Monotone weak distributive laws over weakly lifted powerset monads in categories of algebras

Quentin Aristote, IRIF, Université Paris-Cité, INRIA PiCube

November 15th, 2024

Composing effects

- Effects can be modelled using monads, e.g.:

Composing effects

- Effects can be modelled using monads, e.g.:
  - non-determinism: $X \to \mathrm{P}Y = \{\text{subsets of } Y\}$

Composing effects

- Effects can be modelled using monads, e.g.:
  - non-determinism: $X \to \mathrm{P}Y = \{\text{subsets of } Y\}$
  - probabilities: $X \to \mathrm{D}Y = \{\text{finite-support prob. distr. on } Y\}$

Composing effects

- Effects can be modelled using monads, e.g.:
  - non-determinism: $X \to \mathrm{P}Y = \{\text{subsets of } Y\}$
  - probabilities: $X \to \mathrm{D}Y = \{\text{finite-support prob. distr. on } Y\}$
- What about combining effects?

Composing effects

- Effects can be modelled using monads, e.g.:
  - non-determinism: $X \to \mathrm{P}Y = \{\text{subsets of } Y\}$
  - probabilities: $X \to \mathrm{D}Y = \{\text{finite-support prob. distr. on } Y\}$
- What about combining effects? In general, given monads $\left(\mathrm{T}, \eta^{\mathrm{T}}, \mu^{\mathrm{T}}\right)$ and $\left(\mathrm{S}, \eta^{\mathrm{S}}, \mu^{\mathrm{S}}\right)$, there may not be any monad structure on ST.

Composing effects

- Effects can be modelled using monads, e.g.:
  - non-determinism: $X \to \mathrm{P}Y = \{\text{subsets of } Y\}$
  - probabilities: $X \to \mathrm{D}Y = \{\text{finite-support prob. distr. on } Y\}$
- What about combining effects? In general, given monads $\left(\mathrm{T}, \eta^{\mathrm{T}}, \mu^{\mathrm{T}}\right)$ and $\left(\mathrm{S}, \eta^{\mathrm{S}}, \mu^{\mathrm{S}}\right)$, there may not be any monad structure on ST.
- True with a *distributive law* (Beck 1969), i.e. a $\lambda \colon \mathrm{TS} \Rightarrow \mathrm{ST}$ s.t.:

$$\begin{tikzcd} & \mathrm{T} \arrow[dl, "\mathrm{T}\eta^{\mathrm{S}}"'] \arrow[dr, "\eta^{\mathrm{S}}\mathrm{T}"] \arrow[d, phantom, "(\eta^{\mathrm{S}})"] & \\ \mathrm{TS} \arrow[rr, "\lambda"'] & {} & \mathrm{ST} \end{tikzcd}
\qquad
\begin{tikzcd} \mathrm{TTS} \arrow[r, "\mathrm{T}\lambda"] \arrow[d, "\mu^{\mathrm{T}}\mathrm{S}"'] & \mathrm{TST} \arrow[r, "\lambda\mathrm{T}"] \arrow[d, phantom, "(\mu^{\mathrm{T}})"] & \mathrm{STT} \arrow[d, "\mathrm{S}\mu^{\mathrm{T}}"] \\ \mathrm{TS} \arrow[rr, "\lambda"'] & {} & \mathrm{ST} \end{tikzcd}$$

$$\begin{tikzcd} & \mathrm{S} \arrow[dl, "\eta^{\mathrm{T}}\mathrm{S}"'] \arrow[dr, "\mathrm{S}\eta^{\mathrm{T}}"] \arrow[d, phantom, "(\eta^{\mathrm{T}})"] & \\ \mathrm{TS} \arrow[rr, "\lambda"'] & {} & \mathrm{ST} \end{tikzcd}
\qquad
\begin{tikzcd} \mathrm{TSS} \arrow[r, "\lambda\mathrm{S}"] \arrow[d, "\mathrm{T}\mu^{\mathrm{S}}"'] & \mathrm{STS} \arrow[r, "\mathrm{S}\lambda"] \arrow[d, phantom, "(\mu^{\mathrm{S}})"] & \mathrm{SST} \arrow[d, "\mu^{\mathrm{S}}\mathrm{T}"] \\ \mathrm{TS} \arrow[rr, "\lambda"'] & {} & \mathrm{ST} \end{tikzcd}$$

Weak distributive laws (Böhm 2010; Garner 2020)

Weak distributive laws (Böhm 2010; Garner 2020)

- There is no distributive law $\mathrm{DP} \Rightarrow \mathrm{PD}$ (Varacca and Winskel 2006)!

Weak distributive laws (Böhm 2010; Garner 2020)

- There is no distributive law $\mathrm{DP} \Rightarrow \mathrm{PD}$ (Varacca and Winskel 2006)!
- **Definition (weak distributive law).** A WDL of $\left(\mathrm{T}, \eta^{\mathrm{T}}, \mu^{\mathrm{T}}\right)$ over $\left(\mathrm{S}, \eta^{\mathrm{S}}, \mu^{\mathrm{S}}\right)$ is a $\lambda\colon \mathrm{TS} \Rightarrow \mathrm{ST}$ s.t.

Weak distributive laws (Böhm 2010; Garner 2020)

- There is no distributive law $\mathrm{DP} \Rightarrow \mathrm{PD}$ (Varacca and Winskel 2006)!
- **Definition (weak distributive law).** A WDL of $\left(\mathrm{T}, \eta^{\mathrm{T}}, \mu^{\mathrm{T}}\right)$ over $\left(\mathrm{S}, \eta^{\mathrm{S}}, \mu^{\mathrm{S}}\right)$ is a $\lambda\colon \mathrm{TS} \Rightarrow \mathrm{ST}$ s.t.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & \mathrm{T} \arrow[dl, "\mathrm{T}\eta^{\mathrm{S}}"'] \arrow[dr, "\eta^{\mathrm{S}}\mathrm{T}"] \arrow[d, phantom, "(\eta^{\mathrm{S}})"] & \\
\mathrm{TS} \arrow[rr, "\lambda"'] & {} & \mathrm{ST}
\end{tikzcd}
\qquad
\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{TTS} \arrow[r, "\mathrm{T}\lambda"] \arrow[d, "\mu^{\mathrm{T}}\mathrm{S}"'] & \mathrm{TST} \arrow[r, "\lambda\mathrm{T}"] \arrow[d, phantom, "(\mu^{\mathrm{T}})"] & \mathrm{STT} \arrow[d, "\mathrm{S}\mu^{\mathrm{T}}"] \\
\mathrm{TS} \arrow[rr, "\lambda"'] & {} & \mathrm{ST}
\end{tikzcd}$$

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{TSS} \arrow[r, "\lambda\mathrm{S}"] \arrow[d, "\mathrm{T}\mu^{\mathrm{S}}"'] & \mathrm{STS} \arrow[r, "\mathrm{S}\lambda"] \arrow[d, phantom, "(\mu^{\mathrm{S}})"] & \mathrm{SST} \arrow[d, "\mu^{\mathrm{S}}\mathrm{T}"] \\
\mathrm{TS} \arrow[rr, "\lambda"'] & {} & \mathrm{ST}
\end{tikzcd}$$

Weak distributive laws (Böhm 2010; Garner 2020)

- There is no distributive law $\mathrm{DP} \Rightarrow \mathrm{PD}$ (Varacca and Winskel 2006)!
- **Definition (weak distributive law).** A WDL of $\left(\mathrm{T}, \eta^{\mathrm{T}}, \mu^{\mathrm{T}}\right)$ over $\left(\mathrm{S}, \eta^{\mathrm{S}}, \mu^{\mathrm{S}}\right)$ is a $\lambda\colon \mathrm{TS} \Rightarrow \mathrm{ST}$ s.t.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & \mathrm{T} \arrow[dl, "\mathrm{T}\eta^{\mathrm{S}}"'] \arrow[dr, "\eta^{\mathrm{S}}\mathrm{T}"] \arrow[d, phantom, "(\eta^{\mathrm{S}})"] & \\
\mathrm{TS} \arrow[rr, "\lambda"'] & {} & \mathrm{ST}
\end{tikzcd}
\qquad
\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{TTS} \arrow[r, "\mathrm{T}\lambda"] \arrow[d, "\mu^{\mathrm{T}}\mathrm{S}"'] & \mathrm{TST} \arrow[r, "\lambda\mathrm{T}"] \arrow[d, phantom, "(\mu^{\mathrm{T}})"] & \mathrm{STT} \arrow[d, "\mathrm{S}\mu^{\mathrm{T}}"] \\
\mathrm{TS} \arrow[rr, "\lambda"'] & {} & \mathrm{ST}
\end{tikzcd}$$

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{TSS} \arrow[r, "\lambda\mathrm{S}"] \arrow[d, "\mathrm{T}\mu^{\mathrm{S}}"'] & \mathrm{STS} \arrow[r, "\mathrm{S}\lambda"] \arrow[d, phantom, "(\mu^{\mathrm{S}})"] & \mathrm{SST} \arrow[d, "\mu^{\mathrm{S}}\mathrm{T}"] \\
\mathrm{TS} \arrow[rr, "\lambda"'] & {} & \mathrm{ST}
\end{tikzcd}$$

- A WDL yields a *weak composite* monad $\mathrm{S} \bullet \mathrm{T}$

Examples of weak distributive laws

- (Goy and Petrișan 2020) In Set, there is a WDL $\mathrm{DP} \Rightarrow \mathrm{PD}$ s.t. $(\mathrm{P} \bullet \mathrm{D})X = \{\text{convex subsets of prob. distr. on } X\}$

i

ii

Examples of weak distributive laws

- (Goy and Petrișan 2020) In Set, there is a WDL $\mathrm{DP} \Rightarrow \mathrm{PD}$ s.t. $(\mathrm{P} \bullet \mathrm{D})X = \{\text{convex subsets of prob. distr. on X}\}$
- (Garner 2020) In Set, a WDL $\mathrm{PP} \Rightarrow \mathrm{PP}$:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mathrm{PP}X & \to & \mathrm{PP}X \\ A & \mapsto & \{E \mid E \subseteq \bigcup A \text{ and } \forall E' \in A, E \cap E' \neq \varnothing\} \end{array}$$

i

ii

Examples of weak distributive laws

- (Goy and Petrișan 2020) In Set, there is a WDL $\mathrm{DP} \Rightarrow \mathrm{PD}$ s.t. $(\mathrm{P} \bullet \mathrm{D})X = \{\text{convex subsets of prob. distr. on } \mathsf{X}\}$

- (Garner 2020) In Set, a WDL $\mathrm{PP} \Rightarrow \mathrm{PP}$:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mathrm{PP}X & \to & \mathrm{PP}X \\ A & \mapsto & \{E \mid E \subseteq \bigcup A \text{ and } \forall E' \in A, E \cap E' \neq \varnothing\} \end{array}$$

- (Goy, Petrișan, and Aiguier 2021) In KHaus[i], a WDL $\mathrm{VV} \Rightarrow \mathrm{VV}$[ii]:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mathrm{VV}X & \to & \mathrm{VV}X \\ A & \mapsto & \{E \mid E \subseteq \bigcup A \text{ and } \forall E' \in A, E \cap E' \neq \varnothing\} \end{array}$$

[i] the category of compact Hausdorff spaces and continuous functions
[ii] V is the Vietoris monad of closed subsets

Examples of weak distributive laws

- (Goy and Petrișan 2020) In Set, there is a WDL $\mathrm{DP} \Rightarrow \mathrm{PD}$ s.t. $(\mathrm{P} \bullet \mathrm{D})X = \{\text{convex subsets of prob. distr. on X}\}$

- (Garner 2020) In Set, a WDL $\mathrm{PP} \Rightarrow \mathrm{PP}$:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mathrm{PP}X & \to & \mathrm{PP}X \\ A & \mapsto & \{E \mid E \subseteq \bigcup A \text{ and } \forall E' \in A, E \cap E' \neq \varnothing\} \end{array}$$

- (Goy, Petrișan, and Aiguier 2021) In KHaus[i], a WDL $\mathrm{VV} \Rightarrow \mathrm{VV}$[ii]:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mathrm{VV}X & \to & \mathrm{VV}X \\ A & \mapsto & \{E \mid E \subseteq \bigcup A \text{ and } \forall E' \in A, E \cap E' \neq \varnothing\} \end{array}$$

The formula is the same... is this just a coincidence?

---

[i] the category of compact Hausdorff spaces and continuous functions
[ii] V is the Vietoris monad of closed subsets

Equivalent presentations of WDLs

TFAE	WDLs of T over S
i.e.	$\rho\colon \mathrm{TS} \Rightarrow \mathrm{ST}$
examples	

iii

Equivalent presentations of WDLs

TFAE	WDLs of T over S	weak extensions of T to $\mathrm{Kl(S)}$
i.e.	$\rho \colon \mathrm{TS} \Rightarrow \mathrm{ST}$	$(\underline{\mathrm{T}}, \mu^{\underline{\mathrm{T}}})$ in $\mathrm{Kl(S)}$
examples		

iii

Equivalent presentations of WDLs

TFAE	WDLs of T over S	weak extensions of T to $\mathrm{Kl}(\mathrm{S})$
i.e.	$\rho\colon \mathrm{TS} \Rightarrow \mathrm{ST}$	$(\underline{\mathrm{T}}, \mu^{\underline{\mathrm{T}}})$ in $\mathrm{Kl}(\mathrm{S})$
examples	$\mathrm{PP} \Rightarrow \mathrm{PP}$	in $\mathrm{Kl}(\mathrm{P}) \cong \mathrm{Rel}$, $\underline{\mathrm{P}}\left(X \xleftarrow{f} R \xrightarrow{g} Y\right) = \mathrm{P}X \xleftarrow{\mathrm{P}f} \mathrm{P}R \xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}g} \mathrm{P}Y$

iii

Equivalent presentations of WDLs

TFAE	WDLs of T over S	weak extensions of T to $\mathrm{Kl(S)}$
i.e.	$\rho\colon \mathrm{TS} \Rightarrow \mathrm{ST}$	$(\underline{\mathrm{T}}, \mu^{\underline{\mathrm{T}}})$ in $\mathrm{Kl(S)}$
examples	$\mathrm{PP} \Rightarrow \mathrm{PP}$	in $\mathrm{Kl(P)} \cong \mathrm{Rel}$, $\underline{\mathrm{P}}\left(X \xleftarrow{f} R \xrightarrow{g} Y\right) = \mathrm{P}X \xleftarrow{\mathrm{P}f} \mathrm{P}R \xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}g} \mathrm{P}Y$
	$\mathrm{VV} \Rightarrow \mathrm{VV}$	in $\mathrm{Kl(V)} \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Rel(KHaus)}$, $\underline{\mathrm{V}}\left(X \xleftarrow{f} R \xrightarrow{g} Y\right) = \mathrm{V}X \xleftarrow{\mathrm{V}f} \mathrm{V}R \xrightarrow{\mathrm{V}g} \mathrm{V}Y$

iii

Equivalent presentations of WDLs

TFAE	WDLs of T over S	weak extensions of T to $\mathrm{Kl}(\mathrm{S})$	weak liftings of S to $\mathrm{EM}(\mathrm{T})$
i.e.	$\rho\colon \mathrm{TS} \Rightarrow \mathrm{ST}$	$(\underline{\mathrm{T}}, \mu^{\underline{\mathrm{T}}})$ in $\mathrm{Kl}(\mathrm{S})$	$\left(\overline{\mathrm{S}}, \eta^{\overline{\mathrm{S}}}, \mu^{\overline{\mathrm{S}}}\right)$ in $\mathrm{EM}(\mathrm{T})$
examples	$\mathrm{PP} \Rightarrow \mathrm{PP}$	in $\mathrm{Kl}(\mathrm{P}) \cong \mathrm{Rel}$, $\underline{\mathrm{P}}\left(X \xleftarrow{f} R \xrightarrow{g} Y\right) =$ $\mathrm{P}X \xleftarrow{\mathrm{P}f} \mathrm{P}R \xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}g} \mathrm{P}Y$	
	$\mathrm{VV} \Rightarrow \mathrm{VV}$	in $\mathrm{Kl}(\mathrm{V}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{KHaus})$, $\underline{\mathrm{V}}\left(X \xleftarrow{f} R \xrightarrow{g} Y\right) =$ $\mathrm{V}X \xleftarrow{\mathrm{V}f} \mathrm{V}R \xrightarrow{\mathrm{V}g} \mathrm{V}Y$	

iii

Equivalent presentations of WDLs

TFAE	WDLs of T over S	weak extensions of T to $\mathrm{Kl}(\mathrm{S})$	weak liftings of S to $\mathrm{EM}(\mathrm{T})$
i.e.	$\rho\colon \mathrm{TS} \Rightarrow \mathrm{ST}$	$(\underline{\mathrm{T}}, \mu^{\underline{\mathrm{T}}})$ in $\mathrm{Kl}(\mathrm{S})$	$\left(\overline{\mathrm{S}}, \eta^{\overline{\mathrm{S}}}, \mu^{\overline{\mathrm{S}}}\right)$ in $\mathrm{EM}(\mathrm{T})$
examples	$\mathrm{PP} \Rightarrow \mathrm{PP}$	in $\mathrm{Kl}(\mathrm{P}) \cong \mathrm{Rel}$, $\underline{\mathrm{P}}\left(X \xleftarrow{f} R \xrightarrow{g} Y\right) = \mathrm{P}X \xleftarrow{\mathrm{P}f} \mathrm{P}R \xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}g} \mathrm{P}Y$	
	$\mathrm{VV} \Rightarrow \mathrm{VV}$	in $\mathrm{Kl}(\mathrm{V}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{KHaus})$, $\underline{\mathrm{V}}\left(X \xleftarrow{f} R \xrightarrow{g} Y\right) = \mathrm{V}X \xleftarrow{\mathrm{V}f} \mathrm{V}R \xrightarrow{\mathrm{V}g} \mathrm{V}Y$	
	$\beta\mathrm{P} \Rightarrow \mathrm{P}\beta$[iii]		$\left(\mathrm{V}, \eta^{\mathrm{V}}, \mu^{\mathrm{V}}\right)$ in $\mathrm{EM}(\beta) \cong \mathrm{KHaus}$

[iii] β is the ultrafilter monad

- If V is a weak lifting of P, is the WDL $\mathrm{VV} \Rightarrow \mathrm{VV}$ some sort of weak lifting of the WDL $\mathrm{PP} \Rightarrow \mathrm{PP}$?

- If V is a weak lifting of P, is the WDL $\mathrm{VV} \Rightarrow \mathrm{VV}$ some sort of weak lifting of the WDL $\mathrm{PP} \Rightarrow \mathrm{PP}$?
- Can we also weakly lift the WDL $\mathrm{PP} \Rightarrow \mathrm{PP}$ to $\mathrm{EM}(\mathrm{P})$ and $\mathrm{EM}(\mathrm{D})$?

- If V is a weak lifting of P, is the WDL $\mathrm{VV} \Rightarrow \mathrm{VV}$ some sort of weak lifting of the WDL $\mathrm{PP} \Rightarrow \mathrm{PP}$?
- Can we also weakly lift the WDL $\mathrm{PP} \Rightarrow \mathrm{PP}$ to $\mathrm{EM}(\mathrm{P})$ and $\mathrm{EM}(\mathrm{D})$?
- Two approaches:

- If V is a weak lifting of P, is the WDL $\mathrm{VV} \Rightarrow \mathrm{VV}$ some sort of weak lifting of the WDL $\mathrm{PP} \Rightarrow \mathrm{PP}$?
- Can we also weakly lift the WDL $\mathrm{PP} \Rightarrow \mathrm{PP}$ to $\mathrm{EM(P)}$ and $\mathrm{EM(D)}$?
- Two approaches:
  - ~~weakly lifting is 2-categorical~~

- If V is a weak lifting of P, is the WDL $\mathrm{VV} \Rightarrow \mathrm{VV}$ some sort of weak lifting of the WDL $\mathrm{PP} \Rightarrow \mathrm{PP}$?
- Can we also weakly lift the WDL $\mathrm{PP} \Rightarrow \mathrm{PP}$ to $\mathrm{EM}(\mathrm{P})$ and $\mathrm{EM}(\mathrm{D})$?
- Two approaches:
  - ~~weakly lifting is 2-categorical~~
  - weakly lifting the construction of $(\underline{\mathrm{P}}, \mu^{\underline{\mathrm{P}}})$ on spans

Background: monotone WDLs in regular categories

- For every reg. cat. C, one can define $\mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{C})$:

- For every reg. cat. C, one can define $\mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{C})$:
  - $\mathrm{Ob}(\mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{C})) = \mathrm{Ob}(\mathrm{C})$

- For every reg. cat. C, one can define $\mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{C})$:
  - $\mathrm{Ob}(\mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{C})) = \mathrm{Ob}(\mathrm{C})$
  - $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{C})}(X, Y) = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{spans } X \leftarrow R \rightarrow Y \text{ in } \mathrm{C} \\ \mid R \hookrightarrow X \times Y \text{ is a mono} \end{array} \right\}$

- For every reg. cat. C, one can define $\mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{C})$:
    - $\mathrm{Ob}(\mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{C})) = \mathrm{Ob}(\mathrm{C})$
    - $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{C})}(X, Y) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{spans } X \leftarrow R \rightarrow Y \text{ in C} \\ \mid R \hookrightarrow X \times Y \text{ is a mono} \end{array} \right\}$
    - preorder:

- For every reg. cat. C, one can define $\mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{C})$:
  - $\mathrm{Ob}(\mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{C})) = \mathrm{Ob}(\mathrm{C})$
  - $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{C})}(X, Y) = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{spans } X \leftarrow R \rightarrow Y \text{ in } \mathrm{C} \\ \mid R \hookrightarrow X \times Y \text{ is a mono} \end{array} \right\}$
  - preorder: $(X \leftarrow R \rightarrow Y) \leq (X \leftarrow S \rightarrow Y)$

- For every reg. cat. C, one can define $\mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{C})$:
  - $\mathrm{Ob}(\mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{C})) = \mathrm{Ob}(\mathrm{C})$
  - $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{C})}(X, Y) = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{spans } X \leftarrow R \rightarrow Y \text{ in C} \\ \mid R \hookrightarrow X \times Y \text{ is a mono} \end{array} \right\}$
  - preorder: $(X \leftarrow R \rightarrow Y) \leq (X \leftarrow S \rightarrow Y)$
    $\iff \exists m \text{ mono},$

$$\begin{tikzcd} & R \arrow[dl] \arrow[d, hook, "m"] \arrow[dr] & \\ X & S \arrow[l] \arrow[r] & Y \end{tikzcd}$$

- For every reg. cat. C, one can define $\mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{C})$:
  - $\mathrm{Ob}(\mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{C})) = \mathrm{Ob}(\mathrm{C})$
  - $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{C})}(X, Y) = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{spans } X \leftarrow R \rightarrow Y \text{ in C} \\ \mid R \hookrightarrow X \times Y \text{ is a mono} \end{array} \right\}$
  - preorder: $(X \leftarrow R \rightarrow Y) \leq (X \leftarrow S \rightarrow Y)$
    $\iff \exists m \text{ mono},$

$$\begin{tikzcd} & R \arrow[dl] \arrow[d, hook, "m"] \arrow[dr] & \\ X & S \arrow[l] \arrow[r] & Y \end{tikzcd}$$

- **Examples.** Set is regular, $\mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{Set}) = \mathrm{Rel}$. KHaus is regular, $\mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{KHaus}) =$ compact Hausdorff spaces and closed relations.

Background: *monotone WDLs* in regular categories

- **Theorem (Carboni *et al.* 1991).** If C and D are regular,

Background: *monotone WDLs* in regular categories

- **Theorem (Carboni *et al.* 1991).** If C and D are regular,
  - $\mathrm{F} \colon \mathrm{C} \to \mathrm{D}$ has a **monotone** extension $\underline{\mathrm{F}} \colon \mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{C}) \to \mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{D})$ iff it is a *nearly cartesian* functor, in which case

$$\underline{\mathrm{F}}(X \xleftarrow{f} R \xrightarrow{g} Y) = \mathrm{F}X \xleftarrow{\mathrm{F}f} \mathrm{F}R \xrightarrow{\mathrm{F}g} \mathrm{F}Y$$

Background: *monotone WDLs* in regular categories

- **Theorem (Carboni *et al.* 1991).** If C and D are regular,
  - $\mathrm{F}\colon \mathrm{C} \to \mathrm{D}$ has a **monotone** extension $\underline{\mathrm{F}}\colon \mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{C}) \to \mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{D})$ iff it is a *nearly cartesian* functor, in which case

$$\underline{\mathrm{F}}(X \xleftarrow{f} R \xrightarrow{g} Y) = \mathrm{F}X \xleftarrow{\mathrm{F}f} \mathrm{F}R \xrightarrow{\mathrm{F}g} \mathrm{F}Y$$

  - $\alpha\colon F \Rightarrow G$ has a (necessarily unique) extension $\underline{\alpha}\colon \underline{\mathrm{F}} \Rightarrow \underline{\mathrm{G}}$ iff it is a *nearly cartesian* natural transformation

Background: *monotone WDLs* in regular categories

- **Theorem (Carboni *et al.* 1991).** If C and D are regular,
  - $\mathrm{F}\colon \mathrm{C} \to \mathrm{D}$ has a **monotone** extension $\underline{\mathrm{F}}\colon \mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{C}) \to \mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{D})$ iff it is a *nearly cartesian* functor, in which case

$$\underline{\mathrm{F}}(X \xleftarrow{f} R \xrightarrow{g} Y) = \mathrm{F}X \xleftarrow{\mathrm{F}f} \mathrm{F}R \xrightarrow{\mathrm{F}g} \mathrm{F}Y$$

  - $\alpha\colon F \Rightarrow G$ has a (necessarily unique) extension $\underline{\alpha}\colon \underline{\mathrm{F}} \Rightarrow \underline{\mathrm{G}}$ iff it is a *nearly cartesian* natural transformation
- Suppose T and μ^{T} nearly cartesian, and that $\underline{\mathrm{T}}\colon \mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{C}) \to \mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{C})$ restricts along $\mathrm{Kl}(\mathrm{S}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{C})$

Background: *monotone WDLs* in regular categories

- **Theorem (Carboni *et al.* 1991).** If C and D are regular,
  - $\mathrm{F}\colon \mathrm{C} \to \mathrm{D}$ has a **monotone** extension $\underline{\mathrm{F}}\colon \mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{C}) \to \mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{D})$ iff it is a *nearly cartesian* functor, in which case

$$\underline{\mathrm{F}}(X \xleftarrow{f} R \xrightarrow{g} Y) = \mathrm{F}X \xleftarrow{\mathrm{F}f} \mathrm{F}R \xrightarrow{\mathrm{F}g} \mathrm{F}Y$$

  - $\alpha\colon F \Rightarrow G$ has a (necessarily unique) extension $\underline{\alpha}\colon \underline{\mathrm{F}} \Rightarrow \underline{\mathrm{G}}$ iff it is a *nearly cartesian* natural transformation
- Suppose T and μ^{T} nearly cartesian, and that $\underline{\mathrm{T}}\colon \mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{C}) \to \mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{C})$ restricts along $\mathrm{Kl}(\mathrm{S}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{C})$
  - then $(\underline{\mathrm{T}}, \mu^{\underline{\mathrm{T}}})$ is a monotone weak extension of T to $\mathrm{Kl}(\mathrm{S})$

Background: *monotone WDLs* in regular categories

- **Theorem (Carboni *et al.* 1991).** If C and D are regular,
  - $\mathrm{F}\colon \mathrm{C} \to \mathrm{D}$ has a **monotone** extension $\underline{\mathrm{F}}\colon \mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{C}) \to \mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{D})$ iff it is a *nearly cartesian* functor, in which case

$$\underline{\mathrm{F}}(X \xleftarrow{f} R \xrightarrow{g} Y) = \mathrm{F}X \xleftarrow{\mathrm{F}f} \mathrm{F}R \xrightarrow{\mathrm{F}g} \mathrm{F}Y$$

  - $\alpha\colon F \Rightarrow G$ has a (necessarily unique) extension $\underline{\alpha}\colon \underline{\mathrm{F}} \Rightarrow \underline{\mathrm{G}}$ iff it is a *nearly cartesian* natural transformation
- Suppose T and μ^{T} nearly cartesian, and that $\underline{\mathrm{T}}\colon \mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{C}) \to \mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{C})$ restricts along $\mathrm{Kl}(\mathrm{S}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{C})$
  - then $(\underline{\mathrm{T}}, \mu^{\underline{\mathrm{T}}})$ is a monotone weak extension of T to $\mathrm{Kl}(\mathrm{S})$
  - we get a *monotone* WDL $\mathrm{TS} \Rightarrow \mathrm{ST}$

Background: *monotone WDLs* in regular categories

- **Theorem (Carboni *et al.* 1991).** If C and D are regular,
  - $\mathrm{F}\colon \mathrm{C} \to \mathrm{D}$ has a **monotone** extension $\underline{\mathrm{F}}\colon \mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{C}) \to \mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{D})$ iff it is a *nearly cartesian* functor, in which case

$$\underline{\mathrm{F}}(X \xleftarrow{f} R \xrightarrow{g} Y) = \mathrm{F}X \xleftarrow{\mathrm{F}f} \mathrm{F}R \xrightarrow{\mathrm{F}g} \mathrm{F}Y$$

  - $\alpha\colon F \Rightarrow G$ has a (necessarily unique) extension $\underline{\alpha}\colon \underline{\mathrm{F}} \Rightarrow \underline{\mathrm{G}}$ iff it is a *nearly cartesian* natural transformation
- Suppose T and μ^{T} nearly cartesian, and that $\underline{\mathrm{T}}\colon \mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{C}) \to \mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{C})$ restricts along $\mathrm{Kl}(\mathrm{S}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{C})$
  - then $(\underline{\mathrm{T}}, \mu^{\underline{\mathrm{T}}})$ is a monotone weak extension of T to $\mathrm{Kl}(\mathrm{S})$
  - we get a *monotone* WDL $\mathrm{TS} \Rightarrow \mathrm{ST}$
- **Examples.** P and μ^{P} are nearly cartesian and $\mathrm{Kl}(\mathrm{P}) \cong \mathrm{Rel}$ (Garner 2020). V and μ^{V} are nearly cartesian and $\mathrm{Kl}(\mathrm{V}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{KHaus})$ (Goy, Petrișan, and Aiguier 2021).

Weakly lifting the setting for monotone WDLs, part 1

- From now on T is a monad on Set s.t. T and μ^{T} are nearly cartesian:

Weakly lifting the setting for monotone WDLs, part 1

- From now on T is a monad on Set s.t. T and μ^{T} are nearly cartesian:
  - $\left(\mathrm{T}, \eta^{\mathrm{T}}, \mu^{\mathrm{T}}\right)$ has a monotone weak extension to $\mathrm{Rel} \cong \mathrm{Kl}(\mathrm{P})$;

Weakly lifting the setting for monotone WDLs, part 1

- From now on T is a monad on Set s.t. T and μ^{T} are nearly cartesian:
  - $\left(\mathrm{T}, \eta^{\mathrm{T}}, \mu^{\mathrm{T}}\right)$ has a monotone weak extension to $\mathrm{Rel} \cong \mathrm{Kl}(\mathrm{P})$;
  - there is a monotone WDL $\mathrm{TP} \Rightarrow \mathrm{PT}$;

Weakly lifting the setting for monotone WDLs, part 1

- From now on T is a monad on Set s.t. T and μ^{T} are nearly cartesian:
  - $(\mathrm{T}, \eta^{\mathrm{T}}, \mu^{\mathrm{T}})$ has a monotone weak extension to $\mathrm{Rel} \cong \mathrm{Kl}(\mathrm{P})$;
  - there is a monotone WDL $\mathrm{TP} \Rightarrow \mathrm{PT}$;
  - $(\mathrm{P}, \eta^{\mathrm{P}}, \mu^{\mathrm{P}})$ has a weak lifting $\left(\overline{\mathrm{P}}, \eta^{\overline{\mathrm{P}}}, \mu^{\overline{\mathrm{P}}}\right)$ to $\mathrm{EM}(\mathrm{T})$;

Weakly lifting the setting for monotone WDLs, part 1

- From now on T is a monad on Set s.t. T and μ^{T} are nearly cartesian:
  - $(\mathrm{T}, \eta^{\mathrm{T}}, \mu^{\mathrm{T}})$ has a monotone weak extension to $\mathrm{Rel} \cong \mathrm{Kl}(\mathrm{P})$;
  - there is a monotone WDL $\mathrm{TP} \Rightarrow \mathrm{PT}$;
  - $(\mathrm{P}, \eta^{\mathrm{P}}, \mu^{\mathrm{P}})$ has a weak lifting $\left(\overline{\mathrm{P}}, \eta^{\overline{\mathrm{P}}}, \mu^{\overline{\mathrm{P}}}\right)$ to $\mathrm{EM}(\mathrm{T})$;

  Moreover:
  - $\mathrm{EM}(\mathrm{T})$ is regular;

Weakly lifting the setting for monotone WDLs, part 1

- From now on T is a monad on Set s.t. T and μ^{T} are nearly cartesian:
  - $\left(\mathrm{T}, \eta^{\mathrm{T}}, \mu^{\mathrm{T}}\right)$ has a monotone weak extension to $\mathrm{Rel} \cong \mathrm{Kl}(\mathrm{P})$;
  - there is a monotone WDL $\mathrm{TP} \Rightarrow \mathrm{PT}$;
  - $\left(\mathrm{P}, \eta^{\mathrm{P}}, \mu^{\mathrm{P}}\right)$ has a weak lifting $\left(\overline{\mathrm{P}}, \eta^{\overline{\mathrm{P}}}, \mu^{\overline{\mathrm{P}}}\right)$ to $\mathrm{EM}(\mathrm{T})$;

  Moreover:
  - $\mathrm{EM}(\mathrm{T})$ is regular;
- Is there a monotone WDL $\overline{\mathrm{P}}\overline{\mathrm{P}} \Rightarrow \overline{\mathrm{P}}\overline{\mathrm{P}}$?

Weakly lifting the setting for monotone WDLs, part 1

- From now on T is a monad on Set s.t. T and μ^{T} are nearly cartesian:
  - $(\mathrm{T}, \eta^{\mathrm{T}}, \mu^{\mathrm{T}})$ has a monotone weak extension to $\mathrm{Rel} \cong \mathrm{Kl}(\mathrm{P})$;
  - there is a monotone WDL $\mathrm{TP} \Rightarrow \mathrm{PT}$;
  - $(\mathrm{P}, \eta^{\mathrm{P}}, \mu^{\mathrm{P}})$ has a weak lifting $\left(\overline{\mathrm{P}}, \eta^{\overline{\mathrm{P}}}, \mu^{\overline{\mathrm{P}}}\right)$ to $\mathrm{EM}(\mathrm{T})$;

  Moreover:
  - $\mathrm{EM}(\mathrm{T})$ is regular;
- Is there a monotone WDL $\overline{\mathrm{P}}\overline{\mathrm{P}} \Rightarrow \overline{\mathrm{P}}\overline{\mathrm{P}}$?
- **Lemma.** Weakly lifting preserves *near cartesianness*.

Weakly lifting the setting for monotone WDLs, part 1

- From now on T is a monad on Set s.t. T and μ^{T} are nearly cartesian:
  - $(\mathrm{T}, \eta^{\mathrm{T}}, \mu^{\mathrm{T}})$ has a monotone weak extension to $\mathrm{Rel} \cong \mathrm{Kl}(\mathrm{P})$;
  - there is a monotone WDL $\mathrm{TP} \Rightarrow \mathrm{PT}$;
  - $(\mathrm{P}, \eta^{\mathrm{P}}, \mu^{\mathrm{P}})$ has a weak lifting $\left(\overline{\mathrm{P}}, \eta^{\overline{\mathrm{P}}}, \mu^{\overline{\mathrm{P}}}\right)$ to $\mathrm{EM}(\mathrm{T})$;

  Moreover:
  - $\mathrm{EM}(\mathrm{T})$ is regular;
- Is there a monotone WDL $\overline{\mathrm{P}}\overline{\mathrm{P}} \Rightarrow \overline{\mathrm{P}}\overline{\mathrm{P}}$?
- **Lemma.** Weakly lifting preserves *near cartesianness*.
- **Example.** V weak lifting of P to $\mathrm{EM}(\beta) \cong \mathrm{KHaus}$: P and μ^{P} are nearly cartesian hence V and μ^{V} are as well.

Weakly lifting the setting for monotone WDLs, part 2

- Is $\mathrm{Kl}\left(\overline{\mathrm{P}}\right)$ always a subcategory of $\mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{EM}(\mathrm{T}))$? If so, when does the relational extension of $\overline{\mathrm{S}}$ restrict to $\mathrm{Kl}\left(\overline{\mathrm{P}}\right)$?
- When does the relational extension of $\overline{\mathrm{S}}$ restrict to $\mathrm{Kl}\left(\overline{\mathrm{P}}\right)$?

Weakly lifting the setting for monotone WDLs, part 2

- Is $\mathrm{Kl}\left(\overline{\mathrm{P}}\right)$ always a subcategory of $\mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{EM}(\mathrm{T}))$? If so, when does the relational extension of $\overline{\mathrm{S}}$ restrict to $\mathrm{Kl}\left(\overline{\mathrm{P}}\right)$?
- When does the relational extension of $\overline{\mathrm{S}}$ restrict to $\mathrm{Kl}\left(\overline{\mathrm{P}}\right)$?
- **Proposition.** An $\mathrm{EM}(\mathrm{T})$-relation $(A, a) \leftrightsquigarrow (B, b)$

$$
\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{T}A \arrow[d, "a"'] \arrow[dr, phantom, "\leq"] & \mathrm{T}R \arrow[l, "\mathrm{T}f"'] \arrow[r, "\mathrm{T}g"] \arrow[d, dashed, "r"] & \mathrm{T}B \arrow[d, "b"] \\
A & R \arrow[l, "f"] \arrow[r, "g"'] & B
\end{tikzcd}
$$

Weakly lifting the setting for monotone WDLs, part 2

- Is $\mathrm{Kl}\left(\overline{\mathrm{P}}\right)$ always a subcategory of $\mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{EM}(\mathrm{T}))$? If so, when does the relational extension of $\overline{\mathrm{S}}$ restrict to $\mathrm{Kl}\left(\overline{\mathrm{P}}\right)$?
- When does the relational extension of $\overline{\mathrm{S}}$ restrict to $\mathrm{Kl}\left(\overline{\mathrm{P}}\right)$?
- **Proposition.** An $\mathrm{EM}(\mathrm{T})$-relation $(A, a) \leftrightsquigarrow (B, b)$

$$
\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{T}A \arrow[d, "a"'] & \mathrm{T}R \arrow[l, "\mathrm{T}f"'] \arrow[r, "\mathrm{T}g"] \arrow[d, dashed, "r"] \arrow[dl, phantom, "\leq"] & \mathrm{T}B \arrow[d, "b"] \\
A & R \arrow[l, "f"] \arrow[r, "g"'] & B
\end{tikzcd}
$$

is a $\mathrm{Kl}\left(\overline{\mathrm{P}}\right)$-morphism $(A, a) \multimap (B, b)$

Weakly lifting the setting for monotone WDLs, part 2

- Is $\mathrm{Kl}\left(\overline{\mathrm{P}}\right)$ always a subcategory of $\mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{EM}(\mathrm{T}))$? If so, when does the relational extension of $\overline{\mathrm{S}}$ restrict to $\mathrm{Kl}\left(\overline{\mathrm{P}}\right)$?
- When does the relational extension of $\overline{\mathrm{S}}$ restrict to $\mathrm{Kl}\left(\overline{\mathrm{P}}\right)$?
- **Proposition.** An $\mathrm{EM}(\mathrm{T})$-relation $(A, a) \leftrightsquigarrow (B, b)$

$$
\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{T}A \arrow[d, "a"'] & \mathrm{T}R \arrow[l, "\mathrm{T}f"'] \arrow[r, "\mathrm{T}g"] \arrow[d, dashed, "r"] \arrow[dl, phantom, "\leq"] & \mathrm{T}B \arrow[d, "b"] \\
A & R \arrow[l, "f"] \arrow[r, "g"'] & B
\end{tikzcd}
$$

is a $\mathrm{Kl}\left(\overline{\mathrm{P}}\right)$-morphism $(A, a) \mathrel{\circ\!\!\rightarrow} (B, b)$

  - iff the inequality on the left is an equality

Weakly lifting the setting for monotone WDLs, part 2

- Is $\mathrm{Kl}\left(\overline{\mathrm{P}}\right)$ always a subcategory of $\mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{EM}(\mathrm{T}))$? If so, when does the relational extension of $\overline{\mathrm{S}}$ restrict to $\mathrm{Kl}\left(\overline{\mathrm{P}}\right)$?
- When does the relational extension of $\overline{\mathrm{S}}$ restrict to $\mathrm{Kl}\left(\overline{\mathrm{P}}\right)$?
- **Proposition.** An $\mathrm{EM}(\mathrm{T})$-relation $(A, a) \leftrightsquigarrow (B, b)$

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{T}A \arrow[d, "a"'] & \mathrm{T}R \arrow[l, "\mathrm{T}f"'] \arrow[r, "\mathrm{T}g"] \arrow[d, dashed, "r"] \arrow[dl, phantom, "\lneq"] & \mathrm{T}B \arrow[d, "b"] \\
A & R \arrow[l, "f"] \arrow[r, "g"'] & B
\end{tikzcd}$$

is a $\mathrm{Kl}\left(\overline{\mathrm{P}}\right)$-morphism $(A, a) \multimap (B, b)$

  - iff the inequality on the left is an equality
  - iff $\forall x \in A, x' \in R, t \in \mathrm{T}A, a(t) = x = f(x')$
    $\Rightarrow \exists t' \in \mathrm{T}R, x' = r(t') \wedge (\mathrm{T}f)(t') = t$.

Weakly lifting the setting for monotone WDLs, part 2

- Is $\mathrm{Kl}\left(\overline{\mathrm{P}}\right)$ always a subcategory of $\mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{EM}(\mathrm{T}))$? If so, when does the relational extension of $\overline{\mathrm{S}}$ restrict to $\mathrm{Kl}\left(\overline{\mathrm{P}}\right)$?
- When does the relational extension of $\overline{\mathrm{S}}$ restrict to $\mathrm{Kl}\left(\overline{\mathrm{P}}\right)$?
- **Proposition.** An $\mathrm{EM}(\mathrm{T})$-relation $(A, a) \leftrightsquigarrow (B, b)$

$$
\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{T}A \arrow[d, "a"'] \arrow[dr, phantom, "\leq"] & \mathrm{T}R \arrow[l, "\mathrm{T}f"'] \arrow[r, "\mathrm{T}g"] \arrow[d, dashed, "r"] & \mathrm{T}B \arrow[d, "b"] \\
A & R \arrow[l, "f"] \arrow[r, "g"'] & B
\end{tikzcd}
$$

is a $\mathrm{Kl}\left(\overline{\mathrm{P}}\right)$-morphism $(A, a) \mathrel{\circ\!\!\!\rightarrow} (B, b)$

- iff the inequality on the left is an equality
- iff $\forall x \in A, x' \in R, t \in \mathrm{T}A, a(t) = x = f(x')$
  $\Rightarrow \exists t' \in \mathrm{T}R, x' = r(t') \wedge (\mathrm{T}f)(t') = t.$

I say f is *decomposable*.

- Is $\mathrm{Kl}\left(\overline{\mathrm{P}}\right)$ always a subcategory of $\mathrm{Rel}(\mathrm{EM}(\mathrm{T}))$? If so, when does the relational extension of $\overline{\mathrm{S}}$ restrict to $\mathrm{Kl}\left(\overline{\mathrm{P}}\right)$?
- When does the relational extension of $\overline{\mathrm{S}}$ restrict to $\mathrm{Kl}\left(\overline{\mathrm{P}}\right)$?
- **Proposition.** An $\mathrm{EM}(\mathrm{T})$-relation $(A, a) \leftrightsquigarrow (B, b)$

$$
\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{T}A \arrow[d, "a"'] & \mathrm{T}R \arrow[l, "\mathrm{T}f"'] \arrow[r, "\mathrm{T}g"] \arrow[d, dashed, "r"] \arrow[dl, phantom, "\not\leq"] & \mathrm{T}B \arrow[d, "b"] \\
A & R \arrow[l, "f"] \arrow[r, "g"'] & B
\end{tikzcd}
$$

  is a $\mathrm{Kl}\left(\overline{\mathrm{P}}\right)$-morphism $(A, a) \mathrel{-\!\!\circ\!\!\!\to} (B, b)$
  - iff the inequality on the left is an equality
  - iff $\forall x \in A, x' \in R, t \in \mathrm{T}A, a(t) = x = f(x')$
    $\Rightarrow \exists t' \in \mathrm{T}R, x' = r(t') \wedge (\mathrm{T}f)(t') = t.$

  I say f is *decomposable*.
- **Theorem.** Let $\overline{\mathrm{S}}$ be a weak lifting of a monad S with a monotone WDL $\mathrm{SP} \Rightarrow \mathrm{PS}$. There is a monotone WDL $\overline{\mathrm{S}}\,\overline{\mathrm{P}} \Rightarrow \overline{\mathrm{P}}\,\overline{\mathrm{S}}$ iff $\overline{\mathrm{S}}$ preserves decomposable morphisms.

Weakly lifting the setting for monotone WDLs to KHaus

In $\mathrm{KHaus} \cong \mathrm{EM}(\beta)$,

[iv] $\mathrm{V}_* X$ = space of closed subsets of X, excluding $\varnothing$

Weakly lifting the setting for monotone WDLs to KHaus

In $\mathrm{KHaus} \cong \mathrm{EM}(\beta)$,

- $\overline{\mathrm{P}} = \mathrm{V}$

[iv] $\mathrm{V}_* X$ = space of closed subsets of X, excluding $\varnothing$

Weakly lifting the setting for monotone WDLs to KHaus

In $\mathrm{KHaus} \cong \mathrm{EM}(\beta)$,

- $\overline{\mathrm{P}} = \mathrm{V}$
- decomposable morphisms of β-algebras correspond to open maps (Clementino *et al.* 2014)

[iv] $\mathrm{V}_* X =$ space of closed subsets of X, excluding $\varnothing$

Weakly lifting the setting for monotone WDLs to KHaus

In $\mathrm{KHaus} \cong \mathrm{EM}(\beta)$,

- $\overline{\mathrm{P}} = \mathrm{V}$
- decomposable morphisms of β-algebras correspond to open maps (Clementino *et al.* 2014)
- **Corollary.** V preserves open maps hence there is a (unique) monotone WDL $\mathrm{VV} \Rightarrow \mathrm{VV}$.

[iv] $\mathrm{V}_* X$ = space of closed subsets of X, excluding $\varnothing$

Weakly lifting the setting for monotone WDLs to KHaus

In $\mathrm{KHaus} \cong \mathrm{EM}(\beta)$,

- $\overline{\mathrm{P}} = \mathrm{V}$
- decomposable morphisms of β-algebras correspond to open maps (Clementino *et al.* 2014)
- **Corollary.** V preserves open maps hence there is a (unique) monotone WDL $\mathrm{VV} \Rightarrow \mathrm{VV}$.
- Consider the Radon monad $\left(\mathrm{R}, \eta^{\mathrm{R}}, \mu^{\mathrm{R}}\right)$ $(\mathrm{R}X = \{\text{Radon probability measures on } X\})$

[iv] $\mathrm{V}_* X$ = space of closed subsets of X, excluding $\varnothing$

Weakly lifting the setting for monotone WDLs to KHaus

In $\mathrm{KHaus} \cong \mathrm{EM}(\beta)$,

- $\overline{\mathrm{P}} = \mathrm{V}$
- decomposable morphisms of β-algebras correspond to open maps (Clementino *et al.* 2014)
- **Corollary.** V preserves open maps hence there is a (unique) monotone WDL $\mathrm{VV} \Rightarrow \mathrm{VV}$.
- Consider the Radon monad $\left(\mathrm{R}, \eta^{\mathrm{R}}, \mu^{\mathrm{R}}\right)$ $(\mathrm{R}X = \{\text{Radon probability measures on } X\})$
  - **Corollary.** R does not preserve open maps hence there is no monotone WDL $\mathrm{RV} \Rightarrow \mathrm{VR}$.

[iv] $\mathrm{V}_* X$ = space of closed subsets of X, excluding $\varnothing$

Weakly lifting the setting for monotone WDLs to KHaus

In $\mathrm{KHaus} \cong \mathrm{EM}(\beta)$,

- $\overline{\mathrm{P}} = \mathrm{V}$
- decomposable morphisms of β-algebras correspond to open maps (Clementino *et al.* 2014)
- **Corollary.** V preserves open maps hence there is a (unique) monotone WDL $\mathrm{VV} \Rightarrow \mathrm{VV}$.
- Consider the Radon monad $\left(\mathrm{R}, \eta^{\mathrm{R}}, \mu^{\mathrm{R}}\right)$ $(\mathrm{R}X = \{\text{Radon probability measures on } X\})$
  - **Corollary.** R does not preserve open maps hence there is no monotone WDL $\mathrm{RV} \Rightarrow \mathrm{VR}$.
  - **Theorem.** R preserves surjective open maps hence there is a (unique) monotone WDL $\mathrm{RV}_* \Rightarrow \mathrm{V}_*\mathrm{R}$[iv]. See also (Goubault-Larrecq 2024).

[iv] $\mathrm{V}_*X =$ space of closed subsets of X, excluding $\varnothing$

Conclusion: no-go theorems for monotone WDLs

$\mathrm{PP} \Rightarrow \mathrm{PP}$ and $\mathrm{VV} \Rightarrow \mathrm{VV}$ look the same... but monotone WDLs over $\overline{\mathrm{P}}$ are quite rare otherwise:

	KHaus		JSL	Conv	Mon				CMon		
	V	R	$\overline{\mathrm{P}}$	$\overline{\mathrm{P}}$	$\overline{\mathrm{M}}$	$\overline{\mathrm{D}}$	$\overline{\mathrm{P}}$	$\overline{\mathrm{M}_S}$	$\overline{\mathrm{M}}$	$\overline{\mathrm{D}}$	$\overline{\mathrm{P}}$
$\overline{\mathrm{P}}$	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
$\overline{\mathrm{P}_*}$	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗

- What's next?
  - extending this framework: Pos-regular categories, other monads of relations
  - no-go theorems for (all) WDLs
  - seeing this in the setting of monoidal topology