## AFFINE FROBENIUS BRAUER CATEGORIES

SAIMA SAMCHUCK-SCHNARCH

ABSTRACT. We define the affine Frobenius Brauer category  $\mathcal{AB}(A, -^*)$  associated to each symmetric involutive Frobenius superalgebra A. We then define an action of these categories on the categories of finite-dimensional supermodules for orthosymplectic Lie superalgebras defined over A. The case where A is the base field recovers the known action of the affine Brauer category on categories of supermodules for orthogonal and symplectic Lie algebras. The definition and associated action of  $\mathcal{AB}(A, -^*)$  are both novel when A is e.g. the quaternions  $\mathbb{H}$ , a finite group algebra, a zigzag superalgebra, or a truncated polynomial algebra. Finally, we state a conjecture for bases of hom-spaces in  $\mathcal{AB}(A, -^*)$  and outline a potential proof strategy.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Brauer algebras, introduced by the eponymous Richard Brauer in [Bra37], are closely related to the representation theory of orthogonal and symplectic (and, more generally, orthosymplectic) groups and Lie algebras. The Brauer category  $\mathcal{B}$ , first explicitly defined by Lehrer and Zhang in [LZ15], is the free linear symmetric monoidal category generated by a single symmetrically self-dual object I; its name reflects the fact that the endomorphism algebras of  $\mathcal{B}$  are Brauer algebras. Many results involving Brauer algebras have natural interpretations in terms of  $\mathcal{B}$ ; for instance, Schur-Weyl duality for orthosymplectic groups can be proved by constructing full functors from  $\mathcal{B}$  to the categories of finite-dimensional representations of these groups. Many variants of the Brauer category have since been defined and studied. The oriented Brauer category OB is the free symmetric monoidal category generated by a single object  $\uparrow$  and its dual  $\downarrow$ , and it is an analogue of  $\mathcal{B}$  corresponding to the general linear groups and Lie algebras. More generally, oriented Frobenius Brauer categories, denoted  $\mathcal{OB}(A)$  (first implicitly appearing as a subcategory of the Frobenius Heisenberg category  $\mathcal{H}eis_{A,0}$  in [Sav19], and then explicitly defined in [MS23]), correspond to general linear groups and Lie superalgebras defined over a Frobenius superalgebra A. In the unoriented case, one needs to restrict to Frobenius superalgebras equipped with an involution  $-^{\star}$ , leading to the Frobenius Brauer categories  $\mathcal{B}^{\sigma}(A, -^{\star})$  of [SSS24]. Oriented and unoriented Frobenius Brauer categories provide a natural framework for proving results about the representation theory of the classical Lie algebras and their Frobenius superalgebra analogues. In [SSS24], the *incarnation superfunctor* we mention in Proposition 3.3 and Theorem 3.10 of the current paper was proved to be full when A is a central real division superalgebra. Equivalences between various categories of tensor supermodules for real orthosymplectic and unitary supergroups follow from this fullness result; see [SSS24, Prop. 11.5, 12.5, 13.5].

There are also the affine Brauer and affine oriented Brauer categories  $\mathcal{AB}$  and  $\mathcal{AOB}$ , introduced in [RS19] and [BCNR17], respectively. These affine categories act via translation functors on the categories of finite-dimensional supermodules over orthosymplectic and general linear Lie superalgebras, respectively. The affine oriented Brauer category has been generalized to the case of Frobenius algebras, with these categories  $\mathcal{AOB}(A)$  first appearing as the special case k = 0 of the aforementioned Frobenius Heisenberg categories in [Sav19], and then being studied more explicitly in [MS23]. In the current paper, we will define the *(unoriented) affine Frobenius Brauer category*   $\mathcal{AB}^{\sigma}(A, -^{*})$  and prove in Theorem 3.10 that it acts on the category of finite-dimensional supermodules for orthosymplectic Lie superalgebras defined over A. Along the way, we will introduce and study the properties of two kinds of *teleporter* morphisms in  $\mathcal{B}^{\sigma}(A, -^{*})$ , drawn as  $\downarrow$  and  $\downarrow$ . These teleporters appear in the definition of  $\mathcal{AB}^{\sigma}(A, -^{*})$  and serve as the unoriented analogues of the single type of teleporter  $\uparrow$  that appears in the definition of the oriented category  $\mathcal{AOB}(A)$ . In the final section of this paper, we will state a conjecture for bases of the hom-spaces in  $\mathcal{AB}^{\sigma}(A, -^{*})$  and sketch a potential method of proof. This basis conjecture generalizes the known result [RS19, Thm. B] for  $\mathcal{AB}$ , and the proof technique draws inspiration from methods used to prove basis results for  $\mathcal{AOB}(A)$ ,  $\mathcal{B}(A, -^{*})$ , and the nil-Brauer category  $\mathcal{NB}_{t}$  in [BSW21b], [SSS24], and [BWW23], respectively.

We conclude this introduction by listing some potential future avenues of research related to affine Frobenius Brauer categories.

- It is relatively straightforward to adjust the definitions of the oriented and unoriented Frobenius Brauer categories to allow for the case of non-symmetric Frobenius superalgebras such as the two-dimensional Clifford superalgebra; this level of generality was addressed in the oriented case in [Sav19], and in the unoriented case in [SSS24]. The author of the present paper expects that it should be possible to find an appropriate generalization of the unoriented affine Frobenius Brauer category  $\mathcal{AB}^{\sigma}(A, -^*)$  such that the corresponding version of Theorem 3.10 holds when A is non-symmetric.
- As we will discuss in Remark 3.11, the most straightforward generalization of the affine functor F<sub>Φ</sub> from Theorem 3.10 does not yield a useful action of the affine dot when considering Frobenius superalgebras with odd trace maps, stemming from the fact that the quadratic Casimir element C is an odd supercentral element of U(g). Similar issues have previously appeared in the study of the representation theory of periplectic Lie superalgebras p(n). In [BDEA<sup>+</sup>19, §4], Balagovic et al. defined the *fake Casimir element* Ω ∈ p(n) ⊗ p(n)<sup>⊥</sup>, which allowed them to study the translation functors associated to p(n). This suggests that it may be possible to extend the definition of F<sub>Φ</sub> to cover the case of odd trace maps by using generalized fake Casimir elements.
- The BMW category, also known as the quantum Brauer category or Kauffman skein category, is a quantum generalization of the unoriented Brauer category. Its endomorphism algebras are the BMW algebras introduced in [BW89] and [Mur87], and it has been used to study the representation theory of the quantum enveloping algebras of the special orthogonal and symplectic Lie algebras,  $U_q(\mathfrak{so}_m)$  and  $U_q(\mathfrak{sp}_{2n})$ . Affine BMW algebras were defined in [OR07], and a corresponding affine version of the Kauffmann category first appeared in the literature in [GRS22]. This category was previously defined in terms of string diagrams on an annulus by Kevin Walker; his as-yet-unpublished joint work with Monica Vazirani on the category was discussed in [Vaz]. Oriented quantum affine Frobenius Brauer categories are a special case of the quantum Frobenius Heisenberg categories defined in [BSW22]. Defining and studying unoriented quantum affine Frobenius categories would be a natural generalization of the work in the present paper. The affine Kauffmann/BMW category would be a special case of such a category, where the Frobenius algebra is the base field.

# 2. Preliminaries

2.1. Conventions. Throughout this paper, k is a field of characteristic different from 2. All vector spaces and tensor products are taken over k.

If V is a super vector space and  $v \in V$  is a homogeneous element, we write  $\bar{v}$  for the parity of that element, i.e.  $\bar{v} = 0$  if v is even, and  $\bar{v} = 1$  if v is odd. Whenever we write an expression involving terms of the form  $\bar{v}$ , we are implicitly assuming/requiring that v is homogeneous. When definitions or proofs are given in terms of homogeneous elements, the full definition or proof follows from linear extension to the whole super vector space.

When working with a monoidal supercategory  $\mathcal{C}$ , we write  $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}}$  for its unit object, or just  $\mathbb{1}$  if the category is clear from context. We write  $\mathrm{id}_X$  for the identity morphism of an object X.

Except for Lie superalgebras, all superalgebras in this document are assumed to be associative and unital.

2.2. Supercategories. Much of this document is concerned with (strict) monoidal supercategories and their associated calculus of string diagrams. We will recall a few key properties here; for full details, see e.g. [BE17] and [SS22, §2, §3.1].

We write SVec for the category whose objects are super vector spaces and whose morphisms are parity-preserving linear maps. A supercategory is a category enriched in SVec. Thus a supercategory's hom-sets are super vector spaces, and its composition is parity-preserving, i.e.  $\overline{f \circ g} = \overline{f} + \overline{g}$ . A superfunctor is a k-linear functor between supercategories that preserves the parity of morphisms. A supernatural transformation  $\alpha \colon F \to G$  of parity  $i \in \{0, 1\}$  between two superfunctors  $F, G \colon \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$  is a collection of  $\mathcal{D}$ -morphisms  $\alpha_X \colon F(X) \to G(X)$ , ranging over  $X \in ob(\mathcal{C})$ , such that  $\overline{\alpha_X} = i$  for all X and satisfying  $G(f) \circ \alpha_X = \alpha_Y \circ (-1)^{i\overline{f}}F(f)$  for all  $\mathcal{C}$ -morphisms  $f \colon X \to Y$ . Note that even supernatural transformations are ordinary natural transformations (all of whose component maps are even), but odd supernatural transformations are not natural transformations due to the sign. A general supernatural transformation  $\alpha \colon F \to G$  is a sum of an even and an odd supernatural transformation.

Given a supercategory C (not necessarily monoidal), the *endofunctor supercategory* End(C) is a strict monoidal supercategory, with the composition and tensor product in End(C) respectively being given by vertical and horizontal composition of supernatural transformations.

We represent morphisms in strict monoidal supercategories via string diagrams, with composition corresponding to vertical stacking and tensor products corresponding to horizontal juxtaposition. The main feature distinguishing string diagrams in the super setting from those in the non-super setting is the existence of the *superinterachange law* for monoidal supercategories: for all morphisms  $f: X \to Y$  and  $g: A \to B$ , we have

(2.1) 
$$(f \otimes \mathrm{id}_B) \circ (\mathrm{id}_X \otimes g) = f \otimes g = (-1)^{f\overline{g}} (\mathrm{id}_Y \otimes g) \circ (f \otimes \mathrm{id}_A),$$

which in the strict case can be drawn as:

Note that if either f or g is even, the sign vanishes and we recover the ordinary interchange law for monoidal categories.

## 2.3. Frobenius Superalgebras.

**Definition 2.1.** A Frobenius superalgebra is a finite-dimensional superalgebra A equipped with linear functional tr:  $A \to k$ , called the *trace map* for A, such that the induced bilinear form

 $(x, y) \mapsto \operatorname{tr}(xy)$  is nondegenerate. Equivalently, this says that ker(tr) contains no nonzero left ideals. We call A a symmetric Frobenius superalgebra if its trace map satisfies

(2.3) 
$$\operatorname{tr}(xy) = (-1)^{\overline{xy}} \operatorname{tr}(yx)$$

for all  $x, y \in A$ . Throughout this paper, we require that all trace maps are even; see Remark 3.11 for a discussion of why we disregard the case of odd trace maps.

Given a basis  $B_A$  for a symmetric Frobenius superalgebra A, there is an associated *left dual* basis, denoted  $B_A^{\vee} = \{b^{\vee} \mid b \in B_A\}$ , satisfying  $\operatorname{tr}(b^{\vee}c) = \delta_{bc}$  for all  $b, c \in B_A$ . Note that  $\overline{b^{\vee}} = \overline{b}$ . It is straightforward to show that

$$(2.4) (b^{\vee})^{\vee} = (-1)^b t^{\vee}$$

for all  $b \in B_A$ , where on the left hand side we are taking duals with respect to  $B_A^{\vee}$ . We also have

(2.5) 
$$a = \sum_{b \in B_A} \operatorname{tr}(b^{\vee}a)b = \sum_{b \in B_A} \operatorname{tr}(ab)b^{\vee} \text{ for all } a \in A.$$

**Definition 2.2.** An *involution* on a superalgebra A is an even self-inverse k-linear endomorphism  $-^* \colon A \to A$  satisfying  $(xy)^* = (-1)^{\bar{x}\bar{y}}y^*x^*$  for all  $x, y \in A$ . Equivalently, an involution is an even self-inverse algebra homomorphism from A to  $A^{\text{op}}$ . Note that some authors refer to such maps as *anti-involutions*, and instead use the term "involution" to refer to self-inverse maps satisfying  $(xy)^* = x^*y^*$ .

An involution  $-^*$  on a Frobenius superalgebra (A, tr) is said to be *compatible with the trace map* on A if it satisfies

(2.6) 
$$\operatorname{tr}(x^{\star}) = \operatorname{tr}(x)$$

for all  $x \in A$ .

A symmetric involutive Frobenius superalgebra is a symmetric Frobenius superalgebra equipped with a compatible involution  $-^*$ .

**Examples 2.3.** The two-dimensional real algebra  $\mathbb{C}$  becomes a symmetric involutive Frobenius superalgebra when equipped with the trace map  $\operatorname{tr}(x+iy) = x$  and the involution given by complex conjugation. Similarly, the real quaternion algebra  $\mathbb{H} = \langle i, j, k \mid i^2 = j^2 = k^2 = ijk = -1 \rangle$  is a symmetric involutive Frobenius superalgebra with respect to the trace map  $\operatorname{tr}(a+ib+jc+kd) = a$  and the involution  $(a+ib+jc+kd)^* = a-ib-jc-kd$ .

Further examples of symmetric involutive Frobenius superalgebras include finite group algebras, zigzag superalgebras, and truncated polynomial algebras.

**Example 2.4.** If  $(A, \operatorname{tr}_A, -^*)$  is any involutive Frobenius superalgebra, the matrix superalgebra  $\operatorname{Mat}_{m|n}(A)$  is itself a Frobenius superalgebra with trace map  $\operatorname{tr} = \operatorname{tr}_A \circ \operatorname{str}$ . Here, str denotes the *supertrace*, given on a supermatrix in block form by

str 
$$\begin{pmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} M_{00} & M_{01} \\ M_{10} & M_{11} \end{bmatrix}$$
 = Tr $(M_{00}) - (-1)^{\overline{M_{11}}}$  Tr $(M_{11})$ ,

where Tr is the ordinary matrix trace. This Frobenius superalgebra is symmetric if and only if A is. When n is even, there is always a compatible involution on  $\operatorname{Mat}_{m|n}(A)$  called the *generalized* orthosymplectic involution. Such an involution can also be constructed when n is odd for certain choices of A; see Remark 2.10 for further details.

**Lemma 2.5.** Let  $(A, \operatorname{tr}, -^*)$  be a symmetric involutive Frobenius superalgebra. Let  $B_A$  be a basis of A. For all  $x, y \in A$  and  $b \in B_A$ , we have:

(2.7) 
$$\operatorname{tr}(xy) = \operatorname{tr}(x^*y^*), \qquad \operatorname{tr}(x^*y) = \operatorname{tr}(xy^*),$$

(2.8)  $(b^{\star})^{\vee} = (b^{\vee})^{\star},$ 

where on the left of (2.8) we are taking duals with respect to the basis  $B_A^* = \{b^* \mid b \in B_A\}$ .

Proof. For the first identity, we have

$$\operatorname{tr}(xy) \stackrel{(2.6)}{=} \operatorname{tr}((xy)^{\star}) = (-1)^{\bar{x}\bar{y}} \operatorname{tr}(y^{\star}x^{\star}) \stackrel{(2.3)}{=} \operatorname{tr}(x^{\star}y^{\star}).$$

The second identity follows from the fact that  $-^*$  is self-inverse. For the third identity, we have the following for all  $b, c \in B_A$ :

$$\operatorname{tr}((c^{\vee})^{\star}b^{\star}) \stackrel{(2.7)}{=} \operatorname{tr}(c^{\vee}b) = \delta_{bc},$$

as desired.

2.4. Supermodules and Lie Superalgebras. For the rest of the paper, fix a symmetric involutive Frobenius superalgebra  $(A, tr, -^*)$  and a homogeneous basis  $B_A$  of A. For the rest of this section, also fix a right A-supermodule V.

**Definition 2.6.** Let  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ . We write  $A^{m|n}$  for the right A-supermodule that is equal to  $A^{m+n}$  as a module, with element parities determined by  $\overline{ae_i} = \overline{a} + p(i)$  for  $a \in A$  and  $1 \leq i \leq m+n$ , where  $e_i$  denotes the vector with a 1 in position i and zeroes elsewhere, and

$$p(i) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } 1 \le i \le m, \\ 1 & \text{if } m+1 \le i \le m+n. \end{cases}$$

**Definition 2.7.** Let  $\nu \in \{1, -1\}$ . A  $\star$ -sesquilinear form on V is a homogeneous k-bilinear map  $\varphi: V \times V \to A$  that satisfies the following identity for all  $a, b \in A$  and  $v, w \in V$ :

(2.9)  $\varphi(va, wb) = (-1)^{\bar{a}(\bar{\varphi} + \bar{v})} a^{\star} \varphi(v, w) b.$ 

A  $(\nu, \star)$ -superhermitian form on V is a  $\star$ -sesquilinear form  $\varphi$  that additionally satisfies the following identity for all  $v, w \in V$ :

(2.10) 
$$\varphi(v,w) = \nu(-1)^{\bar{v}\bar{w}}\varphi(w,v)^{\star}.$$

A  $\star$ -sesquilinear form  $\varphi$  is called *nondegenerate* if the map  $v \mapsto \varphi(v, -)$  is an injective A-supermodule homomorphism  $V \to \operatorname{Hom}_A(V, A)$ , and *unimodular* if that map is an A-supermodule isomorphism.

**Example 2.8.** Let  $\star: \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$  denote complex conjugation, and suppose V is a purely even right  $\mathbb{C}$ -supermodule. Then a  $(1, \star)$ -superhermitian form on V is an ordinary hermitian form, and a  $(-1, \star)$ -superhermitian form is a skew-hermitian form. If we instead use id as our involution, a  $(1, \mathrm{id})$ -superhermitian form is a symmetric  $\mathbb{C}$ -bilinear form, and a  $(-1, \mathrm{id})$ -superhermitian form is a skew-symmetric  $\mathbb{C}$ -bilinear form.

**Lemma 2.9** ([SSS24, Lem. 7.11, Lem. 7.12]). Suppose  $\varphi$  is a unimodular superhermitian form on V. For all  $X \in \text{End}_A(V)$ , there exists a unique  $X^{\dagger} \in \text{End}_A(V)$ , called the map adjoint to X, that satisfies the following identity for all  $v, w \in V$ :

(2.11) 
$$\varphi(v, Xw) = (-1)^{X\bar{v}} \varphi(X^{\dagger}v, w).$$

Moreover, the map  $X \to X^{\dagger}$  is an involution of the superalgebra  $\operatorname{End}_A(V)$  known as the generalized orthosymplectic involution.

**Remark 2.10.** For any symmetric involutive Frobenius superalgebra  $(A, \text{tr}, \star)$ , one can define a  $(1, \star)$ -superhermitian form on  $A^{m|n}$  when n is even; see [SS22, §5.4] for details. For some choices of A, one can define superhermitian forms on  $A^{m|n}$  when n is odd as well; see [SS24, §A.3, §A.4, §A.5] for some examples. In either case, after identifying  $\text{End}_A(A^{m|n})$  and  $\text{Mat}_{m|n}(A)$  in the usual way, Lemma 2.9 yields an involution on  $\text{Mat}_{m|n}(A)$  that is compatible with the trace map specified in Example 2.4.

**Definition 2.11.** Let  $\varphi$  be a unimodular superhermitian form on V. The orthosymplectic Lie superalgebra associated to  $\varphi$  is defined as

(2.12) 
$$\mathfrak{osp}(\varphi) = \{ X \in \operatorname{End}_A(V) \mid X^{\dagger} = -X \},\$$

with Lie superbracket given by the supercommutator, i.e.  $[X, Y] = XY - (-1)^{\bar{X}\bar{Y}}YX$ . It is straightforward to show that  $\mathfrak{osp}(\varphi) = \{X \in \operatorname{End}_A(V) \mid \varphi(Xv, w) = -(-1)^{\bar{X}\bar{v}}\varphi(v, Xw) \text{ for all } v, w \in V\}.$ 

**Definition 2.12.** Let  $\nu \in \{1, -1\}$ . A  $(\nu, \star)$ -supersymmetric form on V is a homogeneous k-bilinear map  $\Phi: V \times V \to k$  that satisfies the following identities for all  $a \in A$  and  $v, w \in V$ :

(2.13) 
$$\Phi(v,w) = \nu(-1)^{\bar{v}\bar{w}}\Phi(w,v), \qquad \Phi(va,w) = (-1)^{\bar{a}\bar{w}}\Phi(v,wa^{\star}).$$

**Lemma 2.13** ([SSS24, Lem. 7.10]). If  $\varphi$  is a nondegenerate  $(\nu, \star)$ -superhermitian form on V, then the map  $\Phi := \text{tr} \circ \varphi$  is a nondegenerate  $(\nu, \star)$ -supersymmetric form on V.

# 3. FROBENIUS BRAUER CATEGORIES

In this section, we recall the definition and key properties of the Frobenius Brauer categories  $\mathcal{B}^{\sigma}(A, -^{\star})$ , and then define and study *teleporter* morphisms in those categories. We use these teleporters to define the affine Frobenius Brauer categories  $\mathcal{AB}^{\sigma}(A, -^{\star})$ , and then prove Theorem 3.10, which states that these affine categories have a natural action on the corresponding categories of supermodules for orthosymplectic Lie superalgebras defined over A.

# 3.1. Basic Properties and the Incarnation Superfunctor.

**Definition 3.1** ([SSS24, Def. 9.1]). Let  $\sigma \in \mathbb{Z}_2$ . The Frobenius Brauer category of parity  $\sigma$  associated to  $(A, -^*)$ , denoted  $\mathcal{B}^{\sigma}(A, -^*)$ , is the strict monoidal k-linear supercategory generated by a single object I and the morphisms

$$\times : \mathsf{I} \otimes \mathsf{I} \to \mathsf{I} \otimes \mathsf{I}, \quad \bigcirc : \mathsf{I} \otimes \mathsf{I} \to \mathbb{1}, \quad \bigcup : \mathbb{1} \to \mathsf{I} \otimes \mathsf{I}, \quad \blacklozenge a : \mathsf{I} \to \mathsf{I} \quad a \in A,$$

subject to the following relations:

for all  $a, b \in A$  and  $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{k}$ . The parity of a is  $\bar{a}$ , the morphisms  $\bigcap$  and  $\bigcup$  have parity  $\sigma$ , and  $\times$  is even. The morphisms a are called *(Frobenius) tokens.* 

For  $d \in \mathbb{k}$ , we define  $\mathcal{B}^{\sigma}(A, -^{\star}, d)$  to be the quotient of  $\mathcal{B}^{\sigma}(A, -^{\star})$  by the additional relations

$$(3.3) \qquad \qquad \bigcirc a = d \operatorname{str}_A(a) \operatorname{id}_1,$$

where a ranges over A and  $\operatorname{str}_A(a) := \sum_{b \in B_A} (-1)^{\overline{b}} \operatorname{tr}(b^{\vee}ba)$  is the supertrace of the action of a on A. We call d the specialization parameter.

**Lemma 3.2** ([SSS24, Prop. 9.3]). The following relations hold in  $\mathcal{B}^{\sigma}(A, -^{\star})$  for all  $a \in A$ :

From this point forward, let V be a right A-supermodule,  $\varphi$  a unimodular  $(\nu, \star)$ -superhermitian form on V, and  $\Phi = \operatorname{tr} \circ \varphi$  the corresponding nondegenerate  $(\nu, \star)$ -supersymmetric form on V, as in Lemma 2.13. Let  $\sigma$  be the parity of  $\Phi$ . Fix a homogeneous k-basis  $B_V$  of V, and let  $B_V^{\vee} = \{b^{\vee} \mid b \in B_V\}$  be the left dual basis with respect to  $\Phi$ .

**Proposition 3.3** ([SSS24, Thm. 10.1]). There exists a unique monoidal superfunctor, called the incarnation superfunctor associated to  $\Phi$ , denoted  $F_{\Phi} : \mathcal{B}^{\sigma}(A, -^{*}) \to \mathfrak{osp}(\varphi)$ -smod, such that  $F_{\Phi}(\mathsf{I}) = V$ ,

$$F_{\Phi}(\swarrow) : V \otimes V \to V \otimes V, \qquad v \otimes w \mapsto \nu(-1)^{\bar{v}\bar{w}} w \otimes v$$

$$F_{\Phi}(\bigcap) : V \otimes V \to \Bbbk, \qquad v \otimes w \mapsto \Phi(v,w),$$

$$F_{\Phi}(\blacklozenge a) : V \to V, \qquad v \mapsto (-1)^{\bar{a}\bar{v}} v a^{\star}.$$

This superfunctor also satisfies

$$F_{\Phi}\left(\bigcup\right): \mathbb{k} \to V \otimes V, \qquad 1 \mapsto \sum_{v \in B_V} (-1)^{\sigma \bar{v}} v \otimes v^{\vee},$$

and

 $F_{\Phi}\left(\bigcirc a\right) = \operatorname{str}_{V}(a)\operatorname{id}_{\mathbb{1}}$ 

for all  $a \in A$ . Hence in the case  $V = A^{m|n}$  for some  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $F_{\Phi}$  is also well-defined as a monoidal superfunctor from  $\mathcal{B}^{\sigma}(A, -^{\star}, \nu(m-n))$  to  $\mathfrak{osp}(\varphi)$ -smod.

In the rest of the paper, we specialize to the case  $V = A^{m|n}$  for some  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

3.2. Affine Category and Superfunctor. The definition of affine Frobenius Brauer categories involve *teleporter* morphisms in  $\mathcal{B}^{\sigma}(A, -^*)$ . The *ordinary teleporter* morphism is defined as follows:

It is straightforward to show that this definition is independent of the choice of basis  $B_A$ . The definition does depend on the choice of trace map for A, but as we will discuss after Definition 3.6, different choices of trace map yield isomorphic affine Frobenius Brauer categories.

One can also draw teleporters with the right endpoint above the left one; the definition is slightly altered such that the dual element appears on the left, i.e.

This modification ensures that teleporter endpoints slide up and down freely:

$$=\sum_{b\in B_A} \left| b \right| \quad \left| b^{\vee} \right| \stackrel{(2.2)}{=} \sum_{b\in B_A} (-1)^{\overline{b}} \left| b^{\vee} \right| \stackrel{(2.4)}{=} \sum_{b\in B_A} \left| b^{\vee} \right| \quad \left| b \right| = \left| b^{\vee} \right|,$$

where in the second-to-last equality we switched to a sum over the left dual basis. Further, one can draw teleporters with one or both endpoints pointing downwards. The corresponding definitions are similar to ordinary teleporters, but with -\* applied to the tokens corresponding to the endpoint(s) that are facing downwards. For example,

### SAIMA SAMCHUCK-SCHNARCH

where in the second-to-last equality we switched to a sum over the involuted basis  $\{b^* \mid b \in B_A\}$ . In general, this kind of calculation shows that one can flip the orientation of both endpoints of a teleporter simultaneously without changing the morphism, i.e. only the relative orientation of the endpoints matters. Teleporters whose endpoints have opposite orientations are called *reflecting teleporters*. The names of the teleporter morphisms are inspired by the properties outlined in Proposition 3.4.

One can also draw teleporters in larger diagrams. When doing so, one should include the sign  $(-1)^{\bar{b}x}$  to the sum defining the teleporter, where x is the sum of the parities of all morphisms in the diagram appearing vertically between the two teleporter endpoints. For instance,

$$d = \sum_{b \in B} (-1)^{\overline{b}(\overline{c} + \overline{d})} d = c | b^{\vee} | d$$

This convention ensures that one can freely slide the endpoints of teleporters along strands; the signs arising from (2.2) do not need to be actively tracked since they are incorporated into the definition of the teleporters. For instance, we have:

**Proposition 3.4.** Teleporter morphisms satisfy the following relations, for all  $a \in A$ :

Note that tokens travel from one vertical side of an ordinary teleporter to the other, but stay on the same vertical side after travelling through a reflecting teleporter.

*Proof.* We will prove the first identity; the others are similar.

$$\begin{array}{c|c} a & \hline & (3.2) \\ \hline & = \\ \end{array} \sum_{b \in B_A} a^{b} & \downarrow \\ b^{\vee} & \stackrel{(2.5)}{=} \sum_{b \in B_A} \sum_{c \in B_A} c^{c} \downarrow \\ \hline & (3.2) \\ \hline & = \\ \end{array} \sum_{c \in B_A} \sum_{b \in B_A} c^{c} \downarrow \\ \hline & \downarrow_{\mathrm{tr}(c^{\vee}ab)b^{\vee}} \stackrel{(2.5)}{=} \sum_{c \in B_A} c^{c} \downarrow \\ \hline & \downarrow_{c^{\vee}a} \stackrel{(3.2)}{=} \downarrow_{a} \downarrow . \quad \Box$$

Lemma 3.5. Teleporters of both types slide through crossings:

*Proof.* We have:

$$= \sum_{b \in B_A} b^{\vee} = \sum_{b \in B_A} b^{\vee} = \sum_{b \in B_A} b^{\vee} = \sum_{b \in B_A} (-1)^{\bar{b}} b^{\vee} b^{\vee} = \sum_{b \in B_A} b^{\vee} b^{\vee} = \mathbf{X}.$$

Note that we changed to a sum over the dual basis in the second-to-last equality. The calculation for reflecting teleporters is essentially the same.  $\Box$ 

The last relations in (3.2) and (3.4) imply that teleporter endpoints slide across cups and caps, flipping orientation in the process. For instance, we have 1 = 1 and 1 = 1. This allows us to unambiguously draw diagrams with sideways teleporter endpoints appearing at critical points of cups and caps; we define such diagrams to be equal to the morphism obtained by sliding the endpoints to either side of the cup(s) and/or cap(s). For instance,



**Definition 3.6.** The (unoriented) affine Frobenius Brauer category of parity  $\sigma$  associated to  $(A, \text{tr}, -^*)$ , denoted  $\mathcal{AB}^{\sigma}(A, -^*)$ , is the supercategory obtained from  $\mathcal{B}^{\sigma}(A, -^*)$  by adjoining one new even generating morphism,  $\diamond: I \to I$ , called an (affine) dot, subject to the following relations:

$$(3.10) \qquad \qquad \bigcirc \qquad - \qquad \bigcirc = \qquad - (-1)^{\sigma}$$

As with the non-affine category, for any  $d \in \mathbb{k}$ , we define  $\mathcal{AB}^{\sigma}(A, -^{\star}, d)$  to be the quotient of  $\mathcal{AB}^{\sigma}(A, -^{\star})$  by the additional relations (3.3).

As mentioned previously, teleporter morphisms depend on the choice of trace map for A, so to be fully precise one needs to indicate which trace map is being used to define  $\mathcal{AB}^{\sigma}(A, -^*)$ . However, the following result shows that different choices of trace map yield isomorphic categories. As such, we choose to suppress this detail in our notation for the affine Frobenius Brauer category for the sake of simplicity.

**Proposition 3.7.** Let A be a superalgebra, and suppose that  $(A, \operatorname{tr}_1, -^*)$  and  $(A, \operatorname{tr}_2, -^*)$  are involutive Frobenius superalgebras, using the same involution  $-^*$  in both cases. Write  $\mathcal{AB}^{\sigma}(A, -^*)_i$  for the affine Frobenius Brauer category defined with respect to  $\operatorname{tr}_i$ . There exists an even invertible element  $u \in A$  and an isomorphism  $T: \mathcal{AB}^{\sigma}(A, -^*)_1 \to \mathcal{AB}^{\sigma}(A, -^*)_2$  given by:

$$T(\mathsf{I}) = \mathsf{I}, \quad T(f) = f \text{ for all } f \in \{ \swarrow, \bigcap, \bigcup, \phi^a : a \in A \}, \quad T(\phi) = \phi^u.$$

*Proof.* Since  $tr_1$  and  $tr_2$  are both trace maps for A, there exists an invertible element  $u \in A$  such that  $tr_2(a) = tr_1(ua)$  for all  $a \in A$ ; see e.g. [Abr97, Prop. 2.1.6] for a proof. Moreover, since both  $tr_1$  and  $tr_2$  are even, symmetric, and compatible with  $-^*$ , we get that u is even, central, and satisfies  $u^* = u$ . Writing  $-^{\vee_i}$  for left duals taken with respect to  $tr_i$ , we have  $b^{\vee_2} = u^{-1}b^{\vee_1}$ . Using subscripts in the same way for teleporters, this yields:

It is immediate that T respects all of the defining relations for  $\mathcal{B}^{\sigma}(A, -\star)$ . For (3.10), we compute:



where the equality labelled \* follows from the fact that u (and hence  $u^{-1}$ ) is even and central, and thus  $\oint u^{-1}$  slides through teleporter endpoints. It is straightforward to show that T respects (3.11) and (3.12) using those two relations in the target category, together with (3.2) and the fact that uis central and satisfies  $u^* = u$ . This shows T is well-defined. Noting that  $\operatorname{tr}_1(a) = \operatorname{tr}_2(u^{-1}a)$  for all  $a \in A$ , reversing the roles of  $\operatorname{tr}_1$  and  $\operatorname{tr}_2$  yields a functor  $\mathcal{AB}^{\sigma}(A, -^*)_2 \to \mathcal{AB}^{\sigma}(A, -^*)_1$  sending  $\oint \operatorname{to}$  $\oint u^{-1}$ , which is the inverse of T. Hence T is an isomorphism.  $\Box$ 

**Lemma 3.8.** The following relations hold in  $\mathcal{AB}^{\sigma}(A, -^{\star})$ :

(3.14) 
$$(-1)^{\sigma} = (-1)^{\sigma}$$
,  $(-1)^{\sigma} = (-1)^{\sigma}$ 

*Proof.* Adjoining a crossing to the top and bottom of (3.10) yields



The first relation from (3.14) follows after sliding the teleporter endpoints through crossings, using the first relation from (3.1) several times, and reversing the orientation of both teleporter endpoints in the last diagram. For the second relation, we compute:

$$\begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \overset{(3.1)}{=} \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} (-1)^{\sigma} \\ \bullet \\ \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \overset{(3.11)}{=} \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} (-1)^{\sigma} \\ \bullet \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \overset{(3.1)}{=} \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} (-1)^{\sigma} \\ \bullet \\ \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \end{array} \end{array}$$

Recall that  $\varphi$  denotes a unimodular  $(\nu, \star)$ -superhermitian form on  $V = A^{m|n}$ , and  $\Phi = \operatorname{tr} \circ \varphi$ is the corresponding nondegenerate  $(\nu, \star)$ -supersymmetric form. From this point forward, we set  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{osp}(\varphi)$  and fix a homogeneous k-basis  $B_{\mathfrak{g}}$  for  $\mathfrak{g}$ . In the following, the duals for this basis are taken with respect to the bilinear form  $\operatorname{tr} \circ \operatorname{str}$ , which one can easily verify is nondegenerate on  $\mathfrak{g}$ .

**Definition 3.9.** Define  $\Omega = \sum_{X \in B_{\mathfrak{g}}} X \otimes X^{\vee} \in \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathfrak{g}$  and  $C = \sum_{X \in B_{\mathfrak{g}}} XX^{\vee} \in U(\mathfrak{g})$ , where  $U(\mathfrak{g})$  denotes the universal enveloping algebra of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Note that both of these elements are even and independent of the choice of basis  $B_{\mathfrak{g}}$ .

**Theorem 3.10.** There exists a monoidal superfunctor  $\hat{F}_{\Phi} : \mathcal{AB}^{\sigma}(A, -^{\star}) \to \operatorname{End}(\mathfrak{g}\operatorname{-smod})$  such that  $\hat{F}_{\Phi}(\mathsf{I}) = V \otimes -,$ 

$$\hat{F}_{\Phi}(f) = F_{\Phi}(f) \otimes - \quad \text{for all } f \in \{ \times, \bigcap, \bigcup, \phi a : a \in A \},$$
$$\hat{F}_{\Phi}(\phi) = \nu \left( \Delta(C) - 1 \otimes C \right).$$

Here,  $F_{\Phi}$  is the incarnation functor of Proposition 3.3,  $\Delta: U(\mathfrak{g}) \to U(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes U(\mathfrak{g})$  is the usual comultiplication map, and  $\Delta(C) - 1 \otimes C$  denotes the supernatural transformation from  $V \otimes -$  to  $V \otimes -$  with components given by

$$v \otimes w \mapsto (\Delta(C) - 1 \otimes C)(v \otimes w).$$

Throughout the rest of the document, we will identify elements of tensor powers of  $U(\mathfrak{g})$  and their associated supernatural transformations in the same way we did with  $\Delta(C) - 1 \otimes C$  above.

A calculation analogous to the proof of Proposition 3.4 shows that the action of C intertwines the action of  $\mathfrak{g}$  on V. Using this, it is straightforward to show that the image of the affine dot is indeed an even supernatural transformation. Another straightforward computation shows that

$$\Delta(C) - 1 \otimes C = C \otimes 1 + 2\Omega.$$

**Remark 3.11.** It is straightforward to extend Proposition 3.3 to also cover the case of involutive Frobenius superalgebras with odd trace maps. The same is not true for Theorem 3.10. When we allow for non-even traces, several of the basic results from Section 2.3 must be updated with appropriate signs that vanish in the case  $\overline{\text{tr}} = 0$ . In particular, left dual bases satisfy  $\overline{b^{\vee}} = \overline{b} + \overline{\text{tr}}$ , and we define  $C = \sum_{X \in B_g} (-1)^{\overline{X} \cdot \overline{\text{tr}}} X X^{\vee}$ . These signs are necessary to ensure that the action of Cintertwines the action of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . However, this natural generalization does not generate a useful affine settement to is odd. Assuming  $\overline{\text{tr}} = 1$  are how that C is odd since  $\overline{X^{\vee}} + \overline{X} = 1$ . As the action

category when tr is odd. Assuming  $\overline{tr} = 1$ , we have that C is odd since  $\overline{X^{\vee}} + \overline{X} = 1$ . As the action of C supercommutes with the action of  $U(\mathfrak{g})$ , we get that  $C^2$  acts as 0. Schur's Lemma then tells us that C acts on each irreducible supermodule as 0. Thus we restrict our attention to even trace maps in this paper.

In the remainder of this section, we will work towards proving Theorem 3.10. In light of Proposition 3.3 and a standard result about extending functors to endofunctor categories (see, for instance, [McS, Thm. 5.3.9]), we only need to show that the relations involving the affine dot are preserved.

## **Definition 3.12.** Define

$$\Omega^{12} = \sum_{X \in B_{\mathfrak{g}}} X \otimes X^{\vee} \otimes 1, \quad \Omega^{13} = \sum_{X \in B_{\mathfrak{g}}} X \otimes 1 \otimes X^{\vee}, \quad \Omega^{23} = \sum_{X \in B_{\mathfrak{g}}} 1 \otimes X \otimes X^{\vee}$$

Lemma 3.13. We have

(3.16) 
$$\hat{F}_{\Phi} \begin{pmatrix} \downarrow \\ \uparrow \end{pmatrix} = \nu \left( C \otimes 1 \otimes 1 + 2(\Omega^{12} + \Omega^{13}) \right),$$

(3.17) 
$$\hat{F}_{\Phi}\left( \left| \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{k} \\ \mathbf{$$

*Proof.* Let W be a left g-supermodule, and  $u, v \in V, w \in W$ . We have that  $\hat{F}_{\Phi} \begin{pmatrix} \downarrow \\ \downarrow \end{pmatrix}_{W}$  acts as  $u \otimes v \otimes w \mapsto \nu(C \otimes 1 + 2\Omega)(u \otimes (v \otimes w))$ , and

$$(C \otimes 1 + 2\Omega)(u \otimes (v \otimes w))$$
  
=  $Cu \otimes v \otimes w + 2 \sum_{X \in B_{\mathfrak{g}}} (-1)^{\bar{X}\bar{u}} Xu \otimes X^{\vee}(v \otimes w)$ 

$$= Cu \otimes v \otimes w + 2 \sum_{X \in B_{\mathfrak{g}}} (-1)^{\bar{X}\bar{u}} Xu \otimes X^{\vee} v \otimes w + (-1)^{\bar{X}\bar{u} + \bar{X}\bar{v}} Xu \otimes v \otimes X^{\vee} w$$
$$= \left( C \otimes 1 \otimes 1 + 2 \sum_{X \in B_{\mathfrak{g}}} X \otimes X^{\vee} \otimes 1 + 2 \sum_{X \in B_{\mathfrak{g}}} X \otimes 1 \otimes X^{\vee} \right) (u \otimes v \otimes w)$$
$$= (C \otimes 1 \otimes 1 + 2(\Omega^{12} + \Omega^{13}))(u \otimes v \otimes w).$$

For the second claim,  $\hat{F}_{\Phi} \begin{pmatrix} | & | \\ | & | \\ W \end{pmatrix}_{W}$  is equal to  $\mathrm{id}_{V \otimes V \otimes W} \circ \nu(\mathrm{id}_{V} \otimes (C \otimes 1 + 2\Omega)) = \nu(1 \otimes C \otimes 1 + 2\Omega^{23}).$ 

**Lemma 3.14.** For all  $u, v \in V$ , we have

(3.18) 
$$\Phi(Cu, v) = \Phi(u, Cv)$$

Proof.

$$\Phi(Cu,v) = \sum_{X \in B_{\mathfrak{g}}} \Phi(XX^{\vee}u,v) \stackrel{(2.11)}{=} \sum_{X \in B_{\mathfrak{g}}} (-1)^{\bar{X}} \Phi(u,(X^{\vee})^{\dagger}X^{\dagger}v) \stackrel{(2.12)}{=} \sum_{X \in B_{\mathfrak{g}}} (-1)^{\bar{X}} \Phi(u,X^{\vee}Xv)$$
$$\stackrel{(2.4)}{=} \sum_{X \in B_{\mathfrak{g}}} \Phi(u,X^{\vee}(X^{\vee})^{\vee}v) = \sum_{X \in B_{\mathfrak{g}}} \Phi(u,XX^{\vee}v) = \Phi(u,Cv),$$

where we switch to a sum over the dual basis in the second-to-last equality.

**Proposition 3.15.** We have  $\hat{F}_{\Phi}\left(\bigcap\right) = -\hat{F}_{\Phi}\left(\bigcap\right)$ .

*Proof.* Let W be a left  $\mathfrak{g}$ -supermodule and  $u, v \in V, w \in W$ . We compute:

$$\begin{split} \hat{F}_{\Phi}\left( \bigcap \right)_{W} (u \otimes v \otimes w) \\ \stackrel{(3.16)}{=} \nu \left( F_{\Phi}\left( \bigcap \right) \otimes \mathrm{id}_{W} \right) \left( C \otimes 1 \otimes 1 + 2(\Omega^{12} + \Omega^{13}) \right) (u \otimes v \otimes w) \\ &= \nu \Phi(Cu, v)w + 2\nu \left( \sum_{X \in B_{\mathfrak{g}}} (-1)^{\bar{X}\bar{u}} \Phi(Xu, X^{\vee}v)w + \sum_{X \in B_{\mathfrak{g}}} (-1)^{\bar{X}(\bar{u}+\bar{v})} \Phi(Xu, v)X^{\vee}w \right) \\ \stackrel{(2.11)}{=} \nu \Phi(Cu, v)w - 2\nu \left( \sum_{X \in B_{\mathfrak{g}}} \Phi(u, XX^{\vee}v)w + \sum_{X \in B_{\mathfrak{g}}} (-1)^{\bar{X}\bar{v}} \Phi(u, Xv)X^{\vee}w \right) \\ \stackrel{(3.18)}{=} \nu \Phi(u, Cv)w - 2\nu \left( \Phi(u, Cv)w + \sum_{X \in B_{\mathfrak{g}}} (-1)^{\bar{X}\bar{v}} \Phi(u, Xv)X^{\vee}w \right) \\ &= -\nu \Phi(u, Cv)w - 2\nu \sum_{X \in B_{\mathfrak{g}}} (-1)^{\bar{X}\bar{v}} \Phi(u, Xv)X^{\vee}w \\ &= -\nu \left(F_{\Phi}\left( \bigcap \right) \otimes \mathrm{id}_{W} \right) (1 \otimes C \otimes 1 + 2\Omega^{23})(u \otimes v \otimes w) \\ \stackrel{(3.17)}{=} -\hat{F}_{\Phi}\left( \bigcap \right)_{W} (u \otimes v \otimes w), \end{split}$$

as desired.

**Proposition 3.16.** For all  $a \in A$ , we have  $\hat{F}_{\Phi} \begin{pmatrix} \bullet & a \\ \circ & \end{pmatrix} = \hat{F}_{\Phi} \begin{pmatrix} \bullet & a \\ \bullet & a \end{pmatrix}$ .

*Proof.* Let W be a left g-supermodule,  $a \in A, v \in V$ , and  $w \in W$ . We compute:

$$\begin{split} \hat{F}_{\Phi} \begin{pmatrix} \bullet & a \\ \uparrow & \end{pmatrix}_{W} (v \otimes w) &= \nu \hat{F}_{\Phi} \begin{pmatrix} \bullet & a \\ \bullet & a \end{pmatrix}_{W} \begin{pmatrix} Cv \otimes w + 2\sum_{X \in B_{\mathfrak{g}}} (-1)^{\bar{X}\bar{v}} Xv \otimes X^{\vee} w \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \nu (-1)^{\bar{a}\bar{v}} Cva^{\star} \otimes w + 2\nu \sum_{X \in B_{\mathfrak{g}}} (-1)^{\bar{X}\bar{v} + \bar{a}\bar{X} + \bar{a}\bar{v}} Xva^{\star} \otimes X^{\vee} w \\ &= \nu (C \otimes 1 + 2\Omega)((-1)^{\bar{a}\bar{v}} va^{\star} \otimes w) = \hat{F}_{\Phi} \begin{pmatrix} \bullet \\ \uparrow \end{pmatrix}_{W} ((-1)^{\bar{a}\bar{v}} va^{\star} \otimes w) = \hat{F}_{\Phi} \begin{pmatrix} \bullet & a \\ \uparrow & \end{pmatrix}_{W} (v \otimes w). \quad \Box \end{split}$$

Fix a homogeneous k-basis  $B_{\text{End}}$  for  $\text{End}_A(V)$ . As for  $B_{\mathfrak{g}}$ , we take duals for this basis relative to the nondegenerate bilinear form trostr.

Lemma 3.17. We have

(3.19) 
$$2\Omega = \sum_{X \in B_{\text{End}}} X \otimes X^{\vee} - \sum_{X \in B_{\text{End}}} X^{\dagger} \otimes X^{\vee}.$$

*Proof.* It is straightforward to show that the sums appearing in the lemma statement are independent of the basis for  $\operatorname{End}_A(V)$ . Since  $-^{\dagger}$  is a self-inverse linear operator on  $\operatorname{End}_A(V)$ ,  $\operatorname{End}_A(V)$  decomposes a direct sum of its 1-eigenspace and its (-1)-eigenspace. Let  $B_1$  be a basis for the 1-eigenspace. Noting that  $\mathfrak{g}$  is precisely the (-1)-eigenspace, we find that  $B_1 \dot{\cup} B_{\mathfrak{g}}$  is a basis for  $\operatorname{End}_A(V)$ . Hence we have:

$$2\Omega = 2 \sum_{X \in B_{\mathfrak{g}}} X \otimes X^{\vee}$$

$$= \sum_{X \in B_{\mathfrak{g}}} X \otimes X^{\vee} + \sum_{X \in B_{1}} X \otimes X^{\vee} + \sum_{X \in B_{\mathfrak{g}}} X \otimes X^{\vee} - \sum_{X \in B_{1}} X \otimes X^{\vee}$$

$$= \sum_{X \in B_{\mathfrak{g}}} X \otimes X^{\vee} + \sum_{X \in B_{1}} X \otimes X^{\vee} - \sum_{X \in B_{\mathfrak{g}}} X^{\dagger} \otimes X^{\vee} - \sum_{X \in B_{1}} X^{\dagger} \otimes X^{\vee}$$

$$= \sum_{X \in B_{\text{End}}} X \otimes X^{\vee} - \sum_{X \in B_{\text{End}}} X^{\dagger} \otimes X^{\vee}.$$

**Lemma 3.18.** For all  $u, v \in V$  we have:

(3.20) 
$$\left(\sum_{X\in B_{\mathrm{End}}} X\otimes X^{\vee}\right)(u\otimes v) = (-1)^{\bar{u}\bar{v}}v\otimes u\left(\sum_{b\in B_A}b\otimes b^{\vee}\right),$$

(3.21) 
$$\left(\sum_{X\in B_{\mathrm{End}}} X^{\dagger}\otimes X^{\vee}\right)(u\otimes v) = \nu \sum_{b\in B_{A}} \sum_{w\in B_{V}} (-1)^{\bar{w}\sigma+\sigma} \Phi(u,vb)w\otimes w^{\vee}b^{\vee}.$$

*Proof.* The first identity is the left supermodule version of [MS23, Lem. 3.6]; note that  $\Omega$  in that paper is the  $\sum_{X \in B_{\text{End}}} X \otimes X^{\vee}$  appearing in (3.20), not our  $\Omega$  from Definition 3.9. For the second identity, we compute:

$$\left(\sum_{X\in B_{\mathrm{End}}} X^{\dagger}\otimes X^{\vee}\right)(u\otimes v) = \sum_{X\in B_{\mathrm{End}}} (-1)^{\bar{X}\bar{u}}X^{\dagger}u\otimes X^{\vee}v$$

$$\stackrel{(2.5)}{=} \sum_{X \in B_{\text{End}}} \sum_{w \in B_V} (-1)^{\bar{X}\bar{u}} \Phi(w^{\vee}, X^{\dagger}u) w \otimes X^{\vee}v$$

$$\stackrel{(2.11)}{=} \sum_{X \in B_{\text{End}}} \sum_{w \in B_V} (-1)^{\bar{X}\bar{u}+\bar{X}\bar{\sigma}} \Phi(Xw^{\vee}, u) w \otimes X^{\vee}v$$

$$\stackrel{(2.13)}{=} \nu \sum_{X \in B_{\text{End}}} \sum_{w \in B_V} (-1)^{\bar{X}\bar{w}+\bar{X}\sigma+\bar{u}\bar{w}+\bar{u}\sigma} \Phi(u, Xw^{\vee}) w \otimes X^{\vee}v$$

$$\stackrel{(3.20)}{=} \nu \sum_{b \in B_A} \sum_{w \in B_V} (-1)^{\bar{u}\bar{w}+\bar{u}\sigma+\bar{w}\bar{v}+\sigma\bar{v}+\bar{b}\bar{w}+\bar{b}\sigma} \Phi(u, vb) w \otimes w^{\vee}b^{\vee}$$

$$= \nu \sum_{b \in B_A} \sum_{w \in B_V} (-1)^{\bar{w}\sigma+\sigma} \Phi(u, vb) w \otimes w^{\vee}b^{\vee},$$

as desired. Note that in the last equality we used the fact that the only nonzero terms are those in which  $\bar{u} = \sigma + \bar{v} + \bar{b}$  to simplify the sign.

**Proposition 3.19.** We have 
$$\hat{F}_{\Phi}\left( \bigcirc - \bigcirc \right) = \hat{F}_{\Phi}\left( \bigcirc - (-1)^{\sigma} \bigcirc \right)$$

*Proof.* Given that we know  $\hat{F}_{\Phi}$  respects the first relation from (3.1), it suffices to prove the equality obtained by adjoining a crossing to the top of each of the four diagrams. Using the aforementioned relation, the first relation from (3.4), and (3.9), our goal reduces to showing that

$$\hat{F}_{\Phi}\left( \bigcirc - | \\ \bigcirc \\ - | \\ \end{vmatrix} \right) = \hat{F}_{\Phi}\left( \bigcirc \\ - \\ (-1)^{\sigma} \bigcirc \\ \bigcirc \\ - \\ (-1)^{\sigma} \bigcirc \\ \bigcirc \\ - \\ \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let W be a left g-supermodule,  $u, v \in V$ , and  $w \in W$ . We compute:

$$\begin{split} \hat{F}_{\Phi} \left( \bigvee_{W} \right)_{W} & (u \otimes v \otimes w) \\ &= \nu (-1)^{\bar{u}\bar{v}} \hat{F}_{\Phi} \left( \bigvee_{W} \right)_{W} (v \otimes u \otimes w) \\ \begin{pmatrix} 3.16 \\ = \end{pmatrix} (-1)^{\bar{u}\bar{v}} \hat{F}_{\Phi} \left( \bigvee_{W} \right)_{W} \left( Cv \otimes u \otimes w + 2\sum_{X \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}} (-1)^{\bar{X}\bar{v}} Xv \otimes X^{\vee} u \otimes w \\ &+ 2\sum_{X \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}} (-1)^{\bar{X}\bar{v} + \bar{X}\bar{u}} Xv \otimes u \otimes X^{\vee} w \right) \\ &= \nu (-1)^{\bar{u}\bar{v}} \left( (-1)^{\bar{v}\bar{u}} u \otimes Cv \otimes w + 2\sum_{X \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}} (-1)^{\bar{X}\bar{v} + (\bar{X} + \bar{v})(\bar{X} + \bar{u})} X^{\vee} u \otimes Xv \otimes w \\ &+ 2\sum_{X \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}} (-1)^{\bar{X}\bar{v} + \bar{u}\bar{v}} u \otimes Xv \otimes X^{\vee} w \right) \\ &= \nu \left( u \otimes Cv \otimes w + 2\sum_{X \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}} (-1)^{\bar{X} + \bar{X}\bar{u}} X^{\vee} u \otimes Xv \otimes w + 2\sum_{X \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}} (-1)^{\bar{X}\bar{v}} u \otimes Xv \otimes X^{\vee} w \right) \end{split}$$

$$\stackrel{(2.4)}{=} \nu \left( u \otimes Cv \otimes w + 2 \sum_{X \in B_{\mathfrak{g}}} (-1)^{\bar{X}\bar{u}} Xu \otimes X^{\vee} v \otimes w + 2 \sum_{X \in B_{\mathfrak{g}}} (-1)^{\bar{X}\bar{v}} u \otimes Xv \otimes X^{\vee} w \right)$$
$$= \nu (1 \otimes C \otimes 1 + 2\Omega^{12} + 2\Omega^{23}) (u \otimes v \otimes w).$$

Hence, using (3.17), we find that  $\hat{F}_{\Phi} \left( \bigcirc - | \circ \right) = 2\nu \Omega^{12}$ . Next, we have

$$\hat{F}_{\Phi}\left(\bigcup_{W}\left(u\otimes v\otimes w\right)=\sum_{b\in B_{A}}\sum_{x\in B_{V}}\left(-1\right)^{\bar{b}\bar{u}+\bar{b}\bar{v}+\sigma\bar{x}+\sigma\bar{b}}\Phi(u,vb^{\vee})x\otimes x^{\vee}b\otimes w$$
$$\stackrel{(2.4)}{=}\sum_{b\in B_{A}}\sum_{x\in B_{V}}\left(-1\right)^{\sigma\bar{x}}\Phi(u,vb)x\otimes x^{\vee}b^{\vee}\otimes w,$$

where in the last equality we switch to the dual basis of  $B_A$  and use the fact that the summands are zero unless  $\sigma = \bar{u} + \bar{v} + \bar{b}$  to simplify the sign. With this in mind, we compute:

$$\begin{split} \hat{F}_{\Phi} \left( \bigotimes_{W} - \left| \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \end{array} \right| \right)_{W} & (u \otimes v \otimes w) \\ &= 2\nu \Omega^{12} (u \otimes v \otimes w) \\ \begin{pmatrix} 3.19 \\ = \end{array} \nu \left( \sum_{X \in B_{\text{End}}} (X \otimes X^{\vee} - X^{\dagger} \otimes X^{\vee}) u \otimes v \right) \otimes w \\ & \begin{pmatrix} 3.20 \\ = \end{array} \nu \left( (-1)^{\bar{u}\bar{v}} v \otimes u \sum_{b \in B_{A}} b \otimes b^{\vee} - \nu \sum_{b \in B_{A}} \sum_{x \in B_{V}} (-1)^{\bar{x}\sigma + \sigma} \Phi(u, vb) x \otimes x^{\vee} b^{\vee} \right) \otimes w \\ &= \hat{F}_{\Phi} \left( \bigotimes_{W} (u \otimes v \otimes w) - (-1)^{\sigma} \hat{F}_{\Phi} \left( \bigcup_{W} \right)_{W} (u \otimes v \otimes w), \end{split}$$

proving the desired equality. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.10.

### 4. Basis Conjecture

In this final section, we state a conjecture for the bases of hom-spaces in  $\mathcal{AB}^{\sigma}(A, -^{\star})$  and discuss a potential proof strategy.

**Definition 4.1.** For  $r, s \in \mathbb{N}$ , an (r, s)-Brauer diagram is a string diagram representing a morphism in  $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{AB}^{\sigma}(A, -\star)}(\mathsf{I}^{\otimes r}, \mathsf{I}^{\otimes s})$  with no tokens or dots on any strand. Each (r, s)-Brauer diagram induces a perfect matching of  $\{1, \ldots, r + s\}$  by pairing the endpoints of each non-loop strand, numbered from left-to-right and bottom-to-top. For instance, the (4, 6)-Brauer diagram



yields the matching  $\{\{1, 8\}, \{2, 6\}, \{3, 4\}, \{5, 7\}, \{9, 10\}\}$ . We define an equivalence relation on the set of (r, s)-Brauer diagrams by asserting that two diagrams are equivalent precisely when they induce the same matching of  $\{1, \ldots, r+s\}$  and they contain the same number of closed loops. For  $r, s \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\mathbb{D}(r, s)$  be a complete set of representative diagrams for this equivalence relation. We choose representatives such that all closed loops are in the shape of a circle, they appear strictly between the top and bottom endpoints of the diagram, their rightmost points all lie on the same horizontal line, and they are entirely separated from other strands, i.e. not intersecting with other strands or nested within other closed loops. For instance, the diagram drawn above could not be an element of  $\mathbb{D}(4, 6)$  since its closed loop intersects another strand and lies partially below the bottom row of endpoints, but it is equivalent to the diagram



which could be chosen as an element of  $\mathbb{D}(4, 6)$ .

For all  $r, s \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\mathbb{D}^{\bullet\circ}(r, s)$  be the set of all morphisms in  $\mathcal{AB}^{\sigma}(A, -^{\star})$  obtained by adding one token and a nonnegative number of dots to each strand of an element from  $\mathbb{D}(r, s)$ , subject to the following conventions:

- Each token is labelled with an element of the basis  $B_A$ ;
- If both ends of a strand are on the top of the diagram, its token and dots appear near the left endpoint of the strand, above all crossings, cups, and caps in the diagram;
- If both ends of a strand are on the bottom of the diagram, its token and dots appear near the right endpoint of the strand, below all crossings, cups, and caps;
- If a strand has ends at both the top and bottom of the diagram, its token and dots appear near the bottom endpoint the strand, below all crossings, cups, and caps;
- All tokens near top endpoints are at the same height, and all tokens near bottom endpoints are at the same height;
- Tokens on closed strands appear on the rightmost point of the circle;
- All dots appear just above the token on its strand.

For instance, the elements of  $\mathbb{D}^{\bullet\circ}(4,6)$  corresponding to the sample element of  $\mathbb{D}(4,6)$  noted above are of the following form:



where the  $b_i$  are elements of  $B_A$ , the  $d_i$  are nonnegative integers, and  $d_i \, \diamond := (\diamond)^{d_i}$ .

**Conjecture 4.2.** For all  $r, s \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\mathbb{D}^{\bullet\circ}(r, s)$  is a k-basis for  $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{AB}^{\sigma}(A, -^{\star})}(\mathsf{I}^{\otimes r}, \mathsf{I}^{\otimes s})$ .

When  $A = \Bbbk$ , Conjecture 4.2 essentially recovers the basis result for the affine Brauer category  $\mathcal{AB}$  proved by Rui and Song in [RS19, Thm. B], though their conventions for the positions of dots and locations of closed strands are slightly different than those stated above.

We conclude the paper by outlining a potential method to prove Conjecture 4.2. It is straightforward to show that  $\mathbb{D}^{\bullet\circ}(r,s)$  spans  $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{AB}^{\sigma}(A,-^{\star})}(\mathsf{I}^{\otimes r},\mathsf{I}^{\otimes s})$ , so it suffices to show linear independence. The key idea is to embed  $\mathcal{AB}^{\sigma}(A,-^{\star})$  into the additive envelope of a localized version of the oriented Frobenius Brauer category  $\mathcal{AOB}(A)$  mentioned in the introduction, and use the basis result for  $\mathcal{AOB}(A)$  (namely the k = 0 case of [BSW21b, Thm. 7.2]) to show that the image of  $\mathbb{D}^{\bullet\circ}(r,s)$ is linearly independent. A similar method was used to prove [SSS24, Thm. 9.6], which gives homspace bases for the non-affine categories  $\mathcal{B}^{\sigma}(A, -^{\star})$ , and [BWW23, Thm. 5.1], which does the same for the nil-Brauer category  $\mathcal{NB}_t$ . In turn, these proofs employ arguments similar to those used to prove [BSW21b, Thm. 5.12] and [BSW21a, Thm. 5.4], respectively; these latter two theorems establish the existence of functors from a Heisenberg category into the additive envelope of a localized symmetric product of two Heisenberg categories.

The author of the current paper has begun investigating the  $A = \Bbbk$  case of this proof technique; the basis theorem is already known in this case, but the proof of [RS19, Thm. B] does not seem like it can be easily generalized to other choices of A. The following definitions are for the case  $A = \Bbbk$ . We assume the reader is already familiar with the definition of  $\mathcal{AOB}$ , which can be found in [RS19, Def. 1.2], or presented slightly differently in [MS23, Def. 4.3] (with  $A = \Bbbk$ ).

**Definition 4.3.** We define the following morphisms in  $\mathcal{AOB}$ :

$$(4.1) \qquad \widehat{\uparrow} = \widehat{\uparrow} + \widehat{\uparrow}, \quad \oint = \widehat{\downarrow} + \widehat{\downarrow}, \quad \widehat{\uparrow} = \widehat{\downarrow} + \widehat{\downarrow}, \quad \widehat{\uparrow} = \widehat{\downarrow} + \widehat{\downarrow}, \quad \widehat{\downarrow} = \widehat{\uparrow} + \widehat{\downarrow}, \quad \oint = \widehat{\downarrow} + \widehat{\downarrow} + \widehat{\downarrow},$$

Let  $\mathcal{L}$  denote the category obtained from  $\mathcal{AOB}$  by localizing at  $\widehat{\uparrow} - \widehat{\uparrow}$ ,  $\widehat{\downarrow} - \widehat{\uparrow}$ ,  $\widehat{\uparrow} - \widehat{\downarrow}$ , and  $\widehat{\downarrow} - \widehat{\downarrow}$ . That is, we adjoin two-sided inverses for these morphisms, which we denote  $\widehat{\uparrow} - \widehat{\uparrow}$ ,  $\widehat{\downarrow} - \widehat{\uparrow}$ ,  $\widehat{\uparrow} - \widehat{\downarrow}$ , and  $\widehat{\downarrow} - \widehat{\downarrow}$ , respectively. These morphisms are called *affine teleporters*. This definition immediately implies e.g.  $\widehat{\diamondsuit} = \widehat{\uparrow} - \widehat{\frown} \widehat{\diamondsuit}$ .

We define the also following morphisms in  $\mathcal{L}$ :

$$\hat{\mathbf{f}} = 2 \quad \text{if } , \qquad \mathbf{f} = \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{f} \, .$$

These are the two-sided inverses of  $\oint$  and  $\oint$ , respectively.

**Definition 4.4.** We define the following *internal bubble* morphisms in  $\mathcal{L}$ :

$$(4.2) \quad \textcircled{\bullet} = \uparrow + \clubsuit \bigcirc -\frac{1}{2} \stackrel{\textcircled{\bullet}}{-\frac{1}{2}} \stackrel{\phantom{\bullet}}{-\frac{1}{2}} \stackrel{\phantom{\bullet}}{-\frac{1}{$$

Using the relations from Definition 4.3, one can show that the two orientations of internal bubbles are mutual inverses. Our conjectured functor  $G: \mathcal{AB} \to \mathrm{Add}(\mathcal{L})$  is defined as follows: the generating object I of  $\mathcal{AB}$  gets sent to  $\uparrow \oplus \downarrow$ , and the generating morphisms are mapped via



The author has confirmed that G preserves almost all of the defining relations for  $\mathcal{AB}$ ; the only

one remaining is the braid relation, = . Briefly, the definition of G was obtained

by first assuming that, in analogy to the definition of the functor from [BWW23, Thm. 4.2], G maps the dot, cap, and cup as noted above, where the internal bubbles are two initially-unknown endomorphisms of  $\uparrow$ . Calculations in a cyclotomic quotient of  $\mathcal{AOB}$  associated to the minimal polynomials of the actions of  $\oint$  and  $\oint$  then allow one to deduce candidates for the definitions of the internal bubbles and the action of  $\tilde{G}$  on the crossing, as given above.

### References

- [Abr97] Lowell Edward Abrams. Frobenius algebra structures in topological quantum field theory and quantum cohomology. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 1997. Thesis (Ph.D.)-The Johns Hopkins University. URL: http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?url\_ver=Z39.88-2004&rft\_val\_fmt=info: ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:dissertation&res\_dat=xri:pqdiss&rft\_dat=xri:pqdiss:9730655.
- [BCNR17] Jonathan Brundan, Jonathan Comes, David Nash, and Andrew Reynolds. A basis theorem for the affine oriented Brauer category and its cyclotomic quotients. *Quantum Topol.*, 8(1):75–112, 2017. doi: 10.4171/QT/87.
- [BDEA<sup>+</sup>19] M. Balagovic, Z. Daugherty, I. Entova-Aizenbud, I. Halacheva, J. Hennig, M. S. Im, G. Letzter, E. Norton, V. Serganova, and C. Stroppel. Translation functors and decomposition numbers for the periplectic Lie superalgebra p(n). Math. Res. Lett., 26(3):643–710, 2019. doi:10.4310/MRL.2019.v26.n3.a2.
- [BE17] Jonathan Brundan and Alexander P. Ellis. Monoidal supercategories. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 351(3):1045–1089, 2017. doi:10.1007/s00220-017-2850-9.
- [Bra37] Richard Brauer. On algebras which are connected with the semisimple continuous groups. Ann. of Math. (2), 38(4):857–872, 1937. doi:10.2307/1968843.
- [BSW21a] Jonathan Brundan, Alistair Savage, and Ben Webster. The degenerate Heisenberg category and its Grothendieck ring, 2021. arXiv:1812.03255.
- [BSW21b] Jonathan Brundan, Alistair Savage, and Ben Webster. Foundations of Frobenius Heisenberg categories. J. Algebra, 578:115–185, 2021. doi:10.1016/j.jalgebra.2021.02.025.
- [BSW22] Jonathan Brundan, Alistair Savage, and Ben Webster. Quantum Frobenius Heisenberg categorification. J. Pure Appl. Algebra, 226(1):Paper No. 106792, 50, 2022. doi:10.1016/j.jpaa.2021.106792.
- [BW89] Joan S. Birman and Hans Wenzl. Braids, link polynomials and a new algebra. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 313(1):249–273, 1989. doi:10.2307/2001074.
- [BWW23] Jonathan Brundan, Weiqiang Wang, and Ben Webster. The nil-Brauer category. Ann. Rep. Theory, 1(1):21-58, 2023. doi:10.5802/art.2.
- [GRS22] Mengmeng Gao, Hebing Rui, and Linliang Song. A basis theorem for the affine Kauffman category and its cyclotomic quotients. J. Algebra, 608:774–846, 2022. doi:10.1016/j.jalgebra.2022.07.005.
- [LZ15] Gus I. Lehrer and Ruibin B. Zhang. The Brauer category and invariant theory. J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS), 17(9):2311–2351, 2015. doi:10.4171/JEMS/558.

- [McS] Alexandra McSween. Affine oriented Frobenius Brauer categories and general linear Lie superalgebras. Master's thesis. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.20381/ruor-26564.
- [MS23] Alexandra McSween and Alistair Savage. Affine oriented Frobenius Brauer categories. Comm. Algebra, 51(2):742-756, 2023. doi:10.1080/00927872.2022.2113401.
- [Mur87] Jun Murakami. The Kauffman polynomial of links and representation theory. Osaka J. Math., 24(4):745–758, 1987. URL: http://projecteuclid.org/euclid.ojm/1200780357.
- [OR07] Rosa Orellana and Arun Ram. Affine braids, Markov traces and the category O. In Algebraic groups and homogeneous spaces, volume 19 of Tata Inst. Fund. Res. Stud. Math., pages 423–473. Tata Inst. Fund. Res., Mumbai, 2007. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0401317.
- [RS19] Hebing Rui and Linliang Song. Affine Brauer category and parabolic category  $\mathcal{O}$  in types B, C, D. Math. Z., 293(1-2):503–550, 2019. doi:10.1007/s00209-018-2207-x.
- [Sav19] Alistair Savage. Frobenius Heisenberg categorification. *Algebr. Comb.*, 2(5):937–967, 2019. doi:10.5802/alco.73.
- [SS22] Saima Samchuck-Schnarch. Frobenius Brauer categories. Master's thesis, 2022. doi:10.20381/ruor-28137.
- [SSS24] Saima Samchuck-Schnarch and Alistair Savage. Diagrammatics for real supergroups. Ann. Rep. Theory, 2024. To appear. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.01414.
- [Vaz] Monica Vazirani. Representations of the affine BMW category. URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch? v=Hpq3d8Jxag0.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA, OTTAWA, ON K1N 6N5, CANADA *Email address*: ssamc090@uottawa.ca