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Abstract
Joyce showed that for a classical knot \( K \), the order of the involutory medial quandle is \( |\det K| \). Generalizing Joyce’s result, we show that for a classical link \( L \) of \( \mu \geq 1 \) components, the order of the involutory medial quandle is \( \mu |\det L|/2^{\mu-1} \). In particular, \( IMQ(L) \) is infinite if and only if \( \det L = 0 \). Moreover \( IMQ(L) \) is equivalent (as an invariant) to several other link invariants. For instance, if \( L_1 \) and \( L_2 \) are classical links then there is an isomorphism between \( IMQ(L_1) \) and \( IMQ(L_2) \) if and only if there is an isomorphism between the first homology groups of the cyclic double covers of \( S^3 \) branched over \( L_1 \) and \( L_2 \).
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1 Introduction

Let \( \mu \) be a positive integer, and let \( L = K_1 \cup \cdots \cup K_\mu \) be a classical link of \( \mu \) components. That is, \( K_1, \ldots, K_\mu \) are pairwise disjoint, piecewise smooth knots (closed curves) in \( S^3 \). Almost forty years ago, Joyce [8] and Matveev [10] introduced a powerful invariant of oriented links, the fundamental quandle \( Q(L) \). Both the theory of link quandles and the general theory of quandles have seen considerable development since then.

In this paper we focus on a simplified version of \( Q(L) \), the involutory medial quandle \( IMQ(L) \). It is an invariant of unoriented links. Joyce [8] proved the following result about involutory medial quandles of knots. (Joyce used the term “abelian” rather than “medial,” and he denoted the quandle \( AbQ_2(L) \) rather than \( IMQ(L) \).)

**Theorem 1.** (Joyce [8, Sec. 18]) For a classical knot \( K \), \( IMQ(K) \) is isomorphic to the core quandle of the first homology group of the cyclic double cover of \( S^3 \), branched over \( K \). It follows that \( |IMQ(K)| = |\det K| \).
In order to keep the introduction brief, we do not state the definitions of well-known objects (determinants, double covers, involutory medial quandles, etc.). An exception is the following.

**Definition 2.** If $A$ is an abelian group, then $\text{Core}(A)$ is the quandle on the set $A$ given by the operation $a \triangleright b = 2b - a$.

Our purpose is to extend Theorem 1 to include classical links of more than one component. A complication is that in general, $\text{IMQ}(L)$ is not the core quandle of any abelian group. Instead, $\text{IMQ}(L)$ is a particular kind of subquandle of a core quandle.

**Definition 3.** Suppose

$$A = \mathbb{Z}^r \oplus \mathbb{Z}_{2^{n_1}} \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{Z}_{2^{n_k}} \oplus B,$$

where $k,r \geq 0$, $n_1,\ldots,n_k \geq 1$, $\mathbb{Z}^r$ is a free abelian group of rank $r$, and $|B|$ is odd. (If $r = 0, k = 0$ or $|B| = 1$ then the corresponding direct summands need not appear.) We think of elements of $A$ as $(r+k+1)$-tuples, with the first $r$ coordinates coming from $\mathbb{Z}$ and the last coordinate coming from $B$. The characteristic subquandle of $\text{Core}(A)$ is

$$\text{Core}'(A) = \{(x_1,\ldots,x_{r+k+1}) \in A \mid \text{at most one of } x_1,\ldots,x_{r+k} \text{ is odd}\},$$

considered as a quandle using the operation $\triangleright$ of $\text{Core}(A)$.

Notice that $\text{Core}'(A) = \text{Core}(A)$ if $r+k = 0$ or $1$, and $\text{Core}'(A)$ is a proper subset of $\text{Core}(A)$ if $r+k > 1$.

Every finitely generated abelian group $A$ is isomorphic to a direct sum like the one in Definition 3. The factors of the direct sum are uniquely determined, but the isomorphism is not. (For instance, if $A \cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2$ then there are three distinct direct sum decompositions of $A$, one for each basis of $A$ as a vector space over the two-element field $GF(2)$.) In general, then, $\text{Core}(A)$ has several different characteristic subquandles, all isomorphic to each other. We use the notation $\text{Core}'(A)$ with the understanding that the characteristic subquandle is defined only up to automorphisms of $A$.

In Sec. 3 we show that $\text{Core}'(A)$ is a classifying invariant:

**Proposition 4.** Let $A_1$ and $A_2$ be finitely generated abelian groups. Then $A_1 \cong A_2$ if and only if $\text{Core}'(A_1) \cong \text{Core}'(A_2)$.

We are now ready to state our main result, which is the following generalization of Theorem 1.

**Theorem 5.** If $L$ is a classical link of $\mu$ components, then $\text{IMQ}(L)$ is isomorphic to the characteristic subquandle of the core quandle of the first homology group of the cyclic double cover of $S^3$, branched over $L$. It follows that

$$|\text{IMQ}(L)| = \frac{\mu |\det L|}{2^{\mu-1}}$$

if $\det L \neq 0$, and $\text{IMQ}(L)$ is infinite if $\det L = 0$. 
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Proposition 4 and Theorem 5 imply the following.

**Corollary 6.** Let $L_1$ and $L_2$ be classical links. Then $IMQ(L_1) \cong IMQ(L_2)$ if and only if the first homology groups of the cyclic double covers of $S^3$, branched over $L_1$ and $L_2$, are isomorphic.

The next two corollaries follow from Corollary 6 and results of [12]. We refer to [12] for definitions.

**Corollary 7.** Let $L_1$ and $L_2$ be classical links. If any of the following conditions hold, then all of them hold.

1. $IMQ(L_1) \cong IMQ(L_2)$.
2. For every abelian group $A$, the group of Dehn (or Fox) colorings of $L_1$ with values in $A$ is isomorphic to the group of Dehn (or Fox) colorings of $L_2$ with values in $A$.
3. The invariant factors of an adjusted Goeritz matrix of $L_1$ are the same as the invariant factors of an adjusted Goeritz matrix of $L_2$, except that one of the matrices may have extra invariant factors equal to 1.

**Corollary 8.** Suppose $0 = \phi_0, \phi_1, \ldots, \phi_{n-1}$ are the invariant factors of an adjusted Goeritz matrix of $L$. Then there is a connected sum of torus links

$$T = T_{(2, \phi_1)} \# \cdots \# T_{(2, \phi_{n-1})}$$

such that $IMQ(L) \cong IMQ(T)$.

Here is an outline of the paper. In Sec. 2 we discuss the elementary theory of semiregular involutory medial quandles, which is a small part of the work of Jedlička, Pilitowska, Stanovský and Zamojska-Dzienio on general medial quandles [6, 7]. Proposition 4 is proven in Sec. 3. In Sec. 4 we recall the definition of $IMQ(L)$, and verify that it is semiregular. In Sec. 5 we recall some machinery associated with Alexander matrices, Alexander modules, and branched double covers. In Sec. 6 we observe that the Alexander module of a link $L$ yields an involutory medial quandle, which we denote $IMQ'(L)$. We show that $IMQ'(L)$ is isomorphic to the characteristic subquandle of the core quandle of the first homology group of the branched double cover. The proof of Theorem 5 is completed in Sec. 7, where we show that every classical link has $IMQ(L) \cong IMQ'(L)$. Corollaries 6, 7 and 8 are discussed briefly in Sec. 8. In Sec. 9 we discuss an example, the Borromean rings.

Before proceeding, we should mention that this paper is self-contained and does not presume familiarity with the previous paper [13]. The reader familiar with that work will see the connection, though; several ideas of the present paper are images of ideas from [13] under forgetful functors that ignore algebraic properties associated with link orientations. For instance, $IMQ'(L)$ is the image of the multivariate Alexander quandle $Q_A(L)$ of [13] under a simplifying tensor product, as discussed in Secs. 5 and 6.
2 Semiregular involutory medial quandles

In this section we give a brief account of some theory regarding involutory medial quandles. The results are extracted from the more general discussion of medial quandles given by Jedlička, Pilitowska, Stanovský and Zamojska-Dzienio [6,7]. The notation and terminology in these papers are different from those of many knot-theoretic references, like [3] or [8]; for instance the roles of the first and second variables in the quandle operation are reversed. So although the mathematical content of this section is all taken from [6] and [7], notation and terminology have been modified for the convenience of readers familiar with the conventions of the knot-theoretic literature.

Definition 9. An involutory medial quandle is a set $Q$ equipped with a binary operation $\triangleright$, which satisfies the following properties.

1. $x \triangleright x = x \quad \forall x \in Q$.
2. $(x \triangleright y) \triangleright y = x \quad \forall x, y \in Q$.
3. $(x \triangleright y) \triangleright z = (x \triangleright z) \triangleright (y \triangleright z) \quad \forall x, y, z \in Q$.
4. $(w \triangleright x) \triangleright (y \triangleright z) = (w \triangleright y) \triangleright (x \triangleright z) \quad \forall w, x, y, z \in Q$.

All the quandles we consider in this paper satisfy Definition 9, but we should mention that for general quandles the medial property (property 4 of Definition 9) is removed, and the involutory property (property 2 of Definition 9) is replaced by the weaker requirement that for each $y \in Q$, the map $\beta_y$ given by $\beta_y(x) = x \triangleright y$ is a permutation of $Q$.

Let $Q$ be an involutory medial quandle. An automorphism of $Q$ is a bijection $f : Q \rightarrow Q$ with $f(x \triangleright y) = f(x) \triangleright f(y) \quad \forall x, y \in Q$. A group structure on the set $\mathrm{Aut}(Q)$ of automorphisms of $Q$ is defined by function composition. If $y \in Q$ then the translation of $Q$ corresponding to $y$ is the function $\beta_y : Q \rightarrow Q$ given by $\beta_y(x) = x \triangleright y$. Property 3 of Definition 9 implies that $\beta_y$ is an automorphism of $Q$.

Proposition 10. If $Q$ is an involutory medial quandle then $\mathrm{Dis}(Q)$ is an abelian group.

Proof. We claim that $\beta_y \beta_z = \beta_z \beta_y \beta_z \forall y, z \in Q$. To verify the claim, notice that if $x, y, z \in Q$, then

$\beta_y \beta_z(x) = x \triangleright (y \triangleright z) = ((x \triangleright z) \triangleright y) \triangleright (y \triangleright z) = ((x \triangleright z) \triangleright (y \triangleright z)) \triangleright z = \beta_z \beta_y \beta_z(x)$. 
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Now, suppose $x, y, z \in Q$. Property 4 of Definition 9 tells us that $\beta_{yz} \beta_x = \beta_{xy} \beta_x$. It follows from the claim above that $\beta_z \beta_y \beta_x = \beta_z \beta_x \beta_y$. As $\beta_x^2$ is the identity map, we deduce that

$$\beta_y \beta_z \beta_x = \beta_z \beta_y \beta_x = \beta_z \beta_x \beta_y = \beta_x \beta_z \beta_y.$$ 

If $a, b, c, d \in Q$ then using the above formula twice, we have

$$\begin{align*}
(\beta_a \beta_b)(\beta_c \beta_d) &= \beta_a(\beta_b \beta_c \beta_d) = \beta_a(\beta_d \beta_c \beta_b) \\
&= (\beta_a \beta_d \beta_c \beta_a)(\beta_b) = (\beta_c \beta_d)(\beta_a \beta_b).
\end{align*}$$

That is, the elementary displacements $\beta_a \beta_b$ and $\beta_c \beta_d$ commute. \hfill \Box

**Definition 13.** Let $Q$ be an involutory medial quandle. An orbit in $Q$ is an equivalence class under the equivalence relation generated by $x \sim x \forall x, y \in Q$.

**Proposition 12.** If $x \in Q$ then the orbit of $x$ in $Q$ is \{d(x) | d \in Dis(Q)\}.

**Proof.** A displacement is a composition of translations, so the orbit of $x$ includes $d(x)$ for every displacement $d$.

Now, suppose $y$ is an element of the orbit of $x$. Then there are elements $y_1, \ldots, y_n \in Q$ such that $y = \beta_{y_1} \cdots \beta_{y_1}(x)$. If $n$ is even, then $\beta_{y_1} \cdots \beta_{y_1} = (\beta_{y_1} \beta_{y_1-1}) \cdots (\beta_{y_1-2} \beta_{y_1})$ is a displacement. If $n$ is odd, then $y = \beta_{y_1} \cdots \beta_{y_1}(x)$ and $\beta_{y_1} \cdots \beta_{y_1} = (\beta_{y_1} \beta_{y_1-1}) \cdots (\beta_{y_1-2} \beta_{y_1})(\beta_{y_1} \beta_{y_1})$ is a displacement. \hfill \Box

**Definition 13.** An involutory medial quandle is semiregular if the identity map is the only displacement with a fixed point.

If $A$ is an abelian group, the subgroup \{a \in A | 2a = 0\} is denoted $A(2)$.

**Proposition 14.** Let $A$ be an abelian group. Then $Core(A)$ is involutory, medial and semiregular. Moreover, $Dis(Core(A)) \cong A/A(2)$.

**Proof.** It is easy to see that core quandles satisfy Definition 9.

To verify semiregularity, suppose $d \in Dis(Core(A))$. Then $d = \beta_{a_1} \cdots \beta_{a_n}$ for some elements $a_1, \ldots, a_{2n} \in A$, so $d(a) = 2a_1 - 2a_2 - \cdots - 2a_{2n} + a \forall a \in A$. If $d(a) = a$ for one $a \in A$, it must be that $2a_1 - 2a_2 - \cdots - 2a_{2n} = 0$, and hence $d(a) = a$ for every $a \in A$.

Let $f : A \rightarrow Dis(Core(A))$ be the function with $f(a) = \beta_a \beta_0 \forall a \in A$. Then $f(a)(x) = 2a - (2 \cdot 0 - x) = 2a + x \forall a, x \in A$. As

$$f(a_1 + a_2)(x) = 2(a_1 + a_2) + x = 2a_1 + (2a_2 + x) = f(a_1)(f(a_2)(x)),$$

$f$ is a homomorphism. It is obvious that $\ker f = A(2)$. If $a_1, a_2 \in A$ then the elementary displacement $\beta_{a_1} \beta_{a_2}$ is given by $\beta_{a_1} \beta_{a_2}(x) = 2a_1 - (2a_2 - x) = 2(a_1 - a_2) + x$, so $\beta_{a_1} \beta_{a_2} = f(a_1 - a_2)$. The elementary displacements $\beta_{a_1} \beta_{a_2}$ generate $Dis(Core(A))$, so it follows that $f$ is surjective. \hfill \Box

**Proposition 15.** If $Q$ is a semiregular involutory medial quandle then every orbit in $Q$ is isomorphic, as a quandle, to $Core(Dis(Q))$. 
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Proof. Let $x \in Q$. Observe that if $d = \beta_y \beta_z$ is an elementary displacement, then as $Dis(Q)$ is commutative,
\[
\beta_x d \beta_x = (\beta_x \beta_y)(\beta_x \beta_z) = (\beta_z \beta_x)(\beta_x \beta_y) = \beta_z \beta_y = \beta_y^{-1} = d^{-1}.
\]
The elementary displacements generate $Dis(Q)$, so it follows that $\beta_x d \beta_x = d^{-1}$ \forall $d \in Dis(Q)$.

Together, Proposition 12 and Definition 13 imply that $d \mapsto d(x)$ maps $Dis(Q)$ bijectively onto the orbit of $x$ in $Q$. We denote this bijection $|_x$.

Suppose $c, d \in Dis(Q)$. As $d$ is a quandle automorphism of $Q$,
\[
d(d^{-1} c(x) \triangleright x)) = dd^{-1} c(x) \triangleright d(x) = c(x) \triangleright d(x)
\]
and hence
\[
c(x) \triangleright d(x) = d(d^{-1} c(x) \triangleright x)) = d\beta_x d^{-1} c(x) = (d(\beta_x d^{-1} \beta_z))(\beta_x c \beta_z)(x).
\]
According to the observation of the first paragraph, it follows that
\[
c(x) \triangleright d(x) = (d) (d^{-1}(c^{-1}))(x),
\]
or if we temporarily use additive notation for the operation of $Dis(Q)$,
\[
(c|_x) \triangleright (d|_x) = (2d - c)|_x.
\]
That is, the bijection $|_x$ is a quandle isomorphism mapping $Core(Dis(Q))$ onto the orbit of $x$ in $Q$.

Corollary 16. Suppose $Q_1$ and $Q_2$ are semiregular, involutory medial quandles, and $f : Q_1 \to Q_2$ is a surjective quandle map. Then $f$ induces an epimorphism $Dis(f) : Dis(Q_1) \to Dis(Q_2)$ of abelian groups, and $f$ is an isomorphism if and only if both of these statements hold: (a) $Dis(f)$ is an isomorphism. (b) If $x$ and $y$ belong to different orbits in $Q_1$, then $f(x) \neq f(y)$.

Proof. The epimorphism $Dis(f)$ is given by
\[
Dis(f)(\beta_{q_1} \cdots \beta_{q_{2n}}) = \beta_{f(q_1)} \cdots \beta_{f(q_{2n})} \ \forall q_1, \ldots, q_{2n} \in Q_1.
\]

If $f$ is an isomorphism, then it is clear that (a) and (b) hold. For the converse, suppose (a) and (b) hold, $x \neq y \in Q_1$ and $f(x) = f(y)$. Then (b) tells us that $y$ belongs to the orbit of $x$ in $Q_1$. According to Proposition 12, it follows that there is a displacement $d \in Dis(Q_1)$ with $d(x) = y$. Then $Dis(f)(d)(f(x)) = f(y)$, so $f(x) = f(y)$ is a fixed point of $Dis(f)(d)$. As $Q_2$ is semiregular, it follows that $Dis(f)(d)$ is the identity map of $Q_2$. Hence $d \in \ker Dis(f)$, violating (a).

Before proceeding we should mention that the theory developed by Jedlička, Pilitowska, Stanovský and Zamojska-Dzienio is more general and more powerful than we have indicated; they provide a complete structure theory of medial quandles. In particular, describes a construction called a canonical semiregular extension, which provides an isomorphic replica of a semiregular medial quandle, built from its displacement group. We do not include an account of this construction because for links, there is an equivalent construction that builds an isomorphic replica of $IMQ(L)$ within a simplified version of a well-known invariant, the Alexander module. See Sec. 6 for details.
3 Characteristic subquandles

Suppose $A$ is a finitely generated abelian group. Up to isomorphism, we may assume that

$$A = \mathbb{Z}^r \oplus \mathbb{Z}_{2^{n_1}} \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{Z}_{2^{n_k}} \oplus \mathbb{Z}_{m_1} \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{Z}_{m_\ell},$$

where $r, k, \ell \geq 0$, if $k \geq 1$ then $n_1, \ldots, n_k \geq 1$, and if $\ell \geq 1$ then $m_1, \ldots, m_\ell$ are odd. For convenience, let $Q = \text{Core}'(A)$ for the rest of this section. According to Definition 3, there is a function $j : Q \to \{0, \ldots, r + k\}$ defined as follows. If $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_{r+k+\ell}) \in Q$, $1 \leq j \leq r + k$ and $x_j$ is odd, then $j(x) = j$. If $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_{r+k+\ell}) \in Q$ and $x_1, \ldots, x_{r+k}$ are all even, then $j(x) = 0$.

Let $\mathbb{Z}^Q$ be the free abelian group on the set $Q$ and let $f : \mathbb{Z}^Q \to A$ be the homomorphism that sends each generator $x \in Q$ to itself, considered as an element of $A$. Let $g : Q \to \mathbb{Z}^Q$ be the function that sends each $x \in Q$ to itself, considered as a generator of $\mathbb{Z}^Q$. Also, for $1 \leq j \leq r + k + \ell$ let $1_j$ be the element $(0, \ldots, 0, 1, 0, \ldots, 0) \in Q$, with the 1 in the $j$th coordinate. These elements generate $A$, so $f$ is surjective.

Lemma 17. Let $K$ be the subgroup of $\mathbb{Z}^Q$ generated by

$$\{g(2y) - g(x) - g(x \triangleright y) \mid x, y \in Q\}.$$

Then $g(mx) - mg(x) \in K \forall x \in Q \forall m \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Proof. The lemma holds trivially when $m = 1$, and it holds when $m = 2$ because $x \triangleright x = x$ and $g(2x) - g(x) - g(x \triangleright x) \in K$. The lemma holds when $m = 0$ because $g(2 \cdot 0) - g(0) - g(0 \triangleright 0) = g(0) - g(0) - g(0) = -g(0) \in K$, so $g(0) = g(1 \cdot 0) = g(0) \in K$. The lemma holds when $m = -1$ because $g(0) - g(x) - g(x \triangleright 0) = g(0) = g(x) - g(-x) \in K$, and $g(0) \in K$, so $g(-x) + g(x) \in K$.

Now, suppose $m \geq 2$, $x \in Q$ and $g(py) - pg(y) \in K \forall p \in \{-1, \ldots, m\} \forall y \in Q$. Then $K$ contains $g(2x) - 2g(x)$ and $g((m - 1)x) - (m - 1)g(x)$. Also, $K$ contains $g((m - 1)x) + g((1 - m)x)$, because $y = (m - 1)x \in Q$ and $g(y) + g(-y) = g((m - 1)x) + g((1 - m)x)$. As $K$ contains

$$g(2x) - g((1 - m)x) - g(((1 - m)x) \triangleright x) = g(2x) - g((1 - m)x) - g((m + 1)x),$$

it follows that $K$ contains

$$2g(x) + (m - 1)g(x) - g((m + 1)x) = (m + 1)g(x) - g((m + 1)x).$$

If $m \leq -2$ and $x \in Q$ then $-x \in Q$ too, so $K$ contains $g(|m|(-x)) - |m|g(-x) = g(mx) + mg(-x)$. As $K$ contains $g(-x) + g(x)$, it follows that $K$ contains $g(mx) + m \cdot (-g(x)) = g(mx) - mg(x)$.

Lemma 18. For every $z \in \mathbb{Z}^Q$, there are integers $z_1, \ldots, z_{r+k+\ell}$ such that

$$z - \sum_{j=1}^{r+k+\ell} z_j \cdot g(1_j) \in K.$$
Proof. Consider an element $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_{r+k+\ell}) \in Q$, with $x_1, \ldots, x_r \leq 0$. Notice that if $1 \leq j \leq r + k + \ell$ then $(-x) \cdot 1_j = 2 \cdot 1_j + x$, so $K$ contains $g(2 \cdot 1_j) - g(\frac{x}{2}) - g(2 \cdot 1_j + x)$. According to Lemma 17, $K$ also contains $g(2 \cdot 1_j) - 2 \cdot g(1_j)$ and $g(\frac{x}{2}) + g(x)$, so

$$g(x) - g(\frac{x}{2}) + 2 \cdot g(1_j) \in K. \quad (1)$$

Suppose $j \neq j(k) \in \{1, \ldots, r + k + \ell\}$. If $j > r + k$ then $m_{j-k}$ is odd, so multiplication by 2 defines an automorphism of $\mathbb{Z}_{m_{j-k}}$; hence there is a non-negative integer $y_j$ with $2y_j = -x_j$ in $\mathbb{Z}_{m_{j-k}}$. If $r < j \leq r + k$ then $x_j$ is even, so there is a non-negative integer $y_j$ with $2y_j = -x_j$ in $\mathbb{Z}_{2^r}$. If $j \leq r$ there is a non-negative integer $y_j$ with $2y_j = -x_j$ in $\mathbb{Z}$. Applying formula $[1]$ $y_j$ times with respect to each such $j$, we deduce that $K$ contains the element

$$x' = g(x) - g\left(x - \sum_{j=1 \atop j \neq j(x)}^{r+k+\ell} x_j \cdot 1_j\right) - \sum_{j=1 \atop j \neq j(x)}^{r+k+\ell} x_j \cdot g(1_j).$$

If $j(x) = 0$, then it follows that

$$g(x) - g(0) - \sum_{j=1}^{r+k+\ell} x_j \cdot g(1_j) \in K.$$ 

As $g(0) \in K$, we deduce that

$$g(x) - \sum_{j=1}^{r+k+\ell} x_j \cdot g(1_j) \in K.$$ 

If $j(x) > r$ then $x_j(x)$ is odd, and there is a positive integer $y_j(x)$ with $2y_j(x) = 1 - x_j(x)$ in $\mathbb{Z}_{2^r(x)}$. We apply the formula $[1]$ to $x'y_j(x)$ times, using $j = j(x)$. We deduce that $K$ contains

$$g(x) - g\left(x - \sum_{j=1 \atop j \neq j(x)}^{r+k+\ell} x_j \cdot 1_j + (1-x_j(x)) \cdot 1_j(x)\right) + (1-x_j(x)) \cdot g(1_j(x)) - \sum_{j=1 \atop j \neq j(x)}^{r+k+\ell} x_j \cdot g(1_j)$$

$$= g(x) - g(1_j(x)) + g(1_j(x)) - \sum_{j=1 \atop j \neq j(x)}^{r+k+\ell} x_j \cdot g(1_j) = g(x) - \sum_{j=1}^{r+k+\ell} x_j \cdot g(1_j).$$

If $1 \leq j(x) \leq r$ then $x_j(x)$ is odd and negative, so there is a positive integer $y_j(x)$ with $2y_j(x) = 1 - x_j(x)$ in $\mathbb{Z}$. We apply $[1]$ to $x'y_j(x)$ times, using $j = j(x)$. We deduce that $K$ contains

$$g(x) - g\left(x - \sum_{j=1 \atop j \neq j(x)}^{r+k+\ell} x_j \cdot 1_j + (1-x_j(x)) \cdot 1_j(x)\right) + (1-x_j(x)) \cdot g(1_j(x)) - \sum_{j=1 \atop j \neq j(x)}^{r+k+\ell} x_j \cdot g(1_j)$$
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for some integers $z$.

It follows that $K$.

Proof. Let $y$ be the element with $y_j = x_j$ for $j \neq j_0$ and $y_{j_0} = -x_{j_0}$. According to the formula (1), for $i \geq 0$

$$g(y + 2i \cdot 1_{j_0}) - g(y + 2(i + 1) \cdot 1_{j_0}) + 2 \cdot g(1_{j_0}) \in K.$$

It follows that $K$ contains

$$g(y) - \sum_{j=1}^{r+k+\ell} y_j \cdot g(1_j) - \left(g(y) - g(x) + 2x_{j_0} \cdot 1_{j_0}\right) = g(x) - \sum_{j=1}^{r+k+\ell} x_j \cdot g(1_j).$$

Using induction on the number of positive coordinates $x_j$ with $j \leq k$, we conclude that the lemma holds for $z = g(x)$ whenever $x \in Q$.

If $z$ is an arbitrary element of $\mathbb{Z}^Q$, then $z$ is equal to a linear combination over $\mathbb{Z}$ of the various elements $g(x)$ with $x \in Q$. Applying the lemma to each $g(x)$ and collecting terms, we conclude that $K$ contains the difference between $z$ and a linear combination over $\mathbb{Z}$ of $g(1_1), \ldots, g(1_{r+k+\ell})$.

Proposition 19. The kernel of the epimorphism $f : \mathbb{Z}^Q \rightarrow A$ is $K$.

Proof. If $x, y \in Q$ then certainly $f(g(2y) - g(x) - g(x \triangleright y)) = 2y - x - x \triangleright y = 0$ in $A$. Therefore $K \subseteq \ker f$.

Now, suppose $z \in \ker f$. According to Lemma [18]

$$z - \sum_{j=1}^{r+k+\ell} z_j \cdot g(1_j) \in K$$

for some integers $z_1, \ldots, z_{r+k+\ell}$. As $K \subseteq \ker f$, it follows that

$$f(z) = f\left(\sum_{j=1}^{r+k+\ell} z_j \cdot g(1_j)\right) = \sum_{j=1}^{r+k+\ell} z_j \cdot f(g(1_j)) = \sum_{j=1}^{r+k+\ell} z_j \cdot 1_j \in A.$$
As \( f(z) = 0 \), it follows that \( z_j \cdot 1_j = 0 \) for each \( j \). Lemma \( \square \) implies that for each \( j \), \( z_j g(1_j) - g(0) = z_j g(1_j) - g(z_j \cdot 1_j) \in K \). As \( g(0) \in K \), it follows that for each \( j \), \( z_j g(1_j) \in K \). With \( \square \), this implies that \( z \in K \).

We are now ready to prove Proposition \( \square \). Let \( A_1 \) and \( A_2 \) be finitely generated abelian groups. We use the notation established above for both \( A_1 \) and \( A_2 \), with subindices; for instance, \( Q_i = \text{Core}'(A_i) \). If \( A_1 \cong A_2 \) then Definition \( \square \) makes it clear that \( Q_1 \cong Q_2 \).

For the converse, suppose \( h : Q_1 \to Q_2 \) is a quandle isomorphism. Let \( \sigma : A_2 \to A_2 \) be the function given by \( \sigma(x) = x - h(0) \). Then \( \sigma \) is an automorphism of \( \text{Core}(A_2) \), so the composition \( \sigma h \) maps \( Q_1 \) isomorphically onto a subquandle \( Q_2 = \sigma(Q_2) \) of \( \text{Core}(A_2) \).

As \( f_2 : Z^{Q_2} \to A_2 \) is surjective, for each \( x \in Q_1 \) we may choose an element \( \eta(x) \in Z^{Q_2} \) with \( f_2 \eta(x) = \sigma h(x) \). Extending linearly, we obtain a homomorphism \( \eta : Z^{Q_1} \to Z^{Q_2} \) that has \( f_2 \eta g_1 = \sigma h : Q_1 \to Q_2 \). The subset \( Q_2 \) is a generating subset of \( A_2 \), so \( Q_2 = \{ y - h(0) \mid y \in Q_2 \} \) is also a generating subset; \( \sigma h : Q_1 \to Q_2 \) is surjective, so it follows that \( f_2 \eta : Z^{Q_1} \to A_2 \) is an epimorphism.

As \( h'(0) = h(0) = 0 \) and \( h' : Q_1 \to Q_2 \) is a quandle isomorphism, every \( x \in Q_1 \) has
\[
 h'(2x) = h'(2x - 0) = h'(0 \triangleright x) = h'(0) \triangleright h'(x) = 2h'(x) - h'(0) = 2h'(x).
\]
It follows that if \( x, y \in Q_1 \) then
\[
 f_2 \eta(g_1(2y) - g_1(x) - g_1(x \triangleright y)) = h'(2y) - h'(x) - h'(x \triangleright y)
 = 2h'(y) - h'(x) - h'(x \triangleright y) = 0.
\]
We deduce that \( K_1 \subseteq \ker(f_2 \eta) \). According to Proposition \( \square \), \( K_1 = \ker f_1; f_1 : Z^{Q_1} \to A_1 \) is an epimorphism, so \( f_2 \eta \) induces an epimorphism \( A_1 \to A_2 \).

Interchanging the roles of \( A_1 \) and \( A_2 \), we obtain an epimorphism \( A_2 \to A_1 \). As \( A_1 \) and \( A_2 \) are finitely generated modules over the Noetherian ring \( \mathbb{Z} \), such paired epimorphisms exist only if \( A_1 \cong A_2 \). This completes the proof of Proposition \( \square \).

Before proceeding, we discuss the relationship between orbits in core quandles and orbits in characteristic subquandles.

**Proposition 20.** Consider a finitely generated abelian group, 
\[
 A = \mathbb{Z}^r \oplus \mathbb{Z}_{2^{n_1}} \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{Z}_{2^{n_k}} \oplus \mathbb{Z}_{m_1} \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{Z}_{m_l}.
\]

1. The groups \( \text{Dis}(	ext{Core}(A)) \) and \( \text{Dis}(	ext{Core}'(A)) \) are isomorphic.
2. Every orbit in \( \text{Core}'(A) \) is also an orbit in \( \text{Core}(A) \).
3. There are \( 2^{r+k} \) orbits in \( \text{Core}(A) \).
4. There are \( r + k + 1 \) orbits in \( \text{Core}'(A) \).
Proof. There is a natural monomorphism $\text{ext} : \text{Dis}(\text{Core}'(A)) \to \text{Dis}(\text{Core}(A))$, given by $\text{ext}(\beta_1 \cdot \cdots \cdot \beta_{2n}) = \beta_1 \cdot \cdots \cdot \beta_{2n}$ $\forall x_1, \ldots, x_{2n} \in \text{Core}'(A)$. To verify the first assertion, we prove that $\text{ext}$ is surjective.

Suppose $d \in \text{Dis}(\text{Core}(A))$ is an elementary displacement. Then there are $x_1, x_2 \in A$ such that $d(x) = \beta_{x_1} \beta_{x_2}(x) = 2x_1 - 2x_2 + x \forall x \in A$. Choose integers $m_1, \ldots, m_{r+\ell}$ such that

$$x_1 - x_2 = \sum_{j=1}^{r+\ell} (-1)^{j+1} m_j \cdot 1_j,$$

and notice that $m_j \cdot 1_j \in \text{Core}'(A)$ for each index $j$. If $r + \ell$ is even, then

$$d' = \beta_{(m_1 \cdot 1_1)} \cdots \beta_{(m_{r+\ell} \cdot 1_{r+\ell})} \in \text{Dis}(\text{Core}'(A)),$$

and $\text{ext}(d')(x) = d(x) \forall x \in A$. If $r + \ell$ is odd then as $0 \in \text{Core}'(A)$,

$$d' = \beta_{(m_1 \cdot 1_1)} \cdots \beta_{(m_{r+\ell} \cdot 1_{r+\ell})} \beta_0 \in \text{Dis}(\text{Core}'(A)),$$

and $\text{ext}(d')(x) = d(x) \forall x \in A$. Either way, $d = \text{ext}(d')$. The elementary displacements generate $\text{Dis}(\text{Core}(A))$, so the first assertion holds. The second assertion follows from the surjectivity of $\text{ext}$ and Proposition 12.

For the third assertion, notice that for each $j \in \{1, \ldots, r + \ell\}$, $d_j = \beta_1 \beta_0 \in \text{Dis}(\text{Core}(A))$ and $d'_j = \beta_{j-1} \beta_0 \in \text{Dis}(\text{Core}(A))$. It follows that if $x \in A$ then $d_j(x) = 2 \cdot 1_j + x$ and $d'_j(x) = -2 \cdot 1_j + x$ are both elements of the orbit of $x$ in $\text{Core}(A)$. Applying these displacements $d_j$ and $d'_j$ repeatedly, we see that every orbit in $\text{Core}(A)$ includes an element $(y_1, \ldots, y_{r+k}, 0, \ldots, 0)$ such that $y_1, \ldots, y_{r+k} \in \{0, 1\}$. It is easy to see that no two such elements appear in the same orbit in $\text{Core}(A)$; this implies the third assertion. The fourth assertion follows from the fact that $\text{Core}'(A)$ contains precisely $r + k + 1$ of the elements $(y_1, \ldots, y_{r+k}, 0, \ldots, 0)$ with $y_1, \ldots, y_{r+k} \in \{0, 1\}$. \hfill \square

4 IMQ($L$)

In this section we recall two definitions of the involutory medial quandle of a link, verify its semiregularity, and mention several other properties.

Let $D$ be a diagram of a link $L$. As usual, this means that $D$ is obtained from a generic projection of $L$ in the plane, i.e., a projection whose only singularities are crossings (double points). At each crossing two short segments are removed to distinguish the underpassing arcs from the overpassing arc. We use $A(D)$ to denote the set of arcs of $D$, and $C(D)$ to denote the set of crossings of $D$.

The following definition is implicit in the seminal work of Joyce [8], who used the notation $\text{AbQ}_2(L)$ rather than $\text{IMQ}(L)$. (Joyce considered many different kinds of quandles, and did not state this particular definition separately.)

**Definition 21.** Let $D$ be a diagram of a link $L$. Then $\text{IMQ}(L)$ is the involutory medial quandle generated by the elements of $A(D)$, subject to the requirement that if a crossing of $D$ includes the overpassing arc $a_o$ and underpassing arc(s) $a_{u_1}$ and $a_{u_2}$, then $a_{u_1} \triangleright a_o = a_{u_2}$ and $a_{u_2} \triangleright a_o = a_{u_1}$. 11
Proposition 22. IMQ(L) has \( \mu \) orbits, one for each component of \( L \).

Proof. By definition, IMQ(L) is generated by the elements of \( A(D) \), so every \( x \in IMQ(L) \) is obtained from some \( a \in A(D) \) through some sequence of \( \triangleright \) operations. Thus every orbit in IMQ(L) contains an element associated with a particular component \( K_i \) of \( L \).

Suppose \( i \in \{1, \ldots, \mu\} \), and \( a \) is an arc of \( A(D) \) that belongs to \( K_i \). As we walk along \( K_i \) starting at \( a \), each time we pass from one arc of \( K_i \) to another we obtain another element of the same orbit of IMQ(L), because we pass through a crossing in which the two arcs of \( K_i \) are the two underpassing arcs. Therefore all the arcs belonging to \( K_i \) lie in a single orbit of IMQ(L).

To verify that no orbit contains arcs belonging to distinct components, let \( Q \) be the quandle obtained from IMQ(L) by adding relations that require \( x \triangleright y = x \forall x, y \). It is easy to see that \( Q \) has \( \mu \) elements, one for each component of \( L \); and there is a well-defined quandle homomorphism mapping IMQ(L) onto \( Q \). \( \square \)

Notice that Propositions 20 and 22 tell us that if \( \mu \) is not a power of 2 then IMQ(L) is not isomorphic to the core quandle of any finitely generated abelian group.

In addition to describing quandles using generators and relations, Joyce \[8\] also described quandles in a different way, as “augmented quandles.” The idea is to describe a quandle through the action of a group. An advantage is that we can then use the group to investigate the quandle.

Again, although Joyce did not single out the group associated with IMQ(L) for special attention, the following definition is implicit in \[8\].

Definition 23. Let \( D \) be a diagram of a link \( L \). Then IMG(L), the involutory medial group of \( L \), is the group generated by the elements of \( A(D) \), with three kinds of relations.

1. If \( a \in A(D) \) then \( a^2 = 1 \).
2. If \( c_1, c_2, c_3 \) are conjugates of \( a_1, a_2, a_3 \in A(D) \), then \( c_1c_2^{-1}c_3 = c_3c_2^{-1}c_1 \).
3. If a crossing of \( D \) includes the overpassing arc \( a_o \) and underpassing arc(s) \( a_{u_1} \) and \( a_{u_2} \), then \( a_oa_{u_1}a_o = a_{u_2} \) and \( a_oa_{u_2}a_o = a_{u_1} \).

By the way, it is for the sake of Definition 23 that we use the term “medial” rather than “abelian” in this paper. It would be confusing to refer to IMG(L) as the “involutory abelian group of \( L \)” because IMG(L) is not commutative, in general.

The involutory medial quandle IMQ(L) is contained in the involutory medial group IMG(L). IMQ(L) consists of the conjugates of the elements of \( A(D) \), with the quandle operation realized through conjugation: \( x \triangleright y = yxy^{-1} \). As Joyce noted \[8\], both IMG(L) and IMQ(L) are unaffected (up to isomorphism) by Reidemeister moves, so they provide invariants of unoriented links.
Lemma 24. Suppose \( n \) is an odd, positive integer, and \( c_1, \ldots, c_n \) are conjugates in \( \text{IMG}(L) \) of \( a_1, \ldots, a_n \in A(D) \). Then 
\[
(c_1 \cdots c_n)^2 = (c_1 \cdots c_n)^{-1} = c_n \cdots c_1 \in \text{IMG}(L).
\]

Proof. If \( n = 1 \) we have \( c_1 = ga_1g^{-1} \) for some \( g \in \text{IMG}(L) \), and according to part 1 of Definition 23 \( c_1^2 = gag^{-1} = g^{-1}g = 1 \). If \( n = 3 \) then according to part 2 of Definition 23 and the \( n = 1 \) case of the lemma, we have 
\[
(c_1c_2c_3)^2 = (c_1c_2c_3)(c_3c_2c_1) = (c_1c_2)(c_2c_1) = c_1c_2c_1 = c_1^2 = 1.
\]

The proof proceeds using induction on \( n \geq 5 \). The inductive hypothesis implies that the lemma holds when \( n \) is replaced by 1, 3, \( n-4 \), or \( n-2 \), so 
\[
(c_1 \cdots c_n)^2 = (c_1 \cdots c_{n-2})(c_{n-1}c_n)(c_2 \cdots c_n)
\]

\[
= (c_{n-2} \cdots c_1)(c_1c_{n-1}c_n)(c_2 \cdots c_n)
\]

\[
= (c_{n-2} \cdots c_2)(c_2c_{n-1}c_n)(c_3 \cdots c_n)
\]

\[
= (c_3 \cdots c_{n-2})c_{n-1}c_n(c_3 \cdots c_n)
\]

\[
= (c_1 \cdots c_{n-2})c_{n-1}c_n(c_3 \cdots c_n) = (c_3 \cdots c_n)^2 = 1.
\]

\[\square\]

Proposition 25. If \( L \) is a classical link then \( \text{IMG}(L) \) is semiregular.

Proof. Suppose \( d \in \text{Dis}(\text{IMG}(L)) \); then there are \( y_1, \ldots, y_{2n} \in \text{IMG}(L) \) such that 
\[
d = \beta_{y_1} \cdots \beta_{y_{2n}}.
\]

Suppose \( z \in \text{IMG}(L) \) has \( d(z) = z \). Then according to Lemma 24, 
\[
z = d(z) = y_1 \cdots y_{2n} \cdot (zy_{2n} \cdots y_1) = y_1 \cdots y_{2n} \cdot (y_1 \cdots y_{2n} \cdot z) = (y_1 \cdots y_{2n})^2 z.
\]

Cancelling \( z \), we conclude that 
\[
1 = (y_1 \cdots y_{2n})^2 \text{ in } \text{IMG}(L).
\]

Using Lemma 24 again, we deduce that for every \( x \in \text{IMG}(L) \), 
\[
d(x) = y_1 \cdots y_{2n} \cdot (xy_{2n} \cdots y_1) = y_1 \cdots y_{2n} \cdot (y_1 \cdots y_{2n} \cdot x) = (y_1 \cdots y_{2n})^2 x = x.
\]

That is, if \( d \) has a fixed point, then \( d \) must be the identity map. \[\square\]

We close this section with some useful properties of the displacement group \( \text{Dis}(\text{IMG}(L)) \).

Proposition 26. Let \( D \) be a diagram of a link \( L \), and let \( a^* \) be a fixed element of \( A(D) \). Then \( \text{Dis}(\text{IMG}(L)) \) is generated by the elements \( d_a = \beta_a\beta_{a^*} \) with \( a \in A(D) \). Moreover, whenever \( D \) has a crossing with overpassing arc \( a_o \) and underpassing arcs \( a_{u_1}, a_{u_2} \), the corresponding displacements satisfy the formula 
\[
d_{a_o}^2d_{a_{u_1}}^{-1}d_{a_{u_2}}^{-1} = 1 \text{ in } \text{Dis}(\text{IMG}(L)).
\]

Proof. To see why the particular elementary displacements \( d_a = \beta_a\beta_{a^*} \) generate \( \text{Dis}(\text{IMG}(L)) \), notice that if \( d \in \text{Dis}(\text{IMG}(L)) \) is an arbitrary elementary displacement then 
\[
d = \beta_{a_1}\beta_{a_2} \text{ for some } a_1, a_2 \in A(D), \text{ so } d = (\beta_{a_1}\beta_{a^*})(\beta_{a^*}\beta_{a_2}) = d_{a_1}d_{a_2}^{-1}.
\]
Suppose $D$ has a crossing with overpassing arc $a_o$ and underpassing arcs $a_u_1, a_u_2$; then $a_o a_u_1 a_o = a_u_2$ in $IMG(L)$. As $\text{Dis}(IMG(L))$ is commutative, it follows that every $x \in IMG(L)$ has
\[
d^2_{a_o} d^{-1}_{a_u_1} d^{-1}_{a_u_2}(x) = d_{a_o} d^{-1}_{a_u_1} d_{a_u_2}(x) = (\beta_{a_o} \beta_{a_u_1})(\beta_{a_u_2} \beta_{a_o})(\beta_{a_u_1} \beta_{a_o})(\beta_{a_u_2} \beta_{a_o})(x)
\]
\[= \beta_{a_o} \beta_{a_u_1} \beta_{a_u_2} \beta_{a_o} \beta_{a_u_2}(x) = a_o a_u_1 a_o a_u_2 a_o a_u_1 a_o = a^2_{u_2} x a^2_{u_2} = x.
\]

The last result of this section is a lemma involving a rather special situation. Let $L = K_1 \cup \cdots \cup K_\mu$ be a link with a component $K_i$, and let $B$ be a diagram of $L$. Suppose the number of crossings of $D$ in which $K_i$ is the underpassing component is even. Choose a starting point $P$ on the image of $K_i$ in $D$, and walk along $K_i$ in either direction. Let $a_1, \ldots, a_{2k}, a_{2k+1} = a_1$ be the sequence of arcs of $D$ with $K_D(a) = i$, indexed in the order in which they are encountered while walking along $K_i$. For $1 \leq i \leq 2k$ let $c_i$ be the crossing separating $a_i$ from $a_{i+1}$, and let $a'_i$ be the overpassing arc of $D$ at $c_i$.

**Lemma 27.** Under these circumstances, the displacement $\beta_{a'_1} \cdots \beta_{a'_{2k}}$ is the identity map of $IMG(L)$.

**Proof.** We may presume that the link $L$ is constructed from the diagram $D$ in a simple way, by attaching small U-shaped curves connecting the underpassing arcs at each crossing of $D$. Choose a basepoint high above the plane containing $D$, and think of the fundamental group $\pi_1(S^3 - L)$ with this basepoint. As discussed (for instance) in [4], the group $\pi_1(S^3 - L)$ is described by a presentation much like the one given in Definition 23, except that only relations like those in part 3 of Definition 23 are included. The relations for $\pi_1(S^3 - L)$ are of the form $a_o a_u a^{-1}_o = a_u$, where $i, j = \{1, 2\}$ and the choice of $i$ and $j$ is determined using the orientation of the arc $a_o$. As $a_o = a^{-1}_o$ in $IMG(L)$, the defining relations for $\pi_1(S^3 - L)$ are all valid in $IMG(L)$; it follows that there is a natural epimorphism from $\pi_1(S^3 - L)$ onto $IMG(L)$.

Let $N$ be a thin tubular neighborhood of $K_i$; the boundary of $N$ is a torus $\partial N$ imbedded in $S^3 - L$. The product $a'_1 \cdots a'_{2k}$ is the image in $IMG(L)$ of the element of $\pi_1(S^3 - L)$ represented by a loop that follows a segment from the basepoint down to a point of $\partial N$ near the starting point $P$, follows a longitude around $\partial N$, and then follows the first segment back up to the basepoint. N.b. If we were describing a longitude in $\pi_1(S^3 - L)$, we would need to be careful about the orientations of the arcs of $D$; but orientations do not matter in $IMG(L)$, as every arc has $a^2 = 1$.

The generator $a_1$ of $IMG(L)$ represents the image in $IMG(L)$ of a meridian of $\partial N$. The fundamental group of $\partial N$ is commutative, so the images of a meridian and a longitude of $\partial N$ commute with each other in $\pi_1(S^3 - L)$. It follows that $a_1$ and $a'_1 \cdots a'_{2k}$ commute with each other in $IMG(L)$. Therefore
\[
\beta_{a'_1} \cdots \beta_{a'_{2k}}(a_1) = a'_1 \cdots a'_{2k} a_1 a'_1 = a_1 a'_1 \cdots a'_{2k} a'_1 = a_1 a'_1 \cdots a'_{2k} a'_1 = a_1 \cdots = a_1 (a_1')^2 = a_1.
\]

The lemma now follows from the semiregularity of $IMG(L)$. \qed
5 The unoriented Alexander module

The (multivariate) Alexander module $M_A(L)$ is a famous invariant of oriented links. It is a module over the ring $\mathbb{Z}[t_1^{\pm 1}, \ldots, t_\mu^{\pm 1}]$ of Laurent polynomials, and the effect of reversing the orientation of a link component is to interchange the roles of $t_i$ and $t_i^{-1}$ for the variable $t_i$ corresponding to that component. (N.b. Many references use the term "Alexander module" to refer to the reduced version of the module, obtained by setting $t_i = t_j \forall i, j$.) The theory of Alexander modules is very rich, and includes many connections with other invariants. We do not attempt to survey this rich theory here; the reader who would like more information is referred to Fox’s famous survey [4], and to Hillman’s excellent book [3].

As the involutory medial quandle $\text{IMQ}(L)$ is an unoriented link invariant, the present paper requires only a weak form of $M_A(L)$, obtained by setting all the $t_i$ to $-1$ (so that interchanging $t_i$ and $t_i^{-1}$ has no effect). Here is an explicit definition.

Suppose $D$ is a diagram of an unoriented link $L$. Let $\mathbb{Z}^{A(D)}$ and $\mathbb{Z}^{C(D)}$ be the free abelian groups on the sets $A(D)$ and $C(D)$, and let $r_D : \mathbb{Z}^{C(D)} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{A(D)}$ be the homomorphism given by

$$r_D(c) = 2a_o - a_{u_1} - a_{u_2}$$

whenever $c \in C(D)$ is a crossing with overpassing arc $a_o$ and underpassing arcs $a_{u_1}, a_{u_2}$. If these arcs are not distinct then the corresponding terms in $r_D(c)$ are added together; for instance if $a_o = a_{u_1} \neq a_{u_2}$ then $r_D(c) = a_o - a_{u_2}$.

**Definition 28.** The cokernel of $r_D$ is the unoriented Alexander module of $L$, denoted $M_A(L)_\nu$. That is, there is an epimorphism $s_D : \mathbb{Z}^{A(D)} \rightarrow M_A(L)_\nu$ with $\ker s_D = r_D(\mathbb{Z}^{C(D)})$.

Definition 28 gives an explicit description of $M_A(L)_\nu$ using generators and relations associated with the arcs and crossings of a diagram of $L$. This kind of description is especially useful for us because the quandle $\text{IMQ}(L)$ is also defined using the arcs and crossings of a diagram of $L$. However there are other ways to describe the group $M_A(L)_\nu$.

Here is one. Let $M_A(L)$ be the usual Alexander module, and let $\nu$ be the ring homomorphism $\mathbb{Z}[t_1^{\pm 1}, \ldots, t_\mu^{\pm 1}] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ with $\nu(t_i) = -1 \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, \mu\}$. Let $Z_\nu$ denote the $\mathbb{Z}[t_1^{\pm 1}, \ldots, t_\mu^{\pm 1}]$-module obtained from $\mathbb{Z}$ using $\nu$. (That is, $t_i \cdot n = -n \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, \mu\}$.) Then $M_A(L)_\nu$ is the tensor product of the $\mathbb{Z}[t_1^{\pm 1}, \ldots, t_\mu^{\pm 1}]$-modules $M_A(L)$ and $Z_\nu$.

To say the same thing in a different way: the matrix $R_D$ representing the map $r_D$ is the image under $\nu$ of an Alexander matrix associated with an orientation of the diagram $D$. (See [4] for information on Alexander matrices.) The fact that $M_A(L)_\nu$ is an invariant of unoriented links (up to isomorphism) may be verified either by observing that the Alexander module depends functorially on the link group (as in [4]) or by explicitly analyzing the effects of Reidemeister moves on the matrix $R_D$. 
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Lemma 29. If \( L \) is a link with a diagram \( D \) then there is an epimorphism \( t_\nu : M_A(L)_\nu \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}, \) with \( t_\nu(s_D(a)) = 1 \) \( \forall a \in A(D). \) For any particular arc \( a^* \in A(D), \) \( M_A(L)_\nu \) is the internal direct sum of \( \ker t_\nu \) and the infinite cyclic subgroup generated by \( s_D(a^*) \).

Proof. There is a homomorphism \( T : \mathbb{Z}^{A(D)} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \) with \( T(a) = 1 \) \( \forall a \in A(D). \) As \( T(r_D(c)) = 0 \) \( \forall c \in C(D), \) \( T \) induces a map on \( \text{coker} \ r_D. \)

Now, suppose \( a^* \in A(D). \) As \( t_\nu(s_D(a^*)) = 1, \) \( a^* \) is of infinite order in \( M_A(L)_\nu. \) Every other \( a \in A(D) \) has \( s_D(a) - s_D(a^*) \in \ker t_\nu, \) so \( M_A(L)_\nu \) is the sum of \( \ker t_\nu \) and the subgroup generated by \( s_D(a^*). \) The sum is direct because \( t_\nu(ns_D(a^*)) = n, \) so the only multiple of \( s_D(a^*) \) contained in \( \ker t_\nu \) is 0.

The subgroup \( \ker t_\nu \) of \( M_A(L)_\nu \) is isomorphic to one of the oldest invariants in knot theory: the first homology group of the cyclic double cover of \( \mathbb{S}^3, \) branched over \( L. \) We cannot provide a simple reference for this isomorphism, because the standard descriptions of the homology group (e.g. in [4] or [9, Chap. 9]) involve a Goeritz or Seifert matrix, rather than an Alexander matrix. One way to explain the connection is this: if \( A \) is a Seifert matrix for \( L \) then \( A + A^T \) is a presentation matrix for the first homology group of the branched double cover as a \( \mathbb{Z} \)-module (see for instance [9, Theorem 9.1]), and \( A - A^T \) is a presentation matrix for the first homology group of the total linking number cover as a \( \mathbb{Z}[t, t^{-1}] \)-module. The latter module can also be described as the quotient of the \( \mathbb{Z}[t, t^{-1}] \)-module presented by a reduced Alexander matrix (i.e. a matrix obtained from an Alexander matrix by setting all \( t_i = t \)) obtained by modding out a direct summand isomorphic to \( \mathbb{Z}[t, t^{-1}]. \) (See for instance [9, p. 117].) It does not matter which particular Alexander matrix is used, because all Alexander matrices of a link \( L \) are equivalent as module presentation matrices. It follows that the first homology group of the branched double cover is obtained from the abelian group presented by the matrix \( R_D \) (i.e., \( M_A(L)_\nu \)) by modding out a direct summand isomorphic to \( \mathbb{Z}. \) According to Lemma 29, \( \ker t_\nu \) can be obtained from \( M_A(L)_\nu \) in the same way, so the homology group is isomorphic to \( \ker t_\nu. \) A more direct description of the situation involves a recent result of Silver, Williams and the present author [11]: if \( L \) is a link then it has a particular Alexander matrix which, when all the variables \( t_i \) are set equal to \( t, \) becomes \( A - A^T \) with a column of zeroes adjoined. Then setting \( t \) to \( -1 \) yields \( -A - A^T = -(A + A^T) \) (presenting the first homology of the branched double cover) with a column of zeroes adjoined (presenting a direct summand isomorphic to \( \mathbb{Z} \)).

We close this section with some well-known properties of the first homology group of the branched double cover (see [9, Corollary 9.2], for instance). We provide proofs for the sake of completeness.

---

\[ \text{Lemma 29.} \] If \( L \) is a link with a diagram \( D \) then there is an epimorphism \( t_\nu : M_A(L)_\nu \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}, \) with \( t_\nu(s_D(a)) = 1 \) \( \forall a \in A(D). \) For any particular arc \( a^* \in A(D), \) \( M_A(L)_\nu \) is the internal direct sum of \( \ker t_\nu \) and the infinite cyclic subgroup generated by \( s_D(a^*). \)

Proof. There is a homomorphism \( T : \mathbb{Z}^{A(D)} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \) with \( T(a) = 1 \) \( \forall a \in A(D). \) As \( T(r_D(c)) = 0 \) \( \forall c \in C(D), \) \( T \) induces a map on \( \text{coker} \ r_D. \)

Now, suppose \( a^* \in A(D). \) As \( t_\nu(s_D(a^*)) = 1, \) \( a^* \) is of infinite order in \( M_A(L)_\nu. \) Every other \( a \in A(D) \) has \( s_D(a) - s_D(a^*) \in \ker t_\nu, \) so \( M_A(L)_\nu \) is the sum of \( \ker t_\nu \) and the subgroup generated by \( s_D(a^*). \) The sum is direct because \( t_\nu(ns_D(a^*)) = n, \) so the only multiple of \( s_D(a^*) \) contained in \( \ker t_\nu \) is 0.

The subgroup \( \ker t_\nu \) of \( M_A(L)_\nu \) is isomorphic to one of the oldest invariants in knot theory: the first homology group of the cyclic double cover of \( \mathbb{S}^3, \) branched over \( L. \) We cannot provide a simple reference for this isomorphism, because the standard descriptions of the homology group (e.g. in [4] or [9, Chap. 9]) involve a Goeritz or Seifert matrix, rather than an Alexander matrix. One way to explain the connection is this: if \( A \) is a Seifert matrix for \( L \) then \( A + A^T \) is a presentation matrix for the first homology group of the branched double cover as a \( \mathbb{Z} \)-module (see for instance [9, Theorem 9.1]), and \( A - A^T \) is a presentation matrix for the first homology group of the total linking number cover as a \( \mathbb{Z}[t, t^{-1}] \)-module. The latter module can also be described as the quotient of the \( \mathbb{Z}[t, t^{-1}] \)-module presented by a reduced Alexander matrix (i.e. a matrix obtained from an Alexander matrix by setting all \( t_i = t \)) obtained by modding out a direct summand isomorphic to \( \mathbb{Z}[t, t^{-1}]. \) (See for instance [9, p. 117].) It does not matter which particular Alexander matrix is used, because all Alexander matrices of a link \( L \) are equivalent as module presentation matrices. It follows that the first homology group of the branched double cover is obtained from the abelian group presented by the matrix \( R_D \) (i.e., \( M_A(L)_\nu \)) by modding out a direct summand isomorphic to \( \mathbb{Z}. \) According to Lemma 29, \( \ker t_\nu \) can be obtained from \( M_A(L)_\nu \) in the same way, so the homology group is isomorphic to \( \ker t_\nu. \) A more direct description of the situation involves a recent result of Silver, Williams and the present author [11]: if \( L \) is a link then it has a particular Alexander matrix which, when all the variables \( t_i \) are set equal to \( t, \) becomes \( A - A^T \) with a column of zeroes adjoined. Then setting \( t \) to \( -1 \) yields \( -A - A^T = -(A + A^T) \) (presenting the first homology of the branched double cover) with a column of zeroes adjoined (presenting a direct summand isomorphic to \( \mathbb{Z} \)).

We close this section with some well-known properties of the first homology group of the branched double cover (see [9, Corollary 9.2], for instance). We provide proofs for the sake of completeness.

---

Footnote: It is a regrettable fact that terminology is not standard in the literature. Lickorish [9] used the term “Alexander module” for the \( \mathbb{Z}[t, t^{-1}] \)-module after the direct summand is modded out. We follow Hillman [5] instead, and use the term “reduced Alexander module” for the \( \mathbb{Z}[t, t^{-1}] \)-module before the direct summand is modded out.
**Proposition 30.** If the determinant of $L$ is not 0, then $|\ker t_\nu| = |\det L|$. If the determinant of $L$ is 0, then $\ker t_\nu$ is infinite.

**Proof.** Let $R_D$ be the matrix representing the homomorphism $r_D$. Let $m = |C(D)|$ and $n = |A(D)|$, so $R_D$ is $m \times n$. The determinant of $L$ satisfies the formula $|\det L| = |\Delta(-1)|$, where $\Delta$ is the reduced (one-variable) Alexander polynomial of $L$. That is, $\Delta$ is the greatest common divisor of the determinants of the $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ submatrices of a matrix obtained from an Alexander matrix by setting all $t_i$ equal to $t$. From the connection between Alexander matrices and $R_D$ mentioned before Lemma 29, we deduce that $|\det L|$ is the greatest common divisor of the determinants of the $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ submatrices of $R_D$. As the columns of $R_D$ sum to 0, for any $a^* \in A(D)$ this greatest common divisor is the same as the greatest common divisor of the determinants of those $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ submatrices of $R_D$ that avoid the $a^*$ column.

Choose an arc $a^* \in A(D)$, and let $R_D'$ be the $(m+1) \times n$ matrix obtained from $R_D$ by adjoining a row whose only nonzero entry is a 1 in the $a^*$ column. Lemma 29 implies that $R_D'$ is a presentation matrix for the abelian group $\ker t_\nu$.

The fundamental structure theorem for finitely generated abelian groups tells us that $\ker t_\nu$ is determined up to isomorphism by the elementary ideals of $R_D'$. In particular, $\ker t_\nu$ is finite if and only if the greatest common divisor of the determinants of $n \times n$ submatrices of $R_D'$ is not 0, and if this is the case then this greatest common divisor equals the order of $\ker t_\nu$. An $n \times n$ submatrix $S$ of $R_D'$ is either an $n \times n$ submatrix of $R_D$ (in which case $|\det S| = 0$, because the columns of $R_D$ sum to 0) or a matrix obtained from an $(n-1) \times n$ submatrix of $R_D$ by adjoining the new row of $R_D'$ (in which case $|\det S|$ equals the determinant of an $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ submatrix of $R_D$ that avoids the $a^*$ column). Considering the first paragraph of this proof, we conclude that $\ker t_\nu$ is finite if and only if $|\det L| \neq 0$, and if this is the case then $|\ker t_\nu| = |\det L|$. \hfill $\square$

**Corollary 31.** Suppose $\det L \neq 0$. Then $\ker t_\nu$ is the torsion subgroup of $M_A(L)_\nu$.

**Proof.** On the one hand, $|\ker t_\nu| = |\det L|$, so $\ker t_\nu$ is finite. Of course it follows that $\ker t_\nu$ is contained in the torsion subgroup of $M_A(L)_\nu$. On the other hand, $t_\nu$ is a homomorphism to $\mathbb{Z}$, so an element of $M_A(L)_\nu$ that is not included in $\ker t_\nu$ cannot be an element of the torsion subgroup. \hfill $\square$

**Proposition 32.** The tensor product $\ker t_\nu \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}_2$ has dimension $\mu - 1$ as a vector space over the two-element field, $GF(2)$.

**Proof.** Let $D$ be a diagram of $L$, and let $R_D'$ be the presentation matrix for $\ker t_\nu$ used in the proof of Proposition 30. Then $\ker t_\nu \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}_2$ is a vector space over $GF(2)$, with a presentation matrix equal to the matrix $R_D'(2)$ obtained from $R_D'$ by reducing all entries modulo 2. It follows that the number of columns of $R_D'(2)$ is $r + d$, where $r$ is the $GF(2)$-rank of $R_D'(2)$ and $d$ is the dimension of $\ker t_\nu \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}_2$ as a vector space over $GF(2)$.

It is easy to describe $R_D'(2)$ explicitly. If $m = |C(D)|$ and $n = |A(D)|$ then $R_D'(2)$ is an $(m+1) \times n$ matrix with entries in $\mathbb{Z}_2$. For each crossing $c \in C(D)$,
the row of $R'_D(2)$ corresponding to $c$ has two nonzero entries, in the columns corresponding to the underpassing arcs at $c$. (If the underpassing arcs at $c$ are the same, the $c$ row has no nonzero entry.) The one extra row of $R'_D(2)$ has precisely one nonzero entry, in the column corresponding to an arc $a^*$. Using elementary column operations to bring $R'_D(2)$ into column echelon form, we obtain one column of zeroes for each component of $L$ other than the component containing $a^*$. Therefore the $GF(2)$-rank of $R'_D(2)$ is $r = n - (\mu - 1)$. As the dimension $d$ of $\ker t_\nu \otimes \mathbb{Z}_2$ satisfies $r + d = n$, it follows that $d = \mu - 1$. 

6 \textit{IMQ}'(L)

Part of the Alexander module theory that will be especially useful for us is a homomorphism $\phi$ that appears in the link module sequence introduced by Crowell. (For a thorough discussion see Crowell’s papers [1, 2], or [5, Chap. 4].) The unoriented version of $\phi$ (i.e., the tensor product with the identity map of $\mathbb{Z}_2$) is a homomorphism $\phi_\nu$, whose domain is $M_A(L)_\nu$. This homomorphism is defined explicitly as follows.

Let $A_\mu$ be the direct sum $\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2$, with $\mu - 1$ copies of $\mathbb{Z}_2$. Let $D$ be a diagram of $L = K_1 \cup \cdots \cup K_\mu$, and let $\kappa_D : A(D) \to \{1, \ldots, \mu\}$ be the function with $\kappa_D(a) = i$ whenever $a$ is an arc of $D$ that belongs to the image of $K_i$. Let $\Phi_\nu : \mathbb{Z}^{A(D)} \to A_\mu$ be the homomorphism with $\Phi_\nu(a) = (1, 0, \ldots, 0)$ for every $a \in A(D)$ with $\kappa_D(a) = 1$, and $\Phi_\nu(a) = (1, 0, \ldots, 0, 1, 0, \ldots, 0)$, with the second 1 in the $i$th coordinate, for every $a \in A(D)$ with $\kappa_D(a) = i > 1$. Then it is easy to see that $\Phi_\nu(r_D(c)) = 0 \forall c \in C(D)$, so $\Phi_\nu$ defines a homomorphism $\phi_\nu : M_A(L)_\nu \to A_\mu$ with $\phi_\nu(s_D(a)) = \Phi_\nu(a) \forall a \in A(D)$.

Unoriented Alexander modules and $\phi_\nu$ maps have the following mutual invariance property.

**Proposition 33.** Let $D$ and $D'$ be diagrams of the same unoriented link, with associated maps $\phi_\nu$ and $\phi'_\nu$. Then there is an isomorphism $i : \ker r_D \to \ker r_{D'}$ such that $\phi'_\nu \circ i = \phi_\nu$.

**Proof.** The proposition follows from the invariance of Crowell’s link module sequence, by taking the tensor product with $\mathbb{Z}_2$, as discussed before Lemma [29]. A more direct proof can be provided by analyzing the effect of a Reidemeister move on $r_D$ and $\phi_\nu$. Arguments of the latter type appear in [13, Sec. 3].

The map $\phi_\nu$ provides another involutory medial quandle associated to a link $L$.

**Definition 34.** Let $L$ be a link with a diagram $D$, and let $\phi_\nu : M_A(L)_\nu \to A_\mu$ be the associated map. Then $\textit{IMQ}'(L) = \phi_\nu^{-1}(\phi_\nu(s_D(A(D))))$.

That is, $\textit{IMQ}'(L)$ is the subset of $M_A(L)_\nu$ consisting of elements with the same images under $\phi_\nu$ as the elements of $s_D(A(D))$.

**Proposition 35.** $\textit{IMQ}'(L)$ is a subquandle of $\text{Core}(M_A(L)_\nu)$.
Proof. We need to verify that if \( x \) and \( y \) are elements of \( \phi^{-1}_\nu(\phi_\nu(s_D(A(D)))) \), then so is \( x \star y = 2y - x \). The key fact is that \( 2\phi_\nu(x) = 2\phi_\nu(y) = (2,0,\ldots,0) \in A_\mu \), so \( \phi_\nu(2y - x) = \phi_\nu(2x - x) = \phi_\nu(x) \).

\[ \square \]

**Corollary 36.** \( \text{IMQ}'(L) \) is a semiregular involutory medial quandle.

**Proof.** According to Proposition \[14\] \( \text{Core}(M_A(L)_\nu) \) is semiregular, involutory and medial. Subquandles inherit all three properties.

The quandle \( \text{IMQ}'(L) \) is intimately connected to the group \( \ker t_\nu \).

**Proposition 37.** The characteristic subquandle \( \text{Core}'(\ker t_\nu) \) is isomorphic to \( \text{IMQ}'(L) \).

**Proof.** Recall that

\[ A_\mu \cong \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z} \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{Z}, \]

with \( \mu - 1 \) factors of \( \mathbb{Z} \). Let \( T(A_\mu) \) be the torsion subgroup of \( A_\mu \), i.e., the set of elements whose first coordinate is 0. Comparing the definitions of \( t_\nu \) and \( \phi_\nu \), we see that \( t_\nu : M(A(L)_\nu) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \) is simply the first coordinate of \( \phi_\nu : M(A(L)_\nu) \rightarrow A_\mu \).

It follows that \( \ker t_\nu = \phi^{-1}_\nu(T(A_\mu)) \).

According to Proposition \[12\] the dimension of \( \ker t_\nu \otimes \mathbb{Z} \mathbb{Z} \) as a vector space over \( GF(2) \) is \( \mu - 1 \). Therefore

\[ \ker t_\nu \cong \mathbb{Z}^r \oplus \mathbb{Z}^{n_1} \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{Z}^{n_{\mu - r - 1}} \oplus B \]

for some abelian group \( B \) of odd order and some integers \( n_1, \ldots, n_{\mu - r - 1} \geq 1 \) and \( r \in \{0, \ldots, \mu - 1\} \). (If \( r = 0 \) or \( \mu - r = 1 \) then the corresponding summands of \[3\] are absent.) Elements of \( \ker t_\nu \) are represented by \( \mu \)-tuples, with the first \( r \) coordinates coming from \( \mathbb{Z} \) and the last coordinate coming from \( B \). We may presume that the direct sum description \[3\] is compatible with the map \( \phi_\nu \), in the sense that for each \( j \in \{1, \ldots, \mu - 1\} \), the element \( (0, \ldots, 0, 1, 0, \ldots, 0) \in \ker t_\nu \), with 1 in the \( j \)th coordinate, is mapped by \( \phi_\nu \) to the element \( (0, \ldots, 0, 1, 0, \ldots, 0) \in A_\mu \), with 1 in the \( (j + 1) \)st coordinate. It follows that an element \( x \in M(A(L)_\nu) \) is included in \( \text{Core}'(\ker t_\nu) \) if and only if \( \phi_\nu(x) = (x_1, \ldots, x_\mu) \in A_\mu \) has these properties: \( x_1 = 0 \), and no more than one of \( x_2, \ldots, x_\mu \) is not 0.

Let \( D \) be a diagram of \( L \), and \( a^* \) a fixed arc of \( D \) with \( \kappa_D(a^*) = 1 \). According to Definition \[34\] \( \text{IMQ}'(L) = \phi^{-1}_\nu(\phi_\nu(s_D(A(D)))) \). It is obvious that \( \text{IMQ}'(L) \) is isomorphic, as a subquandle of \( \text{Core}(M_A(L)_\nu) \), to the set \( S = \{ y - s_D(a^*) \mid y \in \text{IMQ}'(L) \} \). As \( t_\nu(y) = t_\nu(s_D(a^*)) = 1 \ \forall y \in \text{IMQ}'(L) \), this set \( S \) is contained in \( \ker t_\nu \). Moreover, the description of \( \text{Core}'(\ker t_\nu) \) given at the end of the preceding paragraph implies that \( S = \text{Core}'(\ker t_\nu) \).

\[ \square \]

**Proposition 38.** If the determinant of \( L \) is 0, then \( \text{IMQ}'(L) \) is infinite. If the determinant of \( L \) is not 0, then

\[ |\text{IMQ}'(L)| = \frac{\mu |\det L|}{2^{\mu - 1}}. \]
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Proof. As noted in the proof of Proposition 37, \( \ker t_\nu = \phi_\nu^{-1}(T(A_\mu)) \). It follows that \( |\ker t_\nu| = |\ker \phi_\nu| \cdot |T(A_\mu)| = |\ker \phi_\nu| \cdot 2^{\mu-1} \). As \( IMQ'(L) \) consists of \( \mu \) cosets of \( \ker \phi_\nu \) in \( M_A(L)_\nu \), \( |IMQ'(L)| = \mu \cdot |\ker \phi_\nu| = \mu \cdot (|\ker t_\nu|/2^{\mu-1}) \). The proposition now follows from Proposition 30.

7 Proof of Theorem 5

In this section we prove Theorem 5 by showing that the quandles \( IMQ(L) \), \( IMQ'(L) \) and \( \text{Core}'(\ker t_\nu) \) are isomorphic to each other. Suppose \( D \) is a link diagram, \( s_D : Z^{A(D)} \rightarrow M_A(L)_\nu \) is the epimorphism discussed in Sec. 5, and \( \phi_\nu : M_A(L)_\nu \rightarrow A_\mu \) is the epimorphism discussed in Sec. 6.

Lemma 39. The kernel of \( \phi_\nu \) is generated by \( \{2(s_D(a) - s_D(a')) \mid a, a' \in A(D)\} \).

Proof. If \( a, a' \in A(D) \) then \( \phi_\nu(s_D(a) - s_D(a')) \) is an element of order 2 in \( A_\mu \), so \( 2(s_D(a) - s_D(a')) \in \ker \phi_\nu \).

Now, suppose \( a_1, \ldots, a_n \in A(D) \), \( m_1, \ldots, m_n \in \mathbb{Z} \) and

\[
x = \sum_{j=1}^{n} m_j s_D(a_j) \in \ker \phi_\nu.
\]

As \( A_\mu = \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2 \), these two properties hold:

1. \( \sum_{j=1}^{n} m_j = 0 \).
2. For each \( i \in \{1, \ldots, \mu\} \), \( \sum_{\kappa_D(a_j) = i} m_j \) is even.

If \( m_1, \ldots, m_n \) are all even, then property (1) implies that the sum can be written as a sum of terms of the form \( 2(s_D(a) - s_D(a')) \).

The argument proceeds using induction on the number of odd coefficients \( m_j \). Suppose \( m_1 \) is odd. Property (2) implies that there is an index \( j > 1 \) such that \( \kappa_D(a_j) = \kappa_D(a_1) \) and \( m_j \) is odd; we may as well assume that \( j = 2 \). Rewrite the sum so that \( m_1 = m_2 = 1 \), and there are new summands (if necessary) to contribute \( (m_1 - 1)s_D(a_1) \) and \( (m_2 - 1)s_D(a_2) \).

If \( a_1 = a_2 \) then combine terms, replacing \( m_1 s_D(a_1) + m_2 s_D(a_2) = s_D(a_1) + s_D(a_2) \) with \( 2s_D(a_1) \); this reduces the number of odd coefficients. If \( a_1 \neq a_2 \), let \( a_1' \) be an arc of \( K_{s_D(a_1)} \) that is separated from \( a_1 \) by a crossing. If \( a_0 \) is the overpassing arc that separates \( a_1 \) from \( a_1' \), then according to the definition of \( s_D \), \( s_D(a_1) = s_D(a_0) - s_D(a_1') = 2s_D(a_0) - 2s_D(a_1') + s_D(a_1') \). Therefore we can replace \( s_D(a_1) \) with \( s_D(a_1') \) in the sum representing \( x \), without increasing the number of odd coefficients. If \( a_1' = a_2 \), we can combine terms as in the first sentence of this paragraph, and reduce the number of odd coefficients. If \( a_1' \neq a_2 \), let \( a_2' \) be the arc of \( K_{s_D(a_2)} \) that is separated from \( a_1' \) by a crossing, and is not equal to \( a_1 \). By the same process as before, we can replace the sum.
equal to \( x \) with a sum that has precisely the same terms with odd coefficients, except that the summand \( s_D(a'_1) \) has been replaced with \( s_D(a''_1) \). Repeating this process, we walk along \( K_{\kappa_D(a_1)} = K_{\kappa_D(a_2)} \) until we reach \( a_2 \), and then we combine terms to reduce the number of odd coefficients in the sum. 

**Proposition 40.** Let \( D \) be a diagram of a link \( L \). Then there is a surjective quandle map \( \tilde{s}_D : IMQ'(L) \to IMQ'(L) \) with \( \tilde{s}_D(a) = s_D(a) \forall a \in A(D) \).

**Proof.** If there is a crossing of \( D \) with overpassing arc \( a_o \) and underpassing arcs \( a_{u_1}, a_{u_2} \) then \( s_D(2a_o - a_{u_1} - a_{u_2}) = 0 \), so according to the definition of a core quandle, \( s_D(a_{u_1}) = 2s_D(2a_o) - s_D(a_{u_2}) = s_D(a_{u_2}) \triangleright s_D(a_o) \) and \( s_D(a_{u_2}) = 2s_D(2a_o) - s_D(a_{u_1}) = s_D(a_{u_1}) \triangleright s_D(a_o) \) in \( IMQ'(L) \).

If \( x \in IMQ'(L) \) then \( \phi_\nu(x) = \phi_\nu(s_D(a)) \) for some \( a \in A(D) \). Of course this implies that \( x - s_D(a) \in \ker \phi_\nu \). According to Lemma 39 it follows that there are \( a_1, \ldots, a_n, a'_1, \ldots, a'_n \in A(D) \) such that

\[
x - s_D(a) = 2s_D(a_1 - a'_1) + 2s_D(a_2 - a'_2) + \cdots + 2s_D(a_n - a'_n)
\]

and consequently,

\[
x = 2s_D(a_1) - 2s_D(a'_1) + \cdots + 2s_D(a_n) - 2s_D(a'_n) + s_D(a).
\]

According to the definition of a core quandle, it follows that

\[
x = ((\cdots((s_D(a) \triangleright s_D(a'_1)) \triangleright s_D(a_n)) \triangleright \cdots \triangleright s_D(a_1)) \triangleright s_D(a'_1)).
\]

As \( x \in IMQ'(L) \) is arbitrary, we conclude that the quandle \( IMQ'(L) \) is generated by \( s_D(A(D)) \).

We have just verified that \( IMQ'(L) \) is a quandle generated by \( s_D(A(D)) \), which satisfies the relations \( s_D(a_o) \triangleright s_D(a_o) = s_D(a_{o_2}) \) and \( s_D(a_{o_2}) \triangleright s_D(a_o) = s_D(a_{o_1}) \) whenever \( D \) has a crossing at which \( a_o \) is the overpassing arc and \( a_{o_1}, a_{o_2} \) are the underpassing arcs. As a subquandle of a core quandle, \( IMQ'(L) \) is also both involutory and medial. By definition, \( IMQ(L) \) is the largest involutory medial quandle generated by \( A(D) \) which satisfies the relations \( a_{o_1} \triangleright a_o = a_{o_2} \) and \( a_{o_2} \triangleright a_o = a_{o_1} \) whenever \( D \) has a crossing at which \( a_o \) is the overpassing arc and \( a_{o_1}, a_{o_2} \) are the underpassing arcs. It follows that there is a surjective quandle map \( \tilde{s}_D : IMQ(L) \to IMQ'(L) \) defined by \( \tilde{s}_D(a) = s_D(a) \forall a \in A(D) \).

**Corollary 41.** \( IMQ'(L) \) has \( \mu \) orbits, one for each component of \( L \).

**Proof.** Proposition 22 tells us that \( IMQ(L) \) has \( \mu \) orbits, one for each component of \( L \). Proposition 40 implies that each orbit of \( IMQ'(L) \) is the image under \( \tilde{s}_D \) of an orbit of \( IMQ(L) \), so \( IMQ'(L) \) has no more than \( \mu \) orbits.

On the other hand, if \( x, y \in IMQ'(L) \) then \( \phi_\nu(x \triangleright y) = \phi_\nu(2y - x) = \phi_\nu(2y - 2x) + \phi_\nu(x) = 0 + \phi_\nu(x) \), so \( \phi_\nu \) is constant on each orbit in \( IMQ'(L) \). As the image of \( IMQ'(L) \) under \( \phi_\nu \) includes \( \mu \) different elements of \( A_\mu \), it follows that \( IMQ'(L) \) has at least \( \mu \) different orbits.
Proposition 42. Let $D$ be a diagram of a link $L$, and $a^*$ a fixed arc of $D$. Then there is an epimorphism $e_D : \ker t_\nu \to \text{Dis}(IMQ(L))$ with $e_D(s_D(a) - s_D(a^*)) = \beta_a \beta_{a^*} \forall a \in A(D)$.

Proof. Let $R_D$ be the matrix representing $r_D : \mathbb{Z}^{C(D)} \to \mathbb{Z}^{A(D)}$. Let $R_D'$ be the matrix obtained from $R_D$ by adjoining a row whose only nonzero entry is a 1 in the $a^*$ column, as in the proof of Proposition 39. As noted there, $R_D'$ is a presentation matrix for $\ker t_\nu$. To be explicit: there is an epimorphism $s_D' : \mathbb{Z}^{A(D)} \to \ker t_\nu$ with $s_D'(a) = s_D(a) - s_D(a^*) \forall a \in A(D)$, and the kernel of $s_D'$ is generated by the elements of $\mathbb{Z}^{A(D)}$ represented by the rows of $R_D'$.

According to Proposition 26, $\text{Dis}(IMQ(L))$ is generated (as a group written multiplicatively) by the elementary displacements $d_a = \beta_a \beta_{a^*}$, and whenever $c$ is a crossing of $D$ with overpassing arc $a_o$ and underpassing arcs $a_{u_1}, a_{u_2}$, the formula $d^2_a d^{-1}_{a_{u_1}} d^{-1}_{a_{u_2}} = 1$ holds in $\text{Dis}(IMQ(L))$. This formula matches the element of $\mathbb{Z}^{A(D)}$ represented by the $c$ row of $R(D)$, namely $r_D(c) = 2a_o - a_{u_1} - a_{u_2}$ (in additive notation). The one row of $R_D'$ that does not correspond to a crossing of $D$ is the row whose only nonzero entry is a 1 in the $a^*$ column. As $d_{a^*} = \beta_a \beta_{a^*}$ is the identity map, the relation represented by this row is also valid in $\text{Dis}(IMQ(L))$.

It follows that there is a well-defined homomorphism of abelian groups $e_D : \ker t_\nu \to \text{Dis}(IMQ(L))$, with $e_D(s_D'(a)) = d_a \forall a \in A(D)$. The group $\text{Dis}(IMQ(L))$ is generated by the $d_a$ elements, so $e_D$ is surjective.

Propositions 40 and 42 give us the following version of Joyce’s Theorem 1 [8, Sec. 18].

Corollary 43. If $L$ is a classical knot then $IMQ(L) \cong IMQ'(L)$.

Proof. As $L$ is a knot, we denote it $K$. It is well known that $\det K$ is an odd integer; in particular $\det K \neq 0$. According to Proposition 22, $IMQ(K)$ has one orbit; and according to Proposition 15 this orbit is isomorphic to the core quandle of $\text{Dis}(IMQ(K))$. It follows that $|IMQ(K)| = |\text{Core}(\text{Dis}(IMQ(K)))| = |\text{Dis}(IMQ(K))|$. Propositions 38 and 40 imply that $|IMQ(K)| \geq |IMQ'(K)| = |\det K|$. On the other hand, Propositions 30 and 42 imply that $|\det K| = |\ker t_\nu| \geq |\text{Dis}(IMQ(K))| = |IMQ(K)|$. We conclude that $IMQ(K)$ and $IMQ'(K)$ are both finite quandles of cardinality $|\det K|$, so the surjective quandle map $\hat{s}_D$ of Proposition 40 must be an isomorphism.

It turns out that $\hat{s}_D$ is always an isomorphism, but proving this is more difficult when $\mu > 1$. The cardinality inequalities used to prove Corollary 43 do not apply in general, because $\ker e_D$ may be nontrivial, and $IMQ(L)$ and $IMQ'(L)$ may be infinite. In order to bring Lemma 27 into the discussion, we observe that if $D$ is a link diagram then it is always possible to change $D$ so that in the resulting diagram, each component of $L$ has an even number of associated arcs. The idea is simple: if a component of $L$ is the underpassing component of some crossing of $D$, we can use a Reidemeister move of the first
type to introduce a trivial crossing, which splits an arc of that component in two. (See Fig. 1) If a component of \( L \) is not the underpassing component of any crossing, it has only one arc; we can split this arc in two with a pair of trivial crossings.

![Figure 1: A trivial crossing.](image)

**Proposition 44.** Let \( D \) be a diagram of \( L \), in which every component of \( L \) has an even number of associated arcs. If \( x \in \ker t_\nu \) and \( 2x = 0 \), then \( x \in \ker e_D \).

**Proof.** As \( s_D : Z^A(D) \to M_A(L)_\nu \) is surjective,

\[
x = s_D \left( \sum_{a \in A(D)} f_x(a)a \right)
\]

for some function \( f_x : A(D) \to \mathbb{Z} \). Of course \( f_x \) is not unique; any element of \( \ker s_D \) may be added to the sum on the right-hand side of (4) without affecting the image under \( s_D \).

The hypothesis \( 2x = 0 \) implies that

\[
2 \cdot \sum_{a \in A(D)} f_x(a)a \in \ker s_D = r_D(\mathbb{Z}^C(D)).
\]

It follows that there is a function \( g_x : C(D) \to \mathbb{Z} \) with

\[
2 \cdot \sum_{a \in A(D)} f_x(a)a = \sum_{c \in C(D)} g_x(c) \cdot r_D(c).
\]

For any \( c \in C(D) \), we may add \( \pm 2r_D(c) \) to the sum on the right-hand side of (5) without invalidating either (4) or (5), so long as we adjust \( f_x \) to add \( \pm r_D(c) \) to the sum on the left-hand side of (5). (As \( r_D(c) \in \ker s_D \), this adjustment is justified by the non-uniqueness of \( f_x \) mentioned above.) The effect on \( g_x \) is to replace \( g_x(c) \) with \( g_x(c) \pm 2 \). By doing this as many times as necessary, we can assume without loss of generality that every \( c \in C(D) \) has \( g_x(c) \in \{0,1\} \). That is, there is a set \( C(x) \subseteq C(D) \) such that

\[
2 \cdot \sum_{a \in A(D)} f_x(a)a = \sum_{c \in C(x)} r_D(c) = \sum_{c \in C(x)} (2a_o(c) - a_{u_1}(c) - a_{u_2}(c)).
\]

Here \( a_o(c) \) is the overpassing arc of \( D \) at \( c \) and \( a_{u_1}(c), a_{u_2}(c) \) are the underpassing arcs of \( D \) at \( c \). (If \( a_o(c), a_{u_1}(c), a_{u_2}(c) \) are not all distinct, some of the terms on the right-hand side of (6) will be equal.)
We adopt the convention that a crossing $c$ of $D$ is associated with the component $K_i$ of $L$ that contains the undercrossing arcs of $c$. That is, $\kappa_D(c) = \kappa_D(a_{u_1}(c)) = \kappa_D(a_{u_2}(c))$.

The equality [27] holds in the free abelian group $\mathbb{Z}^{A(D)}$, so every $a \in A(D)$ has precisely the same coefficient on the left-hand side of [27] as it has on the right-hand side of [27]. The hypothesis that every component of $L$ has an even number of associated arcs in $D$ guarantees that every crossing of $D$ has $a_{u_1}(c) \neq a_{u_2}(c)$. It follows that if $c \in C(x)$, then the contributions of $c$ to the coefficients of $a_{u_1}(c)$ and $a_{u_2}(c)$ on the right-hand side of [27] are odd. The coefficients of these arcs on the left-hand side of [27] are even, though, because of the factor of 2 that appears there. It follows that the crossings at the other ends of $a_{u_1}(c)$ and $a_{u_2}(c)$ must also be included in $C(x)$, as these are the only crossings of $D$ that can provide odd contributions to the coefficients of $a_{u_1}(c)$ and $a_{u_2}(c)$ on the right-hand side of [27], other than $c$ itself. Applying this argument repeatedly, we see that the set $C(x)$ has this property: if $C(x)$ contains any crossing of $D$ with $\kappa_D(c) = i$, then $C(x)$ contains every crossing of $D$ with $\kappa_D(c) = i$. We conclude that there is a subset $S(x) \subseteq \{1, \ldots, \mu\}$ such that $C(x) = \{c \in C(D) \mid \kappa_D(c) \in S(x)\}$.

Suppose for the moment that $S(x) = \{1\}$. Then

$$x = s_D\left( \sum_{a \in A(D)} f_x(a)a \right) = s_D\left( \frac{1}{2} \cdot 2 \cdot \sum_{a \in A(D)} f_x(a)a \right)$$

$$= s_D\left( \frac{1}{2} \cdot \sum_{c \in C(D)} \kappa_D(c) r_D(c) \right) = s_D\left( \sum_{c \in C(D)} \kappa_D(c) a_o(c) \right) - s_D\left( \sum_{a \in A(D)} \kappa_D(a) a \right).$$

We index the arcs and crossings with $\kappa_D = 1$ as in the discussion of Lemma [27]. That is, we choose a starting point $P$ on $K_1$, and we let $a_1, \ldots, a_{2k}, a_{2k+1} = a_1$ be the arcs of $K_1$, indexed in the order in which they appear if we walk along $K_1$ starting at $P$. We also index the crossings separating these arcs, so that $c_i$ separates $a_i$ from $a_{i+1}$, for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, 2k\}$; and we use the notation $a'_i = a_o(c_i)$. Then if $a^*$ is a fixed arc of $D$,

$$x = s_D\left( \sum_{c \in C(D)} \kappa_D(c) a_o(c) \right) - s_D\left( \sum_{a \in A(D)} \kappa_D(a) a \right)$$

$$= s_D\left( \sum_{i=1}^{k} (a'_{2i+1} + (a'_{2i} - a_{2i} - a_{2i+1})) \right) = s_D\left( \sum_{i=1}^{k} (a'_{2i+1} + (r_D(c_{2i}) - a_{2i})) \right)$$

$$= s_D\left( \sum_{i=1}^{k} (a'_{2i+1} - a'_{2i}) \right) = s_D\left( \sum_{i=1}^{2k} (-1)^{i+1} a'_i \right) = s_D\left( \sum_{i=1}^{2k} (-1)^{i+1} (a'_i - a^*) \right).$$

It follows that

$$e_D(x) = e_D(s_D(a'_1 - a^*) - s_D(a'_2 - a^*) + \cdots - s_D(a'_{2k} - a^*))$$
\( e_D s_D (a'_1 - a^*) e_D s_D (-(a'_2 - a^*)) \cdots e_D s_D (a'_{2k-1} - a^*) e_D s_D (-(a'_{2k} - a^*)) \\
= d_{a'_1} d_{a'_2}^{-1} \cdots d_{a'_{2k-1}} d_{a'_{2k}}^{-1} = (\beta_{a'_1} \beta_{a'_2}) (\beta_{a'_3} \beta_{a'_4}) \cdots (\beta_{a'_{2k-1}} \beta_{a'_{2k}}) \\
= \beta_{a'_1} \beta_{a'_2} \cdots \beta_{a'_{2k-1}} \beta_{a'_{2k}}.
\)

Lemma 27 tells us that this is the identity map of \( IMQ(L) \), so \( x \in \ker e_D \).

In general it is certainly possible that \( |S(x)| > 1 \). But then \( x \) is a sum of elements of \( \ker t_v \), one for each element of \( S(x) \), and each of these elements is contained in \( \ker e_D \) by the argument just given. It follows that \( x \), as a sum of elements of \( \ker e_D \), is itself contained in \( \ker e_D \).

\[ \qed \]

We are now ready to complete the proof of Theorem 5.

**Corollary 45.** If \( L \) is a classical link then \( IMQ(L) \cong \text{Core}'(\ker t_v) \).

\textbf{Proof.} Let \( D \) be a diagram of \( L \) in which each component has an even number of associated arcs, and let \( a^* \) be a fixed element of \( A(D) \) with \( \kappa_D(a^*) = 1 \). Proposition 40 tells us that \( \hat{s}_D : IMQ(L) \to IMQ'(L) \) is a surjective quandle map with \( \hat{s}_D(a) = s_D(a) \forall a \in A(D) \). As in the proof of Proposition 37 there is a quandle isomorphism \( \sigma : IMQ'(L) \to \text{Core}'(\ker t_v) \) given by \( \sigma(x) = x - s_D(a^*) \forall x \in IMQ'(L) \). We claim that the composition \( \sigma \hat{s}_D : IMQ(L) \to \text{Core}'(\ker t_v) \) satisfies the two requirements of Corollary 16.

According to Corollary 41, \( \hat{s}_D \) maps each orbit of \( IMQ(L) \) onto the orbit of \( IMQ'(L) \) corresponding to the same component of \( L \). It follows that \( \sigma \hat{s}_D \) satisfies requirement (b) of Corollary 16.

To show that \( \sigma \hat{s}_D \) satisfies requirement (a) of Corollary 16 we must show that the induced epimorphism \( \text{Dis}(\sigma \hat{s}_D) : \text{Dis}(IMQ(L)) \to \text{Dis}(\text{Core}'(\ker t_v)) \) is an isomorphism. Recall the definition: if \( a \in A(D) \) then

\[ \text{Dis}(\sigma \hat{s}_D)(\beta_{a^*}) = \beta_{\sigma \hat{s}_D(a^*)}\beta_{\sigma \hat{s}_D(a^*)} = \beta_{s_D(a) - s_D(a^*)} \beta_{a^*}. \]

According to Propositions 14 and 20 there is an epimorphism

\[ f : \ker t_v \to \text{Dis}(\text{Core}'(\ker t_v)) \]

given by \( f(x) = \beta_x \beta_0 \forall x \in \ker t_v \), and \( f \) is the subgroup \( \ker t_v \langle 2 \rangle = \{ x \in \ker t_v \mid 2x = 0 \} \). If \( e_D \) is the epimorphism of Proposition 42 then \( \ker t_v \langle 2 \rangle \subseteq \ker e_D \) by Proposition 44 so \( e_D \) induces an epimorphism \( \tilde{e}_D : \text{Dis}(\text{Core}'(\ker t_v)) \to \text{Dis}(IMQ(L)) \) with \( \tilde{e}_D(f(x)) = e_D(x) \forall x \in \ker t_v \).

We claim that the identity map of \( \text{Dis}(IMQ(L)) \) is equal to the composition \( \tilde{e}_D \text{Dis}(\sigma \hat{s}_D) \). To verify the claim, note that if \( a \in A(D) \) then

\[ \tilde{e}_D \text{Dis}(\sigma \hat{s}_D)(\beta_{a^*}) = \tilde{e}_D(\beta_{s_D(a) - s_D(a^*)}) \beta_0 \]
\[ = \tilde{e}_D(f(s_D(a) - s_D(a^*)) = e_D(s_D(a) - s_D(a^*)) = \beta_{a^*}. \]

The elementary displacements \( \beta_a \beta_{a^*} \) generate \( \text{Dis}(IMQ(L)) \), so the claim holds.

The claim implies that \( \text{Dis}(\sigma \hat{s}_D) \) is injective, so requirement (a) of Corollary 16 is satisfied, and \( \sigma \hat{s}_D \) is an isomorphism.

\[ \qed \]

The assertions of Theorem 5 regarding the cardinality of \( IMQ(L) \) follow directly from Proposition 38.
8 Corollaries 6, 7 and 8

As mentioned in the introduction, Corollary 6 follows immediately from Proposition 4 and Theorem 5.

The equivalence between parts 1 and 3 of Corollary 7 follows from Corollary 6 and the well-known property that a Goeritz matrix provides a presentation matrix for the first homology group of the cyclic double cover of \( S^3 \), branched over a link \( L \); see [9, Theorems 9.3 and 9.4] for instance. Note that this property requires that the Goeritz matrix in question arise from a link diagram whose shaded regions provide a connected spanning surface; adjusted Goeritz matrices are mentioned in Corollary 7 to allow for split link diagrams, as discussed in [12]. Note also that as the homology group is isomorphic to \( \text{ker } t \nu \), the adjusted Goeritz matrix can be replaced in Corollary 7 with any presentation matrix of \( \text{ker } t \nu \); for instance the matrix \( R'_{D} \) discussed in the proof of Proposition 30 provides the same invariant factors.

See [12] for Corollary 8 and the equivalence of parts 2 and 3 of Corollary 7.

9 The Borromean rings

Fig. 2 presents a diagram \( D \) of the Borromean rings; we denote this link \( B \). In this section we use \( B \) to illustrate the theory explained above: \( IMQ(B) \) and \( IMQ'(B) \) are isomorphic quandles of size 12 = 3 \( \cdot \) \( |\det B|/4 \), and they are not isomorphic to the core quandle of any abelian group. A secondary purpose is to illustrate how convenient it is to work with \( IMQ'(B) \) rather than \( IMQ(B) \).

As a first step in describing \( IMQ(B) \) we have the following.

**Proposition 46.** Every \( x \in IMQ(B) \) has \( x \triangleright c = x \triangleright ((c \triangleright a)) \).

**Proof.** It is helpful to work with the group \( IMG(B) \) given by Definition 23.

A crossing of \( D \) provides the relation \( b \triangleright c = b \triangleright ((c \triangleright a)) \), or \( cbc = acbaca \); hence \( aca = cbacab \). Using Lemma 24, we conclude that

\[
(c \triangleright (c \triangleright a)) = acacaca = cbacabca = cbc \cdot acacb \cdot aca
\]

\[
= cbc \cdot cbaca \cdot aca = cbc^2baca^2ca = cb^2ac^2a = ca^2 = c = c \triangleright c.
\]

Similarly,

\[
(c \triangleright a) \triangleright c = cacac = cbacacbc
\]

\[
= c^2bc \cdot acabc = bc \cdot cbaca = aca = c \triangleright a = (c \triangleright a) \triangleright (c \triangleright a).
\]

A crossing of \( D \) provides the relation \( c \triangleright (a \triangleright b) = c \triangleright a \), or \( babcbab = aca \), so \( cbab = babaca \). Another crossing provides the relation \( (a \triangleright b) \triangleright (b \triangleright c) = a \).

Therefore

\[
a \triangleright c = cac = cbc \cdot cbab \cdot bc = cbc \cdot babaca \cdot bc = cbcbab \cdot acabc = cbcbab \cdot cbaca
\]

\[
= cbcbabcbaca = (a \triangleright b) \triangleright (b \triangleright c)) \cdot caca = acaca = aca \cdot a \cdot aca = a \triangleright (c \triangleright a).
\]
Two crossings of \( D \) give the equalities \( a \triangleright (b \triangleright c) = a \triangleright b \) and \( (c \triangleright a) \triangleright (a \triangleright b) = c \), so we also have

\[
(a \triangleright b) \triangleright c = cbabc = cbca \cdot acabc = cbca \cdot cbaca = (cbc)a(cbc) \cdot c \cdot aca
\]

\[
= (a \triangleright (b \triangleright c)) \cdot ((c \triangleright a) \triangleright (a \triangleright b)) \cdot aca = (a \triangleright b) \cdot ((c \triangleright a) \triangleright (a \triangleright b)) \cdot aca
\]

\[
= (a \triangleright b) \cdot (a \triangleright b) \cdot (c \triangleright a) \cdot (a \triangleright b) \cdot (c \triangleright a) = (c \triangleright a) \cdot (a \triangleright b) \cdot (c \triangleright a)
\]

\[
= (a \triangleright b) \triangleright (c \triangleright a).
\]

The equalities \( b \triangleright c = b \triangleright (c \triangleright a) \) and \( (b \triangleright a) \triangleright c = (b \triangleright a) \triangleright (c \triangleright a) \) arise from crossings in \( D \), so we have \( x \triangleright c = x \triangleright (c \triangleright a) \) \( \forall x \in A(D) \). That is, \( \beta_c \) and \( \beta_{c\triangleright a} \) agree on \( A(D) \). As \( \beta_c \) and \( \beta_{c\triangleright a} \) are automorphisms of \( IMQ(B) \), and the elements of \( A(D) \) generate \( IMQ(B) \), the proposition follows. \( \square \)

Proposition 46 states that \( \beta_c = \beta_{c\triangleright a} \). Similar arguments imply that \( \beta_a = \beta_{a\triangleright b} \) and \( \beta_b = \beta_{b\triangleright c} \). We deduce a peculiar property of \( IMQ(B) \):

**Corollary 47.** The maps \( \beta_a, \beta_b \) and \( \beta_c \) commute with each other.

**Proof.** If \( x \in IMQ(B) \) then \( \beta_a \beta_c(x) = \beta_a \beta_c \beta_a(x) = aca \cdot aca \cdot aca = \beta_{c\triangleright a}(\beta_a(x)) \). Proposition 46 tells us that \( \beta_{c\triangleright a} = \beta_c \), so we conclude that every \( x \in IMQ(B) \) has \( \beta_a \beta_c(x) = \beta_c \beta_a(x) \). The equalities \( \beta_a \beta_b = \beta_b \beta_a \) and \( \beta_b \beta_c = \beta_c \beta_b \) are verified in the same way. \( \square \)
As $a^2 = b^2 = c^2 = 1$, it follows that the subgroup of $Aut(IMQ(B))$ generated by $\beta_a, \beta_b$ and $\beta_c$ has eight elements, the compositions $\beta_i^j \beta_j^k \beta_k^l$ with $i, j, k \in \{0, 1\}$. The subgroup $Dis(IMQ(B))$ has four elements, the compositions $\beta_i^j \beta_j^k \beta_k^l$ with $i, j, k \in \{0, 1\}$ and $i + j + k \in \{0, 2\}$. Proposition 22 tells us that $IMQ(B)$ has $\mu = 3$ orbits, so $|IMQ(B)| = 12$.

In order to describe $IMQ(B)$ explicitly, we adopt notation for the elements: if $i, j, k \in \{0, 1\}$ have $i + j + k \in \{0, 2\}$ then for $x \in \{a, b, c\}$, $\beta_i^j \beta_j^k \beta_k^l(x)$ is denoted $x_{ijk}$. The four elements of the orbit of $a$ are $a = a_{000}, a \triangleright b = a_{110}, a \triangleright c = a_{101},$ and $(a \triangleright b) \triangleright c = a_{011}$. The four elements of the orbit of $b$ are $b = b_{000}, b \triangleright a = b_{110}, b \triangleright c = b_{101},$ and $(b \triangleright a) \triangleright c = b_{011}$. The four elements of the orbit of $c$ are $c = c_{000}, c \triangleright a = c_{101}, c \triangleright b = c_{011},$ and $(c \triangleright a) \triangleright b = c_{110}$.

The $\beta_x$ maps of $IMQ(B)$ commute, and every $y \in IMQ(B)$ has $y^2 = 1$ in $IMQ(B)$, so if $x, y \in IMQ(B)$ then $\beta_{x \triangleright y} = \beta_x \beta_y \beta_{y \triangleright x} = (\beta_y)^2 \beta_x = \beta_x$. That is, there are only three distinct $\beta_x$ maps, one for each orbit. The map $\beta_a$ is the product of transpositions $(b_{000}b_{110})(b_{011}b_{101})(c_{000}c_{101})(c_{011}c_{110})$, the map $\beta_b$ is the product of transpositions $(a_{000}a_{110})(a_{011}a_{101})(c_{000}c_{110})(c_{011}c_{110})$, and the map $\beta_c$ is the product of transpositions $(a_{000}a_{101})(a_{011}a_{110})(b_{000}b_{110})(b_{011}b_{101})$.

We turn to $IMQ'(B)$. The images of the crossings of $D$ under $\tau_D$ are $2b - a - (\triangleright b)(2c - b - (\triangleright c)a, 2a - c - (\triangleright ca), 2b - a - (\triangleright a)c, 2c - b - (\triangleright b)a, 2a - b - (\triangleright ab)c, 2b - a - (\triangleright ab)b$. The images of these relations under $s_D$ are all 0, so $M_A(B)_\nu$ is generated by the three elements $x = s_D(a), y = s_D(b)$ and $z = s_D(c)$; the first three relations imply that $s_D(a \triangleright b) = 2y - x, s_D(b \triangleright c) = 2z - y$ and $s_D(c \triangleright a) = 2x - z$. The three remaining relations imply that $4z - 2y - x - (2y - x) = 0, 4x - 2z - y - (2z - y) = 0$ and $4y - 2x - z - (2x - z) = 0$; more simply, $4x = 4y = 4z$. It follows that

$$M_A(B)_\nu \cong \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}_4 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_4,$$

with the three summands generated by $x, y - x$ and $z - x$ respectively. The definition of $\phi_\nu : M_A(B)_\nu \to A_3 = \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2$ in Sec. 8 implies that if we identify $M_A(B)_\nu$ with $\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}_4 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_4$, then $\phi_\nu$ is given by using the identity map in the first coordinate, and the natural projection $\mathbb{Z}_4 \to \mathbb{Z}_2$ in the second and third coordinates.

It follows that $IMQ'(B)$ is the union of these three orbits:

$$\phi_\nu^{-1}((1, 0, 0)) = \{x = (1, 0, 0), (1, 2, 0), (1, 0, 2), (1, 2, 2)\}$$

$$\phi_\nu^{-1}((1, 1, 0)) = \{y = (1, 1, 0), (1, 3, 0), (1, 1, 2), (1, 3, 2)\}$$

$$\phi_\nu^{-1}((1, 0, 1)) = \{z = (1, 0, 1), (1, 2, 1), (1, 0, 3), (1, 2, 3)\}$$

The core quandle operation $v \triangleright w = 2w - v$ provides only three distinct $\beta$ maps, one for each orbit. Each is a product of four disjoint transpositions:

$$\beta_x = ((1, 1, 0)(1, 3, 0))(1, 1, 2)(1, 3, 2))((1, 0, 1)(1, 0, 3))(1, 2, 1)(1, 2, 3))$$

$$\beta_y = ((1, 0, 0)(1, 2, 0))(1, 0, 2)(1, 2, 0))((1, 0, 1)(1, 2, 3))(1, 2, 1)(1, 0, 3))$$

$$\beta_z = ((1, 0, 0)(1, 0, 2))(1, 2, 0)(1, 2, 2))((1, 1, 0)(1, 3, 2))(1, 3, 0)(1, 1, 2))$$
We see that $IMQ'(B)$ is indeed isomorphic to $IMQ(B)$.

We leave it as an exercise for the reader to confirm the assertion of Corollary 8 that the connected sum of torus links $T = T_{(2,4)} T_{(2,4)}$ has $IMQ(T) \cong IMQ(B)$. As $B$ and $T$ are very different from each other – $B$ is prime and $T$ is not, $T$ has only one trivial two-component sublink and $B$ has three, $T$ has two nonzero linking numbers and $B$ has none, the components of $B$ are interchanged by symmetries and the components of $T$ are not, etc. – this example indicates that $IMQ(L)$ and the other link invariants mentioned in Corollary 7 are not very sensitive.
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