

# INTRINSIC LINKING AND KNOTTING OF GRAPHS IN ARBITRARY 3-MANIFOLDS

ERICA FLAPAN, HUGH HOWARDS, DON LAWRENCE, BLAKE MELLOR

**ABSTRACT.** We prove that a graph is intrinsically linked in an arbitrary 3-manifold  $M$  if and only if it is intrinsically linked in  $S^3$ . Also, assuming the Poincaré Conjecture, a graph is intrinsically knotted in  $M$  if and only if it is intrinsically knotted in  $S^3$ .

## 0. INTRODUCTION

The study of intrinsic linking and knotting began in 1983 when Conway and Gordon [CG] showed that every embedding of  $K_6$  (the complete graph on six vertices) in  $S^3$  contains a non-trivial link, and every embedding of  $K_7$  in  $S^3$  contains a non-trivial knot. Since the existence of such a non-trivial link or knot depends only on the graph and not on the particular embedding of the graph in  $S^3$ , we say that  $K_6$  is *intrinsically linked* and  $K_7$  is *intrinsically knotted*.

At roughly the same time as Conway and Gordon's result, Sachs [S1] [S2] independently proved that  $K_6$  and  $K_{3,3,1}$  are intrinsically linked, and used these two results to prove that any graph with a minor in the *Petersen family* (Figure 1) is intrinsically linked. Conversely, Sachs conjectured that any graph which is intrinsically linked contains a minor in the Petersen family. In 1995, Robertson, Seymour, and Thomas [RST] proved Sachs' conjecture, and thus completely classified intrinsically linked graphs.

Examples of intrinsically knotted graphs other than  $K_7$  are now known [F],[KS], [Sh]. Furthermore, a result of Robertson and Seymour [RS] implies that there are only finitely many intrinsically knotted graphs that are minor-minimal with respect to intrinsic knottedness. However, as of yet, intrinsically knotted graphs have not been classified.

In this paper, we consider the properties of intrinsic linking and knotting in *arbitrary* 3-manifolds. We show that these properties are truly *intrinsic* to a graph in the sense that they do not depend on either the ambient 3-manifold or the particular embedding of the graph in the 3-manifold. Our proof in the case of intrinsic knotting assumes the Poincaré Conjecture.

We will use the following terminology. By a *graph* we shall mean a finite graph, possibly with loops and repeated edges. Manifolds may have boundary, and do not have to be compact. All spaces are piecewise linear;




FIGURE 1. The Petersen family of graphs

in particular, we assume that the image of an *embedding* of a graph in a 3-manifold is a piecewise linear subset of the 3-manifold. An embedding of a graph  $G$  in a 3-manifold  $M$  is *unlinked* if every pair of disjoint circuits in  $G$  bounds disjoint disks in  $M$ ; otherwise, the embedding is *linked*. An embedding of a graph is *unknotted* if every circuit in  $G$  bounds a disk in  $M$ ; otherwise, the embedding is *knotted*. A graph is *intrinsically linked* in  $M$  if every embedding of the graph in  $M$  is linked; and a graph is *intrinsically knotted* in  $M$  if every embedding of the graph in  $M$  is knotted.

The main results of this paper are that a graph is intrinsically linked in an arbitrary 3-manifold if and only if it is intrinsically linked in  $S^3$  (Theorem 1); and (assuming the Poincaré Conjecture) that a graph is intrinsically knotted in an arbitrary 3-manifold if and only if it is intrinsically knotted in  $S^3$  (Theorem 2). We use Robertson, Seymour, and Thomas' classification of intrinsically linked graphs in  $S^3$  in our proof of Theorem 1. However, because there is no analogous classification of intrinsically knotted graphs in  $S^3$ , we need to take a different approach to prove Theorem 2. In particular, the proof of Theorem 2 uses Proposition 2 (every compact subset of a simply connected 3-manifold is homeomorphic to a subset of  $S^3$ ), whose proof in turn relies on the Poincaré Conjecture. Our assumption of the Poincaré Conjecture seems reasonable, because Perelman has announced a proof of Thurston's Geometrization Conjecture, which implies the Poincaré Conjecture [M].

We would like to thank Waseda University, Toyko, for hosting the International Workshop on Knots and Links in a Spatial Graph, at which this paper was conceived. We also thank the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science for providing funding for the third author with a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research.

## 1. INTRINSICALLY LINKED GRAPHS

In this section, we prove that intrinsic linking is independent of the 3-manifold in which a graph is embedded. We begin by showing (Lemma 1) that any unlinked embedding of  $K_6$  or  $K_{3,3,1}$  in a 3-manifold lifts to an embedding of  $K_6$  or  $K_{3,3,1}$  in the universal cover. In the universal cover, linking number can be used to analyze intrinsic linking (Lemma 2), as in the proofs of Conway and Gordon [CG] and Sachs [S1] [S2]. After we've shown that  $K_6$  and  $K_{3,3,1}$  are intrinsically linked in any 3-manifold (Proposition 1), we use the classification of intrinsically linked graphs in  $S^3$  [RST] to conclude that any graph that is intrinsically linked in  $S^3$  is intrinsically linked in every 3-manifold (Theorem 1).

We call a circuit of length 3 in a graph a *triangle*, and a circuit of length 4 a *square*.

**Lemma 1.** *Any unlinked embedding of  $K_6$  or  $K_{3,3,1}$  in a 3-manifold  $M$  lifts to an unlinked embedding of  $K_6$  or  $K_{3,3,1}$  in the universal cover  $\widetilde{M}$ .*

*Proof.* First, let  $f : K_6 \rightarrow M$  be an unlinked embedding. We will show that  $f_*(\pi_1(K_6))$  is trivial in  $\pi_1(M)$ . Let  $x$  be a vertex of  $K_6$ , and choose  $x$  to be the basepoint of  $\pi_1(K_6)$ . Let  $\alpha$  be a loop in  $K_6$  at  $x$ . Then we can write  $[\alpha] = [xv_1v_2 \dots v_nx]$  for some vertices  $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n$  of  $K_6$ . Without loss of generality, assume that any two of the  $v_i$  with consecutive indices are distinct, and also assume that none of them is  $x$ . Now  $[\alpha] = [xv_1v_2x][xv_2v_3x] \dots [xv_{n-1}v_nx]$ . For any  $i$ ,  $xv_i v_{i+1}x$  is a triangle, so there is a complementary (disjoint) triangle in  $K_6$ ; and since the embedding of  $K_6$  is unlinked, these triangles bound disjoint disks in  $M$ . In particular,  $f_*[xv_i v_{i+1}x]$  is trivial in  $\pi_1(M)$ . Since  $f$  was arbitrary,  $f_*[\alpha]$  is trivial in  $\pi_1(M)$ ; and since  $\alpha$  was an arbitrary loop,  $f_*(\pi_1(K_6))$  is trivial in  $\pi_1(M)$ .

Now consider an unlinked embedding  $f : K_{3,3,1} \rightarrow M$ . We choose the vertex of valence six to be the basepoint  $x$  of  $\pi_1(K_{3,3,1})$ . Let  $\alpha$  be a loop in  $K_{3,3,1}$  based at  $x$ . As in the  $K_6$  case, we can write  $[\alpha] = [xv_1v_2 \dots v_nx] = [xv_1v_2x][xv_2v_3x] \dots [xv_{n-1}v_nx]$ , where any two vertices with consecutive indices are distinct, and none of the  $v_i$  is  $x$ . Now, each of the triangles  $xv_i v_{i+1}x$  has a complementary *square* in  $K_{3,3,1}$ , hence bounds a disk in  $M$ . It follows as in the  $K_6$  case that  $f_*(\pi_1(K_{3,3,1}))$  is trivial in  $\pi_1(M)$ .

Thus, an unlinked embedding of either graph into  $M$  lifts to an embedding of that graph in the universal cover  $\widetilde{M}$ . Since the embedding into  $M$  is unlinked, pairs of disjoint cycles bound disjoint disks in  $M$ ; these disks lift to  $\widetilde{M}$ , so the embedding of the graph in  $\widetilde{M}$  is also unlinked.  $\square$

Recall that if  $M$  is a 3-manifold with  $H_1(M) = 0$ , then disjoint oriented loops  $J$  and  $K$  in  $M$  have a well-defined linking number  $lk(J, K)$ , which is the algebraic intersection number of  $J$  with any oriented surface bounded by  $K$ . Also, the linking number is symmetric:  $lk(J, K) = lk(K, J)$ .

It will be convenient to have a notation for the linking number modulo 2: Define  $\omega(J, K) = lk(J, K) \bmod 2$ . Notice that  $\omega(J, K)$  is defined for a pair

of *unoriented* loops. Since linking number is symmetric, so is  $\omega(J, K)$ . If  $J_1, \dots, J_n$  are loops in an embedded graph such that in the list  $J_1, \dots, J_n$  every edge appears an even number of times, and if  $K$  is another loop, disjoint from the  $J_i$ , then  $\sum \omega(J_i, K) = 0 \pmod 2$ .

If  $G$  is a graph embedded in a simply connected 3-manifold, let  $\omega(G) = \sum \omega(J, K) \pmod 2$ , where the sum is taken over all *unordered* pairs  $(J, K)$  of disjoint circuits in  $G$ . Notice that if  $\omega(G) \neq 0$ , then the embedding is linked (but the converse is not true).

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $\widetilde{M}$  be a simply connected 3-manifold, and let  $H$  be an embedding of  $K_6$  or  $K_{3,3,1}$  in  $\widetilde{M}$ . Let  $e$  be an edge of  $H$ , and let  $e'$  be an arc in  $\widetilde{M}$  with the same endpoints as  $e$ , but otherwise disjoint from  $H$ . Let  $H'$  be the graph  $(H - e) \cup e'$ . Then  $\omega(H') = \omega(H)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $D = e \cup e'$ .

First consider the case that  $H$  is an embedding of  $K_6$ . We will count how many terms in the sum defining  $\omega(H)$  change when  $e$  is replaced by  $e'$ . Let  $K_1, K_2, K_3$ , and  $K_4$  be the four triangles in  $H$  disjoint from  $e$  (hence also disjoint from  $e'$  in  $H'$ ), and for each  $i$  let  $J_i$  be the triangle complementary to  $K_i$ . The  $J_i$  all contain  $e$ . For each  $i$ , let  $J'_i = (J_i - e) \cup e'$ , and notice that

$$(1) \quad \omega(J'_i, K_i) = \omega(J_i, K_i) + \omega(D, K_i) \pmod 2.$$

Because each edge appears twice in the list  $K_1, K_2, K_3, K_4$ , we have  $\omega(K_1, D) + \omega(K_2, D) + \omega(K_3, D) + \omega(K_4, D) = 0 \pmod 2$ . Thus,  $\omega(K_i, D)$  is nonzero for an even number of  $i$ . It follows from equation (1) that there are an even number of  $i$  such that  $\omega(J'_i, K_i) \neq \omega(J_i, K_i)$ . Thus,  $\sum_{i=1}^4 \omega(J'_i, K_i) = \sum_{i=1}^4 \omega(J_i, K_i) \pmod 2$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(H') &= \sum_{\substack{J, K \subseteq H' \\ \ni e' \notin J, K}} \omega(J, K) + \sum_{i=1}^4 \omega(J'_i, K_i) \pmod 2 \\ &= \sum_{\substack{J, K \subseteq H \\ \ni e \notin J, K}} \omega(J, K) + \sum_{i=1}^4 \omega(J_i, K_i) \pmod 2 \\ &= \omega(H). \end{aligned}$$

Next consider the case that  $H$  is an embedding of  $K_{3,3,1}$ . Let  $x$  be the vertex of valence six in  $H$  (and in  $H'$ ).

*Case 1:  $e$  contains  $x$ .*

Then  $e$  is not in any square in  $H$  that has a complementary disjoint triangle. Let  $K_1, K_2$ , and  $K_3$  be the three squares in  $H$  disjoint from  $e$ , and let  $J_1, J_2$ , and  $J_3$  be the corresponding complementary triangles, all of which contain  $e$ . As in the  $K_6$  case, let  $J'_i = (J_i - e) \cup e'$  for each  $i$ ; again we have equation (1). Every edge in the list  $K_1, K_2, K_3$  appears exactly twice,

so  $\omega(K_1, D) + \omega(K_2, D) + \omega(K_3, D) = 0 \pmod{2}$ . Thus,  $\omega(K_i, D)$  is nonzero for an even number of  $i$ ; and for an even number of  $i$ ,  $\omega(J'_i, K_i) \neq \omega(J_i, K_i)$ . The other pairs of circuits contributing to  $\omega(H)$  do not involve  $e$ . As in the  $K_6$  case, it follows that  $\omega(H') = \omega(H)$ .

*Case 2:  $e$  doesn't contain  $x$ .*

Let  $J_0$  be the triangle containing  $e$ , and let  $K_0$  be the complementary square. Let  $J_1$  through  $J_4$  be the four squares that contain  $e$ , but not  $x$  (so that they have complementary triangles); and let  $K_1$  through  $K_4$  be the complementary triangles. With  $J'_i$  defined as in the other cases, we again have equation (1). Every edge appears an even number of times in the list  $K_0, K_1, K_2, K_3, K_4$ , so  $\sum_{i=0}^4 \omega(K_i, D) = 0 \pmod{2}$ , and  $\omega(K_i, D) \neq 0$  for an even number of  $i$ . As in the other cases, it follows that for an even number of  $i$ ,  $\omega(J'_i, K_i) \neq \omega(J_i, K_i)$ ; and an even number of the terms in the sum defining  $\omega(H)$  change when  $e$  is replaced by  $e'$ ; and  $\omega(H') = \omega(H)$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 1.**  *$K_6$  and  $K_{3,3,1}$  are intrinsically linked in any 3-manifold  $M$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $G$  be either  $K_6$  or  $K_{3,3,1}$ , and let  $f : G \rightarrow M$  be an embedding. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that  $f(G)$  is unlinked. Let  $\widetilde{M}$  be the universal cover of  $M$ . By Lemma 1,  $f$  lifts to an unlinked embedding  $\widetilde{f} : G \rightarrow \widetilde{M}$ .


Let  $\widetilde{G} = \widetilde{f}(G) \subseteq \widetilde{M}$ , and let  $\widetilde{H}$  be a copy of  $G$  embedded in a ball in  $\widetilde{M}$ . Isotop  $\widetilde{H}$  so that  $\widetilde{H}$  and  $\widetilde{G}$  have the same vertices, but do not otherwise intersect. Then  $\widetilde{G}$  can be transformed into  $\widetilde{H}$  by changing one edge at a time – replace an edge of  $\widetilde{G}$  by the corresponding edge of  $\widetilde{H}$ , once for every edge. By repeated applications of Lemma 2,  $\omega(\widetilde{G}) = \omega(\widetilde{H})$ . Since  $\widetilde{H}$  is inside a ball in  $\widetilde{M}$ , Conway and Gordon's proof [CG], and Sach's proof [S1] [S2], that  $K_6$  and  $K_{3,3,1}$  are intrinsically linked in  $S^3$ , show that  $\omega(\widetilde{H}) = 1$ .

Thus,  $\omega(\widetilde{G}) = 1$ , and there must be disjoint circuits  $J$  and  $K$  in  $\widetilde{G}$  that do not bound disjoint disks in  $\widetilde{M}$ , contradicting that  $\widetilde{f}$  is an *unlinked* embedding. Thus,  $f(G)$  is linked in  $M$ .  $\square$

Let  $G$  be a graph which contains a triangle  $\Delta$ . Remove the three edges of  $\Delta$  from  $G$ . Add three new edges, connecting the three vertices of  $\Delta$  to a new vertex. The resulting graph,  $G'$ , is said to have been obtained from  $G$  by a “ $\Delta - Y$  move” (Figure 2). The seven graphs that can be obtained from  $K_6$  and  $K_{3,3,1}$  by  $\Delta - Y$  moves are the *Petersen family* of graphs (Figure 1).

If a graph  $G'$  can be obtained from a graph  $G$  by repeatedly deleting edges and isolated vertices of  $G$ , and/or contracting edges of  $G$ , then  $G'$  is a *minor* of  $G$ .

The following facts were first proved, in the  $S^3$  case, by Motwani, Raghunathan, and Saran [MRS]. The proofs generalize, virtually unchanged, to any 3-manifold  $M$ .

FIGURE 2. A  $\Delta - Y$  Move

**Fact (a):** If a graph  $G$  is intrinsically linked in  $M$ , and  $G'$  is obtained from  $G$  by a  $\Delta - Y$  move, then  $G'$  is intrinsically linked in  $M$ .

**Fact (b):** If a graph  $G$  has an unlinked embedding in  $M$ , then so does every minor of  $G$ .

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $G$  be a graph, and let  $M$  be a 3-manifold. The following are equivalent.*

- (1)  $G$  is intrinsically linked in  $M$ .
- (2)  $G$  is intrinsically linked in  $S^3$ .
- (3)  $G$  has a minor in the Petersen family of graphs.

*Proof.* Robertson, Seymour, and Thomas [RST] proved that (2) and (3) are equivalent. We see as follows that (1) implies (2): Suppose there is an unlinked embedding of  $G$  in  $S^3$ , then the embedded graph and its system of pairs of disjoint disks are contained in a ball, which embeds in  $M$ .

We will complete the proof by checking that (3) implies (1).  $K_6$  and  $K_{3,3,1}$  are intrinsically linked in  $M$  by Proposition 1. Thus, by Fact (a), all the graphs in the Petersen family are intrinsically linked in  $M$ . Therefore, if  $G$  has a minor in the Petersen family, then it is intrinsically linked in  $M$ , by Fact (b).  $\square$

## 2. COMPACT SUBSETS OF A SIMPLY CONNECTED SPACE

In this section, we assume the Poincaré conjecture, and present some known results about 3-manifolds, which will be used in Section 3 to prove that intrinsic knotting is independent of the 3-manifold (Theorem 2).

**Fact 1.** *Assume that the Poincaré conjecture is true. Let  $\widetilde{M}$  be a simply connected 3-manifold, and suppose that  $B \subseteq \widetilde{M}$  is a compact 3-manifold whose boundary is a disjoint union of spheres. Then  $B$  is a ball with holes (possibly zero holes).*

*Proof.* By the Seifert-Van Kampen theorem,  $B$  itself is simply connected. Cap off each boundary component of  $B$  with a ball, and the result is a closed

simply connected 3-manifold. By the Poincaré conjecture, this must be the 3-sphere.  $\square$

**Fact 2.** *Let  $\widetilde{M}$  be a simply connected 3-manifold, and suppose that  $N \subseteq \widetilde{M}$  is a compact 3-manifold whose boundary is nonempty and not a union of spheres. Then there is a compression disk  $D$  in  $\widetilde{M}$  for a component of  $\partial N$  such that  $D \cap \partial N = \partial D$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\partial N$  is nonempty, and not a union of spheres, there is a boundary component  $F$  with positive genus. Because  $\widetilde{M}$  is simply connected,  $F$  is not incompressible in  $\widetilde{M}$ . Thus,  $F$  has a compression disk. But this disk may intersect some other boundary components of  $N$ .

Among all compression disks for boundary components of  $N$  (intersecting  $\partial N$  transversely), let  $D$  be one such that  $D \cap \partial N$  consists of the fewest circles. Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that there is a circle of intersection in the interior of  $D$ . Let  $c$  be a circle of intersection which is innermost in  $D$ , bounding a disk  $D'$  in  $D$ . Either  $c$  is nontrivial in  $\pi_1(\partial N)$ , in which case  $D'$  is itself a compression disk; or  $c$  is trivial, bounding a disk on  $\partial N$ , which can be used to remove the circle  $c$  of intersection from  $D \cap \partial N$ . In either case, there is a compression disk for  $\partial N$  which has fewer intersections with  $\partial N$  than  $D$  has, contradicting minimality. Thus,  $D \cap \partial N = \partial D$ .  $\square$

We are now ready to prove the main result of this section. Because its proof uses Fact 1, it relies on the Poincaré conjecture.

**Proposition 2.** *Assume that the Poincaré conjecture is true. Then every compact subset  $K$  of a simply connected 3-manifold  $\widetilde{M}$  is homeomorphic to a subset of  $S^3$ .*

*Proof.* We may assume without loss of generality that  $K$  is connected. Let  $N_0 \subseteq \widetilde{M}$  be a closed regular neighborhood of  $K$  in  $\widetilde{M}$ . Then  $N_0$  is a compact connected 3-manifold with boundary. The plan is to repeatedly compress the boundary of  $N_0$  until the resulting 3-manifold is a union of balls with holes; then glue back in some 1-handles that were deleted during the compression, to get a manifold containing  $N_0$ ; and finally embed that manifold in  $S^3$ .

If  $\partial N_0$  is not a collection of spheres, then by Fact 2 it has a compression disk  $D_0$  such that  $D_0 \cap \partial N_0 = \partial D_0$ .  $D_0$  lies either “outside”  $N_0$  (if  $D_0 \cap N_0 = \partial D_0$ ), or “inside”  $N_0$  (if  $D_0 \cap N_0 = D_0$ ). If  $D_0$  is outside  $N_0$ , then add a 2-handle to  $N_0$ , with core  $D_0$ , to obtain a new 3-manifold  $N_1 \subseteq \widetilde{M}$ . If  $D_0$  is inside  $N_0$ , remove an open regular neighborhood of  $D_0$  in  $N_0$  to obtain  $N_1$ . Notice that the inverse of removing this neighborhood is the addition of a 1-handle to  $N_1$ , which results in (a manifold homeomorphic to)  $N_0$ . Call the core of this 1-handle  $\alpha$ , and let  $C_1 = \{\alpha\}$ . If  $D_0$  is outside  $N_0$ , let  $C_1$  be the empty set. We need to keep track of these cores, so that we can add the 1-handles back in later.

Repeat this process, constructing  $N_{i+1}$  from  $N_i$  by either adding or deleting a neighborhood of the compression disk  $D_i$ . At each step, construct a

set  $C_{i+1}$  of cores from  $C_i$ . Sometimes,  $C_{i+1}$  will be the same as  $C_i$ , but there are two situations in which the set of cores will change. First, if the compression disk is inside  $N_i$ , add the core of the 1-handle to  $C_i$  to obtain  $C_{i+1}$ . Second, an “outside”  $D_i$  might intersect the interior of some core  $\beta$  already in  $C_i$ . When this happens, construct  $C_{i+1}$  from  $C_i$  by deleting  $\beta$ , and adding the arcs in  $cl(\beta - N(D_i))$  (for example, see Figure 3).




FIGURE 3.

Each  $D_i$  must be chosen so that a neighborhood of  $\partial D_i$  is disjoint from the endpoints of all the 1-handle cores in  $C_i$ . This ensures that when  $N_{i+1}$  is constructed, the endpoints of the cores are on its boundary, not in its interior or exterior.

At each step, either the boundary component of  $N_i$  that is compressed becomes a boundary component of  $N_{i+1}$  with smaller genus (this is the case if  $\partial D_i$  is a non-separating curve on  $\partial N_i$ ); or it becomes *two* boundary components of  $N_{i+1}$ , each with smaller genus than the original (if  $\partial D_i$  is separating on  $\partial N_i$ ). Thus, the process eventually terminates in a (not necessarily connected) manifold  $N_m \subseteq \widetilde{M}$ , whose boundary is a collection of spheres. Let  $N_m^H$  be the manifold that results from adding 1-handles to  $N_m$ , along all the arcs in  $C_m$ . Then  $N_0 \subseteq N_m^H$ , because  $N_m^H$  is just the union of  $N_0$  and the “outside” 2-handles. (In order to construct  $N_m$ , we also deleted 1-handles, but then we added them back in to get  $N_m^H$ .)

We define a graph  $H$  associated with  $N_m^H$  where the vertices are the components of  $N_m$ , and every arc in  $C_m$  contributes an edge (possibly a loop) in the obvious way. Notice that  $H$  is connected because  $N_0$  was connected. Let  $T$  be a maximal tree in  $H$ , and let  $N_m^T \subseteq \widetilde{M}$  be the result of adding to  $N_m$  the 1-handles corresponding to the edges of  $T$ . Each component of  $N_m$  is a ball with holes by Fact 1; and connecting two balls with holes with a 1-handle results in a new ball with holes. Thus,  $N_m^T$  is a ball with holes.

Let  $\gamma$  be any remaining arc in  $C_m$  (that is, an arc corresponding to an edge of  $H$  that isn’t in  $T$ ). Then  $\gamma$  is disjoint from  $\text{int}(N_m^T)$ . Suppose for the sake of contradiction that  $\gamma$  has endpoints on two different boundary components  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  of  $N_m^T$ . Let  $\beta$  be a properly embedded arc in  $N_m^T$



connecting  $F_1$  and  $F_2$ . Then  $\gamma \cup \beta$  is a loop in  $\widetilde{M}$  that intersects the closed surface  $F_1$  in exactly one point. But because  $H_1(\widetilde{M}) = 0$ , the algebraic intersection number of  $\gamma \cup \beta$  with  $F_1$  is zero. This is impossible since  $\gamma \cup \beta$  meets  $F_1$  in a single point. Thus, both endpoints of any remaining arc lie on the same boundary component of  $N_m^T$ .

Since  $N_m^T$  is a ball with holes, it certainly embeds in  $S^3$ . And since every remaining arc has both endpoints on a single boundary component of  $N_m^T$ , 1-handles corresponding to the remaining arcs can be added to  $N_m^T$  in  $S^3$ , to obtain an embedding of  $N_m^H$  in  $S^3$ . Finally, because  $K \subseteq N_0 \subseteq N_m^H$ ,  $K$  embeds in  $S^3$ .  $\square$

### 3. INTRINSICALLY KNOTTED GRAPHS

In this section, we use Proposition 2 to prove that the property of a graph being intrinsically knotted is independent of the 3-manifold it is embedded in. Notice that since Proposition 2 relies on the Poincaré conjecture, so does the intrinsic knotting result.

**Theorem 2.** *Assume that the Poincaré conjecture is true. Let  $M$  be a 3-manifold. A graph is intrinsically knotted in  $M$  if and only if it is intrinsically knotted in  $S^3$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that a graph  $G$  is not intrinsically knotted in  $S^3$ . Then it embeds in  $S^3$  in such a way that every circuit bounds a disk embedded in  $S^3$ . The union of the embedding of  $G$  with these disks is compact, hence is contained in a ball  $B$  in  $S^3$ . Any embedding of  $B$  in  $M$  yields an unknotted embedding of  $G$  in  $M$ .

Conversely, suppose there is an unknotted embedding  $f : G \rightarrow M$ . Let  $\widetilde{M}$  be the universal cover of  $M$ .  $\pi_1(G)$  is generated by the circuits of  $G$  (attached to a basepoint), and every circuit in  $f(G)$  is trivial in  $\pi_1(M)$  by unknottedness. Thus,  $f_*(\pi_1(G))$  is trivial, and hence  $f$  lifts to an embedding  $\tilde{f} : G \rightarrow \widetilde{M}$ . Let  $\tilde{G} = \tilde{f}(G)$ . The disks bounded by the circuits of  $G$  lift to disks bounded by the circuits of  $\tilde{G}$ . (Thus,  $\tilde{G}$  is unknotted in  $\widetilde{M}$ .) Let  $K$  be the union of  $\tilde{G}$  with the disks bounded by its circuits. Then  $K$  is compact, so by Proposition 2, there is an embedding  $g : K \rightarrow S^3$ . Now  $g \circ \tilde{f}(G)$  is an embedding of  $G$  in  $S^3$ , in which every circuit bounds a disk. Hence  $g \circ \tilde{f}(G)$  is an unknotted embedding of  $G$  in  $S^3$ .  $\square$

**Remark.** It might appear that the proof of Theorem 2 could also be used, almost verbatim, to show that intrinsic *linking* is independent of the 3-manifold. The complication is that an unlinked embedding of a graph in  $M$  does not necessarily lift to an embedding of the graph in the universal cover. For example, the graph consisting of a single vertex and a single loop, embedded as a homotopically nontrivial loop in  $S^2 \times S^1$ , is vacuously unlinked, but does not lift to an embedding of the graph in the universal cover.

Nevertheless, Proposition 2 *can* be used to give an alternate proof (one that does not use the linking number argument of Proposition 1) that intrinsic linking is independent of the 3-manifold  $M$ . We know from the proof of Theorem 1 that it suffices to show that  $K_6$  and  $K_{3,3,1}$  are intrinsically linked in  $M$ . But if either of those graphs had an unlinked embedding in  $M$ , it would lift to an unlinked embedding in the universal cover  $\widetilde{M}$ , by Lemma 1; and then, as in the proof of Theorem 2, Proposition 2 would yield an unlinked embedding into  $S^3$ , which is a contradiction.

Of course, this argument relies on the Poincaré conjecture; so the proof given in Section 1 is more elementary.

## REFERENCES

- [CG] J. Conway and C. Gordon, *Knots and links in spatial graphs*, J. of Graph Theory **7** (1983), 445–453.
- [F] J. Foisy *A newly recognized intrinsically knotted graph*, J. Graph Theory **43** (2003), no. 3, 199–209.
- [KS] T. Kohara and S. Suzuki, *Some remarks on knots and links in spatial graphs*, in Knots 90, Walter de Gruyter and Co., Berlin, New York, (1992), 435–445.
- [M] J. Milnor, *Towards the Poincaré conjecture and the classification of 3-manifolds* Notices Amer. Math. Soc. **50** (2003), no. 10, 1226–1233.
- [MRS] R. Motwani, A. Raghunathan, and H. Saran, *Constructive results from graph minors; Linkless embeddings*, in 29th annual Symposium of Computer Science, IEEE, (1988), 398–409.
- [RS] N. Robertson and P. Seymour, *Graph minors XX. Wagner’s Conjecture*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B (2004).
- [RST] N. Robertson, P. Seymour, and R. Thomas, *Sachs’ linkless embedding conjecture* J. Combin. Theory Ser. B **64** (1995), no. 2, 185–227.
- [S1] H. Sachs, *On a spatial analogue of Kuratowski’s theorem on planar graphs—an open problem*. Graph theory (Łagow, 1981), 230–241, Lecture Notes in Math., **1018**, Springer, Berlin, 1983.
- [S2] H. Sachs, *On spatial representations of finite graphs* Finite and infinite sets, Vol. I, II (Eger, 1981), 649–662, Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai, 37, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984.
- [Sh] M. Shimabara, *Knots in certain spatial graphs* Tokyo J. Math **11** (1988), no 2, 405–413.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, POMONA COLLEGE, CLAREMONT, CA 91711, USA  
*E-mail address:* eflapan@pomona.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY, WINSTON-SALEM, NC 27109, USA  
*E-mail address:* howards@wfu.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, OCCIDENTAL COLLEGE, LOS ANGELES, CA 90041, USA  
*E-mail address:* DonL@oxy.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, LOYOLA MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY, LOS ANGELES, CA 90045, USA  
*E-mail address:* bmellor@lmu.edu