

The warping degree of a link diagram

Ayaka Shimizu

Department of Mathematics, Osaka City University
Sugimoto, Sumiyoshi-ku Osaka 558-8585, Japan

Email: ayakaberrycandy@y2.dion.ne.jp

October 26, 2018

Abstract

For an oriented link diagram D , the warping degree $d(D)$ is the smallest number of crossing changes which are needed to obtain a monotone diagram from D in the usual way. We show that $d(D) + d(-D) + sr(D)$ is less than or equal to the crossing number of D , where $-D$ denotes the inverse of D and $sr(D)$ denotes the number of component subdiagrams which have at least one self-crossing. Moreover, we prove the condition of the equality. We also consider the minimal $d(D) + d(-D) + sr(D)$ for all diagrams D . And for the warping degree and linking warping degree, we show some relations to the linking number, unlinking number, and the splitting number.

1 Introduction

The warping degree, which is defined by Kawauchi, is an invariant of an oriented diagram of a knot, a link or a spatial graph ([3], [4]). The warping degree represents such a complexity of a diagram, and it depends on the orientation of a diagram. For an oriented link diagram D , the warping degree $d(D)$ is the smallest number which is needed to obtain a monotone diagram from D in the usual way, where a monotone diagram, which is also defined by Kawauchi, is like a descending diagram ([3], [1]). We give a correct definitions of the warping degree and a monotone diagram in Section 2. Let $-D$ be the diagram D with orientation reversed for all components, and we call $-D$ the

inverse of D . Let $c(D)$ be the crossing number of D . In the case where D is an oriented knot diagram which has at least one crossing point, we have the inequality,

$$d(D) + d(-D) + 1 \leq c(D). \quad (1)$$

Further, the equality holds if and only if D is an alternating diagram [7]. In this paper, we generalize this to a link diagram as follows:

Theorem 1.1. *Let D be a link diagram, and $sr(D)$ the number of component subdiagrams D^i such that D^i has at least one self-crossing. Then we have*

$$d(D) + d(-D) + sr(D) \leq c(D).$$

Further, the equality holds if and only if every component subdiagram D^i is alternating, and the number of over-crossings of D^i is equal to the number of under-crossings of D^i in every subdiagram $D^i \cup D^j$.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we define the warping degree $d(D)$ of an oriented link diagram D . In Section 3, we define the linking warping degree $ld(D)$, and show relations to the linking number and the crossing number. In Section 4, we consider the value $d(D) + d(-D)$, and prove Theorem 1.1. In Section 5, we apply the warping degree to a link itself. In Section 6, we take a look at relations to unknotting number and crossing number. And in Section 7, we define the splitting number and consider relations between the warping degree and the splitting number.

2 The warping degree of an oriented link diagram

Let L be an r component non-ordered link, and D a diagram of L . We take a sequence \mathbf{a} of base points a_i ($i = 1, 2, \dots, r$), where every component subdiagram has just one base point except at crossing points. Then $D_{\mathbf{a}}$, the pair of D and \mathbf{a} , is represented by $D_{\mathbf{a}} = D_{a_1}^1 \cup D_{a_2}^2 \cup \dots \cup D_{a_r}^r$ with the order of \mathbf{a} . A crossing point p of $D_{\mathbf{a}}$ is a *warping crossing point* if p satisfies the following condition[3]:

- If p is a self-crossing of $D_{a_i}^i$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, r$), then we meet the point first at the under-crossing when we go along the oriented diagram $D_{a_i}^i$ by starting from a_i . We call p a warping crossing point of $D_{a_i}^i$.
- If p is a crossing of $D_{a_i}^i$ and $D_{a_j}^j$ ($i < j$), then p is the under-crossing of $D_{a_i}^i$. We call p a warping crossing point between $D_{a_i}^i$ and $D_{a_j}^j$.




Figure 1:

For example in Figure 1, p is a warping crossing point of $D_{a_1}^1$, and q is a warping crossing point between $D_{a_1}^1$ and $D_{a_2}^2$. We define the warping degree for an oriented non-ordered link diagram [3].

Definition 2.1. The *warping degree* of $D_{\mathbf{a}}$, denoted by $d(D_{\mathbf{a}})$, is the number of warping crossing points of $D_{\mathbf{a}}$. The *warping degree* of D , denoted by $d(D)$, is the minimal warping degree $d(D_{\mathbf{a}})$ for all base point sequences \mathbf{a} of D .

Ozawa and Fung showed respectively that the non-trivial link which has a diagram D with $d(D) = 1$ is the split union of a twist knot or Hopf link and r trivial knots ($0 \leq r$) ([6], [2]).

For an oriented link diagram and its base point sequence $D_{\mathbf{a}} = D_{a_1}^1 \cup D_{a_2}^2 \cup \dots \cup D_{a_r}^r$, we denote by $d(D_{a_i}^i)$ the number of warping crossing points of $D_{a_i}^i$. We denote by $d(D_{a_i}^i, D_{a_j}^j)$ the number of warping crossing points between

$D_{a_i}^i$ and $D_{a_j}^j$. Then we have

$$d(D_{\mathbf{a}}) = \sum_{i=1}^r d(D_{a_i}^i) + \sum_{i < j} d(D_{a_i}^i, D_{a_j}^j).$$

Thus, the set of the warping crossing points of $D_{\mathbf{a}}$ is divided into two types in the sense that the warping crossing point is self-crossing or not.

The pair $D_{\mathbf{a}}$ is *monotone* if $d(D_{\mathbf{a}}) = 0$. In other words, we meet every crossing point of a monotone diagram as an over-crossing first, respectively by starting from a_1, a_2, \dots , and a_r in numerical order. For example, $D_{\mathbf{a}}$ depicted in Figure 2 is monotone.




Figure 2:

Note that a monotone diagram is a trivial link diagram. Hence we have $u(D) \leq d(D)$, where $u(D)$ is the unlinking number of D ([5], [9]).

In the rest of this section, we give a method of obtaining the warping degree $d(D)$ of an oriented knot diagram D . The method for a link diagram is given in Section 3. Let a be an arbitrary base point of D . We can obtain the warping degree $d(D_a)$ of D_a by counting the warping crossing points easily. Let $[D_a]$ be a sequence of some "o" and "u", which is obtained as follows. When we go along the oriented diagram D from a , we write down "o" (resp. "u") if we reach a crossing point as an over-crossing (resp. under-crossing) in numerical order. We next perform normalization to $[D_a]$, by deleting the subsequence "ou" repeatedly, to obtain the normalized sequence $\lfloor D_a \rfloor$. Then we have

$$d(D) = d(D_a) - \frac{1}{2} \# \lfloor D_a \rfloor,$$

where $\# \lfloor D_a \rfloor$ denotes the number of elements in $\lfloor D_a \rfloor$. Thus, we obtain the warping degree $d(D)$ of D . In the following example, we find the warping

degree of a knot diagram by using the above algorithm.

Example 2.2. For the oriented knot diagram D and the base point a in Figure 3, we have $d(D_a) = 4$ and $[D_a] = [oouuouuouuouoouoou]$. By normalizing $[D_a]$, we obtain $[D_a] = [uuoo]$. Hence we find the warping degree of D as follows:

$$d(D) = 4 - \frac{1}{2} \times 4 = 2.$$




Figure 3:

For some types of knot diagram, this algorithm is useful in formulating the warping degree or looking into its properties. We enumerate the properties of an oriented diagram of a pretzel knot of odd type in the following example:

Example 2.3. Let $D = P(\varepsilon_1 n_1, \varepsilon_2 n_2, \dots, \varepsilon_m n_m)$ be an oriented pretzel knot diagram of odd type ($\varepsilon_i \in +1, -1, n_i, m: \text{ odd} > 0$), where the orientation is given as shown in Figure 4. We take base points a, b in Figure 4. Then we have

$$d(D_a) = d(-D_b) = \frac{c(D)}{2} + \sum_i \frac{(-1)^{i+1} \varepsilon_i}{2}$$

and

$$\sharp[D_a] = \sharp[-D_b].$$

Hence we have $d(D) = d(-D)$ in this case. In particular, if D is alternating i.e. $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2 = \dots = \varepsilon_m = \pm 1$, then we have that

$$d(D) = \frac{c(D)}{2} - \frac{1}{2}.$$




Figure 4:

3 The linking warping degree of a link diagram

In this section, we first define the linking warping degree, which is something like a restricted warping degree, and which has relations to the linking number and the crossing number. We next show a method of finding the warping degree of an oriented link diagram.

The number of warping crossing points which are non-self crossings does not depend on the orientation. We define the *linking warping degree* of $D_{\mathbf{a}}$, denoted by $ld(D_{\mathbf{a}})$, by the following formula:

$$ld(D_{\mathbf{a}}) = \sum_{i < j} d(D^i, D^j) = d(D_{\mathbf{a}}) - \sum_{i=1}^r d(D_{a_i}^i),$$

where D^i, D^j are component subdiagrams of $D_{\mathbf{a}}$ ($i, j = 1, 2, \dots, r$). The *linking warping degree* of D , denoted by $ld(D)$, is the minimal $ld(D_{\mathbf{a}})$ for all base point sequences \mathbf{a} . It does not depend on any choices of orientations of component subdiagrams. For example, the diagram D in Figure 5 has $ld(D) = 2$. A diagram $D_{\mathbf{a}}$ is *stacked* if $ld(D_{\mathbf{a}}) = 0$. A diagram D is *stacked* if $ld(D) = 0$. For example, the diagram E in Figure 5 is a stacked diagram. We shall explore how to take a base point sequence \mathbf{a} with an order which satisfies $ld(D_{\mathbf{a}}) = ld(D)$ by using matrices. For a link diagram D and a base




Figure 5:

point sequence \mathbf{a} of D , we define an r -square matrix $M(D_{\mathbf{a}}) = (m_{i\ j})$ by the following rule:

- For $i \neq j$, $m_{i\ j}$ is the number of crossings of D^i and D^j which are under-crossings of D^i .
- For $i = j$, $m_{i\ j} = d(D^i)$.

We show an example.

Example 3.1. For $D_{\mathbf{a}} = D_{a_1}^1 \cup D_{a_2}^2 \cup D_{a_3}^3 \cup D_{a_4}^4 \cup D_{a_5}^5$ in Figure 6, we have

$$M(D_{\mathbf{a}}) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 4 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 4 & 3 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We notice that $ld(D_{\mathbf{a}})$ is obtained by summing the upper triangular entries of $M(D_{\mathbf{a}})$, that is

$$ld(D_{\mathbf{a}}) = \sum_{i < j} m_{i\ j},$$

and we notice that

$$d(D_{\mathbf{a}}) = \sum_{i \leq j} m_{i\ j},$$

where $m_{i j} \in M(D_{\mathbf{a}})$. By performing this procedures if necessary, we obtain the minimal value $ld(D)$.

Let $lc(D)$ be the number of non-self crossings of D . Remark that $lc(D)$ is always even. For a non-ordered diagram D , we assume that D^i and $D^i \cup D^j$ denote subdiagrams of D with an order. We have a relation of $ld(D)$, $lc(D)$ and the linking number in the following lemma:

Lemma 3.2. *For a link diagram D , we have the following (i) and (ii):*

(i)

$$\sum_{i < j} |Link(D^i, D^j)| \leq ld(D) \leq \frac{lc(D)}{2}.$$

Further, the equality $ld(D) = \frac{lc(D)}{2}$ holds if and only if the number of over-crossings of D^i is equal to the number of under-crossings of D^i in every subdiagram $D^i \cup D^j$.

(ii)

$$\sum_{i < j} |Link(D^i, D^j)| \equiv ld(D) \pmod{2}. \quad (2)$$

Proof. (i) We first prove $\sum_{i < j} |Link(D^i, D^j)| \leq ld(D)$. For a subdiagram $D^i \cup D^j$ ($i < j$) with $d(D^i, D^j) = m$, we prove

$$|Link(D^i, D^j)| \leq d(D^i, D^j).$$

Let p_1, p_2, \dots, p_m be warping crossing points between D^i and D^j , and $\varepsilon(p_1), \varepsilon(p_2), \dots, \varepsilon(p_m)$ the signatures of them. Since a stacked diagram is a diagram of a completely splittable link, we have

$$Link(D^i, D^j) - (\varepsilon(p_1) + \varepsilon(p_2) + \dots + \varepsilon(p_m)) = 0$$

by considering the diagram $D^i \cup D^j$ with p_1, p_2, \dots, p_m crossing changed. Then we have

$$|Link(D^i, D^j)| = |\varepsilon(p_1) + \varepsilon(p_2) + \dots + \varepsilon(p_m)| \leq m = d(D^i, D^j).$$

Hence we obtain

$$\sum_{i < j} |Link(D^i, D^j)| \leq ld(D).$$

We next prove the inequality $ld(D) \leq \frac{lc(D)}{2}$. We make sure the inequality because $ld(D_{\mathbf{a}}) + ld(D_{\tilde{\mathbf{a}}}) = lc(D)$, where \mathbf{a} is a base point sequence of D , and $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}$ is \mathbf{a} with order reversed. We next prove the equality. The condition that the number of over-crossings of D^i is equal to the number of under-crossings of D^i in every subdiagram $D^i \cup D^j$, is equivalent to that $M(D_{\mathbf{a}})$ has $m_{i j} = m_{j i}$ ($i, j = 1, 2, \dots, r$) for every i and j , i.e. $M(D_{\mathbf{a}})$ is a symmetric matrix for an arbitrary \mathbf{a} . In this case, $ld(D)$ is half the sum of the non-self-crossing number. On the other hand, we consider the case the equality $2ld(D) = lc(D)$ holds. Let \mathbf{a} be a base point sequence of D which satisfies $2ld(D_{\mathbf{a}}) = 2ld(D) = lc(D)$. Since \mathbf{a} realizes the minimal $ld(D_{\mathbf{a}})$, there exists no base point sequences \mathbf{a}' of D which satisfy $ld(D_{\mathbf{a}'}) < ld(D_{\mathbf{a}})$. We also notice that there exists no \mathbf{a}'' which satisfy $ld(D_{\mathbf{a}''}) > ld(D_{\mathbf{a}})$ by considering transposed matrices. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} m_{i i+1} + m_{i i+2} + \cdots + m_{i j} + m_{i+1 j} + \cdots + m_{j-1 j} \\ = m_{i+1 i} + m_{i+2 i} + \cdots + m_{j i} + m_{j i+1} + \cdots + m_{j j-1} \end{aligned}$$

for all i and j ($1 \leq i < j \leq r$). Then we observe that $M(D_{\mathbf{a}})$ is symmetric by an induction of i and j . This is equivalent to that the number of over-crossings of D^i is equal to the number of under-crossings of D^i in every subdiagrams $D^i \cup D^j$.

- (ii) We prove (ii) by an induction. For an r component trivial link diagram D with $c(D) = 0$, we have

$$\sum_{i < j} |Link(D^i, D^j)| = ld(D) = 0.$$

We prove that Reidemeister moves and crossing changes remain the equivalence (2) for a diagram which satisfies (2) because every r component link diagram is obtained from r component trivial link diagram by performing some Reidemeister moves and crossing changes. It is well-known that Reidemeister moves remain the linking number. Reidemeister moves of type I and III obviously remain the linking warping




Figure 7:

degree. We next prove that Reidemeister move of type II in Figure 7 remains (2). Let D' be the diagram which is obtained from D by the Reidemeister move of type II. If $i \leq j$, then we have $ld(D) = ld(D')$. In the case of $i > j$, the diagrams D and D' may have different orders to realise the linking warping degrees. If D and D' have same orders, then we have $ld(D') = ld(D) + 2$. We next consider the case that D and D' have different orders. Let D^k, D^l ($k < l$) be component subdiagrams of D , and $D^{k'}, D^{l'}$ ($k' > l'$) be component subdiagrams of D' , where $D^{k'}$ corresponds to D^k , and $D^{l'}$ corresponds to D^l . For $cl(D^k \cup D^l) = 2m$ and $d(D^k, D^l) = h$ ($m, h = 0, 1, 2, \dots$), we have $d(D^{k'}, D^{l'}) = 2m - h \equiv d(D^k, D^l) \pmod{2}$. Hence we have $ld(D) \equiv ld(D') \pmod{2}$. We next prove that a crossing change remains (2). Let D'' be a diagram which is obtained from D by crossing changing at a non-self-crossing point. Then we have

$$\sum_{i < j} |Link(D^{i''}, D^{j''})| = \sum_{i < j} |Link(D^i, D^j) \pm 1|,$$

$$ld(D'') = ld(D) \pm 1.$$

Hence a crossing change also remains (2). □

Example 3.3. In Figure 8, D has $\sum_{i < j} |Link(D^i D^j)| = 0 < 2ld(D) = 4 < lc(D) = 6$, and E has $\sum_{i < j} |Link(E^i E^j)| = 4 < 2ld(E) = lc(E) = 8$.




Figure 8:

4 Warping degree for unoriented link diagram

In this section, we consider the value $d(D) + d(-D)$ for an oriented non-ordered link diagram D and the inverse $-D$. We have the following proposition:

Proposition 4.1. *The value $d(D) + d(-D)$ does not depend on the orientation of D .*

Proof. Let D, D' be D with orientations respectively. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 d(D') + d(-D') &= \sum_{i=1}^r d(D'_i) + \sum_{i=1}^r d(-D'_i) + 2ld(D) \\
 &= \sum_{i=1}^r \{d(D'_i) + d(-D'_i)\} + 2ld(D) \\
 &= \sum_{i=1}^r \{d(D_i) + d(-D_i)\} + 2ld(D) \\
 &= d(D) + d(-D).
 \end{aligned}$$

□

For an arbitrary orientation of L , we have the following lemma:

Lemma 4.2. *Let L be an oriented non-ordered link with r components. Let D be a diagram of L which has at least one crossing point for every component. Then we have*

$$d(D) + d(-D) + r \leq c(D).$$

Further, the equality holds if and only if every component subdiagram D^i is alternating and the number of over-crossings of D^i is equal to the number of under-crossings of D^i in every subdiagram $D^i \cup D^j$.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_r)$, $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_r)$ be base point sequences which satisfy $d(D_{\mathbf{a}}) = d(D)$ and $d(-D_{\mathbf{b}}) = d(-D)$, that is $d(D_{a_i}^i) = d(D^i)$ and $d(-D_{b_i}^i) = d(-D^i)$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, r$), and we suppose that $D_{\mathbf{a}}$ and $D_{\mathbf{b}}$ have same orders which satisfies $ld(D_{\mathbf{a}}) = ld(D_{\mathbf{b}}) = ld(D)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(D) + d(-D) + r &= \sum_{i=1}^r \{d(D^i) + d(-D^i) + 1 | D^i \subset D_{\mathbf{a}}\} + 2ld(D) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^r c(D^i) + 2ld(D) \text{ (by the inequality (1))} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^r c(D^i) + lc(D) \text{ (by Lemma 3.2)} \\ &= c(D). \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have the inequality. The equality holds if and only if every component subdiagram D^i is alternating and the number of over-crossings of D^i is equal to the number of under-crossings of D^i in every subdiagram $D^i \cup D^j$. \square

Here are examples of Lemma 4.2.

Example 4.3. The link diagram D in Figure 9 has $d(D) + d(-D) + r = 8 = c(D)$.




Figure 9:

Example 4.4. In Figure 10, there are three diagrams with 12 crossings. D is a diagram whose two component subdiagrams are alternating and two component subdiagram has 3 over-non-self crossings and 3 under-non-self crossings respectively. Then we have $d(D) + d(-D) + r = 12 = c(D)$. D' is a diagram which has a non-alternating component diagram. Then we have $d(D') + d(-D') + r = 10 < c(D')$. D'' is a diagram such that a component subdiagram has 2 over-non-self crossings and 4 under-non-self-crossings. Then we have $d(D'') + d(-D'') + r = 10 < c(D'')$.




Figure 10:

Lemma 4.2 is for diagrams which has at least one self-crossing for every component. We prove Theorem 1.1 which is for every link diagram.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. For every component subdiagram D^i such that D^i has no self-crossings, we apply a Reidemeister move of type I as shown in Figure 11. Then we obtain the diagram $D^{i'}$ from D^i , and $D^{i'}$ satisfies $d(D^{i'}) = d(-D^{i'}) = 0 = d(D^i) = d(-D^i)$ and $c(D^{i'}) = 1 = c(D^i) + 1$. For example the base points a_i, b_i in Figure 11 satisfy $d(D_{a_i}^i) = d(D^i) = 0$, $d(-D_{b_i}^i) = d(-D^i) = 0$. We remark that every D^i and $D^{i'}$ are alternating. We denote by




Figure 11:

D' the diagram obtained from D by this procedure. Since every component subdiagram has at least one self-crossing, we apply Lemma 4.2 to D' as follows:

$$d(D') + d(-D') + r \leq c(D').$$

And we obtain

$$d(D) + d(-D) + r \leq c(D) + (r - sr(D)).$$

Hence we have

$$d(D) + d(-D) + sr(D) \leq c(D).$$

The equality holds if and only if every component subdiagram D^i is alternating and the number of over-crossings of D^i is equal to the number of under-crossings of D^i in every subdiagram $D^i \cup D^j$. \square

5 Warping degree for a link

In this section, we consider the minimal $d(D) + d(-D)$ for minimal crossing diagrams D of L in the following formula:

$$e(L) = \min\{d(D) + d(-D) \mid D : \text{a diagram of } L \text{ with } c(D) = c(L)\},$$

where $c(L)$ denotes the crossing number of L . In the case where K is a non-trivial knot, we have

$$e(K) + 1 \leq c(K). \tag{3}$$

Further, the equality holds if and only if K is a prime alternating knot [7]. Note that the condition of equality of (3) requires that D is a minimal crossing diagram in the definition of $e(L)$. We next define $c^*(L)$ and $e^*(L)$ as follows:

$$c^*(L) = \min\{c(D) \mid D : \text{a diagram of } L \text{ s.t. } \forall D^i \text{ has } c(D^i) \geq 1\},$$

$$c^*(L) = \min\{d(D) + d(-D) \mid D : \text{a diagram of } L \text{ s.t. } \forall D^i \text{ has } c(D^i) \geq 1 \\ \text{and } c(D) = c^*(L)\}.$$

As a generalization of the above inequality (3), we have the following theorem:

Theorem 5.1. *We have*

$$e^*(L) + r \leq c^*(L).$$

Further, the equality holds if and only if every diagram D of L such that every component subdiagram D^i has $c(D^i) \geq 1$ and that $c(D) = c^(L)$ is a diagram whose component subdiagrams are all alternating, and the number of over-crossings of D^i is equal to the number of under-crossings of D^i in every subdiagram $D^i \cup D^j$.*

Proof. Let D be a diagram of L such that $c(D^i) \geq 1$ for every component subdiagram D^i , that $c(D) = c^*(L)$ and that D satisfies the equality $d(D) + d(-D) = e^*(L)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} e^*(L) + r &= d(D) + d(-D) + r \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^r \{d(D^i) + d(-D^i) + 1\} + 2ld(D) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^r c(D^i) + 2ld(D) \text{ (by the inequality (1))} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^r c(D^i) + lc(D) \text{ (by Lemma 3.2)} \\ &= c(D) = c^*(L). \end{aligned}$$

If D has a non-alternating component subdiagram D^i , or D has a diagram $D^i \cup D^j$ such that the number of over-crossings of D^i is not equal to the number of under-crossings of D^i , then we have $e^*(L) + r < c^*(L)$. On the other hand, the equality holds if D is a diagram such that every component subdiagram D^i is alternating and the number of over-crossings of D^i is equal to the number of under-crossings of D^i in every subdiagram $D^i \cup D^j$. \square

We have the following example:

Example 5.2. For non-trivial prime alternating knots L^1, L^2, \dots, L^r ($r \geq 2$), we have a non-split link L by performing n_i -full twists for every L^i and L^{i+1} ($i = 1, 2, \dots, r$) with $L^{r+1} = L^1$ as shown in Figure 12, where we assume that n_1 and n_r have the same sign.




Figure 12:

Note that we do not change the type of knot components L^i . Let D be a diagram of L with $c(D) = c(L)$. This is equivalent to that D is a diagram such that every component subdiagram D^i has $c(D^i) \geq 1$ and $c(D) = c^*(L)$. And we notice that D satisfies that every D^i is alternating, and the number of over-crossings of D^i is equal to the number of under-crossings of D^i in every subdiagram $D^i \cup D^j$ because $c(D^i \cup D^j) = 2|n_i|$ and $Link(D^i, D^j) = n_i$, and $c(D^1 \cup D^r) = 2|n_1 + n_r|$ and $Link(D^1, D^r) = n_1 + n_r$ in the case where $r = 2$. Hence we have $e^*(L) + r = c^*(L)$ in this case.

We have the following corollary:

Corollary 5.3. *Let L be a link whose all components are non-trivial. Then we have*

$$e(L) + r \leq c(L).$$

Further, the equality holds if and only if every diagram D of L with $c(D) = c(L)$ is a diagram such that every component subdiagram D^i is alternating and the number of over-crossings of D^i is equal to the number of under-crossings of D^i in every subdiagram $D^i \cup D^j$.

Proof. Since every diagram D has $c(D^i) \geq 1$ for all component subdiagram D^i , we have $e(L) = e^*(L)$ and $c(L) = c^*(L)$. \square

We also consider the minimal $d(D) + d(-D) + sr(D)$ and the minimal $sr(D)$ for diagrams D of L in the following formulas:

$$f(L) = \min\{d(D) + d(-D) + sr(D) \mid D : \text{ a diagram of } L\},$$

$$sr(L) = \min\{sr(D) \mid D : \text{ a diagram of } L\}.$$

Note that the value $f(L)$ and $sr(L)$ also do not depend on the orientation of L . The following corollary is directly obtained from Theorem 1.1.

Corollary 5.4. *We have*

$$f(L) \leq c(L).$$

Proof. For a diagram D with $c(D) = c(L)$, we have

$$f(L) \leq d(D) + d(-D) + sr(D) \leq c(D) = c(L)$$

by Theorem 1.1. \square

We have the following question:

Question 5.5. When does the equality $f(L) = c(L)$ hold?

By the definition, we have the following proposition:

Proposition 5.6. *We have*

$$e(L) + sr(L) \leq f(L).$$

And we naturally raise the following question:

Question 5.7. When does the equality

$$e(L) + sr(L) = f(L)$$

hold?

6 Relations of warping degree, unknotting number, and crossing number

In this section, we enumerate several relations of the warping degree, the unknotting number, and the crossing number. Let $|D|$ be D with orientation forgotten. We define the minimal warping degree of D for all orientations as follows:

$$d(|D|) := \min\{d(D) \mid D : |D| \text{ with an orientation}\}.$$

Note that the minimal $d(|D|)$ for all diagrams D of L is equal to the ascending number $a(L)$ [6]:

$$a(L) = \min\{d(|D|) \mid D : \text{a diagram of } L\}.$$

Let E be a knot diagram, and D a diagram of a non-ordered r component link ($r \geq 2$). We review the relation of the unknotting number $u(E)$ (resp. the unlinking number $u(D)$) and the crossing number $c(E)$ (resp. $c(D)$) of E (resp. D).

The following inequalities are well-known [5]:

$$u(E) \leq \frac{c(E) - 1}{2}, \tag{4}$$

$$u(D) \leq \frac{c(D)}{2}. \tag{5}$$

Moreover, Taniyama mentioned the following conditions ([9], Theorem 1.5(1)):

The condition of the equality of (4) is that E is a reduced alternating diagram of some $(2, p)$ -torus knot, or E is a diagram with $c(E) = 1$. The condition of the equality of (5) is that every D^i is a simple closed curve on \mathbb{S}^2 and every subdiagram $D^i \cup D^j$ is an alternating diagram.

By adding to (4), we have the following corollary:

Corollary 6.1. *For a knot diagram E , we have*

$$u(E) \leq d(|E|) \leq \frac{c(E) - 1}{2}.$$

Further, the equality

$$u(E) = d(|E|) = \frac{c(E) - 1}{2}$$

holds if and only if E is a reduced alternating diagram of some $(2, p)$ -torus knot, or E is a diagram with $c(E) = 1$.

By adding to (5), we have the following corollary:

Corollary 6.2. (1) For an r component link diagram D ($r \geq 2$), we have

$$u(D) \leq d(|D|) \leq \frac{c(D)}{2}.$$

(2) We have

$$u(D) \leq d(|D|) = \frac{c(D)}{2}$$

if and only if every D^i is a simple closed curve on \mathbb{S}^2 and the number of over-crossings of D^i is equal to the number of under-crossings of D^i in every subdiagram $D^i \cup D^j$.

(3) We have

$$u(D) = d(|D|) = \frac{c(D)}{2}$$

if and only if every D^i is a simple closed curve on \mathbb{S}^2 and for each pair i, j , the subdiagram $D^i \cup D^j$ is an alternating diagram.

Proof. (1) Let D be an oriented diagram which satisfies

$$d(D) = \sum_{i=1}^r d(D^i) + ld(D) = d(|D|).$$

Then D also satisfies

$$d(D^i) \leq \frac{c(D^i)}{2} \tag{6}$$

for every component subdiagram D^i because of the orientation of D . By Lemma 3.2, we have

$$ld(D) \leq \frac{lc(D)}{2}. \quad (7)$$

Then we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^r d(D^i) + ld(D) \leq \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{d(D^i)}{2} + \frac{ld(D)}{2}$$

by (6) and (7). Hence we obtain the inequality

$$d(|D|) \leq \frac{c(D)}{2}.$$

(2) Suppose that the equality $d(|D|) = \frac{c(D)}{2}$ holds. Then the equalities

$$d(D^i) = \frac{c(D^i)}{2} \quad (8)$$

and

$$ld(D) = \frac{lc(D)}{2} \quad (9)$$

hold by (6) and (7). The equality (8) is equivalent to that $c(D^i) = 0$ for every D^i . We prove this by an indirect proof. We assume $c(D^i) > 0$ for a component subdiagram D^i . In this case, we have the inequality

$$d(D^i) + d(-D^i) + 1 \leq c(D^i) \quad (10)$$

by Theorem 1.1 since D^i has a self-crossing. We also have

$$d(D^i) = d(-D^i) = \frac{c(D^i)}{2} \quad (11)$$

because $d(D^i) \leq d(-D^i)$ and (8). By substituting (11) for (10), we have

$$c(D^i) + 1 \leq c(D^i).$$

This implies that the assumption $c(D^i) > 0$ is incorrect. Therefore every D^i is a simple closed curve. The inequality (9) is equivalent to that the number of over-crossings of D^i is equal to the number of under-crossings of D^i in every subdiagram $D^i \cup D^j$ by Lemma 3.2. On the other hand, suppose that every D^i is a simple closed curve, and the number of over-crossings of D^i is equal to the number of under-crossings of D^i in every subdiagram $D^i \cup D^j$, then we have

$$d(|D|) = ld(D) = \frac{lc(D)}{2} = \frac{c(D)}{2}.$$

(3) This holds by Corollary 6.2(1) and above Taniyama's condition. □

Let K be a knot, and L an r component link ($r \geq 2$). Let $u(K)$ be the unknotting number of K , and $u(L)$ be the unlinking number of L . The following inequalities are also well-known [5]:

$$u(K) \leq \frac{c(K) - 1}{2}, \tag{12}$$

$$u(L) \leq \frac{c(L)}{2}. \tag{13}$$

The following conditions are mentioned by Taniyama ([9], Theorem 1.5(2)):

The condition of the equality of (12) is that K is a $(2, p)$ -torus knot (p :odd, $\neq \pm 1$). The condition of the equality of (13) is that L has a diagram D such that every D^i is a simple closed curve on \mathbb{S}^2 and every subdiagram $D^i \cup D^j$ is an alternating diagram.

By adding to (12) and (3), we have the following corollary:

Corollary 6.3. (1) We have

$$u(K) \leq \frac{e(K)}{2} \leq \frac{c(K) - 1}{2}.$$

(2) We have

$$u(K) \leq \frac{e(K)}{2} = \frac{c(K) - 1}{2}$$

if and only if K is a prime alternating knot.

(3) We have

$$u(K) = \frac{e(K)}{2} = \frac{c(K) - 1}{2}$$

if and only if K is a $(2, p)$ -torus knot (p : odd, $\neq \pm 1$).

By adding to (13), we have the following corollary:

Corollary 6.4. For a diagram of an unoriented non-ordered r component link, we have

$$u(L) \leq \frac{e(L)}{2} \leq \frac{c(L)}{2}.$$

Further, the equality $u(L) = \frac{e(L)}{2} = \frac{c(L)}{2}$ holds if and only if L has a diagram $D = D^1 \cup D^2 \cup \dots \cup D^r$ such that every D^i is a simple closed curve on \mathbb{S}^2 and for each pair i, j , the subdiagram $D^i \cup D^j$ is an alternating diagram.

Proof. We prove the inequality $u(L) \leq \frac{e(L)}{2}$. Let D be a minimal crossing diagram of L which satisfies $e(L) = d(D) + d(-D)$. Then we obtain

$$e(L) = d(D) + d(-D) \geq 2u(D) \geq 2u(L).$$

The condition which realizes the equality is due to above Taniyama's condition. \square

7 Relation of linking warping degree and splitting number

In this section, we define the splitting number and enumerate relations of the warping degree and the splitting number.

The *splitting number* of D , denoted by $split(D)$, is the smallest number of crossing changes which is needed to obtain a completely splittable link diagram from D . The *linking splitting number* of D , denoted by $lsplit(D)$, is the smallest number of non-self-crossing changes which is needed to obtain a completely splittable link diagram from D . Naturally, we have the following propositions:

Proposition 7.1. (1) *We have*

$$split(D) \leq d(D).$$

(2) *We have*

$$split(D) \leq lsplit(D) \leq ld(D).$$

Here is an example of Proposition 7.1.

Example 7.2. The diagram D in Figure 13 has $d(D) = ld(D) = split(D) = lsplit(D) = 4$. The diagram E in Figure 13 has $d(E) = ld(E) = 2$, $split(E) = 1$, and $lsplit(E) = 2$.

We have the following corollary:

Corollary 7.3.

$$\sum_i d(D^i) + lsplit(D) \leq d(D).$$




Figure 13:

And we raise the following question:

Question 7.4. When does the equality

$$\mathit{split}(D) = d(D),$$

$$\mathit{split}(D) = \mathit{lsplit}(D),$$

$$\mathit{lsplit}(D) = \mathit{ld}(D),$$

or

$$\sum_i d(D^i) + \mathit{lsplit}(D) = d(D)$$

hold?

Acknowledgments

The author is deeply grateful to Ryo Hanaki, Tetsuya Ito, and the members of Friday Seminar on Knot Theory in Osaka City University, who assisted her in valuable information, helpful comments, and the tender encouragement. She especially wants to thank her advisor, Akio Kawauchi, whose support and encouragement inspired her to greater efforts throughout this project.

References

- [1] P. Cromwell, *Knots and Links*, Cambridge University Press (2004).

- [2] T. S. Fung, Immersions in knot theory, a dissertation, Columbia University (1996).
- [3] A. Kawauchi, Lectures on knot theory (in Japanese), Kyoritsu shuppan (2007).
- [4] A. Kawauchi, On a complexity of a spatial graph, to appear in the proceedings of the workshop "Knots and soft-matter physics" , Bussei Kenkyu (2008).
- [5] Y. Nakanishi, A note on unknotting number, *Math. Sem. Notes Kobe Univ.* **9** (1981), no. 1, 99–108.
- [6] M. Ozawa, Ascending number of knots and links, arXiv:math. GT/0705333v1 (2007).
- [7] A. Shimizu, The warping degree of a knot diagram, to appear in *J. Knot Theory Ramifications*.
- [8] K. Taniyama, A partial order of knots, *Tokyo J. Math.* **12** (1989), 205–229.
- [9] K. Taniyama, Unknotting numbers of diagrams of a given nontrivial knot are unbounded, arXiv:math. GT/08053174v2 (2008).