DISKS IN TRIVIAL BRAID DIAGRAMS

PATRICK DEHORNOY

Abstract. We show that every trivial 3-strand braid diagram contains a disk, defined as a ribbon ending in opposed crossings. Under a convenient algebraic form, the result extends to every Artin–Tits group of dihedral type, but it fails to extend to braids with 4 strands and more. The proof uses a partition of the Cayley graph and a continuity argument.

1. Introduction

Let us say that a braid diagram is trivial if it represents the unit braid, i.e., if it is isotopic to an unbraided diagram. Consider the following simple trivial diagrams:

We see that these diagrams contain a disk, defined as an embedded ribbon ending in crossings with opposite orientations (the striped areas). Below is another trivial braid diagram containing a disk: here the shape is more complicated, but we still have the property that the third strand does not pierce the disk.

Finally, let us display a more intricate example involving a disk: here the third strand pierces the ribbon, but it does it so as to make a topologically trivial handle through the disk, so, up to an isotopy, we still have an unpierced disk.

A few tries should convince the reader that most trivial braid diagrams seem to contain at least one disk in the sense above—a precise definition will be given below—and make the following question natural:

Question 1.1. Does every trivial braid diagram (with at least one crossing) contain a disk?

Our aim is to answer the question by proving
Proposition 1.2. The answer to Question 1.1 is positive in the case of 3-strand braids, i.e., every trivial 3-strand braid diagram with at least one crossing contains a disk. It is negative in the case of 4 strands and more.

As for the negative part, it is sufficient to exhibit a counter-example, what will be done at the end of Section 2 (see Figure 2).

As for the positive part, the argument consists in going to the Cayley graph of the braid group and using a continuity result, which itself relies on the properties of division in the braid monoid \( B_n^+ \). The argument works in every Artin–Tits group of spherical type, and we actually prove the counterpart of (the positive part of) Proposition 1.2 in all Artin–Tits groups of type \( I_2(m) \).

One should keep in mind that we are interested in braid diagrams, not in braids: up to an isotopy, all braid diagrams we consider can be unbraided. What makes the question nontrivial is that isotopy may change the possible disks of a braid diagram completely, so that it is hopeless to trace the disks along an isotopy. For instance, the reader can check that applying one type III Reidemeister move in the braid diagram of Figure 2 suffices to let one disk appear.

2. Disks and removable pairs of letters

Definition. (Figure 1) Assume that \( D \) is an \( n \)-strand braid diagram, which is the projection of a 3-dimensional geometric braid \( \beta \) consisting of \( n \) disjoint curves connecting \( n \) points \( P_1, \ldots, P_n \) in the plane \( z = 0 \) to \( n \) points \( P'_1, \ldots, P'_n \) in the plane \( z = 1 \). For \( 1 \leq i, j < n \), we say that \( D \) is an \((i, j)\)-disk if \( D \) begins with a crossing of the strands starting at \( P_i \) and \( P_{i+1} \), it finishes with a crossing of opposite orientation of the strands ending at \( P'_j \) and \( P'_{j+1} \), and the figure obtained from \( \beta \) by connecting \( P_i \) to \( P_{i+1} \) and \( P'_j \) to \( P'_{j+1} \) is isotopic to the union of \( n - 2 \) curves and the boundary of a disk disjoint from these curves.
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This definition is directly reminiscent of the notion of a life disk in a singular braid introduced in [15]: another way to state that \( D \) is a disk is to say that, when one makes the initial and the final crossings in \( D \) singular—with the convention that the first crossing is replaced with a “birth” singular crossing, while the last one, which is supposed to have the opposite orientation, is replaced with a “death” singular crossing—then the resulting figure is a life disk.

We shall address Question 1.1 using the braid group \( B_n \) and the geometry of its Cayley graph. As is standard, braid diagrams will be encoded by finite words over the alphabet \( \{ \sigma_1^{+1}, \ldots, \sigma_{n-1}^{+1} \} \), using \( \sigma_i \) to encode the elementary diagram where the
We denote by \( \equiv \) the equivalence relation on braid words that corresponds to braid isotopy. As is well known, \( \equiv \) is the congruence generated by the pairs \((\sigma_i, \sigma_j, \sigma_j \sigma_i)\) with \(|i - j| \geq 2\) and \((\sigma_i, \sigma_j, \sigma_i \sigma_j, \sigma_j)\) with \(|i - j| = 1\), together with \((\sigma_i, \sigma_i^{-1}, \varepsilon)\) and \((\sigma_i^{-1} \sigma_i, \varepsilon)\), where \(\varepsilon\) denotes the empty word.

**Proposition 2.1.** A braid diagram is an \((i, j)\)-disk if and only if it is encoded in a word of the form \(\sigma_i^e w \sigma_j^{-e} \equiv w\).

**Proof.** Assume that \(D\) is an \((i, j)\)-disk. By definition, \(D\) is encoded in some braid word of the form \(\sigma_i^e w \sigma_j^{-e}\) with \(e = \pm 1\). Moreover, we can assume that, after an isotopy, the strands of \(D\) starting at positions \(i\) and \(i+1\) make an unpierced ribbon. Then, the initial \(\sigma_i^e\) crossing may be pushed along that ribbon, so as to eventually cancel the final \(\sigma_j^{-e}\) crossing. Hence \(D\) is isotopic to the diagram obtained by deleting its first and last crossings, \(i.e.,\) we have \(\sigma_i^e w \sigma_j^{-e} \equiv w\).

Conversely, assume that \(D\) is encoded in \(\sigma_i^e w \sigma_j^{-e}\) and \(\sigma_i^e w \sigma_j^{-e} \equiv w\) holds. Then we have \(\sigma_i^e w \equiv w \sigma_j^e\). By Theorem 2.2 of [16], this implies that \(D\) contains a ribbon connecting \([i, i+1] \times 0\) to \([j, j+1] \times 1\) that is, up to an isotopy, disjoint from the other strands. Hence, with our current definition, \(D\) is an \((i, j)\)-disk. \(\square\)

We thus are led to introduce:

**Definition.** A braid word of the form \(\sigma_i^e w \sigma_j^{-e}\) with \(e = \pm 1\) is said to be a removable pair of letters if \(\sigma_i^e w \sigma_j^{-e} \equiv w\) holds.

With this notion, Question 1.1 is equivalent to

**Question 2.2.** Does every nonempty trivial braid word contain a removable pair of letters?

Speaking of “removable pair” is natural here: indeed, saying that a braid word \(w'\) contains a removable pair \(\sigma_i^e w \sigma_j^{-e}\) implies that \(w'\) is equivalent to the word obtained from \(w'\) by replacing the subword \(\sigma_i^e w \sigma_j^{-e}\) with \(w\), \(i.e.,\) by deleting the end letters \(\sigma_i^e\) and \(\sigma_j^{-e}\). Observe that the notion of a removable pair of letters actually makes sense for any group presentation: we shall use it in a more general context in Section 5 below.

As there exist efficient algorithms for deciding braid word equivalence, it is easy to systematically search the possible removable pairs in a braid word, and an experimental approach of Question 2.2 is possible. Random tries would suggest a positive answer, but this is misleading: for instance, the 4 strand braid word

\[
\sigma_1^{-1} \sigma_2^{-2} \sigma_3^{-1} \sigma_1^{-1} \sigma_2^{-1} \sigma_3^{-1} \sigma_2^{-2} \sigma_3^{-1} \sigma_2^{-2} \sigma_3 \sigma_1 \sigma_3 \sigma_3 \sigma_2 \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \sigma_3 \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \sigma_3
\]

contains no removable pair of letters, and, therefore, the associated braid diagram, which is displayed in Figure 2, contains no disk. This establishes the negative part of Proposition 1.2.

### 3. The valuation of a pure simple element

The proof of (the positive part of) Proposition 1.2 relies on partitioning the Cayley graph of \(B_3\) using integer parameters connected with division in the braid.
monoid $B_3^+$. The construction is not specific to the braid group $B_3$, nor is it either specific to braid groups: actually, it is relevant for all spherical type Artin–Tits groups, and, more generally, for all Garside groups in the sense of [11].

A monoid $G^+$ is said to be a Garside monoid if it is cancellative, 1 is the only invertible element, any two elements admit a left and a right least common multiple, and $G^+$ contains a Garside element, defined as an element whose left and right divisors coincide, they generate the monoid, and they are finite in number. If $G^+$ is a Garside monoid, it embeds in a group of fractions. A group $G$ is said to be a Garside group if $G$ can be expressed in at least one way as the group of fractions of a Garside monoid.

Typical examples of Garside monoids are the braid monoids $B_n^+$, and, more generally, the Artin–Tits monoids $A^+$ of spherical type, i.e., those Artin–Tits monoids such that the associated Coxeter group $W$ is finite. In this case, the image of the longest element of $W$ under the canonical section of the projection of $A^+$ onto $W$ is a Garside element in $A^+$. In the particular case of $B_n^+$, one obtains the half-twist braid $\Delta_n$. So, the braid groups $B_n$, and, more generally, the Artin–Tits groups of spherical type, are Garside groups. Let us mention that a given group may be the group of fractions of several Garside monoids: for instance, the braid groups $B_n$ admit a second Garside structure, associated with the Birman–Ko–Lee monoid of [4]—see [1, 18] for similar results involving other Artin–Tits groups. Still another Garside structure for $B_3$ involves the submonoid generated by $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_1\sigma_2$, a Garside monoid with presentation $\langle a, b; aba = b^2 \rangle$, hence not of Artin–Tits type.

Assume that $G^+$ is a Garside monoid. Then every element $x$ in $G^+$ admits finitely many expressions as a product of atoms (indecomposable elements), and the supremum $\|x\|$ of the length of these decompositions, called the norm of $x$, satisfies $\|xy\| \geq \|x\| + \|y\|$ and $\|x\| \geq 1$ for $x \neq 1$. Then there exists in $G^+$ a unique Garside element of minimal norm; this element is traditionally denoted $\Delta$, and its (left and right) divisors are called the simple elements of $G^+$.

We shall start from two technical results about division in Garside monoids—as shown in [11], these results also happen to be crucial in the construction of an automatic structure [14, 6, 7]. For $x, y$ in a Garside monoid $G^+$, we denote by $x \backslash y$ the unique element $z$ such that $xz$ is the right lcm of $x$ and $y$, and we write $y \preceq z$ (resp. $z \succeq y$) to express that $y$ is a left (resp. right) divisor of $z$.

**Lemma 3.1.** Assume that $G^+$ is a Garside monoid, that $y, z$ are elements of $G^+$ and that every simple right divisor of $yz$ is a right divisor of $z$. Let $x$ be an arbitrary element of $G^+$, and let $y' = x \backslash y$ and $z' = (y \backslash x) \backslash z$. Then every simple right divisor of $y'z'$ is a right divisor of $z'$.

**Proof.** Let $x' = y \backslash x$ and $x'' = z \backslash (y \backslash x)$. By definition of a right lcm, we have $xy' = yx'$, and $x'z' = zx''$. Moreover 1 is the only common right divisor of $y'$ and $x'$. Assume that $s$ is a simple right divisor of $y'z'$. Then we have $xy'z' \succneq s$, and
hence $yzz'' \gg s$. Let $s'z''$ be the left lcm of $s$ and $x''$. Then $yzz'' \gg s$ implies $yzz'' \gg s'z''$, hence $yz \gg s'$. Moreover, $s$ being simple implies that $s'$ is simple as well, as shows an induction on the minimal number $p$ such that $x''$ can be decomposed into the product of $p$ simple elements. Then, the hypothesis of the lemma implies $z \gg s'$, and, therefore, $zz'' \gg s$, i.e., $x'z' \gg s$. It follows that $s$ is a right divisor of the right lcm of $y'z'$ and $x'z'$, which is $z'$ since 1 is the only common right divisor of $y'$ and $x'$.

\[ \Box \]

**Lemma 3.2.** Assume that $G^+$ is a Garside monoid, that $y, z, x$ are elements of $G^+$, and that every simple right divisor of $yz$ is a right divisor of $z$. Then $y \not\gg x$ implies $yz \not\gg xt$ for every simple element $t$ of $G^+$.

**Proof.** We assume $yz \not\ll xt$, and aim at proving $y \not\ll x$. Let $y' = y \setminus y$, and $z' = (y \setminus x) \setminus z$. By construction, we have $y'z' = x\setminus (yz)$, and $yz \not\ll xt$ implies $y'z' \not\ll t$, so, in particular, $y'z'$ must be simple. By Lemma 3.1, every simple right divisor of $y'z'$ is a right divisor of $z'$, so we deduce $z' \gg y'z'$, which is possible for $y' = 1$ only, i.e., for $y \not\ll x$.

\[ \Box \]

Now, the idea is to consider, for each element of a Garside group $G$ and each simple element $s$ of $G^+$, the maximal power of $s$ that divides a given element. We begin with the monoid.

**Definition.** Assume that $G^+$ is a Garside monoid. We say that a simple element $s$ of $G^+$ is pure if $s$ is the maximal simple right divisor of $s^k$, for every $k$. If $s$ is a pure simple element of $G^+$, we define the (left) valuation $\nu_s(x)$ of $s$ in $x$ to be the maximal $k$ satisfying $s^k \ll x$.

In the braid monoid $B_n^+$, each generator $\sigma_i$, as well as the Garside element $\Delta_n$—and, more generally, each simple braid which is an lcm of generators $\sigma_i$—is a pure simple element. If $G^+$ is an arbitrary Garside monoid, the Garside element $\Delta$ is always pure by definition, but the atoms or their lcm's need not be pure in general: for instance, in the monoid $\langle a, b; aba = b^2 \rangle^+$, the atom $b$ is not pure, as $b^2$ is simple.

**Lemma 3.3.** Assume that $G^+$ is a Garside monoid and that $s$ is a pure simple element of $G^+$. Then, for every $x$ in $G^+$, we have

$$\begin{equation}
\nu_s(x) \ll \nu_s(xt) \ll \nu_s(x) + 1 \tag{3.1}
\end{equation}$$

whenever $t$ is a simple element of $G^+$; more specifically, for $t = \Delta$, we have

$$\begin{equation}
\nu_s(x\Delta) = \nu_s(x) + 1 \tag{3.2}
\end{equation}$$

**Proof.** First $s^k \ll x$ implies $s^k \ll xt$ for every $t$, hence $\nu_s(x) \ll \nu_s(xt)$. On the other hand, assume $s^{k+1} \not\ll x$. By hypothesis, every right divisor of $s^{k+2}$ is a right divisor of $s$. Applying Lemma 3.2 with $y = s^{k+1}$ and $z = s$, we deduce $s^{k+2} \not\ll xt$, hence $\nu_s(xt) \ll \nu_s(x) + 1$, and (3.1) follows.

As $\Delta$ is simple, (3.1) implies $\nu_s(x\Delta) \ll \nu_s(x) + 1$. On the other hand, let $\phi$ be the automorphism of $G^+$ defined for $z$ a simple element by $\phi(z) = (z\setminus \Delta) \setminus \Delta$ (see [11]). Then $z\Delta = \Delta \phi(z)$ holds for every $z$. Now assume $s^k \ll x$. We find

$$x\Delta = s^k x' \Delta = s^k \Delta \phi(x') = s^{k+1}(s\Delta) \phi(x'),$$

hence $s^{k+1} \ll x\Delta$, and, therefore, $\nu_s(x\Delta) > \nu_s(x)$, hence 3.2.

\[ \Box \]
Lemma 3.4. Assume that $G^+$ is a Garside monoid, $x, x'$ are elements of $G^+$, and we have $x\Delta^k = x'\Delta^{k'}$ in the group of fractions $G$ of $G^+$. Then, for each pure simple element $s$ of $G^+$, we have $\nu_s(x) + k = \nu_s(x') + k'$.

Proof. Assume for instance $k \leq k'$, say $k' = k + m$. Then we have $x\Delta^k = x'\Delta^m\Delta^k$ in $G$, hence $x = x'\Delta^m$ in $G^+$ (we recall that $G^+$ embeds in $G$). Using Lemma 3.3, we obtain $\nu_s(x') + m$ for every $s$, hence $\nu_s(x) = \nu_s(x') + m$, i.e., $\nu_s(x) + k = \nu_s(x') + k'$.

Then the following definition is natural:

Definition. Assume that $G^+$ is a Garside monoid, $G$ is the group of fractions of $G^+$, and $s$ is a pure simple element of $G^+$. Then, for $x$ in $G$, the (left) valuation $\nu_s(x)$ of $s$ in $x$ is defined to be $\nu_s(z) + k$, where $z = x\Delta^k$ is an arbitrary decomposition of $x$ with $z \in G^+$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Example 3.5. Let $G = B_3$, and $x = \sigma_1^{-1}\sigma_2$. We can also write $x = \sigma_2\sigma_1^2\Delta_3^{-1}$. We have $\nu_{\sigma_2}(\sigma_2\sigma_1^2) = 0$ and $\nu_{\sigma_2}(\sigma_2\sigma_1^2) = 1$, so we find $\nu_{\sigma_1}(x) = 0 - 1 = -1$, and $\nu_{\sigma_2}(x) = 1 - 1 = 0$.

It is now easy to see that the inequalities of Lemma 3.3 remain valid in the group:

Proposition 3.6. Assume that $G$ is the Garside group associated with a Garside monoid $G^+$, and that $s$ is a pure simple element of $G^+$. Then, for every element $x$ in $G$, and every simple element $t$ in $G^+$, we have

$$\nu_s(x) \leq \nu_s(xt) \leq \nu_s(x) + 1;$$

for $t = \Delta$, we have $\nu_s(x\Delta) = \nu_s(x) + 1$.

Proof. Assume $x = y\Delta^k$ with $y \in G^+$. We have $xt = y\Delta^kt = y\phi^{-k}(t)\Delta^k$. Then $y\phi^{-k}(t)$ belongs to $G^+$, hence we have $\nu_s(x) = \nu_s(y) + k$, and $\nu_s(xt) = \nu_s(y\phi^{-k}(t)) + k$. As $\phi^{-k}(t)$ is a simple element of $G^+$, Lemma 3.3 gives $\nu_s(y) \leq \nu_s(y\phi^{-k}(t)) \leq \nu_s(y) + 1$.

Inequality 3.3 is the algebraic socle on which we shall build in the sequel.

4. Partitions of the Cayley graph

From now on, we restrict to Artin–Tits groups, i.e., we consider presentations of the form

$$\langle S : \text{prod}(\sigma, \tau, m_{\sigma, \tau}) = \text{prod}(\tau, \sigma, m_{\sigma, \tau}) \text{ for } \sigma \neq \tau \text{ in } S \rangle,$$

where $\text{prod}(\sigma, \tau, m)$ denotes the alternated product $\sigma\tau\sigma\tau\ldots$ with $m$ factors, and $m_{\sigma, \tau} \geq 2$ holds. Moreover, we restrict to the spherical type, i.e., we assume that the Coxeter group obtained by adding to 3.1 the relation $\sigma^2 = 1$ for each $\sigma$ in $S$ is finite. Then the monoid $A^+$ defined by 3.1 is a Garside monoid, and the group $A$ defined by 3.1 is the group of fractions of $A^+$. 


In this case, each generator \( \sigma \) in \( S \) is pure, since \( \sigma^2 \) is not simple and \( \sigma \) is the right gcd of \( \sigma^2 \) and \( \Delta \). Hence, each element \( x \) of the group \( A \) has a well-defined valuation \( \nu_\sigma(x) \) for each \( \sigma \) in \( S \), and we can associate to \( x \) the valuation sequence \((\nu_\sigma(x); \sigma \in S)\).

**Example 4.1.** Consider the case of \( B_3 \). There are two atoms, namely \( \sigma_1 \) and \( \sigma_2 \). The valuation sequence associated with \( \sigma_1 \) is \((1, 0)\), while the one associated with \( \sigma_1^{-1} \sigma_2 \) is \((1, -1)\), as was seen above. Observe that the influence of right multiplication on the valuation sequence may be anything that is compatible with the constraints of (3.3). For instance, \( \nu_\sigma \) defined valuation (4.1) can be anything that is compatible with the constraints of (3.3). For instance, \( \sigma_1, \sigma_1 \sigma_2, \) and \( \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \sigma_1 \) all admit the valuation sequence \((1, 0)\), while the valuation sequences of \( \sigma_1 \cdot \sigma_2, \sigma_1 \cdot \sigma_1, \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \cdot \sigma_1, \) and \( \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \sigma_1 \cdot \sigma_2 \) are \((1, 0), (2, 0), (1, 1), \) and \((2, 1)\), respectively.

Using the valuation sequence, we can partition the group \( A \), hence, equivalently, its Cayley graph, into disjoint regions according to the values of the valuations. For our current purpose, we shall consider a coarser partition, namely the one obtained by taking into account not the values of the valuations, but their relative positions only. Let us say that two \( n \)-tuples of integers \((k_1, \ldots, k_n)\) and \((k'_1, \ldots, k'_n)\) are order-equivalent if \( k_i = k'_i \) and \( k'_i = k_i \) (resp. \( k_i < k'_i \) and \( k'_i < k_i \)) hold for the same pairs \((i, j)\). The equivalence class of a tuple \((k_1, \ldots, k_n)\) will be called its order-type.

For instance, there are 3 order-types of pairs, corresponding to pairs \((k_1, k_2)\) with \( k_1 < k_2, k_1 = k_2, \) and \( k_1 > k_2, \) respectively. Similarly, there are 13 order-types of triples, and, in the general case of \( n \)-tuples, the number of order-types is the \( n \)th ordered Bell number \( \sum_{p=1}^{n} a_p p^n \) with \( a_p = \sum_{q=0}^{p-q} (-1)^q (p+q)^q \).

**Definition.** Assume that \( A \) is an Artin–Tits group of spherical type with presentation (4.1). For \( x \) in \( A \), the type of \( x \) is defined to be the order-type of the sequence \((\nu_\sigma(x); \sigma \in S)\).

So, there are 3 types of braids in \( B_3 \), according to whether the value of \( \nu_{\sigma_1} \) is smaller than, equal to, or bigger than the value of \( \nu_{\sigma_2} \). These types will be denoted \([\nu_{\sigma_1} < \nu_{\sigma_2}], [\nu_{\sigma_1} = \nu_{\sigma_2}], \) and \([\nu_{\sigma_1} > \nu_{\sigma_2}]\). Thus, saying that a braid \( \beta \) in \( B_3 \) is of type \([\nu_{\sigma_1} > \nu_{\sigma_2}]\) means that there are “more \( \sigma_1 \)’s than \( \sigma_2 \)’s at the left of \( \beta \)”. For instance, the type of \( \sigma_1 \) is \([\nu_{\sigma_1} > \nu_{\sigma_2}]\), while that of \( \sigma_2 \) and of \( \sigma_1^{-1} \) is \([\nu_{\sigma_1} < \nu_{\sigma_2}]\), and that of 1 or \( \Delta^{-1} \) is \([\nu_{\sigma_1} = \nu_{\sigma_2}]\).

Proposition 3.4 immediately leads to constraints on how the type may change under right multiplication by a simple element:

**Proposition 4.2.** Assume that \( A \) is an Artin–Tits group of spherical type. Say that two types \( T, T' \) are neighbours if there exist \((k_1, \ldots, k_n)\) in \( T \) and \((k'_1, \ldots, k'_n)\) in \( T' \) such that \( k'_i - k_i \) is either 0 or 1 for every \( i \), or is either 0 or \(-1\) for every \( i \). Then, for every \( x \) in \( A \) and every simple element \( t \) of \( A^+ \), the type of \( xt^\pm 1 \) is a neighbour of the type of \( x \).

We display in Figures 3 and 4 the graph of the neighbour relation for order-types of pairs and of triples—as well as examples of 3- and 4-strand braids of the corresponding types. We see in Figure 3 that the types \([\nu_{\sigma_1} > \nu_{\sigma_2}]\) and \([\nu_{\sigma_1} < \nu_{\sigma_2}]\) are not neighbours, since, starting with a pair \((k_1, k_2)\) with \( k_1 > k_2 \) and adding 1 to \( k_1 \) or \( k_2 \), we can obtain \((k'_1, k'_2)\) with \( k'_1 > k'_2 \), but not with \( k'_1 < k'_2 \). As a consequence, we cannot obtain a braid of type \([\nu_{\sigma_1} < \nu_{\sigma_2}]\) by multiplying a braid of type \([\nu_{\sigma_1} > \nu_{\sigma_2}]\) by a single simple braid or its inverse: crossing the intermediate type \([\nu_{\sigma_1} = \nu_{\sigma_2}]\) is necessary. Similarly, we can see on Figure 4 that, for
instance, going from type $[\nu_{\sigma_1} > \nu_{\sigma_2} = \nu_{\sigma_3}]$ to type $[\nu_{\sigma_1} < \nu_{\sigma_2} = \nu_{\sigma_3}]$ necessitates that one goes through at least one of the intermediate types $[\nu_{\sigma_1} = \nu_{\sigma_2} < \nu_{\sigma_3}]$, $[\nu_{\sigma_1} = \nu_{\sigma_2} = \nu_{\sigma_3}]$, or $[\nu_{\sigma_1} = \nu_{\sigma_2} < \nu_{\sigma_3}]$.

Figure 3. The 3 types of braids in $B_3$
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Figure 4. The 13 types of braids in $B_4$—here $i$ stands for $\nu_{\sigma_i}$

5. Loops in the Cayley Graph

We are now ready to establish that every nonempty trivial 3-strand braid word contains at least one removable pair of letters. The geometric idea of the proof is as follows: a trivial word corresponds to a loop in the Cayley graph of $B_3$, and we can choose the origin of that loop so that it contains vertices of types $[\nu_{\sigma_1} < \nu_{\sigma_2}]$ and $[\nu_{\sigma_1} > \nu_{\sigma_2}]$. But then Proposition 4.2 tells us that one cannot jump from the region $[\nu_{\sigma_1} < \nu_{\sigma_2}]$ to the region $[\nu_{\sigma_1} > \nu_{\sigma_2}]$ without crossing the separating region, i.e., $[\nu_{\sigma_1} = \nu_{\sigma_2}]$. This means that some subword of $w$ must represent a power of $\Delta_3$, and it is easy to deduce a removable pair of letters.

Actually, we shall prove a more general statement valid for every Artin–Tits group with two generators, i.e., for every Artin–Tits group of type $I_2(m)$—the case of $B_3$ corresponding to $m = 3$:

Proposition 5.1. Assume that $A$ is an Artin–Tits group of type $I_2(m)$, i.e., $A$ admits the presentation $\langle \sigma_1, \sigma_2; \sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_1\sigma_2\cdots = \sigma_2\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_1\cdots \rangle$ where both sides of the equality have length $m$. Then every nonempty word on the letters $\sigma_1^{\pm 1}, \sigma_2^{\pm 1}$ representing 1 in $A$ contains a removable pair of letters.
We begin with two auxiliary results.

**Lemma 5.3.** Assume that $G$ is a group generated by a set $S$, that $w$ is a trivial word on $S U S^{-1}$ (i.e., $w$ represents $1$ in $G$), and some cyclic conjugate of $w$ contains a removable pair of letters. Then $w$ contains a removable pair of letters.

**Proof.** Assume that we have $w = wv$ and $\sigma^e w^r \tau^e$ is a removable pair of letters in $wv$, with $\sigma, \tau \in S$, and $e = \pm 1$. Let us write $wv = w_1 \sigma^e w^r \tau^e w_2$. If $w_1 \sigma^e w^r \tau^e$ is a prefix of $v$, or if $\sigma^e w^r \tau^e w_2$ is a suffix of $u$, then $\sigma^e w^r \tau^e$ is a subword of $w$, and the result is obvious. Otherwise, we have $w' = v' u'$ with $\sigma^e v'$ a prefix of $v$ and $u' \tau^e$ a prefix of $u$, hence $v = w_1 \sigma^e v'$ and $u = u' \tau^e w_2$. By construction, $\tau^e w_2 w_1 \sigma^e$ is a subword of $wv$, i.e., of $w$. Let us use $\equiv$ for the congruence that defines $G$. By hypothesis, we have $wv \equiv \varepsilon$ and $\sigma^e v' u' \tau^e \equiv v' u'$, hence $\tau^e u^{-1} v^{-1} \sigma^e \equiv u^{-1} v^{-1}$. We deduce

$$w_2 w_1 \equiv \tau^e u^{-1} w v u'^{-1} \sigma^{-e} \equiv \tau^e v' \sigma^{-1} \tau^{-e} \equiv u^{-1} v^{-1} \sigma^{-e} \equiv \tau^{-e} w_2 w_1 \sigma^e,$$

which shows that $\tau^{-e} w_2 w_1 \sigma^e$ is a removable pair of letters in $w$. \hfill $\Box$

**Lemma 5.3.** Let $A$ be an Artin–Tits group with presentation $[\Sigma]$. Assume that $\sigma, \tau$ belong to $S$, $s$ belongs to $S \cup S^{-1}$, and $w$ is a word on $S \cup S^{-1}$ such that $\tau ws \equiv \text{prod}(\sigma, \tau, m_{\sigma, \tau})^k$ holds and $\tau w$ represents an element of the region $[\nu_1 < \nu_2]$. Then either $\sigma^{-1} \tau ws$ or $\tau ws$ is a removable pair of letters.

**Proof.** For $u$ a word on $S \cup S^{-1}$, let $\overline{u}$ denote the element of $A$ represented by $u$. Let us write $m$ for $m_{\sigma, \tau}$. By hypothesis, we have $\nu_{\sigma} (\overline{\tau ws}) = \nu_{\tau} (\overline{\tau ws}) = k$. Assume first that $mk$ is even. Then there are two possibilities for $s$ only, namely $s = \sigma$, and $s = \tau^{-1}$. Indeed, $\overline{\tau ws}$ is $\text{prod}(\sigma, \tau, m)^k$, so $s = \rho \pm 1$ with $\rho \neq \sigma, \tau$ would imply

$$\nu_{\sigma} (\overline{\tau w}) = \nu_{\sigma} (\overline{\tau ws}) = \nu_{\tau} (\overline{\tau ws}) = \nu_{\tau} (\overline{\tau w}),$$

while $s = \sigma^{-1}$ and $s = \tau$ would imply

$$\nu_{\sigma} (\overline{\tau w}) \geq \nu_{\sigma} (\overline{\tau ws}) = \nu_{\tau} (\overline{\tau ws}) \geq \nu_{\tau} (\overline{\tau w}),$$

all contradicting the hypothesis $\nu_{\sigma} (\overline{\tau w}) < \nu_{\tau} (\overline{\tau w})$.

Now, for $s = \sigma$, we find

$$\sigma^{-1} \tau \sigma w \equiv \sigma^{-1} \text{prod}(\sigma, \tau, m)^k \equiv \text{prod}(\sigma, \tau, m)^k \sigma^{-1} \equiv \tau w \sigma^{-1} \equiv \tau w,$$

i.e., $\sigma^{-1} \tau ws$ is a removable pair. Similarly, for $s = \tau^{-1}$, we find

$$\tau w \tau^{-1} \equiv \text{prod}(\sigma, \tau, m)^k \tau^{-1} \equiv \tau^{-1} \text{prod}(\sigma, \tau, m)^k \tau \equiv \tau^{-1} \tau w \tau^{-1} \tau = \equiv w,$$

i.e., $\tau ws$ is a removable pair. The argument is similar when $mk$ is odd, the possible values of $s$ now being $\sigma^{-1}$ and $\tau$ instead of $\sigma$ and $\tau^{-1}$. \hfill $\Box$

**Proof of Proposition 5.3.** (Figure 5) Assume that $w$ is a nonempty word on the letters $\sigma_{1,2}^{\pm 1}$, representing $1$. Necessarily $w$ contains the same number of letters with exponent $+1$ and with exponent $-1$, so it must contain a subword of the form $s^{-1} t$ or $s t^{-1}$ with $s, t \in \{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}$. Assume for instance that $w$ contains a subword of the form $s^{-1} t$; the argument in the case of $s t^{-1}$ would be similar. The case $s = t$ is trivial (then $s^{-1} s$ is a removable pair of letters of $w$, and we are done), so, up to a symmetry, we can assume that $s^{-1} t$ is $\sigma_{1}^{-1} \sigma_{2}$. The word $w$ specifies a path $\gamma$ in the Cayley graph of $G$, and, by hypothesis, $\gamma$ is a loop. Let $P$ be the point of $\gamma$ corresponding to the middle vertex in the...
subword $\sigma_1^{-1}\sigma_2$ considered above. By Lemma 5.2 we can assume that $P$ is the origin of $\gamma$ without loss of generality.

Now, let us follow $\gamma$ starting from $P$: as the first letter is $\sigma_2$, the path $\gamma$ enters the region $[\nu_{\sigma_1} < \nu_{\sigma_2}]$. At the other end, the last letter of $\gamma$ is $\sigma_1^{-1}$, which means that, before ending at $P$, the path $\gamma$ comes from the region $[\nu_{\sigma_1} > \nu_{\sigma_2}]$. So $\gamma$ goes from the region $[\nu_{\sigma_1} < \nu_{\sigma_2}]$ to the region $[\nu_{\sigma_1} > \nu_{\sigma_2}]$. By Proposition 4.2 $\gamma$ must cross the separating region $[\nu_{\sigma_1} = \nu_{\sigma_2}]$ at least once. This means that there must exist at least one second point $Q$ in $\gamma$ with type $[\nu_{\sigma_1} = \nu_{\sigma_2}]$. Now—and this is where we use the hypothesis that $A$ is of Coxeter type $I_2(m)$—the only elements of $A$ of this type are the powers of the element $\Delta$, i.e., of $\text{prod}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, m)$. So we deduce that (a cyclic conjugate of) $w$ must contain a subword $\sigma_1^{-1}\sigma_2 w'$ such that $\sigma_2 w'$ is equivalent to a power of $\text{prod}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, m)$ and $\sigma_2 w'$ represents an element of the region $[\nu_{\sigma_1} < \nu_{\sigma_2}]$. Then Lemma 5.3 implies that either $\sigma_1^{-1}\sigma_2 w'$ or $\sigma_2 w'$ is a removable pair of letters.

\[ \text{Figure 5.} \] Proof of Proposition 5.1: a loop must intersect the diagonal at least twice

Remark 5.4. It is known [3, 2, 8] that the Cayley graph of any Garside group is traced on some flag complex of the form $X \times \mathbb{R}$, where the $\mathbb{R}$-component corresponds to powers of $\Delta$. In the case of an Artin–Tits group of type $I_2(m)$, the space $X$ is an $m$-valent tree. A loop $\gamma$ in the Cayley graph projects onto a loop in the tree, so the projection necessarily goes twice through the same vertex, which means that $\gamma$ contains vertices that are separated by a power of $\Delta$, and we can deduce the existence of a removable pair of letters as above.

6. Special cases

As the counter-example of Figure 2 shows, a trivial 4-strand braid word need not contain any removable pair of letters. However, partial positive results exist, in particular when we consider words of the form $u^{-1}v$, with $u, v$ positive words representing a divisor of $\Delta$.

The following result is an easy consequence of the classical Exchange Lemma for Coxeter groups ([3, Lemma IV.1.4.3] rephrased for Artin–Tits monoids.)
Lemma 6.1. Assume that $A^+$ is an Artin–Tits monoid of spherical type, $\sigma, \tau$ are atoms of $A^+$, and we have $\sigma \not\leq x$ and $\sigma \leq x\tau \leq \Delta$. Then we have $x\tau = \sigma x$.

Indeed, let $\pi$ denote the bijection of the divisors of $\Delta$ in $A^+$ to the corresponding Coxeter group $W$ and $\ell$ denote the length in $W$. Then $\sigma \leq x\tau$ implies $\ell(\pi(\sigma x)) < \ell(\pi(x))$. Hence the minimal decomposition of $\pi(\sigma x)$ is obtained from that of $\pi(x)$ by removing one generator, which cannot come from $x$ for, otherwise, we would obtain $\ell(\pi(\sigma x)) < \ell(\pi(x))$ by cancelling $\tau$ and contradict $\sigma \not\leq x$.

So we must have $\pi(\sigma x) = \pi(x)$, hence $\pi(\sigma x) = \pi(x\tau)$, in $W$, and $\sigma x = x\tau$ in $A^+$.

Proposition 6.2. Assume that $A^+$ is an Artin–Tits monoid of spherical type, and $w$ is a nonempty trivial word of the form $u^{-1}v$ with $u, v$ positive simple words. Then $w$ contains at least one removable pair of letters.

Proof. For $w$ a positive word, let $\overline{w}$ denote the element of $A^+$ represented by $w$. Now, let $\sigma$ be the first letter in $u$. By hypothesis, we have $\sigma \leq \overline{v}$. Let $v'\tau$ be the shortest prefix of $v$ such that $\sigma \leq v'\tau$ is true. Then, by definition, we have $\sigma \not\leq \overline{v'}$, and, as $\overline{v}$ is supposed to be simple, so is $\overline{v'}\tau$. We can therefore apply Lemma 6.1 and we obtain $\sigma v' \equiv v'\tau$, hence $\sigma^{-1}v'\tau \equiv v'$. Thus $\sigma^{-1}v'\tau$ is a removable pair of letters in $w$. \hfill $\Box$

Remark 6.3. In the case of braids, a direct geometric argument also gives Proposition 6.2. Indeed, if $u$ and $v$ are positive braid words representing simple braids, then the braid diagrams coded by $u$ and $v$ can be realised as the projections of three-dimensional figures where the $i$-th strand entirely lives in the plane $y = i$: the simplicity hypothesis guarantees that no altitude contradiction can occur, as any two strands cross at most once \cite{10}. So the same is true for the braid coded by $u^{-1}v$, provided we require that the strand living in the plane $y = i$ is the one at position $i$ after $u^{-1}$. Now, let $i$ be the least index such that the $i$th strand is not a straight line, and let $j$ be the least index such that the $j$th strand crosses the $i$th strand. Then, necessarily, the $i$th and the $j$th strands make a disk, as they must return to their initial position if $u^{-1}v$ represents 1 (Figure 6).

Figure 6. Disk in a trivial braid diagram coded by $u^{-1}v$ with $u, v$ simple

Proposition 6.2 does not extend to arbitrary trivial negative–positive words, i.e., of the form $u^{-1}v$ with $u, v$ positive: the hypothesis that $u$ and $v$ represent a simple braid is essential.

An easy method for producing equivalent positive braid words is as follows: starting with a seed consisting of two positive words $u, v$, we can complete them into equivalent words—i.e., we can find a common right multiple for $\overline{u}$ and $\overline{v}$—by using the word reversing technique of \cite{9}, which gives two positive words $u', v'$ so that both $u'v'$ and $v'u'$ represent the right lcm of $\overline{u}$ and $\overline{v}$. Then, by construction,
\(v^{-1}u^{-1}vu'\) represents 1. By systematically enumerating all possible seeds \((u, v)\), we obtain a large number of negative–positive trivial braid words in which possible removable pair of letters can be investigated.

One obtains in this way very few counter-examples, \textit{i.e.}, trivial braid words with no removable pair of letters. In the case of \(B_4\), there exists no counter-example with seeds of length at most 4, and there exists only one counter-example among the 29,403 pairs of length 5 words, namely the one of Figure 2 which is associated with the seed \((\sigma_1^2 \sigma_2^3, \sigma_2^2 \sigma_2^3)\). The situation is similar with longer seeds, and for \(B_n\) with \(n \geq 5\). This explains why random tries have little chance to lead to counter-examples, and raises the question of understanding why there seems to almost always exist disks in trivial braid diagrams.

Finally, let us mention a connection with the (open) question of unbraiding every trivial braid diagram in such a way that all intermediate diagrams have at most as many crossings as the initial diagram—as is well known, there is no solution in the case of knots when the number of crossings is considered, but there is now a solution when the complexity is defined in a more subtle way \cite{13}. Assume that a method for detecting removable pairs of letters has been chosen. Then one obtains an unbraiding algorithm by starting with an arbitrary braid word and iteratively removing removable pairs of letters until no one is left. If the answer to Question 1.1 was positive, this algorithm would always succeed, in the sense that it would end with the empty word if and only if the initial word is trivial. Note that the number of iteration steps is always bounded by half the length of the initial word. In the case of 4 strands and more, the answer to Question 1.1 is negative, so the above algorithm is not correct. In addition, it must be kept in mind that, in any case, the algorithm requires a subroutine detecting removable pairs: we can appeal to any solution of the braid word problem, but, then, the algorithm gives no new solution to that word problem, nor does it either answer the question of length-decreasing unbraiding as long as there is no length-preserving method for proving an equivalence of the form \(\sigma_i^j w \sigma_j^{-e} \equiv w\).

As trivial diagrams without disk seem to be rare, it might happen that, in some sense to be made precise, the above method almost always works. It can be observed on Figure 7 that the braid diagram of Figure 2 which contains no disk, contains an actual ribbon, in the sense that no isotopy is needed to let this ribbon appear. By merging the two strands bordering this ribbon, one obtains a 3-strand diagram—namely the last example in Section 1—which contains a disk. Improving the unbraiding method so as to include such a strand merging procedure might make it work for still more cases.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure7.png}
\caption{A ribbon in the counter-example of Figure 2}
\end{figure}

\textbf{References}

[1] D. Bessis, \textit{The dual braid monoid}, Ann. Sci. Ec. Norm. Sup. Paris; to appear; arXiv: math.GR/0101158
[2] T. Brady & C. Watt, $K(\pi, 1)$s for Artin groups of finite type, Geometriae Dedicata 94 (2002) 225–250.
[3] M. Bestvina, Non-positively curved aspects of Artin groups of finite type, Geometry & Topology 3 (1999) 269–302.
[4] J. Birman, K.H. Ko & S.J. Lee, A new approach to the word problem in the braid groups, Advances in Math. 139-2 (1998) 322-353.
[5] N. Bourbaki, Groupes et algèbres de Lie, chapitres 4, 5 et 6, Hermann (1968).
[6] R. Charney, Artin groups are finite type are biautomatic, Math. Ann. 292 (1992) 671–683.
[7] R. Charney, Geodesic automation and growth functions for Artin groups of finite type, Math. Ann. 301 (1995) 307–324.
[8] R. Charney, J. Meier & K. Whittlesey, Bestvina’s normal form complex and the homology of Garside groups, Preprint.
[9] P. Dehornoy, Groups with a complemented presentation, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 116 (1997) 115–137.
[10] P. Dehornoy, Three-dimensional realizations of braids, J. London Math. Soc. 60-2 (1999) 108–132.
[11] P. Dehornoy, Groupes de Garside, Ann. Scient. Ec. Norm. Sup. 35 (2002) 267–306.
[12] P. Dehornoy & L. Paris, Gaussian groups and Garside groups, two generalizations of Artin groups, Proc. London Math. Soc. 79-3 (1999) 569–604.
[13] I. Dynnikov, Arc-presentation of links. Monotonic simplification, Preprint (2002).
[14] D. Epstein & al., Word Processing in Groups, Jones & Bartlett Publ. (1992).
[15] R. Fenn, E. Keyman & C. Rourke, The singular braid monoid embeds in a group, J. Knot Th. and its Ramifications 7 (1998) 881–892.
[16] R. Fenn, D. Rolfsen & J. Zhu, Centralisers in the braid group and in the singular braid monoid, Ens. Math. 42 (1996) 75–96.
[17] F. A. Garside, The braid group and other groups, Quart. J. Math. Oxford 20-78 (1969) 235–254.
[18] M. Picantin, Explicit presentations for dual Artin monoids, C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris 334 (2002) 843–848.
[19] D. Rolfsen, Braids subgroup normalisers, commensurators and induced representations, Invent. Math. 130 (1997) 575–587.

Laboratoire de Mathématiques Nicolas Oresme, CNRS UMR 6139, Université de Caen, 14032 Caen, France
E-mail address: dehornoy@math.unicaen.fr
URL: //www.math.unicaen.fr/~dehornoy