PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS
Vol. 131, No. 2, 1988

JONES POLYNOMIALS OF PERIODIC LINKS

KUNIO MURASUGI

Let L be a link in S^3 which has a prime period and L_* be its factor link. Several relationships between the Jones polynomials of L and L_* are proved. As an application, it is shown that some knot cannot have a certain period.

1. Introduction. Let L be an oriented link that has period $r > 1$. That is, there exists an orientation preserving auto-homeomorphism $\phi: S^3 \to S^3$ of order r with a set of fixed points $F \cong S^1$ disjoint from L and which maps L onto itself. By the positive solution of Smith Conjecture, F is unknotted. Let $\Sigma^3 = S^3/\phi$ be the quotient space under ϕ. Since F is unknotted, Σ^3 is again a 3-sphere, and S^3 is the r-fold cyclic covering space of Σ^3 branched along F.

Let $\psi: S^3 \to \Sigma^3$ be the covering projection. Denote $\psi(L) = L_*$, which is called the *factor link*, and let $V_L(t)$ and $V_{L_*}(t)$ denote, respectively, the Jones polynomials of L and L_*.

In this paper, we will prove some relationships between $V_L(t)$ and $V_{L_*}(t)$ which are analogous to those between their Alexander polynomials [**M2**]. In fact, we will prove

THEOREM 1. *Let r be a prime and L a link that has period r^q, $q \geq 1$. Then*

$$V_L(t) \equiv \left[V_{L_*}(t)\right]^{r^q} \mod(r, \xi_r(t)), \tag{1.1}$$

where $\xi_r(t) = \sum_{j=0}^{r-1}(-t)^j - t^{(r-1)/2}$.

If L is not split, then we are able to prove a slightly more precise formula.

Let $\operatorname{lk}(X, Y)$ denote the linking number between two simple closed curves X and Y in S^3. Then we have

THEOREM 2. *Let r be a prime and L a non-split link that has period r^q, $q \geq 1$.*

(1) *If* $\operatorname{lk}(L, F) \equiv 1 \pmod 2$, *then*

$$V_L(t) \equiv \left[V_{L_*}(t)\right]^{r^q} \quad \operatorname{mod}(r, \eta_r(t)), \tag{1.2}$$

where $\eta_r(t) = [\sum_{j=0}^{r-2}(j+1)(-t)^j](1+t^r) - t^{r-1}$.

(2) *If* $\operatorname{lk}(L, F) \equiv 0 \pmod 2$, *then*

$$V_L(t) \equiv \left[V_{L_*}(t)\right]^{r^q} \quad \operatorname{mod}(r, \xi_r(t)). \tag{1.3}$$

Note that $\eta_r(t) \equiv 0 \operatorname{mod}(r, \xi_r(t))$. (See Lemma 6 in §3.) As a simple consequence, we obtain

COROLLARY 3. *Let* **b** *be an n-braid and let* $V_{\mathbf{b}}(t)$ *be the Jones polynomial of the closure* $\hat{\mathbf{b}}$ *of* **b**. *Let r be a prime and* $q \geq 1$. *Then*

$$V_{\mathbf{b}^{r^q}}(t) \equiv \left[V_{\mathbf{b}}(t)\right]^{r^q} \quad \operatorname{mod}(r, \xi_r(t)).$$

Formulas (1.1), (1.2), and (1.3) involve slightly larger ideals than those in the corresponding formulas about the Alexander polynomials [**M2**]. However, they are the best possible. To see this, consider an n-component trivial link L. L has any period r and a factor link L_* is also an n-component trivial link. Since $V_L(t) = V_{L_*}(t) = (-1)^{n-1}(\sqrt{t} + 1/\sqrt{t})^{n-1}$, the formula $V_L(t) \equiv [V_{L_*}(t)]^r \pmod I$ holds only if the ideal I contains $\xi_r(t)$. We should note that while the Alexander polynomial of a link may vanish, the Jones polynomial of a link never vanishes.

Corollary 3 is also verified for $n = 3$ by a direct computation using Theorem 21 [**J**] and Theorem [**M2**].

These formulas may have more theoretical values than practical values. (See Proposition 7 in §4.) Nevertheless, we can prove that 10_{105} cannot have period 7 (Proposition 10). This solves one of several undecided cases for knots with 10 crossings.

2. Proof of Theorem 1. Since it suffices to prove Theorem 1 for $q = 1$, we assume that L has a prime period r. In this section, we prove that Theorem 2 implies Theorem 1.

Suppose that L has period r and let ϕ be an orientation preserving auto-homeomorphism of S^3 that maps L onto itself. Suppose that L splits into k components $L_1, L_2, \dots, L_k$. Then ϕ must map a split component not having period r onto another split component not having period r. Therefore, split components of L are divided into $h + 1$ sets $A_1 = \{L_1, \dots, L_r\}$, $A_2 = \{L_{r+1}, \dots, L_{2r}\}, \dots, A_h = \{L_{(h-1)r+1}, \dots, L_{hr}\}$ and $B = \{L_{hr+1}, \dots, L_k\}$ such that any two links in A_i $(i = 1, 2, \dots, h)$ are ambient isotopic and a link in B has period r. The factor link L_*, then, has $h + (k - hr)$ $(= k - h(r-1))$ split components. Noting that the factor link of the r-split component link $L_{sr+1} \cup \cdots \cup L_{(s+1)r}$ is

L_{sr+1}, $0 \le s \le h-1$, we have

$$(2.1)\ (1)\quad V_L(t) = \left[-\left(\sqrt{t} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}\right)\right]^{k-1} \prod_{i=1}^{k} V_{L_i}(t), \quad \text{and}$$

$$(2)\quad V_{L_*}(t) = \left[-\left(\sqrt{t} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}\right)\right]^{k-h(r-1)-1} \prod_{s=0}^{h-1} V_{L_{sr+1}}(t) \prod_{j=hr+1}^{k} V_{L_{j*}}(t).$$

Now Theorem 2 implies that for $j = hr+1, \dots, k$, $V_{L_j}(t) \equiv V_{L_{j*}}(t)^r \bmod(r, \xi_r(t))$ and hence

$$(2.2)\quad V_{L_*}(t)^r = \left[-\left(\sqrt{t} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}\right)\right]^{r[k-h(r-1)-1]} \prod_{s=0}^{h-1} V_{L_{sr+1}}(t)^r \prod_{j=hr+1}^{k} V_{L_{j*}}(t)^r$$

$$\equiv \left[-\left(\sqrt{t} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}\right)\right]^{k-h(r-1)-1} \prod_{i=1}^{k} V_{L_i}(t) \qquad \bmod(r, \xi_r(t)).$$

Comparing (2.2) with (2.1) (1), we see that Theorem 1 will follow from Lemma 4 below.

LEMMA 4. *For a prime r,*

$$(-1)^{k-h(r-1)-1}\left(\sqrt{t} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}\right)^{k-h(r-1)-1}$$

$$\equiv (-1)^{k-1}\left(\sqrt{t} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}\right)^{k-1} \quad \bmod(r, \xi_r(t)).$$

Proof. Since $\xi_r(t) \equiv (1+t)^{r-1} - t^{(r-1)/2} \pmod r$ by Lemma 6 (proved in §3), it follows that $(\sqrt{t} + (1/\sqrt{t}))^{r-1} = ((t+1)/\sqrt{t})^{r-1} \equiv 1 \ (\bmod(r, \xi_r(t)))$. Since r is a prime, $(-1)^{k-h(r-1)-1} \equiv (-1)^{k-1} \pmod r$. □

3. Proof of Theorem 2. We may assume that $q = 1$ and L is not split.

Let ζ be the rotation of R^2 about the origin 0 through $2\pi/r$. Since L is a link having period r, L has a diagram $\tilde{L}$ ($\not\ni \{0\}$) on R^2 which is divided into r pieces $\tilde{L}_0, \tilde{L}_1, \dots, \tilde{L}_{r-1}$ such that $\zeta(\tilde{L}_i) = \tilde{L}_{i+1}$, $i = 0, 1, \dots, r-1$, $\tilde{L}_r = \tilde{L}_0$. Let $R(0, 2\pi/r)$ be the closed domain bounded by two half lines $\theta = 0$ and $\theta = 2\pi/r$ in the polar coordinate system. We may assume that $\tilde{L}_0 = \tilde{L} \cap R(0, 2\pi/r)$. Let $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_l$ be the points of intersection of $\tilde{L}_0$ and the line $\theta = 0$ and let $\zeta(A_i) = B_i$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, l$, $A_i \ne B_i$. By joining A_i and B_i on R^2 by a circle C_i centered 0, we obtain a diagram $\tilde{L}_*$ of the factor link $L_* = \psi(L)$. For simplicity, we write $\tilde{L}_* = \tilde{L}/\zeta$. $\tilde{L}_*$ divides R^2 into finitely many domains, which we classify as shaded or unshaded. Now unshading the domain containing 0, we have the graph Γ_* of $\tilde{L}_*$. We may take 0 as one vertex of Γ_*. Furthermore, we can assign $+1$ or -1 to each edge of Γ_* [**M4**]. Similarly, we have the graph Γ of $\tilde{L}$ by unshading the domain containing 0. Γ is also an oriented graph. Using Γ and Γ_*, we can evaluate $V_L(t)$ and $V_{L_*}(t)$ as follows. (See [**M4**].)

Let p' and n' be, respectively, the number of positive and negative edges in Γ. Let $S(a, b)$, $0 \le a \le p'$ and $0 \le b \le n'$, be the collection of subgraphs obtained from Γ by removing exactly a positive edges and b negative edges. $S(a, b)$ contains $\binom{p'}{a}\binom{n'}{b}$ subgraphs.

For $\gamma \in S(a, b)$, let $\mu(\gamma) = b_0(\gamma) + b_1(\gamma)$, where $b_i(\gamma)$, $i = 0, 1$, denotes the ith Betti number of γ as a 1-complex. Then the bracket polynomial $P_{\tilde{L}}(A)$ defined in [**K**] associated with the link diagram $\tilde{L}$ is given by the following formula:

$$(3.1)\quad P_{\tilde{L}}(A) = \sum_{\substack{0\le a\le p'\\ 0\le b\le n'}} A^{p'-2a-n'+2b} \sum_{\gamma\in S(a,b)} \left[-(A^2 + A^{-2})\right]^{\mu(\gamma)-1}.$$

Note that (3.1) is equivalent to the formula (2.10) in [**M4**].

We will use (3.1) to evaluate $P_{\tilde{L}}(A)$ and $P_{\tilde{L}_*}(A)$.

Let p and n be, respectively, the number of positive and negative edges in Γ_*. Then Γ has exactly rp positive and rn negative edges, i.e. $p' = rp$ and $n' = rn$. Let $S_*(a, b)$ be the collection of subgraphs of Γ_* which is defined in a similar way to $S(a, b)$. Then we have

$$(3.2)\quad P_{\tilde{L}_*}(A) = \sum_{\substack{0\le a\le p\\ 0\le b\le n}} A^{p-2a-n+2b} \sum_{\gamma_*\in S_*(a,b)} \left[-(A^2 + A^{-2})\right]^{\mu(\gamma_*)-1}.$$

Since the rotation $\zeta\colon R^2 \to R^2$ maps $\tilde{L}$ onto itself, we may assume that ζ maps the graph Γ onto itself, preserving the sign of each edge. In other words, ζ defines an automorphism of the oriented graph Γ.

If $\operatorname{lk}(L, F) \equiv 1 \pmod 2$, then the unbounded domain is shaded. Therefore, ζ fixes only the origin 0. If $\operatorname{lk}(L, F) \equiv 0 \pmod 2$, however, the unbounded domain is unshaded, and hence, ζ keeps exactly two vertices 0 and ∞ fixed, where ∞ is a point associated with the unbounded domain. Therefore, if $\operatorname{lk}(L, F) \equiv 0 \pmod 2$, ζ may be considered as an automorphism of the graph Γ in S^2 which keeps the north and south poles fixed.

Case A. $\operatorname{lk}(L, F) \equiv 1 \pmod 2$.

In this case, Γ is the r-fold cyclic covering of Γ branched at 0. Take $\gamma \in S(a, b)$.

Case 1. γ is not fixed under ζ, i.e. $\zeta(\gamma) \ne \gamma$.

This is, of course, the case when $a \not\equiv 0 \pmod r$ or $b \not\equiv 0 \pmod r$. In this case, $\gamma, \zeta(\gamma), \zeta^2(\gamma), \dots, \zeta^{r-1}(\gamma)$ are all distinct, but, since any two of these are isomorphic, we have exactly r identical terms in $P_{\tilde{L}}(A)$, and they vanish by reducing modulo r.

Case 2. γ is fixed under ζ setwise, i.e. $\zeta(\gamma) = \gamma$.

In this case, $a \equiv b \equiv 0 \pmod r$. Write $a = ra'$ and $b = rb'$. Then γ defines a unique quotient subgraph $\gamma_*(= \gamma/\zeta) \in S_*(a', b')$.

Let α and α_*, be, respectively, the terms in $P_{\tilde{L}}(A)$ and $P_{\tilde{L}_*}(A)$ which are associated with γ and γ_*. Since $p' = rp$ and $n' = rn$, we have

(3.3) (1) $\alpha = A^{r(p-2a'-n+2b')}\left[-(A^2 + A^{-2})\right]^{\mu(\gamma)-1}$, and

(2) $\alpha_* = A^{p-2a'-n+2b'}\left[-(A^2 + A^{-2})\right]^{\mu(\gamma_*)-1}$.

We will compare $\mu(\gamma) - 1$ and $\mu(\gamma_*) - 1$.

If we use the fact that γ is the r-fold cyclic cover of γ_*, it is not difficult to find some relationship between $b_1(\gamma)$ and $b_1(\gamma_*)$.

Consider connected components of γ. Let $D_0, D_1, \dots, D_k, D_{1,1}, \dots, D_{1,r}, D_{2,1}, \dots, D_{2,r}, \dots, D_{m,1}, \dots, D_{m,r}$ be connected components of γ such that

(3.4) (1) D_0 contains the origin $\{0\}$, and $\zeta(D_0) = D_0$,

(2) D_i $(i = 1, 2, \dots, k)$ is a component $(\notin \{0\})$ of γ such that $\zeta(D_i) = D_i$,

(3) $\{D_{j,1}, \dots, D_{j,r}\}$, $(j = 1, 2, \dots, m)$ is a set of components of γ which permutes by ζ

Then connected components of γ_* consist of the sets: $D_i' = D_i/\zeta$ $(i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k)$ and $D_{j,1}' = D_{j,1}$ $(j = 1, 2, \dots, m)$.

We compare $b_1(D_i)$ and $b_1(D_{j,\lambda})$ with $b_1(D_i')$ and $b_1(D_{j,1}')$.

LEMMA 5.

(3.5) (1) $b_1(D_0) = rb_1(D_0')$,

(2) $b_1(D_i) - 1 = r\{b_1(D_i') - 1\}$ *for* $1 \le i \le k$,

(3) $b_1(D_{j,1}) = b_1(D_{j,\lambda}) = b_1(D_{j,1}')$ *for* $1 \le j \le m$ *and* $1 \le \lambda \le r$.

Proof. (1) Let d_0' and e_0', denote, respectively, the number of vertices and edges of D_0'. Then, since D_0 is the r-fold cyclic covering of D_0' branched at 0, the number of vertices and edges of D_0 are given by

$r(d_0' - 1) + 1$ and re_0' respectively. Therefore

$$1 - b_1(D_0) = r(d_0' - 1) + 1 - re_0' = r(d_0' - e_0') - r + 1$$
$$= r(1 - b_1(D_0')) - r + 1 = 1 - rb_1(D_0'),$$

and hence, $b_1(D_0) = rb_1(D_0')$.

(2) Since D_i is the r-fold (unbranched) cyclic covering of D_0', it follows that $\chi(D_i) = r\chi(D_i')$, where χ denotes the Euler characteristic. Since $\chi(D_i) = 1 - b_1(D_i)$, we have

$$1 - b_1(D_i) = r\chi(D_i') = r\{1 - b_1(D_i')\}$$

and hence, $b_1(D_i) - 1 = r\{b_1(D_i') - 1\}$.

(3) is obvious.

Now we compare $\mu(\gamma) - 1$ and $\mu(\gamma_*) - 1$. Using Lemma 5, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(\gamma) - 1 &= b_1(\gamma) + b_0(\gamma) - 1 \\ &= b_1(D_0) + \sum_{i=1}^{k} b_1(D_i) + \sum_{j=1}^{m}\sum_{\lambda=1}^{r} b_1(D_{j,\lambda}) + k + 1 + rm - 1 \\ &= rb_1(D_0') + \sum_{i=1}^{k}\{rb_1(D_i') - r + 1\} + \sum_{j=1}^{m} rb_1(D_{j,1}') + k + rm \\ &= r\left[b_1(D_0') + \sum_{i=1}^{k} b_1(D_i') + \sum_{i=1}^{m} b_1(D_{j,1}') + k + 1 + m - 1\right] \\ &\quad -rk - rm - rk + k + k + rm \\ &= r[b_1(\gamma_*) + b_0(\gamma_*) - 1] - 2k(r - 1) \\ &= r\{\mu(\gamma_*) - 1\} - 2k(r - 1).\end{aligned}$$

Using this equality, we have

$$\alpha \equiv \alpha_*^r \mod\left[\{-(A^2 + A^{-2})\}^{2(r-1)} - 1\right]. \tag{3.6}$$

In fact, a simple computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha &= A^{r(p-2a'-n+2b')}\left[-(A^2 + A^{-2})\right]^{\mu(\gamma)-1} \\ &= A^{r(p-2a'-n+2b')}\left[-(A^2 + A^{-2})\right]^{r(\mu(\gamma_*)-1)}\left[-(A^2 + A^{-2})\right]^{-2k(r-1)} \\ &= \left\{A^{p-2a'-n+2b'}\left[-(A^2 + A^{-2})\right]^{\mu(\gamma_*)-1}\right\}^r\left[-(A^2 + A^{-2})\right]^{-2k(r-1)} \\ &= \alpha_*^r\left[-(A^2 + A^{-2})\right]^{-2k(r-1)} \\ &\equiv \alpha_*^r \mod\left(\left[-(A^2 + A^{-2})\right]^{2(r-1)} - 1\right).\end{aligned}$$

Case B. $\mathrm{lk}(L, F) \equiv 0 \pmod 2$.

We consider connected components of $\gamma \in S(a, b)$. Let $D_0, D_1, \ldots, D_k,\ D_\infty, D_{1,1}, \ldots, D_{1,r}, D_{2,1}, \ldots, D_{2,r}, \ldots, D_{m,1}, \ldots, D_{m,r}$ be connected components of γ which satisfy (3.4) (2) and (3). Furthermore, D_0 and D_∞ are such that

(3.7) D_0 contains $\{0\}$ and D_∞ contains $\{\infty\}$, and $\zeta(D_0) = D_0$ and $\zeta(D_\infty) = D_\infty$.

It may occur that $D_0 = D_\infty$. We should note that γ is the r-fold cyclic covering of γ_* branched at 0 and ∞.

Now (3.5) (2) and (3) are still valid under the present case. Only (3.5) (1) should be changed to the following.

(3.8) (i) If $D_0 \neq D_\infty$, then $b_1(D_0) = rb_1(D_0')$ and $b_1(D_\infty) = rb_1(D_\infty')$.

(ii) If $D_0 = D_\infty$, then $b_1(D_0) + 1 = r\{b_1(D_0') + 1\}$.

Proof. (i) follows from the fact that D_0 and D_∞ are, respectively, the r-fold cyclic coverings of D_0' and D_∞' branched at 0 and ∞.

(ii) $D_0(= D_\infty)$ is the r-fold cyclic covering of D_0' branched at 0 and ∞. Let d' and e' denote the number of vertices and edges of D_0'. Then

$$1 - b_1(D_0) = 2 + r(d' - 2) - re' = r(d' - e') - 2r + 2$$

$$= r\big(1 - b_1(D_0')\big) - 2r + 2,$$

which yields $b_1(D_0) + 1 = r\{b_1(D_0') + 1\}$.

Using (3.8) (i) and (3.5) (1), (2), we obtain the following formulas.

(i) When $D_0 \neq D_\infty$,

$$\mu(\gamma) - 1 = b_1(\gamma) + b_0(\gamma) - 1$$

$$= b_1(D_0) + \sum_{i=1}^{k} b_1(D_i) + b_1(D_\infty)$$

$$+ \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{\lambda=1}^{r} b_1(D_{j,\lambda}) + k + 2 + rm - 1$$

$$= rb_1(D_0') + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \{rb_1(D_i') - r + 1\}$$

$$+ rb_1(D_\infty') + \sum_{j=1}^{m} rb_1(D_{j,1}') + k + 1 + rm$$

(continues)

(continued)

$$= r\left\{ b_1(D_0') + \sum_{i=1}^{k} b_1(D_i') + b_1(D_\infty') + \sum_{j=1}^{m} b_1(D_{j,1}') + k + 2 + m - 1 \right\}$$

$$-kr + k - rk - r - rm + k + 1 + rm$$

$$= r\{\mu(\gamma_*) - 1\} - (2k+1)(r-1).$$

(ii) When $D_0 = D_\infty$,

$$\mu(\gamma) - 1 = b_1(D_0) + \sum_{i=1}^{k} b_i(D_i) + \sum_{j=1}^{m}\sum_{\lambda=1}^{r} b_1(D_{j,\lambda}) + k + 1 + rm - 1$$

$$= rb_1(D_0') + r - 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{k} rb_1(D_i') + \sum_{j=1}^{m} rb_1(D_{j,1}') + k + rm$$

$$= r\left\{ b_1(D_0') + \sum_{i=1}^{k} b_1(D_i') + \sum_{j=1}^{m} b_1(D_{j,1}') + k + 1 + m - 1 \right\}$$

$$-rk - rm + r - 1 + k + rm$$

$$= r[\mu(\gamma_*) - 1] - (k-1)(r-1).$$

Therefore, we have

$$\alpha \equiv \alpha_*^r \mod\left([-(A^2 + A^{-2})]^{r-1} - 1\right). \tag{3.9}$$

Now it only remains to show the following simple lemma.

LEMMA 6. *For any prime r,*

(1) $$(t+1)^{2(r-1)} - t^{r-1} \equiv \eta_r(t) \pmod r.$$

(2) $$(t+1)^{r-1} - t^{r-1/2} \equiv \xi_r(t) \pmod r.$$

Proof. If $r = 2$, the lemma is obvious. Therefore, we assume that r is an odd prime. Then it suffices to prove the following.

(3.10) For $j = 0, 1, \ldots, r-1$,

(1) $$\binom{2r-2}{j} \equiv (-1)^j (j+1) \pmod r,$$

(2) $$\binom{2r-2}{r+j} \equiv (-1)^j (j+1) \pmod r,$$

(3) $$\binom{r-1}{j} \equiv (-1)^j \pmod r.$$

Proof. Firstly, (3) is obviously true for $j = 0$ and 1. Since $\binom{r}{j} = \binom{r-1}{j} + \binom{r-1}{j-1}$, it follows by the induction hypothesis that $0 \equiv \binom{r-1}{j} + (-1)^{j-1} \pmod r$ which yields $\binom{r-1}{j} \equiv (-1)^j \pmod r$. This proves (3). Secondly, (1) is trivially true for $j = 0$ and 1. Now for $1 \le j \le r-1$,

$$\binom{2r-2}{j} = \binom{2r-2}{j-1}\frac{2r-j-1}{j}.$$

Using the induction hypothesis, we can write

$$\binom{2r-2}{j-1} = (-1)^{j-1}j + rk$$

for some integer k. Then

$$\binom{2r-2}{j} = (-1)^j(j+1) + (-1)^{j-1}2r + \frac{rk}{j}(2r-j-1).$$

Since $\binom{2r-2}{j}$ is an integer and r is a prime, $j \mid k(2r-j-1)$ and hence

$$\binom{2r-2}{j} \equiv (-1)^j(j+1) \pmod r.$$

This proves (1). Finally, since r is odd and $r-j-2 \le r-1$ for $0 \le j \le r-1$, (3.10) (1) implies that

$$\binom{2r-2}{r+j} = \binom{2r-2}{r-j-2} \equiv (-1)^{r-j+2}(r-j-2+1)$$
$$\equiv (-1)^{r-j+1}(j+1) \equiv (-1)^j(j+1) \pmod r.$$

This proves (2). □

Let I be the ideal in $Z[A, A^{-1}]$ generated by r and

$$\left[-(A^2+A^{-2})\right]^{2(r-1)} - 1 \quad \left(\text{or } \left[-(A^2+A^{-2})\right]^{r-1} - 1 \text{ in } Z[A, A^{-1}]\right)$$

when $\operatorname{lk}(L, F) \equiv 1 \pmod 2$ (or $\operatorname{lk}(L, F) \equiv 0 \pmod 2$). The Lemma 6 yields that $P_{\tilde{L}}(A) \equiv [P_{\tilde{L}_*}(A)]^r \pmod I$. Let $w(\tilde{L})$ be the twisting number (or the writhe) of $\tilde{L}$. Then, since $w(\tilde{L}) = rw(\tilde{L}_*)$, it follows that

$$f_L(A) = (-A)^{-3w(\tilde{L})}P_{\tilde{L}}(A) = (-A)^{-3rw(\tilde{L}_*)}P_{\tilde{L}}(A) \equiv \left[(-A)^{-3w(\tilde{L}_*)}P_{\tilde{L}_*}(A)\right]^r$$
$$= \left[f_{L_*}(A)\right]^r \pmod I.$$

Here $f_L(t^{-1/4}) = V_L(t)$ [**K**] and Theorem 1 follows from Lemma 6. A proof of Theorem 2 is now complete.

4. Applications and remarks. Formula (1.1) may not be used to determine whether a knot (but not a link) K has small prime period $r \leq 5$. In fact, we have the following

PROPOSITION 7. *Let K be a knot. Then for $r = 2, 3$ or 5,*

$$V_K(t) \equiv 1 \mod(r, \xi_r(t)). \tag{4.1}$$

Proof. First, note that $\xi_2(t) = 1 - t - \sqrt{t}$, $\xi_3(t) = 1 - 2t + t^2$ and $\xi_5(t) = 1 - t - t^3 + t^4$. Now, as is well known (Definition 17 [J]), $1 - V_k(t) \equiv 0 \mod \xi_5(t)$, and hence $V_K(t) \equiv 1 \mod \xi_5(t)$. Furthermore, congruences $1 - t + t^2 \equiv (1 - t - \sqrt{t})(1 - t - \sqrt{t}) \pmod 2$, $(1 - t)(1 - t^3) \equiv (1 - t + t^2)(1 + t^2) \pmod 2$ and $(1 - t)(1 - t^3) \equiv (1 - 2t + t^2)\cdot(1 + t + t^2) \pmod 3$ prove Proposition 7.

It is also easy to show that for any prime $r \geq 5$, $\xi_5(t) \mid \xi_r(t)$.

PROPOSITION 8. *Let r be an odd prime ≥ 5. Let ω and τ denote, respectively, a primitive $(r - 1)/2$th-root and $(r + 1)/2$th-root of unity. If a link L has period r, then*

$$(4.2) \qquad (1) \quad V_L(\omega) \equiv V_{L_*}(\omega) \pmod r$$

$$(2) \quad V_L(\tau) \equiv V_{L_*}(\tau^{-1}) \pmod r.$$

Proof. From Theorem 1, we see that $V_L(t) \equiv V_{L_*}(t)^r \equiv V_{L_*}(t^r)$ $\mod(r, \xi_r(t))$. Note that

$$\xi_r(t) = \frac{1 + t^r}{1 + t} - t^{(r-1)/2} = \frac{1}{1 + t}(1 - t^{(r-1)/2})(1 - t^{(r+1)/2}).$$

Since

$$\omega^r = \left(\omega^{(r-1)/2}\right)^2 \omega = \omega \quad \text{and} \quad \tau^r = \left(\tau^{(r+1)/2}\right)^2 \tau^{-1} = \tau^{-1},$$

a substitution ω or τ for t in $V_L(t)$ and $V_{L_*}(t^r)$ proves (4.2).

COROLLARY 9. *Under the conditions of Proposition 8, if L_* is unknotted, then*

$$V_L(\omega) \equiv V_L(\tau) \equiv 1 \pmod r. \tag{4.3}$$

Using Corollary 9, we can prove the following

PROPOSITION 10. *The knot 10_{105} in* **[R]** *has no period.*

Proof. According to **[B-Z**, p. 312], 7 is the only possible period of 10_{105}. Suppose that K has period 7. Since K is alternating and fibred **[M1]**, the factor knot K_* is either unknotted or fibred **[M3]**. Since $\Delta_K(t) = 1 - 8t + 22t^2 - 29t^3 + 22t^4 - 8t^5 + t^6 \equiv (1+t)^6 \pmod 7$, it follows from **[M2]** that K_* must be unknotted. Therefore, by Corollary 9, $V_K(\omega) \equiv 1$ and $V_K(\tau) \equiv 1 \pmod 7$, where $\omega = e^{2\pi i/3}$ and $\tau = e^{2\pi i/4} = \sqrt{-1}$. Since $V_K(t) = t^{-7} - 4t^{-6} + 8t^{-5} - 12t^{-4} + 15t^{-3} - 15t^{-2} + 14t^{-1} - 11 + 7t - 3t^2 + t^3$, we have $V_K(\sqrt{-1}) \equiv -1 \pmod 7$. Therefore, K cannot have period 7.

REMARK. A similar argument reveals that if $K = 10_{101}$ in **[R]** has period 7, then the factor knot cannot be unknotted.

REFERENCES

[B-Z] G. Burde-H. Zieschang, *Knots*, Walter de Gruyter (1985).

[J] V. F. R. Jones, *A polynomial invariant for knots via von Neumann algebras*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc., **89** (1985), 103–111.

[K] L. H. Kauffman, *State models and the Jones polynomial*, (to appear).

[M1] K. Murasugi, *On a certain subgroup of the group of an alternating link*, Amer. J. Math., **85** (1963), 544–550.

[M2] _____, *On periodic knots*, Comment. Math. Helv., **46** (1971), 162–174.

[M3] _____, *On symmetries of knots*, Tsukuba J. Math., **4** (1980), 331–347.

[M4] _____, *Jones polynomials and classical conjectures in knot theory*, Topology, **26** (1987), 187–194.

[R] D. Rolfsen, *Knots and links*, Publish or Perish Inc., (1976).

Received October 20, 1986 and in revised form December 1, 1986. This research was partially supported by NSERC No. A4034.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
TORONTO, CANADA, M5S 1A1