

## Definite hermitian forms and the cancellation of simple knots

By

EVA BAYER\*)

Schubert has shown that every classical knot  $\Sigma^1 \subset S^3$  factorises uniquely into the connected sum of finitely many indecomposable knots (cf. [12]). In particular cancellation holds for these knots. For higher dimensional simple knots factorisation is not always unique (cf. [5] and [1]), but in many cases we still have cancellation (see [2], Proposition 6.6).

In this note we shall give counter examples to the cancellation of non-singular hermitian and skew-hermitian forms. In order to obtain these examples we shall show that the extension of the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -lattice  $\Gamma_{4n}$ ,  $n \neq 1$ , to certain orders is indecomposable.

Using the classification of simple  $(2q-1)$ -knots  $\Sigma^{2q-1} \subset S^{2q+1}$ ,  $q \neq 1$ , in terms of  $(-1)^{q+1}$ -hermitian (Blanchfield) forms, we shall then prove that cancellation does not hold for higher odd-dimensional knots.

I thank Hans-Jochen Bartels and Larry Gerstein for useful conversations.

**1. Definite hermitian forms.** Let  $K$  be a number field with a  $Q$ -involution which we shall denote by an overbar. Assume that  $K$  is totally imaginary and that the fixed field  $F$  of the involution is totally real. Let  $A$  be an order of  $K$ , and let  $L$  be a torsion free  $A$ -module of finite rank. We shall say that a hermitian form  $h: L \times L \rightarrow A$  is *definite* if  $h$  is anisotropic at every real embedding of  $F$ . Otherwise we shall say that  $h$  is *indefinite*.

The following is a result of Eichler (cf. [3]).

**Lemma 1.** *Every definite hermitian form decomposes uniquely as an orthogonal sum of indecomposable forms.*

Sketch of proof (see Kneser [8] and O'Meara [11], § 105). We shall say that  $x \in L$  is irreducible if  $x$  cannot be written as a sum  $x = y + z$ ,  $y \neq 0$ ,  $z \neq 0$  and  $h(y, z) = 0$ . Then every  $x \in L$  can be expressed as a finite sum of irreducible elements. Indeed, if  $x = y + z$  with  $h(y, z) = 0$  then  $h(x, x) = h(y, y) + h(z, z)$ . As  $h$  is anisotropic at every real place,  $h(y, y)$  and  $h(z, z)$  have the same sign at each real

---

\*) Supported by the "Fonds National Suisse de la recherche scientifique".

embedding of  $F$ . Therefore

$$N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(h(y, y)) < N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(h(x, x)), \quad \text{and} \quad N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(h(z, z)) < N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(h(x, x)).$$

As  $N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(h(x, x))$  is a natural number, we see by induction that  $x$  can be written as a finite sum of irreducibles. We shall say that two irreducible elements  $x$  and  $x'$  are equivalent if there exists a finite chain of irreducible elements

$$x = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k = x',$$

such that  $h(x_i, x_{i+1}) \neq 0$ . Every equivalence class generates a sublattice of  $L$ , and  $L$  is the orthogonal sum of these lattices. It is easy to see (cf. [11], § 105), that every orthogonal splitting of  $L$  into indecomposables is a permutation of these sublattices.

Let  $L$  be a free  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module of finite rank, and let  $b: L \times L \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  be a symmetric  $\mathbb{Z}$ -bilinear form. Let  $\hat{L} = A \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} L$ , and let  $h: \hat{L} \times \hat{L} \rightarrow A$  be the hermitian form which is defined by  $h(\alpha x, \beta y) = \alpha\beta b(x, y)$  for  $\alpha, \beta \in A$  and  $x, y \in L$ . If  $b$  is definite then  $h$  is also definite.

We shall apply this construction to the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -bilinear form  $b: L \times L \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  which corresponds to the lattice  $\Gamma_{4n}$  (cf. [10], chap. II, § 6, or [11], § 106 E).

**Proposition.** *The hermitian form  $A\Gamma_{4n}$  is indecomposable if  $n > 1$ .*

The following lemma is well known.

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $m = [F : \mathbb{Q}]$ . If  $a \in F$  is a totally positive algebraic integer, then  $Tr_{F/\mathbb{Q}}(a) \geq m$ . Moreover, if  $Tr_{F/\mathbb{Q}}(a) = m$  then  $a = 1$ .*

This follows immediately from the inequality between arithmetic and geometric means.

**Proof of Proposition.** Let  $V = Ke_1 \oplus \dots \oplus Ke_{4n}$  with the hermitian form  $h(e_i, e_j) = \delta_{ij}$ . Then  $A\Gamma_{4n}$  is the lattice in  $V$  which is generated by  $e_i + e_j$  and  $\frac{1}{2}(e_1 + \dots + e_{4n})$ . We shall prove that if  $x \in A\Gamma_{4n}$  such that  $h(x, x) = 2$ , then  $x$  is irreducible.

Indeed, assume that  $x = y + z$  with  $y \neq 0, z \neq 0$  and  $h(y, z) = 0$ . Therefore  $h(x, x) = h(y, y) + h(z, z)$ , so we have

$$2m = Tr_{F/\mathbb{Q}}(h(x, x)) = Tr_{F/\mathbb{Q}}(h(y, y)) + Tr_{F/\mathbb{Q}}(h(z, z)),$$

where  $m = [F : \mathbb{Q}]$ . But  $h(y, y)$  and  $h(z, z)$  are both totally positive. By Lemma 2 this implies that  $Tr_{F/\mathbb{Q}}(h(y, y)) = Tr_{F/\mathbb{Q}}(h(z, z)) = m$  (in fact,  $h(y, y) = h(z, z) = 1$ ). Now we shall show that if  $y \in A\Gamma_{4n}$ , then  $Tr_{F/\mathbb{Q}}(h(y, y)) = m$  is impossible. In-

deed, if  $y = \sum_{i=1}^{4n} a_i e_i \in A\Gamma_{4n}$ , then  $a_i \in \frac{1}{2}A, a_i - a_j \in A$  for every  $i, j = 1, \dots, 4n$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^{4n} a_i \in 2A$  (cf. [11], § 106 E). We have  $h(y, y) = \sum_{i=1}^{4n} a_i \bar{a}_i$ , so  $m = \sum_{i=1}^{4n} Tr_{F/\mathbb{Q}}(a_i \bar{a}_i)$ .

Two cases are possible: either all of the  $a_i$ 's are in  $A$ , or  $a_i = \frac{1}{2}b_i$  with  $b_i \in A$  and  $b_i \neq 0, i = 1, \dots, 4n$ . If we are in the first case, then Lemma 2 implies that all the  $a_i$ 's except one, say  $a_1$ , are zero. But then  $a_1 \in 2A$ , which contradicts

$Tr_{F/\mathbb{Q}}(\alpha_1 \bar{\alpha}_1) = m$ . In the second case we have  $m = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i=1}^{4n} b_i \bar{b}_i \geq n \cdot m$ , using Lemma 2.

But  $n > 1$  so this is impossible. Let  $x_i = e_i - e_{i+1}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, 4n - 1$  and let  $x_{4n} = e_{4n-1} + e_{4n}$ . We have  $h(x_i, x_i) = 2$ , so  $x_1, \dots, x_{4n}$  are irreducible. But  $h(x_i, x_{i+1}) \neq 0$ , so the  $x_i$ 's are all in the same indecomposable component of  $A \Gamma_{4n}$  (see Lemma 1). But the  $x_i$ 's are linearly independent, so this component must be  $A \Gamma_{4n}$ .

Remark 1. The proposition can be generalized as follows: If  $(L, b)$  is definite, indecomposable, then  $(\hat{L}, h)$  is also indecomposable. If  $K$  is a quadratic field, then this has been proved by L. Gerstein (cf. [4], Corollary 1.4) and R. Smith (cf. [13], Theorem 2.2). In the general case the analogue of this statement for quadratic forms has been proved by Y. Kitaoka (cf. [7], Corollary of Theorem 4). It is possible to adapt Kitaoka's proof to hermitian forms, only obvious changes are necessary.

Remark 2. Assume that  $A$  is integrally closed and that there exists an  $\alpha \in A$  such that  $\bar{\alpha} + \alpha = 1$ . Then two indefinite non-singular hermitian forms are isometric if and only if they have the same rank, signatures and isometric determinants (cf. [2], Definition 1.9 and Corollary 4.10).

By contrast, the above proposition shows that the number of isometry classes of definite hermitian forms of rank  $4n$  and determinant  $\langle 1 \rangle$  is at least  $p(n)$ , where  $p(n)$  is the number of partitions of  $n$  into a sum of positive integers. (See Gerstein [4], Theorem 3.9 for related results.)

**2. Counter-examples to the cancellation of simple  $(2q - 1)$ -knots,  $q > 1$ .** Let  $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$  be an irreducible polynomial such that  $\lambda(x) = x^{\deg \lambda}$ ,  $\lambda(x^{-1})$  and  $\lambda(0) = \lambda(1) = \lambda(-1) = 1$ .

Set  $A = \mathbb{Z}[x]/(\lambda)$ ,  $K = \mathbb{Q}[x]/(\lambda) = \mathbb{Q}(\tau)$ . Then  $K$  has a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -involution which sends  $\tau$  to  $\tau^{-1}$ .

Let  $M$  be a torsion free  $A$ -module of finite rank. By results of Kearton, Levine and Trotter, we have: Every non-singular  $(-1)^{q+1}$ -hermitian form  $h: M \times M \rightarrow A$  can be realized as the Blanchfield form of a simple  $(2q - 1)$ -knot  $\Sigma^{2q-1} \subset S^{2q+1}$  if  $q > 2$ . Two simple  $(2q - 1)$ -knots are isotopic if and only if the associated Blanchfield forms are isometric, for  $q > 1$  (cf. [6], [9], [14]). Therefore it is enough to show that cancellation does not always hold for non-singular hermitian and skew-hermitian forms.

Let us choose  $\lambda$  such that  $K$  is totally imaginary and that the fixed field  $F$  of the involution is totally real. (For instance,  $\lambda(x) = x^4 - x^2 + 1$ , the cyclotomic polynomial corresponding to the 12th roots of unity.)

We have:

$$(*) \quad A \Gamma_8 \perp A \Gamma_8 \perp \langle -1 \rangle \cong A \Gamma_{16} \perp \langle -1 \rangle$$

(where  $\perp$  denotes orthogonal sum, and  $\langle -1 \rangle$  is the hermitian form  $Ae \times Ae \rightarrow A$  such that  $ee = -1$ ). Indeed, this isomorphism already holds over  $\mathbb{Z}$  (cf. [10],

Chap. II, Theorem (4.3)). On the other hand,  $A\Gamma_8 \perp A\Gamma_8$  is not isometric to  $A\Gamma_{16}$  because the latter is indecomposable (see Section 1).

This gives the desired counter-example for  $q$  odd,  $q \neq 1$ .

Let  $u = \tau - \tau^{-1}$ . Then  $u$  is a unit of  $A$  because

$$N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(u) = N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\tau^{-1}) \cdot N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\tau - 1) N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\tau + 1) = \lambda(0) \cdot \lambda(1) \cdot \lambda(-1) = 1.$$

We have  $\bar{u} = -u$ , so multiplying (\*) by  $u$  we obtain a counter-example to cancellation of non-singular skew-hermitian forms, i.e. for the case  $q$  even,  $q \neq 2$ .

We need a special argument for 3-knots. Let  $h: M \times M \rightarrow A$  be a non-singular skew-hermitian form. There exists a simple 3-knot  $\Sigma^3 \subset S^5$  such that the Blanchfield form of  $\Sigma^3$  is isometric to  $h$  if and only if the signature of the intersection form corresponding to  $h$  is divisible by 16 (cf. [9], [14]).

Let  $\Gamma$  be the orthogonal sum of 16 copies of  $\Gamma_8$ . We have

$$A\Gamma \perp \langle 1 \rangle \perp \langle -1 \rangle \cong A\Gamma_{128} \perp \langle 1 \rangle \perp \langle -1 \rangle.$$

As before, we multiply by  $u$  in order to obtain skew-hermitian forms.

#### References

- [1] E. BAYER, Factorisation is not unique for higher dimensional knots. *Comment. Math. Helv.* **55**, 583–592 (1980).
- [2] E. BAYER, Unimodular hermitian and skew-hermitian forms. *J. Algebra* (to appear).
- [3] M. EICHLER, Zur Theorie der Kristallgitter. *Math. Ann.* **125**, 51–55 (1952).
- [4] L. GERSTEIN, Classes of definite hermitian forms. *Amer. J. Math.* **100**, 81–97 (1978).
- [5] C. KEARTON, Factorisation is not unique for 3-knots. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **28**, 451–452 (1979).
- [6] C. KEARTON, Blanchfield duality and simple knots. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **202**, 141–160 (1975).
- [7] Y. KITAOKA, Scalar extension of quadratic lattices. *Nagoya Math. J.* **66**, 139–149 (1977).
- [8] M. KNESE, Zur Theorie der Kristallgitter. *Math. Ann.* **127**, 105–106 (1954).
- [9] J. LEVINE, An algebraic classification of some knots of codimension two. *Comment. Math. Helv.* **45**, 185–198 (1970).
- [10] J. MILNOR and D. HUSEMOLLER, *Symmetric bilinear forms*. Berlin-Heidelberg-New York 1973.
- [11] O. T. O'MEARA, *Introduction to quadratic forms*. Berlin-Heidelberg-New York 1973.
- [12] H. SCHUBERT, Die eindeutige Zerlegbarkeit eines Knotens in Primknoten. *S.-B. Heidelberger Akad. Wiss. Math.-Natur. Kl.* **1**, **3**, 57–104 (1949).
- [13] R. F. SMITH, The construction of definite indecomposable hermitian forms. *Amer. J. Math.* **100**, 1021–1048 (1978).
- [14] H. F. TROTTER, On  $S$ -equivalence of Seifert matrices. *Invent. math.* **20**, 173–207 (1973).

Eingegangen am 25. 9. 1981

Anschrift des Autors:

Eva Bayer  
 Université de Genève  
 Section de Mathématiques  
 2–4, rue du Lièvre  
 Case postale 124  
 CH-1211 Genève 24