

# CIRCUIT ALGEBRAS, MODULAR OPERADS AND INVARIANT THEORY

SOPHIE RAYNOR

**ABSTRACT.** Circuit algebras, used in the study of finite-type knot invariants, are a symmetric analogue of Jones’s planar algebras. This work, the first of a pair of papers comprising a detailed study of circuit algebra combinatorics, provides three equivalent descriptions of circuit algebras: in terms of operads of wiring diagrams, modular operads and categories of Brauer diagrams. As an application, circuit algebra characterisations of algebras over the orthogonal and symplectic groups are given.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Circuit algebras are a symmetric version of Jones’s planar algebras [24]. Their basic data consists of a graded monoid equipped with a contraction (or trace) operation and a levelwise symmetric action. They were introduced by Bar-Natan and Dancso [3] as a framework for relating local and global features of virtual tangles in the study of finite-type invariants of knotted objects (see also [9, 23, 52]). Recently, Dancso, Halacheva and Robertson have shown [10] that *oriented* circuit algebras are equivalent to wheeled props [37, 39], and used this to describe the Kashiwara-Vergne group KV and the graded Grothendieck-Teichmüller group GRT as automorphism groups of circuit algebras [11].

This is the first of a pair of papers that together provide a conceptually and technically detailed account of the combinatorics of circuit algebras and thereby describe their wider categorical context. Though the term ‘circuit algebra’ is not commonly used outside quantum topology, circuit algebra structures appear widely across mathematics:

This paper contains three equivalent descriptions of circuit algebras: as algebras over an operad (corresponding to their original definition [3]); as monoidal functors; and as modular operads equipped with an extra product operation. This is, to the best of my knowledge, the first time that these perspectives have been explicitly stated and compared together in one work.

**Theorem 1.1** (Theorem 4.15 & Proposition 5.11). *A circuit algebra may equivalently be described as*

- (1) *an algebra over an operad of wiring diagrams,*
- (2) *a symmetric lax monoidal functor from a category of Brauer diagrams,*
- (3) *a modular operad equipped with an additional binary product.*

In the sister paper [41], I extend existing results for modular operads [42] to construct a graphical calculus and abstract nerve theorem for circuit algebras. This provides further characterisations of circuit algebras: as algebras for a monad on a category of graded symmetric objects, and as ‘Segal presheaves’ on a category of graphs [41, Section 8].

Each description in Theorem 1.1 relates to structures that are important in different areas of mathematics. Thus, the paper provides a dictionary for translating results between these contexts. Moreover, the categorical and operadic structures underlying each version may be generalised (and specialised) in distinct ways, thereby locating circuit algebras within a diverse zoo of related concepts.

---

*Date:* December 31, 2024.

The author acknowledges the support of Australian Research Council grants DP160101519 and FT160100393.

As an application of this combined approach and building on [12], the following theorem, providing a circuit algebra characterisation of algebras over the orthogonal and symplectic groups, is proved:

**Theorem 1.2** (Theorem 6.3). *The category of algebras over the  $d$ -dimensional orthogonal (respectively symplectic) group is equivalent to a subcategory of circuit algebras that satisfy two simple relations.*

In their original low-dimensional topology and quantum algebra context (first in [3], then e.g., [9, 23, 52]), circuit algebras are defined as algebras over operads of wiring diagrams (see e.g., [10, 11]). In a circuit algebra approach to virtual knotted objects, the combinatorics of virtual (or *singular*) crossings are encoded in the wiring diagram composition, in contrast to a planar algebra approach where the virtual structure is described by adding generators and relations [3, Section 2].

As a device for encoding virtual crossings, operads of wiring diagrams are closely related to categories of symmetric tangles or ‘Brauer diagrams’. In Section 4.2, operads of wiring diagrams are defined in terms of categories of Brauer diagrams (Section 3.2).

Brauer diagrams have been widely studied for nearly a century since Brauer’s 1937 paper [6] that extended Schur-Weyl duality to representations of the finite dimensional orthogonal and symplectic groups (see e.g. [32, 57]. More recently, categorifications of these results have led to an interest in *Brauer categories* [34, 44, 46, 47]. Statement (2) of Theorem 1.1 establishes a link – articulated in Theorem 1.2, and [12] – between circuit algebras and the classical representation theory of the orthogonal and symplectic groups, and between oriented circuit algebras, which by [10] (and Proposition 3.26) are wheeled props, and the representation theory of the general linear groups [12].

The category BD of Brauer diagrams described in Section 3 is, moreover, equivalent to the one dimensional cobordism category so, by Theorem 1.1 (2), circuit algebras may also be described as *lax* or *weak TQFTs* [18] (see also [1, 40]).

Statements (1) & (2) of Theorem 1.1 describe a symmetric analogue of the relationship between planar algebras and Temperley-Lieb diagrams [24] that is already implicit in the original definition of circuit algebras [3]. Indeed, we may define planar algebras as in (1) & (2) of Theorem 1.1 by restricting to the suboperad of planar (wiring) diagrams, or to the Temperley-Lieb subcategory  $TL \subset BD$ , thereby obtaining a characterisation of circuit algebras as planar algebras with an extra symmetry structure.

The final characterisation (3) in Theorem 1.1 describes circuit algebras as modular operads equipped with an extra product operation. In this case, modular operads – which were introduced in [16] to describe moduli spaces of higher genus curves – may be obtained by restricting to a suboperad of *connected* wiring diagrams. This is a purely operadic construction and admits no categorical analogue in terms of Brauer diagrams. Building on the results of [42], this perspective is used in the sister paper [41] to construct a monad and prove an abstract nerve theorem for circuit algebras.

Other combinatorial features of circuit algebras and modular operads [41, 42] have an interesting translation to the Brauer diagram and invariant theoretic perspectives on circuit algebras. For example, nonunital modular operads and circuit algebras play an important role in [41, 42]. These are combinatorially much simpler than unital ones [42] due to the ‘*problem of loops*’ [42]. In the language of Brauer algebras and Brauer categories (in the sense of [34]), representations of which are studied in e.g [43, 44, 47]), this simply refers to the parameter (or dimension) associated to the unit trace.

In Section 5.2 of this work, nonunital circuit algebras are defined as symmetric monoidal functors from subcategories of ‘*downward*’ Brauer diagrams [46] (see also Definition 3.14 and Section 6.2) that have been used in [46] to describe the representation theory of the infinite dimensional general linear, orthogonal and symplectic groups. This operadic (nonunital circuit algebra) perspective on functors from the downward Brauer category, together with the results of [46] has been exploited in [33] to

prove that the Malcev Lie algebras associated to the Torelli groups of surfaces of arbitrary genus are stably Koszul. Nonunital (d.g.)-modular operads are described in [51] as lax functors from a ‘*Brauer properad*’ by restricting to connected diagrams part of the initial (d.g.)-circuit algebra.

The results of this paper apply to a very general class of circuit algebras, including (un)oriented, coloured and mixed versions (e.g., Section 4.2). By [10] oriented circuit algebras are equivalent to wheeled props that appear in a variety of contexts involving trace operations (see e.g. [12, 37, 39]). Hence, it follows from Theorem 1.1 that wheeled props are, equivalently, symmetric monoidal functors from categories of *oriented* Brauer diagrams. Derksen and Makam [12] have characterised  $GL_n$  algebras as wheeled props satisfying certain simple relations easily obtained from Weyl’s fundamental theorems [58] on the invariant theory of  $GL_n$ . Since wheeled props are oriented circuit algebras, Theorem 1.2 is easily obtained by adapting the methods of [12] to the unoriented case (see Section 6). Moreover, it follows from [46], that algebras in the category of representations of the infinite general linear group are described by nonunital wheeled props.

One goal of the paper is to broaden the toolbox of by creating a dictionary for representation theorists, low-dimensional topologists and operad theorists alike. For example, can the operadic perspective provide new insights into the invariant theory (and Schur-Weyl duality) of the classical groups? The operad governing nonunital wheeled props is Koszul [50] as is the operad (of ‘downward wiring diagrams’) for unoriented nonunital circuit algebras [30]. It is natural (and useful!) to ask whether the operads for unital circuit algebras (i.e., operads of wiring diagrams) are Koszul. How can this be interpreted in terms of the Brauer diagram category  $\text{BD}$ ? Is there a general Tannakian formalism [27] for such questions? (I thank Ross Street for helpful discussions on questions of duality.)

Indeed, a central motivation for this work and [41] has been to describe *homotopy coherent* circuit algebras in order to extend the results of [11], where circuit algebras are used to relate the *graded* Grothendieck-Teichmüller and Kashiwara-Vergne groups  $\text{GRT}$  and  $\text{KRV}$  to relate  $\text{GT}$  and  $\text{KV}$  directly (see [11, Introduction, Remark 1.1]). Weakening the characterisation in [41, Theorem 8.4] of circuit algebras in terms of Segal functors suggests one way to do this, but there are difficulties in generalising the Segal models of homotopy modular operads in [22] and [42] to circuit algebras (see [41, Section 8.4]).

Stoeckl’s construction [50] of a model for nonunital  $(\infty, 1)$ -wheeled props, and the proof, in [30], that the operad for monochrome nonunital circuit algebras is Koszul provide a potential (operadic) approach that builds on the iterated distributive law for the circuit algebra monad [41, Theorem 7.9] together with the proof in [30] using operad distributive laws [38] (see [41, Introduction & Remark 7.12]). From the categorical perspective, Sharma’s model structure for compact closed categories [48] may also shed light on this question.

Moreover, the equivalent circuit algebra characterisations in Theorem 1.1 (and in [41]) provide a plethora of options for generalising circuit algebras. For example, circuit algebras are equivalent to lax one-dimensional TQFTs. What are the higher dimensional versions of Theorems 1.1 and Theorem 1.2? (See also [47, Section 1.5].)

Finally, the categorical and graphical structures governing circuit algebras are seeing increasing applications outside pure mathematics. With rapid developments in new technologies – AI and quantum computing in particular – they provide a powerful formal framework for organising, understanding and classifying complex connected systems, by studying their local-global-local structure. Potentially, these methods could help define the theoretical limits of emerging technologies, as well as improving transparency (e.g., in AI) and informing efficient design of algorithms and software. The ZX-calculus [8], for example, that provides a rigorous graphical formalism for quantum computation (and a potential route for making quantum computation accessible to a general audience [14]), admits

a circuit algebra description. How does this compare with circuit algebras that appear in quantisation problems [3, 11]?

**1.1. Details and overview.** The categorical preliminaries are given in Section 2 which establishes notation and terminology for symmetric monoidal categories and functors, and the structures – such as compact closed categories, and wheeled props – related to categorical duality and trace, that are central to the rest of the paper.

Section 3 provides a detailed discussion of the categories of (coloured) Brauer diagrams, and describes their role in some key results on the invariant theory of classical groups (c.f. [34, 46]).

Categories of Brauer diagrams are used, in Section 4, to define circuit algebras. Section 4.1 provides a quick introduction to operads and their algebras. In Section 4.2, operads of wiring diagrams and circuit algebras are introduced and defined using categories of Brauer diagrams from Section 3.

In Section 5, an axiomatic characterisation of circuit algebras is given and it is shown that they are modular operads admitting an extra external product. Finally, Theorem 1.2 is proved in Section 6 as an application of the preceding ideas.

The second paper of this pair [41] builds on the modular operadic perspective to establish a graphical calculus, monad and nerve theorem for circuit algebras. The machinery used to prove this – involving the combined use of iterated distributive laws [7] and abstract nerve theory [4, 56] – is also explained in detail.

**Acknowledgements.** I thank Marcy Robertson and her students – Chandan Singh and Kurt Stoeckl in particular – and Zsuzsanna Dancso for encouraging my interest and feeding my understanding of this topic. I am grateful to Ole Warnaar for all his support and to Kevin Coulembier for patiently explaining some representation theory. I thank my colleagues and students at James Cook University for their support and friendship and I am grateful to the members of Centre of Australian Category Theory, Macquarie University, where I first began thinking about this work. I acknowledge, in particular, Ross Street for his friendship and patience speaking with me about duality, and Richard Garner, without whom this paper would have been a subsection of [41].

I acknowledge and pay my respects to the Darug Nation, the traditional owners of the land on which Macquarie is built, and to the Wulgurukaba and Bindal Peoples upon whose lands I now live and work.

## 2. KEY CATEGORICAL CONCEPTS

This section provides a brief outline of the notation and terminology conventions for symmetric monoidal categories that will be used in the rest of the paper. For precise definitions and a detailed discussion of symmetric monoidal categories, see e.g. [15, Chapters 2&8].

**2.1. Symmetric monoidal categories.** A *monoidal category* is a category  $\mathbf{X}$  together with a bifunctor  $\otimes: \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathbf{X}$  (the *monoidal product*) that is associative up to natural *associator* isomorphism, and for which there is an object  $I$  of  $\mathbf{X}$  (the *monoidal unit*) that acts as a two-sided identity for  $\otimes$  up to natural (left and right) *unitor* isomorphisms. The monoidal product and the associator and unitor isomorphisms are required to satisfy axioms that mean that certain sensible diagrams commute. If the associator and unitor isomorphisms are the identity, then the monoidal category is called *strict monoidal*.

A *braiding* on a monoidal category  $(\mathbf{X}, \otimes, I)$  is a collection of isomorphisms  $\sigma_{x,y}: x \otimes y \rightarrow y \otimes x$  (defined for all  $x, y \in \mathbf{X}$ ) that satisfy the braid identities

$$(2.1) \quad (\sigma_{y,z} \otimes id_x)(id_y \otimes \sigma_{x,z})(\sigma_{x,y} \otimes id_z) = (id_z \otimes \sigma_{x,y})(\sigma_{x,z} \otimes id_y)(id_x \otimes \sigma_{y,z}) \quad \text{for all } x, y, z.$$

If  $\sigma_{y,x} = \sigma_{x,y}^{-1}$  for all  $x, y$ , then the monoidal structure on  $\mathbf{X}$  is *symmetric*.

*Remark 2.2.* In this paper, associators, unitors and symmetry (braiding) isomorphisms will be ignored in the notation, and (symmetric) monoidal categories will be denoted simply by  $\mathbf{X}$  or  $(\mathbf{X}, \otimes, I)$ .

*Example 2.3.* For any category  $\mathbf{X}$  and object  $x \in \mathbf{X}$ , objects of the *slice category*  $x/\mathbf{X}$  of  $\mathbf{X}$  under  $x$  are pairs  $(y, f)$  where  $f \in \mathbf{X}(x, y)$ . Morphisms  $(y, f) \rightarrow (y', f')$  are commuting triangles in  $\mathbf{X}$  of the form:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & x & \\ f \swarrow & & \searrow f' \\ y & \xrightarrow{g} & y' \end{array}$$

The *slice category*  $\mathbf{X}/x$  of  $\mathbf{X}$  over  $x$  is defined similarly, with objects  $(y, f): f \in \mathbf{X}(y, x)$  and morphisms  $g: (y, f) \rightarrow (y', f')$  given by morphisms  $g \in \mathbf{X}(y', y)$  such that  $f \circ g = f'$ .

If  $(\mathbf{X}, \otimes, I)$  is a monoidal category, then in general  $\mathbf{X}/x$  (respectively  $x/\mathbf{X}$ ) does not inherit a monoidal structure from  $\mathbf{X}$ . However, since  $I \otimes I \cong I$  by definition,  $\otimes$  defines a monoidal product on  $I/\mathbf{X}$  (respectively  $\mathbf{X}/I$ ) with unit  $id_I \in \mathbf{X}(I, I)$ .

**Definition 2.4.** *Symmetric strict monoidal categories are called permutative categories. The notation  $\oplus$  and  $0$  will often be used to designate the monoidal product and unit of a permutative category.*

An (ordinary)  $\mathfrak{D}$ -coloured prop is a small permutative category  $\mathbf{P}$  whose object monoid is free on a set  $\mathfrak{D}$ . When  $\mathfrak{D} = \{1\}$  is a singleton, then  $\mathbf{P}$  is a (monochrome) prop (with object set  $\mathbb{N}$ ) in the original sense of [36].

*Example 2.5.* For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\mathbf{n}$  denote the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  (so  $\mathbf{0} = \emptyset$ ), and let  $\Sigma_n$  be the group of permutations on  $\mathbf{n}$ . Let  $\Sigma$  be the *symmetric groupoid* with  $\Sigma(n, n) = \Sigma_n$  for all  $n$ , and  $\Sigma(m, n) = \emptyset$  when  $m \neq n$ . Addition of natural numbers gives  $\Sigma$  a (monochrome) prop structure.

More generally, let  $\mathfrak{D}$  be a set, and let  $\text{list}(\mathfrak{D}) = \coprod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathfrak{D}^n$  denote the set of finite ordered sets  $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_n)$  of elements of  $\mathfrak{D}$ . So  $\text{list}(\mathfrak{D})$  underlies the free associative monoid on  $\mathfrak{D}$ . For  $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_m)$  and  $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_n)$  in  $\text{list}(\mathfrak{D})$ , their (concatenation) product  $\mathbf{cd} = \mathbf{c} \oplus \mathbf{d}$  is given by

$$\mathbf{cd} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (c_1, \dots, c_m, d_1, \dots, d_n).$$

The empty list is the unit for  $\oplus$  and is denoted by  $\emptyset$  (or  $\emptyset_{\mathfrak{D}}$ ).

The symmetric groupoid  $\Sigma$  acts on  $\text{list}(\mathfrak{D})$  from the right by  $\sigma: (\mathbf{c}\sigma) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (c_{\sigma_1}, \dots, c_{\sigma_m}) \mapsto \mathbf{c}$ , for all  $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_m)$  and  $\sigma \in \Sigma_m$ .

The  $\mathfrak{D}$ -coloured prop so obtained is the *free symmetric groupoid*  $\Sigma^{\mathfrak{D}}$  on  $\mathfrak{D}$ .

*Example 2.6.* For any category  $\mathbf{X}$ , a functor  $S: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbf{X}$  is equivalently described by a sequence  $(S(n))_n$  of objects of  $\mathbf{X}$  such that  $\Sigma_n$  acts on  $S(n)$  for all  $n$ .

A functor  $B: \Sigma^{\mathfrak{D}} \rightarrow \mathbf{X}$  is a *list( $\mathfrak{D}$ )-graded symmetric object in  $\mathbf{X}$*  is a functor  $B: \Sigma^{\mathfrak{D}} \rightarrow \mathbf{X}$  or, equivalently a collection  $(B(\mathbf{d}))_{\mathbf{d} \in \text{list}(\mathfrak{D})}$  of  $\mathbf{X}$ -objects, and  $\mathbf{X}$ -isomorphisms  $B(\sigma\mathbf{d}) \xrightarrow{\cong} B(\mathbf{d})$ , defined for all  $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_n) \in \mathfrak{D}^n$  and all  $\sigma \in \Sigma_n$ .

In a  $\mathbf{V}$ -(enriched) category, the hom sets are  $\mathbf{V}$ -objects and composition is a  $\mathbf{V}$ -morphism such that compatibility axioms are satisfied. Other than (ordinary), **Set**-enriched categories, this paper will

also consider categories *enriched* in the category  $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$  of  $\mathbb{k}$ -vector spaces (where  $\mathbb{k}$  is an algebraically closed field of characteristic 0) and the category  $R\text{-Mod}$  of modules over a commutative ring  $R$ .

*Example 2.7.* Let  $R$  be a commutative ring. Then  $R[\Sigma] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{N}} R[\Sigma_n]$ , where  $R[\Sigma_n]$  denotes the group algebra (for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ), describes the free  $R\text{-Mod}$ -prop on  $\Sigma$ .

*Example 2.8.* Given a vector space  $V$ , th ( $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ -enriched) *endomorphism prop associated to  $V$*  is denoted  $T(V)$ , with  $T(V)(m, n) = \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{k}}(V^{\otimes m}, V^{\otimes n})$  – the space of linear transformations  $V^{\otimes m} \rightarrow V^{\otimes n}$ . By convention,  $V^{\otimes 0} = \mathbb{k}$ , so  $T(V)(0, 0) = \mathbb{k}$  and  $T(V)$  embeds canonically in  $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$  as the full subcategory with objects  $V^{\otimes n}$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . These categories are identified in what follows.

For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the symmetric group  $\Sigma_n$  acts on  $V^{\otimes n}$  by permuting factors. Hence  $\Sigma$  acts on  $T(V)$  levelwise.

**Definition 2.9.** A (lax) monoidal functor  $(\Theta, \eta_{\Theta}, \theta): (\mathbf{X}_1, \otimes_1, I_1) \rightarrow (\mathbf{X}_2, \otimes_2, I_2)$  consists of a functor  $\Theta: \mathbf{X}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{X}_2$ , together with a morphism  $\eta = \eta_{\Theta}: I_2 \rightarrow \Theta(I_1)$  in  $\mathbf{X}_2$  and a natural transformation  $\pi = \pi_{\Theta}: \Theta(-) \otimes_2 \Theta(-) \Rightarrow \Theta(- \otimes_1 -)$  such that all the expected structure diagrams commute. A monoidal functor  $(\Theta, \pi, \eta)$  is called *strong* if  $\pi$  and  $\eta$  are invertible, and *strict* if they are the identity.

*Example 2.10.* As in Example 2.5, let  $\Sigma$  be the symmetric groupoid. For any symmetric monoidal category  $(\mathbf{X}, \otimes, I)$  and any choice of object  $x \in \mathbf{X}$ , there is a unique symmetric strict monoidal functor  $\Sigma \rightarrow \mathbf{X}$  with  $0 \mapsto I$  and  $1 \mapsto x$ .

**Definition 2.11.** A  $\text{list}(\mathcal{D})$ -graded symmetric monoid in  $\mathbf{X}$  is a *symmetric monoidal functor*

$$(B, \pi, \eta): (\Sigma^{\mathcal{D}}, \oplus, \emptyset) \rightarrow (\mathbf{X}, \otimes, I)$$

where  $(\Sigma^{\mathcal{D}}, \oplus, \emptyset)$  is the prop defined in Example 2.6. The structure maps  $(\pi, \eta)$  describe a commutative and associative (up to symmetry and associators in  $\mathbf{X}$ ) unital monoid structure on the underlying graded symmetric object  $(B(\mathbf{d}))_{\mathbf{d}}$ .

*Remark 2.12.* Enriched (lax) monoidal  $\mathbf{V}$ -functors between monoidal  $\mathbf{V}$ -categories are defined similarly except that the underlying functor is  $\mathbf{V}$ -enriched and the structure maps are  $\mathbf{V}$ -morphisms such that the relevant diagrams commute in  $\mathbf{V}$ .

Symmetric monoidal categories enriched in a linear category (such as  $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ ) are often called *tensor categories* [15]. In the tensor category literature, (*tensor*) *functors* between tensor categories are usually assumed to preserve the monoidal product strictly. This is in contrast with the approach of this paper where all monoidal functors are assumed to be lax, unless explicitly stated otherwise.

## 2.2. Categorical duality and trace.

**Definition 2.13.** An object  $x$  of a symmetric monoidal category  $\mathbf{X}$  has a dual object  $x^*$  in  $\mathbf{X}$  if there are morphisms  $\cup_x: I \rightarrow x \otimes x^*$ ,  $\cap_x: x^* \otimes x \rightarrow I$  such that the triangle identities (illustrated in Figure 1) hold:

$$(2.14) \quad (\cap_x \otimes id_x) \circ (id_x \otimes \cup_x) = id_x = (id_x \otimes \cap_x) \circ (\cup_x \otimes id_x).$$

.

A compact closed category is a symmetric monoidal category such that every object has a dual [36].

Let  $\mathbf{X}$  be a compact closed category. For all morphisms  $f \in \mathbf{X}(x, y)$ , there is a corresponding *evaluation morphism*  $\lceil f \rceil \in \mathbf{X}(y^* \otimes x, I)$  induced by composition with  $\cap_y$  (Figure 2 (a)), and *coevaluation morphism*  $\lfloor f \rfloor \in \mathbf{X}(I, y \otimes x^*)$  induced by composition with  $\cup_x$  (Figure 2 (b)):

$$(2.15) \quad \lceil f \rceil \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \cap_y \circ (id_{y^*} \otimes f) \text{ and } \lfloor f \rfloor \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (f \otimes id_{x^*}) \circ \cup_x,$$





FIGURE 1. String diagram representation of the triangle identities.

and a *dual morphism* (called the *transpose morphism* in e.g., [48])  $f^* \in \mathbf{X}(y^*, x^*)$  (Figure 2 (c)):

$$(2.16) \quad f^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\cap_y \otimes id_{x^*}) \circ (id_{y^*} \otimes f \otimes id_{x^*}) \circ (id_{y^*} \otimes \cup_x).$$


 FIGURE 2. (a)  $[f]: y^* \otimes x \rightarrow I$ ; (b)  $[f]: I \rightarrow y \otimes x^*$ ; (c)  $f^*: y^* \rightarrow x^*$ .

In particular  $\cap_x = [id_x]$  and  $\cup_x = [id_x]$  for all objects  $x$ . And, for composable morphisms  $f$  and  $g$ ,  $(g \circ f)^* = f^* \circ g^*$  in  $\mathbf{X}$ .

*Example 2.17.* Let  $\mathbb{k}$  be a field. The monoidal category  $(\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}^f, \otimes, \mathbb{k})$  of finite dimensional  $\mathbb{k}$ -vector spaces has a canonical compact closed structure given by  $V^* = \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}(V, \mathbb{k})$ . For each  $V \in \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}^f$ , its dimension  $\dim(V)$  over  $\mathbb{k}$  is equal to its *categorical dimension* given by  $\cap_V \circ \cup_V \in \mathbb{k}$ .

A *traced symmetric monoidal category* [28] is a monoidal category  $(\mathbf{X}, \otimes, I)$  equipped with a family of (partial) trace functions  $tr_{x,y}^z: \mathbf{X}(x \otimes z, y \otimes z) \rightarrow \mathbf{X}(x, y)$ , natural in objects  $x, y, z \in \mathbf{X}$  and satisfying:

**Vanishing:** For all objects  $x, y, a, b \in \mathbf{X}$ ,  $tr_{x,y}^I$  is the identity on  $\mathbf{X}(x, y) = \mathbf{X}(x \otimes I, y \otimes I)$ ,  
 $tr_{x,y}^{a \otimes b} = tr_{x,y}^a \circ tr_{x \otimes a, y \otimes a}^b: \mathbf{X}(x \otimes a \otimes b, y \otimes a \otimes b) \rightarrow \mathbf{X}(x, y)$

**Superposing:** For all  $f \in \mathbf{X}(x \otimes a, y \otimes a)$  and  $g \in \mathbf{X}(w, z)$ ,  $tr_{w \otimes x, z \otimes y}^a(g \otimes f) = g \otimes tr_{x,y}^a(f)$ .

**Yanking:** Let  $\sigma_{x,y}: x \otimes y \rightarrow y \otimes x$  denote the symmetry in  $\mathbf{X}$ . For all  $x \in \mathbf{X}$ ,  $tr_{x,x}^x(\sigma_{x,x}) = id_x$ .

(In a  $\mathbf{V}$ -enriched traced monoidal category, the trace  $tr$  is described by  $\mathbf{V}$ -morphisms.)

A compact closed category  $(\mathbf{X}, \otimes, I, *)$  has a traced monoidal structure given by

$$tr_{x,y}^a(f) = (id_y \otimes \cap_{a^*}) \circ f \circ (id_x \otimes \cup_a), \text{ for all } f \in \mathbf{X}(x \otimes a, y \otimes a).$$

admit a trace induced by composition with  $\cup$  and  $\cap$ . However, the converse is not true (see, e.g., Example 2.20). Via the ‘*Int construction*’ [28, Section 4], any traced symmetric monoidal category  $\mathbf{X}$  embeds fully faithfully in its compact closed completion  $Int(\mathbf{X})$ .

Another special class of traced symmetric monoidal category is given by wheeled props. These appear in a variety of contexts involving algebraic structures with trace operations (see e.g. [37, 39]).

**Definition 2.18.** A ( $\mathfrak{D}$ -coloured) wheeled prop  $(P, \oplus_P, 0, tr_P)$  is a ( $\mathfrak{D}$ -coloured) prop  $(P, \otimes_P, I)$  equipped with a trace  $tr_P$  satisfying the axioms of [28].

Most applications consider wheeled props enriched in a linear category such as  $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ . By Proposition 3.26, wheeled props enriched in  $(\mathbf{X}, \otimes, I)$  are described by symmetric monoidal functors to  $(\mathbf{X}, \otimes, I)$ .

*Remark 2.19.* Wheeled props are usually defined as algebras for a *graph substitution* monad (see e.g., [10, 37, 39]). The equivalence of Definition 2.18 and the standard definition in terms of graph substitution will follow from [41, Theorem 7.9].

*Example 2.20.* Let  $V$  be a finite dimensional  $\mathbb{k}$ -vector space. The endomorphism prop  $T(V)$  described in Example 2.8 is not compact closed since the dual space  $V^* = \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}(V, \mathbb{k})$  is not an object of  $T(V)$ . However, the canonical isomorphism  $T(V)(m, n) = \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}(V^{\otimes m}, V^{\otimes n}) \cong V^{\otimes n} \otimes (V^*)^{\otimes m}$  (for all  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ ) induces a trace on  $T(V)$  by

$$v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_n \otimes \alpha_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \alpha_m \mapsto \alpha_m(v_n)(v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{n-1} \otimes \alpha_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \alpha_{m-1}).$$

In what follows, unless otherwise stated,  $T(V)$  will be assumed to be a wheeled prop with the canonical trace.

The  $(\{V, V^*\}$ -coloured) mixed tensor prop  $T^{\{\uparrow, \downarrow\}}(V) \subset \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}^f$  is closed under duals and thus inherits the compact closed structure from  $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}^f$ . It is straightforward to check that  $T^{\{\uparrow, \downarrow\}}(V)$  is equivalent – via shuffle permutations of mixed tensor products  $(V^*)^{\otimes n} \otimes V^{\otimes m}$  – to the compact closed category  $\mathit{Int}(T(V))$  obtained by applying the  $\mathit{Int}$  construction of [28].

### 3. BRAUER DIAGRAMS

Circuit algebras are defined in Section 4 as algebras over an operad of wiring diagrams. It will follow from Theorem 4.15 that they admit an equivalent description as symmetric monoidal functors from categories of (coloured) Brauer diagrams. These diagrams are an important tool in the representation theory of orthogonal, symplectic and general linear groups [6, 47].

The category  $\mathbf{BD}$  of monochrome Brauer diagrams is described in Section 3.1. In Section 3.2, this definition is generalised to the categories of coloured Brauer diagrams, of which oriented Brauer diagrams – that encode the combinatorics of wheeled props (c.f., Proposition 3.26) – are a special class.

*Remark 3.1.* Several variations of the categories of Brauer diagrams defined in this work have appeared in diverse contexts, usually under the name ‘*Brauer category*’: For some authors (e.g. [1, 2, 40]), Brauer categories are ordinary categories and coincide with the categories  $\mathbf{BD}$  (and  $\mathbf{BD}^{(\mathbf{e}, \omega)}$ ) described in this section. However, most works (e.g., [34, 44–46]) consider Brauer categories that are linear (enriched) categorifications of Brauer algebras [6] whose definition is dependent on a choice of parametrising element of the ground ring.

Hence, to distinguish them from linear versions, the categories  $\mathbf{BD}$ ,  $\mathbf{BD}^{(\mathbf{e}, \omega)}$  described here are called ‘categories of Brauer diagrams’.

**3.1. Monochrome Brauer diagrams.** The category (prop)  $\mathbf{BD}$  of (ordinary, monochrome) Brauer diagrams may be pithily defined as the free compact closed category generated by a single self-dual object. This section gives a more concrete description of  $\mathbf{BD}$ , in terms of pairings on finite sets.

**Definition 3.2.** A pairing (perfect matching) on a set  $X$  is a fixed point free involution  $\tau$  on  $X$ . So,  $\tau^2 = \mathit{id}_X$  and  $\tau(x) \neq x$  for all  $x$ .

Equivalently, a pairing  $\tau$  on  $X$  is a partition of  $X$  into two-element subsets. In particular, a finite set  $X$  admits a pairing if and only if it has even cardinality. The empty set has trivial pairing  $\emptyset$  by convention.

*Example 3.3.* If  $\mathcal{M}$  is a compact 1-manifold, then its boundary  $\partial\mathcal{M}$  has a canonical pairing  $\tau^{\mathcal{M}}$ , with  $x = \tau^{\mathcal{M}}y$  if  $x \neq y$  and  $x$  and  $y$  are in the same connected component of  $\mathcal{M}$ .



**Definition 3.4.** A (monochrome) Brauer diagram  $f$  between natural numbers  $m$  and  $n$  is a pair  $(\tau_f, \mathfrak{k}_f)$  of a pairing  $\tau$  on the disjoint union  $\mathfrak{S}(f) \amalg \mathfrak{T}(f)$  – where  $\mathfrak{S}(f) = \{s_1, \dots, s_m\}$  is the source, and  $\mathfrak{T}(f) = \{t_1, \dots, t_n\}$  the target of  $f$  – and a natural number  $\mathfrak{k}_f$  called the number of closed components of  $f$ . An open Brauer diagram is a Brauer diagram  $\tau = (\tau, 0)$  with no closed components.

If  $\text{BD}(m, n)$  denotes the set of Brauer diagrams from  $m$  to  $n$  and  $\mathring{\text{BD}}(m, n) \subset \text{BD}(m, n)$  the subset of open Brauer diagrams, then  $\text{BD}(m, n) \cong \mathring{\text{BD}}(m, n) \times \mathbb{N}$  for all  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

*Example 3.5.* For all  $n$ , there is a canonical inclusion  $\Sigma_n \hookrightarrow \mathring{\text{BD}}(n, n)$  that takes  $\sigma \in \Sigma_n$  to the open Brauer diagram induced by the pairing  $s_i \mapsto t_{\sigma i}$  on  $\{s_1, \dots, s_n\} \amalg \{t_1, \dots, t_n\}$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$ .

In particular, the pairing  $s_i \mapsto t_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$  defines the *identity (open) Brauer diagram*  $id_n$  on  $n$ .

Brauer diagrams may be represented graphically as follows: a pairing  $\tau$  on the disjoint union  $X \amalg Y$  of finite sets  $X$  and  $Y$  is described by a univalent graph whose vertices are indexed by  $X \amalg Y$ , with elements of  $X$  below those of  $Y$ , and edges connecting vertices  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  if and only if the corresponding elements of  $X \amalg Y$  are identified by  $\tau$ . A Brauer diagram  $f = (\tau, \mathfrak{k}) : m \rightarrow n$  may be represented by the graph for  $\tau$ , together with  $\mathfrak{k}$  closed circles (called *bubbles* in [44]) drawn next to it.

Given finite sets  $X, Y, Z$ , and pairings  $\tau_{X,Y}$  and  $\tau_{Y,Z}$  on  $X \amalg Y$  and  $Y \amalg Z$  respectively, one may stack the diagrams for  $\tau_{X,Y}$  and  $\tau_{Y,Z}$  as in Figure 3 to obtain a pairing  $\tau_{Y,Z} \circ \tau_{X,Y}$  on  $X \amalg Z$ :

Namely,  $\tau_{X,Y}$  and  $\tau_{Y,Z}$  generate an equivalence relation on  $X \amalg Y \amalg Z$  where objects  $x$  and  $y$  are equivalent if and only if they are related by a sequence of (alternating) applications of  $\tau_{X,Y}$  and  $\tau_{Y,Z}$  (Figure 3(b)(i)-(iv)). Each equivalence class contains precisely zero or two elements of  $X \amalg Z$ . The classes that contain two elements of  $X \amalg Z$  – the *open components* of the composition – describe the desired pairing  $\tau_{Y,Z} \circ \tau_{X,Y}$  on  $X \amalg Z$ . The remaining equivalence classes – that describe cycles of elements of  $Y$  – are called *closed components formed by the composition* of  $\tau_{X,Y}$  and  $\tau_{Y,Z}$ .

Brauer diagrams  $f = (\tau_f, \mathfrak{k}_f) \in \text{BD}(l, m)$  and  $g = (\tau_g, \mathfrak{k}_g) \in \text{BD}(m, n)$  may be composed vertically to obtain a Brauer diagram  $g \circ f = (\tau_{gf}, \mathfrak{k}_{gf}) \in \text{BD}(l, n)$  with

- the pairing  $\tau_{g,f}$  is the composition pairing  $\tau_g \circ \tau_f$  obtained by identifying  $\mathfrak{T}(f) = \mathfrak{S}(g)$  according to  $t_{f,i} \mapsto s_{g,i}$ ;
- the number  $\mathfrak{k}_{gf}$  of closed components in  $g \circ f$  satisfies  $\mathfrak{k}_{gf} = \mathfrak{k}_f + \mathfrak{k}_g + \mathfrak{k}(\tau_f, \tau_g)$  where  $\mathfrak{k}(\tau_f, \tau_g)$  is the number of closed components *formed* by the composition of  $\tau_f$  and  $\tau_g$ .




FIGURE 3. (a) Composition of pairings on  $X \amalg Y$  and  $Y \amalg Z$ ; (b) the resulting pairing on  $X \amalg Z$ , together with the single closed component formed in the composition.

This composition is associative, with two-sided unit  $(id_n, 0)$ . Hence, we may define:

**Definition 3.6.** The category  $\text{BD}$  of (monochrome unoriented) Brauer diagrams has objects  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , hom sets  $\text{BD}(m, n)$  and composition given by vertical composition of Brauer diagrams.

The category  $\text{BD}$  is a prop with monoidal product (horizontal sum) induced by addition of natural numbers and juxtaposition of Brauer diagrams

$$(\tau_1, \mathfrak{k}_1) \oplus (\tau_2, \mathfrak{k}_2) = (\tau_1 \amalg \tau_2, \mathfrak{k}_1 + \mathfrak{k}_2) : m_1 + m_2 \rightarrow n_1 + n_2,$$

for  $(\tau_1, \mathfrak{k}_1): m_1 \rightarrow n_1$  and  $(\tau_2, \mathfrak{k}_2): m_2 \rightarrow n_2$ . The monoidal unit is given by the trivial open Brauer diagram  $(\emptyset, 0): 0 \rightarrow 0$ .

Note, in particular, that any Brauer diagram  $f = (\tau, \mathfrak{k}): m \rightarrow n$  may be written as a horizontal sum  $(\tau, 0) \oplus (\emptyset, \mathfrak{k})$  of an open Brauer diagram  $(\tau, 0): m \rightarrow n$  and a scalar  $(\emptyset, \mathfrak{k}) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{k}} (\emptyset, 1): 0 \rightarrow 0$ .

Let  $id_1 \in \text{BD}(1, 1)$ ,  $\cup \in \text{BD}(0, 2)$  and  $\cap \in \text{BD}(2, 0)$  be the morphisms induced by the unique pairing on the two-element set. For all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $id_n = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n id_1 \in \text{BD}(n, n)$ , and  $\cup_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [id_n] \in \text{BD}(0, 2n)$  and  $\cap_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [id_n] \in \text{BD}(2n, 0)$  satisfy the  $n$ -fold triangle identities.

$$(3.7) \quad (\cap_n \oplus id_n) \circ (id_n \oplus \cup_n) = id_n = (id_n \oplus \cap_n) \circ (\cup_n \oplus id_n).$$

As such,  $\text{BD}$  is the free compact closed category generated by one self-dual object. Hence, it has the following universal property:

**Lemma 3.8.** *For any symmetric monoidal category  $\mathcal{C}$  and any self-dual object  $x \in \mathcal{C}$ , there is a unique symmetric strict monoidal functor  $\xi_x: \text{BD} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  such that  $\xi_x(1) = x$ .*

*Remark 3.9.* It is important to note that the subsets  $\mathring{\text{BD}}(m, n) \subset \text{BD}(m, n)$  of open Brauer diagrams do not describe a subcategory of  $\text{BD}$ . Namely, the *unit trace*  $\bigcirc \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} tr(id_i) = \cap \circ \cup$  satisfies  $\bigcirc = \cap \circ \cup = (\emptyset, 1) \in \text{BD}(0, 0)$  which is not open. And, for all  $n \geq 0$ ,

$$\cap_n \circ \cup_n = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \bigcirc = (\emptyset, n) \in \text{BD}(0, 0).$$

*Example 3.10.* Brauer diagrams may equivalently be defined as tangles in some high ( $>3$ )-dimensional space (e.g., [1]). In fact,  $\text{BD}$  is a skeleton subcategory of the 1-dimensional cobordism category whose morphisms are boundary-preserving isotopy classes of compact 1-manifolds. Hence, monoidal functors from  $\text{BD}$  may be referred to as *lax TQFTs*.

Let  $I$  denote the unit interval  $[0, 1]$ , and let  $\mathcal{M} \cong n_o(I) \amalg n_c(S^1)$  be a compact 1-manifold with canonical pairing  $\tau^{\mathcal{M}}$  on  $\partial\mathcal{M}$  as in Example 3.3. If  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfy  $m+n = 2n_o$ , and  $\phi: \{s_1, \dots, s_m\} \amalg \{t_1, \dots, t_n\} \rightarrow \partial\mathcal{M}$  is any isomorphism, then  $(\phi^{-1}\tau^{\mathcal{M}}\phi, n_c) \in \text{BD}(m, n)$ .

Conversely, given a morphism  $f = (\tau, \mathfrak{k}) \in \text{BD}(m, n)$ , there is a unique up to boundary-preserving isotopy pair  $(\mathcal{M}_f, \phi_f)$  of a compact 1-manifold  $\mathcal{M}_f \cong \frac{m+n}{2}(I) \amalg \mathfrak{k}(S^1)$  and isomorphism  $\phi_f: \mathfrak{S}(f) \amalg \mathfrak{T}(f) \rightarrow \partial\mathcal{M}$  such that  $\phi_f^{-1}\tau^{\mathcal{M}_f}\phi_f = \tau$ .

Let  $f = (\tau, \mathfrak{k}) \in \text{BD}(m, n)$ . Following Example 3.10,  $\partial f \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathfrak{S}(f) \amalg \mathfrak{T}(f)$  is called the *boundary of  $f = (\tau, \mathfrak{k}) \in \text{BD}(m, n)$* . A *component of  $f$*  is an element of the set  $\pi_0(f)$  of connected components of a compact manifold  $\mathcal{M}_f$  as in Example 3.10. So,  $|\pi_0(f)| = \frac{(m+n)}{2} + \mathfrak{k}$ .

There is a canonical map  $\partial f \rightarrow \pi_0(f)$  so that  $f$  is described by a diagram of cospans of finite sets:

$$(3.11) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} \mathfrak{S}(f) & \xrightarrow{S_i \mapsto \tau(S_i)} & \partial f & \xleftarrow{t_j \mapsto \tau(t_j)} & \mathfrak{T}(f) \\ & \searrow \text{---} & \downarrow & \swarrow \text{---} & \\ & & \pi_0(f) & & \end{array}$$

*Remark 3.12.* By (3.11), for composable morphisms  $f \in \text{BD}(k, m)$  and  $g \in \text{BD}(m, n)$ , we may consider the pushout diagram:

$$(3.13) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} \mathfrak{S}(f) & & \mathfrak{T}(f) = \mathfrak{S}(g) & & \mathfrak{T}(g) \\ & \searrow^{\tau_f} & \swarrow_{\tau_f} & \searrow^{\tau_g} & \swarrow_{\tau_g} \\ & \partial f & & \partial g & \\ & \downarrow^{\pi_0(f)} & \dashrightarrow & \downarrow^{\pi_0(g)} & \\ & \pi_0(f) & & \pi_0(g) & \\ & \dashrightarrow & P(gf) & \dashrightarrow & \\ & & \downarrow & & \\ & & \pi^P(gf) & & \end{array}$$

However,  $\text{BD}$  is not a cospan category since, in general,  $P(gf) \not\cong \partial(gf) = \mathfrak{S}(f) \amalg \mathfrak{T}(g)$  and hence composition of morphisms in  $\text{BD}$  is not described by compositions (pushouts) of cospans as in (3.13).

For example, in the pushout (3.13) for the composition  $\cap \circ \cup = \circ$ ,  $P(\cap \circ \cup)$  has two elements, but  $\partial \circ = \emptyset$ . This is equivalent to the observation that open Brauer diagrams do not describe a subcategory of  $\text{BD}$  and closely related to the *problem of loops* discussed in detail in [42, Section 6].

By e.g. [34, Theorem 2.6] or [1, Proposition 2.15], the category  $\text{BD}$  is generated, under horizontal and vertical composition, by the open morphisms  $id_1, \cup, \cap$  and the unique non-identity permutation  $\sigma_2 \in \Sigma_2 \subset \text{BD}(2, 2)$  according to the obvious identity and symmetry relations and the triangle relations (Figure 1). Interesting subcategories of  $\text{BD}$  may be obtained by taking subsets of the generating set.

**Definition 3.14.** *The subcategory  $\text{dBD} \subset \text{BD}$  of downward Brauer diagrams is the subcategory of open morphisms  $(\tau^\downarrow, 0) \in \text{BD}(m, n)$  such that, for all  $y \in \mathfrak{T}(f)$ ,  $\tau^\downarrow(y) \in \mathfrak{S}(f)$ . So,  $\text{dBD}(m, n)$  is empty whenever  $n > m$ .*

*The category  $\text{uBD} \subset \text{BD}$  of upward Brauer diagrams is the opposite category of  $\text{dBD}$ .*

The category  $\text{dBD}$  is generated by  $id_1, \sigma_2$ , and  $\cap$  (and  $\text{uBD}$  is generated by  $id_1, \sigma_2$ , and  $\cup$ ) under horizontal and vertical composition, according to the relations in  $\text{BD}$ . In particular,  $\cup$  is not a morphism in  $\text{dBD}$  and  $\cap$  is not a morphism in  $\text{uBD}$ . Since morphisms in  $\text{dBD}$  are open,  $\text{dBD}(m, n)$  is finite for all  $m, n$ . Moreover, composition in  $\text{dBD}$  (respectively  $\text{uBD}$ ) may be described by pushouts of cospans as in (3.13).

In [46], representations of the infinite orthogonal and symplectic groups are described in terms of the categories  $\text{dBD}$  and  $\text{uBD}$  and, in Definition 5.5,  $\text{dBD}$  is used to define nonunital circuit algebras. (See also [41, Section 5].)

*Remark 3.15.* Other interesting subcategories of  $\text{BD}$  may be obtained by restricting to different subsets of the generating morphisms. Of course, the permutation groupoid  $\Sigma$ , generated by  $id_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  is the intersection of  $\text{dBD}$  and  $\text{uBD}$ . The *Temperley-Lieb category*  $\text{TL} \subset \text{BD}$  is the subcategory of *planar Brauer diagrams* generated by  $id_1, \cup, \cap$ , without the symmetry morphism  $\sigma_2$  (see [19]).

**3.2. Coloured Brauer diagrams, orientations and wheeled props.** Generalisations of categories of Brauer diagrams are obtained by colouring the diagram components. By considering involutions on colours, the same constructions also describe (coloured) oriented Brauer diagrams. (See also [13, 42].)

**Definition 3.16.** *A pair  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$  of a set  $\mathfrak{C}$  together with an involution  $\omega: \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$  is called an (involutive) palette. Elements  $c \in \mathfrak{C}$  are called colours in  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$ . The set of orbits of  $\omega$  in  $\mathfrak{C}$  is denoted by  $\tilde{\mathfrak{C}}$ .*

For any palette  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$ , there is an induced free monoid palette  $(\text{list}(\mathfrak{C}), \overleftarrow{\omega})$  with involution

$$(3.17) \quad \overleftarrow{\omega} : (c_1, \dots, c_n) \mapsto (\omega c_n, \dots, \omega c_1).$$

Objects of the category  $\text{Pal}$  are palettes  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$ , and morphisms  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega) \rightarrow (\mathfrak{C}', \omega')$  are given by morphisms  $\lambda \in \text{Set}(\mathfrak{C}, \mathfrak{C}')$  such that  $\lambda \circ \omega = \omega' \circ \lambda$ .

Now let  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$  be any palette and  $(X, \tau)$  be the palette described by a pairing  $\tau$  on a finite set  $X$ .

**Definition 3.18.** A  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$ -colouring of  $\tau$  is morphism  $\lambda : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$  in  $\text{Pal}$ .

A  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$ -colouring  $\lambda$  of a Brauer diagram  $f = (\tau, \mathfrak{k}) \in \text{BD}(m, n)$  is given by a pair  $\lambda = (\lambda_\partial, \tilde{\lambda})$  where  $\lambda_\partial$  is a colouring of  $\tau$  and  $\tilde{\lambda}$  is a map  $\pi_0(f) \rightarrow \tilde{\mathfrak{C}}$  such that the following diagram of sets commutes:

$$(3.19) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \partial f & \xrightarrow{\lambda_\partial} & \mathfrak{C} \\ \tau \downarrow \cong & & \cong \downarrow \omega \\ \partial f & \xrightarrow{\lambda_\partial} & \mathfrak{C} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \cong \\ \pi_0(f) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\lambda}} & \tilde{\mathfrak{C}}. \end{array}$$

The type of the colouring  $\lambda$  is the pair  $(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}) \in (\text{list}(\mathfrak{C}))^2$  – where  $\mathbf{c}$  is called the input type, and  $\mathbf{d}$  is called the output type, of  $(f, \lambda)$  – defined by:

$$(3.20) \quad \mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_n) = \lambda_\partial(\mathfrak{T}(f)), \text{ and } \mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_m) = \omega \circ \lambda_\partial(\mathfrak{S}(f)).$$

*Remark 3.21.* The application of  $\omega$  in the definition of the input type  $\mathbf{c} = \omega \circ \lambda_\partial(\mathfrak{S}(f))$  is necessary to define categorical composition of coloured Brauer diagrams in Definition 3.22.

Given  $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_m)$  and  $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_n)$  in  $\text{list}(\mathfrak{C})$ , objects of the set  $\text{BD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d})$  of  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$ -coloured Brauer diagrams from  $\mathbf{c}$  to  $\mathbf{d}$  are pairs  $(f, \lambda)$  where  $f = (\tau, \mathfrak{k})$  is a morphism in  $\text{BD}(m, n)$ , and  $\lambda$  is a colouring of  $f$  of type  $(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d})$ .

Horizontal composition  $\oplus$  of coloured Brauer diagrams  $(f, \lambda) \in \text{BD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}(\mathbf{c}_1, \mathbf{d}_1)$  and  $(g, \gamma) \in \text{BD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}(\mathbf{c}_2, \mathbf{d}_2)$  is given by juxtaposition and concatenation:

$$(f, \lambda) \oplus (g, \gamma) = (f \oplus g, \lambda \amalg \gamma) \in \text{BD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}(\mathbf{c}_1 \mathbf{c}_2, \mathbf{d}_1 \mathbf{d}_2).$$

Let  $(f, \lambda) \in \text{BD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$  and  $(g, \gamma) \in \text{BD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d})$  with  $f = (\tau_f, \mathfrak{k}_f) \in \text{BD}(k, m)$  and  $g = (\tau_g, \mathfrak{k}_g) \in \text{BD}(m, n)$  be such that  $gf = (\tau_{gf}, \mathfrak{k}_{gf}) \in \text{BD}(k, n)$ . By definition,  $\gamma_\partial(y) = \omega \lambda_\partial(y)$  for each  $y \in \mathfrak{T}(f) = \mathfrak{S}(f)$ .

Hence, for each  $x \in \mathfrak{S}(f)$ ,  $\lambda_\partial(\tau_{gf})(x) = \omega \lambda_\partial(x)$ . Likewise, for  $z \in \mathfrak{T}(g)$ ,  $\gamma_\partial(\tau_{gf})(z) = \omega \gamma_\partial(z)$ . Therefore, there is a well-defined colouring  $(\gamma \lambda)_\partial$  of  $\tau_{gf}$  that restricts to  $\lambda_\partial$  on  $\mathfrak{S}(f)$  and to  $\gamma_\partial$  on  $\mathfrak{T}(g)$ .

Moreover, for each closed component  $[y] = (y, y_1 = \tau_f(y), y_2 = \tau_g(y_1), \dots) \subset \mathfrak{T}(f)$  created by the composition  $g \circ f$ , there is a well-defined element  $\tilde{c} \in \tilde{\mathfrak{C}}$  given by the class of  $\tilde{\lambda}(y_i)$  ( $y_i \in [y]$ ) in  $\tilde{\mathfrak{C}}$ . Therefore, the composition  $g \circ f$  induces a well-defined map  $\tilde{\gamma \lambda} : \pi_0(gf) \rightarrow \tilde{\mathfrak{C}}$  (see Figure 4).

It follows that  $((\gamma \lambda)_\partial, \tilde{\gamma \lambda})$  describes a colouring  $\gamma \lambda$  on  $\tau_{gf}$ .

**Definition 3.22.** Objects of the category  $\text{BD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}$  of  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$ -coloured Brauer diagrams are elements of  $\text{list}(\mathfrak{C})$ . Morphisms in  $\text{BD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d})$  are  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$ -coloured Brauer diagrams of type  $(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d})$ , with composition of morphisms  $(f, \lambda) \in \text{BD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$  and  $(g, \gamma) \in \text{BD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d})$  is given by  $(gf, \gamma \lambda) \in \text{BD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{d})$ .




FIGURE 4. Composing coloured pairings.

*Remark 3.23.* Let  $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_m)$ ,  $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_n)$  and let  $(f, \lambda) \in \text{BD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d})$  be a morphism with underlying Brauer diagram  $f = (\tau, \mathfrak{k}_f) \in \text{BD}(m, n)$ .

The pairing  $\tau$  induces a pairing on  $\{c_1, \dots, c_m\} \amalg \{d_1, \dots, d_n\}$  in the obvious manner and  $\tilde{\lambda}$  describes an unordered  $\mathfrak{k}_f$ -tuple in  $\tilde{\mathfrak{C}}$ . Hence, a  $(f, \lambda) \in \text{BD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d})$  may also be denoted simply by  $(\tau, \tilde{\lambda})$ .

The category  $\text{BD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}$  is a  $\mathfrak{C}$ -coloured prop (see Section 2.1), with monoidal structure  $\oplus$  induced by concatenation of object lists and disjoint union of coloured Brauer diagrams. It has a compact closed structure given by  $\mathbf{c}^* = \overleftarrow{\omega \mathbf{c}}$  for all  $\mathbf{c}$ .

*Remark 3.24.* When  $\omega = id_{\mathfrak{C}}$  is the identity,  $\text{BD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}$  coincides with the *chromatic Brauer category*, of [40] used to extend the *positive TQFTs* of [1, 2] and applied to distinguish exotic smooth spheres.

Of particular importance is the palette  $\{\uparrow, \downarrow\}$  given by the unique non-trivial involution  $(\uparrow) \leftrightarrow (\downarrow)$  on the two-element set  $\{\uparrow, \downarrow\}$ . A  $\{\uparrow, \downarrow\}$ -coloured Brauer diagram is called *oriented* and  $\text{OBD} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{BD}^{\{\uparrow, \downarrow\}}$  is the category of (*monochrome*) *oriented Brauer diagrams*. Objects of OBD are finite words in the alphabet  $\{\uparrow, \downarrow\}$ . Let  $\uparrow^n$  (respectively  $\downarrow^n$ ) denote the object of OBD given by  $n$  copies of  $\uparrow$  (respectively  $\downarrow$ ) in list  $\{\uparrow, \downarrow\}$ . So objects of OBD are concatenations of words of the form  $\uparrow^m$  and  $\downarrow^n$ . Morphisms in OBD are represented, as in Figure 5, by diagrams of oriented intervals and (unoriented) circles.

More generally, if  $\mathfrak{D}$  is a set, and  $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{D} \times \{\uparrow, \downarrow\}$ , then the category  $\text{OBD}^{\mathfrak{D}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{BD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}$  of  $\mathfrak{D}$ -coloured oriented Brauer diagrams is the free compact closed prop generated by elements of the set  $\mathfrak{D}$  and their formal duals. For  $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_n) \in \text{list}(\mathfrak{D})$ , let  $\uparrow^{\mathbf{d}}$  (respectively  $\downarrow^{\mathbf{d}}$ ) denote  $((d_1, \uparrow), \dots, (d_n, \uparrow)) \in \text{list}(\mathfrak{D} \times \{\uparrow, \downarrow\})$ . If  $\downarrow^{\mathbf{d}}$  is defined similarly, then objects of  $\text{OBD}^{\mathfrak{D}}$  are concatenations of words of the form  $\uparrow^{\mathbf{d}}$  and  $\downarrow^{\mathbf{c}}$ . Note that  $\overleftarrow{\omega}(\uparrow^{\mathbf{d}}) = \downarrow^{\mathbf{d}^\dagger}$  where  $\mathbf{d}^\dagger \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (d_n, \dots, d_1)$ .

*Example 3.25.* The full subcategory  $W^{\mathfrak{D}} \subset \text{OBD}^{\mathfrak{D}}$  on objects of the form  $\uparrow^{\mathbf{d}}$  is canonically a  $\mathfrak{D}$ -coloured wheeled prop. But it is not compact closed, since  $W^{\mathfrak{D}}$  does not admit duals.

Applying the Int construction [28] to  $W^{\mathfrak{D}}$  results in the category  $W\text{BD}^{\mathfrak{D}}$  of  $\mathfrak{D}$ -coloured *walled Brauer diagrams*. This is the full subcategory of  $\text{OBD}^{\mathfrak{D}}$  on objects of the form  $\uparrow^{\mathbf{c}} \downarrow^{\mathbf{d}}$ ,  $\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d} \in \text{list}(\mathfrak{D})$ . The inclusion  $W\text{BD}^{\mathfrak{D}} \hookrightarrow \text{OBD}^{\mathfrak{D}}$  is an equivalence of categories since every object of  $\text{OBD}^{\mathfrak{D}}$  is isomorphic – via a canonical shuffle permutation – to a unique object of  $W\text{BD}^{\mathfrak{D}}$  (see Figure 5).

*Walled Brauer algebras* were introduced independently in [32, 54] and appear in the theory of algebraic representations of  $GL_d$ .

In fact, the category  $\text{OBD}^{\mathfrak{D}}$  classifies  $\mathfrak{D}$ -coloured wheeled props:




FIGURE 5. (a) Composing oriented Brauer diagrams. (b) Up to a shuffle permutation, this is equivalent to a composition of walled Brauer diagrams, where horizontal arrows go from left to right.

**Proposition 3.26.** *There is an equivalence of categories between the category  $\text{WP}_{\mathbb{X}}^{\mathfrak{D}}$  of  $\mathfrak{D}$ -coloured wheeled props in a symmetric monoidal category  $(\mathbb{X}, \otimes, I)$  and the category  $[\text{OBD}^{\mathfrak{D}}, \mathbb{X}]_{\text{lax}}$  of symmetric monoidal functors  $\text{OBD}^{\mathfrak{D}} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}$  and natural transformations.*

*Proof.* Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \pi, \eta): \text{OBD}^{\mathfrak{D}} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}$  be a symmetric monoidal functor. This describes a  $\mathfrak{D}$ -coloured wheeled prop  $(P_{\mathcal{A}}, \otimes^P, \varnothing_{\mathfrak{D}}, \text{tr}^P)$  as follows:

For  $\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d} \in \text{list}(\mathfrak{D})$ ,  $P_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{A}(\uparrow^{\mathbf{c}} \downarrow^{\mathbf{d}^\dagger})$ . The symmetric structure of  $(\mathcal{A}, \pi)$  induces symmetry isomorphisms in  $P_{\mathcal{A}}$ . The monoidal (horizontal) composition  $\otimes_P$  on morphisms in  $P_{\mathcal{A}}$  is obtained from  $\pi$  by composition with the appropriate symmetry (shuffle) isomorphism and has monoidal unit  $1_{\varnothing} = \eta: I_{\mathbb{X}} \rightarrow P_{\mathcal{A}}(\varnothing, \varnothing) = \mathcal{A}(\varnothing)$ .

For each  $d \in \mathfrak{D}$ , the identity  $1_d: I \rightarrow P_{\mathcal{A}}(d, d)$  is given by the composition

$$I \xrightarrow{\eta} \mathcal{A}(\varnothing) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{A}(\cup_{\uparrow d})} \mathcal{A}(\uparrow^d \downarrow^d) = P_{\mathcal{A}}(d, d).$$

Categorical (vertical) composition  $P_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}) \otimes P_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}) \rightarrow P_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{d})$  in  $P_{\mathcal{A}}$  is defined by

$$\mathcal{A}(\text{id}_{\uparrow \mathbf{b}} \otimes \cap_{\uparrow \mathbf{c}} \otimes \text{id}_{\downarrow \mathbf{d}^\dagger}) \circ \pi: \mathcal{A}(\uparrow^{\mathbf{b}} \downarrow^{\mathbf{c}^\dagger}) \otimes \mathcal{A}(\uparrow^{\mathbf{c}} \downarrow^{\mathbf{d}^\dagger}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(\uparrow^{\mathbf{b}} \downarrow^{\mathbf{d}^\dagger}),$$

and likewise the trace is given by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{cb}, \mathbf{db}) & \xrightarrow{\text{tr}_{\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}}^{\mathbf{b}}} & P_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}) \\ \parallel & & \parallel \\ \mathcal{A}(\uparrow^{\mathbf{c}} \uparrow^{\mathbf{b}} \downarrow^{\mathbf{b}^\dagger} \downarrow^{\mathbf{d}^\dagger}) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{A}(\text{id}_{\uparrow \mathbf{c}} \otimes \cap_{\downarrow \mathbf{b}^\dagger} \otimes \text{id}_{\downarrow \mathbf{d}^\dagger})} & \mathcal{A}(\uparrow^{\mathbf{c}} \downarrow^{\mathbf{d}^\dagger}) \end{array}$$

It follows immediately from the relations in  $\text{OBD}^{\mathfrak{D}}$  that  $P_{\mathcal{A}}$  satisfies the axioms for traced monoidal categories (Section 2.2).

Conversely, let  $(P, \otimes_P, \varnothing_{\mathfrak{D}}, \text{tr})$  be a  $\mathfrak{D}$ -coloured wheeled prop in  $\mathbb{X}$ . Define  $(\mathcal{A}_P, \pi_P, \eta_P): \text{OBD}^{\mathfrak{D}} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}$  by  $\mathcal{A}_P(\uparrow^{\mathbf{c}} \downarrow^{\mathbf{d}}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} P(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}^\dagger)$ . The symmetric action on  $\mathcal{A}_P$  is induced by symmetry in  $P$ . Permutations that shuffle  $\uparrow^{\mathbf{c}}$  with  $\downarrow^{\mathbf{d}^\dagger}$  act trivially on  $\mathcal{A}_P$ .

Horizontal composition  $\otimes_P$  in  $P$  induces a lax multiplication  $\pi_P$  on  $\mathcal{A}$  with a lax unit for  $\mathcal{A}_P$  described by the unit morphism  $1_{\varnothing}: I_{\mathbb{X}} \rightarrow P(\varnothing, \varnothing) = \mathcal{A}_P(\varnothing)$ .

For each  $d \in \mathfrak{D}$ ,

$$\mathcal{A}(\cap_{\downarrow d}) = \text{tr}^d: \mathcal{A}(\uparrow^d \downarrow^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(\varnothing)$$

and  $\mathcal{A}(\cup_{\downarrow}^d)$  is given by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{A}(\emptyset_{\mathbf{e}}) = P(0, 0) & \longrightarrow & P(d, d) = \mathcal{A}(\uparrow^d \downarrow^d). \\ & \searrow \text{tr}(id_0) & \nearrow 1_d \\ & & I \end{array}$$

Since  $P$  satisfies the wheeled prop axioms (Definition 2.18 & [28]),  $\mathcal{A}_P$  satisfies the relations in  $\text{OBD}^{\mathfrak{D}}$ , and hence defines a symmetric lax functor from  $\text{OBD}^{\mathfrak{D}}$ .

The assignments  $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow P_{\mathcal{A}}$  and  $P \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_P$  preserve all defining structure and are each others' inverses up to shuffle isomorphisms in  $\text{OBD}^{\mathfrak{D}}$ , and therefore define a categorical equivalence.  $\square$

By [10], this result will also follow from Theorem 4.15.

**3.3. Representations of BD and OBD.** This short section reviews some known results on the representation theory of (oriented) Brauer diagrams. These results are categorifications of the classical theorems of Weyl [58] and Brauer [6].

Let  $R$  be a commutative ring, and  $R\text{-Mod}$  its category of modules. For  $\delta \in R$ , let  $\text{Br}_{\delta} = \text{Br}_{\delta}^R$  be the  $R\text{-Mod}$ -enriched *Brauer category (with specialisation  $\delta$ )* [34] whose objects are natural numbers  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and, for all  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\text{Br}_{\delta}(m, n)$  is the free  $R$ -module (finitely) generated by the open Brauer diagrams  $\tau \in \text{BD}(m, n)$ . If  $\tau_f \in \text{Br}_{\delta}(k, m)$  and  $\tau_g \in \text{Br}_{\delta}(m, n)$  are generating morphisms, then their composition in  $\text{Br}_{\delta}$  is defined by  $\tau_g \tau_f = \delta^{\mathfrak{t}_{gf}} \tau_{gf} \in \text{Br}_{\delta}(k, n)$ . In particular,  $\text{Br}_{\delta}(0, 0) = \langle \delta \rangle \subset R$  is the ideal generated by  $\delta$ .

Let  $\underline{\text{BD}}_R$  be the free  $R\text{-Mod}$ -category on BD. So, for each pair  $m, n$  of natural numbers,  $\underline{\text{BD}}_R(m, n)$  is the free  $R$  module (infinitely) generated by  $\text{BD}(m, n)$ . There is a canonical isomorphism  $\underline{\text{BD}} \cong \text{Br}_t^{R[t]}$  of  $R\text{-Mod}$ -enriched categories given by  $(\tau, \mathfrak{k}) \leftrightarrow t^{\mathfrak{k}} \tau$ . For each  $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$ , let  $T_{\delta}: \text{BD} \rightarrow \text{Br}_{\delta}$  be the obvious identity-on-objects symmetric (strict) monoidal functor such that  $\bigcirc = \cap \circ \cup \mapsto \delta$ . This factors through the symmetric strict monoidal ( $R\text{-Mod}$ )-enriched *specialisation* functor  $\text{Br}_t^{R[t]} \rightarrow \text{Br}_{\delta}$  induced by  $t \mapsto \delta$ .

In the oriented case, let  $\text{OBr}_{\delta}$  be the *oriented Brauer category (with specialisation  $\delta$ )* defined similarly to  $\text{Br}_{\delta}$  (so, there is a canonical orientation-forgetting functor  $\text{OBr}_{\delta} \rightarrow \text{Br}_{\delta}$ ). In particular, the free  $R\text{-Mod}$  category  $\underline{\text{OBD}}$  on OBD is isomorphic to  $\text{OBr}_t^{R[t]}$ . As in the unoriented case, for each  $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$ , the obvious identity-on-objects symmetric (strict) monoidal functor  $\text{OBD} \rightarrow \text{OBr}_{\delta}$  such that  $\bigcirc \mapsto \delta$  is denoted by  $T_{\delta}$ .

If  $(\mathcal{A}, \pi, \eta): \text{BD} \rightarrow R\text{-Mod}$  is a symmetric monoidal functor, then  $\mathcal{A}(0)$  is an  $R$ -algebra with unit  $\eta$  and algebra multiplication  $\pi$ . For  $r \in R$ , it is convenient to denote  $\eta(r) \in \mathcal{A}(0)$  simply by  $r$ .

**Lemma 3.27.** *A symmetric monoidal functor  $\mathcal{A}: \text{BD} \rightarrow R\text{-Mod}$  factors through  $T_{\delta}$  if and only if  $\mathcal{A}(0) \mapsto \delta$ .*

*An identical statement holds for the oriented case with BD replaced by OBD.*

*Proof.* If  $\mathcal{A}$  factors through  $T_{\delta}$ , then clearly  $\mathcal{A}(\bigcirc) = \delta$ . For the converse, define a lax monoidal functor  $\underline{\mathcal{A}}: \text{Br}_{\delta} \rightarrow R\text{-Mod}$  by  $\underline{\mathcal{A}}(\tau') = \mathcal{A}(\tau', 0)$  for each generator  $\tau' \in \text{Br}_{\delta}(m, n)$ . Since  $\mathcal{A}$  is lax monoidal, for all morphisms  $f = (\tau, \mathfrak{k}) = (\tau, 0) \oplus (\emptyset, \mathfrak{k}) \in \text{BD}(m, n)$ ,

$$\mathcal{A}(f) = \delta^{\mathfrak{k}} \mathcal{A}(\tau) = \delta^{\mathfrak{k}} \underline{\mathcal{A}}(\tau) = \underline{\mathcal{A}}(T_{\delta}(f)).$$

Hence  $\mathcal{A} = \underline{\mathcal{A}} \circ T_{\delta}: \text{BD} \rightarrow \text{Br}_{\delta} \rightarrow R\text{-Mod}$ . The proof is unchanged for the oriented case.  $\square$

For fixed  $\delta \in R$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the endomorphism algebras  $\text{Br}_\delta(n, n)$  coincide with *Brauer algebras*, introduced by Brauer in [6] to study of representations of the finite dimensional orthogonal and symplectic groups  $O_d$  and  $Sp_k$  ( $d, k \in \mathbb{N}$ ).

Let  $\mathbb{k}$  be a field of characteristic 0 and let  $V$  be a  $d$ -dimensional vector space equipped with a nondegenerate bilinear form  $\theta: V \otimes V \rightarrow V$  that is either symmetric or skew-symmetric (in which case, nondegeneracy implies that  $d = 2k$  for some  $k$ ). Since  $\theta$  is nondegenerate, it defines an isomorphism  $v \mapsto \theta(v, -)$  of  $V$  with its dual  $V^*$ . Fix  $\delta = d \in \mathbb{k}$  is  $\theta$  is symmetric, and  $\delta = -k = -d/2$  if  $\theta$  is skew-symmetric.

The isometry group  $G = \{g: \theta(gv, gw) = \theta(v, w) \text{ for all } v, w, \in V\} \subset GL(V)$  of  $\theta$  is

- the orthogonal group  $O(V, \theta) \cong O_d$  when  $\theta$  is symmetric
- the symplectic group  $Sp(V, \theta) \cong Sp_k$  when  $\theta$  is skew-symmetric.

Brauer [6] extended the Schur-Weyl duality between representations of the symmetry and general linear groups to prove that, for  $n \geq |\delta|$ , representations of  $\text{Br}_\delta^{\mathbb{k}}(n, n)$  in  $V^{\otimes n}$  are in one-to-one correspondence with degree  $n$  representations of  $G$ .

Categorified versions of Brauer's theorems were established in [34, Theorems 3.4, 4.6, 4.8, 5.9, 6.10]:

View the endomorphism prop  $T(V)$  (see Example 2.8) as a full sub-category of  $\text{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$  with objects  $V^{\otimes k}$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  (here  $V^{\otimes 0} = \mathbb{k}$  by convention). Note that objects of  $T(V)$  have a  $G$ -module structure induced by the factor-wise action  $g \cdot (v_1, \dots, v_n) = (g(v_1), \dots, g(v_n))$  on each  $V^{\otimes n}$ .

Let  $T_G(V) \subset T(V)$  be the subprop of  $G$ -equivariant morphisms. By definition  $\theta: V^{\otimes 2} \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$  is in  $T_G(V)$  and hence, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $1 \leq i < j \leq n+2$ , so are the ‘contraction’ maps  $\theta^{i \ddagger j}: V^{\otimes(n+2)} \rightarrow V^{\otimes n}$  induced by applying  $\theta$  to the  $i^{\text{th}}$  and  $j^{\text{th}}$  factors.

Recall that  $\mathbb{k}[\Sigma] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{k}[\Sigma_n]$  describes a monochrome  $\text{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ -prop. The canonical levelwise action of  $\Sigma$  on  $T(V)$  by permuting factors (see Example 2.8) extends linearly to a functor  $\mathbb{k}[\Sigma] \hookrightarrow T(V)$ .

Define

$$(3.28) \quad e(k) = \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_k} \text{sgn}(\sigma) \sigma \in \mathbb{k}[\Sigma_k]$$

where  $\text{sgn}(\sigma)$  is the sign of a permutation  $\sigma \in \Sigma_k$ . Since  $\mathbb{k}[\Sigma] \subset \text{Br}_\delta$  for all  $\delta \in \mathbb{k}$ , for each  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\langle e(k) \rangle_{m, n} \subset \text{Br}_\delta(m, n)$  be the subspace generated by  $e(k)$  under horizontal and vertical composition in  $\text{Br}_\delta$ .

**Theorem 3.29.** [Lehrer-Zhang, 2015] *There is a unique symmetric strict monoidal (tensor) functor  $\text{Br}_\delta \rightarrow \text{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$  such that  $1 \mapsto V$ ,  $\cup \mapsto \theta$ . This factors through the inclusion  $T_G(V) \hookrightarrow \text{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ . Let  $F_G: \text{Br}_\delta \rightarrow T_G(V)$  denote the corresponding (corestriction) functor.*

Let  $\sigma_2 \in \Sigma_2 \subset \text{Br}_\delta(2, 2)$  be the unique non-identity permutation. For all  $v \otimes w \in V^{\otimes 2}$ ,

$$F_G(\sigma_2)(v \otimes w) = \begin{cases} w \otimes v & \text{when } \theta \text{ is symmetric,} \\ -w \otimes v & \text{when } \theta \text{ is skew-symmetric.} \end{cases}$$

The functor  $F_G$  is full. Its restriction  $\text{Br}_\delta(m, n) \rightarrow T_G(V)(V^{\otimes m}, V^{\otimes n})$  is injective when  $m + n \leq 2|\delta|$ . When  $m + n > 2|\delta|$ , its kernel is  $\langle e(|\delta| + 1) \rangle_{m, n}$ .

*Remark 3.30.* The statement that  $F_G: \text{Br}_\delta \rightarrow T_G(V)$  is full is one formulation of the first fundamental theorem of invariant theory for the orthogonal and symplectic groups. In particular, it implies that, since  $\text{Br}_\delta(m, n) = 0$  when  $m + n$  is odd, so also  $T_G(V)(V^{\otimes m}, V^{\otimes n}) = 0$  when  $m + n$  is odd.

The description of the kernels of the maps  $F_G(m, n): \text{Br}_\delta(m, n) \rightarrow T_G(V)(V^{\otimes m}, V^{\otimes n})$  is the second fundamental theorem of invariant theory for the orthogonal and symplectic groups.



An oriented version of Theorem 3.29 categorifies Weyl's first and second fundamental theorems of invariant theory of the finite dimensional general linear groups:

If  $V$  is a finite  $d$ -dimensional vector space, then the general linear group  $GL = GL(V)$  (left) acts on  $V$  by the standard representation  $(g, v) \mapsto g(v)$ , and (right) acts on  $V^*$  by the dual representation  $(g, \alpha) \mapsto (v \mapsto \alpha(g^{-1}(v)))$ . As above, let  $T_{GL}(V) \subset T(V)$  be the subcategory of subcategory of  $GL$ -equivariant morphisms. In particular, the trace on  $T(V)$  is  $GL$ -equivariant, as is the monoidal product of  $GL$ -equivariant morphisms in  $T(V)$ , so  $T_{GL}(V)$  inherits a wheeled prop structure from  $T(V)$ .

For  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $e(k) \in \mathbb{k}[\Sigma]$  be defined as above (3.28) and let  $\langle e(k) \rangle_{n,n}^{\mathbb{k}[\Sigma]} \subset \mathbb{k}[\Sigma_n]$  be the subspace generated by  $e(k)$  under horizontal and vertical composition in  $\mathbb{k}[\Sigma]$ .

**Theorem 3.31** (Weyl, [58]). *The category  $T_{GL}(V)$  of  $GL$ -equivariant morphisms in  $T(V)$  is a  $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ -groupoid such that  $T_{GL}(V)(m, n) = 0$  when  $m \neq n$ .*

For  $n \leq d$ ,  $T_{GL}(V)(n, n) \cong \mathbb{k}[\Sigma_n]$  and for  $n > d$ ,  $T_{GL}(V)(n, n) \cong \mathbb{k}[\Sigma_n] / \langle e(d+1) \rangle_{n,n}^{\mathbb{k}[\Sigma]}$ .

By Proposition 3.26, this can be reformulated almost identically to Theorem 3.29:

**Corollary 3.32.** *There is a unique symmetric strict monoidal (tensor) functor  $\mathbf{OBr}_d \rightarrow \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$  such that  $(\uparrow) \mapsto V$ ,  $(\downarrow) \mapsto V^*$  and*

$$\cup \mapsto ((\alpha, v) \mapsto \alpha(v) : V^* \otimes V \rightarrow \mathbb{k}).$$

*This factors through the inclusion  $T_{GL}^{\{\uparrow, \downarrow\}}(V) \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ .*

*The corresponding (corestriction) functor  $F_{GL} : \mathbf{OBr}_d \rightarrow T^{\{\uparrow, \downarrow\}}(V)_{GL}$  is full. For  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ , its restriction  $\mathbf{OBr}_d(m, n) \rightarrow T^{\{\uparrow, \downarrow\}}(V)_{GL}(V^{\otimes m}, V^{\otimes n})$  is injective when  $m+n \leq 2d$ . When  $m+n > 2d$ , its kernel is  $\langle e(d+1) \rangle_{m,n} \subset \mathbf{OBr}_d(m, n)$ .*

By [12], there is an equivalence of categories between algebras over  $GL_d$  and wheeled props for which  $\bigcirc = d$  and  $e(d+1) = 0$ . The comparison of Theorems 3.31 and 3.29 is used in Section 6 to prove similar results – in terms of unoriented circuit algebras – for the categories of  $O_d$  and  $Sp_k$  algebras.

*Remark 3.33.* Given a sequence of groups  $(G_d)_d$  such that  $G_d \hookrightarrow G_{d+1}$  for all  $d \geq 0$ , let  $G_\infty \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup G_d$  denote the colimit. A representation  $W$  of  $G_\infty$  is the colimit of a sequence of representations  $(W_d)_d$  of the sequence of groups  $(G_d)_d$  with inclusions  $W_d \hookrightarrow W_{d+1}$  induced by the inclusions  $G_d \hookrightarrow G_{d+1}$ .

For example, for all  $d \geq 1$ , the  $d$ -dimensional general linear group  $GL_d$  is naturally a subgroup of  $GL_{d+1}$  under the inclusion induced by  $\mathbb{k}^d \hookrightarrow \mathbb{k}^{d+1} = \mathbb{k}^d \times \mathbb{k}$ . The infinite general linear, orthogonal and symplectic groups  $GL_\infty, O_\infty$  and  $Sp_\infty$  are the colimits of the induced sequences  $(GL_d)_d, (O_d)_d$  and  $(Sp_k)_k$ .

The triangle identities (3.7) in BD imply that, if  $F : \mathbf{BD} \rightarrow \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$  is a strict (or strong) symmetric monoidal functor with  $F(1) = V$  then  $\theta = F(\cap)$  induces an isomorphism  $\theta^* : V \xrightarrow{\cong} V^*$  and  $V$  must be finite dimensional, so there is no strict monoidal functor  $\mathbf{BD} \rightarrow \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$  such that  $1 \mapsto V$ .

However, if the sequence  $(\theta_d)_d$  of nondegenerate symmetric or skew-symmetric forms induces the sequence of orthogonal or symplectic groups  $(G_d)_d$ , there is a unique form  $\theta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{colim}_d \theta_d$  on  $V$  and a unique strict monoidal functor  $\mathbf{F} : \mathbf{dBD} \rightarrow \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ ,  $1 \mapsto V$ , the image of which is the colimit of the (image of the) functors  $F_{G_d}$  described in Theorem 3.29.

So, to study the stability properties of compatible sequences of representations of  $(G_d)_d$ , one may look at functors  $\mathbf{dBD} \rightarrow \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$  with suitably nice restrictions. Sam and Snowden [46] established a contravariant equivalence between the categories of finite length functors  $\mathbf{dBD} \rightarrow \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$  (respectively

$\text{dOBD} \rightarrow \text{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ ) and representations of the infinite orthogonal and symplectic groups (respectively algebraic representations of the infinite general linear group). See also Remark 5.6.

#### 4. WIRING DIAGRAMS AND CIRCUIT ALGEBRAS

Circuit algebras are algebraic structures described by a small family of algebraic objects indexed by some free commutative monoid (see Section 4.2). Their operations are governed by wiring diagrams, which are, essentially, non-planar versions of Jones's planar diagrams [24].

Wiring diagrams are commonly described by partitioning boundaries of 1-manifolds (e.g. [10, 11]). However, they admit a straightforward definition in terms of Brauer diagrams. This paper takes the latter approach.

**4.1. Operadic preliminaries.** This section summarises the basic theory of (coloured) operads. See [35] and [5] for precise definitions and more details of coloured operads (called multicategories in [35]) and their algebras.

A (symmetric)  $\mathfrak{D}$ -coloured operad  $\mathcal{O}$  (in the category of sets) is given by a  $(\text{list}(\mathfrak{D}) \times \mathfrak{D})$ -graded set  $(\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{c}; d))_{(\mathbf{c}; d)}$  (with  $\mathbf{c} \in \text{list}(\mathfrak{D})$  and  $d \in \mathfrak{D}$ ), and a family of *composition morphisms*,

$$\gamma: \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{c}; d) \times \left( \prod_{i=1}^m \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{b}_i; c_i) \right) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{b}_1 \dots \mathbf{b}_m; d),$$

defined for each  $d \in \mathfrak{D}$ ,  $\mathbf{c} = (c_i)_{i=1}^m$  and  $\mathbf{b}_i \in \text{list}(\mathfrak{D})$  ( $1 \leq i \leq m$ ).

If  $\phi \in \mathcal{O}(c_1, \dots, c_m; d)$ , then  $d$  is called the *output* of  $\phi$  and each  $c_i$  is an *input* of  $\phi$ . The symmetric groupoid  $\Sigma$  acts on  $\mathcal{O}$  by permuting the inputs: each  $\sigma \in \Sigma_n$  induces isomorphisms  $\mathcal{O}(c_{\sigma 1}, \dots, c_{\sigma n}; d) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{O}(c_1, \dots, c_n; d)$ . The composition  $\gamma$  is required to be associative and equivariant with respect to the  $\Sigma$ -action on  $\mathcal{O}$ .

Moreover, for all  $d \in \mathfrak{D}$ , there is an element  $\nu_d \in \mathcal{O}(d; d)$  that acts as a 2-sided unit for  $\gamma$ : for all  $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_m) \in \text{list}(\mathfrak{D})$ , the composite morphisms

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{c}; d) \xrightarrow{\cong} I \times \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{c}; d) \xrightarrow{(\nu_d, id)} \mathcal{O}(d; d) \times \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{c}; d) \xrightarrow{\gamma} \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{c}; d),$$

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{c}; d) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{c}; d) \times I \xrightarrow{(id, \otimes_{i=1}^m \nu_{c_i})} \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{c}; d) \times \left( \bigotimes_{i=1}^m \mathcal{O}(c_i; c_i) \right) \xrightarrow{\gamma} \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{c}; d)$$

are the identity on  $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{c}; d)$ .

Let  $(\mathbb{C}, \oplus, 0)$  be a small permutative category with object set  $\mathbb{C}_0$ .

**Definition 4.1.** The  $\mathbb{C}_0$ -coloured operad  $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{C}}$  underlying  $(\mathbb{C}, \oplus, 0)$  is defined by

$$\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{C}}(x_1, \dots, x_n; y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{C}(x_1 \oplus \dots \oplus x_n, y),$$

with operadic composition  $\gamma$  in  $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{C}}$  induced by composition in  $\mathbb{C}$  as follows:

Let the operation  $\bar{g} \in \mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{C}}(x_1, \dots, x_n; y)$  correspond to the morphism  $g \in \mathbb{C}(x_1 \oplus \dots \oplus x_n, y)$  and, for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , let  $\bar{f}_i \in \mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{C}}(w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i,m_i}; x_i)$  correspond to  $f_i \in \mathbb{C}(w_{i,1} \oplus \dots \oplus w_{i,m_i}, x_i)$ . Then,

$$\gamma(\bar{g}, (\bar{f}_i)_i) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \overline{(g \circ (f_1 \oplus \dots \oplus f_n))}.$$

(In fact, any small cocomplete symmetric monoidal category  $\mathbb{X}$  has an underlying operad by defining, for  $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{X}$ , the object  $x_1 \otimes \dots \otimes x_n \in \mathbb{X}$  as in Example 4.3.)

Observe that, if  $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbf{C}}$  is the operad underlying a small permutative category  $\mathbf{C}$ , then, for all  $\bar{f}_1 \in \mathcal{O}^{\mathbf{C}}(x_{1,1}, \dots, x_{1,m}; y_1)$ ,  $\bar{f}_2 \in \mathcal{O}^{\mathbf{C}}(x_{2,1}, \dots, x_{2,n}; y_2)$ , there is an operation

$$(4.2) \quad \bar{f}_1 \oplus \bar{f}_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \gamma(\bar{id}_{y_1 \oplus y_2}, (\bar{f}_1, \bar{f}_2)) \in \mathcal{O}^{\mathbf{C}}(x_{1,1}, \dots, x_{1,m}, x_{2,1}, \dots, x_{2,n}; y_1 \oplus y_2).$$

Observe that  $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbf{C}}(-; y) \cong \mathcal{O}^{\mathbf{C}}(0; y)$  canonically for all  $y$ . In particular, there is a canonical isomorphism  $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbf{C}}(-; 0) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{O}^{\mathbf{C}}(0; 0) = \mathbf{C}(0, 0)$ . Let  $\bar{id}_0 \in \mathcal{O}^{\mathbf{C}}(-; 0)$  be the preimage of  $id_0 \in \mathbf{C}(0, 0)$  under this isomorphism. Then, for all  $(x_1, \dots, x_k, y)$ , precomposition with  $(\bigotimes_{i=1}^k id_{x_k}, \bar{id}_0)$  induces an isomorphism  $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbf{C}}(x_1, \dots, x_k, 0; y) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{O}^{\mathbf{C}}(x_1, \dots, x_k; y)$ .

Let  $\mathbf{Op}$  be the category whose objects are (coloured) operads, and if  $(\mathcal{O}^i, \gamma^i, \nu^i)$  is a  $\mathfrak{D}_i$ -coloured operad for  $i = 1, 2$ , then a morphism  $\mathcal{A}: (\mathcal{O}^1, \gamma^1, \nu^1) \rightarrow (\mathcal{O}^2, \gamma^2, \nu^2)$  is given by a map of sets  $A: \mathfrak{D}_1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}_2$ , and a  $(\text{list}(\mathfrak{D})_1 \times \mathfrak{D}_1)$ -indexed family of maps

$$\mathcal{A}_{(c_1, \dots, c_k; d)}: \mathcal{O}^1(c_1, \dots, c_k; d) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}^2(A(c_1), \dots, A(c_k); A(d))$$

that respect units and composition, and are equivariant with respect to the symmetric action.

If  $A = id_{\mathfrak{D}}$  (with  $\mathfrak{D} = \mathfrak{D}_1 = \mathfrak{D}_2$ ), then  $\mathcal{A}: \mathcal{O}^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}^2$  is called *colour-preserving*. The category of  $\mathfrak{D}$ -coloured operads and colour-preserving morphisms is denoted by  $\mathbf{Op}^{\mathfrak{D}}$ .

In the remains of this section,  $(\mathbf{X}, \otimes, I)$  is a symmetric monoidal category with all finite colimits, and  $(\mathbf{C}, \oplus, 0)$  is a small permutative category with object set  $\mathbf{C}_0$ .

*Example 4.3.* For any  $n$ -tuple  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  of objects of  $\mathbf{X}$ , define  $x_1 \otimes \dots \otimes x_n$  to be the colimit of all ways (indexed by planar binary rooted trees) of tensoring  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  under associator isomorphisms in  $\mathbf{X}$ .

Given a set  $\mathfrak{D}$  and a  $\mathfrak{D}$ -indexed object  $A = (A_c)_{c \in \mathfrak{D}}$  in  $\mathbf{X}$ , the  $\mathfrak{D}$ -coloured *endomorphism operad*  $End^A$  is defined by

$$End^A(c_1, \dots, c_k; d) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{X}(A_{c_1} \otimes \dots \otimes A_{c_k}, A_d),$$

together with the obvious composition and units induced by composition and identities in  $\mathbf{X}$ .

**Definition 4.4.** A  $\mathbf{X}$ -algebra for a  $\mathfrak{D}$ -coloured operad  $\mathcal{O}$  is a  $\mathfrak{D}$ -indexed object  $(A_c)_{c \in \mathfrak{D}}$  in  $\mathbf{X}$ , together with a morphism  $\mathcal{A}: \mathcal{O} \rightarrow End^A$  of  $\mathfrak{D}$ -coloured operads.

The category  $\mathbf{Alg}_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathcal{O})$  of  $\mathbf{X}$ -algebras for  $\mathcal{O}$  is the subcategory of the slice category  $\mathcal{O}/\mathbf{Op}$  (Example 2.3) whose objects are  $\mathbf{X}$ -algebras for  $\mathcal{O}$ . Morphisms in  $\mathbf{Alg}_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathcal{O})((A, \mathcal{A}), (B, \mathcal{B}))$  are of the form  $(g, (g_c)_c)$  where  $g: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  in  $\mathcal{O}/\mathbf{Op}^{\mathfrak{D}}$  and, for all  $c \in \mathfrak{D}$ ,  $g_c \in \mathbf{X}(A_c, B_c)$  such that, if  $\phi \in \mathcal{O}(c_1, \dots, c_k; d)$ , then the following diagram commutes in  $\mathbf{X}$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A_{c_1} \otimes \dots \otimes A_{c_k} & \xrightarrow{g_{c_1} \otimes \dots \otimes g_{c_k}} & B_{c_1} \otimes \dots \otimes B_{c_k} \\ \mathcal{A}(\phi) \downarrow & & \downarrow g_{\mathcal{A}(\phi)} \\ A_d & \xrightarrow{g_d} & B_d. \end{array}$$

*Remark 4.5.* Observe that Definition 4.4, though it relies on the symmetric monoidal structure on  $\mathbf{X}$ , is concerned with operads in the category of sets and does not involve operads enriched in a (closed) symmetric monoidal category. It therefore diverges slightly from the usual definition of an operad algebra (as in [5]).

Let  $(\mathbf{C}, \oplus, 0)$  be a small permutative category and  $(\mathbf{X}, \otimes, I)$  a cocomplete symmetric monoidal category and let  $[\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{X}]_{\text{lax}}$  denote the category of symmetric monoidal functors  $\mathcal{A}: (\mathbf{C}, \oplus, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbf{X}, \otimes, I)$  and natural transformations that commute with the monoidal structure maps.

**Lemma 4.6.** *The categories  $\text{Alg}_X(\mathcal{O}^C)$  of  $X$ -algebras for the operad  $\mathcal{O}^C$  underlying  $(\mathbb{C}, \oplus, 0)$  and  $[\mathbb{C}, X]_{\text{lax}}$  are canonically isomorphic.*

*Proof.* If  $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}^C$  is the  $\mathbb{C}_0$ -coloured operad underlying  $\mathbb{C}$ , and  $(\mathcal{A}, \pi, \eta): \mathbb{C} \rightarrow X$  is a symmetric monoidal functor, then  $(\mathcal{A}(x))_{x \in \mathbb{C}_0}$  has an  $\mathcal{O}$ -algebra structure as follows: For  $k \geq 1$  and all  $\bar{f} \in \mathcal{O}(x_1, \dots, x_k; y)$  induced by  $f \in \mathbb{C}(x_1 \dots x_k, y)$ ,

$$\mathcal{A}_{x_1, \dots, x_k; y}(\bar{f}) = \mathcal{A}(f) \circ \pi_{x_1, \dots, x_n} \in X(\mathcal{A}(x_1) \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{A}(x_k), \mathcal{A}(y)).$$

(Here  $\pi_{x_1, \dots, x_n}: \mathcal{A}(x_1) \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{A}(x_n) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(x_1 \dots x_n)$  is the universal map from the colimit.)

When  $k = 0$ , and  $\bar{f} \in \mathcal{O}(-; y)$  is induced by  $f \in \mathbb{C}(0, y)$ ,

$$\mathcal{A}_{-, y}(\bar{f}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{A}(f) \circ \eta \in X(I, \mathcal{A}(y)).$$

Conversely, a  $X$ -algebra  $(A, \hat{\mathcal{A}})$  for  $\mathcal{O}$  induces a functor  $\mathcal{A}: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow X$  described by  $x \mapsto A_x$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{C}$ . If  $\bar{f} \in \mathcal{O}(x; y)$  is induced by  $f \in \mathbb{C}(x, y)$ , then  $f \mapsto \hat{\mathcal{A}}(\bar{f}) \in X(A_x, A_y)$ . This has symmetric lax monoidal structure  $\pi_{\mathcal{A}}: A_x \otimes A_y \rightarrow A_{x \oplus y}$  induced by  $\overline{id_{x \oplus y}} \in \mathcal{O}(x, y; x \oplus y)$  and  $\eta_{\mathcal{A}}: I \rightarrow A_0$  induced by  $\overline{id_0} \in \mathcal{O}(-; 0)$ . It follows from the definitions that the assignments  $(\mathcal{A}, \pi, \eta) \mapsto ((\mathcal{A}(x))_x, \mathcal{A})$  and  $(A, \hat{\mathcal{A}}) \mapsto (\mathcal{A}, \pi_{\mathcal{A}}, \eta_{\mathcal{A}})$  extend to mutually inverse functors  $\text{Alg}_X(\mathcal{O}^C) \simeq [\mathbb{C}, X]_{\text{lax}}$ .

(For more details, see e.g. [35, Chapters 2-3,]: Example 2.1.10 and Section 3.3 in particular.)  $\square$

**Definition 4.7.** *Let  $(A, \mathcal{A})$  be an algebra over a  $\mathfrak{D}$ -coloured operad  $\mathcal{O}$ . An ideal of  $(A, \mathcal{A})$  is an  $\mathcal{O}$ -subalgebra  $(I, \mathcal{I}) \subset (A, \mathcal{A})$  such that, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $(c_1, \dots, c_n) \in \mathfrak{D}^n$  and  $d \in \mathfrak{D}$ ,  $x_i \in A_{c_i}$  and all  $\phi \in \mathcal{O}(c_1, \dots, c_n; d)$ , if there is a  $1 \leq j \leq n$  such that  $x_j \in I_{c_j}$ , then  $\mathcal{A}(\phi)(x_1 \otimes \dots \otimes x_j \otimes \dots \otimes x_n)$ .*

Equivalently,  $(I, \mathcal{I}) \subset (A, \mathcal{A})$  is an ideal precisely if the quotient  $(A/I, \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{I})$  inherits an  $\mathcal{O}$ -algebra structure from  $(A, \mathcal{A})$ .

If  $\mathcal{O}^C$  is the operad underlying a monoidal category  $\mathbb{C}$ , and  $(\mathcal{A}, \pi, \eta): \mathbb{C} \rightarrow X$  is a symmetric monoidal functor as in Lemma 4.6, then an ideal  $(I, \mathcal{I})$  of the operad algebra corresponding to  $\mathcal{A}$  is a symmetric monoidal subfunctor  $\mathcal{I} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{A}$  such that, for all  $x, y \in \mathbb{C}$ , the restrictions of  $\pi_{x, y}: \mathcal{A}(x) \otimes \mathcal{A}(y) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(x \oplus y)$  to  $\mathcal{I}(x) \otimes \mathcal{A}(y)$  and  $\mathcal{A}(x) \otimes \mathcal{I}(y)$  describe morphisms to  $\mathcal{I}(x \oplus y)$ .

**4.2. Wiring diagrams and circuit algebras.** As in [3, 10, 11], circuit algebras will be defined as algebras over an operad of *wiring diagrams*.

Wiring diagrams are usually described (for example in [10, 11]) as isotopy classes of immersions of compact 1-manifolds in punctured 2-discs that are injective on boundaries and preserve boundaries and interiors (see Figure 7 and Remark 4.10). Composition of wiring diagrams, illustrated in Figure 7, is then defined by inserting discs into the punctures in such a way that the boundaries agree. In the coloured case, 1-manifolds are coloured according to Example 3.10 and Definition 3.18 to define  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$ -coloured wiring diagrams. For the operadic composition in  $\text{WD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}$  the colours on the disc boundaries are required to match.

Wiring diagrams are purely combinatorial objects and may also be described in terms of (coloured) perfect matchings on disjoint unions of ordered finite sets (c.f., [3, Definition 2.9]). Unpacking the definition gives:

**Definition 4.8.** *For a given palette  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$ , and each  $(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k; \mathbf{d}) \in \text{list}^2(\mathfrak{C}) \times \text{list}(\mathfrak{C})$ , a wiring diagram of type  $(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k; \mathbf{d})$  is an element of the set*

$$\text{WD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k; \mathbf{d}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{BD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}(\mathbf{c}_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathbf{c}_k; \mathbf{d}).$$

*The  $\text{list}(\mathfrak{C})$ -coloured operad of  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$ -wiring diagrams is the operad  $\text{WD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{O}^{\text{BD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}}$  underlying  $\text{BD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}$ .*

In particular, for  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega) = \{\uparrow, \downarrow\}$ ,  $\text{OWD} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{WD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}$  is the operad of (monochrome) oriented wiring diagrams, and for a set  $\mathfrak{D}$ , the operad  $\text{OWD}^{\mathfrak{D}}$  of  $\mathfrak{D}$ -coloured oriented wiring diagrams is the operad underlying the category  $\text{OBD}^{\mathfrak{D}} = \text{BD}^{\mathfrak{D}} \times \{\uparrow, \downarrow\}$  of  $\mathfrak{D}$ -coloured oriented Brauer diagrams.

When  $\mathfrak{C}$  is the singleton set, the  $\mathbb{N}$ -coloured operad of (monochrome) wiring diagrams  $\text{WD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{O}^{\text{BD}}$  is denoted by  $\text{WD}$ .



FIGURE 6. Composition in  $\text{WD}$ . (See also Figure 7.)

**Definition 4.9.** A  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$ -coloured  $X$ -circuit algebra is a  $X$ -valued algebra for the operad  $\text{WD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}$  of  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$ -coloured wiring diagrams. The full subcategory of  $X$ -circuit algebras in  $\text{Alg}(\text{WD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)})$  is denoted by  $X\text{-CA}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}$ . When  $X = \text{Set}$ ,  $X\text{-CA}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}$  is denoted simply by  $\text{CA}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}$ , and when  $X = \text{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ ,  $\text{CA}_{\mathbb{k}}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} X\text{-CA}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}$ .

If  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega) = \{*\}$  is trivial, then  $X\text{-CA} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} X\text{-CA}^*$  is the category of monochrome  $X$ -circuit algebras.

Oriented (respectively non-oriented) circuit algebras are algebras over operads of oriented (respectively non-oriented) wiring diagrams.




FIGURE 7. Disc representation of the wiring diagram composition in Figure 6.

*Remark 4.10.* Figure 7 provides a punctured disc representation of the same composition of wiring diagrams as Figure 6.

The punctured disc representation of wiring diagrams provides a clear visualisation of the relationship of wiring diagrams (and hence circuit algebras) to planar diagrams and algebras [25] and tangle categories [53]. It also exhibits the operad of monochrome wiring diagrams as a suboperad of the Spivak’s operad of wiring diagrams [49]. Moreover, the disc representation of wiring diagrams is highly suggestive of the relationship between circuit algebras and modular operads (c.f., Section 5.2) and

the graphical construction of circuit algebras that is developed in the sister paper [41] (Remark 4.11 below).

On the other hand, the definition in terms of Brauer diagrams is obviously combinatorial and reveals connections between circuit algebras and representations of classical groups (c.f., Sections 3.3, 6).

*Remark 4.11.* Circuit algebras are described as algebras in a category  $\mathfrak{MO}$  of modular operads in Section 5.2. In [41], modular operads and circuit algebras are obtained in terms of (Feynman) graphs, originally due to Joyal and Kock [26]. (See also [21, 22, 31, 42].)

To understand the relationship between wiring diagrams and graphs, let  $\bar{f} \in \text{WD}(m_1, \dots, m_k; n)$  be a monochrome wiring diagram with no loops (so  $\bar{f}$  is induced by an open Brauer diagram  $f = (\tau_f, 0) \in \text{BD}(\sum_{i=1}^k m_i, n)$ ). This may be represented as an immersion of a disjoint union of intervals in a disc with  $k$  punctures as in Figure 7. Informally, it is clear that, by shrinking the punctures to points, and deleting the outer disc, we obtain a graph with  $k$  vertices of degree  $m_1, \dots, m_k$  and  $n$  loose edges.

Precisely, an open wiring diagram  $\bar{f} = \overline{(\tau_f, 0)} \in \text{WD}(m_1, \dots, m_k; n)$  may equivalently be written as a diagram of finite sets:

$$(4.12) \quad \tau_f \circlearrowleft \partial f \xleftarrow{\text{inc}} \coprod_{i=1}^k \mathbf{m}_i \xrightarrow{p} \mathbf{k}$$

where  $p: \coprod_{i=1}^k \mathbf{m}_i \rightarrow \mathbf{k}$  is the canonical projection and, as usual,  $\mathbf{n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{1, \dots, n\}$  for all  $n$ .

A *graph*  $\mathcal{G}$  (in the sense of [26]) is a diagram of finite sets

$$(4.13) \quad \mathcal{G} = \tau \circlearrowleft E \xleftarrow{s} H \xrightarrow{t} V,$$

such that  $s: H \rightarrow E$  is injective, and  $\tau: E \rightarrow E$  is an involution without fixed points.

By forgetting the orderings on  $\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{k}$  and each  $\mathbf{m}_i$  in (4.12), we obtain a graph in the sense of (4.13).

Let  $(\mathbf{X}, \otimes, I)$  be a cocomplete symmetric monoidal category. As an algebra for the operad  $\text{WD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}$ , a  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$ -coloured  $\mathbf{X}$ -circuit algebra consists of objects  $(\mathcal{A}(\mathfrak{c}))_{\mathfrak{c} \in \text{list}(\mathfrak{C})}$  and, for each  $(\mathfrak{c}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{c}_k; \mathfrak{d}) \in \text{list}^2 \mathfrak{C} \times \text{list}(\mathfrak{C})$ , a set of  $\mathbf{X}$ -morphisms  $\mathcal{A}(\bar{f}, \lambda): \otimes_{i=1}^k \mathcal{A}(\mathfrak{c}_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(\mathfrak{d})$  indexed by Brauer diagrams  $(f, \lambda) \in \text{BD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}(\mathfrak{c}_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathfrak{c}_k, \mathfrak{d})$ . These satisfy:

- for all  $\mathfrak{c} \in \text{list}(\mathfrak{C})$ ,  $\mathcal{A}(\overline{id_{\mathfrak{c}}}) = id_{\mathcal{A}(\mathfrak{c})} \in \mathbf{X}(\mathcal{A}(\mathfrak{c}), \mathcal{A}(\mathfrak{c}))$ ;
- the morphisms  $\mathcal{A}(\bar{f}, \lambda)$  are equivariant with respect to the  $\Sigma$ -action on  $\text{list}(\mathfrak{C})$  and on  $\text{WD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}$ ;
- given wiring diagrams  $(\bar{f}, \lambda) \in \text{WD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}(\mathfrak{c}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{c}_k; \mathfrak{d})$ , and, for all  $1 \leq i \leq k$ ,  $(\bar{f}^i, \lambda^i) \in \text{WD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}(\mathfrak{b}_{i,1}, \dots, \mathfrak{b}_{i,k_i}; \mathfrak{c}_i)$ , the following diagram commutes in  $\mathbf{X}$ :

$$(4.14) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \otimes_{i=1}^k \otimes_{j=1}^{k_i} \mathcal{A}(\mathfrak{b}_{i,j}) & \xrightarrow{\otimes_{i=1}^k \mathcal{A}(\bar{f}^i, \lambda^i)} & \otimes_{i=1}^k \mathcal{A}(\mathfrak{c}_i) \\ & \searrow \mathcal{A}_{\gamma((\bar{f}, \lambda), (\bar{f}^i, \lambda^i)_i)} & \downarrow \mathcal{A}(\bar{f}, \lambda) \\ & & \mathcal{A}(\mathfrak{d}) \end{array}$$

The following is immediate from Lemma 4.6:

**Theorem 4.15.** *The category  $\mathbf{X}\text{-CA}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}$  of  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$ -coloured  $\mathbf{X}$ -circuit algebras is isomorphic to the category of symmetric monoidal functors  $\text{BD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)} \rightarrow \mathbf{X}$ . (See e.g., [35, Example 2.1.10 & Section 3.3] for more details.)*

*Example 4.16.* Oriented circuit algebras are described in detail in [10, 11]. Proposition 3.26 and Theorem 4.15 provide another proof of the result, established in [10], that  $\mathfrak{D}$ -coloured oriented circuit algebras are equivalent to  $\mathfrak{D}$ -coloured wheeled props.

*Example 4.17.* Let  $\mathcal{F}: \mathbf{BD} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$  be the circuit algebra defined by  $\mathcal{F}_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{BD}(0, n)$  and for all  $g \in \mathbf{BD}(m, n)$ ,  $\mathcal{F}(g)(f) = g \circ f$ . This is initial in the category of (monochrome) circuit algebras: For any circuit algebra  $(\mathcal{A}, \pi, \eta)$ , there is a unique morphism  $\alpha_{\mathcal{A}}: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  such that  $\alpha_{\mathcal{A}}(f) = (\mathcal{A}(f) \circ \eta)(1) \in \mathcal{A}_n$  for all  $f \in \mathbf{BD}(0, n)$ .

As in Section 3.3, for a fixed commutative ring  $R$ ,  $\underline{\mathbf{BD}}$  is the free  $R$ -Mod-category on  $\mathbf{BD}$ . Let  $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}_R$  be the free  $R$ -Mod-circuit algebra on  $\mathcal{F}$ , defined by  $\mathcal{U}(n) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \underline{\mathbf{BD}}(0, n)$ . This is initial in the category of (monochrome)  $R$ -Mod-circuit algebras.

For a palette  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$ , the initial  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$ -coloured circuit algebra  $\mathcal{F}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}$  (and  $(R$ -Mod)-circuit algebra  $\mathcal{U}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}$ ) with  $\mathcal{F}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}(\mathfrak{c}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{BD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}(\emptyset, \mathfrak{c})$  may be similarly defined. In particular, by Proposition 3.26,  $\mathcal{U}^{\{\uparrow, \downarrow\}}$  describes the initial monochrome  $R$ -Mod-wheeled prop  $U$  (called  $\mathcal{Z}$  in [12]) with  $U(m, n) = \underline{\mathbf{BD}}^{\{\uparrow, \downarrow\}}(\emptyset, \uparrow^m \downarrow^n)$ .

As usual,  $\mathbb{k}$  is a field of characteristic 0. In the remainder of this paper  $R = \mathbb{k}$  and so  $R$ -Mod =  $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ .

*Example 4.18.* As in Section 3.3, let  $\mathbf{Br}_{\delta}$  be the Brauer category with specialisation  $\delta \in \mathbb{k}$ .

Let  $V$  be a (finite)  $d$ -dimensional vector space and let  $T(V)$  be the (wheeled prop) that is the full subcategory of  $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$  on objects of the form  $V^{\otimes n}$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Equip  $V$  with a symmetric or skew-symmetric nondegenerate form  $\theta$  with isometry group  $G$ . Let

$$\delta = \begin{cases} = d & \text{when } \theta \text{ is symmetric, in which case } G \cong O_{\delta} \\ = -\frac{d}{2} & \text{when } \theta \text{ is skew-symmetric, , in which case } G \cong Sp_{|\delta|}. \end{cases}$$

By Theorem 3.29, the unique symmetric strict monoidal functor  $\mathcal{V}_{\theta}: \mathbf{BD} \rightarrow \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$  such that  $1 \mapsto V$  and  $\cap \mapsto \theta$  factors through the symmetric strict monoidal functor  $F_G: \mathbf{Br}_{\delta} \rightarrow T_G(V)$  where  $T_G(V) \subset T(V)$  is the subprop of  $G$ -equivariant morphisms. Theorem 3.29 implies, moreover, that the kernel of the unique  $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ -circuit algebra morphism  $\alpha_{\theta}: \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_{\theta}$  is the circuit algebra ideal  $\mathcal{I}_{\theta} \subset \mathcal{U}$  generated by  $\bigcirc - \delta \in \mathcal{U}(0)$  and  $[e(|\delta| + 1)] \in \mathcal{U}(2(|\delta| + 1))$ , where

$$(4.19) \quad [e(k)] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_k} \text{sgn}(\sigma) [\sigma]$$

is the element of  $\mathcal{U}(2k)$  obtained by linear coevaluation of the components of  $e(k) \in \underline{\mathbf{BD}}(k, k)$  (3.28).

In particular, if  $\mathcal{V}_{\theta}^G \subset \mathcal{V}_{\theta}$  is the  $G$ -invariant sub-circuit algebra, then  $\mathcal{U}/\mathcal{I}_{\theta} \cong \mathcal{V}_{\theta}^G$ .

In Section 6, it is proved that there is an equivalence between algebras over the orthogonal (and symplectic) groups and circuit algebras  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $[e(|\delta| + 1)]$  and  $\bigcirc - \delta$  are in the kernel of the unique morphism  $\alpha_{\mathcal{A}}: \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ .

*Example 4.20.* As in Section 3.3,  $T_{GL}(V) \subset T(V)$  is the sub-wheeled prop of  $GL(V)$ -equivariant morphisms, where  $V$  is a finite  $d$ -dimensional vector space. By Theorem 3.31, the kernel of the unique morphism  $a_V: \mathcal{U} \rightarrow T_{GL}(V)$  of wheeled props is generated by  $e(d + 1) \in \mathcal{U}(d + 1, d + 1)$  and  $\bigcirc - d \in \mathcal{U}(0, 0)$ . Equivalently, the kernel of the unique  $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ -valued oriented circuit algebra morphism  $\mathcal{U}^{\{\uparrow, \downarrow\}} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$  is generated by  $[e(d + 1)]$  and  $\bigcirc - d$ .

**Definition 4.21.** Given any  $\text{list}(\mathfrak{C})$ -graded set  $S = (S_{\mathfrak{c}})_{\mathfrak{c} \in \text{list}(\mathfrak{C})}$ , the free ( $\mathbf{Set}$ -valued) circuit algebra  $\mathcal{F}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}\langle S \rangle$  on  $S$  is defined as follows:

The collection  $(F^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}\langle S \rangle_{\mathbf{d}})_{\mathbf{d} \in \text{list}(\mathfrak{C})}$  of  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$ -coloured wiring diagrams decorated by  $S$  is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} F^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}\langle S \rangle_{\mathbf{d}} &= \coprod_{(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k) \in \text{list}^2 \mathfrak{C}} \left( \text{WD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k; \mathbf{d}) \times \prod_{i=1}^k S(\mathbf{c}_i) \right) \\ &= \coprod_{((\mathbf{c} \oplus \dots \oplus \mathbf{c}_k), (f, \lambda)) \in \text{BD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}/\mathbf{d}} \left( \prod_{i=1}^k S(\mathbf{c}_i) \right). \end{aligned}$$

For each  $(\bar{f}, \lambda) \in \text{WD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k; \mathbf{d})$ , the morphism  $\mathcal{F}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}\langle S \rangle(\bar{f}, \lambda): F^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}\langle S \rangle_{\mathbf{c}_1} \otimes \dots \otimes F^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}\langle S \rangle_{\mathbf{c}_k} \rightarrow F^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}\langle S \rangle_{\mathbf{d}}$  is described by

$$\prod_{i=1}^k \left( (\bar{f}^i, \lambda^i), (x_{j_i}^i)_{j_i=1}^{m_i} \right) \mapsto \left( \gamma \left( (\bar{f}, \lambda), \left( (\bar{f}^i, \lambda^i)_{i=1}^k \right) \right), (x_{j_i}^i)_{\substack{1 \leq j_i \leq m_i \\ 1 \leq i \leq k}} \right).$$

For a fixed commutative ring  $R$ , let  $\mathcal{U}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}\langle S \rangle$  be the  $R$ -Mod-circuit algebra freely generated by  $\mathcal{F}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}\langle S \rangle$ . So, for all  $\mathbf{c}$ ,  $\mathcal{U}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}\langle S \rangle(\mathbf{c})$  is the free  $R$ -module on  $F^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}\langle S \rangle_{\mathbf{c}}$ . In what follows, we will always take  $R = \mathbb{k}$ , a field of characteristic 0.

When  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega) = \{*\}$  is trivial, write  $\mathcal{F}\langle S \rangle = \mathcal{F}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}\langle S \rangle$  and  $\mathcal{U}\langle S \rangle = \mathcal{U}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}\langle S \rangle$ .

Note that, when  $S = \emptyset$ ,  $\mathcal{F}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}\langle S \rangle = \mathcal{F}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}$  (and likewise  $\mathcal{U}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}\langle S \rangle = \mathcal{U}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}$ ) is just the initial ( $R$ -Mod-)  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$ -coloured circuit algebra.

Circuit algebras, like operads (see [17, Section 2.1]), admit *presentations* in terms of *generators* and *relations* (see [11, Remark 2.6]): A ( $R$ -Mod-) circuit algebra  $\mathcal{A} = (A, \alpha)$  may be obtained as a quotient of the free ( $R$ -Mod-) circuit algebra  $\mathcal{F}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}\langle A \rangle$  (or  $\mathcal{U}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}\langle A \rangle$ ) on its underlying symmetric graded set  $A$ .

*Example 4.22.* Let  $T_4 = \{ \overline{\curvearrowright}, \overleftarrow{\curvearrowright} \}$  and  $T_n = \emptyset$  for  $n \neq 4$ . Then,  $\mathcal{F}\langle T \rangle(n) = \emptyset$  when  $n$  is odd and  $\mathcal{F}\langle T \rangle(2m)$  is the set of diagrams (planar representations) of virtual tangles on  $m$  unoriented strands. The *circuit algebra of virtual tangles*  $\mathcal{T}$  is the quotient of  $\mathcal{F}\langle T \rangle$  by the (ordinary) Reidemeister relations since the virtual Reidemeister relations of [29] are a consequence of the relations in BD. The *oriented virtual tangle circuit algebra*  $\mathcal{OT}$ , with generating set  $\{ \overleftarrow{\curvearrowright}, \overrightarrow{\curvearrowright} \} \subset \mathcal{OT}(\uparrow^2 \downarrow^2)$  is defined similarly. This is explained in detail in [10, Section 4.2].

More generally, we may consider circuit algebras of  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$ -coloured virtual tangles. This includes, for example, circuit algebras of embedded tangles of mixed dimensions.

*Example 4.23.* Given a (virtual) tangle with  $2m$  labelled boundary points, its *skeleton* [3] is the virtual tangle obtained by replacing each over- and under-crossing with a virtual (symmetric) crossing. This is an element of  $\text{BD}(0, 2m)$ .

In [3] and [11], a *circuit algebra with skeleton* is a circuit algebra  $\mathcal{S}$  indexed by Brauer diagrams rather than lists of colours. More formally,  $\mathcal{S}$  is a circuit algebra together with a surjective circuit algebra morphism  $\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ . Equivalently, this is a symmetric monoidal functor from the slice category  $(0/\text{BD}, \oplus, id_0)$  (see Example 2.3). Oriented circuit algebras with skeleton may be similarly defined as symmetric monoidal functors from  $(0/\text{OBD}, \oplus, id_0)$ .

## 5. CIRCUIT ALGEBRAS ARE MODULAR OPERADS

Modular operads [21, 22, 42] are symmetric graded objects that admit two operations – contraction and multiplication – such that certain axioms are satisfied. They were introduced in the study of moduli spaces of higher genus curves [16].

In Section 5.1, an axiomatic (biased) description of circuit algebras is given in terms of operations on the underlying graded symmetric monoid and in Section 5.2, this is shown to satisfy the modular operad axioms.



**5.1. Axioms for circuit algebras.** By Theorem 4.15, the combinatorics of a  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$ -coloured circuit algebra are completely described by  $\text{BD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}$ . This enables an axiomatic (biased) description of circuit algebras in terms of their underlying symmetric monoids.

Let  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$  be a palette. For  $1 \leq i \leq n$  and  $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_n) \in \mathfrak{C}^n$ , let  $\mathbf{c}_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (c_1, \dots, c_{i-1}, c_{i+1}, \dots, c_n) \in \mathfrak{C}^{n-1}$  be the tuple obtained by ‘forgetting’  $c_i$ . More generally, for distinct  $1 \leq j_1, \dots, j_k \leq n$ , the tuple  $\mathbf{c}_{\overline{j_1, \dots, j_k}} \in \mathfrak{C}^{n-k}$  is obtained from  $\mathbf{c}$  by forgetting  $c_{j_1}, \dots, c_{j_k}$ . And, for  $\sigma \in \Sigma_n$  and distinct  $1 \leq j_1, \dots, j_k \leq n$ , let  $\sigma_{\overline{j_1, \dots, j_k}} \in \Sigma_{n-k}$  be the permutation obtained by pre and post composing  $\sigma$  with the order-preserving bijections.

Let  $S = (S(\mathbf{c}))_{\mathbf{c}}$  be a  $\text{list}(\mathfrak{C})$ -graded symmetric object in  $\mathbf{X}$ .

**Definition 5.1.** A contraction  $\zeta$  on  $S$  is a collection of morphisms  $\zeta_{\mathbf{c}}^{i\ddagger j}: S(\mathbf{c}) \rightarrow S(\mathbf{c}_{i,j})$  in  $\mathbf{X}$  defined for all  $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_n) \in \text{list}(\mathfrak{C})$  such that  $c_i = \omega c_j$ .

A multiplication  $\diamond$  on  $S$  is a family of maps

$$(5.2) \quad -\diamond_{\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}}^{i\ddagger j}: S_{\mathbf{c}} \otimes S_{\mathbf{d}} \rightarrow S_{(\mathbf{c}_i \mathbf{d}_j)}$$

defined for all  $\mathbf{c} \in \mathfrak{C}^m, \mathbf{d} \in \mathfrak{C}^n$  and  $1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n$  such that  $c_i = \omega d_j$ .

A contraction or multiplication that commutes with the  $\Sigma$ -action on  $S$  is  $\Sigma$ -equivariant.

A multiplication  $\diamond$  is *commutative* if, for all  $\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}$  as above, the following diagram commutes in  $\mathbf{E}$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S_{\mathbf{c}} \otimes S_{\mathbf{d}} & \xrightarrow{\diamond_{\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}}^{i\ddagger j}} & S_{\mathbf{c}_i \mathbf{d}_j} \\ \cong \downarrow & & \downarrow \cong \\ S_{\mathbf{d}} \otimes S_{\mathbf{c}} & \xrightarrow{\diamond_{\mathbf{d}, \mathbf{c}}^{j\ddagger i}} & S_{\mathbf{d}_j \mathbf{c}_i} \end{array}$$

A *unit*  $\epsilon$  for a commutative multiplication  $\diamond$  on  $S$  is a choice, for each  $c \in \mathfrak{C}$ , of distinguished morphism  $\epsilon_c: I \rightarrow S_{c, \omega c}$  in  $\mathbf{X}$ , such that for all  $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_n) \in \text{list}(\mathfrak{C})$  and  $1 \leq i \leq n$  such that  $c_i = c$ , the compositions

$$S_{\mathbf{c}} \xrightarrow{\cong} I \otimes S_{\mathbf{c}} \xrightarrow{\epsilon_c \otimes \text{id}_{S_{\mathbf{c}}}} S_{c, \omega c} \otimes S_{\mathbf{c}} \xrightarrow{\diamond_{(c, \omega c), \mathbf{c}}^{2\ddagger i}} S_{\mathbf{c}}$$

and

$$S_{\mathbf{c}} \xrightarrow{\cong} I \otimes S_{\mathbf{c}} \xrightarrow{\epsilon_{\omega c} \otimes \text{id}_{S_{\mathbf{c}}}} S_{c, \omega c} \otimes S_{\mathbf{c}} \xrightarrow{\diamond_{(c, \omega c), \mathbf{c}}^{1\ddagger i}} S_{\mathbf{c}}$$

are equal to the identity on  $S_{\mathbf{c}}$ .

By [42, Lemma 1.13], if a multiplication  $\diamond$  on  $S$  admits a unit  $\epsilon$ , then it is unique.

Observe in particular that, if  $((S_{\mathbf{c}})_{\mathbf{c}}, \boxtimes, \eta, \zeta)$  is a symmetric  $\text{list}(\mathfrak{C})$ -graded monoid with contraction, then  $S$  admits a commutative equivariant multiplication given by:

$$(5.3) \quad \diamond_{\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}}^{i\ddagger j} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \zeta_{\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}}^{i\ddagger m+j} \circ \boxtimes_{\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}}: S(\mathbf{c}) \otimes S(\mathbf{d}) \rightarrow S(\mathbf{c}_i \mathbf{d}_j),$$

defined for all  $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_m), \mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_n)$  and all  $1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n$  such that  $c_i = \omega d_j$ .

**Proposition 5.4.** A  $\text{list}(\mathfrak{C})$ -graded symmetric object  $(A_{\mathbf{c}})_{\mathbf{c}}$  in  $\mathbf{X}$  describes a  $\mathbf{X}$ -circuit algebra if and only if it has the structure of a symmetric graded monoid  $(A, \boxtimes, \eta)$  in  $\mathbf{X}$  and is equipped with an equivariant contraction  $\zeta$  and, for each  $c \in \mathfrak{C}$ , a distinguished unit  $\epsilon_c: I \rightarrow A_{(c, \omega c)}$ , such that the following conditions (illustrated in Figure 8) hold:

- (c1) the graded monoidal product  $\boxtimes$  on  $(A_{\mathbf{c}})_{\mathbf{c} \in \text{list}(\mathfrak{C})}$  is associative up to associators in  $\mathbf{X}$ ;
- (c2) contractions commute (see also (m1) Definition 5.7):

$$\zeta_{\mathbf{c}_{\overline{k, m}}}^{i'\ddagger j'} \circ \zeta_{\mathbf{c}}^{k\ddagger m} = \zeta_{\mathbf{c}_{\overline{i, j}}}^{k'\ddagger m'} \circ \zeta_{\mathbf{c}}^{i\ddagger j}: A_{\mathbf{c}} \rightarrow A_{\mathbf{c}_{\overline{i, j, k, m}}} \quad \text{wherever defined;}$$

(c3) contraction commutes with the monoid operation:

$$\zeta_{\mathbf{c}\mathbf{d}}^{i\ddagger j} \circ \boxtimes_{\mathbf{c},\mathbf{d}} = \boxtimes_{\mathbf{c}_{i,j} \oplus \mathbf{d}} \circ (\zeta_{\mathbf{c}}^{i\ddagger j} \otimes id_{\mathbf{d}}): A_{\mathbf{c}} \otimes A_{\mathbf{d}} \rightarrow A_{\mathbf{c}_{i,j}\mathbf{d}}$$

for all  $\mathbf{d} \in \text{list}(\mathfrak{C})$  and  $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_m) \in \text{list}(\mathfrak{C})$  with  $c_i = \omega c_j$ ,  $1 \leq i < j \leq m$ .

(e1) the distinguished morphisms  $(\epsilon_c)_c$  provide units for the multiplication  $\eta$  induced by  $\boxtimes$  and  $\zeta$  as in (5.3):

$$\begin{aligned} id_{A_{\mathbf{c}}} &= \zeta_{(c_i, \omega c_j)\mathbf{c}}^{2\ddagger 2+j} \circ \boxtimes_{(c_i, \omega c_j)\mathbf{c}} \circ (\epsilon_c \otimes id_{\mathbf{c}}) \\ &= \zeta_{(c_i, \omega c_j)\mathbf{c}}^{1\ddagger 2+j} \circ \boxtimes_{(c_i, \omega c_j)\mathbf{c}} \circ (\epsilon_{\omega c} \otimes id_{\mathbf{c}}). \end{aligned}$$

A morphism of  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$ -coloured circuit algebras in  $\mathsf{X}$  is precisely a morphism of the underlying graded symmetric objects in  $\mathsf{X}$  that preserves the monoid operation, contraction and multiplicative units.




FIGURE 8. Circuit algebras satisfy the conditions (c1)-(c3).

*Proof.* By Theorem 4.15, a  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$ -coloured  $\mathsf{X}$ -circuit algebra is given by a symmetric monoidal functor  $(\mathcal{A}, \pi, \eta): \text{BD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)} \rightarrow \mathsf{X}$ . Since  $\Sigma^{\mathfrak{C}} \subset \text{BD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}$ ,  $(\mathcal{A}, \pi, \eta)$  describes a symmetric graded monoid in  $\mathsf{X}$  and so satisfies (c1).

Let  $(\tau_{\mathbf{c}}^{i\ddagger j}, \emptyset) \in \text{dBD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{c}_{i,j}^{\wedge})$  be the downward Brauer diagram given by

$$\mathbf{c} \ni c_k \mapsto \begin{cases} c_j & k = i \\ c_k \in \mathbf{c}_{i,j}^{\wedge} & k \neq i, k \neq j. \end{cases}$$

This defines an equivariant contraction  $\zeta$  on  $(\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{c}))_{\mathbf{c}}$  given by  $\zeta_{\mathbf{c}}^{i\ddagger j} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{A}(\tau_{\mathbf{c}}^{i\ddagger j})$ . The relations in  $\text{BD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}$  imply that  $(\mathcal{A}, \pi, \zeta)$  satisfies (c2) and (c3). (See e.g., [34, Theorem 2.6] or [2, Proposition 2.15].)

For  $c \in \mathfrak{C}$ , define  $\epsilon_c \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{A}(\cup_c): \mathcal{A}(\emptyset_{\mathfrak{C}}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(c, \omega c)$ . This satisfies (e1) by the triangle identities in  $\text{BD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}$ .

Conversely, let  $((A_{\mathbf{c}})_{\mathbf{c}}, \boxtimes, \eta, \zeta, \epsilon)$  satisfy (c1)-(c3) and (e1). Then  $(A, \boxtimes, \eta)$  describes a symmetric monoidal functor  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}: \Sigma^{\mathfrak{C}} \rightarrow \mathsf{X}$ .

By [34, Theorem 2.6] or [2, Proposition 2.15], there is a unique symmetric monoidal functor  $\mathcal{A}: \text{BD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)} \rightarrow \mathsf{X}$  such that  $\mathcal{A} = \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$  on  $\Sigma^{\mathfrak{C}}$  and, for all  $c \in \mathfrak{C}$ ,

$$\mathcal{A}(\cap_c) = \zeta_{(\omega c, c)^{1\ddagger 2}}: A_{(\omega c, c)} \rightarrow A_{\emptyset_{\mathfrak{C}}}$$

and

$$\mathcal{A}(\cup_c) \circ \eta = \epsilon_c: I \rightarrow A_{(c, \omega c)}.$$

The final statement – that morphisms of circuit algebras are morphisms of graded symmetric monoids preserving these maps – is immediate.  $\square$

Observe that, in the proof of Proposition 5.4, the cap morphisms  $\cap_c$  in  $\text{BD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}$  induce contractions while the units for the multiplication  $\diamond$  are induced by cup morphisms  $\cup_c$ . In particular, a lax monoidal functor  $\mathcal{B}: \text{dBD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  is, equivalently, a symmetric graded monoid with contraction satisfying (c1)-(c3) but without a unit for the induced multiplication. This motivates the following:

**Definition 5.5.** A  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$ -coloured nonunital  $\mathcal{X}$ -circuit algebra is a symmetric lax monoidal functor  $\mathcal{A}: \text{dBD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ .

Equivalently, these are algebras over the operad  $\text{dWD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}$  of downward  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$ -coloured wiring diagrams.

*Remark 5.6.* By [46], algebras in the category of representations of the infinite dimensional orthogonal and symplectic groups  $O_\infty$  and  $Sp_\infty$  are described by nonunital circuit algebras. Algebras in the category of representations of  $GL_\infty$  are described by nonunital oriented circuit algebras. See also Sections and 3.3 & 6.2.


**5.2. Circuit algebras and modular operads.** As usual, let  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$  be an involutive palette and  $(\mathcal{X}, \otimes, I)$  a symmetric monoidal category. The following definition of modular operads agrees with [21, 22]:

**Definition 5.7.** A  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$ -coloured modular operad with values in  $\mathcal{X}$  is a  $\text{list}(\mathfrak{C})$ -graded symmetric object  $S = (S_c)_{c \in \mathfrak{C}}$  together with a unital multiplication  $(\diamond, \epsilon)$ , and a contraction  $\zeta$ , such that the following axioms are satisfied:

(m1) Multiplication is associative:

For all  $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_{n_1}), \mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_{n_2}), \mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_{n_3}) \in \text{list}(\mathfrak{C})$  and all  $1 \leq i \leq n_1, 1 \leq j, k \leq n_2$  with  $j \neq k$  and  $1 \leq m \leq n_3$  such that  $b_i = \omega c_j$  and  $c_k = \omega d_m$ , the following square commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S_{\mathbf{b}} \otimes S_{\mathbf{c}} \otimes S_{\mathbf{d}} & \xrightarrow{\diamond_{\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}}^{i+j} \otimes id_{S_{\mathbf{d}}}} & S_{b_i c_j} \otimes S_{\mathbf{d}} \\ \downarrow id_{S_{\mathbf{b}}} \otimes \diamond_{\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}}^{k+m} & & \downarrow \diamond_{\mathbf{b}_i c_j, \mathbf{d}}^{k'+m} \\ S_{\mathbf{b}} \otimes S_{c_k d_m} & \xrightarrow{\diamond_{\mathbf{b}, c_k}^{i+j'}} & S_{b_i c_j, k d_m} \end{array}$$




(m2) Contractions commute (see (c2), Proposition 5.4 and Figure 8)

(m3) Multiplication and contraction commute:

For all  $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_{n_1}), \mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_{n_2}) \in \text{list}(\mathfrak{C})$  and all distinct  $1 \leq i, j, k \leq n_1, 1 \leq m \leq n_2$  such that  $c_i = \omega c_j$  and  $c_k = \omega d_m$ , the following square commutes:


$$\begin{array}{ccc}
S_{\mathbf{c}} \otimes S_{\mathbf{d}} & \xrightarrow{\zeta_{\mathbf{c}}^{i+j} \otimes \text{id}_{S_{\mathbf{d}}}} & S_{\mathbf{c}_{i,j}} \otimes S_{\mathbf{d}} \\
\downarrow \diamond_{\mathbf{c}\mathbf{d}}^{k+m} & & \downarrow \diamond_{\mathbf{c}_{i,j}, \mathbf{d}}^{k'+m} \\
S_{\mathbf{c}_k} \mathbf{d}_m & \xrightarrow{\zeta_{\mathbf{c}_k}^{i'+j'}} & S_{\mathbf{c}_{i,j,k}} \mathbf{d}_m.
\end{array}$$



(m4) ‘Parallel multiplication’ of pairs is well-defined:

For all  $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_{n_1}), \mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_{n_2}) \in \text{list}(\mathfrak{C})$  and all distinct  $1 \leq i, j \leq n_1$  and distinct  $1 \leq k, m \leq n_2$  such that  $c_i = \omega d_k$  and  $c_j = \omega d_m$ , the following square commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
S_{\mathbf{c}} \otimes S_{\mathbf{d}} & \xrightarrow{\diamond_{\mathbf{c}\mathbf{d}}^{i+k}} & S_{\mathbf{c}_i} \mathbf{d}_k \\
\downarrow \diamond_{\mathbf{c}\mathbf{d}}^{j+m} & & \downarrow \zeta_{\mathbf{c}_i}^{j'+m'} \\
S_{\mathbf{c}_j} \mathbf{d}_m & \xrightarrow{\zeta_{\mathbf{c}_j}^{i'+k'}} & S_{\mathbf{c}_{i,j}} \mathbf{d}_{k,m}.
\end{array}$$



Morphisms in the category  $\mathbf{X}\text{-MO}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}$  of  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$ -coloured modular operads with values in  $\mathbf{X}$  are morphisms of the underlying symmetric graded objects that preserve multiplication, contraction and units.

Symmetric graded objects with multiplication and contraction satisfying (m1)-(m4) but without a unit for the multiplication are called nonunital modular operads. The category of  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$ -coloured nonunital modular operads and levelwise maps that preserve multiplication and contraction is denoted  $\mathbf{X}\text{-MO}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)^-}$ .

*Remark 5.8.* This paper considers (coloured) modular operads and circuit algebras, *enriched* in a symmetric monoidal category  $\mathbf{X}$ , in the sense of [21, 22]. In particular, their definition is relative to a fixed palette  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$ , which can be thought of as the set of objects.

In [41, Section 3], a different definition of modular operads, *internal* to a category  $\mathbf{E}$  with sufficient (co)limits, is given. Under this definition, which is based on [26] and follows [42], the object set is replaced with an involutive object *object* in  $\mathbf{E}$ . Of course, the two versions coincide (up to equivalence) in  $\text{Set}$ .

The assignment  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega) \mapsto \mathbf{X}\text{-CA}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}$  defines a  $\text{Cat}$ -valued presheaf  $ca_{\mathbf{X}}$  on the palette category  $\text{Pal}$ : a morphism  $\phi: (\mathfrak{C}, \omega) \rightarrow (\mathfrak{C}', \omega')$  in  $\text{Pal}$  induces a strict symmetric monoidal functor  $\text{BD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)} \rightarrow \text{BD}^{(\mathfrak{C}', \omega')}$ , and hence  $\mathcal{A}' \in \text{CA}_{\mathbf{X}}^{(\mathfrak{C}', \omega')}$  may be pulled back to a  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$ -coloured circuit algebra  $\phi^* \mathcal{A}' \in \mathbf{X}\text{-CA}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}$ .

For a symmetric monoidal category  $(X, \otimes, I)$ , let  $X\text{-CA}$  be the category of all  $X$ -circuit algebras: objects are pairs  $((\mathfrak{C}, \omega), \mathcal{A})$  of a palette  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$  and a  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$ -coloured  $X$ -circuit algebra  $\mathcal{A}$ , and morphisms  $((\mathfrak{C}, \omega), \mathcal{A}) \rightarrow ((\mathfrak{C}', \omega'), \mathcal{A}')$  are pairs  $(\phi, \gamma)$  where  $\phi: \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}'$  satisfies  $\phi\omega = \omega'\phi$  and  $\gamma: \phi^*\mathcal{A}' \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ . When  $X$  is clear from the context, we will write  $\mathbf{CA} = X\text{-CA}$ .

The categories  $X\text{-CA}^-$  of all nonunital  $X$ -circuit algebras, and  $X\text{-MO}$  (and  $X\text{-MO}^-$ ) of all (nonunital)  $X$ -modular operads are defined similarly.

*Remark 5.9.* Note that  $X\text{-CA}$  is not a category of algebras for some single operad since the operad composition in each  $\text{WD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)}$  is dependent on  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$ . However, when  $X = \text{Set}$ ,  $X\text{-CA}$  can be obtained as a category of algebras for a monad. In this construction – based on [26, 42] – the palette  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$  is just part of the data of any given object. More generally, if  $E$  is a symmetric monoidal category with all finite limits, then it is possible to construct a monad whose algebras are circuit algebras *internal* to  $E$  with palettes replaced by involutive objects in  $E$ . This is described in detail in [41].

*Example 5.10.* A morphism  $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \text{OWD}$  of  $\text{Set}$ -valued circuit algebras in  $\mathbf{CA}$  pulls back to an orientation on  $\mathcal{A}$ . Hence, by Proposition 3.26, the category  $\mathbf{WP}$  of wheeled props (of all colours) in  $X$  is equivalent to the slice category  $\mathbf{OCA} \simeq \mathbf{CA}/\text{OWD}$ .

More generally, a morphism of palettes  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega) \rightarrow \{\uparrow, \downarrow\}$  induces an orientation on  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$ . Objects of the category  $X\text{-WP}$  of wheeled props (of any colour) with values in  $X$  are equivalent to pairs  $(\theta, \mathcal{A})$  with  $\mathcal{A}$  a  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$ -coloured  $X$ -circuit algebra and  $\theta: (\mathfrak{C}, \omega) \rightarrow \{\uparrow, \downarrow\}$  a morphism of palettes. Morphisms in  $X\text{-WP}$  are described by morphisms on the underlying circuit algebras that preserve the orientation on palettes.

**Proposition 5.11.** *There are canonical inclusions of categories*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X\text{-CA}^- & \longrightarrow & X\text{-MO} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ X\text{-CA}^- & \longrightarrow & X\text{-MO}^- \end{array}$$

*Proof.* Since multiplicative units are unique, the vertical inclusions are full and induced by simply forgetting units.

Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \pi, \eta): \text{dBD}^{(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)} \rightarrow X$  define a nonunital  $(\mathfrak{C}, \omega)$ -coloured circuit algebra. By Proposition 5.4,  $\mathcal{A}$  admits a contraction  $\zeta$  such that  $(\mathcal{A}, \pi, \eta, \zeta)$  satisfies (c1)-(c3).

Since (m2) coincides with (c2), and  $\mathcal{A}$  satisfies (e1), it is only necessary to check that  $(\mathcal{A}, \zeta, \diamond)$  satisfies (m1), (m3), (m4).

Let  $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_{n_1})$ ,  $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_{n_2})$ ,  $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_{n_3}) \in \text{list}(\mathfrak{C})$  and all  $1 \leq i \leq n_1$ ,  $1 \leq j, k \leq n_2$  with  $j \neq k$  and  $1 \leq m \leq n_3$  such that  $b_i = \omega c_j$  and  $c_k = \omega d_m$ . The composition

$$\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{b}) \otimes \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{c}) \otimes \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{d}) \xrightarrow{\diamond_{\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}}^{i \ddagger j} \otimes \text{id}_{\mathbf{d}}} \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{b}_i \mathbf{c}_j) \otimes \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{d}) \xrightarrow{\diamond_{\mathbf{b}_i \mathbf{c}_j, \mathbf{d}}^{k' \ddagger m}} \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{b}_i \mathbf{c}_{j,k} \mathbf{d}_{\hat{m}})$$

is given by

$$\zeta_{\mathbf{b}_i \mathbf{c}_j \mathbf{d}}^{k' \ddagger m'} \circ \pi_{\mathbf{b}_i \mathbf{c}_j, \mathbf{d}} \circ \left( \zeta_{\mathbf{bc}}^{i \ddagger (n_1+j)} \circ \pi_{\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}} \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{d})} \right)$$

where  $k' = (n_1 - 1) + k$ ,  $m' = (n_1 + n_2 - 2) + m$ . By (c1)-(c3) this is

$$\zeta_{\mathbf{b}_i \mathbf{c}_j \mathbf{d}}^{k' \ddagger m'} \circ \pi_{\mathbf{b}_i \mathbf{c}_j, \mathbf{d}} \circ \left( \zeta_{\mathbf{bc}}^{i \ddagger (n_1+j)} \circ \pi_{\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}} \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{d})} \right) \stackrel{(c3)}{=} \zeta_{\mathbf{b}_i \mathbf{c}_j \mathbf{d}}^{k' \ddagger m'} \circ \zeta_{\mathbf{bcd}}^{i \ddagger (n_1+j)} \circ \pi_{\mathbf{bc}, \mathbf{d}} \circ \left( \pi_{\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}} \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{d})} \right)$$

$$\stackrel{(c1)}{=} \zeta_{\mathbf{b}_i \mathbf{c}_j \mathbf{d}}^{k' \ddagger m'} \circ \zeta_{\mathbf{bcd}}^{i \ddagger (n_1+j)} \circ \pi_{\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{cd}} \circ \left( \text{id}_{\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{b})} \otimes \pi_{\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}} \right) \stackrel{(c2)}{=} \zeta_{\mathbf{bc}_k \mathbf{d}_{\hat{m}}}^{i' \ddagger j'} \circ \zeta_{\mathbf{bcd}}^{(n_1+k) \ddagger (n_1+n_2+m)} \circ \pi_{\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{cd}} \circ \left( \text{id}_{\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{b})} \otimes \pi_{\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}} \right)$$

$$\stackrel{(c3)}{=} \zeta_{\mathbf{bc}_k \mathbf{d}_{\hat{m}}}^{i' \dagger j'} \circ \pi_{\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}_k \mathbf{d}_{\hat{m}}} \circ \left( id_{\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{b})} \otimes \zeta_{\mathbf{cd}}^{k \dagger m} \circ \pi_{\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}} \right).$$

And this is precisely the composition

$$\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{b}) \otimes \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{c}) \otimes \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{d}) \xrightarrow{id_{\mathbf{b}} \otimes \zeta_{\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}}^{k \dagger m}} \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{b}) \otimes \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{c}_k \mathbf{d}_{\hat{m}}) \xrightarrow{\zeta_{\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}_k \mathbf{d}_{\hat{m}}}^{i' \dagger j'}} \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{b}_i \widehat{\mathbf{c}_{j, k}} \mathbf{d}_{\hat{m}}).$$

Hence  $(\mathcal{A}, \diamond, \zeta)$  satisfies (m1). Axioms (m3) and (m4) follow similarly, whereby  $(\mathcal{A}, \pi, \eta)$  defines a modular operad. Hence, since  $\diamond$  is obtained as a composition of  $\zeta$  and  $\pi$ , this defines a functorial inclusion of categories  $\mathbf{X}\text{-CA}^- \hookrightarrow \mathbf{X}\text{-MO}^-$ .

Finally, if  $\mathcal{A}$  extends to a functor from  $\text{BD}^{(\mathbf{e}, \omega)}$ , it admits a unital multiplication  $(\diamond, \epsilon)$  with  $\epsilon$  induced by  $\mathcal{A}(\cup_c)$  and  $\diamond$  defined as in (5.3) and this is preserved under the above inclusion.  $\square$

*Remark 5.12.* The relationship between circuit algebras and modular operads observed in Proposition 5.11 generalises that between wheeled props and wheeled properads (c.f. [55]).

The image of a wheeled prop (viewed as a circuit algebra with oriented palette) under the forgetful functor  $\mathbf{X}\text{-CA} \rightarrow \mathbf{X}\text{-MO}$  is its underlying *wheeled properad* (see [20, 59]).

By Theorem 4.15, circuit algebras may be characterised categorically, as lax monoidal functors from a category of Brauer diagrams, or operadically, as algebras over an operad of wiring diagrams. By contrast, the modular operad structure is inherently operadic: modular operads cannot be described by functors from (some subcategory of)  $\text{BD}^{(\mathbf{e}, \omega)}$ . They do, however, admit a straightforward description in terms of wiring diagrams:

A *connected wiring diagram* in  $\overline{f}$  in  $\text{WD}^{(\mathbf{e}, \omega)}$  is one that cannot be obtained as a disjoint sum  $\overline{f} = \overline{f}_1 \oplus \overline{f}_2$  of non-trivial wiring diagrams as in (4.2). Note that this notion of connectedness only makes sense in the operad  $\text{WD}$  and not in the category  $\text{BD}$ . Connected wiring diagrams form a suboperad of  $\text{WD}$  (or  $\text{WD}^{(\mathbf{e}, \omega)}$ ) and modular operads are algebras over this suboperad of connected wiring diagrams. See [41, Section 6] for more details.

In fact, the inclusions in Proposition 5.11 are the right adjoints in a square of monadic adjunctions. The left adjoints for the vertical pairs are obtained by formally adjoining units, and the left adjoints for the horizontal pairs are induced by the free graded monoid monad on the underlying symmetric graded objects. This is discussed in detail in [41].

## 6. CIRCUIT ALGEBRAS AND INVARIANT THEORY

Henceforth, unless otherwise stated, all circuit algebras will take values in the category  $\text{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$  of vector spaces over a field  $\mathbb{k}$  of characteristic 0.

**6.1. Unital circuit algebras and finite dimensional classical groups.** Derksen and Makam [12] have described  $GL_d$  algebras in terms of wheeled props. The aim of this section is to adapt their methods to provide a characterisation of algebras for the orthogonal and symplectic groups in terms of circuit algebras.

An action of an algebraic group  $G$  on a (possibly infinite dimensional)  $\mathbb{k}$ -vector space  $W$  is *rational* if for all  $w \in W$ , there is a finite dimensional  $G$ -stable subspace  $W_w \subset W$  containing  $w$ . In other words, there is a  $\mathbb{k}$ -linear morphism  $\gamma: W \rightarrow \mathbb{k}[G] \otimes W$  such that, if  $\gamma(w) = \sum_{i=1}^k f_i \otimes w_i$ , then  $G$  acts by  $g \cdot w = \sum_{i=1}^k f_i(g)w_i$ .

**Definition 6.1.** *A  $G$ -algebra is a commutative  $\mathbb{k}$ -algebra  $R$  equipped with a rational action of  $G$  by  $\mathbb{k}$ -algebra automorphisms. The category of  $G$ -algebras and  $G$ -equivariant ring homomorphisms is denoted by  $\text{Alg}(G)$ .*

Let  $V$  be a (finite)  $d$ -dimensional vector space with dual  $V^*$  and let  $GL = GL(V)$  be the general linear group of  $V$ -automorphisms. Let  $U$  be the initial  $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ -valued wheeled prop described in Example 4.17. For any wheeled prop  $P$ , let  $a_P: U \rightarrow P$  denote the unique wheeled prop map.

**Theorem 6.2** (Derksen-Makam, Theorems 5.2 & 7.3 [12]). *There is an equivalence of categories between  $Alg(GL)$  and the category of wheeled props  $P$  such that  $e(d+1) \in U(d+1, d+1)$  and  $\bigcirc - d \in U(0, 0)$  are in the kernel of  $a_P: U \rightarrow P$ .*

By Proposition 3.26, Theorem 6.2 may be restated in terms of oriented circuit algebras. So, it is natural to ask whether (analogous to the similarities between Theorems 3.29 and 3.31) there is an undirected circuit algebra version of Theorem 6.2 that characterises algebras over the orthogonal and symplectic groups.

To this end, let  $V$  be equipped with a non degenerate bilinear form  $\theta: V \otimes V \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$  that is either symmetric or skew-symmetric (in which case, nondegeneracy implies that  $d = 2k$  for some  $k$ ). As in Section 3.3, let  $\delta = d$  if  $\theta$  is symmetric, and  $\delta = -k$  if  $\theta$  is skew-symmetric. And let  $G \subset GL(V)$  be the isometry group of  $\theta$ . For  $\theta$  symmetric,  $G \cong O_d$  and, for  $\theta$  skew-symmetric  $G \cong Sp_k$ .

As in Example 4.18, let  $\mathcal{I}_\theta \subset \mathcal{U}$  be the ideal generated by  $[e(|\delta| + 1)] \in \mathcal{U}(2(|\delta| + 1))$  and  $\bigcirc - \delta \in \mathcal{U}(0)$ . Let  $\mathbf{CA}_\theta$  be the category of (monochrome  $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ -) circuit algebras  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $\mathcal{I}_\theta$  is in the kernel of the unique circuit algebra morphism  $\alpha_{\mathcal{A}}: \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ .

The remainder of this section is devoted to the proof of the following theorem:

**Theorem 6.3.** *There is an equivalence of categories between  $Alg(G)$  and  $\mathbf{CA}_\theta$ .*

By Lemma 3.27, a circuit algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $\mathcal{A}(\bigcirc) = \delta$  factors through  $\mathbf{Br}_\delta$ . Hence Theorem 6.3 may also be formulated as the statement that  $Alg(G)$  is equivalent to the category of symmetric monoidal  $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ -functors  $\mathbf{Br}_\delta \rightarrow \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$  for which  $e(d+1) \in \mathbf{Br}_\delta(d+1, d+1)$  vanishes.

The proof of Theorem 6.3 is based on the proof method of Theorem 6.2 in [12, Section 5-7], and involves showing that each category  $Alg(G)$  and  $\mathbf{CA}_\theta$  is equivalent to a third category  $\mathbf{K}_\theta$  that will now be described.

Recall from Example 4.18 that  $\mathcal{V}_\theta: \mathbf{BD} \rightarrow \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$  is the unique symmetric strict monoidal functor such that  $1 \mapsto V$  and  $\cap \mapsto \theta$ . For any  $\mathbb{k}$ -algebra  $R$ , we may construct a circuit algebra  $R \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta$ ,  $n \mapsto R \otimes V^{\otimes n}$  in the obvious way: Contraction in  $\mathcal{V}_\theta$  extends to  $R \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta$ , and the monoidal product is induced by

$$\left( \left( \sum_i r_i \otimes v_i \right), \left( \sum_j r_j \otimes v_j \right) \right) \mapsto \sum_{i,j} r_i r_j \otimes v_i \otimes v_j.$$

The category  $\mathbf{K}_\theta$  is the full subcategory of  $\mathbf{CA}$  whose objects are circuit algebras  $\mathcal{A}$  such that there exists a  $\mathbb{k}$ -algebra  $R$  and an injective morphism of circuit algebras  $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow R \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta$ .

A functor  $\Phi: Alg(G) \rightarrow \mathbf{K}_\theta$  is constructed as follows: For  $R \in Alg(G)$ , the subspace  $\bigoplus_n (R \otimes V^{\otimes n})^G$  of  $G$ -invariant elements in the image of  $R \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta$  is, by Theorem 3.29, closed under the image of  $\mathbf{BD}$  morphisms and hence describes a circuit algebra  $(R \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta)^G$ . And, if  $\phi: R \rightarrow S$  is a  $G$ -algebra homomorphism, then the induced morphism of circuit algebras  $\phi \otimes id: (R \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta) \rightarrow (S \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta)$  is  $G$ -equivariant. Hence the assignment  $R \mapsto (R \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta)^G$  extends to a functor  $\Phi: Alg(G) \rightarrow \mathbf{K}_\theta$ .

The construction of the converse functor  $\Psi: \mathbf{K}_\theta \rightarrow Alg(G)$  is more involved.

Let  $R$  be a  $\mathbb{k}$  algebra. For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the pairing  $\theta$  on  $V$  extends to a pairing  $V^{\otimes n} \otimes V^{\otimes n} \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$  by

$$v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_n \otimes w_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes w_n \mapsto \prod_{i=1}^n \theta(v_i, w_i)$$

and therefore. Hence  $\theta$  describes, for all  $n$ , a map of  $\mathbb{k}$ -algebras  $R \otimes V^{\otimes n} \otimes V^{\otimes n} \rightarrow R$ . This map will also be denoted by  $\theta$ .

Given a morphism  $\rho: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow R \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta$  of circuit algebras, let  $T_\rho$  be the subspace of  $R$  spanned by elements of the form  $\theta(\rho(a), v)$ , where  $a \in \mathcal{A}(n)$  if  $v \in V^{\otimes n}$ . This is a  $\mathbb{k}$ -algebra since

$$\theta(\rho(a), v)\theta(\rho(b), w) = \theta(\rho(a) \otimes \rho(b), v \otimes w)$$

for all  $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $v, w \in \mathcal{V}_\theta$  such that  $\theta(\rho(a), v), \theta(\rho(b), w)$  are defined.

Moreover,  $\rho$  factors through the inclusion  $(T_\rho \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta) \hookrightarrow (R \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta)$  induced by  $T_\rho \subset R$ : Namely, for any non-zero  $w \in V^{\otimes n}$ , let  $w^* \in V^{\otimes n}$  be the element defined by  $\theta(w, w^*) = 1$ . Let  $a \in \mathcal{A}(n)$ . Since  $(V, \theta)$  is an orthogonal (or symplectic) space then, for all  $n$  there exists a basis  $(w_i)_i$  for  $V^{\otimes n}$  such that for all  $a \in \mathcal{A}(n)$ ,

$$\rho(a) = \sum_i \theta(\rho(a), w_i^*) \otimes w_i \in T_\rho \otimes V^{\otimes n}.$$

If  $\rho: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow (R \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta)$  is, moreover, an injective morphism of circuit algebras, then the subspace  $T_\rho \subset R$  has the following universal property:

**Lemma 6.4** (C.f., Lemma 5.1 Derksen-Makam '23 [12]). *For any morphism  $\lambda: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow S \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta$  where  $S$  is a  $\mathbb{k}$ -algebra, there is a unique  $\mathbb{k}$ -algebra homomorphism  $\phi_\lambda: T_\rho \rightarrow S$  such that the following diagram commutes*

$$(6.5) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{\rho} & T_\rho \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta \\ & \searrow \lambda & \downarrow \phi_\lambda \otimes id \\ & & S \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta. \end{array}$$

Moreover,  $T_\rho \in Alg(G)$  and the assignment  $\mathcal{A} \mapsto T_\rho$  extends to a functor  $\Psi: \mathcal{K}_\theta \rightarrow Alg(G)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $S$  be a  $\mathbb{k}$ -algebra and let  $\lambda: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow S \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta$  be a circuit algebra morphism.

For all  $a \in \mathcal{A}(n)$ ,

$$\rho(a) = \sum_i \theta(\rho(a), w_i^*) \otimes w_i \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda(a) = \sum_i \theta(\lambda(a), w_i^*) \otimes w_i.$$

Hence, since  $\rho$  is injective,  $\phi(\theta(\rho(a), w_i^*)) = \theta(\lambda(a), w_i^*)$  is well defined for all  $a, w_i$ . So there is, by linear extension, a unique map  $\phi: T_\rho \rightarrow S$ , defined by  $(\theta(\rho(a), v)) \mapsto \theta(\lambda(a), v) \in S$ , that respects the ring structure and therefore gives the unique  $\mathbb{k}$ -algebra homomorphism such that Diagram (6.5) commutes.

To obtain a  $G$ -algebra structure on  $T_\rho$ , let  $\gamma_{\mathcal{V}_\theta}: \mathcal{V}_\theta \rightarrow \mathbb{k}[G] \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta$  describe the rational  $G$ -action on  $\mathcal{V}_\theta$ . By the universal property of  $T_\rho$ , there is a unique  $\mathbb{k}$ -algebra homomorphism  $\mu: T_\rho \rightarrow T_\rho \otimes \mathbb{k}[G]$  such that the following diagram commutes:

$$(6.6) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{\rho} & T_\rho \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta \\ \rho \downarrow & & \downarrow id \otimes \gamma_{\mathcal{V}_\theta} \\ T_\rho \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta & \xrightarrow{\mu \otimes id} & T_\rho \otimes \mathbb{k}[G] \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta. \end{array}$$

In particular,  $\mu$  defines a rational right action of  $G$  on  $T_\rho$  such that, if  $\mu(r) = \sum_i r_i \otimes f'_i$ , then  $r \cdot g = \sum_i r_i f_i(g)$ , and hence a rational left action of  $G$  on  $R$  by  $g \cdot r = r \cdot g^{-1}$ .

To obtain the functor  $\Psi: \mathcal{K}_\theta \rightarrow Alg(G)$ , observe that, if  $\rho: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow R \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta$  and  $\lambda: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow S \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta$  are both injective morphisms of circuit algebras, then it follows from the universal property that  $\rho(a) \mapsto \lambda(a)$



induces an isomorphism  $T_\rho \cong T_\lambda$ . So define  $T_{\mathcal{A}} \cong T_\rho$  to be the limit of  $T_\rho$  where  $\rho$  varies over all injective circuit algebra morphisms of the form  $\mathcal{A} \hookrightarrow R \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta$  (with  $R$  a  $\mathbb{k}$ -algebra).

By the universal property, if  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{K}_\theta$ , and  $\gamma: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  is a morphism of circuit algebras, then there is a  $\mathbb{k}$ -algebra morphism  $T_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow T_{\mathcal{B}}$ . This commutes with the  $G$ -algebra structure by construction. Hence,  $\mathcal{A} \mapsto T_{\mathcal{A}}$  extends to a functor  $\Psi: \mathcal{K}_\theta \rightarrow \text{Alg}(G)$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 6.7** (C.f. Derksen-Makam '23 [12]). *The pair of functors  $\Phi: \text{Alg}(G) \rightleftarrows \mathcal{K}_\theta: \Psi$  defines an equivalence of categories.*

*Proof.* The proof follows that of [12, Theorem 5.2].

To show that  $\Phi \circ \Psi$  is equivalent to the identity functor on  $\mathcal{K}_\theta$ , observe first that, if  $\rho: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow R \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta$  is an injective morphism of circuit algebras with  $R$  a  $\mathbb{k}$ -algebra, then its image  $\rho(\mathcal{A})$  is invariant under the  $G$ -action on  $T_\rho \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta$ : Namely, for  $g \in G$ , let  $L_g$  and  $R_g$  respectively define left and right multiplication by  $g$  in  $T_\rho$  and  $\mathcal{V}_\theta$ . So  $G$  acts on  $T_\rho \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta$  by  $g \mapsto L_g \otimes L_g = R_{g^{-1}} \otimes L_g$ . By (6.6) above,

$$(L_g \otimes L_g) \circ \rho = (R_{g^{-1}} \otimes L_g) \circ \rho = (id \otimes L_g) \circ (R_{g^{-1}} \otimes id) \circ \rho = (id \otimes L_g) \circ (id \otimes L_{g^{-1}}) \circ \rho = \rho.$$

Hence  $\rho(\mathcal{A}) \subset (T_\rho \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta)^G$  is  $G$ -invariant.

In fact,  $\rho(\mathcal{A}) \cong (T_\rho \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta)^G$ : To show that  $(T_\rho \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta)^G \subset \rho(\mathcal{A})$ , let  $u \in (T_\rho \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta)^G$ . So  $u$  has the form  $\sum_i \theta(\rho(a_i), v_i) \otimes w_i$  with  $a_i \in \mathcal{A}(n_i)$ ,  $v_i \in V^{\otimes n_i}$ , and  $w_i \in V^{\otimes n}$ . Writing  $f_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \theta(-, v_i) \otimes w_i: V^{\otimes n_i} \rightarrow V^{\otimes n}$ , gives  $u = \sum_i f_i(\rho(a_i))$ . The elements  $\rho(a_i)$  are  $G$ -invariant since  $\rho(\mathcal{A}) \subset (T_\rho \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta)^G$ . So, if  $u \in (T_\rho \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta)^G$  is also  $G$ -invariant, then – by applying the Reynolds operator to  $u$  and  $\sum f_i(\rho(a_i))$  – each  $f_i$  may also be assumed to be  $G$ -invariant. Hence, by Theorem 3.29,  $f_i$  is a linear combination of morphisms in the image of  $\mathcal{V}_\theta: \text{BD} \rightarrow \text{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$  whereby  $u \in \rho(\mathcal{A})$  and  $\rho(\mathcal{A}) \cong (T_\rho \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta)^G$ .

In particular, since  $\rho$  is injective,  $\mathcal{A} \cong (T_\rho \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta)^G$ . It follows from the definitions of  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$  that this extends to an equivalence of functors  $\Phi \circ \Psi \simeq id_{\mathcal{K}_\theta}$ .

For the converse, let  $R \in \text{Alg}(G)$ , so  $\Phi(R) = (R \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta)^G$ . Let  $\rho: (R \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta)^G \hookrightarrow R \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta$  denote the inclusion. This factors through  $T_\rho \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta$ , where  $T_\rho \subset R$  is a  $G$ -subalgebra. In particular, restricting  $\iota \otimes id_{\mathcal{V}_\theta}$  to  $G$ -invariant subspaces gives  $(T_\rho \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta)^G = (R \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta)^G$ .

Since  $T_\rho \cong (\Psi \circ \Phi)(R)$ , we want to show that  $T_\rho = R$ . Let  $\iota: T_\rho \rightarrow R$  denote the inclusion. For any irreducible  $G$ -representation  $W$ , let  $T_W \subset T$ ,  $R_W \subset R$  denotes the  $W$ -isotypic components of  $T$  and  $R$ . So  $T_\rho \cong \bigoplus_W T_W$  and  $R \cong \bigoplus_W R_W$  where the sum is over all irreducible representations of  $W$ . By the universal property of  $T_\rho$ ,  $\iota$  is  $G$ -equivariant, and hence preserves  $G$ -subrepresentations. In particular  $\iota = \sum_W \iota_W$  where  $\iota_W: T_W \rightarrow R_W$  is the restriction.

Hence, to show that  $T_\rho = R$ , it suffices to show that  $\iota_W$  is an isomorphism for all irreducible representations  $W$  of  $G$ .

Let  $W \subset V^{\otimes n}$  be an irreducible representation. Then  $\theta: (R_W \otimes W)^G \otimes W \rightarrow R$  induces isomorphisms  $(R_W \otimes W)^G \otimes W \cong R_W$  and  $(T_W \otimes W)^G \otimes W \cong T_W$ , and hence there is an equivariant map  $\psi_W: (T_\rho \otimes W)^G \otimes W \rightarrow (R \otimes W)^G \otimes W$  – of the form  $\psi_W = \tilde{\psi}_W \otimes id_W$  for some  $\tilde{\psi}_W: (T_\rho \otimes W)^G \rightarrow (R \otimes W)^G$  – such that the following diagram commutes

$$(6.8) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} T_W & \xrightarrow{\iota_W} & T_W \\ \cong \downarrow & & \downarrow \cong \\ (T_\rho \otimes W)^G \otimes W & \xrightarrow{\psi_W} & (R \otimes W)^G \otimes W. \end{array}$$

Since  $\iota_W$  is injective, so is  $\tilde{\psi}_W$ . Hence, by the universal property of  $T_\rho$ ,  $\tilde{\psi}_W$  is the restriction to  $(T_\rho \otimes W)^G$  of  $\iota \otimes id_W$  and therefore an isomorphism. Therefore  $T_W = R_W$  for all irreducible representations  $W$  of  $G$ , and so  $R = T_\rho \cong (\Psi \circ \Phi)(R)$ .

By  $G$ -equivariance of morphisms in  $Alg(G)$  and  $K_\theta$ , this extends to an equivalence of functors  $\Psi \circ \Phi \simeq id_{Alg(G)}$ , and therefore the categories  $Alg(G)$  and  $K_\theta$  are equivalent.  $\square$

It remains to prove that  $K_\theta \simeq CA_\theta$ . As in [12, Proposition 5.3 & Remark 5.4], this rests on the following:

**Lemma 6.9** (C.f., Derksen-Makam ‘23 [12]). *If  $\mathcal{J} \subset \mathcal{A}$  is a circuit algebra ideal, with  $\mathcal{A} \cong (R \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta)^G$  for some  $R \in Alg(G)$ , then there exists an ideal  $J \subset R$  such that  $\mathcal{J} = (J \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta)^G$ .*

*Furthermore, if  $\mathcal{A} \in K_\theta$  and  $\phi: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  is a morphism of circuit algebras, then  $\phi(\mathcal{A}) \in K_\theta$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $R \in Alg(G)$  and  $\mathcal{A} = (R \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta)^G$ , and let  $\rho: \mathcal{J} \subset \mathcal{A}$  be the inclusion of a circuit algebra ideal. Write  $J \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} T_\rho$ . Then  $J \subset R$  is a  $G$ -subalgebra. By the proof of Proposition 6.7,  $\mathcal{J} \cong (T_\rho \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta)^G$  as circuit algebras. To show that  $J$  is an ideal of  $R$ , let  $r \in R$  and let  $u = \sum_j \theta(\rho(\beta_j), w_j)$  – with  $\beta_j \in \mathcal{J}(m_i)$  and  $w_j \in V^{\otimes m_j}$  – be an element of  $J$ . By the proof of Proposition 6.7,  $r = \sum_i \theta(\alpha_i, v_i)$  for some  $\alpha_i \in \mathcal{A}(n_i)$ ,  $v_i \in V^{\otimes n_i}$ . Hence,

$$ru = \sum_{i,j} \theta(\alpha_i, v_i) \theta(\rho(\beta_j), w_j) = \sum_{i,j} \theta(\alpha_i \otimes \rho(\beta_j), v_i \otimes w_j).$$

Since  $\mathcal{J} \subset \mathcal{A}$  is an ideal,  $\alpha_i \otimes \rho(\beta_j) \in \mathcal{J}$  for all  $i, j$ . Hence  $ru \in J$ , whereby  $J$  is an ideal of  $R$ .

For the second statement, let  $\phi: \mathcal{A} = (R \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta)^G \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a morphism of circuit algebras with kernel  $\mathcal{J} \subset \mathcal{A}$ . So, there is an isomorphism  $\phi(\mathcal{A}) \cong \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{J}$  of circuit algebras.

Let  $\iota: J \hookrightarrow R$  denote the inclusion of the ideal  $J$  such that  $\mathcal{J} \cong (J \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta)^G$ , and let  $q: R \rightarrow R/J$  be the quotient. The inclusion  $\mathcal{J} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{A}$  is given by the restriction to  $(J \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta)^G$  of  $\iota \otimes id_{\mathcal{V}_\theta}$ .

Then the following diagram – where the vertical arrows are inclusions – commutes:

$$(6.10) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{J} & \xrightarrow{\iota \otimes id_{\mathcal{V}_\theta}|_{\mathcal{J}}} & \mathcal{A} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{J} \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & J \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta & \xrightarrow{\iota \otimes id_{\mathcal{V}_\theta}} & R \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta & \xrightarrow{q \otimes id_{\mathcal{V}_\theta}} & R/J \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta \longrightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

It follows that  $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{J}$  is isomorphic to the image of the restriction to  $\mathcal{A} = (R \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta)^G$  of the quotient  $q \otimes id_{\mathcal{V}_\theta}: R \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta \rightarrow R/J \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta$ . Since  $\iota: J \rightarrow R$  – and hence also  $q: R \rightarrow R/J$  – is  $G$ -equivariant, so is  $q \otimes id_{\mathcal{V}_\theta}$ . Hence, the image of its restriction to  $\mathcal{A}$  is  $G$ -invariant, and therefore  $\mathcal{J} \subset (R/J \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta)^G$  is in  $K_\theta$  and the lemma is proved.  $\square$

**Proposition 6.11.** *The categories  $K_\theta$  and  $CA_\theta$  are equivalent.*

*Proof.* By Proposition 6.7, objects of  $K_\theta$  have the form  $(R \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta)^G$ . Hence  $[e(|\delta| + 1)]$  and  $\bigcirc - \delta$  are in the kernel of the unique circuit algebra morphism  $z: \mathcal{U} \rightarrow (R \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta)^G$  since they are in the kernel of  $\alpha_\theta: \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_\theta$ . It follows that  $K_\theta \subset CA_\theta$  is a full subcategory. It therefore suffices to show that each  $\mathcal{A} \in CA_\theta$  is equivalent to some object of  $K_\theta$ .

Let  $\mathcal{A} \in CA_\theta$  and let  $A = (A_n)_n$  be the graded set underlying  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then  $\mathcal{A} \cong \mathcal{U}\langle A \rangle / \mathcal{I}$  where  $\mathcal{U}\langle A \rangle$  is the free  $\text{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ -circuit algebra generated by  $A$  (see Definition 4.21) and  $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{U}\langle A \rangle$  is a circuit algebra ideal. Let  $\mathcal{I}_\theta \subset \mathcal{U}\langle A \rangle$  be the ideal generated by  $[e(d + 1)]$  and  $\bigcirc - \delta$  and let  $\mathcal{B} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{U}\langle A \rangle / \mathcal{I}_\theta$ . Then  $\mathcal{I}^\theta \subset \mathcal{I}$  since  $\mathcal{A} \in CA_\theta$ . So, there exists a circuit algebra ideal  $\mathcal{J} \subset \mathcal{B}$  such that  $\mathcal{A} \cong \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{J}$ .

To prove the proposition, it therefore suffices – by Lemma 6.9 – to show that there is a  $\mathbb{k}$ -algebra  $R$  and an inclusion of circuit algebras  $\mathcal{B} \subset R \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta$ .

So, let  $\{e_1, \dots, e_d\}$  be a basis for  $V$  and, for each  $n$ , let  $\{e_{j_1, \dots, j_n}\}_{1 \leq j_i \leq d}$  denote the induced basis for  $V^{\otimes n}$ . For each  $\alpha \in A_n \subset A$ , introduce formal variables  $\{a_{j_1, \dots, j_n}^\alpha\}_{(j_1, \dots, j_n) \in \{1, \dots, d\}^n}$  and define

$$R \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{k}[a_{j_1, \dots, j_n}^\alpha \mid (j_1, \dots, j_n) \in \{1, \dots, d\}^n, \alpha \in A_n, n \in \mathbb{N}].$$

Then, the circuit algebra morphism  $\rho: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow R \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta$  given by

$$\alpha \mapsto \sum_{(j_1, \dots, j_n)} a_{j_1, \dots, j_n}^\alpha \otimes e_{j_1, \dots, j_n}, \quad \alpha \in A_n$$

is well defined since  $I^\theta$  vanishes in  $\mathcal{V}_\theta$  and therefore also in  $R \otimes \mathcal{V}_\theta$ . Moreover, by Theorem 3.29,  $\rho$  is injective. Hence  $\mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{K}_\theta$  and therefore, by Lemma 6.9, so is  $\mathcal{U}(A)/\mathcal{I} \cong \mathcal{A}$ .

Whereby  $\text{CA}_\theta \simeq \mathcal{K}_\theta$  as required.  $\square$

Theorem 6.3 follows immediately from Propositions 6.7 and 6.11.

*Remark 6.12.* The ideals of the initial  $\text{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ -circuit algebra  $\mathcal{U}$  may be classified following the methods of [12, Section 4] (where this is done for the initial wheeled prop  $U$ ). It is therefore natural to whether there are interesting statements, analogous to Proposition 6.7, that consider quotients of  $\mathcal{U}$  by different ideals, and whether this leads to a (partial) classification of monochrome (oriented) circuit algebras via duality results like Theorem 6.3 and Theorem 6.2.

**6.2. Nonunital circuit algebras and representations of infinite dimensional groups.** Let  $G_\infty = \bigcup_d G_d$  be the infinite dimensional orthogonal or symplectic group (c.f. Remark 3.33) defined by a sequence of nondegenerate orthogonal or symplectic forms  $(\theta_d)_d$  on a filtered sequence of spaces  $(V_d)_d$ ,  $V_d \subset V_{d+1}$  such that, for all  $d \geq 0$ ,  $\theta_{d+1}$  restricts to  $\theta_d$  on  $V_d$ . An algebra  $W$  over  $G_\infty$  is, in particular, an algebra over  $G_d$  for all  $d \geq 1$ . Hence by Proposition 6.7, there is a compatible sequence of circuit algebras  $(\mathcal{A}_d)_d$  with  $\mathcal{A}_d \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (W \otimes \mathcal{V}_{\theta_d})_d^{G_d}$ .

For  $d \geq 0$ , let  $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_{\theta_d}$  be nonunital circuit algebra given by the restriction of  $\mathcal{V}_{\theta_d}$  to dBD. Since  $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_{\theta_d}$  is strict,  $\mathcal{V}_{\theta_d}$  is the unique extension of  $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_{\theta_d}$  to BD.

As in Remark 3.33, let  $\mathbf{V}$  be the standard representation of  $G_\infty$  with induced symmetric (or skew-symmetric) form  $\boldsymbol{\theta} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_d \theta_d$ , and let  $\mathbf{F}: \text{dBD} \rightarrow \text{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$  be the strict symmetric monoidal functor  $1 \mapsto \mathbf{V}$ ,  $\cap \mapsto \boldsymbol{\theta}$ . Then  $\mathbf{F} = \text{colim}_d \tilde{\mathcal{V}}_{\theta_d}$  and is  $G_\infty$ -equivariant. In particular, for each  $d \geq 0$ , there is a morphism of nonunital circuit algebras  $p_d: \mathbf{F} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{V}}_{\theta_d}$  that commutes with the actions by  $G_\infty$  and  $G_d$ .

Let  $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\theta$  be the category of nonunital circuit algebras  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$  for which there exists a  $\mathbb{k}$ -algebra  $R$  and an inclusion of nonunital circuit algebras  $\rho: \tilde{\mathcal{A}} \hookrightarrow R \otimes \mathbf{F}$ .

**Theorem 6.13.** *There is an equivalence of categories  $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\theta \simeq \text{Alg}(G_\infty)$ .*

*Proof.* Given a  $G_\infty$ -algebra  $R$ , we may construct the nonunital circuit algebra  $(R \otimes \mathbf{F})^{G_\infty} \in \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\theta$ . The assignment  $R \mapsto (R \otimes \mathbf{F})^{G_\infty}$  clearly extends to a functor  $\Phi: \text{Alg}(G_\infty) \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\theta$ .

Conversely, let  $R$  be a  $\mathbb{k}$ -algebra and let  $\rho: \tilde{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow R \otimes \mathbf{F}$  be an inclusion of nonunital circuit algebras.

Let  $\tilde{R}$  be the space generated by  $\boldsymbol{\theta}(\rho(a), v)$  for all  $a \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(n)$ ,  $v \in \mathbf{F}(n)$  and all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . This is a  $\mathbb{k}$ -algebra as  $\boldsymbol{\theta}(\rho(a), v)\boldsymbol{\theta}(\rho(b), w) = \boldsymbol{\theta}(\rho(a) \otimes \rho(b), v \otimes w)$ .

To show that  $\tilde{R}$  is a  $G_\infty$ -algebra, observe that, since  $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_{\theta_d}$  admits a unique extension to a circuit algebra (namely  $\mathcal{V}_{\theta_d}$ ) for all  $d$ , there is an increasing sequence of circuit algebras  $(R \otimes \mathcal{V}_{\theta_d})_d$ . Moreover, for all  $d \geq 0$ , there is an injection  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}/\ker_d \rightarrow R \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{V}}_{\theta_d}$  of nonunital circuit algebras, where  $\ker_d \subset \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$  is

the kernel of the nonunital circuit algebra morphism  $\rho_d = p_d \circ \rho: \tilde{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow R \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{V}}_{\theta_d}$ . Since  $\rho$  is an injection,  $\ker_d$  does not depend on  $R$ .

As  $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_{\theta_d}$  admits a unique extension to a circuit algebra (namely  $\mathcal{V}_{\theta_d}$ ), so does  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}/\ker_d$ . Let  $\mathcal{A}_d$  be the circuit algebra so defined. Then there is an inclusion  $\mathcal{A}_d \hookrightarrow R \otimes \mathcal{V}_{\theta_d}$  and hence, by Proposition 6.7, there is a  $G_d$  algebra  $T_d \subset R$  such that  $\mathcal{A}_d \cong (T_d \otimes \mathcal{V}_{\theta_d})^{G_d}$ .

Moreover,  $T_d$  is generated by elements of the form  $\theta(\rho(a), v)$  for all  $a \in \mathcal{A}_d(n), v \in \mathcal{V}_{\theta_d}(n) = \tilde{\mathcal{V}}_{\theta_d}(n)$  and all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and is, up to isomorphism, independent of  $R$ .

It follows, in particular, that  $\tilde{R} = \bigcup_d T_d$  describes a filtration and hence  $\tilde{R}$  is, up to isomorphism, independent of  $R$  and a  $G^\infty$  algebra. The assignment  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} \mapsto \tilde{R}$  clearly extends to a functor  $\Psi: \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\theta \rightarrow \text{Alg}(G_\infty)$  and  $\Phi: \text{Alg}(G_\infty) \rightleftharpoons \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\theta: \Psi$  describes an equivalence of categories by Proposition 6.7 and the constructions of  $\Phi, \Psi$ .  $\square$

By similarly modifying the results of [12] a directed version of Theorem 6.13, relating nonunital wheeled props and  $GL_\infty$  may be obtained.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Markus Banagl. High-Dimensional Topological Field Theory, Positivity, and Exotic Smooth Spheres. Preprint, arXiv:1508.01337 [math.AT] (2015), 2015.
- [2] Markus Banagl. Positive topological quantum field theories. *Quantum Topol.*, 6(4):609–706, 2015.
- [3] Dror Bar-Natan and Zsuzsanna Dancso. Finite type invariants of w-knotted objects II: tangles, foams and the Kashiwara-Vergne problem. *Math. Ann.*, 367(3-4):1517–1586, 2017.
- [4] Clemens Berger, Paul-André Melliès, and Mark Weber. Monads with arities and their associated theories. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 216(8-9):2029–2048, 2012.
- [5] Clemens Berger and Ieke Moerdijk. Resolution of coloured operads and rectification of homotopy algebras. In *Categories in algebra, geometry and mathematical physics*, volume 431 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 31–58. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2007.
- [6] Richard Brauer. On algebras which are connected with the semisimple continuous groups. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 38(4):857–872, 1937.
- [7] Eugenia Cheng. Iterated distributive laws. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 150(3):459–487, 2011.
- [8] Bob Coecke and Aleks Kissinger. *Picturing Quantum Processes: A First Course in Quantum Theory and Diagrammatic Reasoning*. Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- [9] Celeste Damiani and Vincent Florens. Alexander invariants of ribbon tangles and planar algebras. *J. Math. Soc. Japan*, 70(3):1063–1084, 2018.
- [10] Zsuzsanna Dancso, Iva Halacheva, and Marcy Robertson. Circuit algebras are wheeled props. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 225(12):106767, 33, 2021.
- [11] Zsuzsanna Dancso, Iva Halacheva, and Marcy Robertson. A topological characterisation of the Kashiwara-Vergne groups. *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.*, 376(5):3265–3317, 2023.
- [12] Harm Derksen and Visu Makam. Invariant theory and wheeled PROPs. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 227(9):30, 2023. Id/No 107302.
- [13] Gabriel C. Drummond-Cole and Philip Hackney. Dwyer-Kan homotopy theory for cyclic operads. *Proc. Edinb. Math. Soc., II. Ser.*, 64(1):29–58, 2021.
- [14] Selma Dündar-Coecke, Lia Yeh, Caterina Puca, Sieglinde M.-L. Pfaendler, Muhammad Hamza Waseem, Thomas Cervoni, Aleks Kissinger, Stefano Gogioso, and Bob Coecke. Quantum pictorialism: Learning quantum theory in high school. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Quantum Computing and Engineering (QCE)*, volume 03, pages 21–32, 2023.
- [15] Pavel Etingof, Shlomo Gelaki, Dmitri Nikshych, and Victor Ostrik. *Tensor categories*, volume 205 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2015.
- [16] E. Getzler and M. M. Kapranov. Modular operads. *Compositio Math.*, 110(1):65–126, 1998.
- [17] Victor Ginzburg and Mikhail Kapranov. Koszul duality for operads. *Duke Math. J.*, 76(1):203–272, 1994.
- [18] Ángel González-Prieto, Marina Logares, and Vicente Muñoz. A lax monoidal topological quantum field theory for representation varieties. *Bull. Sci. Math.*, 161:33, 2020. Id/No 102871.
- [19] Frederick M. Goodman and Hans Wenzl. Ideals in the Temperley Lieb Category. Preprint, arXiv:math/0206301 [math.QA] (2002), 2002.

- [20] Philip Hackney, Marcy Robertson, and Donald Yau. *Infinity properads and infinity wheeled properads*, volume 2147 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, Cham, 2015.
- [21] Philip Hackney, Marcy Robertson, and Donald Yau. A graphical category for higher modular operads. *Adv. Math.*, 365:107044, 2020.
- [22] Philip Hackney, Marcy Robertson, and Donald Yau. Modular operads and the nerve theorem. *Adv. Math.*, 370:107206, 39, 2020.
- [23] Iva Halacheva. Alexander type invariants of tangles, 2016. arXiv: 1611.09280.
- [24] V. F. R. Jones. The Potts model and the symmetric group. In *Subfactors (Kyuzeso, 1993)*, pages 259–267. World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 1994.
- [25] V. F. R. Jones. Planar algebras I. *Preprint*, 1999. arXiv:math/9909027.
- [26] A. Joyal and J. Kock. Feynman graphs, and nerve theorem for compact symmetric multicategories (extended abstract). *Electronic Note in Theoretical Computer Science*, 270(2):105 – 113, 2011.
- [27] André Joyal and Ross Street. An introduction to Tannaka duality and quantum groups. *Category theory*, Proc. Int. Conf., Como/Italy 1990, Lect. Notes Math. 1488, 413–492 (1991)., 1991.
- [28] André Joyal, Ross Street, and Dominic Verity. Traced monoidal categories. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 119(3):447–468, 1996.
- [29] Louis H. Kauffman. Virtual knot theory. *European J. Combin.*, 20(7):663–690, 1999.
- [30] Ralph M. Kaufmann and Benjamin C. Ward. Schwarz Modular Operads Revisited. Preprint, arXiv:2404.17540 [math.AT] (2024), 2024.
- [31] Joachim Kock. Cospan construction of the graph category of Borisov and Manin. *Publ. Mat.*, 62(2):331–353, 2018.
- [32] Kazuhiko Koike. On the decomposition of tensor products of the representations of the classical groups: by means of the universal characters. *Adv. Math.*, 74(1):57–86, 1989.
- [33] Alexander Kupers and Oscar Randal-Williams. On the Torelli Lie algebra. *Forum Math. Pi*, 11:47, 2023. Id/No e13.
- [34] G. I. Lehrer and R. B. Zhang. The Brauer category and invariant theory. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 17(9):2311–2351, 2015.
- [35] Tom Leinster. *Higher operads, higher categories*, volume 298 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.
- [36] Saunders Mac Lane. Categorical algebra. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 71:40–106, 1965.
- [37] M. Markl, S. Merkulov, and S. Shadrin. Wheeled PROPs, graph complexes and the master equation. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 213(4):496–535, 2009.
- [38] Martin Markl. Distributive laws and Koszulness. *Ann. Inst. Fourier*, 46(2):307–323, 1996.
- [39] Sergei A. Merkulov. Wheeled props in algebra, geometry and quantization. In *European Congress of Mathematics*, pages 83–114. Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2010.
- [40] L. Felipe Müller and Dominik J. Wrazidlo. The chromatic Brauer category and its linear representations. *Appl. Categ. Structures*, 29(2):349–377, 2021.
- [41] Sophie Raynor. Modular operads, distributive laws and a nerve theorem for circuit algebras. Preprint, 2024.
- [42] Sophie Raynor. Graphical combinatorics and a distributive law for modular operads. *Adv. Math.*, 392:Paper No. 108011, 87, 2021.
- [43] Andrew Reynolds. *Representations of the oriented Brauer category*. PhD thesis, University of Oregon, 2015.
- [44] Hebing Rui and Linliang Song. Representations of Brauer category and categorification. *J. Algebra*, 557:1–36, 2020.
- [45] Steven V. Sam. Structures in representation stability. *Notices Amer. Math. Soc.*, 67(1):38–43, 2020.
- [46] Steven V. Sam and Andrew Snowden. Stability patterns in representation theory. *Forum Math. Sigma*, 3:Paper No. e11, 108, 2015.
- [47] Steven V. Sam and Andrew Snowden. The representation theory of Brauer categories. I: triangular categories. *Appl. Categ. Struct.*, 30(6):1203–1256, 2022.
- [48] Amit Sharma. Compact closed categories and  $\Gamma$ -categories. *Theory Appl. Categ.*, 37:1222–1261, 2021.
- [49] David I. Spivak. The operad of wiring diagrams: formalizing a graphical language for databases, recursion, and plug-and-play circuits. Preprint, arXiv:1305.0297 [cs.DB] (2013), 2013.
- [50] Kurt Stoeckl. Koszul operads governing props and wheeled props. *Adv. Math.*, 454:80, 2024. Id/No 109869.
- [51] Robin Stoll. Modular operads as modules over the Brauer properad. *Theor. Appl. Categor.*, 38:1538–1607, 2022.
- [52] Daniel Tubbenhauer. Virtual Khovanov homology using cobordisms. *J. Knot Theory Ramifications*, 23(9):1450046, 91, 2014.
- [53] V. G. Turaev. The category of oriented tangles and its representations. *Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen*, 23(3):93–94, 1989.
- [54] V. G. Turaev. Operator invariants of tangles, and R-matrices. *Math. USSR, Izv.*, 35(2):411–444, 1990.
- [55] Bruno Vallette. A Koszul duality for PROPs. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 359(10):4865–4943, 2007.

- [56] Mark Weber. Familial 2-functors and parametric right adjoints. *Theory Appl. Categ.*, 18:No. 22, 665–732, 2007.
- [57] Hans Wenzl. On the structure of Brauer’s centralizer algebras. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 128(1):173–193, 1988.
- [58] Hermann Weyl. *The classical groups, their invariants and representations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, reprint of the second edition (1946) of the 1939 original edition, 1997.
- [59] Donald Yau and Mark W. Johnson. *A foundation for PROPs, algebras, and modules*, volume 203 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2015.