

# QUANTIZATION OF ALGEBRAIC INVARIANTS THROUGH TOPOLOGICAL QUANTUM FIELD THEORIES

ÁNGEL GONZÁLEZ-PRIETO

ABSTRACT. In this paper we investigate the problem of constructing Topological Quantum Field Theories (TQFTs) to quantize algebraic invariants. We provide necessary conditions for quantizability based on Euler characteristics and, in the case of surfaces, also sufficient conditions in terms of almost-TQFTs and almost-Frobenius algebras. As an application, we show that the  $E$ -polynomial of  $G$ -representation varieties is not a quantizable invariant by means of a monoidal TQFTs, for any algebraic group  $G$  of positive dimension.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Since their inception by Witten [21] and Atiyah [1], Topological Quantum Field Theories (TQFTs) have become very important algebro-geometric tools in mathematical physics, homotopy theory, and knot theory, among others. Recall that a (monoidal) TQFT is a monoidal symmetric functor

$$\mathcal{Z} : \mathbf{Bd}_{n+1} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$$

out of the category of  $(n+1)$ -dimensional bordisms into a symmetric monoidal category  $\mathcal{C}$ , which is typically taken as  $\mathcal{C} = R\text{-Mod}$ , the category of  $R$ -modules.

Exploiting the monoidality of  $\mathcal{Z}$ , the classification of such functors has been accomplished in the literature in the case of  $(1+1)$ -TQFTs [13], fully extended TQFT as functors of  $\infty$ -categories [15] or precise classification of extended 2-dimensional TQFTs [18] in terms of generators and relators of the bordism category. Indeed, extending these TQFTs to the  $\infty$ -category framework has motivated some of the recent exciting developments in higher category theory [14], motivic homotopy theory [7], and factorization homology [2].

However, apart from the theoretic developments, TQFTs have also been used to compute algebraic invariants of smooth manifolds. Indeed, suppose that we are interested in some invariant  $\chi(W) \in R$  for  $(n+1)$ -dimensional orientable manifolds  $W$ , which may be quite hard to compute, e.g. because it captures the geometry of some moduli space attached to  $W$ . In that case, suppose that we manage to find a TQFT

$$\mathcal{Z} : \mathbf{Bd}_{n+1} \rightarrow R\text{-Mod}$$

such that, for any closed  $(n+1)$ -dimensional manifold  $W$ , seen as a bordism  $W : \emptyset \rightarrow \emptyset$ , the map  $\mathcal{Z}(W) : R \rightarrow R$  is given by multiplication by  $\chi(W)$ . In this situation, we will say that the invariant  $\chi$  has been (strongly) quantized.

In this case, it turns out that we can use the categorical structure of  $\mathbf{Bd}_{n+1}$  to decompose  $W$  into simpler pieces and to re-ensable the invariant by gluing the morphisms. For instance, in the  $1+1$  case (surfaces) we have that the genus  $g$  closed orientable surface  $\Sigma_g$  can be decomposed as shown in Figure 1.

---

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 57R56, Secondary: 18M05, 57K16, 14D21.

Key words and phrases: Topological Quantum Field Theory, TQFT, quantization, monoidal structure, representation variety.




FIGURE 1. Decomposition of a closed orientable surface into simpler pieces

Hence, in this context, we can compute the invariant  $\chi(\Sigma_g)$  once at a time for all the surfaces as

$$(1) \quad \chi(\Sigma_g) = \mathcal{Z}(D^\dagger) \circ (\mathcal{Z}(L))^g \circ \mathcal{Z}(D)(1).$$

However, quantizing  $\chi$  may be an impossible task for some important invariants. The reason is that the monoidality constraint of the TQFT actually imposes very strong restrictions, such as duality, on the modules associated through  $\mathcal{Z}$ . The main aim of this paper is to investigate this quantizability problem:

**Question.** *Given an invariant  $\chi$ , does there exist a TQFT  $\mathcal{Z} : \mathbf{Bd}_{n+1} \rightarrow R\text{-Mod}$  such that  $\chi(W) = \mathcal{Z}(W)(1)$  for any closed orientable  $(n+1)$ -dimensional manifold?*

Our first result in this direction is a consequence of a well-known argument regarding the trace of the map associated by  $\mathcal{Z}$ , presented in Proposition 2.7 for the sake of completeness.

**Theorem** (Corollary 2.8). *Let  $\chi$  be a diffeomorphism-invariant with values in a ring  $R$ . If there exists a closed orientable manifold  $M$  such that  $\chi(M \times S^1)$  does not lie in the subring of integers of  $R$ , then the invariant  $\chi$  is not strongly quantizable.*

Despite its simplicity, from this result we directly get the following key observation. Suppose that we want to understand a certain functor  $\mathcal{M} : \mathbf{Diff}_c^{or} \rightarrow \mathbf{Top}$  out of the category  $\mathbf{Diff}_c^{or}$  of closed orientable smooth manifolds. We think of  $\mathcal{M}(W)$  as a certain moduli space attached to  $W$ . If there exists  $M$  such that  $\mathcal{M}(M \times S^1)$  is not an acyclic space, then the Poincaré polynomial of  $\mathcal{M}$  (or any other graded homology-based invariant of  $\mathcal{M}$ ) is not strongly quantizable.

For these reasons, the business of finding genuine TQFTs to compute homology invariants of classical moduli spaces is intrinsically too restrictive. To overcome this problem, in [11], it was proposed that a weak version, called an almost-TQFTs, may be used as substitutes of genuine monoidal TQFTs. To be precise, let  $\mathbf{Tb}_{n+1}$  be the wide subcategory of  $\mathbf{Bd}_{n+1}$  with the same objects but whose morphisms are disjoint unions of ‘tubes’, that is, bordisms with connected in and out boundaries. Then, an almost-TQFT is a monoidal symmetric functor

$$\mathcal{Z} : \mathbf{Tb}_{n+1} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}.$$

Of course, working in  $\mathbf{Tb}_{n+1}$  we are not allowed to decompose our manifold into any simple piece, only into tubes. However, this restriction does not jeopardize most of the important gluing arguments used to compute invariants, such as Equation (1), so almost-TQFTs can still be used to quantize invariants. In this setting, we will say that an invariant  $\chi$  is almost-quantizable if there exists an almost-TQFT that computes it.

The key point is that these almost-TQFTs can be also interpreted in terms of lax monoidal TQFTs. Lax monoidality means that the functor  $\mathcal{Z} : \mathbf{Bd}_{n+1} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  does not preserve the monoidal structure, but it is equipped with a collection of natural maps

$$\Delta_{M_1, M_2} : \mathcal{Z}(M_1) \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{Z}(M_2) \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}(M_1 \sqcup M_2),$$

for any  $M_1, M_2 \in \mathbf{Bd}_{n+1}$ . In this scenario, the functor  $\mathcal{Z}$  does not have to satisfy duality properties, so  $\mathcal{Z}(M_1 \sqcup M_2)$  can be larger than  $\mathcal{Z}(M_1) \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{Z}(M_2)$ , let us say, by containing elements ‘not lying in the diagonal’ (e.g. think of  $\mathcal{Z}(M)$  as the derived category of coherent sheaves on  $\mathcal{M}(M)$ ). Obviously, any lax monoidal TQFT induces an almost-TQFT by restriction. In this paper we also show that the converse holds true.

**Theorem** (Theorem 2.11). *If  $\mathcal{C}$  is a co-complete category, then any almost-TQFT  $Z$  induces a lax monoidal TQFT  $\mathcal{Z}$  through Kan extension*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{Bd}_{n+1} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{Z}} & \mathcal{C} \\ \uparrow & \nearrow Z & \\ \mathbf{Tb}_{n+1} & & \end{array}$$

Thanks to the simple structure of  $\mathbf{Tb}_{n+1}$ , it turns out that the almost-quantizability problem is much simpler than the strong quantizability. For instance, for surfaces,  $\mathbf{Tb}_{1+1}$  is literally made of disjoint unions of the bordisms  $D, D^\dagger$  and  $L$  of Figure 1. In this way, an almost-TQFT for surfaces can be understood as a linear discrete dynamical system. Using that the solution to linear dynamical system can be written explicitly, we get the following result

**Theorem** (Theorem 3.13 and Remark 3.14). *A non-constant invariant  $\chi$  of closed orientable surfaces with values in a field  $k$  is almost-quantizable if and only if there exist  $n \geq 1$ , a partition  $(m_1, \dots, m_s)$  of  $n$ , and coefficients  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s \in \bar{k}$  and  $a_{i,j} \in \bar{k}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq s$  and  $0 \leq j \leq m_i - 1$ , in the algebraic closure  $\bar{k}$  of  $k$ , such that for all  $g \geq \max(m_1, \dots, m_s)$*

$$\chi(\Sigma_g) = \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=0}^{m_i-1} a_{i,j} \binom{g}{j} \lambda_i^{g-j}.$$

Furthermore, if the  $n \times n$  matrix  $(\chi(\Sigma_{g+g'}))_{1 \leq g, g' \leq n}$  is invertible, then  $\chi(\Sigma_g)$  for  $g \geq 0$  must take the simpler form

$$\chi(\Sigma_g) = a_1 \lambda_1^g + a_2 \lambda_2^g + \dots + a_n \lambda_n^g.$$

This theorem is not only an existence result. As we show in Remark 3.16, if the invariant  $\chi$  is quantizable, there is an algorithmic way of recovering the associated almost-TQFT by means of the iterated vectors

$$v_g = (\chi(\Sigma_g), \chi(\Sigma_{g+1}), \dots, \chi(\Sigma_{g+n-1})) \in k^n,$$

for  $0 \leq g < n$ . In particular, this shows that the invariant  $\chi$  can be computed once at a time for all the genus  $g$  orientable surfaces from the knowledge of this invariant in finitely many surfaces (to be precise, from  $\chi(\Sigma_g)$  for  $g \leq 2n - 1$ ). This observation turns the problem of computing such invariants, which is usually a very hard task that requires the use of advanced motivic or arithmetic techniques, into a problem of computing a finite set of examples that can be solved through a brute force approach.

The aforementioned results provide an effective criterion to decide whether an algebraic invariant is almost-quantizable (or, equivalently, lax-quantizable). However, we still need a procedure to decide whether such almost-TQFT (or the associated lax monoidal TQFT) can be promoted to a monoidal TQFT. To address this question, in this paper we introduce almost-Frobenius algebras as the almost-TQFT counterpart of Frobenius algebras (which are known to be equivalent to 1 + 1 TQFT [13]).

Roughly speaking, an almost-Frobenius algebra is a tuple  $(V, \tilde{T}, \tilde{\epsilon}, \tilde{\eta})$  with  $V$  a finite dimensional  $k$ -vector space and linear maps  $\tilde{T} : V \rightarrow V$ ,  $\tilde{\epsilon} : k \rightarrow V$  and  $\tilde{\eta} : V \rightarrow k$ . These linear maps correspond to the images of the bordisms  $L$ ,  $D$  and  $D^\dagger$  of Figure 1 under the almost-TQFT. In this manner, the problem of promoting the almost-Frobenius algebra to a genuine Frobenius algebra is recasted as the existence of algebra  $m : V \otimes_k V \rightarrow V$  and co-algebra  $w : V \rightarrow V \otimes_k V$  structures on  $V$  such that  $\tilde{T} = m \circ w$ . In general, there may not exist such extension, or there can be infinitely many, but in the case that  $V$  is spanned by the iterated vectors  $v_g = \tilde{T}^g(\tilde{\epsilon}(1))$  for  $g \geq 0$  (a situation that we shall call a wide almost-Frobenius algebra) it turns out that the problem is completely geometric and, at most, only one such extension may exist. Using these facts, we get the following criterion.

**Theorem** (Theorem 3.6). *A 1 + 1 wide almost-TQFT  $Z$  can be extended to a monoidal TQFT if and only if the following conditions hold:*

- (1) *The bilinear form  $B(v_g, v_{g'}) = Z(D^\dagger)(v_{g+g'})$  is non-degenerate.*
- (2) *Let  $b_1, \dots, b_n$  be any orthogonal basis of  $Z(S^1)$  with respect to  $B$ . Then, for all  $1 \leq j \leq n$ , we have*

$$Z(L)(b_j) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{b_j b_i^2}{B(b_i, b_i)},$$

where multiplication of  $b_i = \sum_g a_g^i v_g$  and  $b_j = \sum_g a_g^j v_g$  is given by

$$b_i b_j = \sum_{g, g'} a_g^i a_{g'}^j v_{g+g'}.$$

We hope that the techniques developed of this paper will help in the future to prove similar results on the quantizability problem for higher dimensional TQFTs. In this case, the linear discrete dynamical systems exchange vectors from different vector spaces, so a tight relation with quiver varieties may be expected.

As application of these results, we shall focus on representation varieties, an important instance of moduli space that arises in non-abelian Hodge theory. This is the space parametrizing, for a closed manifold  $W$ , the collection of representations of the fundamental group of  $W$  into a fixed complex algebraic group  $G$

$$\mathfrak{X}_G(W) = \text{Hom}(\pi_1(W), G).$$

By choosing a presentation of  $\pi_1(W)$ , the set  $\mathfrak{X}_G(W)$  can be naturally endowed with the structure of an algebraic variety, called the  $G$ -representation varieties. In the case  $G = \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{C}), \text{SL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ , these spaces play a crucial role in the non-abelian Hodge correspondence since their GIT quotients under the adjoint action (the so-called character varieties) turn out to be homeomorphic to moduli spaces of Higgs bundles [5] and of flat connections [19, 20].

A simple dimensional counting shows that  $\mathfrak{X}_G(S^1 \times S^1)$  is not an acyclic space for  $\dim G > 0$  (Theorem 4.6), so a direct application of the simple criterion of Corollary 2.8 shows that graded homology invariants of the representation variety are not quantizable. A posteriori, this behavior is clearly expectable since TQFTs do not take into account basepoints, which are crucial for the functoriality of the fundamental group.

For this reason, any hope of quantizing homology invariants of representation varieties requires to enlarge the category of bordism to equip them with a finite number of basepoints, leading to the category  $\mathbf{Bdp}_{n+1}$  of bordisms with basepoints. This extension also gives rise to the so-called TQFTs with basepoints (see Section 4.1), which are (lax) monoidal symmetric functors

$\mathcal{Z} : \mathbf{Bdp}_{n+1} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ . However, it turns out that the simple argument of Proposition 2.7 to characterize strongly quantizable invariants does not work in this setting, since the ‘Zorro’ bordism is no longer the identity, but the identity with a pair of extra basepoints. To manage this situation, we introduce a special bordism, the twisting bordism  $\Theta_M : M \rightarrow M$ , for  $M \in \mathbf{Bdp}_{n+1}$ . This morphism is the identity bordism as topological space but with an extra basepoint. In this way, the analogue of Proposition 2.7 in this setting is the following.

**Theorem** (Proposition 4.9). *Let  $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, I)$  be a symmetric monoidal category and let  $\mathcal{Z} : \mathbf{Bdp}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  be a monoidal TQFT with basepoints. Then, for any closed connected  $n$ -dimensional manifold  $M$  we have that the induced homomorphism*

$$\mathcal{Z}(M \times S^1, \{x_1, x_2\}) \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(I, I),$$

where  $x_1, x_2$  are any two basepoints, is the trace  $\mathrm{Tr}(\mathcal{Z}(\Theta_M^2))$ .

This result provides strong conditions on the strong quantizability of invariants. In the particular case of representation varieties, the eigenvalues of the endomorphism  $\mathcal{Z}(\Theta_M^2)$  can be easily computed. From this observation and a subtler analysis on the motivic structure of the representation variety, we get the following result.

**Theorem** (Theorems 4.6, 4.21 and 4.24). *Let  $G$  a complex algebraic group of dimension  $\dim G > 0$ . Then, the Poincaré polynomial of  $G$ -representation varieties of closed orientable manifolds of dimension  $\geq 2$ :*

- (1) *Is not strongly quantizable.*
- (2) *Is not strongly quantizable with basepoints and split.*
- (3) *Is lax-quantizable (or, equivalently, almost-quantizable) with basepoints.*

Of course, the same result can be applied to more refined invariants of the complex structure on the representation variety, such as its Hodge polynomial, its  $E$ -polynomial or even its virtual class (motive) in the Grothendieck ring of algebraic varieties. The no-go statements (1), (2) and (3) are obtained in this paper for the first time, settling an important open question conjectured in [17]. Statement (4) was obtained in [9], but the lax monoidality of the built TQFT was though to be a limitation of the construction, and it was open whether such lax monoidal TQFT could be promoted to a monoidal TQFT. The results of this paper show that the construction of [9] is actually sharp.

On the other hand, in the case that  $\dim G = 0$  or  $G$  is a finite group, the number of points of the  $G$ -representation variety is obviously an integer, so the necessary conditions of Corollary 2.8 are fulfilled. In fact, in this situation, it turns out that the lax monoidal TQFT constructed in [9] is actually monoidal on the nose, giving rise to the following result.

**Theorem** ([9] and Proposition 4.26). *Let  $G$  be a finite group or an algebraic group of dimension 0. Then, the number of points of the  $G$ -representation varieties is strongly quantizable with basepoints.*

It is worth mentioning that, in this work, we have focused on representation varieties since they are the building blocks of other moduli spaces such as character varieties (through GIT quotient) or character stacks (through stacky quotient). Nevertheless, the same type of arguments show that, for  $G = \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ , neither character varieties (from the computation of its  $E$ -polynomial in [17]) nor character stacks (from the computation of its virtual class in [10]) are acyclic, so their homology invariants are not strongly quantizable either. In the case of character stacks, they

turn out to be lax-quantizable [10], but almost nothing is known for character varieties (apart from the extended character field theory of Ben-Zvi, Gunningham and Nadler [3]). From these results, we may expect that character stacks are not strongly quantizable and character varieties are not even lax-quantizable.

Finally, as an application of the interpretation of a 1+1 almost-TQFT as a dynamical system, in this paper we also provide a new very simple method for computing the  $E$ -polynomial of representation varieties over arbitrary surfaces from the knowledge of the  $E$ -polynomial in a finite number of cases (which can be obtained through brute force). In particular, in the case  $G = \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ , only the  $E$ -polynomial for surfaces of genus  $0 \leq g \leq 11$  is needed and, from this knowledge, we can re-prove the following result of [17, Proposition 11] (see [9, Remark 5.11] for the case of virtual classes).

**Theorem.** *The virtual class in the Grothendieck ring of algebraic varieties of the  $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ -representation variety is*

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathfrak{X}_{\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})}(\Sigma_g)] &= (q^2 - 1)^{2g-1} q^{2g-1} + \frac{1}{2} (q - 1)^{2g-1} q^{2g-1} (q + 1) (2^{2g} + q - 3) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} (q + 1)^{2g+r-1} q^{2g-1} (q - 1) (2^{2g} + q - 1) + q(q^2 - 1)^{2g-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $q = [\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{C}}^1]$  is the Lefschetz motive.

The structure of this paper is as follows. Section 2 reviews the fundamental properties of TQFTs, discussing the quantizability problem (Section 2.1) and studying almost-TQFTs and lax monoidal TQFTs (Section 2.2). Necessary conditions for monoidality are given in that section, as well as the equivalence between lax monoidal and almost-TQFTs. Section 3 is devoted to sufficient conditions for monoidality in the case of 1+1 TQFTs (surfaces). In particular, Section 3.1 studies almost-Frobenius algebras and their interplay with usual Frobenius algebras, whereas Section 3.2 discusses the interpretation of almost-TQFTs as linear discrete dynamical systems. The case of representation varieties is analyzed in Section 4, where TQFTs with basepoints are proposed in Section 4.1 and the quantizability problem is studied in Sections 4.2 and 4.3. Finally, Section 4.4 exemplifies the new computational method for  $E$ -polynomials based on the interpretation of the almost-TQFT as a dynamical system for  $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ -representation varieties.

**Acknowledgments.** The author is greatly indebted to Thomas Wasserman for very enlightening conversations regarding the monoidality problem. He also wants to thank M. Ballandras, G. Barajas, G. Gallego, K. Knop and A. Saha for useful discussions.

The author also acknowledges the hospitality of Department of Mathematics at Universidad Autónoma de Madrid where this work was partially completed. This work has been partially supported through Comunidad de Madrid R+D project PR27/21-029.

## 2. TOPOLOGICAL RESTRICTIONS TO THE MONOIDALITY PROBLEM

Recall that the category of  $n + 1$ -dimensional bordisms  $\mathbf{Bd}_{n+1}$  is the category comprised of the following information:

- **Objects:** The objects of  $\mathbf{Bd}_{n+1}$  are the closed (i.e. compact and boundaryless) orientable  $n$ -dimensional smooth manifolds.
- **Morphisms:** A morphism  $M_1 \rightarrow M_2$  is a class of  $(n + 1)$ -dimensional orientable bordisms, that is, compact smooth orientable manifolds  $W$  such that  $\partial W = M_1 \sqcup M_2$ . Two such

bordisms are declared as equivalent if there exists a boundary-preserving diffeomorphism between them.

- **Composition:** Given two bordisms  $W : M_1 \rightarrow M_2$  and  $W' : M_2 \rightarrow M_3$ , the composed morphism  $W' \circ W : M_1 \rightarrow M_3$  is the result of gluing  $W$  and  $W'$  along their common boundary  $M_2$ , usually denoted by  $W \cup_{M_2} W'$ .
- **Monoidality:**  $\mathbf{Bd}_{n+1}$  is endowed with its natural monoidal structure given by disjoint union (of both closed manifolds and bordisms).

*Remark 2.1.* Notice that differentiable gluing is only well-defined up to diffeomorphism. That is why we should take the morphisms as classes of cobordisms up to boundary-preserving diffeomorphism.

Recall that, given monoidal categories  $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes_{\mathcal{C}})$  and  $(\mathcal{D}, \otimes_{\mathcal{D}})$ , a symmetric functor  $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$  is said to be *lax monoidal* if there exists a family of morphisms in  $\mathcal{D}$

$$(2) \quad \Delta_{c,c'} : \mathcal{F}(c \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} c') \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(c) \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{F}(c'),$$

natural in  $c, c' \in \mathcal{C}$  and commuting with the map interchanging the factors in the monoidal structures. The functor is *monoidal* if all the morphisms  $\Delta_{c,c'}$  are isomorphisms.

**Definition 2.2.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  a symmetric monoidal category. An  $(n+1)$ -*lax monoidal Topological Quantum Field Theory* (TQFT) with values in  $\mathcal{C}$  is a lax monoidal and symmetric functor  $\mathcal{Z} : \mathbf{Bd}_{n+1} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ . Furthermore, if  $\mathcal{Z}$  is a monoidal functor we will say that  $\mathcal{Z}$  is a *monoidal TQFT*.

*Remark 2.3.* Typically, as in [1], the target category is taken as  $\mathcal{C} = R\text{-Mod}$ , the category of  $R$ -modules and module homomorphism between them.

*Remark 2.4.* In  $\mathbf{Bd}_{n+1}$  we took our objects and morphisms to be orientable manifolds (but without a fixed orientation). We make this choice to recover the classical result that shows that  $1+1$  TQFTs are equivalent to Frobenius algebras [13] since otherwise we would need to add an extra non-orientable morphism. However, the orientation (and the smooth structure) play no role in the following arguments and, with the appropriate modifications, most of the results of this paper can be adapted to work in the non-orientable setting.

**2.1. The quantizability problem.** Let us consider an invariant  $\chi$  of  $(n+1)$ -dimensional closed orientable manifolds with values in a set  $\Lambda$  which is invariant under diffeomorphisms. This means that  $\chi$  is a map that assigns, to any  $(n+1)$ -dimensional closed orientable manifold  $W$ , an element  $\chi(W) \in \Lambda$ . This element must be invariant under diffeomorphisms, that is, if  $W$  and  $W'$  are diffeomorphic then  $\chi(W) = \chi(W')$ .

**Definition 2.5.** Let  $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, I)$  be a locally small symmetric monoidal category with monoidal identity  $I$  and satisfying  $\Lambda \subseteq \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(I, I)$ . A  $\Lambda$ -valued diffeomorphism invariant  $\chi$  is said to be *lax-quantizable* in  $\mathcal{C}$  if there exists a lax monoidal TQFT

$$\mathcal{Z} : \mathbf{Bd}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$$

such that for any  $(n+1)$ -dimensional closed orientable manifold  $W$ , seen as a bordism  $W : \emptyset \rightarrow \emptyset$ , we have that  $\mathcal{Z}(W) = \chi(W)$ .

If  $\mathcal{Z}$  can be taken to be a monoidal TQFT, we shall say that  $\chi$  is *strongly quantizable*.

*Remark 2.6.* If  $\mathcal{C} = R\text{-Mod}$ , then we have a natural identification  $R \cong \text{Hom}_{R\text{-Mod}}(R, R)$ . In this case, a lax monoidal TQFT  $\mathcal{Z} : \mathbf{Bd}_n \rightarrow R\text{-Mod}$  quantizes  $\chi$  if  $\mathcal{Z}(W)(1) = \chi(W)$  for all  $(n+1)$ -dimensional closed orientable manifold  $W$ .

Recall that, given a symmetric monoidal category  $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, I)$  and an object  $c \in \mathcal{C}$ , a *dual* of  $c$  is an object  $c^* \in \mathcal{C}$  together with morphisms

$$\mu : c \otimes c^* \rightarrow I, \quad \delta : I \rightarrow c^* \otimes c,$$

such that  $(\mu \otimes \text{Id}_c) \circ (\text{Id}_c \otimes \delta) = \text{Id}_c$  and  $(\text{Id}_{c^*} \otimes \mu) \circ (\delta \otimes \text{Id}_{c^*}) = \text{Id}_{c^*}$ . Dual objects are unique up to isomorphism. Given  $f : c \rightarrow c$  with  $c$  a dualizable object, the *trace* of  $f$  is the morphism  $\text{Tr}(f) : I \rightarrow I$  given by the composition

$$I \xrightarrow{\delta} c \otimes c^* \cong c^* \otimes c \xrightarrow{\text{Id}_{c^*} \otimes f} c^* \otimes c \xrightarrow{\mu} I.$$

The *Euler characteristic* of a dualizable object  $c \in \mathcal{C}$  is  $[c] = \text{Tr}(\text{Id}_c) = \mu \circ \delta$ . For further information, see [6].

It turns out that, for some manifolds, the invariant computed by a monoidal TQFT is just an Euler characteristic. The proof is well-known, but we include it here for completeness.

**Proposition 2.7.** *Let  $\mathcal{Z} : \mathbf{Bd}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  be a monoidal TQFT. Then, for any closed orientable manifold  $M \in \mathbf{Bd}_n$  we have that the induced homomorphism*

$$\mathcal{Z}(M \times S^1) : I \rightarrow I$$

*is the Euler characteristic of  $\mathcal{Z}(M)$ .*

*Proof.* Let us denote by  $\delta = M \times [0, 1] : \emptyset \rightarrow M \sqcup M$  and by  $\mu = M \times [0, 1] : M \sqcup M \rightarrow \emptyset$  the two ‘elbow’ bordisms. As depicted in Figure 2 we have that the ‘Zorro’ bordism shows that  $M$  is self-dual with duality maps  $\delta$  and  $\mu$ .




FIGURE 2. The ‘Zorro’ bordism

Since a monoidal functor preserves duality, we have that  $\mathcal{Z}(M)$  is self-dual with duality maps  $\mathcal{Z}(\delta)$  and  $\mathcal{Z}(\mu)$ . In particular, we have that

$$\mathcal{Z}(M \times S^1) = \mathcal{Z}(\mu \circ \delta) = \mathcal{Z}(\mu) \circ \mathcal{Z}(\delta) = \text{Tr}(\text{Id}_M).$$

□

Using Proposition 2.7 with  $\mathcal{C} = R\text{-Mod}$ , and noting that the Euler characteristic of a finitely generated projective  $R$ -module  $M$  (the dualizable objects of  $R\text{-Mod}$ ) is the rank of  $M$ , we find a useful criterion for non-quantizability of invariants. Recall that the subring of integers of a ring  $R$  is the subring of  $R$  generated by 1.

**Corollary 2.8.** *Let  $\chi$  be an  $R$ -valued invariant of  $n$ -dimensional closed orientable manifolds. If there exists an  $(n - 1)$ -dimensional closed orientable manifold such that  $\chi(M \times S^1)$  does not lie in the subring of integers of  $R$ , then  $\chi$  is not strongly quantizable.*

**2.2. Almost-TQFTs.** Corollary 2.8 prevents many invariants to be strongly quantizable by means of a monoidal TQFT. However, with a view towards applications, full monoidality may be not needed. For instance, regarding  $(1+1)$ -dimensional TQFTs, any closed orientable surface can be decomposed into the composition of a disc  $D : \emptyset \rightarrow S^1$ , a bunch of holed torus  $L : S^1 \rightarrow S^1$  and a disc in the other way around  $D^\dagger : S^1 \rightarrow \emptyset$ , as shown in Figure 3.




FIGURE 3. Decomposition of a closed orientable surface into simpler pieces

In this manner, to compute invariants we do not need to know the value of a TQFT on an arbitrary disjoint union of circles, but only on connected manifolds. This is a weaker class of functors that we shall call almost-TQFTs.

**Definition 2.9.** Fix an integer  $n \geq 0$ . The category  $\mathbf{Tb}_{n+1}^0$  of  $(n+1)$ -strict tubes is the subcategory of  $\mathbf{Bd}_{n+1}$  whose objects and morphisms are connected manifolds (maybe empty). The category  $\mathbf{Tb}_{n+1}$  of  $(n+1)$ -tubes is the monoidal closure of  $\mathbf{Tb}_{n+1}^0$ , that is,  $\mathbf{Tb}_{n+1}$  has the same objects as  $\mathbf{Bd}_{n+1}$  and a morphism  $W$  of  $\mathbf{Bd}_{n+1}$  is in  $\mathbf{Tb}_{n+1}$  if  $W$  can be decomposed as a disjoint union  $W = \sqcup W_i$  of bordisms, where each  $W_i$  has connected in and out boundaries.

**Definition 2.10.** Let  $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, I)$  be a symmetric monoidal category. An  $(n+1)$ -almost Topological Quantum Field Theory with values in  $\mathcal{C}$  is a symmetric monoidal functor

$$Z : \mathbf{Tb}_{n+1} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}.$$

In analogy with Definition 2.5, a  $\Lambda$ -valued diffeomorphism invariant  $\chi$  is said to be *almost-quantizable* if there exists an almost-TQFT  $Z$  such that  $\Lambda \subseteq \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(I, I)$  and  $Z(W) = \chi(W)$  for any  $(n+1)$ -dimensional closed orientable manifold  $W$ .

Notice that any lax monoidal TQFT  $Z : \mathbf{Bd}_{n+1} \rightarrow R\text{-Mod}$  gives rise to a monoidal functor  $\mathbf{Tb}_{n+1}^0 \rightarrow R\text{-Mod}$  just by restriction. This functor is automatically promoted to an almost-TQFT  $Z : \mathbf{Tb}_{n+1} \rightarrow R\text{-Mod}$  by setting  $Z(\sqcup_i M_i) = \otimes_i M_i$ , both for objects and morphisms. Hence, any lax monoidal TQFT induces an almost-TQFT. The following results gives a reciprocal to this observation.

**Theorem 2.11.** Suppose that  $\mathcal{C}$  is cocomplete. Given an almost-TQFT  $Z : \mathbf{Tb}_{n+1} \rightarrow R\text{-Mod}$ , there exists a lax monoidal TQFT  $\tilde{Z} : \mathbf{Bd}_{n+1} \rightarrow R\text{-Mod}$  extending  $Z$ .

*Proof.* The proof follows similar lines to [8], but weaker hypotheses are needed due to the particular situation considered. Let us spell out the details.

We take  $\tilde{Z}$  as the left Kan extension  $\tilde{Z} = LZ$  of  $Z$  along the inclusion  $\iota : \mathbf{Tb}_{n+1} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Bd}_{n+1}$  (which exists by hypothesis on  $\mathcal{C}$  [16])

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{Bd}_{n+1} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{Z}} & \mathcal{C} \\ \uparrow \iota & \nearrow Z & \\ \mathbf{Tb}_{n+1} & & \end{array}$$

This diagram is equipped with a natural transformation  $\eta : Z \Rightarrow \tilde{Z} \circ \iota$ .

Observe that this Kan functor is actually an extension for the objects of  $\mathbf{Tb}_{n+1}^0$ , i.e.  $\eta_M$  is an isomorphism for  $M \in \mathbf{Tb}_{n+1}^0$ . This can be obtained through an adaptation of the argument of [16, Corollary X.4]. To be precise, for  $M \in \mathbf{Tb}_{n+1}^0$ , recall that the left Kan extension  $\mathcal{Z}(M)$  is given as the colimit of the functor  $Z \circ Q_M : (\iota \downarrow \iota(M)) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ , where  $Q_M : (\iota \downarrow \iota(M)) \rightarrow \mathbf{Tb}_{n+1}^0$  is  $Q_M(M', f) = M'$  for an object  $f : \iota(M') \rightarrow \iota(M)$  of the comma category  $(\iota \downarrow \iota(M))$ . Since the inclusion  $\iota : \mathbf{Tb}_{n+1}^0 \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Bd}_{n+1}$  is full and faithful, then  $\text{Id}_M : M \rightarrow M$  is a final object of  $(\iota \downarrow \iota(M))$ . Hence, the colimit is computed by evaluating  $Z \circ Q_M$  in this final object so  $\mathcal{Z}(M) = Z \circ Q_M(\text{Id}_M, M) = Z(M)$ .

The natural transformation  $\eta : Z \Rightarrow \mathcal{Z} \circ \iota$  gives rise to the maps  $\Delta_{M_1, M_2} : \mathcal{Z}(M_1) \otimes_R \mathcal{Z}(M_2) \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}(M_1 \sqcup M_2)$  of Equation (2) needed for the lax monoidal structure as follows. Let us suppose that  $M = M_1 \sqcup M_2$  with  $M_1, M_2$  connected (the general case follows by induction). Since  $\eta_{M_1}, \eta_{M_2}$  are isomorphisms, we can complete the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Z(M_1) \otimes Z(M_2) = Z(M_1 \sqcup M_2) & \xrightarrow{\eta_{M_1 \sqcup M_2}} & \mathcal{Z}(M_1 \sqcup M_2) \\ \eta_{M_1} \otimes \eta_{M_2} \downarrow & \dashrightarrow & \Delta_{M_1, M_2} \\ \mathcal{Z}(M_1) \otimes \mathcal{Z}(M_2) & & \end{array}$$

A straightforward computation shows that the maps  $\Delta_{M_1, M_2}$  satisfy all the properties needed for the lax monoidal maps. For further details, see [8, Theorem 2.1].  $\square$

**Corollary 2.12.** *An invariant is lax-quantizable if and only if it is almost-quantizable.*

### 3. ALMOST-FROBENIUS ALGEBRAS AND SUFFICIENT CONDITIONS FOR MONOIDALITY

Recall that a (commutative) Frobenius  $k$ -algebra is a finite commutative  $k$ -algebra  $A$  endowed with a non-degenerate symmetric bilinear form  $B : A \times A \rightarrow k$  such that  $B(xy, z) = B(x, yz)$  for all  $x, y, z \in A$ . It is well-known that the category of commutative Frobenius algebra (with intertwining maps between them as morphisms) is equivalent to the category of  $(1+1)$ -dimensional monoidal TQFTs with values in the category  $k\text{-Vect}$  [13], where the ring structure comes from the image of the pair of pants  $S^1 \sqcup S^1 \rightarrow S^1$ , the unit of the ring is the image of a disc and  $B$  corresponds to the ‘elbow’ bordism  $S^1 \sqcup S^1 \rightarrow \emptyset$ .

In particular, several new maps can be computed from this information. The most relevant ones for our purposes are the linear maps

$$T = m \circ w : A \rightarrow A, \quad \epsilon : k \rightarrow A, \quad \eta : A \rightarrow k,$$

where  $m : A \times A \rightarrow A$  is the ring multiplication map,  $w : A \rightarrow A \times A$  is the associated comultiplication map,  $\epsilon(1) = 1_A$  is the unit of the algebra, and  $\eta(x) = B(1, x)$ . Notice that the bilinear form  $B$  can be also recovered from these data as  $B(x, y) = \eta(xy)$ .

In this section, we shall study a weak version of a Frobenius algebra, as well as the problem of extending them to genuine Frobenius algebras.

**Definition 3.1.** An almost-Frobenius  $k$ -algebra is a finitely dimensional  $k$ -vector space  $V$  endowed with a linear endomorphism  $\tilde{T} : V \rightarrow V$ , a linear map  $\tilde{\epsilon} : k \rightarrow V$  and a linear functional  $\tilde{\eta} : V \rightarrow k$ .

The rationale behind almost-Frobenius algebras is that they are the algebraic counterpart of almost-TQFTs.

**Proposition 3.2.** *The category of (commutative) almost-Frobenius  $k$ -algebras is equivalent to the category of  $(1+1)$  almost-TQFTs with values in  $k\text{-Vect}$ .*

*Proof.* Given an almost-Frobenius algebra  $(V, \tilde{T}, \tilde{\epsilon}, \tilde{\eta})$ , with the notation of Figure 3 let us define the  $(1+1)$ -dimensional almost-TQFT  $Z$  given by  $Z(S^1) = V$ ,  $Z(D) = \tilde{\epsilon}$ ,  $Z(D^\dagger) = \tilde{\eta}$  and  $Z(L) = \tilde{T}$ . This automatically defines  $Z$  on any morphism of  $\mathbf{Tb}_{1+1}^0$ , and thus of  $\mathbf{Tb}_{1+1}$  by monoidality.

Indeed, let  $W : S^1 \rightarrow S^1 \in \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{Tb}_{1+1}^0}(S^1, S^1)$  be a bordism with non-empty connected in and out boundaries. Then by gluing two discs to  $W$  we get a closed orientable surface, which is diffeomorphic to  $\Sigma_g$  for some  $g \geq 0$ . Hence,  $W$  is isomorphic to  $L^g : S^1 \rightarrow S^1$  and thus we set  $Z(W) = \tilde{T}^g$ . This representation of  $W$  as a holed surface is unique, so the assignment is well-defined. The case in which  $W$  has some empty boundary is can be treated similarly.  $\square$

**3.1. Monoidal quantizability of almost-Frobenius algebras.** Given an almost-Frobenius algebra  $(V, \tilde{T}, \tilde{\epsilon}, \tilde{\eta})$ , let us denote  $v_0 = \tilde{\epsilon}(1) \in V$  and consider the collection of vectors  $v_g = \tilde{T}^g v_0$  for  $g \geq 0$ . The vector subspace  $W = \langle v_g \rangle_{g=0}^\infty$  generated by these vectors will be called the *core subspace* of  $\tilde{T}$ . We will say that the almost-Frobenius algebra is *wide* if  $W = V$ . Notice that we can always get a wide algebra just by restricting  $\tilde{T}$  and  $\tilde{\eta}$  to  $W$ .

The following result shows that this information actually determines any potential Frobenius algebra extending an almost-Frobenius algebra.

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let  $(V, \tilde{T}, \tilde{\epsilon}, \tilde{\eta})$  be a wide almost-Frobenius algebra. There exists at most one Frobenius algebra structure on  $V$  such that  $T = \tilde{T}$ ,  $\epsilon = \tilde{\epsilon}$  and  $\eta = \tilde{\eta}$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that there exists a Frobenius algebra on  $V$  compatible with  $\tilde{T}$ . Then, since the Frobenius algebra satisfies  $(T^g v_0) \cdot (T^{g'} v_0) = T^{g+g'} v_0$  (see Figure 4), then we must have that  $v_g \cdot v_{g'} = v_{g+g'}$  for all  $g, g' \geq 0$ . Since the vectors  $v_g$  span  $V$ , this characterizes uniquely the algebra structure and therefore also the bilinear form as  $B(x, y) = \tilde{\eta}(xy)$ .  $\square$




FIGURE 4. The bordism  $(T^g v_0) \cdot (T^{g'} v_0)$  is equivalent to  $T^{g+g'} v_0$

*Remark 3.4.* In the case that  $(V, \tilde{T}, \tilde{\epsilon}, \tilde{\eta})$  is not wide, we still get a result by restricting to the core subspace  $W \subseteq V$ : There exists at most one Frobenius algebra structure on  $W$  such that  $T = \tilde{T}|_W$ ,  $\epsilon = \tilde{\epsilon}|_W$  and  $\eta = \tilde{\eta}|_W$ . On the whole space, several Frobenius algebra structures may exist (see Example 3.9).

According to the previous result, we will say that a  $(1+1)$ -dimensional almost-TQFT  $Z$  is *wide* if the associated almost-Frobenius algebra is wide. Notice that this means that the collection of vectors  $v_g = Z(L^g \circ D)(1)$  for  $g \geq 0$  spans  $Z(S^1)$ . Combining Propositions 3.2 and 3.3, we get the following result.

**Corollary 3.5.** *Let  $Z : \mathbf{Tb}_{1+1} \rightarrow k\text{-Vect}$  be a wide  $(1+1)$ -dimensional almost-TQFT. There exists at most one monoidal TQFT  $\mathcal{Z} : \mathbf{Bd}_{1+1} \rightarrow k\text{-Vect}$  extending  $Z$ , that is, such that the following diagram commutes.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{Bd}_2 & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{Z}} & k\text{-Vect} \\ \uparrow & \nearrow Z & \\ \mathbf{Tb}_2 & & \end{array}$$

Proposition 3.3 and Corollary 3.5 not only are uniqueness results. They do provide an affective procedure for checking whether the almost-TQFT  $Z$  can be promoted to a monoidal TQFT, since the (unique) algebra structure can be easily computed from the core submodule.

**Theorem 3.6.** *A  $(1+1)$ -dimensional wide almost-TQFT  $Z$  can be extended to a monoidal TQFT if and only if the following conditions hold:*

- (1) *The bilinear form  $B(v_g, v_{g'}) = Z(D^\dagger)(v_{g+g'})$  is non-degenerate.*
- (2) *Let  $b_1, \dots, b_n$  be any orthogonal basis of  $Z(S^1)$  with respect to  $B$ . Then, for all  $1 \leq j \leq n$ , we have*

$$Z(L)(b_j) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{b_j b_i^2}{B(b_i, b_i)}.$$

*Proof.* The necessity of (1) is clear from the definition of a Frobenius algebra. For (2), observe that the counit of the Frobenius algebra is the element  $\delta = \sum_i \frac{1}{B(b_i, b_i)} b_i \otimes b_i \in Z(S^1) \otimes_k Z(S^1)$ , where  $b_1, \dots, b_n$  is any orthogonal basis of  $Z(S^1)$ . Hence, the comultiplication map is given by (c.f. Figure 5)

$$w(x) = (m \otimes \text{Id}_{S^1})(\text{Id}_{S^1} \otimes \delta)(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{B(b_i, b_i)} (x b_i) \otimes b_i.$$

Therefore, the map  $Z(L)$  is given by

$$Z(L)(x) = m \circ w(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{B(b_i, b_i)} m(x b_i, b_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{B(b_i, b_i)} x b_i^2.$$




FIGURE 5. The comultiplication map in terms of the elbow and the multiplication bordisms

On the contrary, suppose that  $Z$  is an almost-TQFT and let  $(V, \tilde{T}, \tilde{\epsilon}, \tilde{\eta})$  be the almost-Frobenius algebra associated to  $Z$  through Proposition 3.2. Since  $V$  is wide, it is spanned by the vectors  $v_0, \dots, v_{n-1} \in V$ , where  $v_g = \tilde{T}^g \tilde{\epsilon}(1) \in V$ , and following Proposition 3.3 let us define a ring structure on  $V$  by setting  $v_g \cdot v_{g'} = v_{g+g'}$  for  $g \geq 0$ . It is clear that this multiplication is associative and  $v_0$  is the unit of the ring. We also set as bilinear form  $B(v_g, v_{g'}) = \tilde{\eta}(v_{g+g'})$ .

Due to (1), this is a Frobenius algebra so it defines a monoidal TQFT  $\mathcal{Z}$ . Furthermore, by construction  $\mathcal{Z}(D) = \tilde{\epsilon}$  and  $\mathcal{Z}(D^\dagger) = \tilde{\eta}$ , so in order to show that  $\mathcal{Z}$  extends  $Z$  it only remains to prove that  $\mathcal{Z}(L) = Z(L)$ . But, by the computation above, this is exactly condition (2).  $\square$

*Remark 3.7.* Condition (2) fits perfectly with Proposition 2.7. Indeed, if  $Z$  satisfies (2), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} Z(S^1 \times S^1)(1) &= Z(D^\dagger) \circ Z(L) \circ Z(D)(1) = Z(D^\dagger)(Z(L)(1)) \\ &= Z(D^\dagger) \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{b_i^2}{B(b_i, b_i)} \right) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{Z(D^\dagger)(b_i^2)}{B(b_i, b_i)} = n. \end{aligned}$$

Where, in the last equality, we used that  $Z(D^\dagger)(b_i^2) = B(b_i, b_i)$ .

Let us show how to check these conditions in practice in a couple of examples.

**Example 3.8.** Consider the real almost-TQFT  $Z : \mathbf{Tb}_{1+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\text{-Vect}$  given by  $Z(S^1) = \mathbb{R}^2$  and

$$Z(L) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad Z(D)(1) = (1, 0), \quad Z(D^\dagger)(x, y) = x + y.$$

Then,  $v_0 = (1, 0)$ ,  $v_1 = (0, 1)$ ,  $v_2 = (1, 2)$  so the core subspace coincides with the whole vector space  $Z(S^1)$  and thus  $Z$  is wide. In the basis  $v_0, v_1$  the bilinear form is given by

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 3 \end{pmatrix},$$

so applying the Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization procedure we get that  $b_1 = v_0 = (1, 0)$  and  $b_2 = (1/\sqrt{2}, -1/\sqrt{2})$  is an orthonormal basis. Moreover,  $b_2 \cdot b_2 = \frac{1}{2}(v_0 - v_1)^2 = (1, 0)$  and, thus

$$\frac{1}{B(b_1, b_1)} b_1 b_1^2 + \frac{1}{B(b_2, b_2)} b_1 b_2^2 = (2, 0) \neq Z(L)(b_1).$$

Hence,  $Z$  does not admit any extension to a monoidal TQFT. It is worth noticing that we actually knew that from Proposition 2.7, since  $Z(\Sigma_g)(1) = Z(D^\dagger)(v_1) = 1$  does not agree with the dimension of  $Z(S^1)$ .

**Example 3.9.** In some cases, the argument in the proof of Proposition 3.3 can be used even for non-wide TQFTs. Consider the real almost-TQFT  $Z$  given by  $Z(S^1) = \mathbb{R}^2$  and

$$Z(L) = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad Z(D)(1) = e_1 = (1, 0), \quad Z(D^\dagger)(x, y) = x.$$

This is not a wide TQFT since the core subspace is  $W = \langle (1, 0) \rangle$ . However, since  $Z(D)(1) = e_1$ , for any Frobenius algebra on  $\mathbb{R}^2$  extending this almost-Frobenius TQFT, the vector  $e_1$  must be the unit of the ring. In particular, for  $e_2 = (0, 1)$  we have  $e_1 \cdot e_2 = e_2$ . Hence, any Frobenius algebra must satisfy

$$e_1 \cdot e_1 = e_1, \quad e_1 \cdot e_2 = e_2, \quad e_2 \cdot e_2 = a e_1 + b e_2,$$

for certain  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ . Hence, since  $Z(D^\dagger)(e_1) = 1$  and  $Z(D^\dagger)(e_2) = 0$ , in this basis the bilinear form is

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & a \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus, we must have  $a \neq 0$  and  $e_1, e_2$  is an orthogonal basis so that the counit is  $\delta = e_1 \otimes e_1 + \frac{1}{a} e_2 \otimes e_2$ . Hence, we must have

$$2e_1 = Z(L)(e_1) = e_1^3 + \frac{1}{a} e_1 e_2^2 = 2e_1 + \frac{b}{a} e_2, \quad 2e_2 = Z(L)(e_2) = e_2 e_1^2 + \frac{1}{a} e_2^3 = b e_1 + \left(2 + \frac{b^2}{a}\right) e_2.$$

This forces  $b = 0$ . Hence, there exist infinitely many monoidal TQFTs extending the almost-TQFT  $Z$ , one for each value of  $a \neq 0$ . Up to isomorphism, this gives two possible Frobenius algebras:  $\mathbb{R}^2$  with  $e_2 \cdot e_2 = 1$  (corresponding to  $a = 1$ ) and  $\mathbb{C}$  (corresponding to  $a = -1$ ).

**3.2. Almost-TQFTs as dynamical systems.** In Section 3.1 we have discussed under which conditions an almost-Frobenius algebra (equivalently, a  $1 + 1$  almost-TQFT) can be promoted to a Frobenius algebra (i.e. a monoidal  $1 + 1$  TQFT). However, in order to apply the previous results to quantize a diffeomorphism invariant of closed orientable surfaces, we still need to construct an initial almost-TQFT. To address this issue, the aim of this section is precisely to provide a method for constructing a wide almost-TQFT for an invariant (when possible). For this purpose, we shall adopt a different viewpoint by re-interpreting an almost-TQFT as a dynamical system.

**Lemma 3.10.** *There exists an equivalence of categories*

$$\text{Fun}^{\otimes}(\mathbf{Tb}_{n+1}, k\text{-Vect}) \cong \text{Fun}(\mathbf{Tb}_{n+1}^0, k\text{-Vect})$$

between  $(n + 1)$ -dimensional almost-TQFTs and linear representations of the category  $\mathbf{Tb}_n^0$ .


*Proof.* The proof is immediate. Any almost-TQFT induces a representation of  $\mathbf{Tb}_{n+1}^0$  by restriction. On the contrary, since  $\mathbf{Tb}_{n+1}$  is the closure under disjoint union of  $\mathbf{Tb}_{n+1}^0$ , the TQFT is obtained from a functor  $\mathbf{Tb}_{n+1}^0 \rightarrow k\text{-Vect}$  by forcing monoidality.  $\square$

*Remark 3.11.* Lemma 3.10 can be simplified even further by choosing a presentation  $\mathcal{T}_{n+1}$  of  $\mathbf{Tb}_{n+1}^0$ , that is, a quiver with relations such that  $\mathbf{Tb}_{n+1}^0$  is the compositional closure of  $\mathcal{T}_{n+1}$ . In that case, we get an equivalence  $\text{Fun}^{\otimes}(\mathbf{Tb}_{n+1}, k\text{-Vect}) \cong \text{Fun}(\mathcal{T}_{n+1}, k\text{-Vect})$  between almost-TQFTs and linear representations of  $\mathcal{T}_{n+1}$ .

Despite its simplicity, Lemma 3.10 leads to a natural interpretation of almost TQFTs in terms of linear discrete dynamical systems. A linear discrete dynamical system is a collection of finitely dimensional  $k$ -vector spaces  $\{V_{\alpha}\}$  (maybe infinitely many) and linear maps  $f_{\beta} : V_{\alpha} \rightarrow V_{\alpha'}$ . In this manner, given a functor  $Z : \mathcal{T}_{n+1} \rightarrow k\text{-Vect}$ , coming from an almost-TQFT, we define the dynamical system with vector spaces  $\{Z(M)\}_{M \in \mathcal{T}_n}$  and maps  $Z(W) : Z(M_1) \rightarrow Z(M_2)$  for each morphism  $W : M_1 \rightarrow M_2$  of  $\mathcal{T}_n$ .

Furthermore, two linear dynamical systems  $(V_{\alpha}, f_{\beta})$  and  $(V'_{\alpha}, f'_{\beta})$  are equivalent (conjugated in the language of ODEs) if there exists linear isomorphisms  $g_{\alpha} : V_{\alpha} \rightarrow V'_{\alpha}$  such that  $f'_{\beta} = g_{\alpha} f_{\beta} g_{\alpha}^{-1}$ . But this is nothing but the definition of a natural equivalence of almost-TQFTs, so classifying almost-TQFTs up to isomorphism is precisely to study linear discrete dynamical systems up to conjugacy. In particular, these observations open the door to studying almost-TQFT through the classical techniques of linear dynamical systems.

**Example 3.12.** We have a presentation  $\mathcal{T}_{1+1}$  of  $\mathbf{Tb}_{1+1}^0$  with two objects (corresponding to  $\emptyset$  and  $S^1$ ), two arrows (corresponding to the caps) and one loop (corresponding to  $L : S^1 \rightarrow S^1$ ), as in the following diagram.



In this way, a  $(1 + 1)$ -dimensional almost-TQFT is the same as a vector space  $V$  equipped with an endomorphism  $V \rightarrow V$  and two maps  $k \rightarrow V$  and  $V \rightarrow k$ . This provides an alternative proof of Proposition 3.2 since this is precisely the information of an almost-Frobenius algebra.

**Theorem 3.13.** *A non-constant invariant  $\chi$  of closed orientable surfaces with values in a field  $k$  is almost-quantizable if and only if there exist  $n \geq 1$ , a partition  $(m_1, \dots, m_s)$  of  $n$  and coefficients  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s \in \bar{k}$  and  $a_{i,j} \in \bar{k}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq s$  and  $0 \leq j \leq m_i - 1$ , in the algebraic closure  $\bar{k}$  of  $k$ , such that for all  $g \geq \max(m_1, \dots, m_s)$*

$$(3) \quad \chi(\Sigma_g) = \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=0}^{m_i-1} a_{i,j} \binom{g}{j} \lambda_i^{g-j}.$$

*Proof.* This formula is just the general solution to a linear discrete dynamical system. To make it more precise, notice that without loss of generality we can suppose that  $k$  is algebraically closed. Suppose that there exists an almost-Frobenius algebra  $(V, \tilde{T}, \tilde{\epsilon}, \tilde{\eta})$  of dimension  $n$  computing  $\chi$ . As in Section 3.1, denote  $v_0 = \tilde{\epsilon}(1)$  and  $v_g = \tilde{T}^g(v_0)$  so that  $\chi(\Sigma_g) = \tilde{\eta}(v_g)$ . Since  $k$  is algebraically closed, there exists an automorphism  $P$  of  $V$  such that  $P\tilde{T}P^{-1} = J$  is of Jordan form. Then, the close formula (3) follows from taking  $(m_1, \dots, m_s)$  as the partition of  $n$  defined by the Jordan blocks of  $J$  with eigenvalues  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s$  and computing  $\chi(\Sigma_g) = \tilde{\eta}P^{-1}J^gPv_0$ .

On the contrary, if  $\chi(\Sigma_g)$  satisfies (3) then we can find a linear form  $\tilde{\eta} : k^n \rightarrow k$ , a Jordan type matrix  $J$  and a vector  $v_0 \in k^n$  such that  $\chi(\Sigma_g) = \tilde{\eta}(J^g v_0)$ . Setting  $V = k^n$ ,  $\tilde{T} = J$  and  $\tilde{\epsilon}(1) = v_0$ , we get the desired almost-Frobenius algebra.  $\square$

*Remark 3.14.* If the endomorphism  $\tilde{T}$  is diagonalizable, then formula (3) takes the simpler form

$$\chi(\Sigma_g) = a_1 \lambda_1^g + a_2 \lambda_2^g + \dots + a_n \lambda_n^g.$$

This happens, for instance, if the bilinear form  $B(v_g, v_{g'}) = \tilde{\epsilon}(v_{g+g'})$  is non-degenerate, as in condition (1) of Theorem 3.6.

*Remark 3.15.* An almost-quantizable invariant  $\chi$  of closed orientable surfaces can be understood as a higher order recurrence. Let  $(V, \tilde{T}, \tilde{\epsilon}, \tilde{\eta})$  be an almost-Frobenius algebra almost-quantizing  $\chi$  and let  $v_g = \tilde{T}^g \tilde{\epsilon}(1) \in V$  for  $g \geq 0$ . If  $\dim V = n$ , then there exist coefficients  $a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} \in k$  such that

$$v_n = a_0 v_0 + a_1 v_1 + \dots + a_{n-1} v_{n-1}.$$

Furthermore, since  $\tilde{T}^k v_i = v_{i+k}$ , we have that for all  $k \geq 0$

$$v_{n+k} = \tilde{T}^k v_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} a_i \tilde{T}^k v_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} a_i v_{i+k}.$$

In particular, since  $\chi(\Sigma_g) = \tilde{\eta}(v_g)$  we have that  $\chi(\Sigma_{n+k}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} a_i \chi(\Sigma_{i+k})$ , which is a recurrence relation of order  $n$  for the invariant.

*Remark 3.16.* If the invariant  $\chi(\Sigma_g)$  is almost-quantizable as in Theorem 3.13, there is an easy way of computing an almost-Frobenius algebra almost-quantizing it. Given  $g \geq 0$  and  $n \geq 1$ , let us form the vectors

$$v_{g,n} = (\chi(\Sigma_g), \chi(\Sigma_{g+1}), \dots, \chi(\Sigma_{g+n-1})) \in k^n.$$

As in Remark 3.15, there exists a maximum integer  $n \geq 0$  such that the vectors  $v_{0,n}, v_{1,n}, \dots, v_{n-1,n}$  of  $k^n$  are linearly independent. Hence, they form a basis of  $k^n$  so we can write

$$v_{n,n} = a_0 v_{0,n} + a_1 v_{1,n} + \dots + a_{n-1} v_{n-1,n},$$

for some constants  $a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} \in k$ . The coincidence of notation is not accidental: these coefficients are precisely the recurrence coefficients of Remark 3.15. In this form, the almost-Frobenius algebra can be easily recovered. Indeed,  $V = k^n$ ,  $\tilde{\epsilon}(1) = v_{0,n}$  and  $\tilde{\eta} : k^n \rightarrow k$  is the

projection onto the first component. The linear map  $\tilde{T}$  satisfies, in the basis  $v_{0,n}, v_{1,n}, \dots, v_{n-1,n}$ ,

$$\tilde{T}(v_{i,n}) = \tilde{T}(v_{i+1,n}) \text{ for } 0 \leq i \leq n-1, \quad \tilde{T}(v_{n-1,n}) = a_0 v_{0,n} + a_1 v_{1,n} + \dots + a_{n-1} v_{n-1,n}.$$

Hence, only with the knowledge of the invariant on the surfaces of genus  $\leq 2n-1$ , we can recover the whole almost-Frobenius algebra, and thus compute it for arbitrary genus.

#### 4. TQFTS WITH BASEPOINTS AND REPRESENTATION VARIETIES

In this section, we shall apply the previous results to the case of representation and character varieties.

**Definition 4.1.** Let  $G$  be an algebraic group and let  $M$  be a compact orientable manifold. The  $G$ -representation variety of  $M$  is the variety parametrizing representations of  $\pi_1(M)$  into  $G$

$$\mathfrak{X}_G(M) = \text{Hom}(\pi_1(M), G).$$

The Geometric Invariant Theory (GIT) quotient of  $\mathfrak{X}_G(M)$  under the adjoint action of  $G$  is the so-called *character variety* and denoted by  $\mathcal{R}_G(M) = \mathfrak{X}_G(M) // G$ .

*Remark 4.2.* Recall that the algebraic structure of  $\mathfrak{X}_G(M)$  is induced as follows. Let us consider a presentation of  $\pi_1(M)$  with finitely many generators  $\pi_1(M) = \langle \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_s \mid R_\alpha(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_s) = 1 \rangle$ . Hence, we have a natural identification of  $\mathfrak{X}_G(M)$  with the algebraic set  $\{(g_1, \dots, g_s) \in G^s \mid R_\alpha(g_1, \dots, g_s) = 1\}$ . Moreover, different presentations give rise to isomorphic algebraic sets, so this induces a unique algebraic structure on  $\mathfrak{X}_G(M)$ .

**Definition 4.3.** A map  $\phi : \mathbf{Var}_k \rightarrow R$  of algebraic varieties with values in a ring  $R$  is said to be *weakly dimension-aware* if, for any smooth algebraic varieties  $X$  and  $Y$ ,  $\phi(X) = \phi(Y)$  implies that  $\dim X = \dim Y$ . It is said to be *dimension-aware* if this property holds for any algebraic varieties, even if they are not smooth.

**Example 4.4.** The Poincaré polynomial  $P_c(X) = \sum_k (-1)^k H_c(X) t^k$  of the compactly supported (sheaf) cohomology of an algebraic variety  $X$  is a weakly dimension-aware invariant since, for  $X$  smooth, the degree of  $P_c(X)$  is twice the dimension of  $X$ .

**Example 4.5.** An important invariant associated to an algebraic variety is its virtual class in the Grothendieck ring  $\mathbf{KVar}_k$  of algebraic varieties. Recall that  $\mathbf{KVar}_k$  is the ring generated by isomorphism classes of algebraic varieties, denoted by  $[X]$ , modulo the cut-and-paste relations  $[X] = [Y] + [X - Y]$ , for any algebraic variety  $X$  and any locally closed set  $Y \subseteq X$ . In this way, we can form the invariant  $\phi(X) = [X]$ , called the *virtual class* or the *motive* of  $X$ . Notice that the Poincaré polynomial with compact support factorizes through the Grothendieck ring of algebraic varieties

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{Var}_k^{sm} & \xrightarrow{P_c} & \mathbb{Z}[t] \\ \downarrow & \nearrow & \\ \mathbf{KVar}_k & & \end{array}$$

Here,  $\mathbf{Var}_k^{sm}$  denotes the subcategory of  $\mathbf{Var}_k$  of smooth algebraic varieties. In particular, since the virtual class of any algebraic variety can be written as the sum of smooth subvarieties [4], this implies that the virtual class of an algebraic variety is a dimension-aware invariant.

Let  $\phi$  be a dimension-aware invariant and  $G$  an algebraic group, and let us form the invariant  $\chi(M) = \phi(\mathfrak{X}_G(M))$ . The following result shows that there is no hope of quantizing  $\chi$  through a monoidal TQFT.

**Theorem 4.6.** *If  $G$  is an algebraic group with  $\dim G > 0$ , then any dimension-aware invariant of the  $G$ -representation variety is not a strongly quantizable invariant.*

*Proof.* If  $n \neq 2$ , consider the manifold  $M = S^{n-1} \times S^1$  (in the case  $n = 1$ ,  $M = S^1$  should be understood). Then,  $\pi_1(M) = \pi_1(S^1) = \mathbb{Z}$  and, thus,  $\mathfrak{X}_G(M) = G$  so in particular  $\dim \mathfrak{X}_G(S^{n-1} \times S^1) > 0$ . Hence, for any dimension-aware invariant  $\phi$ , we cannot have  $\phi(\mathfrak{X}_G(S^{n-1} \times S^1))$  lying in the ring of integers of  $R$ , as required by Corollary 2.8.

In the case  $n = 2$ , use that we have a diagonal embedding  $G \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{X}_G(S^1 \times S^1)$ , which also implies that  $\dim \mathfrak{X}_G(S^1 \times S^1) > 0$ , and we proceed as above.  $\square$

**4.1. Quantization with basepoints.** As shown in Theorem 4.6, the virtual classes of representation varieties are not strongly quantizable. However, a closer look evidences that this is an expectable fact, since the fundamental group is not a functor out of the category of topological spaces, but of pointed topological spaces. Hence some sort of extra data seem to be needed. For this purpose, we shall enlarge our category of bordisms by adding a finite collection of basepoints. This new category  $\mathbf{Bdp}_{n+1}$  is comprised of the following information:

- **Objects:** The objects of  $\mathbf{Bdp}_{n+1}$  are pairs  $(M, A)$  where  $M$  is an object of  $\mathbf{Bd}_{n+1}$  and  $A \subseteq M$  is a finite set of basepoints with non-empty intersection with every connected component of  $M$ .
- **Morphisms:** A morphism  $(M_1, A_1) \rightarrow (M_2, A_2)$  is a class of pairs  $(W, A)$  where  $W$  is a  $(n+1)$ -dimensional bordism between  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  as in  $\mathbf{Bd}_{n+1}$  and  $A \subseteq W$  is a non-empty finite set such that  $A \cap M_1 = A_1$  and  $A \cap M_2 = A_2$ . Two such pairs  $(W, A), (W', A')$  are declared as equivalent if there exists a boundary-preserving diffeomorphism  $F : W \rightarrow W'$  with  $F(A) = A'$ .
- **Composition:** Given two bordisms of the form  $(W, A) : (M_1, A_1) \rightarrow (M_2, A_2)$  and  $(W', A') : (M_2, A_2) \rightarrow (M_3, A_3)$ , the composed morphism  $(W', A') \circ (W, A) : (M_1, A_1) \rightarrow (M_3, A_3)$  is the class of the pair  $(W \cup_{M_2} W', A \cup A')$ .
- **Monoidality:**  $\mathbf{Bdp}_{n+1}$  is endowed with its natural monoidal structure given by disjoint union (of both manifolds and basepoints).

For simplicity, the singleton set of basepoints will be denoted by  $\star$ . Thus  $(M, \star)$  will be a manifold with a single marked point, which we loosely will denote by  $M$ . Notice that, to obtain a genuine category, we also need to add ‘thin’ artificial bordisms  $(M, A) : (M, A) \rightarrow (M, A)$  for any object  $(M, A)$  as identity arrows.

**Definition 4.7.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a symmetric monoidal category. A *monoidal (resp. lax monoidal) TQFT with basepoints* with values in  $\mathcal{C}$  is a monoidal (resp. lax monoidal) symmetric functor

$$\mathcal{Z} : \mathbf{Bdp}_{n+1} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}.$$

Observe that the question of quantizability for TQFTs with basepoints is subtler than for usual TQFTs since  $\mathbf{Bdp}_{n+1}$  contains more morphisms than  $\mathbf{Bd}_{n+1}$ . In particular, we cannot directly apply Proposition 2.7 to give necessary conditions to the quantizability of algebraic invariants through TQFTs with basepoints.

To set this problem, an analogy with the unpointed case of Section 2.1, a  $\Lambda$ -valued diffeomorphism invariant  $\chi$  of manifolds with basepoints will be an assignment of an element  $\chi(W, A) \in \Lambda$  to any pair of a closed orientable manifold  $W$  and a non-empty finite subset  $A \subseteq W$  such that, if  $f : W \rightarrow W'$  is a diffeomorphism with  $f(A) = A'$ , then  $\chi(W, A) = \chi(W', A')$ .

As we will see, the basepoints prevent us to have a duality property on the nose, as used in the proof of Proposition 2.7. To get some control on the basepoints, we introduce the following special bordism.

**Definition 4.8.** Given a closed connected orientable manifold  $M$ , the *twisting bordism* is the morphism

$$\Theta_M = (M \times [0, 1], \{x_0, x_1\}) : M \rightarrow M,$$

where  $x_0 \in M \times \{0\}$  and  $x_1 \in M \times \{1\}$ , as depicted in Figure 6.




FIGURE 6. The twisting bordism

In this setting, keeping track of the basepoints in the proof of Proposition 2.7, we get the following result in the case  $\mathcal{C} = R\text{-Mod}$ .

**Proposition 4.9.** Consider a monoidal TQFT with basepoints

$$\mathcal{Z} : \mathbf{Bdp}_n \rightarrow R\text{-Mod}.$$

Then, for any closed connected orientable  $n$ -dimensional manifold  $M$ , we have that the induced homomorphism  $\mathcal{Z}(M \times S^1, \{x_1, x_2\}) : R \rightarrow R$  where  $x_1, x_2$  are any two basepoints, is given by multiplication by the trace  $\text{Tr}(\mathcal{Z}(\Theta_M^2))$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\delta : \emptyset \rightarrow (M, \star) \sqcup (M, \star)$  and  $\mu : (M, \star) \sqcup (M, \star) \rightarrow \emptyset$  be the two ‘elbow’ bordisms with two basepoints. As depicted in Figure 7, in this setting we have that  $(\mu \sqcup \text{Id}_M) \circ (\text{Id}_M \sqcup \delta) = (M \times [0, 1], \{x, x', x''\}) = \Theta_M^2$ .




FIGURE 7. The Zorro argument with punctures

Set  $\mathcal{Z}(\delta)(1) = \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{i,j} v_i \otimes v_j$  with  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  linearly independent vectors of  $\mathcal{Z}(M, \star)$ . Applying the Gram-Schmidt process, we can suppose that they are orthogonal with respect to  $\mathcal{Z}(\mu)$ , i.e.  $\mathcal{Z}(\mu)(v_i, v_j) = 0$  for  $i \neq j$ . Hence, under the TQFT, we have that

$$\mathcal{Z}(\Theta_M^2)(v_k) = (\mathcal{Z}(\mu) \otimes \mathcal{Z}(\text{Id}_M)) \circ (\mathcal{Z}(\text{Id}_M) \otimes \mathcal{Z}(\delta))(v_k) = \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{i,j} \mathcal{Z}(\mu)(v_k, v_i) v_j.$$

Therefore, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}(M \times S^1)(1) &= \mathcal{Z}(\mu) \circ \mathcal{Z}(\delta)(1) = \mathcal{Z}(\mu) \left( \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{i,j} v_i \otimes v_j \right) = \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{i,j} \mathcal{Z}(\mu)(v_i, v_j) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n a_{i,i} \mathcal{Z}(\mu)(v_i, v_i) = \text{Tr}(\mathcal{Z}(\Theta_M^2)). \end{aligned}$$

□

**Definition 4.10.** An  $R$ -valued invariant  $\chi$  is said to be *split* with factor  $\theta \in R$  if, for any closed connected orientable manifold  $W$  and any non-empty finite set  $A \subseteq W$ , we have

$$\chi(W, A \cup \star) = \theta \chi(W, A).$$

**Definition 4.11.** A TQFT  $\mathcal{Z} : \mathbf{Bdp}_{n+1} \rightarrow R\text{-Mod}$  is said to be *split* with factor  $\theta \in R$  if for any closed orientable manifold  $M$  we have

$$\mathcal{Z}(\Theta_M^2) = \theta \mathcal{Z}(\Theta_M).$$

Furthermore, we will say that  $\mathcal{Z}$  is *totally split* if, for any bordism  $(W, A)$  of  $\mathbf{Bdp}_{n+1}$ ,

$$\mathcal{Z}(W, A \cup \star) = \theta \mathcal{Z}(W, A).$$

*Remark 4.12.* Since  $\Theta_M^2 = (M \times [0, 1], \{x_0, x_1\} \cup \star)$ , any totally split TQFT is split.

*Remark 4.13.* Using several times the definition of being totally split, we get that for all non-empty finite set  $A \subseteq W$

$$\chi(W, A) = \theta^{|A|-1} \chi(W, \star).$$

Analogously, if  $\mathcal{Z}$  is a split TQFT then

$$\mathcal{Z}(W, A) = \theta^{|A|-|A_0|} \mathcal{Z}(W, A_0),$$

where  $A_0 \subseteq W$  is a finite set with a single point on each connected component of  $\partial W$ . Notice that, by the definition of a morphism in  $\mathbf{Bdp}_{n+1}$ , no more points can be removed.

*Remark 4.14.* Not necessarily a monoidal TQFT  $\mathcal{Z}$  computing a split invariant is split itself. However, the situation is different if  $\mathcal{Z}$  is wide i.e. for any object  $M$ , the  $R$ -module  $\mathcal{Z}(M)$  is generated by the images  $\mathcal{Z}(B)(1)$  of the possible “fillings”  $B : \emptyset \rightarrow M$ . In that case, for any bordism  $W : M_1 \rightarrow M_2$  we have that the non-degenerate bilinear map  $(v_1, v_2) \mapsto \mathcal{Z}(\mu_{M_2})(\mathcal{Z}(W \circ \Theta_{M_1})(v_1), v_2)$  equals the bilinear map  $(v_1, v_2) \mapsto \theta \mathcal{Z}(\mu_{M_2})(\mathcal{Z}(W)(v_1), v_2)$  and thus  $\mathcal{Z}(W \circ \Theta_{M_1}) = \theta \mathcal{Z}(W)$ , so  $\mathcal{Z}$  is actually split.

**Lemma 4.15.** *The eigenvalues of  $\mathcal{Z}(\Theta_M)$  are either  $\theta$  or 0.*

*Proof.* Since  $\mathcal{Z}(\Theta_M)^2 - \theta \mathcal{Z}(\Theta_M) = 0$ , then by the Cayley-Hamilton theorem we have that the roots of  $p(x) = x^2 - \theta x = x(x - \theta)$  are the possible eigenvalues of  $\mathcal{Z}(\Theta_M)$ . □

**Corollary 4.16.** *Let  $\mathcal{Z} : \mathbf{Bdp}_{n+1} \rightarrow R\text{-Mod}$  be a split monoidal TQFT with basepoints. Then, for any closed connected orientable  $n$ -dimensional manifold  $M$ , we have that the induced homomorphism*

$$\mathcal{Z}(M \times S^1, \{x_1, x_2\}) : R \rightarrow R,$$

where  $x_1, x_2$  are any two basepoints, is given by multiplication by  $m\theta^2$  for some integer  $m \geq 0$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 4.15, the eigenvalues of  $\Theta_M^2$  are either  $\theta^2$  or 0, so  $\text{Tr}(\Theta_M^2) = m\theta^2$ , where  $m$  is the number of non-vanishing eigenvalues. □

**Corollary 4.17.** *Let  $\chi$  be an split invariant of  $n$ -dimensional closed orientable manifolds with basepoints with values in a ring  $R$  and factor  $\theta \in R$ . If there exists an  $(n-1)$ -dimensional closed orientable manifold such that  $\chi(M \times S^1, \star) \notin \theta\mathbb{N}$ , then  $\chi$  is not strongly quantizable through a split monoidal TQFT.*

**4.2. Split TQFTs for representation varieties.** Let us come back to the problem of quantizing representation varieties. The virtual classes of representation varieties can be extended to work with basepoints. Given a compact manifold  $M$  and a finite set  $A \subseteq M$ , let  $\Pi(M, A)$  be the fundamental groupoid of  $M$  with basepoints in  $A$ , that is, the groupoid of homotopy classes of paths in  $M$  between points of  $A$ . Then, given an algebraic group  $G$ , the representation variety of  $(M, A)$  is the set of groupoid homomorphisms  $\rho : \Pi(M, A) \rightarrow G$ , that is,

$$\mathfrak{X}_G(M, A) = \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{Grpd}}(\Pi(M, A), G).$$

Decompose  $M$  into connected components  $M = M_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup M_s$  and let us choose a set  $A_0 = \{x_1, \dots, x_s\} \subseteq A$  with  $x_i \in M_i$  for all  $i$ . Then, by choosing paths between the remaining points of  $M_i \cap A$  and  $x_i$ , we have a natural identification

$$(4) \quad \mathfrak{X}_G(M, A) = \prod_{i=1}^s \left( \text{Hom}(\pi_1(M_i), G) \times G^{|M_i \cap A| - 1} \right) = G^{|A| - s} \times \prod_{i=1}^s \mathfrak{X}_G(M_i).$$

Hence,  $\mathfrak{X}_G(M, A)$  is an algebraic variety. Moreover, we can consider the character variety of  $(M, A)$  as the GIT quotient of  $\mathfrak{X}_G(M)$  under the adjoint action of  $G$ ,  $\mathcal{R}_G(M) = \mathfrak{X}_G(M) // G$ .

Now, let us consider an invariant  $\phi : \mathbf{Var}_k \rightarrow R$  of algebraic varieties with values in a ring  $R$ , as in Definition 4.3. We will say that  $\phi$  is *multiplicative* if  $\phi(X \times Y) = \phi(X)\phi(Y)$  for all algebraic varieties  $X$  and  $Y$ .

**Lemma 4.18.** *If  $\phi$  is a multiplicative invariant with values in a ring  $R$ , then the  $\chi(M, A) = \phi(\mathfrak{X}_G(M, A))$  is a split invariant with factor  $\phi(G) \in R$ .*

*Proof.* It is a straightforward computation. Let  $M$  be a closed connected manifold and let  $A \subseteq W$  be a finite non-empty set. By (4) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{X}_G(W, A \cup \star) &= \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{Grpd}}(\Pi(W, A \cup \star), G) \\ &= \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{Grpd}}(\Pi(W, A), G) \times G = \mathfrak{X}_G(W, A) \times G. \end{aligned}$$

In particular,  $\phi(\mathfrak{X}_G(W, A \cup \star)) = \phi(G)\phi(\mathfrak{X}_G(W, A))$ , as we wanted to prove.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.19.** *Suppose that  $k$  is an algebraically closed field. If  $G$  is an algebraic group over  $k$ , then  $\dim \mathfrak{X}_G(S^1 \times S^1) > \dim G$ .*

*Proof.* Notice that we have

$$\mathfrak{X}_G(S^1 \times S^1) = \{(g, h) \in G^2 \mid [g, h] = 1\} \cong \{(g, h) \in G^2 \mid hgh^{-1} = g\}.$$

In this way, the projection onto the first component  $\mathfrak{X}_G(S^1 \times S^1) \rightarrow G$  has as fiber the centralizer  $C_g(G)$  of  $g$  inside  $G$ . Hence, if  $\dim C_g(G) > 0$  for all  $g$  in a dense open set of  $G$ , the result follows.

We actually have that  $\dim C_g(G) > 0$  for any  $g \in G^\dagger$ . Indeed,  $\dim C_g(G) \geq \dim C_g(B)$ , where  $B$  is a Borel subgroup containing  $g$ . Now, the conjugacy class of  $g$  in  $B$  is contained in the coset  $g^{-1}(B, B)$ , with  $(B, B)$  the commutator subgroup of  $B$ . But  $\dim(B, B) < \dim B$  since  $B$  is solvable (and non-trivial), so the dimension of the conjugacy class is also strictly smaller than  $\dim B$ . Thus,  $\dim C_g(B) > 0$ , as we wanted to prove.  $\square$

<sup>†</sup>This proof was communicated to us by F. Knop.

**Theorem 4.20.** *If  $G$  is an algebraic group with  $\dim G > 0$ , then any multiplicative dimension-aware invariant of the  $G$ -representation variety of manifolds of dimension  $\geq 2$  is not a strongly quantizable invariant through a split monoidal TQFT with basepoints.*

*Proof.* Let us first consider the case of surfaces. Let  $\phi$  be the dimension-aware invariant and suppose that there exists a monoidal TQFT with basepoints  $\mathcal{Z} : \mathbf{Bdp}_{1+1} \rightarrow R\text{-Mod}$  quantizing the  $\phi$ -invariant of the  $G$ -representation variety. By Corollary 4.16 and Lemma 4.18, we have that

$$m\phi(G^2) = \mathcal{Z}(S^1 \times S^1) = \phi(\mathfrak{X}_G(S^1 \times S^1, \{x_1, x_2\})) = \phi(G \times \mathfrak{X}_G(S^1 \times S^1))$$

for some  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Hence, since  $\phi$  is dimension-aware, we get  $2 \dim G = \dim G + \dim \mathfrak{X}_G(S^1 \times S^1)$ , contradicting Proposition 4.19.

For dimension  $n > 3$ , the same argument as above works verbatim with the manifold  $S^{n-2} \times S^1 \times S^1$ . In the case  $n = 3$ , notice that  $\mathfrak{X}_G(S^1 \times S^1)$  is a subvariety of  $\mathfrak{X}_G(S^1 \times S^1 \times S^1)$ . Hence, the previous argument implies that  $2 \dim G = \dim G + \dim \mathfrak{X}_G(S^1 \times S^1 \times S^1) \geq \dim G + \dim \mathfrak{X}_G(S^1 \times S^1)$ , which is again a contradiction.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.21.** *If  $G$  is an algebraic group with  $\dim G > 0$ , then the virtual class of the  $G$ -representation variety of manifolds of dimension  $\geq 2$  is not a strongly quantizable invariant through a split monoidal TQFT with basepoints.*

*Remark 4.22.* The hypothesis of being a split TQFT in Theorem 4.21 can be substituted for being a wide TQFT, as pointed out in Remark 4.14.

*Remark 4.23.* The previous argument can be applied to other related situations, such as the virtual classes of  $G$ -character stacks as studied in [10], to show that they are not strongly quantizable either.

**4.3. Lax monoidal TQFTs for representation varieties.** We have seen in Theorem 4.21 that the virtual class of  $G$ -representations varieties cannot be strongly quantized through a monoidal TQFT, even if we consider basepoints. However, it turns out that it can be lax-quantized through a lax monoidal TQFT with basepoints.

**Theorem 4.24.** [9, Theorem 4.9] *Let  $G$  be an algebraic group and  $n \geq 0$ . There exists a split lax monoidal TQFT with basepoints*

$$\mathcal{Z}_G : \mathbf{Bdp}_{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbf{KVar}_k\text{-Mod}$$

*such that  $\mathcal{Z}_G(W, \star)(1) = [\mathfrak{X}_G(W)] \in \mathbf{KVar}_k$  for any closed connected orientable  $(n+1)$ -dimensional manifold  $W$ .*

*Remark 4.25.* For the sake of completeness, let us sketch briefly the construction of this TQFT. For further details, please refer to [11, 9]. Given an algebraic variety  $X$  over  $k$ , let us denote by  $\mathbf{Var}/X$  the category of  $X$ -varieties, that is, the category whose objects are regular morphisms  $f : Z \rightarrow X$  and whose morphisms between  $f : Z \rightarrow X$  and  $f' : Z' \rightarrow X$  are intertwining regular maps  $g : Z \rightarrow Z'$ , i.e. satisfying  $f' \circ g = f$ . Given a regular map  $h : X \rightarrow X'$  we have two induced functors  $h_! : \mathbf{Var}/X \rightarrow \mathbf{Var}/X'$  (covariant) and  $h^* : \mathbf{Var}/X' \rightarrow \mathbf{Var}/X$  (contravariant) given by post-composition and pullback, respectively.

Passing to the Grothendieck ring, we get  $\mathbf{KVar}_k$ -algebras  $\mathbf{KVar}/X$ , and each regular morphism  $h : X \rightarrow X'$  induces a  $\mathbf{KVar}_k$ -module homomorphism  $h_! : \mathbf{KVar}/X \rightarrow \mathbf{KVar}/X'$  and an algebra homomorphism  $h^* : \mathbf{KVar}/X' \rightarrow \mathbf{KVar}/X$ . With these notions, the functor  $\mathcal{Z}_G$  is given as follows.

- On an object  $(M, A) \in \mathbf{Bdp}_{n+1}$ , the functor assigns the  $\mathbf{KVar}_k$ -algebra  $\mathcal{Z}_G(M, A) = \mathbf{KVar}/\mathfrak{X}_G(M, A)$ , seen as a  $\mathbf{KVar}_k$ -module.
- For a bordism  $(W, A) : (M_1, A_1) \rightarrow (M_2, A_2)$ , let us denote by  $j_1 : \mathfrak{X}_G(W, A) \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}_G(M_1, A_1)$  and  $j_2 : \mathfrak{X}_G(W, A) \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}_G(M_2, A_2)$  the restriction maps. Then,  $\mathcal{Z}(W, A) = (j_2)_! \circ (j_1)^* : \mathbf{KVar}/\mathfrak{X}_G(M_1, A_1) \rightarrow \mathbf{KVar}/\mathfrak{X}_G(M_2, A_2)$ .

Using the Seifert-van Kampen theorem for fundamental groupoids and the properties of base change, it can be proven that  $\mathcal{Z}_G$  is actually a functor. Moreover, the external product  $\boxtimes : \mathbf{KVar}/\mathfrak{X}_G(M_1, A_1) \otimes \mathbf{KVar}/\mathfrak{X}_G(M_2, A_2) \rightarrow \mathbf{KVar}/\mathfrak{X}_G(M_1 \sqcup M_2, A_1 \sqcup A_2)$  endows  $\mathcal{Z}_G$  with the structure of a lax monoidal functor, giving rise to a lax monoidal TQFT.

As shown in Theorem 4.21, if  $\dim G \geq 1$ , then the virtual classes of the  $G$ -representation varieties are not quantizable. Nevertheless, if  $\dim G = 0$ , then the necessary condition of Corollary 4.16 may still hold, since  $[\mathfrak{X}_G(S^1 \times S^1)]$  may be an integer, its number of points. In fact, in this case, the lax monoidal TQFT of Theorem 4.24 is actually monoidal.

**Proposition 4.26.** *If  $\dim G = 0$ , then the TQFT of Theorem 4.24 is monoidal.*

*Proof.* Let  $X$  be variety of dimension 0. Given  $x \in X$ , let  $1_x : \star \rightarrow X$  denote the inclusion map of  $x$  into  $X$ . In this situation, we have a natural identification

$$\mathbf{KVar}/k^{\oplus|X|} \cong \mathbf{KVar}/X, \quad (\alpha_x)_{x \in X} \mapsto \sum_{x \in X} \alpha_x 1_x.$$

In particular, using this isomorphism we get an identification  $\mathbf{KVar}/(X \times Y) \cong \mathbf{KVar}/k^{\oplus|X||Y|} \cong \mathbf{KVar}_k^{\oplus|X|} \otimes_{\mathbf{KVar}/k} \mathbf{KVar}/k^{\oplus|Y|} \cong \mathbf{KVar}/X \otimes_{\mathbf{KVar}_k} \mathbf{KVar}/Y$ .

Now, if  $\mathcal{Z}_G : \mathbf{Bdp}_{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbf{KVar}_k\text{-Mod}$  is the TQFT of Theorem 4.24, for any  $n$ -dimensional closed orientable manifolds  $M$  and  $M'$ , we have  $\mathcal{Z}_G(M \sqcup M') = \mathbf{KVar}/(\mathfrak{X}_G(M) \times \mathfrak{X}_G(M'))$ , which by the previous observation is isomorphic to  $\mathbf{KVar}/\mathfrak{X}_G(M) \otimes_{\mathbf{KVar}_k} \mathbf{KVar}/\mathfrak{X}_G(M') = \mathcal{Z}_G(M) \otimes_{\mathbf{KVar}_k} \mathcal{Z}_G(M')$ . An analogous computation with disjoint union of bordisms shows that they preserve this isomorphism.  $\square$

*Remark 4.27.* If  $G$  is a algebraic group over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  (no necessarily of dimension 0), then we can adapt the TQFT of Theorem 4.24 to get a monoidal TQFT computing the number of points of the  $G$ -representation variety. For that purpose, we consider the forgetful functor of closed points  $\mathbf{Var}_{\mathbb{F}_q} \rightarrow \mathbf{Top}$ ,  $X \mapsto X(\mathbb{F}_q)$ , which gives rise to a ring homomorphism  $\mathbf{KVar}_{\mathbb{F}_q} \rightarrow \mathbf{KTop}$  and its relative versions  $\mathbf{KVar}/Z \rightarrow \mathbf{KTop}/Z(\mathbb{F}_q)$ . These maps induce a natural transformation  $\mathcal{Z}_G \Rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_G^{\mathbb{F}_q}$  where  $\mathcal{Z}_G^{\mathbb{F}_q}(M) = \mathbf{KTop}/\mathfrak{X}_G(M)(\mathbb{F}_q)$  and analogously for bordisms. This TQFT computes the invariant  $[\mathfrak{X}_G(M)(\mathbb{F}_q)] \in \mathbf{KTop}$ , which is the number of  $\mathbb{F}_q$ -points of  $\mathfrak{X}_G(M)$ . Moreover, an analogous argument to Proposition 4.26 shows that  $\mathcal{Z}_G^{\mathbb{F}_q}$  is a monoidal TQFT.

We finish this section with a rather non-standard proof of a well-known result in group theory.

**Corollary 4.28.** *Let  $G$  be a finite group with  $c > 0$  conjugacy classes. Then  $G$  has  $|G|c$  pairwise commuting pairs of elements.*

*Proof.* The twisting map  $\Theta_{S^1} : (\mathbf{KTop})^{\oplus|G|} \rightarrow (\mathbf{KTop})^{\oplus|G|}$  is given by  $\Theta_{S^1}(1_g) = \sum_h |\text{Stab}(g)| 1_h$  where the sum runs over the elements  $h \in G$  in the same conjugacy class as  $g$ . In particular, the trace of this map is

$$\text{Tr}(\Theta_{S^1}) = \sum_{\mathcal{C} \subseteq G} |\text{Stab}(\mathcal{C})| |\mathcal{C}| = \sum_{\mathcal{C} \subseteq G} |G| = |G|c,$$

where the sum runs over the conjugacy classes  $\mathcal{C}$  of  $G$ . Since the number of pairwise commuting pairs of elements of  $G$  is  $\chi(S^1 \times S^1)/|G| = \text{Tr}(\Theta_{S^1}^2)/|G| = \text{Tr}(\Theta_{S^1})$ , the result follows.  $\square$

*Remark 4.29.* The previous count agrees with usual counting formula for solutions of equations over finite fields. For instance, using [12, Equation (2.3.8)] we also get that the number of pairwise commuting elements of  $G$  is

$$|\text{Hom}(\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}, G)| = |G| \sum_{\chi \in \text{Irr}(G)} \left( \frac{|G|}{\chi(1)} \right)^{2 \cdot 1 - 2} = |G| \sum_{\chi \in \text{Irr}(G)} 1 = |G|c,$$

where the sum runs over the set of irreducible characters of  $G$ .

**4.4. Motives of  $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ -representation varieties as a dynamical system.** In this section, we shall show how to apply the techniques from Section 3.2 to compute virtual classes of representation varieties for  $G = \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ . Recall from Theorem 4.24 that we already know that there exists a lax monoidal TQFT computing the motives of  $G = \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ -representation varieties. In fact, the map  $\tilde{T} = \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})} : \mathbf{KVar}/\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathbf{KVar}/\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$  has been previously computed in [17] (see also [9, Section 5.4]). The aim of this section is to show that, even without this knowledge, the TQFT can be fully computed after finitely many computations.

In fact, suppose that we have computed the virtual classes of the  $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ -representation varieties over  $\Sigma_g$  for some finite number of genii  $g$ . This can be done through a long case-by-case analysis. The results for  $0 \leq g \leq 11$  are shown in Table 1.

$g$	$[\mathfrak{X}(\Sigma_g)]$
1	1
2	$q^4 + 4q^3 - q^2 - 4q$
3	$q^9 + q^8 + 12q^7 + 2q^6 - 3q^4 - 12q^3 - q$
4	$q^{15} - 5q^{13} + q^{12} + 73q^{11} + 9q^{10} + 295q^9 - 5q^8 - 295q^7 - 5q^6 - 73q^5 + 5q^3 - q$
5	$q^{21} - 7q^{19} + 21q^{17} + q^{16} + 220q^{15} + 20q^{14} + 3584q^{13} + 14q^{12} - 28q^{10} - 3584q^9 - 7q^8 - 220q^7 - 21q^5 + 7q^3 - q$
6	$q^{27} - 9q^{25} + 36q^{23} - 84q^{21} + q^{20} + 1149q^{19} + 35q^{18} + 27459q^{17} + 90q^{16} + 43044q^{15} - 42q^{14} - 43044q^{13} - 75q^{12} - 27459q^{11} - 9q^{10} - 1149q^9 + 84q^7 - 36q^5 + 9q^3 - q$
7	$q^{33} - 11q^{31} + 55q^{29} - 165q^{27} + 330q^{25} + q^{24} + 3633q^{23} + 54q^{22} + 180587q^{21} + 275q^{20} + 675235q^{19} + 132q^{18} - 297q^{16} - 675235q^{15} - 154q^{14} - 180587q^{13} - 11q^{12} - 3633q^{11} - 330q^9 + 165q^7 - 55q^5 + 11q^3 - q$
8	$q^{39} - 13q^{37} + 78q^{35} - 286q^{33} + 715q^{31} - 1287q^{29} + q^{28} + 18099q^{27} + 77q^{26} + 1063101q^{25} + 637q^{24} + 7029243q^{23} + 1001q^{22} + 7026877q^{21} - 429q^{20} - 7026877q^{19} - 1001q^{18} - 7029243q^{17} - 273q^{16} - 1063101q^{15} - 13q^{14} - 18099q^{13} + 1287q^{11} - 715q^9 + 286q^7 - 78q^5 + 13q^3 - q$
9	$q^{45} - 15q^{43} + 105q^{41} - 455q^{39} + 1365q^{37} - 3003q^{35} + 5005q^{33} + q^{32} + 59100q^{31} + 104q^{30} + 5904480q^{29} + 1260q^{28} + 59631040q^{27} + 3640q^{26} + 131201616q^{25} + 1430q^{24} - 3432q^{22} - 131201616q^{21} - 2548q^{20} - 59631040q^{19} - 440q^{18} - 5904480q^{17} - 15q^{16} - 59100q^{15} - 5005q^{13} + 3003q^{11} - 1365q^9 + 455q^7 - 105q^5 + 15q^3 - q$
10	$q^{51} - 17q^{49} + 136q^{47} - 680q^{45} + 2380q^{43} - 6188q^{41} + 12376q^{39} - 19448q^{37} + q^{36} + 286453q^{35} + 135q^{34} + 31170571q^{33} + 2244q^{32} + 445660984q^{31} + 9996q^{30} + 1622121640q^{29} + 11934q^{28} + 1274542972q^{27} - 4862q^{26} - 1274542972q^{25} - 13260q^{24} - 1622121640q^{23} - 5508q^{22} - 445660984q^{21} - 663q^{20} - 31170571q^{19} - 17q^{18} - 286453q^{17} + 19448q^{15} - 12376q^{13} + 6188q^{11} - 2380q^9 + 680q^7 - 136q^5 + 17q^3 - q$
11	$q^{57} - 19q^{55} + 171q^{53} - 969q^{51} + 3876q^{49} - 11628q^{47} + 27132q^{45} - 50388q^{43} + 75582q^{41} + q^{40} + 956197q^{39} + 170q^{38} + 159475607q^{37} + 3705q^{36} + 3048129207q^{35} + 23256q^{34} + 16257140715q^{33} + 48450q^{32} + 26417750100q^{31} + 16796q^{30} - 41990q^{28} - 26417750100q^{27} - 38760q^{26} - 16257140715q^{25} - 10659q^{24} - 3048129207q^{23} - 950q^{22} - 159475607q^{21} - 19q^{20} - 956197q^{19} - 75582q^{17} + 50388q^{15} - 27132q^{13} + 11628q^{11} - 3876q^9 + 969q^7 - 171q^5 + 19q^3 - q$

TABLE 1. Virtual classes of  $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ -representation varieties for closed orientable surfaces of genus  $1 \leq g \leq 11$ . Here,  $q = [\mathbb{A}^1]$  is the Lefschetz motive.

Following Remark 3.16, let us form the vectors

$$v_{g,n} = ([\mathfrak{X}(\Sigma_g)], \dots, [\mathfrak{X}(\Sigma_{g+n-1})]) \in \mathbb{Z}[q]^n \subseteq \mathbf{KVar}_{\mathbb{C}}^n.$$

A direct calculation shows that for  $n \leq 6$ , the vectors  $v_{0,n}, \dots, v_{n-1,n}$  are linearly independent but for  $n = 7$  they are linearly dependent. Hence, the dimension of the underlying vector space is  $n = 6$ . A direct computation shows that

$$v_{6,6} = P_0 v_{0,6} + P_1 v_{1,6} + \dots + P_5 v_{5,6},$$

where the polynomials  $P_i \in \mathbb{Z}[q]$  are

$$\begin{aligned} P_0 &= q^6 + 9q^4 + 9q^2 + 1, \\ P_1 &= -11q^{10} - 29q^8 + 16q^6 - 29q^4 - 11q^2, \\ P_2 &= 43q^{14} - 25q^{12} - 18q^{10} - 18q^8 - 25q^6 + 43q^4, \\ P_3 &= -73q^{18} + 198q^{16} - 135q^{14} + 20q^{12} - 135q^{10} + 198q^8 - 73q^6, \\ P_4 &= 56q^{22} - 280q^{20} + 504q^{18} - 280q^{16} - 280q^{14} + 504q^{12} - 280q^{10} + 56q^8, \\ P_5 &= -16q^{26} + 128q^{24} - 448q^{22} + 896q^{20} - 1120q^{18} + 896q^{16} - 448q^{14} + 128q^{12} - 16q^{10}. \end{aligned}$$

As argued in Remark 3.16, this implies the recurrence relation

$$[\mathfrak{X}(\Sigma_g)] = P_0 [\mathfrak{X}(\Sigma_{g-6})] + P_1 [\mathfrak{X}(\Sigma_{g-2})] + \dots + P_5 [\mathfrak{X}(\Sigma_{g-1})],$$

for all  $g \geq 6$ .

In other words, we have that map  $\tilde{T} : \mathbb{Z}[q]^6 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}[q]^6$  of the almost-Frobenius algebra is the only map satisfying  $\tilde{T}(v_{g,6}) = v_{g+1,6}$  for  $g < 5$  and  $\tilde{T}(v_{5,6}) = P_0 v_{0,6} + \dots + P_5 v_{5,6}$ . That is, in the basis  $v_{0,6}, \dots, v_{5,6}$ , we have

$$\tilde{T} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & P_0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & P_1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & P_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & P_3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & P_4 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & P_5 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Moreover, setting  $P_0 = \left( v_{0,6} \mid v_{2,6} \mid v_{2,6} \mid v_{3,6} \mid v_{4,6} \mid v_{5,6} \right)$ , we have that  $P_0 \tilde{T} P_0^{-1}$  is the matrix of  $\tilde{T}$  in the canonical basis. In this basis, we recover the whole almost-Frobenius algebra associated to the lax monoidal TQFT of Theorem 4.24 with the inclusion  $\tilde{\epsilon}(1) = v_{0,n}$  and the projection onto the first component  $\tilde{\eta} : \mathbb{Z}[q]^6 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}[q]^6$ . For instance, writing  $\tilde{T} = PDP^{-1}$  with  $D$  a diagonal matrix and setting  $e_1 = (1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$ , we get that

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathfrak{X}(\Sigma_g)] &= \tilde{\eta}(\tilde{T}^g(v_{0,6})) = e_1^t P_0 P D^g P^{-1} P_0^{-1} e_1 \\ &= (q^2 - 1)^{2g-1} q^{2g-1} + \frac{1}{2} (q - 1)^{2g-1} q^{2g-1} (q + 1) (2^{2g} + q - 3) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} (q + 1)^{2g+r-1} q^{2g-1} (q - 1) (2^{2g} + q - 1) + q(q^2 - 1)^{2g-1}. \end{aligned}$$

This formula agrees with [17, Proposition 11] (see also [9, Remark 5.11]).

*Remark 4.30.* The map  $\tilde{T}$  computed above does not coincide exactly with  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})}(L)$ , for  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})}$  the lax monoidal TQFT of Theorem 4.24. The reason is that  $\tilde{T}^g$  is computing  $[\mathfrak{X}_{\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})}(\Sigma_g)]$ , but  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})}(L)^g$  is computing  $[\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})]^g [\mathfrak{X}_{\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})}(\Sigma_g)]$ , since  $L^g$  is equipped with  $g + 1$  basepoints. In other words, in this section we have actually computed  $\tilde{T} = \frac{1}{[\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})]} \mathcal{Z}_{\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})}(L)$ .

The upshot of this computation is that from the simple knowledge of the virtual class of the representation variety for only finitely many genii, which can be computed through a brute force approach, the virtual class for arbitrary genus can be computed thanks to the existence of an underlying TQFT.

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. Atiyah. Topological quantum field theories. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, (68):175–186 (1989), 1988.
- [2] D. Ayala and J. Francis. Factorization homology of topological manifolds. *Journal of Topology*, 8(4):1045–1084, 2015.
- [3] D. Ben-Zvi, S. Gunningham, and D. Nadler. The character field theory and homology of character varieties. *Preprint arXiv:1705.04266*, 2017.
- [4] F. Bittner. The universal euler characteristic for varieties of characteristic zero. *Compositio Mathematica*, 140(4):1011–1032, 2004.
- [5] K. Corlette. Flat  $G$ -bundles with canonical metrics. *J. Differential Geom.*, 28(3):361–382, 1988.
- [6] A. Dold and D. Puppe. Duality, trace and transfer. *Trudy Matematicheskogo Instituta imeni VA Steklova*, 154:81–97, 1983.
- [7] B. I. Dundas, M. Levine, P. A. Østvær, O. Röndigs, and V. Voevodsky. *Motivic homotopy theory: lectures at a summer school in Nordfjordeid, Norway, August 2002*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.
- [8] T. Fritz and P. Perrone. A criterion for Kan extensions of lax monoidal functors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.10481*, 2018.
- [9] Á. González-Prieto. Motivic theory of representation varieties via topological quantum field theories. *Preprint arXiv:1810.09714*, 2018.
- [10] Á. González-Prieto, M. Hablicsek, and J. Vogel. Virtual classes of character stacks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.08699*, 2022.
- [11] Á. González-Prieto, M. Logares, and V. Muñoz. A lax monoidal Topological Quantum Field Theory for representation varieties. *Bulletin des Sciences Mathématiques*, page 102871, 2020.
- [12] T. Hausel and F. Rodriguez-Villegas. Mixed Hodge polynomials of character varieties. *Invent. Math.*, 174(3):555–624, 2008. With an appendix by Nicholas M. Katz.
- [13] J. Kock. *Frobenius algebras and 2D topological quantum field theories*, volume 59 of *London Mathematical Society Student Texts*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.
- [14] J. Lurie. *Higher topos theory*. Princeton University Press, 2009.
- [15] J. Lurie. On the classification of topological field theories. In *Current developments in mathematics, 2008*, pages 129–280. International Press of Boston, 2009.
- [16] S. Mac Lane. *Categories for the working mathematician*, volume 5 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1998.
- [17] J. Martínez and V. Muñoz. E-polynomials of the  $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ -character varieties of surface groups. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (3):926–961, 2016.
- [18] C. J. Schommer-Pries. *The classification of two-dimensional extended topological field theories*. University of California, Berkeley, 2009.
- [19] C. T. Simpson. Moduli of representations of the fundamental group of a smooth projective variety. I. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, (79):47–129, 1994.
- [20] C. T. Simpson. Moduli of representations of the fundamental group of a smooth projective variety. II. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, (80):5–79 (1995), 1994.
- [21] E. Witten. Quantum field theory and the jones polynomial. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 121(3):351–399, 1989.

FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDAD COMPLUTENSE DE MADRID, PLAZA CIENCIAS 3, 28040 MADRID SPAIN.

INSTITUTO DE CIENCIAS MATEMÁTICAS (CSIC-UAM-UC3M-UCM), C. NICOLÁS CABRERA 15, 28049 MADRID, SPAIN.

*Email address:* `angelgonzalezprieto@ucm.es`