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Abstract  We give an algorithm to determine the crosscap number of a knot in the 3–sphere using 0–efficient triangulations and normal surface theory. This algorithm is shown to be correct for a larger class of complements of knots in closed 3–manifolds. The crosscap number is closely related to the minimum over all spanning slopes of a more general invariant, the slope norm. For any irreducible 3–manifold $M$ with incompressible boundary a torus, we give an algorithm that, for every slope on the boundary that represents the trivial class in $H_1(M;\mathbb{Z}_2)$, determines the maximal Euler characteristic of any properly embedded surface having a boundary curve of this slope.
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1 Introduction

The main contribution of this paper is an algorithm to compute the crosscap number of a knot in the 3–sphere. Efforts to compute the crosscap number of a knot have been at the centre of various other research projects using a variety of techniques. Among these is a formula for the crosscap number of torus knots by Teragaito [22]; an algorithm for alternating knots developed by Adams and Kindred [1]; or upper and lower bounds for the general case via the Jones polynomial by Kalfagianni and Lee [17]. Recent work by Ito and Takimura [8, 9, 10] establishes various further bounds. The KnotInfo data base [18], and in particular their page on crosscap numbers, gives a detailed overview and results for specific knots.

Our work completes an approach put forward by Burton and Ozlen [3]. Our starting point is Jaco and Sedgwick’s generalisation [16] of a celebrated result by Hatcher [5]: they showed that in any orientable, irreducible 3–manifold with incompressible boundary a torus there are only finitely many boundary slopes of geometrically incompressible and $\partial$-incompressible surfaces. We give three applications of a technical observation in [16] that concerns fundamental surfaces.

Slope norm. We give an algorithm that, for an irreducible 3-manifold with boundary a torus and a slope on the boundary that represent the trivial class in $H_1(M;\mathbb{Z}_2)$, determines the maximal Euler characteristic of any properly embedded connected surface having connected boundary of this slope (Theorem 8). We call the negative of this number the norm of the slope. This norm is used in forthcoming work to apply the complexity bounds given in [13, 14, 15] to infinite families of Dehn fillings. Similar results to our slope norm algorithm were obtained independently by Howie [7], and used for different applications. In this paper, our work on slope norm feeds into the second application.

Crosscap number. The second application is two algorithms to determine the crosscap number of a knot in the 3–sphere (Theorem 11 and Theorem 15). Our algorithms are shown to be correct for a larger class of complements of knots in closed 3–manifolds $N$ that represent the trivial class in $H_1(N;\mathbb{Z}_2)$, including all that have a complete hyperbolic structure of finite volume. Burton and Ozlen [3] describe a procedure (Algorithm 3), where on input a knot in the 3–sphere the output is either one integer (the crosscap number) or a pair of consecutive integers (one of which is the crosscap number). Our Theorem 11 shows that in the latter case, the crosscap number is the larger integer. The apparent difficulty of determining the crosscap number algorithmically lies in the key case where every maximal Euler characteristic spanning surface is orientable. This is
addressed in Lemma 14. Burton and Ozlen use special triangulations, in which the existence of fundamental spanning surfaces is guaranteed. Our more general algorithm given by Theorem 15 uses the slope norm algorithm to work with arbitrary 0–efficient triangulations. The basic idea is that Burton and Ozlen’s so-called suitable triangulations ensure that minimal spanning surfaces can be found amongst the normal surfaces even though in general they may be $\partial$–compressible. In an arbitrary triangulation, there may be no non-orientable normal spanning surfaces of maximal Euler characteristic, but our slope norm algorithm keeps track of optimal boundary compression sequences.

**Knot genus.** As a third application, we show in Section 4 that in the framework of this paper, one can give a short proof of Schubert’s classical result that the genus of a knot is realised by one of the fundamental surfaces.

**Terminology and notation.** We refer the reader to either of [3, 12, 16, 19] for the definitions and basic properties of normal surface theory in (singular) triangulations, and [3, 12] for basic facts concerning 0–efficient triangulations used in this paper.

**Computation.** A previous version of this article announced computational results which contained an error in implementation and need to be re-run.

**Acknowledgements.** Jaco is partially supported by the Grayce B. Kerr Foundation. Research of Rubinstein, Spreer and Tillmann is supported in part under the Australian Research Council’s Discovery funding scheme (project number DP190102259).

## 2 The norm of an even slope

Throughout this section let $M$ be an orientable, compact, irreducible 3–manifold with $\partial M$ a single, incompressible torus. Suppose $\mathcal{T}$ is a (singular or semi-simplicial) triangulation of $M$ with the property that the induced triangulation $\mathcal{T}_0$ of $\partial M$ has exactly one vertex. For instance, a 0–efficient triangulation has this property [12]. In the following, we choose the single vertex of $\mathcal{T}$ as the base point for the fundamental group of $M$ and omit it in the notation.

We first show that every connected essential curve $c \subset \partial M$ with $[c] = 0 \in H_1(M, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ bounds a properly embedded connected surface $S \subset M$ with $\partial S = c$ (Corollary 4). We then use a result by Jaco and Sedgwick, Proposition 6 or [16, Corollary 3.8], to conclude that if $\mathcal{T}$ is 0–efficient and $S$ is of maximal Euler characteristic amongst all connected surfaces with this slope and $\partial$–incompressible, then a surface of equal boundary slope and Euler characteristic must be represented by a fundamental surface in $\mathcal{T}$. This then leads to Algorithm 9 to compute the smallest norm of a given boundary slope on $\partial M$ with respect to a given framing.

**Lemma 1** Let $\rho : \pi_1(M) \to \mathbb{Z}_2$ be a homomorphism with the property that $\rho (m) = 1$ for some primitive peripheral element $m \in im(\pi_1(\partial M) \to \pi_1(M))$. Then for every primitive peripheral element $\gamma \in ker(\rho)$, there is a properly embedded surface $S$ in $M$ with $\partial S$ a single boundary curve that satisfies $[\partial S] = \gamma^{\pm 1}$, as free homotopy classes of unoriented loops. In particular, $[\gamma] = 0 \in H_1(M, \mathbb{Z}_2)$.

The proof of the lemma introduces the way we will use the Farey graph in our later algorithms.

**Proof** First note that there is $l \in im(\pi_1(\partial M) \to \pi_1(M))$ with $\rho(l) = 0$ and $(m, l) = im(\pi_1(\partial M) \to \pi_1(M))$. The primitive peripheral elements in $ker \rho$ are precisely the elements $m^{2k}l^q$, where $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $gcd(2k, q) = 1$. Since the boundary of $M$ is incompressible and has abelian fundamental group, we have

$$im(\pi_1(\partial M) \to \pi_1(M)) \cong \pi_1(\partial M) \cong H_1(\partial M, \mathbb{Z}).$$

We therefore identify all groups and start using additive notation for peripheral elements. Since we are only interested in unoriented isotopy classes of primitive elements, we always choose $\rho m + q l$ with $q \geq 0$.

We first show that there is a surface for some peripheral element in the kernel. Our 0–efficient triangulation $\mathcal{T}$ of $M$ has exactly one vertex. Hence every edge is a loop and represents an element of $\pi_1(M)$. This maps to
either 0 or 1 under $\rho$. Place a normal corner on an edge if and only if the corresponding element maps to 1. As observed in [15], this results in a normal surface in $M$ having at most a single triangle or a single quadrilateral in each tetrahedron as shown in Figure 1. Since $\rho(m) = 1$, this normal surface has a single boundary curve $|\partial S| = 2k' m + q' l$ for some $q' \geq 0$ and $\gcd(2k', q') = 1$. This single boundary curve meets each boundary triangle in a single normal arc.

We now show how all other boundary curves $2k \ m + q \ l$, where $q > 0$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\gcd(2k, q) = 1$ can be obtained by adding saddles to $S$. To this end, we use the layering procedure (see [15] and Figure 3) in conjunction with the Farey tesselation as an organising principle for the set of isotopy classes of triangulations of the torus with a marked point. This is different from the $L$–graph used in [15].

We treat the single vertex in the induced triangulation $T_0$ of $\partial M$ as a marked point, and give the torus $\partial M$ a Euclidean structure with the property that the marked point lifts to the integer lattice via a universal covering map $\mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \partial M$. Moreover, up to the action of the Deck group, we may assume that $m$ and $l$ lift to horizontal and vertical lines respectively. The map

$$p \ m + q \ l \mapsto \frac{p}{q}$$

gives a bijection between the set of isotopy classes of primitive curves and $\mathbb{Q} \cup \{\infty\}$. Now the isotopy classes of triangulations with single vertex at the marked point correspond to the orbit of the triple $\left(\frac{1}{0}, \frac{0}{1}, \frac{-1}{1}\right)$ under the action of $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$ by Möbius transformations. Identifying $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ with the boundary of the Poincaré disc model of the hyperbolic plane and each triple with an ideal triangle gives the well-known Farey tesselation.

Each triple $\left(\frac{m_0}{q_0}, \frac{p_1}{q_1}, \frac{p_2}{q_2}\right)$ contains precisely one fraction with even numerator, say $\frac{m_0}{q_0}$. Note that the corresponding primitive element is in the kernel of $\rho$, whilst the other two are mapped to 1. The normal curve resulting from our above procedure of assigning 0 or 1 to each edge, when applied to the corresponding marked triangulation of the boundary, results in a normal curve of slope $p_0 \ m + q_0 \ l$. We call $\frac{p_0}{q_0}$ the even slope of the triple.

The dual 1–skeleton to the Farey tesselation is an infinite trivalent tree. Any two triangulations that correspond to triangles sharing an edge in the tesselation are related by an edge flip. If one of the triangulations corresponds to $T_0$, then, as an operation on the triangulation $T$ of $M$, one can layer a tetrahedron $\sigma$ on $T$ along the edge that is being flipped; see Figure 3. This results in a new triangulation $T' = T \cup \sigma$ of $M$ with the property that the isotopy class of the triangulation of the boundary has changed. Since the trivalent tree is connected, one observes that all isotopy classes of triangulations of $\partial M$ can be realised as the induced triangulations of the boundary of $M$. In particular, every even slope is an edge in some triangulation of the boundary of $M$. It remains to relate this information to triangulations of $M$ and boundary curves of properly embedded surfaces.

Each triangulation of $\partial M$ allows three distinct flips, corresponding to the three edges of the ideal triangle in the Farey tesselation. The effect of layering a tetrahedron on the triangulation has the effect of changing the normal surface $S$ to a normal surface $S'$ by adding a quadrilateral. If the corresponding ideal edge in the Farey tesselation has endpoint at the even slope, then the layering adds a pinched annulus to $S$ and maintains its boundary slope. If the ideal edge does not have an endpoint at the even slope, then a punctured and pinched Möbius strip (which we call a saddle) is added to $S$, hence its Euler characteristic lowered by 1, and its slope changes to the even slope of the adjacent triangle in the Farey tesselation. Topologically, the relationship
The inclusion map induces a homomorphism $H_1(\partial M, \mathbb{Z}) \to H_1(M, \mathbb{Z})$ which we precompose with the natural map $H_1(\partial M, \mathbb{Z}) \to H_1(\partial M, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ to obtain $\varphi: H_1(\partial M, \mathbb{Z}) \to H_1(M, \mathbb{Z}_2)$. The next lemma shows that the homomorphism in the hypothesis of Lemma 1 exists and is unique.

**Lemma 2** We have $H = \text{im}(\varphi: H_1(\partial M, \mathbb{Z}) \to H_1(M, \mathbb{Z}_2)) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$.

It follows from the lemma that we may choose a basis $(m_2, l_2)$ of $H_1(\partial M, \mathbb{Z})$ with the property that $\varphi(m_2) \neq 0 = \varphi(l_2)$. We say that the basis $(m_2, l_2)$ is a 2–torsion framing of $\partial M$ and call $m_2$ a 2–meridian and $l_2$ a 2–longitude.

**First proof (geometric topology).** First assume that $H = \text{im}(\varphi: H_1(\partial M, \mathbb{Z}) \to H_1(M, \mathbb{Z}_2)) = \{0\}$. Let $(m, l)$ be any basis of $H_1(\partial M, \mathbb{Z})$. Choose a sufficiently fine simplicial triangulation of $M$ so that we may choose a simple closed curve $L$ in the 1–skeleton in $\partial M$ that is isotopic to $l$. Since $\varphi(l) = 0$, there is a 2–chain $C$ in the 2–skeleton with $\partial C = L$. Since we are working with $\mathbb{Z}_2$ coefficients, $C$ is an assignment of 0 or 1 to each
2–simplex in the triangulation. We add a product collar to ∂M and add the annulus L × [0, 1] to C. We let M and C denote the resulting manifold and chain again.

Each 1–simplex in the interior of M meets C in an even number of 2–simplices. Hence, away from the vertices, we can resolve the 2–simplices in pairs to obtain a properly embedded but possibly singular surface S’ in M with the property that its singularities are contained in the set of interior vertices of the triangulation of M. Now a small regular neighbourhood N of the union of all vertices meets S’ in a union of circles. Hence, we replace S ∩ N with a union of discs, giving a properly embedded surface S in M with ∂S = L.

Since m meets 1 in a single point, the intersection pairing implies that ϕ(m∞) ̸= 0 ∈ H1(M, Z2). But this contradicts our hypothesis that H = {0}.

Hence H ̸= {0}. It now follows from Lemma 1 that the rank of H cannot be two. Hence, it must be one.

Second proof (algebraic topology). First assume that H = im(ϕ : H1(∂M, Z) → H1(M, Z2)) = {0}. Glue a solid torus to M, resulting in a closed 3–manifold N. Since N is closed, the Euler characteristic of N is zero and we have b1(N, Z2) = b2(N, Z2). Consider the following part of the Mayer-Vietoris long exact sequence in homology with Z2 coefficients:

... → H1(∂M, Z) → H1(M, Z) ⊕ H1(S1 × D2, Z2) → H1(N, Z2) → ....

Since H = {0}, we have H1(N, Z2) ≃ H1(M, Z2). Now H = {0} also implies that there is a relative Z2–chain in M that attaches to the meridian disc of the solid torus. The intersection pairing with the core curve of the solid torus implies that the rank of H2(N, Z2) is one larger than the rank of H2(M, Z2). In particular, b1(M, Z2) = b2(M, Z2) + 1.

Now consider the long exact sequence for the pair (M, ∂M) with Z2–coefficients. We obtain

0 → H2(M, Z2) → H2(M, ∂M, Z2) → H1(∂M, Z2) → 0.

Using Poincaré-Lefschetz duality and the universal coefficient theorem, we have


This gives b1(M, Z2) = b2(M, Z2) + 2, contradicting the calculation in the first paragraph.

Hence H ̸= {0}. It now follows from Lemma 1 that the rank of H is one.

Remark 3 The standard half-lives half-dies argument [6, Lemma 3.5] implies for homology with rational coefficients that one may choose a basis {m∞, l∞} = H1(∂M, Z) with the property that m∞ maps to an element of infinite order whilst l∞ maps to an element of finite order under the inclusion map to H1(M, Z). In particular, l∞ is uniquely determined up to sign, whilst m∞ is only well-defined up to sign and a power of l∞. We call l∞ the homological longitude and m∞ a homological meridian.
Figure 4: The three possible layerings on the boundary torus. Two add a pinched annulus to the surface and do not change the boundary slope. The last adds a saddle and changes the boundary slope according to the labelling of the associated ideal triangles in the Farey graph.

It is not necessarily the case that one may choose \((m_2, l_2) = (m_\infty, l_\infty)\). To make this statement less mysterious, we give a third proof of the lemma that does not appeal to a contradiction.

**Third proof (geometric topology).** Suppose the order of \(l_\infty\) is \(m\) in \(H_1(M, \mathbb{Z})\). The significance of the order is that \(m_\infty\) maps to an element of the form \(a^m h\) in \(H_1(M, \mathbb{Z})\), where \(a\) generates a free \(\mathbb{Z}\) summand and \(h\) is a torsion element. A geometric interpretation of this algebraic relationship arises from a construction due to Stallings [21] that produces a properly embedded, connected oriented surface \(S\) in \(M\) with \([\partial S] = \pm m l_\infty\) dual to the action of \(\pi_1(M)\) on \(\mathbb{R}\) associated with a homomorphism \(\pi_1(M) \to H_1(M, \mathbb{Z}) \to \mathbb{Z}\) with \(a \mapsto 1\). Moreover, \(S\) has exactly \(m\) boundary components, which implies that all have the same induced orientation, and the meridian has algebraic intersection number \(\pm m\) with the surface.

Note that if one connects any two adjacent boundary components with a boundary parallel annulus, then one obtains a non-orientable surface. In particular, if \(m\) is odd, then one may connect pairs of boundary components with annuli to obtain a properly embedded non-orientable surface \(S\) in \(M\) with a single boundary curve \([\partial S] = \pm l_\infty\). In particular, \(m_\infty\) maps to a generator of the image and \(l_\infty\) is contained in the kernel of \(\phi: H_1(\partial M, \mathbb{Z}) \to H_1(M, \mathbb{Z}_2)\). Hence we may choose \(m_2 = m_\infty\) and \(l_2 = l_\infty\).

If \(m\) is even, the same construction of connecting boundary components in pairs results in a closed non-orientable surface in \(M\). Since \(m\) is the order of \(l_\infty\) in \(H_1(M, \mathbb{Z})\), there are two cases, depending on whether \(\phi(l_\infty)\) maps to zero or not.

First assume that \(m = 2\) and \(\phi(l_\infty)\) is the generator of a \(\mathbb{Z}_2\)-summand. Then there is a homomorphism \(\rho: \pi_1(M) \to \mathbb{Z}_2\) with \(\rho(l_\infty) = 1\). Then \(\rho(\gamma) = 0\), where either \(\gamma = m_\infty\) or \(\gamma = m_\infty l_\infty\). Now \([\gamma] = 0 \in H_1(M, \mathbb{Z}_2)\) according to Lemma 1. It follows that we may choose \(m_2 = l_\infty\) and \(l_2 = \gamma\).
The remaining case is that \( \varphi(l_0) = 0 \). In this case, the construction from the first proof of the surface \( S \) with 
\[ \{l_0\} = [\partial S] = 0 \in H_1(M, \mathbb{Z}_2) \]
can be applied, and we let \( l_2 = l_0 \). Since \( m_\infty \) meets \( l_0 \) in a single point, we have 
\[ \varphi(m_\infty) \neq 0 \in H_1(M, \mathbb{Z}_2) \]. So we let \( m_2 = m_\infty \). 

We use the following terminology and notation for unoriented isotopy classes of non-trivial simple closed loops on the boundary torus. Let \( \alpha \in \text{im}(\pi_1(\partial M) \to \pi_1(M)) \), and consider \( [\alpha] \in H_1(\partial M, \mathbb{Z}) \). If \( [\alpha] = p m_2 + q l_2 \) is a non-trivial primitive class in \( H_1(\partial M, \mathbb{Z}) \) with \( q \geq 0 \), then we call \( \alpha \) a slope. We may therefore identify a slope with an unoriented isotopy class of a non-trivial simple closed loop on the torus. Conversely, each such unoriented isotopy class arises from a unique slope. A slope \( \alpha \) is an even slope if \( \alpha \) maps to zero in \( H_1(M, \mathbb{Z}_2) \). We remark that this is consistent with the terminology concerning even slopes in the Farey construction in Lemma 1.

Given a surface \( S \) with connected boundary, we give \( \partial S \) the unique orientation that makes \( [\partial S] \in \pi_1(M) \) a slope. Now Lemmas 1 and 2 imply:

**Corollary 4** Let \( \alpha \in \text{im}(\pi_1(\partial M) \to \pi_1(M)) \) be a slope. There is a properly embedded surface \( S \) in \( M \) with 
\[ [\partial S] = \alpha \] if and only if \( \alpha \) is an even slope.

The norm of an even slope \( \alpha \) is defined as:
\[ || \alpha || = \min \{-\chi(S) \mid S \text{ is a properly embedded surface in } M \text{ with } [\partial S] = \alpha\} \]

Since \( \partial M \) is incompressible, we have \( || \alpha || \geq 0 \) for all even slopes. We say that \( S \) is taut for \( \alpha \) if \( S \) is connected, \( [\partial S] = \alpha \) and \( || \alpha || = -\chi(S) \).

**Remark 5** We emphasise here that the slope norm is defined on isotopy classes of simple closed connected curves on the boundary of \( M \), and that it gives the maximal Euler characteristic of a surface with connected boundary of this slope. A related approach, which we do not take, would be to also consider surfaces with multiple boundary components.

The key results that will be used from Jaco and Sedgwick’s work are [16, Proposition 3.7 and Corollary 3.8]. We require a few definitions in order to state them. We refer readers unfamiliar with the concepts in normal surface theory that are mentioned here to either of [12, 16].

The boundary curves of a normal surface \( S \) form a collection of normal curves on \( \partial M \). It is shown in [16] that two normal curves are normally isotopic with respect to \( \mathcal{T} \) if and only if they are isotopic on \( \partial M \), and that a normal curve is trivial if and only if it is vertex linking. It follows that we can identify a slope with the normal isotopy class of a non-trivial normal curve on the torus. For a collection \( C \) of pairwise disjoint normal curves on the torus containing at least one non-trivial component, the slope of \( C \) is the isotopy class of a non-trivial component. Two slopes are complementary if their Haken sum is a collection of trivial curves.

Jaco and Sedgwick show that if two normal surfaces are compatible and meet \( \partial M \) in non-trivial slopes, then these slopes are either equal or complementary [16, Proposition 3.7]. The projective solution space of normal surface theory is denoted by \( \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T}) \). Given a normal surface \( S \), its carrier is the unique minimal face \( \mathcal{C}(S) \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T}) \) that contains the projectivised normal coordinate of \( S \).

**Proposition 6** (Jaco-Sedgwick, Corollary 3.8 [16]) Let \( M \) be an orientable, compact, connected 3–manifold with \( \partial M \) a single torus. Suppose \( \mathcal{T} \) is a triangulation of \( M \) that restricts to a one-vertex triangulation of \( \partial M \). Suppose \( S \) is a normal surface and \( \partial S \neq 0 \). Assume also that \( \partial S \) contains at least one essential curve. There are at most two slopes (complementary ones) for all surfaces in the carrier \( \mathcal{C}(S) \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T}) \).

**Lemma 7** Let \( M \) be an orientable, compact, irreducible 3–manifold with \( \partial M \) a single, incompressible torus. Let \( \mathcal{T} \) be a 0–efficient triangulation of \( M \) and let \( \alpha \in \text{im}(\pi_1(\partial M) \to \pi_1(M)) \) be an even slope. If there is an incompressible and \( \partial \)–incompressible surface \( S \) in \( M \) with 
\[ [\partial S] = \alpha \] and 
\[ \chi(S) = -|| \alpha ||, \]
then there is a fundamental surface \( F \) of \( \mathcal{T} \) with 
\[ [\partial F] = \alpha \] and 
\[ \chi(F) = -|| \alpha ||. \]
Proof Let $S$ be an incompressible and $\partial$–incompressible surface $S$ with $[\partial S] = \alpha$ and $\chi(S) = -||\alpha||$. Since $M$ is irreducible and has incompressible boundary, we can isotope $S$ to be a normal surface. If $S$ is not fundamental, then $S$ is a sum of fundamental surfaces. Now $S$ has boundary a single curve. It follows from Proposition 6 that there is only a single summand, $F$, with non-empty boundary and all other summands are closed normal surfaces. To see this note that otherwise $S$ would have disconnected boundary or a trivial curve in the boundary. Whence $[\partial F] = [\partial S] = \alpha$. Since $\chi(S) = -||\alpha||$, we have $\chi(F) \leq \chi(S)$. Since Euler characteristic is additive under Haken sums and the triangulation is 0–efficient, this forces $\chi(F) = \chi(S)$. \hfill \Box

Theorem 8 Let $M$ be an orientable, compact, irreducible 3–manifold with $\partial M$ a single, incompressible torus. Suppose $\mathcal{T}$ is a 0–efficient triangulation of $M$, and $(m_2, l_2)$ a 2-torsion framing of $\partial M$.

There is an algorithm that, upon input $\mathcal{T}$ with a 2-torsion framing and an even slope, computes the norm of this slope.

Proof Let $\delta$ be an even slope and $S$ be a taut surface for $\delta$. Hence $S$ has a single boundary slope of slope $\delta$, is incompressible, and satisfies $||\delta|| = -\chi(S)$. If $S$ is not $\partial$–incompressible, we can perform boundary compressions on $S$ until we have an incompressible and $\partial$–incompressible surface. Denote the resulting sequence of surfaces $S = S_0, S_1, \ldots, S_n$ with boundary slopes $\delta = \delta_0, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n$, where $S_0$ is an incompressible and $\partial$–incompressible surface, and $S_i$ is obtained from $S_{i-1}$ by a single boundary compression. In particular, $\chi(S_i) = \chi(S_{i-1}) + 1$.

Let $\delta_i$ be the slope of $S_i$. Since $S = S_0$ is a taut surface for $\delta_0$, it follows inductively that $S_i$ is a taut surface for $\delta_i$, since otherwise reversing the process of boundary compressions by adding saddles to a taut surface would result in a surface of higher Euler characteristic. It now follows from Lemma 7 that $S_n$ is isotopic to a fundamental surface with respect to the 0–efficient triangulation $\mathcal{T}$.

A priori, there are infinitely many possibilities for the slope $\delta_1$ that result from a boundary compression on $S_0$, as can be seen from the Farey tree described in Figure 2. However, the facts that we have a sequence of boundary compressions terminating at a fundamental surface (and hence at one of only a finite list of slopes), and that the set of boundary slopes can be organised via the trivalent tree that is the dual 1–skeleton of the Farey tesselation, makes the problem of determining $\chi(S)$ finite.

In order to compute the norm of the given even slope $\delta$, we first compute the (finite) set of all fundamental surfaces. This is equivalent to enumerating a Hilbert basis on the projective solution space. Amongst these, we select the surfaces with connected boundary. Denote these surfaces $F_i$ and their slopes $\alpha_i$. We remark that $F_i$ may not be taut for $\alpha_i$. For all the surfaces in the list that have the same slope, we only keep one of maximal Euler characteristic.

Consider the Farey tesselation associated with the framing $(m_2, l_2)$. Recall that the dual 1–skeleton is an infinite trivalent tree. We use this to define distances between ideal triangles (equivalently, isotopy classes of 1–vertex triangulations). For every slope, there are infinitely many ideal triangles with a vertex at this slope. We make a canonical (but arbitrary) choice by choosing, for each $\alpha_i$ the ideal triangle $\tau(\alpha_i) = (\alpha_i, \beta_i, \gamma_i)$ that is at shortest distance from the base triangle $\left(\frac{1}{\beta_i}, 0, -\frac{1}{\gamma_i}\right)$. Note that this is characterised by the relationship $\alpha_i = \beta_i \oplus \gamma_i$ in Farey addition (whereby numerators and denominators are simply added). If $\alpha_i$ is the ideal vertex of some ideal triangle $\tau_i$, then we call $\alpha_i$ the even slope of $\tau_i$. Note that the set of all ideal triangles with the same even slope corresponds to an infinite line in the dual tree.

The effect of a boundary compression on the slope of a surface is exactly one step in the dual tree between triangles with distinct even slopes. The reverse step is the addition of a saddle. Hence the sequence $S = S_0, S_1, \ldots, S_n$ described above corresponds to a path without backtracking between $\tau(\delta_0)$ and $\tau(\delta_n)$ in the dual tree. The difference $\chi(S_n) - \chi(S_0)$ is the number of edges in this path that have endpoints in triangles of different even slopes. This difference is well-defined since the dual 1–skeleton of the Farey tesselation is a tree.

Given even slopes $\alpha$ and $\beta$, let $d(\alpha, \beta)$ be the number of edges in the shortest path between $\tau(\alpha)$ and $\tau(\beta)$ that have endpoints in triangles of different even slopes. Note that this is independent of the choice of $\tau(\alpha)$.
and \( \tau(\beta) \) as triangles with those even slopes. It follows that
\[
|| \delta || = -\chi(S) = \min_{F_i} \{-\chi(F_i) + d(\alpha_i, \delta)\}.
\]
This completes the proof.

The proof leads to the following algorithm:

**Algorithm 9** Compute the norm of a given even slope

**INPUT:**
1. \( \mathcal{T} \) 0-efficient triangulation of \( M \)
2. \( (m_2, l_2) \) 2-torsion framing of \( \partial M \)
3. \( p/q \) even boundary slope

Compute fundamental surfaces of \( \mathcal{T} \)

for \( S \) fundamental surface with connected boundary do

Compute boundary slope of \( S \) with respect to \( (m_2, l_2) \)

if boundary slope already in Farey tesselation data structure then

update norm = min (norm, \(-\chi(S)\))

else

insert boundary slope and norm into Farey tesselation data structure

end if

end for

Insert \( p/q \) into boundary slope into Farey tesselation data structure

**return** minimum of (distance + norm) of \( p/q \) to boundary slopes in the Farey tesselation data structure

**Remark 10** (Farey tesselation data structure.) In the proof, we have chosen to associate a canonical triangle in the Farey tesselation with an even slope. In practice, one may use any triangle with the slope, thus saving some computations. If the norms of many slopes are to be computed, then it would be worthwhile to first setup a data structure containing the norm for each slope of a fundamental surface.

It is important to note that we do not have to deal with the infinite object that is the Farey tesselation, but with a finite tree that is modelled on the dual 1-skeleton of the Farey tesselation. The nodes of our data structure are the ones of the dual 1-skeleton corresponding to even boundary slopes realised as boundary slopes of fundamental surfaces. Arcs are established between nodes along edges in the dual 1-skeleton of the Farey tesselation. This is an efficient procedure thanks to the Euclidean algorithm. It may add auxiliary nodes that are common to paths coming from different nodes. The arcs are assigned weights equal to the number of edges in the dual 1-skeleton of the Farey tesselation that have endpoints in triangles of different even slopes. With this setup, providing a query boundary slope amounts to inserting this extra slope into the data structure (exactly as before), and computing weighted path lengths without backtracking to all other nodes.

### 3 Crosscap number of knots

We are now restricting our view to knot exteriors with the following special property. Suppose \( N \) is a closed, orientable 3–manifold, and \( K \subset N \) a knot with \([K] = 0 \in H_1(N; \mathbb{Z}_2)\).

Let \( \nu(K) \) be an open regular neighbourhood of \( K \). We assume that the exterior \( M = N \setminus \nu(K) \) is irreducible and contains no non-separating torus and no embedded Klein bottle. For instance, this is the case for any knot in \( N = S^3 \), and it is the case for any hyperbolic knot in \( N \), i.e. when \( M \) has a complete hyperbolic structure of finite volume.
The knot $K$ is trivial in $N$ if there is a properly embedded disc in $M$ that has non-trivial slope on $\partial M$. In particular, $K$ is non-trivial if and only if $M$ has incompressible boundary.

The crosscap number $c(K)$ of a non-trivial knot $K \subset N$ is defined by:

$$c(K) = \min \{ 1 - \chi(S) \mid S \text{ is a non-orientable spanning surface for } K \}.$$ 

The crosscap number of a trivial knot is defined to be zero. The subtle difference between crosscap number and slope norm is that the crosscap number is not simply obtained by computing the minimal norm over all slopes of spanning surfaces, since it also takes into account the orientability class of a taut surface.

3.1 Geometric framings and spanning surfaces

The closure of $\nu(K)$ is a solid torus, and the curve $m_g$ on $\partial M$ bounding the meridian disc for this solid torus is the geometric meridian for $K$. This information allows us to pass between $(N, K)$ and $(M, m_g)$.

A spanning surface for $K$ in $N$ is an embedded, connected surface $S$ in $N$ with $\partial S = K$. If $S$ is a spanning surface for $K$ in $N$, then $F = S \cap M$ has the property that $\partial F$ has algebraic intersection number $\pm 1$ with $m_g$ on the boundary torus (after choosing orientations for both curves). Conversely, suppose $F$ is a properly embedded surface in $M$ with a single boundary component. If $\partial F$ has algebraic intersection number $\pm 1$ with $m_g$, then $F$ extends to a spanning surface of $K$ in $N$.

The condition that $[K] = 0 \in H_1(N; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ implies that $K$ has a (possibly non-orientable) spanning surface. The intersection pairing with the meridian shows that $m_g$ maps to a non-trivial element of $\text{im}(H_1(\partial M, \mathbb{Z}) \to H_1(M, \mathbb{Z}_2))$, and hence is a 2–meridian.

Recall the definition of a homological framing in Remark 3. In the setting here, it is more natural to define a geometric framing that includes the class of the boundary of the meridian disc as a generator.

**Geometric framing, I.** Suppose $K$ has an orientable spanning surface $S$. Then the boundary of $S$ is the homological longitude of $M$ and, due to the intersection pairing, the geometric meridian is a homological meridian. In particular, $K$ has an orientable spanning surface if and only if $[K] = 0 \in H_1(N; \mathbb{Z})$. By the discussion above, in this case, every non-orientable spanning surface has boundary slope of the form $2k m_g + l_\infty$ (recall that we represent isotopy classes of unoriented curves by choosing a representative with non-positive longitudinal coordinate). Any orientable spanning surface can be turned into a non-orientable spanning surface by attaching a saddle, and iteratively adding saddles shows that the set of all slopes of spanning surfaces is precisely the set

$$S(K) = \{ 2k m_\infty + l_\infty \mid k \in \mathbb{Z} \}$$

for any homological meridian. Alternatively, one may define a geometric longitude $l_g = l_\infty$ and hence

$$S(K) = \{ 2k m_g + l_g \mid k \in \mathbb{Z} \}$$

is the set of all boundary slopes of spanning surfaces. See Figure 9 for the subtree of spanning slopes sitting inside the dual of the Farey tesselation.

**Geometric framing, II.** Now suppose $K$ has no orientable, but a non-orientable spanning surface $S$. This is the case if and only if $[K] = 0 \in H_1(N; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ and $[K] \neq 0 \in H_1(N; \mathbb{Z})$. The “only if” direction follows from the existence of $S$ and the discussion above, and the “if” direction from the construction given in the proof of Lemma 1. By the above, we have $|\partial S| = 2k_0 m_\infty + q_0 l_\infty$, for some $q_0, k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$, $q_0$ and $2k_0$ co-prime, and $q_0 > 0$. Since this is isotopic to the core curve of $\nu(K)$, $m_g = r_0 m_\infty + s_0 l_\infty$, where $2k_0 s_0 - q_0 r_0 = \pm 1$. Each slope of a non-orientable surface is zero in $H_1(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ and meets the geometric meridian once algebraically. Again, by adding saddles to $S$, one can obtain all possible slopes that arise this way, and we conclude that the slopes of all spanning surfaces are precisely the set

$$S(K) = \{ 2k m_g + (2k_0 m_\infty + q_0 l_\infty) \mid k \in \mathbb{Z} \}.$$
To obtain a more pleasing description, we define a geometric longitude $l_g$ as follows. Fix a Euclidean norm on $H_1(\partial M, \mathbb{Z})$ with the property that $\| l_\infty \| = 1$ and $\| m_g \| = 1$. Then define $l_g$ to be a shortest curve in $S(K)$. It then follows that

$$S(K) = \{ 2k m_g + l_g \mid k \in \mathbb{Z} \}.$$  

**Computing intersection numbers.** Suppose $\mathcal{T}$ is a triangulation of $M$ with the property that the induced triangulation $\mathcal{T}_g$ of $\partial M$ is a two-triangle triangulation of the torus. The purpose of this section is to show how to set up the equations to determine whether a given normal surface is a spanning surface.

Given a normal surface $S$ with non-empty boundary, we obtain $\partial S = c$ as a (not necessarily connected) normal curve in $\mathcal{T}_g$. The normal curve $c$ is connected if and only if the greatest common divisor of its coordinates equals one. Hence $S$ can only be a spanning surface if this is the case.

We assume that the geometric meridian $m_g$ is given as a normal curve with respect to $\mathcal{T}_g$. We now explain how to compute the minimal number of intersections between the isotopy classes of any two essential, connected normal curves (such as $m_g$ and $\partial S = c$). This makes use of the fact that, on the torus, the geometric and the algebraic intersection numbers of oriented curves coincide.

![Figure 5: The figure-8 graphs and their orientations for the three types of essential normal curves.](image)

Represent the triangulation $\mathcal{T}_g$ as the identification space of a square with a diagonal as shown in Figure 5, and label the normal coordinates as shown. It was shown in [16] that the normal coordinates $(x_1, x_2, x_3)$ of one triangle determine the normal coordinates in the second triangle as indicated in the figure. A connected essential normal curve contains no vertex linking curves, and hence its normal coordinate satisfies $x_i = 0$ for at least one $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Again, we check that $\partial S = c$ satisfies this requirement.

It follows that an essential normal curve can be isotoped to be in the neighbourhood of a figure–8 graph on the torus that is composed of four normal arcs. There are three such graphs, as shown in Figure 5. The normal coordinates can be viewed as weights on the edges of this graph. It was observed in [2] that each essential normal curve can be given a canonical orientation which depends only on which normal coordinate is zero. This, in turn can be viewed as an orientation of the edges of the corresponding figure–8 graph as shown in Figure 5.

In particular, the oriented intersection numbers between an oriented normal curve and two oriented edges $e_i$ and $e_h$ of the triangulation $\mathcal{T}_g$ can be read off from the normal coordinate. We call them oriented edge weights. Hence the intersection number of two essential normal curves can be computed as a determinant in these oriented edge weights. With respect to the labelling shown in Figure 5, the normal coordinate $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ results in the oriented edge weights $(x_2 + x_3, x_3)$ if $x_1 = 0$, $(x_3, x_1 + x_3)$ if $x_2 = 0$, and $(x_2, -x_1)$ if $x_3 = 0$. The intersection number between two oriented essential normal curves is then the determinant of the $2 \times 2$ matrix with these oriented edge weights as columns. For example, if $x = (0, x_2, x_3)$ and $y = (y_1, 0, y_3)$, then the intersection number is $(x_2 + x_3)(y_1 + y_3) - x_3 y_3 = x_2 y_1 + x_2 y_3 - x_3 y_1$.

The up-shot of this discussion is that given a normal curve with respect to $\mathcal{T}_g$ that represents the meridian, we have an algorithm to determine whether a normal surface is a spanning surface.

**Efficient suitable triangulations.** One of the tools used in [3] is the following concept. We say that $\mathcal{T}$ is an efficient suitable triangulation of $M$ if there is no normal 2–sphere with respect to $\mathcal{T}$, and the induced
triangulation $\mathcal{T}_0$ of the boundary has a single vertex and the geometric meridian is isotopic with a boundary edge. As in [3], it follows easily from [12, Proposition 5.15 and Theorem 5.20] that if $K$ is a non-trivial knot in $N$, then $M$ has an efficient suitable triangulation and that this can be constructed algorithmically from any triangulation of $M$. Namely, one first constructs a 0–efficient triangulation of $M$. If one of the edges in the boundary is isotopic with the geometric meridian, then we are done. Otherwise, we layer tetrahedra on the triangulation until one of the edges is the geometric meridian. A minimal layering sequence can be determined from the Farey tessellation. Now a 0–efficient triangulation has no normal 2–spheres. Consider a step in the layering procedure. If the triangulation before layering a tetrahedron on the boundary has no normal 2–sphere, then so does the triangulation after layering a tetrahedron, since any normal surface that meets the new tetrahedron in a disc has non-empty boundary. So it follows inductively that an efficient suitable triangulation can be obtained from a 0–efficient triangulation.

**Normalisation.** An excellent discussion of the procedure that constructs normal surfaces from properly embedded surfaces transverse to a triangulation can be found in Matveev’s book [19, §3.3.3]. See also [3] for a similar discussion to what follows. Normalisation moves are either isotopies, removal of trivial components, or compressions along circles of intersection of the surface with triangles of the triangulation, or boundary compressions along discs that have part of their boundary in the interior of boundary edges of the triangulation.

Suppose $S$ is a properly embedded surface in $M$ that is incompressible and transverse to the triangulation. Since $M$ is irreducible, any normalisation move that would result in a 2–sphere or properly embedded disc split off from $S$ can be avoided by a suitable isotopy of $S$ that is supported in a regular neighbourhood of a ball bounded by the 2–sphere or co-bounded by the disc. In particular, this isotopy removes some intersection points of $S$ with the edges or some intersection circles of $S$ with the triangles (possibly both). Instead of a normalisation move of this type, we perform the associated isotopy. If $S$ can be transformed to a normal surface in this way, then we say that $S$ normalises by isotopies.

The only normalisation moves that cannot be replaced by an isotopy are boundary compressions with the following property. The boundary compression disc $D$ is contained in a 3–simplex $\Delta$ of the triangulation and $\partial D = \gamma \cup \gamma'$ with the property that $\gamma$ is an arc contained in the interior of an edge $e \subset \partial M$ of $\Delta$ and $\gamma'$ is an arc contained in $S$. Moreover, $D \setminus \gamma$ is contained in the interior of $\Delta$. Note that such a boundary compression decreases $S \cap e$ by two points and leaves the intersections with all other boundary edges unchanged. The normalisation procedure may involve multiple boundary compressions. The up-shot of this discussion is that if $S$ meets one boundary edge in a single point, then this is also true of any surface obtained from $S$ by applying the normalisation procedure (with or without the modification of using isotopies).

### 3.2 Crosscap number via suitable triangulations

**Theorem 11** in this section is a result about the crosscap number of certain knots in closed 3–manifolds, which, in particular, gives an algorithm to compute the crosscap number of an arbitrary knot in $S^3$. The result requires the use of efficient suitable triangulations, as defined in the previous section. **Theorem 15** in Section 3.3 is the equivalent result for arbitrary 0-efficient triangulations. Both results share Lemma 14, which is why forward references to **Theorem 15** and Section 3.3 appear in this section.

The following result improves and generalises [3, Algorithm 3].

**Theorem 11** Let $M$ be the exterior of a non-trivial knot $K$ in a closed 3–manifold $N$ with $[K] = 0 \in H_1(N; \mathbb{Z}_2)$. Suppose that $M$ is irreducible and contains no non-separating torus and no embedded Klein bottle. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be an efficient suitable triangulation of $M$. Then $c(K) = \min(A, B)$, where

- $A = \min\{ 1 - \chi(S) \mid S \text{ is a non-orientable fundamental spanning surface for } K \}$,
- $B = \min\{ 2 - \chi(S) \mid S \text{ is an orientable fundamental spanning surface for } K \}$,

and we let $\min\emptyset = \infty$.
The proof of the theorem shows that the following algorithm to compute crosscap number is correct:

**Algorithm 12** Compute crosscap number of knot $K$ in 3-manifold $M$, satisfying conditions of Theorem 11.

**INPUT:**
1. $\mathcal{T}$ efficient suitable triangulation of $M$ with boundary $\partial \mathcal{T}$
2. $m$ meridian of $K$ represented by an edge of $\partial \mathcal{T}$

Compute $S_0$, the set of fundamental surfaces of $\mathcal{T}$
Compute $S_1 = \{ S \in S_0 \mid \partial S \cap m = 1 \}$, the set of spanning fundamental surfaces
Compute $x = \max \{ \chi(S) \mid S \in S_1 \}$, maximum Euler characteristic of all spanning fundamental surfaces
if $x = 1$ then
  return $c(K) = 0$
end if
if $x = 0$ then
  return $c(K) = 1$
end if
Compute $S_2 = \{ S \in S_1 \mid \chi(S) = x \}$, the set of maximal Euler characteristic spanning fundamental surfaces
if $S_2$ contains non-orientable surface then
  return $c(K) = 1 - x$
else
  return $c(K) = 2 - x$
end if

We also state the following immediate consequence of Theorem 11 in the case where a knot has no orientable spanning surface:

**Corollary 13** Let $M$ be the exterior of a non-trivial knot $K$ in a closed 3–manifold $N$ with $[K] = 0 \in H_1(N; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ and $[K] \neq 0 \in H_1(N; \mathbb{Z})$. Suppose that $M$ is irreducible and contains no non-separating torus and no embedded Klein bottle. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be an efficient suitable triangulation of $M$. Then

$$c(K) = \min \{ 1 - \chi(S) \mid S \text{ is a fundamental spanning surface for } K \}.$$

**Proof of Theorem 11** Suppose $S_o$ is an orientable spanning surface of maximal Euler characteristic, and $S_n$ is a non-orientable spanning surface of maximal Euler characteristic. Then $c(K) = \min \{ 1 - \chi(S_o), 2 - \chi(S_n) \}$. The definitions imply that $c(K) \leq \min(A, B)$, since any orientable spanning surface can be turned into a non-orientable spanning surface by adding a saddle appropriately.

Both $S_o$ and $S_n$ are incompressible due to the maximality condition on Euler characteristic.

Since $\partial M$ is a torus and $S_o$ is orientable, this also implies that $S_o$ is $\partial$–incompressible. We may therefore assume that $S_o$ is normal in $M$. By [16, Corollary 3.8], two compatible normal surfaces with non-empty boundary either have the same slope (hence their sum has at least two boundary curves) or complementary boundary curves (hence their sum has boundary containing a trivial curve). Hence only one of the fundamental surface summands, $G_o$, yielding $S_o$ has non-empty boundary and $\partial S_o = \partial G_o$. Since Euler characteristic is additive and there are no normal 2–spheres, we have $\chi(S_o) \leq \chi(G_o)$. Since $\partial S_o = \partial G_o$, $G_o$ is also a (not necessarily orientable) spanning surface.

If $\chi(S_n) < \chi(S_o)$, then $G_o$ must be orientable. Also, $\chi(S_n) < \chi(S_o)$ implies $c(K) = 2 - \chi(S_o) \leq 1 - \chi(S_n)$. Since $G_o$ is an orientable spanning surface, we have $\chi(G_o) = \chi(S_o)$, and therefore $c(K) = 2 - \chi(G_o) \geq B$.

Thus, $c(K) = B$.

1See the proof of Theorem 18 for an argument that $G_o$ is always orientable if $S_o$ is of least weight in its isotopy class.

2Note that in this case, we either have $c(K) = B < A$ or $c(K) = B = A$. See ?? for examples of both cases.
Hence assume $\chi(S_n) \geq \chi(S_o)$. In this case $c(K) = 1 - \chi(S_n) < 2 - \chi(S_o)$.

Now $S_n$ may not be $\partial$-incompressible. We use the following argument from [3]. Since $\partial S_n$ has algebraic intersection number one with the geometric meridian $m_\varphi$, we may isotope $S_n$ in $M$ so that it meets the edge in $\mathcal{F}_0$ that represents $m_\varphi$ in exactly one point. We now isotope $S_n$ so that it is transverse to the triangulation. This still meets $m_\varphi$ in exactly one point. As noted above, any surface obtained by applying the normalisation procedure to $S_n$ results in a surface meeting $m_\varphi$ in exactly one point, and hence a spanning surface.

In particular, any non-trivial boundary compression involved in putting $S_n$ into normal form results in a spanning surface of larger Euler characteristic. Since $\chi(S_n) \geq \chi(S_o)$, this surface must again be non-orientable, which contradicts the maximality of the Euler characteristic of $S_n$. Hence $S_n$ can be normalised by isotopies. As above, we see that only one of the fundamental surface summands, $G_n$, yielding $S_n$ has non-empty boundary. Since Euler characteristic is additive, we have $\chi(S_n) \leq \chi(G_n)$. Since $\partial S_n = \partial G_n$, $G_n$ is also a spanning surface.

We now have the following cases:

- If $\chi(S_n) > \chi(S_o)$, then $G_n$ must be non-orientable. This forces $\chi(G_n) = \chi(S_o)$, and we have $c(K) \geq A$, which implies $c(K) = A < B$.
- If $\chi(S_n) = \chi(S_o)$, then $\chi(G_n) = \chi(S_n) = \chi(S_o) = \chi(G_n)$. The proof is continued with Lemma 14, where it is shown that there is at least one non-orientable fundamental spanning surface with this maximal Euler characteristic. Hence $c(K) = A < B$. \[\square\]

**Lemma 14** Suppose $M$ and $\mathcal{F}$ are as in the hypothesis of Theorem 11 or Theorem 15. Also assume, in the case of Theorem 15, that $c(K) < Z$.

Suppose $S_o$ is an orientable spanning surface of maximal Euler characteristic, and $S_n$ is a non-orientable spanning surface of maximal Euler characteristic. If $\chi(S_n) = \chi(S_o)$, then there is at least one non-orientable fundamental spanning surface $F$ with $\chi(F) = \chi(S_n) = \chi(S_o)$.

**Proof** We prove this by contradiction. We know that every non-orientable spanning surface of maximal Euler characteristic is isomorphic to a normal surface (since we either assume that the triangulation is suitable or that $c(K) < Z$). We also know (from the last paragraph in the proof of each Theorems 11 and 15) that there is at least one fundamental spanning surface of Euler characteristic $\chi(S_n) = \chi(S_o)$. Suppose every such fundamental spanning surface is orientable, and hence $S_n$ is isomorphic to a non-trivial Haken sum $S$ of normal surfaces. We then show that this implies that $S$ must be orientable as well, a contradiction.

Here is the outline of our proof:

1. **Setup**: Let $S$ be a non-orientable normal spanning surface with $\chi(S) = \chi(S_n)$ that is of least-weight.
2. **Setting up the Haken sum for $S$**: We show that $S = R + T$, where $T$ is a torus, $R$ connected (incompressible), and no patch is a disc.
3. **$R$ meets $T$ an even number of times**: We show that $R \cap T$ is an even number of essential curves on $T$.
4. **All components of $R \setminus T$ above $T$ are annuli**: We show that any patch of $R$ in the component of $M \setminus T$ that does not contain $\partial M$ must be a (separating) annulus.
5. **$R + T$ is orientable**: We use the above statements to conclude that $R + T$ must be orientable.

**Proof setup**: Suppose $x = \chi(S_n) = \chi(S_o)$ is the maximum Euler characteristic of a fundamental spanning surface. We assume that all fundamental spanning surfaces with maximum Euler characteristic are orientable. Since $K$ is non-trivial, none of these is a disc. Since there are no orientable spanning surfaces of Euler characteristic 0, we can hence assume for the remainder of the proof that all orientable fundamental spanning surfaces have strictly negative Euler characteristic.

We know that a non-orientable normal spanning surface $S$ with $\chi(S) = x$ exist. Furthermore, we may assume that $S$ has least weight amongst all non-orientable normal spanning surfaces with Euler characteristic $x$. By hypothesis, $S$ is not fundamental.
Setting up the Haken sum for \( S \):  By [16, Corollary 3.8] (see Proposition 6), two compatible normal surfaces with non-empty boundary either have the same slope (hence their sum has at least two boundary curves) or complementary boundary curves (hence their sum has boundary containing a trivial curve). Hence only one of the fundamental surface summands, \( F \), yielding \( S \) has non-empty boundary and \( \partial F = \partial S \). In particular, \( F \) is a spanning surface for \( K \) and has negative Euler characteristic.

By hypothesis, \( \mathcal{T} \) does not admit any normal spheres, and since \( M \) is irreducible with non-empty boundary a torus, it does not admit any embedded \( \mathbb{R}P^2 \). Hence, every surface in the Haken sum giving \( S \) has non-positive Euler characteristic. Since \( F \) is a spanning surface and Euler characteristic is additive in Haken sums, the maximality of Euler characteristic \( x \) amongst all spanning surfaces forces \( \chi(F) = x \), and all other summands have Euler characteristic zero. Since \( F \) is a fundamental spanning surface and \( \chi(F) = x \), it follows that \( F \) is orientable. Since \( M \) contains no Klein bottles, all other summands are fundamental tori.

Note that removing any normal torus from any Haken sum with result \( S \) must produce an orientable surface, since \( S \) is least-weight.

Let \( R \) be such an orientable surface, and let \( T \) be the missing torus such that \( R + T = S \). There are potentially many such decompositions and we claim that for at least one of them \( R \) is connected: Assume that we have \( R + T = S \) with \( R \) disconnected. Hence, \( R \) must consist of one spanning surface of maximal Euler characteristic, and a number of tori. Since \( R + T = S \) is connected, all of these extra torus components of \( R \) must intersect \( T \). Pick one of these tori, denote it by \( T' \), and use the remaining components of \( R \) to form the Haken sum \( R' = (R \setminus T') + T \). By construction, \( S = R' + T' \) and \( R' \cap T' \subset R \cap T \) is a proper subset. Iterating this process eventually yields a decomposition \( S = R + T \) with \( R \) connected.

Since \( R \) is an orientable spanning surface of maximal Euler characteristics, it is incompressible and boundary-incompressible.

As is customary when talking about Haken sums, we refer to the connected components of \( (R \cup T) \setminus \nu(R \cap T) \) as patches. Every patch is a compact orientable subsurface of \( S \) with non-empty boundary. Since both \( R \) and \( T \) are orientable, the patches are connected on \( S \) by annuli contained on the frontier of \( \nu(R \cap T) \). These are called the exchange annuli. The core curve of an exchange annulus is called a trace curve. Note that a trace curve corresponds to the boundary curves of patches on both \( R \) and \( T \) that are joined by the corresponding annulus.

The complementary annuli on the frontier of \( \nu(R \cap T) \) are the irregular annuli. Let \( \gamma \subset R \cap T \). Attaching the exchange annuli to the patches is called a regular exchange at \( \gamma \), and attaching the irregular annuli to the patches is called an irregular exchange.

Amongst all ways to write \( S = R + T \), where \( R \) is an orientable normal spanning surface of maximal Euler characteristic and \( T \) is a normal torus, we assume we have chosen one with the least number of patches. Note that \( |R \cap T| \neq \emptyset \) as \( S \) is non-orientable.

No patch of \( S = R + T \) is a disc.  This follows almost verbatim from the proof of Lemma 2.1 of [11]. We repeat a slightly adapted version of the beginning of the proof here, as our set-up is slightly different. However, the end-game remains the same.

Suppose \( \gamma \subset R \cap T \) and denote the two associated trace curves \( \gamma' \) and \( \gamma'' \). Suppose \( \gamma' \) bounds a patch \( D' \) that is a disc on \( S \). Since a disc is 2-sided in \( M \), there is an embedded disc \( D \subset M \) with interior disjoint from \( S \) and boundary curve \( \gamma' \). Since \( S \) is incompressible this implies that \( \gamma'' \) also bounds a disc \( D'' \) on \( S \). Since \( D' \) is a patch, we have \( D'' \not\subset D' \). We claim that \( D'' \) is not a patch.

If \( D' \subset D'' \), then \( D'' \) is clearly not a patch.

Hence assume that \( D' \not\subset D'' \). Then \( D' \cap D'' = \emptyset \). Perform an irregular exchange along \( \gamma \) and regular exchanges along all other curves in \( R + T \). If an irregular annulus does not join \( D' \) and \( D'' \), then we can construct a 2-sphere
in $M$ that separates $S$, a contradiction since $S$ is connected. Hence the union of $D'$, $D''$ and an irregular annulus is an embedded 2–sphere in $M$. Now if both $D'$ and $D''$ are patches, then we may perform a regular exchange along only $\gamma$ and no other component of $R \cap T$ to obtain new normal surfaces $R'$ and $T'$ with $S = R' + T'$. Moreover, $R'$ is isotopic with $R$ and $T'$ is isotopic with $T$. So $R' + T'$ still satisfies our hypothesis on the Haken sum that $R'$ is an orientable normal spanning surface of maximal Euler characteristic and $T'$ is a normal torus. Now $R' + T'$ has two patches fewer than $R + T$, since $D'$ and $D''$ are now contained in patches. It follows that $D''$ is not a patch.

So in either case, we establish that $D''$ is not a patch. To conclude, we know that for each patch $D'$ that is a disc, there is an associated disc $D''$ on $S$ which is not a patch and with the property that the boundary curves of $D'$ and $D''$ are associated with the same curve in $R \cap T$. Now the construction and argument given in the last four paragraphs in the proof of Lemma 2.1 of [11] results in a surface of lower weight than $S$ and isotopic with $S$. Hence no patch is a disc, and in particular, no patch is of positive Euler characteristic.

**Irregular exchanges.** Recall that we have established that $R \cap T$ is a collection of essential curves on $T$ slicing up $T$ into a set of annuli. Any such situation can be fully reconstructed from the schematic picture shown in Figure 6, where the horizontal line represents the torus $T$, and the vertical lines represent $R$ slicing through $T$. Every possible Haken sum is then described by an orientation at each intersection for how the Haken sum operates, and the transverse orientation for every sheet of $R$.

![Figure 6: Cross-section of the intersection of $T$ and $R$ together with transverse orientation of $R$ and marked potential obstructions to orientability of the resolution realised by the Haken sum $S = R + T$.](image)

Suppose any non-empty subset of components of $R \cap T$ are resolved via irregular exchanges, whilst all other components are resolved via regular exchanges. This results in a surface that is not normal, has non-empty boundary and is not necessarily connected. However, it contains a component $C$ that is a maximum Euler characteristic spanning surface. Since we have performed at least one irregular exchange, we know that $C$ is not a normal surface and hence normalises to a normal surface of lower weight than $S$.

We claim that $C$ is orientable. This is the only place where we have different arguments given the hypotheses of the theorems:

First assume the hypotheses of Theorem 11. Since $\partial C = \partial S$, the surface $C$ is a maximum Euler characteristic spanning surface that meets the meridian edge in exactly one point and hence normalises by isotopies. In particular, the resulting normal surface is again a spanning surface. The minimality of the weight of $S$ implies that this spanning surface (and therefore $C$) is orientable.

Next assume the hypotheses of Theorem 15 and that $c(K) < Z$. Hence if $C$ is non-orientable, then it normalises by isotopies. But this contradicts the minimality of $S$. Hence $C$ is orientable.

This proves the claim. It follows that if we perform at least one irregular exchange, then there is a component $C$ that is a maximum Euler characteristic spanning surface and that normalised to an orientable spanning surface of maximal Euler characteristic. We will repeatedly make use of this observation.
**R meets T an even number of times:** Since \( R + T \) is non-orientable, and \( R \) and \( T \) are orientable, every orientation reversing loop in \( R + T \) must pass through patches of both \( R \) and \( T \). Take one such loop \( c \subset R + T \) that minimises the number of times it intersects the exchange annuli between patches of \( R \) and \( T \). We claim that \( c \) intersects each exchange annulus in at most one arc from one boundary component to the other.

To see this first note that if \( c \) intersects an exchange annulus in an arc going back to the same boundary component we can simply isotope it out of the exchange annulus. A contradiction to the assumption that \( c \) minimises intersections with exchange annuli.

If \( c \) intersects the same exchange annulus in more than one arc, take two such arcs that are next to each other and isotope them into a small disc containing a section of the exchange annulus and a piece of \( R \) and \( T \) on either side. Delete the two arcs meeting the disc and connect the four ends outside the exchange annulus to obtain a curve \( c' \) meeting the exchange annuli of \( R + T \) fewer times than \( c \) (see Figure 7).

We show that one component of \( c' \) must still be orientation reversing. Referring to Figure 7 we start at end 1 which can be connected to end 2, 3, or 4.

- If it is connected to end 2, we immediately obtain a contradiction to the assumption that \( c \) is connected. See Figure 7 first row.
- If it is connected to end 3, then end 2 must connect to end 4. Tracing transverse orientations through both arcs and connecting them in the disc either leaves us with no, one, or two orientation reversing components of \( c' \). We can now check that if none or both components were orientation reversing, then \( c \) would have been orientation preserving. A contradiction. Hence, exactly one of them is orientation reversing. A contradiction to the assumption that \( c \) intersect the exchange annuli of \( R + T \) a minimum number of times. See Figure 7 middle row.
- If it is connected to end 4, then end 2 must be connected to end 3. Similarly to the case before, we can trace orientations through \( c' \) thereby checking all four choices. As before, in each case we obtain contradictions to either \( c \) being orientation reversing or \( c \) having minimal intersection with the exchange annuli of \( R + T \). See Figure 7, bottom row.

Altogether it follows that \( c \) intersects every exchange annulus at most once.

Now, assume that \( c \) is disjoint to the two exchange annuli coming from some component of \( R \cap T \). If this is the case, we can make an irregular exchange along that component and regular exchanges along all other components of \( R \cap T \). Then the resulting new surface still contains an orientation reversing loop \( c \) and hence is non-orientable – a contradiction to \( S \) being least-weight as explained above.

Next, assume that \( c \) intersects both exchange annuli coming from some component of \( R \cap T \). Consider the solid torus \( D^2 \times S^1 \) that is a regular neighbourhood of this component and containing the two exchange annuli. Choose an open regular neighbourhood of the two exchange annuli on \( S \). There is an isotopy of \( c \) on \( S \) that is the identity on the complement of this neighbourhood, and has the effect that the intersection of \( c \) with these exchange annuli is contained in some disc \( D = D^2 \times \{x\} \). In \( D \) we now have a similar picture as before and we refer to Figure 7. Performing an annular exchange yielding a new surface \((R + T)'\) cuts \( c \) open along two small arcs with ends 1, 2, 3, and 4. Connecting ends 1 and 3 and ends 2 and 4 through the newly added annuli yields another curve \( c' \) in the changed surface. An analysis of how orientations can be traced on \( c' \) results in an orientation reversing loop assuming that \( c \) was orientation reversing. It follows that \((R + T)'\) must be non-orientable. A contradiction to the assumption that \( R + T \) is least-weight.

Altogether we conclude that \( c \) must meet exactly one of the two exchange annuli coming from a component of \( R \cap T \) for every such component. Running through \( c \) we meet patches of \( R \) or \( T \) and exchange annuli in an alternating fashion. Moreover, a patch of \( R \), followed by an exchange annulus, must then be followed by a patch of \( T \) and vice versa (i.e., \( c \) runs through patches of \( R \) and \( T \) in an alternating fashion as well). In particular, \( c \) must run through an even number of exchange annuli. But since the number of exchange annuli meeting \( c \) is in bijection to the components of \( R \cap T \) we conclude that the number of components of \( R \cap T \) must be even.
Figure 7: Case 1: 1 is connected to 2. \( e \) is not connected. Case 2: 1 is connected to 3. Two cases of 16 for choosing orientations on \( e \) near 1, 2, 3, and 4 are shown. The others follow by flipping \( R \) and \( T \), top and bottom, and direction of all arrows. Case 3: 1 is connected to 4. Again, only two out of 16 cases are shown and the others follow by symmetry.
All patches of \( S \) on one side of \( T \) are annuli: The Euler characteristic of \( S \) equals the sum of the Euler characteristics of all patches on \( S \). Since no patch is a disc, the Euler characteristic of any patch is non-positive. We already know that all patches of \( S \) contained on \( T \) are annuli. Since \( T \) is separating in \( M \) we say that the component of \( M \setminus T \) containing \( \partial M \) is below \( T \) and that the other component is above \( T \).

Since \(|R \cap T|\) is even, we now perform (possibly irregular) exchanges on \( R \cap T \) such that we obtain a new surface \( S' \) that is isotopic to a surface disjoint from \( T \). This is achieved by alternating the exchanges such that patches on \( R \) above \( T \) are joined via annuli on \( T \) with patches above \( T \) and patches below \( T \) with patches below \( T \). This results in one surface, \( R' \), below \( T \) and one surface, \( T' \), above \( T \). As above, \( \chi(R') = \chi(S) \) and this forces all patches that are not contained on \( R' \) to be annuli.

\( R + T \) is orientable: Every properly embedded annulus above \( T \) is separating in \( M \setminus T \) since otherwise we have a non-separating torus in \( M \). Take an innermost annulus patch of \( S \), i.e. a patch contained in a component \( C \) of \( R \setminus T \) with the property that the frontier of \( C \) bounds an annulus on \( T \) that does not contain any components of \( R \cap T \). There are four possibilities for how the Haken sum \( R + T \) connects the patch on \( C \) with patches on \( T \). One of them produces a separate connected torus component and hence contradicts the connectedness (least-weight) assumption for \( R + T \) (see Figure 8 on the top right). Two solutions give us the opportunity to resolve the Haken sum in the opposite way on one of the crossings, producing an extra torus component and not changing the non-orientability of the rest of the Haken sum (see Figure 8 bottom row). This leaves us with the last option which is an exchange of annuli between the summands (see Figure 8 on the top left).

![Figure 8: Resolving a separating annulus in all four possible ways.](image)

Given that all components of \( R \setminus T \) on the side of \( M \) not containing \( \partial M \) are separating annuli, we can iterate this argument stating that the entire Haken sum can be resolved this way. But then \( R + T \) is disconnected. A contradiction.

We conclude that there is no non-orientable normal spanning surface \( S \) with \( \chi(S) = \chi(S_0) \). This contradicts our hypothesis that \( \chi(S_0) = \chi(S_n) \) and the hypothesis that \( S_n \) is normal.

### 3.3 Crosscap number via arbitrary 0–efficient triangulations

A trade-off in the previous algorithm is that one cannot apply it to arbitrary 0–efficient or minimal triangulations.

**Even integral subtree.** With respect to the geometric framing \((m_{\mu}, l_{\lambda})\), construct the Farey tesselation. We claim that the dual 1–skeleton restricted to all ideal triangles that are labelled with the slopes of spanning
surfaces is connected. Note that these are precisely the ideal triangles with labels of the form \( \frac{2k}{1} \), where \( k \in \mathbb{Z} \). We call this the even integral subtree, and denote it \( \mathcal{F}_e \). This tree is shown in Figure 9.

First suppose \( k > 0 \). There is a Farey triangle with vertices \( 1/0, 2k/1, (2k - 1)/1 \). This is since we can act by the element
\[
\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2k \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}
\]
on the base triangle \( 1/0, 0/1, -1/1 \). Then flipping across the ideal edge \([1/0, (2k - 1)/1]\) gives the triangle with vertices \( 1/0, (2k - 1)/1, (2k - 2)/1 \). Hence inductively we arrive at the base triangle with even slope \( 0/1 \).

Now suppose \( k < 0 \). Then there is a Farey triangle with vertices \( 1/0, 2k/1, (2k + 1)/1 \). This is obtained by acting by
\[
\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2k \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}
on the triangle \( 1/0, 0/1, 1/1 \). Again, flipping across the ideal edge \([1/0, (2k + 1)/1]\) gives a triangle with even slope \( (2k + 2)/1 \). So inductively we arrive at the ideal triangle with vertices \( 1/0, 0/1, -1/1 \), which shares an edge with the base triangle. This completes the proof that the even integral subtree is connected.

For any slope \( \frac{p}{q} \), we define its even integral subtree distance, \( d(\frac{p}{q}, \mathcal{F}_e) \) to be the number of edges in the shortest path between \( \tau(\frac{p}{q}) \) and \( \mathcal{F}_e \) that have endpoints in triangles of different slopes.

**Theorem 15** Let \( M \) be the exterior of a non-trivial, rationally null-homologous knot \( K \) in a closed 3–manifold \( N \) with \( [K] = 0 \in H_1(N; \mathbb{Z}_2) \). Suppose that \( M \) is irreducible and contains no non-separating torus and no embedded Klein bottle. Let \( \mathcal{T} \) be a \( 0 \)-efficient triangulation of \( M \) and suppose that the coordinates for a meridian for \( K \) on the induced triangulation \( \mathcal{T}_0 \) of \( \partial M \) are given. Then \( \text{c}(K) = \min(A, B, Z) \), where

- \( A = \min \{ 1 - \chi(S) \mid S \text{ is a non-orientable fundamental spanning surface for } K \} \),
- \( B = \min \{ 2 - \chi(S) \mid S \text{ is an orientable fundamental spanning surface for } K \} \),
- \( Z = \min \{ 1 - \chi(S) + d(\partial S, \mathcal{F}_e) \mid S \text{ is a fundamental non-spanning surface for } K \text{ with connected essential boundary} \} \),

and we let \( \min \emptyset = \infty \).
Again, in the case where there is no orientable spanning surface, this specialises to:

**Corollary 16**  Let $M$ be the exterior of a non-trivial, rationally null-homologous knot $K$ in a closed 3–manifold $N$ with $|K| = 0 \in H_1(N;\mathbb{Z}_2)$ and $|K| \neq 0 \in H_1(N;\mathbb{Z})$. Suppose that $M$ is irreducible and contains no non-separating torus and no embedded Klein bottle. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a $0$-efficient triangulation of $M$ and suppose that the coordinates for a meridian for $K$ on the induced triangulation $\mathcal{T}_0$ of $\partial M$ are given. Then $c(K) = \min(A,Z)$, where

- $A = \min\{1 - \chi(S) \mid S \text{ is a fundamental spanning surface for } K\}$,
- $Z = \min\{1 - \chi(S) + d(\partial S, \mathcal{F}_{\epsilon}) \mid S \text{ is a fundamental non-spanning surface for } K$

with connected essential boundary $\partial$.

**Proof of Theorem 15**  It follows from the definitions that $c(K) \leq A$ and $c(K) \leq B$. Note that if $S$ is a fundamental non-spanning surface for $K$ with connected essential boundary, then adding $d(\partial S, \mathcal{F}_{\epsilon})$ saddles according to the corresponding shortest path in the Farey tesselation gives a non-orientable spanning surface of Euler characteristic $\chi(S) - d(\partial S, \mathcal{F}_{\epsilon})$ for $K$. Hence $c(K) \leq Z$. So $c(K) \leq \min(A,B,Z)$, and we need to show equality.

Let $S_n$ be an orientable spanning surface of maximal Euler characteristic, and let $S_n$ be a non-orientable spanning surface of maximal Euler characteristic. We have $c(K) = \min(1 - \chi(S_n), 2 - \chi(S_o))$.

As in the proof of Theorem 11, $S_n$ is incompressible and $\partial$–incompressible, and hence may be normalised using isotopies. As before, there is a fundamental surface $G_o$ with $\chi(S_o) \leq \chi(G_o)$ and $\partial S_o = \partial G_o$. Hence $G_o$ is also a spanning surface. If $\chi(S_n) < \chi(S_o)$, then $G_o$ must be orientable. This forces $\chi(G_o) = \chi(S_o)$, and we have $c(K) = B$.

Hence assume $\chi(S_n) \geq \chi(S_o)$. In this case $c(K) = 1 - \chi(S_n) < 2 - \chi(S_o) \leq B$.

Note that $S_n$ is incompressible, but $S_n$ may not be $\partial$-incompressible.

Normalisation of $S_n$ may involve a finite number of non-trivial boundary compressions resulting in surfaces that are not spanning surfaces. Each non-trivial boundary compression increases Euler characteristic by one. Suppose $S_n$ normalises to the normal surface $S'_n$, and, topologically, the latter is obtained from the former by performing $k > 0$ non-trivial boundary compressions. Then $\chi(S'_n) = \chi(S_n) - k$. Now if $S'_n$ is not fundamental, then we obtain a fundamental surface $G_n$ with $\partial G_n = \partial S'_n$ and $\chi(S'_n) \leq \chi(G_n)$. The maximality of $\chi(S_n)$ implies that $\chi(S'_n) = \chi(G_n)$ and $k = d(\partial G_n, \mathcal{F}_{\epsilon})$ since any surface obtained by adding saddles to $G_n$ is non-orientable (regardless of whether $G_n$ is orientable or not). Hence

$$c(K) = 1 - \chi(S_n) = 1 - \chi(G_n) + d(\partial G_n, \mathcal{F}_{\epsilon}) \geq Z.$$ 

Hence $c(K) = Z$.

We may therefore assume that $c(K) < \min(B,Z)$. So $\chi(S_n) \geq \chi(S_o)$ and every non-orientable fundamental spanning surface with maximal Euler characteristic $\chi(S_n)$ normalises by isotopies. As above, we obtain a fundamental surface $G_n$ with $\partial G_n = \partial S_n$ and $\chi(S_n) \leq \chi(G_n)$.

If $\chi(S_n) > \chi(S_o)$, then $G_n$ must be non-orientable. This forces $\chi(G_n) = \chi(S_n)$, and we have $c(K) \geq A$, which implies $c(K) = A$.

If $\chi(S_n) = \chi(S_o)$, then $\chi(G_n) = \chi(S_n) = \chi(S_o) = \chi(G_n)$. The proof is continued with Lemma 14, where it is shown that there is at least one non-orientable fundamental spanning surface with this maximal Euler characteristic. Hence $c(K) = A$.  

**Remark 17**  It is known from work by Clark [4] that a knot in the 3–sphere has crosscap number one if and only if it is a $(2,2k+1)$-cable of a knot $(k \geq 0)$. Hence, one corollary of Theorem 15 is that a given 0-efficient triangulation of a knot complement in the 3–sphere is that of a $(2,2k+1)$-cable of a knot if and only if one of the fundamental surfaces is a Möbius strip.
4 Genus of knots

We wish to point out that in the setting of this paper, it is not difficult to recover a special case of a more general result of Schubert [20] (which was originally proved in the context of normal surfaces with respect to handle decompositions). Namely, there is an algorithm to determine the genus of a knot using normal surface theory.

Theorem 18 Let \( M \) be the exterior of a non-trivial knot \( K \) in a closed 3–manifold \( N \) with \( \langle K \rangle = 0 \in H_1(N; \mathbb{Z}) \). Suppose that \( M \) is irreducible and let \( \mathcal{T} \) be a 0–efficient triangulation of \( M \). Then an orientable spanning surface of maximal Euler characteristic is amongst the fundamental surfaces.

Proof Suppose \( S_o \) is an orientable spanning surface of maximal Euler characteristic. Since \( \partial M \) is a torus and \( S_o \) is orientable, this also implies that \( S_o \) is \( \partial \)–incompressible. We may therefore assume that \( S_o \) is normal in \( M \). Amongst all maximal Euler characteristic orientable normal spanning surfaces, we choose a surface \( S \) of least weight.

By [16, Corollary 3.8], two compatible normal surfaces with non-empty boundary either have the same slope (hence their sum has at least two boundary curves) or complementary boundary curves (hence their sum has boundary containing a trivial curve). Hence only one of the fundamental surface summands, \( F \), yielding \( S \) has non-empty boundary and \( \partial S = \partial F \).

Since Euler characteristic is additive and there are no normal 2–spheres, we have \( \chi(S) \leq \chi(F) \). We also note that the weight of \( F \) is strictly less than the weight of \( S \) unless \( S = F \).

These two observations imply that if \( F \) is orientable, then we have \( S = F \) and hence \( S \) is fundamental.

Hence suppose that \( F \) is non-orientable. In this case, \( S = F + G \) is a non-trivial Haken sum with \( G \neq \emptyset \) a closed normal surface. We give all patches of \( F + G \) the induced orientation from \( S \). Since \( F \) is non-orientable, there is a curve \( \gamma \) in \( F \cap G \) where the induced orientations from \( S \) on the two patches on \( F \) meeting in \( \gamma \) do not agree. Since the Haken sum is orientable, it is also the case that the induced orientations on \( G \) do not agree. It follows that if one performs an irregular exchange at \( \gamma \) and regular exchanges at all other intersection curves, then one obtains an orientable spanning surface with the same Euler characteristic as \( S \) but which is not normal. Hence a normalisation of this surface will have lower weight than \( S \). This is a contradiction. Hence \( F \) is indeed orientable.
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