## KNOTS WITH ALGEBRAIC UNKNOTTING NUMBER ONE

MICAH E. FOGEL

Every knot, K, in  $S^3$  has associated to it an equivalence class of matrices based on S-equivalence of Seifert matrices. When the knot is altered by changing a crossing, the S-equivalence class of the new knot is related to that of the original knot in a very specific way. This change in the Seifert matrices can be studied without regard to the underlying geometric situation, leading to a theory of algebraic crossing changes. Thus, the algebraic unknotting number may be defined as the smallest number of these algebraic crossing changes necessary to convert a Seifert matrix for the knot into a matrix for the unknot. A straightforward test of some well-known knot invariants will reveal that the algebraic unknotting number is one.

In [4], Murakami defined an operation on Seifert matrices that he called an *algebraic unknotting operation*. He showed that any geometric crossing change induced an algebraic unknotting operation on a suitably chosen Seifert matrix. Since any knot could be changed into any other knot by a sequence of crossing changes, any Seifert matrix could be transformed into any other Seifert matrix by a sequence of algebraic unknotting operations and S-equivalences. For knots  $K_1$  and  $K_2$  the *algebraic Gordian distance* from  $K_1$  to  $K_2$  is the minimum number of algebraic unknotting number,  $u_a(K)$ , is then the algebraic Gordian distance of K from the unknot, i.e. the minimum number of algebraic unknotting operations needed to reduce a Seifert matrix for K to a matrix S-equivalent to the zero matrix.

Since every crossing change induces an algebraic unknotting operation, there is the inequality  $u_a(K) \le u(K)$  where u(K) is the regular geometric unknotting number of the knot. And in many cases  $u_a(K)$ is the appropriate object of study rather than u(K) because only the algebraic information contained in a Seifert matrix is used. Such is the case in Murasugi's result on signatures [5] and Nakanishi's theorem about minor indices [6]. Also, results depending only on the abelian invariants (notably Lickorish [3] as generalized by Cochran and Lickorish [1]) apply to  $u_a(K)$  since all of the homology information about