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ABSTRACT. In the 1980’s Daryl Cooper introduced the notion of a C-complex (or clasp-complex) bounded by a link and explained how to compute signatures and polynomial invariants using a C-complex. Since then this was extended by works of Cimasoni, Florens, Mellor, Melvin, Conway, Toffoli, Friedl, and others to compute other link invariants. Informally a C-complex is a union of surfaces which are allowed to intersect each other in clasps. The purpose of the current paper is to study the minimal number of clasps amongst all C-complexes bounded by a fixed link $L$. This measure of complexity is related to the number of crossing changes needed to reduce $L$ to a boundary link. We prove that if $L$ is a 2-component link with nonzero linking number, then the linking number determines the minimal number of clasps amongst all C-complexes. In the case of 3-component links, the triple linking number provides an additional lower bound on the number of clasps in a C-complex.

1. INTRODUCTION

There is a generalization of a Seifert surface to the setting of links called a C-complex or clasp-complex originally defined by Cooper [5, 6]. Informally, if $L = L_1 \cup \cdots \cup L_n$ is an $n$-component link then a C-complex for $L$ is a collection of Seifert surfaces, $F = F_1 \cup \cdots \cup F_n$ for the components of $L$ which are allowed to intersect, but only in clasps. See Figure 1 for a local picture of a clasp and Figures 3 and 4 for some examples of C-complexes. See also Definition 8.

If a C-complex, $F$, for $L$ has no clasp intersections, then $F$ is a collection of disjoint Seifert surfaces for the components of $L$. In this case $L$ is called a boundary link and $F$ is called a boundary surface. Thus, the number of clasps in a C-complex can be used the measure how far $F$ is from being a boundary surface and so how far $L$ is from being a boundary link. In this paper we shall study the minimal number of clasps amongst all C-complexes bounded by $L$. This should not be confused with the clasp number introduced by Shibuya in in [13].

Definition 1. For a link $L$ we define the clasp number of $L$, $C(L)$, to be the minimum number of clasps amongst all C-complexes bounded by $L$.

For a 2-component link $L = L_1 \cup L_2$ and any C-complex $F = F_1 \cup F_2$ bounded by $L$, the linking number, $\text{lk}(L_1, L_2)$, can be computed as the number of positive clasps in $F$ minus the number of
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Figure 1. Left: A positive clasp. Right: A negative clasp.
negative. It follows that $C(L) \geq |\text{lk}(L_1, L_2)|$. Our first main result is that for most 2-component links, $C(L) = |\text{lk}(L_1, L_2)|$.

**Theorem 2.** Let $L = L_1 \cup L_2$ be a 2-component link. If $\text{lk}(L_1, L_2) \neq 0$ then $C(L) = |\text{lk}(L_1, L_2)|$. If $\text{lk}(L_1, L_2) = 0$ then $C(L) \in \{0, 2\}$.

![Figure 2. Left: A clasp. Right: A crossing change removing the clasp.](image)

We mentioned that the number of clasps in a $C$-complex for $L$ measures how far that link is from being a boundary link. We take a moment and make that explicit. Any link can be reduced to a boundary link by a finite sequence of crossing changes. Indeed, that boundary link can be taken to be the unlink. Let $B(L)$ be the minimum number of crossing changes needed to reduce $L$ to a boundary link. If $F$ is a $C$-complex for $L$ admitting $C(L)$ total clasps, then by changing a crossing at each clasp as in Figure 2 one reduces $F$ to a boundary surface and so $L$ to a boundary link. Therefore

$$B(L) \leq C(L).$$

On the other hand, changing a crossing of $L$ changes only one linking number of $L$ and that by at most 1. As any boundary link has vanishing pairwise linking numbers, we conclude that if $L = L_1 \cup \cdots \cup L_n$ is an $n$-component link then

$$\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} |\text{lk}(L_i, L_j)| \leq B(L).$$

According to Theorem 2 if $L = L_1 \cup L_2$ has only two components and $\text{lk}(L_1, L_2) \neq 0$ then $C(L) = |\text{lk}(L_1, L_2)|$. Thus, the discussion of the preceding paragraph yields the following corollary

**Corollary 3.** Let $L = L_1 \cup L_2$ be a 2-component link. If $\text{lk}(L_1, L_2) \neq 0$ then there exists a sequence of $|\text{lk}(L_1, L_2)|$ crossing changes reducing $L$ to a boundary link. If $\text{lk}(L_1, L_2) = 0$ then either $L$ is a boundary link or there exists a sequence of 2 crossing changes reducing $L$ to a boundary link.

**Example 4.** In order to demonstrate that Theorem 2 and Corollary 3 are surprising, consider the link of Figure 3. The depicted $C$-complex has three clasps. Since $\text{lk}(L_1, L_2) = 1$, there exists a $C$-complex bounded by $L$ with a single clasp and perhaps more surprisingly there exists a single crossing change reducing $L$ to a boundary link.

![Figure 3. A 2-component link with linking number 1.](image)
According to Theorem 2, the linking number determines the clasp number of 2-component links. This behavior does not extend to links of more than 2 components. In [11], Milnor introduced a family of higher order linking invariants. The first of these, the triple linking number, $\mu_{ijk}$, is well-defined when the pairwise linking numbers vanish and measures the linking of the $i$'th, $j$'th, and $k$'th components. According to Mellor-Melvin [10], $\mu_{ijk}(L)$ can be computed in terms of the clasps of a C-complex bounded by $L$. Thus, it comes as no surprise that $\mu_{123}(L)$ can be used to deduce a bound on $C(L)$. We explicitly compute this bound.

**Theorem 5.** Let $L = L_1 \cup L_2 \cup L_3$ be a 3-component link with vanishing pairwise linking numbers. Then $C(L) \geq 2 \left\lceil \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} \right\rceil$. Here $\lceil \cdot \rceil$ is the ceiling function.

In order to illustrate the power of this theorem we compute the clasp number of some examples. The Boromean rings, denoted $BR$, has $\mu_{123}(BR) = 1$ and so by Theorem 5, $C(BR) \geq 4$. Figure 4 (a) depicts a C-complex bounded by $BR$ with four clasps. Thus, $C(BR) = 4$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the generalized Boromean rings $BR^n$ of Figure 4 (b) bounds a C-complex with $4n$ clasps and has $\mu_{123}(BR^n) = n^2$. We make this computation in Proposition 10. As a consequence we get the following corollary, producing links with vanishing pairwise linking numbers and arbitrarily large clasp number.

**Corollary 6.** For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, consider generalized Boromean rings $BR^n$ of Figure 4 (b). The pairwise linking numbers of $BR^n$ vanish and yet $2 \left\lfloor \frac{2n}{\sqrt{3}} \right\rfloor \leq C(L) \leq 4n$.

In [10], Mellor-Melvin provides a means of computing $\mu_{123}(L)$ in terms of any collection of Seifert surfaces for the components of $L$. We shall use this result in the special case of a C-complex. While a more complete description appears in Section 3, we recall it informally now. Start with a link $L = L_1 \cup L_2 \cup L_3$ bounding a C-complex $F = F_1 \cup F_2 \cup F_3$, follow a component $L_k$ of $L$, and record a word $w_k(F)$ in $x_1^{\pm 1}, x_2^{\pm 1}, x_3^{\pm 1}$ capturing the order and sign of the clasps $L_k$ encounters. Set $e_{ij}(w_k(F)) \in \mathbb{Z}$ to be the signed count of the number of $x_i$’s appearing in $w_k$ before an $x_j$. The triple linking number is given by $\mu_{123}(L) = e_{12}(w_3(F)) + e_{23}(w_1(F)) + e_{31}(w_2(F))$. 

**Figure 4.** (a) A C-complex bounded by the Boromean rings. (b) A C-complex bounded by the generalized Boromean rings, $BR^n$. 

**Figure 4.** (a) A C-complex bounded by the Boromean rings. (b) A C-complex bounded by the generalized Boromean rings, $BR^n$. 


A technical result we use in our proof of Theorem 5 is a new geometric strategy to compute \( e_{ij}(w) \). For any word \( w \) in letters \( x_1^{±1}, x_2^{±1}, x_3^{±1} \) and any \( i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\} \) construct a piecewise linear curve \( \gamma_{ij}(w) \) in \( \mathbb{R}^2 \) as follows. Start at the origin \((0,0)\). Each time you see an \( x_i \) (respectively \( x_i^{-1} \), \( x_j \), \( x_j^{-1} \)) in \( w \) travel right (respectively left, up, down) a length of 1. The following reveals that \( e_{ij}(L) \) is the area enclosed by this curve.

Theorem 7. Let \( w = \prod_{n=1}^{m} x_{in}^{en} \) be a word in letters \( x_1^{±1}, x_2^{±1}, x_3^{±1} \). For any \( i \neq j \in \{1, 2, 3\} \), \( e_{ij}(w) = \int_{\gamma_{ij}(w)} x \, dy \). Additionally, if \( \gamma_{ij}(w) \) is a simple closed curve with counterclockwise orientation, then \( e_{ij}(w) \) is the area enclosed by \( \gamma_{ij}(w) \).

1.1. Questions. Theorem 2 states that any 2-component link with nonzero linking number has a C-complex admitting precisely \( \|\text{lk}(L_1, L_2)\| \) clasps. However, our proof makes no attempt to minimize the first Betti number of the C-complex, which is the measure of complexity most directly accessible using the tools like Alexander polynomial or signature \([1, 2]\). We pose the following question.

Question 1. Suppose that \( L = L_1 \cup L_2 \) is a 2-component link with nonzero linking number. Amongst all C-complexes \( F \) bounded by \( L \) admitting precisely \( \|\text{lk}(L_1, L_2)\| \) clasps, what is the minimal value for \( \beta_1(F) \)? Is it possible to simultaneously minimize the number of clasps in \( F \) as well as \( \beta_1(F) \)?

Theorem 2 almost completely determines \( C(L) \) for 2-component links. Theorem 5 concludes that \( C(L) \geq 2 \left\lfloor 2\sqrt{|\mu_{1123}(L)|/3} \right\rfloor \) for three component links with vanishing linking numbers. One might ask if equality holds.

Question 2. Let \( L = L_1 \cup L_2 \cup L_3 \) be a 3-component link with vanishing pairwise linking numbers and \( \mu_{123}(L) \neq 0 \). Does it follow that \( C(L) = 2 \left\lfloor 2\sqrt{|\mu_{123}(L)|/3} \right\rfloor \)?

More specifically, for any \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), consider the generalized Borromean rings \( BR^n \) of Figure 4 (b). Corollary 6 concludes that \( 2\left\lfloor 2n/\sqrt{3} \right\rfloor \leq C(BR^n) \leq 4n \). When \( n = 2 \) this gives \( 6 \leq C(BR^2) \leq 8 \).

Question 3. What is \( C(BR^n) \)?

One might ask about the clasp number of links of more than three components.

Question 4. Let \( n \geq 3 \) and let \( L = L_1 \cup \cdots \cup L_n \) be an \( n \)-component link with vanishing pairwise linking numbers and \( \mu_{ijk}(L) \neq 0 \) for some \( i, j, k \). Is there a formula for \( C(L) \) in terms of the set of all triple linking numbers of \( L \)?

In the case of links of more than 2 components with nonvanishing pairwise linking numbers, the triple linking numbers are not well defined. Instead by \([7]\) there is a total triple linking number recording all of the individual triple linking numbers taking values in some quotient \( \mathcal{M} \).

Question 5. Let \( L = L_1 \cup \cdots \cup L_n \) be an \( n \)-component link with either a nonvanishing pairwise linking number or a nonvanishing triple linking number. Is there a formula for \( C(L) \) in terms of the linking numbers and the total triple linking number?

2. C-complexes and the Proof of Theorem 2

Throughout this paper all knots will be smoothly embedded curves in \( S^3 \), and all surfaces will be smoothly embedded in \( S^3 \), compact, connected, and oriented. A smoothly embedded compact oriented surface with boundary equal to a knot \( K \) will be called a Seifert surface for \( K \). We begin by recalling the formal definition of a C-complex.
Theorem 2. \( F \) is given by counting with sign how many times \( L \) shared by \( F \) bounded by \( L \) See Figure 1 for a local picture. If \( F \) (or negative assumption we see that
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Proof of Theorem 2. Let \( L = L_1 \cup L_2 \) be a 2-component link. If \( \text{lk}(L_1, L_2) = 0 \) then \( C(L) \in \{0, 2\} \). If \( \text{lk}(L_1, L_2) \neq 0 \) then \( C(L) = |\text{lk}(L_1, L_2)| \)

Proof of Theorem 2. Let \( L = L_1 \cup L_2 \) be a 2-component link and \( F = F_1 \cup F_2 \) be any C-complex bounded by \( L \). Let \( c_+ \) be the number of positive clasps in \( F \) and \( c_- \) be the number of negative clasps. By the triangle inequality,

\[
|\text{lk}(L_1, L_2)| = |c_+ - c_-| \leq c_+ + c_-.
\]

So that \( F \) has at least \( |\text{lk}(L_1, L_2)| \) many clasps. As \( F \) is an arbitrary C-complex bounded by \( L \), \( C(L) \geq |\text{lk}(L_1, L_2)| \). Thus, we need only to show that \( C(L) \leq |\text{lk}(L_1, L_2)| \). Since \( C(L) \) is the minimum number of clasps amongst all C-complexes bounded by \( L \), it suffices to exhibit a C-complex with precisely \( |\text{lk}(L_1, L_2)| \) clasps or 2 clasps in the case that \( \text{lk}(L_1, L_2) = 0 \). Without loss of generality we shall assume that \( \text{lk}(L_1, L_2) \geq 0 \).

We begin by producing a pair of Seifert surfaces \( F_1 \) and \( F_2 \) for \( L_1 \) and \( L_2 \) which will have no negative clasps in their intersection but which may have some non-clasp intersections. Let \( F_1 \) be any Seifert surface for \( L_1 \). Suppose \( F_1 \) is transverse to \( L_2 \) and \( F_1 \cap L_2 \) contains \( n_+ \) positive points of intersection and \( n_- \) points of negative intersection. If both of \( n_+ \) and \( n_- \) are nonzero then as you follow \( L_2 \) you will at some point encounter a positive point of intersection with \( F_1 \) followed by a negative, as in Figure 3(a). By adding a tube to \( F_1 \) as in Figure 5(b) we see a new Seifert surface bounded by \( L_1 \) which intersects \( L_2 \) in two fewer points. Iterating, we see a Seifert surface for \( L_1 \), which we persist in calling \( F_1 \), bounded by \( L_1 \) which either intersects \( L_2 \) in only positive points or only negative points of intersection. Thus, \( n_+ = 0 \) or \( n_- = 0 \). Since \( n_+ - n_- = \text{lk}(L_1, L_2) \geq 0 \) by assumption we see that \( n_- = 0 \). By the same process, we find a Seifert surface \( F_2 \) which intersects \( L_1 \) in only positive points of intersection.

Figure 5. (a) A knot \( L_2 \) intersecting an oriented surface \( F_1 \) in a positive point of intersection followed by a negative point of intersection. (b) Adding a tube to \( F_1 \) removes both intersection points.
There is no reason to expect that \( F_1 \cup F_2 \) is a C-complex. After a small isotopy of \( F_1 \) and \( F_2 \) we may assume that they intersect transversely. Therefore \( F_1 \cap F_2 \) consists of a collection of:

- Arcs with one endpoint in \( L_1 = \partial F_1 \) and the other in \( L_2 = \partial F_2 \). (Clasps.)
- Arcs with both endpoints in \( L_1 = \partial F_1 \) or both endpoints in \( L_2 = \partial F_2 \). (Ribbons.)
- Simple closed curves interior to \( F_1 \) and interior to \( F_2 \). (Loops.)

See Figure 6. Since \( F_1 \) has no negative points of intersection with \( L_2 \), there can be no negative clasps in \( F_1 \cap F_2 \). The endpoints of a ribbon intersection are intersection points between \( F_1 \) and \( L_2 \) (or \( F_2 \) and \( L_1 \)) with opposite signs. Since we have already arranged that there are no negative points of intersection, there can be no ribbon intersections in \( F_1 \cap F_2 \). Thus, \( F_1 \cap F_2 \) consists only of loops and positive clasps. It remains to further modify \( F_1 \) and \( F_2 \) to eliminate all loops.

![Figure 6](image)

**Figure 6.** (a) A positive clasp intersection. (b) A ribbon intersection. (c) A loop intersection.

Assume that \( \text{lk}(L_1, L_2) \neq 0 \) so that there there is at least one clasp in \( F_1 \cap F_2 \). Let \( c \) be one such clasp. Consider any loop intersection \( \ell \subseteq F_1 \cap F_2 \). Without loss of generality we may assume that there exists an arc \( \alpha \) in \( F_2 \) running from a point in \( c \) to a point in \( \ell \). Moreover, we may assume that \( \alpha \) connects two points pushed off from \( F_1 \) in the same normal direction. Figure 7 reveals how one may add a tube to \( F_1 \) following \( \alpha \) to combine \( c \) and \( \ell \) into a single simple arc. The resulting arc has one endpoint in \( L_1 \) and the other in \( L_2 \). In other words, it is a clasp. Thus, we have reduced the number of loop intersections by 1 and preserved the number of clasp intersections. Iterating, we eliminate all loop intersections and produce a C-complex for \( L = L_1 \cup L_2 \) with number of clasps equal to \( \text{lk}(L_1, L_2) \), as claimed.

In the case that the linking number is zero, \( F_1 \cap F_2 \) contains no clasps. If \( F_1 \cap F_2 \) also has no loops, then \( F_1 \cup F_2 \) is a C-complex with no clasps and \( C(L) = 0 \). Otherwise, modify \( F_1 \cup F_2 \) as in Figure 8 to add a positive and a negative clasp. Now we use the move of Figure 7 just as in the previous paragraph to remove all loop intersections and produce a C-complex with precisely 2 clasps, so \( 0 \leq C(L) \leq 2 \). In order to see that \( C(L) \) cannot be 1, notice that since \( c_+ - c_- = \text{lk}(L_1, L_2) = 0 \), it must be that \( c_+ = c_- \). In particular, \( F \) has an even number of clasps. This completes the proof.

![Figure 7](image)

**Figure 7.** Left: A pair of surfaces sharing a clasp and a loop intersection together with an arc running from the clasp to the loop. Center: Perform a finger move to push the clasp intersection closer to the loop. Right: Tubing the clasp into the loop results in a single clasp intersection.
3. TRIPLE LINKING NUMBERS VIA CLASPS AND POLYOMINOS

In this section we recall an invariant of links called the triple linking number and provide a formula in terms of the area of a polyomino. A polyomino is a region of \( \mathbb{R}^2 \) consisting of a union of closed unit squares with vertices at points in \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \).

In [10] Mellor-Melvin produces a formula for the triple linking number for any union of Seifert surfaces for the components of \( L \). We shall recall it in the special case of a C-complex. Let \( L = L_1 \cup \cdots \cup L_n \) be an \( n \)-component link and \( F = F_1 \cup \cdots \cup F_n \) be a C-complex bounded by \( L \). We associate to each \( k = 1, \ldots, n \) a word \( w_k(F) \) called a clasp word as follows. Pick a basepoint \( p_k \) on \( L_k \) and follow \( L_k \) in the positive direction starting at \( p_k \). Record an \( x_j \) whenever \( L_k \) crosses through \( F_j \) at a positive clasp and \( x_j^{-1} \) when \( L_k \) crosses \( F_j \) at a negative clasp. Let \( e_{ij}(w_k(F)) \) be given by counting with sign how often in \( w_k(F) \) \( x_i \) appears before \( x_j \). More formally, if \( w_k(F) = \prod_{v=1}^{m} x_{i_v}^{\epsilon_v} \) then

\[
e_{ij}(w_k(F)) = \sum_{v=1}^{m} \sum_{u=1}^{v} \delta(i_u, i) \delta(i_v, j) \epsilon_u \epsilon_v.
\]

Here \( \delta(a, b) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } a = b \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \) indicates the Kronecker \( \delta \). We encourage the reader to take a moment and use this definition to compute \( e_{12}(x_1 x_2 x_1^{-1} x_2^{-1}) = 1 \). The triple linking number is given by

\[
\mu_{ijk}(L) = e_{ij}(w_k(F)) + e_{jk}(w_i(F)) + e_{ki}(w_j(F))
\]

When \( L \) is a link with vanishing pairwise linking numbers, \( \mu_{ijk}(L) \) is independent of the choice of \( F \) and of the choice of basepoints.

Example 9. For the sake of clarity, we provide an example computing the triple linking number of the Borromean Rings \( BR = BR_1 \cup BR_2 \cup BR_3 \) using the C-complex \( F \) of Figure 4.

• Following \( BR_1 \) starting at the arrow we encounter in order a negative clasp with \( F_3 \), a positive clasp with \( F_2 \), a positive clasp with \( F_3 \) and a negative clasp with \( F_2 \). Therefore,

\[
w(F_1) = x_3^{-1} x_2 x_3 x_2^{-1}.
\]

Similarly, \( w(F_2) = x_1^{-1} x_1 \) and \( w(F_3) = x_3^{-1} x_1 \).

• Count with sign how many times you see \( x_2 \) before \( x_3 \) in \( w(L_1) \) to get \( e_{23}(w_1(F)) = +1 \). Similarly, \( e_{12}(w(F_3)) = e_{31}(w(F_2)) = 0 \).

• The triple linking number is given by summing,

\[
\mu_{123}(BR) = e_{12}(w_3(F)) + e_{23}(w_1(F)) + e_{31}(w_2(F)) = 1.
\]
Our next goal is the statement and proof of Theorem 7 which computes $e_{ij}(w_k(F))$ in terms of some curve $\gamma_{ij}(w_k(F))$ in the plane. We begin by explaining the construction of $\gamma_{ij}(w_k(F))$. Let $w$ be any word in the letters $x_1^\pm, \ldots, x_n^\pm$. We give a procedure which associates to $w$ a curve in the plane. Start at the point $(0,0) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Each time you encounter $x_i$ in $w$ travel right a length of 1. When $x_i^{-1}$ is encountered travel left. When $x_j$ or $x_j^{-1}$ is encountered travel up or down respectively. Call the resulting curve $\gamma_{ij}(w_k)$. For instance, when $w = x_i x_j x_i x_j x_i^{-2} x_j^{-2}$, $\gamma_{ij}(w)$ appears in Figure 9. The assiduous reader will now compute $e_{ij}(w) = 3$ using equation (1) which suggestively agrees with the area of the region enclosed by $\gamma_{ij}(w)$.

![Figure 9](image-url) The curve $\gamma_{ij}(w)$ associated to the word $w = x_i x_j x_i x_j x_i^{-2} x_j^{-2}$ together with the region $\gamma_{ij}(w)$ encloses encloses.

We are now ready to prove Theorem 7.

**Theorem 7.** Let $w = \prod_{v=1}^{m} x_{i_v}^{e_v}$ be a word in letters $x_1^\pm, \ldots, x_n^\pm$. For any $i \neq j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$,

$$e_{ij}(w) = \oint_{\gamma_{ij}(w)} x \, dy.$$  

Additionally, if $\gamma_{ij}(w)$ is a simple closed curve with counterclockwise orientation, then $e_{ij}(w)$ is the area enclosed by $\gamma_{ij}(w)$.

**Proof of Theorem 7.** Let $w = \prod_{v=1}^{m} x_{i_v}^{e_v}$ be a word in the letters $x_1^\pm, \ldots, x_n^\pm$. Let $|w| = m$ be the length of $w$. Then $\gamma_{ij}(w)$ consists of a concatenation of $|w|$ many curves, $\gamma_{ij}^1(w), \ldots, \gamma_{ij}^m(w)$ where $\gamma_{ij}^v(w)$ is constant if $i_v \notin \{i,j\}$ and is a length 1 line segment traveling in a cardinal direction otherwise. Therefore, the integral in question breaks up as

$$\oint_{\gamma_{ij}(w)} x \, dy = \sum_{v=1}^{m} \left( \oint_{\gamma_{ij}^v(w)} x \, dy \right).$$

If $i_v \neq j$ then $\gamma_{ij}^v(w)$ is either constant or parametrizes a horizontal line segment. In either case $dy = 0$ so that $\oint_{\gamma_{ij}^v(w)} x \, dy = 0$. If $i_v = j$ then $\gamma_{ij}^v(w)$ is a vertical line segment parametrized by $\gamma_{ij}^v(t) = (x, t \cdot e_v + c)$ with $x$ and $c$ constants and $t$ running from 0 to 1. In particular $dy = \epsilon_v \, dt$.

The fixed $x$-coordinate over which this vertical line sits is the signed count of $u < v$ with $i_u = i$:

$$x = \sum_{u=1}^{v} \delta(x_u, 1) \epsilon_u.$$ 

Thus, in the case that $i_v = j$, we have

$$\oint_{\gamma_{ij}^v(w)} x \, dy = \int_{0}^{1} x \cdot \epsilon_v \, dt = x \cdot \epsilon_v = \sum_{u=1}^{v} \delta(x_u, 1) \epsilon_u \epsilon_v.$$ 

Combining the cases $i_v = j$ and $i_v \neq j$, we see for all $v$,

$$\oint_{\gamma_{ij}^v(w)} x \, dy = \delta(i_v,j) \sum_{u=1}^{v} \delta(x_u, 1) \epsilon_u \epsilon_v.$$
Summing over all values of $v$, $\int_{\gamma_{ij}(w)} x \, dy = \sum_{v=1}^{n} \delta(i_v, j) \sum_{u=1}^{v} \delta(x_u, i) \epsilon_u \epsilon_v$. An application of the distributive law reduces this to the definition of $e_{ij}(w)$ appearing in equation $[1]$. This completes the proof of the first claim. The second claim follows from a standard application of Green’s theorem. \hfill \Box

As an illustration of the efficacy of Theorem 7 we use it to make some computations.

**Proposition 10.** For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the generalized Boromean rings $BR^n$ of Figure 4 has triple linking number $n^2$.

**Proof.** Using the C-complex of Figure 4 (b) we get clasp words

$$w_1(F) = x_3^{-n}x_2^n x_3^n, w_2(F) = x_1^n x_1^{-n}, w_3(F) = (x_1 x_1^{-1})^n$$

The curve $\gamma_{23}(w_1(F))$ traces a counterclockwise $n \times n$ square. The curve, $\gamma_{31}(w_2(F))$ lies in the vertical line $x = 0$ so that $e_{31}(w_2(F)) = 0$.

Finally, $\gamma_{23}(w_1(F))$ lies in the horizontal line $y = 0$ so that $e_{12}(w_3(F)) = 0$. Therefore, $\mu_{123}(BR^n) = n^2$. \hfill \Box

## 4. The proof of Theorem 5

We now turn our attention to a lower bound on the number of clasps in a C-complex in terms of the triple linking number. Notice that the curve $\gamma_{ij}(w(L_k))$ of Section 3 has length equal to the number of clasps in $F_k \cap F_i$ plus the number of clasps in $F_k \cap F_j$. By Theorem 7, $\int_{\gamma_{ij}(w)} x \, dy = e_{ij}(w(L_k))$. Thus, we will begin the proof of Theorem 5 by studying how $\int_{\gamma} x \, dy$ provides a lower bound on the length of $\gamma$.

For the lemma below, a **polyomino curve** is a closed curve in $\mathbb{R}^2$ given by a concatenation of straight lines of length 1 between points in $\mathbb{Z}^2$. The length of a curve, $\gamma$, is denoted by $||\gamma||$.

**Lemma 11.** Let $\gamma$ be a polyomino curve in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Let $A = \int_{\gamma} x \, dy$. Then $||\gamma|| \geq 2 \left[2\sqrt{|A|}\right]$. 

**Proof.** Let $\gamma$ be a polyomino curve in $\mathbb{R}^2$ and let $A = \int_{\gamma} x \, dy$. If $\gamma$ is a simple closed curve then a standard application of Green’s theorem shows that $|A| = \int_{\gamma} 1 \, dx \, dy$ is the area of the region $R$ enclosed by $\gamma$. In [8], Harary-Harborth shows that the minimum perimeter amongst all polyominos with a fixed area $|A|$ is given by $\left(2 \left[2\sqrt{|A|}\right]\right)$. Thus, $||\gamma||$, which is the perimeter of $A$, is at least $2 \left[2\sqrt{|A|}\right]$, as the lemma claims.

It remains to deal with the case that $\gamma$ is not simple. Recall that by assumption, $\gamma$ consists of a concatenation of vertical and horizontal line segments of length 1. Denote the rightward pointing horizontal line segments as $\gamma^1_1(t), \ldots, \gamma^1_k(t)$, the leftward pointing as $\gamma^2_1(t), \ldots, \gamma^2_k(t)$, the upward as $\gamma^u_1(t), \ldots, \gamma^u_k(t)$ and the downward as $\gamma^d_1(t), \ldots, \gamma^d_k(t)$. As $\gamma$ is a closed curve, the number of rightward and leftward pointing segments must be equal to each other as must the number of upward and downward pointing segments.

Up to a translation and a reparametrization preserving $||\gamma||$ and $\int_{\gamma} x \, dy$, we may assume that $\gamma$ is parametrized by some $(x(t), y(t))$ such that the minimum value of $x(t)$ is $x(0) = 0$. It follows for
all $t$ that $0 \leq x(t) \leq h$, where $h$ is the number of rightward pointing length 1 line segments in $\gamma$. Breaking the integral up as a sum,

$$A = \int_{\gamma} x \, dy = \sum_{i=1}^{u} \int_{\gamma_i^u} x \, dy + \sum_{i=1}^{v} \int_{\gamma_i^v} x \, dy + \sum_{i=1}^{h} \int_{\gamma_i^h} x \, dy + \sum_{i=1}^{h} \int_{\gamma_i^h} x \, dy$$

Since $\gamma_i^u$ and $\gamma_i^v$ are horizontal line segments, they each have $dy = 0$ so that $\int_{\gamma_i^u} x \, dy = 0$. Since $\gamma_i^u$ is an upward pointing length 1 line segment, we may parametrize $\gamma_i^u$ as $(x, t + c)$ where $x$ and $c$ are constant and $t$ runs from 0 to 1. Therefore, $dy = dt$ and $0 \leq x \leq h$. Thus, $\int_{\gamma_i^u} x \, dy = \int_{0}^{1} x \, dt = x$ and in particular $0 \leq \int_{\gamma_i^u} x \, dy \leq h$. Similarly, $-h \leq \int_{\gamma_i^d} x \, dy \leq 0$. Therefore, $0 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{u} \int_{\gamma_i^u} y \, dx \leq h \cdot v$ and $-h \cdot v \leq \sum_{i=1}^{v} \int_{\gamma_i^d} y \, dx \leq 0$. Applying these bounds to the rightmost expression in (2) we see that $-h \cdot v \leq A \leq h \cdot v$, so that $|A| \leq h \cdot v$.

Let $R$ be an $h \times v$ rectangle and let $r$ be the curve traversing its boundary counterclockwise. As $r$ is made up of the same number of length 1 line segments as $\gamma$, $||\gamma|| = ||r||$. Since $R$ is a polyomino of area $h \cdot v$, [8] applies and $||r|| \geq 2 \left\lceil 2 \sqrt{h \cdot v} \right\rceil$. Summarizing,

$$||\gamma|| = ||r|| \geq 2 \left\lceil 2 \sqrt{h \cdot v} \right\rceil \geq 2 \left\lceil 2 \sqrt{|A|} \right\rceil.$$  

This completes the proof. 

If $w = \prod_{v=1}^{m} x_{i_v}^{\epsilon_v}$ is a word in $x_1^{\pm 1}, \ldots, x_n^{\pm 1}$ for which the signed count of $x_i$’s and $x_j$’s are both zero then $||\gamma_{ij}(w)||$ is the same as the length of the word $w$ after deleting all letters other than $x_i^{\pm 1}$ and $x_j^{\pm 1}$, while $e_{ij}(w) = \oint_{\gamma_{ij}(w)} y \, dx$ by Theorem 7. Thus, Lemma 11 has the following corollary.

**Corollary 12.** Let $w = \prod_{n=1}^{m} x_{i_n}^{\epsilon_n}$ be a word in $x_1^{\pm 1}, \ldots, x_n^{\pm 1}$. Fix some $i \neq j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and assume the signed count of $x_i$’s and $x_j$’s are both zero. If $e_{ij}(w) = A$ then $|w| \geq 2 \left\lceil 2 \sqrt{|A|} \right\rceil$.

We are now ready to prove Theorem 5 giving a lower bound on $C(L)$ in terms of $\mu_{ijk}(L)$.

**Theorem 5.** Let $L = L_1 \cup L_2 \cup L_3$ be a 3-component link with vanishing pairwise linking numbers. Then $C(L) \geq 2 \left\lceil \sqrt{\mu_{123}(L)/3} \right\rceil$.

**Proof.** Let $L$ be a 3-component link with vanishing pairwise linking numbers and $F$ be a C-complex bounded by $L$. Let $C(F)$ be the number of clasps between the components of $F$. Let $w_1 = w_1(F)$, $w_2 = w_2(F)$ and $w_3 = w_3(F)$ be the resulting clasp words. Each clasps corresponds to a letter in two of these words, and so

$$2C(F) = |w_1| + |w_2| + |w_3|.$$  

Let $e_1 = e_{23}(w_1)$, $e_2 = e_{31}(w_2)$, and $e_3 = e_{12}(w_3)$. Then $\mu_{123}(L) = e_1 + e_2 + e_3$. Assume without loss of generality that $|e_1| \leq |e_2| \leq |e_3|$. Then it must be that $|e_3| \geq \frac{1}{3} \mu_{123}(L)$. Corollary 12 concludes that $|w_3| \geq 2 \left\lceil \sqrt{|e_3|} \right\rceil \geq 2 \left\lceil \sqrt{\mu_{123}(L)/3} \right\rceil$.

Now, each letter of $w_3$ corresponds to either a clasp in $F_3 \cap F_1$ or a clasp in $F_3 \cap F_2$. Each of these clasps produces a letter in $w_1$ or in $w_2$. As a consequence $|w_3| \leq |w_1| + |w_2|$. Putting this
together,
\[ 2C(F) = |w_1| + |w_2| + |w_3| \geq 2|w_3| \geq 4 \left\lceil \frac{2\sqrt{|\mu_{123}(L)|}}{3} \right\rceil \]
division by 2 completes the proof.

\[\square\]
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