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Abstract

In this paper, we show that the Turaev-Viro invariant volume conjecture posed by Chen and Yang is preserved under gluings of toroidal boundary components for a family of 3-manifolds. In particular, we show that the asymptotics of the Turaev-Viro invariants are additive under certain gluings of elementary pieces arising from a construction of hyperbolic cusped 3-manifolds due to Agol. The gluings of the elementary pieces are known to be additive with respect to the simplicial volume. This allows us to construct families of manifolds with an arbitrary number of hyperbolic pieces such that the resultant manifolds satisfy an extended version of the Turaev-Viro invariant volume conjecture.

1 Introduction

The Turaev-Viro invariants $TV_r(M; q)$ for a compact 3-manifold $M$ are a family of invariants parameterized by an integer $r \geq 3$ dependent on a $2r$-th root of unity $q$. For this paper, we will be concerned with the $SU(2)$-version of the Turaev-Viro invariants; however, the results hold for the $SO(3)$-version with minor changes.

We focus on a conjecture stated by Chen and Yang in [3] which relates the growth rate of the Turaev-Viro invariants for hyperbolic manifolds to the manifold’s hyperbolic volume. Also in [3], the authors provide computational evidence supporting the conjecture. The conjecture is given as follows.

**Conjecture 1.1** ([3], Conjecture 1.1). Let $TV_r(M; q)$ be the Turaev-Viro invariant of a hyperbolic 3-manifold $M$, and let $vol(M)$ be the hyperbolic volume of $M$. For $r$ running over odd integers and $q = e^{\frac{2\pi \sqrt{-1}}{r}}$, $$\lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{2\pi}{r} \log |TV_r(M; q)| = vol(M).$$
As a natural extension to manifolds which are not hyperbolic, Conjecture 1.1 has been restated by Detcherry and Kalfagianni\cite{DetcherryKalfagianni} in terms of the simplicial volume. For more details on the simplicial volume, we refer to\cite{Gromov} by Gromov and\cite{Thurston} by Thurston. For our purposes, we will only need the relationship between the hyperbolic volume and the simplicial volume given by

\[ \text{vol}(M) = v_3 \| M \| \]

where \( v_3 \approx 1.0149 \) is the volume of a regular ideal tetrahedron and \( \| \cdot \| \) is the simplicial volume.

**Conjecture 1.2** (\cite{DetcherryKalfagianni}, Conjecture 8.1). Let \( M \) be a compact and orientable 3-manifold with empty or toroidal boundary. For \( r \) running over odd integers and \( q = e^{2\pi \sqrt{-1}} \),

\[ \limsup_{r \to \infty} \frac{2\pi}{r} \log |TV_r(M; q)| = v_3 \| M \|. \]

**Remark 1.3.** Conjectures 1.1 and 1.2 should be compared to the well-known volume conjecture of Kashaev\cite{Kashaev} which similarly relates the growth rate of the Kashaev invariant to the hyperbolic volume of hyperbolic link complements. By a result from Murakami and Murakami\cite{MurakamiMurakami}, the Kashaev volume conjecture is more commonly written in terms of the colored Jones polynomials.

An important property of any compact irreducible orientable 3-manifold is that it can be cut along a canonical collection of incompressible tori into atoroidal 3-manifolds through the JSJ decomposition\cite{JSJ1,JSJ2}. Furthermore, these atoroidal manifolds are each either hyperbolic or Seifert fibered by Thurston’s Geometrization Conjecture\cite{Thurston}. For a given manifold \( M \), its simplicial volume is equal to the sum of the simplicial volumes of the pieces of its JSJ decomposition. The simplicial volume is positive for each hyperbolic piece and zero for each Seifert fibered piece. We expect the same additivity relationship to hold asymptotically for the Turaev-Viro invariants as reflected in Conjecture 1.2.

The asymptotic additivity property of the Turaev-Viro invariant has previously been shown for a few families of manifolds. For a manifold \( M \) which satisfies Conjecture 1.2, the property was proven for so-called invertible cablings of \( M \) by Detcherry and Kalfagianni\cite{DetcherryKalfagianni} and \((p, 2)\)-torus knot cablings of \( M \) by Detcherry\cite{Detcherry}. Each of these results involve gluing a Seifert-fibered manifold to another manifold, which does not change simplicial volume. Additionally, it was proven for the figure-eight knot cabled with Whitehead chains by Wong\cite{Wong}, providing examples of gluing additivity for certain pairs of hyperbolic manifolds. Our construction is the first which glues several hyperbolic pieces to produce infinite families of manifolds satisfying the asymptotic additivity property.

As our main result, the following theorem establishes the asymptotic additivity property for an infinite family of manifolds glued from several hyperbolic pieces. Our construction is inspired by a construction of Agol\cite{Agol} of cusped 3-manifolds with well-understood geometric properties. Agol begins with an oriented \( S^1 \)-bundle over a surface and systematically drills out curves to produce octahedral link complements. This procedure depends on a path on the 1-skeleton of the pants complex of the surface. The hyperbolic building blocks for
our family $\mathcal{M}$ of manifolds are obtained as follows: We begin with a trivial $S^1$-bundle over the once-punctured torus and use Agol’s procedure to drill out a 2-component link. This produces a hyperbolic manifold, which we call an $S$–piece, of volume $2v_8$, where $v_8 \approx 3.66$ is the volume of the regular ideal hyperbolic octahedron. Then we begin with a trivial $S^1$-bundle over the four-punctured sphere and use Agol’s procedure to drill out a 2-component link, producing a hyperbolic manifold of volume $4v_8$ which we call an $A$–piece. Gluing $k$ $S$–pieces and $l$ $A$–pieces along their original boundaries produces a compact manifold $M_L(k, l) \in \mathcal{M}$, where $L$ is the union of the link components of the $S$– and $A$–pieces. For more details, see Subsection 2.2.

**Theorem 4.1.** Let $M_L(k, l) \in \mathcal{M}$. Then for $r$ running over odd integers and $q = e^{\frac{2\pi \sqrt{-1}}{r}}$,

$$
\lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{2\pi}{r} \log |TV_r(M_L(k, l); q)| = v_3 ||M_L(k, l)|| = 2(k + 2l)v_8.
$$

In general, the asymptotic additivity property is difficult to prove. In order to simplify the calculation, the family $\mathcal{M}$ was constructed to have several advantageous properties which we utilize. In particular, the family can be described effectively from Turaev’s shadow perspective [20] which Turaev related to the relative Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants in [21]. Additionally, manifolds in the family $\mathcal{M}$ have relative Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants which are comparably simple to manage as well as well-understood simplicial volumes. We note that the consideration of the shadow perspective was taken from the following works. In [5], Costantino extended the colored Jones invariants to links in $S^3 \#_k S^2 \times S^1$ and used the formulation of the invariant to prove a version of the volume conjecture for a family of links in $S^3 \#_k S^2 \times S^1$ known as the fundamental shadow links. Furthermore in [2], Belletti, Detcherry, Kalfagianni, and Yang prove the Turaev-Viro invariants can be computed using the relative Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants, which they used in combination with Costantino’s formulation [4] to show the fundamental shadow links satisfy Conjecture 1.2. In [24], Wong and Yang also use this shadow viewpoint to study a version of the Volume Conjecture involving the relative Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants. In this paper, we utilize the same approach to prove Theorem 4.1; however, we note that the form of the relative Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants we study here is more complicated.

Moreover, the Turaev-Viro invariants are related to a measure of complexity of a manifold called the shadow complexity derived from Turaev’s shadow perspective for 3-manifolds. We refer to Costantino and Thurston [6] or Turaev [21] for more details. The shadow complexity $c \in \mathbb{N}$ of a manifold gives a sharp upper bound for the growth rate of its Turaev-Viro invariants as stated in the following.

**Corollary 1.4 (2, Corollary 3.11).** If $M$ has shadow complexity $c$, then

$$
lTV(M) \leq LTV(M) \leq 2cv_8,
$$

where $lTV(M) = \liminf_{r \to \infty} \frac{2\pi}{r} \log |TV_r(M; q)|$ and $LTV(M) = \limsup_{r \to \infty} \frac{2\pi}{r} \log |TV_r(M; q)|$. Furthermore, we have equalities for fundamental shadow links.
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In a similar way, the manifolds $M_L(k, l)$ have a shadow complexity based on the elementary pieces used in their construction such that they satisfy the same equalities as the fundamental shadow links as shown in Theorem 4.1.

The paper is organized as follows: We recall Agol’s construction of cusped 3-manifolds and introduce the family of manifolds $\mathcal{M}$ in Section 2. In Section 3 we introduce Turaev’s shadow invariant and discuss its relationship with the relative Reshetikhin-Turaev and Turaev-Viro invariants. The proof of Theorem 4.1 comprises Section 4 and lastly, Section 5 consists of further directions for this project.
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2 Link family

In this section, we will construct the link family $\mathcal{M}$. We begin by recalling a construction of Agol [1] in Subsection 2.1. In Subsection 2.2 we use Agol’s algorithm to construct the family of link complements $\mathcal{M}$.

2.1 Agol’s construction of cusped 3-manifolds

Agol [1] gave a construction of manifolds with well-understood geometric characteristics presented by links in surface bundles based on the pants complex of the base surface. We outline the construction here.

Definition 2.1. Let $\Sigma_{g,n}$ be a connected compact orientable surface of genus $g$ with $n$ boundary components and Euler characteristic $\chi(\Sigma_{g,n}) = 2(1 - g) - n$. We denote the closed surface of genus $g$ by $\Sigma_g$. For $\chi(\Sigma_{g,n}) < 0$, a pants decomposition is a maximal collection of distinct smoothly embedded simple closed curves on $\Sigma_{g,n}$ which have trivial intersection pairwise. A pants decomposition $\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_N\}$ consists of $N = 3(g - 1) + n$ curves, and cutting $\Sigma_{g,n}$ along these curves produces $-\chi(\Sigma_{g,n})$ pairs of pants $\Sigma_{0,3}$.

We note that the pants decompositions of a given surface are not unique.

Definition 2.2. Two pants decompositions $P = \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_N\}$ and $P' = \{\alpha'_1, \ldots, \alpha'_N\}$ of a surface $\Sigma_{g,n}$ are said to differ by an elementary move if $P'$ can be obtained from $P$ by replacing one curve $\alpha_i$ with another curve $\alpha'_i$ such that $\alpha_i$ and $\alpha'_i$ intersect minimally in one of the following ways:

- If $\alpha_i$ lies on a $\Sigma_{1,1}$ in the complement of the other curves in $P$, then $\alpha_i$ is on a single pair of pants such that $\alpha_i$ and $\alpha'_i$ must intersect exactly once.
• If $\alpha_i$ lies on a $\Sigma_{0,4}$ in the complement of the other curves in $P$, then $\alpha_i$ is the boundary between two pairs of pants such that $\alpha_i$ and $\alpha_i'$ must intersect exactly twice.

We call a curve switch on $\Sigma_{1,1}$ a simple move, or $S$–move, and a curve switch on $\Sigma_{0,4}$ an associativity move, or $A$–move. Examples of the elementary moves are given in Figure 1.
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(a) An example of an $S$–move.  
(b) An example of an $A$–move.

Figure 1: Examples of the elementary moves.

**Definition 2.3.** The pants decomposition graph $\mathcal{P}(\Sigma_{g,n})^{(1)}$ is the graph with vertices corresponding to isotopy classes of pants decompositions and edges corresponding to pairs of isotopy classes which differ by a single elementary move.

A proof of the following theorem is given by Hatcher, Lochak, and Schneps [11].

**Theorem 2.4 ([11]).** $\mathcal{P}(\Sigma_{g,n})^{(1)}$ is connected.

**Definition 2.5.** For a given homeomorphism $f : \Sigma_{g,n} \to \Sigma_{g,n}$, define the mapping torus by $T_f = (\Sigma_{g,n} \times [0,1])/( (x,0) \sim (f(x),1))$.

In [1], Agol constructed cusped 3-manifolds from the mapping torus $T_f$ and a path $P$ on the pants decomposition graph $\mathcal{P}(\Sigma_{g,n})^{(1)}$. We outline the construction as follows:

• Let $f : \Sigma_{g,n} \to \Sigma_{g,n}$ be a homeomorphism and $P = \{P_i\}_{i=0}^m$ be a path such that each $P_i$ is a vertex of the pants decomposition graph where each $P_i$ and $P_{i+1}$ are connected by an edge and $P_m = f(P_0)$.

• For $i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$, let $\beta_i$ correspond to the simple closed curve in $P_i$ obtained from performing a simple elementary move on a simple closed curve in $P_{i-1}$. We assume there exists no curve $\beta_j$ that is contained in all the pants decompositions $P_i$.

• Let $B = \{B_i\}_{i=1}^m$ be the link in $T_f$ such that $B_i = \beta_i \times \{ \frac{i}{m} \}$ is a link component, and we define the cusped 3-manifold $M_P$ to be the complement of the link $B$ in $T_f$.

Agol proves the following lemma in [1].

**Lemma 2.6 ([1], Lemma 2.3).** Let $M_P$ be the cusped 3-manifold obtained from Agol’s construction for a homeomorphism $f : \Sigma_{g,n} \to \Sigma_{g,n}$ and a path $P$ on $\mathcal{P}(\Sigma_{g,n})^{(1)}$. Then $M_P$ has a complete hyperbolic metric such that $\text{vol}(M_P) = (|S| + 2|A|)v_8$ where $\text{vol}(M_P)$ is the hyperbolic volume, $|S|$ and $|A|$ are the number of $S$– and $A$–moves in $P$, respectively, and $v_8 \approx 3.66$ is the volume of a regular ideal hyperbolic octahedron.
2.2 Manifold construction

Here we will discuss a family of links with octahedral complements in $S^1$-bundles over connected closed orientable surfaces.

Let $\Sigma_g$ be a connected closed orientable surface of genus $g$ constructed by gluing $k$ copies of $\Sigma_{1,1}$ and $l$ copies of $\Sigma_{0,4}$ along their boundary components. We glue each pair of $S^1$ boundary components via identity maps. Since $\Sigma_g$ has no boundary components, $k$ must be even.

The closed orientable 3-manifold $T_{id} = \Sigma_g \times S^1$ has an elementary decomposition by cutting along the tori corresponding to the gluing circles of $\Sigma_g$ such that the resulting pieces are trivial $S^1$-bundles over $k$ copies of $\Sigma_{1,1}$ and $l$ copies of $\Sigma_{0,4}$. From Lemma 2.6, performing a pair of $S-$moves in each copy of $\Sigma_{1,1}$ with $P_0 = P_2$ on the pants complex of $\Sigma_{1,1}$ produces a two-component link such that its complement in $\Sigma_{1,1} \times S^1$ has a complete hyperbolic metric with hyperbolic volume $2v_8$. We call this complement an $S-$piece. Similarly, performing a pair of $A-$moves in each copy of $\Sigma_{0,4}$ with $P_0 = P_2$ produces a two-component link such that its complement in $\Sigma_{0,4} \times S^1$ has a complete hyperbolic metric with hyperbolic volume $4v_8$. We call this complement an $A-$piece.

Let $L$ be the union of these two component links in $\Sigma_g \times S^1$. We denote the link complement $(\Sigma_g \times S^1) \setminus L$ by $M_L(k,l)$. We remark that $M_L(k,l)$ is not hyperbolic since the gluing procedure produces essential tori. However, by Lemma 2.6 each $S-$piece and $A-$piece of $M_L(k,l)$ contributes $2v_8$ and $4v_8$ to the simplicial volume, respectively, so $v_3\|M_L(k,l)\| = 2(k+2l)v_8$. Two examples of manifolds of type $(2,2)$ are given in Figure 2. Figure 3 gives a decomposition of each example into their respective $S-$ and $A-$pieces.

Figure 2: The projections of $M_L(2,2)$ and $M_L'(2,2)$ onto the base surface $\Sigma_4$, where $L$ and $L'$ are 8-component links in $\Sigma_4 \times S^1$.

Let $\mathcal{M} = \{M_L(k,l) \mid k, l \in \mathbb{N}, k \text{ even}\}$ be the family of compact orientable 3-manifolds constructed from $k$ $S-$pieces and $l$ $A-$pieces. In Section 4, we will prove Theorem 4.1 for manifolds in this infinite family.

Remark 2.7. Note that since we only require that $P_0 = P_2$ in the construction of the $S-$ and $A-$pieces, we can take $P_0$ to be an arbitrary vertex on the pants decomposition graph which gives rise to infinitely many choices for $P_1$. This implies that we also have infinitely many choices for the elementary pieces used in the construction of $M_L(k,l)$. That being said, because they are hyperbolic, a result of Thurston implies that there are at most finitely many elementary pieces up to homeomorphism.
Figure 3: From cutting $\Sigma_4$ along the blue curves which lift to essential tori in $M_L(2, 2)$ and $M'_L(2, 2)$, we obtain two $S-$pieces and two $A-$pieces.

3 The Turaev-Viro invariants from the perspective of shadows

In this section, we introduce Turaev’s shadow theory to 3-manifolds. We begin with an introduction to the quantum $6j$-symbols and some of their properties in Subsection 3.1. In Subsection 3.2, we introduce Turaev’s shadow invariant for links in $S^1$-bundles over surfaces and relate it to the relative Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants of colored framed trivalent graphs in 3-manifolds. We will then discuss the results of Belletti, Detcherry, Kalfagianni, and Yang [2] relating the Turaev-Viro invariants to the relative Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants.

For the rest of this paper, let $r \geq 3$ be an odd integer and $q = e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1}/r}$. Define the quantum integer by $[n] = q^n - q^{-n}$ and the quantum factorial

$$[n]! = \prod_{k=1}^{n} [k].$$

Finally, let $I_r = \{0, 1, 2, \ldots, r - 2\}$. Throughout the paper, we use the convention that $\sqrt{y} = \sqrt{|y|}\sqrt{-1}$ for any negative real number $y$.

3.1 Quantum $6j$ symbols

We first introduce the quantum $6j$-symbols. Deeper algebraic and geometric properties of the quantum $6j$-symbols can be found in Kirillov and Reshetikhin [15], Turaev and Viro [22], and Turaev [20, 21]. Note that our coloring set $I_r$ is defined in terms of integers rather than the conventionally chosen half-integers.

**Definition 3.1.** A triple $(a_1, a_2, a_3)$ of integers in $I_r$ is $r$-admissible if

(i) $a_1 + a_2 + a_3$ is even,

(ii) $a_1 + a_2 + a_3 \leq 2(r - 2)$,
(iii) \( a_i + a_j - a_k \geq 0 \).

We say a 6-tuple \((a_1, \ldots, a_6)\) is \(r\)-admissible if the triples \((a_1, a_2, a_3)\), \((a_1, a_5, a_6)\), \((a_2, a_4, a_6)\), and \((a_3, a_4, a_5)\) are \(r\)-admissible.

For an \(r\)-admissible triple \((a_1, a_2, a_3)\), define

\[
\Delta(a_1, a_2, a_3) = \sqrt{\frac{[a_1 + a_2 - a_3]! [a_1 + a_3 - a_2]! [a_2 + a_3 - a_1]!}{[a_1 + a_2 + a_3 + 1]!}}.
\]

**Definition 3.2.** The quantum 6\(j\)-symbol of an \(r\)-admissible 6-tuple \((a_1, \ldots, a_6)\) is the complex number

\[
\begin{vmatrix}
    a_1 & a_2 & a_3 \\
    a_4 & a_5 & a_6
\end{vmatrix}
= \sqrt{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{6} a_i \Delta(a_1, a_2, a_3) \Delta(a_1, a_5, a_6) \Delta(a_2, a_4, a_6) \Delta(a_3, a_4, a_5)
\]

\[
\sum_{k=\max\{Q_i\}}^{\min\{T_i\}} (-1)^k [k + 1]! \prod_{i=1}^{T_i} [k - T_i]! \prod_{j=1}^{Q_i} [Q_j - k]! \in \mathbb{C},
\]

(1)

where \(T_1 = \frac{a_1 + a_2 + a_3}{2}\), \(T_2 = \frac{a_1 + a_5 + a_6}{2}\), \(T_3 = \frac{a_2 + a_4 + a_6}{2}\), \(T_4 = \frac{a_3 + a_4 + a_5}{2}\), \(Q_1 = \frac{a_1 + a_2 + a_4 + a_5}{2}\), \(Q_2 = \frac{a_1 + a_3 + a_4 + a_6}{2}\), and \(Q_3 = \frac{a_2 + a_3 + a_5 + a_6}{2}\).

We remark that the value of the quantum 6\(j\)-symbol is either real or purely imaginary.

We now recall some properties of the quantum 6\(j\)-symbol at \(q = e^{\frac{2\pi \sqrt{-1}}{r}}\). For an \(r\)-admissible 6-tuple \((i, j, k, l, m, n)\), the symmetries

\[
\begin{vmatrix}
    i & j & k \\
    l & m & n
\end{vmatrix}
= \begin{vmatrix}
    j & i & k \\
    l & m & n
\end{vmatrix}
= \begin{vmatrix}
    i & k & j \\
    l & n & m
\end{vmatrix}
= \begin{vmatrix}
    i & m & n \\
    l & j & k
\end{vmatrix}
= \begin{vmatrix}
    l & j & n \\
    i & m & k
\end{vmatrix}
\]

(2)

follow immediately from the definition of the quantum 6\(j\)-symbol.

Belletti, Detcherry, Kalfagianni, and Yang [2] give an upper bound for the growth rate of the quantum 6\(j\)-symbol, which we state in the following theorem. Related results on these growth rates are also due to Costantino [4].

**Theorem 3.3** ([2], Theorem 1.2 and Lemma 3.13). For any odd \(r \geq 3\) and any \(r\)-admissible 6-tuple \((a_1, \ldots, a_6)\),

\[
\frac{2\pi}{r} \log \left| \begin{array}{ccc}
    a_1 & a_2 & a_3 \\
    a_4 & a_5 & a_6
\end{array} \right|_{q = e^{\frac{2\pi \sqrt{-1}}{r}}} \leq v_8 + O \left( \frac{\log(r)}{r} \right).
\]

(3)

Moreover, this bound is sharp. If the sign is chosen such that \(\frac{r + 1}{2}\) is even, then

\[
\frac{2\pi}{r} \log \left| \begin{array}{ccc}
    \frac{r + 1}{2} & \frac{r + 1}{2} & \frac{r + 1}{2} \\
    \frac{r + 1}{2} & \frac{r + 1}{2} & \frac{r + 1}{2}
\end{array} \right|_{q = e^{\frac{2\pi \sqrt{-1}}{r}}} = v_8 + O \left( \frac{\log(r)}{r} \right).
\]

(4)
The authors of [2] also prove the following result of Costantino [4] for the root \( q = e^{2\pi \sqrt{-1}/r} \).

Let the summand of Equation (1) be given by

\[
S_k = \frac{(-1)^k [k + 1]!}{\prod_{i=1}^{2} [k - T_i]! \prod_{j=1}^{3} [Q_j - k]!}
\]

where \( k = \max \{T_i\}, \ldots, \min \{Q_j\} \) for \( i = 1, 2, 3, 4 \) and \( j = 1, 2, 3 \).

**Theorem 3.4** ([2], Theorem A.1). Let \((a_1^{(r)}, \ldots, a_6^{(r)})\) be a sequence of admissible 6-tuples such that

1. \( 0 \leq Q_j - T_i \leq \frac{r - 2}{2} \) for \( i = 1, 2, 3, 4 \) and \( j = 1, 2, 3, 4 \).
2. \( \frac{r - 2}{2} \leq T_i \leq r - 2 \) for \( i = 1, 2, 3, 4 \).

Let \( \theta_i = \lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{2\pi a_i^{(r)}}{r} \) and let \( \alpha_i = |\pi - \theta_i| \). Then

1. for each \( r \), the sign of \( S_k \) is independent of the choice of \( k \), for \( k = \max \{T_i\}, \ldots, \min \{Q_j\} \),
2. \( \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_6 \) are the dihedral angles of an ideal or a hyperideal truncated tetrahedron \( \Delta \), and
3. as \( r \) runs over the odd integers
   \[
   \lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{2\pi}{r} \log \left| \frac{a_1^{(r)} a_2^{(r)} a_3^{(r)} a_4^{(r)} a_5^{(r)} a_6^{(r)}}{a_1^{(r)} a_2^{(r)} a_3^{(r)} a_4^{(r)} a_5^{(r)} a_6^{(r)}} \right|_{q = e^{2\pi \sqrt{-1}}} = Vol(\Delta)
   \] (5)

The two subsequences \( \left(\frac{r+1}{2}\right) \) and \( \left(\frac{r-1}{2}\right) \) of even integers in Theorem 3.3 correspond to \( r \equiv 3 \mod 4 \) and \( r \equiv 1 \mod 4 \), respectively. Another such pair of subsequences is \( \left(\frac{r-3}{2}\right) \) and \( \left(\frac{r-1}{2}\right) \). The following is analogous to Lemma 3.13 of [2].

**Lemma 3.5.** If the sign is chosen such that \( \frac{r - 2 + 1}{2} \) is even, then

\[
\frac{2\pi}{r} \log \left| \frac{r - 2 + 1}{2} r - 2 + 1 r - 2 + 1 r - 2 + 1 r - 2 + 1 r - 2 + 1}{q = e^{2\pi \sqrt{-1}}} \right| = v_8 + O \left( \log \frac{r}{r} \right).
\] (6)

**Proof.** First note that the \( r \equiv 1 \mod 4 \) case is covered by Equation (4). When \( r \equiv 3 \mod 4 \), \( T_i = \frac{3(r-3)}{4} \) for all \( i = 1, 2, 3, 4 \) and \( Q_j = r - 3 \) for \( j = 1, 2, 3 \), so the 6-tuple \( (\frac{r-3}{2}, \ldots, \frac{r-3}{2}) \) satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 3.4 for \( r \geq 5 \). Here the corresponding hyperideal truncated tetrahedron \( \Delta \) has dihedral angles \( \alpha_i = 0 \) for all \( i \), so \( \Delta \) is a regular ideal hyperbolic octahedron and \( Vol(\Delta) = v_8 \). We refer to [4], Definition 2.1 for details. By part (3) of Theorem 3.4

\[
\lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{2\pi}{r} \log \left| \frac{r - 3}{2} r - 3 r - 3 r - 3 r - 3 r - 3}{q = e^{2\pi \sqrt{-1}}} \right| = v_8.
\]
3.2 Relating the quantum invariants

We now describe Turaev’s state sum invariants for two-dimensional polyhedra representing links in $S^1$-bundles over surfaces and relate them to the $r$-th relative Reshetikhin-Turaev and Turaev-Viro invariants. In an effort to construct analogous invariants to the colored Jones polynomial \[17\] of links in $S^3$, Turaev \[20, 21\] introduces a technique to present links in $S^1$-fibrations over surfaces as loops on $\Sigma_g$ with additional topological data given by the bundle. From this 2-dimensional presentation, we can build quantum invariants of the colored link. In \[21\], Turaev relates these invariants to the $r$-th relative Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants which can be used to compute the Turaev-Viro invariants \[2, 9\].

We begin by recalling the construction of Turaev’s shadow state sum invariant \[20, 21\] for $S^1$-bundles over surfaces.

**Definition 3.6.** A shadow on a compact orientable surface $\Sigma_{g,n}$ is a finite collection of closed curves on $\Sigma_{g,n}$ with only double transverse crossings or self-crossings such that each connected component of the complement of the collection of loops in $\Sigma_{g,n}$ is assigned a half-integer. We call these connected components the regions of the shadow and the associated half-integer the gleam of the region. We denote a shadow by $(P, gl)$ where $P$ is the CW-complex containing the surface $\Sigma_{g,n}$ with the collection of loops and crossing points, and $gl$ assigns the gleams to each region. Finally, the total gleam of a shadow is the sum of the gleams of the regions minus twice the number of crossing points.

We will restrict our attention to shadows on closed surfaces. Suppose $\Sigma_g$ is a closed orientable surface and $\rho : M \to \Sigma_g$ is an oriented $S^1$-bundle over $\Sigma_g$. Let $L \subset M$ be a link. In \[20\], Turaev constructs a map which associates a shadow $(P(L), gl)$ to $L$ and proves the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.7** (\[20\], Theorem 3.2). Let $\rho : M \to \Sigma_g$ be an oriented circle bundle over a closed orientable surface $\Sigma_g$, and let $L \subset M$ be a generic link. Then there is a shadow $(P(L), gl)$ with total gleam $-\chi(p)$ associated to $L$, where $\chi(p)$ is the Euler number of the bundle.

In the special case where $L \subset \Sigma_g \times S^1$ and $\rho$ is the trivial bundle, the shadow $(P(L), gl)$ is constructed by projecting $L$ onto $\Sigma_g$ through $\rho$. Since $\rho$ is trivial, the total gleam of $(P(L), gl)$ is zero. The gleams of regions are assigned as in Figure 4 where the gleam of each region is the sum of the gleams of the regions minus twice the number of crossing points.

In order to define the invariant, we need to consider colorings of the link. Let $M$ be a closed 3-manifold. An $I_r$-coloring of a link $L \subset M$ assigns an element of $I_r$ to each component of $L$. Similarly, an $I_r$-coloring of a shadow $(P, gl)$ assigns an element of $I_r$ to each loop of $(P, gl)$. If $\rho : M \to \Sigma_g$ is a circle bundle over a closed surface $\Sigma_g$, a coloring $\gamma$ of a link $L$ in $M$ descends to a coloring $\gamma$ of the loops of the shadow $(P(L), gl)$ constructed using Theorem 3.7.

Let $(P, gl, \gamma)$ be an $I_r$-colored shadow with gleams $gl$ and loops colored by $\gamma$. A surface-coloring of $(P, gl, \gamma)$ assigns an element of $I_r$ to each region of $(P, gl, \gamma)$. A surface-coloring is called admissible if for any edge $e$ of the shadow loops of $(P, gl, \gamma)$, the triple formed by
the color of the loop of \((P, gl, \gamma)\) containing \(e\) and the colors of the two regions adjacent to \(e\) form an admissible coloring. Let \(\text{adm}(P, gl, \gamma)\) denote the set of admissible surface-colorings of \((P, gl, \gamma)\).

Suppose \(c_1, \ldots, c_p\) are the crossing points of \(P\), each an intersection of two distinct loops or a self-crossing of a single loop of \(P\). Suppose these loops have colors \(i\) and \(l\), respectively. Then an admissible surface-coloring \(\eta \in \text{adm}(P, gl, \gamma)\) assigns colors \(j, k, m, n\) to the four regions incident at the crossing point \(c_s\). Figure 5 illustrates an admissible surface-coloring \((j, k, m, n)\) of a crossing point of loops colored by \(i\) and \(l\).

Using Definition 3.2 of the quantum 6j-symbol, we let

\[
|c_s|_\eta = \left|\begin{array}{ccc}
i & j & k \\
 l & m & n
\end{array}\right| \in \mathbb{C}.
\]

Let \(X_1, \ldots, X_q\) be the regions of \((P, gl, \gamma)\), and let \(x_t, \chi_t\), and \(z_t\) be the gleam, Euler characteristic, and number of corners of the region \(X_t\), respectively. Define the modified gleam of \(X_t\) by \(x'_t = x_t - z_t/2\). For \(j \in I_r\), let

\[
u_j = \pi \sqrt{-1} \left(\frac{j}{2}\right) \left(1 - \frac{j + 2}{r}\right), \quad v_j = (-1)^j [j + 1].
\]

Then for each admissible surface-coloring \(\eta\), let

\[
|(P, gl)|_\eta^\eta = \prod_{s=1}^p |c_s|_\eta^\eta \prod_{t=1}^q \left((v_{\eta(X_t)})^{x_t} \exp(2u_{\eta(X_t)x'_t})\right) \in \mathbb{C},
\]

where \(\eta(X_t)\) is the region color of \(X_t\) assigned by \(\eta\).
Remark 3.8. Note that the gleams and the surface-colorings are independent of each other. The gleams do not affect the quantum $6j$-symbols in the first product of Equation (7), only the second product taken over the regions of $(P, gl)$.

Summing over all admissible surface-colorings, we obtain the state sum

$$|(P, gl)|_\gamma = \sum_{\eta \in \text{adm}(P, gl, \gamma)} |(P, gl)|_\eta \in \mathbb{C}. \quad (8)$$

Turaev established the following theorem in [20] and generalized it in [21].

**Theorem 3.9** ([20], Theorem 5.1 and Corollary 5.2). Let $(P, gl, \gamma)$ be an $I_r$-colored shadow. Then the state sum $|(P, gl)|_\gamma$ is a complex-valued regular isotopy invariant of colored shadows. Furthermore, this invariant gives rise to a complex-valued isotopy invariant of colored links in $S^1$-bundles over closed orientable surfaces.

Turaev [21] related this state sum invariant to the $r$-th relative Reshetikhin-Turaev invariant of a colored framed trivalent graph in a closed 3-manifold. In [5], Costantino used this relationship to study the colored Jones invariants of links in $S^3 \#_k S^2 \times S^1$ from the shadow perspective. We include Costantino’s statement of Turaev’s result here and refer to [21] for more details.

**Theorem 3.10** ([5], Theorem 3.3). Let $N$ be a closed 3-manifold and $T \subset N$ a colored framed trivalent graph in $N$ colored by $\gamma$. Let $(P, gl, \gamma)$ be a colored shadow of $(N, T)$. Then $RT_r(N, T, \gamma) := C_r |(P, gl)|_\gamma$ is a complex-valued homeomorphism invariant of $(N, T)$.

**Remark 3.11.** Here, the factor $C_r$ is considered a “normalization factor.” See [5] for a precise formulation. In the case Turaev [20] studies, where $N$ is homeomorphic to an $S^1$-bundle over a closed surface and $T$ is a link, the factor $C_r$ does not depend on $T$. It can therefore be ignored for our purposes.

Finally, we introduce the Turaev-Viro invariant in terms of the $r$-th relative Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants. Turaev and Viro [22] defined a real-valued topological invariant on a triangulation of a compact 3-manifold for fixed $r$ and a root of unity $q$ using quantum $6j$-symbols. In [2] and [9], the authors prove that the Turaev-Viro invariant of a link complement $M \setminus L$ in a 3-manifold $M$ can be computed via the $r$-th relative Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants of $(M, L)$.

**Proposition 3.12** ([2, 9]). Let $M$ be a 3-manifold and $L \subset M$ be a link colored by $n$. The Turaev-Viro invariant of the complement $M \setminus L$ at $q = e^{2\pi \sqrt{-1}}/r$ is given by

$$TV_r(M \setminus L; q) = \sum_{n \in \text{Adm}(r)} |RT_r(M, L, n)|^2, \quad (9)$$

where $\text{Adm}(r)$ is the set of $r$-admissible colorings $n$. 
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4 Proof of Theorem 4.1

In this section, we prove Theorem 4.1 which we restate here.

**Theorem 4.1.** Let $M_L(k, l) \in \mathcal{M}$. Then for $r$ running over odd integers and $q = e^{\frac{2\pi \sqrt{-1}}{r}}$,
\[
\lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{2\pi}{r} \log |TV_r(M_L(k, l); q)| = v_3 ||M_L(k, l)|| = 2(k + 2l)v_8
\]
where $v_8 \approx 3.66$ is the volume of the regular ideal hyperbolic octahedron.

To do this, we first write a formula for the shadow state sum invariants $|(P, gl)|_\gamma$ for the family $\mathcal{M}$ of links in trivial $S^1$-bundles over surfaces constructed in Subsection 2.2. We will then state and prove Lemma 4.4 regarding the asymptotics of $|(P, gl)|_\gamma$. We complete the proof of Theorem 4.1 using Lemma 4.4 and the formulation of the Turaev-Viro invariants from Subsection 3.2 in terms of the $r$-th relative Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants.

**Remark 4.2.** Computing the relative Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants is difficult in general, but the family $\mathcal{M}$ was constructed in order to simplify their calculation significantly from the shadow state sum perspective. In particular, shadows of these manifolds have simple gleams and topologically simple regions that allow us to reduce the proof of Theorem 4.1 to studying properties of quantum 6j-symbols. These manifolds also have well-understood simplicial volumes determined by $k$ and $l$.

Let $M_L$ be the complement of a link $L$ in a 3-manifold $M = \Sigma_g \times S^1$ constructed as in Subsection 2.2. By Theorem 3.7, $M_L$ has a shadow $(P, gl)$ associated to it. $M_L$ has an elementary decomposition into $k$ $S$-pieces and $l$ $A$-pieces. The shadow $(P, gl)$ has a corresponding decomposition, so we also refer to these shadows on $\Sigma_{1,1}$ and $\Sigma_{0,4}$ as $S$-pieces and $A$-pieces, respectively. An $S$-piece has two loops which intersect at a single vertex. Let $s_1, \ldots, s_k$ denote the intersection points on the $k$ $S$-pieces. An $A$-piece has two loops which intersect at two vertices. Let $(a^1_1, a^2_1), \ldots, (a^1_l, a^2_l)$ denote the intersection points on the $l$ $A$-pieces.

We make the following observations about $M_L$:

- Each $S$-piece of $(P, gl)$ has two curves, one vertex, and one region $X$ with $z = 4$ corners as in Figure 6a. This region has gleam $x = 2$ since gleams are assigned to regions for trivial bundles as in Figure 4. Cutting $\Sigma_{1,1}$ along one of the two curves produces a pair of pants such that the second curve becomes a simple arc connecting the two new boundary components. Cutting along this arc produces an annulus, so $X$ has Euler characteristic $\chi = 0$. The modified gleam of the region of this shadow is $x' = x - z/2 = 0$.

- Each $A$-piece of $(P, gl)$ has two curves, two vertices, and four regions $X_t$, $t = 1, 2, 3, 4$, each with $z_t = 2$ corners, as in Figure 6b. Again, using the gleam assignment from Figure 4 each of the four regions has gleam $x_t = 1$. Cutting $\Sigma_{0,4}$ along one of the two curves separates $\Sigma_{0,4}$ into two pairs of pants such that the second curve is split into
a simple arc on each pair of pants with endpoints on a single boundary component. Cutting the two pairs of pants along these arcs produces four annuli, so $X_t$ has Euler characteristic $\chi_t = 0$ for $t = 1, 2, 3, 4$. The modified gleam of each region of this shadow is $x'_t = x_t - z_t/2 = 0$.

Figure 6: $S$– and $A$–pieces.

Let $\gamma$ be an $I_r$-coloring of $L \subset M$. The associated shadow $(P, gl)$ inherits this $I_r$-coloring such that the loops of $(P, gl)$ are colored by $\gamma$. Let $\eta \in \text{adm}(P, gl, \gamma)$ be an admissible surface-coloring of $(P, gl, \gamma)$. The $S$– and $A$–piece observations imply that for the state $|\langle P, gl \rangle|_g^\eta$ defined in Equation (7), $\chi_t = x'_t = 0$ for all regions $X_t$. This means

$$\prod_{i=1}^q \left( (v_{\eta(X_i)})^{x_i} \exp \left( 2u_{\eta(X_i)}x'_i \right) \right) = 1.$$ 

Using this and Equation (7), we reformulate the state sum invariant of the $I_r$-colored shadow associated to $M_L(k, l)$ in the following proposition.

**Proposition 4.3.** Let $(P, gl, \gamma)$ be a colored shadow associated to $M_L(k, l)$. Then the state sum invariant is given by

$$\langle (P, gl) \rangle_{g} = \sum_{\eta \in \text{adm}(P, gl, \gamma)} |\langle P, gl \rangle|_g^\eta$$

$$= \sum_{\eta \in \text{adm}(P, gl, \gamma)} \prod_{i=1}^k |s_i|^\eta \prod_{j=1}^l |a_j^1|^\eta |a_j^2|^\eta.$$ 

(10)

Since Equation (10) is a sum of products of quantum $6j$-symbols, Proposition 4.3 allows us to use the explicit properties of quantum $6j$-symbols discussed in Subsection 3.1. The following technical lemma will be used to prove Theorem 4.1.

**Lemma 4.4.** Let $M_L(k, l) \in \mathcal{M}$, and let $(P, gl, \gamma)$ be the $I_r$-colored shadow representing $M_L(k, l)$. Suppose all loops of $(P, gl, \gamma)$ are colored by $n_r$, where $n_r := \frac{r-1}{2}$ when $r \equiv 1 \mod 4$ and $n_r := \frac{r-3}{2}$ when $r \equiv 3 \mod 4$. Then

$$\lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{4\pi}{r} \log \|\langle P, gl \rangle|_{(n_r)}\| = v_3\|M_L(k, l)\|,$$

(11)

where $v_3\|M_L(k, l)\| = 2(k+2l)v_8$ is the simplicial volume of $M_L(k, l)$ and $(n_r) = (n_r, \ldots, n_r)$. 
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Remark 4.5. We will use the abbreviation \((n) := (n, \ldots, n)\) for tuples of colors throughout the rest of the paper.

Proof of Lemma 4.4. From Subsection 2.2, the link complement \(M_L(k, l)\) is a compact orientable 3-manifold with simplicial volume \(v_3 \|M_L(k, l)\| = 2(k + 2l)v_8\). We proceed by bounding the limit in Equation (11) above and below by \(v_3 \|M_L(k, l)\|\).

For the upper bound, note that each summand in Equation (10) is a product of \(k + 2l\) quantum 6j-symbols. By Theorem 3.3, the growth rate of a single summand of Equation (10) is bounded above sharply by \((k + 2l)v_8\). Let \(B_r = \# \text{adm}(P, gl, \gamma)\) be the number of \(r\)-admissible surface-colorings of \((P, gl, \gamma)\). \(B_r\) grows at most polynomially with \(r\) since \(B_r\) is bounded above by the total number of \(r\)-admissible 6-tuples corresponding to well-defined quantum 6j-symbols. Thus, we obtain the following upper bound:

\[
\limsup_{r \to \infty} \frac{4\pi}{r} \log |((P, gl)|_\gamma| \leq \limsup_{r \to \infty} \frac{4\pi}{r} \log \left| \max_{\eta \in \text{adm}(P, gl, \gamma)} |(P, gl)|^2_\gamma \right|
\]

\[
= 2 \limsup_{r \to \infty} \frac{2\pi}{r} \log \left| \max_{\eta \in \text{adm}(P, gl, \gamma)} |(P, gl)|^2_\gamma \right|
\]

\[
\leq 2(k + 2l)v_8,
\]

where the last inequality is due to Theorem 3.3. For a precise calculation of this upper bound, we refer to the proof of Theorem 1.3 in [8].

We remark that this upper bound holds for all \(I_r\)-colorings \(\gamma \in \text{Adm}(r)\) which implies the necessary upper bound for Lemma 4.4.

Let \(n_r := \frac{r-1}{2}\) when \(r \equiv 1\) mod 4 and \(n_r := \frac{r-3}{2}\) when \(r \equiv 3\) mod 4. Note that \(n_r\) is always even. We will prove the lower bound for the \((n_r)\)-colored link.

For the lower bound, it suffices to show that summands of Equation (10) do not cancel with each other when \(\gamma = (n_r)\). In particular, we will show that, for fixed \(r\), the sign of every summand of Equation (10) is independent of the surface-coloring \(\eta \in \text{adm}(P, gl, (n_r))\). This means that the absolute value of any individual summand is a lower bound for \(|((P, gl)|_{(n_r)}|\).

We now make some observations about \(\prod_{i=1}^k |s_i|^{n_r} \prod_{j=1}^l |a_j^1|^{n_r} |a_j^2|^{n_r}\).

- The surface-coloring of each \(S\)-piece is given by Figure 7a. This means each factor \(|s_i|^{n_r}\) is the quantum 6j-symbol associated to the 6-tuple \((n_r, m, n_r, m, m, m)\).

- The surface-coloring of each \(A\)-piece is given by Figure 7b. Using the symmetries of the quantum 6j-symbol in Equation (2), each factor \(|a_j^i|^{n_r}\), for \(i = 1, 2\), is the quantum 6j-symbol associated to the 6-tuple \((n_r, m_1, m_2, n_r, m_3, m_4)\).

Using these observations, we can re-formulate Equation (10) for the \((n_r)\)-colored shadow:

\[
|((P, gl)|_{(n_r)} = \sum_{\eta \in \text{adm}(P, gl, (n_r))} \prod_{i=1}^k |n_r|^{m_i} |m_i|^{m_i} \prod_{j=1}^l |n_r|^{m_j^1} |m_j^1|^{m_j^1} |m_j^2|^{m_j^2} \quad (12)
\]

We remark that the notation of Equation (12) is chosen out of convenience. Due to the construction of the invariant, the surface-colorings may be dependent on each other such
that the quantum 6j-symbols have entries that are related. For example, if an S-piece with region colored by \( m^j \) is glued to an A-piece along the boundary circle adjacent to a region colored by \( m^j \), the regions combine to form a single region with color \( m^j = m^j \). We choose to omit these additional details since they do not change the overall result of Lemma 4.4.

We now show that every summand of Equation (12) is real-valued. Consider the quantum 6j-symbol associated to the tuple \( (n_r, m_1, m_2, n_r, m_3, m_4) \). From Definition 3.2, the quantum 6j-symbol associated to the 6-tuple \( (a_1, \ldots, a_6) \) is either real or purely imaginary based on the value of the coefficient

\[
\sqrt{-1}(-\sum_{i=1}^{6} a_i) \Delta(a_1, a_2, a_3) \Delta(a_1, a_5, a_6) \Delta(a_2, a_4, a_6) \Delta(a_3, a_4, a_5),
\]

since the sum in Equation (11) is real-valued.

For \( (n_r, m_1, m_2, n_r, m_3, m_4) \), the first factor is given by

\[
(\sqrt{-1})^{-(n_r + m_1 + m_2 + n_r + m_3 + m_4)} = (\sqrt{-1})^{m_1 + m_2 + m_3 + m_4} = \pm 1.
\]

The first equality holds because \( n_r \) is even, so \( 2n_r \) has a factor of 4. The second equality is due to the admissibility conditions which require that each of the sums \( m_1 + m_2, m_3 + m_4, m_1 + m_4, \) and \( m_2 + m_3 \) are even. Notice in the case of \( (n_r, m, n_r, m, m) \), the factor is positive.

For the other factors of Equation (13), suppose \( (n_r, m, m') \) is \( r \)-admissible triple and without loss of generality, assume \( m \geq m' \). Then

\[
\Delta(n_r, m, m') = \sqrt{\frac{\left[\frac{n_r + m - m'}{2}\right]! \left[\frac{m' + n_r - m}{2}\right]! \left[\frac{m + m' - n_r}{2}\right]!}{\left[\frac{n_r + m + m'}{2} + 1\right]!}}.
\]

By the admissibility conditions, \( \frac{n_r + m - m'}{2} \leq n_r < \frac{r}{2} \), \( \frac{n_r + m' - m}{2} \leq n_r < \frac{r}{2} \), and \( \frac{m + m' - n_r}{2} \leq r - 2 - n_r < \frac{r}{2} \). Since \( [n] > 0 \) for \( 0 \leq n < \frac{r}{2} \), the numerator of \( \Delta(n_r, m, m') \) is real-valued. This implies the numerator of \( \Delta(n_r, m_1, m_2) \Delta(n_r, m_3, m_4) \Delta(m_1, n_r, m_4) \Delta(m_1, n_r, m_3) \) is also real-valued. In addition, the admissibility conditions imply that \( \frac{r-1}{2} \leq n_r + 1 \leq \frac{n_r + m + m'}{2} + 1 \leq r - 1 \), so the sign of \( \left[\frac{n_r + m + m'}{2} + 1\right]! \) is given by

\[
(-1)^{\frac{n_r + m + m'}{2} + 1 - \frac{r-1}{2}}.
\]
This means the denominator of \( \Delta(n_r, m_1, m_2) \Delta(n_r, m_3, m_4) \Delta(m_1, n_r, m_4) \Delta(m_2, n_r, m_3) \) is some real-valued multiple of
\[
\sqrt{(-1)^{2n_r+4-2(r-1)+m_1+m_2+m_3+m_4}} = \pm 1,
\]
where equality holds because \( 2n_r + 4 - 2(r-1) \) contains a factor of 4 and \( m_1 + m_2 + m_3 + m_4 \) is even. Hence, the coefficient given by Equation (13) is real-valued. This implies that the quantum 6\( j \)-symbol associated to the 6-tuple \( (n_r, m_1, m_2, n_r, m_3, m_4) \) is real-valued. Notice in the case of \( (n_r, m, n_r, m, m, m) \), the coefficient given by Equation (13) is positive.

Since the quantum 6\( j \)-symbols of the form \( (n_r, m_1, m_2, n_r, m_3, m_4) \) are real-valued,
\[
\prod_{j=1}^{l} \left| \begin{array}{ccc}
  n_r & m_1^j & m_2^j \\
  n_r & m_3^j & m_4^j \\
\end{array} \right|^2
\]
is non-negative. This implies that the sign of the summand of Equation (12) is determined by the quantum 6\( j \)-symbols associated to the \( S \)-pieces
\[
\prod_{i=1}^{k} \left| \begin{array}{ccc}
  n_r & m_i^i & m_i^i \\
  n_r & m_i^i & m_i^i \\
\end{array} \right|.
\]

We will now show that the sign of the quantum 6\( j \)-symbol associated to the 6-tuple \( (n_r, m, m, n_r, m, m) \) is independent of the region color \( m \). The admissibility conditions imply that \( \frac{n_r}{2} \leq m \leq r - 2 - \frac{n_r}{2} \). By Definition 3.2
\[
\left| \begin{array}{ccc}
  n_r & m & m \\
  n_r & m & m \\
\end{array} \right| = \Delta(n_r, m, m) \sum_{k=m+\frac{n_r}{2}}^{\min(m+n_r, 2m)} S_{m,k}
\]
where
\[
S_{m,k} = \frac{(-1)^{k} [k + 1]!}{[k - (m + \frac{n_r}{2})]! [m + n_r - k]! [2m - k]!}.
\]
Suppose that \( r \equiv 1 \mod 4 \). By the admissibility conditions, the 6-tuple \( (\frac{r-1}{2}, m, m, \frac{r-1}{2}, m, m) \) satisfies assumptions (1) and (2) of Theorem 3.4. In the case that \( r \equiv 3 \mod 4 \), the admissibility conditions of the 6-tuple \( (\frac{r-3}{2}, m, m, \frac{r-3}{2}, m, m) \) imply it satisfies assumptions (1) and (2) of Theorem 3.4 for all admissible region colors except \( m = \frac{n_r}{2} = \frac{r-3}{4} \) and \( m = r - 2 - \frac{n_r}{2} = \frac{3r-5}{4} \). We will consider these cases separately.

Suppose either \( r \equiv 1 \mod 4 \) or \( r \equiv 3 \mod 4 \) with \( \frac{r-3}{4} < m < \frac{3r-5}{4} \). Then by part (1) of Theorem 3.4, the sign of \( S_{m,k} \) is independent of \( k \). We now show that the sign of \( S_{m,k} \) is independent of the region color \( m \). Without loss of generality, consider the case \( k = m + \frac{n_r}{2} \):
\[
S_{m, m + \frac{n_r}{2}} = \frac{(-1)^{m + \frac{n_r}{2}} [m + \frac{n_r}{2} + 1]!}{[\frac{n_r}{2}]^2 [m - \frac{n_r}{2}]!}.
\]
Since the quantum integer \([n]\) is real-valued, we only need to consider the signs of \([m + \frac{n}{2} + 1]!\)
and \([m - \frac{n}{2}]!\). By assumption (1) of Theorem 3.4 and the assumption that \(m < r - 2 - \frac{n}{2}\),
we know \(0 \leq m - \frac{n}{2} \leq \frac{r-2}{2}\), so \([m - \frac{n}{2}]! > 0\) for all region colors \(m\). By assumption
(2) of Theorem 3.4 and the assumption that \(m > \frac{n}{2}\), we know \(\frac{r-2}{2} \leq m + \frac{n}{2} \leq r - 2\),
so \([m + \frac{n}{2} + 1] < 0\) for all region colors \(m\). Note that \([\frac{r-1}{2}]! > 0\), so \([m + \frac{n}{2} + 1]! =
[m + \frac{n}{2} + 1] \cdots [\frac{r+1}{2}] [\frac{r-1}{2}]!\) has sign
\((-1)^{m\frac{n}{2} + 1 - \frac{r-1}{2}}\).

Then the sign of \(S_{m,m + \frac{n}{2}}\) is
\((-1)^{m\frac{n}{2} + m + \frac{n}{2} + 1 - \frac{r-1}{2}} = (-1)^{-\frac{r-3}{2}},\)
which is independent of the region color \(m\). By part (1) of Theorem 3.4 and Equation (14),
the sign of the quantum 6j-symbol associated to \((n_r, m, m, n_r, m)\) is independent of
the region color \(m\), provided \(m \neq \frac{r-3}{4}, \frac{3r-5}{4}\) in the case \(r \equiv 3 \mod 4\). In particular,
the sign of the quantum 6j-symbol associated to \((n_r, m, m, n_r, m)\) is negative when \(r \equiv 1 \mod 4\)
and positive when \(r \equiv 3 \mod 4\). Thus it suffices to show that when \(r \equiv 3 \mod 4\), we retain
positivity when we color by \(m = \frac{r-3}{4}\) or \(m = \frac{3r-5}{4}\).

If \(m = \frac{r-3}{4}\), we have \(\max T_i = \frac{r-3}{2} = \min Q_j\), so
\[\Delta \left(\frac{r-3}{2}, \frac{r-3}{4}, \frac{r-3}{4}\right) \left(\frac{(-1)^{\frac{r-3}{2}} [\frac{r-3}{2} + 1]!}{\frac{r-3}{4}}\right) > 0.\]
Positivity follows because \(n_r = \frac{r-3}{2}\) is even and \(0 < \frac{r-3}{2} + 1 < \frac{5}{2}\).

If \(m = \frac{3r-5}{4}\), we have \(\max T_i = r - 2\) and \(\min Q_j = r - 2 + \frac{r-3}{4}\). However, since \([k+1]! = 0\)
for \(k \geq r - 2\),
\[\Delta \left(\frac{r-3}{2}, \frac{3r-5}{4}, \frac{3r-5}{4}\right) \left(\frac{(-1)^{r-2} [r-1]!}{\frac{r-3}{4}}\right) > 0.\]
Positivity follows because the denominator is positive and the numerator is given by \((-1)^{r-2}[r-1][r] \cdots [\frac{r+1}{2}] [\frac{r-1}{2}]!\), which has sign
\((-1)^{r-2 + (r-1 - \frac{r-1}{2})} = (-1)^{\frac{3r-5}{2}} = 1.\)
This means that for \(r \equiv 3 \mod 4\), the quantum 6j-symbol associated to \((n_r, m, m, n_r, m, m)\)
is positive for every admissible region color \(m\).

Therefore, the sign of \(|(P, gl)|_{(n_r)}^{\eta}\) is independent of the surface-coloring \(\eta\). From this, we
can conclude
\[\left|\left|(P, gl)\right|_{(n_r)}^{\eta}\right| = \sum_{\eta \in \text{adm}(P, gl, n_r)} \left|\left|(P, gl)\right|_{(n_r)}^{\eta}\right| = \sum_{\eta \in \text{adm}(P, gl, n_r)} \left|\left|(P, gl)\right|_{(n_r)}^{\eta}\right|.\]
In fact, since the number of $S$-pieces $k$ is even, every summand of Equation (12) is non-negative, though Equation (15) is sufficient for our purposes.

We can bound the sum in Equation (15) below by the absolute value of a single state $|(P, gl)|_{(n_r)}$. In particular, we consider the bound obtained from the surface-coloring $\eta = (n_r)$. This gives us the inequality

$$\liminf_{r \to \infty} \frac{4\pi}{r} \log |(P, gl)|_{(n_r)}| \geq \liminf_{r \to \infty} \frac{4\pi}{r} \log \left| \begin{array}{ccc} n_r & n_r & n_r \\ n_r & n_r & n_r \end{array} \right|^{k+2l}$$

$$= 2(k + 2l)v_8,$$

where the equality is due to Equation (6) in Lemma 3.5. This means the growth rate of the shadow state sum invariant is bounded below by the simplicial volume $v_3\|M_L(k, l)\| = 2(k + 2l)v_8$, establishing the lemma.

We can now prove Theorem 4.1.

**Proof of Theorem 4.1.** Fix a root of unity $q = e^{2\pi \sqrt{-1}}$. Let $M = \Sigma_g \times S^1$ be a trivial $S^1$-bundle over an orientable closed surface $\Sigma_g$, and let $L \subset M$ such that $M_L(k, l) \in \mathcal{M}$. Suppose $L$ is colored by $\gamma$, and consider the $I_r$-colored shadow $(P, gl, \gamma)$ associated to $M_L(k, l)$.

We begin by formulating $TV_r(M_L(k, l); q)$ in terms of the shadow state sum invariant. By Proposition 3.12 and Theorem 3.10, the Turaev-Viro invariant of $M_L(k, l)$ is given by

$$TV_r(M_L(k, l); q) = \sum_{\gamma \in \text{Adm}(r)} |RT_r(M, L, \gamma)|^2$$

$$= \sum_{\gamma \in \text{Adm}(r)} |C_r|(P, gl)|_\gamma|^2.$$

We start with the upper bound, which is proven analogously to the upper bound in Lemma 4.4. Let $B'_r = \#\text{Adm}(r)$ be the number of $r$-admissible colorings. Both $|C_r|$ and $B'_r$ grow at most polynomially with $r$, so we obtain the following bound.

$$\limsup_{r \to \infty} \frac{2\pi}{r} \log |TV_r(M_L(k, l); q)| = \limsup_{r \to \infty} \frac{2\pi}{r} \log \left| \sum_{\gamma \in \text{Adm}(r)} |RT_r(M, L, \gamma)|^2 \right|$$

$$\leq 2 \limsup_{r \to \infty} \max_{\gamma \in \text{Adm}(r)} \frac{2\pi}{r} \log ||(P, gl)|_\gamma||.$$

Since $|(P, gl)|_\gamma$ is a product of $k + 2l$ quantum 6j-symbols, we obtain the following bound using Theorem 3.3

$$\limsup_{r \to \infty} \frac{2\pi}{r} \log |TV_r(M_L(k, l); q)| \leq 2(k + 2l)v_8.$$

See the proof of Theorem 1.3 in [8] for a precise calculation of this bound.
We now focus on the lower bound. Since all summands are positive, we can bound the absolute value of the sum below by the absolute value of an individual summand. In particular, we consider the bound obtained from the summand corresponding to the $I_r$-coloring $\gamma = (n_r)$. This gives us the following inequality:

$$\liminf_{r \to \infty} \frac{2\pi}{r} \log |TV_r(M_L(k, l); q)| \geq \liminf_{r \to \infty} \frac{2\pi}{r} \log \left| |C_r|(P, gl)|_{(n_r)} |^2 \right| \geq \lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{4\pi}{r} \log \left| (P, gl)|_{(n_r)} \right|,$$

where equality holds because $|C_r|$ grows at most polynomially. Applying Lemma 4.4, we obtain the lower bound

$$\liminf_{r \to \infty} \frac{2\pi}{r} \log |TV_r(M_L(k, l); q)| \geq 2(k + 2l)v_8.$$

Therefore, we can conclude that

$$\lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{2\pi}{r} \log |TV_r(M_L(k, l); q)| = 2(k + 2l)v_8 = v_3||M_L||.$$

\[\Box\]

5 Future Directions

By Theorem 3.4, we remark that the quantum 6j-symbols have a connection with the hyperbolic volumes of truncated tetrahedra [2, 4]. In particular, we use that when all of the sequences of colors grow as $\frac{r}{2}$, the quantum 6j-symbols have asymptotics corresponding to the volume of an ideal hyperbolic octahedron. One can similarly consider different sequences of colors for the invariants of this family of manifolds. In these cases, the manifolds will not have a complete hyperbolic metric; however, by a conjecture of Wong and Yang [24], it is expected that the asymptotics of the relative Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants for these sequences of colors still recover geometric properties of the truncated tetrahedra used in the construction. This conjecture has been studied by Wong and Yang for manifolds with complements homeomorphic to either the fundamental shadow links [24] or the figure-eight knot [25]. In our future work, we will investigate this conjecture for the family of manifolds $M$ in further depth.
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