

NON-COMPACT 3D TQFT AND NON-SEMIPLICITY

THEODOROS LAGIOTIS

ABSTRACT. We define a once extended non-compact 3-dimensional TQFT \mathcal{Z} from the data of a (potentially) non-semisimple modular tensor category. This is in the framework of generators and relations of [Bar+15], having disallowed generating 2-morphisms whose source is the empty. Moreover, we show that the projective mapping class group representations this TQFT gives rise to, are dual to those of [Lyu95b] and [De +23]. We develop a method to decompose a closed 3-manifold in terms of 2-morphism generators. We use this to compute the value of \mathcal{Z} on 3-manifolds, explaining why it should recover Lyubashenko's 3-manifold invariants [Lyu95b]. Finally, we explain that the value of the non-compact TQFT on the solid torus recovers the data of a modified trace [GPT09].

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Survey of previous literature	2
1.2. Intuition and outline of results	4
1.3. Future directions	6
1.4. Conventions and notation	6
1.5. Acknowledgements	7
2. Setup	8
2.1. The non-compact 3d cobordism 2-category	8
2.2. Presentation of the non-compact 3d cobordism 2-category	9
2.3. Finite ribbon categories and projectives	13
2.4. Coends	14
2.5. Integrals and modular tensor categories	17
2.6. Target bicategory	19
3. Construction of the TQFT	20
3.1. Assignment to generators	20
3.2. Checking the relations	24
4. Mapping class group representations	36
4.1. Mapping class group representations from the non-compact TQFT	36
4.2. Relation to the Lyubashenko projective representations	41
5. From Lincat to Bimod	42

Date: 2025.

6. 3-manifold invariants	48
6.1. 3-manifold presentation in terms of generators	48
6.2. Computing the invariants	51
7. Modified trace	55
7.1. 1-dualizability in bicategories	56
7.2. The canonical isomorphism	58
7.3. The composite is a modified trace	66
References	69

1. INTRODUCTION

In this thesis, we define a once extended non-compact 3-dimensional TQFT \mathcal{Z} from the data of a (potentially) non-semisimple modular tensor category \mathcal{C} , such that $\mathcal{Z}(S^1) = \mathcal{C}$. This is done in a framework of generators and relations, akin to [Bar+15]. In Section 2.2 we define the (conjectural) presentation of the cobordism bicategory we use to define the TQFT. This complies with Lurie's approach in [Lur09, Def 4.2.10], where the 2-morphisms having connected components with empty intersection with the source are discarded, hence the term 'non-compact'. This work is closely related to the constructions of Kerler-Lyubashenko [KL01] and De Renzi et al. [De +22; De 21]. It should be loosely thought of as translating the above in an undecorated, 2-category setting. This is the non-semisimple analog of what [Bar+15] is to the Reshetikhin-Turaev TQFT [Tur20] in the semisimple case.

In section 3 we prove the following:

Theorem 1.1 (3.3). The assignment \mathcal{Z} , defined in section 3.1, is a well defined symmetric monoidal 2-functor.

Assuming Conjecture 2.1, we have:

Corollary 1.2. \mathcal{Z} is a non-compact 3d TQFT.

We believe that a proof of Conjecture 2.1 will be straightforward once the presentation of [Bar+15] for the full 3d cobordism bicategory is verified. See [Syt] for the current progress - a proof for the presentation of the 3d cobordism bicategory, whose 2-morphisms are restricted to be invertible. One way to view Theorem 1.1 is as providing independent evidence for Conjecture 2.1.

The perks of our approach are the following. First of all, the cobordism category is promoted to a 2-category, which takes away any need for decorations and more complicated definitions. This in turn, relates to the fact that it is easier to talk about 'classification' of TQFTs. This is something we do not address in this thesis, but intend to consider in future work.

In addition, we tackle questions related to invariants associated to \mathcal{Z} , providing further evidence for Conjecture 2.1. We compute the values of 2-morphisms meant to correspond to mapping class group (MCG) generators. From there, we relate the (would be) projective mapping class group representations obtained from this construction to those of [Lyu95b] and [De +23]. More specifically, if we call their (equivalent) representations $\bar{\rho}_X$, we have the following:

Theorem 1.3 (4.3). If $\bar{\rho}_{nc}$ is the projective mapping class group representation obtained from the TQFT \mathcal{Z} , then $\bar{\rho}_{nc} \cong \bar{\rho}_X^*$.

For a closed oriented 3-manifold M we can compute the value of \mathcal{Z} on $M^* := (M \setminus (D^3 \sqcup D^3))$. If $\mathcal{L}(M)$ is the Lyubashenko invariant of M [Lyu95b], using a decomposition of M in terms of 2-morphism generators we show that:

Theorem 1.4 (6.6). $\mathcal{Z}(M^*) = (1/\mathcal{D}) \cdot \mathcal{L}(M) \cdot \text{id}_{\mathcal{Z}'(S^2)}$.

In the case where \mathcal{C} is semisimple, $\mathcal{Z}(M^*) = \mathcal{RT}(M) \cdot \text{id}_{\mathcal{Z}'(S^2)}$, the Reshetikhin-Turaev invariant of M [RT91].

Lastly, again following ideas from [Lur09], the solid torus should give rise to a trace map, part of the 'Calabi-Yau' structure on $\mathcal{Z}(S^1)$.

Theorem 1.5 (7.7,7.20). Denoting $\mathcal{P} := \text{Proj}(\mathcal{C})$, the full subcategory of projectives in \mathcal{C} ,

- There exists a canonical isomorphism

$$c_t: \int^{P \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, P) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{Z}(T^2)$$

- The map $t' := \mathcal{Z}(S^1 \times D^2) \circ c_t$ is a modified trace.

1.1. Survey of previous literature. A quantum field theory is called topological if its action functional has no dependence on the spacetime metric [Wit88]. The mathematical formalization of QFT is a notoriously difficult problem. However, the class of topological QFTs proves to be simple enough to allow for a mathematical definition. Atiyah in [Ati88], following Segal's work [Til04], proposed a definition of TQFT as a symmetric monoidal functor from a 'geometric' cobordism category, to an 'algebraic' category of vector spaces. This definition has undergone several generalizations since its first appearance. Given the above, an interesting question arises naturally: Are there examples of physical TQFTs that can be adapted to the mathematical formalism?

One of the first and most important examples of this bridging of the two notions came with the foundation of the area of quantum topology. In his seminal work [Wit89], Witten recovered the Jones polynomial of a link, through Chern-Simons theory. The input data for the 3d Chern-Simons TQFT is a connected, compact Lie group G , and a level (which is an integer for simple G). Soon after, Reshetikhin and Turaev were able to obtain a mathematically rigorous construction of the associated 3-manifold invariants [RT90; RT91], and using those, to define a mathematical TQFT [Tur20]. Importantly, their construction uses the same input data of G and a level. This is in the form of the category of representations $\mathcal{C}(G, q)$ of the corresponding quantum group at a root of unity q , determined by the level. In fact, the necessary algebraic input data for the Reshetikhin-Turaev (RT) construction is that of a semisimple modular tensor category. Objects and morphisms of this category can be used to decorate the cobordism category used in the RT construction.

Extending this construction to include non-semisimple MTCs has been a problem of interest since its appearance. This is interesting from a mathematical perspective of generalizing the result, but also from a physical one. Rational vertex operator algebras (VOAs) are not the only types of VOAs that arise in conformal field theory (CFT). Another interesting class is that of logarithmic VOAs, whose categories of representations are not semisimple. Some references for the connection to logarithmic CFT are [FS11; FSS13; FS16; FS17; Cre+24]. There are of course more classes of non-semisimple theories in physics, so one could argue that from a physical point of view, non-semisimplicity is quite 'natural'.

The first attempts of generalizing the RT construction started with work of Hennings [Hen96], who was the first to define 3-manifold invariants from finite-dimensional factorizable ribbon Hopf algebras. Since semisimplicity was not required, this constituted the first construction from non-semisimple data. Lyubashenko generalized this construction by giving the definition of a non-semisimple MTC. He also used it to define projective mapping class group representations [Lyu95b]. Then, Kerler-Lyubashenko in [KL01], define a partial version of an extended TQFT. Their functor

is defined out of a double category of cobordisms, whose objects are restricted to be connected surfaces, and the monoidal product to be given by the connected sum.

The question of whether there is a 3d TQFT construction from a non-semisimple MTC was answered some years later by [Bar+15]. They proved that once extended 3d TQFTs are classified by semisimple modular tensor categories. In this extended setting, instead of a decorated category of cobordisms, they considered an undecorated 2-category with objects 1-dimensional closed manifolds. The classification result is achieved by considering a ‘generators and relations’ presentation of the 3d cobordism 2-category. Importantly, this suggests that semisimplicity is inevitable, if one considers the full cobordism 2-category as the source of the TQFT.

The work of [De +22], constructs a RT-type TQFT from the data of a (potentially) non-semisimple MTC. The decorated cobordism categories considered are subject to an admissibility condition. This reflects the comment above, regarding whether there can be non-semisimple TQFTs defined on all cobordisms. In [De +23], these TQFTs were further examined by computing the resulting projective mapping class group representations, and showing their equivalence to those of Lyubashenko’s.

In fact, De Renzi defined a 2-categorical extension of the above in [De 21], in the form of a once extended TQFT, using the so-called ‘extended universal construction’. Importantly, we note that this is still in the framework of decorated cobordism categories. In fact, 2-dimensional cobordisms with empty incoming boundary and no decorations are disallowed in this construction. In some ways, our work, even though in a different framework, provides an answer to De Renzi’s question in [De 21], as to whether the admissibility condition for surfaces can be lifted. This is a result of considering the appropriate target for the TQFT. The discrepancy between our choice of the target and De Renzi’s makes a straightforward comparison of the two constructions somewhat difficult. However, we can somewhat compare the assignments on some generating 1- and 2-morphisms, as the assignment to the circle, although different, is similar: \mathcal{C} vs. \mathcal{P} . Accounting for this difference, we see that the assignments for the pairs of pants are the same: the tensor product functor and (inevitably) its biadjoint, which involves the Lyubashenko coend \mathcal{F} (2.30). We also see that the assignment of De Renzi’s on the 3-ball involves the modified trace, something that happens in our construction as well — ν^\dagger contains the data of the modified trace if the appropriate assignment to the \square is considered (see Remark 5.5). Based on these observations, we believe that a De Renzi type construction with Bimod as a target, when restricted to undecorated 1-morphisms should recover our construction.

Very recently there have been some 1-categorical ‘non-compact’ TQFT constructions from non-semisimple data. This means that there is a non-compact condition imposed on the morphisms of the (1)-category of cobordisms considered. The first such construction appears in [Cos+23b], where such a non-compact 3d TQFT is constructed from the data of non-semisimple spherical categories, and thus generalizing the Turaev-Viro TQFT [TV92; BW99] to the non-semisimple case. Soon after, there was a construction of a 4d TQFT [Cos+23a] using the data of a non-semisimple ribbon category, generalizing the Crane-Yetter TQFT [CY93] in the non-semisimple setting.

1.2. Intuition and outline of results. Having reviewed the literature thus far, and especially if we are interested in a classification result, we are led to a natural question: How can we allow for non-semisimplicity in the once extended 3d setting? This is the main motivation of this thesis, and what we eventually achieve.

To do this however, there is a crucial observation to be made.

Starting with a once extended 3d TQFT Z , one can compactify it on the circle $Z(S^1 \times -)$ and obtain a fully extended 2d TQFT. This implies that $Z(S^1)$ will be 2-dualizable. However, for all the ‘2-vector space’ candidate targets for such a 3d ETQFT that were considered in [Bar+15, Appendix A], the 2-dualizable objects are semisimple.

In order to overcome this problem, there are only so many things we can alter: the source, and the target 2-categories of the TQFT we consider.

To appropriately alter the source, we turn to the idea of non-compact TQFTs introduced by Lurie in [Lur09]. In this framework, we disallow certain 3d cobordisms (2-morphisms) that witness adjunctions for $\text{ev}_{Z(S^1)}$ and $\text{coev}_{Z(S^1)}$, and therefore lift the strong requirement of 2-dualizability on $Z(S^1)$. Having gotten rid of the 2-dualizability, we also need to choose a suitable target 2-category, whose 1-dualizable objects are not semisimple. This is the bicategory Lincat we define in Section 2.6.

The necessary admissibility conditions for the decorated cobordism categories encountered in [De +22; De 21] can be thought of as a reflection of the above fact. The admissibility condition boils down to requiring the existence of projective strands. The non-compactness condition matches this, since it corresponds to disallowing the 0-handle, which in the decorated setting translates to not allowing the inclusion of the empty skein.

With this in mind, and given a modular tensor category \mathcal{C} in the sense of Definition 2.10, we can define the assignment \mathcal{Z} in section 3.1. The source of \mathcal{Z} is $\text{Bord}_{3,2,1}^{\text{sig},\text{nc}}$, the (conjectural) presentation of the 2-category $\text{Bord}_{3,2,1}^{\text{sig},\text{nc}}$, the signature extension of the 2-category of non-compact 3d cobordisms. Comparing it to [Bar+15], we have disallowed the only 2-morphism generator with empty incoming boundary, as well as any relations involving it. Below, we give a table (1) to describe the algebraic data used to define \mathcal{Z} . Note that at this point, we only mention non-invertible 2-morphisms of $\text{Bord}_{3,2,1}^{\text{sig},\text{nc}}$, as the assignments for the invertible 2-morphisms (2.4, 2.5, 2.6) are rather straightforward.

Some key ingredients that appear are:

- The distinguished object $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{C}$, defined in 2.30. It carries the structure of a Hopf algebra in \mathcal{C} .
- The Hopf algebra \mathcal{F} has additional structure, namely that of an integral $\Lambda: \mathbb{1} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ and a cointegral $\Lambda^{\text{co}}: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{1}$ (Definition 2.13). These morphisms are crucial for our construction.
- The projective cover $(P_{\mathbb{1}}, \varepsilon_{\mathbb{1}})$ of the unit of \mathcal{C} , along with the uniquely determined (Lemma 2.20) morphism $\eta_{\mathbb{1}}: \mathbb{1} \rightarrow P_{\mathbb{1}}$, exhibiting it as the injective envelope as well.

We then proceed to show that \mathcal{Z} preserves all the relations from 2.2. This implies that \mathcal{Z} is a well defined symmetric monoidal functor from the 2-category generated by the presentation 2.2 to Lincat.

Generators of $\text{Bord}_{3,2,1}^{\text{sig,nc}}$	Data used to define \mathcal{Z}
	\mathcal{C}
	$\otimes: \mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$
	$\int^{y \in \mathcal{C}} - \otimes y^\vee \boxtimes y: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{C}$
	$- \otimes \mathbb{1}: \text{Vec}_k \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$
	$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(-, \mathbb{1})^*: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Vec}_k$
$\xrightarrow{\epsilon}$	Involves the evaluation
$\xrightarrow{\eta}$	Involves the coevaluation
$\xrightarrow{\epsilon^\dagger}$	Involves the integral $\Lambda: \mathbb{1} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$
$\xrightarrow{\eta^\dagger}$	Involves the cointegral $\Lambda^{co}: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{1}$
$\xrightarrow{\mu}$	Involves $\varepsilon_{\mathbb{1}}: P_{\mathbb{1}} \rightarrow \mathbb{1}$ and $\eta_{\mathbb{1}}: \mathbb{1} \rightarrow P_{\mathbb{1}}$
$\xrightarrow{\mu^\dagger}$	Unit of $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(-, \mathbb{1})^* \dashv - \otimes \mathbb{1}$
$\xrightarrow{\nu^\dagger}$	Counit of $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(-, \mathbb{1})^* \dashv - \otimes \mathbb{1}$

Table 1. Algebraic data assigned by \mathcal{Z} to generators of $\text{Bord}_{3,2,1}^{\text{sig,nc}}$

We will highlight a few important points of our construction:

- State spaces for surfaces are given by $\mathcal{Z}(\Sigma_g) = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{F}^{\otimes g}, \mathbb{1})^*$. We already see that these are dual to the state spaces of [De +22].
- It is a classical result of Crane and Yetter [CY99] that the once punctured torus is a Hopf algebra object. It is therefore only natural that it is sent to the coend \mathcal{F} by \mathcal{Z} .
- Under \mathcal{Z} , the 2-isomorphism trivializing gives rise to a trivialization of the Nakayama functor (Remark 7.6).

Having constructed the 2-functor $\mathcal{Z}: \text{Bord}_{3,2,1}^{\text{sig,nc}} \rightarrow \text{Lincat}$, we obtain representations of a central extension of the mapping class group of surfaces. Equivalently, we obtain projective representations of the mapping class group. We compute the action of generators of the MCG and find that we obtain representations dual to those of [Lyu95b; De +23]. To do this, we use descriptions of the corresponding Dehn twists as composites of generators of 2.2.

The outline of the thesis is as follows:

- (1) In the first part of chapter 2 we review the definitions of extended non-compact cobordism categories and define the presentation of $\text{Bord}_{3,2,1}^{\text{sig,nc}}$. Following that, we give the necessary algebraic background on modular tensor categories.
- (2) In the first part of chapter 3 we give an explicit definition of the assignment \mathcal{Z} that we sketched in table 1. The second part of this chapter is devoted to proving that \mathcal{Z} preserves the relations of the presentation 2.2. This constitutes the proof of Theorem 1.1.
- (3) In the first part of chapter 4 we investigate the actions of composites that correspond to Dehn twists that generate the mapping class group. We then proceed to identify the corresponding projective representations with those of Lyubashenko and De Renzi et al.
- (4) There is a 2-functor $\text{Lincat} \rightarrow \text{Bimod}$. In chapter 5 we use this to compute the values of \mathcal{Z} in Bimod , thus obtaining a diagrammatic way to represent the action of 2-morphisms. We do this to facilitate computations in the next chapters.
- (5) In chapter 6 we explain a procedure to extract a number from the non-compact TQFT \mathcal{Z} , given a 3-manifold M . We verify that this number ‘coincides’ with the Lyubashenko invariant for M . A corollary of this in the semisimple case is that the value of M under the TQFT of [Bar+15] is the Reshetikhin-Turaev invariant of M .
- (6) The aim of chapter 7 is to explain why, and in what sense the value of $\mathcal{Z}(S^1 \times D^2)$ is a modified trace. This involves explaining why there is a canonical isomorphism $\mathcal{Z}(T^2) \cong \int_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, P)$. We do this via arguments relating to the theory of 1-dualizability in bicategories.

1.3. Future directions. As has already been alluded to, an important motivation for this work is to obtain a full classification of 3d non-compact TQFTs. Having established Theorem 1.1, this amounts to considering the converse question: ‘Starting with a non-compact 3d TQFT Z with target $\text{Lincat}/\text{Bimod}$, what is the induced structure on $Z(S^1)$?’

Because of the proof of Theorem 1.1 being very explicit, a lot of the induced structure is already clear. We expect that $Z(S^1)$ turns out to be some form of ‘generalized’ MTC. This is due to the fact that rigidity will only be imposed on projective objects.

1.4. Conventions and notation. Fix k to be a perfect field. This is to ensure that the results of [KL01] hold. Note that this is a milder assumption than the algebraic closedness in other works. All vector spaces, algebras and categories are considered to be over k . By Vec_k , we denote the category of finite dimensional vector spaces and linear maps. In a monoidal category \mathcal{C} , we denote the left dual of an object X by X^\vee , and consequently, we denote the left evaluation and coevaluation by $\text{ev}_X: X^\vee \otimes X \rightarrow \mathbb{1}$ and $\text{coev}_X: \mathbb{1} \rightarrow X \otimes X^\vee$ respectively. The right dualizability data only appears in chapter 7. Since the categories we work with are pivotal ($\text{piv}: X \xrightarrow{\sim} (X^\vee)^\vee$), we define it by:

$$\text{ev}_X^R := \text{ev}_{X^\vee} \circ (\text{piv} \otimes \text{id}_{X^\vee}) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{coev}_X^R := (\text{id}_{X^\vee} \otimes \text{piv}^{-1}) \circ \text{coev}_{X^\vee}.$$

As an exception, we denote the dual vector space of V as V^* .

The convention for reading cobordisms and diagrams is from bottom to top. Internal string diagrams encountered in chapters 5 and 6 are read from top to bottom.

1.5. Acknowledgements. I would like to thank my advisor Pavel Safronov for his guidance throughout this project. I am grateful to Benjamin Haïoun and Iordanis Romaidis for helpful discussions. I also want to extend my thanks to the authors of [Bar+15] for making their tikz code available. This research is part of my PhD thesis, undertaken at the university of Edinburgh.

2. SETUP

2.1. The non-compact 3d cobordism 2-category. We give a sketch of a definition of the bicategory of non-compact 3d oriented cobordisms $\mathbf{Bord}_{3,2,1}^{or,nc}$. For a detailed definition of the full bicategory of oriented cobordisms, we refer the reader to [Sch14].

- An object is a closed oriented 1-manifold, i.e. a disjoint unions of a finite (possibly zero) number of circles.

(2.1) 


- A 1-morphism is a compact oriented 2-dimensional cobordism between the objects. For instance, the cobordism depicted below is a 1-morphism $S^1 \rightarrow S^1 \sqcup S^1$.

(2.2) 


Composition is given by gluing manifolds along their common boundary.

- A 2-morphism $\Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma'$ is a 3-manifold M , potentially with corners, which is a cobordism between Σ and Σ' , with the property that every connected component of M has nonempty intersection with Σ .

For example, a 3-manifold realizing the 2-morphism

(2.3) 

can be visualized as having appropriately 'drilled' out two solid cylinders from the solid 'X' shape that is the target of the 2-morphism. This can be depicted as follows:



where we have removed the tubular neighborhoods of the two lines depicted above.

To give some intuition for the non-compactness condition, the 3-ball $D^3: S^2 \rightarrow$ is a 2-morphism in this category, but $D^3: \emptyset \rightarrow S^2$ is not.

- The symmetric monoidal structure is given by disjoint union.

As mentioned in the introduction, the input data for our construction is that of a modular tensor category. In the case where the ratio $p_+/p_- \neq 1$ (as defined in Definition 2.17), the resulting TQFT is anomalous. We will therefore work with a presentation that should be equivalent to a 'central extension' of $\mathbf{Bord}_{3,2,1}^{or,nc}$. This is the 2-category of cobordisms equipped with signature, $\mathbf{Bord}_{3,2,1}^{sig,nc}$. The definition is the same as for $\mathbf{Bord}_{3,2,1}^{or,nc}$, except for the fact that 1- and 2- morphisms are equipped with some extra data:

- Objects are closed 1-dimensional manifolds Γ , equipped with a bounding 2-manifold $\tilde{\Gamma}$, which we choose to be a disjoint union of disks.
- 1-morphisms $(\Sigma, \tilde{\Sigma}): (\Gamma, \tilde{\Gamma}) \rightarrow (\Gamma', \tilde{\Gamma}')$ are again 2-dimensional cobordisms Σ , equipped with a choice of a 3-manifold $\tilde{\Sigma}$ that bounds $\tilde{\Gamma} \cup_{\Gamma} \Sigma \cup_{\Gamma'} \tilde{\Gamma}'$.
- 2-morphisms $(M, W): (\Sigma, \tilde{\Sigma}) \rightarrow (\Sigma', \tilde{\Sigma}')$ are 3-dimensional cobordisms $M: \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma'$ with corners, with the property that every connected component of M has nonempty intersection with Σ , and equipped with a 4-manifold W with $\partial W = \tilde{\Sigma} \cup_{\Sigma} M \cup_{\Sigma'} \tilde{\Sigma}'$.

Note that we could have also defined $\mathbf{Bord}_{3,2,1}^{sig,nc}$ similar to [De 21], equipping 1-morphisms with a Lagrangian in their first cohomology, and 2-morphisms with an integer (the signature of the corresponding bounding 4-manifold).

2.2. Presentation of the non-compact 3d cobordism 2-category. In this section we give a description of our source 2-category for the TQFT in terms of generators and relations. To be more precise, this is a conjectured equivalence between the 2-category of non-compact 3d cobordisms and the presentation we will provide later in this section.

In more detail, a presentation for a symmetric monoidal 2-category consists of the following finite collection of data:

- generating objects;
- generating 1-morphisms, whose sources and targets are composites of generating objects;
- generating 2-morphisms, whose sources and targets are composites of generating 1-morphisms;
- relations, which are equations between composites of generating 2-morphisms.

To such a presentation, we can associate a (fully-weak) symmetric monoidal 2-category that is generated by it, in the sense of [Sch14, page 161].

Strict symmetric monoidal functors out of this generated symmetric monoidal 2-category are uniquely specified by the images of the generating objects, 1-morphisms and 2-morphisms, such that the relations of the presentation are satisfied.

Conjecture 2.1. The non-compact 3d cobordism 2-category $\mathbf{Bord}_{3,2,1}^{sig,nc}$, whose definition was sketched in Section 2.1, is equivalent to the 2-category obtained from the presentation we describe below.

The following presentation is identical to the signature presentation in [Bar+15], apart from the fact that we have removed ‘ ν ’ from the set of generators, as well as any relations involving it. Note that if we discard the generator ξ (i.e $\xi = \text{id}$), then we expect that the corresponding presentation is equivalent to $\mathbf{Bord}_{3,2,1}^{or,nc}$.

Definition 2.2. We define the **non-compact** signature presentation $\mathbf{Bord}_{3,2,1}^{sig,nc}$ as follows:

- Generating object:

○

- Generating 1-morphisms:



- Invertible generating 2-morphisms:

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 1: Two 2-morphisms with labels } \alpha \text{ and } \alpha^{-1} \text{ above/below them.} \\ \text{Diagram 2: A 2-morphism with label } \rho \text{ above/below it.} \\ \text{Diagram 3: A cylinder with label } \lambda^{-1} \text{ above/below it.} \\ \text{Diagram 4: A 2-morphism with label } \lambda \text{ above/below it.} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\alpha} \\ \xleftarrow{\alpha^{-1}} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\rho} \\ \xleftarrow{\rho^{-1}} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\lambda^{-1}} \\ \xleftarrow{\lambda} \end{array}$$

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 1: A 2-morphism with label } \beta \text{ above/below it.} \\ \text{Diagram 2: A 2-morphism with label } \beta^{-1} \text{ above/below it.} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\beta} \\ \xleftarrow{\beta^{-1}} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\theta} \\ \xleftarrow{\theta^{-1}} \end{array}$$

$$(2.6) \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 1: A 2-morphism with label } \xi \text{ above/below it.} \\ \text{Diagram 2: A 2-morphism with label } \xi^{-1} \text{ above/below it.} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\xi} \\ \xleftarrow{\xi^{-1}} \end{array}$$

- Non-invertible generating 2-morphisms:

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 1: Two cylinders with label } \eta \text{ above/below them.} \\ \text{Diagram 2: A 2-morphism with label } \eta^\dagger \text{ above/below it.} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\eta} \\ \xleftarrow{\eta^\dagger} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 1: A 2-morphism with label } \epsilon \text{ above/below it.} \\ \text{Diagram 2: A cylinder with label } \epsilon^\dagger \text{ above/below it.} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\epsilon} \\ \xleftarrow{\epsilon^\dagger} \end{array}$$

$$(2.8) \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 1: A square with label } \nu^\dagger \text{ above/below it.} \\ \text{Diagram 2: A 2-morphism with label } \theta \text{ above/below it.} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{\nu^\dagger} \\ \xrightarrow{\theta} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 1: A cylinder with label } \mu \text{ above/below it.} \\ \text{Diagram 2: A 2-morphism with label } \mu^\dagger \text{ above/below it.} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\mu} \\ \xleftarrow{\mu^\dagger} \end{array}$$

The relations are as follows:

- (Inverses) Each of the invertible generating 2-morphisms ω satisfies $\omega \circ \omega^{-1} = \text{id}$ and $\omega^{-1} \circ \omega = \text{id}$.
- (Monoidal) The generating 2-morphisms in (2.4) obey the pentagon and unit equations:

$$(2.9) \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 1: A 2-morphism with label } \alpha \text{ above/below it.} \\ \text{Diagram 2: A 2-morphism with label } \alpha \text{ above/below it.} \\ \text{Diagram 3: A 2-morphism with label } \alpha \text{ above/below it.} \\ \text{Diagram 4: A 2-morphism with label } \alpha \text{ above/below it.} \\ \text{Diagram 5: A 2-morphism with label } \text{int} \text{ above/below it.} \\ \text{Diagram 6: A 2-morphism with label } \alpha \text{ above/below it.} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\alpha} \\ \xleftarrow{\alpha} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{int}} \\ \xleftarrow{\text{int}} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\alpha} \\ \xleftarrow{\alpha} \end{array}$$

$$(2.10) \quad \text{Diagram showing a sequence of operations on a surface. The initial state is a surface with a red box and a green box. An arrow labeled } \alpha \text{ leads to a state where the red box is removed. A second arrow labeled } \rho \text{ leads to a state where the green box is removed. A third arrow labeled } \lambda \text{ leads to a simplified surface with a single hole.}$$

The 2-morphism int at (2.9) is an interchanger, part of a canonical family of 2-morphisms in any monoidal 2-category that switches the 1-morphism composition order of two tensored 1-morphisms [Bar14].

- (Balanced) The data (2.4) and (2.5) forms a braided monoidal object equipped with a compatible twist:

$$(2.11) \quad \text{Diagram showing the equivalence of two 3D structures (top and bottom) via local moves } \alpha \text{ and } \beta. \text{ The top structure is a sum of two components, each with a green box highlighting a local region. The bottom structure is a sum of two components, each with a red box highlighting a different local region. The moves } \alpha \text{ and } \beta \text{ are shown as local transformations that preserve the overall sum structure.}$$

$$(2.12) \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram showing a surface deformation with a red box and green arrow} \\ \beta^2 \downarrow \quad \uparrow \theta \\ \text{Diagram showing a surface deformation with a green box and red arrow} \end{array}$$

$$(2.13) \quad \text{Diagram: } \text{A box labeled } \text{id} \text{ with a green border and a green dot inside, connected by a double-headed arrow to a box labeled } \theta \text{ with a green border and a green dot inside.} = \quad \text{Diagram: } \text{A box labeled } \text{id} \text{ with a green border and a green dot inside, connected by a double-headed arrow to a box labeled } \text{id} \text{ with a green border and a green dot inside.}$$

- (Rigidity) Write ϕ_l for the following composite:

$$(2.14) \quad \phi_l := \text{Diagram 1} \xrightarrow{\eta} \text{Diagram 2} \xrightarrow{\alpha} \text{Diagram 3} \xrightarrow{\epsilon} \text{Diagram 4}$$

The left rigidity relation says that ϕ_l is invertible, with the following explicit inverse:

$$(2.15) \quad \phi_l^{-1} = \text{Diagram 1} \xrightarrow{\epsilon^\dagger} \text{Diagram 2} \xrightarrow{\alpha^{-1}} \text{Diagram 3} \xrightarrow{\eta^\dagger} \text{Diagram 4}$$

Similarly, write ϕ_r for ϕ_l rotated about the z -axis (See [Bar+14, Appendix B] for what this means):

$$(2.16) \quad \phi_r := \text{Diagram} \xrightarrow{\eta} \text{Diagram} \xrightarrow{\alpha^{-1}} \text{Diagram} \xrightarrow{\epsilon} \text{Diagram}$$

The right rigidity relation says that ϕ_r is invertible, with the following explicit inverse :

$$(2.17) \quad \phi_r^{-1} = \text{Diagram} \xrightarrow{\epsilon^\dagger} \text{Diagram} \xrightarrow{\alpha} \text{Diagram} \xrightarrow{\eta^\dagger} \text{Diagram}$$

- (Ribbon) The twist satisfies the following equation:

$$(2.18) \quad \text{Diagram} \xrightarrow{\theta} \text{Diagram} = \text{Diagram} \xrightarrow{\theta} \text{Diagram}$$

- (Adjoints) The data (2.7) expresses Diagram as the biadjoint of Diagram , while (part of the) (2.8) data, expresses Diagram as the left adjoint of Diagram . That is, the following equations hold:

$$(2.19) \quad \text{Diagram} \xrightarrow{\eta} \text{Diagram} \xrightarrow{\epsilon} \text{Diagram} = \text{Diagram} \xrightarrow{\text{id}} \text{Diagram}$$

$$(2.20) \quad \text{Diagram} \xrightarrow{\eta} \text{Diagram} \xrightarrow{\epsilon} \text{Diagram} = \text{Diagram} \xrightarrow{\text{id}} \text{Diagram}$$

$$(2.21) \quad \text{Diagram} \xrightarrow{\epsilon^\dagger} \text{Diagram} \xrightarrow{\eta^\dagger} \text{Diagram} = \text{Diagram} \xrightarrow{\text{id}} \text{Diagram}$$

$$(2.22) \quad \text{Diagram} \xrightarrow{\epsilon^\dagger} \text{Diagram} \xrightarrow{\eta^\dagger} \text{Diagram} = \text{Diagram} \xrightarrow{\text{id}} \text{Diagram}$$

$$(2.23) \quad \text{Diagram} \xrightarrow{\mu^\dagger} \text{Diagram} \xrightarrow{\nu^\dagger} \text{Diagram} = \text{Diagram} \xrightarrow{\text{id}} \text{Diagram}$$

$$(2.24) \quad \text{Diagram} \xrightarrow{\mu^\dagger} \text{Diagram} \xrightarrow{\nu^\dagger} \text{Diagram} = \text{Diagram} \xrightarrow{\text{id}} \text{Diagram}$$

- (Pivotality) The following equation holds, together with its rotation about the z -axis (2.25)^z:

$$(2.25) \quad \text{Diagram showing the pivotality equation. It consists of a sequence of cobordism morphisms: } \Theta \xrightarrow{\epsilon^\dagger} \text{a handle with a green box} \xrightarrow{\mu^\dagger} \text{a handle with a green box} \xrightarrow{\mu} \text{a handle with a green box} \xrightarrow{\epsilon} \Theta = \Theta \xrightarrow{\text{id}} \Theta.$$

- (Modularity) The following equation holds, together with its rotation about the z -axis (2.26)^z:

$$(2.26) \quad \text{Diagram showing the modularity equation. It shows a cylinder on the left with two arrows: } \epsilon^\dagger \text{ and } \mu^\dagger. \text{ These lead to a handle with a red box labeled } \theta, \theta^{-1}. \text{ From this handle, two arrows lead to a cylinder on the right: } \epsilon \text{ and } \mu. \text{ There is also a handle labeled } \epsilon^\dagger \text{ and a handle labeled } \mu \text{ at the bottom.}$$

- (Anomaly) The following equation holds:

$$(2.27) \quad \text{Diagram showing the anomaly equation. It consists of a sequence of cobordism morphisms: } \Theta \xrightarrow{\epsilon^\dagger} \text{a handle with a green box} \xrightarrow{\theta} \text{a handle with a green box} \xrightarrow{\epsilon} \Theta = \Theta \xrightarrow{\xi} \Theta.$$

Remark 2.3. If we ask that the anomaly relation holds for ξ^3 instead of ξ , as well as impose another relation ([Bar+15, Relation (40)], the resulting presentation should be equivalent to the 2-category of non-compact 3d cobordisms equipped with p_1 structure, $\mathbf{Bord}_{3,2,1}^{p_1,nc}$. We do not give a definition of $\mathbf{Bord}_{3,2,1}^{p_1,nc}$, but we make a note of this as we could have defined the non-compact TQFT as a functor out of the p_1 presentation $\mathbf{Bord}_{3,2,1}^{p_1,nc}$. The only difference is that we would have to consider a sixth root of the anomaly of the MTC $\sqrt[6]{p_+/p_-}$, instead of $\sqrt{p_+/p_-}$ (see Remark 3.9).

2.3. Finite ribbon categories and projectives. Following [Eti+15] we have the following definition:

Definition 2.4. A linear category \mathcal{C} is **finite** if it is abelian and:

- it has a finite number of isomorphism classes of simple objects,
- it has enough projectives,
- its objects have finite length,
- its morphism spaces have finite dimension.

For now by \mathcal{C} we denote a finite category.

Let I be the set of isomorphism classes of simples. For $j \in I$, let L_j be a representative of the j -th class of simples. Then $P_j \twoheadrightarrow L_j$ is a projective cover of L_j . If \mathcal{C} is monoidal and $\mathbb{1}$ is simple, we will denote its projective cover by $(P_{\mathbb{1}}, \varepsilon_{\mathbb{1}})$, where $\varepsilon_{\mathbb{1}} : P_{\mathbb{1}} \rightarrow \mathbb{1}$ is the canonical surjection.

By $\text{Proj}(\mathcal{C})$ we denote the full subcategory of projective objects in \mathcal{C} . This will turn out to be a tensor ideal once we additionally assume \mathcal{C} to be rigid monoidal.

For such a \mathcal{C} , we have the following results:

- The indecomposable projective objects in \mathcal{C} are exactly the projective covers of simple objects, and for j, j' simples, $P_j \cong P_{j'}$ if and only if $L_j \cong L_{j'}$.
- For a finite linear category \mathcal{C} , $\text{Proj}(\mathcal{C})$ is generated under direct sums by the projective covers of simples P_j .
- Let $L_j, L_{j'} \in \mathcal{C}$ be simple objects in \mathcal{C} and P_j be the projective cover of L_j , then

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P_j, L_{j'}) \cong \begin{cases} k & \text{if } j = j' \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

- Let $P \in \text{Proj}(\mathcal{C})$, then by the above we have:

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1}) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\bigoplus_j P_j^{\oplus n_j}, \mathbb{1}) \cong \bigoplus_{n_j} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P_j, \mathbb{1}) \cong \bigoplus_{n_1} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P_1, \mathbb{1}).$$

See [Lei15] for a reference.

Now let V be a finite dimensional vector space and $X, Y \in \mathcal{C}$. The fact that \mathcal{C} is linear allows us to define $V \otimes Y$ by the following universal property:

$$(2.28) \quad \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(V \otimes Y, X) \cong \text{Hom}_{\text{Vec}_k}(V, \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Y, X)).$$

From this equivalence we obtain the following natural (counit) map:

$$(2.29) \quad \text{EV}_Y: \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Y, X) \otimes Y \rightarrow X.$$

2.4. Coends. We now assume that \mathcal{C} is a finite tensor category in the sense of [Eti+15]. We remind that this definition includes rigidity.

We review the definition of a coend, as well as some results that will be used later on.

Definition 2.5. Let \mathcal{D} be a finite linear category and $B: \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be a bifunctor. A **dinatural transformation** from B to a constant bifunctor is given by an object $Z \in \mathcal{D}$ (the image of the constant bifunctor) equipped with a family $\{d_X: B(X, X) \rightarrow Z\}_{X \in \mathcal{C}}$ of morphisms of \mathcal{C} satisfying:

$$d_X \circ (f^{\vee} \otimes \text{id}_X) = d_Y \circ (\text{id}_{Y^{\vee}} \otimes f)$$

for every morphism $f: X \rightarrow Y$ in \mathcal{C} .

For simplicity, we will call this a dinatural transformation of source B .

Definition 2.6. The **coend** of B is a universal dinatural transformation of source B , i.e an object $\int^{X \in \mathcal{C}} B(X, X) \in \mathcal{D}$ with a dinatural family of structure morphisms $d_X: B(X, X) \rightarrow \int^{X \in \mathcal{C}} B(X, X)$ satisfying the following condition: for every dinatural transformation (Z, d') of source B , there exists a unique morphism

$$\int d': \int^{X \in \mathcal{C}} B(X, X) \rightarrow Z$$

such that the diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 Y^\vee \otimes X & \xrightarrow{f^\vee \otimes id_X} & X^\vee \otimes X \\
 id_{Y^\vee} \otimes f \downarrow & & \downarrow d_X \\
 Y^\vee \otimes Y & \xrightarrow{d_Y} & \int^{X \in \mathcal{C}} B(X, X) \\
 & \searrow d'_Y & \swarrow f d' \\
 & & Z
 \end{array}$$

commutes for every morphism $f: X \rightarrow Y$ in \mathcal{C} .

In practice, we sometimes will denote $\int d'$ by d' .

As explained in [KL01], EV is dinatural, and according to [KL01, Prop 5.1.5]:

Proposition 2.7. The natural morphism $\int EV_Y: \int^Y \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Y, X) \otimes Y \rightarrow X$ is an isomorphism. This is true for $Y \in \mathcal{C}$ as well as $Y \in \text{Proj}(\mathcal{C})$, due to the fact that \mathcal{C} has enough projectives.

Remark 2.8. This is an instance of the so-called co-Yoneda lemma, or ninja Yoneda lemma, as encountered in [Lor21, Chapter 2].

Now, using the fact that the object $G = \bigoplus_j P_j$ is a projective generator, [KL01, Prop 5.1.7] gives us the following result:

Proposition 2.9. For a bifunctor $B: \mathcal{C}^{op} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ that is exact in each variable, the following coends are equivalent:

$$\int^{X \in \mathcal{C}} B(X, X) \cong \int^{P \in \text{Proj}(\mathcal{C})} B(P, P) \cong \int^{\{P_j\}_{j=\text{simple}}} B(P_j, P_j).$$

Using the above, we can reduce certain coends to be over projectives, or even indecomposable projectives. We will use this fact later on.

From now on we assume that \mathcal{C} is additionally ribbon, and that the monoidal unit $\mathbb{1}$ is simple.

For a finite ribbon category \mathcal{C} , it was shown by Majid [Maj91] and Lyubashenko [Lyu95a], [Lyu99], that the coend

$$(2.30) \quad \mathcal{F} := \int^{X \in \mathcal{C}} X^\vee \otimes X$$

exists. We denote its family of structure morphisms by $i_X: X^\vee \otimes X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$.

Additionally, they showed that the coend \mathcal{F} is a Hopf algebra object in \mathcal{C} .

The structure morphisms for the Hopf algebra structure will be denoted as:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 \text{Product} & m: \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \\
 \text{Coproduct} & \Delta: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{F} \\
 \text{Antipode} & S: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}.
 \end{array}
 \quad
 \begin{array}{ll}
 \text{Unit} & u: \mathbb{1} \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \\
 \text{Counit} & \varepsilon: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{1}
 \end{array}$$

and are defined as follows:

$$(2.31) \quad \begin{array}{ccc}
 \begin{array}{c} m \\ \boxed{m} \\ \mathcal{F} \quad \mathcal{F} \\ i_X \quad i_Y \\ X^\vee \quad X \quad Y^\vee \quad Y \end{array} & = & \begin{array}{c} \mathcal{F} \\ \boxed{i_{X \otimes Y}} \\ \mathcal{F} \\ \text{braids} \\ X^\vee \quad X \quad Y^\vee \quad Y \end{array} \\
 & & \begin{array}{c} \mathcal{F} \\ u \\ \boxed{i_{\mathbb{1}}} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \mathcal{F} \\ i_{\mathbb{1}} \end{array}
 \end{array}$$

$$(2.32) \quad \begin{array}{ccc}
 \begin{array}{c} \Delta \\ \boxed{\Delta} \\ \mathcal{F} \quad \mathcal{F} \\ i_X \\ X^\vee \quad X \end{array} & = & \begin{array}{c} \mathcal{F} \quad \mathcal{F} \\ i_X \quad i_X \\ \text{braids} \\ X^\vee \quad X \end{array} \\
 & & \begin{array}{c} \varepsilon \\ \boxed{i_X} \\ \mathcal{F} \\ X^\vee \quad X \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{braids} \\ X^\vee \quad X \end{array}
 \end{array}$$

$$(2.33) \quad \begin{array}{ccc}
 \begin{array}{c} S \\ \boxed{S} \\ \mathcal{F} \\ i_X \\ X^\vee \quad X \end{array} & = & \begin{array}{c} \mathcal{F} \\ i_X \\ \text{braids} \\ X^\vee \quad X \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \mathcal{F} \\ i_X \\ \text{braids} \\ X^\vee \quad X \end{array} \\
 & & \quad \quad \quad \boxed{\vartheta_X}
 \end{array}$$

Additionally, the coend \mathcal{F} has a Hopf pairing $\omega: \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{1}$. It is uniquely defined in the following way:

$$(2.34) \quad \begin{array}{ccc}
 \begin{array}{c} \omega \\ \boxed{\omega} \\ \mathcal{F} \quad \mathcal{F} \\ i_X \quad i_Y \\ X^\vee \quad X \quad Y^\vee \quad Y \end{array} & = & \begin{array}{c} \text{braids} \\ X^\vee \quad X \quad Y^\vee \quad Y \end{array}
 \end{array}$$

Definition 2.10. A braided finite tensor category \mathcal{C} is **non-degenerate**, if the Hopf pairing ω is non-degenerate.

For an object $Y \in \mathcal{C}$ we can define ϱ_Y by the composite:

$$(2.35) \quad \varrho_Y: Y \xrightarrow{\text{coev}_Y \otimes \text{id}_Y} Y \otimes Y^\vee \otimes Y \xrightarrow{\text{id}_Y \otimes i_Y} Y \otimes \mathcal{F}.$$

Given the definition of the comultiplication Δ of \mathcal{F} , it is easy to see that (Y, ϱ_Y) is a \mathcal{F} -comodule. The morphism ϱ_Y is also referred to as the canonical coaction. In particular, the coaction for the free comodule $X \otimes \mathcal{F}$ is given by the comultiplication Δ of \mathcal{F} . We will be using this fact implicitly in our computations. For a proof of this, see Corollary 3.6. By $\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{F}}$ we denote the category of right \mathcal{F} comodules in \mathcal{C} .

An important fact we will make use of in our construction in Section 3, is the following:

Lemma 2.11. For a braided finite tensor category \mathcal{C} , the functor

$$\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{F}}, \quad X \boxtimes Y \mapsto (X \otimes Y, \text{id}_Y \otimes \varrho_Y)$$

is an equivalence.

This is a special case of a more general result of Lyubashenko's, using the notion of squared coalgebras [Lyu99, Section 2.7].

2.5. Integrals and modular tensor categories.

Definition 2.12. A **modular tensor category** is a finite ribbon category that is non-degenerate.

Note that this definition does not assume semisimplicity. See [Shi19] for other equivalent conditions to non-degeneracy of ω .

We will now state some properties of modular tensor categories, that will be useful for our construction.

Definition 2.13. A morphism $\Lambda: \mathbb{1} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ is called a (two-sided) **integral** of \mathcal{F} if it satisfies

$$m \circ (\Lambda \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{F}}) = \Lambda \circ \varepsilon = m \circ (\text{id}_{\mathcal{F}} \otimes \Lambda).$$

The dual notion is that of a (two-sided) **cointegral**, which is a morphism $\Lambda^{co}: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{1}$ that satisfies

$$(\Lambda^{co} \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{F}}) \circ \Delta = \eta \circ \Lambda^{co} = (\text{id}_{\mathcal{F}} \otimes \Lambda^{co}) \circ \Delta.$$

Proposition 2.14. If \mathcal{C} is modular, integrals and cointegrals exist and are unique up to scalar.

Remark 2.15. Proposition 2.14 holds when \mathcal{C} is unimodular. But as shown in [KL01, Lemma 5.2.8], modularity implies unimodularity.

Lemma 2.16. Let Λ and Λ^{co} be a non-zero integral and a non-zero cointegral of \mathcal{F} respectively. Then the following hold:

- (1) $\Lambda^{co} \circ \Lambda \neq 0$
- (2) $S \circ \Lambda = \Lambda$
- (3) $\Lambda^{co} \circ m \circ (S \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{F}}) = \Lambda^{co} \circ m \circ (\text{id}_{\mathcal{F}} \otimes S)$

Proof. Part (1) is proven in [KL01, Theorem 4.2.5] and (2) follows from equation (a) in [DR13, Lemma 3.13], after composing with $\text{id}_{\mathcal{F}} \otimes \Lambda^{co}$ from the left and Λ from the right.

We will now prove part (3):

Where in the first equality we used [KL01, Figure 4.3(c)], precomposed with the antipode S , and in the second, [KL01, Figure 4.3(d)], again precomposed with S . Note that for the above to be true, we used the fact that \mathcal{C} is modular, and hence the object of integrals appearing in [KL01] is in fact, the tensor unit.

□

Definition 2.17. The morphism $\mathcal{T}: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ is the unique morphism satisfying for all $X \in \mathcal{C}$ the following identity:

$$\mathcal{T} \circ i_X = i_X \circ (\text{id}_{X^\vee} \otimes \vartheta_X).$$

For a modular tensor category \mathcal{C} with an integral Λ , there exist non-zero constants p_\pm , such that:

$$\varepsilon \circ \mathcal{T}^\pm \circ \Lambda = p_\pm \text{id}_{\mathbb{1}}.$$

This lemma was proven in [Ker96, Thm. 5]:

Lemma 2.18. Let \mathcal{C} be modular and let Λ and Λ^{co} be an integral and a cointegral of \mathcal{F} satisfying $\Lambda^{co} \circ \Lambda = \text{id}_{\mathbb{1}}$. Then, there exists a non-zero coefficient $\zeta \in k^\times$ satisfying the equation

$$\omega \circ (\Lambda \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{F}}) = \zeta \Lambda^{co}.$$

We call ζ the **modularity parameter** of Λ .

The following lemma is proven in [De +22, Cor 4.6]:

Lemma 2.19. If \mathcal{C} is a modular category, then $\zeta = p_- \cdot p_+$.

The result below was proven in [GR20, Cor. 6.4].

Lemma 2.20. If \mathcal{C} is a modular category, then there exists a unique morphism $\eta_{\mathbb{1}} : \mathbb{1} \rightarrow P_{\mathbb{1}}$ satisfying, for every simple object $j \in \mathcal{C}$, the equation

$$\Lambda^{co} \circ i_{P_j} = \delta_{P_j, \mathbb{1}} \eta_{\mathbb{1}}^\vee \otimes \varepsilon_{\mathbb{1}}.$$

2.6. Target bicategory.

Definition 2.21 (Lincat). The symmetric monoidal bicategory Lincat is defined as follows:

- Its objects are finite abelian linear categories
- Its 1-morphisms are right exact functors, i.e functors that preserve finite colimits. We denote by $\text{Fun}^{\text{Lincat}}(-, -) \subset \text{Fun}(-, -)$, the full subcategory of right exact linear functors.
- Its 2-morphisms are natural transformations.

There is a natural tensor product on Lincat defined by Kelly [Kel82] (generalizing the Deligne tensor product of finite abelian categories) which is uniquely characterized by the universal property that a functor $\mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ preserving finite colimits is the same as a functor $\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ preserving finite colimits separately in \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} . The unit of this tensor product is the category Vec_k of finite-dimensional k -vector spaces.

Remark 2.22. The 1-morphisms in Lincat are right exact functors, and the modular tensor category we will be working with has enough projectives. In this case, a right exact functor is determined by its values on projectives. This means that $\text{Fun}^{\text{Lincat}}(\mathcal{C}, \text{Vec}_k) \cong \text{Fun}(\text{Proj}(\mathcal{C}), \text{Vec}_k)$. When defining the TFT, this will allow us to specify certain 1-morphism generators only on the projective objects. Better yet, it is sufficient to talk about the indecomposable projectives, since the direct summands of a projective are projective.

Moreover, we will implicitly identify functors $F: \text{Vec}_k \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ with their value $F(k)$, an object of \mathcal{C} .

3. CONSTRUCTION OF THE TQFT

According to the definition of a presentation of a symmetric monoidal 2-category (Section 2.2) and Conjecture 2.1, to define the non-compact 3d TQFT, we need to specify the images of the generators in the target bicategory Lincat and to check that all the relevant relations of the non-compact presentation given in Section 2.2 hold.

3.1. Assignment to generators. Fix \mathcal{C} to be a (not necessarily semisimple) modular tensor category, and $\mathcal{P} := \text{Proj}(\mathcal{C})$. Thus, $\mathcal{C} \in \text{Lincat}$. Additionally, let $\mathcal{D} \in k^\times$ be a constant whose value is going to be fixed later by certain relations, and fix an integral Λ , whose existence is guaranteed by Proposition 2.14. This uniquely determines a cointegral Λ^{co} satisfying $\Lambda^{co} \circ \Lambda = \text{id}_1$ and a modularity parameter $\zeta \in k^\times$, according to Lemma 2.18.

For the convenience of the reader, before we give the full assignment in detail, we repeat our table 1 from the introduction.

Generators of $\text{Bord}_{3,2,1}^{sig,nc}$	Value in Lincat
	\mathcal{C}
	Forget: $\mathcal{C}^F \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ Co-free: $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^F$ $- \otimes 1: \text{Vec}_k \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$
	$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(-, 1)^*: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Vec}_k$
	$\text{id}_X \otimes \varepsilon: X \otimes \mathcal{F} \rightarrow X$
	Coaction δ_X
	$\text{id}_X \otimes \mathcal{D}^{-1}\Lambda: X \rightarrow X \otimes \mathcal{F}$
	$(\text{id}_X \otimes (\mathcal{D}\Lambda^{co} \circ m \circ (S \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{F}}))) \circ (\delta_X \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{F}})$
	$\mathcal{D}(\text{ev}_{\varepsilon_1} \otimes \eta_1)$
	$(\text{id} \otimes EV_P) \circ (\text{coev}_{\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, 1)})$
	Evaluation of vector spaces

Table 2. Assignment \mathcal{Z} to generators of $\text{Bord}_{3,2,1}^{sig,nc}$

Note that, having developed the necessary algebraic prerequisites, we have given a more precise description of the assignments. In particular, we make use of the equivalence $\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{C}^F$ (Lemma 2.11).

Now, in more detail, we define the assignment $\mathcal{Z} : \text{Bord}_{3,2,1}^{sig,nc} \rightarrow \text{Lincat}$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{Z}(S^1) = \mathcal{C}$$

Call

- $T := \mathcal{Z}(\text{---})$
- $T^R := \mathcal{Z}(\text{---})$
- $U := \mathcal{Z}(\text{---})$
- $U^L := \mathcal{Z}(\text{---})$

and define:

- T to be given by the monoidal product:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{C} &\xrightarrow{T} \mathcal{C} \\ X \boxtimes Y &\mapsto X \otimes Y \end{aligned}$$

- T^R to be:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C} &\xrightarrow{T^R} \mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{C} \\ X &\mapsto \int^{Z \in \mathcal{C}} X \otimes Z^\vee \boxtimes Z \end{aligned}$$

We call this map T^R as, when we later check the relations (2.19), (2.20), this will show that it's the right adjoint of T .

- $U : \text{Vec}_k \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Vec}_k &\xrightarrow{U} \mathcal{C} \\ V &\mapsto V \otimes \mathbb{1} \end{aligned}$$

- U^L is (as we will see) the left adjoint of U . We define it to be:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C} &\xrightarrow{U^L} \text{Vec}_k \\ X &\mapsto \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X, \mathbb{1})^* \end{aligned}$$

As mentioned in Section 2.6, it will be beneficial to work with \mathcal{C}^F instead of $\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{C}$. So, under the equivalence $\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{C} \cong \mathcal{C}^F$ the functor:

- T corresponds to the forgetful functor:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}^F &\xrightarrow{T} \mathcal{C} \\ (x, \delta_X) &\mapsto X \end{aligned}$$

- T^R corresponds to:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C} &\xrightarrow{T^R} \mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{F}} \\ X &\mapsto (X \otimes \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \end{aligned}$$

Now we will define the images of 2-morphisms.

The assignment for the generating 2-morphisms $\alpha, \lambda, \rho, \beta, \theta$ is straightforward. They are respectively given by the associator, left/right unitor, braiding ($c_{X,Y}$) and twist (ϑ) morphisms of the modular tensor category \mathcal{C} .

The maps $\mathcal{Z}(\epsilon), \mathcal{Z}(\eta)$ are given by (and will prove to be the counit and unit, respectively, of the adjunction of $T \dashv T^R$):

- $\mathcal{Z}(\epsilon)$ is a natural transformation: $T \circ T^R \Rightarrow \text{id}_{\mathcal{C}}$. For $X \in \mathcal{C}$, we define it to be:

$$\mathcal{Z}(\epsilon): X \otimes \mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{\text{id}_X \otimes \varepsilon} X$$

- $\mathcal{Z}(\eta)$ is a natural transformation: $\text{id}_{\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{F}}} \Rightarrow T^R \circ T$. For $(X, \delta_X) \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{F}}$, we define it to be:

$$\mathcal{Z}(\eta): (X, \delta_X) \xrightarrow{\delta_X} (X \otimes \mathcal{F}, \Delta),$$

where ε is the counit of \mathcal{F} and $\delta_X: X \rightarrow X \otimes \mathcal{F}$ is the coaction for the \mathcal{F} -comodule (X, δ_X) .

To define the maps $\mathcal{Z}(\epsilon^\dagger), \mathcal{Z}(\eta^\dagger)$, we will make use of the integral $\Lambda: \mathbb{1} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ and cointegral $\Lambda^{co}: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{1}$ that we defined earlier:

- $\mathcal{Z}(\epsilon^\dagger): \text{id}_{\mathcal{C}} \Rightarrow T^R \circ T$, meaning, a natural transformation with components: $X \rightarrow X \otimes \mathcal{F}$. We define this to be:

$$X \xrightarrow{\text{id}_X \otimes \mathcal{D}^{-1} \Lambda} X \otimes \mathcal{F}.$$

As mentioned, the constant $\mathcal{D} \in k^\times$ will be determined later by some of the axioms.

- $\mathcal{Z}(\eta^\dagger)$: We want a natural transformation with components: $(X \otimes \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \rightarrow (X, \delta_X)$

$$\begin{aligned} (X \otimes \mathcal{F}, \Delta) &\xrightarrow{\delta_X \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{F}}} (X \otimes \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \xrightarrow{\text{id}_X \otimes S \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{F}}} (X \otimes \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \\ &\xrightarrow{\text{id}_X \otimes m} (X \otimes \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \xrightarrow{\text{id}_X \otimes \mathcal{D} \Lambda^{co}} (X, \delta_X) \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.1. The intuition behind the definition of $\mathcal{Z}(\epsilon^\dagger), \mathcal{Z}(\eta^\dagger)$ is related to the following: The pairing $\Lambda^{co} \circ m$ is non degenerate (with the copairing involving the integral Λ) ([KL01], Corol 4.2.13), and thus introduces an isomorphism $\mathcal{F} \cong \mathcal{F}^\vee$. Now, as $T^L(X) = (X \otimes \mathcal{F}^\vee, (\text{id}_X \otimes \Delta^\vee \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{F}}) \circ (\text{id}_X \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{F}^\vee} \otimes \text{coev}_{\mathcal{F}^\vee}))$ and $T^R(X) = (X \otimes \mathcal{F}, \text{id}_X \otimes \Delta)$, utilizing the isomorphism above, we obtain an isomorphism $T^L \cong T^R$. This is precisely why $\mathcal{Z}(\epsilon^\dagger), \mathcal{Z}(\eta^\dagger)$ will be the counit and unit of the adjunction $T^R \dashv T$, and will therefore satisfy the desired axioms.

Now we define the natural transformations $\mathcal{Z}(\mu^\dagger)$, $\mathcal{Z}(\nu^\dagger)$ on projectives as follows:

- $\mathcal{Z}(\mu^\dagger)$: $\text{id} \Rightarrow U \circ U^L$, meaning, for $P \in \mathcal{P}$, we have a natural transformation with components:

$$P \xrightarrow{\mathcal{Z}(\mu^\dagger)_P} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})^* \otimes \mathbb{1}$$

given by the following composite:

$$P \xrightarrow{\text{coev}_{\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})} \otimes \text{id}_P} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})^* \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1}) \otimes P \xrightarrow{\text{id} \otimes EV_P} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})^* \otimes \mathbb{1}$$

where in the first step we used co-evaluation for the vector space $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})$.

- $\mathcal{Z}(\nu^\dagger)$: $U^L \circ U \Rightarrow \text{id}$, in other words, a natural transformation

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbb{1}, \mathbb{1})^* \xrightarrow{\mathcal{Z}(\nu^\dagger)} k$$

is given by evaluation on $\text{id}_{\mathbb{1}}$.

As for $\mathcal{Z}(\mu)$, it is not an obvious map.

- $\mathcal{Z}(\mu)$: $U \circ U^L \Rightarrow \text{id}$, i.e a natural transformation with components:

$$(3.1) \quad \text{Hom}(P, \mathbb{1})^* \otimes \mathbb{1} \xrightarrow{\mu_P} P$$

To define it, it suffices to define $\mu_{P_{\mathbb{1}}} : \text{Hom}(P_{\mathbb{1}}, \mathbb{1})^* \otimes \mathbb{1} \rightarrow P_{\mathbb{1}}$.

This morphism is given by:

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P_{\mathbb{1}}, \mathbb{1})^* \otimes \mathbb{1} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}(\text{ev}_{\varepsilon_{\mathbb{1}}} \otimes \eta_{\mathbb{1}})} P_{\mathbb{1}}$$

where by $\text{ev}_{\varepsilon_{\mathbb{1}}}$ we mean the map $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P_{\mathbb{1}}, \mathbb{1})^* \rightarrow k$ obtained by evaluating an element $f \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P_{\mathbb{1}}, \mathbb{1})^*$ on the canonical element $\varepsilon_{\mathbb{1}} \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P_{\mathbb{1}}, \mathbb{1})$.

However, it will be useful to think about the map $\text{ev}_{\varepsilon_{\mathbb{1}}}$ in the following way:

We have the canonical element $\varepsilon_{\mathbb{1}} \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P_{\mathbb{1}}, \mathbb{1})$ which gives rise to a linear map $\bar{\varepsilon}_{\mathbb{1}} : k \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P_{\mathbb{1}}, \mathbb{1})$ and therefore we can define the map $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P_{\mathbb{1}}, \mathbb{1})^* \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_{\varepsilon_{\mathbb{1}}}} k$ as:

$$k \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P_{\mathbb{1}}, \mathbb{1})^* \xrightarrow{\bar{\varepsilon}_{\mathbb{1}} \otimes \text{id}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P_{\mathbb{1}}, \mathbb{1}) \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P_{\mathbb{1}}, \mathbb{1})^* \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_{\text{vect}}} k$$

The usefulness of this description of $\text{ev}_{\varepsilon_{\mathbb{1}}}$ is showcased in the proof of the following lemma, which will be useful when checking relations (2.25) and (2.26).

Remark 3.2. The functor $U^L : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Vec}_k$ has two equivalent descriptions. Since the functor $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(-, \mathbb{1})^* : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Vec}_k$ is right exact, it suffices to define it only on projectives: $U^L(P) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})^*$. This gives us another way to describe it, using Proposition 2.7.

This way, $U^L(-) \cong \int^{P \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, -) \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})^*$, and $\mathcal{Z}(\nu^\dagger)$ is correspondingly given by evaluation of vector spaces $\int^{P \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1}) \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})^* \xrightarrow{\mathcal{Z}(\nu^\dagger)} k$. In fact, this coincides with the action of ν^\dagger when the target is *Bimod*, something we are concerned with in chapters 6 and 7.

3.2. Checking the relations. One of the main results of this thesis is proving the following:

Theorem 3.3. The assignment \mathcal{Z} in Section 3.1 defines a symmetric monoidal functor between bicategories $\text{Bord}_{3,2,1}^{\text{sig},\text{nc}} \rightarrow \text{Lincat}$.

In order to prove Theorem 3.3, it is sufficient to check that the relations (2.9)-(2.27) are preserved after applying the assignment \mathcal{Z} . We will be referring to this as ‘checking the relations’ without mentioning the assignment \mathcal{Z} . This amounts to checking equalities between natural transformations. We will therefore work in components, denoting by X, Y, Z objects in \mathcal{C} , $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}$.

Before we proceed to the proof of Theorem 3.3, we prove some useful lemmas:

Lemma 3.4. $(\mathcal{Z}(\mu) \circ \mathcal{Z}(\mu^\dagger))(P_j) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{D}(\eta_1 \circ \varepsilon_1) & P_j \cong P_1 \\ 0 & P_j \not\cong P_1 \end{cases}$.

Proof. First, if $P_j \not\cong P_1$, then this composite is the zero morphism (Section 2.3).

Now, for the case where $P_j \cong P_1$, the composite $\mu_{P_1} \circ \mu_{P_1}^\dagger$ looks as follows in string diagram notation:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} & = & \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \end{array}$$

Where the blue string is meant to correspond to the vector space $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P_1, \mathbb{1})$ and the equality holds because of the duality relations as well as [KL01, Lemma 5.1.3]. \square

Lemma 3.5. The coaction $\delta_{X \otimes \mathcal{F} \otimes Y}$ appearing in $\mathcal{Z}(\phi_r)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(\phi_r^{-1})$ is given by:

$$\begin{array}{c} X \otimes \mathcal{F} \otimes Y \xrightarrow{\text{id}_X \otimes \Delta \otimes \rho_Y} X \otimes \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{F} \otimes Y \otimes \mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{\text{id}_X \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{F}} \otimes c_{\mathcal{F}, Y} \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{F}}} X \otimes \mathcal{F} \otimes Y \otimes \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{F} \\ \xrightarrow{\text{id}_{X \otimes \mathcal{F} \otimes Y} \otimes m} X \otimes \mathcal{F} \otimes Y \otimes \mathcal{F}. \end{array}$$

As a diagram this is represented as:

$$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \end{array}$$

Proof. The coaction $\delta_{X \otimes \mathcal{F} \otimes Y}$ is given by ϱ , applied on the appropriate object. To understand what that object is, we need to look at the level at which η (resp. η^\dagger) is applied on (2.16) (resp. (2.17)). η is applied on the two cylinders (resp. η^\dagger on $\text{C}_1 \circ \text{C}_2$). In both cases, the object at the source of that 1-morphism is $\int_{Z \in \mathcal{C}} X \otimes Z^\vee \boxtimes Z \otimes Y$. η is given by the coaction of this object and the first part of the η^\dagger composite is the coaction of this object. So we are looking to compute the coaction induced on $X \otimes \mathcal{F} \otimes Y$ from the equivalence $\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{C} \cong \mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{F}}$, in other words from $\varrho_{Z \otimes Y}$.

Recall that $(Z \otimes Y)^\vee \cong Y^\vee \otimes Z^\vee$. We therefore have the following:

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \text{Diagram 1:} \\
 \begin{array}{c}
 \text{Left: } \text{U-shaped diagram with } i_{Z \otimes Y} \text{ in a box.} \\
 \text{Middle: } \text{U-shaped diagram with } i_{Z \otimes Y} \text{ in a box, } \mathcal{F} \text{ above, and a red line } \text{U} \text{ connecting } i_{Z \otimes Y} \text{ to } \mathcal{F}. \\
 \text{Right: } \text{U-shaped diagram with } m \text{ in a box, } \mathcal{F} \text{ above, and a red line } \text{U} \text{ connecting } m \text{ to } \mathcal{F}. \\
 \text{Equation: } \text{Left} = \text{Middle} = \text{Right} = \text{U-shaped diagram with } m \text{ in a box, } \mathcal{F} \text{ above, and a red line } \text{U} \text{ connecting } m \text{ to } \mathcal{F}.
 \end{array} \\
 \\[10pt]
 \text{Diagram 2:} \\
 \begin{array}{c}
 \text{Left: } \text{U-shaped diagram with } m \text{ in a box, } i_Z \text{ and } i_Y \text{ in boxes below.} \\
 \text{Middle: } \text{U-shaped diagram with } m \text{ in a box, } i_Z \text{ in a box below, and } i_Y \text{ in a box to the right.} \\
 \text{Right: } \text{U-shaped diagram with } m \text{ in a box, } i_Z \text{ in a box below, and } \varrho_Y \text{ in a box to the right.} \\
 \text{Equation: } \text{Left} = \text{Middle} = \text{Right} = \text{U-shaped diagram with } m \text{ in a box, } i_Z \text{ in a box below, and } \varrho_Y \text{ in a box to the right.}
 \end{array}
 \end{array}$$

Therefore, the action $\delta_{X \otimes \mathcal{F} \otimes Y} : X \otimes \mathcal{F} \otimes Y \rightarrow X \otimes \mathcal{F} \otimes Y \otimes \mathcal{F}$ is given by the unique morphism that is determined by the universal property of \mathcal{F} as follows:

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \text{Diagram 3:} \\
 \begin{array}{c}
 \text{Left: } \text{U-shaped diagram with } i_Z \text{ in a box, } Y \text{ above, and } \mathcal{F} \text{ above.} \\
 \text{Middle: } \text{U-shaped diagram with } i_Z \text{ in a box, } \mathcal{F} \text{ above, and } \varrho_Y \text{ in a box to the right.} \\
 \text{Right: } \text{U-shaped diagram with } \Delta \text{ in a box, } \mathcal{F} \text{ above, and } \varrho_Y \text{ in a box to the right.} \\
 \text{Equation: } \text{Left} = \text{Middle} = \text{Right} = \text{U-shaped diagram with } \Delta \text{ in a box, } \mathcal{F} \text{ above, and } \varrho_Y \text{ in a box to the right.}
 \end{array}
 \end{array}$$

□

Corollary 3.6. In the case where $Y = \mathbb{1}$, we get that the coaction of the free \mathcal{F} comodule $X \otimes \mathcal{F}$ is given by the comultiplication Δ .

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 3.3:

Proof.

f.

- Relations (2.9), (2.10), (2.11), (2.12), (2.13) hold trivially, as they correspond to the pentagon, triangle, hexagon and balancing relations of the modular category \mathcal{C} .
- The first relations we need to check, are the images of (2.14)-(2.15) and (2.16)-(2.17) under \mathcal{Z} , namely, that $\mathcal{Z}(\phi_l)^{-1} = \mathcal{Z}(\phi_l^{-1})$ and $\mathcal{Z}(\phi_r)^{-1} = \mathcal{Z}(\phi_r^{-1})$. We begin by seeing that $\mathcal{Z}(\phi_l)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(\phi_l^{-1})$ are both the identity natural transformation, so the desired relation is satisfied trivially:

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 1: } X \text{ and } Y \text{ are connected to } \Delta \text{, which is connected to } \mathcal{F} \text{. } \varepsilon \text{ is connected to } \Delta. \\ \text{Diagram 2: } X \text{ and } Y \text{ are connected to } \Delta \text{, which is connected to } \mathcal{F}. \\ \text{Diagram 3: } X \text{ and } Y \text{ are connected to } \Delta \text{, which is connected to } \Lambda \text{, which is connected to } \mathcal{F}. \\ \text{Diagram 4: } X \text{ and } Y \text{ are connected to } \Lambda \text{, which is connected to } \mathcal{F}. \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} X \text{ and } Y \text{ are connected to } \mathcal{F}. \end{array}$$

The first equality holds because of the counit-comultiplication relation while the second holds because of the fact that $\Delta \circ \Lambda$ is a non-degenerate pairing and more precisely, because of [KL01, Lemma 4.2.12].

- Now, for (2.16)-(2.17), things require a bit more computation:
First, we would like to simplify both $\mathcal{Z}(\phi_r)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(\phi_r^{-1})$. The former is

given by the composite:


And the latter involves the commutativity of

$$X \otimes Y \otimes \mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{\quad \quad \quad} X \otimes \mathcal{F} \otimes Y \otimes \mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{\quad \quad \quad} X \otimes \mathcal{F} \otimes Y \otimes \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{F}.$$

Now using Lemma 3.3, $\mathcal{L}(\psi_r)$ becomes:


$$\begin{array}{c}
 \begin{array}{c}
 \varepsilon \\
 \square
 \end{array}
 \end{array}
 \begin{array}{c}
 \begin{array}{c}
 m \\
 \square
 \end{array}
 \end{array}
 \begin{array}{c}
 \begin{array}{c}
 \Delta \\
 \square
 \end{array}
 \end{array}
 \begin{array}{c}
 \begin{array}{c}
 \varrho Y \\
 \square
 \end{array}
 \end{array}
 \begin{array}{c}
 = \\
 \parallel
 \end{array}
 \begin{array}{c}
 \begin{array}{c}
 m \\
 \square
 \end{array}
 \end{array}
 \begin{array}{c}
 \begin{array}{c}
 \varrho Y \\
 \square
 \end{array}
 \end{array}$$

And $\mathcal{Z}(\phi_r^{-1})$:





Where in the second equality we used Lemma 2.16 (iii) and in the third equality, we used associativity of the multiplication m . The last equality is due to [KL01, Relation (c) of figure 4.3].

Now using the above, we check the composite $\mathcal{Z}(\phi_r^{-1}) \circ \mathcal{Z}(\phi_r)$:



Where in the second equality we used the compatibility of the coaction ϱ_Y with the comultiplication Δ of \mathcal{F} , in the third equality, the so called 'anti-multiplicativity' [TV17, p. 6.2.1] of the antipode of a Hopf algebra, in the fourth, the fundamental relation for the antipode of the Hopf algebra \mathcal{F} , and finally in the penultimate equality, the unit and counit axioms for \mathcal{F} .

As for the composite $\mathcal{Z}(\phi_r^{-1}) \circ \mathcal{Z}(\phi_r)$:



Where the second equality is due to the compatibility of the coaction with the comultiplication Δ . The third equality is again due to the 'anti-multiplicativity' of the antipode S , but now we have pre-composed it with the inverse braiding and post-composed with S^{-1} . The fourth equality is given by the associativity of m , the fifth by the defining relation of the antipode S , and the penultimate by the relations between unit-multiplication and counit-coaction.

- Fixing $X \boxtimes Y \in \mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{C}$, relation (2.18) demands that for all $\phi \in \text{Hom}(X \otimes Y, \mathbb{1})^*$, it is true that $\phi(- \circ \vartheta_X \otimes \text{id}_Y) = \phi(- \circ \text{id}_X \otimes \vartheta_Y)$. Since this has to hold for all ϕ , that implies that the arguments of ϕ have to be equal.

In other words, we will show the equality of the following 2-morphisms:

$$\text{Hom}(X \otimes Y, \mathbb{1}) \xrightarrow{- \circ (\vartheta_X \otimes \text{id}_Y)} \text{Hom}(X \otimes Y, \mathbb{1}) = \text{Hom}(X \otimes Y, \mathbb{1}) \xrightarrow{- \circ (\text{id}_X \otimes \vartheta_Y)} \text{Hom}(X \otimes Y, \mathbb{1}).$$

To do this, let $g \in \text{Hom}(X \otimes Y, \mathbb{1})$. Then we have the following:

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \text{Diagram 1:} \\
 \begin{array}{c}
 \text{Left: } = \text{ } \boxed{g} \text{ } \boxed{\vartheta_X} \text{ } X \\
 \text{Right: } = \text{ } \boxed{g} \text{ } \boxed{\vartheta_X} \text{ } X \text{ } Y
 \end{array}
 \end{array}$$

Where in the second equality we used the duality property of the twist ϑ , and in the third the naturality of ϑ with respect to the morphism

$$(g \otimes \text{id}_{Y^\vee}) \circ (\text{id}_X \otimes \text{coev}_Y) : X \rightarrow Y^\vee.$$

- We then continue by checking relation (2.19). This implies that we want:

$$X \xrightarrow{\delta_X} X \otimes \mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} X = \text{id}_X$$

Which is true because of the relation between the coaction δ_X and the counit ε .

- Relation (2.20) is verified in exactly the same way, and in some sense it is a special case of (2.19):

$$(X \otimes \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \xrightarrow{\Delta} ((X \otimes \mathcal{F}) \otimes \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \xrightarrow{\text{id}_X \otimes \varepsilon \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{F}}} (X \otimes \mathcal{F}, \Delta)$$

- Now, checking the relations (2.21) and (2.22) respectively:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 \Lambda^{co} & & \Lambda^{co} & & \Lambda^{co} & & \Lambda^{co} \\
 | & & | & & | & & | \\
 m & & m & & m & & \Lambda \\
 | & & | & & | & & | \\
 S & & S & & S & & \varepsilon \\
 | & & | & & | & & | \\
 \varrho_X & & \varrho_X & & \varrho_X & & \varrho_X \\
 | & & | & & | & & | \\
 x & & x & & x & & x \\
 & & & & & & \\
 & = & & = & & = & = \\
 & & & & & & \\
 \Lambda & & \Lambda & & \Lambda & & \Lambda
 \end{array}$$

Where in the first and second equality we used Lemma 2.16 (iii), (ii) respectively, and in the third, the definition of the integral Λ .

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \Lambda^{co} \\
 \square \\
 \downarrow \\
 m \\
 \square \\
 \downarrow \\
 S \\
 \square \\
 \downarrow \\
 \Delta \\
 \square \\
 \downarrow \\
 \Lambda \\
 \square \\
 \downarrow \\
 \mathcal{F}
 \end{array}
 = \quad X \quad \mathcal{F}$$

By [KL01, Lemma 4.2.12].

- Now we turn to relations (2.23) and (2.24). Note that these manifest U^L as the left adjoint of U .

To check relation (2.23), we write $\mathbb{1}$ as a colimit of projectives. We can do this using Proposition 2.7:

$$\mathbb{1} \cong \int^{P \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1}) \otimes P.$$

The isomorphism is given by $\int EV$, so we have a map

$$\mathbb{1} \xrightarrow{(\int EV)^{-1}} \int^{P \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1}) \otimes P.$$

So, for relation (2.23) to hold, the following diagram needs to commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \int^P \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1}) \otimes P & \xleftarrow{(\int EV)^{-1}} & \mathbb{1} \\
 \downarrow f(\text{id}_{\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})} \otimes \text{coev}_{\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})} \otimes \text{id}_P) & & \downarrow \text{id}_{\mathbb{1}} \\
 \int^P \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1}) \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})^* \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1}) \otimes P & & \\
 \downarrow f(\text{id}_{\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})} \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})^* \otimes EV_P) & & \\
 \int^P \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1}) \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})^* \otimes \mathbb{1} & \xrightarrow{f(ev_{\text{vect}}) \otimes \text{id}_{\mathbb{1}}} & \mathbb{1}
 \end{array}$$

Indeed, this diagram is commutative as the evaluation and coevaluation of vector spaces satisfy a snake relation, and then $\int EV$ cancels with $(\int EV)^{-1}$.

- As for relation (2.24), we want the following diagram to be commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})^* & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_{\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})^*}} & \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})^* \\
 \downarrow \mathcal{Z}(\mu^\dagger) & & \nearrow \mathcal{Z}(\nu^\dagger) \\
 \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})^* \otimes \int^{Q \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, \mathbb{1}) \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, \mathbb{1})^* & &
 \end{array}$$

Note that $\mathcal{Z}(\mu^\dagger)$ is applied on P , the argument of $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})^*$. For sake of simplicity, we will denote the maps as applied on P , instead of $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})^*$. Then the above diagram looks like this:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})^* & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_{\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})^*}} & \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})^* \\
\downarrow \text{coev}_{vect} \otimes \text{id}_P & & \uparrow \int \text{ev}_{vect} \\
\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})^* \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1}) \otimes P, \mathbb{1})^* & & \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})^* \otimes \int^Q \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, \mathbb{1}) \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, \mathbb{1})^* \\
\downarrow \text{id}_{\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})} \otimes \text{EV}_P & & \uparrow \sim \\
\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})^* \otimes \mathbb{1}, \mathbb{1})^* & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_{\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})^*} \otimes (\int \text{EV})^{-1}} & \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})^* \otimes \int^Q \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, \mathbb{1}) \otimes Q, \mathbb{1})^*
\end{array}$$

where by \sim we have denoted the isomorphism of coends induced by

$$\text{Hom}(V \otimes X, Y)^* \cong V \otimes \text{Hom}(X, Y)^*,$$

for $V = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})^* \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, \mathbb{1})$, $X = Q$ and $Y = \mathbb{1}$.

This diagram is indeed commutative and we now explain why.

First, looking at the composite $(\int \text{EV})^{-1} \circ \text{EV}_P$, this is equal to d_P^1 , where d^1 is the dinatural family of maps for the coend $\int^P \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1}) \otimes P$. Then this, (post-)composed with \sim , is equal to d_P^2 , where by d^2 we denote the dinatural family of maps for the coend $\int^P \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1}) \otimes \text{Hom}(P, \mathbb{1})^*$.

Then, by the definition of $\int \text{ev}_{vect}$ and by the snake relation satisfied by $\text{coev}_{\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})}$ and $\text{ev}_{\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})}$ we get the desired result.

- The pivotality relation (2.25) says that a certain composite of 2-morphisms is the identity 2-morphism on S^2 . However, since this composite is in fact an endomorphism of the cylinder, we will check something stronger. Namely,

we will show that the relation holds for $\mathcal{Z}(\square)$, instead of $\mathcal{Z}(\oplus)$.

We first need to make sense of $\mu \circ \mu^\dagger$ applied on 'one leg' as a morphism $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$. To do this, we start with $P_1^\vee \otimes P_1$. Relation (2.25) instructs us to apply $\mu \circ \mu^\dagger$ on P_1 . So we have the following:

$$P_1^\vee \otimes P_1 \xrightarrow{\text{id}_{P_1^\vee} \otimes (\eta_1 \circ \varepsilon_1)} P_1^\vee \otimes P_1 \xrightarrow{i_{P_1}} \mathcal{F}$$

Diagrammatically, we have the following equality:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\mathcal{F} \\
\downarrow \\
\boxed{i_{P_1}} \\
\downarrow \\
\eta_1 \\
\downarrow \\
\varepsilon_1 \\
\downarrow \\
P_1^\vee \quad P_1
\end{array}
=
\begin{array}{c}
\mathcal{F} \\
\downarrow \\
\boxed{i_{P_1}} \\
\downarrow \\
\eta_1 \\
\text{---} \\
\varepsilon_1 \\
\downarrow \\
P_1^\vee \quad P_1
\end{array}
=
\begin{array}{c}
\mathcal{F} \\
\downarrow \\
\boxed{i_{P_1}} \\
\downarrow \\
\eta_1^\vee \\
\text{---} \\
\varepsilon_1 \\
\downarrow \\
P_1^\vee \quad P_1
\end{array}
=
\begin{array}{c}
\mathcal{F} \\
\downarrow \\
\boxed{i_{P_j}} \quad \boxed{i_{P_j}} \\
\downarrow \quad \downarrow \\
P_j^\vee \quad P_j
\end{array}$$

Where in the last step we make use of Lemma 2.20, and the fact that the morphism is zero for all $j \neq 1$.

This then induces the following morphism $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$:

$$\begin{array}{c} \boxed{\Lambda^{co}} \\ \downarrow \\ \boxed{\Delta} \\ \downarrow \\ \mathcal{F} \end{array}$$

Given the above, checking that relation (2.25) holds, boils down to showing that the composite $\mathbb{1} \xrightarrow{\Delta} \mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{(\text{id} \otimes \Lambda^{co}) \circ \Delta} \mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} \mathbb{1}$ is equal to the identity. This is true, due to the relation of ε and Δ , as well as the fact that $\Lambda^{co} \circ \Delta = \text{id}_{\mathbb{1}}$.

Note that for this relation to be satisfied, we also had γ from $\mathcal{Z}(\varepsilon^\dagger)$ cancel out γ^{-1} from $\mathcal{Z}(\mu)$.

- To understand the composite given by the modularity relation (2.26), let us first understand how we're meant to apply " $\vartheta, \vartheta^{-1}$ ".

The object at the level where $\vartheta, \vartheta^{-1}$ is applied is $\int^Y X \otimes Y^\vee \boxtimes Y$. Therefore, ' $\mathcal{Z}(\vartheta, \vartheta^{-1})$ ' is the coend morphism induced by $\vartheta_{X \otimes Y^\vee} \boxtimes \vartheta_Y^1$.

After using the twist relation for $\vartheta_{X \otimes Y^\vee}$, this looks as follows:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram showing the simplification of the coend morphism } \mathcal{Z}(\vartheta, \vartheta^{-1}) \text{ using the twist relation.} \\ \text{The first part shows the coend morphism } \vartheta_{X \otimes Y^\vee} \boxtimes \vartheta_Y^1 \text{ with labels } i_Y, \vartheta_X, \vartheta_{Y^\vee}, \vartheta_Y^{-1} \text{ and objects } X, Y^\vee, Y. \\ \text{The second part shows the simplification using the twist relation, resulting in a morphism } \vartheta_X \text{ and objects } X, Y^\vee, Y. \\ \text{The third part shows the final simplified form with label } i_Y \text{ and objects } X, Y^\vee, Y. \end{array}$$

Where in the first equality we used the coend property as well as the fact that $\vartheta_{X^\vee} = \vartheta_X^\vee$ for all $X \in \mathcal{C}$.

If we include the ε that we have in the modularity composite we get:

Now, by the universal property of the coend \mathcal{F} , the above gives rise to a morphism $X \otimes \mathcal{F} \rightarrow X$.

So now, seeing the full composite, we have:

where we used Lemma 2.18 since $\Lambda^{\text{co}} \circ \Lambda = \text{id}_{\mathbb{1}}$.

Here we remind that it is sufficient to check the relation for $X = P_j$, a projective cover of a simple j , by Lemma 2.20 we have that all the above morphisms are zero, apart from:

which, by Lemma 3.4 is the desired composite.

Note that we used the naturality of ϑ and the fact that $\vartheta_{\mathbb{1}} = \text{id}_{\mathbb{1}}$.

As for the constants involved, the relation that they have to satisfy is: $\mathcal{D}^{-1} \cdot \zeta = \mathcal{D}$ which gives $\mathcal{D} = \sqrt{\zeta}$, fixing the constant $\mathcal{D} \in k^{\times}$.

Remark 3.7. Note that the rotated forms around the z -axis of (2.25) and (2.26) hold because of the universal property of the coend \mathcal{F} .

- In order to check the anomaly relation (2.27), we will make use of the fact that $\mathcal{Z}(S^2) \cong k$. Since $\mathcal{Z}(\xi): \mathcal{Z}(S^2) \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}(S^2)$, then $\mathcal{Z}(\xi)$ is a scalar multiple of the identity, and abusing notation we write: $\mathcal{Z}(\xi) = \xi \cdot \text{id}_{\mathcal{Z}(S^2)}$, where $\xi \in k$.

Now, we check the value of the left composite of (2.27) on $\mathcal{Z}(\bigcirclearrowleft)$, instead of $\mathcal{Z}(\bigcirclearrowright)$, which, from the twist non-degeneracy (2.17) of \mathcal{C} we know is:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{1} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}^{-1}\Lambda} & \mathcal{F} \\ \mathcal{D}^{-1} \cdot p_+ \text{id}_1 \downarrow & & \downarrow \tau \\ \mathbb{1} & \xleftarrow{\varepsilon} & \mathcal{F} \end{array}$$

Therefore, for the anomaly relation (2.27) to hold, we want to fix

$$\xi = \mathcal{D}^{-1} \cdot p_+,$$

which, together with what we have computed above ($\mathcal{D}^{-1} = 1/\sqrt{p_+ p_-}$), gives $\xi = \sqrt{p_+/p_-}$.

With this, we have checked that all the necessary relations are satisfied. \square

Remark 3.8. The special case when $\xi = \text{id}$ in $\text{Bord}_{3,2,1}^{sig,nc}$ gives the oriented non-compact presentation $\text{Bord}_{3,2,1}^{or,nc}$. Having computed that $\xi = \sqrt{p_+/p_-}$ we see that we can define an oriented non-compact TQFT (i.e a functor out of $\text{Bord}_{3,2,1}^{or,nc}$), if and only if $p_+/p_- = 1$. This is often referred to as ‘ \mathcal{C} being anomaly-free’.

Remark 3.9. As mentioned in Remark 2.3, if we change the source 2-category in Theorem 3.3 from $\text{Bord}_{3,2,1}^{sig,nc}$ to $\text{Bord}_{3,2,1}^{p_1,nc}$, we would instead compute $\xi = \sqrt[6]{p_+/p_-}$.

4. MAPPING CLASS GROUP REPRESENTATIONS

4.1. Mapping class group representations from the non-compact TQFT. Let Σ_g be a (smooth, compact, oriented, closed) surface of genus $g \geq 0$. We will denote by $\text{Mod}(\Sigma_g)$ the mapping class group, i.e the group of isotopy classes of diffeomorphisms of Σ_g . It is a well known fact [FM11] that $\text{Mod}(\Sigma_g)$ is finitely generated by the so-called Dehn twists. We will denote a (right-handed) Dehn twist along a curve γ by T_γ . In particular, there exists a specific set of generators, called the Lickorish generators, which is given by Dehn twists

$\{T_{\alpha_1}, \dots, T_{\alpha_g}, T_{\beta_1}, \dots, T_{\beta_{g-1}}, T_{\gamma_1}, \dots, T_{\gamma_g}\}$, along the curves $\alpha_i, \beta_i, \gamma_i$, as shown in Figure 1. Note that this is an independent use of the letters α, β and γ than the one we had in previous chapters.





Figure 1. Lickorish generators of Mod_g . Taken from [RR23].

We will use an alternative set of generators for $\text{Mod}(\Sigma_g)$ by replacing T_{β_i} by the **inverse** of the composite $S_i := T_{\alpha_i} \circ T_{\beta_i} \circ T_{\alpha_i}$.

In $\text{Bord}_{3,2,1}^{\text{sig,nc}}$, Σ_g should correspond to:



For simplicity, we also denote this 1-morphism by Σ_g . This way, $\mathcal{Z}(\Sigma_g) \cong \text{Hom}(\mathcal{F}^{\otimes g}, \mathbb{1})^*$.

By Σ_g^* we denote the 1-morphism as above, but without the \square applied at the top (corresponding to the once punctured genus g surface). Then $\mathcal{Z}(\Sigma_g^*) = \mathcal{F}^{\otimes g}$.

Now, we define the following composites in $\text{Bord}_{3,2,1}^{\text{sig,nc}}$:

$$(4.1) \quad I := \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram of a surface with a hole} \\ \xrightarrow{\theta} \text{Diagram of a surface with a hole} \end{array}$$

$$(4.2) \quad II := \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram of a surface with two holes} \\ \xrightarrow{\phi_l^{-1}} \text{Diagram of a surface with two holes} \\ \xrightarrow{\theta} \text{Diagram of a surface with two holes} \\ \xrightarrow{\phi_l} \text{Diagram of a surface with two holes} \end{array}$$

$$(4.3) \quad A^\dagger := \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram of a surface with a hole} \\ \xrightarrow{\epsilon^\dagger} \text{Diagram of a surface with a hole} \\ \xrightarrow{II} \text{Diagram of a surface with a hole} \\ \xrightarrow{\epsilon} \text{Diagram of a surface with a hole} \end{array}$$

$$(4.4) \quad III^{-1} := \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram of a surface with a hole} \\ \xrightarrow{\theta^{-1}} \text{Diagram of a surface with a hole} \\ \xrightarrow{A^\dagger} \text{Diagram of a surface with a hole} \\ \xrightarrow{\theta^{-1}} \text{Diagram of a surface with a hole} \end{array}$$

By $I_i, II_j, A_i^\dagger, III_i^{-1}: \Sigma_g \rightarrow \Sigma_g$ we denote the 2-morphisms that are obtained by applying the above on the i -th ‘hole’, or between the j ’th and $(j+1)$ ’th ‘holes’ of Σ_g . As explained in [Bar+14], these composites are invertible, and they are meant to correspond to the mapping cylinders for the generators of the mapping class group $\{T_{\alpha_i}, T_{\gamma_j}, T_{\beta_i}^{-1}, S_i^{-1}\}$ respectively.

The value of any of the $\mathcal{Z}(I_i), \mathcal{Z}(II_i), \mathcal{Z}(III_i^{-1}): \mathcal{Z}(\Sigma_g^*) \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}(\Sigma_g^*)$, is really some invertible morphism $x: \mathcal{F}^g \rightarrow \mathcal{F}^g$. Then, if $f \in \text{Hom}(\mathcal{F}^g, \mathbb{1})^*$, the (left) action on the state space $\mathcal{Z}(\Sigma_g) = \text{Hom}(\mathcal{F}^g, \mathbb{1})^*$ is given by $f(- \circ x)$.

Now, we define the following unique morphisms in \mathcal{C} :

- $\Omega: \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{F}$, satisfying for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{C}$ the identity:

$$\Omega \circ (i_X \otimes i_Y) = (i_X \otimes i_Y) \circ (\text{id}_{X^\vee} \otimes (c_{Y^\vee, X} \circ c_{X, Y^\vee}) \otimes \text{id}_Y).$$

- $\mathcal{S}: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ satisfying for all $X \in \mathcal{C}$ the identity:

$$\mathcal{S} \circ i_X = (\varepsilon \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{F}}) \circ \Omega \circ (\text{id}_X \otimes \Lambda).$$

Additionally, we denote by $\mathcal{H}: \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{F}$ the morphism

$$\mathcal{H} := \Omega \circ (\mathcal{T} \otimes \mathcal{T}).$$

Lemma 4.1. Computing, we have that:

$$(4.5) \quad \mathcal{Z}(I_i)(f) = f(- \circ \text{id}_{\mathcal{F}^{i-1}} \otimes \mathcal{T} \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{F}^{g-i}})$$

$$(4.6) \quad \mathcal{Z}(II_i)(f) = f(- \circ \text{id}_{\mathcal{F}^{j-1}} \otimes \mathcal{H} \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{F}^{g-j-1}})$$

$$(4.7) \quad \mathcal{Z}(III_i^{-1})(f) = 1/\sqrt{p_+ p_-} \cdot f(- \circ \text{id}_{\mathcal{F}^{i-1}} \otimes \mathcal{S} \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{F}^{g-i}})$$

Proof. We compute the values of the 2-morphisms in eqs. (4.1) to (4.4) after applying the constructed TQFT \mathcal{Z} . This will be sufficient, as the result is independent of the incoming object of the functor $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{V})$.

- It is easy to see that:

$$\mathcal{Z}(I): X \otimes \mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{\text{id}_X \otimes \mathcal{T}} X \otimes \mathcal{F}.$$


We have already used this when checking the relations in eqs. (2.26) and (2.27).

- We will compute $\mathcal{Z}(II)$ on:




So abusing notation, $\mathcal{Z}(II): Z \otimes \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{F} \rightarrow Z \otimes \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{F}$.

The image of the above under \mathcal{Z} is a functor $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$. If the input is some object $Z \in \mathcal{C}$ and if by $X \in \mathcal{C}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{C}$ we respectively denote the objects over which we take the first and second coend coming from the two $\mathcal{Z}(\square)$, we find:




Where in the first step, we used the property of the twist of a tensor product, and in the third we used dinaturality of the coend, as well as the property $\vartheta_{Y^\vee} = \vartheta_Y^\vee$.

- Now we check the value of $\mathcal{Z}(A^\dagger): Z \otimes \mathcal{F} \rightarrow Z \otimes \mathcal{F}$. This results to the following:



- Using the above, as well as the equivalent descriptions of \mathcal{H} , we can compute the value of $\mathcal{Z}(\text{III}^{-1}): Z \otimes \mathcal{F} \rightarrow Z \otimes \mathcal{F}$:



The first equation follows from the naturality of the twist ϑ and braiding c .

□

We could pause here and observe that the same morphisms appear in the projective mapping class group action of [De +23] (see section 4.2). In order to form a mathematical statement out of this observation, we are forced to assume the validity of Conjecture 2.1. Then, thanks to Theorem 3.3, we know that the non-compact TQFT \mathcal{Z} gives rise to a representation $\tilde{\rho}_{nc}$ of a central extension of the mapping class group. Equivalently, we obtain a projective representation

$$\bar{\rho}_{nc}: \text{Mod}(\Sigma_g) \rightarrow \text{PGL}_k(\mathcal{Z}(\Sigma_g)).$$

Using Lemma 4.1 we have:

Proposition 4.2. The projective mapping class group representation

$$\bar{\rho}_{nc}: \text{Mod}(\Sigma_g) \rightarrow \text{PGL}_k(\mathcal{Z}(\Sigma_g))$$

satisfies:

$$(4.8) \quad \bar{\rho}_{nc}(T_{\alpha_i})(f) = f(- \circ \text{id}_{\mathcal{F}^{i-1}} \otimes \mathcal{T} \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{F}^{g-i}})$$

$$(4.9) \quad \bar{\rho}_{nc}(T_{\gamma_j})(f) = f(- \circ \text{id}_{\mathcal{F}^{j-1}} \otimes \mathcal{H} \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{F}^{g-j-1}})$$

$$(4.10) \quad \bar{\rho}_{nc}(S_i^{-1})(f) = f(- \circ \text{id}_{\mathcal{F}^{i-1}} \otimes \mathcal{S} \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{F}^{g-i}})$$

4.2. Relation to the Lyubashenko projective representations. The projective mapping class group representations $\bar{\rho}_X$ coming from the non-semisimple 3d TQFTs constructed in [De +22] are computed in [De +23]. In addition, it is shown that they are equivalent to the family of projective representations $\bar{\rho}_L$ constructed by Lyubashenko in [Lyu95b].

We will briefly review the construction of $\bar{\rho}_X$ for a surface without punctures, and proceed to show that the projective representation $\bar{\rho}_{nc}$ from Section 4.1 is dual to $\bar{\rho}_X$.

The vector space they consider is $X'_g := \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{F}^g, 1)$.

Let $x' \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{F}^g, 1)$, the group homomorphism $\bar{\rho}_X: \text{Mod}(\Sigma_g) \rightarrow \text{PGL}_k((X'_g))$ satisfies:

$$(4.11) \quad \rho_X(T_{\alpha_i})(f) = x' \circ (\text{id}_{\mathcal{F}^{i-1}} \otimes \mathcal{T}^{-1} \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{F}^{g-i}})$$

$$(4.12) \quad \rho_X(T_{\gamma_j})(f) = x' \circ (\text{id}_{\mathcal{F}^{j-1}} \otimes \mathcal{H}^{-1} \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{F}^{g-j-1}})$$

$$(4.13) \quad \rho_X(S_i^{-1})(f) = x' \circ (\text{id}_{\mathcal{F}^{i-1}} \otimes \mathcal{S}^{-1} \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{F}^{g-i}})$$

This is a group homomorphism as they consider inverse mapping cylinders [De +23, Eq (17)].

Note that the inverses appear because their choice of generators of $\text{Mod}(\Sigma_g)$ is inverse to ours.

We therefore get that:

Theorem 4.3. By definition, we have that $\bar{\rho}_{nc} = \bar{\rho}_X^*$.

5. FROM LINCAT TO BIMOD

In order to tackle the questions concerning 3-manifold invariants (Section 6) and modified traces (Section 7), we will adapt the non-compact TQFT 3.3 to a different target, the bicategory Bimod . This is due to the fact that, in order to compute the values of \mathcal{Z} on 3-manifolds, it is useful to have a ‘skein-theoretic description’. Working in Bimod provides such a setting.

Definition 5.1 (Bimod). The symmetric monoidal bicategory Bimod is defined as follows:

- Its objects are linear categories;
- Its 1-morphisms are bimodules $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$, defined as linear functors $F: \mathcal{D}^{op} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Vect}_k$;
- Its 2-morphisms are natural transformations between the associated linear functors.

Composition of bimodules $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ and $G: \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ is defined as:

$$G \circ F(e, c) := \int^{d \in \mathcal{D}} G(e, d) \otimes F(d, c).$$

The identity 1-morphisms are given by the Hom functor:

$$\mathrm{Hom}(-, -) : \mathcal{C}^{op} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathrm{Vect}_k.$$

For a bimodule $F: \mathcal{D}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_2$, we will denote its value on $X \in \mathcal{D}_1$ and $Y \in \mathcal{D}_2$ by F_X^Y .

Definition 5.2. Given a linear functor $F: \mathcal{D}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_2$, we can construct an *associated bimodule* $F_*: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ as: $F_* := \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(-, F(-))$.

Given a natural transformation $\omega: F \Rightarrow G$ between linear functors $F, G: \mathcal{D}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_2$, there is an induced natural transformation between associated bimodules:

$\omega_*: F_* \rightarrow G_*$, given by postcomposition with ω .

In fact, the above is organized in a 2-functor $(-)^{fg,proj}$ from Lincat to Bimod, that sends a small linear category that admits finite colimits to its subcategory of compact projective objects. In general, a right exact functor does not preserve projective objects, but always gives rise to a bimodule.

Postcomposing \mathcal{Z} with this 2-functor we obtain a TQFT in Bimod . We will denote this TQFT by \mathcal{Z}' .

The values of the Bimod TQFT on object and 1-morphism generators are:

- $(T^R)_* = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}\boxtimes\mathcal{C}}(- \boxtimes -, \int^{P \in \mathcal{P}} - \otimes P^\vee \boxtimes P)$
- $(U^L)_* = \text{Hom}_{\text{Vect}}(k, \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(-, 1)^*)$

As explained in [Bar+15], the bimodule vector space is the same as the vector space of string diagrams drawn internal to the volume of that particular surface embedded in \mathbb{R}^3 . This can be thought of as the skein module of the 3-manifold bound by the surface. We are interested in this description as it facilitates computations.

$$(5.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \text{Diagram with boundary components } A, B, C \text{ and internal red string morphisms.} & \text{Diagram with boundary components } A, B, C \text{ and internal red string morphisms.} & \text{Diagram with boundary component } A \text{ and internal red string morphism.} \\ f \in \mathcal{Z}'(\text{Diagram})_{B,C}^A & g \in \mathcal{Z}'(\text{Diagram})_C^{A,B} & h \in \mathcal{Z}'(\text{Diagram})^A \end{array}$$

Remark 5.4. Morphisms in the interior are drawn in the opposite direction as that of the cobordism. As of now, we adopt the convention that red string diagrams are to be read from top to bottom and from left to right.

Remark 5.5. Having defined $\mathcal{Z}'(\text{Diagram})_A = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(A, 1)^*$, it appears that we do not have a string diagrammatic description of its elements. However, since $A \in \mathcal{P}$, we can use the natural isomorphism $\Omega^1: \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(A, 1)^* \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(A, 1)$ defined in 7.10, and work with string diagrams this way.

$$(5.2) \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram with boundary component } A \text{ and internal red string morphism.} \\ j \in \Omega^1(\mathcal{Z}'(\text{Diagram})_A) \end{array}$$

We will implicitly do this in later chapters when working with closed surfaces. It is important to note, however, that this is not necessary, but only for the sake of simplicity. We could instead work with a surface with one boundary component and the resulting (internal string) morphism $A \rightarrow 1$, which looks similar to the ‘admissibility condition’ appearing in [De +22]. This does not affect our analysis in later chapters, as we can ‘localize’ this morphism in a cylinder near the cap Diagram (via the coend relation), and then evaluate it using $\mathcal{Z}'(\text{Diagram})_A = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(A, 1)^*$.

Having the string diagram notation makes computations easier in many cases. This is why, for the rest of this section, we express the actions of 2-morphism generators in Bimod , and whenever applicable, describe them by how they act on internal string diagrams. We will only focus on the ones that appear in sections 6 and 7.

We have two ways to describe what \mathcal{Z}' assigns to a surface in Bimod .

- (1) Use the value in Lincat to obtain the associated bimodule;

(2) Decompose the given surface into a composite of the generators above, and obtain a composite in Bimod .

The string diagrammatic approach is associated with the latter. Having defined \mathcal{Z} in Lincat however, we automatically get an action of 2-morphism generators on the associated bimodules. To connect the two, we use Definition 5.2, as well as the fact that the two descriptions are related by (potentially several) applications of the co-Yoneda lemma.

First, define for $X, Y, Z \in \mathcal{C}$ the natural isomorphisms

$$(5.3) \quad (-)^\flat: \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X \otimes Y, Z) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X, Z \otimes Y^\vee)$$

$$(5.4) \quad (-)^\sharp: \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Y, X \otimes Z) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X^\vee \otimes Y, Z)$$

$$(5.5) \quad (-)^\natural: \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X \otimes Y, Z) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Y, X^\vee \otimes Z)$$

by

$$f^\flat = (f \otimes \text{id}_{Y^\vee}) \circ (\text{id}_X \otimes \text{coev}_Y), \quad g^\sharp = (\text{ev}_X \otimes \text{id}_Z) \circ (\text{id}_{X^\vee} \otimes g), \quad h^\natural = (\text{id}_{X^\vee} \otimes h) \circ (\text{coev}_X^R \otimes \text{id}_Y).$$

Throughout this section, fix $P, Q, P_1, P_2, Q_1, Q_2 \in \mathcal{P}$.

Proposition 5.6. $\mathcal{Z}'(\epsilon)$ and $\mathcal{Z}'(\eta)$ act as follows on internal string diagrams:

$$(5.6) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \text{Diagram 1} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{Z}'(\epsilon)} & \text{Diagram 2} \\ \text{Diagram 3} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{Z}'(\eta)} & \text{Diagram 4} \end{array}$$

Proof. We start with $\mathcal{Z}'(\epsilon)$:

This corresponds to the natural transformation between the bimodules

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, P \otimes \mathcal{F}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{Z}'(\epsilon)_*} \text{Hom}(Q, P),$$

given by postcomposition with ϵ .

We want to understand:

$$\int^{X, Y} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, X \otimes Y) \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X \otimes Y, P) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{Z}'(\epsilon)} \text{Hom}(Q, P)$$

In other words, we aim to understand the isomorphism:

$$\int^{X, Y} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, X \otimes Y) \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X \otimes Y, P) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, P \otimes \mathcal{F})$$

This is the composite of

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \int^{X,Y} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, X \otimes Y) \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X \otimes Y, P) & \xrightarrow{\text{id} \otimes (-)^{\flat}} & \int^{X,Y} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, X \otimes Y) \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X, P \otimes Y^{\vee}) \\ f \otimes g & \mapsto & f \otimes ((g \otimes \text{id}_{Y^{\vee}}) \circ (\text{id}_P \otimes \text{coev}_Y)) \end{array}$$

with the co-Yoneda isomorphism

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \int^{X,Y} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, X \otimes Y) \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X, P \otimes Y^{\vee}) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \int^Y \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, P \otimes Y^{\vee} \otimes Y) \\ f \otimes h & \mapsto & (g \otimes \text{id}_Y) \circ f \end{array}$$

Thanks to the exactness of $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, -)$ and the fact that ε is given by ev_Y 2.32, we conclude that $\mathcal{Z}'(\epsilon)$ acts by composition, as desired.

Now for $\mathcal{Z}'(\eta)$:

The corresponding natural transformation of associated bimodules is:

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{C}}(Q_1 \boxtimes Q_2, P_1 \boxtimes P_2) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{Z}(\eta)_*} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{C}}(Q_1 \boxtimes Q_2, P_1 \otimes P_2 \otimes \int^Y Y^{\vee} \boxtimes Y),$$

given by the coevaluation on Q_2 and inclusion in the coend, essentially as explained in Remark 2.35. We remind the reader that this is the unit of the adjunction $T \dashv T^R$.

We want to understand

$$(5.7) \quad \mathcal{Z}'(\eta): \text{Hom}(Q_1, P_1) \otimes \text{Hom}(Q_2, P_2) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q_1 \otimes Q_2, P_1 \otimes P_2)$$

By definition, it is true that $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{C}}(Q_1 \boxtimes Q_2, P_1 \boxtimes P_2) \cong \text{Hom}(Q_1, P_1) \otimes \text{Hom}(Q_2, P_2)$.

Let $f: Q_1 \rightarrow P_1$ and $g: Q_2 \rightarrow P_2$.

The counit of the adjunction $T \dashv T^R$, gives:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{C}}(Q_1 \boxtimes Q_2, P_1 \otimes P_2 \otimes \int^Y Y^{\vee} \boxtimes Y) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q_1 \otimes Q_2, P_1 \otimes P_2) \\ f \boxtimes g & \mapsto & (\text{id}_{P_1} \otimes \text{id}_{P_2} \otimes \varepsilon) \circ (f \otimes g) \end{array}$$

Due to the cancellation of unit and counit (coevaluation and evaluation), we find that the desired morphism $\mathcal{Z}'(\eta)$ is given by the inclusion

$$\text{Hom}(Q_1, P_1) \otimes \text{Hom}(Q_2, P_2) \hookrightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q_1 \otimes Q_2, P_1 \otimes P_2).$$

□

Let $f: Q \rightarrow P$. Abusing notation, we call the image of $f \otimes \Lambda$ under

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, P \otimes \mathcal{F}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \int^Y \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, P \otimes Y^{\vee} \otimes Y)$$

again $f \otimes \Lambda$.

Proposition 5.7. $\mathcal{Z}'(\epsilon^\dagger)$ acts as follows on internal string diagrams:

The convention for the red circle is that the top part is Λ and the bottom is ev .

Proof. We have that $\mathcal{Z}(\epsilon^\dagger)_*$ is given by:

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, P) \xrightarrow{(\mathcal{D}^{-1}(\text{id}_P \otimes \Lambda))_*} \text{Hom}(Q, P \otimes \mathcal{F}).$$

Computing $\mathcal{Z}'(\epsilon^\dagger)$ in terms of string diagrams involves the isomorphisms:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \int^Y \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, P \otimes Y^\vee \otimes Y) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \int^{X,Y} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, X \otimes Y) \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X, P \otimes Y^\vee) \\ h & \mapsto & h \otimes (\text{id}_{P \otimes Y^\vee}) \end{array}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \int^{X,Y} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, X \otimes Y) \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X, P \otimes Y^\vee) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \int^{X,Y} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, X \otimes Y) \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X \otimes Y, P) \\ h \otimes g & \mapsto & h \otimes ((\text{id}_P \otimes \text{ev}_Y) \circ (g \otimes \text{id}_Y)) \end{array}$$

Under the full composite, the image of $f: Q \rightarrow P$ is:

$$f \mapsto \mathcal{D}^{-1}(f \otimes \Lambda) \otimes (\text{id}_P \otimes \text{ev}_Y),$$

which is the desired morphism. \square

Remark 5.8. The red circle notation coincides with that from [De +22].

Proposition 5.9. The action of $\mathcal{Z}'(\beta)$ and $\mathcal{Z}'(\theta)$ on internal string diagrams is given by:

Proof. This is automatic from the action of $\mathcal{Z}(\beta)_*$ and $\mathcal{Z}(\theta)_*$. \square

Proposition 5.10. $\mathcal{Z}'(\mu^\dagger): \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, P) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, \mathbb{1}) \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})^*$ is given by

$$(5.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, P) &\xrightarrow{\text{id} \otimes \text{coev}_{\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, P) \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1}) \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})^* \\ &\xrightarrow{\text{compose} \otimes \text{id}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, \mathbb{1}) \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})^* \end{aligned}$$

and $\mathcal{Z}'(\nu^\dagger)$ is given by the evaluation of vector spaces:

$$(5.10) \quad \mathcal{Z}'(\nu^\dagger): \int^{P \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1}) \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})^* \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_{\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, \mathbb{1})}} k$$

Proof. The action of $\mathcal{Z}'(\mu^\dagger)$ follows directly from properties of *EV* 2.29.

As for $\mathcal{Z}'(\nu^\dagger)$, this is also straightforward, as discussed in Remark 3.2. \square

6. 3-MANIFOLD INVARIANTS

In this section, we will compute the 3-manifold invariant the non-compact TQFT defined in Theorem 3.3 gives rise to. We do this for the case where \mathcal{Z} is oriented, i.e when \mathcal{C} is anomaly-free. We will have to be a bit loose and think of the generators of $\text{Bord}_{3,2,1}^{or,nc}$ geometrically. We will implicitly employ this strategy throughout this chapter. This procedure could be made formal via a ‘geometric realization’ functor [Bar+14; Bar+15].

Before we get into explicit computations, we need to explain how to extract a closed 3-manifold invariant from a non-compact TQFT. Despite the fact that the noncompact 3d TQFT does not have assignments for closed 3-manifolds, we can still extract invariants associated to them, via the following procedure:

Given a closed, connected 3-manifold M , we can evaluate the non-compact TQFT on M , after removing two copies of D^3 , one incoming, the other outgoing. That is:

$$\mathcal{Z}(M \setminus (D^3 \sqcup D^3)) : \mathcal{Z}(S^2) \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}(S^2).$$

The vector space $\mathcal{Z}(S^2)$ is one dimensional, so the above linear map is just an element of k . We will prove that this number is the Lyubashenko 3-manifold invariant [Lyu95b] multiplied by a factor. We also note that, since we work in the non-compact setting, and the Lyubashenko invariant specializes to the Reshetikhin-Turaev invariant in the semisimple case, we also prove that the TQFT constructed by [Bar+15] recovers the Reshetikhin-Turaev invariant.

6.1. 3-manifold presentation in terms of generators. To achieve our goal, the first thing we need to address is how to present any closed oriented 3-manifold in terms a composite of 2-morphism generators. We therefore work in the full cobordism bicategory $\text{Bord}_{3,2,1}^{or}$, and use the generator

$$\square \xrightarrow{\nu} \text{---}$$

The decomposition we provide is based on a surgery presentation of the 3-manifold.

Theorem 6.1 (Lickorish-Wallace). Any closed, oriented, connected 3-manifold M is realized by (integral) Dehn surgery on a link L in S^3 .

Assume M has a surgery presentation in terms of a framed knot K . Dehn surgery is the procedure of gluing a solid torus $S^1 \times D^2$, into the knot complement $S^3 \setminus T(K)$, twisted by φ .

Then, via Theorem 6.1, we get that $M = (S^3 \setminus T(K)) \cup_{\varphi} (S^1 \times D^2)$, where $T(K)$ is the tubular neighborhood of the knot K and $\varphi: T^2 \rightarrow \partial(S^3 \setminus T(K))$ is the diffeomorphism determined by the framing of K .

Viewing this as a composite of cobordisms, we have:

$$(6.1) \quad M = (S^3 \setminus T(K)) \circ I_{\varphi} \circ (S^1 \times D^2),$$

where I_{φ} is the mapping cylinder of the diffeomorphism φ .

We can think of φ as a composite $\varphi = \varphi' \circ S$. First, applying an S transformation (S_1 in the notation of Chapter 4) on $T^2 = \partial(S^1 \times D^2)$, and then the diffeomorphism $\varphi': T^2 \rightarrow \partial(S^3 \setminus T(K))$, which involves Dehn twists T_α to ‘match’ the framing of K .

In order to express the knot complement $S^3 \setminus T(K)$ in terms of generators, we write it as a composite of certain 3-cobordisms. This essentially involves ‘passing through’ a genus g surface:

$$(6.2) \quad S^3 \setminus T(K) = \left((S^3 \setminus H_g^0) \cup_{\text{id}_{\Sigma_g}} (H_g \setminus T(K)) \right),$$

where g depends on the choice of knot diagram of K and H_g is the genus g handlebody.




Figure 2. Cobordism from $\partial(T(K))$ (blue) to Σ_4 (black) for the trefoil.

First let us understand $H_g \setminus T(K)$. Fix a presentation of the knot diagram.

The data of a knot diagram is the same as that of a connected planar graph, if we replace crossings by vertices. If the number of faces of this planar graph is $g+1$, its tubular neighborhood is diffeomorphic to H_g . We can obtain a cobordism $H_g \setminus T(K): \partial(T(K)) \rightarrow \Sigma_g$ as the complement of the tubular neighborhood of the knot diagram in H_g , as depicted in Figure 2 for the example of the trefoil knot. The handlebody $(S^3 \setminus H_g)$ is given by applying g -many 2-handles (filling the holes) and a 3-handle


$$\Sigma_g \xrightarrow{\text{2-handles}} S^2 \xrightarrow{\text{3-handle}} \emptyset$$

gives the full decomposition of $S^3 \setminus T(K)$.


This procedure is by no means unique. However, one can already see that it gives rise to a decomposition of M in terms of generators. We have explicit generators matching the 2- and 3-handles (ϵ and ν^\dagger), and the 3-cobordism $H_g \setminus T(K)$ is non-trivial only at crossings. In other words, it can be obtained by an application of a 1-handle (η) and a β to match the crossing. This last point is the merit of the decomposition of 6.2.

We now write this decomposition 6.1 in terms of 2-morphism generators for certain examples.


Note that the solid torus $S^1 \times D^2$, whose boundary is twisted by S , is given by:



Example 6.2. Let K be the 0-framed trefoil. It can be represented as a braid closure as follows:




Then, the decomposition of the corresponding 3-manifold is:




Remark 6.3. To apply some of the ϵ 's we need to use ϕ_l^{-1} and associators α or α^{-1} .

The case where M is obtained via surgery on a link works entirely analogously. Let L be the link with l components. The only meaningful difference is the use of μ^\dagger $l - 1$ times, followed by l applications of ϵ^\dagger on the resulting S^2 s.

Example 6.4. Let L be the Hopf link (with 0 framing on both components):



If M is obtained by surgery on L it can be decomposed as follows:




We can therefore decompose any 3-manifold M as the examples above. By M^* we denote the composite $S^2 \rightarrow S^2$ obtained by throwing away ν and ν^\dagger from the decomposition of M .

6.2. Computing the invariants. Let M be an oriented 3-manifold that has a surgery presentation in terms of a framed link L with l components. Denote the Lyubashenko invariant of M [Lyu95b] by $\mathcal{L}(M)$, and $\mathcal{RT}(M)$ the Reshetikhin-Turaev invariant [RT91] in the semisimple case.

In order to compute the invariant associated to M by \mathcal{Z} , we make the following assumption.

Lemma 6.5. $I_{\varphi'}$ acts on



by having the red strand of the i -th torus go through all the (interior of the) surface $\partial(S^3 \setminus (T(L_i)))$ with appropriate twists ϑ , matching the framing of L .

For example, in the case of the +1-framed trefoil we have:

$$(6.5) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \text{Diagram of a trefoil knot} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{Z}'(I_{\varphi'})} & \text{Diagram of a link with two components} \end{array}$$

Intuitively, this is because Dehn surgery sends the meridian of the $S^1 \times D^2$ glued to the i -th component of L to the curve on $\partial(S^3 \setminus T(L_i))$ determined by the framing of L_i .

Proof. This claim essentially follows from the fact that $\text{Bord}_{3,2,1}^{or,nc}$ is a symmetric monoidal 2-category. In particular, every ‘linked’ surface (1-morphism that is the boundary of the tubular neighborhood of the link) is isomorphic to a disjoint union of tori. To see this, we can use elementary moves (2-isomorphisms) like:

$$(6.6) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \text{Diagram of a torus with a red box} & \xrightarrow{\theta, \beta} & \text{Diagram of a torus with a red box} \end{array}$$

the cusp 7.4, or 2-isomorphisms involving the symmetric braiding of the symmetric monoidal 2-category $\text{Bord}_{3,2,1}^{or,nc}$ and its compatibility with the tensor unit \emptyset . Finally, we use appropriately many θ to match the framing. In the end, the composite of these 2-isomorphisms is equal to the diffeomorphism $I_{\varphi'}$ since their action on the meridian and longitude of the torus coincide. \square

Using Lemma 6.5, we can prove the following:

Theorem 6.6. If M is obtained by Dehn surgery on a knot, we have that: $\mathcal{Z}'(M^*) = (1/\mathcal{D}) \cdot \mathcal{L}(M) \cdot \text{id}_{\mathcal{Z}'(S^2)}$.

In the case where \mathcal{C} is semisimple, $\mathcal{Z}'(M^*) = \mathcal{RT}(M) \cdot \text{id}_{\mathcal{Z}'(S^2)}$.


Proof. We adopt the convention from Remark 5.5. This way, we can draw an internal string diagram $j: \mathbb{1} \rightarrow A$ for the cap \square . The string diagram of the S^2 we start with, is a composite morphism $\mathbb{1} \rightarrow \mathbb{1}$. As mentioned in the same remark, after applying ϵ^\dagger , we can localize this morphism in a cylinder below \square , using the coend relations. Thanks to this, we see that this morphism is not altered when applying the 2-morphisms from the decomposition of M^* . This, along with the actions of the generators computed in propositions 5.6, 5.7, 5.9 and 5.10 gives us the desired result. \square

Remark 6.7. We expect that Theorem 6.6 holds for 3-manifolds obtained by Dehn surgery on a link. In particular, that $\mathcal{Z}'(M^*) = (1/\mathcal{D}^l) \cdot \mathcal{L}(M) \cdot \text{id}_{\mathcal{Z}'(S^2)}$.


Corollary 6.8. In the semisimple case there is no non-compactness condition on the cobordisms. Therefore, the proof of Theorem 6.6 works for any 3-manifold M , which in turn implies that the 3d TQFT Z defined in [Bar+15] computes the Reshetikhin Turaev invariant: $Z(M) = \mathcal{RT}(M)$.

Let us see how this works in examples. Note that each ϵ^\dagger gives rise to a factor of \mathcal{D}^{-1} , which we do not write. We have also adopted the convention of not drawing the element of $\mathcal{Z}'(S^2)$ we start with, since, as explained before, it can be localized away from where the 2-morphisms are applied. The ‘final’ string diagrams in S^2 can be thought of as living in a cylinder between \square and \square .

Example 6.9. For the 0-framed trefoil knot we have:



Example 6.10. For the 0-framed Hopf link we have:



Remark 6.11. Our recipe for decomposing M in terms of 2-morphism generators works for the anomaly-free/oriented case. It is not clear how to extend this for $\text{Bord}_{3,2,1}^{\text{sig}}$ at this point, as composition is not fully worked out. However, we make the following observation: Our recipe computes the correct invariant when the signature $\sigma(L) = 0$. If $\sigma(L) \neq 0$, we can obtain an L' with $\sigma(L') = 0$ that gives rise to the same 3-manifold M via surgery. This can be done with a series of Kirby 1-moves (blow-up/down). This essentially adds $|\sigma(L)|$ -many \pm -framed unknots to L , unlinked to the rest of L . Applying our recipe on L' , these framed unknots correspond to anomaly composites 2.27. This way, we see that $\mathcal{Z}'(M)$ is multiplied by $\xi^{\sigma(L)}$, and therefore again retrieve the correct formula for the invariant.

7. MODIFIED TRACE

The technology of modified traces developed in recent years [GPT09; GKP11; GPV12; GKP13; BBG20; GKP22; SS21] has been used to renormalize invariants that proved to be somewhat degenerate. Modified traces were used in the construction of non-semisimple TQFTs in [De +22], which are closely related to our construction in Section 3. In this chapter, we examine how the TQFT \mathcal{Z} relates to modified traces. In particular, we will explain how to extract such a modified trace from \mathcal{Z} .

We start with some basic definitions.

Definition 7.1. For \mathcal{C} a finite abelian category over a field k , a *trace* on a full subcategory $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{C}$, is a family of k -linear maps $\{t_P: \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, P) \rightarrow k\}_{P \in \mathcal{P}}$, satisfying the following conditions:

(1) (Cyclicity) For all $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}$ and $f: P \rightarrow Q$, $g: Q \rightarrow P$, it is true that

$$t_P(g \circ f) = t_Q(f \circ g).$$

(2) (Non-degeneracy) For all $P \in \mathcal{P}$ and $X \in \mathcal{C}$, the pairing

$$t_P(- \circ -): \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, X) \times \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X, P) \rightarrow k,$$

is non-degenerate.

Remark 7.2. The cyclicity condition is equivalent to saying that the family $\{t_P: \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, P) \rightarrow k\}_{P \in \mathcal{P}}$ is dinatural.

If \mathcal{C} is rigid monoidal, pivotal, and $\mathcal{P} = \text{Proj}(\mathcal{C})$, the tensor ideal of projectives, we can define a *modified* trace.

First, for $X, Y \in \mathcal{C}$ and $f \in \text{End}(X \otimes Y)$, we define the left and right partial traces of f as:

$$\text{tr}_L(f) = (\text{ev}_X \otimes \text{id}_Y) \circ (\text{id}_{X^\vee} \otimes f) \circ (\text{coev}_X^R \otimes \text{id}_Y),$$

$$\text{tr}_R(f) = (\text{id}_Y \otimes \text{ev}_X^R) \circ (f \otimes \text{id}_{X^\vee}) \circ (\text{id}_Y \otimes \text{coev}_X)$$

Definition 7.3. Now, the trace t_P will be called *modified* if it additionally satisfies the following conditions:

(1) (Right partial trace) For all $P \in \mathcal{P}$, $X \in \mathcal{C}$ and $f \in \text{End}(P \otimes X)$,

$$t_{P \otimes X}(f) = t_X(\text{tr}_R(f));$$

(2) (Left partial trace) For all $P \in \mathcal{P}$, $X \in \mathcal{C}$ and $f \in \text{End}(X \otimes P)$,

$$t_{X \otimes P}(f) = t_X(\text{tr}_L(f)).$$

Note that when \mathcal{C} is ribbon, the conditions (1) and (2) above are equivalent [GKP11].

Remark 7.4. Modified traces can be defined in the non-pivotal setting [SS23].

To see how modified traces appear through \mathcal{Z} , it will be beneficial to think of the family t_P as a k -linear map

$$\int^{P \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, P) \rightarrow k,$$

as in our setting, the space $\int^{P \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, P)$ is canonically isomorphic to $\mathcal{Z}(T^2)$. Moreover, by evaluating the non-compact TQFT \mathcal{Z} on the solid torus, we obtain a map

$$\mathcal{Z}(\nu^\dagger \circ \epsilon): \mathcal{Z}(T^2) \rightarrow k.$$

Arguing in terms of the compactified 2d TQFT $\mathcal{Z}(S^1 \times -)$ and Lurie's non-compact cobordism hypothesis [Lur09], this map is a trace map, part of the 'Calabi-Yau' structure on $\mathcal{Z}(S^1)$.

What we prove in this chapter is that the map $\int^{P \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, P) \rightarrow k$ we obtain as the composite of the above, is a modified trace. A central, non-trivial component of this statement concerns the origin of the canonical isomorphism

$$\mathcal{Z}(T^2) \cong \int^{P \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, P).$$

7.1. 1-dualizability in bicategories. In order to explain why there is a canonical isomorphism $\mathcal{Z}(T^2) \cong \int^{P \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, P)$, we will be concerned with the theory of 1-dualizable objects in bicategories. For this, we follow closely the exposition in [Pst22].

Let \mathcal{M} be a monoidal bicategory with monoidal unit I .

Definition 7.5. A *dual pair* in \mathcal{M} is a tuple $(L, R, e, c, \sigma, \tau)$, where $L, R \in \mathcal{M}$ are objects, $e: L \otimes R \rightarrow I$, $c: I \rightarrow R \otimes L$ are 1-morphisms and σ, τ are isomorphisms witnessing the 'snake' identities:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & L \otimes (R \otimes L) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & (L \otimes R) \otimes L & \\ & \text{id}_L \otimes c \nearrow & & & \searrow e \otimes \text{id}_L \\ L \otimes I & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \sigma \Downarrow & & I \otimes L \xrightarrow{\sim} \\ & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_L} & & & \xrightarrow{\sim} \\ & & & & L \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & (R \otimes L) \otimes R & \xrightarrow{\sim} & R \otimes (L \otimes R) & \\ & c \otimes \text{id}_R \nearrow & & & \searrow \text{id}_R \otimes e \\ I \otimes R & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \tau \Downarrow & & R \otimes I \xrightarrow{\sim} \\ & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_R} & & & \xrightarrow{\sim} \\ & & & & R \end{array}$$

Whenever there is no ambiguity, we will denote a dual pair $(L, R, e, c, \sigma, \tau)$ in \mathcal{M} by $\langle L, R \rangle$.

Dual pairs are organized into a bicategory, $\text{DualPair}(\mathcal{M})$ - see [Pst22, Definition 3.8, Notation 3.9] for a complete description. We are interested in the data of a 1-morphism in this bicategory, and this is what we explain now.

A morphism (s, t, γ, δ) between two dual pairs $(L, R, e, c, \sigma, \tau)$ and $(L', R', e', c', \sigma', \tau')$, consists of the data of:

- Two 1-morphisms in \mathcal{M} , $s: L \rightarrow L'$ and $t: R \rightarrow R'$;
- Two invertible 2-morphisms γ, δ :

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 I & \xrightarrow{c'} & R' \otimes L' \\
 \uparrow \text{id}_I & \delta & \uparrow t \otimes s \\
 I & \xrightarrow{c} & R \otimes L
 \end{array}
 \quad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 L' \otimes R' & \xrightarrow{e'} & I \\
 \uparrow s \otimes t & \gamma & \uparrow \text{id}_I \\
 L \otimes R & \xrightarrow{e} & I
 \end{array}$$

Satisfying the following coherence:

$$(7.1) \quad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 L' & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_{L'} \otimes c'} & L' \otimes R' \otimes L' \\
 \uparrow s & \uparrow s \otimes \delta & \uparrow e' \otimes \text{id}_{L'} \\
 L & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_L \otimes c} & L \otimes R \otimes L \\
 \uparrow \text{id}_L & \uparrow \sigma & \uparrow e \otimes \text{id}_L \\
 L & & L
 \end{array}
 = \begin{array}{ccc}
 L' & \xrightarrow{\sigma'} & L' \\
 \uparrow s & \uparrow \text{id}_{L'} & \uparrow s \\
 L & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_L} & L
 \end{array}$$

$$(7.2) \quad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 R' & \xrightarrow{c' \otimes \text{id}_{R'}} & R' \otimes L' \otimes R' \\
 \uparrow t & \uparrow \delta \otimes t & \uparrow \text{id}_{R'} \otimes e' \\
 R & \xrightarrow{c \otimes \text{id}_R} & R \otimes L \otimes R \\
 \uparrow \text{id}_R & \uparrow \tau & \uparrow \text{id}_R \otimes e \\
 R & & R
 \end{array}
 = \begin{array}{ccc}
 R' & \xrightarrow{\tau'} & R' \\
 \uparrow t & \uparrow \text{id}_{L'} & \uparrow t \\
 R & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_R} & R
 \end{array}$$

Clearly, an object is part of a dual pair if and only if it is 1-dualizable [Pst22, Proposition 3.6]. However, it turns out that if we naively consider the forgetful 2-functor from the bicategory of dual pairs onto the 2-groupoid of 1-dualizable objects, this needn't be an equivalence. In order to fix this, we need to consider a class of dual pairs that satisfy additional coherence equations, the so-called *swallowtail* axioms [Pst22, Definition 3.11]. We call the bicategory of such dual pairs the *bicategory of coherent dual pairs* in \mathcal{M} , which we denote by $\text{CohDualPair}(\mathcal{M})$. Since we are only concerned with coherent dual pairs, any mention of 'dual pairs' after this point implicitly refers to coherent.

We have the following results:

- $\text{CohDualPair}(\mathcal{M})$ is a 2-groupoid [Pst22, Proposition 3.10];
- The data (L, R, e, c, σ) can be uniquely completed to a dual pair [Pst22, Theorem 3.14];

- If $(\mathcal{M}^d)^\sim$ is the 2-groupoid of dualizable objects in \mathcal{M} , the forgetful 2-functor

$$(7.3) \quad F: \text{CohDualPair}(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{M}^d)^\sim$$

is an equivalence [Pst22, Theorem 3.16].

We will denote an object of $\text{CohDualPair}(\mathcal{M})$ by (L, R, e, c, σ) , something enabled by the second result above.


7.2. The canonical isomorphism. In order to explain how to obtain the isomorphism $\mathcal{Z}(T^2) \cong \int_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, P)$, we will define two objects of $\text{CohDualPair}(\text{Bimod}_k)$. A 1-morphism between these objects gives rise to such an isomorphism. Through further analysis, we will see that an appropriately defined space of such 1-morphisms is contractible, and therefore a choice of such is unique, up to a unique 2-isomorphism. We begin by defining the two objects of $\text{CohDualPair}(\text{Bimod}_k)$ in question. They both are associated to fully extended, non-compact 2d TQFTs \mathcal{Z}_0 and $\mathcal{Z}(- \times S^1)$, so we denote them as such. We emphasize that we do not prove this claim for \mathcal{Z}_0 , and we simply present them as objects of $\text{CohDualPair}(\text{Bimod}_k)$.

$\text{Bord}_{2,1,0}^{nc}$	$\mathcal{Z}_0: \text{Bord}_{2,1,0}^{nc} \rightarrow \text{Bimod}_k$	$\mathcal{Z}'(- \times S^1): \text{Bord}_{2,1,0}^{nc} \rightarrow \text{Bimod}_k$
pt_+	\mathcal{P}	\mathcal{P}
pt_-	\mathcal{P}^{op}	\mathcal{P}
	$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(-, -): \mathcal{P} \boxtimes \mathcal{P}^{op} \rightarrow \text{Vec}_k$	$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(- \otimes -, \mathbb{1})^*: \mathcal{P} \boxtimes \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \text{Vec}_k$
 $\xrightarrow{\text{cusp}}$	$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(-, -): \mathcal{P}^{op} \boxtimes \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \text{Vec}_k$	$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(- \otimes -, \mathbb{1}): \mathcal{P}^{op} \boxtimes \mathcal{P}^{op} \rightarrow \text{Vec}_k$
	Co-Yoneda	α_1

Table 3. Dualizability data for $\mathcal{Z}_0(pt)$ and $\mathcal{Z}'(pt \times S^1)$.

The isomorphism α_1 is given by the image of the cusp isomorphism under the non-compact TQFT \mathcal{Z} .

In $\text{Bord}_{3,2,1}^{sig,nc}$, the cusp isomorphism is given by the following composite of 2-morphisms:

$$(7.4) \quad \text{cusp} := \text{cusp} \xrightarrow{\phi_l} \text{cusp} \xrightarrow{\check{\lambda}} \text{cusp} \xrightarrow{\rho} \text{cusp}$$


As explained in [Bar+14], a formula for the left co-unit $\check{\lambda}$ can be given via ‘calculus of mates’, by the following composite of generators:

$$(7.5) \quad \check{\lambda} := \text{Diagram} \xrightarrow{\lambda^{-1}} \text{Diagram} \xrightarrow{\mu} \text{Diagram} \xrightarrow{\epsilon} \text{Diagram}$$

Remark 7.6. In Lincat, $\mathcal{Z}(\text{Diagram})(-) = \int^{X \in \mathcal{C}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(- \otimes X^{\vee}, 1)^* \otimes X$, which is isomorphic to the Nakayama functor \mathcal{N} [FSS20]. It is known that trivializations of the Nakayama functor are in 1-1 correspondence with modified traces [SW23; SS23]. Since the cusp isomorphism provides such a trivialization, it should not come as a surprise that it is related to the definition of the modified trace. We emphasize, however, that our method for obtaining a modified trace is independent of those in the aforementioned works.

Specializing the discussion of the previous section, a morphism between two such dual pairs consists of the following data:

- A functor $\mathcal{P} \xrightarrow{s_0} \mathcal{P}$;
- A functor $\mathcal{P}^{op} \xrightarrow{t_0} \mathcal{P}$;
- A natural isomorphism with components $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Y, P) \xrightarrow{\gamma_0} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P \otimes Y^{\vee}, 1)^*$;
- A natural isomorphism with components $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, Y) \xrightarrow{\delta_0} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Y^{\vee} \otimes Q, 1)$.

The ingredients to obtain the isomorphism $c_t : \int^{P \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, P) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{F}, 1)^*$ ($= \mathcal{Z}(T^2)$) are the following:

- The canonical isomorphism $\mathcal{Z}_0(S^1) \cong \int^{P \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, P)$, given by the cusp isomorphism under \mathcal{Z}_0 (co-Yoneda);
- An isomorphism $\mathcal{Z}_0(S^1) \cong \mathcal{Z}'(S^1 \times S^1)$ coming from a 1-morphism $\langle \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{P}^{op} \rangle \rightarrow \langle \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{P} \rangle$ in $\text{CohDualPair}(\text{Bimod}_k)$;
- The identification $\mathcal{Z}(T^2) \cong \mathcal{Z}'(T^2)$, as explained in Section 5.

Technically, γ_0 and δ_0 cannot give us an isomorphism $\mathcal{Z}_0(S^1) \cong \mathcal{Z}'(S^1 \times S^1)$, as they are part of a morphism between right dualizability data for \mathcal{P} , and therefore we can't quite compose the two bimodules to get $\mathcal{Z}(S^1 \times S^1)$. However, since Bimod_k is symmetric monoidal, we obtain the left dualizability data of \mathcal{P} from the right. So, to be more precise, to obtain the isomorphism in question, we also need part of the data of a 1-morphism $\langle \mathcal{P}^{op}, \mathcal{P} \rangle \rightarrow \langle \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{P} \rangle$. In particular, a natural isomorphism

$$(7.6) \quad \gamma_1 : \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Y, P) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Y^{\vee} \otimes P, 1)^*$$

(notice the flipped entries in the target compared to γ_0).

To summarise, the isomorphism c_t is given by the following composite:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\int^{P \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, P) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \int^{P, Q \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, Q) \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, P) \\
\downarrow c_t & & \downarrow \gamma_1 \otimes \delta_0 \\
\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{F}, 1)^* & \xleftarrow{\sim} & \int^{P, Q \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P^{\vee} \otimes Q, \mathbb{1})^* \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P^{\vee} \otimes Q, \mathbb{1})
\end{array}$$

At this point, c_t appears to depend on the choice of γ_1 and δ_0 . We dedicate the rest of this section on the following:

Theorem 7.7. The isomorphism c_t exists and is canonical.

To do this, we will show that there exists such a 1-morphism $\langle \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{P}^{op} \rangle \rightarrow \langle \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{P} \rangle$ of dual pairs, and that it is unique up to a contractible choice.

We start with the former.

Define a non-degenerate pairing, dinatural in $P \in \mathcal{P}$

$$(7.7) \quad t_P: \text{Hom}(\mathbb{1}, P) \otimes \text{Hom}(P, \mathbb{1}) \rightarrow k.$$

From the results discussed in Chapter 2.3, to define t_P it is sufficient to specify t_{P_1} , which we define by:

$$\begin{aligned}
t_{P_1}: \text{Hom}(\mathbb{1}, P_1) \otimes \text{Hom}(P_1, \mathbb{1}) &\rightarrow k \\
(\eta_1, \varepsilon_1) &\mapsto \mathcal{D}^{-1}
\end{aligned}$$

The associated copairing

$$(7.8) \quad \Omega_P: k \rightarrow \text{Hom}(P, \mathbb{1}) \otimes \text{Hom}(\mathbb{1}, P),$$

is determined by:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega_{P_1}: k &\rightarrow \text{Hom}(P_1, \mathbb{1}) \otimes \text{Hom}(\mathbb{1}, P_1) \\
1 &\mapsto \mathcal{D}(\varepsilon_1, \eta_1)
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 7.8. The data of a dinatural non-degenerate pairing follows from that of a non-degenerate trace (Definition 7.1) on the category. Dinaturality follows from the cyclicity condition.

The data of t_P is equivalent to that of a natural isomorphism:

$$(7.9) \quad t_P^1: \text{Hom}(\mathbb{1}, P) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Hom}(P, \mathbb{1})^*$$

Using Ω we have a formula for the inverse $\Omega^1 := (t^1)^{-1}$ given by the following composite:

(7.10)

$$\text{Hom}(P, \mathbb{1})^* \xrightarrow{\Omega_P \otimes \text{id}} \text{Hom}(\mathbb{1}, P) \text{Hom}(P, \mathbb{1}) \otimes \text{Hom}(P, \mathbb{1})^* \xrightarrow{\text{id} \otimes \text{ev}_{vect}} \text{Hom}(\mathbb{1}, P)$$

A useful fact we will use later on is the following:

Lemma 7.9. $\mathcal{Z}(\mu) = EV_{\mathbb{1}} \circ (\Omega^1 \otimes \text{id}_{\mathbb{1}})$

Proof. We remind that EV was defined in 2.29 and $\mathcal{Z}(\mu)$ at 3.1. The claim follows easily by unpacking the definitions. \square

Remark 7.10. In fact, the data of a natural isomorphism t^1 (and therefore also of t) is equivalent to an isomorphism $\mathbb{1} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{N}(\mathbb{1})$, where \mathcal{N} is the Nakayama functor. As explained in [SS23], such isomorphisms are equivalent to trivializations of \mathcal{N} .

We define the morphism between the two dual pairs to be

$$(7.11) \quad (\text{id}_{\mathcal{P}}, (-)^{\vee}, t^1 \circ (-)^{\flat}, (-)^{\sharp}).$$

More explicitly,

- $\mathcal{P} \xrightarrow{\text{id}_{\mathcal{P}}} \mathcal{P}$;
- $\mathcal{P}^{op} \xrightarrow{(-)^{\vee}} \mathcal{P}$;
- $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(-, -) \xrightarrow{t^1 \circ (-)^{\flat}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(- \otimes -, \mathbb{1})^*$;
- $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(-, -) \xrightarrow{(-)^{\sharp}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(- \otimes -, \mathbb{1})$.

Proposition 7.11. The data $(\text{id}_{\mathcal{P}}, (-)^{\vee}, t^1 \circ (-)^{\flat}, (-)^{\sharp})$ is a well defined morphism of dual pairs.

Proof. To prove this, we check the compatibility requirement 7.1. We remind that we do not need to check 7.2, as there is a unique choice of τ satisfying it.

The coherence 7.1 in this case becomes:

where the arrows (1),(2),(3) are the bimodules:

- (1) = $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(-, -) \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(- \otimes -, \mathbb{1})$,
- (2) = $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(- \otimes -, \mathbb{1})^* \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(-, -)$,
- (3) = $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(-, -) \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(-, -)$.

In other words, working in components $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}$ ($\mathcal{Z}_0(\text{□} \text{△} \text{□})_P^Q$ and $\mathcal{Z}'(\text{□} \text{△} \text{□})_P^Q$), we want to check the commutativity of the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \int^{Y \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Y, P) \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, Y) & \xrightarrow{\text{co-Yoneda}} & \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, P) \\
 \downarrow t_{P \otimes Y^\vee}^1 \circ (-)^\flat \otimes (-)^\sharp & & \nearrow \alpha_1 \\
 \int^{Y \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P \otimes Y^\vee, \mathbb{1})^* \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Y^\vee \otimes Q, \mathbb{1}) & &
 \end{array}$$

We first compute α_1 . Note that by 2.28 it is true that:

$$(7.12) \quad \int^{Y \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P \otimes Y^\vee, \mathbb{1})^* \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, Y) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, \int^{Y \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P \otimes Y^\vee, \mathbb{1})^* \otimes Y)$$

This, together with an application of $(-)^{\flat}$ identifies $\mathcal{Z}'(\text{□} \text{△} \text{□})$ with $(\mathcal{Z}(\text{□} \text{△} \text{□}))_*$:

$$\int^{Y \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P \otimes Y^\vee, \mathbb{1})^* \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Y^\vee \otimes Q, \mathbb{1}) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, \int^{Y \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P \otimes Y^\vee, \mathbb{1})^* \otimes Y).$$

So we have:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \text{Diagram 1} & & \text{Equation 1} \\
 \text{Diagram 2} & \downarrow \phi_l & \text{Equation 2} \\
 \text{Diagram 3} & \downarrow \rho & \text{Equation 3} \\
 \text{Diagram 4} & \downarrow \lambda^{-1} & \text{Equation 4} \\
 \text{Diagram 5} & \downarrow \mu & \text{Equation 5} \\
 \text{Diagram 6} & \downarrow \epsilon & \text{Equation 6}
 \end{array}$$

$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, \int^{Y \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P \otimes Y^{\vee}, \mathbb{1})^* \otimes Y)$
 $\text{Z}(\phi_l)_* \parallel$
 $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, \int^{Y \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P \otimes Y^{\vee}, \mathbb{1})^* \otimes Y)$
 $\text{Z}(\rho)_* \parallel$
 $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, \int^{Y \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P \otimes Y^{\vee}, \mathbb{1})^* \otimes Y)$
 $\text{Z}(\lambda^{-1})_* \parallel$
 $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, \int^{Y \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P \otimes Y^{\vee}, \mathbb{1})^* \otimes \mathbb{1} \otimes Y)$
 $\text{Z}(\mu)_* \parallel$
 $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, \int^{Y \in \mathcal{P}} P \otimes Y^{\vee} \otimes Y)$
 $\text{Z}(\epsilon)_* \parallel$
 $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, P)$

(7.13)

But as we know, $\text{Z}(\phi_l) = \text{id}$ and since we have been suppressing the unit ($P \otimes \mathbb{1} \cong P$), the right unitor $\text{Z}(\rho)$ is also the identity.

Therefore, the diagram whose commutativity we want to check becomes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\int^{Y \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Y, P) \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, Y) & \xrightarrow{\text{co-Yoneda}} & \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, P) \\
\downarrow t_{P \otimes Y^\vee}^1 \circ (-)^\flat \otimes (-)^\sharp & & \\
\int^{Y \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P \otimes Y^\vee, \mathbb{1})^* \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Y^\vee \otimes Q, \mathbb{1}) & & \Bigg| \\
\downarrow \text{id} \otimes (\text{7.12} \circ (-)^\flat) & & \\
\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, \int^{Y \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P \otimes Y^\vee, \mathbb{1})^* \otimes Y) & & \\
\downarrow \mathcal{Z}(\lambda^{-1})_* & & \\
\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, \int^{Y \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P \otimes Y^\vee, \mathbb{1})^* \otimes \mathbb{1} \otimes Y) & & \Bigg| \\
\downarrow (EV_1 \circ (\Omega_{P \otimes Y^\vee}^1 \otimes \text{id}_1) \otimes \text{id}_Y)_* & & \\
\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, \int^{Y \in \mathcal{P}} P \otimes Y^\vee \otimes Y) & \xrightarrow{(\text{id}_P \otimes \text{ev}_Y)_*} & \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, P)
\end{array}$$

This is indeed commutative, since

- $(-)^{\sharp}$ cancels with $(-)^{\flat}$ applied right after;
- $t_{P \otimes Y^\vee}^1$ cancels with $\Omega_{P \otimes Y^\vee}^1$;
- The isomorphism 7.12 followed by EV_1 is the same as:

$$\int^{Y \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbb{1}, P \otimes Y^\vee) \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, \mathbb{1} \otimes Y) \xrightarrow{\text{composition}} \int^{Y \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, P \otimes Y^\vee \otimes Y);$$

- $(-)^{\flat}$ cancels with ev_Y ;
- The co-Yoneda isomorphism is given by composition.

□

As mentioned above, $\gamma_1 = t^1 \circ (-)^{\sharp}$ is part of another morphism of dualizability data, $\langle \mathcal{P}^{op}, \mathcal{P} \rangle \rightarrow \langle \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{P} \rangle$. The definition of this 1-morphism (as well as the proof of this fact) is entirely analogous to the above, and we omit it.

With this we have proved the existence of c_t . We proceed to explain why and in what sense the above choice of 1-morphism is canonical.

Let $\mathfrak{G}_1 := \text{Hom}(\langle \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{P}^{op} \rangle, \langle \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{P} \rangle)$ in $\text{CohDualPair}(\text{Bimod}_k)$ and $\mathfrak{G}_2 := \text{Hom}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{P})$ in $(\text{Bimod}_k^d) \sim$.

Then, the equivalence 7.3 gives an equivalence of 1-groupoids $F: \mathfrak{G}_1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{G}_2$.

We are not interested in the entire category of morphisms \mathfrak{G}_1 , but rather 1-morphisms lying over $\text{id}_{\mathcal{P}}$. So, the correct notion to look at is that of the homotopy fiber $hoF^{-1}(\text{id}_{\mathcal{P}})$.

Definition 7.12. Let $\Phi: \mathcal{G}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_2$ be a map of groupoids and $x \in \mathcal{G}_2$ an object. The *homotopy fiber* $ho\Phi^{-1}(x)$ is the groupoid whose:

- Objects are pairs (z, g) of an object $z \in \mathcal{G}_1$ and an isomorphism $g: \Phi(z) \xrightarrow{\sim} x$;
- Morphisms $(z_1, g_1) \rightarrow (z_2, g_2)$ are given by morphisms $h: z_1 \rightarrow z_2$ in \mathcal{G}_1 , such that $g_2 \circ \Phi(h) = g_1$.

We are also interested in the strict fiber $stF^{-1}(\text{id}_{\mathcal{P}})$.

Definition 7.13. Let $\Phi: \mathcal{G}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_2$ be a map of groupoids and $x \in \mathcal{G}_2$ an object. The *strict fiber* $st\Phi^{-1}(x)$ is the groupoid whose:

- Objects are objects $z \in \mathcal{G}_1$ such that $\Phi(z) = x$;
- Morphisms $z_1 \rightarrow z_2$ are given by morphisms $h: z_1 \rightarrow z_2$ in \mathcal{G}_1 , such that $\Phi(h) = \text{id}_x$.

There is a canonical inclusion functor:

$$\begin{aligned} \iota: st\Phi^{-1}(x) &\hookrightarrow ho\Phi^{-1}(x) \\ z &\mapsto (z, \text{id}_x) \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 7.14. Let $\Phi: \mathcal{G}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_2$ be an equivalence of groupoids and $x \in \mathcal{G}_1$ an object. Then the homotopy fiber $ho\Phi^{-1}(x)$ is contractible.

Proof. Let $(z_1, g_1), (z_2, g_2) \in ho\Phi^{-1}(x)$. Then, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{G}_2}(x, x) &\cong \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{G}_2}(\Phi(z_1), \Phi(z_2)) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{G}_1}(z_1, z_2) \\ \text{id}_x &\mapsto g_2^{-1} \circ g_1 &\mapsto h \end{aligned}$$

In other words, there is a unique $h \in \text{Hom}_{ho\Phi^{-1}(x)}(z_1, z_2)$. \square

Remark 7.15. The proof of Lemma 7.14 also works if we replace $ho\Phi^{-1}(x)$ by $st\Phi^{-1}(x)$, provided that the latter is not empty. This is true for $stF^{-1}(\text{id}_{\mathcal{P}})$, thanks to the existence of the 1-morphism 7.11.

Corollary 7.16. Since $F: \mathfrak{G}_1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{G}_2$ is an equivalence, the homotopy fiber $hoF^{-1}(\text{id}_{\mathcal{P}})$ is contractible.

We will also show that $F: \mathfrak{G}_1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{G}_2$ is an isofibration.

Definition 7.17. Let C, D be categories. An *isofibration* is a functor $\Psi: C \rightarrow D$ such that for any object $y \in D$, and any isomorphism $g: \Psi(y) \xrightarrow{\sim} x$, there exists an isomorphism $h: y \xrightarrow{\sim} y'$, such that $\Psi(h) = g$.

Lemma 7.18. $F: \mathfrak{G}_1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{G}_2$ is an isofibration.

Proof. As already mentioned, $stF^{-1}(\text{id}_{\mathcal{P}})$ is not empty. Fix an object $z_0 \in stF^{-1}(\text{id}_{\mathcal{P}})$. Since $hoF^{-1}(\text{id}_{\mathcal{P}})$ is contractible, for every object $(z, g) \in hoF^{-1}(\text{id}_{\mathcal{P}})$ there exists a unique morphism $h_0: (z, g) \rightarrow \iota(z_0)$. In other words, F is an isofibration. \square

The following result is the reason why F being an isofibration is important.

Proposition 7.19. If $F: \mathfrak{G}_1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{G}_2$ is an isofibration, then the canonical inclusion $\iota: stF^{-1}(\text{id}_{\mathcal{P}}) \hookrightarrow hoF^{-1}(\text{id}_{\mathcal{P}})$ is an equivalence.

Proof. • F being an isofibration gives essential surjectivity.

- The fact that ι is fully faithful, i.e

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{stF^{-1}(\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{P}})}(z_1, z_2) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{hoF^{-1}(\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{P}})}((z_1, \mathrm{id}), (z_2, \mathrm{id})),$$

is true by definition.

□

In other words, the 1-morphism of dualizability data is canonical, in the sense that it is unique, up to a unique 2-isomorphism. By extension, the choice of c_t is canonical.

7.3. The composite is a modified trace. In this section, we prove the main result of this chapter.

Theorem 7.20. The map

$$(7.14) \quad t' : \int^{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, P) \rightarrow k,$$

given by $t' := \mathcal{Z}(\nu^\dagger \circ \epsilon) \circ c_t$ is a modified trace.

Before we prove this, let us first understand t' explicitly. It is equal to the following composite:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \int^{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, P) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \int^{P, Q \in \mathcal{P}} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, Q) \otimes \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, P) \\
 \downarrow t' & & \downarrow (-)^\natural \otimes (-)^\sharp \\
 & & \int^{P, Q \in \mathcal{P}} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbb{1}, P^\vee \otimes Q) \otimes \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P^\vee \otimes Q, \mathbb{1}) \\
 & & \downarrow t_{P^\vee \otimes Q}^1 \otimes \mathrm{id} \\
 & & \int^{P, Q \in \mathcal{P}} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P^\vee \otimes Q, \mathbb{1})^* \otimes \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P^\vee \otimes Q, \mathbb{1}) \\
 & & \downarrow \mathrm{id} \otimes (-)^\flat \\
 & & \int^{P, Q \in \mathcal{P}} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P^\vee \otimes Q, \mathbb{1})^* \otimes \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Q, P) \\
 & & \downarrow \sim \\
 & & \int^{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P^\vee \otimes P, \mathbb{1})^* \\
 & & \downarrow \sim \\
 k & \xleftarrow{\mathrm{ev}_{vect}(\varepsilon)} & \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{1})^*
 \end{array}$$

The maps comprising this composite are canonical. The first map is the cusp isomorphism of \mathcal{Z}_0 . It is followed by maps that are part of the morphisms of dualizability data described in the previous section. Lastly, the (solid torus) map $\mathcal{Z}(\nu^\dagger \circ \epsilon)$ is applied. Note that the isomorphism $\mathcal{Z}(T^2) \cong \mathcal{Z}'(T^2)$ is included in the

composite. We could have defined the composite considering the actions of $\mathcal{Z}'(\epsilon)$ and $\mathcal{Z}'(\nu^\dagger)$ directly, as computed in Section 6.

Let $f \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, P)$. Since $(-)^{\sharp}$ cancels with $(-)^{\flat}$, and the co-Yoneda isomorphism cancels with its inverse, we compute that

$$(7.15) \quad t'(f) = t_{P^\vee \otimes P} ((\text{id}_{P^\vee} \otimes f) \circ \text{coev}_P^R, \text{ev}_P).$$

Graphically,

$$t'(f) = t_{P^\vee \otimes P} \left(\begin{array}{c} P^\vee \quad P \\ \text{U} \quad \text{f} \quad \text{U} \\ \text{P}^\vee \quad \text{P} \end{array} \right)$$

We can now prove Theorem 7.20:

Proof. We check that t' satisfies the necessary conditions:

- The cyclicity condition is automatically satisfied, since t' is a map out of $\int_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, P)$.
- Let $P \in \mathcal{P}$, $X \in \mathcal{C}$ and $g_1: P \rightarrow X$, $g_2: X \rightarrow P$.

$$t'(g_2 \circ g_1) = t_{P^\vee \otimes P} ((\text{id}_{P^\vee} \otimes (g_2 \circ g_1)) \circ \text{coev}_P^R, \text{ev}_P)$$

which is non-degenerate due to the non-degeneracy of t .

- Since \mathcal{C} is ribbon, it is sufficient to check the left partial trace property. In other words, we want to show that for $h \in \text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(X \otimes P)$:

$$t'_{X \otimes P}(h) = t'_P ((\text{ev}_X \otimes \text{id}_P) \circ (\text{id}_{X^\vee} \otimes h) \circ (\text{coev}_X^R \otimes \text{id}_P)).$$

We once again remind that $(X \otimes P)^\vee \cong P^\vee \otimes X^\vee$, with dualizability morphisms given by:

$$\text{ev}_{X \otimes P} = \text{ev}_P \circ (\text{id}_{P^\vee} \otimes \text{ev}_X \otimes \text{id}_P), \quad \text{coev}_{X \otimes P} = (\text{id}_P \otimes \text{coev}_X \otimes \text{id}_{P^\vee}) \circ \text{coev}_P$$

Computing, we get:

$$t'_{X \otimes P}(h) = t_{P^\vee \otimes X^\vee \otimes X \otimes P} ((\text{id}_{P^\vee} \otimes \text{id}_{X^\vee} \otimes h) \circ (\text{coev}_{X \otimes P}^R, \text{ev}_{X \otimes P})$$

Graphically,

$$t'_{X \otimes P}(h) = t_{P^\vee \otimes X^\vee \otimes X \otimes P} \left(\begin{array}{c} P^\vee X^\vee \quad X \quad P \\ \text{U} \quad \text{h} \quad \text{U} \\ \text{P}^\vee X^\vee \quad X \quad P \end{array} \right)$$

Using the morphism $P^\vee \otimes X^\vee \otimes X \otimes P \xrightarrow{\text{id}_{P^\vee} \otimes \text{ev}_X \otimes \text{id}_P} P^\vee \otimes P$, dinaturality of t gives us that the following square commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbb{1}, P^{\vee} \otimes X^{\vee} \otimes X \otimes P) \otimes \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P^{\vee} \otimes P, \mathbb{1}) & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{ev}_X \otimes \mathrm{id}} & \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbb{1}, P^{\vee} \otimes P) \otimes \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P^{\vee} \otimes P, \mathbb{1}) \\
 \downarrow \mathrm{id} \otimes \mathrm{ev}_X & & \downarrow t_{P^{\vee} \otimes P} \\
 \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbb{1}, P^{\vee} \otimes X^{\vee} \otimes X \otimes P) \otimes \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P^{\vee} \otimes X^{\vee} \otimes X \otimes P, \mathbb{1}) & \xrightarrow{t_{P^{\vee} \otimes X^{\vee} \otimes X \otimes P}} & k
 \end{array}$$

In other words,

$$t_{P^{\vee} \otimes X^{\vee} \otimes X \otimes P} \left(\begin{array}{c} P^{\vee} X^{\vee} X P \\ \text{---} \quad \text{---} \quad \text{---} \\ h \\ \text{---} \quad \text{---} \quad \text{---} \\ P^{\vee} X^{\vee} X P \end{array} \right) = t_{P^{\vee} \otimes P} \left(\begin{array}{c} P^{\vee} \\ \text{---} \\ h \\ \text{---} \\ P^{\vee} \end{array} \right),$$

which is the desired property. □

REFERENCES

[Ati88] M. Atiyah. “Topological quantum field theories”. en. In: *Publications mathématiques de l'IHÉS* 68.1 (Jan. 1988), pp. 175–186. ISSN: 0073-8301, 1618-1913. URL: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/BF02698547>.

[Bar+14] B. Bartlett, C. L. Douglas, C. J. Schommer-Pries, and J. Vicary. *Extended 3-dimensional bordism as the theory of modular objects*. arXiv:1411.0945 [math]. Nov. 2014. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1411.0945>.

[Bar+15] B. Bartlett, C. L. Douglas, C. J. Schommer-Pries, and J. Vicary. *Modular categories as representations of the 3-dimensional bordism 2-category*. arXiv:1509.06811 [math]. Sept. 2015. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1509.06811>.

[Bar14] B. Bartlett. “Quasistrict symmetric monoidal 2-categories via wire diagrams”. In: (Sept. 2014). arXiv:1409.2148 [math]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1409.2148>.

[BBG20] A. Beliakova, C. Blanchet, and A. M. Gainutdinov. *Modified trace is a symmetrised integral*. arXiv:1801.00321 [math]. Oct. 2020. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1801.00321>.

[BW99] J. W. Barrett and B. W. Westbury. “Spherical Categories”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 143.2 (May 1999), pp. 357–375. ISSN: 0001-8708. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S000187089891800X>.

[Cos+23a] F. Costantino, N. Geer, B. Haïoun, and B. Patureau-Mirand. *Skein (3+1)-TQFTs from non-semisimple ribbon categories*. arXiv:2306.03225 [math]. June 2023. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2306.03225>.

[Cos+23b] F. Costantino, N. Geer, B. Patureau-Mirand, and A. Virelizier. *Non compact (2+1)-TQFTs from non-semisimple spherical categories*. arXiv:2302.04509 [math]. June 2023. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2302.04509>.

[Cre+24] T. Creutzig, T. Dimofte, N. Garner, and N. Geer. “A QFT for non-semisimple TQFT”. EN. In: *Advances in Theoretical and Mathematical Physics* 28.1 (Aug. 2024). Publisher: International Press of Boston, pp. 161–405. ISSN: 1095-0753. URL: <https://link.intlpress.com/JDetail/1833468021823725578>.

[CY93] L. Crane and D. Yetter. “A categorical construction of 4d topological quantum field theories”. In: *Quantum Topology*. Vol. Volume 3. Series on Knots and Everything Volume 3. WORLD SCIENTIFIC, Sept. 1993, pp. 120–130. ISBN: 978-981-02-1544-6. URL: https://www.worldscientific.com/doi/abs/10.1142/9789812796387_0005.

[CY99] L. Crane and D. Yetter. “ON ALGEBRAIC STRUCTURES IMPLICIT IN TOPOLOGICAL QUANTUM FIELD THEORIES”. en. In: *Journal of Knot Theory and Its Ramifications* 08.02 (Mar. 1999), pp. 125–163. ISSN: 0218-2165, 1793-6527. URL: <https://www.worldscientific.com/doi/abs/10.1142/S0218216599000109>.

[De +22] M. De Renzi, A. M. Gainutdinov, N. Geer, B. Patureau-Mirand, and I. Runkel. “3-Dimensional TQFTs From Non-Semisimple Modular Categories”. In: *Selecta Mathematica* 28.2 (Apr. 2022). arXiv:1912.02063 [hep-th], p. 42. ISSN: 1022-1824, 1420-9020. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1912.02063>.

- [De +23] M. De Renzi, A. M. Gainutdinov, N. Geer, B. Patureau-Mirand, and I. Runkel. “Mapping Class Group Representations From Non-Semisimple TQFTs”. In: *Communications in Contemporary Mathematics* 25.01 (Feb. 2023). arXiv:2010.14852 [hep-th], p. 2150091. ISSN: 0219-1997, 1793-6683. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2010.14852>.
- [De 21] M. De Renzi. “Extended TQFTs From Non-Semisimple Modular Categories”. In: *Indiana University Mathematics Journal* 70.5 (2021). arXiv:2103.04724 [math], pp. 1769–1811. ISSN: 0022-2518. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2103.04724>.
- [DR13] A. Davydov and I. Runkel. “ $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ -extensions of Hopf algebra module categories by their base categories”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 247 (Nov. 2013), pp. 192–265. ISSN: 0001-8708. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0001870813002338>.
- [Eti+15] P. Etingof, S. Gelaki, D. Nikshych, and V. Ostrik. *Tensor Categories*. en. Vol. 205. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs. ISSN: 0076-5376, 2331-7159. American Mathematical Society, July 2015. ISBN: 978-1-4704-2024-6 978-1-4704-2349-0 978-1-4704-2350-6. URL: <https://www.ams.org/surv/205>.
- [FM11] B. Farb and D. Margalit. *A Primer on Mapping Class Groups*. en. Princeton University Press, Sept. 2011. ISBN: 978-1-4008-3904-9. URL: <https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/9781400839049.html>.
- [FS11] J. Fuchs and C. Schweigert. *Hopf algebras and finite tensor categories in conformal field theory*. arXiv:1004.3405. Jan. 2011. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1004.3405>.
- [FS16] J. Fuchs and C. Schweigert. *Coends in conformal field theory*. arXiv:1604.01670 [hep-th]. Apr. 2016. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1604.01670>.
- [FS17] J. Fuchs and C. Schweigert. “Consistent systems of correlators in non-semisimple conformal field theory”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 307 (Feb. 2017), pp. 598–639. ISSN: 0001-8708. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S000187081630425X>.
- [FSS13] J. Fuchs, C. Schweigert, and C. Stigner. “From non-semisimple Hopf algebras to correlation functions for logarithmic CFT”. en. In: *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* 46.49 (Nov. 2013). Publisher: IOP Publishing, p. 494008. ISSN: 1751-8121. URL: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1751-8113/46/49/494008>.
- [FSS20] J. Fuchs, G. Schaumann, and C. Schweigert. “Eilenberg-Watts calculus for finite categories and a bimodule Radford $\$S^4\$$ theorem”. en. In: *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 373.1 (Jan. 2020), pp. 1–40. ISSN: 0002-9947, 1088-6850. URL: <https://www.ams.org/tran/2020-373-01/S0002-9947-2019-07838-8/>.
- [GKP11] N. Geer, J. Kujawa, and B. Patureau-Mirand. “Generalized trace and modified dimension functions on ribbon categories”. en. In: *Selecta Mathematica* 17.2 (June 2011), pp. 453–504. ISSN: 1420-9020. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00029-010-0046-7>.
- [GKP13] N. Geer, J. Kujawa, and B. Patureau-Mirand. “Ambidextrous objects and trace functions for nonsemisimple categories”. en. In: *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 141.9 (Sept. 2013), pp. 2963–2978.

ISSN: 0002-9939, 1088-6826. URL: <https://www.ams.org/proc/2013-141-09/S0002-9939-2013-11563-7/>.

[GKP22] N. Geer, J. Kujawa, and B. Patureau-Mirand. “M-traces in (Non-Unimodular) Pivotal Categories”. en. In: *Algebras and Representation Theory* 25.3 (June 2022), pp. 759–776. ISSN: 1572-9079. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10468-021-10044-y>.

[GPT09] N. Geer, B. Patureau-Mirand, and V. Turaev. “Modified quantum dimensions and re-normalized link invariants”. en. In: *Compositio Mathematica* 145.1 (Jan. 2009), pp. 196–212. ISSN: 1570-5846, 0010-437X. URL: <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/compositio-mathematica/article/modified-quantum-dimensions-and-renormalized-link-invariants/0622CA9B877F6282023962D89A937C90>.

[GPV12] N. Geer, B. Patureau-Mirand, and A. Virelizier. “Traces on ideals in pivotal categories”. en. In: *Quantum Topology* 4.1 (Nov. 2012), pp. 91–124. ISSN: 1663-487X. URL: <https://ems.press/journals/qt/articles/4482>.

[GR20] A. M. Gainutdinov and I. Runkel. “Projective objects and the modified trace in factorisable finite tensor categories”. In: *Compositio Mathematica* 156.4 (Apr. 2020). arXiv:1703.00150 [hep-th], pp. 770–821. ISSN: 0010-437X, 1570-5846. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1703.00150>.

[Hen96] M. Hennings. “Invariants of Links and 3-Manifolds Obtained from Hopf Algebras”. en. In: *Journal of the London Mathematical Society* 54.3 (1996). _eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1112/jlms/54.3.594>, pp. 594–624. ISSN: 1469-7750. URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1112/jlms/54.3.594>.

[Kel82] G. M. Kelly. *Basic Concepts of Enriched Category Theory*. en. Google-Books-ID: MPE6AAAAIAAJ. CUP Archive, Feb. 1982. ISBN: 978-0-521-28702-9.

[Ker96] T. Kerler. *Genealogy of Nonperturbative Quantum-Invariants of 3-Manifolds: The Surgical Family*. arXiv:q-alg/9601021. Mar. 1996. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/q-alg/9601021>.

[KL01] T. Kerler and V. Lyubashenko. *Non-Semisimple Topological Quantum Field Theories for 3-Manifolds with Corners*. en. Vol. 1765. Lecture Notes in Mathematics. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, 2001. ISBN: 978-3-540-42416-1. URL: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/b82618>.

[Lei15] T. Leinster. “The bijection between projective indecomposable and simple modules”. In: *Bulletin of the Belgian Mathematical Society - Simon Stevin* 22.5 (Dec. 2015). Publisher: The Belgian Mathematical Society, pp. 725–735. ISSN: 1370-1444. URL: <https://projecteuclid.org/journals/bulletin-of-the-belgian-mathematical-society-simon-stevin/volume-22/issue-5/The-bijection-between-projective-indecomposable-and-simple-modules/10.36045/bbms/1450389244.full>.

[Lor21] F. Loregian. *(Co)end Calculus*. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021. ISBN: 978-1-108-74612-0. URL: <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/coend-calculus/C662E90767358B336F17B606D19D8C43>.

- [Lur09] J. Lurie. *On the Classification of Topological Field Theories*. arXiv:0905.0465 [math]. May 2009. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/0905.0465>.
- [Lyu95a] V. Lyubashenko. “Modular transformations for tensor categories”. en. In: *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* 98.3 (Feb. 1995), pp. 279–327. ISSN: 0022-4049. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/002240499400045K>.
- [Lyu95b] V. Lyubashenko. “Invariants of 3-manifolds and projective representations of mapping class groups via quantum groups at roots of unity”. In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 172.3 (Sept. 1995). arXiv:hep-th/9405167, pp. 467–516. ISSN: 0010-3616, 1432-0916. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9405167>.
- [Lyu99] V. V. Lyubashenko. *Squared Hopf Algebras*. en. Google-Books-ID: TM_TQCQAAQBAJ. American Mathematical Soc., 1999. ISBN: 978-0-8218-1361-4.
- [Maj91] S. Majid. “Reconstruction theorems and rational conformal field theories”. In: *International Journal of Modern Physics A* 06.24 (Oct. 1991). Publisher: World Scientific Publishing Co., pp. 4359–4374. ISSN: 0217-751X. URL: <https://www.worldscientific.com/doi/abs/10.1142/S0217751X91002100>.
- [Pst22] P. Pstragowski. “On dualizable objects in monoidal bicategories”. In: *Theory and Applications of Categories* 38.9 (Feb. 2022), pp. 257–310. URL: <http://www.tac.mta.ca/tac/volumes/38/9/38-09abs.html>.
- [RR23] I. Romañis and I. Runkel. “Mapping class group representations and Morita classes of algebras”. en. In: *Quantum Topology* 14.3 (Oct. 2023), pp. 429–465. ISSN: 1663-487X. URL: <https://ems.press/journals/qt/articles/12879480>.
- [RT90] N. Y. Reshetikhin and V. G. Turaev. “Ribbon graphs and their invariants derived from quantum groups”. en. In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 127.1 (Jan. 1990), pp. 1–26. ISSN: 1432-0916. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02096491>.
- [RT91] N. Reshetikhin and V. G. Turaev. “Invariants of 3-manifolds via link polynomials and quantum groups”. en. In: *Inventiones mathematicae* 103.1 (Dec. 1991), pp. 547–597. ISSN: 1432-1297. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01239527>.
- [Sch14] C. J. Schommer-Pries. *The Classification of Two-Dimensional Extended Topological Field Theories*. arXiv:1112.1000 [math] version: 2. Aug. 2014. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1112.1000>.
- [Shi19] K. Shimizu. “Non-degeneracy conditions for braided finite tensor categories”. en. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 355 (Oct. 2019), p. 106778. ISSN: 0001-8708. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0001870819303962>.
- [SS21] T. Shibata and K. Shimizu. *Modified traces and the Nakayama functor*. arXiv:2103.13702. Oct. 2021. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2103.13702>.
- [SS23] T. Shibata and K. Shimizu. “Modified Traces and the Nakayama Functor”. In: *Algebras and Representation Theory* 26.2 (Apr. 2023), pp. 513–551. ISSN: 1386-923X. URL: <http://www.scopus.com/inward/record.url?scp=85119279603&partnerID=8YFLogxK>.

- [SW23] C. Schweigert and L. Woike. “The Trace Field Theory of a Finite Tensor Category”. en. In: *Algebras and Representation Theory* 26.5 (Oct. 2023). Publisher: Springer Science and Business Media LLC, pp. 1931–1949. ISSN: 1386-923X, 1572-9079. URL: <https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10468-022-10147-0>.
- [Syt] F. Sytilidis. *On surgery presentations of bordism bicategories - PhD thesis*. el. URL: <https://sites.google.com/view/fsytilidis/phd-thesis>.
- [Til04] “The definition of CFT”. In: *Topology, Geometry and Quantum Field Theory: Proceedings of the 2002 Oxford Symposium in Honour of the 60th Birthday of Graeme Segal*. Ed. by U. Tillmann. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004, pp. 432–575. ISBN: 978-0-521-54049-0. URL: <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/topology-geometry-and-quantum-field-theory/definition-of-cft/675AF695B2670994C329E37DCEF029B0>.
- [Tur20] V. G. Turaev. *Quantum Invariants of Knots and 3-Manifolds*. en. De Gruyter, Mar. 2020. ISBN: 978-3-11-088327-5. URL: <https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/9783110883275/html>.
- [TV17] V. Turaev and A. Virelizier. *Monoidal Categories and Topological Field Theory*. Vol. 322. Progress in Mathematics. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2017. ISBN: 978-3-319-49833-1 978-3-319-49834-8. URL: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-319-49834-8>.
- [TV92] V. G. Turaev and O. Y. Viro. “State sum invariants of 3-manifolds and quantum 6j-symbols”. In: *Topology* 31.4 (Oct. 1992), pp. 865–902. ISSN: 0040-9383. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/004093839290015A>.
- [Wit88] E. Witten. “Topological quantum field theory”. en. In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 117.3 (Sept. 1988), pp. 353–386. ISSN: 1432-0916. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01223371>.
- [Wit89] E. Witten. “Quantum field theory and the Jones polynomial”. en. In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 121.3 (Sept. 1989), pp. 351–399. ISSN: 1432-0916. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01217730>.