

CONTINUANT, CHEBYSHEV POLYNOMIALS, AND RILEY POLYNOMIALS

KYEONGHEE JO AND HYUK KIM

ABSTRACT. In the previous paper, we showed that the Riley polynomial $\mathcal{R}_K(\lambda)$ of each 2-bridge knot K is split into $\mathcal{R}_K(-u^2) = \pm g(u)g(-u)$, for some integral coefficient polynomial $g(u) \in \mathbb{Z}[u]$. In this paper, we study this splitting property of the Riley polynomial. We show that the Riley polynomial can be expressed by ‘ ϵ -Chebyshev polynomials’, which is a generalization of Chebyshev polynomials containing the information of ϵ_i -sequence ($\epsilon_i = (-1)^{\lfloor \frac{i}{\alpha} \rfloor}$) of the 2-bridge knot $K = S(\alpha, \beta)$, and then we give an explicit formula for the splitting polynomial $g(u)$ also as ϵ -Chebyshev polynomials. As applications, we find a sufficient condition for the irreducibility of the Riley polynomials and show the unimodal property of the symmetrized Riley polynomial.

1. INTRODUCTION

Riley investigated non-abelian parabolic representations of 2-bridge knot groups in [13] and he showed that for each 2-bridge knot K , there is an integer coefficient polynomial $\mathcal{R}_K(\lambda) \in \mathbb{Z}[\lambda]$, the Riley polynomial, and each zero of this polynomial corresponds to a parabolic representation (see Theorem 2 of [13]).

In [6], we studied the parabolic representations of 2-bridge knots and links by finding arc coloring vectors on the Conway diagram. The method we used is to convert the system of conjugation quandle equations to that of symplectic quandle equations. In this approach, we naturally get to see the Riley polynomial as $\mathcal{R}_K(-u^2)$ instead of $\mathcal{R}_K(\lambda)$. In the process, we discovered some interesting arithmetic properties of the Riley polynomials. Namely, splitting of the Riley polynomial, $\mathcal{R}_K(-u^2) = \pm g(u)g(-u)$, for some integral coefficient polynomial $g(u) \in \mathbb{Z}[u]$, and the fact that the trace field is generated by u instead of $\lambda = -u^2$. (See Theorem 5.1 and Proposition 5.5 of [6].)

Our main concern in this paper is the splitting property of the Riley polynomial. We will show in §5 that the Riley polynomial $\mathcal{R}_K(-u^2)$ can be expressed by ‘ ϵ -Chebyshev polynomials’, which is a generalization of Chebyshev polynomials containing the information of ϵ_i -sequence ($\epsilon_i = (-1)^{\lfloor \frac{i}{\alpha} \rfloor}$) of the 2-bridge knot $K = S(\alpha, \beta)$, and then using this together with some properties related to Continuant we’ll find an explicit formula for the splitting polynomial $g(u)$ of the Riley polynomial, which is also expressed by ϵ -Chebyshev polynomials. See §4 for the definition of ϵ -Chebyshev polynomials.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 57M25, 57M27.

Key words and phrases. 2-bridge knots, parabolic representations, Chebyshev polynomials, Continuant, Riley polynomials, unimodal polynomials.

As applications, we will find a sufficient condition for the irreducibility of the Riley polynomials in §6, and show under the assumption of Artin's primitive root conjecture that the set of prime numbers α such that the Riley polynomial of a 2-bridge knot $S(\alpha, \beta)$ is irreducible for each β has the asymptotic density $\geq 0.3739558136\dots$

In the last section §7, we will define the symmetrized Riley polynomial for each Riley polynomial and then show that they are all unimodal functions. More precisely, by symmetrizing the variable u to $u = x + \frac{1}{x}$, all the Riley polynomials $\mathcal{R}(-u^2)$ become unimodal. This result is similar to the unimodal property of the Alexander polynomial, well known as the Fox's conjecture.

2. PARABOLIC REPRESENTATIONS OF 2-BRIDGE KMOT GROUPS

The knot group $G(K)$ of a 2-bridge knot $K = S(\alpha, \beta)$ always has a presentation of the form

$$G(K) = \pi_1(S^3 \setminus K) = \langle x, y \mid wx = yw \rangle,$$

where w is of the form

$$w = x^{\epsilon_1} y^{\epsilon_2} x^{\epsilon_3} y^{\epsilon_4} \dots x^{\epsilon_{\alpha-2}} y^{\epsilon_{\alpha-1}}$$

with each $\epsilon_i = (-1)^{\lfloor \frac{i}{\alpha} \rfloor}$ and $\epsilon_i = \epsilon_{\alpha-i}$. Here the generators x and y come from the two bridges and represent the meridians. More generally, Riley defined 2-bridge "knot" groups as follows and studied their parabolic representations.

Definition 2.1. A (2-bridge) *knot group* is a group G with a presentation

$$(2.1) \quad G = \langle x, y \mid wx = yw \rangle,$$

where w is of the form

$$(2.2) \quad w = x^{\epsilon_1} y^{\epsilon_2} x^{\epsilon_3} y^{\epsilon_4} \dots x^{\epsilon_{\alpha-2}} y^{\epsilon_{\alpha-1}} \quad (\alpha \text{ is an odd integer } \geq 3)$$

and $\epsilon_i = \epsilon_{\alpha-i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, \alpha - 1$.

We write $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_{\alpha-1})$ and $G = G(\epsilon) = G(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_{\alpha-1})$. Suppose that $\rho : G(\epsilon) \rightarrow SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ is a non-abelian *parabolic* representation, i.e., the trace of ρ -image of any meridian is 2. Then after conjugating if necessary, we may assume

$$(2.3) \quad \rho(x) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \rho(y) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \lambda & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Riley had shown in [13] that λ determines a non-abelian parabolic representation if and only if $W_{11} = 0$. Here W_{ij} is the (i, j) -element of

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{aligned} W(\epsilon) &= \rho(w) = \rho(x)^{\epsilon_1} \rho(y)^{\epsilon_2} \rho(x)^{\epsilon_3} \rho(y)^{\epsilon_4} \dots \rho(x)^{\epsilon_{\alpha-2}} \rho(y)^{\epsilon_{\alpha-1}} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{\epsilon_1} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \lambda & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{\epsilon_2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{\epsilon_3} \dots \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{\epsilon_{\alpha-2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \lambda & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{\epsilon_{\alpha-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

for $i, j = 1, 2$. Furthermore W_{11} has no repeated roots and the non-abelian parabolic representations bijectively correspond to the roots of the polynomial $W_{11} \in \mathbb{Z}[\lambda]$, the *Riley polynomial* $\mathcal{R}(\lambda)$.

Note that every knot group $G(K)$ of a 2-bridge knot K is a knot group, but there is a knot group which is not a 2-bridge knot group. For example, a word $w = xy^{-1}x^{-1}y^{-1}x^{-1}y$ does not define any 2-bridge knot group: For $\alpha = 7$, only the following set of ϵ_i -sequences are from 2-bridge knot groups.

$$\{\pm(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1), \pm(1, 1, -1, -1, 1, 1), \pm(1, -1, 1, 1, -1, 1)\}$$

The following formulas are well-known. (See for instance [9].) But we present a proof for the convenience of readers and of later use.

Proposition 2.2. *For a ϵ_i -sequence $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_{2m})$, let*

$$W(\epsilon) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{\epsilon_1} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \lambda & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{\epsilon_2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{\epsilon_3} \cdots \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{\epsilon_{2m-1}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \lambda & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{\epsilon_{2m}} = \begin{pmatrix} W_{11} & W_{12} \\ W_{21} & W_{22} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} W_{11} &= 1 + \lambda \sum_{i_1: \text{odd}}^{\wedge} \epsilon_{i_1} \epsilon_{i_2} + \cdots + \lambda^k \sum_{i_1: \text{odd}}^{\wedge} \epsilon_{i_1} \cdots \epsilon_{i_{2k}} + \cdots + \lambda^m \epsilon_1 \epsilon_2 \epsilon_3 \cdots \epsilon_{2m} \\ W_{12} &= \sum_{i_1: \text{odd}}^{\wedge} \epsilon_{i_1} + \lambda \sum_{i_1: \text{odd}}^{\wedge} \epsilon_{i_1} \epsilon_{i_2} \epsilon_{i_3} + \cdots + \lambda^{m-1} \epsilon_1 \epsilon_2 \epsilon_3 \cdots \epsilon_{2m-1} \\ W_{21} &= \lambda \sum_{i_1: \text{even}}^{\wedge} \epsilon_{i_1} + \lambda^2 \sum_{i_1: \text{even}}^{\wedge} \epsilon_{i_1} \epsilon_{i_2} \epsilon_{i_3} + \cdots + \lambda^m \epsilon_2 \epsilon_3 \epsilon_4 \cdots \epsilon_{2m} \\ W_{22} &= 1 + \lambda \sum_{i_1: \text{even}}^{\wedge} \epsilon_{i_1} \epsilon_{i_2} + \lambda^2 \sum_{i_1: \text{even}}^{\wedge} \epsilon_{i_1} \epsilon_{i_2} \epsilon_{i_3} \epsilon_{i_4} + \cdots + \lambda^k \sum_{i_1: \text{even}}^{\wedge} \epsilon_{i_1} \cdots \epsilon_{i_{2k}} + \cdots + \lambda^{m-1} \epsilon_2 \epsilon_3 \cdots \epsilon_{2m-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Here the notations $\sum_{i_1: \text{odd}}^{\wedge}$ and $\sum_{i_1: \text{even}}^{\wedge}$ are the summations defined as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i_1: \text{odd}}^{\wedge} &: i_1 < i_2 < i_3 < \cdots < i_k, \quad i_{2i+1} \text{ is odd, } i_{2i} \text{ is even} \\ \sum_{i_1: \text{even}}^{\wedge} &: i_1 < i_2 < i_3 < \cdots < i_k, \quad i_{2i+1} \text{ is even, } i_{2i} \text{ is odd} \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The formulas hold for $m = 1$ since

$$\begin{aligned} W(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2) &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{\epsilon_1} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \lambda & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{\epsilon_2} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \epsilon_1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \epsilon_2 \lambda & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 + \lambda \epsilon_1 \epsilon_2 & \epsilon_1 \\ \epsilon_2 \lambda & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that the formulas hold for all $m < n$. Then

$$W(\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_{2n}) = W(\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_{2n-2}) \begin{pmatrix} 1 + \lambda \epsilon_{2n-1} \epsilon_{2n} & \epsilon_{2n-1} \\ \epsilon_{2n} \lambda & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

and thus $W(\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_{2n})_{11}$ is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & W(\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_{2n-2})_{11} (1 + \lambda \epsilon_{2n-1} \epsilon_{2n}) + W(\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_{2n-2})_{12} \epsilon_{2n} \lambda \\ &= (1 + \lambda \epsilon_{2n-1} \epsilon_{2n}) (1 + \lambda \sum_{i_1: \text{odd}, i_2 < 2n}^{\wedge} \epsilon_{i_1} \epsilon_{i_2} + \dots + \lambda^{n-1} \epsilon_1 \epsilon_2 \dots \epsilon_{2n-2}) \\ & \quad + \epsilon_{2n} \lambda \left(\sum_{i_1: \text{odd}, i_1 < 2n-1}^{\wedge} \epsilon_{i_1} + \lambda \sum_{i_1: \text{odd}, i_3 < 2n-1}^{\wedge} \epsilon_{i_1} \epsilon_{i_2} \epsilon_{i_3} + \dots + \lambda^{n-2} \epsilon_1 \epsilon_2 \dots \epsilon_{2n-3} \right) \\ &= 1 + \lambda (\epsilon_{2n-1} \epsilon_{2n} + \sum_{i_1: \text{odd}, i_2 < 2n}^{\wedge} \epsilon_{i_1} \epsilon_{i_2} + \sum_{i_1: \text{odd}}^{\wedge} \epsilon_{i_1} \epsilon_{2n}) + \dots \\ & \quad + \lambda^{n-1} [(\epsilon_1 \epsilon_2 \dots \epsilon_{2n-2} + \epsilon_{2n-1} \epsilon_{2n} (\sum_{i_1: \text{odd}, i_{2n-4} < 2n}^{\wedge} \epsilon_{i_1} \dots \epsilon_{i_{2n-4}}) + \epsilon_1 \epsilon_2 \dots \epsilon_{2n-3} \epsilon_{2n})] + \lambda^n \epsilon_1 \epsilon_2 \dots \epsilon_{2n} \\ &= 1 + \lambda \sum_{i_1: \text{odd}}^{\wedge} \epsilon_{i_1} \epsilon_{i_2} + \dots + \lambda^k \sum_{i_1: \text{odd}}^{\wedge} \epsilon_{i_1} \dots \epsilon_{i_{2k}} + \dots + \lambda^n \epsilon_1 \epsilon_2 \epsilon_3 \dots \epsilon_{2n} \end{aligned}$$

which proves that the formulas hold for $m = n$ also. Similarly we can check that $W(\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_{2n})_{12}$ and $W(\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_{2n})_{22}$ also satisfy the given formulas. \square

Let W^* be the matrix obtained from W by exchanging $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ and $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \lambda & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, that is,

$$W^*(\epsilon) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \lambda & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{\epsilon_1} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{\epsilon_2} \dots \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \lambda & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{\epsilon_{2m-1}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{\epsilon_{2m}}.$$

Then we have

Lemma 2.3. $W^*(\epsilon) = \begin{pmatrix} W_{22} & \lambda^{-1} W_{21} \\ \lambda W_{12} & W_{11} \end{pmatrix}.$

Proof. The identity holds for $m = 1$ since

$$W(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \epsilon_1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \epsilon_2 \lambda & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + \lambda \epsilon_1 \epsilon_2 & \epsilon_1 \\ \epsilon_2 \lambda & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

and

$$W^*(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \epsilon_1 \lambda & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \epsilon_2 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \epsilon_2 \\ \epsilon_1 \lambda & 1 + \lambda \epsilon_1 \epsilon_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Assume that the identity holds for all $m < n$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} W^*(\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_{2n}) &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \epsilon_1 \lambda & 1 \end{pmatrix} W(\epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_{2n-1}) \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \epsilon_{2n} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ W(\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_{2n}) &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \epsilon_1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} W^*(\epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_{2n-1}) \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \epsilon_{2n} \lambda & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

If we let $W' = W(\epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_{2n-1})$, then

$$\begin{aligned} W^*(\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_{2n}) &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \epsilon_1 \lambda & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} W'_{11} & W'_{12} \\ W'_{21} & W'_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \epsilon_{2n} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} W'_{11} & W'_{12} \\ \epsilon_1 \lambda W'_{11} + W'_{21} & \epsilon_1 \lambda W'_{12} + W'_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \epsilon_{2n} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} W'_{11} & W'_{12} + \epsilon_{2n} W'_{11} \\ \epsilon_1 \lambda W'_{11} + W'_{21} & * \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

and by the induction hypothesis

$$\begin{aligned} W(\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_{2n}) &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \epsilon_1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} W'_{22} & \lambda^{-1} W'_{21} \\ \lambda W'_{12} & W'_{11} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \epsilon_{2n} \lambda & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} W'_{22} + \epsilon_1 \lambda W'_{12} & \lambda^{-1} W'_{21} + \epsilon_1 W'_{11} \\ \lambda W'_{12} & W'_{11} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \epsilon_{2n} \lambda & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} * & \lambda^{-1} W'_{21} + \epsilon_1 W'_{11} \\ \lambda(W'_{12} + \epsilon_{2n} W'_{11}) & W'_{11} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

This implies that the identity holds for $m = n$ also. \square

Corollary 2.4. *For a symmetric ϵ_i -sequence $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_{2m})$, that is, $\epsilon_i = \epsilon_{2m-i+1}$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, 2m$, we have*

- (i) $W(\epsilon) = \begin{pmatrix} W_{11} & W_{12} \\ \lambda W_{12} & W_{22} \end{pmatrix}$, $W^*(\epsilon) = \begin{pmatrix} W_{22} & W_{12} \\ \lambda W_{12} & W_{11} \end{pmatrix}$
- (ii) λ defines a non-abelian parabolic representation of the *kmot* group $G(\epsilon)$ by (2.3) if and only if $W_{11} = 0$.

Proof. (i) follows immediately from Proposition 2.2.

Since

$$\begin{pmatrix} W_{11} & W_{12} \\ \lambda W_{12} & W_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} W_{11} & W_{11} + W_{12} \\ \lambda W_{12} & \lambda W_{12} + W_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \lambda & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} W_{11} & W_{12} \\ \lambda W_{12} & W_{22} \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} W_{11} & W_{12} \\ \lambda(W_{11} + W_{12}) & \lambda W_{12} + W_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \\ \begin{pmatrix} W_{11} & W_{12} \\ \lambda W_{12} & W_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \lambda & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} W_{11} & W_{12} \\ \lambda W_{12} & W_{22} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

is equivalent to $W_{11} = 0$, which implies (ii). \square

3. RECURSIVE FORMULA FOR RILEY POLYNOMIALS

For each symmetric ϵ_i -sequence $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_{2m})$, we have seen that there exist two monic polynomials $f_\epsilon(\lambda) = W_{11}(\lambda), g_\epsilon(\lambda) = W_{12}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{Z}[\lambda]$ and $W(\epsilon) \in SL(2, \mathbb{Z}[\lambda])$ such that

$$W(\epsilon) = \begin{pmatrix} W_{11}(\lambda) & W_{12}(\lambda) \\ \lambda W_{12}(\lambda) & \frac{1 + \lambda W_{12}(\lambda)^2}{W_{11}(\lambda)} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} f_\epsilon(\lambda) & g_\epsilon(\lambda) \\ \lambda g_\epsilon(\lambda) & \frac{1 + \lambda g_\epsilon(\lambda)^2}{f_\epsilon(\lambda)} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that

$$(3.1) \quad f_{-\epsilon}(\lambda) = f_\epsilon(\lambda), \quad g_{-\epsilon}(\lambda) = -g_\epsilon(\lambda).$$

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\epsilon, \epsilon', \epsilon''$ be symmetric ϵ_i -sequences such that*

$$\epsilon = (\epsilon_n, \dots, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n), \epsilon' = (\epsilon_{n-1}, \dots, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_{n-1}), \epsilon'' = (\epsilon_{n-2}, \dots, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_{n-2}).$$

Then we have the followings.

- (i) $g_\epsilon = g_{\epsilon'} + \epsilon_n f_{\epsilon'}$
- (ii) $f_\epsilon f_{\epsilon'} = 1 + \lambda g_\epsilon^2$
- (iii) $W = \begin{pmatrix} f_\epsilon & g_\epsilon \\ \lambda g_\epsilon & f_{\epsilon'} \end{pmatrix}$
- (iv) $f_\epsilon = f_{\epsilon''} + \lambda f_{\epsilon'} + 2\epsilon_n \lambda g_{\epsilon'}$ for $n > 1$
- (v) $\epsilon_n (f_\epsilon - f_{\epsilon''}) = \lambda (g_\epsilon + g_{\epsilon'})$ for $n > 1$

Here we let $f_{\epsilon'}(\lambda) = 1$ and $g_{\epsilon'}(\lambda) = 0$ when $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \epsilon_1)$.

Proof. (i)-(iv) follow immediately from

$$\begin{aligned} W(\epsilon) &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \epsilon_n \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} W^*(\epsilon') \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \epsilon_n \lambda & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \epsilon_n \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1 + \lambda g_{\epsilon'}^2}{f_{\epsilon'}} & g_{\epsilon'} \\ \lambda g_{\epsilon'} & f_{\epsilon'} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \epsilon_n \lambda & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1 + \lambda g_{\epsilon'}^2}{f_{\epsilon'}} + \epsilon_n \lambda g_{\epsilon'} & g_{\epsilon'} + \epsilon_n f_{\epsilon'} \\ \lambda g_{\epsilon'} & f_{\epsilon'} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \epsilon_n \lambda & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1 + \lambda g_{\epsilon'}^2}{f_{\epsilon'}} + 2\epsilon_n \lambda g_{\epsilon'} + \lambda f_{\epsilon'} & g_{\epsilon'} + \epsilon_n f_{\epsilon'} \\ \lambda (g_{\epsilon'} + \epsilon_n f_{\epsilon'}) & f_{\epsilon'} \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

and then (v) is proved as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_n f_\epsilon &= \epsilon_n (f_{\epsilon''} + \lambda f_{\epsilon'} + 2\epsilon_n \lambda g_{\epsilon'}) \\ &= \epsilon_n f_{\epsilon''} + \lambda (2g_{\epsilon'} + \epsilon_n f_{\epsilon'}) = \epsilon_n f_{\epsilon''} + \lambda (g_{\epsilon'} + (g_{\epsilon'} + \epsilon_n f_{\epsilon'})) \\ &= \epsilon_n f_{\epsilon''} + \lambda (g_{\epsilon'} + g_\epsilon) \end{aligned}$$

□

Now we can deduce recursive formulas for f_ϵ and g_ϵ using Proposition 3.1 as follows. For any sequence e_1, e_2, e_3, \dots , with $e_i \in \{-1, 1\}$, consider the set of symmetric ϵ_i -sequences

$$\mathbf{e}(n) = (e_n, \dots, e_2, e_1, e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n),$$

and denote $f_{\mathbf{e}(n)}$ and $g_{\mathbf{e}(n)}$ by f_n and g_n . Let $f_0 = 1$ and $g_0 = 0$. Then by Proposition 3.1 we have

$$(3.2) \quad W(\mathbf{e}(n)) = \begin{pmatrix} f_n & g_n \\ \lambda g_n & f_{n-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} g_n &= g_{n-1} + e_n f_{n-1} \\ f_n f_{n-1} &= 1 + \lambda g_n^2 \\ f_n &= f_{n-2} + \lambda f_{n-1} + 2e_n \lambda g_{n-1} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we have

Proposition 3.2. f_n and g_n satisfy the following recursive formulas.

- (i) $f_n = f_{n-2} + \lambda f_{n-1} + 2e_n \lambda (e_{n-1} f_{n-2} + e_{n-2} f_{n-3} + \dots + e_2 f_1 + e_1 f_0)$
- (ii) $g_n = e_n f_{n-1} + e_{n-1} f_{n-2} + \dots + e_2 f_1 + e_1 f_0$

Proof. By applying the first identity of (3.3) repeatedly, we get (ii):

$$\begin{aligned} g_n &= g_{n-1} + e_n f_{n-1} \\ &= e_n f_{n-1} + e_{n-1} f_{n-2} + g_{n-2} \\ &= e_n f_{n-1} + e_{n-1} f_{n-2} + \dots + e_2 f_1 + e_1 f_0 \end{aligned}$$

and using this and the third identity of (3.3) we have (i):

$$\begin{aligned} f_n &= f_{n-2} + \lambda f_{n-1} + 2e_n \lambda g_{n-1} \\ &= f_{n-2} + \lambda f_{n-1} + 2e_n \lambda (e_{n-1} f_{n-2} + e_{n-2} f_{n-3} + \dots + e_2 f_1 + e_1 f_0) \end{aligned}$$

□

4. ϵ -CHEBYSHEV POLYNOMIALS AND THE CONTINUANT

Chebyshev polynomials are defined by a three-term recursion

$$g_{n+1}(t) = t g_n(t) - g_{n-1}(t).$$

We denote the Chebyshev polynomials $g_n(t)$ with the initial condition $g_0(t) = a, g_1(t) = b$ by $Ch_n^t(a, b)$, which clearly depends on the initial condition linearly. And the following properties are also obvious:

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{aligned} Ch_n^t(a, b) &= Ch_{n-k}^t(Ch_k^t(a, b), Ch_{k+1}^t(a, b)) \\ Ch_n^t(a, b) &= a Ch_n^t(1, 0) + b Ch_n^t(0, 1) \end{aligned}$$

If we denote a particular Chebyshev polynomials $Ch_n^t(0, 1)$ by $s_n(t)$, then

$$Ch_n^t(1, 0) = Ch_{n-1}^t(0, -1) = -Ch_{n-1}^t(0, 1) = -s_{n-1}(t),$$

and arbitrary Chebyshev polynomials are expressed as linear combinations of $s_{n-1}(t)$ and $s_n(t)$ as follows :

$$Ch_n^t(a, b) = -as_{n-1}(t) + bs_n(t)$$

The following identities for Chebyshev polynomials are well-known or easily proved using induction. (See [5, 15, 17] for references.)

Lemma 4.1. *Let*

$$v_n(x) := s_{n+1}(x) - s_n(x) = Ch_n^x(1, x-1) = Ch_{n+1}^x(1, 1).$$

Then

- (i) $s_n(x)^2 - s_{n-1}(x)s_{n+1}(x) = 1$
- (ii) $v_n(-x) = (-1)^n(s_{n+1}(x) + s_n(x))$
- (iii) $v_n(x)v_{n-1}(x) = 1 + (x-2)s_n(x)^2$
- (iv) $v_n(2-x^2) = v_n(x)v_n(-x)$
- (v) $s_{2n+1}(x) = (-1)^n v_n(-x)v_n(x)$
- (vi) $\frac{1}{x}s_{2n}(x) = s_n(x^2-2) = (-1)^{n+1}s_n(2-x^2)$

Note that $U_n(x) = s_{n+1}(2x)$ and $V_n(x) = v_n(2x)$ are exactly the Chebyshev polynomials of the second and third kinds, respectively.

Definition 4.2. For a given ϵ_i -sequence $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3, \dots)$, $\epsilon_i = \pm 1$, we will call the family of polynomials $\{g_n(t)\}$ defined by a three-term recursion

$$g_{n+1}(t) = \epsilon_n t g_n(t) - g_{n-1}(t)$$

ϵ -Chebyshev polynomials.

We will denote the ϵ -Chebyshev polynomials $g_n(t)$ with the initial condition $g_0(t) = a$, $g_1(t) = b$ by $\mathcal{E}Ch_n^t(a, b)$, and $\sigma^k(\epsilon)$ -Chebyshev polynomials with the initial condition a, b by $\mathcal{E}^{+k}Ch_n^t(a, b)$, where $\sigma(\epsilon)$ is an ϵ_i -sequence 1-shifted from ϵ to the right, that is,

$$\sigma^k(\epsilon)_i = \epsilon_{i+k}.$$

If we denote a particular ϵ -Chebyshev polynomials $\mathcal{E}Ch_n^t(0, 1)$ by $s_n^\epsilon(t)$, then we have

$$\mathcal{E}Ch_n^t(a, b) = \mathcal{E}^{+k}Ch_{n-k}^t(\mathcal{E}Ch_k^t(a, b), \mathcal{E}Ch_{k+1}^t(a, b))$$

and

$$\mathcal{E}Ch_n^t(a, b) = -as_{n-1}^{\sigma(\epsilon)}(t) + bs_n^\epsilon(t).$$

Note that for a finite ϵ_i -sequence $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_m)$, $\mathcal{E}Ch_n^t(a, b)$ is defined only for $n = 0, 1, \dots, m+1$ and $\mathcal{E}^{+k}Ch_n^t(a, b)$ is defined only for $n = 0, 1, \dots, m-k+1$.

The following two lemmas can be proved easily from the definitions of ϵ -Chebyshev polynomials $s_n^\epsilon(t)$ and $v_n^\epsilon(t)$.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $v_n^\epsilon(t)$ be the ϵ -Chebyshev polynomials defined by*

$$v_n^\epsilon(t) := \mathcal{E}Ch_{n+1}^t(1, 1).$$

Then

- (i) $v_{n+2}^\epsilon(t) = \epsilon_{n+2} t v_{n+1}^\epsilon(t) - v_n^\epsilon(t)$, that is, $v_n^\epsilon(t) = \mathcal{E}^{+1}Ch_n^t(1, \epsilon_1 t - 1)$

- (ii) $v_n^\epsilon(t) = s_{n+1}^\epsilon(t) - s_n^{\sigma(\epsilon)}(t)$
- (iii) $v_n^\epsilon(-t) = (-1)^n (s_{n+1}^\epsilon(t) + s_n^{\sigma(\epsilon)}(t)) = (-1)^n \mathcal{ECh}_{n+1}^t(-1, 1)$

Lemma 4.4. *The following identities hold for $n = 0, 1, \dots$.*

- (i) $s_n^{-\epsilon}(t) = (-1)^{n+1} s_n^\epsilon(t)$
- (ii) $v_n^{-\epsilon}(t) = v_n^\epsilon(-t)$

The *continuant* is a multivariate polynomial representing the determinant of the following tridiagonal matrix.

$$K_n(c_1, \dots, c_n) := \det \begin{pmatrix} c_1 & 1 & & & \\ 1 & c_2 & 1 & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & 1 & c_{n-1} & 1 \\ & & & & 1 & c_n \end{pmatrix}$$

We set $K_0 := 1, K_{-1} := 0$ for convenience. The continuant has a long history and is related to various fields. For example, continuants occur as both the numerator and the denominator of continued fractions:

$$c_1 - \frac{1}{c_2 - \frac{1}{\ddots - \frac{1}{c_{n-1} - \frac{1}{c_n}}}} = \frac{K_n(c_1, \dots, c_n)}{K_{n-1}(c_2, \dots, c_n)}$$

In fact, the term ‘‘continuant’’ is an abbreviation for ‘‘continued-fraction determinant’’. (See [2] for a reference.)

Note that we get the following identities immediately from the definition of the continuant.

- $K_n(c_1, \dots, c_n) = c_n K_{n-1}(c_1, \dots, c_{n-1}) - K_{n-2}(c_1, \dots, c_{n-2})$
- $K_n(c_1, \dots, c_n) = K_n(c_n, \dots, c_1)$
- $K_n(-c_1, \dots, -c_n) = (-1)^n K_n(c_1, \dots, c_n)$

The first identity shows the Chebyshev property and we will relate the continuant to ϵ -Chebyshev polynomials by letting $c_i = e_i t$. The following is known as Euler’s Identity and play the crucial role for the combinatorial properties of continuant. (See [3], [11], or [16] for references.)

Proposition 4.5 (Euler’s Identity). *For $0 < i < j < k < l$, the following identity holds.*

$$\begin{aligned} & K_{k-i-1}(c_{i+1}, \dots, c_{k-1}) K_{l-j-1}(c_{j+1}, \dots, c_{l-1}) \\ = & K_{j-i-1}(c_{i+1}, \dots, c_{j-1}) K_{l-k-1}(c_{k+1}, \dots, c_{l-1}) + K_{k-j-1}(c_{j+1}, \dots, c_{k-1}) K_{l-i-1}(c_{i+1}, \dots, c_{l-1}) \end{aligned}$$

Applying Proposition 4.5 to the case $k = j + 1$, we get

Corollary 4.6.

$$\begin{aligned} & K_{j-i}(c_{i+1}, \dots, c_j) K_{l-j-1}(c_{j+1}, \dots, c_{l-1}) \\ = & K_{j-i-1}(c_{i+1}, \dots, c_{j-1}) K_{l-j-2}(c_{j+2}, \dots, c_{l-1}) + K_{l-i-1}(c_{i+1}, \dots, c_{l-1}) \end{aligned}$$

Using Corollary 4.6 we get the following lemma.

Lemma 4.7. *The following identities hold.*

- (i) $K_{2n}(c_n, c_{n-1}, \dots, c_1, c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n) = K_n(c_1, \dots, c_n)^2 - K_{n-1}(c_2, \dots, c_n)^2$
- (ii) $\sum_{k=1}^n K_{2k}(c_1, c_2, \dots, c_k, c_k, \dots, c_2, c_1) = K_n(c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n)^2 - 1$

Proof. (i) Applying Corollary 4.6 to the case $i = 0, j = n + 1, l = 2n + 1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & K_{2n}(c_n, c_{n-1}, \dots, c_1, c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n) \\ &= K_n(c_n, \dots, c_1)K_n(c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n) - K_{n-1}(c_n, \dots, c_2)K_{n-1}(c_2, \dots, c_n) \\ &= K_n(c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n)^2 - K_{n-1}(c_2, \dots, c_n)^2 \end{aligned}$$

(ii) By applying (i) repeatedly we have

$$\begin{aligned} K_n(c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n)^2 &= K_{2n}(c_1, \dots, c_n, c_n, \dots, c_1) + K_{n-1}(c_1, \dots, c_{n-1})^2 \\ &= K_{2n}(c_1, \dots, c_n, c_n, \dots, c_1) + K_{2n-1}(c_1, \dots, c_{n-1}, c_{n-1}, \dots, c_1) + K_{n-2}(c_1, \dots, c_{n-2})^2 \\ &= \sum_{k=n-2}^n K_{2k}(c_1, c_2, \dots, c_k, c_k, \dots, c_2, c_1) + K_{n-3}(c_1, \dots, c_{n-3})^2 \\ &= \dots \\ &= \sum_{k=2}^n K_{2k}(c_1, c_2, \dots, c_k, c_k, \dots, c_2, c_1) + K_1(c_1)^2 \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^n K_{2k}(c_1, c_2, \dots, c_k, c_k, \dots, c_2, c_1) + 1 \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 4.8. *The following identities hold.*

- (i) $K_{2n+1}(c_1, \dots, c_n, x, -c_n, \dots, -c_1) = (-1)^n x K_n(c_1, \dots, c_n)^2$
- (ii) $\frac{K_{2n+1}(c_1, \dots, c_n, x, c_1, \dots, c_n)}{K_n(c_1, \dots, c_n)} = x K_n(c_1, \dots, c_n) - K_{n-1}(c_2, \dots, c_n) - K_{n-1}(c_1, \dots, c_{n-1})$
- (iii) $\frac{K_{2n+1}(c_1, \dots, c_n, x, -c_1, \dots, -c_n)}{K_n(c_1, \dots, c_n)} = (-1)^n [x K_n(c_1, \dots, c_n) + K_{n-1}(c_2, \dots, c_n) - K_{n-1}(c_1, \dots, c_{n-1})]$
- (iv) $K_{2n+1}(c_1, \dots, c_n, x, c_n, \dots, c_1) = K_n(c_1, \dots, c_n)(x K_n(c_1, \dots, c_n) - 2K_n(c_1, \dots, c_{n-1}))$

Proof. Applying Corollary 4.6 to the case $i = 0, j = n + 1, l = 2n + 2$, we get the identities (i) and (ii) as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(i)} \quad & K_{2n+1}(c_1, \dots, c_n, x, -c_n, \dots, -c_1) \\
&= K_n(c_1, \dots, c_n)K_{n+1}(x, -c_n, \dots, -c_1) - K_{n-1}(c_1, \dots, c_{n-1})K_n(-c_n, \dots, -c_1) \\
&= (-1)^{n+1}K_n(c_1, \dots, c_n)K_{n+1}(-x, c_n, \dots, c_1) - (-1)^n K_{n-1}(c_1, \dots, c_{n-1})K_n(c_n, \dots, c_1) \\
&= (-1)^{n+1}K_n(c_1, \dots, c_n)[K_{n+1}(-x, c_n, \dots, c_1) + K_{n-1}(c_1, \dots, c_{n-1})] \\
&= (-1)^{n+1}K_n(c_1, \dots, c_n)[K_{n+1}(c_1, \dots, c_n, -x) + K_{n-1}(c_1, \dots, c_{n-1})] \\
&= (-1)^{n+1}K_n(c_1, \dots, c_n)[-xK_n(c_1, \dots, c_n) - K_{n-1}(c_1, \dots, c_{n-1}) + K_{n-1}(c_1, \dots, c_{n-1})] \\
&= (-1)^n x K_n(c_1, \dots, c_n)^2
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(ii)} \quad & K_{2n+1}(c_1, \dots, c_n, x, c_1, \dots, c_n) \\
&= K_n(c_1, \dots, c_n)K_{n+1}(x, c_1, \dots, c_n) - K_{n-1}(c_1, \dots, c_{n-1})K_n(c_1, \dots, c_n) \\
&= K_n(c_1, \dots, c_n)[K_{n+1}(x, c_1, \dots, c_n) - K_{n-1}(c_1, \dots, c_{n-1})] \\
&= K_n(c_1, \dots, c_n)[xK_n(c_n, \dots, c_1) - K_{n-1}(c_n, \dots, c_2) - K_{n-1}(c_1, \dots, c_{n-1})] \\
&= K_n(c_1, \dots, c_n)[xK_n(c_1, \dots, c_n) - K_{n-1}(c_2, \dots, c_n) - K_{n-1}(c_1, \dots, c_{n-1})]
\end{aligned}$$

(iii) and (iv) are also proved similarly. \square

Using these identities, we obtain the following divisibility property of continuants.

Corollary 4.9. *Let $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_n)$ and $\bar{\mathbf{c}} = (c_n, \dots, c_1)$. Then*

$$K_n(\mathbf{c}) \mid K_{nk+n+m}(*, x_1, *, x_2, *, x_3, \dots, x_m, *)$$

where $*$ is one of $\{\mathbf{c}, -\mathbf{c}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}, -\bar{\mathbf{c}}\}$.

Proof. By Lemma 4.8 $K_n(\mathbf{c}) \mid K_{2n+1}(*, x, *)$, and by Corollary 4.6 the following identity holds.

$$\begin{aligned}
& K_{nk+n+k}(*, x_1, *, x_2, *, x_3, \dots, x_k, *) \\
&= K_{n+1}(*, x_1)K_{nk+k-1}(*, x_2, *, x_3, \dots, x_k, *) - K_n(*)K_{nk+k-2}(*', x_2, *, x_3, \dots, x_k, *),
\end{aligned}$$

where $*'$ is one of $\{(c_1, \dots, c_{n-1}), (c_2, \dots, c_n), (-c_1, \dots, -c_{n-1}), (-c_2, \dots, -c_n)\}$. (For example, if the second $*$ is $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_n)$, then $*' = (c_2, \dots, c_n)$.) Hence the statement is easily proved using the induction on k . \square

The following lemma shows the relationship between the continuant and the ϵ -Chebyshev polynomials.

Lemma 4.10. *Let $s_n^\epsilon(t) = \mathcal{E}Ch_n^t(0, 1)$ and $v_n^\epsilon(t) = \mathcal{E}Ch_{n+1}^t(1, 1)$ be the ϵ -Chebyshev polynomials for $\epsilon = (e_1, e_2, e_3, \dots)$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(i)} \quad & s_{n+1}^\epsilon(t) = K_n(e_1 t, e_2 t, \dots, e_n t) \\
\text{(ii)} \quad & v_n^\epsilon(t) = K_{n+1}(1, e_1 t, e_2 t, \dots, e_n t) = K_n(e_1 t, e_2 t, \dots, e_n t) - K_{n-1}(e_2 t, e_3 t, \dots, e_n t) \\
\text{(iii)} \quad & v_n^\epsilon(-t) = (-1)^n [K_n(e_1 t, e_2 t, \dots, e_n t) + K_{n-1}(e_2 t, e_3 t, \dots, e_n t)]
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. (i) follows from the fact that

$$s_1^\epsilon(t) = 1 = K_0(1), \quad s_2^\epsilon(t) = e_1 t = K_1(e_1 t)$$

and

$$s_{k+2}^\epsilon(t) = e_{k+1} t s_{k+1}^\epsilon(t) - s_k^\epsilon(t), \quad k \geq 0.$$

Similarly the first equality of (ii) follows from the fact that

$$v_0^\epsilon(t) = 1 = K_1(1), \quad v_1^\epsilon(t) = e_1 t - 1 = K_2(1, e_1 t)$$

and

$$v_{k+2}^\epsilon(t) = e_{k+2} t v_{k+1}^\epsilon(t) - v_k^\epsilon(t), \quad k \geq 0.$$

The second equality of (ii) is obvious. (iii) is proved as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} v_n^\epsilon(-t) &= K_n(-e_1 t, -e_2 t, \dots, -e_n t) - K_{n-1}(-e_2 t, -e_3 t, \dots, -e_n t) \\ &= (-1)^n K_n(e_1 t, e_2 t, \dots, e_n t) - (-1)^{n-1} K_{n-1}(e_2 t, e_3 t, \dots, e_n t) \\ &= (-1)^n [K_n(e_1 t, e_2 t, \dots, e_n t) + K_{n-1}(e_2 t, e_3 t, \dots, e_n t)] \end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 4.11. *Let $\epsilon = (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n)$ and $\bar{\epsilon} = (e_n, \dots, e_2, e_1)$. Then*

- (i) $s_{n+1}^\epsilon(t) = s_{n+1}^{\bar{\epsilon}}(t)$
- (ii) $v_n^\epsilon(t) = s_{n+1}^{\bar{\epsilon}}(t) - s_n^{\bar{\epsilon}}(t)$

Corollary 4.12. *Let $\epsilon = (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n)$ and $\mathbf{e}(n) = (e_n, \dots, e_2, e_1, e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n)$.*

$$s_{2n+1}^{\mathbf{e}(n)}(t) = (-1)^n v_n^\epsilon(t) v_n^\epsilon(-t)$$

Proof. By Lemma 4.3, Lemma 4.7 and Lemma 4.10,

$$\begin{aligned} s_{2n+1}^{\mathbf{e}(n)}(t) &= K_{2n}(e_n t, \dots, e_1 t, e_1 t, \dots, e_n t) \\ &= K_n(e_1 t, \dots, e_n t)^2 - K_{n-1}(e_2 t, \dots, e_n t)^2 \\ &= s_{n+1}^\epsilon(t)^2 - s_n^{\sigma(\epsilon)}(t)^2 \\ &= (s_{n+1}^\epsilon(t) + s_n^{\sigma(\epsilon)}(t))(s_{n+1}^\epsilon(t) - s_n^{\sigma(\epsilon)}(t)) \\ &= (-1)^n v_n^\epsilon(-t) v_n^\epsilon(t) \end{aligned}$$

□

5. RILEY POLYNOMIALS AS ϵ -CHEBYSHEV POLYNOMIALS AND DIVISIBILITY

We have seen in [6] that the Riley polynomial of any 2-bridge knot K has a special splitting $\mathcal{R}_K(-u^2) = \pm g(u)g(-u)$ for some integral coefficient polynomial $g(u) \in \mathbb{Z}[u]$, and indeed for a Torus knot $K = T(2, 2n+1)$,

$$(5.1) \quad \mathcal{R}_K(-u^2) = \pm s_{2n+1}(u) = \pm v_n(u)v_n(-u).$$

In this section, we show that (5.1) holds true for each 2-bridge knot $S(\alpha, \beta)$, $\alpha = 2n + 1$ by changing Chebyshev polynomials $v_n(u)$ and $s_{2n+1}(u)$ into ϵ -Chebyshev polynomials as follows.

$$\mathcal{R}_{S(\alpha, \beta)}(-u^2) = (-1)^{\frac{\alpha-1}{2}} s_\alpha^\epsilon(u) = (-1)^n s_{2n+1}^\epsilon(u) = v_n^{\hat{\epsilon}}(u) v_n^{\hat{\epsilon}}(-u)$$

where $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_{\alpha-1})$, $\hat{\epsilon} = (\epsilon_{\frac{\alpha-1}{2}}, \epsilon_{\frac{\alpha-1}{2}-1}, \dots, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_1)$, $\epsilon_i = (-1)^{\lfloor \frac{i}{2} \rfloor}$. And we also describe a sufficient condition for the divisibility of the Riley polynomials of 2-bridge knots. To do this, we show first that W_{ij} can be expressed as ϵ -Chebyshev polynomials.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_{2n})$, $\epsilon' = (\epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_{2n-1})$ and*

$$W(\epsilon) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{\epsilon_1} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -u^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{\epsilon_2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{\epsilon_3} \cdots \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{\epsilon_{2n-1}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -u^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{\epsilon_{2n}}.$$

Then

$$W(\epsilon) = \begin{pmatrix} (-1)^n s_{2n+1}^\epsilon(u) & (-1)^{n+1} \frac{s_{2n}^\epsilon(u)}{u} \\ (-1)^n u s_{2n}^{\sigma(\epsilon)}(u) & (-1)^{n-1} s_{2n-1}^{\epsilon'}(u) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Proof. If we let $W(\epsilon) = \begin{pmatrix} W_{11} & W_{12} \\ W_{21} & W_{22} \end{pmatrix}$, then by Proposition 2.2

$$W_{11} = 1 - u^2 \sum_{i_1: \text{odd}}^{\wedge} \epsilon_{i_1} \epsilon_{i_2} + \cdots + (-1)^k u^{2k} \sum_{i_1: \text{odd}}^{\wedge} \epsilon_{i_1} \cdots \epsilon_{i_{2k}} + \cdots + (-1)^n u^{2n} \epsilon_1 \epsilon_2 \epsilon_3 \cdots \epsilon_{2n}$$

$$W_{12} = \sum_{i_1: \text{odd}}^{\wedge} \epsilon_{i_1} - u^2 \sum_{i_1: \text{odd}}^{\wedge} \epsilon_{i_1} \epsilon_{i_2} \epsilon_{i_3} + \cdots + (-1)^{n-1} u^{2n-2} \epsilon_1 \epsilon_2 \epsilon_3 \cdots \epsilon_{2n-1}$$

$$W_{21} = -u^2 \sum_{i_1: \text{even}}^{\wedge} \epsilon_{i_1} + u^4 \sum_{i_1: \text{even}}^{\wedge} \epsilon_{i_1} \epsilon_{i_2} \epsilon_{i_3} + \cdots + (-1)^n u^{2n} \epsilon_2 \epsilon_3 \epsilon_4 \cdots \epsilon_{2n}$$

$$W_{22} = 1 - u^2 \sum_{i_1: \text{even}}^{\wedge} \epsilon_{i_1} \epsilon_{i_2} + u^4 \sum_{i_1: \text{even}}^{\wedge} \epsilon_{i_1} \epsilon_{i_2} \epsilon_{i_3} \epsilon_{i_4} + \cdots + (-1)^{n-1} u^{2n-2} \epsilon_2 \epsilon_3 \cdots \epsilon_{2n-1}.$$

Hence it suffices to show that

$$(5.2) \quad W_{11} = (-1)^n s_{2n+1}^\epsilon(u)$$

and

$$(5.3) \quad W_{12} = (-1)^{n+1} \frac{s_{2n}^\epsilon(u)}{u}.$$

Firstly, the formulas hold for $n = 1$ because

$$\begin{aligned} W(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2) &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{\epsilon_1} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -u^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{\epsilon_2} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \epsilon_1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -\epsilon_2 u^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 - u^2 \epsilon_1 \epsilon_2 & \epsilon_1 \\ -\epsilon_2 u^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -s_3^\epsilon(u) & \frac{s_2^\epsilon(u)}{u} \\ -u s_2^{\sigma(\epsilon)}(u) & s_1^\epsilon(u) \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that the formulas hold for all $n < m$ to proceed by induction on n . Since

$$\begin{aligned} W(\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_{2m}) &= W(\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_{2m-2}) \begin{pmatrix} 1 + \lambda\epsilon_{2m-1}\epsilon_{2m} & \epsilon_{2m-1} \\ \epsilon_{2m}\lambda & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} (-1)^{m-1}s_{2m-1}^\epsilon(u) & (-1)^m \frac{s_{2m-2}^\epsilon(u)}{u} \\ (-1)^{m-1}us_{2m-2}^{\sigma(\epsilon)}(u) & (-1)^m s_{2m-3}^{\epsilon'}(u) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 - u^2\epsilon_{2m-1}\epsilon_{2m} & \epsilon_{2m-1} \\ -\epsilon_{2m}u^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

we have the following.

$$\begin{aligned} W_{11} &= (-1)^m [(u^2\epsilon_{2m-1}\epsilon_{2m} - 1)s_{2m-1}^\epsilon(u) - \epsilon_{2m}us_{2m-2}^\epsilon(u)] \\ &= (-1)^m [\epsilon_{2m}u(\epsilon_{2m-1}us_{2m-1}^\epsilon(u) - s_{2m-2}^\epsilon(u)) - s_{2m-1}^\epsilon(u)] \\ &= (-1)^m (\epsilon_{2m}us_{2m}^\epsilon(u) - s_{2m-1}^\epsilon(u)) \\ &= (-1)^m s_{2m+1}^\epsilon(u) \\ W_{12} &= (-1)^{m-1}\epsilon_{2m-1}s_{2m-1}^\epsilon(u) + (-1)^m \frac{s_{2m-2}^\epsilon(u)}{u} \\ &= \frac{(-1)^{m-1}}{u} (\epsilon_{2m-1}us_{2m-1}^\epsilon(u) - s_{2m-2}^\epsilon(u)) \\ &= \frac{(-1)^{m-1}}{u} s_{2m}^\epsilon(u) \end{aligned}$$

So (5.2) and (5.3) hold for $n = m$ as well. \square

Example 5.2. In the case when all the ϵ_i are equal to 1, which is the case that the group is the knot group of a Torus knot $K = T(2, 2n + 1)$,

$$W(\epsilon) = \begin{pmatrix} v_n(2 + \lambda) & s_n(2 + \lambda) \\ \lambda s_n(2 + \lambda) & v_{n-1}(2 + \lambda) \end{pmatrix}.$$

by the identities

$$(-1)^n s_{2n+1}(u) = v_n(2 - u^2) = v_n(2 + \lambda)$$

and

$$\frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{u} s_{2n}(u) = s_n(2 - u^2) = s_n(2 + \lambda)$$

in Lemma 4.1. Hence the Riley polynomial of K is equal to

$$\mathcal{R}_K(\lambda) = f_n(\lambda) = v_n(2 + \lambda).$$

Note that

$$(5.4) \quad \mathcal{R}_K(-u^2) = v_n(u)v_n(-u)$$

since $v_n(2 + \lambda) = v_n(2 - u^2) = v_n(u)v_n(-u)$ by Lemma 4.1, (iv).

Corollary 4.12 and Theorem 5.1 show that (5.4) holds for all the Riley polynomials of knot groups.

Corollary 5.3. *Let $\mathbf{e} = (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n)$, $e_i = \pm 1$ and $\mathbf{e}(n) = (e_n, \dots, e_2, e_1, e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n)$. Then the Riley polynomial $\mathcal{R}(\lambda)$ of the kmot group $G(\mathbf{e}(n))$ is expressed as*

$$\mathcal{R}(-u^2) = (-1)^n s_{2n+1}^{\mathbf{e}(n)}(u) = v_n^{\mathbf{e}}(u)v_n^{\mathbf{e}}(-u) = f_n(-u^2),$$

where f_n is the polynomial recursively defined in Proposition 3.2. In particular, the Riley polynomial $\mathcal{R}_K(\lambda)$ of a 2-bridge knot $K = S(\alpha, \beta)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_K(-u^2) &= (-1)^{\frac{\alpha-1}{2}} s_{\alpha}^{\epsilon}(u), \quad \epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_{\alpha-1}), \quad \epsilon_i = (-1)^{[i\frac{\beta}{\alpha}]} \\ &= (-1)^{\frac{\alpha-1}{2}} v_n^{\hat{\epsilon}}(u)v_n^{\hat{\epsilon}}(-u), \quad \hat{\epsilon} = (\epsilon_{\frac{\alpha-1}{2}}, \epsilon_{\frac{\alpha-1}{2}-1}, \dots, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_1) \end{aligned}$$

From Corollary 5.3, we can observe immediately the well-known fact that the Riley polynomial of any 2-bridge knot is the same as its mirror's, since $s_{2n+1}^{-\mathbf{e}(n)}(u) = s_{2n+1}^{\mathbf{e}(n)}(u)$ by Lemma 4.4. Here is another immediate consequence of Corollary 5.3.

Corollary 5.4. *The Riley polynomial $\mathcal{R}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{Z}[\lambda]$ of the kmot group $G(\mathbf{e}(n))$ is irreducible if and only if $v_n^{\mathbf{e}}(u) \in \mathbb{Z}[u]$ is irreducible.*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{R}(-u^2) = v_n^{\mathbf{e}}(u)v_n^{\mathbf{e}}(-u)$ by Corollary 5.3, it is obvious that the reducibility of $v_n^{\mathbf{e}}(u)$ implies the reducibility of $\mathcal{R}(\lambda)$.

Now suppose that $\mathcal{R}(\lambda) = A(\lambda)B(\lambda)$ for some $A(\lambda), B(\lambda) \in \mathbb{Z}[\lambda]$. Then we have

$$v_n^{\mathbf{e}}(u)v_n^{\mathbf{e}}(-u) = \mathcal{R}(-u^2) = A(-u^2)B(-u^2).$$

If $v_n^{\mathbf{e}}(x)$ is irreducible, then either

$$v_n^{\mathbf{e}}(u) = A(-u^2), \quad v_n^{\mathbf{e}}(-u) = B(-u^2)$$

or

$$v_n^{\mathbf{e}}(-u) = A(-u^2), \quad v_n^{\mathbf{e}}(u) = B(-u^2)$$

holds and thus $A(-u^2) = B(-u^2)$. But this implies that $\mathcal{R}(\lambda) = A(\lambda)^2$, which contradicts the fact that the Riley polynomial of any 2-bridge knot has no repeated roots [13]. Therefore $v_n^{\mathbf{e}}(u)$ must be also reducible and this completes the proof. \square

Proposition 5.5. *Let $G = G(\mathbf{e})$ and $\tilde{G} = G(\tilde{\mathbf{e}})$ be two kmot groups. Then the Riley polynomial of \tilde{G} has that of G as a factor if $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}$ is expressed as*

$$(5.5) \quad \tilde{\mathbf{e}} = (\mathbf{e}, \delta_1, \pm \mathbf{e}, \delta_2, \pm \mathbf{e}, \delta_3, \dots, \pm \mathbf{e}, \delta_{2k}, \mathbf{e})$$

where $\delta_i \in \{1, -1\}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, 2k$.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{e} = (e_1, \dots, e_{2n})$ and $\mathbf{c} = (e_1u, \dots, e_{2n}u)$. Then the Riley polynomials \mathcal{R}_G and $\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{G}}$ of G and \tilde{G} satisfy the following identities by Lemma 4.10 and Corollary 5.3. (Note that $\bar{\mathbf{e}} = \mathbf{e}$ and $\bar{\tilde{\mathbf{e}}} = \tilde{\mathbf{e}}$ since both G and \tilde{G} are kmot groups.)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_G(-u^2) &= (-1)^n s_{2n+1}^{\mathbf{e}}(u) = (-1)^n K_{2n}(c_1, \dots, c_{2n}) = (-1)^n K_{2n}(\mathbf{c}) \\ \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{G}}(-u^2) &= (-1)^{(2k+1)n+k} s_{(2k+1)(2n+1)}^{\tilde{\mathbf{e}}}(u) \\ &= (-1)^{(2k+1)n+k} K_{2k(2n+1)+2n}(\mathbf{c}, \delta_1u, \pm \mathbf{c}, \delta_2u, \pm \mathbf{c}, \dots, \pm \mathbf{c}, \delta_{2k}u, \mathbf{c}) \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{G}}(\lambda)$ has $\mathcal{R}_G(\lambda)$ as a factor by Corollary 4.9. \square

Example 5.6. For the ϵ_i -sequence $\mathbf{e} = (1, 1)$ of the trefoil $3_1 = S(3, 1)$, there are 4 ϵ_i -sequences with length 8 which satisfy the identity (5.5):

$$(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1), (1, 1, -1, 1, 1, -1, 1, 1), (1, 1, -1, -1, -1, -1, 1, 1), (1, 1, 1, -1, -1, 1, 1, 1)$$

The first one $(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)$ is the ϵ_i -sequence of 2-bridge knot $9_1 = S(9, 1)$, and the remaining three in the second line are all ϵ_i -sequences of knot groups which are not from 2-bridge knots.

Remark 5.7. Note that if $G_1 = G$ and $G_2 = \tilde{G}$ in Proposition 5.5 are the knot groups of 2-bridge knots K_1 and K_2 respectively, then the divisibility of Riley polynomials implies that there exists an epimorphism from G_2 to G_1 by Kitano-Morifuji [7]. Furthermore, if $C[a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m]$ is the Conway normal form of K_1 and $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m)$, then by Aimi-Lee-Sakai-Sakuma [1] K_2 has an ORS-expansion with respect to \mathbf{a} , that is,

$$K_2 = C[\delta_1 \mathbf{a}, 2c_1, \delta_2 \mathbf{a}^{-1}, 2c_2, \delta_3 \mathbf{a}, 2c_3, \delta_4 \mathbf{a}^{-1}, 2c_4, \dots, \delta_{2n} \mathbf{a}^{-1}, 2c_{2n}, \delta_{2n+1} \mathbf{a}]$$

where

$$\mathbf{a}^{-1} = (a_m, a_{m-1}, \dots, a_1), \quad \delta_i = \pm 1 \ (\delta_1 = 1), \quad c_i \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

The converse statement of Proposition 5.5 is not true in general. That is, the existence of an epimorphism between two knot groups does not imply that the corresponding ϵ_i -sequences of the two 2-bridge knots have such a relation as in Proposition 5.5. For example, there exists an epimorphism from the knot group of 9_6 to that of $3_1 = S(3, 1)$, but the ϵ_i -sequences of $S(27, 5)$ and $S(27, 11)$ are

$$(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, -1, -1, -1, -1, -1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, -1, -1, -1, -1, -1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)$$

and

$$(1, 1, -1, -1, 1, 1, 1, -1, -1, 1, 1, 1, -1, -1, 1, 1, 1, -1, -1, 1, 1, 1, -1, -1, 1, 1)$$

respectively. Note that $S(27, 5)$ is the Schubert form of 9_6 and $S(27, 11)$ is that of its upside-down in the Conway normal form expression.

Using Lemma 4.7, Lemma 4.10, and Corollary 5.3, we have another recursive formula for the Riley polynomials of knot groups as follows.

Corollary 5.8. *Let $\mathbf{e}'(n)$ be a symmetric sequence $\mathbf{e}'(n) = (e_1, \dots, e_{n-1}, e_n, e_n, e_{n-1}, \dots, e_1)$. Then the sequence of the Riley polynomials $\mathcal{R}_k(\lambda)$ of the knot group $G(\mathbf{e}'(k))$ satisfies*

$$\sum_{k=1}^n (-1)^k \mathcal{R}_k(-u^2) = K_n(e_1 u, \dots, e_{n-1} u, e_n u)^2 - 1 = s_{n+1}^\epsilon(u)^2 - 1$$

where $\epsilon = (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n)$.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
s_{n+1}^\epsilon(u)^2 - 1 &= K_n(e_1u, e_2u, \dots, e_nu)^2 - 1 \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^n K_{2k}(e_1u, e_2u, \dots, e_ku, e_ku, \dots, e_2u, e_1u) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^n (-1)^k \mathcal{R}_k(-u^2)
\end{aligned}$$

□

6. IRREDUCIBILITY OF RILEY POLYNOMIALS

Let $\Phi_k(x)$ be the k -th cyclotomic polynomial. Then there is a unique polynomial $\Psi_k(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ for $k \geq 3$ such that

$$\Psi_k\left(x + \frac{1}{x}\right) = x^{-\frac{1}{2}\varphi(k)} \Phi_k(x),$$

where φ is the Euler function. M. Yamagishi has shown in [17] that

$$(6.1) \quad v_n(x) = \prod_{1 < d | 2n+1} \Psi_{2d}(x).$$

(See Proposition 2.4, (iii) in [17].) This identity implies that the Riley polynomial of the torus knot $T(2, 2n+1) = S(2n+1, 1)$ is irreducible over \mathbb{Q} if and only if $2n+1$ is a prime number. For arbitrary knot groups with ϵ_i -sequence of length $2n$, we can prove that their Riley polynomials are all irreducible if $2n+1$ is a prime number and 2 is a primitive root modulo $2n+1$.

Theorem 6.1. *Let α be a prime number and $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_{\alpha-1})$ be any symmetric ϵ_i -sequence, that is, $\epsilon_i = \epsilon_{\alpha-i} \in \{1, -1\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, \alpha-1$. Then the Riley polynomial of a knot group $G(\epsilon)$ is irreducible if 2 is a primitive root modulo α .*

Proof. Let $\alpha = 2n+1$ and $\mathbf{e} = (\epsilon_{n+1}, \dots, \epsilon_{2n}) = (\epsilon_n, \dots, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_1)$.

By Corollary 5.3 and Corollary 5.4, the Riley polynomial $\mathcal{R}(\lambda)$ of $G(\mathbf{e}(n))$ satisfies

$$\mathcal{R}(-u^2) = (-1)^n s_{2n+1}^\epsilon(u) = v_n^\mathbf{e}(u) v_n^\mathbf{e}(-u),$$

and $\mathcal{R}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{Z}[\lambda]$ is irreducible if and only if $v_n^\mathbf{e}(u) \in \mathbb{Z}[u]$ is irreducible.

Hence it suffices to show that $v_n(u) \in \mathbb{Z}_2[u]$ is irreducible if 2 is a primitive root modulo $2n+1$ by the following 2 facts.

- $v_n^\mathbf{e}(u)$ is equal to $v_n(u)$ in $\mathbb{Z}_2[u]$.
- $v_n^\mathbf{e}(u)$ is irreducible in $\mathbb{Z}[u]$ if $v_n^\mathbf{e}(u)$ is irreducible in $\mathbb{Z}_2[u]$.

Firstly, we claim that $v_n(u)$ is equal to $\Psi_{2n+1}(u)$ in $\mathbb{Z}_2[u]$. Since $2n+1$ is a prime,

$$v_n(u) = \prod_{1 < d | 2n+1} \Psi_{2d}(u) = \Psi_{2(2n+1)}(u)$$

by (6.1) and thus we have

$$(6.2) \quad v_n(u) = \Psi_{2(2n+1)}(u) = (-1)^{\frac{1}{2}\phi(2n+1)}\Psi_{2n+1}(-u) \equiv \Psi_{2n+1}(u) \in \mathbb{Z}_2[u],$$

which proves our claim. The second equality of (6.2) follows from the property

$$\Phi_{2(2n+1)}(x) = \Phi_{2n+1}(-x).$$

Since $\Psi_{2n+1}(u) \in \mathbb{Z}_2[u]$ is irreducible if $\Phi_{2n+1}(x)$ is irreducible in $\mathbb{Z}_2[x]$, and $\Phi_{2n+1}(x)$ is irreducible in $\mathbb{Z}_2[x]$ if and only if 2 is a primitive root modulo $2n+1$ as is well known, it is immediate that $v_n(u) \in \mathbb{Z}_2[u]$ is irreducible if 2 is a primitive root modulo $2n+1$, which completes the proof. \square

As an immediate consequence of Theorem 6.1 we get the following, which Morifuji and Tran have already proved in a different way in [12].

Corollary 6.2 (Morifuji-Tran [12]). *Let α be a prime number and β be any odd integer. Then the Riley polynomial of a 2-bridge knot $S(\alpha, \beta)$ is irreducible if 2 is a primitive root modulo α .*

Denote by $S(2)$ the set of prime numbers p such that 2 is a primitive root modulo p . Then for any $\alpha \in S(2)$, the Riley polynomial of a 2-bridge knot $S(\alpha, \beta)$ is irreducible for each β by Corollary 6.2.

Artin's primitive root conjecture claims that the set $S(2)$ is infinite and has the asymptotic density 0.3739558136..., which is called Artin constant [10]. From this, we have the following.

Corollary 6.3. *Under the assumption of Artin's conjecture, the set of prime numbers α such that the Riley polynomial of a 2-bridge knot $S(\alpha, \beta)$ is irreducible for each β has the asymptotic density ≥ 0.3739558136*

For each symmetric ϵ_i -sequence $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_{\alpha-1})$, denote the number of irreducible factors of the Riley polynomial of a knot group $G(\epsilon) = G(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_{\alpha-1})$ by $n(\epsilon) = n(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_{\alpha-1})$. Then from the above argument in the proof of Theorem 6.1, we have the following.

Proposition 6.4. *Let α be an odd number such that 2 is a primitive root modulo $d \neq 1$ for any divisor d of α . Then*

$$n(\epsilon) \leq |\{d \in \mathbb{N} \mid d \neq 1, d \mid \alpha\}|$$

for any symmetric ϵ_i -sequence $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_{\alpha-1})$ of length $\alpha - 1$. For the case when $\epsilon_i = 1$ for all $i = 1, \dots, \alpha - 1$, that is, for the torus knot $T(2, \alpha)$, the equality holds.

Proof. Let $\alpha = 2n + 1$ and $\mathbf{e} = (\epsilon_{n+1}, \dots, \epsilon_{2n}) = (\epsilon_n, \dots, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_1)$. Then $n(\epsilon)$ is equal to the number of irreducible factors of $v_n^{\mathbf{e}}$ by Corollary 5.3. Since 2 is a primitive root modulo $d \neq 1$ for any divisor d of α , $\Psi_{2d}(x) \equiv \Psi_d(x)$ is irreducible in $\mathbb{Z}_2[x]$ and $v_n(x) = \prod_{1 < d \mid 2n+1} \Psi_{2d}(x)$, the number of irreducible factors of $v_n(x) \equiv v_n^{\mathbf{e}}(x)$ in $\mathbb{Z}_2[x]$ is equal to $n(\epsilon)$. So the number of irreducible factors of $v_n^{\mathbf{e}}$ in $\mathbb{Z}[x]$ is less than or equal to $n(\epsilon)$. \square

Example 6.5. Let $\alpha = 9$. Then 2 is a primitive root modulo 3 and 9, and

$$|\{d \in \mathbb{N} \mid d \neq 1, d \mid 9\}| = |\{3, 9\}| = 2.$$

If we denote v_4^ϵ for an ϵ_i -sequence $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3, \epsilon_4)$ by $v_4^{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3, \epsilon_4}$, then we have

$$v_4^{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3, \epsilon_4}(u) = \epsilon_4 \epsilon_3 \epsilon_2 \epsilon_1 u^4 - \epsilon_4 \epsilon_3 \epsilon_2 u^3 - (\epsilon_4 \epsilon_3 + \epsilon_4 \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2 \epsilon_1) u^2 + (\epsilon_4 + \epsilon_2) u + 1.$$

Hence we can check that $n(\epsilon) \leq 2$ for all 16 ϵ_i -sequences of length 4 as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} v_4^{1,1,1,1}(u) &= v_4(u) = (u-1)(u^3 - 3u - 1) = \Psi_3(-u)\Psi_9(-u) = \Psi_6(u)\Psi_{18}(u) \\ &= v_4^{-1,-1,-1,-1}(-u) \\ v_4^{1,1,1,-1}(u) &= -(u+1)(u^3 - 2u^2 + u - 1) = v_4^{-1,-1,-1,1}(-u) \\ v_4^{1,1,-1,1}(u) &= -u^4 + u^3 - u^2 + 2u + 1 = v_4^{-1,-1,1,-1}(-u) \\ v_4^{1,-1,1,1}(u) &= -(u-1)(u^3 + u + 1) = v_4^{-1,1,-1,-1}(-u) \\ v_4^{-1,1,1,1}(u) &= -(u+1)(u^3 - u - 1) = v_4^{1,-1,-1,-1}(-u) \\ v_4^{-1,-1,1,1}(u) &= (u+1)(u^3 - u + 1) = v_4^{1,1,-1,-1}(-u) \\ v_4^{1,-1,-1,1}(u) &= u^4 - u^3 + u^2 + 1 = v_4^{-1,1,1,-1}(-u) \\ v_4^{-1,1,-1,1}(u) &= u^4 + u^3 + 3u^2 + 2u + 1 = v_4^{1,-1,1,-1}(-u) \end{aligned}$$

Note that the last two equality imply that the Riley polynomials of 2-bridge knots $S(9, 5)$ and $S(9, 7)$ are irreducible.

7. SYMMETRIZED RILEY POLYNOMIALS

Putting the two generators of a 2-bridge knot group $G(K) = \langle x, y \mid wx = yw \rangle$

$$(7.1) \quad x = \begin{pmatrix} M & 1 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{M} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad y = \begin{pmatrix} M & 0 \\ \lambda & \frac{1}{M} \end{pmatrix},$$

all the non-abelian $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ representations are given by the solutions of the 2-variable Riley polynomial

$$\mathcal{R}(\lambda, s) = 0, \quad s = M^2 + \frac{1}{M^2} - 2$$

in $\mathbb{Z}[\lambda, s]$. (See [14].) Note that $s = 0$ gives the parabolic representations, that is, $\mathcal{R}(\lambda, 0)$ is equal to the Riley polynomial $\mathcal{R}(\lambda)$.

In the case of $\lambda = 0$, if we symmetrize the variable s , more precisely

$$s + 2 = t + \frac{1}{t}, \quad t = M^2,$$

then we get the Alexander polynomial $\Delta_K(t)$ and $\Delta_K(-t)$ has been proved to be unimodal by Hartley in [4], as is well known for the Fox's conjecture. Here, the unimodality of a polynomial $\sum_{i=0}^n a_i x^i \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ means that there exists an index $0 \leq j \leq n$ for which one of the following two properties holds:

$$(i) \quad a_0 \leq a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \cdots \leq a_{j-1} \leq a_j \geq a_{j+1} \geq a_{j+2} \geq \cdots \geq a_n$$

(ii) $a_0 \geq a_1 \geq a_2 \geq \cdots \geq a_{j-1} \geq a_j \leq a_{j+1} \leq a_{j+2} \leq \cdots \leq a_n$

Furthermore if the sequence $\{a_0, a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ has the strict monotonicity, we will say $\sum_{i=0}^n a_i^n x^i$ is *strongly unimodal*.

Interestingly, we can see that the same result can be achieved by reversing the roles of the two variables s and $\lambda = -u^2$. By symmetrizing the variable u to $u = x + \frac{1}{x}$ when $s = 0$, the Riley polynomial $\mathcal{R}(-u^2)$ becomes to be unimodal.

Since $s_{n+1}^\epsilon(u) = K_n(\epsilon_1 u, \epsilon_2 u, \dots, \epsilon_n u)$ is either an odd polynomial or an even polynomial for any $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots)$, we have a palindromic polynomial $\tilde{\phi}_n^\epsilon(x)$ such that

$$\tilde{\phi}_n^\epsilon(x^2) = x^n s_{n+1}^\epsilon\left(x + \frac{1}{x}\right).$$

Note that

$$\tilde{\phi}_0^\epsilon(x) = 1, \quad \tilde{\phi}_1^\epsilon(x) = \epsilon_1(x+1)$$

and the following identity follows from the recursion of $s_{n+1}^\epsilon(u)$.

$$\tilde{\phi}_{n+1}^\epsilon(x) = \epsilon_{n+1}(x+1)\tilde{\phi}_n^\epsilon(x) - x\tilde{\phi}_{n-1}^\epsilon(x)$$

If we let

$$\phi_n^\epsilon(x) := \epsilon_1 \epsilon_2 \cdots \epsilon_n \tilde{\phi}_n^\epsilon(x),$$

then we have

$$\phi_0^\epsilon(x) = 1, \quad \phi_1^\epsilon(x) = x+1$$

and

$$(7.2) \quad \phi_{n+1}^\epsilon(x) = (x+1)\phi_n^\epsilon(x) - \epsilon_n \epsilon_{n+1} x \phi_{n-1}^\epsilon(x).$$

Now we prove that ϕ_n^ϵ is unimodal, which implies that $\tilde{\phi}_n^\epsilon$ is also unimodal. Note that if n is even and ϵ is symmetric, then $\phi_n^\epsilon = \tilde{\phi}_n^\epsilon$.

Proposition 7.1. *Let $\phi_n^\epsilon(x) = \sum_{j=0}^n a_j^n x^j$. Then*

- (i) $a_0^n = a_n^n = 1$, $a_j^n \geq 0$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, n$.
- (ii) $a_j^n \geq a_{j-1}^n$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$.
- (iii) $a_j^n - a_{j-1}^n \geq a_j^{n-1} - a_{j-1}^{n-1}$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$.
- (iv) $a_j^n \geq a_j^{n-1}$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$.
- (v) $a_1^n = a_{n-1}^n = 1 + 2s$, where s is the number of sign changes in $(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_n)$.
- (vi) $a_k^n = a_{n-k}^n = \sum_{m=0}^k (-1)^m \binom{n-2m}{k-m} \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < j_{i+1} - 1 < \dots < j_m} \delta_{j_1} \cdots \delta_{j_m}$ for $n > 1$ and $k = 0, 1, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$. Here $\delta_i = \epsilon_i \epsilon_{i+1}$.

Proof. From (7.2),

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n+1} a_j^{n+1} x^j = (x+1) \sum_{j=0}^n a_j^n x^j - \epsilon_n \epsilon_{n+1} x \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} a_j^{n-1} x^j$$

and thus

$$(7.3) \quad a_j^{n+1} = a_j^n + a_{j-1}^n - \epsilon_n \epsilon_{n+1} a_{j-1}^{n-1}, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

Hence we have

$$a_j^{n+1} - a_{j-1}^{n+1} = (a_j^n - a_{j-1}^n) + (a_{j-1}^n - a_{j-2}^n) - \epsilon_n \epsilon_{n+1} (a_{j-1}^{n-1} - a_{j-2}^{n-1})$$

for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

Since $\phi_2^\epsilon(x) = (x+1)\phi_1^\epsilon(x) - \epsilon_2\epsilon_1x = (x+1)^2 - \epsilon_2\epsilon_1x = x^2 + (2 - \epsilon_2\epsilon_1)x + 1$, the statements (i)-(vi) hold for $n = 1, 2$. Suppose that they hold for all $n \leq k$ to proceed by induction on n . Then for $j = 0, 1, \dots, \lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \rfloor$

$$\begin{aligned} a_j^{k+1} - a_{j-1}^{k+1} &= (a_j^k - a_{j-1}^k) + (a_{j-1}^k - a_{j-2}^k) - \epsilon_k \epsilon_{k+1} (a_{j-1}^{k-1} - a_{j-2}^{k-1}) \\ &\geq (a_j^k - a_{j-1}^k) + (a_{j-1}^k - a_{j-2}^k) - (a_{j-1}^{k-1} - a_{j-2}^{k-1}) \\ &\geq a_j^k - a_{j-1}^k \\ &\geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

and for $j = 0, 1, \dots, k$

$$\begin{aligned} a_j^{k+1} - a_j^k &= a_{j-1}^k - \epsilon_k \epsilon_{k+1} a_{j-1}^{k-1} \\ &\geq a_{j-1}^k - a_{j-1}^{k-1} \\ &\geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

which imply the statements (i)-(iv) hold for $n = k + 1$ as well.

To prove (v), it suffices to show that

$$(7.4) \quad a_{n-1}^n = n - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \epsilon_j \epsilon_{j+1} \quad \text{for } n > 1$$

because

$$n - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \epsilon_j \epsilon_{j+1} = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (1 - \epsilon_j \epsilon_{j+1}) = 1 + 2s.$$

Since $\phi_2^\epsilon(x) = x^2 + (2 - \epsilon_2\epsilon_1)x + 1$, $a_1^2 = 2 - \epsilon_2\epsilon_1$ and thus (7.4) holds for $n = 2$. If we assume that (7.4) holds for all $n \leq k$, then

$$\begin{aligned} a_k^{k+1} &= a_k^k + a_{k-1}^k - \epsilon_k \epsilon_{k+1} a_{k-1}^{k-1} \\ &= 1 + (k - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \epsilon_j \epsilon_{j+1}) - \epsilon_k \epsilon_{k+1} \\ &= (k + 1) - \sum_{j=1}^k \epsilon_j \epsilon_{j+1}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that (7.4) holds for $n = k + 1$ as well.

By (7.3) and (7.4), we have

$$a_j^{n+1} = a_j^n + a_{j-1}^n - \delta_n a_{j-1}^{n-1}, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, n$$

and

$$a_{n-1}^n = n - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \epsilon_j \epsilon_{j+1} = \binom{n}{1} - \binom{n}{0} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \delta_j.$$

Using these two identities and the identity

$$\binom{n+1-2m}{k-m} = \binom{n-2m}{k-m} + \binom{n-2m}{k-m-1}$$

(vi) is proved by the induction argument as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m=0}^k (-1)^m \binom{n+1-2m}{k-m} \sum_{1 \leq j_i < j_{i+1}-1 < n} \delta_{j_1} \cdots \delta_{j_m} \\ &= \sum_{m=0}^k (-1)^m \left(\binom{n-2m}{k-m} + \binom{n-2m}{k-m-1} \right) \sum_{1 \leq j_i < j_{i+1}-1 < n} \delta_{j_1} \cdots \delta_{j_m} \\ &= \sum_{m=0}^k (-1)^m \binom{n-2m}{k-m} \sum_{1 \leq j_i < j_{i+1}-1 < n-1} \delta_{j_1} \cdots \delta_{j_m} \\ & \quad + \sum_{m=0}^k (-1)^m \binom{n-2m}{(k-1)-m} \sum_{1 \leq j_i < j_{i+1}-1 < n-1} \delta_{j_1} \cdots \delta_{j_m} \\ & \quad + \delta_n \sum_{m=0}^k (-1)^m \binom{n+1-2m}{k-m} \sum_{1 \leq j_i < j_{i+1}-1 < n-2} \delta_{j_1} \cdots \delta_{j_{m-1}} \\ &= a_{n-k}^n + a_{n-(k-1)}^n - \delta_n \sum_{m=0}^k (-1)^{m-1} \binom{n+1-2m}{k-m} \sum_{1 \leq j_i < j_{i+1}-1 < n-2} \delta_{j_1} \cdots \delta_{j_{m-1}} \\ &= a_{n-k}^n + a_{n-(k-1)}^n - \delta_n \sum_{m=0}^k (-1)^{m-1} \binom{(n-1)-2(m-1)}{(k-1)-(m-1)} \sum_{1 \leq j_i < j_{i+1}-1 < n-2} \delta_{j_1} \cdots \delta_{j_{m-1}} \\ &= a_{k-1}^n + a_{(n+1)-k}^n - \delta_n a_{n-k}^{n-1} (= a_k^n + a_{k-1}^n - \delta_n a_{k-1}^{n-1} \text{ by the induction hypothesis}) \\ &= a_{(n+1)-k}^{n+1} (= a_k^{n+1}) \end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 7.2. *Let $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_n)$, $\epsilon_i = \pm 1$. Then*

- (i) *The coefficients of $\phi_n^\epsilon(x)$ are minimum when $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_i$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. In this case, $\phi_n^\epsilon(x) = \sum_{j=0}^n x^j$.*
- (ii) *The coefficients of $\phi_n^\epsilon(x)$ are maximum when ϵ_i is alternating.*
- (iii) *$\phi_n^\epsilon(x)$ is strongly unimodal if ϵ_i is alternating.*

Proof. If $\epsilon_i = \epsilon_1$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, then

$$\phi_0(x) = 1, \quad \phi_1(x) = x + 1, \quad \phi_{n+1}(x) = (x+1)\phi_n(x) - x\phi_{n-1},$$

so (i) is proved by the induction argument. And (ii) follows from the following inequality.

$$\begin{aligned}
a_{n-k}^n &= \sum_{m=0}^k (-1)^m \binom{n-2m}{k-m} \sum_{1 \leq j_i < j_{i+1} - 1 < n-1} \delta_{j_1} \cdots \delta_{j_m} \\
&\leq \sum_{m=0}^k \binom{n-2m}{k-m} \sum_{\substack{(j_1, \dots, j_m) \\ 1 \leq j_i < j_{i+1} - 1 < n-1}} 1 \\
&= \sum_{m=0}^k (-1)^m \binom{n-2m}{k-m} \sum_{\substack{(j_1, \dots, j_m) \\ 1 \leq j_i < j_{i+1} - 1 < n-1}} (-1)^m \quad (\text{when } \delta_i = -1 \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, n-1)
\end{aligned}$$

(iii) is obvious from the identity

$$a_k^n = a_{n-k}^n = \sum_{m=0}^k \binom{n-2m}{k-m} \sum_{\substack{(j_1, \dots, j_m) \\ 1 \leq j_i < j_{i+1} - 1 < n-1}} 1, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor.$$

□

Definition 7.3. When $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_{2n})$ is the ϵ_i -sequence of a 2-bridge knot group $G(\epsilon)$, the Riley polynomial of $G(\epsilon)$ is $\mathcal{R}(-u^2) = (-1)^n s_{2n+1}^\epsilon(u) = (-1)^n K_{2n}(\epsilon_1 u, \epsilon_2 u, \dots, \epsilon_{2n} u)$. And we will call the polynomial $\phi_{2n}^\epsilon(x)$ the *symmetrized Riley polynomial* of $G(\epsilon)$, where $\phi_{2n}^\epsilon(x^2) = x^{2n} s_{2n+1}^\epsilon(x + \frac{1}{x})$.

Corollary 7.4. *The symmetrized Riley polynomial of any 2-bridge knot group is unimodal.*

This symmetrized Riley polynomial is actually obtained from $\mathcal{R}(\lambda, s)$ by substituting

$$s = 0, \quad -(\lambda + 2) = X + \frac{1}{X}, \quad X = x^2$$

similar to the Alexander polynomial $\Delta_K(-t)$ obtained by substituting

$$\lambda = 0, \quad -(s + 2) = T + \frac{1}{T}, \quad T = -t.$$

That is, symmetrizing 2-variable Riley polynomial $\mathcal{R}(\lambda, s)$ by

$$-(\lambda + 2) = X + \frac{1}{X}, \quad -(s + 2) = T + \frac{1}{T},$$

we get a polynomial $F(T, X)$ such that

$$F(T, -1) = \Delta_K(-t), \quad F(-1, X) = \phi_{\alpha-1}^\epsilon(X).$$

Note that $\lambda + 2$ is the trace of $\rho(x)\rho(y) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \lambda & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ and $s + 2$ is the trace of

$$\rho(x)^2 = \begin{pmatrix} M & 1 \\ 0 & 1/M \end{pmatrix}^2 \text{ as well as } \rho(y)^2 = \begin{pmatrix} M & 0 \\ \lambda & 1/M \end{pmatrix}^2.$$

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Both authors were supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea(NRF) grant funded by the Korea government(MSIT) (NRF-2021R1F1A1049444 and NRF-2018R1A2B6005691, respectively). The authors would like to thank the anonymous referee for his helpful comments and Philip Choi for his help with computer calculations.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Aimi, D. Lee, S. Sakai, and M. Sakuma, *Classification of parabolic generating pairs of Kleinian groups with two parabolic generators*, Rend. Istit. Mat. Univ. Trieste, Volume **52** (2020), 477–511.
- [2] C. H. Conley and V. Ovsienko, *Rotundus: Triangulations, Chebyshev polynomials, and Pfaffians*, Math. Intell. **40** (2018), 45–50.
- [3] R. Graham, D. Knuth, and O. Patashnik, *Concrete Mathematics. a Foundation for Computer Science*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Advanced Book Program, Reading, MA, 1989, xiv+625 pp.
- [4] R. I. Hartley, *On two-bridged knot polynomials*, J. Austral. Math. Soc. Ser. A, **28(2)**, 241–249, 1979.
- [5] H. J. Hsiao, *On factorization of Chebyshev’s polynomials of the first kind*, Bulletin of the Institute of Mathematics, Academia Sinica **12** (1), 1984, pp. 89–94.
- [6] K. Jo and H. Kim, *Symplectic quandles and parabolic representations of 2-bridge knots and links*, Internat. J. Math., **31**, No. 10 (2020) 2050081 (45 pages).
- [7] T. Kitano and T. Morifuji, *A note on Riley polynomials of 2-bridge knots*, Annales de la faculté des sciences de Toulouse, Volume XXVI, no 5 (2017), pp. 1211-1217.
- [8] Thang T.Q. Le and Anh T. Tran, *On the AJ Conjecture for Knots*, Indiana University Mathematics Journal, Vol. **64**, No. 4 (2015), pp. 1103-1151 (49 pages)
- [9] C. Maclachlan and A. W. Reid, *The arithmetic of hyperbolic 3-manifolds*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, **219**. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2003.
- [10] P. Moree, *Artin’s primitive root conjecture -a survey-*, INTEGERS 12A (2012): John Selfridge Memorial Issue.
- [11] S. Morier-Genoud and V. Ovsienko, *Farey Boat: Continued fractions and triangulations*, Modular group and Polygon dissections, Jahresber. Dtsch. Math. Ver. **121**, 91–136 (2019)
- [12] T. Morifuji and Anh T. Tran, *Twisted Alexander polynomials of 2-bridge knots for parabolic representations*, Pacific Journal of Mathematics, Vol. **269**, No. 2 (2014), 433–451.
- [13] R. Riley, *Parabolic representations of knot groups, I*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **24** (1972), 217–242.
- [14] R. Riley, *Nonabelian representations of 2-bridge knot groups*, Quart. J. Math. Oxford, **35(2)** (1984), 191–208.
- [15] Theodore J. Rivlin, *Chebyshev polynomials. From Approximation Theory to Algebra and Number Theory*, second edition, Pure Appl. Math. (New York), John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1990.
- [16] A. Ustinov, *A short proof of Euler’s Identity for continuants*, Math. Notes **79**, 146-147 (2006).
- [17] M. Yamagishi, *A note on Chebyshev polynomials, cyclotomic polynomials and twin primes*, Journal of Number theory **133** (2013), 2455-2463.

DIVISION OF LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES, MOKPO NATIONAL MARITIME UNIVERSITY, MOKPO, CHONNAM, 530-729, KOREA

Email address: khjo@mmu.ac.kr

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, SEOUL NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, SEOUL, 08826, KOREA

Email address: hyukkim@snu.ac.kr