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ABSTRACT. Let $L$ be an alternating two-component link with Alexander polynomial $\Delta(x,y)$. Then the polynomials $(1-x)\Delta(x,y)$ and $(1-y)\Delta(x,y)$ are alternating. That is, $(1-y)\Delta(x,y)$ can be written as $\sum_{i,j} c_{ij} x^i y^j$ in such a way that $(-1)^{i+j} c_{ij} \geq 0$.
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1. INTRODUCTION.

This paper extends the graphical methods of Crowell [1] from the study of the reduced Alexander polynomial $\Delta(t)$ to the study of the unreduced Alexander polynomial $\Delta(x,y)$. This extension requires extra care in labelling the edges of our graph and in comparing its adjacency matrix to the Alexander matrix of the alternating link.
Crowell also used his method to prove that for alternating links, 
\[ \deg \Delta(t) = 2h, \] 
where \( h \) is the genus. In a future paper, we hope to prove 
equalities relating the \( \chi \)- and \( \gamma \)-degrees of \( \Delta(x,y) \) to geometric properties 
of an alternating link.

The author would like to thank James Bailey and Joan Hutchinson for their 
helpful comments.

2. ALTERNATING LINK PROJECTIONS.

Let \( P \) be an alternating, regular, planar projection of a two-component 
link \( L = K_1 \cup K_2 \), such as the projection of the link \( \beta_3^2 \) [4, p.416] in Fig. 1. 
The components of \( L \) are oriented, and \( P \) inherits this link-orientation. 
The two thick arrows off the projection in Fig. 1 indicate link orientation. 
We call \( K_1 \) the \( \chi \)-component and \( K_2 \) the \( \gamma \)-component.

The crossings of a projection are either positive, as shown in Fig. 2a), or 
negative, as shown in Fig. 2b), depending upon the orientations of the constituent 
segments. We also distinguish four types of crossings depending upon how 
the \( \chi \)- and \( \gamma \)-components enter in. These are:

- \( r_{\chi} \)-crossings: \( \chi \)-component overcrosses \( \gamma \)-component.
- \( r_{\gamma} \)-crossings: \( \gamma \)-component overcrosses \( \chi \)-component.
- \( s_{\chi} \)-crossings: \( \chi \)-component overcrosses itself.
- \( s_{\gamma} \)-crossings: \( \gamma \)-component overcrosses itself.

The capital letters \( R_{\chi} \), \( R_{\gamma} \), \( S_{\chi} \), and \( S_{\gamma} \) denote the number of crossings of each 
type. We follow Crowell's convention that if \( R_{\chi} = R_{\gamma} = 0 \) for a projection \( P \), 
then \( P \) is not alternating.

We shall need the following not-quite-obvious fact:

**Lemma 2.1.** In an alternating link projection \( P \), \( R_{\chi} = R_{\gamma} \).
PROOF. Let $0_x$ be the union of the $r_x$- and $s_x$-crossings and let $U_x$ be the union of the $r_y$- and $s_x$-crossings. Let $(i)$ be a crossing in $0_x$. The overcrossing $x$-component at $(i)$ must terminate (go under) at an adjacent vertex $(j) \in U_x$, since the projection is alternating. Define $f((i)) = (j).$ $f$ is a one-to-one correspondence between $0_x$ and $U_x$, so $R_x + S_x = R_y + S_x$ and $R_x = R_y$. 

If a projection has $d$ crossings labelled $(1),(2),\ldots,(d)$, we stipulate that $(1)$ be an $r_x$-crossing, $(2),\ldots,(2R_x)$ be $r_x$- or $r_y$-crossings, and $(2R_x+1),\ldots,(d)$ be $s_x$- or $s_y$-crossings.

A Wirtinger presentation [2, p.86] for the link group $\Pi_1(S^3-L)$ has one generator for each overcrossing segment in a regular projection of the link. If the projection is alternating, we can label the segment which overcrosses at vertex $(i)$ "$x_i$" or "$y_i$", depending on whether it belongs to the $x$- or $y$-component of the link. (Thus we define only one of the two symbols "$x_i","y_i".) The relators $r_i$, $i = 1,\ldots,d$, of the Wirtinger presentation are of the form

$$r_i = x_j y_i x_k^{-1} y_i^{-1}$$

for the crossing of Fig. 2a) and of the form

$$r_i = x_i y_j x_i^{-1} y_k^{-1}$$

for the crossing of Fig. 2b).

3. ASSOCIATED GRAPH THEORY.

We now regard the projection $P$ as a graph with the crossings of $P$ as vertices and the segments of $P$ joining vertices as edges. Thus each overcrossing segment in an alternating projection contributes two edges to the graph. We will use the word "vertex" when we are thinking of $P$ strictly as
a graph, and the word "crossing" when we are thinking of \( P \) as a link projection.

We next orient and label the edges of the graph of \( P \). This \textit{alternating} orientation differs from the link orientation. At each vertex \((i)\) of \( P \), we orient the two incident edges which belong to undercrossing segments at \((i)\) \textit{toward} \((i)\). The edge which is on the left with respect to the overcrossing segment receives the label "1". The edge on the right receives the label "-x" if the overcrossing segment belongs to the \( x \)-component and "-y" if the overcrossing segment belongs to the \( y \)-component. Fig. 1 shows the alternating orientation and labelling of \( 6^2_3 \). We indicate the alternating orientation by arrows on the edges of \( P \). We differ from Crowell \([1, pp.260-61]\) only in using "-x" and "-y" where he uses simply "-t".

The \textit{adjacency matrix} \( B = (b_{ij}) \) of an oriented and labelled graph is the \( d \times d \) matrix having for \((i,j)\) entry, \( i \neq j \), the sum of the labels on the edges which start at \( j \) and end at \( i \). (If there are no such edges, then \( b_{ij} = 0 \).) We also define \( b_{ii} = -\sum_{j \neq i} b_{ij} \). Thus each row-sum of \( B \) is zero.

THEOREM 3.1 (Matrix-tree theorem). Let \( B' \) be the matrix obtained from an adjacency matrix \( B \) by crossing out the first row and column. Then
\[
\det B' = \sum_T \Pi(T),
\]
where the summation is over all maximal rooted trees \( T \) with origin \((1)\) in the graph \([1, footnote 2, p. 262]\) and \( \Pi(T) \) denotes the product of the labels on the edges of \( T \).

PROOF. See \([3, p.47]\). Our matrix \( B \) is the transpose of Crowell's (disregarding the difference in labelling). Crowell makes his column-sums zero while Moon \([3]\) makes his row-sums zero. This discrepancy arises because Crowell is counting trees oriented \textit{away from} the origin (as we are) while Moon is counting trees oriented \textit{toward} the origin.
4. **Comparison with the Alexander Matrix.**

Our next task is to prove that the polynomial \( \det B' \) given in the last theorem is a link-type invariant.

The **Alexander matrix** \( A \) [2, p.100] of \( L \) with respect to the projection \( P \) and its Wirtinger presentation is the \( d \times d \) matrix \( (a_{ij}) = \left( \alpha_y \frac{\partial r_i}{\partial x_j} \right) \). (The map \( \gamma : F_d \to \pi_1(S^3-L) \) displays the link group as a homomorphic image of a free group, and the Abelianizing map \( \alpha \) sends all \( x_i \to x \) and all \( y_i \to y \).) The rows and columns of \( A \) correspond naturally to the vertices \( (1),\ldots,(d) \) of \( P \) since the relators and generators of the Wirtinger presentation so correspond. Define \( \overline{A} \) to be the matrix obtained from \( A \) by multiplying any row which corresponds to a negative crossing by \( -1 \). From now on, we will call \( \overline{A} \) the Alexander matrix.

**Lemma 4.1.** Let \( \overline{A}' \) be the matrix obtained from \( \overline{A} \) by deleting the first row and column. Then there is a polynomial \( \Delta(x,y) \) such that, up to units \( \pm x^p y^q \) in \( \mathbb{Z}[x, x^{-1}, y, y^{-1}] \), \( \det (1-x) \overline{A}(x,y) = (1-x)\Delta(x,y) \).

**Proof.** This is a special case of a theorem of Torres [5, p.61].

\( \Delta(x,y) \) is defined to be the **Alexander polynomial** of the link. It is a link-type invariant [2, p.120]. If we had deleted a column of \( \overline{A} \) corresponding to a segment from the \( y \)-component, we would have gotten \( \det \overline{A}' = (1-y)\Delta(x,y) \).

**Theorem 4.2.** For a given alternating link projection, the adjacency matrix \( B \) and the Alexander matrix \( \overline{A} \) are identical, except for the diagonal entries in rows corresponding to \( r_x^- \) or \( r_y^- \)-crossings. If \( (i) \) is an \( r_x^- \) (resp. \( r_y^- \)) crossing, then \( b_{ii} = x-1 \) (resp. \( y-1 \)) while \( a_{ii} = y-1 \) (resp. \( x-1 \)).

**Proof.** This is a routine application of the free differential calculus, and exactly follows [1, (2.10), p.261]. Notice that \( b_{ii} \) is defined to be minus the sum of the labels on all edges coming in to vertex \( (i) \). This sum must be either \( x-1 \) or \( y-1 \).
We give below the matrices $\overline{A}$ and $B$ for the alternating projection of the link $6_3^2$ shown in Fig. 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>$x-1$</td>
<td>$-x$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$y-1$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$-y$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>$-y$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$y-1$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$-x$</td>
<td>$x-1$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$y-1$</td>
<td>$-y$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$-y$</td>
<td>$y-1$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recall that $\det B' = \prod_{i=2}^{d} b_{io(i)}$, where $\Sigma$ is the group of permutations of $\{2,3,\ldots,d\}$. Let $b_0 = \prod_{i=2}^{d} b_{io(i)}$. Any permutation $\sigma$ can be written as a product of (algebraic) cycles $(i,\sigma(i), \sigma(\sigma(i)), \ldots)$ in $\Sigma$. A (geometric) cycle in a graph is a collection of oriented edges which forms a closed curve.

**Lemma 2.3.** Let $b_0$ be a non-zero entry in $\det B'$. Then for every non-trivial cycle $(i,\sigma(i), \ldots)$ in $\sigma$, there is a cycle of edges in $P$ joining vertex $i$ to vertex $\sigma(i)$, etc.

**Proof.** This is clear from the definition of the adjacency matrix.

In Fig. 1, hashmarks indicate the (geometric) cycles corresponding to $\sigma = (3 4)(5 6)$. For this example, $b_0 = (y-1)(1)(-x)(-y)(-y)$.

**Lemma 4.4.** Suppose there is an edge of the graph of $P$ joining vertex $i$ to vertex $\sigma(i)$. Then if $(i)$ is an $r_x$-crossing, $\sigma(i)$ is an $r_y$- or $s_x$-crossing. If $(i)$ is an $r_y$-crossing, then $\sigma(i)$ is an $r_x$- or $s_y$-crossing.

**Proof.** The edge in question is part of an overcrossing segment at $(i)$ which belongs to the $x$- (resp. $y$-) component. At $\sigma(i)$, this overcrossing segment must terminate. Thus $\sigma(i)$ is an $r_y$- or $s_x$- (resp. $r_x$- or $s_y$-) crossing.
COROLLARY 4.5. If \( b_0 \neq 0 \), the number of off-diagonal factors \( b_{i0} \) coming from \( r_x \)-rows equals the number of off-diagonal elements coming from \( r_y \)-rows.

COROLLARY 4.6. If \( b_0 \neq 0 \), then there is a positive integer \( p_1 \) and non-negative integers \( p_2, p_3, p_4, p_5 \) such that
\[
b_0 = (x-1)^{p_1-1} (y-1)^{p_1} (-x)^{p_2} (-y)^{p_3} (x-1)^{p_4} (y-1)^{p_5}.
\]
The corresponding term of \( \det \tilde{A}' \) is
\[
a_0 = (x-1)^{p_1} (y-1)^{p_1-1} (-x)^{p_2} (-y)^{p_3} (x-1)^{p_4} (y-1)^{p_5}.
\]

PROOF. In \( B' \), there are \( R_x - r_x \)-rows and \( R_y - r_y \)-rows. Since the off-diagonal factors of \( b_0 \) must be paired between \( r_x \)- and \( r_y \)-rows, there must be an imbalance of 1 in the diagonal elements. In \( a_0 \), this imbalance is reversed.

THEOREM 4.7. \( \det B' = (1-y)\Delta(x,y) \), up to units in \( \mathbb{Z}[x,x^{-1},y,y^{-1}] \).

PROOF. By Lemma 4.1, \( \det \tilde{A}' = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{E}} (-1)^{G} a_0 = (1-x)\Delta(x,y) \), up to units.

Let \( a_0 = (x-1)a_0' \). By Corollary 4.6, \( b_0 = (y-1)a_0' \). Thus \( \det B' = \sum_{0} (-1)^{G} b_0 = (1-y)\Delta(x,y) \), up to units.

THEOREM 4.8. The polynomials \( (1-y)\Delta(x,y) \) and \( (1-x)\Delta(x,y) \) are alternating. That is, \( (1-y)\Delta(x,y) \) can be written as \( \sum_{i,j} c_{ij} x^i y^j \) in such a way that \( (-1)^{i+j} c_{ij} \geq 0 \).

PROOF. The argument is identical to [1, (2.13), p.262]. By Theorem 3.1, we can compute \( \det B' = (1-y)\Delta(x,y) \) by summing the products of the labels on maximal rooted trees in the graph of \( P \). One of these products is positive if and only if it has an even number of edges labelled "-x" or "-y". All the results we have developed for \( (1-y)\Delta(x,y) \) can be duplicated for \( (1-x)\Delta(x,y) \) by making vertex (1) an \( r_y \)-crossing.
It would be interesting to know whether the polynomial $\Delta(x,y)$ must be alternating for alternating links. This does not follow by elementary algebra from our results. For example, the polynomial

$$3 - 2x + 2x^2$$

$$-2y - xy - 2x^2y$$

$$+2y^2 - 2xy^2 + 3x^2y^2$$

becomes alternating upon multiplication by $(1-x)$ or $(1-y)$. According to the Torres conditions [5, p.57], this polynomial could be the Alexander polynomial of a linking-number-one link each of whose components has Alexander polynomial $3 - 5t + 3t^2$.
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POLYNOMIALS OF ALTERNATING LINKS
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a) + crossing  b) - crossing