




Knot Invariants from Zero-Dimensional QFT

$\omega\epsilon\beta := \text{http://drorbn.net/bo25}$

Abstract. For the purpose of today, an “I-Type Knot Invariant” is a knot invariant computed from a knot diagram by integrating the exponential of a *perturbed Gaussian* Lagrangian which is a sum over the features of that diagram (crossings, edges, faces) of locally defined quantities, over a product of finite dimensional spaces associated to those same features.



joint with
R. van der Veen

Q. Are there any such things? **A.** Yes.


Q. Are they any good? **A.** They are the strongest we know per CPU cycle, and are excellent in other ways too.

Q. Didn't Witten do that back in 1988 with path integrals?

A. No. His constructions are infinite dimensional and far from rigorous.

Q. But integrals belong in analysis!

A. Ours only use squeaky-clean algebra.



The Good. 1. At the centre of low dimensional topology.


2. “Invariants” connect to pretty much all of algebra.

The Agony. 1&2 don't talk to each other.

- Not enough topological applications for all these invariants.
- The fancy algebra doesn't arise naturally within topology.

⇒ We're still missing something about the relationship between knots and algebra.

The $sl_2^{\epsilon^2}$ Example. With T an indeterminate and with $\epsilon^2 = 0$:



Implementation (see IType.nb of ωεβ/ap).

☺ Once [<< KnotTheory` ; << Rot.m] ;

☐ C:\drorbn\AcademicPensieve\Projects\KnotTheory\KnotTheory

☐ Loading KnotTheory` version

of February 2, 2020, 10:53:45.2097.

Read more at <http://katlas.org/wiki/KnotTheory>.

☐ Loading Rot.m from

<http://drorbn.net/AP/Talks/Geneva-2408>

to compute rotation numbers.

☺ CF [ω_ . ε_ E] := CF [ω] × CF / @ ε ;

CF [ε_ List] := CF / @ ε ;

CF [ε_] := Module [{ vs, ps, c },

vs = Cases [ε, (x | p | ξ | π | g) __, ∞] ∪ { ε } ;

Total [CoefficientRules [Expand [ε], vs] /.

(ps_ → c_) ⇒ Factor [c] (Times @@ vs^ps)]] ;

Integration using Picard iteration. The core is in yellow and hacks are in pink.

☺ E / : E [A_] × E [B_] := E [A + B] ;

☺ \$π = Identity ; (* The Wisdom Projection *)

☺ Unprotect [Integrate] ;

∫ ω_ . E [L_] d (vs_ List) :=

Module [{ n, L0, Q, Δ, G, Z0, Z, λ, DZ, DDZ, FZ,

a, b },

n = Length @ vs ; L0 = L /. ε → 0 ;

Q = Table [(- ∂_vs [a], vs [b] L0) /. Thread [vs → 0] /.

(p | x) → 0, { a, n }, { b, n }] ;

If [(Δ = Det [Q]) == 0, Return @ "Degenerate Q ! "] ;

Z = Z0 = CF @ \$π [L + vs . Q . vs / 2] ; G = Inverse [Q] ;

FixedPoint [(DZ = Table [∂_v Z, { v, vs }] ;

DDZ = Table [∂_u DZ, { u, vs }] ;

FZ = Sum [G [a, b] (DDZ [a, b] + DZ [a] × DZ [b]),

{ a, n }, { b, n }] / 2 ;

Z = CF [Z0 + ∫_0^λ \$π [FZ] d λ] &, Z] ;

PowerExpand @ Factor [ω Δ^-1/2] ×

E [CF [Z /. λ → 1 /. Thread [vs → 0]]] ;

Protect [Integrate] ;

☺ ∫ E [- μ x^2 / 2 + i ξ x] d { x }

☐ E [- ξ^2 / (2 μ)] / √ μ

☺ FofG = ∫ E [- μ (x - a)^2 / 2 + i ξ x] d { x }

☐ E [i (2 a μ + i ξ) ξ / (2 μ)] / √ μ

☺ ∫ FofG E [- i ξ x] d { ξ }

☐ E [- 1 / 2 (a - x)^2 μ]

So we've tested and nearly proven the Fourier inversion formula!

☺ L = - 1 / 2 { x_1, x_2 } . (a b / b c) . { x_1, x_2 } + { ξ_1, ξ_2 } . { x_1, x_2 } ;

Z12 = ∫ E [L] d { x_1, x_2 }

☐ E [c ξ_1^2 / (2 (- b^2 + a c)) + b ξ_1 ξ_2 / (b^2 - a c) + a ξ_2^2 / (2 (- b^2 + a c))] / √ (- b^2 + a c)

☺ { Z1 = ∫ E [L] d { x_1 }, Z12 = ∫ Z1 d { x_2 } }

☐ E [- (- b^2 + a c) x_2^2 / (2 a) - b x_2 ξ_1 / a + ξ_1^2 / (2 a) + x_2 ξ_2] / √ a, True }



Guido Fubini

☺ \$π = Normal [# + 0 [ε]^13] & ; ∫ E [- φ^2 / 2 + ε φ^3 / 6] d { φ }

☐ E [5 ε^2 / 24 + 5 ε^4 / 16 + 1105 ε^6 / 1152 + 565 ε^8 / 128 + 82825 ε^10 / 3072 + 19675 ε^12 / 96]

From <https://oeis.org/A226260>:

THE ON-LINE ENCYCLOPEDIA
OF INTEGER SEQUENCES®

founded in 1964 by N. J. A. Sloane

(Greetings from The On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences!)

A226260 Numerators of mass formula for connected vacuum graphs on 2n nodes for a phi^3 field theory.
1, 5, 5, 1105, 565, 82825, 19675, 1282031525, 80727925, 1683480621875, 13209845125,
2239646759308375, 19739117098375, 6320791709083309375, 32468078556378125, 38362676768845045751875,
281365778405032973125, 2824650747089425586152484375, 776632157034116712734375 (list; graph; refs; listen;
history; text; internal format)

The Right-Handed Trefoil.

☺ K = Mirror @ Knot [3, 1] ; Features [K]

☐ Features [7, C4 [- 1] X1,5 [1] X3,7 [1] X6,2 [1]]

☺ L [X_i, j_ [s_]] := T^s/2 E [x_i (p_{i+1} - p_i) + x_j (p_{j+1} - p_j) + (T^s - 1) x_i (p_{i+1} - p_{j+1}) + (ε s / 2) × (x_i (p_i - p_j) ((T^s - 1) x_i p_j + 2 (1 - x_j p_j)) - 1)]
L [C_i [φ_]] := T^φ/2 E [x_i (p_{i+1} - p_i) + ε φ (1 / 2 - x_i p_i)]
L [K_] := CF [L / @ Features [K] [[2]]]
vs [K_] := Join @@ Table [{ p_i, x_i }, { i, Features [K] [[1]] }]




Joseph Fourier

$$\square \left\{ \{p_1, x_1, p_2, x_2, p_3, x_3, p_4, x_4, p_5, x_5, p_6, x_6, p_7, x_7\}, \right. \\ \left. T \mathbb{E} \left[-2 \in -p_1 x_1 + \in p_1 x_1 + T p_2 x_1 - \in p_5 x_1 + (1 - T) p_6 x_1 + \right. \right. \\ \left. \frac{1}{2} (-1 + T) \in p_1 p_5 x_1^2 + \frac{1}{2} (1 - T) \in p_5^2 x_1^2 - p_2 x_2 + p_3 x_2 - p_3 x_3 + \right. \\ \left. \in p_3 x_3 + T p_4 x_3 - \in p_7 x_3 + (1 - T) p_8 x_3 + \frac{1}{2} (-1 + T) \in p_3 p_7 x_3^2 + \right. \\ \left. \frac{1}{2} (1 - T) \in p_7^2 x_3^2 - p_4 x_4 + \in p_4 x_4 + p_5 x_4 - p_5 x_5 + p_6 x_5 - \right. \\ \left. \in p_1 p_5 x_1 x_5 + \in p_5^2 x_1 x_5 - \in p_2 x_6 + (1 - T) p_3 x_6 - p_6 x_6 + \right. \\ \left. \in p_6 x_6 + T p_7 x_6 + \in p_2^2 x_2 x_6 - \in p_2 p_6 x_2 x_6 + \frac{1}{2} (1 - T) \in p_2^2 x_6^2 + \right. \\ \left. \left. \frac{1}{2} (-1 + T) \in p_2 p_6 x_6^2 - p_7 x_7 + p_8 x_7 - \in p_3 p_7 x_3 x_7 + \in p_7^2 x_3 x_7 \right] \right\}$$

$$-\frac{i T \mathbb{E} \left[-\frac{(-1+T)^2 (1+T^2)}{(1-T+T^2)^2} \epsilon \right]}{1-T+T^2}$$

Invariance Under Reidemeister 3.



Reidemeister

False

True

😊 1hs

$$\begin{aligned} \textcircled{c} \text{ lhs} &= \int (\mathbb{E} [\dot{\mathbf{i}} \pi_{\mathbf{i}} \mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{i}} + \dot{\mathbf{i}} \pi_{\mathbf{j}} \mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{j}} + \dot{\mathbf{i}} \pi_{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{k}}] \times \mathcal{L} / @ (X_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}[1] \ X_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{k}}[1] \ X_{\mathbf{j},\mathbf{k}+1}[1])) \\ &\quad \mathbb{d} \{ \mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{i}}, \mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{j}}, \mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{k}}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{i}}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{j}}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{k}}, \mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{i}+1}, \mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{j}+1}, \mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{k}+1}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{i}+1}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{j}+1}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{k}+1} \}; \\ \text{rhs} &= \int (\mathbb{E} [\dot{\mathbf{i}} \pi_{\mathbf{i}} \mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{i}} + \dot{\mathbf{i}} \pi_{\mathbf{j}} \mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{j}} + \dot{\mathbf{i}} \pi_{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{k}}] \times \mathcal{L} / @ (X_{\mathbf{j},\mathbf{k}}[1] \ X_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{k}+1}[1] \ X_{\mathbf{i}+1,\mathbf{j}+1}[1])) \\ &\quad \mathbb{d} \{ \mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{i}}, \mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{j}}, \mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{k}}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{i}}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{j}}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{k}}, \mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{i}+1}, \mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{j}+1}, \mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{k}+1}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{i}+1}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{j}+1}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{k}+1} \}; \\ \text{lhs} &= \text{rhs} \end{aligned}$$

True

😊 1hs

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{3}{2} + i \mathbf{T}^2 \mathbf{p}_{2+i} \pi_i - i (-1 + \mathbf{T}) \mathbf{T} \mathbf{p}_{2+j} \pi_i + i \mathbf{T}^2 \in \mathbf{p}_{2+j} \pi_i - i (-1 + \mathbf{T}) \mathbf{p}_{2+k} \pi_i + \\ & i \mathbf{T} \in \mathbf{p}_{2+k} \pi_i - \frac{1}{2} (-1 + \mathbf{T}) \mathbf{T}^3 \in \mathbf{p}_{2+i} \mathbf{p}_{2+j} \pi_i^2 + \frac{1}{2} (-1 + \mathbf{T}) \mathbf{T}^3 \in \mathbf{p}_{2+j}^2 \pi_i^2 - \\ & \frac{1}{2} (-1 + \mathbf{T}) \mathbf{T}^2 \in \mathbf{p}_{2+i} \mathbf{p}_{2+k} \pi_i^2 + \frac{1}{2} (-1 + \mathbf{T})^2 \mathbf{T} \in \mathbf{p}_{2+j} \mathbf{p}_{2+k} \pi_i^2 + \\ & \frac{1}{2} (-1 + \mathbf{T}) \mathbf{T} \in \mathbf{p}_{2+k}^2 \pi_i^2 + i \mathbf{T} \mathbf{p}_{2+j} \pi_j - i \mathbf{T} \in \mathbf{p}_{2+j} \pi_j - i (-1 + \mathbf{T}) \mathbf{p}_{2+k} \pi_j + \\ & i (-1 + 2 \mathbf{T}) \in \mathbf{p}_{2+k} \pi_j + \mathbf{T}^3 \in \mathbf{p}_{2+i} \mathbf{p}_{2+j} \pi_i \pi_j - \mathbf{T}^3 \in \mathbf{p}_{2+j}^2 \pi_i \pi_j - \\ & (-1 + \mathbf{T}) \mathbf{T}^2 \in \mathbf{p}_{2+i} \mathbf{p}_{2+k} \pi_i \pi_j + (-1 + \mathbf{T})^2 \mathbf{T} \in \mathbf{p}_{2+j} \mathbf{p}_{2+k} \pi_i \pi_j + \\ & (-1 + \mathbf{T}) \mathbf{T} \in \mathbf{p}_{2+k}^2 \pi_i \pi_j - \frac{1}{2} (-1 + \mathbf{T}) \mathbf{T} \in \mathbf{p}_{2+j} \mathbf{p}_{2+k} \pi_j^2 + \frac{1}{2} (-1 + \mathbf{T}) \mathbf{T} \in \mathbf{p}_{2+k}^2 \pi_j^2 + \\ & i \mathbf{p}_{2+k} \pi_k - 2 i \in \mathbf{p}_{2+k} \pi_k + \mathbf{T}^2 \in \mathbf{p}_{2+i} \mathbf{p}_{2+k} \pi_i \pi_k - (-1 + \mathbf{T}) \mathbf{T} \in \mathbf{p}_{2+j} \mathbf{p}_{2+k} \pi_i \pi_k - \\ & \mathbf{T} \in \mathbf{p}_{2+k}^2 \pi_i \pi_k + \mathbf{T} \in \mathbf{p}_{2+j} \mathbf{p}_{2+k} \pi_j \pi_k - \mathbf{T} \in \mathbf{p}_{2+k}^2 \pi_j \pi_k \end{aligned}$$

There's more! To get sl_2 invariants mod ϵ^3 , add the following to $L(X_{ij}^+)$, $L(X_{ij}^-)$, and $L(C_i^\varphi)$, respectively (and see More.nb at [ω-εβ/ap](#) for the verifications):

$$\text{😊 } \epsilon^2 r_2[1, i, j]$$

$$\frac{1}{12} \epsilon^2 \left(-6 p_i x_i + 6 p_j x_i - 3 (-1 + 3 T) p_i p_j x_i^2 + 3 (-1 + 3 T) p_j^2 x_i^2 + 4 (-1 + T) p_i^2 p_j x_i^3 - 2 (-1 + T) (5 + T) p_i p_j^2 x_i^3 + 2 (-1 + T) (3 + T) p_j^3 x_i^3 + 18 p_i p_j x_i x_j - 18 p_j^2 x_i x_j - 6 p_i^2 p_j x_i^2 x_j + 6 (2 + T) p_i p_j^2 x_i^2 x_j - 6 (1 + T) p_j^3 x_i^2 x_j - 6 p_i p_i^2 x_i x_j^2 + 6 p_j^3 x_i x_j^2 \right)$$

$$\text{😊 } \epsilon^2 \mathbf{r}_2[-1, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}]$$

$$\frac{1}{12 T^2} \epsilon^2 \left(-6 T^2 p_i x_i + 6 T^2 p_j x_i + \right. \\ \left. 3 (-3 + T) T p_i p_j x_i^2 - 3 (-3 + T) T p_j^2 x_i^2 - 4 (-1 + T) T p_i^2 p_j x_i^3 + \right. \\ \left. 2 (-1 + T) (1 + 5 T) p_i p_j^2 x_i^3 - 2 (-1 + T) (1 + 3 T) p_j^3 x_i^3 + \right. \\ \left. 18 T^2 p_i p_j x_i x_j - 18 T^2 p_j^2 x_i x_j - 6 T^2 p_i^2 p_j x_i^2 x_j + 6 T (1 + 2 T) p_i p_j^2 x_i^2 x_j - \right. \\ \left. 6 T (1 + T) p_j^3 x_i^2 x_j - 6 T^2 p_i p_j^2 x_i x_j^2 + 6 T^2 p_j^3 x_i x_j^2 \right)$$

$$\odot \epsilon^2 \gamma_2[\varphi, \mathbf{i}]$$

$$\frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 \varphi^2 p_i x_i$$

Even more! • The sl_2 formulas mod ϵ^4 are in the last page of the handout of [BN3].

- Using [GPV] we can show that every finite type invariant is I-Type.
- Probably, $\langle \text{Reshetikhin-Turaev} \rangle \subset \langle \text{I-Type} \rangle$ efficiently.
- Possibly, $\langle \text{Rozansky Polynomials} \rangle \subset \langle \text{I-Type} \rangle$ efficiently.
- Knot signatures are I-Type, at least mod 8.
- We already have some work on sl_3 , and it leads to the strongest genuinely-computable knot invariant presently known.

The sl_3^{1/e^2} Example (continues Schaveling [Sch]). Here we have two formal variables T_1 and T_2 , we set $T_3 := T_1 T_2$, we integrate over 6 variables for each edge: $p_{1i}, p_{2i}, p_{3i}, x_{1i}, x_{2i}$, and x_{3i} .



Schaveling

```
⊙  $T_3 = T_1 T_2$ ;  $i_-^+ := i + 1$ ;
 $\$ \pi =$ 
  (CF@Normal[# + O[ $\epsilon$ ]2] /.
    { $\pi_{is\_} \mapsto B^{-1} \pi_{is}$ ,  $x_{is\_} \mapsto B^{-1} x_{is}$ ,
      $p_{is\_} \mapsto B p_{is}$ } /.  $\epsilon \in B^b$  /.  $b < 0 \rightarrow 0$  /.  $B \rightarrow 1$ ) &;
```

```
⊙  $vs_{i\_} :=$  Sequence[ $p_{1,i}, p_{2,i}, p_{3,i}, x_{1,i}, x_{2,i}, x_{3,i}$ ];
 $\mathcal{F}[is\_] := \mathbb{E}[\text{Sum}[\pi_{v,i} p_{v,i}, \{i, \{is\}\}, \{v, 3\}]]$ ;
 $\mathcal{L}[K\_] := \text{CF}[\mathcal{L} / \text{@ Features}[K][[2]]]$ ;
 $vs[K\_] :=$ 
  Union@@Table[{ $vs_i$ }, { $i$ , Features[K][[1]]}]
```

The Lagrangian.

```
⊙  $\mathcal{L}[X_{i,j}[s\_]] := T_3^s \mathbb{E}[\text{CF@Plus}[
  \sum_{v=1}^3 (x_{vi} (p_{vi}^+ - p_{vi}) + x_{vj} (p_{vj}^+ - p_{vj}) + (T_v^s - 1) x_{vi} (p_{vi}^+ - p_{vj}^+)),
  (T_1^s - 1) p_{3j} x_{1i} (T_2^s x_{2i} - x_{2j}),
  \epsilon \in s (T_3^s - 1) p_{1j} (p_{2i} - p_{2j}) x_{3i} / (T_2^s - 1),
  \epsilon \in s (1/2 + T_2^s p_{1i} p_{2j} x_{1i} x_{2i} - p_{1i} p_{2j} x_{1i} x_{2j} - p_{3i} x_{3i} -
  (T_2^s - 1) p_{2j} p_{3i} x_{2i} x_{3i} + (T_3^s - 1) p_{2j} p_{3j} x_{2i} x_{3i} +
  2 p_{2j} p_{3i} x_{2j} x_{3i} + p_{1i} p_{3j} x_{1i} x_{3j} - p_{2i} p_{3j} x_{2i} x_{3j} -
  T_2^s p_{2j} p_{3j} x_{2i} x_{3j} +
  ((T_1^s - 1) p_{1j} x_{1i} (T_2^s p_{2j} x_{2i} - T_2^s p_{2j} x_{2j} -
  (T_2^s + 1) (T_3^s - 1) p_{3j} x_{3i} + T_2^s p_{3j} x_{3j}) +
  (T_3^s - 1) p_{3j} x_{3i} (1 - T_2^s p_{1i} x_{1i} + p_{2i} x_{2j} + (T_2^s - 2) p_{2j} x_{2j})) /
  (T_2^s - 1))] ]]$ 
```

```
⊙  $\mathcal{L}[C_{i\_}[\varphi\_]] := T_3^\varphi \mathbb{E}[\sum_{v=1}^3 x_{vi} (p_{vi}^+ - p_{vi}) + \epsilon \varphi (p_{3i} x_{3i} - 1/2)]$ 
```

Reidemeister 3.

```
⊙ Short[
  lhs =  $\int \mathcal{F}[i, j, k] \times \mathcal{L} / \text{@} (X_{i,j}[1] X_{i^+,k}[1] X_{j^+,k^+}[1])$ 
  d{ $vs_i, vs_j, vs_k, vs_{i^+}, vs_{j^+}, vs_{k^+}$ } ]
```

```
⊙  $T_1^3 T_2^3$ 
 $\mathbb{E}[\frac{3\epsilon}{2} + T_1^2 p_{1,2+i} \pi_{1,i} - (-1 + T_1) T_1 p_{1,2+j} \pi_{1,i} + \ll 150 \gg]$ 
```

```
⊙ rhs =  $\int \mathcal{F}[i, j, k] \times \mathcal{L} / \text{@} (X_{j,k}[1] X_{i,k^+}[1] X_{i^+,j^+}[1])$ 
  d{ $vs_i, vs_j, vs_k, vs_{i^+}, vs_{j^+}, vs_{k^+}$ };
lhs == rhs
```

True

The Trefoil.

```
⊙  $K = \text{Knot}[3, 1]$ ;  $\int \mathcal{L}[K] d vs[K]$ 
```



```
⊙ - ( (i T_1^2 T_2^2
   $\mathbb{E}[-((\epsilon (1 - T_1 + T_1^2 - T_2 - T_1^3 T_2 + T_2^2 + T_1^4 T_2^2 - T_1 T_2^3 -
  T_1^4 T_2^3 + T_1^2 T_2^4 - T_1^3 T_2^4 + T_1^4 T_2^4)) / ((1 - T_1 + T_1^2)
  (1 - T_2 + T_2^2) (1 - T_1 T_2 + T_1^2 T_2^2))) /
  ((1 - T_1 + T_1^2) (1 - T_2 + T_2^2) (1 - T_1 T_2 + T_1^2 T_2^2))) ]$ 
```

A faster program, in which the Feynman diagrams are “pre-computed” (see theta.nb at [wεß/ap](#)):

```
⊙  $R_1[s\_ , i\_ , j\_ ] = \text{CF}[
  s (1/2 - g_{3ii} + T_2^s g_{1ii} g_{2ji} - g_{1ii} g_{2jj} - (T_2^s - 1) g_{2ji} g_{3ii} +
  2 g_{2jj} g_{3ii} - (1 - T_3^s) g_{2ji} g_{3ji} - g_{2ii} g_{3jj} - T_2^s g_{2ji} g_{3jj} +
  g_{1ii} g_{3jj} +
  ((T_1^s - 1) g_{1ji} (T_2^s g_{2ji} - T_2^s g_{2jj} + T_2^s g_{3jj}) +
  (T_3^s - 1) g_{3ji} (1 - T_2^s g_{1ii} - (T_1^s - 1) (T_2^s + 1) g_{1ji} +
  (T_2^s - 2) g_{2jj} + g_{2ij})) / (T_2^s - 1)]$ 
```

```
⊙  $\theta[\{s0\_ , i0\_ , j0\_ \}, \{s1\_ , i1\_ , j1\_ \}] :=$ 
  CF[ $s1 (T_1^{s0} - 1) (T_2^{s1} - 1)^{-1} (T_3^{s1} - 1) g_{1,j1,i0} g_{3,j0,i1}
  ( (T_2^{s0} g_{2,i1,i0} - g_{2,i1,j0}) - (T_2^{s0} g_{2,j1,i0} - g_{2,j1,j0})) ]$ 
```

```
⊙  $T_1[\varphi\_ , k\_ ] = -\varphi / 2 + \varphi g_{3kk}$ ;
```

We call the invariant computed θ :

```
⊙  $\theta[K\_ ] := \text{Module}[\{Cs, \varphi, n, A, s, i, j, k, \Delta, G, v, \alpha, \beta, gEval, c, z\},
  \{Cs, \varphi\} = \text{Rot}[K]; n = \text{Length}[Cs];
  A = \text{IdentityMatrix}[2 n + 1];
  Cases[Cs, { $s\_ , i\_ , j\_ \}] \mapsto
    (A[[\{i, j\}, \{i + 1, j + 1\}]] += (-T^s T^s - 1))$ ];
   $\Delta = T^{(-\text{Total}[\varphi] - \text{Total}[Cs[[All, 1]]]) / 2} \text{Det}[A]$ ;
   $G = \text{Inverse}[A]$ ;
   $gEval[\mathcal{E}_-] := \text{Factor}[\mathcal{E} /. g_{v\_ , \alpha\_ , \beta\_} \mapsto (G[\alpha, \beta] /. T \rightarrow T_v)]$ ;
   $z = gEval[\sum_{k1=1}^n \sum_{k2=1}^n \theta[Cs[[k1]], Cs[[k2]]]]$ ;
   $z += gEval[\sum_{k=1}^n R_1 @@ Cs[[k]]]$ ;
   $z += gEval[\sum_{k=1}^{12 n} T_1[\varphi[[k]], k]]$ ;
   $\{\Delta, (\Delta /. T \rightarrow T_1) (\Delta /. T \rightarrow T_2) (\Delta /. T \rightarrow T_3) z\} // \text{Factor}$ ];$ 
```

Some Knots.

```
⊙ Expand[ $\theta[\text{Knot}[3, 1]]]$ 
```



$$\left\{ -1 + \frac{1}{T} + T, -\frac{1}{T_1^2} - T_1^2 - \frac{1}{T_2^2} - \frac{1}{T_1^2 T_2^2} + \frac{1}{T_1 T_2^2} + \frac{1}{T_1^2 T_2} + \frac{T_1}{T_2} + \frac{T_2}{T_1} + T_1^2 T_2 - T_2^2 + T_1 T_2^2 - T_1^2 T_2^2 \right\}$$

```
⊙ PolyPlot[0] = Graphics[{}];
PolyPlot[p_] := Module[{crs, m1, m2, maxc, minc, s, hex},
  crs = CoefficientRules[T_1^{-m1} - Exponent[p, T_1, Min] T_2^{-m2} - Exponent[p, T_2, Min] p,
    {T_1, T_2}];
  maxc = N@Log@Max@Abs[Last /@ crs];
  minc = N@Log@Min@Select[Abs[Last /@ crs], # > 0 &];
  If[minc == maxc, s[_] = 0,
    s[c_] := s[c] = (maxc - Log@c) / (maxc - minc)];
  hex = Table[{Cos[ $\alpha$ ], Sin[ $\alpha$ ]} / Cos[2  $\pi$  / 12] / 2,
    { $\alpha$ , 2  $\pi$  / 12, 2  $\pi$ , 2  $\pi$  / 6}}];
  Graphics[crs /. ({ $x1\_ , x2\_ \}) \mapsto c\_ \mapsto$ 
    If[c == 0, White, Lighter[If[c > 0, Red, Blue],
      0.88 s[Abs@c]]],
    Polygon[{{(1 - 1/2) / (1 + sqrt(3)/2), {x1 + m1, x2 + m2} + #} & /@ hex}]]];
PolyPlot[{ $\Delta\_ , \theta\_ \}] := PolyPlot[\theta]$ 
```


Remove




☺ GraphicsRow[PolyPlot[θ [Knot[#]]] & /@ {"3_1", "K11n34", "K11n42"}]





So θ detects knot mutation and separates the Conway knot K11n34 from the Kinoshita-Terasaka knot K11n42!



☺ GraphicsRow[PolyPlot[θ [TorusKnot @@ #]] & /@ {{13, 2}, {17, 3}, {13, 5}, {7, 6}}, Spacings $\rightarrow \emptyset$]



The 48-crossing Gompf-Scharlemann-Thompson knot [GST] is significant because it may be a counterexample to the slice-ribbon conjecture:




☺ AbsoluteTiming@ PolyPlot[

θ [EPD[X_{14,1}, X_{2,29}, X_{3,40}, X_{43,4}, X_{26,5}, X_{6,95}, X_{96,7}, X_{13,8}, X_{9,28}, X_{10,41}, X_{42,11}, X_{27,12}, X_{30,15}, X_{16,61}, X_{17,72}, X_{18,83}, X_{19,34}, X_{89,20}, X_{21,92}, X_{79,22}, X_{68,23}, X_{57,24}, X_{25,56}, X_{62,31}, X_{73,32}, X_{84,33}, X_{50,35}, X_{36,81}, X_{37,70}, X_{38,59}, X_{39,54}, X_{44,55}, X_{58,45}, X_{69,46}, X_{80,47}, X_{48,91}, X_{90,49}, X_{51,82}, X_{52,71}, X_{53,60}, X_{63,74}, X_{64,85}, X_{76,65}, X_{87,66}, X_{67,94}, X_{75,86}, X_{88,77}, X_{78,93}]]]




add the bar codes! ✓


{39.0193,




The torus knot $T_{22/7}$:



Last, a random ~~200~~ crossing knot (knot from N. Dunfield; more at $\omega\epsilon\beta$ /DK):




Prior Art. θ is probably equal to the “2-loop polynomial” studied by Ohtsuki at [Oh2] (at much greater difficulty, and with harder computations). θ is related, but probably not equivalent, to the invariant studied by Garoufalidis and Kashaev at [GK].



θ Sees Topology! Indeed, for a knot K , half the T_1 degree (say) of $\theta(K)$ bounds the genus of K from below, and this bound is sometimes better (and sometimes worse) than the bound coming from Δ . It is fair to hope that “anything Δ can do θ can do too” (see [BN2]), and in particular, that θ may say something about ribbon and/or slice properties.

The Rolfsen Table of Knots.



Where is it coming from? The most honest answer is “we don’t know” (and *that’s good!*). The second most, “undetermined coefficients for an ansatz that made sense”. The ansatz comes from the following principles / earlier work:

Morphisms have generating functions. Indeed, there is an isomorphism

$$\mathcal{G}: \text{Hom}(\mathbb{Q}[x_i], \mathbb{Q}[y_j]) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}[y_j][[\xi_i]],$$

and by PBW, many relevant spaces are polynomial rings, though only as vector spaces.

Composition is integration. Indeed, if $f \in \text{Hom}(\mathbb{Q}[x_i], \mathbb{Q}[y_j])$ and $g \in \text{Hom}(\mathbb{Q}[y_j], \mathbb{Q}[z_k])$, then

$$\mathcal{G}(g \circ f) = \int e^{-y \cdot \eta} f g \, dy \, d\eta$$

Use universal invariants. These take values in a universal enveloping algebra (perhaps quantized), and thus they are expressible as long compositions of generating functions. See [La, Oh1].

“Solvable approximation” $\leadsto$ perturbed Gaussians. Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a semisimple Lie algebra, let $\mathfrak{h}$ be its Cartan subalgebra, and let $\mathfrak{b}^u$ and $\mathfrak{b}^l$ be its upper and lower Borel subalgebras. Then $\mathfrak{b}^u$ has a bracket β , and as the dual of $\mathfrak{b}^l$ it also has a cobracket δ , and in fact, $\mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathfrak{h} \equiv \text{Double}(\mathfrak{b}^u, \beta, \delta)$. Let $\mathfrak{g}_\epsilon^+ := \text{Double}(\mathfrak{b}^u, \beta, \epsilon\delta)$ (mod ϵ^{d+1} it is solvable for any d). Then by [BV3, BN1] (in the case of $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_2$) all the interesting tensors of $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{g}_\epsilon^+)$ (quantized or not) are perturbed Gaussian with perturbation parameter ϵ with understood bounds on the degrees of the perturbations.

The Philosophy Corner. “Universal invariants”, valued in universal enveloping algebra (possibly quantized) rather than in representations thereof, are a priori better than the representation theoretic ones. They are compatible with strand doubling (the Hopf coproduct), and as the knot genus and the ribbon property for knots are expressible in terms of strand doubling, universal invariants stand a chance to say something about these properties. Indeed, they sometimes do! See e.g. [BN2, Oh2, GK, LV, BG]. Representation theoretic invariants don’t do that!



- [BN1] D. Bar-Natan, *Everything around sl_{2+}^ϵ is DoPeGDO*. **References.** *So what?*, talk given in “Quantum Topology and Hyperbolic Geometry Conference”, Da Nang, Vietnam, May 2019. Handout and video at [wef/DPG](#).
- [BN2] D. Bar-Natan, *Algebraic Knot Theory*, talk given in Sydney, September 2019. Handout and video at [wef/AKT](#).
- [BN3] D. Bar-Natan, *Cars, Interchanges, Traffic Counters, and some Pretty Darned Good Knot Invariants*, talk given in “Using Quantum Invariants to do Interesting Topology”, Oaxaca, Mexico, October 2022. Handout and video at [wef/Cars](#).
- [BV1] D. Bar-Natan and R. van der Veen, *A Polynomial Time Knot Polynomial*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **147** (2019) 377–397, [arXiv:1708.04853](#).
- [BV2] D. Bar-Natan and R. van der Veen, *A Perturbed-Alexander Invariant*, to appear in Quantum Topology, [wef/APAI](#).
- [BV3] D. Bar-Natan and R. van der Veen, *Perturbed Gaussian Generating Functions for Universal Knot Invariants*, [arXiv:2109.02057](#).
- [BG] J. Becerra Garrido, *Universal Quantum Knot Invariants*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Groningen, [wef/BG](#).
- [GK] S. Garoufalidis and R. Kashaev, *Multivariable Knot Polynomials from Braided Hopf Algebras with Automorphisms*, [arXiv:2311.11528](#).
- [GST] R. E. Gompf, M. Scharlemann, and A. Thompson, *Fibered Knots and Potential Counterexamples to the Property 2R and Slice-Ribbon Conjectures*, Geom. and Top. **14** (2010) 2305–2347, [arXiv:1103.1601](#).
- [GPV] M. Goussarov, M. Polyak, and O. Viro, *Finite type invariants of classical and virtual knots*, Topology **39** (2000) 1045–1068, [arXiv:math.GT/9810073](#).
- [La] R. J. Lawrence, *Universal Link Invariants using Quantum Groups*, Proc. XVII Int. Conf. on Diff. Geom. Methods in Theor. Phys., Chester, England, August 1988. World Scientific (1989) 55–63.
- [LV] D. López Neumann and R. van der Veen, *Genus Bounds from Unrolled Quantum Groups at Roots of Unity*, [arXiv:2312.02070](#).
- [Oh1] T. Ohtsuki, *Quantum Invariants*, Series on Knots and Everything **29**, World Scientific 2002.
- [Oh2] T. Ohtsuki, *On the 2-Loop Polynomial of Knots*, Geom. Topol. **11-3** (2007) 1357–1475.
- [Ov] A. Overbay, *Perturbative Expansion of the Colored Jones Polynomial*, Ph.D. thesis, University of North Carolina, August 2013, [wef/Ov](#).
- [R1] L. Rozansky, *A Contribution of the Trivial Flat Connection to the Jones Polynomial and Witten’s Invariant of 3D Manifolds, I*, Comm. Math. Phys. **175-2** (1996) 275–296, [arXiv:hep-th/9401061](#).
- [R2] L. Rozansky, *The Universal R-Matrix, Burau Representation and the Melvin-Morton Expansion of the Colored Jones Polynomial*, Adv. Math. **134-1** (1998) 1–31, [arXiv:q-alg/9604005](#).
- [R3] L. Rozansky, *A Universal $U(1)$ -RCC Invariant of Links and Rationality Conjecture*, [arXiv:math/0201139](#).
- [Sch] S. Schaveling, *Expansions of Quantum Group Invariants*, Ph.D. thesis, Universiteit Leiden, September 2020, [wef/Scha](#).

R. M. S. V.