

# THE RIBBON CATEGORY FRAMEWORK FOR TOPOLOGICAL QUANTUM COMPUTING

WILLIE ABOUMRAD

ABSTRACT. This expository article supplies the mathematical background underpinning the braid representation calculator introduced in [Abo22]; those representations describe the sets of logic gates available to a topological quantum computer for processing encoded qubits. Assuming little background in category theory, we first recall the notion of a ribbon fusion category (RFC), collecting most of the necessary definitions. Then we discuss how certain RFCs arise from the representation theory of quantum groups. We explore the braiding in these categories in detail, since it is essential for the quantum computing application.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. The ribbon category framework	3
2.1. Abelian categories	3
2.2. Tensor categories	4
2.3. Braids and ribbons	5
2.4. Diagrammatical calculus	9
3. Conventions for Lie algebras and quantum groups	9
4. Ribbon categories from quantum groups	12
4.1. Infinitesimal braids	13
4.2. (Topological) quantized enveloping algebras	15
4.3. $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{g})$ is a ribbon category	23
References	28

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The notion of a *ribbon fusion category* (RFC) features prominently in the story of topological quantum computers powered by anyons. This expository article recalls that notion, explains how RFCs induce representations of the Artin braid group, and describes how RFCs arise from quantum groups. We will more or less introduce all the necessary terminology. In particular, this article provides the background in category theory assumed in the author's article [Abo22] on computing the braid representations arising from

---

*Key words and phrases.* Ribbon category, fusion, quantum groups, topological quantum computing.

anyon systems. However, the reader need not grasp every detail in order to start doing braid computations using SAGEMATH.

Ribbon categories are certain abelian monoidal, or *tensor*, categories. Tensor categories play an important role in many areas of modern mathematics, such as algebraic geometry, algebraic topology, number theory, mathematical physics, and quantum computation. There are spectacular connections between the theory of tensor categories and representation theory, quantum groups, infinite dimensional Lie algebras, conformal field theory and vertex algebras, operator algebras, and invariants of knots and 3-manifolds which arose from the works of Drinfeld, Moore and Seiberg, Kazhdan and Lusztig, Jones, Witten, Reshetikhin and Turaev, and many others [Lus88, Dri89c, Dri89a, MS89, RT90, GK92, KL93, Jon06, DFMS11]. See also [EGNO15] and references therein. The theory of anyonic computation relies on these connections.

In this context it is helpful to think of category theory as a “categorification” of ordinary algebra. In other words, there is a dictionary between the two subjects, such that the usual algebraic structures can be recovered from the categorical structures by passing to the isomorphism classes of objects [EGNO15]. For instance, the notion of a category is the categorification of the notion of a set<sup>1</sup> and the notion of a monoidal category is the categorification of the notion of a monoid.

This correspondence allows for a theory of algebra representations without vectors, in the same sense that category theory allows for a theory of sets without elements. For instance, the representation theory of a quasitriangular (braided) Hopf algebra may be formulated in terms of a ribbon category.

In the setting of quantum computing, the correspondence allows us to capture the dynamics of anyons, modeled as simple objects in an RFC, without knowing much about what they “actually look like.” This is explained in [Abo22].

This article is structured as follows. Section 2 introduces ribbon categories and necessary terminology. In addition, it discusses the induced braid representations and briefly presents the associated diagrammatical calculus, which is ubiquitous and useful for computations. Section 3 fixes our notation for quantum groups. Then Section 4 elucidates the connection between semisimple ribbon categories and the representation theory of quantum groups. The aim is to show that the category  $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{g})$  of finite-dimensional modules over the quantum group  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$  is a ribbon category whose braiding is generated infinitesimally. This means the braid group representation induced by the categorical braiding of  $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{g})$  on any tensor product  $V^{\otimes m}$  is equivalent to the representation induced by the exponential of the symmetric invariant 2-tensor on  $U(\mathfrak{g})$  defined by the enveloping algebra’s Casimir element. This representation has a geometric interpretation in terms of the monodromy of the Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov equations, which motivates the connection between certain conformal field theories and the RFC framework [Dri89b]. Demonstrating this equivalence requires showing that the braiding on  $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{g})$  is induced by the  $R$ -matrix of a related

---

<sup>1</sup>There is a foundational subtlety that is not relevant in our context: in general objects and morphisms in a category are defined to form a *class* rather than a set. This is to circumvent Russell’s paradox regarding the existence of a set of all sets. In this work we deal only with *small* categories, which means their objects and hom-sets are indeed sets.

topological ribbon algebra  $\widetilde{U_q(\mathfrak{g})}$ , which can be understood as a certain completion of  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ .

## 2. THE RIBBON CATEGORY FRAMEWORK

We assume the notion of a category, subcategory, functor, and their equivalences. Otherwise we start from the beginning. MacLane [Lan78] provides a great introduction to the subject of category theory.

**2.1. Abelian categories.** To begin, we need the notion of *additive* categories.

**Definition 2.1.** [EGNO15, Definition 1.2.1] An *additive category* is a category  $\mathcal{C}$  satisfying the following axioms:

- (i) Every hom-set  $\text{Hom}(X, Y)$  is equipped with the structure of an abelian group (written additively) making composition of morphisms biadditive.
- (ii) There exists a zero object  $0 \in \mathcal{C}$  such that  $\text{Hom}(0, 0) = 0$ .
- (iii) (Direct sums exist.) For any  $X, Y \in \mathcal{C}$  there exists an object  $S \in \mathcal{C}$  and morphisms  $p_X: S \rightarrow X$ ,  $p_Y: S \rightarrow Y$ ,  $i_X: X \rightarrow S$ , and  $i_Y: Y \rightarrow S$  such that  $p_X i_X = \text{id}_X$ ,  $p_Y i_Y = \text{id}_Y$ , and  $i_X p_X + i_Y p_Y = \text{id}_S$ .

A universal property shows the object  $S$  in (iii) is unique up to isomorphism. It is the *direct sum* of  $X$  and  $Y$ , and we denote it by  $X \oplus Y$ . This means every additive category  $\mathcal{C}$  is equipped with a bifunctor  $\oplus: \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ .

The categories considered in this work are  $\mathbb{C}$ -linear, or *enriched over  $\mathbb{C}$* , which means every hom-set  $\text{Hom}(X, Y)$  is equipped with the structure of a complex vector space making composition of morphisms  $\mathbb{C}$ -linear.

Introducing the notion of a *decomposition* of an object requires the notion of *kernels* and *cokernels*. These are categorifications of the usual notions of kernels and cokernels in linear algebra. Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an additive category and let  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  be a morphism in  $\mathcal{C}$ . The *kernel*  $\ker(f)$  of  $f$  (if it exists) is an object  $K$  together with a morphism  $k: K \rightarrow X$  such that  $fk = 0$ . If  $k': K' \rightarrow X$  is such that  $fk' = 0$  then there exists a unique morphism  $\ell: K' \rightarrow K$  such that  $k\ell = k'$ . Thus when  $\ker(f)$  exists it is unique up to a unique isomorphism.

Dually, the *cokernel*  $\text{coker}(f)$  of  $f$  (if it exists) is an object  $C$  together with a morphism  $c: Y \rightarrow C$  such that  $cf = 0$ . Similarly, if  $c': Y \rightarrow C'$  is such that  $c'f = 0$  then there exists a unique morphism  $\ell: C \rightarrow C'$  such that  $\ell c = c'$ . Therefore if  $\text{coker}(f)$  exists then it is unique up to a unique isomorphism.

**Definition 2.2.** [EGNO15, Definition 1.3.1] An *abelian category* is an additive category  $\mathcal{C}$  in which for every morphism  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  there exists a sequence

$$K \xrightarrow{k} X \xrightarrow{i} I \xrightarrow{j} Y \xrightarrow{c} C$$

with the following properties:

- (i)  $ji = f$ ,
- (ii)  $(K, k) = \ker(f)$  and  $(C, c) = \text{coker}(f)$ ,
- (iii)  $(I, i) = \text{coker}(k)$  and  $(I, j) = \ker(c)$ .

The object  $I$  is the *image* of  $f$  and we denote it by  $\text{Im}(f)$ .

The notion of a kernel allows us to identify subobjects in a given object  $X$ . Concretely, a morphism  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  in an abelian category is a *monomorphism* if  $\ker(f) = 0$ . Then a *subobject* of  $X$  is an object  $Y$  together with a monomorphism  $i: Y \rightarrow X$ . In the quantum computing application, we interpret subobjects of a tensor product as the possible outcomes of anyon fusion.

The following theorem justifies thinking of direct sums, morphisms, kernels and cokernels in an abelian category in terms of ordinary linear algebra.

**Theorem 2.3.** [Fre66] *Every abelian  $\mathbb{C}$ -linear category is equivalent, as an additive category, to a full subcategory of the category of modules over a unital associative  $\mathbb{C}$ -linear algebra.*

Moreover, a  $\mathbb{C}$ -linear abelian category  $\mathcal{C}$  is *finite* if it is equivalent to the category  $A\text{-Mod}_{\text{fr}}$  of finite-dimensional modules over a finite-dimensional  $\mathbb{C}$ -algebra  $A$  [EGNO15, Definition 1.8.5]. Note that  $\mathcal{C}$  does not uniquely or canonically determine the algebra  $A$ , but rather its Morita equivalence class.

Crucially, the notion of a kernel allows us to define a distinguished set of elements in an abelian category. A non-zero object  $X$  in an abelian category  $\mathcal{C}$  is *simple* if its only subobjects are  $0$  and  $X$ . In a  $\mathbb{C}$ -linear abelian category,  $X$  is simple if and only if  $\text{End}(X) \cong \mathbb{C}$ . If  $\mathcal{C}$  is *semisimple*, the simple objects can be viewed as a generating set for  $\text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$  under  $\oplus$ .

**Definition 2.4.** An abelian category  $\mathcal{C}$  is *semisimple* if each object is semisimple; an object in  $\mathcal{C}$  is *semisimple* if it is a finite direct sum of simple objects.

Since we only consider *finite* direct sums, there is an alternative characterization of finite  $\mathbb{C}$ -linear abelian categories: a  $\mathbb{C}$ -linear abelian category is *finite* if and only if it has finitely many simple objects and its hom-sets are finite-dimensional.

**2.2. Tensor categories.** Whereas abelian categories are equipped with an additive structure, *monoidal categories* are equipped with a multiplicative one.

**Definition 2.5.** [Lan78, Section VII.1] A *monoidal category*  $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, I, a, l, r)$  is a category  $\mathcal{C}$  with a bifunctor  $\otimes: \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ , a unit object  $I$ , and natural isomorphisms  $a, l, r$  satisfying the following conditions. First, the following diagram commutes for all triples

$(U, V, W)$  of objects in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & (U \otimes V) \otimes (W \otimes X) & \\
 a_{U \otimes V, W, X} \nearrow & & \searrow a_{U, V, W \otimes X} \\
 ((U \otimes V) \otimes W) \otimes X & & U \otimes (V \otimes (W \otimes X)) \\
 a_{U, V, W} \otimes \text{id}_X \searrow & & \nearrow \text{id}_U \otimes a_{V, W, X} \\
 (U \otimes (V \otimes W)) \otimes X & \xrightarrow{a_{U, V \otimes W, X}} & U \otimes ((V \otimes W) \otimes X)
 \end{array} \tag{2.1}$$

The natural isomorphism  $a$  is known as the *associativity constraint*. In addition, the associativity constraint is compatible with the *left* and *right unit constraints*  $l$  and  $r$ , which means the following diagram commutes for all  $U, V \in \mathcal{C}$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 (V \otimes I) \otimes W & \xrightarrow{a_{V, I, W}} & V \otimes (I \otimes W) \\
 r_V \otimes \text{id}_W \searrow & & \swarrow \text{id}_V \otimes l_W \\
 & V \otimes W &
 \end{array} \tag{2.2}$$

A monoidal category is said to be *strict* if the associativity and unit constraints  $a, l, r$  are all identities of the category.

A *tensor category* is a monoidal abelian category [EGNO15]. This means every tensor product of objects in a tensor category is a direct sum. In other words, tensor categories are the categorifications of rings.

If  $\mathbb{C}$ -linear abelian categories are categories of modules over a  $\mathbb{C}$ -algebra, then  $\mathbb{C}$ -linear *tensor categories* are categories of modules over a complex *bialgebra*: compatible algebra and coalgebra structures are needed to define module structures on tensor products.

Notice that any bialgebra corresponding to a strict tensor category must be coassociative. Relaxing strictness results in the notion of a *quasi-bialgebra*, which is coassociative up to conjugation by a distinguished element known as an *associator*. Section 4.2 discusses quasi-bialgebras in more detail.

**2.3. Braids and ribbons.** In order to construct representations of the braid group, we need *braided categories*.

**Definition 2.6.** A tensor category  $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, I, a, l, r)$  is *braided* if there exists a commutativity constraint  $c$ , called a *braiding*, such that for any pair of objects  $V, W$  the map

$$c_{V, W} : V \otimes W \rightarrow W \otimes V$$

is a natural isomorphism. We require that  $c$  satisfies the Hexagon Axioms, encoded in the commutativity following diagrams.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & U \otimes (V \otimes W) \xrightarrow{c_{U,V \otimes W}} (V \otimes W) \otimes U & \\
 a_{U,V,W} \nearrow & & \searrow a_{V,W,U} \\
 (U \otimes V) \otimes W & & V \otimes (W \otimes U) \\
 c_{U,V} \otimes \text{id}_W \searrow & & \nearrow \text{id}_V \otimes c_{U,W} \\
 (V \otimes U) \otimes W \xrightarrow{a_{V,U,W}} V \otimes (U \otimes W) & & 
 \end{array} \tag{2.3}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & (U \otimes V) \otimes W \xrightarrow{c_{U \otimes V,W}} W \otimes (U \otimes V) & \\
 a_{U,V,W}^{-1} \nearrow & & \searrow a_{W,U,V}^{-1} \\
 U \otimes (V \otimes W) & & (W \otimes U) \otimes V \\
 \text{id}_U \otimes c_{V,W} \searrow & & \nearrow c_{U,W} \otimes \text{id}_V \\
 U \otimes (W \otimes V) \xrightarrow{a_{U,W,V}^{-1}} (U \otimes W) \otimes V & & 
 \end{array} \tag{2.4}$$

The braiding  $c$  in a braided category  $\mathcal{C}$  is *symmetric* if

$$c_{W,V} \circ c_{V,W} = \text{id}_{V \otimes W} \tag{2.5}$$

for all objects  $V, W$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ . In this case  $\mathcal{C}$  is a *symmetric category*.

Note that in a braided category, the isomorphism  $c_{V,V}: V \otimes V \rightarrow V \otimes V$  is *not* required to be involutive; in general, we obtain non-trivial isomorphisms  $V \otimes W \rightarrow W \otimes V \rightarrow V \otimes W$ .

Moreover, observe that braided tensor categories are still categories of modules over a bialgebra, but the bialgebra is not cocommutative in general. However, it is always *quasitriangular (braided)*: cocommutativity is enforced only up to conjugation by a distinguished element called the universal  $R$ -matrix.

Next we show how to obtain representations of the *Artin braid group* from a braided category. For starters, recall the braid group  $B_m$  is generated by  $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}$  subject to the *braid relations*:

$$\sigma_i \sigma_{i+1} \sigma_i = \sigma_{i+1} \sigma_i \sigma_{i+1}, \quad \sigma_i \sigma_j = \sigma_j \sigma_i, \quad \text{for } |i - j| > 1. \tag{2.6}$$

The braid group  $B_m$  models isotopy classes of braids on  $m$  strands, so it has a nice diagrammatic interpretation. For instance, Figure 1 illustrates the braid generator  $\sigma_2$  in  $B_4$ . By convention the  $(i + 1)$ st strand in  $\sigma_i$  crosses over the  $i$ th. Vertical concatenation implements multiplication in the group. Like [Wan10], we adopt the *optimistic convention*: we parse diagrams from bottom to top, so “time” flows upwards.




FIGURE 1. A diagrammatic interpretation of the braid generator  $\sigma_2 \in B_4$ .

Now let  $V$  be any object in a braided category  $\mathcal{C}$  and set  $\check{R} = c_{V,V}$ . The map  $\check{R}$  is known as a *braiding* operator because it induces braid representations as follows. The Hexagon Axioms imply  $\check{R}$  satisfies the celebrated *Yang-Baxter* equation in  $\text{End}(V \otimes V \otimes V)$ :

$$(\check{R} \otimes \text{id})(\text{id} \otimes \check{R})(\check{R} \otimes \text{id}) = (\text{id} \otimes \check{R})(\check{R} \otimes \text{id})(\text{id} \otimes \check{R}). \quad (2.7)$$

Thus if we let  $\check{R}_i$  denote the endomorphism of  $V^{\otimes m}$  acting as  $\check{R}$  on the  $(i, i+1)$ st pair of tensor factors, Relation (2.7) implies  $\check{R}_i \check{R}_{i+1} \check{R}_i = \check{R}_{i+1} \check{R}_i \check{R}_{i+1}$ . Together with the obvious far commutativity  $\check{R}_i \check{R}_j = \check{R}_j \check{R}_i$  for  $|i-j| > 1$ , this means there is a homomorphism  $B_m \rightarrow \text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(V^{\otimes m})$  satisfying

$$\sigma_i \rightarrow \check{R}_i. \quad (2.8)$$

So far our dictionary between categories and algebras does not include Hopf algebras. This requires a notion of dual objects at the category level because at the algebra level, the Hopf algebra antipode turns the dual of any module into a module. Concretely, recall that if  $H$  is a Hopf algebra with antipode  $S$  and  $V$  is an  $H$ -module, then  $H$  acts on  $V^*$  via  $S$ :

$$(h \triangleright f)(v) = f(S(h)v), \quad h \in H, f \in V^*, v \in V.$$

Thus we introduce *left* and *right dualities* on a tensor category.

**Definition 2.7.** [Kas95, Definition XIV.2.1] Let  $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, I)$  be a strict tensor category with unit object  $I$ . It is a tensor category with *left duality* if for each object  $V$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  there exists an object  $V^*$  and morphisms

$$b_V : I \rightarrow V \otimes V^* \quad \text{and} \quad d_V : V^* \otimes V \rightarrow I$$

satisfying the *rigidity axioms*

$$(\text{id}_V \otimes d_V)(b_V \otimes \text{id}_{V^*}) = \text{id}_V, \quad \text{and} \quad (d_V \otimes \text{id}_{V^*})(\text{id}_{V^*} \otimes b_V) = \text{id}_{V^*}. \quad (2.9)$$

For any morphism  $f : V \rightarrow W$ , we define the *left transpose*  $f^* : W^* \rightarrow V^*$  of  $f$  by the formula

$$f^* = (d_W \otimes \text{id}_{V^*})(\text{id}_{W^*} \otimes f \otimes \text{id}_{V^*})(\text{id}_{W^*} \otimes b_V). \quad (2.10)$$

Alternatively, the tensor category  $\mathcal{C}$  has *right duality* if for each object  $V$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  there exists an object  ${}^*V$  and morphisms

$$b'_V: I \rightarrow {}^*V \otimes V \quad \text{and} \quad d'_V: V \otimes {}^*V \rightarrow I$$

satisfying

$$(d'_V \otimes \text{id}_V)(\text{id}_V \otimes b'_V) = \text{id}_V \quad \text{and} \quad (\text{id}_{{}^*V} \otimes d'_V)(b'_V \otimes \text{id}_{{}^*V}) = \text{id}_{{}^*V} \quad (2.11)$$

Of course we may define the *right transpose* of a morphism, but we do not need it here.

Although a right duality enjoys properties analogous to those of a left duality, they are different in general. However, when  $\mathcal{C}$  is a *ribbon category* the left and right duals coincide [Kas95, Section XIV.5].

**Definition 2.8.** A strict braided tensor category  $\mathcal{C}$  with left duality is a *ribbon category* if there exists a family  $\theta_V: V \rightarrow V$  of natural isomorphisms, called *twists*, such that

$$\theta_{V \otimes W} = (\theta_V \otimes \theta_W)c_{V,W}c_{W,V} \quad \text{and} \quad \theta_{V^*} = (\theta_V)^*.$$

Relation (2.10) defines the transpose  $f^*$  of a morphism  $f$ .

Moreover, a ribbon structure also controls the categorical braiding: while the symmetry constraint  $c_{W,V} \circ c_{V,W} = \text{id}_{V \otimes W}$  is too strict in general, in a ribbon category we require this composition to be a kind of coboundary instead [KRT97]. This has important implications for the braiding in ribbon categories, especially for semisimple ones.

In particular, the twists determine induced action of braid generators, up to a choice of signs, in any semisimple ribbon category. Concretely, suppose  $\mathcal{C}$  is a semisimple ribbon category and let  $(\theta_W)_{W \in \mathcal{C}}$  denote a family of twists in  $\mathcal{C}$ . For each simple object  $W$ , let  $\check{\theta}_W$  denote the complex scalar defined by  $\theta_W = \check{\theta}_W \text{id}_W \in \text{End}(W) \cong \mathbb{C}$ . Now choose any simple object  $V$ . Since  $\mathcal{C}$  is semisimple, there is a set  $\mathcal{I}$  of simple objects in  $\mathcal{C}$  and integers  $N_X^{V,V}$  such that

$$V \otimes W = \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{I}} N_X^{V,V} X.$$

Suppose each  $N_X^{V,V} = 1$ . In this case, we say the decomposition of  $V \otimes V$  is *multiplicity-free*. This means there are maps  $i_X: X \rightarrow V \otimes V$  and  $p_X: V \otimes V \rightarrow X$  for every  $X \in \mathcal{I}$  satisfying

$$i_X p_Y = \delta_{X,Y} \text{id}_X \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{X \in \mathcal{I}} i_X p_X = \text{id}_{V \otimes V}.$$

Let  $P[X]: V \otimes V \rightarrow V \otimes V$ , with  $P[X] = i_X p_X$ , denote the projection of  $V \otimes V$  onto its subobject  $X$ . The set of  $P[X]$ , for  $X \in \mathcal{I}$  is a complete set of orthogonal idempotents:

$$P[X]P[Y] = \delta_{X,Y} \text{id}_{V \otimes V} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{X \in \mathcal{I}} P[X] = \text{id}_{V \otimes V}.$$

Finally, let  $\check{R} := c_{V,V}$  denote the braiding operator on  $V \otimes V$  and set  $\check{R}_X^{V,V} = \sqrt{\check{\theta}_X \check{\theta}_V^{-2}} \in \mathbb{C}$  for every  $X \in \mathcal{I}$ .



**Theorem 2.9.** *With the notation of the previous paragraph in mind, there exists a sign  $\epsilon: \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$  such that*

$$\check{R} = \sum_{X \in \mathcal{I}} \epsilon(X) \check{R}_X^{V,V} P[X].$$

*Proof.* The naturality of the twist implies  $p_X \theta_{V \otimes V} = \theta_X p_X$  for any  $X \in \mathcal{I}$ . By definition  $\theta_{V \otimes V} = (\theta_V \otimes \theta_V) \check{R}^2$  and  $\theta_V \otimes \theta_V = \check{\theta}_V \check{\theta}_V$  because  $V$  is simple. Substituting and rearranging yields  $p_X \check{R}^2 = \check{\theta}_X \check{\theta}_V^{-2} p_X$ . Pre-multiplying by  $i_X$  and adding over  $X \in \mathcal{I}$  implies  $\check{R}^2 = \sum_X \left( \check{R}_X^{V,V} \right)^2 P[X]$ . The theorem follows because the  $P[X]$  form a complete set of orthogonal idempotents.  $\square$

Thus from now on we focus on semisimple ribbon categories, which induce braid representations characterized by their twists, as in Theorem 2.9. In particular, [Abo22] considers *ribbon fusion categories* exclusively.

**Definition 2.10.** A *ribbon fusion category (RFC)* is a finite  $\mathbb{C}$ -linear semisimple ribbon category.

*Remark 2.11.* In the literature, RFCs are sometimes known as *premodular categories* [Bru00]. An RFC becomes a *modular category* if its braiding satisfies a non-degeneracy condition making the so-called *S-matrix* non-singular [Tur16, Section II.1.4].

## 2.4. Diagrammatical calculus.

### 3. CONVENTIONS FOR LIE ALGEBRAS AND QUANTUM GROUPS

In this section we fix our notation for Lie algebras and recall some basic definitions. We will use  $e_i$  throughout to denote the standard basis of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

Following [CP94], we use the *Chevalley presentation*. Let  $\mathfrak{g}$  denote a complex semisimple Lie algebra, let  $A = [a_{ij}]$  denote its *generalized Cartan matrix*, and let  $D = \text{diag}(d_1, \dots, d_r)$  denote the diagonal matrix of root lengths such that  $DA$  is symmetric positive definite. Recall  $a_{ii} = 2$  and  $a_{ij} \leq 0$  whenever  $i \neq j$ .

The semisimple algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$  is generated by  $H_i, E_i$ , and  $F_i$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, r$ , subject to the relations

$$[H_i, H_j] = 0, \quad [H_i, E_j] = a_{ij} E_j, \quad [H_i, F_j] = -a_{ij} F_j, \quad [E_i, F_j] = \delta_{ij} H_i, \quad (3.1)$$

along with the *Serre relations* for  $i \neq j$ :

$$(\text{ad}_{E_i})^{1-a_{ij}}(E_j) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad (\text{ad}_{F_i})^{1-a_{ij}}(F_j) = 0 \quad (3.2)$$

*Remark.* Authors like Jantzen [Jan96], Lusztig [Lus88], and Sawin [Saw96] prefer the notation  $X_i^+ = E_i$  and  $X_i^- = F_i$ .

We will denote by  $U(\mathfrak{g})$  the *universal enveloping algebra* associated to  $\mathfrak{g}$ .

Now fix the *Cartan subalgebra*  $\mathfrak{h}$  generated by the  $H_i$ . The *simple roots* of  $\mathfrak{g}$  are the linear functionals  $\alpha_i: \mathfrak{h} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  satisfying

$$\alpha_i(H_j) = a_{ji}.$$

We let

$$\mathcal{P} = \{\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^* \mid \lambda(H_i) \in \mathbb{Z}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{P}^+ = \{\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^* \mid \lambda(H_i) \in \mathbb{Z}_+\} \quad (3.3)$$

denote the lattice of *weights* and *dominant weights*, respectively.

When  $\mathfrak{g}$  is semisimple, there exists a unique non-degenerate symmetric invariant bilinear form  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle: \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle H_i, H_j \rangle &= d_j^{-1} a_{ij}, & \langle H_i, E_j \rangle &= \langle H_i, F_j \rangle = 0, \\ \langle E_i, E_j \rangle &= \langle F_i, F_j \rangle = 0, & \text{and} \quad \langle E_i, F_j \rangle &= d_i^{-1} \delta_{ij}, \end{aligned}$$

for all  $i, j$  [Kac83, Theorem 2.2]. When  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{gl}_n$  we take  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  to be the non-degenerate trace bilinear form of the natural representation.

The bilinear form  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  induces an isomorphism of vector spaces  $\nu: \mathfrak{h} \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}^*$  under which  $H_i$  corresponds to the *coroot*  $\alpha_i^\vee = d_i^{-1} \alpha_i$ . The induced form on  $\mathfrak{h}^*$  satisfies

$$\langle \alpha_i, \alpha_j \rangle = d_i a_{ij}. \quad (3.4)$$

Since  $a_{ii} = 2$ , we must have  $d_i = \langle \alpha_i, \alpha_i \rangle / 2$ . Thus we obtain a formula for the *Cartan integers*:

$$a_{ij} = \langle \alpha_i^\vee, \alpha_j \rangle = \frac{2 \langle \alpha_i^\vee, \alpha_j \rangle}{\langle \alpha_i, \alpha_i \rangle}. \quad (3.5)$$

Notice the bilinear form induced by  $\nu$  is normalized so that

$$\langle \alpha_i, \alpha_i \rangle = 2d_i.$$

When  $\mathfrak{g}$  is simple  $\langle \alpha_i, \alpha_i \rangle = 2$  for *short* roots.

For concreteness and convenience, we record some relevant Cartan matrices:

$$A_n = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & -1 & & & & \\ -1 & 2 & -1 & & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & & -1 & 2 & -1 & \\ & & & -1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.6)$$

$$B_n = \left[ \begin{array}{cccc|c} & & & & 0 \\ & & & & \vdots \\ & & & & 0 \\ & & & & -1 \\ \hline 0 & \cdots & 0 & -2 & 2 \end{array} \right], \quad \text{and} \quad D_n = \left[ \begin{array}{cccc|c} & & & & 0 \\ & & & & \vdots \\ & & & & 0 \\ & & & & -1 \\ & & & & 0 \\ \hline 0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & 0 & 2 \end{array} \right].$$

We label the matrices by the Lie type of the root system to which they are associated. The corresponding diagonal root lengths matrices are described by  $d = (1, \dots, 1)$  for the root systems of types  $A_n, D_n$ , and by  $d = (2, \dots, 2, 1)$  for type  $B_n$ .

If  $\alpha \in \mathcal{Q}$ , define the *root space*

$$\mathfrak{g}_\alpha = \{x \in \mathfrak{g} \mid [h, x] = \alpha(h)x \text{ for all } h \in \mathfrak{h}\}.$$

The elements of  $\Delta = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{Q} \mid \alpha \neq 0, \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \neq 0\}$  are the *roots* of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . The intersection  $\Delta^+ = \Delta \cap \mathcal{Q}^+$  denotes the set of *positive roots*. The *negative roots* are given by  $\Delta^- = -\Delta^+$  and  $\Delta = \Delta^+ \amalg \Delta^-$  [Kac83, Chapter 1]. Distinct root spaces are orthogonal with respect to the bilinear form  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ :

$$\langle \mathfrak{g}_\alpha, \mathfrak{g}_\beta \rangle \text{ if } \alpha \neq \beta \text{ and } \langle \mathfrak{g}_\alpha, \mathfrak{h} \rangle \text{ if } \alpha \neq 0$$

[Kac83, Theorem 2.2(c)]. The Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$  has a triangular decomposition with respect to its roots. As vector spaces,

$$\mathfrak{g} = \left( \bigoplus_{\alpha < 0} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \right) \oplus \mathfrak{h} \oplus \left( \bigoplus_{\alpha > 0} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \right).$$

We let  $\rho$  denote the half sum of the positive roots in  $\mathfrak{h}^*$ . Alternatively, the *Weyl vector*  $\rho$  is uniquely characterized by  $\langle \alpha_i^\vee, \rho \rangle = 1$ . Thus its image  $\rho^* \in \mathfrak{h}$  under  $\nu^{-1}$  satisfies  $\alpha_i(\rho^*) = d_i$ . Concretely, if  $b_i = \sum_j (A^{-1})_{ji} d_j$ , then

$$\rho = \sum_i b_i \alpha_i^\vee \quad \text{and} \quad \rho^* = \sum_i b_i H_i. \quad (3.7)$$

The *fundamental weights*  $\omega_i \in \mathfrak{h}^*$  are defined by  $\omega_i(H_j) = \delta_{ij}$ , or equivalently,  $\langle \omega_i, \alpha_j^\vee \rangle = \delta_{ij}$ . The  $\omega_i$  form a basis of  $\mathcal{P}$  and clearly

$$\alpha_i = \sum_j a_{ji} \omega_j.$$

Since  $C = DA$  is symmetric  $\alpha_i = \sum_j c_{ij} (d_j^{-1} \omega_j)$  and therefore

$$\omega_i = \sum_j (DA^{-1})_{ij} \alpha_j^\vee$$

because  $C$  is invertible. Then  $\langle \omega_i, \omega_j \rangle = d_i (A^{-1})_{ij}$  follows from the definition of  $\omega_i$ .

Now consider any weights  $\lambda = \sum_i \lambda_i \omega_i$  and  $\mu = \sum_i \mu_i \omega_i$ , and notice  $\lambda(H_i) = \lambda_i$  and similarly  $\mu(H_i) = \mu_i$ . Therefore

$$\langle \lambda, \mu \rangle = \sum_{ij} \lambda_i \mu_j \langle \omega_i, \omega_j \rangle = \sum_{ij} (DA^{-1})_{ij} \lambda(H_i) \mu(H_j). \quad (3.8)$$

Let  $X_\alpha$  denote any basis of  $\mathfrak{g}$ , and let  $X^\alpha$  denote the corresponding dual basis with respect to  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ . The next formula uniquely characterizes the *Casimir element*

$$C = \sum_\alpha X_\alpha X^\alpha = \sum_\alpha X^\alpha X_\alpha \in U(\mathfrak{g}). \quad (3.9)$$

The Casimir element is in fact canonical and central [Bum04, Theorem 10.2]. In addition,  $C$  acts as the scalar

$$\chi_\lambda(C) = \langle \lambda, \lambda + 2\rho \rangle \quad (3.10)$$

on any irreducible  $U(\mathfrak{g})$ -module with highest weight  $\lambda$  [Kac83, Corollary 2.6].

In what follows, the term ‘‘quantum group’’ refers to an associative Hopf algebra  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$  as presented in [CP94, Definition 9.1.1]. For convenience, we reproduce the definition.

Let  $\mathfrak{g}$  denote a semisimple Lie algebra and let  $A$  denote its generalized Cartan matrix with the diagonal matrix  $D = \text{diag}(d_1, \dots, d_r)$  such that  $DA$  is symmetric. Let  $q$  be *indeterminate* and write  $q_i = q^{d_i}$ . The *quantum group*  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$  is the associative unital algebra over  $\mathbb{C}(q)$  generated by the elements  $E_i, F_i, K_i$ , and  $K_i^{-1}$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, r$ , subject to the relations:

$$\begin{aligned} K_i K_j &= K_j K_i, & K_i K_i^{-1} &= K_i^{-1} K_i = 1, \\ K_i E_j K_i^{-1} &= q_i^{a_{ij}} E_j, & K_i F_j K_i^{-1} &= q_i^{-a_{ij}} F_j, \\ E_i F_j - F_j E_i &= \delta_{ij} \frac{K_i - K_i^{-1}}{q_i - q_i^{-1}}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

together with the  $q$ -Serre relations for  $i \neq j$ ,

$$\sum_{k=0}^{1-a_{ij}} (-1)^k \begin{bmatrix} 1 - a_{ij} \\ k \end{bmatrix}_{q_i} X_i^k X_j X_i^{1-a_{ij}-k} = 0. \tag{3.12}$$

In the last equality every  $X$  is either an  $E$  or an  $F$ . The  $q$ -integer is given by  $[n]_{q_i} = \frac{q_i^n - q_i^{-n}}{q_i - q_i^{-1}}$ , the  $q$ -factorial  $[n]_{q_i}! = [n]_{q_i} \cdots [1]_{q_i}$ , and the  $q$ -binomial coefficient is defined analogously.

Unless otherwise stated, we assume  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$  is equipped with the co-algebra structure defined by the comultiplication map  $\Delta: U_q(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow U_q(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes 2}$  satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(E_i) &= E_i \otimes K_i + 1 \otimes E_i \\ \Delta(F_i) &= F_i \otimes 1 + K_i^{-1} \otimes F_i, \quad \text{and} \\ \Delta(K_i) &= K_i \otimes K_i, \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

as in [LZZ10].

In this work, we only consider finite-dimensional type  $(1, \dots, 1)$  modules for the quantum groups  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ . Refer to Chapters 9 and 10 in [CP94] for definitions. Every type  $(1, \dots, 1)$  finite-dimensional  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module is semisimple [Jan96, Theorem 5.17] and each simple  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module is in one-to-one correspondence with a  $\mathfrak{g}$ -module parametrized by a dominant weight of  $\mathfrak{g}$  [Jan96, Theorem 5.10]. Moreover, corresponding modules have the same weight multiplicities [Jan96, Lemma 5.14].

#### 4. RIBBON CATEGORIES FROM QUANTUM GROUPS

In this section we show that the category  $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{g})$  of finite-dimensional modules over the Drinfeld-Jimbo quantum group  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$  is a semisimple ribbon category. The interested reader may refer to [AP95] to construct RFCs as finite quotients of  $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{g})$ .

In addition, we show that the braiding on  $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{g})$  is characterized by an infinitesimal braiding on the category of finite-dimensional  $U(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules, which is itself characterized by the infinitesimal braiding on  $U(\mathfrak{g})$  induced its Casimir element. Section 4.1 recalls infinitesimal braidings. This characterization of the braiding on  $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{g})$  has a geometric interpretation in terms of the Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov (KZ) equations; the connection was developed in the works [Dri89b, KL93, Koh02] by Drinfeld, Kazhdan and Lusztig, and Kohno, amongst others.

A key step in our construction is showing that the braiding on  $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{g})$  is generated by the universal  $R$ -matrix of the topological ribbon algebra  $\widetilde{U}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ , defined in Section 4.3 as a certain completion of  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ . This requires an understanding of topological quantized enveloping algebras, which is developed in Section 4.2. In particular, Section 4.2 culminates in a Drinfeld-Kohno theorem: the braiding on *any* topological quantized enveloping algebra over  $\mathfrak{g}$  is generated by some infinitesimal braiding on  $U(\mathfrak{g})$ .

We omit most proofs where precise references are provided.

**4.1. Infinitesimal braids.** We recall the notion of infinitesimal braids and show  $U(\mathfrak{g})$  carries infinitesimal braidings. This means the collection of finite-dimensional  $U(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules is an infinitesimal symmetric category in the sense of Definition 4.4.

**Definition 4.1.** The *infinitesimal braid algebra*  $\mathfrak{p}_n$  is the unital associative  $\mathbb{C}$ -algebra generated by  $t_{ij}$ ,  $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$  subject to the following relations, for all pairwise distinct  $i, j, k, l$ :

$$t_{ij} = t_{ji}, \quad [t_{ij}, t_{kl}] = 0, \quad [t_{ij}, t_{ik} + t_{jk}] = 0. \quad (4.1)$$

Here  $[\cdot, \cdot]$  denotes the usual algebra commutator.

The *infinitesimal braidings* on  $U(\mathfrak{g})$ , that is, the homomorphisms  $\mathfrak{p}_n \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes n}$ , are determined by structural properties of  $U(\mathfrak{g})$  as a cocommutative Hopf algebra. Thus we study infinitesimal braidings in this more general context first.

Let  $H$  denote a cocommutative Hopf algebra. Every *symmetric invariant 2-tensor* on  $H$  determines an infinitesimal braiding on  $H^{\otimes n}$ .

**Definition 4.2.** Let  $\text{Prim}(H) = \{x \in H \mid \Delta(x) = x \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes x\}$  denote the subset of *primitive elements* in  $H \otimes H$ . A *symmetric invariant 2-tensor* on  $H$  is an element  $\theta \in \text{Prim}(H) \otimes \text{Prim}(H)$  such that  $\theta_{21} = \theta$  and  $[\Delta(x), \theta] = 0$  for all  $x \in H$ .

**Proposition 4.3.** [*Kas95*, Lemma XIX.3.2] Let  $\theta = \sum_a x_a \otimes y_a$  denote a symmetric invariant 2-tensor on  $H$ . For all  $i \neq j$ , let  $\theta_{ij}$  denote the element of  $H^{\otimes n}$  defined by

$$\theta_{ij} = \sum_a x_a^{(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes x_a^{(n)},$$

where  $x_a^{(i)} = x_a$ ,  $y_a^{(i)} = y_a$ , and  $x_k^{(\ell)} = 1$  otherwise. There is an algebra homomorphism  $\mathfrak{p}_n \rightarrow H^{\otimes n}$  satisfying  $t_{ij} \rightarrow \theta_{ij}$ .

We will also need the dual notion at the level of categories.

**Definition 4.4.** [*Kas95*, Definition XX.4.1] An *infinitesimal braiding* on a strict monoidal category  $\mathcal{S}$  with involutive braiding  $\sigma_{V,W} : V \otimes W \rightarrow W \otimes V$  is a family of functorial endomorphisms  $t_{V,W} : V \otimes W \rightarrow V \otimes W$ , defined for all pairs  $(V, W)$  of objects in  $\mathcal{S}$ , which satisfies

$$\sigma_{V,W} \circ t_{V,W} = t_{W,V} \circ \sigma_{V,W}, \quad (4.2)$$

and

$$t_{U,V \otimes W} = t_{U,V} \otimes \text{id}_W + (\sigma_{U,V} \otimes \text{id}_W)^{-1} \circ (\text{id}_V \otimes t_{U,W}) \circ (\sigma_{U,V} \otimes \text{id}_W) \quad (4.3)$$

for all objects  $U, V, W$  in  $\mathcal{S}$ .

An *infinitesimal symmetric category* is a symmetric braided category equipped with an infinitesimal braiding.

Observe that Relation (4.2) implies Relation (4.3) is equivalent to

$$t_{U \otimes V, W} = \text{id}_U \otimes t_{V, W} + (\text{id}_U \otimes \sigma_{V, W})^{-1} \circ (t_{U, W} \otimes \text{id}_V) \circ (\text{id}_U \otimes \sigma_{V, W}). \quad (4.4)$$

The following proposition partially explains the terminology: it shows Relations (4.3) and (4.4) are infinitesimal versions of the Hexagon Relations (2.3) and (2.4) imposed on a braiding in a braided category.

**Proposition 4.5.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a braided category in which the morphisms are given as formal series in a parameter  $h$ . In particular, suppose the braiding  $c_{V, W}$  is of the form*

$$c_{V, W} = \sigma_{V, W}(\text{id}_{V \otimes W} + ht_{V, W} + O(h^2))$$

for some involutive symmetry  $\sigma_{V, W}$ . Here  $O(h^2)$  denotes a sum of terms of degree 2 or higher in  $h$ . Then  $t_{V, W}$  satisfies Relations (4.3) and (4.4).

*Proof.* In view of Relation (4.2), we need only verify Relation (4.3). Together with  $(\sigma_{U, V} \otimes \text{id}_W)(\text{id}_V \otimes \sigma_{U, W}) = \sigma_{U, V \otimes W}$ , Relation (4.2) implies

$$\begin{aligned} (c_{U, V} \otimes \text{id}_W)(\text{id}_V \otimes c_{U, W}) &= (\text{id}_V \otimes \sigma_{U, W})(\sigma_{U, V} \otimes \text{id}_W) \\ &\quad + h(\text{id}_V \otimes \sigma_{U, W})((\sigma_{U, V} \otimes \text{id}_W)(t_{U, W} \otimes \text{id}_W) + (\text{id}_V \otimes t_{U, W})(\sigma_{U, V} \otimes \text{id}_W)) \\ &= \sigma_{U, V \otimes W}(1 + h((t_{U, W} \otimes \text{id}_W) + (\sigma_{U, V} \otimes \text{id}_W)^{-1}(\text{id}_V \otimes t_{U, W})(\sigma_{U, V} \otimes \text{id}_W))), \end{aligned}$$

modulo  $h^2$ . The Hexagon Relation (2.3) implies

$$c_{U, V \otimes W} = (c_{U, V} \otimes \text{id}_W)(\text{id}_V \otimes c_{U, W}).$$

Identifying the linear terms in the last equality proves the claim.  $\square$

Since  $H$  is cocommutative, the category  $H\text{-Mod}$  of modules over  $H$  is a symmetric braided category with the flip map  $\tau_{V, W}$  taking  $v \otimes w \rightarrow w \otimes v$  as its symmetry.

Moreover, there is a one-to-one correspondence between infinitesimal braidings on  $H\text{-Mod}$  and symmetric invariant 2-tensors on  $H$ . On one hand, each symmetric invariant 2-tensor on  $H$  defines an infinitesimal braiding on  $H\text{-Mod}$ : Proposition 4.3 implies that if  $\theta$  is a symmetric invariant 2-tensor, there is an infinitesimal braiding on  $H\text{-Mod}$  satisfying

$$t_{V, W}(v \otimes w) = \theta \triangleright v \otimes w \quad (4.5)$$

for every pair of  $H$ -modules  $V, W$ . Conversely, every infinitesimal braiding on  $H\text{-Mod}$  arises this way: if  $t_{V, W}$  denotes an infinitesimal braiding on  $H\text{-Mod}$  then  $\theta = t_{H, H}(1 \otimes 1)$  is a symmetric invariant 2-tensor.

We can characterize the infinitesimal braidings on an infinitesimal symmetric category more precisely when there is additional structure in the category, such as a left duality in the sense of Definition 2.7. In such categories, every infinitesimal braiding has the form [Kas95, Section XX.4]

$$t_{V, W} = \frac{1}{2}(C_{V \otimes W} - \text{id}_V \otimes C_W - C_V \otimes \text{id}_W), \quad (4.6)$$

with  $C_V : V \rightarrow V$  denoting the natural endomorphism defined by

$$C_V = - \left( \text{id}_V \otimes (d_V \circ t_{V^*, V}) \right) \circ (b_V \otimes \text{id}_V). \quad (4.7)$$

Thus since the subcategory  $H\text{-Mod}_f$  of finite-dimensional  $H$ -modules has left duality, every infinitesimal braiding on  $H\text{-Mod}_f$  is induced by the action of a *single* element  $\sum_i x_i y_i \in H$ , such that  $\theta = \sum_i x_i \otimes y_i$  is a symmetric invariant 2-tensor.

Specializing  $H = U(\mathfrak{g})$ , this means each infinitesimal braiding on  $U(\mathfrak{g})\text{-Mod}_f$  is induced by the action of an element  $\sum_i x_i y_i$ , with  $x_i, y_i \in \text{Prim}(U(\mathfrak{g})) = \mathfrak{g}$ . An important example concerns the Casimir element  $C = \sum_\alpha X_\alpha X^\alpha$  introduced in Relation (3.9). Note that the associated 2-tensor

$$t = \frac{1}{2} (\Delta(C) - C \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes C) = \sum_\alpha X_\alpha \otimes X^\alpha \quad (4.8)$$

is symmetric and it is invariant because  $C$  is canonical and central in  $U(\mathfrak{g})$ .

We shall see in Section 4.3 that this infinitesimal braiding generates the braiding on the category of finite-dimensional  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules. To see this, however, we will need to go through a certain topological quantized enveloping algebra first.

**4.2. (Topological) quantized enveloping algebras.** We define topological quantized enveloping algebras (QUEs) in the sense of [Dri87]. As a certain deformation of  $U(\mathfrak{g})$ , a QUE is equipped with a braiding that is generated infinitesimally by a symmetric invariant 2-tensor on  $U(\mathfrak{g})$ . The Drinfeld-Kohno Theorem 4.15 makes this precise. We single out the QUE  $U_h(\mathfrak{g})$  because it carries a braiding whose action on any tensor product is equivalent to that induced by the matrix  $e^{ht}$ , with  $t$  as in Relation (4.8), and, in addition, it has a ribbon element.

We begin by recalling topological algebras and deformations. Fix a parameter  $h$  and let  $\mathbb{C}[[h]]$  denote the ring of formal power series in  $h$  with complex coefficients.

**Definition 4.6.** [BFGP94, A.4.1] A *topological vector space (t.v.s.)* is a complex vector space with a locally convex Hausdorff topology. A *topological algebra* over a ring  $R$  is a triple  $(A, \mu, \eta)$  where  $A$  is a complete t.v.s., and the multiplication  $\mu : A \tilde{\otimes} A \rightarrow A$  and unit  $\eta : R \rightarrow A$  are continuous linear maps satisfying

$$\mu \circ (\mu \tilde{\otimes} \text{id}_A) = \mu \circ (\text{id}_A \tilde{\otimes} \mu) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu \circ (\eta \tilde{\otimes} \text{id}_A) = \text{id}_A = \mu \circ (\text{id}_A \tilde{\otimes} \eta)$$

with  $\tilde{\otimes}$  denoting the completion of the projective topological tensor product.

*Remark 4.7.* When the topology of the t.v.s.  $A$  is generated by a family of seminorms  $(p_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{F}}$ , the topology on  $A \tilde{\otimes} A$  is generated by the family  $(p_\alpha \otimes p_\beta)_{\alpha, \beta}$  of all possible tensor products of the  $(p_\alpha)_\alpha$  [Gro55]. Recall each tensor product  $p_\alpha \otimes p_\beta : A \tilde{\otimes} A \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  satisfies

$$(p_\alpha \otimes p_\beta)(z) = \inf_{(x_i), (y_i)} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} p_\alpha(x_i) p_\beta(y_i).$$

for any  $z = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} x_i \otimes y_i$ .

**Definition 4.8.** [BS03, Definition 1] A *deformation* of a  $\mathbb{C}$ -algebra  $A$  is a  $\mathbb{C}[[h]]$ -algebra  $\tilde{A}$  such that  $\tilde{A}/hA \cong A$ . A deformation is *trivial* if it is isomorphic to  $A$  considered as a  $\mathbb{C}[[h]]$ -algebra by base field extension. Two deformations are *equivalent* if they are isomorphic as  $\mathbb{C}[[h]]$ -algebras.

Now set  $A = U(\mathfrak{g})[[h]]$ . Then  $A$  becomes a topological algebra when we equip it with the  $h$ -adic topology: since the topology is metrizable, the completion of the projective topological tensor product coincides with the completion of  $A \otimes A$  in the  $h$ -adic topology; that is,

$$A \tilde{\otimes} A = (U(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes U(\mathfrak{g}))[[h]].$$

As topological *algebras*, deformations of  $U(\mathfrak{g})$  are not very interesting: the next theorem shows that the multiplication on every deformation is essentially the same.

**Theorem 4.9.** *Let  $(A, \mu, \eta)$  be a deformation of  $U(\mathfrak{g})$  such that  $A = U(\mathfrak{g})[[h]]$  as a  $\mathbb{C}[[h]]$ -module and suppose the unit  $\eta(1)$  is the constant formal series 1 in  $U(\mathfrak{g})[[h]]$ . There is a unique isomorphism  $\alpha: A \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{g})[[h]]$  of topological algebras inducing the identity  $A/hA \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{g})$  modulo  $h$  and satisfying  $\alpha = \text{id} \pmod{h}$ .*

*Moreover, if  $\mathfrak{g}'$  is any other semisimple Lie algebra and  $\beta, \beta'$  are any two morphisms of topological algebras from  $A$  to  $U(\mathfrak{g}')[[h]]$  such that  $\beta \equiv \beta' \pmod{h}$ , there exists an element  $F$  in  $U(\mathfrak{g}')[[h]]$  such that  $F \equiv 1 \pmod{h}$  and  $\beta'(a) = F\beta(a)F^{-1}$  for all elements  $a$  in  $A$ .*

*Proof.* This theorem relies on vanishing results for certain cohomology groups associated to  $\mathfrak{g}$ ; see Sections XVIII.2 and XVIII.3 in [Kas95]. Drinfeld proves the uniqueness statement in [Dri89a].  $\square$

However, the category of Hopf algebras is less rigid; deformations of  $U(\mathfrak{g})$  are quite interesting as *topological braided quasi-bialgebras*.

**Definition 4.10.** [Kas95, Section XVI.4] A *topological quasi-bialgebra* is a sextuple  $(A, \mu, \eta, \Delta, \varepsilon, \Phi)$  such that the triple  $(A, \mu, \eta)$  is a topological algebra over a ring  $R$ ,  $\Delta: A \rightarrow A \tilde{\otimes} A$  and  $\varepsilon: A \rightarrow R$  are continuous algebra maps, and  $\Phi$  is an invertible element in  $A \tilde{\otimes} A \tilde{\otimes} A$  satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} (\varepsilon \tilde{\otimes} \text{id}_A) \Delta &= \text{id}_A = (\text{id}_A \tilde{\otimes} \varepsilon) \Delta, & (\text{id}_A \tilde{\otimes} \varepsilon \tilde{\otimes} \text{id}_A)(\Phi) &= 1 \tilde{\otimes} 1, & \text{and} \\ (\text{id}_A \tilde{\otimes} \text{id}_A \tilde{\otimes} \Delta)(\Phi) &(\Delta \tilde{\otimes} \text{id}_A \tilde{\otimes} \text{id}_A)(\Phi) &= \Phi_{234} (\text{id}_A \tilde{\otimes} \Delta \tilde{\otimes} \text{id}_A)(\Phi) &\Phi_{123}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

We say  $\Phi$  is an *associator* and for all  $a$  in  $A$  we require

$$(\text{id}_A \tilde{\otimes} \Delta)(\Delta(a)) = \Phi((\Delta \tilde{\otimes} \text{id}_A)(\Delta(a))) \Phi^{-1}. \quad (4.10)$$

If  $\Phi = 1 \tilde{\otimes} 1 \tilde{\otimes} 1$  is trivial, we say  $A$  is a *bialgebra*.

We say the topological quasi-bialgebra  $(A, \mu, \eta, \Delta, \varepsilon, \Phi)$  is *braided* if there exists an invertible element  $\mathcal{R}$  in  $A \tilde{\otimes} A$  such that

$$(\text{id}_A \tilde{\otimes} \Delta) \mathcal{R} = (\Phi_{231})^{-1} \mathcal{R}_{13} \Phi_{213} \mathcal{R}_{12} (\Phi_{123})^{-1}, \quad \text{and} \quad (4.11)$$

$$(\Delta \tilde{\otimes} \text{id}_A)(\mathcal{R}) = \Phi_{312} \mathcal{R}_{13} (\Phi_{132})^{-1} \mathcal{R}_{23} \Phi_{123}, \quad (4.12)$$



We say  $\mathcal{R}$  is a *universal R-matrix* and for all  $a$  in  $A$  we require

$$\Delta^{\text{op}}(a) = \mathcal{R}\Delta(a)\mathcal{R}^{-1}. \quad (4.13)$$

Quasi-bialgebras were first introduced by Drinfeld in [Dri89c]. They generalize the notion of a coassociative bialgebra by requiring coassociativity only up to conjugation by an associator. This is Axiom (4.10). Braided bialgebras generalize the notion of a cocommutative bialgebra in a similar way, by relaxing cocommutativity to Axiom (4.13) instead.

At the level of categories, the representation theory of a braided quasi-bialgebra  $A$  is captured by a braided category: Axiom (4.9) requires a consistency for the associator that is equivalent to the Pentagon Relation (2.1) and Axioms (4.11) and (4.12) enforce the Hexagon Relations (2.3) and (2.4). The category is strict only if  $A$  is in fact a bialgebra.

We may now introduce *quantized enveloping algebras*, as certain braided quasi-bialgebra deformations of  $U(\mathfrak{g})$ .

**Definition 4.11.** [Kas95, Definition XVI.5.1] A *quantized enveloping algebra (QUE)* for the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$  is a topological braided quasi-bialgebra  $A = (A, \mu, \eta, \Delta, \varepsilon, \Phi, \mathcal{R})$  such that

- (1)  $A$  is a topologically free module, which means  $A/hA = U(\mathfrak{g})$  as a left  $\mathbb{C}[[h]]$ -module.
- (2) For  $a, a' \in U(\mathfrak{g})$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(a \otimes a') &= \mu_0(a \otimes a') + \sum_{n \geq 1} \mu_n(a \otimes a')h^n, \\ \Delta(a) &= \Delta_0(a \otimes a') + \sum_{n \geq 1} \Delta_n(a)h^n, \quad \text{and} \\ \varepsilon(a) &= \varepsilon_0(a) + \sum_{n \geq 1} \varepsilon_n(a)h^n, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mu_0$ ,  $\Delta_0$ , and  $\varepsilon_0$  denote the multiplication, comultiplication, and counit maps of the enveloping algebra  $U(\mathfrak{g})$ , and  $(\mu_n)_{n \geq 0}$ ,  $(\Delta_n)_{n \geq 0}$ ,  $(\varepsilon_n)_{n \geq 0}$  are families of linear maps from  $U(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes U(\mathfrak{g})$  to  $U(\mathfrak{g})$ ,  $U(\mathfrak{g})$  to  $U(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes U(\mathfrak{g})$ , and  $U(\mathfrak{g})$  to  $\mathbb{C}$ , respectively.

- (3) The unit  $\eta$  extends the unit of  $U(\mathfrak{g})$  trivially, so  $\eta(f) = f1$  for all  $f \in \mathbb{C}[[h]]$ .
- (4) The elements  $\Phi$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  can be written as

$$\Phi = 1 \otimes 1 \otimes 1 + \sum_{n \geq 1} \Phi_n h^n, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{R} = 1 \otimes 1 + \sum_{n \geq 1} R_n h^n,$$

with  $(\Phi_n)_{n \geq 0}$  and  $(R_n)_{n \geq 0}$  denoting elements of  $U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes 3}$  and  $U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes 2}$ .

There is an important invariant associated to a QUE. If  $A$  is a QUE with  $R$ -matrix  $\mathcal{R}$ , the formula

$$\mathcal{R}_{21}\mathcal{R} \equiv 1 \otimes 1 + 2ht \pmod{h^2} \quad (4.14)$$

defines a unique element  $t \in U(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes U(\mathfrak{g})$ . It turns out that  $t$  is a symmetric in variant 2-tensor on  $U(\mathfrak{g})$  in the sense of Definition 4.2.

**Definition 4.12.** The *canonical 2-tensor* of a QUE  $A$  is the element  $t \in \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathfrak{g}$  defined by Relation (4.14). The pair  $(\mathfrak{g}, t)$  is called the *classical limit* of  $A$ . Dually,  $A$  is a *quantization* of  $(\mathfrak{g}, t)$ .

In our context, the canonical 2-tensor is crucial because it characterizes the (action of the) braiding on a QUE. Theorem 4.15 makes this precise, but it requires the notion of *gauge equivalence*.

**Definition 4.13.** [Kas95, Definition XV.3.1] A *gauge transformation* on the topological quasi-bialgebra  $A$  is an invertible element  $F$  of  $A \tilde{\otimes} A$  such that

$$(\varepsilon \tilde{\otimes} \text{id})(F) = (\text{id} \tilde{\otimes} \varepsilon)(F) = 1.$$

*Remark 4.14.* Gauge transforms are sometimes referred to as *Drinfeld twists* and less frequently as *skrooching* in the literature, e.g. in [Dri89b] and [Sta92]. The term “skrooching” results from the transliteration of a Russian term for twisting.

Notice that twisting defines an equivalence relation:  $(A_F)_{F^{-1}} = A = (A_{F^{-1}})_F$  and if  $F$  and  $F'$  are gauge transformations, then  $FF'$  defines a gauge transformation such that  $(A_F)_{F'} = A_{FF'}$ . Therefore, we say that two (braided) quasi-bialgebras  $(A, \Delta, \varepsilon, \Phi)$  and  $(A', \Delta', \varepsilon', \Phi')$  are *equivalent* if there exists a gauge transform  $F$  on  $A'$  and an isomorphism  $\alpha: A \rightarrow A'_F$  of (braided) quasi-bialgebras.

We use gauge transformations to obtain new QUEs from old ones. In particular, if  $A = (A, \mu, \eta, \Delta, \varepsilon, \Phi)$  is a topological quasi-bialgebra and  $F$  is a gauge transformation on  $A$ , we obtain another topological quasi-bialgebra  $A_F = (A, \mu, \eta, \Delta_F, \varepsilon, \Phi_F)$ , with

$$\Delta_F(a) = F\Delta(a)F^{-1}, \quad a \in A, \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_F = F_{23}(\text{id} \tilde{\otimes} \Delta)(F)\Phi(\Delta \tilde{\otimes} \text{id})(F^{-1})F_{12}^{-1}$$

by “twisting”  $A$  [Kas95, Proposition XV.3.2].

Moreover, if  $A$  is braided with universal  $R$ -matrix  $\mathcal{R}$ , then so is  $A_F$ , with  $R$ -matrix  $\mathcal{R}_F = F_{21}\mathcal{R}F^{-1}$  [Kas95, Proposition XV.3.6]. This means canonical 2-tensors are invariant under gauge transformation:

$$(\mathcal{R}_F)_{21}\mathcal{R}_F = F\mathcal{R}_{21}\mathcal{R}F^{-1} = 1 \otimes 1 + 2ht \pmod{h^2}.$$

It also means the braiding operators  $\check{R}$  and  $\check{R}_F$  induced by  $A$  and  $A_F$  are similar:

$$\check{R}_F = \tau \circ \mathcal{R}_F = F\check{R}F^{-1}. \quad (4.15)$$

Relation (4.15) implies that if  $A$  and  $A'$  are equivalent topological braided quasi-bialgebras and  $M$  is any *finite-rank topologically free* module over  $A$ , that is, a module of the form  $M = V[[h]]$  with  $V$  finite-dimensional, then  $A$  and  $A'$  induce equivalent braid group representations on  $M^{\otimes n}$ .

It turns out the braid representations induced by any QUE are equivalent to those induced by a QUE of the form

$$A_{\mathfrak{g}, \theta} = (U(\mathfrak{g})[[h]], \Delta_0, \varepsilon_0, \Phi, \mathcal{R}_\theta = e^{h\theta}),$$

where  $\theta$  is a symmetric invariant 2-tensor on  $U(\mathfrak{g})$ , in the sense of Definition 4.2. Notice  $A_{\mathfrak{g}, \theta}$  is a quantization of the pair  $(\mathfrak{g}, \theta)$ , in the sense of Definition 4.12, and it is equipped

with the undeformed multiplication and comultiplication of  $U(\mathfrak{g})$ . While  $A_{\mathfrak{g},\theta}$  is cocommutative because the invariance of  $\theta$  guarantees  $R_\theta$  commutes with  $\Delta_0(U(\mathfrak{g}))$ , it is not coassociative in general.

**Theorem 4.15.** [*Dri89b*, Theorem 1] *If  $(A, \Delta, \Phi, \mathcal{R})$  is a QUE, there exists an associator  $\Phi \in U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]^{\otimes 3}$  and a symmetric invariant 2-tensor  $\theta$  on  $U(\mathfrak{g})$  such that  $A$  is equivalent to  $A_{\mathfrak{g},\theta}$  as a topological braided quasi-bialgebra. If  $\mathcal{R}$  is known explicitly, then  $\theta$  is the limit of  $\hbar^{-1}(\mathcal{R}_{21}\mathcal{R} - 1)$  as  $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ .*

At the categorical level, this result implies that for any QUE  $A$  there is a symmetric invariant 2-tensor  $\theta$  on  $U(\mathfrak{g})$  such that  $A\text{-Mod}_{\text{fr}}$  and  $A_{\mathfrak{g},\theta}\text{-Mod}_{\text{fr}}$  are tensor equivalent, since the categories of modules over equivalent QUEs are tensor equivalent [*Kas95*, Theorems XV.3.5, XV.3.9].

We obtain a geometric interpretation of the Drinfeld-Kohno Theorem 4.15 via the KZ equations; see e.g. [*KZ84*, *KL93*, *Fin96*].

**Definition 4.16.** Given a symmetric invariant 2-tensor  $\theta$  on  $U(\mathfrak{g})$  as in Definition 4.2, a complex parameter  $h$ , a finite-dimensional  $\mathfrak{g}$ -module  $V$ , and  $n > 1$ , the *Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov (KZ) differential system* is given by

$$dw = \frac{h}{2\pi\sqrt{-1}} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \frac{\theta_{ij}}{z_i - z_j} (dz_i - dz_j)w, \quad (4.16)$$

where  $w = w(z_1, \dots, z_n)$  is a function on (ordered) configuration space with values in  $V^{\otimes n}$ .

In particular, consider a QUE  $A$ , let  $\theta$  denote its canonical 2-tensor, and fix any topologically free finite-rank  $A$ -module  $V[[\hbar]]$ . Recall Proposition 4.3, which shows that the map  $t_{ij} \rightarrow \theta_{ij}$  defines a representation  $\mathfrak{p}_n \rightarrow \text{End}(V^{\otimes n})$  of the infinitesimal braid algebra, and note that the fundamental group of (ordered) configuration space is the *pure braid group*  $P_n$ , defined as the kernel of the projection  $B_n \rightarrow S_n$  of the braid group onto the symmetric group [*Kas95*, Remark XIX.2.3]. The KZ equations define a flat connection on  $V^{\otimes n}$ , so they induce a monodromy representation of  $P_n$  on  $V^{\otimes n}$ . We may therefore view the infinitesimal braid algebra, with Lie bracket given by the commutator, as the Lie algebra analogue of a Lie group for the pure braid group  $P_n$ ; monodromy is the analogue of integrating a representation of the Lie algebra to a representation of the Lie group. In fact, infinitesimal braids were first introduced by Kohno [*Koh02*] to explain the monodromy of the KZ equations as they arise in Wess-Zumino-Witten conformal field theories (CFTs).

The monodromy representation of  $P_n$  may be extended to a representation of the full braid group and Drinfeld shows this (analytic) braid representation is equivalent to that induced by the  $R$ -matrix  $\mathcal{R}_\theta = e^{h\theta}$ , once we identify analytic functions with formal series [*Dri89b*]. In view of Theorem 4.15, this representation is in turn equivalent to the representation induced by  $A$  on  $V[[\hbar]]^{\otimes n}$ .

Moreover, Drinfeld constructs the associator  $\Phi$  mentioned in Theorem 4.15 explicitly using solutions to KZ system [*Dri89b*]. Drinfeld's construction shows that, conversely, solutions to the KZ equations give rise to braided quasi-bialgebras.

Now we turn our attention to the QUE  $U_h(\mathfrak{g})$  defined below.

**Definition 4.17.** [Kas95, Definition XVII.2.3] Consider the enveloping algebra  $U(\mathfrak{g})$  as described by Relations (3.1) and (3.2). Set  $q_i = e^{hd_i}$  and fix  $q = e^h$ . Let  $U_h(\mathfrak{g})$  denote the unital associative  $\mathbb{C}[[h]]$ -algebra generated by the  $U(\mathfrak{g})$  generators  $E_1, \dots, E_r, F_1, \dots, F_r$ , and  $H_1, \dots, H_r$  subject to the relations

$$\begin{aligned} [H_i, H_j] &= 0, & [H_i, E_j] &= a_{ij}E_j, & [H_i, F_j] &= -a_{ij}F_j, & \text{and} \\ [E_i, F_j] &= \delta_{ij} \frac{e^{hd_i H_i} - e^{-hd_i H_i}}{q_i - q_i^{-1}}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.17)$$

along with the  $q$ -Serre relations for  $i \neq j$ :

$$\sum_{k=0}^{1-a_{ij}} (-1)^k \begin{bmatrix} 1 - a_{ij} \\ k \end{bmatrix}_{q_i} X_i^k X_j X_i^{1-a_{ij}-k} = 0. \quad (4.18)$$

In the last equality every  $X$  is either an  $E$  or an  $F$ . The  $q$ -integer  $[n]_{q_i} = \frac{q_i^n - q_i^{-n}}{q_i - q_i^{-1}}$ , the  $q$ -factorial  $[n]_{q_i}! = [n]_{q_i} \cdots [1]_{q_i}$ , and the  $q$ -binomial coefficient is defined similarly.

Observe there is an algebra isomorphism  $U_h(\mathfrak{g})/hU_h(\mathfrak{g}) \cong U(\mathfrak{g})$  arising as follows. First note that while  $q_i - q_i^{-1} = 2 \sinh(hd_i) = 2 \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{(hd_i)^{2n+1}}{(2n+1)!}$  is not invertible  $\mathbb{C}[[h]]$ , it is the product of  $h$  and a unit. This means  $[E_i, F_j]$  is indeed well-defined. In particular,

$$[E_i, F_j] = \delta_{ij} \frac{\sinh(hd_i H_i)}{\sinh(hd_i)} = \delta_{ij} H_i \pmod{h},$$

so we recover Relations (3.1) and (3.2), characterizing  $U(\mathfrak{g})$ , by setting  $h = 0$  in Relations (4.17) and (4.18).

In [Dri87], Drinfeld proved that  $U_h(\mathfrak{g})$  is in fact a braided bialgebra with universal  $R$ -matrix of the form

$$\mathcal{R}_h = \exp \left( h \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq r} (DA^{-1})_{ij} H_i \otimes H_j \right) \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}^r} P_\ell, \quad (4.19)$$

where  $P_\ell$  is a homogeneous polynomial of degree  $\ell_i$  in the variables  $E_i \otimes 1$  and in  $1 \otimes F_i$ . In particular,  $P_0 = 1 \otimes 1$  so  $\mathcal{R}_h \equiv 1 \otimes 1 \pmod{h}$ . Explicit formulas for  $\mathcal{R}_h$  may be found in, e.g., [KR90, Ros91]. The QUE  $U_h(\mathfrak{g})$  is coassociative but not cocommutative, because the associator is trivial but the  $R$ -matrix is not. The comultiplication  $\Delta_h$  and the counit  $\varepsilon_h$  satisfy

$$\Delta_h = \Delta_0 \pmod{h} \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon_h = \varepsilon_0 \pmod{h}.$$

For details, see [CP94, Theorem 8.3.9].

The QUE  $U_h(\mathfrak{g})$  stands out because its canonical 2-tensor  $t^*$  is induced by the Casimir element  $C$  in  $U(\mathfrak{g})$  through the formula

$$t^* = \frac{1}{2}(\Delta_0(C) - C \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes C). \quad (4.20)$$

This can be seen by considering  $U_h(\mathfrak{g})$  as a *ribbon algebra*.

**Definition 4.18.** A (topological) braided Hopf algebra  $(H, \Delta, \varepsilon, S, \mathcal{R})$  is a (topological) ribbon algebra if there exists a central element  $\theta$  in  $H$  satisfying

$$\Delta(\theta) = (\mathcal{R}_{21}\mathcal{R})^{-1}(\theta \otimes \theta), \quad \varepsilon(\theta) = 1, \quad S(\theta) = \theta.$$

We say  $\theta$  is a ribbon element.

*Remark 4.19.* If  $H$  is a ribbon algebra with ribbon element  $\theta$ , then  $\mathbf{H}\text{-Mod}_f$  is a ribbon category with twist  $\theta_V$  satisfying  $\theta_V(v) = \theta^{-1}v$  for every  $V \in \mathbf{H}\text{-Mod}_f$  [Kas95, Proposition XIV.6.2]. Moreover, for any  $V, W \in \mathbf{H}\text{-Mod}_f$ , the induced braiding operator  $c_{V,W} = \tau \circ \mathcal{R}$  satisfies

$$c_{V,V}^2 = (\mathcal{R}_{21}\mathcal{R}) = \Delta(\theta)(\theta \otimes \theta). \quad (4.21)$$

**Theorem 4.20.** Let  $C$  denote the Casimir element of  $U(\mathfrak{g})$ , as in Relation (3.9), let  $\alpha: A \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{g})[[h]]$  denote the unique isomorphism satisfying  $\alpha \equiv \text{id} \pmod{h}$  guaranteed by Theorem 4.9, and set  $C_h = \alpha^{-1}(C)$ . Then the QUE  $U_h(\mathfrak{g})$  is a ribbon algebra with ribbon element  $\theta_h = e^{-hC_h}$ .

A key step in the proof of Theorem 4.20 involves identifying central elements in  $U_h(\mathfrak{g})$  by comparing their actions on certain modules. This is possible because: (1)  $\alpha$  maps the center of  $U_h(\mathfrak{g})$  to  $Z(\mathfrak{g})[[h]]$  isomorphically, with  $Z(\mathfrak{g})$  denoting the center of  $U(\mathfrak{g})$ , thereby identifying each central element in  $U_h(\mathfrak{g})$  with a polynomial function on the weight lattice of  $\mathfrak{g}$  via the classical Harish-Chandra homomorphism; and (2) the representation theory of  $U_h(\mathfrak{g})$  is parallel to that of  $U(\mathfrak{g})$ .

Indeed, there is a one-to-one correspondence between irreducible  $U(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules and indecomposable finite-rank topologically free modules over  $U_h(\mathfrak{g})$ . Over  $U_h(\mathfrak{g})$ , we consider indecomposable, rather than irreducible, modules because the  $U_h(\mathfrak{g})$ -action preserves each subspace  $h^n V[[h]]$  in any topologically free  $V[[h]]$ . In particular, for every dominant weight  $\mu$  of  $\mathfrak{g}$  there is a unique indecomposable topologically free  $U_h(\mathfrak{g})$ -module  $\tilde{V}(\mu)$  satisfying

$$\tilde{V}(\mu)/h\tilde{V}(\mu) \cong L(\mu),$$

with  $L(\mu)$  denoting an irreducible  $U(\mathfrak{g})$ -module with highest weight  $\mu$  [Dri89a]. As in the classical case, there is a highest weight vector  $v_\mu$  in  $\tilde{V}(\mu)$  satisfying

$$H_i v_\mu = \mu(H_i) v_\mu \quad \text{and} \quad E_i v_\mu = 0,$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, r$ , that both generates and characterizes  $\tilde{V}(\mu)$  [Dri89a, Proposition 4.3].

By uniqueness, the  $U_h(\mathfrak{g})$ -action on  $\tilde{V}(\mu)$  must coincide with the composition

$$U_h(\mathfrak{g}) \xrightarrow{\alpha} U(\mathfrak{g})[[h]] \rightarrow \text{End}(V[[h]]).$$

Letting  $\chi_\mu(C) = \langle \mu, \mu + 2\rho \rangle$  denote the eigenvalue of  $C$  on  $L(\mu)$  as in Relation (3.10), it follows that the element  $\theta_h$  acts on  $\tilde{V}(\mu)$  as

$$\theta_h = e^{-h\alpha(C_h)} = e^{-hC} = q^{-\langle \mu, \mu + 2\rho \rangle}. \quad (4.22)$$

*Proof of Theorem 4.20.* Let  $S_h$  denote the antipode of  $U_h(\mathfrak{g})$ . Set  $u = \mu((S_h \otimes \text{id})\mathcal{R}_{21})$  and take  $\rho^* = \sum_i b_i H_i$  as in Relation (3.7). We show  $e^{-2h\rho^*} u$  is a ribbon element and conclude by showing it acts on  $\tilde{V}(\mu)$  as in Relation (4.22).

First we show  $\theta$  is central by comparing two expressions for  $S_h^2$ . On one hand, Proposition 2.1 in [Dri89a] shows  $S_h^2(x) = u x u^{-1}$ . On the other, we use Lemma 6.4.2 in [CP94] to prove  $e^{hzH_j} X_i^\pm e^{-hzH_j} = e^{\pm hz\langle \alpha_j^\vee, \alpha_i \rangle} X_i^\pm$  with  $X_i^+ = E_i$  and  $X_i^- = F_i$ , which implies  $S_h^2(x) = e^{2h\rho^*} x e^{-2h\rho^*}$ . Rearranging  $u x u^{-1} = S_h^2(x) = e^{2h\rho^*} x e^{-2h\rho^*}$  implies

$$\theta x = (e^{-2h\rho^*} u) x = x (e^{-2h\rho^*} u) = x \theta.$$

Next, applying the two expressions for  $S_h^2$  with  $x = u$  yields  $e^{-2h\rho^*} u = u e^{-2h\rho^*}$ . Propositions 3.1 and 3.2 in [Dri89a] prove  $\varepsilon(u) = 1$  and  $\Delta(u) = (\mathcal{R}_{21}\mathcal{R})^{-1}(u \otimes u)$ . Therefore  $\varepsilon(\theta_h) = \varepsilon(u) = e^{-2h\varepsilon(\rho^*)} = 1$ , and

$$\Delta_h(\theta) = \Delta_h(u) \Delta_h(e^{-2h\rho^*}) = ((\mathcal{R}_h)_{21}\mathcal{R}_h)^{-1}(u e^{-2h\rho^*} \otimes u e^{-2h\rho^*}) = ((\mathcal{R}_h)_{21}\mathcal{R}_h)^{-1}(\theta \otimes \theta).$$

To conclude, we compute the action of  $e^{-2h\rho^*} u$  on  $\tilde{V}(\mu)$ . Since  $e^{-2h\rho^*} u$  is central, it suffices to consider a highest weight vector  $v_\mu$ . For starters, we compute that

$$e^{-2h\rho^*} v_\mu = \prod_i \left( \sum_{k \geq 0} (-2h)^k b_i^k \frac{\mu(H_i)^k}{k!} \right) v_\mu = \exp \left( -2h \sum_i b_i \mu(H_i) \right) v_\mu = e^{-h\langle \mu, 2\rho \rangle} v_\mu.$$

Now notice the formula defining  $u$  is such that every  $E_i$  appears on the right. Each  $P_\ell$  in (4.19) is homogeneous of degree  $\ell$  in  $E_i \otimes 1$  and each  $E_i$  annihilates  $v_\mu$ , so only the  $\ell = 0$  term contributes to the sum. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} u \triangleright v_\mu &= \exp \left( h \sum_{i,j} (DA^{-1})_{ij} S(H_j) H_i \right) v_\mu \\ &= \prod_{i,j} \left( \sum_{k \geq 0} (-h)^k (DA^{-1})_{ij}^k \frac{\mu(H_j)^k \mu(H_i)^k}{k!} \right) v_\mu \\ &= \exp \left( -h \sum_{i,j} (DA^{-1})_{ij} \mu(H_j) \mu(H_i) \right) v_\mu \\ &= e^{-h\langle \mu, \mu \rangle} v_\mu. \end{aligned} \tag{4.23}$$

The last equality follows immediately from Relation (3.8). Combining results implies  $e^{-2h\rho^*} u$  indeed acts on  $\tilde{V}(\mu)$  as in Relation (4.22), so  $\theta_h = e^{-2h\rho^*} u$ .

Notice  $\theta_h$  is indeed fixed by the antipode:  $S_h(\theta_h)$  acts on  $\tilde{V}(\mu)$  as  $\theta_h$  acts on the contragredient  $\tilde{V}(\mu)^*$ , whose highest weight is the opposite of the reflection of  $\mu$  by the long element  $w_0$  in the Weyl group  $W$ . Thus  $S_h(\theta_h)$  acts on  $\tilde{V}(\mu)$  as the scalar

$$e^{-h\langle -w_0\lambda, -w_0\lambda \rangle} e^{-h\langle -w_0\lambda, 2\rho \rangle} = e^{-h\langle \lambda, \lambda + 2\rho \rangle},$$

because  $-w_0\rho = \rho$  and the form is  $W$ -invariant [LR97].  $\square$

Notice that Theorem 4.20 implies

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{R}_h)_{21}\mathcal{R}_h &= \Delta_h(\theta_h)(\theta_h \otimes \theta_h) = e^{h\Delta_h(C_h)}(e^{-hC_h} \otimes e^{-hC_h}) \\ &\equiv 1 \otimes 1 + (\Delta_0(C) - C \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes C)h \pmod{h^2}. \end{aligned}$$

The last identity uses the congruence  $C_h \equiv C \pmod{h}$ .

Specializing Theorem 4.15 to the case  $A = U_h(\mathfrak{g})$  then shows  $U_h(\mathfrak{g})$  is equivalent to a QUE of the form

$$(U(\mathfrak{g})[[h]], \Delta, \varepsilon, \Phi, \mathcal{R} = e^{ht^*}). \quad (4.24)$$

This means the braiding on  $U_h(\mathfrak{g})$  is generated infinitesimally by the symmetric invariant 2-tensor  $t^*$  induced by the Casimir element on  $U(\mathfrak{g})$  via Relation (4.20).

This result is key. The following theorem shows  $U_h(\mathfrak{g})\text{-Mod}_{\text{fr}}$  essentially characterizes all possible  $h$ -adic deformations of  $U(\mathfrak{g})\text{-Mod}_{\text{f}}$ .

**Definition 4.21.** [Yet92, Definition 3.5] An  $h$ -adic deformation of a braided  $\mathbb{C}$ -linear category  $\mathcal{C}$  is a  $\mathbb{C}[[h]]$ -linear category with the same objects as  $\mathcal{C}$  but with the  $\mathbb{C}[[h]]$ -module hom-sets from  $V$  to  $W$  given by  $\mathbb{C}[[h]] \tilde{\otimes} \text{Hom}(V, W)$ , with composition extended  $\mathbb{C}[[h]]$ -bilinearly and continuously. The deformation is equipped with a monoidal structure that matches the structure on  $\mathcal{C}$  on objects, and extends it  $\mathbb{C}[[h]]$ -bilinearly and continuously on maps. The associativity, left and right unit constraints, and the braiding on the deformation all reduce modulo  $h$  to the corresponding maps on  $\mathcal{C}$ .

**Theorem 4.22.** [EGNO15, Example 7.22.6] [CE04, Example 2.24] Let  $G$  be a complex reductive Lie group with Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$ , and let  $\text{Rep}(G)_f$  denote the category of finite-dimensional  $G$ -modules. There exists a unique one-parameter deformation of  $\text{Rep}(G)_f$ , and it is realized by  $U_h(\mathfrak{g})\text{-Mod}_{\text{fr}}$ .

**4.3.  $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{g})$  is a ribbon category.** We show the category  $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{g})$  of finite-dimensional modules over the quantum group  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$  is a ribbon category; by Theorem 4.22, this category is tensor equivalent to  $U_h(\mathfrak{g})\text{-Mod}_{\text{fr}}$ . This implies the braid group representation induced by the braiding on  $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{g})$  on any tensor product  $V^{\otimes m}$  is equivalent to the representation induced by the  $R$ -matrix of  $U_h(\mathfrak{g})$ , once we identify  $q = e^h$ . In view of Relation (4.24), this means the representations induced by  $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{g})$  are generated infinitesimally by the symmetric invariant 2-tensor  $t$  in Relation (4.20), which is induced by the Casimir element in  $U(\mathfrak{g})$ . Concretely, if  $V$  is any simple  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module, the braid representation  $\sigma_i \rightarrow \check{R}_i$  on  $V^{\otimes m}$  induced by the braiding on  $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{g})$  is equivalent to the representation induced by  $q^t$ .

For starters we describe the objects in  $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{g})$ . When  $q$  is transcendental over  $\mathbb{Q}$ , the finite-dimensional representation theory of  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$  is parallel to that of  $U(\mathfrak{g})$ : there is a one-to-one correspondence between simple modules, as follows. Every finite-dimensional  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module is a direct sum of *weight spaces*  $V_\mu$  defined by

$$V_\mu = \{v \in V \mid K_i v = q^{\langle \mu, \alpha_i \rangle} v, i = 1, \dots, r\}$$

for any weight  $\mu$  in  $\mathcal{P}$  [Jan96, Proposition 5.1]. In addition, every finite-dimensional  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module is completely reducible. Every finite-dimensional irreducible module  $V$  is a *highest weight module*, which means there is a dominant weight  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}^+$  and  $v \in V_\mu$  such that  $E_i v = 0$  for  $i = 1, \dots, r$  and  $V = U_q(\mathfrak{g}) \cdot v$  [Jan96, Theorem 5.10]. Conversely, every highest weight module is in fact irreducible [CP94, Theorem 10.1.6]. Thus for each  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}^+$ , there is exactly one irreducible  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module  $V(\mu)$ , which decomposes as  $V(\mu) = \bigoplus_\nu V_\nu$ , with the same weight multiplicities as in an irreducible  $U(\mathfrak{g})$ -module with highest weight  $\mu$  [Lus88, Theorem 4.12].

*Remark 4.23.* Our discussion characterizes  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules of *type*  $\mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1)$ . Weight spaces can be defined more generally, by taking any group homomorphism  $\sigma: \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$  and setting  $V_{\mu, \sigma} = \{v \in V \mid K_i v = \sigma(\alpha_i) q^{\langle \mu, \alpha_i \rangle} v, i = 1, \dots, r\}$ . This more general definition results in modules of *type*  $\sigma$ ; see Chapter 5 in [Jan96] or Chapter 9 in [CP94] for details.

Next we show  $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{g})$  is a braided category. We construct a braiding on  $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{g})$  in two steps. First recall Relation (4.19), which defines the  $R$ -matrix  $\mathcal{R}_h$  of  $U_h(\mathfrak{g})$ , and write  $\mathcal{R}_h = \mathcal{E}_h \mathcal{S}_h$  with

$$\mathcal{E}_h = \exp \left( h \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq r} (DA^{-1})_{ij} H_i \otimes H_j \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{S}_h = \sum_{\ell} P_{\ell}.$$

Each  $E_i, F_i$  acts nilpotently on every finite-dimensional  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module, so all but finitely many summands of  $\mathcal{S}_h$  act trivially on any tensor product. This means  $\mathcal{S}_h$  induces a well-defined endomorphism on every tensor product  $V(\mu) \otimes V(\nu)$  of simple objects in  $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{g})$ . Call this map  $R_{\mu, \nu}$ .

The exponential term is more nuanced. For any pair  $V(\mu), V(\nu)$  of irreducible modules,  $V(\mu) \otimes V(\nu)$  is a direct sum of subspaces of the form  $V_{\mu'} \otimes V_{\nu'}$ . A calculation like the one in Relation (4.23) shows each  $V_{\mu'} \otimes V_{\nu'} \subseteq V(\mu) \otimes V(\nu)$  is an eigenspace for  $\mathcal{E}_h$  with eigenvalue  $e^{h \langle \mu', \nu' \rangle}$ . For this reason we define  $E_{\mu, \nu}$  as the operator on  $V(\mu) \otimes V(\nu)$  acting as the scalar  $q^{\langle \mu', \nu' \rangle}$  on the subspace  $V_{\mu'} \otimes V_{\nu'}$ .

We compose these two endomorphisms with the flip map  $\tau$  taking  $v \otimes w \rightarrow w \otimes v$  as usual to obtain a morphism  $c_{\mu, \nu}: V(\mu) \otimes V(\nu) \rightarrow V(\nu) \otimes V(\mu)$  given by

$$c_{\mu, \nu} = \tau \circ E_{\mu, \nu} R_{\mu, \nu}.$$

Proposition 10.1.19 in [CP94] proves the family  $(c_{\mu, \nu})_{\mu, \nu}$  defines a braiding on  $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{g})$ .

If we identify  $q = e^h$ , we see that the actions of  $E_{\mu, \nu} R_{\mu, \nu}$  and  $\mathcal{R}_h$  on  $V(\mu) \otimes V(\nu)$  are identical: the map  $E_{\mu, \nu} R_{\mu, \nu}$  is defined to *implement*  $\mathcal{R}_h$ . Technically, this achieves this section's goal: we have just shown that the action of the braiding on  $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{g})$  on any tensor product  $V(\mu) \otimes V(\nu)$  coincides with the action of the braiding operator induced by the  $R$ -matrix of  $U_h(\mathfrak{g})$ , which is generated infinitesimally by the canonical tensor defined by Relation (4.20). Nice!

However, this method does not tell the whole story. The category  $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{g})$  is in fact a ribbon category that may be realized as a category of modules over a certain ribbon algebra  $\widetilde{U}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ . This characterization of  $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{g})$  is important because it yields a convenient expression for the (square of) the braiding operators in terms of the algebra's ribbon element via Relation (4.21).

The algebra  $\widetilde{U}_q(\mathfrak{g})$  is a completion of  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$  whose elements may be characterized by their action on every finite-dimensional  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module. We dedicate the rest of this section to constructing  $\widetilde{U}_q(\mathfrak{g})$  and exploring some of its basic properties. Our discussion culminates in Theorem 4.28.

To begin let  $U_q^-, U_q^0$ , and  $U_q^+$  denote the subalgebras of  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$  generated by the  $E_i$ , the  $K_i^{\pm}$ , and the  $F_i$ . Let  $(U_q^+)_{\beta} = \{u \in U_q^+ \mid K_i u K_i^{-1} = q^{\langle \beta, \alpha_i \rangle} u, i = 1, \dots, n\}$  and define the



height of a root  $\beta = \sum_i \beta_i \alpha_i$  as  $\text{height}(\beta) = \sum_i \beta_i$ . For each  $m \geq 1$ , set

$$U_q^{+,m} = \bigoplus_{\beta \in \mathcal{Q}: \text{height}(\beta) \geq m} (U_q^+)_{\beta}.$$

The completion  $\widetilde{U}_q(\mathfrak{g})$  is defined as the inverse limit

$$\widetilde{U}_q(\mathfrak{g}) = \varprojlim (U_q(\mathfrak{g})) / (U_q(\mathfrak{g})) U_q^{+,m}. \quad (4.25)$$

This algebra can be understood as a direct product because  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$  has a triangular decomposition and a PBW-type basis, much like its classical counterpart  $U(\mathfrak{g})$  [KS97, Theorem 6.14]. Since

$$U_q(\mathfrak{g}) \cong \bigoplus_{\beta \in \mathcal{Q}^+} U_q^{\leq 0}(U_q^+)_{\beta},$$

with  $U_q^{\leq 0}$  denoting  $U_q^- U_q^0$ , it follows that  $\widetilde{U}_q(\mathfrak{g})$  is the direct product

$$\widetilde{U}_q(\mathfrak{g}) \cong \prod_{\beta \in \mathcal{Q}^+} U_q^{\leq 0}(U_q^+)_{\beta}$$

whose elements are infinite formal sums  $\sum_{\beta} x_{\beta}$  with  $x_{\beta} \in U_q^{\leq 0}(U_q^+)_{\beta}$  [KS97, 6.3.3].

The direct product suggests an alternative characterization of  $\widetilde{U}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ .

**Definition 4.24.** [KT08, Definition 3.1] Let  $S$  denote the ring of formal series  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} x_k$  such that each  $x_k \in U_q(\mathfrak{g})$  and for any fixed  $\mu$ , we have  $x_k \triangleright V(\mu) = 0$  for all but finitely many  $k$ . Let  $I$  denote the two-sided ideal of  $S$  consisting of elements which act as zero on all  $V(\mu)$ . Then  $\widetilde{U}_q(\mathfrak{g})$  is defined as  $S/I$ .

Indeed, the two completions just defined are equivalent. In fact each element in either completion is specified uniquely by its action on every  $V(\mu)$  in  $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{g})$ .

**Theorem 4.25.** Let  $\widetilde{U}_q(\mathfrak{g})$  denote the completion of  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$  defined by 4.24 or by Relation (4.25). There is an isomorphism of  $\mathbb{C}(q)$ -algebras

$$\widetilde{U}_q(\mathfrak{g}) \cong \prod_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}^+} \text{End}_{\mathbb{C}(q)}(V(\mu)).$$

This result combines Theorem 3.3 and Corollary 3.6 in [KT08]. Its proof relies on the following technical lemma.

**Lemma 4.26.** [KT08, Lemma 3.4] For each  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}^+$ , fix a highest weight vector  $v_{\mu} \in V(\mu)$ . There is an element  $p_{\mu} \in U_q(\mathfrak{g})$  such that

- (i)  $p_{\mu}(v_{\mu}) = v_{\mu}$ .
- (ii) For any  $\nu \neq \mu$ ,  $p_{\mu}$  kills the weight space  $V_{\nu} \subseteq V(\mu)$ .
- (iii)  $p_{\mu}V(\nu) = 0$  unless  $\langle \nu - \mu, \alpha_i^{\vee} \rangle \geq 0$  for some  $\alpha_i^{\vee}$ .

*Remark 4.27.* Our statement of (iii) differs slightly from the one in [KT08], so we provide a proof.

*Proof.* Fix a lowest weight vector  $v_\mu^{\text{low}} \in V(\mu)$ . Recall that  $V(\mu) = U_q^- \cdot v_\mu$ , so there exists  $F \in U_q^-$  such that  $v_\mu^{\text{low}} = Fv_\mu$ . Similarly, there exists  $E \in U_q^+$  such that  $E v_\mu^{\text{low}} = v_\mu$ . It follows that  $p' = EF$  satisfies (i) and (ii), since for every non-zero weight space  $V_\nu \subseteq V(\mu)$  we must have  $\nu < \mu$ , so that  $FV_\nu = 0$ .

Now write  $\mu = \sum_j \mu_j \omega_j$ , set  $p_i = (E_i)^{\mu_i} (F_i)^{\mu_i}$ , and define

$$p'_\mu = \left( \prod_{i=1}^r p_i \right) p',$$

where the product is taken in any order. Now if  $\langle \nu - \mu, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle < 0$  for each  $\alpha_i^\vee$ , then  $p_i$  acts by zero on  $V(\nu)$ . Conversely, if  $\langle \nu - \mu, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle \geq 0$  for some  $\alpha_i^\vee$ , there is a weight vector in  $V(\nu)$  that is not killed by  $p'_\mu$  because the simple reflection  $s_i$  corresponding to the simple root  $\alpha_i$  acts as

$$s_i(\nu) = \nu - \langle \nu, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle \alpha_i.$$

We conclude that some scalar multiple of  $p'_\mu$  satisfies (i)-(iii) because each  $p_i$  fixes  $V_\mu \subseteq V(\nu)$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 4.25.* Lemma 3.5 in [KT08] shows that if  $I(\mu)$  denotes the kernel of the action of  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$  on  $V(\mu)$ , then  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})/I(\mu)$  is isomorphic to  $\text{End}_{\mathbb{C}(q)} V(\mu)$ . Combined with Lemma 4.26, this means we can realize any endomorphism of  $V(\mu)$  using an element of  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$  that kills every other  $V(\nu)$  unless  $\langle \nu - \mu, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle \geq 0$  for some  $i = 1, \dots, r$ . Thus the completion defined by 4.24 is equivalent to the direct product  $M = \prod_{\mu} \text{End}_{\mathbb{C}(q)}(V(\mu))$ .

The equivalence between  $M$  and the completion defined by Relation (4.25) follows similarly. Each element of the direct limit has a well-defined action on every  $V(\mu)$ , so there is a map taking elements of the direct limit into  $M$ . Injectivity follows from the definition of the direct limit and surjectivity follows from the technical Lemma 4.26.  $\square$

Theorem 4.25 implies  $\widetilde{U_q(\mathfrak{g})}$  is equivalent to the completion of  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$  in the weak topology generated by the matrix coefficients of all finite-dimensional  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules [KT08]. In particular,  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$  is a locally convex t.v.s. with topology generated by the family of seminorms

$$p_{i,j}^\mu(x) = |v^i(x \triangleright v_j)|, \quad \text{where } i, j = 1, \dots, \dim(V(\mu)), \text{ and } \mu \in \mathcal{P}^+.$$

Here  $v_i$  is a weight basis of  $V(\mu)$  and  $v^i$  is the corresponding dual basis of  $V(\mu)^*$ . This topology is Hausdorff: Theorem 7.13 in [KS97] guarantees no non-zero element of  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$  acts by zero on every  $V(\mu)$ , which means

$$\bigcap_{\mu, i, j} \ker(p_{i,j}^\mu) = 0.$$

The topology is generated by countably many seminorms, so sequences characterize completeness. Each equivalence class of Cauchy sequences on  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$  induces an endomorphism on each  $V(\mu)$  considered with its weak topology and Theorem 4.25 proves that each such family of endomorphisms corresponds uniquely to a formal sum  $\sum_k x_k$  with  $x_k \in U_q(\mathfrak{g})$  such that  $x_k \triangleright V(\mu) = 0$  for all but finitely many  $k$ .

Thus  $\widetilde{U_q(\mathfrak{g})}$  is a topological algebra in the sense of Definition 4.6. The Hopf algebra structure of  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$  naturally extends to the completion  $\widetilde{U_q(\mathfrak{g})}$ . However, the comultiplication on  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$  is only a *topological* comultiplication, in the sense that  $\Delta_q(\widetilde{U_q(\mathfrak{g})})$  is not contained in  $\widetilde{U_q(\mathfrak{g})} \otimes \widetilde{U_q(\mathfrak{g})}$ , but rather in the completed tensor product  $\widetilde{U_q(\mathfrak{g})} \widetilde{\otimes} \widetilde{U_q(\mathfrak{g})}$ . This is most easily seen using Theorem 4.25: each element of  $\widetilde{U_q(\mathfrak{g})}$  is equivalent to a choice of  $f \in \text{End}(V(\mu))$  for each  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}^+$ , so  $\Delta_q$  maps  $\widetilde{U_q(\mathfrak{g})}$  into  $\prod_{\mu, \nu} \text{End}_{\mathbb{C}(q)}(V(\mu)) \otimes \text{End}_{\mathbb{C}(q)}(V(\nu))$ , which is understood as the completion of  $\prod_{\mu} \text{End}_{\mathbb{C}(q)}(V(\mu)) \otimes \prod_{\nu} \text{End}_{\mathbb{C}(q)}(V(\nu))$  [KT08].

It follows that specifying an element of  $\widetilde{U_q(\mathfrak{g})} \widetilde{\otimes} \widetilde{U_q(\mathfrak{g})}$  is equivalent to specifying an action on every tensor product of any pair of irreducible  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules. This means  $\mathcal{E}_h$  and  $\mathcal{S}_h$  define elements  $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_q$  and  $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q$  in  $\widetilde{U_q(\mathfrak{g})} \widetilde{\otimes} \widetilde{U_q(\mathfrak{g})}$ . Therefore  $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_q = \widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_q \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q$  is a well-defined element of  $\widetilde{U_q(\mathfrak{g})} \widetilde{\otimes} \widetilde{U_q(\mathfrak{g})}$ . This element must be an  $R$ -matrix of  $\widetilde{U_q(\mathfrak{g})}$  because it acts as the braiding on  $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{g})$  on any tensor product of irreducibles. Hence  $\widetilde{U_q(\mathfrak{g})}$  is a braided topological bialgebra.

Moreover, there is a ribbon element in  $\widetilde{U_q(\mathfrak{g})}$ , in the sense of Definition 4.18. Concretely, the ribbon element  $\theta_h$  defined in Theorem 4.20 induces an action on each  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module via Relation (4.22) once we identify  $q = e^h$ . In view of Theorem 4.25, this means  $\theta_h$  specifies an element  $\theta_q$  in  $\widetilde{U_q(\mathfrak{g})}$ .

**Theorem 4.28.** *For any  $V(\mu) \in \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{g})$ , let  $\theta_{V(\mu)} : V(\mu) \rightarrow V(\mu)$  denote the isomorphism acting as the scalar  $q^{\langle \mu, \mu + 2\rho \rangle}$ . Then  $\theta_{V(\mu)}$  is a family of twists in the sense of Definition 4.18, making  $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{g})$  into a ribbon category. The twists are induced by the action of a single element  $\theta_q^{-1} \in \widetilde{U_q(\mathfrak{g})}$ , which means  $\widetilde{U_q(\mathfrak{g})}$  is a topological ribbon algebra.*

*Proof.* Theorem 4.25 implies the family of maps  $(\theta_{V(\mu)})_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}}$  specifies a single element  $\theta_q^{-1} \in \widetilde{U_q(\mathfrak{g})}$ . Recalling that  $\rho = \sum_i \mu_i \alpha_i^\vee$ , set  $K_{2\rho} = \prod_i K_i^{2d_i^{-1} \mu_i}$ , with the product taken in any order. As the sum of the positive roots,  $2\rho \in \mathcal{Q}$ , and therefore each  $2d_i^{-1} \mu_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ . The element  $K_{2\rho}$  acts as the scalar  $q^{\langle \mu, 2\rho \rangle}$  on the weight space  $V_\mu$  of any finite-dimensional module. Arguing as in the proof of Theorem 4.20, we construct a distinguished element  $u \in \widetilde{U_q(\mathfrak{g})}$ , this time using the  $R$ -matrix  $\mathcal{R}_q$ . The eigenvalue calculation in that proof implies that the element  $K_{2\rho} u^{-1} \in \widetilde{U_q(\mathfrak{g})}$  also acts by the scalar  $q^{\langle \mu, \mu + 2\rho \rangle}$  on  $V(\mu)$ . The isomorphism of Theorem 4.25 guarantees that  $\theta^{-1} = K_{2\rho} u^{-1}$ . Theorem 4.20 then shows that  $(\mathcal{R}_q)_{21} \mathcal{R}_q$  and  $\Delta(\theta)(\theta^{-1} \widetilde{\otimes} \theta^{-1})$  have the same action on the tensor product of any pair of finite-dimensional  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules, so they define the same element of  $\widetilde{U_q(\mathfrak{g})} \widetilde{\otimes} \widetilde{U_q(\mathfrak{g})}$  by Theorem 4.25. The remaining relations  $S_q(\theta) = \theta$  and  $\varepsilon_q(\theta) = 1$  follow from the argument used to establish Theorem 4.20; see for more details [CP94, p. 323].  $\square$

*Remark 4.29.* The element  $\theta_q$  can also be constructed in the PBW-type basis as a sum of canonical elements analogous to the Casimir element of  $U(\mathfrak{g})$ , by defining a non-degenerate bilinear pairing between  $U_q^+$  and  $U_q^-$ . For details, see [KS97, Section 6.3.3].

## REFERENCES

- [Abo22] Willie Aboumrad. Quantum computing with anyons: an  $F$ -matrix and braid calculator, 2022. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.00831>, doi:10.48550/ARXIV.2212.00831.
- [AP95] Henning Haar Andersen and Jan Paradowski. Fusion categories arising from semisimple Lie algebras. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 169(3):563–588, 1995. doi:10.1007/bf02099312.
- [BFGP94] P. Bonneau, M. Flato, M. Gerstenhaber, and G. Pinczon. The hidden group structure of quantum groups: Strong duality, rigidity and preferred deformations. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 161(1):125–156, 1994. doi:10.1007/bf02099415.
- [Bru00] Alain Bruguières. Catégories prémodulaires, modularisations et invariants des variétés de dimension 3. *Mathematische Annalen*, 316(2):215–236, 2000. doi:10.1007/s002080050011.
- [BS03] Philippe Bonneau and Daniel Sternheimer. Topological hopf algebras, quantum groups and deformation quantization, 2003. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0307277>, doi:10.48550/ARXIV.MATH/0307277.
- [Bum04] Daniel Bump. *Lie Groups*. Springer, second edition, 2004. doi:10.1007/978-1-4757-4094-3.
- [CE04] Damien Calaque and Pavel Etingof. *Lectures on tensor categories*. Universite Louis Pasteur, 2004. doi:10.4171/047-1/1.
- [CP94] Vyjayanthi Chari and Andrew Pressley. *A guide to quantum groups*. Cambridge University Press, 1994. doi:10.1007/BF00750760.
- [DFMS11] Philippe Di Francesco, Pierre Mathieu, and David Senechal. *Conformal Field Theory*. Springer, 2011.
- [Dri87] Vladimir G Drinfeld. Quantum groups. In *Proceedings from International Congress of Mathematics (Berkeley, 1986)*, pages 798–820. American Mathematical Society, 1987. doi:10.1007/BF01247086.
- [Dri89a] V. G. Drinfeld. On almost cocommutative Hopf algebras. *Algebra i Analiz*, pages 30–46, 1989.
- [Dri89b] V. G. Drinfeld. Quasi-hopf algebras and Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov equations. *Research Reports in Physics Problems of Modern Quantum Field Theory*, pages 1–13, 1989. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-84000-5\_1.
- [Dri89c] V.G. Drinfeld. Quasi-Hopf algebras. *Algebra i Analiz*, 6:114–148, 1989. [English transl.: Leningrad Math J. 1 (1990), 1419-1457.].
- [EGNO15] P. I. Etingof, Shlomo Gelaki, Dmitri Nikshych, and Victor Ostrik. *Tensor categories*. American Mathematical Society, 2015.
- [Fin96] M. Finkelberg. An equivalence of fusion categories. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, 6(2):249–267, 1996. doi:10.1007/bf02247887.
- [Fre66] Peter Freyd. *Abelian categories, etc*. New York; John Weatherhill: Tokyo; printed in Japan, 1966.
- [GK92] Sergei Gelfand and David Kazhdan. Examples of tensor categories. *Inventiones Mathematicae*, 109(1):595–617, 1992. doi:10.1007/bf01232042.
- [Gro55] Alexandre Grothendieck. Produits tensoriels topologiques et espaces nucléaires. *Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society*, 0(16), 1955. doi:10.1090/memo/0016.
- [Jan96] Jens Carsten Jantzen. *Lectures on quantum groups*, volume 6 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1996. doi:10.1090/gsm/006.
- [Jon06] V.F.R. Jones. The jones polynomial. *Encyclopedia of Mathematical Physics*, pages 179–187, 2006. doi:10.1016/b0-12-512666-2/00257-1.

- [Kac83] V.G. Kac. *Infinite Dimensional Lie Algebras*. Cambridge University Press, 1983. doi:10.1007/978-1-4757-1382-4.
- [Kas95] Christian Kassel. *Quantum Groups*. Springer-Science, first edition, 1995. doi:0.1007/978-1-4612-0783-2.
- [KL93] D. Kazhdan and G. Lusztig. Tensor structures arising from affine lie algebras. i. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 6(4):905–947, 1993. doi:10.1090/s0894-0347-1993-99999-x.
- [Koh02] Toshitake Kohno. *Conformal Field Theory and Topology*. American Mathematical Society, 2002.
- [KR90] A. N. Kirillov and N. Reshetikhin.  $q$ -Weyl group and a multiplicative formula for universal  $r$ -matrices. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 134(2):421–431, 1990. doi:10.1007/bf02097710.
- [KRT97] Christian Kassel, Marc Rosso, and Vladimir Georgievic Turaev. *Quantum groups and knot invariants*. Société mathématique de France, 1997.
- [KS97] Anatoli Klimyk and Konrad Schmüdgen. *Quantum groups and their representations*. Springer-Verlag, 1997. doi:0.1007/978-3-642-60896-4.
- [KT08] Joel Kamnitzer and Peter Tingley. The crystal commutator and Drinfeld’s unitarized  $R$ -matrix. *Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics*, 29(3):315–335, 2008. doi:10.1007/s10801-008-0137-0.
- [KZ84] V.G. Knizhnik and A.B. Zamolodchikov. Current algebra and Wess-Zumino model in two dimensions. *Nuclear Physics B*, 247(1):83–103, 1984. doi:10.1016/0550-3213(84)90374-2.
- [Lan78] Saunders Mac Lane. *Categories for the working mathematician*. Springer, 1978. doi:10.1007/978-1-4757-4721-8.
- [LR97] Robert Leduc and Arun Ram. A ribbon Hopf algebra approach to the irreducible representations of centralizer algebras: The Brauer, Birman–Wenzl, and type A Iwahori–Hecke algebras. *Advances in Mathematics*, 125(1):1–94, 1997. doi:10.1006/aima.1997.1602.
- [Lus88] G Lusztig. Quantum deformations of certain simple modules over enveloping algebras. *Advances in Mathematics*, 70(2):237–249, 1988. doi:10.1016/0001-8708(88)90056-4.
- [LZZ10] G. I. Lehrer, Hechun Zhang, and R. B. Zhang. A quantum analogue of the First Fundamental Theorem of classical invariant theory. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 301(1):131–174, 2010. doi:10.1007/s00220-010-1143-3.
- [MS89] Gregory Moore and Nathan Seiberg. Classical and quantum conformal field theory. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 123(2):177–254, 1989. doi:10.1007/bf01238857.
- [Ros91] Marc Rosso. Représentations des groupes quantiques. *Astérisque*, 33:443–482, 1991.
- [RT90] N. Y. Reshetikhin and V. G. Turaev. Ribbon graphs and their invariants derived from quantum groups. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 127(1):1–26, Jan 1990. doi:10.1007/bf02096491.
- [Saw96] Stephen Sawin. Links, quantum groups and TQFTs. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 33(04):413–446, Jan 1996. doi:10.1090/s0273-0979-96-00690-8.
- [Sta92] Jim Stasheff. Drinfel’d’s quasi-hopf algebras and beyond. *Deformation Theory and Quantum Groups with Applications to Mathematical Physics Contemporary Mathematics*, pages 297–307, 1992. doi:10.1090/conm/134/1187294.
- [Tur16] V. G. Turaev. *Quantum invariants of knots and 3-manifolds*. Walter de Gruyter GmbH, 2016.
- [Wan10] Zhenghan Wang. *Topological Quantum Computation*. Published for the Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences by the American Mathematical Society, 2010.
- [Yet92] David N. Yetter. Framed tangles and a theorem of Deligne on braided deformations of Tannakian categories. *Deformation Theory and Quantum Groups with Applications to Mathematical Physics Contemporary Mathematics*, pages 325–349, 1992. doi:10.1090/conm/134/1187296.

(W. Aboumrad) THE INSTITUTE FOR COMPUTATIONAL AND MATHEMATICAL ENGINEERING (ICME)  
AT STANFORD UNIVERSITY  
*Email address:* willieab@stanford.edu  
*URL:* <https://web.stanford.edu/~willieab>