

Cheat Sheet SL2Portfolio on 180214

February 14, 2018 8:28 AM

Series $[(1 - T^2 e^{-2\epsilon a \hbar}) / \hbar, \{a, 0, 3\}]$

$$\frac{1 - T^2}{\hbar} + 2 T^2 \epsilon a - 2 (T^2 \epsilon^2 \hbar) a^2 + \frac{4}{3} T^2 \epsilon^3 \hbar^2 a^3 + O[a]^4$$

Rescale $T^2 \rightarrow T$
back again!



should all coefficients be Series in \hbar/ϵ ?

can everything be done at $\hbar=1$, defining a filtration by other means? That ought to be possible, as the end results depend on t/T and not on \hbar .

Cheat Sheet sl_2 -Portfolio (an implementation of the sl_2 portfolio)

http://drorbn.net/AcademicPensieve/Projects/SL2Portfolio/modified February 13, 2018.

$\mathcal{U}_{y \in \mathbb{h}}$ conventions.

$q = e^{\hbar y \epsilon}$, $H = \langle a, x \rangle / ([b, x] = \gamma x)$ with

$$A = e^{-\hbar \epsilon a}, \quad xA = qAx, \quad S_H(a, A, x) = (-a, A^{-1}, -A^{-1}x),$$

$$\Delta_H(a, A, x) = (a_1 + a_2, A_1 A_2, x_1 + A_1 x_2)$$

and dual $H^* = \langle b, y \rangle / ([b, y] = -\epsilon y)$ with

$$B = e^{-\hbar y b}, \quad By = qyB, \quad S_{H^*}(b, B, y) = (-b, B^{-1}, -yB^{-1}),$$

$$\Delta_{H^*}(b, B, y) = (b_1 + b_2, B_1 B_2, y_1 B_2 + y_2).$$

Pairing with $(a, x)^* = \hbar \langle b, y \rangle \Rightarrow \langle B, A \rangle = q$ making $\langle y^i b^j, a^i x^k \rangle = \delta_{ij} \delta_{kl} \hbar^{-(j+k)} j! k! q^j$ so $R = \sum \frac{\hbar^{j+k} y^j b^j a^i x^k}{j! k! q^j}$. Then $\mathcal{U} = H^{scop} \otimes H$

with $(\phi f)(\psi g) = \langle \psi | S^{-1} f_3 \rangle \langle \psi_3, f_1 \rangle (\phi \psi_2)(f_2 g)$ and

$$S(y, b, a, x) = (-B^{-1}y, -b, -a, -A^{-1}x),$$

$$\Delta(y, b, a, x) = (y_1 + y_2 B_1, b_1 + b_2, a_1 + a_2, x_1 + A_1 x_2).$$

With the central $t := \epsilon a - \gamma b$, $T := e^{\hbar t/2} = A^{-1/2} B^{1/2}$ get

$$[a, y] = -\gamma y, \quad [b, x] = \epsilon x, \quad xy - qyx = (1 - T^2 A^2) / \hbar.$$

Cartan: $\theta(y, b, a, x) = (-B^{-1}Tx, -b, -a, -A^{-1}T^{-1}y)$. (Suggesting that it may be better to redefine $y \rightarrow y' = \theta x = A^{-1}T^{-1}y$.)

At $\epsilon = 0$, $\mathcal{U}_{\hbar \rightarrow 0} = \langle b, y, a, x \rangle / ([b, \cdot] = 0, [a, x] = \gamma x, [a, y] = -\gamma y, [x, y] = (1 - e^{-\hbar y b}) / \hbar)$ with $\Delta(b, y, a, x) = (b_1 + b_2, y_1 + e^{-\hbar y b_1} y_2, a_1 + a_2, x_1 + x_2)$ and $\theta(y, b, a, x) = (-e^{\hbar y b/2} x, -b, -a, -e^{\hbar y b/2} y)$.

Working Hypothesis. (\hbar, t, y, a, x) makes a PBW basis.

Casimir. $\omega = \gamma y x + \epsilon a^2 - (t - \gamma \epsilon) a$, satisfies...

Scaling with deg: $\{\gamma, \epsilon, a, b, x, y\} \rightarrow 1, \{\hbar\} \rightarrow -2, \{t\} \rightarrow 2, \{\omega\} \rightarrow 3$.

"consolidate"

DeclareAlgebra[QU, Generators $\rightarrow \{y, a, x\}$,

Centrals $\rightarrow \{t, T\}$];

q = SS[e^{γϵa}]; (*T=SS[e^{ħt/2}];*)

B[aqu, yqu] = -γyqu; B[xqu, aqu] = -γquex;

B[xqu, yqu] = (q-1)QU@{y, x} +

Oqu[SS[(1-T²e^{-2ϵaħ})/ħ], {a, y}];

(S@yqu = Oqu[SS[-T²e^{ħϵa}y], {a, y}]; S@aqu = -aqu;

S@xqu = Oqu[SS[-e^{ħϵa}x], {a, x}];)

S_i[QU, Centrals] = {t_i \rightarrow -t_i, T_i \rightarrow T_i⁻¹};

DeclareMorphism[C@, CU \rightarrow CU, {y \rightarrow -x_{cu}, a \rightarrow -a_{cu}, x \rightarrow -y_{cu}},

{t \rightarrow -t, T \rightarrow T⁻¹};

DeclareMorphism[Q@, QU \rightarrow QU,

{y \rightarrow Oqu[SS[-T⁻¹e^{ħϵa}x], {a, x}], a \rightarrow -aqu,

x \rightarrow Oqu[SS[-T⁻¹e^{ħϵa}y], {a, y}], {t \rightarrow -t, T \rightarrow T⁻¹}]

Can the AD and SD formulas be written so as to manifestly see their lowest term in ϵ ? This may allow more flexibility with $\$k$. Or perhaps better, these should be written in implicit form and solved by power series.

$$AD\$f = \gamma \frac{\text{Cosh}[\hbar(a + \frac{\gamma \epsilon}{2} - \frac{t}{2})] - \text{Cosh}[\hbar \sqrt{(\frac{t-\gamma \epsilon}{2})^2 + \epsilon \omega}]}{\hbar e^{\hbar((a+\gamma)\epsilon - t/2)} \text{Sinh}[\frac{\gamma \epsilon \hbar}{2}]} (a^2 \epsilon + a \gamma \epsilon - a t - \omega);$$

$\epsilon \rightarrow \epsilon$

AD\\$ω = γCU[y, x] + εCU[a, a] - (t - γε)CU[a];

DeclareMorphism[AD, QU \rightarrow CU,

{a \rightarrow aqu, x \rightarrow CU@x, y \rightarrow S_{cu}[SS[AD\\$f], a \rightarrow aqu, ω \rightarrow AD\\$ω] ** y_{cu}}]

$$SID\$g = \sqrt{\frac{2\gamma(\text{Cosh}[\frac{\hbar}{2}\sqrt{t^2 + \gamma^2 \epsilon^2 + 4\epsilon\omega}] - \text{Cosh}[\frac{t-\gamma\epsilon-2\epsilon a}{2\hbar}])}{\text{Sinh}[\frac{\gamma \epsilon \hbar}{2}]} (t(2a + \gamma) - 2a(a + \gamma)\epsilon + 2\omega)\hbar};$$

$\epsilon \rightarrow \epsilon$

SID\\$f = FullSimplify[e^{ħ(t/2-εa)}(SID\\$g /. {a \rightarrow -a, t \rightarrow -t})];

$\epsilon \rightarrow \epsilon$

SID\\$ω = γCU[y, x] + εCU[a, a] - (t - γε)CU[a] - tγ1_{cu}/2;

DeclareMorphism[SD, QU \rightarrow CU, {a \rightarrow aqu,

x \rightarrow S_{cu}[SS[SID\\$f], a \rightarrow aqu, ω \rightarrow SID\\$ω] ** x_{cu},

y \rightarrow S_{cu}[SS[SID\\$g], a \rightarrow aqu, ω \rightarrow SID\\$ω] ** y_{cu}}]

$\epsilon \rightarrow \epsilon$

$$e_{q, \hbar}[X_-] := e^{\hbar \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{(1-q)^j x^j}{j(1-q^j)}}; e_{q, \hbar}[X] := e_{q, \hbar}[X_-]$$

QU[R_{i, j}] := Oqu[SS[e^{ħb₁a₂} e_q[ħy₁x₂] /. b₁ \rightarrow γ⁻¹(εa₁ - t_i), {y₁, a₁}, {a₂, x₂}]_j];

QU[R_{i, j}⁻¹] := S_j@QU[R_{i, j}];

SetAttributes[{CO, QO}, Orderless];

CU@CO[specs___, E[L₋, Q₋, P₋]] := Oqu[SS[e^{L+Q}P], specs];

QU@QO[specs___, E[L₋, Q₋, P₋]] := Oqu[SS[e^{L+Q}P], specs];

$$\rho@y_{cu} = \rho@y_{qu} = \begin{pmatrix} \theta & \theta \\ \epsilon & \theta \end{pmatrix}; \rho@a_{cu} = \rho@a_{qu} = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma & \theta \\ \theta & \theta \end{pmatrix};$$

$$\rho@x_{cu} = \begin{pmatrix} \theta & \gamma \\ \theta & \theta \end{pmatrix}; \rho@x_{qu} = \text{SS} \left(\begin{pmatrix} \theta & (1 - e^{-\gamma \epsilon \hbar}) \\ \theta & \theta \end{pmatrix} / (\epsilon \hbar) \right);$$

ρ[e^ϵ] := MatrixExp[ρ[ϵ]]; ρ[ϵ] :=

$$\left\{ \epsilon / . \{t \rightarrow \gamma \epsilon, T \rightarrow e^{\hbar \gamma \epsilon / 2}\} / . \right.$$

$$\left. (U : CU | QU) [u___] \Rightarrow \text{Fold}[\text{Dot}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \theta \\ \theta & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \rho / @ U / @ \{u\}] \right.$$

Verification (as in Projects/PPSA/Verification.nb).

\$p = 3; \$k = 1; ε /: ε^k /: k > \$k := 0; (* \$k can't be ∞ at least because of Quesne. Can't be ∞ at least because of the explicit ε² in SID\$g. *)

SetAttributes[{SS, SST}, HoldAll]; SS[ε_] := Block[{h, ε}, (* Shielded Series *) Collect[Normal@Series[ε, {h, 0, \$p}], h, Together]];

SST[ε_] := Block[{h, ε}, Collect[Normal@Series[ε /. {T_i \rightarrow e^{ħt_i/2}, T \rightarrow e^{ħt/2}}, {h, 0, \$p}], h, Together]];

Simp[ε, op_] := Collect[ε, _CU | _QU, op];

Simp[ε_] := Simp[ε, Collect[Normal@Series[#, {h, 0, \$p}], h, Expand] &];

SimpT[ε_] := Collect[ε, _CU | _QU, Collect[Normal@Series[#, {T_i \rightarrow e^{ħt_i/2}, T \rightarrow e^{ħt/2}}, {h, 0, \$p}], h, Expand] &];

DP_{α₋→0₊, β₋→0₊}[P₋][λ] := Total[CoefficientRules[P, {α, β}] /. {m₋, n₋} \rightarrow c_D[λ, {x, m}, {y, n}]]

DeclareAlgebra[CU, Generators $\rightarrow \{y, a, x\}$, Centrals $\rightarrow \{t\}$];

B[a_{cu}, y_{cu}] = -γy_{cu}; B[x_{cu}, a_{cu}] = -γx_{cu};

B[x_{cu}, y_{cu}] = 2εa_{cu} - t1_{cu};

(S@CU@y = -y_{cu}; S@a_{cu} = -a_{cu}; S@x_{cu} = -x_{cu});

S_i[CU, Centrals] = {t_i \rightarrow -t_i};

SS_e[ε_] := Block[{ε}, Collect[Normal@Series[ε, {ε, 0, \$k}], ε, Together]; (* Shielded e-Series *)

CA[ε₁, y₁, a₁, x₁, ε₂, y₂, a₂, x₂] := Module[{eqn, d, b, c, sol, λ, q, v, ε, η},

eqn = ρ[e^ϵx_{cu}] . ρ[e^ηy_{cu}] ==

ρ[e^dy_{cu}] . ρ[e^c(t1_{cu} - 2εa_{cu})] . ρ[e^bx_{cu}];

sol = Solve[Thread[Flatten/@eqn], {d, b, c}] [1] /.

SW_{x_i, a_j}[(O : CO | QO) [OrderlessPatternSequence[{Lh₋, x_i, a_j, rh₋}]_s, more₋, E[L₋, Q₋, P₋]]] := O[{Lh, a_j, x_i, rh}]_s, more, With[{q = e^{-γ^α} ξ x_i + α a_j}, E[L₋, e^{-γ^α} ξ x_i + (Q / . x_i \rightarrow θ), e^{-α} DP_{x_i→0₊, a_j→0₊}[P][e^α]] / . {α \rightarrow ∂_{a_j}L, ξ \rightarrow ∂_{x_i}Q}]]

Fix the verify!

try to eliminate.

try to eliminate q

```
SSe[δ_] :=
Block[{e}, Collect[Normal@Series[δ, {e, 0, $k}],
e, Together]]; (* Shielded e-Series *)
CA[t1_, y1_, a1_, x1_, ξ1_, η1_, δ_] := Module[
{eqn, d, b, c, sol, λ, q, v, ξ, η},
eqn = ρ[eξxcu].ρ[eηycu] ==
ρ[edycu].ρ[ec(t1cu-2eca)] .ρ[ebxcu];
sol = Solve[Thread[Flatten/@eqn], {d, b, c}][[1]] /.
C[1] → 0;
λ = Simplify[e-ηy-ξx+ηtSSe[ect+dy-2eca+bx /. sol]];
q = ev(-tξ+ηy+ξx+δyx);
Collect[v q-1DPξ→δx, η→δy[λ][q] /. v → (1+tδ)-1,
e, Simplify] /. {t → t1, y → y1, a → a1, x → x1,
ξ → ξ1, η → η1};
```

$$e^{\xi x} e^{\eta y} = e^{\eta y} \lambda e^{\xi x} \Rightarrow \lambda = e^{-\eta y} e^{\xi x} e^{\eta y} e^{-\xi x}$$

comment! = $e^{\xi x} y e^{-\xi x}$

```
QA[T1_, y1_, a1_, x1_, ξ1_, η1_, δ_] := Module[
{G, F, fs, f, bs, e, b, es, λ, q, v, ξ, η, t},
G = Simp[Table[εk/k!, {k, 0, $k+1}].
NestList[Simp[xqu ** # - # ** xqu] &, yqu, $k+1]];
fs = Flatten@Table[fi,j,k[η], {1, 0, $k}, {i, 0, 1},
{j, 0, 1}, {k, 0, 1}];
F = fs.(bs = fs /. fi,j,k[η] ⇒ eiQUe[{yi, aj, xk}]);
es = Flatten[Table[Coefficient[e, b] == 0,
{e, {F - 1qu} /. η → 0, F ** G - yqu ** F - δηF}}, {b, bs}]];
{λ} = F /. DSolve[es, fs, η] /. {e → 1, QU → Times};
q = ev(-tξ+ηy+ξx+δyx);
Collect[v q-1DPξ→δx, η→δy[λ][q] /. v → (1+tδ)-1 /.
t → (T2-1)/h, e, Simplify] /.
{T → T1, y → y1, a → a1, x → x1, ξ → ξ1, η → η1};
```

abstract & merge, "complete source"

```
SWxi, aj[
(O : CO | QO) [OrderlessPatternSequence[
{Lh___, xi, aj, rh___}_s, more___, E[L_, Q_, P_]]] :=
O[{Lh, aj, xi, rh}_s, more,
With[{q = e-γa ξ xi + α aj},
E[L, e-γa ξ xi + (Q /. xi → θ), e-α DPxi→θξ, aj→δa[P][eq]]] /.
{α → δajL, ξ → δxiQ}]
```

```
SWyi, yi[
(O : CO | QO) [OrderlessPatternSequence[
{Lh___, aj, yi, rh___}_s, more___, E[L_, Q_, P_]]] :=
O[{Lh, yi, aj, rh}_s, more,
With[{q = e-γa η yi + α aj},
E[L, e-γa η yi + (Q /. yi → θ), e-α DPyi→θη, aj→δa[P][eq]]] /.
{α → δajL, η → δyiQ}]
```

```
SWxi, yj→h[CO[{Lh___, xi, yj, rh___}_s, more___,
E[L_, Q_, P_]]] := CO[{Lh, yh, ah, xh, rh}_s, more,
With[{q = v (ξ xh + η yh + δ xh yh - th ξ η)},
E[L, q + (Q /. xi | yj → θ),
e-α DPxi→δξ, yj→δη[P][CA[th, yh, ah, xh, ξ, η, δ] eq]]] /.
v → (1+thδ)-1 /.
{ξ → (δxiQ /. yj → θ), η → (δyjQ /. xi → θ), δ → δxi, yjQ}]
```

```
SWxi, yj→h[QO[{Lh___, xi, yj, rh___}_s, more___,
E[L_, Q_, P_]]] := QO[{Lh, yh, ah, xh, rh}_s, more,
With[{q = v (ξ xh + η yh + δ xh yh - h-1 (Th2-1) ξ η)},
E[L, q + (Q /. xi | yj → θ),
e-α DPxi→δξ, yj→δη[P][QA[Th, yh, ah, xh, ξ, η, δ] eq]]] /.
v → (1+h-1 (Th2-1) δ)-1 /.
{ξ → (δxiQ /. yj → θ), η → (δyjQ /. xi → θ), δ → δxi, yjQ}]
```

To do. • Consider renormalizing x and y. • Implement variable swaps. • Implement $m_{ij \rightarrow k}$. • Implement E, RE, and the casts CU and QU. • Reconsider the expansion of T and q in the hope of improving speed.

Replace swaps by "Rewrite Rules" (RR):

$$RR_U[\{x_i, y_j\} \rightarrow \{y_k, a_k, x_k\}, RQ, \lambda] \quad (RQ \text{ replaces } q)$$

revised quadratic

the linear Logos!

ADT:

$$RR_U[e^{\xi x_i} e^{\eta y_j} = 0, [E(RQ, \lambda) : \{y, a, x\}_k]]$$

ADT:

$$RR_U[\{x_i, y_j\} \rightarrow \{y_k, a_k, x_k\}, \{\xi, \eta\}, RQ, \lambda]$$

Program (as in Projects/PPSA/Verification.nb).

```

Unprotect[NonCommutativeMultiply];
Attributes[NonCommutativeMultiply] = {};
(NCM = NonCommutativeMultiply)[x_] := x;
NCM[x_, y_, z_] := (x ** y) ** z;
0 ** _ = _ ** 0 = 0;
(x_Plus) ** y_ := (# ** y) & /@ x;
x ** (y_Plus) := (x ** #) & /@ y;
B[x_, x_] = 0; B[x_, y_] := x ** y - y ** x;
DeclareAlgebra[U_Symbol, opts_Rule] :=
Module[{gp, sr, cp, CE, pow,
  gs = Generators /. {opts}, cs = Centrals /. {opts},
  (#U = U@#) & /@ gs;
  gp = Alternatives @@ gs; gp = gp | gp;
  (* gen's pattern *)
  sr = Thread[gs -> Range@Length@gs]; (* sorting rule *)
  cp = Alternatives @@ cs; (* cent's pattern *)
  CE[_] := Collect[_U,
    (Expand[#] /. h^d_ /; d > $p -> 0) &];
  U_i[_] :=
  _ / . {t : cp -> t_i, u_U -> Replace[u, x_ -> x_i, 1]};
  U_i[NCM[]] = pow[_] = U@{} = 1_U = U[];
  B[U@(x_)_i, U@(y_)_i] :=
  B[U@x_i, U@y_i] = U_i@B[U@x, U@y];
  B[U@(x_)_i, U@(y_)_j] /; i != j := 0;
  B[U@y_, U@x_] := CE[-B[U@x, U@y]];
  x_ ** 1_U := x; 1_U ** x_ := x;
  (a_ * x_U) ** (b_ * y_U) :=
  If[a b == 0, 0, CE[a b (x ** y)]];
  U[xx_, x_] ** U[y_, yy_] :=
  If[OrderedQ[{x, y} /. sr], U[xx, x, y, yy],
  U@xx ** (U@y ** U@x + B[U@x, U@y]) ** U@yy];
  U@{c_. * (L : gp)^n_, r___} /; FreeQ[c, gp] :=
  CE[c U@Table[L, {n}] ** U@{r}];
  U@{c_. * L : gp, r___} := CE[c U[L] ** U@{r}];
  U@{c_, r___} /; FreeQ[c, gp] := CE[c U@{r}];
  U@{L_Plus, r___} := CE[U@{#, r} & /@ L];
  U@{L_, r___} := U@{Expand[L], r};
  U[_NonCommutativeMultiply] := U /@ _;
  O_U[poly_, specs___] := Module[{sp, null, vs, us},
  sp = Replace[{specs}, L_List -> L_null, {1}];
  vs = Join@@ (First /@ sp);
  us = Join@@ (sp /. L_s_ -> (L /. x_i -> x_s));
  CE[Total[
    CoefficientRules[poly, vs] /. (p_ -> c_) -> c U@{us^p}
  ] / . x_null -> x
  ];
  pow[_] := pow[_] = pow[_] - 1 ** _;
  S_U[_] := CE@Total[
  CoefficientRules[_] /. {ss} / .
  (p_ -> c_) ->
  c NCM @@ MapThread[pow, {Last /@ {ss}, p}];
  S_i[c_. * u_U] :=
  CE[c / . S_i[U, Centrals]]
  DeleteCases[u, _i] **
  U_i[NCM @@ Reverse@Cases[u, x_i -> S@U@x]]; ]

```

improve

```

DeclareMorphism[m_, U_ -> V_, ongs_List, oncs_List: {}] := (
  Replace[ongs, (g_ -> img_) -> (m[U@g] = img), {1}];
  m[1_U] = 1_V;
  m[U[g_i]] := V_i[m[U@g]];
  m[U[vs_]] := NCM @@ (m /@ U /@ {vs});
  m[_] := Simp[_ / . oncs / . u_U -> m[U]];
  S_i[_Plus] := Simp[S_i /@ _];

```

(Proposed) Agenda. Using Århus-like techniques, construct a map $Z: \mathcal{T}_{vous} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{vous}$, where \mathcal{T}_{vous} is the space of VOUS-tangles: Virtual tangles with only Over or Under strands, some labeled as Surgery strands, with a non-singular linking matrix between the surgery strands, modulo acyclic Reidemeister 2 moves and Kirby slide relations, and where \mathcal{A}_{vous} is some space of arrow diagrams modulo appropriate relations. The construction will either fix the definitions of \mathcal{T}_{vous} and \mathcal{A}_{vous} or will allow some flexibility that will be fixed so that the following will hold true:

1. \mathcal{T}_{vous} should have a clearer topological interpretation, perhaps in terms of Heegaard diagrams.
2. \mathcal{A}_{vous} should pair with some kind of Lie bialgebras.
3. \mathcal{A}_{vous} should be the associated graded of \mathcal{T}_{vous} and Z should be an expansion.
4. Ordinary tangles \mathcal{T}_{ord} and ordinary virtual tangles \mathcal{T}_{v-ord} should map into \mathcal{T}_{vous} , and when viewed on $\mathcal{T}_{(v-)ord}$, the invariant Z should explain the Drinfel'd double construction.

It may be better to first construct a Z and only later worry about the numbered properties. Yet property 4 has stand-alone topological content which may be very interesting: \mathcal{T}_{vous} is a space with an $R3$ -free presentation and which contains $\mathcal{T}_{(v-)ord}$, at least nearly faithfully. What does it mean? To what extent does it make $R3$ superfluous in knot theory? As for constructing Z , the first step should be a $Z: \mathcal{T}_{vou} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{vou}$ (no surgery), which would have a prescribed behaviour on strand-doubling.