

DIAGRAM CATEGORIES OF BRAUER TYPE

SIGISWALD BARBIER

ABSTRACT. This paper introduces monoidal (super)categories resembling the Brauer category. For all categories, we can construct bases of the hom-spaces using Brauer diagrams. These categories include the Brauer category, its deformation the BWM-category, the periplectic Brauer category, and its deformation the periplectic q -Brauer category but also some new exotic categories. We show that the BWM-category is the unique deformation of the Brauer category in this framework, while the periplectic Brauer category has two deformations, which are each other monoidal opposite.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Diagram algebras and categories. It is well known that certain classes of algebras such as the symmetric group algebra, the Temperley-Lieb algebra, the Brauer algebra, and the periplectic Brauer algebra all can be graphically represented using diagrams. This diagrammatical interpretation allows us to construct for each class of these diagram algebras a corresponding category. The objects of such category \mathcal{C} are the natural numbers and homomorphisms between m and n in \mathcal{C} are given by linear combinations of the appropriate (m, n) -diagrams. The diagram algebras themselves can then be recovered by the endomorphism algebras $\text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(m, m)$. This categorical approach has many advantages [LZ22, SS22]. For example, Lehrer and Zhang [LZ15] used the Brauer category associated with the Brauer algebras to prove and extend the first and second theorem of invariant theory for the orthogonal and symplectic groups in an elegant manner.

In this paper, we will be mainly interested in the Brauer and periplectic Brauer categories. Schur-Weyl duality relates the Brauer algebra to the symplectic group, the orthogonal group [Bra37], or the encompassing orthosymplectic supergroup [BLSR98] while the periplectic Brauer algebra is related via Schur-Weyl duality to the periplectic Lie supergroup [Moo03]. The Brauer algebra and the periplectic Brauer algebra are at first glance very similar. They are depicted using the same diagrams and the multiplication rules are equivalent up to some minus signs. This makes it possible to describe them together in one framework as done by Kujawa and Tharp [KT17]. The similarity between these categories leads to similarities in their representation theory. This manifests itself, for instance, in the classification and labelling of the simple modules [KT17, Theorem 4.3.1]. However, some properties can still differ wildly between these categories. For example, the classification of

Date: June 27, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 18M05, 18M30, 17B10.

Key words and phrases. diagram category, monoidal category, supercategory, Brauer algebra, periplectic Brauer algebra, Birman-Wenzl-Murakami algebra, periplectic q -Brauer algebra.

the blocks is completely different for the Brauer algebra compared to the periplectic Brauer algebra [CDVM09, Cou18].



FIGURE 1.1. An example of a $(8, 6)$ -Brauer diagram with one cup, two caps, and four propagating lines.

The Brauer algebra and the periplectic Brauer algebra also have deformations, namely the Birman-Wenzl-Murakami algebra [BW89, Mur90] and the periplectic q -Brauer algebra [AGG21, RS22]. These deformed algebras can also be represented using diagrams and have corresponding categories.

The Brauer category, the BWM-category, and the periplectic (q -)Brauer category all share some interesting properties. They are monoidally generated by one object and three morphisms: \diagdown , \cup and \cap . In the (q -)periplectic case these last two morphisms are required to be odd so we obtain a graded (i.e. super) category. For each category, we can use the set of Brauer diagrams as a basis for the hom-spaces. Figure 1.1 gives an example of such a Brauer diagram. These categories also have a natural triangular decomposition. This decomposition allows us to define in each case so-called standard modules or cell modules, which are a great tool in the study of the representation theory [BS24, CZ19].

The characterising difference to distinguish between these categories is in the relations the morphisms satisfy. Figure 1.2 shows some examples of such relations. The research behind this article grew out of the search for the defining relations for a deformation of the periplectic Brauer category. Recently, Rui and Song [RS22] defined such a deformation, which they call the periplectic q -Brauer category. Although no motivation for the choice of generators and relations is given, we know that they are the ‘correct’ ones because they lead to a periplectic q -Brauer algebra which satisfies a Schur-Weyl duality with the quantum group of type P [AGG21]. An important motivation behind this paper was to understand better why exactly these relations are the correct ones.

We will see in Section 10.2 that there exist two categories satisfying the assumption that it is a diagram category of Brauer type as defined in Definition 4.1 and which has the periplectic Brauer category as a limit. One of these categories is isomorphic to the periplectic q -Brauer category defined in [RS22] and the other is its monoidal opposite (in the sense of [EGNO15, Definition 2.1.5]). In some way, we can thus conclude that the periplectic q -Brauer category is the only possible deformation of the periplectic Brauer category. In Section 10.1, we will also show that the BWM-category is the unique possible deformation for the Brauer category. The BWM-category is its own monoidal opposite, see Corollary 9.4.

1.2. The diagram categories of Brauer type. In this paper, we look at the following problem. Which monoidal (super)categories exist which are generated by one object and three morphisms, $H = \diagdown$, $A = \cap$ and $U = \cup$, where A and U have the same parity, if we furthermore require that H is invertible and induces a

FIGURE 1.2. Some examples of relations to simplify diagrams.

braiding and the hom-spaces can be given a basis using the same diagrams as for the Brauer category. This last condition forces us to impose relations, such as in Figure 1.2, to simplify diagrams.

A priori imposing such relations introduces a whole plethora of parameters and corresponding categories. Remarkably, we only get a fairly small list of possible categories. We summarized the possible categories in Table 7.1. These categories have at most four independent parameters. By a rescaling isomorphism, we can reduce the number of independent parameters further to at most two. We can distinguish between the different categories using only four relations: sliding, upside-down sliding, straightening, and untwisting. Let us now take a closer look at these distinguishing relations.

The main relation to distinguish between categories is the sliding relation and its upside-down version:

$$\begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \cup = d \cup \quad | + e \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array} + f \begin{array}{c} \cup \\ \cap \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{c} \cup \\ \cap \end{array} = d' \cap \quad | + e' \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} + f' \begin{array}{c} \cap \\ \cup \end{array}.$$

The parameter e always satisfies $e^4 = 1$. For most categories, we got a stronger condition. We have either $e^2 = 1$ or $e^2 = -1$, where the odd case always has a different sign than the even case. In particular, if -1 is not a square in our field \mathbb{K} , only the even category or the odd supercategory exists, but not both.

We also distinguish between categories by whether the values for f and d are zero. If they are both non-zero, they are related by $d = -ef$. Note that by rescaling we can always set f or d to 1, if they are non-zero. For most categories, the value of e' is determined by e , but there are a few cases where it is independent. In these cases e' satisfies the same constraints as e . The parameters d' and f' can always expressed using the other parameters. Namely, we always have $d = -ef'$ and $d' = -e'f$.

The straightening relation $\cup = \zeta \mid$ is another relation dividing categories into two different cases. We have categories where ζ is zero and categories for which ζ is non-zero. If ζ is non-zero, we can use another rescaling to put $\zeta = 1$.

The last relation to divide between categories is the untwisting relation: $\begin{array}{c} \cup \\ \cap \end{array} = \lambda' \cap$.

Here we have that either the parameter λ' has the same value as the parameter λ determined by $\begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} = \lambda \cup$ or that the value of λ' is different from λ . Even if $\lambda' \neq \lambda$, the value of λ' is not independent but can be expressed using other parameters.

We will use the notation $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda', \varsigma}^{f, f'}(\varepsilon, e, e')$ for a category with the corresponding values for the parameters $f, f', \lambda', \varsigma, e, e'$ and where ε is $+$ or $-$ depending on the parity of the cup and cap. For example $\mathcal{C}_{b-\lambda, 0}^{b, 0}(+, i, -i)$ is the monoidal category with $f = b, f' = 0, \lambda' = b - \lambda, \varsigma = 0, e = i, e' = -i$ and where the cup and cap are even morphisms. Remark that not all possible values for the parameters lead to a valid category. For instance, the category $\mathcal{C}_{b-\lambda, 0}^{b, 0}(-, i, -i)$ does not exist. See Table 7.1 for the allowed categories.

In Section 10, we will show that the Brauer category is given by $\mathcal{C}_{1,1}^{0,0}(+, 1, 1)$, the Birman-Wenzl-Murakami category is $\mathcal{C}_{v,1}^{z,z}(+, 1, 1)$, the periplectic Brauer category is $\mathcal{C}_{-1,1}^{0,0}(-, 1, 1)$ and the periplectic q -Brauer category is $\mathcal{C}_{-q^{-1},1}^{q-q^{-1},0}(-, 1, 1)$.

1.3. Structure of the paper. We start the paper with two preliminary sections. In Section 2 we define Brauer diagrams and show how we can represent them graphically. We introduce fundamental diagrams. We also define a standard expression for each Brauer diagram. This is a unique decomposition of a Brauer diagram into fundamental diagrams. It is these standard expressions that we will use as a basis for the hom-spaces of the categories of Brauer type. Since the categories of Brauer type will be monoidally generated supercategories, we recall some basic facts about monoidal supercategories in Section 3.

In Section 4, we define what we mean by a diagram category of Brauer type, while in Section 5 we give some relations to simplify diagrams. We show in Theorem 5.1 that these relations are sufficient to reduce any morphism in our category to a linear combination of standard expressions.

Section 6 derives the equations the parameters have to satisfy to obtain a well-defined category. Most of the calculations are redelegated to Appendix A to not distract from the flow of the story. We then solve these equations in Section 7 leading to an overview in Table 7.1 of the possible categories of Brauer type. Theorem 8.1 in Section 8 establishes that the standard expressions are linearly independent and thus that the Brauer diagrams indeed form a basis for the hom-spaces.

In Section 9, we introduce functors giving isomorphisms between different categories of Brauer type. This allows us in particular to rescale some independent parameters. We end the paper by giving the relation between the categories of Brauer type introduced in this paper and existing categories and algebras in the literature in Section 10. We also show that the Brauer category has a unique deformation, while there exist two possible deformations for the periplectic Brauer category. As an aside, we prove that the q -Brauer algebra introduced by Wenzl in [Wen12] does not fit in our framework.

In this paper, algebras and linear structures will be defined over a field \mathbb{K} of characteristic different from 2. Most results still hold if we take \mathbb{K} to be an integral domain. We will also introduce several parameters $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$. These parameters can either be seen as elements in \mathbb{K} or as formal variables. In the latter case, we will work over the ring $\mathbb{K}[\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n]$ or even $\mathbb{K}[\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n, \alpha_1^{-1}, \dots, \alpha_n^{-1}]$ if the parameters are assumed to be invertible.

2. BRAUER DIAGRAMS

In this section, we will introduce Brauer diagrams and define for each Brauer diagram a unique way to depict it graphically, which we will call the standard expression for that Brauer diagram. It will be these standard expressions that we will use in this paper as a basis for the hom-spaces of our categories.

Definition 2.1 (Brauer diagram). *An (r, s) -Brauer diagram is a partitioning of $r + s$ dots into disjoint pairs.*

We will depict such a Brauer diagram graphically in a diagram, see Figure 1.1. We draw r -bottom dots on a horizontal line, s -top dots on another horizontal line above the first and connect the paired dots with arcs. An arc connecting two bottom dots is called a cap, while an arc connecting two top dots is called a cup. An arc connecting a bottom top and top dot we call a propagating line.

Definition 2.2. *We define the following fundamental Brauer diagrams:*

$$\begin{aligned}
 s_i^n &= \left| \cdots \right| \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ i \quad i+1 \end{array} \left| \cdots \right| && \text{an } (n, n)\text{-Brauer diagram,} \\
 a_i^n &= \left| \cdots \right| \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \cap \\ i \quad i+1 \end{array} \left| \cdots \right| && \text{an } (n+2, n)\text{-Brauer diagram,} \\
 u_i^n &= \left| \cdots \right| \begin{array}{c} \cap \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ i \quad i+1 \end{array} \left| \cdots \right| && \text{an } (n, n+2)\text{-Brauer diagram.}
 \end{aligned}$$

We can put a fundamental diagram x_1 on top of another fundamental diagram x_2 when the number of bottom dots of x_1 matches the number of top dots of x_2 . Connecting these matching dots, we obtain a new Brauer diagram which we denote by x_1x_2 . Note that x_1x_2 may contain a closed loop, necessitating a rule to remove this loop from the diagram to really again obtain a Brauer diagram. For now, we can ignore it. It is clear that every Brauer diagram can be decomposed into fundamental diagrams by making repeated use of this construction. However, this procedure is highly non-unique, as Figure 2.1 shows.





FIGURE 2.1. Two different decompositions into fundamental diagrams of the same Brauer diagram: $s_1^2 a_1^2 a_1^4 s_2^6 = a_1^2 a_2^4 s_3^6 s_5^6$.

We will choose for every Brauer diagram a distinguished decomposition into these fundamental diagrams, which we will call the standard expression. In such a standard expression all cups will be above the caps. We also want the left strand of a cup or a cap to be a straight line not encountering any crossings. Furthermore, we will

order the height of the occurring caps and cups by the position of this left strand. Cups will be ascending from left to right, while caps will be descending.

Let us now introduce standardly ordered cups and caps and a distinguished basis for the symmetric group algebra to define this standard expression.

Define I_s as a cup crossing s propagating lines and where the left strand of the arc is a straight line:



We can embed such a cup I_s into an $(n, n+2)$ -Brauer diagram by adding straight propagating lines to the left and right

$$(1) \quad I_s^{n,a} := \mathbb{1}^{a-1} \otimes I_s \otimes \mathbb{1}^{n-a-s+1}.$$

We call $I_s^{n,a}$ an elementary cup. Note that the left strand of the cup of $I_s^{n,a}$ is on the a th node. Then we can define the set of standardly ordered cups $I(r, n)$, containing (r, n) -Brauer diagrams with only cups:

$$I(r, n) := \left\{ I_{s_1}^{n-2, a_1} I_{s_2}^{n-4, a_2} \dots I_{s_{\frac{n-r}{2}}}^{r, a_{\frac{n-r}{2}}} \mid \begin{array}{l} 0 \leq s_i \leq n - 2i, \\ a_i > a_j \text{ if } i < j \end{array} \right\}.$$

This set consists of compositions of elementary cups which are ordered such that the left strand of a cup is to the left of all left strands of cups above it. Note that this assures that the left strand of a cup is always a straight line to the dot above it since crossings only occur on right strands.





FIGURE 2.2. Example of the diagram $I_1^{7,7} I_2^{5,4} I_0^{3,2} I_1^{1,1}$ in $I(1, 9)$.

Similarly, we can define standardly ordered caps. Set



and define the elementary cap by

$$J_s^{n,a} := \mathbb{1}^{a-1} \otimes J_s \otimes \mathbb{1}^{n-a-s+1}.$$

This is a $(n+2, n)$ -Brauer diagram where the left strand of the cap is on the a th node. We now look at combinations of elementary caps such that the left strand of a cap is to the left of all left strands of caps under it:

$$J(n, r) := \left\{ J_{s_1}^{r, a_1} J_{s_2}^{r+2, a_2} \dots J_{s_{\frac{n-r}{2}}}^{n-2, a_{\frac{n-r}{2}}} \mid \begin{array}{l} 0 \leq s_i \leq n-2i, \\ a_i < a_j \text{ if } i < j \end{array} \right\}.$$

Consider a basis $H(r)$ for the symmetric group algebra $\mathbb{K}S_r$ consisting of reduced expressions in the generators s_1, \dots, s_{r-1} . We will also interpret an element in $H(r)$ as the diagram obtained via the composition of the fundamental diagrams s_i corresponding to this expression. The specific choice for the expressions does not matter to us. We only require that we have reduced expressions in the generators s_i and that the subexpression $s_i s_{i+1} s_i$ does not occur. This is always possible since we have the braid relation $s_i s_{i+1} s_i = s_{i+1} s_i s_{i+1}$.

Proposition 2.3. *Every (m, n) -Brauer diagram has a unique decomposition into fundamental diagrams of the form UXA where $U \in I(r, n)$, $X \in H(r)$ and $A \in J(m, r)$.*

We call this decomposition the standard expression.

Proof. An (m, n) -Brauer diagram is a partitioning of $m+n$ dots into disjunct pairs where we have m bottom dots and n top dots. A pair which connects two top dots is called a cup and we order them as follows. We say that a cup is lower in the order than another cup if the left dot of the first cup is to the left of the left dot of the second cup. This ordering gives us a unique corresponding element U in $I(n-2s, n)$, where s is the number of cups in the Brauer diagram.

Similarly, we call a pair that connects two bottom dots a cap and order them as follows. We say that a cap is higher in the order than another cap if the left dot of the first cap is to the left of the left dot of the second cap. This leads to a unique corresponding element A in $J(m, m-2t)$, where t is the number of caps in the Brauer diagram.

Since the other pairs in the Brauer diagram correspond to pairings of a top and bottom dot, we necessarily have $m-2t = n-2s$. Moreover, these other pairs, corresponding to propagating lines, give a unique permutation of $r := m-2t$ elements. Let X be the element in $H(r)$ corresponding to this permutation. We conclude that every Brauer diagram can be uniquely decomposed into fundamental diagrams such that it is of the form UXA with $U \in I(r, n)$, $X \in H(r)$ and $A \in J(m, r)$. \square

3. MONOIDAL SUPERCATEGORIES

In this section, we will recall monoidal supercategories as introduced by Brundan and Ellis in [BE17]. A more detailed exposition can be found therein.

3.1. Definition of a monoidal supercategory. A super vector space V is a vector space over \mathbb{K} with a $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ -grading, i.e. $V = V_{\bar{0}} \oplus V_{\bar{1}}$. Elements in $V_{\bar{0}}$ are called even, and elements in $V_{\bar{1}}$ are called odd. Together the even and odd elements give the homogeneous elements. For a homogeneous element, we set the parity $|x| = i$ if $x \in V_i$.

Let $\mathbf{svec}_{\mathbb{K}}$ be the category of super vector spaces with grading preserving homomorphisms.

Definition 3.1. A supercategory \mathcal{C} is defined as a category enriched over $\mathbf{svec}_{\mathbb{K}}$.

This means that for all $a, b \in \mathcal{C}$ we have that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(a, b)$ is a vector space which decomposes as $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(a, b)_{\bar{0}} \oplus \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(a, b)_{\bar{1}}$ and that the composition of morphisms is grading-preserving and linear. Thus $f \circ g \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(a, c)_{|f|+|g|}$ for $f \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(b, c)_{|f|}$ and $g \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(a, b)_{|g|}$.

Definition 3.2. A superfunctor between two supercategories \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} is a functor $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ such that the map $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\lambda, \mu) \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(F(\lambda), F(\mu))$ is linear and even.

Let \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} be supercategories, then $\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{D}$ is defined as the category which has as objects pairs of objects of \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} and morphisms are defined by

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{D}}((\lambda, \mu), (\sigma, \tau)) := \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\lambda, \sigma) \otimes \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mu, \tau).$$

Composition of morphisms is defined using the super interchange law:

$$(f \otimes g) \circ (h \otimes k) = (-1)^{|h||g|} (f \circ h) \otimes (g \circ k).$$

Definition 3.3 (Strict monoidal supercategory). A strict monoidal supercategory is a supercategory \mathcal{C} with a superfunctor

$$- \otimes -: \mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C},$$

and a unit object $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}}$, such that we have

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}} \otimes - = \mathrm{id} = - \otimes \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}}, \quad (- \otimes -) \otimes - = - \otimes (- \otimes -).$$

An important difference between monoidal supercategories and ordinary monoidal categories is in the way composition of morphisms and the monoidal product interact with each other. In a monoidal supercategory, we have the so-called super interchange law


$$(f \otimes g) \circ (h \otimes k) = (-1)^{|h||g|} (f \circ h) \otimes (g \circ k).$$

Definition 3.4 (Monoidal superfunctors). A strict monoidal superfunctor F between two strict monoidal supercategories \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} is a superfunctor $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ such that $F(a \otimes b) = F(a) \otimes F(b)$ and $F(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}}) = \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{D}}$.


Definition 3.5 (Monoidal opposite). Let (\mathcal{C}, \otimes) be a strict monoidal supercategory. The opposite category $(\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{op}}, \otimes^{\mathrm{op}})$ is defined such that $\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{op}} = \mathcal{C}$ as categories, but the tensor product satisfies $f \otimes^{\mathrm{op}} g := (-1)^{|f||g|} g \otimes f$.

Note that this is a different notion than the dual of a category, which is defined by reversing all the arrows in a category, i.e. changing the source and the target for each morphism.


We can depict morphisms graphically as follows. A morphism $f \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\lambda, \mu)$ corresponds to the picture



Composition is represented by putting one morphism on top of the other, while the monoidal product corresponds to putting morphisms next to each other:



Graphically, the super interchange law can then be depicted as follows:



Note that we suppress identity morphisms.

3.2. Example: the marked Brauer category. The marked Brauer category $\mathcal{B}(\varepsilon)$ introduced in [KT17] has as objects the natural numbers. The morphisms $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}(\varepsilon)}(r, s)$ are given by linear combination of (r, s) -Brauer diagrams. We have two types of multiplication.

- Vertical multiplication corresponds to the composition of morphisms

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}(\varepsilon)}(s, t) \times \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}(\varepsilon)}(r, s) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}(\varepsilon)}(r, t)$$

defined via (periplectic) multiplication of Brauer diagrams. See [KT17, Section 2] for a precise definition.

- Horizontal multiplication is given on objects by $m \otimes n = m + n$ and on morphisms

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}(\varepsilon)}(r, s) \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}(\varepsilon)}(r', s') \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}(\varepsilon)}(r + r', s + s')$$

by putting Brauer diagrams next to each other.

As mentioned in [BE17, Example 1.5 (iii)] the marked Brauer category is a strict monoidal supercategory which can be presented graphically as follows. It has one generating object: \cdot and three generating morphisms. One even generating morphism \times and two generating morphisms \cap and \cup of the same parity subject to the following relations

Here $\varepsilon = 1$ if \cap and \cup are even and $\varepsilon = -1$ if they are odd. In the even case, we obtain a monoidal category, which corresponds to the Brauer category. For the odd case, we obtain a monoidal supercategory, which corresponds to the periplectic Brauer category.

4. MOTIVATING THE DEFINITION OF CATEGORIES OF BRAUER TYPE

The goal of this paper is to obtain categories similar to the marked Brauer category introduced in the previous section (both the even and odd cases) by tweaking the relations. So we are interested in monoidal (super)categories generated by the same generating morphisms but with different relations. We also impose that the hom-spaces have bases given by Brauer diagrams and that the cross is an isomorphism satisfying the braid relation.

Consider a monoidal supercategory \mathcal{C} over \mathbb{K} with one generating object and three generating morphisms: the over-cross $H \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(2, 2)$ which is always even, and two morphisms of the same parity: the cap $A \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(2, 0)$ and the cup $U \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(0, 2)$.

Since we have one generating object, the objects of \mathcal{C} can be labelled by \mathbb{N} . An arbitrary morphism in \mathcal{C} is a combination of the three generating morphisms together with the identity morphism $I \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(1, 1)$ using composition and tensoring.

We will represent the morphisms H , A , and U graphically by

$$H = \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \times \\ \diagdown \end{array}, \quad A = \cap, \quad U = \cup.$$

We want that $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(m, n) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}(\varepsilon)}(m, n)$ as vector spaces. This forces us to impose relations to simplify diagrams. For example, since $\text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(0) = \mathbb{K} \text{ id}_0$, we need to impose $\bigcirc = \delta$, for $\delta \in \mathbb{K}$. Similarly, $\text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(1) = \mathbb{K} \text{ id}_1$ leads to

$$(2) \quad \begin{array}{c} \cup \\ \cap \end{array} = \varsigma \mid, \quad \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array} = q_1 \mid, \quad \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} = q_2 \mid,$$

and $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(2,0) = \mathbb{K} \cap$, $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(0,2) = \mathbb{K} \cup$ forces relations of the following form

$$\begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array} = \lambda \cup, \quad \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} = \lambda' \cap.$$

A priori these constraints on the hom-spaces force us to introduce a whole plethora of relations and parameters. Remarkably, we can get by with at most 4 independent parameters and we get a fairly small list of possible categories as we will show in Section 7.

Let us give an example of how we can reduce parameters. The fact that $\text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(1) = \mathbb{K} \text{id}_1$ also forces us to impose a relation

$$(3) \quad \cup \cap = \zeta' |.$$

However, from the superinterchange law and relation (2), we can deduce

$$\zeta' \cap = \int \cup \cap = \varepsilon \int \cup \cap = \varepsilon \zeta \cap.$$

Here $\varepsilon = -1$ if the cup and cap are odd and $\varepsilon = 1$ if they are even. So we obtain $\zeta' = \varepsilon \zeta$ and we see that Relation (3) did not introduce an extra parameter.

We will call a monoidal supercategory a category of Brauer type if it is of the form we have described in this section.

Definition 4.1. *A monoidal supercategory \mathcal{C} is called of Brauer type if*

- (1) *The objects of \mathcal{C} are generated by one object*
- (2) *The morphisms of \mathcal{C} are generated by three morphisms :*
 - *the over-cross $H \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(2,2)$ denoted by $\begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array}$,*
 - *the cap $A \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(2,0)$ denoted by \cap ,*
 - *the cup $U \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(0,2)$ denoted by \cup .*

The morphism H is always even, while A and U are either both even or both odd.

- (3) *The over-cross is an isomorphism that satisfies the braid relation.*
- (4) *The set of standard expressions for (m,n) -Brauer diagrams (as defined in Section 2) form a basis for $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(m,n)$.*

Note that the marked Brauer category of Section 3.2 satisfies this definition. We will see that also its deformations are categories of Brauer type.

5. THE DEFINING RELATIONS OF THE CATEGORY

Consider a category \mathcal{C} as in definition 4.1. Then \mathcal{C} is a monoidal supercategory which is generated by one object \bullet , an even morphism $\begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array}$ and two morphisms \cup and \cap of the same parity. A morphism in \mathcal{C} is then a diagram obtained by combining the identity morphisms and these generating morphisms using composition and tensor products. Note that any morphism can be seen as the composition of the

fundamental diagrams introduced in Definition 2.2. We set $\varepsilon = -1$ if the cup and cap are odd and $\varepsilon = 1$ if they are even. Note that in the last case, there is no super component and \mathcal{C} will just be a monoidal category.

In this section, we introduce relations, which we call the defining relations of \mathcal{C} . The existence of such relations in \mathcal{C} follows by definition from the fact that the set of standard expressions of (m, n) -Brauer diagrams form a basis for $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(m, n)$. For example, $\{\cup, \cap, \text{crossing}\}$ is a basis for $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(1, 3)$ and thus every $(1, 3)$ -Brauer diagram can be expressed as a linear combination of these three diagrams.

The defining relations of \mathcal{C} are the following:

- Untwisting and upside-down untwisting

$$\begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \\ \cup \end{array} = \lambda \cup, \quad \begin{array}{c} \cup \\ \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} = \lambda' \cap$$

- Looping

$$\bigcirc = \delta$$

- Straightening and upside-down straightening

$$\begin{array}{c} \cup \\ \cup \end{array} = \varsigma, \quad \begin{array}{c} \cap \\ \cap \end{array} = \varsigma'$$

- Delooping

$$\begin{array}{c} \cup \\ \cap \\ \cup \end{array} = \rho$$


- Twisting

$$\begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \\ \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} = a \left| \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \right| + b \left| \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array} \right| + c \left| \begin{array}{c} \cup \\ \cap \end{array} \right|$$


- Sliding

$$\begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \cup \\ \diagup \end{array} = d \left| \begin{array}{c} \cup \end{array} \right| + e \left| \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \cup \\ \diagup \end{array} \right| + f \left| \begin{array}{c} \cup \\ \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \right|$$


- Pulling




- Upside-down sliding:



- Upside-down Pulling



- Braiding



Note that we have introduced the following parameters:

$$\lambda, \lambda', \varsigma, \varsigma', \delta, \rho, a, b, c, d, e, f, d', e', f', D, E, F, D', E', F'.$$

We will always simplify diagrams using these relations from left to right. Thus we will replace a local occurrence of a left-hand side diagram with the corresponding linear combination on the right-hand side. In this way, the simplifying procedure will always end and result in a linear combination of standard expressions of Brauer diagrams, as we will show in Theorem 5.1. However, to have a well-defined category, we also want this simplification to be unique. So, if different relations can be used to simplify a diagram, they should in the end lead to the same linear combination of diagrams. Demanding this will give us equations that the parameters should satisfy. This will be addressed in Section 6.

Theorem 5.1. *Consider a diagram composed of an arbitrary number of fundamental diagrams in \mathcal{C} . Simplifying this diagram using the defining relations of \mathcal{C} will always end in a linear combination of standard expressions of Brauer diagrams.*

Proof. Note first that the standard expression of a diagram can not be simplified using the relations. This follows since in the standard expression cups are always above caps and the left strand of a cup or a cap is always a straight line. Furthermore, we choose a basis of the symmetric group algebra in such a way that the expression is reduced and the relation $s_i s_{i+1} s_i$ does not occur.

We will use induction on the number of fundamental diagrams. Note that a fundamental diagram is already a standard expression, covering the induction base case. So assume that we have a diagram X consisting of $k + 1$ fundamental diagrams. Then $X = x_0 X'$, where x_0 is a fundamental diagram and X' consists of k fundamental diagrams. By the induction hypothesis, we have $X' = \sum \lambda_i x_i$, where the x_i are standard expressions consisting of at most k fundamental diagrams.

We will now show that $x_0 x_i$ is a linear combination of standard expressions consisting of at most $k + 1$ fundamental diagrams. We will consider the cases where x_0 is a cup, cap or over-crossing separately.

- If x_0 is a fundamental cup, then using the super interchange rule, we can pull the cup down to the appropriate level in the ordering, making $x_0 x_i$ into a standard expression. This is always possible without crossing lines since all left-side strands of cups are straight lines in the standard expression x_i .
- Assume now that x_0 is a fundamental cap of the form a_r^n and x_i is of the form $I_s^{n,a'} x'_i$, where $I_s^{n,a'}$ is an elementary cup as in Equation (1). If $r + 1 < a'$ or $r > s + a' - 1$, i.e. if the right strand of the cap is to the left of the cup or the left strand of the cap is to the right of the cup, then we can use the superinterchange rule to switch the level of the elementary cup and the fundamental cap. This leads to $x_0 x_i = \pm I_s^{n,a'} x_0 x'_i$ and for $x_0 x'_i$ we can use the induction hypothesis to obtain a linear combination of standard expressions. Note that the cup of $I_s^{n,a'}$ is to the right of the other cups in x'_i since $x_i = I_s^{n,a'} x'_i$ is a standard expression. If the cup of $I_s^{n,a'}$ is still to the right of the cups in $x_0 x'_i$, then $I_s^{n,a'} x_0 x'_i$ is a standard expression. The only simplifying relations that could introduce a cup in $x_0 x'_i$ to the right of $I_s^{n,a'}$ are twisting and the right-most term in pulling. But these relations reduce the number of fundamental diagrams, so we can use the induction hypothesis to rewrite $I_s^{n,a'} x_0 x'_i$ into a standard expression.




FIGURE 5.1. The different possible situations where the fundamental cap and cup overlap.

If the fundamental cap and the cup overlap, see Figure 5.1, we can simplify the resulting diagram using straightening, delooping, looping, upside-down pulling, untwisting, or upside-down sliding. Except for the upside-down sliding, all these relations reduce the number of fundamental diagrams, and then we can use our induction hypothesis to obtain a linear combination of standard expressions for x_0x_i . The upside-down sliding relation $\begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \cap =$

$$d' \begin{array}{c} \cap \\ | \end{array} + e' \begin{array}{c} \cap \\ \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} + f' \begin{array}{c} | \\ \cap \end{array}$$

is needed in the most right diagram in Figure 5.1. We only have to consider the term in $\begin{array}{c} \cap \\ \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array}$ as for the others term the numbers of fundamental diagrams has again been reduced. Observe that we can then repeat upside-down sliding until we obtain $\begin{array}{c} \cap \\ | \end{array}$. On this, we can apply straightening which reduces the number of fundamental diagrams and allows us to apply the induction hypothesis.

Assume x_0 is still a fundamental cap of the form a_r but the diagram x_i does not contain any cups. Then we repeatedly apply upside-down sliding and upside-down pulling until the left strand of the cup is a straight line. We can then use the superinterchange rule to bring this cup to the appropriate level to obtain a standard expression.

- We will consider now the case when x_0 is a fundamental cross s_r and x_i is of the form $I_s^{n,a'}x'_i$. If the strands of the cross s_r are to the left or the right of the strands of the cup we can use the superinterchange rule to switch the cross and the elementary cup, while if the strands of s_r are between the strands of the cup, we can use the braid rule to switch the cross and the cup. In these cases we have $x_0I_s^{n,a'}x'_i = \pm I_s^{n,a'}x_0x'_i$ and on $x_0x'_i$ we can apply the induction hypothesis. This leaves us the four cases where the strands of the cross overlap with the strands of the cup. If $r = a' - 1$ then we can apply sliding $\begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \cup = d \begin{array}{c} \cup \\ | \end{array} + e \begin{array}{c} \cup \\ \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} + f \begin{array}{c} | \\ \cup \end{array}$. The terms in $\begin{array}{c} \cup \\ | \end{array}$ and $\begin{array}{c} | \\ \cup \end{array}$ reduce the number of fundamental diagrams, while the term in $\begin{array}{c} \cup \\ \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array}$ leads to $I_{s+1}^{n,a'-1}$. Hence $x_0I_s^{n,a'}x'_i = I_{s+1}^{n,a'-1}x'_i +$ terms with less fundamental diagrams. If $r = a'$, we can apply pulling to reduce the number of fundamental diagrams. while for $r = a' + s - 2$ we can use twisting to reduce the number of fundamental diagrams. If $r = a' + s - 1$, we immediately have that $x_0I_s^{n,a'} = I_{s+1}^{n,a'}$.

For the last case, x_0 is a fundamental cross s_r and x_i does not contain any cup. Then $x_i = XA$, where $X \in H(n)$. We can use the braid relation to rewrite x_0X into a linear combination $\sum_l \mu_l X_l$ in $H(n)$ where every occurrence of $s_j s_j$ can be discarded since the twisting relation reduces the number of fundamental diagrams. This allows us to obtain $x_0x_i = x_0XA = \sum_l \mu_l X_l A +$ terms with less fundamental diagrams.

Using induction, this proves the theorem. □

The previous theorem shows that the Brauer diagrams, which we represent using their standard expression, form a spanning set for the hom-spaces of the monoidal supercategory \mathcal{C} generated by the cup, cap and over-cross and satisfying the defining relations in this section.

From now on, we will also always assume that the over-cross is invertible. This has the following implications.

Lemma 5.2. *If the over-cross \diagup is invertible, then the inverse is given by*

$$\diagdown = -\frac{b}{a} \Big| \Big| + \frac{1}{a} \diagdown - \frac{c}{\lambda a} \cup.$$

Furthermore, λ , λ' and a are non-zero.

Proof. Denote the inverse of \diagdown by the under-cross \diagup . First note

$$\cup = \diagup \diagdown = \lambda \diagup.$$

Hence λ must be non-zero and similar also λ' must be non-zero.

Multiplying the twisting relation on the left by the inverse \diagup we obtain

$$\diagup = a \diagup + b \Big| \Big| + c\lambda^{-1} \cup.$$


Since the over-cross is by assumption linearly independent from $\Big| \Big|$ and \cup , the parameter a can not be zero. Then rewriting the previous relation gives us the lemma. \square


6. ESTABLISHING THE EQUATIONS

Consider the monoidal supercategory \mathcal{C} generated by the cup, cap and over-cross and satisfying the defining relations of Section 5 and assume furthermore that the over-cross is invertible. Recall that these relations depend on parameters $\lambda, \lambda', \varsigma, \varsigma', \delta, \rho, a, b, c, d, e, f, d', e', f', D, E, F, D', E', F'$, where a, λ, λ' are non-zero. We will now derive the constraints these parameters have to satisfy such that the relations do not lead to contradictions and such that if we simplify a diagram using different relations, the resulting linear combination of diagrams we obtain is the same.

Take two defining relations and consider the diagrams occurring on the left side of these relations. Since simplifying is a local operation, we only have to look at diagrams which contain these two diagrams as subdiagrams in such a way that they overlap. If this happens, we will simplify the diagram using these two relations in two different ways. We will then derive the equations which express that the final result of these simplifications is unique.

The possible diagrams we have to consider are the following. We coloured the part of the diagram that overlaps.





The calculations to obtain the equations expressing that rewriting the above overlapping diagrams gives a consistent result are straightforward but long. Therefore

we put them in the appendix. We will now summarize here the results of Appendix A. The parameters $\zeta', d, d', D, E, F, D', E, F'$ can be expressed in the other parameters as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta' &= \varepsilon\zeta & d &= -ef' & d' &= -e'f & E &= b-f & E' &= b-f' \\ D &= \frac{aE}{\lambda} & D' &= \frac{aE'}{\lambda'} & F &= \frac{a}{e} & F' &= \frac{a}{e'}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore

$$(4) \quad e^4 = e'^4 = 1.$$

In particular e and e' are non-zero.

If $\lambda = \lambda'$, we have the following equation

$$(5) \quad \lambda^2 - b\lambda - c\delta = a,$$

while if $\lambda \neq \lambda'$, we have

$$(6) \quad c = \delta = 0 \quad a = -\lambda'\lambda \quad b = \lambda' + \lambda.$$

From the equation

$$(7) \quad f(b-f) = 0 \quad f'(b-f') = 0,$$

we conclude that we can distinguish four separate cases:

- $f = f' = 0$,
- $f = 0$ and $f' = b \neq 0$,
- $f = b \neq 0$ and $f' = 0$,
- $f = f' = b \neq 0$.

We then have to solve the following equations for each case:

$$(8) \quad \begin{aligned} a(b-f)/\lambda &= \frac{c\zeta}{e} - (b-\lambda-f)f' \\ a(b-f')/\lambda' &= \frac{c\zeta'}{e'} - (b-\lambda'-f')f \\ \varepsilon e^2(a(b-f)/\lambda - f\lambda) &= (f'^2 - ff' - f'\lambda + f\lambda) + ec\zeta' \\ \varepsilon e'^2(a(b-f')/\lambda' - f'\lambda') &= (f^2 - ff' - f\lambda' + f'\lambda') + e'\zeta \\ \varepsilon e^2(b-2f) &= (b-2f') \\ \varepsilon e'^2(b-2f') &= (b-2f), \\ f'(ec\zeta' + f\lambda) &= a(b-f)(b-f')/\lambda \\ f(e'\zeta + f'\lambda') &= a(b-f)(b-f')/\lambda' \\ \lambda(b-f-f') - ec\zeta' &= (b-f)(b-f') \\ \lambda'(b-f'-f) - e'\zeta &= (b-f)(b-f') \\ \lambda(ec\zeta' + f\lambda - f^2) - ec\zeta'f &= a(b-f') \\ \lambda'(e'\zeta + f'\lambda' - f'^2) - e'\zeta f' &= a(b-f). \end{aligned}$$

The parameters should also satisfy the following equations

$$\begin{aligned}
c\rho &= a(b - f - f') \\
\lambda(\zeta e'c + ff') + c\delta f' &= \lambda'(\zeta'ec + ff') + c\delta f = a(b - f - f') \\
\rho &= \zeta'(d + e\lambda) + f\delta = \zeta(d' + e'\lambda') + f'\delta \\
\zeta(\lambda' - \lambda)(1 + \varepsilon e^2) &= 0 \\
(\lambda - b + f')\rho &= \frac{a}{\lambda'}(b - f')\delta + a\zeta'e \\
(\lambda' - b + f)\rho &= \frac{a}{\lambda}(b - f)\delta + a\zeta e' \\
(b - f)(\rho\lambda + a\delta) + \zeta a\lambda e' &= (b - f')(\rho\lambda' + a\delta) + \zeta' a\lambda' e \\
a\delta(e - \frac{1}{e'}) &= (b - f')(\zeta \frac{a}{\lambda'} - e\rho) + (b - f' - f)\lambda\zeta - e\zeta\zeta' \\
a\delta(e' - \frac{1}{e}) &= (b - f)(\zeta' \frac{a}{\lambda} - e'\rho) + (b - f - f')\lambda'\zeta' - e'\zeta\zeta'
\end{aligned}
\tag{9}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
a(bE + c\zeta'e) &= D^2 + Ea\lambda + EbD + Ec\zeta'd + F\lambda d \\
a\lambda + bD + b^2E + c\zeta'd + c\zeta'eb &= DE + bE^2 + Ec\zeta'e + F\lambda e \\
bEc\zeta' + bF\lambda + c^2\zeta'^2e + c\zeta'\lambda f &= DF + EbF + Ec\zeta'f + F\lambda f \\
a(bE' + c\zeta'e') &= D'^2 + E'a\lambda' + E'bD' + E'c\zeta'd' + F'\lambda'd' \\
a\lambda' + bD' + b^2E' + c\zeta'd' + c\zeta'e'b &= D'E' + bE'^2 + E'c\zeta'e' + F'\lambda'e' \\
bE'c\zeta + bF'\lambda' + c^2\zeta^2e' + c\zeta\lambda'f' &= D'F' + E'bF' + E'c\zeta'f' + F'\lambda'f'.
\end{aligned}
\tag{10}$$

Furthermore, if c is non-zero, we have the following extra equations

$$\begin{aligned}
f &= f' \\
e^2\varepsilon f &= e'^2\varepsilon f = f \\
E &= E' = 0 \\
ee' &= 1 \\
ec\zeta' + f\lambda &= 0 & e'c\zeta + f'\lambda' &= 0 \\
\lambda &= \lambda',
\end{aligned}
\tag{11}$$

while if ζ is non-zero, we also have

$$ee' = 1.
\tag{12}$$

Theorem 6.1. *Assume we have parameters $\lambda, \lambda', \zeta, \delta, \rho, a, b, c, e, e', f, f'$ which satisfy Equations (4) to (12). Then the category \mathcal{C} monoidally generated by the overcross, the cup and the cap satisfying the defining relation of Section 5 is well-defined.*

Proof. The way we established the equations immediately implies that different simplifications lead to the same result. Thus we can not have any contradictions in the relations. \square

7. CATEGORIES OF BRAUER TYPE

We will now solve the equations derived in the previous section. We will show that the possible categories can be distinguished by the values for f and f' , the values for e and e' , whether $\lambda' = \lambda$ or $\lambda' \neq \lambda$ and whether ς is zero or non-zero, and the parity of the cup and cap.

We will use the notation $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda', \varsigma}^{f, f'}(\varepsilon, e, e')$ for the category \mathcal{C} where we plug in the values for the occurring parameters. For example, $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda, 0}^{0, b}(-, 1, 1)$ has $f = 0$, $f' = b$, $\lambda' = \lambda$, $\varsigma = 0$, $e = e' = 1$ and the cup and cap are odd morphisms. We will often drop the (ε, e, e') part in this notation.

7.1. The case $f = f' = 0$. Note that from $f'(ec\varsigma' + f\lambda) = a(b - f)(b - f')/\lambda$ in Equation (8), we have $ab^2/\lambda = 0$. Since a and λ are non-zero, we conclude that $b = 0$. The other equations in Equation (8) are then equivalent with $c\varsigma = 0$. It can be readily verified that the equations in Equation (10) are trivially satisfied, while Equation (9) reduces to

$$(13) \quad \begin{aligned} c\rho = 0, \quad \rho = \varsigma'e\lambda = \varsigma'e'\lambda', \quad \lambda\rho = a\varsigma'e, \quad \lambda'\rho = a\varsigma'e', \quad \varsigma a\lambda e' = \varsigma'a\lambda'e, \\ a\delta = ee'a\delta, \quad \varsigma(\lambda' - \lambda)(1 + \varepsilon e^2). \end{aligned}$$

Since $c\varsigma = 0$, it is clear that $c\rho = 0$ follows from $\rho = \varsigma'e\lambda$, while $\lambda\rho = a\varsigma'e$ and $\lambda'\rho = a\varsigma'e'$ imply $\varsigma a\lambda e' = \lambda\lambda'\rho = \varsigma'a\lambda'e$.

7.1.1. The subcase ς non-zero and $\lambda' = \lambda$. If ς is non-zero, then $c\varsigma = 0$ imply $c = 0$, and $ee' = 1$ by Equation (12). If moreover $\lambda = \lambda'$, then Equation (13) reduces to $\rho = \varepsilon e\varsigma\lambda = e'\varsigma\lambda = (a/\lambda)\varepsilon e\varsigma = (a/\lambda)e'\varsigma$. Thus $a^2 = \lambda$, $e' = \varepsilon e$ and therefore also $e^2 = \varepsilon$. Summarising, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 7.1. *If $f = f' = 0$, $\lambda' = \lambda$ and ς is non-zero, we obtain the category $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda, \varsigma}^{0, 0}(\varepsilon, e, \varepsilon e)$, with independent variables $\{\lambda, \varsigma, \delta\}$ and where e is a square root of ε , while for the other variables we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda' = \lambda, \quad a = \lambda^2, \quad b = 0, \quad c = 0 \quad \varsigma' = \varepsilon\varsigma, \quad \rho = \varepsilon\varsigma e\lambda, \quad e' = \varepsilon e, \\ d = d' = f = f' = 0, \quad D = E = D' = E' = 0, \quad F = \varepsilon e\lambda^2, \quad F' = e\lambda^2. \end{aligned}$$

7.1.2. The subcase ς non-zero and $\lambda' \neq \lambda$. On the other hand, if ς is non-zero but $\lambda' \neq \lambda$, then from Equation (6), we obtain $\lambda' = -\lambda$, $a = \lambda^2$ and $\delta = 0$. Equation (13) will then be satisfied if $e' = -\varepsilon e$ and $e^2 = -\varepsilon$. Hence, we obtain the following proposition.

Proposition 7.2. *If $f = f' = 0$, $\lambda' \neq \lambda$ and ς is non-zero, we obtain the category $\mathcal{C}_{-\lambda, \varsigma}^{0, 0}(\varepsilon, e, -\varepsilon e)$, with independent variables $\{\lambda, \varsigma\}$ and where e is a square root of $-\varepsilon$, while for the other variables we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda' = -\lambda, \quad \delta = 0, \quad a = \lambda^2, \quad b = 0, \quad c = 0 \quad \varsigma' = \varepsilon\varsigma, \quad \rho = \varepsilon\varsigma e\lambda, \quad e' = -\varepsilon e, \\ d = d' = f = f' = 0, \quad D = E = D' = E' = 0, \quad F = -\varepsilon e\lambda^2, \quad F' = e\lambda^2. \end{aligned}$$

7.1.3. *The subcase $\varsigma = 0$ and $\lambda' \neq \lambda$.* Assume $\varsigma = 0$, then it is clear that $\rho = 0$ and Equation (13) reduces to $\delta(ee' - 1) = 0$. If $\lambda \neq \lambda'$, then Equation (6) implies $\delta = c = 0$ and $a = \lambda^2, \lambda' = -\lambda$. The only restrictions on e or e' are then $e^4 = e'^4 = 1$ by Equation (4). We conclude the following.

Proposition 7.3. *If $f = f' = 0, \lambda' \neq \lambda$ and $\varsigma = 0$, we obtain the category $\mathcal{C}_{-\lambda,0}^{0,0}(\varepsilon, e, e')$, with independent variable $\{\lambda\}$ and $e^4 = e'^4 = 1$ while for the other variables, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda' &= -\lambda, & \delta &= 0, & a &= \lambda^2, & b &= 0, & c &= 0 & \varsigma' &= \varsigma = 0, & \rho &= 0, \\ d = d' = f = f' &= 0, & D = E = D' = E' &= 0, & F &= e^3\lambda^2, & F' &= e'^3\lambda^2. \end{aligned}$$

7.1.4. *The subcase $\varsigma = 0$ and $\lambda' = \lambda$.* If $\varsigma = 0$ and $\lambda' = \lambda$, then $a = \lambda^2 - c\delta$ by Equation (5). By Equation (4) we have $e^4 = e'^4 = 1$. If furthermore c or δ is non-zero, we have $ee' = 1$.

Proposition 7.4. *If $f = f' = 0, \lambda' = \lambda$ and $\varsigma = 0$, we obtain the category $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,0}^{0,0}(\varepsilon, e, e')$, with independent variables $\{\lambda, c, \delta\}$ and $e^4 = e'^4 = 1$. Furthermore, if c is non-zero or δ is non-zero then $e' = e^3$. For the other variables we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda' &= \lambda, & a &= \lambda^2 - c\delta, & b &= 0, & \varsigma' &= \varsigma = 0, & \rho &= 0, \\ d = d' = f = f' &= 0, & D = E = D' = E' &= 0, & F &= e^3\lambda^2, & F' &= e'^3\lambda^2. \end{aligned}$$

7.2. **The case $f = f' = b \neq 0$.** If $f = f' = b \neq 0$, then Equation (8) reduces to $e^2 = e'^2 = \varepsilon$ and $ec\varsigma' = -b\lambda$ and $e'\varsigma = -b\lambda'$. Hence, we immediately conclude that ς and c are non-zero since λ and b are non-zero. Then Equation (11) will be satisfied if $\lambda' = \lambda$ and $ee' = 1$, or equivalently $e' = \varepsilon e$. Equation (12) and Equation (10) are then also trivially satisfied. Equation (9) will be satisfied if $\rho = \varepsilon e\varsigma(\lambda - b) + b\delta$. Furthermore, since $\lambda' = \lambda$, we have $a = \lambda^2 - b\lambda - c\delta$. We conclude the following.

Proposition 7.5. *Assume $f = f' = b \neq 0$. Then we must have $\lambda' = \lambda$ and that ς and c are non-zero. We obtain the category $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,\varsigma}^{b,b}(\varepsilon, e, \varepsilon e)$, with independent variables $\{\lambda, b, \varsigma, \delta\}$ and $e^2 = \varepsilon$. For the other variables we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda' &= \lambda, & a &= \lambda^2 - b\lambda + eb\lambda\delta/\varsigma, & c &= -eb\lambda/\varsigma & \varsigma' &= \varepsilon\varsigma, & \rho &= \varepsilon e\varsigma(\lambda - b) + b\delta, \\ e' &= \varepsilon e, & d &= -eb, & d' &= -\varepsilon eb, & f &= f' = b, \\ D &= E = D' = E' = 0, & F &= \varepsilon ea, & F' &= ea. \end{aligned}$$

7.3. **The case $f = 0, f' = b \neq 0$.** Equation (8) is satisfied if $c\varsigma = c\delta = 0$ and $e^2 = e'^2 = -\varepsilon$. From Equation (11) we can conclude that $c = 0$ since otherwise we would have $f = f'$. Equation (10) is trivially satisfied, while Equation (9) reduces to

$$(14) \quad \begin{aligned} \rho &= \varepsilon e\varsigma(\lambda - b) = e'\varsigma\lambda' + b\delta, & (\lambda' - b)\rho &= \frac{a}{\lambda}b\delta + a\varsigma e' \\ b\rho\lambda + ab\delta + \varsigma a\lambda e' &= \varsigma' a\lambda' e, & \delta(ee' - 1) &= 0, & \varsigma(1 - ee') &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we frequently used $\lambda^2 - b\lambda = \lambda'^2 - b\lambda' = a$. Note that using $\rho = e'\varsigma\lambda' + b\delta$, we see that $(\lambda' - b)\rho = \frac{a}{\lambda}b\delta + a\varsigma e'$ is equivalent to $a\delta = \lambda(\lambda' - b)\delta$. This is always

satisfied since if $\lambda = \lambda'$, we have $\lambda(\lambda' - b) = \lambda^2 - b\lambda = a$ and if $\lambda \neq \lambda'$, then $\delta = 0$.

7.3.1. *The subcase ς is zero.* Assume ς is zero, then the equations in (14) reduces to $\rho = 0$ and $\delta = 0$. We conclude the following

Proposition 7.6. *Let $f = 0$, $f' = b \neq 0$ and $\varsigma = 0$. If $\lambda' = \lambda$, we obtain the category $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,0}^{0,b}(\varepsilon, e, e')$, while for $\lambda' \neq \lambda$, we have $\lambda' = b - \lambda$ and we obtain the category $\mathcal{C}_{b-\lambda,0}^{0,b}(\varepsilon, e, e')$. In both cases, we have independent variables $\{\lambda, b\}$ and $e^2 = e'^2 = -\varepsilon$. For the other variables, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} a &= \lambda^2 - b\lambda, & c &= 0 & \varsigma' &= \varsigma = 0, & \rho &= 0, & \delta &= 0 \\ d &= -eb, & d' &= 0, & f &= 0, & f' &= b, \\ D &= (\lambda - b)b, & E &= b, & D' &= E' = 0, & F &= -\varepsilon ea, & F' &= -\varepsilon e'a. \end{aligned}$$

7.3.2. *The subcase ς is non-zero.* Assume ς is non-zero, then $e' = 1/e = -\varepsilon e$. If we then set $\rho = \varepsilon e \varsigma (\lambda - b)$ and $\delta = \varepsilon e \varsigma (\lambda + \lambda' - b)/b$, we see that Equation (14) is satisfied. Note that $\delta = 0$ for $\lambda' = b - \lambda$. So we have proven the following proposition.

Proposition 7.7. *Let $f = 0$, $f' = b \neq 0$ and ς non-zero. If $\lambda' = \lambda$, we obtain the category $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,\varsigma}^{0,b}(\varepsilon, e, -\varepsilon e)$, while for $\lambda' \neq \lambda$, we have $\lambda' = b - \lambda$ and we obtain the category $\mathcal{C}_{b-\lambda,0}^{0,b}(\varepsilon, e, -\varepsilon e)$. In both cases, we have independent variables $\{\lambda, b, \varsigma\}$ and $e^2 = -\varepsilon$. For the other variables, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} a &= \lambda^2 - b\lambda, & c &= 0 & \varsigma' &= \varepsilon \varsigma, & \rho &= \varepsilon e \varsigma (\lambda - b), & \delta &= \varepsilon e \varsigma (\lambda + \lambda' - b)/b \\ e' &= -\varepsilon e, & d &= -eb, & d' &= 0, & f &= 0, & f' &= b, \\ D &= (\lambda - b)b, & E &= b, & D' &= E' = 0, & F &= -\varepsilon ea, & F' &= ea. \end{aligned}$$

7.4. **The case $f = b \neq 0$, $f' = 0$.** This case is similar to the case $f = 0$ and $f' = b$ with the accents switched. So we obtain the following results.

Proposition 7.8. *Let $f' = 0$, $f = b \neq 0$ and $\varsigma = 0$. If $\lambda' = \lambda$, we obtain the category $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,0}^{b,0}(\varepsilon, e, e')$, while for $\lambda' \neq \lambda$, we have $\lambda' = b - \lambda$ and we obtain the category $\mathcal{C}_{b-\lambda,0}^{b,0}(\varepsilon, e, e')$. In both cases, we have independent variables $\{\lambda, b\}$ and $e^2 = e'^2 = -\varepsilon$. For the other variables, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} a &= \lambda^2 - b\lambda, & c &= 0 & \varsigma' &= \varsigma = 0, & \rho &= 0, & \delta &= 0 \\ d &= 0, & d' &= -e'b, & f &= b, & f' &= 0, \\ D &= E = 0, & D' &= (\lambda' - b)b, & E' &= b, & F &= -\varepsilon ea, & F' &= -\varepsilon e'a. \end{aligned}$$

Let $f' = 0$, $f = b \neq 0$ and ς non-zero. If $\lambda' = \lambda$, we obtain the category $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,\varsigma}^{b,0}(\varepsilon, e, -\varepsilon e)$, while for $\lambda' \neq \lambda$, we have $\lambda' = b - \lambda$ and we obtain the category $\mathcal{C}_{b-\lambda,0}^{b,0}(\varepsilon, e, -\varepsilon e)$. We have independent variables $\{\lambda, b, \varsigma\}$ and $e^2 = -\varepsilon$. For the

other variables we have

$$\begin{aligned} a &= \lambda^2 - b\lambda, & c &= 0 & \zeta' &= \varepsilon\zeta, & \rho &= -\varepsilon\varepsilon\zeta(\lambda' - b), & \delta &= -\varepsilon\varepsilon\zeta(\lambda + \lambda' - b)/b \\ & & & & e' &= -\varepsilon e, & d' &= \varepsilon eb, & d &= 0, & f' &= 0, & f &= b, \\ D &= E = 0, & D' &= (\lambda' - b)b, & E' &= b, & F &= -\varepsilon ea, & F' &= ea. \end{aligned}$$

7.5. Summary table. We have summarized the results of this section in Table 7.1.

Note that if we work over a field \mathbb{K} where -1 is not a square, then there are no odd versions of the categories $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,\zeta}^{0,0}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,\zeta}^{b,b}$, and there are no even versions of the categories $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,\zeta}^{b,0}$, $\mathcal{C}_{b-\lambda,\zeta}^{b,0}$, $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,0}^{b,0}$, $\mathcal{C}_{b-\lambda,0}^{b,0}$, $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,\zeta}^{0,b}$, $\mathcal{C}_{b-\lambda,\zeta}^{0,b}$, $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,0}^{0,b}$, $\mathcal{C}_{b-\lambda,0}^{0,b}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{-\lambda,\zeta}^{0,0}$.

We also remark that taking the limit b going to 0 in $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,\zeta}^{b,b}(\varepsilon, e, \varepsilon e)$ leads to the category $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,\zeta}^{0,0}(\varepsilon, e, \varepsilon e)$. However, we can not take the limit for ζ going to zero in $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,\zeta}^{b,b}(\varepsilon, e, \varepsilon e)$ since then a and c would become infinity. We also have the following limits

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\zeta \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{C}_{\lambda,\zeta}^{0,0}(\varepsilon, e, \varepsilon e) &= \mathcal{C}_{\lambda,0}^{0,0}(\varepsilon, e, \varepsilon e) \\ \lim_{\zeta \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{C}_{\lambda,\zeta}^{b,0}(\varepsilon, e, -\varepsilon e) &= \mathcal{C}_{\lambda,0}^{b,0}(\varepsilon, e, -\varepsilon e) \\ \lim_{b \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{C}_{\lambda,0}^{b,0}(\varepsilon, e, e') &= \mathcal{C}_{\lambda,0}^{0,0}(\varepsilon, e, e') \\ \lim_{\zeta \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{C}_{b-\lambda,\zeta}^{b,0}(\varepsilon, e, -\varepsilon e) &= \mathcal{C}_{b-\lambda,0}^{b,0}(\varepsilon, e, -\varepsilon e) \\ \lim_{b \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{C}_{b-\lambda,0}^{b,0}(\varepsilon, e, e') &= \mathcal{C}_{-\lambda,0}^{0,0}(\varepsilon, e, e') \\ \lim_{b \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{C}_{b-\lambda,\zeta}^{b,0}(\varepsilon, e, -\varepsilon e) &= \mathcal{C}_{-\lambda,\zeta}^{0,0}(\varepsilon, e, -\varepsilon e) \\ \lim_{\zeta \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{C}_{-\lambda,\zeta}^{0,0}(\varepsilon, e, -\varepsilon e) &= \mathcal{C}_{-\lambda,0}^{0,0}(\varepsilon, e, -\varepsilon e), \end{aligned}$$

and similar limits for $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda',\zeta}^{0,b}$. Note that in the limit $\lim_{\zeta \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{C}_{\lambda,\zeta}^{0,0}(\varepsilon, e, \varepsilon e)$ we get the category $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,0}^{0,0}(\varepsilon, e, \varepsilon e)$ where the independent variable c is zero. Similar for $\lim_{b \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{C}_{\lambda,0}^{b,0}(\varepsilon, e, e')$ where in $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,0}^{0,0}(\varepsilon, e, e')$ the independent variables c and δ are zero. Remark also that the limit $\lim_{b \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{C}_{\lambda,\zeta}^{b,0}(\varepsilon, e, -\varepsilon e)$ does not exist since δ goes to infinity.

Name	λ	λ'	ς	b	c	δ	ρ	d	e	d'	e'	D	E	D'	E'
$\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,\varsigma}^{b,0}$	λ	λ	ς	b	0	$-e\epsilon\varsigma\frac{2\lambda-b}{b}$	$-e\epsilon\varsigma(\lambda-b)$	0	$e^2 = -\epsilon$	ϵeb	$-\epsilon e$	0	0	$b(\lambda-b)$	b
$\mathcal{C}_{b-\lambda,\varsigma}^{b,0}$	λ	$b-\lambda$	ς	b	0	0	$\epsilon\epsilon\varsigma\lambda$	0	$e^2 = -\epsilon$	ϵeb	$-\epsilon e$	0	0	$-b\lambda$	b
$\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,0}^{b,0}$	λ	λ	0	b	0	0	0	0	$e^2 = -\epsilon$	$-e'b$	$e'^2 = -\epsilon$	0	0	$b(\lambda-b)$	b
$\mathcal{C}_{b-\lambda,0}^{b,0}$	λ	$b-\lambda$	0	b	0	0	0	0	$e^2 = -\epsilon$	$-e'b$	$e'^2 = -\epsilon$	0	0	$-b\lambda$	b
$\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,\varsigma}^{0,b}$	λ	λ	ς	b	0	$e\epsilon\varsigma\frac{2\lambda-b}{b}$	$\epsilon\epsilon\varsigma(\lambda-b)$	$-eb$	$e^2 = -\epsilon$	0	$-\epsilon e$	$b(\lambda-b)$	b	0	0
$\mathcal{C}_{b-\lambda,\varsigma}^{0,b}$	λ	$b-\lambda$	ς	b	0	0	$\epsilon\epsilon\varsigma(\lambda-b)$	$-eb$	$e^2 = -\epsilon$	0	$-\epsilon e$	$b(\lambda-b)$	b	0	0
$\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,0}^{0,b}$	λ	λ	0	b	0	0	0	$-eb$	$e^2 = -\epsilon$	0	$e'^2 = -\epsilon$	$b(\lambda-b)$	b	0	0
$\mathcal{C}_{b-\lambda,0}^{0,b}$	λ	$b-\lambda$	0	b	0	0	0	$-eb$	$e^2 = -\epsilon$	0	$e'^2 = -\epsilon$	$b(\lambda-b)$	b	0	0
$\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,\varsigma}^{b,b}$	λ	λ	ς	b	$-e\lambda\frac{b}{\varsigma}$	δ	$\epsilon\varsigma e(\lambda-b) + b\delta$	$-eb$	$e^2 = \epsilon$	$-\epsilon eb$	ϵe	0	0	0	0
$\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,\varsigma}^{0,0}$	λ	λ	ς	0	0	δ	$\epsilon\varsigma e\lambda$	0	$e^2 = \epsilon$	0	ϵe	0	0	0	0
$\mathcal{C}_{-\lambda,\varsigma}^{0,0}$	λ	$-\lambda$	ς	0	0	0	$\epsilon\varsigma e\lambda$	0	$e^2 = -\epsilon$	0	$-\epsilon e$	0	0	0	0
$\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,0}^{0,0}$	λ	λ	0	0	c	δ	0	0	$e^4 = 1$	0	$e'^4 = 1$	0	0	0	0
$\mathcal{C}_{-\lambda,0}^{0,0}$	λ	$-\lambda$	0	0	0	0	0	0	$e^4 = 1$	0	$e'^4 = 1$	0	0	0	0

TABLE 7.1. The values of the parameters for the possible categories of Brauer type $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda',\varsigma}^{f,f'}(\epsilon, e, e')$. The independent parameters are shown in red. Note that the independent parameters λ , b and ς are always non-zero, while the independent parameters δ and c are allowed to be zero. If -1 is not a square, all categories but $\mathcal{C}_{-\lambda,0}^{0,0}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,0}^{0,0}$ only exist for one type of parity.

8. BASES FOR THE CATEGORIES

We claim that the Brauer diagrams represented by their standard expression give a basis for the hom-spaces of the category \mathcal{C} . We have already shown that these diagrams are a spanning set in Theorem 5.1.

To prove the linear independence of our proposed basis we will use a trick described in [DDPW08, Section 0.3] adapted to a categorical setting. It works as follows. Assume we want to show that a spanning set $(x_i)_i$ in a unital algebra A is a linearly independent set, where we furthermore assume $x_0 = \text{id}$. We construct a free module V by formally taking linear combinations of the set $(X_i)_i$, where each X_i corresponds to x_i . By definition $(X_i)_i$ is a linear independent set. Then we define an action $F: A \rightarrow \text{End}(V)$ by setting $F(a)X_i = \sum_j \lambda_j X_j$ if $ax_i = \sum_j \lambda_j x_j$. The difficult part is showing that F is well-defined. But if F is indeed well-defined, then linear independence for $(x_i)_i$ follows immediately since $\sum_i \mu_i x_i = 0$ implies $F(\sum_i \mu_i x_i)X_0 = \sum_i \mu_i X_i = 0$. We conclude that all μ_i are zero since the X_i are linearly independent.

Theorem 8.1. *Let \mathcal{C} be a category of Brauer type as in definition 4.1. Then the (m, n) -Brauer diagrams depicted using their standard expression form a basis of $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(m, n)$.*

Proof. We have already shown that they form a spanning set in Theorem 5.1. Let us now prove linear independence using an adapted version of the trick described above. Let $(X_i)_i$ be the set of all Brauer diagrams and V the free module obtained by taking linear combinations of these Brauer diagrams. Let A be the algebra consisting of the morphisms of the category \mathcal{C} . This means that if morphisms are compatible, then their product in A is given by the composition of morphisms in the category, while if two morphisms are not compatible their product is by definition zero.

We define an action F of A on V as follows. Each Brauer diagram X corresponds by Proposition 2.3 to a unique standard expression x which is a morphism in A . Moreover, from Theorem 5.1, we know that for each fundamental diagram a , the product ax can be simplified using the defining relations to a linear combination $\sum \lambda_i x_i$ of standard expressions of Brauer diagrams. From Section 6, we know that this simplification is unique. We can thus define $F(a)X$ by $\sum_i \lambda_i X_i$. Since the fundamental diagrams generate A and we used the defining relations in the definition of F , this gives a well-defined action of the whole A on V . We do not have an identity morphism in A , but we can use the identity (m, m) -Brauer diagram id_m instead. This is the diagram which consists of m non-crossing propagating lines. So assume $a = \sum \mu_j x_j = 0$ where all x_j are standard expressions in $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(m, n)$. Then we see that $0 = F(a)X_{\text{id}_m} = \sum \mu_j X_j$ since $x_j \text{id}_m = x_j$. Since the X_i are linearly independent, all μ_j are zero, which concludes the proof. \square

9. SCALING AND FLIPPING

9.1. Rescaling. In this section, we will show that, up to a monoidal isomorphism, it is always possible to rescale either λ , b or a to 1 and to rescale either the parameter ς , δ , c or ρ to 1 if they are non-zero.

Let \mathcal{C} and $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ be two categories of Brauer type. We define a (strict) monoidal superfunctor $F_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$, where α, β and γ are non-zero scalars. On the objects $F_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}$ act as the identity, and on the generating morphism $F_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}$ acts by scalar multiplication with α, β and γ :

$$F_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}(\cap) = \alpha \cap, \quad F_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}(\cup) = \beta \cup, \quad F_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}\left(\begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array}\right) = \gamma \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array}.$$

Lemma 9.1. *The functor $F_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}$ is a well-defined isomorphism if the parameters of \mathcal{C} and $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ are related by*

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma\tilde{\lambda} = \lambda, \quad \gamma\tilde{\lambda}' = \lambda', \quad \alpha\beta\tilde{\varsigma} = \varsigma, \quad \alpha\beta\tilde{\varsigma}' = \varsigma', \quad \alpha\beta\tilde{\delta} = \delta, \quad \alpha\beta\gamma\tilde{\rho} = \rho, \\ \gamma^2\tilde{a} = a, \quad \gamma\tilde{b} = b, \quad \gamma^2\tilde{c} = \alpha\beta c, \\ \gamma\tilde{d} = d, \quad \gamma\tilde{d}' = d', \quad \tilde{e} = e, \quad \tilde{e}' = e', \quad \gamma\tilde{f} = f, \quad \gamma\tilde{f}' = f', \\ \gamma^2\tilde{D} = D, \quad \gamma^2\tilde{D}' = D', \quad \gamma\tilde{E} = E, \quad \gamma\tilde{E}' = E', \quad \gamma^2\tilde{F} = F, \quad \gamma^2\tilde{F}' = F'. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since we defined $F_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}$ on the generating morphisms, we only have to check that $F_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}$ respects the defining relations of the categories. Applying $F_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}$ on the defining relations from Section 5 gives us exactly the relations in the lemma. Note that the relations in this lemma are consistent with the relations between the parameters of Section 6. For instance $a = \lambda^2 - b\lambda - c\delta$. Applying the relations from the lemma, this results in $\gamma^2\tilde{a} = (\gamma\tilde{\lambda})^2 - \gamma\tilde{b}\gamma\tilde{\lambda} - \frac{\gamma^2}{\alpha\beta}\tilde{c}\alpha\beta\tilde{\delta}$. It is clear that the inverse is given by $F_{1/\alpha,1/\beta,1/\gamma}$. \square

Since $F_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}$ is an isomorphism with inverse $F_{1/\alpha,1/\beta,1/\gamma}$, we see that we can use it to rescale two parameters in our categories of Brauer type. Remark that we can only rescale two parameters and not three since α and β always occur together as the product $\alpha\beta$. To obtain the connection with categories occurring in the existing literature in Section 10 we will have to rescale in such a way that $\varsigma = 1$ and $a = 1$.

9.2. Vertical flipping. We also have a contravariant monoidal functor by exchanging the roles of the cup and the cap. This corresponds to vertically flipping a diagram.

Proposition 9.2. *Let \mathcal{C} and $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ be two categories of Brauer type whose parameters are related as follows:*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\lambda} = \lambda', \quad \tilde{\lambda}' = \lambda, \quad \tilde{\varsigma} = \varsigma', \quad \tilde{\varsigma}' = \varsigma, \\ \tilde{\delta} = \delta, \quad \tilde{\rho} = \rho, \quad \tilde{a} = a, \quad \tilde{b} = b, \quad \tilde{c} = c, \\ \tilde{d} = d', \quad \tilde{d}' = d, \quad \tilde{e} = e', \quad \tilde{e}' = e, \quad \tilde{f} = f', \quad \tilde{f}' = f, \\ \tilde{D} = D', \quad \tilde{D}' = D, \quad \tilde{E} = E', \quad \tilde{E}' = E, \quad \tilde{F} = F' \quad \tilde{F}' = F. \end{aligned}$$

Then the monoidal contravariant superfunctor $F_{v\text{-flip}}$ defined by $F_{v\text{-flip}}\left(\begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array}\right) = \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array}$, $F_{v\text{-flip}}(\cap) = \cup$ and $F_{v\text{-flip}}(\cup) = \cap$ is a well-defined isomorphism between \mathcal{C} and $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$.

Proof. We defined $F_{v\text{-flip}}$ on the generators and a straightforward verification shows that $F_{v\text{-flip}}$ respects the defining relations for the given parameters. Applying $F_{v\text{-flip}}$ twice is clearly the identity functor, hence $F_{v\text{-flip}}$ is an isomorphism. \square

9.3. Horizontal flipping. We can also consider the functor which flips diagrams horizontally. This will, however, not be a monoidal functor.

Proposition 9.3. *Let \mathcal{C} and $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ be two categories of Brauer type whose parameters are related as follows:*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\lambda} &= \lambda, & \tilde{\lambda}' &= \lambda', & \tilde{\zeta} &= \zeta', & \tilde{\zeta}' &= \zeta, \\ \tilde{\delta} &= \delta, & \tilde{\rho} &= \rho + e\zeta'(\lambda' - \lambda), & \tilde{a} &= a, & \tilde{b} &= b, & \tilde{c} &= c, \\ \tilde{d} &= \frac{d'}{ee'}, & \tilde{d}' &= \frac{d}{ee'}, & \tilde{e} &= 1/e, & \tilde{e}' &= 1/e', & \tilde{f} &= f', & \tilde{f}' &= f, \\ \tilde{D} &= D'\lambda'/\lambda, & \tilde{D}' &= D\lambda/\lambda', & \tilde{E} &= E', & \tilde{E}' &= E, & \tilde{F} &= ee'F' & \tilde{F}' &= ee'F. \end{aligned}$$

Then the superfunctor $F_{h\text{-flip}}$ defined as the identity on the objects and the generating morphisms and satisfying by $F_{h\text{-flip}}(X \otimes Y) = (-1)^{|X||Y|} F_{h\text{-flip}}(Y) \otimes F_{h\text{-flip}}(X)$ is a well-defined isomorphism between \mathcal{C} and $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$. We then also have $\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \cong \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$.

Proof. The functor $F_{h\text{-flip}}$ is the identity on objects and the generating morphisms, so we only have to verify that it respects the relations. For example, applying $F_{h\text{-flip}}$ on the delooping relation gives us

$$\rho \mid = F_{h\text{-flip}} \left(\text{diagram of two crossing strands} \right) = \left(\tilde{d}\tilde{\zeta}' + \tilde{e}\tilde{\lambda}'\tilde{\zeta}' + \tilde{f}\tilde{\delta} \right) \mid,$$

where we used the sliding relation in $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$. From the relations between the parameters of the categories \mathcal{C} and $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$, we see that $\rho = \tilde{d}\tilde{\zeta}' + \tilde{e}\tilde{\lambda}'\tilde{\zeta}' + \tilde{f}\tilde{\delta}$ is equivalent to $\rho = \zeta(d' + e'\lambda') + f'\delta$. This last expression holds by Equation (9). The other relations can be similarly verified.

Applying $F_{h\text{-flip}}$ twice is clearly the identity functor, hence $F_{h\text{-flip}}$ is an isomorphism. Combining $F_{h\text{-flip}}$ with the construction of the monoidal opposite is clearly the identity, so we can conclude that $\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \cong \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$. \square

From this, we can immediately conclude that the Brauer category, BWM-category and the periplectic Brauer category are their own monoidal opposite. This does not hold for the periplectic q -Brauer category.

Corollary 9.4. *The categories $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,\zeta}^{b,b}(+, 1, 1)$, $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,\zeta}^{0,0}(+, 1, 1)$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,\zeta}^{0,0}(-, 1, 1)$ are each their own monoidal opposite, while the categories $\mathcal{C}_{b-\lambda,\zeta}^{b,0}(-, 1, 1)$ and $\mathcal{C}_{b-\lambda,\zeta}^{0,b}(-, 1, 1)$ are each other monoidal opposites.*

Proof. For $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,\zeta}^{b,b}(+, 1, 1)$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,\zeta}^{0,0}(+, 1, 1)$ this follows immediately from the previous theorem. For $\mathcal{C}_{b-\lambda,\zeta}^{b,0}(-, 1, 1)$ we have to combine $F_{h\text{-flip}}$ with the rescaling $F_{1,1,\varepsilon}$ to

obtain $\mathcal{C}_{b-\lambda,\varsigma}^{0,b}(-, 1, 1)$. Similarly, combining F_{h-flip} with the rescaling $F_{1,1,\varepsilon}$ gives $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,\varsigma}^{0,0}(-, 1, 1) \cong (\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,\varsigma}^{0,0}(-, 1, 1))^{\text{op}}$. \square

10. CONNECTION WITH EXISTING CATEGORIES

In this section, we will show the connection between the categories we introduced in this paper and known categories in the literature.

10.1. The Birman-Wenzl-Murakami category. The Birman-Wenzl-Murakami algebra is a deformation of the Brauer algebra introduced by Birman and Wenzl in [BW89] and Murakami in [Mur90]. We will use the definition of the BWM-algebra as stated in [Mor10], which can also be found in [LZ15]

Definition 10.1 ([Mor10, Section 2.1], [LZ15, Section 8]). *The Birman-Wenzl-Murakami algebra BWM_n is the unital, associative $\mathbb{K}[v, v^{-1}, z, \delta]/(v^{-1} - v - z(\delta - 1))$ -algebra generated by elements g_i^\pm and e_i for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ satisfying the following relations:*

$$\begin{aligned} (g_i - g_i^{-1}) &= z(1 - e_i), \\ e_i^2 &= \delta e_i, \\ e_i g_i &= v e_i = g_i e_i, \\ g_i g_j &= g_j g_i, \quad \text{for } |i - j| \geq 2 \\ g_i g_{i+1} g_i &= g_{i+1} g_i g_{i+1}, \\ e_{i+1} e_i e_{i+1} &= e_{i+1}, \quad e_i e_{i+1} e_i = e_i, \\ g_i g_{i+1} e_i &= e_{i+1} e_i, \quad g_{i+1} g_i e_{i+1} = e_i e_{i+1} \\ e_i g_{i+1} e_i &= v^{-1} e_i, \quad e_{i+1} g_i e_{i+1} = v^{-1} e_{i+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the Brauer algebra is obtained from the BWM-algebra by setting $z = 0$ and $v = 1$.

Although we could not find an explicit definition for the BWM-category in the literature, the definition of the Brauer category defined in [LZ15] can be easily deformed to obtain a BWM-category which has as endomorphism spaces the BWM algebras.

Definition 10.2 (BWM-category). *The BWM-category \mathcal{B} is a strict monoidal category generated by a single object \bullet and the even morphisms $\searrow \in \mathcal{B}(2, 2)$, $\swarrow \in \mathcal{B}(2, 2)$, $\cap \in \mathcal{B}(0, 2)$ and $\cup \in \mathcal{B}(2, 0)$ subject to the following defining relations:*

- (1) *The Kauffman skein relation:* $\searrow - \swarrow = z \mid \mid - z \cup$,
- (2) *The loop removing relation:* $\bigcirc = \delta$,
- (3) *The untwisting relations:* $\bigcirc = v \cup$ and $\bigcirc = v \cap$,
- (4) *The braid relations:* $\langle \rangle = \mid \mid = \langle \rangle$ and $\langle \rangle = \langle \rangle$,

- (5) The snake relations: $\cap = |$ and $\cup = |$,
- (6) The tangle relation: $\begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ | \\ \diagup \end{array} = | \cup$ and $\begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ | \\ \diagdown \end{array} = | \cup$,
- (7) Delooping relations: $\begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ | \\ \diagup \end{array} = v^{-1} |$ and $\begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ | \\ \diagdown \end{array} = v^{-1} |$.

This BWM-category is equivalent to a category of Brauer type we constructed in this paper.

Proposition 10.3. *Consider the category $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_{v,1}^{z,z}(+, 1, 1)$ where we scaled ς and a to be one. This category is isomorphic to the BWM-category \mathcal{B} defined in Definition 10.2.*

Proof. The category $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_{v,1}^{z,z}$ has four independent parameters v , δ , ς and z . We rescale ς to one, eliminating the parameter ς . Further rescaling a to one gives the relation $1 = v^2 - zv + zv\delta$ or equivalently $v^{-1} = v - z + z\delta$. This is the same relation we also have in \mathcal{B} between v , δ and z . Then the parameters of \mathcal{C} become

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda = \lambda' = v, \quad \delta = \delta, \quad \varsigma = \varsigma' = 1, \quad a = 1, \quad b = z, \quad c = -zv, \\ \rho = v^{-1}, \quad d = d' = -z, \quad e = e' = 1, \quad f = f' = z, \\ D = E = D' = E' = 0, \quad F = F' = 1. \end{aligned}$$

If we then compare the relation in \mathcal{C} with the relations in \mathcal{B} we see that the relations which they do not share are the twisting, the sliding, upside-down sliding and upside-down pulling in \mathcal{C} and the Kauffman skein relation, the right tangle and right delooping relation in \mathcal{B} . Remark that applying the under-cross to the twisting relation in \mathcal{C} and then using untwisting, shows that twisting is equivalent to the Kauffman skein relation. If we multiply sliding with $| \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array}$ we obtain, using twisting and untwisting,

$$\begin{aligned} | \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \cdot \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} = -z \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ | \\ \diagup \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ | \\ \diagup \end{array} + z \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ | \\ \diagup \end{array} \\ = -z \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ | \\ \diagup \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ | \\ \diagup \end{array} + z \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ | \\ \diagup \end{array} - zv \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ | \\ \diagup \end{array} + zv \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ | \\ \diagup \end{array} \\ = \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ | \\ \diagup \end{array}. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that sliding is equivalent to the right tangle relation. We also have, using sliding and straightening in \mathcal{C} ,

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ | \\ \diagup \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \\ = \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} + z \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} - z \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \\ = \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} + z \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} - z \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that upside-down sliding follows from sliding and straightening. Similarly, we can show that multiplying upside-down sliding with $\begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \Big|$ gives us upside-down pulling, while multiplying sliding with $\Big| \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array}$ leads to the right delooping relation in \mathcal{B} . Hence \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{B} satisfy the same relations and we conclude that \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{C} are isomorphic categories. \square

Corollary 10.4. *The category $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_{1,1}^{0,0}(+, 1, 1)$ where we scaled ς and λ to one, is isomorphic to the Brauer category $\mathcal{B}(+1)$ defined in Section 3.2.*

Proof. If we specialize to $v = v^{-1} = 1$ and $z = 0$ in the definition of the BWM-category, we get the Brauer category of Section 3.2, while if we take the limit b to zero in $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,\varsigma}^{b,b}(+, 1, 1)$ we get $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,\varsigma}^{0,0}(+, 1, 1)$. Using our rescaling, we indeed see that $\mathcal{C}_{1,1}^{0,0}(+, 1, 1) \cong \mathcal{B}(+1)$. \square

Note that the discussion about limits of categories at the end of Section 7 shows that the BWM-category is the only possible deformation of the Brauer category in the framework of diagram categories of Brauer type since $\lim_{b \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{C}_{1,1}^{b,b}(+, 1, 1)$ is the only possible limit leading to $\mathcal{C}_{1,1}^{0,0}(+, 1, 1)$

10.2. The quantum periplectic Brauer category. Ahmed, Grantcharov and Guay introduced in [AGG21] algebras $\mathcal{A}_q(n)$ as the centralizer of the quantum periplectic Lie superalgebra $U_q(\mathfrak{p}_m)$ acting on $(\mathbb{C}^{m|m})^{\otimes n}$, leading to a sort of Schur-Weyl duality.

Definition 10.5 ([AGG21, Definition 5.1]). *The periplectic q -Brauer algebra $\mathcal{A}_q(n)$ is the unital associative $\mathbb{K}(q)$ -algebra generated by elements g_i and e_i for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ satisfying the following relations:*

$$\begin{aligned} (g_i - q)(g_i + q^{-1}) &= 0, \\ e_i^2 &= 0, \\ e_i g_i &= -q^{-1} e_i, & g_i e_i &= q e_i \\ g_i g_j &= g_j g_i, & g_i e_j &= e_j g_i, & e_i e_j &= e_j e_i & \text{for } |i - j| \geq 2 \\ g_i g_{i+1} g_i &= g_{i+1} g_i g_{i+1}, \\ e_{i+1} e_i e_{i+1} &= -e_{i+1}, & e_i e_{i+1} e_i &= -e_i, \\ g_i e_{i+1} e_i &= -g_{i+1} e_i + (q - q^{-1}) e_{i+1} e_i, \\ e_{i+1} e_i g_{i+1} &= -e_{i+1} g_i + (q - q^{-1}) e_{i+1} e_i. \end{aligned}$$

In [RS22] Rui and Song introduced a monoidal supercategory which they called the periplectic q -Brauer category. It is a deformation of the periplectic Brauer category. The endomorphism spaces of the periplectic q -Brauer category give us the periplectic q -Brauer algebras $\mathcal{A}_q(n)$.

Definition 10.6 ([RS22, Definition 2.2]). *The periplectic q -Brauer category \mathcal{B} is a strict monoidal supercategory generated by a single object \bullet and two even morphisms $\begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \in \mathcal{B}(2, 2)$ and $\begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array} \in \mathcal{B}(2, 2)$ and two odd morphisms $\cap \in \mathcal{B}(0, 2)$ and $\cup \in \mathcal{B}(2, 0)$ subject to the following defining relations:*

- (1) The braid relations: $\begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array} = | \quad | = \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array}$ and $\begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array}$,
- (2) The skein relation: $\begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array} - \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} = (q - q^{-1}) | \quad |$,
- (3) The snake relations: $\cup = |$ and $\cap = -|$
- (4) The untwisting relations: $\begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array} = q \cup$ and $\begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} = -q \cap$,
- (5) The loop removing relation: $\bigcirc = 0$.

We will now give a connection between this category and a category of Brauer type.

Proposition 10.7. *Consider the category $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_{-q^{-1}, 1}^{q-q^{-1}, 0}(-, 1, 1)$ where we scaled $\varsigma = 1$ and $a = 1$. The category \mathcal{C} is isomorphic to the quantum periplectic Brauer category. Then also $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(n, n) \cong \mathcal{A}_q(n)$. Furthermore, if we specialize $q = q^{-1}$ to one, we get the periplectic Brauer category. Hence $\mathcal{C}_{-1, 1}^{0, 0}(-, 1, 1)$ is isomorphic to the periplectic Brauer category.*

Proof. The category $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_{b-\lambda, \varsigma}^{b, 0}(-, 1, 1)$ has three independent parameters. When we rescale ς and a to one we have one independent parameter λ , which we set equal to q . Then the parameters of \mathcal{C} become

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &= q, & \lambda' &= -q^{-1}, & \delta &= 0, & \varsigma &= 1, & \varsigma' &= -1, & a &= 1, & b &= q - q^{-1}, & c &= 0, \\ \rho &= -q, & d &= f' = 0, & d' &= -f = -(q - q^{-1}), & e &= e' = 1, \\ D &= E = 0, & D' &= -q^2 + 1, & E' &= q - q^{-1}, & F &= F' = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the skein-relation allows us to express the under-cross as a linear combination of the over-cross and id_2 . Thus we see that \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{C} are generated by the same object and the same morphisms. We thus only have to show they satisfy the same relations. Note that the first braid relation in \mathcal{B} just expresses that the over-cross is invertible, which we also assume to hold in \mathcal{C} . The second braid relation in \mathcal{B} is the same as the braid relation in \mathcal{C} . The skein relation also holds in \mathcal{C} by Lemma 5.2. The snake relations in \mathcal{B} are the straightening relations in \mathcal{C} . The sliding relation in \mathcal{C} is given by $\begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array} \cup = \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} + (q - q^{-1}) | \quad \cup$. Using the skein relation

this is equivalent to $\begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array}$. So the untwisting relations and loop-removing

relations of \mathcal{B} are also satisfied in \mathcal{C} . We thus have shown that every relation in \mathcal{B} also holds in \mathcal{C} . We still have to show that the relations upside-down untwisting, delooping, pulling, upside-down sliding and upside-down pulling which hold in \mathcal{C} are also satisfied in \mathcal{B} . From [RS22, Lemma 2.3], we have that $\begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array} \cap = -q \cup$, $\begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \cap = -q |$,

and $\begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \cup = \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array} \cap$ hold in \mathcal{B} . This is equivalent to upside-down untwisting, delooping

and upside-down sliding in \mathcal{C} . The pulling relation in \mathcal{C} is given by $\begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array} \cup = | \quad \cup$.

This relation can be obtained via the untwisting relation $\bigcup \diagdown = \diagup \bigcup$ in \mathcal{B} by multiplying on the left with $\diagdown \mid$. Upside-down pulling is a bit more involved. We can combine $\bigcap \diagdown = \diagup \bigcap$ with the skein relation to obtain

$$(15) \quad \bigcap \diagdown - (q - q^{-1}) \bigcap \mid = \diagup \bigcap.$$

Multiplying on the right with $\diagdown \mid$ leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \bigcap \diagdown \mid &= (q - q^{-1}) \bigcap \mid + \bigcap \diagup \mid \\ &= (-1 + q^{-2}) \bigcap \mid + (q - q^{-1}) \bigcap \diagdown \mid \\ &= (1 - q^2) \bigcap \mid + (q - q^{-1}) \bigcap \diagup \mid, \end{aligned}$$

where we used upside-down untwisting and the skein relation for the first step and again Equation (15) in the second step. This shows that the upside-down pulling also holds in \mathcal{B} and we conclude that \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{C} are isomorphic categories. This also immediately implies the other statements of the proposition since the periplectic Brauer category is obtained from the periplectic Brauer category by setting $q = 1$ and the category $\mathcal{C}_{-\lambda, 1}^{0,0}$ is obtained from $\mathcal{C}_{b-\lambda, 1}^{b,0}$ by taking the limit $b = 0$. Note that the isomorphism between $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(n, n)$ and $\mathcal{A}_q(n)$ is given by mapping $s_i = \bigcap \diagdown \cdots \mid$ to g_i and $\bigcap \diagup \cdots \mid$ to e_i . \square

We know that $\lim_{b \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{C}_{b-\lambda, \varsigma}^{b,0}(-, 1, 1) = \mathcal{C}_{-\lambda, \varsigma}^{0,0}(-, 1, 1)$. If we rescale λ and ς to one and set $b = q - q^{-1}$, this expresses that the periplectic q -Brauer category is a deformation of the periplectic Brauer category. However, if we look at the discussion about limits at the end of Section 7, we see that we have another deformation $\mathcal{C}_{b-\lambda, \varsigma}^{0,b}(-, 1, 1)$ since $\lim_{b \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{C}_{b-\lambda, \varsigma}^{0,b}(-, 1, 1)$ is also equal to $\mathcal{C}_{-\lambda, \varsigma}^{0,0}(-, 1, 1)$. This deformation is obtained by replacing the untwisting relation $\bigcup \diagdown = \diagup \bigcup$ by $\bigcup \diagdown = \diagup \bigcup$ in Definition 10.6 of the periplectic q -Brauer category.

We thus get two deformations of the periplectic Brauer category. We have seen in Corollary 9.4 that they are each other monoidal opposites.

10.3. The q -Brauer algebra. Aside from the BWM-algebra, there exists another deformation of the Brauer algebra called the q -Brauer algebra introduced by Wenzl [Wen12]. However, no topological or diagrammatical interpretation of this algebra is known. We will now show that they also do not occur as endomorphisms algebras of a category of Brauer type.

The q -Brauer algebra $Br_n(q, r)$ is defined [Wen12, 3.1] as the algebra with generators e and g_1, g_2, \dots, g_{n-1} satisfying relations

$$(1) \quad g_i^2 = (q - 1)g_i + q, \quad g_i g_{i+1} g_i = g_{i+1} g_i g_{i+1}, \quad \text{and} \quad g_i g_j = g_j g_i \quad \text{if} \quad |i - j| > 1,$$

$$(2) e^2 = \frac{r-1}{q-1}e,$$

$$(3) eg_i = g_i e \text{ for } i > 2, eg_1 = qe, eg_2e = re \text{ and } eg_2^{-1}e = q^{-1}e$$

$$(4) g_2g_3g_1^{-1}g_2^{-1}e_{(2)} = e_{(2)} = e_{(2)}g_2g_3g_1^{-1}g_2^{-1} \text{ with } e_{(2)} = eg_2g_3g_1^{-1}g_2^{-1}e.$$

We will represent g_i by the Brauer diagram $g_i = \left| \cdots \right| \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \left| \cdots \right|$ and e by the Brauer

$$\text{diagram } e = \bigcup \left| \cdots \right|.$$

Assume \mathcal{C} is a category of Brauer type such that the endomorphism algebras $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(n, n)$ are isomorphic to the q -Brauer algebras $Br_n(q, r)$. Then the relation $g_i^2 = (q-1)g_i + q$ implies that the parameters in \mathcal{C} satisfy $a = q$, $b = q-1$, $c = 0$, while $eg_1 = qe$, $eg_2e = re$ imply $\lambda = q$, $\rho = r$. Using Lemma 5.2, $eg_2^{-1}e = q^{-1}e$ leads to $\delta = \frac{r-1}{q-1}$, which is also consistent with $e^2 = \frac{r-1}{q-1}e$. Since b , δ and ρ are non-zero, but $c = 0$, we see from Table 7.1, that the only possible categories are $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda, \varsigma}^{b, 0}(-, 1, 1)$ or $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda, \varsigma}^{b, 0}(-, -1, -1)$. Looking at the values of $\rho = -\varepsilon e \varsigma (\lambda - b)$ and $\delta = -\varepsilon e \varsigma (2\lambda - b)/b$ for these categories, we see that they are not compatible with $\delta = \frac{r-1}{q-1}$ and $\rho = r$. We conclude that the q -Brauer algebra $Br_n(q, r)$ can not be obtained via a category of Brauer type.

APPENDIX A. THE EQUATIONS FOR SIMPLIFYING DIAGRAMS


In Section 6 we listed all the diagrams we can rewrite in two different ways. In this section, we will deduce the corresponding equations which have to be satisfied such that rewriting is consistent. We will also already simplify the resulting equations.



Lemma A.1. *Rewriting  and  leads to*

$$\zeta' = \varepsilon \varsigma.$$

Proof. Directly using the upside-down straightening relation on  leads to $\zeta' \cup$. On the other hand, using the super interchange law and then the straightening law, we have

$$\text{upside-down straightening relation diagram} = \varepsilon \text{super interchange law diagram} = \varepsilon \zeta \cup.$$


We conclude that $\zeta' = \varepsilon \zeta$. Similarly, rewriting  leads to $\zeta = \varepsilon \zeta'$. \square

Lemma A.2. *Rewriting  and  gives us the equations*




$$\begin{aligned} \varsigma(1 - ee') = 0, \quad \zeta'(1 - ee') = 0, \quad d + ef' = 0, \quad d' + e'f = 0, \\ \zeta'(f + ed') = 0, \quad \varsigma(f' + e'd) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Using upside-down sliding we deduce





$$\text{sliding relation diagram} = d' \zeta' \left| \right| + e' \zeta' \text{ sliding relation diagram} + f' \varepsilon \text{ sliding relation diagram}.$$

This allows us to rewrite  using sliding as



$$\begin{aligned} \text{Diagram} &= d\varepsilon \text{Diagram} + e \left| \text{Diagram} \right| + f\zeta' \text{Diagram} \\ &= (f + ed')\zeta' \text{Diagram} + ee'\zeta' \text{Diagram} + (d + ef')\varepsilon \text{Diagram}. \end{aligned}$$



On the other hand, using the straightening relation we obtain  = ζ' . Comparing these two different rewritings, we obtain $\zeta'(1 - ee') = 0$, $d + ef' = 0$ and $\zeta'(f + ed') = 0$. Similarly, rewriting  leads to $\zeta(1 - ee') = 0$, $d' + e'f = 0$ and $\zeta(f' + e'd) = 0$. \square

Note that the last two equations are satisfied if the first four equations hold. Namely multiplying $d' + e'f = 0$ with $\zeta'e$ and using $\zeta'(1 - ee') = 0$ we obtain $\zeta'(ed' + f) = 0$ while multiplying $d + ef' = 0$ with $\zeta e'$ gives us $\zeta(f' + e'd) = 0$. Also, since $\zeta' = \varepsilon\zeta$, the first two equations are equivalent.

Lemma A.3. Rewriting , ,  and  gives us


$$\lambda^2 = a + b\lambda + c\delta \quad \lambda'^2 = a + b\lambda' + c\delta \quad (\lambda' - \lambda)\delta = 0, \quad (\lambda' - \lambda)c = 0.$$

Proof. Rewriting  using on the one hand twisting and on the other hand untwisting gives us $(a + b\lambda + c\delta) \cup = \lambda^2 \cup$. Rewriting  leads to $\lambda'^2 = a + b\lambda' + c\delta$.

We can rewrite  in two different ways. If we first use upside-down untwisting we obtain $\lambda' \circ$ while first using untwisting gives us $\lambda \circ$. So, we conclude that $(\lambda' - \lambda)\delta = 0$. Rewriting in a similar fashion  we obtain $(\lambda' - \lambda)c = 0$. \square

Corollary A.4. We have two disjoint cases. If $\lambda' = \lambda$, then $a = \lambda^2 - b\lambda - c\delta$. Otherwise, if $\lambda' \neq \lambda$, then $\lambda' = b - \lambda$, $a = -\lambda'\lambda$, $\delta = 0$ and $c = 0$.

Proof. Subtracting the equations $\lambda^2 = a + b\lambda + c\delta$ and $\lambda'^2 = a + b\lambda' + c\delta$ from each other, we obtain $(\lambda - \lambda')(\lambda + \lambda' - b) = 0$. We thus indeed obtain two cases: $\lambda' = \lambda$ or $\lambda' = b - \lambda$. When $\lambda \neq \lambda'$, the equations $(\lambda' - \lambda)\delta = 0$ and $(\lambda' - \lambda)c = 0$ imply that $\delta = c = 0$. The expression for a is obtained by simplifying $a = \lambda^2 - b\lambda - c\delta$. \square

Lemma A.5. Rewriting  and  leads to the following expressions for D, E, F and D', E', F' :


$$\begin{aligned} eD &= c\varsigma + (b - \lambda - f)d, & eE &= e(b - f), & eF &= (b - f)f + a, \\ e'D' &= c\varsigma' + (b - \lambda' - f')d', & e'E' &= e'(b - f'), & e'F' &= (b - f')f' + a. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Rewriting  using twisting leads to

$$(bd + c\varsigma) \cup \left| + be \left| \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array} \right| + (bf + a) \right| \cup,$$

while applying sliding gives us

$$(d\lambda + eD + fd) \cup \left| + (eE + fe) \left| \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array} \right| + (eF + f^2) \right| \cup.$$


Rewriting  gives us similar expressions for D', E', F' . □

Lemma A.6. Rewriting  gives us

$$\begin{aligned} f(b - f) &= 0, & c(f + \varepsilon ed) &= 0 & d(d + eb) &= 0, \\ c\varsigma'ed + df\lambda + efD &= 0, & efE &= 0, & f(a - eF) &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

while rewriting  leads to

$$\begin{aligned} f'(b - f') &= 0, & c(f' + \varepsilon e'd') &= 0 & d'(d' + e'b) &= 0, \\ c\varsigma'e'd' + d'f'\lambda' + e'f'D' &= 0, & e'f'E' &= 0, & f'(a - e'F') &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Rewriting  using sliding leads eventually to

$$\begin{aligned} & (d^2 + edb) \cup \left| \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array} \right| + de \left| \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array} \right| + df \left| \begin{array}{c} \cup \\ \diagdown \end{array} \right| + eda \cup \left| \right| \\ & + e^2 \left| \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array} \right| + ef \left| \begin{array}{c} \cup \\ \diagdown \end{array} \right| + fa \left| \right| \cup + fb \left| \begin{array}{c} \cup \\ \diagdown \end{array} \right| \cup + (\varepsilon edc + fe) \left| \begin{array}{c} \cup \\ \cup \end{array} \right| \cup, \end{aligned}$$

while rewriting using the braid relation leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (d^2 + edb) \left| \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \\ \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \right| + de \left| \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \\ \diagdown \\ \diagup \\ \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \right| + df \left| \begin{array}{c} \cup \\ \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \right| + eda \left| \begin{array}{c} \cup \\ \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \right| + e^2 \left| \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \\ \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \right| \\
 & + ef \left| \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \\ \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \right| + efF \left| \begin{array}{c} \cup \\ \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \right| + f^2 \left| \begin{array}{c} \cup \\ \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \right| + (dec\zeta' + df\lambda + efD) \left| \begin{array}{c} \cup \\ \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \right| + efE \left| \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \right|.
 \end{aligned}$$

Comparing these two expressions gives us the first part of the lemma. The calculation for the flipped diagram is similar. \square

Using $d = -ef'$, $d' = -e'f$ and the expression for D, E, F, D', E' , and F' from Lemma A.5 the equations of the previous lemma are equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned}
 & f(b-f) = 0, \quad c(f - e^2\epsilon f') = 0, \quad e^2 f'(b-f') = 0, \\
 & c\zeta(-e^2\epsilon f' + f) - e f f'(b-f) = 0, \quad ef(b-f) = 0, \quad f^2(b-f) = 0,
 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 & f'(b-f') = 0, \quad c(f' - e'^2\epsilon f) = 0, \quad e'^2 f(b-f) = 0, \\
 & c\zeta'(-e'^2\epsilon f + f') - e' f' f(b-f') = 0, \quad e' f'(b-f') = 0, \quad f'^2(b-f') = 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Note that $f(b-f) = 0$, $f'(b-f') = 0$, $c(f - e^2\epsilon f') = 0$ and $c(f' - e'^2\epsilon f) = 0$ imply that the other equations hold.

If we assume $\left| \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \right|$ is invertible, then λ , λ' and a are non-zero by Lemma 5.2. Combining $eF = (b-f)f + a$ with $f(b-f) = 0$, we can conclude that e and F are also non-zero. From Lemma A.5, we then also infer that $E = b-f$.

Lemma A.7. Rewriting $\left| \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \\ \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \right|$ and $\left| \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \\ \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \right|$ leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
 cD = cD' = 0, & & c(d + eb) = c(d' + e'b) = 0, \\
 cE = cE' = 0, & & c(ec\zeta' + f\lambda) = c(e'\zeta + f'\lambda') = 0, \\
 cF = ce'a, & & cF' = cea.
 \end{aligned}$$

Proof. First applying twisting and then braiding and pulling gives us

$$\left| \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \\ \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \right| = a \left| \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \right| + b \left| \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \\ \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \right| + cD \left| \begin{array}{c} \cup \\ \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \right| + cE \left| \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \right| + cF \left| \begin{array}{c} \cup \\ \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \right|.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
ce(d' + e'b) &= ce'(d + eb), \\
c(d + eb)f' &= c(bd + b^2e + e(e'c\varsigma + f'\lambda')), \\
c(d' + e'b)f &= c(bd' + b^2e' + e'(ec\varsigma' + f\lambda)), \\
c(bce'\varsigma + bf'\lambda' + (ec\varsigma' + f\lambda)f') &= c(bec\varsigma' + bf\lambda + f(e'c\varsigma + f'\lambda')).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that using $d = -ef'$, $d' = -ef$, $c(b - f') = c(b - f) = 0$, $c(ee' - 1) = 0$, $c(ec\varsigma' + f\lambda) = 0$ and $c(e'c\varsigma + f'\lambda') = 0$, we can easily verify that all equations but the first are always trivially satisfied. Using the fact that a , e and e' are non-zero, the first equation is equivalent to

$$(19) \quad cf = cf'.$$

Lemma A.10. *Rewriting  leads to*

$$\begin{aligned}
c\rho &= D(\lambda + E - b) + Fd = D'(\lambda' + E' - b) + F'd', \\
a &= E(E - b) + Fe = E'(E' - b) + F'e', \\
0 &= F(E + f - b) = F'(E' + f' - b).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the last equation is satisfied since $E = b - f$ while $a = Fe$ and $(b - f)f = 0$ implies that the second equation is satisfied. On the other hand, the first equation is equivalent to

$$(20) \quad c\rho = a(b - f - f'),$$

by using $D(E - b) = (aE/\lambda)(-f) = 0$.

Lemma A.11. *Rewriting  leads to*

$$\begin{aligned}
\zeta'ae' &= \zeta'(F + Ed'), & \zeta ae &= \zeta(F' + E'd), \\
\zeta'(d' + e'b) &= Ee'\zeta', & \zeta(d + eb) &= E'e\zeta, \\
f'\lambda + \varepsilon\zeta'e'c &= Ef' + D, & f\lambda' + \varepsilon\zeta ec &= E'f + D'.
\end{aligned}$$

The first two equations are always satisfied. The last equation is equivalent to

$$(21) \quad \lambda(\zeta e'c + ff') + c\delta f' = \lambda'(\zeta'ec + ff') + c\delta f = a(b - f - f'),$$

where we used $D = a(b - f)/\lambda$ and $\lambda^2 - b\lambda = a + c\delta$.


Lemma A.12. *Rewriting  leads to*

$$(22) \quad \rho = \varepsilon\zeta(d + e\lambda) + f\delta = \varepsilon\zeta'(d' + e'\lambda') + f'\delta.$$

Lemma A.13. Rewriting  and  leads to

$$e\rho = -d\delta + (\lambda' - f)\varsigma \quad \text{and} \quad e'\rho = -d'\delta + (\lambda - f')\varsigma'.$$

From $d = -ef'$ and $\varsigma(1 - ee') = 0$, we see that the equation in Lemma A.13 is equivalent to Lemma A.12.

Lemma A.14. Rewriting  leads to

$$\varsigma'(d + e\lambda') + f\delta = \varsigma(d' + e'\lambda) + f'\delta.$$

Using Lemma A.12, we can rewrite this equation as


$$(23) \quad \varsigma(\lambda' - \lambda)(1 + \varepsilon e^2) = 0.$$

Lemma A.15. Rewriting  and  leads to

$$(\lambda - E')\rho = D'\delta + F'\varsigma' \quad \text{and} \quad (\lambda' - E)\rho = D\delta + F\varsigma.$$

This is equivalent to

$$(24) \quad (\lambda - b + f')\rho = \frac{a}{\lambda'}(b - f')\delta + a\varsigma'e \quad \text{and} \quad (\lambda' - b + f)\rho = \frac{a}{\lambda}(b - f)\delta + a\varsigma e'.$$

Lemma A.16. Rewriting  leads to

$$\rho(D + Eb) + a\delta E + \varsigma(c\varsigma'E + F\lambda) = \rho(D' + E'b) + a\delta E' + \varsigma'(c\varsigma E' + F'\lambda').$$

Using $cE = 0$ and $a/\lambda + b = \lambda - c\delta/\lambda$, this is equivalent to

$$(25) \quad (b - f)(\rho\lambda + a\delta) + \varsigma a\lambda e' = (b - f')(\rho\lambda' + a\delta) + \varsigma' a\lambda' e.$$

Lemma A.17. Rewriting  and  leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \varsigma(D' + \lambda E' - f\lambda - e\varsigma\varsigma') &= (-F' + ea)\delta + (d + eb)\rho, \\ \varsigma'(D + \lambda'E - f'\lambda' - e'\varsigma\varsigma') &= (-F + e'a)\delta + (d' + e'b)\rho. \end{aligned}$$

This is equivalent to

$$(26) \quad \begin{aligned} (b - f')(\varsigma \frac{a}{\lambda'} - e\rho) + (b - f' - f)\lambda\varsigma - e\varsigma\varsigma' &= a\delta(e - \frac{1}{e'}), \\ (b - f)(\varsigma' \frac{a}{\lambda} - e'\rho) + (b - f - f')\lambda'\varsigma' - e'\varsigma\varsigma' &= a\delta(e' - \frac{1}{e}). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma A.18. Rewriting  leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon D + \varepsilon E f &= d^2 + \varepsilon f \lambda + d e f + e d \lambda + e^3 c \zeta' + e^2 f \lambda, \\
\varepsilon E d + F &= d^2 e + \varepsilon d f + e^3 a, \\
\varepsilon E e &= d e^2 + e^2 d + e^3 b + \varepsilon e f, \\
\varepsilon D' + \varepsilon E' f' &= d'^2 + \varepsilon f' \lambda' + d' e' f' + e' d' \lambda' + e'^3 c \zeta + e'^2 f' \lambda', \\
\varepsilon E' d' + F' &= d'^2 e' + \varepsilon d' f' + e'^3 a, \\
\varepsilon E' e' &= d' e'^2 + e'^2 d' + e'^3 b + \varepsilon e' f'.
\end{aligned}$$

These equations are equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon(a(b-f)/\lambda - f\lambda) &= e^2(f'^2 - f f' - f' \lambda + f \lambda) + e^3 c \zeta', \\
\varepsilon e^2(2f-b)f' + a &= e^4(a + f'^2), \\
\varepsilon e^2(b-2f) &= e^4(b-2f'), \\
\varepsilon(a(b-f')/\lambda' - f'\lambda') &= e'^2(f^2 - f f' - f \lambda' + f' \lambda') + e'^3 c \zeta, \\
\varepsilon e'^2(2f'-b)f + a &= e'^4(a + f^2), \\
\varepsilon e'^2(b-2f') &= e'^4(b-2f).
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting $\varepsilon e^2(b-2f) = e^4(b-2f')$ in $\varepsilon e^2(2f-b)f' + a = e^4(a + f'^2)$ gives us that $e^4 = 1$, so that we can also rewrite these equations as



$$\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon e^2(a(b-f)/\lambda - f\lambda) &= (f'^2 - f f' - f' \lambda + f \lambda) + e c \zeta', \\
\varepsilon e'^2(a(b-f')/\lambda' - f'\lambda') &= (f^2 - f f' - f \lambda' + f' \lambda') + e' c \zeta, \\
(27) \quad e^4 &= e'^4 = 1, \\
\varepsilon e^2(b-2f) &= (b-2f'), \\
\varepsilon e'^2(b-2f') &= (b-2f).
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma A.19. Rewriting  leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
e c \zeta' d + f \lambda d &= -D(d + e b), \\
e' c \zeta d' + f' \lambda' d' &= -D'(d' + e' b), \\
\lambda(e b - e f + d) - e^2 c \zeta' &= E(d + e b), \\
\lambda'(e' b - e' f' + d') - e'^2 c \zeta &= E'(d' + e' b), \\
\lambda(e c \zeta' + f \lambda - f^2) - e c \zeta' f &= F(d + e b), \\
\lambda'(e' c \zeta + f' \lambda' - f'^2) - e' c \zeta f' &= F'(d' + e' b).
\end{aligned}$$

This we can rewrite as

$$\begin{aligned}
 f'(ec\zeta' + f\lambda) &= a(b-f)(b-f')/\lambda, \\
 f(e'\zeta + f'\lambda') &= a(b-f)(b-f')/\lambda', \\
 \lambda(b-f-f') - ec\zeta' &= (b-f)(b-f'), \\
 \lambda'(b-f'-f) - e'\zeta &= (b-f)(b-f'), \\
 \lambda(ec\zeta' + f\lambda - f^2) - ec\zeta'f &= a(b-f'), \\
 \lambda'(e'\zeta + f'\lambda' - f'^2) - e'\zeta f' &= a(b-f).
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{28}$$

Lemma A.20. *Rewriting*  *and*  *leads to*

$$\begin{aligned}
 a(bE + c\zeta'e) &= D^2 + Ea\lambda + EbD + Ec\zeta'd + F\lambda d, \\
 a\lambda + bD + b^2E + c\zeta'd + c\zeta'eb &= DE + bE^2 + Ec\zeta'e + F\lambda e, \\
 bEc\zeta' + bF\lambda + c^2\zeta'^2e + c\zeta'\lambda f &= DF + EbF + Ec\zeta'f + F\lambda f, \\
 a(bE' + c\zeta'e') &= D'^2 + E'a\lambda' + E'bD' + E'c\zeta'd' + F'\lambda'd', \\
 a\lambda' + bD' + b^2E' + c\zeta'd' + c\zeta'e'b &= D'E' + bE'^2 + E'c\zeta'e' + F'\lambda'e', \\
 bE'\zeta + bF'\lambda' + c^2\zeta^2e' + c\zeta\lambda'f' &= D'F' + E'bF' + E'c\zeta f' + F'\lambda'f'.
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{29}$$

We conclude that simplifying the overlapping diagrams of Section 6 leads to a consistent result if Equations (16) to (29) are satisfied.

Acknowledgements. This research has been supported by a FWO postdoctoral junior fellowship from the Research Foundation Flanders (1269821N).

REFERENCES

- [AGG21] S. Ahmed, D. Grantcharov, and N. Guay. Quantized enveloping superalgebra of type P . *Lett. Math. Phys.*, 111(3):17, 2021. Id/No 84.
- [BE17] J. Brundan and A. P. Ellis. Monoidal supercategories. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 351(3):1045–1089, 2017.
- [BLSR98] G. Benkart, C. Lee Shader, and A. Ram. Tensor product representations for orthosymplectic Lie superalgebras. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 130(1):1–48, 1998.
- [Bra37] R. Brauer. On algebras which are connected with the semisimple continuous groups. *Ann. Math. (2)*, 38:857–872, 1937.
- [BS24] J. Brundan and C. Stroppel. *Semi-infinite highest weight categories*, volume 1459 of *Mem. Am. Math. Soc.* Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society (AMS), 2024.
- [BW89] J. S. Birman and H. Wenzl. Braids, link polynomials and a new algebra. *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.*, 313(1):249–273, 1989.
- [CDVM09] A. Cox, M. De Visscher, and P. Martin. The blocks of the Brauer algebra in characteristic zero. *Represent. Theory*, 13:272–308, 2009.
- [Cou18] K. Coulembier. The periplectic Brauer algebra. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)*, 117(3):441–482, 2018.
- [CZ19] K. Coulembier and R. Zhang. Borelic pairs for stratified algebras. *Adv. Math.*, 345:53–115, 2019.
- [DDPW08] B. Deng, J. Du, B. Parshall, and J. Wang. *Finite dimensional algebras and quantum groups*, volume 150 of *Math. Surv. Monogr.* Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society (AMS), 2008.

- [EGNO15] P. Etingof, S. Gelaki, D. Nikshych, and V. Ostrik. *Tensor categories*, volume 205 of *Math. Surv. Monogr.* Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society (AMS), 2015.
- [KT17] J. R. Kujawa and B. C. Tharp. The marked Brauer category. *J. Lond. Math. Soc., II. Ser.*, 95(2):393–413, 2017.
- [LZ15] G. I. Lehrer and R. B. Zhang. The Brauer category and invariant theory. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 17(9):2311–2351, 2015.
- [LZ22] G. I. Lehrer and R. B. Zhang. Diagram categories and invariant theory for classical groups and supergroups, 2022.
- [Moo03] D. Moon. Tensor product representations of the Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{p}(n)$ and their centralizers. *Commun. Algebra*, 31(5):2095–2140, 2003.
- [Mor10] H. R. Morton. A basis for the birman-wenzl algebra, Preprint. arXiv:1012.3116, 2010.
- [Mur90] J. Murakami. The representations of the q -analogue of Brauer’s centralizer algebras and the Kauffman polynomial of links. *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.*, 26(6):935–945, 1990.
- [RS22] H. Rui and L. Song. The periplectic q -brauer category, Preprint. arXiv:2209.02324, 2022.
- [SS22] S. V. Sam and A. Snowden. The representation theory of Brauer categories. I: triangular categories. *Appl. Categ. Struct.*, 30(6):1203–1256, 2022.
- [Wen12] H. Wenzl. A q -Brauer algebra. *J. Algebra*, 358:102–127, 2012.

DEPARTMENT OF ELECTRONICS AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS, FACULTY OF ENGINEERING AND ARCHITECTURE, GHENT UNIVERSITY, KRIJGSLAAN 281, 9000 GENT, BELGIUM.

Email address: `barbier.sigiswald@gmail.com`