

TOWARDS A DIAGRAMMATIC ANALOGUE OF THE RESHETIKHIN-TURAEV LINK INVARIANTS

AMI HAVIV

ABSTRACT. By considering spaces of directed Jacobi diagrams, we construct a diagrammatic version of the Etingof-Kazhdan quantization of complex semisimple Lie algebras. This diagrammatic quantization is used to provide a construction of a directed version of the Kontsevich integral, denoted \mathbf{Z}_{EK} , in a way which is analogous to the construction of the Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants from the R -matrices of the Drinfel'd-Jimbo quantum groups. Based on this analogy, we conjecture (and prove in a restricted sense) a formula for the value of the invariant \mathbf{Z}_{EK} on the unknot. This formula is simpler than the Wheels formula of [BGR], but the precise relationship between the two is yet unknown.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Quick summary for the expert	2
1.2. Paper overview	2
1.3. Related work	8
1.4. Acknowledgments	8
2. Preliminaries	8
2.1. Vassiliev invariants	8
2.2. The Algebra \mathcal{A} and invariant Lie tensors	10
2.3. Maps between \mathcal{A} -spaces	17
2.4. Algebraic structures on \mathcal{A}	22
3. The algebra $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ of directed Jacobi diagrams	29
3.1. Lie bialgebras	29
3.2. Directed Jacobi diagrams and directed Lie relations	33
3.3. Mapping \mathcal{A} -spaces into $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ -spaces	38
4. Link invariants from quasitriangular quasi-Hopf algebras	44
4.1. Quasitriangular quasi-Hopf algebras	45
4.2. The KZ structures	50
4.3. Drinfel'd-Jimbo quantum groups	57
4.4. H -invariants of framed links	60
4.5. The Kontsevich integral and the Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants	74
5. The Etingof-Kazhdan quantization of $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$	75
5.1. Verma modules	75
5.2. The diagrammatic Etingof-Kazhdan twist	84
5.3. The invariant \mathbf{Z}_{EK}	87
5.4. Summary of spaces, structures, and link invariants	89

Date: September 1, 2002.

5.5. The Polyak spaces	89
References	91

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Quick summary for the expert. The algebra \mathcal{A} of Jacobi diagrams modulo IHX-like relations is the target space for the Kontsevich integral (of framed knots), which is a universal Vassiliev (finite-type) framed knot invariant. This algebra is fruitfully thought of as a diagrammatic model for the ‘invariant part’ of the theory of complex semisimple Lie algebras. We propose a richer diagrammatic framework, involving *directed* Jacobi diagrams modulo directed versions of the IHX relations, which captures some features of the Cartan-Weyl theory.

Within this framework we can provide a diagrammatic interpretation of the Etingof-Kazhdan quantization of a complex semisimple Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} (more precisely, the quantization of the Manin triple corresponding to the standard Lie bialgebra structure of \mathfrak{g}). We are then able to construct a framed link invariant \mathbf{Z}_{EK} , taking values in suitable spaces of directed Jacobi diagrams, in a way which is analogous, to some extent, to the construction of the Reshetikhin-Turaev framed link invariants from the R -matrices of the Drinfel’d-Jimbo quantum groups. The invariant \mathbf{Z}_{EK} is closely related (and possibly equivalent) to the Kontsevich integral, by means of the map ι sending an undirected Jacobi diagram to the sum over all possibilities of directing its arcs. The analogy with the Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants leads us to conjecture a formula, which holds ‘at the level of complex semisimple Lie algebras’, for the value of \mathbf{Z}_{EK} on the unknot, in terms of the exponential of a certain simple directed Jacobi diagram:

$$\mathbf{Z}_{\text{EK}}(\text{unknot}) = \text{Tr}\left(\exp\left(\frac{1}{2} \begin{array}{c} \circlearrowleft \\ \downarrow \end{array} \right)\right),$$

where the exponential is computed with respect to the juxtaposition product and Tr is the operation of closing the line into a circle.

While our motivation for introducing the spaces of directed Jacobi diagrams is purely Lie algebraic, similar (but not identical) spaces of ‘arrow diagrams’ were considered by Polyak ([Po]) in conjunction with the theory of virtual knots. We discuss the similarities and differences between our and Polyak’s diagrammatic spaces.

1.2. Paper overview. We provide here a more leisurely description of this paper, without strictly following the way it is organized. More information about the organization of the paper can be obtained from the table of contents, as well as from the short summaries at the beginning of each section.

1.2.1. The universal Vassiliev invariant, \mathcal{A} -spaces, and invariant Lie tensors. Vassiliev invariants of framed knots (and other knot-like objects) are an important and wide family of knot invariants, including, for example, the coefficients of the Conway, Jones, HOMFLY, and Kauffman polynomials.

The fundamental theorem of the theory of Vassiliev invariants asserts that all the (numerical) Vassiliev invariants of framed knots are encapsulated in a single ‘universal’ invariant

\mathbf{Z}_K , which takes its values in \mathcal{A} , the *algebra of chord diagrams*. Every numerical Vassiliev invariant is obtained by composing \mathbf{Z}_K with a *weight system* (a linear functional in the graded dual of \mathcal{A}). Similar results hold for other types of knotted objects.

There are several known methods for constructing a universal Vassiliev invariant (see [BS] for a survey). While the defining universal property of \mathbf{Z}_K does not determine it uniquely, all the constructions yield, at least conjecturally, the same result (up to minor normalization issues), which is usually referred to, after its first construction, as the (*framed*) *Kontsevich integral*.

Recall that \mathcal{A} is the graded space of formal linear combinations of certain uni-trivalent diagrams, called *Jacobi diagrams*, modulo certain linear relations — the AS, IHX, and STU relations. The diagrams in \mathcal{A} are based on a *skeleton* consisting of a single oriented interval, meaning that the univalent vertices of a diagram in \mathcal{A} are ordered along the skeleton interval. The trivalent vertices of a diagram are *oriented*, meaning that one of the two possible orderings of the arcs meeting in a trivalent vertex is specified. The space \mathcal{A} is graded by half the total number of vertices in a diagram, and is often interchanged with its completion with respect to that grading. Examples of diagrams in \mathcal{A} and the local parts of the relations are shown in Figure 1.

By varying the skeleton, allowing any ordered set of oriented intervals, oriented circles, and ‘colors’ as the set of skeleton components, we obtain a variety of spaces, collectively called \mathcal{A} -*spaces*. In particular, the space \mathcal{B} is the \mathcal{A} -space corresponding to a single color skeleton, namely the space spanned by Jacobi diagrams with unordered univalent vertices modulo AS and IHX relations. The \mathcal{A} -space based on an n -tuple of oriented intervals is denoted by $\mathcal{A}^{\boxtimes n}$, and the one based on an n -tuple of colors is denoted $\mathcal{B}^{\boxtimes n}$. Some examples of diagrams in these spaces are also shown in Figure 1.




Figure 1. Examples of diagrams in \mathcal{A} , $\mathcal{A}^{\boxtimes 2}$, and $\mathcal{B}^{\boxtimes 2}$, and the local parts of the AS, IHX, and STU relations. All the trivalent vertices are oriented counterclockwise. $*_1$ and $*_2$ are the colors of univalent vertices of diagrams in $\mathcal{B}^{\boxtimes 2}$.

In many respects, \mathcal{A} is a diagrammatic analogue of the ad-invariant part of the universal enveloping algebras $U(\mathfrak{g})$ of *metrized* Lie algebras \mathfrak{g} (notably complex semisimple Lie algebras). This analogy is mediated by the ‘diagrams to invariant Lie tensors’ maps, collectively denoted $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}$, which assign to diagrams in \mathcal{A} -spaces elements in appropriate \mathfrak{g} -spaces. For example, $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ maps $\mathcal{A}^{\boxtimes n}$ into $(U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes n})^{\mathfrak{g}}$ and maps \mathcal{B} into $S(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}}$, the spaces of \mathfrak{g} -invariants (with respect to the adjoint action) in the n -fold tensor product of $U(\mathfrak{g})$ and in the symmetric algebra $S(\mathfrak{g})$ of \mathfrak{g} , respectively.

\mathcal{A} is equipped with the structure of a *diagrammatic Hopf algebra*, whose components are maps between the *diagrammatic tensor powers* $\mathcal{A}^{\boxtimes n}$ of \mathcal{A} . All the Hopf structure components are intertwined by suitable $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ maps with the parallel components of the standard Hopf algebra structure of $U(\mathfrak{g})$. The product of \mathcal{A} is done by juxtapositioning the skeleton intervals. Similarly, \mathcal{B} is endowed with the 'two colors made one' product, which is analogous to the product of $S(\mathfrak{g})$; when restricted to $\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{B}$ (which naturally injects into $\mathcal{B}^{\boxtimes 2}$), it equips \mathcal{B} with the disjoint union product (which is a product operation in the usual algebraic sense).

The Poincarè-Birkhoff-Witt (PBW) isomorphism $\chi : S(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{g})$ restricts to an isomorphism $\chi : S(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}} \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}}$. It has a diagrammatic counterpart, the *diagrammatic PBW isomorphism* $\chi : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$, which acts by averaging all the possible orderings of the legs of a diagram in \mathcal{B} along the oriented interval skeleton of \mathcal{A} .

Another instance of the \mathcal{A} to $U(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}}$ analogy is that the natural 'closing the interval' projection $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(\uparrow) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(\circ)$ is actually an isomorphism, just like its algebraic counterpart, which is the projection of $U(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}}$ onto the space of its \mathfrak{g} -*coinvariants*; the latter two spaces are trivially isomorphic.

Drinfel'd showed that the Hopf algebra structure of $U(\mathfrak{g})$ can be deformed, in the space $U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]$ of formal power series in \hbar over $U(\mathfrak{g})$, into a quasitriangular quasi-Hopf structure¹, sharing the product and coproduct of $U(\mathfrak{g})$. The R -matrix of the deformed structure is the exponential $R_{\mathfrak{g}} = e^{\hbar\Omega_{\mathfrak{g}}/2} \in (U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes 2})^{\mathfrak{g}}[[\hbar]]$ of half the metric tensor of \mathfrak{g} , and its associator $\Phi_{\mathfrak{g}} \in (U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes 3})^{\mathfrak{g}}[[\hbar]]$ is the famous *Drinfel'd associator*, originating from the Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov (KZ) system of differential equations. We call this structure the *KZ structure* of $U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]$. Moreover, these KZ structures are 'universal' in \mathfrak{g} : there are elements $R \in \mathcal{A}^{\boxtimes 2}$ and $\Phi \in \mathcal{A}^{\boxtimes 3}$ such that $R_{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\hbar}(R)$ and $\Phi_{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\hbar}(\Phi)$ for any semisimple Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} . (The maps $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\hbar}$ are simple variants of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}$, multiplying the value of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ on a diagram of degree d by \hbar^d .) The element R is simple to describe: $R = \exp(\frac{1}{2} \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \uparrow \end{array})$. On the contrary, the Drinfel'd associator Φ is a mysterious object. The elements R and Φ equip \mathcal{A} with the structure of a *diagrammatic quasitriangular quasi-Hopf algebra* (which we call the KZ structure of \mathcal{A}).

The axioms of quasitriangular quasi-Hopf algebra H , either in the usual algebraic sense or in our diagrammatic setting, lead to a procedure for associating to such an algebra a topological invariant \mathbf{Z}_H of *parenthesized framed tangles*. This procedure is explained in depth in Section 4. It has the important property that the restriction of \mathbf{Z}_H to framed links is unchanged if the quasitriangular quasi-Hopf structure of H is replaced by a *twist equivalent* structure. The values of \mathbf{Z}_H on framed links with n components belong to the space of *coinvariants* of $H^{\otimes n}$. For $H = \mathcal{A}$, this space is $\mathcal{A}(\circ_1, \dots, \circ_n)$, whereas for $H = U(\mathfrak{g})$ it is equal to $(U(\mathfrak{g})_{\mathfrak{g}})^{\otimes n}$, the n -fold tensor power of the space of \mathfrak{g} -coinvariants of $U(\mathfrak{g})$.

Applying the \mathbf{Z}_H -procedure to the KZ structure of \mathcal{A} and restricting the resulting invariant to framed knots, we obtain a universal Vassiliev invariant taking values in $\mathcal{A}(\circ) \cong \mathcal{A}$ (which is known to coincide with the Kontsevich integral \mathbf{Z}_K). Applying the same procedure to the accompanying structures on the enveloping algebras $U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]$ yields a series of invariants of framed knots, which we denote by $\mathbf{KZ}_{\mathfrak{g}}$. The invariants $\mathbf{KZ}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ take values in the spaces $U(\mathfrak{g})_{\mathfrak{g}}[[\hbar]]$, and are $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ -related to the Kontsevich integral: $\mathbf{KZ}_{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\hbar} \circ \mathbf{Z}_K$.

The complicated nature of Φ makes it difficult to carry out explicit non-perturbative computations of the values of \mathbf{Z}_K for particular knots (the situation is no better for other

¹The basic definitions from the theory of quasitriangular quasi-Hopf algebras are recalled in Section 4.1

constructions of the Kontsevich integral). In fact, even the value of \mathbf{Z}_K for the *unknot* was hard to compute. The following *Wheels formula* for this value, initially conjectured in [BGRT], was recently proved (see [T], [BLT], and the references therein):

$$\chi^{-1}\mathbf{Z}_K(\text{unknot}) = \exp_{\cup} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_{2n}\omega_{2n} = \exp_{\cup} \left(\frac{\text{---}\circ\text{---}}{48} - \frac{\text{---}\circ\text{---}}{5760} + \frac{\text{---}\circ\text{---}}{362880} \mp \dots \right), \quad (1.1)$$

where the ‘modified Bernoulli numbers’ b_{2n} are defined by the power series expansion

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_{2n}x^{2n} = \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{\sinh x/2}{x/2},$$

ω_{2n} is the ‘ $2n$ -wheel’ (the uni-trivalent diagram made of a $2n$ -gon with $2n$ legs), and the exponential is computed using the disjoint union product of \mathcal{B} .

1.2.2. The quest for a diagrammatic Reshetikhin-Turaev invariant. When \mathfrak{g} is a complex semisimple Lie algebra, there is an alternative construction of the invariants $\mathbf{KZ}_{\mathfrak{g}}$, namely their values on framed links coincide with those of the *Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants* $\mathbf{RT}_{\mathfrak{g}}$. In our language, the latter invariants are obtained by applying the \mathbf{Z}_H -procedure to another quasitriangular quasi-Hopf structure on $U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]$, which is an isomorphic image of the *Drinfel’d-Jimbo quantum group* $U_{\hbar}(\mathfrak{g})$, a quantum universal enveloping algebra of \mathfrak{g} defined by means of ‘quantum Chevalley generators and quantum Serre relations’. (All this is reviewed in detail in Section 4.3.) We call this structure the *DJ structure* of $U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]$. The fact that the framed link invariants $\mathbf{KZ}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ and $\mathbf{RT}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ coincide follows from a deep result of Drinfel’d, asserting that the underlying quasitriangular quasi-Hopf KZ and DJ structures are twist equivalent.

We comment that in our approach the Reshetikhin-Turaev invariant $\mathbf{RT}_{\mathfrak{g}}(K)$ of a framed knot K belongs to the space $U(\mathfrak{g})_{\mathfrak{g}}[[\hbar]]$. In the literature, starting with [RT], the value $\mathbf{RT}_{\mathfrak{g}}(K)$ is identified with the equivalent collection of formal series in \hbar , denoted $\mathbf{RT}_{\mathfrak{g};V}$, which are obtained by taking the trace of the action of $\mathbf{RT}_{\mathfrak{g}}(K)$ on a finite-dimensional module V of \mathfrak{g} . (A similar remark applies to framed links with any number of components.)

While the KZ construction is universal and manifestly \mathfrak{g} -invariant, the $\mathbf{RT}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ construction has several merits:

- (RT1) The underlying DJ structure is actually Hopf (that is, its associator is trivial), so that there is no need for the somewhat artificial machinery of parenthesization for computing the values of $\mathbf{RT}_{\mathfrak{g}}$.
- (RT2) The R -matrix of $U_{\hbar}(\mathfrak{g})$ has an *explicit* (albeit complicated) expression in terms of the generators of $U_{\hbar}(\mathfrak{g})$, with *rational* coefficients, which implies that the values of $\mathbf{RT}_{\mathfrak{g};V}$ are rational power series in \hbar . (A similar rationality result can be proved directly for $\mathbf{KZ}_{\mathfrak{g}}$, and even in the ‘universal’ framework of the KZ structure of \mathcal{A} , but only by indirect means; see Section 4.5 for a review of such a proof.)
- (RT3) There is a simple formula for the value of $\mathbf{RT}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ on the unknot. Fixing an arbitrary Cartan subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} and then choosing a set of positive roots for the associated root system, we have

$$\mathbf{RT}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\text{unknot}) = \text{Tr}(e^{\hbar\rho_{\mathfrak{g}}}), \quad (1.2)$$

where $\rho_{\mathfrak{g}}$ is the element of the Cartan algebra dual to the half-sum of the positive roots, and Tr is the natural projection of $U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]$ onto $U(\mathfrak{g})_{\mathfrak{g}}[[\hbar]]$.

These advantages make it appealing to look for a diagrammatic version of the Reshetikhin-Turaev construction. However, there is an inherent difficulty with trying to make such a construction in the diagrammatic framework offered by \mathcal{A} -spaces, in that the components of the DJ structure underlying $\mathbf{RT}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ are *not* \mathfrak{g} -invariant, and thus are inaccessible by the $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ -maps. Even if this initial difficulty is tackled somehow, the generators and relations definition of the Drinfel'd-Jimbo quantum groups is highly ‘non-universal’ and does not seem to be directly susceptible to a diagrammatic reformulation.

1.2.3. A diagrammatic Etingof-Kazhdan quantization. Our hint for (partially) solving both problems came from the Etingof-Kazhdan theory of quantization of Lie bialgebras, which we quickly describe. (Section 3.1 includes the needed definitions and facts from the theory of Lie bialgebras).

A finite-dimensional Lie bialgebra \mathfrak{g}_+ is part of a *Manin triple* $(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathfrak{g}_+, \mathfrak{g}_-)$. The ambient Lie bialgebra $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ is the *Drinfel'd double* of the Lie bialgebra \mathfrak{g}_+ . It carries a natural metric, hence the enveloping algebra $U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})[[\hbar]]$ has a KZ structure. By using *Verma modules* of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ and a fixed Drinfel'd associator, Etingof and Kazhdan ([EK1]) construct an element $J \in U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})^{\otimes 2}[[\hbar]]$, such that twisting the KZ structure of $U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})[[\hbar]]$ by J^{-1} leads to a *coassociative* structure. We shall call this quasitriangular (quasi-)Hopf structure of $U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})[[\hbar]]$ the *EK structure*.

A complex semisimple Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} with a choice of Cartan subalgebra, followed by a choice of the set of positive roots, has a *standard* Lie bialgebra structure. \mathfrak{g} equipped with this structure is not the ambient Lie bialgebra of a Manin triple, but is closely related to one, denoted $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$, which is obtained by ‘doubling’ the Cartan subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} , and is the Drinfel'd double of the positive Borel subbialgebra of \mathfrak{g} (see Section 3.1.5)².

The EK structure of $U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ is sent by the projection $p : \tilde{\mathfrak{g}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$ to a quasitriangular Hopf structure on $U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]$, carrying the same name. By its construction, the EK structure is twist equivalent to the KZ structure of $U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]$.

Since Etingof-Kazhdan theory is ‘universal’ in the Manin triple $(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathfrak{g}_+, \mathfrak{g}_-)$, it seemed to be a good candidate for a diagrammatic interpretation. Our results in doing so are the central theme of this paper.

We begin by introducing a diagrammatic model of Manin triples (or, equivalently, double Lie bialgebras), by considering *directed* Jacobi diagrams, with suitable directed versions of the IHX-like relations. Most interestingly, there is a ‘5T relation’

The diagrammatic 5T relation is represented as an equation between five directed Jacobi diagrams. The first diagram on the left is a vertex with three incoming arrows from the top and three outgoing arrows from the bottom. This is equal to the sum of four other diagrams: a vertex with two incoming arrows from the top and one from the left, and two outgoing arrows to the right and one to the bottom; a vertex with two incoming arrows from the top and one from the right, and two outgoing arrows to the left and one to the bottom; a vertex with two incoming arrows from the top and one from the left, and two outgoing arrows to the right and one to the bottom; and a vertex with two incoming arrows from the top and one from the right, and two outgoing arrows to the left and one to the bottom.

which is the diagrammatic analogue of the *cocycle identity* satisfied by the bracket and cobracket of \mathfrak{g}_+ .

The resulting diagrammatic spaces are called $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ -spaces. In particular, $\vec{\mathcal{A}} = \vec{\mathcal{A}}(\uparrow)$ is called the *algebra of directed Jacobi diagrams*.

The vague notion of ‘diagrammatic model’ is made more precise by constructing the ‘directed Jacobi diagrams to Lie tensors’ maps, collectively denoted $\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}$, from $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ -spaces to

²It is because of this difference between \mathfrak{g} and $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ that we have chosen the notation $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$, rather than \mathfrak{g} , for the ‘generic’ ambient Lie bialgebra of a Manin triple, while reserving \mathfrak{g} for denoting most of the time a complex semisimple Lie algebra.

the paralleling tensor products of $U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$, $U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}$, and $S(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$. This construction is carried out in Section 3.2.2. When \mathfrak{g} is a complex semisimple Lie algebra, we denote by $\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ the composition

$$\vec{\mathcal{A}}\text{-space} \xrightarrow{\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}} \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}\text{-space} \xrightarrow{p} \mathfrak{g}\text{-space}.$$

The \hbar -variants $\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}^{\hbar}$ and $\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\hbar}$ of these maps are defined as in the undirected case.

The tensors in the images of the $\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ maps are not necessarily \mathfrak{g} -invariant. An important example is the element

$$\varrho = \frac{1}{2} \left(\begin{array}{c} \curvearrowright \\ \longrightarrow \end{array} - \begin{array}{c} \curvearrowleft \\ \longrightarrow \end{array} \right) \in \vec{\mathcal{A}}, \tag{1.3}$$

which is mapped by $\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ (\mathfrak{g} a complex semisimple Lie algebra) to $\varrho_{\mathfrak{g}}$.

In the Lie algebraic setting, the \mathfrak{g} -invariant tensors trivially form subspaces of their ambient tensor spaces. The diagrammatic situation is more involved, in that an \mathcal{A} -space is not directly a subspace of the $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ -space based on the same skeleton. We do have a collection of natural maps between isoskeletal \mathcal{A} and $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ -spaces, called the ι -maps, which act on a diagram in an \mathcal{A} -space via ‘directization’: sending that diagram to the sum of all possible ways of directing its arcs. We show that these maps are well-defined and ‘cover’ the injections $U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})^{\natural} \rightarrow U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$, for any double Lie bialgebra $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$. This motivates us to conjecture (see Conjecture 1 in Section 3.3.2) that all the ι -maps are *injective*.

This sets the stage for a diagrammatic Etingof-Kazhdan construction. Using the ι -maps, the KZ structure is exported from \mathcal{A} to $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$. The *diagrammatic Verma modules* \mathcal{M}_+ and \mathcal{M}_- are defined as the quotients of $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ by the RI (“right in”) and RO (“right out”) relations, respectively, with natural projections $p_{\pm} : \vec{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\pm}$. The RI and RO relations are illustrated in the following figure.

$$\text{RI: } \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \uparrow \quad \uparrow \quad \uparrow \\ \text{---} \end{array} = 0 \quad ; \quad \text{RO: } \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \downarrow \quad \downarrow \quad \downarrow \\ \text{---} \end{array} = 0.$$

Diagrammatic versions of algebraic PBW arguments show that the (diagrammatic) coproduct of $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ induces an isomorphism $\phi : \vec{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_+ \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_-$. The diagrammatic analogue of the Etingof-Kazhdan twist can then be defined as

$$J = (\phi^{-1} \boxtimes \phi^{-1})(p_+ \boxtimes p_- \boxtimes p_+ \boxtimes p_-) \mathbf{Z}_{\text{K}} \left(\begin{array}{c} | \ \ \ \ | \\ \diagdown \ \ \ / \end{array} \right) \in \vec{\mathcal{A}}^{\otimes 2},$$

and it is not too hard to prove that twisting by J^{-1} establishes a twist equivalence between the KZ structure of $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ and a *coassociative* structure, called the *EK structure* of $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$. The topological invariant associated to the latter structure, denoted \mathbf{Z}_{EK} , takes its values in $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ -spaces, and it readily follows that, when restricted to framed links, it is ι -related to the Kontsevich integral (hence the two invariants are equivalent if Conjecture 1 is true).

In accordance with (1.2) and (1.3), we conjecture³ that

$$\mathbf{Z}_{\text{EK}}(\text{unknot}) = \text{Tr} \left(\exp \left(\frac{1}{2} \begin{array}{c} \circ \\ \longrightarrow \end{array} \right) \right), \tag{1.4}$$

³We actually make a more refined conjecture about the value of the *Drinfel’d element* of the EK structure of $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$; see Conjecture 2 in Section 5.3.

where Tr is the ‘closing the circle’ map $\vec{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{A}}(\bigcirc)$, and

$$\begin{array}{c} \circlearrowleft \\ \downarrow \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \circlearrowleft \\ \downarrow \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} \circlearrowright \\ \downarrow \end{array} .$$

We show that this conjecture holds at the level of complex semisimple Lie algebras: applying $\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\hbar}$ to both sides, with \mathfrak{g} complex semisimple, yields an equality.

This putative formula is simpler than the Wheels formula (1.1) in several respects. First, it gives the value on the unknot in the original target space of the invariant \mathbf{Z}_{EK} , without having to resort to the PBW map χ . Second, the diagrams and rational numbers appearing in it are far less complicated than their counterparts in the Wheels formula.

1.3. Related work. Spaces of directed Jacobi diagrams, similar to the $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ -spaces, were independently studied by M. Polyak in [Po], in relation to the theory of virtual knots (see [GPV]). We review Polyak’s work in Section 5.5, and discuss the similarities and differences between his spaces and $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ -spaces.

1.4. Acknowledgments. This paper is my Ph.D. thesis, which was prepared in the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. I would like to thank my advisor, Dror Bar-Natan, for suggesting the topic of this work and for numerous instructive talks.

I also thank P. Etingof, D. Kazhdan, J. Lieberum, T. Ohtsuki, M. Polyak, E. de-Shalit, and D. P. Thurston for some useful discussions and helpful comments.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Section summary: We recall some of the definitions, constructions, and results of the basic theory of Vassiliev invariants and \mathcal{A} -spaces (mostly from [BN1]), in a way which aims to ease the treatment of their directed counterparts in the next section. After stating the definitions of Vassiliev invariants, weight systems, and chord diagrams, we describe the transition to Jacobi diagrams (allowing for trivalent vertices) and the fundamental construction of the maps from \mathcal{A} -spaces to spaces of (invariant) Lie tensors. We give a detailed review of the proof of the diagrammatic PBW theorem, and close this section with a study of the basic algebraic operations on \mathcal{A} -spaces, emphasizing that \mathcal{A} has the structure of a diagrammatic Hopf algebra.

2.1. Vassiliev invariants.

2.1.1. Definition of Vassiliev invariants. Suppose V is an invariant of oriented knots taking values in an abelian group. It can be inductively extended to an invariant $V^{(m)}$ of immersed oriented circles with exactly m transversal self intersection points, using the formulas

$$V^{(0)} = V ,$$

$$V^{(m)} \left(\begin{array}{c} \nearrow \searrow \\ \times \end{array} \right) = V^{(m-1)} \left(\begin{array}{c} \nearrow \nearrow \\ \times \end{array} \right) - V^{(m-1)} \left(\begin{array}{c} \searrow \searrow \\ \times \end{array} \right) . \quad (2.1)$$

Definition 2.1. V is called a *Vassiliev invariant of type m* if $V^{(m+1)}$ vanishes identically.

Similar definitions can be made for a variety of ‘knot-like’ objects, such as braids, tangles and framed links.

2.1.2. Chord diagrams and weight systems.

Definition 2.2. A (1-dimensional) skeleton is a finite ordered collection of oriented intervals and oriented circles, which are called the *components* of the skeleton.

Definition 2.3. A *chord diagram* based on a skeleton \mathbf{M} is a finite graph made of the components of \mathbf{M} and finitely many chords marked on those components. The collection of all \mathbf{M} -based chord diagrams is denoted by $\mathcal{D}^c(\mathbf{M})$. This collection is graded by the number of chords in a diagram. Its degree m part is denoted by $\mathcal{G}_m(\mathcal{D}^c(\mathbf{M}))$.

An example of a chord diagram is depicted in Figure 2.




Figure 2. Example of a chord diagram based on a three component skeleton. By convention, skeleton circles are oriented counterclockwise, and the order of components is such that the subset of oriented circles succeeds the subset of oriented intervals.

Given an orientation preserving immersion $K : \mathbf{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ whose only singularities are m transversal self intersections, we associate to K an \mathbf{M} -based chord diagram D of degree m , by the following procedure: For each double point p of K , mark a chord in D connecting the two points in \mathbf{M} which are mapped to p (see Figure 3). This chord diagram can be thought of as recording the pattern of singularities of the immersion.




Figure 3. Associating a chord diagram to a singular knot.

Let V be a Vassiliev knot invariant of type m taking values in a field \mathbb{k} , and let D be a (circle-based) chord diagram of degree m . D can be *embedded* in \mathbb{R}^3 , that is, there is a knot $K_D : S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ (with m double points) whose associated chord diagram is D .


Two different embeddings of D are related by a sequence of moves of the form $\bowtie \rightarrow \bowtie$. Such a move does not change the value of $V^{(m)}(K_D)$, because the change caused by the move is equal to $V^{(m+1)}$ evaluated on a knot with $m+1$ double points, which is zero by Definition 2.1. Thus, we can unambiguously define the *weight system of V* :

$$W_m(V) : \mathcal{G}_m(\mathcal{D}^c(\bigcirc)) \rightarrow \mathbb{k}, \quad W_m(V)(D) = V(K_D). \quad (2.2)$$

$W_m(V)$ can be extended to $\mathcal{D}^c(\bigcirc)$ by setting it equal to zero on the other homogeneous components, and then can be extended by linearity to the \mathbb{k} -linear space formally spanned by chord diagrams, $\text{span}_{\mathbb{k}}(\mathcal{D}^c(\bigcirc))$.

There is no difficulty in extending the definition of weight system to Vassiliev invariants of tangles or framed tangles, yielding linear functionals $W = W_m(V)$ on $\text{span}(\mathcal{D}^c(\mathbf{M}))$, for the appropriate skeleton \mathbf{M} . In particular, it applies to Vassiliev invariants of framed links, where chord diagrams are based on a collection of circles.

A simple topological argument ([BN1, Section 2.2]) shows that the weight system W of a Vassiliev invariant satisfies the *4T relations*: W vanishes on linear combinations of four chord diagrams of the form



(The oriented segments may belong to the same or different skeleton components. The parts of the diagrams not shown in the figure are the same for all four diagrams.)

Thus, we may regard weight systems as linear functionals on the quotient space.

$$\mathcal{A}^c(\mathbf{M}) = \text{span}_{\mathbb{k}}(\mathcal{D}^c(\mathbf{M})) / \{4T \text{ relations} \},$$

in which the above linear combinations vanish. $\mathcal{A}^c(\mathbf{M})$ is a graded vector space (as 4T relations are homogeneous). Its graded completion is also denoted $\mathcal{A}^c(\mathbf{M})$.

Remark 2.4. When we consider *unframed* knots, it is easy to derive another set of relations satisfied by a weight system W of a Vassiliev invariant — the *framing independence (FI) relations*: $W(D) = 0$ if $D \in \mathcal{G}_m(\mathcal{D}^c(\bigcirc))$ has an isolated chord. Similar relations hold for unframed links or tangles (where the isolated chord has both endpoints on the *same* skeleton component).

Remark 2.5. In the case of *pure braids* with n strands, the suitable patterns of singularities are chord diagrams based on an n -interval skeleton with all the chords being *horizontal*. Denote this space by $\mathcal{D}^h(\uparrow_1 \cdots \uparrow_n)$. Weight systems of Vassiliev invariants of pure braids again satisfy the 4T relations. The corresponding quotient space is denoted by $\mathcal{A}^h(\uparrow_1 \cdots \uparrow_n)$.

2.2. The Algebra \mathcal{A} and invariant Lie tensors.

2.2.1. Jacobi diagrams. We extend the definition of a 1-dimensional skeleton as follows.

Definition 2.6. A *skeleton* is a finite ordered collection of components, which are either oriented intervals, oriented circles, or *colors*. (Colors are usually denoted $*_1, *_2, \dots$)

It is also useful to work with a family of diagrams extending the family of chord diagrams.

Definition 2.7. A *Jacobi diagram based on a skeleton \mathbf{M}* is a finite graph made of the 1-dimensional components of \mathbf{M} and additional undirected arcs, with two types of vertices allowed:

- (1) *External* vertices in which an arc ends in a component of \mathbf{M} . (Ending in $*_1$ means that the arc ends in a univalent vertex colored by $*_1$.) Arcs ending in external vertices are called *legs*.
- (2) *Internal* vertices in which three arcs meet. These vertices are oriented — one of the two possible cyclic orderings of the arcs meeting in such a vertex is specified.

The *body* of such a diagram is the graph obtained by removing all the components of \mathbf{M} from it. (Removing the colors means making all the univalent vertices colorless.)




Figure 4. Example of a Jacobi diagram based on a five component skeleton. By convention, internal trivalent vertices are oriented counterclockwise, and the ordering of components is obtained by concatenating the separate orderings of isotypical component subsets, with the oriented intervals preceding the oriented circles, which are succeeded by the colors.

The collection of all Jacobi diagrams based on a skeleton \mathbf{M} will be denoted by $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{M})$. Its subcollection consisting of diagrams having at least one external vertex in each connected component (called *boundary-connected diagrams*) will be denoted by $\mathcal{D}'(\mathbf{M})$. Both $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{M})$ and $\mathcal{D}'(\mathbf{M})$ are graded by half the number of vertices in a diagram.

2.2.2. Lie tensors. Let \mathfrak{g} be a finite-dimensional Lie algebra over a field k of characteristic zero. Let \mathbf{m} be a component of a skeleton \mathbf{M} . We assign to \mathbf{m} a \mathfrak{g} -space, denoted⁴ $T(\mathbf{m})$, which depends on the type of \mathbf{m} :

- (1) \mathbf{m} is an oriented interval: $T(\mathbf{m})$ is $T(\mathfrak{g})$, the tensor algebra over \mathfrak{g} . \mathfrak{g} acts on $T(\mathbf{m})$ via the adjoint representation.
- (2) \mathbf{m} is an oriented circle: $T(\mathbf{m}) = T(\mathfrak{g})_{\mathfrak{g}}$, where

$$T(\mathfrak{g})_{\mathfrak{g}} = T(\mathfrak{g}) / \text{span}\{xv - vx \mid x \in \mathfrak{g}, v \in T(\mathfrak{g})\}$$

⁴The Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} does not appear explicitly in the notation for the various tensor spaces, unless there is a risk of confusion.

is the space of coinvariants for the action of \mathfrak{g} on $T(\mathfrak{g})$. The action of \mathfrak{g} on $T(\mathfrak{g})_{\mathfrak{g}}$ is the zero action (inherited from the action of \mathfrak{g} on $T(\mathfrak{g})$).

- (3) \mathfrak{m} is a color: set $T(\mathfrak{m}) = S(\mathfrak{g})$, the symmetric algebra over \mathfrak{g} , with the corresponding adjoint action of \mathfrak{g} .

Remark 2.8. A short reminder about the symmetric algebra may be helpful here. Since we work in characteristic zero, there are two alternative definitions, or ‘models’, for the symmetric algebra: either as the *quotient* of $T(\mathfrak{g})$ by the two-sided ideal generated by $x \otimes y - y \otimes x$ ($x, y \in \mathfrak{g}$), or as the *subspace* of symmetric tensors in $T(\mathfrak{g})$, which is the direct sum of the images of the symmetrization operators

$$\text{sym}^k : T^k(\mathfrak{g}) \longrightarrow T^k(\mathfrak{g}), \quad \text{sym}^k(x_1 \cdots x_k) = \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\pi \in S_k} x_{\pi(1)} \cdots x_{\pi(k)},$$

acting on the homogeneous components of $T(\mathfrak{g})$. The adjoint action of \mathfrak{g} on $T(\mathfrak{g})$ leaves invariant the subspace model and descends to the quotient model. The linear isomorphism between these two models is the restriction to the subspace model of the natural projection from $T(\mathfrak{g})$ onto the quotient model. This isomorphism is a \mathfrak{g} -map (it intertwines the adjoint actions), and can be used to export the product structure from the quotient model to the subspace model. Another (equivalent) way to define the product in the subspace model is to multiply symmetric tensors as elements of $T(\mathfrak{g})$ and symmetrize the result. In the sequel we use the subspace model of $S(\mathfrak{g})$.

Definition 2.9. The tensor space $T(\mathbf{M})$ associated to the skeleton \mathbf{M} is the tensor product (over \mathbb{k})

$$T(\mathbf{M}) = \bigotimes_{\mathfrak{m} \in \mathbf{M}} T(\mathfrak{m}),$$

where the order of factors is the order of components of \mathbf{M} . Being the tensor product of \mathfrak{g} -spaces, $T(\mathbf{M})$ carries an action of \mathfrak{g} .

2.2.3. Mapping Jacobi diagrams into Lie tensors. Let V, W be finite-dimensional linear spaces over \mathbb{k} . We make below a frequent use of the identification between the spaces $\text{Hnd}(V, W)$ and $W \otimes V^*$, via the isomorphism

$$(h : V \longrightarrow W) \mapsto \sum_i h(v_i) \otimes v^i, \quad (2.3)$$

where $\{v_i\}$ is any basis of V , and $\{v^i\}$ is the dual basis of V^* .

We now assume that the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} is equipped with a *metric* — a \mathfrak{g} -invariant symmetric non-degenerate bilinear form t . (Prominent examples are semisimple Lie algebras with their Killing forms.) By (2.3) we may equivalently regard t either as a map $t : \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$, often denoted (\cdot, \cdot) , as a symmetric tensor $t \in \mathfrak{g}^* \otimes \mathfrak{g}^*$, or as a map $t : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*$. The non-degeneracy assumption implies that the last map is actually an isomorphism. The inverse isomorphism, $t^{-1} : \mathfrak{g}^* \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathfrak{g}$, may be identified with a tensor $t^{-1} \in \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathfrak{g}^{**} \cong \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathfrak{g}$, which is again symmetric.

The Lie bracket of \mathfrak{g} is a map $\tilde{s} : \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$, that is, a tensor $\tilde{s} \in \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathfrak{g}^* \otimes \mathfrak{g}^*$. Applying the map $1 \otimes t^{-1} \otimes t^{-1}$ to \tilde{s} yields a tensor $s \in \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathfrak{g}$. It is simple to check that the \mathfrak{g} -invariance of the metric t is equivalent to the tensor s being invariant under any *cyclic* permutation of its components.

We note that t, t^{-1} , and s are all \mathfrak{g} -invariant tensors.

It is useful to have formulas for the above tensors in terms of a basis $\{e_i\}$ of \mathfrak{g} . Let $\{f^i\}$ be the t -dual basis of \mathfrak{g} , so that for all $x \in \mathfrak{g}$, $x = (x, f^i)e_i$ (using the summation convention). We have

$$t^{-1} = e_i \otimes f^i = f^i \otimes e_i, \tag{2.4}$$


$$s = [e_i, e_j] \otimes f^i \otimes f^j. \tag{2.5}$$

Remark 2.10. The tensor t^{-1} is often called the *Casimir element* of \mathfrak{g} . We reserve this terminology for the closely related element of the universal enveloping algebra of \mathfrak{g} (see Example 2.17), and call t^{-1} the (inverse) metric tensor of \mathfrak{g} . We sometimes denote it by $\Omega_{\mathfrak{g}}$.

We assign graphical representations to t^{-1} and s . t^{-1} is represented by the *atomic bivalent graph*

$$e_i \text{---} f^i,$$

and s is represented by the *atomic trivalent graph*



The graph with the opposite orientation of the trivalent vertex represents the tensor $(-s)$.

Let D be a *Jacobi graph* — a graph having either univalent vertices or oriented trivalent vertices (basic example: the body of a Jacobi diagram based on some skeleton). We associate to D the tensor space

$$T(D) = \bigotimes_{\substack{\text{univalent vertices} \\ v \text{ of } D}} \mathfrak{g}.$$

$T(D)$ is a \mathfrak{g} -space, the \mathfrak{g} -action being the tensor power of the adjoint action of \mathfrak{g} on itself.

Construct a tensor $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}(D) \in T(D)$ by the following procedure:

- Separate the graph D into a union of bivalent and trivalent atomic graphs, by putting separation points on some of the arcs. (It is possible to put more than one separation point on a single arc.)




Figure 5. Separating a graph into atomic graphs.

- Attach to each atomic graph in the separation of D the tensor it represents, to get an intermediate tensor in

$$\bigotimes_{\substack{\text{atomic subgraphs } G \\ \text{making up } D}} T(G).$$


Note that this step is unambiguous due to the symmetry of t^{-1} and the cyclic invariance of s .

- For each separation point, use the metric to contract the two components of the intermediate tensor belonging to the pair of spaces standing at the two sides of the point. The resulting tensor is in $T(D)$; this is $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}(D)$.

Proposition 2.11. *Every Jacobi graph D can be separated into atomic subgraphs, and $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}(D)$ is independent of the separation used to compute it.*

Proof. To get one possible separation, put one separation point on each arc. In order to prove that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}(D)$ is independent of the separation, it is enough to check that:

- The tensor s' computed according to the separation



of the trivalent atomic graph is equal to s .

- The tensor corresponding to the separation



is equal to t^{-1} .

Indeed, s' is the contraction of the second component of $[e_i, e_j] \otimes f^i \otimes f^j$ with the first component of $e_k \otimes f^k$, yielding

$$(f^i, e_k)[e_i, e_j] \otimes f^k \otimes f^j = s,$$

since $(f^i, e_k)f^k = f^i$. The second assertion is easier. \square

Since all the building blocks of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}(D)$ are \mathfrak{g} -invariant and contractions are \mathfrak{g} -maps, we have:

Proposition 2.12. *The tensors $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}(D)$ are \mathfrak{g} -invariant.*

Exercise 2.13. Show that for the graph D in Figure 5,

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}(D) = [[e_i, e_j], e_k] \otimes [f^i, [f^j, f^k]].$$

We apply the preceding construction to Jacobi diagrams. Let \mathbf{M} be a skeleton and D be a diagram in $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{M})$. We also denote its body by D . There is a natural \mathfrak{g} -map $T(D) \rightarrow T(\mathbf{M})$, obtained by:

- Mapping the tensor product of \mathfrak{g} 's along an oriented interval into $T(\mathfrak{g})$. (The order of the factors in the tensor product is from the first vertex to the last vertex, according to the order dictated by the orientation of the interval.)
- For an oriented circle, fixing arbitrarily a starting vertex, mapping into $T(\mathfrak{g})$ as for an oriented interval, and projecting to $T(\mathfrak{g})_{\mathfrak{g}}$.

- For a color, taking an arbitrary ordering of the vertices of this color, mapping into $T(\mathfrak{g})$, and symmetrizing to get a tensor in $S(\mathfrak{g})$.

The resulting map is independent of the arbitrary choices that have been made. The composition

$$D \xrightarrow{\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}} T(D) \longrightarrow T(M)$$

yields a \mathbb{k} -linear map $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}} : \text{span}_{\mathbb{k}}(\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{M})) \rightarrow T(\mathbf{M})$.

2.2.4. Algebraic and diagrammatic Lie relations. Let \mathbf{M} be a skeleton. We form the \mathfrak{g} -space $L_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbf{M})$ (usually denoted $L(\mathbf{M})$), which is constructed like $T(\mathbf{M})$ by dealing with each component \mathbf{m} of \mathbf{M} separately:

- (1) \mathbf{m} is an oriented interval: $L(\mathbf{m})$ is $U(\mathfrak{g})$, the universal enveloping algebra of \mathfrak{g} .
- (2) \mathbf{m} is an oriented circle: $L(\mathbf{m}) = U(\mathfrak{g})_{\mathfrak{g}}$, where

$$U(\mathfrak{g})_{\mathfrak{g}} = U(\mathfrak{g}) / \text{span}\{xv - vx \mid x \in \mathfrak{g}, v \in U(\mathfrak{g})\}$$

is the space of coinvariants for the adjoint action of \mathfrak{g} on $U(\mathfrak{g})$.

- (3) \mathbf{m} is a color: $L(\mathbf{m}) = S(\mathfrak{g})$ (no change).

\mathfrak{g} acts on the each space $L(\mathbf{m})$ by the appropriate adjoint actions, hence also on

$$L(\mathbf{M}) = \bigotimes_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{M}} L(\mathbf{m}).$$

The projection from $T(\mathbf{M})$ to $L(\mathbf{M})$ reflects modding out by the relations that make \mathfrak{g} into a Lie algebra, rather than just a vector space with a product. We next describe the analogous relations for Jacobi diagrams.

Consider the subspace of $\text{span}_{\mathbb{k}}(\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{M}))$ which is spanned by the following relations⁵:

- (1) Antisymmetry of internal vertices:

- (2) IHX relations:

- (3) STU relations:

(The bold line is part of a 1-dimensional component of \mathbf{M} .)

Definition 2.14. $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M})$ is the quotient space

$$\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}) = \text{span}_{\mathbb{k}}(\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{M})) / \{\text{AS, IHX, and STU relations}\}.$$

$\mathcal{A}'(\mathbf{M})$ is defined similarly as a quotient of $\text{span}_{\mathbb{k}}(\mathcal{D}'(\mathbf{M}))$.

⁵As for the 4T relations, all the diagrams in a relation share an identical part which is not shown in the figure.

Since all the relations are homogeneous (the diagrams appearing in a relation have the same number of vertices), $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M})$ and $\mathcal{A}'(\mathbf{M})$ are graded vector spaces. We usually work with their graded completions (with no change of notation).

Remark 2.15. The spaces $\mathcal{A}'(\uparrow)$ (\uparrow is a single oriented interval skeleton) and $\mathcal{A}'(*)$ ($*$ is a single color) are the \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} spaces of [BN1], respectively. We will reserve the symbols \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} for $\mathcal{A}(\uparrow)$ and $\mathcal{A}(*)$, respectively.

The following proposition (compare [BN1, Proposition 2.11]) gives a precise meaning to the intuitive analogy between the diagrammatic relations and the algebraic ones.

Proposition 2.16. *The map $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}} : \text{span}_{\mathbb{k}}(\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{M})) \rightarrow T(\mathbf{M})$ descends to a map $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}} : \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}) \rightarrow L(\mathbf{M})$. The image of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ lies in $L(\mathbf{M})^{\mathfrak{g}}$, the space of \mathfrak{g} -invariant tensors in $L(\mathbf{M})$.*

Proof. We prove that each IHX relation is mapped to zero by $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}$. Each diagram in the relation has an 'internal' part (I, H, or X), and an 'external' part, which is the same for all the participating diagrams. By construction, $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ of such a diagram can be computed by computing first the tensor corresponding to the internal part (call it T_I , T_H , or T_X) and the one corresponding to the external part (call it T_E), and then contracting these two tensors and mapping the resulting tensor to $L(\mathbf{M})$. Clearly, the operation of contraction against T_E followed by mapping to $L(\mathbf{M})$ is linear. Thus, we need only to show that the signed sum of tensors computed for the internal parts, $T_I - T_H + T_X$, is zero.

We draw the internal parts of an IHX relation in a slightly different way than before, separate each graph into two trivalent atomic graphs, and number the univalent vertices and the separation point:

$$\begin{array}{c} 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \quad 5 \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \quad 4 \end{array} - \begin{array}{c} 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \quad 5 \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \quad 4 \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \quad 5 \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \quad 4 \end{array} = 0.$$

We denote by \mathfrak{g}_i the copy of \mathfrak{g} standing at the i th position. The I-graph is mapped to the contraction at \mathfrak{g}_5 of the tensors

$$f^i \otimes f^j \otimes [e_i, e_j] \in \mathfrak{g}_1 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_2 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_5, \quad f^k \otimes f^l \otimes [e_k, e_l] \in \mathfrak{g}_5 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_3 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_4,$$

which is equal to

$$f^i \otimes f^j \otimes f^l \otimes [[e_i, e_j], e_l] \in \mathfrak{g}_1 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_2 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_3 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_4.$$

This is the tensor in $\mathfrak{g}^{\otimes 4}$ representing the map $(x, y, z) \in \mathfrak{g}^{\otimes 3} \mapsto [[x, y], z]$ (more precisely, the tensor represents the composition of this map with the map $(t^{-1})^{\otimes 3} : (\mathfrak{g}^*)^{\otimes 3} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^{\otimes 3}$.) In the same fashion, the H-graph corresponds to the iterated bracket $[x, [y, z]]$ and the X-graph corresponds to $[y, [x, z]]$. Therefore, the signed sum of the IHX relation is zero by the Jacobi identity in \mathfrak{g} .

Similarly, an STU relation is mapped to zero by $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ because of the defining identity of the universal enveloping algebra, $[x, y] = xy - yx$, and an AS relation is mapped to zero because of the antisymmetry of the bracket.

The second assertion of the proposition follows directly from Proposition 2.12. \square

Example 2.17. The diagram

$$C = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \curvearrowright \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \in \mathcal{A}(\uparrow)$$

is mapped by $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ to the *Casimir element* $C_{\mathfrak{g}} = \sum_i e_i f^i \in U(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}}$, while the diagram

$$\Omega = \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \text{---} \\ \uparrow \end{array} \in \mathcal{A}(\uparrow_1, \uparrow_2)$$

is mapped to the (inverse) metric tensor $\Omega_{\mathfrak{g}} \in (\mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}} \subset (U(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes U(\mathfrak{g}))^{\mathfrak{g}}$ (see Remark 2.10). We call C and Ω the diagrammatic Casimir element and the diagrammatic metric tensor, respectively.

Remark 2.18. The construction of the maps $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ can be extended with no change to the case when \mathfrak{g} is a *Lie superalgebra*.

2.3. Maps between \mathcal{A} -spaces. We discuss several maps between \mathcal{A} -spaces.

2.3.1. From chord diagrams to Jacobi diagrams. Let \mathbf{M} be a 1-dimensional skeleton. The obvious inclusion $\mathcal{D}^c(\mathbf{M}) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{M})$ descends to a map $\phi^c : \mathcal{A}^c(\mathbf{M}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}'(\mathbf{M})$, because a 4T relation is seen to be equal to zero in $\mathcal{A}'(\mathbf{M})$ by two applications of STU relations:

Proposition 2.19. *The map $\phi^c : \mathcal{A}^c(\mathbf{M}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}'(\mathbf{M})$ is an isomorphism.*

This is a slight generalization of [BN1, Theorem 6], where the case $\mathbf{M} = \bigcirc$ is proved.

2.3.2. Circling an interval. The map $\mathcal{D}(\uparrow) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\bigcirc)$, defined by closing the interval to form a circle, clearly descends to a map $\phi^l : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(\bigcirc)$.

Proposition 2.20. *The map ϕ^l is an isomorphism.*

We sketch the proof, following [BN1, Lemma 3.1]. We need to show that the leftmost leg of a diagram in $\mathcal{A}(\uparrow)$ can be moved to the right without changing the diagram modulo the AS, IHX, and STU relations:

Once this is known, it is immediate that the map $\mathcal{D}(\bigcirc) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\uparrow)$ defined by ‘opening the circle at some point where no leg ends’ descends to a well-defined map $\mathcal{A}(\bigcirc) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(\uparrow)$ (independent of the opening point), which is an inverse of ϕ^l .

To prove (2.6), attach three right turning hooks near each of the vertices except the leftmost vertex. Assign minus signs to hooks that are to the right of skeleton vertices. Disconnect the leftmost leg and consider the sum of diagrams obtained by connecting this leg to one of the hooks (taking the diagram with minus sign if the corresponding hook was assigned a minus sign). The terms in this sum can be grouped by arcs or by vertices. Grouping by arcs yields, using the sign choice and AS relations, the left hand side of (2.6). Grouping by vertices, the sum in each group is seen to be zero (using IHX relations at internal vertices, and STU relations at skeleton vertices), thus proving our claim.

Remark 2.21. The same argument shows that if $\mathbf{M} = \uparrow \cup X$ and $\widetilde{\mathbf{M}} = \circ \cup X$, where X consists of circle components, then $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}) \cong \mathcal{A}(\widetilde{\mathbf{M}})$. The situation when \mathbf{M} has more than one interval component is more complicated; see [T, Section 3.3] for details.

2.3.3. The PBW isomorphism. The PBW map $\chi : S(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{g})$ is the restriction to $S(\mathfrak{g})$ of the natural projection of $T(\mathfrak{g})$ on $U(\mathfrak{g})$ (recall that we use the subspace model of $S(\mathfrak{g})$). The PBW theorem asserts that χ is a vector space isomorphism. Since χ is a \mathfrak{g} -map, it also induces an isomorphism $\chi : S(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}} \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}}$.

We now construct the diagrammatic analogue of this map. For a diagram $D \in \mathcal{B}$ having k legs ending in vertices v_1, \dots, v_k , we put

$$\chi(D) = \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\substack{\text{orderings } \pi \\ \text{of } v_1, \dots, v_k}} \pi D, \quad (2.7)$$

where $\pi D \in \mathcal{A}$ is the diagram obtained from D by arranging the vertices v_1, \dots, v_k along the skeleton interval according to π . For example,

$$\chi \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{diagram with 3 legs} \end{array} \right) = \frac{1}{6} \left(\begin{array}{ccc} \text{diagram 1} & + & \text{diagram 2} & + & \text{diagram 3} \\ \text{diagram 4} & + & \text{diagram 5} & + & \text{diagram 6} \end{array} \right).$$

It is easy to check that $\chi : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is well-defined. The analogy between the Lie algebraic and diagrammatic maps is made precise by fitting them into a commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{B} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}} & S(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}} \\ \chi \downarrow & & \downarrow \chi \\ \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}} & U(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}}. \end{array}$$

The analogy carries over to the isomorphism assertion.

Proposition 2.22. *The map $\chi : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is an isomorphism.*

For later use, we review in detail the proof of this theorem, following [BN1, Section 5] with some small changes. We begin by introducing filtrations

$$\mathcal{D}_k(\mathbf{M}) = \text{span}_k \{ D \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{M}) : D \text{ has at most } k \text{ legs} \}$$

of the spaces $\text{span}_k \{ \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{M}) \}$, for any skeleton \mathbf{M} (we need $M = \uparrow$ and $\mathbf{M} = *$ in this proof). Let \mathcal{I}_k be the subspace of $\mathcal{D}_k(\uparrow)$ which is spanned by AS, IHX, and STU relations in which all the participating diagrams have at most k legs. The quotient spaces $\mathcal{A}_k = \mathcal{D}_k(\uparrow) / \mathcal{I}_k$ are naturally injected into \mathcal{A} and form a filtration of \mathcal{A} .

The plan of the proof is to construct a sequence of compatible maps $\sigma_k : \mathcal{D}_k(\uparrow) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ satisfying:

- ($\Sigma 1$) $\sigma_k(\chi(C)) = C$ for $C \in \mathcal{D}_k(*)$.
- ($\Sigma 2$) $\sigma_k(\mathcal{I}_k) = 0$.
- ($\Sigma 3$) $\chi(\sigma_k(D)) - D \in \mathcal{I}_k$ for $D \in \mathcal{D}_k(\uparrow)$.

Fix $D \in \mathcal{D}_k(\uparrow)$ and define a map $\Gamma_D : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{k-1}(\uparrow)$ by

$$\Gamma_D(u_{i_1} \cdots u_{i_q}) = \sum_{p=1}^q s_{i_p} u_{i_{p+1}} \cdots u_{i_q} D. \quad (2.13)$$

Using (2.12) in (2.13) we get a telescopic series

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_D(u_{i_1} \cdots u_{i_q}) &= \sum_{p=1}^q (u_{i_{p+1}} \cdots u_{i_q} D - u_{i_p} u_{i_{p+1}} \cdots u_{i_q} D) \bmod \mathcal{I}_k \\ &= D - u_{i_1} \cdots u_{i_q} D. \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

Moding out the range of Γ_D by \mathcal{I}_{k-1} and extending by linearity from \mathcal{M} to $\mathbb{Z}[\mathcal{M}]$, we henceforth view Γ_D as a map

$$\Gamma_D : \mathbb{Z}[\mathcal{M}] \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{k-1}.$$

We observe that Γ_D vanishes on the generators of \mathcal{K} . For example,

$$\Gamma_D(u_i u_j - u_j u_i) = s_i u_j D + s_j D - s_j u_i D - s_i D$$

$$= \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 1} \\ \text{Diagram 2} \\ \text{Diagram 3} \\ \text{Diagram 4} \end{array} \quad (2.15)$$

The diagram shows four terms representing the expansion of $\Gamma_D(u_i u_j - u_j u_i)$. Each term consists of a shaded oval labeled D at the top, with four vertical lines extending downwards. The first and third diagrams have the lines crossing each other, while the second and fourth diagrams have the lines parallel. The terms are separated by plus and minus signs.

Apply twice STU relations from \mathcal{I}_{k-1} , once on the first and fourth diagrams and once on the two middle diagrams, to get

$$\Gamma_D(u_i u_j - u_j u_i) = \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 1} \\ \text{Diagram 2} \end{array} = 0.$$

The diagram shows two terms representing the result of applying STU relations. Each term consists of a shaded oval labeled D at the top, with four vertical lines extending downwards. The first diagram has the lines crossing, and the second diagram has the lines parallel. The terms are separated by a minus sign.

Similarly, $\Gamma_D(u_i^2 - e) = 0$ by applying an AS relation and $\Gamma_D(u_i u_{i-1} u_i - u_{i-1} u_i u_{i-1}) = 0$ by a combination of STU and IHX relations. Together with the ‘cocycle property’ of Γ_D ,

$$\Gamma_D(w_1 w_2) = \Gamma_{w_2 D}(w_1) + \Gamma_D(w_2), \quad w_1, w_2 \in \mathcal{M}, \quad (2.16)$$

which is easily derived from (2.13), it follows that Γ_D vanishes on any element of \mathcal{K} , hence it descends to a well-defined map $\Gamma_D : \mathbb{Z}[S_k] \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{k-1}$. This means that we can unambiguously compute $\Gamma_D(\pi)$ for $\pi \in S_k$ by choosing any presentation of π as a product of transpositions and using (2.13). We can now write (2.14) in the form

$$i(\Gamma_D(\pi)) = (D - \pi D) \bmod \mathcal{I}_k, \quad D \in \mathcal{D}_k(\uparrow), \quad (2.17)$$

where $i : \mathcal{A}_{k-1} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_k$ is the natural injection.

As a last preparation for the definition of σ_k , we put, for $D \in \mathcal{D}_k(\uparrow)$,

$$\Lambda_D = \sigma_{k-1} \circ \Gamma_D : S_k \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}. \quad (2.18)$$

Note that Λ_D is well-defined as $\sigma_{k-1}(\mathcal{I}_{k-1}) = 0$ by $\Sigma 2$. By (2.16),

$$\Lambda_D(\rho\pi) = \Lambda_{\pi D}(\rho) + \Lambda_D(\pi), \quad \rho, \pi \in S_k. \quad (2.19)$$

Given a diagram $D \in \mathcal{D}_k(\uparrow)$ having precisely k legs, let $D^* \in \mathcal{D}(\ast)$ be the diagram obtained by removing the interval skeleton of D and coloring the detached legs with \ast . Set

$$\sigma_k(D) = D^* + \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\pi \in S_k} \Lambda_D(\pi).$$

If $D \in \mathcal{D}_k(\uparrow)$ has less than k legs, then we simply set $\sigma_k(D) = \sigma_{k-1}(D)$. We next check that σ_k has the desired properties.

Proof of $\Sigma 1$: For $C \in \mathcal{D}_k(\ast)$ with k legs, write $C = D^*$ for some $D \in \mathcal{D}_k(\uparrow)$ (by picking an arbitrary ordering of the legs along an added skeleton interval). Clearly, $\chi(C) = \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\pi \in S_k} \pi D$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_k(\chi(C)) &= \frac{1}{k!} \sigma_k \left(\sum_{\pi \in S_k} \pi D \right) = \frac{1}{k!} \left(\sum_{\pi \in S_k} (\pi D)^* + \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\pi, \rho \in S_k} \Lambda_{\pi D}(\rho) \right) \\ &= D^* + \frac{1}{(k!)^2} \sum_{\pi, \rho \in S_k} (\Lambda_D(\rho\pi) - \Lambda_D(\pi)) \quad \text{by (2.19)} \\ &= C + \frac{1}{k!} \left(\sum_{\lambda \in S_k} \Lambda_D(\lambda) - \sum_{\pi \in S_k} \Lambda_D(\pi) \right) = C. \end{aligned}$$

The case when C has less than k legs follows from $\Sigma 1$ for σ_{k-1} .

Proof of $\Sigma 2$: That $\sigma_k(\text{AS}) = 0$ and $\sigma_k(\text{IHX}) = 0$ essentially follows from the fact that the definitions of Γ_D and the $D \mapsto D^*$ operation do not touch the internal vertices of D . To prove that $\sigma_k(\text{STU}) = 0$, it is enough to show that $\sigma_k(s_i D) = \sigma_k(D - u_i D)$, for a diagram $D \in \mathcal{D}_k(\uparrow)$ having k legs. We compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_k(D) - \sigma_k(u_i D) &= D^* - (u_i D)^* + \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\pi \in S_k} (\Lambda_D(\pi) - \Lambda_{u_i D}(\pi)) \\ &= \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\pi \in S_k} (\Lambda_D(\pi) - \Lambda_D(\pi u_i) + \Lambda_D(u_i)) \\ &= \Lambda_D(u_i) = \sigma_{k-1}(\Gamma_D(u_i)) = \sigma_k(s_i D), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality used (2.19) and the last equality used (2.13).

Proof of $\Sigma 3$: Working modulo \mathcal{I}_k we have, for a diagram $\mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{D}_k(\uparrow)$ with k legs,

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(\sigma_k(D)) &= \chi \left(D^* + \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\pi \in S_k} \Lambda_D(\pi) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\pi \in S_k} \pi D + \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\pi \in S_k} \chi(\sigma_{k-1}(\Gamma_D(\pi))) \quad \text{by (2.18)} \\ &= \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\pi \in S_k} (\pi D + \Gamma_D(\pi)) \quad \text{by } \Sigma 3 \text{ for } \sigma_{k-1} \\ &= \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\pi \in S_k} (\pi D + D - \pi D) = D \quad \text{by (2.17),} \end{aligned}$$

as required. This completes our review of the proof of Proposition 2.22.

Remark 2.23. There is no difficulty in extending the definition of \mathcal{X} to get a map from the space $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M})$ based on a skeleton $\mathbf{M} = * \cup X$, to the space $\mathcal{A}(\widetilde{\mathbf{M}})$, where $\widetilde{\mathbf{M}} = \uparrow \cup X$ (a color component is replaced by an oriented interval). The same proof works to show that this map is an isomorphism.

2.4. Algebraic structures on \mathcal{A} .

2.4.1. The Hopf algebra structure of $U(\mathfrak{g})$. Recall that $U(\mathfrak{g})$ has the structure of a Hopf algebra. The ingredients of this structure are:

- (1) An associative product $\mu : U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes 2} \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{g})$ with a unit. The unit is considered as a linear map $\eta : \mathbb{k} \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{g})$ sending $1 \in \mathbb{k}$ to $1 \in U(\mathfrak{g})$.
- (2) A coassociative coproduct $\Delta : U(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes 2}$, defined by declaring elements of \mathfrak{g} to be primitive ($\Delta(x) = 1 \otimes x + x \otimes 1, x \in \mathfrak{g}$), with a counit $\epsilon : U(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$, determined by $\epsilon(1) = 1, \epsilon(x) = 0$ for $x \in \mathfrak{g}$. The coproduct and counit are morphisms of the algebra structure.
- (3) The antipode map $S : U(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{g})$, defined by

$$S(x_1 \cdots x_n) = (-1)^n x_n \cdots x_1, \quad x_1 \cdots x_n \in U(\mathfrak{g}).$$

It satisfies the identities

$$\mu(S \otimes \text{id})\Delta(x) = \eta\epsilon(x) = \mu(\text{id} \otimes S)\Delta(x), \quad x \in U(\mathfrak{g}), \quad (2.20)$$

where id is the identity map.

All the Hopf algebra axioms satisfied by these maps can be described by commutative diagrams of maps between tensor powers of $U(\mathfrak{g})$. For example, the fact that the coproduct is an algebra morphism is described by the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} U(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes U(\mathfrak{g}) & \xrightarrow{\Delta \otimes \Delta} & (U(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes U(\mathfrak{g})) \otimes (U(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes U(\mathfrak{g})) \\ \mu \downarrow & & \downarrow (\mu \otimes \mu)(\text{id} \otimes \tau \otimes \text{id}) \\ U(\mathfrak{g}) & \xrightarrow{\Delta} & U(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes U(\mathfrak{g}) \end{array}, \quad (2.21)$$

where $\tau : U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes 2} \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes 2}$ is the flip morphism, $\tau(x \otimes y) = y \otimes x$.

2.4.2. Diagrammatic operations on \mathcal{A} -spaces. Our aim is to define the analogous structure on \mathcal{A} . This structure, it turns out, does not make \mathcal{A} into a Hopf algebra in the usual algebraic sense⁶. The first step is to define a suitable notion of tensor powers of \mathcal{A} . Then we define diagrammatic maps between these tensor powers, which satisfy the Hopf algebra axioms in the sense that there exist commutative diagrams like (2.21).

Definition 2.24. Let $\mathbf{M}_1, \mathbf{M}_2$ be two skeletons. The *diagrammatic tensor product* of $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}_1)$ and $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}_2)$ is defined as $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}_1 \cup \mathbf{M}_2)$ (disjoint union, in which the ordering of components is the concatenation of the separate orderings). It is denoted by $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}_1) \boxtimes \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}_2)$.

There are associativity isomorphisms

$$(\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}_1) \boxtimes \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}_2)) \boxtimes \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}_3) \cong \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}_1) \boxtimes (\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}_2) \boxtimes \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}_3)),$$

inherited from the identifications $(\mathbf{M}_1 \cup \mathbf{M}_2) \cup \mathbf{M}_3 = \mathbf{M}_1 \cup (\mathbf{M}_2 \cup \mathbf{M}_3)$. Thus, we can define unambiguously the diagrammatic tensor products of several \mathcal{A} -spaces. In particular, the

⁶Thus, it should not be confused with the structure defined and discussed in [BN1, Section 3].

diagrammatic tensor powers $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M})^{\boxtimes n}$ are well-defined. These diagrammatic tensor powers are mapped by $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ into (the \mathfrak{g} -invariant part of) the algebraic tensor powers $L(\mathbf{M})^{\otimes n}$. The space $\mathcal{A}(\emptyset)$ plays for diagrammatic tensor products the role of the base field \mathbb{k} in algebraic tensor products: $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}) \boxtimes \mathcal{A}(\emptyset) \cong \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M})$ for any skeleton \mathbf{M} .

We now define several general diagrammatic operations. Instances of these operations provide the Hopf algebra maps for \mathcal{A} .

Definition 2.25. Assume \mathbf{M} is a skeleton and $\mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_2$ are two components of \mathbf{M} , which are either both oriented intervals or both colors. The *juxtaposition* map

$$\mu_{\mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_2} : \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M} - \{\mathbf{m}_2\})$$

is defined by gluing the two components, with \mathbf{m}_1 before \mathbf{m}_2 (see Figure 6).




Figure 6. Gluing oriented intervals ($\mu_{\uparrow_1, \uparrow_2}$) and gluing colors ($\mu_{*1, *2}$).

In particular, we get a map $\mu : \mathcal{A}^{\boxtimes 2} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$:

$$\mu = \mu_{\uparrow_1, \uparrow_2} : \mathcal{A}(\uparrow_1, \uparrow_2) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(\uparrow_1).$$

The unit morphism $\eta : \mathcal{A}(\emptyset) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is the linear map sending a trivalent diagram to itself. The maps ν and η make \mathcal{A} into an 'associative algebra with a unit'. For example, associativity of \mathcal{A} is expressed by the commutativity of the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{A}(\uparrow_1, \uparrow_2, \uparrow_3) & \xrightarrow{\mu_{\uparrow_2, \uparrow_3}} & \mathcal{A}(\uparrow_1, \uparrow_2) \\ \mu_{\uparrow_1, \uparrow_2} \downarrow & & \downarrow \mu_{\uparrow_2, \uparrow_3} \\ \mathcal{A}(\uparrow_1, \uparrow_3) & \xrightarrow{\mu_{\uparrow_1, \uparrow_3}} & \mathcal{A}(\uparrow_1) = \mathcal{A}(\uparrow_2) \end{array}, \quad (2.22)$$

which holds already at the level of diagrams without relations: gluing the skeleton components in any of the two orders results in the same Jacobi diagram.

It is a simple observation that the product μ of \mathcal{A} is indeed mediated by the maps $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ to the product of $U(\mathfrak{g})$, so that the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{A} \boxtimes \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}} & U(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes U(\mathfrak{g}) \\ \mu \downarrow & & \downarrow \mu \\ \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}} & U(\mathfrak{g}) \end{array}$$

is commutative, and similarly for the unit maps.

Definition 2.26. Assume \mathbf{M} is a skeleton and \mathbf{m} is any component of \mathbf{M} . Denote by $\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}$ the skeleton obtained from \mathbf{M} by adding a skeleton component $\widetilde{\mathbf{m}}$ of the same type. (The ordering of $\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}$ is such that $\widetilde{\mathbf{m}}$ is inserted immediately after \mathbf{m} .)

The *cabling along \mathbf{m}* ,

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{m}} : \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}(\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}),$$

is defined by summing all the possible ways of splitting the legs ending on \mathbf{m} between \mathbf{m} and $\widetilde{\mathbf{m}}$.

A proof that the map $\Delta_{\mathbf{m}}$, which is initially defined on Jacobi diagrams, does descend to $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M})$ is demonstrated in Figure 7, when \mathbf{m} is 1-dimensional. (There is no problem with the

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \right) - \Delta \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \right) &= \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \\ - \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} - \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} - \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} - \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \end{array} \\ &= \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} - \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} - \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} = \Delta \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \right) \end{array}$$

Figure 7. Cabling respects the STU relations.

AS and IHX relations, which pertain to internal vertices. In particular, the case when \mathbf{m} is a color is trivial.)

Definition 2.27. For \mathbf{m} a component of a skeleton \mathbf{M} , the *component removal map*

$$\epsilon_{\mathbf{m}} : \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M} - \{\mathbf{m}\})$$

sends to zero any diagram having at least one external vertex on the component \mathbf{m} , and leaves unchanged diagrams not touching \mathbf{m} , except for the removal of \mathbf{m} .

$(\{1\} \cup I, I)$, where I is a subset of $\{2, \dots, k\}$, so that

$$\Delta(D) = \sum_I \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 1} \\ \text{Diagram 2} \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 3} \\ \text{Diagram 4} \end{array} \right).$$

Now our claim follows, as

$$\mu(S \boxtimes \text{id}) \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 1} \\ \text{Diagram 2} \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 3} \\ \text{Diagram 4} \end{array} \right) = (-1)^{|I|+1} \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 5} \\ \text{Diagram 6} \end{array} + (-1)^{|I|} \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 7} \\ \text{Diagram 8} \end{array} = 0.$$

We have proved most of

Proposition 2.29. $(\mathcal{A}, \mu, \eta, \Delta, \epsilon, S)$ is a (diagrammatic) Hopf algebra. For any metrized Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} , the map $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{g})$ is a morphism of Hopf algebras. Moreover, \mathcal{A} is commutative and cocommutative.

Proof. Let $\tau : \mathcal{A}^{\boxtimes 2} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{\boxtimes 2}$ be the flip morphism, which acts by interchanging the two skeleton intervals. The commutativity assertion means that $\mu\tau = \mu$. This follows from the argument in the proof of Proposition 2.20: given $D \in \mathcal{A}(\uparrow_1, \uparrow_2)$, the legs of $\mu(D)$ which originally ended on \uparrow_1 can be moved to the right of the legs from \uparrow_2 , without changing $\mu(D)$ modulo the relations of \mathcal{A} . In this process the ordering of the legs from \uparrow_1 along the interval is preserved, hence the resulting diagram is precisely $\mu\tau(D)$. The cocommutativity of \mathcal{A} is obvious. \square

Remark 2.30. Our algebro-diagrammatic terminology may be given a precise formal meaning using the notion of algebraic structures in a \mathbb{k} -linear tensor category. This notion is fairly clear: to define some sort of a structure on an object of the category (associative algebra object, Lie algebra object, Hopf algebra object, etc.), express the usual axioms for this structure as commutative diagrams of linear maps in the category $\text{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ of vector spaces over \mathbb{k} . These commutative diagrams make perfect sense in any k -linear tensor category. (See [EK2] for more categorical details.)

An appropriate category for the diagrammatic structures on \mathcal{A} has as its objects the spaces $\{\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}) : \mathbf{M} \text{ is a skeleton}\}$. A morphism from $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}_1)$ to $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}_2)$ is a family $\{F_{k_1, k_2, \dots}\}$ of elements of $\text{span}_{\mathbb{k}}\{\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{M}_1 \cup \mathbf{M}_2)\}$ indexed by tuples of non-negative integers, one for each component of \mathbf{M}_1 . $F_{k_1, k_2, \dots}$ is required to be a sum of diagrams having k_i legs on the i th component of \mathbf{M}_1 . The morphism maps a Jacobi diagram $\mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{M}_1)$ with k_i legs ending on the i th component of \mathbf{M}_1 to the image in $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}_2)$ of the sum of diagrams obtained by glueing $\{F_{k_1, k_2, \dots}\}$ to \mathcal{D} along \mathbf{M}_1 .

Glueing is different for each type of skeleton component of \mathbf{M}_1 . For an oriented interval component it is defined as in (2.9). for the case of an oriented circle, see Figure 8. Glueing along a color component $*$ is done by summing over all ways of connecting the $*$ -colored legs of \mathcal{D} to the $*$ -colored legs of the glued diagrams (see [BGRT, Definition 1.1]).

The resulting map from $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{M}_1)$ to $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}_2)$ is required to descend to $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}_1)$, which amounts to respecting the STU relations for 1-dimensional components. A typical example of such a morphism is the family $\{\sigma_k\}$ constructed in the proof of Proposition 2.22.




Figure 8. Glueing diagrams along an oriented circle.

Given two such morphisms, say $F : \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}_2)$ and $G : \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}'_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}'_2)$, it is clear how to define their diagrammatic tensor product $F \boxtimes G : \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}_1) \boxtimes \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}'_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}_2) \boxtimes \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}'_2)$, by applying F along \mathbf{M}_1 and G along \mathbf{M}'_1 .

We will not pursue this categorical approach. Nevertheless, we will freely use algebraic terminology in connection with the diagrammatic objects and maps defined above and in the sequel.

Exercise 2.31. Find a family of elements of $\mathcal{D}(\uparrow_1, \uparrow_2)$ which gives rise to the antipode $S : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$.

Remark 2.32. The first part of the previous remark applies in a purely algebraic context: $U(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}}$ is not a Hopf algebra with respect to the usual tensor product (because the coproduct does not map $U(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}}$ into $U(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}} \otimes U(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}}$). However, it is a Hopf algebra object in the category whose objects are $(U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes n})^{\mathfrak{g}}$. With this observation in mind, we see that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}}$ is a morphism of Hopf algebra objects.

Having stressed that \mathcal{A} is a diagrammatic Hopf algebra, it is nevertheless useful to note that the diagrammatic product also makes \mathcal{A} into an algebra in the usual sense (that is, an algebra object in $\text{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$)⁷ as follows. Starting with the map $\mathcal{D}(\uparrow_1) \times \mathcal{D}(\uparrow_2) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\uparrow_1, \uparrow_2)$ sending a pair of diagrams to a ‘disconnected diagram’ as in Figure 9, we obtain a map $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \boxtimes \mathcal{A}$. This map is injective, essentially because all the name-giving parts of diagrams participating in \mathcal{A} -relations are connected.




Figure 9. An element of $\mathcal{A} \boxtimes \mathcal{A}$ coming from $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}$.

The composition

$$\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A} \boxtimes \mathcal{A} \xrightarrow{\mu} \mathcal{A} \tag{2.26}$$

⁷This is not true for the diagrammatic coproduct; see [BN1, Definition 3.7] for the definition of a $\text{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ -coproduct $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}$.

endows \mathcal{A} with an algebra structure.

Similarly, $\mathcal{A}^{\boxtimes n}$ is a $\text{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ -algebra whose product is ‘juxtaposition along the n skeleton components’; more precisely, it is the composition of maps

$$\mathcal{A}(\uparrow_1, \dots, \uparrow_n) \otimes \mathcal{A}(\uparrow_{n+1}, \dots, \uparrow_{2n}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}(\uparrow_1, \dots, \uparrow_{2n}) \xrightarrow{\mu_{\uparrow_n, \uparrow_{2n}} \circ \dots \circ \mu_{\uparrow_1, \uparrow_{n+1}}} \mathcal{A}^{\boxtimes n}.$$

We denote by $D_1 D_2$ the product of $D_1, D_2 \in \mathcal{A}^{\boxtimes n}$, and by $[D_1, D_2]$ their commutator.

Define the iterated coproduct map $\Delta^{(n)} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{\boxtimes n}$ ($n \geq 1$) as the composition

$$\mathcal{A}(\uparrow_1) \xrightarrow{\Delta_{\uparrow_1}} \mathcal{A}(\uparrow_1, \uparrow_2) \xrightarrow{\Delta_{\uparrow_2}} \dots \xrightarrow{\Delta_{\uparrow_{n-1}}} \mathcal{A}(\uparrow_1, \dots, \uparrow_n). \quad (2.27)$$

We have the following commutativity result.


Proposition 2.33. *For all $D \in \mathcal{A}$ and $E \in \mathcal{A}^{\boxtimes n}$,*

$$[\Delta^{(n)}(D), E] = 0.$$

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Proposition 2.20 (which is closely related to the case $n = 1$, where $\Delta^{(1)} = \text{id}$). It is sufficient to give the proof for $n = 2$. Assume D is represented by a diagram having k legs. Write

$$\Delta(D)E = \sum_{I \subset \{1, \dots, k-1\}} \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 1} \\ + \\ \text{Diagram 2} \end{array} \right).$$

We attach three right-turning hooks around each vertex of E (with minus signs on hooks to the right of skeleton vertices), and form the sum of all the diagrams obtained by connecting the free leg of



to one of the hooks. Grouping the summands by vertices shows that the sum is zero (in $\mathcal{A}^{\boxtimes 2}$), and then regrouping by arcs shows that $\Delta(D)E$ is equal to

$$\sum_{I \subset \{1, \dots, k-1\}} \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 3} \\ + \\ \text{Diagram 4} \end{array} \right).$$

We keep moving legs of D across E in this fashion, until we get $E\Delta(D)$. \square

For Lie algebras, the analogue of Proposition 2.33 is just the easy fact that a \mathfrak{g} -invariant tensor $X \in (U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes n})^{\mathfrak{g}}$ commutes with any tensor in the image of the iterated coproduct $\Delta^{(n)} : U(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes n}$.

3. THE ALGEBRA $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ OF DIRECTED JACOBI DIAGRAMS

Section summary: After recalling the definitions of Lie bialgebras, the classical Yang-Baxter equation, the Drinfel'd double, and Manin triples, we describe the standard Lie bialgebra structure of a complex semisimple Lie algebra. We then go to define $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ -spaces as quotients of spaces spanned by directed Jacobi diagrams modulo directed versions of the AS, IHX, and STU relations, which are diagrammatic forms of the axioms of Lie bialgebra. We give the construction of the maps from $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ -spaces to spaces of (possibly non-invariant) Lie tensors, which closely parallels the construction in the undirected case.

\mathcal{A} -spaces are mapped into $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ -spaces by the ι -maps, sending an undirected diagram to the sum over all possible ways of directing its arcs. We verify that the ι -maps are well-defined, show that elements in their images are invariant (in a suitable diagrammatic sense), and conjecture that these maps are injective. Finally, we extend to the directed case the proof that the diagrammatic PBW map is an isomorphism.

3.1. Lie bialgebras. Let \mathfrak{a} be a finite-dimensional Lie algebra over \mathbb{k} . We recall the basic definitions related to Lie bialgebras. We refer to [CP, Sections 1.3–1.4, 2.1] or [ES, Lectures 2–4] for full details.

3.1.1. Definition of Lie bialgebras.

Definition 3.1. A map $\delta : \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathfrak{a} \otimes \mathfrak{a}$ endows \mathfrak{a} with a Lie bialgebra structure if it has the following properties:

- (1) δ satisfies the co-Jacobi identity

$$(\text{id} + \tau_3 + \tau_3^2)((\delta \otimes \text{id})\delta(a)) = 0, \quad a \in \mathfrak{a},$$

where $\tau_3 : \mathfrak{a}^{\otimes 3} \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}^{\otimes 3}$ is a cyclic permutation of the tensor power.

- (2) δ is co-antisymmetric:

$$\delta^{\text{op}}(a) = -\delta(a), \quad a \in \mathfrak{a}.$$

Here δ^{op} is the composition of δ with the flip morphism $\tau : \mathfrak{a}^{\otimes 2} \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}^{\otimes 2}$.

- (3) δ is a 1-cocycle of \mathfrak{a} with coefficients in $\mathfrak{a} \otimes \mathfrak{a}$; that is, the following identity (the *cocycle identity*) holds⁸:

$$\delta([ab]) = [1 \otimes a + a \otimes 1, \delta(b)] + [\delta(a), 1 \otimes b + b \otimes 1], \quad a, b \in \mathfrak{a}.$$

δ is called the *cobracket* of the Lie bialgebra \mathfrak{a} .

The first two properties imply that the dual map $\delta^* : \mathfrak{a}^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}^* \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}^*$ makes \mathfrak{a}^* into a Lie algebra. The third property is a compatibility criterion which the two Lie algebra structures, on \mathfrak{a} and \mathfrak{a}^* , need to satisfy.

Example 3.2. We describe a non-trivial Lie bialgebra of dimension two, with basis vectors $\{X, Y\}$. The bracket and cobracket are given by:

$$[X, Y] = X, \quad \delta(X) = \frac{1}{2}X \wedge Y, \quad \delta(Y) = 0,$$

where $X \wedge Y = X \otimes Y - Y \otimes X$.

⁸ The right hand side is computed in $U(\mathfrak{a})^{\otimes 2}$, but the end result belongs to $\mathfrak{a}^{\otimes 2}$.

3.1.2. Quasitriangular Lie bialgebras. For $r \in \mathfrak{a} \otimes \mathfrak{a}$, the *classical Yang-Baxter equation (CYBE)* is the equation

$$[r^{12}, r^{13}] + [r^{12}, r^{23}] + [r^{13}, r^{23}] = 0 \quad (3.1)$$

in $U(\mathfrak{a})^{\otimes 3}$. (r^{13} , for example, is the image of r under the injection $\mathfrak{a} \otimes \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{a})^{\otimes 3}$, $a \otimes b \mapsto a \otimes 1 \otimes b$.)

Definition 3.3. A Lie bialgebra \mathfrak{a} is called *quasitriangular* if there exists an element $r \in \mathfrak{a} \otimes \mathfrak{a}$ (called the *r-matrix* of \mathfrak{a}) such that

- (1) r satisfies the CYBE.
- (2) $r + r^{21}$ is \mathfrak{a} -invariant (r^{21} denotes $\tau(r)$).
- (3) δ is the coboundary of r , that is,

$$\delta(a) = [1 \otimes a + a \otimes 1, r] \text{ for all } a \in \mathfrak{a}.$$

It can be checked that if \mathfrak{a} is a Lie algebra and $r \in \mathfrak{a} \otimes \mathfrak{a}$ meets the first two conditions, then the last formula defines a cobracket on \mathfrak{a} .

3.1.3. The double of a Lie bialgebra. Let \mathfrak{a} be a Lie bialgebra. Recall that \mathfrak{a} acts on \mathfrak{a}^* via the coadjoint action:

$$(\text{ad}^* a)b = -b \circ \text{ad} a, \quad a \in \mathfrak{a}, b \in \mathfrak{a}^*.$$

The vector space $D\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{a}^*$ has a natural structure of a quasitriangular Lie bialgebra, which is defined as follows:

- $\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{a}^*$ are Lie subalgebras of $D\mathfrak{a}$, and the bracket of $a \in \mathfrak{a}, b \in \mathfrak{a}^*$ is

$$[a, b] = (\text{ad}^* a)b - (1 \otimes b)(\delta(a)). \quad (3.2)$$

- Let $r \in \mathfrak{a} \otimes \mathfrak{a}^* \subset D\mathfrak{a} \otimes D\mathfrak{a}$ be the element corresponding to the identity map of \mathfrak{a} . Then r satisfies the CYBE and $r + r^{21}$ is $D\mathfrak{a}$ -invariant. The cobracket of $D\mathfrak{a}$ is taken to be the coboundary of r .

$D\mathfrak{a}$ is called the (*Drinfel'd*) *double* of the Lie bialgebra \mathfrak{a} . It is endowed with a metric⁹ given by

$$(a + a', b + b') = a'(b) + b'(a), \quad a, b \in \mathfrak{a}, a', b' \in \mathfrak{a}^*.$$

3.1.4. Manin triples.

Definition 3.4. A triple $(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathfrak{g}_+, \mathfrak{g}_-)$ of Lie algebras is called a *Manin triple* if $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ is a metrized Lie algebra with a metric (\cdot, \cdot) , such that \mathfrak{g}_{\pm} are (\cdot, \cdot) -isotropic Lie subalgebras of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$, and $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathfrak{g}_+ \oplus \mathfrak{g}_-$.

The construction of the double of a Lie bialgebra \mathfrak{a} shows that $(D\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{a}^*)$ is a Manin triple. Conversely, if $(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathfrak{g}_+, \mathfrak{g}_-)$ is a (finite-dimensional) Manin triple, then \mathfrak{g}_+ can be endowed with a Lie bialgebra structure such that

$$(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathfrak{g}_+, \mathfrak{g}_-) \cong (D\mathfrak{g}_+, \mathfrak{g}_+, \mathfrak{g}_+^*). \quad (3.3)$$

This is done in the following way: the non-degeneracy of the metric of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ and the isotropy of \mathfrak{g}_{\pm} imply that the pairing $(\cdot, \cdot) : \mathfrak{g}_+ \otimes \mathfrak{g}_- \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$ is non-degenerate, hence it induces a vector space isomorphism $\phi : \mathfrak{g}_+^* \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_-$. The Lie bracket of \mathfrak{g}_- becomes, via this isomorphism, a putative cobracket map $\delta : \mathfrak{g}_+ \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_+ \otimes \mathfrak{g}_+$, satisfying the first two properties of Definition 3.1. The

⁹Recall from Section 2.2.3 that a metric is an invariant symmetric non-degenerate bilinear form.

third property (the cocycle identity) can be verified by a direct computation. Furthermore, it can be checked that the vector space isomorphism

$$D\mathfrak{g}_+ \longrightarrow \tilde{\mathfrak{g}} : (x, y) \mapsto (x, \phi(y)), \quad x \in \mathfrak{g}_+, y \in \mathfrak{g}_+^*,$$

is a metric preserving Lie algebra map.

The isomorphism (3.3) endows $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$, the ambient Lie algebra of the Manin triple, with the structure of a quasitriangular Lie bialgebra. Its r -matrix (which is the image of the r -matrix of $D\mathfrak{g}_+$) is of the form $r = \sum_i e_i \otimes f^i$, where $\{e_i\}$ is a basis of \mathfrak{g}_+ and $\{f^i\}$ is the (\cdot, \cdot) -dual basis of \mathfrak{g}_- .

3.1.5. The standard Lie bialgebra structure of a complex semisimple Lie algebra. Let \mathfrak{g} be a complex simple Lie algebra. (All the constructions and results that are discussed here and in other sections below for simple Lie algebras, can be trivially extended to semisimple Lie algebras by decomposing them into direct sums of simple Lie algebras.) We recall the rudiments of the structure theory of \mathfrak{g} . Everything we need can be found in [H, Sections 8–10], but some care is needed to adjust for our choice of a different normalization of the metric.

We fix a Cartan subalgebra \mathfrak{h} of \mathfrak{g} . For $\alpha \in \mathfrak{h}^* - \{0\}$, we denote by \mathfrak{g}_α the root subspace

$$\mathfrak{g}_\alpha = \{x \in \mathfrak{g} \mid [h, x] = \alpha(h)x \text{ for all } h \in \mathfrak{h}\}. \quad (3.4)$$

The root subspaces are either zero or one-dimensional, and $[\mathfrak{g}_\alpha, \mathfrak{g}_\beta] = \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha+\beta}$. The set of roots of $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ is

$$R = \{\alpha \in \mathfrak{h}^* - \{0\} \mid \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \neq 0\}.$$

The Cartan decomposition of \mathfrak{g} is

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha \in R} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha.$$

The set of roots R can be partitioned (in several ways) into a union, $R = R_+ \cup R_-$, with $R_- = -R_+$ and $\alpha, \beta \in R_+, \alpha + \beta \in R \Rightarrow \alpha + \beta \in R_+$. We choose one such a partition. R_+ (R_-) is called the set of positive (negative) roots. There is a unique subset $\Lambda = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}$ of R_+ ($n = \dim \mathfrak{h}$), called the set of simple roots, such that every element of R_+ can be uniquely written as a linear combination with nonnegative integral coefficients of the roots in Λ . Associated with the choice of positive roots are the positive and negative maximal nilpotent subalgebras $\mathfrak{n}_\pm = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in R_\pm} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$, and the positive and negative Borel (maximal solvable) subalgebras $\mathfrak{b}_\pm = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{n}_\pm$.

There is a metric $(\cdot, \cdot)_\mathfrak{g}$ on \mathfrak{g} , which is unique up to a nonzero scalar. We have $(\mathfrak{g}_\alpha, \mathfrak{g}_\beta)_\mathfrak{g} = 0$ if $\alpha + \beta \neq 0$, and the restriction of $(\cdot, \cdot)_\mathfrak{g}$ to \mathfrak{h} , denoted $(\cdot, \cdot)_\mathfrak{h}$, is a metric on \mathfrak{h} . We use the metrics to identify \mathfrak{g} and \mathfrak{h} with their dual spaces, and use the same notation for the metrics induced on \mathfrak{g}^* and \mathfrak{h}^* by these identifications. Now the metric can be normalized so that $(\alpha, \alpha)_\mathfrak{g} > 0$ for $\alpha \in R \subset \mathfrak{h}^*$, and then these squared root lengths take at most two values on R . We completely fix the normalization of $(\cdot, \cdot)_\mathfrak{g}$ by scaling so that the *smaller* value (called the squared length of the short roots) is equal to 2.

For $\alpha \in R_+$ we can choose $e_\alpha \in \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ and $f_\alpha \in \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha}$ such that $(e_\alpha, f_\alpha)_\mathfrak{g} = 1$. Put $h_\alpha = [e_\alpha, f_\alpha] \in \mathfrak{h}$. One checks that $\alpha \mapsto h_\alpha$ under the identification $\mathfrak{h} \cong \mathfrak{h}^*$ induced by the metric.

It follows that the following commutation relations hold¹⁰:

$$[h_\beta, e_\alpha] = (\beta, \alpha)e_\alpha, \quad [h_\beta, f_\alpha] = -(\beta, \alpha)f_\alpha, \quad \alpha, \beta \in R_+. \quad (3.5)$$

We now turn to the description of the Lie bialgebra structure of \mathfrak{g} , following the treatment of [ES, Section 4.4].

We consider the Lie algebra obtained from \mathfrak{g} by ‘doubling’ the Cartan subalgebra: $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathfrak{n}_+ \oplus \mathfrak{h}^{(1)} \oplus \mathfrak{h}^{(2)} \oplus \mathfrak{n}_-$, where $\mathfrak{h}^{(1)} = \mathfrak{h}^{(2)} = \mathfrak{h}$, with the commutation relations

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathfrak{h}^{(1)}, \mathfrak{h}^{(2)}] &= 0, \\ [h^{(i)}, e_\alpha] &= \alpha(h)e_\alpha, \quad [h^{(i)}, f_\alpha] = -\alpha(h)f_\alpha \text{ for } h \in \mathfrak{h}, i = 1, 2, \\ [e_\alpha, f_\alpha] &= \frac{1}{2}(h_\alpha^{(1)} + h_\alpha^{(2)}). \end{aligned}$$

The projection $p : \tilde{\mathfrak{g}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$ defined by

$$p(e_\alpha) = e_\alpha, \quad p(f_\alpha) = f_\alpha, \quad p(h^{(i)}) = h,$$

is a Lie algebra map. We next show that $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ is a quasitriangular Lie bialgebra.

We define a bilinear form on $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ by the formula

$$(x + h^{(1)} + k^{(2)}, x' + h'^{(1)} + k'^{(2)})_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}} = 2((h, k') + (k, h')) + (x, x'),$$

for $h, k, h', k' \in \mathfrak{h}$, $x, x' \in \mathfrak{n}_+ \oplus \mathfrak{n}_-$. It is immediate that $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}$ is a metric on $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$.

Set $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_+ = \mathfrak{n}_+ \oplus \mathfrak{h}^{(1)}$, $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_- = \mathfrak{n}_- \oplus \mathfrak{h}^{(2)}$. Since \mathfrak{n}_\pm are $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}$ -isotropic, it follows that $(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_+, \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_-)$ is a Manin triple. By the discussion in Section 3.1.4, $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ is a quasitriangular Lie bialgebra. To write its r -matrix, choose an orthonormal basis $\{k_i\}$ of \mathfrak{h} with respect to $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\mathfrak{h}}$. Then $\{e_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in R_+}$, $\{k_i^{(1)}\}$ is a basis of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_+$, and its $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}$ -dual basis of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_-$ is $\{f_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in R_+}$, $\{\frac{1}{2}k_i^{(2)}\}$. Thus, the r -matrix of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ is

$$r_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}} = \sum_{\alpha \in R_+} e_\alpha \otimes f_\alpha + \frac{1}{2} \sum_i k_i^{(1)} \otimes k_i^{(2)}. \quad (3.6)$$

The projection $p : \tilde{\mathfrak{g}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$ maps $r_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}$ to the r -matrix

$$r_{\mathfrak{g}} = \sum_{\alpha \in R_+} e_\alpha \otimes f_\alpha + \frac{1}{2} \sum_i k_i \otimes k_i, \quad (3.7)$$

which endows \mathfrak{g} with a quasitriangular Lie bialgebra structure (called the *standard* structure). We have $r_{\mathfrak{g}} + r_{\mathfrak{g}}^{21} = \Omega_{\mathfrak{g}}$, the inverse metric tensor of \mathfrak{g} . With this structure, \mathfrak{g} is ‘almost’ the double of \mathfrak{b}_+ (or \mathfrak{b}_-), which is a Lie subbialgebra of \mathfrak{g} .

Remark 3.5. There is another description of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ which avoids the slightly artificial doubling of \mathfrak{h} . It is the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathfrak{h}$ together with the metric $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\mathfrak{g}} - (\cdot, \cdot)_{\mathfrak{h}}$. A metric preserving Lie algebra isomorphism $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathfrak{h}$ is given by

$$e_\alpha \mapsto (e_\alpha, 0), \quad f_\alpha \mapsto (f_\alpha, 0), \quad h^{(1)} \mapsto (h, h), \quad h^{(2)} \mapsto (h, -h).$$

Note however that in the $\mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathfrak{h}$ picture, the description of the isotropic subalgebras is somewhat less symmetric.

¹⁰Suffixes of the metrics are sometimes omitted.

It can be shown that the cobracket δ of \mathfrak{g} has the following values when $\beta \in \Lambda$ is a simple root:

$$\delta(e_\beta) = \frac{1}{2}e_\beta \wedge h_\beta \quad ; \quad \delta(f_\beta) = \frac{1}{2}f_\beta \wedge h_\beta .$$

Since the Lie algebra \mathfrak{n}_+ (\mathfrak{n}_-) is generated by $\{e_\beta\}$ ($\{f_\beta\}$), $\beta \in \Lambda$, the cobracket of a general element of \mathfrak{g} can be computed by combined applications of the above formulas and the cocycle identity.

Example 3.6. For $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}(2)$, we take as usual

$$\mathfrak{h} = \text{span}_{\mathbb{C}} \left\{ h = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \right\} .$$

The roots are $\pm\alpha \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, where $\alpha(h) = 2$, and we choose $R_+ = \{\alpha\}$. The corresponding root spaces are

$$\mathfrak{n}_+ = \text{span}_{\mathbb{C}} \left\{ e = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\} , \quad \mathfrak{n}_- = \text{span}_{\mathbb{C}} \left\{ f = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\} .$$

The normalized metric of \mathfrak{g} is

$$(x, y) = \text{Tr}(xy) , \quad x, y \in \mathfrak{g} .$$

Since $(e, f) = 1$ and $[e, f] = h$, the r -matrix of \mathfrak{g} is

$$r_{\mathfrak{g}} = e \otimes f + \frac{1}{4}h \otimes h .$$

We have $\delta(h) = 0$, $\delta(e) = \frac{1}{2}e \wedge h$, and $\delta(f) = \frac{1}{2}f \wedge h$. Note that the Lie subalgebras \mathfrak{b}_{\pm} are isomorphic to the Lie bialgebra of Example 3.2.

3.2. Directed Jacobi diagrams and directed Lie relations.

3.2.1. The basic definitions. We want to construct diagrammatic objects which are related to Lie bialgebras in a way resembling the relationship between \mathcal{A} -spaces and Lie algebras.

Definition 3.7. A *directed Jacobi diagram* based on a skeleton \mathbf{M} is a Jacobi diagram in which each arc of the body has a prescribed direction.

We denote the space of directed Jacobi diagrams based on a skeleton \mathbf{M} by $\vec{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{M})$. We consider the subspace of $\text{span}_{\mathbb{k}}(\vec{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{M}))$ which is spanned by the following relations:

(1) The no sink no source (NS) relations:



(2) The antisymmetry (AS) of internal vertices:



(3) IHX relations:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 1} \\ \text{Diagram 2} \end{array} - \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 3} \\ \text{Diagram 4} \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 5} \\ \text{Diagram 6} \end{array} = 0, \\
\begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 7} \\ \text{Diagram 8} \end{array} - \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 9} \\ \text{Diagram 10} \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 11} \\ \text{Diagram 12} \end{array} = 0, \\
\begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 13} \\ \text{Diagram 14} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 15} \\ \text{Diagram 16} \end{array} - \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 17} \\ \text{Diagram 18} \end{array} - \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 19} \\ \text{Diagram 20} \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 21} \\ \text{Diagram 22} \end{array}.
\end{array}$$

(4) STU relations:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 1} \\ \text{Diagram 2} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 3} \\ \text{Diagram 4} \end{array} - \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 5} \\ \text{Diagram 6} \end{array}, \\
\begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 7} \\ \text{Diagram 8} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 9} \\ \text{Diagram 10} \end{array} - \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 11} \\ \text{Diagram 12} \end{array}, \\
\begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 13} \\ \text{Diagram 14} \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 15} \\ \text{Diagram 16} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 17} \\ \text{Diagram 18} \end{array} - \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 19} \\ \text{Diagram 20} \end{array}, \\
\begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 21} \\ \text{Diagram 22} \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 23} \\ \text{Diagram 24} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 25} \\ \text{Diagram 26} \end{array} - \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 27} \\ \text{Diagram 28} \end{array}.
\end{array}$$

We refer to the first and second relation in each group as the incoming and outgoing relation, respectively, to the third IHX relation as the *mixed IHX relation* or *5T relation*, and to the last two relations as the *mixed STU relations*.

Definition 3.8. $\vec{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{M})$ is the quotient space

$$\vec{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{M}) = \text{span}_{\mathbb{k}} \left(\vec{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{M}) \right) / \{NS, AS, IHX, \text{ and } STU \text{ relations}\}.$$

We put $\vec{\mathcal{A}} = \vec{\mathcal{A}}(\uparrow)$ and $\vec{\mathcal{B}} = \vec{\mathcal{A}}(*)$.

Remark 3.9. Let $\vec{\mathcal{D}}_{NS}(\mathbf{M})$ be the subset of $\vec{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{M})$ consisting of diagrams having no sinks or sources. The quotient of $\text{span}_{\mathbb{k}}(\vec{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{M}))$ by the NS relations alone is clearly isomorphic to the subspace $\text{span}_{\mathbb{k}}(\vec{\mathcal{D}}_{NS}(\mathbf{M}))$. Thus, we may regard $\vec{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{M})$ as the quotient of the latter subspace by the AS, IHX and STU relations.

As in the undirected case, $\vec{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{M})$ is graded by half the number of vertices in a diagram. As all the directed relations are homogeneous, this grading is inherited by $\vec{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{M})$. We also denote by $\vec{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{M})$ its graded completion.

3.2.2. Mapping directed Jacobi diagrams into Lie tensors. Given a finite-dimensional Lie bialgebra \mathfrak{a} and its double $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}} = D\mathfrak{a}$ (or equivalently, a Manin triple $(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{a}^*)$), we are going to construct, for each skeleton \mathbf{M} , a map $\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}} : \vec{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{M}) \rightarrow L(\mathbf{M})$, where $L(\mathbf{M})$ is the $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ -space attached to \mathbf{M} . (We stress that although \mathfrak{a} is suppressed from the notation, the map $\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}$ depends on the Manin triple $(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{a}^*)$ and not just on the Lie bialgebra $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$.) This construction is the directed counterpart of the construction of the maps $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}} : \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}) \rightarrow L(\mathbf{M})$ in Section 2.2.4 for a metrized Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} .

We begin by describing the atomic graphs and the tensors corresponding to them. There are four types of trivalent atomic graphs (up to the choice of orientation of the vertex). The corresponding tensors all belong to $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\otimes 3}$.

The first two atomic graphs are the sink and source graphs; to these we assign the zero tensor. The third has two incoming arcs; the attached tensor is $s_+ \in \mathfrak{a} \otimes \mathfrak{a}^* \otimes \mathfrak{a}^* \subset \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\otimes 3}$ representing the bracket $[\cdot, \cdot] : \mathfrak{a} \otimes \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}$. The fourth graph, with two outgoing arcs, is assigned the tensor $s_- \in \mathfrak{a} \otimes \mathfrak{a} \otimes \mathfrak{a}^* \subset \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\otimes 3}$, which represents the cobracket of \mathfrak{a} . The same graphs with the reversed orientations are assigned the negated tensors.

Finally, there is a bivalent atomic graph with the corresponding tensor being the r -matrix $r \in \mathfrak{a} \otimes \mathfrak{a}^* \subset \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\otimes 2}$.

Let $\{e_i\}$ be a basis of \mathfrak{a} and $\{f^i\}$ be the dual basis of \mathfrak{a}^* . In terms of the basis elements, we have the following formulas:

$$\begin{aligned} r &= e_i \otimes f^i, \\ s_+ &= [e_i, e_j] \otimes f^i \otimes f^j, \\ s_- &= f^i \otimes \delta(e_i). \end{aligned}$$

Figure 10 shows the directed atomic graphs with their tensors.

As in the undirected case, we associate with a directed Jacobi graph D the tensor power

$$T(D) = \bigotimes_{\substack{\text{univalent vertices} \\ v \text{ of } D}} \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}.$$

We construct $\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(D) \in T(D)$ following the same procedure as in Section 2.2.3:

- (1) D is separated into atomic graphs.
- (2) For each atomic graph, the components of the corresponding tensor are placed on its vertices, as illustrated in Figure 10. (That this process is unambiguous is even simpler than in the undirected case.)





Figure 10. Attaching tensors to directed atomic graphs.

(3) Tensor components from the two sides of each separation point are contracted using the natural metric of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$.

The proof that $\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(D)$ is independent of the separation used is essentially identical to that of Proposition 2.11. For example,



$$\mapsto (f^i, \delta(e_j)') f^j \otimes e_i \otimes \delta(e_j)'' = f^j \otimes \delta(e_j)' \otimes \delta(e_j)'' = s_- ,$$

where we used the notation (similar to the Sweedler notation) $\delta(x) = \delta(x)' \otimes \delta(x)''$, $x \in \mathfrak{a}$, to indicate the decomposition of $\delta(x)$ into the sum of factorable tensors.

Let D be a directed Jacobi diagram in $\vec{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{M})$. Also denote by D the body of D (which is a directed Jacobi graph). Recall the map $T(D) \rightarrow T(\mathbf{M})$ (defined at the end of Section 2.2.3).

Proposition 3.10. *The series of maps*

$$D \mapsto \vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(D) \in T(D) \longrightarrow T(\mathbf{M}) \mapsto L(\mathbf{M})$$

descends to a well-defined map $\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}} : \vec{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{M}) \rightarrow L(\mathbf{M})$.

Proof. We follow the lines of the proof of Proposition 2.16. First, it is clear that the NS and AS relations are mapped to zero. The proofs for the incoming STU and IHX relations are almost the same as in the undirected case, so we focus on the outgoing and mixed relations.

We see from the figure below

that the assertion for the outgoing STU relations boils down to checking that

$$\delta(e_i) \otimes f^i = e_i \otimes e_j \otimes [f^i, f^j].$$

This follows from the fact that the bracket (in $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$) of elements from \mathfrak{a}^* is dual to the cobracket of \mathfrak{a} ; that is,

$$([f^i, f^j], e_k) = (\delta(e_k), f^i \otimes f^j).$$

Hence

$$e_i \otimes e_j \otimes [f^i, f^j] = (\delta(e_k), f^i \otimes f^j) e_i \otimes e_j \otimes f^k = \delta(e_k) \otimes f^k,$$

as required.

Similarly, the assertion for the mixed STU relations follows from (3.2), and that for the outgoing IHX relations from the co-Jacobi identity.

We finally turn to the mixed IHX relations. Separating the I-graph into two atomic graphs by placing one separation point on the inner arc, we find that it is mapped to the tensor $f^i \otimes f^j \otimes \delta([e_i, e_j])$. This tensor corresponds to the map $(x, y) \in \mathfrak{a}^{\otimes 2} \mapsto \delta([x, y])$, which is on the left hand side of the cocycle identity. Doing the same for the other four graphs, we find that each of them corresponds to one of the terms on the right hand side of the cocycle identity. Thus, the mixed IHX relations are mapped to zero as a consequence of the cocycle identity in \mathfrak{a} . \square

Example 3.11. The diagram $r = \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \leftarrow \\ \downarrow \end{array}$ is mapped by $\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}$ to the r -matrix of the Manin triple $(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{a}^*)$, and is accordingly called the *diagrammatic r -matrix*.

Exercise 3.12. Show that r satisfies (a diagrammatic form of) the CYBE (3.1).

In the case of a complex semisimple Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} we introduce a variant of the $\vec{\mathcal{T}}$ -maps. With the notation of Section 3.1.5, $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ is the double of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_+$, yielding a map $\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}} : \vec{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{M}) \rightarrow L_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\mathbf{M})$. The projection $p : \tilde{\mathfrak{g}} \twoheadrightarrow \mathfrak{g}$ induces a map $p : L_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\mathbf{M}) \rightarrow L_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbf{M})$. We define the map $\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathfrak{g}} : \vec{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{M}) \rightarrow L_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbf{M})$ as the composition $p \circ \vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}$.

Example 3.13. By the definition of $\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}$ and (3.6),

$$\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\text{arc with arrow}) = \sum_{\alpha \in R_+} e_\alpha f_\alpha + \frac{1}{2} \sum_i k_i^{(1)} k_i^{(2)},$$

$$\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\text{arc with arrow}) = \sum_{\alpha \in R_+} f_\alpha e_\alpha + \frac{1}{2} \sum_i k_i^{(2)} k_i^{(1)}.$$

Hence

$$\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathfrak{g}}\left(\frac{1}{2}(\text{arc with arrow} - \text{arc with arrow})\right) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha \in R_+} [e_\alpha, f_\alpha] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha \in R_+} h_\alpha$$

is the element of the Cartan algebra which is dual to the half-sum of the positive roots; we denote this element by $\varrho_{\mathfrak{g}}$. Thus,

$$\varrho = \frac{1}{2}(\text{arc with arrow} - \text{arc with arrow}) \in \vec{\mathcal{A}}$$

is the diagrammatic analogue of $\varrho_{\mathfrak{g}}$. By a mixed STU relation, we can also write ϱ as

$$\varrho = \frac{1}{2}(\text{arc with arrow} + \text{arc with arrow}).$$

3.2.3. Algebraic structures on $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ -spaces. $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ -spaces can be endowed with the various algebraic structures (products, coproducts, antipodes, ...), that were defined for \mathcal{A} -spaces; the definitions, proofs of maps being well-defined, and verifications of axioms are essentially identical. The maps $\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}$ interchange all these structures with the corresponding structures on the Lie spaces $L_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\mathbf{M})$. We shall use the same notation as in the undirected case for the various structure maps.

In particular, $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ is a diagrammatic Hopf algebra, and for any Manin triple $(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathbf{a}, a^*)$ the map $\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}} : \vec{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ is a morphism of Hopf algebras.

One basic difference from the undirected case is that $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$, unlike \mathcal{A} , is not commutative. For example,

$$\mu \left(\begin{array}{c} \uparrow \quad \uparrow \\ \leftarrow \quad \rightarrow \\ \downarrow \end{array} \right) - \mu \circ \tau \left(\begin{array}{c} \uparrow \quad \uparrow \\ \leftarrow \quad \rightarrow \\ \downarrow \end{array} \right) = 2\varrho \neq 0.$$

We also endow the spaces $\vec{\mathcal{A}}^{\boxtimes n}$ with a $\text{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ -algebra structure as in (2.27).


3.3. Mapping \mathcal{A} -spaces into $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ -spaces.

3.3.1. Definition of the ι -maps. We define a map $\iota : \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{M}) \rightarrow \text{span}_{\mathbb{k}}(\vec{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{M}))$ by summing over all the possible choices of directions for the arcs of a diagram $D \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{M})$.

Proposition 3.14. ι descends to a well-defined map $\iota : \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}) \rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{M})$.

Proof. As in the proof of Proposition 2.16, the local nature of the definition of ι makes it sufficient to check that the local parts of the AS, STU, and IHX relations are mapped to zero modulo the directed relations.

This is clear for the AS relations. The image of an STU relation is depicted below. (The two terms which are zero by NS relations are omitted from the image of the S-graph.)




The first three terms in the images of the undirected graphs sum to zero by an incoming STU relation, while the second terms do so by an outgoing STU relation. The sum of the third and fourth terms in the image of the S-graph together with the third terms in the

images of the T-graph and U-graph is zero by a mixed STU relation, and so is the sum of the remaining four terms.

We turn to deal with the IHX relations. Each of the graphs in an IHX relation is mapped to the sum of 32 graphs. We group the resulting 96 signed graphs into 16 groups according to the directions of the four legs. We show that the signed sum of the six terms in each group is equal to zero modulo the directed relations.

There are two groups in which all the legs are incoming or outgoing. Each of the graphs appearing in these groups has either a sink or a source, hence is equal to zero by an NS relation.

Consider one of the four groups having exactly one incoming leg. Three of the graphs in this group have a source and are zero by NS relations; the signed sum of the remaining three graphs (in which the direction of the middle arc 'follows' the direction of the incoming leg) is zero by an outgoing IHX relation, possibly in combination with AS relations. For example, below is the resulting signed sum when the incoming leg is arriving from the upper left corner:




By making a half-turn clockwise and then applying AS at the two ends of the inner arc of the third graph, the sum becomes the outgoing IHX relation in its standard form.

The four groups having exactly one outgoing leg are handled in a similar way.

We are left with six groups having two incoming and two outgoing legs. In such a group, one term is zero by an NS relation, and the other five terms make up (after using AS relations) a mixed IHX relation (see Exercise 3.15 below for an example). This completes the proof. \square

Exercise 3.15. Show that the following signed sum is zero:



We note that the maps $\iota : \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}) \rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{M})$ interchange all the diagrammatic operations defined in Section 2.4.2. For example, for any skeleton \mathbf{M} and one of its components m ,

$$\iota(\Delta_{\mathbf{m}}(D)) = \Delta_{\mathbf{m}}(\iota(D)), \quad D \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}).$$

These properties hold already at the level of linear combinations of diagrams, and are verified by simple inspections. In particular, the map $\iota : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{A}}$ is a morphism of diagrammatic Hopf algebras.

The Lie algebraic counterpart of ι is described in the following proposition.

Proposition 3.16. *For any Manin triple $(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{a}^*)$, the diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}) & \xrightarrow{\iota} & \vec{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{M}) \\ \tau_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}} \downarrow & & \downarrow \vec{\tau}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}} \\ L(\mathbf{M})^{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}} & \xrightarrow{i} & L(\mathbf{M}) \end{array} \quad (3.8)$$

is commutative. (The metric of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ underlying $\mathcal{T}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}$ is its natural metric as the double of \mathfrak{a} .)

Proof. It follows from the definitions of ι , $\mathcal{T}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}$, and $\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}$ that we only need to check that $\mathcal{T}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(G) = \vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}} \circ \iota(G)$, when G is one of the two undirected atomic graphs.

For the bivalent atomic graph, this amounts to the equality

$$t^{-1} = r + r^{21}. \quad (3.9)$$

Using the basis $\{e_i\}$ of \mathfrak{a} and the dual basis $\{f^i\}$ of \mathfrak{a}^* (in terms of which $r = e_i \otimes f^i$), we note that $\{e_i, f^i\}$ is a basis of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$, and its dual with respect to the natural metric of the double is simply $\{f^i, e_i\}$. From (2.4) we get

$$t^{-1} = e_i \otimes f^i + f^i \otimes e_i,$$

proving (3.9).

The image of the trivalent atomic graph under ι is the sum of six directed graphs, which are mapped by $\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}$ to the sum of the three cyclic permutations of s_+ and s_- :

$$\begin{aligned} s' = \vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}} \circ \iota \left(\begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array} \right) &= [e_i, e_j] \otimes f^i \otimes f^j + f^j \otimes [e_i, e_j] \otimes f^i + f^i \otimes f^j \otimes [e_i, e_j] \\ &\quad + \delta(e_i)'' \otimes f^i \delta(e_i)' + \delta(e_i) \otimes f^i + f^i \otimes \delta(e_i). \end{aligned}$$

$\mathcal{T}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}$ maps the trivalent atomic graph to the bracket tensor of the double, which is

$$s = [e_i, e_j] \otimes f^i \otimes f^j + [f^i, e_j] \otimes e_i \otimes f^j + [e_i, f^j] \otimes f^i \otimes e_j + [f^i, f^j] \otimes e_i \otimes e_j.$$

We have to show that $s = s'$. The first terms in s and s' are equal; so are their last terms (see the proof of Proposition 3.10). We use (3.2) to compute the second term of s :

$$\begin{aligned} [f^i, e_j] \otimes e_i \otimes f^j &= ((1 \otimes f^i) \delta(e_j) - (\text{ad}^* e_j) f^i) \otimes e_i \otimes f^j \\ &= (f^i, \delta(e_j)'') \delta(e_j)' + (f^i, [e_j, e_k]) f^k \otimes e_i \otimes f^j \\ &= \delta(e_j)' \otimes \delta(e_j)'' \otimes f^j + f^k \otimes [e_j, e_k] \otimes f^j, \end{aligned}$$

which cancels out the second and fifth terms of s' . Similarly, the third term of s is equal to the sum of the remaining two terms of s' , thus proving our claim. \square

We elaborate on (3.8) in the example of a complex semisimple Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} (Section 3.1.5), where $\mathfrak{a} = \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_+$ and its double is $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ (\mathfrak{g} with ‘doubled’ Cartan subalgebra). We apply to the two L -spaces in (3.8) the maps induced by the projection $p : \tilde{\mathfrak{g}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$. Recall that we defined $\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}$ as the composition

$$\vec{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{M}) \xrightarrow{\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}} L_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\mathbf{M}) \xrightarrow{p} L_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbf{M}).$$

On the other hand, it is clear from the definition of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ that $L_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\mathbf{M})^{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}$ is mapped into $L_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbf{M})^{\mathfrak{g}}$. We claim that the composition

$$\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{T}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}} L_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\mathbf{M})^{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}} \xrightarrow{p} L_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbf{M})^{\mathfrak{g}}$$

is equal to the map $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ (defined with the metric of \mathfrak{g} being the one used in the construction of the Manin triple structure on $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$). As in the proof of the last proposition, it is enough to verify the equality for the two atomic graphs. This is immediate for the bivalent atomic graph, because by (3.6) and (3.7)


$$\Omega_{\mathfrak{g}} = r_{\mathfrak{g}} + r_{\mathfrak{g}}^{21} = p(r_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}} + r_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}^{21}) = p(\Omega_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}).$$

The assertion for the trivalent atomic graph follows from a similar straightforward computation. We have thus proved the commutativity of the following diagram, for any complex semisimple Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}) & \xrightarrow{\iota} & \vec{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{M}) \\ \tau_{\mathfrak{g}} \downarrow & & \downarrow \vec{\tau}_{\mathfrak{g}} \\ L(\mathbf{M})^{\mathfrak{g}} & \xrightarrow{i} & L(\mathbf{M}). \end{array} \quad (3.10)$$

3.3.2. The image and kernel of ι . We continue to assume that $(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{a}^*)$ is a Manin triple. By the very definition, an element $u \in U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})^{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}$ is (mapped by $i : U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})^{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}} = L(\uparrow)^{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}} \rightarrow L(\uparrow) = U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ to) a $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ -invariant element in $U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$, namely $xu - ux = 0$ for all $x \in \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$. It is easy to define the diagrammatic notion of invariance.

Definition 3.17. An element $D \in \vec{\mathcal{A}}$ is called *invariant* if




$$= 0 \text{ in } \vec{\mathcal{A}}(\uparrow, *), \quad (3.11)$$

and similarly with an outgoing leg (directed from the interval to the $*$ -colored vertex). The subspace of invariant elements in $\vec{\mathcal{A}}(\uparrow)$ is denoted by $\vec{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{inv}}$.

We can make a similar definition for \mathcal{A} , using the undirected version of (3.11); of course, any element of \mathcal{A} is invariant, as follows from the argument in the proof of Proposition 2.20.

An easy consequence of the invariance of $D \in \vec{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{inv}}$ is that



$$\text{for all } E \in \vec{\mathcal{A}}. \quad (3.12)$$

This is proved, as in the proof of commutativity in Proposition 2.29, by moving leg after leg of E across D .


In view of Proposition (3.8), the following result is no surprise.

Proposition 3.18. *The image of $\iota : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{A}}$ lies in $\vec{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{inv}}$.*

Proof. Let D be a diagram in \mathcal{A} . We have to prove that (3.11) holds for $\iota(D)$. We consider the case of an incoming leg; the case of an outgoing leg is completely analogous.

Let C be a diagram in $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ (here we have in mind for C one of the summands making up $\iota(D)$). We examine first the effect of moving the incoming leg across C .


Lemma 3.19. *For a diagram $C \in \vec{\mathcal{A}}$,*



$$= \sum_{\mathfrak{a}} (-1)^{\mathfrak{a}} C_{\mathfrak{a}}, \quad (3.13)$$


where:

- The summation is over the internal arcs of C .
- The diagram $C_{\mathbf{a}}$ is obtained by connecting the incoming leg to a new vertex in the middle of \mathbf{a} , directing the two newly formed arcs as outgoing from the new vertex.
- The sign $(-1)^{\mathbf{a}}$ is ± 1 according to the positioning of the internal arc \mathbf{a} with respect to the incoming leg:



(Formally, the sign is the orientation type of the planar basis formed by the direction of the arc and the direction of the incoming leg.)


Proof. As in the proof of Proposition 2.20, we attach three right-turning hooks near every vertex of C , with minus signs under the hooks that are connected to a skeleton arc leaving a vertex. An example of the resulting decorated diagram is shown in the following figure:



We form the signed sum of the diagrams obtained by all possible ways of connecting the incoming leg to one of the hooks and, if the incoming leg is connected to a non-skeleton hook, specifying one out of the two possible directions of the small arc between the hook and its vertex. We group the terms of this signed sum in two ways.

- By vertices:

Consider first the left-most skeleton vertex. There are four summands in its group. They are identical outside a small neighborhood of the vertex, and their sum locally looks like



hence is zero by a mixed STU relation. The same argument applies for all other skeleton vertices, possibly using NS and incoming STU relations instead of the mixed STU relation.

For the internal vertex (in our example), the sum of the six terms in its group is locally



which is zero by NS (applied to the sixth term), AS, and mixed IHX. Similarly, if an internal vertex has two arcs emanating from it, then three terms are zero by NS, and the remaining three sum to zero by AS and incoming IHX.

- By arcs:

The two terms obtained by connecting the incoming leg to the left and right ‘semi-infinite’ skeleton arcs yield the difference created by moving the incoming leg from left to right.

The group of an internal skeleton arc contains two terms which cancel each other.

3.3.3. The directed PBW isomorphism. The PBW map $\chi : \vec{\mathcal{B}} \rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{A}}$ is defined exactly as in (2.7). Using the ι -maps, we can now prove without difficulty that this map is an isomorphism (just like its algebraic counterpart $\chi : S(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}) \rightarrow U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$).

Proposition 3.21. *The map $\chi : \vec{\mathcal{B}} \rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{A}}$ is an isomorphism.*

Proof. The proof is a simple adaptation of the proof of Proposition 2.22. We need to:

- Replace all spaces ($\mathcal{D}_k(\mathbf{M})$, \mathcal{I}_k , \mathcal{A}_k , etc.) with the corresponding directed spaces.
- Replace the graphical representations of u_i , e , and s_i ((2.8), (2.10), and (2.11)), with their images under ι in $\text{span}_{\mathbb{k}}\{\vec{\mathcal{D}}(\uparrow, \uparrow)\}$. Also replace in this way the graphical representation of any $\pi \in S_k$.
- For a directed diagram $C \in \vec{\mathcal{D}}(\uparrow, \uparrow)$, define the ‘glueing C ’ operator on $\text{span}_{\mathbb{k}}\{\vec{\mathcal{D}}(\uparrow)\}$ by

$$C(D) = \begin{cases} \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram of } D \text{ and } C \text{ glued together} \\ \text{where } C \text{ is below } D \text{ and their legs are connected} \end{array} & \text{C and D are compatible} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad (3.16)$$

where the compatibility criteria are clear from the figure: the number of legs of C on the upper skeleton is equal to the number of legs of D , and each incoming (outgoing) leg of D is glued to an outgoing (incoming) leg of C .

- Extend the definition of glueing operators to elements of $\text{span}_{\mathbb{k}}\{\vec{\mathcal{D}}(\uparrow, \uparrow)\}$ by linearity. We denote the operator associated to $\iota(u_i)$ by u_i , and similarly for any $\pi \in S_k$ and s_i . For example,

$$s_2 \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram of } D \\ \text{with two legs} \end{array} \right) = \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram of } D \text{ with legs swapped} \\ \text{and } C \text{ below} \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram of } D \text{ with legs swapped} \\ \text{and } C \text{ below} \end{array} \dots$$

- Notice that (2.12) and the vanishing of Γ_D on the generators of \mathcal{K} , as in (2.15), are all consequences of relations only between the elements of $\text{span}_{\mathbb{k}}\{\vec{\mathcal{D}}(\uparrow, \uparrow)\}$ representing the permutations $\pi \in S_k$ (u_i and e in particular) and the elements representing s_i . The fact that ι is well-defined (Proposition 3.14) guarantees that the needed relations continue to hold in the directed spaces. A slightly closer look reveals that the filtrations used are also preserved.

The rest of the proof consists now of formal computations identical to the ones carried out in the proof of the undirected case. \square

4. LINK INVARIANTS FROM QUASITRIANGULAR QUASI-HOPF ALGEBRAS

Section summary: After reviewing the basic theory of ribbon quasitriangular quasi-Hopf algebras and their twist transformations, we go on to describe the examples of interest to us. These are the Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov (KZ) structures, having both Lie algebraic and diagrammatic versions, and the Drinfel’d-Jimbo (DJ) quantum groups.

We then work out in complete generality the construction of an invariant \mathbf{Z}_H of framed links associated to a ribbon quasitriangular quasi-Hopf algebra H (possibly a diagrammatic one), showing that the natural target spaces of \mathbf{Z}_H are spaces of coinvariants of H . (Close relatives of this construction were considered by many authors; see Section 4.4 for an explanation of our reasons for reworking it here.) We prove that \mathbf{Z}_H remains unchanged when twisting the quasitriangular quasi-Hopf structure of H .

In the last part of this section, we fit the Kontsevich integral and the Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants into the framework of \mathbf{Z}_H -invariants corresponding to the KZ and DJ structures, respectively. This motivates the search for a diagrammatic structure on $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ having some of the features of the DJ structures, which is the subject matter of Section 5.

4.1. Quasitriangular quasi-Hopf algebras. Let H be an associative algebra over \mathbb{k} with a product $\mu : H \otimes H \rightarrow H$ and a unit $\eta : \mathbb{k} \rightarrow H$. For brevity we refer to H simply as an algebra, and accordingly morphisms of algebras are always unital. Even though we have much in mind diagrammatic algebras, we do use in this section the element-wise notation $\mu(a, b) = ab$ and write all identities as equalities between H -tensors, rather than as commutative diagrams of maps. The translations to the diagrammatic scenarios are usually straightforward, and are occasionally indicated.

We use throughout the following notational convention. Let $X = \sum_i x_i^{(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes x_i^{(p)} \in H^{\otimes p}$ be a tensor. For any p -tuple (k_1, \dots, k_p) of distinct indices from $\{1, \dots, n\}$, $n \geq p$ (not necessarily in ascending order), we set

$$X^{k_1 \dots k_p} = \sum_i y_i^{(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes y_i^{(n)} \in H^{\otimes n} \quad \text{where} \quad y_i^{(k)} = \begin{cases} x_i^{(j)} & k = k_j \text{ for some } j \leq p, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$


As n does not appear explicitly in the notation, there is in principle some danger of ambiguity (if $X \in H^{\otimes 3}$, for example, then X^{312} may stand for a tensor in any of the spaces $H^{\otimes n}$, $n \geq 3$). In practice, however, it is always possible to deduce n from the context.

Another convention we often employ is to drop the summation signs; summations over all indices of tensor components are implicitly implied.

As an example of both conventions, if $R = s_i \otimes t_i \in H^{\otimes 2}$, then $R^{31} \in H^{\otimes 3}$ is given by

$$R^{31} = t_i \otimes 1 \otimes s_i.$$

If \mathcal{H} is a diagrammatic algebra (\mathcal{A} or $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$), then the parallel operation on a diagram $D \in \mathcal{H}^{\boxtimes p}$ is adding $n - p$ oriented intervals to the skeleton of D (with no leg attached to them), and then relabeling the n skeleton intervals as dictated by the p -tuple (k_1, \dots, k_p) : the j th skeleton component of D ($j \leq p$) is labeled by k_j , and the remaining $n - p$ labels are arbitrarily assigned to the added skeleton components. Below is an example, with $D \in \mathcal{A}^{\boxtimes 2}$.



Note that the algebraic and diagrammatic notations are compatible: $\mathcal{T}_g(D^{31}) = (\mathcal{T}_g(D))^{31}$ for any metrized Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} , and similarly with $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ -diagrams and $\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\vec{\mathfrak{g}}}$ -maps, for any Manin triple $(\vec{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathfrak{g}_+, \mathfrak{g}_-)$.

In the algebraic framework we may write expressions like $1 \otimes X$ for the image of X under the mapping $H^p \rightarrow H^{p+1}$ determined by the tuple $(2, \dots, p+1)$. Accordingly, we shall write $1 \boxtimes D$ for the image of $D \in H^{\boxtimes p}$ under the corresponding diagrammatic map.

4.1.1. Definition of quasitriangular quasi-Hopf algebras. We recall the basics of the theory of quasitriangular quasi-Hopf algebras. Missing proofs for which explicit references are not given may be found in the fundamental paper [D3].

Assume an algebra H is equipped with linear maps $\Delta : H \rightarrow H \otimes H$, $\epsilon : H \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$, and possibly $S : H \rightarrow H$. We let

$$\Delta_i = \text{id} \otimes \dots \otimes \Delta \otimes \dots \otimes \text{id} : H^{\otimes n} \longrightarrow H^{\otimes(n+1)} \quad (\Delta \text{ in the } i\text{th slot})$$

be the map obtained by applying Δ to the i th component of a tensor in $H^{\otimes n}$, and similarly define $\epsilon_i : H^{\otimes n} \rightarrow H^{\otimes(n-1)}$, $S_i : H^{\otimes n} \rightarrow H^{\otimes n}$.

Definition 4.1. A *quasi-bialgebra* is an algebra H equipped with an algebra morphism $\Delta : H \rightarrow H \otimes H$ (the *coproduct*), an algebra morphism $\epsilon : H \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$ (the *counit*), and an invertible element $\Phi \in H^{\otimes 3}$ (the *associator*) such that

$$(\Delta_2 \Delta)(x) = \Phi(\Delta_1 \Delta)(x)\Phi^{-1}, \quad x \in H, \quad (4.1)$$

$$\Delta_3(\Phi)\Delta_1(\Phi) = \Phi^{234}\Delta_2(\Phi)\Phi^{123}, \quad (4.2)$$

$$\epsilon_1 \Delta = \text{id} = \epsilon_2 \Delta, \quad (4.3)$$

$$\epsilon_2(\Phi) = 1 \otimes 1. \quad (4.4)$$

The associator Φ measures the failure of the coproduct to be coassociative. If $\Phi = 1 \otimes 1 \otimes 1$, then Δ is coassociative and H is a bialgebra. (4.2) is called the *pentagon relation* for Φ .

It can be checked that (4.2)–(4.4) imply

$$\epsilon_1(\Phi) = 1 \otimes 1 = \epsilon_3(\Phi). \quad (4.5)$$

In general, a tensor $X \in H^{\otimes n}$ is called *non-degenerate* if $\epsilon_i(X) = 1^{\otimes(n-1)}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Thus, the associator Φ is non-degenerate.

We shall use a variant of Sweedler notation and write $\Delta(x) = x' \otimes x''$ for the coproduct of $x \in H$, which implicitly indicates a sum of factorable tensors. If

$$\Phi = X_i \otimes Y_i \otimes Z_i \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi^{-1} = \bar{X}_i \otimes \bar{Y}_i \otimes \bar{Z}_i, \quad (4.6)$$

then we may write (4.1), for example, in the form

$$x' \otimes (x'')' \otimes (x'')'' = X_i(x')' \bar{X}_j \otimes Y_i(x'')'' \bar{Y}_j \otimes Z_i x'' \bar{Z}_j.$$

A morphism of quasi-bialgebras

$$f : (H, \Delta, \epsilon, \Phi) \longrightarrow (H', \Delta', \epsilon', \Phi')$$

is an algebra morphism satisfying

$$(f \otimes f) \circ \Delta = \Delta' \circ f, \quad \epsilon = \epsilon' \circ f, \quad (f \otimes f \otimes f)(\Phi) = \Phi'.$$

Definitions of morphisms for the more refined structures below are similar and will not be given explicitly.

Let H be a quasi-bialgebra. The opposite coproduct of H is $\Delta^{\text{op}}(x) = \Delta(x)^{21} = x'' \otimes x'$.

Definition 4.2. H is *quasitriangular* if there exists an invertible element $R \in H^{\otimes 2}$, called the *universal R -matrix* of H , such that

$$\Delta^{\text{op}}(x) = R\Delta(x)R^{-1}, \quad x \in H, \quad (4.7)$$

$$(\text{id} \otimes \Delta)(R) = (\Phi^{231})^{-1}R^{13}\Phi^{213}R^{12}(\Phi^{123})^{-1}, \quad (4.8)$$

$$(\Delta \otimes \text{id})(R) = \Phi^{312}R^{13}(\Phi^{132})^{-1}R^{23}\Phi^{123}. \quad (4.9)$$

The universal R -matrix measures how far is the coproduct from being cocommutative. (4.8) – (4.9) are called the *hexagon relations*. It is not hard to see that R is non-degenerate:

$$\epsilon_1(R) = 1 = \epsilon_2(R). \quad (4.10)$$

We write the components of R and its inverse as

$$R = s_i \otimes t_i \quad \text{and} \quad R^{-1} = \bar{s}_i \otimes \bar{t}_i. \quad (4.11)$$

The universal R -matrix satisfies the *quantum quasi-Yang-Baxter equation*

$$R^{12}\Phi^{312}R^{13}(\Phi^{132})^{-1}R^{23}\Phi^{123} = \Phi^{321}R^{23}(\Phi^{231})^{-1}R^{13}\Phi^{213}R^{12}; \quad (4.12)$$

see [D3, Section 3] or [Ka, Corollary XV.2.3] for a proof.

Definition 4.3. A *quasi-Hopf algebra* is a quasi-bialgebra H together with an anti-automorphism $S : H \rightarrow H$ of the underlying algebra ($S(xy) = S(y)S(x)$), called the *antipode* of H , and elements $\alpha, \beta \in H$, such that

$$S(x')\alpha x'' = \epsilon(x)\alpha, \quad (4.13)$$

$$x'\beta S(x'') = \epsilon(x)\beta, \quad (4.14)$$

for all $x \in H$, and, with the notation of (4.6),

$$X_i\beta S(Y_i)\alpha Z_i = 1, \quad (4.15)$$

$$S(\bar{X}_i)\alpha \bar{Y}_i\beta S(\bar{Z}_i) = 1. \quad (4.16)$$

A quasi-Hopf algebra is quasitriangular if the underlying quasi-bialgebra is.

We will also assume that the element α is invertible, as is the case in all of our examples.

(4.13) – (4.14) are the quasi-versions of the antipodal identities (2.20). Two consequences of the conditions satisfied by S, α, β are

$$\epsilon(\alpha)\epsilon(\beta) = 1, \quad \epsilon \circ S = \epsilon.$$

If (S, α, β) is an antipodal triple for a quasi-Hopf algebra H , then another antipodal triple can be obtained by an *antipodal rescaling* transformation of the form

$$S \mapsto \hat{S}, \quad \hat{S}(x) = cS(x)c^{-1}; \quad \alpha \mapsto c\alpha; \quad \beta \mapsto \beta c^{-1}, \quad (4.17)$$

where $c \in H$ is an invertible element. In fact, the antipodal triple is unique up to antipodal rescaling ([D3, Proposition 1.1]).

If H is a *coassociative* quasi-Hopf algebra, then (4.15) – (4.16) show that $\beta = \alpha^{-1}$, hence rescaling with $c = \beta$ gives an antipodal triple $(\hat{S}, 1, 1)$. This means that \hat{S} satisfies the axioms of a *Hopf algebra antipode*, so that H is a Hopf algebra. We always use this normalization of the antipodal triple for Hopf algebras.

4.1.2. The square of the antipode. Let H be a quasitriangular quasi-Hopf algebra, with Φ and R as in (4.6) and (4.11).

Definition 4.4. The (*Drinfel'd*) u -element of H is given by

$$u = S(\bar{Y}_i \beta S(\bar{Z}_i)) S(t_j) \alpha s_j \bar{X}_i. \quad (4.18)$$

The following proposition is due to Altschüler and Coste ([AC, Section 3]), generalizing a result of Drinfel'd for quasitriangular Hopf algebras.

Proposition 4.5. *The u -element is invertible, and the inner automorphism of H it determines is the square of the antipode: for any $x \in H$,*

$$S^2(x) = u x u^{-1}. \quad (4.19)$$

We also have

$$S(\alpha)u = S(t_i)\alpha s_i. \quad (4.20)$$

An easy corollary of (4.19) is that $uS(u) = S(u)u$.

Definition 4.6. H is a *ribbon* quasitriangular quasi-Hopf if there exists a central element $v \in H$ (called the *ribbon element* of H) such that

$$v^2 = uS(u) = S(u)u, \quad S(v) = v, \quad \epsilon(v) = 1, \quad (4.21)$$

and

$$\Delta(v) = (v \otimes v)(R^{21}R)^{-1}. \quad (4.22)$$

Remark 4.7. We have used the assumption that α is invertible in order to be able to write the condition (4.22) in the current form. A more complicated condition is needed in the general case. (See [AC, Section 4.1] for the general form of the condition and the end of [AC, Section 4.4] for a proof of its equivalence to (4.22) when α is invertible.)

Remark 4.8. For diagrammatic examples, we replace the requirement of centrality in Definition 4.6 by that of *invariance* (see Definition 3.17).

We might have attempted to define centrality with respect to the $\text{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ -products of \mathcal{A} and $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$, and use this notion of centrality in Definition 4.6. The problem is that in several $\text{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ computations, we use the fact that if $x \in H$ is central, then so is, for example, $1 \otimes x \in H^{\otimes 2}$. (See the end of the proof of Proposition 4.12 below for an example). The hypothetical $\text{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ -notion of diagrammatic centrality may not be enough to guarantee that if D is central in $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$, then $1 \boxtimes D$ commutes with every element of $\vec{\mathcal{A}}^{\boxtimes 2}$; invariance does guarantee that, and allows us to use the $\text{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ results in diagrammatic computations.

The only diagrammatic ribbon element we shall actually encounter in $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ will belong to the image of $\iota : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{A}}$, and is thus invariant by Proposition 3.18.

The following proposition describes the effect of antipodal rescaling on the u -element and the ribbon element.

Proposition 4.9. *Let H be a ribbon quasitriangular quasi-Hopf algebra. If the antipodal triple (S, α, β) is rescaled by an invertible element c into an antipodal triple $(\hat{S}, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta})$, then*

$$\hat{u} = cS(c^{-1})u, \quad \hat{v} = v.$$

Proof. The formula for u follows by substituting (4.17) into (4.18). To show that $\hat{v} = v$, we need to check that $\hat{S}(\hat{u})\hat{u} = S(u)u$. Using (4.19) and the centrality (or invariance) of v^2 ,

$$\hat{S}(\hat{u})\hat{u} = cS(u)S^2(c^{-1})u = cS(u)uc^{-1}u^{-1}u = cv^2c^{-1} = v^2 = S(u)u,$$

as required. \square

4.1.3. Twisting a quasitriangular quasi-Hopf algebra.

Definition 4.10. Let $H = (H, \Delta, \epsilon, \Phi, R, S)$ be a quasitriangular quasi-algebra. An element $F \in H \otimes H$ is a *twist* (alternatively called *gauge transformation*) if F is invertible and non-degenerate.

Write

$$F = f_i \otimes g_i \quad \text{and} \quad F^{-1} = \bar{f}_i \otimes \bar{g}_i, \quad (4.23)$$

and define a new set of structure ingredients as follows:

$$\Delta_F(x) = F\Delta(x)F^{-1}, \quad x \in H, \quad (4.24)$$

$$\epsilon_F = \epsilon, \quad (4.25)$$

$$\Phi_F = F^{23}\Delta_2(F)\Phi\Delta_1(F^{-1})(F^{12})^{-1}, \quad (4.26)$$

$$R_F = F^{21}RF^{-1}, \quad (4.27)$$

Proposition 4.11. $H_F = (H, \Delta_F, \epsilon, \Phi_F, R_F)$ is a quasitriangular quasi-bialgebra. If F_1, F_2 are both twists, then so is their product F_1F_2 , and $H_{F_1F_2} = (H_{F_2})_{F_1}$.

We say that H_F is obtained from H by *twisting via F* (or that F twists H into H_F), and that H, H_F are *twist equivalent*.

If H is a quasitriangular quasi-Hopf algebra, with antipodal triple (S, α, β) , then H_F is also quasi-Hopf; an antipodal triple for H_F is given by

$$\begin{aligned} S_F &= S, \\ \alpha_F &= S(\bar{f}_i)\alpha\bar{g}_i, \\ \beta_F &= f_i\beta S(g_i). \end{aligned} \quad (4.28)$$

To adhere to our assumption that the α -element of a quasi-Hopf algebra is invertible, we impose on F the additional condition that α_F is invertible; this will be trivially satisfied in our examples.

If H, H' are quasitriangular quasi-Hopf algebras, we say that they are twist equivalent if the underlying quasitriangular quasi-bialgebras are. Note that if H' is obtained from H by twisting via F , then the antipodal triple (S', α', β') of H' need not coincide with the antipodal triple given by (4.28), but, as discussed at the end of Section 4.1.1, the two antipodal triples are related by an antipodal rescaling transformation.

Proposition 4.12. Let H, H' be quasitriangular quasi-Hopf algebras. If H has a ribbon element v and H' is twist equivalent to H (via $F \in H^{\otimes 2}$), then v is also a ribbon element for H' .

Proof. We may assume, by Proposition 4.9, that the antipodal triple of H' is given by (4.28). We denote by u_F the u -element of H' .

By applying S to (4.20), and then using (4.19) and the centrality of v , we obtain

$$S(u)u\alpha = S(t_i)S(\alpha)ut_i = S(s_i)S(t_j)\alpha s_j t_i. \quad (4.29)$$

We apply this formula to H' , to compute $S_F(u_F)u_F\alpha_F$. Substituting $R_F = g_i s_j \bar{f}_k \otimes f_i t_j \bar{g}_k$, $\alpha_F = S(\bar{f}_l)\alpha \bar{g}_l$, and using $S_F = S$, a straightforward computation (utilizing once more each of (4.20) and (4.29)) leads to

$$S_F(u_F)u_F\alpha_F = S(\bar{f}_l)S(u)u\alpha \bar{g}_l = v^2\alpha_F.$$

Since α_F is invertible, we have $v^2 = S_F(u_F)u_F$.

It remains to check that

$$\Delta_F(v) = (v \otimes v)(R_F^{21}R_F)^{-1}.$$

As $(R_F^{21}R_F)^{-1} = F(R^{21}R)^{-1}F^{-1}$ and $\Delta_F(v) = F\Delta(v)F^{-1}$, this amounts to

$$\Delta(v) = F^{-1}(v \otimes v)F(R^{21}R)^{-1},$$

which follows from the centrality (or invariance, for diagrammatic algebras) of $v \otimes v$ and (4.22). \square

See [LGZ, Section 5] for a proof which does not rely on the assumption that α is invertible.

4.2. The KZ structures. We turn to describe a set of examples of quasitriangular quasi-Hopf structures originating from the monodromy of the Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov (KZ) system of differential equations.

4.2.1. The algebra of horizontal chords and KZ associator. We recall the spaces $\mathcal{A}_n^h = \mathcal{A}^h(\uparrow_1, \dots, \uparrow_n)$ that were defined in Remark 2.5. \mathcal{A}_n^h is the quotient by 4T relations of the formal span of the space \mathcal{D}_n^h of chord diagrams based on the skeleton $\mathbf{M} = \{\uparrow_1, \dots, \uparrow_n\}$, all of their chords are horizontal. It has the usual grading by half the number of vertices (= number of chords). As with \mathcal{A} and $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$, we almost always work with the graded completion of \mathcal{A}_n^h , without introducing a separate notation.

It is customary to refer to the oriented intervals making up the skeleton of \mathcal{A}_n^h as *strands*. We denote by $t^{ij} \in \mathcal{A}_n^h$ ($1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$) the element represented by a diagram with a single chord connecting the i th strand to the j th strand:

$$t^{ij} = \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \quad \uparrow^i \quad \uparrow^j \quad \uparrow \\ \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \\ \dots \quad \dots \quad \dots \quad \dots \\ \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \\ \uparrow \quad \uparrow^i \quad \uparrow^j \quad \uparrow \end{array} .$$

As for $\mathcal{A}^{\boxtimes n}$, the juxtaposition product $D_1 D_2$ of diagrams $D_1, D_2 \in \mathcal{A}_n^h$ is defined by glueing the head of the i th strand of D_1 to the tail of the i th strand of D_2 , for $i = 1, \dots, n$; it endows \mathcal{A}_n^h with the structure of an algebra (in $\text{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$). The algebra \mathcal{A}_n^h is generated by the elements t^{ij} , which satisfy the relations

$$t^{ij} = t^{ji}, \quad [t^{ij}, t^{kl}] = 0 \quad \text{if } |\{i, j, k, l\}| = 4, \quad (4.30)$$

and

$$[t^{jk}, t^{ij} + t^{ik}] = 0 \quad \text{if } |\{i, j, k\}| = 3. \quad (4.31)$$

The last relations follow from the 4T relations; for example,

$$[t^{34}, t^{13} + t^{14}] = \left(\begin{array}{c} \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow \\ \text{---} \end{array} \right) - \left(\begin{array}{c} \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow \\ \text{---} \end{array} \right) + \left(\begin{array}{c} \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow \\ \text{---} \end{array} \right) - \left(\begin{array}{c} \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow \\ \text{---} \end{array} \right) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{A}_4^h.$$

(The strands are labeled 1–4 from left to right.) It is not hard to show that \mathcal{A}_n^h is isomorphic to the graded completion of the algebra generated over \mathbb{k} by symbols t^{ij} (of degree 1) subject to the relations (4.30) and (4.31).

We can define the cabling and strand removal operations

$$\Delta_i = \Delta_{\uparrow_i} : \mathcal{A}_n^h \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{n+1}^h \quad ; \quad \epsilon_i = \epsilon_{\uparrow_i} : \mathcal{A}_n^h \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{n-1}^h,$$

just as for $\mathcal{A}^{\boxtimes n}$. The injection $\mathcal{A}_p^h \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_n^h$ ($p \leq n$), corresponding to a tuple (k_1, \dots, k_p) , is defined as in Section 4.1, by adding and relabeling strands. Thus, the notion of non-degeneracy and the pentagon and hexagon relations make sense in the sequence of spaces¹² $\{\mathcal{A}_n^h\}$, and we can ask whether there exist a pair of non-degenerate, invertible elements $(R \in \mathcal{A}_2^h, \Phi \in \mathcal{A}_3^h)$, solving (4.2), (4.8), and (4.9). We are particularly interested in solutions (R, Φ) in which the R -matrix is given by

$$R = e^{t^{12}/2} = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^m m!} \left(\begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \vdots \\ \uparrow \\ \text{---} \end{array} \right)_{(m \text{ chords})}, \quad (4.32)$$

where the power series, having finitely many terms in each degree, is convergent in (the graded completion of) \mathcal{A}_2^h . Such an element Φ is then called a *Drinfel'd associator*.

For $k = \mathbb{C}$, Drinfel'd ([D4, Section 2]) proved the existence of such an associator, denoted Φ_{KZ} , by studying the monodromy of the KZ system

$$\frac{\partial W}{\partial z_i} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{t^{ij}}{z_i - z_j} W, \quad W : \{(z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n \mid z_i \neq z_j \text{ for } i \neq j\} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_n^h.$$

The element $\Phi_{\text{KZ}} \in \mathcal{A}_3^h$, called the *KZ associator*, is highly complicated; it can be written explicitly in terms of *multiple zeta values* (see [LM2, Section 4]).

Drinfel'd further established the following rationality result.

Theorem 1. [D4, Theorem A'] *There exists a Drinfel'd associator defined over \mathbb{Q} .*

This theorem implies that there exists a Drinfel'd associator over any field \mathbb{k} (of characteristic zero). We fix one such an associator Φ from now on. We note that the non-degeneracy of Φ implies that

$$\Phi = \left(\begin{array}{c} \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow \\ \text{---} \end{array} \right) + \sum_i c_i D_i, \quad c_i \in \mathbb{k}, D_i \in \mathcal{D}_3^h, \quad (4.33)$$

where every strand of a diagram D_i touches at least one chord; in particular, $\deg D_i \geq 2$, because all the elements of degree 1 in \mathcal{A}_3^h (linear combinations of t_{12}, t_{13}, t_{23}) fail to meet this condition.

Remark 4.13. The existence of the associator Φ_{KZ} (over \mathbb{C}) plays an essential role in the proof of Theorem 1. Accordingly, we refer to the structures involving Φ as *KZ structures*, even when $\mathbb{k} \neq \mathbb{C}$ or if another Drinfel'd associator is used over \mathbb{C} .

¹²These spaces may be thought of as the diagrammatic tensor powers of \mathcal{A}_1^h , even though the latter space is spanned by the single diagram having no chords.

4.2.2. **KZ structures on \mathcal{A} and $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$.** The inclusion maps $\mathcal{D}_n^h \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\uparrow_1, \dots, \uparrow_n)$ descend to maps $\phi^h : \mathcal{A}_n^h \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{\boxtimes n}$; see Section 2.3.1 for the proof that 4T relations map to zero. These maps evidently interchange all the algebraic structures on \mathcal{A}^h -spaces with the parallel structures on the spaces $\mathcal{A}^{\boxtimes n}$.

The maps ϕ^h are actually injective (see [BN2], in particular Corollary 4.4). We will not need this fact in the sequel, but we do retain the notation Φ for $\phi^h(\Phi)$. Notice that t^{12} is mapped by ϕ^h to the diagrammatic metric tensor Ω (see Example 2.17), and hence $R = e^{t^{12}/2}$ is mapped to $R = e^{\Omega/2}$.

The elements $R \in \mathcal{A}^{\boxtimes 2}$ and $\Phi \in \mathcal{A}^{\boxtimes 3}$ are the major components of a quasitriangular quasi-Hopf structure on \mathcal{A} .

Proposition 4.14. *$(\mathcal{A}, \Delta, \epsilon, \Phi, R)$ is a diagrammatic quasitriangular quasi-bialgebra.*

We stress that this structure shares the same coproduct (and counit) with the usual bialgebra structure $(\mathcal{A}, \Delta, \epsilon, 1^{\boxtimes 3}, 1^{\boxtimes 2})$.

Proof. The pentagon and hexagon relations follow from the fact that they hold in \mathcal{A}^h -spaces, and so does (4.4). We know that Δ and ϵ are algebra morphisms and that (4.3) holds, because these properties are enjoyed by the usual Hopf structure. Thus, it remains to check (4.1) and (4.7). As Δ is coassociative and cocommutative, they take the form

$$[(\Delta_2 \Delta)(D), \Phi] = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad [\Delta(D), R] = 0 \quad \text{for all } D \in \mathcal{A},$$

which follows at once from Proposition 2.33. □

We denote \mathcal{A} equipped with the above described structure by \mathcal{A}_{KZ} . It remains to describe an antipodal triple of \mathcal{A}_{KZ} . For that we need a short preparation.

Definition 4.15. An element $D \in \mathcal{A}^{\boxtimes n}$ is called a *perturbation of the identity* if $D = 1^{\boxtimes n} + D_{>0}$, where $1^{\boxtimes n}$ is the no-chord diagram on n strands, and $D_{>0}$ is D with its degree 0 piece removed.

Clearly, the R -matrix and associator of \mathcal{A}_{KZ} are perturbations of the identity.

A perturbation of the identity in $\mathcal{A}^{\boxtimes n}$ is invertible¹³, because a two-sided inverse can be defined using the power series of $(1+x)^{-1}$. We note for a later purpose that, similarly, we can use the power series of $\sqrt{1+x}$ to define the square root $D^{\frac{1}{2}}$ of a perturbation of the identity D .

We return to describing the antipodal triple of \mathcal{A}_{KZ} . Its antipode is the same as the antipode of the usual Hopf structure of \mathcal{A} (see Definition 2.28). Put

$$\nu = (X_i S(Y_i) Z_i)^{-1} \in \mathcal{A}. \tag{4.34}$$


Since all elements of \mathcal{A} are invariant, (4.13) and (4.14) hold for any choice of α, β , and we can satisfy (4.15) by choosing

$$\alpha = \nu; \quad \beta = 1. \tag{4.35}$$


In diagrammatic notation, ν is the inverse of $(\mu_{\uparrow_1, \uparrow_3} \mu_{\uparrow_1, \uparrow_2} S_{\uparrow_2})(\Phi)$; the latter element is indeed invertible, because it is a perturbation of the identity in \mathcal{A} . If we depict (a summand of) Φ

¹³The notion of an element being invertible is always with respect to the $\text{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ -product.


as



then ν^{-1} is (omitting the parity sign in the definition of S)



and the antipodal identity (4.15), with $\beta = 1 =$ empty diagram, looks like



We will use below more algebraic expressions as in (4.34) for elements of \mathcal{A} -spaces; a little thought shows in each case how to translate those expressions and algebraic manipulations with them into diagrammatic arguments.

We claim that the triple $(S, \alpha = \nu, \beta = 1)$ also satisfies (4.16). Here is a sketch of the proof. We rewrite the pentagon relation (4.2) as

$$(\text{id} \boxtimes \text{id} \boxtimes \Delta)(\Phi) \cdot (\Delta \boxtimes \text{id} \boxtimes \text{id})(\Phi) \cdot (\Phi^{-1} \boxtimes 1) = (1 \boxtimes \Phi) \cdot (\text{id} \boxtimes \Delta \boxtimes \text{id})(\Phi).$$

We apply to both sides the map $\mathcal{A}^{\boxtimes 4} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ taking $D \in \mathcal{A}^{\boxtimes 4}$ to

$$\mu^{(7)}(S_1 \boxtimes S_5)(D \boxtimes \alpha \boxtimes \beta \boxtimes \alpha)^{1357246},$$

where $S_i = S_{\uparrow_i}$, and $\mu^{(7)} : \mathcal{A}^{\boxtimes 7} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is the iterated product map, concatenating the seven skeleton components, with \uparrow_1 before \uparrow_2 before $\dots \uparrow_7$. (Just for orientation, the corresponding map in a Vect_k notation is: $a \otimes b \otimes c \otimes d \rightarrow S(a)\alpha b\beta S(c)\alpha d$.) The resulting expressions on both sides can be simplified in several steps, by using (4.13), (4.14), and the non-degeneracy of Φ , until we get

$$(S(\bar{X}_i\alpha\bar{Y}_i\beta S(\bar{Z}_i))\alpha = \alpha(X_j\beta S(Y_j)\alpha Z_j) = \alpha,$$

where the last equality follows from (4.15). Since α is invertible, we see that (4.16) also holds true. Thus, $(S, \nu, 1)$ is an antipodal triple for \mathcal{A}_{KZ} .

Remark 4.16. The argument above is an adaptation of an excerpt from the proof of [D3, Proposition 1.3], which basically states that for a quasitriangular quasi-bialgebra in Vect_k , conditions (4.13) – (4.15) imply condition (4.16). (The proof there is somewhat more complicated, as it avoids the need to assume that α is invertible.)

We now want to compute the u -element of \mathcal{A}_{KZ} . Before doing that, we state a useful property of the associator and comment on its proof.

Proposition 4.17. *The associator of \mathcal{A}_{KZ} satisfies*

$$\Phi^{-1} = \Phi^{321}. \quad (4.36)$$

Indeed, Drinfel'd ([D3, Proposition 3.5]) proves that for a certain class of graded quasitriangular quasi-Hopf algebras, called QUE algebras (see Definition 4.22 below), the symmetry of the R -matrix ($R^{21} = R$) implies (4.36). An inspection of the proof shows that it carries over to \mathcal{A}_{KZ} ; except for algebraic manipulations valid in any quasitriangular quasi-Hopf ($\text{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ or diagrammatic) algebra, the proof uses only the ability to extract square roots of perturbations of the identity.

Another version of the proof, already in a diagrammatic framework, can be found in [BN3, Proposition 3.7], which utilizes the restriction to braids of the invariants to be described in Section 4.4.

Plugging (4.36) into (4.34), we find that

$$\nu = (\bar{Z}_i S(\bar{Y}_i) \bar{X}_i)^{-1}.$$

We compute u according to (4.18). Using the commutativity of \mathcal{A} , that $S^2 = \text{id}$, and the last formula for ν , we have

$$\begin{aligned} u &= S(\bar{Y}_i \beta S(\bar{Z}_i)) S(t_j) \alpha s_j \bar{X}_i \\ &= (\bar{Z}_i S(\bar{Y}_i) \bar{X}_i) \nu S(t_j) s_j \\ &= S(t_j) s_j = \mu(S \boxtimes \text{id})(R^{21}). \end{aligned}$$

From (4.32) we get

$$u = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^m}{2^m m!} \text{ (diagram with } m \text{ chords) }.$$

Repeatedly moving the rightmost leg across the half circles below it until it is immediately to the right of its origin (which we may do by the invariance of the diagram made of the lower circles), we obtain

$$\text{ (diagram with } m \text{ chords) } = \text{ (diagram with } m \text{ separate half circles) } = \left(\text{ (diagram with one half circle) } \right)^m,$$

and we conclude that

$$u = e^{-C/2}, \quad (4.37)$$

where C is the diagrammatic Casimir element (Example 2.17).

The coproduct of C is

$$\Delta(C) = \uparrow \uparrow \downarrow \downarrow + \uparrow \downarrow \uparrow \downarrow + 2 \uparrow \uparrow \downarrow \downarrow = 1 \boxtimes C + C \boxtimes 1 + 2\Omega. \quad (4.38)$$

The elements on the right hand side commute with each other, thanks to the invariance of C (compare Remark 4.8). Therefore,

$$\Delta(u) = e^{-\Delta(C)/2} = (1 \boxtimes e^{-C/2})(e^{-C/2} \boxtimes 1)e^{-\Omega} = (u \boxtimes u)(R^{21}R)^{-1}.$$

As $S(u) = u$, it follows that $v = u$ meets all the conditions of Definition 4.6, and is a ribbon element for \mathcal{A}_{KZ} .

We record another consequence of (4.38). As $\Delta(C)$ commutes with all $D \in \mathcal{A}^{\boxtimes 2}$ (by Proposition 2.33), and so do $1 \boxtimes C$ and $C \boxtimes 1$, we have:

Proposition 4.18. $[\Omega, D] = 0$ for all $D \in \mathcal{A}^{\boxtimes 2}$.

The quasitriangular quasi-Hopf structure of \mathcal{A}_{KZ} depends on the choice of the Drinfel'd associator Φ . Suppose $\tilde{\Phi} \in \mathcal{A}_3^{\hbar}$ is another Drinfel'd associator, and denote by $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\text{KZ}}$ the structure corresponding to $\tilde{\Phi}$.

The following result is due to Le and Murakami ([LM2, Theorem 8]). It is the diagrammatic analogue of a result of Drinfel'd for universal enveloping algebras ([D3, Theorem 3.15]).

Theorem 2. *There exists a symmetric twist $F \in \mathcal{A}^{\boxtimes 2}$ such that $\tilde{\Phi} = \Phi_F$, where Φ_F is given by the formula of Equation 4.26.*

We note that twisting by F leaves the R -matrix unchanged, because F commutes with $R = e^{\Omega/2}$ (by Proposition 4.18), and therefore

$$R_F = F^{21} R F^{-1} = F^{21} F^{-1} R = R,$$

as F is symmetric.

By Proposition 2.33, $\Delta_F = \Delta$. We have thus proved:

Proposition 4.19. *If $\Phi, \tilde{\Phi}$ are Drinfel'd associators, then the quasitriangular quasi-Hopf algebras \mathcal{A}_{KZ} and $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\text{KZ}}$ are twist equivalent.*

The \mathcal{A}_{KZ} structure can be exported to $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ with the help of the ι -maps. We recall that ι -images in $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ -spaces of \mathcal{A} -elements are denoted by the same symbols as their preimages.

Proposition 4.20. *$\vec{\mathcal{A}}_{\text{KZ}} = (\vec{\mathcal{A}}, \Delta, \epsilon, \Phi, R = e^{\Omega/2}, S, \alpha = \nu, \beta = 1)$ is a ribbon quasitriangular quasi-Hopf algebra. Its u -element and ribbon element are equal to $e^{-C/2}$.*

Proof. As in the proof of Proposition 4.14, we need only verify axioms pertaining to a general element $D \in \vec{\mathcal{A}}$, namely the quasi-coassociativity (4.1), quasi-cocommutativity (4.7), and the quasi-antipodal identities (4.13) – (4.14). The first two follow from Proposition 3.20, and the other two follow immediately from the fact that elements from \mathcal{A} are (mapped by ι to) invariant elements in $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$. \square

4.2.3. KZ structures on universal enveloping algebras. We want to use the maps $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ to transfer the KZ structure of \mathcal{A} into $U(\mathfrak{g})$, the universal enveloping algebra of a metrized Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} . Here we face a problem: The maps $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}$, initially defined for single diagrams, can only be extended to *finite* linear combinations of such diagrams, whereas $R = e^{\Omega/2}$, for example, is a linear combination of infinitely many diagrams.

The remedy to this problem is replacing $U(\mathfrak{g})$ by $U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]$, the space of formal power series in \hbar with coefficients from $U(\mathfrak{g})$, which is a (left) module over the ring $\mathbb{k}[[\hbar]]$. More generally, for any skeleton \mathbf{M} , we replace the space $L(\mathbf{M})$ with $L(\mathbf{M})[[\hbar]]$. The action of \mathfrak{g} on $L(\mathbf{M})$ extends to an action on $L(\mathbf{M})[[\hbar]]$, and $(L(\mathbf{M})[[\hbar]])^{\mathfrak{g}} = L(\mathbf{M})^{\mathfrak{g}}[[\hbar]]$. For a homogeneous element $D \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M})$ of degree d , we define

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\hbar}(D) = \mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}(D)\hbar^d,$$

and extend by linearity to (the graded completion of) $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M})$, obtaining a map $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\hbar} : \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M}) \rightarrow L(\mathbf{M})^{\mathfrak{g}}[[\hbar]]$. In the same way we define $\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\hbar} : \vec{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{M}) \rightarrow L(\mathbf{M})[[\hbar]]$, when \mathfrak{g} is the ambient Lie bialgebra of a Manin triple, and $\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\hbar} : \vec{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{M}) \rightarrow L(\mathbf{M})[[\hbar]]$ for a complex semisimple Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} .

A $\mathbb{k}[[\hbar]]$ -module M is endowed with the \hbar -adic topology, which is defined by declaring $\{\hbar^n M\}_n$ as a basis of open neighborhoods of 0. For $x, y \in M$, we write

$$x \equiv y \pmod{\hbar^n} \quad \text{if } x - y \in \hbar^n M.$$

M is called a *topologically free* module if there exist a \mathbb{k} -linear space V such that $M \cong V[[\hbar]]$ as $\mathbb{k}[[\hbar]]$ -modules.

The *topological tensor product* of two topologically free $\mathbb{k}[[\hbar]]$ -modules of the form $M = V[[\hbar]]$, $N = W[[\hbar]]$, is

$$M \hat{\otimes} N = (V \otimes W)[[\hbar]].$$

More intrinsically, it can be defined as the *\hbar -adic completion* of the algebraic tensor product $M \otimes N$ (see [Ka, XVI.2–3] for details). The latter definition is applicable to any pair of $\mathbb{k}[[\hbar]]$ -modules.

With the notion of tensor product at our disposal, we can carry over the definitions of Section 4.1 to the category of $\mathbb{k}[[\hbar]]$ -modules; all the results mentioned there hold in this category as well, with identical proofs. We refer to objects in this category as ‘*topological*’, partly to follow common terminology, and partly as a reminder that topological tensor products are used throughout.

In particular, $U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]$ is a topological Hopf algebra, with its coproduct, for example, given by

$$\Delta \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} u_n \hbar^n \right) = \Delta(u_n) \hbar^n.$$

The maps $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\hbar}$ and $\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\hbar}$ intertwine all the structure maps of $U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]$ -spaces with their parallels for \mathcal{A} -spaces and $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ -spaces, respectively, essentially because all the diagrammatic structure maps are degree preserving.

We now describe the KZ structure on $U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]$. Set $\Phi_{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\hbar}(\Phi) \in (U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]^{\hat{\otimes} 3})^{\mathfrak{g}}$, $R_{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\hbar}(R) = e^{\hbar \Omega_{\mathfrak{g}}/2} \in (U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]^{\hat{\otimes} 2})^{\mathfrak{g}}$, and $\nu_{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\hbar}(\nu) \in (U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]])^{\mathfrak{g}}$.

Proposition 4.21. *$U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]_{KZ} = (U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]], \Delta, \epsilon, \Phi_{\mathfrak{g}}, R_{\mathfrak{g}}, S, \nu_{\mathfrak{g}}, 1)$ is a topological ribbon quasitriangular quasi-Hopf algebra. Its u -element is $u_{\mathfrak{g}} = e^{-\hbar C_{\mathfrak{g}}/2}$, which is also the ribbon element.*

Proof. Similarly to the proof of Proposition 4.20, we only need to comment that the properties of quasi-coassociativity, quasi-cocommutativity, and the quasi-antipodal identities hold for all $x \in U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]$, due to the \mathfrak{g} -invariance of $\Phi_{\mathfrak{g}}$, $R_{\mathfrak{g}}$, and $\nu_{\mathfrak{g}}$. \square

We note that by (4.33),

$$\Phi_{\mathfrak{g}} = 1 \hat{\otimes} 1 \hat{\otimes} 1 \pmod{\hbar^2}.$$

The algebras $U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]_{KZ}$ are examples of *quantum enveloping algebras*:

Definition 4.22. A quasitriangular quasi-Hopf quantum enveloping (QUE) algebra for a Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} is a topologically free quasitriangular quasi-Hopf algebra $H = (H, \bar{\Delta}, \bar{\epsilon}, \bar{\Phi}, \bar{R})$, such that ‘ H is isomorphic to $U(\mathfrak{g})$ modulo \hbar ’, namely $H/\hbar H \cong (U(\mathfrak{g}), \Delta, \epsilon, 1^{\hat{\otimes} 3}, 1^{\hat{\otimes} 2})$. In addition, $\bar{\Phi}$ is required to satisfy

$$\frac{1}{3}(\bar{\Phi}^{123} + \bar{\Phi}^{312} + \bar{\Phi}^{231}) \equiv 1^{\hat{\otimes} 3} \pmod{\hbar^2}.$$

More explicitly, the topological freeness condition implies that there exists an invertible $\mathbb{k}[[\hbar]]$ -linear map $f : H \rightarrow V[[\hbar]]$, for a certain k -linear space V ; necessarily then, $V \cong U(\mathfrak{g})$. Hence there is an invertible $\mathbb{k}[[\hbar]]$ -linear map $f : H \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]$. That f is a ‘morphism modulo \hbar ’ means, for example, that

$$f(xy) \equiv f(x)f(y) \pmod{\hbar},$$

for all $x, y \in H$, and

$$(f \hat{\otimes} f)(\tilde{R}) \equiv 1 \hat{\otimes} 1 \pmod{\hbar}.$$

Remark 4.23. We have omitted the antipodal triple from the displayed components of the structure of H because the relevant conditions, such as

$$f(\tilde{S}(x)) \equiv S(f(x)) \pmod{\hbar},$$

are automatically satisfied; this can be deduced from [D3, Theorem 1.6].

4.3. Drinfel’d-Jimbo quantum groups. Let \mathfrak{g} be a complex (semi-)simple Lie algebra. Our aim is to describe an important construction of a *coassociative* QUE algebra for \mathfrak{g} .

We begin by stating a technical definition.

Definition 4.24. Let X be a set and R be a subset of $\mathbb{k}\{X\}[[\hbar]]$, where $\mathbb{k}\{X\}$ is the \mathbb{k} -linear space formally spanned by X . A topological algebra H is said to be (*topologically*) *generated* by the set X of generators and the set R of relations if H is isomorphic to the quotient of $\mathbb{k}\{X\}[[\hbar]]$ by the \hbar -adic closure of the two-sided ideal generated by R .

We recall the definitions of several q -symbols. For an invertible $q \in \mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$, the q -integers are

$$[n]_q = \frac{q^n - q^{-n}}{q - q^{-1}} = q^{n-1} + q^{n-3} + \cdots + q^{-n+3} + q^{-n+1}.$$

For a non-negative integer k , the q -factorials and q -binomial coefficients are defined as

$$[k]_q! = \prod_{i=1}^k [i]_q, \quad \begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix}_q = \frac{[n]_q!}{[n-k]_q! [k]_q!},$$

where these expressions are considered as elements of $\mathbb{Z}[q, q^{-1}]$; that $\begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix}_q \in \mathbb{Z}[q, q^{-1}]$ follows from the recursion formula

$$\begin{bmatrix} n+1 \\ k \end{bmatrix}_q = q^{-k} \begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix}_q + q^{n-k+1} \begin{bmatrix} n \\ k-1 \end{bmatrix}_q.$$

We use the notation and results that were reviewed in Section 3.1.5. We further recall that the entries of the Cartan matrix of \mathfrak{g} are

$$a_{ij} = 2 \frac{(\alpha_i, \alpha_j)}{(\alpha_i, \alpha_i)}, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, n,$$

and set

$$d_i = \frac{(\alpha_i, \alpha_i)}{2}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

The numbers a_{ij} are non-positive integers for $i \neq j$, while $d_i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ (due to our choice of normalization of the metric).

For a simple root $\alpha_i \in \Lambda$, let

$$e_i = e_{\alpha_i}, \quad f_i = d_i^{-1} f_{\alpha_i} \quad h_i = [e_i, f_i] (= d_i^{-1} h_{\alpha_i}).$$

These elements satisfy *Serre's relations*:

$$[h_i, h_j] = 0, \quad [h_i, e_j] = a_{ij} e_j, \quad [h_i, f_j] = -a_{ij} f_j, \quad [e_i, f_i] = h_i,$$

and for $i \neq j$,

$$(\text{ad } e_i)^{1-a_{ij}}(e_j) = 0, \quad (\text{ad } f_i)^{1-a_{ij}}(f_j) = 0.$$

By a theorem of Serre (see [H, Section 18]), $U(\mathfrak{g})$ is isomorphic to the algebra generated by a set of $3n$ generators $\{e_i, f_i, h_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ subject to the above relations.

In terms of the generators $\{e_i, f_i, h_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$, the standard cobracket of \mathfrak{g} is determined by

$$\delta(h_i) = 0, \quad \delta(e_i) = \frac{d_i}{2} e_i \wedge h_i, \quad \delta(f_i) = \frac{d_i}{2} f_i \wedge h_i.$$

We are now ready to define the Drinfel'd-Jimbo algebra $U_{\hbar}(\mathfrak{g})$. Put $q = e^{\hbar/2}$.

Definition 4.25. $U_{\hbar}(\mathfrak{g})$ is the topological algebra generated by the set of generators $\{E_i, F_i, H_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ subject to the relations

$$[H_i, H_j] = 0, \quad [H_i, E_j] = a_{ij} E_j, \quad [H_i, F_j] = -a_{ij} F_j,$$

$$[E_i, F_i] = \delta_{ij} \frac{q^{d_i H_i} - q^{-d_i H_i}}{q^{d_i} - q^{-d_i}},$$

and for $i \neq j$,

$$\sum_{k=0}^{1-a_{ij}} (-1)^k \begin{bmatrix} 1 - a_{ij} \\ k \end{bmatrix}_{q^{d_i}} E_i^k E_j E_i^{1-a_{ij}-k} = 0,$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{1-a_{ij}} (-1)^k \begin{bmatrix} 1 - a_{ij} \\ k \end{bmatrix}_{q^{d_i}} F_i^k F_j F_i^{1-a_{ij}-k} = 0.$$

It is not hard to see that as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$, the above relations become Serre's relations for $U(\mathfrak{g})$. Thus, $U_{\hbar}(\mathfrak{g}) / \hbar U_{\hbar}(\mathfrak{g}) \cong U(\mathfrak{g})$.

We endow $U_{\hbar}(\mathfrak{g})$ with putative coproduct Δ_{\hbar} , counit ϵ_{\hbar} , and antipode S_{\hbar} , which are determined by

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\hbar}(H_i) &= H_i \hat{\otimes} 1 + 1 \hat{\otimes} H_i, \\ \Delta_{\hbar}(E_i) &= E_i \hat{\otimes} q^{d_i H_i / 2} + q^{-d_i H_i / 2} \hat{\otimes} E_i, \\ \Delta_{\hbar}(F_i) &= F_i \hat{\otimes} q^{d_i H_i / 2} + q^{-d_i H_i / 2} \hat{\otimes} F_i; \end{aligned}$$

$$\epsilon_{\hbar}(H_i) = \epsilon_{\hbar}(E_i) = \epsilon_{\hbar}(F_i) = 0;$$

and

$$S_{\hbar}(H_i) = -H_i, \quad S_{\hbar}(E_i) = -q^{d_i} E_i, \quad S_{\hbar}(F_i) = -q^{-d_i} F_i.$$

The following theorem is proved in [D1] (see also [CP, Section 6.5]).

Theorem 3. *There is a universal R -matrix¹⁴ $R_{\hbar} \in U_{\hbar}(\mathfrak{g})^{\hat{\otimes} 2}$ such that*

$$U_{\hbar}(\mathfrak{g}) = (U_{\hbar}(\mathfrak{g}), \Delta_{\hbar}, \epsilon_{\hbar}, R_{\hbar}, S_{\hbar})$$

is a quasitriangular Hopf QUE algebra for \mathfrak{g} .

Further properties and explicit expressions for R_{\hbar} can be found in [CP, Section 8.3].

The theorem implicitly asserts that $U_{\hbar}(\mathfrak{g})$ is topologically free, so that $U_{\hbar}(\mathfrak{g})$ and $U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]$ are isomorphic as $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$ -modules (it is a difficult part of the proof). In fact, much more is proved in [D2] and [CP, Proposition 6.5.7].

Theorem 4. *There is an isomorphism of topological algebras $\varphi : U_{\hbar}(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]$ satisfying*

$$\varphi(E_i) = e_i \pmod{\hbar}, \quad \varphi(F_i) = f_i \pmod{\hbar}, \quad \varphi(H_i) = h_i \pmod{\hbar}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

The restriction of φ to $\mathbf{Z}_{\hbar}(\mathfrak{g})$, the center of $U_{\hbar}(\mathfrak{g})$, is uniquely determined by these conditions and induces a canonical isomorphism of topological algebras $\varphi : \mathbf{Z}_{\hbar}(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}}[[\hbar]]$. Moreover, φ can be chosen in such a way that $\varphi(H_i) = h_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ (strict equality).

In particular, we can define the *Quantum Casimir element* $C_{\hbar} \in \mathbf{Z}_{\hbar}(\mathfrak{g})$ as the inverse image of the (classical) Casimir element $C_{\mathfrak{g}} \in U(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}} \subset U(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}}[[\hbar]]$. Write $\varrho_{\mathfrak{g}}$, the (element of \mathfrak{h} dual to the) half-sum of positive roots, as $\varrho_{\mathfrak{g}} = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i h_i$, and set

$$\varrho_{\hbar} = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i H_i \in U_{\hbar}(\mathfrak{g}).$$

(It can be checked that the coefficients are given by $c_i = \sum_{j=1}^n a^{ji} d_j$, where (a^{ij}) is the inverse of the Cartan matrix.)

Proposition 4.26. *Let $v_{\hbar} = e^{-\hbar C_{\mathfrak{g}}/2}$. Then the u -element of $U_{\hbar}(\mathfrak{g})$ is $u_{\hbar} = e^{\hbar \varrho_{\mathfrak{g}}} v_{\hbar}$, and v_{\hbar} is a ribbon element for $U_{\hbar}(\mathfrak{g})$.*

See [Ka, Section XVII.3] for a proof, based on the results of [D2, Section 5].

Using an isomorphism φ as in Theorem 4, we obtain a ribbon quasitriangular Hopf structure on $U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]$ by using φ to export the quasitriangular Hopf structure from $U_{\hbar}(\mathfrak{g})$ to $U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]$. We call such a structure a *DJ structure* of $U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]$ and denote it by $U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]_{\text{DJ}}$. We write

$$U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]_{\text{DJ}} = (U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]], \Delta_{\hbar}, \epsilon_{\hbar}, R_{\mathfrak{g}, \hbar}, S_{\hbar}),$$

where the coproduct, the counit, and the antipode are denoted by the same symbols as their φ -related maps for $U_{\hbar}(\mathfrak{g})$, and the R -matrix is

$$R_{\mathfrak{g}, \hbar} = \varphi \hat{\otimes} \varphi(R_{\hbar}).$$

It can be shown (see [Ka, Lemma XIX.5.1]) that $\epsilon_{\hbar} = U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$ is equal to the usual counit of $U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]$.

It is immediate from the properties of φ stated in Theorem 4, that the u -element and ribbon element of $U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]_{\text{DJ}}$ are

$$u_{\mathfrak{g}, \hbar} = e^{\hbar \varrho_{\mathfrak{g}}} e^{-\hbar C_{\mathfrak{g}}/2}, \quad v_{\mathfrak{g}, \hbar} = e^{-\hbar C_{\mathfrak{g}}/2}. \quad (4.39)$$

¹⁴The Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} is suppressed from the notation for elements of $U_{\hbar}(\mathfrak{g})$ -spaces.

As $U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]_{DJ}$ has a trivial associator, Equation 4.12 for $R_{\mathfrak{g},\hbar}$ becomes the *quantum Yang-Baxter equation (QYBE)*,

$$R_{\mathfrak{g},\hbar}^{12} R_{\mathfrak{g},\hbar}^{13} R_{\mathfrak{g},\hbar}^{23} = R_{\mathfrak{g},\hbar}^{23} R_{\mathfrak{g},\hbar}^{13} R_{\mathfrak{g},\hbar}^{12},$$

which is a ‘quantum form’ of the CYBE (3.1). It can be proved (see the remark following [CP, Theorem 8.3.9]) that

$$R_{\mathfrak{g},\hbar} = 1 \hat{\otimes} 1 + \hbar r_{\mathfrak{g}} \pmod{\hbar^2}, \quad (4.40)$$

where $r_{\mathfrak{g}}$ is the classical r -matrix of \mathfrak{g} , given by (3.7). Thus, $R_{\mathfrak{g},\hbar}$ is a *quantization* of $r_{\mathfrak{g}}$.

The next theorem is an important ingredient in Drinfel’d’s celebrated proof of the Drinfel’d-Kohno theorem (see [Ka, XIX.4–5] for a streamlined exposition).

Theorem 5. $U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]_{DJ}$ is twist equivalent to $U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]_{KZ}$.

We stress that this result is independent of the particular isomorphism φ which is used to define a DJ structure on $U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]$.

4.4. H -invariants of framed links. Coupled with some important examples of algebraic and diagrammatic ribbon quasitriangular quasi-Hopf algebras, we are going to describe how to construct from such algebras topological invariants of *framed parenthesized tangles* (restricting, in particular, to invariants of framed links). Similar constructions appear in many texts, including [AC], [BN3], [C], [Ka, Chapter XX], [LGZ], [LM2], [Pi], and [RT]. Unfortunately, none of those treatments is sufficient for our purposes. This is because constructions in the usual algebraic framework (most notably [AC] and [LGZ]) work with finite-dimensional modules, which are unavailable in diagrammatic cases, while diagrammatic constructions (such as [BN3] and [LM2]) utilize specialized properties of \mathcal{A} and its KZ structure, which we can not use when working with the EK structure of $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$, to be described in Section 5.

4.4.1. The space of coinvariants.

Definition 4.27. The *space of coinvariants* of an algebra H is the quotient space

$$H^{\text{coinv}} = H / \text{span}\{xy - yx \mid x, y \in H\}.$$

We often use the alternative notation \bar{H} . We denote by $\text{Tr} : H \rightarrow \bar{H}$ the natural projection.

For $H = U(\mathfrak{g})$, with \mathfrak{g} a metrized Lie algebra, an elementary argument shows that $\bar{H} = U(\mathfrak{g})_{\mathfrak{g}}$, the space of coinvariants for the adjoint action of \mathfrak{g} on $U(\mathfrak{g})$ (see Section 2.2.4). If V is a finite-dimensional representation of \mathfrak{g} , then the associated algebra morphism $U(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow \text{End}(V)$ descends upon composition with the trace map $\text{Tr} : \text{End}(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$ to a map $\text{Tr}_V : U(\mathfrak{g})_{\mathfrak{g}} \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$. Therefore, $U(\mathfrak{g})_{\mathfrak{g}}$ is in a sense a ‘trace object’. If \mathfrak{g} is a complex semisimple Lie algebra, then it can be proved¹⁵ that the trace maps $\{\text{Tr}_V\}$, with V ranging over finite-dimensional representations of \mathfrak{g} , separate the points of $U(\mathfrak{g})_{\mathfrak{g}}$, so that $U(\mathfrak{g})_{\mathfrak{g}}$ is a ‘universal trace object’.

For the diagrammatic algebra $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$, the subspace corresponding to $\text{span}\{xy - yx\}$ is the image of the map

$$\gamma : \vec{\mathcal{A}}^{\boxtimes 2} \rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{A}}, \quad D \mapsto \mu(D) - \mu(D^{21}).$$

Let $\phi^l : \vec{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{A}}(\bigcirc)$ be the ‘circling the interval’ map, defined as in Section 2.3.2. It is clear that $\text{Im}(\gamma) \subset \ker(\phi^l)$, so ϕ^l descends to a map $\phi^l : \vec{\mathcal{A}} / \text{Im}(\gamma) \rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{A}}(\bigcirc)$. By an argument

¹⁵The crucial ingredient in the proof is a well-known theorem of Chevalley ([H, Section 23.1]), asserting that the trace maps $\{\text{Tr}_V\}$ span the space of linear functionals on $U(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}}$.

similar to the one in the beginning of the proof of Proposition 2.20, the latter map has an ‘opening the circle’ inverse. We conclude that

$$\vec{\mathcal{A}} / \text{Im}(\gamma) \cong \vec{\mathcal{A}}(\bigcirc),$$

so it is reasonable to define $\vec{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{coinv}} = \vec{\mathcal{A}}(\bigcirc)$. Accordingly, we henceforth denote the natural projection from $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ to $\vec{\mathcal{A}}(\bigcirc)$ by Tr instead of ϕ^l . The spaces of coinvariants and trace maps for $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ and $U(\mathfrak{g})$ (\mathfrak{g} a complex semisimple Lie algebra) fit into the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \vec{\mathcal{A}} & \xrightarrow{\text{Tr}} & \vec{\mathcal{A}}(\bigcirc) \\ \vec{\tau}_{\mathfrak{g}} \downarrow & & \downarrow \vec{\tau}_{\mathfrak{g}} \\ U(\mathfrak{g}) & \xrightarrow{\text{Tr}} & U(\mathfrak{g})_{\mathfrak{g}} \end{array} \quad (4.41)$$

For a Vect_k -algebra H , the space of coinvariants of the tensor power $H^{\otimes n}$ (with its usual Vect_k -algebra structure) is clearly equal to $\bar{H}^{\otimes n}$. To extend (4.41), we define

$$(\vec{\mathcal{A}}^{\boxtimes n})^{\text{coinv}} = \vec{\mathcal{A}}(\bigcirc_1, \dots, \bigcirc_n),$$

and make an analogous definition for \mathcal{A} :

$$(\mathcal{A}^{\boxtimes n})^{\text{coinv}} = \mathcal{A}(\bigcirc_1, \dots, \bigcirc_n),$$

Note that $\mathcal{A}^{\text{coinv}} = \mathcal{A}(\bigcirc) = \mathcal{A}$, but for $n \geq 2$, $(\mathcal{A}^{\boxtimes n})^{\text{coinv}} \neq \mathcal{A}^{\boxtimes n}$ (see Remark 2.21). That these are the correct diagrammatic definitions will become clear below when we discuss in Section 4.4.3 the **HS** categories.

4.4.2. The category of parenthesized framed tangles.

Definition 4.28. A *parenthesized string* of length l over the alphabet $\{\uparrow, \downarrow\}$ is either the empty string \emptyset ($l = 0$), one of the two single-letter strings \uparrow and \downarrow ($l = 1$), or a string of the form $(W_1 W_2)$, where W_1, W_2 are parenthesized strings of lengths $0 < l_1, l_2 < l$ such that $l = l_1 + l_2$. The length of a parenthesized string W is denoted by $|W|$.

We denote by \mathcal{W} the set of parenthesized strings over $\{\uparrow, \downarrow\}$. Some elements of \mathcal{W} are $\downarrow, (\uparrow\downarrow), (\uparrow(\downarrow\uparrow)), ((\uparrow\downarrow)\uparrow), ((\uparrow\downarrow)((\uparrow\uparrow)\downarrow))$. Such elements are often represented by a collection of vertical arrows along a horizontal line, whose distances from each other reflect the parenthesization; for example,

$$((\uparrow\downarrow)((\uparrow\uparrow)\downarrow)) \quad \longleftrightarrow \quad \uparrow\downarrow \quad \uparrow\uparrow \downarrow.$$

We endow \mathcal{W} with the concatenation product $\emptyset \cdot W = W \cdot \emptyset = W$, $W_1 \cdot W_2 = (W_1 W_2)$ if $|W_1|, |W_2| \geq 1$. Henceforth, we drop the dots and reserve the expression $W_1 W_2$ for the product of $W_1, W_2 \in \mathcal{W}$, rather than for their concatenation. The product of \mathcal{W} is not associative; we follow the usual habit of indicating the order of products by parentheses, which should not (and are unlikely to) be confused with the left and right parenthesis letters appearing in elements of \mathcal{W} .

We similarly define the set \mathcal{W}^* as the set of parenthesized strings over the alphabet $\{\uparrow, \downarrow, \star\}$, in which the letter \star appears exactly once.

Definition 4.29. Let $W \in \mathcal{W}^*$ and $A \in \mathcal{W}$. The *substitution* of A into W is the operation of replacing the \star letter in W by A . The resulting element in \mathcal{W} is denoted by $W/\{\star \rightarrow A\}$.

A little care is needed when substituting the empty word $A = \emptyset$, in order to avoid redundant parentheses. The rule is that \star is erased, and (if $|W| > 1$) a matching pair of parentheses, one of which was adjacent to \star in W , is also erased. For example,

$$((\uparrow\downarrow)(\star((\uparrow\uparrow)\downarrow))) / \{\star \rightarrow \emptyset\} = ((\uparrow\downarrow)((\uparrow\uparrow)\downarrow)).$$

We briefly recall some definitions and facts about tangles and framed tangles (consult, for example, [Ka, Section X.5] for more details). A *tangle* T is a smooth oriented embedding of a 1-dimensional skeleton \mathbf{M} into $\mathbb{R}^2 \times [0, 1]$, considered up to isotopy relative to the boundary, such that T intersects the two boundary planes of $\mathbb{R}^2 \times [0, 1]$ transversally, and the intersection points (necessarily the images of ends of oriented interval components of \mathbf{M}) are along the lines $\mathbb{R} \times \{0\} \times \{0\}$ and $\mathbb{R} \times \{0\} \times \{1\}$. The *domain* of T is the (non-parenthesized) string over $\{\uparrow, \downarrow\}$ indicating the orientation types of the intersection points along the line $\mathbb{R} \times \{0\} \times \{0\}$, while the *target* of T is defined in the same way with respect to the line $\mathbb{R} \times \{0\} \times \{1\}$.

A tangle can be represented by a *tangle diagram*, which is a projection of the tangle (more precisely, of a certain embedding in its isotopy class) on the plane $\mathbb{R} \times \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}$, whose only singularities are transversal double points. The topological notion of isotopic tangles can be expressed in terms of a suitable set of *Reidemeister moves* on tangle diagrams (see [Ka, Theorem X.5.9]).

Figure 11 shows an example of a tangle diagram. The domain of this tangle is $\uparrow\uparrow\downarrow$ and its target is $\uparrow\downarrow\uparrow$.




Figure 11. Example of a tangle diagram.

We define a *normal vector field* on a tangle T as a smooth vector field on T that is nowhere tangent to T , and that is given by the vector $(0, 1, 0)$ at the points of T along its domain and target lines. A *framing* of T is a normal vector field on T , considered up to homotopy (within the class of normal vector fields).

A *framed tangle* is a tangle equipped with a framing, considered up to framing preserving isotopy relative to the boundary. A framed tangle may be thought of as a *tangled ribbon*, whose rims are the tangle itself and another tangle obtained by a small translation along a normal vector field in the framing homotopy class.

Framed tangles can be represented by tangle diagrams equipped with the *blackboard framing* — the framing determined by the constant vector field $(0, 1, 0)$, which is perpendicular to the diagram plane and points away from the reader. Figure 12 shows an example of a vertical framed tangle whose normal vector field makes a counterclockwise turn by an angle of 2π , and a tangle diagram representing it. It can be proved (see [Ka, Section X.8]) that

isotopy classes of framed tangles are the same as equivalence classes of tangle diagrams with respect to certain Reidemeister moves.




Figure 12. A framed tangle and its tangle diagram.

Definition 4.30. The *category FT of framed tangles* is the category whose objects are (non-parenthesized) strings over $\{\uparrow, \downarrow\}$, and whose morphisms are framed tangles (a framed tangle T belongs to the set of morphisms between its domain and target strings).

The *category PFT of parenthesized framed tangles* is defined in the same way, only with elements of \mathcal{W} as its objects. Note that the endomorphisms of the object \emptyset in both categories are simply *framed links*.

We proceed to provide a description of the category **PFT** in terms of ‘generators and relations’, following the treatment in [BN3, Section 2]. We begin by defining an auxiliary category which is ‘freely generated’ by a certain collection of morphisms, and whose ‘quotient’ by suitable relations is **PFT**. We refer to [Ka, Chapter XII] for precise definitions of all the categorical terms, and for detailed discussions of presentations of several categories of (non-parenthesized) knot-like objects by generators and relations.

Definition 4.31. Let **PFT₀** be the category whose set of objects is \mathcal{W} , and whose morphisms are freely generated by the following morphisms:

(G1) *Associativity morphisms:* A pair of morphisms

$$W_{A,B,C}^{|\uparrow|} \in \text{Mor}(W/\{\star \rightarrow (AB)C\}, W/\{\star \rightarrow A(BC)\});$$

$$W_{A,B,C}^{|\downarrow|} \in \text{Mor}(W/\{\star \rightarrow A(BC)\}, W/\{\star \rightarrow (AB)C\}),$$

for each $W \in \mathcal{W}^*$, and each triple (A, B, C) of \mathcal{W} -strings. Graphically, we represent these morphisms as follows:

$$\star_{(\uparrow\downarrow),(\downarrow\uparrow),\uparrow}^{|\uparrow|} \longleftrightarrow \begin{array}{c} \updownarrow \\ \nearrow \searrow \\ \uparrow \end{array}; \quad \star_{(\uparrow\downarrow),(\uparrow\downarrow),\uparrow}^{|\downarrow|} \longleftrightarrow \begin{array}{c} \updownarrow \\ \searrow \nearrow \\ \uparrow \end{array}.$$

(G2) *Braiding morphisms:* A pair of morphisms

$$W_{A,B}^{\times} \in \text{Mor}(W/\{\star \rightarrow AB\}, W/\{\star \rightarrow BA\}),$$

for each $W \in \mathcal{W}^*$, and each pair A, B of \mathcal{W} -strings. The graphical representations of these morphisms are:

$$((\uparrow \star) \downarrow)_{\downarrow,(\uparrow\uparrow)}^{\times} \longleftrightarrow \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \times \\ \downarrow \end{array};$$

(R4) *Locality in space:* (for any pair W_A and W_B of morphisms)

(R5) *Locality in scale:* for any morphisms $W_A, W_B,$ and $W_C,$

• *Braiding relations:*

(R6) $W_{A,B}^\times$ is equal to an identity morphism if A or B is the empty string. Similarly for $W_{A,B}^\times$.

(R7) $W_{B,A}^\times$ is a two-sided inverse of $W_{A,B}^\times$:

(R8) *The hexagons:*

• *Creation/annihilation relations:*

(R9) , (R10)

where $a \in \{\uparrow, \downarrow\}$ is an arrow and \bar{a} is its opposite.

By Theorem 1 in [BN3] (see also [AC]), the kernel of $\mathbf{For} : \mathbf{PFT}_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{PFT}$ is generated by the above relations. Thus, \mathbf{PFT} is generated by the morphisms (G1)–(G3) subject to the relations (R1)–(R10).

4.4.3. Construction of the H -invariant. The description of **PFT** in terms of generators and relations provides the following method for constructing topological invariants of parenthesized framed tangles:

- Construct a functor $\mathbf{Z} : \mathbf{PFT}_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$, where \mathbf{C} is some arbitrary ‘target category’. This can be done by simply stating the values of \mathbf{Z} on the generators of \mathbf{PFT}_0 .
- Check that \mathbf{Z} respects relations (R1)–(R10).
- If it does, it descends to a functor (denoted by the same symbol) $\mathbf{Z} : \mathbf{PFT} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$, which is an invariant of parenthesized framed tangles.

We carry out this procedure in the case where $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{HS}$ is the category of H -decorated skeletons¹⁶, which we now turn to define.

Let \mathbf{M} be a skeleton. For \mathbf{m} , a component of \mathbf{M} , we put $H(\mathbf{m}) = H$ if $\mathbf{m} = \uparrow$ (an oriented interval), and $H(\mathbf{m}) = \bar{H}$ if $\mathbf{m} = \circ$ (an oriented circle). If H is a $\text{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ -algebra, then we define the H -space associated to \mathbf{M} as (compare Definition 2.9 and Section 2.2.4)

$$H(\mathbf{M}) = \bigotimes_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{M}} H(\mathbf{m}).$$

(Recall from Definition 2.6 that the set of components of \mathbf{M} is ordered, hence the tensor product is well-defined.) For the diagrammatic algebras, \mathcal{A} and $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$, the spaces $H(\mathbf{M})$ are taken to be the familiar spaces $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M})$ and $\vec{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{M})$, respectively.

Definition 4.32. Let \mathbf{HS} be the category whose objects are (non-parenthesized) strings of \uparrow and \downarrow arrows (same as the objects of **FT**), and whose morphisms are pairs (\mathbf{M}, X) , where \mathbf{M} is a skeleton and $X \in H(\mathbf{M})$. The tails and heads of the oriented intervals in \mathbf{M} are in a bijective direction preserving correspondence with the \uparrow and \downarrow arrows in the domain and target objects of the morphism (\mathbf{M}, X) . We call \mathbf{M} the *morphism skeleton*, and say that X *decorates* \mathbf{M} , or that X is the *decorating tensor* of the morphism. When H is a $\text{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ -algebra, we graphically represent a morphism (\mathbf{M}, X) (with X a factorable tensor) by drawing \mathbf{M} with each component decorated by a pair consisting of an order tag and the corresponding factor of X . (For diagrammatic algebras, the graphical representations of morphisms are simply the usual pictures of elements in $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M})$ or $\vec{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{M})$.)

The rule for composing two composable morphisms (\mathbf{M}_1, X_1) and (\mathbf{M}_2, X_2) is illustrated by stacking the graphical representation of (\mathbf{M}_2, X_2) on top of that of (\mathbf{M}_1, X_1) : when several oriented interval components are glued, the elements of H decorating them are multiplied left to right from tail to head; if an oriented circle is formed by glueing two oriented intervals at both ends, then the two elements decorating it are multiplied in any order and the result is mapped by Tr to \bar{H} . (These multiplication rules refer to a $\text{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ -algebra; for \mathcal{A} and $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$, stacking the graphical representations one on top of the other automatically provides the skeleton of the composed morphism with its decoration.) The order of the components of the skeleton of the composed morphism is determined by first declaring the components of \mathbf{M}_1 as preceding those of \mathbf{M}_2 , and then marking each component of the composition skeleton with the smallest order tag it carries; see Figure 13 for an example.

Remark 4.33. When $H = \mathcal{A}$, we retrieve the category **AT** of [BN3, Definition 3.1].

¹⁶All skeletons considered in this section are 1-dimensional.




Figure 13. The composition in **HS** of a morphism in $\text{Mor}(\uparrow\uparrow\downarrow, \uparrow\uparrow\downarrow\downarrow)$ whose decorating tensor is $a_1 \otimes a_2 \otimes a_3 \otimes a_4 \otimes a_5 \in H^{\otimes 4} \otimes \bar{H}$, with a morphism in $\text{Mor}(\uparrow\uparrow\downarrow\downarrow, \uparrow\downarrow\uparrow)$ decorated by $b_1 \otimes b_2 \otimes b_3 \otimes b_4 \in H^{\otimes 4}$. The general composition law of **HS** is obtained from the one indicated here by multilinear extension.

In order to define the functor $\mathbf{Z} : \mathbf{PFT}_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{HS}$, we need a collection of auxiliary maps $\Delta_W : H \rightarrow H^{\otimes |W|}$, indexed by $W \in \mathcal{W}$.

Definition 4.34. We set $\Delta_W = S_W \Delta_W^0$, where the maps $\Delta_W^0 : H \rightarrow H^{\otimes |W|}$ and $S_W : H^{\otimes |W|} \rightarrow H^{\otimes |W|}$ are recursively defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_\emptyset^0 &= \epsilon & ; & \quad S_\emptyset = \text{id}_{\mathbb{k}}, \\ \Delta_\uparrow^0 &= \Delta_\downarrow^0 = \text{id} & ; & \quad S_\uparrow = \text{id}, \quad S_\downarrow = S, \end{aligned}$$

and for $W = W_1 W_2$ with $|W_1|, |W_2| \geq 1$,

$$\Delta_W^0 = (\Delta_{W_1}^0 \otimes \Delta_{W_2}^0) \Delta; \quad S_{W_1 W_2} = S_{W_1} \otimes S_{W_2}.$$

For example, $\Delta_{(\uparrow(\downarrow\uparrow))} = S_2 \Delta_2 \Delta$. Note that Δ_W^0 is independent of the directions of the arrows in W and is an algebra morphism, while S_W is independent of the parenthesization of W .

Definition 4.35. The action of $\mathbf{Z} : \mathbf{PFT}_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{HS}$ on objects is just dropping the parentheses. The action of \mathbf{Z} on the generating morphisms of \mathbf{PFT}_0 is divided into two stages:

- First, a generating morphism is sent to the skeleton read from the graphical representation of the morphism, with the skeleton components ordered from left to right.

For example, the skeletons of $\mathbf{Z}(\uparrow(\downarrow\uparrow))$ and $\mathbf{Z}(\uparrow(\downarrow\uparrow))$ are



respectively.

- Second, the skeleton is decorated by a tensor specified by the following table. Here $W \in W^*$, $A, B, C \in W$, and we assume that there are n_1 arrows in W to the left of

the \star , and n_2 arrows to its right.

$$\begin{aligned}
W_{A,B,C}^{|I|} &: 1^{\otimes n_1} \otimes (\Delta_A \otimes \Delta_B \otimes \Delta_C)(\Phi^{-1}) \otimes 1^{\otimes n_2} \\
W_{A,B,C}^{|I|} &: 1^{\otimes n_1} \otimes (\Delta_A \otimes \Delta_B \otimes \Delta_C)(\Phi) \otimes 1^{\otimes n_2} \\
W_{A,B}^{\times} &: 1^{\otimes n_1} \otimes (\Delta_A \otimes \Delta_B)(R^{21}) \otimes 1^{\otimes n_2} \\
W_{A,B}^{\times} &: 1^{\otimes n_1} \otimes (\Delta_A \otimes \Delta_B)(R^{-1}) \otimes 1^{\otimes n_2} \\
W^{\heartsuit} &: 1^{\otimes n_1} \otimes \alpha \otimes 1^{\otimes n_2} \\
W^{\heartsuit} &: 1^{\otimes n_1} \otimes S(\alpha)uv^{-1} \otimes 1^{\otimes n_2} \\
W^{\heartsuit} &: 1^{\otimes n_1} \otimes u^{-1}vS(\beta) \otimes 1^{\otimes n_2} \\
W^{\heartsuit} &: 1^{\otimes n_1} \otimes \beta \otimes 1^{\otimes n_2}
\end{aligned}$$

We will graphically represent the values of \mathbf{Z} on generating morphisms as in the following examples, using the notation of (4.6) and (4.11).

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{Z} \left(\begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \downarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \curvearrowright \\ \curvearrowleft \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \downarrow \end{array} \right) &= \begin{array}{c} \uparrow x'_i \\ \downarrow S(x''_i) \\ \uparrow y'_i \\ \downarrow S(y''_i) \\ \uparrow z_i \end{array} , \\
\mathbf{Z} \left(\begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \downarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \times \\ \times \end{array} \right) &= \begin{array}{c} \uparrow 1 \\ \downarrow 1 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \swarrow s'_i \searrow s''_i \\ \swarrow s''_i \searrow s'_i \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \uparrow S(t_i) \\ \downarrow 1 \end{array} , \\
\mathbf{Z} \left(\begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \downarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \cup \\ \cup \end{array} \right) &= \begin{array}{c} \uparrow 1 \\ \downarrow 1 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \cup \\ \cup \end{array} \alpha .
\end{aligned}$$

(Order tags are omitted and the convention of implicit summation over indices of tensor components is employed.)

The interpretation of Definition 4.35 for diagrammatic algebras is simple. We content with a single example for $H = \mathcal{A}_{\text{KZ}}$:

$$\mathbf{Z} \left(\begin{array}{c} \times \\ \times \end{array} \right) = \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \uparrow \\ \uparrow \end{array} + \frac{1}{2} \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \uparrow \\ \uparrow \uparrow \\ \uparrow \uparrow \end{array} + \frac{1}{2} \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \uparrow \\ \uparrow \uparrow \\ \uparrow \uparrow \end{array} + \dots$$

Theorem 6. *The functor $\mathbf{Z} : \text{PFT}_0 \rightarrow \text{HS}$ respects the relations (R1)–(R10), and descends to an invariant of parenthesized framed tangles $\mathbf{Z} : \text{PFT} \rightarrow \text{HS}$.*

Proof. (R1) essentially follows from the non-degeneracy of Φ . In more detail, we prove that

$\mathbf{Z}(W_{A,B,C}^{|I|}) = \mathbf{Z}(\text{id})$ if $A = \emptyset$ as follows. Start from the equality $(\epsilon \otimes \text{id} \otimes \text{id})(\Phi^{-1}) = 1 \otimes 1$, which is an immediate consequence of (4.5), and apply to it the map $(\Delta_B \otimes \Delta_C)$, followed by addition of $1^{\otimes n_1}$ to the left and $1^{\otimes n_2}$ to the right (n_1, n_2 are as in Definition 4.35).

The result on the left hand side is $\mathbf{Z}(W_{\emptyset,B,C}^{|I|})$, while on the right hand side we obtain, using $\Delta_U(1) = 1^{\otimes |U|}$ for all $U \in \mathcal{W}$, the value assigned by \mathbf{Z} to the identity morphism of $W/\{\star \rightarrow (\emptyset B)C\}$. Similar considerations apply to all the other cases of (R1), as well as to (R6), using the non-degeneracy of the R -matrix (4.10).

A lesson we learn from the above argument and keep for the rest of the proof, is that it is sufficient to deal only with cases in which $W = \star$ (so that $n_1 = n_2 = 0$).

We turn to (R7) and prove that $\mathbf{Z}(\star_{A,B}^\times)\mathbf{Z}(\star_{B,A}^\times) = \mathbf{Z}(\text{id})$. We note that it is enough to prove this equality for $A = B = \uparrow$, for then we can apply the map $\Delta_A \otimes \Delta_B$ and conclude the equality for any A, B , using that Δ and ϵ are algebra morphisms and S is an algebra anti-morphism.

The proof for $A = B = \uparrow$ is simple:

$$\mathbf{Z} \left(\begin{array}{c} \curvearrowright \\ \curvearrowleft \end{array} \right) \mathbf{Z} \left(\begin{array}{c} \curvearrowleft \\ \curvearrowright \end{array} \right) = \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \nearrow \\ \searrow \\ \nwarrow \\ \nearrow \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \bar{s}_i \\ \bar{t}_i \\ t_i \\ s_i \end{array} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ 1 \\ \uparrow \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ 1 \\ \uparrow \end{array} .$$

(R2) is verified in a similar way.

Reasoning as for the previous relations, we find that (R3) and (R8) basically reduce to the pentagon relation and hexagon relations, respectively. For example, it is clear that both sides of the first hexagon are mapped by \mathbf{Z} to morphisms having the same skeleton; the decoration for the \mathbf{Z} -value of the right hand side (with $A = B = C = \uparrow$) is

$$(\Phi^{123})^{-1} R^{32} \Phi^{132} R^{31} (\Phi^{312})^{-1} ,$$

which, by applying the map $X \mapsto X^{231}$ to (4.8), is seen to be equal to $(\Delta \otimes \text{id})(R^{21})$, the decorating tensor of $\mathbf{Z}(\star_{(\uparrow\uparrow),\uparrow}^\times)$.

Locality in space (R4) obviously follows from the fact that tensors living on different components commute with each other. We next examine locality in scale (R5). It is clearly enough to verify the relations when the participating morphisms are generators of \mathbf{PFT}_0 , because if a morphism is the composition of several generating morphisms, then the generating morphisms can be ‘slided up one by one’. Similarly, we may also restrict to cases in which one of W_A and W_B (and W_C , when relevant) is one of the generators of \mathbf{PFT}_0 , while the other one (or two) are the identity morphisms. A final reduction is that, like in the proofs of previous relations, it is enough to check (R4) when the identity morphism(s) are $\text{id}_\uparrow \in \text{Mor}(\uparrow, \uparrow)$, and the non-identity morphism is one of the fundamental generators:

$\star_{\uparrow,\uparrow,\uparrow}^{\text{VI}}, \star_{\uparrow,\uparrow,\uparrow}^{\text{NI}}, \star_{\uparrow,\uparrow}^\times, \star_{\uparrow,\uparrow}^\times, \star^\cup, \star^\cup, \star^\cap, \star^\cap$; the required equalities with identity morphisms of arbitrary objects and all generating morphisms then follow by applying appropriate tensor products of Δ_W -maps.

We give several representative examples of the cases that remain to be checked. In all cases, the skeletons of the morphisms being compared are evidently equal, so we focus on the decorating tensors.

Take in the second group of (R4) relations $W_A = W_C = \text{id}_\uparrow$, $W_B = \star_{\uparrow,\uparrow,\uparrow}^{\text{NI}}$. The decorating tensors for the \mathbf{Z} -values of the two sides are

$$\Phi^{234}(\text{id} \otimes (\Delta_2 \Delta_2) \otimes \text{id})(\Phi) \quad \text{and} \quad (\text{id} \otimes (\Delta_3 \Delta_2) \otimes \text{id})(\Phi) \Phi^{234} ,$$

which are equal by the quasi-coassociativity axiom (4.1), applied to the second component of Φ . Similarly, relations in the third or fourth groups with such W_A and W_B follow from the quasi-coassociativity applied to components of the R -matrix or its inverse.

A relation in the fourth group with $W_A = \star_{\uparrow, \uparrow}^{\times}$ and $W_B = \text{id}_{\uparrow}$ is equivalent to the equality

$$(\Delta^{21} \otimes \text{id})(R^{-1}) = R^{12}(\Delta \otimes \text{id})(R^{-1})(R^{12})^{-1},$$

which is the quasi-cocommutativity axiom (4.7) applied to the first component of R^{-1} . Plugging a fundamental braiding morphism (together with two identity morphisms) into relations of the first or second group, we encounter equalities that follow by applying the quasi-cocommutativity axiom to components of the associator or its inverse.

As a last example of verifying locality in scale, we put $W_A = \star^{\vee}$, $W_B = W_C = \text{id}_{\uparrow}$ in the second group of relations. Using that by (R1) $\mathbf{Z}(\star_{\emptyset, \uparrow, \uparrow}^{\text{N}}) = \mathbf{Z}(\text{id})$, we need to check that

$$X_i'' u^{-1} v S(\beta) X_i' \otimes Y_i \otimes Z_i = u^{-1} v S(\beta) \otimes 1 \otimes 1.$$

By applying S to (4.14), and then using (4.19) and the centrality of v , the first component is seen to be equal to $\epsilon(X_i) u^{-1} v S(\beta)$; our claim now follows from the non-degeneracy of Φ .

The four (R9) relations follow from (4.15) and (4.16), either directly or after applying the antipode to these equations. We finish the proof of the theorem by verifying the relation (R10) with $a = \downarrow$. Mapping to **HS** each of the seven generating morphisms composing the morphism on the left hand side, and then multiplying the factors of the decorating tensors along the single skeleton component, we are left with proving that

$$S(\bar{X}_j) S(s_k) S(\alpha) u v^{-1} t_k \bar{Y}_j X_i \beta S(Y_i) S(\bar{Z}'_j) S(\bar{t}_l) S(\alpha) u v^{-1} \bar{s}_l \bar{Z}''_j Z_i = \alpha. \quad (4.42)$$

By (4.29),

$$S(s_k) S(\alpha) u t_k = S(u) u \alpha = v^2 \alpha.$$

We also have

$$S(\bar{t}_l) S(\alpha) u \bar{s}_l = \alpha,$$

which is established by substituting (4.20) into it, and comparing with the result of the application of the map $X \mapsto ((\text{id} \otimes S)(X) \otimes \alpha)^{312}$ to both sides of the equation $s_i \bar{s}_k \otimes t_i \bar{t}_k = 1 \otimes 1$. Utilizing the centrality of v , the last two equations simplify the left hand side of (4.42) into

$$S(\bar{X}_j) \alpha \bar{Y}_j X_i \beta S(Y_i) S(\bar{Z}'_j) \alpha \bar{Z}''_j Z_i,$$

which, by (4.13) and then the non-degeneracy of Φ^{-1} , is equal to

$$\alpha X_i \beta S(Y_i) \alpha Z_i.$$

The proof of (4.42) is now completed by invoking (4.15). \square

Let T be a parenthesized framed tangle whose underlying tangle is the (isotopy class of an) embedding of a skeleton \mathbf{M}_T . The invariant $\mathbf{Z}(T)$ is then of the form (\mathbf{M}, X) , where the skeleton \mathbf{M} has the same components as \mathbf{M}_T , but with a possibly different ordering. The two orderings of components determine an isomorphism $H(\mathbf{M}) \xrightarrow{\sim} H(\mathbf{M}_T)$, and the image of $X \in H(\mathbf{M}_T)$ under this isomorphism may be regarded as a tensor decorating the components of T . (In terms of the graphical representation of \mathbf{Z} , this simply means that the auxiliary order tags used in composing the images in **HS** of the generating morphisms making up T , are omitted from the final result.) Henceforth, we sometimes consider $\mathbf{Z}(T)$ in this way as an element of $H(\mathbf{M}_T)$.

For a framed link L , the invariant $\mathbf{Z}(L)$ takes its value in the space $\bar{H}^{\otimes m}$, where m is the number of components of L . Suppose that the components of L are *colored* by finite-dimensional H -modules V_1, \dots, V_m . We obtain a *numerical* invariant (taking values in \mathbb{k}), denoted $\mathbf{Z}_{V_1, \dots, V_m}(L)$, by picking a representative in $H^{\otimes m}$ of $\mathbf{Z}(L)$, and computing the trace of its action on $V_1 \otimes \dots \otimes V_m$; by the definition of \bar{H} , the value of the trace is independent of the choice of a representative. The invariants $\mathbf{Z}_{V_1, \dots, V_m}$ coincide with the invariants constructed in [AC] (and previously in [RT] for the case of quasitriangular Hopf algebras).

Example 4.36. The H -invariant of the unknot: Presenting the unknot as a composition of generating morphisms in two ways,



we obtain

$$\mathbf{Z}(\text{unknot}) = \text{Tr}(u^{-1}vS(\beta)\alpha) = \text{Tr}(\beta S(\alpha)uv^{-1}) \in \bar{H}. \quad (4.43)$$

Exercise 4.37. Show that the H -invariant of the framed tangle in Figure 12 is equal to the ribbon element of H .

4.4.4. Behavior of the H -invariant under twisting. Let $F \in H^{\otimes 2}$ be a twist, and $H_F = (H, \Delta_F, \epsilon, \Phi_F, R_F, S, \alpha_F, \beta_F)$ the corresponding twist equivalent quasitriangular quasi-Hopf algebra, which for the time being we endow with the antipodal triple specified by (4.28). Recall (Proposition 4.12) that H_F has a ribbon element (same as that of H), hence we may construct the H_F -invariant $\mathbf{Z}_F : \mathbf{PFT} \rightarrow \mathbf{HS}$. We want to describe the relationship between \mathbf{Z} and \mathbf{Z}_F .

We recursively define a collection of elements $\{F_W^0 \in H^{\otimes |W|}\}_{W \in \mathcal{W}}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} F_\emptyset^0 &= 1_{\mathbb{k}} \\ F_\uparrow^0 &= F_\downarrow^0 = 1, \end{aligned}$$

and for $W = W_1W_2$ with $|W_1|, |W_2| \geq 1$,

$$F_W^0 = (F_{W_1}^0 \otimes F_{W_2}^0)(\Delta_{W_1}^0 \otimes \Delta_{W_2}^0)(F).$$

We then set

$$F_W = S_W(F_W^0) \in H^{\otimes |W|}, \quad W \in \mathcal{W}.$$

Similarly, we define elements $G_W^0 \in H^{\otimes |W|}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} G_\emptyset^0 &= 1_{\mathbb{k}} \\ G_\uparrow^0 &= G_\downarrow^0 = 1, \\ G_{W_1W_2}^0 &= (\Delta_{W_1}^0 \otimes \Delta_{W_2}^0)(F^{-1})(G_{W_1}^0 \otimes G_{W_2}^0), \end{aligned}$$

and set $G_W = S_W(G_W^0)$. The elements F_W^0 and G_W^0 are inverse to each other (but this is not necessarily true for F_W and G_W). Two examples are

$$F_{(\uparrow(\uparrow\uparrow))} = F^{23}\Delta_2(F) \quad \text{and} \quad G_{((\uparrow\uparrow)\uparrow)} = \Delta_1(F^{-1})(F^{12})^{-1}. \quad (4.44)$$

We sometimes denote the twisted coproduct Δ_F by Δ' , for typographical convenience. It is not hard to prove by induction on $|W|$ the following generalization of (4.24):

$$\Delta'_W(x) = F_W^0 \Delta_W^0(x) G_W^0, \quad \text{for all } W \in \mathcal{W}, x \in H. \quad (4.45)$$

If $W \in \mathcal{W}^*$ has n_1 arrows left to the \star and n_2 arrows to its right, then for all $A \in \mathcal{W}$ the following formulas hold:

$$\begin{aligned} F_{W/\{\star \rightarrow A\}}^0 &= (1^{\otimes n_1} \otimes F_A^0 \otimes 1^{\otimes n_2}) \cdot (\text{id}^{\otimes n_1} \otimes \Delta_A^0 \otimes \text{id}^{\otimes n_2})(F_{W/\{\star \rightarrow \uparrow\}}^0), \\ G_{W/\{\star \rightarrow A\}}^0 &= (\text{id}^{\otimes n_1} \otimes \Delta_A^0 \otimes \text{id}^{\otimes n_2})(G_{W/\{\star \rightarrow \uparrow\}}^0) \cdot (1^{\otimes n_1} \otimes G_A^0 \otimes 1^{\otimes n_2}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.46)$$

These are proved by induction on the structure of W .

For $W \in \mathcal{W}$, we also denote by W the same string after erasing the parentheses, which is an object in **HS**. We let \mathcal{F}_W be the morphism in $\text{Mor}_{\mathbf{HS}}(W, W)$ whose skeleton consists of $|W|$ vertical strands (ordered from left to right), and whose decorating tensor is F_W . For example,

$$F_{(\uparrow(\downarrow\uparrow))} = \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \downarrow \\ \uparrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} f_i \\ S(f_i g_j) \\ g_i g_j'' \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \downarrow \\ \uparrow \end{array} .$$

By applying the map S_W to the equation

$$F_W^0 G_W^0 = 1^{\otimes |W|} = G_W^0 F_W^0,$$

and recalling the composition rule in **HS**, we see that \mathcal{F}_W has a two-sided inverse \mathcal{F}_W^{-1} , which is the morphism with the same skeleton as \mathcal{F}_W and decorating tensor G_W .

Proposition 4.38. *Let $D, U \in \mathcal{W}$, and let T be a parenthesized framed tangle belonging to $\text{Mor}_{\mathbf{PFT}}(D, U)$. Then*

$$\mathbf{Z}_F(T) = \mathcal{F}_U^{-1} \mathbf{Z}(T) \mathcal{F}_D. \quad (4.47)$$

Proof. It is clearly enough to prove the proposition when T is a generator of **PFT**. The morphisms on both sides of (4.47) have the same skeleton, so it is left to establish the equality of their decorating tensors, which we denote in this proof by $\mathbf{Z}(T)$ and $\mathbf{Z}_F(T)$.

Before explaining the general proof, it may be instructive to check (4.47) for several fundamental generators. For $T = \star_{\uparrow, \uparrow}^{\text{nl}}$ we have $\mathbf{Z}(T) = \Phi$, $\mathbf{Z}_F(T) = \Phi_F$, and the result is immediate from (4.44) and (4.26); for $T = \star_{\uparrow, \uparrow}^{\times}$ the required equality is

$$R_F^{-1} = F R^{-1} (F^{21})^{-1}$$

which is obtained by inverting (4.27), and for $T = \star^{\curvearrowright}$, using $F_{(\uparrow\downarrow)} = S_2(F)$, it is

$$\beta_F = f_i \beta S(g_i),$$

which is indeed the twisting rule for β .

As a typical example of the proof for general associativity and braiding morphisms, we consider an (A, B) -braiding extended by a single C -bundle of vertical strands on the right; that is, $T = W_{A, B}^{\times}$, where $W = \star C$ and $A, B, C \in \mathcal{W}$. We may assume that there are only \uparrow arrows in A, B, C ; once (4.47) is established in those cases, it can be extended to any combination of arrow directions by applying S (which is also S_F) on both sides of (4.47) to the tensor factors corresponding to \downarrow arrows. Note that with only \uparrow arrows around, we have $\Delta_A = \Delta_A^0$, $F_B = F_B^0$, etc.; in particular, Δ_A , Δ_B , and Δ_C are algebra morphisms.

We turn to the computation itself. By Definition 4.35,

$$\mathbf{Z}_F(T) = (\Delta'_A \otimes \Delta'_B)(R_F^{-1}) \otimes 1^{\otimes |C|},$$

which by (4.45) is equal to

$$(F_A \otimes F_B) \cdot (\Delta_A \otimes \Delta_B)(R_F^{-1}) \cdot (G_A \otimes G_B) \otimes 1^{\otimes |C|}. \quad (4.48)$$

The decorating tensor for $\mathcal{F}_{(BA)C}^{-1} \mathbf{Z}(T) \mathcal{F}_{(AB)C}$ is

$$F_{(AB)C} \cdot (\Delta_A \otimes \Delta_B)(R^{-1} \otimes 1^{|C|}) \cdot G_{(BA)C}^\pi,$$

where π is the permutation of tensor factors ‘swapping A and B ’; more precisely, π leaves unchanged the last $|C|$ factors, and cycles the first $|A| + |B|$ factors by $|A|$ places to the right. Repeatedly using (4.46), the above expression becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & (F_A \otimes F_B \otimes F_C) \cdot (\Delta_A \otimes \Delta_B \otimes \Delta_C)(F_{((\uparrow\uparrow)\uparrow)}) \cdot (\Delta_A \otimes \Delta_B \otimes \Delta_C)(R^{-1} \otimes 1) \\ & \cdot (\Delta_A \otimes \Delta_B \otimes \Delta_C)(G_{((\uparrow\uparrow)\uparrow)}^{213}) \cdot (G_A \otimes G_B \otimes G_C). \end{aligned} \quad (4.49)$$

By the defining property (4.7) of the R -matrix,

$$\begin{aligned} F_{((\uparrow\uparrow)\uparrow)} \cdot (R^{-1} \otimes 1) \cdot G_{((\uparrow\uparrow)\uparrow)}^{213} &= F^{12} \cdot (\Delta \otimes \text{id})(F) \cdot (R^{-1} \otimes 1) \cdot (\Delta^{21} \otimes \text{id})(F^{-1}) \cdot (F^{21})^{-1} \\ &= R_F^{-1} \otimes 1 \end{aligned}$$

which simplifies (4.49) into

$$(F_A \otimes F_B \otimes F_C) \cdot (\Delta_A \otimes \Delta_B \otimes \Delta_C)(R_F^{-1} \otimes 1) \cdot (G_A \otimes G_B \otimes G_C);$$

this last expression is clearly equal to (4.48).

We move to demonstrate the proof for creation and annihilation morphisms, and consider the case $T = (\star A)^\heartsuit$. As in the previous case, we may assume that all arrows in A are pointing up. By Definition 4.35, $\mathbf{Z}_F(T) = \beta_F \otimes 1^{\otimes |A|}$. The decorating tensor for $\mathcal{F}_{(\uparrow\downarrow)A}$ is, using (4.46),

$$F_{(\uparrow\downarrow)A} = S_2((1^{\otimes 2} \otimes F_A) \cdot (\text{id}^{\otimes 2} \otimes \Delta_A)(F^{12} \cdot (\Delta \otimes \text{id})(F))),$$

and \mathcal{F}_A^{-1} is decorated by G_A . The composition of morphisms on the right hand side of (4.47) is therefore

$$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \curvearrowright \beta \\ \uparrow f_i f_j' \quad \downarrow S(g_i f_j'') \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \uparrow G_A \\ \uparrow 1 \\ \uparrow F_A \Delta_A(g_j) \\ \downarrow A \end{array} \end{array},$$

so that its decorating tensor is

$$f_i f_j' \beta S(f_j'') S(g_i) \otimes F_A \Delta_A(g_j) G_A = \epsilon(f_j) \beta_F \otimes F_A \Delta_A(g_j) G_A = \beta_F \otimes 1^{\otimes |A|},$$

where we have used (4.14), (4.28), and finally the non-degeneracy of F . \square

Remark 4.39. Proposition 4.38 is a generalization of Theorem 7 of [LM2], which was formulated for the case $H = \mathcal{A}_{\text{KZ}}$.

The use of the particular antipodal triple (S, α_F, β_F) is too restrictive for our applications, so we need to understand the effect of antipodal rescaling on \mathbf{Z} . Suppose that the antipodal triple (S, α, β) of H is rescaled by an invertible element c into an antipodal triple $(\hat{S}, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta})$ given by (4.17), and denote by $\hat{\mathbf{Z}}$ the corresponding invariant of **PFT**.

For $W \in \mathcal{W}$, write W after erasing the parentheses as $W = a_1 a_2 \dots a_{|W|}$, where $a_i \in \{\uparrow, \downarrow\}$. Put $c_\uparrow = 1$, $c_\downarrow = c$, and let $\mathcal{C}_W \in \text{Mor}_{\mathbf{HS}}(W, W)$ be the morphism with the same skeleton as

\mathcal{F}_W , decorated by the tensor $\otimes_{i=1}^{|W|} c_{a_i}$. The inverse morphism \mathcal{C}_W^{-1} is defined by replacing c with c^{-1} .

Proposition 4.40. *For $D, U \in \mathcal{W}$ and $T \in \text{Mor}_{\mathbf{PFT}}(D, U)$,*

$$\hat{\mathbf{Z}}(T) = \mathcal{C}_U \mathbf{Z}(T) \mathcal{C}_D^{-1}. \quad (4.50)$$

Proof. It is sufficient to verify (4.50) for generating morphisms. The only non-trivial cases are the morphisms of types W^\heartsuit and W^\spadesuit , which are settled with the help of Proposition 4.9. \square

Combining (4.47) and (4.50) when T is a *framed link* L (so that $D = U = \emptyset$), we conclude:

Corollary 4.41. *If H_1 and H_2 are twist equivalent ribbon quasitriangular quasi-Hopf algebras, then $\mathbf{Z}_{H_1}(L) = \mathbf{Z}_{H_2}(L)$ for any framed link L .*

Remark 4.42. For another proof of Corollary 4.41 (when the invariants are evaluated on finite-dimensional modules coloring the components of L), see [LGZ]. The proof there uses the difficult machinery of the presentation of framed links as closures of braids modulo Markov moves.

4.5. The Kontsevich integral and the Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants. We now discuss the invariants of framed links obtained by applying the H -invariant construction to the ribbon quasitriangular quasi-Hopf algebras described in Sections 4.2 and 4.3.

The invariant corresponding to \mathcal{A}_{KZ} is denoted by \mathbf{Z}_K . Note that by Proposition 4.19 and Corollary 4.41, the invariant \mathbf{Z}_K is independent of the Drinfel'd associator used for defining \mathcal{A}_{KZ} .

\mathbf{Z}_K , when restricted to framed knots¹⁷, is a *universal Vassiliev invariant*: for a chord diagram D of degree m ,

$$\mathbf{Z}_K(K_D) = D + (\text{terms of degree } > m),$$

where K_D is an embedding of D as in Section 2.1.2, and \mathbf{Z}_K is extended to singular framed knots by (2.1). The basic observation in the proof is that by Definition 4.35, with $R = e^{\Omega/2}$,

$$\mathbf{Z}_K \left(\begin{array}{c} \nearrow \searrow \\ \nwarrow \nearrow \end{array} \right) - \mathbf{Z}_K \left(\begin{array}{c} \nwarrow \nearrow \\ \nearrow \searrow \end{array} \right) = R^{21} - R^{-1} = \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \uparrow \\ \text{---} \\ \uparrow \uparrow \end{array} + \text{higher degree terms}.$$

See [BN3, Theorem 4] for more details.

Le and Murakami ([LM1]) proved that when $\Phi = \Phi_{\text{KZ}}$, the invariant \mathbf{Z}_K coincides with the iterated integral formula of Kontsevich ([BN1, Section 4]), which was the first (rigorous) construction of a universal Vassiliev invariant. An interesting consequence of the independence of \mathbf{Z}_K of the Drinfel'd associator and Theorem 1, is that the values taken by Kontsevich's highly transcendental formula are linear combinations of chord diagrams with *rational* coefficients.

Since the u -element and ribbon element of \mathcal{A}_{KZ} are equal and $\beta = 1$, we have by (4.43) that

$$\mathbf{Z}_K(\text{unknot}) = \nu \in \mathcal{A}(\bigcirc).$$

(We have omitted the trace projection, as $\mathcal{A}(\bigcirc)$ may be identified with \mathcal{A} .) An explicit formula for this element is given by (1.1).

¹⁷The discussion can be easily extended to framed links.

It is clear that the invariants associated to the KZ structures $\vec{\mathcal{A}}_{\text{KZ}}$ and $U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]_{\text{KZ}}$ (\mathfrak{g} a metrized Lie algebra) are simply the compositions $\iota \circ \mathbf{Z}_{\text{K}}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\hbar} \circ \mathbf{Z}_{\text{K}}$, respectively. We denote the latter invariant by $\mathbf{KZ}_{\mathfrak{g}}$.

Let \mathfrak{g} be a complex semisimple Lie algebra. The invariant associated to $U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]_{\text{DJ}}$ is denoted by $\mathbf{RT}_{\mathfrak{g}}$; the numerical invariants of colored framed links derived from $\mathbf{RT}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ are the *Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants* $\mathbf{RT}_{\mathfrak{g};V_1,\dots,V_m}$ ([RT]). From Theorem 5 and Corollary 4.41 we deduce that following equality holds in $U(\mathfrak{g})_{\mathfrak{g}}[[\hbar]]^{\otimes m}$, for any framed link L with m components:

$$\mathbf{RT}_{\mathfrak{g}}(L) = \mathbf{KZ}_{\mathfrak{g}}(L). \tag{4.51}$$

See [Pi, Section 5], [LM2, Theorem 10], and [Ka, Section XX.8] for other proofs of this equality, at the (equivalent) level of the associated numerical invariants of framed links colored by finite-dimensional \mathfrak{g} -modules.

Since $U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]_{\text{DJ}}$ is a Hopf algebra, we get from (4.43) and (4.39) that (compare [RT, Section 7])

$$\mathbf{RT}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\text{unknot}) = \text{Tr}(e^{\hbar e_{\mathfrak{g}}}) = \text{Tr}(e^{-\hbar e_{\mathfrak{g}}}) \in U(\mathfrak{g})_{\mathfrak{g}}[[\hbar]]. \tag{4.52}$$

5. THE ETINGOF-KAZHDAN QUANTIZATION OF $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$

Section summary: The first two subsections are devoted to our diagrammatic reformulation of the Etingof-Kazhdan quantization of the ambient Lie bialgebra of a finite-dimensional Manin triple. We then consider the resulting framed link invariant \mathbf{Z}_{EK} , and examine the extent to which it has the nice features of the Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants. A particular attention is given to the value of \mathbf{Z}_{EK} on the unknot.

After giving a diagram of spaces and maps, which summarizes some of the algebraic and diagrammatic quasitriangular quasi-Hopf structures (together with the related framed link invariants) that we have considered in this paper, we provide a short review of the work of Polyak on directed versions of the chord diagram models of \mathcal{A} -spaces, which we call $\vec{\mathcal{P}}$ -spaces, and ask whether it is possible to carry out our construction within these spaces.

5.1. Verma modules.

5.1.1. **The algebras $\vec{\mathcal{A}}_{\pm}$.** Let $(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathfrak{g}_+, \mathfrak{g}_-)$ be a finite-dimensional Manin triple (see Section 3.1.4). We saw that the map $\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}} : \vec{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ makes $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ into a ‘diagrammatic version’ of the Hopf algebra $U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$. The algebras $U(\mathfrak{g}_+)$ and $U(\mathfrak{g}_-)$ are naturally Hopf subalgebras of $U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$. These subalgebras have diagrammatic companions inside $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$.

Definition 5.1. Let $\vec{\mathcal{D}}_+(\uparrow)$ be the subset of $\vec{\mathcal{D}}(\uparrow)$ consisting of diagrams whose legs are all *incoming* into the skeleton interval. The quotient of $\text{span}_{\mathbb{k}}\{\vec{\mathcal{D}}_+(\uparrow)\}$ by NS, AS, STU, and IHX relations (in which all the participating diagrams belong to $\vec{\mathcal{D}}_+(\uparrow)$) is denoted by $\vec{\mathcal{A}}_+$. Symbolically,

$$\vec{\mathcal{A}}_+ = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \end{array} \right\} / \{ \text{NS, AS, STU, IHX} \} .$$

Let $\chi_+ \boxtimes \chi_- : \vec{\mathcal{B}}_+ \boxtimes \vec{\mathcal{B}}_- \rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{A}}_+ \boxtimes \vec{\mathcal{A}}_-$ be the diagrammatic tensor product of the isomorphisms in Proposition 5.3. We recall that it is informally defined as applying χ separately on each skeleton component (see Remark 2.30 for a more formal discussion). Explicitly, if $D \in \vec{\mathcal{D}}_{+-}(*_1, *_2)$ has m_1 vertices v_1, \dots, v_{m_1} colored by $*_1$ and m_2 vertices w_1, \dots, w_{m_2} colored by $*_2$, then

$$\chi \boxtimes \chi(D) = \frac{1}{m_1! m_2!} \sum_{\pi_1 \in S_{m_1}} \sum_{\pi_2 \in S_{m_2}} (\pi_1 \boxtimes \pi_2) D,$$

where $(\pi_1 \boxtimes \pi_2)D$ is the diagram obtained from D by placing $v_{\pi_1(1)}, \dots, v_{\pi_1(m_1)}$ (in this order) along a first skeleton interval, and placing $w_{\pi_2(1)}, \dots, w_{\pi_2(m_2)}$ along a second skeleton interval.

Since the inverse isomorphisms $\sigma_{\pm} : \vec{\mathcal{A}}_{\pm} \rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{B}}_{\pm}$ also act at the level of skeleton components, we may form the map $\sigma_+ \boxtimes \sigma_- : \vec{\mathcal{A}}_+ \boxtimes \vec{\mathcal{A}}_- \rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{B}}_+ \boxtimes \vec{\mathcal{B}}_-$. A little thought shows that it is an inverse of $\chi_+ \boxtimes \chi_-$. We conclude:

Proposition 5.4. *The map $\chi_+ \boxtimes \chi_- : \vec{\mathcal{B}}_+ \boxtimes \vec{\mathcal{B}}_- \rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{A}}_+ \boxtimes \vec{\mathcal{A}}_-$ is an isomorphism.*

The PBW theorem implies that the product map $\mu : U(\mathfrak{g}_+) \otimes U(\mathfrak{g}_-) \rightarrow U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ is a linear isomorphism. Accordingly, we have the following diagrammatic result.

Proposition 5.5. *The map $\mu : \vec{\mathcal{A}}_+ \boxtimes \vec{\mathcal{A}}_- \rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{A}}$ is an isomorphism of linear spaces.*

Proof. Consider the diagram of maps

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \vec{\mathcal{A}}_+ \boxtimes \vec{\mathcal{A}}_- & \xrightarrow{\mu} & \vec{\mathcal{A}} \\ \chi_+ \boxtimes \chi_- \uparrow & & \uparrow \chi \\ \vec{\mathcal{B}}_+ \boxtimes \vec{\mathcal{B}}_- & \xrightarrow{\mu} & \vec{\mathcal{B}} \end{array} \quad (5.1)$$

This diagram is *not* commutative. Nevertheless, we claim that it does commute up to lower filtration levels. More precisely, as in the proofs of Proposition 2.22 and Proposition 3.21, we filter the diagram collections $\vec{\mathcal{D}}_{+-}(*_1, *_2)$, $\vec{\mathcal{D}}(*)$, $\vec{\mathcal{D}}_{+-}(\uparrow_1, \uparrow_2)$, and $\vec{\mathcal{D}}(\uparrow)$ according to the number of legs; this induces filtrations of the spaces appearing in (5.1), which are preserved by the maps between them. Our claim is that if $D \in \vec{\mathcal{D}}_{+-}(*_1, *_2)$ has k legs, then the element $\chi \circ \mu(D) - \mu \circ (\chi_+ \boxtimes \chi_-)(D)$ is equivalent, modulo $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ -relations, to a linear combination of diagrams having no more than $k - 1$ legs.

Assume that D has m_1 legs ending in $*_1$ and m_2 legs ending in $*_2$ (so that $m_1 + m_2 = k$). Write

$$(\chi \circ \mu - \mu \circ (\chi_+ \boxtimes \chi_-)) \left(\begin{array}{c} *_2 \quad *_1 \\ \downarrow \quad \uparrow \\ \text{---} D \text{---} \\ \uparrow \quad \downarrow \\ *_1 \quad *_2 \quad *_1 \end{array} \right) = \\
 \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\pi \in S_k} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} D \text{---} \\ \uparrow \quad \downarrow \\ \text{---} \pi \text{---} \\ \uparrow \quad \downarrow \end{array} - \frac{1}{m_1! m_2!} \sum_{\substack{\pi_1 \in S_{m_1}, \\ \pi_2 \in S_{m_2}}} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} D \text{---} \\ \uparrow \quad \downarrow \\ \text{---} \pi_1 \text{---} \quad \text{---} \pi_2 \text{---} \\ \uparrow \quad \downarrow \end{array} ,$$

where the permutation boxes determine the orderings of vertices along the skeleton interval. In a π -summand, we can move all the outgoing legs to the right by a repeated use of (mixed) STU relations. Thus, each π -summand is equivalent, modulo $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ -relations and diagrams having less than k legs, to a (π_1, π_2) -summand. Every (π_1, π_2) -summand is obtained in this way from $\binom{k}{m_1} = \frac{k!}{m_1! m_2!}$ different π -summands, because π is uniquely determined by the orderings of incoming legs (π_1) and outgoing legs (π_2), and the choice of m_1 out of k places for the incoming legs. This proves our claim.

We next show that the map $\mu : \vec{\mathcal{B}}_+ \boxtimes \vec{\mathcal{B}}_- \rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{B}}$ is an isomorphism. At the level of diagrams we have $\vec{\mathcal{D}}_{+-}(*_1, *_2) \cong \vec{\mathcal{D}}(*)$ via the pair of inverse maps

$$\vec{\mathcal{D}}_{+-}(*_1, *_2) \ni \begin{array}{c} *_2 \quad *_1 \\ \downarrow \quad \uparrow \\ \text{---} \text{---} \\ \uparrow \quad \downarrow \\ *_1 \quad *_2 \quad *_1 \end{array} \xrightarrow[\xi]{\mu} \begin{array}{c} * \quad * \\ \downarrow \quad \uparrow \\ \text{---} \text{---} \\ \uparrow \quad \downarrow \\ * \quad * \quad * \end{array} \in \vec{\mathcal{D}}(*) ,$$

where ξ colors the univalent end vertices of incoming legs with $*_1$ and those of outgoing legs with $*_2$. Both maps descend to $\vec{\mathcal{B}}$ -spaces (as there are no STU relations to worry about; this is what makes the $\vec{\mathcal{B}}$ situation easier), and our assertion is proved.

We can now use an elementary lemma from linear algebra.

Lemma 5.6. *Let V and W be filtered linear spaces, with filtrations $\{V_k\}$ and $\{W_k\}$, respectively. Let $\mu, \eta : V \rightarrow W$ be filtration preserving linear maps. Assume that η is an isomorphism and that*

$$\eta(x) - \mu(x) \in V_{k-1} \text{ for all } x \in V_k \quad (k \geq 1) .$$


Then μ is also an isomorphism.

The proof of the proposition is completed by applying Lemma 5.6 with $\mu : \vec{\mathcal{A}}_+ \boxtimes \vec{\mathcal{A}}_- \rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\eta = \chi \circ \mu \circ (\chi_+ \boxtimes \chi_-)^{-1}$. □


Exercise 5.7. Prove Lemma 5.6. Observe that if μ, η, η^{-1} are all diagrammatic morphisms, then so is μ^{-1} .

5.1.2. Definition of Verma modules. Let $\mathbf{1}$ denote the trivial 1-dimensional representation of both \mathfrak{g}_+ and \mathfrak{g}_- . We consider Verma modules of $U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ which are the induced representations $M_+ = \text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{g}_+}^{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}} \mathbf{1}$, $M_- = \text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{g}_-}^{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}} \mathbf{1}$. Recall that $\text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{g}_{\pm}}^{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}} \mathbf{1} = U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}) \otimes_{U(\mathfrak{g}_{\pm})} \mathbf{1}$ (see [H, Section 20.3]). Therefore, M_{\pm} are generated (as $U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ -modules) by vectors 1_{\pm} such that $\mathfrak{g}_{\pm} 1_{\pm} = 0$. This leads us to the following diagrammatic definition.

Definition 5.8. Let \mathcal{J}_+ be the subspace of $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ which is spanned by the images in $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ of diagrams from $\vec{\mathcal{D}}(\uparrow)$ whose rightmost leg is incoming. The *diagrammatic Verma module* \mathcal{M}_+ is the quotient of $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ by \mathcal{J}_+ . Thus, \mathcal{M}_+ is the quotient of $\text{span}_{\mathbb{k}}\{\vec{\mathcal{D}}(\uparrow)\}$ by the usual directed relations (Definition 3.8) and the additional RI relations




We similarly define \mathcal{J}_- to be the span of images of diagrams whose rightmost leg is outgoing, and put $\mathcal{M}_- = \vec{\mathcal{A}} / \mathcal{J}_-$. The corresponding RO relations are



We denote by 1_{\pm} the elements of \mathcal{M}_{\pm} corresponding to the empty diagram.

Since RI and RO relations are homogeneous, \mathcal{M}_{\pm} have the usual grading by half the number of vertices. We denote by $p_{\pm} : \vec{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\pm}$ the natural projections. When we view a diagram in $\vec{\mathcal{D}}(\uparrow)$ as an element of \mathcal{M}_+ we draw it in the form



and similarly for \mathcal{M}_- .

An RI diagram is mapped by $\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}$ to a linear combination of elements of $U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ of the form $u = yx$, $y \in U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$, $x \in \mathfrak{g}_+$; hence $u1_+ = 0$. Thus, the composition

$$\vec{\mathcal{A}} \xrightarrow{\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}} U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}) \xrightarrow{u \mapsto u1_+} M_+$$

descends to a map $\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}} : \mathcal{M}_+ \rightarrow M_+$. A twin argument establishes the existence of a well-defined map $\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}} : \mathcal{M}_- \rightarrow M_-$.

The definitions of diagrammatic tensor products involving \mathcal{M}_{\pm} , such as $\vec{\mathcal{A}} \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_+$ and $\mathcal{M}_+ \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_-$, should be clear. For example, $\mathcal{M}_+ \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_-$ is the quotient of $\vec{\mathcal{A}} \boxtimes \vec{\mathcal{A}}$ by $\mathcal{J}_+ \boxtimes \vec{\mathcal{A}} + \vec{\mathcal{A}} \boxtimes \mathcal{J}_-$, which is the span of (images of) diagrams having either an incoming rightmost leg on the first skeleton interval, or an outgoing rightmost leg on the second one. The accompanying projection map is denoted $p_+ \boxtimes p_- : \vec{\mathcal{A}} \boxtimes \vec{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_+ \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_-$.

We can now justify the module qualifications of \mathcal{M}_{\pm} . The maps

$$\vec{\mathcal{A}} \boxtimes \vec{\mathcal{A}} \xrightarrow{\mu} \vec{\mathcal{A}} \xrightarrow{p_{\pm}} \mathcal{M}_{\pm}$$

send $\vec{\mathcal{A}} \boxtimes \mathcal{J}_\pm$ to zero, because \mathcal{J}_\pm are ‘diagrammatic ideals’ as illustrated (for \mathcal{J}_+) in the figure below:

$$\mu \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{[Diagram: A grey oval with multiple legs pointing down to a horizontal line. The line has two points labeled (1) and (2).]} \\ \hline \end{array} \right) = \begin{array}{c} \text{[Diagram: A grey oval with multiple legs pointing down to a horizontal line.]} \\ \hline \end{array} .$$

Hence these maps descend to $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ -module structure maps $\mu_\pm : \vec{\mathcal{A}} \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_\pm \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_\pm$. The basic module axiom, namely the commutativity of the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \vec{\mathcal{A}} \boxtimes \vec{\mathcal{A}} \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_\pm & \xrightarrow{\text{id} \boxtimes \mu_\pm} & \vec{\mathcal{A}} \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_\pm \\ \mu \boxtimes 1 \downarrow & & \downarrow \mu_\pm \\ \vec{\mathcal{A}} \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_\pm & \xrightarrow{\mu_\pm} & \mathcal{M}_\pm \end{array} ,$$

follows from the associativity of the diagrammatic product. The analogy of the diagrammatic module structures to the algebraic ones is conveyed by the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \vec{\mathcal{A}} \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_\pm & \xrightarrow{\mu_\pm} & \mathcal{M}_\pm \\ \vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathfrak{g}} \downarrow & & \downarrow \vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathfrak{g}} \\ U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}) \otimes M_\pm & \longrightarrow & M_\pm \end{array}$$

It is clear that the product $\mu : \vec{\mathcal{A}}^{\boxtimes 2} \rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{A}}$ makes $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ itself into an $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ -module (which is analogous to the left regular action of $U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ on itself). The maps $p_\pm : \vec{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_\pm$ are then morphisms of $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ -modules (or $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ -maps, for short), in the sense that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \vec{\mathcal{A}} \boxtimes \vec{\mathcal{A}} & \xrightarrow{\text{id} \boxtimes p_\pm} & \vec{\mathcal{A}} \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_\pm \\ \mu \downarrow & & \downarrow \mu_\pm \\ \vec{\mathcal{A}} & \xrightarrow{p_\pm} & \mathcal{M}_\pm \end{array}$$

is commutative.

5.1.3. The PBW isomorphisms $p_\pm : \vec{\mathcal{A}}_\mp \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_\pm$. The PBW isomorphism $\mu : U(\mathfrak{g}_+) \otimes U(\mathfrak{g}_-) \rightarrow U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ implies that the map $U(\mathfrak{g}_+) \rightarrow M_- : u \mapsto u1_-$ is an isomorphism of linear spaces (not of $U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ -modules). We state and prove the corresponding diagrammatic result.

Proposition 5.9. *The maps $p_\pm : \vec{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_\pm$ restrict to linear isomorphisms $p_\pm : \vec{\mathcal{A}}_\mp \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_\pm$.*

Proof. We treat the case of $p_- : \vec{\mathcal{A}}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_-$. We follow the pattern of proof of Proposition 2.22, and freely use the objects employed there, or their adaptations to the directed case, as indicated in the proof of Proposition 3.21. We filter $\vec{\mathcal{D}}(\uparrow)$ by the number of legs, and denote the induced filtrations of $\vec{\mathcal{A}}_+$ and \mathcal{M}_- by $(\vec{\mathcal{A}}_+)_k$ and $(\mathcal{M}_-)_k$.

We shall inductively construct a sequence of compatible maps $q_k : \vec{\mathcal{D}}_k(\uparrow) \rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{A}}_+$ satisfying:

(Q1) $q_k(E) = E$ for all $E \in (\vec{\mathcal{D}}_+(\uparrow))_k$.

(Q2) $q_k(\vec{\mathcal{I}}_k) = 0$, where $\vec{\mathcal{I}}_k$ is the subspace of $\vec{\mathcal{D}}_k(\uparrow)$ spanned by NS, AS, IHX, and STU relations which belong to $\vec{\mathcal{D}}_k(\uparrow)$ (that is, all the diagrams participating in a relation have at most k legs).

(Q3) $q_k((\mathcal{J}_-)_k) = 0$, where $(\mathcal{J}_-)_k$ is spanned by RO diagrams having no more than k legs.

(Q4) $p_-(q_k(D)) = p_-(D)$ for all $D \in \vec{\mathcal{D}}_k(\uparrow)$.

By Q2 and Q3, the maps q_k descend to compatible maps $q_k : (\mathcal{M}_-)_k \rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{A}}_+$. The resulting map $q : \mathcal{M}_- \rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{A}}_+$ is an inverse of $p_- : \vec{\mathcal{A}}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_-$ by Q1 and Q4.

For $k = 0$ we set

$$q_0 \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{○} \\ \longrightarrow \end{array} \right) = \begin{array}{c} \text{○} \\ \longrightarrow \end{array},$$

and for $k = 1$

$$q_1 \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{○} \quad \text{○} \\ \longrightarrow \\ \uparrow \end{array} \right) = \begin{array}{c} \text{○} \quad \text{○} \\ \longrightarrow \\ \uparrow \end{array}; \quad q_1 \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{○} \quad \text{○} \\ \longrightarrow \\ \uparrow \end{array} \right) = 0.$$

Let $k > 1$ and assume that a map $q_{k-1} : \vec{\mathcal{D}}_{k-1}(\uparrow) \rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{A}}_+$ with the desired properties was already constructed. Let $D \in \vec{\mathcal{D}}_k(\uparrow)$ be a diagram with k legs. It is convenient to call D a *fully incoming* diagram if $D \in (\vec{\mathcal{D}}_+(\uparrow))_k$. If D is not fully incoming, then there exists $\pi \in S_k$ such that πD is an RO diagram; we say that such a permutation is *admissible* for D .

Recall that the element $\Gamma_D(\pi) \in \vec{\mathcal{A}}_{k-1}$ is defined by presenting π as a product of transpositions, $\pi = u_{i_1} \cdots u_{i_m}$, and putting

$$\Gamma_D(\pi) = \sum_{l=1}^m s_{i_l} u_{i_{l+1}} \cdots u_{i_m} D; \quad (5.2)$$

it was shown to be independent of the presentation of π being used. We now mod out the target space of Γ_D by $(\mathcal{J}_-)_{k-1}$ and regard it for the rest of this proof as a map $\Gamma_D : S_k \rightarrow (\mathcal{M}_-)_{k-1}$.

The crux of the proof is showing that if D is not fully incoming, then

$$\Gamma_D(\pi_1) = \Gamma_D(\pi_2) \text{ in } (\mathcal{M}_-)_{k-1}, \text{ when both } \pi_1, \pi_2 \text{ are admissible for } D. \quad (5.3)$$

Granting this fact for the moment, we denote by π_D any permutation admissible for D (unless D is fully incoming), and define

$$q_k(D) = \begin{cases} D & \text{if } D \text{ is fully incoming,} \\ q_{k-1}(\Gamma_D(\pi_D)) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (5.4)$$

(Q2 and Q3 for q_{k-1} make this a legitimate definition.) For a diagram D with less than k legs, we define $q_k(D) = q_{k-1}(D)$.

We note that that if D is not fully incoming, then by (2.17)

$$q_k(D) - q_k(\pi_D D) = q_{k-1}(\Gamma_D(\pi_D)).$$

Since $\pi_D D$ is an RO diagram, we are led to the definition in (5.4).

Proof of Q1: Immediate for $E \in (\vec{\mathcal{D}}_+(\uparrow))_k$ with exactly k legs, and follows from the induction hypothesis about q_{k-1} for E with less than k legs. We omit similar remarks about diagrams having less than k legs in the proofs of the remaining properties.

Proof of Q2: As usual, the only difficulty is verifying that STU relations are sent to zero, which amounts to

$$q_k(D - u_i D) = q_k(s_i D) \quad \text{for } D \in \vec{\mathcal{D}}_k(\uparrow), 1 \leq i < k.$$

For a fully incoming diagram D , this is just an incoming STU relation. Otherwise, let π_D be an admissible permutation for D . Then $\pi_D u_i$ is an admissible permutation for $u_i D$. Using (5.3) and the cocycle property (2.16), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} q_k(D - u_i D) &= q_{k-1}(\Gamma_D(\pi_D)) - q_{k-1}(\Gamma_{u_i D}(\pi_D u_i)) \\ &= q_{k-1}(\Gamma_D(\pi_D)) - (q_{k-1}(\Gamma_{u_i u_i D}(\pi_D)) + q_{k-1}(\Gamma_{u_i D}(u_i))) \\ &= -q_{k-1}(\Gamma_{u_i D}(u_i)) = -q_{k-1}(s_i u_i D) \\ &= q_{k-1}(s_i D) = q_k(s_i D), \end{aligned}$$

where the last three equalities follow from (5.2), an AS relation, and the definition of q_k , respectively.

Proof of Q3: If D is an RO diagram with k legs, then we can take $\pi_D = e$, the identity permutation. Since $\Gamma_D(e) = 0$ (presenting e as an empty product of transpositions), we get $q_k(D) = 0$.

Proof of Q4: This is clear for a fully incoming diagram. If D is not fully incoming, then by Q4 for q_{k-1} we have

$$p_-(q_k(D)) = (p_- \circ q_{k-1})(\Gamma_D(\pi_D)) = p_-(\Gamma_D(\pi_D)).$$

By (2.17),

$$p_-(\Gamma_D(\pi_D)) = p_-(D - \pi_D D) = p_-(D),$$

because $\pi_D D$ is an RO diagram. Thus $p_-(q_k(D)) = p_-(D)$, as required.

It remains to prove (5.3). We embed S_{k-1} in S_k as the subgroup of permutations fixing k . We observe that if D is an RO diagram and $\rho \in S_{k-1}$, then $\Gamma_D(\rho)$ is a linear combination of RO diagrams, and is thus zero in $(\mathcal{M}_-)_{k-1}$. To establish this fact, present ρ as a product of transpositions from $\{u_1, \dots, u_{k-2}\}$. Looking at (5.2), we see that none of the glueing operators in $\Gamma_D(\rho)$ alters the rightmost leg of D , hence all terms are RO diagrams.

Let π_1, π_2 be two admissible permutations for a diagram $D \in \vec{\mathcal{D}}_k(\uparrow)$ with k legs (such that at least one of the legs is outgoing). There are two cases:

- (1) π_1 and π_2 move the same (outgoing) leg of D to the right end. In this case,

$$\pi_2 = \rho \pi_1 \quad \text{for some } \rho \in S_{k-1}.$$

- (2) π_1 and π_2 move different legs of D to the right end, say $\pi_1(i_1) = k$ and $\pi_2(i_2) = k$, where $i_1, i_2 < k$ and $i_1 \neq i_2$. Pick $\rho_1 \in S_{k-1}$ such that $\rho_1 \pi_1(i_2) = k-1$. Then $\pi_2 \pi_1^{-1} \rho_1^{-1} u_{k-1}(k) = k$, so that

$$\pi_2 = \rho_2 u_{k-1} \rho_1 \pi_1 \quad (\rho_1, \rho_2 \in S_{k-1}).$$

In the first case we find, using (2.16),

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_D(\pi_2) &= \Gamma_{\pi_1 D}(\rho) + \Gamma_D(\pi_1) \\ &= \Gamma_D(\pi_1) \quad (\text{since } \pi_1 D \text{ is an RO diagram}). \end{aligned}$$

In the second case,

$$\Gamma_D(\pi_2) = \Gamma_{u_{k-1} \rho_1 \pi_1 D}(\rho_2) + \Gamma_D(u_{k-1} \rho_1 \pi_1).$$

Since $u_{k-1}\rho_1\pi_1 D$ is an RO diagram, the first term on the right hand side is zero. Hence

$$\Gamma_D(\pi_2) = \Gamma_{\rho_1\pi_1 D}(u_{k-1}) + \Gamma_D(\rho_1\pi_1).$$

By (5.2), $\Gamma_{\rho_1\pi_1 D}(u_{k-1}) = s_{k-1}(\rho_1\pi_1 D)$. But ρ_1 was chosen in such a way that the two rightmost legs of $\rho_1\pi_1 D$ are outgoing. Therefore, applying s_{k-1} results in an RO diagram, which is equivalent to zero. Thus,

$$\Gamma_D(\pi_2) = \Gamma_D(\rho_1\pi_1),$$

which is equal to $\Gamma_D(\pi_1)$ by the argument of the first case. \square

As with other PBW maps, the proof shows that the maps $p_{\pm} : \vec{\mathcal{A}}_{\mp} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\pm}$ can be inverted ‘skeleton by skeleton’. In particular, the map $p_+ \boxtimes p_- : \vec{\mathcal{A}}_- \boxtimes \vec{\mathcal{A}}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_+ \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_-$ is an isomorphism.


5.1.4. The map $\phi : \vec{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_+ \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_-$. The tensor product of two $U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ -modules V, W is given the structure of a $U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ -module with the help of the coproduct of $U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$:

$$u(v \otimes w) = \Delta(u)(v \otimes w), \quad u \in U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}), v \in V, w \in W.$$

We can imitate this construction without difficulty for the diagrammatic tensor product of $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ -modules. In particular, $\mathcal{M}_+ \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_-$ is an $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ -module; the module map is the composition

$$\vec{\mathcal{A}} \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_+ \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_- \xrightarrow{\Delta_{\uparrow 1}} \vec{\mathcal{A}} \boxtimes \vec{\mathcal{A}} \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_+ \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_- \xrightarrow{\mu_{\uparrow 1, \uparrow 3} \boxtimes \mu_{\uparrow 2, \uparrow 4}} \mathcal{M}_+ \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_-,$$

which can be pictured as



Definition 5.10. The map $\phi : \vec{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_+ \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_-$ is defined as the composition

$$\vec{\mathcal{A}} \xrightarrow{\Delta} \vec{\mathcal{A}} \boxtimes \vec{\mathcal{A}} \xrightarrow{p_+ \boxtimes p_-} \mathcal{M}_+ \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_-.$$

Proposition 5.11. ϕ is an isomorphism of $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ -modules.

Proof. That ϕ is an $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ -map, namely

$$\phi(DE) = \Delta(D)\phi(E) \text{ for } D, E \in \vec{\mathcal{A}},$$

is immediate from the compatibility of the coproduct of $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ with its product (see (2.24)). To prove that ϕ is an isomorphism, we use the method of proof of Proposition 5.5: We show that ϕ coincides, up to lower filtration levels, with the composition of isomorphisms

$$\vec{\mathcal{A}} \xrightarrow{\mu^{-1}} \vec{\mathcal{A}}_- \boxtimes \vec{\mathcal{A}}_+ \xrightarrow{p_+ \boxtimes p_-} \mathcal{M}_+ \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_-,$$

that is

$$\phi(D) - (p_+ \boxtimes p_-)\mu^{-1}(D) \in (\mathcal{M}_+ \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_-)_{k-1} \quad \text{for } D \in \vec{\mathcal{A}}_k. \quad (5.5)$$

We can then apply Lemma 5.6 to finish the proof.

and it is then easy to check that

$$J = \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \uparrow \\ \uparrow \end{array} + \frac{1}{2} \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \leftarrow \\ \uparrow \end{array} + \text{terms of degree } > 1. \quad (5.7)$$

Theorem 7. *Twisting $\vec{\mathcal{A}}_{KZ}$ by $F = J^{-1}$ yields a quasitriangular Hopf structure on $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$, denoted $\vec{\mathcal{A}}_{EK}$, whose R -matrix is a quantization of the diagrammatic r -matrix:*


$$R_{EK} = \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \uparrow \\ \uparrow \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \leftarrow \\ \uparrow \end{array} + \text{terms of degree } > 1. \quad (5.8)$$

Proof. By the transformation formula (4.26) of the associator under twisting, we have to show that

$$\Phi \cdot (\Delta \boxtimes \text{id})(J) \cdot J^{12} = (\text{id} \boxtimes \Delta)(J) \cdot J^{23}, \quad (5.9)$$

in order to prove that $\vec{\mathcal{A}}_{EK}$ is Hopf (that is, its coproduct is coassociative).

Our starting point is the topological equivalence of the following two parenthesized braids:



Applying \mathbf{Z}_K to both sides, using Definition 4.35 and the definition of \tilde{J} , we find that

$\Delta^{\boxtimes 3}(\Phi) \cdot (\tilde{J} \boxtimes 1^{\boxtimes 2}) \cdot ((\Delta^{\boxtimes 2} \boxtimes \text{id}^{\boxtimes 2})(\tilde{J}))^{(23)} = (1^{\boxtimes 2} \boxtimes \tilde{J}) \cdot ((\text{id}^{\boxtimes 2} \boxtimes \Delta^{\boxtimes 2})(\tilde{J}))^{(45)} \cdot (\Phi^{135} \boxtimes \Phi^{246})$ in $\mathcal{A}^{\boxtimes 6}$. Here we have used the following notation: for an element X in some (diagrammatic) tensor product, $X^{(ij)}$ is the element obtained from X by transposing its i th and j th factors.

We map the last equality into $\vec{\mathcal{A}}^{\boxtimes 6}$ (using $\iota : \mathcal{A}^{\boxtimes 6} \rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{A}}^{\boxtimes 6}$) and then apply the map $(p_+ \boxtimes p_-)^{\boxtimes 3} : \vec{\mathcal{A}}^{\boxtimes 6} \rightarrow (\mathcal{M}_+ \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_-)^{\boxtimes 3}$. Since p_{\pm} are $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ -maps we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^{\boxtimes 3}(\Phi) \cdot (p_+ \boxtimes p_-)^{\boxtimes 3}((\tilde{J} \boxtimes 1^{\boxtimes 2}) \cdot ((\Delta^{\boxtimes 2} \boxtimes \text{id}^{\boxtimes 2})(\tilde{J}))^{(23)}) = \\ (1^{\boxtimes 2} \boxtimes \tilde{J}) \cdot ((\text{id}^{\boxtimes 2} \boxtimes \Delta^{\boxtimes 2})(\tilde{J}))^{(45)} \cdot (p_+ \boxtimes p_-)^{\boxtimes 3}(\Phi^{135} \boxtimes \Phi^{246}). \end{aligned}$$

The crucial observation now (compare [EK1, Lemma 2.3]) is that

$$(p_+ \boxtimes p_-)^{\boxtimes 3}(\Phi^{135} \boxtimes \Phi^{246}) = (1_+ \boxtimes 1_-)^{\boxtimes 3}.$$

This follows from the fact that Φ is horizontal and the definitions of ι and p_{\pm} . We thus conclude that the following equality holds in $(\mathcal{M}_+ \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_-)^{\boxtimes 3}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^{\boxtimes 3}(\Phi) \cdot (p_+ \boxtimes p_-)^{\boxtimes 3}((\tilde{J} \boxtimes 1^{\boxtimes 2}) \cdot ((\Delta^{\boxtimes 2} \boxtimes \text{id}^{\boxtimes 2})(\tilde{J}))^{(23)}) = \\ (p_+ \boxtimes p_-)^{\boxtimes 3}((1^{\boxtimes 2} \boxtimes \tilde{J}) \cdot ((\text{id}^{\boxtimes 2} \boxtimes \Delta^{\boxtimes 2})(\tilde{J}))^{(45)}). \quad (5.10) \end{aligned}$$

We introduce an auxiliary map $\psi : \mathcal{M}_+ \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_- \rightarrow (\mathcal{M}_+ \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_-)^{\boxtimes 2}$, which is defined by

$$\psi(E) = (\tilde{J}^{(23)} \cdot (i_+ \boxtimes i_-)(E))^{(23)}, \quad E \in \mathcal{M}_+ \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_-.$$

Note that

$$\psi(1_+ \boxtimes 1_-) = \tilde{J} \cdot (1_+ \boxtimes 1_-)^{\boxtimes 2} = \phi^{\boxtimes 2}(J). \quad (5.11)$$

We claim that ψ is an $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ -map: Since i_{\pm} are $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ -maps,

$$\psi(\Delta(D) \cdot E) = (\tilde{J}^{(23)} \cdot \Delta^{(4)}(D) \cdot (i_+ \boxtimes i_-)(E))^{(23)}.$$

for $D \in \vec{\mathcal{A}}, E \in \mathcal{M}_+ \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_-$. Since \tilde{J} is an element coming from an \mathcal{A} -space, we may use Proposition 3.20 and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\Delta(D) \cdot E) &= (\Delta^{(4)}(D) \cdot \tilde{J}^{23} \cdot (i_+ \boxtimes i_-)(E))^{(23)} \\ &= \Delta^{(4)}(D) \cdot (\tilde{J}^{23} \cdot (i_+ \boxtimes i_-)(E))^{(23)} \\ &= \Delta^{(4)}(D) \cdot \psi(E), \end{aligned}$$

as required.

We next compute $(\psi \boxtimes \text{id})\psi(1_+ \boxtimes 1_-)$ and $(\text{id} \boxtimes \psi)\psi(1_+ \boxtimes 1_-)$ in two ways. First, by the definition of ψ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{id} \boxtimes \psi)\psi(1_+ \boxtimes 1_-) &= ((1^{\boxtimes 2} \boxtimes \tilde{J}^{(23)}) \cdot (\text{id}^{\boxtimes 2} \boxtimes i_+ \boxtimes i_-)(\tilde{J} \cdot (1_+ \boxtimes 1_-)^{\boxtimes 2}))^{(45)} \\ &= (p_+ \boxtimes p_-)^{\boxtimes 3} ((1^{\boxtimes 2} \boxtimes \tilde{J}) \cdot ((\text{id}^{\boxtimes 2} \boxtimes \Delta^{\boxtimes 2})(\tilde{J}))^{(45)}), \end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$(\psi \boxtimes \text{id})\psi(1_+ \boxtimes 1_-) = (p_+ \boxtimes p_-)^{\boxtimes 3} ((\tilde{J} \boxtimes 1^{\boxtimes 2}) \cdot ((\Delta^{\boxtimes 2} \boxtimes \text{id}^{\boxtimes 2})(\tilde{J}))^{(23)}).$$

Comparing with (5.10), we see that

$$\Delta^{\boxtimes 3}(\Phi) \cdot (\psi \boxtimes \text{id})\psi(1_+ \boxtimes 1_-) = (\text{id} \boxtimes \psi)\psi(1_+ \boxtimes 1_-). \quad (5.12)$$

Second, by (5.11) we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\psi \boxtimes \text{id})\psi(1_+ \boxtimes 1_-) &= (\psi \boxtimes \text{id})\phi^{\boxtimes 2}(J) \\ &= (\text{id}^{\boxtimes 2} \boxtimes \phi)(\psi\phi \boxtimes \text{id})(J). \end{aligned}$$

Since both ψ and ϕ are $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ -maps,

$$\psi\phi(D) = \Delta^{(4)}(D) \cdot \psi\phi(1) = \Delta^{(4)}(D) \cdot \phi^{\boxtimes 2}(J) = \phi^{\boxtimes 2}(\Delta(D) \cdot J),$$

for all $D \in \vec{\mathcal{A}}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{id}^{\boxtimes 2} \boxtimes \phi)(\psi\phi \boxtimes \text{id})(J) &= (\text{id}^{\boxtimes 2} \boxtimes \phi)(\phi^{\boxtimes 2} \boxtimes \text{id})((\Delta \boxtimes \text{id})(J) \cdot J^{12}) \\ &= \phi^{\boxtimes 3}((\Delta \boxtimes \text{id})(J) \cdot J^{12}), \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$(\psi \boxtimes \text{id})\psi(1_+ \boxtimes 1_-) = \phi^{\boxtimes 3}((\Delta \boxtimes \text{id})(J) \cdot J^{12}).$$

A similar computation shows that

$$(\text{id} \boxtimes \psi)\psi(1_+ \boxtimes 1_-) = \phi^{\boxtimes 3}((\text{id} \boxtimes \Delta)(J) \cdot J^{23}).$$

Together with (5.12) we have

$$\Delta^{\boxtimes 3}(\Phi) \cdot \phi^{\boxtimes 3}((\Delta \boxtimes \text{id})(J) \cdot J^{12}) = \phi^{\boxtimes 3}((\text{id} \boxtimes \Delta)(J) \cdot J^{23}),$$

and using one more time that ϕ is an $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ -map, we finally get

$$\phi^{\boxtimes 3}(\Phi \cdot (\Delta \boxtimes \text{id})(J) \cdot J^{12}) = \phi^{\boxtimes 3}((\text{id} \boxtimes \Delta)(J) \cdot J^{23}).$$

The proof of (5.9) is now finished by applying the map $(\phi^{-1})^{\boxtimes 3} : (\mathcal{M}_+ \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_-)^{\boxtimes 3} \rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{A}}^{\boxtimes 3}$.

The R -matrix of $\vec{\mathcal{A}}_{EK}$ is given, according to (4.27), by the formula

$$R_{EK} = (J^{-1})^{21} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \text{---} \\ \uparrow \end{array} \right) \cdot J.$$

The expansion (5.8) of R_{EK} is then an immediate consequence of (5.7). \square

5.3. The invariant \mathbf{Z}_{EK} . We denote by \mathbf{Z}_{EK} the invariant corresponding to $\vec{\mathcal{A}}_{EK}$ by the procedure of Section 4.4.3. Since the invariant corresponding to $\vec{\mathcal{A}}_{KZ}$ is the directed Kontsevich integral $\iota \circ \mathbf{Z}_K$, we deduce from Corollary 4.41 the following result.

Theorem 8. *For any framed link L ,*

$$\mathbf{Z}_{EK}(L) = \iota \circ \mathbf{Z}_K(L).$$

Note that if Conjecture 1 (that ι is injective) is true, then Theorem 8 implies that the framed link invariant \mathbf{Z}_{EK} is *equivalent* to the Kontsevich integral. Since Conjecture 1 is true at least at the level of complex semisimple Lie algebras, it is safe to designate \mathbf{Z}_{EK} as an invariant ‘closely related’ to the Kontsevich integral. Theorem 8 thus shows that such an invariant can be constructed from an R -matrix satisfying the QYBE, and this construction captures the first nice property (RT1) of the Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants (see Section 1.2.2).

Admittedly, our construction of the R -matrix of $\vec{\mathcal{A}}_{EK}$ has little success in mimicking the property (RT2), as the construction of the diagrammatic Etingof-Kazhdan twist is far from being explicit. First, it involves a specific value of the Kontsevich integral (the element $\mathbf{Z}_K(|\times|) \in \mathcal{A}^{\boxtimes 4}$), which we can write down only by using the Drinfel’d associator Φ . Second, our recipe for computing $\phi^{-1} : \mathcal{M}_+ \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_- \rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{A}}$ is quite complicated.

We can only assert, thanks to the non-constructive existence result of Theorem 1, that the invariant \mathbf{Z}_{EK} may be constructed based on an R -matrix having *rational* coefficients.

We turn to consider (RT3), namely the existence of a simple formula for the invariant of the unknot. By (4.43), the computation of $\mathbf{Z}_{EK}(\text{unknot})$ requires the knowledge of the u -element and ribbon element of $\vec{\mathcal{A}}_{EK}$. (The α and β elements are equal to 1, since $\vec{\mathcal{A}}_{EK}$ is coassociative.) The latter element is easy, as by Proposition 4.12 it is equal to the ribbon element of $\vec{\mathcal{A}}_{KZ}$. Thus (see Proposition 4.20),

$$v_{EK} = \iota(\exp(-\frac{1}{2} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array})) = \exp(-\frac{1}{2} (\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array})). \quad (5.13)$$

For the u -element, we make the following conjecture. Recall from Example 3.13 that the diagrammatic half-sum of positive roots is the element

$$\varrho = \frac{1}{2} (\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} - \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array}) = \frac{1}{2} (\begin{array}{c} \circ \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} \circ \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array}) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{array}{c} \circ \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \in \vec{\mathcal{A}}. \quad (5.14)$$

Here we have introduced the convention that a diagram having both directed and undirected arcs denotes the sum of all directed Jacobi diagrams obtained by all possible assignments of directions to the undirected arcs.

Conjecture 2. *The u -element of $\vec{\mathcal{A}}_{EK}$ is given by*

$$u_{EK} = \exp(\varrho)v_{EK} = \exp(- \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array}). \quad (5.15)$$

Remark 5.14. An obvious corollary of Conjecture 3 would be that $\text{Tr}(e^e) = \text{Tr}(e^{-e})$. This equality, which is a (conjectural) consequence of a simple topological fact (reversing the orientation of the unknot does not change its isotopy class) seems to be non-trivial in itself. We note that it is equivalent to the series of equalities

$$\text{Tr}(\rho^k) = 0, \quad k = 1, 3, 5, \dots$$

5.4. Summary of spaces, structures, and link invariants. Some of the ribbon quasi-triangular quasi-Hopf structures we have encountered, together with the associated framed link invariants, are summarized in the diagram in Figure 14. In this diagram, \mathcal{L}^F is the set of (isotopy classes of) framed links, and the target spaces of each invariant are indicated by its ‘base target space’ (that is, its values on framed links with n components are in the n th tensor power of the base target space). The wavy lines stand for twist equivalences.




Figure 14. Ribbon quasitriangular quasi-Hopf structures and associated link invariants.

5.5. The Polyak spaces. Let \mathbf{M} be a 1-dimensional skeleton. We denote by $\vec{\mathcal{D}}^c(\mathbf{M})$ the collection of \mathbf{M} -based diagrams whose body consists of directed chords.

Definition 5.15. The space $\vec{\mathcal{P}}^c(\mathbf{M})$ is the quotient of the space formally spanned by $\vec{\mathcal{D}}^c(\mathbf{M})$ (over the base field \mathbb{k}), by the *6T relations* (compare Exercise 3.12):

$$(5.17)$$

The spaces $\vec{\mathcal{P}}^c(\mathbf{M})$ are graded by the number of chords in a diagram, and are often interchanged with their graded completions. We put $\vec{\mathcal{P}}^c = \vec{\mathcal{P}}^c(\uparrow)$. The study of these spaces is motivated by the theory of finite-type invariants of *virtual knots* (see [GPV]).

Equation 5.17 is a diagrammatic form of the CYBE (3.1). This leads, along the lines of Section 3.2.2, to the construction of a map $\vec{\mathcal{T}}_r : \vec{\mathcal{P}}^c \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{a})$, where \mathfrak{a} is a quasitriangular Lie bialgebra and r is its r -matrix. (More generally, there are maps $\vec{\mathcal{T}}_r : \vec{\mathcal{P}}^c(\mathbf{M}) \rightarrow L(\mathbf{M})$, where $L(\mathbf{M})$ is the space of \mathbf{M} -based \mathfrak{a} -tensors.)

Recall from Section 2.3.1 that $\mathcal{A}^c(\mathbf{M})$ is the chord diagram version of $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{M})$ (it is isomorphic to $\mathcal{A}'(\mathbf{M})$). The maps $\iota : \mathcal{A}^c(\mathbf{M}) \rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{P}}^c(\mathbf{M})$ are defined by summing over all possible assignments of directions to the chords of a diagram in $\mathcal{A}^c(\mathbf{M})$. It is not hard to verify that these maps are well-defined, namely that 4T relations are mapped to zero. They are conjectured in [Po] to be *injective* (compare Conjecture 1). If $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ is the ambient Lie bialgebra of a Manin triple and r is the natural r -matrix of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$, then we have the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{A}^c & \xrightarrow{\iota} & \vec{\mathcal{P}}^c \\ \tau_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}} \downarrow & & \downarrow \vec{\mathcal{T}}_r \\ U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})^{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}} & \xrightarrow{i} & U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}). \end{array}$$

Next comes the transition to uni-trivalent diagrams. Recall that a directed graph is *acyclic* if it contains no directed cycles. A directed Jacobi diagram is acyclic if its body graph is. We denote by $\vec{\mathcal{D}}^a(\mathbf{M})$ the collection of acyclic directed Jacobi diagrams based on a skeleton \mathbf{M} .

Definition 5.16. The space $\vec{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{M})$ is the quotient of the formal \mathbb{k} -span of $\vec{\mathcal{D}}^a(\mathbf{M})$ by directed NS, AS, IHX, and STU relations (as in Definition 3.8), in which only acyclic diagrams participate.

As usual, $\vec{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{M})$ is graded by half the number of vertices in a diagram, and we denote by $\vec{\mathcal{P}}$ the space $\vec{\mathcal{P}}(\uparrow)$.

For \mathbf{M} a 1-dimensional skeleton, The injection $i : \vec{\mathcal{D}}^c(\mathbf{M}) \rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{D}}^a(\mathbf{M})$ descends to a well-defined map $i : \vec{\mathcal{P}}^c(\mathbf{M}) \rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{M})$, as a 6T relation is a consequence of directed STU relations. The following result (compare Proposition 2.19) is due to Ohtsuki and Polyak.

Theorem 10. *The map $i : \vec{\mathcal{P}}^c \rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{P}}$ is an isomorphism.*

We also have an injection $j : \vec{\mathcal{D}}^a(\mathbf{M}) \rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{M})$, which induces a map $j : \vec{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{M}) \rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{M})$. This map is not onto (for example, the degree 1 diagram  is easily seen not to lie in the image of $j : \vec{\mathcal{P}} \rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{A}}$.) I do not know whether it is injective or not.

Since the algebra¹⁹ $\vec{\mathcal{P}}$ has (unlike $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$) an equivalent description in terms of directed chord diagrams, it would be interesting to carry out some of the constructions of Section 5.2 within $\vec{\mathcal{P}}$ -spaces. A naive imitation is due to fail: If we try to define Verma modules by an acyclic

¹⁹All algebraic structures on $\vec{\mathcal{P}}$ -spaces are defined as for $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ -spaces.

version of Definition 5.1, then the map $\phi : \vec{\mathcal{P}} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_+ \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_-$ (induced by the coproduct) is not an isomorphism already in degree 1.

Nevertheless, the following question makes sense.

Question 2. Is there a solution of the QYBE in $\vec{\mathcal{P}}^{\boxtimes 2}$ which is a quantization of the diagrammatic r -matrix $\begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \leftarrow \\ \uparrow \end{array}$? More specifically, does the R -matrix R_{EK} of $\vec{\mathcal{A}}_{\text{EK}}$ belong to the image of $j : \vec{\mathcal{P}}^{\boxtimes 2} \rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{A}}^{\boxtimes 2}$?

Remark 5.17. The results of Etingof and Kazhdan in [EK2] (see also [ES, Lecture 20]) seem to hint at a positive answer, but I do not know whether their algebraic constructions and arguments can be translated into a diagrammatic framework.

REFERENCES

- [AC] D. Altschüler and A. Coste, *Quasi-quantum groups, knots, three-manifolds, and topological field theory*, Comm. Math. Phys. **150** (1992), no. 1, 83–107.
- [BN1] D. Bar-Natan, *On the Vassiliev knot invariants*, Topology **34** (1995), no. 2, 423–472.
- [BN2] ———, *Vassiliev and quantum invariants of braids*, The interface of knots and physics (San Francisco, CA, 1995), 129–144, Proc. Sympos. Appl. Math. **51**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1996.
- [BN3] ———, *Non-associative tangles* Geometric topology (Athens, GA, 1993), 139–183, AMS/IP Stud. Adv. Math., 2.1, Amer. Math. Soc. Providence, RI, 1997.
- [BGRT] ———, S. Garoufalidis, L. Rozansky, and D. P. Thurston, *Wheels, wheeling, and the Kontsevich integral of the unknot*, Israel J. Math. **119** (2000), 217–237, arXiv:q-alg/9703025.
- [BLT] ———, Thang. Q. Le, and D. P. Thurston, *Two applications of elementary knot theory to Lie algebras and Vassiliev invariants*, arXiv:math.QA/0204311.
- [BS] ——— and A. Stoimenow, *The fundamental theorem of Vassiliev invariants*, Geometry and physics (Århus, 1995), 101–134, Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math., 184, Dekker, New York, 1997, arXiv:q-alg/9702009.
- [C] P. Cartier, *Construction combinatoire des invariants de Vassiliev-Kontsevich des nœuds*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. **316** (1993) 1205–1210.
- [CP] V. Chari and A. Pressley, *A guide to quantum groups*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
- [D1] V. G. Drinfel’d, *Quantum groups*, Proc. Int. Cong. Math. (Berkeley, 1986), 798–820, Amer. Math. Soc. Providence, RI, 1987.
- [D2] ———, *On almost cocommutative Hopf algebras*, Leningrad Math. J. **1** (1990), no. 2, 321–342.
- [D3] ———, *Quasi-Hopf algebras*, Leningrad Math. J. **1** (1990), no. 6, 1419–1457.
- [D4] ———, *On quasitriangular quasi-Hopf algebras and a group closely connected with $\text{Gal}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}/\mathbb{Q})$* , Leningrad Math. J. **2** (1991), no. 4, 829–860.
- [EK1] P. Etingof and D. Kazhdan, *Quantization of Lie bialgebras, I*, Selecta Math. (N.S.) **2** (1996), no. 1, 1–41, arXiv:q-alg/9506005.
- [EK2] ——— and ———, *Quantization of Lie bialgebras, II*, Selecta Math. (N.S.) **4** (1998), no. 2, 213–231, arXiv:q-alg/9701038.
- [EK6] ——— and ———, *Quantization of Lie bialgebras, VI*, arXiv:math.QA/0004042.
- [ES] ——— and O. Schiffmann, *Lectures on quantum groups*, Lectures in Mathematical Physics, International Press, Boston, MA, 1998.
- [GPV] M. Goussarov, M. Polyak, and O. Viro, *Finite-type invariants of classical and virtual knots*, Topology **39** (2000), no. 5, 1045–1068, arXiv:math.GT/9810073.
- [H] J. E. Humphreys, *Introduction to Lie algebras and representation theory*, Springer-Verlag GTM **9**, New York, 1997.
- [Ka] C. Kassel, *Quantum groups*, Springer-Verlag GTM **155**, New York, 1995.

- [Kn] J. Kneissler, *The number of primitive Vassiliev invariants up to degree 12*, University of Bonn preprint, 1997, arXiv:q-alg/9706022.
- [LGZ] J. R. Links, M. D. Gould and Y.-Z. Zhang, *Twisting invariance of link polynomials derived from ribbon quasi-Hopf algebras*, J. Math. Phys. **41** (2000), no. 7, 5020–5032, arXiv:math.QA/9904069.
- [LM1] T. Q. T. Le and J. Murakami, *Representation of the category of tangles by Kontsevich’s iterated integral*, Comm. Math. Phys. **168** (1995), no. 3, 535–562.
- [LM2] ——— and ———, *The universal Vassiliev-Kontsevich invariant for framed oriented links*, Compositio Math. **102** (1996), 41–64, arXiv:hep-th/9401016.
- [Pi] S. Piunikhin, *Weights of Feynman diagrams, link polynomials and Vassiliev knot invariants*, J. Knot Theory Ramifications **4** (1995), no. 1, 163–188.
- [Po] M. Polyak, *On the algebra of arrow diagrams*, Lett. Math. Phys. **51** (2000), 275–291.
- [RT] N. Yu. Reshetikhin and V. G. Turaev, *Ribbon graphs and their invariants coming from quantum groups*, Commun. Math. Phys. **127** (1990), no. 1, 1–26.
- [T] D. Thurston, *Wheeling: A diagrammatic analogue of the Duflo isomorphism*, University of California at Berkeley Ph.D. thesis, May 2000, arXiv:math.QA/0006083.
- [V] P. Vogel, *Algebraic structures on modules of diagrams*, University of Paris VII preprint, October 1997.

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY, GIV’AT-RAM, JERUSALEM 91904, ISRAEL
E-mail address: haviv@math.huji.ac.il