Comparison of Strategies

December-14-08
11:24 AM

Log / BCH	Scatter and Glow
Almost the first thing that comes to mind.	Definitely not the first thing you would consider
$Z = \exp L$ illusion of symplicity	$Z = G^{-1}(\Gamma)$ Looks mysterious
All you need is L	All you need is Γ, but without S you cannot in practice compute anything
Needs BCH Two options: "All strands at once" - $BCH/[[L,L],[L,L]]$ is not sufficient ☹ "BCH stand by strand" ~ may work.	Can be used to derive BCH
No consistancy condition required.	I don't know how to write the consistency that is required between S and G. Thus when solving equations, the unknown remains Z or L and cannot be replaced by G. $\Rightarrow$ The $L \to G$ function must be explicitly computable?!
Composition is highly non-linear, involves multiple BCH's, and I don't really understand how to implement it.	Composition is reasonably clear.
Make sense only in Δ-resorting	Makes sense in all internal

	be explicitly computable!
Composition is highly non-linear, involves multiple BCH's, and I don't really understand how to implement it.	Composition is reasonably clear.
Make sense only in Δ-respecting internal quotients.	Makes sense in <u>all</u> internal quotients, including ones in which disconnected relations are allowed. <u>Question</u>: can we use this, say, for the Jones quotient of $\mathcal{A}$ (classical F.T., no u)?

<u>Conclusion</u> For now, scatter and flow wins, though only because of my present difficulties working with BCH. Once I overcome these, Log/BCH may win.