

Last time: • Hopf algebra structure on  $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$

- For any two  $f$ -dimensional  $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ -modules, we constructed a functorial isomorphism  $M_2 \otimes M_1 \xrightarrow{\cong} M_1 \otimes M_2$  (of  $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ -modules) in the form  $\Theta^{\pm, \tau}$  ( $\tau$ -permutation  $M_2 \otimes M_1 \rightarrow M_1 \otimes M_2 : m_2 \otimes m_1 \mapsto m_1 \otimes m_2$ ).

Remark 1: I forgot to mention last time that this Hopf algebra structure on  $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$  degenerates the canonical Hopf algebra structure on  $U(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ . To state the result, recall the algebra  $\tilde{U}_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$  from Lecture 5, which was generated by  $\{E, F, K^{\pm 1}, L\}$  and isomorphic to  $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$  for  $q \neq \pm 1$ , while specialization  $\tilde{U}_{q=1}(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$  was well-defined and  $U(\mathfrak{sl}_2) \cong \tilde{U}_{q=1}(\mathfrak{sl}_2)/(K-1)$  as algebras.

The point now is that  $\tilde{U}_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$  has a Hopf alg. structure, s.t. the isomorphism  $U(\mathfrak{sl}_2) \cong \tilde{U}_{q=1}(\mathfrak{sl}_2)/(K-1)$  is an isom. of Hopf alg-s. The images of  $E, F, K^{\pm 1}$  under  $\Delta, \varepsilon, S$  are defined as in  $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ , while we set  $\Delta(L) := L \otimes K + K^{-1} \otimes L$ ,  $\varepsilon(L) := 0$ ,  $S(L) := -L$ . (Exercise 1: Check the claim).

Remark 2: In the simplest case of  $M_1 = M_2 = L(1, +)$  and a map  $f: \tilde{\Lambda} \times \tilde{\Lambda} \rightarrow k$  as in Lecture 8, verify that  $\Theta^{\pm}$  is given by the following  $4 \times 4$  matrix

$$\Theta^{\pm} = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda q & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda q(q^{-1}-q) & \lambda q & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda \end{pmatrix}, \text{ where } \lambda := f(q, q) \text{ and the basis we use is } \{m_0 \otimes m_0, m_0 \otimes m_1, m_1 \otimes m_0, m_1 \otimes m_1\}.$$

Remark 3: Last time we played with three coproducts:

(1)  $\Delta: K \mapsto K \otimes K, E \mapsto E \otimes 1 + K \otimes E, F \mapsto F \otimes K^{-1} + 1 \otimes F$

(2)  $\Delta^{\text{op}}: K \mapsto K \otimes K, E \mapsto E \otimes K + 1 \otimes E, F \mapsto F \otimes 1 + K^{-1} \otimes F$

(3)  $\tilde{\Delta}: K \mapsto K \otimes K, E \mapsto E \otimes 1 + K^{-1} \otimes E, F \mapsto F \otimes K + 1 \otimes F$

$\tilde{\Delta}$  is related to  $\Delta$  via the following formula  $\tilde{\Delta}(x) = (\sigma \otimes \sigma) \Delta(\sigma^{-1}(x))$ , where  $\sigma$  is an anti-involution of  $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$  given by  $E \mapsto E, F \mapsto F, K \mapsto K^{-1}$ .

During the proof of Thm 2 of Lecture 8, we verified

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \Theta^{\pm} \tilde{\Delta}(x) &= \Delta(x) \Theta^{\pm} \\ \tilde{\Delta}(x) \Theta^{\pm} &= \Theta^{\pm} \Delta^{\text{op}}(x) \end{aligned} \right\} \Rightarrow \Delta(x) \Theta^{\pm} = \Theta^{\pm} \Delta^{\text{op}}(x), \text{ which is equivalent to Thm 2.}$$

Last time, we concluded with equality b/w  $\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}', \mathbb{H}''$ , denoted  $(\dagger)$  in Lecture 8. Let us now provide a proof for it. We recall that  $\mathbb{H}' = \sum_{n \geq 0} \mathbb{H}'_n, \mathbb{H}'' = \sum_{n \geq 0} \mathbb{H}''_n$  with  $\mathbb{H}'_n = a_n F^n \otimes K^n \otimes E^n, \mathbb{H}''_n = a_n F^n \otimes K^n \otimes E^n$

Prop 1: We have:

$$\boxed{\mathbb{H}_{12} \circ \mathbb{H}' \circ \mathbb{H}_{23} = \mathbb{H}_{23} \circ \mathbb{H}'' \circ \mathbb{H}_{12}} \quad (\dagger)$$

$\mathbb{H}_{23} \circ \mathbb{H}'' = \sum_{i,j \geq 0} a_i a_j (1 \otimes F^i \otimes E^j)(F^i \otimes K^j \otimes E^i) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \sum_{i=0}^n a_i a_{n-i} \cdot F^i \otimes F^{n-i} K^i \otimes E^i$   
 On the other hand, due to [Lecture 8, Lemma 2], we have:  
 $\Delta(F^n) = \sum_{i=0}^n q^{i(n-i)} \begin{bmatrix} n \\ i \end{bmatrix} F^i \otimes F^{n-i} K^i$ . However, we have:  
 $a_i a_{n-i} = (-1)^n \cdot q^{\frac{-i(i-1)}{2} - \frac{(n-i)(n-i-1)}{2}} \cdot \frac{(q-q^{-1})^n}{[i]! [n-i]!} = a_n \cdot \begin{bmatrix} n \\ i \end{bmatrix} \cdot q^{\frac{n(n-1)-i(i-1)-(n-i)(n-i-1)}{2}} = a_n \cdot q^{i(n-i)} \begin{bmatrix} n \\ i \end{bmatrix}$

$$\Rightarrow \boxed{\mathbb{H}_{23} \circ \mathbb{H}'' = (\Delta \otimes 1)(\mathbb{H})}$$

• Last time (see also Rmk 3 above), we proved  $\Delta(x)\mathbb{H} = \mathbb{H} \Delta^{\text{op}}(x)$ .

$$\Rightarrow \text{Right-hand side of } (\dagger) \text{ equals } \boxed{\mathbb{H}_{12} \circ (\tilde{\Delta} \otimes 1)(\mathbb{H})}$$

• Hence, to prove  $(\dagger)$ , it suffices to verify  $(\tilde{\Delta} \otimes 1)(\mathbb{H}) = \mathbb{H}' \circ \mathbb{H}_{23}$ .

But  $\mathbb{H}' \circ \mathbb{H}_{23}$  can be computed as  $\mathbb{H}_{23} \circ \mathbb{H}''$  above, that is:

$$\mathbb{H}' \circ \mathbb{H}_{23} = \sum_{i,j \geq 0} a_i a_j (F^i \otimes K^i \otimes E^i)(1 \otimes F^j \otimes E^j) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \sum_{i=0}^n a_i a_{n-i} \cdot F^i \otimes K^i F^{n-i} \otimes E^n$$

But  $\tilde{\Delta}(F) = F \otimes K + 1 \otimes F \xrightarrow{q\text{-binomial}} \tilde{\Delta}(F^n) = \sum_{i=0}^n q^{i(n-i)} \begin{bmatrix} n \\ i \end{bmatrix} F^i \otimes K^i F^{n-i}$

$a_i a_{n-i} = a_n \cdot q^{i(n-i)} \begin{bmatrix} n \\ i \end{bmatrix}$  (above)

$$\Rightarrow \boxed{\mathbb{H}' \circ \mathbb{H}_{23} = (\tilde{\Delta} \otimes 1)(\mathbb{H})}$$

This completes the proof of Prop 1, hence, completing the proof of Thm 2 from Lecture 8.

Recall that our construction of intertwiners  $\mathbb{H}' \circ \tau$  depends on a choice of a map  $f: \tilde{\Lambda} \times \tilde{\Lambda} \rightarrow k^*$  (here  $\tilde{\Lambda} = 1 + q^{\mathbb{Z}}$ ) subject to:

$$\boxed{f(\lambda, \mu) = \lambda \cdot f(\lambda, \mu q) = \mu \cdot f(\lambda q, \mu)} \quad (1)$$

There is a plenty of such maps, but requesting some additional properties, restricts the choice - see our next result.

Prop 2: Let  $M_1, M_2, M_3$  be three finite dimensional  $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ -modules.

We also assume that the map  $f$  satisfying (1) also satisfies

$$\boxed{f(\lambda, \mu\nu) = f(\lambda, \nu) f(\lambda, \mu), \quad f(\lambda\mu, \nu) = f(\lambda, \nu) f(\mu, \nu)} \quad (2)$$

for all weights  $\lambda, \mu, \nu$  of these modules. Then, the following diagrams commute:

$$(\diamond_1) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} & & \xrightarrow{1 \otimes \check{R}} & M_1 \otimes (M_3 \otimes M_2) & \xrightarrow{\text{can}} & (M_1 \otimes M_3) \otimes M_2 & \xrightarrow{\check{R} \otimes 1} & (M_3 \otimes M_1) \otimes M_2 \\ & \swarrow & & & & & & \\ M_1 \otimes (M_2 \otimes M_3) & & & & & & & \\ & \searrow & & & & & & \\ & & \xrightarrow{\text{can}} & (M_1 \otimes M_2) \otimes M_3 & \xrightarrow{\check{R}} & M_3 \otimes (M_1 \otimes M_2) & \xrightarrow{\text{can}} & (M_3 \otimes M_1) \otimes M_2 \end{array}$$

and

$$(\diamond_2) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} & & \xrightarrow{\check{R} \otimes 1} & (M_2 \otimes M_1) \otimes M_3 & \xrightarrow{\text{can}} & M_2 \otimes (M_1 \otimes M_3) & \xrightarrow{1 \otimes \check{R}} & M_2 \otimes (M_3 \otimes M_1) \\ & \swarrow & & & & & & \\ (M_1 \otimes M_2) \otimes M_3 & & & & & & & \\ & \searrow & & & & & & \\ & & \xrightarrow{\text{can}} & M_1 \otimes (M_2 \otimes M_3) & \xrightarrow{\check{R}} & (M_2 \otimes M_3) \otimes M_1 & \xrightarrow{\text{can}} & M_2 \otimes (M_3 \otimes M_1) \end{array}$$

Here  $\text{can}: A \otimes (B \otimes C) \rightarrow (A \otimes B) \otimes C$  via  $a \otimes (b \otimes c) \mapsto (a \otimes b) \otimes c$ , while  $\check{R} := \mathbb{1} \otimes \tau: B \otimes A \rightarrow A \otimes B$  for any  $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ -modules  $A, B, C$ .

"Upper half" of the diagram  $(\diamond_1)$  equals

$$\mathbb{1}_{12} \circ \tilde{f}_{12} \circ \tau_{12} \circ \mathbb{1}_{23} \circ \tilde{f}_{23} \circ \tau_{23} = \mathbb{1}_{12} \circ \tilde{f}_{12} \circ \mathbb{1}_{13} \circ \tau_{12} \circ \tilde{f}_{23} \circ \tau_{23} = \mathbb{1}_{12} \circ \tilde{f}_{12} \circ \mathbb{1}_{13} \circ \tilde{f}_{13} \circ \tau_{12} \circ \tau_{23}$$

Lemmas 4.1.1 & 4.1.2

$$\mathbb{1}_{12} \circ \mathbb{1}' \circ \tilde{f}'_{12} \circ \tilde{f}'_{23} \circ \tau_{12} \circ \tau_{23}$$

"Lower half" of the diagram  $(\diamond_1)$  equals

$$(1 \otimes \Delta)(\mathbb{1}) \circ \tilde{f}' \circ \tau_{12} \circ \tau_{23}, \text{ where } \tilde{f}'(w) = f(\lambda, \mu\nu)w \text{ for } w \in (M_3)_{\lambda} \otimes (M_1)_{\mu} \otimes (M_2)_{\nu}.$$

But: analogously to our computations in the proof of Prop 2, one can check that  $\boxed{(1 \otimes \Delta)(\mathbb{1}) = \mathbb{1}_{12} \circ \mathbb{1}'}$

Thus, the commutativity of  $(\diamond_1)$  follows from  $f(\lambda, \mu\nu) = f(\lambda, \mu) f(\lambda, \nu)$ .

Likewise, the commutativity of  $(\diamond_2)$  follows from  $f(\lambda\mu, \nu) = f(\lambda, \nu) f(\mu, \nu)$ .

Exercise 2: Classify all  $f: \tilde{\Lambda} \times \tilde{\Lambda} \rightarrow k^*$  (resp.  $f: \Lambda \times \Lambda \rightarrow k^*$ ,  $\Delta := \mathbb{Z}$ ) satisfying (1, 2) for all weights  $\lambda, \mu, \nu \in \tilde{\Lambda}^*$  (resp.  $\lambda, \mu, \nu \in \Lambda$ )

Question: What is the relation between two quantum groups we studied so far:  $U_q(SL_2)$  and  $SL_q(2)$ ?

As always, we should first understand its classical counterpart.

Def: (a) Given two bialgebras  $A, B$ , a bilinear form  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle: A \times B \rightarrow k$  is called a bialgebra pairing if the following equalities hold:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \langle a, b_1 b_2 \rangle &= \sum_{(a)} \langle a', b_1 \rangle \cdot \langle a'', b_2 \rangle, & \langle a, a_2, b \rangle &= \sum_{(b)} \langle a_2, b'' \rangle \cdot \langle a_2, b' \rangle \\ \langle a, 1_B \rangle &= \varepsilon(a), & \langle 1_A, b \rangle &= \varepsilon(b). \end{aligned} \right\} (1)$$

(b) If  $A, B$  - Hopf algebras, then  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  is a Hopf pairing if in addition

$$\langle S(a), b \rangle = \langle a, S^{-1}(b) \rangle \quad (2)$$

Lemma 1: (a) Given bialgebras  $A, B$  and a bilinear pairing  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle: A \times B \rightarrow k$ , it is a bialg. pairing iff the natural linear maps  $\varphi: A^* \rightarrow B^*$  and  $\psi: B \rightarrow A^*$  (induced by  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ ) are algebra morphisms.

(b) If  $\dim(B) < \infty$ , then  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  - bialgebra pairing iff  $\varphi: A^* \rightarrow B^*$  is a bialgebra morphism.

► (a) Note that the second equality in (1) is equivalent to  $\varphi(a, a_2) = \varphi(a_2)\varphi(a_1)$ :  
 $\varphi(a_1 a_2)(b) = \langle a, a_2, b \rangle = \sum_{(b)} \langle a_1, b'' \rangle \cdot \langle a_2, b' \rangle = (\varphi(a_2)\varphi(a_1))(b)$

Also  $\varphi(1_A)(b) = \langle 1_A, b \rangle = \varepsilon(b)$  implies that 4<sup>th</sup> equality of (1) is equiv. to  $\varphi(1_A) = 1_{B^*}$

Likewise, the first equality of (1) is equivalent to  $\psi(b, b_2) = \psi(b, b_1)\psi(b_2)$ :

$$\psi(b, b_2)(a) = \langle a, b, b_2 \rangle = \sum_{(a)} \langle a', b_1 \rangle \langle a'', b_2 \rangle = (\psi(b, b_1)\psi(b_2))(a)$$

Finally, the 3<sup>rd</sup> eq-n of (1) is equivalent to  $\psi(1_B) = 1_{A^*}$ , due to:

$$\psi(1_B)(a) = \langle a, 1_B \rangle = \varepsilon(a)$$

(b) It suffices to check that 1<sup>st</sup> & 3<sup>rd</sup> conditions of (1) are equivalent to  $\varphi$  being a coalgebra morphism. The 1<sup>st</sup> follows from:

$$\Delta(\varphi(a))(b \otimes c) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \varphi(a)(b \cdot c) = \langle a, bc \rangle = \sum_{(a)} \langle a', b \rangle \cdot \langle a'', c \rangle = (\varphi \otimes \varphi)(\Delta(a))(b \otimes c)$$

while the 3<sup>rd</sup> is equivalent to  $\varphi$  being compatible with counits.

Consider the homomorphism  $\varphi: M(2)^{\text{op}} \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{sl}_2)^*$  determined by  $\varphi: \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$ , where  $\begin{pmatrix} A(u) & B(u) \\ C(u) & D(u) \end{pmatrix} = \rho(u)$ ,  $\rho: U(\mathfrak{sl}_2) \rightarrow \text{End}(V_1)$ ,  $V_1$  - irr. 2-dim  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -repr.

Note: (1)  $M(2)$ -commutative  $\Rightarrow M(2)^{\text{op}} \cong M(2)$   
 (2)  $U(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ -cocommutative  $\Rightarrow U(\mathfrak{sl}_2)^*$ -commutative  $\Rightarrow \varphi$  is well-defined.

Prop 3: Define the pairing  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle: M(2) \times U(\mathfrak{sl}_2) \rightarrow k$  via  $\langle h, u \rangle := \varphi(h)(u)$ .  
 This is a bialgebra pairing.

According to the proof of Lemma 1, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> conditions of (1) hold.

The 3<sup>rd</sup> condition of (1) follows from the fact  $\rho(1) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \Rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \langle a, 1 \rangle & \langle b, 1 \rangle \\ \langle c, 1 \rangle & \langle d, 1 \rangle \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \varepsilon \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$  and the fact that  $\varepsilon(\cdot), \langle \cdot, 1 \rangle$ -homom, where the latter follows from 2<sup>nd</sup> condition of (1):  $\langle a, a_2, 1 \rangle = \langle a, 1 \rangle \cdot \langle a_2, 1 \rangle$ .

To check the 1<sup>st</sup> condition of (1), note that  $\rho(uv) = \rho(u)\rho(v) \Rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \langle a, uv \rangle & \langle b, uv \rangle \\ \langle c, uv \rangle & \langle d, uv \rangle \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \langle a, u \rangle & \langle b, u \rangle \\ \langle c, u \rangle & \langle d, u \rangle \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \langle a, v \rangle & \langle b, v \rangle \\ \langle c, v \rangle & \langle d, v \rangle \end{pmatrix} \Rightarrow$   
 $\Delta \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$

$\Rightarrow$  1<sup>st</sup> condition of (1) holds for  $a$  being one of the 4 generators  $\{a, b, c, d\}$ .  
 The result now follows from the following claim:

CLAIM: If  $\langle x, b_1 b_2 \rangle = \sum_{(x')} \langle x', b_1 \rangle \langle x'', b_2 \rangle$ ,  $\langle y, b_1 b_2 \rangle = \sum_{(y')} \langle y', b_1 \rangle \langle y'', b_2 \rangle \forall b_1, b_2$ ,  
 then  $\langle xy, b_1 b_2 \rangle = \sum_{(xy')} \langle (xy)', b_1 \rangle \langle (xy)'', b_2 \rangle$ .

Indeed,  
 $\langle xy, b_1 b_2 \rangle = \sum_{(b_1 b_2)} \langle x, (b_1 b_2)'' \rangle \cdot \langle y, (b_1 b_2)' \rangle = \sum_{(b_1)(b_2)} \langle x, b_1'' \cdot b_2'' \rangle \cdot \langle y, b_1' \cdot b_2' \rangle$   
 $= \sum_{(b_1)(b_2)(x')(y')} \langle x', b_1'' \rangle \cdot \langle x'', b_2'' \rangle \cdot \langle y', b_1' \rangle \cdot \langle y'', b_2' \rangle$   
 $= \sum_{(x)(y)} \langle x'y', b_1 \rangle \cdot \langle x''y'', b_2 \rangle = \sum_{(xy')} \langle (xy)', b_1 \rangle \cdot \langle (xy)'', b_2 \rangle \quad \checkmark$

This completes the proof of Proposition

Lemma 2:  $\varphi(ad-bc) = 1$ .

Need to verify  $\langle ad-bc, u \rangle = \varepsilon(u) \forall u \in U(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ . Since  $ad-bc$  is a group-like el- it suffices to check the latter equality for  $u = 1, e, f, h$ . This is a straight-forward computation. E.g:  $\langle ad-bc, h \rangle = \langle aod - boc, h \circ 1 + 1 \circ h \rangle = 1 \cdot \varepsilon(d) + \varepsilon(a) \cdot (-1) - 0 \cdot \varepsilon(c) - \varepsilon(b) \cdot 0 = 1 - 1 = 0$

Due to Lemma 2, we see that  $\varphi$  factors through

$$\boxed{\varphi: SL(2) = M(2)/(ad-bc=1) \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{sl}_2)^*}$$

Prop 4: Define the pairing  $\langle, \rangle: SL(2) \times U(\mathfrak{sl}_2) \rightarrow k$  via  $\langle h, u \rangle := \varphi(h)(u)$ .

This is a Hopf pairing.

► The fact that  $\langle, \rangle$  is a bialgebra pairing follows immediately from Prop 3. Indeed, due to Lemma 1, we need to verify that  $\varphi: U(\mathfrak{sl}_2) \rightarrow SL(2)^*$  is an algebra homomorphism. But we know that composing it further with injective morphism  $SL(2)^* \hookrightarrow M(2)^*$  is an alg. homom. (Prop 3), hence, the result.

It remains to verify the compatibility with antipodes, condition (2).

$$\langle \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}, S^{-1}(h) \rangle = \langle \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}, -h \rangle = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\langle S \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}, h \rangle = \langle \begin{pmatrix} d & -b \\ -c & a \end{pmatrix}, h \rangle = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

One similarly checks  $\langle \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}, S^{-1}(e) \rangle = \langle S \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}, e \rangle$ ,  $\langle \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}, S^{-1}(f) \rangle = \langle S \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}, f \rangle$ .

Knowing it on generators, we can prove in general, due to:

$$\begin{aligned} \bullet \langle S(xy), u \rangle &= \langle S(y)S(x), u \rangle = \sum_{(u)} \langle S(y), u'' \rangle \cdot \langle S(x), u' \rangle = \sum_{(u)} \langle y, S^{-1}(u'') \rangle \cdot \langle x, S^{-1}(u') \rangle \\ &= \langle xy, S^{-1}(u) \rangle \text{ due to the fact } \Delta \circ S = (S \otimes S) \Delta^{\text{op}}. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \bullet \langle S(x), uv \rangle &= \sum_{(x)} \langle S(x''), u \rangle \cdot \langle S(x'), v \rangle = \sum_{(x)} \langle x'', S^{-1}(u) \rangle \cdot \langle x', S^{-1}(v) \rangle \\ &= \langle x, S^{-1}(v) \cdot S^{-1}(u) \rangle = \langle u, S^{-1}(uv) \rangle \text{ due to } S\mu = \mu^{\text{op}}(S \otimes S). \end{aligned}$$

We have established a Hopf pairing btw  $SL(2)$  and  $U(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ .

In particular, this yields algebra morphisms  $SL(2)^{\text{op}} \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$  and  $U(\mathfrak{sl}_2) \rightarrow SL(2)^*$ .

In particular, using the latter algebra morphism, any  $SL(2)^*$ -module becomes an  $U(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ -module. Recall the comodule  $k[x, y]_n$  of  $SL(2) \Rightarrow$   
 $\Rightarrow$  its dual  $k[x, y]_n^*$  is an  $SL(2)^*$ -module  $\Rightarrow U(\mathfrak{sl}_2) \curvearrowright k[x, y]_n^*$ .

Exercise 3: Verify that  $k[x, y]_n^* \cong V_n$  as  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -modules

Hint: An invariant way to think about the introduced pairing btw  $SL(2)$  and  $U(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$  is by realizing any elt  $u \in U(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$  as a left/right-invariant differential operator  $D_u$  on  $\text{Spec}(SL(2))$  and evaluating  $(D_u(h))$  at  $1 \forall h \in SL(2)$ -function on  $\text{Spec}(SL(2))$

It turns out that all the results from pp. 4-6 generalize to the  $q$ -case in a straightforward way (though the proofs are more technical).

Exercise 4: (a) Prove that there is an algebra automorphism  $\varphi: M_q(2)^{op} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)^*$  s.t.  $\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$ , where  $\forall u \in \mathcal{U}_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$  we define  $\begin{pmatrix} A(u) & B(u) \\ C(u) & D(u) \end{pmatrix} = \varphi(u)$  with  $\varphi: \mathcal{U}_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2) \rightarrow \text{End}(L(1, +))$ .

(b) Verify that the induced pairing  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle: M_q(2) \times \mathcal{U}_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2) \rightarrow k$  is a bialgebra pairing

(c) Verify  $\varphi(\det_q) = 1$

(d) Verify that the induced pairing  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle: SL_q(2) \times \mathcal{U}_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2) \rightarrow k$  is a Hopf pairing.

(e) Let us consider an  $SL_q(2)$ -comodule  $k_q[x, y]_n^*$ , degrading which, we get  $SL_q(2)^* \curvearrowright k_q[x, y]_n^*$ . On the other hand, pairing of (d) gives rise to an alg. homom  $\psi: \mathcal{U}_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2) \rightarrow SL_q(2)^*$ . Prove that the induced action of  $\mathcal{U}_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$  on  $k_q[x, y]_n^*$  is isomorphic to  $L(n, +)$ .