

Centers of categorified endomorphism rings

Alexandru Chirvasitu

Abstract

We prove that for a large class of well-behaved cocomplete categories \mathcal{C} the weak and strong Drinfeld centers of the monoidal category \mathcal{E} of cocontinuous endofunctors of \mathcal{C} coincide. This generalizes similar results in the literature, where \mathcal{C} is the category of modules over a ring A and hence \mathcal{E} is the category of A -bimodules.

Key words: Drinfeld center; weak center; locally presentable category; 2-abelian group; 2-ring; dualizable; linearly reductive

MSC 2020: 18D15; 18N10; 18E50; 16B50; 16T15

Introduction

The present note is motivated by the following result from [2] (see Theorem 2.10 therein):

Theorem 0.1 *For a ring A , the weak and strong centers of the monoidal category ${}_A\mathcal{M}_A$ of A -bimodules coincide.*

We give a refresher on the terminology in §1.2 below, pausing here only for a broad-strokes perspective on the result.

As seen from Definitions 1.8 and 1.10 below, Theorem 0.1 says, essentially, that a certain morphism

$$A \otimes V \rightarrow V \otimes A$$

of $A \otimes A$ -bimodules (for a bimodule $V \in {}_A\mathcal{M}_A$ underlying a weak-center object) is automatically an isomorphism. The proofs of [2, Propositions 2.5 and 2.6] make it clear that this is the type of rigidity phenomenon familiar from the theory of *descent* in ring theory and / or algebraic geometry [13]. In the latter setup one typically starts with commutative rings $R \rightarrow S$ and an S -module M and seeks to recover an R -module M_R such that

$$M \cong S \otimes_R M_R;$$

in other words, the goal is to *descend* the S -module to an R -module. The sort of structure necessary to achieve this in good cases (e.g. S is faithfully flat over R [13, Théorème 3.2]) is a *descent datum* (see [13, discussion preceding Proposition 3.1]): an $S \otimes S$ -module morphism

$$g : S \otimes M \rightarrow M \otimes S$$

(where ‘ \otimes ’ means ‘ \otimes_R ’) such that

(1) the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S \otimes S \otimes M & \xrightarrow{g_{23}} S \otimes M \otimes S & \xrightarrow{g_{12}} M \otimes S \otimes S \\ & \searrow g_{13} & \\ & & \end{array}$$

commutes (with the indices indicating the tensorands on which g operates), and

(2) the morphism

$$M \rightarrow S \otimes M \xrightarrow{g} M \otimes S \rightarrow M$$

is the identity, where the leftmost arrow is the natural inclusion obtained by tensoring the unit $R \rightarrow S$ of S with id_M and the rightmost arrow is multiplication by scalars in S .

Under these circumstances it turns out [13, Proposition 3.1] that in fact g is automatically an isomorphism. This is essentially the same phenomenon as that captured in Theorem 0.1 in the broader context of non-commutative rings.

In attempting to isolate precisely what it is about categories of bimodules that occasions such rigidity results one is led to consider the celebrated Eilenberg-Watts theorem ([21, Theorem 1] or [8]):

- ${}_A\mathcal{M}_A$ is equivalent to the category of cocontinuous (i.e. colimit-preserving [15, §V.4]) endofunctors of the category ${}_A\mathcal{M}$ of left A -modules (or its right-handed version \mathcal{M}_A),
- such that the monoidal structure given by ‘ \otimes_A ’ is identified with endofunctor composition.

This is the starting point for the generalization of Theorem 0.1 appearing as Theorem 2.1 below. The pattern we extrapolate can be summarized as follows (with a forward reference to §1.1 below for category-theoretic terminology).

- One can substitute other “well-behaved” cocomplete categories \mathcal{C} for ${}_A\mathcal{M}$;
- and their *duals* $\mathcal{C}^* \cong$ consisting of cocontinuous functors $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow$ (some “base” category) for \mathcal{M}_A ;
- and their *endomorphism 2-rings*

$$\mathcal{E} := \mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{C}^* \cong \text{cocontinuous endofunctors of } \mathcal{C} \tag{0-1}$$

for ${}_A\mathcal{M}_A$.

For (0-1) to be both meaningful and valid \mathcal{C} needs to be what in Definition 1.6 (and [4, Definition 1.1]) we refer to as *dualizable* (this is what ‘well-behaved’ means in the above discussion). With all of this behind us, Theorem 2.1 reads more or less as follows.

Theorem 0.2 *If \mathcal{C} is a dualizable locally presentable category then the weak center of its category of cocontinuous endofunctors coincides with its strong center.*

In addition to recovering Theorem 0.1, this applies to categories \mathcal{C} going beyond modules, as we recall in Section 2: \mathcal{C} can be, for instance,

- the category \mathcal{M}^C of right-comodules over a *right-semiperfect* ([14, p.369]) coalgebra over a field;
- the category $\text{QCOH}([X/G])$ of quasicoherent sheaves over the quotient stack $[X/G]$ where X is affine and G is a *virtually linearly reductive* [7, §1] linear algebraic group acting on X .

Acknowledgements

This work was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-2001128.

I am grateful for illuminating comments by Ana Agore and for the referee's careful reading and insightful comments.

1 Preliminaries

Some standard background on monoidal categories is needed, as covered for instance in [11, Chapter XI], [5, §5.1], [15, Chapter XI], and any number of other sources.

1.1 Some 2-algebra

We reprise some terminology from [6, §2].

Definition 1.1 (a) A *2-abelian group* is a locally presentable category in the sense of [1, Definition 1.17]. 2-abelian groups form a 2-category $2\mathbf{AB}$ with left adjoints as 1-morphisms and natural transformations as 2-morphisms.

(b) A *2-ring* is a 2-abelian group \mathcal{C} which is in addition a monoidal category with tensor product ' \otimes ', so that all functors of the form $x \otimes -$ and $- \otimes x$ are left adjoints. 2-rings similarly form a 2-category $2\mathbf{RNG}$ with *monoidal* left adjoints as 1-morphisms.

(c) A *commutative 2-ring* is a 2-ring additionally equipped with a symmetry (i.e. it is a symmetric monoidal category). As before, these form the 2-category $2\mathbf{COMRNG}$ with symmetric monoidal left adjoints as 1-morphisms. \blacklozenge

It turns out (e.g. [6, Corollary 2.2.5]) that $2\mathbf{AB}$ is symmetric monoidal, being equipped with a tensor product denoted by ' \boxtimes '. For 2-abelian groups \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} their tensor product $\mathcal{A} \boxtimes \mathcal{B}$ is the universal recipient of a bifunctor

$$\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \boxtimes \mathcal{B}$$

that is separately cocontinuous (i.e. a “bilinear map” of 2-abelian groups). The symmetric monoidal structure lifts to $2\mathbf{RNG}$ and $2\mathbf{COMRNG}$ in the sense that if \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are 2-rings so is $\mathcal{A} \boxtimes \mathcal{B}$ in a natural fashion, etc.

This machinery allows us to employ the usual language of rings and modules in the context of 2-abelian groups:

Definition 1.2 Let \mathcal{R} be a 2-ring. A *left (2-) \mathcal{R} -module* is a 2-abelian group \mathcal{X} equipped with a morphism $\mathcal{R} \boxtimes \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ in $2\mathbf{AB}$, satisfying the obvious unitality and associativity conditions. *Right (2-) \mathcal{R} -modules* are defined analogously, as are bimodules, etc.

The respective 2-categories of left or right or bimodules are denoted by ${}_{\mathcal{R}}\mathcal{M}$, $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{R}}$ and ${}_{\mathcal{R}}\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}$ respectively. \blacklozenge

As usual, we have tensor product 2-bifunctors

$${}_{\mathcal{R}}\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}} \times {}_{\mathcal{S}}\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}} \xrightarrow{\boxtimes_{\mathcal{S}}} {}_{\mathcal{R}}\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}} :$$

For 2- \mathcal{S} -modules \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} with module-structure functors

$$\mathcal{X} \boxtimes \mathcal{S} \xrightarrow{\triangleleft} \mathcal{X} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{S} \boxtimes \mathcal{Y} \xrightarrow{\triangleright} \mathcal{Y}$$

we can define $\mathcal{X} \boxtimes_{\mathcal{S}} \mathcal{Y}$ as the universal functor π admitting a natural isomorphism θ as depicted below:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{X} \boxtimes \mathcal{S} \boxtimes \mathcal{Y} & \xrightarrow{\llbracket \text{id} \rrbracket} & \mathcal{X} \boxtimes \mathcal{Y} & \xrightarrow{\pi} & \mathcal{X} \boxtimes_{\mathcal{S}} \mathcal{Y} \\ & & \cong \Downarrow \theta & & \\ \mathcal{X} \boxtimes \mathcal{S} \boxtimes \mathcal{Y} & \xrightarrow{\text{id} \boxtimes \triangleright} & \mathcal{X} \boxtimes \mathcal{Y} & \xrightarrow{\pi} & \mathcal{X} \boxtimes_{\mathcal{S}} \mathcal{Y} \end{array}$$

This is a 2-colimit, and can be obtained as a combination of a *co-inserter* and a *co-equifier*: constructions dual to the inserters and equifiers of [1, §2.71 and Lemma 2.76], for instance. [6, Proposition 2.1.11] outlines a more explicit construction for such 2-colimits in 2AB, which do exist.

In particular, for a *commutative* 2-ring \mathcal{R} , the 2-category ${}_{\mathcal{R}}\mathcal{M} \cong \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{R}}$ is symmetric monoidal under $\boxtimes_{\mathcal{R}}$.

Definition 1.3 For a commutative 2-ring \mathcal{R} an \mathcal{R} -algebra (or 2- \mathcal{R} -algebra for extra precision) is an algebra in the symmetric monoidal 2-category ${}_{\mathcal{R}}\mathcal{M}$. \blacklozenge

It turns out that 2AB is not only symmetric monoidal but also *monoidal-closed*, i.e. has *internal homs*. More precisely, we have the familiar hom-tensor adjunction in the present higher-categorical setting (see e.g. [12, §6.5], [1, Exercise 1.1]). The following result is a “relative” version of [4, Lemma 2.7] (which cites the preceding two sources), in the sense that it deals with modules over 2-rings rather than plain 2-abelian groups. The techniques involved in the proofs are no different.

Lemma 1.4 Let \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} be three 2-rings.

(a) For any two bimodules

- $\mathcal{X} \in {}_{\mathcal{R}}\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}$
- $\mathcal{Y} \in {}_{\mathcal{S}}\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}$

the category

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{X}) := \{\text{left adjoints } \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y} \text{ compatible with the 2-module structures}\}$$

has a natural structure of a \mathcal{R} - \mathcal{S} -bimodule.

(b) This gives us, for each bimodule $\mathcal{Y} \in {}_{\mathcal{S}}\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}$, a 2-adjunction

$$\begin{array}{ccc} {}_{\mathcal{R}}\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}} & \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{-\boxtimes_{\mathcal{S}} \mathcal{Y}} \\ \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{Y}, -)} \end{array} & {}_{\mathcal{R}}\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}} \end{array}$$

with the top arrow as the left (2-)adjoint. \blacksquare

Remark 1.5 We leave it to the reader to formulate analogous versions for tensoring on the left rather than right, etc. \blacklozenge

Definition 1.6 Let \mathcal{R} be a 2-ring and \mathcal{X} a left \mathcal{R} -module.

(a) The *dual* \mathcal{X}^* of \mathcal{X} over \mathcal{R} is ${}_{\mathcal{R}}\text{Hom}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{R})$; it is a *right* \mathcal{R} -module. Similarly, duals of right modules are naturally left modules.

(b) If \mathcal{R} is commutative the 2- \mathcal{R} -module \mathcal{X} is *(1-)dualizable over \mathcal{R}* if the canonical morphism

$$\mathcal{X} \boxtimes_{\mathcal{R}} \mathcal{X}^* \xrightarrow{\text{CAN}} \text{END}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{X}) \quad (1-1)$$

is an isomorphism of 2- \mathcal{R} -modules. \blacklozenge

Remark 1.7 For any 2-ring \mathcal{R} and 2- \mathcal{R} -module \mathcal{X} $\text{END}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{X})$ is naturally a 2-ring (and a 2- \mathcal{R} -algebra when \mathcal{R} is commutative), with composition as the tensor product and $\text{id}_{\mathcal{X}}$ as the unit. \blacklozenge

Dualizable objects (typically over $\mathcal{R} = \text{Vect}_{\mathbb{K}}$ for some field \mathbb{K}) were the focus of [4], where we give alternative characterizations of dualizability in [4, Lemma 3.1]. In particular, it is enough to require that the identity

$$\text{id}_{\mathcal{X}} \in \text{END}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{X})$$

belong to the image of (1-1).

1.2 Centers

Recall (e.g. [11, Definition XIII.4.1] or [10, Definition 3]):

Definition 1.8 Let $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, \mathbf{1})$ be a monoidal category. The *(Drinfeld) center* $Z(\mathcal{C})$ of \mathcal{C} is the category of pairs (x, θ) where $x \in \mathcal{C}$ is an object and

$$\theta : - \otimes x \xrightarrow{\cong} x \otimes - \quad (1-2)$$

is a natural isomorphism satisfying the following conditions (suppressing the associativity constraints in the monoidal category):

(1) For $y, z \in \mathcal{C}$ the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} y \otimes z \otimes x & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_y \otimes \theta_z} & y \otimes x \otimes z & \xrightarrow{\theta_y \otimes \text{id}_z} & x \otimes y \otimes z \\ & \searrow \theta_{y \otimes z} & & \nearrow & \\ & & & & \end{array}$$

commutes, and

(2) the isomorphism

$$\theta_{\mathbf{1}} : \mathbf{1} \otimes x \rightarrow x \otimes \mathbf{1}$$

is the canonical one attached to the monoidal structure $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, \mathbf{1})$. \blacklozenge

Remark 1.9 In fact, in Definition 1.8 condition (2) follows from (1), but this uses the fact that θ is an *isomorphism*; we have displayed both conditions with an eye towards Definition 1.10 below. \blacklozenge

Following [18, Definition 4.3] (where the notion seems to have been introduced) and [2, §1.1], we give

Definition 1.10 For $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, \mathbf{1})$ as in Definition 1.8 the *weak right center* $WZ_r(\mathcal{C})$ is the category of pairs (x, θ) as above, satisfying conditions (1) and (2), but requiring only that (1-2) be a natural transformation.

One defines the *weak left center* $WZ_\ell(\mathcal{C})$ analogously, requiring a natural transformation

$$x \otimes - \rightarrow - \otimes x$$

instead.

Unless specified otherwise *weak center* means *weak right center*, and we simply write WZ for WZ_r . \blacklozenge

2 Main results

Theorem 2.1 *Let \mathcal{R} be a commutative 2-ring, $\mathcal{X} \in {}_{\mathcal{R}}\mathcal{M}$ a dualizable \mathcal{R} -module, and*

$$\mathcal{E} := \mathcal{X} \boxtimes_{\mathcal{R}} \mathcal{X}^* \cong \text{END}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{X}) \quad (2-1)$$

its endomorphism ring. Then, the canonical fully faithful inclusion

$$Z(\mathcal{E}) \rightarrow WZ(\mathcal{E}) \quad (2-2)$$

is an equivalence.

This requires some preliminary discussion and tooling, starting with the observation that this weak-equals-strong principle cannot be expected to hold in general: [Definition 1.10](#) is indeed a weakening of [Definition 1.8](#), in the sense that there are examples of monoidal categories (even 2-algebras) \mathcal{C} where the canonical functor (2-2) is not an equivalence.

Example 2.2 Let $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, \mathbf{1})$ be any symmetric, additive monoidal category. Recall (e.g. [\[9, Definition 2.1\]](#)) that its *Bernstein center* is the (commutative) ring of natural endomorphisms of the identity functor. Any element θ of the Bernstein center gives an element $(\mathbf{1}, \psi)$ of the weak center $WZ(\mathcal{C})$, whereby

$$y \cong y \otimes \mathbf{1} \xrightarrow{\psi_y} \mathbf{1} \otimes y \cong y$$

is simply θ_y , provided $\theta_{\mathbf{1}}$ is the identity. Furthermore, if θ_y fails to be an isomorphism for any y we obtain an element outside the plain center $Z(\mathcal{C})$.

All of this is easily arranged. Let \mathcal{C} , for instance, be the (symmetric, monoidal) category $\text{Rep}_f(G)$ of finite-dimensional complex representations over a finite group G . Every $y \in \text{Rep}_f(G)$ has a canonical *$\mathbf{1}$ -isotypic component*: the space y^G of all G -invariant vectors in y . There is an element θ of the Bernstein center that surjects every object onto this isotypic component:

$$y \ni v \xrightarrow{\theta_y} \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{g \in G} gv \in y$$

If G is non-trivial then θ_y will fail to be an isomorphism on those y that are not sums of copies of $\mathbf{1}$, and we have an example as required above. \blacklozenge

Since \mathcal{R} is our “base ring” throughout the discussion we henceforth abbreviate ‘ $\boxtimes_{\mathcal{R}}$ ’ to simply ‘ \boxtimes ’, and similarly for $\text{HOM} := \text{HOM}_{\mathcal{R}}$. Recall also our notation (2-1) for the endomorphism 2-ring \mathcal{E} of \mathcal{X} .

Because \mathcal{X} is assumed dualizable over \mathcal{R} , the canonical morphism

$$\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^{**}$$

is an isomorphism (of abelian 2-groups, i.e. an equivalence of categories). It follows from this that \mathcal{E} is also dualizable and in fact self-dual, and we can identify

$$\text{END}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{E}) \cong \mathcal{E} \boxtimes \mathcal{E}^* \cong \mathcal{E} \boxtimes \mathcal{E} \cong \mathcal{X} \boxtimes \mathcal{X}^* \boxtimes \mathcal{X} \boxtimes \mathcal{X}^*. \quad (2-3)$$

Given that 2AB is a *symmetric* monoidal 2-category, there is some choice in how we identify the right and left-hand sides of (2-3). In the sequel, it will be convenient to make this identification

by pairing the two *middle* tensorands on the right-hand side of (2-3) against $\mathcal{E} \cong \mathcal{X} \boxtimes \mathcal{X}^*$ in the obvious fashion (by pairing each \mathcal{X} to a \mathcal{X}^*). Concretely, simple-tensor object

$$x \boxtimes f \boxtimes y \boxtimes g \in \mathcal{X} \boxtimes \mathcal{X}^* \boxtimes \mathcal{X} \boxtimes \mathcal{X}^*$$

corresponds to the element

$$\mathcal{E} \ni \psi \longmapsto f(\psi(y))x \boxtimes g \in \mathcal{X} \boxtimes \mathcal{X}^* \cong \mathcal{E}$$

of $\text{END}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{E})$.

Now fix an object $(e, \theta) \in WZ(\mathcal{E})$ of the weak right center and consider the two endomorphisms

$$- \otimes e \text{ and } e \otimes - \in \text{END}(\mathcal{E}) \cong \mathcal{E} \boxtimes \mathcal{E}.$$

With the above convention in mind, they are identifiable, respectively, with

$$\mathbf{1} \boxtimes e \quad \text{and} \quad e \boxtimes \mathbf{1} \tag{2-4}$$

where

$$\mathbf{1} := \text{id}_{\mathcal{X}} = \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}} \in \mathcal{E} = \text{END}(\mathcal{X}) \cong \mathcal{X} \boxtimes \mathcal{X}^*$$

is the identity functor on \mathcal{X} (i.e. the monoidal unit of \mathcal{E}). We caution the reader that the tensor product in (2-4) is *external*, i.e. it is not to be confused with the internal tensor product ‘ \otimes ’ of \mathcal{E} . Indeed, under the latter we of course have

$$\mathbf{1} \otimes e \cong e \cong e \otimes \mathbf{1}$$

(as in any monoidal category).

The natural transformation

$$- \otimes e \rightarrow e \otimes -$$

that constitutes the structure of a weak-center element (Definition 1.10) translates to a morphism

$$\mathbf{1} \boxtimes e \xrightarrow{\theta} e \boxtimes \mathbf{1} \tag{2-5}$$

in $\mathcal{E} \boxtimes \mathcal{E}$ (denoted slightly abusively by the same symbol ‘ θ ’ we used for the natural transformation in Definition 1.10). The conditions (1) and (2) can then be recast in terms of (2-5) as we explain presently.

To express condition (1) we need to work in the *triple* tensor product $\mathcal{E}^{\boxtimes 3}$. To that end, we consider morphisms between tensor products of e and two copies of $\mathbf{1}$, with two indices among 1, 2 and 3 indicating where θ operates. Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{12} &:= \theta \boxtimes \text{id}_{\mathbf{1}} : \mathbf{1} \boxtimes e \boxtimes \mathbf{1} \rightarrow e \boxtimes \mathbf{1} \boxtimes \mathbf{1}, \\ \theta_{23} &:= \text{id}_{\mathbf{1}} \boxtimes \theta : \mathbf{1} \boxtimes \mathbf{1} \boxtimes e \rightarrow \mathbf{1} \boxtimes e \boxtimes \mathbf{1}, \end{aligned}$$

and similarly,

$$\theta_{13} : \mathbf{1} \boxtimes \mathbf{1} \boxtimes e \rightarrow e \boxtimes \mathbf{1} \boxtimes \mathbf{1}$$

is the morphism acting identically on the middle tensorand and as θ on the two outer ones. (1) in Definition 1.8 can now be recovered simply as

$$\theta_{13} = \theta_{12} \circ \theta_{23} : \mathbf{1} \boxtimes \mathbf{1} \boxtimes e \rightarrow e \boxtimes \mathbf{1} \boxtimes \mathbf{1}. \tag{2-6}$$

Next, denote by

$$m : \mathcal{E} \boxtimes \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$$

the “multiplication” morphism, imparting on $\mathcal{E} = \text{END}(\mathcal{X})$ its monoidal category structure. In terms of the decomposition

$$\mathcal{E} \boxtimes \mathcal{E} \cong \mathcal{X} \boxtimes \mathcal{X}^* \boxtimes \mathcal{X} \boxtimes \mathcal{X}^*$$

m is simply the evaluation of the two middle tensorands \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{X}^* against each other. With this in place, condition (2) in Definition 1.8 simply asks that

$$m(\theta) : \mathbf{1} \otimes e \rightarrow e \otimes \mathbf{1}$$

be the canonical isomorphism, i.e. the identity once we have made the usual identifications

$$\mathbf{1} \otimes e \cong e \cong e \otimes \mathbf{1}.$$

In short, for future reference:

$$m(\theta) = \text{id}_e : e \cong \mathbf{1} \otimes e \rightarrow e \otimes \mathbf{1} \cong e. \quad (2-7)$$

Proof of Theorem 2.1 Since we already know that (2-2) is fully faithful (as is immediate from Definitions 1.8 and 1.10), it remains to show that it is essentially surjective: for an arbitrary object $(e, \theta) \in WZ(\mathcal{E})$ the morphism (2-5) is an isomorphism in $\mathcal{E} \boxtimes \mathcal{E}$. What we will in fact do is identify the inverse of θ : it is precisely

$$\theta' := \tau \circ \theta \circ \tau : e \boxtimes \mathbf{1} \rightarrow \mathbf{1} \boxtimes e,$$

where τ is the tensorand-reversal functor on $\mathcal{E} \boxtimes \mathcal{E}$.

Denote by

$$m_{13} : \mathcal{E} \boxtimes \mathcal{E} \boxtimes \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E} \boxtimes \mathcal{E}$$

the functor that multiplies the outer (first and third) tensorands of the domain onto the second tensorand of the codomain. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} \theta &= m_{13}(\theta_{23}) \quad \text{and} \\ \theta' &= m_{13}(\theta_{12}), \end{aligned}$$

meaning that

$$m_{13}(\theta_{13}) = m_{13}(\theta_{12} \circ \theta_{23}) = \theta' \circ \theta \quad (2-8)$$

(where the first equality uses (2-6) above). On the other hand though, (2-7) implies that the left-hand side $m_{13}(\theta_{13})$ of (2-8) is nothing but the identity, and thus

$$\theta' \circ \theta = \text{id}_{\mathbf{1} \boxtimes e}.$$

The other composition $\theta \circ \theta'$ is treated similarly, so we do not repeat the argument. ■

Remark 2.3 The proof of Theorem 2.1 given above is a paraphrase, in the present categorified context, of an argument familiar from descent theory. See e.g. [13, Proposition 3.1]. Where \mathcal{X} would have been the category of modules over (in those authors’ notation) a ring S . ◆

In the context of k -linear 2-abelian groups (for some field k) the examples of dualizable \mathcal{C} in [4] are all, abstractly, of the form

$$k\text{-linear functors } \Gamma^{op} \rightarrow {}_k\text{VECT} \quad (2-9)$$

for small k -linear categories Γ . These are also

- the k -linear abelian categories admitting a generating set of *small* projective objects [17, §3.6, Corollary 6.4];
- the k -linear locally presentable admitting a strongly generating set of small projective objects [12, Theorem 5.26];

recall that the small projective objects in an abelian category \mathcal{C} are simply those $x \in \mathcal{C}$ for which the representable functor

$$\text{hom}(x, -) : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{SET}$$

is cocontinuous. This is taken as the definition of the hyphenated term ‘*strong-projective*’ in [12, §5.5], and we reuse that term in Corollary 2.4 below for consistency.

Conversely, [4, Lemma 3.5] shows that *all* categories of the form (2-9) are dualizable 2-modules over ${}_k\text{VECT}$. The same argument goes through for arbitrary commutative 2-rings \mathcal{R} (in place of ${}_k\text{VECT}$), so we have

Corollary 2.4 *Let \mathcal{R} be a commutative 2-ring and \mathcal{X} a 2- \mathcal{R} -module with a strong generating set of small-projective objects. Then, the weak center of the monoidal category*

$$\mathcal{X} \boxtimes_{\mathcal{R}} \mathcal{X}^* \cong \text{END}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{X})$$

coincides with its strong center. ■

We end with some examples of categories falling under the scope of Corollary 2.4 (and hence Theorem 2.1).

Example 2.5 Throughout the present discussion we assume C is a coalgebra over a field.

By [4, Theorem 1.3], Theorem 2.1 applies to categories of right comodules \mathcal{M}^C over *right-semiperfect* coalgebras C in the sense of [14, p.369]: every right C -comodule has a projective cover.

This of course includes cosemisimple coalgebras (i.e. those with only projective modules or equivalently, direct sums of simple coalgebras; [20, Definition, p.290] or [16, Definition 2.4.1]). ◆

Example 2.6 Overlapping Example 2.5 to a degree, consider a linear algebraic group [3, §1.6] G acting on an affine scheme X and the category

$$\text{QCOH}(X)^G \cong \text{QCOH}([X/G]) \quad (2-10)$$

of G -equivariant quasicoherent sheaves on X , or equivalently, as (2-10) recalls ([19, Tag 06WV]), that of quasicoherent sheaves on the quotient stack [19, Tag 044O] $[X/G]$.

According to [4, Theorem 1.5] (2-10) is dualizable provided G is *virtually linearly reductive* in the sense of [7, §1]: G has a normal linearly reductive closed algebraic subgroup $H \trianglelefteq G$ such that G/H is a finite group scheme. This means that

- the Hopf algebra $\mathcal{O}(H)$ is cosemisimple while $\mathcal{O}(G/H)$ is finite-dimensional;

- equivalently by [7, Theorem, p.76], the Hopf algebra $\mathcal{O}(G)$ of regular functions on G is (left and right) semiperfect in the sense of Example 2.5. \blacklozenge

Example 2.7 One can generalize Example 2.6 as follows. Note that the category (2-10) can be recovered as that of $\mathcal{O}(X)$ -modules (where $\mathcal{O}(X)$ is the algebra of regular functions on X) internal to the category of $\mathcal{O}(G)$ -comodules. In short:

$$\mathrm{QCOH}([X/G]) \cong \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{O}(X)}^{\mathcal{O}(G)}.$$

Mimicking this construction, we can take \mathcal{X} in Theorem 2.1 to be the category \mathcal{M}_A of (right, say) modules over an algebra A internal to the commutative 2-algebra \mathcal{R} (so that in Example 2.6 we would have $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{O}(G)}$ and $A = \mathcal{O}(X)$).

This means that Theorem 2.1 applies, for instance, to categories of graded modules over graded algebras (for arbitrary grading monoids), etc. \blacklozenge

References

- [1] Jiří Adámek and Jiří Rosický. *Locally presentable and accessible categories*, volume 189 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994.
- [2] A. L. Agore, S. Caenepeel, and G. Militaru. The center of the category of bimodules and descent data for noncommutative rings. *J. Algebra Appl.*, 11(6):1250102, 17, 2012.
- [3] Armand Borel. *Linear algebraic groups*, volume 126 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1991.
- [4] Martin Brandenburg, Alexandru Chirvasitu, and Theo Johnson-Freyd. Reflexivity and dualizability in categorified linear algebra. *Theory Appl. Categ.*, 30:Paper No. 23, 808–835, 2015.
- [5] Vyjayanthi Chari and Andrew Pressley. *A guide to quantum groups*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995. Corrected reprint of the 1994 original.
- [6] Alexandru Chirvasitu and Theo Johnson-Freyd. The fundamental pro-groupoid of an affine 2-scheme. *Appl. Categ. Structures*, 21(5):469–522, 2013.
- [7] Stephen Donkin. On projective modules for algebraic groups. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)*, 54(1):75–88, 1996.
- [8] Samuel Eilenberg. Abstract description of some basic functors. *J. Indian Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 24:231–234 (1961), 1960.
- [9] David Helm. The Bernstein center of the category of smooth $W(k)[\mathrm{GL}_n(F)]$ -modules. *Forum Math. Sigma*, 4:Paper No. e11, 98, 2016.
- [10] André Joyal and Ross Street. Tortile Yang-Baxter operators in tensor categories. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 71(1):43–51, 1991.
- [11] Christian Kassel. *Quantum groups*, volume 155 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.

- [12] G. M. Kelly. Basic concepts of enriched category theory. *Repr. Theory Appl. Categ.*, (10):vi+137, 2005.
- [13] Max-Albert Knus and Manuel Ojanguren. *Théorie de la descente et algèbres d’Azumaya*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 389. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1974.
- [14] Bertrand I-peng Lin. Semiperfect coalgebras. *J. Algebra*, 49(2):357–373, 1977.
- [15] Saunders Mac Lane. *Categories for the working mathematician*, volume 5 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1998.
- [16] Susan Montgomery. *Hopf algebras and their actions on rings*, volume 82 of *CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics*. Published for the Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, DC; by the American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1993.
- [17] N. Popescu. *Abelian categories with applications to rings and modules*. Academic Press, London-New York, 1973. London Mathematical Society Monographs, No. 3.
- [18] Peter Schauenburg. Duals and doubles of quantum groupoids (\times_R -Hopf algebras). In *New trends in Hopf algebra theory (La Falda, 1999)*, volume 267 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 273–299. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2000.
- [19] The Stacks Project Authors. *Stacks Project*. <https://stacks.math.columbia.edu>, 2018.
- [20] Moss E. Sweedler. *Hopf algebras*. Mathematics Lecture Note Series. W. A. Benjamin, Inc., New York, 1969.
- [21] Charles E. Watts. Intrinsic characterizations of some additive functors. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 11:5–8, 1960.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY AT BUFFALO, BUFFALO, NY 14260-2900, USA
E-mail address: chirvasitua@gmail.com