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#### Abstract

The 2-variable polynomial $P_{K}$ of a satellite $K$ is shown not to satisfy any formula, relating it to the polynomial of its companion and of the pattern, which is at all similar to the formulae for Alexander polynomials. Examples are given of various pairs of knots which can be distinguished by calculating $P$ for 2 -strand cables about them even though the knots themselves share the same $P$. Properties of a given knot such as braid index and amphicheirality, which may not be apparent from the knot's polynomial $P$, are shown in certain cases to be detectable from the polynomial of a 2 -cable about the knot.


## 1. Introduction

With the development of the 2 -variable polynomial $P_{K}$ of an oriented knot $K$ (of one or more components) [5], has come the desire to relate it directly to the geometry of the knot exterior, as Seifert, and later Fox, were able to do with the Alexander polynomial. One obvious place where the geometry should show up is when the knot is a satellite. In this case the exterior is made up of the union of two link exteriors, that of a companion and that of a pattern link, forming part of a natural decomposition of the exterior in the context of 3 -manifolds.

The multi-variable Alexander polynomial of such a union bears a simple relation to those of the two constituent link exteriors. This takes the form of an equation $S_{K}=S_{C} S_{R}$, where $K$ is a satellite with companion $C$ and pattern link $R$ consisting of an unknotted component defining a complementary solid torus $V$ which contains the other component(s) of $R$. The knot $K$ is formed from the image of these component(s) when a solid torus neighbourhood of $C$ is replaced by $V$ using a faithful (longitude-preserving) homeomorphism. In the equation $S$ is either the multi-variable Alexander polynomial, or, in the case of a 1-component knot, a modified version of it; the variables, which correspond to homology classes in the appropriate link exterior, are each replaced by the element which they represent in the exterior of $K$. See [2] for a general, but not very readable, account.

## Possible satellite formula

On the analogy of the Alexander polynomial, we expected some such satellite formula for the other polynomials. For each $K$ a conjectural function $S_{K}$ of several variables might exist, specializing to $P_{K}$ in some way and satisfying an equation $S_{K}=S_{C} S_{R} \phi$ for a satellite $K$ of $C$ with pattern $R$, where the variables in $S_{C}$ and $S_{R}$ are substituted by others in a way which depends in some suitable sense only on the
gluing of these two exteriors, and $\phi$ is a possible normalizing factor, again depending only on the gluing homeomorphism.

Under such a framework, if two knots $C_{1}$ and $C_{2}$ with $S_{C_{1}}=S_{C_{2}}$ were used with the same pattern and method of gluing to construct satellites $K_{1}$ and $K_{2}$ we would then have $S_{K_{1}}=S_{K_{2}}$.

Conceivably there may be an $S_{K}$ which specialises to $P_{K}$ and satisfies such a satallite formula (possibly specializing also to Kauffman's recently announced polynomial $F_{K}$ [8]). In this paper we show however that no such function $S_{K}$ can be found with the additional property that $S_{K}=P_{K}$ for a 1-component knot $K$, even if it differs from $P_{K}$ when $K$ has more components.

The examples given are pairs of knots $C_{1}$ and $C_{2}$ with $P_{C_{1}}=P_{C_{2}}$ whose (2,1) cables $K_{1}$ and $K_{2}$ (satellites constructed with the same pattern $R=$ $P_{K_{1}} \neq P_{K_{2}}$. These are described in a later section under the heading 'Birman's pairs of 3 -braids' and the polynomials are displayed in Table 1.

## 2. Scope of the calculations

To compute the polynomial $P$ for these examples we developed a program to calculate $P_{K}$ from a presentation of $K$ as a closed braid, based on the construction of Ocneanu and Jones [13, 6]. Details of the theoretical basis for the calculations, and their practical implementation are given in [12].

Our program can handle interactive calculations for 7 -string braids of over 100 crossings and will deal with 8 -string braids of up to 150 crossings on the Liverpool University IBM 3083 computer using less than 16 megabytes storage and under 200 seconds of computer time. The time required grows relatively slowly (quadratically) with the number of crossings for braids of a given string index, so within the constraints of presentation as a closed braid on at most 8 strings the method provides an efficient way of handling knots with many crossings. It may be contrasted with Thistlethwaite's encyclopaedic work in producing tables of $P$ for all knots up to 13 crossings based on the Conway recurrence relation [14]. His method works well, given information about all knots with fewer crossings, and is not particularly sensitive to braid index, but in general it would face exponential time growth with the number of crossings if calculation of $P$ for an individual knot beyond the range of the table was required.

Annotated copies of the Pascal program to calculate the polynomial $P$ and also the Alexander and Jones polynomials of a knot presented as a closed braid on at most eight strings are available on request.

## 3. Further consequences

While the failure of the satellite formula proves disappointing from the point of view of understanding the general structure of the polynomial $P_{K}$, it leaves the way open to using $P$ in a second attempt at distinguishing two knots $C_{1}$ and $C_{2}$ with $P_{C_{1}}=P_{C_{2}}$ by comparing $P$ on satellites of $C_{1}$ and $C_{2}$. From our limits on the computing power available, we have been restricted to considering 2 -string cables where $C_{1}$ and
$C_{2}$ can themselves be presented as closed braids on at most four strings, so that the cables can be presented as 8 -string braids. Other satellites such as doubles or higher string cables could in principle be used.

The only examples so far observed where the satellites are still indistinguishable using $P$ have come when $C_{2}$ is a mutant of $C_{1}$. In all cases tried so far, if $C_{1}$ and $C_{2}$ are mutants then their 2 -cables, although not apparently mutants themselves, have the same $P$. Examples are discussed in a later section.

## Burau polynomials

The possibility of calculating $P_{K}$ from the 'Burau polynomial' of a closed braid representative $\beta$ of $K$, i.e. from the characteristic polynomial $\operatorname{det}(x I-\beta(t))$ of the Burau matrix $\beta(t)$ for $\beta$, was raised tentatively by Jones[7]. Our examples used in disproving the existence of a simple satellite formula can also serve to discount this possibility.

To see why this is so, suppose that $C$ is a knot presented as the closure $\beta$ of some $\beta \in B_{n}$. The complete closure, $\beta \cup L_{\beta}$, consisting of $\beta$ together with the braid axis $L_{\beta}$ is then a link whose 2 -variable Alexander polynomial is the Burau polynomial of $\beta$ [11]. The ( $2, r$ ) cable $K$ about $C$ can be presented naturally as the closure of a $2 n$-string braid, by doubling all strings in $\beta$, with twists as required. The complete closure of this braid is then a satellite constructed using the $(2, r)$ cable pattern $R$ on the string $C$ from the complete closure $C \cup L_{\beta}$ of $\beta$. Using the satellite formula for Alexander polynomials the Burau polynomial of this representation for $K$ can then be calculated from that of $C \cup L_{\beta}$ and the pattern.

If this construction is applied to two braids $\beta_{1}$ and $\beta_{2}$ with the same Burau polynomial, the resulting braid presentations for the ( $2, r$ ) cables $K_{1}$ and $K_{2}$ will then have the same Burau polynomial. The examples of Birman given in tables 1 and 2 are ( $2, r$ ) cables about 3 -braids with the same Burau polynomial. The resulting 6-braids have then the same Burau polynomials, but their closures $K_{1}$ and $K_{2}$ have $P_{K_{1}} \neq P_{K_{2}}$.

With the failure of the satellite formula, features of a knot $K$ which do not show up directly from $P_{K}$ may nevertheless become apparent from the polynomial of a 2 -cable about $K$. These features include the braid index and the question of amphicheirality of $K$, and examples are discussed in the course of the next section.

## 4. Discussion of examples

Braids in the accompanying tables are listed as elements of $B_{8}$, using $\pm i$ to stand for the generator $\sigma_{i}^{ \pm 1}$. The polynomial $P_{K}(v, z)$ is given as a matrix of coefficients $\left(p_{i j}\right)$, where $P_{K}(v, z)=\Sigma p_{i j} z^{i} v^{j}$, with the range of $i$ and $j$ indicated at the side. We use the convention that $v^{-1} P_{K^{+}}-v P_{K^{-}}=z P_{K^{0}}$, where $K^{+}, K^{-}$and $K^{0}$ differ only as shown:


$K^{-}$

$K^{0}$

Putting $v=1$ gives $\nabla_{K}(z)$, the Conway polynomial. The substitutions ( $z=x-x^{-1}$, $v=1$ ) and ( $z=x-x^{-1}, v=x^{2}$ ) give respectively the Alexander and Jones polynomials, $\Delta\left(x^{2}\right)$ and $V\left(x^{2}\right)$. In the tables the negative powers of $x$ in the Alexander polynomial have been omitted, because of its invariance when $x$ is replaced by $-x^{-1}$.
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Table 2
Braid representing a knot $C_{1}$ *** 11122221211-2-2-2111234567 Braid representing a knot $C_{2}$
$* * *$
$111222212111211-2-2-234567$




| 20 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Braid representing the }(2,1) \text {-cable about } C_{2} \\ { }^{* * *}(2132)^{3}(4354)^{4} 21324354(2132)^{3} 4354(2132)^{2}(4354)^{-3} 1^{-23} 67 * * * \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | The polynomial $P$ for this cable |  |  |  |  |  | Conway polynomia |
|  | 22 | 24 | 26 | 28 | 30 |  |  |
| -165 | 487 | -479 | 206 | -83 | 35 | 0 | 1 (0) |
| -4682 | 14144 | -15040 | 8775 | -4896 | 1763 | 2 | 64 (2) |
| -52346 | 156355 | -164697 | 104655 | -68114 | 24787 | 4 | 640 (4) |
| -323272 | 953193 | -962 106 | 626410 | -464256 | 172391 | 6 | 2360 (6) |
| -1261615 | 3708909 | -3525854 | 2288638 | -1930063 | 724120 | 8 | 4135 (8) |
| -3348179 | 9947173 | -8810295 | 5620926 | -5434061 | 2028404 | 10 | 3968 (10) |
| -6329257 | 19277235 | -15776844 | 9817955 | -11000795 | 4013978 | 12 | 2272 (12) |
| -8792001 | 27859220 | -20907214 | 12641994 | -16620167 | 5818968 | 14 | 800 (14) |
| -9166476 | 30683856 | -20941807 | 12287546 | -19189381 | 6326432 | 16 | 170 (16) |
| -7272923 | 26138520 | -16070255 | 9153211 | -17183061 | 5234528 | 18 | 20 (18) |
| -4426218 | 17381680 | -9517127 | 5270758 | -12031334 | 3322242 | 20 | 1 (20) |
| -2071247 | 9062226 | -4357579 | 2352590 | -6606731 | 1620741 | 22 |  |
| -742861 | 3702831 | -1536581 | 811317 | -2840188 | 605482 | 24 |  |
| -202189 | 1179113 | -412907 | 213996 | -949436 | 171423 | 26 |  |
| -40980 | 289139 | -82920 | 42346 | -243661 | 36076 | 28 |  |
| -5986 | 53481 | -12037 | 6081 | -46999 | 5460 | 30 |  |
| -595 | 7210 | -1192 | 598 | -6582 | 561 | 32 |  |
| -36 | 668 | -72 | 36 | -631 | 35 | 34 |  |
| -1 | 38 | -2 |  | -37 | 1 | 36 |  |
|  | 1 |  |  | -1 |  | 38 |  |

The Alexander polynomial in particular serves as a useful check for the calculations, since it can be quickly found for a cable using the satellite formula.

It is noticeable in these examples that the coefficients of the Alexander and Jones polynomials are considerably smaller than those in the Conway polynomial. This cannot be true in general, since all integer polynomials in $z^{2}$ with constant term 1 are possible as Conway polynomials of some knot, and so some Conway polynomials must correspond to Alexander polynomials with larger coefficients. Most probably it is a result of using fairly positive braids on a relatively small number of strings.

To reduce the size of the coefficients in these examples it would be tempting to rewrite $P$ itself in terms of $x$ rather than $z$, but this would only be possible for a 1 -component knot because of the negative powers of $z$ which occur otherwise.

## Birman's pairs of 3-braids

The original motivation for these calculations arose from the simple examples of pairs of 3-braids discovered by M. T. Lozano and H. R. Morton, and simultaneously in greater variety by $J$. Birman [1]. Each example consists of two 3 -braids $\beta_{1}, \beta_{2}$, with the same exponent sum and the same trace for their Burau matrix, consequently the same Burau polynomial, while closing to inequivalent knots. Since the polynomial $P$ for the closure of a 3 -braid is also determined by exponent sum and trace of Burau matrix these pairs give examples of inequivalent knots with the same polynomial $P$.

One of the simplest such pairs is $\beta_{1}=\sigma_{1}^{-1} \sigma_{2}^{7}, \beta_{2}=\Delta_{3}^{4} \sigma_{1} \sigma_{2}^{-7}$, conjugate to $\sigma_{2}^{2} \sigma_{1}^{2} \sigma_{2}^{2} \sigma_{1}^{2} \sigma_{2} \sigma_{1}^{-3}$, where $\Delta_{n}$ is the half twist on $n$ strings, so that $\Delta_{3}=\sigma_{1} \sigma_{2} \sigma_{1}$. Their closures give inequivalent knots $C_{1}$ (the (2,7) torus knot) and $C_{2}$. A 2-cable about each can be presented as a 6 -braid, by replacing $\sigma_{1}$ with $\sigma_{2} \sigma_{3} \sigma_{1} \sigma_{2}$ and $\sigma_{2}$ with $\sigma_{4} \sigma_{5} \sigma_{3} \sigma_{4}$. The linking number of the two strands in the resulting cable is then the exponent sum of the original 3-braid, so that the cables produced in this way will in this example be the $(2,12)$ cables about $C_{1}$ and $C_{2}$ respectively. Addition of one extra $\sigma_{1}$ to each 6 -braid will give 1 -component knots $K_{1}, K_{2}$, the ( 2,13 ) cables about $C_{1}, C_{2}$. In table 1 the polynomials $P_{K_{1}}$ and $P_{K_{2}}$ are exhibited; they can be seen to differ considerably, as do the Jones polynomials of $K_{1}$ and $K_{2}$, while their Alexander polynomials, which satisfy a satellite formula, do not.

One further pair is given in table 2 of Birman's more general type. These pairs are given by $\beta_{1}=\delta_{1} \delta_{2} \delta_{3}, \beta_{2}=\delta_{1} \delta_{3} \delta_{2}$, where

$$
\delta_{1}=\sigma_{1}^{p_{1}} \sigma_{2}^{q_{1}} \sigma_{1}^{p_{2}} \sigma_{2}^{q_{2}}, \quad \delta_{2}=\sigma_{1}^{p_{1}} \sigma_{2}^{q_{2}}, \quad \delta_{3}=\sigma_{1}^{p_{1}-p_{2}} \sigma_{2}^{q_{2}}-q_{1} .
$$

All other Birman pairs which we have tried can be distinguished by their 2-cable polynomials. This may be compared with Birman's difficulties in distinguishing the closed 3-braids using other methods.

Any of these examples will show also that the Burau polynomial is insufficient for calculating $P$, as noted earlier.

Symmetry and amphicheirality
The polynomial $P_{K}$ of an amphicheiral knot $K$ is unchanged when $v$ is replaced by $-v^{-1}$. The knot $9_{42}$ has

$$
P(v, z)=\left(2+z^{2}\right) v^{-2}-\left(3+4 z^{2}+z^{4}\right)+\left(2+z^{2}\right) v^{2}
$$

Table 3
Braid representing the knot $9_{42}$
***-21332-1-32-12-34567***

| -2 | 0 | 2 |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2 | -3 | 2 | 0 |
| 1 | -4 | 1 | 2 |
|  | -1 |  | 4 |


| The polynomial $P$ for this cable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Jones polynomial |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -5 | -3 | -1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 7 |  |  |
| 4 | -16 | 29 | -29 | 16 | -4 |  | -1 | $-1(-21)$ |
| 30 | -109 | 159 | -124 | 46 | 5 | -7 | 1 | $1(-19)$ |
| 76 | -274 | 341 | -201 | 43 | 29 | -14 | 3 | $-1(-5)$ |
| 85 | -338 | 376 | -159 | 16 | 27 | -7 | 5 | $1(-3)$ |
| 45 | -221 | 231 | -65 | 2 | 9 | -1 | 7 | -1(-1) |
| 11 | -78 | 79 | -13 |  | 1 |  | 9 | -1(1) |
| 1 | -14 | 14 | -1 |  |  |  | 11 | 1 (3) |
|  | -1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 13 | - 1 (5) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 (19) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -1(21) |
| Alexander Polynomial $=$ Conway polynomial $=0$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

which has this symmetry although $9_{42}$ is not amphicheiral. The $(2,0)$ cable about an amphicheiral knot will again be amphicheiral, so its polynomial will be symmetric. Calculation of the polynomial for the $(2,0)$ cable about $9_{42}$ is displayed in Table 3. This polynomial is not symmetric, so giving a proof that $9_{42}$ is not amphicheiral. Notice that the Jones polynomial in table 3 still exhibits symmetry, so that it does not detect the lack of amphicheirality, in this case, nor apparently does Kauffman's new polynomial $F$.

## Braid index

It was shown in [10], and also in [3], that a lower bound for the braid index of $K$ can be found from the polynomial $P_{K}$.

Explicitly, $n \geqslant \frac{1}{2}\left(e_{\max }-e_{\min }\right)+1$, where $n$ is the braid index of $K$, i.e. the smallest number of strings needed to present $K$ as a closed braid, $e_{\max }$ and $e_{\min }$ are the largest and smallest degree respectively of the non-Alexander variable $v$ in $P_{K}(v, z)$. This same inequality is shown in [10] to apply also where $n$ is the number of Seifert circles arising from any diagram of $K$.

In a number of instances the braid index inequality can be shown to be strict, and the braid index calculated exactly, by applying the inequality to a cable about $K$. For example the $(2,7)$ cable $K$ about a trefoil can be presented as the closure of the 4 -braid $\sigma_{1}\left(\sigma_{2} \sigma_{3} \sigma_{1} \sigma_{2}\right)^{3}$, but it has $\frac{1}{2}\left(e_{\max }-e_{\min }\right)+1=3$. This was noted by Franks and Williams [4], who asked whether its braid index was actually 3 . Our calculations presented in Table 4 exclude this possibility. For if $K$ has a presentation as a 3-braid, then every 2 -cable about $K$ has a presentation as a 6 -braid, and so the polynomial
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Table 4

Braid representing the (2,27)-cable about the (2,7)-cable about the trefoil *** $2132(4354657621324354)^{3}{ }^{1}$

| The polynomial $P$ for this knot |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 46 | 48 | 50 | 52 | 54 | 56 | 58 |  |
| 893 | -2935 | 3740 | -2295 | 675 | -79 | 2 | 0 |
| 24030 | -66203 | 68350 | -32340 | 6775 | -485 | 4 | 2 |
| 310359 | -713763 | 591303 | -211414 | 30170 | -1161 | 1 | 4 |
| 2503447 | -4798408 | 3170667 | -844269 | 79190 | -1461 |  | 6 |
| 13881384 | -22194447 | 11658704 | -2284522 | 136147 | -1068 |  | 8 |
| 55537145 | -74293024 | 30971785 | -4416455 | 161397 | -468 |  | 10 |
| 165324695 | - 185800514 | 61398463 | -6296288 | 135570 | -121 |  | 12 |
| 374554353 | -355168252 | 92877922 | -6755584 | 81723 | -17 |  | 14 |
| 657426753 | -527978406 | 108944297 | -5525984 | 35398 | -1 |  | 16 |
| 906832669 | -618538005 | 100234894 | -3470613 | 10901 |  |  | 18 |
| 994140130 | -576814659 | 72894389 | -1676680 | 2325 |  |  | 20 |
| 873633502 | -431 235362 | 42078814 | -620805 | 326 |  |  | 22 |
| 619135093 | -259594689 | 19295646 | -174377 | 27 |  |  | 24 |
| 355091052 | -126031335 | 7007766 | -36455 | 1 |  |  | 26 |
| 164964919 | -49280982 | 2000681 | -5489 |  |  |  | 28 |
| 61960207 | -15447015 | 443071 | -562 |  |  |  | 30 |
| 18717410 | $-3846817$ | 74482 | -35 |  |  |  | 32 |
| 4505528 | -750139 | 9177 | -1 |  |  |  | 34 |
| 851448 | -111970 | 781 |  |  |  |  | 36 |
| 123451 | -12342 | 41 |  |  |  |  | 38 |
| 13245 | -946 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 40 |
| 990 | -45 |  |  |  |  |  | 42 |
| 46 | -1 |  |  |  |  |  | 44 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 46 |

Table 5

Braid representing a 2 -cable about Conway's 11 -crossing knot *** $(4354)^{3} 2132(6576)^{-1}(4354)^{-2} 2132(4354)^{-1} 2132(6576)^{-1} 1 * * *$
Braid representing a similar 2-cable about the Kinoshita-Teresaka knot *** $(2132)^{3}(6576)^{2} 4354(6576)^{-1}(2132)^{-2} 4354(6576)^{-1}(2132)^{-1}(4354)^{-1} 1 * * *$

The polynomial $P$ for both these knots

for each cable would satisfy $\frac{1}{2}\left(e_{\max }-e_{\min }\right) \leqslant 6$, as would also be the case if any diagram for $K$ had just 3 Seifert circles.

The 8 -braid used in Table 4 represents the $(2,27)$ cable about $K$. The seven non-zero columns of coefficients show that $\frac{1}{2}\left(e_{\max }-e_{\min }\right)+1=7$, so that at least seven strings are needed to present this cable. The knot $K$ is then an example of the closure of a positive braid with braid index strictly larger than $\frac{1}{2}\left(e_{\max }-e_{\min }\right)+1$.

## Mutants

A knot $K$ whose diagram is made up of tangles $R$ and $S$ as in figure 1 is converted into a mutant of $K$ by replacing $R$ with $\tau(R)$, where $\tau$ is the operation of rotation through $\pi$ about one of three axes.


Fig. 1
Mutants have long been known to have the same Alexander polynomial, and more recently to have the same polynomial $P$ [9]. Possibly the best known mutant pair are the inequivalent knots of Conway and Kinoshita-Terasaka which both have trivial Alexander polynomial. Although their 2 -cables are not obviously mutants they do still share the same polynomial $P$ shown in Table 5. This coincidence of polynomials has given us a measure of confidence in the accuracy of the computer calculations, as it would appear highly unlikely that the coefficients would all agree if there was an error in the algorithm or its implementation.

Other pairs of mutants within the range of our computations have been tried with similar results. A variety of mutants can be tackled using the fact that the 4-braids $\quad w\left(\sigma_{1}, \sigma_{2}\right) v\left(\sigma_{2}, \sigma_{3}\right), \quad w\left(\sigma_{1}, \sigma_{2}\right) \sigma_{2}^{-1} v\left(\sigma_{2}, \sigma_{3}\right) \sigma_{2}, \quad w\left(\sigma_{1}, \sigma_{2}\right) \operatorname{rev} v\left(\sigma_{2}, \sigma_{3}\right) \quad$ and $w\left(\sigma_{1}, \sigma_{2}\right) \sigma_{2}^{-1} \operatorname{rev} v\left(\sigma_{2}, \sigma_{3}\right) \sigma_{2}$ close to mutants, where rev $v$ is the braid $v$ in reverse.

The result suggested by these calculations, that 2 -cables of any pair of mutant knots have the same polynomial, has been subsequently proved by Lickorish and Lipson [15], and also by Przytycki and Traczyk.
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