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Abstract. The Kauffman bracket of classical links extends to an invariant of links in an arbitrary oriented 3-manifold $M$ with values in the skein module of $M$. In this paper, we consider the skein bracket in case $M$ is a thickened surface. We develop a theory of adequacy for link diagrams on surfaces and show that any alternating link diagram on a surface is skein adequate. We apply our theory to establish the first and second Tait conjectures for adequate link diagrams on surfaces. These are the statements that any adequate link diagram has minimal crossing number, and any two adequate diagrams of the same link have the same writhe.

Given a link diagram $D$ on a surface $\Sigma$, we use $[D]_{\Sigma}$ to denote its skein bracket. If $D$ has minimal genus, we show that
\[
\text{span}([D]_{\Sigma}) \leq 4c(D) + 4|D| - 4g(\Sigma),
\]
where $|D|$ is the number of connected components of $D$, $c(D)$ is the number of crossings, and $g(\Sigma)$ is the genus of $\Sigma$. This extends a classical result proved by Kauffman, Murasugi, and Thistlethwaite. We further show that the above inequality is an equality if and only if $D$ is weakly alternating, namely if $D$ is the connected sum of an alternating link diagram on $\Sigma$ with one or more alternating link diagrams on $S^2$. This last statement is a generalization of a well-known result for classical links due to Thistlethwaite, and it implies that the skein bracket detects the crossing number for weakly alternating links. As an application, we show that the crossing number is additive under connected sum for adequate links in thickened surfaces.

1. Introduction

The Kauffman bracket is a $\mathbb{Z}[A^{\pm1}]$-valued invariant of framed links in $\mathbb{R}^3$ determined by the skein relations:
\[
\begin{align*}
\otimes - A & \otimes A^{-1} \otimes \quad \text{and} \quad \bigcirc - \delta,
\end{align*}
\]
where $\delta = -A^2 - A^{-2}$.

It naturally extends to an invariant of framed links in an arbitrary oriented 3-manifold $M$ (possibly with boundary), via the skein module construction: let $\mathcal{L}(M)$ be the set of all unoriented, framed links in $M$, including the empty link $\emptyset$. The skein module $\mathcal{I}(M)$ of $M$ is the quotient of the free $\mathbb{Z}[A^{\pm1}]$-module spanned by $\mathcal{L}(M)$ by the submodule generated by the Kauffman bracket skein relations $[1]$, cf. [Prz99], [Tur88], [Tur91].

By this construction, the bracket
\[
[\cdot] : \mathcal{L}(M) \to \mathcal{I}(M),
\]
which sends a framed link $L$ to its equivalence class in $\mathcal{S}(M)$, is the universal invariant of framed links in $M$ satisfying (1).

The original motivation for introducing skein modules was to study invariants of links in arbitrary 3-manifolds, but it is difficult, in practice, to compute the skein invariants in the general setting. Nevertheless, skein modules have played a pivotal role in the development of quantum topology over the last two decades. Indeed, skein modules have deep connections to $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ character varieties [Bul97, PS00, FKL17, Tur91, BFKB99], to topological quantum field theory, [BHMV95, Tur94], to (quantum) Teichmüller spaces and (quantum) cluster algebras [BW11, CL19, FG06, FST08, Mul16], and to the AJ conjecture [FGL02, Le06], and many more.

In this paper we develop a general theory of adequacy for links in thickened surfaces with the aid of skein modules.

Let $\Sigma$ be an oriented surface and $I = [0, 1]$ be the unit interval. The skein module of the thickened surface $\Sigma \times I$ comes naturally equipped with a product structure given by stacking, i.e., the product $L_1 \cdot L_2$ is defined by placing $L_1$ on top of $L_2$ in $\Sigma \times I$. With this product structure, the skein module $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma \times I)$ becomes an algebra over $\mathbb{Z}[A^{\pm 1}]$.

Let $C(\Sigma)$ denote the space of non-contractible unoriented simple loops on $\Sigma$ up to isotopy and $MC(\Sigma)$ denote the space of non-trivial unoriented multi-loops on $\Sigma$, i.e., collections of disjoint simple loops, including $\emptyset$, up to isotopy. Then by [Prz99] (cf., [SW07]), the skein module $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma \times I)$ is a free $\mathbb{Z}[A^{\pm 1}]$-module with basis $MC(\Sigma)$. Consequently, via this identification, the skein bracket gives a map

$$[\cdot]: \mathcal{L}(\Sigma \times I) \to \mathcal{S}(\Sigma \times I) = \mathbb{Z}[A^{\pm 1}]MC(\Sigma). \tag{2}$$

We use the association (2) to develop a theory of skein adequacy for links in $\Sigma \times I$ which extends that for classical links. This theory is broader and more powerful than the corresponding notions of simple adequacy [LT88] and homological adequacy [BK19]. For example, we will see that every weakly alternating link in $\Sigma \times I$ without removable nugatory crossings is skein adequate.

We will apply the skein bracket to establish the first and the second Tait conjecture for skein adequate link diagrams on surfaces. The first one says that skein adequate diagrams have minimal crossing number, and the second one says that two skein adequate diagrams for the same oriented link have the same writhe. (The writhe of a link diagram $D$ is denoted $w(D)$ and is defined to be the sum of its crossing signs.) Further, we show that any connected sum of two skein adequate link diagrams on surfaces is again skein adequate. It follows that the crossing number and writhe are essentially additive under connected sum of skein adequate links in thickened surfaces.

For any link diagram $D$ on a surface $\Sigma$ of minimal genus, we prove that

$$\text{span}([D]_\Sigma) \leq 4c(D) + 4|D| - 4g(\Sigma),$$

where $|D|$ is the number of connected components of $D$, $c(D)$ is the number of crossings, and $g(\Sigma)$ is the genus of $\Sigma$. This inequality generalizes a result proved by Kauffman, Murasugi, and Thistlethwaite for link diagrams on $\mathbb{R}^2$ [Kau87, Mur87, Thi87]. It also extends and strengthens a recent result proved in [BK19] using the homological Kauffman bracket.

Additionally, we prove that the above inequality is an equality if and only if $D$ is weakly alternating. Therefore, the skein bracket, together with the crossing number, distinguishes weakly alternating links. That generalizes the analogous result of Thistlethwaite for classical links.
The results in this paper are well-known for classical links \cite{Kau87, Mur87, Thi87}. Nevertheless, our results may be applicable studying classical links. Indeed, links in higher genus surfaces arise naturally from classical link diagrams via the Turaev surface construction \cite{Tur87, DFK08}. Given a classical link diagram, this construction associates a minimally embedded alternating link in a thickened surface. The resulting surface is called the Turaev surface, and it has genus zero if and only if the original link diagram is alternating. Therefore, the Turaev genus gives a discrete measure how far the link is from being alternating. (Recall that the Turaev genus of a link is defined as the minimum genus of the Turaev surfaces over all diagrams for the link \cite{CK14}.)

Links in thickened surfaces are of growing interest in 3-dimensional geometry. For example, Adams et al. proved that, with a few specific exceptions, the complement of a prime alternating link \(L \subset \Sigma \times I\) is hyperbolic, for \(g(\Sigma) = 1\), and hyperbolic with geodesic boundaries \(\Sigma \times \{0,1\}\), for \(g(\Sigma) > 1\), \cite{AARH19}. Adams and his collaborators apply their results to study classical and virtual links, through the Turaev surface construction in \cite{AEG19}.

Furthermore, Howie and Purcell generalize the setting of thickened surfaces to 3-manifolds with a “generalized projection surface” and study hyperbolic structures of links in such manifolds represented by alternating diagrams on the surface, \cite{HP20}.

Additional motivation for our study stems from virtual knot theory. Virtual links can be viewed as links in thickened surfaces, considered up to homeomorphisms and stabilization \cite{CKS02}, and minimal genus realizations of virtual links are known to be unique up to homeomorphism by Kuperberg’s theorem \cite{Kup03}. Since our theory of adequate and alternating links is “homeomorphism invariant,” many of our results can be restated in the language of virtual links.

This line of inquiry will be continued in \cite{BKS20}, where we introduce and study invariants of links in \(\Sigma \times I\) derived from the Kauffman skein bracket (2).

2. State sum formula and the generalized Jones polynomial

We will assume throughout this paper that \(\Sigma\) is an oriented surface with one or more connected components, which may also have boundary. Links in \(\Sigma \times I\) will be represented as diagrams on \(\Sigma\) up to Reidemeister moves.

Every framed link in \(\Sigma \times I\) can also be represented by a link diagram with framing given by the blackboard framing. Equivalence of framed links is given by regular isotopy, which includes the second and third Reidemeister moves and the modified first Reidemeister move.

Let \(D\) be a link diagram on a surface \(\Sigma\). Given a crossing of \(D\), we consider its \(A\)-type and \(B\)-type resolution, as in the Kauffman bracket construction. A choice of resolution for each crossing of \(D\) is called a state. Let \(\mathcal{S}(D)\) denote the set of all states of \(D\). Thus \(|\mathcal{S}(D)| = 2^{c(D)}\), where \(c(D)\) is the crossing number of \(D\).

For \(S \in \mathcal{S}(D)\), let \(t(S)\) denote the number of contractible loops in \(S\) and let \(\hat{S}\) denote \(S\) with contractible loops removed. Hence, \(\hat{S} \in \mathcal{MC}(\Sigma)\). The following state sum formula is an immediate consequence of the definition and it generalizes the usual formula for the classical Kauffman bracket:

\[
[D]_\Sigma = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}(D)} A^{e(S)-b(S)} \delta^t(S) \hat{S} \in \mathbb{Z}[A^{\pm 1}].\mathcal{MC}(\Sigma),
\]
where $a(S), b(S)$ are the numbers of $A$- and $B$-smoothings in $S$ and $\delta = -A^2 - A^{-2}$ as before. A similar formula appears in the paper of Dye and Kauffman on the surface bracket polynomial [DK05].

Any invariant of framed links in $\Sigma \times I$ satisfying [1] can be normalized to obtain a Jones-type polynomial invariant of oriented links. In the case of the skein bracket [2], one obtains the generalized Jones polynomial, an invariant for oriented links in $\Sigma \times I$ given by

$$J_\Sigma(D) = (-1)^{w(D)}t^{3w(D)/4}([D]_{\Sigma})_{A=t^{-1/4}}.$$

3. Adequate link diagrams in surfaces

Given a link diagram $D$, let $S_A$ be the pure $A$ state and let $S_B$ be the pure $B$ state. Then $S_A$ and $S_B$ are the states which theoretically give rise to the terms of maximal and minimal degree in [3]. The notion of adequacy of a link diagram is designed to guarantee that the terms from $S_A$ and $S_B$ survive in the state sum formula. Therefore, when $D$ is a skein adequate diagram, its skein bracket $[D]_{\Sigma}$ has maximal possible span.

Two states $S, S'$ are said to be adjacent if their resolutions differ at exactly one crossing.

Definition 1. A link diagram $D$ on a surface $\Sigma$ is said to be $A$-adequate if $t(S) \leq t(S_A)$ or $\hat{S} \neq \hat{S}_A$ in $\mathcal{A}(\Sigma \times I)$ for any state $S$ adjacent to $S_A$. It is said to be $B$-adequate if $t(S) \leq t(S_B)$ or $\hat{S} \neq \hat{S}_B$ for any state $S$ adjacent to $S_B$. The diagram $D$ is called skein adequate if it is both $A$- and $B$-adequate.

The notions of $A$- and $B$-adequacy are modelled on the notions of plus- and minus-adequacy for classical links [Li97]. Recall that a classical link diagram is said to be plus-adequate if $|S| = |S_A| - 1$ for any state $S$ adjacent to $S_A$, and it is minus-adequate if $|S| = |S_B| - 1$ for any state $S$ adjacent to $S_B$. This notion of adequacy is also closely related to the notion of homological adequacy, which was introduced in [BK19], will be reviewed in Section 4. We will see that adequacy as defined above is more general than simple or homological adequacy.

The following suggests an alternative definition of adequacy:

Proposition 2. (1) A link diagram $D$ on $\Sigma$ is $A$-adequate if and only if $t(S) \leq t(S_A)$ or $|\hat{S}| \neq |\hat{S}_A|$ for any state $S$ adjacent to $S_A$.

(2) A link diagram $D$ on $\Sigma$ is $B$-adequate if and only if $t(S) \leq t(S_B)$ or $|\hat{S}| \neq |\hat{S}_B|$ for any state $S$ adjacent to $S_B$.

Proof. We begin with some general comments. Given a link diagram $D$ and two adjacent states $S, S'$, the transition from $S$ to $S'$ is one of the following types:

(i) $|S'| = |S| + 1$, i.e., one cycle of $S$ splits into two cycles of $S'$.

(ii) $|S'| = |S| - 1$, i.e., two cycles of $S$ merge into one cycle of $S'$.

(iii) $|S'| = |S|$, i.e., one cycle $C$ of $S$ rearranges itself into a new cycle $C'$ of $S'$.

In cases (ii) and (iii), either $t(S') \leq t(S)$ or $\hat{S}' \neq \hat{S}$. Specifically, in case (ii), $t(S') > t(S)$ only when two non-trivial parallel cycles in $S$ merge to form one trivial cycle in $S'$, which implies that $\hat{S} \neq \hat{S}'$. Likewise, in case (iii), we claim that neither $C$ nor $C'$ is trivial and, consequently, $t(S') = t(S)$. To see that, note that if $S'$ is obtained from $S$ by a smoothing change of a crossing $x$ then there are two simple closed loops $\alpha, \beta \subset \Sigma$ intersecting at $x$ only and such that the two different smoothings of $x$ yield $C$ and $C'$. 

Assigning some orientations to $\alpha$ and $\beta$, we see that $C$ and $C'$ with some orientations equal $\pm(\alpha + \beta)$ and $\pm(\alpha - \beta)$ in $H_1(\Sigma)$. Since the algebraic intersection number of $\alpha$ and $\beta$ is 1, we know that $\alpha \neq \pm \beta$ and, consequently, neither $C$ nor $C'$ is trivial.

Therefore, to verify that a given diagram is $A$- or $B$-adequate, it is enough to check that the conditions of Definition 1 hold in case (i).

We will now prove part (1). Suppose $S$ is a state adjacent to $S_A$ with $t(S) = t(S_A) + 1$. Then the transition from $S_A$ to $S$ must either be case (i) or (ii).

If it is case (i), then $|S| = |S_A| + 1$ and $t(S) = t(S_A) + 1$, therefore $\tilde{S} = \tilde{S}_A$. Thus $D$ is not $A$-adequate and $|\tilde{S}| = |\tilde{S}_A|$. If it is case (ii), then $|S| = |S_A| - 1$, and two nontrivial cycles of $S_A$ must merge into a trivial cycle of $S$. In this case, $D$ is $A$-adequate and $|\tilde{S}| \neq |\tilde{S}_A|$.

The proof of part (2) is similar and is left to the reader.

For any diagram $D$, its bracket has a unique presentation

$$[D]_{\Sigma} = \sum_{\mu} p_\mu(D) \mu \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma \times I),$$

where the sum is over all multi-loops $\mu$ in $\Sigma$. Denote the maximal and minimal degrees (in the variable $A$) of the non-zero polynomials $p_\mu(D)$ in this expression by $d_{\max}([D]_{\Sigma})$ and $d_{\min}([D]_{\Sigma})$.

**Proposition 3.** For any link diagram $D$ on $\Sigma$,

1. $d_{\max}([D]_{\Sigma}) \leq c(D) + 2t(S_A)$, with equality if $D$ is $A$-adequate.
2. $d_{\min}([D]_{\Sigma}) \geq -c(D) - 2t(S_B)$, with equality if $D$ is $B$-adequate.

**Proof of (1).** By (3), $[D]_{\Sigma}$ is given by a state sum with the term $A^{c(D) + 2t(S_A)} S_A$ for the state $S_A$. Now the inequality of (1) follows from the fact that every change of a smoothing in $S_A$ decreases $a(S) - b(S)$ by two and increases $t(S)$ by at most one.

The proof of equality in (1) when $D$ is $A$-adequate follows immediately from part (1) of the lemma below.

The proof of (2) is analogous, and the proof of equality in (2) when $D$ is $B$-adequate follows from part (2) of the lemma below.

**Lemma 4.** (1) If $D$ is $A$-adequate and $S$ is a state with at least one $B$-smoothing, then either

$$a(S) - b(S) + 2t(S) < c(D) + 2t(S_A) \quad \text{or} \quad \tilde{S} \neq \tilde{S}_A.$$

(2) If $D$ is $B$-adequate and $S$ is a state with at least one $A$-smoothing, then either

$$a(S) - b(S) + 2t(S) > -c(D) - 2t(S_B) \quad \text{or} \quad \tilde{S} \neq \tilde{S}_B.$$

**Proof.** We prove (1) by contradiction: Suppose to the contrary that $S$ is a state with at least one $B$-smoothing such that $\tilde{S} = \tilde{S}_A$ and

$$a(S) - b(S) + 2t(S) = c(D) + 2t(S_A).$$

Clearly, $S$ can be obtained from $S_A$ by a sequence of smoothing changes from $A$ to $B$, $S_A = S_0 \to S_1 \to \cdots \to S_k = S$. Further, each smoothing change must increase $t(\cdot)$ by one, i.e., $t(S_{i+1}) = t(S_i) + 1$, for $i = 0, \ldots, k - 1$. Since each smoothing change increases the number of cycles in a state by at most one, none of these smoothing changes can add a new cycle to $\tilde{S}_i$, $i = 0, \ldots, k$. Therefore $|\tilde{S}_i| \leq |\tilde{S}_{i-1}|$ for $i = 0, \ldots, k - 1$. However,
Corollary 5. If $D$ is a link diagram on $\Sigma$, then
\[ \text{span}(\{D\}_\Sigma) \leq 2c(D) + 2t(S_A) + 2t(S_B), \]
with equality if $D$ is skein adequate.

The map $\Psi: \mathcal{MC}(\Sigma) \to \mathbb{Z}[z]$ sending $S$ to $z^{|S|}$ extends linearly to the skein module,
\[ \Psi: \mathcal{K}(\Sigma \times I) = \mathbb{Z}[A^\pm 1, \mathcal{MC}(\Sigma)] \to \mathbb{Z}[A^\pm 1, z]. \]
The composition $\Psi([D]_\Sigma)$ is called the **reduced homotopy Kauffman bracket** in \cite{BodenKamijoSikora2020}. Obviously,
\[ \text{span}(\Psi([D]_\Sigma)) \leq \text{span}([D]_\Sigma). \]

**Proposition 6.** If $D$ is a skein adequate link diagram on $\Sigma$, then
\[ \text{span}(\Psi([D]_\Sigma)) = \text{span}([D]_\Sigma). \]

**Proof.** Let $S$ be a state with at least one $B$-smoothing such that $|\hat{S}| = |\hat{S}_A|$ and $a(S) - b(S) + 2t(S) = c(D) + 2t(S_A)$. As before, $S$ can be obtained from $S_A$ by a sequence of smoothing changes from $A$ to $B$, each smoothing change can increase $t(\cdot)$ by at most one, i.e., $S_A = S_0 \to S_1 \to \cdots \to S_k = S$. As in the proof of Lemma 4 we must have $t(S_{i+1}) = t(S_i) + 1$. Further, since a smoothing change can increase the number of cycles in $S_i$ by at most one, we have $|\hat{S}_{i+1}| \leq |\hat{S}_i|$ for $i = 0, \ldots, k - 1$. Now the assumption that $|\hat{S}| = |\hat{S}_A|$ then implies that $|\hat{S}_{i+1}| = |\hat{S}_i|$ for $i = 0, \ldots, k - 1$. However, since $D$ is adequate, for the first transition $S_A = S_0 \to S_1$, either $t(S_1) \neq t(S_0) + 1$ or $\hat{S}_1 \neq \hat{S}_0$. But $t(S_1) = t(S_0) + 1$ and $|\hat{S}_1| = |\hat{S}_0|$ imply that $\hat{S}_1 = \hat{S}_0$, which gives a contradiction.

Therefore, the term with maximum $A$-degree in $\Psi([D]_\Sigma)$ must survive. A similar argument applies to show that the term with minimum $A$-degree survives. It follows that
\[ \text{span}(\Psi([D]_\Sigma)) = 2c(D) + 2t(S_A) + 2t(S_B) = \text{span}([D]_\Sigma). \]

The next proposition shows that skein adequacy is inherited under passing to subsurfaces $\Sigma' \subset \Sigma$.

**Proposition 7.** If a link diagram $D$ on a subsurface $\Sigma'$ of $\Sigma$ is $A$- or $B$-adequate in $\Sigma$ then it is $A$- or $B$-adequate (respectively) in $\Sigma'$. 

since $\hat{S} = \hat{S}_A$, none of the smoothing changes can decrease $|\hat{S}_i|$ either. It follows that
$\hat{S}_{i+1} = \hat{S}_i$ for $i = 0, \ldots, k - 1$. Thus $|\hat{S}_{i+1}| = |\hat{S}_i|$ and
\[ |S_{i+1}| = t(S_{i+1}) + |\hat{S}_{i+1}| = t(S_i) + 1 + |\hat{S}_i| = |S_i| + 1, \]
for $i = 0, \ldots, k - 1$. In particular, each transition $S_i \to S_{i+1}$ is of type (i) as discussed in the proof of Proposition 2 i.e., one where a cycle of $S_i$ splits into two cycles of $S_{i+1}$.

However, since $D$ is $A$-adequate, the first smoothing change $S_A = S_0 \to S_1$ has either $t(S_1) \leq t(S_A)$ or $\hat{S}_1 \neq \hat{S}_A$, which is a contradiction.

This completes the proof of the first statement. The proof of the second one is similar and is left to the reader. 

The next result is an immediate consequence of Proposition 3. 

Corollary 5. If $D$ is a link diagram on $\Sigma$, then
\[ \text{span}(\{D\}_\Sigma) \leq 2c(D) + 2t(S_A) + 2t(S_B), \]
with equality if $D$ is skein adequate.
Proof. Suppose $D$ is not $A$-adequate in $\Sigma'$. Then switching a certain smoothing in $S_A$ from $A$ to $B$ splits a cycle $C$ in $S_A$ into cycles $C_1$ and $C_2$. By assumption, at least one of $C_1$ or $C_2$ must be trivial in $\Sigma'$. If $C_1$ is trivial in $\Sigma'$, then it must also be trivial in $\Sigma$, because $\Sigma' \subset \Sigma$ is a subsurface.

If the cycle $C$ is trivial in $\Sigma$, then $C_2$ must also be trivial in $\Sigma$, which is impossible, since then all three cycles would be trivial in $\Sigma$, contradicting the hypothesis of $A$-adequacy in $\Sigma$. If, on the other hand, $C$ is nontrivial in $\Sigma$, then $C_2$ must also be nontrivial in $\Sigma$, which is again impossible, as it leads to the same kind of contradiction. Thus, $D$ must be $A$-adequate on $\Sigma'$.

The proof of $B$-adequacy of $D$ is identical. \hfill \Box

4. Simple and homological adequacy

For completeness of discussion, in this section we compare Definition[1] of skein adequacy to two legacy versions, namely simple and homological adequacy. We will see that our notion of adequacy is broader and that the statements of Lemma[4] and Corollary[5] are strictly stronger than the corresponding statements for simple and homological adequacy. Henceforth, we will say a link diagram on a surface is adequate if it is skein adequate.

For any state $S \subset \Sigma$, let us denote the ranks of the kernel and the image of

$$i_*: H_1(S; \mathbb{Z}/2) \to H_1(\Sigma; \mathbb{Z}/2),$$

by $k(S)$ and $r(S)$, respectively.

The **homological Kauffman bracket**,

$$\langle D \rangle_{\Sigma} = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}(D)} A^{a(S) - b(S)} g^{k(S)} z^{r(S)},$$

was introduced by Krushkal [Kru11] and studied in [BK19].

Based on this invariant, [BK19] introduced the notion of homological adequacy for link diagrams in surfaces. A diagram $D$ on $\Sigma$ is **homologically $A$-adequate** if $k(S) \leq k(S_A)$ for any state $S$ adjacent to $S_A$, and it is **homologically $B$-adequate** if $k(S) \leq k(S_B)$ for any state $S$ adjacent to $S_B$. A diagram $D$ is **homologically adequate** if it is both homologically $A$- and $B$-adequate.

It is not difficult to show that a diagram that is plus-adequate is homologically $A$-adequate, and one that is minus-adequate is homologically $B$-adequate. (For further details, see §2.2 of [BK19].)

**Proposition 8.** Every homologically $A$-adequate link diagram is $A$-adequate and every homologically $B$-adequate link diagram is $B$-adequate.

Proof. Recall from the discussion at the beginning of the proof of Proposition[2] that there are the three possible cases, and to verify that a given diagram is $A$- or $B$-adequate, it is enough to check that the conditions of Definition[1] hold in case (i). Hence, it is enough to focus on states $S$ adjacent to $S_A$ or $S_B$ with $|S| = |S_A| + 1$ or $|S| = |S_B| + 1$, respectively.

If $D$ is not $A$-adequate, then there exists a state $\hat{S}$ adjacent to $S_A$ with $|\hat{S}| = |S_A| + 1$, $t(\hat{S}) = t(S_A) + 1$, and $\hat{S} = \hat{S}_A$. (Notice that if $|\hat{S}| = |S_A| + 1$ and $t(\hat{S}) = t(S_A) + 1$, then $\hat{S} = \hat{S}_A$ automatically holds.) In this case, we have $k(S) = k(S_A) + 1$, and it follows that $D$ is not homologically $A$-adequate. This proves the first statement in the proposition, and the proof of the second statement on $B$-adequacy is similar. \hfill \Box
In summary then, for a link diagram $D$ on a surface $\Sigma$, it follows that
\begin{equation}
\text{plus-adequacy} \implies \text{homological } A\text{-adequacy} \implies A\text{-adequacy},
\end{equation}
with similar statements relating minus-adequacy, homological $B$-adequacy, and $B$-adequacy.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{alternating_diagram.png}
\caption{An alternating diagram on the torus.}
\end{figure}

In Example 18 we will see a knot diagram in a genus two surface which is adequate but not homologically adequate. On the other hand, it is easy to construct examples which are homologically adequate but not simply adequate. For instance, consider the alternating diagram $D$ with three crossings on the torus in Figure 1. A straightforward calculation shows that it is homologically adequate but not simply adequate. These examples show that none of the reverse implications in (5) hold, therefore the notion of adequacy in Definition 1 is strictly more general than either homological or simple adequacy.

In general, notice that
\[
\text{span}(\langle D \rangle_{\Sigma}) \leq \text{span}(\langle D \rangle_{\Sigma}) \leq 2c(D) + 2t(S_A) + 2t(S_B) \leq 2c(D) + 2k(S_A) + 2k(S_B).
\]
Therefore, Corollary 5 immediately implies an analogous inequality holds for homological adequacy, cf., [BK19, Corollary 2.7].

5. Alternating links and the Tait conjectures

When tabulating knots, Tait formulated three conjectures on alternating links. The first one states that any reduced alternating diagram of a classical link has minimal crossing number. The second one asserts that any two such diagrams representing the same link have the same writhe. The third one states that any two reduced alternating diagrams of the same link are related by flype moves. The first two conjectures were resolved almost 100 years later, independently by Kauffman, Murasugi, and Thistlethwaite, using the newly discovered Jones polynomial, [Kau87, Mur87, Thi87]. The third conjecture was established shortly after by Menasco and Thistlethwaite [MT93]. The first two Tait conjectures actually hold more generally for adequate links [LT88], and their proofs have been generalized to homologically adequate links in thickened surfaces in [BK19]. Here, we generalize these results even further to adequate links in thickened surfaces.

Henceforth, all links in thickened surfaces will be unframed, unless stated otherwise. Given an oriented link diagram $D$, let $c_+(D)$ and $c_-(D)$ be the numbers of positive and negative crossings, respectively. The proof of the following theorem can be found in Subsection 7.1.

**Theorem 9.** Let $D$ and $E$ be oriented link diagrams on $\Sigma$ representing the same oriented unframed link in $\Sigma \times I$. 
(i) If $D$ is $A$-adequate, then $c_-(D) \leq c_-(E)$.
(ii) If $D$ is $B$-adequate, then $c_+(D) \leq c_+(E)$.

The crossing number of a link $L \subset \Sigma \times I$, $c(L)$, is defined as the minimal crossing number among all diagram representatives of $L$. A link $L \subset \Sigma \times I$ is said to be adequate if it admits an adequate diagram on $\Sigma$.

Using Theorem 9, one can deduce the first and second Tait conjectures for adequate links in surfaces.

**Corollary 10.** (i) Any adequate diagram of a link in $\Sigma \times I$ has $c(L)$ crossings. (ii) Any two adequate diagrams of the same oriented link in $\Sigma \times I$ have the same writhe.

**Proof.** Statements (i) and (ii) are immediate consequences of Theorem 9. In the case of (ii), if adequate diagrams $D$ and $E$ represent the same oriented link, then $c_+(D) = c_+(E)$ and $c_-(D) = c_-(E)$ by the above theorem and, hence,

$$w(D) = c_+(D) - c_-(D) = c_+(E) - c_-(E) = w(E). \, \Box$$

Corollary 10 implies that for an adequate link $L \subset \Sigma \times I$, the writhe is a well-defined invariant of its oriented link type.

Let $g(\Sigma)$ be the sum of the genera of the connected components of $\Sigma$. A link diagram $D$ on $\Sigma$ is minimally embedded if it does not lie on a subsurface of $\Sigma$ of smaller genus. In other words, the complement of $D$ on $\Sigma$ has no non-separating loops. Let $N_D$ be a neighborhood of $D$ in $\Sigma$ small enough so that it is a ribbon surface retractive onto $D$. A diagram $D$ is minimally embedded if and only if $g(N_D) = g(\Sigma)$.

Furthermore, note that if $D$ is connected and $\Sigma$ is closed, then $D$ is minimally embedded if and only if $\Sigma \setminus D$ is composed of disks. In that case, we say that $D$ is cellularly embedded.

A link diagram $D$ on a closed surface $\Sigma$ is said to have minimal genus if it is minimally embedded within its isotopy class. In [Man13], it is proved that any cellularly embedded knot diagram with minimal crossing number has minimal genus. It is conjectured that the same is true for link diagrams, see [BK19].

A link diagram $D$ on $\Sigma$ is alternating if, when traveling along any of its components, its crossings alternate between over and under. A link $L \subset \Sigma \times I$ is alternating if it can be represented by an alternating link diagram.

A crossing $x$ of $D$ is nugatory if there is a simple loop in $\Sigma$ which separates $\Sigma$ and intersects $D$ only at $x$.

As observed in [BK19], although nugatory crossings in diagrams in $\Sigma = \mathbb{R}^2$ can always be removed by rotating one side of the diagram $180^\circ$ relative to the other, that is not always true for diagrams in non-contractible surfaces $\Sigma$, see Figure 2. A nugatory crossing is said to be removable if the simple loop can be chosen to bound a disk, otherwise it is called essential. A link diagram is reduced if it does not contain any removable nugatory crossings.

The following strengthens Proposition 2.8 of [BK19]. Its proof is given in Subsection 7.2.

**Theorem 11.** Any reduced alternating diagram is adequate.

Note that unlike Proposition 2.8 of [BK19], we do not assume here that $D$ is cellularly embedded, checkerboard colorable, nor that $D$ has no nugatory crossings.

A link diagram on $\Sigma$ is said to be weakly alternating if it is a connected sum $D_0 \# D_1 \# \cdots \# D_k$ of an alternating diagram $D_0$ in $\Sigma$ and with alternating diagrams...
$D_1, \ldots, D_k$ in $S^2$ (cf., Lemma 14). Theorem 11 can be generalized to show that weakly alternating diagrams are adequate. In fact, in the next section we will prove Proposition 15 showing that any diagram on a surface obtained as the connected sum of two adequate link diagrams is itself adequate.

Let us return to Tait conjectures now. By Corollary 10, any reduced alternating diagram $D$ has the minimal crossing number for all diagrams representing the same unframed link $L$ in $\Sigma \times I$. Furthermore, all such oriented diagrams representing the same link $L$ have the same writhe.

The results of Kauffman, Murasugi, Thistlethwaite [Kau87, Mur87, Thi87] imply that the span of the Kauffman bracket of any diagram $D \subset S^2$ satisfies
\[ \text{span}(\mathcal{K}(D)) \leq 4c(D) + 4, \]
or equivalently for the Jones polynomial, that $\text{span}(V_D(t)) \leq c(D)$, with equality if $D$ is alternating. Furthermore, in [Thi87] Thistlethwaite proved that if $D \subset S^2$ is prime and non-alternating, then
\[ \text{span}(\mathcal{K}(D)) < 4c(D) + 4. \]

In [Tur87], it is observed that the above results hold if $D \subset S^2$ is weakly alternating, namely if $D$ is a connected sum of alternating diagrams. Thus the Kauffman bracket $\mathcal{K}(D)$, together with $c(D)$, detect weakly alternating classical links.

The homological Kauffman bracket of $\mathcal{K}(D)$ in closed surfaces $\Sigma$ after replacing 4 by $4|\Sigma| - 4g(\Sigma)$ is not sufficiently strong to prove an analogous statement for links in thickened surfaces. Consider the two knots in the genus two surface in Figure 3. These knots have the same homological Kauffman bracket, namely
\[ \langle D_1 \rangle_{\Sigma} = \langle D_2 \rangle_{\Sigma} = 3\delta z^2 - 4\delta^2 z + (A^4 + 3 + A^{-4})\delta, \]
but one of them is alternating and the other is not. Consequently, the homological Kauffman bracket does not detect alternating knots in thickened surfaces.

However, we are going to show that Kauffman, Murasugi, Thistlethwaite statements hold for the Kauffman bracket $\mathcal{K}(D)$ of diagrams in closed surfaces $\Sigma$ after replacing 4 by $4|D| - 4g(\Sigma)$ on the right.

Let $|D|$ denote the number of connected components of $D$ (which may be smaller than the number of connected components of the link in $\Sigma \times I$ represented by $D$). The proof of the next result is given in Subsection 7.4.

**Theorem 12.** (i) If $D$ is minimally embedded in $\Sigma$ then
\[ \text{span}(\mathcal{K}(D)) \leq 4c(D) + 4|D| - 4g(\Sigma). \]
(ii) If $D$ is cellularly embedded, reduced, and weakly alternating, then
\[ \text{span}(\mathcal{K}(D)) = 4c(D) + 4|D| - 4g(\Sigma). \]
Figure 3. Two knots in a genus two surface with the same homological Kauffman bracket.

(iii) If $D$ is minimally embedded and not weakly alternating then

$$\text{span}(|D|_{\Sigma}) < 4c(D) + 4|D| - 4g(\Sigma).$$

The assumptions of Theorem 12 are necessary:

(i) If $D$ is not required to be minimally embedded, then by adding handles to $\Sigma$, one can make the right hand side of the above inequality a negative number of an arbitrarily large magnitude.

(ii) If $D$ has a removable nugatory crossings, then eliminating it decreases the right hand side of the above equality but not the left hand side. Therefore, (ii) does hold for diagrams with removable crossings.

It also fails unless $D$ is cellularly embedded. For example, consider the alternating link in Figure 4. It has $t(S_A) = 4$ and $t(S_B) = 2$, and so $\text{span}(|D|_{\Sigma}) \leq 16 + 12 = 28$ whereas $4c(D) + 4|D| - 4g(\Sigma) = 32$. Note that this diagram is minimally embedded but not cellularly embedded.

Figure 4. Minimally embedded alternating diagram for which the equality of Theorem 12 (ii) does not hold.

Although (ii) holds for weakly alternating diagrams, in the next section we will see that it does not hold generally for connected sums of alternating diagrams in arbitrary surfaces (see Example 17).

Corollary 13. Let $L$ be a link in $\Sigma \times I$ with a reduced, weakly alternating diagram $D$ which is cellularly embedded. Then any other cellularly embedded diagram $E$ for $L$ satisfies $c(D) \leq c(E)$. If $E$ is not weakly alternating, then $c(D) < c(E)$.

Proof. The first part of the proof is a direct consequence of Tait conjecture (Corollary 10). Let us prove the full statement now: Any cellularly embedded link diagram on a connected surface is itself connected. Therefore, it is enough to prove the statement under the assumption that $\Sigma$ and $D$ are both connected. Theorem 12 (ii) then implies
that $c(D) = \text{span}([D]_{\Sigma})/4 + g(\Sigma) - 1$. If $E$ is a second link diagram for $L$ on $\Sigma$, then since $E$ is cellularly embedded, it must also be connected. Theorem 12 (i) implies that

$$c(D) = \text{span}([D]_{\Sigma})/4 + g(\Sigma) - 1 = \text{span}([E]_{\Sigma})/4 + g(\Sigma) - 1 \leq c(E).$$

If $E$ is not weakly alternating, then Theorem 12 (iii) shows the last inequality is strict, therefore it follows that $c(D) < c(E)$. \qed

6. Crossing number and connected sums

In this section, we will study the behavior of the crossing number under connected sum of links in thickened surfaces. This problem is closely related to an old and famous conjecture for classical links, which asserts that, for any two links $L_1, L_2$,

$$c(L_1 \# L_2) = c(L_1) + c(L_2).$$

This conjecture has been verified for a wide class of links, including alternating links, adequate links, and torus links [Dia04]. Clearly, $c(L_1 \# L_2) \leq c(L_1) + c(L_2)$. In addition, in [Lac09], Lackenby has proved that, in general, one has a lower bound of the form:

$$c(L_1 \# L_2) \geq \frac{1}{132} (c(L_1) + c(L_2)).$$

The operation of connected sum is not so well-behaved for arbitrary links in thickened surfaces.

Just as for classical links, it depends on the choice of components which are joined as well as their orientations. However, unless one of the links is in $S^2 \times I$, it also depends on the diagram representatives as well as the choice of basepoints $x_i \in D_i$ where the link components are joined. The issue is the fact that a Reidemeister move applied to either of the link diagrams may change the link type of their connected sum. We take a moment to quickly review its construction.

Suppose $\Sigma_1$ and $\Sigma_2$ are oriented surfaces and let $\Sigma_1 \# \Sigma_2$ denote their connected sum. It is obtained from the union $(\Sigma_1 \setminus \text{int} B_1) \cup (\Sigma_2 \setminus \text{int} B_2)$ by gluing $\partial B_1 \subset \Sigma_1$ to $\partial B_2 \subset \Sigma_2$ by an orientation reversing homeomorphism $g: \partial B_1 \to \partial B_2$. For connected surfaces, $\Sigma_1 \# \Sigma_2$ is independent of the choice of disks $B_i \subset \Sigma_i$ and gluing map.

If $D_1 \subset \Sigma_1$ and $D_2 \subset \Sigma_2$ are link diagrams, we can choose cutting points $x_i \in D_i$ and disk neighborhoods $B_i$ from $\Sigma_i$ such that $B_i \cap D_i$ is an interval for $i = 1, 2$. Then the surface $\Sigma_1 \# \Sigma_2$ can be formed in such a way that $D = (D_1 \setminus \text{int} B_1) \cup (D_2 \setminus \text{int} B_2)$ is a link diagram in $\Sigma_1 \# \Sigma_2$. If $D_1, D_2$ are oriented link diagrams, then we require the gluing to respect the orientations of the arcs. The resulting diagram is called a connected sum of $D_1$ and $D_2$. In general, it depends on the choice of link diagrams $D_1, D_2$, components being joined, and the points $x_i \in D_i$. However, it is independent of the choice of disk neighborhoods $B_i$ containing $x_i$.

The next result shows that when one of the diagrams lies in $S^2 \times I$, the operation of connected sum is well-behaved.

**Lemma 14.** Let $D_1 \subset \Sigma \times I$ and $D_2 \subset S^2 \times I$ be oriented diagrams, where $\Sigma$ is an arbitrary surface. Then the connected sum of $D_1$ and $D_2$ is independent of the choice of the cutting points $x_1, x_2$ on the selected components of $D_1$ and of $D_2$.

We will denote the connected sum in this case by $D_1 \# D_2$. The oriented link type of $D_1 \# D_2$ depends only on the link types of $D_1$ and $D_2$ and a choice of which components are joined.
Proof. One can shrink the image of $D_2$ in the connected sum so that all its crossings lie in a small 3-ball $B^3$ in $\Sigma \times I$. By an isotopy, we can move the ball along arcs of $D_1$ representing the component to which $D_1$ is joined, and moving over or under the other arcs at any crossing that we encounter.

This shows that the connected sum is independent of the choice of the cut point $x_1$ on $D_1$. The independence on the cut point $x_2$ on $D_2$ follows from the well-known fact that all long knots, or rather (1, 1) tangles, obtained by cutting $D_2$ at different points $x_2$ of its specified component are isotopic (as (1, 1) tangles). Shrinking $D_2$ into a small 3-ball also allows one to translate any Reidemeister move of $D_1$ or $D_2$ into a Reidemeister move on the connected sum $D_1 \# D_2$. This proves the last statement.

Proposition 15. Any connected sum of two $A$- or $B$-adequate diagrams is itself $A$- or $B$-adequate (respectively).

Proof. Let $D$ be a link diagram in $\Sigma_1 \# \Sigma_2$ obtained as the connected sum of $A$-adequate diagrams $D_1 \subset \Sigma_1$ and $D_2 \subset \Sigma_2$, and suppose to the contrary that $D$ is not $A$-adequate. Note that each cycle of $D$ is a connected sum of a cycle of $D_1$ and a cycle of $D_2$. Therefore, there is a crossing $x$, say in $D_1$, such that a smoothing change at $x$ from $A$ to $B$ splits a cycle $C_1 \# C_2$ of $S_A$ of $D$ into two cycles, $C_1' \# C_2$ and $C_1'' \# C_2$. By assumption, one of the cycles $C_1' \# C_2$ and $C_1'' \# C_2$, say $C_1' \# C_2$, must be trivial. This implies $C_1'$ is trivial in $\Sigma_1$ and $C_2$ is trivial in $\Sigma_2$.

If $C_1' \# C_2$ is trivial, then $C_1'' \# C_2$ must also be trivial. This is impossible because it implies the triviality of $C_1, C_1', C_1''$ in $\Sigma_1$, contradicting $A$-adequacy of $D_1$. If, on the other hand, $C_1 \# C_2$ is non-trivial, then $C_2$ must be trivial in $\Sigma_2$. Therefore, $C_1$ and $C_1''$ must both be non-trivial in $\Sigma_1$. This also contradicts $A$-adequacy of $D_1$, so $D = D_1 \# D_2$ must be $A$-adequate.

The proof of $B$-adequacy of $D$ is similar.

Corollary 16. Suppose $L_1 \subset \Sigma_1 \times I$ and $L_2 \subset \Sigma_2 \times I$ are links represented by adequate diagrams $D_1 \subset \Sigma_1$ and $D_2 \subset \Sigma_2$. Then any link $L$ in $\Sigma_1 \# \Sigma_2$ admitting a diagram which is a connected sum of $D_1$ and $D_2$ is itself adequate. Further, the crossing number and writhe satisfy $c(L) = c(L_1) + c(L_2)$ and $w(L) = w(L_1) + w(L_2)$.

Proof. Suppose $L$ is represented by $D = D_1 \# D_2 \subset \Sigma_1 \# \Sigma_2$. Then $D$ is adequate by Proposition 15. Further, by parts (i) and (ii) of Corollary 10 we see that:

\[
\begin{align*}
    c(L) &= c(D) = c(D_1) + c(D_2) = c(L_1) + c(L_2) \\
    w(L) &= w(D) = w(D_1) + w(D_2) = w(L_1) + w(L_2).
\end{align*}
\]

Example 17. Figure 5 shows a knot diagram $D$ in the genus two surface obtained as the connected sum of two alternating diagrams of the same knot in the torus. One can easily verify that $D$ is reduced and cellularly embedded, but not alternating. Further, Proposition 15 implies that this diagram is adequate, and therefore a minimal crossing diagram for the knot type. Direct calculation reveals that $t(S_A) = 2, t(S_B) = 0$, and $|S_A| = |S_B| = 1$. Therefore $\text{span}(\{D|\Sigma\}) = 16$. On the other hand, since $4(c(D) + |D| - g(\Sigma)) = 20$, by Theorem 12(ii), it follows that $D$ is not weakly alternating, and in fact not equivalent to any weakly alternating knot in $\Sigma \times I$.

Example 18. Figure 6 shows a knot in a genus two surface with an essential nugatory crossing. Since it is reduced and alternating, Theorem 11 shows that it is adequate. Note that this diagram is not homologically adequate. In fact, if $S$ is the state with a
$B$-smoothing at the nugatory crossing and $A$-smoothings at all the other crossings, then one can show that $|S| = |S_A| + 1$ and $k(S) > k(S_A)$.

Notice that this knot can also be obtained as the connected sum of two alternating knots $K_1, K_2$ in $T^2 \times I$, with $c(K_i) = 3$ but after performing a Reidemeister one move on one of them to obtain a diagram with four crossings. In particular, this example shows that a connected sum of two diagrams $D_1 \subset \Sigma_1$ and $D_2 \subset \Sigma_2$ can be adequate even when one of them is not adequate.

Suppose $L_1 \subset \Sigma_1 \times I$ and $L_2 \subset \Sigma_2 \times I$ are two alternating links in thickened surfaces with $g(\Sigma_i) > 0$ for $i = 1, 2$. Suppose further that $D_i$ is a link diagram on $\Sigma_i$ representing $L_i$ for $i = 1, 2$, and that $D_1, D_2$ are both reduced and alternating.

Instead of forming the connected sum of $D_1$ and $D_2$, take one of the diagrams and insert an arbitrary number (say $n$) of twists before forming the connected sum. See Figure 7 for an illustration.

The result will be a diagram $D$, which is similar to a connected sum of $D_1$ and $D_2$, but with $n$ essential nugatory crossings in between. This construction can be carried out so that $D$ is reduced and alternating. In particular, it will have crossing number $c(D) = c(D_1) + c(D_2) + n$. If $L$ denotes the link type of $D$, and since $D_1$ and $D_2$ are alternating and have minimal crossing number, this shows that the analogue of (6) can fail arbitrarily badly for links in thickened surfaces other than $S^2 \times I$.

The reason (6) fails in general for connected sums of links in thickened surfaces is due to the use of non-minimal diagrams in forming the connected sum. However, if one restricts the connected sum operation to minimal crossing diagrams, then one gets a plausible generalization:
Conjecture 19. Suppose $L_1 \subset \Sigma_1 \times I$ and $L_2 \subset \Sigma_2 \times I$ are links in thickened surfaces with diagrammatic representatives $D_1, D_2$, respectively. Suppose further that $D_1$ and $D_2$ are both minimal crossing diagrams. Then any link $L$ in the thickening of $\Sigma_1 \# \Sigma_2$ arising as a connected sum of $D_1$ and $D_2$ satisfies

$$c(L) = c(L_1) + c(L_2).$$

As evidence, notice that Corollary 16 confirms that the conjecture is true if $L_1$ and $L_2$ are adequate links in thickened surfaces. In particular, it holds for alternating and weakly alternating links.

7. Proofs of Theorems 9, 11, and 12

7.1. Proof of Theorem 9. Given a link diagram $D$ on $\Sigma$ and positive integer $r$, the $r$-th parallel of $D$ is the link diagram $D^r$ on $\Sigma$ in which each link component of $D$ is replaced by $r$ parallel copies, with each one repeating the same “over” and “under” behavior of the original component.

Lemma 20. If $D$ is $A$-adequate, then $D^r$ is also $A$-adequate. If $D$ is $B$-adequate, then $D^r$ is also $B$-adequate.

Proof. Let $S_A(D)$ and $S_A(D^r)$ be the pure $A$-smoothings of $D$ and the pure $A$-smoothings of $D^r$, respectively. It is straightforward to check that $S_A(D^r)$ is the $r$-parallel of $S_A(D)$.

Suppose $D^r$ is not $A$-adequate. Then there is a state $S'$ obtained by switching one $A$-smoothing in $S_A(D^r)$ to a $B$-smoothing, such that $t(S_A(D^r)) < t(S')$, and $S_A(D^r) = S'$. In the terminology of the proof of Proposition 2, that can only happen for a smoothing change of type (i). More specifically, when the smoothing change involves one of the innermost cycles in $S_A(D^r)$ which is trivial and self-abutting. Notice that it is only possible if there is a trivial self-abutting cycle in $S_A(D)$. Since $D$ is $A$-adequate, this cannot happen.

An analogous argument proves the statement for $B$-adequate diagrams. □

Proof of Theorem 4 (i) Since

$$c(D) - w(D) = c_+(D) + c_-(D) - (c_+(D) - c_-(D)) = 2c_-(D),$$

we will prove that

$$c(D) - w(D) \leq c(E) - w(E).$$

Our argument is an adaptation of Stong’s proof [Ste94] (cf., Theorem 5.13 [Lic97]).

Let $L_1, \ldots, L_m$ be the components of $L$ and let $D_i$ and $E_i$ be the subdiagrams of $D$ and $E$ corresponding to $L_i$. For each $i = 1, \ldots, m$, choose non-negative integers $\mu_i$ and $\nu_i$ such that $w(D_i) + \mu_i = w(E_i) + \nu_i$. Let $D'$ be composed of components $D'_1, \ldots, D'_m$, where each $D'_i$ is obtained from $D_i$ by adding $\mu_i$ positive kinks to it. (These kinks do not cross with other components). Similarly, let $E'$ be composed of components $E'_1, \ldots, E'_m$, where each $E'_i$ is obtained from $E_i$ by adding $\nu_i$ positive kinks to it. Notice that $D'$ is still $A$-adequate.

The writhes of the individual components satisfy:

$$w(D'_i) = w(D_i) + \mu_i = w(E_i) + \nu_i = w(E'_i).$$

Since, furthermore, there is a 1-1 correspondence between the crossings $D'_i \cap D'_j$ and $E'_i \cap E'_j$ and the crossing signs coincide, $w(D') = w(E')$.

For any $r$, consider the $r$-th parallels $(D')^r$ and $(E')^r$ now. Then $w((D')^r) = r^2 w(D')$, because each crossing of $D'$ corresponds to $r^2$ crossings in $(D')^r$ of the same sign. The
diagrams \((D')^r\) and \((E')^r\), are equivalent and have the same writhe, thus their Kauffman brackets must be equal. In particular, we have \(d_{\max}([([D'])^r]_{\Sigma}) = d_{\max}(([E'])^r]_{\Sigma})\). Lemma 3 implies now that
\[
d_{\max}([([D'])^r]_{\Sigma}) = \left(c(D) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \mu_i\right) r^2 + 2 \left(t(S_A(D)) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \mu_i\right) r,
\]
\[
d_{\max}([([E'])^r]_{\Sigma}) \leq \left(c(E) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \nu_i\right) r^2 + 2 \left(t(S_A(E)) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \nu_i\right) r.
\]
Since this is true for all \(r\), by comparing coefficients of the \(r^2\) terms, we find that:
\[
(7) \quad c(D) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \mu_i \leq c(E) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \nu_i.
\]
Subtracting \(\sum_{i=1}^{m} (\mu_i + w(D_i)) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} (\nu_i + w(E_i))\) from both sides of (7), we get that
\[
(8) \quad c(D) - \sum_{i=1}^{m} w(D_i) \leq c(E) - \sum_{i=1}^{m} w(E_i).
\]
Subtracting the total linking number of \(L\) from both sides of (8) gives the desired inequality.
The proof of (ii) is analogous. One adds negative kinks to \(D\) and \(E\) in this case. \(\square\)

7.2. Proof of Theorem 11. A link diagram \(D\) on \(\Sigma\) is\(\textbf{ alternable}\) if it can be made alternating by inverting some of its crossings. Every classical link diagram is alternable, but the same is not true for link diagrams in arbitrary surfaces. For example, the knot diagram in the torus in Figure 8 is not alternable.

![A knot diagram in the torus which is not alternable.](image)

**Figure 8.** A knot diagram in the torus which is not alternable.

A link diagram \(D\) on \(\Sigma\) is\(\textbf{ checkerboard colorable}\) if the components of \(\Sigma \smallsetminus D\) can be colored by two colors such that any two components of \(\Sigma \smallsetminus D\) that share an edge have opposite colors.

**Proposition 21.** Any minimal embedding \(D\) on \(\Sigma\) is alternable if and only if it is checkerboard colorable.

**Proof.** Filling the boundaries of \(\Sigma\) with disks does not affect alternability nor checkerboard colorability. This has two consequences:
(a) it is enough to prove this statement for surfaces \(\Sigma\) with all boundary components capped, i.e. for closed surfaces.
(b) Since Kamada proved that if a diagram \(D\) is a deformation retract of \(\Sigma\) then it is alternable if and only if it is checkerboard colorable, [Kam02, Lemma 7], our statement holds for cellularly embedded diagrams.
Our strategy is to reduce the proof to this case of cellular embeddings. Suppose that \( C \) is a non-disk component of \( \Sigma \setminus D \). Then it contains a non-contractible simple closed loop \( \alpha \). Let \( \Sigma' \) be obtained by cutting \( \Sigma \) along \( \alpha \) and by capping the boundary components. The loop \( \alpha \) must be separating \( \Sigma \), since otherwise \( D \hookrightarrow \Sigma' \) would be a lower genus embedding of \( D \). Observe now that since \( \Sigma \) is a connected sum of two surfaces \( \Sigma_1 \# \Sigma_2 \), where \( \Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_2 = \Sigma' \) and \( D \) is a disjoint union of \( D \cap \Sigma_1 \) and of \( D \cap \Sigma_2 \), it is enough to prove that \( D \subset \Sigma_i \) is checkerboard colored for \( i = 1, 2 \).

By repeating this process as long as possible we reduce the statement to cellularly embedded diagrams, which is covered by (b) above.

**Lemma 22.** Any alternable diagram can be extended by disjoint simple closed loops to a checkerboard colorable one.

**Proof.** The surface \( N_D \subset \Sigma \), being a regular neighborhood of \( D \), is checkerboard colorable by the earlier mentioned result of Kamada, [Kam02, Lemma 7]. The only reason that coloring does not extend to \( D \subset \Sigma \) is that some connected components \( C \) of \( \Sigma \setminus \text{int} N_D \) may have multiple connected components of their boundary whose neighborhoods are colored differently. However, that issue can be resolved by adding simple closed loops around those boundary components of \( C \) which are white.

**Proof of Theorem 11:** Let \( D \) be alternating diagram without removable crossings. By Proposition 21, by adding disjoint simple closed loops to \( D \) we obtain a diagram \( D' \) which is alternating and checkerboard colorable. Hence, it is enough to prove that \( D' \) is adequate. Let us assume for simplicity of notation that \( D \) is checkerboard colorable.

We will prove the \( A \)-adequacy of \( D \) only, as the proof of \( B \)-adequacy is identical. Let \( S \) be a state with all \( A \)-smoothings except for a \( B \)-smoothing at a crossing \( x \) of \( D \). We will prove that \( D \) is \( A \)-adequate “at \( x \),” meaning that \( t(S) \leq t(S_A) \) or \( \hat{S} \neq \hat{S}_A \) in \( \mathcal{S}(\Sigma \times I) \).

As in the proof of Proposition 2, there are three cases, and to check adequacy, it is enough to check that the conditions of Definition 1 hold in the first case, namely when \( |S| = |S_A| + 1 \). Therefore, \( S_A \) must contain a self-approaching cycle \( C \), and in the transition from \( S_A \) to \( S \), the cycle \( C \) splits into two cycles \( C_1, C_2 \) of \( S \). Since \( D \) is alternating and checkerboard colorable, \( S_A \) bounds a subsurface \( \Sigma' \) of \( \Sigma \) of a certain color, say white, which contains no crossings of \( D \).

![Figure 9](image)

We claim that neither \( C_1 \) nor \( C_2 \) is trivial. Indeed, if say \( C_1 \) were trivial, then there would be a loop \( \gamma \) parallel to \( C_1 \) totally inside \( \Sigma' \) except for a little neighborhood of \( x \), in which it would cross \( x \). Such a curve would imply that the crossing \( x \) is removable, (see for example Figure 9), which is a contradiction. Therefore neither \( C_1 \) nor \( C_2 \) is trivial, and it follows that \( t(S) = t(S_A) \). Therefore, \( D \) is \( A \)-adequate at \( x \), and this completes the proof of the theorem.
7.3. **Link diagrams and shadows.** A link shadow in $\Sigma$ is a 4-valent graph in $\Sigma$, possibly with loop components. In other words, a shadow is a link diagram with crossing types ignored. For that reason we refer to shadow vertices as crossings and the components of any link realization of a shadow as its components. (Not to be confused with connected components of a shadow.)

Some properties of link diagrams are entirely determined by its link shadow. For example, we will say that a link shadow $D$ on $\Sigma$ is **checkerboard colorable** if the components of $\Sigma \setminus D$ can be colored by two colors such that any two components of $\Sigma \setminus D$ that share an edge have opposite colors. Clearly, a link diagram is checkerboard colorable if and only if its link shadow is. Similarly, a link shadow is **minimally embedded** if it does not lie in a subsurface of $\Sigma$ of smaller genus, and it is immediate that a link diagram on $\Sigma$ is minimally embedded if and only if its link shadow is.

Each shadow crossing has two smoothings, which cannot be differentiated as $A$- and $B$-type, as in the case of link diagrams. For that reason, for shadow links it is customary to place markers at the crossings indicating the smoothing as in Figure 10.

![Figure 10](image)

**Figure 10.** Two types of markers for a state of a link shadow.

Two consecutive crossings can have identical or opposite smoothings, see Figure 11. An **alternating state** of a shadow is one with alternating crossing smoothings along all of its components. Not all shadow links admit alternating smoothings, for example the shadow of the non-alternable knot in the torus in Figure 8. On the other hand, any shadow link of an alternating link diagram admits two alternating smoothings, namely the shadow smoothings coming from $S_A$ and $S_B$.

Given a state $S$ for a link shadow $D$, the dual state is denoted $S^\vee$ and has opposite smoothing to $S$ at each crossing of $D$. Notice that a state $S$ is alternating if and only if its dual state $S^\vee$ is alternating.

We say that a 2-disk $D^2$ is 2-cutting, or simply, **cutting** a shadow $D$ if its boundary intersects $D$ transversely at two points (which are not crossings) and $D^2 \cap D$ contains some but not all the crossings of $D$. A connected shadow $D$ is said to be **strongly prime** if it has no cutting disk. More generally, a shadow $D$ is strongly prime if all of its connected components are.

![Figure 11](image)

**Figure 11.** Two consecutive crossings with identical markers (left) and opposite markers (right).
**Lemma 23.** Every crossing of every strongly prime shadow $D \subset \Sigma$ has at least one smoothing producing a shadow which is again strongly prime.

For classical links, a proof of this statement can be found in [Lic97]. That proof relies on checkerboard colorability of the diagram, which is of course true for classical links. Below, we give a proof that does not require the shadow to be checkerboard colorable.

**Proof.** Without loss of generality we can assume that $D$ is connected. Assume now that the smoothings of a crossing $v$ in a strongly prime $D$ produce diagrams $D_1, D_2$ neither of which is strongly prime. Let $B_1, B_2$ be cutting disks for $D_1$ and $D_2$. Since $D$ is strongly prime, we can assume that $v \in \partial B_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. We can also assume that $\partial B_1$ and $\partial B_2$ are in transversal position. Let $C$ be the connected component of $B_1 \cap B_2$ containing $v$, as in Figure 12 (left). The circles $\partial B_1, \partial B_2$ are broken because they may intersect each other many times.

By modifying $B_1$ or $B_2$ slightly if necessary we can assume that $D$ does not contain the second intersection point, $w$, of $\partial B_1 \cap \partial B_2$ in $C$.

Let $\alpha_1 = \text{int} C \cap \partial B_1$ and $\alpha_2 = \text{int} C \cap \partial B_2$. (Note that $v \not\in \alpha_1 \cup \alpha_2$.) Since $D$ intersects $\partial B_i - \{v\}$ twice, for $i = 1, 2$, and $D$ intersects $\alpha_1 \cup \alpha_2$ at an odd number of points, we have the following possibilities:

1. $|D \cap \alpha_2| = 1, D \cap \alpha_1 = \emptyset$
2. $|D \cap \alpha_2| = 2, |D \cap \alpha_1| = 1$
3. one of the two cases above with $\alpha_1$ interchanged with $\alpha_2$. We will ignore it without loss of generality.

In the first case, $D$ looks like in Figure 12 (center), where $S, T$ (in dashed circles) are shadow tangles. In the second case, $D$ looks like in Figure 12 (right).

In the first case, since neighborhoods of $S, T$ are not cutting disks for $D$, the tangles $S, T$ are crossingless. That means that $B_2$ is not a cutting disk for $D_2$ - a contradiction.

Consider the second case now. Note that all crossings of $D$, other than $v$, are contained in $R, S$ or $T$, since otherwise a disk containing $v, R, S$ and $T$ but no other crossings of $D$ would be cutting for $D$.

Note also that, as in the first case, $T$ is crossingless. That means that all crossings of $D_1$ are in $R$ and $S$. Hence, $B_1$ is not cutting for $D_1$ – a contradiction. 

**Proposition 24.** Let $D$ be a link shadow minimally embedded in $\Sigma$ (not necessarily connected). Then for any state $S$ of $D$,

1. $t(S) + t(S^\lor) \leq c(D) + 2|D| - 2g(\Sigma)$.

2. If $D$ is strongly prime and $S$ is non-alternating, then

$$t(S) + t(S^\lor) < c(D) + 2|D| - 2g(\Sigma).$$
Proof. If $D$ is disconnected then there is a non-trivial simple closed loop $\alpha \subset \Sigma$ in the complement of $D$. Since $D$ is minimally embedded, that loop is separating. Cutting $\Sigma$ along $\alpha$ and capping the holes does not affect the right hand side of the above inequalities and it can only increase the left hand side. Therefore, it is enough to prove statements (1) and (2) for connected shadows in closed surfaces. By the discussion at the end of Section 3, when $D$ is connected and $\Sigma$ is closed, the diagram $D$ is minimally embedded if and only if it is cellurally embedded.

Recall that $N_D$ denotes a neighborhood of $D$ in $\Sigma$ small enough so that it is a ribbon surface retractible onto $D$. For the remainder of the proof it will be useful to remember that $D$ is minimally embedded if and only if $g(N_D) = g(\Sigma)$.

If $c(D) = 0$ then $D$ is a loop, $|S| = |S^\vee| \leq 1$, $g(\Sigma) = 0$ and the statements (1) and (2) hold. (Note that $D$ is alternating.)

Assume $c(D) = 1$ now. If the crossing of $D$ is a loop self-intersection then $g(D) = 0$, $t(S) + t(S^\vee) \leq 2 + 1$, $S$ is alternating and the statement (1) holds and statement (2) is vacuously true. If the crossing of $D$ is between different components (of a link lift of $D$), then both smoothings of the crossing produce non-trivial loops and, hence, $t(S) = t(S^\vee) = 0$. Since $g(\Sigma) = 1$ statements (1) and (2) hold.

Let us prove part (2) for two crossing shadows. All possible abstract connected 2-crossing shadows $D$ are listed below.

By the celullarity assumption, $\Sigma \setminus D$ consists of disks only and, consequently, $D$ of the first and second kind must lie in $\Sigma = S^2$. The non-alternating states $S$ of $D$ of the first kind are: $\begin{array}{c}
\includegraphics[width=2cm]{first_kind_state1}\n\includegraphics[width=2cm]{first_kind_state2}\n\end{array}$. Since $t(S) = t(S^\vee) = 1$, the statement (2) holds in this case.

For the proof of part (2) for $D$ of second kind, it is enough to assume that the top and bottom loops are non-trivial (since $D$ is not strongly prime otherwise). In that case, for the non-alternating states, we have

$$t(S) + t(S^\vee) \leq 1 + 1 < 2 + c(D) + 2|D| - 2g(\Sigma).$$

Note that a cellurally embedded shadow of the third, fourth, and fifth kind must lie in a torus and that $t(S) = t(S^\vee) = 0$ for its non-alternating states in these cases. Consequently, statement (2) holds.

Now we continue the proof by induction on the crossing number $c(D)$. The base case is $c(D) = 1$ for part (1) and $c(D) = 2$ for part (2).
Inductive step: Assume the statement holds for all shadows with at most \(c-1\) crossings. Let \(S\) be a state of a cellularly embedded, \(c\)-crossing shadow \(D\) and \(x\) a crossing in \(D\).

For part (2) we assume additionally that \(D\) is strongly prime and \(S\) non-alternating. Then \(S\) has two consecutive smoothings of opposite types and we require that \(x\) is a third crossing of \(D\). Let \(D'\) be obtained from \(D\) by a smoothing of \(x\) which is arbitrary for part (1) but strongly prime for part (2). Such a smoothing exists by Lemma 23.

The chosen smoothing coincides either with the smoothing of \(x\) in \(S\) or in \(S^\vee\), and, without loss of generality, we can assume that it coincides with the smoothing of \(x\) in \(S\). Then \(S\) is a state for \(D\) and \(D'\) is a \((c-1)\)-crossing shadow and \(S\) is a state for \(D'\), non-alternating in case of part (2).

If \(D'\) is cellularly embedded (and, hence, connected), then
\[
t(S) + t(S^\vee') \leq c(D') + 2 - 2g(\Sigma),
\]
by the inductive assumption, with the sharp inequality for statement (2). Since
\[
t(S^\vee) \leq t(S^\vee') + 1 \text{ and } c(D') + 1 = c(D),
\]
the statement follows.

Assume now that \(D'\) is not cellularly embedded in \(\Sigma\). Since \(D\) is cellularly embedded, that means that there is a component of \(\Sigma \setminus D\) (necessarily a disk), which becomes an annulus in \(\Sigma \setminus D'\). Then \(S^\vee\) has two components along the boundary of that annulus, cf. Figure 13. Consequently, \(D'\) is cellularly embedded in a new surface \(\Sigma'\) obtained from \(\Sigma\) by cutting it along the core of the annulus and capping the two boundary components. Now,
\[
t(S, \Sigma') + t(S^\vee', \Sigma') \leq c(D') + \chi(\Sigma'),
\]
by the inductive assumption, where \(t(S, \Sigma'), t(S^\vee', \Sigma')\) denote the numbers of trivial components in \(\Sigma'\). That is a sharp inequality for statement (2).

Since the transition from \(S^\vee \subset \Sigma\) to \(S'^\vee \subset \Sigma'\) eliminates one trivial cycle and creates two cycles (boundaries of the annulus) which become trivial on \(\Sigma'\),
\[
t(S^\vee) + 1 \leq t(S^\vee', \Sigma').
\]
(Other cycles of \(S^\vee\) can be trivialized as well in the process of transforming \(\Sigma\) into \(\Sigma'\).)

Furthermore,
\[
t(S) \leq t(S, \Sigma'), \text{ and } \chi(\Sigma') = \chi(\Sigma) + 2.
\]

Figure 13. Transition from \(D\) to \(D'\) creating an annulus in \(\Sigma \setminus D'\).
Hence,
\[ t(S) + t(S') \leq t(S, \Sigma') + t(S', \Sigma') - 1 \leq c(D') + \chi(\Sigma') - 1 = c(D) + \chi(\Sigma). \]
This inequality is sharp in part (2). Hence, the statement follows. \( \square \)

7.4. **Proof of Theorem 12.** Part (i) follows immediately by combining Proposition 24 and Corollary 5.

For parts (ii) and (iii), note that if \( D \) is a connected sum of \( D_0 \subset \Sigma \), and \( D_1, \ldots, D_k \subset S^2 \) then
\[ (9) \quad [D]_\Sigma = \delta^{-k}[D_0]_\Sigma \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{k} [D_i]_{S^2}. \]
Therefore, it is enough to prove parts (ii) and (iii) for prime diagrams (alternating for (2) and non-alternating for (3)).

Proof of (iii): Assume \( D \) is prime. If \( D \) is strongly prime, then the statement follows from Proposition 24 and Corollary 5. If \( D \) is not strongly prime then it contains a self-crossing trivial arc. Let \( D' \) be obtained by replacing it by a simple trivial arc. Since \( D' \) is minimally embedded and \( \text{span}([D]_\Sigma) \) is invariant under Reidemeister moves,
\[ \text{span}([D]_\Sigma) = \text{span}([D']_\Sigma) \leq 4c(D') + 4|D| - 4g(\Sigma) < 4c(D) + 4|D| - 4g(\Sigma), \]
by part (i).

Our proof of (ii) follows that of [BK19, Thm. 2.9]. Since both sides of the equality in (ii) are additive under disjoint union of diagrams, it is enough to prove it for connected diagrams.

By Proposition 24, \( D \) is checkerboard colorable. Then all regions of one color, say white, are enclosed by the cycles in the state \( S_A \) of \( D \), and all regions of the other color, i.e., black, are enclosed by the cycles in the state \( S_B \). Therefore, the numbers of white and black regions are \( t(S_A) \) and \( t(S_B) \), respectively. Since \( D \) defines a cellular decomposition of \( \Sigma \) into \( c(D) \) 0-cells, \( 2c(D) \) 1-cells, and \( t(S_A) + t(S_B) \) 2-cells,
\[ 2 - 2g(\Sigma) = \chi(\Sigma) = c(D) - 2c(D) + t(S_A) + t(S_B), \]
and
\[ t(S_A) + t(S_B) = c(D) + 2 - 2g(\Sigma). \]
By Proposition 3
\[ \text{span}([D]_\Sigma) = d_{\max}([D]_\Sigma) - d_{\min}([D]_\Sigma)), \]
\[ = 2c(D) + 2t(S_A) + 2t(S_B), \]
\[ = 4c(D) + 4 - 4g(\Sigma). \]

\[ \square \]
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