CAHIERS DE
TOPOLOGIE ET GÉOMÉTRIE DIFFÉRENTIELLE
CATÉGORIQUES

PAOLA CRISTOFORI

Heegard and regular genus agree for compact 3-manifolds

Cahiers de topologie et géométrie différentielle catégoriques, tome 39, n° 3 (1998), p. 221-235

<http://www.numdam.org/item?id=CTGDC_1998__39_3_221_0>

© Andrée C. Ehresmann et les auteurs, 1998, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la revue « Cahiers de topologie et géométrie différentielle catégoriques » implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (http://www.numdam.org/conditions). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

NUMDAM

Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme
Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques
http://www.numdam.org/

CAHIERS DE TOPOLOGIE ET GEOMETRIE DIFFERENTIELLE CATEGORIQUES *Volume XXXIX-3 (1998)*

HEEGARD AND REGULAR GENUS AGREE FOR COMPACT 3-MANIFOLDS

by Paola CRISTOFORI

Rèsumé. Le genre de Heegaard et le genre régulier sont deux invariants pour les 3-variétés. On sait déjà qu'ils coïncident pour les 3-variétés orientables avec frontière; on sait aussi que le genre régulier d'une 3-variété non orientable fermée est exactement le double de son genre de Heegaard. Dans cet article, nous prouvons que ces résultats s'étendent au cas général des 3-variétés compactes.

1. Introduction.

Throughout this paper we consider only compact, connected, PL-manifolds and PL-maps.

The Heegaard genus is a well-known topological invariant, introduced in [12], for closed 3-manifolds and it has been often used in the study of 3-manifolds.

More recently Montesinos extended the definition of Heegaard genus to compact 3-manifolds with boundary (see [14]).

The regular genus is an invariant for compact n-manifolds, which was introduced in the combinatorial setting, by using the theory of representation of manifolds by coloured graphs ([9] and [10]).

Many results are already known about this invariant: for example the characterization of the n-dimensional sphere and disk as the only n-manifolds (with either empty or connected boundary) having genus zero ([11]) and some interesting results in dimension four and five with the regard to the classification of manifolds according to their regular genus (see [3] and [4]).

It is well-known that for compact surfaces the regular genus equals the genus.

Furthermore, for orientable 3-manifolds with boundary, the regular genus coincides with the Heegaard one (see [5]). The coincidence is proved by using

(*) Work performed under the auspicies of the G.N.S.A.G.A. of the C.N.R. (National Research Council of Italy) and financially supported by M.U.R.S.T. of Italy (project "Topologia e Geometria").

we have, according to [9], that:

- $\mathcal{G}(M) = \mathcal{H}(M)$ if M is orientable;
- $\mathcal{G}(M) = 2\mathcal{H}(M)$ if M is non-orientable.

In this paper we prove that the above result extends to 3-manifolds with boundary, i.e. that the second equality holds also when M has non-empty boundary. The proof uses combinatorial techniques and constructions, which are not in the least affected by the orientability or non-orientability of M. Therefore, it is also an alternative proof of the coincidence of the two invariants in the orientable case.

As a consequence of our result the regular genus can be thought as a "natural" extension to dimension n of the classical concepts of genus of a surface and Heegaard genus of a 3-manifold.

2. Coloured graphs and the regular genus of a manifold.

A *(n+1)-coloured graph (with boundary)* is a pair (Γ, γ), where $\Gamma = (V(\Gamma), E(\Gamma))$ is a multigraph (i.e. loops are forbidden) and $\gamma : E(\Gamma) \to \Delta_n = \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ a map, which is injective on each pair of adjacent edges of Γ.

For each $B \subseteq \Delta_n$, we call *B-residues* the connected components of the multigraph $\Gamma_B = (V(\Gamma), \gamma^{-1}(B))$; we set $\hat{\imath} = \Delta_n \setminus \{i\}$ for each $i \in \Delta_n$; furthermore we write Γ_i, Γ_{ij} instead of $\Gamma_{\{i\}}, \Gamma_{\{i,j\}}$.

The vertices of Γ whose degree is strictly less than $n+1$ are called *boundary vertices*; if (Γ, γ) has no boundary vertices, it is called *without boundary*.

In the following we shall always consider only $(n+1)$-coloured graphs which are *regular with respect to the colour* n, i.e. $\Gamma_{\hat{n}}$ is regular of degree n.

The *boundary graph* of (Γ, γ) is a n-coloured graph (without boundary) $(\partial\Gamma, {}^{\partial}\gamma)$ whose vertices are the boundary vertices of (Γ, γ) and, for each $i \in \Delta_{n-1}$ two vertices of $(\partial\Gamma, {}^{\partial}\gamma)$ are joined by an i-coloured edge iff they belong to the same $\{n, i\}$-residue of (Γ, γ).

If K is an n-dimensional homogeneous pseudocomplex [13], and $V(K)$ its set of vertices, we call *coloured n-complex* the pair (K, ξ) where $\xi : V(K) \to \Delta_n$ is a map which is injective on every simplex of K.

If σ^h is an h-simplex of K then the *disjoint star* $std(\sigma^h, K)$ *of* σ^h *in* K is the pseudocomplex obtained by taking the disjoint union of the h-simplexes of K containing σ^h and identifying the $(n-1)$-simplexes containing σ^h together with all their faces.

The *disjoint link* $lkd(\sigma^h, K)$ *of* σ^h *in* K is the pseudocomplex:

$$lkd(\sigma^h, K) = \{\tau \in std(\sigma^h, K) \mid \sigma^h \cap \tau = \emptyset\} \subset std(\sigma^h, K).$$

A *quasi-manifold* is a polyhedra $|K|$, where K is a pseudocomplex, such that:
- each $(n-1)$-simplex is face of exactly two n-simplexes of K;
- for each simplex σ of K, $std(\sigma, K)$ is strongly connected.

From now on we shall restrict our attention to the coloured complexes which triangulate quasi-manifolds (the reason of this restriction will become clear in the following).

Given a $(n+1)$-coloured graph (Γ, γ), consider the coloured complex $(K(\Gamma), \xi(\Gamma))$, constructed as follows:
- take one n-simplex $\sigma(a)$ for each $a \in V(\Gamma)$;
- for each $i \in \Delta_n$ and each pair a, b of i-adjacent vertices of Γ, identify the $(n-1)$-faces of $\sigma(a)$ and $\sigma(b)$ opposite to the i-coloured vertices, taking care to identify vertices of the same colour.

It is clear that the construction can be easily reversed. Our previous restriction to the class of quasi-manifolds assures that the two constructions are really inverse to each other (see [7]).

Note that, by the above construction, there is a bijective correspondence between the h-simplexes $(0 \leqslant h \leqslant dim K(\Gamma))$ of $K(\Gamma)$ and the $(n-h)$-residues of Γ, in the sense that, if σ^h is an h-simplex of $K(\Gamma)$, whose vertices are labelled by $\{i_0, ..., i_h\}$, then there is a unique $(n-h)$-residue Ξ of Γ whose edges are coloured by $\Delta_n \setminus \{i_0, ...i_h\}$ and such that $K(\Xi) = lkd(\sigma^h, K)$.

A direct way to see this correspondence is to think (Γ, γ) imbedded in $K(\Gamma)$ as its dual 1-skeleton, i.e. the vertices of Γ are the barycenters of the n-simplexes of $K(\Gamma)$ and the edges of Γ are the 1-cells dual of the $(n-1)$-simplexes of $K(\Gamma)$. Of course the $(n-1)$-simplex dual to an edge e with $\gamma(e) = i$ has its vertices labelled by $\hat{\imath}$.

If M is a manifold (with boundary) of dimension n and (Γ, γ) a $(n+1)$-coloured graph (with boundary) such that $|K(\Gamma)| \cong M$, we say that M is *represented* by (Γ, γ). In this case we have that ∂M is represented by the boundary graph of (Γ, γ) and that M is orientable iff (Γ, γ) is bipartite.
A $(n+1)$-coloured graph with non-empty boundary (resp. without boundary) (Γ, γ) is *contracted* iff $\Gamma_{\hat{n}}$ is connected and, for each $i \in \Delta_{n-1}$, the number of connected components of $\Gamma_{\hat{\imath}}$ equals the number of connected components of $\partial\Gamma$ (resp. is 1).

A contracted $(n+1)$-coloured graph representing a n-manifold M is called a *crystallization* of M.

For a general survey on coloured graphs and crystallizations see [6].

A *(n-1)-pondered structure* is a triple $(\bar{\Gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \omega)$ where $\bar{\Gamma}$ is an oriented pseudograph, regular of degree $2n$, $\bar{\gamma} : E(\bar{\Gamma}) \to \Delta_n$ is a map and $\omega : E(\bar{\Gamma}) \to \Delta_2$ is another map, called *weight on* $\bar{\Gamma}$, such that:

(1) for each $i \in \hat{1}$, the connected components of $\bar{\gamma}^{-1}(i)$ are elementary cycles (possibly of length one);

(2) for each $e \in \bar{\gamma}^{-1}(i), i \neq 1$, we have $\omega(e) = 1$;

(3) if e, f are adjacent 1-coloured (oriented) edges of $\bar{\Gamma}$, let us denote by $e(0), f(0)$ (resp. $e(1), f(1)$) the first (resp. the second) endpoints of e and f. Then, with regard to the weights of e and f, we have the following possibilities:

$$\text{- } e(1) = f(0) \Rightarrow \begin{cases} \omega(e) = \omega(f) = 1 \\ \omega(e) = 1 \quad \omega(f) = 0 \\ \omega(e) = 2 \quad \omega(f) = 0 \\ \omega(e) = 0 \quad \omega(f) = 2 \\ \omega(e) = 2 \quad \omega(f) = 1 \end{cases}$$

$$\text{- } e(1) = f(1) \Rightarrow \begin{cases} \omega(e) = 1 \quad \omega(f) = 0 \\ \omega(e) = 0 \quad \omega(f) = 2 \end{cases}$$

$$\text{- } e(0) = f(0) \Rightarrow \begin{cases} \omega(e) = 1 \quad \omega(f) = 2 \\ \omega(e) = 0 \quad \omega(f) = 2 \end{cases}.$$

Given a $(n-1)$-pondered structure $(\bar{\Gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \omega)$, the *bijoin over* $(\bar{\Gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \omega)$ is a $(n+1)$-coloured graph (without boundary) $B(\bar{\Gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \omega) = (\Gamma, \gamma)$, constructed as follows:

1) $V(\Gamma) = V(\bar{\Gamma}) \times \{0, 1\}$;

2) for each $a \in V(\bar{\Gamma})$ $(a, 0)$ and $(a, 1)$ are 0-adjacent in (Γ, γ);

3) for each $e \in E(\bar{\Gamma})$ $(e(0), h)$ and $(e(1), k)$ $(h, k \in \{0, 1\})$ are $\bar{\gamma}(e)$-adjacent in (Γ, γ) iff $h \leqslant k$ and $h + k = \omega(e)$.

Remark 1. If $(\bar{\Gamma}', \bar{\gamma}', \omega')$ is a pondered structure obtained from $(\bar{\Gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \omega)$ by inverting the orientations on some of the edges of $\omega^{-1}(\{0, 2\})$, then the bijoins $(\Gamma', \gamma') = B(\bar{\Gamma}', \bar{\gamma}', \omega')$ and $(\Gamma, \gamma) = B(\bar{\Gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \omega)$ are graph-isomorphic by a isomorphism which preserves the colours, i.e. there exists a graph-isomorphism $\Phi : \Gamma \to \Gamma'$ such that $a, b \in V(\Gamma)$ are i-adjacent in (Γ, γ) iff $\Phi(a)$ and $\Phi(b)$ are i-adjacent in (Γ', γ') (for each $i \in \Delta_n$) (see [2, Lemma 7]).

Hence, as far as we are only interested in the resulting $(n+1)$-coloured graph $B(\bar{\Gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \omega)$, we can drop the orientations on the edges belonging to

$\omega^{-1}(\{0,2\})$, since they are not essential (up to graph-isomorphisms). Therefore in the following, whenever defining a pondered structure, we shall give the orientations only to the edges of weight 1.

The definitions of pondered structure and bijoin can be found in [2]; with respect to the original definitions, we have only changed the roles of the colours 0,1 and n because it turns out to be useful in our proofs.

Let (Γ,γ) be an $(n+1)$-coloured graph, we call *extended graph associated to* (Γ,γ) the $(n+1)$-coloured graph (Γ^*,γ^*) obtained in the following way:

- add to $V(\Gamma)$ a set V^* in bijective correspondence with the set of the boundary-vertices of (Γ,γ);
- add to $E(\Gamma)$ the set of all possible n-coloured edges having as endpoints a boundary-vertex of (Γ,γ) and its correspondent vertex in V^*.

Now we describe a particular type of imbeddings of a coloured graph into a surface ([8],[10]).

A *regular imbedding* of (Γ,γ) into a surface (with boundary) F, is a cellular imbedding of (Γ^*,γ^*) into F, such that:

(a) the image of a vertex of Γ^* lies in ∂F iff the vertex belongs to V^*;

(b) the boundary of any region of the imbedding is either the image of a cycle of (Γ^*,γ^*) (*internal region*) or the union of the image α of a path in (Γ^*,γ^*) and an arc of ∂F, the intersection consisting of the images of two vertices belonging to V^* (*boundary region*);

(c) there exists a cyclic permutation $\varepsilon=(\varepsilon_0,\dots,\varepsilon_{n-1},n)$ of Δ_n such that for each internal region (resp. boundary region), the edges of its boundary (resp. of α) are alternatively coloured ε_i and ε_{i+1}, $i\in\mathbb{Z}_{n+1}$.

Proposition 4 of [10] assures that for each cyclic permutation $\varepsilon=(\varepsilon_0,\dots,\varepsilon_{n-1},n)$ of Δ_n, there exists a regular imbedding of (Γ,γ) into a surface (with boundary) F_ε which is orientable iff (Γ,γ) is bipartite and is called the *regular surface* associated to (Γ,γ) and ε.

Let us define $\chi_\varepsilon(\Gamma)=\chi(F_\varepsilon)$ and $\rho_\varepsilon(\Gamma)=genus(F_\varepsilon)$.

Denote by $g_{ij}(\Gamma)$ (resp. ${}^{\partial}g_{ij}(\Gamma)$) the number of cycles of Γ_{ij} (resp. $\partial\Gamma_{ij}$) and by $p(\Gamma)$ (resp. $\bar{p}(\Gamma)$) the order of (Γ,γ) (resp. of $(\partial\Gamma,{}^{\partial}\gamma)$); set $\dot{p}(\Gamma)=p(\Gamma)-\bar{p}(\Gamma)$.

According to [10, Proposition 4], we have formulas to compute $\chi_\varepsilon(\Gamma)$ and $\rho_\varepsilon(\Gamma)$:

$$\chi_\varepsilon(\Gamma)=\sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}_{n+1}} g_{\varepsilon_i\varepsilon_{i+1}}(\Gamma)+\frac{(1-n)\dot{p}(\Gamma)}{2}+\frac{(2-n)\bar{p}(\Gamma)}{2}$$

$$\rho_\varepsilon(\Gamma) = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{1}{2}(\chi_\varepsilon(\Gamma) +^{\partial} g_{\varepsilon_0\varepsilon_{n-1}}(\Gamma)) & \text{if } \Gamma \text{ is bipartite} \\ 2 - \chi_\varepsilon(\Gamma) -^{\partial} g_{\varepsilon_0\varepsilon_{n-1}}(\Gamma) & \text{if } \Gamma \text{ is not bipartite.} \end{cases}$$

The *regular genus* $\rho(\Gamma)$ of (Γ,γ) is defined as the minimum $\rho_\varepsilon(\Gamma)$ among all cyclic permutations ε of Δ_n.

Following [9], we call *regular genus* of a n-manifold M the non-negative integer:

$$\mathcal{G}(M) = \min\{\rho(\Gamma) | (\Gamma,\gamma) \text{ represents } M\}.$$

Finally, we recall that, by [1, Theorem 1], given a 3-manifold with boundary M, there always exists a crystallization of M, whose genus is $\mathcal{G}(M)$. We shall use this result in our proofs.

3. Heegaard splittings and diagrams.

In the following we shall always denote by F_g the closed orientable (resp. non-orientable) surface of genus g (resp. of genus $2g$).

All the definitions of this section are extensions of those given for the orientable case in [14] and [5].

A *hollow handlebody of genus g* is a 3-manifold with boundary X_g, which is obtained from $F_g \times [0,1]$ by attaching 2- and 3-handles along $F_g \times \{1\}$. We call $F_g \times \{0\}$ the *free boundary* of X_g.

Note that X_g is orientable iff F_g is orientable.

We call X_g a *proper* handlebody of genus g iff $\partial X_g = F_g \times \{0\}$.

Lemma 1. *X_g is a proper handlebody iff it is a handlebody in the usual sense, i.e. it is obtained by attaching g 1-handles along $\partial\mathbb{D}^3$.*

The proof is the same as in [5, Remark 1], since it does not depend on the orientability of the surface F_g.

Given a 3-manifold with boundary M, a *generalized Heegaard splitting of genus g* of M is a pair (X_g, Y_g) of hollow handlebodies of genus g, such that $X_g \cup Y_g = M$ and $X_g \cap Y_g = F_g \times \{0\}$ is the free boundary of both.

If at least one of the two hollow handlebodies (say X_g) is proper, the pair (X_g, Y_g) is called a *proper Heegaard splitting of genus g* of M.

We define the *Heegaard genus* of a 3-manifold with boundary M as:

$$\mathcal{H}(M) = \min\{g | \text{ there exists a proper Heegaard splitting of genus } g \text{ of } M\}.$$

By Lemma 1, it is clear that this definition is a generalization of the classical one for closed 3-manifolds [12].

Clearly from the above definition arises the problem of the existence of proper Heegaard splittings. As in the case of closed manifolds we can prove that every 3-manifold M with boundary admits a proper Heegaard splitting, starting from a triangulation K of M. The argument is exactly the same as sketched in [5, Proposition 1] for the orientable case.

A *generalized Heegaard diagram* is a triple $(F_g; v, w)$ where v and w are systems of simple, closed, disjoint curves on F_g.

As in the orientable case (see [14] and [5]), given a generalized Heegaard splitting of genus g, (X_g, Y_g), we can consider the generalized Heegaard diagram $(F_g; v, w)$, where $v = \{v_1, \dots, v_r\}$ (resp. $w = \{w_1, \dots, w_s\}$) is formed by the attacching spheres of the 2-handles of X_g (resp. of Y_g).

Conversely, from a generalized Heegaard diagram $(F_g; v, w)$, we can obtain a hollow handlebody X (resp. Y) by considering $F_g \times [0,1]$ (resp. $F_g \times [-1,0]$) with 2-handles attached along $F_g \times \{1\}$ (resp. $F_g \times \{-1\}$) according to v (resp. to w) and possibly by capping off some of the resulting spherical boundary components by 3-handles. If M is the 3-manifold (with boundary) obtained from $X \cup Y$ by identifying their free boundaries, then (X, Y) is a generalized Heegaard splitting of the 3-manifold M. In this case we say that $(F_g; v, w)$ *represents* M.

A *proper Heegaard diagram* is a generalized Heegaard diagram whose corresponding splitting is proper.

Remark 2. If $(F_g; v = \{v_1, \dots, v_r\}, w = \{w_1, \dots, w_s\})$ is a proper Heegaard diagram representing a 3-manifold with boundary M, then $r \geqslant g$; moreover, we can always modify v in order to obtain a new proper Heegaard diagram $(F_g; v', w)$, representing M, such that $\#v' = g$ and v' is a complete system of meridian curves for F_g, i.e. $F_g \setminus v'$ is planar and connected.

Therefore, from now on, when considering a proper Heegaard diagram $(F_g; v, w)$, we can always suppose that v is a complete system of meridian curves for F_g.

Remark 3. Let $(F_g; v, w)$ be a proper Heegaard diagram of a 3-manifold with boundary M; by Lemma 1 and Remark 2, M can be constructed from $(F_g; v, w)$, in the following way:

- consider the proper (orientable or not, according to M) handlebody of genus g, X_g such that $\partial X_g = F_g$ and, for each $i = 1, \dots, g$, the curve v_i bounds a disk $\mathbb{D}_i$ in X_g such that $\{\mathbb{D}_1, \dots, \mathbb{D}_g\}$ is a complete system of meridian disks of X_g;

- for each $i = 1, \dots, s$ $(s = \#w)$, attach along ∂X_g a 2-handle according to w_i;
- attach some 3-handles in order to get the same number of spherical components as in ∂M.

Furthermore, if we cap off each boundary component of M, we obtain a singular 3-manifold $\hat{M}$ (i.e. each point x of $\hat{M}$ has a neighbourhood homeomorphic to a cone over a closed connected surface), which we shall call *associated to* M.

We briefly recall that, given a singular 3-manifold N, the *singular points* of N are those having neighbourhoods homeomorphic to cones over a surface which is not $\mathbb{S}^2$; note that, if we remove small open neighbourhoods of the singular points of N, we obtain a 3-manifold with boundary, which obviously has no spherical boundary components.

From now on we shall always consider only such 3-manifolds; in this way we make the correspondence between singular 3-manifolds and 3-manifolds bijective and we can properly define the 3-manifold with boundary *associated* to a given singular 3-manifold.

4. The relation between Heegaard and regular genus.

Throughout this section, in order to group together the orientable and non-orientable case, we shall use the following notations:

$$\ddot{\rho}_\varepsilon(\Gamma) = \begin{cases} \rho_\varepsilon(\Gamma) & \text{if } \Gamma \text{ is bipartite} \\ \frac{1}{2}\rho_\varepsilon(\Gamma) & \text{if } \Gamma \text{ is not bipartite.} \end{cases} \qquad \ddot{\rho}(\Gamma) = \min_{\varepsilon}\{\ddot{\rho}_\varepsilon(\Gamma)\}$$

$$\ddot{\mathcal{G}}(M) = \min\{\ddot{\rho}(\Gamma) | (\Gamma, \gamma) \text{ represents } M\} = \begin{cases} \mathcal{G}(M) & \text{if } M \text{ is orientable} \\ \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{G}(M) & \text{if } M \text{ is non-orientable.} \end{cases}$$

Proposition 1. *For every 3-manifold with boundary M, we have: $\ddot{\mathcal{G}}(M) = \mathcal{H}(M)$*

The proof is a consequence of some lemmas.

Lemma 2. *Given a crystallization (Γ, γ) of a 3-manifold with boundary M, for each cyclic permutation $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, 3)$ of Δ_3, there exists a proper Heegaard splitting of M of genus $\ddot{\rho}_\varepsilon(\Gamma)$.*

The proof is hanalogous to that of the orientable case (see [5, Lemma 1]).

Before starting to complete the proof of Proposition 1, let us consider a Heegaard diagram $(F_g; v, w)$ of a 3-manifold with boundary M, such that $\#v = g$, $\#w = s$ and $w \neq \emptyset$. We can always consider a planar representation in $\mathbb{E}^2$ where each curve v_i corresponds to two circles v_i' and v_i'' such that, for each $i = 1, \dots, g$, v_i' (resp. v_i'') lies in the upper half-plane (resp. in the lower half-plane). Let us call v_0 the (closed) curve on F_g which corresponds to the x-axis in the planar representation; clearly $v_0 \cap v = \emptyset$, therefore $v \cup v_0$ is again a system of simple, closed, disjoint curves on F_g.

Note that we can always suppose that (see, for example, [14]):

- each w_i intersects at least once the system $v \cup v_0$ (otherwise we can use isotopies to push w_i through one v_j $(j \in \{0, \dots, g\})$);
- each connected component of $F_g \setminus (v \cup v_0 \cup w)$ is an open disk (if there is one having more than one boundary component, we can push a curve w_i belonging to one boundary component through a curve v_j belonging to another boundary component $(i \in \{1, \dots, s\}, j \in \{0, \dots, g\})$).

All the above hypothesis assure that the planar representation of $(F_g; v \cup v_0, w)$ is a connected subset of the plane.

Furthermore we can give to all the circles v_i' $(i = 1, \dots, g)$ the same orientation; note that, as a consequence, each v_i'' $(i = 1, \dots, g)$ has the opposite (resp. the same) orientation as v_i' iff v_i corresponds to an "orientable" (resp. "non-orientable") 1-handle of the proper handlebody X_g, in the proper Heegaard splitting associated to the diagram. Hence we can divide the v_i'''s in two disjoint "orientation-classes" $\mathcal{O}$ and $\mathcal{O}'$ such that $v_i'' \in \mathcal{O}$ (resp. $v_i'' \in \mathcal{O}'$) iff it has the orientation opposite to that of v_i' (resp. the same orientation as v_i').

Let us construct a pondered structure $(\bar{\Gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \omega)$ in the following way:

(i) $V(\bar{\Gamma})$ is the set of intersection points of the curves of $v \cup v_0$ with the curves of w;

(ii) for each $a, b \in V(\bar{\Gamma})$, join a and b by an edge iff they are joined by an arc of $v \cup v_0 \cup w$;

(iii) colour 2 the edges corresponding to an arc of $v \cup v_0$; colour 1 (resp. 3) the edges corresponding to arcs of w whose interiors lie in the lower (resp. upper) half-plane;

(iv) give to each 2-coloured edge the same orientation of the corresponding arc of $v \cup v_0$ and weight 1;

(v) double (i.e. draw an arc with the same endpoints and the same colour) each edge e which corresponds to an arc in w; if e is 3-coloured give to it

and its "double" weight 1; if e is 1-coloured, then:

- if both the edges 2-adjacent to e correspond to arcs of v, then give to e and its "double" weight 1 (resp. give to e weight 0 and to its "double" weight 2) iff these arcs belong to the same orientation-class (resp. to different orientation-classes) of the v_i'''s;
- if only one of the edges 2-adjacent to e corresponds to an arc of v_0, then give to e and its "double" weight 1 (resp. give to e weight 0 and to its "double" weight 2) iff the other arc belong to $\mathcal{O}$ (resp. to $\mathcal{O}'$);
- if both the 2-coloured edges adjacent to e correspond to arcs of v_0, then give to e and its "double" weight 1;

- for each $e \in E(\bar{\Gamma})$ of weight 1, with $\bar{\gamma}(e) \in \hat{2}$, give to e and its "double" opposite orientations.

Let (Γ, γ) be the 4-coloured graph which is the bijoin over the pondered structure $(\bar{\Gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \omega)$.

Let us state some results about (Γ, γ) :

Lemma 3. *Given the cyclic permutation $\varepsilon = (0,1,2,3)$, we have: $\ddot{\rho}_\varepsilon(\Gamma) = g$.*

Proof. Let h be the number of intersection points between the system of curves $v \cup v_0$ and the system of curves w. Then we have that $V(\Gamma) = 2h$.

For each $i, j \in \Delta_3$ let us denote by g_{ij} the number of connected components of Γ_{ij}.

Note that the Heegaard diagram induces on F_g a decomposition where:

- the vertices are the intersection points between the curves of $v \cup v_0$ and those of w;
- the edges are the arcs of $v \cup v_0 \cup w$, joining two vertices;
- the 2-cells are the connected components of $F_g \setminus (v \cup v_0 \cup w)$, which are in bijective correspondence with the {1,2}- and {2,3}-residues of Γ. Therefore we have:

$$2 - 2g = \chi(F_g) = h - 2h + (g_{12} + g_{23})$$

Hence

$$g_{12} + g_{23} = h + 2 - 2g.$$

Moreover note that:

$$g_{03} = g_{01} = \frac{h}{2}$$

since each {1,2}-coloured (resp. {2,3}-coloured) edge of $K(\Gamma)$ belongs, by

construction, to exactly four tethraedra. Therefore we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\chi_\varepsilon(\Gamma) &= g_{01} + g_{12} + g_{23} + g_{03} - 2h = \\ &= \frac{h}{2} + h + 2 - 2g + \frac{h}{2} - 2h = 2 - 2g\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 4. *$|K(\Gamma)|$ is a singular 3-manifold whose singular vertices are all 0-coloured.*

Proof. We shall proof the lemma by directly computing the Euler characteristics of the disjoint links of the vertices of $K(\Gamma)$. For each $i \in \Delta_3$, let us denote by $g_{\hat{i}}$ the number of connected components of $\Gamma_{\hat{i}}$. Note that $g_{\hat{2}} = s$, i.e. the number of curves of the system w. Therefore, for each $i = 1, \dots, s$, let h_i be the number of intersection points of the curve $w_i \in w$ with the curves of the system $v \cup v_0$, $\Xi^{(i)}$ the connected component of $\Gamma_{\hat{2}}$ corresponding to w_i and $g^{(i)}_{hk}$ the number of connected components of the graph $\Xi^{(i)}_{hk}$. Then, for each $i = 1, \dots, s$, we have:

$$\chi(\Xi^{(i)}) = 2h_i - \frac{6h_i}{2} + (g^{(i)}_{01} + g^{(i)}_{03} + g^{(i)}_{13}) = -h_i + 2 + \frac{2h_i}{2} = 2$$

Since the planar representation of $(F_g; v \cup v_0, w)$ is a connected subset of the plane, we have:

$$g_{\hat{1}} = g_{\hat{3}} = 1$$

therefore:

$$\chi(\Gamma_{\hat{1}}) = 2h - 3h + (g_{02} + g_{23} + g_{03}) = -h + g + 1 + g_{23} + \frac{h}{2} = -\frac{h}{2} + g + 1 + g_{23}$$

$$\chi(\Gamma_{\hat{3}}) = 2h - 3h + (g_{01} + g_{12} + g_{02}) = -h + \frac{h}{2} + g_{12} + g + 1 = -\frac{h}{2} + g + 1 + g_{12}$$

and finally

$$\chi(\Gamma_{\hat{1}}) + \chi(\Gamma_{\hat{3}}) = -h + 2g + 2 + (g_{23} + g_{12}) = 4.$$

Since $\chi(\Gamma_{\hat{i}}) \leqslant 2$, for each $i = 1, 3$, it follows that:

$$\chi(\Gamma_{\hat{1}}) = \chi(\Gamma_{\hat{3}}) = 2.$$

□

Lemma 5. *$|K(\Gamma)| \cong \hat{M}$, where $\hat{M}$ is the singular 3-manifold associated to M.*

Proof. First note that, given a Heegaard diagram $(F_g; v, w)$ of a 3-manifold with boundary M, the singular 3-manifold $\hat{M}$ is obtained in the following way:

- let X_g be the handlebody of genus g such that $\partial X_g = F_g$ and $v_i = \partial \mathbb{D}_i$ $(i = 1, \dots, g)$, $\{\mathbb{D}_1, \dots, \mathbb{D}_g\}$ being a complete system of meridian disks for X_g;
- consider $N = X_g \cup H_1^{(2)} \cup \dots \cup H_s^{(2)}$ the 3-manifold with boundary obtained by adding, along X_g, the 2-handles $H_i^{(2)}$, whose attaching spheres are the curves w_i $(i = 1, \dots, s)$ (note that M can be constructed by adding some 3-handles on ∂N, i.e. by capping off all the spherical boundary components of N);
- finally $\hat{M}$ is obtained by capping off by a cone each component (spherical or not) of ∂N.

Let K_{13} and K_{02} be the 1-dimensional subcomplexes of $K(\Gamma)$ generated by the {1,3}- and {0,2}-coloured vertices respectively, and let H be the largest 2-dimensional subcomplex of the first barycentric subdivision of $K(\Gamma)$ disjoint from the first barycentric subdividisions of K_{13} and K_{02}. The surface $F = |H|$ splits $|K(\Gamma)|$ in two polyhedra $\mathcal{A}_{13}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{02}$ such that $\mathcal{A}_{13} \cap \mathcal{A}_{02} = F$ (see Lemma 2 above).

Let us show, now, that $\mathcal{A}_{13}$ is a proper (orientable or non-orientable) handlebody of genus $g = g_{02} - 1$.

In fact, we have the graph Γ imbedded in $F \subset |K(\Gamma)|$ and this imbedding is regular with respect to the cyclic permutation $\varepsilon = (0, 1, 2, 3)$. By Lemma 3, the genus of F is g or $2g$ according to its orientability, i.e. to Γ being bipartite or not.

Moreover we can think of $\mathcal{A}_{13}$ as constructed in the following way:

- consider a collar C of F in $\mathcal{A}_{13}$ and let C_1 be the component of ∂C corresponding to $F \times \{1\}$;
- add on C_1 the 2-handles $H_1^{(2)}, \dots, H_g^{(2)}$ whose attaching spheres are the {0,2}-residues of Γ except that corresponding to v_0.

We have now obtained a hollow handlebody of genus g with exactly two boundary components represented by the residues $\Gamma_{\hat{1}}$ and $\Gamma_{\hat{3}}$, which, by Lemma 4, are spheres; hence by adding two 3-handles we obtain a proper handlebody of genus g which is exactly $\mathcal{A}_{13}$.

Moreover, since the meridian curves of $\mathcal{A}_{13}$ are exactly the {0,2}-residues corresponding to $\{v_1, \dots, v_g\}$, then $\mathcal{A}_{13} = X_g$.

Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the set formed by the 0- and 2-coloured vertices of $K(\Gamma)$; let us consider the subcomplex of $K(\Gamma)$:

$$\tilde{K} = K(\Gamma) \setminus \Big(\bigcup_{a \in \mathcal{S}} \dot{st}d(a, K(\Gamma)) \Big)$$

where $\dot{st}d(a, K(\Gamma)) = std(a, K(\Gamma)) \setminus lkd(a, K(\Gamma))$.

Note that $\tilde{K}$ is obtained by adding on $\partial \mathcal{A}_{13} = \partial X_g$ the 2-handles:

$$\bar{H}_1^{(2)}, \bar{\bar{H}}_1^{(2)}, \dots, \bar{H}_s^{(2)}, \bar{\bar{H}}_s^{(2)}$$

such that the attacching spheres of $\bar{H}_i^{(2)}$ and $\bar{\bar{H}}_i^{(2)}$ are the two "parallel" {1,3}-residues corresponding to the same curve $w_i \in w$ $(i = 1, \dots, s)$.

Moreover, note that the 2-handles $\bar{H}_i^{(2)}$ and $\bar{\bar{H}}_i^{(2)}$ are attached to each other in such a way that, denoting by ϕ_i the "glueing map", for each $i = 1, \dots, s$, $\tilde{H}_i^{(2)} = \bar{H}_i^{(2)} \cup_{\phi_i} \bar{\bar{H}}_i^{(2)}$ is again a 2-handle. Therefore $|\tilde{K}| \cong X_g \cup \tilde{H}_1^{(2)} \cup \dots \cup \tilde{H}_s^{(2)}$ and we can obviously consider as attaching sphere for $\tilde{H}_i^{(2)}$ one of the two {1,3}- residues corresponding to w_i.

Hence $|\tilde{K}| \cong N$ and the components of ∂N are the disjoint links of the vertices of $\mathcal{S}$ (note that, if the vertex is 2-coloured then its disjoint link is a sphere by Lemma 4). $K(\Gamma)$ is therefore obtained from $\tilde{K}$ by attaching on $\partial \tilde{K}$ the disjoint stars (in $K(\Gamma)$) of the vertices belonging to $\mathcal{S}$, identifying the two copies of the disjoint link. Since the disjoint star is exactly the cone over the disjoint link, we have that $|K(\Gamma)| \cong \hat{M}$. □

Lemma 6. *Let (Γ, γ) be a 4-coloured graph without boundary representing a singular 3-manifold N and suppose that all the singular vertices of $K(\Gamma)$ are 0-coloured. There exists a 4-coloured graph with boundary $(\tilde{\Gamma}, \tilde{\gamma})$, which represents the 3-manifold with boundary associated to N, such that:*

$$\ddot{\rho}_\varepsilon(\tilde{\Gamma}) = \ddot{\rho}_\varepsilon(\Gamma) \quad \textit{with} \quad \varepsilon = (0,1,2,3)$$

The proof of the above lemma is the same as in [5, Lemma 3], since it does not depend on the orientability of N.

Proof of Proposition 1. One inequality is the direct consequence of Lemma 2 and Theorem 1 of [1].

Suppose now that $(F_g; v, w)$ is a Heegaard diagram of M such that $\mathcal{H}(M) = g$.

If M is not a proper handlebody (i.e. $w \neq \emptyset$) then we can apply the construction described above to obtain a 4-coloured graph (Γ, γ); by applying Lemmas 3,4,5 and 6 to (Γ, γ) we obtain the required inequality.

If M is a proper handlebody of genus g then $\ddot{\mathcal{G}}(M) = g$ (see [10]).

Since $g = rank(M) \leqslant \mathcal{H}(M)$ again we have the required inequality. □

REFERENCES

[1] P.Bandieri, *A note on the genus of 3-manifolds with boundary*, Ann. Univ. Ferrara - Sez. VII - Sc. Mat. **XXXV** (1989), 163-175

[2] P.Bandieri, *Constructing n-manifolds from spines*, to appear

[3] M.R.Casali, *An infinite class of bounded 4-manifolds having regular genus three*, Boll. Un. Mat. Ital. (7) **10-A** (1996), 279-303.

[4] M.R.Casali, *Classifying PL 5-manifolds by regular genus: the boundary case*, Can. J. Math. **49** (2) (1997), 193-211.

[5] P.Cristofori - C.Gagliardi - L.Grasselli, *Heegaard and regular genus of 3-manifolds with boundary*, Revista Mat. Universidad Complutense Madrid **8** (2) (1995), 379-398.

[6] M.Ferri - C.Gagliardi - L.Grasselli, *A graph-theoretical representation of PL-manifolds - A survey on crystallizations*, Aequationes Math. **31** (1986), 121-141.

[7] C.Gagliardi, *A combinatorial characterization of 3-manifolds crystallisations*, Boll. Un. Mat. Ital. **16-A** (1979), 441-449.

[8] C.Gagliardi, *Regular imbeddings of edge-coloured graphs*, Geom. Dedicata **11** (1981), 397-414.

[9] C.Gagliardi, *Extending the concept of genus to dimension n*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **81** (1981), 473-481.

[10] C.Gagliardi, *Regular genus: the boundary case*, Geom. Dedicata **22** (1987), 261-281.

[11] C.Gagliardi, *The only genus zero n-manifold is* $\mathbb{S}^n$, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **85** (1982), 638-642.

[12] P.Heegaard, *Forstudier til topologisk teori för de algebraiske Sammenhäeng*, Nordiske Forlag Ernst Bojesen, Copenhagen (1898); french translation: Bull. Soc. Math. France **44** (1916), 161-212.

[13] P.J.Hilton - S.Wylie, *An introduction to algebraic topology - Homology theory*, Cambridge Univ. Press (1960).

[14] J.M.Montesinos, *Representing 3-manifolds by a universal branching set*, Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. **94** (1983), 109-123.

Paola CRISTOFORI
Dipartimento di Matematica Pura ed Applicata
Università di Modena
Via Campi 213 B,
I-41100 MODENA (Italy)