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Abstract

It is proved in [2] that the category of relative 3-dimensional cobordisms $\text{Cob}^{2+1}$ is equivalent to the universal algebraic category $\mathcal{H}_r$ generated by a Hopf algebra object. A different algebraic category $\mathcal{A}_{lg}$ generated by a Hopf algebra object is defined in [1] and it conjectured to be equivalent to $\text{Cob}^{2+1}$ as well. We prove that there exists a functor $\mathcal{A}_{lg} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_r$, and use it to present an alternative set of axioms for $\mathcal{H}_r$.

1 Introduction

The development of quantum topology builds a bridge between low dimensional topology and the theory of Hopf algebras. The initial steps of the theory consisted in constructing invariants of 3-manifolds and 3-dimensional TQFT’s, starting with the category of representations of some quantum groups [17]. Then Hennings [7], Kaufmann and Radford [13] build similar invariants directly from the Hopf algebra itself. Eventually, the works of Crane and Yetter [4], Habiro [6], Kerler and Lyubashenko [10] lead to the understanding that the Hopf algebra structure is intrinsic to the category of relative 3-dimensional cobordisms $\text{Cob}^{2+1}$. In particular, in [9], Kerler defined a universal monoidal braided category $\mathcal{A}_{lg}$, freely generated by a Hopf algebra object and a full (surjective) functor from $\mathcal{A}_{lg}$ to the category of relative 3-dimensional cobordisms. He also posed the problem [10, Problem 8-16 (1)] to find a set of additional relations for $\mathcal{A}_{lg}$, such that the above functor induces a category equivalence on the quotient of $\mathcal{A}_{lg}$ by the new relations.

This problem was solved in [2], where it was proved that in order to obtain a category equivalence, two more relations should be added to the defining axioms of $\mathcal{A}_{lg}$ (see (r8) and (r9) in Table 1). These new relations can be thought as

$^1$Actually, Kerler defines a functor from $\mathcal{A}_{lg}$ to the category $\tilde{\text{Cob}}^{2+1}$ of 2-framed relative 3-dimensional cobordisms. The difference between the two categories is that $\text{Cob}^{2+1}$ is the quotient of $\tilde{\text{Cob}}^{2+1}$ by one more normalization relation (relation (n) in Table 3). We work here with $\text{Cob}^{2+1}$ instead of $\tilde{\text{Cob}}^{2+1}$, because this is the framework in [1]. Observe that relation (25) of the algebra defined in [1] doesn’t hold in $\text{Cob}^{2+1}$.  


compatibility conditions between the the ribbon morphism and the copairing on one hand and the comultiplication and the braiding morphisms on the other.

In [2] the algebraic structure of $Cob^{2+1}$ is derived from the one of the category of relative cobordisms of 4-dimensional 2-handlebodies $Chb^{3+1}$. Indeed, any 3-dimensional cobordism can be seen as the boundary of a 4-dimensional handlebody and this allows to define the category $Cob^{2+1}$ as quotient of $Chb^{3+1}$, modulo all transformations which change the interior of the handlebody but leave invariant its boundary. Then two universal monoidal braided categories freely generated by a ribbon Hopf algebra object are introduced: $\mathcal{H}^r$ and its quotient $\mathcal{H}'^r$, and it is shown that we have the following commutative diagram:

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
Chb^{3+1} & \rightarrow & Cob^{2+1} \\
\Phi \uparrow & & \Phi \uparrow \\
\mathcal{H}^r & \rightarrow & \mathcal{H}'^r \\
\end{array}
$$

where the horizontal arrows represent quotient functors, while $\Phi$ and $\Phi$ are equivalences of categories.

On the other hand, in [1] the universal algebraic category $\overline{Alg}$ is defined and it is announced an unpublished result of Habiro [1, Theorem 2.3], according to which there is a category equivalence between the category of 3-dimensional cobordisms and $\overline{Alg}$. We observe that while the elementary morphisms of $\overline{Alg}$ and $\overline{H}^r$ are basically the same (the only difference being the way in which the ribbon morphisms are introduced), in the set of axioms there are some important differences. The first one is that the Hopf algebra in $\overline{Alg}$ is not required to have an integral, while both $\overline{Alg}$ and $\overline{H}^r$ have two sided integrals. Moreover, in $\overline{Alg}$ four new relations, regarding the ribbon structure, are added to the ones of Kerler’s category $\overline{Alg}$ ((see $h10 - 13$) in Table 6) and they are all different from relations ($r8-9$) in the definition of $\overline{H}^r$.

The goal of these notes is to summarize the results in [2], related to the algebraic structures of the cobordism categories, in order to facilitate their use and to investigate the independence of the axioms of $\mathcal{H}^r$ and $\overline{H}^r$ and the relationship between the categories $\mathcal{H}'^r$ and $\overline{Alg}$.

In particular, we show that in $\mathcal{H}^r$ the integral axioms and axiom ($r8$) are independent from the rest of axioms of the category (Proposition 2.5). Then we prove that there exists a functor $\Gamma : \overline{Alg} \rightarrow \overline{H}^r$ (Theorem 3.2). Finally, we present an alternative solution of the problem of Kerler by proving that in $\overline{H}^r$ axiom ($r9$) is equivalent to $\Gamma(h10)$, while axiom ($r8$) of $\overline{H}^r$ is equivalent to the requirement that the adjoint morphism intertwines with the copairing (Proposition 3.3). The equivalence of $\Gamma(h10)$ and ($r9$) has been communicated to the author by Mariya Stamatova.

The author wish to thank Mariya Stamatova for posing some questions which became the main motivation for writing down the present notes.
2 Preliminaries

In what follows we are going to use the terminology and the notations in [2], where complete definitions, proofs and references can be found. The morphisms in the topological categories $\text{Chb}^{2+1}$ and $\text{Cob}^{2+1}$ will be described in terms of Kirby tangles, while the morphisms in the algebraic categories $\mathcal{H}^r$ and $\mathcal{H}^r$ will be described in terms of plane diagrams, where each diagram is a composition of products of elementary ones modulo some defining relations to which we refer as axioms. The composition of two diagrams $D_2 \circ D_1$ is obtained by stacking $D_2$ on the top of $D_1$, while the product $D_1 \cdot D_2$ is given by the horizontal juxtaposition of $D_1$ and $D_2$.

2.1 The universal ribbon Hopf algebra $\mathcal{H}^r$

Definition 2.1. Given a braided monoidal category $\mathcal{C}$ with product $\circ$, unit object $1$ and braiding morphism $\gamma$, a Hopf-algebra in $\mathcal{C}$ is a objects $H$ in $\mathcal{C}$, equipped with the following morphisms in $\mathcal{C}$:

a comultiplication $\Delta : H \rightarrow H \circ H$, such that for any $g \in \mathcal{G}$:

$(\Delta \circ \text{id}) \circ \Delta = (\text{id} \circ \Delta) \circ \Delta$; \hspace{1cm} (a1)

a counit $\epsilon : H \rightarrow 1$, such that:

$(\epsilon \circ \text{id}) \circ \Delta = \text{id} = (\text{id} \circ \epsilon) \circ \Delta$; \hspace{1cm} (a2-2')

a multiplication $m : H \circ H$, such that:

$m \circ (m \circ \text{id}) = m \circ (\text{id} \circ m)$, \hspace{1cm} (a3)

$(m \circ m) \circ (\text{id} \circ \gamma \circ \text{id}) \circ (\Delta \circ \Delta) = \Delta \circ m$, \hspace{1cm} (a5)

$\epsilon \circ m = \epsilon \circ \epsilon$; \hspace{1cm} (a6)

a unit $\eta : 1 \rightarrow H$, such that:

$m \circ (\text{id} \circ \eta) = \text{id} = m \circ (\eta \circ \text{id})$, \hspace{1cm} (a4-4')

$\Delta \circ \eta = \eta \circ \eta$, \hspace{1cm} (a7)

$\epsilon \circ \eta = \text{id}_1$; \hspace{1cm} (a8)

an antipode $S : H \rightarrow H$ and its inverse $\overline{S} : H \rightarrow H$, such that for any:

$m \circ (S \circ \text{id}) \circ \Delta = \eta \circ \epsilon$, \hspace{1cm} (s1)

$m \circ (\text{id} \circ S) \circ \Delta = \eta \circ \epsilon$, \hspace{1cm} (s1')

$S \circ \overline{S} = \overline{S} \circ S = \text{id}$; \hspace{1cm} (s2-2')

A unimodular Hopf-algebra in $\mathcal{C}$ is a Hopf algebra $H$ in $\mathcal{C}$, equipped with the following morphisms in $\mathcal{C}$:
an integral $L : \mathbb{1} \to H$ and a cointegral $l : H \to \mathbb{1}$, such that:

$$(\text{id} \circ l) \circ \Delta = \eta \circ l \quad \text{(i1)}$$

$$m \circ (L \circ \text{id}) = L \circ \epsilon, \quad \text{(i2)}$$

$$l \circ L = \text{id}, \quad \text{(i3)}$$

$$l \circ S = l, \quad \text{(i5)}$$

$$S \circ L = L; \quad \text{(i4)}$$

A ribbon Hopf-algebra in $\mathcal{C}$ is a unimodular Hopf algebra $H$ in $\mathcal{C}$, equipped an invertible ribbon morphism $v : H \to H$ and a copairing $\sigma : \mathbb{1} \to H \circ H$, such that:

$$S \circ v = v \circ S, \quad \text{(r3)}$$

$$\epsilon \circ v = \epsilon, \quad \text{(r4)}$$

$$m \circ (v \circ \text{id}) = v \circ m, \quad \text{(r5)}$$

$$\sigma = (v^{-1} \circ (v^{-1} \circ S)) \circ \Delta \circ v \circ \eta, \quad \text{(r6)}$$

$$(\Delta \circ \text{id}) \circ \sigma = (\text{id} \circ \text{id} \circ m) \circ (\text{id} \circ \sigma \circ \text{id}) \circ \sigma, \quad \text{(r7)}$$

$$\Delta \circ v^{-1} = (v^{-1} \circ v^{-1}) \circ \mu \circ \overline{\gamma} \circ \Delta, \quad \text{(r8)}$$

$$(m \circ m) \circ (S \circ (\mu \circ \overline{\gamma} \circ \mu) \circ S) \circ (\rho_l \circ \rho_r) = \gamma \quad \text{(r9)},$$

where $\mu = (m \circ m) \circ (\text{id} \circ \sigma \circ \text{id}) : H \circ H \to H \circ H$ and $\rho_l = (\text{id} \circ m) \circ (\sigma \circ \text{id}) : H \to H \circ H$ (resp. $\rho_r = (m \circ \text{id}) \circ (\text{id} \circ \sigma) : H \to H \circ H$) defines a left (resp. right) $H$-comodule structure on $H$.

**Definition 2.2.** The universal ribbon Hopf algebra $\mathcal{H}^r$ is the braided strict monoidal category freely generated by a ribbon Hopf algebra $H$.

In terms of graph diagrams, the elementary morphisms and defining relations of the universal ribbon Hopf algebra $\mathcal{H}^r$ are presented in Table 1 (cf. Tables 4.7.12 and 4.7.13 in [2]), while in Tables 2 and 3 we list some important relations which are satisfied in $\mathcal{H}^r$. The reader can find their proofs in [2, Propositions 4.1.4, 4.1.5, 4.1.6, 4.1.9, 4.1.10, 4.2.5, 4.2.7, 4.2.11, 4.2.13].

The existence of a non degenerate form $\lambda$ and coform $\Lambda$, given by (f1-2) in Table 2, is well known consequence of the integral axioms (i1-3). This allows to change a graph diagram by isotopy moves which preserve the orientation of its vertices (see (f3-11) and the duality of the univalent vertices in Table 2). Similarly to what is done in [2], the use of the isotopy moves in the diagrammatic proofs in the following section will be implicit.

**Definition 2.3.** A braided monoidal category $\mathcal{(C, \circ, \mathbb{1}, \gamma)}$ is called symmetric if $\gamma \circ \gamma = \text{id}$ and a Hopf algebra $H$ in a symmetric category is called triangular if $\gamma \circ \Delta = \Delta$.

**Proposition 2.4.** Any triangular Hopf algebra $H$ in a symmetric monoidal category $\mathcal{(C, \circ, \mathbb{1}, \gamma)}$ satisfies the ribbon axioms (r1-9) with ribbon morphism $v = \text{id}_H$ and trivial copairing $\sigma = \eta \circ \eta$. In particular, any unimodular triangular Hopf algebra is a ribbon Hopf algebra with ribbon morphism $v = \text{id}_H$. 

4
Proof. By substituting $v$ with $\text{id}_H$ and $\sigma$ with $\eta \circ \eta$ in the ribbon axioms (r1-9) in Table 1, we see that (r1-6) are trivially satisfied, while by applying axioms (a4) and (a7) both sides of (r7) reduce to $\eta \circ \eta \circ \eta$ and by applying axioms (a4-4') and property (s6) in Table 2 (r8) and (r9) reduce to the defining relations of a triangular Hopf algebra: $\gamma \circ \Delta = \Delta$ and $\gamma \circ \gamma = \text{id}$.

Any classical (non categorical) Hopf algebra over a field $k$ is a Hopf algebra in the (symmetric) tensor category of $k$-modules where the braiding morphism is simply the transposition $\tau$. Such Hopf algebra is called cocommutative if $\tau \circ \Delta = \Delta$. Therefore, Proposition 2.4 implies that any unimodular cocommutative Hopf algebra is a triangular ribbon Hopf algebra in the category of $k$-modules. Examples of such algebras are the group algebras $k\mathbb{C}[G]$, where $G$ is a finite group.

Examples of non triangular ribbon Hopf algebras in (non symmetric) braided categories can be obtained from classical non cocommutative unimodular ribbon Hopf algebras. The most famous family of such algebras come from quantum groups (see for example Chapter 36 of [14]) and have been used to define quantum invariants of 3-dimensional manifolds and of 4-dimensional handlebodies (cf. [17], [7], [13] and [3]). Given such algebra, one can define an appropriate braiding on the category of its two-sided modules and modify its coproduct in a way to obtain a ribbon Hopf algebra in this last category.

Now we can address the problem of the independence of the set axioms of $H^r$.

Proposition 2.5. (a) The integral axioms (i1-4) are independent from the rest of the axioms of $H^r$;

(b) The ribbon axiom (r8) is independent from the rest of the axioms of $H^r$.

Proof. (a) follows from a theorem of Sweedler [18], according to which a Hopf algebra over a field $k$ has an integral if and only if it is finite dimensional. Therefore, it is enough to find a categorical infinite dimensional Hopf algebra which satisfies the ribbon axioms. One example is the Hopf algebra $H_1 = k[x]$ with $\Delta(x) = x \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes x$, $\epsilon(x) = 0$ and $S(x) = -x$. $H_1$ is an infinite dimensional triangular Hopf algebra in the symmetric category of $k$-modules and according to Proposition 2.4 it satisfies the ribbon axioms (r1-9) with $v = \text{id}_H$.

To show (b), consider a classical non cocommutative unimodular ribbon Hopf algebra $H$ (for example any of the finite dimensional quantum group algebras over $k = Q[v]/<1+v+\ldots+v^{p-1}>$, where $p$ is a prime, defined in Chapter 36 of [14]). $H$ is a categorical unimodular Hopf algebra in the symmetric tensor category of $k$-modules, i.e it satisfies all braid, bialgebra, antipode and integral axioms in Table 1. Take now $v = \text{id}_A$. Then (r6) implies that $\sigma = \eta \otimes \eta$ and all ribbon axioms (r1-7) and (r9) will be satisfied as well, but (r8) will fail, since the algebra is not cocommutative. Therefore (r8) is independent from the rest of the axioms. \qed

\footnote{One can take as well the universal enveloping algebra of any Lie algebra.}
Elementary diagrams for the universal ribbon Hopf algebra $\mathcal{H}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagram</th>
<th>Braid axioms</th>
<th>Bialgebra axioms</th>
<th>Antipode axioms</th>
<th>Integral axioms</th>
<th>Ribbon axioms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>γ = <img src="braid.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td><img src="braid.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td><img src="braid.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td><img src="braid.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td><img src="braid.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td><img src="braid.png" alt="image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ = <img src="commult.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td><img src="commult.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td><img src="commult.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td><img src="commult.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td><img src="commult.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td><img src="commult.png" alt="image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ε = <img src="counit.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td><img src="counit.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td><img src="counit.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td><img src="counit.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td><img src="counit.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td><img src="counit.png" alt="image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S = <img src="antipode.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td><img src="antipode.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td><img src="antipode.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td><img src="antipode.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td><img src="antipode.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td><img src="antipode.png" alt="image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l = <img src="cointegral.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td><img src="cointegral.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td><img src="cointegral.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td><img src="cointegral.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td><img src="cointegral.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td><img src="cointegral.png" alt="image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1
Duality of uni-valent vertices with the same polarization properties of coform and form

Consequences of the Hopf algebra and integral axioms of $\mathcal{H}^r$

\[ \Lambda = \bigcup \quad \lambda = \bigcup \]

Symmetry of the integrals

Properties of the antipode

Definition of coform and form

Other properties of coform and form

Table 2
### Consequences of ribbon axioms (r1)-(r7) of $\mathcal{H}'$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relations symmetric to (r5) and (r7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Relations symmetric to (r5) and (r7)" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Extended isotopy moves

| ![Extended isotopy moves](image) |

### Other relations

| ![Other relations](image) |

### Consequences of the ribbon axioms (r8) and (r9) of $\mathcal{H}'$

#### Equivalent forms of the axiom (r8)

| ![Equivalent forms of the axiom (r8)](image) |

#### Equivalent form of the axiom (r9)

| ![Equivalent form of the axiom (r9)](image) |

#### Inverting the antipode through the copairing

| ![Inverting the antipode through the copairing](image) |

---

**Table 3**
Remarks

1. Relation \((r_6)\) in Definition 2.1 can actually be seen as the definition of \(\sigma\) in terms of the ribbon morphism \(v\) and this is how it is presented in Table 1. Nevertheless, the set of axioms can be changed by removing \((r_6)\) and introducing property \((p_2)\) in Table 3 as an axiom; then \((r_6)\) will follow from \((s_3)\), \((p_2)\) and \((r_8)\).

2. Our definition of categorical ribbon Hopf algebra includes the condition that the algebra is unimodular (axioms \((i_1-3)\)). This is not a standard choice of terminology and it was done in an attempt to find a single name which illustrates the most important characteristic of the algebra.

3. As it was seen in Proposition 2.4, the axioms of \(\mathcal{H}^r\) are compatible with trivial copairing and therefore do not imply that the copairing \(\sigma\) is non degenerate. This is the main difference between \(\mathcal{H}^r\) and the category \(\overline{\mathcal{H}}^r\), where the non degeneracy of \(\sigma\) will be imposed (see Section 2.4).

4. The proof of point (b) in Proposition 2.5 shows that the role of axiom \((r_8)\) is to insure that the choice of the ribbon morphism is compatible with the comultiplication. Analogously, the role of \((r_9)\) is to insure that the copairing is compatible with the braiding of the category. Indeed, suppose that \(H\) is ribbon Hopf algebra with ribbon morphism \(v\) in a non symmetric braided category; in particular \(\gamma_{H,H} \circ \gamma_{H,H} \neq \text{id}_{H \otimes H}\). Consider now \(H\) with a different ‘ribbon morphism’, for example \(v' = \text{id}_H\). All axioms will still be satisfied with the exception of \((r_8-9)\), since the choice of the ribbon morphism will not be compatible any more with the braiding and the comultiplication.

2.2 The category \(Chb^{3+1}\)

We start by presenting a brief review of the definition of the category of relative 4-dimensional 2-handlebody cobordisms \(Chb^{3+1}\) with a single 0-handle, and its description in terms of Kirby tangles. Full details and references to the broad literature on this argument \([12, 5, 8, 10]\) can be found in Chapter 2 of [2].

The set of objects in \(Chb^{3+1}\) is \(\{M_n, \iota_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\), where \(M_n\) is a standard 3-dimensional relative 1-handlebody with a single 0-handle and \(n\) 1-handles, and \(\iota_n : D^2 \to \partial H^0\) is an embedding of the 2-dimensional disk in the boundary of the 0-handle. A morphism \(W : M_n \to M_m\) in \(Chb^{3+1}\) is a relative 4-dimensional 2-handlebody build on the connected 3-dimensional 1-handlebody \(X(M_n, M_m) = (M_n \sqcup M_m) \cup_{\iota_n \sqcup \iota_m} D^1 \times D^2\), obtained by attaching a single 1-handle between the 0-handles of \(M_n\) and \(M_m\) (see Figure 1 for an example, where all the horizontal segments represent copies of \(B^2\)). Such 4-dimensional 2-handlebody is considered up to 2-equivalence, i.e. up to changing the attaching maps of its 1- and 2-handles by isotopy and creation/cancellation of 1/2 handles pairs.
The morphisms of $\mathcal{Chb}^{3+1}$ are represented diagrammatically by admissible Kirby tangles and this allows to identify $\mathcal{Chb}^{3+1}$ with the category of such tangles [2, Proposition 2.3].

In particular, the category of admissible Kirby tangles has as set of objects sequences $I_n = ((a_1', a_1''), \ldots , (a_n', a_n''))$ of pairs of intervals in $E = [0, 1]^2$ associated to each $M_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then an admissible Kirby tangle $K : I_n \rightarrow I_m$ is a tangle with two types of components:

- Dotted unknots spanning disjoint flat disks in $\text{Int } E \times [0, 1]$. Such unknots represent the 1-handles of the 4-dimensional 2-handlebody whose attaching regions (disjoint pairs of 3-balls) are thought to be squeezed onto the spanning disks. Observe that the spanning discs won’t be explicitly drawn in the plane diagrams but will be assumed to project bijectively onto l’interior of the unknots.

- Framed curves regularly embedded in $\text{Int } E \times [0, 1]$ and transversal to the spanning disks of the unknots; such curves represent the attaching maps of the 2-handles and will be drawn as ribbons in which the base curve is thicker then the parallel framing curve. Each open curve joins a pair of intervals $(a_k' \times \{0\}, a_k'' \times \{0\})$ for some $(a_k', a_k'') \in I_n$ or $(a_k' \times \{1\}, a_k'' \times \{1\})$ for some $(a_k', a_k'') \in I_m$ and the base curve always ends in the left end-points of the intervals.

The composition of two tangles $K_1 : I_n \rightarrow I_m$ and $K_2 : I_m \rightarrow I_p$ is given by translating $K_2$ on the top of $K_1$, glueing the two tangles along $I_m$ and then rescaling. Two 2-handlebodies are 2-equivalent if and only if the corresponding Kirby tangles are related by isotopy and the moves of Figure 2.

Figure 2: Equivalence moves for Kirby tangles
The category of admissible Kirby tangles has a strict monoidal structure, whose product, once again denoted by $\odot$, is given by $I_n \odot I_m = I_{n+m}$ on the objects, while on the morphisms $K \odot K'$ is obtained by translating $K'$ in the space on the right of $K$ and rescaling. The unit of the product is the empty tangle.

The following is Theorem 4.7.5 in [2].

**Theorem 2.6.** [2] The universal algebraic category $\mathcal{H}^r$ is equivalent to the category of relative cobordisms of 4-dimensional 2-handlebodies $\text{Chb}^{3+1}$. The equivalence functor $\Phi : \mathcal{H}^r \to \text{Chb}^{3+1}$ sends the elementary morphisms, the form, the coform and the copairing of $\mathcal{H}^r$ to the corresponding Kirby tangles in Figure 3.

![Figure 3: $\Phi : \mathcal{H}^r \to \text{Chb}^{3+1}$](image)

**Remarks**

1. As it is seen in Figure 3, the images under $\Phi$ of the cointegral $\lambda$ and of the unit $\eta$ have the same topological structure in $\text{Chb}^{3+1}$ with the source and the target exchanged. The same is true for the images of the integral $\Lambda$ and of the counit $\epsilon$. Moreover, in $\text{Chb}^{3+1}$ both the integral axioms $(i1-3)$ and the defining axioms of the unit and the counit $(a2-2')$ and $(a4-4')$ reduce to a cancellation of 1/2 handle pairs. Nevertheless, as we saw in Proposition 2.5 (a), on algebra level the integral axioms do not follow from the rest of the axioms.

2. One can define a pairing $\sigma = (\lambda \odot \lambda) \circ (\text{id} \odot \sigma \odot S) : \mathcal{H}^r \odot \mathcal{H}^r \to 1$ (Figure 4 (a)), but as it is shown in Figure 4 (b), $\Phi((\sigma \circ \text{id}) \circ (\text{id} \odot \sigma)) \neq \text{id}$. Actually, substituting $\Phi((\sigma \circ \text{id}) \circ (\text{id} \odot \sigma))$ with the identity would correspond to substituting an undotted component with a dotted one (1/2-handle trading).
Such move would change the interior of the corresponding 4-dimensional handlebody, leaving unchanged its boundary. Therefore, the non degeneracy of $\sigma$ doesn’t hold in $H^r$, but should be imposed in the definition of the boundary category $\overline{H}^r$, equivalent to the category of 3-dimensional cobordisms $\text{Cob}^{2+1}$.

$$\begin{align*}
\sigma &= \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{(a)}
\end{array}
\end{array} \\
= \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{(b)}
\end{array}
\end{array} \\
\end{align*}$$

Figure 4: Definition of $\sigma$ and its image under $\Phi$.

3. Observing the images of the ribbon element and the copairing under the equivalence functor $\Phi$ in Figure 4, we deduce that invariants coming from triangular Hopf algebras, where the ribbon morphism and the copairing are trivial, can not detect changes in the framing or in the linking of the attaching maps of the two handles. It can easily be seen that such invariants will depend only on the 2-dimensional spine of the handlebody up to 2-deformations. For example, group algebras of finite groups will provide well-known homotopy invariants of 4-dimensional 2-handlebodies.

### 2.3 Adjoint morphisms in $H^r$

The adjoint morphisms $\alpha_n : H \diamond H^{on} \to H^{on}$ have been used in Chapter 4.4 of [2] to give an alternative formulation of the ribbon axioms $(r8)$ and $(r9)$. We present here the definition and list the basic properties of such morphisms.

**Definition 2.7.** Define the (left) adjoint morphism $\alpha_n : H \diamond H^{on} \to H^{on}$ inductively by the following identities (see Table 4):

$$\begin{align*}
\alpha_1 &= m \circ (m \circ S) \circ (\text{id}_H \circ \gamma_{H,H}) \circ (\Delta \circ \text{id}_H) \\
\alpha_{n+1} &= (\alpha_n \circ \alpha_1) \circ (\text{id}_H \circ \gamma_{H,H^{on}} \circ \text{id}_H) \circ (\Delta \circ \text{id}_{H^{2n+1}}).
\end{align*}$$

In Table 4 are presented the properties of the adjoint morphisms which are relevant to the present work (see Tables 4.4.1 and 4.4.5 in [2] for the complete list). Observe that, analogously to the case of classical Hopf algebras, properties (q3-6) imply that the adjoint morphism defines a left action of $H$ on itself and intertwines with the multiplication and the unit morphisms. The proofs of those relations are straightforward and do not make use of the ribbon axioms. Moreover, the ribbon axioms $(r8)$ and $(r9)$ can be reformulated in terms of the adjoint morphisms in the form $(q7')$ and $(q8)$ presented in Table 4 [2, Proposition 4.4.5].

The last property $(q14)$ in Table 4 states that not just the multiplication and the unit, but any morphism $F : H^{on} \to H^{om}$, $n, m \geq 0$ in $H^r$ intertwines with the adjoint morphism [2 Lemma 4.4.10]:

$$F \circ \alpha_n = \alpha_m \circ (\text{id} \circ F)$$

(q14)
This is highly non trivial fact. In the classical case of symmetric tensor category, the adjoint action is known to intertwine with the comultiplication and the antipode only when the Hopf algebra is cocommutative [15, Lemma 5.7.2]. A ribbon Hopf algebra with non-trivial braiding is not cocommutative and if the proof of Proposition 4.4.5 in [2] works, it is only because the ribbon axioms (r8) and (r9) are the right ones to make the comultiplication, the antipode and the braiding morphisms intertwine with the adjoint action. A legitimate question is if, modulo the rest of the axioms of $\mathcal{H}^r$, the ribbon axioms (r8) and (r9) are equivalent to the condition that the comultiplication and the braiding intertwine with the adjoint morphism. In the case of the quotient category $\mathcal{H}^r$, Proposition 3.3 bellow makes a step in this direction.

The topological meaning of the intertwining property (q14) can be understood by looking at the image of the adjoint morphism under the functor $\Phi : H^r \rightarrow Cob^{3+1}$. Such image consists in a single dotted component which embraces some open framed components (Figure 5). In other words, the adjoint morphism represents an 1-handle along which pass the attaching maps of some 2-handles. Therefore the intertwining of a given morphism with the adjoint one is the algebraic analog of pushing part of
the Kirby diagram through an 1-handle.

\[ \Phi \]

Figure 5: The image of the adjoint morphism under $\Phi$.

2.4 The universal boundary ribbon Hopf algebra $\overline{H}^r$

The category of 3-dimensional relative cobordisms $\text{Cob}^{2+1}$ can be seen as the boundary of $\text{Cob}^{3+1}$ and, following [10], we define it as the quotient category of $\text{Chb}^{3+1}$ modulo the well known Kirby moves [11] relating any two 4-dimensional 2-handlebodies with diffeomorphic boundaries. In particular, the objects of $\text{Cob}^{2+1}$ are those of $\text{Chb}^{3+1}$, while the morphisms of $\text{Cob}^{2+1}$ are equivalence classes of morphisms of $\text{Chb}^{3+1}$ under the relations generated by 1/2-handle trading and blowing down/up (Figure 6).

As it was observed in Remark 2 on p. [11] in $\mathcal{H}^r$ the invariance under 1/2-handle trading corresponds to the non-degeneracy of the copairing. Moreover, in order to obtain the such nondegeneracy, it is enough to require that the integral is dual to the cointegral with respect to the copairing [2, Proposition 5.4.2]. This motivates the following definition.

**Definition 2.8.** The universal selfdual ribbon Hopf algebra $\overline{H}^r$ is the quotient category of $\mathcal{H}^r$ modulo the relations (see Table 5):

\[
(\lambda \circ \text{id}) \circ \sigma = \Lambda, \quad (d)
\]

\[
\lambda \circ v \circ \eta = 1, \quad (n)
\]

The axioms and the properties of $\overline{H}^r$ are presented in Table 5. In particular, properties ($d2'-2'$) and ($d3'-3'$) in Table 5 assert the existence of a non degenerate pairing $\overline{\sigma}$ which defines an isomorphism between the algebra and its dual.

The following theorem [2, Theorem 5.5.4] solves the problem posed by Kerler.
Theorem 2.9. \cite{2} The functor $\Phi$ induces an equivalence of categories $\overline{\Phi} : \overline{H}^r \rightarrow \text{Cob}^{2+1}$.

Theorem 2.9 implies that any $2+1$-dimensional TQFT is generated by a (categorical) selfdual ribbon Hopf algebra and also that any TQFT of 4-dimensional 2-handlebodies, generated by such algebra won’t detect more then the boundaries of those handlebodies and, in the case in which the normalization condition $(n)$ is not satisfied, their signature.

2.5 The universal category $\overline{Alg}$

We now introduce the category $\overline{Alg}$ as it is defined in \cite{1}.

Definition 2.10. $\overline{Alg}$ is the universal braided strict monoidal category, generated by a Hopf algebra $H$, equipped with \textit{ribbon elements} $w_+ : 1 \rightarrow H$, $w_- : 1 \rightarrow H$, \textit{copairing} $\sigma : 1 \rightarrow H \odot H$ and \textit{pairing} $\overline{\sigma} : H \odot H \rightarrow 1$, such that:

- $m \circ (w_+ \odot \text{id}) = m \circ (\text{id} \odot w_+)$, \hspace{1cm} (h1)
- $m \circ (w_+ \odot w_-) = \eta$, \hspace{1cm} (h2)
- $\epsilon \circ w_+ = 1$, \hspace{1cm} (h3)
- $S \circ w_+ = w_+$, \hspace{1cm} (h4)
- $\Delta \circ w_+ = (w_+ \odot w_+) \circ \sigma$, \hspace{1cm} (h5)
- $(\epsilon \circ \text{id}) \circ \sigma = \eta = (\text{id} \odot \epsilon) \circ \sigma$, \hspace{1cm} (h6 - 6')
The elementary morphisms and defining relations of $\overline{Alg}$ are presented in Table 6 where the notations adopted for all elementary morphisms with the exception of the ribbon elements, is the same as the one used for the analogous morphisms of $H^r$ in Tables 1 and 5. This won’t cause a confusion since, as we will see bellow, the functor from $\overline{Alg}$ to $H^r$ sends these morphisms to the corresponding ones in $H^r$. On the other hand, for the ribbon element of $\overline{Alg}$ and its inverse (which do not appear as elementary morphism of $H^r$) we have kept the notation used in [1].

We observe that $H^r$ and $\overline{Alg}$ present different choices for the set of ribbon axioms. Moreover, in the definition of $\overline{Alg}$ the integral morphisms and the normalization axiom (n) are missing.

3 The functor $\Gamma : \overline{Alg} \rightarrow \overline{H}^r$

In this section we define the functor from $\overline{Alg}$ to $\overline{H}^r$ and present an alternative set of axioms for $\overline{H}^r$.

The proofs in the section will consist in showing that some morphisms in the universal algebra $\overline{H}^r$ are equivalent, meaning that the graph diagram of one of them can be obtained from the graph diagram of the other by applying a sequence of the algebra’s axioms and properties. We will outline the main steps in this procedure by drawing in sequence some intermediate diagrams, and for each step we will indicate in the corresponding order, the main moves from Tables 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 needed to transform the diagram on the left into the one on the right. Notice, that the moves represent equivalences of diagrams and we will use the same notation for them and their inverses. On the other hand, we recall that the use of the isotopy moves ($f3-11$) and of the duality of the univalent vertices in Table 2 will be implicit.

In order to prove that there exist a functor $\overline{Alg} \rightarrow \overline{H}^r$, we need the following lemma, which shows that relations analogous to (h5) and (h10) in Definition 2.10 of $\overline{Alg}$ are satisfied in $\overline{H}^r$, i.e the proof of these relations doesn’t require that the copairing is non degenerate.

**Lemma 3.1.** The following relations are satisfied in $\overline{H}^r$:

\[
\Delta \circ v^{-1} \circ \eta = (v^{-1} \circ v^{-1}) \circ \sigma \quad (h5)
\]

\[
\alpha_1 \circ (id \circ \gamma) \circ (\Delta \circ id) = \eta \circ (id \circ \alpha_1) \circ (\Delta \circ id) \quad (h10)
\]
Elementary diagrams for $\mathcal{Alg}$

\begin{align*}
\gamma &= \quad \text{braiding} \\
\Delta &= \quad \text{comultiplication} \\
\varepsilon &= \quad \text{counit} \\
S &= \quad \text{antipode} \\
\tilde{\gamma} &= \quad \text{multiplication} \\
\eta &= \quad \text{unit} \\
w_+ &= \quad \text{ribbon element and its inverse} \\
w_- &= \quad \text{copairing} \\
\sigma &= \quad \text{pairing}
\end{align*}

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Table 6} & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}
Proof. The proofs are presented in Figures 7 and 8. Observe that the proof of (h10) uses relations (q7′) and (q8) in Table 4, equivalent to axioms (r8) and (r9). □

Figure 7: Proof of (h5).

Figure 8: Proof of Lemma (h10).

**Theorem 3.2.** There exists a braided monoidal functor $\Gamma : \overline{\text{Alg}} \rightarrow \overline{\text{H}}^r$ which preserves the Hopf algebra structure and sends the pairing and the copairing in $\overline{\text{Alg}}$ to the corresponding ones in $\overline{\text{H}}^r$. Moreover, (see Figure 9):

$\Gamma(w_+) = v^{-1} \circ \eta$, \hspace{1cm} $\Gamma(w_-) = v \circ \eta$.

Figure 9: Images under $\Gamma : \overline{\text{Alg}} \rightarrow \overline{\text{H}}^r$ of the ribbon element and its inverse.

Proof. It is enough to show that the defining relations of $\overline{\text{Alg}}$ in Table 6 are satisfied in the image of $\Gamma$. The braid, the bialgebra and the antipode axioms of $\overline{\text{Alg}}$ are the same as the ones of $\overline{\text{H}}^r$, so we only need to check the ribbon axioms. Most of them coincide or follow directly from axioms or properties of $\overline{\text{H}}^r$:

(h1) follows from (r5-5′) in Tables 4 and 8;
(h2) follows from (r1-2-5-5′) in Tables 4 and 8;
(h3) follows from (a8) and (r4) in Table 4;
(h4) follows from (r3) and (s6) in Tables 4 and 8;
(h5) and (h10) follow from Proposition 3.1;
(h6-6′) coincide with (p2-2′);
(h7-7′) coincide with (r7-7′) in Tables 4 and 8;
(h8-8′) coincide with (d2-2′) in 5.

The proofs of the remaining relations (h9), (h11) and (h12) are presented in Figures 10, 11 and 12. □
We believe that the functor $\Gamma : \text{Alg} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is not a category equivalence since the integral axioms and $(n)$ do not hold in $\text{Alg}$. On the other hand, the requirement that the Hopf algebra is selfdual is a strong one and it is legitimate to ask if in $\mathcal{H}$, axioms $(r8-9)$ are still independent from the rest or if they can be presented in simpler form. It seems to us that the independence still holds, but the next proposition, the second part of which was communicated to the author by Stamatova, shows that indeed, in $\mathcal{H}$ $(r9)$ is equivalent to $(h10)$ and $(r8)$ is equivalent to the requirement that the copairing intertwines with the adjoint action (see Figure 13).

Figure 13: Relations equivalent to $(r8)$ and $(r9)$ in $\mathcal{H}$.

**Proposition 3.3.** In $\mathcal{H}$, modulo the rest of its axioms

(a) axiom $(r8)$ is equivalent to relation $(q)$;

(b) [Stamatova] axiom $(r9)$ is equivalent to relation $(h10)$.

Therefore $\mathcal{H}$ is equivalent to the universal algebraic category, generated by the elementary morphisms and axioms in Tables 7 and 5 where axioms $(r8)$ and $(r9)$ are replaced by relations $(q)$ and $(h10)$.
Proof. We remind that according to Lemma 3.1 and property (q14) in Table 4, both relations (q) and (h12) hold in $\mathcal{H}r$. Moreover, modulo the other axioms of $\mathcal{H}r$, (r8) is equivalent to (q7') and (r9) is equivalent to (q8) in Table 4. Therefore, it is enough to show that (q7') follows from (q) and the rest of the axioms of $\mathcal{H}r$, excluded (r8), and that (q8) follows from (h12) and the rest of the axioms of $\mathcal{H}r$, excluded (r9). This is done in Figures 14 and 15.

Figure 14: Proof that in $\mathcal{H}r$ (q7') follows from (q).

Figure 15: Proof that in $\mathcal{H}r$ (q8) follows from (h10).
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