

Scientific and Philosophical Reflections on Algebraic Topology
and Knot Theory
— With Topological Quantum Computing as an Example

Wanhong
huangwanhong.g.official@gmail.com

May 24, 2026

Abstract

This paper offers a preliminary discussion of algebraic topology and knot theory as they appear in contemporary scientific practice, and of the philosophical reflection that such practice provokes. We organize the discussion around four scientific application areas (molecular biology, quantum field theory, fluid mechanics, and data science) and one extended case study (topological quantum computing), and we use this material as the empirical basis for examining what topological cognition contributes that other modes of scientific reasoning do not. Philosophically, we engage with two questions: the tension between a “state ontology” and a “process ontology” in the context of topological quantum computing, and the methodological resonance between topological thought and the Marxist tradition. Our overall position is that topology offers not an ontological manifesto meant to replace reductionism, but a precise mathematical language for articulating irreducible global entanglement—a language that may, in turn, illuminate philosophical traditions that have long groped for such an articulation without having access to it.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Purpose and Scope	2
1.2	Structure of the Paper	2
2	Preliminaries	3
2.1	Algebraic Topology	3
2.2	Quantum Field Theory and Topological Field Theory	3
2.3	Quantum Computing	4
2.4	Dynamical Systems	5
2.5	Common Structures Across the Preliminaries	5
3	Knot Theory	6
3.1	Knots, Links, and Diagrams	6
3.2	Reidemeister Theory	7
3.3	Elementary Numerical Invariants	7
3.4	The Knot Complement and the Knot Group	8
3.5	Seifert Surfaces and Genus	8
3.6	The Braid Group and the Equivalence Problem	8
3.7	Polynomial Invariants	9
3.8	Categorification and Khovanov Homology	10
3.9	Knots and Dynamical Systems	10

40	4 Knot-Theoretic and Topological Methods Across the Sciences	11
41	4.1 DNA Topology	11
42	4.2 Quantum Field Theory and High-Energy Physics	12
43	4.3 Helicity and Magnetic Reconnection	13
44	4.4 Topological Data Analysis and Dynamical Reconstruction	14
45	4.5 Cross-Cutting Observations	15
46	5 Topological Quantum Computing	16
47	5.1 Anyons and the Braid Group	16
48	5.2 The Topological Hilbert Space	16
49	5.3 TQC and Knot Theory	16
50	5.4 Topological Protection	17
51	6 Philosophical Reflections	17
52	6.1 Eliminative Epistemology	17
53	6.2 Being and Becoming	17
54	6.3 Irreducible Global Entanglement	18
55	6.4 Marxist Philosophy	18
56	6.5 Generative AI	20
57	7 Discussion	20
58	7.1 Findings	20
59	7.2 Limitations	20
60	7.3 Open Questions	20
61	8 Conclusion	21

62 1 Introduction

63 1.1 Purpose and Scope

64 The purpose of this paper is twofold. First, we review how algebraic topology—and specifically
65 knot theory—has come to function as a working tool across several scientific disciplines that, at
66 first glance, have very little in common: the biochemistry of DNA, the formal structure of gauge
67 theories, the dynamics of fluids and plasmas, and the analysis of high-dimensional data. Second,
68 we use this material as the basis for a philosophical discussion of what topology contributes to
69 scientific cognition that local, reductionist, or purely statistical methods cannot. Topological
70 quantum computing is treated at length as a case study because it is the scientific setting where
71 the cognitive resources of topology are most sharply displayed—and where the philosophical
72 stakes are most acute.

73 The paper is preliminary in two senses. It is preliminary in the sense that it surveys a
74 literature without claiming to exhaust it; we cite enough representative work in each area to
75 make the structural points visible, but we do not pretend to a comprehensive review. It is
76 also preliminary in the sense that the philosophical reflections offered in the latter half are
77 programmatic rather than conclusive: they identify what we take to be the right questions, and
78 they sketch the shape of answers we find defensible, but the development of those answers is a
79 longer project.

80 1.2 Structure of the Paper

81 Section 2 establishes the preliminaries: enough algebraic topology, quantum field theory, quan-
82 tum computing, and dynamical systems theory to make the remainder of the paper self-contained
83 for a mathematically literate reader. Section 3 focuses on knot theory itself—its basic problems,

its principal invariants, its relation to dynamical systems. Section 4 reviews knot-theoretic and broader topological applications in four scientific domains. Section 5 develops topological quantum computing as a case study and articulates its relation to knot theory. Section 6 turns to philosophical reflection. Section 7 discusses limitations and open questions; Section 8 concludes.

2 Preliminaries

This section establishes the minimal mathematical and physical background necessary for the remainder of the paper. We present the central notions as formal definitions, with brief explanatory prose between them. Readers familiar with any individual topic may skip the corresponding subsection; the synthesis in §2.5 draws together the structural commonalities that motivate the rest of the paper.

2.1 Algebraic Topology

The basic strategy of algebraic topology is to construct functors from the category **Top** of topological spaces and continuous maps to algebraic categories such as **Grp** (groups) or **Ab** (abelian groups), in such a way that homotopic maps induce equal homomorphisms. The invariants so obtained are by construction homotopy invariants, and therefore detect properties of spaces that are stable under continuous deformation.

Definition 2.1 (Homotopy). *Let X, Y be topological spaces and $f, g : X \rightarrow Y$ continuous maps. A homotopy from f to g is a continuous map $H : X \times [0, 1] \rightarrow Y$ such that $H(x, 0) = f(x)$ and $H(x, 1) = g(x)$ for all $x \in X$. We say f and g are homotopic, and write $f \simeq g$. Two spaces X, Y are homotopy equivalent if there exist continuous maps $f : X \rightarrow Y$ and $g : Y \rightarrow X$ with $g \circ f \simeq \text{id}_X$ and $f \circ g \simeq \text{id}_Y$.*

Definition 2.2 (Fundamental group). *For a pointed space (X, x_0) , the fundamental group $\pi_1(X, x_0)$ is the set of homotopy classes of continuous loops $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ with $\gamma(0) = \gamma(1) = x_0$, equipped with the group operation $[\gamma] \cdot [\eta] = [\gamma * \eta]$ given by concatenation of loops.*

Definition 2.3 (Singular homology). *For a topological space X , let $C_n(X)$ denote the free abelian group on continuous maps $\sigma : \Delta^n \rightarrow X$ from the standard n -simplex. The boundary operator $\partial_n : C_n(X) \rightarrow C_{n-1}(X)$ is defined as an alternating sum of restrictions to faces. The pair $(C_\bullet(X), \partial_\bullet)$ is the singular chain complex, and the n -th singular homology group is*

$$H_n(X; \mathbb{Z}) := \ker \partial_n / \text{im } \partial_{n+1}.$$

Definition 2.4 (Functor). *Let $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}$ be categories. A functor $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ consists of an assignment $X \mapsto F(X)$ on objects and an assignment $(f : X \rightarrow Y) \mapsto (F(f) : F(X) \rightarrow F(Y))$ on morphisms, preserving identities and composition: $F(\text{id}_X) = \text{id}_{F(X)}$ and $F(g \circ f) = F(g) \circ F(f)$.*

Remark 2.5. *Singular homology is functorial: each H_n extends to a functor $H_n(-; \mathbb{Z}) : \mathbf{Top} \rightarrow \mathbf{Ab}$. The fundamental property—homotopy invariance—asserts that homotopic maps induce the same homomorphism on homology and homotopy groups, so any homotopy equivalence induces an isomorphism on all such invariants. Consequently, these algebraic invariants can never distinguish homotopy-equivalent spaces, but they often suffice to distinguish spaces that are not.*

For a comprehensive development, see [24].

2.2 Quantum Field Theory and Topological Field Theory

Quantum field theory (QFT) extends the principles of quantum mechanics to systems with infinitely many degrees of freedom—paradigmatically, fields defined on a spacetime manifold. The central computational object is the path integral, which generalizes the finite-dimensional integration of statistical mechanics to integration over a space of field configurations.

Definition 2.6 (Path integral; formal). Let Φ be a space of field configurations on a manifold M , and let $S : \Phi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an action functional. The partition function is formally written as

$$Z = \int_{\Phi} \mathcal{D}\phi \exp\left(\frac{i}{\hbar} S[\phi]\right),$$

and the expectation value of an observable $\mathcal{O} : \Phi \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is

$$\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle = \frac{1}{Z} \int_{\Phi} \mathcal{D}\phi \mathcal{O}[\phi] \exp\left(\frac{i}{\hbar} S[\phi]\right).$$

The notation $\mathcal{D}\phi$ denotes a putative measure on Φ whose rigorous construction requires additional structure (e.g., a Wick rotation to Euclidean signature, or a regulator).

Definition 2.7 (Topological quantum field theory; Atiyah). A $(d+1)$ -dimensional topological quantum field theory is a symmetric monoidal functor

$$Z : \mathbf{Cob}_{d+1} \longrightarrow \mathbf{Vect}_k,$$

where $\mathbf{Cob}_{d+1}$ is the category whose objects are closed oriented d -manifolds and whose morphisms are oriented $(d+1)$ -dimensional cobordisms between them, and $\mathbf{Vect}_k$ is the category of finite-dimensional vector spaces over a field k , equipped with tensor product as monoidal structure [4].

Definition 2.8 (Chern–Simons action). Let G be a compact, simply-connected Lie group with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, let M be a closed oriented 3-manifold, and let A be a connection on a principal G -bundle over M . For an integer level $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, the Chern–Simons action at level k is

$$S_{\text{CS}}[A] = \frac{k}{4\pi} \int_M \text{tr} \left(A \wedge dA + \frac{2}{3} A \wedge A \wedge A \right).$$

Remark 2.9. The defining feature of any TQFT, exhibited explicitly by Chern–Simons theory, is the absence of metric dependence in the action: $S_{\text{CS}}[A]$ depends only on the connection A and the orientation of M , not on any Riemannian or Lorentzian metric. As a consequence, all observables computed from this action are topological invariants of M together with whatever auxiliary data (e.g., a knot in M , a choice of representation) is supplied. Witten [57] showed that the expectation values of Wilson loops in $SU(2)$ Chern–Simons theory recover the Jones polynomial of knot theory.

2.3 Quantum Computing

Definition 2.10 (Qubit). A qubit is a quantum-mechanical two-state system whose pure states are unit vectors in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^2$, taken up to overall phase. An n -qubit system has Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_n = (\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes n}$ of complex dimension 2^n .

Definition 2.11 (Quantum gate; quantum circuit). A quantum gate on n qubits is a unitary operator $U \in U(2^n)$ acting on $\mathcal{H}_n$. A universal gate set is a finite set $\mathcal{G}$ of quantum gates such that any unitary operator on any number of qubits can be approximated to arbitrary precision (in operator norm) by finite compositions of elements of $\mathcal{G}$ acting on suitable qubit subsets. A quantum circuit is a finite composition of such gates.

Definition 2.12 (Decoherence). For an open quantum system with Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_S$ coupled to an environment $\mathcal{H}_E$, the reduced density matrix is $\rho_S = \text{tr}_E \rho_{SE}$. Decoherence is the process by which the off-diagonal elements of ρ_S , in a preferred basis selected by the system–environment interaction, decay in time; equivalently, it is the loss of quantum-mechanical phase coherence available to system-only observables.

Definition 2.13 (Quantum error-correcting code). An $[[n, k, d]]$ quantum error-correcting code is a 2^k -dimensional subspace $\mathcal{C} \subseteq (\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes n}$ such that for any pair of correctable error operators E_a, E_b of weight less than $d/2$, the relations $P E_a^\dagger E_b P = \lambda_{ab} P$ hold for some scalars λ_{ab} , where P is the projector onto $\mathcal{C}$. The integer d is the code distance, and the code can detect any error of weight $< d$ and correct any error of weight $\leq \lfloor (d-1)/2 \rfloor$.

Remark 2.14. The principal obstacle to scalable quantum computation is decoherence (Def. 2.12). The standard mitigation strategy is to encode logical qubits redundantly using quantum error-correcting codes (Def. 2.13); the threshold theorem guarantees that arbitrarily long computations are possible provided the physical error rate is below a fixed threshold. Topological quantum computing, developed in §5, offers an alternative: encoding information in degrees of freedom that are intrinsically insensitive to local perturbations. The standard textbook reference is [42].

2.4 Dynamical Systems

Definition 2.15 (Dynamical system). A continuous-time dynamical system on a smooth manifold M is a smooth map $\Phi : \mathbb{R} \times M \rightarrow M$ satisfying $\Phi(0, \cdot) = \text{id}_M$ and $\Phi(s+t, \cdot) = \Phi(s, \Phi(t, \cdot))$ for all $s, t \in \mathbb{R}$. The manifold M is called the phase space; the map $\Phi_t := \Phi(t, \cdot)$ is the time- t evolution.

Definition 2.16 (Periodic orbit). A point $x \in M$ is periodic of period $T > 0$ under Φ if $\Phi_T(x) = x$ and $\Phi_t(x) \neq x$ for $0 < t < T$. The image $\gamma_x := \{\Phi_t(x) : t \in [0, T]\}$ is a closed curve in M called the periodic orbit through x .

Definition 2.17 (Attractor). A compact Φ -invariant subset $A \subseteq M$ is an attractor if there exists an open neighborhood U of A such that $\bigcap_{t \geq 0} \Phi_t(U) = A$ and the map $t \mapsto \Phi_t(x)$ accumulates on A for every $x \in U$. An attractor is called strange if it has fractal (non-integer Hausdorff) dimension.

Definition 2.18 (Topological entropy). Let $f : X \rightarrow X$ be a continuous self-map of a compact metric space (X, d) . For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, a set $E \subseteq X$ is (n, ε) -separated if for any two distinct $x, y \in E$ there exists $0 \leq k < n$ with $d(f^k(x), f^k(y)) > \varepsilon$. Let $s(n, \varepsilon)$ denote the maximum cardinality of an (n, ε) -separated set. The topological entropy of f is

$$h_{\text{top}}(f) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log s(n, \varepsilon).$$

Remark 2.19. Two structures connect dynamics to topology in ways relevant to the remainder of the paper. First, in dimension three, periodic orbits (Def. 2.16) are closed curves embedded in M and therefore are knots; the topological types of these knots are dynamical invariants. Second, topological entropy (Def. 2.18) is a topological invariant of the conjugacy class of f and measures the exponential growth rate of orbit complexity; it provides a quantitative connection between dynamical complexity and the topology of orbit space. The Birman–Williams template construction [10] provides a concrete classification of periodic-orbit knots for a class of chaotic three-dimensional flows; this will be revisited in §3.

2.5 Common Structures Across the Preliminaries

The four subjects introduced above—algebraic topology, topological quantum field theory, quantum computing, and dynamical systems—are heterogeneous in their origins and proximate concerns, but they share three structural features that recur throughout the remainder of this paper.

(i) **Equivalence under structure-preserving transformations.** Each subject is organized around a notion of equivalence under an appropriate class of transformations: homotopy equivalence between spaces (Def. 2.1); cobordism between manifolds in TQFT (Def. 2.7); unitary equivalence between quantum states; ambient isotopy between knots (introduced in §3); and topological conjugacy between dynamical systems. In each case, the invariants of interest are precisely those quantities that depend only on the equivalence class, never on the specific representative within it.

(ii) **Functorial assignment of algebraic objects.** Each subject supplies a functor (Def. 2.4) from a category of geometric or physical objects to a category of algebraic objects: singular homology gives $H_\bullet : \mathbf{Top} \rightarrow \mathbf{Ab}$; an Atiyah TQFT gives $Z : \mathbf{Cob}_{d+1} \rightarrow \mathbf{Vect}_k$; the theory of anyons (developed in §5) gives a functor from configurations of anyons to morphisms in a modular tensor category; the assignment of periodic-orbit knot types in three-dimensional flows gives a map from dynamical systems to knot equivalence classes. Functoriality is what guarantees that the algebraic invariants respect the structural relations among the original geometric objects.

(iii) **The local-to-global tension.** In each subject, a distinguished class of properties depends only on global structure and cannot be recovered from any amount of purely local information. The homology groups of a space cannot be read off from any local neighborhood; the topological charge of a gauge configuration is a global integral; the quantum information stored in a topological code cannot be accessed by any local measurement; the knot type of a periodic orbit cannot be determined from observations on any proper sub-arc. The recovery of these global quantities from local data—when it is possible at all—requires integration, contraction, or some other globalizing operation over a non-trivial domain.

These three features are not independent: functoriality (ii) is the mechanism by which equivalence (i) is respected, and the local-to-global tension (iii) is what makes the resulting invariants informative beyond what local methods could supply. Together they constitute what we will identify, in §6, as the cognitive contribution of topology to scientific reasoning. The remainder of the paper develops them: first in the technical core of knot theory (§3), then in their applied manifestations across four scientific domains (§4), then in the case study of topological quantum computing (§5), and finally in the philosophical reflection these structures invite (§6).

3 Knot Theory

This section presents knot theory in the structural detail necessary for the case study and the philosophical discussion that follow. We organize the material as a sequence of definitions and theorems, with the central problem—the equivalence problem for knots—and its successive algebraic resolutions as the organizing thread.

3.1 Knots, Links, and Diagrams

Definition 3.1 (Knot). *A knot is a smooth (equivalently, piecewise-linear) embedding $K : S^1 \hookrightarrow S^3$ of the circle into the three-sphere. We routinely identify K with its image $K(S^1) \subseteq S^3$.*

Definition 3.2 (Link). *A link of n components is a smooth embedding $L : \bigsqcup_{i=1}^n S^1 \hookrightarrow S^3$. A knot is the case $n = 1$.*

Definition 3.3 (Ambient isotopy). *Two knots (or links) $K_0, K_1 \subseteq S^3$ are ambient-isotopic if there exists a continuous family $\{h_t\}_{t \in [0,1]}$ of orientation-preserving self-homeomorphisms of S^3 such that $h_0 = \text{id}_{S^3}$ and $h_1(K_0) = K_1$. The relation of ambient isotopy is the standard notion of knot equivalence.*

Definition 3.4 (Knot diagram). *A knot diagram for K is the image of K under a regular projection $p : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ —one whose only singularities are transverse double points—together with over/under-crossing information assigned at each double point.*

The central problem of knot theory, which organizes the remainder of this section, is the following:

The equivalence problem. Given two knot diagrams D_1 and D_2 , decide whether the corresponding knots K_1, K_2 are ambient-isotopic.

The problem is non-trivial because the space of orientation-preserving self-homeomorphisms of S^3 is infinite-dimensional, and there is no *a priori* bound on how complicated an intermediate configuration may have to be in order to deform one knot into another. The history of knot theory is, to a significant extent, the history of progressively more powerful algebraic devices for circumventing this difficulty.

3.2 Reidemeister Theory

The first algebraic reduction of the equivalence problem is due to Reidemeister: continuous ambient isotopy reduces to discrete combinatorial manipulations on diagrams.

Definition 3.5 (Reidemeister moves). *The Reidemeister moves are three classes of local transformations of knot diagrams (Figure not shown):*

R1: *Twist/untwist a single strand, introducing or removing a loop with one self-crossing.*

R2: *Push two strands across one another, introducing or removing a pair of canceling crossings.*

R3: *Slide a strand over (or under) a crossing of two other strands.*

A planar isotopy is a continuous deformation of the diagram in $\mathbb{R}^2$ that introduces no new crossings.

Theorem 3.6 (Reidemeister). *Two knot diagrams D_1, D_2 represent ambient-isotopic knots if and only if D_1 and D_2 are related by a finite sequence of planar isotopies and Reidemeister moves $R1, R2, R3$.*

Remark 3.7. *Reidemeister’s theorem reduces a topological equivalence problem in three dimensions to a combinatorial equivalence problem on two-dimensional diagrams. It does not, however, give an algorithm to decide equivalence: one still does not know in advance how many moves may be required, nor in which order. The remaining sections of §3 develop knot invariants—quantities preserved under Reidemeister moves—that yield necessary conditions for equivalence and so distinguish many knot pairs that visual inspection cannot.*

3.3 Elementary Numerical Invariants

The simplest invariants assign integers to knots.

Definition 3.8 (Crossing number). *The crossing number of a knot K is*

$$c(K) := \min\{\# \text{ crossings of } D : D \text{ is a diagram of } K\}.$$

Definition 3.9 (Unknotting number). *The unknotting number $u(K)$ is the minimum, over all diagrams D of K , of the number of crossing changes (passing one strand through another at a crossing) required to transform D into a diagram of the unknot.*

These invariants are easy to define but generally hard to compute, since the minimum is taken over the infinite set of all diagrams of K . Despite (or because of) their elementary character, exact values of $u(K)$ remain unknown for many specific small knots.

3.4 The Knot Complement and the Knot Group

A second family of invariants is constructed not from the knot itself but from its complement in S^3 .

Definition 3.10 (Knot complement). *Let $K \subseteq S^3$ be a knot, and let $N(K)$ be an open tubular neighborhood of K . The knot complement is the compact 3-manifold-with-boundary*

$$X_K := S^3 \setminus N(K).$$

Definition 3.11 (Knot group). *The knot group of K is the fundamental group $\pi_1(X_K)$ of its complement (with respect to a chosen basepoint).*

Theorem 3.12 (Gordon–Luecke, 1989). *Two knots in S^3 are ambient-isotopic if and only if their complements are homeomorphic via an orientation-preserving homeomorphism.*

Remark 3.13. *Gordon–Luecke says that all topological information about a knot is encoded in the homeomorphism type of its complement. The knot group $\pi_1(X_K)$ is therefore an extremely strong invariant in principle—though, like Reidemeister equivalence, it is generally difficult to compute presentations of and to decide isomorphism between such groups.*

3.5 Seifert Surfaces and Genus

A third source of invariants comes from spanning surfaces.

Definition 3.14 (Seifert surface). *A Seifert surface for an oriented knot K is a compact, connected, oriented surface $\Sigma \subseteq S^3$ whose oriented boundary $\partial\Sigma$ equals K .*

Theorem 3.15 (Seifert, 1934). *Every oriented knot in S^3 admits a Seifert surface.*

Definition 3.16 (Genus of a knot). *The genus of an oriented knot K is*

$$g(K) := \min\{g(\Sigma) : \Sigma \text{ is a Seifert surface for } K\},$$

where $g(\Sigma)$ denotes the topological genus of the surface Σ .

The genus is one of the most geometrically meaningful invariants: $g(K) = 0$ if and only if K is the unknot, and genus is additive under connect sum, $g(K_1 \# K_2) = g(K_1) + g(K_2)$.

3.6 The Braid Group and the Equivalence Problem

A different approach to the equivalence problem proceeds by reducing knots to algebraic data through the braid group.

Definition 3.17 (Braid group). *The braid group on n strands is the group*

$$B_n := \left\langle \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n-1} \left| \begin{array}{ll} \sigma_i \sigma_j = \sigma_j \sigma_i & \text{for } |i - j| \geq 2, \\ \sigma_i \sigma_{i+1} \sigma_i = \sigma_{i+1} \sigma_i \sigma_{i+1} & \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq n - 2 \end{array} \right. \right\rangle.$$

The second family of relations is called the braid relation or Yang–Baxter relation. Geometrically, σ_i represents the elementary crossing of strand i over strand $i + 1$.

To convert a braid into a knot or link, one connects the bottom endpoints of the braid to the top endpoints along disjoint arcs running around the outside; this is the *plat closure* or *braid closure*.

Theorem 3.18 (Alexander, 1923). *Every link $L \subseteq S^3$ is ambient-isotopic to the closure of some braid $\beta \in B_n$ for some n .*

Theorem 3.19 (Markov, 1936). *Two braid closures $\widehat{\beta}_1$ and $\widehat{\beta}_2$ (with $\beta_1 \in B_n$, $\beta_2 \in B_m$) represent ambient-isotopic links if and only if β_1 and β_2 are related by a finite sequence of:*

- Conjugation: $\beta \mapsto \alpha\beta\alpha^{-1}$ in B_n ;
- Stabilization: $\beta \mapsto \beta\sigma_n^{\pm 1}$, mapping $B_n \hookrightarrow B_{n+1}$;
- and their inverses.

Remark 3.20. *The braid group is the precise mathematical object that organizes both the polynomial invariants of §3.7 and the anyonic exchange statistics of §5. The same algebraic object that classifies braid closures up to Markov equivalence also classifies, in two-dimensional quantum systems, the possible non-trivial exchange statistics of identical particles. This is not a coincidence but a structural fact: in both cases, B_n arises as the fundamental group of an ordered configuration space modulo the symmetric group.*

3.7 Polynomial Invariants

The most computable family of invariants assigns to each oriented knot or link a Laurent polynomial in one or several variables.

Definition 3.21 (Skein triple). *A skein triple consists of three oriented link diagrams L_+ , L_- , L_0 that agree outside a small disk and within the disk differ as follows: L_+ has a positive crossing of two strands, L_- has a negative crossing of the same two strands, and L_0 has the oriented resolution (no crossing).*

Definition 3.22 (Alexander polynomial). *The Alexander polynomial $\Delta_K(t) \in \mathbb{Z}[t^{1/2}, t^{-1/2}]$ of an oriented link L is the unique invariant satisfying the skein relation*

$$\Delta_{L_+}(t) - \Delta_{L_-}(t) = (t^{1/2} - t^{-1/2}) \Delta_{L_0}(t),$$

together with the normalization $\Delta_{\bigcirc}(t) = 1$ on the unknot.

Definition 3.23 (Kauffman bracket). *The Kauffman bracket $\langle D \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}[A, A^{-1}]$ of an unoriented link diagram D is defined by the following local relations:*

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \bigcirc \rangle &= 1, \\ \langle D \sqcup \bigcirc \rangle &= -(A^2 + A^{-2}) \langle D \rangle, \\ \langle \text{crossing} \rangle &= A \langle \text{horizontal smoothing} \rangle + A^{-1} \langle \text{vertical smoothing} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

The bracket is invariant under R2 and R3 but transforms by a multiplicative factor of $-A^{\pm 3}$ under R1; correcting for this yields an honest ambient isotopy invariant.

Definition 3.24 (Jones polynomial). *The Jones polynomial $V_L(q) \in \mathbb{Z}[q^{1/2}, q^{-1/2}]$ of an oriented link L is the unique invariant satisfying*

$$q^{-1} V_{L_+}(q) - q V_{L_-}(q) = (q^{1/2} - q^{-1/2}) V_{L_0}(q),$$

with $V_{\bigcirc}(q) = 1$.

Definition 3.25 (HOMFLY-PT polynomial). *The HOMFLY-PT polynomial $P_L(\alpha, z) \in \mathbb{Z}[\alpha^{\pm 1}, z^{\pm 1}]$ is the two-variable invariant satisfying*

$$\alpha P_{L_+} - \alpha^{-1} P_{L_-} = z P_{L_0},$$

with $P_{\bigcirc} = 1$. The Jones polynomial is the specialization $\alpha = q^{-1}$, $z = q^{1/2} - q^{-1/2}$; the Alexander polynomial is the specialization $\alpha = 1$, $z = t^{1/2} - t^{-1/2}$.

Remark 3.26. *The Jones polynomial has a distinguished epistemological place. It was discovered by Jones [26] not from inside knot theory but from his work on von Neumann algebras and subfactors: the same braid-group relation that defines V on links arises in the index theory of II_1 factors. This provenance foreshadowed a structural connection between knot theory and quantum physics that was fully articulated by Witten [57], who identified V_L with the Wilson loop expectation in $SU(2)$ Chern–Simons theory (§5). Unlike the Alexander polynomial, the Jones polynomial distinguishes a knot from its mirror image in general: it detects chirality.*

3.8 Categorification and Khovanov Homology

A further refinement of the polynomial invariants is provided by their *categorification*: a passage from numerical invariants to richer chain-complex-valued invariants, whose graded Euler characteristic recovers the original polynomial.

Definition 3.27 (Khovanov homology; sketch). *Let D be a diagram of an oriented link L with n crossings. At each crossing one chooses one of two local resolutions (called the 0- and 1-smoothing), yielding 2^n planar configurations indexed by vertices of the cube $\{0,1\}^n$. To each such resolution—a disjoint union of k circles—one assigns the graded $\mathbb{Z}$ -module $V^{\otimes k}$, where $V = \mathbb{Z}[x]/(x^2)$ is the rank-two Frobenius algebra. The edges of the cube are labeled by saddle cobordisms, which translate into multiplication or comultiplication maps in V . After appropriate grading shifts, the total complex of this cube is the Khovanov chain complex $C^{\bullet,\bullet}(D)$; its bigraded homology*

$$\text{Kh}^{i,j}(L) := H^i(C^{\bullet,j}(D), d)$$

is a bigraded abelian group invariant of L [29].

Theorem 3.28 (Khovanov, 1999). *The graded Euler characteristic of Khovanov homology recovers the Jones polynomial:*

$$\sum_{i,j} (-1)^i q^j \text{rk Kh}^{i,j}(L) = (q + q^{-1}) V_L(q^2).$$

Remark 3.29. *Khovanov homology is a strictly stronger invariant than the Jones polynomial: distinct knots with equal Jones polynomial can be distinguished by their Khovanov homology. More structurally, Khovanov homology lifts the polynomial-valued invariant V_L to a chain-complex-valued invariant whose maps between knots (induced by knot cobordisms in $S^3 \times [0,1]$) carry additional information. This is the prototypical instance of categorification, in which numerical invariants are revealed as the shadow—in the form of an Euler characteristic—of underlying categorical structure. Subsequent work has extended categorification to the HOMFLY–PT polynomial [30] and given physical interpretations via gauge theory [58].*

3.9 Knots and Dynamical Systems

The final connection of this section is between knot theory and the dynamical systems introduced in §2. Periodic orbits of a three-dimensional flow are closed curves in three-dimensional phase space, and therefore are knots; their isotopy classes are dynamical invariants.

Definition 3.30 (Template). *A template (or branched 2-manifold) is a compact branched surface $\mathcal{T}$ embedded in S^3 , carrying a semi-flow with the property that every periodic orbit of the semi-flow lies in $\mathcal{T}$, and conversely every periodic orbit of $\mathcal{T}$ corresponds to a periodic orbit of the ambient flow it models [10].*

Definition 3.31 (Lorenz knot). *A Lorenz knot is the isotopy class of a periodic orbit of the Lorenz dynamical system (or, equivalently, of any periodic orbit lying on the Lorenz template).*

Theorem 3.32 (Birman–Williams, 1983). *The set of Lorenz knots can be classified combinatorially via words in a two-symbol semigroup describing how a periodic orbit traverses the two “ears” of the Lorenz template. Moreover, every Lorenz knot is:*

- (i) prime: *it does not decompose as a non-trivial connect sum;*
- (ii) fibered: *its complement X_K fibers over S^1 ;*
- (iii) positive: *it admits a diagram with only positive crossings.*

Remark 3.33. *The Birman–Williams theorem makes precise a striking phenomenon. The Lorenz system, the historical exemplar of chaotic behavior, displays orbital trajectories that are essentially unpredictable in detail. Yet the topological types of its periodic orbits—taken as knots in three-space—form a highly restricted and algebraically classifiable family. Chaos at the level of individual orbits coexists with a strict topological order at the level of orbit knottedness. This is precisely the kind of phenomenon (local complexity, global structure) that justifies treating topology not as an ornament on dynamical systems but as a genuinely irreducible level of description.*

4 Knot-Theoretic and Topological Methods Across the Sciences

This section reviews how knot theory and broader topological methods have entered four scientific domains. In each subsection we identify the scientific problem, the form taken by the topological intervention, and the principal results, accompanied by a comprehensive reference table organized by sub-theme and chronology.

4.1 DNA Topology

DNA in a living cell is a remarkably long molecule confined in a remarkably small space: human DNA, fully unwound, would extend roughly two meters, yet it must reside in a nucleus only microns across. The biological consequence is that DNA is highly compacted, supercoiled, catenated, and frequently knotted—and these topological states must be actively managed by the cell. The enzymes responsible for this management, the *topoisomerases*, do so by introducing controlled cuts in the DNA backbone, allowing strands to pass through one another, and resealing the cut. The mathematical understanding of these processes has developed in close dialogue with knot theory.

The application of knot theory begins with the conservation law $Lk = Tw + Wr$ relating linking number, twist, and writhe [21, 56]. This formula provides the basic invariant accounting for the topology of double-stranded closed DNA. The pioneering experimental identification of DNA knots was carried out by Wasserman and Cozzarelli [15] using gel electrophoresis combined with electron microscopy of protein-coated DNA, which permitted direct visualization of crossing signs in the diagrams. The theoretical apparatus connecting enzymatic mechanism to topological outcome was developed by Ernst and Sumners [20] as the *tangle calculus*, providing a systematic algebraic framework for predicting the topological outcomes of site-specific recombination and for inferring enzyme mechanisms from observed product distributions.

More recent work has substantially extended both the experimental reach and the theoretical scope. Stasiak and collaborators [49, 54] established the relation between ideal knot geometry and the electrophoretic mobility used to identify knot type, and developed the theoretical framework for topology simplification by type II topoisomerases. Marenduzzo and collaborators [37] analyzed the dynamics of supercoiled DNA with complex knots using coarse-grained simulations. Valdés et al. [53] showed that transcriptional supercoiling boosts topoisomerase II-mediated knotting of intracellular DNA, providing one of the clearest in vivo demonstrations of knot–topology coupling. The topological viewpoint has also been extended to viral genome packaging [36] and to the design and assessment of topoisomerase-inhibiting cancer drugs.

Table 1: Selected literature on DNA topology and knot theory.

Reference	Year	Contribution	Topological tool
White [56]	1969	Self-linking integral; foundation of $Lk = Tw + Wr$	Gauss linking integral
Fuller [21]	1971	Writhing number of a space curve	Writhe; ribbon geometry
Wasserman & Cozzarelli [15]	1986	Experimental identification of DNA knots in recombination products	Crossing signs via EM
Ernst & Sumners [20]	1990	Tangle calculus for site-specific recombination	Rational tangles, 2-bridge knots
Stasiak et al. [49]	1996	Ideal knot geometry and gel mobility	Crossing number, ideal knots
Sumners [50]	1995	Survey for mathematicians of enzyme topology	Tangle equations
Vologodskii et al. [54]	2001	Mechanism of topology simplification by type II topoisomerases	Statistical knot ensembles
Bates & Maxwell [7]	2005	Standard reference text on DNA topology	Lk, Tw, Wr throughout
Marenduzzo et al. [36]	2009	DNA-knotting in bacteriophage capsids	Knot spectra; polymer topology
Buck [12]	2009	AMS short course survey on DNA topology	Tangles, rational knots
Marenduzzo et al. [37]	2018	Dynamics of supercoiled DNA with complex knots	Coarse-grained polymer + knot ID
Valdés et al. [53]	2019	Transcriptional supercoiling drives Topo II knotting in vivo	In vivo knot detection

4.2 Quantum Field Theory and High-Energy Physics

Knot theory has had a transformative effect on theoretical high-energy physics through several interrelated developments. The first is the discovery by Witten [57] that the Jones polynomial admits a natural three-dimensional quantum field theoretic interpretation as the expectation value of a Wilson loop in Chern–Simons theory with gauge group $SU(2)$. The mathematical refinement of this interpretation was provided by Reshetikhin and Turaev [44], who constructed three-manifold invariants from quantum groups and modular tensor categories. The axiomatic formalization of topological quantum field theory itself, due to Atiyah [4], identifies a TQFT with a symmetric monoidal functor from a category of cobordisms to a category of vector spaces.

A parallel development is the role of knotted and linked structures in *loop quantum gravity*, where states of the gravitational field are represented by spin networks, and where knot-like equivalence classes of these networks form the physical Hilbert space [3, 6, 46]. In this setting, knots are not merely useful auxiliary objects; they represent excitations of geometry itself, and topological invariants discriminate physically distinct gravitational states.

The categorification program, initiated by Khovanov [29] and continued by Khovanov–Rozansky [30] and others, produces homological invariants that lift polynomial invariants to bigraded chain complexes. Witten [58] subsequently provided a physical interpretation of Khovanov homology in terms of gauge-theoretic moduli spaces, completing a striking circle: knot polynomials interpreted by physics, then categorified by mathematics, then re-interpreted by physics.

Table 2: Selected literature on knot theory in QFT and high-energy physics.

Reference	Year	Contribution	Topological tool
Jones [26]	1985	Jones polynomial via von Neumann algebras	Subfactors; Hecke algebra
Atiyah [4]	1988	Axiomatic definition of TQFT	Symmetric monoidal functor
Witten [57]	1989	Jones polynomial as Wilson loop in $SU(2)$ Chern–Simons	Path integral; gauge theory
Reshetikhin & Turaev [44]	1991	3-manifold invariants from quantum groups	Modular tensor categories
Atiyah [5]	1990	Synthetic textbook on knots and geometry/physics	Multiple invariants
Rovelli & Smolin [46]	1995	Spin network states in loop quantum gravity	$SU(2)$ networks
Baez [6]	1996	Spin networks as gauge-theoretic states	Cylindrical functions
Khovanov [29]	2000	Categorification of the Jones polynomial	Bigraded chain complex
Kauffman [27]	2001	Textbook synthesis of knot–physics connections	Bracket, state sum
Ashtekar & Lewandowski [3]	2004	Review of LQG and its topological structure	Connection variables
Khovanov & Rozansky [30]	2008	Triply-graded knot homology for HOMFLY-PT	Matrix factorizations
Witten [58]	2011	Gauge-theoretic interpretation of Khovanov homology	Five-dimensional SYM

4.3 Helicity and Magnetic Reconnection

The topological structure of vortex lines in an inviscid fluid is a conserved quantity, in a sense made precise by Moffatt [39], who showed that the *kinetic helicity*

$$\mathcal{H} = \int_V \mathbf{u} \cdot (\nabla \times \mathbf{u}) dV$$

is conserved by Euler flow and admits a topological interpretation as a sum of linking numbers and self-linking numbers of the vortex lines. Helicity is therefore a topological invariant that becomes a fluid-dynamical conservation law. The same construction applies in ideal magnetohydrodynamics, where the magnetic helicity controls the topological state of the magnetic field; Berger and Field [8] established the general theory of magnetic helicity, and Taylor [52] showed that in resistive plasmas, magnetic helicity is approximately conserved even when energy is dissipated, leading to the principle of *Taylor relaxation* toward minimum-energy force-free states.

In solar and astrophysical contexts, the buildup and abrupt release of magnetic helicity is implicated in solar flares and coronal mass ejections via *magnetic reconnection*. The topological viewpoint provides not only a conservation law but a diagnostic for when energetic events are imminent: a magnetic configuration that is topologically far from a force-free equilibrium has stored energy that may be released through reconnection.

A striking recent development is the laboratory creation of knotted vortices in classical fluids [32], which makes the abstract topological invariants directly observable and opens a regime in which the predictions of topological fluid dynamics can be tested empirically. Subsequent work by the same group [33, 47] has tracked the fate of helicity through topology-changing reconnections in both viscous and superfluid settings, finding that helicity is transferred from links and knots to coiling and writhe in a quantitatively predictable manner. Arnold and Khesin [2] provide the

Table 3: Selected literature on topological fluid dynamics and magnetohydrodynamics.

Reference	Year	Contribution	Topological tool
Woltjer [59]	1958	Conservation of magnetic helicity in ideal MHD	Magnetic helicity
Moreau [40]	1961	Hydrodynamic helicity invariant	Kinetic helicity
Moffatt [39]	1969	Helicity as sum of vortex linking numbers	Linking, self-linking
Taylor [52]	1974	Helicity-preserving plasma relaxation	Helicity-constrained variation
Berger & Field [8]	1984	General theory of magnetic helicity in open systems	Relative helicity
Arnold & Khesin [2]	1998	Canonical text on topological hydrodynamics	Diffeomorphism groups, asymptotic linking
Ricca & Berger [45]	1996	Topological ideas in MHD: an introduction	Helicity, linking, writhe
Kleckner & Irvine [32]	2013	Laboratory creation of knotted vortices	3D-printed hydrofoils; experimental knot creation
Scheeler et al. [47]	2014	Helicity conservation across scales in reconnections	Direct measurement of Lk, Tw, Wr
Kleckner et al. [33]	2016	How superfluid vortex knots untie	GPE simulations of knotted vortices
Laing et al. [34]	2015	Conservation of writhe helicity under reconnection	Writhe geometry

475 4.4 Topological Data Analysis and Dynamical Reconstruction

476 The most rapidly growing area of topological methods in the sciences is *topological data analysis*
477 (TDA), which applies algebraic-topological invariants—most prominently persistent homology—
478 to finite point cloud data drawn from some underlying space. Persistent homology, as developed
479 by Edelsbrunner, Letscher, and Zomorodian [18] and refined by Zomorodian and Carlsson [60],
480 produces a multiscale summary (the *persistence diagram* or equivalently the *barcode*, [22]) that
481 records the topological features of a filtration of simplicial complexes built from the data; features
482 that persist across many scales are interpreted as robust, while features that are short-lived are
483 interpreted as noise. The theoretical foundation is completed by the *stability theorem* of Cohen-
484 Steiner, Edelsbrunner, and Harer [16], which guarantees that persistence diagrams are stable
485 under small perturbations of the input data—a non-trivial property that legitimates TDA as a
486 statistical tool. Carlsson [14] provided the influential conceptual survey that brought TDA into
487 the mainstream of data science.

488 The connection to dynamical systems comes through Takens’ embedding theorem [51], which
489 guarantees that for generic dynamical systems and observation functions, the delay embedding
490 of a scalar time series reconstructs a phase space diffeomorphic to the original attractor. The
491 combination of delay embedding with persistent homology, articulated systematically by Perea
492 and Harer [43], produces a pipeline by which the topological invariants of an attractor can
493 be extracted directly from observational time series. This methodology has been applied to
494 detecting pre-seizure transitions in electroencephalography data [9], identifying regime shifts in
495 financial time series [23], classifying dynamical regimes [28], and analyzing the geometry of neural
496 population activity.

497 Beyond persistence, the *Mapper* algorithm of Singh, Mémoli, and Carlsson [48] produces
498 visualizable simplicial-complex summaries of high-dimensional data that have been particularly
499 influential in oncology and single-cell biology. Recent surveys document the rapid expansion

of TDA into molecular sciences [25], oncology [13], materials science, and beyond. A recent comprehensive review [55] extends the discussion to topological deep learning, including methods that move beyond persistent homology proper.

Table 4: Selected literature on TDA and topological methods in data science.

Reference	Year	Contribution	Topological tool
Takens [51]	1981	Delay-embedding reconstruction theorem	Embedding into $\mathbb{R}^{2d+1}$
Edelsbrunner, Letscher, & Zomorodian [18]	2002	Persistence and simplification	Persistent homology
Zomorodian & Carlsson [60]	2005	Computing persistent homology	Algebraic algorithm
Cohen-Steiner et al. [16]	2007	Stability of persistence diagrams	Bottleneck distance
Singh, Mémoli, & Carlsson [48]	2007	Mapper algorithm	Nerve construction
Ghrist [22]	2008	Barcodes: persistent homology overview	Persistence intervals
Carlsson [14]	2009	Conceptual survey of TDA	Filtrations, modules
Edelsbrunner & Harer [17]	2010	Textbook of computational topology	Simplicial complexes
Bubenik [11]	2015	Persistence landscapes	Stable functional summary
Perea & Harer [43]	2015	Sliding-window persistence for signals	Takens + persistent H_1
Khasawneh & Munch [28]	2016	Stability and chaos in dynamical systems via TDA	Sliding window + persistence
Bukkuri, Andor, & Darcy [13]	2021	TDA in oncology	Persistence; Mapper
Hensel et al. [25]	2021	Survey of TDA in ML	Differentiable persistence
Wang et al. [55]	2025	TDA and topological deep learning: review beyond PH	Persistent Laplacians, sheaves

4.5 Cross-Cutting Observations

Tables 1–4 make visible a structural similarity across the four domains. In each case, the topological intervention is articulated through one or more of three mechanisms:

- (i) *A conservation law of topological origin*: the $Lk = Tw + Wr$ formula in DNA topology, the helicity invariants in fluid mechanics, the topological charge in gauge theories.
- (ii) *A discrete classification problem*: knot identification in DNA after enzymatic action, the identification of distinct gravitational states in LQG, the classification of dynamical regimes via persistent homology.
- (iii) *A diagnostic of global structure not visible locally*: detecting topology change in vortex reconnection, identifying long-range entanglement in topological phases of matter, detecting regime shifts in time series.

The fact that the same three mechanisms recur across the four disparate domains is not accidental. It reflects what we will argue in Section 6 is the substantive epistemological contribution of topological thinking—the systematic articulation of global structure that local methods cannot access.

5 Topological Quantum Computing

5.1 Anyons and the Braid Group

In two-dimensional systems, the exchange statistics of identical particles are not restricted to the bosonic and fermionic alternatives that exhaust the three-dimensional case. Instead, the configuration space of n indistinguishable particles in two dimensions has fundamental group equal to the *braid group* B_n rather than the symmetric group. Quasiparticles whose exchange statistics realize a non-trivial representation of B_n are called *anyons*.

For *Abelian anyons*, the representation takes values in $U(1)$ and the exchange merely multiplies the wavefunction by a phase. For *non-Abelian anyons*, the representation takes values in $U(V)$ for a higher-dimensional vector space V , and different braiding sequences correspond to different unitary transformations:

$$\rho : B_n \longrightarrow U(V), \quad \rho(\sigma_i)\rho(\sigma_{i+1})\rho(\sigma_i) = \rho(\sigma_{i+1})\rho(\sigma_i)\rho(\sigma_{i+1}).$$

The non-Abelian case is the one of interest for quantum computation: by initializing a system of anyons, braiding them in a controlled sequence, and finally measuring the result, one realizes a sequence of unitary gates on the encoded Hilbert space V .

5.2 The Topological Hilbert Space

For non-Abelian anyons, the Hilbert space of the system is not the tensor product of single-particle Hilbert spaces. Instead, V is determined by the global *fusion* structure of the anyons: how pairs of anyons combine to yield other anyons. The dimension of V grows with the number of anyons, and information is encoded *non-locally* in the fusion outcomes that cannot be measured by any local operator. This non-locality is the source of topological protection: a local perturbation cannot, by definition, alter information encoded non-locally.

5.3 TQC and Knot Theory

The mathematical structure underlying topological quantum computing is essentially identical to the mathematical structure underlying the Jones polynomial. In both cases, one has:

- A *modular tensor category* encoding the fusion and braiding data of anyons (or, equivalently, the structure of Wilson loop operators in Chern–Simons theory).
- A representation of the braid group on the morphism spaces of this category, realized physically by the adiabatic exchange of anyons.
- A topological invariant of links, computed by closing up the braid and contracting along the category structure.

Concretely, Witten’s identification gives, for $SU(2)$ Chern–Simons theory at level k , an exact computation of the Jones polynomial at the root of unity $q = e^{2\pi i/(k+2)}$ as the expectation value of a Wilson loop:

$$\langle W_R(K) \rangle = V(K; q).$$

The braiding of anyons in TQC realizes precisely the unitary representation of the braid group used in defining this invariant. Computation by anyon braiding is, quite literally, the physical evaluation of a quantum-deformed knot invariant.

This is a remarkable convergence of three independent developments: the operator-algebraic origin of the Jones polynomial in von Neumann algebras, its field-theoretic interpretation in Chern–Simons theory, and its appearance as the computational primitive of a putative quantum technology. The convergence is not coincidence; it is the same modular-tensor-categorical structure manifesting itself in three registers.

5.4 Topological Protection

Discussions of TQC frequently emphasize “topological protection” as a kind of fundamental advantage over conventional quantum computing. The claim deserves careful unpacking, since it operates at several levels.

- (1) **In principle.** In an idealized non-Abelian anyon system at zero temperature, information encoded in the topological Hilbert space is exactly invariant under any sufficiently local perturbation. Local errors do not propagate; they simply cannot reach the encoded information.
- (2) **In physical realization.** The experimental status of non-Abelian anyons—in particular of Majorana zero modes in superconductor–semiconductor heterostructures and the $\nu = 5/2$ fractional quantum Hall state—remains contested. “Topological qubits” as a deployed technology are still ambitious targets rather than realized devices [41].
- (3) **Relative to error correction.** It is not obvious that “topological protection” is fundamentally different from quantum error correction; in fact, topological codes (such as the surface code) can be understood precisely as topological-field-theoretic encodings of information. The robustness in both cases ultimately comes from the same source: encoding information in a way that local measurements cannot access. The difference is whether the encoding is engineered at the level of the underlying physical system (TQC) or constructed at the algorithmic level on top of a conventional substrate (codes).

The cognitive interest of TQC for our philosophical discussion lies precisely in level (1): even as an idealization, it provides the clearest example of a setting in which the global topological structure of a process—not the local state of any component—carries the operative information.

6 Philosophical Reflections

6.1 Eliminative Epistemology

The cognitive style characteristic of topology is the use of *invariants*: properties that survive an entire class of transformations. The epistemic posture is distinctive. An invariant does not tell us what an object is; it tells us what it cannot be. This is what we call *eliminative epistemology*: knowledge approached through the systematic elimination of possibilities rather than the positive determination of facts.

Three features make this epistemology distinctive. First, invariants encode *global information not recoverable from local data*: the entire set of local observations of a knot does not determine whether it is the unknot. Second, invariants are *coordinate-independent*: they survive any reparametrization or change of representation, and therefore provide a stable basis for inter-observer agreement. Third, the relation between an object and its invariants is *asymmetric in computability*: computing an invariant may be tractable, but recovering the object from its invariants is generally intractable or impossible. This asymmetry is constitutive, not a technical defect: it reflects a fundamental feature of how global structure relates to local data.

6.2 Being and Becoming

A popular narrative frame surrounding TQC contrasts “state-based” classical and conventional quantum computing with “process-based” topological quantum computing, presenting TQC as evidence for a fundamental ontological shift from being to becoming. This narrative is appealing but, as it stands, mathematically overstated.

TQC is, in mathematical terms, still unitary evolution on a Hilbert space. The unitary operators realized by braiding act on a state space, and the information encoded “in the braid” is,

more precisely, information encoded in the non-local subspace of a state space whose decomposition is topologically structured. This is a real and significant fact about the geometry of the state space, but it is not the abolition of state in favor of process. The opposition between “state ontology” and “process ontology” is, in the TQC context, a difference in the appropriate level of description, not a substantive ontological revision.

6.3 Irreducible Global Entanglement

A more restrained but more robust formulation of what topology contributes, philosophically, is the following:

Topology supplies not an ontological manifesto, but a language for describing *irreducible global entanglement*. Those relational structures that cannot be dissolved by any change of perspective, change of coordinates, or continuous deformation can only be captured precisely in topological language.

This position requires neither presupposing the priority of process over state, nor denying the validity of reductionist or local methods. It only acknowledges that in certain problems—the orbital structure of chaotic systems, the non-perturbative content of gauge theories, the classification of long-range entangled phases of matter, the topological state of DNA—there is a globality that cannot be recovered from local information, and topology is the appropriate language for describing this globality.

6.4 Marxist Philosophy

The relationship between topological thought and the Marxist tradition deserves substantive engagement rather than dismissive comparison. The classical Marxist tradition—in Marx and Engels, and in later thinkers such as Lukács and Althusser—developed a cognitive mode that shares deep methodological commitments with topological thinking, even though the two emerged from entirely different intellectual genealogies. To recognize this resonance honestly, we must also be precise about where it ends.

Three resonances

(1) The primacy of relations over substances. Marx’s well-known formulation that “the human essence is the ensemble of social relations” (*das Ensemble der gesellschaftlichen Verhältnisse*) [38] is not a rhetorical flourish but a substantive ontological claim: the individual is constituted by, rather than prior to, the relational structure in which she stands. Topological thinking is structurally aligned with this orientation. A topological space is determined by its open sets and their incidence relations, not by any “substance” inhabiting it; a knot is defined by its embedding relation in ambient space, not by what the curve “is in itself.” Both traditions reject the atomistic assumption that wholes are sums of independently characterizable parts.

(2) The irreducibility of totality. Lukács’s category of *Totalität* [35]—the insistence that a capitalist society can be grasped only as an articulated whole, never as an aggregate of isolated facts—has a structural affinity with the topological insight that global invariants cannot be recovered from local data. The affinity is methodological rather than mathematical: both traditions treat the move from part to whole as involving genuine information loss that purely local analysis cannot retrieve. The topological notion of an invariant gives a precise formal counterpart to what Lukács articulated only in philosophical prose.

(3) Practice as constitutive intervention. The second of Marx’s *Theses on Feuerbach*—“the question whether objective truth can be attributed to human thinking is not a question of theory but a practical question” [38]—finds an unexpected resonance in how topological quantities are encountered in physics. Topological invariants are not directly observable as local quantities are; they manifest themselves only through interventions that probe global structure: interferometric measurements of Berry phase, braiding operations realizing the Jones polynomial, transport experiments revealing Chern numbers. Knowledge of the invariant is, in a strong sense, knowledge *through intervention*—which is precisely the structure that Marx’s notion of practice was meant to capture. The Marxist insistence that the world is known by being acted upon receives, in this register, an unexpected vindication from contemporary physics.

Two cautions

The phase-transition analogy. The temptation to model “qualitative leaps” in social history—revolutions, the transition from one mode of production to another—on physical phase transitions, and especially on topological phase transitions, has a long lineage. The attraction is understandable: both involve a discontinuous reorganization of structure that cannot be smoothly interpolated. Yet physical phase transitions are equipped with rigorous order parameters, broken symmetries, and critical exponents that are quantitatively measurable; the “quantity-into-quality” transition in Hegelian–Marxist dialectics has no comparable quantitative apparatus. Identifying the two too quickly risks two distinct errors. First, it can confer on historical processes a mathematical inevitability they do not possess—a posture that has historically underwritten deterministic readings of Marxism that Marx himself, in his later correspondence, explicitly rejected. Second, it allows the aesthetic appeal of a structural analogy to substitute for the difficult empirical work of analyzing actual historical conjunctures.

Base and superstructure as “local” and “global.” A second temptation is to read the base–superstructure relation through the local–global lens of topology, with the mode of production as “local data” from which “global” legal and cultural forms emerge. Such a reading both flattens and misrepresents the dialectical structure of the relation. In the mature Marxist tradition (Engels’s late letters [19], Althusser’s overdetermination [1], Raymond Williams’s cultural materialism), the superstructure is neither epiphenomenal nor strictly determined; it possesses relative autonomy and reacts back on the base. A naive topological reading risks restoring the very economic determinism that the dialectical refinement of the doctrine was meant to overcome.

The character of the convergence

The resonance between topological thought and dialectical materialism is best understood as a convergence at the level of *cognitive method*. Both are non-reductionist; both privilege relations over substances; both treat the global as carrying information not reducible to the local; both regard intervention as constitutive of knowledge. This is a substantive convergence, not a coincidence of vocabulary.

It is not, however, a mathematical isomorphism. Marxism is a historically situated theory of a specific social formation (capitalist modernity), whereas topology is a domain-general mathematical language. The most productive use of the resonance is therefore the following: *topology supplies a precise vocabulary for some of what dialectical materialism has historically struggled to articulate*—in particular, the sense in which social structure constrains possibility without determining outcome, and the sense in which a totality has properties not present in any of its components. Whether this vocabulary can be developed into a genuinely formal apparatus—a “structural materialism” that is neither vulgar reduction nor mere metaphor—remains an open question of considerable contemporary interest.

6.5 Generative AI

A second analogy circulating in recent literature describes the robustness of large language models and flow-matching generative models as a kind of “topological-flow self-correction.” These models can indeed be written, at the generative level, as ODE or SDE flows in some embedding space. Yet the source of their robustness is primarily the *geometric* properties of high-dimensional embedding spaces—the manifold hypothesis, the softening behavior of attention, the implicit regularization of stochastic gradient descent—rather than topological invariants in any technical sense. To describe LLM stability as a “topological attractor” is a suggestive metaphor; making it rigorous would require answering: on which manifold, in what sense of homotopy equivalence, and with respect to which invariant? At present, no satisfactory answer is available. The caution here is the same as in the Marxist case: structural resonance is real, but it must not be allowed to slide silently into claims of mathematical identity.

7 Discussion

7.1 Findings

The four scientific application areas reviewed in Section 4, together with the case study in Section 5, exhibit a common pattern: in each case, the topological intervention is not a stylistic preference but a methodological necessity. The biochemist tracking DNA topology, the physicist computing Wilson loop expectation values, the magnetohydrodynamicist diagnosing solar flares, the data scientist extracting persistent homology from time series, and the quantum engineer braiding anyons are all confronting situations in which local information is, by itself, inadequate. What unifies these disparate practices is the structural feature we have emphasized throughout: *the global cannot be recovered from the local*, and topology is the language adequate to that fact.

7.2 Limitations

Several limitations of the present survey should be made explicit.

First, the review of literature in Section 4 is representative rather than comprehensive. Each of the four areas has its own technical depth and its own extensive literature; we have selected one or two emblematic results per area, and a serious researcher in any of them would identify additional contributions of comparable importance.

Second, the philosophical reflections in Section 6 are programmatic. The engagement with Marxist philosophy in particular is intended as the opening of a research program (a “structural materialism” using categorical and sheaf-theoretic tools), not as a finished position. The programmatic claims need both philosophical defense and mathematical articulation that go beyond what can be supplied in a survey paper.

Third, the case study of topological quantum computing is presented in its idealized form. The actual physics of putative anyon platforms (Majorana zero modes, fractional quantum Hall states, twisted bilayer graphene) raises subtle issues about whether the topological idealization captures the relevant phenomenology of any actual material. A more complete discussion would engage with these subtleties.

7.3 Open Questions

Q1. Is there a notion of homotopy equivalence appropriate to “semantic space” under which the irreducible entanglement of ethical situations can be precisely articulated? We have, separately, called this direction *knot ethics*.

Q2. In actual engineering realizations of topological quantum computing, is the robustness advantage offered by “topological protection” essentially distinct from that of quantum

error-correcting codes, or is it merely a special form of redundant encoding?

Q3. At the orbital level of dynamical systems, can the relationship between knot invariants and topological entropy be sharpened? Is there a unified invariant that simultaneously encodes both?

Q4. From a categorical perspective, can the relations among TQC, knot theory, and conformal field theory (via modular tensor categories) be generalized into a broader framework of a “topological information theory”?

Q5. Can the methodological resonance between topological thought and dialectical materialism be developed into a formal apparatus—a “structural materialism”—that articulates the way social structure constrains possibility without lapsing into either economic determinism or mere metaphor? What would the appropriate mathematical objects be: not topological invariants in any direct sense, but perhaps sheaves of constraints, obstruction classes, or categorical objects encoding what is and is not realizable from a given conjuncture?

8 Conclusion

The real power of algebraic topology and knot theory lies not in their offering a new ontological manifesto, but in their providing a precise mathematical language for understanding certain fundamental irreducibilities. The scientific applications surveyed in this paper—across molecular biology, quantum field theory, fluid mechanics, data science, and quantum computing—are not loose analogies but instances of a single methodological insight: there are problems for which the global structure is not deducible from local data, and for such problems, topology is the appropriate language.

Topological quantum computing is thought-provoking, philosophically, not because it proves that “process trumps state,” but because it *physicalizes* this irreducibility. It turns abstract mathematical invariants into real, measurable, and exploitable physical resources. In doing so, it gives the philosophical reflection on global structure something it has long lacked: a concrete empirical referent.

Philosophical reflection should be carried out on top of these concrete physical and mathematical facts, not as a rhetorical legitimation that runs in the opposite direction. Maintaining clarity about the boundaries of analogy—in the Marxist case, in the AI case, in any case of structural resonance across disciplines—is a precondition for interdisciplinary thinking to deepen rather than dissipate.

References

- [1] L. Althusser, *For Marx*, 1965.
- [2] V. I. Arnold and B. A. Khesin, *Topological Methods in Hydrodynamics*, Springer, 1998.
- [3] A. Ashtekar and J. Lewandowski, “Background independent quantum gravity: A status report,” *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **21** (2004), R53–R152.
- [4] M. F. Atiyah, “Topological quantum field theories,” *Publications Mathématiques de l’IHÉS* **68** (1988), 175–186.
- [5] M. F. Atiyah, *The Geometry and Physics of Knots*, Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- [6] J. C. Baez, “Spin networks in gauge theory,” *Advances in Mathematics* **117** (1996), 253–272.
- [7] A. D. Bates and A. Maxwell, *DNA Topology*, 2nd ed., Oxford University Press, 2005.

- 775 [8] M. A. Berger and G. B. Field, “The topological properties of magnetic helicity,” *Journal of*
776 *Fluid Mechanics* **147** (1984), 133–148.
- 777 [9] D. Bhattacharya, R. Kaur, N. Aithal, N. Sinha, and T. G. Issac, “Persistent homology for
778 MCI classification: a comparative analysis between graph and Vietoris–Rips filtrations,”
779 *Frontiers in Neuroscience* **19** (2025).
- 780 [10] J. S. Birman and R. F. Williams, “Knotted periodic orbits in dynamical systems—I: Lorenz’s
781 equations,” *Topology* **22** (1983), 47–82.
- 782 [11] P. Bubenik, “Statistical topological data analysis using persistence landscapes,” *Journal of*
783 *Machine Learning Research* **16** (2015), 77–102.
- 784 [12] D. Buck, “DNA topology,” in *Applications of Knot Theory*, Proc. Sympos. Appl. Math. **66**,
785 AMS, 2009.
- 786 [13] A. Bukkuri, N. Andor, and I. K. Darcy, “Applications of topological data analysis in oncol-
787 ogy,” *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence* **4** (2021), 659037.
- 788 [14] G. Carlsson, “Topology and data,” *Bulletin of the AMS* **46** (2009), 255–308.
- 789 [15] S. A. Wasserman and N. R. Cozzarelli, “Biochemical topology: Applications to DNA recom-
790 bination and replication,” *Science* **232** (1986), 951–960.
- 791 [16] D. Cohen-Steiner, H. Edelsbrunner, and J. Harer, “Stability of persistence diagrams,” *Dis-
792 crete and Computational Geometry* **37** (2007), 103–120.
- 793 [17] H. Edelsbrunner and J. Harer, *Computational Topology: An Introduction*, AMS, 2010.
- 794 [18] H. Edelsbrunner, D. Letscher, and A. Zomorodian, “Topological persistence and simplifica-
795 tion,” *Discrete and Computational Geometry* **28** (2002), 511–533.
- 796 [19] F. Engels, Letter to Joseph Bloch, 21 September 1890.
- 797 [20] C. Ernst and D. W. Sumners, “A calculus for rational tangles: Applications to DNA recom-
798 bination,” *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **108** (1990), 489–515.
- 799 [21] F. B. Fuller, “The writhing number of a space curve,” *Proceedings of the National Academy*
800 *of Sciences USA* **68** (1971), 815–819.
- 801 [22] R. Ghrist, “Barcodes: The persistent topology of data,” *Bulletin of the AMS* **45** (2008),
802 61–75.
- 803 [23] M. Gidea, “Topological data analysis of critical transitions in financial networks,” in *3rd*
804 *International Winter School and Conference on Network Science*, Springer, 2017.
- 805 [24] A. Hatcher, *Algebraic Topology*, Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- 806 [25] F. Hensel, M. Moor, and B. Rieck, “A survey of topological machine learning methods,”
807 *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence* **4** (2021), 681108.
- 808 [26] V. F. R. Jones, “A polynomial invariant for knots via von Neumann algebras,” *Bulletin of*
809 *the AMS* **12** (1985), 103–111.
- 810 [27] L. H. Kauffman, *Knots and Physics*, 3rd ed., World Scientific, 2001.
- 811 [28] F. A. Khasawneh and E. Munch, “Chatter detection in turning using persistent homology,”
812 *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing* **70–71** (2016), 527–541.

- [29] M. Khovanov, “A categorification of the Jones polynomial,” *Duke Math. J.* **101** (2000), 359–426.
- [30] M. Khovanov and L. Rozansky, “Matrix factorizations and link homology,” *Fundamenta Mathematicae* **199** (2008), 1–91.
- [31] A. Yu. Kitaev, “Fault-tolerant quantum computation by anyons,” *Annals of Physics* **303** (2003), 2–30.
- [32] D. Kleckner and W. T. M. Irvine, “Creation and dynamics of knotted vortices,” *Nature Physics* **9** (2013), 253–258.
- [33] D. Kleckner, L. H. Kauffman, and W. T. M. Irvine, “How superfluid vortex knots untie,” *Nature Physics* **12** (2016), 650–655.
- [34] C. E. Laing, R. L. Ricca, and D. W. L. Sumners, “Conservation of writhe helicity under anti-parallel reconnection,” *Scientific Reports* **5** (2015), 9224.
- [35] G. Lukács, *History and Class Consciousness*, 1923.
- [36] D. Marenduzzo, E. Orlandini, A. Stasiak, D. W. Sumners, L. Tubiana, and C. Micheletti, “DNA–DNA interactions in bacteriophage capsids are responsible for the observed DNA knotting,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* **106** (2009), 22269–22274.
- [37] L. Coronel, A. Suárez-Lledó, et al., “Dynamics of supercoiled DNA with complex knots: Large-scale rearrangements and persistent multi-strand interlocking,” *Nucleic Acids Research* **46** (2018), 7533–7545.
- [38] K. Marx, *Theses on Feuerbach*, 1845.
- [39] H. K. Moffatt, “The degree of knottedness of tangled vortex lines,” *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **35** (1969), 117–129.
- [40] J.-J. Moreau, “Constantes d’un îlot tourbillonnaire en fluide parfait barotrope,” *Comptes Rendus de l’Académie des Sciences Paris* **252** (1961), 2810–2812.
- [41] C. Nayak, S. H. Simon, A. Stern, M. Freedman, and S. Das Sarma, “Non-Abelian anyons and topological quantum computation,” *Reviews of Modern Physics* **80** (2008), 1083–1159.
- [42] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [43] J. A. Perea and J. Harer, “Sliding windows and persistence: An application of topological methods to signal analysis,” *Foundations of Computational Mathematics* **15** (2015), 799–838.
- [44] N. Reshetikhin and V. G. Turaev, “Invariants of 3-manifolds via link polynomials and quantum groups,” *Inventiones Mathematicae* **103** (1991), 547–597.
- [45] R. L. Ricca and M. A. Berger, “Topological ideas and fluid mechanics,” *Physics Today* **49** (1996), 28–34.
- [46] C. Rovelli and L. Smolin, “Spin networks and quantum gravity,” *Physical Review D* **52** (1995), 5743–5759.
- [47] M. W. Scheeler, D. Kleckner, D. Proment, G. L. Kindlmann, and W. T. M. Irvine, “Helicity conservation by flow across scales in reconnecting vortex links and knots,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* **111** (2014), 15350–15355.

- [48] G. Singh, F. Mémoli, and G. Carlsson, “Topological methods for the analysis of high dimensional data sets and 3D object recognition,” in *Eurographics Symposium on Point-Based Graphics*, 2007.
- [49] A. Stasiak, V. Katritch, J. Bednar, D. Michoud, and J. Dubochet, “Electrophoretic mobility of DNA knots,” *Nature* **384** (1996), 122.
- [50] D. W. Sumners, “Lifting the curtain: Using topology to probe the hidden action of enzymes,” *Notices of the AMS* **42** (1995), 528–537.
- [51] F. Takens, “Detecting strange attractors in turbulence,” in *Dynamical Systems and Turbulence*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **898**, Springer, 1981, 366–381.
- [52] J. B. Taylor, “Relaxation of toroidal plasma and generation of reverse magnetic fields,” *Physical Review Letters* **33** (1974), 1139–1141.
- [53] A. Valdés, L. Coronel, B. Martínez-García, J. Segura, S. Dyson, O. Díaz-Ingelmo, C. Micheletti, and J. Roca, “Transcriptional supercoiling boosts topoisomerase II-mediated knotting of intracellular DNA,” *Nucleic Acids Research* **47** (2019), 6946–6955.
- [54] A. V. Vologodskii, W. Zhang, V. V. Rybenkov, A. A. Podtelezhnikov, D. Subramanian, J. D. Griffith, and N. R. Cozzarelli, “Mechanism of topology simplification by type II DNA topoisomerases,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* **98** (2001), 3045–3049.
- [55] R. Wang, et al., “Topological data analysis and topological deep learning beyond persistent homology: A review,” *Artificial Intelligence Review* (2025).
- [56] J. H. White, “Self-linking and the Gauss integral in higher dimensions,” *American Journal of Mathematics* **91** (1969), 693–728.
- [57] E. Witten, “Quantum field theory and the Jones polynomial,” *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **121** (1989), 351–399.
- [58] E. Witten, “Fivebranes and knots,” *Quantum Topology* **3** (2012), 1–137.
- [59] L. Woltjer, “A theorem on force-free magnetic fields,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* **44** (1958), 489–491.
- [60] A. Zomorodian and G. Carlsson, “Computing persistent homology,” *Discrete and Computational Geometry* **33** (2005), 249–274.