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1. What’s wrong with Khovanov homology?
   - It’s almost functorial
   - ... but not quite
   - ... and it ought to be!

2. How do we fix it?
   - Disorientations
   - Movie moves
   - Calculations
   - Confusions

3. Odds and ends.
   - Decategorifying
   - Pin$^-$ structures
   - Recovering the old theory
   - Kevin’s doubly monoidal 4-category
What is Khovanov homology?

Khovanov homology is a map from tangles to up-to-homotopy complexes of (matrices of) cobordisms.

- On single crossings it is given by

- It is a map of planar algebras: to compose two tangles in a planar way, take the tensor product of the corresponding complexes, combining objects and morphisms using the specified planar operation.
We need to impose some relations on cobordisms in order to make this a tangle invariant.
We need to impose some relations on cobordisms in order to make this a tangle invariant.

- Closed surface relations:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{circle with line} & = 0 \\
\text{two loops} & = 2 \\
\text{two linked circles} & = 0
\end{align*}
\]
We need to impose some relations on cobordisms in order to make this a tangle invariant.

- **Closed surface relations:**
  
  
  \[
  \begin{array}{ccc}
  \begin{array}{c}
  \includegraphics[width=0.2\textwidth]{closed_surface_1} \\
  \end{array} & = & 0 \\
  \begin{array}{c}
  \includegraphics[width=0.2\textwidth]{closed_surface_2} \\
  \end{array} & = & 2 \\
  \begin{array}{c}
  \includegraphics[width=0.2\textwidth]{closed_surface_3} \\
  \end{array} & = & 0 \\
  \end{array}
  \]

- **The “neck cutting” relation:**
  
  \[
  \begin{array}{c}
  \includegraphics[width=0.2\textwidth]{neck_cut_1} \\
  \end{array} = \frac{1}{2} \\
  \begin{array}{c}
  \includegraphics[width=0.2\textwidth]{neck_cut_2} \\
  \end{array} + \frac{1}{2}
  \]
Example

The hopf link.
Why is it actually an invariant of tangles?

We need to construct homotopy equivalences between the complexes on either side of each Reidemeister move.

Example
So far, I’ve described an invariant associated to tangles. We can try to make Khovanov homology functorial, associating to a cobordism between two tangles some chain map between the associated complexes. Link cobordisms can be given presentations as ‘movies’. Each frame of a movie is a tangle diagram. Between each pair of frames, one of the ‘elementary movies’ takes place:

- a Reidemeister move, in either direction
- the birth of death of a circle
- a morse move between two parallel arcs
We need to assign chain maps to each of the elementary movies.

- All the morse moves are easy; there are obvious cobordisms implementing them.
- To each Reidemeister move, we assign the chain map we constructed when showing that the two sides of the Reidemeister move were homotopically equivalent complexes.

To assign a chain map to an arbitrary link cobordism, we choose a movie presentation, and compose the chain maps associated to each elementary piece. Is this well defined?
Theorem (Carter and Saito)

Two movies are secretly presentations of the same link cobordism exactly if they are related by a sequence of ‘movie moves’.

Example (Movie moves 6-10)

Each movie here is equivalent to the ‘do nothing’ movie.
Thus to check our proposed invariant of link cobordisms is well defined, we ‘only’ need to check that we assign the same chain map (up to homotopy equivalence!) to either side of each movie move.

Theorem (Bar-Natan, 2004)

*Movie moves agree up to sign!*

Theorem (Jacobsson, 2002)

*The signs don’t come out right. You can shuffle them around, but not make them go away.*
It would be nice if Khovanov homology really were functorial.

- Functors are good!
- Khovanov’s construction of a categorification of the coloured Jones polynomial would be much easier.
- Kevin Walker’s interpretation of Khovanov homology as a doubly monoidal 4-category might actually work.
How do we fix it?

To fix the sign problems in Khovanov homology, we’ll make two modifications to the ‘target category’ of cobordisms.

**Disorientations**  Objects and cobordisms will be ‘piecewise oriented’, with ‘disorientation lines’ where the orientations disagree.

**Confusions**  Extra morphisms called ‘confusions’ fix some defects in the category, and make proofs manageable. They are ‘spinorial’ objects.
Disorientations

We’ll replace the unoriented cobordism category previously used with a category of ‘disoriented cobordisms’.

**Objects** Non-crossing arcs embedded in a disc, each piecewise oriented. Each a ‘disorientation mark’ separating oppositely oriented intervals also has a preferred direction.

**Morphisms** Surfaces are piecewise oriented, with ‘disorientation’ lines marking the boundaries between regions with opposite orientations. Each disorientation line has a ‘fringe’, indicating a preferred side.
Example

In the oriented regions, we impose the usual cobordism relations. We also need some rules for removing closed disorientation lines, and reconnecting parallel disorientation lines.
Disorientation relations

Fix a parameter $\omega$, such that $\omega^4 = 1$.

- At $\omega = 1$, we recover the old theory by forgetting all orientation data. (We also recover the sign problems!)

- At $\omega = i$, we’ll have functoriality!

Introduce some relations on disorientations:
Modifying the tangle invariant

Now tangles are mapped to (up-to-homotopy) complexes of disoriented cobordisms. It’s obvious where to put the seams in, if we want to preserve orientation data away from crossings.

Disorientation marks near a crossing face to the right.
Theorem (M&W)

This is still an invariant of tangles. We’ll see all the homotopy equivalences for Reidemeister moves soon!

It not obvious at this point what the relationship is with the old theory. We expect that it will be equivalent for knots and links, but different for tangles. This is only based on some small examples, however!
Now we need to check 15 movie moves. These come in several types.

**Inverses**  These almost trivial moves insist that the time reverse of a Reidemeister move is also its inverse.

**Circular clips**  These ‘circular’ clips should be equivalent to the identity. These include the 3 ‘hard’ clips that involve a type III Reidemeister move.

**Non-reversible clips**  These pairs of clips should be equivalent, when read either up or down.
Inverse moves

These are boring; we know these are identities, because the two successive steps are a homotopy equivalence and its inverse.
These are ‘hard’; moves 6, 8 and 10 involve the third Reidemeister move.
Each pair of clips should give the same map, whether read up or down.

These ones don’t seem so bad, but there are lots of sign problems lurking here!

Often there’s a sign problem one way but not the other.
Jacobsson’s sign tables

Jacobsson reported sign problems in almost every move! (Unfortunately he used a different numbering.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MM</th>
<th>J#</th>
<th>±</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (mirror)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (mirror)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (mirror)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can calculate the corresponding table for the disoriented theory, as a function of $\omega$.

- At $\omega = 1$, we recover the tables above.
- At $\omega = i$, all the signs agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MM</th>
<th>J#</th>
<th>↓</th>
<th>↑</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 (mirror)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 (mirror)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What about all the orientations!?

- At this point it appears we need to check many orientations of each of these movie moves; up to 16 in the worst case.
- For now, we’ll ignore this, and just check the signs for one oriented representative of each movie move.
- Later, the introduction of ‘confusions’ will deal with the rest.
Bar-Natan’s proof

Bar-Natan gave a simple proof that Khovanov homology is well-defined ‘up-to-sign’.

- Certain tangles are simple, in that the automorphism group of the associated complex consists only of multiples of the identity.
- Each of movie moves 1-10 starts and ends with a ‘simple tangle’, and so must be a multiple of the identity.
- Movie moves 11-15 can be done easily by hand.

In our situation, many small tangles are still ‘simple’ in this sense, although now there are more units in our coefficient ring: \(\pm 1, \pm i\). We’ll make use of this often.
Detecting the sign

Bar-Natan’s result ensures that movie moves are well-defined up to sign. We can relatively easily detect this sign.

- Cobordisms between loopless diagrams are all in non-positive degree.
- Because of the grading shifts in the definition of Khovanov homology, homotopies must be in strictly positive degree.
- Not many homotopies are possible. We call a direct summand of an object in a complex *homotopically isolated* if there are no possible homotopies in or out.
Example

The initial (and final) frame of MM8 is $\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{cc}
\uparrow & \downarrow \\
\downarrow & \uparrow
\end{array}
\end{array}$, whose associated complex is

$\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\uparrow \\
\downarrow
\end{array}
\end{array}$

Neither of the objects have loops, so both objects are isolated. If $f : \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\uparrow \\
\downarrow
\end{array}
\end{array} \rightarrow \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\uparrow \\
\downarrow
\end{array}
\end{array}$ is homotopic to the identity, it must be the identity on the nose; $f - I = dh + hd = 0$.

We can often detect the sign associated to a movie move by choosing an isolated summand in the complex, and observing its image under the movie move.
Twist maps

The twist maps implement the Reidemeister I moves. There are four variations.

Positive right twist

Positive left twist

Negative right twist

Negative left twist
The positive right twist map is

where $t_{+r}$ and $u_{+r}$ are given by

$t_{+r} = \alpha_{+r} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) \left[ 8 - \frac{\omega^2}{2} \right] \left[ \theta \right]$

$u_{+r} = \alpha_{+r} \left[ \theta \right]$
The positive left twist map is

\[ t_{+l} \quad \text{and} \quad u_{+l} \text{ are given by} \]

\[ t_{+l} = \min \left( \frac{1}{2} \# \square - \frac{1}{2} w^2 \right) \]

\[ u_{+l} = \max \left( \# \square \right) \]
Tuck maps

RIIa  The are two variations of the RIIa map, depending on whether the upper strand is on the right or left.

RIIb
RIIa maps
RIIb maps

Here $t_0 = t_1 = 1$, $u_0 = \omega^{-2}$ and $u_1 = -\omega^{-2}$. 

Scott Morrison

Fixing functoriality
Obtaining the RIII map takes some work! We follow through Bar-Natan’s proof of RIII invariance, keeping track of the explicit homotopy equivalence being constructed.

**Lemma**

The RII moves are strong deformation retracts.

**Lemma**

If $f : A^\bullet \to B^\bullet$ is a chain map, and $r : B^\bullet \to C^\bullet$ is a strong deformation retract, $C(rf) \simeq C(f)$. 
Lemma

Each side of the RIII move can be realised as a cone over the morphism switching between two smoothings of the ‘central’ crossing.

We can then compose this morphism with the ‘untuck’ move, a strong deformation retract. Doing this to either side of the RIII move, we obtain the same cone!
Putting this together, we have

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{K}^- &= C(\cdots) \\
&\sim C(\cdots) \\
&= C(\cdots) \\
&\sim C(\cdots) \\
&= \cdots
\end{align*}
\]
Outline
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Scott Morrison
Fixing functoriality
Each side of MM13 consists of a twist move \((t_{+r} \text{ and } t_{+l})\) respectively) followed by a morse move.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Reading down the left side, we get } & 1^2 (\mathbf{\omega} - 2) \\
\text{and on the right } & 1^2 (\mathbf{\omega}^2 + 2) \\
\text{Thus we see the two sides of MM13 differ by a sign of } & -\mathbf{\omega}^2!
\end{align*}
\]
Each side of MM13 consists of a twist move ($t_{+r}$ and $t_{+l}$ respectively) followed by a morse move. Reading down the left side, we get

$$\frac{1}{2} \left( \begin{array}{c} -\omega^2 \\ -\omega^{-2} \end{array} \right)$$

and on the right

$$\frac{1}{2} \left( \begin{array}{c} -\omega^2 \\ + \end{array} \right)$$
Each side of MM13 consists of a twist move ($t_{+r}$ and $t_{+l}$ respectively) followed by a morse move. Reading down the left side, we get

$$\frac{1}{2} \left( \begin{array}{c}
- \omega^2 \\
- \omega^{-2}
\end{array} \right)$$

and on the right

$$\frac{1}{2} \left( \begin{array}{c}
- \omega^2 \\
- \omega^2
\end{array} \right)$$

Thus we see the two sides of MM13 differ by a sign of $-\omega^2$!
Look at the initial frame. The associated complex has one object in homological degree 0; the object we obtain from the ‘positive smoothing’ of each of the four crossings, and it’s homotopically isolated:

We just need to calculate its image under the movie.
Happily, the cone construction tells us that the ‘all positive smoothings’ diagram on one side of a Reidemeister III move is taken, with coefficient one, to the ‘all positive smoothings’ diagram on the other side.

Thus the sign of MM10 is $1^8 = 1$. 
MM8 is the second hardest of the movie moves involving RIII, but it turns out to barely depend on the details of the RIII map. We calculate the image of a homotopically isolated element of the initial complex.
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Fixing functoriality
Following the maps around the circular movie, starting at the left, we obtain the following composition:

\[ \text{composition} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
  \theta L & \circ w^{-1} (d\theta) \circ \frac{1}{2} (8 - w^2 \theta \\
  & = -\frac{1}{2} w^2 \Theta - 1 = -w^2 \text{id} \end{align*} \]

Again, the disoriented theory gets the sign right!
Theorem (M&W)

All the movie moves that we’ve checked come out right in at least one orientation – at \( \omega = 1 \) we see the sign problem Jacobsson observed, but at \( \omega = i \) movie moves really are equivalences.

Which movie moves have we checked? MM1-5, 8, 10-15. Movie moves 6, 7 and 9 still need to be done!
What about all the other orientations?
Confusions

The disoriented cobordism category has some defects.

- There are no cobordisms from the empty diagram to a circle with two clockwise disorientation marks.
- If we extend the invariant to disoriented tangles, there’s no nice equivalence allowing us to slide a disorientation mark past a crossing.

Introducing some new morphisms called ‘confusions’ solve both of these problems.
Definition

Confusions are points on a disorientation line at which the ‘fringe’ changes side. They have a spin framing, recorded with a (possibly twisted) ribbon connecting the confusion to a ‘reference framing’.

Thus the simplest appearance of a confusion is

This is a map between two disoriented strands, which changes the preferred direction of the disorientation mark.
Confusion rules

We can create and annihilate confusion pairs, according to the following rules.

The last line partially checks consistency of disorientation and confusion rules. You can see here that the spinorial nature of confusions is forced upon us.
We can now prove that there is a isomorphism of complexes which allows us to slide a disorientation mark through a crossing. (At the expense of an overall grading and degree shift.)

(Actually, we’re still a bit confused here...) Next we’d like to hope that disorientation slides commute with Reidemeister moves.
This works for the RIII move. We’re not 100% confident yet for the other moves. If this works out, it’s easy to show all the other orientations of movie moves are equivalent to the ones we’ve checked.
Decategorifying

Scott Morrison

Fixing functoriality
What's behind this diagrammatic formalism of 'disorientations' and 'confusions'?
Hmmm... we don’t yet know how to do this!
Khovanov homology as a doubly monoidal 4-category