CONSTRUCTING BIQUANDLES

EVA HORVAT

Abstract. We define biquandle structures on a given quandle, and show that any biquandle is given by some biquandle structure on its underlying quandle. We characterize all biquandles with a given underlying quandle. Using this characterization, we obtain a relationship between the automorphism group of a biquandle and the automorphism group of its underlying quandle. As an application, we determine the automorphism groups of Alexander and dihedral biquandles. We also define a biquandle structure on a direct product of two quandles and describe the automorphism group of the biquandle thus obtained.

1. Introduction

Since the onset of quandle theory, a considerable amount of research has been dedicated to quandle structures and their automorphism groups. Biquandles, as algebraic generalization of quandles, are not so well known. Study of biquandles began with [8], and biquandle invariants have been amply used in the theory of virtual and other knots, see for example [2],[6],[1],[3]. The structure of biquandles is more rigid than the quandle structure, and consequently they are harder to understand. Also, there are not many known families of biquandles apart from those that were found by a computer search. We would thus like to find a way of constructing new biquandles with a chosen structure.

In this paper, we explore the relationship between quandles and biquandles. Our study is based on the functor $Q$, defined by [4]. We define biquandle structures on a given quandle. We show that every biquandle $X$ is given by a biquandle structure on its underlying quandle $Q(X)$. By determining when two biquandle structures are isomorphic, we are able to characterize all biquandles with a given underlying quandle. Using the knowledge of quandles and their automorphism groups together with our results, one may construct a fair amount of new biquandles. An advantage of our construction is that it yields biquandles with a chosen structure. It also lays ground for a theoretical (versus computer - based) knowledge about the number of biquandles of a given order. We obtain the following partial result in this direction:
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**Corollary. 3.6** The number of nonisomorphic constant biquandle structures on a quandle \( Q \) is equal to the number of conjugacy classes of \( \text{Aut}(Q) \).

Using the characterization of nonisomorphic biquandle structures, we obtain a relationship between the automorphism group of a given biquandle and the automorphism group of its underlying quandle:

**Theorem. 4.1** Let \( X \) be a biquandle with \( Q(X) = Q \) that is given by a biquandle structure \( \{ \beta_y \mid y \in Q \} \subset \text{Aut}(Q) \). Then

\[
\text{Aut}(X) \leq N_{\text{Aut}(Q)} \{ \beta_y \mid y \in Q \}.
\]

Moreover, in case of a constant biquandle structure, we obtain

**Theorem. 4.2** Let \( X_f \) be a biquandle with \( Q(X) = Q \) that is given by a constant biquandle structure \( \{ \beta_y = f \mid y \in Q \} \). Then \( \text{Aut}(X_f) \cong C_{\text{Aut}(Q)}(f) \).

In particular, this yields the automorphism groups of Alexander and dihedral biquandles, see Corollary 1.3 and Proposition 1.5.

We also give a construction of a biquandle from a direct product of two quandles using a nonconstant biquandle structure. We characterize product biquandles and describe their automorphism groups.

**Proposition. 5.4** Let \((Q, \ast)\) and \((K, \circ)\) be connected quandles, and denote by \( B \) their product biquandle. Then

\[
\text{Aut}(B) \cong \text{Aut}(Q) \times \text{Aut}(K).
\]

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, the basic definitions concerning quandles and biquandles are recalled. In Section 3, we define the functor \( Q \) from category of biquandles to the quandle category. Starting from a given quandle \( Q \), we impose on it a biquandle structure to obtain a biquandle \( X \) with \( Q(X) = Q \). We show that every biquandle is obtained by such construction, and give some examples. Further, we determine when two biquandle structures are isomorphic, thus giving a characterization of biquandle structures. In Section 4, we apply our results to describe automorphism groups of biquandles. We obtain a relationship between the automorphism group of a biquandle and the automorphism group of its underlying quandle. We determine the automorphism group of biquandles with a constant biquandle structure, which includes the Alexander and dihedral biquandles. In Section 5, we study product quandles and biquandles. Subsection 5.1 is an introduction to the direct product of quandles and its automorphism group. In Subsection 5.2, we define a biquandle structure on the direct product of two quandles to obtain the product biquandle. The automorphism group of product biquandles is described.
2. Preliminaries

Definition 2.1. A quandle is a set $Q$ with a binary operation $\ast : Q \times Q \to Q$ that satisfies the following axioms:

(1) $x \ast x = x$ for every $x \in Q$;
(2) the map $S_y : Q \to Q$, given by $S_y(x) = x \ast y$, is a bijection for every $y \in Q$;
(3) $(x \ast y) \ast z = (x \ast z) \ast (y \ast z)$ for every $x, y, z \in Q$.

A map $f : Q_1 \to Q_2$ between quandles is called a quandle homomorphism if $f(x \ast y) = f(x) \ast f(y)$ for every $x, y \in Q_1$. It follows from Definition 2.1 that the map $S_y$ is in fact an automorphism of the quandle $Q$. We call these automorphisms the symmetries of $Q$. The subgroup $\langle S_y | y \in Q \rangle \leq \text{Aut}(Q)$ is called the inner automorphism group $\text{Inn}(Q)$.

In the following, we recall some examples of quandles:

- If $G$ is a group, then $a \ast b = b^{-1}ab$ defines a quandle operation on $G$; the resulting quandle $(G, \ast)$ is called the conjugation quandle.
- In any group $G$, the operation, given by $a \circ b = ba^{-1}b$, also defines a quandle.
- Define a binary operation on $\mathbb{Z}_n$ by $i \ast j = 2^j - i \mod n$. Then $R_n = (\mathbb{Z}_n, \ast)$ is a quandle, called the dihedral quandle.
- Let $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}[t, t^{-1}]$ and let $M$ be a $\Lambda$-module, then $x \ast y = tx + (1 - t)y$ defines a quandle, that is called an Alexander quandle.

Definition 2.2. A biquandle is a set $X$ with two binary operations $\ast, \bar{\ast} : X \times X \to X$ that satisfy the following axioms:

(1) $x \ast x = x \bar{\ast} x$ for every $x \in X$;
(2) the maps $\alpha_y, \beta_y : X \to X$ and $S : X \times X \to X \times X$, given by $\alpha_y(x) = x \ast y$, $\beta_y(x) = x \bar{\ast} y$ and $S(x, y) = (y \bar{\ast} x, x \ast y)$ are bijections for every $y \in X$;
(3) the exchange laws

\begin{align*}
(x \ast y) \ast (z \ast y) &= (x \ast z) \ast (y \bar{\ast} z), \\
(x \ast y) \bar{\ast} (z \ast y) &= (x \bar{\ast} z) \ast (y \ast z) \text{ and} \\
(x \bar{\ast} y) \bar{\ast} (z \bar{\ast} y) &= (x \bar{\ast} z) \bar{\ast} (y \ast z)
\end{align*}

are valid for every $x, y, z \in X$.

Observe that if $\beta_y = id$ for every $y \in X$, then $(X, \ast)$ is a quandle - thus biquandles are a generalization of quandles. We would like to describe the precise relationship between the two algebraic structures.

Some examples of biquandles are listed below:

- Let $G$ be a group. Define two binary operations on $G$ by $a \ast b = b^{-1}a^{-1}b$ and $a \bar{\ast} b = b^{-2}a$. Then $(G, \ast, \bar{\ast})$ is a biquandle, called the Wada biquandle.
• Define two operations \( \ast \) and \( \bar{\ast} \) on the set \( \mathbb{Z}_n \) by \( i \ast j = (s+1)j - i \) and \( i \bar{\ast} j = si \) for some chosen element \( s \in \mathbb{Z}_n^* \). Then \( B_n = (\mathbb{Z}_n, \ast, \bar{\ast}) \) is a biquandle, called the **dihedral biquandle**.

• Denote \( \Lambda = \mathbb{Z}[t^{\pm 1}, s^{\pm 1}] \) and let \( M \) be a \( \Lambda \)-module, then \( x \ast y = tx + (s-t)y \) and \( x \bar{\ast} y = sx \) define a biquandle \( (M, \ast, \bar{\ast}) \), that is called an **Alexander biquandle**.

### 3. Constructing biquandles from a quandle

It is known that to any biquandle \( (X, \ast, \bar{\ast}) \) we may associate a quandle \( Q(X) = (X, \ast) \), whose operation is given by

\[
x \ast y = (x \ast y)^{-1} y
\]

for every \( x, y \in X \). In fact, \( Q \) defines a functor from the category of biquandles to the quandle category [1]. We reprove this fact in the following Lemma.

**Lemma 3.1.** \( Q \) is a functor from the category of biquandles to the quandle category.

**Proof.**

(1) Let \((X, \ast, \bar{\ast})\) be a biquandle. We will show that \( Q(X) \) is a quandle.

Since \( X \) is a biquandle, the equality \( x \ast x = x \bar{\ast} x \) is satisfied for any \( x \in X \), therefore \( x \ast x = x \bar{\ast} x \) for any \( x \in Q(X) \). Secondly, the maps \( \alpha_y(x) = x \ast y \) and \( \beta_y(x) = x \bar{\ast} y \) are bijections, therefore the map \( S_y : Q(X) \rightarrow Q(Y) \), given by \( S_y(x) = x \ast y = (\beta_y^{-1} \circ \alpha_y)(x) \), is also a bijection.

To show the validity of the third quandle axiom, we choose \( x, y, z \in X \). Denote \( b = x \ast z \), \( c = y \ast z \) and \( w = x \bar{\ast} y \), which implies \( b \bar{\ast} z = x \bar{\ast} z \), \( c \bar{\ast} z = y \bar{\ast} z \), \( w \bar{\ast} y = x \bar{\ast} y \) and \( (x \ast y) \ast z = w \bar{\ast} z \). We use the third biquandle axiom for \((X, \ast, \bar{\ast})\) to compute:

\[
((x \ast z) \ast (y \ast z)) \bar{\ast} (y \bar{\ast} z) = ((x \ast z) \ast (y \ast z)) \bar{\ast} (c \bar{\ast} z) = ((x \ast z) \ast (y \ast z)) \bar{\ast} (z \bar{\ast} c) = (b \bar{\ast} c) \bar{\ast} (z \bar{\ast} c) = (b \bar{\ast} c) \bar{\ast} (z \bar{\ast} c) = (x \ast z) \ast (y \ast z)
\]

\[
((x \ast y) \ast z) \bar{\ast} (y \bar{\ast} z) = (w \bar{\ast} z) \bar{\ast} (y \bar{\ast} z) = (w \bar{\ast} y) \bar{\ast} (z \bar{\ast} y) = (x \ast y) \bar{\ast} (z \bar{\ast} y) = (x \ast z) \bar{\ast} (y \bar{\ast} z),
\]

and it follows by the second biquandle axiom that \( (x \ast z) \ast (y \bar{\ast} z) = (x \ast y) \ast z \).

(2) Let \( F : X \rightarrow Y \) be a biquandle homomorphism from a biquandle \((X, \ast, \bar{\ast})\) to another biquandle \((Y, \vee, \bar{\vee})\). Then the equalities

\[
Q(F)(x \ast y) = F(x \ast y \bar{\ast}^{-1} y) = F(x \ast F(y) \bar{\ast}^{-1} F(y) = Q(F)(x) \ast Q(F)(y)
\]

imply that \( Q(F) : Q(X) \rightarrow Q(Y) \) is a quandle homomorphism. Similarly, for \( X = Y \) and \( F = id_X \) we obtain that \( Q(id_X) = id_{Q(X)} \). Also, if \( F, G : X \rightarrow Y \) are two biquandle homomorphisms, then \( Q(G \circ F) = Q(G) \circ Q(F) \).

\[\square\]

Thus, every biquandle determines a quandle. This fact raises some questions, like:
• Starting from a quandle \( Q \), how do we construct a (nontrivial) biquandle \( X \) with \( Q(X) = Q \)?
• Is it possible to characterize all biquandles \( X \) with \( Q(X) = Q \)?
• What is the relationship between all biquandles \( X \) with \( Q(X) = Q \)? When are two of those biquandles isomorphic?

Our results in the remainder of the Section will answer to all these questions. We begin by defining a biquandle structure on a given quandle.

**Definition 3.1.** Let \((Q, \ast)\) be a quandle. A **biquandle structure** on \((Q, \ast)\) is a family of automorphisms \( \{ \beta_y : Q \to Q \mid y \in Q \} \subset \text{Aut}(Q) \) that satisfies the following conditions:

1. \( \beta_{y}(x \ast y) \beta_y = \beta_{y}(y \ast x) \beta_x \) for every \( x, y \in Q \),
2. the map \( (y \mapsto \beta_y(y)) \) is a bijection of \( Q \).

Observe that any automorphism \( f \) of a quandle \( Q \) defines a biquandle structure on \( Q \) by \( \beta_y = f \) for every \( y \in Q \). We call this a **constant** biquandle structure on \( Q \).

**Theorem 3.1.** Let \( \{ \beta_y : Q \to Q \mid y \in Q \} \) be a biquandle structure on a quandle \((Q, \ast)\). Define two binary operations on \( Q \) by \( x \ast y = \beta_y(x \ast y) \) and \( x \bar{\ast} y = \beta_y(x) \) for every \( x, y \in Q \). Then \( X = (Q, \ast, \bar{\ast}) \) is a biquandle and \( Q(X) = (Q, \ast) \).

**Proof.** Since \( x \bar{\ast} x = \beta_x(x) = x \) for every \( x \in Q \), the first biquandle axiom is valid.

To verify the second biquandle axiom, observe that since \( Q \) is a quandle and \( \beta_y \) is a bijection, the maps \( \alpha_y(x) = \beta_y(x \ast y) \) and \( \beta_y(x) = x \bar{\ast} y \) are bijections for every \( y \in Q \). It remains to show that the map \( S : Q \times Q \to Q \times Q \), given by \( S(x,y) = (y \bar{\ast} x, x \ast y) = (\beta_x(y), \beta_y(x \ast y)) \), is a bijection. Choose \( (z,w) \in Q \times Q \). By property (2) from Definition 3.1 there exists a unique \( y \in Q \) such that \( \beta_y^{-1}(z) = \beta_y(w) \). There exists a unique \( x \in Q \) such that \( \beta_y(x) \ast \beta_y(y) = w \). We have \( S(x,y) = (\beta_z(y), \beta_y(x \ast y)) = (\beta_z(y), w) \) and use property (1) in Definition 3.1 to calculate

\[
\begin{align*}
\beta_{z}(z) &= \beta_{\beta_y(x \ast y)}(z) = \beta_{y}^{-1}(z) = \beta_{y}(y) = \beta_{y}^{-1}(y) \\
\beta_{z}(y) &= \beta_{\beta_y(x \ast y)}(y) = \beta_{y}(y) = \beta_{y}(y) = \beta_{z}(y).
\end{align*}
\]

and property (2) from Definition 3.1 implies that \( \beta_z(y) = z \).

To check the third biquandle axiom, we choose any \( x, y, z \in Q \) and compute

\[
\begin{align*}
(x \ast y) \bar{\ast} (z \ast y) &= \beta_{y}(x \ast y) \ast \beta_{y}(z \ast y) = \beta_{y}(x \ast y) \ast \beta_{y}(z) = \beta_{y}(x) \ast \beta_{y}(y) \\
(x \ast z) \bar{\ast} (x \ast y) &= \beta_{y}(x) \ast \beta_{y}(z) = \beta_{y}(x) \ast \beta_{y}(z) = \beta_{y}(x) \ast \beta_{y}(z) \\
(x \bar{\ast} y) \bar{\ast} (x \bar{\ast} y) &= \beta_{y}(x) \ast \beta_{y}(y) = \beta_{y}(x) \ast \beta_{y}(y) = \beta_{y}(x) \ast \beta_{y}(y) \\
(x \bar{\ast} z) \bar{\ast} (y \bar{\ast} z) &= \beta_{y}(x) \ast \beta_{y}(y) = \beta_{y}(x) \ast \beta_{y}(y) = \beta_{y}(x) \ast \beta_{y}(y) \\
(x \bar{\ast} z) \bar{\ast} (z \bar{\ast} y) &= \beta_{y}(x) \ast \beta_{y}(y) = \beta_{y}(x) \ast \beta_{y}(y) = \beta_{y}(x) \ast \beta_{y}(y) \\
(x \bar{\ast} z) \bar{\ast} (z \bar{\ast} y) &= \beta_{y}(x) \ast \beta_{y}(y) = \beta_{y}(x) \ast \beta_{y}(y) = \beta_{y}(x) \ast \beta_{y}(y)
\end{align*}
\]
By condition (1) of Definition 3.1, it follows that the third biquandle axiom is valid. We have shown that $X$ is a biquandle and the equality $x * y \overline{\beta}^{-1} y = \beta_y^{-1}(x * y) = x * y$ implies that $Q(X) = (Q, *)$. \hfill \Box

**Example 3.2 (Wada biquandle).** Let $G$ be a group. It is easy to check that $a * b = ba^{-1}b$ defines a quandle operation on $G$. For every $y \in G$, define a map $\beta_y : G \to G$ by $\beta_y(a) = y^{-2}a$. Since $G$ is a group, $\beta_y$ is bijective, and

$$
\begin{align*}
\beta_y(a) * \beta_y(b) &= (y^{-2}a) * y^{-2}b = y^{-2}ba^{-1}b = \beta_y(a * b)
\end{align*}
$$

implies that $\beta_y$ is a quandle automorphism of $(G, *)$. The map $(y \mapsto \beta_y(y))$ is a bijection since $\beta_y(y) = y^{-1}$. We have

$$
\begin{align*}
\beta_{\beta_y(x*y)}(a) &= (y^{-1}x^{-1}y)^{-2}y^{-2}a = y^{-1}x^{-1}y a \\
\beta_{\beta_y(y)}(y) &= (x^{-2}y)^{-2}x^{-2}a = y^{-1}x^{-1}y a
\end{align*}
$$

for every $x, y, a \in G$, so the family of automorphisms $\{\beta_y | y \in G\}$ defines a biquandle structure on $(G, *)$. By Theorem 3.1, this structure defines a biquandle $(G, *, \overline{\beta})$ with operations $x \overline{\beta} y = y^{-1}x^{-1}y$ and $x \overline{\beta} y = y^{-2}x$, which is exactly the Wada biquandle.

Theorem 3.1 describes a construction of a biquandle from a given quandle $Q$. In the following Theorem, we show that every biquandle $X$ with $Q(X) = Q$ is obtained by this construction, thus giving a complete classification of all such biquandles.

**Theorem 3.3.** Let $(Q, *)$ be a quandle. Suppose that $X = (Q, *, \overline{\beta})$ is a biquandle with $Q(X) = (Q, *)$. Then there exists a biquandle structure $\{\beta_y : Q \to Q | y \in Q\} \subset Aut(Q)$ such that $x * y = \beta_y(x * y)$ and $x \overline{\beta} y = \beta_y(x)$ for every $x, y \in Q$.

*Proof.* Since $X$ is a biquandle, for every $y \in Q$ there exists a bijection $\beta_y : Q \to Q$, given by $\beta_y(x) = x \overline{\beta} y$. Since $Q(X) = Q$, we have $x * y = (x \overline{\beta} y) \overline{\beta}^{-1} y = \beta_y^{-1}(x * y)$, which implies $x * y = \beta_y(x * y)$.

It follows from the third biquandle axiom that $\beta_{\beta_y(z)}(\beta_y(x)) = \beta_y(x) \overline{\beta} \beta_y(z) = (x \overline{\beta} y) \overline{\beta} (y \overline{\beta} z) = (x \overline{\beta} z) \overline{\beta} (y \overline{\beta} z) = \beta_z(x) \overline{\beta} \beta_z(y * z) = \beta_{\beta_z(y * z)}(\beta_z(x))$, which implies the equality $\beta_{\beta_z(x)}(\beta_y(z)) = \beta_{\beta_z(y * z)}(\beta_z(x))$ for every $y, z \in Q$. The maps $\beta_y$ thus satisfy condition (1) from Definition 3.1, and we may compare

$$
\begin{align*}
(x \overline{\beta} y) \overline{\beta} (z \overline{\beta} y) &= \beta_y(x \overline{\beta} z) \overline{\beta} (y \overline{\beta} z) = \beta_{\beta_y(z * y)}(\beta_y(x \overline{\beta} z)) = \beta_{\beta_y(y)}(\beta_z(x \overline{\beta} y)) \\
(x \overline{\beta} z) \overline{\beta} (y \overline{\beta} z) &= \beta_y(x \overline{\beta} z) \overline{\beta} (y \overline{\beta} z) = \beta_{\beta_y(y)}(\beta_z(x) \overline{\beta} y)
\end{align*}
$$

By the third biquandle axiom we have $(x \overline{\beta} y) \overline{\beta} (z \overline{\beta} y) = (x \overline{\beta} z) \overline{\beta} (y \overline{\beta} z)$ and therefore $\beta_z(x * y) = \beta_z(x) \overline{\beta} \beta_z(y)$ for every $x, y, z \in Q$. We have shown that $\beta_y \in Aut(Q)$ for every $y \in Q$.

It remains to prove condition (2) from Definition 3.1. Since $X$ is a biquandle, the map $S : Q \times Q \to Q \times Q$, given by $S(x, y) = (y \overline{\beta} x, x \overline{\beta} y)$, is a bijection. It follows that the restriction $S|_{\Delta : \Delta \to \Delta}$, given by $S(x, x) = (\beta_z(x), \beta_z(x))$, is injective, thus
(x \mapsto \beta_x(x)) is injective. To show it is also surjective, choose any z \in Q. Since S is a bijection, there exist x, y \in Q such that S(x, y) = (z, z). It follows that

\[ z = \beta_x(y) = \beta_y(x \ast y) \]

and by condition (1) we have

\[ \beta_{\beta_y(x \ast y)} \beta_y = \beta_{\beta_x(y)} \beta_x = \beta_{\beta_y(x \ast y)} \beta_x, \]

which implies \( \beta_x = \beta_y \) and thus \( \beta_y(y) = \beta_x(y) = z \).

Example 3.4 (Alexander quandles and biquandles). Let \( \Lambda = \mathbb{Z}[t^\pm 1, s^\pm 1] \). Consider an Alexander quandle as a \( \Lambda \)-module \( M \), whose operation is given by

\[ x \ast y = (s^{-1}t)x + (1 - s^{-1}t)y. \]

Taking a constant biquandle structure \( \{ \beta_y \mid \beta_y(x) = sx \text{ for every } x, y \in M \} \), we obtain the Alexander biquandle \( (M, \ast, \overline{\ast}) \) with operations \( x \ast y = tx + (s - t)y \) and \( x \overline{\ast} y = sx \) for every \( x, y \in M \).

As we have observed, every automorphism \( f \) of a quandle \( (Q, \ast) \) defines a constant biquandle structure \( \{ \beta_y = f \mid y \in Q \} \) and thus defines a biquandle \( X_f \) with \( Q(X_f) = Q \). One would then like to know when two such biquandles are isomorphic.

Proposition 3.5. Let \((Q, \ast)\) be a quandle and let \( f, g \in Aut(Q) \) be two automorphisms that define biquandles \( X_f \) and \( X_g \). The biquandles \( X_f \) and \( X_g \) are isomorphic if and only if \( f \) and \( g \) belong to the same conjugacy class of \( Aut(Q) \).

Proof. Denote \( X_f = (Q, \ast, \overline{\ast}) \) and \( X_g = (Q, \vee, \overline{\vee}) \).

(\(\Rightarrow\)) Suppose there exists an isomorphism \( F: X_f \rightarrow X_g \). Then we have

\[ F(x \overline{\ast} y) = F(f(x)) = F(x) \overline{\vee} F(y) = g(F(x)) \]

for every \( x \in Q \), which implies \( gFf^{-1} = F \). Moreover, the other operation gives

\[ F(f(x) \ast f(y)) = F(x \overline{\ast} y) = F(x) \vee F(y) = g(F(x) \ast F(y)) = g(F(x)) \ast g(F(y)), \]

which for \( z = f(x) \) and \( w = f(y) \) implies \( F(z \ast w) = (gFf^{-1})(z) \ast (gFf^{-1})(w) = F(z) \ast F(w) \), therefore \( F \in Aut(Q) \). It follows from \( gFf^{-1} = F \) that \( FfF^{-1} = g \), so \( f \) and \( g \) are in the same conjugacy class of \( Aut(Q) \).

(\(\Leftarrow\)) If \( f \) and \( g \) belong to the same conjugacy class of \( Aut(Q) \), then there exists a \( G \in Aut(Q) \) such that \( GfG^{-1} = g \). Thus \( Gf = gG \) and we may compute

\[ G(x \overline{\ast} y) = Gf(x \ast y) = gG(x \ast y) = g(G(x) \ast G(y)) = G(x) \vee G(y) \]

\[ G(x \overline{\ast} y) = G(f(x)) = g(G(x)) = G(x) \overline{\vee} G(y), \]

therefore \( G: X_f \rightarrow X_g \) is a biquandle isomorphism.

Corollary 3.6. The number of nonisomorphic constant biquandle structures on a quandle \( Q \) is equal to the number of conjugacy classes of \( Aut(Q) \).
Proposition 3.5 can be generalized to determine when any two biquandles are isomorphic. It follows from Lemma 3.1 that an isomorphism between biquandles $X$ and $Y$ induces an isomorphism between their underlying quandles $Q(X)$ and $Q(Y)$. Therefore it suffices to consider biquandles $X$ and $Y$ with $Q(X) = Q(Y)$.

**Proposition 3.7.** Let $X$ and $Y$ be biquandles with $Q(X) = Q(Y) = Q$, that are given by biquandle structures \{\alpha_y \mid y \in Q\} and \{\beta_y \mid y \in Q\} respectively. Let $F \in \text{Aut}(Q)$. Then $F$ defines a biquandle isomorphism from $X$ to $Y$ if and only if $F\alpha_y F^{-1} = \beta_{F(y)}$ for every $y \in Q$.

**Proof.** Denote $X = (Q, \ast, \bar{\ast})$ and $Y = (Q, \triangleright, \bar{\triangleright})$.

(⇒) Suppose $F: X \to Y$ is a biquandle isomorphism. Then the equalities $F(\alpha_y(x)) = F(x\bar{\ast}y) = F(x)\bar{\triangleright}F(y) = \beta_{F(y)}(F(x))$ for every $x, y \in Q$ imply that $F\alpha_y F^{-1} = \beta_{F(y)}$ for every $y \in Q$.

(⇐) Suppose that $F \in \text{Aut}(Q)$ is a map for which $F\alpha_y F^{-1} = \beta_{F(y)}$ for every $y \in Q$. Then we have

\[
F(x\bar{\ast}y) = F(\alpha_y(x)) = \beta_{F(y)}(F(x)) = F(x)\bar{\triangleright}F(y)
\]

\[
F(x\ast y) = F(\alpha_y(x \ast y)) = \beta_{F(y)}(F(x \ast y)) = \beta_{F(y)}(F(x) \ast F(y)) = F(x) \triangleright F(y)
\]

due to $F: X \to Y$ is a biquandle isomorphism. □

4. Automorphism groups of biquandles

In Section 3 we introduced biquandle structures and showed that every biquandle is given by a biquandle structure on its underlying quandle. Proposition 3.7 determines when two biquandle structures are isomorphic. We may use this result to relate the automorphism group of a biquandle with the automorphism group of its underlying quandle.

**Theorem 4.1.** Let $X$ be a biquandle with $Q(X) = Q$ that is given by a biquandle structure \{\beta_y \mid y \in Q\} ⊂ \text{Aut}(Q). Then

\[
\text{Aut}(X) \leq N_{\text{Aut}(Q)} \{\beta_y \mid y \in Q\}.
\]

**Proof.** Let $F \in \text{Aut}(Q)$ be a quandle automorphism. It follows from Proposition 3.7 that

\[
F \in \text{Aut}(X) \iff F\beta_y F^{-1} = \beta_{F(y)} \text{ for every } y \in Q.
\]

□

In case of a constant biquandle structure, the biquandle automorphism group is completely determined by the quandle automorphism group:

**Theorem 4.2.** Let $X_f$ be a biquandle with $Q(X_f) = Q$ that is given by the constant biquandle structure \{\beta_y = f \mid y \in Q\}. Then $\text{Aut}(X_f) \cong C_{\text{Aut}(Q)}(f)$.
Proof. If \( F \in \text{Aut}(Q) \) is a quandle automorphism, then it follows from Proposition 3.7 that
\[
F \in \text{Aut}(X_f) \iff Ff = fF.
\]
\( \square \)

The automorphism group of Alexander quandles was determined in [5]. Using this result together with Theorem 4.2, we may obtain the automorphism group of any Alexander biquandle.

**Corollary 4.3.** Let \( M \) be an Alexander biquandle with the corresponding Alexander quandle \( Q(M) \), as defined in Example 3.4. Then
\[
\text{Aut}(M) \cong C_{\text{Aut}(Q(M))}(s).
\]

Similarly, we obtain a classification of Alexander biquandles as follows.

**Proposition 4.4.** Alexander biquandles \( M \) and \( N \) are isomorphic if and only if there exists an isomorphism of Alexander quandles \( F : Q(M) \to Q(N) \) such that \( F(sx) = sF(x) \) for every \( x \in M \).

Proof. It follows from Proposition 3.7. \( \square \)

In the following, we compute the automorphism group of the dihedral biquandle. Recall the definition of the affine group of \( \mathbb{Z}_n \):
\[
\text{Aff}(\mathbb{Z}_n) = \{ f_{a,b} : \mathbb{Z}_n \to \mathbb{Z}_n | f_{a,b}(i) = ai + b, a \in \mathbb{Z}_n^*, b \in \mathbb{Z}_n \}.
\]

By [4, Theorem 2.1], the automorphism group of a dihedral quandle \( R_n \) is isomorphic to the affine group \( \text{Aff}(\mathbb{Z}_n) \). The reader may check that the underlying quandle of a dihedral biquandle \( Q(B_n) \) is a quandle with operation \( x \ast y = (1+s^{-1})y - s^{-1}x \), which is not exactly the dihedral quandle. We will show, however, that \( \text{Aut}(B_n) \cong C_{\text{Aff}(\mathbb{Z}_n)}(s) \), as expected.

**Proposition 4.5.** Let \( B_n \) be the dihedral biquandle. Then the automorphism group \( \text{Aut}(B_n) \) is isomorphic to the subgroup \( \{ f_{a,b} \in \text{Aff}(\mathbb{Z}_n) | b = 0 \} \leq \text{Aff}(\mathbb{Z}_n) \) of the affine group \( \text{Aff}(\mathbb{Z}_n) \).

Proof. Denote \( H = \{ f_{a,b} \in \text{Aff}(\mathbb{Z}_n) | b = 0 \} \leq \text{Aff}(\mathbb{Z}_n) \) and define a map \( \psi : H \to \text{Aut}(B_n) \) by \( \psi(f_{a,b}) = f_{a,b} \). We may compute
\[

gf(a,(s+1)j - i) + b = (s+1)aj - ai + b 
gf(a(i) \ast f_{a,b}(j)) = (ai + b)_*(aj + b) = (s+1)aj - ai + sb 
gf(a,i) = sai + b 
gf(a,i) \ast f_{a,b}(j) = sai + sb \text{ for every } i, j \in B_n \text{ and every } a \in \mathbb{Z}_n.
\]

It follows that \( f_{a,b} \) is a biquandle homomorphism if and only if \((s - 1)b = 0\). If \( s = 1 \), then \( B_n \) is in fact the dihedral quandle \( R_n \) and \( \text{Aut}(R_n) \cong \text{Aff}(\mathbb{Z}_n) \) by [3]. If \( f_{a,b} \in H \), then \( b = 0 \) and \( \psi(f_{a,b}) \) is a biquandle homomorphism. The map \( f_{a,0}: B_n \to B_n \) is bijective if and only if \( a \in \mathbb{Z}_n^* \), therefore \( \psi(f_{a,b}) \) is a biquandle automorphism for every \( f_{a,b} \in H \). The map \( \psi \) is clearly a group homomorphism and \( \ker(\psi) = \{f_{1,0}\} = 1 \).

It remains to show that \( \psi \) is surjective. Choose any element \( g \in \text{Aut}(B_n) \). Since \( g \) is a biquandle isomorphism, we have \( g((s + 1)j - i) = (s + 1)g(j) - g(i) \) and \( g(s^j) = sg(i) \) for every \( i,j \in B_n \). If \( s \neq 1 \) (so \( B_n \) is not a quandle), it follows that \( g(0) = 0 \) and also \( g(-i) = g((s + 1) \cdot 0 - i) = -g(i) \). Using these equalities, we compute

\[
g((s + 1)i) = (s + 1)g(i) \\
g(k(s + 1)i) = g((s + 1)i - ((k - 1)(s + 1)i)) = (s + 1)g(i) + g((k - 1)(s + 1)i)
\]

for every \( i,k \in \mathbb{Z}_n \). It follows by induction that \( g(k(s + 1)i) = k(s + 1)g(i) \) for every \( i,k \in \mathbb{Z}_n \). This equality, together with equality \( g(k(s + 1)i) = g((s + 1)ki) = (s + 1)g(ki) \), implies \( g(ki) = kg(i) \) for every \( i,k \in \mathbb{Z}_n \). We have \( g(k) = kg(1) \) for every \( k \in \mathbb{Z}_n \). Since \( g \) is an automorphism, it follows that \( g(1) \in \mathbb{Z}_n^* \) and therefore \( g = \psi(f_{g(1),0}) \).

The affine group \( \text{Aff}(\mathbb{Z}_n) \) is a semi-direct product \( \mathbb{Z}_n \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_n^* \), which implies

**Corollary 4.6.** \( |\text{Aut}(B_n)| = \phi(n) \), where \( \phi \) denotes the Euler function.

5. **Product quandles and biquandles**

In this Section, we study a family of biquandles that naturally arise from any pair of quandles. More precisely, any member of this family is constructed from a direct product of two quandles, equipped by a biquandle structure. To prepare the ground, we first define the direct product of quandles and analyze some of its properties, including its automorphism group.

5.1. **Product quandles and their automorphisms.**

**Definition 5.1.** Let \((Q,\ast)\) and \((K,\circ)\) be quandles. A **direct product** of \(Q\) and \(K\) is the quandle \((Q \times K, \triangleright)\), whose operation is given by \((x,a) \triangleright (y,b) = (x \ast y, a \circ b)\) for every \((x,a), (y,b) \in Q \times K\).

For any finite quandle \(Q\), we may define the **order** of an element \(x \in Q\) as the order of the inner automorphism \(S_x \in \text{Aut}(Q)\). It follows from this definition that

\[
\text{ord}(x) \leq n \iff a \ast x \ast \ldots \ast x = a \text{ for every } a \in Q.
\]

Note that the order of an element \(x \in Q\) does not necessarily divide the order of \(Q\) (as is the case with groups). It does, however, divide the order of \(\text{Aut}(Q)\).
Lemma 5.1. For any quandles $Q$ and $K$ we have:

1. $\text{Inn}(Q \times K) \cong \text{Inn}(Q) \times \text{Inn}(K)$,
2. $\text{ord}(x, a) = \text{lcm}(\text{ord}(x), \text{ord}(a))$ for every $(x, a) \in Q \times K$,
3. $\text{Aut}(Q) \times \text{Aut}(K) \leq \text{Aut}(Q \times K)$.

Proof. (1) We have $S_{(x,a)} = S_x \times S_a$ for every $(x,a) \in Q \times K$.

(2) It follows from (1).

(3) It is easy to see that for any $f \in \text{Aut}(Q)$ and $g \in \text{Aut}(K)$, the map $f \times g$ is an automorphism of the direct product $Q \times K$. Also, the map $(f, g) \mapsto f \times g$ is injective.

Definition 5.2. A quandle $(Q, \ast)$ is called medial if the equality $(x \ast y) \ast (z \ast w) = (x \ast z) \ast (y \ast w)$ is valid for every $x, y, z, w \in Q$.

The structure of medial quandles was quite extensively studied in [7]. Mediality ensures that the set of quandle homomorphisms is closed under the quandle operation.

Lemma 5.2. Let $(Q, \ast)$ and $(K, \circ)$ be medial quandles. Let $\alpha: Q \rightarrow Q$, $\beta: K \rightarrow Q$, $\gamma: K \rightarrow K$ and $\delta: Q \rightarrow K$ be quandle homomorphisms. Then a map $F: Q \times K \rightarrow Q \times K$, given by $F(x, a) = (\alpha(x) \ast \beta(a), \gamma(a) \circ \delta(x))$, is an endomorphism of the product quandle $Q \times K$.

Proof. Choose $(x, a), (y, b) \in Q \times K$ and use mediality to compute

$F((x, a) \triangleright (y, b)) = F(x \ast y, a \circ b) = (\alpha(x \ast y) \ast \beta(a \circ b), \gamma(a \circ b) \circ \delta(x \ast y)) =

= ((\alpha(x) \ast \alpha(y)) \ast (\beta(a) \ast \beta(b)), (\gamma(a) \circ \gamma(b)) \circ (\delta(x) \circ \delta(y)) =

= ((\alpha(x) \ast \beta(a)) \ast (\alpha(y) \circ \beta(b)), (\gamma(a) \circ \delta(x)) \circ (\gamma(b) \circ \delta(y)) = F(x, a) \triangleright F(y, b)$.

Proposition 5.1. Let $(Q, \ast)$ and $(K, \circ)$ be medial quandles. Let $\beta: K \rightarrow Q$, $\delta: Q \rightarrow K$ be quandle homomorphisms and let $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(Q)$, $\gamma \in \text{Aut}(K)$ be quandle automorphisms. Define a map $F: Q \times K \rightarrow Q \times K$ by $F(x, a) = (\alpha(x) \ast \beta(a), \gamma(a) \circ \delta(x))$ for every $(x, a) \in Q \times K$.

1. If $\beta$ is injective and $\delta(x) = k$ for every $x \in Q$, then $F \in \text{Aut}(Q \times K)$.
2. If $\delta$ is injective and $\beta(a) = q$ for every $a \in K$, then $F \in \text{Aut}(Q \times K)$.
3. If $\beta(a) = q$ for every $a \in K$ and $\delta(x) = k$ for every $x \in Q$, then $F \in \text{Aut}(Q \times K)$.

Proof. $F$ is a quandle homomorphism by Lemma 5.2, so it remains to show it is bijective.
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(1) Suppose that $F(x, a) = F(y, b)$ for some $(x, a), (y, b) \in Q \times K$. Then $\gamma(a) \circ k = \gamma(b) \circ k$ implies $a = b$, since $K$ is a quandle and $\gamma$ is injective. Furthermore, the equality $\alpha(x) \ast \beta(a) = \alpha(y) \ast \beta(b)$ implies that $x = y$, since $Q$ is a quandle and $\alpha$ is injective. We have shown that $F$ is injective.

To check surjectivity, choose an element $(y, b) \in Q \times K$. Since $\gamma$ is surjective, there exists an $a \in K$ such that $\gamma(a) = b \circ^{-1} k$ and thus $\gamma(a) \circ k = b$. Since $\alpha$ is surjective, there exists an $x \in Q$ such that $\alpha(x) = y \circ^{-1} \beta(a)$ and thus $\alpha(x) \ast \beta(a) = y$, so $F(x, a) = (y, b)$.

(2) A similar proof as in (1) settles the second case.

(3) If $F(x, a) = F(y, b)$ for some $(x, a), (y, b) \in Q \times K$, it follows that $\alpha(x) = \alpha(y)$ and $\gamma(a) = \gamma(b)$, therefore $(x, a) = (y, b)$. Since $\alpha$ and $\gamma$ are surjective and right multiplication by $q$ (respectively by $k$) is an automorphism of $Q$ (respectively of $K$), it follows that $F$ is surjective.

$\square$

5.2. Product biquandles. Having introduced the direct product of quandles, we are now ready to define product biquandles. We will need the following standard result.

**Lemma 5.3.** If $(Q, \ast)$ is a quandle, then $(Q, \ast^{-1})$ is also a quandle.

**Proof.** By the first quandle axiom we have $x \ast x = x$, which implies $x \ast^{-1} x = x$ for every $x \in Q$.

By the second quandle axiom, the map $S_b : Q \to Q$, given by $S_b(x) = x \ast y$, is a bijection for every $y \in Q$. Thus also its inverse $S_b^{-1}$ is a bijection and $S_b^{-1}(x) = x \ast^{-1} y$.

To check the third quandle axiom, choose any $x, y, z \in Q$ and denote $(x \ast^{-1} y) \ast^{-1} z = a, x \ast^{-1} z = b$ and $y \ast^{-1} z = c$. This implies $b \ast z = x, c \ast z = y$ and $x \ast^{-1} y = (b \ast z) \ast^{-1} (c \ast z) = a \ast z$, therefore $b \ast z = (a \ast z) \ast (c \ast z) = (a \ast c) \ast z$ and by the third quandle axiom it follows that $b = a \ast c$. We have shown that $(x \ast^{-1} y) \ast^{-1} z = a = b \ast^{-1} c = (x \ast^{-1} z) \ast^{-1} (y \ast^{-1} z)$. $\square$

For any quandles $(Q, \ast)$ and $(K, \circ)$, take their direct product $(Q \times K, \triangleright)$ and consider the family of maps $\{id_Q \times S_b^{-1} \mid b \in K\}$, where $S_b : K \to K$ is the inner automorphism, defined by $S_b(a) = a \circ b$.

**Proposition 5.2.** The family of maps $\{id_Q \times S_b^{-1} \mid b \in K\}$ is a biquandle structure on $(Q \times K, \triangleright)$.

**Proof.** Denote $\beta_{(z, b)} = id_Q \times S_b^{-1}$ for any $(z, b) \in Q \times K$. Since $K$ is a quandle, the map $\beta_{(z, b)}$ is a bijection of $Q \times K$. Choose any $(x, a), (y, c) \in Q \times K$ and denote
Then the identities \((x,a) \triangleright (y,c) = (x \cdot y, a \circ c \circ^{-1} b) = (x \cdot y, q)\) to compute
\[
\beta_{(z,b)}((x,a) \triangleright (y,c)) = (x \times y, a \circ c \circ^{-1} b) = (x \times y, q)
\]
\[
\beta_{(z,b)}(x,a) \triangleright \beta_{(z,b)}(y,c) = (x \times y, (a \circ^{-1} b) \circ (c \circ^{-1} b)) = (x \times y, m \circ n)
\]
\[
q \circ b = a \circ c = (m \circ b) \circ (n \circ b) = (m \circ n) \circ b \quad \Rightarrow \quad q = m \circ n,
\]
which implies that \(\beta_{(z,b)} \in \text{Aut}(Q \times K)\).

Since \(\beta_{(z,b)}(z,b) = (z,b)\) for any \((z,b) \in Q \times K\), the map \((z,b) \mapsto \beta_{(z,b)}(z,b)\) is clearly a bijection and condition (2) from Definition 3.1 is satisfied.

It remains to show that the family \(\{\beta_{(z,b)} | (z,b) \in Q \times K\}\) satisfies condition (1) from Definition 3.1. Choose any \((x,a), (y,b) \in Q \times K\) and compute
\[
\beta_{(y,b)}((x,a) \triangleright (y,b)) = \beta_{(y,b)}(x \times y, a \circ b) = (x \times y, a)
\]
\[
\beta_{(y,b)}(x,a) \triangleright \beta_{(y,b)}(y,b) = \beta_{(x \times y,a)}(z) = (z, (c \circ^{-1} b) \circ^{-1} a)
\]
\[
\beta_{(x,a)}(z, c) = (z, (c \circ^{-1} a) \circ^{-1} (b \circ^{-1} a)),
\]
so we need to show that \((c \circ^{-1} b) \circ^{-1} a = (c \circ^{-1} a) \circ^{-1} (b \circ^{-1} a)\). This follows from Lemma 5.3 since \((K, \circ)\) is a quandle.

By Theorem 3.1 the biquandle structure \(\{id_Q \times S_b^{-1} | b \in K\}\) defines a biquandle \((Q \times K, \ast, \triangleright, \triangleright^{-1})\), whose operations are given by
\[
(x,a) \ast (y,b) = (x \times y, a),
\]
\[
(x,a) \triangleright (y,b) = (x, a \circ^{-1} b).
\]
We will call this the product biquandle of quandles \((Q, \ast)\) and \((K, \circ)\). Observe that the product biquandle of two nontrivial quandles has a non-constant biquandle structure.

When is a given biquandle isomorphic to a product biquandle? We answer this question in order to characterize product biquandles.

**Theorem 5.3.** A biquandle \((B, \ast, \triangleright, \triangleright^{-1})\) is isomorphic to a product biquandle if and only if the following conditions are satisfied:

1. \((B, \ast)\) and \((B, \triangleright^{-1})\) are quandles,
2. there exist quandle homomorphisms \(p_1: (B, \ast) \to Q\) and \(p_2: (B, \triangleright^{-1}) \to K\) to some quandles \(Q\) and \(K\) such that \(p_1(x \triangleright^{-1} y) = p_1(x)\) and \(p_2(x \ast y) = p_2(x)\) for every \(x, y \in B\),
3. \(\forall x \in Q \forall y \in K \exists! b \in B\) such that \(p_1(b) = x\) and \(p_2(b) = y\).

**Proof.** \((\Rightarrow)\) Let \((B, \ast, \triangleright, \triangleright^{-1})\) be the product biquandle of quandles \((Q, \ast)\) and \((K, \circ)\). Then the identities \((x,a) \ast (y,b) = (x \times y, a)\) and \((x,a) \triangleright^{-1} (y,b) = (x, y \circ b)\) imply that \((B, \ast)\) and \((B, \triangleright^{-1})\) are both quandles. Define maps \(p_1: B \to Q\) and \(p_2: B \to K\) by \(p_1(x,a) = x\) and \(p_2(x,a) = a\). We have \(p_1((x,a) \ast (y,b)) = x \times y = p_1(x,a) \ast p_1(y,b),\)
\( p_1((x,a)^{\overline{1}}(y,b)) = p_1(x,a), \quad p_2((x,a)^{(y,b)}(y,b)) = p_2(x,a) \) and \( p_2((x,a)^{\overline{1}}(y,b)) = a \circ b = p_2(x,a) \circ p_2(y,b) \). Condition (3) obviously holds.

(\( \Leftarrow \)) Let \((B,\ast,\overline{\ast})\) be a biquandle that satisfies conditions (1), (2) and (3). Define a map \( \phi: B \to (Q \times K, \ast, \overline{\ast}) \) by \( \phi(x) = (p_1(x), p_2(x)) \). We use (2) to compute

\[
\phi(x \ast y) = (p_1(x) \ast p_1(y), p_2(x)) = (p_1(x), p_2(x))^\overline{\ast}(p_1(y), p_2(y)) = \phi(x)^\overline{\ast}\phi(y)
\]

and

\[
\phi(x \overline{\ast} y) = (p_1(x), p_2(x) \circ p_2(y)) = (p_1(x), p_2(x))^\overline{\ast}(p_1(y), p_2(y)) = \phi(x)^\overline{\ast}\phi(y),
\]

which shows that \( \phi \) is a biquandle homomorphism. It follows from (3) that \( \phi \) is bijective. \( \square \)

Our goal for the remainder of this Section is to describe the automorphism group of product biquandles.

Recall that a quandle \((Q, \ast)\) is called \textbf{connected} if for every \( x, y \in Q \), there exist some elements \( z_1, \ldots, z_n \in Q \) so that \( y = ((x \ast z_1) \ast z_2 \ast \ldots) \ast z_n \). For biquandles, we have an analogous definition:

**Definition 5.3.** In a biquandle \( X \), consider the equivalence relation \( \sim_c \), generated by \( x \sim_c x \overline{\ast} y \) and \( x \sim_c x \ast y \) for every \( x, y \in X \). The equivalence classes are called \textbf{connected components}, and the biquandle is called \textbf{connected} if there is only one class.

**Lemma 5.4.** If \((Q, \ast)\) and \((K, \circ)\) are connected quandles, then their product biquandle \( B = (Q \times K, \ast, \overline{\ast}) \) is connected.

**Proof.** Choose two elements \( (x,a), (y,b) \in B \). Since \( Q \) is connected, there exist elements \( z_1, \ldots, z_n \) so that \( y = ((x \ast z_1) \ast z_2 \ast \ldots) \ast z_n \) and since \( K \) is connected, there exist elements \( c_1, \ldots, c_m \) so that \( a = ((b \circ c_1) \circ c_2 \circ \ldots) \circ c_m \). It follows that

\[
(y, b) = ((x, a)^{\overline{1}}(z_1, a)^{\overline{1}} \ldots (z_n, a)^{\overline{1}}(x, c_1)^{\overline{1}} \ldots (x, c_1)^{\overline{1}},
\]

therefore \( (y, b) \) is in the same connected component as \( (x,a) \). \( \square \)

**Proposition 5.4.** Let \((Q, \ast)\) and \((K, \circ)\) be connected quandles, and denote by \( B = (Q \times K, \ast, \overline{\ast}) \) their product biquandle. Then

\[
\text{Aut}(B) \cong \text{Aut}(Q) \times \text{Aut}(K).
\]

**Proof.** Consider the map \( \phi: \text{Aut}(Q) \times \text{Aut}(K) \to \text{Aut}(B) \) that assigns to a pair of automorphisms \( f \in \text{Aut}(Q) \) and \( g \in \text{Aut}(K) \) the map of pairs \( f \times g: B \to B \). We have

\[
(f \times g)((x,a)^\ast(y,b)) = (f(x \ast y), g(a)) = (f(x), g(a))^\overline{\ast}(f(y), g(b)) = (f \times g)(x, a)^\ast(f \times g)(y, b),
\]

\[
(f \times g)((x,a)^\overline{\ast}(y,b)) = (f(x), g(a \circ^{-1} b)) = (f(x), g(a) \circ^{-1} g(b)) = (f(x), g(a))^\overline{\ast}(f \times g)(y, b),
\]

\[
(f \times g)(x,a)^\overline{\ast}(f(y), g(b)) = (f \times g)(x, a)^\overline{\ast}(f \times g)(y, b),
\]

\[
(f \times g)(x, a)^\overline{\ast}(f \times g)(y, b).
\]
therefore \((f \times g) \in Aut(B)\). It is easy to see that \(\phi\) is a group homomorphism and that \(\text{Ker}(\phi) = \{(id, id)\}\).

It remains to show that \(\phi\) is surjective. Let \(F \in Aut(B)\) be an automorphism of the product biquandle. Denote by \(p_1: Q \times K \to Q\) and \(p_2: Q \times K \to K\) the projection maps and let \(p_1 \circ F = F_1: B \to Q\) and \(p_2 \circ F = F_2: B \to K\). Since \(F\) is a biquandle automorphism, we have

\[
F((x, a) \text{#}(y, b)) = F(x \ast y, a) = F(x, a) \ast F(y, b) = (F_1(x, a) \ast F_1(y, b), F_2(x, a))
\]

\[
F((x, a) \text{#}(y, b)) = F(x, a \circ^{-1} b) = F(x, a) \circ F(y, b) = (F_1(x, a), F_2(x, a) \circ^{-1} F_2(y, b))
\]

which implies \(F_2(x \ast y, a) = F_2(x, a)\) and \(F_1(x, a \circ b) = F_1(x, a)\) for every \(x, y \in Q\) and \(a, b \in K\). Since \(K\) is connected, it follows that \(F_1(x, a) = F_1(x, b)\) for every \(x \in Q\) and every \(a, b \in K\), thus \(F_1\) is actually defined by a map \(f: Q \to Q\), where \(F_1(x, a) = f(x)\). Since \(Q\) is connected, it follows that \(F_2(x, a) = F_2(y, a)\) for every \(x, y \in Q\) and every \(a \in K\), thus \(F_2\) is defined by a map \(g: K \to K\), where \(F_2(x, a) = g(a)\). Moreover, the equalities

\[
f(x \ast y) = F_1(x \ast y, a) = F_1(x, a) \ast F_1(y, a) = f(x) \ast f(y)
\]

\[
g(a \circ b) = F_2(x, a \circ b) = F_2(x, a) \circ F_2(y, b) = g(a) \circ g(b)
\]

for every \(x, y \in Q\) and every \(a, b \in K\) imply that \(f\) and \(g\) are quandle homomorphisms. We have shown that \(F = f \times g\) and since \(F\) is bijective, it follows that both \(f\) and \(g\) are also bijective, therefore \(F \in \text{Im}(\phi)\).

What about the automorphisms of product biquandles that are not connected? First we make the following simple observations.

**Lemma 5.5.** Let \(X\) and \(Y\) be biquandles and let \(f: X \to Y\) be a biquandle homomorphism. If \(x_1\) and \(x_2\) are in the same connected component of \(X\), then \(f(x_1)\) and \(f(x_2)\) are in the same connected component of \(Y\).

**Proof.** The equivalence relation \(\sim_e\) on \(X\) is generated by the equivalences \(a \sim_e a \text{#} b\) (type 1) and \(a \sim_e a \text{#} b\) (type 2) for every \(a, b \in X\). If \(x_1 \sim_e x_2\) in \(X\), this means that \(x_1\) and \(x_2\) are connected by a sequence of equivalences of type 1 and 2, and since \(f\) is a biquandle homomorphism, \(f(x_1)\) and \(f(x_2)\) are also connected by the same sequence of equivalences in \(Y\). Thus \(f(x_1)\) and \(f(x_2)\) are in the same connected component of \(Y\). \(\square\)

**Lemma 5.6.** Let \(Q\) be a quandle and let \(f \in \text{Aut}(Q)\) be a quandle automorphism. If \(x, y \in Q\) are in the same component of \(Q\), then \(f(x)\) and \(f(y)\) are in the same component of \(Q\).

**Proof.** If \(x, y\) are in the same component of \(Q\), then \(y = ((x \ast z_1) \ast z_2 \ast \ldots) \ast z_n\) for some elements \(z_1, \ldots, z_n \in Q\), which implies \(f(y) = ((f(x) \ast f(z_1)) \ast f(z_2) \ast \ldots) \ast f(z_n)\). \(\square\)
Let us briefly analyze the automorphism group of a non-connected quandle. Suppose \((Q, \ast)\) is a quandle with components \(Q_1, \ldots, Q_k\). By Lemma 5.6, the restriction of every automorphism \(f \in Aut(Q)\) to the component \(Q_i\) has \(Im(f|_{Q_i}) \subseteq Q_j\) for some \(j\). Since \(f\) is a bijection, there exists a permutation \(\rho \in S_k\) such that \(Im(f|_{Q_i}) = Q_{\rho(i)}\) for \(i = 1, \ldots, k\). The automorphism \(f\) may thus be written as

\[ f = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{k} f_i : Q_1 \sqcup \ldots \sqcup Q_k \to Q_{\rho(i)} \sqcup \ldots \sqcup Q_{\rho(k)}, \]

where \(f_i : Q_i \to Q_{\rho(i)}\) is a quandle isomorphism.

**Theorem 5.5.** Let \((Q, \ast)\) and \((K, \circ)\) be quandles. Denote by \(Q_1, \ldots, Q_k\) the components of \(Q\) and by \(K_1, \ldots, K_m\) the components of \(K\). A map \(F : Q \times K \to Q \times K\) is an automorphism of the product biquandle \(B = (Q \times K, \ast, \circ)\) if and only if

1. there exist maps \(f_1, \ldots, f_m : Q \to Q\) and \(g_1, \ldots, g_k : K \to K\) such that \(f_i|_{Q_i}\) and \(g_j|_{K_j}\) is a bijection for \(i = 1, \ldots, m\) and \(j = 1, \ldots, k\),
2. the equalities \(f_i(x) \ast f_r(y) = f_i(x \ast y)\) and \(g_j(a) \circ g_l(b) = g_j(a \circ b)\) hold for every \(i, r \in \{1, \ldots, m\}\) and every \(j, l \in \{1, \ldots, k\}\),
3. there exists a bijection \(\rho : (1, \ldots, k) \times (1, \ldots, m) \to (1, \ldots, k) \times (1, \ldots, m)\) such that \(f_i(Q_j) \sim g_j(K_i) = Q_{\rho(j,i)} \times K_{\rho(j,i)}\) for every \((i, j) \in (1, \ldots, k) \times (1, \ldots, m)\),

such that \(F(x,a) = (f_i(x), g_j(a))\) for every \((x,a) \in Q \times K_i\).

**Proof.** (\(\Rightarrow\)) Suppose \(F : Q \times K \to Q \times K\) is an automorphism of the product biquandle. Denote \(F_1 = p_1 \circ F\) and \(F_2 = p_2 \circ F\), where \(p_1, p_2\) are projections to the respective factors of \(Q \times K\). Since \(F\) is a biquandle automorphism, we have

\[ F((x,a) \ast (y,b)) = F(x \ast y,a) = F(x,a) \ast F(y,b) = (F_1(x,a) \ast F_1(y,b), F_2(x,a)) \]

\[ F((x,a) \circ (y,b)) = F(x,a \circ^{-1} b) = F(x,a) \circ F(y,b) = (F_1(x,a), F_2(x,a) \circ^{-1} F_2(y,b)), \]

which implies \(F_2(x \ast y,a) = F_2(x,a)\) and \(F_1(x,a \circ b) = F_1(x,a)\) for every \(x, y \in Q\) and \(a, b \in K\). It follows that \(F_i|_{Q \times K_i}(x,a) = f_i(x)\) for some map \(f_i : Q \to Q\) and \(F_2|_{Q \times K}(x,a) = g_j(a)\) for some map \(g_j : K \to K\). It also follows from the above equalities that

\[ f_i(x) \ast f_r(y) = F_1(x,a) \ast F_1(y,b) = F_1(x \ast y,a) = f_i(x \ast y) \]

\[ g_j(a) \circ g_l(b) = F_2(x,a) \circ F_2(y,b) = F_2(x,a \circ b) = g_j(a \circ b) \]

for \(i, r \in \{1, \ldots, m\}\) and \(j, l \in \{1, \ldots, k\}\). We have \(F_i|_{Q \times K_i} = f_i \times g_j\).

By Lemma 5.4, the sets \(Q_j \times K_i\) are connected components of the product biquandle \(B\) and by Lemma 5.5 we have \(Im(F_i|_{Q_j \times K_i}) \subseteq Q_k \times K_l\) for some \(k\) and \(l\). Since \(F\) is an isomorphism, there exists a bijection \(\rho : (1, \ldots, k) \times (1, \ldots, m) \to (1, \ldots, k) \times (1, \ldots, m)\) such that \(F(Q_j \times K_i) = f_i(Q_j) \times g_j(K_i) = Q_{\rho(j,i)} \times K_{\rho(j,i)}\) for \(j = 1, \ldots, k\) and \(i = 1, \ldots, m\).
Since $F$ is injective, also $F|_{Q_j \times K_i} = (f_i \times g_j)|_{Q_j \times K_i}$ is injective. Since $F$ is surjective, it follows from Lemma 5.5 that also $(f_i \times g_j)|_{Q_j \times K_i}$ is surjective. Therefore both $f_i|_{Q_j}$ and $g_j|_{K_i}$ are bijections for $j = 1, \ldots, k$ and $i = 1, \ldots, m$.

$(\Leftrightarrow)$ Suppose that $f_1, \ldots, f_m: Q \to Q$ and $g_1, \ldots, g_k: K \to K$ are maps that satisfy conditions (1), (2) and (3) of the Theorem. Define a map $F: Q \times K \to Q \times K$ by $F(x, a) = (f_i(x), g_j(a))$ for $(x, a) \in Q_j \times K_i$. Choose two elements $(x, a) \in Q_j \times K_i$ and $(y, b) \in Q_l \times K_r$, and compute

$$F((x, a) \circlearrowleft (y, b)) = F(x * y, a) = (f_i(x * y), g_j(a)) = (f_i(x) * f_r(y), g_j(a)) =$$

$$= (f_i(x), g_j(a)) * (f_r(y), g_l(b)) = F(x, a) * F(y, b)$$

which shows that $F$ is a biquandle homomorphism of the product biquandle $B$. It follows from (3) that if $(i, j) \neq (k, l)$, then $\text{Im}(F|_{Q_j \times K_i}) \cap \text{Im}(F|_{Q_k \times K_l}) = \emptyset$ and since $F|_{Q_j \times K_i}$ is injective, then $F$ is injective. Since $F|_{Q_j \times K_i}$ is surjective for every $(i, j) \in \{1, \ldots, k\} \times \{1, \ldots, m\}$, it follows from (3) that $F$ is surjective. We have thus shown that $F \in \text{Aut}(B)$. □

Conditions (1) - (3) of Theorem 5.5 imply that $f_i \in \text{Aut}(Q)$ and $g_j \in \text{Aut}(K)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m$ and $j = 1, \ldots, k$. Every automorphism of a product biquandle $B = (Q \times K, \circlearrowleft, \circlearrowright)$ is thus given by

$$F = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{k} \bigoplus_{j=1}^{m} (f_i \times g_j): \sqcup (Q_j \times K_i) \to \sqcup (Q_j \times K_i),$$

where $(f_1, \ldots, f_m)$ and $(g_1, \ldots, g_k)$ are tuples of quandle automorphisms of $Q$ and $K$ that are connected by conditions (2) and (3) of Theorem 5.5.
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