

COCOMMUTATIVE HOPF-LIKE ACTIONS ON ALGEBRAS

F. CALDERÓN, H. HUANG, E. WICKS, AND R. WON

ABSTRACT. We call an algebraic structure H “Hopf-like” if its category of (co)representations is monoidal. Here, we study algebras A in such monoidal categories when H is cocommutative, including when H is a cocommutative Hopf algebra, is a groupoid (algebra), and is, more generally, a cocommutative weak Hopf algebra. We establish that A is an H -module algebra precisely when there exists a structure preserving map from H to a certain collection of linear endomorphisms of A that has the same structure as H . This yields an equivalence between categorical and representation-theoretic notions of an algebra A admitting an action of H . Many examples are included throughout.

1. INTRODUCTION

The goal of this article is to study symmetries of algebras A captured by actions of algebraic structures H which resemble cocommutative Hopf algebras. We will establish a correspondence between categorical and representation-theoretic frameworks for such H -actions on A . Here, we say that H acts on A *categorically* if A is an algebra in the monoidal category of H -modules, and we say that H acts on A *representation-theoretically* if there is a structure preserving map from H to a certain structure of linear endomorphisms of A . See Definitions 1.2 and 1.3 below. Similar to the correspondence between modules and representations over algebras, each action framework has its own advantage: the algebra A is easier to manipulate in the module-theoretic setting (e.g., towards *simplicity* [Fis75, Coh87]), whereas it is more feasible to alter H in the representation-theoretic setting (e.g., towards *inner faithfulness* [BB10, CWZ14]). At any rate, the correspondence between the two action frameworks above is well-known in the classical case when H is a group or a Lie algebra. We extend this work for action correspondences of other cocommutative Hopf-like structures H : cocommutative Hopf algebras, groupoids, and cocommutative weak Hopf algebras. In particular, our work on groupoid actions on algebras unifies previous works on partial actions on algebras (e.g., [BP12, PF14, PT14]) with categorical methods. We also expect that these results can be generalized to the noncocommutative case, and leave this to the reader to consider. To proceed, consider the following hypotheses and terminology.

Hypothesis 1.1. We work over an algebraically closed field \mathbb{k} of characteristic 0, and an unadorned \otimes means $\otimes_{\mathbb{k}}$. Unless stated otherwise, all algebras A are assumed to be associative and unital. By abuse of notation, we use A to denote both the algebra, as well as its underlying vector space.

Definition 1.2. (a) A *monoidal category* is a category \mathcal{C} equipped with a bifunctor $\otimes_{\mathcal{C}}$, an object $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}}$, and natural isomorphisms for associativity and unitality such that the pentagon and triangle axioms hold.

(b) An *algebra* in a monoidal category $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes_{\mathcal{C}}, \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}})$ is an object $A \in \mathcal{C}$ equipped with morphisms $m: A \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} A \rightarrow A$ (multiplication) and $u: \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow A$ (unit) in \mathcal{C} satisfying associativity and unitality axioms.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 18B40, 16T05, 18M05.

Key words and phrases. cocommutative, groupoid, Hopf algebra, module algebra, weak Hopf algebra.

- (c) We call an algebraic structure H *Hopf-like* if its category of (co)modules is monoidal.
- (d) For H a Hopf-like structure, let $\Delta_H : H \rightarrow H \otimes H$ be the map which makes $M \otimes_{H\text{-mod}} N$ an H -module, for $M, N \in H\text{-mod}$. (Namely, $h \cdot (m \otimes_{H\text{-mod}} n) := (h_1 \cdot m) \otimes_{H\text{-mod}} (h_2 \cdot n)$ for all $m \in M, n \in N$, where $\Delta_H(h) := h_1 \otimes h_2$ with $h \in H$.) We say that H is *cocommutative* if the map Δ_H is cocommutative.
- (e) An algebra A in a monoidal category $H\text{-mod}$, for a Hopf-like structure H , is referred to as an H -*module algebra*; we say that H *acts on A categorically*.

We examine H -module algebras, and leave the study of H -comodule algebras to the reader. Next, we introduce a representation-theoretic version of an H -action on an algebra.

Definition 1.3. A Hopf-like structure H acts on A *representation-theoretically* if there exists a collection of linear endomorphisms of A , denoted by $\text{end}(A)$, such that $\text{end}(A)$ admits the same structure as H , and there exists a structure preserving map $H \rightarrow \text{end}(A)$.

The connection between categorical and representation-theoretic actions of groups G and of Lie algebras \mathfrak{g} on algebras A is well-known. Namely, A is a G -module algebra precisely when there is a group map from G to the group of algebra automorphisms $\text{Aut}_{\text{Alg}}(A)$ of A [Proposition 2.4]. Moreover, A is a \mathfrak{g} -module algebra if and only if there exists a Lie algebra map from \mathfrak{g} to the Lie algebra of derivations $\text{Der}(A)$ of A [Proposition 2.14].

The classic results above can be linearized for actions of group algebras and of enveloping algebras via adjunctions between the group algebra functor, group of units functor, and the group of grouplike elements functor (see Proposition 2.8), and also via adjunctions between the enveloping algebra functor, the underlying Lie algebra functor, and the Lie algebra of primitive elements functor (see Proposition 2.18). As a consequence, group algebras and enveloping algebras act on algebras categorically if and only if they do so representation-theoretically.

Proposition 1.4 (Propositions 2.10, 2.20). *For a group G , a Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} , and an algebra A , the following statements hold.*

- (a) A is a $\mathbb{k}G$ -module algebra if and only if there exists a Hopf algebra homomorphism $\mathbb{k}G \rightarrow \mathbb{k}(\text{Aut}_{\text{Alg}}(A))$.
- (b) A is a $U(\mathfrak{g})$ -module algebra if and only if there exists a Hopf algebra homomorphism $U(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow U(\text{Der}(A))$. \square

Then, we extend the results above for actions of cocommutative Hopf algebras on algebras, which, to the best of our knowledge, is new here. The Cartier–Gabriel–Kostant–Milnor–Moore theorem states that a cocommutative Hopf algebra H is isomorphic to the smash product $U(\mathfrak{g})\#\mathbb{k}G$, for the group $G = \Gamma(H)$ acting on the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g} = P(H)$ by conjugation (see, e.g., [EGNO15, Theorem 5.10.2], [Mon93, Section 5.6]).

Theorem 1.5 (Theorem 2.22). *Take a cocommutative Hopf algebra $H := U(\mathfrak{g})\#\mathbb{k}G$. Then, for an algebra A , we have that A is an H -module algebra if and only if there exists a Hopf algebra homomorphism*

$$H \longrightarrow U(\text{Der}(A))\#\mathbb{k}(\text{Aut}_{\text{Alg}}(A)). \quad \square$$

Next, we study actions of groupoids and of related structures. Recall that a *groupoid* is a small category in which all morphisms are isomorphisms. Consider the terminology below.

Definition 1.6 (Definitions 3.19, 3.23). Let X be a nonempty finite set.

- (a) We say that a nonzero algebra A is an X -*decomposable algebra* if A has an algebra decomposition $A = \bigoplus_{x \in X} A_x$, where each A_x is a unital algebra.

- (b) For an X -decomposable algebra $A = \bigoplus_{x \in X} A_x$, define the groupoid, $\text{Aut}_{X\text{-Alg}}(A)$, to have object set $\{A_x\}_{x \in X}$, and for all $x, y \in X$, take $\text{Hom}_{\text{Aut}_{X\text{-Alg}}(A)}(A_x, A_y)$ to be the set of invertible, unital algebra homomorphisms from A_x to A_y .

We establish a connection between categorical and representation-theoretic actions of groupoids; compare this to the result for groups mentioned above (i.e., Proposition 2.4).

Proposition 1.7 (Proposition 3.25). *For an algebra A and a groupoid \mathcal{G} with object set X , we have that A is a \mathcal{G} -module algebra if and only if A is an X -decomposable algebra and there exists an X -preserving groupoid homomorphism,*

$$\pi : \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \text{Aut}_{X\text{-Alg}}(A),$$

i.e., π is a functor such that $\pi(x) = A_x$ for all $x \in X$. \square

The result above can be linearized for actions of groupoid algebras via the result below.

Theorem 1.8 (Theorem 4.32). *For a nonempty finite set X , take the categories:*

- $X\text{-Alg}$, of X -decomposable algebras,
- $X\text{-Grpd}$, of groupoids with object set X , and
- $X\text{-WeakHopf}$, of weak Hopf algebras with a complete set X of grouplike idempotents,

from Definition 4.27. Then, we construct the functors and adjunctions below.

- (a) *The following functor forms an X -decomposable groupoid algebra and is well-defined,*

$$\mathbb{k}(-) : X\text{-Grpd} \longrightarrow X\text{-Alg}.$$

It is also the left adjoint to the functor,

$$(-)_X^\times : X\text{-Alg} \longrightarrow X\text{-Grpd},$$

that forms a groupoid of local units with object set X [Definition 4.7].

- (b) *The following functor forms a weak Hopf, groupoid algebra and is well-defined,*

$$\mathbb{k}(-) : X\text{-Grpd} \longrightarrow X\text{-WeakHopf}.$$

It is also the left adjoint to the functor,

$$\Gamma(-) : X\text{-WeakHopf} \longrightarrow X\text{-Grpd},$$

forming a groupoid of grouplike elements with object set X [Definition 4.18]. \square

Now we get results about actions of groupoid algebras, cf. Proposition 1.4(a).

Corollary 1.9 (Corollary 4.33). *Let \mathcal{G} be a groupoid with object set X and let A be an algebra. Then A is a $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ -module algebra if and only if A is X -decomposable and there is an X -weak Hopf algebra homomorphism $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{k}(\text{Aut}_{X\text{-Alg}}(A))$. \square*

Finally, we extend the results above for actions of certain Lie algebroids and of cocommutative weak Hopf algebras on algebras. Note that Nikshych established a version of the Cartier–Gabriel–Kostant–Milnor–Moore theorem for cocommutative weak Hopf algebras H . It states that H is isomorphic to $(\bigoplus_{x \in X} U(\mathfrak{g}_x)) \# \mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$, for the groupoid $\mathcal{G} = \Gamma(H)$ acting on a direct sum of universal enveloping algebras of Lie algebras $\{\mathfrak{g}_x\}_{x \in X}$ by conjugation [Nik01, Theorem 3.2.4]. Here, $\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{x \in X} \mathfrak{g}_x$ is the space of primitive elements of H . So, it suffices to restrict our attention to X -Lie algebroids, which are direct sums $\mathfrak{G} = \bigoplus_{x \in X} \mathfrak{g}_x$ of Lie algebras \mathfrak{g}_x with a partially defined bracket [Definition 5.1]. The X -universal enveloping algebra of \mathfrak{G} is defined to be $U_X(\mathfrak{G}) = \bigoplus_{x \in X} U(\mathfrak{g}_x)$ [Definition 5.11]. For these special Lie algebroids, we obtain a generalization of Proposition 1.4(b) as follows.

Proposition 1.10 (Proposition 5.15). *For an X -Lie algebroid \mathfrak{G} , we obtain that an algebra A is a $U_X(\mathfrak{G})$ -module algebra if and only if A is a \mathfrak{G} -module algebra. In this case, there exists an X -Lie algebroid homomorphism $\mathfrak{G} \rightarrow \text{Der}_X(A)$, and there exists an X -weak Hopf algebra homomorphism $U_X(\mathfrak{G}) \rightarrow U_X(\text{Der}_X(A))$. Here, $\text{Der}_X(A)$ is given in Notation 5.8. \square*

This brings us to the final result of our paper.

Theorem 1.11 (Theorem 6.14). *Let X be a nonempty finite set. Let $H := U_X(\mathfrak{G})\#\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ be a cocommutative weak Hopf algebra, where $X = \mathcal{G}_0$ and \mathfrak{G} is an X -Lie algebroid. Then, for an algebra A , we obtain that A is an H -module algebra if and only if A is X -decomposable and there exists an X -weak Hopf algebra homomorphism,*

$$H \longrightarrow U_X(\text{Der}_X(A))\#\mathbb{k}(\text{Aut}_{X\text{-Alg}}(A)). \quad \square$$

In summary, the constructions and results below are the main achievements of this article.

<u>Hopf-like structure H</u>	<u>end(A) for algebra A</u>
group	$\text{Aut}_{\text{Alg}}(A)$
group algebra	$\mathbb{k}(\text{Aut}_{\text{Alg}}(A))$
Lie algebra	$\text{Der}(A)$
enveloping algebra	$U(\text{Der}(A))$
cocommutative Hopf algebra	$U(\text{Der}(A))\#\mathbb{k}(\text{Aut}_{\text{Alg}}(A))$
<u>Hopf-like structure H with base X</u>	<u>end(A) for X-decomp. alg. A</u>
groupoid with object set X	$\text{Aut}_{X\text{-Alg}}(A)$
X -groupoid algebra	$\mathbb{k}(\text{Aut}_{X\text{-Alg}}(A))$
X -Lie algebroid	$\text{Der}_X(A)$
enveloping algebra of X -Lie algebroid	$U_X(\text{Der}_X(A))$
cocommutative X -weak Hopf algebra	$U_X(\text{Der}_X(A))\#\mathbb{k}(\text{Aut}_{X\text{-Alg}}(A))$

TABLE 1. The structures end(A) [Def. 1.3] that provide equivalences between categorical and representation-theoretic actions of cocommutative Hopf-like structures H on an algebra A .

The results on actions on algebras by groups and group algebras, by Lie algebras and enveloping algebras, and by cocommutative Hopf algebras (i.e., Proposition 1.4, Theorem 1.5) will be presented in Section 2. The result on actions of groupoids (Proposition 1.7) is established in Section 3, and the results on actions of groupoid algebras (i.e., Theorem 1.8, Corollary 1.9) are established in Section 4. The result on Lie algebroids, Proposition 1.10, is presented in Section 5. The last result on actions of cocommutative weak Hopf algebras (Theorem 1.11) is proved in Section 6. The article ends by illustrating the results above for actions on polynomial algebras in Section 7.

2. CLASSICAL ACTIONS ON ALGEBRAS

In this section, we recall known results on classical symmetries of algebras, i.e., actions of groups (by automorphisms) and of Lie algebras (by derivations), along with extensions to actions of group algebras and enveloping algebras of Lie algebras; see Sections 2.1 and 2.2, respectively. Moreover, we extend these results to analyze actions of cocommutative Hopf algebras in Section 2.3. This is all in view of connecting the categorical and the representation-theoretic notions of such actions in Definitions 1.2(e) and 1.3 in the Introduction.

2.1. Actions of groups. Consider the following notation.

Notation 2.1 ($\mathrm{GL}(V)$, $\mathrm{Aut}_{\mathrm{Alg}}(A)$). Let V be a vector space, and let A be an algebra.

- (a) The group of automorphisms of V under composition is denoted $\mathrm{GL}(V)$.
- (b) Let $\mathrm{Aut}_{\mathrm{Alg}}(A)$ be the subgroup of $\mathrm{GL}(A)$ consisting of algebra automorphisms of A .

Lemma 2.2 ($G\text{-mod}$). For a group G , let $G\text{-mod}$ be the category of left G -modules, i.e., of vector spaces V equipped with an action map $G \times V \rightarrow V$, $(g, v) \mapsto g \cdot v$. This category is monoidal, where for G -modules V, W we have $V \otimes W \in G\text{-mod}$ with $g \cdot (v \otimes w) = (g \cdot v) \otimes (g \cdot w)$, and $\mathbb{1} := \mathbb{k} \in G\text{-mod}$ with $g \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{k}} = \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{k}}$. \square

We recall the connection between G -modules and representations over G below.

Lemma 2.3 ($\mathrm{rep}(G)$). Let $\mathrm{rep}(G)$ be the category of representations of G , i.e., objects are vector spaces V equipped with a group homomorphism $\pi : G \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}(V)$. Then, $\mathrm{rep}(G)$ and $G\text{-mod}$ are isomorphic, given by $V \mapsto V$ and $g \cdot v = \pi(g)(v)$, for all $g \in G$ and $v \in V$. \square

The following result is well-known (see, e.g., [CM84, Proposition 1.2]), but we include a brief proof for completeness.

Proposition 2.4. Let A be an algebra and G a group. Then the following are equivalent.

- (a) A is a G -module algebra.
- (b) A is a G -module, via structure map $\cdot : G \otimes A \rightarrow A$, such that

$$(2.5) \quad g \cdot (ab) = (g \cdot a)(g \cdot b),$$

$$(2.6) \quad g \cdot \mathbb{1}_A = \mathbb{1}_A,$$

for all $g \in G$ and $a, b \in A$.

- (c) There exists a group homomorphism $\pi : G \rightarrow \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathrm{Alg}}(A)$.

Proof. Note that (a) and (b) are equivalent because, in both parts, A is a G -module, and (2.5)–(2.6) are a reformulation of the multiplication map m_A and the unit map u_A of A being G -module maps, respectively. Notice that, in fact, (2.5) implies (2.6) since

$$g \cdot \mathbb{1}_A = (g \cdot \mathbb{1}_A)(g \cdot (g^{-1} \cdot \mathbb{1}_A)) = g \cdot (\mathbb{1}_A(g^{-1} \cdot \mathbb{1}_A)) = g \cdot (g^{-1} \cdot \mathbb{1}_A) = \mathbb{1}_A.$$

On the other hand, A being a G -module is the same as there existing a group homomorphism π from G to $\mathrm{GL}(A)$ [Lemma 2.3]. Moreover, m_A, u_A being G -module maps is the same as $\pi(g)$ being multiplicative and unital for each $g \in G$, respectively. Hence, condition (b) is the same as requiring the image of π is contained in the subgroup $\mathrm{Aut}_{\mathrm{Alg}}(A)$ of $\mathrm{GL}(A)$. So, (b) and (c) are equivalent as desired. \square

So, groups act on algebras categorically if and only if they do so representation-theoretically. Next, we linearize the result above for actions of a group algebra $\mathbb{k}G$.

Remark 2.7. We obtain that $\mathbb{k}G\text{-mod}$ is a monoidal category by linearizing the G -action given in Lemma 2.2. Also, $\mathbb{k}G\text{-mod}$ is monoidally equivalent to $G\text{-mod}$.

We proceed by recalling the following adjunctions pertaining to group algebras.

Proposition 2.8 ($\mathbb{k}(-)$, $(-)^{\times}$, $\Gamma(-)$). (see [Lor18, (3.2),(9.33)], [Fre17, Proposition 7.1.16])

- (a) Consider the group algebra functor $\mathbb{k}(-) : \mathbf{Group} \rightarrow \mathbf{Alg}$, and the group of units functor $(-)^{\times} : \mathbf{Alg} \rightarrow \mathbf{Group}$. Then, $\mathbb{k}(-) \dashv (-)^{\times}$, that is, for a group G and an algebra B , we have a bijection that is natural in each slot:

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{Group}}(G, B^{\times}) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{Alg}}(\mathbb{k}G, B).$$

- (b) Consider the group algebra functor $\mathbb{k}(-) : \mathbf{Group} \rightarrow \mathbf{Hopf}$, and the group of grouplike elements functor $\Gamma(-) : \mathbf{Hopf} \rightarrow \mathbf{Group}$. Then, $\mathbb{k}(-) \dashv \Gamma(-)$, that is, for a group G and a Hopf algebra H , we have a bijection that is natural in each slot:

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{Group}}(G, \Gamma(H)) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{Hopf}}(\mathbb{k}G, H).$$

In particular, $\Gamma(\mathbb{k}G) = G$. \square

Finally, we see that $\mathbb{k}G$ acts on an algebra A categorically if and only if $\mathbb{k}G$ acts on A representation-theoretically by way of the result below. This follows from Remark 2.7, Proposition 2.4, and the bijection from Proposition 2.8(b):

$$(2.9) \quad \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{Group}}(G, \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathbf{Alg}}(A)) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{Hopf}}(\mathbb{k}G, \mathbb{k}(\mathrm{Aut}_{\mathbf{Alg}}(A))), \quad \pi \mapsto \tilde{\pi}.$$

Proposition 2.10. *For a group G and an algebra A , the following are equivalent.*

- (a) A is a $\mathbb{k}G$ -module algebra.
- (b) A is a G -module algebra.
- (c) There exists a group homomorphism $\pi : G \rightarrow \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathbf{Alg}}(A) = \Gamma(\mathbb{k}(\mathrm{Aut}_{\mathbf{Alg}}(A)))$.
- (d) There exists a Hopf algebra homomorphism $\tilde{\pi} : \mathbb{k}G \rightarrow \mathbb{k}(\mathrm{Aut}_{\mathbf{Alg}}(A))$.

Here, $\pi(g)(a) = g \cdot a$, for all $g \in G$ and $a \in A$, where \cdot is the G -action on A . \square

2.2. Actions of Lie algebras. Consider the notation below.

Notation 2.11 ($\mathfrak{gl}(V)$, $\mathrm{Der}(A)$). Let V be a vector space, and let A be an algebra.

- (a) Let $\mathfrak{gl}(V)$ be the Lie algebra of endomorphisms of V with commutator bracket.
- (b) Let $\mathrm{Der}(A)$ be the Lie subalgebra of $\mathfrak{gl}(A)$ consisting of derivations of A .

The following result is well-known.

Lemma 2.12 ($\mathfrak{g}\text{-mod}$). *For a Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} over \mathbb{k} , let $\mathfrak{g}\text{-mod}$ be the category of left \mathfrak{g} -modules, i.e., of vector spaces V with an action map $\mathfrak{g} \times V \rightarrow V, (p, v) \mapsto p \cdot v$. This category is monoidal, where for \mathfrak{g} -modules V, W , we have $V \otimes W \in \mathfrak{g}\text{-mod}$ with $p \cdot (v \otimes w) = v \otimes (p \cdot w) + (p \cdot v) \otimes w$, and $\mathbb{1} := \mathbb{k} \in \mathfrak{g}\text{-mod}$ with $p \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{k}} = 0_{\mathbb{k}}$. \square*

We recall the connection between \mathfrak{g} -modules and representations over \mathfrak{g} below.

Lemma 2.13 ($\mathrm{rep}(\mathfrak{g})$). *Let $\mathrm{rep}(\mathfrak{g})$ be the category of representations of \mathfrak{g} , i.e., objects are vector spaces V equipped with a Lie algebra homomorphism $\tau : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{gl}(V)$. Then, $\mathrm{rep}(\mathfrak{g})$ and $\mathfrak{g}\text{-mod}$ are isomorphic, given by $V \mapsto V$ and $p \cdot v = \tau(p)(v)$, for all $p \in \mathfrak{g}$ and $v \in V$. \square*

The following result is well-known, but we include a brief proof for completeness.

Proposition 2.14. *For an algebra A and a Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} , the following are equivalent.*

- (a) A is a \mathfrak{g} -module algebra.
- (b) A is a \mathfrak{g} -module, via structure map $\cdot : \mathfrak{g} \otimes A \rightarrow A$, such that

$$(2.15) \quad p \cdot (ab) = a(p \cdot b) + (p \cdot a)b,$$

$$(2.16) \quad p \cdot \mathbb{1}_A = 0,$$

for all $p \in \mathfrak{g}$ and $a, b \in A$.

- (c) There exists a Lie algebra homomorphism $\tau : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathrm{Der}(A)$.

Proof. Note that (a) and (b) are equivalent because, in both parts, A is a \mathfrak{g} -module, and because equations (2.15)–(2.16) are a reformulation of the multiplication map m_A and the unit map u_A of A being \mathfrak{g} -module maps, respectively. In fact, (2.15) implies (2.16) since

$$p \cdot 1_A = 1_A(p \cdot 1_A) + (p \cdot 1_A)1_A = 2(p \cdot 1_A).$$

On the other hand, A being a \mathfrak{g} -module is the same as there existing a Lie algebra homomorphism τ from \mathfrak{g} to $\mathfrak{gl}(A)$ [Lemma 2.13]. Moreover, m_A being an \mathfrak{g} -module map is the same as $\tau(p)$ belonging to $\text{Der}(A)$, for each $p \in \mathfrak{g}$. We get also that u_A is a morphism in $\mathfrak{g}\text{-mod}$ as $p \cdot 1_A = 0_A$ corresponds to $\tau(p)(1_A) = 0_A$, which holds because $\tau(p) \in \text{Der}(A)$. Hence, condition (b) can be reformulated as requiring the image of the Lie algebra homomorphism τ to be contained in the Lie subalgebra $\text{Der}(A)$ of $\mathfrak{gl}(A)$. So, (b) and (c) are equivalent. \square

Next, we turn our attention to actions by enveloping algebras.

Remark 2.17. We obtain that $U(\mathfrak{g})\text{-mod}$ is a monoidal category by extending the \mathfrak{g} -action given in Lemma 2.12. Also, $U(\mathfrak{g})\text{-mod}$ is monoidally equivalent to $\mathfrak{g}\text{-mod}$.

To proceed, let us recall the following adjunctions related to enveloping algebras.

Proposition 2.18 ($U(-)$, $L(-)$, $P(-)$). (see [Lor18, (5.15), (9.34)], [Fre17, Proposition 7.2.13 and Theorem 7.2.18])

- (a) Consider the enveloping algebra functor $U(-) : \text{Lie} \rightarrow \text{Alg}$, and the underlying Lie algebra (with commutator bracket) functor $L(-) : \text{Alg} \rightarrow \text{Lie}$. Then, $U(-) \dashv L(-)$, that is, for a Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} and an algebra B , we have a bijection that is natural in each slot:

$$\text{Hom}_{\text{Lie}}(\mathfrak{g}, L(B)) \cong \text{Hom}_{\text{Alg}}(U(\mathfrak{g}), B).$$

- (b) Consider the enveloping algebra functor $U(-) : \text{Lie} \rightarrow \text{Hopf}$, and the Lie algebra of primitive elements functor $P(-) : \text{Hopf} \rightarrow \text{Lie}$. Then, $U(-) \dashv P(-)$, that is, for a Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} and a Hopf algebra H , we have a bijection that is natural in each slot:

$$\text{Hom}_{\text{Lie}}(\mathfrak{g}, P(H)) \cong \text{Hom}_{\text{Hopf}}(U(\mathfrak{g}), H).$$

In particular, $P(U(\mathfrak{g})) = \mathfrak{g}$. \square

We will see next that $U(\mathfrak{g})$ acts on an algebra A categorically if and only if $U(\mathfrak{g})$ acts on A representation-theoretically. The result below can be deduced from Remark 2.17, Proposition 2.14, and the bijection from Proposition 2.18(b):

$$(2.19) \quad \text{Hom}_{\text{Lie}}(\mathfrak{g}, \text{Der}(A)) \cong \text{Hom}_{\text{Hopf}}(U(\mathfrak{g}), U(\text{Der}(A))), \quad \tau \mapsto \tilde{\tau},$$

Proposition 2.20. For a Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} and an algebra A , the following are equivalent.

- (a) A is a $U(\mathfrak{g})$ -module algebra.
- (b) A is a \mathfrak{g} -module algebra.
- (c) There exists a Lie algebra homomorphism $\tau : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \text{Der}(A) = P(U(\text{Der}(A)))$.
- (d) There exists a Hopf algebra homomorphism $\tilde{\tau} : U(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow U(\text{Der}(A))$.

Here, $\tau(p)(a) = p \cdot a$, for all $p \in \mathfrak{g}$ and $a \in A$, where \cdot is the \mathfrak{g} -action on A . \square

2.3. Actions of cocommutative Hopf algebras. In this part, let H be a cocommutative Hopf algebra, and so by the Cartier–Gabriel–Kostant–Milnor–Moore theorem, we have:

$$H \cong U(\mathfrak{g})\#\mathbb{k}G, \quad \text{for } \mathfrak{g} = P(H), \quad G = \Gamma(H).$$

Here, G acts on \mathfrak{g} by conjugation. Recall that the smash product algebra $U(\mathfrak{g})\#\mathbb{k}G$ acquires the structure of a Hopf algebra by considering the tensor product coalgebra structure and antipode $S(p\#g) = (1_{U(\mathfrak{g})}\#g^{-1})(S_{U(\mathfrak{g})}(p)\#1_{\mathbb{k}G})$ for $p \in \mathfrak{g}$ and $g \in G$; see [Mon93, Section 5.6] or Remark 6.9 below.

Likewise, for any algebra A , if $g \in \text{Aut}_{\text{Alg}}(A)$ and $p \in \text{Der}(A)$, then $gpg^{-1} \in \text{Der}(A)$. So, the group $\text{Aut}_{\text{Alg}}(A)$ acts on the Lie algebra $\text{Der}(A)$ by conjugation, and we can form the Hopf algebra: $U(\text{Der}(A))\#\mathbb{k}(\text{Aut}_{\text{Alg}}(A))$. Again, the coalgebra structure is that of tensor product of coalgebras, and the antipode is given by $S(p\#g) = (1\#g^{-1})(S(p)\#1)$ for $p \in \text{Der}(A)$ and $g \in \text{Aut}_{\text{Alg}}(A)$; Proposition 6.5 below gives an explicit proof of this.

To proceed, we need the following construction.

Definition 2.21. Take two rings R and S with ring homomorphism $\beta : R \rightarrow S$, along with a left R -module M , and a left S -module N . We call a group homomorphism $\alpha : M \rightarrow N$ a β -linear homomorphism if $\alpha(r \cdot m) = \beta(r) \cdot \alpha(m)$ for all $m \in M$ and $r \in R$.

This brings us to the main result of this section.

Theorem 2.22. Take a cocommutative Hopf algebra $H := U(\mathfrak{g})\#\mathbb{k}G$ for a group G acting on a Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} by conjugation. Then, for an algebra A , the following are equivalent.

- (a) A is an H -module algebra.
- (b) There exist homomorphisms,

$$\pi : G \longrightarrow \text{Aut}_{\text{Alg}}(A) \quad (\text{of groups}), \quad \tau : \mathfrak{g} \longrightarrow \text{Der}(A) \quad (\text{of Lie algebras}).$$

Moreover, for the Hopf algebra homomorphisms $\tilde{\pi} : \mathbb{k}G \rightarrow \mathbb{k}(\text{Aut}_{\text{Alg}}(A))$ from (2.9) and $\tilde{\tau} : U(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow U(\text{Der}(A))$ from (2.19), $\tilde{\tau}$ is a $\tilde{\pi}$ -linear homomorphism.

- (c) There exists a Hopf algebra homomorphism $\phi : H \rightarrow U(\text{Der}(A))\#\mathbb{k}(\text{Aut}_{\text{Alg}}(A))$.

Proof. (a) \Rightarrow (b): If A is an $(U(\mathfrak{g})\#\mathbb{k}G)$ -module algebra, then A is a G -module algebra via $g \cdot a := (1_{U(\mathfrak{g})}\#g) \cdot a$, and A is a \mathfrak{g} -module algebra via $p \cdot a := (p\#1_{\mathbb{k}G}) \cdot a$, for $g \in G$, $p \in \mathfrak{g}$, and $a \in A$. Now there exists a group homomorphism $\pi : G \rightarrow \text{Aut}_{\text{Alg}}(A)$, a Lie algebra homomorphism $\tau : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \text{Der}(A)$, and Hopf algebra homomorphisms $\tilde{\pi} : \mathbb{k}G \rightarrow \mathbb{k}(\text{Aut}_{\text{Alg}}(A))$ and $\tilde{\tau} : U(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow U(\text{Der}(A))$ by Propositions 2.10 and 2.20. We also have that:

$$\pi(g)(a) = g \cdot a = (1_{U(\mathfrak{g})}\#g) \cdot a \quad \text{and} \quad \tau(p)(a) = p \cdot a = (p\#1_{\mathbb{k}G}) \cdot a.$$

Since A is a faithful $\text{Der}(A)$ -module, to obtain the remaining part of (b), we shall show $\tilde{\tau}(g \cdot p)(a) = (\tilde{\pi}(g) \cdot \tilde{\tau}(p))(a)$ for all $g \in G$, $p \in \mathfrak{g}$, and $a \in A$. Indeed, we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{\pi}(g) \cdot \tilde{\tau}(p))(a) &= \tilde{\pi}(g) \circ \tilde{\tau}(p) \circ \tilde{\pi}(g^{-1})(a) = (1_{U(\mathfrak{g})}\#g)(p\#1_{\mathbb{k}G})(1_{U(\mathfrak{g})}\#g^{-1}) \cdot a \\ &= ((g \cdot p)\#1_{\mathbb{k}G}) \cdot a = \tilde{\tau}(g \cdot p)(a). \end{aligned}$$

- (b) \Rightarrow (c): Given the Hopf algebra homomorphisms $\tilde{\pi}$ and $\tilde{\tau}$ in (b), define the map

$$\phi : U(\mathfrak{g})\#\mathbb{k}G \longrightarrow U(\text{Der}_{\mathbb{k}}(A))\#\mathbb{k}(\text{Aut}_{\text{Alg}}(A)), \quad p\#g \mapsto \tilde{\tau}(p)\#\tilde{\pi}(g).$$

It is straight-forward to check that ϕ is a coalgebra map since the smash product Hopf algebra has the standard tensor coalgebra structure, and $\tilde{\pi}$ and $\tilde{\tau}$ are coalgebra maps. Moreover,

ϕ is unital as $\tilde{\pi}$ and $\tilde{\tau}$ are unital. Finally, ϕ is multiplicative due to the computation below:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi((p\#g)(q\#h)) &= \phi(p(g \cdot q) \# gh) = \tilde{\tau}(p(g \cdot q)) \# \tilde{\pi}(gh) \\ &= \tilde{\tau}(p)\tilde{\tau}(g \cdot q) \# \tilde{\pi}(g)\tilde{\pi}(h) \stackrel{(*)}{=} \tilde{\tau}(p)(\tilde{\pi}(g) \cdot \tilde{\tau}(q)) \# \tilde{\pi}(g)\tilde{\pi}(h) \\ &\stackrel{(**)}{=} (\tilde{\tau}(p) \# \tilde{\pi}(g))(\tilde{\tau}(q) \# \tilde{\pi}(h)) = \phi(p\#g)\phi(q\#h), \end{aligned}$$

for $g, h \in G$ and $p, q \in \mathfrak{g}$. Here, $(*)$ holds because $\tilde{\tau}$ is a $\tilde{\pi}$ -linear homomorphism, and $(**)$ holds because $\tilde{\pi}$ preserves grouplike elements.

(c) \Rightarrow (a): Observe that A is a module algebra over the smash product Hopf algebra $U(\text{Der}(A))\#\mathbb{k}(\text{Aut}_{\text{Alg}}(A))$ via $(\delta\#\alpha) \cdot a = \delta \cdot (\alpha \cdot a)$ for $\delta \in U(\text{Der}(A))$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{k}(\text{Aut}_{\text{Alg}}(A))$, and $a \in A$. Now, given the Hopf map ϕ , we have that A is an H -module algebra via $h \cdot a := \phi(h) \cdot a$, for all $h \in H$ and $a \in A$. Namely, $(hh') \cdot a = h \cdot (h' \cdot a)$ since ϕ is multiplicative; $1_H \cdot a = a$ since ϕ is unital; $h \cdot (aa') = (h_1 \cdot a)(h_2 \cdot a')$ since ϕ is comultiplicative; and $h \cdot 1_A = \varepsilon_H(h)1_A$ since ϕ is counital, for $h, h' \in H$ and $a, a' \in A$. \square

Therefore, cocommutative Hopf algebras act on algebras categorically if and only if they do so representation-theoretically.

3. ACTIONS OF GROUPOIDS ON ALGEBRAS

In this section, we examine actions of groupoids on algebras, by first studying groupoid modules and representations in Sections 3.1 and 3.2, respectively. We then generalize Proposition 2.4 to the groupoid setting; see Proposition 3.25 in Section 3.3.

Definition 3.1. $[\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{G}_0, \mathcal{G}_1, e_x]$ A *groupoid* $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{G}_0, \mathcal{G}_1)$ is a small category in which every morphism is an isomorphism. Here, \mathcal{G}_0 (resp., \mathcal{G}_1) is the set of objects (resp., morphisms) of \mathcal{G} . If $g \in \mathcal{G}_1$, then $s(g)$ (resp., $t(g)$) denotes the source (resp., target) object of g . For each $x \in \mathcal{G}_0$, the identity morphism of $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{G}}(x, x)$ is denoted by e_x .

A *homomorphism of groupoids* is simply a functor.

A group can be viewed as a groupoid with only one object. Unless otherwise stated, we assume that \mathcal{G}_0 is a nonempty finite set. If, further, \mathcal{G}_1 is a finite set, then we call \mathcal{G} *finite*.

3.1. Modules over groupoids. Some of the concepts here are adapted from [BHS11, Definition 7.1.7] and [PT14, p. 85].

Notation 3.2 (X). Henceforth, let X be a nonempty finite set.

Definition 3.3. A vector space V is *X -decomposable* if there exists a family $\{V_x\}_{x \in X}$ of subspaces of V such that $V = \bigoplus_{x \in X} V_x$. We call the $\{V_x\}_{x \in X}$ the *components* of V .

If $V = \bigoplus_{x \in X} V_x$ and $W = \bigoplus_{x \in X} W_x$ are X -decomposable vector spaces, a linear map $f : V \rightarrow W$ is said to be *X -decomposable* if there is a family $\{f_x : V_x \rightarrow W_x\}_{x \in X}$ of linear maps such that $f|_{V_x} = f_x$ for all $x \in X$. In this case, we write $f = (f_x)_{x \in X}$.

For instance, every vector space V has a trivial X -decomposition if $|X| = 1$. Even if $|X| > 1$, V has an X -decomposition where $V_x = V$ for one $x \in X$, and $V_y = 0$ otherwise.

Definition 3.4 (\mathcal{G} -module). Let \mathcal{G} be a groupoid with finite object set \mathcal{G}_0 . A \mathcal{G}_0 -decomposable vector space $V = \bigoplus_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} V_x$ is said to be a *left \mathcal{G} -module* if it is equipped with, for each $x, y \in \mathcal{G}_0$, a linear map $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{G}}(x, y) \times V_x \rightarrow V_y$, denoted $(g, v) \mapsto g \cdot v$, such that

- $(gh) \cdot v = g \cdot (h \cdot v)$, for all $g, h \in \mathcal{G}_1$ with $t(h) = s(g)$ and all $v \in V_{s(h)}$, and
- $e_x \cdot v = v$, for all $x \in \mathcal{G}_0$ and $v \in V_x$.

Given two left \mathcal{G} -modules $V = \bigoplus_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} V_x$ and $W = \bigoplus_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} W_x$, a \mathcal{G} -module morphism $f = (f_x)_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} : V \rightarrow W$ is a \mathcal{G}_0 -decomposable linear map such that

$$(3.5) \quad g \cdot f_{s(g)}(v) = f_{t(g)}(g \cdot v), \quad \text{for all } g \in \mathcal{G}_1 \text{ and } v \in V_{s(g)}.$$

For two \mathcal{G} -module morphisms $f = (f_x)_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} : V \rightarrow W$ and $f' = (f'_x)_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} : W \rightarrow Z$, their *composition* is defined as the \mathcal{G} -module morphism $f'f = (f'_x f_x)_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} : V \rightarrow Z$.

Remark 3.6. Let $V = \bigoplus_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} V_x$ be a left \mathcal{G} -module and $g \in \mathcal{G}_1$. Notice that the action is defined locally, meaning that $g \cdot v$ makes sense only when $v \in V_{s(g)}$. For this reason, in the literature, the linear maps associated to the module are called a *partial (groupoid) action* (see e.g., [BP12, Section 1]).

The following result is an adapted version of [IR19a, Proposition 9.3].

Lemma 3.7. *Let $V = \bigoplus_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} V_x$ be a left \mathcal{G} -module. Then, for each $g \in \mathcal{G}_1$, the linear map $\nu_g : V_{s(g)} \rightarrow V_{t(g)}$ given by $v \mapsto g \cdot v$ is an isomorphism. In particular, $(\{V_x\}_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0}, \{\nu_g\}_{g \in \mathcal{G}_1})$ is a groupoid.*

Proof. If $g : x \rightarrow y$ is a morphism in \mathcal{G}_1 , then $\nu_g^{-1} = \nu_{g^{-1}}$. Indeed, for every $v \in V_x$ we have $\nu_{g^{-1}}\nu_g(v) = g^{-1} \cdot (g \cdot v) = (g^{-1}g) \cdot v = e_x \cdot v = v$. Similarly, for any $v' \in V_y$ we have $\nu_g\nu_{g^{-1}}(v') = e_y \cdot v' = v'$. In particular, $\nu_{e_x} = \text{Id}_{V_x}$, for every $x \in \mathcal{G}_0$. \square

Notation 3.8 ($\nu_g, \omega_g, \alpha_g$). The maps $\{\nu_g\}_{g \in \mathcal{G}_1}$ above are called the *structure isomorphisms* of the \mathcal{G} -module $V = \bigoplus_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} V_x$. In the remaining of this section we will use the Greek letters $\{\nu_g\}_{g \in \mathcal{G}_1}$, $\{\omega_g\}_{g \in \mathcal{G}_1}$, $\{\alpha_g\}_{g \in \mathcal{G}_1}$, etc., to denote the respective structure isomorphisms of given \mathcal{G} -modules $V = \bigoplus_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} V_x$, or $W = \bigoplus_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} W_x$, or $A = \bigoplus_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} A_x$, etc.

For instance, if $f = (f_x)_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} : V \rightarrow W$ is a \mathcal{G} -morphism, then condition (3.5) can be restated as $\omega_g f_{s(g)} = f_{t(g)} \nu_g$, for all $g \in \mathcal{G}_1$.

Example 3.9. Consider the following groupoid:

$$(3.10) \quad \mathcal{G} = \begin{array}{ccc} & \xrightarrow{g} & \\ e_x \curvearrowright & \bullet_x & \bullet_y \curvearrowright e_y \\ & \xleftarrow{g^{-1}} & \end{array}$$

- (a) Let $V_x = V_y = \mathbb{k}^2$ and define for all $a, b \in \mathbb{k}$,

$$g \cdot (a, b) = g^{-1} \cdot (a, b) := (b, a), \quad e_x \cdot (a, b) = e_y \cdot (a, b) := (a, b).$$

Then $V = V_x \oplus V_y$ is a left \mathcal{G} -module; $\nu_g, \nu_{g^{-1}} : \mathbb{k}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{k}^2$ are given by $(a, b) \mapsto (b, a)$.

- (b) Let $W_x = W_y = \mathbb{k}^3$ and define for all $a, b, c \in \mathbb{k}$,

$$g \cdot (a, b, c) = g^{-1} \cdot (a, b, c) := (-a, c, b), \quad e_x \cdot (a, b, c) = e_y \cdot (a, b, c) := (a, b, c).$$

Then $W = W_x \oplus W_y$ is a left \mathcal{G} -module. Also, $\omega_g, \omega_{g^{-1}} : \mathbb{k}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{k}^3$ are both given by $(a, b, c) \mapsto (-a, c, b)$. Furthermore, the maps $f_x, f_y : \mathbb{k}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{k}^3$ both defined as $(a, b) \mapsto (0, a, b)$ make $f = (f_x, f_y)$ a \mathcal{G} -module morphism from V to W .

- (c) Let $Z_x = Z_y = \mathbb{k}[t, t^{-1}]$ and define for every $r \in \mathbb{k}[t, t^{-1}]$,

$$g \cdot r := tr, \quad g^{-1} \cdot r := t^{-1}r, \quad e_x \cdot r = e_y \cdot r := r.$$

Then $Z = Z_x \oplus Z_y$ is an infinite-dimensional left \mathcal{G} -module. The structure isomorphisms $\xi_g, \xi_{g^{-1}} : \mathbb{k}[t, t^{-1}] \rightarrow \mathbb{k}[t, t^{-1}]$ are given by $\xi_g(r) = tr$ and $\xi_{g^{-1}}(r) = t^{-1}r$, for every $r \in \mathbb{k}[t, t^{-1}]$.

The following result is straight-forward.

Lemma 3.11 ($\mathcal{G}\text{-mod}$). *Let $\mathcal{G}\text{-mod}$ be the category of left \mathcal{G} -modules. This category admits a monoidal structure as follows.*

- If $V = \bigoplus_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} V_x, W = \bigoplus_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} W_x \in \mathcal{G}\text{-mod}$, then $V \otimes_{\mathcal{G}\text{-mod}} W = \bigoplus_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} V_x \otimes W_x$; the structure isomorphisms are $\{\nu_g \otimes \omega_g\}_{g \in \mathcal{G}_1}$,
- $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}\text{-mod}} = \bigoplus_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} \mathbb{k}$ with the structure isomorphisms $\{\kappa_g = \text{Id}_{\mathbb{k}}\}_{g \in \mathcal{G}_1}$.

If $f = (f_x)_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} : V \rightarrow W$ and $f' = (f'_x)_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} : V' \rightarrow W'$ are two \mathcal{G} -module morphisms, then $f \otimes_{\mathcal{G}\text{-mod}} f' = (f_x \otimes f'_x)_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0}$. The associativity constraint is that induced by the tensor product of components, and the left/right unital constraints

$$l_V : \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}\text{-mod}} \otimes_{\mathcal{G}\text{-mod}} V \longrightarrow V, \quad r_V : V \otimes_{\mathcal{G}\text{-mod}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}\text{-mod}} \longrightarrow V,$$

are given by scalar multiplication, that is, for each $x \in \mathcal{G}_0$,

$$(l_V)_x : \mathbb{k} \otimes V_x \rightarrow V_x, \quad k \otimes v \mapsto k \cdot v \quad (r_V)_x : V_x \otimes \mathbb{k} \rightarrow V_x, \quad v \otimes k \mapsto k \cdot v. \quad \square$$

3.2. Representations of groupoids. In this part we focus our study on representations of groupoids, by adapting terminology present in [IR19a, Section 9.3], [IR19b, Section 3.1] and [PF14, Section 2.3]. First, we introduce a generalization of the automorphism group, $\text{GL}(V)$, from Notation 2.1(a).

Definition 3.12 ($\text{GL}_X(V), \text{GL}_{(d_1, \dots, d_n)}(\mathbb{k})$). Let $V = \bigoplus_{x \in X} V_x$ be an X -decomposable vector space. We define $\text{GL}_X(V)$, the X -automorphism groupoid of V , as follows.

- The objects are the subspaces $\{V_x\}_{x \in X}$.
- For any $x, y \in X$, $\text{Hom}_{\text{GL}_X(V)}(V_x, V_y)$ is the space of invertible linear maps between the vector spaces V_x and V_y .

If $X = \{1, \dots, n\}$ and V_i has dimension d_i , then we also denote $\text{GL}_X(V)$ by $\text{GL}_{(d_1, \dots, d_n)}(\mathbb{k})$ for $d_1 \leq d_2 \leq \dots \leq d_n$. This generalizes the classical notation $\text{GL}_d(\mathbb{k}) = \text{GL}(V)$ when V has dimension d .

Note that, in general, this groupoid is not finite (but always has finitely many objects).

Example 3.13. If $X = \{x, y\}$, then \mathbb{k}^4 is X -decomposable by taking $(\mathbb{k}^4)_x := (\mathbb{k}, \mathbb{k}, 0, 0)$ and $(\mathbb{k}^4)_y := (0, 0, \mathbb{k}, \mathbb{k})$. Moreover, we have

$$\text{GL}_X(\mathbb{k}^4) = \text{GL}_{(2,2)}(\mathbb{k}) = \begin{array}{ccc} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \curvearrowright \\ \text{---} \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \left(\begin{array}{c} \mathbb{k} \\ \mathbb{k} \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array} \right) & \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \curvearrowleft \\ \text{---} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \curvearrowright \\ \text{---} \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \left(\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \\ \mathbb{k} \\ \mathbb{k} \end{array} \right) & \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \curvearrowleft \\ \text{---} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \curvearrowright \\ \text{---} \end{array} \end{array} \cong \begin{array}{ccc} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \curvearrowright \\ \text{---} \end{array} & \mathbb{k}^2 & \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \curvearrowleft \\ \text{---} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \curvearrowright \\ \text{---} \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \mathbb{k}^2 & \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \curvearrowleft \\ \text{---} \end{array} \end{array} \end{array},$$

where the dashed arrows represent the spaces of linear isomorphisms.

Definition 3.14 (Representation of \mathcal{G}). A *representation of \mathcal{G}* is a \mathcal{G}_0 -decomposable vector space $V = \bigoplus_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} V_x$ equipped with a groupoid homomorphism $\pi : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \text{GL}_{\mathcal{G}_0}(V)$ such that $\pi(x) = V_x$ for all $x \in \mathcal{G}_0$.

Given two representations $(V, \pi), (V', \pi')$, a *morphism of representations of \mathcal{G}* is a natural transformation $\pi \Rightarrow \pi'$.

Remark 3.15. In [IR19b, Definition 2], a representation of \mathcal{G} is defined as a functor from \mathcal{G} to the category of vector spaces; our definition is a repackaging of the information carried out by such a functor.

Example 3.16. Let \mathcal{G} be as in (3.10). Then the $\{x, y\}$ -decomposable vector space \mathbb{k}^4 of Example 3.13 is a representation of \mathcal{G} by taking $\pi : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \text{GL}_{\mathcal{G}_0}(\mathbb{k}^4) = \text{GL}_{(2,2)}(\mathbb{k})$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(g) : (\mathbb{k}, \mathbb{k}, 0, 0) &\longrightarrow (0, 0, \mathbb{k}, \mathbb{k}) & \pi(g^{-1}) : (0, 0, \mathbb{k}, \mathbb{k}) &\longrightarrow (\mathbb{k}, \mathbb{k}, 0, 0) \\ (a, b, 0, 0) &\mapsto (0, 0, b, a), & (0, 0, a, b) &\mapsto (b, a, 0, 0). \end{aligned}$$

The following result is a generalization of Lemma 2.3 and it reconciles various notions of (linear) groupoid actions in the literature; see, e.g. [BHS11, Section 7.1.ii], [BP12, Section 1], [IR19a, Section 9.3], [IR19b, Section 3.1], [PF14, Section 2.3], [PT14, Section 3].

Lemma 3.17 ($\text{rep}(\mathcal{G})$). *Let $\text{rep}(\mathcal{G})$ be the category of representations of \mathcal{G} . Then, the categories $\mathcal{G}\text{-mod}$ and $\text{rep}(\mathcal{G})$ are isomorphic, given by sending a left \mathcal{G} -module $V = \bigoplus_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} V_x$ with associated structure isomorphisms $\{\nu_g\}_{g \in \mathcal{G}_1}$ to the representation $V = \bigoplus_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} V_x$ with associated functor $\pi : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \text{GL}_{\mathcal{G}_0}(V)$ defined as $\pi(g) := \nu_g$ for all $g \in \mathcal{G}_1$. (Here, we must have $\pi(x) = V_x$, for all $x \in \mathcal{G}_0$, by Definition 3.14.) \square*

Example 3.18. The correspondence of Lemma 3.17 tells us that the left \mathcal{G} -module $\mathbb{k}^2 \oplus \mathbb{k}^2$ of Example 3.9(a) is, up to isomorphism, the same as the \mathcal{G} -representation $\mathbb{k}^4 \cong \mathbb{k}^2 \oplus \mathbb{k}^2$ of Example 3.16.

3.3. Module algebras over groupoids. Next, we generalize Proposition 2.4 for groupoids. For that, we extend the notions in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 from vector spaces to algebras.

Definition 3.19. Let A be an algebra. We say that A is an X -decomposable algebra if there exists a family $\{A_x\}_{x \in X}$ of unital algebras (some of which may be 0) such that $A = \bigoplus_{x \in X} A_x$ as algebras.

In other words, X -decomposable algebras are simply direct sum of $|X|$ unital algebras with the canonical (unital) algebra structure.

Remark 3.20. Let $A = \bigoplus_{x \in X} A_x$ be an X -decomposable algebra. If 1_x denotes the multiplicative identity element of A_x , for each $x \in X$, then $1_A = \sum_{x \in X} 1_x$ by definition. We refer to the set of elements $\{1_x \mid x \in X \text{ such that } 1_x \neq 0\}$ as the *local identities* of A . The local identities form a complete set of orthogonal central idempotents of A .

However, the local identities could be a sum of nonzero central orthogonal idempotents (i.e., non-primitive), as the next example shows. Thus, an X -decomposition of an algebra is not unique.

Example 3.21. The $\{x, y\}$ -decomposable vector space \mathbb{k}^4 of Example 3.13 is, in fact, a $\{x, y\}$ -decomposable algebra when considering component-wise operations. Here, the local identities are $1_x = (1, 1, 0, 0)$ and $1_y = (0, 0, 1, 1)$, which are not primitive.

We point out an example of an X -decomposable algebra which is used in [CL09] for their classification of weak Hopf algebra structures derived from $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$.

Example 3.22. Take $q \in \mathbb{k}^\times$. We follow [CL09] for the following construction. The *weak quantum group* $A := wsl_q 2$ is the unital \mathbb{k} -algebra generated by indeterminates E, F, K, \overline{K} subject to the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned} KE &= q^2 EK, & \overline{K}E &= q^{-2} E \overline{K}, & KF &= q^{-2} FK, & \overline{K}F &= q^2 F \overline{K}, \\ K\overline{K} &= \overline{K}K, & K\overline{K}K &= K, & \overline{K}K\overline{K} &= \overline{K}, & EF - FE &= (K - \overline{K})/(q - q^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

For $X = \{x, y\}$, take $A_x = A1_x$, $A_y = A1_y$, with $1_x = K\overline{K}$, and $1_y = 1_A - K\overline{K}$. Thus, $A = A_x \oplus A_y$ is an X -decomposable algebra; in fact, $A_x \cong U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ and $A_y \cong \mathbb{k}[t_1, t_2]$ as algebras [CL09, Theorems 2.3, 2.5, 2.7].

Next, we generalize the algebra automorphism group, $\text{Aut}_{\text{Alg}}(A)$, from Notation 2.1(b).

Definition 3.23 ($\text{Aut}_{X\text{-Alg}}(A)$). Let $A = \bigoplus_{x \in X} A_x$ be an X -decomposable algebra. We define $\text{Aut}_{X\text{-Alg}}(A)$, the X -algebra automorphism groupoid of A , as follows:

- the objects are the algebras $\{A_x\}_{x \in X}$,
- for any $x, y \in X$, $\text{Hom}_{\text{Aut}_{X\text{-Alg}}(A)}(A_x, A_y)$ is the space of invertible unital algebra maps between the unital algebras A_x and A_y .

Remark 3.24. Note that the X -automorphism groupoid $\text{Aut}_{X\text{-Alg}}(A)$ can be seen as a subgroupoid (i.e. subcategory closed under inversion) of $\text{GL}_X(A)$ from Definition 3.12, and it is usually proper in the sense that $\text{Aut}_{X\text{-Alg}}(A)_1 \subsetneq \text{GL}_X(A)_1$. Also, when $|X| = 1$ we recover the groups of automorphisms $\text{GL}(A)$ and $\text{Aut}_{\text{Alg}}(A)$ of Notation 2.1.

Now, we give a generalization of Proposition 2.4. Recall from Definition 3.4 that any \mathcal{G} -module V is \mathcal{G}_0 -decomposable (i.e., as vector space $V = \bigoplus_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} V_x$).

Proposition 3.25. *Let A be an algebra and let \mathcal{G} be a groupoid. Then the following are equivalent.*

- A is a left \mathcal{G} -module algebra.
- A is a \mathcal{G} -module, via structure isomorphisms $\{\alpha_g\}_{g \in \mathcal{G}_1}$, such that

$$(3.26) \quad g \cdot (ab) = (g \cdot a)(g \cdot b),$$

$$(3.27) \quad g \cdot 1_{s(g)} = 1_{t(g)},$$

for all $g \in \mathcal{G}_1$ and $a, b \in A_{s(g)}$.

- $A = \bigoplus_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} A_x$ is a \mathcal{G}_0 -decomposable algebra and there exists a groupoid homomorphism $\pi : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \text{Aut}_{\mathcal{G}_0\text{-Alg}}(A)$ satisfying $\pi(x) = A_x$ for all $x \in \mathcal{G}_0$.

Proof. Recall Lemma 3.11. Note that (a) and (b) are equivalent because in both assertions $A = \bigoplus_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} A_x$ is a left \mathcal{G} -module, and equations (3.26)–(3.27) are a reformulation of the multiplication map $m_A : A \otimes_{\mathcal{G}\text{-mod}} A \rightarrow A$ and the unit map $u_A : \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}\text{-mod}} \rightarrow A$ of A being \mathcal{G} -module morphisms. Observe that, in fact, (3.26) implies (3.27) since

$$1_{t(g)} = g \cdot (g^{-1} \cdot 1_{t(g)}) = g \cdot (g^{-1} \cdot 1_{t(g)}) 1_{s(g)} = (g \cdot (g^{-1} \cdot 1_{t(g)}))(g \cdot 1_{s(g)}) = 1_{t(g)}(g \cdot 1_{s(g)}) = g \cdot 1_{s(g)}.$$

On the other hand, $A = \bigoplus_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} A_x$ being a \mathcal{G} -module is the same as there existing a functor $\pi : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \text{GL}_{\mathcal{G}_0}(A)$ such that $\pi(x) = A_x$ and $\pi(g) = \alpha_g$ for all $x \in \mathcal{G}_0$, $g \in \mathcal{G}_1$ (see Lemma 3.17). Moreover, (3.26)–(3.27) are the same as each map $\pi(g)$ being a unital algebra map. Hence, condition (b) can be reformulated as requiring the image of the groupoid homomorphism π to be contained in the subgroupoid $\text{Aut}_{\mathcal{G}_0\text{-Alg}}(A)$ of $\text{GL}_{\mathcal{G}_0}(A)$. So, (b) and (c) are equivalent as required. \square

Therefore, groupoids act on algebras categorically if and only if they do so representation-theoretically.

Example 3.28. In Example 3.9(a), the left \mathcal{G} -module $\mathbb{k}^4 \cong \mathbb{k}^2 \oplus \mathbb{k}^2$ is a \mathcal{G} -module algebra A with functor $\pi : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \text{Aut}_{\mathcal{G}_0\text{-Alg}}(A)$ induced from π in Example 3.16. However, the \mathcal{G} -module in Example 3.9(b) is not an example of \mathcal{G} -module algebra since the structure isomorphisms are not unital. Similarly, the induced \mathcal{G}_0 -decomposition of the \mathcal{G} -module of Example 3.9(c) does not make it into an \mathcal{G}_0 -decomposable algebra.

4. ACTIONS OF GROUPOID ALGEBRAS ON ALGEBRAS

In this part, we generalize Proposition 2.8 to the groupoid setting, see Theorem 4.32. This yields results about module algebras over groupoid algebras as given in Corollary 4.33. These results are presented in Section 4.6. Leading up to this, we discuss modules and representations of groupoid algebras in Section 4.1. Then we introduce local units for decomposable algebras in Section 4.2. We review weak Hopf algebras in Section 4.3, and

study their groupoids of group-like elements in Section 4.4. The key categories for the main results of the section are presented in Section 4.5. Along the way, we also show that finite groupoid actions on domains factor through group actions, see Corollary 4.26.

4.1. Representations and modules over groupoid algebras. Consider the following terminology.

Definition 4.1 ($\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$). Let \mathcal{G} be a groupoid with finite object set \mathcal{G}_0 . We define the *groupoid algebra* $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ to be the algebra with vector space basis \mathcal{G}_1 , with the product of two morphisms being their composition if defined and 0 otherwise, extended linearly. Here, $1_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}} = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} e_x$.

We consider the following module and representation categories for $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$.

Definition 4.2 ($\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}\text{-mod}$, $\text{rep}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G})$). Take a groupoid \mathcal{G} .

- (a) Let $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}\text{-mod}$ be the category of $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ -modules, that is, \mathcal{G}_0 -decomposable vector spaces $V = \bigoplus_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} V_x$ equipped with a structure map $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G} \times V \rightarrow V$ formed by linearizing actions of \mathcal{G} on V (see Definition 3.4). Likewise, morphisms between $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ -modules can be defined.
- (b) Let $\text{rep}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G})$ be the category of *representations of $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$* , that is, \mathcal{G}_0 -decomposable vector spaces $V = \bigoplus_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} V_x$ equipped with an algebra homomorphism $\tilde{\pi} : \mathbb{k}\mathcal{G} \rightarrow \text{End}(V)$, such that $\tilde{\pi}(e_x) = \text{Id}_{V_x}$, for all $x \in \mathcal{G}_0$.

A morphism between representations $(V, \tilde{\pi})$ and $(V', \tilde{\pi}')$ of $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ is a linear map $\phi : V \rightarrow V'$ with $\phi(V_x) \subset V'_x$ for all $x \in \mathcal{G}_0$, such that $\phi \circ \tilde{\pi}(g) = \tilde{\pi}'(g) \circ \phi$ for $g \in \mathcal{G}_1$.

Remark 4.3. Similar to the group case (where $|\mathcal{G}_0| = 1$), we have an isomorphism of categories: $\text{rep}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}) \cong \mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}\text{-mod}$. Moreover, the notion of a $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ -module given here is not different of the classical notion of module over the algebra $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$. For instance, a $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ -module V in the classical sense is as in Definition 4.2 by taking $V_x := e_x \cdot V$ for each $x \in \mathcal{G}_0$.

4.2. Local units of decomposable algebras. Next, we introduce the notion of local units of an algebra. This will serve the purpose of generalizing the group of units functor from Proposition 2.8(a) to the groupoid setting; see Theorem 4.32(a) below.

Definition 4.4 (\hat{a}). Let A be an algebra and $\{e_x\}_{x \in X}$ be a set of nonzero orthogonal idempotents of A . For $x, y \in X$, take an element $a \in e_y A e_x$. We say that a is a *local unit* if there exists an element $b \in e_x A e_y$ such that $ab = e_y$ and $ba = e_x$. The element b is called a *local inverse* of a , denoted by \hat{a} .

The notions above are well-defined due to the following straight-forward lemma.

Lemma 4.5. *Let A be an algebra and $\{e_x\}_{x \in X}$ be a set of nonzero orthogonal idempotents of A . Let $a \in e_y A e_x$ be a local unit of A for some $x, y \in X$. Then:*

- (a) a is nonzero.
- (b) If $a \in e_{y'} A e_{x'}$ for $x', y' \in X$, then $x = x'$ and $y = y'$.
- (c) If there exists $b, b' \in e_x A e_y$ such that $ab = ab' = e_y$ and $ba = b'a = e_x$, then $b = b'$.
- (d) For $x, y, z \in X$, if $a_1 \in e_y A e_x$ and $a_2 \in e_z A e_y$ are local units of A , then the product $a_2 a_1 \in e_z A e_x$ is also a local unit of A . \square

Remark 4.6. In contrast with the notion of local identities introduced in Remark 3.20 for X -decomposable algebras, the idempotents in Lemma 4.5 are not asked to be central, nor do we require $1_A = \sum_{x \in X} e_x$. This allows us to work with a broader scope of algebras towards our main result, Theorem 4.32. For example, a groupoid algebra $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ has the set of nonzero orthogonal idempotents $\{e_x\}_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0}$, and even though $1_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}} = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} e_x$, they are not

central; hence, unless \mathcal{G} is totally disconnected, $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ is not a \mathcal{G}_0 -decomposable algebra via these elements.

Definition 4.7 ($(-)_X^\times$). Let A be an algebra and $\{e_x\}_{x \in X}$ be a set of nonzero orthogonal idempotents of A . The *groupoid of local units* of A , denoted by A_X^\times , is defined as the following category:

- The objects are the elements $x \in X$,
- For each $x, y \in X$, $\text{Hom}_{A_X^\times}(x, y) = \{a \in A \mid a \in e_y A e_x \text{ is a local unit of } A\}$. In this case we write $a : x \rightarrow y$.
- Given two morphisms $a : x \rightarrow y$ and $a' : y \rightarrow z$ we define their composition as the product $a'a : x \rightarrow z$.
- The inverse of a morphism $a : x \rightarrow y$ is given by its local inverse $\widehat{a} : y \rightarrow x$.

Remark 4.8. Lemma 4.5 guarantees that the construction above is well-defined, and it is indeed a groupoid. Note that the identities are $\text{Id}_x = e_x : x \rightarrow x$.

The construction of A_X^\times strongly depends on the choice of the family of idempotents, so an algebra might have several different associated groupoids of local units.

Example 4.9. (a) If $|X| = 1$, then for any algebra A we can take $\{1_A\}$ as the set of idempotents indexed by X . In this case, A_X^\times is precisely the group of units A^\times .

- (b) If \mathcal{G} is a groupoid, $X = \mathcal{G}_0$, and $A = \mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$, then the identity morphisms $\{e_x\}_{x \in X}$ of \mathcal{G} form a set of orthogonal nonzero idempotents in $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$. Hence, \mathcal{G} is a subgroupoid of $(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G})_{\mathcal{G}_0}^\times$ since $gg^{-1} = e_{t(g)}$ and $g^{-1}g = e_{s(g)}$ for all $g \in \mathcal{G}_1$. If $|X| = 1$, then this reduces to the fact that \mathcal{G} is a subgroup of the group $(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G})^\times$.
- (c) Let $A = \bigoplus_{x \in X} A_x$ be an X -decomposable algebra. Then A_X^\times is a disjoint collection of groups due to the fact that $\text{Hom}_{A_X^\times}(x, x) \cong (A_x)^\times$ as multiplicative groups and $\text{Hom}_{A_X^\times}(x, y) = 0$, for every $x, y \in X$ with $x \neq y$.
- (d) Let $V = \bigoplus_{x \in X} V_x$ be an X -decomposable vector space with $V_x \neq 0$ for all $x \in X$. Take $A = \text{End}(V)$. By $\{\pi_x : V \rightarrow V_x\}_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0}$ we denote the canonical projection maps, and by $\{\iota_x : V_x \rightarrow V\}_{x \in X}$ the canonical inclusion maps. We define nonzero orthogonal idempotents $e_x : V \rightarrow V$ as $e_x := \iota_x \pi_x$ for all $x \in X$. Note that $e_x|_{V_x} = \text{Id}_{V_x}$. Moreover, $e_y A e_x \cong \text{Hom}(V_x, V_y)$. So, $f \in e_y A e_x$ is a local unit if and only if it is an isomorphism of vector spaces between V_x and V_y . Hence, $A_X^\times \cong \text{GL}_X(V)$. If $|X| = 1$, then we recover that $(\text{End}(V))^\times = \text{GL}(V)$.

4.3. Weak Hopf algebras. Now, we work towards generalizing the grouplike elements functor from Proposition 2.8(b) to the weak Hopf algebra setting. To proceed, let us recall the notion of a weak Hopf algebra. We refer the reader to [BNS99, NV02] for details.

Definition 4.10. A *weak bialgebra* over \mathbb{k} is a quintuple $(H, m, u, \Delta, \varepsilon)$ such that

- (a) (H, m, u) is an algebra over \mathbb{k} ,
- (b) (H, Δ, ε) is a \mathbb{k} -coalgebra over \mathbb{k} ,
- (c) $\Delta(ab) = \Delta(a)\Delta(b)$ for all $a, b \in H$,
- (d) $\varepsilon(abc) = \varepsilon(ab_1)\varepsilon(b_2c) = \varepsilon(ab_2)\varepsilon(b_1c)$ for all $a, b, c \in H$,
- (e) $\Delta^2(1_H) = (\Delta(1_H) \otimes 1_H)(1_H \otimes \Delta(1_H)) = (1_H \otimes \Delta(1_H))(\Delta(1_H) \otimes 1_H)$.

Here, we use the *sumless Sweedler notation*, for $h \in H$:

$$\Delta(h) := h_1 \otimes h_2.$$

A *weak bialgebra homomorphism* between two weak bialgebras is a linear map that is both an algebra and a coalgebra map.

Definition 4.11 ($\varepsilon_s, \varepsilon_t, H_s, H_t$). Let $(H, m, u, \Delta, \varepsilon)$ be a weak bialgebra. We define the *source and target counital maps*, respectively as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon_s : H &\longrightarrow H, & x &\mapsto 1_1 \varepsilon(x1_2) \\ \varepsilon_t : H &\longrightarrow H, & x &\mapsto \varepsilon(1_1x) 1_2.\end{aligned}$$

We denote the images of these maps by $H_s := \varepsilon_s(H)$ and $H_t := \varepsilon_t(H)$, which are counital subalgebras of H : the *source and target counital subalgebras* of H , respectively.

Remark 4.12. Since the counital subalgebras are separable and Frobenius, they are finite-dimensional. Moreover, $H_t^{\text{op}} \cong H_s$ as algebras.

Definition 4.13. A *weak Hopf algebra* is a sextuple $(H, m, u, \Delta, \varepsilon, S)$, where the quintuple $(H, m, u, \Delta, \varepsilon)$ is a weak bialgebra and $S : H \rightarrow H$ is a \mathbb{k} -linear map called the *antipode* that satisfies the following properties for all $h \in H$:

$$S(h_1)h_2 = \varepsilon_s(h), \quad h_1S(h_2) = \varepsilon_t(h), \quad S(h_1)h_2S(h_3) = S(h).$$

A *weak Hopf algebra homomorphism* between two weak Hopf algebras is a weak bialgebra map $f : H \rightarrow H'$ such that $S_{H'} \circ f = f \circ S_H$.

A *(weak) Hopf ideal* I of a weak Hopf algebra H is a biideal of H such that $S(I) \subseteq I$.

It follows that S is anti-multiplicative with respect to m , and anti-comultiplicative with respect to Δ . Moreover, the following conditions are equivalent: $\Delta(1_H) = 1_H \otimes 1_H$; $\varepsilon(xy) = \varepsilon(x)\varepsilon(y)$ for all $x, y \in H$; $S(x_1)x_2 = \varepsilon(x)1_H$ for all $x \in H$; $x_1S(x_2) = \varepsilon(x)1_H$ for all $x \in H$. In this case, H is a Hopf algebra.

Example 4.14. A groupoid algebra $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ is a weak Hopf algebra with $\Delta(g) = g \otimes g$, $\varepsilon(g) = 1_{\mathbb{k}}$, and $S(g) = g^{-1}$, for all $g \in \mathcal{G}_1$. Here, $(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G})_s = (\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G})_t = \bigoplus_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} \mathbb{k}e_x \cong \mathbb{k}^{\mathcal{G}_0}$.

We recall the definition of an H -module algebra over a weak Hopf algebra as follows.

Proposition 4.15. [BS00, Section 2.1] [CR22] (see also [WWW22]) *Let H be a weak Hopf algebra. Then, $H\text{-mod}$ is monoidal, where $V \otimes_{H\text{-mod}} W := \Delta(1_H) \cdot (V \otimes W)$ and $\mathbb{1} := H_t$. Also, the following are equivalent for an algebra A .*

- (a) *A is an H -module algebra (as in Definition 1.2).*
- (b) *A is a left H -module via $h \otimes a \mapsto h \cdot a$ satisfying $h \cdot ab = (h_1 \cdot a)(h_2 \cdot b)$, and $h \cdot 1_A = \varepsilon_t(h) \cdot 1_A$ for all $h \in H$, and $a, b \in A$ (as in [NV02, Definition 4.1.1]).* \square

Definition 4.16. Let H be a weak Hopf algebra. A left H -module algebra A is called *inner faithful* if the only weak Hopf ideal I of H such that $I \cdot A = 0$ is $I = 0$.

We also have a useful result about weak Hopf algebras and their module algebras.

Proposition 4.17. *Let $\{H_x\}_{x \in X}$ be a finite collection of a weak Hopf algebras.*

- (a) *Then $H = \bigoplus_{x \in X} H_x$ is a weak Hopf algebra. The algebra operations and antipode are defined component-wise, while the coalgebra structure is given by the sum of the component-wise operations. Moreover, $H_s = \bigoplus_{x \in X} (H_x)_s$ and $H_t = \bigoplus_{x \in X} (H_x)_t$.*
- (b) *If, for each $x \in X$, A_x is a left H_x -module algebra, then $\bigoplus_{x \in X} A_x$ is a left H -module algebra with H -action defined component-wise.* \square

4.4. Groupoids of grouplike elements. Now following [BGTL14, Corollary 6.6, Proposition 6.8, Theorem 8.4], consider the construction below.

Definition 4.18 ($\Gamma(H)$). [BG TLC14] Let H be a weak Hopf algebra over \mathbb{k} . The *groupoid of grouplike elements* of H , denoted $\Gamma(H)$, is defined as follows. The morphisms of $\Gamma(H)$ are the elements in

$$\Gamma(H)_1 = \{h \in H : \Delta(h) = h \otimes h, \varepsilon(h) = 1_{\mathbb{k}}\}.$$

The object set $\Gamma(H)_0$ is $\Gamma(H)_1 \cap H_t$. Each $h \in \Gamma(H)_1$ is an element in $\text{Hom}_{\Gamma(H)}(\varepsilon_s(h), \varepsilon_t(h))$; the inverse of $h \in \text{Hom}_{\Gamma(H)}(\varepsilon_s(h), \varepsilon_t(h))$ is given by $S(h) \in \text{Hom}_{\Gamma(H)}(\varepsilon_t(h), \varepsilon_s(h))$. The composition of morphisms is defined by restriction of the product in H .

If H is a Hopf algebra, then this definition gives the classical group of grouplike elements of H , and so we use the same notation $\Gamma(H)$ whether H is a Hopf algebra or a weak Hopf algebra. We remark that $\Gamma(H)_0$ is a finite set since H_t is finite-dimensional and grouplike elements are linearly independent. However, $\Gamma(H)_0$ may be empty (see Example 4.21 below). We now seek to understand $\Gamma(H)_0$ in two cases: when $H_s \cap H_t \cong \mathbb{k}$ and when $H_s = H_t$.

The next result shows that it is possible to understand the object set $\Gamma(H)_0$ in terms of its *minimal weak Hopf subalgebra* $H_{\min} := H_s H_t$, which was studied in [Nik02, Nik04].

Lemma 4.19. *Let H be a weak Hopf algebra. Then*

$$\Gamma(H)_0 = \{p \in H_s \cap H_t \mid p \text{ is a nonzero idempotent and } \dim(H_{\min} p) = 1\}.$$

Proof. Note that for $x \in \Gamma(H)_1$, by the above definition, both $\varepsilon_s(x)$ and $\varepsilon_t(x)$ are objects in $\Gamma(H)$. This forces $\Gamma(H)_0 \subseteq H_t \cap H_s$. Now take $p \in \Gamma(H)_0$. Since p is identified with the identity morphism at p , we also see that $p^2 = p$. Since $\varepsilon(p) = 1$, this shows that p is a nonzero idempotent. Now by [Nik04, p. 643], we have that $H_{\min} p = p H_{\min} p$ is a weak Hopf algebra with unit p . However, since $\Delta(p) = p \otimes p$, we get that $H_{\min} p$ is actually a Hopf algebra. Thus $\dim(H_{\min} p) = 1$ as $H_{\min} p = (H_{\min} p)_{\min} = \mathbb{k} p$.

Conversely, suppose that $p \in H_s \cap H_t$ is a nonzero idempotent such that $H_{\min} p$ has dimension 1. Since $H_{\min} p$ has a weak Hopf algebra structure, $\Delta(H_{\min} p) \subset H_{\min} p \otimes H_{\min} p$. Write $\Delta(p) = \alpha p \otimes p$ for $\alpha \in \mathbb{k}$. Since $\Delta(p) = \Delta(p^k) = \alpha^k p \otimes p$ for any positive integer k , $(\alpha)^k = \alpha$ and so $\alpha = 1$. So, $\Delta(p) = p \otimes p$. Next, $p = (\varepsilon \otimes \text{Id})\Delta(p) = \varepsilon(p)p$; thus, $\varepsilon(p) = 1_{\mathbb{k}}$. Hence, $p \in \Gamma(H)_0$, as desired. \square

Next, we consider the case when $H_s \cap H_t \cong \mathbb{k}$.

Proposition 4.20. *If H is a weak Hopf algebra with $H_s \cap H_t \cong \mathbb{k}$. Then H is either a Hopf algebra or $\Gamma(H)_0 = \emptyset$.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.19, we have that $|\Gamma(H)_0| \leq 1$. If $|\Gamma(H)_0| = 1$, then there exists some scalar $\alpha \in \mathbb{k}$ such that $\Gamma(H)_0 = \alpha 1_H$. Since $\alpha 1_H$ is grouplike, $\Delta(1_H) = \alpha(1_H \otimes 1_H)$. By [NV02, Proposition 2.2.2], $H_t = H_s = \mathbb{k} 1_H$ and hence H is a Hopf algebra. Otherwise, $|\Gamma(H)_0| = 0$, whence $\Gamma(H)_0 = \emptyset$. \square

Example 4.21. Let $N \geq 2$ be an integer, let $\epsilon \in \{1, -1\}$, and consider the face algebra $H = \mathfrak{S}(A_{N-1}; t)_{\epsilon}$ introduced by Hayashi [Hay99, Example 2.1]. Then H is a weak Hopf algebra with $H_s \cap H_t = \mathbb{k} 1_H$. So by the result above, we have that $\Gamma(H)_0 = \emptyset$.

We now consider the case when $H_s = H_t$. In particular, this holds if H is a cocommutative weak Hopf algebra.

Proposition 4.22. *Let H be a weak Hopf algebra with $H_s = H_t$. Then the following statements hold.*

- (a) $\Gamma(H)_0 = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$, where $1_H = \sum_{i=1}^n e_i$ and $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ is a complete set of primitive orthogonal idempotents. Moreover, each e_i is grouplike.

- (b) If A is a left H -module algebra, then $A = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n A_i$ is an X -decomposable algebra where $X = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ is a complete set of primitive idempotents of H . The local identities of A are given by the family of orthogonal idempotents $\{e_i \cdot 1_A \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$.
- (c) Suppose, further, that $H = \bigoplus_{x \in X} H_x$ is a direct sum of weak Hopf algebras H_x . If A is a left H -module algebra, then A is X -decomposable, and A_x is a left H_x -module algebra obtained by restricting the action of H on A , for each $x \in X$. Moreover, $H_y \cdot A_x = 0$ if $x \neq y$.

Proof. (a) If $H_s = H_t$, then $H_s = H_t = H_{\min}$ is a commutative semisimple algebra by Remark 4.12. Hence, $H_t = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n H_t e_i$, where $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ is a complete set of primitive orthogonal idempotents. Since \mathbb{k} is algebraically closed, so $H_t e_i \cong \mathbb{k} e_i$ for i . Now apply Lemma 4.19 to get the first statement.

Next, by [NV02, Proposition 2.2.1(iii)], $\Delta(e_i) = 1_1 e_i \otimes 1_2 = 1_1 \otimes e_i 1_2 = 1_1 \otimes 1_2 e_i$. Since each e_i is idempotent, we therefore have

$$\Delta(e_i) = \Delta(e_i^2) = (1_1 e_i \otimes 1_2)(1_1' \otimes 1_2' e_i) = 1_1 e_i \otimes 1_2 e_i = \Delta(1_H)(e_i \otimes e_i).$$

Writing $\Delta(1_H) = \sum_{i,j=1}^n \alpha_{i,j} e_i \otimes e_j$ for some scalars $\alpha_{i,j} \in \mathbb{k}$, we see that

$$\Delta(e_i) = \sum_{i,j=1}^n (\alpha_{i,j} e_i \otimes e_j)(e_i \otimes e_i) = \alpha_{i,i} e_i \otimes e_i.$$

Since $\Delta(e_i) = \Delta(e_i^k) = \alpha_{i,i}^k e_i \otimes e_i$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, so $\alpha_{i,i} = 1$. Thus, $\Delta(e_i) = e_i \otimes e_i$.

(b) Take $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ as in part (a). Next define the \mathbb{k} -linear map $\varepsilon'_s : H \rightarrow H$ by $\varepsilon'_s(h) = 1_1 \varepsilon(1_2 h)$. It follows from a left-sided version of [CDG00, Proposition 4.15] that

$$(4.23) \quad (h \cdot 1_A)a = \varepsilon_t(h)a \quad \text{and} \quad a(h \cdot 1_A) = \varepsilon'_s(h)a,$$

for any $a \in A$ and $h \in H$. Note that for $h \in H$, we have

$$\varepsilon'_s(h) = 1_1 \varepsilon(1_2 h) = \sum_{i=1}^n e_i \varepsilon(e_i h) = \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon(e_i h) e_i = \varepsilon(1_1 h) 1_2 = \varepsilon_t(h).$$

In particular, for any $1 \leq j \leq n$, we have

$$(4.24) \quad \varepsilon'_s(e_j) = e_j.$$

Therefore, by (4.23) we see that

$$(4.25) \quad (h \cdot 1_A)a = a(h \cdot 1_A)$$

for any $a \in A$ and $h \in H$.

By Definition 3.19, to show that A is an X -decomposable algebra it suffices to check that $\{e_i \cdot 1_A \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ is a complete set of orthogonal central idempotents of A . Indeed,

$$(e_i \cdot 1_A)(e_j \cdot 1_A) \stackrel{(4.23)}{=} \varepsilon'_s(e_j)(e_i \cdot 1_A) \stackrel{(4.24)}{=} e_j(e_i \cdot 1_A) = \delta_{i,j} e_i \cdot 1_A.$$

So $e_i \cdot 1_A$ and $e_j \cdot 1_A$ are mutually orthogonal idempotents. It follows from $\sum_{i=1}^n (e_i \cdot 1_A) = (\sum_{i=1}^n e_i) \cdot 1_A = 1_A$ that $\{e_i \cdot 1_A \mid e_i \in X\}$ is a complete set of idempotents. Letting $h = e_i$ in (4.25), we get $(e_i \cdot 1_A)a = a(e_i \cdot 1_A)$ for all $a \in A$. Hence each $e_i \cdot 1_A$ is central in A .

(c) We give the proof in the case that $|X| = 2$. The proof easily generalizes to any finite set X . Let H_1 and H_2 be weak Hopf algebras and suppose that A_i is an H_i -module algebra for $i = 1, 2$. By part (b), we know that A is Y -decomposable, where $Y = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ is a complete set of primitive idempotents of H , and the algebra decomposition of A is given by

$$A = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n (e_i \cdot 1_A)A.$$

Suppose that $1_{H_1} = e_1 + \dots + e_k$ and $1_{H_2} = e_{k+1} + \dots + e_n$. Then

$$A = \bigoplus_{i=1}^k (e_i \cdot 1_A)A \oplus \bigoplus_{i=k+1}^n (e_i \cdot 1_A)A = (1_{H_1} \cdot 1_A)A \oplus (1_{H_2} \cdot 1_A)A.$$

For $i = 1, 2$, let $A_i = (1_{H_i} \cdot 1_A)A$, so that $A = A_1 \oplus A_2$.

We claim that $H_i \cdot A_i \subseteq A_i$, but $H_i \cdot A_j = 0$ if $i \neq j$. Choosing $h_i \in H_i$ and $a_j = (1_{H_j} \cdot 1_A)a \in A_j$ for some $a \in A$, if $i \neq j \in \{1, 2\}$, then we compute:

$$h_i \cdot a_j = h_i \cdot ((1_{H_j} \cdot 1_A)a) = ((h_i)_{(1)} \cdot (1_{H_j} \cdot 1_A))((h_i)_{(2)} \cdot a) = (((h_i)_{(1)} 1_{H_j}) \cdot 1_A)((h_i)_{(2)} \cdot a) = 0.$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $h_1 \cdot a_1 = b_1 + b_2$ where $h_1 \in H_1$, $a_1 \in A_1$, and $b_i \in A_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then, $h_1 \cdot a_1 = 1_{H_1} \cdot b_1 + 1_{H_1} \cdot b_2 = b_1$. So, $H_1 \cdot A_1 \subseteq A_1$. Likewise, $H_2 \cdot A_2 \subseteq A_2$ as claimed. \square

As a corollary to the previous proposition, we obtain that groupoid actions on domains factor through group actions; cf. similar results for inner faithful Hopf actions on various domains factoring through actions of groups [EW14, CEW15, CEW16, EW16, EW17].

Corollary 4.26. *Suppose that \mathcal{G} is a finite groupoid and A is a domain such that A is an inner faithful $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ -module algebra. Then \mathcal{G} is a disjoint union of groups, and at most one of the groups is nontrivial.*

Proof. By Proposition 4.22, if A is a $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ -module algebra, then A is X -decomposable where $X = \{1, \dots, n\}$ is the set of objects of \mathcal{G} , that is, $A = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n A_i$. Since A is a domain, this implies that exactly one of the A_i is nonzero. Suppose $A_1 \neq 0$, without loss of generality. Now consider the ideal of $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ defined by

$$I = \langle g - e_i \mid g \in \mathcal{G} \text{ such that } s(g) = t(g) = i, 2 \leq i \leq n \rangle.$$

It is straight-forward to check that I is in fact a weak Hopf ideal of $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$. Further observe that if $a \in A_1$ and $g - e_i$ is a generator of I (so $i \neq 1$), then we have $(g - e_i) \cdot a = 0$. Hence, $I \cdot A_1 = 0$, whence $I \cdot A = 0$. Since A is inner faithful, this implies that for $2 \leq i \leq n$, the only element $g \in \mathcal{G}$ satisfying $s(g) = t(g) = i$ is the trivial path e_i . This shows that \mathcal{G} is a disjoint union of trivial groups, together with a possibly nontrivial group at vertex 1. \square

4.5. Key categories. Next, we define categories that will play the role of **Alg**, **Group**, and **Hopf** from the classical symmetry case studied in Section 2.1.

Definition 4.27 (X -Alg, X -Grpd, X -WeakHopf). We define the following categories.

(a) Let X -Alg be the category defined as follows:

- The objects are unital algebras A with a given set $\{e_x^A\}_{x \in X}$ of nonzero orthogonal idempotents such that $1_A = \sum_{x \in X} e_x^A$; we call these X -algebras.
- The morphisms are unital algebra maps $f : A \rightarrow B$ such that $f(e_x^A) = e_x^B$ for every $x \in X$; we call these maps X -algebra homomorphisms.

(b) Let X -Grpd be the category defined as follows:

- the objects are groupoids \mathcal{G} such that $\mathcal{G}_0 = X$; we call these X -groupoids,
- the morphisms are groupoid homomorphisms leaving X fixed, i.e., functors $\pi : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}'$ such that $\pi(x) = x$ for all $x \in X$; we call these functors X -groupoid homomorphisms.

(c) Let X -WeakHopf be the category defined as follows:

- The objects are weak Hopf algebras H with a given set $\{e_x^H\}_{x \in X}$ of nonzero orthogonal idempotents such that $1_H = \sum_{x \in X} e_x^H$, $\Delta(e_x^H) = e_x^H \otimes e_x^H$, and $\varepsilon(e_x^H) = 1_{\mathbb{k}}$ for all $x \in X$; we call these X -weak Hopf algebras.
- The morphisms are unital weak Hopf algebra homomorphisms $f : H \rightarrow H'$ such that $f(e_x^H) = e_x^{H'}$ for all $x \in X$; we call these maps X -weak Hopf algebra homomorphisms.

- Remark 4.28.** (a) Every X -decomposable algebra is an X -algebra, but not conversely (as the idempotents of an X -algebra are not necessarily central).
- (b) We have that $X\text{-WeakHopf}$ is a subcategory of $X\text{-Alg}$.
- (c) By Proposition 4.22(a), a weak Hopf algebra H satisfying $H_s = H_t$ is an X -weak Hopf algebra, where X is the complete set of primitive idempotents of H .
- (d) By [NV02, Proposition 2.3.3], weak Hopf algebra morphisms preserve counital subalgebras. Hence, by considering all possible finite sets X , our results pertain to all weak Hopf algebra with commutative counital subalgebras, and all morphisms between such weak Hopf algebras.
- (e) We remark that the category \mathbf{wha} considered in [BGTLC14] has a weaker notion of morphisms than those in $X\text{-WeakHopf}$ here. The morphisms in \mathbf{wha} need not be weak Hopf algebra morphisms (e.g., they are not necessarily algebra homomorphisms; see [BGTLC14, Theorem 4.12]).

Example 4.29. Continuing Example 4.14, the groupoid algebra $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ belongs to $\mathcal{G}_0\text{-WeakHopf}$.

Example 4.30. Take a groupoid \mathcal{G} . Then a \mathcal{G}_0 -decomposable vector space $V = \bigoplus_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} V_x$ is a representation of \mathcal{G} if and only if $\mathcal{G} \rightarrow \text{GL}_{\mathcal{G}_0}(V)$ is a morphism in $\mathcal{G}_0\text{-Grpd}$. Moreover, a \mathcal{G}_0 -decomposable vector space $V = \bigoplus_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} V_x$ is a representation of $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ if and only if $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G} \rightarrow \text{End}(V)$ is a morphism in $\mathcal{G}_0\text{-Alg}$.

Consider the next preliminary result.

Lemma 4.31. *Let $A, B \in X\text{-Alg}$ with respective sets of idempotents $\{e_x^A\}_{x \in X}$ and $\{e_x^B\}_{x \in X}$. If $f : A \rightarrow B$ is an X -algebra map and $a \in A$ is a local unit in A , then $f(a)$ is a local unit in B .*

Proof. Let $a \in e_y^A A e_x^A$ for some $x, y \in X$. Then, $f(a) = f(e_y^A a e_x^A) = e_y^B f(a) e_x^B \in e_y^B B e_x^B$. Moreover, $f(a)f(\hat{a}) = f(a\hat{a}) = f(e_y^A) = e_y^B$, and similarly, $f(\hat{a})f(a) = e_x^B$. \square

4.6. Module algebras over groupoid algebras. We are now able to generalize Proposition 2.8. Note that we can recover that result by taking $|X| = 1$ in the theorem below.

Theorem 4.32. (a) *The following functors are well-defined:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{k}(-) : X\text{-Grpd} &\longrightarrow X\text{-Alg} && (\text{groupoid algebra}); \\ (-)_X^\times : X\text{-Alg} &\longrightarrow X\text{-Grpd} && (\text{groupoid of local units}). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, $\mathbb{k}(-) \dashv (-)_X^\times$, that is, for an X -groupoid \mathcal{G} and an X -algebra B , we have a bijection that is natural in each slot:

$$\text{Hom}_{X\text{-Grpd}}(\mathcal{G}, B_X^\times) \cong \text{Hom}_{X\text{-Alg}}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}, B).$$

(b) *The following functors are well-defined:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{k}(-) : X\text{-Grpd} &\longrightarrow X\text{-WeakHopf} && (\text{groupoid algebra}); \\ \Gamma(-) : X\text{-WeakHopf} &\longrightarrow X\text{-Grpd} && (\text{groupoid of grouplike elements}). \end{aligned}$$

Then, $\mathbb{k}(-) \dashv \Gamma(-)$, that is, for an X -groupoid \mathcal{G} and an X -weak Hopf algebra H , we have a bijection that is natural in each slot:

$$\text{Hom}_{X\text{-Grpd}}(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma(H)) \cong \text{Hom}_{X\text{-WeakHopf}}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}, H).$$

In particular, $\Gamma(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}) = \mathcal{G}$.

Proof. (a) Firstly, we prove that $\mathbb{k}(-) : X\text{-Grpd} \rightarrow X\text{-Alg}$ is indeed a functor. As mentioned in Remark 4.6 and Example 4.9(b), $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ is an X -algebra with idempotent set $\{e_x^{\mathcal{G}}\}_{x \in X}$ given by the identity morphisms of \mathcal{G} , so $\mathbb{k}(-)$ sends objects to objects. Also, if $\phi : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}'$ is an X -groupoid homomorphism, then we can consider ϕ as a function between \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}'_1 so the linear extension $\mathbb{k}\phi : \mathbb{k}\mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}'$ makes sense. It is straight-forward to check that ϕ being a functor translates into $\mathbb{k}\phi$ being an X -algebra map. Hence, $\mathbb{k}(-)$ also sends morphisms to morphisms. Since the linear extension of a map behaves as the map itself when restricted to basis elements, $\mathbb{k}(-)$ respects compositions and identities.

Secondly, we check that $(-)_X^\times : X\text{-Alg} \rightarrow X\text{-Grpd}$ is a functor. By construction, the groupoid of local units is an X -groupoid, so $(-)_X^\times$ sends objects to objects. Moreover, if $\psi : A \rightarrow B$ is an X -algebra map, we can define the X -groupoid map $\psi_X^\times : A_X^\times \rightarrow B_X^\times$ where $a : x \rightarrow y$ maps to $\psi(a) : x \rightarrow y$ (which is a local unit by Lemma 4.31). So ψ_X^\times fixes X and it is a functor due to the properties of ψ . Also, $(-)_X^\times$ respects compositions and identities.

Now, for any X -groupoid \mathcal{G} and any X -algebra B , we want to display a bijection

$$\text{Hom}_{X\text{-Grpd}}(\mathcal{G}, B_X^\times) \cong \text{Hom}_{X\text{-Alg}}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}, B).$$

Given an X -groupoid homomorphism $\phi \in \text{Hom}_{X\text{-Grpd}}(\mathcal{G}, B_X^\times)$, we consider it as a function $\phi : \mathcal{G}_1 \rightarrow (B_X^\times)_1$, and construct the linear extension $\phi' : \mathbb{k}\mathcal{G} \rightarrow B$. Note that for $g \in \mathcal{G}_1$, $\phi'(g) = \phi(g)$, which implies that ϕ' is indeed an X -algebra map. Such verification uses that $1_B = \sum_{x \in X} e_x^B$. Hence, we have constructed the assignment

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{G}, B} : \text{Hom}_{X\text{-Grpd}}(\mathcal{G}, B_X^\times) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_{X\text{-Alg}}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}, B), \quad \phi \mapsto \phi'.$$

On the other hand, given an X -algebra map $\psi \in \text{Hom}_{X\text{-Alg}}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}, B)$, consider the restriction $\psi|_{\mathcal{G}} : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow B_X^\times$ given by $\psi|_{\mathcal{G}}(g : x \rightarrow y) := \psi(g) : x \rightarrow y$. As above, this assignment is well-defined due to Lemma 4.31. The fact that $\psi|_{\mathcal{G}}$ is a functor follows from ψ being an X -algebra map. Hence, we have constructed the assignment

$$\Psi_{\mathcal{G}, B} : \text{Hom}_{X\text{-Alg}}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}, B) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_{X\text{-Grpd}}(\mathcal{G}, B_X^\times), \quad \psi \mapsto \psi|_{\mathcal{G}}.$$

The following calculations show that these assignments are mutually-inverse. If $g : x \rightarrow y$ in \mathcal{G}_1 , then

$$\begin{aligned} [(\Psi_{\mathcal{G}, B} \circ \Phi_{\mathcal{G}, B})(\phi)](g) &= \Psi_{\mathcal{G}, B}(\phi')(g) = \phi'|_{\mathcal{G}}(g) = \phi(g), \\ [(\Phi_{\mathcal{G}, B} \circ \Psi_{\mathcal{G}, B})(\psi)](g) &= \Phi_{\mathcal{G}, B}(\psi|_{\mathcal{G}})(g) = (\psi|_{\mathcal{G}})'(g) = \psi(g). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, the bijection is natural since for any X -groupoid homomorphism $\varphi : \mathcal{G}' \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$, any X -algebra map $f : B \rightarrow B'$, and all $\psi \in \text{Hom}_{X\text{-Alg}}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}, B)$ one can check the following equality:

$$(\Phi_{\mathcal{G}', B'} \circ \text{Hom}_{X\text{-Alg}}(\mathbb{k}\varphi, f))(\psi) = (\text{Hom}_{X\text{-Grpd}}(\varphi, f_X^\times) \circ \Phi_{\mathcal{G}, B})(\psi).$$

Here, $\text{Hom}_{X\text{-Alg}}(\mathbb{k}\varphi, f) : \text{Hom}_{X\text{-Alg}}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}, B) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{X\text{-Alg}}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}', B')$ is given by composition, i.e., $\psi \mapsto f \circ \psi \circ \mathbb{k}\varphi$; a similar notion holds for $\text{Hom}_{X\text{-Grpd}}(\varphi, f_X^\times)$.

(b) First, we show that $\mathbb{k}(-) : X\text{-Grpd} \rightarrow X\text{-WeakHopf}$ is a functor. If \mathcal{G} is an X -groupoid, then $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ is a weak Hopf algebra structure by Example 4.14. The set $\{e_x^{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}}\}_{x \in X}$ of identity morphisms of \mathcal{G} are idempotent elements of $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ satisfying $1_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}} = \sum_{x \in X} e_x^{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}}$ and $\Delta(e_x^{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}}) = e_x^{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}} \otimes e_x^{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}}$ for each $x \in X$, and so $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ is an object of $X\text{-WeakHopf}$. If $\phi : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}'$ is an X -groupoid homomorphism, then by part (a), $\mathbb{k}\phi : \mathbb{k}\mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}'$ is a map of X -algebras. Since the elements of \mathcal{G} form a \mathbb{k} -basis of grouplike elements for $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$, and $\mathbb{k}\phi$ maps these elements to grouplike elements of $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}'$, we have that $\mathbb{k}\phi$ is also a coalgebra map. Since the antipode of $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ is defined by $S_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}}(g) = g^{-1}$ for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$, therefore $S_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}'} \circ \mathbb{k}\phi = \mathbb{k}\phi \circ S_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}}$. Finally, $\phi(e_x^{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}}) = e_x^{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}'}$, so $\mathbb{k}\phi$ is a morphism in $X\text{-WeakHopf}$.

Now we show that $\Gamma(-) : X\text{-WeakHopf} \rightarrow X\text{-Grpd}$ is a functor. Note that $\Gamma(-)$ is the restriction of the functor $\mathbf{g}(-) : \mathbf{wha} \rightarrow \mathbf{Grpd}$ in [BGTLC14, Theorem 8.4] to $X\text{-WeakHopf}$, where the category \mathbf{wha} has a weaker notion of morphism; see Remark 4.28(e). So, we need only check that if $H \in X\text{-WeakHopf}$ then $\Gamma(H) \in X\text{-Grpd}$. Indeed, if $H \in X\text{-WeakHopf}$, then $\Gamma(H)$ is a groupoid with object set $\{e_x^H\}_{x \in X}$, and so $\Gamma(H) \in X\text{-Grpd}$. We remark that if $f : H \rightarrow H'$ is a morphism in $X\text{-WeakHopf}$, then $\Gamma(f)$ is the restriction of f to $\Gamma(H)$.

Finally, for any $\mathcal{G} \in X\text{-Grpd}$ and $H \in X\text{-WeakHopf}$, we wish to exhibit a bijection

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{X\text{-Grpd}}(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma(H)) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{X\text{-WeakHopf}}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}, H).$$

Given $\phi \in \mathrm{Hom}_{X\text{-Grpd}}(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma(H))$, the \mathbb{k} -linearization $\mathbb{k}\phi : \mathbb{k}\mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{k}\Gamma(H)$ is a morphism of X -weak Hopf algebras. Since composition in $\Gamma(H)$ was defined as restriction of multiplication in H , the map $\nu_H : \mathbb{k}\Gamma(H) \rightarrow H$ induced by the inclusion $\Gamma(H) \subseteq H$ is an algebra map. It is also unital. Since the elements of $\Gamma(H)$ are grouplike in H , it is also a coalgebra map. Since the inverse in $\Gamma(H)$ coincides with the antipode of H , ν_H intertwines the antipodes of $\mathbb{k}\Gamma(H)$ and H . Therefore, $\nu_H \circ \mathbb{k}\phi \in \mathrm{Hom}_{X\text{-WeakHopf}}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}, H)$, and we have the assignment

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{G}, H} : \mathrm{Hom}_{X\text{-Grpd}}(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma(H)) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{X\text{-WeakHopf}}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}, H), \quad \phi \mapsto \nu_H \circ \mathbb{k}\phi.$$

Conversely, if $\psi \in \mathrm{Hom}_{X\text{-WeakHopf}}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}, H)$, then $\Gamma(\psi) : \Gamma(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}) \rightarrow \Gamma(H)$ is an X -groupoid morphism. Note that $\Gamma(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}) = \mathcal{G}$. It is clear that the elements of \mathcal{G} are grouplike elements of $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$. On the other hand, any element of $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ is of the form $a = \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \alpha_g g$, where

$$a \otimes a = \left(\sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \alpha_g g \right) \otimes \left(\sum_{h \in \mathcal{G}} \alpha_h h \right) = \sum_{g, h \in \mathcal{G}} \alpha_g \alpha_h (g \otimes h)$$

and $\Delta(a) = \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \alpha_g (g \otimes g)$. By the linear independence of grouplike elements, if $a \in \Gamma(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G})$ we have that $\alpha_g \alpha_h = \delta_{g, h} \alpha_g$, whence exactly one $\alpha_g = 1$ and the remaining coefficients are 0. Hence, the only grouplike elements of $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ are the elements of \mathcal{G} . We have therefore constructed an assignment

$$\Psi_{\mathcal{G}, H} : \mathrm{Hom}_{X\text{-WeakHopf}}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}, H) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{X\text{-Grpd}}(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma(H)), \quad \psi \mapsto \Gamma(\psi) \circ \eta_{\mathcal{G}},$$

where $\eta_{\mathcal{G}} : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G})$ is the identity map.

It is straight-forward to check that $\Phi_{\mathcal{G}, H}$ and $\Psi_{\mathcal{G}, H}$ are mutually-inverse. Naturality holds by [BGTLC14, Theorem 8.4]. \square

Finally, we will establish that $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ acts on an algebra A categorically if and only if $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ acts on A representation-theoretically.

Corollary 4.33. *For a groupoid \mathcal{G} and an algebra A , the following statements are equivalent.*

- (a) A is a $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ -module algebra.
- (b) A is a \mathcal{G} -module algebra.
- (c) $A = \bigoplus_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} A_x$ is a \mathcal{G}_0 -decomposable algebra and there exists a functor

$$\pi : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathcal{G}_0\text{-Alg}}(A) = \Gamma(\mathbb{k}(\mathrm{Aut}_{\mathcal{G}_0\text{-Alg}}(A))),$$

such that $\pi(x) = A_x$ for all $x \in \mathcal{G}_0$.

- (d) $A = \bigoplus_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} A_x$ is a \mathcal{G}_0 -decomposable algebra and there exists an \mathcal{G}_0 -weak Hopf algebra homomorphism $\tilde{\pi} : \mathbb{k}\mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{k}(\mathrm{Aut}_{\mathcal{G}_0\text{-Alg}}(A))$.

Proof. Note that we have an isomorphism of categories, $\mathrm{rep}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}) \cong \mathrm{rep}(\mathcal{G})$, via Theorem 4.32(a). Namely, take $B = \mathrm{End}(V)$, for $V = \bigoplus_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} V_x$. So, $B_{\mathcal{G}_0}^\times = \mathrm{GL}_{\mathcal{G}_0}(V)$ and

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{G}_0\text{-Grpd}}(\mathcal{G}, \mathrm{GL}_{\mathcal{G}_0}(V)) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{G}_0\text{-Alg}}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}, \mathrm{End}(V)).$$

See also Example 4.30. Thus, parts (a) and (b) are equivalent.

The equivalence of parts (b) and (c) follows from Proposition 3.25.

Finally, the equivalence of parts (c) and (d) follows from Theorem 4.32(b). Namely, take $H = \mathbb{k}(\text{Aut}_{\mathcal{G}_0\text{-Alg}}(A))$ to get $\Gamma(H) = \text{Aut}_{\mathcal{G}_0\text{-Alg}}(A)$. Thus, we have a bijection:

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{G}_0\text{-Grpd}}(\mathcal{G}, \text{Aut}_{\mathcal{G}_0\text{-Alg}}(A)) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{G}_0\text{-Alg}}(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}, \mathbb{k}(\text{Aut}_{\mathcal{G}_0\text{-Alg}}(A))), \quad \pi \mapsto \tilde{\pi}. \quad \square$$

Remark 4.34. Corollary 4.33 has an alternative presentation appearing in [PF14, Proposition 2.2] using the language of partial actions.

5. ACTIONS OF X -LIE ALGEBROIDS ON ALGEBRAS

Lie algebroids were introduced in [Pra67] using the language of vector bundles over manifolds (see also [Mac87, Chapter III]). An equivalent purely algebraic structure, a Lie–Rinehart algebra, was introduced in [Rin63]. Although some Hopf-like structures have been defined for general Lie–Rinehart algebras by means of Hopf algebroids (see [Sar20, Sar21]), the study of their actions on algebras is still an open problem. The focus of this section is to study actions of the structures above in a special case [Definition 5.1]; the main result here is Proposition 5.9. We also extend this result for universal enveloping algebras [Definition 5.11] in Proposition 5.15.

As in previous sections, here X denotes a finite non-empty set [Notation 3.2].

Definition 5.1. An X -Lie algebroid \mathfrak{G} is a direct sum of vector spaces

$$\mathfrak{G} := \bigoplus_{x \in X} \mathfrak{g}_x$$

where \mathfrak{g}_x has structure of Lie algebra for all $x \in X$. We regard \mathfrak{G} as having a partially defined Lie bracket $[-, -]$, which is only defined on pairs of elements from the same component \mathfrak{g}_x . Namely, $[a, b] = [a, b]_{\mathfrak{g}_x}$ if $a, b \in \mathfrak{g}_x$ for some $x \in X$, and is undefined otherwise.

Let $\mathfrak{G} = \bigoplus_{x \in X} \mathfrak{g}_x$ and $\mathfrak{G}' = \bigoplus_{x \in X} \mathfrak{g}'_x$ be two X -Lie algebroids. A linear map $\tau : \mathfrak{G} \rightarrow \mathfrak{G}'$ is an X -Lie algebroid homomorphism if there exists a collection $\{\tau_x : \mathfrak{g}_x \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}'_x\}_{x \in X}$ of Lie algebra homomorphisms such that $\tau|_{\mathfrak{g}_x} = \tau_x$ for all $x \in X$. Here, we write $\tau = (\tau_x)_{x \in X}$.

As remarked in [Nik01, Section 3.2] an X -Lie algebroid is an special kind of Lie algebroid in the sense of [Mac87].

Notation 5.2 (X -Lie, \mathfrak{G}). The X -Lie algebroids together with X -Lie algebroid homomorphisms form a category, which we denote by X -Lie. Unless otherwise stated, throughout, $\mathfrak{G} = \bigoplus_{x \in X} \mathfrak{g}_x$ denotes an X -Lie algebroid.

Next, we briefly discuss modules and representations over X -Lie algebroids.

Definition 5.3 (\mathfrak{G} -module). A left \mathfrak{G} -module is an X -decomposable vector space $V = \bigoplus_{x \in X} V_x$ such that V_x is a left \mathfrak{g}_x -module for each $x \in X$.

Given two left \mathfrak{G} -modules $V = \bigoplus_{x \in X} V_x$ and $W = \bigoplus_{x \in X} W_x$, a linear map $f : V \rightarrow W$ is a \mathfrak{G} -module morphism if there exist a collection $\{f_x : V_x \rightarrow W_x\}_{x \in X}$ of maps such that $f|_{V_x} = f_x$ and f_x is a \mathfrak{g}_x -module morphism for each $x \in X$. Here, we write $f = (f_x)_{x \in X}$.

The composition of two \mathfrak{G} -module morphisms is defined component-wise (which is again a \mathfrak{G} -module morphism).

Notation 5.4 (\mathfrak{G} -mod). Let $\mathfrak{G}\text{-mod}$ be the category of left \mathfrak{G} -modules, which is monoidal by way of inheriting the monoidal structure of $\mathfrak{g}_x\text{-mod}$ for all $x \in X$. Namely, for V, W in $\mathfrak{G}\text{-mod}$, we have that $V \otimes_{\mathfrak{G}\text{-mod}} W := \bigoplus_{x \in X} (V_x \otimes_{\mathfrak{g}_x\text{-mod}} W_x)$, and $\mathbb{1}_{\mathfrak{G}\text{-mod}} = \bigoplus_{x \in X} \mathbb{1}_{\mathfrak{g}_x\text{-mod}}$.

Now we introduce a generalization of the space $\mathfrak{gl}(V)$ defined in Notation 2.11(a).

Definition 5.5 ($\mathfrak{GL}(V)$). Let $V = \bigoplus_{x \in X} V_x$ be an X -decomposable vector space. We denote by $\mathfrak{GL}(V)$ the X -Lie algebroid $\mathfrak{GL}_X(V) := \bigoplus_{x \in X} \mathfrak{gl}(V_x)$.

Definition 5.6 (Representation of \mathfrak{G}). A *representation* of \mathfrak{G} is an X -decomposable vector space $V = \bigoplus_{x \in X} V_x$ equipped with an X -Lie algebroid homomorphism $\tau : \mathfrak{G} \rightarrow \mathfrak{GL}_X(V)$.

Notation 5.7 ($\text{rep}(\mathfrak{G})$). Take $\text{rep}(\mathfrak{G})$ to be the monoidal category of representations of \mathfrak{G} , whose structure is built from $\{\mathfrak{g}_x\text{-mod}\}_{x \in X}$ (cf. Notation 5.4).

Observe that $\text{rep}(\mathfrak{G}) \cong \mathfrak{G}\text{-mod}$ as categories.

Now, we change our focus to actions of X -Lie algebroids over algebras. To proceed, we introduce a generalization of the Lie algebra $\text{Der}(A)$ of Notation 2.11(b).

Notation 5.8 ($\text{Der}_X(A)$). Let $A = \bigoplus_{x \in X} A_x$ be an X -decomposable algebra. We denote by $\text{Der}_X(A)$ the X -Lie algebroid $\text{Der}_X(A) = \bigoplus_{x \in X} \text{Der}(A_x)$.

Since each $\text{Der}(A_x)$ is a Lie subalgebra of $\mathfrak{gl}(A_x)$, we have that $\text{Der}_X(A)$ is an X -Lie subalgebroid of $\mathfrak{GL}(A)$. Similar to the groupoid case, when $|X| = 1$ we recover the classical Lie structures. We can now generalize Proposition 2.14 for X -Lie algebroids.

Proposition 5.9. *Let A be an algebra and \mathfrak{G} be an X -Lie algebroid. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (a) A is a left \mathfrak{G} -module algebra.
 - (b) $A = \bigoplus_{x \in X} A_x$ is an X -decomposable algebra and A is a left \mathfrak{G} -module, via structure maps $\cdot : \mathfrak{g}_x \otimes A_x \rightarrow A_x$, such that
- $$(5.10) \quad p_x \cdot (a_x b_x) = a_x(p_x \cdot b_x) + (p_x \cdot a_x)b_x \quad \text{and} \quad p_x \cdot 1_{A_x} = 0,$$
- for all $p_x \in \mathfrak{g}_x$ and $a_x, b_x \in A_x$. That is, A_x is a \mathfrak{g}_x -module algebra for each $x \in X$.
- (c) $A = \bigoplus_{x \in X} A_x$ is an X -decomposable algebra and there exists an X -Lie algebroid homomorphism $\tau : \mathfrak{G} \rightarrow \text{Der}_X(A)$.

Proof. By Notation 5.4, A is a left \mathfrak{G} -module algebra if and only if $A = \bigoplus_{x \in X} A_x$ and each A_x is a left \mathfrak{g}_x -module algebra. Therefore, it follows from Proposition 2.14 and Definition 5.3 that (a) and (b) are equivalent. Furthermore, from Proposition 2.14 we have that each \mathfrak{g}_x -module A_x admits a structure map satisfying (5.10) if and only if there is a Lie algebra homomorphism $\tau_x : \mathfrak{g}_x \rightarrow \text{Der}(A_x)$ for all $x \in X$. By taking $\tau : \mathfrak{G} \rightarrow \text{Der}_X(A)$ as $\tau := (\tau_x)_{x \in X}$, it is evident that (b) and (c) are equivalent. \square

Recall that by Propostion 4.17(a), a direct sum of Hopf algebras has a canonical weak Hopf algebra structure. Following [Nik01, Section 3.2] we recall a construction akin to the universal enveloping algebra of a Lie algebra.

Definition 5.11 ($U_X(\mathfrak{G})$). The X -universal enveloping algebra of \mathfrak{G} is the weak Hopf algebra $U_X(\mathfrak{G}) := \bigoplus_{x \in X} U(\mathfrak{g}_x)$, where each $U(\mathfrak{g}_x)$ is the classical universal enveloping algebra of the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g}_x .

Consider the following representation category for $U_X(\mathfrak{G})$.

Definition 5.12 ($\text{rep}(U_X(\mathfrak{G}))$). Let $\text{rep}(U_X(\mathfrak{G}))$ be the category of *representations of $U_X(\mathfrak{G})$* , that is, objects are X -decomposable vector spaces $V = \bigoplus_{x \in X} V_x$ such that each V_x is a representation of $U(\mathfrak{g}_x)$.

Remark 5.13. Observe that $\text{rep}(\mathfrak{G}) \cong \bigoplus_{x \in X} \text{rep}(\mathfrak{g}_x) \cong \bigoplus_{x \in X} \text{rep}(U(\mathfrak{g}_x)) \cong \text{rep}(U_X(\mathfrak{G}))$; see Notation 5.7. With this, the monoidal structure of $\text{rep}(\mathfrak{G})$ passes to $\text{rep}(U_X(\mathfrak{G}))$.

Finally, we will see that $U_X(\mathfrak{G})$ acting on an algebra A categorically is equivalent to $U_X(\mathfrak{G})$ acting on A representation-theoretically.

Recalling the definition of an X -Lie algebroid morphism and that of an X -weak Hopf algebra morphism in Definition 4.27, it follows from Proposition 2.20 that

$$(5.14) \quad \text{Hom}_{X\text{-Lie}}(\mathfrak{G}, \text{Der}_X(A)) \cong \text{Hom}_{X\text{-WeakHopf}}(U_X(\mathfrak{G}), U_X(\text{Der}_X(A))).$$

Proposition 5.15. *For an X -Lie algebroid \mathfrak{G} and an algebra A , the following statements are equivalent.*

- (a) A is a $U_X(\mathfrak{G})$ -module algebra.
- (b) A is a \mathfrak{G} -module algebra.
- (c) $A = \bigoplus_{x \in X} A_x$ is an X -decomposable algebra and there exists an X -Lie algebroid homomorphism $\tau : \mathfrak{G} \rightarrow \text{Der}_X(A)$ where $\tau := \{\tau_x : \mathfrak{g}_x \rightarrow \text{Der}(A_x)\}_{x \in X}$.
- (d) $A = \bigoplus_{x \in X} A_x$ is an X -decomposable algebra and there exists an X -weak Hopf algebra homomorphism $\tilde{\tau} : U_X(\mathfrak{G}) \rightarrow U_X(\text{Der}_X(A))$. For all $x \in X$, we have that $\tilde{\tau}|_{U(\mathfrak{g}_x)} = \tilde{\tau}_x : U(\mathfrak{g}_x) \rightarrow U(\text{Der}(A_x))$.

Proof. As a consequence of Proposition 4.22(c), we have that any $U_X(\mathfrak{G})$ -module algebra A is of the form $A = \bigoplus_{x \in X} A_x$ such that each subalgebra A_x is a $U(\mathfrak{g}_x)$ -module algebra. Hence, by Proposition 2.20, each A_x is a \mathfrak{g}_x -module algebra. By Proposition 5.9, $A = \bigoplus_{x \in X} A_x$ is a \mathfrak{G} -module algebra. Thus (a) implies (b). Similarly, we obtain that (b) implies (a) by Proposition 2.20 and Proposition 4.17(b).

The equivalences between (b) and (c), and between (c) and (d), follow from Proposition 5.9 and (5.14), respectively. \square

6. ACTIONS OF COCOMMUTATIVE WEAK HOPF ALGEBRAS ON ALGEBRAS

Our goal in this section is to generalize Theorem 2.22 to the case of cocommutative weak Hopf algebras. See Theorem 6.14 for the main result.

First, we recall the definition of the smash product over a weak Hopf algebra, which generalizes the construction of a classical smash product used in Section 2.3.

Definition 6.1 ([NV02, Section 4.2]). Let H be a weak Hopf algebra and let A be a left H -module algebra. The *smash product* algebra $A\#H$ is defined as the \mathbb{k} -vector space $A \otimes_{H_t} H$, where A is a right H_t -module via $a \cdot z = S^{-1}(z) \cdot a = a(z \cdot 1_A)$, for $a \in A$ and $z \in H_t$. Multiplication in $A\#H$ is defined by $(a\#h)(b\#g) = a(h_1 \cdot b)\#h_2g$. Here $a\#h$ denotes a coset representative of $a \otimes_{H_t} h$ for $a \in A$ and $h \in H$.

To give a generalization of the Cartier–Gabriel–Kostant–Milnor–Moore theorem, we need to endow the smash product with a weak Hopf algebra structure, so we introduce the following terminology and results.

Definition 6.2. Let H be an weak Hopf algebra. We say that H is a *X -decomposable weak Hopf algebra* if there exists a family $\{H_x\}_{x \in X}$ of weak Hopf algebras (some of which may be 0) such that $H = \bigoplus_{x \in X} H_x$ as weak Hopf algebras.

Remark 6.3. (a) Every X -decomposable weak Hopf algebra is a X -decomposable algebra [Definition 3.19].

- (b) This concept generalizes that of the X -weak Hopf algebra introduced in Definition 4.27(c). There, the orthogonal idempotents are grouplike, whereas in a X -decomposable weak Hopf algebra, since each H_x is itself a weak Hopf algebra, 1_x is not necessarily grouplike.

- (c) For every X -Lie algebroid $\mathfrak{G} = \bigoplus_{x \in X} \mathfrak{g}_x$, the X -universal enveloping algebra $U_X(\mathfrak{G})$ is a X -decomposable weak Hopf algebra.

Definition 6.4 ($\text{Aut}_{X\text{-WBA}}(H)$). Let $H = \bigoplus_{x \in X} H_x$ be an X -decomposable weak Hopf algebra. We define $\text{Aut}_{X\text{-WBA}}(H)$, the X -weak bialgebra automorphism groupoid of H , as follows:

- the objects are the weak Hopf algebras $\{H_x\}_{x \in X}$,
- for any $x, y \in X$, $\text{Hom}_{\text{Aut}_{X\text{-WBA}}(H)}(H_x, H_y)$ is the space of invertible weak bialgebra maps between the weak bialgebras H_x and H_y .

Clearly, $\text{Aut}_{X\text{-WBA}}(H)$ is a subgroupoid of $\text{Aut}_{X\text{-Alg}}(H)$.

Proposition 6.5. Let \mathcal{G} be a groupoid and $H = \bigoplus_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} H_x$ be a \mathcal{G}_0 -decomposable weak Hopf algebra. If H is a left $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ -module algebra, then the following statements are equivalent.

- (a) For every $g \in \mathcal{G}_1$ and $a \in H_{s(g)}$ the following relations hold:

$$(6.6) \quad \Delta_H(g \cdot a) = g \cdot a_1 \otimes g \cdot a_2,$$

$$(6.7) \quad \varepsilon_H(g \cdot a) = \varepsilon_{H_{s(g)}}(a).$$

- (b) There exists a \mathcal{G}_0 -groupoid homomorphism $\pi : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \text{Aut}_{\mathcal{G}_0\text{-WBA}}(H)$.

Moreover, in this case the smash product algebra $H \# \mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ becomes a weak Hopf algebra with operations given by:

$$(6.8) \quad \Delta(a \# g) = a_1 \# g \otimes a_2 \# g, \quad \varepsilon(a \# g) = \varepsilon_H(a), \quad S(a \# g) = (1_H \# g^{-1})(S_H(a) \# 1_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}}),$$

for all $g \in \mathcal{G}_1$ and $a \in H_{t(g)}$.

Proof. Since H is a left $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ -module algebra, Corollary 4.33 guarantees the existence of a \mathcal{G}_0 -groupoid homomorphism $\pi : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \text{Aut}_{\mathcal{G}_0\text{-Alg}}(H)$ that corresponds to the \mathcal{G} -action, i.e., $\pi(g)(a) = g \cdot a$ for all $g \in \mathcal{G}_1$ and $a \in H_{s(g)}$; note that if $a \in H_x$ with $x \neq s(g)$ then $g \cdot a = 0$. Equations (6.6) and (6.7) are equivalent to the statement that for all $g \in \mathcal{G}_0$ the algebra map $\pi(g) : H_{s(g)} \rightarrow H_{t(g)}$ is a coalgebra homomorphism. But this is the same as requiring the image of π to be contained in the subgroupoid $\text{Aut}_{\mathcal{G}_0\text{-Bialg}}(H)$. This proves that (a) and (b) are equivalent.

Now, it is clear that $H \# \mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ is both an algebra and a coalgebra, and the maps of (6.8) are well-defined. Moreover, for all $g, h \in \mathcal{G}_1$ such that $t(h) = s(g)$, $a \in H_{t(g)}$ and $b \in H_{s(g)}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta((a \# g)(b \# h)) &= a_1(g \cdot b)_1 \# gh \otimes a_2(g \cdot b)_2 \# gh \stackrel{(6.6)}{=} a_1(g \cdot b_1) \# gh \otimes a_2(g \cdot b_2) \# gh \\ &= (a_1 \# g \otimes a_2 \# g)(b_1 \# h \otimes b_2 \# h) = \Delta(a \# g)\Delta(b \# h), \end{aligned}$$

which proves that Δ is multiplicative. Note that if $g, h \in \mathcal{G}_1$ and $a, b \in H$ do not satisfy the conditions above, both sides of the above equation are zero. Also, if $g, h, l \in \mathcal{G}_1$ satisfy $t(h) = s(g)$ and $t(l) = s(h)$, and $a \in H_{t(g)}$, $b \in H_{s(g)}$, $c \in H_{s(h)}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon((a \# g)(b \# h)(c \# l)) &= \varepsilon(a(g \cdot b)(gh \cdot c) \# gh) = \varepsilon_H(a(g \cdot b)(gh \cdot c)) \\ &\stackrel{(6.6)}{=} \varepsilon_H(a(g \cdot b_1))\varepsilon_H((g \cdot b_2)(gh \cdot c)) = \varepsilon_H(a(g \cdot b_1))\varepsilon_H(g \cdot (b_2(h \cdot c))) \\ &\stackrel{(6.7)}{=} \varepsilon_H(a(g \cdot b_1))\varepsilon_H(b_2(h \cdot c)) = \varepsilon(a(g \cdot b_1) \# gh)\varepsilon(b_2(h \cdot c) \# hl) \\ &= \varepsilon((a \# g)(b \# h)_1)\varepsilon((b \# h)_2(c \# l)), \end{aligned}$$

and similarly, $\varepsilon((a\#g)(b\#h)(c\#l)) = \varepsilon((a\#g)(b\#h)_2)\varepsilon((b\#h)_1(c\#l))$, so ε is weak multiplicative. Further, letting $1 := 1_H$, $1_x = 1_{H_x}$ for all $x \in \mathcal{G}_0$, and $1_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}} = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} e_x$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (\Delta(1\#1_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}}) \otimes 1\#1_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}})(1\#1_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}} \otimes \Delta(1\#1_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}})) \\
 &= \left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} \Delta(1\#e_x) \otimes \sum_{y \in \mathcal{G}_0} 1\#e_y \right) \left(\sum_{z \in \mathcal{G}_0} 1\#e_z \otimes \sum_{w \in \mathcal{G}_0} \Delta(1\#e_w) \right) \\
 &= \left(\sum_{x,y \in \mathcal{G}_0} 1_1\#e_x \otimes 1_2\#e_x \otimes 1\#e_y \right) \left(\sum_{z,w \in \mathcal{G}_0} 1\#e_z \otimes 1'_1\#e_w \otimes 1'_2\#e_w \right) \\
 &= \sum_{x,y,z,w \in \mathcal{G}_0} [1_1\#e_x][1\#e_z] \otimes [1_2\#e_x][1'_1\#e_w] \otimes [1\#e_y][1'_2\#e_w] \\
 &= \sum_{x,y,z,w \in \mathcal{G}_0} 1_1(e_x \cdot 1)\#e_x e_z \otimes 1_2(e_x \cdot 1'_1)\#e_x e_w \otimes e_y \cdot 1'_2\#e_y e_w \\
 &\stackrel{(*)}{=} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} (1_x)_1\#e_x \otimes (1_x)_2(1_x)'_1\#e_x \otimes (1_x)'_2\#e_x \\
 &\stackrel{(**)}{=} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} (1_x)_1\#e_x \otimes (1_x)_2\#e_x \otimes (1_x)_3\#e_x \stackrel{(***)}{=} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} 1_1\#e_x \otimes 1_2\#e_x \otimes 1_3\#e_x \\
 &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} \Delta(1_1\#e_x) \otimes 1_2\#e_x = \Delta^2(1\#1_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}}).
 \end{aligned}$$

In (*) we used that $e_x \cdot 1 = 1_x$, in (**) that each H_x is a weak Hopf algebra, while in (***) that $(1_y)_1\#e_x = 0$ if $x \neq y$; recall $(\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G})_t = \bigoplus_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} \mathbb{k}e_x$. This proves that Δ is weak comultiplicative and thus the smash product $H\#\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ is a weak bialgebra. Finally, if $g \in \mathcal{G}_1$ and $a \in H_{s(g)}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
 S(a_1\#g)(a_2\#g) &= (1\#g^{-1})(S_H(a_1)\#1_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}})(a_2\#g) = g^{-1} \cdot (S_H(a_1)a_2)\#e_{s(g)} \\
 &= g^{-1}(\varepsilon_H)_s(a)\#e_{s(g)} = (g^{-1} \cdot 1_1\#e_{s(g)})\varepsilon_H(a_1a_2) \\
 &\stackrel{(*)}{=} (g^{-1} \cdot 1_1\#e_{s(g)})\varepsilon_H(a(g \cdot 1_2)) \stackrel{(**)}{=} (1_1\#e_{s(g)})\varepsilon_H(a(g \cdot 1_2)) \\
 &\stackrel{(***)}{=} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} (1_1\#e_x)\varepsilon(a(g \cdot 1_2)\#ge_x) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} (1_1\#e_x)\varepsilon((a\#g)(1_2\#e_x)) \\
 &= (1\#1_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}})_1\varepsilon((a\#g)(1\#1_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}})_2) = \varepsilon_s(a\#g).
 \end{aligned}$$

Here we used in (*) the structure of H as a \mathcal{G}_0 -decomposable weak Hopf algebra, in (**) the underlying vector space structure of the smash product, and in (***) that $(1_y)_1\#e_x = 0$ if $x \neq y$. Similarly, one can prove $(a_1\#g)S(a_2\#g) = \varepsilon_t(a\#g)$. Lastly,

$$\begin{aligned}
 S((a\#g)_1)(a\#g)_2S((a\#g)_3) &= (1\#g^{-1})(S_H(a_1)\#1_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}})(a_2\#g)(1\#g^{-1})(S_H(a_3)\#1_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}}) \\
 &= (g^{-1} \cdot (S_H(a_1)a_2)\#1_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}})(g^{-1} \cdot S_H(a_3)\#g^{-1}) \\
 &= g^{-1} \cdot (S_H(a_1)a_2S_H(a_3))\#g^{-1} \stackrel{(*)}{=} g^{-1} \cdot S_H(a)\#g^{-1} \\
 &= (1\#g^{-1})(S_H(a)\#1_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}}) = S(a\#g).
 \end{aligned}$$

Here, we used in (*) that S_H is an antipode for H . This ends the proof and thus $H\#\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ is a weak Hopf algebra. \square

Remark 6.9. (a) Let \mathcal{G} be a groupoid acting by conjugation on a \mathcal{G}_0 -Lie algebroid \mathfrak{G} . This induces an action of the groupoid algebra $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ on the \mathcal{G}_0 -universal enveloping

algebra $U_{\mathcal{G}_0}(\mathfrak{G})$ satisfying the conditions of Proposition 6.5(a). Thus $U_{\mathcal{G}_0}(\mathfrak{G})\#\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ is a weak Hopf algebra.

- (b) Let G be a group and H be a Hopf algebra. If H is a left $\mathbb{k}G$ -module algebra, then Proposition 6.5 translates into the following classical well-known result: if there is a group homomorphism from G to the group of bialgebra automorphisms of H , $\pi : G \rightarrow \text{Aut}_{\text{Bialg}}(H)$, or equivalently, if the maps $\pi_g : H \rightarrow H$ given by $a \mapsto g \cdot a$ for $g \in G$ are all coalgebra homomorphisms, then the smash product algebra $H\#\mathbb{k}G$ has structure of Hopf algebra with operations as in (6.8). In particular, this proves that the (classical) smash products of Section 2.3 are indeed Hopf algebras.

Next, we recall Nikshych's generalization of the Cartier–Gabriel–Kostant–Milnor–Moore theorem to the weak Hopf setting.

Theorem 6.10 ([Nik01, Theorem 3.2.4]). *Any cocommutative weak Hopf algebra H is isomorphic to $U_X(\mathfrak{G})\#\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ as weak Hopf algebras, for some X -Lie algebroid \mathfrak{G} and groupoid \mathcal{G} where $X = \mathcal{G}_0$. \square*

Lemma 6.11. *If H is a cocommutative weak Hopf algebra of the form $U_X(\mathfrak{G})\#\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ for a groupoid \mathcal{G} acting on an X -Lie algebroid \mathfrak{G} , where $X = \mathcal{G}_0$, then H is an X -weak Hopf algebra. Here, $\{f_x := 1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_x)} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}_0} e_x\}_{x \in X}$ is a complete set of orthogonal primitive idempotents of H satisfying $\Delta(f_x) = f_x \otimes f_x$.*

Proof. Note that $U_X(\mathfrak{G})$ is a left $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ -module algebra, and also is a right $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}_0$ -module via $p \cdot e_x = S^{-1}(e_x) \cdot p = p(e_x \cdot 1_{U_X(\mathfrak{G})})$ for all $x \in \mathcal{G}_0 = X$ and $p \in U_X(\mathfrak{G})$. Moreover, $U_X(\mathfrak{G})\#\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G} = U_X(\mathfrak{G}) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}_0} \mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ as coalgebras. Now we compute:

$$(6.12) \quad \Delta(1_H) = \Delta(1_{U_X(\mathfrak{G})} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}_0} 1_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}}) = \sum_{x,y \in X} (1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_x)} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}_0} e_y) \otimes (1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_x)} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}_0} e_y).$$

Therefore, $H_t = H_s = \text{Span}_{\mathbb{k}}\{1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_x)} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}_0} e_y \mid x, y \in X\}$. Also, for $x, y \in X$, we have

$$(6.13) \quad \begin{aligned} 1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_x)}\#e_y &= 1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_x)} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}_0} e_y \stackrel{(e_y^2=e_y)}{=} 1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_x)} \cdot e_y \otimes_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}_0} e_y \\ &= 1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_x)}(e_y \cdot 1_{U_X(\mathfrak{G})}) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}_0} e_y = \delta_{x,y} 1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_x)} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}_0} e_x \\ &= \delta_{x,y} 1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_x)}\#e_x. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\{f_x = 1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_x)} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}_0} e_x \mid x \in X\}$ is a basis of H_s . Moreover, we have that as algebras, $H_t = H_s \cong U_X(\mathfrak{G})_s \cong (\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G})_s \cong \mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}_0$. Now the result follows from Proposition 4.22(a). \square

Similar to Theorem 2.22, we obtain the following result. We remark that, in fact, Theorem 2.22 is a special case of the following result when $|X| = 1$.

Theorem 6.14. *Let $H := U_X(\mathfrak{G})\#\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ be an arbitrary cocommutative weak Hopf algebra. Then for an algebra A , the following statements are equivalent.*

- (a) A is an H -module algebra.
(b) $A = \bigoplus_{x \in X} A_x$ is an X -decomposable algebra with $A_x = (f_x \cdot 1_A)A$ and there exist homomorphisms,

$$\pi : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \text{Aut}_{X\text{-Alg}}(A) \text{ (of } X\text{-groupoids),} \quad \tau : \mathfrak{G} \rightarrow \text{Der}_X(A) \text{ (of } X\text{-Lie algebroids).}$$

Moreover, for the X -weak Hopf algebra homomorphisms $\tilde{\pi} : \mathbb{k}\mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{k}(\text{Aut}_{X\text{-Alg}}(A))$ from Corollary 4.33(d) and $\tilde{\tau} : U_X(\mathfrak{G}) \rightarrow U_X(\text{Der}_X(A))$ from Proposition 5.15(d), $\tilde{\tau}$ is a $\tilde{\pi}$ -linear homomorphism.

- (c) $A = \bigoplus_{x \in X} A_x$ is an X -decomposable algebra with $A_x = (f_x \cdot 1_A)A$, and there exists an X -weak Hopf algebra homomorphism

$$\phi : H \longrightarrow U_X(\text{Der}_X(A))\#\mathbb{k}(\text{Aut}_{X\text{-Alg}}(A)).$$

Proof. (a) \Rightarrow (b): If A is an H -module algebra, then by Lemma 6.11 and Proposition 4.22(b), $A = \bigoplus_{x \in X} A_x$ is an X -decomposable algebra, where $A_x = (f_x \cdot 1_A)A$.

We can define a $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ -module algebra structure on A via $g \cdot a := (1_{U_X(\mathfrak{G})} \# g) \cdot a$ for $g \in \mathcal{G}$ and $a \in A$. It is clear that A is a $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ -module. By (6.13), we have that

$$(6.15) \quad 1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_x)} \# g = 1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_x)} \# e_{t(g)} g = \delta_{x, t(g)} 1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_x)} \# g.$$

Now we compute:

$$\begin{aligned} g \cdot (ab) &= (1_{U_X(\mathfrak{G})} \# g) \cdot (ab) \\ &= \sum_{x \in X} ((1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_x)} \# g) \cdot a) ((1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_x)} \# g) \cdot b) \\ &\stackrel{(6.15)}{=} ((1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_{t(g)})} \# g) \cdot a) ((1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_{t(g)})} \# g) \cdot b) \\ &\stackrel{(6.15)}{=} ((1_{U_X(\mathfrak{G})} \# g) \cdot a) ((1_{U_X(\mathfrak{G})} \# g) \cdot b) \\ &= (g \cdot a)(g \cdot b). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\varepsilon_t(g) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{G}_0} \varepsilon(e_x g) e_x = e_{t(g)}$. Next we check that

$$\begin{aligned} g \cdot 1_A &= (1_{U_X(\mathfrak{G})} \# g) \cdot 1_A \stackrel{4.15}{=} \varepsilon_t(1_{U_X(\mathfrak{G})} \# g) \cdot 1_A \\ &\stackrel{6.11}{=} \left(\sum_{x \in X} \varepsilon((1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_x)} \# e_x)(1_{U_X(\mathfrak{G})} \# g))(1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_x)} \# e_x) \right) \cdot 1_A \\ &= \left(\sum_{x \in X} \varepsilon(1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_x)}(e_x \cdot 1_{U_X(\mathfrak{G})} \# e_x g))(1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_x)} \# e_x) \right) \cdot 1_A \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{=} \left(\sum_{x \in X} \varepsilon(1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_x)} \# e_x g)(1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_x)} \# e_x) \right) \cdot 1_A \\ &\stackrel{(**)}{=} \varepsilon(1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_{t(g)})} \# g)(1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_{t(g)})} \# e_{t(g)}) \cdot 1_A \\ &\stackrel{(***)}{=} \left(1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_{t(g)})} \# e_{t(g)} \right) \cdot 1_A \\ &\stackrel{(6.15)}{=} (1_{U_X(\mathfrak{G})} \# e_{t(g)}) \cdot 1_A \\ &= (e_{t(g)}) \cdot 1_A \\ &= \varepsilon_t(g) \cdot 1_A. \end{aligned}$$

Here, (*) holds since $e_x \cdot 1_{U_X(\mathfrak{G})} = 1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_x)}$; (**) holds since $e_x g = \delta_{x, t(g)} e_{t(g)} g = \delta_{x, t(g)} g$; and (***) holds since $1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_{t(g)})}$ and g are grouplike, and thus, $\varepsilon(1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_{t(g)})} \# g) = \varepsilon(1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_{t(g)})}) \# \varepsilon(g) = 1_{\mathbb{k}} \# 1_{\mathbb{k}}$. So A is a $\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$ -module algebra by Proposition 4.15.

Next, one can define a $U_X(\mathfrak{G})$ -module structure on A via $p_x \cdot b := (p_x \# 1_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}}) \cdot b$ for all $p_x \in \mathfrak{g}_x$ with $b \in A$. By a similar argument of (6.13), we show $p_x \# e_y = \delta_{x, y} p_x \# e_x$ and so $(p_x \# 1_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}}) = (p_x \# e_x)$ for $p_x \in \mathfrak{g}_x$. It is straight-forward to check that

$$\begin{aligned} p_y \cdot (ab) &= (p_y \cdot a)(1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_y)} \cdot b) + (1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_y)} \cdot a)(p_y \cdot b), \\ p_y \cdot 1_A &= \delta_{p_y, 1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_y)}} \varepsilon_t(1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_y)}) \cdot 1_A, \end{aligned}$$

for $p_y \in \mathfrak{g}_y$ and $a, b \in A$. By Proposition 5.9 and 5.15, A is then a $U_X(\mathfrak{G})$ -module algebra.

Now there exists an X -groupoid map $\pi : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \text{Aut}_{X\text{-Alg}}(A)$ by Proposition 3.25, and an X -Lie algebroid map $\tau = (\tau_x)_{x \in X} : \mathfrak{G} \rightarrow \text{Der}_X(A)$ by Proposition 5.15. So there exist X -weak Hopf algebra map $\tilde{\pi} := \nu_{\mathbb{k}(\text{Aut}_{X\text{-Alg}}(A))} \mathbb{k}(\pi) : \mathbb{k}\mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{k}(\text{Aut}_{X\text{-Alg}}(A))$ by Theorem 4.32 and $\tilde{\tau} : U_X(\mathfrak{G}) \rightarrow U_X(\text{Der}_X(A))$ by Proposition 5.15.

Further, by Lemma 3.17 and Notation 5.7,

$$\pi(g)(a) = g \cdot a = (1_{U_X(\mathfrak{G})} \# g) \cdot a \quad \text{and} \quad \tau(p)(b) = p \cdot b = (p \# 1_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}}) \cdot b$$

for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$ with $a \in A_{s(g)}$, and all $p \in \mathfrak{g}_x$ with $b \in A_x$. Since for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$ and $p \in \mathfrak{g}_{s(g)}$, both $\tilde{\tau}(g \cdot p)$ and $\tilde{\pi}(g) \cdot \tilde{\tau}(p)$ are in $U(\text{Der}(A_{t(g)}))$, to obtain the remaining part of (b), we

shall show $\tilde{\tau}(g \cdot p)(a) = (\tilde{\pi}(g) \cdot \tilde{\tau}(p))(a)$ for all $a \in A_{t(g)}$. Indeed:

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{\pi}(g) \cdot \tilde{\tau}(p))(a) &= \tilde{\pi}(g) \circ \tilde{\tau}(p) \circ \tilde{\pi}(g^{-1})(a) = (1_{U_X(\mathfrak{G})} \# g)(p \# 1_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}})(1_{U_X(\mathfrak{G})} \# g^{-1}) \cdot a \\ &= ((g \cdot p) \# 1_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}}) \cdot a = \tilde{\tau}(g \cdot p)(a). \end{aligned}$$

(b) \Rightarrow (c): Given the X -weak Hopf algebra homomorphisms $\tilde{\pi}, \tilde{\tau}$ in (b), define the map

$$\phi : U_X(\mathfrak{G}) \# \mathbb{k}\mathcal{G} \longrightarrow U_X(\text{Der}_X(A)) \# \mathbb{k}(\text{Aut}_{X\text{-Alg}}(A)), \quad p_x \# g \mapsto \tilde{\tau}_x(p_x) \# \tilde{\pi}(g),$$

where $p_x \in \mathfrak{g}_x, g \in \mathcal{G}$, for $x \in X$. First, we will show that ϕ is well-defined. Suppose that $p \otimes_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}_0} g = q \otimes_{\mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}_0} h$ in $U_X(\mathfrak{G}) \# \mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}$. Then there exists $\beta \in \mathbb{k}\mathcal{G}_0$ such that $p = q \cdot \beta^{-1} = S^{-1}(\beta^{-1}) \cdot q$ and $g = \beta h$. Since $\tilde{\tau}$ is a $\tilde{\pi}$ -linear homomorphism, we have $\tilde{\tau}(g \cdot p) = \tilde{\pi}(g) \cdot \tilde{\tau}(p)$ for $p \in \mathfrak{G}$ and $g \in \mathcal{G}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\tau}(p) \# \tilde{\pi}(g) &= \tilde{\tau}(S^{-1}(\beta^{-1}) \cdot q) \# \tilde{\pi}(\beta h) = (\tilde{\pi}(S^{-1}(\beta^{-1})) \tilde{\tau}(q)) \# \tilde{\pi}(\beta h) \\ &= (\tilde{\tau}(q) \cdot S(\tilde{\pi}(S^{-1}(\beta^{-1})))) \# \tilde{\pi}(\beta h) = \tilde{\tau}(q) \# \tilde{\pi}(\beta^{-1}) \tilde{\pi}(\beta h) \\ &= \tilde{\tau}(q) \# \tilde{\pi}(h). \end{aligned}$$

The second-to-last equality holds since $\tilde{\pi}$ is a weak Hopf algebra homomorphism.

Now ϕ is a coalgebra map since $\tilde{\pi}$ and $\tilde{\tau}$ are coalgebra maps. Moreover, ϕ is unital as $\tilde{\pi}$ and $\tilde{\tau}$ are unital. Finally, ϕ is multiplicative as argued in the proof of Theorem 2.22(b) \Rightarrow (c):

$$\begin{aligned} \phi((p \# g)(y \# h)) &= \phi(p(g \cdot q) \# gh) = \tilde{\tau}(p(g \cdot q)) \# \tilde{\pi}(gh) \\ &= \tilde{\tau}(p) \tilde{\tau}(g \cdot q) \# \tilde{\pi}(g) \tilde{\pi}(h) \stackrel{(*)}{=} \tilde{\tau}(p) (\tilde{\pi}(g) \cdot \tilde{\tau}(q)) \# \tilde{\pi}(g) \tilde{\pi}(h) \\ &\stackrel{(**)}{=} (\tilde{\tau}(p) \# \tilde{\pi}(g)) (\tilde{\tau}(q) \# \tilde{\pi}(h)) = \phi(p \# g) \phi(q \# h), \end{aligned}$$

for $g, h \in \mathcal{G}$ and $p, q \in \mathfrak{G}$. Here, $(*)$ holds because $\tilde{\tau}$ is a $\tilde{\pi}$ -linear homomorphism, and $(**)$ holds because the definition of multiplication in the smash product algebra. Lastly, $\phi(1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_x)} \# x) = \tilde{\tau}(1_{U(\mathfrak{g}_x)}) \# \tilde{\pi}(x) = 1_{U(\text{Der}(A_x))} \# x$. So ϕ preserves the base X .

(c) \Rightarrow (a): Observe that $A = \bigoplus_{x \in X} A_x$ is a module algebra over the smash product weak Hopf algebra $K := U_X(\text{Der}_X(A)) \# \mathbb{k}(\text{Aut}_{X\text{-Alg}}(A))$ via $(\delta \# \alpha) \cdot a = \delta \cdot (\alpha \cdot a)$ for $\alpha \in \text{Aut}_{X\text{-Alg}}(A)$ with $a \in A_{s(\alpha)}$ and $\delta \in U(\text{Der}(A_{t(\alpha)}))$, otherwise 0. Now given the weak Hopf algebra homomorphism ϕ , we have that A is an H -module algebra via $h \cdot a := \phi(h) \cdot a$, for all $h \in H$ and $a \in A$. Namely, $(hh') \cdot a = h \cdot (h' \cdot a)$ since ϕ is multiplicative; $1_H \cdot a = a$ since ϕ is unital; $h \cdot (aa') = (h_1 \cdot a)(h_2 \cdot a')$ since ϕ is comultiplicative, for $h, h' \in H$ and $a, a' \in A$. Since ϕ is a weak Hopf algebra homomorphism, it follows that

$$(6.16) \quad \phi((1_H)_1) \otimes \phi((1_H)_2) = \Delta(\phi(1_H)) = \Delta(1_K) = (1_K)_1 \otimes (1_K)_2.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} h \cdot 1_A &= \phi(h) \cdot 1_A = (\varepsilon_K)_t(\phi(h)) \cdot 1_A \\ &\stackrel{(6.16)}{=} \left(\sum \varepsilon_K(\phi((1_H)_1) \phi(h)) \phi((1_H)_2) \right) \cdot 1_A = (\varepsilon_K \phi \otimes \phi)((1_H)_1 h \otimes (1_H)_2) \cdot 1_A \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{=} (\varepsilon_H \otimes \phi)((1_H)_1 h \otimes (1_H)_2) \cdot 1_A = \phi((\varepsilon_H)_t(h)) \cdot 1_A \\ &\stackrel{(**)}{=} (\varepsilon_H)_t(h) \cdot 1_A \end{aligned}$$

as desired. Here, $(*)$ follows from ϕ being a counital map, and $(**)$ is by the action of H on A . Now part (a) holds by Proposition 4.15. \square

Remark 6.17. As mentioned in the introduction, one potential research direction is to extend the results to the noncocommutative case. For instance, there has been much recent activity on partial actions of Hopf-like structures in this case (see, e.g., [FMS21, FMF22, FMS22, MPS22]).

7. EXAMPLES: ACTIONS ON POLYNOMIAL ALGEBRAS

In this section we illustrate the results above for actions on polynomial algebras by general linear Hopf-like structures. We refer the reader to the introduction for a summary of the results that we will discuss. The results are of two types: when the module algebra A is indecomposable (or X -decomposable for $|X| = 1$), and when A is X -decomposable especially for $|X| \geq 2$. We will examine results for the former case (Propositions 1.4, 2.4, 2.14, Theorem 1.5) in Section 7.1, and results for the latter case (Proposition 1.7, Corollary 1.9, Proposition 1.10, Theorem 1.11) in Section 7.2.

7.1. Indecomposable module algebra case. Take $A := \mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ a polynomial algebra, which is isomorphic to the symmetric algebra $S(V)$ on an n -dimensional vector space V . Moreover, consider the following group and Lie algebra, respectively,

$$T_n := \text{Aut}_{\text{Alg}}(A) \quad \text{and} \quad W_n := \text{Der}(A).$$

It is well-known that T_n is difficult to understand when $n \geq 3$ as it contains an automorphism of wild type [SU04]. So we restrict our attention to the subgroup of grade-preserving automorphisms of A , which is identified as a general linear group:

$$\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{k}) = \text{GL}(V) = \text{Aut}_{\text{GrAlg}}(A).$$

On the other hand, W_n is well-known to be the infinite-dimensional Lie algebra consisting of derivations of the form $f_1(\underline{x})\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} + \dots + f_n(\underline{x})\frac{\partial}{\partial x_n}$, for $f_i(\underline{x}) \in A$ (see, e.g., [Bah87, Section 1.2]). The general linear Lie algebra is a Lie subalgebra of W_n given as follows:

$$\mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{k}) = \text{span}_{\mathbb{k}} \left\{ x_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \right\}_{i,j=1,\dots,n} =: \text{Der}_{\text{Lin}}(A).$$

Moreover, $\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{k})$ acts on $\mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{k})$ by conjugation after identifying $x_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}$ with the elementary matrix $E_{i,j}$. With the maps,

$$\pi : \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{k}) \longrightarrow T_n \quad (\text{inclusion of groups}), \quad \tau : \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{k}) \longrightarrow W_n \quad (\text{inclusion of Lie algebras}),$$

we obtain the Hopf algebra maps,

$$\tilde{\pi} : \mathbb{k} \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{k}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{k}T_n \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\tau} : U(\mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{k})) \longrightarrow U(W_n)$$

by Proposition 2.8(b). We also have that $\tilde{\tau}$ is $\tilde{\pi}$ -linear [Definition 2.21] because τ and π are inclusion maps. Now Propositions 1.4, 2.4, 2.14 and Theorem 1.5 (or Theorem 2.22) yield the result below.

Proposition 7.1. *The polynomial algebra $\mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is a module algebra over the following general linear Hopf-like structures:*

$$\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{k}), \quad \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{k}), \quad \mathbb{k} \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{k}), \quad U(\mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{k})), \quad U(\mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{k})) \# \mathbb{k} \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{k}). \quad \square$$

7.2. X-decomposable module algebra case. For $x \in X$, take $A_x := S(V_x)$ to be the symmetric algebra on a finite-dimensional vector space V_x . Let n_x denote $\dim(V_x)$. Take $V := \bigoplus_{x \in X} V_x$ to be corresponding X -decomposable vector space, and $A_X := \bigoplus_{x \in X} A_x$ to be the corresponding X -decomposable algebra. Take

$$(T_n)_X := \text{Aut}_{X\text{-Alg}}(A),$$

to be the groupoid from Definition 3.23, i.e., objects of $(T_n)_X$ are the algebras A_x and morphisms of $(T_n)_X$ are unital algebra isomorphisms between A_x and A_y , for $x, y \in X$. Moreover, consider the groupoid $\text{GL}_X(V)$ from Definition 3.12, with objects V_x and morphisms being vector space isomorphisms between V_x and V_y , for $x, y \in X$. With this, the result below is straight-forward, where the second statement follows from Theorem 1.8(b) (or Corollary 4.33).

Lemma 7.2. *There is an X -preserving groupoid homomorphism (functor)*

$$\pi : \text{GL}_X(V) \longrightarrow (T_n)_X,$$

given by $\pi(V_x) = S(V_x)$ for all $x \in X$. This also yields an X -weak Hopf algebra morphism:

$$\tilde{\pi} : \mathbb{k} \text{GL}_X(V) \longrightarrow \mathbb{k}(T_n)_X. \quad \square$$

On the other hand, take

$$(W_n)_X := \text{Der}_X(A) := \bigoplus_{x \in X} \text{Der}(A_x),$$

to be the X -Lie algebroid from Definition 5.1 and Notation 5.8. Moreover, consider the X -Lie algebroid

$$\bigoplus_{x \in X} \text{Der}_{\text{Lin}}(A_x) = \bigoplus_{x \in X} \mathfrak{gl}_{n_x}(\mathbb{k}).$$

The next result is straight-forward, with the second statement following from Proposition 5.15.

Lemma 7.3. *There is an X -Lie algebroid homomorphism*

$$\tau : \bigoplus_{x \in X} \mathfrak{gl}_{n_x}(\mathbb{k}) \rightarrow \text{Der}_X(A),$$

given by inclusion. This also yields an X -weak Hopf algebra morphism:

$$\tilde{\tau} : \bigoplus_{x \in X} U(\mathfrak{gl}_{n_x}(\mathbb{k})) \longrightarrow U(\text{Der}_X(A)). \quad \square$$

Working component-wise, we also have the following result.

Lemma 7.4. *Given $\tilde{\pi}$ from Lemma 7.2, we have that $\tilde{\tau}$ from Lemma 7.3 is $\tilde{\pi}$ -linear. \square*

Finally, Lemmas 7.2, 7.3, and 7.4 yield the following consequences of Proposition 1.7, Corollary 1.9, Proposition 1.10, Theorem 1.11.

Proposition 7.5. *For a X -decomposable vector space $V := \bigoplus_{x \in X} V_x$, the X -decomposable algebra $\bigoplus_{x \in X} S(V_x)$ is a module algebra over the following general linear X -Hopf-like structures:*

$$\text{GL}_X(V), \quad \bigoplus_{x \in X} \mathfrak{gl}_{n_x}(\mathbb{k}), \quad \mathbb{k} \text{GL}_X(V), \quad \bigoplus_{x \in X} U(\mathfrak{gl}_{n_x}(\mathbb{k})), \quad \bigoplus_{x \in X} U(\mathfrak{gl}_{n_x}(\mathbb{k})) \# \mathbb{k} \text{GL}_X(V). \quad \square$$

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.

The first author was supported by the research fund of the Department of Mathematics, Universidad Nacional de Colombia - Sede Bogotá, Colombia, HERMES code 52464, and the Fulbright Visiting Student Researcher Program. We thank Chelsea Walton for her guidance, many useful conversations, and her careful reading of our manuscript. Also, the first, second and fourth authors would like to congratulate the third author for her recently-born son, Ethan, who happily—and indirectly—participated in the writing of this paper.

REFERENCES

- [Bah87] Yu. A. Bahturin. *Identical relations in Lie algebras*. VNU Science Press, b.v., Utrecht, 1987. Translated from the Russian by Bahturin.
- [BB10] Teodor Banica and Julien Bichon. Hopf images and inner faithful representations. *Glasg. Math. J.*, 52(3):677–703, 2010.
- [BGTL14] Gabriella Böhm, José Gómez-Torrecillas, and Esperanza López-Centella. On the category of weak bialgebras. *J. Algebra*, 399:801–844, 2014.
- [BHS11] Ronald Brown, Philip Higgins, and Rafael Sivera. *Nonabelian Algebraic Topology: Filtered Spaces, Crossed Complexes, Cubical Homotopy Groupoids*. Number 15 in Tracts in Mathematics. European Mathematical Society, 2011.
- [BNS99] Gabriella Böhm, Florian Nill, and Kornél Szlachányi. Weak Hopf algebras. I. Integral theory and C^* -structure. *J. Algebra*, 221(2):385–438, 1999.
- [BP12] Dirceu Bagio and Antonio Paques. Partial Groupoid Actions: Globalization, Morita theory, and Galois theory. *Commun. Algebra*, 40(10):3658–3678, 2012.
- [BS00] Gabriella Böhm and Kornél Szlachányi. Weak Hopf algebras. II. Representation theory, dimensions, and the Markov trace. *J. Algebra*, 233(1):156–212, 2000.
- [CDG00] Stefaan Caenepeel and Erwin J. De Groot. Modules over weak entwining structures. In *New trends in Hopf algebra theory (La Falda, 1999)*, volume 267 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 31–54. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2000.
- [CEW15] Juan Cuadra, Pavel Etingof, and Chelsea Walton. Semisimple Hopf actions on Weyl algebras. *Adv. Math.*, 282:47–55, 2015.
- [CEW16] Juan Cuadra, Pavel Etingof, and Chelsea Walton. Finite dimensional Hopf actions on Weyl algebras. *Adv. Math.*, 302:25–39, 2016.
- [CL09] Dongming Cheng and Fang Li. The Structure of Weak Hopf Algebras Corresponding to $U_q(sl_2)$. *Commun. Algebra*, 37(3):729–742, 2009.
- [CM84] Miriam Cohen and Susan Montgomery. Group-graded rings, smash products, and group actions. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 282(1):237–258, 1984.
- [Coh87] Miriam Cohen. H -simple H -module algebras. *Canad. Math. Bull.*, 30(3):363–366, 1987.
- [CR22] Fabio Calderón and Armando Reyes. On the (partial) representation category of weak hopf algebras. In preparation, 2022.
- [CWZ14] Kenneth Chan, Chelsea Walton, and James Zhang. Hopf actions and Nakayama automorphisms. *J. Algebra*, 409:26–53, 2014.
- [EGNO15] Pavel Etingof, Shlomo Gelaki, Dmitri Nikshych, and Victor Ostrik. *Tensor categories*, volume 205 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2015.
- [EW14] P. Etingof and C. Walton. Semisimple Hopf actions on commutative domains. *Adv. Math.*, 251:47–61, 2014.
- [EW16] Pavel Etingof and Chelsea Walton. Finite dimensional Hopf actions on algebraic quantizations. *Algebra Number Theory*, 10(10):2287–2310, 2016.
- [EW17] Pavel Etingof and Chelsea Walton. Finite dimensional Hopf actions on deformation quantizations. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 145(5):1917–1925, 2017.
- [Fis75] John R. Fisher. A Jacobson radical for Hopf module algebras. *J. Algebra*, 34:217–231, 1975.
- [FMF22] Eneilson Fontes, Grasiela Martini, and Graziela Fonseca. Partial actions of weak Hopf algebras on coalgebras. *J. Algebra Appl.*, 21(1):Paper No. 2250012, 35, 2022.
- [FMS21] Graziela Fonseca, Grasiela Martini, and Leonardo Silva. Partial (co)actions of Taft and Nichols Hopf algebras on their base fields. *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.*, 31(7):1471–1496, 2021.
- [FMS22] Graziela Fonseca, Grasiela Martini, and Leonardo Silva. Partial (co)actions of Taft and Nichols Hopf algebras on algebras. *ArXiv preprint arXiv:math/2208.05141*, 2022.

- [Fre17] Benoit Fresse. *Homotopy of operads and Grothendieck-Teichmüller groups. Part 1*, volume 217 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2017. The algebraic theory and its topological background.
- [Hay99] Takahiro Hayashi. Face algebras and unitarity of $SU(N)_L$ -TQFT. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 203(1):211–247, 1999.
- [IR19a] Alberto Ibort and Miguel Rodríguez. *An introduction to groups, groupoids and their representations*. CRC Press, 2019.
- [IR19b] Alberto Ibort and Miguel Rodríguez. On the structure of finite groupoids and their representations. *Symmetry*, 11(3):414, 2019.
- [Lor18] Martin Lorenz. *A tour of representation theory*, volume 193 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2018.
- [Mac87] Kirill C. H. Mackenzie. *Lie groupoids and Lie algebroids in differential geometry*, volume 124 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987.
- [Mon93] Susan Montgomery. *Hopf algebras and their actions on rings*, volume 82 of *CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics*. Published for the Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, DC; by the American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1993.
- [MPS22] Grasiela Martini, Antonio Paques, and Leonardo Duarte Silva. Partial actions of a Hopf algebra on its base field and the corresponding partial smash product algebra. *Journal of Algebra and Its Applications*, page 2350140, 2022.
- [Nik01] Dmitri Alexandrovich Nikshych. *Quantum groupoids, their representation categories, symmetries of von Neumann factors, and dynamical quantum groups*. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 2001. Thesis (Ph.D.)—University of California, Los Angeles.
- [Nik02] Dmitri Nikshych. On the structure of weak Hopf algebras. *Adv. Math.*, 170(2):257–286, 2002.
- [Nik04] Dmitri Nikshych. Semisimple weak Hopf algebras. *J. Algebra*, 275(2):639–667, 2004.
- [NV02] Dmitri Nikshych and Leonid Vainerman. Finite quantum groupoids and their applications. In *New directions in Hopf algebras*, volume 43 of *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.*, pages 211–262. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2002.
- [PF14] Antonio Paques and Daiana Flôres. Duality for groupoid (co)actions. *Comm. Algebra*, 42(2):637–663, 2014.
- [Pra67] Jean Pradines. Théorie de lie pour les groupoïdes différentiables. calcul différentiel dans la catégorie des groupoïdes infinitésimaux. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 264:A245–A248, 1967.
- [PT14] Antonio Paques and Thaísa Tamusiunas. A Galois-Grothendieck-type correspondence for groupoid actions. *Algebra Discrete Math.*, 17(1):80–97, 2014.
- [Rin63] George S. Rinehart. Differential forms on general commutative algebras. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 108(2):195–222, 1963.
- [Sar20] Paolo Saracco. On anchored Lie algebras and the Connes-Moscovici’s bialgebroid construction. *ArXiv preprint arXiv:math/2009.14656*, 2020.
- [Sar21] Paolo Saracco. Universal enveloping algebras of Lie-Rinehart algebras as a left adjoint functor. *ArXiv preprint arXiv:math/2102.01553*, 2021.
- [SU04] Ivan P. Shestakov and Ualbai U. Umirbaev. The tame and the wild automorphisms of polynomial rings in three variables. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 17(1):197–227, 2004.
- [WWW22] Chelsea Walton, Elizabeth Wicks, and Robert Won. Algebraic structures in comodule categories over weak bialgebras. *Comm. Algebra*, 50(7):2877–2910, 2022.

CALDERÓN: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL DE COLOMBIA, BOGOTÁ, COLOMBIA
Email address: `facalderonm@unal.edu.co`

HUANG: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, RICE UNIVERSITY, HOUSTON, TX 77005, USA
Email address: `hh40@rice.edu`

WICKS: MICROSOFT CORPORATION, REDMOND, WA 98052, USA
Email address: `elizabeth.wicks@microsoft.com`

WON: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON, DC 20052, USA
Email address: `robertwon@gwu.edu`