [0, 1)$ (where $[0, 1)$ denotes a half-open interval).

A general reference for the theory of special spines of compact 3-manifolds is [12]. Any compact 3-manifold has a special spine, which can be deduced from the fact that any compact 3-manifold admits a triangulation [13]. Moreover, the homeomorphism type of a special spine uniquely determines the homeomorphism type of the 3-manifold [2]. The following classical result explains how all special spines of a compact 3-manifold are related with each other.

Theorem 1 (Matveev [9], Piergallini [15]). *Let M be a compact 3-manifold with special spines P_1, P_2 , and assume that P_1 and P_2 both have at least two true vertices. Then P_1 and P_2 are related by a finite sequence of a local transformation called T move and its inverse. The T move is shown in Figure 1, where true vertices are marked by a thick dot and true edges are drawn bold.*

“Local transformation” means that the special 2-polyhedron remains unchanged outside of the depicted part. It is remarkable that a single type of local transformation suffices. When working with triangulations of 3-manifolds, there is a similar transformation result at hand, due to Pachner [14] — but this one uses two different types of local transformations. Theorem 1 offers a strategy for constructing homeomorphism invariants of 3-manifolds: Define some algebraic expression that




FIGURE 1. The Matveev-Piergallini move


can be read off from any special 2-polyhedron with at least two true vertices, study how this expression changes under the moves T^\pm , and quotient out these changes.

3. TURAEV-VIRO STATE SUMS


Let P be a special 2-polyhedron. Let \mathcal{F} be a finite set, to whose elements we will refer by **2-strata colours**. A \mathcal{F} -colouring of P is any map $\varphi: \mathcal{C}(P) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$, i.e., to any 2-stratum of P is assigned a colour. Hence we can consider φ as a locally constant map $P \setminus S(P) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$, and in this sense it is clear what we mean by the restriction of φ to a subset of P . By $\Phi_{\mathcal{F}}(P)$ we denote the set of all \mathcal{F} -colourings of P .

Let \mathcal{G} be another finite set, to whose elements we will refer by **edge colours**. A \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} -colouring of P is any pair (φ, ψ) of maps $\varphi: \mathcal{C}(P) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$, $\psi: \mathcal{E}(P) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$. Again, we can consider φ as a locally constant map $P \setminus S(P) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ and ψ as a locally constant map $S(P) \setminus \mathcal{V}(P) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$, and in this sense we can talk about the restriction of (φ, ψ) to a subset of P . We denote by $\Phi_{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}}(P)$ the set of all \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} -colourings of P .

Let us now choose an orientation independently for each 2-stratum of P . We would like to make the colour of a 2-stratum dependent on the orientation. For that purpose, we take an involution “ $-$ ” on \mathcal{F} , and impose that, if an oriented 2-stratum is coloured by $f \in \mathcal{F}$, then the oppositely oriented 2-stratum has the colour $-f \in \mathcal{F}$. For any $f \in \mathcal{F}$, the symbol $w(f)$ is referred to as the **weight** of f . At a true vertex of P , six 2-strata and four true edges meet (counted with multiplicities). A \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} -colouring (φ, ψ) of P thus yields for each true vertex of P a 6-tuple of 2-strata colours together with a 4-tuple of edge colours. If to the 2-strata and true edges in the neighbourhood of a true vertex v are assigned by φ and ψ colours $a, \dots, f \in \mathcal{F}$ and $A, \dots, D \in \mathcal{G}$, respectively, as depicted in Figure 2 (where circular orientations of the 2-strata are indicated by arrows, the true vertex is marked by a thick dot, and the true edges are drawn bold), we associate to v a symbol $v^{\varphi, \psi} := \left| \begin{smallmatrix} a & b & c \\ f & e & d \end{smallmatrix} \right|_{C, D}^{A, B}$, called **6j4k-symbol**. If essentially only the 2-strata are coloured, i.e., if $\mathcal{G} = \{*\}$ contains a single colour, we just have a **6j-symbol**

FIGURE 2. A true vertex v with coloured neighbourhood

$v^\varphi := \begin{vmatrix} a & b & c \\ f & e & d \end{vmatrix} = \begin{vmatrix} a & b & c \\ f & e & d \end{vmatrix}_{*,*}^{*,*}$, to simplify the notation. We shall need that the weights and $6j4k$ -symbols only depend on the colourings, but not on additional choices. Therefore the weight of the colour of a 2-stratum must not depend on the choice of orientation of the 2-stratum, hence we assume that $w(f) = w(-f)$ for all $f \in \mathcal{F}$. When depicting a true vertex v as in Figure 2, this also involves some choices: Which of the six 2-strata is on top? And which side of the top 2-stratum shall be visible in front? By the tetrahedral symmetry of true vertices, the same vertex could also be depicted as in Figure 3. Our $6j4k$ -symbols (resp. $6j$ -symbols) shall

FIGURE 3. Symmetry of $6j4k$ -symbols

have the same symmetry. Hence, we assume that the following identities hold for all $a, b, c, d, e, f \in \mathcal{F}$ and all $A, B, C, D \in \mathcal{G}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{vmatrix} a & b & c \\ f & e & d \end{vmatrix}_{C,D}^{A,B} &= \begin{vmatrix} b & c & a \\ -e & -d & f \end{vmatrix}_{B,D}^{C,A} \\ &= \begin{vmatrix} a & -d & -e \\ -f & -c & -b \end{vmatrix}_{D,C}^{A,B} \end{aligned}$$

These identities imply the full tetrahedral symmetry of the $6j4k$ -symbols, because the symmetric group on 4 elements is generated by the cyclic permutation $(1, 2, 3)$ and the transposition $(3, 4)$. To keep notations simple, we make no notational difference between a colour weight respectively a $6j4k$ -symbol and its equivalence class.

Let R be the polynomial ring over some field \mathbb{F} whose variables are the equivalence classes of colour weights and $6j4k$ -symbols. In this paper we will have $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{Q}$, but in related applications it can also be reasonable to choose for \mathbb{F} a finite field [5].

Let $m = |\mathcal{F}|$ and $n = |\mathcal{G}|$. Since additional choices play no role by the symmetry of colour weights and $6j4k$ -symbols, the following polynomial only depends on the

homeomorphism type of P :

$$TV_{m,n}(P) := \sum_{(\varphi, \psi) \in \Phi_{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}}(P)} \left(\prod_{C \in \mathcal{C}(P)} w(\phi(C)) \right) \cdot \left(\prod_{v \in \mathcal{V}(P)} v^{\varphi, \psi} \right) \in R$$

This polynomial is the **Turaev–Viro state sum** of P of type (m, n) .

4. TURAEV–VIRO INVARIANTS

Of course, the Turaev–Viro state sum of a special spine of a compact 3-manifold M is not yet a homeomorphism invariant of M , as it will change under the T^\pm moves. Let P_1 be a special spine of M , and let P_2 be obtained from P_1 by a single T move. Let P_0 be the part of P_1 that is unchanged by the T move; we consider P_0 both as a subset of P_1 and of P_2 . We study how the different terms of the state sum change under the move.

Let $\phi_0 = (\varphi_0, \psi_0)$ be the restriction of a \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} -colouring $\phi_1 = (\varphi_1, \psi_1)$ of P_1 to P_0 . Since any 2-stratum of P_1 meets P_0 , φ_1 is determined by φ_0 . There is one true edge of P_1 that is disjoint from P_0 , so its colour under ψ_1 is not determined by ψ_0 — it can be any $A \in \mathcal{G}$, see the left part of Figure 4. In the figure, $j_1, \dots, j_9 \in \mathcal{F}$ denote 2-strata colours (j_4 and j_6 are the colours of the 2-strata that are hidden by other 2-strata) appearing in φ_0 , and $k_1, \dots, k_6 \in \mathcal{G}$ denote true edge colours appearing in ψ_0 . If ϕ_0 is the restriction of a \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} -colouring $\phi_2 = (\varphi_2, \psi_2)$ of P_2 to P_0 , then ϕ_2 is determined by ϕ_0 , except for the colour $j \in \mathcal{F}$ of the shaded triangular 2-stratum and the edge colours $A_1, A_2, A_3 \in \mathcal{G}$ shown in the right part of Figure 4. Let $X_{\phi_0} \in R$ be the product of the $6j4k$ -symbols and colour weights under the colouring ϕ_0 that are associated to true vertices and 2-strata that are not contained in $P_1 \setminus P_0$. With an appropriate choice of orientations of 2-strata indicated in Figure 4, we obtain

$$TV_{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}}(P_1) = \sum_{\phi_0} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{G}} \left| \begin{array}{ccc|c} j_1 & j_2 & j_3 & k_1, k_2 \\ j_9 & j_8 & j_7 & k_3, A \end{array} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{array}{ccc|c} j_4 & j_5 & j_6 & k_4, k_5 \\ -j_9 & -j_8 & -j_7 & k_6, A \end{array} \right| \cdot X_{\phi_0}$$

and

$$TV_{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}}(P_2) = \sum_{\phi_0} \sum_{A_1, A_2, A_3 \in \mathcal{G}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{F}} w(j) \cdot \left| \begin{array}{ccc|c} j & j_1 & j_2 & A_1, A_2 \\ j_7 & -j_5 & -j_4 & k_1, k_4 \end{array} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{array}{ccc|c} j & j_2 & j_3 & A_2, A_3 \\ j_9 & -j_6 & -j_5 & k_3, k_6 \end{array} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{array}{ccc|c} j & j_3 & j_1 & A_3, A_1 \\ -j_8 & -j_4 & -j_6 & k_2, k_5 \end{array} \right| \cdot X_{\phi_0}.$$


Recall $m = |\mathcal{F}|$, $n = |\mathcal{G}|$. We define the **Turaev–Viro ideal** $I_{m,n} \subset R$ of type (m, n) as the ideal in R that is generated by

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{A \in \mathcal{G}} \left| \begin{array}{ccc|c} j_1 & j_2 & j_3 & k_1, k_2 \\ j_9 & j_8 & j_7 & k_3, A \end{array} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{array}{ccc|c} j_4 & j_5 & j_6 & k_4, k_5 \\ -j_9 & -j_8 & -j_7 & k_6, A \end{array} \right| - \\ & \sum_{A_1, A_2, A_3 \in \mathcal{G}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{F}} w(j) \cdot \left| \begin{array}{ccc|c} j & j_1 & j_2 & A_1, A_2 \\ j_7 & -j_5 & -j_4 & k_1, k_4 \end{array} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{array}{ccc|c} j & j_2 & j_3 & A_2, A_3 \\ j_9 & -j_6 & -j_5 & k_3, k_6 \end{array} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{array}{ccc|c} j & j_3 & j_1 & A_3, A_1 \\ -j_8 & -j_4 & -j_6 & k_2, k_5 \end{array} \right|, \end{aligned}$$

for all $j_1, \dots, j_9 \in \mathcal{F}$ and all $k_1, \dots, k_6 \in \mathcal{G}$. Note that these generators are known from quantum mechanics: If all these generators evaluate to zero, then one says that the $6j4k$ -symbols and colour weights satisfy the “Biedenharn–Elliott equations” [8]. Let $tv_{m,n}(P)$ be the coset of the Turaev–Viro state sum with respect to the Turaev–Viro ideal, i.e.

$$tv_{m,n}(P) = TV_{m,n}(P) + I_{m,n} \in R/I_{m,n}.$$

From Theorem 1 and the previous paragraph, we immediately obtain

FIGURE 4. Change of colourings under T move

Theorem 2 (and Definition). *If P is any special spine of a compact 3-manifold M with at least two true vertices, then the coset $tv_{m,n}(P)$ only depends on the homeomorphism type of M . We call $tv_{m,n}(M) = tv_{m,n}(P)$ an **ideal Turaev–Viro invariant** of M of type (m, n) .*

We remark that even if M has a special spine P_0 with only one true vertex, $tv_{m,n}(M)$ can only be computed using some special spine with at least *two* vertices. In general, $TV_{m,n}(P_0) + I_{m,n}$ is different from $tv_{m,n}(M)$.

Note also that $tv_{m,n}(M)$ depends on the involution that we chose for \mathcal{F} . But for simplicity we did not include the involution in our notation. Let N be the number of variables of R , let $\hat{\mathbb{F}}$ be the algebraic closure of \mathbb{F} , and let $\mathfrak{v}(I_{m,n}) \subset \hat{\mathbb{F}}^N$ be the (affine) zero variety associated to $I_{m,n}$. If $x \in \mathfrak{v}(I_{m,n})$ then, as an obvious corollary of the preceding theorem, the state sum $TV_{m,n}(P)$ evaluated at x yields an element of $\hat{\mathbb{F}}$ that does not depend on the choice of a special spine P with at least two vertices of a compact 3-manifold M , and we will call this a **numerical Turaev–Viro invariant** associated to $tv_{m,n}(\cdot)$. By definition, if an ideal Turaev–Viro invariant coincides on two compact 3-manifolds M_1 and M_2 then *all* associated numerical Turaev–Viro invariants coincide on M_1 and M_2 .

For the following theorem, recall that the **radical** \sqrt{I} of an ideal $I \subset R$ is the ideal formed by all polynomials $p \in R$ with $p^n \in I$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. An ideal is called radical if it coincides with its radical. The zero variety of an ideal and its radical coincide: $\mathfrak{v}(I) = \mathfrak{v}(\sqrt{I})$.

Definition 2. Let M be a compact 3-manifold with a special spine P . Let $tv_{m,n}(\cdot)$ be the ideal Turaev–Viro invariant obtained from the Turaev–Viro ideal $I_{m,n}$. The coset

$$\hat{t}v_{m,n}(M) = TV_{m,n}(P) + \sqrt{I_{m,n}} \in R/\sqrt{I_{m,n}}$$

is called the **universal numerical Turaev–Viro invariant** of M associated to $tv_{m,n}$.

Since $I_{m,n} \subset \sqrt{I_{m,n}}$, it is clear that $\hat{t}v_{m,n}(M)$ is a homeomorphism invariant of M . The name “universal numerical Turaev–Viro invariant” is justified by the following theorem.

Theorem 3. *Let $tv_{m,n}(\cdot)$ be an ideal Turaev–Viro invariant. Then for all compact 3-manifolds M_1, M_2 holds $\hat{t}v_{m,n}(M_1) = \hat{t}v_{m,n}(M_2)$ if and only if all numerical Turaev–Viro invariants associated to $tv_{m,n}(\cdot)$ coincide on M_1 and M_2 .*

Proof. If $\hat{t}v_{m,n}(M_1) = \hat{t}v_{m,n}(M_2)$ then all numerical Turaev–Viro invariants associated to $tv_{m,n}(\cdot)$ coincide on M_1 and M_2 , since $\mathfrak{v}(I_{m,n}) = \mathfrak{v}(\sqrt{I_{m,n}})$.

Now assume that for special spines P_1, P_2 of M_1, M_2 with at least two true vertices holds $TV_{m,n}(P_1)(x) = TV_{m,n}(P_2)(x)$ for all $x \in \mathfrak{v}(I_{m,n})$. So the polynomial $(TV_{m,n}(P_1) - TV_{m,n}(P_2)) \in R$ vanishes on $\mathfrak{v}(I_{m,n})$. Hence by Hilbert’s Nullstellensatz (in the formulation stated in [7, Corollary 2.6.17]) we have

$$(TV_{m,n}(P_1) - TV_{m,n}(P_2)) \in \sqrt{I_{m,n}},$$

and therefore $\hat{t}v_{m,n}(P_1) = \hat{t}v_{m,n}(P_2)$. □

Actually it turns out that the Turaev–Viro ideals studied in Section 7 and 8 are not radical. So we have reason to expect that, in general, with an ideal Turaev–Viro invariant one can distinguish strictly more manifolds than with all its associated numerical Turaev–Viro invariants together.

It is well known that numerical Turaev–Viro invariants exist for arbitrarily large colour sets. First examples have been presented by V. Turaev and O. Viro [16]. The representation theory of quantum groups yields a very successful machinery for constructing numerical Turaev–Viro invariants.

We come to another potential application of ideal Turaev–Viro invariants. Let $\tilde{c}(M)$ be the minimal number of true vertices of a special spine of a compact 3-manifold M . This is related to Matveev’s notion of **complexity** of manifolds, $c(M)$:

If M is a closed irreducible 3-manifold different from the 3-sphere, the projective space and the lens space $L(3, 1)$ then $c(M) = \tilde{c}(M)$.

Let $p \in R$ be a polynomial. Let $\deg_w(p)$ be the total degree of p in the colour weights, and let $\deg_{6j}(p)$ be the total degree of p in the $6j4k$ -symbols. For any subset $A \subset R$, let $\deg_w(A) = \min\{\deg_w(p) : p \in A\}$ and $\deg_{6j}(A) = \min\{\deg_{6j} w(p) : p \in A\}$.

Lemma 1. *Let $tv_{m,n}(\cdot)$ be an ideal Turaev–Viro invariant. For any closed 3-manifold M with $\tilde{c}(M) > 1$, we have*

$$\tilde{c}(M) \geq \max \left\{ \deg_w(tv_{m,n}(M)) - 1, \deg_{6j}(tv_{m,n}(M)) \right\}.$$

Proof. Let P be a special spine of M with $\tilde{c}(M)$ true vertices. Since $\tilde{c}(M) > 1$, P has at least two true vertices, hence we can compute $tv_{m,n}(M)$ using P . Since $\partial M = \emptyset$, we have $|\mathcal{C}(P)| = \tilde{c}(M) + 1$. Hence for the polynomial $TV_{m,n}(P) \in tv_{m,n}(M)$ we find $\deg_w(TV_{m,n}(P)) \leq \tilde{c}(M) + 1$ and $\deg_{6j}(TV_{m,n}(P)) \leq \tilde{c}(M)$ (possibly with strict inequality if simplifying assumption apply for $tv_{m,n}(\cdot)$; see Section 6). \square

5. COMPUTATION OF IDEAL TURAEV–VIRO INVARIANTS

How can one distinguish manifolds using ideal Turaev–Viro invariants? The first task is to present a special 2-polyhedron in a form that is accessible for computers. S. Matveev [12, Sec. 7.1] introduced a way of encoding special 2-polyhedra by lists of cyclic sequences of integers. This is roughly as follows. Let P be a special 2-polyhedron. We number the true edges of P and provide them with an arbitrary orientation. Let C be an oriented 2-stratum of P . When we track the oriented boundary of C , we obtain a cyclic sequence of the oriented true edges met by ∂C . This cyclic sequence of oriented edges is encoded by a cyclic sequence of integers whose absolute value gives the number of each edge met by ∂C , with positive (resp. negative) sign if the orientation of ∂C and of the edge coincides (resp. does not coincide). It turns out that this list of cyclic sequences of integers determines P up to homeomorphism.

It is not difficult to deduce from the representation of P how the oriented 2-strata and true edges of P meet at the true vertices. Hence, one can easily implement the computation of the Turaev–Viro state sum. If P is a special spine of a closed 3-manifold and has c true vertices, then $|\mathcal{C}(P)| = c + 1$ and $|E(P)| = 2c$. Again, let $m = |\mathcal{F}|$ and $n = |\mathcal{G}|$. The number of summands in $TV_{m,n}(P)$ is roughly $m^{c+1} \cdot n^{2c}$. So the computation of the state sum is easy but for large c quite time-consuming.

Let P_1 and P_2 be special spines of compact 3-manifolds M_1 and M_2 . We are now able to compute $TV_{m,n}(P_1)$ and $TV_{m,n}(P_2)$. But how can we determine whether $tv_{m,n}(M_1) = tv_{m,n}(M_2)$ or not? In other words, we need to compare cosets with respect to ideals in a polynomial ring over a field. This is algorithmically possible by the theory of Gröbner bases. For an introduction to that subject, we refer the reader to [3] or [7], among many other possible sources.

Firstly, we need to choose an **admissible monomial ordering** $<$ on R ; this is a total order on the set of monomials (i.e., products of variables) of R such that $1 < \mathfrak{m}$ for any monomial $\mathfrak{m} \in R$ and such that $\mathfrak{m}_1 < \mathfrak{m}_2$ implies $\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{m}_1 < \mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{m}_2$ for all monomials $\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{m}_1, \mathfrak{m}_2 \in R$. For a polynomial $f \in R$, the **leading monomial** of f with respect to $>$ is denoted by $lm_{>}(f)$. If an admissible ordering on R is given then one can generalise the usual division algorithm of univariate polynomials to multivariate polynomials and can define the remainder $\text{rem}_{>}(f, g) \in R$ of a polynomial $f \in R$ with respect to a polynomial $g \in R$. In general the remainder will depend on the chosen ordering.

Let $I = \langle g_1, \dots, g_k \rangle \subset R$ be the ideal generated by the polynomials $g_1, \dots, g_k \in R$. If one wants to test whether some polynomial $f \in R$ belongs to I , it is

a reasonable idea to iteratively compute the remainder $\text{rem}_>(f; g_1, \dots, g_k)$ of f with respect to g_1, \dots, g_k , i.e., $\text{rem}_>(\dots \text{rem}_>(\text{rem}_>(f, g_1), g_2) \dots, g_k)$. Certainly if $\text{rem}_>(f; g_1, \dots, g_k) = 0$ then $f \in I$. However, in general the converse is not true. Moreover, in general $\text{rem}_>(f; g_1, \dots, g_k)$ depends on the order of g_1, \dots, g_k .

A **Gröbner base** of I with respect to $>$ is a finite set $B \subset I$ such that

$$\langle \{lm(f) : f \in B\} \rangle = \langle \{lm(f) : f \in I\} \rangle.$$

It turns out that any Gröbner base of I is a generating subset of I , and that any ideal in R has a Gröbner base (specifically, any ideal is finitely generated). If B satisfies some additional hypothesis (see [3, Sec. 3.7] for details), it is called *reduced* Gröbner base, and turns out to be unique, hence depends only on I and $>$. The reduced Gröbner base can be algorithmically constructed, given an arbitrary finite generating subset of I . One of the main features of (not necessarily reduced) Gröbner bases is that they allow the computation of a unique representative for any coset $f + I \in R/I$: If $\{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$ is a Gröbner base of I with respect to $>$, then for any $f, g \in R$ one has $\text{rem}_>(f; b_1, \dots, b_n) = \text{rem}_>(g; b_1, \dots, b_n)$ if and only if $f + I = g + I$. Moreover, $\text{Nf}_>(f, I) = \text{rem}_>(f; b_1, \dots, b_n)$ does not depend on the choice of a Gröbner base for I or on the order of b_1, \dots, b_n , but only on $f + I$ and $>$, and is therefore called the **normal form** of $f + I$ with respect to $>$. The computation of Gröbner bases and normal forms is implemented in various computer algebra systems, e.g. in `Maple V` or `Mathematica`, and there is also specialised software like `Singular`, `Macaulay 2` or `bergman`.

Our computations involve the following three steps.

- (1) Produce the list of variables of R and the list of generators of $I_{m,n}$ defined in the previous section.
- (2) Compute a Gröbner base of $I_{m,n}$ for the chosen admissible monomial ordering $>$.
- (3) For any special 2-polyhedron P , compute $TV_{m,n}(P)$, and
- (4) compute the normal form of $TV_{m,n}(P) + I_{m,n}$ using the Gröbner base obtained in step 2.

For step 1 and 3, we wrote `maple V` programs. For step 2 and 4, we used `Singular`. If we want to compute the universal numerical Turaev–Viro invariant associated to $tv_{m,n}$, we simply replace $I_{m,n}$ by $\sqrt{I_{m,n}}$, which is possible since one can compute a finite set of generators of $\sqrt{I_{m,n}}$ for any finite set of generators of $I_{m,n}$ (we used `Singular` for that purpose).

We conclude this section with some remarks on the computational complexity. The number of $6j4k$ -symbols is $m^6 \cdot n^4$, and we have m colour weights. The number of variables of R is slightly less since we take equivalence classes, though it still grows rapidly with the number of colours. We have roughly $m^9 \cdot n^6$ generators of $I_{m,n}$ (some of them coincide by symmetry), which are polynomials of degree 4 involving up to $n + m \cdot n^3$ monomials. Apart from the sheer size of the generating system of $I_{m,n}$, step 1 is easy. And so is step 3, except for the size of the state sum and for the number of different manifolds that we want to compute invariants for.

Step 2 is the most critical one. The main problem for computing Gröbner bases is the number of variables, especially if a lexicographic order is used. So one can not expect to be able to use large colour sets. However, the examples exposed in Section 7 show that to some extent the computation of ideal Turaev–Viro invariants is feasible. Fortunately the most critical step 2 is to be performed only once, it is not needed to repeat it for any manifold.

6. SIMPLIFYING ASSUMPTIONS

One way to overcome the complexity problems mentioned in the previous section is to introduce simplifying assumptions. For instance, we can restrict the set of colourings by sending some of the $6j4k$ -symbols to zero. This strategy is supported by the numerical Turaev–Viro invariants obtained from quantum groups. E.g., in the invariants constructed in [16], we have colour sets $\mathcal{F} = \{0, \dots, k-1\}$ and $\mathcal{G} = \{*\}$, and the $6j$ -symbols vanish unless around any true edge the three 2-strata colours satisfy triangle inequalities and have even sum (“admissible” colouring). In the numerical examples, usually one has some colour $z \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $w(z) = \left| \begin{smallmatrix} z & z & z \\ z & z & z \end{smallmatrix} \right| = 1$, and we could assume the same. We even could adopt the values of some more $6j4k$ -symbols occurring in numerical Turaev–Viro invariants, and only declare the remaining symbols as variables. Since the number of variables is critical for computing Gröbner bases, this is an efficient strategy.

Lemma 2. *If $\left| \begin{smallmatrix} a & b & c \\ f & e & d \end{smallmatrix} \right|$ are the $6j$ -symbols of a numerical Turaev–Viro invariant of type $(m, 1)$ with $\mathcal{G} = \{*\}$ then one obtains a numerical Turaev–Viro invariant of type (m, n) by maintaining the colour weights and defining the $6j4k$ -symbols by scaling the $6j$ -symbols: $\left| \begin{smallmatrix} a & b & c \\ f & e & d \end{smallmatrix} \right|_{C,D}^{A,B} = \frac{1}{n^2} \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} a & b & c \\ f & e & d \end{smallmatrix} \right|$ for all $A, B, C, D \in \mathcal{G}$.*

Proof. The scaling implies

$$\sum_{A \in \mathcal{G}} \left| \begin{smallmatrix} j_1 & j_2 & j_3 \\ j_9 & j_8 & j_7 \end{smallmatrix} \right|_{k_3, A}^{k_1, k_2} \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} j_4 & j_5 & j_6 \\ -j_9 & -j_8 & -j_7 \end{smallmatrix} \right|_{k_6, A}^{k_4, k_5} = \frac{n}{n^4} \left| \begin{smallmatrix} j_1 & j_2 & j_3 \\ j_9 & j_8 & j_7 \end{smallmatrix} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} j_4 & j_5 & j_6 \\ -j_9 & -j_8 & -j_7 \end{smallmatrix} \right|$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{A_1, A_2, A_3 \in \mathcal{G}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{F}} w(j) \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} j & j_1 & j_2 \\ j_7 & -j_5 & -j_4 \end{smallmatrix} \right|_{k_1, k_4}^{A_1, A_2} \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} j & j_2 & j_3 \\ j_9 & -j_6 & -j_5 \end{smallmatrix} \right|_{k_3, k_6}^{A_2, A_3} \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} j & j_3 & j_1 \\ -j_8 & -j_4 & -j_6 \end{smallmatrix} \right|_{k_2, k_5}^{A_3, A_1} \\ &= \frac{n^3}{n^6} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{F}} w(j) \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} j & j_1 & j_2 \\ j_7 & -j_5 & -j_4 \end{smallmatrix} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} j & j_2 & j_3 \\ j_9 & -j_6 & -j_5 \end{smallmatrix} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} j & j_3 & j_1 \\ -j_8 & -j_4 & -j_6 \end{smallmatrix} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

So the generators of $I_{m,n}$ are obtained from the generators of $I_{m,1}$ by scaling with $\frac{1}{n^3}$. Hence if the colour weights and the $6j$ -symbols correspond to a point of $\mathfrak{v}(I_{m,1})$ then the colour weights and the $6j4k$ -symbols correspond to a point of $\mathfrak{v}(I_{m,n})$. \square

Of course, the preceding Lemma will not yield an essentially new invariant. But it suggests to give *some* of the $6j4k$ -symbols the value $\left| \begin{smallmatrix} a & b & c \\ f & e & d \end{smallmatrix} \right|_{C,D}^{A,B} = \frac{1}{n^2} \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} a & b & c \\ f & e & d \end{smallmatrix} \right|$ and keep the remaining symbols as variables.

Finally, we can reduce the number of variables of R by providing the $6j4k$ -symbols with additional symmetries. For instance, we could assume

$$(1) \quad \left| \begin{smallmatrix} a & b & c \\ f & e & d \end{smallmatrix} \right|_{C,D}^{A,B} = \left| \begin{smallmatrix} a & b & c \\ f & e & d \end{smallmatrix} \right|_{\sigma(C), \sigma(D)}^{\sigma(A), \sigma(B)},$$

for any $a, b, c, d, e, f \in \mathcal{F}$, any $A, B, C, D \in \mathcal{G}$ and any permutation σ of $\{A, B, C, D\}$.

The general machinery always remains the same: We have a polynomial ring whose variables correspond to $6j4k$ -symbols and colour weights, we have a state sum associated to any special 2-polyhedron, and we have an ideal such that the coset of the state sum does not change under T^\pm moves. Therefore we still call the resulting homeomorphism invariant of compact 3-manifolds “an ideal Turaev–Viro invariant $\tilde{t}v_{m,n}(\cdot)$ of type (m, n) ” (we mark by the tilde the existence of simplifying assumptions), and it should be clear how to define the notion of a (universal) numerical Turaev–Viro invariant associated to $\tilde{t}v_{m,n}(\cdot)$ — Theorem 3 holds with the obvious changes also in the new setting.

Because all mentioned simplifying assumptions are known to hold for some numerical Turaev–Viro invariants, we can be sure that *ideal* Turaev–Viro invariants subject to these assumptions are nontrivial as well.

One may also think of adding *more* generators to $I_{m,n}$. This might accelerate the computation of a Gröbner base, because additional polynomials can be used to simplify the generators of $I_{m,n}$. A source of additional generators could be an adaption of a Gröbner base of a Turaev–Viro ideal of type $(m, 1)$.

7. EXAMPLES

In this section, we present several ideal Turaev–Viro invariants. Our computational results on these invariants will be stated in the next section. For all examples, we chose $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{Q}$.

Our first example, $\tilde{t}v_{2,1}$, is constructed similarly to Matveev’s ϵ -invariant [11], [12]. Actually the ϵ -invariant is obtained as evaluation of $\tilde{t}v_{2,1}$ (see below). For $\tilde{t}v_{2,1}$, we have $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{Q}$, 2-strata colours $\mathcal{F} = \{1, 2\}$ and trivial edge colours $\mathcal{G} = \{*\}$. So we have $6j$ -symbols rather than $6j4k$ -symbols. We work under the simplifying assumption that the $6j$ -symbol of a vertex v vanishes if there is some true edge e meeting v so that there are exactly two 2-strata of colour 1 meeting e (counted with multiplicity). We also assume $w(1) = 1$ and $|\frac{1}{1} \frac{1}{1} \frac{1}{1}| = 1$, which holds for the ϵ -invariant as well. So the variables of R are four equivalence classes of $6j$ -symbols and the colour weight $w(2)$, and we provide R with degree reverse lexicographic order, where $|\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{1}| > |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{1} \frac{2}{2}| > |\frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2}| > |\frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2}| > w(2)$.

The Turaev–Viro ideal in this setting is generated by 12 polynomials:

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2}|^2 - |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}|^3 - w(2) \cdot |\frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2}|^3, \\
& |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}|^2 - |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}|^2 \cdot |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}| - w(2) \cdot |\frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2}|^2 \cdot |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}|, \\
& |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}| \cdot |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}| - w(2) \cdot |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}|^3, \\
& |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}| \cdot |\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}| - w(2) \cdot |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}|^2 \cdot |\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}|, \\
& |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}| \cdot |\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}| - w(2) \cdot |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}|^2 \cdot |\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}|, \\
& |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}|^2 - |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}| \cdot |\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}|^2, \\
& |\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}|^2 - |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}|^3 - w(2) \cdot |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}|^3, \\
& |\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}| - w(2) \cdot |\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}|^3, \\
& - |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}| \cdot |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}|^2 - w(2) \cdot |\frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2}| \cdot |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}|^2, \\
& |\frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2}| \cdot |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}| - w(2) \cdot |\frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2}| \cdot |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}|^2, \\
& |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}|^2 - |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}| \cdot |\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}|^2, \\
& |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}|^2 - w(2) \cdot |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}|^2 \cdot |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}|,
\end{aligned}$$

compare [12, Sec. 8.1.2]. Note that without the assumption $|\frac{1}{1} \frac{1}{1} \frac{1}{1}| = w(1) = 1$ one has two additional generators. One obtains a (non-reduced) Gröbner base formed by 22 polynomials:

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}| \cdot |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}| - |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}|^2, \\
& - |\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}| + |\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}| \cdot w(2)^2 + |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}| \cdot |\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}| - |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}| \cdot |\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}| - w(2) \cdot |\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}|, \\
& |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}|^2 + w(2) \cdot |\frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2}| \cdot |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}|, \\
& w(2) \cdot |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}|^2 - |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}|^2 + |\frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2}| \cdot |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}|, \\
& |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}| \cdot |\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}| + w(2) \cdot |\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}| \cdot |\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}| - w(2) \cdot |\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}|,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& w(2) \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 1 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^2 - \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^2, \\
& w(2) \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 1 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right| - \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^2, \\
& w(2) \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^2 - w(2) \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^2 - \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 1 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^2, \\
& \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^2 \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right| + \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^2 + 2 \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right|, \\
& \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^2 + \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^2 + \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right|, \\
& \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right| + \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right| + 2 \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right| - w(2) \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^2, \\
& \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right| - \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right| \\
& \quad - w(2) \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right| - \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right|, \\
& \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^3 - w(2) \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^2 + \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^2, \\
& \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^2 - \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right| - \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^2, \\
& - \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^2 + \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^2, \\
& \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^3 - \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^2 + \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^2, \\
& \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^2 + \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^2 - \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^2, \\
& - \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^2 + \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^2, \\
& \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^3 + w(2) \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^2 - w(2) \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^3, \\
& w(2) \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^3 + \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^3 - \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^2, \\
& \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^3 \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right| - w(2) \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^2 - 4 \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^2 \\
& \quad - 6 \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^2 + 4 \cdot w(2) \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^2, \\
& \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^3 \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^2 - \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^2 \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^2 + 4 \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^2 + 6 \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right| \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

According to eqn. (8.5) in [12], one obtains the ϵ -invariant by evaluation as follows:

$$\left| \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right| = \epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right| = \epsilon^{-1}, \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right| = \epsilon^{-1}, \left| \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right| = -\epsilon^{-2}, w(2) = \epsilon,$$

where ϵ is any root of $\epsilon^2 - \epsilon - 1$.

This is the only example for which we write down the defining polynomials in this article. In all other cases, there are simply too many polynomials, and we refer to the material that we provide on our web site [6]. Note that one obtains a smaller Gröbner base with a lexicographic order on R . However we did not succeed to work with lexicographic orders in our other examples.

By a result of Matveev–Nowik [10], there are pairs of non-homeomorphic compact manifolds that can not be distinguished by any Turaev–Viro invariant of type $(m, 1)$ with a trivial involution on the set of 2-strata colours (i.e., $f = -f$ for all $f \in \mathcal{F}$). The result was formulated for numerical invariants, but it readily applies for ideal invariants as well. Therefore we also constructed two invariants of type $(3, 1)$ with non-trivial involution and an invariant of type $(2, 2)$.

For type $(3, 1)$, let $\mathcal{F} = \{-1, 0, 1\}$ with the usual involution $-(-1) = 1$, $-0 = 0$. We assume for simplification that $w(0) = 1$ and $\left| \begin{smallmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix} \right| = 1$. Then, we have 41 equivalence classes of $6j$ -symbols and one remaining colour weight $w(1)$. We obtain 1661 generators for the Turaev–Viro ideal, and after two days **Singular** succeeds with finding a Gröbner base with respect to some degree reverse lexicographic order formed by 1297 polynomials. We denote the resulting ideal Turaev–Viro invariant by $tv_{3,1}^+(\cdot)$, where the “+” shall denote that the involution on \mathcal{F} is non-trivial.

In order to compare an ideal invariant of a given type with another ideal invariant of the same type subject to simplifying assumptions, we also consider the following setting. Again, let $\mathcal{F} = \{-1, 0, 1\}$ with the usual involution $-(-1) = 1$, $-0 = 0$. We assume $w(0) = 1$, but we do not assume $|\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}| = 1$. Instead, we assume that the $6j$ -symbol of a vertex v vanishes if there is some true edge e meeting v so that there are exactly two 2-strata of colour 0 meeting e (counted with multiplicity). Hence, the assumption is essentially the same as in the case of $\tilde{tv}_{2,1}$. There remain 21 equivalence classes of $6j$ -symbols. The Turaev–Viro ideal is generated by 474 polynomials, and after a few seconds `Singular` finds a Gröbner base of 337 polynomials. We denote the resulting invariant by $\tilde{tv}_{3,1}^+(\cdot)$.

We now come to an ideal Turaev–Viro invariant of type $(2, 2)$. We use $\mathcal{F} = \{1, 2\}$ with trivial involution, and $\mathcal{G} = \{1, 2\}$. For simplification, we assume $w(1) = |\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}|_{C,D}^{A,B} = \frac{1}{4}$, which is justified by Lemma 2, since in $\tilde{tv}_{2,1}(\cdot)$ we have $|\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}| = 1$. We assume that the $6j$ -symbol of a vertex v vanishes if there is some true edge e meeting v so that there are exactly two 2-strata of colour 1 meeting e (counted with multiplicity). Moreover, we assume the additional symmetry stated in Equation (1). We then have 22 equivalence classes of $6j4k$ -symbols. The Turaev–Viro ideal is generated by 353 polynomials, but we did not succeed to compute a Gröbner base in this setting. Therefore we enlarged the ring R by a new variable X and enlarged the Turaev–Viro ideal by adding 22 generators, obtained as follows: We define $|\begin{smallmatrix} a & b & c \\ f & e & d \end{smallmatrix}| = X \cdot |\begin{smallmatrix} a & b & c \\ f & e & d \end{smallmatrix}|_{1,1}^{1,1}$ for $a, \dots, f \in \mathcal{F}$, apply this definition to the $6j$ -symbols in the 22 polynomials in the above Gröbner base used to compute $\tilde{tv}_{2,1}$, and append them to the list of generators of the Turaev–Viro ideal. After this enlargement of the ideal, `Singular` finds a Gröbner base formed by 449 polynomials within a few minutes. We denote the resulting invariant by $tv_{2,2}(\cdot)$.

8. COMPUTATIONAL RESULTS

In this section, we report the results of computing the invariants presented in the previous section on lists of closed orientable manifolds. We computed $\tilde{tv}_{2,1}(\cdot)$, $\tilde{tv}_{3,1}^+(\cdot)$ and $tv_{3,1}^+(\cdot)$ for irreducible manifolds up to complexity 9, and $\tilde{tv}_{2,2}(\cdot)$ up to complexity 6. The following list of statements is result of our computations.

Proposition 1.

- (1) *The Turaev–Viro ideals involved in the construction of $\tilde{tv}_{2,1}(\cdot)$, $\tilde{tv}_{3,1}^+(\cdot)$ and $tv_{3,1}^+(\cdot)$ are not radical.*
- (2) *On the 1900 closed irreducible orientable 3-manifolds of complexity ≤ 9 , the ϵ -invariant takes 35 different values, $\tilde{tv}_{2,1}(\cdot)$ takes 134 different values and $\tilde{tv}_{3,1}^+(\cdot)$ takes 242 different values, whereas homology takes 272 different values.*
- (3) *Using the combination of homology and $\tilde{tv}_{3,1}(\cdot)$ one can distinguish 764 homeomorphism types of closed irreducible orientable 3-manifolds of complexity ≤ 9 .*
- (4) *On closed irreducible orientable 3-manifolds of complexity ≤ 9 , $\tilde{tv}_{3,1}^+(\cdot)$ and $tv_{3,1}^+(\cdot)$ are equivalent invariants. On closed irreducible orientable 3-manifolds of complexity ≤ 6 , $\tilde{tv}_{2,1}(\cdot)$ and $\tilde{tv}_{2,2}(\cdot)$ are equivalent invariants.*
- (5) *On the closed irreducible orientable 3-manifolds that we considered, the ideal Turaev–Viro invariants $\tilde{tv}_{2,1}(\cdot)$, $\tilde{tv}_{3,1}^+(\cdot)$ and $tv_{3,1}^+(\cdot)$ are equivalent to their associated universal numerical Turaev–Viro invariant.*
- (6) *The lower bound for the complexity stated in 1 is trivial in all examples that we computed.*

We show statement (7) again for $\tilde{tv}_{2,1}(\cdot)$, but it holds analogously also for our other examples of ideal Turaev–Viro invariants. We found

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Nf}_>(\tilde{tv}_{2,1}(L(7,2))) &= w(2)^3 \cdot \left| \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \right|^2 - \left| \frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2} \right|^2 + \left| \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \right| \cdot \left| \frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2} \right| + 1 \\ \text{Nf}_>(\tilde{tv}_{2,1}(L(8,3))) &= w(2)^3 \cdot \left| \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \right|^2 + 2 \cdot \left| \frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2} \right|^2 - \left| \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \right| \cdot \left| \frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2} \right| + 1, \end{aligned}$$

but

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Nf}_>(\tilde{tv}_{2,1}(L(8,3)\#L(8,3))) &= w(2)^3 \cdot \left| \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \right|^2 + 3 \cdot \left| \frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2} \right|^2 + 7 \cdot \left| \frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2} \right|^2 - 6 \cdot \left| \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \right| \cdot \left| \frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2} \right| + 1 \\ \neq \text{Nf}_>(\text{Nf}_>(\tilde{tv}_{2,1}(L(8,3))) \cdot \text{Nf}_>(\tilde{tv}_{2,1}(L(8,3)))) &= w(2)^4 \cdot \left| \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \right|^2 + 2 \cdot w(2)^3 \cdot \left| \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \right|^2 + 7 \cdot \left| \frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2} \right|^2 - 4 \cdot \left| \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \right| \cdot \left| \frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2} \right| + 1 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Nf}_>(\tilde{tv}_{2,1}(L(8,3)\#L(7,2))) &= w(2)^3 \cdot \left| \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \right|^2 + \left| \frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2} \right|^2 + 9 \cdot \left| \frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2} \right|^2 - 6 \cdot \left| \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \right| \cdot \left| \frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2} \right| + 1 \\ \neq \text{Nf}_>(\text{Nf}_>(\tilde{tv}_{2,1}(L(8,3))) \cdot \text{Nf}_>(\tilde{tv}_{2,1}(L(7,2)))) &= w(2)^4 \cdot \left| \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \right|^2 + 2 \cdot w(2)^3 \cdot \left| \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \right|^2 - \left| \frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2} \right|^2 + \left| \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \right| \cdot \left| \frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2} \right| + 1 \end{aligned}$$

For our computations, we used the following special spines (in Matveev-coding):

- ((1, 1, 2, -3), (1, 3, -4, -4, -2), (2, -4, -3)) for $L(7,2)$,
- ((1, 1, 2, -3), (1, 3, -4, -2), (2, -4, -4, -3)) for $L(8,3)$,
- ((1, 1, 2, -3), (1, 3, -7, -16, -15, -4, -2), (2, -7, -6, -5, -4, -7, 17, 18, -4, -3), (8, 8, 9, -10), (8, 10, -14, -17, -16, -11, -14, 18, 15, -11, -9), (9, -14, -13, -12, -11, -10), (15, 12, -5), (16, -6, -12), (17, -13, 6), (18, 5, 13)) for $L(8,3)\#L(7,2)$,
and
- ((1, 1, 2, -3), (1, 3, -7, -16, -15, -4, -2), (2, -7, -6, -5, -4, -7, 17, 18, -4, -3), (8, 8, 9, -10), (8, 10, -14, -13, -12, -11, -9), (9, -14, -17, -16, -11, -14, 18, 15, -11, -10), (15, 12, -5), (16, -6, -12), (17, -13, 6), (18, 5, 13)) for $L(8,3)\#L(8,3)$.

□

The first statement of Proposition 1 says, in combination with Theorem 3, that one should expect that ideal Turaev–Viro invariants are, in general, stronger than a combination of all associated numerical Turaev–Viro invariants.

The second and third statement of Proposition 1 shows that $\tilde{tv}_{2,1}(\cdot)$ sees properties of manifolds that are invisible for homology, and vice versa.

Statement (4) is surprising, because one would expect that one obtains a stronger invariant if one avoids to impose simplifying assumptions. But this is not necessarily the case. Statement (5) is even more surprising, because by statement (1) the Turaev–Viro ideals are not radical — hence there are elements of R so that the cosets with respect to $\sqrt{I_{m,n}}$ coincide, but the cosets with respect to $I_{m,n}$ are different. Are there compact 3-manifolds M_1, M_2 that can be distinguished by some ideal Turaev–Viro invariant $tv(\cdot)$ but can not be distinguished by all associated numerical Turaev–Viro invariants, i.e., can not be distinguished by $\tilde{tv}(\cdot)$? Note that $\tilde{tv}_{2,1}$ is stronger than the ϵ -invariant; but the ϵ -invariant is not the only numerical Turaev–Viro invariant associated to $\tilde{tv}_{2,1}$ (see [12, Sec. 8.1]).

The last statement of Proposition 1 is a bad news if one wants to construct a Topological Quantum Field Theory. But it is a good news if one aims to construct

invariants that potentially detect counter-examples of the Andrews-Curtis conjecture. Namely, by a result of Bobtcheva and Quinn [1], an invariant for Andrews-Curtis moves descending from a multiplicative invariant of 4-thickenings of special 2-polyhedra only depends on homology if the Euler characteristic of the 2-complex under consideration is at least 1. But a non-multiplicative ideal Turaev-Viro invariant for Andrews-Curtis moves [5] is potentially more useful. Note that the ϵ -invariant is multiplicative, and is $1 + \epsilon$ on both $L(8, 3)$ and $L(7, 2)$.

Acknowledgement. I'm grateful to S. V. Matveev for providing me with a list of one special spine for each closed orientable irreducible 3-manifold up to complexity 9, which was essential for the computations. I thank I. Bobtcheva for interesting discussions.

REFERENCES

- [1] I. Bobtcheva, F. Quinn: The reduction of quantum invariants of 4-thickenings. *Preprint*, (2004).
- [2] B. G. Casler: An impeding theorem for connected 3-manifolds with boundary. *Proceedings of the AMS* **16**, 559–566 (1965).
- [3] R. Fröberg *An introduction to Gröbner bases*. Pure and Applied Mathematics. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester, 1997.
- [4] C. Kassel: *Quantum Groups*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 155. Springer-Verlag, 1995.
- [5] S. King: State sum invariants for Andrews-Curtis problems. *Preprint in preparation*.
- [6] <http://www.mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de/~king/tvdaten>
- [7] M. Kreuzer, L. Robbiano: *Computational commutative algebra 1*. Springer-Verlag, 2000.
- [8] L. D. Landau, E. M. Lifschitz: *Lehrbuch der theoretischen Physik*. Band III. Quantenmechanik. Aus dem Russischen übersetzt von A. Kühnel. Achte Auflage. Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, 1988.
- [9] S. V. Matveev: Transformations of special spines and the Zeeman conjecture. *Math. USSR-Izvestiya* **31**, 423–434 (1988).
- [10] S. V. Matveev, T. Nowik. On 3-manifolds having the same Turaev-Viro invariants. *Russian journal of mathematical physics* **2(3)**, 317–324 (1994).
- [11] S. V. Matveev, M.A. Ovchinnikov, M. V. Sokolov: On a simple invariant of Turaev-Viro type. *Zap. Nauchn. Sem. S.-Peterburg. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov.* **234**, 137–142 (1996). Übersetzung in *J. Math. Sci.* **94**, 1226–1229 (1999).
- [12] S. V. Matveev: *Algorithmic topology and classification of 3-manifolds*. Algorithms and Computation in Mathematics, 9. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003.
- [13] E. E. Moise: Affine structures in 3-manifolds. V. The triangulation theorem and Hauptvermutung. *Ann. of Math* **57**, 547–560 (1952).
- [14] U. Pachner: P.L. Homeomorphic Manifolds are Equivalent by Elementary Shellings. *Europ. J. Combinatorics* **12**, 129–145 (1991).
- [15] R. Piergallini: Standard moves for standard polyhedra and spines. *Rendiconti del circolo matematico di Palermo* **37**, 391–414 (1988).
- [16] V. G. Turaev, O. Y. Viro: State sum invariants of 3-manifolds and quantum $6j$ -symbols. *Topology* **31**, 865–902 (1992).
- [17] V. G. Turaev: *Quantum invariants of knots and 3-manifolds*. de Gruyter Studies in Mathematics, 18. Walter de Gruyter & Co. 1994.

Simon A. King
Department of Mathematics
Technical University Darmstadt
64289 Darmstadt
GERMANY
 king@mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de