

# Combinatorial quantization of 4d 2-Chern-Simons theory I: the Hopf category of higher-graph states

Hank Chen<sup>\*1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Beijing Institute of Mathematical Sciences and Applications, Beijing 101408 , China

January 14, 2025

## Abstract

2-Chern-Simons theory, or more commonly known as 4d BF-BB theory with gauged shift symmetry, is a natural generalization of Chern-Simons theory to 4-dimensional manifolds. It is part of the bestiary of higher-homotopy Maurer-Cartan theories. In this article, we present a framework towards the combinatorial quantization of 2-Chern-Simons theory on the lattice, taking inspiration from the work of Aleskeev-Grosse-Schomerus three decades ago. The central geometric input is the 2-truncation  $\Gamma^2$  of the  $\infty$ -groupoid of simplices formed by the underlying lattice  $\Gamma$ . On such a "2-graph", we model states of 2-Chern-Simons holonomies as Crane-Yetter's *measureable fields*. We show that the 2-Chern-Simons action endows the 2-graph states — as well as their quantum 2-gauge symmetries — the structure of a Hopf category, and that their associated higher  $R$ -matriex gives it a comonoidal *cobraiding* structure. This is an explicit realization of the categorical ladder proposal of Baez-Dolan, in the context of Lie group lattice 2-gauge theories. Moreover, we will also analyze the lattice 2-algebra on the graph  $\Gamma$ , and extract the observables of discrete 2-Chern-Simons theory from it.

---

<sup>\*</sup>hank.chen@uwaterloo.ca

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1	Motivation . . . . .	3
1.2	Overview and results . . . . .	5
<b>2</b>	<b>Graph states précis</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1	Coproduct and the antipode . . . . .	7
2.2	Quantum deformation on the lattice . . . . .	7
2.3	A coherent formulation of graph states . . . . .	8
<b>3</b>	<b>2-Chern-Simons theory on the lattice</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1	Discrete 2-gauge theory . . . . .	9
3.2	Configuration space of lattice 2-Chern-Simons theory . . . . .	11
3.2.1	Square-integrable functors: measurable fields . . . . .	12
3.2.2	Haar measures on locally compact Lie 2-groups . . . . .	12
3.2.3	2-group functions as measurable fields . . . . .	13
3.2.4	A categorial 2-group delta function . . . . .	15
3.3	Hopf 2-algebras and the categorified coordinate ring on $\mathbb{G}$ . . . . .	16
3.4	2-graph states as measurable fields . . . . .	17
3.5	Analytic definition of invariant 2-graph states . . . . .	18
<b>4</b>	<b>The Hopf category of 2-graph states</b>	<b>19</b>
4.1	Geometry of 2-graphs . . . . .	19
4.1.1	2-group Fock-Rosly Poisson brackets on $\mathcal{A}^0$ . . . . .	21
4.1.2	Categorical quantum deformations and the $R$ -matrices . . . . .	22
4.2	Hopf structures of 2-graph states . . . . .	24
4.2.1	As a cobraided Hopf opalgebroid . . . . .	24
4.2.2	As a Hopf 2-algebra with a quantum 2- $R$ -matrix . . . . .	27
4.3	The semiclassical limit . . . . .	30
<b>5</b>	<b>Categorical quantum 2-gauge transformations</b>	<b>31</b>
5.1	Coproducts on the 2-gauge transformations . . . . .	31
5.2	Geometry of the coproduct $\tilde{\Delta}$ . . . . .	33
5.2.1	Graph-splitting and 2-gauge transformations . . . . .	33
5.2.2	The $R$ -matrices on $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ . . . . .	35
5.3	Hopf structure on the quantum 2-gauge transformations . . . . .	36
5.3.1	Antipode on the 2-gauge transformations . . . . .	36
5.3.2	2-gauge transformations as a Hopf algebroid . . . . .	37
<b>6</b>	<b>Lattice 2-algebra of 2-Chern-Simons theory</b>	<b>38</b>
6.1	Regularity of the 2-graph states . . . . .	39
6.1.1	Categorical definition of the lattice 2-algebra . . . . .	41
6.1.2	Algebraic definition of invariant 2-graph states . . . . .	42
6.2	*-operation in the lattice 2-algebra $\mathcal{B}^\Gamma$ . . . . .	44
6.2.1	Orientation reversals on 2-graphs . . . . .	44
6.2.2	Extending the *-operation to the lattice 2-algebra . . . . .	45
<b>7</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>47</b>

# 1 Introduction

Over the past century, it was discovered that there is a very interesting interplay between low-dimensional geometry topology and physics. In particular, the work of Witten [1] revealed that the Wilson line observables in the 3-dimensional Chern-Simons theory (as well as its boundary integrable field theory [2]) computed 3-manifold invariants associated to knot complements. On the other hand, the geometry of framed knots and ribbons up to isotopy — also known as *skein theory* — are well-known [3, 4] to admit a description in terms of the so-called *ribbon categories*. These are purely algebraic data, defined by monoidal categories equipped with additional rigidity and braiding structures. The computation of polynomial knot invariants from such purely algebraic input has also been formalized [5, 6].

The stage set by this "low-dimensional triangle", between 3d topological quantum field theories (TQFTs)/2d integrable systems, knot invariants and categorical homotopy algebra, has a central player: the theory of *quantum group Hopf algebras* [7–9] and the (unitary) modular ribbon category of its representations. The seminal works of Reshetikhin-Turaev [10, 11] in particular explained in great detail how the structure of quantum group Hopf algebras — particularly those of the Drinfel'd-Jimbo type coming from quantum deformations [12, 13], such as  $U_q\mathfrak{sl}_2$  arising out of the  $SU(2)_k$  Chern-Simons theory — gave rise to invariants of framed knots and tangles. This formulation came to be known as the "Reshetikhin-Turaev functor"; the idea that, conversely, *all* 3-2-1 functorial TQFTs for a given target [14, 15] are determined by such ribbon functors is known as the *(1-)tangle hypothesis* [16]. These ideas have also been applied very successfully to quantize (2+1)-dimensional gravity with cosmological constant [17–21], which are known classically to be equivalent to a certain type of Chern-Simons theory [22–25].

Direct computations of the 3-manifold quantum invariants involved in the above story, on the other hand, is a notoriously difficult problem itself. A way to make this problem less challenging came in the form of *combinatorial state sum models* by taking a piecewise linear (PL) approximation of the underlying manifold<sup>1</sup>. This procedure computes the TQFT partition function by breaking it into *local* pieces of "admissible" algebraic/categorical data [26], which are invariant under the so-called combinatorial Pachner moves [27, 28]. This idea has been very successfully applied to not only compute the quantum scattering amplitudes in 3d Regge gravity [29–31], but also to characterize topological phases in condensed matter theory [32–35].

It is known that, in the case of the Turaev-Viro TQFT<sup>2</sup> with the quantum group  $U_q\mathfrak{g}$  and its representation category as algebraic input, these combinatorial local pieces in the corresponding Barrett-Westbury state sum model [36] are given by the *quantum 6j-symbols* [37]. The relationship of these 6j-symbols to the 3d chain mail invariants in skein theory has also been studied in [38]. On the other hand, these 6j-symbols can also be obtained as scattering amplitudes in a *discrete* version of Chern-Simons theory — that is, we have a way to compute the combinatorial 3-simplex amplitudes directly *without* prior knowledge of skein theory and surgery theory. This is thanks to the foundational works of Alekseev-Grosse-Schomerus [39, 40], where the full combinatorial Hamiltonian quantization of discrete Chern-Simons holonomies was pinned down. These works serve as the inspiration of this paper.

## 1.1 Motivation

The success of the above relationship between physics, categorical algebra and topology begs the question of how these correspondences would look like in higher dimensions. Based on the categorical ladder proposal of Baez-Dolan [41], as well as the cobordism hypothesis proven in [15], it is expected that higher dimensional physics and geometry is described by a certain "higher-dimensional algebra". Each of the corners of the above triangle has seen such a "categorification" in recent years,

1. categories  $\rightarrow$  weak  $n$ -categories [42–45],
2. knot polynomials  $\rightarrow$  knot homology [46–49],
3. 3d Chern-Simons theory  $\rightarrow$  **4d 2-Chern-Simons theory** [50–52],

---

<sup>1</sup>This is due to a classic theorems of Whitehead, which states that smooth manifolds have a unique PL structure given by its triangulation.

<sup>2</sup>This is related to the Reshetikhin-Turaev TQFT through the Drinfel'd centre of its input category:  $Z_{RT}^C = Z_{TV}^{Z_1^C}$ .

and it has been postulated that a "categorical quantum group" — with the structure of a Hopf monoidal category [16, 53–58] — governs their correspondences. However, how these ideas are related have not yet been made clear: the key issue seems to be that each of these corners have their own different notions of "higher-dimensional algebra": respectively, they are (1) the 2-vector spaces of Kaparnov-Voevodsky [59], (2) the Soergel bimodules [60], and finally (3) the 2-vector spaces of Baez-Crans [61].

Though, it is known from homotopy theory that any algebraic description of framed 2-tangles must have some "higher categorical" flavour [62, 63]. Indeed, the discovery of the crossed-complex model for a higher categorical version of groups, called *2-groups/categorical groups*, dates back to the 40's by Whitehead [64], in the context of homotopy 2-types [65, 66].

**Definition 1.1.** A **(Lie) 2-group**  $\mathbb{G} = (G, H, t, \triangleright)$  is a (Lie) group crossed-module [61, 67, 68], consisting of a pair of (Lie) groups  $H, G$ , a (Lie) group homomorphism  $t : H \rightarrow G$  and a (smooth) action  $\triangleright : G \rightarrow \text{Aut } H$  satisfying the following algebraic conditions

$$t(x \triangleright y) = xt(y)x^{-1}, \quad t(y) \triangleright y' = yy'y^{-1}, \quad \forall x \in G, y \in H.$$

Several equivalent formulations of Lie 2-groups can be given; more will be explained in *Remark 3.1*.

Applications of 2-groups, both Lie and finite, to physics have also been recently studied extensively [52, 69–76].

Based on this current state of affairs, it is then natural to study the geometry of principal Lie 2-group  $\mathbb{G}$ -bundles (with connection) [77–80]. Over a 4-dimensional manifold  $X$ , the topological field theory arising from such a categorical gauge principle is known as the **4d 2-Chern-Simons theory**,

$$S_{2CS}[A, B] = 2\pi k \int_X \langle B, F(A) - \frac{1}{2}tB \rangle,$$

whose fundamental fields are given by a polyform of degree-1,  $A \in \Omega^1(X) \otimes \mathfrak{g}$ ,  $B \in \Omega^2(X) \otimes \mathfrak{h}$ , valued in the Lie 2-algebra  $\text{Lie } \mathbb{G} = \mathfrak{G} = \mathfrak{h} \xrightarrow{t} \mathfrak{g}$  corresponding to the underlying (complex, connected, simply-connected) Lie 2-group  $\mathbb{G} = H \xrightarrow{t} G$ . Here,  $\langle -, - \rangle : \mathfrak{G}^{\otimes 2} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[1]$  is a degree-1 non-degenerate pairing form. See [50–52, 81–84] for more details. The 4d 2-Chern-Simons theory is part of the bestiary of higher-dimensional *homotopy Marer-Cartan theories* [85–87], which are *higher derived* generalizations of Chern-Simons theory. Such 4d higher-gauge theories (which may *not* be topological) have also appeared in various guises throughout theoretical physics [88–94].

The current series of papers is dedicated towards answering the following:

*How much does the 4d (lattice) 2-Chern-Simons theory know about the geometry of 2-tangles and the (piecewise linear) topology of 4-manifolds?*

The motivation for starting the quantization of  $S_{2CS}$  from the combinatorial perspective of the *discrete* holonomies is that it preps us for an explicit computation of its 4-simplex scattering amplitudes and invariants on a lattice, without having first knowing how to do handlebody surgery theory on 4-manifolds. This would provide an explicit state sum model for a 4d topological 2-gauge theory, which can be understood as a Lie 2-group generalization of the Yetter-Dijkgraaf-Witten TQFT encompassed by the seminal work of [95].

While the idea of using higher-dimensional gauge groups [96] and homotopy 2-types [97] to produce 4d TQFTs is not new (it dates back to the 90's [98]), many of the explicit examples constructed in the literature so far had only used *finite* 2-groups (see eg. [74, 91, 99–102]), so the resulting TQFTs are always of Yetter-Dijkgraaf-Witten type. These are known to be too simple to produce any exotic 4d invariants [103].

**A conjecture on the 4d Crane-Yetter TQFT.** An additional motivation for this work is the following. It was conjectured in [41] that 4d BF-BB theory with Lie group  $G = SU(2)$ , which is a special case of 2-Chern-Simons theory on the *inner automorphism 2-group*  $\text{Inn } G = G \xrightarrow{\text{id}} G$  (see eg. [104]), quantizes to a(n oriented) theory which is equivalent to the Crane-Yetter-Broda TQFT [105]. The latter is based on the input pre-modular 2-category  $\text{Mod}(\text{Rep } U_q \mathfrak{sl}_2)$ ; see also §3.4.1 in [95]. A detailed study of the higher-representation theory associated to the 2-Chern-Simons theory can therefore shed light on

Baez's conjecture. Further, since it is known that the 4d Crane-Yetter-Broda TQFT admits a state sum construction in terms of the so-called "15j-symbols" [106], a direct verification of Baez's conjecture can also be obtained by computing the lattice scattering amplitudes in 4d BF-BB theory.

**Conjecture 1.1.** (Baez [41]).

- **Algebraic version:** *There is a (ribbon/pre-modular) equivalence of 2-categories*

$$\text{Mod}(\text{Rep } U_q \mathfrak{sl}_2) \simeq 2\text{Rep}(U_q \text{inn}(\mathfrak{sl}_2)),$$

where  $U_q \text{inn}(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$  is the Hopf category corresponding to the quantization of  $\text{Inn } SU(2)$ .

- **Piecewise-linear version:** *Given a closed 4-simplex  $T^4$ , the lattice 2-Chern-Simons scattering amplitudes on  $T^4$  coincides with the 15j symbols.*

We will give in §5.3 a definition of the "categorical quantum enveloping algebra  $U_q \mathfrak{G}$ " associated to a Lie 2-group  $\mathfrak{G}$  in the context of the current framework.

## 1.2 Overview and results

In §2, we will give a brief review of the quantization of Chern-Simons on the lattice by adapting the formalism of [39] to the language groupoids and functors. This "coherent" setting serves as the template for the framework that we shall develop in §3, in which the *discrete* degrees-of-freedom of  $S_{2CS}$ , living on a triangulation of a codimension-1 Cauchy slice  $\Sigma$  of  $X$ , is described.

Then in §4, based on the semiclassical Lie 2-bialgebra [61, 107]/Poisson-Lie 2-group [67, 108] symmetries of  $S_{2CS}$  [52], we deduce the deformation quantization of the underlying structure Lie 2-group  $\mathfrak{G}$  and develop the configuration space of discrete 2-Chern-Simons theory — as well as its categorical quantum gauge symmetries — by taking inspiration from [39].

Since we are dealing with *infinite* Lie 2-groups, these Hopf categories are in some sense infinite-dimensional. As such, the usual theory of finite-dimensional 2-Hilbert spaces  $2\text{Hilb}$  [109] is not enough. Here, we will develop our framework using an infinite-dimensional version of  $2\text{Hilb}$ , given by the *measurable categories*  $\text{Meas}$  of Crane-Yetter [30, 110, 111]. This work is therefore a marriage of both higher-categorical algebra and functional analysis. In the companion paper [112], the author shows that the 2-category  $2\text{Rep}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}; \tilde{\mathcal{R}})$  of linear finite semisimple  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ -module categories inherits a *rigid tensor* structure from this  $*$ -operation.

In §6.1.1, we construct the **lattice 2-algebra**  $\mathcal{B}^\Gamma$  as a categorical semidirect product [113]. I allowed us to extract the 2-holonomy observables on the lattice. The geometry and orientation of the 2-graph  $\Gamma^2$  [114, 115] is then shown to induce a certain  $*$ -operation on the lattice 2-algebra  $\mathcal{B}^\Gamma$ .

## Results

We will prove that the fundamental degree-of-freedom in the quantum lattice 2-gauge theory has equipped a certain Hopf categorical structure, described most naturally in the framework of *Hopf (op)algebroids* of Day-Street [116].

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $\Gamma^2$  denote the 2-groupoid of 2-graphs associated to a lattice  $\Gamma \subset \Sigma$  embedded in a 3-dimensional Cauchy slice  $\Sigma$  of  $X$ .*

1. *The 2-graph states  $\mathcal{C}$  on  $\Gamma$  has the structure of a Hopf opalgebroid equipped with a cobrading  $R$ .*
2. *Under natural compatibility conditions, the quantum 2-gauge transformations  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$  on  $\mathcal{C}$  has the structure of a Hopf algebroid equipped with a cobrading  $\tilde{R}$ .*

In essence, a "Hopf opalgebroid" is a cocategorical version of Hopf categories, and a "cobrading" is a comonoidal natural transformation  $\Delta \Rightarrow \sigma\Delta$  between the coproduct functor and its opposite.

Based on the above results, we are able to introduce the following notions in §4.2 and §5.2, respectively,

- **Categorical quantum coordinate ring**  $\mathfrak{C}_q(\mathfrak{G})$ ,
- **Categorical quantum enveloping algebra**  $U_q \mathfrak{G}$ .

By extracting their Hopf categorical structures explicitly, we are then able to prove the following quantization result for the 2-Chern-Simons theory on the lattice.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Assuming "hypothesis (H)", the categorical quantum coordinate ring  $\mathfrak{C}_q(\mathbb{G})$  admits a Lie 2-bialgebra  $(\mathfrak{G}; \delta)$  as a semiclassical limit.*

This result will be stated rigorously and proved in §4.3. This theorem leverages results proven previously by the author (Appendix B of [56]).

This "hypothesis (H)" is a purely mathematical assumption about the relationship between the fundamental structures of Baez-Crans 2-vector spaces  $2\text{Vect}^{BC}$  and the Kapranov-Voevodsky 2-vector spaces  $2\text{Vect}^{KV}$  [41, 59, 74]. Specifically, it posits the existence of an association

$$\lambda : \text{Cat}_{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow 2\text{Vect}^{BC}$$

which in a sense "linearizes" the composition of morphisms in linear categories. The author is currently investigating  $\lambda$  in more detail with collaborators. Understanding this hypothesis more deeply would shed light on the relationship between two of the aforementioned approaches (1), (3) to higher-dimensional quantum topology.

*Remark 1.1.* We emphasize that this "hypothesis (H)" is strictly speaking not needed if we do not work in the categorified framework, but we shall explain why it is useful (and in fact *necessary*, in the weakly-associative context) in §3.5. Furthermore, it is what allows us to recover structures consistent with the categorical ladder proposal displayed in figure 1.

## Acknowledgement

The author would like to thank the Beijing Institute of Mathematical Sciences and Applications (BIMSA) for hospitality. The author would also like to thank Yilong Wang, Jinsong Wu, Hao Zheng, and Florian Girelli for enlightening discussions throughout the completion of this work.

## 2 Graph states précis

Let us first briefly recall the discrete quantization of Chern-Simons theory. Let  $X$  be a framed smooth 3-manifold and let  $G$  be a compact Lie group, assumed to be simple. The Chern-Simons partition function is of course written as

$$Z(X) = \int D[A] e^{i2\pi k S_{CS}[A]} = \int D[A] e^{i2\pi k \int_X \langle A, dA + \frac{1}{3}[A, A] \rangle},$$

where  $A$  is a  $G$ -connection on  $X$  and  $\langle -, - \rangle$  is the Killing form on  $\mathfrak{g} = \text{Lie } G$ . One way to make sense of this partition function is to perform a discretization procedure: we triangulate  $X$  and truncate/localize the connection data onto the oriented edges of the dual cells, by defining the holonomy degrees-of-freedom

$$h_e = P \exp \int_e A, \quad e \in T_X^1.$$

Taking an arbitrary 2d Cauchy surface  $\Sigma \subset X$  equipped with an induced triangulation  $T_\Sigma$ , we consider the graph  $\Gamma$  Poincaré dual to the triangulation  $T_\Sigma$ . An admissible  $G$ -decorated graph  $G^\Gamma$  is then defined by a functor  $\Gamma^1 \rightarrow G$  such that  $g_0 g_1 = g_2$  on closed 2-simplices (012) (ie. satisfying the flatness condition).

We shall in the following consider  $\Gamma$  to be planar and non-self-intersecting. Following the philosophy of [117], the physical Hilbert space on  $\Gamma$  is given by the linear span of  $\mathbb{C}$ -valued functions  $\psi : G^{\Gamma^1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  equipped with a certain well-defined (ie. convergent) inner product,

$$\mathcal{H} = L^2(G^{\Gamma^1}) / \sim,$$

modulo gauge transformations  $g_{(01)} \mapsto a_1 g_{(01)} a_0^{-1}$ , where  $a : \Gamma^0 \rightarrow G$  are  $G$ -valued gauge parameters localized on the vertices of  $\Gamma$ , denoted by  $G^{\Gamma^0}$ . Treating  $L^2(G^{\Gamma^1})$  as a left-regular representation of  $G^V$  such that

$$a \triangleright \psi(\{h_e\}_e) = \psi(\{a_{s(e)} h_e a_{t(e)}^{-1}\}), \quad s, t : \Gamma^1 \rightarrow \Gamma^0,$$

this gauge invariance condition can be enforced by a gauge-averaging procedure:

$$\Psi = \int_G \left[ \prod_{\Gamma^0} da \right] a \triangleright \psi.$$

## 2.1 Coproduct and the antipode

We begin with the classical treatment. Given a fixed graph  $\Gamma \subset \Sigma$ , there is a group product on the decorated graphs

$$(\{h_e\}_e, \{h'_e\}_e) \mapsto \{h_e h'_e = (hh')_e\}_e$$

which fuses the decorations on each edge  $e \in \Gamma^1$ . Pulling back yields a coproduct on  $C(G^\Gamma)$  — however, we wish to make this coproduct sensitive to the composition of the holonomies, as well as the geometry of  $\Gamma^1$ .

We do this through the following construction. Let  $c$  denote a 1-cell dual to the triangulation  $\Gamma$ , and suppose  $c$  transversally intersects an edge  $e \in \Gamma^1$ . Splitting  $e$  along  $c$  gives rise to a coproduct which reads

$$(\Delta\psi_e) = \delta_{t(e_1), s(e_2)} \psi_{e_1} \otimes \psi_{e_2}, \quad e = e_1 \cup e_2,$$

where  $s(e), t(e)$  denote the source and target vertices of the edge  $e$  and  $\psi_e$  denotes the *local graph state*  $\psi_e(\{h_{e'}\}_{e'}) = h_e$ , which outputs the (matrix elements of the) holonomy at  $e$ .

A counit for this coproduct can be seen to be clearly given by the trivial decorated graph  $\epsilon(\psi) = \psi(\{1_e\}_e)$ . This geometric interpretation for  $\Delta$  also endows  $C(G^\Gamma)$  with an antipode  $S : C(G^\Gamma) \rightarrow C(G^\Gamma)$ , given in the classical case by

$$(S\psi)(\{h_e\}_e) = \psi(\{h_e^{-1}\}_e) = \psi(\{h_{\bar{e}}\}_e),$$

which can be interpreted as an orientation reversal operation, such that the usual coalgebra axioms

$$(S \otimes 1) \circ \Delta = \epsilon = (1 \otimes S) \circ \Delta$$

are satisfied. This gives the function algebra  $C(G^\Gamma)$  the structure of a Hopf algebra.

We will then introduce a quantum deformation of the above structures from the data of the Chern-Simons action. As is well-known, these data consist of a Lie algebra cocycle  $\psi$  and the associated classical  $r$ -matrix  $r \in \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathfrak{g}$  on the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g} = \text{Lie } G$  [1, 25, 118].<sup>3</sup> The skew-symmetric part of  $r$  equips  $G$  with a Poisson bracket [118, 119], which specifies a quantum deformation of the product on  $C(G)$  along  $q \sim e^{\hbar}$  where  $\hbar \sim \frac{2\pi}{k}$ . This gives  $C_q(G)$  a Hopf algebra structure, called the *quantum coordinate ring* [8, 9, 120].

Here, however, we wish to introduce this quantum deformation to the configuration space  $C(G^\Gamma)$ , hence we need to extend the semiclassical Poisson bracket onto the graph  $\Gamma$  [39]. We will formalize this directly from the geometry and intersections of edges in  $\Sigma$ .

## 2.2 Quantum deformation on the lattice

Written as above, the coproduct is the cocommutative one in  $C(G)$  up to the orientation of the glued edges  $e, e'$ . By combining this coproduct with the Poisson bracket extracted from the Chern-Simons action, we arrive at the *combinatorial Poisson bracket* on  $C_q(G^\Gamma)$ .

Explicitly on local graph states  $\psi_e$ , this Poisson bracket takes the same form as that given in [39],

$$\{\psi_e, \psi_{e'}\}_{\text{dis}} = \frac{2\pi}{k} (\delta_{t(e), s(e')} r \psi_e \otimes \psi_{e'} - \delta_{s(e), t(e')} \psi_e \otimes \psi_{e'} r^T) \equiv \mu([r, \Delta\psi_{e \cup e'}]_c), \quad (2.1)$$

where  $e \cup e'$  is an edge which can be split by a 1-cell  $c$  to obtain the two edges  $e, e'$ . Here,  $\mu$  is the product on  $C(G^\Gamma)$  and  $[-, -]_c$  is the commutator.

The full quantum  $R$ -matrix  $R \in C_q(G^\Gamma) \hat{\otimes} C_q(G^\Gamma)$  then gives rise to the  $q$ -deformed product  $\star$ , which can be written as

$$\psi_e \star \psi_{e'} = \mu([R, \Delta\psi_{e \cup e'}]_c). \quad (2.2)$$

<sup>3</sup>The skew-symmetric part of  $r$  arises from the  $A^3$  interaction term, and the symmetric part arises from the canonical symplectic form  $\omega(A, A) = \int_\Sigma \langle \delta A, \delta \partial_t A \rangle$  on the moduli space of flat  $G$ -connections.

In the context of compact quantum groups, these expressions (2.1), (2.2) for the Poisson bracket and the quantum product has also appeared previously in the literature [8, 9, 25, 118].

The coproduct compatible with  $\star$ , which we shall also denote by  $\Delta$ , then satisfies the following intertwining relation [120]

$$R\Delta\psi = (\sigma \circ \Delta)\psi R, \quad \psi \in C_q(G),$$

where  $\sigma : C_q(G^\Gamma) \otimes C_q(G^\Gamma) \rightarrow C_q(G^\Gamma) \otimes C_q(G^\Gamma)$  is a swap of tensor factors. For a quantum double (cf. [117]), this leads to the definition of Kitaev ribbon operators, in which the graph  $\Gamma$  is "thickened" in order to keep track of the actions of  $R, R^T$ .

*Remark 2.1.* If one takes a colimit over refinements of the triangulation of  $X$  (and hence of  $\Sigma$ ), then the discrete holonomies  $G^\Gamma$  modulo gauge transformations  $G^{\Gamma^0}$  "approaches" the character variety  $\text{Ch}(G) = \text{Hom}(\pi_1\Sigma, G)/G$ , and the Poisson bracket  $\{-, -\}_{\text{dis}}$  approaches the canonical Fock-Rosly one [121] on  $\text{Ch}(G)$  arising from Chern-Simons theory. This can be made more precise, but we are not concerned with this issue at the time.

This quantum deformed  $C^*$ -algebra  $(C_q(G^\Gamma), *, \Delta)$ , together with its gauge transformations  $G^{\Gamma^0}$  is the main player in [39]; with both taken together, it is called the "lattice algebra  $\mathcal{B}^\Gamma$  of Chern-Simons theory". Hence their categorical analogues will be the star of this paper. The algebra of discrete Wilson line observables extracted out of  $\mathcal{B}^\Gamma$  is the main ingredient in the computation of 3-simplex scattering amplitudes in lattice Chern-Simons theory [40]; this will play a more prominent role in the next paper.

### 2.3 A coherent formulation of graph states

In order to lift the above formulation to 2-groups and the categorical setting, we require a "coherent" version of the story. Toward this, we will treat the graph complex  $\Gamma = \Gamma^1 \rightrightarrows \Gamma^0$  as a groupoid, equipped with structure maps  $s, t : (01) \mapsto \{0, 1\}$  sending a 1-skeleton to its endpoints. A decorated graph  $G^\Gamma$  is then equivalent to a functor  $F : \Gamma \rightarrow BG$  between groupoids, where  $BG = G \rightrightarrows *$  is the pointed Lie groupoid with 1-morphisms labelled by  $G$ .

Indeed, a functor  $F$  specifies an assignment of the trivial point  $*$  to a point  $0 \in \Gamma^0$ , and a group element  $h_e \in G$  to an edge  $e \in \Gamma^1$ . By thinking of the graph complex  $\Gamma$  as the 1-truncation of the  $\infty$ -groupoid of simplices on  $\Sigma$ , we then see that all 2-simplices are assigned the identity. This enforces the flatness condition  $h_{(01)}h_{(12)} = h_{(02)}$  for any ordered 2-simplex (012).

Thence, a natural transformation  $\eta : F \Rightarrow F'$  assigns 0-simplices to a group element  $\eta_0 = a_0 \in G$ , such that the naturality condition implies

$$h'_{(01)} = F'(01) = a_0^{-1}F(01)a_1 = a_0^{-1}h_{(01)}a_1,$$

which is precisely a gauge transformation. In other words, the functor category  $\text{Fun}_{\text{Grpd}}(\Gamma, BG)$  has objects decorated graphs  $G^\Gamma$  and 1-morphisms the gauge transformations. This functor category itself forms a groupoid, since all gauge transformations are invertible. We shall without loss of generality denote by this functor category  $\text{Fun}_{\text{Grpd}}(\Gamma, BG)$  by  $G^\Gamma$ .

Graph states are therefore given by another functorial construction,  $G^\Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ , where we consider  $\mathbb{C}$  as a trivial linear category with only identity endomorphisms and no nonzero non-endomorphisms (sometimes called a "discrete category"). The functor category  $\text{Fun}(G^\Gamma, \mathbb{C})$  is 0-truncated; we think of the collection  $\mathcal{A}$  of the objects in  $\text{Fun}(G^\Gamma, \mathbb{C})$  as the  $q$ -deformed  $C^*$ -algebra  $C_q(G^\Gamma)$  described above, and its morphisms as the quantum gauge transformations. In this way, we see that  $\mathcal{A} = C_q(G^\Gamma)$  admits an action by the group

$$G^{\Gamma^0} = \prod_{F, F'} \text{Hom}_{G^\Gamma}(F, F')$$

formed by the hom-spaces of  $G^\Gamma$  via pre-composition, and invariant states/observables can therefore be defined as the *equivariantization*  $\text{Fun}(G^\Gamma, \mathbb{C})^{G^{\Gamma^0}}$  — namely taking homotopy fixed points then truncating. The induced essential surjection  $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{\Gamma^0}$  is given precisely by the Haar integration/group averaging over  $G^{\Gamma^0}$ .



### 3 2-Chern-Simons theory on the lattice

Let  $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{H} \xrightarrow{t} G$  denote a strict Lie 2-group. We will assume the associated Lie 2-algebra  $\mathfrak{G} = \text{Lie } \mathbb{G} = \mathfrak{h} \xrightarrow{t} \mathfrak{g}$  is *balanced* (terminology from [50]): namely it has equipped a non-degenerate invariant pairing  $\langle -, - \rangle : \mathfrak{G}^{\otimes 2} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[1]$  of *degree-1*. In other words,  $\langle -, - \rangle$  is only supported on  $\mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{h} \otimes \mathfrak{g}$ .

*Remark 3.1.* Here, by "strict" we mean that the associator and unitor morphisms (as one typically see in monoidal categories [122]) are trivial. Several equivalent [54, 96, 123–125] descriptions of Lie 2-groups that we shall make use of here are (i) a category internal to the category of Lie groups  $\text{LieGrp}$ , (ii) a Lie group crossed-module  $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{H} \xrightarrow{t} G$ , and (iii) a 2-group object in the category of Lie groupoids  $\text{LieGrpd}$ . These all have "strictness" built-in, and make it clear that Lie 2-groups  $\mathbb{G}$  come with a smooth topology. In order to describe a weak variant of Lie 2-groups, on the other hand, one considers 2-group objects in the bicategory of bibundles  $\text{Bibun}$ , instead of  $\text{LieGrpd}$ : this is a **smooth 2-group** [80], in which the associator and unitor morphisms can be weakened in the smooth setting.

Given a 4-manifold  $M^4$ , the partition function is given formally by

$$Z(M^4) = \int d[A, B] e^{i2\pi k \text{CS}(A, B)} = \int d[A, B] e^{i2\pi k \int_{M^4} \langle B, F(A) - \frac{1}{2}tB \rangle},$$

where  $(A, B) \in \Omega^1 \otimes \mathfrak{g} \oplus \Omega^2 \otimes \mathfrak{h}$  is a  $\mathbb{G}$ -connection on  $M^4$ . The classical equations of motion are given by fake- and 2-flatness

$$F(A) - tB = 0, \quad d_A B = 0,$$

and the gauge symmetries are parameterized by a polyform  $(h, \Gamma) \in C^\infty \otimes G \oplus \Omega^1 \otimes \mathfrak{h}$  such that

$$A \mapsto A^{(h, \Gamma)} = \text{Ad}_g^{-1} A + g^{-1} dg + t\Gamma, \quad B \mapsto B^{(h, \Gamma)} = g^{-1} \triangleright B + d_A g \Gamma - \frac{1}{2}[\Gamma, \Gamma].$$

This in particular reproduces the 4d BF theory when  $t = 0$  and the 4d BF-BB theory when  $t = 1$ . In the latter case, the shift symmetry  $A \mapsto A + t\Gamma$  has been *gauged* by this derived formalism.

In the following, we will demonstrate the *raison d'être* behind the coherent formulation in §2.3: one can put a "2-" in front of every appropriate noun, and obtain a description of 2-Chern-Simons theory.

#### 3.1 Discrete 2-gauge theory

Now the story of trying to discretize this theory tentatively goes in the same way as in the ordinary Chern-Simons case: given a triangulation of the 3d Cauchy surface  $\Sigma$  of  $M^4$ , we decorate the dual graph  $\Gamma$  with the data of  $\mathbb{G}$  admissibly, define functions on them, and then mod out (2-)gauge transformations. We shall once again assume our graphs (which now contains  $k$ -skeleta for  $k \leq 2$ ) are non-self-intersecting.

To make this precise, the coherent formulation of graph states becomes very useful:

**Definition 3.1.** An (admissible) **decorated 2-graph** is a 2-functor  $F : \Gamma \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}$  between the 2-groupoid of  $\leq 2$ -simplices  $\Gamma$  on  $\Sigma$  to  $B\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{G} \rightrightarrows *$ . For any oriented 2-simplex (012), this is the data of

$$F(i) = *, \quad F(ij) = h_{(ij)} \in G, \quad F_{(012)} = b_{(012)} \in \mathbb{H}$$

where  $0 \leq i < j < k \leq 2$ , such that for each closed polygon  $f = (e_*, e_1, \dots, e_p)$  in  $\Gamma$  with  $p$ -number of edges, we have the *fake-flatness* condition [101]

$$\prod_{i=1}^p h_{e_i} = h_{e_*} t(b_f),$$

where  $e_* \in \partial f$  is the distinguished *source edge* of  $\Delta^2$ . In other words, the edges are glued together according to the 2-groupoid structure of  $\Gamma$ .

By treating the 2-graph  $\Gamma^2$  as the 2-truncation of the  $\infty$ -groupoid of simplices in  $\Gamma$ ,  $F$  assigns the trivial value 1 to a contractible 3-cell:

$$\prod_{f \in \partial V} b_f = 1, \quad V \text{ contractible 3-cell.}$$

For the 3-simplex  $\Delta^3$  constructed out of four glued and decorated 2-simplices, this gives the *2-flatness* kinematical condition [91, 97] on the 2-graph states.

*Remark 3.2.* It is important to emphasize here that the fake- and 2-flatness conditions are imposed kinematically as Gauss constraints on the states, while the dynamical constraint defined by the delta operators in the scattering amplitude involve the discretized versions of the 2-Bianchi identities

$$d_A(F - tB) = 0, \quad d_A(d_A B) = 0.$$

This is true for all values of the  $t$ -map; in particular, for  $t = \text{id}$  the 1-Bianchi identity  $d_A F = 0$  that appears on-shell  $F = B$  is in fact a *kinematical* 2-flatness condition, and hence is not part of the dynamical constraint on scattering amplitudes.

A *pseudonatural* transformation  $\eta : F \Rightarrow F'$  assigns a 0-skeleton to an element of  $G$ , and a 1-skeleton to an element of  $\mathbf{H} \rtimes G$ , such that several diagrams commute. . . , working this all out gives

**Definition 3.2.** A **2-gauge transformation** between two decorated 2-graphs is a pseudonatural transformation  $\eta : F \Rightarrow F'$ . On an oriented 1-simplex (01), this is the data of

$$\eta_i = a_i \in G, \quad \eta_{(01)} = \gamma_{(01)} \in \mathbf{H}$$

for each  $i = 0, 1$  such that on every oriented 2-simplex (012) rooted at the edge (01), we have

$$h'_{(ij)} = a_i^{-1} h_{(ij)} t(\gamma_{(ij)}) a_j, \quad b'_{(012)} = a_0^{-1} \triangleright ((h_{(01)} \triangleright \gamma_{(01)})^{-1} (a_1 \triangleright b_{(012)}) \gamma_{(01)}) \quad (3.1)$$

for each  $0 \leq i < j \leq 2$ .

In more compact notation, following the blob model of bicategories in [96], these are actions by conjugation

$$h'_{(10)} \xrightarrow{b'_{(012)}} (a_0 \xrightarrow{\gamma_{(01)}})^{-1} \cdot (h_{(10)} \xrightarrow{b_{(012)}}) \cdot (a_0 \xrightarrow{\gamma_{(01)}}) \equiv \text{hAd}_{(a_0, \gamma_{(01)})}^{-1}(h_{(10)}, b_{(012)}),$$

under the *horizontal* composition  $\cdot$ . Note the target of a  $\xrightarrow{\gamma}$  is determined by  $at(\gamma)$ , so we didn't write them down.

We are not done yet. For pseudonatural transformations  $\eta, \eta' : F \Rightarrow F'$  between 2-functors, there is the notion of *modifications*  $m : \eta \Rightarrow \eta'$ . This defines the notion of **secondary gauge transformations**, ie. redundancy between 2-gauge transformations. This is the data of an element of  $\mathbf{H} \rtimes G$  on each 0-skeleton such that

$$a'_i = a_i t(m_i), \quad \gamma'_{(01)} = m_0^{-1} \gamma_{(01)} m_1$$

for each  $i = 0, 1$  and 1-skeleton (01). In other words, this is the conjugation action

$$a'_0 \xrightarrow{\gamma'_{(01)}} (a_0 \xrightarrow{m_0} a'_0)^{-1} \circ (a_0 \xrightarrow{\gamma_{(01)}}) \circ (a_1 \xrightarrow{m_1} a'_1) \equiv \text{vAd}_{m_0}^{-1}(a_0, \gamma_{(01)})$$

under *vertical* composition  $\circ$ . This describes fully the 2-groupoid  $\text{Fun}(\Gamma, B\mathbb{G})$ , which we shall denote by  $\mathbb{G}^\Gamma$ .

*Remark 3.3.* Note the strictness of the underlying Lie 2-group  $\mathbb{G}$  here means that the hom-categories in  $\mathbb{G}^\Gamma$  are strict monoidal, and hence we can coherently truncate them and treat  $\mathbb{G}^\Gamma$  as a truncated 1-groupoid. Once we have done this, the 1-morphisms in it are then labelled by secondary-gauge equivalence classes of 2-gauge transformations. We shall see that this dramatically simplifies much of our discussion in the next section.

**Weak 2-gauge theory based on weakly-associative 2-groups.** We pause here to make several comments about the weakly associative setting. It is well-known that *finite* 2-groups are classified up to equivalence by its *Hoàng data*  $(G = \text{coker } t, A = \text{ker } t, \tau)$  [126–128], where  $\tau \in H^3(N, A)$  is a group 3-cohomology class called the **Postnikov class**. In this context, the 3-cocycle  $\tau$  can be thought of as an associator isomorphism  $\tau(g_1, g_2, g_3) \in A$  over  $g_1 g_2 g_3 \in G$  [26, 56, 129]. There had been numerous works in the literature which studied higher-group gauge theories built from such Hoàng data, and they led to the so-called *2-group Dijkgraaf-Witten TQFTs* [74, 99, 101, 130–132]. These can be understood as 4d Douglas-Reutter TQFTs [95] built out of the symmetric 2-category  $2\text{Rep}(G, A, \tau)$  of the 2-representations [72] of the 2-group.

In the context of weakly associative smooth 2-groups, the  $\mathbf{H}$ -valued function  $\tau$  witnesses the associativity of the horizontal product  $\tau(g_1, g_2, g_3) : (g_1 g_2) g_3 \rightarrow g_1 (g_2 g_3)$  for each  $g_1, g_2, g_3 \in G$  and  $a \in \mathbf{H}$ .

Although the associativity of the vertical product  $\circ$  is retained, its composition law is modified: namely for  $(g_1, \alpha_1) \circ (g_2, \alpha_2) \circ (g_3, \alpha_3)$  to be composable, we require

$$\tau(g, t(\alpha_1), t(\alpha_2)) \rightarrow (g_1 t(\alpha_1)) t(\alpha_2) \rightarrow g_1(t(\alpha_1 \alpha_2)) = g_1(t(\alpha_1) t(\alpha_2)).$$

Despite the abundance of literature on finite 2-group Dijkgraaf-Witten theories, and despite the fact that we do have the proper setting of *smooth 2-groups* [80] mentioned previously to talk about smooth associator morphisms, the "weak 2-gauge theory" built out of such smooth 2-groups are much less well-understood. Though, the form of the action is known [85–87],

$$S_{w2CS}[A, B] = \int_X \langle B, F(A) - \frac{1}{2}tB \rangle + \frac{1}{4!} \langle \kappa(A), A \rangle,$$

as well as the local kinematical data [50, 51, 104] (the so-called "weak 2-connections" and their 2-gauge transformations). These fields are described by the structure of a weak Lie 2-algebra with a *Jacobiator*  $\kappa$  [67, 108, 133], which sources the covariant 2-curvature [51, 69, 70, 77].

However, there are many issues even semiclassically in this setup, such as the fact that the 2-gauge algebra does not close off-shell of the fake-flatness condition [51, 104]. This particular difficulty is circumvented in our combinatorial setting, as all discrete 2-holonomies we put onto 2-cells are forced to be on-shell. However, complications arise when the non-trivial associator  $\tau$  makes the hom-categories in  $\mathbb{G}^\Gamma$  no longer strict monoidal. Indeed, one can compute that the monoidality of the composition of the 2-gauge transformation (3.1) is witnessed by a secondary gauge transformation,

$$m(a_1, a_2, h) : \text{hAd}_{(a_1, \gamma_1)}^{-1} \circ \text{hAd}_{(a_2, \gamma_2)}^{-1} \Rightarrow \text{hAd}_{(a_1 a_2, \gamma_1(a_1 \triangleright \gamma_2))}^{-1},$$

given by a vertical conjugation  $\text{vAd}_{\tau(a_1, a_2, h)}^{-1}$ , where  $(h, b)$  denotes the source of the 2-gauge transformation  $(a_2, \gamma_2)$ . As such, we cannot truncate  $\mathbb{G}^\Gamma$  if we wish to keep track of  $\tau$  — though it can be shown that, due to the covariance of the 2-curvature, the 2-gauge orbits of the field configurations are labelled by a 3-cocycle  $[\tau] : (\text{coker } t)^{\otimes 3} \rightarrow \ker t$  on the corresponding Hoàng data [52].

### 3.2 Configuration space of lattice 2-Chern-Simons theory

Now to construct the Hilbert space, we would like to use the coherent formulation. This requires us to find a higher notion of  $\mathbb{C}$  — one candidate for it is the category of (complex) Hilbert spaces. As  $\mathbb{G}^\Gamma$  is a bicategory, the functors  $\text{Fun}(\mathbb{G}^\Gamma, \text{Hilb})$  in general form a 2-category; but if we treat  $\text{Hilb}$  as a 2-category with no non-trivial 2-morphisms, then these functors must assign the trivial identity map to secondary gauge transformations. This means that, in this set up, the 2-functors  $\Phi : \mathbb{G}^\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Hilb}$  will factor through the 2-truncated decorated 2-graphs, whose hom-categories contains *secondary gauge equivalence classes* of 2-gauge transformations. As an abuse of notation, we denote by this 2-truncated 1-category also by  $\mathbb{G}^\Gamma$  in the following.

**Definition 3.3.** A **2-graph state with covariance data** is a 2-functor  $\Phi : \mathbb{G}^\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Hilb}$ . This is the data of a function  $\phi = \Phi$  that assigns each decorated 2-graph  $\{(h_e, b_f)\}_{(e, f)} \in \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2}$  a Hilbert space  $\phi_{\{(h_e, b_f)\}_{(e, f)}}$ , and to each (secondary gauge equivalence class of) 2-gauge transformation  $\eta : \{(h_e, b_f)\}_{(e, f)} \rightarrow \{(h'_e, b'_f)\}_{(e, f)}$  a linear isomorphism  $\Phi_\eta = \Lambda : \phi_{\{(h_e, b_f)\}_{(e, f)}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \phi'_{\{(h'_e, b'_f)\}_{(e, f)}} = \phi_{\{(h'_e, b'_f)\}_{(e, f)}}$  defined by (3.1).

The 1-morphisms in this 1-truncated 2-category  $\text{Fun}(\mathbb{G}^\Gamma, \text{Hilb})$  are natural transformations  $\varphi : \phi \rightarrow \phi'$ . This is the data that assigns a linear isomorphism  $\varphi_\Gamma$  to each decorated 2-graph such that

$$\varphi_{\Gamma'} \circ \phi = \phi'_\Gamma \circ \varphi_\Gamma;$$

in other words,  $\varphi$  is an intertwiner between the gauge transformations.

In the following, we found it convenient to separate the 2-functor  $\Phi$  by its categorical level: a "2-graph state"  $\Phi_0 = \phi : \text{Obj } \mathbb{G}^\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Hilb}$  is the 2-functor at the object level, and its "covariance data"  $\Phi_1 = \Lambda$  is the 2-functor at the morphisms level, which acts on  $\phi$  by precomposing the horizontal conjugation  $\text{hAd}_{(a, \gamma)}^{-1}$ , as in (3.1).

The above definition pins down the algebraic properties of 2-graph states, but since we are dealing with Lie 2-groups, certain functional analytic conditions must also be given. In particular, these 2-graph states  $\phi$  should in some sense be "square-integrable", such that an inner product can be defined and they collectively form a "total Hilbert space", denoted by  $\mathcal{A}^0$ . The following section shall deal with these analytic requirements.

### 3.2.1 Square-integrable functors: measureable fields

Similar to the case of the discretized Chern-Simons theory, the 2-graph states should form an "infinite-dimensional 2-Hilbert space". In this section, we wish to properly formalize this notion. For this, it is useful to consider **measureable categories** of Crane-Yetter [30, 110, 111].

**Definition 3.4.** A **measureable category**  $\mathcal{H}^X$  is a  $C^*$ -category with the following.

- The objects are measurable fields  $H^X$ , which is the data of a measure space  $(X, \mu)$  together with an assignment  $x \mapsto H_x$  of (infinite-dimensional) Hilbert spaces  $(H_x, \langle -, - \rangle_x)$  for each  $x \in X$  such that one has a subspace  $\mathcal{M}_H \subset \coprod_x H_x$  defined by:
  1. the norm function  $x \mapsto \|\xi_x\|_{H_x} = \sqrt{\langle \xi_x, \xi_x \rangle_{H_x}}$  is  $\mu$ -measurable,
  2. if  $\eta \in \coprod_x H_x$  is such that  $x \mapsto \langle \eta_x, \xi_x \rangle_{H_x}$  is  $\mu$ -measurable for all  $\xi \in \mathcal{M}_H$ , then  $\eta \in \mathcal{M}_H$ ,
  3. there exists a sequence  $\{\xi_i\} \subset \mathcal{M}_H$  that  $\{(\xi_i)_x\}_i \subset H_x$  is dense for all  $x$ .
- A morphism  $f : H^X \rightarrow H'^X$  is a  $X$ -family  $f_x : H_x \rightarrow H'_x$  of bounded linear operators such that  $f(\mathcal{M}_H) \subset \mathcal{M}_{H'}$ .

Just as in the case of *finite*-dimensional 2-Hilbert spaces [109], a measureable field  $H^X$  has hom's given by a  $C^*$ -algebra of bounded linear operators. But here, these  $C^*$ -algebras are indexed by a measure space  $X$ , instead of just a finite set of basis elements. The collection of all measureable categories form a 2-category **Meas**.

There is a certain decategorification  $\int^\oplus : \mathbf{Meas} \rightarrow \mathbf{Hilb}$  given by the *direct integral*. The Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H} = \int_X^\oplus d\mu_x H_x$  associated to the measureable category  $H^X \in \mathbf{Meas}$  is defined as the space of  $\mu$ -a.e. equivalent classes of  $L^2$ -integrable sections  $\psi \in \mathcal{M}_H$  equipped with the inner product

$$\langle \psi, \psi' \rangle = \int_X d\mu_x \langle \psi_x, \psi'_x \rangle_{H_x} < \infty.$$

This is analogous to the usual integration operation on the Hilbert spaces of  $L^2$ -functions. We shall in the following cast  $\mathcal{A}^0 \in \mathbf{Meas}$  as a measureable category.

### 3.2.2 Haar measures on locally compact Lie 2-groups

Now in order to make use of the above notion of measureable fields, we must first make  $\mathbb{G}$  into a measure space. We will do this by following [134].

**Definition 3.5.** Consider  $\mathbb{G}$  as a locally compact Hausdorff groupoid. A **Haar system** on  $\mathbb{G}$  is a  $G$ -family  $\{\nu^a \mid a \in G\}$  of positive Radon measures  $\nu^a$  supported on  $\mathbf{H}$  (considered as the source fibre of  $a \in G$ ) such that for all compactly supported  $f \in C_c(\mathbf{H})$ ,

1. the assignment  $a \mapsto \int_{\mathbf{H}} d\nu^a(\gamma) f(\gamma)$  is continuous, and
2. for all  $\gamma \in \mathbb{G}$ , with source  $a$  and target  $t(\gamma)a$ , then  $\int_{\mathbf{H}} d\nu^a(\gamma') f(\gamma') = \int_{\mathbf{H}} d\nu^{t(\gamma)a}(\gamma') f(\gamma')$ .

Note the second condition implies the left-invariance of  $\nu^a$  by groupoid (vertical) multiplication.

Now let  $\mathbb{G}$  be a locally compact Hausdorff Lie 2-group (ie. both  $\mathbf{H}, G$  are locally compact Hausdorff, and the structure maps  $s, t$  are smooth). We require the Haar system  $\{\nu^a\}_a$  on  $\mathbb{G}$  to be compatible with the group structure.

Explicitly, this means that for each  $a \in G$  and each measureable subset  $A \subset \mathbf{H}$ , the map  $\nu^b(A) \mapsto \nu^{ab}(A)$  is measureable. Take a usual Haar measure  $\sigma$  on  $G$ , the following measure

$$d\mu_{(a,\gamma)} = d\sigma(a) d\nu^a(\gamma)$$

is then left-invariant under horizontal *whiskering*: for each compactly-supported  $\mathbb{C}$ -valued  $f \in C_c(\mathbb{G})$  and  $a \in G$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{G}} d\mu_{(ab, a \triangleright \gamma)} f(b, \gamma) &= \int_G d\sigma(ab) \int_{\mathbb{H}} d\nu^{ab}(a \triangleright \gamma) f(b, \gamma) \\ &= \int_G d\sigma(b) \int_{\mathbb{H}} d\nu^{t(\gamma)b}(\gamma) f(a^{-1}b, a^{-1} \triangleright \gamma) = \int_{\mathbb{G}} d\mu_{(b, \gamma)} f(a^{-1}b, a^{-1} \triangleright \gamma), \end{aligned}$$

where we have made a change of variable  $(ab, a \triangleright \gamma) \mapsto (b, \gamma)$ . This provides an invariant Haar measure on the 2-group  $\mathbb{G}$ . We now condense this notion into a proper definition.

First, notice the above condition implies that the Haar system  $\Omega_{\mathbb{H}} = \{\nu^a \mid a \in G\}$ , understood as a subspace of all measurable functions  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{H}}$  on  $\mathbb{H}$ , is a measurable  $G$ -representation. We call such Haar systems *G-equivariant*.

**Definition 3.6.** A **2-group Haar measure**  $\mu$  is a Radon measure equipped with a *disintegration* [111, 135]  $\{\nu^a\}_{a \in G}$  along the source map  $s : \mathbb{G} \rightarrow G$  into a  $G$ -equivariant Haar system,

$$\int_{\mathbb{G}} d\mu(\zeta) f(\zeta) = \int_G d\sigma(a) \int_{s^{-1}G} d\nu_a(\gamma) f(a, \gamma), \quad \forall f \in C(\mathbb{G}), \zeta = (a, \gamma) \in \mathbb{G},$$

such that  $\sigma = \mu \circ s^{-1}$  is itself a Haar-Radon measure on  $G$ .

Recall the family of measures  $\{\mu^a\}_a$  exist (as ordinary Radon measures) due to the disintegration theorem [135], while the  $G$ -equivariance is an extra algebraic condition.

In the following, we will always assume that the Haar measure  $\mu$  is also Borel: namely that all  $\mu$ -measurable subsets are open in the smooth topology of  $\mathbb{G}$

**Volumes of Lie 2-groups.** Let us now try to compute the volume  $\mu(\mathbb{G})$  of the compact Lie 2-group  $\mathbb{G}$ . Formally, this can be understood as the sum of all the volumes  $\text{vol}_a(\mathbb{H}) = \int_{\mathbb{H}} d\nu^a(\gamma)$  of  $\mathbb{H}$  determined by the Haar system. To ensure that this definition is well-defined, we require the map  $a \mapsto \text{vol}_a(\mathbb{H})$  itself to be  $\sigma$ -measurable. This is implied precisely by the  $G$ -equivariance of the Haar system: the map  $\nu^b(A) \mapsto \nu^{ab}(A)$  is measurable in  $a \in G$ . The map

$$\nu^1(\mathbb{H}) \mapsto \nu^a(\mathbb{H}) = \text{vol}_a(\mathbb{H})$$

is thus measurable in  $a \in G$ , thanks to the compactness of  $\mathbb{H}$ . The following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} 1 & \longmapsto & \text{vol}_1(\mathbb{H}) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ a & \longmapsto & \text{vol}_a(\mathbb{H}) \end{array}$$

then guarantees the bottom arrow  $a \mapsto \text{vol}_a(\mathbb{H})$  to be  $\sigma$ -measurable, and hence the *Haar volume*

$$\mu(\mathbb{G}) = \int_G d\sigma(a) \text{vol}_a(\mathbb{H}) < \infty$$

to be finite. This allows us to normalize the measure  $\mu$  such that  $\mu(\mathbb{G}) = 1$ ; or in other words, all integration operations of the form  $\int_{\mathbb{G}} d\mu, \int_{\mathbb{G}}^{\oplus} d\mu$  comes with an implicit factor of  $1/\mu(\mathbb{G})$ . In the following, we will therefore WLOG assume that all 2-group Haar measures are normalized in this way.

### 3.2.3 2-group functions as measurable fields

With the Haar measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathbb{G}$  in hand, we can now construct a model for the "Hilbert space-valued 2-group functions"  $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G})$ . Elements in it should be maps that assign entire 2-group elements to a Hilbert space; note this is *not* the "2-group algebra" functor category  $\text{Fun}(\mathbb{G}, \text{Hilb})$  as typically studied in the literature [75]! It is instead more closely related to the "2-groupoid algebra" described in [132]. Keep in mind the actual functor category under study is  $\text{Fun}(\mathbb{G}^F, \text{Hilb})$ .

*Remark 3.4.* The key objects, namely the 2-graph states, are by definition the object-level data of a functor  $\mathbb{G}^\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Hilb}$ . This is just an assignment of a Hilbert space to each decorated 2-graph in  $\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2}$ . If  $\Gamma$  is a "fundamental 2-graph", ie.  $\Gamma^2$  consists of a single face with a single 1-graph boundary, then  $\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2}$  is a single copy of  $\mathbb{G}$  and we recover the "2-group functions"  $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G})$  as our 2-graph states.

We begin by modelling elements  $\phi \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G})$  as a measurable field  $H^X$  over  $X = (\mathbb{G}, \mu)$ ; recall  $\mu$  is assumed to be Borel. For each  $(g, a) \in \mathbb{G}$ , we assign a (finite-dimensional) Hilbert space

$$H_{(g,a)}(\phi) = \phi(g, a), \quad \langle -, - \rangle_{H_a} = \langle -, - \rangle_{\phi(a)},$$

called the *stalk* at  $(g, a)$ , equipped with a fibrewise inner product. Next, we take the space  $\mathcal{M}_H \subset \prod_{(g,a)} H_{(g,a)}$  of measurable sections to consist of vectors  $\xi_{(g,a)}$  such that the norm map  $\mathbb{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{P} : (g, a) \mapsto |\xi_{(g,a)}|_{H_{(g,a)}}$  is continuous (with respect to the smooth topology of  $\mathbb{G}$ ).

Throughout the rest of this paper, we shall assume the existence of  $\mu$ -measureable covering  $U \rightarrow \mathbb{G}$  (ie. a Grothendieck pretopology such that each  $U$  are  $\mu$ -measureable) such that its direct integral produces a coherent sheaf

$$\Gamma_c(H^X) : U \mapsto \left( \int_U^\oplus d\mu(g, a) H_{(g,a)} \right)$$

of locally free projective  $C^\infty(X)$ -modules. The sheaves  $\Gamma_c(H^X)$  shall model objects  $\phi$  in  $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G})$ .

Given the  $L^2$ -inner product on the direct integral Hilbert space, we define the *measureable  $L^2$ -sections* to be the norm-completion

$$\Gamma(H^X) = \text{cl}(\Gamma_c(H^X)).$$

The compactness of  $\mathbb{G}$  guarantees that  $\Gamma(H^X)$  is well-defined as a sheaf of  $C^\infty(X)$ -modules. These sections  $\Gamma(H^X)$  then determine a "measureable" Hermitian vector bundle — also denoted by  $H^X$  — by the Serre-Swan theorem.

*Remark 3.5.* Some of the conditions above are not a priori required in order to view 2-group functions in  $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G})$  as measureable fields. However, it will be made clear later, specifically in §4.1.2 when we introduce quantum deformations, that being able to treat elements in  $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G})$  as measureable sections of Hermitian vector bundles over  $\mathbb{G}$  is desirable.

These vector bundles have an additional multiplicative structure (cf. [136] in the case of ordinary Lie groups) with respect to the (left) group/horizontal  $L_h$  and groupoid/vertical  $L_v$  products in  $\mathbb{G}$ , such that they preserves the dense subset of measureable sections. More precisely, this means that has pullback bundles

$$\begin{array}{ccc} L_h^* H^X & \dashrightarrow & H^X \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbb{G} \times \mathbb{G} & \xrightarrow{L_h} & \mathbb{G} \end{array}, \quad \begin{array}{ccc} L_v^* H^X & \dashrightarrow & H^X \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbb{G} \times_G \mathbb{G} & \xrightarrow{L_v} & \mathbb{G} \end{array},$$

satisfying the following conditions on bundles over  $H^X$ . For each  $k \geq 2$ , let  $\text{pr}_{ij} : (\mathbb{G})^{k \times} \rightarrow \mathbb{G} \times \mathbb{G}$  denote the projection onto the  $i, j$ -th factors for  $1 \leq i, j \leq k$ .

1. We have a canonical identification of bundles

$$L_{h/v}^*(\text{pr}_{12}^* L_{h/v}^* H^X) \cong L_{h/v}^*(\text{pr}_{23}^* L_{h/v}^* H^X)$$

witnessing associativity, as well as

2. a canonical *interchanger* bundle isomorphism

$$L_v^*(\text{pr}_{12}^* L_h^* \otimes \text{pr}_{34}^* L_h^*) H^X \cong L_h^*(\text{pr}_{13}^* L_v^* \otimes \text{pr}_{24}^* L_v^*) H^X,$$

sending the Hermitian fibres over  $((g_1, a_1) \cdot (g_2, a_2)) \circ ((g_3, a_3) \cdot (g_4, a_4))$  to fibres over  $((g_1, a_1) \circ (g_3, a_3)) \cdot ((g_2, a_2) \circ (g_4, a_4))$  for each  $(g_1, a_1), \dots, (g_4, a_4) \in \mathbb{G}$ .

These bundle identifications are required to preserve measureability, such that the induced *pushout* maps on the continuous measureable sections  $\mathcal{M}_H(H^X) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_H(L_{h,v} H^X)$  descend to their direct integrals

$$\Delta_h : \Gamma_c(H^X) \rightarrow \Gamma_c((L_h^* H)^X), \quad \Delta_v : \Gamma_c(H^X) \rightarrow \Gamma_c((L_v^* H)^X).$$

These coproducts land in sheaves which inject into the tensor product  $\Gamma_c(H^X) \otimes \Gamma_c(H^X)$ . Similar to the compact quantum groups of Woronowicz [8], we need a topological "completed" notion of this tensor product, such that these maps define compatible coassociative coproducts on  $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G})$ .

**Categorical completed tensor product.** Let  $H^X, H'^X$  denote two measurable fields over  $X$  as above, with  $\mathcal{M}_{H \otimes H'} = \mathcal{M}_H \otimes \mathcal{M}_{H'}$ . We will define a "completed" tensor product  $\Gamma_c(H^X) \otimes \Gamma_c(H'^X)$  between the corresponding continuous measurable shaves in  $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G})$  through the following. First, recall that there is a canonical isomorphism  $\Gamma(X, \mathcal{F} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{F}') \cong \Gamma(X, \mathcal{F}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Gamma(X, \mathcal{F}')$  for any coherent sheaves  $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}'$  over  $X$ , where  $\mathcal{O}_X$  is the structure sheaf [137]. We can then find a canonical inclusion  $\Gamma_c(H^X) \otimes_{C(X)} \Gamma_c(H'^X) \hookrightarrow \Gamma_c((H \otimes_{C(X)} H')^X)$  which (i) descends to an isomorphism on the algebraic tensor product of  $C^\infty$ -sheaves and (ii) extends to a  $\mu$ -dense map on measurable sections. This allows us to define  $\Gamma_c(H^X) \otimes \Gamma_c(H'^X)$  as the Hilbert norm closure of this dense subset. We will use this "completed" monoidal structure  $-\otimes- : \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G}) \times \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G})$  in the following section, §3.3 and §4.1.

In the following, we will also assume that the image of these coproduct maps are dense in the  $L^2$ -norm.

We denote by  $\text{Hilb}^{\text{hrm}}(X)$  the category formed by the multiplicative  $L^2$ -sheaves  $\Gamma(H^X)$  on  $X$ . The morphisms are given by measurable bundle maps  $H \rightarrow H'$  over  $X = (\mathbb{G}, \mu)$  that preserves the multiplicative structure. The dense inclusion  $\Gamma_c(H^X) \subset \Gamma(H^X)$  defines an inclusion  $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G}) \subset \text{Hilb}^{\text{hrm}}(\mathbb{G})$  of categories. This fact will be used in §3.2.4.

*Remark 3.6.* We note here that there is a possible way to generalize the above construction, using the notion of *generalized distributions* [138]. These are subbundles in an ambient vector bundle such that both the ranks and continuity of their sections can vary fibrewise, such that they still enjoy some desirable sheaf-like properties. This corresponds to the possibility of assigning Hilbert spaces of differing dimensions to different points on the Lie 2-group  $\mathbb{G}$ . We will not consider this here, however.

### 3.2.4 A categorial 2-group delta function

Based on the above construction, let us now define the *delta function* on  $\mathbb{G}$ . For any measure space  $(X, \mu)$ , consider a two measurable fields  $H_1^X, H_2^X$  over  $X$ . We define the tensor product  $H_1^X \otimes H_2^X$  as the measurable field  $(H_1 \otimes H_2)^X$ , and take its measurable sections to be  $\mathcal{M}_{H_1 \otimes H_2} = \mathcal{M}_{H_1} \otimes \mathcal{M}_{H_2}$ . Its morphisms are given by the bounded linear operators  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{M}_{H_1} \otimes \mathcal{M}_{H_2})$  over  $X$ . The direct integral operation produces a Hilbert space

$$\langle\langle H_1, H_2 \rangle\rangle_X = \int_X^\oplus d\mu(x) (H_1)_x \otimes (H_2)_x,$$

which consist of  $\mu$ -a.e. equivalence classes of sections in  $\mathcal{M}_{H_1 \otimes H_2}$ .

**Definition 3.7.** We call a measurable field  $H^X$  **square-integrable** iff  $\langle\langle H, H \rangle\rangle_X$  is a finite-dimensional *real* Hilbert space.

Note  $\mathcal{H}_{12}$  is in general *not* the usual Hilbert space tensor product  $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$  of the direct integrals of  $H_{1,2}^X$ .

Now specialize to  $X = \mathbb{G}$  and consider two measurable fields  $H^X, H'^X$  on  $X$ . Formally, we wish to define  $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G})'$  as the topological dual of the functor category  $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G})$  with respect to the direct integral. This means that it consist of formal elements  $F$  such that

$$F(\phi) = \int_{\mathbb{G}}^\oplus d\mu(g, a) (F \otimes \phi)_{(g,a)} \in \text{Hilb}^{\text{f.d.}}$$

gives a fully-dualizable/finite-dimensional (both abbreviated to "f.d.") Hilbert space for all  $\phi \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G})$ ; what this formula means concretely is explained in *Remark 3.7*. This allows us to define the following notion.

**Definition 3.8.** A **Lie 2-group categorial delta function** is a generalized functor  $\delta = \delta_{(1,1)} \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G})'$  satisfying

$$\delta(\phi) = \int_{\mathbb{G}}^\oplus d\mu(g, a) (\delta \otimes \phi)_{(g,a)} = \phi_{(1,1)}, \quad \forall \phi \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G}). \quad (3.2)$$

Given the Hermitian bundle  $H^X$  underlying a 2-group function  $\phi$ , there is a *non*-canonical isomorphism  $\phi_{(1,1)} \cong \mathbb{C}^n$  determined by the linear span of vectors  $\xi \in \mathcal{M}_H$  around the 2-group unit  $(\mathbf{1}_1, 1) \in \mathbb{G}$ . The delta function should evaluate  $\phi$  to this stalk,  $\delta(\phi) \cong \mathbb{C}^n$ .

*Remark 3.7.* For each Hermitian vector bundle  $H^X$  over  $\mathbb{G}$ , whose continuous measurable sheaf  $\Gamma_c(H^X)$  determine a given 2-group function  $\phi \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G})$ , there is a corresponding space  $\Gamma_c(H^X)'$  of generalized sections of formal distributions [139, 140] determining an element in the topological dual  $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G})'$ . It is natural to also assume that, conversely, every element of  $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G})'$  arises in this way — namely  $F(\phi)$  is only well-defined only when  $\phi$  and  $F$  are certain sheaves of sections of the same Hermitian vector bundle  $H^X$ .<sup>4</sup> This gives rise to a *Gelfand triple* of sections

$$\Gamma_c(H^X) \subset \Gamma(H^X) \subset \Gamma_c(H^X)'$$

and hence a sequence of inclusions of categories

$$\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G}) \subset \text{Hilb}^{\text{hrm}}(\mathbb{G}) \subset \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G})'$$

which can be understood as a sort of **categorical Gelfand triple**.

Now as we know,  $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G})$  admits a  $\mathbb{G}$ -module structure by precomposition with the (left) group/groupoid multiplication  $\lambda : \mathbb{G} \rightarrow \text{Aut } \mathbb{G}$ . The left-invariance of the Haar measure  $\mu$  then implies that

$$(\lambda_{(g,a)^{-1}}\delta)(\phi) = \phi(g, a), \quad \forall (g, a) \in \mathbb{G},$$

exactly as one expects. We will not use this categorical delta function much here, but they will become very important in the next paper in the series.

### 3.3 Hopf 2-algebras and the categorified coordinate ring on $\mathbb{G}$

Recall the collection  $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G})$  of  $\mu$ -measureable continuous sheaves over  $X = (\mathbb{G}, \mu)$  can be equipped with a well-behaved "completed" tensor product  $\otimes$ . As we have described in §3.2.3,  $\mathfrak{C}(X)$  also comes equipped with two coproducts dual to the Lie 2-group structure,

$$(\Delta_h\phi)_{((h,b),(h',b'))} \cong \phi_{(h,b)\cdot(h',b')}, \quad (\Delta_v\phi)_{((h,b),(h',b'))} \cong \phi_{(h,b)\circ(h',b')},$$

where  $(h, b) \in \mathbb{G}$  and  $\cdot, \circ$  denote the group/groupoid multiplications on  $\mathbb{G}$ . The interchange law of  $\mathbb{G}$  then gives identifications of sheaves witnessing the following relation

$$(\Delta_v \otimes \Delta_v) \circ \Delta_h \cong (1 \otimes \sigma \otimes 1) \circ (\Delta_h \otimes \Delta_h) \circ \Delta_v,$$

where  $\sigma : \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G}) \otimes \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G}) \otimes \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G})$  is a swap of tensor factors. Similarly, there are also two mutually commuting antipodes  $S_h, S_v$ ,

$$(S_h\phi)(h, b) = \phi(h^{-1}, h \triangleright b^{-1}), \quad (S_v\phi)(h, b) = \phi(ht(b), b^{-1}),$$

defined by the vertical and horizontal inversions in  $\mathbb{G}$ .

Now 2-groups are special in that they inherit both as a description as a groupoid  $\mathbb{G} = (\mathbb{H} \rtimes G) \rightrightarrows G$ , but also as a crossed-module  $\mathbb{H} \xrightarrow{t} G$  (see eg. [67, 96, 124]). The horizontal multiplication in the groupoid perspective coincides with the "graded semidirect product" in the crossed-module perspective,

$$(h, b) \cdot (h', b') = (hh', (h' \triangleright b)b'), \quad (h, b), (h', b') \in \mathbb{G}. \quad (3.3)$$

This property was leveraged in the literature [56, 142–144] to define a notion of a "Hopf 2-algebra".

**Definition 3.9.** A (strict) **Hopf 2-algebra** is a Hopf algebra bicrossed-module<sup>5</sup> consisting of a Hopf algebra map  $\bar{t} : A_1 \rightarrow A_0$ , where  $A_1$  is a Hopf  $A_0$ -module with coproduct  $\Delta_1$  such that the coaction  $\Delta_0 : A_0 \rightarrow A_1 \otimes A_0$  is required to satisfy the equivariance conditions

$$(\bar{t} \otimes \bar{t}) \circ \Delta_1 = \Delta_0 \circ \bar{t}, \quad (\bar{t} \otimes S_0) \circ \Delta_0 = (\bar{t} \otimes 1) \circ \Delta_0 \circ S_0. \quad (3.4)$$

The antipodes are also equivariant,  $S_0 \circ \bar{t} = \bar{t} \circ S_1$ .

<sup>4</sup>In this case, one can then model  $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G})'$  as a "generalized" measurable category, whose hom-spaces are *Colombeau  $C^*$ -algebras* [141].

<sup>5</sup>This is not to be confused with the different, but closely related, concept of "crossed bimodules of Hopf algebras", which are now known as Drinfel'd-Radford-Yetter modules [145] in the literature.



It was shown in Example 2.12.1 [146] that the *uncategorified*,  $\mathbb{C}$ -valued function algebra  $A = C(\mathbb{G}) = C(G) \xrightarrow{t^*} C(H)$  is a Hopf 2-algebra, with the coproducts  $\Delta_0, \Delta_1$  dual to components of the semidirect product (3.3). The vertical coproduct can then be recovered from the equivariance condition (3.4). We call  $C(\mathbb{G})$  the **coordinate ring** of  $\mathbb{G}$ , and together with a ( $\mu$ -measureable) covering on  $\mathbb{G}$  it serves as the structure sheaf  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{G}} = C(\mathbb{G})$  on  $X = (\mathbb{G}, \mu)$ .

For the *categorified*, Hilb-valued coordinate ring  $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G})$ , on the other hand, the same ideas can be directly imported from **Definition 3.9**. The only difference is that the "algebra" structure for  $A_0 = \mathfrak{C}(H), A_1 = \mathfrak{C}(G)$  should be understood as given by the (completed) tensor products of measureable sheaves over the Lie groups  $G, H$ . Given  $\bar{t}$  preserves the Borel measureable sets, we are then able to recover a "vertical composition" structure for  $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G})$  from the tensor product  $\otimes$ . On a general 2-graph  $\Gamma^2$ , we will leverage this Hopf 2-algebraic perspective in §4.2.2 in order to simplify some structural arguments.

Note that the  $\mathbb{G}$ -induced (co)categorical structure on  $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G})$  described above is *very different* from that of the category of sheaves on  $\mathbb{G}$ ! We will elaborate more on this in §4, where we also construct a combinatorial 2-group Fock-Rosly Poisson bracket which determines the quantum deformation on the 2-graph states.

### 3.4 2-graph states as measurable fields

By the same procedure as in §3.2.3, we shall define 2-graph states  $\mathcal{A}^0 = C(\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2})$  as a measurable field  $H^{\Gamma^2}$ . Given a Haar measure on  $\mathbb{G}$ , we can then define a corresponding measure  $\mu_{\Gamma^2}$  on  $\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2}$  given by

$$d\mu(h, b)_{\Gamma^2} = \prod_{e \in \Gamma^1} d\sigma(h_e) \prod_{f \in \Gamma^2} d\nu^{h_e}(b_f),$$

where the product in the second factor is over faces  $f \in \Gamma^2$  for which  $e$  is its source edge. As an abuse of notation, we shall use  $(h, b)$  to simply denote a configuration  $\{(h_e, b_f)\}_{e \in \Gamma^1, f \in \Gamma^2}$  of 2-graph decorations here. The continuous measureable sections  $\Gamma_c(H^X)$ , constructed analogously as in §3.2.3, will play the role of a "2-graph state"  $\phi$  in our setup,

$$\mathcal{A}^0 = \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2}) = \text{Obj}_0(\text{Fun}(\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2}, \text{Hilb})).$$

We can treat this quantity as the collection of objects in the measureable category  $\mathcal{H}^X$  over  $X$ . We shall mainly work with finite 2-graphs  $\Gamma^2$  such that  $H^X$  still admits an interpretation as a Hermitian vector bundle on  $X = \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2}$ .

*Remark 3.8.* Complex vector bundles over a space  $X$  are determined up to isomorphism by its Chern class [147, 148], hence our set  $\mathcal{A}^0$  of 2-graph states come graded by the ring  $H_{\text{mult}}^{\bullet}(B\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2}, \mathbb{Z})$  of *multiplicative* compactly supported Chern classes, where  $B\mathbb{G}$  denotes the smooth classifying space/stack of  $\mathbb{G}$  [77, 79]; see also [99, 130] for finite 2-groups. A simplicial realization for  $B\mathbb{G}$  — and hence one for  $B\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2}$  for finite 2-graphs by confluence — can be obtained from integrating the Lie 2-algebra  $\mathfrak{G}$  [149]. Lie 2-group cohomology  $H^*(B\mathbb{G}, U(1))$  has been studied in various guises in, eg., [80, 150], but it would be interesting to study the multiplicative version and its transgression map.

Recall from §3.2 that  $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2})$  admits a transitive action by the groupoid  $\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1}$  of (secondary gauge equivalence classes of) 2-gauge transformations. In other words,  $\mathcal{A}^0$  defines an *infinite-dimensional representation* [111] of the groupoid  $\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1}$ ,

$$\Lambda : \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1} \times \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2}), \quad ((a, \gamma), \Gamma_c(H^X)) \mapsto \Gamma_c((H_{(a, \gamma)})^X),$$

where  $X = \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2}$ . This representation is most straightforwardly constructed at the level of the Hermitian vector bundles: using the subscript notation  $H_{(a, \gamma)}^X = (\Lambda_{a, \gamma} H)^X$  (cf. [136]) for the pullback

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H_{(a, \gamma)}^X & \dashrightarrow & H^X \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2} & \xrightarrow{\text{hAd}_{(a, \gamma)}^{-1}} & \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2} \end{array}$$

along the horizontal conjugation action  $\text{hAd}_{(a,\gamma)}^{-1}$  given by a 2-gauge transformation (3.1), then  $\Lambda$  is concretely presented by the following bounded linear operator

$$U_{(a,\gamma)} : \Gamma_c(H^X) \rightarrow \Gamma_c(H_{(a,\gamma)}^X)$$

on the continuous  $\mu_{\Gamma^2}$ -measurable sections. Being bounded and hence continuous operators, they descend to an operator on the  $L^2$ -norm completions  $\Gamma(H^X) \rightarrow \Gamma((H_{(a,\gamma)}^X)^X)$ .

We require  $H_{(1,1_1)}^X = H^X$  and  $U_{(1,1_1)} = \text{id}$  on the unit decorated 1-graph. The strict associativity of  $\mathbb{G}$  means that there are canonical ( $\mu_{\Gamma^2}$ -a.e.) identifications of bundles

$$\Lambda_{(a,\gamma)}(\Lambda_{(a',\gamma')}H^X) \cong \Lambda_{(a,\gamma)\cdot(a',\gamma')}H^X, \quad U_{(a,\gamma)}U_{(a',\gamma')} = U_{(a,\gamma)\cdot(a',\gamma')}$$

over  $X$  that witness the monoidality of this  $\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1}$ -representation, where " $\cdot$ " is the composition of 2-gauge transformations defined in §3.1.

*Remark 3.9.* Given this representation  $(a_v, \gamma_e) \mapsto U_{(a_v, \gamma_e)}$  is faithful, the above bundle isomorphism can be interpreted as a bounded linear operator on the sections which commutes with every element in  $\mathcal{B}(\Gamma_c(H_{(a,\gamma)\cdot(a',\gamma')}^X))$ . Thus, it is determined by a c-number phase  $c_\phi((a, \gamma), (a', \gamma')) \in U(1)$ . The associativity of  $\Lambda$  itself then tells us that  $c_\phi \in Z^2(\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1}, U(1))$  is a Lie 2-group 2-cocycle [150, 151], making  $\phi \in \mathcal{A}^0$  into a *projective* representation of  $\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1}$  under horizontal conjugation.

There is an analogous construction for the *right* 2-gauge transformation  $P : \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1} \times \mathcal{A}^0 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^0$ , which is nothing but the left action  $\Lambda$  of the opposite dual  $(\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1})^{\text{opp},*}$ , with the sources and targets swapped. We represent this action by the adjoint operator

$$U_{(\bar{a}, \bar{\gamma})}^\dagger : \mathcal{M}_H \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{P(a,\gamma)H} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_H,$$

which is to say that  $P$  is the **contragredient 2-representation** of  $\Lambda$ . All constructions in the following have an adjoint counterpart, hence we shall mainly focus on  $\Lambda$ .

**Motivation for categorification.** As we have seen above, this categorification allows room for the bounded linear operation  $U$  on top of the 2-graph states. According to *Remark 3.9*, the presence of this operation  $U$  is what gives rise to the projective phase  $c_\phi$ . For smooth 2-groups with weak associativity, the quantity  $c_\phi$  is in general no longer a 2-cocycle (nor a phase): instead, it becomes a module associator which satisfies a *module pentagon relation* [71, 73, 152] against the associator  $\tau$ . In other words, this operator  $c_\phi$  *must* be present in the weak 2-Chern-Simons theory, and the 2-graph states must be categorified.<sup>6</sup> We will also see that categorifying the coordinate ring will also be necessary in order to produce results that are consistent with the expectations from the categorical ladder [41] (fig. 1).

### 3.5 Analytic definition of invariant 2-graph states

For brevity, let us denote by  $Y = \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1}$  in the following. Given the Haar measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathbb{G}$ , we define a Haar measure  $\mu_{\Gamma^1}$  on  $Y$  by

$$d\mu(a, \gamma)_{\Gamma^1} = \prod_{v \in \Gamma^0} d\sigma(a_v) \prod_{e \in \Gamma^1} d\nu^{a_v}(\gamma_e),$$

where in the edges  $e$  in the second factor has the vertex  $v$  as its source. From the above, we now construct the Hilbert space of invariant 2-graph states  $\mathcal{A}^1$ , whose elements are certain measurable sections over the equivalence classes of  $X = \text{Obj } \mathbb{G}^\Gamma$ .

Recall that in the last section, the 2-gauge transformations is described as a  $Y$ -module structure  $\Lambda$  on  $\mathcal{A}^0 = \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2})$  in terms of concrete bounded linear operators  $U$  between continuous measurable sections  $\Gamma_c$ . Fix a 2-graph state  $\phi \in \mathcal{A}^0$  with an underlying Hermitian vector bundle  $H^X$ . We define a measurable field  $\mathcal{O}'H$  whose Hilbert space stalks are given by the image of the operator  $U$ ,

$$\mathcal{O}H_{(a,\gamma)} = U_{(a,\gamma)}\Gamma_c(H^X), \quad (a, \gamma) \in \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1}.$$

<sup>6</sup>To be more precise, if  $c_\phi$  were absent, then the module pentagon will trivialize the action of  $\tau$  on  $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G}^\Gamma)$ . However, we will show in §6.1 that  $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G}^\Gamma)$  is in fact a *regular* representation of the 2-gauge symmetry, hence if  $\tau$  is trivial on  $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G}^\Gamma)$  then it is trivial everywhere. This would force  $\tau$  to be cohomologous to 0 in the Hoàng data, reducing the theory to the strict 2-Chern-Simons theory.

Its measurable sections  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{O}H}$  consist of vectors of the form  $U\xi$ , with  $\xi \in \mathcal{M}_H$ , such that the  $L^2$ -norm map  $(a, \gamma) \mapsto |U_{(a, \gamma)}\xi|_{\Gamma(H_{(a, \gamma)})}$  is continuous. We now take the direct integral

$$\mathcal{O}H = \int_Y^{\oplus} d\mu(a, \gamma)_{\Gamma^1} \mathcal{O}'H_{(a, \gamma)},$$

which consists of  $\mu_{\Gamma^1}$ -a.e. equivalence classes of continuous measurable sections in  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{O}H}$ , which can formally be understood as the collection

$$\coprod_{(a_v, \gamma_e) \in \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1}} U_{(a_v, \gamma_e)} \Gamma_c(H^X) \subset \coprod_{(a_v, \gamma_e)} \Gamma_c(H_{(a_v, \gamma_e)}^X)$$

of continuous measurable sections modulo equivalence on zero-measure subsets of  $\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1}$ . In other words,  $\mathcal{O}H$  is the **orbit measurable field** of  $\phi$  of under 2-gauge transformations.

Define the *orbit equivalence relation*  $\sim$  on the 2-graph states  $\mathcal{A}^0$  by  $\phi \sim \phi'$  iff the continuous sections  $\Gamma_c(H^X)$  corresponding to  $\phi'$  is contained in the orbit  $\mathcal{O}H$  of  $\phi = \Gamma_c(H^X)$ . This relation is

1. reflexive due to the existence of the unit  $\Lambda_{(1_v, (1_{1_v})_e)}$ ,
2. symmetric due to the existence of inverses  $\Lambda_{(a_v, \gamma_e)}^{-1}$ , and
3. transitive due to the (projective) monoidality of  $\Lambda$ ,

hence its equivalence classes are well-defined.

**Definition 3.10.** The **invariant 2-graph states**  $\mathcal{A}^1 = \mathcal{A}^0 / \sim$  are orbit equivalence classes.

Indeed, it is obvious that  $[\Lambda_A \phi] = [\phi]$  on all  $\mu_{\Gamma^1}$ -measurable subsets  $A \subset \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1}$ , since  $\Lambda_{(a_v, \gamma_e)} \phi$  by construction lies in the orbit space  $\mathcal{O}H$ . Note this definition only observes the invariance under 2-gauge transformations on non-trivially measured subsets of  $\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1}$ .

*Remark 3.10.* Recall from §3.1 that, in the case of weak 2-gauge theory, the associator is implemented by a secondary gauge transformation. This forces us to consider  $\mathcal{A} = C(\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma})$  as a categorical representation under the hom-categories of  $\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma}$ . Invariant 2-graph states  $\mathcal{A}^1$  should then be constructed directly as the homotopy fixed point (cf. **Proposition 6.3**) under the entire groupoid of 2-gauge transformations and secondary gauge transformations on it.

In the following, we shall work with 2-graph states by directly referring to the stalks of the sheaves  $\Gamma_c(H^X)$ , with the measurability assumptions implicit. Further, for invariant 2-graph states, we shall as an abuse of notation denote by  $(h_e, b_f)$  as a 2-gauge equivalence class of holonomy configurations at  $(e, f) \in \Gamma^2$ .

## 4 The Hopf category of 2-graph states

Let us now consider what sort of structure the 2-graph states comes equipped with. We start by studying the geometry of planar graphs on  $\Sigma$  with no self-intersections, where we keep track of faces.

### 4.1 Geometry of 2-graphs

In analogy with the 3d case, the coproduct(s) shall be defined from "cutting" operations on the 2-graph states. To describe them, consider the transversal intersection of  $\Gamma$  with a 2-cell in  $\Sigma$ . Since  $\Sigma$  is now 3d, there are two ways in which a 2-cell  $C_2$  can meet  $\Gamma$ : *horizontally* and *vertically*.

**Definition 4.1.** Let  $C \subset \Sigma$  denote a 2-cell with boundary  $c = \partial C$  which intersects  $\Gamma$ . We say  $C$  meets  $\Gamma$  **horizontally** at a face  $f \in \Gamma^2$  if the source edge/root of  $f$  is normal to  $C$ , and  $C$  meets  $f$  **vertically** if the root of  $f$  is tangent to  $C$ .

In either case, the 2-cell  $C$  splits faces  $f = f_1 \cup f_2$  into two half-faces, and the boundary  $c = \partial C$  splits all edges it meets into half-edges.<sup>7</sup>

Using these transversality properties, we acquire *two* coproducts on the 2-graphs

$$\Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma_1 \coprod \Gamma_2,$$

which pullback to horizontal and vertical products on the decorated 2-graphs

$$\cdot_{\text{h}} : \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma_1} \times \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma_2} \rightarrow \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma}, \quad \cdot_{\text{v}} : \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma_1} \times \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma_2} \rightarrow \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma}$$

such that the decoration

$$((h, b) \cdot_{\text{h}} (h, b))_{(e, f)} = (h_{e_1}, b_{f_1}) \cdot_{\text{h}} (h_{e_2}, b_{f_2}) = (h_{e_1} h_{e_2}, b_{f_1} (h_{e_1} \triangleright b_{f_2}))$$

on the face  $(e, f) \in \Gamma^2$  is given by the *horizontal* product of the half-faces  $(e_i, f_i) \in \Gamma_i$  in the Lie 2-group  $\mathbb{G}$ , where  $i = 1, 2$ . Similarly, the decoration

$$((h, b) \cdot_{\text{v}} (h, b))_{(e, f)} = (h_{e_1}, b_{f_1}) \cdot_{\text{v}} (h_{e_2}, b_{f_2}) = (h_{e_1}, b_{f_1} b_{f_2})$$

is given by the *vertical* product.

Notice  $\cdot_{\text{v}}$  is well-defined only when  $h_{e_2}$  is equal to the target  $h_{e_1} t(b_{f_1})$ , which by the fake-flatness relation  $t(b_f) = h_{\partial f}$  means that  $e_2 = e_1 * \partial f$ , where  $*$  is path concatenation. This happens precisely when  $(e, f)$  is split by a 2-cell that meets it vertically.

Now consider two 2-cells  $C, C'$ , the former of which meets a face  $(e, f)$  horizontally and the second vertically. Splitting the face  $(e, f)$  first along  $C$  then along  $C'$  yields four quadrants  $(e_1, f_1), \dots, (e_4, f_4)$  of  $(e, f)$ , while splitting  $C'$  first and  $C$  second yields another four quadrants. These two sets of four quadrants are equivalent up to a homotopy in  $\Sigma$ , which encloses a 3-cell. Therefore, in conjunction with the interchange relation in the Lie 2-group  $\mathbb{G}$  itself, we achieve the interchange relation

$$((h_{e_1}, b_{f_1}) \cdot_{\text{h}} (h_{e_2}, b_{f_2})) \cdot_{\text{v}} ((h_{e_3}, b_{f_3}) \cdot_{\text{h}} (h_{e_4}, b_{f_4})) \cong ((h_{e_1}, b_{f_1}) \cdot_{\text{v}} (h_{e_3}, b_{f_3})) \cdot_{\text{v}} ((h_{e_2}, b_{f_2}) \cdot_{\text{v}} (h_{e_4}, b_{f_4}))$$

for the decorated 2-graphs, where equality is achieved on-shell of the 2-flatness condition.

Performing another pullback yields the desired geometric coproducts

$$\Delta_{\text{h}} : \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2}) \otimes \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2}), \quad \Delta_{\text{v}} : \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2}) \otimes \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2})$$

on the collection  $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2}) = \mathcal{A}^0$  of multiplicative sheaves of continuous measurable sections on  $X$ . To be more explicit, we first introduce the "localized" characteristic 2-graph states. Let  $H^X$  be the measurable field corresponding to  $\phi$ , then the measurable field corresponding to  $\phi_{(e, f)}$  is  $\delta_{(e, f)} H^X$ , where  $\delta_{(e, f)}$  is the characteristic function (ie. a Kronecker delta) on the face  $(e, f)$  living in the finite 2-graph  $\Gamma^2$ . The stalk Hilbert spaces are given by  $(\delta_{(e, f)} H)_{(h_{e'}, b_{f'})} = \delta_{(e, f), (e', f')} H_{(h_{e'}, b_{f'})}$ .

**Definition 4.2.** Let  $\phi_{(e, f)}$  denote the 2-graph state localized on the two faces  $(e, f), (e', f') \in \Gamma^2$ , and suppose  $C$  is a 2-cell cutting across it. The **2-graph splitting coproduct**  $\otimes$  on  $\mathcal{A}^0$  is defined by the Sweedler notation

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\text{h}}(\phi_{(e, f)}) &= \sum_{\text{h}} \delta_{t(e_1), s(e_2)} (\phi_1)_{(e_1, f_1)} \times (\phi_2)_{(e_2, f_2)}, \\ \Delta_{\text{v}}(\phi_{(e, f)}) &= \delta_{e_2, e_1 * \partial f_1} \sum_{\text{v}} (\phi_1)_{(e_1, f_1)} \otimes (\phi_2)_{(e_2, f_2)}, \end{aligned}$$

where " $\sum_{\text{h}}$ " is a sum over all 2-graph states such that we have the following identification

$$\sum_{\text{h}} \phi_1(\{(h_{e_1}, b_{f_1})\}_{(e_1, f_1)}) \otimes \phi_2(\{(h_{e_2}, b_{f_2})\}_{(e_2, f_2)}) \cong \phi(\{(h_{e_1}, b_{f_1}) \cdot_{\text{h}} (h_{e_2}, b_{f_2})\}_{(e, f)})$$

of spaces of sections over  $X$  upon an evaluation on the 2-holonomies. Similarly for " $\sum_{\text{v}}$ ".

<sup>7</sup>Notice this definition requires a framing of both  $C$  and  $\Gamma$ , which we shall assume to have in the following.

Here  $\otimes$  denotes the symmetric monoidal tensor product (linear over the structure sheaf  $\mathcal{O}_X = C(X)$  on  $X$ ) of sheaves  $\Gamma_c(H^X) \otimes \Gamma_c(H'^X) \cong \Gamma_c(H^X \otimes H'^X) \in \mathcal{A}^0$ . On the other hand, the symbol " $\times$ " simply means "two copies of 2-graph states" as objects in  $\mathcal{A}^0 \times \mathcal{A}^0$ .

Further, these coproducts satisfy the compatibility condition

$$(\Delta_h \otimes \Delta_h) \circ \Delta_v = (1 \otimes \sigma \otimes 1) \circ (\Delta_v \otimes \Delta_v) \circ \Delta_h, \quad (4.1)$$

where  $\sigma$  is a permutation of the tensor factors. This can be seen to follow directly from the interchange law on the decorated 2-graphs on-shell of the 2-flatness condition. In the following, we are going to use the shorthand

$$\sum_h \phi_1 \otimes \phi_2 = \phi_1 \otimes_h \phi_2, \quad \sum_v \phi_1 \otimes \phi_2 = \phi_1 \otimes_v \phi_2. \quad (4.2)$$

The strict coassociativity of the coproducts automatically follow from the associativity of the composition of decorated 2-graphs; in the quantum theory, we must invoke the Jacobi identity of the 2-graded Fock-Rosly Poisson brackets, which we shall introduce in the ensuing section.

*Remark 4.1.* The geometric interpretation of the cointerchange relation (4.1) is the consistency of cutting a decorated 2-graph *twice* with two intersecting 2-cells, one of which meets the 2-graph vertically and the other horizontally. This is precisely the *triple intersection of planes* in 3-space, and in the case of a weakly-associative smooth 2-group  $\mathbb{G}$ , the 2-flatness condition will assign a homotopy  $\beta$  proportional to the Postnikov class  $\tau$  witnessing (4.1). In other words, *weak* 2-group gauge theory is sensitive to triple linking of surfaces; this fact was also noticed in the discrete 2-gauge theory context in [153], §7.

**Definition 4.2** by construction recovers for us, if  $\Gamma^2$  consists of a single face  $(e, f)$ , a 2-group version of the *matrix element coproduct* on the  $*$ -algebra of functions on a Lie group [8, 120]; see also §3.3. Here, we have given a discrete and 2-dimensional version of it, involving the geometry of the underlying 2-graph  $\Gamma^2$ . Following in this line of thinking, we shall see in the following how we can introduce a 2-group version of the Fock-Rosly Poisson bracket as a quantum deformation of this coproduct.

#### 4.1.1 2-group Fock-Rosly Poisson brackets on $\mathcal{A}^0$

We now study a higher but discrete version of the Fock-Rosly Poisson structure, and see how it helps in defining the quantum deformation of the measurable sections  $\mathcal{A}^{\Gamma^2}$  of 2-graph states. We shall see how the data of the 2-Chern-Simons action deforms these coproduct structures, and in particular equips  $\text{Hilb}^{\text{hmm}}(\mathbb{G})$  with the structures of a **Hopf measurable category**. The use of Hopf categories to construct 4d TQFTs is not a new concept [16, 53, 54], but we provide here an explicit construction from the underlying 4d topological 2-Chern-Simons action.

As in the usual 3d Chern-Simons case, the 2-Chern-Simons action determines a *classical 2- $r$ -matrix* [107] of degree-1,

$$r \in (\mathfrak{G} \otimes \mathfrak{G})_1, \quad D_t r = (t \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes t)r = 0.$$

The symmetric part comes from the symplectic form

$$\omega(A, B) = \frac{k}{2\pi} \int_{\Sigma} \langle \delta B, \delta A \rangle$$

of 2-Chern-Simons theory, while the skew-symmetric part can be read off from the interaction terms  $\langle B, [A, A] - tB \rangle$  [68]. This identifies a Lie 2-algebra cocycle  $\delta = [-, r]$  [107], from which one can construct a bivector field  $\Pi \in \mathfrak{X}^2$  on  $\mathbb{G}$  which is multiplicative with respect to both the group and groupoid structures [146]. This makes  $(\mathbb{G}, \Pi)$  into a *Poisson-Lie 2-group* [67].

*Remark 4.2.* The solutions  $r \in \mathfrak{G}_1^{\otimes 2}$  to the 2-graded classical Yang-Baxter equations  $\llbracket r, r \rrbracket = 0$  on a strict Lie 2-algebra  $\mathfrak{G} = \mathfrak{h} \xrightarrow{t} \mathfrak{g}$ , where  $\llbracket -, - \rrbracket$  is the *graded* Schouten bracket, was analyzed in [107]. It was found that the image  $(1 \otimes t)r = (t \otimes 1)r$  of  $r$  under the Lie 2-algebra structure map  $t : \mathfrak{h} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$  is a solution of the *ordinary* classical Yang-Baxter equations on  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Based on this observation, it was shown in [68, 107] that: (i) there is a one-to-one correspondence between ordinary classical  $r$ -matrices for a simple Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$  and classical 2-graded  $r$ -matrices for its inner automorphism Lie 2-algebra  $\mathfrak{G} = \text{inn } \mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g} \xrightarrow{\text{id}} \mathfrak{g}$ ; (ii) there is a one-to-one correspondence between ordinary classical  $r$ -matrices for the *semidirect product*  $V \rtimes \mathfrak{g}$ , where  $V$  is an Abelian  $\mathfrak{g}$ -module, and classical 2-graded  $r$ -matrices for  $\mathfrak{G} = V \xrightarrow{0} \mathfrak{g}$ .

It is also worth mentioning that the quadratic 2-Casimirs were studied in [68], while [154] examined solutions of the classical 2-Yang-Baxter equations in the context of *weak* Lie 2-algebras.

In analogy with the usual Drinfel'd-Jimbo deformation quantization, the data of the classical 2- $r$ -matrix is expected to give rise to quantum deformations of *both* the product and the coproduct on  $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G})$ . This deformation is controlled to first order by a pair  $r = (r_h, r_v) \in \mathfrak{G}_1^{\otimes 2}$  of horizontal and vertical classical  $r$ -matrices and  $r^T$  is its transpose

$$r = \sum r_1 \otimes r_2 \iff r_{12}^T = \sum r_2 \otimes r_1$$

By interpreting elements of the Lie 2-algebra  $\mathfrak{G}$  as derivations on sections of vector bundles (or more generally sheaves) over  $\mathbb{G}$  (see [67] for more details on this perspective), we introduce the following combinatorial Fock-Rosly Poisson brackets.

**Definition 4.3.** Let  $k'$  be a formal parameter. The **combinatorial 2-group Fock-Rosly Poisson bracket** on  $\mathscr{A}^0$  is given on the local 2-graph states by

$$\begin{aligned} \{\phi_{(e,f)}, \phi_{(e',f')}\}_h &= \frac{2\pi}{k} (\delta_{t(e),s(e')} r_h(\phi_{(e,f)} \otimes \phi_{(e',f')}) - \delta_{s(e),t(e')} (\phi_{(e,f)} \otimes \phi_{(e',f')}) r_h^T), \\ \{\phi_{(e,f)}, \phi_{(e',f')}\}_v &= \frac{2\pi}{k'} (\delta_{e',e} * \partial f r_v(\phi_{(e,f)} \otimes \phi_{(e',f')}) - \delta_{e_1, e_2} * \partial f_2 (\phi_{(e,f)} \otimes \phi_{(e',f')}) r_v^T), \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

such that the following property

$$\{\{-, -\}_h, \{-, -\}_h\}_v = \{\{-, -\}_v, \{-, -\}_v\}_h \quad (4.4)$$

is satisfied. This requires  $k \sim k'$  to have the same order.

Since we are modelling 2-graph states  $\phi \in \mathscr{A}^0$  as spaces of continuous measurable sections over  $X = (\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2}, \mu_{\Gamma^2})$ , the formulas (4.3) should be understood as identifications between Hilbert spaces of sections over  $X$ .

*Remark 4.3.* Here we make the crucial point that the 2-Chern-Simons action strictly speaking only provides the data of a Lie 2-algebra cocycle  $\delta$  and the classical 2- $r$ -matrix, which are infinitesimal *horizontal* structures (see §4.3). As such neither the vertical brackets  $\{-, -\}_v$  nor  $r_v$  can be determined in the semiclassical regime. This is why in (4.3), the parameter  $k$  is concretely the coupling strength in the 2-Chern-Simons action while  $k'$  remains a formal parameter. However, by endowing  $\mathscr{A}^0$  with a compatible (co)categorical structure (which we will do in §4.2), the vertical bracket can be determined by the horizontal ones through (4.4). Regardless, we will separately track both structures for bookkeeping.

Let  $(e, f) \cup_{h,v} (e', f') \in \Gamma^2$  denote a face for which, upon a splitting against a 2-cell  $C$  which meets it horizontally/vertically, we obtain  $(e, f), (e', f')$ . Taking inspiration from (2.1), it will be useful to rewrite the horizontal Poisson bracket in the following way,

$$\{\phi_{(e,f)}, \phi_{(e',f')}\}_h \equiv \frac{2\pi}{k} (- \otimes -) [r_h, \Delta_h(\phi_{(e,f) \cup_h (e',f')})]_C, \quad (4.5)$$

where  $\Delta$  is the 2-graph splitting coproduct introduced in **Definition 4.1** and  $[-, -]_c$  is the commutator with respect to the (horizontal) monoidal structure on  $(\mathscr{A}^0)^{\times 2}$  induced from  $\otimes$ .

Of course, if there does not exist a 2-cell along which the two faces  $(e, f), (e', f')$  can be glued — ie. if they are too "far apart"/delocalized — then we interpret  $\{\phi_{(e,f)}, \phi_{(e',f')}\}_h = 0$  as the trivial zero bundle over  $X = \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2}$ . We shall use this Poisson bracket to introduce a deformation quantization of  $\mathscr{A}^0$  in §4.2.

#### 4.1.2 Categorical quantum deformations and the $R$ -matrices

Recall in the case of the coordinate ring  $C(G)$ , a quantum deformation  $\star$  of its commutative product can be introduced from the data of a Lie algebra cobracket  $\delta$  on  $\mathfrak{g} = \text{Lie } G$ , such that the  $\star$ -commutator

$$[-, -]_\star \sim \{-, -\}$$

where  $\{-, -\}$  is the multiplicative Poisson bracket on  $C(G)$  corresponding to  $\delta$  [8, 9, 119]. Equipped with the Lie 2-algebra cocycle  $\delta = [-, r]$  determined by a classical 2- $r$ -matrix  $r$ , we now wish to lift this notion

to our current categorified setting, by introducing vertical/horizontal  $R$ -matrices  $R_h, R_v \in \mathcal{A}^0 \times \mathcal{A}^0$  which act as quantum deformations of the structures in **Definition 4.1**,

$$R_h \sim 1 \otimes 1 + r_h.$$

See also *Remark 4.9* later.

We begin from the combinatorial 2-group Fock-Rosly Poisson bracket defined in (4.3). By leveraging the work [155], we construct our desired quantum deformed product on the space of *formal power series*  $\Gamma_c(H^X)[[\hbar]]$  in sections of a Hermitian vector bundle  $H^X$  over  $X$ .

**Definition 4.4.** Let  $\phi, \phi' \in \mathcal{A}^0$  denote 2-graph states. We shall model them as spaces  $\phi = \Gamma_c(H^X)[[\hbar]], \phi' = \Gamma_c(H'^X)[[\hbar]]$  of formal power series in the continuous measurable sheaves over  $X$ . We say that the monoidal product functor  $\otimes : \mathcal{A}^0 \times \mathcal{A}^0 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^0$  is a **deformation quantization** of (4.3) iff there exist an isomorphism  $\Gamma_c((H \otimes H')^X)[[\hbar]] \rightarrow \Gamma_c((H \otimes H')^X)[[\hbar]]$  of sheaves of formal power series for which

$$\xi \otimes \xi' - \xi' \otimes \xi \mapsto \hbar \{\xi, \xi'\}_h + \dots, \quad \hbar = \frac{2\pi}{k}$$

holds for each  $\xi \in \Gamma_c(H^X)[[\hbar]], \xi' \in \Gamma_c(H'^X)[[\hbar]]$ , which holds  $\mu_{\Gamma^2}$ -a.e. over  $X$ .

More concisely, we write the above as an identification of *spaces* of formal power series of sections

$$\lim_{\hbar \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\hbar} (\phi \otimes \phi' - \phi' \otimes \phi) \cong \{\phi, \phi'\}_h \quad (4.6)$$

over  $X$ , mimicking the usual Dirac deformation quantization condition. Its strict associativity and the interchange law follow from the Jacobi identities and (4.4) of the Poisson brackets  $\{-, -\}_{h,v}$ , respectively.

Assuming that  $\otimes$  exists, the expression (4.5) allows us to write (the horizontal part of)  $\otimes$  in the form analogous to (2.2),

$$\phi_{(e,f)} \otimes \phi_{(e',f')} = (- \otimes -) [R_h, \Delta_h(\phi_{(e,f) \cup_h (e',f')})]_c, \quad (4.7)$$

where  $R_h$  recovers  $r_h$  semiclassically as mentioned previously.<sup>8</sup>

Recall the strictly coassociative and cointerchanging horizontal/vertical 2-graph splitting coproducts on  $\mathcal{A}^0$  introduced in **Definition 4.2**. As an abuse of notation, we shall also denote by  $\Delta_h, \Delta_v$  their quantum versions, which satisfy the following *intertwining relations* against the  $R$ -matrices,

$$(\sigma \circ \Delta_h)(\phi) R_h^T = R_h \Delta_h(\phi), \quad (\sigma \circ \Delta_h)(\phi) R_v^T = R_v \Delta_v(\phi), \quad (4.8)$$

as well as compatibility with the deformed product  $\otimes$  (see **Lemma 4.2**). Here,  $\sigma : \mathcal{A}^0 \times \mathcal{A}^0 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^0 \times \mathcal{A}^0$  is a swap of tensor factors.

*Remark 4.4.* In the ordinary quantum groups case, there is strictly speaking an obstruction to deformation quantization as described above [13, 119]. These are known to live as a certain degree-3 cohomology class of the underlying  $*$ -algebra, but if the Lie algebra cocycle is determined from a solution of the classical Yang-Baxter equation, then no such obstructions exist [156]. Similarly here, since the Lie 2-algebra cocycle  $\delta$  under consideration is determined by a solution to the 2-graded classical Yang-Baxter equations [107], we expect similar obstructions to vanish.

The compatibility of these  $R$ -matrices with the cointerchange (4.1) is captured by the commutative diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (\phi_{11} \otimes_h \phi_{12}) \otimes_v (\phi_{22} \otimes_h \phi_{21}) & \xrightarrow{\beta_{12;43}} & (\phi_{11} \otimes_v \phi_{22}) \otimes_h (\phi_{12} \otimes_v \phi_{21}) & \xrightarrow{R_v^{1;4} \otimes 1} & (\phi_{22} \otimes_v \phi_{11}) \otimes_h (\phi_{12} \otimes_v \phi_{21}) \\ \uparrow 1 \otimes R_h^{3;4} & & \uparrow R_h^{23;14} & & \uparrow R_h^{23;41} \\ (\phi_{11} \otimes_h \phi_{12}) \otimes_v (\phi_{21} \otimes_h \phi_{22}) & & & & \\ \downarrow R_h^{1;2} \otimes 1 & & & & \\ (\phi_{12} \otimes_h \phi_{11}) \otimes_v (\phi_{21} \otimes_h \phi_{22}) & \xrightarrow{\beta_{21;34}} & (\phi_{12} \otimes_v \phi_{21}) \otimes_h (\phi_{11} \otimes_v \phi_{22}) & \xrightarrow{1 \otimes R_v^{1;4}} & (\phi_{12} \otimes_v \phi_{21}) \otimes_h (\phi_{22} \otimes_v \phi_{11}) \end{array}, \quad (4.9)$$

<sup>8</sup>Under certain suitable conditions, it may also be possible to write  $\otimes$  in a "Moyal-Weyl" form

$$\phi \otimes \phi' = e^{\hbar \Pi}(\phi \otimes \phi'), \quad \forall \phi, \phi' \in \mathcal{A}^0,$$

in terms of the graded Poisson bivector  $\Pi$  corresponding to  $\{-, -\}_h$ . We will not need this here, however.

as well as the dual diagrams with the  $h, v$  swapped. Note here that we have used the shorthand (4.2) to write

$$(\Delta_h \otimes \Delta_h) \Delta_v(\phi) = \Delta_h(\phi_1) \otimes_v \Delta_h(\phi_2) = (\phi_{11} \otimes_h \phi_{12}) \otimes_v (\phi_{21} \otimes_h \phi_{22}), \quad \text{etc.}$$

for the coproducts.

The arrows labelled by " $R^{i,j}$ " implements a conjugation by the  $R$ -matrices (4.8) on the  $i, j$ -th tensor leg. These  $\beta$ 's denote the witness for the cointerchange law (4.1) on the 2-graph states, which we recall can be trivialized by going on-shell of the 2-flatness condition. We will prove in **Lemma 4.2** that these quantum deformed coproducts (4.8) are compatible in a Hopf categorical sense with a deformed monoidal structure  $\otimes_q = \otimes$  on  $\mathcal{A}^0$ .

*Remark 4.5.* In the weakly-associative case, we must deal semiclassically with (at least) a quasi-Lie 2-bialgebra, namely a Lie 2-bialgebra with non-trivial cohomotopy map [108]. It is known [67] that such a structure integrates to a *quasi-Poisson-Lie 2-group*, which has equipped a multiplicative trivector field  $\eta$  witnessing the Jacobi identity for the graded Poisson brackets. From the above construction, it then stands to reason that  $\eta$  gives rise to an  $\otimes$ -associator witness for  $\mathcal{A}^0$ . In the uncategorified Hopf 2-algebra setting, on the other hand, this was proven in [56].

Note the property of having *two* types of deformed (co)products is shared with *trialgebras* [54] (mentioned also in fig. 1). Such "doubly-deformed" quantum enveloping trialgebras, eg.  $U_{q,p}\mathfrak{sl}_2$ , has been used [157] previously to define 2-dimensional integrable spin systems. However, here we can do better:  $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G})$  will in fact be endowed with structure maps that make it into a *cocategory*. This is the subject of the following section §4.2.

## 4.2 Hopf structures of 2-graph states

Given the above quantum deformed coproducts and  $R$ -matrices, we now investigate the structure of the 2-graph states  $\mathcal{A}^0$ . Since these were induced through dualization directly from the 2-groupoid structure of the 2-group  $\mathbb{G}$  or the geometry of the 2-graphs  $\Gamma^2$ , the main notion most suitable for describing  $\mathcal{A}^0$  is the *Hopf opalgebroid* introduced in [116]. Then, we shall see how  $\mathcal{A}^0$  can also be described as a "categorified" Hopf 2-algebra [56, 142, 144], equipped with a so-called "2- $R$ -matrix".

### 4.2.1 As a cobraided Hopf opalgebroid

We first fix the definitions, then we get to work.

**Hopf opalgebroids.** An additive cocategory is a collection of objects  $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$  such that its "coarrows"  $\mathcal{C}(A, B)$  are equipped with coassociative cocomposition maps  $\Delta_v : \mathcal{C}(A, C) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(B, C) \times \mathcal{C}(A, B)$ .<sup>9</sup> Consider an additive cocategory equipped with a compatible (ie. there are arrows witnessing the cointerchange 2-cell (4.1)) homotopy-coassociative comonoidal structure  $\Delta_h : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}$ . In the following, we shall collect these coproducts into a strict functor  $\Delta : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}$ .

Now suppose  $\mathcal{C}$  is also equipped with a monoidal structure  $- \otimes - : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ .  $\mathcal{C}$  is an additive (*strong*) *bimonoidal cocategory* [53] if this monoidal structure is compatible with  $\Delta$ : namely we have the bialgebra axioms

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_h(- \otimes -) &\cong (- \otimes - \times - \otimes -) \circ (1 \otimes \sigma \otimes 1) \circ (\Delta_h \times \Delta_h), & \text{on objects,} \\ \Delta_v(- \otimes -) &= (- \otimes - \times - \otimes -) \circ (1 \otimes \sigma \otimes 1) \circ (\Delta_v \times \Delta_v), & \text{on coarrows,} \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

where  $\sigma : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}$  is a swap of factors. Note the first equation only needs to hold up to invertible homotopy/natural transformation. Assuming all (co)associativity and (co)unity coherences hold on the nose, the above structure makes  $\mathcal{C}$  into the delooping of a pointed *comonoidal Gray-monoid* [116].

Now let  $I \in \mathcal{C}$  denote a distinguished unit object for the product  $- \times -$ , and  $\epsilon : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \{*\}$  is the counit functor into the discrete category over the terminal object  $* \in \mathcal{C}$ . The counit axiom states that  $(\epsilon \times 1) \circ \Delta \cong (1 \times \epsilon) \circ \Delta = \text{id}_{\mathcal{C}}$ . A *comonoidal Hopf opalgebroid* is therefore a comonoidal Gray-monoid

<sup>9</sup>More generally, if we suppose these coarrows live in an ordinary monoidal category  $(\mathcal{V}, \times)$ , then  $\mathcal{C}$  is a  $\mathcal{V}$ -*opcategory* [116]. A cocategory in the usual sense is therefore a **Set**-opcategory.



that is equipped with an antipode, which is a lax monoidal functor  $S : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^{\text{m-op}, \text{c-op}}$  into the monoidal-comonoidal opposite of  $\mathcal{C}$ , such that the antipode axioms

$$(- \times -) \circ (S \times 1) \circ \Delta \cong (- \times -) \circ (1 \times S) \circ \Delta \cong \epsilon \otimes I \quad (4.11)$$

hold. A **cobraided Hopf opalgebroid** is then a comonoidal one equipped with a comonoidal natural transformation  $R : \Delta \Rightarrow \sigma \circ \Delta$ . We say  $R$  is *quasitriangular* if it is invertible as a natural transformation.

We now work to prove the main theorem by breaking it up into a few lemmas.

**Lemma 4.1.**  $\mathcal{A}^0$  is a linear comonoidal cocategory.

Here "linear" will also mean that the (co)category is additive.

*Proof.* Linearity follows from the linearity of the target  $\text{Hilb}$ . Take the following maps on the decorated 2-graphs,

$$\iota : h_e \mapsto (h_e, (\mathbf{1}_{h_e})_f), \quad \pi : b_f \mapsto (1_e, b_f).$$

Those in the image  $\psi \in \text{im } \iota^*$  have no non-trivial face decorations, and  $\phi \in \text{im } \pi^*$  have no non-trivial root/source edge. We call the subspaces  $\text{im } \iota^* = \mathcal{F}$ ,  $\text{im } \pi^* \equiv \mathcal{E}$  the *face* and *edge* states, respectively.

We now construct  $\mathcal{A}^0$  as a comonoidal cocategory  $\mathcal{C}$ . Let  $\hat{s}, \hat{t}$  denote the source and target maps in the 2-groupoid  $\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2} = \text{Fun}(\Gamma, B\mathbb{G})$  as the confluence of those in  $\mathbb{G}$  and  $\Gamma^2$ . As the inverse source times the target is given by the boundary/ $t$ -map, this confluence is well-defined on-shell of the fake-flatness condition

$$h_{\partial f} = t(b_f), \quad \forall (h_e, b_f) \in \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2}. \quad (4.12)$$

Of course, we have  $\hat{s} = \iota$  and  $\hat{t}(b_f) = \hat{s}(b_f) \cdot h_{\partial f}$ . We the face states  $\phi, \phi' \in \mathcal{F}$  are the coarrows (cosource/cotarget) of the edge state  $\psi \in \mathcal{E}$

$$\hat{s}^* \psi = \phi, \quad \hat{t}^* \psi = \phi.$$

Cocomposition is given by the vertical coproduct  $\Delta_v : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \bigoplus \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{F}$ , which inserts a face state localized between two edges. Of course, the identity coarrow on  $\psi$  is given by the trivial face state. The comonoidal functor  $\Delta_h : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}$  is given by the horizontal coproduct.

These structure are compatible thanks to the cointercahnge relation (4.1), and their (strict) coassociativity follow from the associativity of 2-graph gluing. This makes  $\mathcal{A}^0 = \mathcal{C}$  into a comonoidal cocategory with the coproduct functor  $\Delta : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{C}$ .  $\square$

The next step is to prove that the quantum deformed product  $\star$  in **Definition 4.4** on  $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{A}^0$  satisfies (4.10). By the main result in [155], this deformation  $\star$  is uniquely determined locally by  $C(X)$ , which is in turn determined uniquely semiclassically by the combinatorial 2-group Fock-Rosly Poisson bracket (4.3) through Kontsevich formality [158]. As such, it suffices to check (4.10) at the semiclassical level.

**Lemma 4.2.** *In the undeformed case,  $\mathcal{A}^0$  is a symmetric comonoidal Gray-monoid. Further, (4.10) holds at the semiclassical level.*

*Proof.* Classically,  $\star \rightarrow \otimes$  reduces to the usual symmetric tensor product of sheaves. Define  $\epsilon_\Gamma(\phi) = \phi(\{(1_e, (\mathbf{1}_1)_f)\}_{(e,f)})$  to be the counit and  $(1_{\mathbb{C}})_{(h,b)} = 1$  the unit section (in which every stalk Hilbert space is  $\mathbb{C}$ ). Note this is a "constant" sheaf, and it is measurable because  $\mathbb{G}^\Gamma$  is compact for any finite graph. It is easy to see that we have the identifications

$$\Delta(1_{\mathbb{C}}) = 1_{\mathbb{C}} \times 1_{\mathbb{C}}, \quad \epsilon_\Gamma(\phi \times \phi') = (\epsilon_{\Gamma_1} \phi) \times (\epsilon_{\Gamma_2} \phi').$$

The condition (4.10) also follows directly from the definition of  $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (\Delta(\phi \times \phi'))(h_e, b_f) &= (\phi \times \phi')(h_{e_1}, b_{f_1}) \otimes (\phi \times \phi')(h_{e_2}, b_{f_2}) \\ &= (\phi_{(h_{e_1}, b_{f_1})} \times \phi'_{(h_{e_1}, b_{f_1})}) \otimes (\phi_{(h_{e_2}, b_{f_2})} \times \phi'_{(h_{e_2}, b_{f_2})}) \\ &\cong (\phi_{(h_{e_1}, b_{f_1})} \otimes \phi_{(h_{e_2}, b_{f_2})}) \times (\phi'_{(h_{e_1}, b_{f_1})} \otimes \phi'_{(h_{e_2}, b_{f_2})}) \\ &= (\Delta\phi)(h_e, b_f) \times (\Delta\phi')(h_e, b_f) = (\Delta\phi \times \Delta\phi')(h_e, b_f). \end{aligned}$$

where  $(e, f) \in \Gamma^2$ . Here  $\Delta$  can mean either the horizontal or vertical 2-graph splitting coproduct.

*Remark 4.6.* Notice that due to the locality (ie. presence of the Kronecker deltas) of the 2-Fock-Rosly Poisson bracket (4.3), the 2-cocycle on  $\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2}$  becomes primitive/grouplike whenever the input 2-graph states are localized far apart (ie. no overlapping faces, edges nor vertices), hence the co/product  $\Delta, \otimes$  also remain as their undeformed versions on such 2-graph states.

The goal now is to prove (4.10) at the semiclassical level. Since only the horizontal structures have non-trivial quantum deformation, it suffices to check (4.10) in the case where the input 2-graph states  $\phi, \phi'$  overlap at a vertex. From the definition of the horizontal Moyal product, the semiclassical expression is (cf. [120]),

$$\Delta_h(\{\phi, \phi'\}_h) = \{\Delta_h(\phi), \Delta_h(\phi')\}_h.$$

In the (categorical) coordinate ring,  $\Delta_h$  is given by the matrix element coproduct, hence this is nothing but the multiplicativity of the bivector  $\Pi$  with respect to the group multiplication in  $\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2}$ . Similarly, when  $\phi, \phi'$  overlap at an edge, then we require multiplicativity of  $\Pi$  with respect to the groupoid multiplication. Both are implied by the Lie 2-algebra cocycle condition on  $\delta$  [67, 146].  $\square$

We emphasize that the 2-graph states  $\phi \in \mathcal{A}^0$  are now modelled as spaces of *formal power series* in the section over  $X$ .

Given the above result,  $\mathfrak{C}_q(\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2}) = (\mathcal{A}^0, \otimes)$  is then indeed a *non-symmetric* comonoidal Gray-monoid. We finally come to the following.

**Theorem 4.1.**  $\mathfrak{C}_q(\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2}) = (\mathcal{A}^0, \otimes)$  is a *symmetric cibraided Hopf opalgebroid*.

*Proof.* We first induce the antipode functor at the classical level on  $\mathcal{A}^0$  from the geometry fo the 2-graphs. Choose an orientation of the 3d Cauchy slice  $\Sigma$ . This induces an orientation on the faces  $f$  of the 2-graph  $\Gamma$ , such that its root edge  $e$  is equipped with the induced orientation from  $\partial f$ . To see how this induces an antipode, we first focus on the undeformed classical  $q = 1$  case.

Let  $(e, f) \in \Gamma^2$  denote a 2-graph with source and target edges  $e, e' : v \rightarrow v'$ . Here, the *unitarity of the 2-holonomies* (terminology inspired from [39, 117]) implies that a full orientation reversal induces the horizontal inverse,

$$(h_{e'}, b_{\bar{f}}) = (h_e, b_f)^{-1} \implies \phi(h_{e'}, b_{\bar{f}}) = \phi((h_e, b_f)^{-1}) = (S\phi)^*(h_e, b_f),$$

where  $\phi^*$  is the complex conjugate 2-graph state, modelled by the continuous measureable sections  $\Gamma_c(\bar{H}^X)$  on the complex conjugate measureable field  $\bar{H}^X$ . This defines naturally an antipode functor  $S_h = S : \mathcal{A}^0 \rightarrow (\mathcal{A}^0)^{m-op, c-op}$ .

When the quantum deformation is nontrivial  $q \neq 1$ , we use the same idea to directly induce  $S$  by a full orientation reversal,  $\phi(h_{e'}, b_{\bar{f}}) = (S\phi)^*(h_e, b_f)$ . Now note the gluing of a 2-graph with its full orientation reversal bounds a contractible 3-cell, which is assigned a trivial decoration on-shell of the 2-flatness condition. This then induces a homotopy which witnesses the antipode axioms.

*Remark 4.7.* There is in fact another involution on the 2-graph  $\Gamma^2$  aside from orientation reversal  $\phi_{\{(h_e, b_f)\}_{(e, f)}} \mapsto \bar{\phi}_{\{(h_e, b_f)\}_{(e, f)}} = \phi_{\{(h_{\bar{e}}, b_{\bar{f}})\}_{(e, f)}}$ . This is a mirror reflection  $\phi_{\{(h_e, b_f)\}_{(e, f)}} \mapsto \bar{\phi}_{\{(h_e, b_f)\}_{(e, f)}} = \phi_{\{(h_e, b_{\bar{f}v})\}_{(e, f)}}$ , which we will see in §6.2 gives the  $*$ -operation on  $\mathcal{A}^0$  a more refined "internal" structure. The "unitarity of the 2-holonomies" is then a property which relates these orientation reversals to the antipode functor.

The second step is to construct a cibraiding on  $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{A}^0$ , by leverage the formulas (4.8). By a cibraiding, we mean a comonoidal natural transformation  $\Delta \Rightarrow \sigma\Delta$  on  $\mathcal{C}$ , where  $\sigma : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}$  is a swap of factors.

To begin, we first consider the opposite cocategory  $\mathcal{C}^{op}$ , whose cosources, cotargets. The cocomposition  $\Delta_v^{op}$  on  $\mathcal{C}^{op}$  is given by the opposite of  $\Delta_v$ , with the cosource and cotarget swapped. (4.8) then gives us a functor  $R_v : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^{op}$  which acts by the identity on objects but by a conjugation under the vertical  $R$ -matrix  $R_v$  on the coarrows.

Now consider  $\mathcal{C}^{c-op}$  with the opposite cocategory and comonoidal structure  $\Delta_h^{c-op} = \sigma \circ \Delta_h$ . For each 2-graph state  $\phi \in \mathcal{A}^0$ , we put a map  $(R_h)_\phi : \Delta_h(\phi) \rightarrow (\sigma \circ \Delta_h)(\phi)$  that implements the conjugation by the horizontal  $R$ -matrix  $R_h$ , and then a swapping of the tensor products. (4.8) then defines this map as the components  $R_\phi$  of the requisite cibraiding  $R : \Delta \Rightarrow \sigma\Delta$ .

To achieve this cobraiding proper, however, we require (i) the naturality of  $R_h$ , and (ii)  $R_h$  to be comonoidal, ie. compatible with  $\tilde{\Delta}_h$ . Here, the commutative diagram (4.9) plays a central role: for naturality,  $R_h, R_v$  needs to be "nudging compatible", which follows from the right-side square of (4.9). For comonodality, we require a sort of "quasitriangularity relations" (4.2.2), (4.19) for  $R_h$ , which we will prove from the left-side square of (4.9) in **Theorem 4.2**.

We are not yet done, however, since naturality also requires  $R_h$  to satisfy certain conditions under the cosource/cotarget maps. For this, we are going to appeal to the Hopf 2-algebra formalism of §3.3. Indeed, it was shown in Lemma 7.4 of [56] that this condition for a quasitriangular Hopf 2-algebra follows from (4.13) displayed later, hence it shall suffice for us to prove that  $R_h$  defines a 2- $R$ -matrix. We will do this in **Lemma 4.3**. □

Note the Hopf opalgebroid we have obtained is strict, since the underlying Lie 2-group is strict and all coherence morphisms (as maps of Hermitian vector bundles) can be trivialized on-shell of the fake- and 2-flatness equations of motion.

*Remark 4.8.* Recall that  $\text{Fun}(\mathbb{G}^\Gamma, \text{Hilb})$  is a category, whose objects are functors

$$(\{(h_e, b_f)\}_{(e,f)}, \{a_v, \gamma_e\}_{(v,e)}) \mapsto (\phi(\{(h_e, b_f)\}_{(e,f)}), \Lambda_{\{(a_v, \gamma_e)\}_{(e,v)}})$$

that contain the data of *both* the 2-graph states  $\phi$  and the 2-gauge datum on it. The above theorem states that datum of *just* the 2-graph states has the structure of a Hopf opalgebroid. We will show in §5.1 that, given certain compatibility conditions are satisfied, the 2-gauge data inherits a Hopf categorical structure from  $\mathcal{A}^0$ . On the other hand, the morphisms in  $\text{Fun}(\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1}, \text{Hilb})$  are natural transformations  $\varphi$  intertwining between 2-gauge transformations, and they will play the role of intertwiners for the representation theory of  $\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1}$ .

We note that the generalization to the weakly-associative case can be carried out directly, by keeping track of the factors of  $\tau$ . We expect to obtain a Hopf opalgebroid as well in this case, but with weak coassociativity and cointerchange.

#### 4.2.2 As a Hopf 2-algebra with a quantum 2- $R$ -matrix

The goal of this subsection is to show that the 2-graph states is a Hopf 2-algebra, as defined in §3.3 and [56], equipped with a quantum 2- $R$ -matrix. The motivation for this is to patch up the proof of **Theorems 4.1** and demonstrate (4.20), by leveraging the results in [56]. We will see that this also helps in determining the semiclassical limit in §4.3.

The notion of Hopf 2-algebra defined in §3.3 and [56] is based on a quantization of Lie 2-bialgebras. In particular, a definition of a "quantum 2- $R$ -matrix"

$$R = R^l + R^r \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G})_1^{\otimes 2} = \mathfrak{C}(G) \otimes \mathfrak{C}(H) \oplus \mathfrak{C}(H) \otimes \mathfrak{C}(G)$$

of degree-1 quantizing the classical 2- $r$ -matrix was proposed, such that we have the equivariance condition

$$(1 \otimes t^*)R = (t^* \otimes 1)R. \tag{4.13}$$

This condition identifies an ordinary  $R$ -matrix at degree-0  $A_0 = \text{pr}_0 \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G}) = \mathfrak{C}(G)$ , similar to the classical case in strict Lie 2-algebras [68, 107] as mentioned in *Remark 4.2*. Various structural theorems in this context were then proven in [56], which we shall reference throughout this section.

*Remark 4.9.* The condition (4.13) above implies that a 2-graded  $R$ -matrix for  $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G})$  can be "bootstrapped" from a  $R$ -matrix for  $C(G)$  at degree-0. Further, if  $\mathbb{G} = \text{Inn } G$  were the inner automorphism 2-group of a compact simple Lie group  $G$  with  $t = \text{id}$ , then 2- $R$ -matrices for  $\text{Inn } G$  has a direct bijective correspondence with quantum  $R$ -matrices for  $C(G)$  through (4.13). As is well-known, solutions of the quantum Yang-Baxter equations have been extensively studied since the 80's [8, 9, 12, 13, 159–162]. This observation is useful for constructing explicit examples of 2-Chern-Simons TQFTs.

We now work to recover  $R_h$  as a 2- $R$ -matrix in the above sense.

**Lemma 4.3.**  $\mathcal{A}^0$  is a Hopf 2-algebra equipped with a 2- $R$ -matrix.

*Proof.* Recall the notion of a Hopf 2-algebra described in §3.3 and [56, 142, 144]. What we need to do is:

1. reconstruct the coproducts  $\Delta_1, \Delta_0$  from  $\Delta_h$ , and
2. reconstruct 2- $R$ -matrix  $R$  from the  $R$ -matrices  $R_h$ .

To do this, consider the map  $t : \mathbb{H} \rightarrow G$  in the Lie 2-group  $\mathbb{G}$ . For each decorated 2-face  $(h_e, b_f)$ , the fake-flatness condition (4.12) allows us to rewrite  $t(b_f) = h_{\partial f} = \hat{s}(b_f)^{-1} \hat{t}(b_f)$  in terms of the cosource and cotarget maps  $\hat{s}, \hat{t}$  defined in **Lemma 4.1**. This induces pullback  $t^* : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  then satisfies  $(t^* \psi)(b_f) = \psi(t(b_f)) = \psi(h_{\partial f})$ , and in the undeformed case it can be reconstructed as

$$(- \times -) \circ ((S_h \circ \hat{s}^*) \otimes \hat{t}^*) \circ \Delta |_{\mathcal{E}} = t^*, \quad (4.14)$$

by making use of the horizontal antipode  $S_h$  (which we assumed to be an equivalence; see also *Remark 5.2* later) introduced in **Theorem 4.1**. In the quantum deformed case, we shall take (4.14) as the *definition* of  $t^*$ . This is the dual of a condition in a strict quantum 2-group (see pg. 4, [143]).

*Remark 4.10.* It is not difficult to see from the geometry of the underlying 2-graph  $\Gamma^2$ , the multiplicative Poisson bracket (4.3) is equivariance against  $t^*$ ,

$$t^* \{-, -\}_h \cong \{t^* -, t^* -\}_h. \quad (4.15)$$

By re-extracting the cocategorical structures from  $t^*$  via (4.14), this implies that  $\{-, -\}_h : \mathcal{A}^0 \times \mathcal{A}^0 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^0$  is a (comonoidal) *bracket functor* [61], which is strictly skew-symmetric and strictly Jacobi. In certain contexts, both of these conditions can be weakened: in [133], weakly Jacobi brackets are called "semi-strict", and weakly skew-symmetric ones are called "hemi-strict".

Following this, we take

$$\Delta_h |_{\mathcal{E}} = \Delta_1, \quad \Delta_h |_{\mathcal{F}} = \Delta_0.$$

We can then make the following computation,

$$\begin{aligned} (\Delta_h t^* \psi)(b_{f_1}, b_{f_2}) &= (t^* \psi)(b_f) = \psi(t(b_f)) = \psi(h_{\partial f}) \\ &= (\Delta_h \psi)(h_{\partial f_1}, h_{\partial f_1}) = ((t^* \otimes t^*) \Delta_h) \psi(b_{f_1}, b_{f_2}). \end{aligned}$$

Now let a 2-cell vertically meet a face  $f$  with no boundary, such that the split faces  $f_1, f_2$  share a boundary  $\partial f_1 = \bar{\partial} f_2$ . Then, for each  $\phi \in \text{im } \pi^*$  we have from the cointerchange relation (4.1) that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum (t^* \otimes 1)(\Delta_h \phi)(b_{f_1}, b_{f_2}) &= \sum (\Delta_h \phi)(t(b_{f_1}), b_{f_2}) = \sum \phi(h_{\partial f_1} \triangleright b_{f_2}) \\ &= \phi(b_f) = \sum \phi(h_{\bar{\partial} f_2}^{-1} \triangleright b_{f_1}) = \sum (\Delta_h \phi)(b_{f_1}, t(b_{f_2})) \\ &= (1 \otimes t^*)(\Delta_h \phi)(b_{f_1}, b_{f_2}), \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

where the sums are over the split faces  $f_1, f_2$  such that  $b_f = h_{\partial f_1} \triangleright b_{f_2} = h_{\bar{\partial} f_2}^{-1} \triangleright b_{f_1}$ . These are precisely the conditions (3.4) for the coproducts on a 2-bialgebra.

Based on this and the permutation relations (4.8), from the quantum  $R$ -matrices  $R_h, R_v$  on  $\mathcal{A}^1$  we attain the correspondence

$$R = R_h |_{\mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{F}} \oplus R_h |_{\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{E}} \equiv R^l \oplus R^r, \quad (4.17)$$

such that  $R \in (\mathcal{A}^0)_1^{\otimes 2}$  is a 2- $R$ -matrix; note  $R^T$  also swaps the  $l, r$ -labels. It is then clear that (4.16) implies

$$(1 \otimes t^*)R = \bar{R} = R_h |_{\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{F}} = (t^* \otimes 1)R,$$

which is precisely (4.13). □

We note here that Hopf opalgebroids in general need not admit a description in terms of a Hopf 2-algebra/strict quantum 2-group. The antipode  $S$  must be a bijection on the image of the cosource  $\hat{s}^*$  in order for (4.14) to give a well-defined map  $t^*$ .

Once the correspondence (4.17) is achieved, it is not hard to prove the following.

**Theorem 4.2.** *The hexagon identity (4.9) implies the 2-Yang-Baxter equations*

$$R_h^{23} \otimes (R_h^{13} \otimes R_h^{12}) = (R_h^{12} \otimes R_h^{13}) \otimes R_h^{23} \quad (4.18)$$

for the 2- $R$ -matrix.

*Proof.* Suppose we have killed the cointerchangers  $\beta$  by going on-shell of the 2-flatness condition. Consider the arrow  $R_h^{23;14}$  in the hexagon relation (4.9). It involves the quantity  $(\Delta_h \otimes \Delta_h)R$ , while the expressions we want are

$$(1 \otimes \Delta_h)R, \quad (\Delta_h \otimes 1)R.$$

These can be computed from various contractions in the left-most commutative square in (4.9). Indeed, by contracting the tensor legs labelled by 2, 3 with  $\otimes$  and putting  $\phi_2 \times \phi_3 = \phi$ , we obtain the commutative diagram,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \phi_1 \otimes_h (\phi \otimes_h \phi_4) & & \\ \downarrow R_h^{13} & \swarrow R_h^{12} & \\ (\phi_1 \otimes_h \phi_4) \otimes_h \phi & \xleftarrow{(\Delta \otimes 1)R_h} & \phi \otimes_h (\phi_1 \otimes_h \phi_4) \end{array}$$

which gives precisely (here the superscripts on  $R$  indicate which tensor factor the  $R$ -matrices act on, not the subscripts of the  $\phi$ 's)

$$(\Delta_h \otimes 1)R_h = R_h^{13} \otimes R_h^{12}.$$

The same argument applied to the contraction  $\phi_1 \times \phi_2 = \phi$  in the diagram (4.9) gives

$$(1 \otimes \Delta_h)R_h = R_h^{13} \otimes R_h^{23}. \quad (4.19)$$

With the correspondence (4.17), these computations and (4.8) were shown in Proposition 3.13 of [56] to be equivalent to the 2-Yang-Baxter equations.  $\square$

Note (4.2.2), (4.19) are precisely the "quasitriangularity relations" required for the proof of **Theorem 4.1**.

**Definition 4.5.** The **categorical quantum coordinate ring**  $\mathfrak{C}_q(\mathbb{G})$  is the 2-graph states  $\mathfrak{C}_q(\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2})$  on the 2-graph  $\Gamma^2$  consisting of only a single face  $f : e \rightarrow e$ , with an edge loop  $v \xrightarrow{e} v \in \Gamma^1$  based at  $v \in \Gamma^0$  as its boundary.

See also *Remark 3.4*.

We note briefly that the antipode axioms (4.11) and (4.18) can be used to deduce the following condition

$$(S_h \otimes 1)R_h \hat{\otimes} R_h \cong 1_{\mathbb{C}} \otimes 1_{\mathbb{C}}; \quad (4.20)$$

see also equation (A.3) in [56].

**The 4d categorical ladder.** The above set of results is a realization of the categorical ladder proposal [16, 53, 54], which states that 4d TQFTs are determined by a Hopf monoidal category; see fig. 1. More precisely, the combinatorial 2-Chern-Simons partition function  $Z_{d2CS}$  assigns (discrete) 2-tangles to the modules  $\text{Mod } \mathcal{A}^0$  over the Hopf category  $\mathcal{A}^0$  of 2-graph states. The 2-tangle hypothesis [63] then implies that such a functor determines a 4-3-2 functorial TQFT

$$Z_{d2CS} : \text{TBord}_{\langle 4,3,2 \rangle}^{\mathbb{G}} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}, \quad (4.21)$$

where the domain is the triangulated twice-extended 4d bordism 2-category with  $\mathbb{G}$ -structure (see [77, 79, 80]), and the target is the symmetric monoidal 4-category of braided tensor 2-categories containing  $\text{Mod } \mathcal{A}^0$ .<sup>10</sup> This is a categorified version of the fact that Chern-Simons theory can be understood as a 3-2-1 TQFT determined by the skein category.

We shall show in §6.1 that  $\mathcal{A}^1$  is in fact a (covariant) regular representation of the so-called *quantum 2-gauge transformations*  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} = \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1}$ , hence it is closely related to the braided tensor 2-category  $2\text{Rep}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}; \tilde{R})$  of its 2-representations. We will in fact show that this 2-category is *ribbon tensor* in the companion paper [112].

<sup>10</sup>The idea is that the "true" 2-Chern-Simons partition function can be obtained by taking a direct limit over graph refinements; we leave the details to a future work.




Figure 1: The categorical ladder as proposed in [16, 53, 54], which gives a prescription for how the observables in a higher-dimensional TQFT should behave. Here, the vertical axis is the dimension and the horizontal axis denotes the operation of taking modules.

### 4.3 The semiclassical limit

As promised in §4.2.2, we now prove that  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$  admits the Lie 2-bialgebra  $(\mathfrak{G}; \delta)$  underlying the 2-Chern-Simons action [52] as its semiclassical limit, with  $\mathfrak{G} = \text{Lie } \mathbb{G}$ . Here, by a "semiclassical limit", we mean taking the "quantum deformation parameter(s)"  $q \sim 1 + \hbar = 1 + \frac{2\pi}{k}$  to first order, and keeping only the commutator brackets.

Note the cointerchange relation (4.1) forces the two deformation parameters  $q_h, q_v$  to be of the same order:

$$\frac{q_h}{q_v} \sim \text{const.}$$

Though we expect the vertical parameter  $q_v$  to be trivial (see *Remark 4.3*), we nevertheless need to "linearize" the vertical structures in order to prove what we want: we need  $\mathfrak{C}_{q \sim 1 + \hbar}(\mathbb{G})$  to reduce to the *uncategorized* coordinate ring  $C(\mathbb{G})$  mentioned in §3.3.

In order to do so, we are going to formulate the following hypothesis. Let  $\text{Cocat}_{\mathbb{C}}$  denote the bicategory of linear cocategories.

**Hypothesis (H):** *there is a 2-functor  $\lambda : \text{Cocat}_{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow 2\text{Vect}^{BC}$ .*

Here,  $2\text{Vect}^{BC}$  denotes the 2-category of *Baez-Crans 2-vector space* [61] — we need this, as Lie (bi)algebras are Lie (bi)algebra objects in  $2\text{Vect}^{BC}$ .

**A possible construction of  $\lambda$ .** To "linearize" the vertical structures of a  $\text{Vect}$ -enriched category  $C$ , we first take the groupoid completion  $C \rightarrow \hat{C}$ , then performing a groupoid Abelianization  $\hat{C} \rightarrow \hat{C}^{\text{ab}} \simeq \hat{C}/[\hat{C}, \hat{C}]$  (cf. [163]). Let  $\lambda : C \rightarrow \hat{C}^{\text{ab}}$  denote the composition of these functors, we then have  $\lambda(f \circ g) = \lambda(f) \hat{+} \lambda(g)$  where  $\hat{+}$  is the Abelian composition of morphisms in  $\hat{C}^{\text{ab}}$ .

Dually for a linear cocategory  $C$  with objects  $C_0$  and coarrows  $C_1$ , we seek to linearize the cocompositions  $\Delta_v : C_1 \rightarrow C_1 \otimes C_1$ .<sup>a</sup> As in the case described above, assuming  $\lambda$  gives rise to an Abelianized cocomposition  $\lambda \Delta_v : \lambda(C_1) \rightarrow \lambda(C_1) \times \lambda(C_1)$ , then we take the dual of the coarrows  $\lambda(C_1) = \lambda(C)_1$  to define a  $\mathbb{C}$ -linear operation  $\hat{+} \equiv \lambda \Delta_v^* : \lambda(C_1)^* \times \lambda(C_1)^* \rightarrow \lambda(C_1)^*$  which we will now use as a vector space addition for the set of dual coarrows  $\lambda(C)_1^*$ .

Now suppose the objects  $\lambda(C)_0$  itself has a vector space structure, such that the dual of the cosource and cotarget maps  $s^*, t^* : \lambda(C)_0^* \rightarrow \lambda(C)_1^*$  are both linear. Then  $\lambda(C)^* \in 2\text{Vect}^{BC}$  with the differential

$$d(f) = t^*(f) - s^*(f), \quad f \in \lambda(C)_0^*.$$

This makes  $\lambda(C)^* = \lambda(C)_0^* \xrightarrow{d} \lambda(C)_1^*$  into a Baez-Crans 2-vector space. The author is currently working with collaborators to flesh out this construction of  $\lambda$ . This construction is expected to be highly *non-canonical*.

<sup>a</sup>A *co-groupoid* is a cocategory whose coarrows are all coinvertible: namely there is a vertical *antipode*  $S_v$  such that the antipode axioms (4.11) hold. A "co-groupoid completion" can thus be understood as a left-adjoint to the forgetful functor from cogroupoids to cocategories.

Notice a swap of degrees upon dualization (cf. [56, 107, 108, 146])! We will see this happen in the proof of the following theorem as well.

**Theorem 4.3.** *Under hypothesis (H), the semiclassical limit of  $\mathfrak{C}_q(\mathbb{G})$  is dual to the Lie 2-bialgebra  $(\mathfrak{G} = \text{Lie } \mathbb{G}; \delta)$ .*

*Proof.* Recall the construction in §4.1. By the semiclassical limit  $\mathfrak{C}_{q \sim 1 + \hbar}(\mathbb{G})$ , we mean that we regard the categorified coordinate ring  $A = (\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{G}); \{-, -\}_\hbar)$  not as a Hopf opalgebroid, but instead merely as a cocategory equipped with the Fock-Rosly Poisson brackets (4.3) as a strict bracket functor (see Remark 4.10). We will also use Lemma 4.3 to view  $A$  also as categorified Hopf 2-algebra  $A = A_1 \xrightarrow{\bar{t}} A_0$  as in Definition 3.9, where  $\bar{t} = t^*$  is the pullback of the map  $t : \mathbb{H} \rightarrow G$  underlying the Lie 2-group  $\mathbb{G}$ .

We now apply  $\lambda$  to  $\mathfrak{C}_{q \sim 1 + \hbar}(\mathbb{G})$ . By construction, this operation leaves the horizontal structures alone while it Abelianizes the vertical structure into an operation " $\hat{+}$ ". The cointerchange (4.1) implies  $\Delta_\hbar$  is bilinear, and the antipode  $S$  reduces to a "subtraction".  $\lambda$  also linearizes the map  $\bar{t} = t^*$  on  $A$  (denoted also by  $\bar{t} = t^*$ ) whence, by functoriality of  $\lambda$  under hypothesis (H), the equivariance conditions (3.4), (4.15) become

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\bar{t}} \circ \Delta_1 &= \Delta_0 \circ \bar{t}, & D_{\bar{t}} \Delta_0 &= 0 & (*) \\ t^* \{-, -\}_\hbar &= \{t^* -, -\}_\hbar + \{-, t^* -\}_\hbar & (**), \end{aligned}$$

where  $D_{\bar{t}} = \bar{t} \otimes 1 \hat{+} 1 \otimes \bar{t}$  is the linear extension of the map  $\bar{t} = t^*$  to the complex  $A^{\otimes 2}$ . These conditions tell us the following.

1. (\*):  $\lambda$  sends the Hopf cocategory  $\mathfrak{C}_{q \sim 1 + \hbar}(\mathbb{G})$ , which is a Hopf algebra object in  $\text{Cocat}_{\mathbb{C}}$  [116], to the uncategoryfied Hopf 2-algebra  $C(\mathbb{G}) = C(G) \xrightarrow{t^*} C(\mathbb{H})$ , which is a Hopf algebra object in  $2\text{Vect}^{BC}$  [56].
2. (\*\*):  $\lambda$  sends the bracket functor  $\{-, -\}_\hbar$  to a (multiplicative) graded Poisson bivector on  $C(\mathbb{G})$  [67], which corresponds uniquely to a Lie 2-algebra cocycle  $\delta$  on  $\mathfrak{G}$  [107, 146].

Now as is well-known, for an ordinary Lie group  $G$  the function algebra  $C(G)$  is dual (topologically) to the universal enveloping algebra  $U\mathfrak{g}$  [9, 119], and the Lie functor  $L(U\mathfrak{g}) = \mathfrak{g}$  is adjoint to the enveloping functor  $U(-)$  [142]. By dualizing the Lie 2-algebra  $\lambda(A) = (C(\mathbb{G}), \{-, -\}_\hbar)$  to  $C(\mathbb{G})^* = C(\mathbb{H})^* \cong U\mathfrak{h} \xrightarrow{t} C(G) \cong U\mathfrak{g}$ , the results of Appendix B in [56] then applies:  $L$  sends  $\lambda(A)^*$  to a Lie 2-bialgebra  $(\mathfrak{G}; \delta)$  where  $\mathfrak{G} = \mathfrak{h} \xrightarrow{t} \mathfrak{g}$ . It was also shown there that the semiclassical limit  $R_\hbar \xrightarrow{q \sim 1 + \hbar} r$  recovers a 2-graded classical  $r$ -matrix for  $\mathfrak{G}$ .  $\square$

In other words, through hypothesis (H), the 2-graph states described above does indeed give a quantization of 2-Chern-Simons theory on the lattice.

## 5 Categorical quantum 2-gauge transformations

Equipped with the knowledge that 2-graph states form various interrelated Hopf structures, we are going to introduce a Hopf structure on 2-gauge transformations such that  $\mathcal{A}^0$  consist of *covariant* elements under the 2-gauge transformation  $\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1}$ -representation. Further, the Hopf structures on the two sides shall be compatible, in the sense that  $\Lambda$  defines a Hopf module structure.

In light of (4.6), the bounded linear operators  $U$  making the 2-gauge transformations  $\Lambda$  concrete strictly speaking now act on spaces of formal power series of sections over  $X$ . In this way, the groupoid of 2-gauge parameters  $\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1}$  themselves acquires a dependence on the formal parameter  $\hbar$ , as hence are themselves operator-valued formal power series. However, as most of what we will prove in the following is algebraic, this will not play a major role, hence we shall keep the dependence on  $\hbar$  and  $q$  implicit.

### 5.1 Coproducts on the 2-gauge transformations

Recall the  $\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1}$ -module structure of the 2-graph states is defined as a map  $\Lambda$  from the decorated 1-graphs  $\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1}$  into bounded linear operators between continuous measurable sections  $\Gamma_c(H^X) \rightarrow \Gamma_c((\Lambda H)^X)$ .

We have previously noted that there are bundle isomorphisms witnessing the compositions of 2-gauge transformations

$$\Lambda_{(a_v, \gamma_e)} \cdot \Lambda_{(a'_v, \gamma'_e)} \cong \Lambda_{(a_v a'_v, \gamma_e (a_v \triangleright \gamma'_e))}$$

horizontally, and also vertically

$$\Lambda_{(a_v, \gamma_{e_1})} \circ \Lambda_{(a_{v'}, \gamma_{e_2})} = \Lambda_{(a_v, \gamma_{e_1} \gamma_{e_2})}, \quad a_{v'} = a_v \dagger(\gamma_e)$$

on adjacent 1-graphs  $v \xrightarrow{e_1} v' \xrightarrow{e_2} v''$ .

Let  $\zeta = (g_v, a_e) \in \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1}$  denote an arbitrary 2-gauge parameter, we define in Sweedler notation the following *horizontal* and *vertical* coproducts

$$\tilde{\Delta}_h(\zeta) = \sum_h \zeta_1^h \otimes \zeta_2^h, \quad \tilde{\Delta}_v(\zeta) = \sum_v \zeta_1^v \otimes \zeta_2^v,$$

subject to the following condition

$$\sum_h \Lambda_{\zeta_1^h} \cdot \Lambda_{\zeta_2^h} = \Lambda_\zeta, \quad \sum_v \Lambda_{\zeta_1^v} \circ \Lambda_{\zeta_2^v} = \Lambda_\zeta. \quad (5.1)$$

We shall neglect the "h,v" superscripts when no confusion is possible. Coassociativity of  $\tilde{\Delta}$  follows from the associativity of the composition of 2-gauge transformations.

An explicit expression can be obtained by

$$\tilde{\Delta}_v(a_{v_1}, \gamma_e) = \sum_{\substack{v_2 = s(e_2) \\ \gamma_e = \gamma_{e_1} \gamma_{e_2}}} (a_{v_1}, \gamma_{e_1}) \otimes (a_{v_2}, \gamma_{e_2}), \quad (5.2)$$

where  $v_{1,2}$  denotes the source vertex of the edge  $e_{1,2}$ , and

$$\tilde{\Delta}_h(a_v, \gamma_e) = \sum_{\substack{a_v = a_v^1 a_v^2 \\ \gamma_e = \gamma_e^1 (a_v^1 \triangleright \gamma_e^2)}} (a_v^1, \gamma_e^1) \otimes (a_v^2, \gamma_e^2), \quad (5.3)$$

where the decorations all live on the same edge  $(v, e)$ . As  $\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1}$  is itself a measure space with respect to the measure  $\mu_{\Gamma^1}$  (see §3.4), we will also assume that the image of these coproducts  $\tilde{\Delta}_h, \tilde{\Delta}_v$  to be dense with respect to  $\mu_{\Gamma^1}$ .

Now the point is that  $\Lambda$  should endow  $\mathscr{A}^0$  with the structure of a Hopf monoidal module category over the 2-gauge transformations  $\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1}$ . This manifests as the following notion.

**Definition 5.1.** We say the action functor  $\Lambda : \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1} \times \mathscr{A}^0 \rightarrow \mathscr{A}^0$  has the **categorical quantum derivation property** iff there exist bundle identifications such that

$$\Lambda_- \circ (- \star -) \cong (- \star -) \circ (\Lambda \otimes \Lambda)_{\tilde{\Delta}}. \quad (5.4)$$

In the semiclassical regime, this condition manifests as the *multiplicativity*

$$\Lambda_- \circ \{-, -\} = \{-, -\} \circ (\Lambda \otimes \Lambda)_{\tilde{\Delta}} \quad (5.5)$$

of  $\Lambda$  against the combinatorial 2-group Fock-Rosly Poisson brackets.

Later, we will explain why this condition is named such in *Remark 5.3*, and prove in **Proposition 6.2** that (5.4) provides a necessary piece of categorical datum for our constructions.

Given the expression (4.5), then this condition (5.5) will boil down to the consistency of the coproducts  $\tilde{\Delta}$  with the geometry of the underlying 2-graphs in the *classical* regime (where the classical 2- $r$ -matrix  $r$  is trivial). We will demonstrate this in the following section.



## 5.2 Geometry of the coproduct $\tilde{\Delta}$

As we have mentioned, the condition (5.4) is necessary for the Hopf category  $\mathcal{A}^0$  to be a (measureable) Hopf module under 2-gauge transformations  $\Lambda : \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1} \times \mathcal{A}^0 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^0$ . Geometrically, this condition also has an interpretation in terms of the transverse intersection of embedded 2-cells  $C$  (now with boundary  $\partial C = c$ ) with the graph  $\Gamma$ , similar to what was described in §4.1.

To see this, it will be useful to introduce the following notation. For each face  $(e, f) \in \Gamma^2$  with root edge  $e$ , we define a 2-gauge action  $\Lambda^{(e, f)}$  on  $\mathcal{A}^{\Gamma^1}$  as follows,

$$\Lambda_{(a_v, \gamma_e)}^{(e', f')} = \begin{cases} \Lambda_{(a_v, \gamma_{e'})} & ; e' = e \\ \Lambda_{(a_v, \gamma_{e'})}^{-1} & ; e' = e * \partial f \\ \Lambda_{(a_v, 1)} & ; v = t(e') = s(e), \\ \Lambda_{(a_v, \mathbf{1}_{a_v})}^{-1} & ; v = s(e') = t(e) \\ \Lambda_{(1_v, (\mathbf{1}_{1_v})_e)} & ; \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad (a_v, \gamma_e) \in \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1}$$

where  $\bar{e}$  denotes the orientation reversal of the edge  $e$ , whose source  $s(\bar{e})$  is the target  $t(e)$  of  $e$ . This notation detects the proximity of a 2-gauge transformation from the decorated 2-graph localized at the face  $(e, f)$ . Thus if  $(e, f)$  is split by an intersecting 2-cell  $C$ , then we are able to deduce its action by 2-gauge transformations locally by looking at how the boundary 1-cell  $\partial C = c$  splits the 1-graph  $\Gamma^1$ . On the other hand, if  $(e, f)$  is *not* being split, then the 2-gauge transformation is applied in the usual manner.

### 5.2.1 Graph-splitting and 2-gauge transformations

Consider a 2-cell  $C$  meeting a face  $(e, f) \in \Gamma^2$  horizontally, and let  $(e_1, f_1), (e_2, f_2)$  denote the half-faces that one obtains upon splitting  $(e, f)$  along the 2-cell  $C$ . Suppose further that the boundary 1-cell  $\partial C = c$  meets the source edge  $e$  of the face  $f$  transversally.

For a 2-gauge transformation applied at this edge intersecting  $c$ , we have

$$\Lambda_{(a_{v_1}, \gamma_{e_1})} \psi_{(e_1, f_1)}, \quad \Lambda_{(a_{v_2}, \gamma_{e_2})} \psi_{(e_2, f_2)},$$

where  $v_{1,2}$  denotes the source vertex of the edge  $e_{1,2}$ . Recall that the left-action  $\Lambda$  is defined by pre-composing with a horizontal conjugation action (3.1), we see at the level of the decorated 2-graphs that

$$\text{hAd}_{(a_{v_1}, \gamma_{e_1})}^{-1}(h_{e_1}, b_{f_1}) \cdot_{\text{h}} \text{hAd}_{(a_{v_2}, \gamma_{e_2})}^{-1}(h_{e_2}, b_{f_2}) = \text{hAd}_{(a_{v_1}, \gamma_{e_1} \gamma_{e_2})}^{-1}(h_e, b_f),$$

where we have noted that  $v_2$  must also be the target vertex of  $e_1$  from the geometry, and by definition  $(h_{e_1}, b_{f_1}) \cdot_{\text{h}} (h_{e_2}, b_{f_2}) = (h_e, b_f)$ . This dictates how the 2-gauge transformations act on tensor products of 2-graph states. Thus evaluating this identity yields the *horizontal covariance* of the graph-cutting coproduct:

$$\Lambda_{(a_{v_1}, \gamma_e)} \circ ((- \otimes -) \circ \Delta_{\text{h}}) = (- \otimes -) \circ \left( \sum_{\substack{v_2 = s(e_2) \\ \gamma_e = \gamma_{e_1} \gamma_{e_2}}} \Lambda_{(a_{v_1}, \gamma_{e_1})} \otimes \Lambda_{(a_{v_2}, \gamma_{e_2})} \right) \circ \Delta_{\text{h}}. \quad (5.6)$$

Now let us consider the case where  $C$  meets the face  $(e, f)$  vertically, with  $(e_1, f_1), (e_2, f_2)$  the resulting split faces. Suppose the boundary  $\partial C = c$  immerses into  $f$  such that we can without loss of generality identify the source edge of the split face as  $e_2 = c$ . If the 2-gauge transformation is performed at the source/root edge of  $f$  (or equivalently that of  $f_1$ ), then it is disjoint from  $c$  and hence the 2-graph states transform as

$$\Lambda_{(a_v, \gamma_e)} \psi_{(e_1, f_1)}, \quad \psi_{(e_2, f_2)}.$$

Similarly, if it is performed at the target edge  $e' = e * \partial f$  of  $f$ , then it is disjoint from  $(e_1, f_1)$  whence we obtain the 2-gauge action

$$\psi_{(e_1, f_1)}, \quad \Lambda_{(a_{v_1}, \gamma_{e'})} \psi_{(e_2, f_2)}.$$

where the orientation reversal is used for the target edge.

Now suppose a 2-gauge transformation is performed at the source edge  $e_2$  of  $f_2$ , such that it overlaps with the 1-cell boundary  $c$ . This intersects both of the split faces, whence

$$\Lambda_{(a_{\bar{v}_2}, \gamma_{\bar{e}_2})} \psi_{(e_1, f_1)}, \quad \Lambda_{(a_{v_2}, \gamma_{e_2})} \psi_{(e_2, f_2)},$$

where an orientation reversal occurs because  $e_2$  must be the target edge of  $f_1$ . Since this edge does not exist prior to splitting the face  $(e, f)$  vertically, the only 2-gauge transformation one apply to  $(e, f)$  in this case can be non-trivial on the source and edge vertices of  $e$ ,

$$a_v = a_{\bar{v}_2} a_{v_2}^{-1}, \quad 1 = \gamma_{\bar{e}_2} \gamma_{e_2}.$$

Thus in summary, we achieve the *vertical covariance* of the coproduct

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_{(a_v, \gamma_\epsilon)} \circ ((-\otimes -) \circ \Delta_v) &= (-\otimes -) \circ \begin{cases} (\Lambda_{(a_v, \gamma_\epsilon)} \otimes \Lambda_{(a_v, 1)}) \circ \Delta_v & ; \epsilon = e \\ \Delta_v \circ \Lambda_{(a_v, \gamma_\epsilon)} = (\Lambda_{(a_v, 1)} \otimes \Lambda_{(a_v, \gamma_\epsilon)}) \circ \Delta_v & ; \epsilon = e * \partial f \end{cases} \\ \Lambda_{(a_v, 1_{a_v})} \circ ((-\otimes -) \circ \Delta_v) &= (-\otimes -) \circ \left( \sum_{\substack{a_v = a_{v_1} a_{v_2} \\ 1 = \gamma_{e_2} \gamma_{e_2}}} \bar{\Lambda}_{(a_{v_1}, \gamma_{e_2})} \otimes \Lambda_{(a_{v_2}, \gamma_{e_2})} \right) \circ \Delta_v, \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

where " $\bar{\Lambda}$ " can be thought of as a vertical inversion of the 2-gauge transformations.

Now in either case, if the 2-gauge transformation is localized to the left of the face  $(e, f)$ , then the it acts only on the source vertex of  $e_1$ . Similarly, if the 2-gauge transformation is localized to the right of  $(e, f)$ , then only the right-most half-face is transformed. The same geometric arguments as above gives a *primitive* form of the coproducts

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_{(a_{v'}, \gamma_{e'})} \circ ((-\otimes -) \circ \Delta_{h,v}) &= (-\otimes -) \circ (\Lambda_{(a_{v_1}, 1)} \otimes 1) \circ \Delta_{h,v}, \\ \Lambda_{(a_{v_2}, \gamma_{e''})} \circ ((-\otimes -) \circ \Delta_{h,v}) &= (-\otimes -) \circ (1 \otimes \Lambda_{(a_{v_2}^{-1}, 1)}) \circ \Delta_{h,v}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

where  $e' : v' \rightarrow v_1$  and where  $e'' : v_2 \rightarrow v''$ . In other words, the coproducts  $\tilde{\Delta}$  are primitive if the 2-gauge parameters and the 2-graph states are delocalized.

Here,  $\tilde{\Delta}$  can be seen form the geometry to satisfy the cointerchange relation

$$(\tilde{\Delta}_v \otimes \tilde{\Delta}_v) \circ \tilde{\Delta}_h \cong (1 \otimes \sigma \otimes 1) \circ (\tilde{\Delta}_h \otimes \tilde{\Delta}_h) \circ \tilde{\Delta}_v. \quad (5.9)$$

Indeed, there is a closed contractible 2-cell which serves as a homotopy between the composition + stacking and the stacking + composition of edge graphs in  $\Gamma^1$ . When the Lie 2-group  $\mathbb{G}$  is strict, this 2-cell is assigned a trivial decoration and hence there are no witnesses for (5.9).

*Remark 5.1.* Here we make the key point about the interchange relations (4.1), (5.9). In the case of the 2-graph states, when the underlying 2-group  $\mathbb{G}$  is weakly-associative, a witness for the cointerchange (4.1) is acquired by the presence of the Postnikov class  $\tau$ . This is because of the 2-curvature condition forcing decorated 2-graphs to assign a factor of  $\tau$  to 3-cells. In the case of the 2-gauge transformations, on the other hand, there is no notion of going "on-shell", hence the cointerchange 2-cell (5.9) acquires a witness in a different way. By working through the 2-gauge transformations, this witness can be seen to be given by the *first descendant* of  $\tau$  [52, 99]. This is a 2-cocycle which depends on the holonomy  $h_e$ , as well as the gauge parameter  $a_v$ , living on the 2-cell.

In the classical undeformed setting, the  $R$ -matrices are trivial  $R = 1_{\mathbb{C}} \otimes 1_{\mathbb{C}}$ , whence the expression (4.7) for  $\star$  only involves a contraction with the graph-splitting coproduct  $(-\otimes -) \circ \Delta$ . As such, these expressions (5.6), (5.7), (5.8) give precisely the *classical* version of (5.4). This suffices for the vertical structures (see *Remark 4.3*), but not for the horizontal ones. We shall see in the following section that, in order to have a quantum version of (5.4), we must have a non-trivial  $R$ -matrix on the 2-gauge parameters  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$  as well.

### 5.2.2 The $R$ -matrices on $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$

To promote the compatibility conditions (5.6), (5.7) to the quantum theory, we are going to assume that there exist elements  $\tilde{R} = \tilde{R}_{h,v} \in \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1} \otimes \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1}$  such that there are bundle identifications

$$\begin{aligned} R \otimes (\Lambda_{\tilde{\Delta}_\zeta}(\phi_1 \times \phi_2)) &\cong \Lambda_{\tilde{R}, \tilde{\Delta}_\zeta}(\phi_1 \times \phi_2) \\ (\Lambda_{\tilde{\Delta}_\zeta}(\phi_1 \times \phi_2)) \otimes R &\cong \Lambda_{\tilde{\Delta}_\zeta, \tilde{R}}(\phi_1 \times \phi_2) \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

for all 2-graph states  $\phi_{1,2} \in \mathcal{A}^0$  and  $\zeta, \zeta' \in \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1}$ .<sup>11</sup> The purpose of this condition is that, if these objects  $\tilde{R}$  "behaves" like a  $R$ -matrix for the quantum 2-gauge parameters  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ , namely they satisfy the intertwining relations

$$(\sigma \tilde{\Delta}_h)(a_v, \gamma_e) \cdot \tilde{R}_h^T = \tilde{R}_h \cdot \tilde{\Delta}_h(a_v, \gamma_e), \quad (\sigma \tilde{\Delta}_v)(a_v, \gamma_e) \circ \tilde{R}_v^T = \tilde{R}_v \circ \tilde{\Delta}_v(a_v, \gamma_e) \quad (5.11)$$

for each  $\zeta = (a_v, \gamma_e) \in \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1}$ , then (5.4) follows.

**Theorem 5.1.** *If there exist  $\tilde{R} = \tilde{R}_h \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}} \times \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$  such that (5.10) and (5.11) are satisfied, then the 2-gauge transformation functor  $\Lambda$  has the categorical quantum derivation property.*

*Proof.* As we have mentioned previously, (5.6), (5.7), (5.8) suffice for the vertical structures. Thus let us focus now on the horizontal structures. For this, we are going to leverage the expression (4.7).

If  $(e, f), (e', f')$  are "delocalized" faces, then from (4.5) the Poisson bracket is trivial, hence the product reduces to the classical one  $\star = \otimes$ . Thus suppose  $(e, f), (e', f')$  are not delocalized.

Let  $\phi_{(e'', f'')}$  be a localized 2-graph state for which  $(e'', f'') = (e, f) \cup (e', f')$  can be written as the gluing of two faces  $(e, f), (e', f') \in \Gamma^2$  along a 2-cell  $C$ . Then beginning from the right-hand side of (5.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (- \star -)(\Lambda_{\tilde{\Delta}_\zeta}(\phi_{(e,f)} \otimes \phi_{(e',f')})) &= (- \otimes -)[R, \Lambda_{\tilde{\Delta}_\zeta} \Delta \phi_{(e'', f'')}]_C \\ &= (- \otimes -)(R \otimes \Lambda_{\tilde{\Delta}_\zeta} \Delta \phi_{(e'', f'')} - (\Lambda_{\tilde{\Delta}_\zeta} \Delta \phi_{(e'', f'')} )^{\text{op}} \otimes \tilde{R}^T), \end{aligned}$$

where the superscript "op" means that the two tensor factors are swapped (note  $\Delta^{\text{op}}$  is the same as  $\sigma \circ \Delta$ ). Consider the first term: using the condition (5.10), then (5.11) and (5.10) again gives us

$$\begin{aligned} R \otimes \Lambda_{\tilde{\Delta}_\zeta} \Delta \phi_{(e'', f'')} &= \Lambda_{\tilde{R}, \tilde{\Delta}_\zeta} \Delta \phi_{(e'', f'')} = \Lambda_{\tilde{\Delta}_\zeta^{\text{op}}, \tilde{R}} \Delta \phi_{(e'', f'')} \\ &\cong (\Delta^{\text{op}} \phi_{(e'', f'')} \Lambda_{\tilde{\Delta}_\zeta^{\text{op}}, \tilde{R}}^T)^{\text{op}} = ((\Delta^{\text{op}} \phi_{(e'', f'')} \otimes \tilde{R}^T) \Lambda_{\tilde{\Delta}_\zeta^{\text{op}}}^T)^{\text{op}} \\ &\cong \Lambda_{\tilde{\Delta}_\zeta} ((\Delta^{\text{op}} \phi_{(e'', f'')} \otimes R^T))^{\text{op}} \end{aligned}$$

If we perform a contraction  $(- \otimes -)$ , then we can make use of (5.6), (5.7) to get

$$\Lambda_\zeta ((- \otimes -)(\Delta^{\text{op}} \phi_{(e'', f'')} \otimes R^T))^{\text{op}} = \Lambda_\zeta (- \otimes -)(R \otimes \Delta \phi_{(e'', f'')}),$$

which is nothing but the first term of  $\Lambda_\zeta(\phi_{(e,f)} \star \phi_{(e',f')})$ . The same argument takes care of the second term, whence we finally achieve (5.4)

$$(- \star -)(\Lambda_{\tilde{\Delta}_\zeta}(\phi_{(e,f)} \otimes \phi_{(e',f')})) = \Lambda_\zeta(\phi_{(e,f)} \star \phi_{(e',f')}),$$

as desired. □

<sup>11</sup>The "." on the right-hand sides denote composition of 2-gauge transformations in  $\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1}$ .

### 5.3 Hopf structure on the quantum 2-gauge transformations

The compatibility condition (5.4) allows us to transport the commutative diagram (4.9) to the 2-gauge transformations,

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
(\zeta_{11} \otimes_{\mathfrak{h}} \zeta_{12}) \otimes_{\mathfrak{v}} (\zeta_{22} \otimes_{\mathfrak{h}} \zeta_{21}) & \xrightarrow{=} & (\zeta_{11} \otimes_{\mathfrak{v}} \zeta_{22}) \otimes_{\mathfrak{h}} (\zeta_{12} \otimes_{\mathfrak{v}} \zeta_{21}) \xrightarrow{\tilde{R}_{\mathfrak{v}}^{1;4} \otimes 1} (\zeta_{22} \otimes_{\mathfrak{v}} \zeta_{11}) \otimes_{\mathfrak{h}} (\zeta_{12} \otimes_{\mathfrak{v}} \zeta_{21}) \\
\uparrow 1 \otimes \tilde{R}_{\mathfrak{h}}^{3;4} & & \uparrow \tilde{R}_{\mathfrak{h}}^{23;14} \\
(\zeta_{11} \otimes_{\mathfrak{h}} \zeta_{12}) \otimes_{\mathfrak{v}} (\zeta_{21} \otimes_{\mathfrak{h}} \zeta_{22}) & & \\
\downarrow \tilde{R}_{\mathfrak{h}}^{1;2} \otimes 1 & & \downarrow \tilde{R}_{\mathfrak{h}}^{23;41} \\
(\zeta_{12} \otimes_{\mathfrak{h}} \zeta_{11}) \otimes_{\mathfrak{v}} (\zeta_{21} \otimes_{\mathfrak{h}} \zeta_{22}) & \xrightarrow{=} & (\zeta_{12} \otimes_{\mathfrak{v}} \zeta_{21}) \otimes_{\mathfrak{h}} (\zeta_{11} \otimes_{\mathfrak{v}} \zeta_{22}) \xrightarrow{1 \otimes \tilde{R}_{\mathfrak{v}}^{1;4}} (\zeta_{12} \otimes_{\mathfrak{v}} \zeta_{21}) \otimes_{\mathfrak{h}} (\zeta_{22} \otimes_{\mathfrak{v}} \zeta_{11})
\end{array}, \tag{5.12}$$

where we have used the Sweedler notation shorthand

$$\tilde{\Delta}_{\mathfrak{h}}(\zeta) = \zeta_1 \otimes_{\mathfrak{h}} \zeta_2, \quad \tilde{\Delta}_{\mathfrak{v}}(\zeta) = \zeta_1 \otimes_{\mathfrak{v}} \zeta_2.$$

In the same manner as in **Theorem 4.2**, this commutative diagram (5.12) can be used to deduce the following quasitriangularity conditions

$$(\tilde{\Delta}_{\mathfrak{h}} \otimes 1) \tilde{R}_{\mathfrak{h}} = \tilde{R}_{\mathfrak{h}}^{13} \otimes \tilde{R}_{\mathfrak{h}}^{12}, \quad (1 \otimes \tilde{\Delta}_{\mathfrak{h}}) \tilde{R}_{\mathfrak{h}} = \tilde{R}_{\mathfrak{h}}^{13} \otimes \tilde{R}_{\mathfrak{h}}^{23}, \tag{5.13}$$

which will come into play later.

#### 5.3.1 Antipode on the 2-gauge transformations

Recall from the geometry of the 1-graphs that a *horizontal* inversion of the 2-gauge transformation operators has been used in the definition of  $\Lambda^{(e,f)}$ , while a *vertical* inversion has been used in the last equation of (5.3). We use these to define the horizontal and vertical antipodes

$$\Lambda_{(a_v, \gamma_e)}^{-1} = \Lambda_{\tilde{S}_{\mathfrak{h}}(a_v, \gamma_e)}, \quad \bar{\Lambda}_{(a_v, \gamma_e)} = \Lambda_{\tilde{S}_{\mathfrak{v}}(a_v, \gamma_e)}$$

such that the computations (5.2) and (5.3) imply by construction

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{v}} \Lambda_{\tilde{S}_{\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{v}}(a_{v_1}, \gamma_{e_1})}^{(e, f)} \cdot \Lambda_{(a_{v_2}, \gamma_{e_2})}^{(e, f)} = \sum_{\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{v}} \Lambda_{(a_{v_1}, \gamma_{e_1})}^{(e, f)} \cdot \Lambda_{\tilde{S}_{\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{v}}(a_{v_2}, \gamma_{e_2})}^{(e, f)} = \text{id} \cdot \tilde{\epsilon}$$

where  $\tilde{\epsilon}$  is the a 2-gauge transformation given by the trivially decorated 1-graph  $\{(1_v, (\mathbf{1}_{1_v})_e)\}_{(v, e)}$  and  $\text{id}$  is the unit 2-gauge transformation  $\Lambda$  such that  $\text{id}_{(a_v, \gamma_e)} = \text{id}$  for all  $(a_v, \gamma_e)$ . This is precisely the *strict* antipode axioms,

$$\begin{aligned}
(- \cdot -)(\tilde{S}_{\mathfrak{h}} \otimes 1) \circ \tilde{\Delta}_{\mathfrak{h}} &= (- \cdot -)(1 \otimes \tilde{S}_{\mathfrak{h}}) \tilde{\Delta}_{\mathfrak{h}} = \tilde{\eta} \cdot \tilde{\epsilon}, \\
(- \circ -)(\tilde{S}_{\mathfrak{v}} \otimes 1) \circ \tilde{\Delta}_{\mathfrak{v}} &= (- \circ -)(1 \otimes \tilde{S}_{\mathfrak{v}}) \tilde{\Delta}_{\mathfrak{v}} = \tilde{\eta} \circ \tilde{\epsilon},
\end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

where  $\cdot, \circ$  are the horizontal and vertical compositions of 2-gauge transformations.

The definition of the vertical antipode is geometric in nature: it is induced by an orientation reversal of the edges. When acting on a 2-graph state, this orientation reversal also performs an involution on  $\Gamma^2$ , whence  $\tilde{S}_{\mathfrak{v}}$  by definition satisfies

$$\overline{\Lambda_{\zeta} \phi} = \bar{\Lambda}_{\zeta} \bar{\phi} = \Lambda_{\tilde{S}_{\mathfrak{v}, \zeta}} \bar{\phi}.$$

Together with the unitarity of the 2-holonomies  $\bar{\phi} = S\phi^*$ , we acquire the compatibility of  $\Lambda$  also against the antipodes

$$S(\Lambda_{\zeta} \phi)^* = \Lambda_{\tilde{S}_{\zeta}}(S\phi^*).$$

This, together with (5.13), allows us to deduce the analogue of (4.20) for  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} = \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1}$ ,

$$(\tilde{S} \otimes 1) \tilde{R} \hat{\cdot} \tilde{R} = \text{id}. \tag{5.15}$$

Note in using these compatibility conditions to transport structures on  $\mathcal{A}^0$  to  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$  requires the 2-gauge transformations  $\Lambda$  to be faithful as a representation.

*Remark 5.2.* In the ordinary Hopf algebra case, the bijectiveness of the antipode can be shown from the relation  $(S \otimes S)R = R$  [9], which in turn can be deduced from the property  $(S \otimes 1)R = R^{-1}$  for the  $R$ -matrix and the antipode axioms. Thus given (5.15) and (5.14), we expect the antipodes  $\tilde{S}_h, \tilde{S}_v$  to be equivalences. However, this is merely an algebraic result; the analytic condition we need is that, for each  $\phi \in \mathcal{A}^0$  corresponding to a measurable field  $H^X$ , the orbit measurable fields  $\mathcal{O}^{-1}H^X, \bar{\mathcal{O}}H^X$  defined using the representations  $\Lambda^{-1}, \bar{\Lambda}$ , respectively, are *dense* in  $\mathcal{O}H^X$  (see §3.5). This then ensures that, for any  $\zeta$  in any measurable subset  $A \subset \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$  with non-trivial measure, we can apply faithfulness of  $\Lambda$  to find an element — call it  $\tilde{S}_h\zeta$  — for which  $\Lambda_\zeta^{-1} = \Lambda_{\tilde{S}_h\zeta}$ ; similarly for  $\tilde{S}_v$ .

We collect these antipodes as functors

$$\tilde{S}_v : \tilde{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{C}}^{\text{op}}, \quad \tilde{S}_h : \tilde{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{C}}^{\text{c-op, m-op}}$$

on  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} = \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1}$ , which we assume to both be equivalences (see the above *Remark 5.2*). Moreover, based on the fact that  $\tilde{S}_v$  is induced from an involutive 1-graph orientation reversal, we will assume that  $\tilde{S}_v$  is also involutive. The strict cointerchange relation (5.9) requires that these antipodes strongly commute  $\tilde{S}_h^{\text{op}} \circ \tilde{S}_v = \tilde{S}_v^{\text{m-op, c-op}} \circ \tilde{S}_h$ . This property will come back to us in §6.2.

### 5.3.2 2-gauge transformations as a Hopf algebroid

By a "Hopf algebroid", we mean an additive *monoidal category* equipped with a coproduct functor, making it also into a (strict) bimonoidal category. This structure is dual but equivalent to a Hopf opalgebroid [116]. We are now ready to prove the following.

**Lemma 5.1.** *The 2-gauge transformations  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} = \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1}$  is an additive comonoidal category.*

*Proof.* First, we make  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} = \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1}$  additive by setting  $\Lambda_{\zeta \oplus \zeta'} = \Lambda_\zeta \oplus \Lambda_{\zeta'}$ . To make  $\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1}$  into an additive category, we will induce a source and target maps  $\bar{s}, \bar{t}$  on  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$  through the following,

$$\hat{s}^*(\Lambda_\zeta \phi) = \Lambda_{\bar{s}\zeta} \hat{s}^* \phi, \quad \hat{t}^*(\Lambda_\zeta \phi) = \Lambda_{\bar{t}\zeta} \hat{t}^* \phi,$$

where we recall  $\hat{s}^*, \hat{t}^*$  are the cosource/cotarget maps on the 2-graph states  $\mathcal{A}^0$  (see **Lemma 4.1**). Denote by  $\mathcal{V}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}$  the *vertex/edge parameters*, whose 2-gauge transformations  $\Lambda_\zeta$  are localized respectively on the vertices  $v$  and edges  $e$  of the 1-graph  $\Gamma^1$ , then these structure maps give

$$\bar{s}, \bar{t} : \tilde{\mathcal{E}} \rightrightarrows \mathcal{V}.$$

The comonoidal functor is the horizontal coproduct  $\tilde{\Delta}_h$ , which together with the structure maps  $\bar{s}, \bar{t}$  completely specifies the vertical coproduct

$$\tilde{\Delta}_v : \tilde{\mathcal{E}} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{E}} \times_{\mathcal{V}} \tilde{\mathcal{E}}$$

through the cointerchange (5.9). □

The way in which the horizontal structures completely determines the vertical structures in a category is as follows. In a monoidal category, for instance, we have the "nudging relation"

$$f \otimes g = (\text{id}_{Y'} \otimes f) \circ (g \otimes \text{id}_X) = (g \otimes \text{id}_{X'}) \circ (\text{id}_Y \otimes f)$$

for morphisms  $f : X \rightarrow X', g : Y \rightarrow Y'$ . Note tensoring with the identity on the tensor unit  $\text{id}_I \otimes - : \text{Hom}(Y, Y') \rightarrow \text{Hom}(Y, Y')$  is an isomorphism. This allows us to deduce the vertical structure  $\circ$  from the horizontal structure  $\otimes$ , at least on the (horizontally) invertible morphisms.

We now endow  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$  with a monoidal structure coming from the composition of 2-gauge transformations  $\Lambda_\zeta \cdot \Lambda_{\zeta'} \cong \Lambda_{\zeta \cdot \zeta'}$  for  $\zeta, \zeta' \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}} = \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1}$ , as explained in §3.4. In the following, we shall make use of the shorthand  $\Lambda_{\tilde{\Delta}_\zeta} = (\Lambda \otimes \Lambda)_{\tilde{\Delta}_\zeta}$ .

**Theorem 5.2.**  *$\tilde{\mathcal{C}} = \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1}$  is a cobraided Hopf algebroid.*

*Proof.* We first need to prove the bimonoidal axioms (4.10). For each 2-graph state  $\phi \in \mathcal{C} = \mathcal{A}^0$ , we have from (5.4) that

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta(\Lambda_\zeta(\Lambda_{\zeta'}\phi)) &= \Lambda_{\tilde{\Delta}_\zeta}(\Delta(\Lambda_{\zeta'}\phi)) = \Lambda_{\tilde{\Delta}_\zeta} \cdot \Lambda_{\tilde{\Delta}_{\zeta'}}(\Delta\phi) \\ &= ((\Lambda_{\zeta_1} \cdot \Lambda_{\zeta'_1}) \otimes (\Lambda_{\zeta_2} \cdot \Lambda_{\zeta'_2}))\Delta(\phi),\end{aligned}$$

whereas

$$\Delta(\Lambda_{\zeta \cdot \zeta'}\phi) = \Lambda_{\tilde{\Delta}_{\zeta \cdot \zeta'}}(\Delta\phi) = (\Lambda_{(\zeta \cdot \zeta')_1} \otimes \Lambda_{(\zeta \cdot \zeta')_2})\Delta(\phi).$$

These two expressions, which model spaces of measurable sections of a Hermitian vector bundle, are equivalent up to possibly a projective phase  $c$  mentioned in Remark 3.9, hence

$$(1 \otimes \sigma \otimes 1)(-\cdot - \otimes - \cdot -)(\tilde{\Delta}_\zeta \otimes \tilde{\Delta}_{\zeta'}) = \zeta_1 \cdot \zeta'_1 \otimes \zeta_2 \cdot \zeta'_2 = \tilde{\Delta}_{\zeta \cdot \zeta'} \quad (5.16)$$

as desired. This makes  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$  into a bimonoidal category.

We now just need the antipodes  $\tilde{S}$  and the cobraiding induced by the  $R$ -matrices  $\tilde{R}$ . They, as well as the appropriate conditions that they satisfy, are already described in the previous sections.  $\square$

We call the Hopf category  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} = \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1}$  the **quantum 2-gauge transformations**.

**Definition 5.2.** The **categorical quantum enveloping algebra**  $\mathbb{U}_q\mathfrak{G}$  is the quantum 2-gauge transformation  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} = \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1}$  on the 1-graph  $\Gamma^1$  consisting of a single edge loop  $v \xrightarrow{e} v$ , and a marked vertex  $v \in \Gamma^0$  as its 0-skeleton.

Suppose the 2-graph  $\Gamma^2$  consist of a single closed face whose 1-skeleton  $\Gamma^1$  is a single closed marked loop, then  $\Lambda$  endows the categorical quantum coordinate ring  $\mathfrak{C}_q(\mathbb{G})$  is a module over the categorical quantum enveloping algebra  $\mathbb{U}_q\mathfrak{G}$ .

*Remark 5.3.* Let us return for the moment to the case of the ordinary compact semisimple Lie group  $G$ . Recall the coproduct on  $U\mathfrak{g}$  is primitive  $\tilde{\Delta}(X) = X \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes X$ . The condition analogous to (5.4) in the classical case then reproduces the *Leibniz rule*

$$\Lambda_X(fg) = (\Lambda_X f)g + f(\Lambda_X g), \quad X \in U\mathfrak{g}, \quad f, g \in C(G),$$

which identifies  $\Lambda : U\mathfrak{g} \otimes C(G) \rightarrow C(G)$  as the canonical action of  $U\mathfrak{g}$  by derivations on the functions  $C(G)$  [119]. This explains why (5.4) was called the "quantum derivation" property: the action of  $\mathbb{U}_q\mathfrak{G}$  on  $\mathfrak{C}_q(\mathbb{G})$  behaves like a "derivation", and give further support for the interpretation that  $\mathbb{U}_q\mathfrak{G}$  is the categorical version of the quantum enveloping algebra. See also §6.1.1 later.

At this point, " $\mathbb{U}_q\mathfrak{G}$ " is merely a suggestive symbol, but we expect to be able to substantiate this notation through a form of *categorical quantum duality* between  $\mathfrak{C}_q(\mathbb{G})$  and  $\mathbb{U}_q\mathfrak{G}$ . This is in analogy with the quantum duality between  $C_q(G)$  and  $U_q\mathfrak{g}$  [119]; we will say more about this in §7.

## 6 Lattice 2-algebra of 2-Chern-Simons theory

Recall in §3.4 the 2-graph states  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{A}^0$  is a (possibly projective) representation  $\Lambda$  of the (secondary-gauge equivalence classes of) 2-gauge transformations  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} = \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1}$ . Given what we have found in the previous sections, we now demonstrate how the Hopf categorical structure of 2-gauge parameters can be "combined" with that of the 2-graph states. This is done by describing the way in which  $\mathcal{A}^0$  can be seen a "regular" representation under  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ .

Then, we will define a Hopf category  $\mathcal{B}^\Gamma$  encapsulating all of the degrees-of-freedom and gauge symmetries of 2-Chern-Simons theory on the lattice. This is accomplished through a categorical semidirect product construction, which will by definition embed the 2-graph states  $\mathcal{A}^0$  into  $\mathcal{B}^\Gamma$  as a subcategory. We call this Hopf category  $\mathcal{B}^\Gamma$  the **lattice 2-algebra** of 2-Chern-Simons theory, which can be understood as a categorified 4d analogue of the lattice algebra constructed in [39].

## 6.1 Regularity of the 2-graph states

Let  $\mathbb{G}$  be a compact matrix Lie 2-group, in the sense that  $G, H$  are both compact matrix groups. We now put the Hopf categories  $\mathcal{A}^0$  of 2-graph states and their 2-gauge transformations  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$  on them together. To do so, we first need a notion of "regularity" for the  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ -module structure of the 2-graph states.

Recall  $\Lambda$  represents  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$  under a horizontal *conjugation* on the 2-graph states  $\mathcal{A}^0$ . To make  $\mathcal{A}^0$  into a regular representation, we need to describe how these 2-graph states  $\phi$  transform under a horizontal *translation*. For this, the above Hopf structure will be used.

To begin, we first recall the bounded linear operator  $U_{(a_v, \gamma_e)} : \Gamma_c(H^X) \rightarrow \Gamma_c((\Lambda_{(a_v, \gamma_e)} H)^X)$  making  $\Lambda$  concrete on the 2-graph states  $\phi$ , treated as spaces of continuous measurable sections of a Hermitian vector bundles. The notion of a 2-graph state  $\phi$  being **regular** is the existence of a  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ -bimodule structure on  $\mathcal{A}^0$ . More precisely, for each  $\zeta = (a_v, \gamma_e) \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$  we denote by  $r_\zeta H^X, \ell_\zeta H^X$  the pullback bundles

$$\begin{array}{ccc} r_\zeta H^X & \dashrightarrow & H^X \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2} & \xrightarrow{-\zeta} & \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2} \end{array}, \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \ell_\zeta H^X & \dashrightarrow & H^X \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2} & \xrightarrow{\zeta \cdot -} & \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2} \end{array}$$

along the left/right horizontal 2-group multiplication by  $\zeta$ ; similarly, we denote by  $t_\zeta H^X, b_\zeta H^X$  the pullback bundles corresponding to a top/bottom vertical groupoid multiplication by  $\zeta$ .

Clearly, there are obvious bundle identifications over  $X = \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2}$  which witness the fact that the left/top multiplications commute with the right/bottom multiplications, as well as their associativity and strict interchange relations.

Given this structure, the  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ -bimodule structure on  $\mathcal{A}^0$  is presented by bounded linear operators denoted by

$$\begin{aligned} - \bullet_h \zeta &: \Gamma_c(H^X) \rightarrow \Gamma_c(r_\zeta H^X), & \zeta \bullet_h - &: \Gamma_c(H^X) \rightarrow \Gamma_c(\ell_\zeta H^X), \\ - \bullet_v \zeta &: \Gamma_c(H^X) \rightarrow \Gamma_c(b_\zeta H^X), & \zeta \bullet_v - &: \Gamma_c(H^X) \rightarrow \Gamma_c(t_\zeta H^X), \end{aligned}$$

where the continuous measurable sections  $\Gamma_c(H^X)$  of  $H^X$  models a 2-graph state  $\phi \in \mathcal{A}^0$ . We shall in the following collectively denote by this bimodule structure as simply  $\bullet$ , and the image of these operators by  $\zeta \bullet \phi$  and  $\phi \bullet \zeta \in \mathcal{A}^0$  for  $\zeta = (a_v, \gamma_e)$ . As such, 2-gauge transformations under the action of  $\Lambda$  of a left-regular 2-graph state  $\phi$  can be written as conjugation under this bimodule structure.

From the shift gauge symmetry  $t(\gamma)$  present in the edge holonomies  $h$ , it is clear that to do this, one must divide  $\gamma_e$  into two decorated half-edges — using the coproduct  $\tilde{\Delta}$  — and then stack them back. This motivates the following notion.

**Definition 6.1.** A 2-graph state  $\phi \in C(\mathbb{G}^\Gamma)$  is called **left-covariant** iff for each  $\zeta$ , there is an isomorphism of Hermitian vector bundles such that we have the following equality

$$\phi \bullet (a_v, \gamma_e) = (1 \otimes U)_{\tilde{\Delta}(a_v, \gamma_e)} \bullet \phi, \quad \forall (a_v, \gamma_e) \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}} \quad (6.1)$$

of spaces of continuous measurable sections over  $X = \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2}$ . Or, more explicitly in Sweedler notation,

$$\phi \bullet (a_v, \gamma_e) = \sum_{\substack{a_v^1 a_v^2 = a_v \\ \gamma_e^1 \gamma_e^2 = \gamma_e}} (((a_v^1, \gamma_e^1) \bullet -)(U_{(a_v^2, \gamma_e^2)})) \bullet \phi \cong \sum_{\substack{a_v^1 a_v^2 = a_v \\ \gamma_e^1 \gamma_e^2 = \gamma_e}} (a_v^1, \gamma_e^2) \bullet (U_{(a_v^2, \gamma_e^2)} \phi),$$

where " $\cong$ " denotes the appearance of module associators, which we shall suppress in the following.

Note (6.1) contains *two* conditions: horizontal/vertical covariance with respect to  $\bullet_h, \tilde{\Delta}_h$  and  $\bullet_v, \tilde{\Delta}_v$ . It is clear to see that these conditions preserve the interchange relations, since the interchange of 2-group multiplication (which is implemented by  $\bullet$ ) implies that of 2-group conjugation (which is implemented by  $U$ ).

Let us see how we can recover the desired notion of covariance from (6.1). By composing on the left by the antipode of  $(a_v^1, \gamma_e^1)$ , the antipode axiom (5.14) leads to

$$\sum_{(a_v^1, \gamma_e^1)^{-1} \cdot (a_v, \gamma_e) = (a_v^2, \gamma_e^2)} (\tilde{S}(a_v^1, \gamma_e^1)) \bullet \phi \bullet (a_v, \gamma_e) = U_{(a_v^2, \gamma_e^2)} \phi,$$

which reads as the desired covariance condition,

$$U_{(a_v, \gamma_e)} \phi = \sum_{(a_v^1, \gamma_{e_1})^{-1} \cdot (a_v^2, \gamma_{e_2}) = (a_v, \gamma_e)} (\tilde{S}(a_v^1, \gamma_{e_1}^1)) \bullet \phi \bullet (a_v^2, \gamma_{e_2}^2),$$

upon a quick change of variables.

**Proposition 6.1.** *Every left-covariant 2-graph state  $\phi$  is also right-covariant,*

$$(a_v, \gamma_e) \bullet \phi = \phi \bullet (1 \otimes \bar{U})_{\tilde{\Delta}(a_v, \gamma_e)}, \quad \forall (a_v, \gamma_e) \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}},$$

where  $\bar{U}_{(a_v, \gamma_e)} = U_{\tilde{S}^{-1}(a_v, \gamma_e)}^\dagger$  is the dual contragredient representation.

*Proof.* Let us use the shorthand  $\zeta$  for transformations by elements in  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ . From the left-covariance of  $\phi$  at the element  $\zeta_1$ , we have

$$\phi \bullet \zeta_1 = \sum_{v_1} \zeta_{11} \bullet (U_{\zeta_{12}} \phi),$$

where  $\sum_{v_1}$  denotes a summation over coproduct components of  $\tilde{\Delta}_v(\zeta_1)$ . By applying from the left the operator  $U_{\tilde{S}^{-1}\zeta_2}$  and summing, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_v U_{\tilde{S}^{-1}\zeta_2} (\phi \bullet \zeta_1) &= \sum_v \sum_{v_1} U_{\tilde{S}^{-1}\zeta_2} (\zeta_{11} \bullet (U_{\zeta_{12}} \phi)) = \sum_v \sum_{v_2} \zeta_1 \bullet (U_{\zeta_{21}\tilde{S}^{-1}\zeta_{22}} \phi) \\ &= \sum_v \zeta_1 \bullet (U_{\epsilon(\zeta_2)} \phi) = \zeta \bullet \phi, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the coassociativity of  $\tilde{\Delta}_v$  and the antipode axiom (5.14). Now going back to the top at the left-hand side, taking a conjugation in the fibre spaces that  $U$  acts on, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_v U_{\tilde{S}^{-1}\zeta_2} (\phi \bullet \zeta_1) &= \sum_v (\phi \bullet \zeta_1) U_{\tilde{S}^{-1}\zeta_2}^\dagger \\ &\cong \sum_v \phi((\bullet \zeta_1)(\bar{U}_{\zeta_2})) = \phi \bullet (1 \otimes \bar{U})_{\tilde{\Delta}(\zeta)}, \end{aligned}$$

where " $\cong$ " in the second line denotes the appearance of a projective phase  $c$ , coming from module associativity. This proves the statement.  $\square$

A simple computation analogous for the left-covariance condition brings right-covariance to the form

$$\phi U_{\tilde{S}^{-1}\zeta} = \sum_{\gamma_{\bar{e}_1} \gamma_{e_1} = \gamma_{\bar{e}}} (S\zeta_1)^\dagger \bullet \phi \bullet \zeta_2.$$

which if we replace  $\zeta \mapsto \tilde{S}\zeta$  we achieve

$$\phi U_\zeta = \sum_{\gamma_{e_1} \gamma_{\bar{e}_2} = \gamma_e} (\tilde{S}^2 \zeta_1)^\dagger \bullet \phi \bullet (\tilde{S} \zeta_2).$$

Note this is *not* the same as left-covariance under the adjoint of  $\Lambda$  (ie. a right-gauge action), since  $\tilde{S}^2$  is in general not naturally isomorphic to the identity.

*Remark 6.1.* One may define a sort of "copivotal" Hopf category  $\mathcal{C}$ , which has equipped with a choice of a Hopf autoequivalence  $-\vee : \tilde{S}^2 \Rightarrow 1_{\mathcal{C}}$ . Then one can use this to identify right-covariance to left-adjoint-covariance. For the ordinary quantum groups that appear in 3d TQFTs, these left- and right-symmetry actions manifest globally on their chiral boundary conditions. Through the 4d-2d correspondence [164], a pair of chiral boundary theories localized at the two poles  $0, \infty$  of the defect sphere  $\mathbb{C}P^1$  can be seen to have their global right-/left-symmetries swapped, hence these chiral symmetries coincide if these boundary theories at  $0, \infty$  coincide. It was found in [86] that a very similar situation occurs for the 4d 2-Chern-Simons theory: its boundary 3d integrable field theory also come in "chiral" pairs (in the topological-holomorphic sense) such that they (i) live on opposite poles of the defect sphere and (ii) have their left- and right-acting 2-group global symmetries swapped. As such, copivotal Hopf categories may underlie 4d TQFTs whose 3d topological-holomorphically chiral boundary theories localized at  $0, \infty$  are equivalent.



### 6.1.1 Categorical definition of the lattice 2-algebra

We are finally ready to define the lattice 2-algebra for 2-Chern-Simons theory. At this point, we are going to construct it categorically from a *semidirect product* operation on monoidal categories. We shall revisit the lattice 2-algebra later and describe it more concretely once we have understood the representation theory of  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ .

Let us first recall the definition of a semidirect product of monoidal categories, following [113].

**Definition 6.2.** Let  $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}$  denote two monoidal categories with  $\mathcal{D}$  equipped with a (strong)<sup>12</sup>  $\mathcal{C}$ -module structure  $\triangleleft : \mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ . The **semidirect product**  $\mathcal{D} \rtimes \mathcal{C}$  is a *monoidal* category consisting of pairs  $(D, C) \in \mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{C}$  equipped with the monoidal structure

$$(D, C) \otimes (D', C') = (D \otimes (D' \triangleleft C), C \otimes C').$$

Let  $\varrho : (-\triangleleft -) \triangleleft - \Rightarrow -\triangleleft(-\otimes -)$  denote the module associator, and let  $\varpi : (-\otimes -) \triangleleft - \Rightarrow (-\triangleleft -) \otimes (-\triangleleft -)$  be the module tensorator. The associator morphism on  $\mathcal{D} \rtimes \mathcal{C}$  is given by  $(\bar{\alpha}_{\mathcal{D}}, \alpha_{\mathcal{C}})$ , where  $\alpha_{\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}}$  are the associators on  $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}$  respectively and

$$\bar{\alpha}_{\mathcal{D}} = \varpi_{C_1}(D_2, D_3 \triangleleft C_2) \circ \mathbf{1}_{D_2 \triangleleft C_1} \otimes \varrho_{C_1, C_2}(D_3) \circ \alpha_{\mathcal{D}}(D_1, D_2 \triangleleft C_1, D_3 \triangleleft (C_1 \otimes C_2)).$$

The fact that  $\mathcal{D} \rtimes \mathcal{C}$  forms a monoidal category is proven in [113].

Taking  $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{A}^0$  to be the Hopf category of the 2-graph states and  $\mathcal{C} = \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$  to be the 2-gauge transformations. We take the action functor  $\triangleleft = \bullet$  to be the right-regular representation, and form the semidirect product  $\mathcal{D} \rtimes \mathcal{C}$  equipped with the tensor product

$$(\phi, \zeta) \otimes (\phi', \zeta') = (\phi \otimes (\phi' \bullet \zeta), \zeta \cdot \zeta'),$$

where  $\circ$  is the left-composition of 2-gauge transformations in  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ . By strict monoidality of  $\mathbb{G}$ , the module associator  $\varrho_{\zeta, \zeta'}(\phi) : (\phi \bullet \zeta) \bullet \zeta' \rightarrow \phi \bullet (\zeta \circ \zeta')$  is an invertible isomorphism of continuous measurable sections

$$r_{\zeta}(r_{\zeta'} \mathcal{M}_H) \cong r_{\zeta \circ \zeta'} \mathcal{M}_H$$

where  $H^X$  (where  $X = \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2}$ ) is the Hermitian vector bundle corresponding to  $\phi$ . We shall denote by  $\varrho_{\zeta, \zeta'}^* = \varrho_{\tilde{S}_h \zeta, \tilde{S}_h \zeta'}$  for this module associator, where  $\tilde{S}_h$  is the horizontal antipode functor on  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ .

*Remark 6.2.* Recall the projective phase  $c$  described in *Remark 3.9*. Suppose we define  $\ell_{\zeta} H^X$  as the pullback of  $H^X$  along the *left* multiplication  $\zeta \cdot -$  on  $X = \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2}$ , and define its module associator  $\lambda_{\zeta, \zeta'}(\phi) : \zeta \bullet (\zeta' \bullet \phi) \rightarrow (\zeta \circ \zeta') \bullet \phi$ . Let  $\tilde{\Delta}_v(\zeta) = \zeta_1 \otimes_v \zeta_2$  denote the components of the vertical coproduct, then

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_{\zeta \circ \zeta'} H^X &= r_{\zeta_1 \circ \zeta_2} \ell_{\tilde{S}_h(\zeta_2 \circ \zeta_2)} H^X \xrightarrow{(\varrho_{\zeta, \zeta'} \times (\lambda_{\zeta, \zeta'}^*)^{-1})(\phi)} (r_{\zeta_1} r_{\zeta_2}) (\ell_{\tilde{S}_h \zeta_2} \ell_{\tilde{S}_h \zeta_2}) H^X \\ &\cong (r_{\zeta_1} \ell_{\zeta_2}^X) H_{\zeta'}^X \cong (H_{\zeta'}^X)_{\zeta}. \end{aligned}$$

This gives us a formula

$$c(\zeta, \zeta') = \varrho_{\zeta, \zeta'} \times (\lambda_{\zeta, \zeta'}^*)^{-1} \tag{6.2}$$

for the projective phase.

On the other hand, to define the module tensorator  $\varpi$ , we shall make use of the coproduct  $\tilde{\Delta}$  with components  $\tilde{\Delta}_{\zeta} = \sum \zeta_1 \otimes \zeta_2$ .

**Proposition 6.2.** *Provided  $\mathcal{A}^0$  consist of all left-covariant 2-graph states, an invertible module associator  $\varpi : (- \star -) \bullet - \Rightarrow (- \star -) \circ ((- \times -) \bullet \tilde{\Delta}_-)$  exists.*

*Proof.* Recall that for left-covariant 2-graph states  $\mathcal{A}^0$ , the 2-gauge transformation  $\Lambda$  is written equivalently in terms of the bimodule structure  $\bullet$  via (6.1). The left-/right-module actions  $\bullet$  strongly commute, hence if  $\Lambda$  has the categorical quantum derivation property (5.4), so must  $\bullet$ .

Now given  $\bullet$  satisfies (5.4), then the bundle identification underlying it

$$\varpi_{\phi, \phi'}(\zeta) : (\phi \star \phi') \bullet \zeta \cong (- \star -)((\phi \times \phi') \bullet \tilde{\Delta}_{\zeta})$$

gives precisely the components of the module associator, where  $\phi, \phi' \in \mathcal{A}^0$  and  $\zeta \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ . Naturality is immediate.  $\square$

<sup>12</sup>Here "strong" means the module associators and unitors are invertible.

Strictly speaking, it should be this bimodule structure  $\bullet$  with the categorical quantum derivation property that appears in *Remark 5.3*.

The lattice 2-algebra (cf. [39]) is thus the semidirect product category satisfying additional conditions.

**Definition 6.3.** Let  $\Gamma$  denote a (2-)graph embedded in a 3d Cauchy slice  $\Sigma \subset M^4$ . The **lattice 2-algebra**  $\mathcal{B}^\Gamma$  of 2-Chern-Simons theory on  $\Gamma$  is the monoidal semidirect product  $\mathcal{A}^0 \rtimes \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$  defined above, such that the following holds.

1. Each  $\phi \in \mathcal{A}^0$  is left-covariant (6.1) (and hence also right-covariant).
2. As  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ -modules, we have the **braid relation**

$$\phi \star \phi' = (U \otimes U')_{\tilde{R}}(\phi' \star \phi) \quad (6.3)$$

for covariant  $\phi, \phi' \in \mathcal{A}^0$  transforming under the realizations  $U, U'$  of 2-gauge transformations.

Let us explain briefly about the braid relation (6.3). Note first that, as representations of the Hopf opalgebroid  $\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^0}$ , the functor  $c_{\phi, \phi'} : \phi \star \phi' \mapsto \phi' \star \phi$ , given by swapping the tensor factors *and* conjugating with the  $R$ -matrix element  $R$ , is intertwining iff the relations (4.8) hold. Based on the definition of  $\tilde{R}$  (5.10), this then assures that both sides of (6.3) furnish the same  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ -representation.

*Remark 6.3.* Recall from *Remark 4.5* that, in the weakly-associative case,  $\mathcal{A}^0$  acquires witnesses for coassociativity, which can be viewed as a natural transformation  $\alpha^\Delta : (\Delta \otimes 1)\Delta \Rightarrow (1 \otimes \Delta)\Delta$  on  $\mathcal{A}^0$ . In this case, the aforementioned functor  $c_{\phi, \phi'}$  is a  $\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^0}$ -intertwiner only up to homotopy.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \phi \star \phi' & \longrightarrow & \phi \star \phi' \\ c_{\phi, \phi'} \downarrow & \nearrow & \downarrow c_{\phi, \phi'} \\ \phi' \star \phi & \longrightarrow & \phi' \star \phi \end{array}$$

As such, both sides of the condition (6.3) only determines the same  $\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^0}$ -module element up to homotopy presented by a bundle map. This homotopy is related to the coassociator  $\alpha^\Delta$  (cf. Lemma 7.3 of [56]).

Here we make a minor but important comment regarding measurability. Recall that we are modelling the 2-graph states as sheaves  $\Gamma_c(H^X)$  of continuous measurable sections of some Hermitian vector bundle  $H^X$ . The braid relations (6.3) can be interpreted as an identification of measurable sheaves

$$\Gamma_c(H^X) \otimes \Gamma_c(H'^X) \cong (U \otimes U')_{\tilde{R}}(\Gamma_c(H'^X) \otimes \Gamma_c(H^X)), \quad \xi \otimes \xi' \rightarrow U_{\tilde{R}_1} \xi \otimes U_{\tilde{R}_2} \xi',$$

where  $\tilde{R} = \sum \tilde{R}_1 \otimes \tilde{R}_2$  are the components of the  $R$ -matrix functor on  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} = \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2}$ . By the direct integral construction of  $\Gamma_c(H^X)$ , this identification of sheaves comes with a measurability property: the vectors  $\xi \otimes \xi'$  and  $U_{\tilde{R}_1} \xi \otimes U_{\tilde{R}_2} \xi'$  are only required to be  $\mu_{\Gamma^2}$ -a.e. equivalent, which means that the braid relation (6.3) can fail on subsets of  $\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2}$  of measure zero.

### 6.1.2 Algebraic definition of invariant 2-graph states

With the lattice 2-algebra  $\mathcal{B}^\Gamma$  in hand, we can now define the observables in discretized 2-Chern-Simons theory in an algebraic manner.

**Definition 6.4.** The **observable 2-subalgebra**  $\mathcal{O}^\Gamma \subset \mathcal{B}^\Gamma$  is the subspace generated by 2-graph states  $\phi$  satisfying the *invariance* condition

$$\phi \bullet \zeta = \zeta \bullet \phi, \quad \forall \zeta \in A \quad (6.4)$$

for all measurable subsets  $A \subset \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ .

In other words,  $\mathcal{O}^\Gamma$  is the space of (a.e.) invariants under the  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ -bimodule structure. We now prove that  $\mathcal{O}^\Gamma$  inherits the linear cocategory structure from  $\mathcal{A}^0$ .

**Proposition 6.3.** Consider 2-graph states  $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{A}^0$  as a Hopf category as in §4.1. The invariant states are precisely the homotopy fixed points  $\mathcal{C}^{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}}$ .

By a "homotopy fixed point"  $\mathcal{C}^A$  of a cocategory  $\mathcal{C}$  under the action of an algebra(-oid)  $A$ , we mean a cocategory such that, for each  $a \in A$  and coarrows  $f \in \mathcal{C}_1$ , there exist an object  $x_a \in \mathcal{C}_0$  such that  $f = \hat{s}(x_a) \in \mathcal{C}_1$  is the cosource and  $a \triangleright f = \hat{t}(x_a) \in \mathcal{C}_1$  is the cotarget. The assignment  $a \mapsto x_a$  also satisfies the usual monoidality conditions.

*Proof.* Neglecting the module associator morphisms for the moment, let us use the covariance condition (6.1) to rewrite the invariance condition in the following way

$$U_\zeta \phi = \bar{\zeta} \bullet \phi \bullet \zeta = \phi.$$

Recall the Hopf categorical structure of the 2-gauge transformations  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ . The objects consist of vertex parameters  $\mathcal{V}$ , and the edge parameters  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$  as coarrows. If we set  $\mathbf{H} = 1$ , the 2-gauge action  $\Lambda$  recovers the notion of gauge transformations in the usual (lattice) 1-gauge theory.

If  $\phi$  satisfies (6.4), then of course  $U = \text{id}$  is the identity operator  $\mu_{\Gamma^2}$ -a.e. Hence for invariant 2-graph states, a vertex parameter  $a_v \in \mathcal{V}$  acts  $\phi$  as given in (3.1),

$$(a_v \triangleright \phi)(\{b_f\}_f) = \phi(\{a_v^{-1} \triangleright (a_{\bar{v}} \triangleright b_f)\}_f),$$

where  $\bar{v}$  is the target vertex of the source edge  $e$  of the face  $f$ . The goal is therefore to find a edge state  $\psi_v$  such that  $\hat{s}^* \psi_v = \phi$  and  $\hat{t}^* \psi_v = a_v \triangleright \phi$ .

If we put a "pure-gauge"  $h_e = a_v^{-1} a_{\bar{v}}$  on the edge  $e : v \rightarrow \bar{v}$ , then we have  $a_v^{-1} \triangleright (a_{\bar{v}} \triangleright b_f) = (a_v^{-1} a_{\bar{v}}) \triangleright b_f = h_e \triangleright b_f$ , which is nothing but a *whiskering* operation [77, 86, 96]. Now let  $\psi_v$  denote an edge state that has support only on such pure gauge configurations  $h_e = a_v^{-1} a_{\bar{v}}$ , then the invariance condition (6.4) identifies  $\psi_v$  to have cosource  $\phi$  and cotarget  $a_v \triangleright \phi$ , as desired. In other words, for each  $v \in \mathcal{V}$  and invariant coarrow  $\phi \in \mathcal{F}$ , there exists an object

$$a_v \triangleright \phi \leftarrow \psi_v \rightarrow \phi$$

trivializing the  $\mathcal{V}$ -action. It is clear from the properties of whiskering that this assignment  $v \mapsto \psi_v$  respects the composition of gauge transformations. □

Now recall the definition of invariant 2-graph states given in §3.5, which was constructed from analytic means. We prove now that these notions coincide.

**Proposition 6.4.** *The observables are precisely the invariant 2-graph states  $\mathcal{O}^\Gamma \simeq \mathcal{A}^1$ .*

*Proof.* It is clear that  $\mathcal{A}^1 \subset \mathcal{O}^\Gamma$ , since orbit equivalence classes  $[\phi] = [\Lambda_\zeta \phi]$  by construction satisfy (6.4).

We now show the converse. Suppose (6.4) holds for all  $\zeta \in A$  in any measurable subset  $A \subset \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ , then the bundle identification  $H_\zeta^X = r_\zeta \ell_{\bar{\zeta}} H^X$  leads to an isomorphism of sheaves

$$\Gamma_c(H^X) \cong \Gamma_c(H_\zeta^X).$$

Further, there is a unitary automorphism  $J \in \mathcal{B}(\Gamma(H^X))$  such that we have the following operator equation

$$JU_\zeta J^\dagger = \text{id}, \quad \forall \zeta \in A$$

$\mu_{\Gamma^2}$ -a.e. If  $D_{U_\zeta}, D_J \subset \Gamma(H^X)$  denote respectively the the dense domains of definition for  $J, U_\zeta$ , then the above equation implies  $U_\zeta = \text{id}$   $\mu_{\Gamma^2}$ -a.e. on the intersection  $D_J \cap D_{U_\zeta}$ . We now use the BLT theorem [165] to find a unique extension of  $J$  to the entirety of  $\Gamma(H^X)$ . Then, given the continuous measurable sections  $\Gamma_c(H^X)$  by hypothesis satisfies  $\Gamma_c(H^X) \subset D_{U_\zeta}$  (as otherwise 2-gauge transformations would not be well-defined), we have  $U_\zeta = \text{id}$  on  $\Gamma_c(H^X)$  for all  $\zeta \in A$  in every measurable subset  $A \subset \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ . As such, the map  $\mathcal{O}^\Gamma \subset \mathcal{A}^1 : \phi \mapsto [\phi]$  is well-defined. □

*Remark 6.4.* In the weakly-associative case, we have previously made the observation that we should directly take the homotopy fixed points under the 2-groupoid  $\mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^{\leq 1}}$  of 2-gauge transformations and secondary gauge transformations on them. Here, the notion of "invariant 2-graph states"  $\mathcal{O}^\Gamma$  can be defined algebraically as the homotopy fixed point as in **Proposition 6.3**. However, the analytic definition is less obvious, and will require more care. For consistency, it would be good for the homotopy fixed points in this context to also inherit a Hopf structure from the 2-graph states.

## 6.2 \*-operation in the lattice 2-algebra $\mathcal{B}^\Gamma$

In the final section of this paper, we now study a \*-operation on  $\mathcal{B}^\Gamma$  induced by, roughly, an orientation reversal on  $\Sigma$ . We now work to make this idea more precise.

Recall the action of the 2-gauge transformations  $\Lambda$  given by bounded linear operators  $U$  from §3.4. On any Hilbert space of continuous measurable sections  $\Gamma_c(H^X)$  over  $X = \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2}$ , we have a dual sheaf  $\Gamma_c(H^X)^*$  such that  $U_\zeta^* : \Gamma_c(H_\zeta^X)^* \rightarrow \Gamma_c(H^X)^*$  for each  $\zeta \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ . Taking its transpose/adjoint we obtain its *Hermitian* conjugate

$$U_\zeta^\dagger : \Gamma_c(H^X)^* \rightarrow \Gamma_c(H_\zeta^X)^*.$$

We define the dual 2-gauge transformation  $\Lambda_{\zeta^\dagger} = \Lambda_\zeta^\dagger$  to be that implemented by this bounded linear operator  $U_\zeta^\dagger$ .

**Definition 6.5.** The \*-operation on  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} = \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^1} \subset \mathcal{B}^\Gamma$  is given by

$$\zeta^* = \bar{\zeta},$$

where  $\bar{\zeta} \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$  is the orientation-reversed decorated 1-graph.

Let  $\bar{H}^X$  denote the measurable field conjugate to  $H^X$  such that its sheaf of continuous measurable sections satisfies  $\Gamma_c(\bar{H}^X) = \Gamma_c(H^X)^*$ . Then if  $\Lambda_\zeta$  is presented by the bounded linear operator  $\Gamma_c(H^X) \rightarrow \Gamma_c((\Lambda_\zeta H)^X)$ , then  $\Lambda_{\zeta^*}$  is presented by the operator

$$U_{\zeta^*} : \Gamma_c(\bar{H}^X) \rightarrow \Gamma_c((\Lambda_{\bar{\zeta}} \bar{H})^X).$$

This means that  $\zeta^*$  naturally acts on the sections of the dual complex conjugate bundle  $\bar{H}^X$ , as expected for a \*-operation.

### 6.2.1 Orientation reversals on 2-graphs

Now let us turn to the \*-operation on the 2-graph states  $\mathcal{A}^0$ . Similar to the 1-graph case above, this operation should be induced from orientation reversal operations on  $\Gamma^2$ . However, as we have mentioned in *Remark 4.7*, the 2-graph  $\Gamma^2$  in fact has *two* involutions. This is explained most precisely by the so-called *2- $\dagger$  structure* [114] underlying the 2-graphs.

Following **Example 5.5** of [115], we take the embedded graph  $\Gamma \subset \Sigma$  as a framed piecewise-linear (PL) 2-manifold, then the PL-group  $\text{PL}(2) = O(2) = SO(2) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$  tells us directly what the 2-dagger structure on  $\Gamma$  is —  $\dagger_2$  is given by the  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  subgroup and  $\dagger_1$  is a  $\pi$ -rotation in the  $SO(2)$ -factor. Geometrically, these can be understood as rotations of the framing of  $\Gamma^2$  as an oriented piecewise linear manifold. Crucially, these daggers are involutive  $\dagger_2^2 = \text{id}$ ,  $\dagger_1^2 \cong \text{id}$  and they *strongly commute*

$$\dagger_2 \circ \dagger_1 = \dagger_1^{\text{op}} \circ \dagger_2. \quad (6.5)$$

We denote by the orientation reversal operations they induce on  $\Gamma^2$  by

Denote by  $(\Gamma^2)^{\dagger_2, \dagger_1}$  the image under these  $\dagger$ -involutions. The induced maps  $X = \mathbb{G}^{\Gamma^2} \xrightarrow{\sim} \bar{X}^{\text{h}, \text{v}} = \mathbb{G}^{(\Gamma^2)^{\dagger_2, \dagger_1}}$  give rise in turn to measurable morphisms  $\eta_{\text{h}, \text{v}} : H^X \rightarrow H^{\bar{X}^{\text{h}, \text{v}}}$  between measurable fields, such that we have the following "orientation reversal intertwiners"  $\eta = (\eta_{\text{h}}, \eta_{\text{v}})$  acting on the 2-graph states satisfying

$$\eta_{\text{h}} \circ \Lambda_\zeta^{(e, f)} = \Lambda_{\bar{\zeta}}^{(e', \bar{f})} \circ \eta_{\text{h}}, \quad \eta_{\text{v}} \circ \Lambda_\zeta^{(e, f)} = \Lambda_{\bar{\zeta}}^{(e', \bar{f})} \circ \eta_{\text{v}}$$

for all  $\zeta \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ . Recall  $\Lambda^{(e, f)}$  are 2-gauge transformations in the proximity of  $(e, f)$  as defined in §5.3, with the corresponding concrete bounded linear operator  $U^{(e, f)}$ .

**Definition 6.6.** Suppose  $(e, f) \in \Gamma^2$  is a 2-graph with source and target edges  $e, e' : v \rightarrow v'$ . The \*-operations on  $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{A}^0 \subset \mathcal{B}^\Gamma$  are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{(e, f)}^{*1} &= \phi_{(\bar{e}', \bar{f})} \bullet (1 \otimes U^{(e', \bar{f})} \otimes 1)_{\bar{R}_{\text{h}}^{-1}} \eta_{\text{h}}, \\ \phi_{(e, f)}^{*2} &= \phi_{(e', \bar{f})} \bullet (1 \otimes U^{(e', \bar{f})})_{\bar{R}_{\text{v}}^{-1}} \eta_{\text{v}}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\phi_{(e, f)} \in \mathcal{A}^0$  are 2-graph states localized on the face  $(e, f) \in \Gamma^2$ .

This can be understood as a 2-dimensional version of the  $*$ -operation on the holonomies defined in [39], (4.14).

*Remark 6.5.* The geometry of this  $*$ -operation is clear: they are directly induced from the  $2\text{-}\dagger$  structure on  $\Gamma^2$ . However, the appearance of the  $R$ -matrices  $\tilde{R}$  is a purely quantum phenomenon, as one needs to "pass" the target edge  $e'$  through the source edge  $e$  of the face  $f$  upon an orientation reversal. In the usual 3d lattice Chern-Simons case, the appearance of the  $R$ -matrices is kept track of by the so-called auxiliary "cilia" on the graphs [39]. Similarly, we can introduce 2-dimensional "2-cilia" as extensions on our 2-graph  $\Gamma^2$ , which could help visualize some of the computations below.

**Unitarity properties.** Recall *Remark 4.7* that we had mentioned a "unitarity of the 2-holonomies" property, which relates orientation reversals to the antipodes. More precisely, these are

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{(e',\bar{f})} &= (S_h\phi)_{(e,f)}^*, & \phi_{(e',\bar{f})} &= (S_v\phi)_{(e,f)}^*, & \phi &\in \mathcal{A}^0 \\ \zeta &= (\tilde{S}_h\zeta)^\dagger, & \bar{\zeta} &= \tilde{S}_v\zeta, & \zeta &\in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $-\dagger$  is defined as in the beginning of §6.2.

The main motivation for imposing these unitarity properties is that it allows us to construct the sesquilinear Hilbert space of states attached to a triangulation of the 3d Cauchy slice  $\Sigma$ . To explain this in more detail, however, we will need to discuss  $\mathcal{A}^0$  as a 2-representation of  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ , which is the subject of the companion paper [112] (see the appendix). Strictly speaking, we will not need these unitarity properties in the rest of this section.

Note these orientation reversals are anti-homomorphisms, hence they will exchange the left- and right-actions in the  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ -bimodule structure of  $\mathcal{A}^0$ .

**Proposition 6.5.** *The  $*$ -operations on  $\mathcal{A}^0$  strongly commute,  $(\phi^{*1})^{*2} \cong (\phi^{*2})^{*1}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\bar{\phi}^{h,v}, \bar{\Lambda}^{h,v}$  denote the evaluation of  $\phi$  on, and the 2-gauge transformations  $\Lambda$  in the proximity of, the 2-graphs living in the horizontal/vertical orientation reversal of  $\Gamma^2$ . It is clear from the strong commutativity (6.5) of the  $2\text{-}\dagger$  structure on  $\Gamma^2$  that there exists an isomorphism of measurable fields

$$\overline{(\bar{\phi}^h)^v} \cong \overline{(\bar{\phi}^v)^h},$$

and that the intertwiners  $\eta$  are idempotent and strongly commute  $\eta_h^{*v} \circ \eta_v = \eta_v^{*h} \circ \eta_h$ . Given  $*_{h,v}$  are anti-homomorphisms, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\phi^{*1})^{*2} &= (\bar{\phi}^h \bullet (1 \otimes \bar{U}^h)_{\tilde{R}_h^{-1}} \eta_h)^{*2} \\ &= \eta_h^* \circ ((1 \otimes \bar{U}^h)_{(\tilde{R}_h^{-1})^T} \bullet -) \circ \eta_v \circ ((1 \otimes \bar{U}^h)_{\tilde{R}_v^{-1}} \bullet \bar{\phi}^v) \\ &\cong \eta_h^{*v} \eta_v (1 \otimes \bar{U}^v)_{(\tilde{R}_h^T)^{-1} \cdot \tilde{R}_v^{-1}} \bullet \bar{\phi}^h \\ &\cong \eta_v^{*h} \eta_h (1 \otimes \bar{U}^v)_{(\tilde{R}_v \cdot \tilde{R}_h^T)^{-1}} \bullet \bar{\phi}^h. \end{aligned}$$

The statement then follows once we can permute the horizontal and vertical  $R$ -matrices, but this is precisely the commutative square on the right side of (5.12).  $\square$

## 6.2.2 Extending the $*$ -operation to the lattice 2-algebra

We are now in a position to extend this  $*$ -operation to the entirety of  $\mathcal{B}^\Gamma$ . In order to do so, we must prove that the relations, namely the covariance condition (6.1) and the braiding relation (6.3), must be preserved.

**Proposition 6.6.** *The  $*$ -operations preserves the left-covariance condition (6.1) (and hence also the right-covariance condition).*

*Proof.* By **Proposition 6.1**, it suffice to prove the statement for left-covariance. We will do this for the horizontal and the vertical orientation reversals at the same time. Towards this, let us introduce the notation  $-^*$  to denote either  $*_1$  or  $*_2$ , and denote  $\bar{\phi}, \bar{\Lambda}$  the evaluation of 2-graph states on, and the 2-gauge transformations in the proximity of, the corresponding orientation reversed 2-graphs. The only caveat is that for 2-gauge transformations, the  $^*$ -operation  $\zeta \mapsto \zeta^*$  comes with a *1-graph* orientation reversal.

We will treat  $-^*$  as a anti-homomorphism also for the semidirect product structure  $\triangleleft$  for  $\mathcal{B}^\Gamma$ ; see §6.1.1. Recall  $\tilde{\Delta}^{\text{op}} = \sigma\tilde{\Delta}$ , we then compute for each  $\zeta \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$  and right-covariant  $\phi \in \mathcal{A}^0$ , using the intertwining properties (5.11),

$$\begin{aligned} ((1 \otimes U)_{\tilde{\Delta}(\zeta)} \bullet \phi)^* &= \phi^* \bullet (1 \otimes U)_{\tilde{\Delta}^{\text{op}}(\zeta^*)} \\ &\cong \bar{\phi}((- \bullet (1 \otimes \bar{U})_{\tilde{R}^{-1}}) \circ \eta \circ (- \bullet (1 \otimes U)_{(\sigma\tilde{\Delta})(\zeta^*)})) \\ &\cong (\bar{\phi} \bullet (1 \otimes \bar{U})_{\tilde{R}^{-1} \cdot (\sigma\tilde{\Delta})(\zeta^*)}) \eta \\ &= (\bar{\phi} \bullet (1 \otimes \bar{U})_{\tilde{\Delta}(\zeta^*) \cdot \tilde{R}^{-1}}) \eta \cong (\zeta^* \bullet \bar{\phi}) \bullet (1 \otimes \bar{U})_{\tilde{R}} \eta \\ &\cong \zeta^* \bullet (\bar{\phi} \bullet (1 \otimes \bar{U})_{\tilde{R}^{-1}}) \eta = \zeta^* \bullet \phi^*, \end{aligned}$$

where in the fourth line we have used the right-covariance property (6.1) and in the fifth line a bimodule associator  $(- \bullet \phi) \bullet - \cong - \bullet (\phi \bullet -)$ .  $\square$

We now also need to show that these  $^*$ -operations preserves the braid relation (6.3). This can be done in a completely analogous way as in the latter half of the proof of Lemma 8 in [39]. To do this, we first note that the quantum  $R$ -matrices  $\tilde{R}$  is compatible with the antipode (5.15), and satisfies the quasitriangularity condition (5.13). Then, by making use of the left-covariance property to pass  $\tilde{R}$  to the left,

$$\phi \bullet (1 \otimes U)_{\tilde{R}^{-1}} = (1 \otimes U \otimes U)_{(1 \otimes \tilde{\Delta})\tilde{R}^{-1}} \bullet \phi,$$

a series of computations similar to the above proposition can be performed to show that the  $^*$ -operation indeed preserves the braid relations.

**Theorem 6.1.** *The above  $^*$ -operation extends to strongly-commutative functors  $-^{*1}, -^{*2} : \mathcal{B}^\Gamma \rightarrow (\overline{\mathcal{B}^\Gamma})^{m\text{-op}, c\text{-op}}$ , where  $\overline{\mathcal{B}^\Gamma}$  denotes the image of  $\mathcal{B}^\Gamma$  under the complex conjugation involution.*

The compatibility between the  $^*$ -operation and the bimodule structure  $\bullet$  then implies that the invariance condition (6.4) is also preserved — that is, provided  $\Lambda$  and its concrete realization  $U$  is faithful and satisfies a certain density condition mentioned in Remark 5.2.

**Corollary 6.1.** *The  $^*$ -operations descend to the observables  $\mathcal{O}^\Gamma \simeq \mathcal{A}^1$ .*

This result is important for constructing scattering amplitudes on the lattice in a future work.

We conclude this section by making a few comments about  $\mathcal{B}^\Gamma$  in the weak 2-gauge theory. Recall in §3.1 that, when the associator  $\tau$  of the smooth 2-group  $\mathbb{G}$  is non-trivial, then the corresponding discrete 2-gauge theory acquires non-trivial secondary gauge transformations valued in  $\mathbb{H}$ . In this case, gauge transformations on the 2-graph states becomes a 2-groupoid, whose objects are given by  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$  and its morphism by the secondary gauge transformations. This has also been noted in the semiclassical BRST analysis in [51].

By endowing a quantum deformation on this 2-groupoid from the 2-graph states (à la what was done in §5.1), the quantum symmetries of weak 2-gauge theory seems to endow the secondary gauge transformations (which we recall are localized on vertices) also with a quantum deformation. This would then equip the  $^*$ -operation on the 2-gauge parameters  $\zeta \mapsto \zeta^*$  with its own  $R$ -matrix  $\tilde{R}$ , which makes the definition of the lattice 2-algebra  $\mathcal{B}^\Gamma$  and the  $^*$ -operations on it much more involved. Nevertheless, the framework developed here provides a guide for how the combinatorial quantization of weak 2-Chern-Simons theory should work as well.

## 7 Conclusion

Given a Lie 2-group  $\mathbb{G}$ , this paper lays the foundation upon which the 4d 2-Chern-Simons theory can be quantized on the lattice. Based on the notion of measureable categories, we have introduced structures which capture the kinematical lattice degrees of freedom of the theory, and categorified the notion of quantum groups to the context of Hopf categories. This substantiates the expectations from the categorical ladder proposal of Baez-Dolan [41]. As we have mentioned in the introduction, this work is part of a series towards the computation of 4-simplex scattering amplitudes for 2-Chern-Simons theory, and this shall remain the central goal. Towards this, an upcoming work in the series will study the algebraic and analytic aspects of the higher-representation theory of the categorical quantum symmetries on the lattice.

Based on the framework introduced in this paper, we have also defined categorified notions of quantum groups and described their Hopf (co)categorical structures. These are the "categorical quantum coordinate ring"  $\mathcal{C}_q(\mathbb{G})$  — which we recall is a Hopf *cocategory* — and the "categorified quantum enveloping algebra"  $\mathbb{U}_q\mathfrak{G}$  Hopf category. We have also shown how, under certain technical assumptions, these categorical quantum groups reduce to the known Lie 2-bialgebra symmetries of the 2-Chern-Simons action. The companion paper [112] examines the geometric aspects of the 2-representations of the categorified quantum enveloping algebra, and show that they form, in a suitable sense, a *ribbon tensor 2-category*. We have also made numerous comments about how our framework can be generalized directly to weak/semistrict 2-Chern-Simons theory [51], in which  $\mathbb{G}$  is a *smooth 2-group* living in the bicategory of bidundles [80].

As we have noted at the end of §5.3.2, these notions of categorified quantum groups should be dual to each other, in analogy to the uncategorified case [119]. In particular, inspired by Majid's quantum double construction [9, 166], we expect the Frobenius pairing functor in the definition of Crane-Frenkel Hopf categories [53] to play an important role in this notion of duality. This understanding that the duality for quantum group Hopf categories should involve not the opposite category, but the *cocategory*, should serve as a crucial observation.

**Categorical quantum Fourier duality.** As our results rely only on the *existence* of Hopf categorical structures on  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ , it is independent of the particular lattice  $\Gamma$  we pick, even if  $\Gamma$  consists of only a single edge  $v \xrightarrow{e} v$ . If furthermore  $v = v'$  and the loop  $e$  bounds a face  $f$ , then we can view  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$  as the quantum gauge symmetries of the 2-Chern-Simons holonomies on the "trivial" lattice, which consists of just the single face  $f$  bound by  $e$ . In this case, the 2-graph states  $\mathcal{C}$  can be thought of as categorical (ie. Hilb-valued) functions on a single copy of  $\mathbb{G}$ .

In this case of the "trivial lattice", the Hopf category  $\mathcal{C}$  upon quantum deformation is given the name *categorical quantum coordinate ring*  $\mathcal{C}_q(\mathbb{G})$  of  $\mathbb{G}$  in [112]. The above Hopf category  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$  can then be interpreted as a model for the "quantized universal enveloping algebra"  $\mathbb{U}_q\mathfrak{G}$ , with  $\mathcal{C}_q(\mathbb{G})$  as its *canonical* (ie. regular) bimonoidal module category. To make this interpretation more precise, we need a *categorical Fourier duality* between  $\mathbb{U}_q\mathfrak{G}$  and  $\mathcal{C}_q(\mathbb{G})$ , in analogy with the usual quantum 1-group case [119]. A similar notion was recently studied [76] in the finite 2-group setting, but the inherent rigidity of finite 2-groups made the duality notion very stringent. We seek to improve upon this notion of "quantum Fourier duality" in a future work.

————— § —————

Another very interesting prospect is to study the boundary conditions of 2-Chern-Simons theory through this lattice theoretic, categorical approach. As mentioned in *Remark 6.1*, recent works [86, 87] have examined the analogue of the localization procedure of Costello-Yamazaki [164] for 2-Chern-Simons theory, and various very interesting 3-dimensional integrable field theories were obtained as boundary theories. Under the categorical ladder proposal, the infinite-dimensional operator algebra of these 3d integrable field theories should be intimately related to the categorical quantum groups described in this paper.

**A categorical Kazhdan-Lusztik correspondence.** Through the localization procedure described above, the author [86] had discovered a 3d topological-holomorphic version of the Wess-Zumino-Witten model, denoted by  $\mathcal{W}$ . Further, he had also shown that it enjoys global (infinitesimal) symmetries governed by a higher-homotopy derived version of the Kac-Moody algebra [146]. Higher derived current algebras of these types have also recently been studied in the literature [167–171].

Furthermore, depending on the the alignment of the topological-holomorphic foliation, the higher Kac-Moody currents that appear in the 3d theory  $\mathcal{W}$  live precisely on the raviolo space, and hence may admit a quantization as a *raviolo vertex operator algebra (VOA)* [169, 170]. It would therefore be very interesting to study a *categorical* version of the Kazhdan-Lusztik correspondence [172]:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Representations of } \mathbb{U}_q\mathfrak{G}; \\ \text{4d 2-Chern-Simons theory} \end{array} \right\} \stackrel{?}{\simeq} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Modules of the raviolo VOA;} \\ \text{3d integrable field theory } \mathcal{W} \end{array} \right\}$$

This would also serve as a 4d-3d example of the *gapless* topological bulk-boundary correspondence described in the series [173–175] (specifically the third one).



## References

- [1] Edward Witten. “Gauge theories, vertex models, and quantum groups”. In: *Nuclear Physics B* 330.2 (1990), pp. 285–346. ISSN: 0550-3213. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0550-3213\(90\)90115-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0550-3213(90)90115-T). URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/055032139090115T>.
- [2] V.G. Knizhnik and A.B. Zamolodchikov. “Current algebra and Wess-Zumino model in two dimensions”. In: *Nuclear Physics B* 247.1 (1984), pp. 83–103. ISSN: 0550-3213. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0550-3213\(84\)90374-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0550-3213(84)90374-2).
- [3] Mei Chee Shum. “Tortile tensor categories”. In: *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* 93.1 (1994), pp. 57–110. ISSN: 0022-4049. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-4049\(92\)00039-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-4049(92)00039-T). URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/002240499200039T>.
- [4] Peter J. Freyd and David N. Yetter. “Braided compact closed categories with applications to low dimensional topology”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 77.2 (1989), pp. 156–182. ISSN: 0001-8708. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8708\(89\)90018-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8708(89)90018-2). URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0001870889900182>.
- [5] Louis H. Kauffman. “State Models and the Jones Polynomial”. In: *Topology* 26 (1987), pp. 395–407. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:8152363>.
- [6] VLADIMIR G. TURAEV. “MODULAR CATEGORIES AND 3-MANIFOLD INVARIANTS”. In: *International Journal of Modern Physics B* 06.11n12 (1992), pp. 1807–1824. DOI: [10.1142/S0217979292000876](https://doi.org/10.1142/S0217979292000876). eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0217979292000876>. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0217979292000876>.
- [7] V. G. Drinfel’d. “Quantum groups”. In: *Journal of Soviet Mathematics* 41.2 (1988), pp. 898–915.
- [8] S.L. Woronowicz. “Tannaka-Krein duality for compact matrix pseudogroups. Twisted SU (N) groups.” In: *Inventiones mathematicae* 93.1 (1988), pp. 35–76. URL: <http://eudml.org/doc/143589>.
- [9] S. Majid. *Foundations of quantum group theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2011. ISBN: 9780511834530, 9780521648684.
- [10] N. Reshetikhin and V. G. Turaev. “Invariants of three manifolds via link polynomials and quantum groups”. In: *Invent. Math.* 103 (1991), pp. 547–597. DOI: [10.1007/BF01239527](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01239527).
- [11] N. Yu. Reshetikhin and V. G. Turaev. “Ribbon graphs and their invariants derived from quantum groups”. In: *Commun. Math. Phys.* 127 (1990), pp. 1–26. DOI: [10.1007/BF02096491](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02096491).
- [12] Michio Jimbo. “A q difference analog of U(g) and the Yang-Baxter equation”. In: *Lett. Math. Phys.* 10 (1985), pp. 63–69. DOI: [10.1007/BF00704588](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00704588).
- [13] V. G. Drinfeld. “Quantum groups”. In: *Zap. Nauchn. Semin.* 155 (1986), pp. 18–49. DOI: [10.1007/BF01247086](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01247086).
- [14] Michael F. Atiyah. “Topological quantum field theory”. en. In: *Publications Mathématiques de l’IHÉS* 68 (1988), pp. 175–186. URL: [http://www.numdam.org/item/PMIHES\\_1988\\_\\_68\\_\\_175\\_0/](http://www.numdam.org/item/PMIHES_1988__68__175_0/).
- [15] Jacob Lurie. “On the classification of topological field theories”. In: *Current developments in mathematics* 2008.1 (2008), pp. 129–280.
- [16] J. C. Baez and J. Dolan. “Higher dimensional algebra and topological quantum field theory”. In: *J. Math. Phys.* 36 (1995), pp. 6073–6105. DOI: [10.1063/1.531236](https://doi.org/10.1063/1.531236). arXiv: [q-alg/9503002](https://arxiv.org/abs/q-alg/9503002).
- [17] Shunya Mizoguchi and Tsukasa Tada. “Three-dimensional gravity from the Turaev-Viro invariant”. In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 68 (1992), pp. 1795–1798. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.68.1795](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.68.1795). arXiv: [hep-th/9110057](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9110057).
- [18] Valentin Bonzom, Maïté Dupuis, and Florian Girelli. “Towards the Turaev-Viro amplitudes from a Hamiltonian constraint”. In: *Phys. Rev. D* 90.10 (2014), p. 104038. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.90.104038](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.90.104038). arXiv: [1403.7121 \[gr-qc\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1403.7121).
- [19] Daniele Pranzetti. “Turaev-Viro amplitudes from 2+1 Loop Quantum Gravity”. In: *Phys. Rev. D* 89.8 (2014), p. 084058. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.89.084058](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.89.084058). arXiv: [1402.2384 \[gr-qc\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1402.2384).

- [20] Etera R. Livine. “3d Quantum Gravity: Coarse-Graining and  $q$ -Deformation”. In: *Annales Henri Poincaré* 18.4 (2017), pp. 1465–1491. DOI: [10.1007/s00023-016-0535-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00023-016-0535-0). arXiv: [1610.02716](https://arxiv.org/abs/1610.02716) [gr-qc].
- [21] S. Majid and B. J. Schroers. “ $q$ -Deformation and Semidualisation in 3d Quantum Gravity”. In: *J. Phys. A* 42 (2009), p. 425402. DOI: [10.1088/1751-8113/42/42/425402](https://doi.org/10.1088/1751-8113/42/42/425402). arXiv: [0806.2587](https://arxiv.org/abs/0806.2587) [gr-qc].
- [22] Edward Witten. “(2+1)-Dimensional Gravity as an Exactly Soluble System”. In: *Nucl. Phys.* B311 (1988), p. 46. DOI: [10.1016/0550-3213\(88\)90143-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0550-3213(88)90143-5).
- [23] Laurent Freidel and David Louapre. “Ponzano-Regge model revisited II: Equivalence with Chern-Simons”. In: (2004). arXiv: [gr-qc/0410141](https://arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0410141) [gr-qc].
- [24] C. Meusburger and B. J. Schroers. “Poisson structure and symmetry in the Chern-Simons formulation of (2+1)-dimensional gravity”. In: *Class. Quant. Grav.* 20 (2003), pp. 2193–2234. DOI: [10.1088/0264-9381/20/11/318](https://doi.org/10.1088/0264-9381/20/11/318). arXiv: [gr-qc/0301108](https://arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0301108) [gr-qc].
- [25] Maite Dupuis et al. “On the origin of the quantum group symmetry in 3d quantum gravity”. In: (June 2020). arXiv: [2006.10105](https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.10105) [gr-qc].
- [26] Shawn X. Cui and Zhenghan Wang. “State sum invariants of three manifolds from spherical multi-fusion categories”. In: *Journal of Knot Theory and Its Ramifications* 26.14 (Dec. 2017), p. 1750104. DOI: [10.1142/s0218216517501048](https://doi.org/10.1142/s0218216517501048). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1142/s0218216517501048>.
- [27] Udo Pachner. “ $P.L.$  Homeomorphic Manifolds are Equivalent by Elementary Shellings”. In: *European Journal of Combinatorics* 12.2 (1991), pp. 129–145. ISSN: 0195-6698. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0195-6698\(13\)80080-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0195-6698(13)80080-7). URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0195669813800807>.
- [28] R. Dijkgraaf, V. Pasquier, and P. Roche. “Quasi hopf algebras, group cohomology and orbifold models”. In: *Nuclear Physics B Proceedings Supplements* 18 (Jan. 1991), pp. 60–72. DOI: [10.1016/0920-5632\(91\)90123-V](https://doi.org/10.1016/0920-5632(91)90123-V).
- [29] Florian Girelli, Robert Oeckl, and Alejandro Perez. “Spin foam diagrammatics and topological invariance”. In: *Class. Quant. Grav.* 19 (2002), pp. 1093–1108. DOI: [10.1088/0264-9381/19/6/305](https://doi.org/10.1088/0264-9381/19/6/305). arXiv: [gr-qc/0111022](https://arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0111022).
- [30] Louis Crane and David Yetter. “A More sensitive Lorentzian state sum”. In: (Jan. 2003). arXiv: [gr-qc/0301017](https://arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0301017).
- [31] L. Freidel. “A Ponzano-Regge model of Lorentzian 3-dimensional gravity”. In: *Nuclear Physics B - Proceedings Supplements* 88.1 (2000), pp. 237–240. ISSN: 0920-5632. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0920-5632\(00\)00775-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0920-5632(00)00775-1). URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0920563200007751>.
- [32] Michael A. Levin and Xiao-Gang Wen. “String-net condensation: A physical mechanism for topological phases”. In: *Physical Review B* 71.4 (Jan. 2005). DOI: [10.1103/physrevb.71.045110](https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevb.71.045110). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevb.71.045110>.
- [33] X. Wen, S. Matsuura, and S. Ryu. “Edge theory approach to topological entanglement entropy, mutual information and entanglement negativity in Chern-Simons theories”. In: *Phys. Rev. B* 93.24 (2016), p. 245140. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevB.93.245140](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.93.245140). arXiv: [1603.08534](https://arxiv.org/abs/1603.08534) [cond-mat.mes-hall].
- [34] T. Lan and X.-G. Wen. “Topological quasiparticles and the holographic bulk-edge relation in (2+1)-dimensional string-net models”. In: *Phys. Rev. B* 90.11 (2014), p. 115119. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevB.90.115119](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.90.115119). arXiv: [1311.1784](https://arxiv.org/abs/1311.1784) [cond-mat.str-el].
- [35] Alexei Kitaev and Liang Kong. “Models for Gapped Boundaries and Domain Walls”. In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 313.2 (June 2012), pp. 351–373. DOI: [10.1007/s00220-012-1500-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-012-1500-5). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-012-1500-5>.
- [36] John W. Barrett and Bruce W. Westbury. “Invariants of piecewise linear three manifolds”. In: *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.* 348 (1996), pp. 3997–4022. DOI: [10.1090/S0002-9947-96-01660-1](https://doi.org/10.1090/S0002-9947-96-01660-1). arXiv: [hep-th/9311155](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9311155).

- [37] V. G. Turaev and O. Y. Viro. “State sum invariants of 3 manifolds and quantum 6j symbols”. In: *Topology* 31 (1992), pp. 865–902. DOI: [10.1016/0040-9383\(92\)90015-A](https://doi.org/10.1016/0040-9383(92)90015-A).
- [38] Justin Roberts. “Skein theory and Turaev-Viro invariants”. In: *Topology* 34.4 (1995), pp. 771–787. ISSN: 0040-9383. DOI: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0040-9383\(94\)00053-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0040-9383(94)00053-0). URL: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0040938394000530>.
- [39] Anton Yu. Alekseev, Harald Grosse, and Volker Schomerus. “Combinatorial quantization of the Hamiltonian Chern-Simons theory”. In: *Commun. Math. Phys.* 172 (1995), pp. 317–358. DOI: [10.1007/BF02099431](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02099431). arXiv: [hep-th/9403066](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9403066) [[hep-th](#)].
- [40] Anton Yu. Alekseev, Harald Grosse, and Volker Schomerus. “Combinatorial quantization of the Hamiltonian Chern-Simons theory. 2.” In: *Commun. Math. Phys.* 174 (1995), pp. 561–604. DOI: [10.1007/BF02101528](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02101528). arXiv: [hep-th/9408097](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9408097) [[hep-th](#)].
- [41] John C. Baez. “Four-Dimensional BF theory with cosmological term as a topological quantum field theory”. In: *Lett. Math. Phys.* 38 (1996), pp. 129–143. DOI: [10.1007/BF00398315](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00398315). arXiv: [q-alg/9507006](https://arxiv.org/abs/q-alg/9507006).
- [42] Jacob Lurie. *Higher Topos Theory (AM-170)*. Princeton University Press, 2009. ISBN: 9780691140490. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt7s47v> (visited on 03/26/2024).
- [43] Liang Kong and Xiao-Gang Wen. “Braided fusion categories, gravitational anomalies, and the mathematical framework for topological orders in any dimensions”. In: (May 2014). arXiv: [1405.5858](https://arxiv.org/abs/1405.5858) [[cond-mat.str-el](#)].
- [44] Theo Johnson-Freyd. “On the Classification of Topological Orders”. In: *Commun. Math. Phys.* 393.2 (2022), pp. 989–1033. DOI: [10.1007/s00220-022-04380-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-022-04380-3). arXiv: [2003.06663](https://arxiv.org/abs/2003.06663) [[math.CT](#)].
- [45] John C. Baez. “An introduction to  $n$ -categories”. In: *Category Theory and Computer Science*. Ed. by Eugenio Moggi and Giuseppe Rosolini. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1997, pp. 1–33. ISBN: 978-3-540-69552-3.
- [46] Mikhail Khovanov. “A categorification of the Jones polynomial”. In: *Duke Mathematical Journal* 101.3 (2000), pp. 359–426. DOI: [10.1215/S0012-7094-00-10131-7](https://doi.org/10.1215/S0012-7094-00-10131-7). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1215/S0012-7094-00-10131-7>.
- [47] Ben Elias. “A Diagrammatic Temperley-Lieb Categorification”. In: *Int. J. Math. Math. Sci.* 2010 (2010), 530808:1–530808:47.
- [48] Ben Webster. *Knot invariants and higher representation theory II: the categorification of quantum knot invariants*. 2013. arXiv: [1005.4559](https://arxiv.org/abs/1005.4559) [[math.GT](#)].
- [49] Raphael Rouquier. “Categorification of  $sl\ 2$  and braid groups”. In: 2005.
- [50] Roberto Zucchini. “4-d Chern-Simons Theory: Higher Gauge Symmetry and Holographic Aspects”. In: *JHEP* 06 (2021), p. 025. DOI: [10.1007/JHEP06\(2021\)025](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP06(2021)025). arXiv: [2101.10646](https://arxiv.org/abs/2101.10646) [[hep-th](#)].
- [51] Emanuele Soncini and Roberto Zucchini. “4-D semistrict higher Chern-Simons theory I”. In: *Journal of High Energy Physics* 2014.10 (2014).
- [52] Hank Chen and Florian Girelli. “Gauging the Gauge and Anomaly Resolution”. In: (Nov. 2022). arXiv: [2211.08549](https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.08549) [[hep-th](#)].
- [53] Louis Crane and Igor Frenkel. “Four-dimensional topological field theory, Hopf categories, and the canonical bases”. In: *J. Math. Phys.* 35 (1994), pp. 5136–5154. DOI: [10.1063/1.530746](https://doi.org/10.1063/1.530746). arXiv: [hep-th/9405183](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9405183).
- [54] Hendryk Pfeiffer. “2-Groups, trialgebras and their Hopf categories of representations”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 212.1 (2007), pp. 62–108. ISSN: 0001-8708. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aim.2006.09.014>. arXiv: [0411468](https://arxiv.org/abs/0411468) [[math-ph](#)]. URL: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0001870806003343>.
- [55] David Green. “Tannaka-Krein reconstruction for fusion 2-categories”. In: (Sept. 2023). arXiv: [2309.05591](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.05591) [[math.CT](#)].
- [56] Hank Chen and Florian Girelli. “Categorified Quantum Groups and Braided Monoidal 2-Categories”. In: (Apr. 2023). arXiv: [2304.07398](https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.07398) [[math.QA](#)].

- [57] John C Baez and Martin Neuchl. “Higher Dimensional Algebra: I. Braided Monoidal 2-Categories”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 121.2 (1996), pp. 196–244. ISSN: 0001-8708. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1006/aima.1996.0052>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0001870896900523>.
- [58] M. Neuchl. *Representation Theory of Hopf Categories*. Verlag nicht ermittelbar, 1997. URL: <https://books.google.ca/books?id=gpgLHAAACAAJ>.
- [59] M. M. Kapranov and V. A. Voevodsky. “2-categories and Zamolodchikov tetrahedra equations”. In: *Algebraic groups and their generalizations: quantum and infinite-dimensional methods (University Park, PA, 1991)*. Vol. 56. Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1994, 177–259.
- [60] Yu Leon Liu et al. “A braided  $(\infty, 2)$ -category of Soergel bimodules”. In: (2024). arXiv: [2401.02956](https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.02956).
- [61] John C. Baez and Alissa S. Crans. “Higher-Dimensional Algebra VI: Lie 2-Algebras”. In: *Theor. Appl. Categor.* 12 (2004), pp. 492–528. arXiv: [math/0307263](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0307263).
- [62] E. Getzler and M.M. Kapranov. *Higher Category Theory: Workshop on Higher Category Theory and Physics, March 28-30, 1997, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL*. Contemporary mathematics - American Mathematical Society. American Mathematical Society, 1998. ISBN: 9780821810569.
- [63] John C. Baez and Laurel Langford. “Higher-dimensional algebra IV: 2-tangles”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 180.2 (2003), pp. 705–764. ISSN: 0001-8708. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8708\(03\)00018-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8708(03)00018-5). URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0001870803000185>.
- [64] J. H. C. Whitehead. “On Adding Relations to Homotopy Groups”. In: *Annals of Mathematics* 42.2 (1941), pp. 409–428. ISSN: 0003486X. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1968907> (visited on 02/28/2024).
- [65] R. Brown. “Computing Homotopy Types Using Crossed  $N$ -Cubes of Groups”. In: *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series* 1 (1992), pp. 187–210. DOI: [10.1017/CB09780511526305](https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09780511526305).
- [66] J. P. Ang and Abhishodh Prakash. “Higher categorical groups and the classification of topological defects and textures”. In: (Oct. 2018). arXiv: [1810.12965](https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.12965) [[math-ph](https://arxiv.org/abs/math-ph)].
- [67] Zhuo Chen, Mathieu Stiénon, and Ping Xu. “Poisson 2-groups”. In: *J. Diff. Geom.* 94.2 (2013), pp. 209–240. DOI: [10.4310/jdg/1367438648](https://doi.org/10.4310/jdg/1367438648). arXiv: [1202.0079](https://arxiv.org/abs/1202.0079) [[math.DG](https://arxiv.org/abs/math.DG)].
- [68] Hank Chen and Florian Girelli. “Categorified Drinfel’d double and  $BF$  theory: 2-groups in 4D”. In: *Phys. Rev. D* 106 (10 Nov. 2022), p. 105017. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.106.105017](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.106.105017). URL: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.106.105017>.
- [69] Clay Córdova, Thomas T. Dumitrescu, and Kenneth Intriligator. “Exploring 2-Group Global Symmetries”. In: *JHEP* 02 (2019), p. 184. DOI: [10.1007/JHEP02\(2019\)184](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP02(2019)184). arXiv: [1802.04790](https://arxiv.org/abs/1802.04790) [[hep-th](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th)].
- [70] Francesco Benini, Clay Córdova, and Po-Shen Hsin. “On 2-group global symmetries and their anomalies”. In: *Journal of High Energy Physics* 2019.3 (Mar. 2019). DOI: [10.1007/jhep03\(2019\)118](https://doi.org/10.1007/jhep03(2019)118). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007%2Fjhep03%282019%29118>.
- [71] Clement Delcamp and Apoorv Tiwari. “Higher categorical symmetries and gauging in two-dimensional spin systems”. In: *SciPost Phys.* 16.4 (2024), p. 110. DOI: [10.21468/SciPostPhys.16.4.110](https://doi.org/10.21468/SciPostPhys.16.4.110). arXiv: [2301.01259](https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.01259) [[hep-th](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th)].
- [72] Thomas Bartsch et al. “Non-invertible symmetries and higher representation theory I”. In: *SciPost Phys.* 17.1 (2024), p. 015. DOI: [10.21468/SciPostPhys.17.1.015](https://doi.org/10.21468/SciPostPhys.17.1.015). arXiv: [2208.05993](https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.05993) [[hep-th](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th)].
- [73] Thomas Bartsch, Mathew Bullimore, and Andrea Grigoletto. “Representation theory for categorical symmetries”. In: (May 2023). arXiv: [2305.17165](https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.17165) [[hep-th](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th)].
- [74] Hank Chen. “Drinfeld double symmetry of the 4d Kitaev model”. In: *JHEP* 09 (2023), p. 141. DOI: [10.1007/JHEP09\(2023\)141](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP09(2023)141). arXiv: [2305.04729](https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.04729) [[cond-mat.str-el](https://arxiv.org/abs/cond-mat.str-el)].

- [75] Mo Huang and Zhi-Hao Zhang. “Tannaka-Krein duality for finite 2-groups”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.18151* (2023).
- [76] Mo Huang, Hao Xu, and Zhi-Hao Zhang. “The 2-character theory for finite 2-groups”. In: *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2404.01162 (Apr. 2024), arXiv:2404.01162. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2404.01162](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2404.01162). arXiv: [2404.01162](https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.01162) [[math.RT](#)].
- [77] John Baez and Urs Schreiber. “Higher gauge theory: 2-connections on 2-bundles”. In: (Dec. 2004). arXiv: [hep-th/0412325](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0412325).
- [78] Christoph Wockel. In: *Forum Mathematicum* 23.3 (2011), pp. 565–610. DOI: [doi:10.1515/form.2011.020](https://doi.org/10.1515/form.2011.020). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1515/form.2011.020>.
- [79] Thomas Nickelsen Nikolaus and Konrad Waldorf. “Four Equivalent Versions of Non-Abelian Gerbes”. In: *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* 264 (2011), pp. 355–420. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:55265704>.
- [80] Christopher-J Schommer-Pries. “Central extensions of smooth 2-groups and a finite-dimensional string 2-group”. In: *Geometry & Topology* 15.2 (May 2011), pp. 609–676. ISSN: 1465-3060. DOI: [10.2140/gt.2011.15.609](https://doi.org/10.2140/gt.2011.15.609). URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2140/gt.2011.15.609>.
- [81] Joao Faria Martins and Aleksandar Mikovic. “Lie crossed modules and gauge-invariant actions for 2-BF theories”. In: *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* 15.4 (2011), pp. 1059–1084. DOI: [10.4310/ATMP.2011.v15.n4.a4](https://doi.org/10.4310/ATMP.2011.v15.n4.a4). arXiv: [1006.0903](https://arxiv.org/abs/1006.0903) [[hep-th](#)].
- [82] Danhua Song et al. “Higher Chern-Simons based on (2-)crossed modules”. In: *Journal of High Energy Physics* 2023.7 (July 2023). DOI: [10.1007/jhep07\(2023\)207](https://doi.org/10.1007/jhep07(2023)207). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007%2Fjhep07%282023%29207>.
- [83] Aleksandar Mikovic, Miguel Angelo Oliveira, and Marko Vojinovic. “Hamiltonian analysis of the BFCG theory for a strict Lie 2-group”. In: (Oct. 2016). arXiv: [1610.09621](https://arxiv.org/abs/1610.09621) [[math-ph](#)].
- [84] Tijana Radenkovic and Marko Vojinovic. “Construction and examples of higher gauge theories”. In: *10th MATHEMATICAL PHYSICS MEETING: School and Conference on Modern Mathematical Physics*. 2020, pp. 251–276. arXiv: [2005.09404](https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.09404) [[gr-qc](#)].
- [85] Branislav Jurčo et al. “ $L_\infty$ -Algebras of Classical Field Theories and the Batalin-Vilkovisky Formalism”. In: *Fortsch. Phys.* 67.7 (2019), p. 1900025. DOI: [10.1002/prop.201900025](https://doi.org/10.1002/prop.201900025). arXiv: [1809.09899](https://arxiv.org/abs/1809.09899) [[hep-th](#)].
- [86] Hank Chen and Joaquin Liniado. “Higher gauge theory and integrability”. In: *Phys. Rev. D* 110.8 (2024), p. 086017. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.110.086017](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.110.086017). arXiv: [2405.18625](https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.18625) [[hep-th](#)].
- [87] Alexander Schenkel and Benoit Vicedo. “5d 2-Chern-Simons Theory and 3d Integrable Field Theories”. In: *Commun. Math. Phys.* 405.12 (2024), p. 293. DOI: [10.1007/s00220-024-05170-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-024-05170-9). arXiv: [2405.08083](https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.08083) [[hep-th](#)].
- [88] John C. Baez. *Higher Yang-Mills Theory*. 2002. DOI: [10.48550/ARXIV.HEP-TH/0206130](https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.HEP-TH/0206130). URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0206130>.
- [89] Hisham Sati, Urs Schreiber, and Jim Stasheff. “Differential twisted String and Fivebrane structures”. In: *Commun. Math. Phys.* 315 (2012), pp. 169–213. DOI: [10.1007/s00220-012-1510-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-012-1510-3). arXiv: [0910.4001](https://arxiv.org/abs/0910.4001) [[math.AT](#)].
- [90] Kevin Walker and Zhenghan Wang. “ $(3+1)$ -TQFTs and topological insulators”. In: *Frontiers of Physics* 7.2 (2012), pp. 150–159. DOI: [10.48550/ARXIV.1104.2632](https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1104.2632). URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1104.2632>.
- [91] A. Bullivant et al. “Topological phases from higher gauge symmetry in 3+1 dimensions”. In: *Phys. Rev. B* 95.15 (2017), p. 155118. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevB.95.155118](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.95.155118). arXiv: [1606.06639](https://arxiv.org/abs/1606.06639) [[cond-mat.str-el](#)].
- [92] Clement Delcamp. “Excitation basis for  $(3+1)$ d topological phases”. In: *JHEP* 12 (2017), p. 128. DOI: [10.1007/JHEP12\(2017\)128](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP12(2017)128). arXiv: [1709.04924](https://arxiv.org/abs/1709.04924) [[hep-th](#)].
- [93] Oleg Dubinkin, Alex Rasmussen, and Taylor L. Hughes. “Higher-form Gauge Symmetries in Multipole Topological Phases”. In: *Annals Phys.* 422 (2020), p. 168297. DOI: [10.1016/j.aop.2020.168297](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aop.2020.168297). arXiv: [2007.05539](https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.05539) [[cond-mat.str-el](#)].

- [94] Danhua Song et al. “Generalized higher connections and Yang-Mills”. In: (Dec. 2021). arXiv: [2112.13370](https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.13370) [[hep-th](#)].
- [95] Christopher L. Douglas and David J. Reutter. “Fusion 2-categories and a state-sum invariant for 4-manifolds”. In: *arXiv: Quantum Algebra* (2018). URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:119305837>.
- [96] John C. Baez and Aaron D. Lauda. “Higher-dimensional algebra. V: 2-Groups.” eng. In: *Theory and Applications of Categories [electronic only]* 12 (2004), pp. 423–491. URL: <http://eudml.org/doc/124217>.
- [97] Joao Faria Martins and Timothy Porter. “On Yetter’s invariant and an extension of the Dijkgraaf-Witten invariant to categorical groups”. In: *Theor. Appl. Categor.* 18 (2007), pp. 118–150. arXiv: [math/0608484](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0608484).
- [98] D. N. Yetter. “TQFT’s from homotopy 2 types”. In: *J. Knot Theor. Ramifications* 2 (1993), pp. 113–123. DOI: [10.1142/S0218216593000076](https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218216593000076).
- [99] Anton Kapustin and Ryan Thorngren. “Higher Symmetry and Gapped Phases of Gauge Theories”. In: *Algebra, Geometry, and Physics in the 21st Century: Kontsevich Festschrift*. Ed. by Denis Auroux et al. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2017, pp. 177–202. ISBN: 978-3-319-59939-7. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-319-59939-7\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-59939-7_5). URL: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-59939-7\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-59939-7_5).
- [100] A. Mikovic and M. Vojinovic. “poincaré 2-group and quantum gravity”. In: *Class. Quant. Grav.* 29 (2012), p. 165003. DOI: [10.1088/0264-9381/29/16/165003](https://doi.org/10.1088/0264-9381/29/16/165003). arXiv: [1110.4694](https://arxiv.org/abs/1110.4694) [[gr-qc](#)].
- [101] Alex Bullivant et al. “Higher lattices, discrete two-dimensional holonomy and topological phases in (3+1)D with higher gauge symmetry”. In: *Rev. Math. Phys.* 32.04 (2019), p. 2050011. DOI: [10.1142/S0129055X20500117](https://doi.org/10.1142/S0129055X20500117). arXiv: [1702.00868](https://arxiv.org/abs/1702.00868) [[math-ph](#)].
- [102] A. Bochniak et al. “Dynamics of a lattice 2-group gauge theory model”. In: *Journal of High Energy Physics* 2021.9 (Sept. 2021). DOI: [10.1007/jhep09\(2021\)068](https://doi.org/10.1007/jhep09(2021)068). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/2Fjhep09%282021%29068>.
- [103] David Reutter. “Semisimple 4-dimensional topological field theories cannot detect exotic smooth structure”. In: (Jan. 2020). arXiv: [2001.02288](https://arxiv.org/abs/2001.02288) [[math.GT](#)].
- [104] Hyungrok Kim and Christian Saemann. “Adjusted parallel transport for higher gauge theories”. In: *J. Phys. A* 53.44 (2020), p. 445206. DOI: [10.1088/1751-8121/ab8ef2](https://doi.org/10.1088/1751-8121/ab8ef2). arXiv: [1911.06390](https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.06390) [[hep-th](#)].
- [105] Louis Crane, Louis H. Kauffman, and David N. Yetter. “State sum invariants of four manifolds. 1.” In: (Sept. 1994). arXiv: [hep-th/9409167](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9409167).
- [106] Louis Crane and David Yetter. “A Categorical construction of 4-D topological quantum field theories”. In: Mar. 1993. arXiv: [hep-th/9301062](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9301062).
- [107] Chengming Bai, Yunhe Sheng, and Chenchang Zhu. “Lie 2-Bialgebras”. In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 320.1 (Apr. 2013), pp. 149–172. DOI: [10.1007/s00220-013-1712-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-013-1712-3). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/2Fs00220-013-1712-3>.
- [108] Zhuo Chen, Mathieu Stiénon, and Ping Xu. “Weak Lie 2-bialgebras”. In: *Journal of Geometry and Physics* 68 (June 2013), pp. 59–68. ISSN: 0393-0440. DOI: [10.1016/j.geomphys.2013.01.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomphys.2013.01.006). URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.geomphys.2013.01.006>.
- [109] John C. Baez. “Higher-Dimensional Algebra II. 2-Hilbert Spaces”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 127 (1996), pp. 125–189. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:2792589>.
- [110] David N. Yetter. “Measurable Categories”. In: *Applied Categorical Structures* 13 (2003), pp. 469–500. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:15178814>.
- [111] John Baez et al. “Infinite-Dimensional Representations of 2-Groups”. In: *Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society* 219.1032 (2012), pp. 0–0. DOI: [10.1090/s0065-9266-2012-00652-6](https://doi.org/10.1090/s0065-9266-2012-00652-6). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1090/2Fs0065-9266-2012-00652-6>.
- [112] Hank Chen. *Categorical quantum symmetries and ribbon tensor 2-categories*. 2025.

- [113] Ben Fuller. “Semidirect Products of Monoidal Categories”. In: *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:1510.08717 (Oct. 2015), arXiv:1510.08717. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.1510.08717](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1510.08717). arXiv: [1510.08717](https://arxiv.org/abs/1510.08717) [math.CT].
- [114] Luuk Stehouwer and Jan Steinebrunner. “Dagger categories via anti-involutions and positivity”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.02928* (2023).
- [115] Giovanni Ferrer et al. *Dagger n-categories*. 2024. arXiv: [2403.01651](https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.01651) [math.CT]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.01651>.
- [116] Brian Day and Ross Street. “Monoidal Bicategories and Hopf Algebroids”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 129.1 (1997), pp. 99–157. ISSN: 0001-8708. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1006/aima.1997.1649>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0001870897916492>.
- [117] Clement Delcamp, Bianca Dittrich, and Aldo Riello. “Fusion basis for lattice gauge theory and loop quantum gravity”. In: *JHEP* 02 (2017), p. 061. DOI: [10.1007/JHEP02\(2017\)061](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP02(2017)061). arXiv: [1607.08881](https://arxiv.org/abs/1607.08881) [hep-th].
- [118] Catherine Meusburger. “Poisson–Lie Groups and Gauge Theory”. In: *Symmetry* 13.8 (2021), p. 1324. DOI: [10.3390/sym13081324](https://doi.org/10.3390/sym13081324).
- [119] M. A. Semenov-Tyan-Shanskii. “Poisson-Lie groups. The quantum duality principle and the twisted quantum double”. In: *Theoretical and Mathematical Physics* 93.2 (Nov. 1992). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01083527>, pp. 1292–1307. ISSN: 1573-9333. DOI: [10.1007/BF01083527](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01083527).
- [120] Janusz Grabowski. “Poisson Lie groups and their relations to quantum groups”. eng. In: *Banach Center Publications* 34.1 (1995), pp. 55–64. URL: <http://eudml.org/doc/251303>.
- [121] V. V. Fock and A. A. Rosly. “Poisson structure on moduli of flat connections on Riemann surfaces and r matrix”. In: *Am. Math. Soc. Transl.* 191 (1999), pp. 67–86. arXiv: [math/9802054](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/9802054) [math-qa].
- [122] Saunders MacLane. *Categories for the Working Mathematician*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Vol. 5. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1971, pp. ix+262.
- [123] Louis Crane and David N. Yetter. “Measurable categories and 2-groups”. In: (May 2003). arXiv: [math/0305176](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0305176).
- [124] Sven-S. Porst. “Strict 2-Groups are Crossed Modules”. In: *arXiv: Category Theory* (2008).
- [125] Matthias Ludewig and Konrad Waldorf. “Lie 2-groups from loop group extensions”. In: *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2303.13176 (Mar. 2023), arXiv:2303.13176. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2303.13176](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2303.13176). arXiv: [2303.13176](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.13176) [math.DG].
- [126] Tien Quang Nguyen, Thi Cuc Pham, and Thu Thuy Nguyen. “CROSSED MODULES AND STRICT GR-CATEGORIES”. In: *Communications of The Korean Mathematical Society* 29 (2014), pp. 9–22. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:55316397>.
- [127] J.P. Ang and Abhishodh Prakash. *Higher categorical groups and the classification of topological defects and textures*. 2018. arXiv: [1810.12965](https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.12965) [math-ph].
- [128] John C. Baez. “Hoàng Xuân Sinh’s Thesis: Categorifying Group Theory”. In: 2023. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:260775694>.
- [129] Tian Lan and Xiao-Gang Wen. “Classification of 3+1D Bosonic Topological Orders (II): The Case When Some Pointlike Excitations Are Fermions”. In: *Phys. Rev. X* 9 (2 Apr. 2019), p. 021005. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevX.9.021005](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevX.9.021005). URL: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevX.9.021005>.
- [130] Chenchang Zhu, Tian Lan, and Xiao-Gang Wen. “Topological nonlinear  $\sigma$ -model, higher gauge theory, and a systematic construction of (3+1)D topological orders for boson systems”. In: *Physical Review B* 100.4 (July 2019). ISSN: 2469-9969. DOI: [10.1103/physrevb.100.045105](https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevb.100.045105). URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.100.045105>.
- [131] Anton Kapustin and Ryan Thorngren. “Higher Symmetry and Gapped Phases of Gauge Theories”. In: *Algebra, Geometry, and Physics in the 21st Century: Kontsevich Festschrift*. Ed. by Denis Auroux et al. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2017, pp. 177–202. ISBN: 978-3-319-59939-7. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-319-59939-7\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-59939-7_5). URL: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-59939-7\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-59939-7_5).

- [132] Alex Bullivant and Clement Delcamp. “Excitations in strict 2-group higher gauge models of topological phases”. In: *JHEP* 01 (2020), p. 107. DOI: [10.1007/JHEP01\(2020\)107](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP01(2020)107). arXiv: [1909.07937](https://arxiv.org/abs/1909.07937) [[cond-mat.str-el](https://arxiv.org/abs/1909.07937)].
- [133] John C. Baez and Christopher L. Rogers. “Categorified symplectic geometry and the string Lie 2-algebra”. In: *Homology, Homotopy and Applications* 12.1 (2010), pp. 221–236. DOI: [hha/1296223828](https://doi.org/10.1296223828). URL: <https://doi.org/>.
- [134] Dana P. Williams. “Haar Systems on Equivalent Groupoids”. In: *arXiv: Operator Algebras* (2015). URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:33769918>.
- [135] Jan K. Pachl. “Disintegration and compact measures.” In: *MATHEMATICA SCANDINAVICA* 43 (June 1978), pp. 157–168. DOI: [10.7146/math.scand.a-11771](https://doi.org/10.7146/math.scand.a-11771). URL: <https://www.msand.dk/article/view/11771>.
- [136] Konrad Waldorf. “Transgressive loop group extensions”. In: *Mathematische Zeitschrift* 286 (2015), pp. 325–360. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:119641403>.
- [137] Otto Forster. “Zur Theorie der Steinschen Algebren und Moduln.” In: *Mathematische Zeitschrift* 97 (1967), pp. 376–405. URL: <http://eudml.org/doc/170723>.
- [138] Andrew D. Lewis. “Generalised subbundles and distributions: A comprehensive review”. In: *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2309.10471 (Sept. 2023), arXiv:2309.10471. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2309.10471](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2309.10471). arXiv: [2309.10471](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.10471) [[math.DG](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.10471)].
- [139] Michael Kunzinger and Roland Steinbauer. “Foundations of a nonlinear distributional geometry”. In: *Acta Appl. Math.* 71 (Feb. 2002), pp. 179–206. arXiv: [math/0102019](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0102019).
- [140] Thomas Baier, José M. Mourão, and João P. Nunes. “Quantization of Abelian Varieties: distributional sections and the transition from Kähler to real polarizations”. In: *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:0907.5324 (July 2009), arXiv:0907.5324. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.0907.5324](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.0907.5324). arXiv: [0907.5324](https://arxiv.org/abs/0907.5324) [[math.SG](https://arxiv.org/abs/0907.5324)].
- [141] E.A. Nigsch. “Nonlinear generalized sections of vector bundles”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 440.1 (2016), pp. 183–219. ISSN: 0022-247X. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmaa.2016.03.022>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022247X16002407>.
- [142] Friedrich Wagemann. *Crossed Modules*. De Gruyter, 2021. ISBN: 9783110750959. DOI: [doi:10.1515/9783110750959](https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110750959). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110750959>.
- [143] Shahn Majid. “Strict quantum 2-groups”. In: (Aug. 2012). arXiv: [1208.6265](https://arxiv.org/abs/1208.6265) [[math.QA](https://arxiv.org/abs/1208.6265)].
- [144] Xiao Han. “On bicrossed modules of Hopf algebras”. In: *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2312.10173 (Dec. 2023), arXiv:2312.10173. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2312.10173](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2312.10173). arXiv: [2312.10173](https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.10173) [[math.QA](https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.10173)].
- [145] David N. Yettera. “Quantum groups and representations of monoidal categories”. In: *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* 108 (1990), pp. 261–290. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:122820844>.
- [146] Hank Chen and Florian Girelli. “Integrability from categorification”. In: (July 2023). arXiv: [2307.03831](https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.03831) [[math-ph](https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.03831)].
- [147] John W. Milnor and John C. Moore. “On the Structure of Hopf Algebras”. In: *Annals of Mathematics* 81.2 (1965), pp. 211–264. ISSN: 0003486X. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1970615> (visited on 03/16/2023).
- [148] Alan Hatcher. *Algebraic Topology*. Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- [149] André Henriques. “Integrating  $L_\infty$ -algebras”. In: *Compositio Mathematica* 144 (2006), pp. 1017–1045. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:17931112>.
- [150] Camilo Angulo and Miquel Cueva. “The van Est homomorphism for strict Lie 2-groups”. In: 2024. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:269790865>.
- [151] Camilo Angulo. *A cohomology theory for Lie 2-algebras and Lie 2-groups*. 2018. DOI: [10.48550/arxiv.1810.05740](https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.1810.05740). URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.05740>.



- [152] P. Etingof et al. *Tensor Categories*. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs. American Mathematical Society, 2016. ISBN: 9781470434410. URL: <https://books.google.ca/books?id=Z6XLDAQAQBAJ>.
- [153] Pavel Putrov, Juven Wang, and Shing-Tung Yau. “Braiding statistics and link invariants of bosonic/fermionic topological quantum matter in 2+1 and 3+1 dimensions”. In: *Annals of Physics* 384 (2017), pp. 254–287. ISSN: 0003-4916. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aop.2017.06.019>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0003491617301859>.
- [154] Lucio Simone Cirio and Joao Faria Martins. “Categorifying the  $sl(2, C)$  Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov Connection via an Infinitesimal 2-Yang-Baxter Operator in the String Lie-2-Algebra”. In: *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* 21.1 (2017). arXiv: [1207.1132](https://arxiv.org/abs/1207.1132) [hep-th].
- [155] Henrique Bursztyn and Stefan Waldmann. “Deformation Quantization of Hermitian Vector Bundles”. In: *Letters in Mathematical Physics* 53 (2000), pp. 349–365. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:117082030>.
- [156] A. Lazarev and M. Movshev. “On the cohomology and deformations of differential graded algebras”. In: *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* 106.2 (1996), pp. 141–151. ISSN: 0022-4049. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-4049\(95\)00021-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-4049(95)00021-6). URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0022404995000216>.
- [157] Harald Grosse and Karl-Georg Schlesinger. “A Suggestion for an integrability notion for two-dimensional spin systems”. In: *Lett. Math. Phys.* 55 (2001), pp. 161–167. DOI: [10.1023/A:1010988421217](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010988421217). arXiv: [hep-th/0103176](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0103176).
- [158] Maxim Kontsevich. “Deformation quantization of Poisson manifolds. 1.” In: *Lett. Math. Phys.* 66 (2003), pp. 157–216. DOI: [10.1023/B:MATH.0000027508.00421.bf](https://doi.org/10.1023/B:MATH.0000027508.00421.bf). arXiv: [q-alg/9709040](https://arxiv.org/abs/q-alg/9709040).
- [159] N. Reshetikhin. *Lectures on the integrability of the 6-vertex model*. 2010. arXiv: [1010.5031](https://arxiv.org/abs/1010.5031) [math-ph]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1010.5031>.
- [160] M. Q. Zhang. “How to find the Lax pair from the Yang-Baxter equation”. In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 141.3 (1991), pp. 523–531. DOI: [cmp/1104248391](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01104248391). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01104248391>.
- [161] T. A. Larsson. “Gerbes, covariant derivatives,  $p$ -form lattice gauge theory, and the Yang-Baxter equation”. In: (May 2002). arXiv: [math-ph/0205017](https://arxiv.org/abs/math-ph/0205017).
- [162] Binlu Feng, Yufeng Zhang, and Hongyi Zhang. “Applications of the R-Matrix Method in Integrable Systems”. In: *Symmetry* 15.9 (2023). ISSN: 2073-8994. DOI: [10.3390/sym15091623](https://doi.org/10.3390/sym15091623). URL: <https://www.mdpi.com/2073-8994/15/9/1623>.
- [163] Shuyu Xiao. “Abelianization of Lie algebroids and Lie groupoids”. In: *Journal of Geometry and Physics* 207 (Jan. 2025), p. 105372. ISSN: 0393-0440. DOI: [10.1016/j.geomphys.2024.105372](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomphys.2024.105372). URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.geomphys.2024.105372>.
- [164] Kevin Costello and Masahito Yamazaki. “Gauge Theory And Integrability III”. In: (Aug. 2019). arXiv: [1908.02289](https://arxiv.org/abs/1908.02289) [hep-th].
- [165] M. Reed and B. Simon. *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics. I Functional Analysis*. Second. New York: Academic Press, 1980.
- [166] S. Majid. “Some remarks on the quantum double”. In: *Czech. J. Phys.* 44 (1994), p. 1059. DOI: [10.1007/BF01690458](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01690458). arXiv: [hep-th/9409056](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9409056).
- [167] Giovanni Faonte, Benjamin Hennion, and Mikhail Kapranov. “Higher Kac–Moody algebras and moduli spaces of  $G$ -bundles”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 346 (2019), pp. 389–466. ISSN: 0001-8708. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aim.2019.01.040>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0001870819300763>.
- [168] Mikhail Kapranov. “Infinite-dimensional (dg) Lie algebras and factorization algebras in algebraic geometry”. In: *Japanese Journal of Mathematics* (2021), pp. 1–32. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:231392391>.
- [169] Niklas Garner and Brian R. Williams. “Raviolo vertex algebras”. In: (Aug. 2023). arXiv: [2308.04414](https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.04414) [math.QA].

- [170] Luigi Alfonsi, Hyungrok Kim, and Charles AS Young. “Raviolo vertex algebras, cochains and conformal blocks”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.11917* (2024).
- [171] Luigi Alfonsi, Hyungrok Kim, and Charles A. S. Young. “Raviolo vertex algebras, cochains and conformal blocks”. In: (Jan. 2024). arXiv: [2401.11917](https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.11917) [[math.QA](#)].
- [172] D. Kazhdan and G. Lusztig. “Tensor Structures Arising from Affine Lie Algebras. III”. In: *Journal of the American Mathematical Society* 7.2 (1994), pp. 335–381. ISSN: 08940347, 10886834. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2152762> (visited on 11/18/2023).
- [173] Liang Kong and Hao Zheng. “Categories of quantum liquids I”. In: *JHEP* 08 (2022), p. 070. DOI: [10.1007/JHEP08\(2022\)070](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP08(2022)070). arXiv: [2011.02859](https://arxiv.org/abs/2011.02859) [[hep-th](#)].
- [174] Liang Kong and Hao Zheng. “Categories of Quantum Liquids II”. In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 405.9 (Aug. 2024), p. 203.
- [175] Liang Kong and Hao Zheng. “Categories of quantum liquids III”. In: (Jan. 2022). arXiv: [2201.05726](https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.05726) [[hep-th](#)].