

Normal subgroups and relative centers of linearly reductive quantum groups

Alexandru Chirvasitu

Abstract

We prove a number of structural and representation-theoretic results on linearly reductive quantum groups, i.e. objects dual to that of cosemisimple Hopf algebras: (a) a closed normal quantum subgroup is automatically linearly reductive if its squared antipode leaves invariant each simple subcoalgebra of the underlying Hopf algebra; (b) for a normal embedding $\mathbb{H} \trianglelefteq \mathbb{G}$ there is a Clifford-style correspondence between two equivalence relations on irreducible \mathbb{G} - and, respectively, \mathbb{H} -representations; and (c) given an embedding $\mathbb{H} \leq \mathbb{G}$ of linearly reductive quantum groups the Pontryagin dual of the relative center $Z(\mathbb{G}) \cap \mathbb{H}$ can be described by generators and relations, with one generator g_V for each irreducible \mathbb{G} -representation V and one relation $g_U = g_V g_W$ whenever U and $V \otimes W$ are not disjoint over \mathbb{H} .

This latter center-reconstruction result generalizes and recovers Mürger's compact-group analogue and the author's quantum-group version of that earlier result by setting $\mathbb{H} = \mathbb{G}$.

Key words: quantum group; cosemisimple Hopf algebra; comodule; cotensor; center; linearly reductive; antipode

MSC 2020: 16T05; 20G42; 16T20

Introduction

The quantum groups in the title are as in [25, §1.2]: objects \mathbb{G} dual to corresponding Hopf algebras $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G})$, with the latter regarded as the algebra of regular functions on (the otherwise non-existent) linear algebraic quantum group \mathbb{G} . Borrowing standard linear-algebraic-group terminology (e.g. [23, Chapter 1, §1, Definition 1.4]), the linear reductivity condition then simply means that the Hopf algebra $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G})$ is cosemisimple.

The unifying thread through the material below is the concept of a (closed) normal quantum subgroup. In the present non-commutative setting normality can be defined in a number of ways that are frequently equivalent [34, Theorem 2.7]. We settle here on the concept introduced in [25, §1.5] (and recalled in Definition 2.1): a quotient Hopf algebra

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{H})$$

dual to a closed quantum subgroup $\mathbb{H} \leq \mathbb{G}$ is normal if that quotient is an $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G})$ -comodule under both adjoint coactions $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G})^{\otimes 2}$:

$$x \mapsto x_2 \otimes S(x_1)x_3 \quad \text{and} \quad x \mapsto x_1 S(x_3) \otimes x_2$$

One piece of motivation for the material is the observation (cf. Remark 2.9) that classically, normal closed subgroups of linearly reductive algebraic groups are again linearly reductive. The non-commutative version of this remark, appearing as Theorem 2.2 below, can be phrased (in somewhat weakened but briefer form) as follows.

Theorem 0.1 *A normal quantum subgroup $\mathbb{H} \trianglelefteq \mathbb{G}$ of a linearly reductive quantum group is again linearly reductive, provided the squared antipode of $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{H})$ leaves invariant all simple subcoalgebras of the latter.*

In particular, this recovers the classical version: in that case the squared antipode is trivial.

Keeping with the theme of what is (or isn't) afforded by normality, another motivating strand is that of *Clifford theory* (so named for [12], where the relevant machinery was introduced). This is a suite of results relating the irreducible representations of a (finite, compact, etc.) group and those of a normal subgroup via induction/restriction functors; the reader can find a brief illuminating summary in [7, §2] (in the context of finite groups).

Hopf-algebra analogues (both purely algebraic and analytic) abound. Not coming close to doing the literature justice, we will point to a selection: [36, 37, 6, 30, 33], say, and the references therein. [13, §5, especially Theorem 5.4] provides a version for *compact quantum groups* [38], which are (dual to) cosemisimple complex Hopf $*$ -algebras with positive Haar integral (the *CQG algebras* of [14, Definition 2.2]); they thus fit within the confines of the present paper.

The following result paraphrases and summarizes Theorem 3.4, Theorem 3.5 and Proposition 3.6. To make sense of it:

- In the language of Section 3, the surjection $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{H})$ of Theorem 0.2 is $H \rightarrow B$.
- As explained in Section 1, for a quantum group \mathbb{G} the symbol $\widehat{\mathbb{G}}$ denotes its category of irreducible representations (i.e. simple right $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G})$ -comodules).
- $\text{Ind}_{\mathbb{H}}^{\mathbb{G}}$ and $\text{Res}_{\mathbb{H}}^{\mathbb{G}}$ denote the induction and restriction functors respectively, as discussed in §1.1.

Theorem 0.2 *Let $\mathbb{H} \trianglelefteq \mathbb{G}$ be a normal embedding of linearly reductive quantum groups, and consider the binary relation \sim on $\widehat{\mathbb{G}} \times \widehat{\mathbb{H}}$ defined by*

$$\widehat{\mathbb{G}} \ni V \sim W \in \widehat{\mathbb{H}} \Leftrightarrow \text{hom}_{\mathbb{H}} \left(\text{Res}_{\mathbb{H}}^{\mathbb{G}} V, W \right) \neq 0 \Leftrightarrow \text{hom}_{\mathbb{G}} \left(V, \text{Ind}_{\mathbb{H}}^{\mathbb{G}} W \right) \neq 0.$$

The following statements hold.

(a) *The left-hand slices*

$$\text{slice}_W := \{V \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}} \mid V \sim W\}, \quad W \in \widehat{\mathbb{H}}$$

of \sim are the classes of an equivalence relation $\sim_{\mathbb{G}}$, given by

$$V \sim_{\mathbb{G}} V' \Leftrightarrow \text{Res}_{\mathbb{H}}^{\mathbb{G}} V \text{ and } \text{Res}_{\mathbb{H}}^{\mathbb{G}} V' \text{ have the same simple constituents.}$$

(b) *The right-hand slices*

$${}_V \text{slice} := \{W \in \widehat{\mathbb{H}} \mid V \sim W\}, \quad V \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}}$$

are the finite classes of an equivalence relation.

A third branch of the present discussion has to do with the *relative centers* of the title: having defined the center $Z(\mathbb{G})$ of a linearly reductive quantum group (Definition 4.3), and given a closed linearly reductive quantum subgroup $\mathbb{H} \leq \mathbb{G}$, one can then make sense of the relative center $Z(\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{H})$ as the *intersection* $\mathbb{H} \cap Z(\mathbb{G})$; see Definition 4.4.

Though not immediately obvious, it follows from [11, §3] (cited more precisely in the text below) that for embeddings $\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{K} \leq \mathbb{G}$ of linearly reductive quantum groups, operations such as the intersection $\mathbb{H} \cap \mathbb{K}$ and the quantum subgroup $\mathbb{H}\mathbb{K}$ generated by the two are well defined and behave as usual when \mathbb{K} , say, is normal (hence the relevance of normality, again).

The initial spark of motivation for Section 4 was provided by the main result of [22] (Theorem 3.1 therein), reconstructing the center of a compact group \mathbb{G} as a universal grading group for the category of \mathbb{G} -representations. This generalizes to linearly reductive *quantum* groups [8, Proposition 2.9], and, as it turns out, goes through in the relative setting; per Theorem 4.5:

Theorem 0.3 *Let $\mathbb{H} \leq \mathbb{G}$ be an embedding of linearly reductive quantum groups, and define the relative chain group $C(\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{H})$ by generators g_V , $V \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}}$ and relations $g_U = g_V g_W$ whenever U and $V \otimes W$ have common simple constituents over \mathbb{H} .*

Then, the map

$$C(\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{H}) \ni g_V \mapsto W \in \widehat{Z(\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{H})} \quad \text{where} \quad \text{Res}_{Z(\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{H})}^{\mathbb{G}} \cong \text{sum of copies of } W$$

is a group isomorphism.

Or, in words: mapping g_V to the ‘‘central character’’ of V restricted to $Z(\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{H})$ gives an isomorphism $C(\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{H}) \cong \widehat{Z(\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{H})}$. The ‘‘plain’’ (non-relative) version [8, Proposition 2.9] (and hence also its classical compact-group counterpart [22, Theorem 3.1]) are recovered by setting $\mathbb{H} = \mathbb{G}$.

Although strictly speaking outside the scope of the present paper, some further remarks, suggestive of an intriguing connection to semisimple-Lie-group representation theory, will perhaps serve to further motivate the relative chain groups discussed in Theorem 0.3.

Definition 4.1 was inspired by the study of plain (non-relative) chain groups of connected, semisimple Lie groups \mathbb{G} with finite center, studied in [10, §4]; specifically, the problem of whether

$$\text{hom}_{\mathbb{H}}(\sigma'', \sigma \otimes \sigma') \neq 0, \quad \sigma, \sigma', \sigma'' \in \widehat{\mathbb{M}} \tag{0-1}$$

for a compact-group embedding $\mathbb{H} \leq \mathbb{M}$ arises naturally while studying the direct-integral decomposition of a tensor product of two *principal-series* representations of such a Lie group \mathbb{G} . To summarize, consider the setup of [20] (to which we also refer, along with its own references, for background on the following).

- a connected, semisimple Lie group \mathbb{G} with finite center, with its *Iwasawa decomposition*

$$\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{K}\mathbb{A}\mathbb{N}$$

($\mathbb{K} \leq \mathbb{G}$ maximal compact, \mathbb{A} abelian and simply-connected, \mathbb{N} nilpotent and simply-connected);

- the corresponding decomposition

$$\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{M}\mathbb{A}\mathbb{N}$$

of a minimal parabolic subgroup, with $\mathbb{M} \leq \mathbb{K}$ commuting with \mathbb{A} ;

- the resulting *principal-series* unitary representations

$$\pi_{\sigma, \nu} := \text{Ind}_{\mathbb{P}}^{\mathbb{G}}(\sigma \otimes \nu \otimes \text{triv}),$$

where $\sigma \in \widehat{\mathbb{M}}$ and $\nu \in \widehat{\mathbb{A}}$ unitary irreducible representations over those groups.

One is then interested in which $\pi_{\sigma'', \nu''}$ are *weakly contained* [3, Definition F.1.1] in tensor products $\pi_{\sigma, \nu} \otimes \pi_{\sigma', \nu'}$ (i.e. feature in a direct-integral decomposition of the latter); we write

$$\pi_{\sigma'', \nu''} \preceq \pi_{\sigma, \nu} \otimes \pi_{\sigma', \nu'}.$$

It turns out that in the cases worked out in the literature there is a closed subgroup $\mathbb{H} \leq \mathbb{M}$ that determines this weak containment via (0-1). Examples:

- When the (connected, etc.) Lie group \mathbb{G} is *complex*, one can simply take $\mathbb{H} = \mathbb{Z}(\mathbb{G})$ (the center of \mathbb{G} , which is always automatically contained in \mathbb{M}). This follows, for instance, from [35, Theorem 3.5.5] in conjunction with [20, Theorems 1 and 2].
- For $\mathbb{G} = \mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{R})$, $n \geq 2$ one can again set $\mathbb{H} = Z(\mathbb{G})$: [27, §4] for $n = 2$ and [20, p.210, Theorem] for the rest.
- Finally, for *real-rank-one* \mathbb{G} the main result of [20], Theorem 16 of that paper, provides such an $\mathbb{H} \leq \mathbb{M}$ (denoted there by \mathbb{M}_0 ; it is in general non-central, and in fact not even normal).

The phenomenon presumably merits some attention in its own right.

Acknowledgements

This work is partially supported by NSF grant DMS-2001128

1 Preliminaries

Everything in sight (algebras, coalgebras, etc.) will be linear over a fixed algebraically closed field k . We assume some background on coalgebras and Hopf algebras, as covered by any number of good sources such as [31, 1, 21, 26].

Notation 1.1 A number of notational conventions will be in place throughout.

- Δ , ε and S denote, respectively, coproducts, counits and antipodes. They will occasionally be decorated with letters indicating which coalgebra, Hopf algebra, etc. they are attached to; S_H , for instance, is the antipode of the Hopf algebra H .
- We use an un-parenthesized version of *Heyneman-Sweedler notation* ([21, Notation 1.4.2] or [26, §2.1]):

$$\Delta(c) = c_1 \otimes c_2, \quad ((\Delta \otimes \mathrm{id}) \circ \Delta)(c) = c_1 \otimes c_2 \otimes c_3$$

and so on for coproducts and

$$c \mapsto c_0 \otimes c_1, \quad c \mapsto c_{-1} \otimes c_0$$

for right and left comodule structures respectively.

- $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G})$, $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{H})$, and so on denote Hopf algebras over a fixed algebraically closed field k ; they are to be thought of as algebras of representative functions on linear algebraic *quantum groups* \mathbb{G} , H , etc.
- An *embedding* $\mathbb{H} \leq \mathbb{G}$ of quantum groups means a Hopf algebra surjection $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G}) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{H})$ and more generally, a morphism $\mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{G}$ is one of Hopf algebras in the opposite direction $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{H})$.
- Categories of (co)modules are denoted by \mathcal{M} , decorated with the symbol depicting the (co)algebra, with the left/right position of the decoration matching the chirality of the (co)module structure. Examples: ${}_A\mathcal{M}$ means left A -modules, \mathcal{M}^C denotes right C -comodules, etc. Comodule structures are right unless specified otherwise.

- These conventions extend to *relative Hopf modules* ([21, §8.5] or [26, §9.2]): if, say, A is a right comodule algebra [21, Definition 4.1.2] over a Hopf algebra H with structure

$$A \ni a \mapsto a_0 \otimes a_1 \in A \otimes H$$

then \mathcal{M}_A^H denotes the category of right A -modules internal to \mathcal{M}^H ; that is, right A -modules M that are also right H -comodules via

$$m \mapsto m_0 \otimes m_1$$

such that

$$(ma)_0 \otimes (ma)_1 = m_0 a_0 \otimes m_1 a_1.$$

There are analogues \mathcal{M}_H^C , say, for right H -module coalgebras C , left- or half-left-handed versions thereof, and so on.

- An additional ‘ f ’ adornment on one of the above-mentioned categories means *finite-dimensional* (co)modules: \mathcal{M}_f^C is the category of finite-dimensional right C -comodules, for instance.
- Reprising a convention common in the operator-algebra literature (e.g. [15, §2.3.2, §18.1.1]), \widehat{C} denotes the isomorphism classes of simple and hence finite-dimensional [21, Theorem 5.1.1] (right, unless specified otherwise) C -comodules and $\widehat{\mathbb{G}} = \overline{\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G})}$.

The purely-algebraic and operator-algebraic notations converge when \mathbb{G} is compact and $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G})$ denotes the Hopf algebra of representative functions on \mathbb{G} : $\widehat{\mathbb{G}}$ as defined above can then be identified with the set of isomorphism classes of irreducible unitary \mathbb{G} -representations.

- In the same spirit, it will also occasionally be convenient to write

$$\text{Rep}(\mathbb{G}) := \mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G})}. \quad \blacklozenge$$

The linear algebraic quantum groups \mathbb{G} in the sequel will frequently be *linearly reductive*, in the sense that the Hopf algebra $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G})$ is *cosemisimple* [21, §2.4]: $\text{Rep}(\mathbb{G})$ is a semisimple category, i.e. every comodule is a direct sum of simple subcomodules. Equivalently ([21, Definition 2.4.1]), $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G})$ is a direct sum of simple subcoalgebras.

Cosemisimple Hopf algebras H are equipped with unique unital *integrals* $\int : H \rightarrow k$ [21, Theorem 2.4.6] and hence have bijective antipodes (by [16, Corollary 5.4.6], say); more is true, though. Still assuming H cosemisimple, for a simple comodule $V \in \widehat{H}$ the canonical coalgebra morphism

$$\text{End}(V)^* \cong V^* \otimes V \rightarrow H$$

(conceptually dual to the analogous map $A \rightarrow \text{End}(V)$ giving V a module structure over an algebra A) is one-to-one and gives the direct-sum decomposition

$$H = \bigoplus_{V \in \widehat{H}} (V^* \otimes V) = \bigoplus_{V \in \widehat{H}} C_V \quad (1-1)$$

into simple subcoalgebras $C_V := V^* \otimes V$ (the *Peter-Weyl* decomposition, in compact-group parlance: [14, Definition 2.2], [17, Theorem 27.40], etc.) that makes H cosemisimple to begin with. With this in place, not only is the antipode $S := S_H$ bijective but in fact its square leaves every C_V , $V \in \widehat{H}$ invariant and acts as an automorphism thereon [16, Theorem 7.3.7].

We refer to $C_V = V^* \otimes V$ as the *coefficient coalgebra* of the simple H -comodule V . This is the coalgebra associated to V in [16, Proposition 2.5.3], and is the smallest subcoalgebra $C \leq H$ for which the comodule structure

$$V \rightarrow V \otimes H$$

factors through $V \otimes C$.

1.1 Restriction, induction and the like

Given a coalgebra morphism $C \rightarrow D$, the *cotensor product* ([21, Definition 8.4.2] or [5, §10]) $- \square_D C$ is right adjoint to the natural “scalar corestriction” functor $\mathcal{M}^C \rightarrow \mathcal{M}^D$:

$$\mathcal{M}^C \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{cores}} \\ \perp \\ \xleftarrow{-\square_D C} \end{array} \mathcal{M}^D \quad (1-2)$$

the central symbol indicating that the top functor is the left adjoint. When $\mathbb{H} \leq \mathbb{G}$ is, say, an inclusion of compact groups and $C \rightarrow D$ the corresponding surjection $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{H})$ of algebras of representative functions, the cotensor functor

$$- \square_{\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{H})} \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G}) : \text{Rep}(\mathbb{H}) \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\mathbb{G})$$

is naturally isomorphic with the usual *induction* $\text{Ind}_H^{\mathbb{G}}$ [28, p.82]. For that reason we repurpose this same notation for the general setting of quantum-group inclusions, writing

$$\text{Ind}_{\mathbb{H}}^{\mathbb{G}} := - \square_{\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{H})} \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G}) : \text{Rep}(\mathbb{H}) \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\mathbb{G})$$

for any quantum-group inclusion $\mathbb{H} \leq \mathbb{G}$; for consistency, we also occasionally also denote the rightward functor in (1-2) by

$$\text{Res}_{\mathbb{H}}^{\mathbb{G}} : \text{Rep}(\mathbb{G}) \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\mathbb{H}).$$

2 Normal subgroups and automatic reductivity

Consider a quantum group embedding $\mathbb{H} \leq \mathbb{G}$, expressed as a surjective Hopf-algebra morphism $\pi : \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{H})$. As is customary in the literature on quantum homogeneous spaces (e.g. [34, proof of Theorem 2.7]), we write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G}/\mathbb{H}) &:= \{x \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G}) \mid (\text{id} \otimes \pi)\Delta(x) = x \otimes 1\} \\ \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{H} \setminus \mathbb{G}) &:= \{x \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G}) \mid (\pi \otimes \text{id})\Delta(x) = 1 \otimes x\}. \end{aligned}$$

According to [2, Definition 1.1.5] a quantum subgroup $\mathbb{H} \leq \mathbb{G}$ would be termed *normal* provided the two quantum homogeneous spaces $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G}/\mathbb{H})$ and $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{H} \setminus \mathbb{G})$ coincide. This will not quite do for our purposes (see Example 2.8), so instead we follow [25, §1.5] (also, say, [34, Definition 2.6], relying on the same source) in the following

Definition 2.1 The quantum subgroup $\mathbb{H} \leq \mathbb{G}$ cast as the surjection $\pi : \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{H})$

- *left-normal* if π is a morphism of left $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G})$ -comodules under the left adjoint coaction

$$\text{ad}_l := \text{ad}_{l,\mathbb{G}} : x \mapsto x_1 S(x_3) \otimes x_2.$$

- *right-normal* if similarly, π is a morphism of right $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G})$ -comodules under the right adjoint coaction

$$\text{ad}_r := \text{ad}_{r,\mathbb{G}} : x \mapsto x_2 \otimes S(x_1)x_3. \quad (2-1)$$

- *normal* if it is both left- and right-normal. ◆

The following result is essentially a tautology in the framework of [11, §1.2], but only because in that paper the definition of a normal quantum subgroup is more restrictive (see [11, Definition 1.2.3], which makes an additional (co)flatness requirement).

Theorem 2.2 *Let $\mathbb{H} \leq \mathbb{G}$ be a left- or right-normal quantum subgroup of a linearly reductive group such that S^2 leaves every simple subcoalgebra of $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{H})$.*

\mathbb{H} is then linearly reductive and normal.

Remark 2.3 The condition that S^2 leave invariant the simple subcoalgebras is certainly necessary for cosemisimplicity [16, Theorem 7.3.7], but I do not know if it is redundant as a hypothesis in the context of Theorem 2.2. \blacklozenge

In particular, the squared-antipode condition of Theorem 2.2 is automatic when $S^2 = \text{id}$ (i.e. when $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G})$, or \mathbb{G} , is *involutory* or *involutive* [26, Definition 7.1.12]). We thus have

Corollary 2.4 *Left- or right-normal quantum subgroups of involutive linearly reductive quantum groups are normal and linearly reductive.* \blacksquare

The proof of Theorem 2.2 requires some preparation. First, a simple remark for future reference.

Lemma 2.5 *Let $\pi : H \rightarrow K$ be a surjective morphism of Hopf algebras with H cosemisimple. K then has bijective antipode, and hence π intertwines antipode inverses.*

Proof That a morphism of bialgebras intertwines antipodes or antipode inverses as soon as these exist is well known, so we focus on the claim that S_K is bijective.

By the very definition of cosemisimplicity H is the direct sum of its simple (hence finite-dimensional [21, Theorem 5.1.1]) subcoalgebras $C_i \leq H$. The assumption is that π is a morphism of Hopf algebras, so the antipode $S := S_H$ restricts to maps

$$S : \ker(\pi|_{C_i}) \rightarrow \ker(\pi|_{S(C_i)}), \quad (2-2)$$

injective because S is bijective. On the other hand though, for cosemisimple Hopf algebras the squared antipode leaves every subcoalgebra invariant [16, Theorem 7.3.7], so

$$S^2 : \ker(\pi|_{C_i}) \rightarrow \ker(\pi|_{S^2(C_i)}) = \ker(\pi|_{C_i}),$$

being a one-to-one endomorphism of a finite-dimensional vector space, must be bijective. Since that map decomposes as (2-2) followed by its (similarly one-to-one) analogue defined on $S(C_i)$, (2-2) itself must be bijective, and hence the inverse antipode S^{-1} leaves $\ker(\pi)$ invariant. This, in essence, was the claim. \blacksquare

The conclusion of Lemma 2.5 is by no means true of arbitrary bijective-antipode Hopf algebras H :

Example 2.6 [29, Theorem 3.2] gives an example of a Hopf algebra H with bijective antipode and a Hopf ideal $I \trianglelefteq H$ that is not invariant under the inverse antipode. In other words, even though H has bijective antipode, the quotient Hopf algebra $H \rightarrow H/I$ does not. \blacklozenge

Proof of Theorem 2.2 The proof proceeds gradually.

Step 1: normality. According to Lemma 2.5 the antipode $S := S_{\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G})}$ and its inverse both leave the kernel \mathcal{K} of the surjection

$$\pi : \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{H})$$

invariant, so $S(\mathcal{K}) = \mathcal{K}$. The fact that left- and right-normality are equivalent now follows from [25, Proposition 1.5.1].

Step 2: The homogeneous spaces \mathbb{G}/\mathbb{H} and $\mathbb{H}\backslash\mathbb{G}$ coincide. This means that

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{H}\backslash\mathbb{G}) = \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G}/\mathbb{H}) =: A, \quad (2-3)$$

and follows from [2, Lemma 1.1.7].

Step 3: Reduction to trivial \mathbb{G}/\mathbb{H} . The subspace $A \leq \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G})$ of (2-3) is in fact a Hopf subalgebra [2, Lemma 1.1.4]. A is also invariant under the right adjoint action

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G}) \otimes \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G}) \ni x \otimes y \mapsto S(y_1)xy_2 \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G})$$

([11, Lemma 1.20]), so by [2, Lemma 1.1.11] the left ideal

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G})A^- \leq \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G}) \text{ where } A^- := \ker(\varepsilon|_A)$$

is bilateral. The quotient $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G})/\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G})A^-$ must then be a *cosemisimple* quotient Hopf algebra [9, Theorem 2.5] $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{K})$, and we have an exact sequence

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G}/\mathbb{K}) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G}) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{K}) & \longrightarrow & k \\ & k \nearrow & \parallel & & & & & & \\ & & \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G}/\mathbb{H}) & & & & & & \end{array}$$

of quantum groups in the sense of [2, §1.2], with everything in sight cosemisimple. Since furthermore A^- is annihilated by the original surjection $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{H})$, \mathbb{H} can be thought of as a quantum subgroup of \mathbb{K} (rather than \mathbb{G}):

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{K}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{H}).$$

I now claim that the corresponding homogeneous space is trivial:

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{K}/\mathbb{H}) = \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{H}\backslash\mathbb{K}) = k. \quad (2-4)$$

To see this, consider a simple representation $V \in \widehat{\mathbb{K}}$ that contains invariant vectors over \mathbb{H} . Because $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{K})$ is cosemisimple, V is a subcomodule (rather than just a subquotient) of a simple comodule $W \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}}$, and it follows that

$$W|_{\mathbb{H}} \geq V|_{\mathbb{H}}$$

contains invariant vectors. The fact that (2-3) is a Hopf subalgebra means that it is precisely

$$\bigoplus_U C_U, \quad U \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}} \text{ and } U|_{\mathbb{H}} \text{ has invariant vectors,}$$

so $C_W \leq A$ and the restriction $W|_{\mathbb{K}}$ decomposes completely as a sum of copies of the trivial comodule k . But then $V \leq W|_{\mathbb{K}}$ itself must be trivial, proving the claim (2-4). Now simply switch the notation back to $\mathbb{G} := \mathbb{K}$ to conclude Step 3:

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G}/\mathbb{H}) = \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{H}\backslash\mathbb{G}) = k. \quad (2-5)$$

This latter condition simply means that for an $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G})$ -comodule V its \mathbb{G} - and \mathbb{H} -invariants coincide:

$$\text{hom}_{\mathbb{G}}(k, V) = \text{hom}_{\mathbb{H}}(k, V).$$

Equivalently, since

$$\mathrm{hom}_{\mathbb{G}}(V, W) = \mathrm{hom}_{\mathbb{G}}(k, W \otimes V^*),$$

this simply means that the restriction functor

$$\mathrm{Rep}(\mathbb{G}) \ni V \mapsto V|_{\mathbb{H}} \in \mathrm{Rep}(\mathbb{H}) \tag{2-6}$$

is full (for both left and right comodules, but here we focus on the latter).

Step 4: Wrapping up. Because the restriction functor (2-6) is full, simple, non-isomorphic \mathbb{G} -representations that remain simple over \mathbb{H} also remain non-isomorphic.

Now, assuming $\mathbb{H} \leq \mathbb{G}$ is not an isomorphism (or there would be nothing to prove), some irreducible $V \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}}$ must become reducible over \mathbb{H} . There are two possibilities to consider:

- (a) All simple subquotients of the reducible representation $V|_{\mathbb{H}}$ are isomorphic. We then have (in $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathbb{H})$) a surjection of V onto a simple quotient thereof, which then embeds into V again. All in all this gives a non-scalar endomorphism of V over \mathbb{H} , contradicting the fullness of the restriction functor (2-6).
- (b) V acquires at least two non-isomorphic simple subquotients V_i , $i = 1, 2$ over \mathbb{H} . Then, the image of the coefficient coalgebra $C_V = V^* \otimes V$ of (1-1) through $\pi : \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{H})$ will contain both

$$C_{V_i} = V_i^* \otimes V_i \leq \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{H}), \quad i = 1, 2$$

as (simple) subcoalgebras.

The requirement that $S^2(C_{V_i}) = C_{V_i}$ means that the simple comodules V_i are isomorphic to their respective double duals V_i^{**} (as $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{H})$ -comodules, not just vector spaces). But then

$$C_{V_i} = V_i^* \otimes V_i \cong V_i^* \otimes V_i^{**}$$

contains an \mathbb{H} -invariant vector, namely the image of the *coevaluation* [19, Definition 9.3.1]

$$\mathrm{coev}_{V_i^*} : k \rightarrow V_i^* \otimes V_i^{**}.$$

It follows that the space of \mathbb{H} -invariants of the $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G})$ -comodule $\pi(C_V)$ is at least 2-dimensional, whereas that of \mathbb{G} -invariants is at most 1-dimensional (because the same holds true of $C_V = V^* \otimes V$). This contradicts the fullness of (2-6) and hence our assumption that $\mathbb{H} \leq \mathbb{G}$ is *not* an isomorphism.

The proof of the theorem is now complete. ■

Remark 2.7 Left and right normality are proven equivalent to an alternative notion ([34, Definition 2.3]) in [34, Theorem 2.7] in the context of *CQG algebras*, i.e. complex cosemisimple Hopf $*$ -algebras with positive unital integral (this characterization is equivalent to [14, Definition 2.2]).

The substance of **Theorem 2.2**, however, is the cosemisimplicity claim; this is of no concern in the CQG-algebra case, as a Hopf $*$ -algebra that is a quotient of a CQG algebra is automatically again CQG (as follows, for instance, from [14, Proposition 2.4]), and hence cosemisimple. ◆

Example 2.8 The weaker requirement that $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G}/\mathbb{H}) = \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{H} \setminus \mathbb{G})$ for normality would render **Theorem 2.2** false.

Let \mathbb{G} be a semisimple complex algebraic group and $\mathbb{B} \leq \mathbb{G}$ a *Borel subgroup* [18, Part II, §1.8]. The restriction functor

$$\text{Res} : \text{Rep}(\mathbb{G}) \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\mathbb{B})$$

is full [18, Part II, Corollary 4.7], so in particular

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G}/\mathbb{B}) = \text{hom}_{\mathbb{B}}(\text{triv}, \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G})) = \text{hom}_{\mathbb{G}}(\text{triv}, \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G})) = \mathbb{C}$$

and similarly for $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{B}\backslash\mathbb{G})$. This means that $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G}/\mathbb{B}) = \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{B}\backslash\mathbb{G})$, but \mathbb{B} is nevertheless not reductive. \blacklozenge

Remark 2.9 The classical (as opposed to quantum) analogue of Theorem 2.2 admits an alternative, more direct proof relying on the structure of reductive groups:

- In characteristic zero linear reductivity is equivalent (by [24, p.88 (2)], for instance) to plain reductivity [4, §11.21], i.e. the condition that the *unipotent radical* $\mathcal{R}_u(\mathbb{G})$ of \mathbb{G} (the largest normal connected unipotent subgroup) be trivial.

Assuming \mathbb{G} is reductive, for any normal $\mathbb{K} \trianglelefteq \mathbb{G}$ the corresponding unipotent radical $\mathcal{R}_u(\mathbb{K})$ is characteristic in N and hence normal in \mathbb{G} , meaning that

$$\mathcal{R}_u(\mathbb{K}) \leq \mathcal{R}_u(\mathbb{G}) = \{1\}$$

and hence N is again reductive (so linearly reductive, in characteristic zero).

- On the other hand, in positive characteristic p [24, p.88 (1)] says that the linearly reductive groups \mathbb{G} are precisely those fitting into an exact sequence

$$\{1\} \rightarrow \mathbb{K} \rightarrow \mathbb{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{G}/\mathbb{K} \rightarrow \{1\}$$

with \mathbb{K} a closed subgroup of a torus and \mathbb{G}/\mathbb{K} finite of order coprime to p . Clearly then, normal subgroups of \mathbb{G} have the same structure. \blacklozenge

3 Clifford theory

We work with an exact sequence (3-1)

$$k \rightarrow A \rightarrow H \rightarrow B \rightarrow k \tag{3-1}$$

of cosemisimple Hopf algebras in the sense of [2, p. 23]. Note that we additionally know that H is left and right coflat over B (simply because the latter is cosemisimple) and left and right faithfully flat over A (by [9, Theorem 2.1]).

We will make frequent use of [32, Theorem 1], to the effect that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & M \mapsto M/MA^- & \\ \mathcal{M}_A^H & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\quad} \\ \xleftarrow{\quad} \end{array} & \mathcal{M}^B \\ & N \otimes A \leftarrow N & \end{array} \tag{3-2}$$

is an equivalence, where the $-$ superscript denotes kernels of counits.

Upon identifying \mathcal{M}^B with \mathcal{M}_A^H via (3-2), the adjunction

$$\mathcal{M}^H \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{corestrict}} \\ \xleftarrow{-\square_B H} \end{array} \mathcal{M}^B \quad (3-3)$$

becomes

$$\mathcal{M}^H \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{-\otimes A} \\ \xleftarrow{\text{forget}} \end{array} \mathcal{M}_A^H. \quad (3-4)$$

We will freely switch points of view between the two perspectives provided by (3-3) and (3-4). Consider the following binary relation \sim_B on \widehat{B} .

Definition 3.1 For $V, W \in \widehat{B}$, $V \sim_B W$ provided there is a simple H -comodule U such that V and W are both constituents of the corestriction of U to B . \blacklozenge

Similarly, we will study the following relation on \widehat{H} :

Definition 3.2 For $V, W \in \widehat{H}$ we set $V \sim_H W$ provided $\text{hom}^B(V, W) \neq 0$. \blacklozenge

Remark 3.3 In other words, \sim_H signifies the fact that the corestrictions of V and W to \mathcal{M}^B have common simple constituents. \blacklozenge

Our first observation is that \sim_H is an equivalence relation, and provides an alternate characterization for it.

Theorem 3.4 \sim_H is an equivalence relation on \widehat{H} , and moreover, for $V, W \in \widehat{H}$ the following conditions are equivalent

- (1) $V \sim_H W$;
- (2) as B -comodules, V and W have the same simple constituents;
- (3) V embeds into $W \otimes A \in \mathcal{M}^H$.

Proof Note first that (2) clearly defines an equivalence relation on \widehat{H} , so the first statement of the theorem will be a consequence of

$$(1) \Leftrightarrow (2) \Leftrightarrow (3).$$

We prove the latter result in stages.

(1) \Leftrightarrow (3). By definition, $V \sim_H W$ if and only if

$$\text{hom}^B(V, W) \neq 0.$$

Via (3-2) and the hom-tensor adjunction (3-4), this hom space can be identified with

$$\text{hom}_A^H(V \otimes A, W \otimes A) \cong \text{hom}^H(V, W \otimes A). \quad (3-5)$$

The simplicity of $V \in \widehat{H}$ now implies that every non-zero element of the right hand side of (3-5) is an embedding, hence finishing the proof of the equivalence of (1) and (3).

(1) \Leftrightarrow (2). Let us denote by $\text{const}(\bullet)$ the set of simple constituents of a B -comodule \bullet .

By definition $V \sim_H W$ means that *some* of the simple constituents of V and W as objects in \mathcal{M}^B coincide, so (2) is clearly stronger than (1). Conversely, note that by the equivalence (1) \Rightarrow (3) proven above, whenever $V \sim_H W$ we have

$$\text{const}(V) \subseteq \text{const}(W \otimes A), \quad (3-6)$$

where the respective objects are regarded as B -comodules via the corestriction functor $\mathcal{M}^H \rightarrow \mathcal{M}^B$.

In turn however, given that $A \in \mathcal{M}^H$ breaks up as a sum of copies of k in \mathcal{M}^B (because of the exactness of (3-1)), the right hand side of (3-6) is simply $\text{const}(W)$. All in all, we have

$$V \sim_H W \Rightarrow \text{const}(V) \subseteq \text{const}(W).$$

This together with the symmetry of \sim_H (obvious by definition from the semisimplicity of \mathcal{M}^B) finishes the proof of (1) \Rightarrow (2) and of the theorem. \blacksquare

Theorem 3.5 \sim_B is an equivalence relation on \widehat{B} with finite classes.

Proof We know from Theorem 3.4 above that as U ranges over \widehat{H} , the sets $\text{const}(U)$ of constituents of $U \in \mathcal{M}^B$ partition \widehat{B} , thus defining an equivalence relation on the latter set.

The definition of \sim_B ensures that $V \sim_B W$ if and only if V and W fall in the same set $\text{const}(U)$, and hence \sim_B coincides with the equivalence relation from the previous paragraph.

Finally, the statement on finiteness of classes is implicit in their description given above: an equivalence class is the set of simple constituents of a simple H -comodule U viewed as a B -comodule, and it must be finite because $\dim(U)$ is. \blacksquare

Theorems 3.4 and 3.5 establish a connection between the equivalence relations \sim_H and \sim_B on \widehat{H} and \widehat{B} respectively. We record it below.

Before getting to the statement, recall the notation $\text{const}(\bullet) \subseteq \widehat{B}$ for the set of simple summands of an object $\bullet \in \mathcal{M}^B$. With that in mind, we have the following immediate consequence of Theorems 3.4 and 3.5.

Proposition 3.6 *The range of the map*

$$\widehat{H} \rightarrow \text{finite subsets of } \widehat{B}$$

sending $V \in \widehat{H}$ to $\text{const}(V)$ consists of the equivalence classes of \sim_B , and its fibers are the classes of \sim_H . \blacksquare

4 Relative chain groups and centers

Definition 4.1 Let $\mathbb{H} \leq \mathbb{G}$ be an inclusion of linearly reductive quantum groups. The (*relative*) *chain group* $C(\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{H})$ is defined by

- generators g_V for simple comodules $V \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}}$;
- relations

$$\text{hom}_{\mathbb{H}}(U, V \otimes W) \neq 0 \Rightarrow g_U = g_V g_W; \quad (4-1)$$

that is, one such relation whenever the restrictions of U and $V \otimes W$ to \mathbb{H} have non-trivial common summands (i.e. U and $V \otimes W$ are not *disjoint* over \mathbb{H}).

We write $C(\mathbb{G}) := C(\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{G})$. ◆

Remark 4.2 For chained inclusions $\mathbb{K} \leq \mathbb{H} \leq \mathbb{G}$ we have a map $C(\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow C(\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{H})$ sending the class of $V \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}}$ in the domain to the class of the selfsame V in the codomain. This is easily seen to be well-defined and a group morphism. ◆

Recall [8, Definition 2.10].

Definition 4.3 Let \mathbb{G} be a linearly reductive quantum group. Its *center* $Z(\mathbb{G}) \leq \mathbb{G}$ is the quantum subgroup dual to the largest Hopf algebra quotient

$$\pi : \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(Z(\mathbb{G}))$$

that is central in the sense of [8, Definition 2.1]:

$$\pi(x_1) \otimes x_2 = \pi(x_2) \otimes x_1 \in \mathcal{O}(Z(\mathbb{G})) \otimes \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G}), \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G}).$$
 ◆

The relative version of this construction, alluded to in the title, is as follows.

Definition 4.4 Let $\mathbb{H} \leq \mathbb{G}$ be an embedding of linearly reductive quantum groups. The corresponding *relative center* $Z(\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{H})$ is the *intersection* $Z(\mathbb{G}) \cap \mathbb{H}$ denoted by $Z(\mathbb{G}) \wedge \mathbb{H}$ in [11, Definition 1.15].

This is a quantum subgroup of both \mathbb{H} and $Z(\mathbb{G})$ (and hence also of \mathbb{G}), and is automatically linearly reductive by [11, Proposition 3.1]. ◆

Each irreducible \mathbb{G} -representation breaks up as a sum of mutually isomorphic (one-dimensional) representations over the center $Z(\mathbb{G})$, and hence gets assigned an element of $\widehat{Z(\mathbb{G})}$: its *central character*. Two such irreducible representations that are not disjoint over \mathbb{H} must have corresponding central characters agreeing on

$$Z(\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{H}) := Z(\mathbb{G}) \cap \mathbb{H}$$

(the *relative center* associated to the inclusion $\mathbb{H} \leq \mathbb{G}$), so we have a canonical morphism

$$\text{CAN} : C(\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{H}) \rightarrow \widehat{Z(\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{H})} \tag{4-2}$$

Theorem 4.5 *For any embedding $\mathbb{H} \leq \mathbb{G}$ of linearly reductive quantum groups (4-2) is an isomorphism.*

Proof Consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & C(\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{H}) & \xrightarrow{\text{CAN}} & \widehat{Z(\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{H})} \\ C(\mathbb{G}) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & & & \\ & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \widehat{Z(\mathbb{G})} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \\ & \xrightarrow{\text{CAN}} & & & \end{array} \tag{4-3}$$

where

- the upper left-hand morphism is an instance of the maps noted in Remark 4.2;
- the bottom right-hand map is the (plain) group surjection dual to the quantum-group inclusion $Z(\mathbb{G}) \cap \mathbb{H} \leq Z(\mathbb{G})$;
- and the fact that the bottom left-hand map is an isomorphism is a paraphrase of [8, Proposition 2.9] in conjunction with [8, Definition 2.10].

The surjectivity of the bottom composition entails that of (4-2), so it remains to show that the latter is one-to-one.

Let $V \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}}$ be a simple comodule where $Z(\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{H})$ operates with trivial character, i.e. one whose class in $C(\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{H})$ is annihilated by (4-2). We can then form the quantum subgroup

$$Z(\mathbb{G})\mathbb{H} := Z(\mathbb{G}) \vee \mathbb{H} \leq \mathbb{G}$$

generated by $Z(\mathbb{G})$ and \mathbb{H} as in [11, Definition 1.15] (the ‘ \vee ’ notation is used there; we suppress the symbol here for brevity), which then satisfies, according to [11, Theorem 3.4], a quantum-flavored isomorphism theorem:

$$\mathbb{H}/Z(\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{H}) \xrightarrow{\cong} Z(\mathbb{G})\mathbb{H}/Z(\mathbb{G})$$

via the canonical map induced from $\mathbb{H} \rightarrow Z(\mathbb{G})\mathbb{H}$. Since V (or rather its restriction $V|_{\mathbb{H}}$) is a representation of the former group because $Z(\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{H})$ operates trivially, it lifts to a $Z(\mathbb{G})\mathbb{H}$ -representation with $Z(\mathbb{G})$ acting trivially. In summary:

The restriction $V|_{\mathbb{H}}$ extends to a $Z(\mathbb{G})\mathbb{H}$ -representation W with trivial $Z(\mathbb{G})$ -action.

But then the induced representation $\text{Ind}_{Z(\mathbb{G})\mathbb{H}}^{\mathbb{G}} W$ again has trivial central character, and hence so do all of its simple summands V_1 . The adjunction (1-2) yields

$$\text{hom}_{Z(\mathbb{G})\mathbb{H}}(V_1|_{Z(\mathbb{G})\mathbb{H}}, W) \cong \text{hom}_{\mathbb{G}}(V_1, \text{Ind}_{Z(\mathbb{G})\mathbb{H}}^{\mathbb{G}} W) \neq \{0\},$$

meaning that V_1 fails to be disjoint from W over $Z(\mathbb{G})\mathbb{H}$ and hence also from

$$V|_{\mathbb{H}} = W|_{\mathbb{H}} \text{ over } \mathbb{H}.$$

To conclude, observe that

- (4-2) agrees on V and V_1 due to the noted non-disjointness

$$\text{hom}_{\mathbb{H}}(V_1, V) \neq 0;$$

- while the bottom left-hand map $\text{CAN} : C(\mathbb{G}) \rightarrow \widehat{Z(\mathbb{G})}$ of (4-3) annihilates V_1 because the latter has trivial central character;
- and hence the top right-hand CAN map in (4-3) must also annihilate V .

This being the desired conclusion, we are done. ■

References

- [1] Eiichi Abe. *Hopf algebras*, volume 74 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge-New York, 1980. Translated from the Japanese by Hisae Kinoshita and Hiroko Tanaka.
- [2] N. Andruskiewitsch and J. Devoto. Extensions of Hopf algebras. *Algebra i Analiz*, 7(1):22–61, 1995.
- [3] Bachir Bekka, Pierre de la Harpe, and Alain Valette. *Kazhdan’s property (T)*, volume 11 of *New Mathematical Monographs*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2008.

- [4] Armand Borel. *Linear algebraic groups*, volume 126 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1991.
- [5] Tomasz Brzezinski and Robert Wisbauer. *Corings and comodules*, volume 309 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.
- [6] Sebastian Burciu. Clifford theory for cocentral extensions. *Israel J. Math.*, 181:111–123, 2011.
- [7] T. Ceccherini-Silberstein, F. Scarabotti, and F. Tolli. Clifford theory and applications. volume 156, pages 29–43. 2009. Functional analysis.
- [8] Alexandru Chirvasitu. Centers, cocenters and simple quantum groups. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 218(8):1418–1430, 2014.
- [9] Alexandru Chirvasitu. Cosemisimple Hopf algebras are faithfully flat over Hopf subalgebras. *Algebra Number Theory*, 8(5):1179–1199, 2014.
- [10] Alexandru Chirvasitu. Chain-center duality for locally compact groups, 2021. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2109.08116v2>.
- [11] Alexandru Chirvasitu, Souleiman Omar Hoche, and PawełKasprzak. Fundamental isomorphism theorems for quantum groups. *Expo. Math.*, 35(4):390–442, 2017.
- [12] A. H. Clifford. Representations induced in an invariant subgroup. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 38(3):533–550, 1937.
- [13] Kenny De Commer, PawełKasprzak, Adam Skalski, and Piotr M. Sołtan. Quantum actions on discrete quantum spaces and a generalization of Clifford’s theory of representations. *Israel J. Math.*, 226(1):475–503, 2018.
- [14] Mathijs S. Dijkhuizen and Tom H. Koornwinder. CQG algebras: a direct algebraic approach to compact quantum groups. *Lett. Math. Phys.*, 32(4):315–330, 1994.
- [15] Jacques Dixmier. *C*-algebras*. North-Holland Mathematical Library, Vol. 15. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-New York-Oxford, 1977. Translated from the French by Francis Jellet.
- [16] Sorin Dăscălescu, Constantin Năstăsescu, and Șerban Raianu. *Hopf algebras*, volume 235 of *Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics*. Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York, 2001. An introduction.
- [17] Edwin Hewitt and Kenneth A. Ross. *Abstract harmonic analysis. Vol. II: Structure and analysis for compact groups. Analysis on locally compact Abelian groups*. Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 152. Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1970.
- [18] Jens Carsten Jantzen. *Representations of algebraic groups*, volume 107 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, second edition, 2003.
- [19] Shahn Majid. *Foundations of quantum group theory*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
- [20] Robert Paul Martin. On the decomposition of tensor products of principal series representations for real-rank one semisimple groups. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 201:177–211, 1975.

- [21] S. 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, 1993.
- [22] Michael Müger. On the center of a compact group. *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, (51):2751–2756, 2004.
- [23] D. Mumford, J. Fogarty, and F. Kirwan. *Geometric invariant theory*, volume 34 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (2) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (2)]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, third edition, 1994.
- [24] Masayoshi Nagata. Complete reducibility of rational representations of a matrix group. *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.*, 1:87–99, 1961/62.
- [25] Brian Parshall and Jian Pan Wang. Quantum linear groups. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 89(439):vi+157, 1991.
- [26] David E. Radford. *Hopf algebras*, volume 49 of *Series on Knots and Everything*. World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., Hackensack, NJ, 2012.
- [27] Joe Repka. Tensor products of unitary representations of $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 82(6):930–932, 1976.
- [28] Alain Robert. *Introduction to the representation theory of compact and locally compact groups*, volume 80 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge-New York, 1983.
- [29] Peter Schauenburg. Faithful flatness over Hopf subalgebras: counterexamples. In *Interactions between ring theory and representations of algebras (Murcia)*, volume 210 of *Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math.*, pages 331–344. Dekker, New York, 2000.
- [30] Hans-Jürgen Schneider. Representation theory of Hopf Galois extensions. volume 72, pages 196–231. 1990. Hopf algebras.
- [31] Moss E. Sweedler. *Hopf algebras*. Mathematics Lecture Note Series. W. A. Benjamin, Inc., New York, 1969.
- [32] Mitsuhiro Takeuchi. Relative Hopf modules—equivalences and freeness criteria. *J. Algebra*, 60(2):452–471, 1979.
- [33] Fred Van Oystaeyen and Yinhua Zhang. Induction functors and stable Clifford theory for Hopf modules. volume 107, pages 337–351. 1996. Contact Franco-Belge en Algèbre (Diepenbeek, 1993).
- [34] Shuzhou Wang. Equivalent notions of normal quantum subgroups, compact quantum groups with properties F and FD , and other applications. *J. Algebra*, 397:515–534, 2014.
- [35] Floyd L. Williams. *Tensor products of principal series representations*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 358. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1973. Reduction of tensor products of principal series. Representations of complex semisimple Lie groups.
- [36] S. J. Witherspoon. Clifford correspondence for finite-dimensional Hopf algebras. *J. Algebra*, 218(2):608–620, 1999.

- [37] Sarah J. Witherspoon. Clifford correspondence for algebras. *J. Algebra*, 256(2):518–530, 2002.
- [38] S. L. Woronowicz. Compact quantum groups. In *Symétries quantiques (Les Houches, 1995)*, pages 845–884. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1998.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY AT BUFFALO, BUFFALO, NY 14260-2900, USA
E-mail address: `achirvas@buffalo.edu`