

Enveloping algebra of a Lie algebra as a Yetter-Drinfeld module algebra over the Hopf algebra of regular functions on its automorphism group

Z. Škoda, M. Stojić

Abstract

We present an elementary proof that there is a (highly degenerate) Hopf pairing between the universal enveloping algebra $U(\mathfrak{g})$ of a finite-dimensional Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ and the Hopf algebra $\mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g}))$ of regular functions on the automorphism group of $\mathfrak{g}$. This Hopf pairing induces a Hopf action of $\mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g}))$ on $U(\mathfrak{g})$ which together with an explicitly given coaction makes $U(\mathfrak{g})$ into a braided-commutative algebra in the category of Yetter–Drinfeld modules over $\mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g}))$. These data may be used to construct a Hopf algebroid structure on the smash product algebra $\mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})) \# U(\mathfrak{g})$ retaining essential features from a related construction of a Hopf algebroid structure on earlier known infinite dimensional versions of Heisenberg double of $U(\mathfrak{g})$ including a noncommutative phase space of Lie algebra type, while avoiding the need of completed tensor products.

Our results are proven in a slightly more general form, where $\mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g}))$ is replaced by $\mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h}))$ where $\mathfrak{h}$ is any finite-dimensional Leibniz algebra having $\mathfrak{g}$ as its maximal Lie algebra quotient.

Keywords: Yetter–Drinfeld module algebra, universal enveloping algebra, Lie algebra automorphism, Leibniz algebra, adjoint map

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Preliminaries	3
2.1	Conventions	3
2.2	Background on Yetter-Drinfeld module algebras	3

2.3	Leibniz algebras	5
2.3.1	Left Leibniz algebra	5
2.3.2	Right Leibniz algebra	6
3	$U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie})$ as a Yetter–Drinfeld $\mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h}))$ -module algebra	6
3.1	Hopf algebra $\mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(L))$	7
3.2	Hopf pairing	7
3.3	Main theorem	11
3.4	Geometry	16

1 Introduction

Yetter–Drinfeld modules over bialgebras (2.2 and [Radford, RadfordTowber, SS]) are ubiquitous in quantum algebra, low dimensional topology and representation theory. More intricate structure of braided commutative monoids in the category ${}^H\mathcal{YD}_H$ of Yetter–Drinfeld modules are an ingredient in a construction of scalar extension bialgebroids and Hopf algebroids. Namely, given a Hopf algebra H and a braided commutative Yetter–Drinfeld H -module algebra A , the smash product algebra $H\sharp A$ has a structure of a Hopf algebroid over A [BohmHAlg, BrzMil, Stojic]. An important special case is the Heisenberg double $H\sharp H^*$ of a finite-dimensional Hopf algebra H , where H^* is the dual Hopf algebra of H ; the H -coaction on H^* is given by an explicit formula involving basis of H and the dual basis of H^* ([Lu], map β in Section 6). There are several important examples in literature, some motivated by mathematical physics, when the underlying algebra of A is the universal enveloping algebra $U(\mathfrak{g})$ of a n -dimensional Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, for example in the example of a noncommutative phase space of Lie algebra type [MSS] the Hopf algebra H is a realization via formal power series of the algebraic dual $U(\mathfrak{g})^*$ with its natural topological Hopf algebra structure. Historically, the noncommutative phase space $\mathcal{H}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ of Lie algebra type has been introduced by extending $U(\mathfrak{g})$ by adding deformed derivatives (“momenta”) in [MS2007] and in a rather nonrigorous treatment [Skoda] it has been argued that $\mathcal{H}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ is actually Heisenberg double of $U(\mathfrak{g})$; this made plausible that Hopf algebroid structure on $\mathcal{H}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ could be exhibited analogously to Lu’s example of finite-dimensional double, leading to an ad hoc version of completed Hopf algebroid structure in [MSS]. An abstract version of $U(\mathfrak{g})^*\sharp U(\mathfrak{g})$ is described in [StojicCHa] as an internal Hopf algebroid in a symmetric monoidal category of filtered cofiltered vector spaces. These examples may be looked as infinite dimensional cases of Heisenberg double (in fact, this observation on nonrigorous treatment [Skoda] influenced Hopf algebroid approach [MSS]), but a number of results [StojicCHa] show that there are intricate conditions for which infinite dimensional dually paired Hopf algebras H and K one can indeed form a Hopf algebroid structure on the smash product algebra $H\sharp K$, even in a completed sense or even when one of the Hopf algebras is the restricted dual of another. In the case of $U(\mathfrak{g})$, formulas from [MSS], show that there are special elements $\mathcal{O}_j^i \in H = U(\mathfrak{g})^*$

for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ such that the coaction on the generators is given by the formulas (adapted to our conventions) $U(\mathfrak{g}) \supset \mathfrak{g} \ni x_k \mapsto \sum_i \mathcal{O}_k^i \otimes x_i \in U(\mathfrak{g}^*) \otimes \mathfrak{g}$. Moreover, elements $\mathcal{O}_j^i$ satisfy the relations which are satisfied by matrix elements of automorphisms of $\mathfrak{g}$. The prime motivation of this article is to demistify this phenomenon and to find a much smaller Hopf algebra H containing an abstract model for $\mathcal{O}_j^i$ and avoiding any completions in describing Yetter–Drinfeld H -module structure on $U(\mathfrak{g})$.

We show that the Hopf algebra of regular functions $H = \mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g}))$ on the automorphism group of $\mathfrak{g}$ will do, namely that $U(\mathfrak{g})$ is a braided commutative Yetter–Drinfeld module $\mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g}))$ -algebra whose structure is given by essentially the same formulas as in the case of $U(\mathfrak{g})^*$ from [StojicCHa]. One can use general formulas for scalar extensions from [Stojic] to describe the Hopf algebroid structure on the smash product $\mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})) \sharp U(\mathfrak{g})$. In the sequel work [StoSko] we present several other natural examples of Hopf algebras H which are equipped with a Hopf algebra homomorphism $\mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})) \rightarrow H$ and where $U(\mathfrak{g})$ is still Yetter–Drinfeld module algebra without completions. In [StoSko], the formulas for the (symmetric) Hopf algebroid structure are also spelled out in full detail.

The main result of this article is actually proved in a slightly more general form than described above. Namely instead of the automorphism group of $\mathfrak{g}$ we can take the automorphism group of any finite-dimensional Leibniz algebra $\mathfrak{h}$ such that $\mathfrak{g}$ is the maximal Lie algebra quotient $\mathfrak{h}_{\text{Lie}}$ of $\mathfrak{h}$.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Conventions

Throughout the paper we freely use Sweedler notation with or without the summation sign [Majid, Radford] and the Kronecker symbol δ_j^i . -Pairings of vector spaces are bilinear maps into the ground field which are in this work not required to be nondegenerate. A pairing between two bialgebras A and H is Hopf if $\langle \Delta_A(a), h \otimes k \rangle = \langle a, h \cdot k \rangle$ where on the left hand side the pairing is a product of pairings in each tensor factor and likewise $\langle a \otimes b, \Delta_H(h) \rangle = \langle a \cdot b, h \rangle$, as well as $\epsilon_A(a) = \langle a, 1 \rangle$ and $\epsilon_H(h) = \langle 1, h \rangle$. If A and H are Hopf algebras, the property $\langle S_A(a), h \rangle = \langle a, S_H(h) \rangle$ is also required.

2.2 Background on Yetter–Drinfeld module algebras

In this subsection, fix a ground field $\mathbf{k}$ and a Hopf $\mathbf{k}$ -algebra $H = (H, \Delta, \epsilon)$ with comultiplication $\Delta: h \mapsto \sum h_{(1)} \otimes h_{(2)}$ and counit $\epsilon: H \rightarrow \mathbf{k}$. Recall that the category $\mathcal{M}_H$ of right H -modules is monoidal: if $(M, \blacktriangleleft_M)$ and $(N, \blacktriangleleft_N)$ are H -modules then their tensor product is $\mathbf{k}$ -module $M \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} N$ with H -action $\blacktriangleleft: (m \otimes n) \otimes h \mapsto (m \blacktriangleleft_M h_{(1)}) \otimes (n \blacktriangleleft_N h_{(2)})$ and the unit object is $\mathbf{k}$ with action $c \blacktriangleleft h = \epsilon(h)c$, $h \in H$, $c \in \mathbf{k}$. A right H -module algebra A is a monoid in $\mathcal{M}_H$: a right H -module $(A, \blacktriangleleft: A \otimes H \rightarrow A)$ with multiplication $\cdot$ such that $\sum (a \blacktriangleleft h_{(1)}) \cdot (b \blacktriangleleft h_{(2)}) = (a \cdot b) \blacktriangleleft h$ and $1 \blacktriangleleft h = \epsilon(h)1$.

One can then form a smash product algebra $H\sharp A$ with underlying $\mathbf{k}$ -vector space $H \otimes A$ and associative multiplication $\cdot$ given by $(h\sharp a) \cdot (k\sharp b) := hk_{(1)}\sharp(a \blacktriangleleft k_{(2)})b$ where $h\sharp a$ is an alias for $h \otimes a \in H\sharp A$. We often identify $a \in A$ with $a\sharp 1$ and $h \in H$ with $1\sharp h \in A\sharp H$ (thus for $a, b \in A$, $h, k \in H$, $a \cdot (h\sharp b)$ denotes $(1\sharp a) \cdot (h\sharp b)$ and $h \cdot (k\sharp b) = (hk)\sharp b$). We extend $\blacktriangleleft$ to a right action, also denoted $\blacktriangleleft$, of $H\sharp A$ on A by setting $a \blacktriangleleft (h\sharp b) := (a \blacktriangleleft h)b \in A$.

A right-left Yetter-Drinfeld H -module $(M, \blacktriangleleft, \lambda)$ is a unital right H -module $(M, \blacktriangleleft)$ with a left H -coaction $\lambda: M \rightarrow H \otimes M$, $m \mapsto \lambda(m) = \sum m_{[-1]} \otimes m_{[0]}$, satisfying Yetter-Drinfeld compatibility condition

$$f_{(2)}(m \blacktriangleleft f_{(1)})_{[-1]} \otimes (m \blacktriangleleft f_{(1)})_{[0]} = m_{[-1]}f_{(1)} \otimes (m_{[0]} \blacktriangleleft f_{(2)}), \quad m \in M, f \in H. \quad (1)$$

Morphisms of Yetter-Drinfeld modules are morphisms of underlying modules which are also morphisms of comodules and the tensor product of underlying H -modules is a Yetter-Drinfeld module via coaction $m \otimes n \mapsto n_{[-1]}m_{[-1]} \otimes m_{[0]} \otimes n_{[0]}$ (notice the order!). Thus we obtain a braided monoidal category ${}^H\mathcal{YD}_H$ of Yetter-Drinfeld H -modules with braiding $\sigma_{M,N}: M \otimes N \rightarrow N \otimes M$ given by $m \otimes n \mapsto (n \blacktriangleleft_N m_{[-1]}) \otimes m_{[0]}$. For finite-dimensional H , ${}^H\mathcal{YD}_H$ is braided monoidally equivalent to the Drinfeld-Majid center of the monoidal category $\mathcal{M}_H$ of right H -modules.

If A is a right H -module algebra with a left H -coaction λ and if we identify the underlying vector spaces of $H\sharp A$ and $H \otimes A$ then the Yetter-Drinfeld compatibility may be rewritten in terms of the multiplication in $H\sharp A$,

$$f_{(2)} \cdot \lambda(a \blacktriangleleft f_{(1)}) = \lambda(a) \blacktriangleleft' f, \quad a \in A, f \in H, \quad (2)$$

where $\blacktriangleleft'$ on the right-hand side is the action on the tensor product of right H -modules.

Monoids in ${}^H\mathcal{YD}_H$ are called (right-left) Yetter-Drinfeld H -module algebras. They are Yetter-Drinfeld modules with multiplication such that they become H -module algebras and H^{op} -comodule algebras. Notice that an H -comodule is the same thing as an H^{op} -comodule, but saying that it is an algebra map is different. If $(A, \blacktriangleleft, \lambda)$ is a Yetter-Drinfeld module and $\mu: A \otimes A \rightarrow A$ a $\mathbf{k}$ -linear map, then μ is braided commutative if $\sigma_{A,A} \circ \mu = \mu$, that is $(a \blacktriangleleft b_{[-1]})b_{[0]} = ba$ for all $a, b \in A$. An H -module algebra $(A, \blacktriangleleft)$ is braided commutative if its multiplication is braided commutative.

Lemma 2.1. *Consider an H -module algebra $(A, \blacktriangleleft)$ with multiplication μ with coaction λ so that $(A, \blacktriangleleft, \lambda)$ is a Yetter-Drinfeld H -module.*

(i) μ is braided commutative in ${}^H\mathcal{YD}_H$ iff for the extended action $\blacktriangleleft$ of the smash product the relation $a \blacktriangleleft \lambda(b) = ba$ holds.

(ii) μ is braided commutative iff all elements of the form $1\sharp a$, $a \in A$, commute with all elements of the form $\lambda(b)$, $b \in A$, viewed inside $H\sharp A$.

(iii) Suppose μ is braided commutative. A is an H^{op} -comodule algebra (hence also a Yetter-Drinfeld module algebra) iff λ considered as a map with values in smash product algebra $H\sharp A$ is antimultiplicative.

For (i) indeed, the left hand side is $a \blacktriangleleft (b_{[-1]}\sharp b_{[0]}) = (a \blacktriangleleft b_{[-1]})b_{[0]}$. Parts (ii) and (iii) are left to the reader. They are implicit in [BrzMil].

2.3 Leibniz algebras

Left and right Leibniz algebras are nonassociative algebras slightly generalizing Lie algebras by dropping the condition of antisymmetry.

2.3.1 Left Leibniz algebra. A $\mathbf{k}$ -vector space $\mathfrak{h}$ equipped with a linear map $[\cdot, \cdot]: \mathfrak{h} \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} \mathfrak{h} \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}$ is a *left Leibniz algebra* [LodPir] if for every $x \in \mathfrak{h}$ the map $y \mapsto [x, y]$ is a derivation on $\mathfrak{h}$, that is if left Leibniz identity $[x, [y, z]] = [[x, y], z] + [y, [x, z]]$ holds for all $x, y, z \in \mathfrak{h}$. Let $\mathfrak{h}^l$ be a copy of vector space $\mathfrak{h}$ with elements l_x , $x \in \mathfrak{h}$ with operations transported via $l: x \mapsto l_x$. Denote by $\mathfrak{h}_{\text{Lie}}$ the Lie algebra obtained as a quotient of $\mathfrak{h}$ by the two-sided ideal $I_{[x, x], x \in \mathfrak{h}}$ generated by all commutators $[x, x]$, $x \in \mathfrak{h}$. It is a Lie algebra and it is maximal in the sense that if $\text{char } \mathbf{k} \neq 2$, every map $\mathfrak{h} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$ to a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ factors through $\mathfrak{h}_{\text{Lie}}$ (if $\text{char } \mathbf{k} = 2$, relation $[x, x] = 0$ is stronger than the antisymmetry).

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\mathfrak{h}$ be a left Leibniz algebra. Universal enveloping algebra $U(\mathfrak{h}_{\text{Lie}})$ of Lie algebra $\mathfrak{h}_{\text{Lie}} \cong \mathfrak{h}/I_{[x, x], x \in \mathfrak{h}}$ is isomorphic to $T(\mathfrak{h}^l)/I^l$, where I^l is the ideal generated by $l_{[x, y]} - l_x \otimes l_y + l_y \otimes l_x$.*

Proof. Denote by $\bar{x}$ the image of $x \in \mathfrak{h}$ in $\mathfrak{h}_{\text{Lie}}$. Denote by $\bar{l}_x$ the image of $l_x \in T(\mathfrak{h}^l)$ in $T(\mathfrak{h}^l)/I^l$. Denote by $\tilde{x}$ the image of $x \in \mathfrak{h}$ in $U(\mathfrak{h}_{\text{Lie}})$. The dashed mapping in the following diagram satisfies that $[x, x] \mapsto 0$ for every $x \in \mathfrak{h}$ since by the composition of mappings $\mathfrak{h} \rightarrow T(\mathfrak{h}^l)$ in the top row $[x, x] \mapsto l_{[x, x]} = l_{[x, x]} - l_x \otimes l_x + l_x \otimes l_x \in I^l \subset T(\mathfrak{h}^l)$.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathfrak{h} & \xleftrightarrow{x \mapsto l_x} & \mathfrak{h}^l & \hookrightarrow & T(\mathfrak{h}^l) \\ & \searrow \text{dashed} & & & \downarrow \\ & & & & T(\mathfrak{h}^l)/I^l \end{array}$$

Therefore, there exists the mapping $\mathfrak{h}_{\text{Lie}} \rightarrow T(\mathfrak{h}^l)/I^l$, $\bar{x} \mapsto \bar{l}_x$, and consequently the mapping $T(\mathfrak{h}_{\text{Lie}}) \rightarrow T(\mathfrak{h}^l)/I^l$. This mapping satisfies $\overline{[x, y]} - \bar{x} \otimes \bar{y} + \bar{y} \otimes \bar{x} \mapsto \bar{l}_{[x, y]} - \bar{l}_x \otimes \bar{l}_y + \bar{l}_y \otimes \bar{l}_x = 0 \in T(\mathfrak{h}^l)/I^l$. Therefore, we have induced the mapping $U(\mathfrak{h}_{\text{Lie}}) \rightarrow T(\mathfrak{h}^l)/I^l$.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathfrak{h} & \longleftrightarrow & \mathfrak{h}^l & \hookrightarrow & T(\mathfrak{h}^l) \\ \downarrow & & \searrow \text{dashed} & & \downarrow \\ \mathfrak{h}_{\text{Lie}} & \xrightarrow{\text{checked}} & & & T(\mathfrak{h}^l)/I^l \\ \downarrow & & \nearrow \text{dashed} & & \\ T(\mathfrak{h}_{\text{Lie}}) & & & & \\ \downarrow & & \nearrow \text{checked} & & \\ U(\mathfrak{h}_{\text{Lie}}) & & & & \end{array}$$

On the other hand, in the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\mathfrak{h} & \longleftrightarrow & \mathfrak{h}^l & \hookrightarrow & T(\mathfrak{h}^l) \\
\downarrow & & \swarrow & & \downarrow \\
\mathfrak{h}_{Lie} & & & & T(\mathfrak{h}^l)/I^l \\
\downarrow & & \swarrow & & \downarrow \\
T(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie}) & & & & \\
\downarrow & & \swarrow & & \\
U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie}) & & & &
\end{array}$$

checked

the map $\mathfrak{h} \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie})$ induces $T(\mathfrak{h}^l) \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie})$. By this map $l_{[x,y]} - l_x \otimes l_y + l_y \otimes l_x \mapsto \widetilde{[x,y]} - \tilde{x} \otimes \tilde{y} + \tilde{y} \otimes \tilde{x} = [\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}] - \tilde{x} \otimes \tilde{y} + \tilde{y} \otimes \tilde{x} = 0 \in U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie})$. Therefore, we have well defined map $T(\mathfrak{h}^l)/I^l \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie})$.

These two maps are inverse to each other. $\square$

2.3.2 Right Leibniz algebra. We say that $\mathbf{k}$ -vector space $\mathfrak{h}$ together with a linear map $[\cdot, \cdot]: \mathfrak{h} \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} \mathfrak{h} \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}$ is a *right Leibniz algebra* if for every $x \in \mathfrak{h}$ the map $y \mapsto [y, x]$ is a derivation on $\mathfrak{h}$, that is if the right Leibniz identity $[[x, y], z] = [[x, z], y] + [x, [y, z]]$ holds for all $x, y, z \in \mathfrak{h}$. By quotienting $\mathfrak{h}$ with the ideal generated by $[x, x], x \in \mathfrak{h}$ we get a maximal quotient Lie algebra, $\mathfrak{h} \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{Lie}$.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\mathfrak{h}$ be a right Leibniz algebra. Universal enveloping algebra $U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie})$ of Lie algebra $\mathfrak{h}_{Lie} \cong \mathfrak{h}/I_{[x,x], x \in \mathfrak{h}}$ is isomorphic to $T(\mathfrak{h}^r)/I^r$, where I^r is the ideal generated by $r_{[x,y]} - r_x \otimes r_y + r_y \otimes r_x$.*

Proof. Analogous to proof of Lemma 2.2. $\square$

3 $U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie})$ as a Yetter–Drinfeld $\mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h}))$ -module algebra

In this section we prove the central result of this article: that for any finite-dimensional Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ over any field $\mathbf{k}$, the universal enveloping algebra $U(\mathfrak{g})$ is a braided commutative Yetter–Drinfeld module algebra over the Hopf algebra of regular functions $\mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g}))$ on the algebraic group of automorphisms of $\mathfrak{g}$. This result immediately implies that the smash product algebra $\mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})) \sharp U(\mathfrak{g})$ has a structure of a Hopf algebroid over base algebras $U(\mathfrak{g})^{\text{op}}, U(\mathfrak{g})$ whose structure is spelled in detail in Section 4. Moreover, this structure is related to other, more geometric, examples in this article.

3.1 Hopf algebra $\mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(L))$

Let $(L, \cdot_L)$ be any nonassociative algebra of finite dimension n over a field $\mathbf{k}$. The general linear group of the underlying vector space, $\text{GL}(L)$ is an affine algebraic group with algebra of regular functions $\mathcal{O}(\text{GL}(L))$ that is therefore a Hopf algebra via $\Delta(f)(M, N) = f(M \circ N)$ and $\epsilon(f) = f(1)$ for any $M, N \in \text{GL}(L)$. For a chosen basis $x_1, \dots, x_n$ of L , which induces an isomorphism $\text{GL}(n, \mathbf{k}) \cong \text{GL}(L)$, the structure constants C_{ij}^k are defined by

$$x_i \cdot x_j = \sum_{k=1}^n C_{ij}^k x_k, \quad i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \quad (3)$$

and we introduce as algebra generators of $\mathcal{O}(\text{GL}(L))$ regular functions $U_j^i: M \mapsto M_j^i, \bar{U}_j^i: M \mapsto (M^{-1})_j^i$, where M_j^i is the (i, j) -th entry of matrix $M \in \text{GL}(n, \mathbf{k})$. As an abstract algebra $\mathcal{O}(\text{GL}(L))$ is the free algebra on n^2 generators $U_j^i, \bar{U}_j^i$ modulo the n^2 relations $\sum_k U_k^i \bar{U}_j^k = \delta_j^i$. The coproduct is then given by $\Delta(U_j^i) = \sum_k U_k^i \otimes U_j^k$ and $\Delta(\bar{U}_j^i) = \sum_k \bar{U}_j^k \otimes \bar{U}_k^i$ with counit $\epsilon(U_j^i) = \epsilon(\bar{U}_j^i) = \delta_j^i$. By definition an element $\psi \in \text{GL}(L)$ is an automorphism if $\psi(a) \cdot_L \psi(b) = \psi(a \cdot_L b)$, for all $a, b \in L$. These relations cut out the subgroup $\text{Aut}(L) \subset \text{GL}(L)$. To see that it is a Zariski closed subgroup, write $a = \sum_k a^k x_k, b = \sum_k b^k x_k$ to observe that this condition amounts to a system of n polynomial equations,

$$\sum_r C_{ij}^r \psi_r^k = \sum_{l,m} \psi_i^l \psi_j^m C_{lm}^k.$$

In other words, $\mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(L))$ is identified with the quotient of $\mathcal{O}(\text{GL}(n, \mathbf{k}))$ by the ideal $I_{\text{Aut}(L)}$ generated by relations

$$\sum_{l,m} C_{lm}^k U_i^l U_j^m = \sum_r U_r^k C_{ij}^r. \quad (4)$$

Regarding that the inclusion of subvarieties $\text{Aut}(L) \subset \text{GL}(n, \mathbf{k})$ is also inclusion of groups, this ideal is Hopf and $\mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(L))$ is the quotient Hopf algebra of functions on the subgroup. One can also directly check that the ideal $I_{\text{Aut}(L)}$ is a Hopf ideal.

Denote by $\mathcal{G}_j^i = U_j^i + I_{\text{Aut}(L)}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^i = \bar{U}_j^i + I_{\text{Aut}(L)}$ the generators of $\mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(L))$.

3.2 Hopf pairing

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\mathfrak{h}$ be a left Leibniz $\mathbf{k}$ -algebra. Let $x_1, \dots, x_n$ be a basis of $\mathfrak{h}$. Denote by C_{jk}^i structure constants determined from $[x_j, x_k] = C_{jk}^i x_i$, for $j, k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Denote by $\tilde{x}$ the image of $x \in \mathfrak{h}$ in $\mathfrak{h}_{\text{Lie}}$.*

Then there is a well defined (and unique) Hopf pairing $U(\mathfrak{h}_{\text{Lie}}) \otimes \mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h})) \rightarrow \mathbf{k}$ such that $\langle \tilde{x}_k, \mathcal{G}_j^i \rangle = C_{kj}^i$ for every $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Proof. Denote the set of generators $\{\mathcal{G}_j^i, \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^i : i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}$ of $\mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h}))$ by $\mathcal{G}$.

Uniqueness. Assume that the Hopf pairing exists such that $\langle \tilde{x}_k, \mathcal{G}_j^i \rangle = C_{kj}^i$ for all $i, j, k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Since the antipode and the counit of $U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie})$ satisfy identities $S(\tilde{x}_k) = -\tilde{x}_k$, $\epsilon(\tilde{x}_k) = 0$, and counit of $\mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h}))$ satisfies $\epsilon(\mathcal{G}_j^i) = \delta_j^i = \epsilon(\bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^i)$, and the pairing is Hopf, it has to be that $\langle \tilde{x}_k, \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^i \rangle = -C_{kj}^i$, $\langle 1, \mathcal{G}_j^i \rangle = \delta_j^i = \langle 1, \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^i \rangle$ and $\langle \tilde{x}_k, 1 \rangle = 0$, for all $i, j, k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Further, since the coproduct on $\mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h}))$ has the property $\Delta(\mathcal{G}) \in \mathcal{G} \otimes \mathcal{G}$, where $\mathcal{G}$ denotes the set of generators, and the pairing is Hopf, pairing of elements in $U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie})$, as products of elements $\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_n \in \mathfrak{h}_{Lie}$, with generators in $\mathcal{G}$ is again uniquely determined by $\langle \tilde{x}_{i_1} \cdots \tilde{x}_{i_m}, \mathcal{G}_j^i \rangle = \langle \tilde{x}_{i_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \tilde{x}_{i_m}, \Delta_m(\mathcal{G}_j^i) \rangle$ and similarly for $\bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^i$.

Finally, pairing of elements $l \in U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie})$ and products of generators in $\mathcal{G}$ is then uniquely determined by coproduct on $U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie})$, because for Hopf pairing identity $\langle l, \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{j_1}^{i_1} \cdots \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{j_m}^{i_m} \rangle = \langle \Delta_m(l), \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{j_1}^{i_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{j_m}^{i_m} \rangle$ holds, where every $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{j_p}^{i_p}$ stands for either $\mathcal{G}_{j_p}^{i_p}$ or $\bar{\mathcal{G}}_{j_p}^{i_p}$.

Therefore, if such pairing exists, it is unique.

Existence. Define the pairing of elements in $\mathfrak{h}^l$ and elements in $\mathcal{G} \cup \{1\}$ by $\langle l_{x_k}, \mathcal{G}_j^i \rangle = C_{kj}^i$, $\langle l_{x_k}, \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^i \rangle = -C_{kj}^i$ and $\langle l_{x_k}, 1 \rangle = 0$, and then extend it to the pairing with the free unital associative algebra on $\mathcal{G}$, $\mathfrak{h}^l \otimes \text{Free}(\mathcal{G}) \rightarrow \mathbf{k}$, by using the "coproduct-like" map $\Delta': \mathfrak{h}^l \oplus \mathbf{k} \rightarrow (\mathfrak{h}^l \oplus \mathbf{k}) \otimes (\mathfrak{h}^l \oplus \mathbf{k})$, defined on generators by $\Delta'(l_x) = 1 \otimes l_x + l_x \otimes 1$, $\Delta'(1) = 1 \otimes 1$, and its iterations Δ'_m , and formula

$$\langle l_{x_k}, \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{j_1}^{i_1} \cdots \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{j_m}^{i_m} \rangle = \langle \Delta'_m(l_{x_k}), \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{j_1}^{i_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{j_m}^{i_m} \rangle. \quad (5)$$

Since the "coproduct-like map" is "cocommutative", the formula defines a well defined pairing $\mathfrak{h}^l \otimes \text{FreeComm}(\mathcal{G}) \rightarrow \mathbf{k}$.

Now we check that every element of $\mathfrak{h}^l$ pairs with $C\mathcal{G}\mathcal{G} - \mathcal{G}C$ and $\mathcal{G}\bar{\mathcal{G}} = I = \bar{\mathcal{G}}\mathcal{G}$ as 0. We check that $\langle l_{x_p}, \sum_{r,m} C_{rm}^k \mathcal{G}_i^r \mathcal{G}_j^m \rangle = \langle l_{x_p}, \sum_n \mathcal{G}_n^k C_{ij}^n \rangle$ and $\langle l_{x_p}, \sum_j \mathcal{G}_j^i \bar{\mathcal{G}}_k^j \rangle = \langle l_{x_p}, \delta_k^i \rangle = \langle l_{x_p}, \sum_j \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^i \mathcal{G}_k^j \rangle$ hold for all $i, j, k, p \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. The first equation is $\sum_{r,m} C_{rm}^k C_{pi}^r \delta_j^m + \sum_{r,m} C_{rm}^k \delta_i^r C_{pj}^m = \sum_n C_{pn}^k C_{ij}^n$, that is,

$$\sum_r C_{rj}^k C_{pi}^r + \sum_m C_{im}^k C_{pj}^m = \sum_n C_{pn}^k C_{ij}^n,$$

which is left Leibniz identity $[[x_p, x_i], x_j] + [x_i, [x_p, x_j]] = [x_p, [x_i, x_j]]$ written by using structure constants. The second equation is simply $\langle l_{x_p}, \mathcal{G}_k^i \rangle + \langle l_{x_p}, \bar{\mathcal{G}}_k^i \rangle = 0$, which holds by definition. Therefore, we have a well defined pairing $\mathfrak{h}^l \otimes \mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h})) \rightarrow \mathbf{k}$.

It is easy to see that for every $l_x \in \mathfrak{h}^l$ and all $f, g \in \mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h}))$ we have

$$\langle l_x, fg \rangle = \langle l_x, f \rangle \epsilon(g) + \epsilon(f) \langle l_x, g \rangle. \quad (6)$$

Now extend this pairing to pairing $T(\mathfrak{h}^l) \otimes \mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h})) \rightarrow \mathbf{k}$ by using coproduct on $\mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h}))$ and formula

$$\langle l_{x_{i_1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes l_{x_{i_m}}, f \rangle = \langle l_{x_{i_1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes l_{x_{i_m}}, \Delta_m(f) \rangle. \quad (7)$$

Denote by I^l be the ideal in $T(\mathfrak{h}^l)$ generated by $l_{[x,y]} - l_x \otimes l_y + l_y \otimes l_x, x, y \in \mathfrak{h}$. By Lemma 2.2, $U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie}) \cong T(\mathfrak{h}^l)/I^l$. We now check that the element $l_{[x,y]} - l_x \otimes l_y + l_y \otimes l_x$ that generates this ideal is paired with every element of $\mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h}))$ as 0.

First we check the generators. Relation $\langle l_{[x_k, x_n]} + l_{x_n} \otimes l_{x_k}, \mathcal{G}_j^i \rangle = \langle l_{x_k} \otimes l_{x_n}, \mathcal{G}_j^i \rangle$ is equivalent to

$$\sum_m C_{kn}^m C_{mj}^i + \sum_p C_{np}^i C_{kj}^p = \sum_p C_{kp}^i C_{nj}^p,$$

which is the left Leibniz identity $[[x_k, x_n], x_j] + [x_n, [x_k, x_j]] = [x_k, [x_n, x_j]]$ written in terms of structure constants. Identity $\langle l_{[x_k, x_n]} + l_{x_n} l_{x_k}, \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^i \rangle = \langle l_{x_k} l_{x_n}, \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^i \rangle$ is

$$\sum_m C_{kn}^m (-C_{mj}^i) + \sum_p (-C_{np}^p) (-C_{kp}^i) = \sum_p (-C_{kj}^p) (-C_{np}^i),$$

that is

$$\sum_p C_{nj}^p C_{kp}^i = \sum_m C_{kn}^m C_{mj}^i + \sum_p C_{kj}^p C_{np}^i,$$

which is the left Leibniz identity $[x_k, [x_n, x_j]] = [[x_k, x_n], x_j] + [x_n, [x_k, x_j]]$ written by using structure constants. Therefore, all elements of $U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie})$ pair well with generators. This completes the base of induction.

In step of induction, we assume that the claim is true for $f, g \in \mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h}))$, and prove that it holds also for fg . We calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \langle l_{x_k} \otimes l_{x_n}, fg \rangle &= \sum_p \langle l_{x_k}, f_{(1)} g_{(1)} \rangle \langle l_{x_n}, f_{(2)} g_{(2)} \rangle \\ &= \sum_p (\langle l_{x_k}, f_{(1)} \rangle \epsilon(g_{(1)}) + \epsilon(f_{(1)}) \langle l_{x_k}, g_{(1)} \rangle) (\langle l_{x_n}, f_{(2)} \rangle \epsilon(g_{(2)}) + \epsilon(f_{(2)}) \langle l_{x_n}, g_{(2)} \rangle) \\ &= \sum_p \langle l_{x_k}, f_{(1)} \rangle \langle l_{x_n}, f_{(2)} \rangle \epsilon(g) + \langle l_{x_k}, f \rangle \langle l_{x_n}, g \rangle + \langle l_{x_k}, g \rangle \langle l_{x_n}, f \rangle + \\ &\quad + \sum \epsilon(f) \langle l_{x_k}, g_{(1)} \rangle \langle l_{x_n}, g_{(2)} \rangle \\ &= \langle l_{x_k} \otimes l_{x_n}, f \rangle \epsilon(g) + \langle l_{x_k}, f \rangle \langle l_{x_n}, g \rangle + \langle l_{x_k}, g \rangle \langle l_{x_n}, f \rangle + \epsilon(f) \langle l_{x_k} \otimes l_{x_n}, g \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

and analogously

$$\langle l_{x_n} \otimes l_{x_k}, fg \rangle = \langle l_{x_n} \otimes l_{x_k}, f \rangle \epsilon(g) + \langle l_{x_n}, f \rangle \langle l_{x_k}, g \rangle + \langle l_{x_n}, g \rangle \langle l_{x_k}, f \rangle + \epsilon(f) \langle l_{x_n} \otimes l_{x_k}, g \rangle.$$

By subtracting, the middle two summands cancel and we get

$$\begin{aligned} \langle l_{x_k} \otimes l_{x_n} - l_{x_n} \otimes l_{x_k}, fg \rangle &= \langle l_{x_k} \otimes l_{x_n} - l_{x_n} \otimes l_{x_k}, f \rangle \epsilon(g) + \epsilon(f) \langle l_{x_k} \otimes l_{x_n} - l_{x_n} \otimes l_{x_k}, g \rangle \\ &= \langle l_{[x_k, x_n]}, f \rangle \epsilon(g) + \epsilon(f) \langle l_{[x_k, x_n]}, g \rangle \\ &= \langle l_{[x_k, x_n]}, fg \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where in the middle row we use the assumption of step of induction, and in the last row the formula (6).

Therefore, we have a well defined pairing $U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie}) \otimes \mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h})) \rightarrow \mathbf{k}$.

□

Proposition 3.2. *Let $\mathfrak{h}$ be a right Leibniz $\mathbf{k}$ -algebra. Let $y_1, \dots, y_n$ be a basis of $\mathfrak{h}$. Denote by C_{jk}^i structure constants determined from $[y_j, y_k] = C_{jk}^i y_i$, for $j, k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Denote by $\tilde{y}$ the image of $y \in \mathfrak{h}$ in $\mathfrak{h}_{Lie}$.*

Then there is a well defined (and unique) Hopf pairing $U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie}) \otimes \mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h})) \rightarrow \mathbf{k}$ such that $\langle \tilde{y}_k, \mathcal{G}_j^i \rangle = -C_{jk}^i$.

Proof. Denote the set of generators $\{\mathcal{G}_j^i, \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^i : i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}$ of $\mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h}))$ by $\mathcal{G}$.

Uniqueness. This is straightforward, analogously as in Proposition 3.1.

Existence. Define the pairing of elements in $\mathfrak{h}^r$ and elements in $\mathcal{G} \cup \{1\}$ by $\langle r_{y_k}, \mathcal{G}_j^i \rangle = -C_{jk}^i$, $\langle r_{y_k}, \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^i \rangle = C_{jk}^i$ and $\langle r_{y_k}, 1 \rangle = 0$, and then extend it to the pairing with the free unital associative algebra on $\mathcal{G}$, $\mathfrak{h}^r \otimes \text{Free}(\mathcal{G}) \rightarrow \mathbf{k}$, by using the "coproduct-like" map $\Delta' : \mathfrak{h}^r \oplus \mathbf{k} \rightarrow (\mathfrak{h}^r \oplus \mathbf{k}) \otimes (\mathfrak{h}^r \oplus \mathbf{k})$, defined on generators by $\Delta'(r_y) = 1 \otimes r_y + r_y \otimes 1$, $\Delta'(1) = 1 \otimes 1$, and its iterations Δ'_m , and formula $\langle r_{y_k}, \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{j_1}^{i_1} \cdots \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{j_m}^{i_m} \rangle = \langle \Delta'_m(r_{y_k}), \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{j_1}^{i_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{j_m}^{i_m} \rangle$. Since the "coproduct-like map" is "cocommutative", the formula defines a well defined pairing $\mathfrak{h}^r \otimes \text{FreeComm}(\mathcal{G}) \rightarrow \mathbf{k}$.

Now we check that every element of $\mathfrak{h}^r$ pairs with $C\mathcal{G}\mathcal{G} - \mathcal{G}C$, $\mathcal{G}\bar{\mathcal{G}} - I$ and $\bar{\mathcal{G}}\mathcal{G} - I$ as 0. We check that $\langle r_{y_p}, \sum_{s,m} C_{sm}^k \mathcal{G}_s^i \mathcal{G}_j^m \rangle = \langle r_{y_p}, \sum_n \mathcal{G}_n^k C_{ij}^n \rangle$ and $\langle r_{y_p}, \sum_j \mathcal{G}_j^i \bar{\mathcal{G}}_k^j \rangle = \langle r_{y_p}, \delta_k^i \rangle = \langle r_{y_p}, \sum_j \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^i \mathcal{G}_k^j \rangle$ hold for all $i, j, k, p \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. The first equation is $-\sum_{s,m} C_{sm}^k C_{ip}^s \delta_j^m - \sum_{s,m} C_{sm}^k \delta_i^s C_{jp}^m = -\sum_n C_{np}^k C_{ij}^n$, that is,

$$\sum_s C_{sj}^k C_{ip}^s + \sum_m C_{im}^k C_{jp}^m = \sum_n C_{np}^k C_{ij}^n,$$

which is right Leibniz identity $[[y_i, y_p], y_j] + [y_i, [y_j, y_p]] = [[y_i, y_j], y_p]$ written by using structure constants. The second equation is simply $\langle r_{y_p}, \mathcal{G}_k^i \rangle + \langle r_{y_p}, \bar{\mathcal{G}}_k^i \rangle = 0$, which holds by definition. Therefore, we have a well defined pairing $\mathfrak{h}^r \otimes \mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h})) \rightarrow \mathbf{k}$.

It is easy to see that for every $r_y \in \mathfrak{h}^r$ and all $f, g \in \mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h}))$ we have

$$\langle r_y, fg \rangle = \langle r_y, f \rangle \epsilon(g) + \epsilon(f) \langle r_y, g \rangle. \quad (8)$$

Now extend this pairing to pairing $T(\mathfrak{h}^r) \otimes \mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h})) \rightarrow \mathbf{k}$ by using coproduct on $\mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h}))$ and formula $\langle r_{y_{i_1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes r_{y_{i_m}}, f \rangle = \langle r_{y_{i_1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes r_{y_{i_m}}, \Delta_m(f) \rangle$.

Denote by I^r the ideal in $T(\mathfrak{h}^r)$ generated by $r_{[x,y]} - r_x \otimes r_y + r_y \otimes r_x$, $x, y \in \mathfrak{h}$. By Lemma 2.3, $U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie}) \cong T(\mathfrak{h}^r)/I^r$. We now check that the element $r_{[x,y]} - r_x \otimes r_y + r_y \otimes r_x$ that generates this ideal is paired with every element of $\mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h}))$ as 0.

First we check the generators. We have that $\langle r_{[y_k, y_n]} + r_{y_n} \otimes r_{y_k}, \mathcal{G}_j^i \rangle = \langle r_{y_k} \otimes r_{y_n}, \mathcal{G}_j^i \rangle$ is

$$-\sum_m C_{kn}^m C_{jm}^i + \sum_p C_{pn}^i C_{jk}^p = \sum_p C_{pk}^i C_{jn}^p,$$

which is right Leibniz identity $-[y_j, [y_k, y_n]] + [[y_j, y_k], y_n] = [[y_j, y_n], y_k]$ written by using structure constants. We have that $\langle r_{[y_k, y_n]} + r_{y_n} \otimes r_{y_k}, \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^i \rangle = \langle r_{y_k} \otimes r_{y_n}, \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^i \rangle$ is

$$\sum_m C_{kn}^m C_{jm}^i + \sum_p C_{jn}^p C_{pk}^i = \sum_p C_{jk}^p C_{pn}^i,$$

which is right Leibniz identity $[y_j, [y_k, y_n]] + [[y_j, y_n], y_k] = [[y_j, y_k], y_n]$ written by using structure constants. Therefore, all elements of $U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie})$ pair well with generators. This completes the base of induction.

In step of induction, we assume that the claim is true for $f, g \in \mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h}))$, and prove that it holds also for fg . The calculation is straightforward and analogous to calculation at the end of the proof of Proposition 3.1.

Therefore, we have a well defined pairing $U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie}) \otimes \mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h})) \rightarrow \mathbf{k}$. □

3.3 Main theorem

Theorem 3.3. *Let $\mathfrak{h}$ be a finite-dimensional left Leibniz $\mathbf{k}$ -algebra and let $x_1, \dots, x_n$ be its generators with structure constants determined from $[x_i, x_j] = \sum_k C_{ij}^k x_k$, $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Let $\mathcal{G}_j^i, \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^i$, $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ be the corresponding generators of the presentation of the algebra $\mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h}))$ defined in Subsection 3.1. Denote by $\tilde{x}$ the image of $x \in \mathfrak{h}$ in $\mathfrak{h}_{Lie}$.*

Then the Hopf pairing $U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie}) \otimes \mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h})) \rightarrow \mathbf{k}$ defined in Proposition 3.1 induces a right Hopf action $\blacktriangleleft : U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie}) \otimes \mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h})) \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie})$ by the formula

$$\tilde{x} \blacktriangleleft f := \langle \tilde{x}_{(1)}, f \rangle \tilde{x}_{(2)}, \quad \text{for } \tilde{x} \in U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie}) \text{ and } f \in \mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h})),$$

which further induces the structure of a smash product algebra $\mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h})) \# U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie})$.

Then there exists a unique $\mathbf{k}$ -linear unital antimultiplicative map $\lambda : U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h})) \# U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie})$ such that

$$\lambda(\tilde{x}_j) = \sum_i \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^i \# \tilde{x}_i, \quad \text{for } j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$$

and it is a left coaction.

Furthermore, $(U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie}), \blacktriangleleft, \lambda)$ is a braided commutative right-left Yetter–Drinfeld module algebra over $\mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h}))$.

Proof. (i) We prove that such λ exists. We first define auxiliary map $\tilde{\lambda}$ as a linear map $\mathfrak{h}^l \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h})) \# U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie})$ such that $\tilde{\lambda}(l_{x_j}) = \sum_i \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^i \# \tilde{x}_i$ for $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, then expand it to $\tilde{\lambda} : T(\mathfrak{h}^l) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h})) \# U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie})$ by antimultiplicativity and then we check that $\tilde{\lambda}(I^l) = 0$, where I^l is the ideal in $T(\mathfrak{h}^l)$ generated by $l_{[x, y]} - l_x \otimes l_y + l_y \otimes l_x$, $x, y \in \mathfrak{h}$.

We have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\lambda}(l_{x_i} \otimes l_{x_j}) &= \tilde{\lambda}(l_{x_j}) \cdot \tilde{\lambda}(l_{x_i}) = \left(\sum_k \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^k \sharp \tilde{x}_k \right) \cdot \left(\sum_m \bar{\mathcal{G}}_i^m \sharp \tilde{x}_m \right) = \sum_{k,m,p} \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^k \bar{\mathcal{G}}_i^p (\tilde{x}_k \blacktriangleleft \bar{\mathcal{G}}_p^m) \tilde{x}_m \\
&= \sum_{k,m,p} \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^k \bar{\mathcal{G}}_i^p \sharp (\delta_p^m \tilde{x}_k - C_{kp}^m) \tilde{x}_m = \sum_{k,m} \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^k \bar{\mathcal{G}}_i^m \sharp \tilde{x}_k \tilde{x}_m - \sum_{k,m,p} \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^k \bar{\mathcal{G}}_i^p C_{kp}^m \sharp \tilde{x}_m \\
&= \sum_{k,m} \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^k \bar{\mathcal{G}}_i^m \sharp \tilde{x}_k \tilde{x}_m - \sum_{k,m} \bar{\mathcal{G}}_m^k C_{ji}^m \sharp \tilde{x}_k,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the identities

$$\sum_{l,m} C_{lm}^k \bar{\mathcal{G}}_i^l \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^m = \sum_r \bar{\mathcal{G}}_r^k C_{ij}^r, \quad \text{for } i, j, k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$$

which are easily deduced from

$$\sum_{l,m} C_{lm}^k \mathcal{G}_i^l \mathcal{G}_j^m = \sum_r \mathcal{G}_r^k C_{ij}^r, \quad \sum_m \mathcal{G}_m^i \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^m = \delta_j^i = \sum_m \bar{\mathcal{G}}_m^i \mathcal{G}_j^m, \quad \text{for } i, j, k \in \{1, \dots, n\}.$$

Analogously,

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\lambda}(l_{x_j} \otimes l_{x_i}) &= \tilde{\lambda}(l_{x_i}) \cdot \tilde{\lambda}(l_{x_j}) = \left(\sum_m \bar{\mathcal{G}}_i^m \sharp \tilde{x}_m \right) \cdot \left(\sum_k \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^k \sharp \tilde{x}_k \right) = \sum_{k,m,p} \bar{\mathcal{G}}_i^m \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^p (\tilde{x}_m \blacktriangleleft \bar{\mathcal{G}}_p^k) \tilde{x}_k \\
&= \sum_{k,m,p} \bar{\mathcal{G}}_i^m \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^p \sharp (\delta_p^k \tilde{x}_m - C_{mp}^k) \tilde{x}_k = \sum_{k,m} \bar{\mathcal{G}}_i^m \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^k \sharp \tilde{x}_m \tilde{x}_k - \sum_{k,m,p} \bar{\mathcal{G}}_i^m \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^p C_{mp}^k \sharp \tilde{x}_k \\
&= \sum_{k,m} \bar{\mathcal{G}}_i^m \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^k \sharp \tilde{x}_m \tilde{x}_k - \sum_{k,m} \bar{\mathcal{G}}_m^k C_{ij}^k \sharp \tilde{x}_m.
\end{aligned}$$

We subtract these and get

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\lambda}(l_{x_i} \otimes l_{x_j} - l_{x_j} \otimes l_{x_i}) &= \sum_{k,m} \bar{\mathcal{G}}_i^m \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^k \sharp [\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{x}_m] - \sum_{k,m} \bar{\mathcal{G}}_m^k C_{ji}^m \sharp \tilde{x}_k + \sum_{k,m} \bar{\mathcal{G}}_m^k C_{ij}^k \sharp \tilde{x}_m \\
&= \sum_{k,m} \bar{\mathcal{G}}_i^m \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^k \sharp [\widetilde{x_k, x_m}] - \sum_{k,m} \bar{\mathcal{G}}_m^k C_{ji}^m \sharp \tilde{x}_k + \sum_{k,m} \bar{\mathcal{G}}_m^k C_{ij}^k \sharp \tilde{x}_m \\
&= \sum_{k,m} \bar{\mathcal{G}}_i^m \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^k C_{km}^p \sharp \tilde{x}_p - \sum_{k,m} \bar{\mathcal{G}}_m^k C_{ji}^m \sharp \tilde{x}_k + \sum_{k,m} \bar{\mathcal{G}}_m^k C_{ij}^k \sharp \tilde{x}_m \\
&= \sum_m C_{ji}^m \bar{\mathcal{G}}_m^p \sharp \tilde{x}_p - \sum_{k,m} \bar{\mathcal{G}}_m^k C_{ji}^m \sharp \tilde{x}_k + \sum_{k,m} \bar{\mathcal{G}}_m^k C_{ij}^k \sharp \tilde{x}_m \\
&= \sum_{k,m} \bar{\mathcal{G}}_k^m C_{ij}^k \sharp \tilde{x}_m.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\tilde{\lambda}(l_{[x_i, x_j]}) = \tilde{\lambda}(\sum_p C_{ij}^p l_{x_p}) = \sum_{p,m} C_{ij}^p \bar{\mathcal{G}}_p^m \sharp \tilde{x}_m.$$

Equality $\tilde{\lambda}(l_{x_i} \otimes l_{x_j} - l_{x_j} \otimes l_{x_i}) = \tilde{\lambda}(l_{[x_i, x_j]})$ is now proven. Therefore, by quotienting the domain of $\tilde{\lambda}$ with the ideal I^l , we induce a well defined map $\lambda: U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h})) \sharp U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie})$. Additionally, we note that clearly

$$\lambda(\tilde{x}\tilde{z}) = \lambda(\tilde{z})\lambda(\tilde{x}), \quad \text{for all } \tilde{x}, \tilde{z} \in U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie}). \quad (9)$$

(ii) We prove that elements of $\text{Im } \lambda$ commute with elements of $1 \sharp U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie})$ in algebra $\mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h})) \sharp U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie})$. First we check this for generators $\tilde{x}_j, \tilde{x}_k$ for all $j, k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{x}_k \cdot \lambda(\tilde{x}_j) &= \tilde{x}_k \cdot \sum_i \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^i \sharp \tilde{x}_i = \sum_{i,m} \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^m \sharp (\tilde{x}_k \blacktriangleleft \bar{\mathcal{G}}_m^i) \tilde{x}_i \\ &= \sum_{i,m} \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^m \sharp (\delta_m^i \tilde{x}_k + C_{mk}^i) \tilde{x}_i = \sum_m \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^m \sharp (\tilde{x}_k \tilde{x}_m + [\tilde{x}_m, \tilde{x}_k]) = \\ &= \sum_m \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^m \sharp \tilde{x}_m \tilde{x}_k = \lambda(\tilde{x}_j) \cdot \tilde{x}_k. \end{aligned}$$

By using (9), it is easy to prove the claim inductively for all elements of $U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie})$,

$$\tilde{z} \cdot \lambda(\tilde{x}) = \lambda(\tilde{x}) \cdot \tilde{z}, \quad \text{for all } \tilde{x}, \tilde{z} \in U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie}). \quad (10)$$

(iii) We prove that λ is a coaction. First, we prove that if the coassociativity identity is true for $\tilde{x}, \tilde{z} \in U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie})$, then it is true for the product $\tilde{x}\tilde{z} \in U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie})$. We have

$$\lambda(\tilde{z}\tilde{x}) \stackrel{(9)}{=} \lambda(\tilde{x})\lambda(\tilde{z}) = \sum \tilde{x}_{[-1]} \sharp \tilde{x}_{[0]} \cdot \tilde{z}_{[-1]} \sharp \tilde{z}_{[0]} \stackrel{(10)}{=} \sum \tilde{x}_{[-1]} \tilde{z}_{[-1]} \sharp \tilde{z}_{[0]} \tilde{x}_{[0]} \quad (11)$$

from which it follows that, because $\tilde{x}$ and $\tilde{z}$ are assumed to satisfy the coassociativity identity,

$$\begin{aligned} ((\text{id} \otimes \lambda) \circ \lambda)(\tilde{x}\tilde{z}) &= \sum \tilde{x}_{[-1]} \tilde{z}_{[-1]} \otimes \lambda(\tilde{z}_{[0]} \tilde{x}_{[0]}) \\ &= \sum \tilde{x}_{[-1]} \tilde{z}_{[-1]} \otimes \tilde{x}_{[0]([-1])} \tilde{z}_{[0]([-1])} \otimes \tilde{z}_{[0]([0])} \tilde{x}_{[0]([0])} \\ &= \sum \tilde{x}_{[-1](1)} \tilde{z}_{[-1](1)} \otimes \tilde{x}_{[-1](2)} \tilde{z}_{[-1](2)} \otimes \tilde{z}_{[0]} \tilde{x}_{[0]} \\ &= \sum (\tilde{x}_{[-1]} \tilde{z}_{[-1]})_{(1)} \otimes (\tilde{x}_{[-1]} \tilde{z}_{[-1]})_{(2)} \otimes \tilde{z}_{[0]} \tilde{x}_{[0]} \end{aligned}$$

and, on the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} ((\Delta \otimes \text{id}) \circ \lambda)(\tilde{z}\tilde{x}) &= (\Delta \otimes \text{id})(\sum \tilde{x}_{[-1]} \tilde{z}_{[-1]} \sharp \tilde{z}_{[0]} \tilde{x}_{[0]}) \\ &= \sum (\tilde{x}_{[-1]} \tilde{z}_{[-1]})_{(1)} \otimes (\tilde{x}_{[-1]} \tilde{z}_{[-1]})_{(2)} \otimes \tilde{z}_{[0]} \tilde{x}_{[0]}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we see that it is sufficient to check the coassociativity identity for generators, and this is trivial:

$$\sum_{k,i} \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^k \otimes \bar{\mathcal{G}}_k^i \sharp \tilde{x}_i = \sum_{i,m} \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^i \otimes \bar{\mathcal{G}}_i^m \sharp \tilde{x}_m.$$

Counitality of λ is checked first for generators, $((\epsilon \otimes \text{id}) \circ \lambda)(\tilde{x}_j) = \sum_i \epsilon(\bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^i) \tilde{x}_i = \tilde{x}_j$ for every $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, and then easily proven inductively by using formula (11).

(iv) We prove the Yetter–Drinfeld property:

$$\sum f_{(2)} \cdot \lambda(\tilde{x} \blacktriangleleft f_{(1)}) = \lambda(\tilde{x}) \cdot f, \quad \text{for all } \tilde{x} \in U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie}) \text{ and } f \in \mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h})).$$

We prove the claim first for generators:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_m \mathcal{G}_j^m \lambda(\tilde{x}_k \blacktriangleleft \mathcal{G}_m^i) &= \sum_m \mathcal{G}_j^m \lambda(\delta_m^i \tilde{x}_k + C_{km}^i) = \mathcal{G}_j^i \lambda(\tilde{x}_k) + \sum_m C_{km}^i \mathcal{G}_j^m, \\ \lambda(\tilde{x}_k) \cdot \mathcal{G}_j^i &= \sum_m \bar{\mathcal{G}}_k^m \sharp \tilde{x}_m \cdot \mathcal{G}_j^i = \sum_{m,p} \bar{\mathcal{G}}_k^m \mathcal{G}_p^i \sharp (\tilde{x}_m \blacktriangleleft \mathcal{G}_j^p) = \sum_{m,p} \bar{\mathcal{G}}_k^m \mathcal{G}_p^i \sharp (\delta_j^p \tilde{x}_m + C_{mj}^p) \\ &= \sum_m \bar{\mathcal{G}}_k^m \mathcal{G}_j^i \sharp \tilde{x}_m + \sum_{m,p} \bar{\mathcal{G}}_k^m \mathcal{G}_p^i C_{mj}^p = \mathcal{G}_j^i \lambda(\tilde{x}_k) + \sum_{m,p} \mathcal{G}_p^i C_{mj}^p \bar{\mathcal{G}}_k^m. \end{aligned}$$

It remains to prove

$$\sum_{m,p} \mathcal{G}_p^i C_{mj}^p \bar{\mathcal{G}}_k^m = \sum_m C_{km}^i \mathcal{G}_j^m, \quad \text{for } i, j, k \in \{1, \dots, n\},$$

which easily follows from

$$\sum_p \mathcal{G}_p^i C_{nj}^p = \sum_{k,m} C_{km}^i \mathcal{G}_n^k \mathcal{G}_j^m, \quad \sum_m \mathcal{G}_m^i \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^m = \delta_j^i = \sum_m \bar{\mathcal{G}}_m^i \mathcal{G}_j^m, \quad \text{for } i, j, k \in \{1, \dots, n\}.$$

The claim for generators $\bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^i$ is proven analogously.

If the identity is true for some $\tilde{x}$ and $\tilde{z}$ in $U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie})$ and all generators $f \in \mathcal{G}$ of $\mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h}))$, then it also holds for the product $\tilde{x}\tilde{z}$ and all generators of $\mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h}))$, because $\Delta(\mathcal{G}) \subset \mathcal{G} \otimes \mathcal{G}$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum f_{(2)} \lambda((\tilde{x}\tilde{z}) \blacktriangleleft f_{(1)}) &= \sum f_{(3)} \lambda((\tilde{x} \blacktriangleleft f_{(1)})(\tilde{z} \blacktriangleleft f_{(2)})) \stackrel{(9)}{=} \sum f_{(3)} \lambda(\tilde{z} \blacktriangleleft f_{(2)}) \lambda(\tilde{x} \blacktriangleleft f_{(1)}) \\ &= \sum \lambda(\tilde{z}) \cdot f_{(2)} \lambda(\tilde{x} \blacktriangleleft f_{(1)}) = \lambda(\tilde{z}) \lambda(\tilde{x}) \cdot f \stackrel{(9)}{=} \lambda(\tilde{x}\tilde{z}) \cdot f. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we conclude inductively that the identity is true for all $\tilde{x} \in U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie})$ with all generators $f \in \mathcal{G}$.

If the identity holds for some f and g in $\mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h}))$ and all $\tilde{x} \in U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie})$, then it also holds for the product $fg \in \mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h}))$ and all $\tilde{x} \in U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie})$, by

$$\begin{aligned} \sum (fg)_{(2)} \lambda(\tilde{x} \blacktriangleleft (fg)_{(1)}) &= \sum \sum f_{(2)} g_{(2)} \lambda(\tilde{x} \blacktriangleleft (f_{(1)} g_{(1)})) \\ &= \sum \sum f_{(2)} g_{(2)} \lambda((\tilde{x} \blacktriangleleft f_{(1)}) \blacktriangleleft g_{(1)}) \\ &= \sum \sum f_{(2)} \lambda(\tilde{x} \blacktriangleleft f_{(1)}) g = \lambda(\tilde{x}) fg. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude inductively that the Yetter–Drinfeld property holds.

- (v) The comodule algebra property is actually proven in (11) by using (10).
(vi) Let us prove the braided commutativity property:

$$\tilde{z} \blacktriangleleft \lambda(\tilde{x}) = \tilde{x}\tilde{z}, \quad \text{for all } \tilde{x}, \tilde{z} \in U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie}).$$

First we check this on generators. For any two $j, k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ we have

$$\tilde{x}_k \blacktriangleleft \sum_i \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^i \sharp \tilde{x}_i = \sum_i (\delta_j^i \tilde{x}_k \tilde{x}_i - C_{kj}^i \tilde{x}_i) = \tilde{x}_k \tilde{x}_j - [\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{x}_j] = \tilde{x}_j \tilde{x}_k.$$

Next, we use induction on the length of the word acted on by $\lambda(\tilde{x}_j)$ on the right, for every $\tilde{x}_j, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. The step of the induction is

$$(\tilde{x}\tilde{z}) \blacktriangleleft \sum_i \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^i \sharp \tilde{x}_i = \sum_{i,m} (\tilde{x} \blacktriangleleft \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^m) (\tilde{z} \blacktriangleleft \bar{\mathcal{G}}_m^i) \tilde{x}_i = \sum_{i,m} (\tilde{x} \blacktriangleleft \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^m) \tilde{x}_m \tilde{z} = \tilde{x}_j \tilde{x} \tilde{z},$$

for all $\tilde{x}, \tilde{z} \in U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie})$. At last, we use the induction on the length of the word on the right. The step of the induction is:

$$\tilde{x} \blacktriangleleft \lambda(\tilde{z}\tilde{v}) = (\tilde{x} \blacktriangleleft \lambda(\tilde{v})) \blacktriangleleft \lambda(\tilde{z}) = (\tilde{v}\tilde{x}) \blacktriangleleft \lambda(\tilde{z}) = \tilde{z}\tilde{v}\tilde{x},$$

for all $\tilde{x}, \tilde{z}, \tilde{v} \in U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie})$. □

Theorem 3.4. *Let $\mathfrak{h}$ be a finite-dimensional right Leibniz $\mathbf{k}$ -algebra and let $y_1, \dots, y_n$ be its generators with structure constants determined from $[y_i, y_j] = \sum_k C_{ij}^k y_k$, $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Let $\mathcal{G}_j^i, \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^i$, $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ be the corresponding generators of the presentation of the algebra $\mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h}))$ defined in Subsection 3.1. Denote by $\tilde{y}$ the image of $y \in \mathfrak{h}$ in $\mathfrak{h}_{Lie}$.*

Then the Hopf pairing $U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie}) \otimes \mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h})) \rightarrow \mathbf{k}$ defined in Proposition 3.2 induces a right Hopf action $\blacktriangleleft : U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie}) \otimes \mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h})) \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie})$ by the formula

$$\tilde{y} \blacktriangleleft f := \langle \tilde{y}_{(1)}, f \rangle \tilde{y}_{(2)}, \quad \text{for } \tilde{y} \in U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie}) \text{ and } f \in \mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h})),$$

which further induces the structure of a smash product algebra $\mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h})) \sharp U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie})$.

Then there exists a unique $\mathbf{k}$ -linear unital antimultiplicative map $\lambda : U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h})) \sharp U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie})$ such that

$$\lambda(\tilde{y}_j) = \sum_i \mathcal{G}_j^i \sharp \tilde{y}_i, \quad \text{for } j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$$

and it is a left coaction.

Furthermore, $(U(\mathfrak{h}_{Lie}), \blacktriangleleft, \lambda)$ is a braided commutative right-left Yetter–Drinfeld module algebra over $\mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h}))$.

Proof. Analogous to the proof of Proposition 3.3. □

3.4 Geometry

Remark 3.5. If $\mathbf{k}$ is $\mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$ and $\mathfrak{h}$ is a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ over $\mathbf{k}$, then $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})$ is a linear Lie group and its Lie algebra is $\text{Der}(\mathfrak{g})$. Here it is easy to see geometrically what the pairing in Proposition 3.1 is and why it does not depend on the choice of the basis for Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$.

Differential df_{id} of function $f \in \mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g}))$ at the unit id of $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})$ is a linear functional on $T_{\text{id}}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})) \cong \text{Der}(\mathfrak{g})$, and therefore $df_{\text{id}} \in \text{Der}(\mathfrak{g})^*$. Let $\text{ad}_X: \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$, $\text{ad}_X: Z \mapsto [X, Z]$. We know that $\text{ad}_X \in \text{Der}(\mathfrak{g})$ for $X \in \mathfrak{g}$.

We prove here that the pairing $U(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes \mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})) \rightarrow \mathbf{k}$ from Theorem 3.3, in the case when $\mathbf{k}$ is $\mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$ and $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{g}$ is a Lie algebra, and the pairing $\mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})) \rightarrow \mathbf{k}$ defined by

$$\langle X, f \rangle' = df_{\text{id}}(\text{ad}_X), \quad \text{for } X \in \mathfrak{g} \text{ and } f \in \mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})),$$

where $\text{ad}_X: \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$, $\text{ad}_X: Z \mapsto [X, Z]$, agree for all $X \in \mathfrak{g}$ and $f \in \mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g}))$.

The pairing here clearly does not depend on the choice of the basis for Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, hence the same can be then concluded for the pairing from Theorem 3.3.

First we check that indeed $d(\mathcal{G}_j^i)_{\text{id}}(\text{ad}_{X_k}) = C_{kj}^i$. The exponential map $\exp$ maps neighborhood of 0 in $\text{Der}(\mathfrak{g})$ to a neighborhood of id in $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})$.

$$\begin{aligned} d(\mathcal{G}_j^i)_{\text{id}}(\text{ad}_{X_k}) &= (\text{ad}_{X_k})(\mathcal{G}_j^i)(\text{id}) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{G}_j^i(\exp(t \text{ad}_{X_k})) \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{G}_j^i \left(\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \frac{(t \text{ad}_{X_k})^r}{r!} \right) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \frac{(t \text{ad}_{X_k})^r}{r!} \right)_j^i \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \left(\sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \frac{t^{r-1} \text{ad}_{X_k}^r}{(r-1)!} \right)_j^i = (\text{ad}_{X_k})_j^i = C_{kj}^i. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, it is checked that $d(\bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^i)_{\text{id}}(\text{ad}_{X_k}) = -C_{kj}^i$, by using that $\exp(t \text{ad}_{X_k})^{-1} = \exp(t \text{ad}_{-X_k})$. By linearity, we conclude that the pairings agree for all $X \in \mathfrak{g}$ and generators $\mathcal{G}_j^i, \bar{\mathcal{G}}_j^i, i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Then, since the pairing here also has the property

$$\langle X, fg \rangle' = \langle X \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes X, f \otimes g \rangle', \quad \text{for } X \in \mathfrak{g} \text{ and } f, g \in \mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})),$$

we conclude that they agree for all $X \in \mathfrak{g}$ and $f \in \mathcal{O}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g}))$.

References

- [BohmHAlg] G. BÖHM, *Hopf algebroids*, in Handbook of Algebra, Vol. 6, ed. by M. Hazewinkel, Elsevier 2009, 173–236. [arXiv:0805.3806](#).
- [BrzMil] T. BRZEZIŃSKI, G. MILITARU, *Bialgebroids, $\times_A$ -bialgebras and duality*, J. Alg. 251: 279–294 (2002)
[math.QA/0012164](#)

- [Cartier] P. CARTIER, *A primer of Hopf algebras*, Frontiers in number theory, physics, and geometry II, 537–615, Springer 2007.; preprint IHÉS 2006.
<http://preprints.ihes.fr/2006/M/M-06-40.pdf>
- [LodPir] J.-L. LODAY, T. PIRASHVILI, *Universal enveloping algebras of Leibniz algebras and (co)homology*, Math. Ann. 296, 139–158 (1993)
- [Lu] J.-H. LU, *Hopf algebroids and quantum groupoids*, Int. J. Math. 7 (1996) 47–70,
[q-alg/9505024](https://arxiv.org/abs/q-alg/9505024)
- [Majid] S. MAJID, *Foundations of quantum group theory*, Cambridge University Press 1995.
- [MS2007] S. MELJANAC, Z. ŠKODA, *Leibniz rules for enveloping algebras*,
[arXiv:0711.0149](https://arxiv.org/abs/0711.0149)
- [MSS] S. MELJANAC, Z. ŠKODA, M. STOJIC, *Lie algebra type noncommutative phase spaces are Hopf algebroids*, Lett. Math. Phys. 107:3, 475–503 (2017)
[arXiv:1409.818](https://arxiv.org/abs/1409.818)
- [Radford] D. E. RADFORD, *Hopf algebras*, World Scientific 2012.
- [RadfordTowber] D. E. RADFORD, J. TOWBER, *Yetter–Drinfeld categories associated to an arbitrary bialgebra*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 87 (1993) 259–279
- [Stojic] M. STOJIC, *Scalar extension Hopf algebroids*, Journal of Algebra and its Applications (2023)
- [StojicCHa] M. STOJIC, *Completed Hopf algebroids*, dissertation in Croatian language (of the title *Upotpunjeni Hopfovi algebroidi*), University of Zagreb (2017)
- [Skoda] Z. ŠKODA, *Heisenberg double versus deformed derivatives*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 26, Nos. 27 & 28 (2011) 4845–4854. [arXiv:0806.0978](https://arxiv.org/abs/0806.0978)
- [SS] Z. ŠKODA, M. STOJIC, *Hopf algebroids with balancing subalgebra*, J. Alg. 598:445–469 (2022) [arXiv:1610.03837](https://arxiv.org/abs/1610.03837)
- [StoSko] M. STOJIC, Z. ŠKODA, *Examples of Hopf algebroids over the universal enveloping algebra*, preprint