

A theory of locally convex Hopf algebras

Hua Wang

Abstract

Using the completed inductive, projective and injective tensor products of Grothendieck for locally convex topological vector spaces, we develop a systematic theory of locally convex Hopf algebras with an emphasis on Pontryagin-type dualities. We describe how classical Hopf algebras, real and complex Lie groups, as well as compact and discrete quantum groups, can all give rise to natural examples of this theory in a variety of different ways. We also show that the space of all continuous functions on a topological group G whose topological structures are compactly generated has an ε -Hopf algebra structure, and we can recover G fully as a topological group from this locally convex Hopf algebra. The latter is done via a generalization of Gelfand duality, which is of its own interest. Certain projective and inductive limits are also considered in this framework, and it is shown that how this can lead to examples seemingly outside of the framework of locally compact quantum groups in the sense of Kustermans-Vaes. As an illustration, we propose a version of the infinite quantum permutation group S_∞^+ , the free orthogonal group O_∞^+ , and the free unitary group U_∞^+ as certain strict inductive limits, all of which still retain a nice duality. Combined with our duality theory, this may be seen as an alternative tentative approach to the Kac program of developing a Pontryagin-type duality to a wider class, while at the same time, we include many more interesting examples of classical and quantum groups.

Introduction

The aim of this paper is to develop a theory of locally convex Hopf algebras that formally enjoys many nice properties of classical Hopf algebras, that are closely related to at least a large portion of classical and quantum groups that frequently appear in (commutative or not) analysis, and that are flexible enough to accommodate many new examples.

The main motivation for this work is two-fold. On the one hand, our current framework of locally compact quantum groups ([49, 50] and [55]) heavily utilizes the machinery in operator algebras. While this culminates in an amazingly nice theory that concludes the Kac program of generalizing the Pontryagin dual to all locally compact groups and later certain quantum groups, it seems that one gets further and further away from Hopf algebras. For example, the antipode and the counit are often no longer everywhere defined (even for non-Kac type compact quantum groups); the multiplication in general won't factor through the tensor product in use (this seems a general issue even for Kac algebras as in [25]); and in the C^* -algebra version, one has to consider multiplier algebras which often makes the theory even more technically demanding. Thus it seems that it is a worthwhile goal to try to make connections between locally compact quantum groups and some sort of topological versions of Hopf algebras that are already alluded in Drinfeld's famous ICM address [22]. On the other hand, there are certainly many interesting topological groups that are not locally compact, so one naturally wonders what are other interesting topological versions of quantum groups that are not locally compact. As it is the consensus of the community that the operator algebra approach, at least the C^* -algebraic version, should describe only the locally compact quantum groups, this naturally begs the question of how can one develop a theory of topological Hopf algebras that include at least many interesting examples of locally compact quantum groups while also include many interesting non locally compact classical topological groups.

We now elaborate a bit on our motivation and describe briefly some background and related works. On the Kac program side, there is a long history starting from the Pontryagin duality of locally compact abelian groups, for which we refer to the excellent introduction in [49], and only mentions the independent works of Kac and Vainerman [85, 86] in the Soviet union, as well as Enock and Schwartz [24–26], resulting in the notion of Kac algebras. Formally, Kac algebras are certain von Neumann algebras that closely resemble a Hopf algebra (together with invariant weights playing the roles of the left and right Haar measures on locally compact groups), and later there are also C^* -algebra version. They form a category that enjoys the Pontryagin duality, include all locally compact groups and restricts to classical Pontryagin duality for locally compact abelian groups, thus provides a very satisfying answer to the Kac program. However, it turns out later that (e.g. [95]) that the framework of Kac algebras is too restricted to include some then newly discovered quantum groups. After a lot of efforts, among which we mention [80, 83] in which van Daele makes

systematic use of the multiplier algebras to treat certain locally compact non compact cases, Kustermans & Vaes first proposed a satisfactory theory [49] of locally compact quantum groups. The powerful machinery of operator algebras are fully employed in this theory, enabling one to establish many beautiful results which are too extensive to mention here. However, if one can say that Kac algebras are still somehow related to Hopf algebras, as the theories progress, one gets further and further away from a Hopf algebra structure, as mentioned above. On the non locally compact topological quantum group side, one first natural step of course is to find a good formulation of certain non locally compact classical groups so that one might recast it successfully and meaningfully in the non-commutative paradigm. It seems that due to the fact that we know preciously little on locally convex algebras when compared to our knowledge of C^* -algebras and von Neumann algebras, there are relatively few attempts in this direction. We here mention Akbarov's work based on the notion of stereotype spaces and envelops, see [2–5], as well as the recent book [6]. However, it seems that Akbarov's work focuses more on the formally nice properties of the category of stereotype spaces, and less on the various examples that we shall consider in this paper. We also mention that still using multiplier algebras, Voigt [87] develops an interesting theory of bornological (instead of topological) Hopf algebras. Also, [9] considers topological Hopf algebras much in our spirit, but only for nuclear ones that are either of class (\mathcal{F}) (Fréchet spaces) or of class $(\mathcal{D}\mathcal{F})$ (see § 1.10), which they termed “well-behaved”. While the scope of [9] is limited for our purposes, it can already be seen there that by introducing the topological tensor products, one can deal with certain quantum deformation that the usual algebraic tensor product can not handle.

With our motivation and some background being said, we now briefly describe our approach. Just as the theory of operator algebras play an important technical background for the development of locally compact quantum groups, for our purposes, we naturally considers various algebras and coalgebras structures based on the highly developed, albeit currently much less active, theory of locally convex spaces, especially various topological tensor products and the related approximation properties introduced by Grothendieck in his thesis [37]. As we want to use topological tensor products to add more elements and still be able to use arguments by continuity and density, it is natural for us to work with locally convex spaces that are complete. We will easily see (§ 2.1) that equipped with some commonly considered topological tensor products, the category $\widehat{\text{LCS}}$ of all complete locally convex spaces admits a symmetric monoidal category structure, hence provides the natural background for us to consider locally convex algebras, coalgebra, bialgebras and of course, Hopf algebras. The latter part of the paper, on the technical side, can be summarized by saying that it is an application of the powerful general theory of locally convex spaces, as well as certain well-known explicit function spaces.

We now describe the organization of this paper and summarize certain main results along the way. As the theory of locally convex spaces as we are going to use seems not in the toolbox of our typical reader, an unusually lengthy preliminary section (§ 1) is devoted to nail down the relevant results, while simultaneously fix some notation. The goal here is to give a quick summary of the results that play an essential role later, with explicit references on where these results can be found. At the same time, some effort has been made to make the account concise and coherent, and hopefully, more readable. The main work starts with § 2, in which we introduce the basic notions and establish some easy results. We point out that we considered two kinds of duality, the strong one as well as a polar one (see § 2.6), while the former is what one usually expects, the latter sometimes is still applicable while the former fails (see § 3). In § 3, we develop some deeper structural results on duality of locally convex Hopf algebras, and these results shall be illustrated by examples described in § 4. We highlight that in § 4.3, it is shown that all classical Hopf algebras over the field of real or complex numbers fit into our framework, and unlike the purely algebraic case, also enjoys a nice topological version of duality. We think that this new point of view might be of interest to some experts working only with classical Hopf algebras. We also show that all compact and discrete quantum groups fit nicely into our framework in § 4.4. The attempt to include certain non locally compact topological groups starts with § 5, the class of topological groups we have in mind is the ones whose topology is compactly generated, and § 5 develops the basics on certain function spaces on the spaces of compactly generated spaces, to the point that one can associate a locally convex Hopf algebra with any topological group with compactly generated topology. In particular, we can now describe not only locally compact groups, but also all metrizable groups, topological groups with a CW complex structure etc, using locally convex Hopf algebras. In § 5, various types of results are established, allowing one to recover the underlying topological groups from a locally convex Hopf algebra under certain mild conditions. It is worth mentioning that we establish a generalization of Gelfand duality in § 6.2, which enables us to recover many topological groups as the character group of the locally convex Hopf algebra equipped with the topology of compact convergence. We also point out in § 6.5 that all the information on the Pontryagin dual of a locally compact abelian group can also be retrieved merely from the corresponding locally convex Hopf algebra. Hence at this point, our theory can already be seen as a seemingly interesting alternate approach to the Kac program. Certain projective and inductive limit constructions are considered next. The original goal is develop enough of the theory to be able to describe certain topological quantum groups that seemingly

go beyond the framework of locally compact quantum groups, which is achieved in the last section § 8.4. The needed theory is developed in § 7, and it is worth pointing out that after the theory is developed, one can use a variant of Bruhat’s regular functions to give an alternative description of second countable locally compact groups in our framework (§ 8.1), based on some beautiful structural results related to Hilbert’s fifth problem.

We end this introduction with some convention and notation.

In this paper, unless stated otherwise, we make the following convention about our terminologies. The scalar field \mathbb{K} always denotes either \mathbb{R} or \mathbb{C} . All compact and locally compact spaces, manifolds, as well as topological groups, are assumed to be Hausdorff. Smooth manifolds need not be second countable, but are assumed to be finite dimensional, with each component of the same dimension, and paracompact. Lie groups, be it over \mathbb{R} or \mathbb{C} , are *not* assumed to be second countable. Similarly, locally compact groups are *not* assumed to be second-countable or σ -compact. Locally convex spaces are always assumed to be Hausdorff, unless it is explicitly mentioned that we are talking about a not necessarily Hausdorff locally convex space. For basic categorical notions such as projective and inductive limits, adjoint functors et cetera, we refer to [54]. By a projective (resp. inductive) system in a category \mathcal{C} , we mean a system $(x_i, f_{i,j})$ given by a family of objects (x_i) in \mathcal{C} (often denoted by $x_i \in \mathcal{C}$ later) indexed by a partially ordered set I that is directed above in the sense that for all $i, j \in I$, there exists $k \in I$, such that $i \leq k$ and $j \leq k$; as well as a family $(f_{i,j} : x_j \rightarrow x_i)$ (resp. $f_{i,j} : x_i \rightarrow x_j$) of morphisms, one for each $i, j \in I$ with $i \leq j$, such that $f_{i,i} = \text{id}_{x_i}$, and $f_{i,k} = f_{i,j} f_{j,k}$ (resp. $f_{i,k} = f_{j,k} f_{i,j}$) whenever $i \leq j \leq k$. By projective (resp. inductive) limits, we always mean the limit (resp. colimit) with respect to a projective (resp. inductive) system.

Notation 0.1. *Unless otherwise stated, the following notation convention are valid throughout the paper. For topological vector spaces E, F , the symbol $L(E, F)$ denotes the space of all linear maps from E to F , $\mathcal{L}(E, F)$ the space of all continuous linear maps. The symbol \odot denotes the algebraic tensor product, with \otimes reserved for tensor products of elements or linear maps. Topological tensor products on locally convex spaces is always suffixed, such as \otimes_τ , with τ being a compatible topology. We denote the category of locally convex spaces with continuous linear maps as morphisms by LCS .*

Contents

1 Preliminaries on locally convex spaces	4
1.1 Uniform spaces	5
1.2 The topology of \mathfrak{S} -convergence	7
1.3 Dual pairs of vector spaces and polar topologies	8
1.4 The Mackey topology, boundedness	9
1.5 Projective and inductive locally convex topologies	10
1.6 Strict morphism, countable strict inductive limits	11
1.7 Completion as a left adjoint	12
1.8 Barrelled and bornological spaces	12
1.9 Quasi-completeness and the completeness of the strong and polar duals	13
1.10 (DF) -spaces	13
1.11 Reflexivity and polar reflexivity (aka. stereotype duality)	13
1.12 Hypocontinuity of bilinear maps	14
1.13 Compatible topologies on the tensor product	14
1.14 The inductive tensor product	15
1.15 The injective tensor product	16
1.16 The projective tensor product	18
1.17 Comparison of the topological tensor products and nuclear spaces	19
1.18 The approximation property	20
1.19 Montel spaces	21
2 Locally convex Hopf algebras, dualizability and reflexivity	22
2.1 Monoidal categories and symmetric monoidal categories	22
2.2 Compatible symmetric monoidal functors on the category of complete locally convex spaces	23
2.3 Locally convex coalgebras, algebras and bialgebras	24
2.4 The convolution algebra of continuous linear maps, locally convex Hopf algebras	26
2.5 Involutive locally convex Hopf algebras	28
2.6 Dualizability and reflexivity	28

3	Duality of topological tensor products and locally convex Hopf algebras	29
3.1	The Buchwalter duality	30
3.2	The polar duality between products and locally convex direct sums	31
3.3	Direct products and polar reflexivity of locally convex Hopf algebras	32
3.4	Products of (FM) -spaces with the approximation property	34
4	Some basic examples of locally convex Hopf algebras	34
4.1	Discrete groups and $\ell^1(\Gamma)$ as a π -Hopf algebra	34
4.2	Locally convex Hopf algebras related to Lie groups	35
4.3	Classical Hopf algebras as locally convex Hopf algebras and their duals	37
4.4	Locally convex Hopf algebras of compact and discrete quantum groups	39
5	Locally convex algebras of continuous functions on compactly generated Hausdorff spaces	41
5.1	Compactly generated Hausdorff spaces and the k -ification	41
5.2	The space $C(X, E)$	42
5.3	$C(X)$ as a projective limit and as an ε -algebra	43
5.4	Topological groups with compactly generated topology	44
6	From locally convex Hopf algebras back to groups	44
6.1	Characters and group like elements	44
6.2	A generalization of the Gelfand duality	47
6.3	Topological groups as the character group with (pre)compact convergence	50
6.4	An analogue of the Eymard-Stinespring-Tatsumma duality	50
6.5	Recovering of the Pontryagin dual of locally compact abelian groups	51
7	Certain projective and inductive limits	51
7.1	Reduced projective limits of projective and injective Hopf algebras	52
7.2	Strict inductive limits of inductive Hopf algebras	53
7.3	A duality result	54
8	Examples of projective and inductive limits	55
8.1	A variant of Bruhat's regular functions on locally compact groups	55
8.2	Certain projective limits with non locally compact character groups	57
8.3	Strict inductive limits of separable compact quantum groups	57
8.4	A notion of S_∞^+ , O_∞^+ , U_∞^+ and their duals	58

1 Preliminaries on locally convex spaces

Since we shall make significant use of the uniform structures in several places, it seems natural to begin this preliminary § 1 by briefly summarizing some part of the theory of uniform spaces in § 1.1 and § 1.2, which is slightly more general than the implicit uniform structure of a locally convex space when one talks about pre-compactness (equivalent to total boundedness), completeness, et cetera. The treatment here follows closely [12, Chapitres II & III] and [13, Chapitre X]. In the rest of § 1, we give a very cursory account of some aspects of the theory of locally convex spaces that are seemingly less well-known nowadays, aiming to briefly lay out the analytic foundations for our subsequent work, so that the main flow of the presentation in later sections is not disturbed. A systematic treatment can be found in some excellent books such as [11], [33], [43], [47, 48], [64] and [78], and of course the systematic treatment of topological tensor product by Grothendieck [37] as well as the summary of this monumental work [32]. Deeper or more specialized results concerning locally convex spaces that are necessary for our treatment shall be stated later as they come along. All results will be either given a proof, a sketch of a proof if it is indeed easy, or an explicit reference in the literature. Due to his own ignorance, the author does not keep proper attributions, nor does he claim originality when a proof is given or sketched in the paper. For the purpose of avoiding unnecessary interrupting of the flow of the text, some special results that are needed later will not be in this preliminary part, but shall be only recalled as the situation arises.

To avoid making this already lengthy preliminary subsection overly long, we make free use of some basic notions and facts about topological and locally convex spaces that can be found in e.g. [64, Chapter I & II], and only treat the needed topics that are more or less beyond the basic level. In particular, we assume basic knowledge on Fréchet spaces, or (F) -spaces, as in e.g. [89, Ch. 7].

To fix the terminologies, in a vector space V , we say that a subset $A \subseteq V$ is **absolutely convex** if it is convex and circled (aka. balanced). Each subset $S \subseteq V$ has an absolutely convex hull, denoted by $\Gamma(S)$ or $\Gamma(S)$,

which is the smallest absolutely convex set containing S and consists of absolutely convex combinations of elements in S , i.e. elements of the form $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i x_i$, with $\sum_{i=1}^n |\lambda_i| \leq 1$, where $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{K}$, $x_i \in S$ for each i .

Notation 1.1. Let E be a vector space equipped with a locally convex topology. We use $\mathcal{N}(x)$ to denote the filter of neighborhoods of $x \in E$, and $\mathcal{N}_\Gamma(0)$ the filter basis for $\mathcal{N}(0)$ consisting of all absolutely convex neighborhoods of 0. We use E' to denote the topological dual of E , and $E^\#$ the algebraic linear dual.

We denote the class of all (F)-spaces by (\mathcal{F}) , and similarly for notation such as (\mathcal{DF}) ((DF)-spaces), (\mathcal{M}) ((M)-spaces, or Montel spaces) etc.

We are going to make a lot of references to Köthe's monographs [47, 48], and thus caution our reader that we will follow him by using E'_c , or more generally $\mathcal{L}_c(E, F)$, to denote the topology of precompact convergence; whereas our other main references such as [11] or [64], the same symbol stands for the topology of compact convergence, with the topology of precompact convergence denoted by E'_{pc} , or more generally $\mathcal{L}_{pc}(E, F)$.

1.1 Uniform spaces

Definition 1.2. A **uniform space** is a couple (X, \mathcal{U}) , where X is a non-empty set, \mathcal{U} a collection of subsets of $X \times X$, whose elements are called **entourages**, such that

- (1) \mathcal{U} has the filter property in the sense that
 - (1.a) $U \in \mathcal{U}$, $U \subseteq W \subseteq X \times X$ implies $W \in \mathcal{U}$;
 - (1.b) $U, W \in \mathcal{U}$ implies $U \cap W \in \mathcal{U}$;
- (2) every entourage contains the diagonal Δ_X ;
- (3) $U \in \mathcal{U}$ implies $U^{-1} \in \mathcal{U}$, where $U^{-1} = \{(y, x) \mid (x, y) \in U\}$;
- (4) for every $U \in \mathcal{U}$, there exists $V, W \in \mathcal{U}$, such that $V \circ W \subseteq U$, where
 - (1.1)
$$V \circ W = \{(x, z) \mid (x, y) \in V, (y, z) \in W\}.$$

We often simply say that X is a uniform space if the collection \mathcal{U} of entourages are clear from context, and say that \mathcal{U} is the uniform structure on X .

It is clear that on a given set X , there is a **finest** uniform structure, where the entourage is any subset of $X \times X$ containing the diagonal, and a **coarsest** one, with the diagonal being the only entourage.

Remark 1.3. When X is non-empty, one often specifies a uniform structure \mathcal{U} on it by giving a filter basis for \mathcal{U} , called a **fundamental system of entourages** for \mathcal{U} . For example, given a metric space (X, d) , collection of sets of the form $B_r(d) = \{(x, y) \mid d(x, y) < r\} \subseteq X \times X$, $r > 0$, forms a filter basis for a uniform structure on X , called **the uniform structure of the metric d** . We say a uniform structure \mathcal{U} on X is **metrizable** if it is the uniform structure of some metric d on X .

Definition 1.4. Let U be an entourage of a uniform space X . For each $x \in X$, define

$$(1.2) \quad U(x) := \{y \in X \mid (x, y) \in U\}.$$

Then there is a unique topology on X , such that $\mathcal{U}(x) = \{U(x) \mid U \in \mathcal{U}\}$ is the filter of neighborhoods of x for each $x \in X$, namely, a set $O \subseteq X$ is open if and only if for each $x \in O$, there exists $U \in \mathcal{U}$, such that $U(x) \subseteq O$. This topology on X is called **the topology of the uniform structure \mathcal{U}** . Conversely, given a topology τ on a set X , we say τ is **compatible with a uniform structure \mathcal{U}** on X if the topology of \mathcal{U} is τ . When speaking of certain topological properties of a uniform space such as being Hausdorff, compact, et cetera, we are referring the topology of the given uniform structure.

Theorem 1.5 ([12, Chapitre II, p5, Proposition 3] and [13, § IX.2.4]). *Let X be a uniform space with the uniform structure \mathcal{U} . Then*

- (1) X is Hausdorff if and only if the intersection of all entourages is the diagonal of X ;
- (2) (X, \mathcal{U}) is metrizable if and only if X is Hausdorff, and \mathcal{U} admits a countable filter basis.

Definition 1.6. Given two uniform spaces (X, \mathcal{U}) and (Y, \mathcal{V}) , a map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is called **uniformly continuous**, if $(f \times f)^{-1}(V) \in \mathcal{U}$ for any $V \in \mathcal{V}$. The collection of all uniform spaces together with uniformly continuous maps among them forms **the category of uniform spaces Unif**.

It is clear that uniformly continuous maps are always continuous with respect to the topologies of the corresponding uniform structures.

Definition 1.7. A filter \mathcal{F} on a uniform space (X, \mathcal{U}) is called a **Cauchy-filter**, if for each entourage V , there exists $M \in \mathcal{F}$ that is **V -small** in the sense that $M \times M \subseteq V$. A uniform space is called **complete** if each Cauchy filter on it converges.

It is well-known that this notion of completeness coincides with the one for metric spaces, see e.g. [13, § IX.2].

Definition 1.8 ([12, § II.2.3]). **The initial uniform structure** on a set X with respect to a family $(f_i)_{i \in I}$ of maps $f_i : X \rightarrow X_i$ into uniform spaces X_i is the unique uniform structure on X , which always exists, that is the coarsest one making all f_i uniformly continuous. In particular, unless stated otherwise, the **subspace** A of a given uniform space Y is equipped with the initial uniform structure with respect to the inclusion $i : A \hookrightarrow Y$, and the **projective limit** $\varprojlim Y_i$ of a projective system $(Y_i, f_{i,j})_{i \in I}$ in Unif is the set-theoretic projective limit $L := \varprojlim Y_i$ equipped with the initial uniform structure with respect to all the canonical projections $p_i : L \rightarrow Y_i$. The (Cartesian) product of a family of uniform spaces, as a uniform space, is defined similarly.

Proposition 1.9 ([12, § II.3, Proposition 8, Proposition 10 & Corollaire]). *The following hold:*

- (1) *Closed subspace of a complete uniform space is complete. A complete subspace of a Hausdorff uniform space is closed.*
- (2) *The product of a family of non-empty uniform space is complete if and only if each of its factor is complete.*
- (3) *The projective limit of any projective system of complete Hausdorff uniform spaces in Unif remains complete.*

Definition 1.10. A **separated completion** of (X, \mathcal{U}) is a pair (\widehat{X}, i) , with \widehat{X} being a Hausdorff uniform space, and $i : X \rightarrow \widehat{X}$ a map, called **canonical**, such that

- (1) $i(X)$ is dense in \widehat{X} ;
- (2) the uniform structure on X is the initial one with respect to the map i ;
- (3) any uniformly continuous map from X to a complete Hausdorff uniform space Y factors uniquely through i .

Theorem 1.11 ([12, § II.3.7]). *The following hold:*

- (1) *The separated completion (\widehat{X}, i) of a uniform space X always exists and is unique up to isomorphism in Unif .*
- (2) *If X is Hausdorff, then $i : X \rightarrow i(X)$ is an isomorphism of uniform spaces.*
- (3) *If $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a morphism in Unif , and let (\widehat{X}, i) , (\widehat{Y}, j) be the separated completion of X and Y respectively, then there exists a unique continuous $\widehat{f} : \widehat{X} \rightarrow \widehat{Y}$, such that $j\widehat{f} = \widehat{f}i$. Moreover, this \widehat{f} is uniformly continuous.*

We now treat the compactness of uniform spaces.

Theorem 1.12 ([12, § II.4.1, Théorème 1]). *Let X be a compact space (recall that we've assumed that compact spaces are Hausdorff), then there exists a unique uniform structure \mathcal{U} on X that is compatible with the topology of X . Moreover, $U \in \mathcal{U}$ if and only if U is a neighborhood of the diagonal in $X \times X$.*

Recall that a set A in a topological space X is called **relatively compact** if its closure is compact.

Definition 1.13. Let X be a uniform space, (\widehat{X}, i) its separated completion. We say that a set $A \subseteq X$ is **precompact**, if $i(A)$ is relatively compact in \widehat{X} . We say $A \subseteq X$ is **totally bounded**, if for each entourage U of X , there exists finite many points a_1, \dots, a_n in A , such that $A \subseteq \cup_{i=1}^n U(a_i)$ (see (1.2) for the notation).

Proposition 1.14 ([12, II.29, Théorème 3]). *Using the above notation, A is precompact if and only if it is totally bounded.*

We end our general discussion of uniform spaces with a very useful notion.

Definition 1.15. Let Y be a uniform space, X a topological space (resp. uniform space), H a family of maps from X to Y . We say that H is **equicontinuous** (resp. **uniformly equicontinuous**), if for each open set V in Y (resp. an entourage \mathcal{V} of Y), the set $\cap_{f \in H} f^{-1}(V)$ (resp. $\cap_{f \in H} (f \times f)^{-1}(\mathcal{V})$) is an open set (resp. an entourage) of X .

Remark 1.16. *It is clear that uniform equicontinuity implies equicontinuity, and a map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is continuous (resp. uniformly continuous) if and only if $\{f\}$ is equicontinuous (resp. uniformly equicontinuous).*

1.2 The topology of \mathfrak{S} -convergence

Definition 1.17 ([13, § X.1.1]). Let be X a set, (Y, \mathcal{V}) a uniform space, $\mathcal{F}(X, Y)$ a collection of maps from X to Y . The **uniform structure of uniform convergence** on $\mathcal{F}(X, Y)$ is the one where a filter basis for the collection of entourages is given by all sets of the form

$$W(V) := \{(u, v) \in \mathcal{F}(X, Y) \times \mathcal{F}(X, Y) \mid \forall x \in X, (u(x), v(x)) \in V\}, \quad V \in \mathcal{V}.$$

We denote the resulting uniform space by $\mathcal{F}_u(X, Y)$.

Definition 1.18 ([13, § X.1.2]). Let be X a set, (Y, \mathcal{V}) a uniform space, $\mathcal{F}(X, Y)$ a collection of maps from X to Y , and \mathfrak{S} a collection of subsets of X . The **uniform structure of \mathfrak{S} -convergence**, or more precisely, the **uniform structure of uniform convergence on sets of \mathfrak{S}** , on $\mathcal{F}(X, Y)$, is the initial uniform structure with respect to the family all restriction map $r_A: \mathcal{F}(X, Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_u(X, Y)$, $A \in \mathfrak{S}$. The resulting uniform space is denoted by $\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{S}}(X, Y)$, and its topology is called the **topology of uniform convergence on sets of \mathfrak{S}** , or simply the **topology of \mathfrak{S} -convergence**.

We will make extensive use of Bourbaki's version of Ascoli theorem.

Theorem 1.19 ([13, X.17, Théorème 2]). *Let X be a topological (resp. uniform) space, Y a uniform space, \mathfrak{S} a family of subsets of X that covers X , and H a family of maps from X to Y . Suppose the restriction of any map in H onto any $A \in \mathfrak{S}$ is continuous (resp. uniformly continuous). For H to be precompact with respect to the uniform structure of \mathfrak{S} -convergence, it is necessary in all cases, and also sufficient in the case when all sets in \mathfrak{S} are compact (resp. precompact), that the following hold:*

- (1) *the restriction $H|_A := \{f|_A \mid f \in H\}$ is equicontinuous;*
- (2) *the set $H(x) := \{f(x) \mid x \in X\}$ is precompact in Y .*

Given a topological vector space E (locally convex or not, Hausdorff or not), when we speak of the uniform structure property of E , unless stated otherwise, we are always referring to the uniform structure on E where a fundamental system of entourages is given by sets of the form $\tilde{V} := \{(x, y) \in E \mid x - y \in V\}$, V being a neighborhood of $0 \in E$. This uniform structure is compatible with the topology on E .

One often give a locally convex topology on a vector space E by specifying a fundamental system of absolutely convex neighborhoods of 0 . Here's a criterion for when this can be done.

Proposition 1.20. *Let E be a vector space, and \mathcal{F} a filter basis consisting of absolutely convex subsets of E . Suppose the following hold:*

- (1) *each $M \in \mathcal{F}$ is absorbing;*
- (2) *$M \in \mathcal{F}$ implies that $\lambda M \in \mathcal{F}$ for all nonzero $\lambda \in \mathbb{K}$.*

Then, there exists a unique locally convex topology on E such that \mathcal{F} is a fundamental system of neighborhoods of $0 \in E$. This topology is Hausdorff if and only if the intersection of all sets in \mathcal{F} is $\{0\}$.

Proof. This follows easily from [61, p52, Theorem 3.2]. □

Proposition 1.21. *Let E be a locally convex space, T a set, \mathfrak{S} a collection of subsets of T , G a linear subspace of the space of maps from T to E . Denote by $G_{\mathfrak{S}}$ the space G equipped with the topology of \mathfrak{S} -convergence.*

- (1) *If $f(A)$ is bounded in E for all $f \in G$, $A \in \mathfrak{S}$, then the topology of $G_{\mathfrak{S}}$ is locally convex.*
- (2) *If (1) holds, and for any $f \in G$, $f(A) = 0$ for all $A \in \mathfrak{S}$ implies $f = 0$, then $G_{\mathfrak{S}}$ is a locally convex space.*

Proof. Unwinding the definitions, a fundamental system of neighborhoods of $0 \in G$, which we denote by \mathcal{F} , can be given by *finite intersections* of absolutely convex sets of the form

$$(1.3) \quad M(S, V) := \{f \in G \mid f(S) \subseteq V\}, \quad S \in \mathfrak{S}, V \in \mathcal{N}_T(0).$$

The condition in (1) implies the filter basis each set in \mathcal{F} is absorbing, hence the topology of \mathfrak{S} -convergence on G is locally convex by Proposition 1.20. Since E is Hausdorff, $\bigcap_{V \in \mathcal{N}_T(0)} V = \{0\}$, the condition in (2) implies that the intersection of all sets in \mathcal{F} is

$$\bigcap_{S \in \mathfrak{S}, V \in \mathcal{N}_T(0)} M(S, V) = \bigcap_{S \in \mathfrak{S}} \left(\bigcap_{V \in \mathcal{N}_T(0)} M(S, V) \right) = \bigcap_{S \in \mathfrak{S}} \left(\left\{ f \in G \mid f(S) \subseteq \bigcap_{V \in \mathcal{N}_T(0)} V = \{0\} \right\} \right) = \{0\},$$

thus $G_{\mathfrak{S}}$ is a locally convex space (it is Hausdorff) by the same proposition. □

We will use Proposition 1.21 to define locally convex topologies on certain spaces of bilinear forms when treating topological tensor products. For now, we focus on the space of linear maps, in which case the standard way is to introduce the notion of a bornology, following [11, § III.1]

Definition 1.22. Let E be a vector space. A **bornology** \mathfrak{B} on E is a collection of subsets of E if it is (1) filtered below in the sense that $B \in \mathfrak{B}$ and $A \subseteq B$ implies $A \in \mathfrak{B}$; (2) closed under taking finite unions. We say the bornology \mathfrak{B} is **convex**, if in addition, we have

- (1) $B \in \mathfrak{B}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{K}$ implies $\lambda B \in \mathfrak{B}$;
- (2) $B \in \mathfrak{B}$ implies $\Gamma(B) \in \mathfrak{B}$, where $\Gamma(B)$ denotes the absolutely convex hull of B .

If E is equipped with a linear topology \mathfrak{T} (locally convex or not), we say that a bornology \mathfrak{B} on E is **bounded** if it consists of only bounded sets; we say \mathfrak{B} is **adapted** to \mathfrak{T} , or simply \mathfrak{B} is an **adapted bornology** when the topology \mathfrak{T} is clear from context, if \mathfrak{B} is convex, bounded and is stable under taking closure. The smallest adapted bornology of a bornology \mathfrak{B} , which always exist, is called the **saturation** of \mathfrak{B} . We say \mathfrak{B} is **total** if $\cup_{B \in \mathfrak{B}} B$ is total in E , i.e. it spans a dense linear subspace; it is **covering** if \mathfrak{B} covers E .

Proposition 1.23 ([48, § 39.1(1) & (2)]). *Let E, F be locally convex spaces, \mathfrak{S} a total bornology on E , then $\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}(E, F)$, i.e. the space of all continuous linear maps from E to F equipped with the \mathfrak{S} -topology, is a locally convex space. Let \mathfrak{S}' be another such bornology, then on $\mathcal{L}(E, F)$, the \mathfrak{S} -topology coincides with the \mathfrak{S}' -topology if and only if \mathfrak{S} and \mathfrak{S}' have the same saturation.*

Notation 1.24. *Let E be a not necessarily Hausdorff locally convex space. We use $\mathfrak{F}(E)$, $\mathfrak{C}(E)$ and $\mathfrak{B}(E)$, or simply \mathfrak{F} , \mathfrak{C} and \mathfrak{B} if E is clear from context, to denote respectively the collection of all finite sets, all absolutely convex weakly compact sets, all precompact sets and all bounded sets in E .*

Proposition 1.25. *Let E be a not necessarily Hausdorff locally convex space, then \mathfrak{F} , \mathfrak{C} and \mathfrak{B} are all bounded covering bornologies on E , among which \mathfrak{C} and \mathfrak{B} are adapted.*

Proof. We sketch the proof of \mathfrak{C} is stable under taking the closed absolutely convex hull, which is the only nontrivial part. By Proposition 1.14, it coincides with the collection of totally bounded subsets. By [64, § II.4.3], \mathfrak{C} is stable under taking the absolutely convex hull, and it's stable under taking closure follows directly from Definition 1.13 and the fact that any closed subspace of compact spaces remains compact. \square

Definition 1.26. Let F be another locally convex space. On $\mathcal{L}(E, F)$, the \mathfrak{F} , \mathfrak{C} and \mathfrak{B} -topologies are called respectively the **topology of simple, precompact and bounded convergence**, and is denoted respectively by $\mathcal{L}_s(E, F)$, $\mathcal{L}_c(E, F)$ (see the caution in Notation 1.1) and $\mathcal{L}_b(E, F)$. When $F = \mathbb{K}$, the resulting locally convex space is denoted by respectively E'_s, E'_c, E'_b , and is respectively called the **weak dual**, the **polar dual** and the **strong dual** of E .

We shall have the occasion to use the Banach-Dieudonné theorem.

Theorem 1.27 ([11, IV.24, Théorème 1]). *Let E be a metrizable locally convex space. Then on E' , the following topologies are identical:*

- (1) *the \mathfrak{N} -topology, where \mathfrak{N} is the collection of the image of all null sequences in E ;*
- (2) *the topology of precompact convergence;*
- (3) *the topology of compact convergence;*
- (4) *the finest topology that coincides with $\sigma(E', E)$ (the topology of simple convergence) on all equicontinuous parts of E' .*

1.3 Dual pairs of vector spaces and polar topologies

Definition 1.28. A **dual pair (or pairing, or duality pairing), of vector spaces** is a bilinear form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : V \times W \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ that is separated on both variables, and shall of be denoted by $\langle V, W \rangle$. We say that a locally convex topology \mathfrak{T} on V is **compatible with the pairing**, if $w \in W \mapsto \langle \cdot, w \rangle \in V^\sharp$ maps W bijectively onto $(V[\mathfrak{T}])'$. In this case, we shall often write $W = (V[\mathfrak{T}])'$ to mean we've identified W with the topological dual of $V[\mathfrak{T}]$ in this way. Compatibility of a locally convex topology on W is defined and notated similarly. If E, F are locally convex spaces, a dual pair $\langle E, F \rangle$ is called **compatible** if it is compatible with both the topology on E and the topology on F .

Definition 1.29. Given a dual pair $\langle V, W \rangle$. The **(absolute) polar** of a subset $A \subseteq V$ is the absolutely convex set

$$(1.4) \quad A^\circ := \{w \in W \mid \forall a \in A, |\langle a, w \rangle| \leq 1\}.$$

The polar B° of a set $B \subseteq W$ is defined similarly. We say a set $A \subseteq V$ is **simply bounded** (with respect to the pairing) if $\{\langle a, w \rangle \mid a \in A\} \subseteq \mathbb{K}$ is bounded for each $w \in W$. Simply bounded sets in W (with respect to the pairing) is defined similarly.

Proposition 1.30. *Let $\langle E, F \rangle$ be a dual pair of vector spaces, and \mathfrak{B} a collection of simply bounded sets on F , and let \mathfrak{B}° be the smallest collection of simply bounded subsets of F that contains \mathfrak{B} and is stable under taking dilations and finite unions. Then $\{B^\circ \mid B \in \mathfrak{B}\}$ specifies a fundamental system of neighborhoods of 0 for a unique locally convex topology on E , and this topology is Hausdorff if \mathfrak{B} is covering.*

Proof. This follows from Proposition 1.20 and Definition 1.22. \square

Definition 1.31. Recall Notation 1.24. The topology in Proposition 1.30 is called the **polar topology** of \mathfrak{B} . The polar topology on E of $\mathfrak{F}(F)$ is called the **weak topology with respect to the dual pair $\langle E, F \rangle$** , and is often denoted by $\sigma(E, F)$; and that of $\mathfrak{B}(F)$ the **strong topology with respect to $\langle E, F \rangle$** , and denoted by $b(E, F)$.

Equipped with $\sigma(E, F)$ (resp. $b(E, F)$), the locally convex space E is called the **weak dual** (resp. **strong dual**) of F (with respect to the pairing $\langle E, F \rangle$).

When $F = E'$ and the pairing $\langle E, E' \rangle$ is given by evaluation, the topology $\sigma(E, E')$ (resp. $b(E, E')$, $c(E, E')$) is simply called the **weak** ((resp. **strong**), **topology** on E).

It is easy to check that $\sigma(E, F)$ is the initial topology on E with respect to $\{\langle \cdot, y \rangle \mid y \in F\} : E \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$, and every polar A° of some $A \subseteq E$ is a weakly (with respect to $\langle E, F \rangle$) closed absolutely convex set in F . The converse also holds by the bipolar theorem.

Theorem 1.32 (Bipolar theorem, [47, § 20.8(5)]). *Let E be a locally convex space, and consider the canonical dual pair $\langle E, E' \rangle$. For any $A \subseteq E$, the (absolute) bipolar $A^{\circ\circ}$ of A is exactly the weakly closed absolutely convex hull of A in E .*

Recall the notion of equicontinuity (Definition 1.15). It is clear that for a locally convex space E , a set $H \subseteq E' = \mathcal{L}(E, \mathbb{K})$ if and only if $H \subseteq U^\circ$ for some $U \in \mathcal{N}(0)$. We also have the following version of Alaoglu's theorem.

Theorem 1.33 ([64, § III.4.3, Corollary]). *Any equicontinuous set in E' is relatively compact for $\sigma(E', E)$.*

Moreover, every locally convex Hausdorff topology can be seen as a polar topology.

Proposition 1.34. *Let E be a locally convex space. Then closed absolutely convex neighborhoods of $0 \in E$ are exactly the polars of equicontinuous sets in E' .*

Proof. If $A \supseteq U^\circ$ for some $U \in \mathcal{N}(0)$, then $A^\circ \supseteq U^{\circ\circ} \supseteq U$, hence $A^\circ \in \mathcal{N}(0)$ and it is absolutely continuous and closed since

$$A = \bigcap_{f \in A} f^{-1}(\{\lambda \in \mathbb{K} \mid |\lambda| \leq 1\}).$$

Conversely, every neighborhood of 0 contains some neighborhood U of 0 that is closed and absolutely convex. By Theorem 1.32, U is the polar of the equicontinuous set U° . \square

Proposition 1.34 motivates us to describe compatible topologies on the algebraic tensor product using some suitable polar topology, see § 1.13, Proposition 1.83.

1.4 The Mackey topology, boundedness

Notation 1.35. *Let $\langle E, F \rangle$ be a dual pair of vector space. The collection of all $\sigma(F, E)$ -compact absolutely convex is denoted by $\mathfrak{K}(F, E)$. If E is a locally convex space, and the pairing $\langle E', E \rangle$ is evaluation, then $\mathfrak{K}(E, E')$ is abbreviated $\mathfrak{K}(E)$, or simply \mathfrak{K} if E is clear from context. If E, F are locally convex spaces, $\mathcal{L}_k(E, F)$ denotes $\mathcal{L}(E, F)$ equipped with the topology of $\mathfrak{K}(E)$ -convergence, and E'_k denotes $\mathcal{L}_k(E, \mathbb{K})$.*

Definition 1.36. Let $\langle E, F \rangle$ be a duality pairing. The polar topology on E of $\mathfrak{K}(F, E)$ is called the **Mackey topology**, and is denoted by $\tau(E, F)$. If E is a locally convex space, then E' , equipped with $\tau(E', E)$ for the evaluation pairing $\langle E', E \rangle$ is also denoted by E'_k ; whereas E , now equipped with $\tau(E, E')$, is denoted by E_τ . We say that the locally convex space E is a **Mackey space**, if $E = E_\tau$.

We have the following consequences of a result of Mackey [53].

Theorem 1.37 (Mackey, [11, IV.2, Théorème 1]). *Let $\langle E, F \rangle$ be a duality pairing. Then a locally convex topology on E is compatible with this pairing if and only if it is finer than $\sigma(E, F)$ and coarser than $\tau(E, F)$.*

Corollary 1.38. *Let E be a locally convex space, $A \subseteq E$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) A is bounded;
- (2) A is bounded for one of the locally convex topology that is coarser than $\tau(E, E')$ and finer than $\sigma(E, E')$;
- (3) A is bounded for all of the locally convex topology that is coarser than $\tau(E, E')$ and finer than $\sigma(E, E')$;
- (4) $u(A) \subseteq \mathbb{K}$ is bounded for every $u \in E'$.

Proof. Equivalence between (1) and (4) follows from [11, § III.4, Théorème 2], the rest of the equivalences now follows from Mackey's theorem. \square

1.5 Projective and inductive locally convex topologies

For the following results in § 1.5, we refer our readers to [64, § II.5 & § II.6], as well as [47, § 19].

Definition 1.39. Let E be a vector space, $f_i : E \rightarrow E_i$, $i \in I$ a collection of linear maps into locally convex spaces E_i . The **projective topology** on E with respect to the family (f_i) is the initial topology with respect to this family. It is a locally convex topology on E , and enjoys the universal property of initial topologies.

Remark 1.40. Being an initial topology, projective topology on E enjoys the universal property of initial topologies with respect to the family $(f_i)_{i \in I}$ as topological spaces.

Proposition 1.41. For a projective system of locally convex spaces $(E_i, p_{ij})_{i,j \in I}$, **the projective limit** $E := \varprojlim E_i$ in LCS, and can be realized by equipping the algebraic projective limit $\varprojlim E_i$ with the projective topologies with respect to the canonical projections $p_i : E \rightarrow E_i$, $i \in I$. Moreover,

$$\varprojlim E_i = \{(x_i) \in \prod_i E_i \mid \forall i \leq j, p_{ij}(x_j) = x_i\}$$

is a closed subspace of $\prod_{i \in I} E_i$, and $\varprojlim E_i$ is complete if every E_i , $i \in I$ is complete.

Proof. The part on the projective limit follows from Remark 1.40 (the universal property is straightforward, then it follows that $\{\alpha_i p_i \in E' \mid \alpha_i \in E'_i, i \in I\}$ is a separating family of linear maps on E , hence E is Hausdorff). The completeness follows from Proposition 1.9. \square

Definition 1.42. In Proposition 1.41, the projective limit is called **reduced**, if $p_i(E)$ is dense in each E_i , $i \in I$.

Reduced projective limits behaves well with the projective and injective tensor products, see § 1.16 & § 1.15.

The dual notion of inductive locally convex topologies is more subtle, e.g. the Hausdorff condition might not be preserved, see Remark 1.47.

Proposition 1.43. Let $f_i : F_i \rightarrow F$, $i \in I$ be a collection of linear maps from locally convex space F_i to the same linear space F . There exists a finest locally convex topology τ_0 on F making each f_i continuous.

Proof. Let \mathfrak{T} denotes the collection of all locally convex topologies on F making each f_i continuous. First of all, $\mathfrak{T} \neq \emptyset$ since it contains the indiscrete topology. For each $\tau \in \mathfrak{T}$, let F_τ denote F equipped with topology and $i_\tau : F \rightarrow F_\tau$ the identity map. Let τ_0 be the projective topology on F with respect to the family $(i_\tau : F \rightarrow F_\tau)_{\tau \in \mathfrak{T}}$, which is convex. From the universal property of the initial topology, it follows that $\tau_0 \in \mathfrak{T}$, and from construction, $i_\tau : F_{\tau_0} \rightarrow F_\tau$ is continuous for all $\tau \in \mathfrak{T}$, meaning τ_0 is the finest locally convex topology in \mathfrak{T} . \square

Definition 1.44. Using the notation in Proposition 1.43, the topology τ_0 on F is called **the inductive topology** with respect to the family (f_i) . We call (F, τ_0) the **locally convex hull** with respect to (f_i) , if the union $\cup_{i \in I} f_i(F_i)$ spans F linearly, and we denote it by $\text{hull}((f_i))$ inductive system of locally convex spaces, and $v_i : E_i \rightarrow \varinjlim^{\text{alg}} E_i$ the canonical insertions into the inductive limit in the category of vector spaces, then $\text{hull}((v_i))$ is called the **locally convex hull** of the system (E_i, u_{ij}) , and we denote it by $\text{hull}((E_i, u_{ij})_{i,j \in I})$.

Proposition 1.45 (Universal property of the inductive topology). Using the notation in Proposition 1.43, let G be a topological vector space that is locally convex. Then a linear map $f : F \rightarrow G$ is continuous if and only if each $f f_i : E \rightarrow G$ is continuous.

Proof. Let τ be the unique locally convex topology on F with $f^{-1}(V)$, $V \in \mathcal{N}_\Gamma^G(0)$ being a fundamental system of neighborhoods of 0. Clearly, $f f_i$ is continuous if f is so. Conversely, each $f f_i$ being continuous, we see that $f_i^{-1}(f^{-1}(V)) = (f f_i)^{-1}(V) \in \mathcal{N}_\Gamma^{F_i}(0)$, meaning $f_i : F_i \rightarrow (F, \tau)$ is continuous for each i . Hence $\tau \subseteq \tau_0$ and f is continuous. \square

Proposition 1.46. Let $f_i : F_i \rightarrow F$, $i \in I$ be a collection of linear maps from locally convex space F_i to the same linear space F , and we equip F with the corresponding inductive topology. Then for each $V \subseteq F$, we have $V \in \mathcal{N}_\Gamma^F(0)$ if and only if $f_i^{-1}(V) \in \mathcal{N}_\Gamma^{F_i}(0)$. Moreover, if F is the locally convex hull of $\{f_i\}$, then a fundamental system of neighborhoods of 0 for F is given by absolutely convex sets of the form $\Gamma(\cup_{i \in I} V_i)$, with $V_i \in \mathcal{N}_\Gamma^{F_i}(0)$ for each $i \in I$.

Proof. The first statement follows easily from the existence of the inductive topology on F . The second statement follows from the first, while noting that the condition of being an inductive hull guarantees that $\Gamma(\cup_{i \in I} V_i)$ is absorbing, cf Proposition 1.20. \square

Remark 1.47. Let E be a locally convex space, N a subspace, and $q : E \rightarrow E/N$ the quotient map. It is clear that the quotient topology on E/N is the inductive topology with respect to $\{q\}$, which is Hausdorff if and only if N is closed.

Definition 1.48. Let E be a vector space equipped with a locally convex topology, the **separated quotient** of E is the quotient locally convex space E/N , where N is the closed subspace of E given by the intersection of all neighborhoods of 0.

Proposition 1.49. Let $(E_i, u_{ij})_{i,j \in I}$ be an inductive system of locally convex space. Then the inductive limit $\varinjlim E_i$ exists in LCS, and is given by the separated quotient of $\text{hull}((E_i, u_{ij}))$.

Proof. This follows from Proposition 1.45 and the universal property of the separated quotient. \square

Definition 1.50. The **(locally convex) direct sum** of a family $E_i, i \in I$ of locally convex space is the locally convex hull with respect to the family of canonical injections $u_i : E_i \hookrightarrow \bigoplus_i E_i$. We shall often denote this locally convex direct sum by the same notation $\bigoplus_i E_i$.

Proposition 1.51 ([47, p212, (3)]). Let $E_i, i \in I$ be a family of locally convex spaces, and $\bigoplus_i E_i$ the locally direct sum. Then,

- (1) $\bigoplus_i E_i$ is a locally convex space;
- (2) $\widehat{\bigoplus_i E_i} = \bigoplus_i \widehat{E_i}$ (we use $\widehat{}$ to denote completion, as introduced in § 1.1, Definition 1.10).

In particular, $\bigoplus_i E_i$ is a complete locally convex space if each $E_i, i \in I$ is complete.

We also have the following characterization of bounded sets in a locally convex direct sum.

Proposition 1.52. Let $E = \bigoplus_{i \in I} E_i$ be a locally convex direct sum of locally convex spaces. For each index i , let $p_i : E \rightarrow E_i$ be the corresponding canonical projection. Then a set $A \subseteq E$ is bounded if and only if there exists a finite $I_0 \subseteq I$, such that $p_i(A) = 0$ for $i \notin I_0$ and $p_i(A)$ is bounded in E_i for each $i \in I_0$. In particular, a set in E is bounded if and only if it is contained the sum of finitely many bounded sets in each of the E_i 's.

We shall need the following duality results.

Proposition 1.53 ([64, p137, 4.3]). Let $(E_i)_{i \in I}$ be a family of locally convex spaces, and $E = \prod_{i \in I} E_i$ the (locally convex) product. Then the topological dual E' of E , as a vector space, is canonically identified with the algebraic direct sum $\bigoplus_{i \in I} E_i'$. Consider canonical pairing $\langle E, E' \rangle$, we have

- (1) $\sigma(E, E') = \prod_i \sigma(E_i, E_i')$;
- (2) $\tau(E, E') = \prod_i \tau(E_i, E_i')$;
- (3) $\tau(E', E) = \bigoplus_i \tau(E_i, E_i')$ (right side is the locally convex direct sum).

Proposition 1.54 ([64, p139, 4.4]). Let $E = \varprojlim E_\beta$ be a reduced projective limit of some projective system $(E_\beta, g_{\alpha\beta})$ in LCS. Then the topological dual E' , when equipped with the Mackey topology $\tau(E', E)$ is canonically identified with the inductive limit $\varinjlim (E_\alpha)'$ in LCS of the dual system $(E'_\alpha, h_{\beta\alpha})$ with $h_{\beta\alpha} : E'_\alpha \rightarrow E'_\beta$ being the transpose of $g_{\alpha\beta} : E_\beta \rightarrow E_\alpha$ whenever $\alpha < \beta$.

1.6 Strict morphism, countable strict inductive limits

Contrary to the projective limit case (Proposition 1.41), taking inductive limit in LCS doesn't preserve completeness. However, it behaves well if we restrict ourselves to strict inductive limits.

Definition 1.55. A continuous linear map $f : E \rightarrow F$ between locally convex spaces is called **strict morphism**, or simply **strict**, if $f : E \rightarrow f(E)$ is an open map, or equivalently, if the induced map $\bar{f} : E/\ker(f) \rightarrow f(E)$ is an isomorphism of locally convex spaces. In LCS, we call an inductive system of the form $(E_n, u_n : E_n \rightarrow E_{n+1})_{n \geq 1}$ **strict**, if each u_n is a strict embedding.

Proposition 1.56. The locally convex hull of a countable strict inductive system (E_n, u_n) is Hausdorff, hence is already a locally convex space and coincides with the inductive limit $\varinjlim E_n$ in LCS. Moreover, each canonical insertion $v_n : E_n \rightarrow \varinjlim E_n$ is a strict morphism onto a closed subspace of $\varinjlim E_n$.

Proof. All statements except the one on the inductive limit follows from [64, § II.6.4]. Now the assertion on the inductive limit follows from Proposition 1.49. \square

1.7 Completion as a left adjoint

We shall have the occasion of using the commutation of the completion with taking colimit in the category LCS, which generalizes Proposition 1.51 (2). Although the consideration is elementary, the author couldn't find an explicit statement in the literature, so we give a brief treatment here.

Proposition 1.57. *The completion functor $\widehat{(\cdot)} : \text{LCS} \rightarrow \widehat{\text{LCS}}$ is left adjoint to the forgetful functor $\mathcal{F} : \widehat{\text{LCS}} \rightarrow \text{LCS}$. More specifically, for any $X \in \text{LCS}$, $Y \in \widehat{\text{LCS}}$, we have a natural isomorphism of vector spaces*

$$(1.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\widehat{X}, Y) &\simeq \mathcal{L}(X, \mathcal{F}Y) \\ f &\mapsto f|_X = f i_X \\ \widehat{g} &\mapsto g \end{aligned}$$

where $\widehat{X} = (X, i_X)$, and \widehat{g} is the unique continuous extension of g .

Proof. The verification of the alleged bijection (1.5) follows from the discussion of separated completion in § 1.1 (Definition 1.10 and Theorem 1.11). The naturalness of this bijection is readily seen by a routine check. \square

Corollary 1.58. *Completion commutes with taking small colimit in LCS.*

Proof. This is a formal property of all left adjoints, see, e.g. the dual version of [54, § V.5, Theorem 1]. \square

Corollary 1.59. *If E is the strict inductive limit of a countable strict inductive system $(E_n, u_n)_{n \geq 1}$ in LCS, then the following hold:*

- (1) *the induced inductive system $(\widehat{E}_n, \widehat{u}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ remain strict;*
- (2) *the completion $\widehat{v}_n : \widehat{E}_n \hookrightarrow \widehat{E}$ of each canonical insertion $v_n : E_n \hookrightarrow E$ remains a strict embedding;*
- (3) *the completion \widehat{E} , together with the canonical injections $\widehat{v}_n : E_n \hookrightarrow \widehat{E}$, is the strict inductive limit of $(\widehat{E}_n, \widehat{u}_n)_{n \geq 1}$.*

Proof. First two statements follow from Theorem 1.11, and the last follows from the first two and Proposition 1.57. \square

1.8 Barrelled and bornological spaces

Definition 1.60. Let E be a locally convex space. A **barrel** in E is a closed absolutely convex set that is also absorbing, i.e. absorbs every point, in the sense that A absorbs B if $\lambda A \supseteq B$ for all scalars λ that are large enough. If every barrel in E is a neighborhood of 0, then we say that E is **barrelled**.

Definition 1.61. A set $B \subseteq E$ is called **bornivorous**, if it absorbs all bounded sets. We say E is **bornological** if every absolutely convex bornivorous (not necessarily closed) set of E is a neighborhood of 0.

Proposition 1.62 ([64, §§ II.7, 8, & p138, Corollary 4]). *The following hold:*

- (1) *A locally convex space E is barrelled if any of the following holds:*
 - (1.a) *E is a Baire space as a topological space;*
 - (1.b) *E is the inductive topology with respect to a family of linear maps from barrelled spaces;*
 - (1.c) *E is the product of a family of barrelled spaces.*
- (2) *A locally convex space E is bornological if any of the following holds:*
- (3) *E is metrizable;*
- (4) *E is the inductive topology with respect to a family of linear maps from bornological spaces.*

Remark 1.63. *Countable product of bornological spaces remain bornological, however; if the family is uncountable, the situation seems unknown. See [64, p61].*

Proposition 1.64 ([64, IV.3.4]). *Let E be a locally convex space. If E is either barreled or bornological, then it is Mackey.*

1.9 Quasi-completeness and the completeness of the strong and polar duals

Definition 1.65. We say a locally convex space E is **quasi-complete**, if every closed *bounded* set in E is complete.

Proposition 1.66 ([11, III.23, Proposition 12]). *Let E be a bornological locally convex space, F a complete locally convex space, \mathfrak{S} a collection of bounded sets in E . If \mathfrak{S} contains the image of every null sequence in E , then $\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{S}}(E, F)$ is complete.*

Corollary 1.67. *Let E be a bornological locally convex space, then the strong dual E'_b and the polar dual E'_c (cf. Definition 1.26) are both complete.*

1.10 (DF) -spaces

Motivated by the studies of strong duals of metrizable locally convex spaces, and based on the observation in [35], Grothendieck introduced the notion of a (DF) -space in [36].

Definition 1.68 ([89, p53]). We say a locally convex space E is a (DF) -space, if it satisfies the following conditions:

- (1) E possesses a fundamental sequence of bounded sets $(B_n)_{n \geq 1}$ in the sense that every $B \in \mathfrak{B}(E)$ is contained in some B_n ;
- (2) if a countable union of equicontinuous sets in E' is strongly bounded, i.e. with respect to the topology $b(E', E)$, then this union remains equicontinuous.

Notation 1.69. *The class of all (DF) -spaces is denoted by (\mathcal{DF}) .*

Proposition 1.70. *The strong dual of a metrizable locally convex is a (DF) space, and the strong dual of a (DF) space is an (F) -space.*

Proof. See [89, p54, Theorem 7.1 & p56, Theorem 7.5], note that Voigt used a different definition of (DF) -spaces [89]p53, which is equivalent to Definition 1.68 by [11, Chapitre IV, § 3, Proposition 1]. \square

1.11 Reflexivity and polar reflexivity (aka. stereotype duality)

Definition 1.71. Recall Notation 1.24. Let $\langle E, F \rangle$ be a duality pair of vector spaces E and F . The polar topology on E of $\mathfrak{C}(F)$ is called the **precompact topology with respect to $\langle E, F \rangle$** (with respect to the pairing $\langle E, F \rangle$), and denoted by $c(E, F)$. Equipped with $c(E, F)$, the locally convex space F is called the **polar dual** of E with respect to the pairing $\langle E, F \rangle$. Similarly, one obtains the notion of the precompact topology on E , and the polar dual of F , both with respect to the same pairing.

When $F = E'$ and the pairing is evaluation, we recover the polar dual E'_c of E as defined in Definition 1.26.

To facilitate our discussion, we also introduce the notion of reflexive and polar reflexive duality pairs.

Definition 1.72. Let E, F be locally convex spaces, and $\langle E, F \rangle$ a duality pair. We say that the duality pair $\langle E, F \rangle$ is

- **reflexive**, if it is compatible (Definition 1.28), the strong topology $b(E, F)$ on E with respect to the pair coincides with the topology on E , and the strong topology $b(F, E)$ on F coincides with the topology on F ;
- **polar reflexive**, if it is compatible (Definition 1.28), the strong topology $b(E, F)$ on E with respect to the pair coincides with the topology on E , and the strong topology $b(F, E)$ on F coincides with the topology on F ;

We say a locally convex space E is **reflexive** (resp. **polar reflexive**), if the evaluation pairing $\langle E, E' \rangle$ is reflexive (resp. polar reflexive).

The definition above of reflexivity of a locally convex space is equivalent to the usual one (see, e.g. [64, p144]). Actually, a direct unwinding of the definition establishes the following result.

Proposition 1.73. *Let E be a locally convex space. Consider the canonical embedding $\kappa : E \rightarrow E''$, $x \mapsto \langle \cdot, x \rangle$ of vector spaces. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) E is reflexive (resp. polar reflexive) in the sense of Definition 1.72;
- (2) κ restricts to an isomorphism of locally convex spaces from E onto $(E'_b)'_b$ (resp. $(E'_c)'_c$).

Proposition 1.74. *Let E be a locally convex space. Then,*

- (1) *the following are equivalent*
- (1.a) *E is reflexive;*
 - (1.b) *E'_b is reflexive;*
 - (1.c) *E is barrelled and every bounded set in E is relatively weakly compact.*
- (2) *consider the following statements:*
- (2.a) *E is an (F) -space;*
 - (2.b) *E is quasi-complete and Mackey, and E'_c is quasi-complete;*
 - (2.c) *E is polar reflexive.*

Then (2.a) implies (2.b), which in turn implies (2.c). Moreover, (1.a) implies (2.c).

Proof. (1) follows from [64, p145, Theorem IV.5.6 & Corollary 1]. Now let E be an (F) -space, then it is complete, hence quasi-complete. Being metrizable, E is bornological (Proposition 1.62), hence Mackey (Proposition 1.64). Thus (2.a) implies (2.b). That (2.b) implies (2.c) is shown in [47, p309, (4)], and that (1.a) implies (2.c) in [47, p309, (3)]. \square

Notation 1.75. *We use (\mathcal{F}'_c) to denote the class of all locally convex spaces that are isomorphic to the polar duals of some (F) -space. Thus the classes (\mathcal{F}'_c) and (\mathcal{F}) are the polar duals of each other.*

Remark 1.76. *What we call polar dual here of a locally convex space E is termed as the **stereotype dual** of E , and polar reflexive spaces are called **stereotyped spaces**, by Akbarov [2], and is then used by him in his series of works. The term “polar dual” is adopted here mainly because it is systematically used in [47, § 23.9], and the work of Köthe is much earlier. We also note that M. Smith characterized the polar duals of Banach spaces in [67], and later Brauner characterized the polar duals of Fréchet spaces in [15].*

1.12 Hypocontinuity of bilinear maps

The notion of hypocontinuity is not directly used in the following, but it facilitates some discussions and plays an crucial role in the development of topological tensor products. Therefore, we include here a brief scratch of the surface.

Notation 1.77. *Let E, F, G be locally convex space. We denote by $B(E, F; G)$ the space of all bilinear maps (no continuity required) from $E \times F$ to G . By $\mathfrak{B}(E, F; G)$, we mean the subspace of $B(E, F; G)$ of separately continuous bilinear maps; and by $\mathfrak{B}(E, F; G)$, the subspace of $\mathfrak{B}(E, F; G)$ of all (jointly) continuous bilinear maps.*

Lying between the separate continuity and continuity, there's also another fruitful notion of continuity, called hypocontinuity and is due to Bourbaki [11, § III.5], for bilinear maps.

Definition 1.78. *Let E, F, G be locally convex spaces, $\mathfrak{M} \subseteq \mathfrak{B}(E)$, $\mathfrak{N} \subseteq \mathfrak{B}(F)$. A map $f \in \mathfrak{B}(E, F; G)$ is called \mathfrak{M} - (resp. \mathfrak{N} -) **hypocontinuous** if for any $W \in \mathcal{N}_\Gamma^G(0)$ and $A \in \mathfrak{M}$ (resp. $B \in \mathfrak{N}$), there exists $V \in \mathcal{N}_\Gamma^F(0)$ (resp. $U \in \mathcal{N}_\Gamma^E(0)$), such that $f(A \times V) \subseteq W$ (resp. $f(U \times B) \subseteq W$). We say f is $(\mathfrak{M}, \mathfrak{N})$ -**hypocontinuous**, if it is both \mathfrak{M} -hypocontinuous and \mathfrak{N} -hypocontinuous. We simply say f is **hypocontinuous**, if it is $(\mathfrak{B}(E), \mathfrak{B}(F))$ -hypocontinuous.*

Proposition 1.79 ([64, p89, 5.2]), *Let E, F, G be locally convex spaces and $f \in \mathfrak{B}(E, F; G)$. If E is barrelled, then f is $\mathfrak{B}(F)$ -hypocontinuous. If E and F are both barrelled, then f is hypocontinuous.*

1.13 Compatible topologies on the tensor product

All of § 1.13 is due to Grothendieck [37]. Our presentation follows closely the treatment in [48].

Definition 1.80 ([48, p.264]). *Let E and F be locally convex spaces, a locally convex topology \mathfrak{T}_τ on $E \odot F$ is called **compatible**, if*

- (1) *the canonical bilinear map from $E \times F$ into $E \otimes_\tau F = (E \odot F, \mathfrak{T}_\tau)$ is separately continuous;*
- (2) *$u \otimes v \in (E \otimes_\tau F)'$ for all $u \in E', v \in F'$;*
- (3) *if $A \subseteq E', B \subseteq F'$ are equicontinuous on E and F respectively, then $A \otimes B$ is equicontinuous on $E \otimes_\tau F$.*

Remark 1.81. *By (2), there are enough continuous linear forms to separate points in $E \otimes_\tau F$, hence a compatible topology on the tensor product is always Hausdorff.*

The compatible topology on the tensor product enjoys the following important property.

Proposition 1.82 ([48, p265,(4)]). *Using the above notation, let $x_0 \in E$, $y_0 \in F$ be nonzero, the maps $y \in F \mapsto x_0 \otimes y \in E \otimes_\tau F$ and $x \in E \mapsto x \otimes y_0 \in E \otimes_\tau F$ are both strict monomorphism.*

It is clear that we have a duality pairing of vector spaces $\langle E \otimes F, \mathfrak{B}(E, F) \rangle$, given by the bilinear form

$$(1.6) \quad \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : (E \otimes F) \times \mathfrak{B}(E, F) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$$

$$\left\langle \sum_i x_i \otimes y_i, f \right\rangle \mapsto \sum_i f(x_i, y_i)$$

Motivated by Proposition 1.34, we give the following characterization of compatible topologies using polars.

Proposition 1.83 ([48, p265,(3)]). *Using the above notation and the duality pairing (1.6), a locally convex topology on $E \otimes F$ is compatible if and only if it is the polar topologies of a collection \mathfrak{M} of subsets of $\mathfrak{B}(E, F)$, such that*

- (1) *every $M \in \mathfrak{M}$ is separately equicontinuous;*
- (2) *for any equicontinuous $G_1 \subseteq E'$ and $G_2 \subseteq F'$, we have $G_1 \otimes G_2 \in \mathfrak{M}$, viewed canonically in $\mathfrak{B}(E, F)$.*

Notation 1.84. *For any locally convex space E , we use $\mathfrak{C}(E)$ to denote the collection of all equicontinuous sets in E' .*

Corollary 1.85. *Using the notation in Proposition 1.83, the following hold:*

- (1) *There exists a finest compatible tensor product on $E \otimes F$, which is given by taking \mathfrak{M} to be the collection of all separately equicontinuous sets in $\mathfrak{B}(E, F)$.*
- (2) *There exists a coarsest compatible tensor product on $E \otimes F$, which is given by taking \mathfrak{M} to be the collection $\{G_1 \otimes G_2 \mid G_1 \in \mathfrak{C}(E), G_2 \in \mathfrak{C}(F)\}$.*

1.14 The inductive tensor product

We can give an alternative description of the finest compatible topology as in Corollary 1.85.

Proposition 1.86. *Let E, F be locally convex spaces. Let \mathfrak{T}_I be the inductive topology on $E \otimes F$ with respect to the family*

$$(1.7) \quad \{x \otimes (\cdot) : F \rightarrow E \otimes F \mid x \in E\} \cup \{(\cdot) \otimes y : F \rightarrow E \otimes F \mid y \in F\},$$

then \mathfrak{T}_I is the finest compatible topology on $E \otimes F$.

Proof. By condition (1) of Definition 1.80, \mathfrak{T}_I is finer than every compatible topology on $E \otimes F$. It remains to check that it is compatible. For all $u \in E'$, $v \in F'$, let $\tau_{u,v}$ be the projective topology on $E \otimes F$ with respect to $u \otimes v : E \otimes F \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$. Then we have form $(u \otimes v)(x \otimes (\cdot)) = v \in F'$, and $(u \otimes v)((\cdot) \otimes y) = u \in E'$ for all $x \in E$, $y \in F$. Hence $\tau_{u,v}$ is coarser than \mathfrak{T}_I by the definition of the inductive topology, and $u \otimes v \in ((E \otimes F)[\mathfrak{T}_I])'$. It remains to check that if $G \in \mathfrak{C}(E)$, $H \in \mathfrak{C}(F)$, then $G \otimes H \in \mathfrak{C}((E \otimes F)[\mathfrak{T}_I])$. It suffices to show that the polar $(G \otimes H)^\circ$ with respect to the canonical pairing $\langle E \otimes F, E' \otimes F' \rangle$ is a neighborhood of 0 for \mathfrak{T}_I , which holds if and only if the inverse image of $(G \otimes H)^\circ$ along each map in the family (1.7) is a neighborhood of 0 of the domain of the map. Take any $x \in E$, since G is equicontinuous, the polar G° (with respect to the evaluation pairing $\langle E, E' \rangle$ of course) is a neighborhood of 0 in E , hence there exists $\varepsilon > 0$, such that for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{K}$ with $|\lambda| \leq \varepsilon$, we have $\lambda x \in G^\circ$. If $x \neq 0$, then $x \otimes (\cdot) = \varepsilon x \otimes \varepsilon^{-1}(\cdot)$. Thus

$$(1.8) \quad \forall y \in \varepsilon H^\circ \in \mathcal{N}_\Gamma^F(0), \quad x \otimes y = \varepsilon x \otimes \varepsilon^{-1} y \in \varepsilon x \otimes H^\circ \subseteq G^\circ \otimes H^\circ \subseteq (G \otimes H)^\circ.$$

Let $f_x : F \rightarrow E \otimes F$ be the map $y \mapsto x \otimes y$. Then (1.8) means $\varepsilon H^\circ \subseteq f_x^{-1}((G \otimes H)^\circ)$, thus the latter is in $\mathcal{N}_\Gamma^F(0)$. Similarly, let $f^y : E \rightarrow E \otimes F$ be the map $x \mapsto x \otimes y$, we have $(f^y)^{-1}((G \otimes H)^\circ) \in \mathcal{N}_\Gamma^E(0)$. As f^0 and f_0 are the zero map, which are the trivial cases, the inverse image of $(G \otimes H)^\circ$ along any maps in the family (1.7) is indeed a neighborhood of 0, and the proof is complete. \square

Definition 1.87. In Proposition 1.86, the topology \mathfrak{T}_I on $E \otimes F$ is called the **inductive tensor product topology** on $E \otimes F$, and we denote the resulting locally convex space by $E \otimes_I F$, and call it the **inductive tensor product**. The completion of $E \otimes_I F$ as a locally convex space, denoted by $E \overline{\otimes}_I F$, is called the **completed inductive tensor product**.

Proposition 1.88 (Universal property of inductive tensor product). *Let E, F and G be locally convex spaces, then for every bilinear map $f : E \times F \rightarrow G$, we have $f \in \mathfrak{B}(E, F; G)$ if and only if there exists a unique $\tilde{f} : E \otimes_I F \rightarrow G$, such that $f = \tilde{f} \chi$, with $\chi : E \times F \rightarrow E \otimes_I F$ being the canonical map.*

Proof. This follows Proposition 1.86 and the universal property of inductive topologies. \square

Corollary 1.89. For $E \in \text{LCS}$, consider the functors $E \otimes_l (\cdot)$, $(\cdot) \otimes_l E$ and $\mathcal{L}_s(E, \cdot)$ from LCS to itself. Then currying yields the natural bijections

$$(1.9) \quad \mathcal{L}(E \otimes_l F, G) \simeq \mathcal{L}(F, \mathcal{L}_s(E, G)) \simeq \mathcal{L}(F \otimes_l E, G), \quad F, G \in \text{LCS}.$$

In particular, $E \otimes_l (\cdot)$ and $(\cdot) \otimes_l E$ are both left adjoint to $\mathcal{L}_s(E, \cdot)$, hence commute with taking colimits in LCS .

Proof. This is a routine check using the universal property of the inductive tensor product as well as the algebraic tensor product of vector spaces. \square

Remark 1.90. One might be tempted to say that $\overline{E \otimes_l (\cdot)}$ commutes with taking colimits in the category $\widehat{\text{LCS}}$ of complete locally convex spaces, by claiming it is the left adjoint of $\widehat{\mathcal{L}_s(E, \cdot)}$, as functors on $\widehat{\text{LCS}}$. This is however false, since $\mathcal{L}_s(E, G)$ is in general not complete, hence a similar adjunction as (1.9) need not hold in $\widehat{\text{LCS}}$, and the left side of (1.9) will miss to detect continuous linear maps from F to $\mathcal{L}_s(E, G)$ whose range is not contained in $\mathcal{L}_s(E, G)$.

In spite of Remark 1.90, we still have the following commutation result with locally convex direct sums.

Corollary 1.91. Let $(E_i)_{i \in I}$ and $(F_j)_{j \in J}$ be two families of locally convex spaces, we have

$$(1.10) \quad \left(\bigoplus_i E_i \right) \overline{\otimes}_l \left(\bigoplus_j F_j \right) = \overline{\bigoplus_{i,j} E_i \otimes_l F_j} = \bigoplus_{i,j} E_i \overline{\otimes}_l F_j.$$

Proof. By Proposition 1.88, we have

$$(1.11) \quad \left(\bigoplus_i E_i \right) \otimes_l \left(\bigoplus_j F_j \right) = \bigoplus_{i,j} E_i \otimes_l F_j = \bigoplus_{i,j} E_i \otimes_j F_j.$$

Now (1.10) follows from (1.11) by Proposition 1.51. \square

Proposition 1.92. The following holds for the (completed) inductive tensor product.

- (1) If $f : A \rightarrow E$, $g : B \rightarrow F$ are continuous linear maps of locally convex spaces, then the induced linear map $f \otimes g : A \otimes_l B \rightarrow E \otimes_l F$ is continuous, hence extends by continuity to a continuous linear map $f \overline{\otimes}_l g : A \overline{\otimes}_l B \rightarrow E \overline{\otimes}_l F$.
- (2) For all locally convex spaces E and F , the swap

$$s : E \otimes_l F \rightarrow F \otimes_l E, \quad \sum_i x_i \otimes y_i \mapsto \sum_i y_i \otimes x_i$$

is an isomorphism of locally convex spaces, hence extends by continuity to an isomorphism of locally convex spaces $\overline{s} : E \overline{\otimes}_l F \rightarrow F \overline{\otimes}_l E$.

- (3) For all locally convex spaces E , F and G , the association map

$$a : (E \otimes_l F) \otimes_l G \rightarrow E \otimes_l (F \otimes_l G), \quad \sum_i (x_i \otimes y_i) \otimes z_i \mapsto \sum_i x_i \otimes (y_i \otimes z_i)$$

is an isomorphism of locally convex spaces, hence extends by continuity to an isomorphism of locally convex spaces $\overline{a} : (E \overline{\otimes}_l F) \overline{\otimes}_l G \rightarrow E \overline{\otimes}_l (F \overline{\otimes}_l G)$.

Proof. (1) follows from the universal property of $A \otimes_l B$ by noting that the composition $A \times B \xrightarrow{f \times g} E \times F \xrightarrow{\chi_{E,F}} E \otimes_l F$ is a separately continuous bilinear map. (2) is similar to (1). To prove (3), note that a similar argument as in Proposition 1.86 establishes that there exists a finest locally convex topology on $E \otimes F \otimes G$ making the trilinear map $(x, y, z) \in E \times F \times G \mapsto x \otimes y \otimes z \in E \otimes F \otimes G$ separately continuous. And one checks that this locally convex topology on $E \otimes F \otimes G$ transports to exactly both sides of a via the canonical identifications. \square

1.15 The injective tensor product

From Corollary 1.85, we can also deduce that there exists a coarsest compatible topology on $E \otimes F$.

Definition 1.93. Let E, F be locally convex space. The space $E \otimes F$, equipped coarsest compatible topology, is called the **injective tensor product** of E and F , and is denoted by $E \otimes_\varepsilon F$, its completion, denoted by $E \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon F$, is called the **completed tensor product**.

We may embed $E \otimes F$ into $\mathfrak{B}(E'_\sigma, F'_\sigma)$ by identifying the tensor $\sum_i x_i \otimes y_i$ with the bilinear form $(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto \sum_i \alpha(x_i)\beta(y_i)$.

Notation 1.94. Define

$$\mathfrak{C} = \{A \times B \mid A \in \mathfrak{C}(E), B \in \mathfrak{C}(B)\}.$$

Let G be another locally convex space. We use $\mathfrak{B}_e(E'_s, F'_s; G)$ to denote the \mathfrak{C} -topology on $\mathfrak{B}(E'_s, F'_s; G)$ viewed as a space of maps from $E'_s \times F'_s$ to G . When $G = \mathbb{K}$, we use $\mathfrak{B}_e(E'_s, F'_s)$ to denote $\mathfrak{B}_e(E'_s, F'_s; \mathbb{K})$.

Proposition 1.95. Using the above notation the following hold:

- (1) the $\mathfrak{B}_e(E'_s, F'_s; G)$ is a locally convex space;
- (2) $\mathfrak{B}_e(E'_e, F'_e)$ is complete if both E and F are;
- (3) the embedding $E \otimes_\epsilon F \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{B}_e(E'_s, F'_s)$ is a strict monomorphism.

In particular, if both E and F are complete, then $E \overline{\otimes}_\epsilon F$ is identified with the closure of $E \otimes_\epsilon F$ in $\mathfrak{B}_e(E'_s, F'_s)$.

Proof. (1) holds by [48, p167,(4)], and (2) by [48, p167,(5)]. We now prove (3). Let $B_{\mathbb{K}}$ denote the unit disk of the scalar field \mathbb{K} . Consider sets of the form

$$(1.12) \quad M(U, V) = \{f \in \mathfrak{B}(E'_s, F'_s) \mid f(U^\circ, V^\circ) \subseteq B_{\mathbb{K}}\}, \quad (U, V) \in \mathcal{N}_\Gamma^E(0) \times \mathcal{N}_\Gamma^F(0).$$

Since every equicontinuous set in E'_s (resp. F'_s) is contained in U° (resp. V°) for some $U \in \mathcal{N}_\Gamma^E(0)$ (resp. $V \in \mathcal{N}_\Gamma^F(0)$), it follows that all sets in (1.12) form a fundamental system of neighborhoods of 0 in $\mathfrak{B}_e(E'_s, F'_s)$. Clearly, $M(U, V) \cap (E \odot F) = (U^\circ \otimes V^\circ)^\circ$, where the outer polar is taken with respect to the duality pairing (1.6). It follows that the subspace topology on $E \odot F$ induced from the topology of $\mathfrak{B}_e(E'_s, F'_s)$ is precisely the injective tensor product topology on $E \odot F$, which finishes the proof. \square

Remark 1.96. Due to the above proposition, the injective tensor product topology is also called the topology of bi-equicontinuous convergence, which is the original terminology in [37].

The following description of $E \otimes_\epsilon F$ (and of $E \overline{\otimes}_\epsilon F$) using seminorms is a consequence by a routine translation between a continuous semi-norm and its associate unit ball, via the Minkowski functionals (aka. the gauge functionals).

Proposition 1.97 ([48, p267, (2) & (3)]). Let $(p_i)_{i \in I}$ (resp. $(q_j)_{j \in J}$) be a generating family of seminorms for the locally convex space E (resp. F). For each index, let U_i (resp. V_j) be the unit ball for the seminorm p_i (resp. q_j). Define

$$p_i \otimes_\epsilon q_j : E \odot F \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ = [0, +\infty[$$

$$t \mapsto \sup_{u \in U_i, v \in V_j} |(u \otimes v)(t)|,$$

then $p_i \otimes_\epsilon q_j$, $(i, j) \in I \times J$, is a generating family of seminorms for $E \otimes_\epsilon F$ and the respective extensions $p_i \overline{\otimes}_\epsilon q_j$, $(i, j) \in I \times J$, is a generating family of seminorms on $E \overline{\otimes}_\epsilon F$.

Remark 1.98. When E, F are B -spaces, or more generally normed spaces, taking p to be the norm on E , and q the norm on F , then $p \otimes_\epsilon q$ is a norm generating the topology on $E \otimes_\epsilon F$. Using this norm, we recover the usual definition of injective tensor product of Banach (or normed) spaces, see e.g. [71, § IV.2].

Corollary 1.99. If E, F are (F) -spaces, then so is $E \overline{\otimes}_\epsilon F$.

Proof. It suffices to take a countable generating family of seminorms for E and for F in Proposition 1.97. \square

Proposition 1.100. The following holds for the (completed) injective tensor product.

- (1) If $f : A \rightarrow E$, $g : B \rightarrow F$ are continuous linear maps of locally convex spaces, then the induced linear map $f \otimes g : A \otimes_\epsilon B \rightarrow E \otimes_\epsilon F$ is continuous, hence extends by continuity to a continuous linear map $f \overline{\otimes}_\epsilon g : A \overline{\otimes}_\epsilon B \rightarrow E \overline{\otimes}_\epsilon F$.
- (2) For all locally convex spaces E and F , the swap

$$s : E \otimes_\epsilon F \rightarrow F \otimes_\epsilon E, \quad \sum_i x_i \otimes y_i \mapsto \sum_i y_i \otimes x_i$$

is an isomorphism of locally convex spaces, hence extends by continuity to an isomorphism of locally convex spaces $\overline{s} : E \overline{\otimes}_\epsilon F \rightarrow F \overline{\otimes}_\epsilon E$.

(3) For all locally convex spaces E, F and G , the association map

$$a : (E \otimes_\varepsilon F) \otimes_\varepsilon G \rightarrow E \otimes_\varepsilon (F \otimes_\varepsilon G), \quad \sum_i (x_i \otimes y_i) \otimes z_i \mapsto \sum_i x_i \otimes (y_i \otimes z_i)$$

is an isomorphism of locally convex spaces, hence extends by continuity to an isomorphism of locally convex spaces $\bar{a} : (E \otimes_\varepsilon F) \otimes_\varepsilon G \rightarrow E \otimes_\varepsilon (F \otimes_\varepsilon G)$.

Proof. (1) is [48, p275,(1)]. (2) follows directly from Definition 1.93 based on Corollary 1.85. (3) can be seen from, e.g. Proposition 1.97 by writing out the corresponding generating families of seminorms. \square

The following result justifies our terminology of using “injective tensor product” instead of the more precise term “tensor product of bi-equicontinuous convergence” as Grothendieck did ([37, p89, Définition 5])

Proposition 1.101 ([48, p278, (6)]). *Let E_i, F_i be locally convex spaces and $f_i : E_i \rightarrow F_i$ a strict monomorphism for $i = 1, 2$. Then both $f_1 \otimes_\varepsilon f_2 : E_1 \otimes_\varepsilon F_1 \rightarrow E_2 \otimes_\varepsilon F_2$ and $f_1 \otimes_\varepsilon f_2 : E_1 \otimes_\varepsilon F_1 \rightarrow E_2 \otimes_\varepsilon F_2$ are strict monomorphisms.*

The completed injective tensor product behaves well with products and reduced projective limits.

Proposition 1.102 ([48, p282, (5)]). *The following hold.*

- (1) *Let E be a locally convex space, $(F_j)_{j \in J}$ a family of locally convex spaces. We have a canonical isomorphism $E \otimes_\varepsilon \prod_{j \in J} F_j \simeq \prod_{j \in J} E \otimes_\varepsilon F_j$.*
- (2) *Let $E = \varprojlim E_i, F = \varprojlim F_j$ be reduced projective limits of locally convex spaces, then $E \otimes_\varepsilon F$ can be canonically identified as the projective limit $\varprojlim E_i \otimes_\varepsilon F_j$, which is already complete by Proposition 1.41.*

Remark 1.103. *The injective tensor product does not behave well with taking locally convex direct sums, see e.g. [48, p283] for a counterexample, as well a partial positive result.*

1.16 The projective tensor product

Informally, just as inductive tensor product is the universal one witnessing separate continuity of bilinear maps, the projective tensor product is the universal one witnessing (joint) continuity. This is formalized in the following result.

Proposition 1.104 ([48, pp176,177]). *Let E, F be locally convex spaces. The absolutely convex hulls $\Gamma(U \otimes V)$, $U \in \mathcal{N}_\Gamma^E(0)$, $V \in \mathcal{N}_\Gamma^F(0)$ form a fundamental system of neighborhoods of 0 for a unique locally convex Hausdorff topology \mathfrak{T}_π on $E \otimes F$. Moreover,*

- (1) *Let p_U (resp. q_V) be the gauge functional for U , then the gauge functional $p_U \otimes_\pi q_V$ for $\Gamma(U \otimes V)$ is given by the formula*

$$(1.13) \quad (p_U \otimes_\pi q_V)(t) = \inf \left\{ \sum_k p_U(x_k) q_V(y_k) \mid t = \sum_k x_k \otimes y_k, (x_k, y_k) \in E \times F \right\}.$$

In particular, $p_U \otimes_\pi q_V$ is (uniformly) continuous and extends by continuity to a unique continuous seminorm on the completion of $(E \otimes F, \mathfrak{T}_\pi)$.

- (2) *If $(p_i), (q_j)$ are generating families of seminorms for E and F respectively, then $p_i \otimes_\pi q_j, (i, j) \in I \times J$ is a generating family of seminorms for $E \otimes_\pi F := (E \otimes F, \mathfrak{T}_\pi)$; and the unique continuous extension $p_i \otimes_\pi q_j, (i, j) \in I \times J$ is a generating family of seminorms for the completion $E \otimes_\pi F$ of $E \otimes_\pi F$.*
- (3) *Let $\chi : E \times F \rightarrow E \otimes F$ be the canonical map. Then \mathfrak{T}_π is the finest locally convex topology making χ continuous.*
- (4) *The locally convex tensor product $E \otimes_\pi F$ enjoys the following universal property: for each locally convex space G , the map $\mathcal{L}(E \otimes_\pi F, G) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(E, F; G), f \mapsto f \chi$ is a bijection.*

Corollary 1.105. *Using the notation in Proposition 1.104, the topology \mathfrak{T}_π on $E \otimes F$ is compatible in the sense of Definition 1.80.*

Proof. The only nontrivial thing to check is that $U^\circ \otimes V^\circ$ is equicontinuous in $(E \otimes_\pi F)'$, for any $U \in \mathcal{N}_\Gamma^E(0)$ and $V \in \mathcal{N}_\Gamma^F(0)$. For each $t = \sum_k \lambda_k x_k \otimes y_k \in \Gamma(U \otimes V)$, $x_k \in U$, $y_k \in V$, and $\lambda_k \in \mathbb{K}$ with $\sum_k |\lambda_k| \leq 1$, as well as each $f \in U^\circ, g \in V^\circ$, we have

$$|\langle t, f \otimes g \rangle| = \left| \sum_k \lambda_k f(x_k) g(y_k) \right| \leq \sum_k |\lambda_k| \cdot |f(x_k)| \cdot |g(y_k)| \leq \sum_k |\lambda_k| \leq 1.$$

Hence $U^\circ \otimes V^\circ$ lies in the polar of the neighborhood $\Gamma(U \otimes V)$ of 0 in $E \otimes_\pi F$, hence equicontinuous. \square

Corollary 1.106. *If E and F are (F) -spaces, then so is $E\overline{\otimes}_\pi F$.*

Proof. It suffices to take a countable generating family of seminorms for E and for F in Proposition 1.104 (2). \square

Definition 1.107. Using the notation in Proposition 1.104, we call the locally convex space $E\otimes_\pi F$ the **projective tensor product** of E and F , and its completion $E\overline{\otimes}_\pi F$ the **completed projective tensor product**.

Remark 1.108. *When E and F are normed spaces, and U, V their respective unit balls, then p_U and p_V are the norms on E and F , and (1.12) describes the norm on the projective tensor product $E\otimes_\pi F$ of normed spaces, cf. [71, § IV.2].*

Proposition 1.109. *The following holds for the (completed) projective tensor product.*

- (1) *If $f : A \rightarrow E, g : B \rightarrow F$ are continuous linear maps of locally convex spaces, then the induced linear map $f \otimes g : A \otimes_\pi B \rightarrow E \otimes_\pi F$ is continuous, hence extends by continuity to a continuous linear map $f \overline{\otimes}_\pi g : A \overline{\otimes}_\pi B \rightarrow E \overline{\otimes}_\pi F$.*
- (2) *For all locally convex spaces E and F , the swap*

$$s : E \otimes_\pi F \rightarrow F \otimes_\pi E, \quad \sum_i x_i \otimes y_i \mapsto \sum_i y_i \otimes x_i$$

is an isomorphism of locally convex spaces, hence extends by continuity to an isomorphism of locally convex spaces $\overline{s} : E \overline{\otimes}_\pi F \rightarrow F \overline{\otimes}_\pi E$.

- (3) *For all locally convex spaces E, F and G , the association map*

$$a : (E \otimes_\pi F) \otimes_\pi G \rightarrow E \otimes_\pi (F \otimes_\pi G), \quad \sum_i (x_i \otimes y_i) \otimes z_i \mapsto \sum_i x_i \otimes (y_i \otimes z_i)$$

is an isomorphism of locally convex spaces, hence extends by continuity to an isomorphism of locally convex spaces $\overline{a} : (E \overline{\otimes}_\pi F) \overline{\otimes}_\pi G \rightarrow E \overline{\otimes}_\pi (F \overline{\otimes}_\pi G)$.

Proof. The proof parallels to the case for inductive tensor product (Proposition 1.92) by using continuous bilinear or trilinear maps instead of the separately continuous ones. \square

The completed projective tensor product also behaves well with products and reduced projective limits.

Proposition 1.110 ([48, p193 (3), & p194, (5)]). *The following hold.*

- (1) *Let E be a locally convex space, $(F_j)_{j \in J}$ a family of locally convex spaces. We have a canonical isomorphism $E\overline{\otimes}_\pi \prod_{j \in J} F_j \simeq \prod_{j \in J} E\overline{\otimes}_\pi F_j$.*
- (2) *Let $E = \varprojlim E_i, F = \varprojlim F_j$ be reduced projective limits of locally convex spaces, then $E\overline{\otimes}_\pi F$ can be canonically identified as the projective limit $\varprojlim E_i \overline{\otimes}_\pi F_j$, which is already complete by Proposition 1.41.*

Remark 1.111. *As injective tensor product, in general, the project tensor product does not behave well with locally convex direct sums, see [48, p195, (6), (7)] for some partial positive result, and the counterexample in [48, p196].*

1.17 Comparison of the topological tensor products and nuclear spaces

Proposition 1.112. *Let E, F be locally convex spaces. Then*

- (1) *The identity map $E \otimes_\iota F \rightarrow E \otimes_\pi F$ is continuous, and extends by continuity to a unique continuous linear map $E \overline{\otimes}_\iota F \rightarrow E \overline{\otimes}_\pi F$.*
- (2) *The identity map $E \otimes_\epsilon F \rightarrow E \otimes_\pi F$ is continuous, and extends by continuity to a unique continuous linear map $E \overline{\otimes}_\epsilon F \rightarrow E \overline{\otimes}_\pi F$.*

Proof. All of this follows from projective tensor product topology is a compatible topology (Corollary 1.105), and among compatible topologies, and the inductive tensor product topology is the finest, while the injective one coarsest. \square

Definition 1.113. All the linear maps in Proposition 1.112 are called **canonical**.

It shall be important for us to have some criterion for the canonical maps to be isomorphisms in LCS. We start with the comparison of the inductive and projective tensor product.

Proposition 1.114. *Let E, F be locally convex spaces. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) *the canonical map $E \otimes_\iota F \rightarrow E \otimes_\pi F$ is an isomorphism;*

- (2) the canonical map $E \overline{\otimes}_I F \rightarrow E \overline{\otimes}_\pi F$ is an isomorphism;
- (3) the canonical map $\chi: E \times F \rightarrow E \otimes_I F$ is continuous;
- (4) for any locally convex space G , we have $\mathfrak{B}(E, F; G) = \mathfrak{B}(E, F; G)$, i.e. every separately continuous bilinear map from $E \times F$ to G is continuous.

Proof. It follows from the uniqueness of the completion of uniform spaces (Theorem 1.11) that (1) and (2) are equivalent. By the universal properties of the inductive and projective tensor product respectively, we see that (1) and (4) are equivalent. Clearly, (4) implies (3). Finally, suppose (3) holds, by the universal property of the projective tensor product, we see that the identity map $E \otimes_\pi F \rightarrow E \otimes_I F$ is continuous, and is clearly the inverse of the continuous canonical map $E \otimes_I F \rightarrow E \otimes_\pi F$, hence we have (1). \square

It is well-known that (F) -spaces and barrelled (DF) -spaces satisfy the equivalent conditions in the above proposition.

Proposition 1.115. *Let E, F, G be locally convex spaces. Then $\mathfrak{B}(E, F; G) = \mathfrak{B}(E, F; G)$ if either one of the following conditions holds:*

- (1) E and F are both metrizable and barrelled, in particular if they are (F) -spaces;
- (2) E and F are both (DF) -spaces and barrelled.

Proof. Case (1) can be found in [48, p158, (2)], while case (2) in [48, p161, (11)]. \square

For the comparison of projective and injective tensor products, we introduce the well-known notion of nuclear spaces due to Grothendieck [37].

Definition 1.116 ([34, Ch.II, p34, Définition 4]). A locally convex space E is called **nuclear**, if for any locally convex space F , the canonical map $E \otimes_\pi F \rightarrow E \otimes_\varepsilon F$ is an isomorphism, or equivalently, the canonical map $E \overline{\otimes}_\pi F \rightarrow E \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon F$ is an isomorphism.

Remark 1.117. *There are a variety of equivalent conditions for a locally convex space to be nuclear, which we will not recall here nor shall we use directly later, but are nevertheless very important in the development of the theory, cf. e.g. [78, p511, Theorem 50.1].*

Notation 1.118. *We use (\mathcal{N}) to denote the class of nuclear locally convex spaces.*

Proposition 1.119. *The following holds for the class (\mathcal{N}) .*

- (1) *The class (\mathcal{N}) is stable under taking countable locally direct sums, separated quotients, inductive limits of a countable family, arbitrary products, subspaces, and projective limits in LCS.*
- (2) *The class (\mathcal{N}) is stable under taking projective (or the same, injective) tensor product.*
- (3) *A locally convex space E is nuclear if and only if its completion \widehat{E} is.*
- (4) *An (F) -space is nuclear if and only if its strong dual is.*
- (5) *A normed space is nuclear if and only if it is finite dimensional.*

Proof. (1) is in [64, p103, 7.4] and (2) in [64, p105, 7.5]. (3) is clear from some equivalent definitions of nuclear spaces but can also be found explicitly in [37, Ch II, p39, Corollaire 3]. (4) is in [78, p523, Proposition 50.6], and (5) in [70, p520, Corollary 2]. \square

On the negative side.

Proposition 1.120 ([78, p527, Theorem 51.2]). *Uncountable locally convex direct sum of \mathbb{K} is not nuclear.*

1.18 The approximation property

Let E be a locally convex space. Then we obtain an algebraic linear embedding $E \odot E' \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(E) = \mathcal{L}(E, E)$, $\sum_i x_i \otimes \omega_i \mapsto \{x \in E \mapsto \sum_i \omega_i(x) x_i\}$, whose image we shall denote by $\mathfrak{F}(E)$. By the theorem of Hahn-Banach, one easily sees that $\mathfrak{F}(E)$ consists exactly of all continuous linear operators on E that has finite rank.

Definition 1.121. A locally convex space E is said to have the **approximation property**, if $\mathfrak{F}(E)$ is dense in $\mathcal{L}_c(E) = \mathcal{L}_c(E, E)$.

Remark 1.122. *There are many well-known characterization of the approximation property, which is of minor importance in this paper, cf. [37, Ch.I, § 5]. Using these characterization, the problem of whether every locally convex space enjoys the approximation property quickly reduces to the case of Banach spaces, see e.g. [64, p110, Corollary 3]. It is well-known that the latter is settled in the negative by a remarkable work of Enflo [23].*

Notation 1.123. We denote the class of all locally convex spaces that has the approximation property by (\mathcal{AP}) .

Proposition 1.124 ([48, pp245–247]). The class (\mathcal{AP}) is stable under taking arbitrary locally convex direct sums, strict inductive limits, arbitrary products and reduced projective limits.

Proposition 1.125 ([48, p256, (3)]). Let K be a compact space. The Banach space $C(K)$ has the approximation property.

We will also have the occasion to use the fact that the Banach space $\ell^1(X)$ on a discrete set X equipped with the counting measure, has the approximate property. For this, we track a more general result.

We adopt the convention as in [39, Chapter III]. Let R be a locally convex space, and μ a Radon measure on R . The Banach spaces $L^p(X, \mu)$, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ is defined as usual, but we modulo out functions that are *locally almost* null. This yields the same $L^p(X, \mu)$ spaces (ones that modulo out functions that are almost null), when $1 \leq p < +\infty$, but there can be some difference for $L^\infty(X, \mu)$ due to the possible existence of sets that are locally μ -null, but not μ -null. For details, see [39, § 135].

Proposition 1.126 ([48, p259, (10) & (11)]). Let μ be a Radon measure on a locally compact space R . Then $L^p(X, \mu)$ has the approximation property for every $p \in [1, +\infty]$.

Proposition 1.127 ([64, p110, Corollary 2]). Every nuclear space has the approximation property.

Proposition 1.128 ([48, p248, (11)]). Let E be a Mackey space such that both E and E'_c are quasi-complete (so that it is polar reflexive by Proposition 1.74), then $E \in (\mathcal{AP})$ if and only if $E_c \in (\mathcal{AP})$. This applies in particular when E is an (F) -space.

The following result, due to Schwartz based on his theory of ε -products, shall be important for us.

Proposition 1.129 ([65, pp46-48, Proposition 11, Corollaries 1 & 2]). If E, F are complete locally convex spaces with the approximation property, then $E \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon F$ has the approximation property.

1.19 Montel spaces

Definition 1.130. A locally convex space E is called a **Montel space**, or simply **Montel**, if it is barrelled and all bounded sets are relatively compact.

Remark 1.131. It follows immediately from the definition that all Montel spaces are **quasi-complete**. However, they need not be complete, cf. [46, p48, Example 32].

Notation 1.132. Montel spaces are also called (M) -spaces, and the class of all Montel spaces is denoted by (\mathcal{M}) . An (F) -space that is also an (M) -space is called an (FM) space, and (\mathcal{FM}) denotes the class of all (FM) -spaces.

Proposition 1.133. In a Montel space E , for an arbitrary $A \subseteq E$, the following are equivalent:

- (1) A is bounded;
- (2) A is relatively compact;
- (3) A is weakly-bounded;
- (4) A is weakly relatively compact;
- (5) A is equicontinuous with respect to the evaluation pairing $\langle E, E' \rangle$, where E' is equipped with the strong topology.

In particular, $E'_c = E'_b = E'_\tau$, i.e. all Montel spaces are Mackey, for which the strong and polar duals are the same.

Proof. The equivalence of (1) and (3) holds for any locally convex space E by the general theory of locally convex spaces (see, e.g. [61]). Since bounded sets are relatively compact in a Montel space and the converse always holds in a locally convex space, we also have equivalence between (1) and (2). Clearly (2) implies (4) as weak topology has less open sets, and it is trivial that (4) implies (3). Thus all first four conditions are equivalent and $E'_c = E'_b = E'_\tau$.

That (5) implies (4) follows from Theorem 1.33.

Finally, since Montel spaces are reflexive by Proposition 1.74, if A is equicontinuous, the polar A° is a neighborhood of $0 \in E'$, hence the bipolar $A^{\circ\circ}$ in E is weakly relatively compact (in fact, weakly compact) by Theorem 1.33 again. Thus $A \subseteq A^{\circ\circ}$ is weakly relatively compact, and (5) implies (4). \square

We shall need the following.

Proposition 1.134 ([47, pp369-370]). *Consider the class (\mathcal{M}) of all (M) -spaces.*

- (1) *Every (M) -space is reflexive, and the strong dual of an (M) -space remains in (\mathcal{M}) .*
- (2) *The class (\mathcal{M}) is stable under taking arbitrary products and locally convex direct sums.*
- (3) *Strict inductive limits of complete M -spaces remains in (\mathcal{M}) .*

The following result is due to Dieudonné.

Proposition 1.135 ([20], **see also** [47, p370, (5)]). *Every (FM) -space is separable.*

The following is due to Grothendieck.

Proposition 1.136 ([37, Ch.II, p38, Corollaire 1], **see also** [78, p520, Corollary 3]). *All bounded sets in a nuclear space is precompact. In particular, a barrelled quasi-complete nuclear space is a Montel space.*

2 Locally convex Hopf algebras, dualizability and reflexivity

Put simply and abstractly, we are going to work with Hopf monoid in a symmetric monoidal category, in the concrete setting of the category $\overline{\text{LCS}}$ of complete locally convex spaces with various completed topological tensor product being the monoidal structure. We mention that there is a systematic treatment of Hopf monoids. See e.g. [58, § 10.5], or even the monograph [1]. But we are not going into that abstract direction. Instead, as will be demonstrated in later sections of this paper, our concrete setting of working over $\overline{\text{LCS}}$ allows us to benefit greatly from the powerful tools as presented in § 1. As a consequence, most results in § 2 can be proved by an obvious parallel argument (with added continuity and density) in the proof of their classical counterparts, and we consider these results elementary. Less elementary results shall be established gradually in later sections.

2.1 Monoidal categories and symmetric monoidal categories

We begin by recalling just enough abstract language in order to be able to put our main objects of study into perspective.

Notation 2.1. *Let k be a field, which we fix throughout § 2.1. An additive category \mathcal{C} is k -linear if each Hom-set is equipped with a vector space structure over k , and the composition map is k -bilinear. We shall often use $A \in \mathcal{C}$ to mean A is an object of the category \mathcal{C} . We also use $\mathcal{C}(A, B)$ to denote the collection of all morphisms from A to B in a category \mathcal{C} , where $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$.*

We now briefly recall some basic notions of monoidal categories following [27].

Definition 2.2. A k -linear monoidal category is a k -additive category equipped with the extra structures \otimes , a , ι and $\mathbb{1}$, where

- $\otimes: \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is a bifunctor that is bilinear over k , called the **tensor product**;
- $a: (- \otimes -) \otimes - \xrightarrow{\sim} - \otimes (- \otimes -)$ a natural isomorphism between functors from $\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}$ to \mathcal{C} , called the **associativity constraint** or the **associator**;
- $\mathbb{1}$ is a distinguished object in \mathcal{C} ;
- $\iota: \mathbb{1} \otimes \mathbb{1} \rightarrow \mathbb{1}$ an isomorphism, such that
- the associator a satisfies **the pentagonal identity** in the sense that

$$(\iota_W \otimes a_{X,Y,X}) a_{W,X \otimes Y,Z} (a_{W,X,Y} \otimes \iota_Z) = a_{W,X,Y \otimes Z} a_{W \otimes X,Y,Z}$$

for all objects $W, X, Y, Z \in \mathcal{C}$, i.e. diagram (2.1) is commutative.

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & ((W \otimes X) \otimes Y) \otimes Z & \\ & \swarrow a_{W,X,Y \otimes Z} \quad \searrow a_{W \otimes X,Y,Z} & \\ (W \otimes (X \otimes Y)) \otimes Z & & (W \otimes X) \otimes (Y \otimes Z) \\ & \swarrow a_{W,X \otimes Y,Z} \quad \searrow a_{W,X,Y \otimes Z} & \\ W \otimes ((X \otimes Y) \otimes Z) & \xrightarrow{\iota_W \otimes a_{X,Y,X}} & W \otimes (X \otimes (Y \otimes Z)) \end{array}$$

- the functors $L_{\mathbb{1}} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{1} \otimes X$ and $R_{\mathbb{1}} : X \rightarrow X \otimes \mathbb{1}$ (with the obvious way of defining how these functors map the morphisms) are auto-equivalence of \mathcal{C} , called **the left and right unit constraints** respectively.

The pair $(\mathbb{1}, \iota)$, or only $\mathbb{1}$ if ι is clear from context, shall be called the **unit object**, and ι the **unit isomorphism**.

Remark 2.3. *This is not the usual way of defining a monoidal category which also features the left and right constraints ($L_{\mathbb{1}}$ and $R_{\mathbb{1}}$ above), see e.g. [52, § VII.1]. It is shown in [27, Ch. 2] that the above slightly more neat formulation is nevertheless equivalent to the usual one.*

Remark 2.4. *If the associator a as well as ι in the above are both identities, then we say that the monoidal category \mathcal{C} is **strict**. There is a whole theory on monoidal categories. Here we only mentions that for our purposes in this paper, MacLane's coherence theorem and strictification theorem ([51], see also [27, Ch. 2] or [52, Ch. VII]) allows us to work as though the underlying monoidal categories are strict. We refer to the above references for the precise formulation of how these strictification and coherence results work.*

We shall also need a good formulation of the comultiplication map preserves multiplication in order to talk about bialgebras and Hopf algebras. For this, we need to recall the structure of a symmetric braiding.

Definition 2.5. Let $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, \mathbb{1}, a, \iota)$ (later abbreviated as \mathcal{C}) be a k -linear monoidal category. and denote the swapping functor $(X, Y) \mapsto (Y, X)$, $(f, g) \mapsto (g, f)$ on $\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}$ by S , and $\otimes^{\text{op}} : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ the composition $\otimes \circ S$. A **symmetric braiding** s on \mathcal{C} is an involutive natural isomorphism from \otimes to \otimes^{op} that is also a braiding. More precisely, this means that s consists a family of isomorphisms $(s_{X,Y})_{(X,Y) \in \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}} : X \otimes Y \rightarrow Y \otimes X$, natural in X and Y , such that

- (1) s is its own inverse, i.e. $s_{X,Y}$ and $s_{Y,X}$ are inverses to each other for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{C}$;
- (2) s satisfies the **hexagon axiom**, i.e. for all $X, Y, Z \in \mathcal{C}$, diagram (2.2) is commutative.

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} (X \otimes Y) \otimes Z & \xrightarrow{s_{X \otimes Y, Z}} & Z \otimes (X \otimes Y) \\ \downarrow a_{X, Y, Z} & & \downarrow a_{Z, X, Y}^{-1} \\ X \otimes (Y \otimes Z) & & (Z \otimes X) \otimes Y \\ \downarrow \iota_X \otimes s_{Y, Z} & & \downarrow s_{Z, X} \otimes \iota_Y \\ X \otimes (Z \otimes Y) & \xrightarrow{a_{X, Z, Y}^{-1}} & (X \otimes Z) \otimes Y \end{array}$$

Remark 2.6. *The braiding condition involves another axiom, which is automatic for symmetric braidings as formulated above, hence is omitted. There's also version of coherence theorem for symmetric monoidal category. Basically, this means the symmetric braiding does behave as "a swapping should behave", in the sense that every diagram (involving the morphisms in the defining structures of a symmetric monoidal category) that should commute does commute. For details of these remarks, we refer to [54, S IX.1]. In our concrete settings of locally convex spaces starting from § 2, one may also easily check the required commutativity of the diagrams.*

Remark 2.7. *Take $X = Y = Z = \mathbb{1}$ in (2.2) and assume \mathcal{C} is strict, we obtain*

$$(2.3) \quad s_{\mathbb{1}, \mathbb{1}} = \iota_{\mathbb{1}} \otimes s_{\mathbb{1}, \mathbb{1}} = (s_{\mathbb{1}, \mathbb{1}} \otimes \iota_{\mathbb{1}}) s_{\mathbb{1} \otimes \mathbb{1}, \mathbb{1}} = s_{\mathbb{1}, \mathbb{1}} s_{\mathbb{1}, \mathbb{1}} = \iota_{\mathbb{1}}.$$

Our proto-example of a (symmetric) monoidal category is the category Vect of all vector spaces over k , where the tensor functor \otimes is given by the usual tensor product, associators by the canonical identifications describing the associativity of such tensor products, k being the unit, and the unit law being the canonical identification again (and the symmetric braiding is the usual swap). Later, starting from § 2, we shall consider topological versions of Vect by working over the category $\widehat{\text{LCS}}$ of complete locally convex spaces over $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$ or \mathbb{C} , and the tensor product being various topological tensor products (§§ 1.141.151.16).

2.2 Compatible symmetric monoidal functors on the category of complete locally convex spaces

Intuitively, locally convex Hopf algebras should be the Hopf algebra in some (symmetric) monoidal category of locally convex spaces. Since we wish to work with complete topological tensor products in order to benefit from the larger range for the comultiplication, we restrict our attention to the category $\widehat{\text{LCS}}$ of complete locally convex spaces. The notation here is consistent with the common convention of denoting the (separated if E is non-Hausdorff) completion of a locally convex space E by \widehat{E} .

We now formalize the categorical structures with which we are going to work.

Definition 2.8. A covariant bifunctor $\overline{\otimes}_{\tau} : \widehat{\text{LCS}} \times \widehat{\text{LCS}} \rightarrow \widehat{\text{LCS}}$ is called a **compatible symmetric monoidal functor**, if it satisfies the following conditions:

- (1) for each pair (E, F) in $\widehat{\text{LCS}}$, denote $\overline{\otimes}_\tau(E, F)$ by $E\overline{\otimes}_\tau F$, there exists a separately continuous bilinear map $\chi : E \times F \rightarrow E\overline{\otimes}_\tau F$, called **the canonical map**, such that the image of χ is total in $E\overline{\otimes}_\tau F$, and $\chi : E \times F \rightarrow \text{Vect}\{\chi(E \times F)\}$ is a realization of the algebraic tensor product $E \odot F$ of the vector spaces E of F , and we shall often identify $E \odot F$ with $\text{Vect}\{\chi(E \times F)\}$ (together with χ to be precise) in this way;
- (2) the subspace topology on $E \odot F$ induced by $E\overline{\otimes}_\tau F$ is a compatible topology in the sense of Definition 1.80, and we use $E \otimes_\tau F$ to denote $E \odot F$ equipped with this topology;
- (3) for all $E \in \widehat{\text{LCS}}$, we have $E\overline{\otimes}_\tau \mathbb{K} = E = \mathbb{K}\overline{\otimes}_\tau E$;
- (4) for all $E, F \in \widehat{\text{LCS}}$, the swap $s_{E,F} : E \otimes_\tau F \rightarrow F \otimes_\tau E$ determined by $x \otimes y \mapsto y \otimes x$ and linearity, is continuous;
- (5) for all $E, F, G \in \widehat{\text{LCS}}$, the associator $a_{E,F,G} : (E \otimes_\tau F) \otimes_\tau G \rightarrow E \otimes_\tau (F \otimes_\tau G)$ determined by $(x \otimes y) \otimes z \mapsto x \otimes (y \otimes z)$ and linearity, is continuous.

Proposition 2.9. *Let $\overline{\otimes}_\tau$ be a compatible symmetric monoidal functor on $\widehat{\text{LCS}}$. Then*

- (1) *for all $E, F \in \widehat{\text{LCS}}$, the swap $s_{E,F}$ is an isomorphism of locally convex spaces, and extends uniquely by continuity to a morphism $\overline{s}_{E,F} : E\overline{\otimes}_\tau F \rightarrow F\overline{\otimes}_\tau E$ in $\widehat{\text{LCS}}$, which is also an isomorphism;*
- (2) *for all $E, F, G \in \widehat{\text{LCS}}$, the associator $a_{E,F,G}$ is an isomorphism of locally convex spaces, and extends uniquely by continuity to a morphism $\overline{a}_{E,F,G} : (E\overline{\otimes}_\tau F)\overline{\otimes}_\tau G \rightarrow E\overline{\otimes}_\tau (F\overline{\otimes}_\tau G)$ in $\widehat{\text{LCS}}$, which is also an isomorphism.*

Proof. (1) follows by noting that $s_{E,F}$ and $s_{F,E}$ are inverses to each other and Theorem 1.11. By the same theorem, $a_{E,F,G}$ extends uniquely by continuity to $\overline{a}_{E,F,G}$ for all $E, F, G \in \widehat{\text{LCS}}$. Now consider the composition in $\widehat{\text{LCS}}$,

$$b_{E,F,G} : \begin{array}{c} E\overline{\otimes}_\tau (F\overline{\otimes}_\tau G) \xrightarrow{\overline{s}_{E,F\overline{\otimes}_\tau G}} (F\overline{\otimes}_\tau G)\overline{\otimes}_\tau E \xrightarrow{\overline{s}_{F,G}\overline{\otimes}_\tau E} (G\overline{\otimes}_\tau F)\overline{\otimes}_\tau E \\ \searrow \overline{a}_{G,E\overline{\otimes}_\tau F} \quad \swarrow \overline{s}_{G,E\overline{\otimes}_\tau F} \\ G\overline{\otimes}_\tau (F\overline{\otimes}_\tau E) \xrightarrow{\overline{a}_{G,E\overline{\otimes}_\tau F}} G\overline{\otimes}_\tau (E\overline{\otimes}_\tau F) \xrightarrow{\overline{s}_{G,E\overline{\otimes}_\tau F}} (E\overline{\otimes}_\tau F)\overline{\otimes}_\tau G \end{array}$$

where the middle connecting “snake arrow” is $\overline{a}_{G,E\overline{\otimes}_\tau F}$. One checks immediately that the morphism $b_{E,F,G}$ and $\overline{a}_{E,F,G}$ in $\widehat{\text{LCS}}$ are inverses to each other, and $b_{E,F,G}$ restricts to the inverse of $a_{E,F,G}$, which establishes (2). \square

Proposition 2.10. *Equipped with a compatible monoidal tensor product $\overline{\otimes}_\tau$, $\overline{a} = (\overline{a}_{E,F,G})$ as the associator, $\overline{s} = (\overline{s}_{E,F})$ as the symmetry, \mathbb{K} as the unit object, and the identity maps as the unit isomorphism as well as left and right constraints, $\widehat{\text{LCS}}$ becomes a symmetric monoidal category.*

Proof. This is a routine check. Every axiom follows from the corresponding one for the symmetric monoidal category Vect , by extending by continuity according to Proposition 2.9. \square

Proposition 2.11. *The completed inductive tensor product $\overline{\otimes}_\iota$, the completed injective tensor product $\overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon$, and the completed projective tensor product $\overline{\otimes}_\pi$, are all compatible symmetric monoidal functors on $\widehat{\text{LCS}}$.*

Proof. This follows from Proposition 1.92, Proposition 1.100 and Proposition 1.109. \square

Notation 2.12. *To facilitate our discussion, we adopt the following convention on our notation. Given a compatible monoidal functor $\overline{\otimes}_\tau$ on $\widehat{\text{LCS}}$, we use $\widehat{\text{LCS}}_\tau$ to denote the symmetric monoidal category in Proposition 2.10. Whenever it is clear from the context, for any $E, F \in \widehat{\text{LCS}}_\tau$, the topology on $E\overline{\otimes}_\tau F$, as well as subspace topology on the canonical copy of the subspace $E \odot F$, shall be denoted by \mathfrak{T}_τ . We use $E \otimes_\tau F$ to denote the space $E \odot F$ equipped with the topology \mathfrak{T}_τ . This applies in particular to $\tau = \iota, \pi, \varepsilon$.*

Remark 2.13. *In the following, we will treat $\widehat{\text{LCS}}_\tau$ as though it is a strict monoidal category, which is valid by MacLane’s coherence and strictification theorem, see Remark 2.4.*

2.3 Locally convex coalgebras, algebras and bialgebras

Unless stated otherwise, the scalar field shall be either \mathbb{R} or \mathbb{C} , and we shall often use \mathbb{K} to denote this scalar field. From now on, we fix a compatible symmetric monoidal functor $\overline{\otimes}_\tau$ (on $\widehat{\text{LCS}}$ of course), and we work as though our symmetric monoidal categories $\widehat{\text{LCS}}_\tau$ is strict, cf. Remark 2.4.

Definition 2.14. An algebra in $\widehat{\text{LCS}}_\tau$, or a τ -algebra, is a triplet (A, m, η) , with $A \in \widehat{\text{LCS}}_\tau$, and $m : A \overline{\otimes}_\tau A \rightarrow A$ (called the **multiplication**), $\eta : \mathbb{K} \rightarrow A$ (called the **unit**), such that the diagram

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} A \overline{\otimes}_\tau A \overline{\otimes}_\tau A & \xrightarrow{m \overline{\otimes}_\tau \iota_A} & A \overline{\otimes}_\tau A \\ \downarrow \iota_A \overline{\otimes}_\tau m & & \downarrow m \\ A \overline{\otimes}_\tau A & \xrightarrow{m} & A \end{array}$$

commutes (called **associativity of m**), i.e. $m(m \overline{\otimes}_\tau \iota_A) = m(\iota_A \overline{\otimes}_\tau m)$; and η satisfies the **unit law**, meaning the diagram

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} A \overline{\otimes}_\tau \mathbb{K} = A & = \mathbb{K} \overline{\otimes}_\tau A & \xrightarrow{\eta \overline{\otimes}_\tau \iota_A} & A \overline{\otimes}_\tau A \\ \downarrow \iota_A \overline{\otimes}_\tau \eta & & & \downarrow m \\ A \overline{\otimes}_\tau A & \xrightarrow{m} & & A \end{array}$$

commutes, or equivalently, $m(\eta \overline{\otimes}_\tau \iota_A) = m(\iota_A \overline{\otimes}_\tau \eta)$.

Let (A, m_A, η_A) , (B, m_B, η_B) be algebras in $\widehat{\text{LCS}}_\tau$. We say a morphism $f : A \rightarrow B$ is a **morphism of (τ) -algebras** if it preserves multiplication in the sense that $m_B(f \overline{\otimes}_\tau f) = f m_A$, i.e. the diagram

$$(2.6) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} A \overline{\otimes}_\tau A & \xrightarrow{m_A} & A \\ \downarrow f \overline{\otimes}_\tau f & & \downarrow f \\ B \overline{\otimes}_\tau B & \xrightarrow{m_B} & B \end{array}$$

commutes; and f preserves the unit, i.e. $f \eta_A = \eta_B$, or equivalently the diagram

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{K} & \xrightarrow{\eta_A} & A \\ & \searrow \eta_B & \downarrow f \\ & & B \end{array}$$

commutes.

Notation 2.15. Given a τ -algebra (A, η, m) , following old traditions, we shall often write xy instead of $m(x \otimes y)$ for $x, y \in A$, and confuse the unit η of A with the image $\eta(1) \in A$, and we also denote $\eta(1)$ by 1 , or 1_A if we want to emphasize it is the multiplicative neutral element of A .

Coalgebras in $\widehat{\text{LCS}}_\tau$, as well as their morphisms, are defined by formally by reversing all the arrows in the diagrams (2.4), (2.5), (2.6) and (2.7).

Definition 2.16. A coalgebra in $\widehat{\text{LCS}}_\tau$, or a τ -coalgebra, is a triplet (C, Δ, ε) , where $C \in \widehat{\text{LCS}}_\tau$, $\Delta : C \rightarrow C \overline{\otimes}_\tau C$, called the **comultiplication**, and $\varepsilon : C \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$, called the **counit**, such that the comultiplication is **coassociative**, i.e. $(\Delta \overline{\otimes}_\tau \iota_C) \Delta = (\iota_C \overline{\otimes}_\tau \Delta) \Delta$, and ε satisfies the **counit law**, in the sense that $(\varepsilon \circ \iota_C) \Delta = \iota_C = (\iota_C \overline{\otimes}_\tau \varepsilon) \Delta$.

A morphism of τ -coalgebras from a τ -coalgebra $(C, \Delta_C, \varepsilon_C)$ to a τ -coalgebra $(D, \Delta_D, \varepsilon_D)$ is a morphism $f : C \rightarrow D$ that preserves both the comultiplication and the counit: $(f \overline{\otimes}_\tau f) \Delta_C = \Delta_D f$ and $\varepsilon_D f = \varepsilon_C$.

Remark 2.17. The unit (resp. counit) of a τ -algebra (resp. τ -coalgebra) is unique, once the multiplication (comultiplication) is fixed. Indeed, let η_1, η_2 are both unit for a τ -algebra A equipped with m as the multiplication. We have

$$\eta_1 = m(\iota_A \overline{\otimes}_\tau \eta_2) \eta_1 = m(\eta_1 \overline{\otimes}_\tau \eta_2) = m(\eta_1 \overline{\otimes}_\tau \iota_A) \eta_2 = \eta_2.$$

The uniqueness of a counit is proved dually.

In a symmetric monoidal category, by using the swap, one may consider the opposite (resp. coopposite) of algebras (resp. coalgebras), as well as forming their tensor products.

The proof of the following proposition is a routine check and is left to the reader.

Proposition 2.18. Consider the symmetric monoidal category $\widehat{\text{LCS}}_\tau$.

- (1) Suppose (A, m, η) (resp. (C, Δ, ε)) is an algebra (resp. a coalgebra) in $\widehat{\text{LCS}}_\tau$. Define $m^{\text{op}} = m_{S_{A,A}}$ (resp. $\Delta^{\text{cop}} = s_{C,C} \Delta$), then (A, m^{op}, η) (resp. $(C, \Delta^{\text{cop}}, \varepsilon)$) is an algebra (resp. a coalgebra) in $\widehat{\text{LCS}}_\tau$.
- (2) For $i = 1, 2$, let (A_i, m_i, η_i) (resp. $(C_i, \Delta_i, \varepsilon_i)$) be an algebra (resp. coalgebra) in $\widehat{\text{LCS}}_\tau$. Define the multiplication $m : (A_1 \overline{\otimes}_\tau A_2) \overline{\otimes}_\tau (A_1 \overline{\otimes}_\tau A_2) \rightarrow A_1 \overline{\otimes}_\tau A_2$ as $(m_1 \overline{\otimes}_\tau m_2)(\iota_{A_1} \overline{\otimes}_\tau s_{A_2, A_1} \overline{\otimes}_\tau \iota_{A_2})$, and the unit $\eta : \mathbb{K} \rightarrow A_1 \overline{\otimes}_\tau A_2$ as $\eta_{A_1} \overline{\otimes}_\tau \eta_{A_2}$ (we identified \mathbb{K} with $\mathbb{K} \overline{\otimes}_\tau \mathbb{K}$) (resp. the comultiplication $\Delta : C_1 \overline{\otimes}_\tau C_2 \rightarrow (C_1 \overline{\otimes}_\tau C_2) \overline{\otimes}_\tau (C_1 \overline{\otimes}_\tau C_2)$ as $(\iota_{C_1} \overline{\otimes}_\tau s_{C_1, C_2} \overline{\otimes}_\tau \iota_{C_2})(\Delta_1 \overline{\otimes}_\tau \Delta_2)$, and the counit $\varepsilon : C_1 \overline{\otimes}_\tau C_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ as $\varepsilon_1 \overline{\otimes}_\tau \varepsilon_2$), then $(A_1 \overline{\otimes}_\tau A_2, m, \eta)$ (resp. $(C_1 \overline{\otimes}_\tau C_2, \Delta, \varepsilon)$) is an algebra (resp. a coalgebra) in $\widehat{\text{LCS}}_\tau$.

Definition 2.19. Using the settings of Proposition 2.18, we call the algebra (A, m^{op}, η) (resp. (C, Δ, ε)) the **opposite** (resp. **coopposite**) of the τ -algebra (A, m, η) (resp. the τ -coalgebra (C, Δ, ε)), and we call the resulting algebra (resp. coalgebra) in Proposition 2.18 (2) the **(τ) -tensor product** of the τ -algebras (resp. τ -coalgebras).

Notation 2.20. *If there is no risk of confusion, following the old tradition of notation abuse, we will often omit the structure maps, and speak of a τ -algebra A (instead of (A, m, η)), τ -coalgebra C , the opposite algebra A^{op} , the coopposite coalgebra C^{cop} , the tensor product (algebra) $A_1 \overline{\otimes}_\tau A_2$, the tensor product coalgebra $C_1 \overline{\otimes}_\tau C_2$, etc.*

Note that in the following result, the unit object \mathbb{K} has a trivial algebra and coalgebra structure where all structure maps are identities (after the canonical identifications).

Proposition 2.21. *Let B be an object in $\widehat{\text{LCS}}_\tau$ that is equipped both with an algebra structure (m, η) and a coalgebra structure (Δ, ε) . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) $\Delta : B \rightarrow B \overline{\otimes}_\tau B$ is a morphism of algebras and ε preserves multiplication;
- (2) $m : B \overline{\otimes}_\tau B \rightarrow B$ is a morphism of coalgebras and η preserves comultiplication;
- (3) $\Delta m = (m \overline{\otimes}_\tau m)(\iota \overline{\otimes}_\tau s \overline{\otimes}_\tau \iota)(\Delta \overline{\otimes}_\tau \Delta)$, $\Delta \eta = \eta \overline{\otimes}_\tau \eta$ and $\varepsilon m = \varepsilon \overline{\otimes}_\tau \varepsilon$.

Proof. Unwinding the definitions, one checks immediately both (1) and (2) are equivalent to (3). \square

Definition 2.22. We say B as Proposition 2.21 is a **bialgebra** in $\widehat{\text{LCS}}_\tau$, or simply a **τ -bialgebra**, if it satisfies one of the equivalent conditions above. Morphisms between τ -bialgebras are the ones that preserves both the τ -algebra and the τ -coalgebra structures.

Proposition 2.23. *If B is a bialgebra in $\widehat{\text{LCS}}_\tau$, then so is B^{op} and B^{cop} . If B_1, B_2 are bialgebras in $\widehat{\text{LCS}}_\tau$, so is $B_1 \overline{\otimes}_\tau B_2$ equipped with the structures of tensor products of algebras and coalgebras.*

Proof. Again, this is a routine check just as in the theory for classical bialgebras and is left to the reader. \square

Naturally, we call B^{op} (resp. B^{cop}) the **opposite (coopposite)** bialgebra of B , and the bialgebras $B_1 \overline{\otimes}_\tau B_2$ the **(τ) -tensor product** of B_1 and B_2 .

2.4 The convolution algebra of continuous linear maps, locally convex Hopf algebras

Suppose C (resp. A) a τ -coalgebra (resp. τ -algebra), and consider the linear space $\mathcal{L}(C, B)$ of all continuous linear maps from the locally convex space C to B . For any $f, g \in \mathcal{L}(C, B)$, we may define their **convolution** $f * g$ as

$$(2.8) \quad f * g := m_B(f \overline{\otimes}_\tau g) \Delta_C \in \mathcal{L}(C, B).$$

Clearly, (2.8) is bilinear in f and g . The convolution is also **associative**. Indeed, let $f, g, h \in \mathcal{L}(C, B)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (f * g) * h &= m_B\left((m_B(f \overline{\otimes}_\tau g) \Delta_C) \overline{\otimes}_\tau h\right) \Delta_C = m_B(m_B \overline{\otimes}_\tau \iota_B)(f \overline{\otimes}_\tau g \overline{\otimes}_\tau h)(\Delta_C \overline{\otimes}_\tau \iota_C) \Delta_C \\ &= m_B(\iota_B \overline{\otimes}_\tau m_B)(f \overline{\otimes}_\tau g \overline{\otimes}_\tau h)(\iota_C \overline{\otimes}_\tau \Delta_C) \Delta_C = f * (g * h), \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality on the second line follows from the associativity of m_B and the coassociativity of Δ_C .

We also have a distinguished element, namely $\eta_B \varepsilon_C$, in $\mathcal{L}(C, B)$. It is the neutral element for the convolution product, since for each $f \in \mathcal{L}(C, B)$, we have

$$f * (\eta_B \varepsilon_C) = m_B(f \overline{\otimes}_\tau (\eta_B \varepsilon_C)) \Delta_C = m_B(\iota_B \overline{\otimes}_\tau \eta_B) f(\iota_C \overline{\otimes}_\tau \varepsilon_C) \Delta_C = f$$

where the last equality follows from the defining property of the unit and counit. Similarly, $(\eta_B \varepsilon_C) * f = f$.

Definition 2.24. We call the \mathbb{K} -algebra $\mathcal{L}(C, B)$ with convolution as the product, and $\eta_B \varepsilon_C$ as the multiplicative neutral element (this is a classical unital associative algebra, or an algebra in Vect), the **convolution algebra** of all continuous linear maps from the τ -coalgebra C to the τ -algebra B , and shall often denote it by the same symbol $\mathcal{L}(C, B)$.

Proposition 2.25. *Let Alg_τ (resp. Coalg_τ) denote the category of τ -algebras (resp. τ -coalgebras), and $\text{Alg}_{\mathbb{K}}$ the category of classical \mathbb{K} -algebras. The association $\text{Coalg}_\tau \times \text{Alg}_\tau \rightarrow \text{Alg}_{\mathbb{K}}, (C, B) \mapsto \mathcal{L}(C, B), (f, g) \mapsto f * g_* = g_* f^*$ ($(\cdot)^*$ denotes the pull-back, and $(\cdot)_*$ the push-forward) is a functor that is contravariant in the first variable and covariant in the second.*

Proof. This follows again from a routine check and is left to the reader. \square

Definition 2.26. We say that a τ -bialgebra H in \mathcal{C} is a **Hopf algebra in $\widehat{\text{LCS}}_\tau$** , or simply a **$\tau$ -Hopf algebra**, if $\iota_H \in \mathcal{L}(H, H)$ admits a multiplicative inverse in the convolution algebra $\mathcal{L}(H, H)$. We call this multiplicative inverse the **antipode** of the τ -Hopf algebra, and often denote it by S_H , or simply S . **Morphisms** between τ -Hopf algebras are the ones that are morphisms of the underlying τ -bialgebras.

As in the classical case, for morphisms of τ -Hopf algebras, the antipode takes care of itself, which is no surprise since it is uniquely determined by the τ -bialgebra structure.

Proposition 2.27. *Let H_1, H_2 be τ -Hopf algebras with antipodes S_1 and S_2 respectively. If $f : H_1 \rightarrow H_2$ is a morphism of τ -Hopf algebras, then $fS_1 = S_2f$.*

Proof. Proof again parallels the classical case (see, e.g. [76, p22, Proposition 1.3.17]). \square

Remark 2.28. *Unwinding the definition, we see that $S \in \mathcal{L}(H, H)$ is the antipode if and only if*

$$(2.9) \quad m(\iota_{\overline{\otimes}_\tau S})\Delta = m(S\overline{\otimes}_\tau \iota)\Delta = \iota.$$

Formally, this is the usual definition of an antipode. We use our equivalent Definition 2.26 to emphasize the fact the antipode is unique once it exists—it is already uniquely determined by the bialgebra structure.

In [80], van Daele gives a characterization for when a bialgebra admits an antipode. Here's a version for locally convex bialgebras.

Proposition 2.29. *Let $\overline{\otimes}_\tau$ be a compatible symmetric monoidal functor and H a τ -bialgebra. Then H is a τ -Hopf algebra if and only if the maps $T_1 := (\iota_H \overline{\otimes}_\tau m)(\Delta \overline{\otimes}_\tau \iota_H)$ and $T_2 := (m \overline{\otimes}_\tau \iota_H)(\iota_H \overline{\otimes}_\tau \Delta)$ are isomorphisms of locally convex spaces from $H \overline{\otimes}_\tau H$ onto itself.*

Proof. This basically boils down to an obvious adaptation of van Daele's work on the algebraic case [80]. More precisely, for necessity, let S be the antipode of H , following [80, Proposition 2.1], we define

$$R_1 := (\iota_H \overline{\otimes}_\tau m)(\iota_H \overline{\otimes}_\tau S \overline{\otimes}_\tau \iota)(\Delta \overline{\otimes}_\tau \iota_H)$$

and

$$R_2 := (m \overline{\otimes}_\tau \iota)(\iota_H \overline{\otimes}_\tau S \overline{\otimes}_\tau \iota_H)(\iota_H \overline{\otimes}_\tau \Delta).$$

For each $i = 1, 2$, it follows from a routine check that R_i is clearly a continuous linear map from the locally convex space $H \overline{\otimes}_\tau H$ to itself, and is the inverse of T_i , thus T_i is indeed an isomorphism.

For sufficiency, define $S : H \rightarrow H$ by $S(a) := (\varepsilon \overline{\otimes}_\tau \iota_H)T_1^{-1}(a \otimes 1)$. It follows from Proposition 1.82 that S is continuous. Now the verification of S being an antipode for the τ -bialgebra of H follows from (an even simpler due to the existence of the unit and counit) adaptation of [80, § 4] using routine continuity and density arguments. \square

Proposition 2.30. *Let H be a τ -Hopf algebra with antipode S . Then S , viewed as a map from the τ -bialgebra to the τ -bialgebra $H^{\text{op}, \text{cop}}$, is a morphism of τ -bialgebras.*

Proof. This follows again from a routine adaptation of the classical argument (see, e.g. [76, p18, Proposition 1.3.12]) using continuity and density. \square

Observe that in general, the antipode for a Hopf algebra need *not* be an isomorphism.

Remark 2.31. *As a counterexample, consider classical coalgebras and Hopf algebras etc. over \mathbb{k} . There is a construction called the **free Hopf algebra** $H(C)$ of a coalgebra C , given by Takeuchi [73, pp262–265]. Recall that a coalgebra is pointed if each of its simple subalgebra is one-dimensional, cf. e.g. [62, p100, Definition 3.4.4]. In our case where k is assumed to be algebraically closed, a result of Takeuchi [73, p569, Theorem 18] showed that the antipode of $H(C)$ is invertible if and only if the coalgebra C pointed. But the comatrix coalgebra $C_S(\mathbb{k})$ ([62, p26, Definition 2.1.16]) on a finite set S of more than two elements is clearly simple, hence not pointed. So the antipode of $H(C_S(\mathbb{k}))$ is not invertible. Moreover, note that as a vector space, $H(C_S(\mathbb{k}))$ is of countable dimension from its construction [73, p262]. In § 4.3, we will see how to fit all classical Hopf algebras into our framework of locally convex Hopf algebras, so these classical counterexamples also work in our setting.*

Definition 2.32. We say a τ -Hopf algebra is **regular**, if its antipode is an isomorphism of locally convex spaces.

Proposition 2.33. *Let H be a τ -Hopf algebra with antipode S , the following are equivalent:*

- (1) H is regular with T being the inverse of S ;
- (2) The bialgebra H^{op} admits antipode T (so is a τ -Hopf algebra);
- (3) The bialgebra H^{cop} admits antipode T (so is a τ -Hopf algebra).

Proof. The proof is a routine check and parallels that of [76, p21, Lemma 1.3.15]. \square

2.5 Involutive locally convex Hopf algebras

Throughout § 2.5, we suppose $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$, and introduce the notion the involutive locally convex Hopf algebras, or simply locally convex Hopf- $*$ algebras.

Definition 2.34. An **involution** $(\cdot)^* : A \rightarrow A$ on a τ -algebra A is an antilinear homeomorphism, such that $x^{**} = x$, $(yx)^* = x^* y^*$ for all $x, y \in A$. An **involutive τ -algebra**, or simply a **τ - $*$ -algebra**, is a τ -algebra equipped with an involution. An **involutive τ -bialgebra**, or simply **τ - $*$ -bialgebra**, B , is one such that the comultiplication preserves the involution, where the involution on $B \overline{\otimes}_\tau B$ is the unique continuous extension of the map $\sum_k x_k \otimes y_k \mapsto \sum_k x_k^* \otimes y_k^*$, which is an antilinear homeomorphism from $B \otimes_\tau B$ onto itself. A τ - $*$ -bialgebra that admits antipode is called an **involutive τ -Hopf algebra**, or simply a **τ -Hopf- $*$ algebra**.

Proposition 2.35. *Let H be a τ -Hopf- $*$ algebra. The following hold:*

- (1) *the counit ε is involutive, i.e. $\varepsilon(x^*) = \overline{\varepsilon(x)}$ for all $x \in H$;*
- (2) *The antipode S satisfies $S \circ (\cdot)^* \circ S \circ (\cdot)^* = \iota_H$. In particular, S is an isomorphism and H is regular.*

Proof. The proofs parallels the classical theory (see, e.g. [76, p27]). □

Among many of its usage, we mention in advance that locally convex Hopf- $*$ algebras will play a vital role when we describe how Pontryagin duality for second countable locally compact abelian groups can manifest in our theory.

2.6 Dualizability and reflexivity

Recall Definition 1.28 and Definition 1.72.

Definition 2.36. Let $\overline{\otimes}_\tau, \overline{\otimes}_\sigma$ be compatible symmetric monoidal functors and $E \in \widehat{\text{LCS}}$. We say E is

- **(τ, σ) -dualizable**, if the strong dual E'_b is complete, and if the canonical algebraic pairings

$$\langle E, E' \rangle, \langle E \circ E, E' \circ E' \rangle, \langle E \circ E \circ E, E' \circ E' \circ E' \rangle, \text{ and } \langle E \circ E \circ E \circ E, E' \circ E' \circ E' \circ E' \rangle$$

extends respectively to duality pairings

$$(2.10) \quad \begin{aligned} &\langle E, E'_b \rangle, \langle E \overline{\otimes}_\tau E, E'_b \overline{\otimes}_\sigma E'_b \rangle, \langle E \overline{\otimes}_\tau E \overline{\otimes}_\tau E, E'_b \overline{\otimes}_\sigma E'_b \overline{\otimes}_\sigma E'_b \rangle \\ &\text{and } \langle E \overline{\otimes}_\tau E \overline{\otimes}_\tau E \overline{\otimes}_\tau E, E'_b \overline{\otimes}_\sigma E'_b \overline{\otimes}_\sigma E'_b \overline{\otimes}_\sigma E'_b \rangle \end{aligned}$$

that are compatible respectively with $E, E \overline{\otimes}_\tau E, E \overline{\otimes}_\tau E \overline{\otimes}_\tau E$ and $E \overline{\otimes}_\tau E \overline{\otimes}_\tau E \overline{\otimes}_\tau E$;

- **(τ, σ) -reflexive**, if it is dualizable and the pairings in (2.10) are reflexive;
- **(τ, σ) -polar dualizable**, if the polar dual E'_c is complete, and if the canonical algebraic pairings

$$\langle E, E' \rangle, \langle E \circ E, E' \circ E' \rangle, \langle E \circ E \circ E, E' \circ E' \circ E' \rangle, \text{ and } \langle E \circ E \circ E \circ E, E' \circ E' \circ E' \circ E' \rangle$$

extends respectively to duality pairings

$$(2.11) \quad \begin{aligned} &\langle E, E'_c \rangle, \langle E \overline{\otimes}_\tau E, E'_c \overline{\otimes}_\sigma E'_c \rangle, \langle E \overline{\otimes}_\tau E \overline{\otimes}_\tau E, E'_c \overline{\otimes}_\sigma E'_c \overline{\otimes}_\sigma E'_c \rangle \\ &\text{and } \langle E \overline{\otimes}_\tau E \overline{\otimes}_\tau E \overline{\otimes}_\tau E, E'_c \overline{\otimes}_\sigma E'_c \overline{\otimes}_\sigma E'_c \overline{\otimes}_\sigma E'_c \rangle \end{aligned}$$

that are polar compatible respectively with $E, E \overline{\otimes}_\tau E, E \overline{\otimes}_\tau E \overline{\otimes}_\tau E$ and $E \overline{\otimes}_\tau E \overline{\otimes}_\tau E \overline{\otimes}_\tau E$;

- **(τ, σ) -polar reflexive**, if it is dualizable and the pairings in (2.11) are polar reflexive;

Proposition 2.37. *Let $\overline{\otimes}_\tau, \overline{\otimes}_\sigma$ be compatible symmetric monoidal functors and $H \in \widehat{\text{LCS}}$. Then the following holds:*

- (1) *If H is (τ, σ) -dualizable and H has a structure of τ -algebra (resp. coalgebra, bialgebra, Hopf algebra, regular Hopf algebra), then the strong dual H'_b has a structure of σ -coalgebra (resp. algebra, bialgebra, Hopf algebra, regular Hopf algebra) by taking transposes of the structure maps of H .*
- (2) *If $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$, H is (τ, σ) -dualizable, and admits a τ -Hopf- $*$ algebra structure, then H'_b has a σ -Hopf- $*$ algebra structure where the σ -Hopf algebra structure is as in (1), and the involution $\omega \in H'_b \mapsto \omega^* \in H'_b$ given by*

$$(2.12) \quad \omega^*(x) = \overline{\langle [S(x)]^*, \omega \rangle}, \quad x \in H,$$

where S is the antipode on H .

- (3) If H is (τ, σ) -polar dualizable and H has a structure of τ -algebra (resp. coalgebra, bialgebra, Hopf algebra, regular Hopf algebra), then the polar dual H'_C has a structure of σ -coalgebra (resp. algebra, bialgebra, Hopf algebra, regular Hopf algebra) by taking transposes of the structure maps of H .
- (4) If $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$, H is (τ, σ) -polar dualizable, and admits a τ -Hopf- $*$ algebra structure, then H'_C has a σ -Hopf- $*$ algebra structure where the σ -Hopf algebra structure is as in (3), and the involution $\omega \in H'_C \mapsto \omega^* \in H'_C$ given by

$$(2.13) \quad \omega^*(x) = \overline{\langle [S(x)]^*, \omega \rangle}, \quad x \in H,$$

where S is the antipode on H .

Proof. Note that since bounded sets (resp. precompact sets) are preserved under continuous linear maps, the transpose of continuous linear maps remains continuous as maps on the strong (resp. polar) duals. Note also that the involution on H also preserves bounded sets (resp. precompact sets). The rest of the proof is parallel to the case of classical (finite dimensional) Hopf algebras, which are well-known, and can be easily checked. We therefore leave it as a routine exercise, and merely point out that the (co)associativity of (co)multiplication involves three-fold tensor products, and the compatibility of the algebra and coalgebra structures (Proposition 2.21) involves four-fold tensor products. \square

Definition 2.38. We place ourselves in the settings of Proposition 2.37. We say that a τ -algebra (resp. coalgebra, bialgebra, Hopf algebra, Hopf- $*$ -algebra) H is (τ, σ) -**dualizable** (resp. **polar dualizable**), if H is so as a complete locally convex space. We define (τ, σ) -**reflexivity** (resp. **polar reflexivity**) similarly. In these cases, we say that H is **reflexive** (resp. **polar reflexive**), if H is (τ, σ) -**reflexive** (resp. **polar reflexive**) for some compatible symmetric monoidal functor $\overline{\otimes}_\sigma$.

In the dualizable (resp. polar dualizable) case, we call H'_b (resp. H'_C), equipped the corresponding obtained structure maps, the **strong dual** (resp. **polar dual**) of H , which is a σ -coalgebra (resp. algebra, bialgebra, Hopf algebra, Hopf- $*$ algebra) if H is a τ -algebra (resp. coalgebra, bialgebra, Hopf algebra, Hopf- $*$ algebra).

In all of the above, if H is nuclear and $\tau \in \{\varepsilon, \pi\}$, then for simplicity, we merely say σ -dualizable instead of (τ, σ) -dualizable, and similarly for σ -reflexive and the polar versions of dualizability and reflexivity.

Remark 2.39. As the duality theory of topological tensor product is quite subtle, we shall often specify which compatible symmetric monoidal functors are involved in studying notions defined above.

Here's a version of Pontryagin type duality for locally convex algebras (resp. coalgebras, bialgebras, Hopf algebras, regular Hopf algebras, Hopf- $*$ -algebras).

Proposition 2.40. Let $\overline{\otimes}_\tau, \overline{\otimes}_\sigma$ be compatible symmetric monoidal functors and H a τ -algebra (resp. coalgebras, bialgebras, Hopf algebras, regular Hopf algebras, Hopf- $*$ -algebras) that is (τ, σ) -reflexive (polar reflexive), then the second strong dual $(H'_b)'_b$ (resp. second polar dual $(H'_C)'_C$) remains so, and is isomorphic to H via the natural bijection.

Proof. This follows from an easy unwinding of Definition 2.38 and Proposition 2.37. \square

In the following, many general results have an analogue for the duality between locally convex algebras and coalgebras, as well between locally convex bialgebras. Since our main focus is on Hopf algebras, to avoid being too pedantic and for the sake of readability as well as clarity, we will leave the easy corresponding formulation and proofs for structures to our readers and only state and prove the ones involving locally convex Hopf algebras.

3 Duality of topological tensor products and locally convex Hopf algebras

Notation 3.1. We adopt the following notation to denote the following several classes of locally convex spaces: $(\mathcal{FM}) = (\mathcal{F}) \cap (\mathcal{M})$, $(\mathcal{DFM}) = (\mathcal{DF}) \cap (\mathcal{M})$, $(\mathcal{FN}) = (\mathcal{F}) \cap (\mathcal{N})$. The class of all reflexive (polar reflexive) spaces is denoted by (\mathcal{R}) (resp. (\mathcal{R}_p)). Recall that we use (\mathcal{F}'_c) to denote the class of all locally convex spaces that are isomorphic to the polar dual of some (F) -space.

3.1 The Buchwalter duality

As a first step out of framework outside Banach algebras such as C^* and W^* -algebras (see, e.g. [71, 72]), which are crucial in the theory of (locally) compact quantum groups (cf. [49, 50, 81, 82, 94, 97]), we now consider the question of (polar) reflexivity of locally convex Hopf algebras of class (\mathcal{F}) .

Buchwalter has established the following duality result which plays a fundamental role in our subsequent study.

Proposition 3.2 ([19, p56, Proposition 2.7]). *Let E, F be (F) -spaces. If at least one of E, F has the approximation property, then*

- (1) $(E\overline{\otimes}_\pi F)'_c = E'_c\overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon F'_c$ and $(E'_c\overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon F'_c)'_c = E\overline{\otimes}_\pi F$;
- (2) $(E\overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon F)'_c = E'_c\overline{\otimes}_\pi F'_c$ and $(E'_c\overline{\otimes}_\pi F'_c)'_c = E\overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon F$.

Before presenting our first result on the (polar) reflexivity of locally convex Hopf algebras, we also need the following preparation.

Proposition 3.3. *The following hold.*

- (1) *All locally convex spaces in $(\mathcal{F}) \cap (\mathcal{AP})$ and $(\mathcal{F}'_c) \cap (\mathcal{AP})$ are complete; and viewing $(\mathcal{F}) \cap (\mathcal{AP})$ and $(\mathcal{F}'_c) \cap (\mathcal{AP})$ as full subcategory of $\overline{\text{LCS}}$, taking polars duals and transposes establishes an anti-equivalence of categories between $(\mathcal{F}) \cap (\mathcal{AP})$ and $(\mathcal{F}'_c) \cap (\mathcal{AP})$.*
- (2) *The class $(\mathcal{F}) \cap (\mathcal{AP})$ is stable under taking completed injective tensor product, and the class $(\mathcal{F}'_c) \cap (\mathcal{AP})$ stable under taking completed projective tensor product.*
- (3) *All locally convex spaces in $(\mathcal{FM}) \cap (\mathcal{AP})$ and $(\mathcal{DFM}) \cap (\mathcal{AP})$ are complete, and taking polars duals establishes a bijection between $(\mathcal{FM}) \cap (\mathcal{AP})$ and $(\mathcal{DFM}) \cap (\mathcal{AP})$.*
- (4) *The class $(\mathcal{FM}) \cap (\mathcal{AP})$ is stable under taking completed injective tensor product, and the class $(\mathcal{DFM}) \cap (\mathcal{AP})$ is stable under taking completed projective tensor products.*

Proof. Being metrizable, an (F) -space is barrelled and bornological (Proposition 1.62), hence Mackey (Proposition 1.64). Now (1) follows from Proposition 1.66, Proposition 1.74, Proposition 1.128. (2), the (F) -space case follows from Proposition 1.129 and Corollary 1.99, and the case for (\mathcal{F}'_c) follows from Buchwalter's duality (Proposition 3.2). Note that the strong dual and the polar dual of a Montel space coincide (Proposition 1.133), then (3) follows from (1) and (4) from (2). \square

Remark 3.4. *It seems, however, unclear that whether $E\overline{\otimes}_\pi F$ remains a (FM) -space, if both E and F are, cf. [48, p304, (7)]*

Now recall Definition 2.36.

Corollary 3.5. *The following holds.*

- (1) *Every space in $(\mathcal{F}) \cap (\mathcal{AP})$ (resp. in $(\mathcal{F}'_c) \cap (\mathcal{AP})$) is both (ε, π) -polar reflexive and (π, ε) -polar reflexive.*
- (2) *Every space in $(\mathcal{FM}) \cap (\mathcal{AP})$ (resp. $(\mathcal{DFM}) \cap (\mathcal{AP})$) is (ε, π) -reflexive (resp. (π, ε) -reflexive).*

Proof. Even though we do not know whether (\mathcal{FM}) (nor for (\mathcal{AP})) is stable under taking the completed projective tensor products. Nevertheless, (\mathcal{F}) is still stable under $\overline{\otimes}_\pi$ (Corollary 1.106). Note that Buchwalter's duality (Proposition 3.2) holds as soon as merely one factor has the approximation property, the corollary now follows from Proposition 3.3 and repeated use of the Buchwalter duality (for three-fold completed projective or injective tensor products). \square

We now easily obtain our first criterion on polar reflexivity and reflexivity of locally convex Hopf algebras.

Theorem 3.6. *The following hold.*

- (1) *If H is an ε -Hopf algebra (resp. π -Hopf algebra) of class $(\mathcal{F}) \cap (\mathcal{AP})$, then H is (ε, π) -polar reflexive (resp. (π, ε) -reflexive), and the polar dual H'_c is of class (\mathcal{F}'_c) .*
- (2) *If H is an ε -Hopf algebra (resp. π -Hopf algebra) of class $(\mathcal{F}'_c) \cap (\mathcal{AP})$, then H is (ε, π) -polar reflexive (resp. (π, ε) -reflexive), and the polar dual H'_c is of class (\mathcal{F}) .*
- (3) *If H is an ε -Hopf algebra of class $(\mathcal{FM}) \cap (\mathcal{AP})$, then H is (ε, π) -reflexive, and the strong dual H'_b is of class $(\mathcal{DFM}) \cap (\mathcal{AP})$.*
- (4) *If H is an π -Hopf algebra of class $(\mathcal{DFM}) \cap (\mathcal{AP})$, then H is (π, ε) -reflexive, and the strong dual H'_b is of class $(\mathcal{FM}) \cap (\mathcal{AP})$.*

All of the above still holds if $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$, and we replace the corresponding locally convex Hopf algebras by locally convex Hopf- $$ -algebras.*

Proof. This follows from Corollary 3.5 and Proposition 2.37. \square

Remark 3.7. Note that due to Remark 3.4, we don't know yet that whether a π -Hopf algebra of class $(\mathcal{FM}) \cap (\mathcal{AP})$ is (π, ε) -reflexive, since we don't now whether the locally convex space $H \overline{\otimes}_\pi H \in (\mathcal{M})$ to continue the use of the Buchwalter's duality for the three-fold tensor products of H with itself (the strong dual and the polar dual for $H \overline{\otimes}_\pi H$ might now be different).

Remark 3.8. In [9, p126, Definition 1.2], the term “well-behaved topological Hopf algebra” is used to refer to what we call ε -Hopf algebra (or equivalent, π -Hopf algebra) of class $(\mathcal{FM}) \cap (\mathcal{N})$ or of class $(\mathcal{DFM}) \cap (\mathcal{N})$ (note Proposition 1.119 and Proposition 1.136). Our Theorem 3.6 extends the main duality result for well-behaved topological Hopf algebras [9, p129, Proposition 1.3]. Thus all the examples of well-behaved topological Hopf algebras described in [9] are examples of our theory. Of course, many more examples of our theory (that fit in Theorem 3.6 or go beyond) shall be given later.

3.2 The polar duality between products and locally convex direct sums

As a preparation for § 3.3, we establish the following duality results.

Proposition 3.9. Let $(E_i)_{i \in I}$ be a family of polar reflexive spaces. Then the canonical pairing

$$(3.1) \quad \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : \left(\prod_i E_i \right) \times \left(\bigoplus_{i \in I} (E_i)'_c \right) \rightarrow \mathbb{K} \\ \left((x_i)_{i \in I}, (l_i)_{i \in I} \right) \mapsto \sum_i l_i(x_i)$$

is polar reflexive. More precisely, $\prod_i E_i$ and $\bigoplus_i (E_i)'_c$ are polar reflexive and they are the polar dual of each other.

Proof. Apply Proposition 1.53 to the weak topologies and note that the topology of precompact convergence lies between the weak and the Mackey topologies, we see that the pairing (3.1) is compatible.

It is clear from the definition of product (uniform) spaces that a set $A \subseteq \prod_i E_i$ is precompact if and only if $p_i(A) \in \mathcal{C}(E_i)$ for each $i \in I$ (recall Notation 1.24). By Proposition 1.25, we see that A is precompact if and only if there exists an absolutely convex $C_i \in \mathcal{C}(E_i)$ for each $i \in I$, such that $A \subseteq \prod_i C_i$. Hence absolutely convex sets of the form $(\prod_i C_i)^\circ$, $\Gamma(C_i) = C_i \in \mathcal{C}(E_i)$ for each i , form a fundamental system of neighborhoods of 0 for the polar dual of $\prod_i E_i$, which we identify with $\bigoplus_i (E_i)'_c$, and the polar is calculated with respect to the canonical pairing $\langle \prod_i E_i, \bigoplus_i (E_i)'_c \rangle$.

We claim that

$$(3.2) \quad \left(\prod_i C_i \right)^\circ = \overline{\Gamma(\bigcup_i C_i^\circ)}^{\sigma(\bigoplus_i (E_i)'_c, \prod_i E_i)},$$

where the polar C_i° is taken with respect to the canonical pairing $\langle E_i, (E_i)'_c \rangle$, then seen as in $\bigoplus_i (E_i)'_c$. Indeed, it is clear that $(\prod_i C_i)^\circ$ contains $\Gamma(\bigcup_i C_i^\circ)$. For the reverse inclusion, let $(l_i) \in \bigoplus_i (E_i)'_c$ lie in $(\prod_i C_i)^\circ$. Note that all but finitely many $l_i \in (E_i)'_c$ is zero. Define $\lambda_i = \sup\{|l_i(x_i)| \mid x_i \in C_i\}$ and $I_0 = \{i \in I \mid \lambda_i > 0\}$, which is finite since $l_i = 0$ clearly implies $\lambda_i = 0$. Let $\omega_i = \lambda_i^{-1} l_i$ for $i \in I_0$. By definition, $\omega_i \in C_i^\circ$ for each $i \in I_0$. Since $(l_i) \in (\prod_{i \in I} C_i)^\circ$, we have

$$(3.3) \quad \forall (x_i) \in \prod_i C_i, \quad \left| \sum_i l_i(x_i) \right| = \left| \sum_{i \in I_0} \lambda_i \omega_i(x_i) \right| \leq 1.$$

As each C_i is absolutely convex, for each $i \in I_0$, we may choose $x_i \in C_i$ so that $l_i(x_i)$ is arbitrarily close to λ_i , i.e. $\omega_i(x_i)$ arbitrarily close to 1, in (3.3), and obtain

$$(3.4) \quad \sum_{i \in I_0} \lambda_i \leq 1.$$

Moreover, by definition we have

$$(3.5) \quad \sum_{i \in I_0} l_i = \sum_{i \in I_0} \lambda_i \omega_i.$$

Now let $I_1 = \{i \in I \mid i \notin I_0, \text{ and } l_i \neq 0\}$. By the definition of I_0 , we know that $l_i(C_i) = 0$ for each $i \in I_1$, and $(l_i) = \sum_i l_i$ is supported in the disjoint union $I_0 \cup I_1$, which is finite. For each $i \in I_1$, the condition $l_i(C_i) = 0$

implies that $tl_i \in C_i^\circ$ for any $t > 0$. Thus for each $t > 0$, define $l_t = \sum_{i \in I_1} t^{-1} l_i$, it is trivial that $l_t \in \Gamma(\cup_{i \in I} C_i^\circ)$ and combined with (3.5), we have

$$(3.6) \quad (l_i) = l_1 + \sum_{i \in I_0} \lambda_i \omega_i.$$

Now for each $\varepsilon > 0$, by (3.6), we have

$$(3.7) \quad (1 + \varepsilon)^{-1} (l_i) = (1 + \varepsilon)^{-1} l_1 + \sum_{i \in I_0} (1 + \varepsilon)^{-1} \lambda_i \omega_i = \varepsilon (1 + \varepsilon)^{-1} l_\varepsilon + \sum_{i \in I_0} (1 + \varepsilon)^{-1} \lambda_i \omega_i.$$

Now that $l_\varepsilon \in \Gamma(\cup_i C_i^\circ)$ and for each $i \in I_0$, $\omega_i \in C_i^\circ \subseteq \Gamma(\cup_i C_i^\circ)$, and note (3.4), equation (3.7) writes $(1 + \varepsilon)^{-1} (l_i)$ as an absolutely convex combination of elements in the absolutely convex hull $\Gamma(\cup_i C_i^\circ)$, which is of course absolutely convex itself. Hence $(1 + \varepsilon)^{-1} (l_i) \in \Gamma(\cup_i C_i^\circ)$ for each $\varepsilon > 0$, and letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we obtain (3.2).

Since each E_i is polar reflexive, as C_i runs through absolutely convex sets in $\mathfrak{C}(E_i)$, C_i° runs through a fundamental system of neighborhoods of 0 in E_i . By Proposition 1.46, polars of the form in (3.2) lies in $\mathcal{N}_\Gamma^{\oplus_i (E_i)'_c}(0)$, hence $c(\oplus_i E'_i, \prod_{i \in I} E_i)$ is coarser than the locally convex direct sum topology $\oplus_i (E_i)'_c$. Conversely, let V be a *closed* absolutely convex neighborhood of 0 in $\oplus_i (E_i)'_c$. Since the polar dual is finer than the weak dual, V is also weakly closed. On the other hand, by the above discussion and Proposition 1.46 again, V being a neighborhood of 0 means that it contains a set of the form $\Gamma(\cup_{i \in I} C_i^\circ)$, where, without loss of generality, we may assume that $C_i \in \mathfrak{C}(E_i)$ is absolutely convex (E_i is polar reflexive). Since V is weakly closed, we have

$$(3.8) \quad \overline{V}^{\sigma(\oplus_i E'_i, \prod_i E_i)} \supseteq \Gamma(\cup_i C_i^\circ) = \left(\prod_i C_i \right)^\circ.$$

As closed absolutely convex neighborhoods of 0 form a fundamental system of neighborhoods 0 in any locally convex space, (3.8) entails that the polar topology $c(\oplus_i E'_i, \prod_i E_i)$ is also finer than the locally convex direct sum topology $\oplus_i (E_i)'_c$. Hence

$$(3.9) \quad \left(\prod_i E_i \right)'_c = \bigoplus_i (E_i)'_c,$$

as desired.

We now determine the polar dual of $\oplus_i (E_i)'_c$, i.e. the polar topology $c(\prod_i E_i, \oplus_i (E_i)'_c)$. Note that precompact sets are preserved under continuous linear maps and all precompact sets are bounded, it follows from Proposition 1.52 that a set in $\oplus_{i \in I} (E_i)'_c$ is precompact if and only if it is contained in a sum of the form $\sum_{i \in I_0} B_i$, where $I_0 \subseteq I$ is finite, and $B_i \in \mathfrak{C}((E_i)'_c)$. Hence, a fundamental system of neighborhoods of 0 for $c(\prod_i E_i, \oplus_i (E_i)'_c)$ is given by polars of the form $(\sum_{i \in I_0} B_i)^\circ$ as above. Fix arbitrarily such a polar, define $U_i = B_i^\circ$ for each $i \in I_0$, and let $U_i = E_i$ if $i \notin I_0$, then a simple calculation yields

$$(3.10) \quad \frac{1}{|I_0|} \prod_i U_i \subseteq \left(\sum_{i \in I_0} B_i \right)^\circ \subseteq \prod_i U_i.$$

Note that as B_i runs through $\mathfrak{C}((E_i)'_c)$, since E_i is polar reflexive, B_i° runs through a fundamental neighborhoods of 0 in E_i . Now (3.10) implies that $c(\prod_i E_i, \oplus_i (E_i)'_c)$ is both coarser and finer than the product topology on $\prod_i E_i$, hence is identical with it. This finishes our proof. \square

3.3 Direct products and polar reflexivity of locally convex Hopf algebras

Recall Definition 2.36. We now establish the following (partial) permanence result.

Proposition 3.10. *Let $(E_i)_{i \in I}$ be a family of (ε, π) -polar reflexive spaces. Suppose that*

- (1) *for all $i, j \in I$, the canonical map*

$$(3.11) \quad \chi_{i,j} : (E_i)'_c \times (E_j)'_c \rightarrow (E_i)'_c \otimes_\tau (E_j)'_c$$

is continuous;

(2) for all $i, j, k \in I$, the canonical map

$$(3.12) \quad \chi_{(i,j),k} : ((E_i)'_c \overline{\otimes}_\pi (E_j)'_c) \times (E_k)'_c \rightarrow ((E_i)'_c \overline{\otimes}_\pi (E_j)'_c) \otimes_t (E_k)'_c$$

is continuous;

(3) for all $i, j, k, l \in I$, the canonical map

$$(3.13) \quad \chi_{(i,j,k),l} : \left(((E_i)'_c \overline{\otimes}_\pi (E_j)'_c) \otimes_t (E_k)'_c \right) \times (E_l)'_c \rightarrow \left(((E_i)'_c \overline{\otimes}_\pi (E_j)'_c) \otimes_t (E_k)'_c \right) \overline{\otimes}_\pi (E_l)'_c$$

is continuous;

Then the product $E = \prod_i E_i$ is (ε, t) -polar reflexive, with $E'_c = \bigoplus_i (E_i)'_c$.

Proof. By Proposition 1.114, the interchanges of $\overline{\otimes}_\pi$ and $\overline{\otimes}_t$ in the following calculation is valid.

First of all, note that both $\prod_i E_i$ and $\bigoplus_i (E_i)'_c$ are complete (Proposition 1.9 and Proposition 1.51). Note also that $\overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon$ commutes with direct products (Proposition 1.102), while $\overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon$ commutes with locally convex direct sums (Corollary 1.91).

By Proposition 3.9, we know that the duality pairing

$$\left\langle \prod_i E_i, \bigoplus_i (E_i)'_c \right\rangle$$

is polar reflexive

For two-fold tensor products, by hypothesis, applying Proposition 3.9, we have

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{aligned} (E \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon E)'_c &= \left(\prod_{i,j} E_i \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon E_j \right)'_c = \bigoplus_{i,j} (E_i \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon E_j)'_c = \bigoplus_{i,j} (E_i)'_c \overline{\otimes}_\pi (E_j)'_c \\ &= \bigoplus_{i,j} (E_i)'_c \overline{\otimes}_t (E_j)'_c = \left(\bigoplus_i (E_i)'_c \right) \overline{\otimes}_t \left(\bigoplus_i (E_i)'_c \right). \end{aligned}$$

Conversely, applying Proposition 3.9 again, we have

$$(3.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \left(\left(\bigoplus_i (E_i)'_c \right) \overline{\otimes}_t \left(\bigoplus_i (E_i)'_c \right) \right)'_c &= \left(\bigoplus_{i,j} (E_i)'_c \overline{\otimes}_t (E_j)'_c \right)'_c = \prod_{i,j} \left((E_i)'_c \overline{\otimes}_t (E_j)'_c \right)'_c \\ &= \prod_{i,j} \left((E_i)'_c \overline{\otimes}_\pi (E_j)'_c \right)'_c = \prod_{i,j} E_i \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon E_j = \left(\prod_i E_i \right) \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon \left(\prod_i E_i \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the pairing

$$\left\langle \left(\prod_i E_i \right) \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon \left(\prod_i E_i \right), \left(\bigoplus_i (E_i)'_c \right) \overline{\otimes}_t \left(\bigoplus_i (E_i)'_c \right) \right\rangle$$

is also polar reflexive.

We also have the corresponding polar reflexive pairings for three-fold and four-fold tensor products, following a similar calculation as in (3.14) and (3.15), which finishes the proof. \square

In the case of (F) -spaces, conditions in Proposition 3.10 can be greatly weakened, as a consequence of Hollstein [42, p241, Satz 2.1], see also [48, p302, (3)]. We won't dive into detailing the notion of σ -locally topological, but merely point out that all spaces in (\mathcal{F}'_c) are σ -locally topological [48, p302, paragraph above (4)]. Then it is trivial from [48, p302, (3)] that we have the following, which we track for future reference.

Proposition 3.11. *Let $E, F \in (\mathcal{F}'_c)$ and G a locally convex space. If $f : E \times F \rightarrow G$ is a bilinear map that is hypocontinuous, then f is already continuous.*

Remark 3.12. *Now it is clear that by Proposition 3.11 and Proposition 1.79 that conditions in Proposition 3.10 are satisfied if the relevant polar duals are all barrelled. But it is easy to see that for an (F) -space E , E'_c is barrelled if and only if E is Montel. This motivates us to consider the situation in § 3.4.*

3.4 Products of (FM) -spaces with the approximation property

Proposition 3.13. *Let $(E_i)_{i \in I}$ be a family of spaces in $(\mathcal{F}\mathcal{M}) \cap (\mathcal{A}\mathcal{P})$, and $E = \prod_i E_i$. Then E is (ε, ι) -reflexive, and $E'_b = \bigoplus_i (E_i)'_b$. Dually, if $(F_j)_{j \in J}$ is a family of spaces in $(\mathcal{D}\mathcal{F}\mathcal{M}) \cap (\mathcal{A}\mathcal{P})$, and $F = \bigoplus_j F_j$ is the locally convex direct sum. Then F is (ι, ε) -reflexive, and $F'_b = \prod_j (F_j)'_b$.*

Proof. We prove only the first statement, as the second follows by duality.

Note again that the polar dual coincides with the strong for Montel spaces (Proposition 1.133). Each $(E_i)'_b = (E_i)'_c$ is therefore in $(\mathcal{D}\mathcal{F}\mathcal{M}) \cap (\mathcal{A}\mathcal{P})$ (Proposition 3.3). By Proposition 1.115 (and Proposition 1.114), we know that the family (E_i) satisfies condition (1) in Proposition 3.10. Since $(\mathcal{D}\mathcal{F}\mathcal{M}) \cap (\mathcal{A}\mathcal{P})$ is stable under taking completed projective tensor products (Proposition 3.3), condition (2) in Proposition 3.10 is also satisfied. We may now conclude with Proposition 3.10 by noting that the class (\mathcal{M}) is stable under taking arbitrary product and locally convex direct sums (Proposition 1.134). \square

Corollary 3.14. *Let $(E_i)_{i \in I}$ be a family of spaces in $(\mathcal{F}\mathcal{N})$, and $E = \prod_i E_i$. Then E is (ε, ι) -reflexive, and $E'_b = \bigoplus_i (E_i)'_b$. Dually, if $(F_j)_{j \in J}$ is a family of spaces in $(\mathcal{D}\mathcal{F}\mathcal{N})$, and $F = \bigoplus_j F_j$, then F is (ι, ε) -reflexive and $F'_b = \prod_j (F_j)'_b$.*

Proof. This is clear from Proposition 3.13 by noting that $(\mathcal{F}\mathcal{N}) \subseteq (\mathcal{F}\mathcal{M}) \cap (\mathcal{A}\mathcal{P})$ (Proposition 1.127 and Proposition 1.136), and also $(\mathcal{D}\mathcal{F}\mathcal{N}) \subseteq (\mathcal{D}\mathcal{F}\mathcal{M}) \cap (\mathcal{A}\mathcal{P})$ by duality (Proposition 1.119). \square

Theorem 3.15. *Let H be an ε -Hopf algebra (resp. ι -Hopf algebra). If as a locally convex space, H is isomorphic to a product of spaces in $(\mathcal{F}\mathcal{M}) \cap (\mathcal{A}\mathcal{P})$ (resp. a locally convex direct sum of spaces in $(\mathcal{D}\mathcal{F}\mathcal{M}) \cap (\mathcal{A}\mathcal{P})$), then as an ε -Hopf algebra (resp. a π -Hopf algebra), it is (ε, ι) -reflexive (resp. (ι, ε) -reflexive). In particular, this applies when the locally convex space H is isomorphic to a product of spaces in $(\mathcal{F}\mathcal{N})$ (resp. a locally convex direct sum of spaces in $(\mathcal{D}\mathcal{F}\mathcal{N})$).*

Proof. This follows from Proposition 2.37, combined with Proposition 3.13 and Corollary 3.14. \square

4 Some basic examples of locally convex Hopf algebras

We now describe some basic examples of locally convex Hopf algebras. To start, as noted in Remark 3.8, all well-behaved topological Hopf algebras as studied in [9] are (σ, τ) -reflexive Hopf algebras, where $\sigma, \tau \in \{\varepsilon, \pi\}$. We are now interested in examples that could go beyond their settings. More sophisticated examples that require further work shall be described later.

4.1 Discrete groups and $\ell^1(\Gamma)$ as a π -Hopf algebra

We start by providing a class of examples that are (π, ε) -polar reflexive, but not reflexive.

Let Γ be a discrete group. Consider $H = \ell^1(\Gamma)$ as a Banach space. Consider the normed space $\ell^1(\Gamma) \otimes_\pi \ell^1(\Gamma)$, where the norm $\|\cdot\|_\pi$ is determined as in Remark 1.108. We may embed $\ell^1(\Gamma) \otimes \ell^1(\Gamma)$ as a subspace of $\ell^1(\Gamma \times \Gamma)$, as follows. Let t be a tensor in $\ell^1(\Gamma) \otimes \ell^1(\Gamma)$, which can be written as

$$(4.1) \quad t = \sum_{k=1}^n \left(\sum_{s \in \Gamma} a_{k,s} \delta_s \right) \otimes \left(\sum_{t \in \Gamma} b_{k,t} \delta_t \right) = \sum_{s,t \in \Gamma} \left(\sum_{k=1}^n a_{k,s} b_{k,t} \right) \delta_s \otimes \delta_t.$$

Clearly, identifying $\delta_s \otimes \delta_t$ with $\delta_{(s,t)}$, we may identify t with $\sum_{s,t \in \Gamma} \left(\sum_{k=1}^n a_{k,s} b_{k,t} \right) \delta_{(s,t)}$. This does not depend on how one writes t in (4.1), since the coefficient of $\delta_{(s,t)}$ is given by

$$\sum_{k=1}^n a_{k,s} b_{k,t} = (\varepsilon_s \otimes e_t)(t),$$

where $\varepsilon_s \in \ell^1(\Gamma)'$ and $e_t \in \ell^1(\Gamma)'$ denote the evaluation at $s \in \Gamma$ and at $t \in \Gamma$ respectively. From this, it follows easily that $\ell^1(\Gamma) \otimes_\pi \ell^1(\Gamma)$ identifies isometrically with a dense subspace of $\ell^1(\Gamma \times \Gamma)$, and we may thus write $\ell^1(\Gamma) \overline{\otimes}_\pi \ell^1(\Gamma) = \ell^1(\Gamma \times \Gamma)$. More generally, a similar argument shows that $\ell^1(S) \overline{\otimes}_\pi \ell^1(T) = \ell^1(S \times T)$ for any sets S and T .

We now define the unit $\eta: \mathbb{K} \rightarrow \ell^1(\Gamma)$ by $1 \mapsto \delta_e$, where $e \in \Gamma$ is the neutral element of Γ ; and the counit $\varepsilon: \ell^1(\Gamma) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ as ε_e . Furthermore, define the multiplication

$$m: \ell^1(\Gamma) \overline{\otimes}_\pi \ell^1(\Gamma) = \ell^1(\Gamma \times \Gamma) \rightarrow \ell^1(\Gamma)$$

$$\sum_{(s,t) \in \Gamma \times \Gamma} \lambda_{s,t} \delta_{(s,t)} \mapsto \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \left(\sum_{s \in \Gamma} \lambda_{s, s^{-1}\gamma} \right) \delta_\gamma,$$

the comultiplication

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta: \ell^1(\Gamma) &\rightarrow \ell^1(\Gamma \times \Gamma) = \ell^1(\Gamma) \overline{\otimes}_\pi \ell^1(\Gamma) \\ \sum_{s \in \Gamma} \lambda_s \delta_s &\mapsto \sum_{s \in \Gamma} \lambda_s \delta_{(s,s)},\end{aligned}$$

and the antipode

$$\begin{aligned}S: \ell^1(\Gamma) &\rightarrow \ell^1(\Gamma) \\ \sum_{s \in \Gamma} \lambda_s \delta_s &\mapsto \sum_{s \in \Gamma} \lambda_{s^{-1}} \delta_s.\end{aligned}$$

It is readily checked that each of $\eta, \varepsilon, m, \Delta$ and S is a contractive linear map, in particular, continuous, and restricts to the corresponding structure maps on the Hopf algebra $\mathbb{K}[G]$, which is a dense subspace of $\ell^1(\Gamma)$. Hence by continuity and density, $H = (\ell^1(\Gamma), \eta, \varepsilon, m, \Delta, S)$ is a π -Hopf algebra.

Since $\ell^1(\Gamma)$ is a Banach space (in particular, an (F) -space), and has the approximation property (Proposition 1.126), Theorem 3.6 applies, and we see that H is (π, ε) -polar reflexive. However, when Γ is an infinite group, it is well-known that $\ell^1(\Gamma)$ is not reflexive as a locally convex space, hence H is not (ε, τ) -reflexive for any choice of compatible symmetric monoidal functor $\overline{\otimes}_\tau$.

Thus the polar dual $\ell^1(\Gamma)'_c$ has an ε -Hopf algebra structure by duality. Note that as a vector space, we do have $\ell^1(\Gamma)'_c = \ell^\infty(\Gamma)$, however, the topology on $\ell^1(\Gamma)'_c$ is no longer normable once Γ is infinite. It is interesting to note that the vector $\ell^\infty(\Gamma)$, when equipped with the $c(\ell^\infty(\Gamma), \ell^1(\Gamma))$ topology, carries an ε -Hopf algebra structure, which we denote of course by H'_c as in Definition 2.38.

One checks also easily that

$$\{\delta_s \mid s \in \Gamma\} = \{x \in H \mid \Delta(x) = x \otimes x, x \neq 0\},$$

and $m(\delta_s \otimes \delta_t) = \delta_{st}$, thus one may recover the discrete group Γ from H , as expected.

We end this class of examples by noting that when $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$, we may even give an involution on H , by letting

$$\left(\sum_{s \in \Gamma} \lambda_s \delta_s \right)^* = \sum_{s \in \Gamma} \overline{\lambda_{s^{-1}}} \delta_s,$$

making H a π -Hopf- $*$ -algebra.

4.2 Locally convex Hopf algebras related to Lie groups

In § 4.2, all smooth manifolds (hence Lie groups) are assumed to be Hausdorff and paracompact, so that they always admits a smooth partitions of unity [41, p43, Theorem 2.1] (note that this reduces to the σ -compact case by [12, 1.70, Théorème 5], or [16, p38, Theorem 12.11]).

Consider a (paracompact) smooth manifold M . We shall work with the so-called weak topology (terminology in [41, p35]) on the algebra $C^\infty(M)$ of smooth functions, which we will always use when referring to the locally convex topology on $C^\infty(M)$ unless stated otherwise. We briefly describe here how this topology is defined. First, fix $r \in \mathbb{N}_+$. Let (φ, U) be a (smooth) chart on M and $K \subseteq U$ compact, in particular $\varphi(U)$ is open in \mathbb{R}^d with d being the dimension of M , so that the right side of (4.2) makes sense. For each $f \in C^r(M)$, define

$$(4.2) \quad p_{K,\varphi,r}(f) = \sup_{k=0,1,\dots,r} \max_{x \in K} \|D^k(f \circ \varphi^{-1}|_{\varphi(U)})(x)\|,$$

where D^k is the total derivation of order k (we can of course also use partial derivatives instead, then locally convex topologies thus obtained can be easily seen to be the same). Clearly, $p_{K,\varphi,r}$ is a semi-norm on $C^r(M)$. We denote by $C_W^r(M)$ the space $C^r(M)$ equipped with the locally convex topology generated by semi-norms of the form $p_{K,\varphi,r}$. It can be checked that if M is second countable, $C_W^r(M)$ is a space of type (F) (cf. [41, pp.33-34]). Now by the weak (smooth) topology on $C^\infty(M)$, we mean the coarsest locally convex topology on $C^\infty(M)$ making all restriction maps $C^\infty(M) \rightarrow C_W^r(M)$ continuous. Or equivalently, the weak topology on $C^\infty(M)$ is the one generated by all semi-norms of the form $p_{K,\varphi,r}|_{C^\infty(M)}$, with (φ, U) a chart, $K \subseteq U$ compact, and $r \in \mathbb{N}_+$. From this observation, it is clear that if M is second countable, $C^\infty(M)$ is metrizable (a suitable countable sub-family of $p_{K,\varphi,r}|_{C^\infty(M)}$ suffices to define the topology). It is also complete by using the completeness of each $C_W^r(M)$ and (after a standard partitions of unity argument) the standard fact in elementary analysis that a sequence (f_n) of functions in $C^1(V)$ ($V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ open and connected) converges uniformly on compact sets if their first partial derivatives converges uniformly on compacts, and $(f_n(x_0))$ converges for some $x_0 \in V$. Hence $C^\infty(M)$ is a space of type (F) if M is second countable.

The following lemmas, at least in the case where the underlying manifolds are second countable, are well-known. We nevertheless includes a brief sketches of the proofs for completeness and convenience of the reader.

Lemma 4.1. *Using the above notation, if M is second countable, then $C^\infty(M)$ is of class (\mathcal{FN}) . If M is merely paracompact, then let $(M_i)_{i \in I}$ be the connected component of M , then each M_i is second countable, and $C^\infty(M) = \prod_{i \in I} C^\infty(M_i) \in (\mathcal{N})$.*

Proof. We first treat the second countable case. It is already noted in the above that $C^\infty(M) \in (\mathcal{F})$. To see that $C^\infty(M) \in (\mathcal{N})$, one needs the theory of nuclear maps, then using [78, Theorem 50.1] and a standard partitions of unity argument, we reduce to the case where M is an open set of an Euclidean space. Now the nuclearity of $C^\infty(M)$ follows from [78, p530, Corollary].

In the general case, by [16, p38, Theorem 12.11], each component M_i is σ -compact, hence second countable since it is locally Euclidean. Note that being smooth is a local property, our definition clearly shows that $C^\infty(M) = \prod_{i \in I} C^\infty(M_i)$ as locally convex spaces, and the proof of the lemma is complete by the above second countable case. \square

Lemma 4.2. *Let M, N be paracompact smooth manifold, then the completed topological tensor product $C^\infty(M) \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon C^\infty(N)$ is canonically isomorphic to $C^\infty(M \times N)$.*

Proof. Note first that we may as well use $C^\infty(M) \overline{\otimes}_\pi C^\infty(N)$ by nuclearity (Lemma 4.1). By Lemma 4.1 and the commutativity of products with completed injective tensor products (Proposition 1.102), we reduce the problem to the case where M, N are both second countable. Then a standard partitions of unity argument reduces further to the case where M, N are open subsets of Euclidean spaces, in which case, the lemma follows from [78, p530, Theorem 51.6]. \square

By a Lie group, we mean a real Lie group that is not necessarily second-countable. So in particular, all discrete groups (countable or not) counts as Lie groups. It is well-known that the connected components of a Lie group is second countable ([92, p83, Remark (c)]), hence Lie groups are paracompact [16, p38, Theorem 12.11], and the above lemmas apply in this situation.

Theorem 4.3. *Let G be a Lie group. We identify $C^\infty(G \times G)$ with $C^\infty(G) \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon C^\infty(G)$ canonically via Lemma 4.2. Then there exists a canonical ε -Hopf algebra structure on $C^\infty(G)$, given as follows*

- (1) *the unit η is given by the constant function $1 \in C^\infty(G)$;*
- (2) *the counit ε is given by evaluation at the neutral element of G ;*
- (3) *the multiplication $m : C^\infty(G \times G) \rightarrow C^\infty(G)$ is given by $m(F)(x) = F(x, x)$, for any $F \in C^\infty(G \times G)$ and $x \in G$;*
- (4) *the comultiplication Δ is by pulling-back the multiplication on G .*

Furthermore, this ε -Hopf algebra is (ε, ι) -reflexive.

Proof. Clearly, all these structure maps are linear and continuous (one need to observe that the product of compact sets in G remain compact for the continuity of Δ). Note that when restricted to the dense subspace $C^\infty(G) \otimes C^\infty(G) \subseteq C^\infty(G \times G)$, the multiplication m is exactly the pointwise multiplication. It is a routine verification that $C^\infty(G)$ equipped with these structure maps is indeed an ε -Hopf algebra. This ε -Hopf algebra is (ε, ι) -reflexive follows from Lemma 4.1 and Theorem 3.15. \square

Notation 4.4. *By abuse of notation, when it's obvious from context, we will simply say the ε -Hopf algebra $C^\infty(G)$, with the structure maps being understood as in Theorem 4.3.*

Remark 4.5. *If G is a complex Lie group, we may use the algebra of holomorphic functions $\mathcal{H}(G)$ on G . The analogues of Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.2 still hold, i.e. $\mathcal{H}(G)$ is a product of (FN) -spaces, and we have a canonical identification $\mathcal{H}(G) \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon \mathcal{H}(G) = \mathcal{H}(G \times G)$. Indeed, in the second countable case, we may still use [78, p530]) to establish these lemmas, and the general paracompact case follows again by applying [16, p38, Theorem 12.11]. Now defined similarly as in Theorem 4.3, we see that $\mathcal{H}(G)$ becomes an (ε, ι) -reflexive ε -Hopf algebra.*

Remark 4.6. *It is easy to check that in the complex case $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$, the ε -Hopf algebra $C^\infty(G)$ becomes an ε -Hopf- $*$ algebra with the pointwise conjugation as the involution. However, the same can not be applied to $\mathcal{H}(G)$ as conjugation is not holomorphic.*

4.3 Classical Hopf algebras as locally convex Hopf algebras and their duals

We now include all classical Hopf algebras over \mathbb{K} into our framework. First, we need some preparations on locally convex spaces.

Proposition 4.7. *For any vector space V , there exists a unique finest locally convex topology τ_V on V , and if V is the algebraic direct sum of finite dimensional subspaces V_i , $i \in I$, then τ_V is the locally convex direct sum of the unique Hausdorff vector topology on each V_i . In particular, the space (V, τ_V) is locally convex and complete, and every linear map out of (V, τ_V) into a locally convex space is continuous.*

Proof. Let \mathfrak{T}_V be the collection of all locally convex topologies on V . Take τ_V to be the inductive topology with respect to the family $\iota_V : (V, \tau) \rightarrow V$, $\tau \in \mathfrak{T}_V$. Clearly, τ_V is the finest locally convex topology on V .

If $V = \oplus_i V_i$ algebraically, where each V_i is finite dimensional, since each $V_i \hookrightarrow (V, \tau_V)$ is continuous by the axiom of a topological linear space (or the uniqueness of the Hausdorff linear topology on V_i), by the universal property of the locally convex direct sum, we see that the identity map from the locally convex direct sum $\oplus_{i \in I} V_i$ onto (V, τ_V) is continuous, forcing it to be an isomorphism since τ_V is already the finest locally convex topology on V .

By Zorn's lemma, V admits a Hamel basis $(v_\beta)_{\beta \in B}$, hence τ_V may be taken to be the locally convex direct sum of its one dimensional subspaces $\mathbb{K}v_\beta$, and is therefore complete and Hausdorff (Proposition 1.51).

Finally, let $f : V \rightarrow E$ be a linear map into a locally convex space E . Since the projective topology on V with respect to the singleton $\{f\}$ is a locally convex topology on V , it is coarser than τ_V , meaning $f : (V, \tau_V) \rightarrow E$ is continuous. \square

We already can fit all classical Hopf algebras into our framework.

Theorem 4.8. *Let H be a classical Hopf algebra. We equip the vector space H with its finest locally convex topology, then H is a ι -Hopf algebra, and is (ι, ε) -reflexive.*

Proof. Let $(x_\beta)_{\beta \in B}$ be a vector basis (Hamel basis) for H . We know that $H = \oplus_{\beta \in B} \mathbb{K}x_\beta$ as locally convex spaces, hence H is complete. By Corollary 1.89, we have

$$H \otimes_\iota H = \bigoplus_{(\beta_1, \beta_2) \in B \times B} \mathbb{K}(x_{\beta_1} \otimes x_{\beta_2}),$$

which coincides with the algebraic tensor product $H \otimes H$ as vector spaces, and is already complete as a locally convex space (Proposition 1.51), so that $H \otimes_\iota H = H \overline{\otimes}_\iota H$ is exactly the vector space $H \otimes H$ equipped with its finest locally convex topology. Now using Proposition 4.7, we also know that every structure map that is used to define the classical Hopf algebra H is continuous, hence H becomes an ι -Hopf algebra in this way. Being the locally convex direct sum $\oplus_{\beta \in B} \mathbb{K}x_\beta$, clearly the locally convex space H is a locally convex direct sum of spaces in (\mathcal{DFN}) , hence Theorem 3.15 applies, and we see that H is (ι, ε) -reflexive. \square

Remark 4.9. *It seems that in the purely algebraic framework, in general, only a partial dual can be reasonably defined for an arbitrary Hopf algebra. Of particular interests is the so-called "restricted dual" (we use the terminology in [76, p35, § 1.4.3]), considered already in [70, Chapter VI, pp109-136]. Recall that for a classical algebra A over \mathbb{K} , the restricted dual A° is defined as the space of linear functionals on A that vanishes on an ideal of A that is of finite codimension [76, pp35,36, Lemma 4.1.8], then one may pull back the multiplication $m : A \otimes A \rightarrow A$ to obtain a comultiplication $\Delta : A^\circ \rightarrow A^\circ \otimes A^\circ$, to obtain a coalgebra structure on A° . When H is a classical Hopf algebra over \mathbb{K} , on H° , we may define a dual Hopf algebra structure, which is called the "dual Hopf algebra" by Sweedler [70, p122, § 6.2]. We do have some results on when the restricted dual $H^\circ \subseteq H^\sharp$ is big enough to allow to recover H by dualization again, see e.g. [70, p119, Lemma 6.1.0, & p121, Theorem 6.1.3], but the range of applicability of these results are limited. We may see this from an extreme example. Let $\mathbb{K}[\Gamma]$ be the group algebra of a discrete group Γ , which admits a canonical Hopf algebra structure [76, p9, Example 1.2.8]. One can check that, as vector spaces, the restricted dual $(\mathbb{K}[\Gamma])^\circ$ consists exactly of the linear span of matrix coefficients of finite dimensional representations of Γ ([76, p38, Example 4.1.12]). However, if we consider the naively looking countable group, namely, the famous Higman group $\Gamma = \langle a_k \mid a_k^{-1} a_{k+1} a_k = a_{k+1}^2 \rangle$ where $k \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus 4\mathbb{Z}$, it follows from the main result of Higman [40] that Γ admits no nontrivial finite dimensional representations. Hence the restricted dual $(\mathbb{K}[\Gamma])^\circ = 0$ in this case, so that once we take the restricted dual, all information on the Hopf algebra $\mathbb{K}[\Gamma]$ and on the group Γ is lost. Nevertheless, working in our framework of locally convex Hopf algebras, Theorem 4.8 yields a good duality theory for all classical Hopf algebras in our framework of locally convex Hopf algebras. We can even have an alternative description of a discrete Γ using any of polar dual pair of locally Hopf algebras described in § 4.1, and still able to recover the group Γ itself.*

We've seen how classical Hopf algebras can be seen as ι -Hopf algebras in Theorem 4.8. Due to the special nature of the finest locally convex topology on a vector spaces as well as its (strong) duals, it is interesting to note that we can actually replace $\overline{\otimes}_\iota$ with $\overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon$ (hence also with $\overline{\otimes}_\pi$) on the dual. For this finer description, we track the following elementary results and include their proofs for convenience of the reader.

Lemma 4.10. *If E is a locally convex space where the topology is the finest locally convex one, then $E'_s = E'_k = E'_c = E'_b \in (\mathcal{M}) \cap (\mathcal{N})$, and is complete.*

Proof. First of all, note that for a locally convex space E where the topology is the finest locally convex one, the topological dual E' coincides with the algebraic dual E^* . Being a locally convex direct sum of one dimensional subspaces, $E \in (\mathcal{M})$ (Proposition 1.134), hence Mackey (Montel spaces are barrelled, then we use Proposition 1.64), and by Proposition 1.53, we see that $E'_\tau = E'_s$ is a product of one-dimensional spaces, hence complete. Moreover, $E' \in (\mathcal{M})$ (Proposition 1.134), hence $E'_b = E'_c$ (Proposition 1.133). Since E is complete, we know $\tau(E', E) = c(E', E)$ on E' , thus $E'_\tau = E'_s = E'_b = E'_c$. Being a product of one dimensional space, of course $E'_s \in (\mathcal{N})$ (Proposition 1.119). \square

Lemma 4.11. *If E, F are locally convex spaces, both having the finest locally convex topology, then*

$$(4.3) \quad E \otimes_\varepsilon F = E \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon F = E \otimes_\pi F = E \overline{\otimes}_\pi F = E \otimes_\iota F = E \overline{\otimes}_\iota F.$$

Proof. In the following, we equip each one dimensional space with a norm (all these norms differ by a nonzero positive constant), which has no effect on the topology since on finite dimensional spaces, Hausdorff linear topology is unique. For each such one dimensional space S , we use $D(S)$ to denote the collection of all closed disks with a finite nonzero radius centered at 0. It is clear that $D(S)$ are in bijective correspondence with $D(S')$ by taking polars with respect to the pairing $\langle S, S' \rangle$.

Let $E = \bigoplus_i E_i$, $F = \bigoplus_j F_j$, with each E_i and F_j being one-dimensional. Then by Corollary 1.89, we have

$$(4.4) \quad E \otimes_\iota F = \bigoplus_{i,j} E_i \otimes_\iota F_j,$$

and with $E_i \otimes_\iota F_j$ being one-dimensional (hence complete), $E \otimes_\iota F$ is already complete, and $E \otimes_\iota F = E \overline{\otimes}_\iota F$.

By Proposition 1.112, to finish the proof, it suffices now to show that $E \otimes_\varepsilon F = E \otimes_\iota F$. By Proposition 1.53, we have $E'_s = \prod_i E'_i$, $F'_s = \prod_j F'_j$, where again all E'_i and F'_j are one dimensional.

Note that a fundamental system of neighborhoods of 0 in E is given by sets of the form $\Gamma(\cup_i V_i)$, $V_i \in D(E_i)$, it follows that their polars (with respect to $\langle E, E' \rangle$) form a fundamental system of equicontinuous sets in E' . A simple calculation yields $\Gamma(\cup_i V_i)^\circ = \prod_i V_i^\circ$. We also have a similar description for equicontinuous sets in F' .

Now consider the duality pairing $\langle E \odot F, \mathfrak{B}(E, F) \rangle$ as in (1.6). From the above discussion and the definition of the ε -tensor product, it follows that a fundamental system of neighborhoods of 0 in $E \otimes_\varepsilon F$ is given by polars of sets of the form $(\prod_i A_i) \otimes (\prod_j B_j) \subseteq \mathfrak{B}(E, F)$, with $A_i \in D(E_i)$ (resp. $B_j \in D(F_j)$) Algebraically, we have the canonical identification

$$(4.5) \quad E \odot F = \bigoplus_{i,j} E_i \otimes F_j.$$

It is clear by a simple computation that with respect to $\langle E \odot F, \mathfrak{B}(E, F) \rangle$, the polar

$$(4.6) \quad \left[\left(\prod_i A_i \right) \otimes \left(\prod_j B_j \right) \right]^\circ = \Gamma \left(\bigcup_{i,j} (A_i \otimes B_j)^\circ \right),$$

where on the right side of (4.6), $(A_i \otimes B_j)^\circ$ is taken with respect to the duality pairing of one-dimensional spaces $\langle E_i \otimes F_j, E'_i \otimes F'_j \rangle$. It is clear that $(A_i \otimes B_j)^\circ$ runs through $D(E_i \otimes F_j)$ as A_i (resp. B_j) runs through $D(E_i)$ (resp. $D(F_j)$). Hence the right side of (4.6) describes a fundamental system of neighborhoods of 0 in $E \otimes_\varepsilon F$, which happens to be a fundamental system of neighborhoods of 0 for the locally convex direct sum on the right side of (4.4). Hence by the identification (4.5), we see that indeed, $E \otimes_\varepsilon F = E \otimes_\iota F$, and the proof is complete. \square

We now have the finer description of classical Hopf algebras as locally convex ones.

Theorem 4.12. *For all $\tau \in \{\iota, \pi, \varepsilon\}$ and $\sigma \in \{\pi, \varepsilon\}$, any classical Hopf algebras is canonically a (τ, σ) -reflexive τ -Hopf algebra when equipped with the finest locally convex topology and exactly the same structure maps for the corresponding locally convex Hopf algebra structures, with its strong dual being of class (\mathcal{N}) .*

Proof. This follows from Lemma 4.10, 4.11 and Theorem 4.8. \square

Remark 4.13. *It is clear how to extend our treatment here to Hopf- $*$ -algebras in the complex case via Proposition 2.37.*

Remark 4.14. *If a classical Hopf algebra H is of uncountable dimension as a vector space, then by Proposition 1.120, H is not of class (\mathcal{N}) . We see that our result on all classical Hopf algebras go beyond the framework of well-behaved topological algebras as developed in [9].*

Remark 4.15. *It is interesting to note that in the above description, classical Hopf algebras are equipped with the finest locally convex topology, while on its dual, the topology is the weak topology. We know that equipped with the weak topology, a locally convex space is complete if and only if it is isomorphic to a product of one-dimensional spaces ([11, pp. II.54, II.55, Proposition 9]), which is exactly as in our case.*

4.4 Locally convex Hopf algebras of compact and discrete quantum groups

We can also put compact and discrete quantum groups in the framework of locally convex Hopf algebras. Here, compact quantum groups are in the sense of Woronowicz [95, 97], but we do *not* assume separability of the C^* -algebra of “continuous functions” on the quantum group, so we are using the essentially the same theory as treated as in [60, Ch.1]. Discrete quantum groups are in the sense of van Daele [82], based on his framework of multiplier Hopf algebras [80]. It is well-known that they are dual to each other, see e.g. [60, pp28,29]. We will first describe how compact and discrete groups fit into our framework of locally convex Hopf algebras, then use our framework to give an alternative approach to these objects, and compare our approach with that of Woronowicz’s and van Daele’s original approaches.

We will freely use the Peter-Weyl theory for compact quantum groups as developed in [97] or [60, Ch.1]. Let \mathbb{G} be a compact quantum groups, and $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{G})$ the unique dense Hopf- $*$ -algebra inside $C(\mathbb{G})$ that inherits the multiplication Δ on $C(\mathbb{G})$. From the Peter-Weyl theory for compact quantum groups, we may identify $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{G}} := \text{Pol}(\mathbb{G})$ canonically with $\bigoplus_{x \in \text{Irr}(\mathbb{G})} \mathbf{Coeff}(x)$, as vector spaces (in fact this decomposition is a direct sum of simple co-subalgebras). We set $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{G}}$ to be $\prod_{x \in \text{Irr}(\mathbb{G})} \mathcal{B}(H_x)$, where H_x is the carrier finite dimensional Hilbert space for some irreducible unitary representation $U^x \in x$ of \mathbb{G} . Note that $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{G}}$ is exactly the multiplier algebra of $c_c(\widehat{\mathbb{G}}) := \bigoplus_{x \in \text{Irr}(\mathbb{G})}^{\text{alg}} \mathcal{B}(H_x)$. Of course, we equip $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{G}}$ with the product topology. It is well-known that $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{G}} = \text{Pol}(\mathbb{G})$ is a Hopf- $*$ algebra ([97]), and $c_c(\widehat{\mathbb{G}})$ is a multiplier Hopf- $*$ algebra ([82] and [83]), with $\mathcal{M}(c_c(\widehat{\mathbb{G}})) = \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{G}}$ ($\mathcal{M}(\cdot)$ here denotes the multiplier algebra), with the structure maps related by the formulas in [60, pp28,29].

In the following, for each $x \in \text{Irr}(\mathbb{G})$, we shall use a duality pairing $\langle \mathbf{Coeff}(x), \mathcal{B}(H_x) \rangle$, furnished by the Fourier transform as in the following lemma.

Lemma 4.16. *Let \mathbb{G} be a compact quantum group, (U, \mathcal{H}) a finite dimensional unitary representation of \mathbb{G} , then the Fourier transform*

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_U : \mathbf{Coeff}(U)' &\rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \\ \omega &\mapsto (\iota \otimes \omega)(U) \end{aligned}$$

is a unital homomorphism of algebra whose range is the commutant $\text{End}(U)'$ of $\text{End}(U)$ in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, and $\mathcal{F}_U(\omega^) = \mathcal{F}_U(\omega)^*$, where $\omega^* = \bar{\omega} \circ S \in \mathbf{Coeff}(U)'$, with S being the restriction to $\mathbf{Coeff}(U)$ of the antipode on $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{G})$.*

Proof. For $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \mathbf{Coeff}(U)'$, the product $\omega_1 \omega_2$ is given by convolution, hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_U(\omega_1 \omega_2) &= (\iota \otimes \omega_1 \otimes \omega_2)(\iota \otimes \Delta)(U) = (\iota \otimes \omega_1 \otimes \omega_2)(U_{12} U_{13}) \\ &= (\iota \otimes \omega_1)(\iota \otimes \iota \otimes \omega_2)(U_{12} U_{13}) = (\iota \otimes \omega_1) \left(U \left(\mathcal{F}_U(\omega_2) \otimes 1 \right) \right) \\ &= \mathcal{F}_U(\omega_1) \mathcal{F}_U(\omega_2), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathcal{F}_U(\varepsilon_U) = (\iota \otimes \varepsilon)(U) = \iota_{\mathcal{H}},$$

where $\varepsilon_U \in \mathbf{Coeff}(U)'$ is the restriction of the counit ε on $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{G})$. Thus \mathcal{F}_U is indeed a unital homomorphism of algebras.

By the defining property of the antipode, we know $(\iota \otimes S)(U) = U^{-1} = U^*$. It follows that

$$\mathcal{F}_U(\omega^*) = (\iota \otimes \bar{\omega})(U^*) = (\iota \otimes \bar{\omega})(\iota \otimes S)(U) = (\iota \otimes \omega^*)(U) = \mathcal{F}_U(\omega^*).$$

In particular, we’ve shown that $\text{Image}(\mathcal{F}_U)$ is a unital self-adjoint sub-algebra of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, hence is a von Neumann algebra on \mathcal{H} as \mathcal{H} is finite dimensional.

Now for any $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, we have $(T \otimes 1)U, U(T \otimes 1) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \otimes \mathbf{Coeff}(U)$, while applying $\iota \otimes \omega$, $\omega \in \mathbf{Coeff}(U)'$ yields

$$T\mathcal{F}_U(\omega) = (\iota \otimes \omega)((T \otimes 1)U), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{F}_U(\omega)T = (\iota \otimes \omega)(U(T \otimes 1)).$$

Since $\mathbf{Coeff}(U)'$ separate points in $\mathbf{Coeff}(U)$, it follows that

$$T \in \text{End}(U) \iff T \in \text{Image}(\mathcal{F}_U)',$$

and the proof is now complete by the bicommutant theorem of von Neumann. \square

Using the decomposition $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{G}} = \bigoplus_{x \in \text{Irr}(\mathbb{G})} \mathbf{Coeff}(x)$, and $\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{\mathbb{G}}} = \prod_{x \in \text{Irr}(\mathbb{G})} \mathcal{B}(H_x)$ and the above pairings, we thus obtain canonically a duality pairing $\langle \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{G}}, \mathcal{H}_{\widehat{\mathbb{G}}} \rangle$, through which we may identify $\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{\mathbb{G}}}$ with the algebraic linear dual $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{G}}^*$ of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{G}}$. As $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{G}}$ is a classical Hopf- $*$ -algebra, Theorem 4.12 and Remark 4.13 apply, and we obtain the following result that include compact (and by duality, discrete) quantum groups into our framework of locally convex Hopf algebra.

Proposition 4.17. *For $\sigma \in \{\pi, \varepsilon\}$ and $\tau \in \{\iota, \pi, \varepsilon\}$, using the above symbol, every compact quantum group $\mathbb{G} = (C(\mathbb{G}), \Delta)$ in the sense of Woronowicz give rise to an τ -Hopf algebra $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{G}}$ that is (τ, σ) -reflexive, with its strong dual $\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{\mathbb{G}}}$ being the multiplier algebra of $c_c(\widehat{\mathbb{G}})$ as a $*$ -algebra, and the structure maps of the σ -Hopf algebra $\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{\mathbb{G}}}$ restricts to the structure maps of $c_c(\widehat{\mathbb{G}})$, making the latter a Hopf- $*$ -algebra, which is a discrete quantum group in the sense of van Daele.*

We now go in the opposite direction of § 4.4 and identify those locally convex Hopf- $*$ algebras that are discrete/compact quantum groups. Note that van Daele's definition of discrete quantum groups ([82, Definition 2.3]) is already quite close to our point of view, so we start with characterizing discrete quantum groups. We will freely use the construction and notation in § 4.4.

Proposition 4.18. *Let H be an ε -Hopf- $*$ algebra, the following are equivalent:*

- (1) H is isomorphic to $\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{\mathbb{G}}}$ for some compact quantum group \mathbb{G} ;
- (2) As an ε -algebra, H can be identified with a direct product of full matrix algebras $H = \prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}_i)$ (equipped with the product topology), with each \mathfrak{H}_i being a finite dimensional Hilbert space; moreover, the structure map

$$T_1 = (\iota_H \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon m)(\Delta \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon \iota_H) : H \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon H \rightarrow H \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon H$$

and the structure map

$$T_2 = (m \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon \iota_H)(\iota_H \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon \Delta) : H \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon H \rightarrow H \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon H$$

both restricts to a bijection of $H_0 \odot H_0$ onto itself, where H_0 is the dense subspace $\bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}_i)$ (algebraic direct sum) of H .

Proof. Unwinding the definition, one checks immediately that condition (2) is a restatement of $(H_0, \Delta|_{H_0})$ is a multiplier Hopf algebra, where $\Delta|_{H_0} : H_0 \rightarrow H \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon H = \mathcal{M}(H_0 \odot H_0)$. Now the proposition follows from van Daele's definition of discrete quantum groups [82, Definition 2.3], and the well-known duality between compact and discrete quantum groups (see the discussion in § 4.4 and e.g. [83, 5.2–5.5]). \square

Remark 4.19. *Due to nuclearity, in Proposition 4.18, we may as well use $\overline{\otimes}_\pi$ instead of $\overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon$ as the underlying compatible symmetric monoidal functor.*

Thanks to the work of van Daele [82], we may say slightly more about the product decomposition as in (2) of Proposition 4.18: there is a distinguished block being one-dimensional.

Corollary 4.20. *Let $H = \prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}_i)$ be as in statement (2) in Proposition 4.18, then there exists a unique nonzero projection $h \in H$ such that $ah = ha = \varepsilon(a)h$ for any $a \in H$. In particular, h linearly spans a unique matrix block.*

Proof. Existence of such an h is established in [82, Proposition 3.1] and its uniqueness from [83, p356, remark after Definition 5.2], or the fact that h corresponds to the Haar state on the strong dual of H , which is of the form $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{G}}$ for some compact quantum group \mathbb{G} . \square

So roughly speaking, we may characterize discrete quantum groups as ε -Hopf algebras whose (locally convex) algebra structure is a product of full matrix algebras, plus some additional conditions. The following result dualizes this.

Proposition 4.21. *Let H be an ε -Hopf- $*$ -algebra. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) H is isomorphic to $\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{\mathbb{G}}}$ for some compact quantum group \mathbb{G} ;

- (2) $H = \mathbb{C}1 \oplus (\oplus_i C_i)$ both as a locally convex direct sums of locally convex spaces, and as a direct sum decomposition of coalgebras, with each C_i being a full matrix coalgebra; moreover, let p denote the linear form of taking the coefficient of 1 with respect to this decomposition, we have $p(x^*x) > 0$ for any nonzero $x \in H$.

Proof. We first show (1) implies (2). By the Peter-Weyl theory for compact quantum groups ([97] or [60, §§ 1.3–1.5]), we have the decomposition $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{G}) = \oplus_{x \in \text{Irr}(\mathbb{G})} \mathbf{Coeff}(x)$, which is already used in § 4.4. Note that as sub-coalgebras of $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{G})$, each $\mathbf{Coeff}(x)$ is a full matrix coalgebra. Note also that $\mathbb{C}1$ is exactly the linear span of the matrix coefficients of the trivial representation. Hence we have the coalgebra decomposition in (2). The fact that this is also a locally direct sum follows directly by noting that H is equipped with the finest locally convex topology. Finally, $p(x^*x) > 0$ for nonzero $x \in H$ follows directly from this decomposition and the orthogonality relations (see, e.g. [60, p15, Theorem 1.4.3]).

We now show the converse, and assume (2) holds. In this case, it is clear that H is again equipped with the finest locally convex topology. It is also clear that the linear functional p is a faithful positive linear form on the $*$ -algebra H . It follows directly from an easy computation (or from [70, p293, Theorem 14.0.3]) that p is a positive invariant functional on H , hence H is an algebraic compact quantum group in the sense of van Daele (see, e.g. [76, CH.3]), and we have (1). \square

5 Locally convex algebras of continuous functions on compactly generated Hausdorff spaces

5.1 Compactly generated Hausdorff spaces and the k -ification

After Steenrod [68] introduced them into algebraic topology, the role played by compactly generated spaces can hardly be overemphasized. We shall briefly describe what we need, following roughly the treatment in [77, § 7.9].

As we restrict ourselves to Hausdorff spaces, we give the definition in this case.

Definition 5.1. Let X be a Hausdorff topological space. We say $A \subseteq X$ is k -closed (resp. open), if for each compact subspace K of X , the intersection $A \cap K$ is closed (resp. open). We say X is **compactly generated**, or a k -space, if all k -closed set in X is closed, which in turn is equivalent to all k -open sets are open.

We include the following elementary result for convenience of the reader.

Proposition 5.2. Let X be a Hausdorff k -space, Y a topological space, a map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is continuous if and only if for each compact $K \subseteq X$, the restriction $f|_K : K \rightarrow Y$ is continuous.

Proof. The necessity of the condition is clear. For its sufficiency, note that if each $f|_K$, $K \subseteq X$ compact is continuous, then $f^{-1}(C)$ is k -closed for any closed $C \subseteq Y$, since $f^{-1}(C) \cap K = f|_K^{-1}(C)$. Hence $f^{-1}(C)$ is closed since X is a k -space, and f is continuous. \square

There are an ample supply of k -spaces, such as all CW -complexes in algebraic topology. For us, we are mainly interested in the following two cases.

Proposition 5.3 ([77, p189, Theorem 7.9.8]). A Hausdorff X is a k -space if it is locally compact or first countable (in particular, metrizable).

We also need the following permanence property of k -spaces under quotients.

Proposition 5.4 ([77, p189, Theorem 7.9.9]). Let $X \in \text{CG}$ and \sim an equivalence relation on X . If the quotient space X/\sim is Hausdorff, then X/\sim is still a k -space.

Notation 5.5. To facilitate our discussion, let X be a Hausdorff space, we shall use $\mathfrak{K}(X)$ to denote the collection of all compact subspaces of X . We use Haus to denote the category of all Hausdorff spaces, and CG the category of all compactly generated Hausdorff spaces, with morphisms in both categories being the continuous maps between their objects.

Let $X \in \text{Haus}$, let $k(X)$ be the topological space where the underlying set is still X , but the open sets are given by the k -open sets in X . As all open sets in X is k -open, the identity map $i_X : k(X) \rightarrow X$ is continuous. If $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a morphism in Haus , we use $k(f) : k(X) \rightarrow k(Y)$ to denote the same set theoretic map as f but viewed as a map between possibly different topological spaces.

Proposition 5.6. Let $X \in \text{Haus}$.

- (1) The space $k(X)$ is a compactly generated Hausdorff space, i.e. a k -space.

- (2) If X is compactly generated already, then $k(X) = X$.
(3) The spaces X and $k(X)$ have the same compact subsets, i.e. $\mathfrak{K}(X) = \mathfrak{K}(k(X))$.
(4) If $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a continuous map from X to another Hausdorff space Y , then $k(f) : k(X) \rightarrow k(Y)$ is continuous.

Proof. (1), (2) and (3) can be found in [68, p136, Theorem 3.2]. To see (4), let $C \in \mathfrak{K}(X)$ and take any k -open set V in Y . We then have $f(C) \in \mathfrak{K}(Y)$, hence $f(C) \cap V$ is open in $f(C)$, thus its inverse image $f^{-1}(f(C) \cap V) \cap C = f^{-1}(V) \cap C$ under the restriction map $C \rightarrow f(C)$, $x \in C \mapsto f(x) \in f(C)$, is open in C . This means $f|_C : C \rightarrow k(Y)$ is continuous for any $C \in \mathfrak{K}(X)$. But $\mathfrak{K}(X) = \mathfrak{K}(k(X))$ by (2), and $k(X)$ is a k -space by (1), it follows from Proposition 5.2 that $k(f)$ is continuous. \square

Corollary 5.7. Let $k : \text{Haus} \rightarrow \text{CG}$ be the functor $X \mapsto k(X)$, and $f \mapsto k(f)$ as above, and $i : \text{CG} \rightarrow \text{Haus}$ the inclusion functor. Then k is right adjoint to i , i.e. we have a natural bijection

$$(5.1) \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{CG}(X, k(Y)) \simeq \text{Haus}(i(X), Y) \\ \{k(f) : k(X) = X \rightarrow Y\} \leftrightarrow f \\ f \mapsto f \end{array}$$

for each $X \in \text{CG}$ and $Y \in \text{Haus}$, where f on the right of the last line of (5.1) means the same set-theoretic map from X to $k(Y)$ but seen as from X to Y . In particular, k commutes with all limits in Haus .

Proof. This follows directly from Proposition 5.6 and the observation that the topology on $k(Y)$ is finer than that on Y . \square

Definition 5.8. The functor $k : \text{Haus} \rightarrow \text{CG}$ is called the k -ification. Note that Haus has arbitrary products in the categorical sense, so has CG since k is a right adjoint. For a family of spaces $(X_i)_{i \in I}$ in Haus , we see that $k(\prod_i X_i)$ (together with same canonical projections) is the product of the family $(k(X_i))$ in CG , and we call it the k -product of the family (X_i) . When $X, Y, Z \in \text{CG}$, we denote $k(X \times Y)$ by $X \times_k Y$ and $k(X \times Y \times Z) = X \times_k Y \times_k Z$, etc.

We end this subsection with the following result.

Proposition 5.9 ([77, p190, Theorem 7.9.12]). If X is a locally compact space (hence $X \in \text{CG}$), and $Y \in \text{CG}$, then $X \times_k Y = X \times Y$.

Remark 5.10. The k -product \times_k is the correct notion widely used in algebraic topology, for example, for the product of CW complexes, see [38, p523-525], especially the counter-example due to Dowker [21] if one uses the usual product instead. We will soon see (Corollary 5.16) that it is also the ‘‘correct’’ product when considering certain completed injective tensor products.

5.2 The space $C(X, E)$

Recall Definition 1.18. We first establish a result on completeness.

Proposition 5.11. Let X be a k -space, E a locally convex space, $C(X, E)$ the space of all continuous functions from X to E . We equip $C(X, E)$ with the uniform structure of compact convergence. Then $C(X, E)$ is a locally convex space equipped with the topology of its uniform structure, and $C(X, E)$ is complete if E is complete.

Proof. That $C(X, E)$ is a locally convex space follows from Proposition 1.21 and the fact that continuous image into Hausdorff spaces of compact sets remain compact, and compact sets are bounded in a locally convex space.

Now assume E is complete. Let \mathcal{F} be a Cauchy filter on $C(X, E)$. Since each singleton is compact, we see that for each $x \in X$, the evaluation $e_x : C(X, E) \rightarrow E$ is uniformly continuous, hence $\mathcal{F}(x) := (e_x)_* \mathcal{F} = \{M(x) \mid M \in \mathcal{F}\}$, where $M(x) = \{f(x) \mid f \in M\}$, is a Cauchy filter in E , hence convergence to a unique point $f_{\mathcal{F}}(x)$ since E is complete. This defines a map $f_{\mathcal{F}} : X \rightarrow E$. Now take any $K \in \mathfrak{K}(X)$. The restriction $\text{Res}_K : C(X, E) \rightarrow C_u(K, E)$ is uniformly continuous, where $C_u(K, E)$ is the uniform subspace of the uniform space of all maps (continuous or not) $F_u(K, E)$ as defined in Definition 1.17. We denote the direct image of \mathcal{F} under Res_K by $\mathcal{F}|_K$. It is clear that $\mathcal{F}|_K$ converges uniformly to $f_{\mathcal{F}}|_K$ in $F_u(K, E)$. However, being the uniform limit of continuous functions, we have $f_{\mathcal{F}}|_K \in C(K, E)$, hence $f_{\mathcal{F}} : X \rightarrow E$ is continuous by Proposition 5.2. It is clear now that \mathcal{F} converges $f_{\mathcal{F}} \in C(X, E)$, and the latter is complete. \square

Notation 5.12. When X is a Hausdorff k -space, E a locally convex space, unless stated otherwise, the symbol $C(X, E)$ denotes the locally convex space as in Proposition 5.11. This applies in particular to the case where E is the scalar field \mathbb{K} , and we denote $C(X, \mathbb{K})$ simply by $C(X)$. Note that $C(X)$ is a unital algebra under pointwise multiplication, and even a unital $*$ -algebra under conjugation when $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$.

Note that Ascoli’s theorem (Theorem 1.19) gives us a characterization of precompact sets (relatively compact sets when E is complete) in $C(X, E)$ in terms of equicontinuity.

5.3 $C(X)$ as a projective limit and as an ε -algebra

Let X be a k -space. We order $\mathfrak{K}(X)$ by inclusion, then $\mathfrak{K}(X)$ become a directed set. For $K \in \mathfrak{K}(X)$, the locally convex space $C(K)$ as defined above is normable with the uniform supremum norm $\|\cdot\|$, hence is a Banach space. For $K_1, K_2 \in \mathfrak{K}(X)$ with $K_1 \leq K_2$ (i.e. $K_1 \subseteq K_2$), let $p_{K_2, K_1} : C(K_2) \rightarrow C(K_1)$ denote the restriction map. In this way, we obtain a projective system $(C(K), p_{K_1, K_2})$ of Banach spaces, and we may form its projective limit $\varprojlim C(K)$. Given an element $(f_K) \in \varprojlim C(K)$. We may define a function f on X by letting $f(x) = f_K(x)$ whenever $x \in K \in \mathfrak{K}(X)$. This is well-defined, for when $K_1, K_2 \in \mathfrak{K}(X)$ with $x \in K_1 \cap K_2$, we have $K_1 \cup K_2 \in \mathfrak{K}(X)$ and

$$f_{K_1}(x) = f_{K_1 \cup K_2}(x) = f_{K_2}(x).$$

Clearly, $f|_K = f_K$ for any $K \in \mathfrak{K}(X)$, and $f \in C(X)$ by Proposition 5.2 (X is a k -space). Conversely, given $f \in C(X)$ and put $f_K = f|_K$, we obtain an element $(f_K) \in \varprojlim C(K)$. We identify $C(X)$ with $\varprojlim C(K)$ in this way as vector spaces. Since the locally convex topology on $C(X)$ is the topology of compact convergence, we see that the identification $C(X) = \varprojlim C(K)$ is also an identification as locally convex spaces. Via this identification, the canonical projection $p_K : C(X) \rightarrow C(K)$ is the restriction for any $K \in \mathfrak{K}(X)$, which is also an algebra morphism ($*$ -algebra morphism in the complex case).

The following result settles the problem when the projective limit $\varprojlim C(K)$ as considered above is reduced.

Proposition 5.13. *Using the above notation, the projective limit $C(X) = \varprojlim C(K)$ is reduced if and only if $C(X)$ separate points in X .*

Proof. Necessity of the condition is clear, for if $x, y \in X$ are distinct points that can not be distinguished by functions in $C(X)$, let $K = \{x, y\}$, then the image of $p_K : C(X) \rightarrow C(K)$ is just the set of scalar functions, which is not dense in $C(K)$. For sufficiency, note that if $C(X)$ separate points in X . In particular, $C(X)$ separates points in K for any $K \in \mathfrak{K}(X)$, meaning the image of $p_K : C(X) \rightarrow C(K)$ also separate points in K , and is dense by the Stone-Weierstrass approximation theorem. \square

Corollary 5.14. *If a k -space X has enough continuous functions, then $C(X)$ has the approximation property.*

Proof. This follows from Proposition 5.13, Proposition 1.125 and Proposition 1.124. \square

To fix terminology, we make the following definition.

Definition 5.15. We say a topological space X **has enough continuous functions**, if for all $x, y \in X$, $x \neq y$, there exists a continuous function (real-valued) f such that $f(x) \neq f(y)$.

Corollary 5.16. *If X, Y are k -spaces with enough continuous functions, then the k -space $X \times_k Y$ also has enough continuous functions, and we have a canonical isomorphism $C(X) \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon C(Y) = C(X \times_k Y)$.*

Proof. By Proposition 5.6, $X \times_k Y$ and $X \times Y$ have the same continuous functions, and it is clear that the latter has enough of them (it suffices already to note that the topology on $X \times_k Y$ is finer). It is well-known that $C(K) \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon C(L) = C(K \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon L)$ when K and L are compact (or more generally, locally compact, see e.g. [48, p288, (3)]). Now by Proposition 5.13, and the commutation of reduced projective limits with $\overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon$ (Proposition 1.102), we have

$$(5.2) \quad C(X) \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon C(Y) = \varprojlim_{K \in \mathfrak{K}(X)} C(K) \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon \varprojlim_{L \in \mathfrak{K}(Y)} C(L) = \varprojlim_{K \times L} C(K \times L),$$

where the projective limit at the right most of (5.1) is taken with respect to the cofinal subsystem formed by $K \times L$, $K \in \mathfrak{K}(X)$, $L \in \mathfrak{K}(Y)$ of the projective systems $\mathfrak{K}(X \times Y) = \mathfrak{K}(X \times_k Y)$. Hence

$$(5.3) \quad \varprojlim_{K \times L} C(K \times L) = \varprojlim_{R \in \mathfrak{K}(X \times_k Y)} C(R) = C(X \times_k Y).$$

Now the proof is complete by combining (5.2) and (5.3). \square

Corollary 5.17. *Let X be a k -space with enough continuous functions. Then the pointwise multiplication $C(X) \odot C(X) \rightarrow C(X)$, $f \otimes g \mapsto fg$ extends to a unique continuous linear map $m : C(X) \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon C(X) \rightarrow C(X)$, together with $\eta : \mathbb{K} \rightarrow C(X)$, $c \mapsto \{x \mapsto c\}$, the triplet $(C(X), m, \eta)$ becomes an ε -algebra.*

Proof. Note that $C(X) \odot C(X)$ is dense in $C(X) \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon C(X) = C(X \times X)$, such an m is unique once it exists. To see its existence, consider the diagonal map $\delta_X : X \rightarrow X \times X$, $x \mapsto (x, x)$, which is clearly continuous. Take its k -ification, we obtain $\delta_X : X \rightarrow X \times_k X$ is still continuous. Now define $m = \delta_X^* : C(X \times_k X) \rightarrow C(X)$, then m is continuous since δ_X maps compact sets in X to compact sets in $X \times_k X$. Note that $C(X) \odot C(X) \odot C(X)$ is dense in $C(X \times_k X \times_k X) = C(X) \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon C(X) \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon C(X)$, and both $m(m \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon \iota_{C(X)})$ and $m(\iota_{C(X)} \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon m)$ restricts to the pointwise multiplication on $C(X) \odot C(X) \odot C(X)$, we see that m is associative by continuity. Similarly, one checks that η is indeed a unit for m , and the proof is complete. \square

Later, when we treat $C(X)$ as an ε -algebra, unless stated otherwise, we always mean the ε -algebra structure given in Corollary 5.17.

5.4 Topological groups with compactly generated topology

We are now ready to study a large class of topological groups, namely, the ones whose topology is compactly generated. This class includes all locally compact groups, all metrizable topological groups and all topological groups whose underlying topology has a CW complex structure. We will show that the category of these topological groups embeds anti-equivalently to the category of ε -Hopf algebras, and establish that the corresponding ε -Hopf algebra is polar reflexive as soon as the topological group is σ -compact.

Recall that a topological space X is called **completely regular**, or a **Tychonoff space**, if it is Hausdorff, and if for each $x \in X$ and closed $C \subseteq X$ with $x \notin C$, there exists a continuous function $f : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$, such that $f(x) = 1$ and $f|_C = 0$. We shall need the following result characterizing Hausdorff spaces that admits a compatible uniform structure.

Theorem 5.18 ([13, IX.7, Théorème 2]). *Let X be a Hausdorff space. Then X admits a compatible uniform structure if and only if it is completely regular.*

It is clear that a completely regular space has enough continuous functions to separate points. It is also well-known that the topology of any topological group admits a compatible uniform structure ([12, III.19–III.20]), even though the uniform structure might not be unique (see, e.g. [71, p84, Remark 4.10]). So in particular, the topology of any topological group is completely regular, hence has enough continuous functions.

Now let G be a topological group whose topology is compactly generated, i.e. G is a k -space as a topological space. Then by Corollary 5.17, $C(G)$ is already an ε -algebra under the continuous extension of pointwise multiplication. We also have $C(G)\overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon C(G) = C(G \times_k G)$ by Corollary 5.16. Since $G \times G$ has enough continuous functions, so has $G \times_k G$, as the latter topology is finer. Apply Corollary 5.16 again yields

$$(5.4) \quad C(G)\overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon C(G)\overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon C(G) = C(G \times_k G \times_k G).$$

Let $\mu : G \times G \rightarrow G$ be the multiplication map of G , which is continuous, so $\mu : G \times_k G \rightarrow G$ remains continuous. Now the pull-back $\mu^* : C(G) \rightarrow C(G \times G) = C(G)\overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon C(G)$ is a well-defined continuous linear map, which we define as the comultiplication Δ . The associativity of μ implies the coassociativity of Δ (this is why we need (5.4)). Naturally, we define the antipode $S : C(G) \rightarrow C(G)$ to be the pull-back of the inversion on G , and the counit $\varepsilon : C(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ the evaluation at the neutral element of G .

Theorem 5.19. *Let G be a topological group whose topology is compactly generated. Then equipped with the above structure maps, $C(G)$ is an ε -Hopf algebra. If $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$ and we define $(\cdot)^*$ to be pointwise conjugation, then $C(G)$ is an ε -Hopf- $*$ algebra.*

Proof. The nontrivial part is the structure maps are well-defined, which is done in the above. All the rest follows from a routine check. \square

Since all locally compact spaces, metrizable spaces and all CW complexes are compactly generated, Theorem 5.19 applies to all topological groups whose underlying topology is of these types, as noted in the beginning of § 5.4.

Definition 5.20. We say a Hausdorff space X . a sequence of compact sets $(K_n)_{n \geq 1}$ in X is called a **fundamental sequence of compact sets**, if there exists , such that for any compact $K \subseteq X$ is contained in some K_n .

Theorem 5.21. *Use the setting of Theorem 5.19, if in addition, G has a fundamental sequence of compact sets, then $C(G)$ is an (F) -space, and the ε -Hopf algebra (or the ε -Hopf- $*$ algebra in the complex case) $C(G)$ is (ε, π) -polar reflexive.*

Proof. Let $(K_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a fundamental sequence of compact sets. It is clear by definition that the countable family of seminorms $(p_{K_n})_{n \geq 1}$ already generates the topology on $C(X)$, where $p_{K_n}(f) := \sup\{|f(x)| \mid x \in K_n\}$. As $C(X)$ is also complete (Proposition 5.11), it is an (F) -space. Note also that $C(G) \in (\mathcal{A}\mathcal{P})$. Now the proof is complete by using Theorem 3.6. \square

6 From locally convex Hopf algebras back to groups

6.1 Characters and group like elements

Let $\overline{\otimes}_\tau$ be a compatible symmetric monoidal functor and H a τ -Hopf algebra. Following the analogues of the classical theory, a **character** ω of H is a multiplicative, unital linear *continuous* functional on H , i.e. a character of H is simply a morphism of τ -algebras $\omega : H \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$. We shall consider the set of all characters

on H , which we denote by $\chi(H)$. It follows by definition that the counit ε is already a character, hence $\chi(H) \neq \emptyset$.

Given $\omega, \varphi \in \chi(H)$, consider the convolution $\omega * \varphi$ defined as $(\omega \overline{\otimes}_\tau \varphi) \Delta$. Using the coassociativity of Δ , counit property of ε , and the property of the antipode S , it is easily checked that $\chi(H)$ becomes a group under the convolution product, where ε is the counit, and the inverse of ω is given by ωS . The group $\chi(H)$ is called the **character group** of H .

In the case where H is a τ -Hopf- $*$ algebra, we say a character $\omega \in \chi(H)$ is involutive, if ω is an involutive functional. The counit is again an involutive character (Proposition 2.35). It follows from the same argument that the set $\chi^{\text{inv}}(H)$ of all involutive characters is a subgroup of the character group $\chi(H)$, and we call it the **involutive character group**.

Remark 6.1. *By contrast, note that for compact quantum groups $(C(\mathbb{G}), \Delta)$, it could happen there is no continuous involutive multiplicative functionals on $C(\mathbb{G})$. As an example, let Γ be a non-amenable discrete group, and $\mathbb{G} = (C_r^*(\Gamma), \Delta)$ where the comultiplication Δ is determined by $\Delta(\delta_\gamma) = \delta_\gamma \otimes \delta_\gamma$, then $C(\mathbb{G}) = C_r^*(\Gamma)$ does not admit an involutive character (see, e.g. [17, p50, Theorem 2.6.8]).*

It is natural to wonder whether can one put a reasonable topology on $\chi(H)$ to make it a topological group, and if H comes from a topological group G , whether under this topology, $\chi(H) \simeq G$ as topological groups. We will soon establish various results that answers the latter question in the affirmative. However, due to the intricacy of general locally convex spaces, the first question seems quite nontrivial. One positive result is tracked in Theorem 6.3, for which we need a fine result on the characterization of relatively compact sets in the completed injective tensor product of two (F) -spaces.

Lemma 6.2 ([48, p275, (9)]). *Let E_1, E_2 be (F) -spaces. The relative compact sets in $E_1 \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon E_2$ are precisely subsets of the form $(C_1^\circ \otimes C_2^\circ)^\circ$, where C_i is absolutely convex and compact in E_i , $i = 1, 2$. Here, the inner polar is taken with respect to the canonical pairing $\langle E_i, E_i' \rangle$, and the outer polar with respect to the canonical pairing $\langle E_1 \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon E_2, E_1' \odot E_2' \rangle$ obtained by extending each $t \in E_i'$ first as a continuous linear form on $E_1 \otimes_\varepsilon E_2$, then as a continuous linear form on $E_1 \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon E_2$ by continuous extension.*

Theorem 6.3. *If H is an ε -Hopf algebra of type (\mathcal{F}) , then $\chi_c(H)$, i.e. the character group equipped with the topology of precompact convergence, is a topological group. Moreover, $\chi_c(H)$ is complete as a subspace of the uniform space $H_c' = \mathcal{L}_c(H, \mathbb{K})$. If H is an ε -Hopf- $*$ algebra of type (\mathcal{F}) , then $\chi_c^{\text{inv}}(H)$ is a closed subgroup of $\chi_c(H)$.*

Proof. We first prove that $\chi_c(H)$ is a topological group. As the antipode preserves precompact sets by continuity, the inversion on $\chi_c(H)$ is clearly continuous. We now show the continuity of the multiplication map

$$(6.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \mu : \chi_c(H) \times \chi_c(H) &\rightarrow \chi_c(H) \\ (\varphi, \psi) &\mapsto \varphi * \psi = (\varphi \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon \psi) \Delta \end{aligned}$$

is continuous. Recall the notation

$$(6.2) \quad M(C, B_{\mathbb{K}}(r)) = \{f \in E' \mid f(C) \subseteq B_{\mathbb{K}}(\lambda)\}, \text{ where } B_{\mathbb{K}}(r) = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{K} \mid |\lambda| \leq r\}, r > 0.$$

By definition of the topology of precompact convergence, as C runs through $\mathcal{C}(H)$ and r through $]0, +\infty[$, sets described by (6.2) form a fundamental system of neighborhoods of 0 for E_c' . By completeness of H , precompact sets and relatively compact sets in H are the same (the same holds for the complete space $H \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon H$). Thus from the homogeneity

$$M(C, B_{\mathbb{K}}(r)) = M(r^{-1}C, B_{\mathbb{K}}(1)) = rM(C, B_{\mathbb{K}}(1)),$$

the continuity of the map μ at $(\varphi_0, \psi_0) \in \chi_c(H) \times \chi_c(H)$ amounts to the following: for any relative compact C in H , there exists relative compact sets C_1 and C_2 in H , such that for $\varphi, \psi \in \chi_c(H)$,

$$(6.3) \quad (\varphi - \varphi_0, \psi - \psi_0) \in C_1^\circ \times C_2^\circ \implies \varphi * \psi - \varphi_0 * \psi_0 \in C^\circ.$$

Working inside the convolution algebra $\mathcal{L}(H) = \mathcal{L}(H, H)$ (see Definition 2.24), we have

$$(6.4) \quad \varphi * \psi - \varphi_0 * \psi_0 = (\varphi - \varphi_0) * \psi_0 + \varphi_0 * (\psi - \psi_0) + (\varphi - \varphi_0) * (\psi - \psi_0).$$

Now take any relative compact C in H , we are going to find the desired C_1 and C_2 as above, which will prove the continuity of μ and finishes the proof that $\chi_c(H)$ is a topological group. Consider the continuous

linear map $\rho(\psi_0) := (\iota \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon \psi_0) \Delta \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ and $\lambda(\varphi_0) := (\varphi_0 \overline{\otimes} \iota) \Delta \in \mathcal{L}(H)$. Let $S_1 = \rho(\psi_0)(C)$ and $S_2 = \lambda(\varphi_0)(C)$. Then both S_1 and S_2 are relatively compact in H . Moreover,

$$(6.5) \quad \varphi - \varphi_0 \in S_1^\circ \implies (\varphi - \varphi_0) * \psi_0 = (\varphi - \varphi_0) \rho(\psi_0) \in C^\circ,$$

and similarly,

$$(6.6) \quad \psi - \psi_0 \in S_2^\circ \implies \varphi_0 * (\psi - \psi_0) \in C^\circ.$$

By Lemma 6.2, we may find two absolutely convex compact sets T_1 and T_2 in H , such that the relatively compact set $\Delta(C) \subseteq H \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon H$ is contained in $(T_1^\circ \otimes T_2^\circ)^\circ$. By definition of the corresponding polars, we have

$$(6.7) \quad \varphi - \varphi_0 \in T_1^\circ \text{ and } \psi - \psi_0 \in T_2^\circ \implies (\varphi - \varphi_0) * (\psi - \psi_0) = ((\varphi - \varphi_0) \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon (\psi - \psi_0)) \Delta \in C^\circ.$$

Now let $C_i = 3(S_i \cup T_i)$, $i = 1, 2$. Then clearly each C_i is relatively compact. Now use the homogeneity (6.2) again, we have, by (6.5)

$$(6.8) \quad \varphi - \varphi_0 \in C_1^\circ \subseteq \frac{1}{3} S_1^\circ \implies (\varphi - \varphi_0) * \psi_0 \in \frac{1}{3} C^\circ,$$

and similarly by (6.6),

$$(6.9) \quad \psi - \psi_0 \in C_2^\circ \implies \varphi_0 * (\psi - \psi_0) \in \frac{1}{3} C^\circ.$$

We also have, by (6.7), that

$$(6.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \varphi - \varphi_0 \in C_1^\circ \text{ and } \psi - \psi_0 \in C_2^\circ &\implies \varphi - \varphi_0 \in \frac{1}{3} T_1^\circ \text{ and } \psi - \psi_0 \in \frac{1}{3} T_2^\circ \\ &\implies (\varphi - \varphi_0) * (\psi - \psi_0) \in \frac{1}{9} C^\circ \subseteq \frac{1}{3} C^\circ. \end{aligned}$$

Now (6.4) follows from (6.8), (6.9) and (6.10), and μ as defined in (6.1) is indeed continuous, and $\chi_c(H)$ is indeed a topological group.

By Corollary 1.67, H'_c is complete. Clearly, $\chi(H)$ is the subspace $\cap_{x, y \in H} (\delta_{xy} - \delta_x \delta_y)^{-1}(0)$ of E'_c , where $\delta_x : H'_c \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$, $\omega \mapsto \omega(x)$ is continuous since $\{x\}$ is compact, and $\delta_x \delta_y : H'_c \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$, $\omega \mapsto \omega(x)\omega(y)$ is also continuous. Hence $\chi(H)$ is a closed subspace of the complete uniform space H'_c , whence $\chi_c(H)$ is complete. Similarly, when in the complex case and H is an ε -Hopf- $*$ algebra, $\chi_c^{\text{inv}}(H) = \chi_c(H) \cap \left(\cap_{x \in H} (\delta_x - \overline{\delta_{x^{-1}}})^{-1}(0) \right)$, and we see that $\chi_c^{\text{inv}}(H)$ is closed in H'_c , a priori closed in $\chi_c(H)$. \square

Dually, for a τ -Hopf algebra H ($\overline{\otimes}_\tau$ being a compatible monoidal symmetric functor), we may define a **cocharacter** of H to be a morphism of τ -coalgebras from the trivial τ -coalgebra \mathbb{K} to the underlying τ -coalgebra H . Since a linear form φ from \mathbb{K} is uniquely determined by $\varphi(1) \in H$, it is clear that φ is a cocharacter if and only if $\varphi(1) \in H$ is a group-like element in H as formalized in Definition 6.6. This being said, we track the following formal property for future comparison when we talk about involutive cocharacters.

Proposition 6.4. *Let H be a τ -Hopf algebra. If H is (τ, σ) -reflexive (resp. (τ, σ) -polar reflexive) for some compatible symmetric monoidal functor $\overline{\otimes}_\sigma$, and H' its strong (resp. polar) dual, then a linear map $\varphi : \mathbb{K} \rightarrow H$ is a cocharacter if and only if the transpose $\varphi^\top : H' \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ is a character of H' .*

Proof. This follows directly from the construction in Proposition 2.37. \square

Proposition 6.5. *Let $\overline{\otimes}_\tau$ be a compatible symmetric monoidal functor and H a τ -Hopf algebra. Then*

- (1) $\{x \in H \mid \Delta(x) = x \overline{\otimes}_\tau x, x \neq 0\} = \{x \in H \mid \Delta(x) = x \overline{\otimes}_\tau x, \varepsilon(x) = 1\}$;
- (2) denote the set in (1) by $\text{Grp}(H)$, then $\text{Grp}(H)$ is a subgroup of the multiplicative group H^\times of invertible elements in H ;
- (3) $x \in \text{Grp}(H)$ if and only if the linear map $\lambda \in \mathbb{K} \rightarrow \lambda x \in H$ is a cocharacter;
- (4) If $\tau = \pi$, then $\text{Grp}(H)$ is a topological group when equipped with the subspace topology.

Proof. The proof parallels the classical case, but we include a proof anyway for convenience of the reader.

(1). The right side is clearly contained in the left. For the reverse inclusion, note that if $\Delta(x) = x \overline{\otimes}_\tau x$ and $x \neq 0$, we have

$$0 \neq x = (\iota \overline{\otimes} \varepsilon) \Delta(x) = (\iota \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon \varepsilon) \Delta(x) = \varepsilon(x)x,$$

forcing $\varepsilon(x) = 1$.

(2). Since Δ is multiplicative, it is clear that $\text{Grp}(H)$ is multiplicative and $1 \in \text{Grp}(H)$ is the neutral element for multiplication in $\text{Grp}(H)$. If $x \in \text{Grp}(H)$, then $Sx \in \text{Grp}(H)$ by Proposition 2.30. Moreover,

$$x(Sx) = m(\iota \overline{\otimes}_\tau S)(x \overline{\otimes}_\tau x) = m(\iota \overline{\otimes}_\tau S)\Delta(x) = \varepsilon(x)1 = 1,$$

and similarly $(Sx)x = 1$, hence Sx is the inverse of x .

(3) is clear by unwinding the definitions.

(4). Clearly $x \mapsto Sx$ is continuous. Continuity of the group multiplication follows from the defining property of \otimes_π (Proposition 1.104). \square

Definition 6.6. We call the group $\text{Grp}(H)$ the group of **group-like elements** in H , and elements of $\text{Grp}(H)$ the group-like elements. When H is a π -Hopf algebra, unless stated otherwise, we always equip $\text{Grp}(H)$ with the subspace topology of H .

Remark 6.7. From a formal point of view, after considering the group of characters, it seems more natural to consider the group of cocharacters (see Proposition 6.5 (3)). But the notion of group-like elements are already well-established in literature on Hopf algebras, so we follow the tradition. However, the notion of involutive cocharacters as introduced below can not be identified with hermitian group-like elements, and seems more interesting.

Definition 6.8. Let H be a τ -Hopf- $*$ algebra, an **involutive cocharacter** φ of H is a morphism $\varphi \in \text{Coalg}_\tau(\mathbb{K}, H)$, such that

$$(6.11) \quad S\varphi(1) = \varphi(1)^*.$$

Motivated by (6.11), we call a group-like element $x \in \text{Grp}(H)$ **involutive**, if $Sx = x^*$. The collection of all involutive group-like elements of H is denoted by $\text{Grp}^{\text{inv}}(H)$.

We now justify our definition, especially the seemingly weird condition (6.11).

Proposition 6.9. Let H be a τ -Hopf- $*$ algebra.

- (1) Involutive group-like elements form a subgroup of $\text{Grp}(H)$.
- (2) If H is (τ, σ) -reflexive (resp. (τ, σ) -polar reflexive) for some compatible symmetric monoidal functor $\overline{\otimes}_\sigma$, and H' its strong (resp. polar) dual, then a linear map $\varphi : \mathbb{K} \rightarrow H$ is a cocharacter if and only if the transpose $\varphi^\top : H' \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ is an involutive character of H' .

Proof. (1). By Proposition 2.30, we have $S1 = 1 = 1^*$, so $1 \in \text{Grp}^{\text{inv}}(H)$; and $x, y \in \text{Grp}^{\text{inv}}(H)$ already implies $xy \in \text{Grp}(H)$, and also

$$S(xy) = S(y)S(x) = y^* x^* = (xy)^*.$$

(2) again follows directly from the construction in Proposition 2.37. \square

The group $\text{Grp}^{\text{inv}}(H)$ will play an important role when we treat classical Pontryagin duality for locally compact abelian groups in our framework.

6.2 A generalization of the Gelfand duality

We now present a refinement of the Gelfand duality of recovering a compact space X as the space of characters of the algebra $C(X)$ equipped with the weak topology. Later we will use this result to recover many topological groups as the character groups equipped with the topology of precompact convergence of the associated locally convex Hopf algebras. For the sake of clarity, and since it is of independent interests, we present the result not for certain topological groups but more generally for certain topological spaces.

For arbitrary topological space X , following Bourbaki [10, I.5, Définition 3], we say a subalgebra A of $C(X)$ (by subalgebra, we always mean the unital ones) is **full**, if $f \in A$ and f is invertible in $C(X)$, then $f^{-1} \in A$. Note that $f \in C(X)$ is invertible in $C(X)$ if and only if it doesn't vanish everywhere. We also need a naive notion of positivity, and we denote by $A_{[0,1]}$ the convex set $\{f \in A \mid f(x) \in [0, 1]\}$ in A .

Notation 6.10. For an arbitrary algebra A equipped with a locally convex topology, we use $\chi_c(A)$ to denote the set of all continuous characters of A (characters here mean unital multiplicative functionals on A).

We track the following elementary result on “partitions of unity on compacts” as a preparation for Theorem 6.13. The argument is routine but we nevertheless include a proof for convenience of the reader.

Lemma 6.11. Let X be a topological space, and A a full subalgebra of $C(X)$ such that functions in $A_{[0,1]}$ separates compact sets and closed set, i.e. for each compact $K \subseteq X$ and closed $C \subseteq X$ with $K \cap C = \emptyset$, there exists $f \in A_{[0,1]}$ such that $f(K) = \{1\}$ and $f(C) = \{0\}$. Then for each compact set K in X and each finite covering $(U_k)_{k=1}^n$ of K with each U_k open in X , there exists $f_1, \dots, f_n \in A_{[0,1]}$, with $\text{supp } f_k \subseteq U_k$ for each k , and $\sum_{k=1}^n f_k(x) = 1$ for all $x \in K$.

Proof. Since (U_k) covers K , for each $x \in K$, we have $x \in U_{k(x)}$ for some $1 \leq k(x) \leq n$. As $A_{[0,1]}$ separates points (singletons are compact) and closed sets in X , there exists $g_x \in A_{[0,1]}$, such that $g_x(x) = 1$ and $g_x(X \setminus U_{k(x)}) = \{0\}$. Put

$$V_{k(x)} := \left\{ y \in X \mid g(y) > \frac{1}{2} \right\}.$$

Then $V_{k(x)}$ is an open neighborhood of 0, and

$$\overline{V_{k(x)}} \subseteq \left\{ y \in X \mid g(y) \geq \frac{1}{2} \right\} \subseteq U_{k(x)}.$$

We may thus use $A_{[0,1]}$ separating the compact set $\{x\}$ and the closed set $X \setminus V_{k(x)}$ again to find an $h_x \in A_{[0,1]}$, such that $h_x(x) = 1$ and h_x vanishes outside $V_{k(x)}$.

Clearly $h_x^{-1}([0, +\infty[) = h_x^{-1}([0, 1])$, $x \in K$ is an open cover of the compact set K . Hence there exists finitely many $x_1, \dots, x_m \in K$, such that

$$(6.12) \quad W := \bigcup_{i=1}^m h_{x_i}^{-1}([0, 1]) \supseteq K.$$

Since $A_{[0,1]}$ separates the compact K and the closed set $X \setminus W$, there exists $h_0 \in A_{[0,1]}$ with $h_0|_K = 1$ and $h_0|_{X \setminus W} = 0$. Take $h_1 := 1 - h_0 \in A_{[0,1]}$, then $h_1|_{X \setminus W} = 1$ and $h_1|_K = 0$. Define $h := h_1 + \sum_{i=1}^m h_{x_i} \in A$. Then for each $y \in X$, either $y \in W$, in which case $h_{x_i}(y) > 0$ for some $1 \leq i \leq m$ by (6.12), or $y \notin W$, in which case $h_1(y) = 1 > 0$. Hence $h(y) > 0$ for all $y \in X$, and $h^{-1} \in A$ since A is a full subalgebra of $C(X)$. Moreover, $h_1|_K = 0$ implies that

$$(6.13) \quad y \in K \implies h(x) = \sum_{i=1}^m h_{x_i}(y) > 0.$$

Now, define $f_{x_i} = h^{-1} h_{x_i} \in A_{[0,1]}$. Clearly, for each $1 \leq i \leq m$,

$$(6.14) \quad \text{supp } f_{x_i} \subseteq \text{supp } h_{x_i} \subseteq \overline{V_{k(x_i)}} \subseteq U_{k(x_i)},$$

and by (6.13), we have

$$(6.15) \quad y \in K \implies \sum_{i=1}^m f_{x_i}(y) = 1.$$

For each $1 \leq k \leq m$, define

$$f_k := \sum_{k(x_i)=k} f_{x_i}$$

with the empty sum being understood as 0. Then (6.14) implies that $\text{supp } f_k \subseteq U_k$ for each $1 \leq k \leq m$, and (6.15) implies that $\sum_{k=1}^n f_k(x) = 1$ for all $x \in K$. Since clearly every $f_k(x) \geq 0$. Hence $f_k \in A_{[0,1]}$ for each $1 \leq k \leq n$, which finishes the proof. \square

We introduce the following notion in order to formulate our generalization of Gelfand's duality.

Definition 6.12. Let X be a k -space, A a subspace of $C(X)$. We say a locally convex topology τ on A is **compactly localized**, if for every continuous seminorm q on (A, τ) , there exists $K \in \mathfrak{K}(X)$, such that $q(f) = 0$ whenever $f|_K = 0$ for all $f \in A$.

Theorem 6.13. Let X be a k -space and A a full subalgebra of $C(X)$. When $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$, we assume in addition that A is self-adjoint in the sense that $f \in A$ implies $\overline{f} \in A$. Let τ be a locally convex topology on A making the embedding $i_A : (A, \tau) \hookrightarrow C(X)$ continuous, and equip $\chi_c(A)$ with the topology of compact convergence, i.e. the subspace topology of A'_c . If $A_{[0,1]}$ separates compact sets and closed sets in X , then the map $\delta : x \in X \mapsto \delta_x \in \chi_c(A)$ is a well-defined homeomorphism onto its image. If in addition, τ is compactly localized, then $\delta : X \rightarrow \chi_c(A)$ is surjective (hence a homeomorphism).

Proof. We first show that $\delta : X \rightarrow \chi_c(A)$ is indeed well-defined and continuous. Let τ_0 denote the subspace topology on A induced by the topology of $C(X)$, then continuity of i_A means τ is finer than τ_0 . As the singleton $\{x\} \in \mathfrak{K}(X)$, it is clear that $\delta_x \in C(X)'$, and by restriction, $\delta_x \in (A, \tau_0)'$, hence $\delta_x \in (A, \tau)'$ since τ is finer than τ_0 . It is clear that δ_x is a unital multiplicative linear functional on A , thus $\{\delta_x \mid x \in X\} \subseteq \chi_c(A)$, and δ is indeed well-defined. We now establish the continuity of δ . To this end, take an arbitrary precompact set H in (A, τ) , which is a priori (since τ_0 is coarser than τ) precompact in (A, τ_0) hence in $C(X)$. By Ascoli's theorem (Theorem 1.19), for every $K \in \mathfrak{K}(X)$, we have, as a family of functions, the restriction $H|_K$ is equicontinuous, which implies that $\delta|_K : K \rightarrow \chi_c(A) \subseteq A'_c$ is continuous. Now the continuity of δ follows from Proposition 5.2.

Now we show that δ is an open map onto its image. Indeed, take any $x \in X$ and an open neighborhood U of x . By our assumption, there exists $f \in A$, such that $f(x) = 1$ and f vanishes outside U . As a singleton, $\{f\}$ is compact in A . Hence, by definition,

$$M(\{f\}, B_{\mathbb{K}}(1/2)) := \{\omega \in A' \mid \omega(f) \in B_{\mathbb{K}}(1/2)\}$$

is a neighborhood of 0 in A'_c , where $B_{\mathbb{K}}(1) = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{K} \mid |\lambda| \leq 1/2\}$. Consider any $y \in X$ such that

$$\delta_y - \delta_x \in M(\{f\}, B_{\mathbb{K}}(1/2)).$$

If $y \notin U$, then $f(y) = 0$ from our choice of f . Hence we must have $y \in U$, and we've established that

$$\delta(U) \supseteq (\delta_x + M(\{f\}, B_{\mathbb{K}}(1/2))) \cap \delta(X).$$

This means $\delta : X \rightarrow \delta(X)$ is open at any point $x \in X$, hence is an open map.

Finally, suppose τ is compactly localized, and we need to show that every $\omega \in \chi_c(A)$ lies in $\delta(X)$. By continuity of ω , there exists a continuous seminorm q on (A, τ) , such that $|\omega(f)| \leq q(f)$. Since τ is compactly localized, we may choose a $K \subseteq \mathfrak{K}(X)$, such that $q(f) = 0$ whenever $f|_K = 0$. Consider the restriction map $r_K : A \rightarrow C(K)$, $f \mapsto f|_K$. We equip $C(K)$ with the inductive locally convex topology (§ 1.5) τ_K with respect to the singleton $\{r_K\}$. Let $A_K = r_K(A)$, then equip A_K with the subspace topology of $(C(K), \tau_K)$, the quotient map $\pi_K : A/\ker(r_K) \rightarrow A_K$ is strict (Definition 1.55). Since A separates points in X , clearly A_K separates points in K , and A_K is dense in $C(K)$ in its uniform supremum norm topology by Stone-Weierstrass. Our choice of K and $|\omega(f)| \leq q(f)$ implies that ω vanishes on $\ker(r_K)$, hence factors through π_K via a unique continuous linear form $\bar{\omega} : A_K \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$. We claim that $\bar{\omega}$ is continuous with respect to the (coarser) uniform supremum norm topology, for which it suffices to employ the fullness of A . Indeed, suppose $f \in A$ with

$$\|f\|_{u,K} := \sup\{|f(x)| \mid x \in K\} < 1.$$

Define

$$W := \{x \in X \mid |f(x)| < 1\}.$$

Then W is an open set in X containing K . By Lemma 6.11, there exists $\varphi \in A_{[0,1]}$, such that $\varphi|_K = 1$ and $\varphi|_{X \setminus W} = 0$. It follows that $|\varphi(x)f(x)| < 1$ for any $x \in X$, hence $1 - \varphi f \in A$ is invertible in $C(X)$, which implies $(1 - \varphi f)^{-1} \in A$ by the fullness of A . Restricting to K , we see that $1 - f|_K$ is invertible in A_K . Clearly $\bar{\omega}$ is a unital multiplicative functional on A_K . The above reasoning shows that for each $g \in A_K$, whenever $|\lambda| > \|g\|_{u,K}$, then $\lambda - g = \lambda(1 - \lambda^{-1}g)$ is invertible in A_K , hence $0 \neq \bar{\omega}(\lambda - g) = \lambda - \bar{\omega}(g)$. This forces $\bar{\omega}(g) \leq \|g\|_{u,K}$, and $\bar{\omega}$ is continuous on $(A_K, \|\cdot\|_{u,K})$, thus extends by continuity to a unique unital multiplicative continuous functional on $C(K)$, in which case, it is well-known that there exists a unique $x \in K$, with $\bar{\omega} = \delta_x$ as functionals on $C(K)$ (see, e.g. [45, p211, Corollary 3.4.2]). Now it is easy to check that we must have $\omega = \delta_x$ from our construction as well, and the proof is complete. \square

Remark 6.14. *There are also other generalization of the Gelfand duality, e.g. [59] and the more recent [8]. However, the spectrum obtained in [59] is always compact, and the functions used in [8] are bounded, thus they do not apply in our setting. The above involved formulation of Theorem 6.13 shall enable us to recover various topological groups in various settings, as will be presently demonstrated.*

Remark 6.15. *Part of the proof of Theorem 6.13 is inspired by the answer provided anonymously to the author's question on the mathoverflow site [79]. The other question answered by van Name [44] shows that unlike the case for commutative C^* -algebras, it is necessary to assume some sort of continuity on characters in Theorem 6.13, even in the locally compact case.*

Remark 6.16. *When $C(X)$ is of class (\mathcal{F}) , i.e. when X has a fundamental sequence of compacts, by the theorem of Banach-Dieudonné (Theorem 1.27), we see that we may replace the topology of (pre)compact convergence by any of the topologies in Theorem 1.27, and still end up with the same $\chi_c(C(X))$. In particular, if we know that, as a subset of $C(X)'$, the set $\chi_c(C(X))$ is equicontinuous, then we may even replace the topology of (pre)compact convergence with the topology of simple convergence. In the case where X is compact, we have $C(X)$ is a Banach algebra, and all characters (without assuming continuity) are automatically of norm 1 (see, [71, p15, Proposition 3.9]), hence $\chi_c(C(X))$ is equicontinuous. Thus Theorem 6.13 recovers the Gelfand duality for compact spaces when X is compact.*

When M is a paracompact smooth manifold. It is clear by smooth partitions of unity that the algebra $C^\infty(M)$ separates closed sets, in particular, separates compact and closed sets in M . Note also that the algebra of all continuous functions on a completely regular space (see before Theorem 5.18) also enjoys this property. Again, the proof is elementary, but we include the proof for completeness.

Lemma 6.17. *If X is a completely regular space, then $C(X)_{[0,1]}$ separates compact sets and closed sets in X .*

Proof. Let K (resp. C) be compact (resp. closed) in X , with $K \cap C = \emptyset$. For each $x \in K$, there exists $f_x \in C(X)_{[0,1]}$ with $f_x(x) = 1$ and $f_x|_C = 0$. Clearly the family of open sets $f_x^{-1}(]0, +\infty[)$, $x \in K$ covers K . Hence by compactness of K , there exists finitely many $x_1, \dots, x_n \in K$ with $\cup_{k=1}^n f_{x_k}^{-1}(]0, +\infty[) \supseteq K$. Let $g := \sum_{k=1}^n f_{x_k}$, then $g \in C(X)$ and $g \geq 0$ with $g|_C = 0$ and $W := g^{-1}(]0, +\infty[)$ containing K . Define $g_k(x) := f_{x_k}(x)/g(x)$ if $x \in W$, and $g_k(x) = 0$ if $x \notin W$. It is clear that each $g_k \in C(X)$, and the sum $g = \sum_{k=1}^n g_k \in C(X)_{[0,1]}$ with $g|_K = 1$ and $g|_C = 0$. \square

Corollary 6.18. *Let X be a k -space, and A a subalgebra of $C(X)$. Then $\delta : X \rightarrow \chi_c(A)$ is a homeomorphism in either one the following cases:*

- (1) X is completely regular and $A = C(X)$;
- (2) X is a paracompact smooth manifold and $A = C^\infty(M)$.

Proof. (1) follows from Lemma 6.17 and Theorem 6.13, and (2) from the same Theorem and the existence of smooth partitions of unity. \square

6.3 Topological groups as the character group with (pre)compact convergence

We may now describe how to recover the some topological groups from the associated locally convex Hopf algebra as character groups.

Theorem 6.19. *In either of the following situations:*

- (1) G is a Lie group, and \mathcal{H}_G is the ε -Hopf algebra $C^\infty(G)$ as in Theorem 4.3;
- (2) G is a topological group with compactly generated topology, and \mathcal{H}_G the ε -Hopf algebra $C(G)$ as in Theorem 5.19.

Then, the map $\delta : G \rightarrow \chi_c(\mathcal{H}_G)$ is an isomorphism of topological groups. The same holds in the complex case, we consider \mathcal{H}_G as an ε -Hopf- $$ algebra and replace $\chi_c(\mathcal{H}_G)$ by $\chi_c^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{H}_G)$.*

Proof. That δ in these situations is a homeomorphism follows from Corollary 6.18 and Theorem 6.13. The fact that δ is a group morphism follows from a direct calculation. \square

6.4 An analogue of the Eymard-Stinespring-Tatsumma duality

It is already noticed in § 4.1 that we may recover a discrete group Γ from the π -Hopf algebra $\ell^1(\Gamma)$ as the collection of group like elements. There is a far reaching analogous result for all locally compact groups, see [72, p69, Theorem 3.9]. In terms of the theory of locally compact quantum groups, this result reads as follows.

Theorem 6.20 (Eymard-Stinespring-Tatsumma). *Let (\mathcal{M}, Δ) be the von Neumann algebra version of the dual of a locally compact group G . Then there is a canonical bijection between elements in G and the set $\{x \in \mathcal{M} \mid \Delta(x) = x \otimes x, x \neq 0\}$ of group like elements.*

Remark 6.21. *The original formulation in [72, p69, Theorem 3.9] uses a certain unitary operator W instead of the comultiplication Δ . It is clear that the operator W there is exactly the corresponding multiplicative unitary ([7]) associated with the locally compact quantum group (\mathcal{M}, Δ) . Since Theorem 6.20 is still in the Kac case, the theory of Kac algebras ([25]) already suffices to see this. In the full generality of locally compact quantum groups, the whole story can be rather involved, see also Woronowicz's contribution [96] and [49, 50]. [72, p69, Theorem 3.9] is called the **Eymard-Stinespring-Tatsumma theorem** by Takesaki [72, p90], attributing to various contributions [28, 63, 69, 75].*

Recall Theorem 5.21 and Theorem 4.3 (when the Lie group G is second countable, the strong dual of $C^\infty(G)$ is a barreled (DF) space, hence it is both a π -Hopf algebra and a ι -Hopf algebra, by Proposition 1.115).

We now establish the following analogue of the Eymard-Stinespring-Tatsumma duality for locally compact groups.

Theorem 6.22. *If $\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{G}}$ is a π -Hopf algebra given by any of the following:*

- (1) *the strong dual of the ε -Hopf algebra $\mathcal{H}_G = C^\infty(G)$ for a second countable Lie group G ;*

- (2) the polar dual of the ε -Hopf algebra $\mathcal{H}_G = C(G)$ for a topological group with compactly generated topology that admits a fundamental sequence of compact sets.

Then the map $G \rightarrow \text{Grp}(\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{G}})$, $g \mapsto \delta_g$ is an isomorphism of topological groups.

Proof. In (1), since $C^\infty(G)$ is of class (\mathcal{FN}) by Lemma 4.1, hence is of class (\mathcal{M}) , we have $\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{G}} = (\mathcal{H}_G)'_c$ as locally convex space in both cases (Proposition 1.133).

Clearly we have a bijective correspondence

$$(6.16) \quad \begin{aligned} \Phi : \text{Grp}(\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{G}}) &\rightarrow \text{Coalg}_\pi(\mathbb{K}, \mathcal{H}_{\widehat{G}}) \\ x &\mapsto \{\varphi_x : \lambda \mapsto \lambda x\}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, one checks immediately by taking transposes that we also have a bijective correspondence

$$(6.17) \quad \begin{aligned} \Psi : \text{Coalg}_\pi(\mathbb{K}, \mathcal{H}_{\widehat{G}}) &\rightarrow \text{Alg}_\pi((\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{G}})', \mathbb{K}) = \text{Alg}_\pi(\mathcal{H}_G, \mathbb{K}) = \chi(\mathcal{H}_G) \\ \varphi &\mapsto \varphi^\top. \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 6.19, $\chi(\mathcal{H}_G) \simeq G$ in both cases, and one checks easily by following the composition $\Phi^{-1}\Psi^{-1}$ and the isomorphism $\delta : G \rightarrow \chi(\mathcal{H}_G)$ that the resulting correspondence, still denoted by $\delta : G \rightarrow \text{Grp}(\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{G}})$, $g \mapsto \delta_g$ is a group isomorphism in both cases. It remains to show that this is also a homeomorphism, but this already follows from Corollary 6.18 in both cases. \square

6.5 Recovering of the Pontryagin dual of locally compact abelian groups

We now describe how Pontryagin duality for all locally compact abelian groups can manifest itself in our theory.

Since all locally compact spaces are k -spaces, it is readily seen, as a special case of Theorem 6.19, that any locally compact group G , in particular the abelian ones, can already be recovered from the associated ε -Hopf algebra $C(G)$ as the character group $\chi_c(C(G))$ equipped with the topology of compact convergence.

Recall that, following Weil [93, pp99-101], the Pontryagin dual \widehat{G} of a locally compact abelian group G is constructed as follows: as a group, \widehat{G} consists of all continuous one-dimensional *unitary* representations of G , where the multiplication is pointwise; the topology on \widehat{G} is the topology of compact convergence.

Theorem 6.23. *Let G be a locally compact group and $C(G)$ the associated ε -Hopf algebra.*

- (1) *An element $f \in C(G)$ is group-like if and only if $f : G \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ is a continuous (one-dimensional) representation of G .*
- (2) *If $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$ and consider $C(G)$ as an ε -Hopf- $*$ algebra. An element $f \in C(G)$ is an involutive group-like elements if and only if $f : G \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a unitary representation. Moreover, if G is abelian, then $\text{Grp}^{\text{inv}}(C(G))$, when equipped with the subspace topology induced from $C(G)$, is exactly the Pontryagin dual \widehat{G} of G .*

Proof. (1). By definition, $f \in \text{Grp}(C(G))$ if and only if $f(1) = 1$, and $\Delta(f) = f \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon f$. As continuous functions in $C(G \times_\varepsilon G) = C(G \times G)$ (see Proposition 5.9), we have $\Delta(f)(s, t) = f(st)$ while $(f \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon f)(s, t) = f(s)f(t)$, where $s, t \in G$. Now (1) is clear.

(2). In this case, suppose $f \in \text{Grp}(C(G))$. To say that f is involutive means $\overline{f} = Sf$, i.e. for all $s \in G$, $\overline{f}(s) = f(s^{-1}) = f(s)^{-1}$. Hence $f \in \text{Grp}^{\text{inv}}(C(G))$ if and only if $f : G \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a unitary representation. We now have $\widehat{G} = \text{Grp}^{\text{inv}}(C(G))$ as a group. Since the topology on $C(G)$ is precisely the topology of compact convergence, the identity $\widehat{G} = \text{Grp}^{\text{inv}}(C(G))$ also holds true as topological groups. \square

Remark 6.24. *It is interesting to note that when a locally compact abelian group G is second countable, it has a fundamental sequence of compact sets, and Theorem 5.21 implies that the ε -Hopf- $*$ algebra $C(G)$ is (ε, π) -polar reflexive, and the polar dual $C(G)'_c$ is a π -Hopf- $*$ algebra. By Proposition 6.9, we see that, as groups, \widehat{G} can be identified canonically as $\chi^{\text{inv}}(C(G)'_c)$. One may even try to consider $\chi_c^{\text{inv}}(C(G)'_c)$, i.e. $\chi^{\text{inv}}(C(G)'_c)$ equipped with the subspace topology of $\mathcal{L}_c(C(G)'_c, \mathbb{C})$ (which is canonically isomorphic to $C(G)$ as vector spaces since $C(G)$, being an (F) -space, is polar reflexive, but the topology is different). One can show that in general, the topology on $\chi_c^{\text{inv}}(C(G)'_c)$ is finer than the one on \widehat{G} . At the time of this writing, the author does not know whether these topologies coincide, or even whether $\chi_c^{\text{inv}}(C(G)'_c)$ is a topological group.*

7 Certain projective and inductive limits

We describe in this section some general theory concerning projective and inductive limits of locally convex Hopf algebras. These abstract theory shall be illustrated by concrete examples in § 8.

7.1 Reduced projective limits of projective and injective Hopf algebras

Using the commutativity of $\overline{\otimes}_\pi$ (resp. $\overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon$) with reduced projective limits, we can easily construct reduced projective limits of π -Hopf algebras (resp. ε -Hopf algebras). We describe how the construction goes in general for τ -Hopf algebras, where $\overline{\otimes}_\tau$ is a symmetric compatible monoidal functor that commutes with reduced projective limits. As examples, we may take $\tau \in \{\pi, \varepsilon\}$ (Proposition 1.110 and Proposition 1.102).

Let $(H_i, p_{i,j})_{i \in I}$ be a projective system of τ -Hopf algebras. Assume that as locally convex spaces, the projective limit $H := \varprojlim H_i$ is reduced. Consider the projective system $(H_i \overline{\otimes}_\tau H_j, p_{i,j} \overline{\otimes}_\tau p_{s,t})$ on $I \times I$ (equipped of course with the product order: $(i, j) \leq (s, t)$ means $i \leq s$ and $j \leq t$). Then by the commutation of $\overline{\otimes}_\tau$ with reduced projective limits, we see that $H \overline{\otimes}_\tau H$ can be identified canonically with the reduced projective limit $\varprojlim_{I \times I} H_i \overline{\otimes}_\tau H_j$. Moreover, as I is directed, we see that $(H_i \overline{\otimes}_\tau H_i, p_{i,j} \overline{\otimes}_\tau p_{i,j})_{i \in I}$ is cofinal in $(H_i \overline{\otimes}_\tau H_j, p_{i,j} \overline{\otimes}_\tau p_{s,t})$. We then have a canonical identification $H \overline{\otimes}_\tau H = \varprojlim H_i \overline{\otimes}_\tau H_i$, with $p_i \overline{\otimes}_\tau p_i : H \overline{\otimes}_\tau H \rightarrow H_i \overline{\otimes}_\tau H_i$ being the canonical projections. Similarly, using the commutation of $\overline{\otimes}_\tau$ with reduced projective limits again, we have the analogous results for three-fold and four-fold tensor products.

On the other hand, we might use the same index set I to build a projective system $(K_i, \beta_{i,j})$, with each $K_i = \mathbb{K}$ and each $\beta_{i,j} = \iota_{\mathbb{K}}$, whenever $i \leq j$. Since I is directed, it is trivial that $\varprojlim K_i = \mathbb{K}$ with all canonical projections $\beta_i : \varprojlim K_i = \mathbb{K} \rightarrow K_i = \mathbb{K}$ being $\iota_{\mathbb{K}}$.

Denote the structure maps on each H_i by $m_i, \eta_i, \Delta_i, \varepsilon_i$ and S_i . We now define $m \in \mathcal{L}(H \overline{\otimes}_\tau H, H)$, $\eta \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{K}, H)$, $\Delta \in \mathcal{L}(H, H \overline{\otimes}_\tau H)$, $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{L}(H, \mathbb{K}) = H'$ and $S \in \mathcal{L}(H) = \mathcal{L}(H, H)$ as follows.

Note that the family $(\eta_i)_{i \in I}$ is a morphism from the projective system $(K_i, \beta_{i,j})$ of locally convex spaces to the projective system $(H_i, p_{i,j})$ of locally convex spaces, in the sense that whenever $i \leq j$, $\eta_i \beta_{i,j} = p_{i,j} \eta_j$. Hence there exists a unique continuous linear map $\eta : \mathbb{K} = \varprojlim K_i \rightarrow H = \varprojlim H_i$, such that $p_i \eta = \eta_i \beta_i$ for each $i \in I$.

Similarly, the family $(m_i)_{i \in I}$ is a morphism from the projective system $(H_i \overline{\otimes}_\tau H_i, p_{i,j} \overline{\otimes}_\tau p_{i,j})$ to the projective system $(H_i, p_{i,j})$, and we obtain, by passing to the respective projective limits, a canonical linear continuous map $m : H \overline{\otimes}_\tau H \rightarrow H$. The maps $\Delta : H \rightarrow H \overline{\otimes}_\tau H$, $\varepsilon : \mathbb{K} \rightarrow H$ and $S : H \rightarrow H$ are defined similarly.

Theorem 7.1. *Let $\overline{\otimes}_\tau$ be a symmetric compatible monoidal functor that commutes with reduced projective limits, and $(H_i, p_{i,j})$ be a projective system of τ -Hopf algebras, such that as locally convex spaces, the projective limit $H = \varprojlim H_i$ is reduced. Then*

- (1) *Equipped with the multiplication m , unit η , comultiplication Δ , counit ε and antipode S as defined above, H is a τ -Hopf algebra.*
- (2) *The canonical projections $p_i : H \rightarrow H_i$, $i \in I$ are all morphisms of τ -Hopf algebras, and H , together with these p_i , $i \in I$, is the projective limit of $(H_i, p_{i,j})$ in the category Hopf_τ of τ -Hopf algebras.*
- (3) *If in addition each H_i is regular, then so is H .*
- (4) *When $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$, and if each H_i is also a τ -Hopf- $*$ algebra and each $p_{i,j}$ being a morphism of τ -Hopf- $*$ algebras, then so is H with the involution induced from the projective limit construction.*

Proof. First of all, $H \in \widehat{\text{LCS}}$ by Proposition 1.41.

(1). This follows from a routine but tedious verification. We briefly describe this verification process for completeness.

Note that from the defining property of m , we have, for each $i \in I$, that

$$\begin{aligned} p_i m(\iota_H \overline{\otimes}_\tau m) &= m_i(p_i \overline{\otimes}_\tau p_i)(\iota_H \overline{\otimes}_\tau m) = m_i(p_i \overline{\otimes}_\tau (p_i m)) \\ &= m_i(p_i \overline{\otimes}_\tau (m_i(p_i \overline{\otimes}_\tau p_i))) = m_i(\iota_{H_i} \overline{\otimes}_\tau m_i)(p_i \overline{\otimes}_\tau p_i \overline{\otimes}_\tau p_i) \\ &= m_i(m_i \overline{\otimes}_\tau \iota_H)(p_i \overline{\otimes}_\tau p_i \overline{\otimes}_\tau p_i) = \dots = p_i m(m \overline{\otimes}_\tau \iota_H). \end{aligned}$$

By the universal property of projective limits, this forces $m(\iota_H \overline{\otimes}_\tau m) = m(m \overline{\otimes}_\tau \iota_H)$, and the multiplication m is associative.

Similarly, the comultiplication Δ is coassociative.

We also have, for each $i \in I$, that

$$p_i m(\iota_H \overline{\otimes}_\tau \eta) = m_i(p_i \overline{\otimes}_\tau (p_i \eta)) = m_i(p_i \overline{\otimes}_\tau \eta_i) = p_i,$$

hence the universal property of projective limits again forces $m(\iota_H \overline{\otimes}_\tau \eta) = \iota_H$. That $m(\eta \overline{\otimes}_\tau \iota_H) = \iota_H$ follows from a similar argument, and η is the unit for m .

Similarly, one can show that ε is the counit for Δ .

We now show that Δ is a morphism of τ -algebras. Clearly, it is unital. To see that it is also multiplicative, note that for each $i \in I$, and recall that we use s to denote the swap (§ 2.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(p_i \overline{\otimes}_\tau p_i) \Delta m &= \Delta_i p_i m = \Delta_i m_i (p_i \overline{\otimes}_\tau p_i) \\
&= (m_i \overline{\otimes}_\tau m_i) (\iota_{H_i} \overline{\otimes}_\tau s_{H_i, H_i} \overline{\otimes}_\tau) (\Delta_i \overline{\otimes}_\tau \Delta_i) (p_i \overline{\otimes}_\tau p_i) \\
&= (m_i \overline{\otimes}_\tau m_i) (\iota_{H_i} \overline{\otimes}_\tau s_{H_i, H_i} \overline{\otimes}_\tau) (p_i \overline{\otimes}_\tau p_i \overline{\otimes}_\tau p_i \overline{\otimes}_\tau p_i) (\Delta \overline{\otimes}_\tau \Delta) \\
&= (m_i \overline{\otimes}_\tau m_i) (p_i \overline{\otimes}_\tau p_i \overline{\otimes}_\tau p_i \overline{\otimes}_\tau p_i) (\iota_H \overline{\otimes}_\tau s_{H, H} \overline{\otimes}_\tau \iota_H) (\Delta \overline{\otimes}_\tau \Delta) \\
&= (p_i \overline{\otimes}_\tau p_i) (m \overline{\otimes}_\tau m) (\iota_H \overline{\otimes}_\tau s_{H, H} \overline{\otimes}_\tau \iota_H) (\Delta \overline{\otimes}_\tau \Delta).
\end{aligned}$$

This forces

$$\Delta m = (m \overline{\otimes}_\tau m) (\iota_H \overline{\otimes}_\tau s_{H, H} \overline{\otimes}_\tau \iota_H) (\Delta \overline{\otimes}_\tau \Delta)$$

by the universal property of projective limits, and Δ is indeed a morphism of τ -algebras, and we've established that $(H, m, \eta, \Delta, \varepsilon)$ is a τ -bialgebra.

Finally, for each $i \in I$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
p_i m (S \overline{\otimes}_\tau \iota_H) \Delta &= m_i (p_i S \overline{\otimes}_\tau p_i) \Delta = m_i (S_i p_i \overline{\otimes}_\tau p_i) \Delta \\
&= m_i (S_i \overline{\otimes}_\tau \iota_{H_i}) \Delta_i p_i = \eta_i \varepsilon_i p_i = \eta_i \varepsilon = p_i \eta \varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

This forces $m (S \overline{\otimes}_\tau \iota_H) \Delta = \eta \varepsilon$ by the universal property of projective limits. Similarly, $m (\iota_H \overline{\otimes}_\tau S) \Delta = \eta \varepsilon$, and S satisfies the axiom for the antipode, which finishes the proof of (1).

(2), (3) and (4) are now (easier) routine verifications. \square

Remark 7.2. In [31] and [66, § 3], there are already some construction of certain projective limits in the context of C^* -version or von Neumann algebraic version of compact quantum groups. Formally, it seems that our construction here seems more natural. Later in § 8, we will use the construction presented here to describe some natural candidates for the quantum groups S_∞^+ , O_∞^+ and U_∞^+ , as well as their duals, and justify why these quantum groups seems not even belonging to the framework of locally compact quantum groups.

Definition 7.3. We call the projective system (H_i, p_i, j) in Theorem 7.1 a **reduced projective system** of τ -Hopf(-*) algebra, and H its **projective limit**.

7.2 Strict inductive limits of inductive Hopf algebras

We may dualize the construction in § 7.1 to construct arbitrary inductive limits in the category Hopf_l of ι -Hopf algebras: just use the commutation of $\overline{\otimes}_l$ with completed inductive limits, i.e. inductive limits in $\widehat{\text{LCS}}$, see Corollary 1.58 and Corollary 1.89. However, there are some caveats.

First of all, we've seen that (Remark 1.47) that the inductive locally convex topology on an algebraic inductive limit might not even be Hausdorff, so we need to take the separated quotient (Definition 1.48) in order to form the corresponding inductive limit in LCS, see Proposition 1.49. In general, this separated quotient needs not be complete, even each of locally convex space in the inductive system is complete (for a counter-example, one may use [14, Ch.III, § 1, Exercice 2]). Hence in order to obtain the colimit in $\widehat{\text{LCS}}$ with which we are working, in general, one also needs to take the completion. As these processes all commutes with forming inductive limits (see Corollary 1.58 and Corollary 1.89), we may indeed obtain the inductive limit of an inductive system of ι -Hopf algebras in the category Hopf_l . However, even so, we should also note that the completion process (as well as the process of taking the separated quotient) in general destroys the relevant duality as in § 7.3.

For these reasons, instead of treating general inductive limits in detail as in § 7.1 for projective limits, we pay more attention to a certain special class of strict inductive limits in Hopf_l .

Theorem 7.4. Let $(H_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a countable family of ι -Hopf algebras. Suppose that for each n , the compatible topologies on

$$H_n \odot H_n, \quad (H_n \overline{\otimes}_l H_n) \odot H_l \quad \text{and} \quad (H_n \overline{\otimes}_l H_n \overline{\otimes}_l H_n) \odot H_n$$

are all unique, and $u_n : H_n \hookrightarrow H_{n+1}$ is a morphism of ι -Hopf algebras that is a strict monomorphism as locally convex spaces. Consider the strict inductive limit $H := \varinjlim H_n$ of the strict inductive system (H_n, u_n) in $\widehat{\text{LCS}}$ with $v_n : H_n \hookrightarrow H$ being the canonical injections, and let $\mathbb{K} = \varinjlim K_n$ be the inductive limit of the trivial inductive system given by $u_{\mathbb{K}} : K_n \rightarrow K_{n+1}$ for each n , where each $K_n = \mathbb{K}$. Then in $\widehat{\text{LCS}}$, the inductive systems

$$\begin{aligned}
&(H_n \overline{\otimes}_l H_n, u_n \overline{\otimes}_l u_n), \quad (H_n \overline{\otimes}_l H_n \overline{\otimes}_l H_n, u_n \overline{\otimes}_l u_n \overline{\otimes}_l u_n) \\
&\text{and} \quad (H_n \overline{\otimes}_l H_n \overline{\otimes}_l H_n \overline{\otimes}_l H_n, u_n \overline{\otimes}_l u_n \overline{\otimes}_l u_n \overline{\otimes}_l u_n)
\end{aligned}$$

are all strict, with

$$H \overline{\otimes}_l H, \quad H \overline{\otimes}_l H \overline{\otimes}_l H \quad \text{and} \quad H \overline{\otimes}_l H \overline{\otimes}_l H \overline{\otimes}_l H$$

being canonically identified with their respective strict inductive limit.

Moreover, define

- (1) $\eta : \mathbb{K} \rightarrow H$ to be the unique continuous linear map such that $\eta = u_n \eta_n$ for each n , with each η_n being the unit of H_n ;
- (2) $m : H \overline{\otimes}_1 H \rightarrow H$ to be the unique continuous linear map such that $m(u_n \overline{\otimes}_1 u_n) = m_n$ for each n , with each m_n being the multiplication of H_n ;
- (3) $\varepsilon : H \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ to be the unique continuous linear map such that $\varepsilon u_n = \varepsilon_n$ for each n , with ε_n being the counit for H_n ;
- (4) $\Delta : H \rightarrow H \overline{\otimes}_1 H$ being the unique continuous linear map such that $\Delta u_n = (u_n \overline{\otimes}_1 u_n) \Delta_n$, with Δ_n being the comultiplication on H_n ;
- (5) $S : H \rightarrow H$ being the unique continuous linear map such that $S u_n = u_n S_n$ for each n , with S_n being the antipode of H_n .

Then equipped with these structure maps, $H \in \widehat{\text{LCS}}$ is a ι -Hopf algebra, and is the inductive limit of the system (H_n, u_n) in the category Hopf_ι of all ι -Hopf algebras. When each H_n is regular, then so is H . And when $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$ and each H_n is a ι -Hopf-* algebra, with each u_n being a morphism of ι -Hopf-* algebras, then H is an ι -Hopf-* algebra under the canonical involution induced it.

Proof. We first establish the first part on the inductive limits. Note that $H \in \widehat{\text{LCS}}$ follows from Proposition 1.56 and Corollary 1.59. By Corollary 1.89, we have

$$(7.1) \quad H \otimes_\iota H = \varinjlim_{m \geq 1, n \geq 1} H_m \otimes_\iota H_n = \varinjlim_{n \geq 1} H_n \otimes_\iota H_n,$$

where the last equality follows by noting that $\{(n, n) \mid n \geq 1\}$ are cofinal in $\mathbb{N}_+ \times \mathbb{N}_+$. To prove the strictness of the inductive system with respect to which the inductive limit at the right most of (7.1) is formed, note that by uniqueness of the compatible topologies in the assumption and Proposition 1.101, we see that

$$u_n \overline{\otimes}_1 u_n = u_n \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon u_n : H_n \overline{\otimes}_1 H_n = H_n \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon H_n \hookrightarrow H_{n+1} \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon H_{n+1} = H_{n+1} \overline{\otimes}_1 H_{n+1}$$

is indeed a strict monomorphism. Now by Corollary 1.58, taking completion in (7.1), we see that

$$H \overline{\otimes}_\iota H = \varinjlim H_n \overline{\otimes}_1 H_n.$$

The case for three-fold and four-fold tensor products are established similarly.

To check the second part on the locally Hopf algebras, one can dualize the argument in Theorem 7.1. The adaption is trivial and hence is omitted here. \square

Definition 7.5. We call the inductive system $(H_n, u_n)_{n \geq 1}$ in Theorem 7.4 a **strict inductive system** of ι -Hopf(-*) algebras, and the ι -Hopf(-*) algebra H the **strict inductive limit** of (H_n, u_n) .

7.3 A duality result

Note that for any (F) -spaces E and F , at least one of which is nuclear, the compatible topology on $E \odot F$ is unique (Proposition 1.114, Proposition 1.115 and Definition 1.116).

We are now ready to establish the following duality result.

Theorem 7.6. Let $(H_n, u_n)_{n \geq 1}$ of a strict inductive system of ι -Hopf(-*) algebras of class (\mathcal{FN}) , and H its strict inductive limit. Then

- (1) for each n , the transpose $p_n : (H_{n+1})'_b \rightarrow (H_n)'_b$ of u_n is a morphism of ε -Hopf(-*) algebras and is surjective as a morphism in $\widehat{\text{LCS}}$;
- (2) the projective system of ε -Hopf(-*) algebras $((H_n)'_b, p_n)$ is reduced;
- (3) the ι -Hopf(-*) algebra H is (ι, ε) -reflexive, and its strong dual is canonically isomorphic to the projective limit $\varprojlim (H_n)'_b$.

Proof. (1). The surjectivity of each p_n follows from the Hahn-Banach theorem. That p_n is a morphism of ε -Hopf(-*) algebras follows directly from our construction of the strong dual.

(2) follows from (1).

(3). Each H_n is a Montel space (Proposition 1.136), so is their strict inductive limit H (Proposition 1.134). Thus for these spaces, as well as their duals, are all in (\mathcal{M}) (Proposition 1.134), hence are all Mackey spaces (Proposition 1.64) as they are in particular all barreled. Moreover, H being Montel implies it is reflexive.

Now apply Proposition 1.54, we see that the strong dual H'_b can be identified canonically as the projective limit of $((H_n)'_b, p_n)$. All nuclear spaces have the approximation property (Proposition 1.127).

Now from the discussion in the beginning of this section and Proposition 3.3, for each n , we have

$$H_n \overline{\otimes}_i H_n = H_n \overline{\otimes}_\pi H_n = H_n \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon H_n$$

remains in the class (\mathcal{FN}) (Corollary 1.99 and Proposition 1.119). It follows from the construction in § 7.2 that $H \overline{\otimes}_i H$ is identified canonically with the strict inductive system $(H_n \overline{\otimes}_i H_n, u_n \overline{\otimes}_i u_n)$, whose strong dual is the projective limit of the dual projective system $((H_n)'_b \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon (H_n)'_b, p_n \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon p_n)$. Repeating the argument in the previous paragraph, we see that the strong dual of $H \overline{\otimes}_i H$ is canonically identified with $H'_b \overline{\otimes}_\varepsilon H'_b$.

Similarly, continuing the argument, one establishes an analogous duality the three-fold and four-fold tensor products, which finishes the proof of (3). \square

We will soon see in § 8 that, Theorem 7.6 already suffices to establish some interesting locally convex Hopf algebras.

8 Examples of projective and inductive limits

8.1 A variant of Bruhat's regular functions on locally compact groups

We have seen in § 5.4 that every locally compact group G induces an ε -Hopf(-*) algebra structure on $C(G)$; in Theorem 6.19 that we can recover G from the ε -Hopf $C(G)$ algebra; and in Theorem 6.23 that we can even recover the Pontryagin dual group \widehat{G} from the ε -Hopf-* algebra $C(G)$ when G is abelian. It is also shown in Theorem 5.21 that the ε -Hopf algebra $C(G)$ is (ε, π) -polar reflexive, when G is σ -compact, or in particular, if G is second countable.

For second countable locally compact groups, it might be desirable to find a locally convex Hopf algebra counterpart that is strongly reflexive instead of polar reflexive. We now describe a way to do this, using a variant of Bruhat's notion regular functions on an arbitrary locally compact groups ([18, pp48–50]), which in turn heavily relies on some structural results of locally compact groups that are discovered during a series of spectacular papers [29, 30], [56], [98, 99], aiming to resolve Hilbert's fifth problem of characterizing Lie groups among locally compact groups. See also the books [57] and [74] for a systematic treatment. An affirmative answer for one version of the formulation of Hilbert's fifth problem goes as follows: we say a topological group G **has no small subgroups**, if there exists a neighborhood U of e , such that there exists no nontrivial subgroup H of G such that $H \subseteq U$. Yamabe [98, p364, Theorem 3] showed that a locally compact group that has no small subgroups is a Lie group, and it is elementary to use exponential maps to see that any Lie group has no small subgroups.

For the rest of § 8.1, we fix a second countable locally compact group G . Following Bruhat [18], we say a compact subgroup K of G is **good**, if the quotient group G/K is a Lie group, which is necessarily second countable since G is so (by [92, p110, 3.41], there's also no ambiguity of the Lie group structure on G/K).

We shall also need the following weaker version of [98, p364, Theorem 5'].

Theorem 8.1 ([57, p175, Theorem]). *Let G be a second countable locally compact group. Then every neighborhood of the identity e contains a good subgroup of G .*

The following notion is due to Bruhat [18].

Definition 8.2. A function f on G is said to be a **regular function with compact support**, if there exists a good subgroup K of G , and a smooth function \tilde{f} on G/K with compact support such that $f = \tilde{f}\pi$, where $\pi : G \rightarrow G/K$ is the canonical projection. The space of all regular functions with compact support on G is denoted by $\mathcal{D}(G)$.

We now introduce the functions with which we are going to work.

Definition 8.3. A function f on G is called **liftably smooth**, if there exists a good subgroup K of G , such that $f = \tilde{f}\pi$ for some $\tilde{f} \in C^\infty(G/K)$, where $\pi : G \rightarrow G/K$ is the canonical projection. The space of all liftably smooth functions on G is denoted by $\mathcal{E}_l(G)$.

As vector spaces, it is clear that $\mathcal{D}(G)$ is a subspace of $\mathcal{E}_l(G)$.

Remark 8.4. *We point out that our definition of a liftably smooth function is closely related to, but distinct from Bruhat's notion of a regular function ([18, § p44], and note that we assume G is second countable, so we don't need the general case in [18, § p44]), the latter is defined as a function that can be locally represented by some regular function with finite support. Hence functions in $\mathcal{E}_l(G)$ is always smooth in Bruhat's sense, but not vice versa.*

We now introduce a locally convex space structure on $\mathcal{E}_l(G)$. Take a countable *decreasing* fundamental system $(U_n)_{n \geq 1}$ of neighborhoods of $e \in G$, and for each n , choose a good subgroup K_n of G with $K_n \subseteq U$. It is shown in [18, p44] that the intersection of two good subgroups remains a good subgroup, so without loss of generality, we may also assume the sequence $(K_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is also decreasing. For each n , let $\pi_n : G \rightarrow G/K_n$ be the canonical projection, consider the ε -Hopf(-*) algebra $C^\infty(G/K_n)$ as in Theorem 4.3 (see also Remark 4.6). Since G is second countable, the locally convex space $C^\infty(G/K_n)$ is of class $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{N})$ (Lemma 4.1). By Proposition 1.115, we see that

$$(8.1) \quad C^\infty(G/K_n) \otimes_l C^\infty(G/K_n) = C^\infty(G/K_n) \otimes_\pi C^\infty(G/K_n) = C^\infty(G/K_n) \otimes_\varepsilon C^\infty(G/K_n)$$

and the compatible topology on $C^\infty(G/K_n) \odot C^\infty(G/K_n)$ is unique. The similar assertion also holds three-fold and four-fold tensor products by the same reasoning, therefore, $C^\infty(G/K_n)$ is also an ι -Hopf(-*) algebra.

Lemma 8.5. *If K, H are good subgroups of G with $K \subseteq H$, and $\pi : G/K \rightarrow G/H$ the canonical projection $xK \mapsto xH$, then $\pi^* : C^\infty(G/H) \rightarrow C^\infty(G/K)$ is a strict monomorphism of locally convex spaces with closed image.*

Proof. It is clear that π maps every compact sets in G/K to compact sets in G/H . We claim for every compact $D \subseteq G/H$, there exists a compact $C \subseteq G/K$ such that $D = \pi(C)$. If the claim holds, then it follows easily from the definition of locally convex topologies on $C^\infty(G/H)$ and $C^\infty(G/K)$ as described in § 4.2, that π^* is a strict monomorphism. The closeness of the image of π^* follows from completeness.

We now prove the claim. For each $x \in \pi^{-1}(D)$, consider a *compact* neighborhood C_x of x . Since π is an open map, $\pi(\text{Int}(C_x))$ is an open neighborhood of $\pi(x)$, where $\text{Int}(\cdot)$ denotes the interior. By compactness of D (and surjectivity of π), there exists finitely many $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \pi^{-1}(D)$, such that $\bigcup_{k=1}^n (\text{Int}(C_{x_k})) \supseteq D$. Note that $\pi^{-1}(D)$ is closed, it suffices to take $C = \left(\bigcup_{k=1}^n C_{x_k} \right) \cap \pi^{-1}(D)$, and the proof is complete. \square

By Lemma 8.5, we may canonically identified $C^\infty(G/K_n)$ as a closed subspace of $C^\infty(G/K_{n+1})$, which are in turn identified canonically as subspaces of $\mathcal{E}_l(G)$ via π_n^* and π_{n+1}^* respectively. Denoting by E_n the subspace of $\pi_n^*(C^\infty(G/K_n))$ in $\mathcal{E}_l(G)$, we see that, by definition, $\mathcal{E}_l(G) = \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty E_n$. We transport the topology of $C^\infty(G/K_n)$ onto E_n , and equip $\mathcal{E}_l(G)$ with the inductive locally convex topology with respect to the inclusions $E_n \hookrightarrow \mathcal{E}_l(G)$. It follows from Lemma 8.5 that $\mathcal{E}_l(G)$ is the strict inductive limit of the strict inductive system $(E_n, u_n)_{n \geq 1}$, where each $u_n : E_n \hookrightarrow E_{n+1}$ is the inclusion. By Corollary 1.59, we see that $\mathcal{E}_l(G)$ is complete.

Now we show that the topology on $\mathcal{E}_l(G)$ defined as above doesn't depend on the choice of (U_n) , nor the choice of (K_n) . Indeed, it suffices to show that for any good subgroup K of G , we have $K \supseteq K_n$ for n large enough (as this means $C^\infty(G/K)$ can be seen as a closed subspace of $C^\infty(G/K_n)$, and the closed subspaces (E_n) of $\mathcal{E}_l(G)$ shall be cofinal for any possible choice as above, hence the topology $\mathcal{E}_l(G)$ is uniquely determined via the above procedure and does not depend on the choices). To see that $K \supseteq K_n$ for some n , it suffices to note that $\pi(K_n)$ is a compact, hence closed subgroup of the Lie group G/K for each n , where $\pi : G \rightarrow G/K$ is the canonical projection. It is well-known that closed subgroups of a Lie group is still a Lie group (see, e.g. [92, p]110, 3.42), we see that $K_n/(K \cap K_n) \simeq \pi(K_n) = (KK_n)/K$ is a Lie subgroup of G/K . Moreover, as $\pi(U_n)$ is a fundamental system of neighborhoods of the identity in G/K and $\pi(K_n) \subseteq \pi(U_n)$, since G/K has no small subgroups, we must have $\pi(K_n)$ is the trivial subgroup in G/K as long as n is large enough, which in turn forces $K_n \subseteq KK_n = K$.

Since E_n is a copy of $C^\infty(G/K_n)$, we may also transport the ε -Hopf(-*) algebra structure of $C^\infty(G/K_n)$ on E_n . It follows from Theorem 4.3 that E_n is (ι, ε) -reflexive, and the transpose of the inclusion $u_n : E_n \hookrightarrow E_{n+1}$ yields a surjective (by Hahn-Banach) continuous linear map $p_n : (E_{n+1})'_b \rightarrow (E_n)'_b$. It is easily seen that both u_n and p_n are morphisms of locally convex Hopf algebras. We may, in particular, equip $\mathcal{E}_l(G)$ with an ι -Hopf(-*) algebra structure by letting it be the strict inductive limit of the strict inductive system $(E_n, u_n)_{n \geq 1}$ as in § 7.2.

Theorem 8.6. *Using the above notation, the ι -Hopf algebra $\mathcal{E}_l(G)$ is (ι, ε) -reflexive, with its strong dual being the projective limit of the reduced projective system $((E_n)'_b, p_n)_{n \geq 1}$.*

Proof. This is clear from the above discussion and Theorem 7.6. \square

It is quite interesting that we may still recover G as a topological group (hence as a Lie group since the Lie group structure is unique once the topological group is given, cf. [92, p110, 3.41]).

Theorem 8.7. *Using the above notation, the map $\delta : G \rightarrow \chi_c(\mathcal{E}_l(G))$, $x \mapsto \delta_x$ is an isomorphism of topological groups.*

Proof. By Theorem 6.13, it suffices to show that liftably smooth functions on G with values in $[0, 1]$ separate compact sets and closed sets. But this follows directly from Bruhat's version of partitions of unity [18, p76, Proposition 2] and that $\mathcal{D}(G) \subseteq \mathcal{E}_1(G)$. \square

Remark 8.8. *Since continuous group morphisms between Lie groups are automatically smooth [92, p109, 3.39], it is easy to see that $\text{Grp}^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{E}_1(G)) = \widehat{G}$ as groups, following the same argument as in Theorem 6.23. However, at the time of this writing, the author is unsure whether the subspace topology on $\text{Grp}^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{E}_1(G))$ induced by the topology on $\mathcal{E}_1(G)$ is exactly the topology on the Pontryagin dual \widehat{G} .*

8.2 Certain projective limits with non locally compact character groups

As a motivation for our theory of the strict inductive limits of separable compact quantum groups, as well as another illustration of the general constructions in § 7, we now consider some projective limits coming from compact Lie groups.

Consider a strictly increasing sequence of *compact* Lie groups $(G_n)_{n \geq 1}$, connected by Lie group morphisms $u_n : G_n \rightarrow G_{n+1}$, $n \geq 1$ that are all embeddings. For example, we may take $G_n = O(n)$ (resp. $SU(n)$ or $U(n)$), and u_n embeds $O(n)$ to the top left corner of $O(n+1)$ (resp. $SU(n)$ or $U(n)$).

We've seen that $C^\infty(G_n)$ is an ε -Hopf(-*) algebra of class $(\mathcal{F}\mathcal{N})$. It is also clear that the pull-back $p_n := u_n^* : C^\infty(G_{n+1}) \rightarrow C^\infty(G_n)$ is a morphism of ε -Hopf(-*) algebras. It is well-known that by partitions of unity, smooth functions on a closed set (which means it extends to a smooth function on an open set containing this closed set) in a smooth manifold can be extended to a smooth function of the whole manifold. Thus p_n is surjective as a map. We thus have a reduced projective system $(C^\infty(G_n), p_n)$ of ε -Hopf(-*) algebras. Now let \mathcal{H} be the projective limit of this projective system (§ 7.1). The underlying locally convex space of \mathcal{H} is $\varprojlim C^\infty(G_n)$, which is still of class $(\mathcal{F}\mathcal{N})$ by Proposition 1.41 and Proposition 1.119. Thus it follows from Theorem 6.3 that $\chi_c(\mathcal{H})$ (or $\chi_c^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{H})$ in the involutive case) is a topological group. To facilitate discussion, let $q_n : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow C^\infty(G_n)$ be the canonical projection for each n .

Proposition 8.9. *Using the above notation, we have*

- (1) *the map $\delta_n : G_n \rightarrow \chi_c(C^\infty(G_n))$, $x \mapsto \delta_x$ is an isomorphism of topological groups;*
- (2) *the map $v_n : \chi_c(C^\infty(G_n)) \rightarrow \chi_c(C^\infty(G))$, $\chi \mapsto \chi q_n$ is an injective morphism of topological groups;*
- (3) *the union of all the images of v_n are strictly increasing, and their union is exactly $\chi(C^\infty(G))$;*
- (4) *if $u_n(G_n)$ is nowhere dense in G_{n+1} for each n , then the topological space $\chi_c(G)$ is not a Baire space; in particular, the topological group $\chi_c(\mathcal{H})$ is not locally compact.*

If $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$, and treating all the above ε -Hopf algebras as ε -Hopf- algebras and replaces $\chi_c(\cdot)$ (resp. $\chi(\cdot)$) with $\chi_c^{\text{inv}}(\cdot)$ (resp. $\chi^{\text{inv}}(\cdot)$), then all of the above still hold.*

Proof. We only treat the non-involutive case, as the involutive case follows from the same argument. (1) follows Theorem 6.19, while (2) follows by noting that $q_n : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow C^\infty(G_n)$ is a morphism of ε -Hopf algebras and maps precompact sets to precompact sets by continuity. The first half of (3) is clear since the sequence (G_n) is strictly increasing. To see the latter half, it suffices to note that by Proposition 1.54 (we've seen several times that all of the relevant spaces are barrelled, hence Mackey), every character of \mathcal{H} factors through a character of some $C^\infty(G_n)$. (4), the image of each v_n , which we denote by C_n , is a compact, hence closed subset of $\chi_c(\mathcal{H})$, and they are strictly increasing with union being the whole space $\chi_c(\mathcal{H})$. By compactness, $v_n \delta_n : G_n \rightarrow C_n$ is a homeomorphism where the latter is equipped with the subspace topology induced by $\chi_c(\mathcal{H})$. The hypothesis of nowhere dense implies that each C_n has an empty interior, thus being the countable union $\cup_{n \geq 1} C_n$, the topological space $\chi_c(\mathcal{H})$ can not be a Baire space. \square

Remark 8.10. *Note that our aforementioned examples of $G_n = O(n)$, $G_n = SU(n)$ and $G_n = U(n)$ all satisfies the hypothesis in Proposition 8.9 (4), hence the resulting \mathcal{H} has a non locally compact character group.*

8.3 Strict inductive limits of separable compact quantum groups

We say a compact quantum group $\mathbb{G} = (C(\mathbb{G}), \Delta)$ is **separable** if the C^* -algebra $C(\mathbb{G})$ is separable. From the Peter-Weyl theory and the orthogonality relations for irreducible unitary representations of \mathbb{G} , one checks easily that \mathbb{G} is separable if and only if $\text{Irr}(\mathbb{G})$ is countable, which in turn, is equivalent to $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{G})$ being of countable dimension. From now on, we will treat compact quantum groups as locally convex Hopf-* algebras as in § 4.4. In particular, we equip $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{G})$ with the finest locally convex topology. It follows Proposition 4.7, Proposition 1.120 and Proposition 1.119 that \mathbb{G} is separable if and only if $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{G})$ is of class \mathcal{N} .

Now consider an increasing sequence of compact quantum groups $(\mathbb{G}_n)_{n \geq 1}$, by which we mean that we may view \mathbb{G}_n as a compact quantum subgroup of \mathbb{G}_{n+1} in the sense that there exists a *surjective* homomorphism $p_n : \text{Pol}(\mathbb{G}_{n+1}) \rightarrow \text{Pol}(\mathbb{G}_n)$ of (ε) -Hopf- $*$ algebras. We thus have a reduced projective system $(\text{Pol}(\mathbb{G}_n), p_n)$ of ε -Hopf- $*$ algebras. We've seen in Theorem 4.8 (and § 4.4) that for each n , the dual $\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{\mathbb{G}}_n}$ is an π -Hopf algebra of type (\mathcal{FN}) , hence can also be seen as an ι -Hopf algebra (Proposition 1.119, Corollary 1.106 and Proposition 1.115). Taking the transpose of each p_n , we obtain a strict inductive system $(\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{\mathbb{G}}_n}, u_n)$ of ι -Hopf algebras. Hence we may take the projective limit of the reduced projective system $(\text{Pol}(\mathbb{G}_n), p_n)$, which we denote by $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{G}_\infty}$, and is still an ε -Hopf- $*$ algebra. We may also take the inductive limit of the strict inductive system $(\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{\mathbb{G}}_n}, u_n)$, which we denote by $\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{\mathbb{G}}_\infty}$, and is an ι -Hopf- $*$ algebra.

By Theorem 7.6, we see that $\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{\mathbb{G}}_\infty}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{G}_\infty}$ are the strong duals of each other as locally convex Hopf- $*$ algebras.

Definition 8.11. We call the ε -Hopf- $*$ algebra $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{G}}$ the **strict inductive limit** of the increasing sequence (\mathbb{G}_n) of separable compact quantum groups.

8.4 A notion of S_∞^+ , O_∞^+ , U_∞^+ and their duals

Since their introduction by the work of S. Wang [90, 91], the quantum permutation group S_N^+ , the free orthogonal group O_N^+ and the free unitary group U_N^+ received a lot attention, and still play an important role in current research on compact/discrete quantum groups. It is natural to ask, however vaguely, the natural question of what should be the right notion of S_∞^+ , O_∞^+ and U_∞^+ , as the respective inductive limit as $N \rightarrow \infty$. In the following, we follow in [60, § 1.1] for the basics of S_N^+ , O_N^+ and U_N^+ .

First, for the infinite quantum permutation group S_∞^+ . We first define the quantum permutation group S_N^+ on N symbols. The universal version of S_N^+ is described as follows (see [60, p6, Example 1.1.8]): let $A_S(N)$ be the universal C^* -algebra generated by the family of symbols $U = (u_{i,j}^N)_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$, subject to the relations given by requiring U to be a so-called “magic unitary”. More precisely, this means that each $u_{i,j}^N$ should be a projection, and the sum of each column and row of U is 1. The formula $\Delta_N(u_{i,j}^N) = \sum_{k=1}^N u_{i,k}^N \otimes u_{k,j}^N$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ extends by the universal property to a unique comultiplication on $A_S(N)$, and it can be shown that $(A_S(N), \Delta_N)$ is a separable compact quantum group, which we denote by S_N^+ . Now $\mathcal{H}_N := \text{Pol}(S_N^+)$ is an ε -Hopf- $*$ algebra, and is generated by $u_{i,j}^N$ as an algebra. We may obtain a surjective morphism $\pi_N : \mathcal{H}_{N+1} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_N$ by requiring $\pi_N(u_{i,j}^{(N+1)}) = u_{i,j}^N$, if $1 \leq i, j \leq N$, and $\pi_N(u_{i,j}^{(N+1)}) = 0$ otherwise. We call the projective limit $\varprojlim \mathcal{H}_n$ of the projective system $(\mathcal{H}_n, \pi_n)_{n \geq 1}$ the ε -Hopf algebra corresponding to S_∞^+ , and its strong dual (see § 8.3) the ι -Hopf algebra corresponding to the dual of S_∞^+ . Classically, this construction correspond to the permutation group S_∞ of all permutations on \mathbb{N}_+ that fix all but finitely many elements, as the inductive limit of S_N , $N \geq 1$, with S_N embeds into S_{N+1} by letting all elements in S_N fix any $n \geq N$.

Next, we treat O_∞^+ . For each $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$, we describe a separable compact quantum group O_n^+ as follows. Consider the universal C^* -algebra $A_o(n)$ generated by the symbols $U = (u_{i,j}^{(n)})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$, subject to the relations given by requiring U to be unitary and each $u_{i,j}^{(n)}$ being self-adjoint (this corresponds to letting F to be the identity matrix in [60, p5, Example 1.1.7]). The formula $\Delta_n(u_{i,j}^{(n)}) = \sum_{k=1}^n u_{i,k}^{(n)} \otimes u_{k,j}^{(n)}$ determines a unique comultiplication on $A_o(n)$ the universal property. It can be shown that $(A_o(n), \Delta_n)$ is a compact quantum group, and we denote it by O_n^+ . The ε -Hopf algebra $\text{Pol}(O_n^+)$ is generated by $u_{i,j}^{(n)}$, $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ as an algebra. And we have a unique surjective morphism of ε -Hopf- $*$ algebras $\pi_n : \text{Pol}(O_{n+1}^+) \rightarrow \text{Pol}(O_n^+)$ such that $\pi_n(u_{i,j}^{(n+1)}) = u_{i,j}^{(n)}$, if $1 \leq i, j \leq n$; and $\pi_n(u_{i,j}^{(n+1)}) = 0$ otherwise. Now the projective limit of the reduced projective system $(\text{Pol}(O_n^+), \pi_n)$ of ε -Hopf- $*$ algebra is an ε -Hopf- $*$ algebra, which we shall denote by $\mathcal{H}_{O_\infty^+}$, and its strong dual, as an ι -Hopf- $*$ algebra, is denoted by $\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{O}_\infty^+}$, both corresponding to O_∞^+ (the former is the analogue of the function algebra, while the latter the convolution algebra). Classically, O_∞^+ corresponds to $O(\infty)$ —the union of all $O(n)$ as we've considered in Remark 8.10, which is shown there is not locally compact. It is by this comparison that O_∞^+ seems lies outside the framework of locally compact quantum groups.

By letting the matrix F to be identity in [60, p6, Example 1.1.6], and proceeds as in the previous paragraph, we may obtain an ε -Hopf- $*$ algebra $\mathcal{H}_{U_\infty^+}$, as well as its strong dual $\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{U}_\infty^+}$, which is an ι -Hopf- $*$ algebra, both related to U_∞^+ . By a similar line of thought as in the case of O_∞^+ , again it seems that U_∞^+ lies outside the framework of locally compact quantum groups; and classically, U_∞^+ corresponds to $U(\infty)$, which is the union of all $U(n)$, $n \geq 1$.

Remark 8.12. In [84], other versions of universal quantum groups are considered, which are more general than $O^+(n)$ and $U^+(n)$. By suitably choosing the invertible matrices $F_n \in \text{Mat}_{n \times n}(\mathbb{C})$ for different n , in

principle, we may consider certain strict inductive limit of separable compact quantum groups of the form $(A_o(F_n))$, and of the form $(A_u(F_n))$ etc. (see the notation in [60, p6]).

Remark 8.13. A version of the object S_∞^+ is already considered in [31] using a much involved method. We also point out that recently, Voigt [88] has constructed the full quantum permutation group on an infinite set, as a discrete quantum group, so still remains in the framework of locally compact quantum groups. Our construction of O_∞^+ and U_∞^+ seems new to the best of the author's knowledge.

Acknowledgement

This work is supported by the Polish National Science Center NCN grant No. 2020/39/I/ST1/01566. The author would also like to express his sincere gratitude to Prof. Adam Skalski for his encouragement and stimulating discussions. The author would also like to thank Prof. Paweł Kasprzak, for his question of why not considering $C(G)$ of all continuous functions on a Lie group G after hearing a talk of the author on some part of this paper, which eventually lead to the constructions in § 5.4.

References

- [1] Marcelo Aguiar and Swapneel Mahajan, *Monoidal functors, species and Hopf algebras*, CRM Monograph Series, vol. 29, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010. With forewords by Kenneth Brown and Stephen Chase and André Joyal.
- [2] S. S. Akbarov, *Pontryagin duality in the theory of topological vector spaces*, Mat. Zametki **57** (1995), no. 3, 463–466.
- [3] ———, *Stereotype locally convex spaces*, Izv. Ross. Akad. Nauk Ser. Mat. **64** (2000), no. 4, 3–46.
- [4] ———, *Pontryagin duality in the theory of topological vector spaces and in topological algebra*, 2003, pp. 179–349. Functional analysis, 9.
- [5] Sergei S. Akbarov, *Pontryagin duality and topological algebras*, Topological algebras, their applications, and related topics, 2005, pp. 55–71.
- [6] ———, *Stereotype spaces and algebras*, De Gruyter Expositions in Mathematics, vol. 73, De Gruyter, Berlin, [2022] ©2022.
- [7] Saad Baaj and Georges Skandalis, *Unitaires multiplicatifs et dualité pour les produits croisés de C^* -algèbres*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **26** (1993), no. 4, 425–488.
- [8] G. Bezhanishvili, P. J. Morandi, and B. Olberding, *A generalization of Gelfand-Naimark-Stone duality to completely regular spaces*, Topology Appl. **274** (2020), 107123, 26.
- [9] P. Bonneau, M. Flato, M. Gerstenhaber, and G. Pinczon, *The hidden group structure of quantum groups: strong duality, rigidity and preferred deformations*, Comm. Math. Phys. **161** (1994), no. 1, 125–156.
- [10] N. Bourbaki, *Théories spectrales. Chapitres 1 et 2*, Springer, Cham, [2019] ©2019. Second edition [of 0213871].
- [11] Nicolas Bourbaki, *Espaces vectoriels topologiques. Chapitres 1 à 5*, New, Masson, Paris, 1981. Éléments de mathématique. [Elements of mathematics].
- [12] ———, *Topologie générale, chapitres 1 à 4*, Reimpression inchangée de l'édition de 1971, Springer-Verlag Berlin and Heidelberg GmbH & Co. K, 2006.
- [13] ———, *Topologie générale, chapitres 5 à 10*, Reimpression inchangée de l'édition de 1974, Springer-Verlag Berlin and Heidelberg GmbH & Co. K, 2006.
- [14] ———, *Intégration: Chapitres 1 à 4*, Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.
- [15] Kalman Brauner, *Duals of Fréchet spaces and a generalization of the Banach-Dieudonné theorem*, Duke Math. J. **40** (1973), 845–855.
- [16] Glen E. Bredon, *Topology and geometry*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 139, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1997. Corrected third printing of the 1993 original.
- [17] Nathaniel P. Brown and Narutaka Ozawa, *C^* -algebras and finite-dimensional approximations*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 88, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2008.
- [18] François Bruhat, *Distributions sur un groupe localement compact et applications à l'étude des représentations des groupes \mathfrak{p} -adiques*, Bull. Soc. Math. France **89** (1961), 43–75.
- [19] Henri Buchwalter, *Produit topologique, produit tensoriel et c -replétion*, Actes du Colloque d'Analyse Fonctionnelle (Univ. Bordeaux, Bordeaux, 1971), 1972, pp. 51–71.
- [20] Jean Dieudonné, *Sur les espaces de Montel métrisables*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris **238** (1954), 194–195.
- [21] C. H. Dowker, *Topology of metric complexes*, Amer. J. Math. **74** (1952), 555–577.
- [22] V. G. Drinfel'd, *Quantum groups*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. 1, 2 (Berkeley, Calif., 1986), 1987, pp. 798–820.
- [23] Per Enflo, *A counterexample to the approximation problem in Banach spaces*, Acta Math. **130** (1973), 309–317.

- [24] Michel Enock and Jean-Marie Schwartz, *Une dualité dans les algèbres de von Neumann*, Bulletin de la Société Mathématique de France. Supplement Mémoire, vol. 44, Société Mathématique de France, Paris, 1975. Supplément au Bull. Soc. Math. France, Tome 103, no. 4.
- [25] ———, *Kac algebras and duality of locally compact groups*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992. With a preface by Alain Connes, With a postface by Adrian Ocneanu.
- [26] Michel Enock and Jean-Michel Vallin, *C^* -algèbres de Kac et algèbres de Kac*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **66** (1993), no. 3, 619–650.
- [27] Pavel Etingof, Shlomo Gelaki, Dmitri Nikshych, and Victor Ostrik, *Tensor categories*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 205, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2015.
- [28] Pierre Eymard, *L'algèbre de Fourier d'un groupe localement compact*, Bull. Soc. Math. France **92** (1964), 181–236.
- [29] A. M. Gleason, *The structure of locally compact groups*, Duke Math. J. **18** (1951), 85–104.
- [30] Andrew M. Gleason, *Groups without small subgroups*, Ann. of Math. (2) **56** (1952), 193–212.
- [31] Debashish Goswami and Adam Skalski, *On two possible constructions of the quantum semigroup of all quantum permutations of an infinite countable set*, Operator algebras and quantum groups, 2012, pp. 199–214.
- [32] A. Grothendieck, *Résumé des résultats essentiels dans la théorie des produits tensoriels topologiques et des espaces nucléaires*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **4** (1952), 73–112.
- [33] ———, *Espaces vectoriels topologiques*, Universidade de São Paulo, Instituto de Matemática Pura e Aplicada, São Paulo, 1954.
- [34] A. Grothendieck, M. Artin, and J. L. Verdier, *Théorie des topos et cohomologie étale des schémas. Tome 1: Théorie des topos*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 269, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1972. Séminaire de Géométrie Algébrique du Bois-Marie 1963–1964 (SGA 4), Dirigé par M. Artin, A. Grothendieck, et J. L. Verdier. Avec la collaboration de N. Bourbaki, P. Deligne et B. Saint-Donat.
- [35] Alexandre Grothendieck, *Quelques résultats relatifs à la dualité dans les espaces (\mathcal{F})* , C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris **230** (1950), 1561–1563.
- [36] ———, *Sur les espaces (F) et (DF)* , Summa Brasil. Math. **3** (1954), 57–123.
- [37] ———, *Produits tensoriels topologiques et espaces nucléaires*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **16** (1955), Chapter 1: 196 pp.; Chapter 2: 140.
- [38] Allen Hatcher, *Algebraic topology*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.
- [39] Edwin Hewitt and Kenneth A Ross, *Abstract harmonic analysis I*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, Springer-Verlag, 2012.
- [40] Graham Higman, *A finitely generated infinite simple group*, J. London Math. Soc. **26** (1951), 61–64.
- [41] Morris W. Hirsch, *Differential topology*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. No. 33, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1976.
- [42] Ralf Hollstein, *σ -lokaltopologische Räume und projektive Tensorprodukte*, Collect. Math. **26** (1975), no. 3, 239–252.
- [43] John Horváth, *Topological vector spaces and distributions. Vol. I*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Reading, Mass.-London-Don Mills, Ont., 1966.
- [44] Joseph Van Name (<https://mathoverflow.net/users/22277/joseph-van-name>), *Is every character of the algebra of continuous functions on a locally compact space some evaluation?*. URL:<https://mathoverflow.net/q/456094> (version: 2023-10-08).
- [45] Richard V. Kadison and John R. Ringrose, *Fundamentals of the theory of operator algebras. Vol. I*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 15, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1997. Elementary theory, Reprint of the 1983 original.
- [46] S. M. Khaleelulla, *Counterexamples in topological vector spaces*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 936, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1982.
- [47] Gottfried Köthe, *Topological vector spaces. I*, Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, vol. Band 159, Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., New York, 1969. Translated from the German by D. J. H. Garling.
- [48] ———, *Topological vector spaces. II*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, vol. 237, Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1979.
- [49] Johan Kustermans and Stefaan Vaes, *Locally compact quantum groups*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **33** (2000), no. 6, 837–934.
- [50] ———, *Locally compact quantum groups in the von Neumann algebraic setting*, Math. Scand. **92** (2003), no. 1, 68–92.
- [51] Saunders Mac Lane, *Topology and logic as a source of algebra*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **82** (1976), no. 1, 1–40.
- [52] ———, *Categories for the working mathematician*, second, Graduate texts in mathematics, vol. 5, Springer Science & Business Media, 1998.
- [53] George W. Mackey, *On convex topological linear spaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **60** (1946), 519–537.
- [54] Saunders MacLane, *Categories for the working mathematician*, Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1971. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Vol. 5.

- [55] T. Masuda, Y. Nakagami, and S. L. Woronowicz, *A C^* -algebraic framework for quantum groups*, Internat. J. Math. **14** (2003), no. 9, 903–1001.
- [56] Deane Montgomery and Leo Zippin, *Small subgroups of finite-dimensional groups*, Ann. of Math. (2) **56** (1952), 213–241.
- [57] ———, *Topological transformation groups*, Interscience Publishers, New York-London, 1955.
- [58] Susan Montgomery, *Hopf algebras and their actions on rings*, CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics, vol. 82, Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, DC; by the American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1993.
- [59] Christopher J. Mulvey, *A generalisation of Gel'fand duality*, J. Algebra **56** (1979), no. 2, 499–505.
- [60] Sergey Neshveyev and Lars Tuset, *Compact quantum groups and their representation categories*, Cours Spécialisés [Specialized Courses], vol. 20, Société Mathématique de France, Paris, 2013.
- [61] M. Scott Osborne, *Locally convex spaces*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 269, Springer, Cham, 2014.
- [62] David E. Radford, *Hopf algebras*, Series on Knots and Everything, vol. 49, World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., Hackensack, NJ, 2012.
- [63] Kazuyuki Saitō, *On a duality for locally compact groups*, Tohoku Math. J. (2) **20** (1968), 355–367.
- [64] Helmut H. Schaefer, *Topological vector spaces*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Vol. 3, Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1971. Third printing corrected.
- [65] Laurent Schwartz, *Théorie des distributions à valeurs vectorielles. I*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **7** (1957), 1–141.
- [66] Adam Skalski and Piotr M. Sołtan, *Projective limits of quantum symmetry groups and the doubling construction for Hopf algebras*, Infin. Dimens. Anal. Quantum Probab. Relat. Top. **17** (2014), no. 2, 1450012, 27.
- [67] Marianne Freudenthal Smith, *The Pontrjagin duality theorem in linear spaces*, Ann. of Math. (2) **56** (1952), 248–253.
- [68] N. E. Steenrod, *A convenient category of topological spaces*, Michigan Math. J. **14** (1967), 133–152.
- [69] W. Forrest Stinespring, *Integration theorems for gages and duality for unimodular groups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **90** (1959), 15–56.
- [70] Moss E. Sweedler, *Hopf algebras*, Mathematics Lecture Note Series, W. A. Benjamin, Inc., New York, 1969.
- [71] M. Takesaki, *Theory of operator algebras. i*, Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences, vol. 124, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2002. Reprint of the first (1979) edition, Operator Algebras and Non-commutative Geometry, 5.
- [72] ———, *Theory of operator algebras. II*, Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences, vol. 125, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003. Operator Algebras and Non-commutative Geometry, 6.
- [73] Mitsuhiro Takeuchi, *Free Hopf algebras generated by coalgebras*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **23** (1971), 561–582.
- [74] Terence Tao, *Hilbert's fifth problem and related topics*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 153, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2014.
- [75] Nobuhiko Tatsuuma, *A duality theorem for locally compact groups*, J. Math. Kyoto Univ. **6** (1967), 187–293.
- [76] Thomas Timmermann, *An invitation to quantum groups and duality*, EMS Textbooks in Mathematics, European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2008. From Hopf algebras to multiplicative unitaries and beyond.
- [77] Tammo tom Dieck, *Algebraic topology*, EMS Textbooks in Mathematics, European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2008.
- [78] François Trèves, *Topological vector spaces, distributions and kernels*, Academic Press, New York-London, 1967.
- [79] user473423, *Characters of algebra of schwartz functions*. URL: <https://mathoverflow.net/q/439722> (version: 2023-01-30).
- [80] A. Van Daele, *Multiplier Hopf algebras*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **342** (1994), no. 2, 917–932.
- [81] ———, *The Haar measure on a compact quantum group*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **123** (1995), no. 10, 3125–3128.
- [82] ———, *Discrete quantum groups*, J. Algebra **180** (1996), no. 2, 431–444.
- [83] ———, *An algebraic framework for group duality*, Adv. Math. **140** (1998), no. 2, 323–366.
- [84] Alfons Van Daele and Shuzhou Wang, *Universal quantum groups*, Internat. J. Math. **7** (1996), no. 2, 255–263.
- [85] L. I. Vainerman and G. I. Kac, *Nonunimodular ring groups, and Hopf-von Neumann algebras*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **211** (1973), 1031–1034.
- [86] L. I. Vainerman and G. I. Kac, *Nonunimodular ring groups and Hopf-von Neumann algebras*, Mat. Sb. (N.S.) **94(136)** (1974), 194–225, 335.
- [87] Christian Voigt, *Bornological quantum groups*, Pacific J. Math. **235** (2008), no. 1, 93–135.
- [88] ———, *Infinite quantum permutations*, Adv. Math. **415** (2023), Paper No. 108887, 37.
- [89] Jürgen Voigt, *A course on topological vector spaces*, Compact Textbooks in Mathematics, Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2020.
- [90] Shuzhou Wang, *Free products of compact quantum groups*, Comm. Math. Phys. **167** (1995), no. 3, 671–692.
- [91] ———, *Quantum symmetry groups of finite spaces*, Comm. Math. Phys. **195** (1998), no. 1, 195–211.

- [92] Frank W. Warner, *Foundations of differentiable manifolds and Lie groups*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 94, Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1983. Corrected reprint of the 1971 edition.
- [93] André Weil, *L'intégration dans les groupes topologiques et ses applications*, Actualités Scientifiques et Industrielles [Current Scientific and Industrial Topics], vol. No. 869, Hermann & Cie, Paris, 1940. [This book has been republished by the author at Princeton, N. J., 1941.]
- [94] S. L. Woronowicz, *Compact matrix pseudogroups* **111** (1987), no. 4, 613–665.
- [95] ———, *Compact matrix pseudogroups*, Comm. Math. Phys. **111** (1987), no. 4, 613–665.
- [96] ———, *From multiplicative unitaries to quantum groups*, Internat. J. Math. **7** (1996), no. 1, 127–149.
- [97] ———, *Compact quantum groups*, Symétries quantiques (Les Houches, 1995), 1998, pp. 845–884.
- [98] Hidehiko Yamabe, *A generalization of a theorem of Gleason*, Ann. of Math. (2) **58** (1953), 351–365.
- [99] ———, *On the conjecture of Iwasawa and Gleason*, Ann. of Math. (2) **58** (1953), 48–54.