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Abstract

From polymer models, it has been conjectured that the exponential growth rate of the number of lattice polygons with knot-type \( K \) is the same as that for unknot polygons, and that the entropic critical exponent increases by one for each prime knot factor in the knot decomposition of \( K \). Here we prove this conjecture for any knot or non-split link embeddable in \( T^* \), the \( \infty \times 2 \times 1 \) tubular sublattice of the simple cubic lattice. This is the first model for which the conjecture has been proved. For the proof, we establish upper and lower bounds relating the asymptotics of the number of \( n \)-edge polygons with fixed knot or link-type \( K \) in \( T^* \) (as \( n \to \infty \)) to that of the number of \( n \)-edge unknot polygons. For the upper bounds, we prove that polygons of any knot or non-split link type \( K \) can be unknotted by \( f_K \) braid insertions, where \( f_K \) is the number of prime factors of \( K \). As part of the proof, we show that a 4-plat diagram of a 2-bridge link can always be unknotted by the insertion of a 4-braid diagram whose crossing number is bounded by the minimal crossing number of the link. For the lower bounds, we prove a pattern theorem for unknots using information from exact transfer-matrix calculations for polygons in the tube. Thus, unknot polygons can be transformed into any fixed knot or non-split link type by inserting one pattern for each prime factor.

1 Introduction

Interest in knotting and linking in ring polymers dates back to at least the 1930’s, when geneticists Navashin and McClintock observed circular chromosomes linked by DNA replication \cite{37,42}. The discovery of the DNA double helix in 1953 \cite{25,67} led researchers to speculate how the geometry of DNA affected cellular transactions \cite{66} and to ask how the cell controls DNA topology and prevents DNA entanglement \cite{16}. An increased interest in understanding the topology of ring polymers such as DNA ensued. In 1962, Frisch
and Wasserman [26] and Delbrück [17] conjectured that sufficiently long ring polymers in dilute solution are knotted with high probability. The first proof of the Frisch-Wasserman-Delbrück (FWD) conjecture was for a lattice polygon model of ring polymers [46, 62]. The conjecture was later proved for a number of off-lattice polymer models [19, 20, 21, 31]. More recently, the probability of knotting has been explored for models of knot diagrams [11, 24, 68].

With the FWD conjecture proved, interest turned to studying the statistics for specific knot-types. In the simple cubic lattice, where polygons have vertices in $\mathbb{Z}^3$ and edges of unit length, studying knot statistics involves studying the number $p_n(K)$ of $n$-edge polygons with fixed knot-type $K$ and its dependence on $K$ as $n \to \infty$. Analogous counts exist for other lattices [48, 49]. The following conjecture for lattice polygons follows from polymer scaling theory and numerical evidence.

**Conjecture 1** ([43]). For any given knot-type $K$, as $n \to \infty$ $p_n(K)$ satisfies the asymptotic equation

$$p_n(K) = B_K n^{f_K} p_n(0_1)(1 + o(1)), \quad (1)$$

where $0_1$ is the unknot, $f_K$ denotes the number of prime knot factors in the knot decomposition of $K$ and $f_0 \equiv 0$. Moreover,

$$p_n(0_1) = A_0 n^{\alpha_0} \mu_0^n(1 + o(1)), \quad (2)$$

where $\alpha_0$ is called the unknot entropic critical exponent and $\mu_0$ is called the unknot exponential growth constant. The constants $B_K, A_0$ and $\mu_0$ are potentially lattice-dependent.

Despite strong numerical evidence in support of Conjecture 1 [43, 49], very little has been proved analytically. Let $\mu$ denote the exponential growth constant for all $n$-edge self-avoiding polygons in the simple cubic lattice, regardless of knot-type. The limits defining $\mu_0$ and $\mu$ exist and $\mu_0 < \mu$ [62]. However the existence of exponential growth constants for $K \neq 0_1$ and of $\alpha_0$ remain open problems. A positive answer to Conjecture 1 along with a corresponding result for all $n$-edge polygons regardless of knot-type would imply that the probability of a random $n$-edge polygon having knot-type $K$ scales with $n$ like $C_K (\frac{\mu_0}{\mu})^n n^{\sigma + f_K}$, for $\sigma$ independent of $K$. This is significant because it is consistent with the idea that, on average, the knotted regions occur in a localized way, somewhat like pearls on a string.

The smallest tubular sublattice of $\mathbb{Z}^3$ which admits non-trivial knots is the $2 \times 2 \times 1$ lattice tube, the $2 \times 1$ tube denoted by $T^*$. Fig. 1A illustrates a knotted polygon in $T^*$. In this paper we prove Conjecture 1 Eq. 1 up to the leading constant $B_K$, for self-avoiding polygons in $T^*$. That is, we prove upper and lower bounds on $p_n(K)$ of the form in Eq. 1, differing only by a constant factor. We also establish similar results for non-split links with two or more components in $T^*$. Since a knot is a 1-component non-split link, from here on we will only distinguish between knots and multi-component non-split links if necessary, or to connect to Conjecture 1.

The main result of this paper is the following.

**Theorem 1.** Let $L$ be any non-split link embeddable in $T^*$. Then, for non-trivial $L$ there exist positive constants $\epsilon \in (0, 1), b_L \in \mathbb{R}, d_L \in \mathbb{Z}, e_L \in \mathbb{Z}$ (independent of $n$) and an integer $N_{L, \epsilon} > 0$ such that for any $n \geq N_{L, \epsilon}$, there are bounds on $p_{T^*, n}(L)$, the number of $n$-edge embeddings of $L$ in $T^*$, as follows:

$$\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\epsilon (n - e_L)}{f_L} \right) p_{T^*, n-e_L}(0_1) \leq p_{T^*, n}(L) \leq b_L \left( \frac{n}{f_L} \right) p_{T^*, n+e_L}(0_1). \quad (3)$$

Furthermore, there exist constants $C_1$ and $C_2$ such that for all sufficiently large $n$

$$C_1 n^{f_L} p_{T^*, n}(0_1) \leq p_{T^*, n}(L) \leq C_2 n^{f_L} p_{T^*, n}(0_1). \quad (4)$$
Figure 1: **A. Upper bound example.** A 98-edge polygon of knot-type $3_1$ (trefoil) in $T^*$. The insert (E) enclosed in a 3-block is a 4-braid containing a half twist of 2 strings. When inserted in (A) at the identified location, the 3-block converts the $3_1$ into an unknot. **B.** A shifted knot diagram obtained from a 2-dimensional projection of the polygon in (A). **C.** The 4-plat diagram associated with the $3_1$ polygon in (A). **D.** A 4-plat diagram of an unknot obtained by inserting a half twist at the location indicated with a dotted line in (B) and in (C). **E.** A lattice tube embedding of the corresponding half twist, that is inserted in (A, shaded region). **F. Lower bound example.** An unknot polygon with eight 2-sections. **G.** A trefoil pattern enclosed in a 7-block which, when inserted at either of the 2-sections indicated by arrows, yields a trefoil polygon in $T^*$. Note that the trefoil pattern could be modified at its ends to be inserted at any of the other 2-sections of the original polygon.
When \( L = K \) is a knot embeddable in \( \mathbb{T}^* \), Eq. 4 gives Conjecture 1, up to the term \( B_K \). More generally, for any link \( L \), the bounds of Theorem 1 establish that the exponential growth constant for embeddings of \( L \) in \( \mathbb{T}^* \) is the same as that for unknot polygons (as in Conjecture 1, Eq. 2), and that the entropic critical exponent increases by one for each prime factor of \( L \). The latter assumes that the entropic exponent \( \alpha_0 \) for the unknot exists. Regarding Eq. 2, the exponential growth constant for unknot polygons in \( \mathbb{T}^* \) is known to exist. The existence of \( \alpha_0 \) remains an open problem.

Our results about the exponential growth constants and entropic critical exponents for lattice polygons with fixed knot-type are believed to hold for any tube size, as well as in the limit where the tube dimensions go to infinity (see [43, 49]). This is the first model for which they are proven. For multi-component non-split links, the growth constant result is known for embeddings in \( \mathbb{Z}^3 \) of links with only unknot components [57]. The tube \( \mathbb{T}^* \) is the first model for which there are results on the growth constants for all multi-component non-split links and results on how the entropic exponent changes with the link-type. Recent numerical evidence [8] for multi-component non-split link embeddings in \( \mathbb{Z}^3 \) suggests that the results in Theorem 1 also hold for the unconfined case.

This paper is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1. The bounds in Theorem 1, Eq. 3 are each obtained by considering ways to convert an embedding of one link-type into an embedding of another link-type by insertions of sub-embeddings. The relevant sub-embeddings, the insertion process and the mathematical challenges and approaches for the upper bound are quite distinct from those for the lower bound.

For the upper bound, the goal is to convert a non-trivial link \( L \) in \( \mathbb{T}^* \) to an unknot polygon as indicated in Fig. 1A-E. Our approach takes advantage of the fact that all links that fit in \( \mathbb{T}^* \) are connected sums of 2-bridge links [29]. It is known that 2-bridge links are 4-plats and therefore can be represented by 4-plat diagrams [9]. The mathematical challenge for the upper bound is finding appropriate sub-embeddings (braid blocks) to insert at specific insertion locations in order to simplify the link. Here we solve this by using the classification of 4-plats [9, 52] and by proving new results about 4-plat diagrams. Specifically, we establish that a 4-plat diagram of a 2-bridge link can always be unknotted by the insertion of a 4-braid diagram whose crossing number is bounded by the minimal crossing number of the link (see Theorem 3). This result is of independent interest in knot theory. Then we show that analogous operations (one for each prime factor of \( L \)) can be performed on lattice links. The binomial term bounds the number of ways the insertion process on different initial embeddings could yield the same unknot polygon.

For the lower bound, the goal is to convert an unknot polygon to an embedding of a non-trivial link \( L \), as indicated by the insertion in Fig. 1F-G. A known result [4], given here in Proposition 1, provides suitable candidate sub-embeddings, called link patterns, which can be inserted at predefined locations (2-sections) to obtain an embedding of \( L \). However, the lower bounds of Eq. 3 and Eq. 4 – in particular the binomial coefficient and power-law term, respectively – require that not only it be possible to insert the suitable link patterns, but that on average there must be many locations (i.e. \( O(n) \)) where this can be done. In Theorem 5 we prove this result by establishing a pattern theorem for unknot polygons in \( \mathbb{T}^* \), and showing that there is a positive density of 2-sections in all but exponentially few unknot polygons.

In Section 2 we provide further background and definitions. Sections 3 and 4 present the new results related to the upper bound and the lower bound, respectively. These results are combined in Section 5 to prove Theorem 1. Consequences related to the size of the linked region and in particular how localized it is, are given in Section 6. The paper ends with a discussion in Section 7. Additional details and proofs are given in the Appendix.
2 Background and definitions

2.1 Knots and links in lattice tubes

We focus on tubular sublattices of the simple cubic lattice. These have been studied previously in various contexts [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 22, 54, 55, 58]. As is standard, we refer to the simple cubic lattice by its vertex set \( \mathbb{Z}^3 \). Any sublattice is also denoted by its vertex set. Unless stated otherwise, the notation and definitions used here are as in [6]. A self-avoiding polygon in \( \mathbb{Z}^3 \) (lattice polygon or polygon, for short) is the image of an embedding of one simple closed curve in \( \mathbb{Z}^3 \). A lattice link is a disjoint union of lattice polygons. We will refer to a lattice link with link type \( L \) as a lattice embedding of \( L \), or simply as an embedding of \( L \). The size of a lattice embedding of a link is defined to be the number of edges, which is always even.

For positive integers \( M_1, M_2 \), the semi-infinite sublattice of \( \mathbb{Z}^3 \) induced by the vertex set

\[
\{(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{Z}^3 : x \geq 0, 0 \leq y \leq M_1, 0 \leq z \leq M_2\}
\]

is called the \( M_1 \times M_2 \) tube and denoted by \( \mathbb{T}_{M_1, M_2} \equiv \mathbb{T} \subset \mathbb{Z}^3 \). We are interested in lattice links in \( \mathbb{T} \) and restrict to those which occupy at least one vertex in the plane \( x = 0 \). Let the span \( s(\pi) \) of a lattice link \( \pi \) be the maximal \( x \)-coordinate reached by any of its vertices.

Counts of polygons by size in lattice tubes have been well-studied. Let \( p_{\mathbb{T}, n} \) be the number of \( n \)-edge self-avoiding polygons in \( \mathbb{T} \) which occupy at least one vertex in the plane \( x = 0 \). See Fig. 1A for an embedding \( \pi \) of the knot-type \( 3_1 \) in a \( 2 \times 1 \) tube with span \( s(\pi) = 16 \) and size \( |\pi| = 98 \). For any given \( \mathbb{T} \), transfer-matrix arguments have been used to prove that [54]:

\[
p_{\mathbb{T}, n} = A_T \mu_T^n (1 + o(1)),
\]

with \( \mu_T \) the exponential growth constant for polygons in \( \mathbb{T} \). Hence, the limit defining \( \mu_T \) exists and the entropic critical exponent is 0 (see Section A for further details). With sufficient computational resources, \( A_T \) and \( \mu_T \) can be determined to arbitrary accuracy using the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of the associated transfer-matrix.

Now let \( p_{\mathbb{T}, n}(K) \) be the number of polygons with knot type \( K \) counted in \( p_{\mathbb{T}, n} \). It is known that \( p_{\mathbb{T}, n}(0_1) = (\mu_{\mathbb{T}, 0_1})^n e^{o(n)} \), where \( \mu_{\mathbb{T}, 0_1} \) is the unknot exponential growth constant given by

\[
\log \mu_{\mathbb{T}, 0_1} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p_{\mathbb{T}, n}(0_1).
\]

Further, in the \( 1 \times 1 \) tube \( \mu_{\mathbb{T}, 0_1} = \mu_T \) and otherwise \( 0 < \mu_{\mathbb{T}, 0_1} < \mu_T \) is known from a pattern theorem argument [54]. Monte Carlo methods have been used [7, 23] to provide strong evidence for Conjecture 1 with \( \alpha_0 = 0 \) for polygons in each of the tube sizes: \( 2 \times 1, 3 \times 1, 4 \times 1, 5 \times 1, 2 \times 2 \) and \( 3 \times 2 \).

More generally, we define \( p_{\mathbb{T}, n}(L) \) to be the number of \( n \)-edge embeddings of a non-split link type \( L \) in \( \mathbb{T} \) which occupy at least one vertex in the plane \( x = 0 \). We do not consider split links \( L \), i.e. two or more separable simple closed curves, since their \( n \)-edge embedding counts are not finite. For general \( \mathbb{T} \), little is known about \( p_{\mathbb{T}, n}(L) \) when \( L \neq 0_1 \). However, reference [29] characterized the link types for which \( p_{\mathbb{T}, n}(L) > 0 \) for some \( n \) (Section A) and showed that \( \mathbb{T}^* = \mathbb{T}_{2,1} \) is the smallest tube that admits non-trivial links.

In addition to characterizing which links are embeddable in \( \mathbb{T} \), we need information about the existence of sub-embeddings (patterns) which guarantee that a given link occurs as a prime factor in the link-type of the embedding.
A few more definitions are needed. Let \( \pi \) in \( \mathbb{T} \) be an embedding of a non-split link with span \( m \). For \( 1 \leq k \leq m \), the \( k \)-th section \( S_k \) of \( \pi \) is the set of edges in \( \pi \) which intersect the plane \( x = k - \frac{1}{2} \). Any section of an embedding which contains exactly \( j \) edges is called a \( j \)-section of the embedding.

A connected sum pattern is as a sub-embedding starting and ending with half of a 2-section (see Section 2 for details). Such a pattern is called a link pattern if closing off each end of the pattern yields a non-trivial non-split link. Otherwise it is called an unknot pattern. By definition, if a lattice embedding of \( L \) has a link pattern, then the corresponding link type is a connected summand of \( L \). See Fig. 1G for an example of a link pattern (for a \( 3_1 \) knot) in \( \mathbb{T}^* \) with span 7. Arguments in [5] establish the following results for any \( \mathbb{T}^* \).

**Proposition 1** ([5] Result 4). For each prime link \( L \) embeddable in \( \mathbb{T} \), there is a link-pattern of \( L \).

Fig. 1F-G illustrates how a \( 3_1 \) knot pattern can be inserted at a 2-section of an unknot polygon to convert it into a \( 3_1 \) polygon. An unknot polygon with at least one 2-section can be decomposed into the connected sum of two unknots. Any link pattern can then be “inserted” in between, as in Fig. 1G. In the next subsection we present implications of this for \( \mathbb{T}^* \).

### 2.2 4-plats, 4-braids and \( \mathbb{T}^* \)

Our results rely heavily on the following proposition. Here we provide the needed background.

**Proposition 2.** [29 Corollary 2] If a link type \( L \) can be embedded in \( \mathbb{T}^* \) then each prime factor of \( L \) is a 4-plat.

Furthermore, there is an embedding of \( L \) in \( \mathbb{T}^* \) which consists of a connected sum of \( f_L \) link-patterns, one corresponding to each prime factor of \( L \).

**Corollary 1.** Consider a link \( L \) embeddable in \( \mathbb{T}^* \). Any unknot polygon with at least one 2-section can be converted to an embedding of \( L \) by \( f_L \) insertions of link-patterns at one or more of the 2-sections of the polygon.

Thus, for \( \mathbb{T}^* \) we know how to convert an unknot polygon with 2-sections into an embedding of a link \( L \). For the lower bound in Theorem 1 we need to know that most unknot polygons contain a sufficient number of 2-sections. In Section 4 we prove this for \( \mathbb{T}^* \).

For the upper bound in Theorem 1 we obtain new results about 4-plats. Note first that 4-plats are links defined as closures of 4-braids. The family of 4-plats is the same as that of 2-bridge links. 4-plats can be represented by 4-plat diagrams (reviewed in [9]).

A 4-braid can be defined as four disjoint strings in a rectangular cuboid, where the strings start at four points in the left (\( x = 0 \)) face of the cuboid and end at four points in the opposite (right) face. Each string is required to run strictly rightwards, i.e. for any \( c \) the string meets the plane \( x = c \) at most once. The 4-braid is studied using a 4-braid diagram obtained by projecting the braid onto the \( xy \)-plane and resolving over and under crossings. A 4-braid diagram with no crossings is said to be trivial. Any 4-braid, except the trivial one, can be obtained by joining elementary braids \( \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3, \sigma_1^{-1}, \sigma_2^{-1} \) and \( \sigma_3^{-1} \) (see Fig. 2).

A sequence of the letters \( \sigma_i^{\pm 1} \), called a 4-braid word, represents a 4-braid (and its corresponding 4-braid diagram). The empty word with no letters represents the trivial braid. The sequence of letters used for a braid word is written in simple exponential form, say \( \sigma_i^a \) or \( \sigma_i^{-a} \). Two 4-braids are equivalent if they are related by “level preserving” isotopies, but they may be represented by different 4-braid diagrams and braid words. In particular, we consider that a reducible word, \( \sigma_i^a \sigma_i^{-b} \) or \( \sigma_i^{-b} \sigma_i^a \) \( (a, b \in \mathbb{N}) \), is different from the reduced one, \( \sigma_i^{a-b} \).

There are two ways to close a 4-braid diagram at each end to form a 4-plat diagram; these are denoted by \([1, 2 \text{ on the left and by }]_1, _2 \text{ on the right, as in Fig. 2}\). Such a closure of the
corresponding braid word $w$ results in a 4-plat diagram $[i_j]$, where $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$. For example, the 4-plat diagram $[\sigma_1^{-1} \sigma_2 \sigma_3 \sigma_2^{-1} \sigma_3^{-1} \sigma_2 \sigma_3^{-1} \sigma_2 \sigma_3]_1$ depicted in Fig. 1C represents the knot 3_1.

Formally, a 4-braid is a 3-dimensional object, a 4-braid diagram is a 2-D projection of a 4-braid with resolved over- and under-crossings and is described by a 4-braid word. All three terms are used to describe the same 3-dimensional object and we may use them interchangeably.

Given a 4-braid word $w$, its reverse word $\overline{w}$ is obtained by reversing the order of the elementary braids in $w$. The inverse word $w^{-1}$ of $w$ is obtained by reversing the order of letters and interchanging $\sigma_i$ and $\sigma_i^{-1}$. For example, $(\sigma_1 \sigma_2 \sigma_3^{-2})^{-1} = \sigma_3^2 \sigma_2^{-1} \sigma_1^{-1}$. Note that the words $ww^{-1}$ and $w^{-1}w$ represent braids that are equivalent to the trivial braid. By convention, a 4-braid word that does not contain any $\sigma_3^\pm 1$ is called a 3-braid word since one string in the braid diagram has no crossings. The flipped word $\hat{w}$ of a 3-braid word $w$ is obtained by interchanging the $i$'s and $j$'s in the subscripts of the elementary braids in $w$.

To connect to lattice embeddings, we need two intermediate results. First, we need a way to go from embeddings in $T^*$ to 4-plat diagrams. We obtain a shifted diagram from the embedding, as described in [29, Definition 3] and illustrated in Fig. 1B. In the proof of Theorem 2 we establish how to get 4-plat diagrams, one for each factor in the link-type.

Second, we use arguments as in [29] to construct an $s$-block corresponding to any sequence of $\sigma_i$'s and hence any 4-braid. In general, an $s$-block is a piece of a lattice link between two half-integer planes a distance $s$ apart (Section A). An $s$-block corresponding to a 4-braid is called a braid $s$-block, or braid block. Fig. 1E shows a braid 3-block.

3 Unknotting lattice links via the unknotting of 4-plat diagrams

Towards establishing the upper bound of Theorem 1 in this section we show how to transition between an embedding of a non-split link $L$ in $T^*$ and a corresponding set of 4-plat diagrams, one for each prime factor of $L$. The ultimate goal is to "unknot" the embedding by a sequence of $f_L$ insertions of braid blocks. Specifically, we obtain the following theorem.

**Theorem 2.** Any lattice embedding of a non-split link $L$ in $T^*$ can be converted to a lattice polygon of the unknot in $T^*$ by $f_L$ insertions of braid $s$-blocks. The span ($s$) is bounded above by $3c + 8$, where $c$ is the maximum crossing number of the prime factors of $L$.

The crossing number of a link $L$ is a topological invariant given by the minimal number of crossings over all its diagrams. Fig. 1H shows a trefoil polygon in $T^*$ with $n = 98$ edges, along with an embedding of a braid block (Fig. 1E) that, upon insertion at the identified location, converts the trefoil to an unknot polygon. Importantly, the spans of the braid blocks are determined by the crossing numbers of the prime factors of $L$ and do not depend on the size of the lattice embedding of $L$. 
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To prove Theorem 2 we show that any 4-plat diagram can be changed into a diagram of the unknot by inserting a specific 4-braid. The problem of untangling knots via local moves on diagrams is of independent interest in knot theory. McCoy [38] proved that for un knotting number one alternating knots, unknotting crossings exist in any alternating diagram. However, in general, it is not easy to find a small number of sets of crossing changes converting a given diagram into a diagram of the unknot. Taniyama [63] showed that for any nontrivial knot and any natural number $N$, there is a diagram of the knot where the unknotting number of the diagram is greater than or equal to $N$. In the case of 4-plats, in Theorem 3 we show that any 4-plat diagram of a prime link can be converted to the unknot by inserting a 4-braid whose length is bounded above by the crossing number of the link.

**Theorem 3.** For any 4-plat $L$, there exists a 3-braid word $w_0$ such that any given 4-plat diagram of $L$ can be converted into a diagram of the unknot by inserting one of $w_0, \overline{w_0}, 0$ and $\hat{w}_0$. Moreover, $w_0$ can be taken so that the number of crossings of $w_0$ is at most the crossing number of $L$.

The definitions of the reverse word $\overline{w_0}$ and the flipped word $\hat{w}_0$ of $w_0$ are given in Section 2.2. Converting a 4-plat diagram $D$ into a diagram $D'$ by inserting $w_0$ means that $D = [w_1w_2]_j$ and $D' = [w_1w_0w_2]_j$ for some 4-braid words $w_1, w_2$. For technical reasons, $w_1$ and $w_2$ are assumed to be non-empty 4-braid words.

Before discussing the proof, let us consider some concrete examples. In the case of $7_6$, $w_0 = \sigma_1^{-2}$ satisfies the condition in Theorem 3. Namely, any given 4-plat diagram of $7_6$ can be converted into a diagram of the unknot by inserting either $\sigma_1^{-2}$ ($= w_0 = \overline{w_0}$) or $\sigma_2^{-2}$ ($= \hat{w}_0 = \overline{w_0}$). Similarly, the 3-braid $\sigma_2^{-1}\sigma_1^{-1}$ satisfies the condition of $w_0$ for $L = 6_3^2$, see Fig. 3. For a given link type $L$, there can be many options for $w_0$. In fact, not only $\sigma_1^{-2}$ but also $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_1^{-1}$ satisfy the condition of $w_0$ for $L = 3_1$.

![Figure 3: Insertions of $w_0 = \sigma_2^{-2}$ and $w_0 = \sigma_2^{-1}\sigma_1^{-1}$ on 4-plat diagrams. Unknot diagrams are obtained by these insertions.](image)

To prove Theorem 3 first we focus on a minimal-crossing 4-plat diagram, $D_0$ of $L$ and find the inserting 3-braid $w_0$ in Theorem 3. The remainder of the proof consists of showing that the cases for all other 4-plat diagrams (minimal and non minimal-crossing) can be handled by deforming them to $D_0$ using moves on 4-plat diagrams, $A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4, B_1, B_2$ and $B_3$, as in Fig. 4. All the moves preserve the link type of 4-plat diagrams (Lemma 5). In particular, it is derived from a symmetry of a rational tangle that an $A_1$ move preserves the link type, while it is easy to see in the figure for the other moves. It can be also confirmed that moves $A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4$ preserve the crossing number of diagrams while moves $B_1, B_2$ and $B_3$ reduce the crossing number.

**Lemma 1.** Let $D_0$ be a minimal-crossing 4-plat diagram of a non-trivial 4-plat $L$. There exists a 3-braid word $w_0$ such that $D_0$ can be converted into a diagram of the unknot by inserting $w_0$.

**Proof.** Since $A_1$ moves preserve link type, we may assume $D_0$ to be a closure of a 3-braid word $w$; see also Proposition 5 in the Appendix. Since $L$ is a non-trivial 4-plat, the 3-braid word $w$ can be divided into
two non-empty 3-braid words \( w_1 \) and \( w_2 \) as \( w = w_1 w_2 \). Using the property of the inverses of braids, all crossings are cancelled after inserting \( w_1^{-1} w_2^{-1} \) into \( D_0 \), so the resulting 4-plat diagram represents an unlink. The 4-plat may be the unknot, but it may be the 2-component unlink depending on how \( w \) is closed for \( D_0 \). In the former case, let \( w_0 = w_1^{-1} w_2^{-1} \). In the latter case, we can select a 3-braid \( w_0 \) that leaves one crossing at an end of \( D_0 \) to obtain the unknot. Thus, there exists a 4-plat \( w_0 \) such that the crossing number of \( w_0 \) is less than or equal to the crossing number of \( L \), and \( D_0 \) can be converted into a diagram of the unknot by inserting \( w_0 \).

From Lemma 1, the remaining proof of Theorem 3 is obtained by taking \( K \) to be the unknot in the following theorem.

**Theorem 4.** Suppose \( D \) and \( D_0 \) are 4-plat diagrams of \( L \), and \( D_0 \) is a minimal-crossing diagram. If a link \( K \) is obtained by inserting a 3-braid word \( w_0 \) into \( D_0 \), then \( K \) can be obtained from \( D \) by inserting one of \( w_0 \), \( \bar{w}_0 \), \( \tilde{w}_0 \) and \( \tilde{\bar{w}}_0 \).

**Sketch of the proof.** By the same observation about \( A_1 \) moves in the proof of Lemma 1, we may always assume that \( D \) is a closure of a 3-braid word. In the case where \( D \) is a minimal-crossing 4-plat diagram of \( L \), it is known that \( D \) and \( D_0 \) are related by \( A_2 \), \( A_3 \), \( A_4 \) moves \([11]\). On the other hand, if \( D \) is a non-minimal-crossing 4-plat diagram of \( L \), the number of crossings can be reduced by at least one of \( B_1 \), \( B_2 \) and \( B_3 \) since \( D \) is a non-alternating diagram. The proof is completed by showing that in each move the link \( K \) obtained from the resulting diagram by inserting \( w_0 \) is also obtained from the original diagram by inserting one of \( w_0 \), \( \bar{w}_0 \), \( \tilde{w}_0 \) and \( \tilde{\bar{w}}_0 \). The full details of the proof of Theorem 4 are given in the Appendix.
Proposition 3. Let $w_0$ be a 3-braid word with $c$ crossings. There is a span-3c braid block in $\mathbb{T}^*$ representing $w_0$. Moreover, for each type of 4-section there is a braid block in $\mathbb{T}^*$ with span at most $3c + 8$ such that it represents $w_0$ and can be inserted into the 4-section.

The proof of Proposition 3 is given in the Appendix. This proposition allows us to connect Theorem 3 to Theorem 2.

Proof of Theorem 2 from Theorem 3. By Proposition 6 in the Appendix we assume, without loss of generality, that an embedding is without 6-sections.

Suppose an embedding does not have 2-sections or hidden 2-sections (see a definition of the latter in Section C of the Appendix). Then we know (Lemma 10) the shifted diagram is a 4-plat diagram and $f_L = 1$. By Theorem 3 we can thus change this diagram into a diagram of the unknot by inserting a suitable 4-braid. The upper bound on $s$ in Theorem 2 can be demonstrated by constructing such a braid in an $s$-block of $\mathbb{T}^*$ as in Proposition 3. The corresponding change in the original embedding can be realized by insertion of the corresponding braid block from Proposition 3.

If an embedding $P$ has (hidden) 2-sections, we show in Lemma 11 in the Appendix that we can divide $P$ into a sequence $(P_i)$ of closed embeddings without (hidden) 2-sections. Suppose some $P_i$ is non-trivial link. Then $P_i$ is without 6-sections and (hidden) 2-sections, and hence it has a 4-plat diagram. By the same argument above, we can change $P_i$ into an unknot polygon by inserting an $s$-block. Note that we can choose the place of the insertions away from other $P_j$'s. Then these insertions change the original embedding into an unknot polygon. The full details of the proof of Theorem 2 are given in the Appendix.

4 A pattern theorem for unknots in $\mathbb{T}^*$

Towards proving the lower bound, in this section we prove a pattern theorem for unknot polygons using information from exact transfer-matrix calculations for polygons in the tube $\mathbb{T}^*$. In essence, a pattern theorem is a result stating that a particular type of lattice object (polygon, walk, tree, etc.), as its size $n$ gets large, typically contains many copies of a small piece (a pattern).

Pattern theorems have been used previously, for example, to prove the FWD conjecture for polygons in tubes [3, 54] and to study linking probabilities for the case of two polygons which span a tube [2]. Here we present the first proof of a pattern theorem for unknot polygons. In particular we show that for $n$ sufficiently large, all but exponentially few $n$-edge unknot polygons (unknots in $\mathbb{T}^*$) contain a density ($\epsilon n$) of sections with exactly two edges (called 2-sections).

Theorem 5. Let $p_{\mathbb{T}^*,n}(0_1, \leq k)$ be the number of unknots of length $n$ in $\mathbb{T}^*$ which contain at most $k$ 2-sections. Then there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p_{\mathbb{T}^*,n}(0_1, \leq \epsilon n) < \log \mu_{\mathbb{T}^*,0_1},$$

where $n$ is taken through multiples of 2 and $\mu_{\mathbb{T}^*,0_1}$ is the unknot exponential growth constant as in Eq. [7].

The proof of Theorem 5 has two separate parts, which we describe below. It will be convenient to refer to logarithms of growth constants. Hence, given any growth constant such as $\mu_{\mathbb{T}^*}$ or $\mu_{\mathbb{T}^*,0_1}$, we define a corresponding growth rate, $\kappa_{\mathbb{T}^*} \equiv \log \mu_{\mathbb{T}^*}$ or $\kappa_{\mathbb{T}^*,0_1} \equiv \log \mu_{\mathbb{T}^*,0_1}$. 
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4.1 Unknots with no 2-sections are exponentially rare

The first part involves showing that the growth rate of unknots with *no 2-sections* is strictly less than that of all unknots. This means that unknots with no 2-sections are exponentially rare.

Note that for lattice models characterized by *finite transfer matrices*, showing something equivalent to the first part above follows from the fact that the dominant eigenvalue(s) of the transfer-matrix must decrease when the pattern in question is forbidden. (A similar idea can sometimes be applied in the absence of a finite transfer-matrix, when one knows something about the critical behavior of the generating function \[62\].) However, unknots in a lattice tube *do not* have a finite transfer-matrix, so we are forced to take a quite different approach.

This part of the proof has two steps. In the first step, detailed in Section D.2, we compute an upper bound on \(\hat{\kappa}_{T^*}\), the growth rate of polygons with no 2-sections.

**Lemma 2.**

\[
\hat{\kappa}_{T^*} < 0.446287.
\]

(9)

Lemma 2 is proved in Section D.2 using a standard upper bound for the spectral radius of a matrix,

\[
\tau_M \leq \|M^k\|^{1/k}
\]

(10)

for any \(k \geq 1\), where \(\|\cdot\|\) is any consistent matrix norm. We use use \(\|\cdot\|_\infty\), which is the maximum absolute row sum. Note that by inclusion, Lemma 2 also provides an upper bound for \(\hat{\kappa}_{T^*}(01)\), the growth rate of unknots with no 2-sections.

For the second step, we establish a lower bound on \(\kappa_{T^*}(01)\).

**Lemma 3.**

\[
\kappa_{T^*}(01) \geq 0.620044.
\]

(11)

The idea of the proof of Lemma 3 is as follows. Because unknots in \(T^*\) can be concatenated to form bigger unknots, we have

\[
p_{T^*,m}(01)p_{T^*,n}(01) \leq p_{T^*,m+n+6}(01),
\]

(12)

where the \((+6)\) corresponds to the number of edges that must be inserted at the concatenation point. So \(\log p_{T^*,n-6}(01)\) is a *superadditive* sequence, and it follows that

\[
\kappa_{T^*}(01) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p_{T^*,n-6}(01) = \sup_{n \geq 0} \frac{1}{n} \log p_{T^*,n-6}(01).
\]

(13)

Brute-force enumeration yields \(p_{T^*,24}(01) = 119,796,593\), from which the lower bound in the lemma follows. (It is known \[29\] that every polygon of length \(\leq 34\) in \(T^*\) is an unknot, so in fact \(p_{T^*,24}(01) = p_{T^*,24}\).)

Combining Lemmas 2 and 3 we have

\[
\hat{\kappa}_{T^*}(01) \leq \hat{\kappa}_{T^*} < 0.446287 < 0.620044 \leq \kappa_{T^*}(01).
\]

(14)

4.2 Unknots have a positive density of 2-sections

The second part of the proof relies crucially on the next lemma. It demonstrates that we can remove all the 2-sections from an unknot while controlling the number of new edges added.
Lemma 4.

\[ p_{T^*,n}(0_1, \leq k) = \sum_{t=0}^{k} p_{T^*,n}(0_1, t) \leq \sum_{t=0}^{k} 2^t \binom{n}{2t} p_{T^*,n+E,t}(0_1, 0) \]  

(15)

for a constant \( E \).

The proof of Lemma 4 is given in Section D.4. We break the proof into two parts (sub-lemmas). We first show how to take a polygon of length \( n \) with \( t \) 2-sections and break it apart into \( t+1 \) polygons with no 2-sections, with total length \( n+2Dt \) for a constant \( D \). We then show how to join those polygons back together into one large polygon of length \( n+(2C+2D+2)t \) with no 2-sections, for another constant \( C \). This process is reversible, with knowledge of where the splits and joins occurred (\( \frac{\kappa}{\kappa} \)) is an upper bound on the number of possibilities) and knowledge of which of a pair of possible choices at each cut formed the original 2-section (at most two choices). Here \( E = 2C+2D+2 \).

Proof of Theorem 5. Take Eq. (15) with \( k = \epsilon n \) and \( \epsilon < \frac{1}{4} \). Then the last summand on the RHS is the largest, so

\[ p_{T^*,n}(0_1, \leq \epsilon n) \leq (\epsilon n + 1)2^{\epsilon n} \binom{n}{2\epsilon n} p_{T^*,n(1+\epsilon)E}(0_1, 0). \]  

(16)

Take logs, divide by \( n \) and take the lim sup:

\[ \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p_{T^*,n}(0_1, \leq \epsilon n) \leq -\epsilon \log \epsilon - \left( \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon \right) \log(1 - 2\epsilon) + (1 + \epsilon E)\kappa_{T^*}. \]  

(17)

As \( \epsilon \to 0 \), the RHS approaches \( \kappa_{T^*} \) and by Eq. (14) we know that \( \kappa_{T^*} < \kappa_{T^*}(0_1) \), so there must be an \( \epsilon T \in (0, 1/4) \) which satisfies Eq. (8).

5 Proof of the main result

Proof of Theorem 1 from Theorems 2 and 5. By Theorem 2, we can insert a finite number of \( s \)-blocks to change an embedding of \( L \) into an unknot polygon. Then \( p_{T^*,n}(L) \leq \binom{n+dl}{f_L} p_{T^*,n+dl}(0_1) \), where \( d_L \) is a fixed number (the total number of edges in the inserted parts) which is bounded above by a finite number times \( f_L \). The binomial term in the upper bound accounts for the number of ways different embeddings of \( L \) could lead to the same unknot polygon; this is bounded above by the number of places (polygon edges) the inserted \( f_L \) braid blocks could be located in the unknot polygon, namely \( \binom{n+dl}{f_L} \leq \binom{n+dl}{f_L} \leq d_L \binom{n}{f_L} \). The first inequality holds provided \( (n+dl)/2 \geq f_L \) and the second follows from a binomial identity.

The pattern theorem for unknot polygons given by Theorem 5 is key to establishing the lower bound.

For this, consider \( L \) a prime link. Let \( P \) be a connected sum pattern for \( L \) and let \( S \) be any 2-section. Then from Corollary 1, \( P \) can be inserted (additional edges may be needed) at \( S \) in a polygon (see for example Fig. 1G as well as the Appendix, Section E), increasing the length of the resulting embedding by some constant \( \Delta \) depending on \( P \) (but not \( S \)).

Now take any unknot polygon with \( n \) edges and at least \( \epsilon n \) 2-sections, with \( \epsilon \) the same as in Theorem 5. By the above, the pattern \( P \) can be inserted at any one of those 2-sections, and the resulting lattice embedding will have link type \( L \). We thus have

\[ \binom{\epsilon n}{1} \left[ p_{T^*,n}(0_1) - p_{T^*,n}(0_1, \leq \epsilon n) \right] \leq p_{T^*,n+\Delta}(L). \]  

(18)
However, from Theorem 5 we have

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{p_{T^*, n}(0, 1) - p_{T^*, n}(0, 1) \leq \epsilon n}{p_{T^*, n}(0, 1)} = 1$$

(19)

so that the numerator can be made arbitrarily close to the denominator for sufficiently large $n$. Hence, for example, there exists $N > 0$ such that for all $n \geq N$, $\frac{1}{2} \binom{\epsilon n}{1} p_{T^*, n}(0, 1) \leq p_{T^*, n+\Delta}(L)$.

This argument can be extended in a straightforward way to the case where $L$ is composite (see Corollary 1 to Proposition 1 in Section 2), and the lower bound follows.

The arguments above establish Eq. [3]. Eq. [4] can be obtained from Eq. [3] by combining the well-known fact that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log \binom{\epsilon n}{1}}{\log n} = b$$

for any given even $m \geq 2$. Note that the case $m = 2$ is given as Corollary 3 in the Appendix. The ratio limit Eq. [20] follows from the proof of a more general pattern theorem (Appendix, Corollary 2) for the occurrence of connected sum patterns in unknot polygons, which in turn follows from Theorem 5 and the proof of [35, Theorem 2.1]. Then [35, Theorem 2.2] gives Eq. [20]. See Section D.5 in the Appendix for more details. Note that the resulting constant $C_1$ will depend at least on $\epsilon$ and $e_L$ and the constant $C_2$ will depend at least on $d_L$ and $b_L$ so that $C_1 < C_2$.

6 Size and mode of the linked region

The significance statement alludes to a connection between the scaling form established in Theorem 1 Eq. [4] and the localization of knots in polymers. In fact our proof of Theorem 1 Eq. [4] provides several ways to clarify that connection.

To measure knot/link localization, a measure of the size (number of edges) of the entangled region is needed and that size must be compared to the size of the whole embedding. Several different approaches have been suggested for defining the size of the knotted region in polygons (see e.g. [39]). A natural definition of this size for an $n$-edge embedding of a link $L$ in a tube is as follows (see [5]). First divide the embedding at each 2-section to create a set of patterns which can each be closed off into embeddings of links. Up to $f_L$ of the resulting embeddings will be non-trivial links and the sizes of these non-trivial pieces can be summed to give the size of the linked part of $L$. To talk about how localized the linked part is, one considers a set of $n$-edge embeddings and then considers how the average size of the linked part grows as $n \to \infty$. If the size of the linked part is $o(n)$, then $L$ is said to be “localized” in the embeddings. Otherwise it is said to be “not localized”. Further, if the size of the linked part is $o(1)$, then $L$ is said to be “strongly localized” in the embeddings.

We make two initial observations. First, the proof of Theorem 1 gives as a corollary (Appendix, Corollary 4) a general pattern theorem for embeddings of non-split $L$. As a consequence, all but exponentially few sufficiently large $n$-edge embeddings in $T^*$ of non-split $L$ contain a density $(en)$ of 2-sections. Dividing an embedding with $en$ 2-sections into connected sum patterns, yields patterns with average size $1/\epsilon$. Thus one expects the link patterns in this to have, on average, a similar size and hence be $o(1)$, i.e. strongly localized. Second, we note that the upper bound proof of Theorem 1 establishes that one can unknot a link by the insertion of $f_L o(1)$-size braid blocks, so in some sense the “essential” parts of the link can
be removed by making $o(1)$ changes, another indication of strong localization. We next discuss further results that expand on these observations.

First, a corollary (Appendix, Corollary 5) to Theorems 1 and 2 gives that sets of embeddings of a link $L$ in $\mathbb{T}^*$ for which the linked part of $L$ has size $O(n) = \alpha n$, for any fixed $0 < \alpha < 1$, are exponentially rare amongst all embeddings of $L$. In contrast, sets of embeddings of $L$ where the linked part is strongly localized (bounded in size by a fixed amount) are not exponentially rare; instead the embedding counts follow the same scaling form as $p_{\mathbb{T}^*, n}(L)$ (Appendix, Corollary 6).

Furthermore, the conclusions of Theorem 1 hold for any subset of embeddings of $L$ where an element of the set can be obtained by inserting any fixed-size link patterns corresponding to the prime factors of $L$. Thus, aside from the size of the linked part, one can also restrict other geometric features of the linked part and get the same scaling form. In particular, for the case of $L$ a prime knot, two modes have been identified for connected sum knot patterns: the 2-filament mode (also called double filament or non-local) and the 1-filament mode (also called single filament or local) [5, 34, 61]. See [5, Figure 1]. Restricting to knot patterns in either one of these modes, will yield the same types of bounds as in Theorem 1. Hence, for example, for a prime knot, the number of embeddings with the knot occurring in the 1-filament mode follows the same scaling form as that for the 2-filament mode except for the constant factor (Appendix, Corollary 7). Thus the likelihood of one type of knot mode occurring over another is determined by the constants in the scaling form. For $\mathbb{T}^*$, numerical evidence [5] indicates that the 2-filament mode is more likely. This could be related to the fact [5, Result 5] that the span of a smallest 2-filament mode knot pattern is smaller than that for a 1-filament mode knot pattern in $\mathbb{T}^*$. Recent numerical results based on data from [23] have shown that the difference between the occurrence probabilities of the two modes decreases with tube size although the 2-filament mode still dominates at tube size $3 \times 2$.

Regarding different modes of occurrence for two component links, we note that prime 4-plats have either one or two components and if they have two components, both components are unknots [9]. For a prime two component link, we define two modes of link patterns: those where all vertices of one component (called here the one-polygon mode) are contained in the link pattern and those where that is not the case (called here the two-polygon mode) (Appendix, Fig. 11). Again, embeddings of each type will have the same scaling form, up to the constant term. It appears that for the Hopf link, the one-polygon mode link pattern is smaller in span than the two-polygon mode. For embeddings of the Hopf link or the Hopf link connected sum with a single prime knot, we thus expect that the one-polygon mode will be more probable, however, if both components of the Hopf link are each connected-summed with a prime knot then the two-polygon mode of the Hopf link is the only option. Similarly, suppose $L = K_1 \# L_1 \# K_2$ where $L_1$ is a 2-component 2-bridge link and $K_1$ and $K_2$ are 2-bridge knots added to different components of $L_1$. Then neither component of $L$ can occur in a single-polygon mode.

## 7 Discussion

The paper is primarily devoted to proving Theorem 1. New knot theory results about 4-plat diagrams are established to prove the upper bound. For the lower bound, a new pattern theorem for unknot polygons is proved based on exact transfer-matrix results for polygons in $\mathbb{T}^*$. Note that one can take the size of an embedding to be its span rather than the number of edges, and in that case analogous results can be proved.

It is expected that bounds of the form in Theorem 1, Eq. 4 hold for any tube size and in the limit as the tube dimensions go to infinity, i.e. for $\mathbb{Z}^2$ [8, 43, 49]. However, the upper bound arguments do not easily extend even to a $3 \times 1$ tube, since the arguments rely not just on the links being connected sums of 4-plats.
but also on the fact that in $T^*$ (due to the geometric constraints) each prime factor is “isolated” in the link embedding (that is they must occur in separate blocks of the embedding). For example in the $3 \times 1$ tube, even if we restrict to connected sums of 4-plats, we cannot easily obtain 4-plat diagrams corresponding to the link embedding. Therefore we cannot find the locations in the embedding to insert the braid blocks needed to unknot it.

For the lower bound, the challenge to extending to larger tubes is two-fold. To extend Lemma 2 the transfer-matrix for polygons in the tube is needed (we have this currently up to $5 \times 1$ and $3 \times 2$ only). For Lemma 3 an accurate count of unknot polygons up to a sufficiently large size is needed. In general this involves generating polygons and checking their knot-type, a time-consuming process. It is likely that the lower bound could be proved for a few more small tube sizes, but this is a long way from extending it to all tube sizes.

Modelling knotting and linking in tubes is of independent interest to polymer scientists and molecular biologists. Recent experimental studies report on the detection of complex DNA knots using nanopore sensors [47, 53]. These methods allow researchers to detect knotting at length scales one order of magnitude larger than traditional gel electrophoresis [59, 65], where the optimal knot and link type detection is in the $3 - 9 \times 10^3$ base pair range [10, 14, 15, 27]. Experimental results have sparked interest in computational modelling of DNA knot translocation through narrow channels (e.g. [61]; reviewed in [44]). The $2 \times 1$ tube studied in the present work gives a theoretical framework to study knotting and linking in narrow channels. Our results provide a robust theoretical justification that knots and links confined to narrow tubular confinement tend on average to have the entanglements localized and separated from each other in the tube.

Other structures of interest are co-transcriptional R-loops which have been the subject of many recent studies due to their biological relevance and potential impact to health [13, 51]. R-loops are prevalent 3-strand nucleic acid structures that form during transcription [51]. They consist of a DNA:RNA hybrid and a DNA single strand. A detailed topological characterization of the entanglement of R-loops is still lacking [12, 30, 60]. Modelling R-loops as chain embeddings in a tube is an ideal way to capture the properties of these braided configurations as 3D objects (and not just as symbolic objects as those represented by braid words). The methods in this paper suggest ways to explore R-loop embeddings combinatorially and to characterize the breadth of possible topological configurations adopted by them.
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**A Additional background and definitions**

In this section we introduce some terminology and results that are needed to give a more detailed overview of the main theorems and their proofs. Definitions given in the main paper carry over to this document.
Since we are focussing on the simple cubic lattice (a crystallographic lattice) we start by giving a more precise definition of this lattice. It has vertices (0-skeleton) which are the integer points in \( \mathbb{R}^3 \) and its 1-skeleton is the set of edges joining pairs of vertices unit distance apart. (Equivalently the lattice can be thought of as \( (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}) \cup (\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{Z}) \cup (\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}) \) with lattice vertices being the points in \( \mathbb{Z}^3 \) and lattice edges being the unit length lines between pairs of vertices.) As is standard, we refer to this lattice by its vertex set \( \mathbb{Z}^3 \). Similarly a sublattice of \( \mathbb{Z}^3 \) is denoted by its vertex set whenever the edge set is induced by the vertices.

A first question of interest is the determination of which non-split links are embeddable in \( \mathbb{Z}^3 \) and \( \mathbb{T}_{M_1, M_2} \). For \( \mathbb{Z}^3 \), it has been established that every knot is embeddable \([56, \text{ Theorem 2.4}]\) and similar arguments work for multicomponent links. To discuss the answer for \( \mathbb{T}_{M_1, M_2} \), let \( h : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) be the projection to the \( x \)-axis, that is \( h(x, y, z) = x \). The link invariant trunk\((L)\) is defined by \( \text{trunk}(L) = \min_{E} \max_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \{ h^{-1}(t) \cap E \} \), where \( E \) is an embedding of link \( L \) in \( \mathbb{R}^3 \) \([29, 45]\). By showing that the trunk of a link limits the size of the smallest tube that can contain it, in \([29]\), the link types that can be confined in \( \mathbb{T}_{M_1, M_2} \) are characterized. In particular the following proposition has been proved:

**Proposition 4** \([29, \text{ Theorem 1}]\). A link type \( L \) can be confined to \( \mathbb{T}_{M_1, M_2} \) if and only if \( \text{trunk}(L) < (M_1 + 1)(M_2 + 1) \).

This then leads to Proposition 2.

Note that any non-trivial non-split link has trunk greater than 3 \([45]\), so that \( \mathbb{T}^* \) is the smallest tube that admits non-trivial non-split links.

A second question of interest, for a given non-split link \( L \), is the determination of the number of embeddings of \( L \) of a given size. Study of this question for knots embedded in \( \mathbb{Z}^3 \) (polygons) has led to Conjecture 1. We give further background on this next.

For polygon enumeration, we consider two polygons in \( \mathbb{Z}^3 \) to be the same if they are translates of each other. Let \( p_n \) be the number of distinct \( n \)-edge polygons in \( \mathbb{Z}^3 \). Hammersley \([28]\) proved that \( p_n = e^n \log \mu + o(n) \) where \( \mu \) is the exponential growth constant of the lattice; that is, Hammersley proved that the following limit that defines \( \mu \) exists:

\[
\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (p_n)^{1/n}.
\]

In a similar way it can be shown \([62]\) that the number of unknot polygons \( p_n(0_1) \) with \( n \) edges satisfies the equation \( p_n(0_1) = e^n \log \mu_0 + o(n) \) and pattern theorem arguments \([33]\) can be used to show that \( \mu_0 < \mu \) \([46, 62]\). This establishes the FWD conjecture. Similar to Conjecture 1 there is evidence that

\[
p_n = A n^\alpha \mu^n (1 + o(1)), \quad n \rightarrow \infty,
\]

where \( A > 0 \) and \( \alpha \) is called the entropic critical exponent for lattice polygons.\(^1\) It is also expected that \( \alpha \) is not lattice-dependent while \( A \) and \( \mu \) are. Note that, aside from the existence of the limit defining \( \mu \), little is known rigorously regarding Eq. \([22]\). In particular, it has yet to be established that the limit that would define \( \alpha \),

\[
\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(p_n/\mu^n)}{\log n},
\]

exists.

Now consider \( p_n(K) \), the number of \( n \)-edge polygons with fixed knot-type \( K \). It is straightforward to show that there exists a fixed integer \( b \) such that \( p_n(0_1) \leq p_{n+b}(K) \) \([56]\) but little else is known rigorously about \( p_n(K) \). There is however strong numerical evidence from Monte Carlo simulations that Conjecture 1 holds, i.e. that as \( n \rightarrow \infty \),

\[
p_n(K) \sim A_K n^{\alpha_0 + b} \mu_0^n (1 + o(1)).
\]

\(^1\)In the statistical mechanics literature the exponent of \( n \) in Eq. \([22]\) is usually written as \( \alpha - 3 \) instead of \( \alpha \); for simplicity we will stick with \( \alpha \) here.
Furthermore, there is numerical evidence that \( \alpha_{0_1} = \alpha \) and that for prime knots \( K_1 \) and \( K_2 \), the amplitude ratios \( A_{K_1}/A_{K_2} \) are lattice-independent, i.e. "universal" [49]. However, except in the case that \( K = 0_1 \), it has yet to be proved that \( \lim_{n \to \infty} \left( p_n(K) \right)^{1/n} \) even exists, although it is known that the corresponding \( \lim \inf \) is bounded below by \( \mu_{0_1} \) and the \( \lim \sup \) is strictly less than \( \mu \) [56].

In general, while it is known that \( \mu_{0_1} < \mu \), there is no known approach for exactly determining either \( \mu \), \( \mu_{0_1} \) or their ratio \( \mu_{0_1}/\mu \), although there are estimates for these quantities based on various numerical approaches [43] [49].

Recently [8] considered embeddings of \( k \)-component non-split links in \( \mathbb{Z}^3 \) for any fixed \( k > 1 \). In the case that all components are unknots, they proved that the exponential growth constant is equal to \( \mu_{0_1} \) and otherwise they obtained that the exponential growth constant, if it exists, is strictly less than \( \mu \) and bounded below by \( \mu_{0_1} \). They provide numerical evidence that is consistent with the exponential growth constant being independent of link type and a scaling form consistent with that of Conjecture [7].

In this paper we make progress on proving Conjecture [1] now generalized to any non-split link, by focusing on the tubular sublattices of the simple cubic lattice \( \mathbb{T} = \mathbb{T}_{M_1,M_2} \). First, define \( \mathcal{P}_\mathbb{T} \) to be the set of self-avoiding polygons in \( \mathbb{T} \) which occupy at least one vertex in the plane \( x = 0 \), and let \( \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{T},n} \) be the subset of \( \mathcal{P}_\mathbb{T} \) comprising polygons with \( n \) edges (\( n \) even). Then let \( p_{\mathbb{T},n} = |\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{T},n}| \); note thus that in the tube, for enumeration, we are identifying embeddings only if they are \( x \)-translates of each other.

We define the span \( s(\pi) \) of a polygon \( \pi \in \mathcal{P}_\mathbb{T} \) to be the maximal \( x \)-coordinate reached by any of its vertices and we use \( |\pi| \) to denote the number of edges in \( \pi \).

One major advantage of focusing on \( \mathbb{T} = \mathbb{T}_{M_1,M_2} \) is that transfer-matrix arguments have been used to prove Eq. [6] [54], which we state again here:

\[
p_{\mathbb{T},n} = A_\mathbb{T}\mu_{0_1}^n(1 + o(1)).
\]

Hence in \( \mathbb{T} \), not only does the limit defining \( \mu_\mathbb{T} \), the exponential growth constant for polygons in \( \mathbb{T} \), exist, i.e.

\[
\mu_\mathbb{T} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \left( p_{\mathbb{T},n} \right)^{1/n},
\]

but we can actually prove that the asymptotic form of Eq. [23] holds where, in this case, the entropic critical exponent \( \alpha_\mathbb{T} = 0 \). Furthermore, given sufficient computational resources, \( A_\mathbb{T} \) and \( \mu_\mathbb{T} \) can be determined to arbitrary accuracy using the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of the associated transfer-matrix. For the case of \( \mathbb{T}^* \), i.e. \( (M_1,M_2) = (2,1) \), the values are respectively \( 2.330946 \times 10^{-4} \) and \( \log(\mu_\mathbb{T}) = \frac{1}{0.498950} \).

Next let \( p_{\mathbb{T},n}(K) \) be the number of polygons in \( \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{T},n} \) with knot-type \( K \). It is known that \( p_{\mathbb{T},n}(0_1) = \left( \mu_{\mathbb{T},0_1} \right)^n e^{o(n)} \), where \( \mu_{\mathbb{T},0_1} \) is the unknot exponential growth constant given by

\[
\log \mu_{\mathbb{T},0_1} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p_{\mathbb{T},n}(0_1).
\]

Further, in the \( 1 \times 1 \) tube \( \mu_{\mathbb{T},0_1} = \mu_\mathbb{T} \) and otherwise \( 0 < \mu_{\mathbb{T},0_1} < \mu_\mathbb{T} \) is known from a pattern theorem argument [54]. Recently Monte Carlo methods have been used [7] [23] to provide strong evidence that Conjecture [1] holds for \( 2 \times 1, 3 \times 1, 4 \times 1, 5 \times 1, 2 \times 2 \) and \( 3 \times 2 \) tubes.

More generally, for any non-split link \( L \) embeddable in \( \mathbb{T} \), define \( p_{\mathbb{T},n}(L) \) to be the number of \( n \)-edge embeddings of \( L \) in \( \mathbb{T} \) having at least one vertex in the \( x = 0 \) plane. Arguments analogous to those of [8] can be used to establish that for \( L \) with all components being unknots, \( p_{\mathbb{T},n}(L) = \left( \mu_{\mathbb{T},0_1} \right)^n e^{o(n)} \). Based on the numerical evidence available for knots in tubes, we make the following conjecture for any tube size and any non-split link.
Conjecture 2 ([7]). For a given $T = T_{M_1, M_2}$ and any given non-split link $L$ embeddable in $T$, there exist constants (independent of $n$ but potentially dependent on $M_1, M_2$ and $L$) $A_{T, L}, \alpha_{T, L}$ and $\mu_{T, 01}$, such that $p_{T, n}(L)$ satisfies the following asymptotic equation:

$$p_{T, n}(L) = A_{T, L} n^{\alpha_{T, L} (\mu_{T, 01})^n (1 + o(1))}, \quad n \to \infty,$$

where it is expected that $\alpha_{T, 01} = 0$ and that: the amplitude $A_{T, L} > 0$; (a) the exponential growth constant $\mu_{T, 01} > 0$; and (b) the entropic critical exponent $\alpha_{T, L} = \alpha_{T, 01} + f_L$.

To discuss embeddings in tubes further, some additional definitions are needed. These definitions are as in [5] but generalized to embeddings of non-split links. For simplicity, unless stated otherwise, the term embedding will henceforth refer to any embedding of a non-split link in $T$. Given an embedding $\pi$ in $T$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, a hinge $H_k$ of $\pi$ is the set of edges and vertices lying in the intersection of $\pi$ and the $y$-$z$ plane defined by $\{(x, y, z) : x = k\}$. A section $S_k$ is the set of edges in $\pi$, in the $x$ direction, connecting $H_{k-1}$ and $H_k$. A half-section of $S_k$ is the set of half-edges in $S_k$ with either $k - 1 \leq x \leq k - \frac{1}{2}$ or $k - \frac{1}{2} \leq x \leq k$. Any section of an embedding which contains exactly $r$ edges is called an $r$-section of the embedding.

A 1-block of $T$ is any non-empty hinge which can occur in an embedding $\pi$ in $T$ together with the half-edges of $\pi$ in the two adjacent half-sections. The length of a 1-block is the sum of the lengths of all its embedding edges and half-edges. It is thus natural to view a 1-block as the part of an embedding between two half-integer $y$-$z$ planes $x = k \pm \frac{1}{2}$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.

An $s$-block is then defined to be any connected sequence of $s$ 1-blocks, the entirety of which can occur in an embedding in $T$. (It is also possible, if the first and last half-sections of the $s$-block are empty, for the $s$-block itself to be an embedding.) The length of an $s$-block is the sum of the lengths of its constituent 1-blocks. See Fig. 3A and G for examples of a 3-block and 7-block respectively.

If $\sigma$ is an $s$-block whose first and last half-sections each contain exactly two half-edges, we call $\sigma$ a connected sum pattern. Given any connected sum pattern $\sigma$, we can derive an embedding $\pi_\sigma$ in $T$ from $\sigma$ by first extending each half-edge into a full edge and then joining the two endpoints in the left-most hinge, and then the two endpoints in right-most hinge, using a shortest path in the tube. If the link-type of $\pi_\sigma$ is $L \neq 0_1$ (the unknot), then we say that $\sigma$ is a link-pattern (we may also sometimes say knot-pattern) and otherwise it is an unknot-pattern. For example, Fig. 3G shows a connected sum pattern $\sigma$ which is a knot-pattern because $\pi_\sigma$ has knot-type $K = 3_1$ (the trefoil). Similarly, if $\sigma$ is an $s$-block whose first (last) half-section is empty and its last (first) half-section contains exactly two half-edges, with all other sections containing more than two edges, we call $\sigma$ a start connected sum pattern (end connected sum pattern). Following the procedure for connected sum patterns, start and end patterns can also be classified as either link or unknot patterns. By dividing at each 2-section, an embedding $\pi$ in $T$ with $k \geq 1$ 2-sections can be decomposed into a start connected sum pattern, a sequence of $k - 1$ connected sum patterns and then an end-connected sum pattern (see for example Fig. 3F, which shows an unknot polygon which has $k = 8$ 2-sections (indicated by the shaded planes)); hence, using the embeddings derived from each pattern, $\pi$ can be viewed as a topological connected sum of embeddings. In particular, if $\pi$ is a polygon, then the knot-type of $\pi$ is completely determined by the knot-types of the polygons in this connected sum. More generally, if $\pi$ is an embedding of a non-split link $L$, then at most $f_L$ of the embeddings derived from the connected sum patterns are not unknot polygons. For any $T$ it has been established that all prime links embeddable in the tube have a corresponding link-pattern in the tube. This is the statement of Proposition 3.

In the next section we focus on the main knot theory results of the paper; these results do not rely on knowing the lattice terminology introduced in this section. The connection between the knot theory and lattice embeddings is made in Section C.
Insertions of 4-braid words into 4-plat diagrams

In this section, we consider knots and links which are obtained by inserting a 4-braid word $w_0$ into a 4-plat diagram, and will prove Theorem 4. Suppose two 4-plat diagrams $D$ and $D'$ are represented by non-empty 4-braid words $w_1, w_2$ as follows:

$$D = \left[ i_{w_1} w_2 \right]_j, \quad D' = \left[ i_{w_1} w_0 w_2 \right]_j.$$  

Then we say that $D'$ is obtained from $D$ by inserting $w_0$, and denote it by $D \xrightarrow{w_0} D'$. Note that we always assume $w_1$ and $w_2$ are non-empty words in the insertion above, so do not consider insertions at ends of 4-plat diagrams.

First, we observe that the $A$ and $B$ moves of Fig. 4 (main text) preserve the link type of 4-plat diagrams.

**Lemma 5.** Suppose two 4-plat diagrams $D_1$ and $D_2$ are related by one of the moves $A_1$, $A_2$, $A_3$, $A_4$, $B_1$, $B_2$ and $B_3$. Then $D_1$ and $D_2$ represent the same link type.

**Proof.** First, we consider two 4-plat diagrams $D_1 = \left[ i_{w_1} \sigma^e_1 w_2 \right]_j$ and $D_2 = \left[ i_{w_1} \sigma^f_1 w_2 \right]_j$ related by an $A_1$ move, where $e = \pm 1$. By closing a 4-braid word $w$ at one end of the braid we have a rational tangle, say $w|_j$. Since the rational tangle $w|_j$ in $D_1$ (and also in $D_2$) has symmetry, $D_1$ and $D_2$ are transformed to each other by turning over the rational tangle ("flype") , thus they represent the same link type as illustrated in Fig. [5a]. Next, we consider $D_1 = \left[ i_{w} \right]_j$ and $D_2 = \left[ i_{\bar{w}} \right]_i$ or $\left[ i_{\hat{w}} \right]_j$ for an $A_2$ or $A_3$ move. We observe $D_2$ is obtained by rotating all of $D_1$ around a vertical axis or by rotating a part of $D_1$ around a horizontal axis, thus $D_1$ and $D_2$ represent the same link type. Two 4-plat diagrams related by an $A_4$ move are the same in terms of link diagrams, thus the $A_4$ move does not change the link type. $B_1$ and $B_2$ moves are the Reidemeister moves of type I and II, respectively, thus do not change the link type. Finally, we observe that a $B_3$ move can be considered as a $\pi$-rotation of a 3-string part of a 4-plat diagram, thus it does not change the link type. \[\square\]

Now for a given 4-braid word $w_0$, we consider links which are obtained from a 4-plat diagram by inserting $w_0$. We can obtain a 3-braid word $w_0'$ from $w_0$ by replacing any $\sigma^\pm_3$ by $\sigma^\pm_1$. An insertion of $w_0'$ into a given 4-plat diagram will yield the same link type as the insertion of $w_0$ into the diagram; this is because the two link diagrams are related by $A_1$ moves, see Fig. [5b]. Thus we may assume that $w_0$ is a 3-braid word. Suppose some link $K$ is obtained from a 4-plat diagram $D_1$ by inserting $w_0$, and $D_1, D_2$ are related by an $A_2$ or $A_3$ move. Then $K$ is also obtained from $D_2$ by inserting $\bar{w}_0$ or $\hat{w}_0$. Therefore, we consider the insertions of $w_0, \bar{w}_0, \hat{w}_0$ and $\hat{w}_0$ all together. Let $S(w_0)$ be the set $\{ w_0, \bar{w}_0, \hat{w}_0, \hat{w}_0 \}$ for a 3-braid word $w_0$. Note that $S(w_0) = S(\bar{w}_0) = S(\hat{w}_0) = S(\hat{w}_0)$ since $\bar{w}_0 = \hat{w}_0 = \hat{w}_0 = \hat{w}_0$. For a 4-plat diagram $D$ and a 3-braid word $w_0$, let $K_{w_0}(D)$ be the set of all link types of 4-plat diagrams that are obtained from $D$ by inserting $w_0, \bar{w}_0, \hat{w}_0$, or $\hat{w}_0$, that is:

$$K_{w_0}(D) := \{ \text{the link type of } D' \mid w_0' \in S(w_0), \ D \xrightarrow{w_0'} D' \}.$$  

This is obviously a set of 4-plats since the resulting diagram $D'$ is also a 4-plat diagram. Theorem 4 is restated by using the set $K_{w_0}(D)$ as follows.

**Theorem 6.** Suppose $D$ and $D_0$ are 4-plat diagrams that represent the same link type, and $D_0$ is a minimal-crossing diagram. Then the following inclusion relation holds for any 3-braid word $w_0$.

$$K_{w_0}(D) \supseteq K_{w_0}(D_0).$$  
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To prove Theorem 6, we deform $D$ to $D_0$ step by step without changing the link type and show that an inclusion relation such as $K_{w_0}(D) \supseteq K_{w_0}(D_0)$ holds for each step. First, we observe that $A$ moves do not change the set $K_{w_0}(D)$.

Lemma 6. Suppose that two 4-plat diagrams $D_1$ and $D_2$ are related by one of the moves $A_1$, $A_2$, $A_3$ or $A_4$. Then the following equation holds for any 3-braid word $w_0$.

$$K_{w_0}(D_1) = K_{w_0}(D_2).$$  \hspace{1cm} (32)

Proof. Except for an $A_4$ move, we already observed the equation $K_{w_0}(D_1) = K_{w_0}(D_2)$ above. Suppose $D_1$ and $D_2$ are related by an $A_4$ move so that $D_1 = [i\sigma^1]_1$ and $D_2 = [i\sigma^0]_1$ and $D_1'$ is obtained from $D_1$ by inserting $w_0$. Since we do not consider the insertion at ends of $D_1$, $D_1$ and $D_1'$ are seen as $D_1 = [i\sigma^1]_1$ and $D_1' = [i\sigma^0]_1$ for some 4-braid words $w_1$ and $w_2$ (a non-empty word but $w_2$ is possibly an empty word). Then $D_1' = [i\sigma^0]_1$ (obtained from $D_2$) represents the same link type as $D_1'$ since they are related by an $A_4$ move. This implies the inclusion relation $K_{w_0}(D_1) \subseteq K_{w_0}(D_2)$. The reverse inclusion relation is shown similarly, so the equation $K_{w_0}(D_1) = K_{w_0}(D_2)$ holds. \hfill \Box

By replacing all $\sigma^\pm_3$’s with $\sigma^\pm_1$’s on a 4-plat diagram by $A_1$ moves, we obtain a 4-plat diagram which is a closure of 3-braid word. In particular, 4-plat diagrams that are closures of reduced 3-braid words,

$$[1]_{[\sigma^a_1 \sigma^b_2 \sigma^c_3 \cdots \sigma^n_j]} \text{ and } [2]_{[\sigma^a_1 \sigma^b_2 \sigma^c_3 \cdots \sigma^n_j]},$$  \hspace{1cm} (33)

are called Conway’s normal form if $a_i \neq 0$ for all $i$ and $j = 1 (j' = 2) \text{ or } j = 2 (j' = 1)$ according to whether $n$ is odd or even. In fact the above two represent the same link type since they are related by an $A_3$ move, and are denoted by $C(a_1, a_2, a_3, \ldots, (-1)^n a_n)$. The following is a special case of Theorem 6 where $D$ is also a minimal-crossing 4-plat diagram.

Proposition 5. Suppose $D$ and $D_0$ are minimal-crossing 4-plat diagrams of the same link type. Then the following equation holds for any 3-braid word $w_0$.

$$K_{w_0}(D) = K_{w_0}(D_0).$$  \hspace{1cm} (34)

Proof. Since $D$ and $D_0$ are minimal-crossing diagrams, they can be transformed into Conway’s normal forms $D'$ and $D'_0$, respectively, by replacing all $\sigma^\pm_3$’s with $\sigma^\pm_1$’s by $A_1$ moves. It is known that two minimal-crossing Conway’s normal forms represent the same link if and only if they are related by the combination of $A_2$, $A_3$ and $A_4$ moves, see [41]. Then $D$ can be transformed to $D_0$ by a finite sequence of $A_1$, $A_2$, $A_3$ and $A_4$ moves, via $D'$ and $D'_0$ on the way. Moreover, the equation $K_{w_0}(D) = K_{w_0}(D_0)$ holds by Lemma 6. \hfill \Box

Next, we observe an inclusion relation $K_{w_0}(D_1) \supseteq K_{w_0}(D_2)$ on $B$ moves from $D_1$ to $D_2$.

Lemma 7. Suppose a 4-plat diagram $D_1$ is deformed into $D_2$ by one of $B_1$, $B_2$ and $B_3$. Then the following inclusion relation holds for any 3-braid word $w_0$.

$$K_{w_0}(D_1) \supseteq K_{w_0}(D_2).$$  \hspace{1cm} (35)

Proof. First, we consider a case where $D_1 = [i\sigma^k_0]_j$ and $D_2 = [i\sigma^\epsilon w]_j$ for a $B_1$ move, where $\epsilon = \pm 1$ and $(k, i) = (1, 2), (2, 1)$ or $(3, 2)$. For any link type $K \in K_{w_0}(D_2)$, there exists a 4-plat diagram $[i\sigma^\epsilon w]_j$ representing $K$ such that $[i\sigma^\epsilon w]_j \Rightarrow [i\sigma^\epsilon w']_j$, for some $w_0' \in S(w_0)$. Then a 4-plat diagram $[i\sigma^\epsilon w']_j$, that is
In this section we will prove that any embedding in $C$ unknotted lattice links via the unknotting of 4-plat diagrams.

First, we change a block insertion that unknots $B$ (midplanes of sections). The previous section can be realized by the insertion of blocks at midplanes of sections of tube embeddings.

Finally, we consider a case where $D_1 = [i_1 w_1 \sigma_k w_2]_j$ and $D_2 = [i_1 w_2]_j$ for a $B_2$ move, where $\epsilon = \pm 1$, $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$ and $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. For any link type $K \in K_{4w_0}(B_2)$, there exists a 4-plat diagram $[i_2 w_1 w_2]_j$ (either $w_1 = w_3$ or $w_2 = w_3$) representing $K$ such that $[i_1 w_1 w_2]_j \dashrightarrow w_0 \rightarrow [i_1 w_2]_j$ for some $w_0 \in S(w_0)$. Then a 4-plat diagram $[i_2 w_1 \sigma_k^{-\epsilon} w_2]_j$, that is deformed into $[i_2 w_1 w_2]_j$ by a $B_2$ move, also represents $K$ and $[i_1 w_1 \sigma_k^{-\epsilon} w_2]_j \dashrightarrow w_0 \rightarrow [i_1 w_1 \sigma_k^{-\epsilon} w_2]_j$. This implies $K_{4w_0}(D_1) \supseteq K_{4w_0}(D_2)$ for the $B_2$ move from $D_1$ to $D_2$.

Finally, we prove Theorem 6 (Theorem 6). It is known that any 4-plat diagram has an alternating (4-plat) diagram, and a reduced alternating diagram of a 4-plat (prime alternating link) is a minimal-crossing diagram, while a non-alternating diagram cannot be minimal-crossing $[32, 40, 64]$.

**Proof of Theorem 6.** First, we change the 4-plat diagram $D$ to $D_1$ so that $D_1$ is a closure of a 3-braid word by replacing all $\sigma_2^{\pm 1}$'s with $\sigma_2^{\pm 1}$ using $A_1$ moves. By Lemma 6, we have $K_{4w_0}(D) = K_{4w_0}(D_1)$. Next, we obtain a 4-plat diagram $D_2$ by applying $B_1, B_2$ and $B_3$ moves to reduce the crossing number of $D_1$ as much as possible. By Lemma 7, we have $K_{4w_0}(D_1) \supseteq K_{4w_0}(D_2)$. $D_2$ is also a closure of a 3-braid word and we cannot apply $B_1, B_2$ and $B_3$ moves. This implies that $D_2$ is a reduced alternating Conway’s normal form, that is a minimal-crossing 4-plat diagram. Then, by Proposition 5, we have $K_{4w_0}(D_2) = K_{4w_0}(D_0)$. (See Fig. 5c for an example.) Therefore,

$$K_{4w_0}(D) = K_{4w_0}(D_1) \supseteq K_{4w_0}(D_2) = K_{4w_0}(D_0).$$

(36)

**C Unknotting lattice links via the unknotting of 4-plat diagrams**

In this section we will prove that any embedding in $T^*$ of a knot or a non-split link $L$ can be converted to a polygon of the unknot by the insertion of at most $f_L$ blocks (one for each prime factor of $L$) which correspond to 4-braid insertions. For the proof, we will establish the following: (i) 4-braids as defined in the previous section can be realized by the insertion of blocks at midplanes of sections of tube embeddings of $L$; (ii) the theory from the previous section can be used to identify the required block insertion locations (midplanes of sections).

The result is Theorem 2

We focus next on (ii). Given an embedding $P$ of link-type $L = L_1 \# L_2 \# \cdots \# L_{f_L}$, first we will find a set of associated embeddings $P_i$ for each factor $L_i$. The $P_i$'s have the properties that: a) their shifted diagrams (as described in [29, Definition 3] and illustrated in Fig. 1B) are 4-plat diagrams; and b) any block insertion that unknocks $P_i$ can be realized by a block insertion at a corresponding section of $P$ so
Figure 5: (a) An $A_1$ move preserves the link type. We illustrate this here with an example where $\equiv$ is used to represent topological equivalence. The portions of each link diagram surrounded by a dotted frame are 2-string rational tangles. Any 2-string rational tangle can be smoothly deformed to obtain one with a symmetric diagram as in the top right image. The top right link diagram can thus be transformed to the diagram on the bottom right by a 180 degree rotation around the vertical axis going through the middle of the tangle (not shown). This move is indicated by an arrow. (b) Two 4-plat diagrams (left), that are obtained from a 4-plat diagram by insertions of a 4-braid word $\sigma_3^{-1}\sigma_2\sigma_1^{-1}\sigma_3\sigma_2^{-1}$ and a 3-braid word $\sigma_1^{-1}\sigma_2\sigma_1^{-2}\sigma_2$, are related by two $A_1$ moves. Thus they represent the same link type (unknot in this case). (c) A diagram $D_1$ is obtained from $D$ by $A_1$ moves, $D_2$ is obtained from $D_1$ by applying $B_1$, $B_2$ and $B_3$ moves as much as possible. Then $D_2$ and $D_0$ are related by $A_1$, $A_2$, $A_3$ and $A_4$ moves.
that \( L_i \) is removed from the factor decomposition of \( P \). Thus the resulting embedding \( P' \) has link-type 
\[ L = L_1 \# \cdots \# L_{i-1} \# L_{i+1} \# \cdots \# L_fL. \]

For this we need the following definitions. We use the standard definition of Type 0, 2 and \(-2\) moves from the BFACF algorithm as illustrated in Fig. [6a]. It has been established that these moves preserve knot and link-type [50]. Then, a 4-section is called a *hidden 2-section* if it can be turned into a 2-section after applying one type \(-2\)-move. See Fig. [6b]. Note that if an embedding \( P \) has a hidden 2-section, we can divide \( P \) into two smaller embeddings in a similar way as in the case of a 2-section. See Fig. [6c]. Note further that a \(-2\)-move involves three edges which form a U-shape; we say the *direction* of the \(-2\)-move is the lattice direction that the edge at the bottom of the U moves when a \(-2\)-move is performed. Here the *bottom* of the U is the edge which is perpendicular to the other two edges forming the U.

We classify U-shapes and their corresponding \(-2\)-move into three types: Type I) U-shapes in the \( \pm x \) direction; Type II) U-shapes that lie entirely in a hinge; Type III) U-shapes in the \( \pm y \) or \( \pm z \) direction with the bottom edge in a section. Note that the only \(-2\)-move that removes edges from a section are Type I, hence hidden 2-sections only involve a Type I \(-2\)-move.

Related to establishing property a) for the \( P_i \)'s, the following result is proved first:

**Lemma 8.** A sufficient condition for an embedding of a link in \( \mathbb{T}^* \) to have a shifted diagram which is a 4-plat diagram is that the embedding only has 4-sections and, except possibly for the first and last section, no sections are hidden 2-sections. For embeddings with span greater than 1, a hidden 2-section in the first section can only involve a \( x \) direction U-shape and one in the last section can only involve a \(-x\) direction U-shape.

**Proof.** In \( \mathbb{T}^* \), a link embedding with span 0 or 1 and having only 4-sections, is either the unknot or the 2-component unlink and thus its shifted diagram is a 4-plat diagram. Otherwise, suppose \( P \) is an embedding of a link in \( \mathbb{T}^* \) with span \( m \geq 2 \), having only 4-sections, having no \(-x\) U-shape at \( x = 1/2 \) and no \(+x\) U-shape at \( x = m - 1/2 \), and for \( m > 2 \), having no hidden 2-sections at the half-integer planes \( x = j + 1/2 \), \( j = 1, \ldots, m - 2 \). \( P \) has 4 “strings” (one for each edge in its first section) leaving from the plane \( x = 0 \) and 4 strings ending in the plane \( x = m \). If no string achieves a local \( x \)-maximum (i.e. locally highest \( x \)-value) or \( x \)-minimum at any integer plane \( x = j \), \( j = 1, \ldots, m - 1 \), then there are exactly 4 strings that extend from \( x = 0 \) to \( x = m \) and they can be represented by a 4-braid. Thus the associated shifted diagram must be a 4-plat diagram. Hence we only need to establish that \( P \) contains no local \( x \)-maxima or minima. Note that \( P \) has a local \( x \)-maximum (minimum) at \( x = j \) only if there is a subwalk of \( P \) in the plane \( x = j \) whose endpoints are both joined to edges in the previous (next) section, i.e. to edges in the section at \( x = j - 1/2 \) (\( x = j + 1/2 \)). Suppose to the contrary that \( P \) contains a local \( x \)-maximum (minimum) at the plane \( x = j \), \( j \in \{1, \ldots, m - 1\} \). By the definition of a local \( x \)-maximum (minimum), the \( x \)-maximum (minimum) occupies at least 2 vertices and one edge of the 6-vertex hinge at \( x = j \), there are two edges entering (leaving) these vertices from the left (right) and there are no edges leaving these vertices to the right (left). Thus, for there to be a 4-section at \( x = j + 1/2 \) (\( x = j - 1/2 \)), there must be four edges leaving the hinge at \( x = j \) to the right (left) and hence there must be 4 vertices in that hinge that are not involved in the \( x \)-maximum (minimum). Thus the \( x \)-maximum (minimum) must occupy exactly one edge of the hinge and it must be part of a \(-x \) \((+x)\) Type I U-shape. A Type I \(-2\)-move can thus be performed and hence \( P \) has a hidden 2-section. This is a contradiction. \( \square \)

### C.1 Finding the associated \( P_i \)'s and the insertion locations in \( P \)

In order to determine the \( P_i \)'s, the first step is to ensure that there are no 6-sections. Given an embedding \( P \) of link-type \( L = L_1 \# L_2 \# \cdots \# L_fL \) in \( \mathbb{T}^* \), we can associate the shifted diagram \( D \) as described in [29] Definition 3].
Figure 6: (a) Illustrations of Type 0, 2 and $-2$ moves from the BFACF algorithm. A vertex in the figure marked by an open circle indicates a lattice point not occupied by the lattice polygon. (This figure borrowed from [29].) (b) An example of a hidden 2-section. A 2-section appears after applying one $-2$-move. (c) If a polygon has a hidden 2-section, we can decompose it into two closed polygons. (d) In case a polygon $P$ has sections of 6-strings, we change it into a polygon $P'$ with the same knot type by squashing those parts. (e) 15 types of 4-sections and span-3 braid blocks representing the elementary braids.
For an embedding $P$ with 6-sections, let $P'$ denote an embedding without 6-sections obtained from $P$ by “collapsing” all boxes containing 6-sections onto a left most plane as illustrated in Fig. 6d. As the strings in the 6-sections are all parallel, this operation does not change the knot or link-type.

**Proposition 6.** If $P'$ is unknotted by inserting a finite number of blocks, then $P$ is also unknotted by the same number of insertions. The locations of insertions in $P'$ determine the locations for $P$.

**Proof.** Note that $P'$ and $P$ are isotopic in $\mathbb{R}^3$. For insertions of blocks in $P'$, we consider corresponding insertions of the same set of blocks in $P$. For example, suppose $P'$ is obtained by collapsing one box containing 6-sections with span $w$. Let $k$ be the $x$-coordinate of the leftmost plane of the box and $\frac{j}{2}$ the $x$-coordinate of the insertion of an $s$-block. Then we consider an insertion of the same $s$-block at $x = \frac{j}{2}$ in $P$ if $\frac{j}{2} < k$ and $x = \frac{j}{2} + w$ if $\frac{j}{2} > k$. Then the obtained embeddings are also isotopic in $\mathbb{R}^3$.

Without loss of generality we assume now that $P$ has no 6-sections. For this, first consider the case $f_L = 1$. If $L$ is a non-trivial 4-plat with no hidden 2-sections except in its first or last section, then its shifted diagram is a 4-plat diagram. Thus for a more general $P$ we need to first find a sub-embedding $P'$ without 2-sections or hidden 2-sections. We do this next in two lemmas. For simplicity we refer to sections other than the first and last of an embedding as *interior* sections.

**Lemma 9.** Let $P$ be a non-split 4-plat embedding. If every section of $P$ is either a 2-section or hidden 2-section then $P$ is an unknot.

**Proof.** Since every section is either a 2-section or can be reduced to a 2-section by a $-2$-move, then applying all $-2$-moves makes every section that remains a 2-section and hence $P$ is isotopic to the unknot.

Thus if an embedding is non-split and non-trivial without 6-sections it must contain at least one section which is neither a 2-section nor a hidden 2-section.

**Lemma 10.** Let $P$ be an embedding of a non-trivial non-split link $L = L_1\#L_2\#\cdots\#L_{f_L}$ in $\mathbb{T}^2$ without 6-sections. A set of embeddings $P_1, P_2, \ldots, P_{f_L}$ can be determined with no interior 2-sections or hidden 2-sections such that: $P_i$ has link-type $L_i$ and $P_i$ minus its first and last hinge is a sub-block of $P$.

**Proof.** We consider first the case $f_L = 1$. Since $P$ is non-trivial and non-split, it must contain a section which is neither a 2-section nor a hidden 2-section. A sub-block of $P$ will be called *suitable* if it contains no 2-sections or hidden 2-sections. $P$ must have at least one suitable sub-block. Let $B_1, \ldots, B_m$ be the maximal (in span) suitable sub-blocks of $P$ ordered from left-to-right according to their occurrence in $P$. We argue next by induction on $m$, that we can obtain an embedding $P'$ of $L$ from exactly one of these sub-blocks and it is only different from the original block of $P$ in its left-most and right-most hinges.

Suppose $m = 1$ and let $s$ be the span of $P$. Let $l$ and $r$ be the section numbers of the first and last sections of $B_1$. If $l = 1$ and $r = s$ then $P_1 = P = B_1$. If $l > 1$ ($r < s$), then the $(l-1)s$th $(r+1)s$th section must be a 2-section or hidden 2-section and hence either it is a 2-section already or there is a type 1-2 move that turns the $(l-1)s$th $(r+1)s$th section into a 2-section. In either case there are two edges $l_1$ and $l_2$ ($r_1$ and $r_2$) in the $(l-1)s$th $(r+1)s$th section that form either the existing 2-section or the resulting 2-section. The endpoints of $l_1$ and $l_2$ ($r_1$ and $r_2$) can then be joined in the leftmost (rightmost) hinge of $B_1$ to form $P_1$. If one of $l = 1$ or $r = s$ (span of $P$) then $P_1$ is obtained as above using only one section. $P_1$ necessarily has link-type $L$ (since the non-suitable blocks on either side of it are closed off into unknots) and its sections are identical to $B_1$ except on the left-most and right-most hinges. Note that the first and last section of $B_1$ could become hidden 2-sections in $P_1$ but all other sections are unchanged.
Let $m > 1$ and assume any embedding of a non-trivial 4-plat without 6-sections that has fewer than $m$ maximal suitable sub-blocks has a block that yields the appropriate $P_1$. Now consider $P$ a non-trivial 4-plat without 6 sections with maximal suitable sub-blocks $B_1, \ldots, B_m$. Because the 2-sections or hidden 2-sections between the $B_i$’s are equivalent to connected sum operations and since $L$ is prime, only one of the $B_i$’s will yield the required $P_1$. Close off $B_1$ into an embedding $P'$ as in the $m = 1$ case. Either $P'$ has link-type $L$ or the closed off sequence of blocks (both suitable and unsuitable) to the right of $B_1$ has link-type $L$. In the former case $P_1 = P'$ and otherwise the inductive assumption yields the required $P_1$ from one of the remaining blocks. Thus by induction on $m$ the result holds for $f_L = 1$.

For $f_L > 1$, suppose $P$ is an embedding of a non-split link $L = L_1L_2\# \cdots \# L_{f_L}$ in $T^*$ without 6-sections. Since $P$ is non-trivial, then it must have maximal suitable sub-blocks $B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_m$. Since the sub-blocks are either located at the start or end of $P$, or are preceded and followed by 2-sections or hidden 2-sections, by Lemma 8, they can each be closed off (as in the $f_L = 1$ case) into embeddings of non-split 4-plats (because they have a 4-plat diagram). Thus $m \geq f_L$ and for each prime $L_i$ there must be a corresponding $B_j$ which when closed off gives $P_i$ with link-type $L_i$. The resulting $P_i$’s have the required properties. \hfill \square

By the same argument as in \cite{29}, we can construct a braid block for each 3-braid word in Proposition 3.

Proof. There are $15 \left(= \binom{6}{4}\right)$ types of 4-sections in Fig. 6e (left). The elementary braids $\sigma_1, \sigma_1^{-1}, \sigma_2$ and $\sigma_2^{-1}$ are constructed as span-$3$ braid blocks in $T^*$ so that they have the same 4-section at ends of the block as shown in Fig. 6e (right). By arranging such braid blocks in the order of the letters that appear in $w_0$, a span-$3c$ braid block can be obtained. Moreover, each type of 4-section can be connected to the 4-section in the ends of the block by a braid block with span at most $4$ that represents the trivial 4-braid as shown in Fig. 6e (left), thus the span-$3c$ braid block can be modified into one with span at most $3c + 8$ so that can be inserted into the 4-section. \hfill \square

Proof of Theorem 2. By Proposition 6 we assume, without loss of generality, that an embedding $P$ of non-split link $L$ is without 6-sections. From Lemma 9 for each prime factor $L_i$ of $L$ we can find a sub-block $B_i$ of $P$ which is associated with an embedding $P_i$ of $L_i$ with no interior 2-sections or hidden 2-sections. Here $B_i$ only differs from $P_i$ in its first and last hinge. Due to this, by Lemma 8, the shifted diagram of $P_i$ is a 4-plat diagram. By Theorem 3 we can change this diagram into a diagram of the unknot by inserting a suitable 4-braid in one place. By Proposition 3, we can construct an $s$-block corresponding to any sequence of $\sigma_i$’s and hence any 4-braid. The corresponding change in $P_i$ can be realized by an insertion of such an $s$-block. The insertion is not in the first or last hinge and hence can be realized as an insertion in $B_i$. \hfill \square

## D A pattern theorem for unknots in $T^*$

Our primary goal here is to prove Theorem 5.

That is, we wish to show that sufficiently long unknot polygons in $T^*$ have a positive density of 2-sections with high probability. (Recall from Section A that a polygon has an $m$-section between $x = k$ and $x = k + 1$ if it occupies exactly $m$ edges between these planes.)

Our approach to proving Theorem 5 will be as follows. In Section D.1 we will define the transfer matrix for polygons in (general) $T$ and explain its connection with the generating function and exponential growth rate. In Section D.2 we show that these concepts also apply to polygons in $T^*$ with no 2-sections. In Section D.3 we calculate two rigorous bounds: an upper bound on the growth rate of polygons in $T^*$ with
Figure 7: (a) The six vertices in a hinge of the $2 \times 1$ tube. (b) A polygon $P$ in $\mathbb{T}^*$ and the 1-block $\beta$ (in blue) occurring between $x = 3 \pm \frac{1}{2}$. Here $\mathcal{E}_\beta = \{a, b, c, f\}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\beta}' = \{a, c, d, e\}$. The pairing $\rho$ on $\mathcal{E}_{\beta}$ induced by $P_{\text{left}}$ is $\{\{a, b\}, \{c, f\}\}$ (indicated by the dashed red lines), and this induces the pairing $\rho' = \{\{a, d\}, \{c, e\}\}$ on $\mathcal{E}_{\beta}'$. The pair $(\beta, \rho)$ forms a 1-pattern.

no 2-sections (using the transfer matrix), and a lower bound on the growth rate of unknots in $\mathbb{T}^*$ (using exact enumeration data). Importantly, these bounds establish that polygons with no 2-sections have a smaller growth rate than unknots. Finally in Section D.4, we show that the 2-sections of any polygon can be removed in a systematic (and reversible) way while controlling the number of edges that must be added. This is then used to prove that polygons with a sufficiently small (but positive) density of 2-sections have the same growth rate as those with none at all, and using the bounds from Section D.3, the theorem follows.

In this section, it will be useful to label the 6 possible $(y, z)$ coordinates within the tube by $\mathcal{V} = \{a, b, c, d, e, f\}$ as in Fig. 7a.

D.1 Transfer matrices for polygons in $\mathbb{T}$

We begin by introducing 1-patterns in $\mathbb{T}$. The definitions presented here are the same as those appearing in [5, 7].

Recall from Section A that a 1-block is any (nonempty) collection of vertices, edges and half-edges that can comprise the part of a polygon in $\mathbb{T}$ between planes $x = k \pm \frac{1}{2}$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. For a 1-block $\beta$, let $\mathcal{E}_{\beta} = \{e_1, \ldots, e_{2m}\}$ be the set of half-edges on the left (it may also be the case that $m = 0$). Similarly let $\mathcal{E}_{\beta}'$ be the set of half-edges on the right. If $m > 0$ and $P$ is a polygon in $\mathbb{T}$ containing an occurrence of $\beta$, then the part of $P$ to the left of $\beta$ ($P_{\text{left}}$) induces a partition of $\mathcal{E}_{\beta}$ into pairs (for any $e_i$, follow the edges of $P$ on the left of $\beta$ from $e_i$ until eventually arriving back at some $e_j$; then $e_i$ and $e_j$ get paired). See Figure 7b. Then for a given 1-block $\beta$ we define $\Pi(\mathcal{E}_{\beta})$ to be the set of all pair-partitions of $\mathcal{E}_{\beta}$ which are induced by some polygon containing $\beta$ in $\mathbb{T}$. If $m = 0$ then $\Pi(\mathcal{E}_{\beta}) = \{\emptyset\}$.

We define a $1$-pattern $\pi$ to be a pair $(\beta, \rho)$ where $\beta$ is a 1-block and $\rho \in \Pi(\mathcal{E}_{\beta})$. Note that a non-empty $\rho$ induces a pairing on $\mathcal{E}_{\beta}'$ – call this pairing $\rho'$. (If $\rho = \emptyset$, then the edges in $\beta$’s hinge induce the pairing $\rho'$.) See Figure 7b. If $\rho$ and $\rho'$ are both nonempty then we say $\pi$ is a proper 1-pattern; if only $\rho$ is empty...
then \( \pi \) is a starting 1-pattern; and if only \( \rho' \) is empty then \( \pi \) is an ending 1-pattern. We denote the sets of starting, proper and ending 1-patterns in \( T \) by \( A_S \), \( A_P \) and \( A_E \) respectively. We also define \( A_0 \) to be the set of all polygons in \( T \) with span \( s = 0 \); namely the 1-patterns for which both \( \rho \) and \( \rho' \) are empty. Note that the connected sum patterns defined in Section A are indeed a subset of the patterns defined here – because connected sum patterns start and end with 2-sections, there is only one possible pairing on the leftmost (and rightmost) half-edges.

Given two 1-patterns \( \pi_1 = (\beta_1, \rho_1) \) and \( \pi_2 = (\beta_2, \rho_2) \), we say \( \pi_2 \) can follow \( \pi_1 \) if \( \rho_1' = \rho_2 \).

With this definition of patterns, we can follow the approaches used in \( [22] \) to obtain transfer matrices. We assign a labelling to the elements of \( A_P \) and denote them as \( \pi_1, \pi_2, \ldots, \pi_N \). Then we obtain the \( N \times N \) transfer matrix \( T(x) \) for proper 1-patterns as follows:

\[
[T(x)]_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 
  x^{n_{\pi j}} & \text{if } \pi_j \text{ can follow } \pi_i \\
  0 & \text{otherwise},
\end{cases}
\] (37)

where \( n_{\pi} \) is the length of the 1-block from which the 1-pattern \( \pi \) was derived. We also need two other matrices. We assign a labelling to the elements of \( A_S \) and denote them as \( \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_{N_S} \). Then we obtain the \( N_S \times N_S \) start matrix \( A(x) \) for starting 1-patterns as follows:

\[
[A(x)]_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 
  x^{n_{\alpha i}+n_{\pi j}} & \text{if } \pi_j \in A_P \text{ can follow } \alpha_i \in A_S \\
  0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}.
\] (38)

We also assign a labelling to the elements of \( A_E \) and denote them as \( \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \ldots, \gamma_{N_E} \). Then we obtain the \( N \times N_E \) end matrix \( B(x) \) for ending 1-patterns as follows:

\[
[B(x)]_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 
  x^{n_{\gamma j}} & \text{if } \gamma_j \in A_E \text{ can follow } \pi_i \in A_P \\
  0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}.
\] (39)

Define \( p_{T,n,s} \) to be the number of polygons counted in \( p_{T,n} \) that have span \( s \). The generating function for polygon counts can be expressed in terms of these matrices as follows:

\[
G(x) = \sum_{n \geq 4} p_{T,n} x^n = \sum_{s=0}^{1} \sum_{n \geq 4} p_{T,n,s} x^n + \sum_{i,j} \left[ \sum_{t \geq 0} A(x)(T(x))^t B(x) \right]_{i,j} \\
= \sum_{s=0}^{1} \sum_{n \geq 4} p_{T,n,s} x^n + \sum_{i,j} \left[ A(x)(I - T(x))^{-1} B(x) \right]_{i,j}.
\] (40)

The radius of convergence of \( G(x) \) is given by \( \mu_T^{-1} = e^{-\kappa_T} \), and since for any \( T_{M_1,M_2} \) it is known that \( T(x) \) is aperiodic and irreducible \([54]\), the radius of convergence can also be determined by the smallest value of \( x > 0 \) which satisfies \( \det(I - T(x)) = 0 \). For the case that \( T = T^* \), \( T(x) \) has been determined (it has dimensions \( 1829 \times 1829 \)) and from that \( \log \mu_T = \kappa_T \approx 0.826948222250681 \), with numerical error expected to be confined to the last digit. Note that \( \mu_T = e^{\kappa_T} \) must be an algebraic number, but we have not attempted to compute its minimal polynomial.

### D.2 Polygons with no 2-sections

We next turn our attention to polygons in \( T \) which have no 2-sections. For these polygons, our goal is to establish a relationship between their exponential growth rate and the radius of convergence of their
generating function. We accomplish this here by defining an appropriate transfer matrix and establishing that it is aperiodic and irreducible. Note that we are assuming the dimensions of $T$ are large enough so that a polygon in $T$ can contain a 4-section.

Define $p_{T,n,s}(0)$ to be the number of polygons counted in $p_{T,n,s}$ that have no 2-sections and $p_{T,n,s}(K,0)$ to be the number of polygons counted in $p_{T,n,s}(0)$ that have knot type $K$. Also define $p_{T,n}(0) = \sum_s p_{T,n,s}(0)$ and $p_{T,n}(K,0) = \sum_s p_{T,n,s}(K,0)$. We can obtain a transfer matrix associated with $p_{T,n}(0)$ by removing all 1-patterns which cannot occur in a polygon without 2-sections from the transfer matrices above. Specifically, we obtain new matrices $\hat{A}(x)$, $\hat{T}(x)$, and $\hat{B}(x)$ respectively from $A(x)$, $T(x)$, $B(x)$ by deleting all rows and columns associated with 1-patterns that cannot occur in a polygon without 2-sections. Analogously to Eq. 40, we have that

$$\hat{G}(x) = \sum_{n\geq4} p_{T,n}(0)x^n = \sum_{n\geq4} \sum_{s\geq0} p_{T,n,s}(0)x^n = \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{n\geq4} p_{T,n,s}(0)x^n + \sum_{i,j} \left[ \hat{A}(x)(I - \hat{T}(x))^{-1}\hat{B}(x) \right]_{i,j}. \tag{42}$$

We denote the set of proper 1-patterns that remain by $\hat{A}_P$ and note that it is not empty since there are proper 1-patterns consisting of exactly 4 edges in the $x$-direction which can occur in a polygon with no 2-sections. $\hat{A}_P$ is necessarily a subset of the set of 1-patterns of $A_P$ that contain no 2-sections; we show in Section 4.4 via Lemma 14 that in fact these two sets of 1-patterns are the same.

The radius of convergence of $\hat{G}(x)$ is given by $\hat{\mu}_T = e^{-\kappa_T}$ where

$$\hat{\mu}_T = \limsup_{n\to\infty} (p_{T,n}(0))^{1/n}, \tag{43}$$

with the limit taken through even values of $n$. If the limit superior can be replaced by a limit then $\hat{\mu}_T$ is the exponential growth constant for polygons in $T$ which have no 2-sections. In fact this is the case for $T^*$, as follows from Lemma 11 below.

The matrix $\hat{T}(x)$ is much smaller than $T(x)$; indeed for $T^*$, $\hat{T}(x)$ has dimensions $553 \times 553$. $\hat{T}(x)$ is aperiodic, since there are many 1-patterns which can occur consecutively in a polygon without 2-sections (e.g. any 1-pattern in $\hat{A}_P$ consisting of exactly 4 edges in the $x$-direction). Further, if the matrix $\hat{T}(x)$ is irreducible, then it will follow that the radius of convergence of $\hat{G}(x)$, $e^{-\kappa_T}$, is the smallest value of $x > 0$ satisfying $\det(I - \hat{T}(x)) = 0$. Thus it remains to establish that $\hat{T}(x)$ is irreducible to achieve the main goals of this section.

$\hat{T}(x)$ is irreducible if, given any two 1-patterns $i$ and $j$ in $\hat{A}_P$, there exists an integer $k \geq 1$ such that $(\hat{T}(x))^k_{ij} > 0$, or equivalently there is a sequence of 1-patterns, starting with $i$ and ending in $j$, which can occur consecutively in a polygon without 2-sections in $T$. If $\hat{T}(x)$ is explicitly known then this can be established by finding a power of $\hat{T}(x)$ for which all the entries are non-zero for $x > 0$. Otherwise a standard approach is to use a "concatenation" argument. Here, even though we have $\hat{T}(x)$ explicitly for $T^*$, we use the latter approach to prove irreducibility, since the same concatenation argument establishes that the $\limsup$ in Eq. 43 is a limit and it is also useful for the arguments in the next sections.

For the concatenation argument, we need to establish that it is possible to join (i.e. concatenate) any two polygons without 2-sections to create a new polygon, also without 2-sections, in such a way that minimal changes are made to the original two polygons. In particular, if the concatenation leaves unchanged any proper 1-patterns that occur in the polygons then irreducibility follows. This is because if $i$ and $j$ are
two 1-patterns in $\hat{A}_P$, then by definition they can both occur in polygons without 2-sections. Let $P_i$ and $P_j$ be such polygons containing $i$ and $j$ respectively. Then $P_i$ and $P_j$ can be concatenated to give a new polygon without 2-sections that contains both $i$ and $j$. This will give the needed sequence of consecutive 1-patterns from $i$ to $j$ to establish that $(\hat{T}(x))_{ij}^k > 0$ for some $k$. Thus it remains to show that there is a way to concatenate two such polygons. Because we are also interested in controlling knot-types, we want the concatenation process to be equivalent to a connected sum. The required concatenation restrictions are given in Lemma 11 below and we prove this lemma using two others, Lemmas 12 and 13. The lemmas are proved only for $T^*$, however, the arguments can be extended in a straightforward manner to larger tubes. See [2, 4] for a similar concatenation argument for a model of 2 component links, called 2-SAPs, in $T$.

Lemma 11. Let $P_1$ and $P_2$ be two polygons with no 2-sections in $T^*$, of lengths $n_1$ and $n_2$ and spans $s_1$ and $s_2$ respectively. Then there exists a polygon $P^*$ of length $n_1 + n_2 + 2C + 2$ (with $C$ being the same as in Lemmas 12 and 13) and span $s_1 + s_2 + 9$ such that

- the first (starting from the left) $s_1$ sections and $s_1$ hinges of $P_1$ and $P^*$ are the same;
- the last $s_2$ sections and $s_2$ hinges of $P_2$ and $P^*$ are the same;
- $P^*$ contains no 2-sections; and
- $K(P^*) = K(P_1) \# K(P_2)$, where $K(P)$ denotes the knot-type of polygon $P$.

To prove Lemma 11 two simple technical lemmas will help. The strategy is to add edges to one end of a polygon so that the polygon either starts (Lemma 13) or ends (Lemma 12) in a specific way in order to make the concatenation easy.

Lemma 12. Let $P$ be an $n$-edge polygon with span $s \geq 0$ and no 2-sections in $T^*$. Then there exists a constant $C$ and a polygon $P'$ of length $n + C$ such that

- the first (starting from the left-most hinge) $s$ sections and $s$ hinges of $P$ and $P'$ are the same;
- $P'$ contains no 2-sections;
- $P$ and $P'$ have the same knot type; and
- the rightmost hinge of $P'$ contains edges $ab$ and $df$, with no other edges occupied.

Proof. The rightmost hinge of $P$ must necessarily have at least two edges which do not share a vertex (even if $P$ has span 0) since the section of the polygon immediately to the left of this hinge is not a 2-section. Choose two such edges and call them $e_1$ and $e_2$. Then there must be a sequence of $C/2 = 10$ BFAF +2 moves (see Figure 6a) which “bump out” $e_1$ and $e_2$ to the right, moving them around if necessary, until $e_1$ has been “stretched” to $ab$ and $e_2$ has been “stretched” to $df$. The resulting polygon $P$ will necessarily have the same knot type as $P$, and will not contain any 2-sections. $P'$ will have length $n + 20$ and span $s + 4$. See Fig. 8 for two of the relevant cases; the top picture shows the best case scenario where $e_1$ and $e_2$ are already $ab$ and $df$ while the bottom picture shows a worst case scenario, that is one requiring the full additional span in order to end at edges $ab$ and $df$ alone in the rightmost hinge.

By symmetry we immediately have the following.
Lemma 13. Let $P$ be a polygon with no 2-sections in $T^*$, of length $n$ and span $s \geq 0$. Then there exists a constant $C$ (the same constant as in Lemma 12) and a polygon $P''$ of length $n + C$ such that

- the rightmost $s$ sections and $s$ hinges of $P$ and $P''$ are the same;
- $P''$ contains no 2-sections;
- $P$ and $P''$ have the same knot type; and
- the leftmost hinge of $P''$ contains edges $ab$ and $ce$, with no other edges occupied.

The proof of Lemma 11 is now straightforward.

Proof of Lemma 11. Let $P'_1$ and $P''_2$ be the polygons obtained by applying Lemma 12 to $P_1$ and Lemma 13 to $P_2$ respectively. Shift $P''_2$ so that its leftmost hinge is one unit to the right of $P'_1$’s rightmost hinge. Remove the edges $ab$ from each of those two hinges, and add the $aa$ and $bb$ edges between the two. Finally, apply a BFACF +2 move in the $+x$ direction to the $df$ edge in (what was) the rightmost hinge of $P'_1$. \[\square\]

We remark at this point that, given $P^*$ and either $n_1$ or $s_1$ (and knowledge of the constant $C$), it is possible to unambiguously recover $P_1$ and $P_2$ from $P^*$.

Since $\hat{T}(x)$ is aperiodic and irreducible, it follows that the radius of convergence of $\hat{G}(x)$ is the smallest value of $x > 0$ satisfying $\det(I - \hat{T}(x)) = 0$. For $\hat{T}^*$, the matrix $\hat{T}(x)$ can be computed exactly, and from this it can be found that $\hat{\kappa}_{\hat{T}^*} = 0.43623880228124$, with the numerical error expected to be confined to the last digit. Note that we do not need to prove the numerical accuracy of this estimate since in the next subsection we obtain a rigorous upper bound on $\hat{\kappa}_{\hat{T}^*}$ (rather than just a numerical estimate) that is sufficient to prove Theorem 5. Full details are given in the next section but first we note two more consequences of Lemma 11.

From Lemma 11 we also have that:

$$p_{T^*,n_1}(0)p_{T^*,n_2}(0) \leq p_{T^*,n_1+n_2+42}(0).$$

Hence we have for $n_1$ and $n_2$ sufficiently large that:

$$\log p_{T^*,n_1-42}(0) + \log p_{T^*,n_2-42}(0) \leq \log p_{T^*,n_1+n_2-42}(0),$$

so that $\log p_{T^*,n-42}(0)$ is a superadditive sequence and it follows (see for example [36 §1.2]) that the lim sup of Eq. (43) is a limit with:

$$\hat{\mu}_{T^*} = \lim_{n \to \infty} (p_{T^*,n}(0))^{1/n} = \sup_{n \geq 0} (p_{T^*,n-42}(0))^{1/n}. \quad (45)$$
Furthermore, because the concatenation corresponds to a connected sum and since the connected sum of two unknots yields an unknot, Lemma 11 also implies the existence of the limit that defines the exponential growth constant, $\hat{\mu}_{T^*}(0_1)$, for unknot polygons in $T$ without 2-sections.

### D.3 Rigorous numerical bounds

It will now be convenient to refer primarily to the logarithms of growth constants. Hence, given any growth constant such as $\mu_T$, $\mu_{T,0_1}$, $\hat{\mu}_T$, $\hat{\mu}_{T,0_1}$, we define a corresponding growth rate, $\kappa_T \equiv \log \mu_T$, $\kappa_{T,0_1} \equiv \log \mu_{T,0_1}$, $\hat{\kappa}_T \equiv \log \hat{\mu}_T$, $\hat{\kappa}_{T,0_1} \equiv \log \hat{\mu}_{T,0_1}$.

The next task is to establish two rigorous bounds: an upper bound on $\hat{\kappa}_{T^*}$, the growth rate of polygons which have no 2-sections; and a lower bound on $\kappa_{T^*}(0_1)$, the growth rate of unknots. The first will be derived by analysis of the transfer matrix $\hat{T}(x)$; the second will follow from analysis of the first few terms of the unknot enumeration series.

Recall that $\hat{\kappa}_T = -\log \hat{x}_0$, where $\hat{x}_0$ is the smallest value of $x > 0$ which satisfies $\det(I - \hat{T}(x)) = 0$. Note that, for real $x > 0$, because $\hat{T}(x)$ is an irreducible, aperiodic matrix with non-negative entries, it has a unique dominant eigenvalue. This eigenvalue is real and positive, and is an increasing function of $x$. Therefore an equivalent definition of $\hat{x}_0$ is the unique positive $x$ such that $\hat{T}(x)$ has dominant eigenvalue 1. So we can find a lower bound for $\hat{x}_0$, and thus an upper bound for $\hat{\kappa}_T$, by finding any value of $x$ which yields a dominant eigenvalue (and thus spectral radius) smaller than 1.

The spectral radius $r_M$ of a matrix $M$ satisfies

$$r_M \leq \|M^k\|^{1/k}$$

for any $k \geq 1$, where $\|\cdot\|$ is any consistent matrix norm. We can, for example, use $\|\cdot\|_\infty$, which is the maximum absolute row sum (see for example [18]).

In this case, when $x = 0.64$, using $k = 10$ establishes that the spectral radius is smaller than 0.99485. So $\hat{x}_0 > 0.64$, and hence

$$\hat{\kappa}_{T^*} < -\log 0.64 = 0.446287.$$  \hspace{1cm} (47)

Next, we require a lower bound on $\kappa_{T^*}(0_1)$. Since any two polygons in $T^*$ can be concatenated with the addition of exactly 6 edges, giving their topological connected sum, we have

$$p_{T^*,0_1}p_{T^*,0_1} \leq p_{T^*,0_1} + 6(0_1) \hspace{1cm} (48)$$

or equivalently

$$\log p_{T^*,m-6}(0_1) + \log p_{T^*,n-6}(0_1) \leq \log p_{T^*,m+n-6}(0_1).$$

So $\log p_{T^*,m-6}(0_1)$ is a superadditive sequence, and it follows that

$$\kappa_{T^*}(0_1) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p_{T^*,n-6}(0_1) = \sup_{n \geq 0} \frac{1}{n} \log p_{T^*,n-6}(0_1).$$

For any $n \geq 0$, $\frac{1}{n} \log p_{T^*,n-6}(0_1)$ is thus a lower bound on $\kappa_{T^*}(0_1)$. We have computed the first few terms in this sequence by exhaustively generating all polygons and checking their knot type. Various simplifications make this task somewhat less onerous than it may seem at first. The data is presented in Table 1. We see that $n = 30$ gives $\kappa_{T^*}(0_1) \geq 0.620044$.

We thus have that

$$\hat{\kappa}_{T^*} < -\log 0.64 = 0.446287 < 0.620044 \leq \kappa_{T^*}(0_1).$$
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Table 1: The first few values in the sequences $p_{T^*,n}(0_1)$ and $\frac{1}{n} \log p_{T^*,n-6}(0_1)$ for $T^*$, the $2 \times 1$ tube.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$p_{T^*,n}(0_1)$</th>
<th>$\frac{1}{n} \log p_{T^*,n-6}(0_1)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$-\infty$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$-\infty$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>$-\infty$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,113</td>
<td>0.219722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5,835</td>
<td>0.311472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>30,561</td>
<td>0.381595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>160,119</td>
<td>0.438426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>838,043</td>
<td>0.481757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4,383,657</td>
<td>0.516374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22,917,673</td>
<td>0.544712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>119,796,593</td>
<td>0.568284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0.588207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0.605265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0.620044</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since unknot polygons without 2-sections are a subset of all polygons without 2-sections, this establishes that unknot polygons with no 2-sections are exponentially rare in the set of all unknot polygons in $T^*$. So all but exponentially few unknot polygons in $T^*$ must contain 2-sections, but this is not sufficient, yet, to prove Theorem $\mathcal{E}$. We must also establish that they contain a non-zero density of 2-sections. We establish more lemmas in the next subsection which allow us to obtain this stronger result.

**D.4 Eliminating 2-sections**

Two more lemmas for this section relate polygons with 2-sections to those without. The first shows that a single 2-section can be removed with the addition of a fixed number of edges. Note that these arguments are for $T^*$ but we expect that they can be modified in a straightforward manner to hold for larger $T$.

**Lemma 14.** Let $P$ be a polygon of span $s$ with $t \geq 1$ 2-sections. Say the leftmost 2-section is between $x = k$ and $x = k + 1$, and that there are $n_1$ edges of $P$ in the half-space $x \leq k$ and $n_2$ edges in the half-space $x \geq k + 1$. Then there exists a constant $D$ and polygons $P_1$ and $P_2$, of lengths $n_1 + D$ and $n_2 + D$ respectively, such that

- the leftmost $k$ sections and $k$ hinges of $P$ and $P_1$ are the same;
- the rightmost $s - k - 1$ sections and $s - k - 1$ hinges of $P$ and $P_2$ are the same;
- $P_1$ has no 2-sections;
- $P_2$ has $t - 1$ 2-sections; and
- $K(P) = K(P_1) \# K(P_2)$.

**Proof.** Let $C$ denote the set of six edges in an arbitrary section of $T^*$. Say the 2-section in question contains edges $u, v \in C$. We break $P$ at $x = k + 1/2$, and first consider only the left piece, call it $P_{left}$. Begin by extending the half-edges of $P_{left}$ to full edges, i.e. make $u$ and $v$ full edges again which end in the hinge $x = k + 1$. Then at least one of the following must be true:
Figure 9: An illustration of the construction used in Lemma 14. Above is a polygon in $\mathbb{T}^*$ with a 2-section between $x = 2$ and $x = 3$ (indicated in red). Below are the two polygons $P_1$ and $P_2$. In this case the endpoints of the edges $u$ and $v$ are in $\{a, f\}$, and both sides are in case (1) — on the left $\eta = cd$ and on the right $\eta = ce$ (we could also have used $\eta = bd$). The number of edges added to each side is $D = 17$ (note that an extra BFACF +2 move was used on $P_2$ to achieve this).

(1) $P$ has an edge $\eta$ in the hinge $x = k$ which is incident on neither $u$ nor $v$; or

(2) there are adjacent vertices $p, q \neq u, v$ in the hinge $x = k$, with $P$ containing neither $p$ nor $q$.

Note that if $k > 0$ then (1) must be true, since between $x = k - 1$ and $x = k$ there is either a 4-section or a 6-section. If $k = 0$ then this can easily be checked by hand (there are not very many cases to consider).

In case (1), perform a single BFACF +2-move in the $+x$ direction to $\eta$ (extending it to the hinge $x = k + 1$). Now in the hinge $x = k + 1$, if there is a simple path joining the endpoints of $u$ and $v$ that does not intersect $\eta$, add such a path to create the polygon $P'_1$. Otherwise $\eta$ must necessarily be the edge $dc$ and only one of $u, v$ has its endpoint in $\{a, b\}$; without loss of generality suppose that $u$ has $a$ as its endpoint. Add 2 edges in the $+x$ direction to each of $u$ and $v$ (extending to the hinge $x = k + 3$). Then use a sequence of 3 BFACF +2-moves to bump $\eta$ to the edge $bd$ in the hinge $x = k + 3$ (avoiding the extended $u$ and $v$). Now there will be a simple path between $u$ and $v$ which avoids $bd$ in the hinge $x = k + 3$, add one to create $P'_1$. Thus the right-most plane of $P'_1$ is $x = k + j + 1$ with the value of $j$ required depending on $u, v$ and $\eta$; it may be 0 or 2 (we will return to this below).

In case (2), join $u$ and $v$ by a simple path in the hinge $x = k + 1$ which contains the edge $pq$. Then apply a BFACF +2 move in the $-x$ direction from that edge to create $P'_1$.

The number of edges added in the above two cases will depend on $j$, as well as the specific values of $u, v$, etc. However, there will always be at least one 4-section (in the section between $x = k$ and $x = k + 1$, for example), whose edges can be duplicated if necessary (increasing the number of edges added by 4), and where a BFACF +2-move can be performed (increasing the number of edges added by 2). It follows that there is a $D$ sufficiently large such that the above operations can be performed on any polygon $P$, so that the piece to the left of the first 2-section is closed off with a total length of $n_1 + D$ to create $P_1$ from $P'_1$.

The mirror image of these arguments allows us to close off the right piece with total length $n_2 + D$ and create the required $P_2$.

We remark at this point that, given $P_1$ and $P_2$ (and knowledge of the constant $D$), it may not be possible to unambiguously recover the original polygon $P$. However, there will be at most two possibilities for $P$.

We get two important consequences from Lemma 14. The first is that it allows us to establish that the set of 1-patterns that can occur in a polygon in $\mathbb{T}$ without 2-sections, $\mathcal{A}_P$, is equal to the set of all
proper 1-patterns from $A_P$ with no 2-sections. That is, we show that any proper 1-pattern in $A_P$ with no 2-sections can occur in some polygon without 2-sections. (We note that we have already used this result in the previous section.) The argument is as follows. Let $\beta$ be a proper 1-pattern with no 2-sections and let $P$ be any polygon containing $\beta$. If $P$ has no 2-sections then we are done, otherwise suppose it has $t > 1$ 2-sections. Lemma 14 shows how to take a polygon with $t$ 2-sections and break it apart into $t + 1$ polygons with no 2-sections. Since $\beta$ has no 2-sections it will not have been altered in this process and hence one of the resulting polygons without 2-sections must contain $\beta$.

The second consequence of Lemma 14 is the final lemma needed before the proof of Theorem 5.

Lemma 15. Let $p_{T^*, n}(0_1, k)$ be the number of unknots of length $n$ which contain $k$ 2-sections. Then

$$p_{T^*, n}(0_1, \leq k) = \sum_{t=0}^{k} p_{T^*, n}(0_1, t) \leq \sum_{t=0}^{k} 2^t \left(\frac{n}{t}\right) p_{T^*, n+Et}(0_1, 0),$$

where $E = 2C + 2D + 2$ and $C$ and $D$ are the constants used in Lemmas 11 and 14.

Proof. The method outlined in Lemma 14 shows how to take a polygon of length $n$ with $t$ 2-sections and break it apart into $t + 1$ polygons with no 2-sections, with total length $n + 2Dt$. The method outlined in Lemma 11 then shows how to join those polygons back together into one large polygon of length $n + (2C + 2D + 2)t$ with no 2-sections. This process is reversible, with knowledge of where the splits and joins occurred ($\left(\frac{2}{t}\right)$ is an upper bound on the number of possibilities) and knowledge of which of a pair of possible choices at each cut formed the original 2-section (at most two choices).

Proof of Theorem 5. Take Eq. (52) with $k = \epsilon n$ and $\epsilon < \frac{1}{t}$. Then the last summand on the RHS is the largest, so

$$p_{T^*, n}(0_1, \leq \epsilon n) \leq (\epsilon n + 1) 2^{\epsilon n} \left(\frac{n}{\epsilon n}\right) p_{T^*, n(1+\epsilon E)}(0_1, 0).$$

Take logs, divide by $n$ and take the lim sup:

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p_{T^*, n}(0_1, \leq \epsilon n) \leq -\epsilon \log \epsilon - \left(\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon\right) \log(1 - 2\epsilon) + (1 + \epsilon E) \kappa_{T^*}.$$

Here we have used the fact that $\lim_{n \to \infty} n^{-1} \log \left(\frac{an}{bn}\right) = a \log a - b \log b - (a - b) \log(a - b)$ provided $0 < b < a$. As $\epsilon \to 0$, the RHS approaches $\kappa_{T^*}$ and for $T^*$ we proved that $\kappa_{T^*} < \kappa_{T^*}(0_1)$, so there must be an $\epsilon_T \in (0, 1/4)$ which satisfies Eq. (53).

D.5 General pattern theorem for unknot polygons and ratio limit theorem

Theorem 5 allows us to prove a more general pattern theorem for unknot polygons (Corollary 2) and then a ratio limit theorem. The method of proof for the general pattern theorem for unknots follows that of [35 Theorem 2.1] and the ratio limit theorem follows directly from [35 Theorem 2.2]. The ratio limit theorem is useful for going from the first pair of bounds to the second pair of bounds in Theorem 1.

Corollary 2 (Corollary of Theorem 5). Let $P$ be an unknot connected sum pattern (defined in Section A) in $T^*$. Let $p_{T^*, n}(0_1, P, \leq k)$ be the number of unknots of length $n$ in $T^*$ which contain at most $k$ $x$-translates of $P$. Then there exists an $\epsilon_P > 0$ such that

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p_{T^*, n}(0_1, P, \leq \epsilon_P n) < \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p_{T^*, n}(0_1) = \log \mu_{T^*, 0_1} = \kappa_{T^*, 0_1},$$
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where \( n \) is taken through multiples of 2.

**Proof.** Fix any \( \epsilon > 0 \) that satisfies Theorem 5. Define \( \mathcal{P}_n(0, 1, \epsilon) \) to be the set of \( n \)-edge unknot polygons with more than \( \epsilon n \) 2-sections. Let \( P \) be an unknot connected sum pattern.

Take any positive \( \epsilon P \) and define \( p_{T^*, n}(0_1, \epsilon n, P, \leq \epsilon P n) \) to be the number of \( n \) edge unknot polygons in \( T^* \) with more than \( \epsilon n \) 2-sections and at most \( \epsilon P n \) \( x \)-translates of \( P \). Note that
\[
p_{T^*, n}(0_1, P, \leq \epsilon P n) \leq p_{T^*, n}(0_1, \epsilon n, P, \leq \epsilon P n) + p_{T^*, n}(0_1, \leq \epsilon n),
\]
so if \( p_{T^*, n}(0_1, \epsilon n, P, \leq \epsilon P n) \leq p_{T^*, n}(0_1, \leq \epsilon n) \) for all \( n \) sufficiently large, then we have the required result from Theorem 5. Otherwise, given any \( N > 0 \) there must exist \( n > N \) such that, \( p_{T^*, n}(0_1, > \epsilon n, P, \leq \epsilon P n) > p_{T^*, n}(0_1, \leq \epsilon n) > 0 \). Hence there is an unbounded sequence of \( n \)'s \( N(\epsilon P) \) such that \( p_{T^*, n}(0_1, \epsilon n, P, \leq \epsilon P n) > p_{T^*, n}(0_1, \leq \epsilon n) > 0 \). For any \( n \in N(\epsilon P) \), take \( \pi \in \mathcal{P}_n(0_1, \epsilon) \) having at most \( \lceil \epsilon P n \rceil \) translates of \( P \). The strategy is to create a new polygon from \( \pi \) that has more copies of \( P \) and show that there must be exponentially more of such polygons.

Take positive \( \tau \) such that \( \lceil \epsilon n \rceil > |\tau n| \). Choose any \( |\tau n| \) of the first \( \lceil \epsilon n \rceil \) 2-sections and “insert” the pattern \( P \) at these 2-sections. Inserting \( P \) at a 2-section can involve inserting a “pad” of edges on each end of \( P \) to connect it to the 2-section. This can always be done so that the total number of edges added by an insertion is the same; let \( k_P \) be this number. The result is a new size \( n + k_P |\tau n| \) unknot polygon with at most \( |\epsilon P n| + |\tau n| \) translates of \( P \).

This gives:
\[
\left\lceil \frac{\epsilon n}{\tau n} \right\rceil p_{T^*, n}(0_1, \epsilon n, P, \leq \epsilon P n) \leq \left( \left\lceil \frac{\epsilon P n}{\tau n} \right\rceil + 1 \right) p_{T^*, n + k_P |\tau n|}(0_1)
\]

Taking logs on both sides, dividing by \( n \) and then taking the \( \lim \sup \) as \( n \) goes to infinity gives
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p_{T^*, n}(0_1, \epsilon n, P, \leq \epsilon P n) \leq \log \mu_{T^*, 0_1} + \tau \left\lceil \frac{\log \frac{\mu_{T^*, 0_1}^{k_P P}(\epsilon P + \tau)}{\epsilon - \tau}}{\epsilon P} \right\rceil + \epsilon P \left\lceil \log \frac{\epsilon P + \tau}{\epsilon P} \right\rceil + \epsilon \log \frac{\epsilon - \tau}{\epsilon},
\]
where the \( \lim \sup \) is taken through the sequence \( N(\epsilon P) \). Then consider any \( t \in (0, 1) \) and set \( \tau = t \epsilon \), \( \epsilon P = \tau / 2 = t P / 2 \) to obtain
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty; n \in N(\epsilon P)} \frac{1}{n} \log p_{T^*, n}(0_1, \epsilon n, P, \leq \epsilon P n) \leq \log \mu_{T^*, 0_1} + \epsilon \log \left[ t^t (1 - t)^{1 - t} Q^t \right]
\]
where \( Q = \frac{(\mu_{T^*, 0_1})^{k_P P} 3^{3/2}}{2} \). Setting \( t = 1 / (Q + 1) \) then gives \( \epsilon P = \epsilon / (2Q + 2) \) and we obtain
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty; n \in N(\epsilon P)} \frac{1}{n} \log p_{T^*, n}(0_1, \epsilon n, P, \leq \epsilon P n) \leq \log \mu_{T^*, 0_1} + \epsilon \log \left[ \frac{Q}{Q + 1} \right] < \log \mu_{T^*, 0_1}.
\]
Hence using Eq. 56 with \( \epsilon P = \epsilon / (2Q + 2) \) along with the definition of \( N(\epsilon P) \) gives
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p_{T^*, n}(0_1, P, \leq \epsilon P n) \leq \max \left\{ \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p_{T^*, n}(0_1, \epsilon n, P, \leq \epsilon P n), \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p_{T^*, n}(0_1, \leq \epsilon n) \right\} < \log \mu_{T^*, 0_1},
\]
where here the \( \lim \sup \) is taken through all even \( n \).

\( \square \)
Figure 10: Unknot connected sum pattern $V$ (on the left) can be interchanged with unknot pattern $U$ (on the right) to change an unknot polygon size by $\pm 2$ edges.

Because we know the limit defining $\mu_{T^*,0_1}$ exists, when taken through even values of $n$, and because there are two connected sum unknot patterns $U$ and $V$ (see Fig. 10) which can be interchanged to change the number of edges in an unknot polygon from $n + 2$ to $n$ or vice versa, then Corollary 2 combined with Madras’ Theorem 2.2 gives the following ratio limit result:

**Corollary 3.**

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{p_{T^*,n+2}(0_1)}{p_{T^*,n}(0_1)} = (\mu_{T^*,0_1})^2,$$

where the limit is taken through even values of $n$. Thus for any given even $m$ and for even $n$ sufficiently large, there exist constants $C_1$ and $C_2$ such that:

$$C_1 p_{T^*,n}(0_1) \leq p_{T^*,n+m}(0_1) \leq C_2 p_{T^*,n}(0_1).$$

(Equation 63)

### E Proof of Theorem 1

Using Theorem 2 from the previous section and Theorem 5 we repeat the proof of Theorem 1 as given in the main paper with a few additional details.

**Proof.** By Theorem 2, we can insert a finite number of $s$-blocks to change an embedding of $L$ into an unknot polygon. Then $p_{T^*,n}(L) \leq \binom{n + d_L}{f_L} p_{T^*,n+d_L}(0_1)$, where $d_L$ is a fixed number (the total number of edges in the inserted parts) which is bounded above by a finite number times $f_L$. The binomial term in the upper bound accounts for the number of ways different embeddings of $L$ could lead to the same unknot polygon; this is bounded above by the number of places (polygon edges) the inserted $f_L$ braid blocks could be located in the unknot polygon, namely $\binom{n + d_L}{f_L} \leq \binom{n + d_L}{f_L + 1} \leq d_L \binom{n}{f_L}$. The first inequality holds provided $(n + d_L)/2 \geq f_L$ and the second follows from a binomial identity.

The pattern theorem for unknot polygons given by Theorem 5 is key to establishing the lower bound.

For this, consider $L$ a prime link. Let $P$ be a connected sum pattern for $L$ and let $S$ be any 2-section. Then from Corollary 1 $P$ can be inserted (additional edges may be needed) at $S$ in a polygon (see for example Fig. 1 G). Note that any connected sum pattern can be inserted at any $S$ by adding a fixed number of edges. The options can be determined in a way similar (but simpler) to that used for inserting a braid block at a 4-section as illustrated in Fig. 6d(e). The length of the resulting embedding is increased by some constant $\Delta$ depending on $P$ (but not $S$).

Now take any unknot polygon with $n$ edges and at least $\epsilon n$ 2-sections, with $\epsilon$ the same as in Theorem 5. By the above, the pattern $P$ can be inserted at any one of those 2-sections, and the resulting lattice embedding will have link type $L$. We thus have

$$\binom{\epsilon n}{1} [p_{T^*,n}(0_1) - p_{T^*,n}(0_1, \leq \epsilon n)] \leq p_{T^*,n+\Delta}(L).$$

(Equation 64)
However, from Theorem 5 we have

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{p_{T^*,n}(0_1) - p_{T^*,n}(0_1, \leq \epsilon n)}{p_{T^*,n}(0_1)} = 1$$

so that the numerator can be made arbitrarily close to the denominator for sufficiently large $n$. Hence, for example, there exists $N > 0$ such that for all $n \geq N$, \(\frac{1}{2}(\epsilon n) p_{T^*,n}(0_1) \leq p_{T^*,n} + \Delta(L)\).

This argument can be extended in a straightforward way to the case where $L$ is composite (see Corollary 1 to Proposition 1 in Section 1, and the lower bound follows.

The arguments above establish Theorem 1 Eq.[3]. Theorem 1 Eq. [4] can be obtained from Theorem 1 Eq.[3] by combining the well-known fact that $\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log \left(\frac{a_n}{b_n}\right)}{\log n} = b$ with the new ratio limit result:

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{p_{T^*,n+m}(0_1)}{p_{T^*,n}(0_1)} = (\mu_{T^*,0_1})^m,$$

for any given even $m \geq 2$. Note that the case $m = 2$ follows from the ratio limit Eq. [62]. Note that the resulting constant $C_1$ will depend at least on $\epsilon$ and $e_L$ and the constant $C_2$ will depend at least on $d_L$ and $b_L$ so that $C_1 < C_2$.

We note that Theorem 2 combined with simpler known lower bounds (obtained by concatenating an arbitrary unknot embedding to an embedding of a given knot or link) is sufficient to give a proof that the exponential growth rate of fixed knot-type or link-type embeddings is the same as that for unknots, that is a proof that Conjecture 2(a) holds. However, since this result is also a consequence of Theorem 1 we do not give the details here.

F Consequences of Theorem 1

F.1 General pattern theorem for fixed-link-type embeddings

A general pattern theorem for fixed-link-type embeddings can be obtained now as a corollary to Theorem 1 and its proof.

**Corollary 4.** Given a non-split link $L$ embeddable in $T^*$, let $P$ be a 2-section or an unknot connected sum pattern. Let $p_{T^*,n}(L, P, \leq k)$ be the number of embeddings of $L$ of length $n$ in $T^*$ which contain at most $k$ translates of $P$. Then there exists an $\epsilon_{L,P} > 0$ such that

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p_{T^*,n}(L, P, \leq \epsilon_{L,P} n) < \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p_{T^*,n}(L) = \log \mu_{T^*,0_1} = \kappa_{T^*,0_1},$$

where $n$ is taken through multiples of 2.

**Proof.** Consider $P$ to be a 2-section or an unknot connected sum pattern. Suppose first that $L$ is prime. Then any embedding of $L$ with at most $k$ translates of $P$ can be converted to an unknot polygon by the insertion of a braid block from $S_L$. The braid block has span $s_L$ and hence this insertion creates at most $s_L$ additional translates of $P$. Thus there exists a number $b_L \geq 0$ such that

$$p_{T^*,n}(L, P, \leq k) \leq \binom{n + b_L}{1} p_{T^*,n+b_L}(0_1, P, \leq k + s_L).$$

(68)
More generally for $L$ with $f_L$ prime factors, there exists a number $B_L \geq 0$ such that

$$p_{T^*,n}(L, P, \leq k) \leq \binom{n + B_L}{f_L} p_{T^*,n+B_L}(0, P, \leq k + f_L s_L).$$  \hspace{1cm} (69)$$

Fix an $\epsilon_P$ from Corollary 2 and consider $n$ sufficiently large so that $-\epsilon_P/2 < (\epsilon_P B_L - f_L s_L)/n < \epsilon_P/2$, and take $0 < \epsilon_L, P < \epsilon_P/2$. Hence $\epsilon_L, P < \epsilon_P + (\epsilon_P B_L - f_L s_L)/n$ so that $\epsilon_L, P n + f_L s_L < \epsilon_P(n + B_L)$.

Then setting $k = \epsilon_L, P n$ in Eq. (69), taking logarithms and lim sups yields the required result:

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p_{T^*,n}(L, P, \leq \epsilon_L, P n) \leq \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p_{T^*,n+B_L}(0, P, \leq \epsilon_P(n + B_L))$$

$$\leq \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p_{T^*,n}(0)$$

$$= \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p_{T^*,n}(L) = \log \mu_{T^*,01} = \kappa_{T^*,01}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (70)

\[\square\]

### F.2 Size and mode of the linked region

Further corollaries allow us to establish results related to the “size” of the linked region. We define the size of the linked part for an $n$-edge embedding of a link $L$ in a tube as follows (see [5]). First divide the embedding at each 2-section to create a set of patterns which can each be closed off into embeddings of links. At most $f_L$ of the resulting embeddings will be non-trivial links (the others are unknot polygons) and the sizes of the corresponding link patterns can be summed to give the size of the linked part of $L$. (If we further divide at hidden 2-sections then there will be exactly $f_L$ link patterns.)

We establish first that sets of embeddings of a link $L$ in $\mathbb{T}^*$ for which the size of the linked part of $L$ is $O(n)$ are exponentially rare amongst all embeddings of $L$.

**Corollary 5** (Corollary of Theorems 1 and 5). Given any $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and even $n$, let $p_{T^*,n}(L, \alpha n)$ be the number of embeddings in $\mathbb{T}^*$ with at least one vertex in the plane $x = 0$ and such that the size of the linked part is $k_{\alpha n} = \lfloor \alpha n \rfloor$. Then

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p_{T^*,n}(L, \alpha n) < \log \mu_{T^*,01}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (71)

*Proof.* Fix any $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and, for each even $n$, consider the set of $n$-edge embeddings of $L$ where the size of the linked part is $k_{\alpha n} = \lfloor \alpha n \rfloor$. Given an even $n$, when any embedding in the corresponding set is divided at its 2-sections, the number of edges in the (up to $f_L$) linked parts adds up to $k_{\alpha n}$. If there are $j \leq f_L$ linked parts, then the embedding can be thought of as a connected sum of $j$ link patterns with $j + 1$ unknot patterns (where some unknot patterns may be empty). Each link pattern has a non-trivial link type and the number of ways that $j$ non-trivial links can give connected sum $L$ is bounded above by $f_L! \binom{f_L - 1}{j - 1}$. Further, each of the link patterns has no internal 2-sections. The number of ways to distribute $k_{\alpha n}$ edges to $j$ link patterns is at most $\binom{k_{\alpha n} - 1}{j - 1}$ and the number of ways to distribute the remaining edges is $\binom{n - k_{\alpha n}}{j}$. The $j$ link patterns can be concatenated to create an embedding of $L$ with at most $2j$ 2-sections and the unknot patterns can be concatenated to create an unknot polygon. By taking $P$ to be 2-sections, it follows that

$$p_{T^*,n}(L, \alpha n) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{f_L} \sum_{L_1 \neq L_2 \neq \ldots \neq L_j = L} \binom{m_1 + \ldots + m_{j-1} + 1}{m_1, \ldots, m_{j-1}, m_j} \sum_{n_1, \ldots, n_j} \left( \prod_{l=1}^{j} p_{T^*,m_l}(0) p_{T^*,n_l}(L_l, P, \leq 2) \right) p_{T^*,m_{j+1}}(0)$$

$$\leq g(f_L) \binom{\alpha n - 1}{f_L - 1} \binom{(1 - \alpha)n + 2 + f_L}{f_L} p_{T^*,\lfloor(1-\alpha)n\rfloor+Q_L}(0) p_{T^*,\lfloor\alpha n\rfloor+C_L}(L, P, \leq 2f_L + C_L).$$  \hspace{1cm} (72)
where \( g(f_L) = (f_L!)^{2f_L-1} \), \( p_{T^*,0}(0_1) \equiv 1 \), and \( Q_L, C_L, c_L \) are constants. We also assume that \( n \) is sufficiently large that \( \lceil \alpha n \rceil - 1 \geq 2(f_L - 1) \). Taking logarithms, dividing by \( n \) and taking the \( \lim \sup \) as \( n \to \infty \) then gives:

\[
\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p_{T^*,n}(L, \alpha n) \\
\leq (1 - \alpha) \log \mu_{T^*,0_1} + \alpha \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{[\alpha n] + C_L} \log p_{T^*,1} + c_L(L, P, \leq 2f_L + c_L) \\
< \log \mu_{T^*,0_1},
\]

(73)

where the strict inequality comes from Corollary 4 (as soon as \( n \) is large enough that \( 2f_L + c_L \leq \epsilon P n \)). \( \square \)

In contrast, sets of embeddings of \( L \) where the linked part is strongly localized are not exponentially rare; instead the embedding counts follow the same scaling form as \( p_{T^*,n}(L) \). Let \( m_L \) be the minimum size of a link pattern of \( L \).

**Corollary 6.** Given any integer \( N \geq m_L \), for any even integer \( n \geq m_L \), let \( p_{T^*,n}(L, \leq N) \) be the number of embeddings in \( T^* \) with at least one vertex in the plane \( x = 0 \) and such that the size of the linked part is at most \( N \). Then there exist constants \( C_{m_L}, C_2 \) such that for sufficiently large \( n \),

\[
C_{m_L} n^{f_L} p_{T^*,n}(0_1) \leq p_{T^*,n}(L, \leq N) \leq C_2 n^{f_L} p_{T^*,n}(0_1).
\]

(74)

The proof is exactly the same as the proof of Theorem 1 where for the lower bound one uses a size \( m_L \) link pattern to insert.

Furthermore, the conclusions of Theorem 1 hold for any subset of embeddings of \( L \) where, as in the proof of the lower bound, an element of the set can be obtained by inserting any fixed-size link patterns corresponding to the prime factors of \( L \). Thus, aside from the size of the linked part one can also restrict other geometric features of the linked part and get the same scaling form. In particular, for the case of \( L \) a prime knot, two modes have been identified for connected sum knot patterns: the double filament mode (also called 2-filament or non-local) and the single filament mode (also called 1-filament or local) \[61, 5, 34\]. See \[5, Figure 1\]. Restricting to knot patterns in either one of these modes will yield the same types of bounds as in Theorem 1. The following is an example corollary.

**Corollary 7.** Given any 4-plat knot \( K \), even integer \( n \) and \( i \in \{1, 2\} \), let \( p_{T^*,n}(K; i) \) be the number of knot-type \( K \) polygons in \( T^* \) with at least one vertex in the plane \( x = 0 \) and such that the polygon contains a link pattern of \( K \) in the \( i \)-filament mode. Then there exist constants \( C_{K,i}, C_2 \) such that for sufficiently large \( n \),

\[
C_{K,i} n^{f_L} p_{T^*,n}(0_1) \leq p_{T^*,n}(K; i) \leq C_2 n^{f_L} p_{T^*,n}(0_1).
\]

(75)

Note that prime 4-plats have either one or two components and if they have two components, both components are unknots \[9\]. For a prime two component link, we can define two modes of link patterns: those where all vertices of one component (called here the \( \text{one-polygon} \) mode) are contained in the link pattern and those where that is not the case (called here the \( \text{two-polygon} \) mode) (see Fig. 11). Embeddings of each type will have the same scaling form, up to the constant term. It appears that for the Hopf link, the one-polygon mode link pattern is smaller in span than the two-polygon mode. For embeddings of the Hopf link or the Hopf link connected sum with a single prime knot, we thus expect that the one-polygon mode will be more probable, however, if both components of the Hopf link are each connected-summed with a prime knot then the two-polygon mode of the Hopf link is the only option.
Figure 11: Two modes of the Hopf link: the two polygon mode (top) appears to require more edges than the one polygon mode (bottom).
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