

INDUCTIVE SYSTEMS OF THE SYMMETRIC GROUP, POLYNOMIAL FUNCTORS AND TENSOR CATEGORIES

KEVIN COULEMBIER

ABSTRACT. We initiate the systematic study of modular representations of symmetric groups that arise via the braiding in (symmetric) tensor categories over fields of positive characteristic. We determine what representations appear for certain examples of tensor categories, develop general principles and demonstrate how this question connects with the ongoing study of the structure theory of tensor categories. We also formalise a theory of polynomial functors as functors which act coherently on all tensor categories. We conclude that the classification of such functors is a different way of posing the above question of which representation of symmetric groups appear. Finally, we extend the classical notion of strict polynomial functors from the category of (super) vector spaces to arbitrary tensor categories, and show that this idea is also a different packaging of the same information.

INTRODUCTION

The structure theory of tensor categories has been an active topic in the last decade. We use the term tensor category over a field \mathbf{k} in the sense of [De1, EGNO], for a *symmetric* rigid monoidal \mathbf{k} -linear abelian category with some finiteness assumptions.

Over fields of characteristic zero, classical results of Deligne [De1, De2] show that tensor categories ‘of moderate growth’ must be representation categories of groups or supergroups. Without the moderate growth assumption, see for instance [HS, HSS], or over fields of positive characteristic, see for instance [BE, BEO, Co2, Co3, CEO1, CEO2, CF, EO2, Os], exploring the structure theory remains ongoing.

To motivate the work in the current paper we give some background on the state of the art regarding tensor categories of moderate growth over fields of positive characteristic. The principle of tannakian reconstruction of [De1] reduces the structure theory problem to the classification of ‘incompressible’ tensor categories, see [CEO2, Theorem 5.2.1]. By [De1, De2] the only incompressible categories of moderate growth in characteristic zero are thus the categories of vector spaces \mathbf{Vec} and supervector spaces $s\mathbf{Vec}$. In contrast, for characteristic $p > 0$, in [BE, BEO, Co3], a chain of incompressible categories of moderate growth

$$\mathbf{Vec} \subset s\mathbf{Vec} \subset \mathbf{Ver}_p \subset \mathbf{Ver}_{p^2} \subset \mathbf{Ver}_{p^3} \subset \dots$$

was constructed. In [BEO] it was conjectured that every tensor category of moderate growth admits a tensor functor to $\mathbf{Ver}_{p^\infty} = \cup_n \mathbf{Ver}_{p^n}$; or equivalently that all incompressible categories of moderate growth are subcategories of \mathbf{Ver}_{p^∞} . Working towards this conjecture, in [CEO1] it was proved that a tensor category of moderate growth admits a tensor functor to \mathbf{Ver}_p if and only if it is ‘Frobenius exact’, meaning the Frobenius functor

$$\mathrm{Fr} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathbf{Ver}_p \tag{0.1}$$

is exact. The functor Fr is defined in [Os, EO2, Co2] as follows. One sends $X \in \mathcal{C}$ to $X^{\otimes p}$, which can be interpreted as an S_p -representation internal to \mathcal{C} via the braiding, and subsequently one manipulates $X^{\otimes p}$ via a non-exact symmetric monoidal functor $\mathrm{Rep}S_p \rightarrow \mathbf{Ver}_p$. These results lead to three (interrelated) questions:

Key words and phrases. modular representations of the symmetric group, completely splittable modules, tensor categories, polynomial functors, Schur algebras.

(Q1) By Takeuchi’s theorem, for a tensor category \mathcal{C} there exists a faithful exact (non-monoidal) functor $\omega : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Vec}$, so that $\omega(X^{\otimes d})$ is an ordinary S_d -representation over \mathbf{k} . Attempts at constructing ‘higher’ versions of Fr in [CF], relating to \mathbf{Ver}_{p^n} rather than \mathbf{Ver}_p , lead to the question of which S_d -representations can occur in this way for $d = p^n$. A concrete example of such questions for $d = p$ already appeared in [CEO1, Question 7.3].

(Q2) The functor Fr in (0.1) ‘commutes with tensor functors’. By taking direct summands of Fr, one obtains functors $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ that commute with tensor functors. More familiar examples are the (skew) symmetric powers Sym^d and \wedge^d , and all of the above functors are subquotients of the functor $X \mapsto X^{\otimes d}$. In characteristic zero, such functors simply produce (direct sums of) Schur functors \mathbf{S}_λ , see [De2]. In positive characteristic, many interesting questions, such as their ‘classification’, are open. We will start by developing a rigorous theory and definition of such functors, and prove that the classification question is just a reformulation of (Q1).

(Q3) A logical term for the functors in (Q2) would be ‘polynomial’ functors. Classical strict polynomial functors were introduced in [FS], as a tool for proving finite generation of the cohomology ring of finite group schemes. In the description of [Kr], the category of strict polynomial functors of degree d is the category of \mathbf{k} -linear functors

$$\mathrm{Fun}_{\mathbf{k}}(\Gamma^d \mathbf{Vec}_{\mathbf{k}}, \mathbf{Vec}_{\mathbf{k}}) \simeq \mathrm{Rep}_{\mathbf{k}}^d GL_V, \quad (0.2)$$

where the equivalence is [FS, Theorem 3.2] for a vector space V of dimension at least d and $\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathbf{k}}^d GL_V$ is the category of polynomial representations of degree d . Here $\Gamma^d \mathbf{Vec}_{\mathbf{k}}$ is the category with as objects vector spaces, but with morphism spaces

$$\Gamma^d \mathbf{Vec}_{\mathbf{k}}(U, V) := \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{k}S_d}(U^{\otimes d}, V^{\otimes d}),$$

so that linear functors out of $\Gamma^d \mathbf{Vec}$ indeed correspond to ‘polynomial of degree d ’ functors out of \mathbf{Vec} . In [Ax], a ‘super’ version of polynomial functors was introduced, and this was used in [Dr] to prove cohomological finite-generation for finite supergroup schemes. One can follow this template for \mathbf{Vec} and \mathbf{sVec} and define a category of strict polynomial functors based on every (incompressible) tensor category, and search for equivalences as in (0.2). In the long term, one would hope to use this towards proving [EO1, Conjecture 2.18] regarding cohomological finite-generation for finite tensor categories. In the current paper we only show that this study is also equivalent to (Q1) and (Q2).

Prelude: Schur-Weyl duality. The double centraliser property between the symmetric group S_d and the general linear group GL_V of a complex vector space V , say with $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} V \geq d$, acting on $V^{\otimes d}$, leads to an equivalence of \mathbb{C} -linear categories

$$\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathbb{C}} S_d \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Rep}_{\mathbb{C}}^d GL_V, \quad M \mapsto V^{\otimes d} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}S_d} M. \quad (0.3)$$

Since $\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathbb{C}} S_d$, as a \mathbb{C} -linear category, is a finite direct sum of $\mathbf{Vec}_{\mathbb{C}}$, it is equivalent to the category of \mathbb{C} -linear functors from $\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathbb{C}} S_d$ to $\mathbf{Vec}_{\mathbb{C}}$. The resulting equivalence

$$\mathrm{Fun}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathbb{C}} S_d, \mathbf{Vec}_{\mathbb{C}}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Rep}_{\mathbb{C}} GL_V, \quad F \mapsto F(V^{\otimes d}) = \bigoplus_{\lambda \vdash d} F(S^\lambda) \otimes \mathbf{S}_\lambda(V) \quad (0.4)$$

is less common, but perhaps more natural as we explain below. Firstly, note that S^λ denotes the (simple) Specht module of S_d , so that, as a bimodule,

$$V^{\otimes d} \simeq \bigoplus_{\lambda \vdash d} S^\lambda \boxtimes \mathbf{S}_\lambda(V).$$

While equivalence (0.3) does not extend to positive characteristic, its incarnation (0.4) can be extended very neatly. Denote by $\mathbf{Young}^d \subset \mathrm{Rep}_{\mathbf{k}} S_d$ the full subcategory of direct sums of Young modules. Then over any field \mathbf{k} we do get an equivalence

$$\mathrm{Fun}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{Young}^d, \mathbf{Vec}_{\mathbf{k}}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Rep}_{\mathbf{k}}^d GL_V, \quad F \mapsto F(V^{\otimes d}). \quad (0.5)$$

We can observe that \mathbf{k} -linear functors out of \mathbf{Young}^d are just modules over the Schur algebra $S(n, d)$, for $n \geq d$, which yields the more standard interpretations of (0.5).

One can also quickly verify that \mathbf{Young}^d is equivalent to the category $\Gamma^d \mathbf{Vec}$, so that (0.5) can also be interpreted as (0.2). Moreover, while we used Schur functors to make (0.4) precise, the assignment $V \mapsto F(V^{\otimes d})$ for some functor F from \mathbf{Young}^d to \mathbf{Vec} , as appears in (0.5), paves the way for more general definitions of polynomial functors in the sense of (Q2). Finally, \mathbf{Young}^d is clearly the category of S_d -representations that arise via the braid action from the tensor category \mathbf{Vec} as in (Q1). It thus follows that (0.5) gives an ansatz for connecting (Q1), (Q2) and (Q3).

To explain our results, we henceforth fix an algebraically closed field \mathbf{k} of prime characteristic p and only consider tensor categories \mathcal{C} over \mathbf{k} .

Representations appearing in tensor categories (Q1). We introduce the notion of an ‘inductive system’, which is an assignment \mathbf{A} of a pseudo-abelian subcategory $\mathbf{A}^d \subset \mathbf{Rep}_{\mathbf{k}} S_d$ for each d , with strong compatibility conditions under $\mathbf{Res}_{S_{d-1}}^{S_d}$. For $\text{char}(\mathbf{k}) > 0$, *semisimple* inductive systems were classified by Kleshchev in [Kl1].

We show that for a tensor category \mathcal{C} and $X \in \mathcal{C}$, the representations $\omega(X^{\otimes d})$ from above define an inductive system $\mathbf{B}_X[\mathcal{C}]$, which is invariant under tensor functors. We show in Theorem 4.1.1 that the $\mathbf{B}_L[\mathbf{Ver}_p]$, for L running over simple objects in \mathbf{Ver}_p , give precisely the semisimple inductive systems from [Kl1].

For a tensor category \mathcal{C} , we get an inductive system $\mathbf{B}[\mathcal{C}] = \sum_X \mathbf{B}_X[\mathcal{C}]$, which is closed under the induction product, ordinary tensor products, taking duals, and contains the trivial representations, see Theorem 3.1.3. The minimal such ‘closed’ system is the inductive system

$$\mathbf{Young} = \mathbf{B}[\mathbf{Vec}]$$

of Young modules. Similarly, \mathbf{sVec} yields the signed Young modules as studied in [Do] and $\mathbf{B}[\mathbf{Ver}_p]$ is a new closed inductive system. These results lead to interesting observations regarding modular representation theory of S_d . An explicit consequence is Corollary 4.1.4 stating that every ‘completely splittable’ representation, see [Kl1], is ‘algebraic’. We also obtain in Proposition 5.4.5, for $p = 2$, strict inclusions

$$\mathbf{B}[\mathbf{Vec}] \subset \mathbf{B}[\mathbf{Ver}_4^+] \subset \mathbf{B}[\mathbf{Ver}_4] \subset \mathbf{B}[\mathbf{Ver}_8^+],$$

which lead to intriguing questions whether the chain continues to be strictly ascending, and whether the union is the inductive system of all representations.

Annihilator ideals of objects in tensor categories. The shadow in $K_0(\mathbf{Rep} S_n)$ of an inductive system yields an inductive system in the sense of Zalissskii [Za]. That notion was used by Baranov and Kleshchev in [BK] to classify the maximal ideals in $\mathbf{k}S_\infty$ when $p > 2$. We reformulate their result in terms of tensor categories. To every object in a tensor category (more generally, to any inductive system) we can assign an ideal in $\mathbf{k}S_\infty$. For $X \in \mathcal{C}$ it is given by the kernel $\text{Ann}(X)$ of the braid morphism ‘ $\mathbf{k}S_\infty \rightarrow \text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(X^{\otimes \infty})$ ’.

The maximal ideals in $\mathbf{k}S_\infty$ for $p > 2$ are then precisely $\text{Ann}(L)$, for L varying over the simple objects in \mathbf{Ver}_p . As a consequence of this realisation, we obtain a very simple description of these maximal ideals, which appears to be new; they are all generated by one symmetriser and/or one skew symmetriser. For $p = 2$ the classification of maximal ideals is not yet complete, but we show that the two known maximal ideals are given precisely by $\text{Ann}(L)$, for L varying over the simple objects in \mathbf{Ver}_4 (but, we can no longer take $\mathbf{Ver}_2 = \mathbf{Vec}$). These results are proved in Proposition 6.2.2 and Lemma 6.2.5.

Strict polynomial functors (Q3). For every tensor category \mathcal{C} , we propose in §7.1 a notion of a category $\mathbf{SPol}_0^d \mathcal{C}$ of strict polynomial functors, generalising the known cases \mathcal{C}

equal to Vec or sVec . Extending (0.2) we prove that, for an object $X \in \mathcal{C}$, we have

$$\text{SPol}_0^d \mathcal{C} \simeq \text{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}} GL_X$$

if and only if $\mathbf{B}^d[\mathcal{C}] = \mathbf{B}_X^d[\mathcal{C}]$. Here GL_X is the general linear affine group scheme internal to \mathcal{C} associated to X . In more detail, in Theorem 9.1.1 we actually prove equivalences

$$\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \text{mod}(\mathbf{B}^d[\mathcal{C}]) \simeq \text{SPol}_0^d \mathcal{C} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{C} \boxtimes \text{mod}(\mathbf{B}_X^d[\mathcal{C}]) \simeq \text{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}^d GL_X,$$

where we write $\text{mod}(-)$ for an abelian subcategory of $\text{Fun}(-, \text{Vec})$ of functors satisfying a minor finiteness property. In particular, the first equivalence demonstrates why (Q1) and (Q3) are simply different packagings of the same content.

Returning to Schur-Weyl duality, we prove in Proposition 9.5.3 that for a tensor category \mathcal{C} and $X \in \mathcal{C}$, the braiding morphism

$$\mathbf{k}S_d \rightarrow \text{End}_{GL_X}(X^{\otimes d})$$

is an isomorphism if and only if it is injective if and only if $\mathbf{k}S_d \in \mathbf{B}_X^d[\mathcal{C}]$.

Universal polynomial functors (Q2). In §7.2 we define a universal functor to be the assignment of an endofunctor to each tensor category (over a fixed field) which ‘commutes with tensor functors’. The category $\text{Pol}_{\mathbf{k}}^d$ of universal polynomial functors of degree d is then the topologising subcategory of the category of universal functors generated by the universal functor ‘ $X \mapsto X^{\otimes d}$ ’. We prove an equivalence

$$\text{Pol}_{\mathbf{k}}^d \simeq \text{mod}(\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{k}}^d),$$

where $\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{k}}^d$ is the sum of $\mathbf{B}^d[\mathcal{C}]$, for \mathcal{C} running over all tensor categories over \mathbf{k} . As hoped, the two notions of polynomial functors are thus intimately related. For example

$$\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \text{Pol}_{\mathbf{k}}^d \simeq \text{SPol}_0^d \mathcal{C},$$

if $\mathbf{B}^d[\mathcal{C}] = \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{k}}^d$, and generally $\text{SPol}_0^d \mathcal{C}$ is a Serre quotient of $\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \text{Pol}_{\mathbf{k}}^d$. Note that [BEO, Conjecture 1.4] predicts that, at least if we focus solely on tensor categories of moderate growth,

$$\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{k}}^d = \mathbf{B}^d[\text{Ver}_{p^\infty}], \quad \text{so} \quad \text{Pol}_{\mathbf{k}}^d \simeq \text{mod}(\mathbf{B}^d[\text{Ver}_p^\infty]).$$

Our results also prove some plausible statements that were lacking proof before, for instance that $\text{Fr}_+ X$ and $\wedge^2 X$ are always simple GL_X representations, see Example 9.3.1(2).

Outlook and speculation. Above we already mentioned several questions that arise from the current work and potential applications. More questions are presented throughout the text. Here we comment on potential applications to the structure theory of tensor categories.

For this purpose, it is convenient to consider a finite tensor category \mathcal{C} . Then another interesting inductive system, besides $\mathbf{B}[\mathcal{C}]$, is $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{P}_r}[\mathcal{C}]$, which is similarly defined but only considering the projective objects in \mathcal{C} . This system is closed except that it need not contain trivial representations. In fact, we prove that \mathcal{C} is Frobenius exact if and only if $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{P}_r}^p[\mathcal{C}]$ contains trivial representations if and only if $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{P}_r}[\mathcal{C}]$ is closed. By [EO2] or [CEO1], $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{P}_r}^p[\mathcal{C}]$ thus determines whether \mathcal{C} admits a tensor functor to Ver_p . Based on recent progress in [CF], it seems plausible that similarly $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{P}_r}^{p^2}[\mathcal{C}]$ could determine whether \mathcal{C} admits a tensor functor to Ver_{p^2} etc. On the other hand, [BEO, Conjecture 1.4] predicts that $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{P}_r}[\mathcal{C}]$ can only contain ‘very specific’ representations. Should the conjecture be false this opens avenues for proving so.

Structure. In Section 1 we recall some necessary background. The rest of the paper is divided into two parts. Part 1 is concerned with the notion of inductive systems and their appearance from tensor categories, while Part 2 is devoted to both notions of polynomial functors and all above equivalences.

1. PRELIMINARIES

1.1. Conventions and notation. Throughout, \mathbf{k} will denote an algebraically closed field. We set $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$.

In Part 2, we will ignore certain set-theoretic issues, which could for instance be resolved by only considering tensor categories that are controlled in size by some cardinality, see [CEO2, Lemma 2.2.8].

1.1.1. Sets of homomorphisms in a category \mathcal{A} will be denoted by $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(-, -)$, although for simplicity we will sometimes simply write $\mathrm{Hom}(A, B)$ when clear that $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$. We will also abbreviate $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{Vec}_{\mathbf{k}}}$ to $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathbf{k}}G}$ to Hom_G .

We identify the symmetric group S_n , for $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, with the permutation group of the set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. This gives a canonical embedding $S_n \subset S_{n+1}$. More generally, for a composition $\lambda \vDash n$, we consider the Young subgroup $S_\lambda < S_n$. We follow the standard convention of denoting the simple S_n -modules in characteristic $p > 0$ by D^λ , for λ varying over p -regular partitions.

For an essentially small abelian category, we denote by $\mathrm{Irr}\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathrm{Idc}\mathcal{A}$ the sets of isomorphism classes of simple and indecomposable objects. Typically, for $i \in \mathrm{Irr}\mathcal{A}$, we will denote a representative by $L_i \in \mathcal{A}$.

1.1.2. A category \mathcal{A} is **pseudo-abelian** if it is additive and idempotent complete. A pseudo-abelian subcategory of \mathcal{A} is a full subcategory \mathcal{B} closed under taking direct sums and summands.

For two pseudo-abelian subcategories \mathcal{B}_1 and \mathcal{B}_2 of \mathcal{A} , we denote by $\mathcal{B}_1 + \mathcal{B}_2$ the pseudo-abelian subcategory of direct summands of direct sums of objects $M_1 \oplus M_2$, with $M_i \in \mathcal{B}_i$. We will mostly deal with Krull-Schmidt categories, where we can leave out ‘direct summands of’ in the previous sentence. Similarly, for a family $\{\mathcal{B}_\alpha \subset \mathcal{A}\}$ of pseudo-abelian subcategories, we write $\sum_\alpha \mathcal{B}_\alpha$ for the pseudo-abelian subcategory of \mathcal{A} generated by (finite) direct sums of objects in the \mathcal{A}_α .

1.2. Tensor categories.

1.2.1. An essentially small \mathbf{k} -linear symmetric category $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, \mathbb{1})$ is a **tensor category over \mathbf{k}** if

- (1) \mathcal{C} is abelian with objects of finite length;
- (2) $\mathbf{k} \rightarrow \mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbb{1})$ is an isomorphism;
- (3) $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, \mathbb{1})$ is rigid, meaning that every object X has a monoidal dual X^\vee .

Such categories are also sometimes called symmetric tensor categories or pretannakian categories. Note that $\mathbb{1}$ is a simple object, see [EGNO, Theorem 4.3.8]. It then follows easily from the assumptions (1)-(3) that morphisms spaces in a tensor category are finite-dimensional.

The standard example of a tensor category is the category of finite dimensional (rational) representations $\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathbf{k}}G$ of an abstract group G or an affine group scheme G over \mathbf{k} .

A tensor functor between tensor categories is a \mathbf{k} -linear symmetric monoidal exact functor. A tensor functor $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is **surjective** if every object in \mathcal{D} is a subquotient of an object in the essential image of F . A **tensor subcategory** of a tensor category is a topologising rigid monoidal subcategory.

1.2.2. For a tensor category \mathcal{C} with objects X_1, \dots, X_n , any $\sigma \in S_n$ gives an isomorphism (natural in X_1, \dots, X_n)

$$\sigma_{X_1, \dots, X_n} : X_1 \otimes X_2 \otimes \dots \otimes X_n \xrightarrow{\sim} X_{\sigma^{-1}(1)} \otimes X_{\sigma^{-1}(2)} \otimes \dots \otimes X_{\sigma^{-1}(n)}.$$

For $X \in \mathcal{C}$, this yields algebra morphisms

$$\beta_X^n : \mathbf{k}S_n \rightarrow \mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(X^{\otimes n}), \quad \text{determined by } \sigma \mapsto \sigma_{X, X, \dots, X}, \quad \text{for } \sigma \in S_n. \quad (1.1)$$

1.2.3. We denote by $\mathcal{Inj}\mathcal{C}$ the category of injective objects in the ind-completion $\text{Ind}\mathcal{C}$. A tensor category \mathcal{C} has a non-zero projective object if and only if it has enough projectives if and only if every object has a projective cover if and only if the indecomposable injective objects in $\mathcal{Inj}\mathcal{C}$ actually belong to $\mathcal{C} \subset \text{Ind}\mathcal{C}$. We then say that the tensor categories ‘has projective objects’ and write $\mathcal{Proj}\mathcal{C}$ for the category of projective objects in \mathcal{C} .

For $i \in \text{Irr}\mathcal{C}$ denote the injective hull of L_i in $\text{Ind}\mathcal{C}$ by I_i and, should it exist, the projective cover of L_i in \mathcal{C} by P_i .

For any associative algebra A in \mathcal{C} , we can consider its category $\text{Mod}_{\mathcal{C}}A$ of modules in \mathcal{C} , which are pairs of an object $Y \in \mathcal{C}$ with an algebra morphism $A \rightarrow \underline{\text{End}}(Y) := Y^* \otimes Y$, or equivalently an appropriate action map $A \otimes Y \rightarrow Y$.

1.2.4. We refer to [BE, BEO] for details on the incompressible tensor categories $\text{Ver}_{p^n}^+$ and Ver_{p^n} . We just mention here that, for $p = 2$, as \mathbf{k} -linear categories, we have

$$\text{Ver}_4 \simeq \mathbf{k}[x]/x^2\text{-mod} \oplus \text{Vec}.$$

The regular $\mathbf{k}[x]/x^2$ -module P is the projective cover of $\mathbb{1}$ and $P \simeq V^{\otimes 2}$, where V is the (projective) simple object in Ver_4 corresponding to the copy of Vec above.

1.2.5. For groups G, H and $V_1 \in \text{Rep}G$ and $V_2 \in \text{Rep}H$, in line with notation from Section 1.3 below, we write $V_1 \boxtimes V_2$ for the $G \times H$ -representation on $V_1 \otimes V_2$. If $G = H$ and $V = V_1 = V_2$, we can abbreviate this to $V^{\boxtimes 2}$, and similarly for higher powers.

1.3. Deligne tensor product.

1.3.1. Takeuchi’s Theorem, see [EGNO, Theorem 1.9.15], states that every \mathbf{k} -linear abelian category with finite dimensional morphism spaces and all objects of finite length is equivalent to the category of (finite dimensional) comodules over some coalgebra over \mathbf{k} .

We denote by $\mathcal{Tak}_{\mathbf{k}}$ the 2-category of \mathbf{k} -linear categories as above, with 1-morphisms given by \mathbf{k} -linear functors and 2-morphisms given by all natural transformations. We consider 2-subcategories

$$\mathcal{Tak}^{ex} \subset \mathcal{Tak}^{rex} \subset \mathcal{Tak}$$

where we keep the same objects and 2-morphisms, but only consider (right) exact functors.

In [De1], see also [CF] for an overview, Deligne introduced the product $\mathcal{A} \boxtimes \mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{Tak}_{\mathbf{k}}$ for \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} in $\mathcal{Tak}_{\mathbf{k}}$. This category is equipped with a bilinear bifunctor

$$- \boxtimes - : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \boxtimes \mathcal{B}, \quad (X, Y) \mapsto X \boxtimes Y, \quad (1.2)$$

satisfying the following universal property. For every \mathbf{k} -linear abelian category \mathcal{C} , restriction along (1.2) yields an equivalence between the category of right exact \mathbf{k} -linear functors $\mathcal{A} \boxtimes \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ with the category of bilinear bifunctors $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ that are right exact in each variable.

1.3.2. By construction, we obtain a pseudo-functor

$$- \boxtimes - : \mathcal{Tak}^{rex} \times \mathcal{Tak}^{rex} \rightarrow \mathcal{Tak}^{rex}$$

which restricts, by [De1, Proposition 5.7], to a pseudo-functor

$$- \boxtimes - : \mathcal{Tak}^{ex} \times \mathcal{Tak}^{ex} \rightarrow \mathcal{Tak}^{ex}.$$

A useful observation, stated formally in [CF, Proposition 3.2.6], but applied earlier in [CE01, EO2], is that the latter can again be extended to a pseudo-functor

$$- \boxtimes - : \mathcal{Tak}^{ex} \times \mathcal{Tak} \rightarrow \mathcal{Tak}. \quad (1.3)$$

It will be very convenient to choose a partially strict version of the pseudo-functor (1.3). Concretely, we will assume that, for every $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{Tak}$, the pseudo-functor

$$- \boxtimes \mathcal{A} : \mathcal{Tak}^{ex} \rightarrow \mathcal{Tak}$$

is actually a (strict) 2-functor and, moreover, $- \boxtimes \mathbf{Vec}$ is simply the inclusion $\mathcal{Tak}^{ex} \subset \mathcal{Tak}$. We will freely use the corresponding identities

$$\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathbf{Vec} = \mathcal{C}, \quad \mathrm{Id}_{\mathcal{C}} \boxtimes \mathrm{Id}_{\mathcal{A}} = \mathrm{Id}_{\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{A}} \quad \text{and} \quad (G \circ F) \boxtimes \mathcal{A} = (G \boxtimes \mathcal{A}) \circ (F \boxtimes \mathcal{A}).$$

To obtain this strict version, it suffices to choose, for every $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{Tak}$, a faithful exact functor to \mathbf{Vec} (and choosing the identity functor for $\mathcal{A} = \mathbf{Vec}$) and correspondingly define $\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{A}$ as a category of comodules in \mathcal{C} over the coalgebra over \mathbf{k} defined from $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{Vec}$. We refer to [CF] for more details. For convenience, we make the additional choice that in case $\mathcal{A} = \mathrm{Rep}S_d$, the choice of $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{Vec}$ is simply the forgetful functor Frg .

Our strictness assumption on (1.3) and the fact that it is a pseudo-functor between (strict) 2-categories allow us to simplify some of its coherence conditions:

Lemma 1.3.3. *For $\Delta : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ in \mathcal{Tak} and $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ in \mathcal{Tak}^{ex} , the natural isomorphism*

$$a(F, \Delta) : (\mathcal{D} \boxtimes \Delta) \circ (F \boxtimes \mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{\sim} (F \boxtimes \mathcal{B}) \circ (\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \Delta)$$

obtained from the composition isomorphisms to and from $(F \boxtimes \Delta)$, satisfy

- (1) $a(\mathrm{Id}_{\mathcal{C}}, \Delta) = \mathrm{Id}_{\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \Delta}$;
- (2) $a(G \circ F, \Delta) = (G \boxtimes \mathcal{A})(a(F, \Delta)) \circ a(G, \Delta)_{F \boxtimes \mathcal{A}}$, for every $G : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ in \mathcal{Tak}^{ex} ;
- (3) For every natural transformation $\zeta : F \Rightarrow G$, for $G : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ in \mathcal{Tak}^{ex} ,

$$a(G, \Delta) \circ (\mathcal{D} \boxtimes \Delta)(\zeta \boxtimes \mathcal{A}) = (\zeta \boxtimes \mathcal{B})_{\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \Delta} \circ a(F, \Delta).$$

- (4) For every natural transformation $\rho : \Delta \Rightarrow \Delta'$, for $\Delta' : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ in \mathcal{Tak} ,

$$(F \boxtimes \mathcal{B})(\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \rho) \circ a(F, \Delta) = a(F, \Delta') \circ (\mathcal{D} \boxtimes \rho)_{F \boxtimes \mathcal{A}}.$$

For \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} tensor categories, their product $\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{D}$ is again a tensor product, see [De1]. Furthermore, by restricting one of the arguments in $\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{D}$ to \mathbf{Vec} , we find embeddings of \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} into $\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{D}$. By abuse of notation, we will sometimes identify \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} with the equivalent tensor subcategories in $\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{D}$.

Example 1.3.4. Let \mathcal{C} be a tensor category.

- (1) By our choice of realisation of $- \boxtimes -$, the category $\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathrm{Rep}S_d$ is the category of S_d -representations in \mathcal{C} , that is of functors $BS_d \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$, where BS_d is the one-object category corresponding to S_d . For example $\mathbf{Vec} \boxtimes \mathrm{Rep}S_d = \mathrm{Rep}S_d$.

For an S_d -representation M in \mathcal{C} (an object in $\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathrm{Rep}S_d$), we write $(M)^{S_d}$ resp. $(M)_{S_d}$, for the subobject, resp. quotient, of invariants resp coinvariants.

- (2) We can view $-^{\otimes n}$ as a (non-additive) symmetric monoidal functor

$$RT_n = RT_n^{\mathcal{C}} : \mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{-^{\otimes n}} \mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathrm{Rep}S_n,$$

by using the braid action (1.1) of S_n on $X^{\otimes n}$.

- (3) For a fixed exact and faithful functor $\Omega : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Vec}$, and $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ we consider the composite functor,

$$\Omega^n : \mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{RT_n} \mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathrm{Rep}S_n \xrightarrow{\Omega \boxtimes \mathrm{Rep}S_n} \mathrm{Rep}S_n.$$

In particular, $\Omega^1 = \Omega$.

1.4. Module categories and enriched categories. Let \mathcal{C} be a tensor category over \mathbf{k} .

1.4.1. A (left) \mathcal{C} -module category is a category \mathcal{M} in $\mathcal{Tak}_{\mathbf{k}}$ equipped with a bilinear functor

$$- \otimes - : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M},$$

exact in the first variable, and a natural isomorphism

$$(X \otimes Y) \otimes M \xrightarrow{\sim} X \otimes (Y \otimes M),$$

satisfying the conditions in [EGNO, §7.1]. In particular \otimes is automatically exact in the second variable, so that we can view it as an exact functor $\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$.

Following [EGNO, §7.9], for a \mathcal{C} -module category \mathcal{M} , we have a bifunctor

$$\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(-, -) : \mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathrm{Ind}\mathcal{C},$$

where $\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(M_1, M_2)$ represents the left exact functor

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}}(- \otimes M_1, M_2) : \mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{op}} \rightarrow \mathrm{Vec}.$$

1.4.2. Let \mathcal{M} be a \mathcal{C} -module category such that the internal hom takes values in $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathrm{Ind}\mathcal{C}$. Then we can associate to \mathcal{M} a \mathcal{C} -enriched category $\underline{\mathcal{M}}$ with objects the same as \mathcal{M} , but with morphism objects given by the internal homs. For example, the unit morphisms $\mathbb{1} \rightarrow \underline{\mathrm{End}}(M)$ come from the identity under

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbb{1}, \underline{\mathrm{End}}(M)) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbb{1} \otimes M, M) \simeq \mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{M}}(M).$$

Example 1.4.3. The standard self-enrichment $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ of \mathcal{C} , with $\mathrm{Ob}\underline{\mathcal{C}} = \mathrm{Ob}\mathcal{C}$ and

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\underline{\mathcal{C}}}(X, Y) = \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(X, Y) := X^\vee \otimes Y$$

can be obtained in this way from the regular \mathcal{C} -module.

Denote by $\mathrm{Func}_{\mathcal{C}}(-, -)$ the category of \mathcal{C} -enriched functors between two \mathcal{C} -enriched categories (so that $\mathrm{Func}_{\mathrm{Vec}_{\mathbf{k}}}$ is just $\mathrm{Func}_{\mathbf{k}}$). We write $\mathrm{Func}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\mathcal{C}}(-, -)$ for the category of \mathcal{C} -module functors between two \mathcal{C} -module categories, as defined in [EGNO, §7.2].

Example 1.4.4. \mathcal{C} -enriched categories with one object are the same thing as algebra objects in \mathcal{C} , and we use the same notation for the interpretation of an algebra object as an enriched category. For an algebra object R in \mathcal{C} and any \mathcal{C} -module category \mathcal{N} the category

$$\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathcal{N}}R := \mathrm{Func}_{\mathcal{C}}(R, \underline{\mathcal{N}})$$

is the category of modules $R \otimes N \rightarrow N$ of the monad $R \otimes -$ on \mathcal{N} .

Lemma 1.4.5. For \mathcal{C} -module categories \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N} as in 1.4.2, there is a functor

$$\mathrm{Func}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Func}_{\mathcal{C}}(\underline{\mathcal{M}}, \underline{\mathcal{N}})$$

such that that for any $M \in \mathcal{M}$, the triangle

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Func}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Func}_{\mathcal{C}}(\underline{\mathcal{M}}, \underline{\mathcal{N}}) \\ & \searrow & \downarrow \\ & & \mathrm{Mod}_{\mathcal{N}}\underline{\mathrm{End}}(M) \end{array}$$

is commutative, where the vertical arrow is simply restriction onto the full subcategory of \mathcal{M} on the object M and the diagonal arrow sends a \mathcal{C} -module functor F to the $\underline{\mathrm{End}}(M)$ -module

$$\underline{\mathrm{End}}(M) \otimes F(M) \rightarrow F(M)$$

inherited from the $\underline{\mathrm{End}}(M)$ -module structure of M .

Proof. Given a module functor, which is a functor $F : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ with natural transformation

$$s_{X, M} : F(X \otimes M) \rightarrow X \otimes F(M)$$

satisfying the conditions in [EGNO, §7.2], we assign the enriched functor $F' : \underline{\mathcal{M}} \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{N}}$ as follows. For $M \in \mathcal{M}$ we set $F'(X) = F(X)$, and the morphisms

$$\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(M_1, M_2) \rightarrow \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(F'(M_1), F'(M_2))$$

in \mathcal{C} come from the following natural transformations:

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}}(- \otimes M_1, M_2) \Rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{N}}(F(- \otimes M_1), F(M_2)) \Rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{N}}(- \otimes F(M_1), F(M_2)),$$

where the first one comes functoriality of F and the second one from s .

Given a morphism ν of \mathcal{C} -module functors from (F, s) to (G, t) , the morphisms

$$\nu_M : F'(M) = F(M) \rightarrow G(M) = G'(M)$$

can be verified to form a natural transformation of \mathcal{C} -enriched functors.

That these assignments produce a functor $\text{Fun}^{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}) \rightarrow \text{Func}(\underline{\mathcal{M}}, \underline{\mathcal{N}})$ with the commutative triangle is left as an exercise. \square

1.4.6. As observed in [CF, Proposition 3.3.6], when \mathcal{C} is a tensor category and $\Delta : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ a functor in $\mathcal{T}ak$, then $\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{B}$ are canonically \mathcal{C} -module categories, and $\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \Delta$ is a \mathcal{C} -module functor. This simply follows by considering naturality and $\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{A}$. We thus obtain a functor

$$\mathcal{C} \boxtimes - : \text{Fun}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \text{Fun}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{B}).$$

Part 1. Representations of symmetric groups in tensor categories

Let \mathbf{k} be a field. Throughout we work over this fixed base field.

2. INDUCTIVE SYSTEMS OF SYMMETRIC GROUP REPRESENTATIONS

2.1. Inductive systems.

Definition 2.1.1. An **inductive system** is the assignment of a pseudo-abelian subcategory $\mathbf{A}^n \subset \text{Rep}_{\mathbf{k}} S_n$, for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, so that $\mathbf{A}^{n-1} \subset \text{Rep}_{\mathbf{k}} S_{n-1}$ is the minimal pseudo-abelian subcategory in which the composite

$$\mathbf{A}^n \hookrightarrow \text{Rep}_{\mathbf{k}} S_n \xrightarrow{\text{Res}_{S_{n-1}}^{S_n}} \text{Rep}_{\mathbf{k}} S_{n-1}$$

takes values. An inductive system \mathbf{A} is **semisimple** if \mathbf{A}^n comprises only semisimple representations for all n .

Remark 2.1.2. (1) Clearly an inductive system could be defined in terms of (isomorphism classes of) indecomposable modules, rather than subcategories.

(2) Using the point of view in (1), our notion of a semisimple inductive system becomes equivalent with Kleshchev's [Kl1, Definition 0.2].

(3) Definition 2.1.1 does not match Zalesskii's notion of an inductive system in [Za, Definition 1.1]. However, taking the collection of simple constituents of the modules in our definition yields an inductive system in the sense of [Za].

2.1.3. We will write $\mathbf{A} \subset \mathbf{B}$ for two inductive systems if \mathbf{A}^n is a subcategory of \mathbf{B}^n for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. For a family of inductive systems $\{\mathbf{A}_{\alpha} \mid \alpha\}$, we denote by $\sum_{\alpha} \mathbf{A}_{\alpha}$ the inductive system with $(\sum_{\alpha} \mathbf{A}_{\alpha})^n = \sum_{\alpha} \mathbf{A}_{\alpha}^n$, see 1.1.2.

For a given inductive system \mathbf{A} , we can define the inductive system $\mathbf{I}(\mathbf{A})$, where for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the category $\mathbf{I}(\mathbf{A})^n$ comprises the direct summands of S_n -representations of the form

$$\text{Ind}_{S_{\lambda}}^{S_n}(V_1 \boxtimes V_2 \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes V_l),$$

where $\lambda \vDash n$ is a composition of length l and $V_i \in \mathbf{A}^{\lambda_i}$. That $\mathbf{I}(\mathbf{A})$ is again an inductive system follows from Mackey's Theorem. It is immediate that this procedure is idempotent, *i.e.* $\mathbf{I}(\mathbf{I}(\mathbf{A})) = \mathbf{I}(\mathbf{A})$.

Example 2.1.4. The most obvious non-zero inductive system \mathbf{A} is defined by letting \mathbf{A}^n be the category of trivial S_n -representations.

In this case we set $\mathbf{Young} := \mathbf{I}(\mathbf{A})$. Hence \mathbf{Young}^n is the category of direct sums of Young modules, that is direct summands of direct sums of permutation modules $M^{\lambda} = \text{Ind}_{S_{\lambda}}^{S_n} \mathbb{1}$ for partitions $\lambda \vdash n$.

Problem 2.1.5. In [BK], the minimal inductive systems in Zalesskii's sense were classified for $\text{char}(\mathbf{k}) > 2$. They are precisely the semisimple inductive systems $\mathbf{CS}(s)$ in Theorem 2.2.2 below. These are also minimal inductive systems in our sense, but no longer the only ones. For example the inductive system of projective objects does not contain any of the $\mathbf{CS}(s)$. It would be interesting to classify minimal inductive systems in the sense of Definition 2.1.1.

2.2. Semisimple inductive systems. If $\text{char}(\mathbf{k}) = 0$ then all inductive systems are semisimple, and they are in bijection with ideals in the poset of partitions, for the inclusion order. Semisimple inductive systems in positive characteristic were classified by Kleshchev in [K11].

2.2.1. Following [K11, Definition 0.1], a simple S_n -representation is **completely splittable** (CS) if its restriction to any Young subgroup $S_\lambda < S_n$ is semisimple. CS representations were classified in [K11], but we only require the following results.

Theorem 2.2.2 (Kleshchev). *Let \mathbf{k} be a field of characteristic $p > 0$.*

- (1) *A simple S_n -representation is completely splittable if and only if it belongs to a semisimple inductive system.*
- (2) *There are $p-1$ minimal semisimple inductive systems, labelled $\mathbf{CS}(s)$, $s \in \{1, \dots, p-1\}$. All other semisimple inductive systems are sums of the minimal ones.*
- (3) *$\mathbf{CS}^n(1)$ comprises precisely the trivial S_n -representations.*
- (4) *If $p > 2$, then $\mathbf{CS}^n(p-s)$ comprises precisely the tensor product of the sign representation with the representations in $\mathbf{CS}^n(s)$.*
- (5) *If $s > 1$, then $\mathbf{CS}^n(s)$ contains the trivial representation if and only if $n + s \leq p$.*
- (6) *For $n \geq p$, the intersection*

$$\mathbf{CS}^n(s) \cap \mathbf{CS}^n(t), \quad s \neq t$$

comprises only the zero representation.

Proof. One direction in (1) is immediate, the other direction follows from [K11, Theorems 2.1 and 2.8(i)]. Part (2) follows from [K11, Theorem 2.8]. Parts (3), (5) and (6) follow immediately from the definition on p590 of [K11]. Finally, taking the tensor product with the sign representation clearly produces an involution on the set of semisimple inductive systems. Tracing that this involution is as in (4) is easy using the explicit descriptions in [K11]. \square

2.3. Closed inductive systems.

2.3.1. We list some potential properties of an inductive system \mathbf{A} :

- (i) Each $\mathbf{A}^n \subset \text{Rep}S_n$ is closed under (internal) tensor products;
- (ii) Each $\mathbf{A}^n \subset \text{Rep}S_n$ is closed under duality $V \mapsto V^*$;
- (iii) Each $\mathbf{A}^n \subset \text{Rep}S_n$ contains the trivial representation $\mathbb{1}$;
- (iv) $\mathbf{I}(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{A}$ or, equivalently, for all $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, the induction product

$$\mathbf{A}^m \times \mathbf{A}^n \xrightarrow{\text{Ind}_{S_m \times S_n}^{S_{m+n}}(- \boxtimes -)} \text{Rep}S_{m+n}$$

takes values in \mathbf{A}^{m+n} .

Definition 2.3.2. An inductive system \mathbf{A} is **closed** if it satisfies 2.3.1(i)-(iv). In other words \mathbf{A} is closed if $\mathbf{I}(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{A}$ and each $\mathbf{A}^n \subset \text{Rep}S_n$ is a rigid monoidal subcategory.

Example 2.3.3. (1) The unique *maximal* (closed) inductive system corresponds to $\mathbf{A}^n = \text{Rep}S_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.

(2) The unique *minimal* closed inductive system is **Young** from Example 2.1.4.

(3) By the combination of (1) and (2), if $\text{char}(\mathbf{k}) = 0$ then the only closed inductive system is **Young**. Similarly, if $\text{char}(\mathbf{k}) = p > 0$, then

$$\mathbf{Young}^n = \mathbf{A}^n = \text{Rep}S_n, \quad \text{for } n < p,$$

for every closed induced system \mathbf{A} .

- (4) The **signed Young modules** are the indecomposable direct summands of the $\mathbf{k}S_n$ -modules which are induced from one-dimensional representations of Young subgroups (which are exterior tensor products of trivial and sign representations). We have the corresponding closed inductive system **SYoung**, with **SYoung** = **Young** if $\text{char}(\mathbf{k}) = 2$. For $p > 2$, the signed Young modules were classified by Donkin in [Do].
- (5) Assume $\text{char}(\mathbf{k}) = p > 0$. Another closed inductive system is p **Perm**, where p **Perm** ^{n} consists of the ‘ p -permutation modules’ of S_n , see [Br]. These can be characterised equivalently as:
 - (a) The modules that have a P -invariant basis for every p -subgroup $P < S_n$;
 - (b) The direct sums of direct summands of representations $\text{Ind}_H^{S_n} \mathbb{1}$, for subgroups $H < S_n$;
 - (c) The direct summands of permutation modules.

Remark 2.3.4. If $\text{char}(\mathbf{k}) = p > 0$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$ is not p -divisible and \mathbf{A} is an inductive system satisfying 2.3.1(iv), e.g. \mathbf{A} is closed, then \mathbf{A}^{m-1} determines \mathbf{A}^m . Indeed, every summand of $\text{Ind}_{S_{m-1}}^{S_m} M$ with $M \in \mathbf{A}^{m-1}$ is in \mathbf{A}^m . But also conversely, every $N \in \mathbf{A}^m$ is a summand of $\text{Ind}_{S_{m-1}}^{S_m} \text{Res}_{S_{m-1}}^{S_m} N$ and $\text{Res}_{S_{m-1}}^{S_m} N$ is in \mathbf{A}^{m-1} by Definition 2.1.1.

2.4. Some inclusions between inductive systems.

2.4.1. Let \mathbf{CS} be the semisimple inductive system $\sum_{1 \leq s < p} \mathbf{CS}(s)$ of all CS representations and let \mathbf{CS}_+ be the subsystem of \mathbf{CS} corresponding to odd $1 \leq s < p$ only. Then we set

$$\mathbf{ICS} := \mathbf{I}(\mathbf{CS}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{ICS}_+ := \mathbf{I}(\mathbf{CS}_+).$$

Proposition 2.4.2. *We have inclusions*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathbf{Young} & \hookrightarrow & \mathbf{SYoung} & \hookrightarrow & p\mathbf{Perm} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ \mathbf{ICS}_+ & \hookrightarrow & \mathbf{ICS} & & \end{array}$$

and no other inclusions, except that the square consists of equalities if $p = 2$, and the downward arrows are equalities if $p = 3$.

Proof. All inclusions except $\mathbf{SYoung} \subset p\mathbf{Perm}$ are by definition. To prove the latter we can observe that the inductive system \mathbf{A} comprising trivial and sign modules is included in $p\mathbf{Perm}$ and use that $\mathbf{I}(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{SYoung}$ while $\mathbf{I}(p\mathbf{Perm}) = p\mathbf{Perm}$.

Now we prove that there are no other inclusions than the ones stated in the lemma.

Consider first $p = 2$. In this case we only need to prove that $\mathbf{Young} \subset 2\mathbf{Perm}$ is strict. Let $P < S_4$ be a 2-Sylow subgroup. It follows easily that $\text{Ind}_P^{S_4} \mathbb{1}$ is a direct sum of the two simple S_4 -modules, while the only simple module in \mathbf{Young}^4 is the trivial one, see [EW].

Now assume $p \geq 3$. The inclusions $\mathbf{Young}^p \subset \mathbf{SYoung}^p$ and $\mathbf{ICS}_+^p \subset \mathbf{ICS}^p$ are strict, as \mathbf{ICS}_+^p does not contain the sign module.

For $p = 3$, it only remains to prove that $3\mathbf{Perm}$ is not included in \mathbf{SYoung} . For this we can consider the 3-permutation module $\text{Ind}_{C_3}^{S_4} \mathbb{1}$, which is 8-dimensional and has every simple S_4 -representation in its socle. Thus by dimension count, $\text{Ind}_{C_3}^{S_4} \mathbb{1}$ is a direct sum of the four irreducible representations. However, not all irreducible representations are Young modules.

For the rest of the proof we can thus assume that $p > 3$. By [Do, §1], the number of isomorphism classes of indecomposable modules in \mathbf{SYoung}^p is one plus the number of partitions of p . Hence, these must be the trivial module, the sign module and the indecomposable projectives, whereas the modules in \mathbf{ICS}^p are all the simple modules and the indecomposable projectives. This shows that the inclusion $\mathbf{SYoung} \subset \mathbf{ICS}$ is strict. For $\mathbf{Young} \subset \mathbf{ICS}_+$ we can argue similarly.

We can observe that \mathbf{ICS}_+^p is not included in $p\mathbf{Perm}^p$. Indeed, such an inclusion would imply that all simple modules in \mathbf{ICS}_+^p are permutation modules over C_p . As the latter group does not detect tensoring with the sign module, this would mean that all simple S_p -modules are permutation modules over C_p . Take the simple S_p -module corresponding to the partition $(p-1, 1)$. It has dimension $p-2 < p$, so it can only be a p -permutation module if it is trivial over $C_p < S_p$, which is not true.

Finally we can observe that $p\mathbf{Perm}^p$ is not included in \mathbf{ICS}^p . Indeed, the p -permutation module $\text{Ind}_{C_p}^{S_p} \mathbb{1}$ contains every simple S_p -representation in its socle. However, since this module does not contain projective summands it would have to be semisimple in order to be in \mathbf{ICS}^p . But, as explained in the previous paragraph, not every simple S_p -representation is a p -permutation module, so $\text{Ind}_{C_p}^{S_p} \mathbb{1}$ is not semisimple and thus not in \mathbf{ICS}^p . \square

3. INDUCTIVE SYSTEMS FROM TENSOR CATEGORIES

Let \mathcal{C} be a tensor category over \mathbf{k} .

3.1. Representations from the braid action.

3.1.1. For $X \in \mathcal{C}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have an anti-algebra morphism, coming from the anti-autoequivalence $-^\vee$, fitting into a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{End}(X^{\otimes n}) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{End}((X^\vee)^{\otimes n}) \\ \beta_X^n \uparrow & & \uparrow \beta_{X^\vee}^n \\ kS_n & \xrightarrow[\sim]{S_n \ni g \mapsto g^{-1}} & kS_n. \end{array} \quad (3.1)$$

For $I \in \text{Inj}\mathcal{C}$, the space $\text{Hom}((X^\vee)^{\otimes n}, I)$ is a right $\text{End}((X^\vee)^{\otimes n})$ -module and hence a (left) S_n -representation via either path in (3.1). If \mathcal{C} has projective objects, these S_n -representations can simply be defined as

$$\text{Hom}(P, X^{\otimes n}), \quad P \in \text{Proj}\mathcal{C}.$$

To simplify formulas (without changing the content substantially) we will sometimes make the non-essential assumption that \mathcal{C} has projective objects.

Definition 3.1.2. For $X \in \mathcal{C}$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, denote by

$$\mathbf{B}_X^n = \mathbf{B}_X^n[\mathcal{C}] \subset \text{Rep}S_n$$

the pseudo-abelian subcategory of direct summands of the S_n -representations

$$\text{Hom}((X^\vee)^{\otimes n}, I), \quad I \in \text{Inj}\mathcal{C}.$$

Equivalently, $\mathbf{B}^n[\mathcal{C}] \subset \text{Rep}S_n$ is the pseudo-abelian subcategory generated by $\Omega^n(X)$, with notation and assumptions as in Example 1.3.4.

Theorem 3.1.3. (1) For each $X \in \mathcal{C}$, the categories $\{\mathbf{B}_X^n \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}\}$ form an inductive system $\mathbf{B}_X = \mathbf{B}_X[\mathcal{C}]$.

(2) For a full subcategory $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{C}$, take the inductive system $\mathbf{B}_\mathcal{A}[\mathcal{C}] := \sum_{X \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbf{B}_X[\mathcal{C}]$.

(a) If \mathcal{A} is closed under tensor products, then $\mathbf{B}_\mathcal{A}[\mathcal{C}]$ satisfies 2.3.1(i).

(b) If \mathcal{A} is closed under $X \mapsto X^\vee$, then $\mathbf{B}_\mathcal{A}[\mathcal{C}]$ satisfies 2.3.1(ii).

(c) If $\mathbb{1} \in \mathcal{A}$, then $\mathbf{B}_\mathcal{A}[\mathcal{C}]$ satisfies 2.3.1(iii).

(d) If \mathcal{A} is additive, then $\mathbf{B}_\mathcal{A}[\mathcal{C}]$ satisfies 2.3.1(iv).

(3) The inductive system $\mathbf{B}[\mathcal{C}] := \mathbf{B}_\mathcal{C}[\mathcal{C}] = \sum_{X \in \mathcal{C}} \mathbf{B}_X[\mathcal{C}]$ is closed.

(4) If \mathcal{C} is semisimple, then

$$\mathbf{B}[\mathcal{C}] = \mathbf{I} \left(\sum_{L \in \text{Irr}\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{B}_L \right).$$

This theorem will be proved in the next section.

Example 3.1.4. If \mathcal{C} has projective objects, we set

$$\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{P}_r}[\mathcal{C}] := \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{P}_{roj}\mathcal{C}}[\mathcal{C}].$$

By Theorem 3.1.3(2) (and [EGNO, Proposition 6.1.3]), this inductive system satisfies 2.3.1(i), (ii) and (iv). Moreover, we will see in Theorem 5.1.5 that $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{P}_r}[\mathcal{C}]$ is closed if and only if \mathcal{C} is Frobenius exact.

An important property of the above definitions, is invariance under tensor functors:

Proposition 3.1.5. *Consider a tensor functor $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$.*

- (1) *For $X \in \mathcal{C}$, we have $\mathbf{B}_{F(X)}[\mathcal{D}] = \mathbf{B}_X[\mathcal{C}]$.*
- (2) *We have $\mathbf{B}[\mathcal{C}] \subset \mathbf{B}[\mathcal{D}]$.*
- (3) *If \mathcal{C} is a finite tensor category and F is surjective, then $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{P}_r}[\mathcal{C}] = \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{P}_r}[\mathcal{D}]$.*

Proof. Let $F_* : \text{Ind}\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \text{Ind}\mathcal{C}$ be the right adjoint of F . Since F is exact, F_* sends injective objects to injective objects. It also follows from faithfulness of F that every indecomposable injective object in $\text{Ind}\mathcal{C}$ is a direct summand of $F_*(I)$ for some $I \in \text{Inj}\mathcal{D}$. Part (1) therefore follows from

$$\text{Hom}((F(X)^\vee)^{\otimes n}, I) \simeq \text{Hom}(F((X^\vee)^{\otimes n}), I) \simeq \text{Hom}((X^\vee)^{\otimes n}, F_*(I)).$$

Part (2) is an immediate consequence of part (1). Part (3) follows from part (1) and [EGNO, Theorem 6.1.16]. \square

Remark 3.1.6. (1) It will follow from Corollary 5.1.3 that Theorem 3.1.3(4) remains valid in Frobenius exact tensor categories. However, it does not extend beyond Frobenius exact categories, see Remark 5.4.8.

- (2) It is tempting to expect an equality $\mathbf{B}[\mathcal{C}] = \mathbf{B}[\mathcal{D}]$ in Proposition 3.1.5(2) for surjective tensor functors F . When \mathcal{D} is semisimple, this is indeed the case. More generally, in Corollary 5.1.4(2), we will show that when \mathcal{D} is Frobenius exact and F is surjective, then $\mathbf{B}[\mathcal{C}] = \mathbf{B}[\mathcal{D}]$.
- (3) If $X \in \mathcal{C}$ is sent to a non-simple object by some tensor functor, then it follows as an application of Proposition 3.1.5(1) that \mathbf{B}_X^i must contain a projective module for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$.

Example 3.1.7. (1) By Proposition 3.1.5(2), we have $\mathbf{B}[\text{Rep}_{\mathbf{k}}G] = \mathbf{Young}$ for any affine group scheme G over \mathbf{k} .

- (2) The Delannoy category \mathcal{D} from [HSS] satisfies $\mathbf{B}[\mathcal{D}] = \mathbf{Young}$. Indeed, as \mathcal{D} is semisimple, we can reduce this claim via Lemmata 3.2.1 and 3.2.3 to the claim

$$\mathbf{B}_{L_\bullet}^n = \mathbf{Young}^n,$$

with L_\bullet the generating simple object, which follows by direct verification.

Question 3.1.8. (1) We can set $\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{k}}^n = \sum_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{B}^n[\mathcal{C}]$, where the sum ranges over all tensor categories \mathcal{C} over \mathbf{k} . Is it true that

$$\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{k}}^n = \text{Rep}S_n?$$

The answer is clearly yes if $\text{char}(\mathbf{k}) = 0$ or $n < p = \text{char}(\mathbf{k})$.

- (2) Using terminology from [HS] and generalising Example 3.1.7(2), is it true that

$$\mathbf{B}[\text{Rep}(G; \mu)] = \mathbf{Young},$$

for every admissible group G with quasi-regular measure μ ?

3.2. The proof of Theorem 3.1.3.

Lemma 3.2.1. *Let $L \in \mathcal{C}$ be simple and denote the injective hulls of L and L^\vee in $\text{Ind}\mathcal{C}$ by I and I' . Then, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $X \in \mathcal{C}$, we have an isomorphism of S_n -representations*

$$\text{Hom}((X^\vee)^{\otimes n}, I)^* \simeq \text{Hom}(X^{\otimes n}, I').$$

In particular $\mathbf{B}_{X^\vee}^n$ comprises the duals of the modules in $\mathbf{B}_X^n \subset \text{Rep}S_n$.

Proof. Consider the exact functor

$$\text{Hom}(-^\vee, I)^* : \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{Vec}.$$

This must be representable by an injective ind-object, which is easily identified as I' . In particular, we find an isomorphism

$$\text{Hom}((X^\vee)^{\otimes n}, I)^* \simeq \text{Hom}(X^{\otimes n}, I')$$

of right $\text{End}(X^{\otimes n})$ -modules. The conclusion follows from diagram (3.1). \square

3.2.2. Construction. We construct natural isomorphisms which will be crucial for the rest of the paper. To keep notation light we work with tensor categories with projective objects. The extension to the general case via injective objects is immediate.

Fix $t \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $P \in \text{Proj}\mathcal{C}$. For every t -tuple (i_1, \dots, i_t) in $\text{Irr}\mathcal{C}$ we choose a section s_{i_1, \dots, i_t} of the linear surjection

$$\text{Hom}(P, P_{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes P_{i_t}) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(P, L_{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes L_{i_t}).$$

We have a natural transformation

$$\bigoplus_{i_1, \dots, i_t \in \text{Irr}\mathcal{C}} \text{Hom}(P, P_{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes P_{i_t}) \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} \text{Hom}(P_{i_1}, -) \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} \dots \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} \text{Hom}(P_{i_t}, -) \Rightarrow \text{Hom}(P, - \otimes \dots \otimes -)$$

of functors $\mathcal{C}^{\times t} \rightarrow \text{Vec}$, which is simply given by

$$g \otimes f_1 \otimes \dots \otimes f_t \mapsto (f_1 \otimes \dots \otimes f_t) \circ g,$$

where it is understood that $f_1 \otimes \dots \otimes f_t$ refers both to the tensor product over \mathbf{k} of morphism spaces and the tensor product in \mathcal{C} of morphisms.

Composing with the chosen sections then produces a natural transformation

$$\bigoplus_{i_1, \dots, i_t} \text{Hom}(P, L_{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes L_{i_t}) \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} \text{Hom}(P_{i_1}, -) \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} \dots \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} \text{Hom}(P_{i_t}, -) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Hom}(P, - \otimes \dots \otimes -), \quad (3.2)$$

of functors $\mathcal{C}^{\times t} \rightarrow \text{Vec}$, which we claim to be an isomorphism. Indeed, since the involved functors are exact in each variable, it suffices to verify that the natural transformation produces an isomorphism on each t -tuple of simple objects, which is by definition.

Lemma 3.2.3. *For $X, Y \in \mathcal{C}$, the S_n -representations in $\mathbf{B}_{X \otimes Y}^n$ are precisely the direct summands of representations $M \otimes N$, with $M \in \mathbf{B}_X^n$ and $N \in \mathbf{B}_Y^n$.*

Proof. For simplicity of notation, we assume that \mathcal{C} has projective objects. We apply (3.2) for $t = 2$ to produce an isomorphism, for $P \in \text{Proj}\mathcal{C}$,

$$\bigoplus_{i, j \in \text{Irr}\mathcal{C}} V_{ij} \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} \text{Hom}(P_i, X^{\otimes n}) \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} \text{Hom}(P_j, Y^{\otimes n}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Hom}(P, (X \otimes Y)^{\otimes n}),$$

of $\text{End}(X^{\otimes n}) \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} \text{End}(Y^{\otimes n})$ -modules (for vector spaces V_{ij}), from which the claim follows quickly. \square

Lemma 3.2.4. *For every $P \in \text{Proj}\mathcal{C}$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $\kappa \models n$ of length l , take $\{Z_i \in \mathcal{C} \mid 1 \leq i \leq l\}$. Then the S_κ -representation*

$$\text{Hom}(P, Z_1^{\otimes \kappa_1} \otimes \dots \otimes Z_l^{\otimes \kappa_l})$$

is a direct sum of modules

$$M_1 \boxtimes M_2 \boxtimes \dots \boxtimes M_l \quad \text{with} \quad M_i \in \mathbf{B}_{Z_i}^{\kappa_i}.$$

Proof. This is a direct application of (3.2). \square

Proof of Theorem 3.1.3. For part (1), we assume that \mathcal{C} has projective objects. For $X \in \mathcal{C}$ and $P \in \text{Proj}\mathcal{C}$, the natural transformation (3.2) for $t = 2$ and evaluated at $(X^{\otimes n-1}, X)$ produces an isomorphism

$$\bigoplus_{i \in \text{Irr}\mathcal{C}} V_i \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} \text{Hom}(P_i, X^{\otimes n-1}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Hom}(P, X^{\otimes n})$$

of S_{n-1} -representations, for some vector spaces V_i .

Part (2)(a) follows from Lemma 3.2.3. Part (2)(b) follows from Lemma 3.2.1, Part (2)(c) is obvious. Part (2)(d) follows from the observation that we have an isomorphism in $\text{Rep}S_n$

$$\text{Hom}(P, (X \oplus Y)^{\otimes n}) \simeq \bigoplus_{l=0}^n \text{Ind}_{S_l \times S_{n-l}}^{S_n} \text{Hom}(P, X^{\otimes l} \otimes Y^{\otimes n-l}),$$

and Lemma 3.2.4. This also proves part (4).

Finally, part (3) is a special case of part (2). \square

We conclude this section with an application of Construction 3.2.2 for Part 2.

Lemma 3.2.5. *For $Z_1, Z_2 \in \mathcal{C}$, the canonical ‘evaluation at M ’ morphism in \mathcal{C}*

$$\int^{M \in \mathbf{B}^n[\mathcal{C}]} (M^* \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} Z_1^{\otimes n})^{S_n} \otimes (M \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} Z_2^{\otimes n})^{S_n} \rightarrow \Gamma^n(Z_1 \otimes Z_2)$$

is an isomorphism.

Proof. For notational convenience, we assume that \mathcal{C} has projective objects. It then suffices to show that the action of $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, -)$ produces an isomorphism, for all $P \in \text{Proj}\mathcal{C}$. By application of (3.2) for $l = 2$, we need to show that, for every $i, j \in \text{Irr}\mathcal{C}$

$$\begin{aligned} & \int^M \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P_i, M^* \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} Z_1^{\otimes n})^{S_n} \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P_j, M \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} Z_2^{\otimes n})^{S_n} \\ & \rightarrow \left(\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P_i, Z_1^{\otimes n}) \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P_j, Z_2^{\otimes n}) \right)^{S_n} \end{aligned}$$

is an isomorphism, where in the target we consider invariants with respect to the diagonal action of S_n . By application of Lemma 3.2.1, we can rewrite this as

$$\begin{aligned} & \int^{M \in \mathbf{B}^n[\mathcal{C}]} \text{Hom}_{S_n}(M, A) \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} \text{Hom}_{S_n}(B, M) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{S_n}(B, A), \quad \text{with} \\ & A := \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P_i, Z_1^{\otimes n}) \in \mathbf{B}^n[\mathcal{C}] \quad \text{and} \quad B := \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P_j, (Z_2^{\vee})^{\otimes n}) \in \mathbf{B}^n[\mathcal{C}]. \end{aligned}$$

This is now indeed an isomorphism, by the (co-)Yoneda lemma. \square

4. THE VERLINDE CATEGORY

Let \mathbf{k} be an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$. We determine $\mathbf{B}^n[\text{Ver}_p]$ for the symmetric fusion category Ver_p . We follow the labelling of simples in Ver_p from [Os], so $\text{Irr}\text{Ver}_p = \{1, 2, \dots, p-1\}$ with $L_1 = \mathbb{1}$. By [Os] the tensor subcategories of Ver_p are given by Vec , sVec (with simple objects L_1, L_{p-1}) and Ver_p^+ (with simple objects L_i for i odd).

4.1. Main result. We will prove the following theorem in Section 4.2.

Theorem 4.1.1. (1) *For $1 \leq i < p$, the inductive system \mathbf{B}_{L_i} is the semisimple inductive system $\mathbf{CS}(i)$ from Theorem 2.2.2.*

(2) *The inductive systems \mathbf{ICS} and \mathbf{ICS}_+ are closed.*

(3) *We have*

$$\mathbf{B}[\text{Vec}] = \mathbf{Young}, \quad \mathbf{B}[\text{sVec}] = \mathbf{SYoung}, \quad \mathbf{B}[\text{Ver}_p^+] = \mathbf{ICS}_+, \quad \mathbf{B}[\text{Ver}_p] = \mathbf{ICS}.$$

From definition, it is clear that \mathbf{ICS} and \mathbf{ICS}_+ satisfy all properties of a closed inductive system, except for the following fact:

Corollary 4.1.2. *The subcategory $\mathbf{ICS}_n \subset \text{Rep}S_n$ is monoidal.*

The following special case can presumably alternatively be obtained from the analysis of $\overline{\text{Rep}S_p}$ in [EO3, §4.4].

Corollary 4.1.3. *The tensor product of two simple S_p -modules is a direct sum of a semisimple and a projective module.*

Recall that a module of a finite group G is **algebraic** if only finitely many isomorphism classes of indecomposable modules appear in its tensor powers; or equivalently if its class in the Green ring $R(G)$ satisfies a polynomial identity. We refer to [Cr] for more context.

Corollary 4.1.4. *Every completely splittable module is algebraic.*

Proof. By construction, \mathbf{ICS}^n contains only finitely many isomorphism classes of indecomposable modules. Hence the conclusion follows from Corollary 4.1.2. \square

Corollary 4.1.5. *The following are equivalent on a Frobenius exact tensor category \mathcal{C} :*

- (1) \mathcal{C} has a surjective tensor functor to Vec , sVec , Ver_p^+ , Ver_p respectively;
- (2) $\mathbf{B}^p[\mathcal{C}]$ equals \mathbf{Young}^p , \mathbf{SYoung}^p , \mathbf{ICS}_+^p , \mathbf{ICS}^p respectively;
- (3) $\mathbf{B}[\mathcal{C}]$ equals \mathbf{Young} , \mathbf{SYoung} , \mathbf{ICS}_+ , \mathbf{ICS} respectively.

Precisely one of the four options applies to \mathcal{C} .

Proof. That (1) implies (3) follows from Remark 3.1.6(1). That (3) implies (2) is straightforward. That (2) implies (1) follows from [CEO1, Theorem 1.1], which states that, regardless of any assumption on $\mathbf{B}[\mathcal{C}]$, we must be in one of the four cases of (1). Indeed, we can then use that (1) implies (3) and the fact that degree p separates the inductive systems (in those cases where they are distinct). \square

Problem 4.1.6. A natural open problem is to extend Donkin's classification of signed Young modules [Do] to a classification of indecomposables in \mathbf{ICS} . By the theory of Part 2, the problem is equivalent to classifying simple polynomial representations of degree n in $\text{Rep}_{\text{Ver}_p}(GL_X, \phi)$, for $X = (\oplus_i L_i)^n$. Note that, even though the simple objects in $\text{Rep}_{\text{Ver}_p}(GL_X, \phi)$ are classified in [Ve], the classification does not reveal which representations are polynomial.

4.2. Semisimple inductive systems and the proof.

Lemma 4.2.1. *Let \mathcal{C} be a semisimple tensor category, $X \in \mathcal{C}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) *The braid action β_X^n in (1.1) is surjective.*
- (2) *In $\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \text{Rep}S_n$ we have an isomorphism*

$$X^{\otimes n} \simeq \bigoplus_{i=1}^l L_i \boxtimes V_i,$$

for non-isomorphic simple $L_i \in \mathcal{C}$ and non-isomorphic simple $V_i \in \text{Rep}S_n$.

Proof. Since \mathcal{C} is semisimple, we always have

$$X^{\otimes n} \simeq \bigoplus_{i=1}^l L_i \boxtimes M_i$$

in $\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \text{Rep}S_n$, for non-isomorphic simple objects $L_i \in \mathcal{C}$ and certain $M_i \in \text{Rep}S_n$. The morphism β_X^n then corresponds to the action morphism

$$\mathbf{k}S_n \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^l \text{End}_{\mathbf{k}}(M_i). \quad (4.1)$$

By Jacobson's density theorem, $\mathbf{k}S_n \rightarrow \text{End}_{\mathbf{k}}(M_i)$ is surjective if and only if M_i is simple. That (4.1) is surjective if and only if all M_i are simple and non-isomorphic then follows easily. \square

Corollary 4.2.2. *Consider a semisimple tensor category \mathcal{C}_1 with an object $Y \in \mathcal{C}_1$ such that β_Y^n is surjective for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For a tensor functor $F : \mathcal{C}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ with $X := F(Y)$ it follows that the inductive system \mathbf{B}_X is semisimple.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.1.5(1), it suffices to prove that \mathbf{B}_Y is semisimple. The latter follows immediately from Lemma 4.2.1. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.1.1. Part (1) implies part (3) by Theorem 3.1.3(4), and part (3) implies part (2) by Theorem 3.1.3(3). It thus suffices to prove part (1). The cases $i = 1$ and $i = p - 1$ are straightforward. We thus focus on $1 < i < p - 1$ and consider the tensor category

$$\text{Ver}_p(SL_i) := \overline{\text{Tilt}SL_i},$$

which is the semisimplification of the category of SL_i -tilting modules, see [EO3, Ve]. The simple $\bar{V} \in \text{Ver}_p(SL_i)$ is the image of the natural i -dimensional SL_i -representation V . By Schur-Weyl duality, $\beta_{\bar{V}}^n$, and hence also

$$\beta_{\bar{V}}^n : \mathbf{k}S_n \xrightarrow{\beta_{\bar{V}}^n} \text{End}_{SL_i}(V) \twoheadrightarrow \text{End}(\bar{V}),$$

is surjective. By [Os], $\text{Ver}_p(SL_i)$ admits a tensor functor to Ver_p . More concretely, by [Ve, Corollary 4.10], we have a tensor functor

$$\text{Ver}_p(SL_i) \rightarrow \text{Ver}_p, \quad \bar{V} \mapsto L_i.$$

It thus follows from Corollary 4.2.2 that \mathbf{B}_{L_i} is a semisimple inductive system.

Finally, to identify which semisimple inductive system \mathbf{B}_{L_i} is, we can use Kleshchev's classification in Theorem 2.2.2. Since $\text{Sym}^{p-i}L_i \neq 0$, but $\text{Sym}^{p-i+1}L_i = 0$ it follows from Theorem 2.2.2(5) that

$$\mathbf{CS}(i) \subset \mathbf{B}_{L_i} \subset \sum_{s \geq i} \mathbf{CS}(s).$$

Moreover, since $\wedge^{i+1}L_i = 0$, we find, by the same reasoning and Theorem 2.2.2(4), that in fact $\mathbf{B}_{L_i} = \mathbf{CS}(i)$. \square

5. FROBENIUS EXACT TENSOR CATEGORIES AND BEYOND

Let \mathbf{k} be a field (algebraically closed) of characteristic $p > 0$. For Frobenius exact tensor categories that are not of moderate growth, contrary to Corollary 4.1.5, we cannot control the corresponding inductive systems via a fibre functor to Ver_p . Therefore, in this section we develop some methods to study the inductive systems.

5.1. Alternative characterisation.

Theorem 5.1.1. *On a tensor category \mathcal{C} , the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) \mathcal{C} is Frobenius exact;
- (2) For the injective hull J in $\text{Ind}\mathcal{C}$ of $\mathbb{1}$ and every monomorphism $\alpha : \mathbb{1} \hookrightarrow X$ in \mathcal{C} , the surjection

$$\text{Hom}(X^{\otimes p}, J) \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}(\alpha^{\otimes p}, J)} \text{Hom}(\mathbb{1}, J) \simeq \mathbf{k}$$

has an S_p -equivariant section.

- (3) For every $I \in \text{Inj}\mathcal{C}$, every composition λ of length l and every l monomorphisms $\{Z_i \hookrightarrow Y_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq l\}$ in \mathcal{C} , the surjection

$$\text{Hom}(Y_1^{\otimes \lambda_1} \otimes Y_2^{\otimes \lambda_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes Y_l^{\otimes \lambda_l}, I) \twoheadrightarrow \text{Hom}(Z_1^{\otimes \lambda_1} \otimes Z_2^{\otimes \lambda_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes Z_l^{\otimes \lambda_l}, I)$$

has an S_λ -equivariant section.

(4) For every $I \in \mathcal{I}nj\mathcal{C}$, $W \in \mathcal{C}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and every monomorphism $Z \hookrightarrow Y$ in \mathcal{C} , the surjection

$$\mathrm{Hom}(W \otimes Y^{\otimes n}, I) \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(W \otimes Z^{\otimes n}, I)$$

has an $\mathrm{End}(W) \otimes kS_n$ -equivariant section.

(5) For every $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, the functor $\Omega^n : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathrm{Rep}S_n$ from Example 1.3.4 sends epimorphisms to split epimorphisms.

Proof. We show that (2) implies (1). An S_p -equivariant section as in (2) corresponds to a S_p -equivariant morphism $X^{\otimes p} \rightarrow J$, meaning a morphism in $\mathrm{Ind}\mathcal{C}$ that factors through $\mathrm{Sym}^p X$, with non-zero composite

$$\mathbb{1} \xrightarrow{\alpha^{\otimes p}} X^{\otimes p} \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{Sym}^p X \rightarrow J.$$

Hence $\mathbb{1} \rightarrow \mathrm{Sym}^p X$ is not zero and \mathcal{C} is Frobenius exact by [Co2, Theorem C(iii)].

Obviously, (3) implies (2).

Now we show that (4) implies (3). For clarity of notation, consider the case $l = 2$. Then the surjection can be decomposed as

$$\mathrm{Hom}(Y_1^{\otimes \lambda_1} \otimes Y_2^{\otimes \lambda_2}, I) \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(Y_1^{\otimes \lambda_1} \otimes Z_2^{\otimes \lambda_2}, I) \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(Z_1^{\otimes \lambda_1} \otimes Z_2^{\otimes \lambda_2}, I).$$

Under condition (4), we can consider an $\mathrm{End}(Y_1^{\otimes \lambda_1}) \otimes kS_{\lambda_2}$ -equivariant section of the first map and a $kS_{\lambda_1} \otimes \mathrm{End}(Z_2^{\otimes \lambda_2})$ -equivariant section of the second, yielding a $kS_{\lambda_1} \otimes kS_{\lambda_2}$ -equivariant overall section.

Now we show that (1) implies (4). Under assumption (1), by [Co2, Theorem 3.2.2], there exists a non-zero commutative algebra A in $\mathrm{Ind}\mathcal{C}$ such that for every short exact sequence $X_1 \hookrightarrow X \twoheadrightarrow X_2$ in \mathcal{C} , the short exact sequence of A -modules

$$0 \rightarrow A \otimes X_1 \rightarrow A \otimes X \rightarrow A \otimes X_2 \rightarrow 0$$

is split. It follows, see [EO2, §8.2], that the algebra A must be injective in $\mathrm{Ind}\mathcal{C}$.

As an instance of the splitting property, the obvious epimorphism of A -modules

$$A \otimes Y^\vee \twoheadrightarrow A \otimes Z^\vee$$

has an A -equivariant section, which induces an $\mathrm{End}(W^\vee) \otimes kS_n$ -equivariant splitting of

$$A \otimes W^\vee \otimes (Y^\vee)^{\otimes n} \twoheadrightarrow A \otimes W^\vee \otimes (Z^\vee)^{\otimes n},$$

where we used $A \otimes X^{\otimes n} \simeq (A \otimes X)^{\otimes n}$. By applying $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{1}, -)$ and using adjunction, this yields an $\mathrm{End}(W) \otimes kS_n$ -equivariant splitting of

$$\mathrm{Hom}(W \otimes Y^{\otimes n}, A) \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(W \otimes Z^{\otimes n}, A).$$

It follows easily that this conclusion remains valid for any indecomposable injective summand of A . The injective hull J of $\mathbb{1}$ is such a summand, so the conclusion in (4) is valid for $I = J$. That is then valid for all I follows from the observation that any indecomposable injective object is a summand of $W^\vee \otimes J$ for some $W \in \mathcal{C}$.

Finally we observe that (5) is equivalent to the previous four (equivalent) properties. Indeed, since we can realise Ω as $\mathrm{Hom}(-^\vee, I)$, for some $I \in \mathcal{I}nj\mathcal{C}$, it follows easily that (4) implies (5), and that (5) implies (2). \square

Remark 5.1.2. Theorem 5.1.1 extends a list of equivalent conditions for Frobenius exactness from [Co2, Theorem C] that are tautologically satisfied for fields \mathbf{k} of characteristic zero.

Corollary 5.1.3. *If \mathcal{C} is Frobenius exact and X is a filtered object in \mathcal{C} , then $\mathbf{B}_X^d = \mathbf{B}_{\mathrm{gr}X}^d$.*

Proof. For A as in the proof of Theorem 5.1.1, it follows that, as A -modules,

$$A \otimes W^\vee \otimes (X^\vee)^d \simeq A \otimes W^\vee \otimes (\mathrm{gr}X^\vee)^d,$$

for all $W \in \mathcal{C}$, equivariantly over S_d , which leads to isomorphisms of S_d -representations

$$\mathrm{Hom}((X^\vee)^d, W \otimes A) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}((\mathrm{gr} X^\vee)^d, W \otimes A).$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Corollary 5.1.4. (1) Let \mathcal{C} be a Frobenius exact tensor category and consider an object $X \in \mathcal{C}$ with subquotient $Y \in \mathcal{C}$, then \mathbf{B}_Y^d is included in \mathbf{B}_X^d .
(2) Consider a surjective tensor functor $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ where \mathcal{D} is Frobenius exact. Then $\mathbf{B}[\mathcal{C}] = \mathbf{B}[\mathcal{D}]$.

Proof. Part (1) follows immediately from Corollary 5.1.3. Part (2) follows from part (1) and Proposition 3.1.5. \square

For tensor categories with projective objects we can augment Theorem 5.1.1 with additional characterisations in terms of the language introduced in the current paper.

Theorem 5.1.5. On a tensor category \mathcal{C} with projective objects, the following conditions are equivalent:

- (1) \mathcal{C} is Frobenius exact;
- (2) The inductive system $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{P}_r}[\mathcal{C}]$ is closed;
- (3) We have $\mathbb{1} \in \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{P}_r}^p[\mathcal{C}]$;
- (4) $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{P}_r}^p[\mathcal{C}]$ is not contained in $\mathrm{ProjRep} S_p$;
- (5) For the projective cover $q: Q \rightarrow \mathbb{1}$ of the tensor unit, the surjection

$$\mathrm{Hom}(Q, Q^{\otimes p}) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Hom}(Q, q^{\otimes p})} \mathrm{Hom}(Q, \mathbb{1}) \simeq \mathbf{k}$$

has an S_p -equivariant section;

- (6) For every $P \in \mathrm{Proj}\mathcal{C}$, every composition λ of length l and every l epimorphisms $\{Y_i \twoheadrightarrow Z_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq l\}$ in \mathcal{C} , the surjection

$$\mathrm{Hom}(P, Y_1^{\otimes \lambda_1} \otimes Y_2^{\otimes \lambda_2} \otimes \dots \otimes Y_l^{\otimes \lambda_l}) \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(P, Z_1^{\otimes \lambda_1} \otimes Z_2^{\otimes \lambda_2} \otimes \dots \otimes Z_l^{\otimes \lambda_l})$$

has an S_λ -equivariant section.

Proof. That (1), (5) and (6) are equivalent follows from Theorem 5.1.1. The special case

$$\mathrm{Hom}(Q, Q^{\otimes n}) \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(Q, \mathbb{1}) \simeq \mathbf{k}$$

of (6) shows that (6) implies that $\mathbb{1} \in \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{P}_r}^n[\mathcal{C}]$ for all n , hence $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{P}_r}[\mathcal{C}]$ is closed by Example 3.1.4. So we find that (6) implies (2). Clearly, (2) implies (3), and (3) implies (4). Finally, that (4) implies (1) follows from [CF, Example 5.2.5]. \square

5.2. Wreath products.

5.2.1. *Notation.* For $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ we consider the wreath product

$$S_m \wr S_n = S_m^{\times n} \rtimes S_n < S_{mn}.$$

For any $V \in \mathrm{Rep} S_m$, we let $V^{\boxtimes n}$ be the $S_m \wr S_n$ -representation, which is $V^{\boxtimes n}$ as a $S_m^{\times n}$ -representation and where S_n acts by permuting the tensor factors.

Finally, any S_n -representation M can be interpreted as an $S_m \wr S_n$ -representation by inflation, with trivial action of $S_m^{\times n}$, which we will denote by M again.

Proposition 5.2.2. Let \mathcal{C} be Frobenius exact and $X \in \mathcal{C}$. The restriction to $S_m \wr S_n$ of any representation in \mathbf{B}_X^{mn} is a direct summand of a direct sum of representations of the form

$$\mathrm{Ind}_{S_m \wr S_\kappa}^{S_m \wr S_n} \left((M_1^{\boxtimes \kappa_1} \otimes M_1') \boxtimes \dots \boxtimes (M_l^{\boxtimes \kappa_l} \otimes M_l') \right)$$

for some partition $\kappa \vdash n$ of length l , with $M_i \in \mathbf{B}_X^m$ and $M'_i \in \mathbf{B}^{\kappa_i}[\mathcal{C}]$ (inflated to a $S_m \wr S_{\kappa_i}$ -representation), using the notation in 5.2.1 and the identification

$$S_m \wr S_\kappa = \prod_{i=1}^l S_m \wr S_{\kappa_i}.$$

We start the proof with the following lemma.

Lemma 5.2.3. *If \mathcal{C} is Frobenius exact and has projective objects, we can choose, for all $P \in \text{Proj}\mathcal{C}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{C}$, an isomorphism of $\text{End}(Y)^{\otimes n}$ -modules*

$$\bigoplus_{i_1, \dots, i_n} \text{Hom}(P, L_{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes L_{i_n}) \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} \text{Hom}(P_{i_1}, Y) \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} \dots \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} \text{Hom}(P_{i_n}, Y) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Hom}(P, Y^{\otimes n}),$$

such that the action of $\sigma \in S_n$ on the right-hand side inherits the expression

$$f \otimes h_1 \otimes \dots \otimes h_n \mapsto (\sigma_{L_{i_1}, \dots, L_{i_n}} \circ f) \otimes (h_{\sigma^{-1}(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes h_{\sigma^{-1}(n)})$$

on the left-hand side.

Proof. We choose sections s_{i_1, \dots, i_n} of

$$\text{Hom}(P, P_{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes P_{i_n}) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(P, L_{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes L_{i_n})$$

in the following way. We fix a total order on $\text{Irr}\mathcal{C}$. For some

$$i_1 \leq i_2 \leq \dots \leq i_n,$$

denote by $\lambda \vDash n$ the composition governing equalities among the i_l , so

$$i_1 = i_2 = \dots = i_{\lambda_1} < i_{\lambda_1+1} = \dots = i_{\lambda_2} < \dots.$$

We then take an S_λ -equivariant section s_{i_1, \dots, i_n} , which exists by Theorem 5.1.5. For all shufflings of (i_1, \dots, i_n) , which are naturally labelled by the coset S_n/S_λ , we define the section by demanding it forms a commutative diagram with s_{i_1, \dots, i_n} and the braid action of the corresponding shortest representative in S_n of the element in S_n/S_λ .

If we choose such sections for the construction 3.2.2, the inherited S_n -action on the left-hand side can now be computed directly. The $\text{End}(Y)^{\otimes n}$ -equivariance follows from the naturality of (3.2). \square

Proof of Proposition 5.2.2. By Lemma 5.2.3, we have an isomorphism of $\mathbf{k}S_m^{\times n}$ -modules,

$$\bigoplus_{i_1, \dots, i_n} \text{Hom}(P, L_{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes L_{i_n}) \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} \text{Hom}(P_{i_1}, X^{\otimes m}) \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} \dots \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} \text{Hom}(P_{i_n}, X^{\otimes m}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Hom}(P, X^{\otimes mn}),$$

together with a recipe for the inherited S_n -action on the left-hand side.

The proposed description then follows by choosing a decomposition into indecomposable summands of each S_m -representation $\text{Hom}(P_i, X^{\otimes m})$, and applying Lemma 3.2.4. \square

Remark 5.2.4. As the proof shows, we can improve the formulation in Proposition 5.2.2 to specify that $M'_i \in \mathbf{B}_L^{\kappa_i}$ for some simple $L \in \mathcal{C}$.

5.3. Applications.

Theorem 5.3.1. *Let \mathcal{C} be a Frobenius exact tensor category with $\mathbf{B}^p[\mathcal{C}] \subset p\text{Perm}^p$, then*

$$\mathbf{B}[\mathcal{C}] \subset p\text{Perm}.$$

Proof. As restrictions of p -permutation representations to subgroups remain p -permutation representations, it is sufficient to prove

$$\mathbf{B}^{p^n}[\mathcal{C}] \subset p\text{Perm}^{p^n}, \quad \text{for } n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}.$$

We prove this inclusion by induction on n , using the base case $n = 1$.

By definition of p -permutation modules and the fact that $S_{p^{n-1}} \wr S_p < S_{p^n}$ contains a Sylow p -subgroup it suffices to consider the restriction to $S_{p^{n-1}} \wr S_p$ of representations in

$\mathbf{B}^n[\mathcal{C}]$. Assuming the inclusion is satisfied for $n - 1$, it then follows from an application of Proposition 5.2.2, using

$$M^{\boxtimes i} \otimes \text{Ind}_H^{S_i} \mathbb{1} \simeq \text{Ind}_{S_m \wr H}^{S_m \wr S_i} M^{\boxtimes i} \quad \text{and} \quad (\text{Ind}_K^{S_m} \mathbb{1})^{\boxtimes i} \simeq \text{Ind}_{K \wr H}^{S_m \wr H} \mathbb{1}$$

in $\text{Rep} S_m \wr S_i$ and $\text{Rep} S_m \wr H$, for $H < S_i$ and $K < S_m$, that the same is true for n . \square

Remark 5.3.2. (1) If $\text{char}(\mathbf{k}) = 2$, then the assumption $\mathbf{B}^2[\mathcal{C}] \subset 2\mathbf{Perm}^2$ is automatic.
(2) If $p = 3$, then the condition $\mathbf{B}^3[\mathcal{C}] \subset 3\mathbf{Perm}^3 = \mathbf{SYoung}^3$ is equivalent with \mathcal{C} being of Frobenius type \mathbf{Vec} , see [CEO1, Question 7.3].

Proposition 5.3.3. *Let \mathcal{C} be a Frobenius exact tensor category, then $\text{Idc}(\mathbf{B}^n[\mathcal{C}])$ is a finite set, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Theorem 5.3.1. Again it is sufficient to prove the claim for $\mathbf{B}^n[\mathcal{C}]$. This can be done by induction on n , via Proposition 5.2.2. The base case $n = 1$ follows from representation finiteness of $\mathbf{k}S_p$. \square

Conjecture 5.3.4. *Let \mathcal{C} be a Frobenius exact tensor category with $\mathbf{B}^p[\mathcal{C}] \subset \mathbf{SYoung}^p$, then $\mathbf{B}[\mathcal{C}] \subset \mathbf{SYoung}$.*

5.3.5. We can apply Proposition 5.2.2 to give a less technical proof of the ‘Key Lemma’ [CEO1, Lemma 5.1]. This can be reformulated as Lemma 5.3.6 below, see also Example 9.2.3(4). For this, for a finite group G , we denote by

$$\text{Triv}_G : \text{Rep}G \rightarrow \mathbf{Vec}$$

the \mathbf{k} -linear functor that assigns to a representation its maximal trivial direct summand, see [Co2, §2]. If $N \triangleleft G$ is a normal subgroup then $\text{Triv}_N(V)$ is naturally a G/N -module.

Lemma 5.3.6. *Let \mathcal{C} be a Frobenius exact tensor category, $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>1}$ and $M \in \mathbf{B}^n[\mathcal{C}]$. Then*

$$\dim_{\mathbf{k}} \text{Triv}_{S_{p^{n-1}}} \left(\text{Triv}_{S_p^{\times p^{n-1}}} (M) \right) = \dim_{\mathbf{k}} \left(\text{Triv}_{S_p \wr S_{p^{n-1}}} (M) \right).$$

Proof. This is a consequence of Proposition 5.2.2. \square

5.4. **Beyond Frobenius-exact categories.** Let $p = 2$.

5.4.1. *The spin inductive system.* Following [GK], for $l \in \mathbb{N}$, we call $D^{(l+2,l)}$ the **spin module** of $\mathbf{k}S_{2l+2}$. It restricts to $D^{(l+1,l)}$ over S_{2l+1} , see [BK, 1.11 and 1.12]. The restriction of $D^{(l+1,l)}$ to S_{2l} is a non-split self-extension of $D^{(l+1,l-1)}$, which we denote by $E^{(l+1,l-1)}$, see [K12, 11.2.10]. For example, $E^{(2,0)} \simeq \mathbf{k}S_2$ and $D^{(2,1)}$ is the non-trivial simple S_3 -representation.

Even though it is not yet guaranteed by the above description, defining $\mathbf{Spin}^{2l+2} \subset \text{Rep}S_{2l+2}$ as the category of direct sums of $E^{(l+2,l)}$, and $\mathbf{Spin}^{2l+1} \subset \text{Rep}S_{2l+2}$ as the category of direct sums of $D^{(l+1,l)}$, yields an inductive system **Spin**, which will follow from its realisation in Theorem 5.4.2. This inductive system is ‘almost semisimple’ in the sense that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $d > n$ with \mathbf{Spin}^d semisimple.

Theorem 5.4.2. *For V the non-trivial simple object in \mathbf{Ver}_4 , we have $\mathbf{B}_V[\mathbf{Ver}_4] = \mathbf{Spin}$.*

The proof will be a consequence of the following technical lemma.

Lemma 5.4.3. *Assume that \mathbf{A} is an inductive system where \mathbf{A}^{2l+1} , for $l > 0$, comprises precisely direct sums of one non-trivial simple module, then $n \mapsto \mathbf{Spin}^n$ is an inductive system and $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Spin}$.*

Proof. By [Ja, Theorem C], for a 2-regular $\lambda \vdash n$, the multiplicity of D^λ in the restriction of D^λ to S_{n-1} is m , where, when counting from right to left, the m -th removable box in λ is the first for which removing the box yields a 2-regular partition, denoted by λ^- .

It follows that the only simple S_{2l+2} -representation for which its restriction to S_{2l+1} only has simple constituents $D^{(l+1,l)}$ is $D^{(l+2,l)}$. Similarly, the only options for simple S_{2l+1} -representations for which their restriction to S_{2l} only have simple constituents $D^{(l+1,l-1)}$ are $D^{(l+2,l-1)}$ and $D^{(l+1,l)}$. The former case would imply that the restriction of $D^{(l+2,l-1)}$ equals $D^{(l+1,l-1)}$, which is contradicted by [K11, Theorem 1.2].

Now we prove that \mathbf{A}^{2l+1} comprises the direct sums of $D^{(l+1,l)}$, by induction on $l > 0$. The base case $l = 1$ is by assumption. So assume the claim is true for a given $l > 0$. By the previous paragraph, the only allowed modules in \mathbf{A}^{2l+2} have only $D^{(l+2,l)}$ as simple constituent and subsequently, the only allowed modules in \mathbf{A}^{2l+3} have only $D^{(l+2,l+1)}$ as simple constituent. By our assumption, it follows that \mathbf{A}^{2l+3} comprises the precisely the direct sums of $D^{(l+2,l+1)}$, concluding the induction step. \square

Proof of Theorem 5.4.2. It follows from 1.2.4 that $V^{\otimes 2l+1}$ is a direct sum of 2^l copies of V . Since we can realise \mathbf{Ver}_4 as a monoidal quotient of $\mathbf{Tilt}SL_2$, with V the image of the vector representation (which we denote by V as well), see [BE, Remark 3.10], it also follows that

$$\beta_V^{2l+1} : \mathbf{k}S_{2l+1} \rightarrow \mathbf{End}_{SL_2}(V) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbf{End}_{\mathbf{Ver}_4}(V^{\otimes 2l+1})$$

is surjective. It follows that, in $\mathbf{Ver}_4 \boxtimes \mathbf{Rep}S_{2l+1}$, we have

$$V^{\otimes 2l+1} \simeq V \boxtimes L_{2l+1}$$

for some simple L_{2l+1} in $\mathbf{Rep}S_{2l+1}$ of dimension 2^l , and $\mathbf{B}_V^{2l+1}[\mathbf{Ver}_4]$ comprises direct sums of L_{2l+1} . The claim now follows from Lemma 5.4.3. \square

5.4.4. We define some $\mathbf{k}S_4$ -modules. Recall that $\mathbf{k}S_4$ has two simple modules, $\mathbb{1}$ and $L := D^{(3,1)}$. All extension spaces between two simple modules all one-dimensional. More generally, a complete description of the Young modules is given in [EW, §5.4].

By R we denote the unique (indecomposable) $\mathbf{k}S_4$ -module with structure

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathbb{1} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ L \quad L \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \quad \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \mathbb{1} \quad \mathbb{1} \end{array}$$

We denote by V the generator of \mathbf{Ver}_{2^n} , see [BE, BEO], which is the image of the tautological SL_2 -representation under the defining symmetric monoidal functor $\mathbf{Tilt}SL_2 \rightarrow \mathbf{Ver}_{2^n}$.

Proposition 5.4.5. (1) $\mathbf{B}^i[\mathcal{C}] = \mathbf{Rep}S_i$, for every tensor category \mathcal{C} over \mathbf{k} and $i \leq 3$.
(2) We have strict inclusions

$$\mathbf{Young}^4 = \mathbf{B}^4[\mathbf{Vec}] \subset \mathbf{B}^4[\mathbf{Ver}_4^+] \subset \mathbf{B}^4[\mathbf{Ver}_4] \subset \mathbf{B}^4[\mathbf{Ver}_8^+].$$

(3) Moreover,

$$\mathrm{Idc}\mathbf{B}^4[\mathbf{Ver}_4^+] = \mathrm{Idc}\mathbf{Young}^4 \sqcup \{R\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{Idc}\mathbf{B}^4[\mathbf{Ver}_4] = \mathrm{Idc}\mathbf{B}^4[\mathbf{Ver}_4^+] \sqcup \{E^{(3,1)}\}.$$

Proof. Part (1) is immediate since \mathbf{Young}^i equals $\mathbf{Rep}S_i$ for $i \leq 3$.

The inclusions in part (2) follow from inclusions of tensor categories and Proposition 3.1.5(2). We only need to show that every inclusion is strict. We start with part (3) which takes care of the first two inclusions. \blacksquare

By part (1), to understand $\mathbf{B}^4[\mathcal{C}]$, it suffices to consider indecomposable objects in \mathcal{C} . Let P be the projective cover of $\mathbb{1}$ in \mathbf{Ver}_4 , or equivalently in \mathbf{Ver}_4^+ , and V the non-trivial simple

object in Ver_4 . We already proved that $\text{Hom}(P, V^{\otimes 4})$ is $E^{(3,1)}$. Since $V^{\otimes 2} = P$ it follows from (3.2) (see also proof of Lemma 3.2.3) that

$$\text{Hom}(P, P^{\otimes 4}) \simeq \text{Hom}(P, V^{\otimes 4})^{\otimes 2} = (E^{(3,1)})^{\otimes 2}$$

as S_4 -representations. We can also quickly calculate this representation directly using the explicit realisation of Ver_4^+ as in [BE, 5.2.1]. Both methods allow us to conclude that the projective cover $Y^{(1,1,1,1)}$ of $\mathbb{1}$ is a direct summand of $(E^{(3,1)})^{\otimes 2}$. We denote a complementary (self-dual) summand of $(E^{(3,1)})^{\otimes 2}$ by M . A direct computation shows that there exists a projective presentation

$$\left(Y^{(2,1,1)}\right)^3 \rightarrow Y^{(1,1,1,1)} \oplus Y^{(2,1,1)} \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0,$$

with $Y^{(2,1,1)}$ the projective cover of L . Since $[M : \mathbb{1}] = 4$ and $[M : L] = 2$ it follows that M is an extension of a cyclic module with socle filtration $L : \mathbb{1} : \mathbb{1}$ and one with $\mathbb{1} : \mathbb{1} : L$. To conclude that $M = R$ it is sufficient to show that M is indecomposable (a non-split extension). By [CF, Lemma 7.1.5] over the Klein 4-subgroup $C_2^2 < S_4$, M is a direct sum of two $\text{Gal}(\mathbf{k} : \mathbb{F}_2)$ -conjugate modules, which shows that M must be indecomposable. This proves part (3).

To conclude the proof of part (2), we prove strictness of the inclusion $\mathbf{B}^4[\text{Ver}_4] \subset \mathbf{B}^4[\text{Ver}_8^+]$. First, we observe that $\mathbf{B}^5[\text{Ver}_8^+]$ contains modules that are not self-dual. Indeed, as observed in [CEO1, §10], there is an object X in Ver_8^+ (an extension of $\mathbb{1}$ and V) so that $\text{Sym}^5 X = \mathbb{1}$ but there is a non-trivial epimorphism $\text{Sym}^5 X^\vee \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{1}$. Hence, with Q the (self-dual) direct sum of the two projective covers in Ver_8^+ , using Lemma 3.2.1 shows

$$\dim_{\mathbf{k}} H_0(S_5, \text{Hom}(Q, X^{\otimes 5})) = 1 < \dim_{\mathbf{k}} H^0(S_5, \text{Hom}(Q, X^{\otimes 5})).$$

Now assume for the sake of contradiction that $\mathbf{B}^4[\text{Ver}_4] = \mathbf{B}^4[\text{Ver}_8^+]$. By Remark 2.3.4 this implies that $\text{Idc}\mathbf{B}^5[\text{Ver}_8^+]$ consists of the indecomposable modules that appear as direct summands of $\text{Ind}_{S_4}^{S_5}$ acting on the indecomposables in $\mathbf{B}^4[\text{Ver}_4]$. We can thus obtain the desired contradiction by proving that for the latter summands M the dimensions of $H_0(S_5, M)$ and $H^0(S_5, M)$ agree. Since Young modules are self-dual, we can focus on $E^{(3,1)}$ and R . Since $H_0(S_5, E^{(3,1)})$ and $H^0(S_5, E^{(3,1)})$ are zero, we can actually focus on R . We can furthermore focus on the (maximal) summand N of $\text{Ind}_{S_4}^{S_5}(R)$ in the principal block. Comparing R with $Y^{(2,2)}$ in [EW, §5.4], and using the results in [EW, §5.5] shows that N has a filtration of length three, where the extremal graded pieces are $\mathbb{1}$ and the middle graded piece is $Y^{(3,2)} \oplus Y^{(2,2,1)}$. This shows that N is either indecomposable (and hence self-dual) or the direct sum of two non-isomorphic (and therefore again self-dual) indecomposable modules. \square

5.4.6. From Proposition 5.4.5 it also follows with minor additional work that

$$\text{Idc}\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{P}_r}^4[\text{Ver}_4^+] = \{Y^{(2,1,1)}, Y^{(1,1,1,1)}, R\} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Idc}\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{P}_r}^4[\text{Ver}_4] = \{Y^{(2,1,1)}, Y^{(1,1,1,1)}, E^{(3,1)}, R\}.$$

In [CF, Corollary 7.2.2] it was proved that, for $n > 2$, the S_4 -modules in

$$\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{P}_r}^4[\text{Ver}_{2^n}] \supset \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{P}_r}^4[\text{Ver}_{2^n}^+]$$

must restrict to permutation modules over the Klein subgroup $C_2^{\times 2} < S_4$. A more refined potential result is suggested in the following question.

Question 5.4.7. For $n > 2$, do we have

$$\text{Idc}\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{P}_r}^4[\text{Ver}_{2^n}] \subset \{Y^{(3,1)}, Y^{(2,2)}, Y^{(2,1,1)}, Y^{(1,1,1,1)}\}?$$

Remark 5.4.8. For $\mathcal{C} = \text{Ver}_4^+$ we can easily observe from Proposition 5.4.5 that $\mathbf{B}[\mathcal{C}]$ is bigger than $\mathbf{I}(\sum_{L \in \mathcal{C}} \mathbf{B}_L)$. Indeed, in this case the only simple object is $\mathbb{1}$, so $\mathbf{I}(\sum_{L \in \mathcal{C}} \mathbf{B}_L)$ is just **Young**. With minor additional work, we can come to the same conclusion for $\mathcal{C} = \text{Ver}_4$.

We conclude this section with another example of symmetric group representations appearing in Ver_{2^n} . As the result is not needed in the rest of the paper we omit the proof, which is mainly an application of tilting module theory for SL_2 .

Lemma 5.4.9. *For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>1}$, let P be the projective cover of $\mathbb{1}$ in Ver_{2^n} and V the generator. Then the S_{2^n} -representation $\text{Hom}(P, V^{\otimes 2^n})$ is the subquotient of the Young module*

$$Y^{(2^{n-1}, 2^{n-1})} = M^{(2^{n-1}, 2^{n-1})} = \text{Ind}_{S_{2^{n-1}} \times S_{2^{n-1}}}^{S_{2^n}} \mathbb{1}$$

obtained by removing $\mathbb{1}$ from top and socle.

6. IDEALS IN THE FINITARY SYMMETRIC GROUP ALGEBRA

We let \mathbf{k} again be of arbitrary characteristic (and algebraically closed). One of the main motivations in [Za] of Zalesskii's notion of inductive systems was the connection with ideals in $\mathbf{k}S_\infty$, for $S_\infty := \cup_n S_n$. Here we show how Definitions 2.1.1 and 3.1.2 relate to such ideals.

6.1. Definitions.

6.1.1. There is a canonical bijection between the set of two-sided ideals $I < \mathbf{k}S_\infty$ and the set of collections of ideals $\{I_n < \mathbf{k}S_n\}$ such that $I_{n-1} = I_n \cap \mathbf{k}S_{n-1}$. It follows that for an inductive system \mathbf{A} , we obtain an ideal $\mathcal{J}(\mathbf{A}) < \mathbf{k}S_\infty$ with

$$\mathcal{J}(\mathbf{A}) \cap \mathbf{k}S_n = \bigcap_{M \in \mathbf{A}^n} \text{Ann}_{\mathbf{k}S_n} M.$$

Example 6.1.2. In [BK], Baranov and Kleshchev proved that, if $\text{char}(\mathbf{k}) = p > 2$, the maximal ideals in $\mathbf{k}S_\infty$ are given precisely by

$$\mathcal{J}^{(i)} := \mathcal{J}(\mathbf{CS}(i)), \quad 1 \leq i < p.$$

For the inductive system of an object X in a tensor category \mathcal{C} , we abbreviate

$$\text{Ann}(X) := \mathcal{J}(\mathbf{B}_X[\mathcal{C}]) < \mathbf{k}S_\infty.$$

We can define this ideal more directly:

Lemma 6.1.3. *The ideal $\text{Ann}(X)$ equals the kernel of the algebra morphism*

$$\varinjlim \beta_X^n : \mathbf{k}S_\infty = \varinjlim \mathbf{k}S_n \rightarrow \text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(X^{\otimes \infty}) := \varinjlim \text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(X^{\otimes n}).$$

Proof. Since the morphisms $f \mapsto f \otimes X$ from $\text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(X^{\otimes n})$ to $\text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(X^{\otimes n+1})$ are injective, it suffices to prove that, for an arbitrary $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, $\ker(\beta_X^n)$ equals the intersection of all $\text{Ann}_{\mathbf{k}S_n} M$, for $M \in \mathbf{B}_X^n$. For simplicity of notation we assume that \mathcal{C} has projective objects. Then $\ker(\beta_X^n)$ is equal to the kernel of the associated morphism

$$\mathbf{k}S_n \rightarrow \prod_{i \in \text{Irr} \mathcal{C}} \text{End}_{\mathbf{k}}(\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P_i, X^{\otimes n})),$$

by faithfulness of $\oplus_i \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P_i, -)$, from which the conclusion follows. \square

Remark 6.1.4. (1) The ideal $\text{Ann}(X)$ contains the same information as the kernel of the symmetric monoidal functor $\mathcal{OB}(\dim X) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ from the oriented Brauer category (the universal \mathbf{k} -linear symmetric rigid monoidal category on an object of categorical dimension $\dim X$ see, [De3, Co1]), but $\text{Ann}(X)$ allows one to ‘compare’ objects of different dimension.

(2) In [CEO1, Corollary 4.11] it was proved that a tensor category \mathcal{C} is of moderate growth if and only if $\text{Ann}(X) \neq 0$ for each $X \in \mathcal{C}$.

Proposition 6.1.5. (1) *For $\mathcal{C} = \text{Ver}_p$ ($\text{char}(\mathbf{k}) = p$) and $1 < i < p-1$, the ideal $\text{Ann}(L_i) < \mathbf{k}S_\infty$ is generated by the skew symmetriser in $\mathbf{k}S_{i+1}$ and the symmetriser in $\mathbf{k}S_{p+1-i}$.*

(2) *For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $V \in \text{Ver}_{p^n}$ the generator, the ideal $\text{Ann}(V) < \mathbf{k}S_\infty$ is generated by the skew symmetriser in $\mathbf{k}S_3$ and the symmetriser in $\mathbf{k}S_{p^n-1}$.*

Proof. We start with case (2), so we need to describe the kernel of

$$\mathbf{k}S_\infty \twoheadrightarrow \text{End}_{SL_2}(V^{\otimes\infty}) \twoheadrightarrow \text{End}_{\text{Ver}_{p^n}}(V^{\otimes\infty}).$$

By classical invariant theory, the kernel of the first surjection is generated by the skew symmetriser in $\mathbf{k}S_3$. We can interpret the middle algebra as an infinite rank Temperley-Lieb algebra, and by construction in [BEO, Co3], see also [Co1, §5], the kernel of the second surjection is generated by the Jones-Wenzl idempotent of rank $p^n - 1$. This can be lifted to the symmetriser in $\mathbf{k}S_{p^n-1}$, for instance because this Jones-Wenzl idempotent cuts out $\text{Sym}^{p^n-1}V$ in the SL_2 -representation $V^{\otimes p^n-1}$.

Part (1) is proved similarly. Indeed, with U the tautological SL_i -representation and using the proof of Theorem 4.1.1(1), we need to describe the kernel of

$$\mathbf{k}S_\infty \twoheadrightarrow \text{End}_{SL_i}(U^{\otimes\infty}) \twoheadrightarrow \text{End}_{\text{Ver}_p(SL_i)}(U^{\otimes\infty}).$$

Now we can use that the maximal tensor ideal in $\text{Tilt}SL_i$, to be quotiented out to create $\text{Ver}_p(SL_i)$, is generated by the symmetriser in $\mathbf{k}S_{p+1-i}$. This is well-known, but will also be proved explicitly in our future work. \square

Problem 6.1.6. A natural open problem is the description of the ideals $\text{Ann}(L)$ for L varying over all simple objects in Ver_{p^∞} , as classified in [BE, BEO].

6.2. Maximal ideals. Let \mathbf{k} be an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$.

6.2.1. First we consider the case $p > 2$, in which case we have the classification of Example 6.1.2. The maximal ideals $\mathcal{J}^{(1)}$ and $\mathcal{J}^{(p-1)}$ in $\mathbf{k}S_\infty$ are generated by the skew symmetriser and symmetriser of $\mathbf{k}S_2$ respectively.

Proposition 6.2.2. *The maximal ideal $\mathcal{J}^{(i)} < \mathbf{k}S_\infty$, for $1 < i < p - 1$, is generated by the skew symmetriser in $\mathbf{k}S_{i+1}$ and the symmetriser in $\mathbf{k}S_{p+1-i}$.*

Proof. This follows from Proposition 6.1.5 and Theorem 4.1.1(1). \square

Remark 6.2.3. To each object X in a tensor category \mathcal{C} , we can now associate a non-empty subset of $\{1, \dots, p - 1\}$ of those i for which $\text{Ann}(X) \subset \text{Ann}(L_i) = \mathcal{J}^{(i)}$. For example, for $X = \mathbb{1}^n$, this set is $\{1, \dots, \min(p - 1, n)\}$.

6.2.4. If $p = 2$, it is no longer true that the only maximal ideal in $\mathbf{k}S_\infty$ correspond to semisimple inductive systems. In other words, there is at least one maximal ideal other than the augmentation ideal $\mathcal{J}^{(1)} = \text{Ann}(\mathbb{1})$, see [BK, Remark(5) on p597]. However, all known maximal ideals connect again to tensor categories:

Lemma 6.2.5. *With $V \in \text{Ver}_4$, we have the maximal ideal*

$$\text{Ann}(V) = \mathcal{J}(\mathbf{Spin}) < \mathbf{k}S_\infty.$$

Proof. It follows from the proof of Theorem 5.4.2 that

$$\mathbf{k}S_\infty / \mathcal{J}(\mathbf{Spin}) \simeq \text{End}_{\text{Ver}_4}(V^{\otimes\infty}) \simeq \varinjlim \text{End}_{\text{Ver}_4}(V^{\otimes 2l+1}) \simeq \varinjlim \text{End}_{\text{Ver}_4}(V^{2^l}).$$

Hence the quotient is a simple algebra, as a direct limit of simple (matrix) algebras. \square

Part 2. Polynomial functors

Let \mathbf{k} be an algebraically closed field.

7. SOME PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS

7.1. Polynomial representations of general linear groups. Fix a tensor category \mathcal{C} over \mathbf{k} and an object $X \in \mathcal{C}$. We refer to [Co4, §7] for a summary of the basic theory of affine group schemes internal to tensor categories and their representations. We also fix $d \in \mathbb{N}$.

7.1.1. We define the Schur algebra $\mathcal{S}(X, d)$, which is an algebra in \mathcal{C} , as the algebra of S_d -invariants in the internal endomorphism algebra of $X^{\otimes d}$

$$\mathcal{S}(X, d) := \underline{\text{End}}(X^{\otimes d})^{S_d} \simeq \Gamma^d(X^\vee \otimes X).$$

7.1.2. The affine group scheme GL_X sends any ind-algebra A in \mathcal{C} to the automorphisms of the A -module $A \otimes X$. One verifies that GL_X is represented by the quotient $\mathcal{O}(GL_X)$ of the algebra

$$\text{Sym}(X^\vee \otimes X \oplus X^\vee \otimes X) \simeq \text{Sym}(X^\vee \otimes X) \otimes \text{Sym}(X^\vee \otimes X) \quad (7.1)$$

by the ideal generated by the images of

$$X^\vee \otimes X \xrightarrow{(\text{ev}_X, X^\vee \otimes \text{co}_X \otimes X)} \mathbb{1} \oplus X^\vee \otimes X \otimes X^\vee \otimes X$$

and a similar morphism

$$X \otimes X^\vee \rightarrow \mathbb{1} \oplus X^\vee \otimes X \otimes X^\vee \otimes X.$$

7.1.3. For the obvious bi-grading of (7.1), the ideal defining $\mathcal{O}(GL_X)$ is thus generated by two subobjects of the direct sum of the components of degree 0,0 and 1,1. Using this grading, it follows easily that the defining morphism from the left factor in (the right-hand side of) equation (7.1) yields a monomorphism

$$\text{Sym}(X^\vee \otimes X) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}(GL_X). \quad (7.2)$$

This induces, for any commutative algebra A in $\text{Ind}\mathcal{C}$

$$GL_X(A) = \text{Aut}_A(A \otimes X) \hookrightarrow \text{End}_A(A \otimes X).$$

7.1.4. Denote by $\text{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}GL_X$ the representation category of GL_X , that is the category of $\mathcal{O}(GL_X)$ -comodules in \mathcal{C} . It contains the d -th tensor power $X^{\otimes d}$ of the defining representation. We consider the category of polynomial representations of degree d

$$\text{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}^d GL_X \subset \text{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}} GL_X$$

which is the topologising subcategory of $\text{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}GL_X$ generated by the GL_X -representations $X^{\otimes d} \otimes Z$, with $Z \in \mathcal{C}$.

Lemma 7.1.5. *Restricting (7.2) to $\text{Sym}^d(X^\vee \otimes X)$ yields a sub-coalgebra of $\mathcal{O}(GL_X)$ which has as dual algebra $\mathcal{S}(X, d)$ from 7.1.1. The resulting functor from $\text{Mod}_{\mathcal{C}}\mathcal{S}(X, d)$ to $\text{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}GL_X$ yields an equivalence*

$$\text{Mod}_{\mathcal{C}}\mathcal{S}(X, d) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}^d GL_X.$$

Proof. Both claims follow precisely as in the classical case $\mathcal{C} = \text{Vec}$. For example, if a GL_X -representation is such that the coaction takes values in $\text{Sym}^d(X^\vee \otimes X) \subset \mathcal{O}(GL_X)$, then the resulting

$$Y \hookrightarrow \text{Sym}^d(X^\vee \otimes X) \otimes Y$$

realises Y as a subquotient of $X^{\otimes d} \otimes \omega((X^\vee)^{\otimes d} \otimes Y)$, where we use ω for the forgetful functor from $\text{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}GL_X$ to \mathcal{C} . \square

7.1.6. We have the standard group homomorphism

$$\phi: \pi(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow GL_X, \quad (7.3)$$

from the fundamental group $\pi(\mathcal{C})$ of \mathcal{C} , see [De1, §7]. For example, on \mathbf{k} -points it is given by evaluation at X

$$\mathrm{Aut}^{\otimes}(\mathrm{Id}_{\mathcal{C}}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathcal{C}}(X).$$

Following [De1, §7] we consider the Serre subcategory $\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}(GL_X, \phi)$ of $\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}GL_X$ comprising GL_X -representations Y on which the canonical action of $\pi(\mathcal{C})$ on Y coincides with the restriction via (7.3).

Denote by $\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}^d(GL_X, \phi)$ the topologising subcategory of $\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}(GL_X, \phi)$ of representations that are in $\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}^dGL_X$ as well as in $\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}(GL_X, \phi)$.

Lemma 7.1.7. (1) *The equivalence*

$$\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}(GL_X, \phi) \boxtimes \mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}GL_X \quad (7.4)$$

from [CEO2, Lemma 4.2.3] restricts to an equivalence

$$\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}^d(GL_X, \phi) \boxtimes \mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}^dGL_X.$$

(2) $\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}^d(GL_X, \phi)$ is the topologising subcategory of $\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}GL_X$ generated by $X^{\otimes d}$.

Proof. Denote by $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}^d(GL_X, \phi)$ the topologising subcategory of $\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}GL_X$ generated by $X^{\otimes d}$. By definition, restriction of the equivalence (7.4) yields a functor

$$\mathcal{A} \boxtimes \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}GL_X,$$

by construction fully faithful and essentially surjective, and hence an equivalence. This implies that

$$\mathrm{Rep}^d(GL_X, d) \boxtimes \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}GL_X,$$

is also essentially surjective and hence an equivalence, proving part (1). Part (2) then follows from [CF, Corollary 3.2.8]. \square

7.2. Modules of categories.

7.2.1. We fix the following data. Let \mathcal{A} be a \mathbf{k} -linear pseudo-abelian category with a fixed *faithful* \mathbf{k} -linear functor

$$\omega: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathrm{Vec}_{\mathbf{k}},$$

where, as before, $\mathrm{Vec}_{\mathbf{k}}$ is the category of finite dimensional vector spaces. It follows that \mathcal{A} is a Krull-Schmidt category, and by finite dimensionality, for each $M \in \mathrm{Idc}\mathcal{A}$, there is a unique \mathbf{k} -algebra morphism

$$\alpha_M: \mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{A}}(M) \rightarrow \mathbf{k}. \quad (7.5)$$

We define $\mathrm{mod}^{\omega}(\mathcal{A})$, or simply $\mathrm{mod}(\mathcal{A})$ when ω is clear from context, as the topologising subcategory, generated by ω , of the abelian category $\mathrm{Fun}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathrm{Vec})$ of \mathbf{k} -linear functors $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathrm{Vec}$. Note that the condition for a functor $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathrm{Vec}$ to be a subquotient of some ω^n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, is only a ‘finiteness’ condition. Indeed, by faithfulness of ω , every functor $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathrm{Vec}$ is (inside the category of functors $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathrm{Vec}^{\infty}$) a subquotient of ω^{κ} for some cardinality κ . In particular, if $\mathrm{Idc}\mathcal{A}$ is a finite set, we have

$$\mathrm{mod}^{\omega}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathrm{Fun}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathrm{Vec}_{\mathbf{k}}).$$

Example 7.2.2. We are interested in cases where \mathcal{A} is a pseudo-abelian subcategory of $\mathrm{Rep}G$, for a finite group G , and $\omega = \mathrm{Frg}$ is the forgetful functor. Note that $\mathrm{mod}^{\omega}(\mathrm{Rep}G)$ contains all finitely generated objects, (*i.e.* quotients of representable functors), but in general more. Similarly, $\mathrm{mod}^{\omega}(\mathrm{Rep}G)$ is usually a strict subcategory of $\mathrm{Fun}(\mathrm{Rep}G, \mathrm{Vec})$.

Lemma 7.2.3. *Keep notation and assumptions from 7.2.1.*

(1) *There is a bijection*

$$\mathrm{Idc}\mathcal{A} \xrightarrow{1:1} \mathrm{Irr}\mathrm{mod}^\omega(\mathcal{A}), \quad M \mapsto \Delta_M,$$

so that $\Delta_M(N) = 0$ for all $M \neq N \in \mathrm{Idc}\mathcal{A}$.

(2) *Inside $\mathrm{mod}^\omega(\mathcal{A})$, we have decomposition multiplicities*

$$[F : \Delta_M] = \dim_{\mathbf{k}} F(M), \quad \text{for all } M \in \mathrm{Idc}\mathcal{A} \text{ and } F \in \mathrm{mod}^\omega(\mathcal{A}).$$

Proof. The bijection between simple objects in $\mathrm{Fun}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathrm{Vec})$ and $\mathrm{Idc}\mathcal{A}$ is well-known. Concretely, for $M \in \mathrm{Idc}\mathcal{A}$, we can define $\Delta_M : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathrm{Vec}$, uniquely determined by $\Delta_M(N) = 0$ for all indecomposables $N \neq M$ and $\Delta_M(M) = \mathbf{k}$, while the action of Δ_M on $\mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{A}}(M)$ is given by α_M in (7.5).

For part (1) it thus suffices to show that Δ_M is included in $\mathrm{mod}^\omega(\mathcal{A})$. For this we can observe that Δ_M is a quotient of its projective cover in $\mathrm{Fun}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathrm{Vec})$

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(M, -) : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathrm{Vec},$$

which is in turn, by faithfulness of ω , a subobject of $\omega^{\dim_{\mathbf{k}} \omega(M)}$.

The previous paragraph shows that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(M, -)$ is the projective cover of Δ_M in $\mathrm{mod}(\mathcal{A})$ so that part (2) follows from the Yoneda lemma. \square

7.2.4. Let $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{A}$ be a pseudo-abelian subcategory. We denote the restriction of ω to \mathcal{B} again by ω . Then we have an obvious restriction functor

$$\mathrm{mod}^\omega(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathrm{mod}^\omega(\mathcal{B}), \quad \Delta \mapsto \Delta|_{\mathcal{B}} \tag{7.6}$$

which identifies the right-hand side with the Serre quotient of $\mathrm{mod}^\omega(\mathcal{A})$ with respect to the Serre subcategory of $F \in \mathrm{mod}^{\mathrm{Frg}}(\mathcal{A})$ that satisfy $F(N) = 0$ for all $N \in \mathcal{B}$. The following lemma is now standard.

Lemma 7.2.5. (1) *Let \mathcal{C} be an abelian category. Composition with (7.6) yields an equivalence of categories between the category of exact functors $\mathrm{mod}(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ and the category of exact functors $\mathrm{mod}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ which send $F : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathrm{Vec}$ to zero when $F|_{\mathcal{B}} = 0$.*

(2) *Consider a family of pseudo-abelian subcategories $\{\mathcal{B}_\alpha \subset \mathcal{A} \mid \alpha \in \Lambda\}$ such that $\sum_{\alpha} \mathcal{B}_\alpha = \mathcal{A}$. Then the functor*

$$\mathrm{mod}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \prod_{\alpha} \mathrm{mod}(\mathcal{B}_\alpha)$$

is faithful. Assume furthermore that there is a function $\Lambda^{(2)} \rightarrow \Lambda$, mapping every unordered pair $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ to $\gamma(\alpha, \beta)$ such that $\mathcal{B}_\alpha \subset \mathcal{B}_{\gamma(\alpha, \beta)}$ and $\mathcal{B}_\beta \subset \mathcal{B}_{\gamma(\alpha, \beta)}$. Then for any $\Delta, \nabla \in \mathrm{mod}(\mathcal{A})$ and a collection of morphisms

$$\{f_\alpha : \Delta|_{\mathcal{B}_\alpha} \Rightarrow \nabla|_{\mathcal{B}_\alpha} \mid \alpha \in \Lambda\},$$

there is $f : \Delta \Rightarrow \nabla$ with $f|_{\mathcal{B}_\alpha} = f_\alpha$ if and only if $f_{\gamma(\alpha, \beta)}|_{\mathcal{B}_\alpha} = f_\alpha$ for all $\{\alpha, \beta\} \in \Lambda^{(2)}$.

Example 7.2.6. We have pseudo-abelian subcategories $\mathbf{B}_X^d[\mathcal{C}] \subset \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{k}}^d$, where $(\mathcal{C}, X \in \mathcal{C})$ runs over all tensor categories and their objects. For $(\mathcal{D}, Y \in \mathcal{D})$, by Proposition 3.1.5(1), we have

$$\mathbf{B}_X^d[\mathcal{C}] = \mathbf{B}_X^d[\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{D}] \subset \mathbf{B}_{X \oplus Y}^d[\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{D}] \supset \mathbf{B}_Y^d[\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{D}] = \mathbf{B}_Y^d[\mathcal{D}].$$

Hence we are in the situation of Lemma 7.2.5(2).

7.2.7. We fix a pseudo-abelian subcategory $\mathcal{A} \subset \text{Rep}S_d$ with $\text{Idc}\mathcal{A}$ finite. Then

$$\text{mod}(\mathcal{A}) \boxtimes \mathcal{C} = \text{Fun}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{A}, \text{Vec}) \boxtimes \mathcal{C} \simeq \text{Fun}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}),$$

see [CF, Example 3.2.4(3)]. By [CF, Lemma 3.2.3], every object in $\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \text{mod}(\mathcal{A})$ is a quotient, and a subobject, of some object of the form $Y \boxtimes X$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} Q &\simeq \int^{M \in \mathcal{A}} Q(M) \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} \text{Hom}_{S_d}(M, -) \\ &\simeq \int_{M \in \mathcal{A}} Q(M) \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} \text{Hom}_{S_d}(-, M)^*, \quad \text{for all } Q \in \text{Fun}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}). \end{aligned}$$

For all $U, V \in \mathcal{C}$, we define

$$R_{U;V} \in \text{Fun}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}), \quad M \mapsto ((M \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} (U^\vee)^{\otimes d})^{S_d})^{S_d} \otimes V. \quad (7.7)$$

8. TWO APPROACHES TO POLYNOMIAL FUNCTORS

Fix $d \in \mathbb{N}$.

8.1. **Strict polynomial functors.** Fix a tensor category \mathcal{C} over \mathbf{k} .

8.1.1. Recall the self-enrichment $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ of \mathcal{C} from Example 1.4.3. We can also consider $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ as enriched in the category of affine schemes in $\text{Ind}\mathcal{C}$, and define strict polynomial functors in this fashion, see [Ax] for the case $\mathcal{C} = \mathbf{sVec}$. Instead, we follow the equivalent path to polynomial functors from [Kr] and references therein.

Let $\Gamma^d \underline{\mathcal{C}}$ be the \mathcal{C} -enriched category with same objects as $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$, but

$$\Gamma^d \underline{\mathcal{C}}(X, Y) := \Gamma^d(\underline{\mathcal{C}}(X, Y)) \simeq \underline{\text{Hom}}(X^{\otimes d}, Y^{\otimes d})^{S_d}.$$

The composition arrows are obtained from the observation that evaluation at $Y^{\otimes d}$,

$$\underline{\text{Hom}}(Y^{\otimes d}, Z^{\otimes d}) \otimes \underline{\text{Hom}}(X^{\otimes d}, Y^{\otimes d}) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Hom}}(X^{\otimes d}, Z^{\otimes d}),$$

restricts to a map between the $\Gamma^d \underline{\mathcal{C}}$ -morphism subobjects.

Remark 8.1.2. Let $\Gamma^d \mathcal{C}$ be the underlying category of $\Gamma^d \underline{\mathcal{C}}$, with morphism spaces

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X^{\otimes d}, Y^{\otimes d})^{S_d}.$$

Then $\Gamma^d \mathcal{C}$ is the full subcategory of $\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \text{Rep}S_d$ corresponding to the essential image of $(-)^{\otimes d}$, see Example 1.3.4(1). Consider also the \mathcal{C} -module category $\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \text{Rep}S_d$. As in Section 1.4 we can consider its corresponding \mathcal{C} -enrichment. Then $\Gamma^d \underline{\mathcal{C}}$ is the full \mathcal{C} -enriched subcategory of $\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \text{Rep}S_d$ corresponding to the objects contained in $\Gamma^d \mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{C} \boxtimes \text{Rep}S_d$.

Definition 8.1.3. The category $\text{SPol}^d \mathcal{C}$ of **strict polynomial \mathcal{C} -functors of degree d** is the \mathbf{k} -linear category of \mathcal{C} -enriched functors $\Gamma^d \underline{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{C}}$ and \mathcal{C} -enriched natural transformations.

Concretely, a strict polynomial \mathcal{C} -functor \mathbb{T} is an assignment

$$\text{Ob}\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Ob}\mathcal{C}, \quad X \mapsto \mathbb{T}(X),$$

and, for each pair of objects X, Y in \mathcal{C} , a morphism in \mathcal{C}

$$\underline{\text{Hom}}(X^{\otimes d}, Y^{\otimes d})^{S_d} \rightarrow \underline{\text{Hom}}(\mathbb{T}(X), \mathbb{T}(Y)) \quad (8.1)$$

satisfying the usual associativity and identity relations.

A morphism from \mathbb{T}_1 to \mathbb{T}_2 comprises a morphism $\mathbb{T}_1(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_2(X)$ in \mathcal{C} for every object $X \in \mathcal{C}$ so that the two canonical morphisms

$$\underline{\text{Hom}}(X^{\otimes d}, Y^{\otimes d})^{S_d} \otimes \mathbb{T}_1(X) \rightrightarrows \mathbb{T}_2(Y)$$

are equal for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{C}$.

Using exactness of the bifunctor $\underline{\text{Hom}}$ it follows easily that $\text{SPol}^d\mathcal{C}$ is an abelian category. In particular, a chain $\mathbb{T}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_3$ in $\text{SPol}^d\mathcal{C}$ is a short exact sequence if and only if

$$0 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_1(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_2(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_3(X) \rightarrow 0$$

is exact in \mathcal{C} for each $X \in \mathcal{C}$.

Example 8.1.4. For $U, V \in \mathcal{C}$, we define $\mathbb{T}_{U;V} \in \text{SPol}^d\mathcal{C}$, by

$$\mathbb{T}_{U;V}(X) := U \otimes \underline{\text{Hom}}(V^{\otimes d}, X^{\otimes d})^{S_d} = U \otimes \Gamma^d(V^\vee \otimes X).$$

The defining morphisms (8.1), for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{C}$, can be obtained via adjunction from

$$U \otimes \Gamma^d(V^\vee \otimes X) \otimes \Gamma^d(X^\vee \otimes Y) \rightarrow U \otimes \Gamma^d(V^\vee \otimes Y).$$

Example 8.1.5. For a fixed $Z \in \mathcal{C}$, we define the assignment $X \mapsto Z \otimes X^{\otimes d}$, with morphisms

$$\underline{\text{Hom}}(X^{\otimes d}, Y^{\otimes d})^{S_d} \hookrightarrow \underline{\text{Hom}}(X^{\otimes d}, Y^{\otimes d}) \hookrightarrow \underline{\text{Hom}}(Z \otimes X^{\otimes d}, Z \otimes Y^{\otimes d})$$

given by inclusion of invariants followed by whiskering of co_Z . We denote the corresponding strict polynomial functor by $Z \otimes \mathbb{T}^d$.

Proposition 8.1.6. (1) For every $\mathbb{T} \in \text{SPol}^d\mathcal{C}$ we have natural isomorphisms

$$\text{Hom}_{\text{SPol}^d\mathcal{C}}(\mathbb{T}_{U;V}, \mathbb{T}) \simeq \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(U, \mathbb{T}(V)).$$

- (2) Every object in $\text{Ind}(\text{SPol}^d\mathcal{C})$ is a quotient of a direct sum of objects of the form $\mathbb{T}_{U;V}$.
(3) Every object in $\text{Ind}(\text{SPol}^d\mathcal{C})$ is a subquotient of a direct sum of strict polynomial functors $Z \otimes \mathbb{T}^d$ as in Example 8.1.5.

Proof. Part (1) is just a version of the Yoneda Lemma. Part (1) implies that

$$\prod_{U,V} \text{Hom}_{\text{SPol}^d\mathcal{C}}(\mathbb{T}_{U;V}, -) : \text{SPol}^d\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Vec}^\infty$$

is a faithful functor, from which part (2) follows.

Since $\mathbb{T}_{U;V}$ is a subobject of $U \otimes (V^\vee)^{\otimes d} \otimes \mathbb{T}^d$, part (3) follows from part (2). \square

Motivated by Proposition 8.1.6 we define the following ‘finite’ version of $\text{SPol}^d\mathcal{C}$.

Definition 8.1.7. The full (topologising) subcategory $\text{SPol}_0^d\mathcal{C}$ of $\text{SPol}^d\mathcal{C}$ is the category of subquotients of the objects $Z \otimes \mathbb{T}^d$, for $Z \in \mathcal{C}$.

Example 8.1.8. We have $\text{SPol}^1\mathcal{C} \simeq \mathcal{C} \simeq \text{SPol}_0^1\mathcal{C}$, see Theorem 9.5.1.

8.1.9. Fix an object $X \in \mathcal{C}$. We have an obvious \mathbf{k} -linear exact functor

$$\text{SPol}^d\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Mod}_{\mathcal{C}}\mathcal{S}(X, d) \simeq \text{Rep}^d GL_X, \quad \mathbb{T} \mapsto \mathbb{T}(X). \quad (8.2)$$

Indeed, if we interpret the \mathcal{C} -algebra $\mathcal{S}(X, d)$ as a \mathcal{C} -enriched category with one object, it is by construction a full subcategory of $\Gamma^d\mathcal{C}$ and the above functor corresponds to restriction.

8.2. Universal polynomial functors.

8.2.1. A **universal functor** is the data of a (not necessarily additive) endofunctor $\Phi^{\mathcal{C}}$ of each tensor category \mathcal{C} over \mathbf{k} together with a natural isomorphism

$$\eta^F : \Phi^{\mathcal{D}} \circ F \xrightarrow{\sim} F \circ \Phi^{\mathcal{C}}$$

for each tensor functor $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ such that:

- (1) $\eta^{\text{Id}_{\mathcal{C}}} = \text{Id}_{\Phi^{\mathcal{C}}}$ and $\eta^{G \circ F} = G(\eta^F) \circ (\eta^G)_F$, for all compositions $G \circ F$ of tensor functors.
(2) For every natural transformation $f : F \Rightarrow G$ of tensor functors $F, G : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$, we have

$$f_{\Phi^{\mathcal{C}}} \circ \eta^F = \eta^G \circ \Phi^{\mathcal{D}}(f).$$

A morphism between universal functors $\{\Phi^{\mathcal{C}}, \eta^F\}$ and $\{\Psi^{\mathcal{C}}, \xi^F\}$ is the assignment of a natural transformation $\alpha^{\mathcal{C}} : \Phi^{\mathcal{C}} \Rightarrow \Psi^{\mathcal{C}}$ for each \mathcal{C} , so that for each tensor functor $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$

$$F(\alpha^{\mathcal{C}}) \circ \eta^F = \xi^F \circ (\alpha^{\mathcal{D}})_F.$$

The category $\mathbf{UFun}_{\mathbf{k}}$ of universal functors is abelian. Indeed, finite limits and colimits can be computed at each object in each tensor category.

Example 8.2.2. The functors

$$T_d^{\mathcal{C}} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}, \quad X \mapsto X^{\otimes d}$$

define a universal functor T_d . Indeed, the monoidal structure of tensor functors provides the required natural isomorphisms

$$\gamma_X^F : F(X)^{\otimes d} \xrightarrow{\sim} F(X^{\otimes d}).$$

All coherence conditions follow from the definition of monoidal functors.

Definition 8.2.3. The category $\mathbf{Pol}_{\mathbf{k}}^d$ of **universal polynomial functors of degree d** is the topologising subcategory of $\mathbf{UFun}_{\mathbf{k}}$ generated by T_d .

- Example 8.2.4.**
- (1) For $\text{char}(\mathbf{k}) = 0$ or $d < \text{char}(\mathbf{k}) = p$ the Schur functors \mathbf{S}^λ , see [De2], for $\lambda \vdash d$ are universal polynomial functors of degree d .
 - (2) For arbitrary characteristics, $\text{Sym}^d, \Gamma^d, \wedge^d, \Lambda^d$ and \mathbf{A}^d , see [CEO1, §2.3], are universal polynomial functors.
 - (3) For $\text{char}(\mathbf{k}) = p > 0$, the enhanced Frobenius functor $\text{Fr}^{en} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C} \boxtimes \overline{\text{Rep}S_p}$ from [CEO1, §3.2] decomposes into $(p-1)^2$ universal polynomial functors of degree p .

8.2.5. For any tensor category \mathcal{D} over \mathbf{k} with object $Y \in \mathcal{D}$, there is an obvious \mathbf{k} -linear and exact evaluation functor

$$\mathbf{Pol}_{\mathbf{k}}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{D}, \quad \Phi \mapsto \Phi^{\mathcal{D}}(Y).$$

Of particular interest is $\mathcal{D} = \text{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}(GL_X, \phi)$ and Y the GL_X -representation X , for some $X \in \mathcal{C}$. This yields a \mathbf{k} -linear and exact evaluation functor

$$\mathbf{Pol}_{\mathbf{k}}^d \rightarrow \text{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}^d(GL_X, \phi). \tag{8.3}$$

Remark 8.2.6. For ease of notation, we will often write abbreviate $\Phi^{\text{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}GL_X}(X)$ to $\Phi^{\mathcal{C}}(X)$. Indeed, we can identify both under the forgetful functor $\text{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}GL_X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ (by definition of universal functors). Moreover, the $\mathcal{O}(GL_X)$ -coaction on $\Phi^{\mathcal{C}}(X)$ can be recovered unambiguously; it is the unique coaction that $\Phi^{\mathcal{C}}(X)$ inherits as a subquotient of the GL_X -representation $(X^{\otimes d})^n$, for $\Phi^{\mathcal{C}}$ viewed as a subquotient of $(T_d)^n$.

9. THREE SIDES OF THE SAME COIN

In this section we show how the study of symmetric group representations from tensor categories in Part 1 and both approaches to polynomial functors in Section 8 are actually different ways of looking at the same information.

Throughout we assume that \mathbf{k} is an algebraically closed field and we fix $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Unless further specified, \mathcal{C} is an arbitrary tensor category over \mathbf{k} .

9.1. Main results. Recall $\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{k}}^d \subset \text{Rep}S_d$ from Question 3.1.8. The results in the following theorem will be proved in Theorems 9.3.3, 9.3.6, 9.4.4 and 9.5.1.

Theorem 9.1.1. *Let \mathcal{C} be a tensor category over \mathbf{k} and $X \in \mathcal{C}$.*

- (1) *Evaluation (8.2) yields an equivalence*

$$\mathbf{SPol}^d \mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}^d GL_X$$

if and only if $\mathbf{B}_X^d = \mathbf{B}^d[\mathcal{C}]$.

(2) Evaluation (8.3) yields an equivalence

$$\text{Pol}^d \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}^d(GL_X, \phi)$$

if and only if $\mathbf{B}_X^d = \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{k}}^d$.

(3) If $\mathbf{B}^d[\mathcal{C}] = \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{k}}^d$, we have an equivalence

$$\text{SPol}_{\circ}^d \mathcal{C} \simeq \mathcal{C} \boxtimes \text{Pol}^d.$$

(4) There are equivalences

$$\text{Pol}^d \simeq \text{mod}^{\text{Frg}}(\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{k}}^d), \quad \text{SPol}_{\circ}^d \mathcal{C} \simeq \mathcal{C} \boxtimes \text{mod}^{\text{Frg}}(\mathbf{B}^d[\mathcal{C}]) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}^d(GL_X, \phi) \simeq \text{Fun}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{B}_X^d, \text{Vec}).$$

(5) Inside $\text{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}} GL_X$, the representation $X^{\otimes d}$ has a Jordan-Hölder filtration with simples labelled by $\text{Idc} \mathbf{B}_X^d$, where the simple corresponding to $M \in \mathbf{B}_X^d$ appears $\dim_{\mathbf{k}} M$ times.

Theorem 9.1.1 motivates the following terminology.

Definition 9.1.2. (1) An object $X \in \mathcal{C}$ is **relatively d -discerning** if $\mathbf{B}_X^d = \mathbf{B}^d[\mathcal{C}]$.

(2) An object $X \in \mathcal{C}$ is **d -discerning** if $\mathbf{B}_X^d = \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{k}}^d$.

(3) A tensor category \mathcal{C} is **d -discerning** if $\mathbf{B}^d[\mathcal{C}] = \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{k}}^d$.

Lemma 9.1.3. Let \mathcal{C} be a finite Frobenius exact tensor category with projective generator $P \in \mathcal{C}$. Then P^n is relatively d -discerning for all $n \geq d$.

Proof. Corollary 5.1.4(1) implies that

$$\mathbf{B}^d[\mathcal{C}] = \cup_n \mathbf{B}_{P^n}^d.$$

That, for any X , $\mathbf{B}_{X^n}^d = \mathbf{B}_{X^d}^d$ for all $n \geq d$ follows easily by induction on d . \square

Remark 9.1.4. Lemma 9.1.3 does not remain true without the condition of Frobenius exactness. Indeed, it is not true for Ver_4 or Ver_4^+ by Example 9.1.5(2) below.

Example 9.1.5. We consider the case $d = 2$ and $p = \text{char}(\mathbf{k}) = 2$.

(1) Every tensor category over \mathbf{k} is 2-discerning, since

$$\mathbf{Young}^2 = \text{Rep} S_2.$$

(2) An object X is 2-discerning if and only if $\wedge^2 X \neq 0$ (i.e. X is not invertible) and $\text{Fr}(X) = X^{(1)} \neq 0$. For instance, in Vec , Ver_4^+ and Ver_4 every object is 2-discerning so long as it contains a direct summand $\mathbb{1}$ and is not indecomposable.

(3) For every tensor category \mathcal{C} and $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>1}$, we have

$$\text{Pol}^2 \simeq \text{SPol}^2 \mathcal{C} \simeq \text{Rep}_{\mathbf{k}}^2 GL_n \simeq \text{Fun}_{\mathbf{k}}(\text{Rep} S_2, \text{Vec}).$$

Example 9.1.6. If $d < p = \text{char}(\mathbf{k})$ or $\text{char}(\mathbf{k}) = 0$, then every tensor category \mathcal{C} over \mathbf{k} is d -discerning and

$$\text{SPol}^d \mathcal{C} \simeq \mathcal{C} \boxtimes \text{Pol}^d \simeq \mathcal{C} \boxtimes \text{Rep}_{\mathbf{k}}^d GL_d \simeq \mathcal{C} \boxtimes \text{Rep} S_d.$$

We conclude this section by observing that in tensor categories of moderate growth, no object can be (relatively) d -discerning for all $d \in \mathbb{N}$.

Lemma 9.1.7. If \mathcal{C} is of moderate growth, then $\mathbf{B}_X \neq \mathbf{B}[\mathcal{C}]$ for all $X \in \mathcal{C}$.

Proof. By [CEO1, Proposition 4.7(3)], there is some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ for which

$$\beta_X^n : kS_n \rightarrow \text{End}(X^{\otimes n})$$

is not injective. By construction, the kernel of β_X^n acts trivially on all representations in \mathbf{B}_X^n . Conversely, $\mathbf{B}^n[\mathcal{C}]$ contains the faithful regular representation kS_n , see Example 2.3.3(2). \square

Remark 9.1.8. For tensor categories not of moderate growth, Lemma 9.1.7 is not true. See Example (3.1.7)(2), or $(\text{Rep} GL)_t$, say for $k = \mathbb{C}$ and $t \notin \mathbb{Z}$, see [De3, §10].

9.2. Representations of the symmetric group and universal functors.

9.2.1. We define a \mathbf{k} -linear functor

$$\mathrm{Fun}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathbf{k}}S_d, \mathrm{Vec}) \rightarrow \mathrm{UFun}_{\mathbf{k}}, \quad \Delta \mapsto T_{\Delta}, \quad (9.1)$$

as follows. For any \mathbf{k} -linear functor

$$\Delta : \mathrm{Rep}S_d \rightarrow \mathrm{Vec},$$

and tensor category \mathcal{C} , we define the composite functor

$$T_{\Delta}^{\mathcal{C}} : \mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{-\otimes d} \mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathrm{Rep}S_d \xrightarrow{\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \Delta} \mathcal{C}.$$

For every tensor functor $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$, we have natural isomorphisms corresponding to the two commutative squares in

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{RT_d^{\mathcal{C}} = -\otimes d} & \mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathrm{Rep}S_d & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \Delta} & \mathcal{C} \\ \downarrow F & & \downarrow F \boxtimes \mathrm{Rep}S_d & & \downarrow F \\ \mathcal{D} & \xrightarrow{RT_d^{\mathcal{D}} = -\otimes d} & \mathcal{D} \boxtimes \mathrm{Rep}S_d & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D} \boxtimes \Delta} & \mathcal{D}. \end{array}$$

Indeed, the first square is commutative via γ in Example 8.2.2. For the second square we can take the natural isomorphism

$$a(F, \Delta) : (\mathcal{D} \boxtimes \Delta) \circ (F \boxtimes \mathrm{Rep}S_d) \xrightarrow{\sim} F \circ (\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \Delta)$$

from Lemma 1.3.3, which allows us to give $T_{\Delta} := \{T_{\Delta}^{\mathcal{C}}\}$ the structure of a universal functor, as follows from Lemma 1.3.3(1)-(3).

For a natural transformation $\beta : \Delta_1 \Rightarrow \Delta_2$, we have the natural transformation

$$(\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{B})_{RT_d} : T_{\Delta_1}^{\mathcal{C}} \Rightarrow T_{\Delta_2}^{\mathcal{C}}.$$

and as an immediate application of Lemma 1.3.3(4) this produces a morphism of universal functors.

Lemma 9.2.2. *Fix $\Delta \in \mathrm{Fun}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathrm{Rep}S_d, \mathrm{Vec})$.*

- (1) *The functor (9.1) is exact.*
- (2) *For a tensor category \mathcal{C} and a faithful exact \mathbf{k} -linear functor $\Omega : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathrm{Vec}$, the following diagram of \mathbf{k} -linear functors is commutative (with Ω^d from Example 1.3.4):*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{T_{\Delta}^{\mathcal{C}}} & \mathcal{C} \\ \Omega^d \downarrow & & \downarrow \Omega \\ \mathrm{Rep}S_d & \xrightarrow{\Delta} & \mathrm{Vec}. \end{array}$$

- (3) *We have $T_{\Delta}^{\mathcal{C}} = 0$ if and only if $\Delta|_{\mathbf{B}^d[\mathcal{C}]} = 0$. For a given $X \in \mathcal{C}$, we have $T_{\Delta}^{\mathcal{C}}(X) = 0$ if and only if $\Delta|_{\mathbf{B}_X^d} = 0$.*

Proof. Part (2) is a direct application of the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{-\otimes d} & \mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathrm{Rep}S_d & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \Delta} & \mathcal{C} \\ & & \Omega \boxtimes \mathrm{Rep}S_d \downarrow & & \downarrow \Omega \\ & & \mathrm{Rep}S_d & \xrightarrow{\Delta} & \mathrm{Vec}, \end{array}$$

which is an example of Lemma 1.3.3.

For part (1), observe that exactness of (9.1) is equivalent to exactness of the composite

$$\mathrm{Fun}(\mathrm{Rep}S_d, \mathrm{Vec}) \xrightarrow{\Delta \mapsto T_\Delta} \mathrm{UFun} \xrightarrow{\Phi \mapsto \Phi^{\mathcal{C}}(X)} \mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{\Omega} \mathrm{Vec}$$

for every tensor category \mathcal{C} and $X \in \mathcal{C}$, and some choice of Ω as in (2). By part (2), this composite functor is simply $\Delta \mapsto \Delta(\Omega^d(X))$, which is indeed exact, proving part (1).

Part (3) follows from part (2) and faithfulness of Ω . \square

Example 9.2.3. The universal functor T_{Frg} is isomorphic to $\{T_d^{\mathcal{C}}\}$ from Example 8.2.2.

9.3. Representations of the symmetric group and universal polynomial functors.

By Example 9.2.3 and Lemma 9.2.2(1), if Δ is a subquotient of Frg^n for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then T_Δ is a universal polynomial functor. Hence (9.1) restricts to a \mathbf{k} -linear exact functor

$$T : \mathrm{mod}^{\mathrm{Frg}}(\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathbf{k}}S_d) \rightarrow \mathrm{Pol}_{\mathbf{k}}^d, \quad \Delta \mapsto T_\Delta. \quad (9.2)$$

Example 9.3.1. (1) Recall from Lemma 7.2.3 that the simple objects in $\mathrm{mod}(\mathrm{Rep}S_d)$ are in bijection with the indecomposable S_d -representations. We abbreviate

$$D_M := T_{\Delta_M}, \quad \text{for } M \in \mathrm{IdcRep}S_d.$$

For a tensor category \mathcal{C} with object $X \in \mathcal{C}$, we will typically further abbreviate $D_M^{\mathcal{C}}(X)$ to $D_M(X)$.

(2) Set $d = 2$ and assume $p = 2$. Then

$$D_{\mathbb{1}}(X) \simeq \mathrm{Fr}(X) = X^{(1)} \quad \text{and} \quad D_{\mathbf{k}C_2}(X) \simeq \wedge^2(X).$$

By Theorem 9.3.3 below, $X^{(1)}$ and $\wedge^2 X$ are simple (or zero) GL_X -representations. Furthermore, by Theorem 9.3.6, the only indecomposable universal polynomial functors of degree 2 are Fr , \wedge^2 , Sym^2 , Γ^2 and T_2 .

(3) For $d < \mathrm{char}(\mathbf{k})$ or $\mathrm{char}(\mathbf{k}) = 0$, the decomposition in terms of Schur functors

$$X^{\otimes d} \simeq \bigoplus_{\lambda \vdash d} \mathbf{S}_\lambda(X)$$

from [De2, §1] satisfies $\mathbf{S}_\lambda = D_{S^\lambda}$, for S^λ the Specht module corresponding to λ . By Theorem 9.3.3 below $\mathbf{S}_\lambda X$ is a simple (or zero) GL_X -representation.

(4) For $p = \mathrm{char}(\mathbf{k}) > 0$ and $d = p^j$, consider the functor $\Delta_{\mathbb{1}} = \mathrm{Triv}_{S_{p^j}}$ from 5.3.5. Then

$$D_{\mathbb{1}} = T_{\Delta_{\mathbb{1}}} \simeq \mathrm{Fr}_+^{(j)},$$

as in [Co2, §4.1]. As proved in [CEO1, Lemma 5.1], with a new interpretation in Lemma 5.3.6, we have $\mathrm{Fr}_+^{(j)} = (\mathrm{Fr}_+)^j$ on Frobenius exact categories.

9.3.2. By Lemma 9.2.2 and Lemma 7.2.5(1) applied to the pseudo-abelian subcategories $\mathbf{B}_X^d \subset \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{k}}^d \subset \mathrm{Rep}S_d$, the functors (8.3) and (9.2) yield a commutative square, defining H_X :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{mod}^{\mathrm{Frg}}(\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathbf{k}}S_d) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{mod}^{\mathrm{Frg}}(\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{k}}^d) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Pol}_{\mathbf{k}}^d \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ & & \mathrm{mod}(\mathbf{B}_X^d) & \xrightarrow{H_X} & \mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}^d(GL_X, \phi). \end{array} \quad (9.3)$$

By construction, the lower horizontal arrow is exact and faithful.

Theorem 9.3.3. Consider a tensor category \mathcal{C} with $X \in \mathcal{C}$ and $M \in \mathrm{IdcRep}S_d$.

- (1) The functor $H_X : \mathrm{mod}(\mathbf{B}_X^d) \rightarrow \mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}^d(GL_X, \phi)$ is an equivalence.
- (2) The GL_X -representation $D_M(X)$ is simple if $M \in \mathbf{B}_X^d$, and zero if $M \notin \mathbf{B}_X^d$.
- (3) Multiplicities of the simple constituents of $X^{\otimes d}$ in $\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}GL_X$ are given by

$$[X^{\otimes d} : D_M(X)] = \dim_{\mathbf{k}} M.$$

Proof. We will prove, as an application of the straightforward Lemma 9.3.4 below, that the composite functor

$$F : \text{Fun}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{B}_X^d, \mathcal{C}) \simeq \mathcal{C} \boxtimes \text{mod}(\mathbf{B}_X^d) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{C} \boxtimes H_X} \mathcal{C} \boxtimes \text{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}^d(GL_X, \phi) \simeq \text{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}^d GL_X \simeq \text{Mod}_{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{S}(X, d)$$

is an equivalence. This implies that also H_X is an equivalence, see [CF, Corollary 3.2.8]. Firstly, F is exact and faithful since H_X is so, see 1.3.2.

From the expressions in 7.2.7, we find for $Q : \mathbf{B}_X^d \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$,

$$F(Q) \simeq \int^{M \in \mathbf{B}_X^d} Q(M) \otimes (M^* \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} X^{\otimes d})^{S_d} \quad (9.4)$$

$$\simeq \int_{M \in \mathbf{B}_X^d} Q(M) \otimes (M^* \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} X^{\otimes d})_{S_d}. \quad (9.5)$$

The GL_X -representation structures of the latter two objects are the unique ones coming from quotients or subobjects of copies of $X^{\otimes d}$, see Remark 8.2.6.

For the collection of objects $E_{\mathcal{B}}$ in $\mathcal{B} := \text{Mod}_{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{S}(X, d)$, we take the free modules

$$E_{\mathcal{B}} := \{\mathcal{S}(X, d) \otimes Y \mid Y \in \mathcal{C}\}.$$

Now, for $Y \in \mathcal{C}$, consider the functor $R_{X;Y}$ from (7.7), for $\mathcal{A} = \mathbf{B}_X^d$. It follows from (9.4) and Lemma 3.2.5 that

$$F(R_{X;Y}) \simeq \mathcal{S}(X, d) \otimes Y. \quad (9.6)$$

Moreover, for any $Q : \mathbf{B}_X^d \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Nat}(R_{X;Y}, Q) &= \int_{M \in \mathbf{B}_X^d} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(R_{X;Y}(M), Q(M)) \\ &\simeq \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}\left(Y, \int_{M \in \mathbf{B}_X^d} (M^* \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} X^{\otimes d})_{S_d} \otimes Q(M)\right) \\ &\simeq \text{Hom}_{\text{Mod}_{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{S}(X, d)}(\mathcal{S}(X, d) \otimes Y, F(Q)) \\ &\simeq \text{Hom}_{\text{Mod}_{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{S}(X, d)}(F(R_{X;Y}), F(Q)). \end{aligned}$$

The first step is by definition, the second is adjunction, the third follows from (9.5) and the fourth from (9.6). Since F is faithful and the morphism spaces in $\text{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}} GL_X$ are finite dimensional over \mathbf{k} , it follows that all conditions in Lemma 9.3.4 are indeed satisfied.

Part (2) follows immediately from part (1), as the equivalence must send simple objects to simple objects. An alternative more direct proof goes as follows. By [EGNO, Example 7.10.2], any object $Y \in \mathcal{C}$ is simple as an $\underline{\text{End}}(Y)$ -module. So if Y has the structure of an A -module, for a \mathcal{C} -algebra A , and the defining algebra morphism $A \rightarrow \underline{\text{End}}(Y)$ is an epimorphism in \mathcal{C} , then Y is a simple A -module. We need to show that $D_M(X)$ is simple as an $\mathcal{S}(X, d)$ -module, so it is sufficient to demonstrate that the algebra morphism

$$\underline{\text{End}}(X^{\otimes d})^{S_d} \rightarrow \underline{\text{End}}(D_M(X)) \quad (9.7)$$

is an epimorphism in \mathcal{C} . This can be demonstrated with a tedious argument.

That $X^{\otimes d}$, as a GL_X -representation, has a filtration where the subquotients are given by $\{D_M(X) \mid M\}$, with $D_M(X)$ appearing $\dim_{\mathbf{k}} M$ times, is a consequence of Lemma 7.2.3(2), for $F = \text{Frg}$, and Lemma 9.2.2(1). Thus part (3) follows from part (2). \square

Lemma 9.3.4. *Let \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} be abelian categories. Assume that there exists a collection of objects $E_{\mathcal{B}} \subset \text{Ob} \mathcal{B}$ such that every object Y in \mathcal{B} has a presentation*

$$Y_1 \rightarrow Y_0 \rightarrow Y \rightarrow 0$$

by objects $Y_0, Y_1 \in E_{\mathcal{B}}$. Then a functor $F : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ is an equivalence if and only if

- (1) F is exact; and
- (2) F is faithful; and

(3) for every $Z \in E_{\mathcal{B}}$, there is $Z' \in \mathcal{A}$ with $F(Z') \simeq Z$ and for which

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(Z', X) \xrightarrow{F} \mathrm{Hom}(F(Z'), F(X))$$

is an isomorphism for all $X \in \mathcal{A}$.

Lemma 9.3.5. (1) For a tensor functor $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}'$ and $X \in \mathcal{C}$, the tensor functor $\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}} GL_X \rightarrow \mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}'} GL_{FX}$ lifting F restricts to an equivalence that fits into a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathrm{mod}(\mathbf{B}_X^d) & \xrightarrow[\sim]{H_X} & \mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}^d(GL_X, \phi) & \longleftarrow & \mathrm{Pol}_{\mathbf{k}}^d \\ & \searrow[\sim]{H_{FX}} & \downarrow \sim & \swarrow & \\ & & \mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}'}^d(GL_{FX}, \phi) & & \end{array}$$

(2) For a tensor category \mathcal{D} and $Y, Z \in \mathcal{D}$, there exists a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathrm{mod}(\mathbf{B}_{Y \oplus Z}^d) & \xrightarrow[\sim]{H_{Y \oplus Z}} & \mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{D}}^d(GL_{Y \oplus Z}, \phi) & \longleftarrow & \mathrm{Pol}_{\mathbf{k}}^d \\ \Delta \mapsto \Delta|_{\mathbf{B}_Y^d} \downarrow & & \downarrow & \swarrow & \\ \mathrm{mod}(\mathbf{B}_Y^d) & \xrightarrow[\sim]{H_Y} & \mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{D}}^d(GL_Y, \phi) & & \end{array}$$

Proof. The right triangle in (1) is commutative by definition of universal functors. Since the left triangle is actually derived from the right triangle via (9.3), it is also commutative. That two (and hence all three) arrows in the left triangle are equivalences follows from Theorem 9.3.3(1).

Now we prove part (2). There is an obvious restriction functor along $GL_Y < GL_{Y \oplus Z}$

$$\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{D}}^d(GL_{Y \oplus Z}, \phi) \rightarrow \mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{D}} GL_Y \simeq \bigoplus_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{D}}^{(t)} GL_Y$$

where the decomposition of the right-hand side is based on the action of $\mathbb{G}_m = GL_1 < GL_X$. Even though $\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{D}}^d GL_Y \subset \mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{D}}^{(d)} GL_Y$ is a strict inclusion, the fact that a polynomial representation of $GL_{Y \oplus Z}$ restricts to a polynomial representation of GL_Y shows that the above functor can be interpreted as

$$\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{D}}^d(GL_{Y \oplus Z}, \phi) \rightarrow \mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{D}}^d(GL_Y, \phi) \oplus \bigoplus_{0 \leq t < d} \mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{D}}^t GL_Y.$$

We define the functor in the middle of the diagram in (2) as the projection onto the relevant summand of the above functor.

As in part (1), it suffices to prove that the right triangle is commutative. This commutativity follows from the following observation. The degree d part decomposition of $T_d(Y \oplus Z) = (Y \oplus Z)^{\otimes d}$ in the above grading of $\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{D}} GL_Y$ is naturally $T_d(Y)$. This principle is inherited for subquotients of $(T_d)^n$, leading to the desired commutativity. \square

Theorem 9.3.6. (1) The functor $\mathrm{mod}^{\mathrm{Frg}}(\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{k}}^d) \rightarrow \mathrm{Pol}_{\mathbf{k}}^d$ in (9.3) is an equivalence.

(2) Evaluation (8.3) yields an equivalence $\mathrm{Pol}_{\mathbf{k}}^d \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}^d(GL_X, \phi)$ if and only if $\mathbf{B}_X^d = \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{k}}^d$.

Proof. Denote the functor in part (1) again by T . We prove that it is an equivalence by proving the following three properties:

(i) T is faithful. By Lemma 7.2.5(2), only zero morphisms in $\mathrm{mod}(\mathbf{B}^d)$ are sent to zero by every (downwards arrow) restriction functor in (9.3). Faithfulness thus follows from Theorem 9.3.3(1) and commutativity of (9.3).

(ii) T is full. Consider $\Delta_i \in \mathrm{mod}(\mathbf{B}^d)$, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and a morphism $\alpha : T_{\Delta_1} \rightarrow T_{\Delta_2}$ in Pol^d , which consists of morphisms $\alpha_X^{\mathcal{C}} : T_{\Delta_1}^{\mathcal{C}}(X) \rightarrow T_{\Delta_2}^{\mathcal{C}}(X)$ in \mathcal{C} for every tensor category \mathcal{C}

and $X \in \mathcal{C}$. By Theorem 9.3.3(1) this defines unique natural transformations $\gamma_X : \Delta_1|_{\mathbf{B}_X^d} \Rightarrow \Delta_2|_{\mathbf{B}_X^d}$, for every (\mathcal{C}, X) .

We claim that for a second $(\mathcal{D}, Y \in \mathcal{D})$, and $X \oplus Y$ interpreted within $\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{D}$, we have

$$\gamma_{X \oplus Y}|_{\mathbf{B}_X^d} = \gamma_X.$$

It would then follow from Lemma 7.2.5(2) that the morphisms γ_X combine to give a natural transformation $\gamma : \Delta_1 \Rightarrow \Delta_2$. It then follows from construction, the fact that no morphism in Pol^d evaluates to zero on every $X \in \mathcal{C}$, that $T(\gamma) = \alpha$.

To prove this claim we consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \text{mod}^d(\mathbf{B}_{X \oplus Y}) & \longleftarrow & \text{mod}(\mathbf{B}^d) & \xrightarrow{T} & \text{Pol}^d & & (9.8) \\ & \searrow & \downarrow & \searrow & \downarrow & \searrow & \\ & & \text{mod}(\mathbf{B}_X^d) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}^d(GL_X, \phi) & \longrightarrow & \text{Rep}_{\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{D}}^d(GL_{X \oplus Y}, \phi) \\ & & \searrow & \searrow & \downarrow & \searrow & \\ & & & & \text{Rep}_{\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{D}}^d(GL_X, \phi) & & \end{array}$$

All functors come from (9.3) or Lemma 9.3.5 and the diagram is therefore commutative. It thus follows indeed that γ_X is the restriction of $\gamma_{X \oplus Y}$ along $\mathbf{B}_X^d \subset \mathbf{B}_{X \oplus Y}^d$.

(iii) *T is essentially surjective.* By definition, every object in Pol^d is a subquotient of $(T_d)^n \simeq (T_{\text{Frg}})^n$, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Up to replacing T with an isomorphic functor, we can assume $(T_d)^n = (T_{\text{Frg}})^n$. By exactness of T , see Lemma 9.2.2(1), it then follows that it suffices to show that every $\Phi \subset T_d^n$ in Pol^d is the image under T of a subobject $\Delta \subset \text{Frg}^n$ in $\text{mod}(\mathbf{B}^d)$.

Hence we fix $\Phi \subset T_{\text{Frg}}^n$ in Pol^d . For every $(\mathcal{C}, X \in \mathcal{C})$, we have the corresponding $\Phi^{\mathcal{C}}(X) \subset (X^{\otimes d})^n$ and, under the equivalence in part (1), a corresponding $\Delta_X \subset \text{Frg}|_{\mathbf{B}_X^d}$. One can observe that this (uniquely) defines a subobject $\Delta \subset \text{Frg}^n$ in $\text{mod}(\mathbf{B}^d)$, with $\Delta|_{\mathbf{B}_X^d} = \Delta_X$ for all X , because of the following consideration. For every $(\mathcal{D}, Y \in \mathcal{D})$, from (9.8) we can derive that Δ_X is the restriction of $\Delta_{X \oplus Y} \subset \text{Frg}^n|_{\mathbf{B}_{X \oplus Y}^d}$. It now remains to show that $T_\Delta \subset (T_d)^n$ and $\Phi \subset (T_d)^n$ are equal as subobjects. This is now straightforward as $T_\Delta^{\mathcal{C}}(X) = \Phi^{\mathcal{C}}(X)$ as subobjects of $(X^{\otimes d})^n$, for all $(\mathcal{C}, X \in \mathcal{C})$.

Part (2) follows from part (1), Theorem 9.3.3(1) and commutativity of (9.3). \square

9.4. Representations of the symmetric group and strict polynomial functors.

9.4.1. Now we define a \mathbf{k} -linear composite functor $\mathbb{T} : \Delta \mapsto \mathbb{T}_\Delta$,

$$\text{Fun}_{\mathbf{k}}(\text{Rep} S_d, \text{Vec}_{\mathbf{k}}) \rightarrow \text{Fun}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \text{Rep} S_d, \mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \text{Fun}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \text{Rep} S_d, \mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \text{Fun}_{\mathcal{C}}(\Gamma^d \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}) = \text{SPol}^d \mathcal{C}.$$

The first functor is as in 1.4.6, the second functor is an example of Lemma 1.4.5, and the third functor is simply the restriction to the subcategory $\Gamma^d \mathcal{C}$ from Remark 8.1.2.

We abbreviate again \mathbb{T}_{Δ_M} to \mathbb{D}_M , for $M \in \text{IdcRep} S_d$.

Lemma 9.4.2. *The functor \mathbb{T} is exact and, for every $X \in \mathcal{C}$, admits a commutative diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Fun}_{\mathbf{k}}(\text{Rep}_{\mathbf{k}} S_d, \text{Vec}_{\mathbf{k}}) & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{T}} & \text{SPol}^d \mathcal{C} & (9.9) \\ \downarrow & & \searrow^{(8.2)} & \\ \text{Fun}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{B}_X^d, \text{Vec}_{\mathbf{k}}) = \text{mod}(\mathbf{B}_X^d) & \xrightarrow{H_X} & \text{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}^d(GL_X, \phi) \subset \text{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}^d GL_X. & \end{array}$$

Proof. To prove exactness of \mathbb{T} , by the discussion following Definition 8.1.3, it is sufficient to show that for each $X \in \mathcal{C}$, the upper path in (9.9) (or equivalently, its composition with the forgetful functor $\text{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}^d GL_X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$) is exact. We consider therefore the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\text{Fun}_{\mathbf{k}}(\text{Rep}S_d, \text{Vec}) & \longrightarrow & \text{Fun}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \text{Rep}S_d, \mathcal{C}) & \longrightarrow & \text{Fun}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \text{Rep}S_d, \underline{\mathcal{C}}) \\
(9.1) \downarrow & & \searrow & & \downarrow \\
\text{UFun}^d & \xrightarrow{\Phi \mapsto \Phi^{\mathcal{C}}(X)} & \mathcal{C} & \longleftarrow & \text{Mod}_{\mathcal{C}}\mathcal{S}(X, d).
\end{array}$$

Here, the upper path from top left to bottom right is simply the upper path in (9.9). The diagonal arrow with commutative triangle is an application of Lemma 1.4.5, and that lemma also shows that the left-hand side of the diagram is commutative. In conclusion, exactness of \mathbb{T} follows from Lemma 9.2.2(1).

It now follows from Lemma 7.2.5(1) that the upper path in (9.9) factors as

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\text{mod}(\text{Rep}S_d) & \hookrightarrow & \text{Fun}_{\mathbf{k}}(\text{Rep}S_d, \text{Vec}_{\mathbf{k}}) & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{T}} & \text{SPol}^d \mathcal{C} \\
& \searrow & \downarrow & & \downarrow (8.2) \\
& & \text{mod}(\mathbf{B}_X^d) = \text{Fun}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{B}_X^d, \text{Vec}_{\mathbf{k}}) & \dashrightarrow & \text{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}^d GL_X.
\end{array}$$

To prove that the dashed arrow is as in the lemma, it suffices to show that the above functor(s) from $\text{mod}(\text{Rep}S_d)$ to $\text{Rep}_{\mathcal{C}}^d GL_X$ is/are isomorphic to the one(s) in (9.3). Also this follows from Lemma 1.4.5 and Remark 8.2.6. \square

9.4.3. It follows from the definition that $\mathbb{T}_{\text{Frg}} \simeq \mathbb{T}^d$. In particular, \mathbb{T} restricts to an exact functor

$$\text{mod}^{\text{Frg}}(\text{Rep}S_d) \rightarrow \text{SPol}_o^d \mathcal{C}.$$

Moreover, we can consider the exact functor

$$\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \text{mod}^{\text{Frg}}(\text{Rep}S_d) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathbb{T}} \mathcal{C} \boxtimes \text{SPol}_o^d \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{SPol}_o^d \mathcal{C}, \quad (9.10)$$

where the second functor corresponds to the canonical \mathcal{C} -module structure $(Y, \mathbb{T}) \mapsto Y \otimes \mathbb{T}$ of $\text{SPol}^d \mathcal{C}$. It then follows from Lemma 9.4.2 that the functor fits into a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \text{mod}^{\text{Frg}}(\mathbf{B}^d[\mathcal{C}]) & \longrightarrow & \text{SPol}^d \mathcal{C} \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow (8.2) \\
\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \text{mod}(\mathbf{B}_X^d) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{Mod}_{\mathcal{C}}\mathcal{S}(X, d)
\end{array}$$

where the lower horizontal arrow is the equivalence in (the proof of) Theorem 9.3.3(1).

Theorem 9.4.4. (1) *The functor (9.10) yields an equivalence*

$$\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \text{mod}^{\text{Frg}}(\mathbf{B}^d[\mathcal{C}]) \rightarrow \text{SPol}_o^d \mathcal{C}.$$

(2) *If $\mathbf{B}^d[\mathcal{C}] = \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{k}}^d$, then $\text{SPol}_o^d \mathcal{C} \simeq \text{Pol}_{\mathbf{k}}^d \boxtimes \mathcal{C}$.*

Proof. Part (1) can be proved using the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 9.3.6(1).

Part (2) follows from the combination of part (1) and Theorem 9.3.6(1). \square

Remark 9.4.5. The equivalence in Theorem 9.4.4(1) can be extended to

$$\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \text{Fun}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{B}^d[\mathcal{C}], \text{Vec}_{\mathbf{k}}) \rightarrow \text{SPol}^d \mathcal{C}.$$

9.5. **Discerning objects and invariant theory.** Let \mathcal{C} be a tensor category with a fixed object X .

Theorem 9.5.1. *The following conditions are equivalent on $X \in \mathcal{C}$:*

- (1) *We have $\mathbf{B}_X^d = \mathbf{B}^d[\mathcal{C}]$.*
- (2) *For all $Y \in \mathcal{C}$, the morphism in \mathcal{C}*

$$\Gamma^d(X^\vee \otimes Y) \otimes \Gamma^d(Y^\vee \otimes X) \rightarrow \underline{\text{End}}(Y^{\otimes d})^{S_d}$$

coming from evaluation of $X^{\otimes d}$ yields an epimorphism.

- (3) *The evaluation at X in (8.2) yields an equivalence*

$$\text{SPol}^d \mathcal{C} \simeq \text{Mod}_{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{S}(X, d), \quad \mathbb{T} \mapsto \mathbb{T}(X).$$

- (4) *We have $D_M(X) \neq 0$ for all $M \in \text{IdcB}^d[\mathcal{C}]$.*

Proof. Equivalence of (1) and (4) follows from Theorem 9.3.3(2).

That (3) implies (4) follows by considering \mathbb{D}_M in $\text{SPol}^d \mathcal{C}$. Clearly this is zero in $\text{SPol}^d \mathcal{C}$ if and only if $0 = \mathbb{D}_M(Y) = D_M(Y)$ for all $Y \in \mathcal{C}$, while it is sent zero in $\mathcal{S}(X, d)$ -mod if and only if $D_M(X) = 0$. Hence the conclusion follows again from Theorem 9.3.3(2).

That (1) implies (3) follows from the diagram in 9.4.3 and Theorem 9.4.4(1).

Finally, we show equivalence between (1) and (2). To keep notation more transparent, we assume that \mathcal{C} has projective objects. We can rewrite property (1) as the property that, for each $Y \in \mathcal{C}$ and $j, l \in \text{Irr} \mathcal{C}$, the composition morphism

$$\begin{aligned} & \bigoplus_i \text{Hom}_{S_d}(\text{Hom}(P_i, X^{\otimes d}), \text{Hom}(P_j, Y^{\otimes d})) \otimes \text{Hom}_{S_d}(\text{Hom}(P_l, Y^{\otimes d}), \text{Hom}(P_i, X^{\otimes d})) \\ & \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{S_d}(\text{Hom}(P_l, Y^{\otimes d}), \text{Hom}(P_j, Y^{\otimes d})) \end{aligned}$$

is surjective.

By using Lemma 3.2.1, and by denoting the projective cover of L_i^\vee by P'_i , the above morphism can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} & \bigoplus_i (\text{Hom}(P'_i, (X^\vee)^{\otimes d}) \otimes \text{Hom}(P_j, Y^{\otimes d}))^{S_d} \otimes (\text{Hom}(P'_l, (Y^\vee)^{\otimes d}) \otimes \text{Hom}(P_i, X^{\otimes d}))^{S_d} \\ & \rightarrow (\text{Hom}(P'_l, (Y^\vee)^{\otimes d}) \otimes \text{Hom}(P_j, Y^{\otimes d}))^{S_d}. \end{aligned}$$

Surjectivity of these maps for all j, l can be written as a condition for every $P \in \text{Proj} \mathcal{C}$, by taking a direct sum of tensor products with the vector spaces $\text{Hom}(P, L_l^\vee \otimes L_j)$. By (3.2) we can then identify the target of the map as

$$\text{Hom}(P, (Y^\vee \otimes Y)^{\otimes d})^{S_d} = \text{Hom}(P, \underline{\text{End}}(Y)^{S_d}).$$

Moreover, for the source, we can instead take a direct sum of tensor products with

$$\text{Hom}(P, L_l^\vee \otimes L_i \otimes L_i^\vee \otimes L_j)$$

and adapt the map by using evaluation at L_i . Evaluation being an epimorphism, this does not change whether the overall map is surjective or not. Moreover, we can then use two different labels for the i in L_i and L_i^\vee , understanding that the map is zero on cases with two distinct labels. After all this, the source becomes, again via (3.2),

$$\text{Hom}(P, (X^\vee \otimes Y \otimes Y^\vee \otimes X))^{S_a \times S_d} \simeq \text{Hom}(P, \Gamma^d(X^\vee \otimes Y) \otimes \Gamma^d(Y^\vee \otimes X)).$$

By construction, the map we now obtain is $\text{Hom}(P, -)$ of the map in (2). \square

Question 9.5.2. What are the (minimal) relatively d -discerning objects in sVec and Ver_p ? For $\text{char}(\mathbf{k}) = 0$ the condition for $\mathbf{k}^{m|n} \in \text{sVec}$ to be relatively d -discerning is $d < (m+1)(n+1)$.

Proposition 9.5.3. *The following conditions are equivalent on X :*

- (1) $\beta_X^d : \mathbf{k}S_d \rightarrow \text{End}_{GL_X}(X^{\otimes d})$ is an isomorphism;

- (2) $\beta_X^d : \mathbf{k}S_d \rightarrow \text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(X^{\otimes d})$ is injective;
- (3) \mathbf{B}_X^d contains a faithful $\mathbf{k}S_d$ -module;
- (4) $\mathbf{k}S_d \in \mathbf{B}_X^d$.

Proof. Obviously (1) implies (2).

To show that (2) implies (3) we assume for convenience that \mathcal{C} has projective objects. Let $P \twoheadrightarrow X^{\otimes d}$ be a projective cover in \mathcal{C} . Then $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, X^{\otimes d})$ is a faithful $\text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(X^{\otimes d})$ -module. Hence under assumption (2), the corresponding representation in \mathbf{B}_X^d is faithful.

That (3) implies (4) is well-known, see for instance [CEKO, Lemma 1.1.1(ii)].

Finally, we show that (4) implies (1). Fully faithfulness of the equivalence in Theorem 9.3.3(1) yields an isomorphism

$$\text{End}(\text{Frg}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{End}_{GL_X}(X^{\otimes d})$$

for the endomorphism algebra of $\text{Frg} : \mathbf{B}_X^d \rightarrow \text{Vec}$. Under condition (4), Frg is representable by $\mathbf{k}S_d$, so that the Yoneda lemma yields an isomorphism with $\mathbf{k}S_d$. Tracing through the morphisms shows that the resulting composite isomorphism is β_X^d . \square

Remark 9.5.4. (1) Note that $\mathbf{k}S_d \rightarrow \text{End}_{GL_X}(X^{\otimes d})$ is not always surjective when $\text{char}(\mathbf{k}) > 0$, see for example [CEKO, Theorem B]. For $\text{char}(\mathbf{k}) = 0$ the morphism is always surjective by [De3, §10.11].

- (2) Together with [CEKO, Theorem A], the result in Proposition 9.5.3 completely determines when the braid action yields an isomorphism for $\mathcal{C} = \mathbf{sVec}$.
- (3) It follows quickly that (relatively) discernable objects satisfy 9.5.3(4) and hence all conditions in Proposition 9.5.3.
- (4) The techniques in the proof of Proposition 9.5.3 demonstrate that, for arbitrary X and with $M := \Omega^d(X) \in \text{Rep}S_d$, we have an isomorphism and commutative triangle

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{End}_{\text{End}_{S_d}(M)}(M) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{End}_{GL_X}(X^{\otimes d}). \\ \uparrow & \nearrow \beta_X^d & \\ \mathbf{k}S_d & & \end{array}$$

Acknowledgement. The author thanks Pavel Etingof, Johannes Flake and Alexander Kleshchev for stimulating discussions. The research was partly supported by ARC grants DP210100251 and FT220100125.

REFERENCES

- [Ax] J. Axtell: Spin polynomial functors and representations of Schur superalgebras. *Represent. Theory* 17 (2013), 584–609.
- [BK] A. Baranov, A. Kleshchev: Maximal ideals in modular group algebras of the finitary symmetric and alternating groups. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 351 (1999), no.2, 595–617.
- [BE] D. Benson, P. Etingof: Symmetric tensor categories in characteristic 2. *Adv. Math.* 351 (2019), 967–999.
- [BEO] D. Benson, P. Etingof, V. Ostrik: New incompressible symmetric tensor categories in positive characteristic. *Duke Math. J.* 172 (2023), no. 1, 105–200.
- [Br] M. Broué: On Scott modules and p-permutation modules: an approach through the Brauer morphism. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 93 (1985), no.3, 401–408.
- [Co1] K. Coulembier: Tensor ideals, Deligne categories and invariant theory. *Selecta Math. (N.S.)* 24 (2018), no. 5, 4659–4710.
- [Co2] K. Coulembier: Tannakian categories in positive characteristic. *Duke Math. Journal*, 169 (2020), no. 16, p. 3167–3219.
- [Co3] K. Coulembier: Monoidal abelian envelopes. *Compos. Math.* 157 (2021), no. 7, 1584–1609.
- [Co4] K. Coulembier: Commutative algebra in tensor categories. arXiv:2306.09727.
- [CEKO] K. Coulembier, P. Etingof, A. Kleshchev, V. Ostrik: Super invariant theory in positive characteristic. *Eur. J. Math.* 9 (2023), no.4, Paper No. 94, 39 pp.

- [CEO1] K. Coulembier, P. Etingof, V. Ostrik: On Frobenius exact symmetric tensor categories. With Appendix A by Alexander Kleshchev. *Ann. of Math.* (2) 197 (2023), no.3, 1235–1279.
- [CEO2] K. Coulembier, P. Etingof, V. Ostrik: Incompressible tensor categories. arXiv:2306.09745.
- [CF] K. Coulembier, J. Flake: Towards higher Frobenius functors for symmetric tensor categories. arXiv:2405.19506.
- [Cr] D.A. Craven: Algebraic modules and the Auslander-Reiten quiver. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* 215 (2011), no.3, 221–231.
- [De1] P. Deligne: Catégories tannakiennes. *The Grothendieck Festschrift, Vol. II*, 111–195, *Progr. Math.*, 87, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1990.
- [De2] P. Deligne: Catégories tensorielles. *Mosc. Math. J.* 2 (2002), no. 2, 227–248.
- [De3] P. Deligne: La catégorie des représentations du groupe symétrique S_t , lorsque t n'est pas un entier naturel. *Algebraic groups and homogeneous spaces*, 209–273, *Tata Inst. Fund. Res. Stud. Math.*, 19, Tata Inst. Fund. Res., Mumbai, 2007.
- [Do] S. Donkin: Symmetric and exterior powers, linear source modules and representations of Schur superalgebras. *Proc. London Math. Soc.* (3) 83 (2001), 647–680.
- [Dr] C. Drupieski: Cohomological finite-generation for finite supergroup schemes. *Adv. Math.* 288 (2016), 1360–1432.
- [EW] M. Elkin, P. Webb: The structure of Young modules and Schur algebras in characteristic 2. arXiv:2011.12357.
- [EGNO] P. Etingof, S. Gelaki, D. Nikshych, V. Ostrik: *Tensor categories*. *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*, 205. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2015.
- [EO1] P. Etingof, V. Ostrik: Finite tensor categories. *Mosc. Math. J.* 4 (2004), no.3, 627–654, 782–783.
- [EO2] P. Etingof, V. Ostrik: On the Frobenius functor for symmetric tensor categories in positive characteristic. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 773 (2021), 165–198.
- [EO3] P. Etingof, V. Ostrik: On semisimplification of tensor categories. *Representation theory and algebraic geometry*, 3–35. *Trends Math*. Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2022.
- [FS] E.M. Friedlander, A. Suslin: Cohomology of finite group schemes over a field. *Invent. Math.* 127 (1997), no.2, 209–270.
- [GK] R. Gow, A. Kleshchev: Connections between the representations of the symmetric group and the symplectic group in characteristic 2. *J. Algebra* 221 (1999), no.1, 60–89.
- [HS] N. Harman, A. Snowden: Oligomorphic groups and tensor categories. arXiv:2204.04526.
- [HSS] N. Harman, A. Snowden, N. Snyder: The Delannoy category. arXiv:2211.15392.
- [Ja] G.D. James: On the decomposition matrices of the symmetric groups. I. *J. Algebra* 43 (1976), no.1, 42–44.
- [Kl1] A. Kleshchev: Completely splittable representations of symmetric groups. *J. Algebra* 181 (1996), no.2, 584–592.
- [Kl2] A. Kleshchev: *Linear and projective representations of symmetric groups*. *Cambridge Tracts in Math.*, 163 Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2005.
- [Kr] H. Krause: Koszul, Ringel and Serre duality for strict polynomial functors. *Compos. Math.* 149 (2013), no.6, 996–1018.
- [Os] V. Ostrik: On symmetric fusion categories in positive characteristic. *Selecta Math. (N.S.)* 26 (2020), no.3, Paper No. 36, 19 pp.
- [Ve] S. Venkatesh: Representations of General Linear Groups in the Verlinde Category. arXiv:2203.03158.
- [Za] A.E. Zalesskii: Group rings of simple locally finite groups. *Finite and locally finite groups (Istanbul, 1994)*, 219–246. *NATO Adv. Sci. Inst. Ser. C: Math. Phys. Sci.*, 471 Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht, 1995.

K.C.: SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY, NSW 2006, AUSTRALIA
Email address: kevin.coulembier@sydney.edu.au