

# Genuine equivariant operads

Peter Bonventre, Luís A. Pereira

April 16, 2017

## Abstract

We build new algebraic structures, which we call genuine equivariant operads, which can be thought of as a hybrid between equivariant operads and coefficient systems. We then prove an Elmendorf type theorem stating that equivariant operads, with their graph model structure, are equivalent to genuine equivariant operads with their projective model structure.

As an application, we build explicit models for the  $N_\infty$ -operads of Blumberg and Hill.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Planar and tall maps</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1	Planar structures . . . . .	2
2.2	Outer faces and tall maps . . . . .	6
2.3	Substitution . . . . .	7
<b>3</b>	<b>The genuine equivariant operad monad</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1	Wreath product over finite sets . . . . .	9
3.2	Equivariant leaf-root and vertex functors . . . . .	10
3.3	Planar strings . . . . .	13
3.4	A monad on spans . . . . .	14
3.5	The free genuine operad monad . . . . .	18
<b>4</b>	<b>Free extensions</b>	<b>21</b>
4.1	Extensions over general monads . . . . .	21
4.2	Labeled planar strings . . . . .	22
4.3	Bar constructions on spans . . . . .	24
<b>5</b>	<b>Filtration of Cellular Extensions</b>	<b>25</b>
5.1	Filtration Pieces . . . . .	25
5.2	Notation . . . . .	29
5.3	Filtration Result . . . . .	30

## 1 Introduction

No content yet.

## 2 Planar and tall maps

### 2.1 Planar structures


Throughout we will work with trees possessing *planar structures* or, more intuitively, trees embedded into the plane.

Our preferred model for trees will be that of broad posets first introduced by Weiss in [4] and further worked out by the second author in [3]. We now define planar structures in this context.

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $T \in \Omega$  be a tree. A *planar structure* of  $T$  is an extension of the descendency partial order  $\leq_d$  to a total order  $\leq_p$  such that:

- *Planar*: if  $e \leq_p f$  and  $e \not\leq_d f$  then  $g \leq_d f$  implies  $e \leq_p g$ .

**Example 2.2.** An example of a planar structure on a tree  $T$  follows, with  $\leq_r$  encoded by the number labels.



(2.3)

PLANAREX EQ

Intuitively, given a planar depiction of a tree  $T$ ,  $e \leq_d f$  holds when the downward path from  $e$  passes through  $f$  and  $e \leq_p f$  holds if either  $e \leq_d f$  or if the downward path from  $e$  is to the left of the downward path from  $f$  (as measured at the node where the paths intersect).

Intuitively, a planar depiction of a tree amounts to choosing a total order for each of the sets of *input edges* of each node (i.e. those edges immediately above that node).

While we will not need to make this last statement precise, we will nonetheless find it convenient to show that Definition 2.1 is equivalent to such choosing total orders for each of the sets of input edges. To do so, we first introduce some notation.

**Notation 2.4.** Let  $T \in \Omega$  be a tree and  $e \in T$  and edge. We will denote

$$I(e) = \{f \in T : e \leq_d f\}$$

and refer to this poset as the *input path* of  $e$ .

We will repeatedly use the following, which is a consequence of [3, Cor. 5.26].

**Lemma 2.5.** If  $e \leq_d f$ ,  $e \leq_d f'$ , then  $f, f'$  are  $\leq_d$ -comparable.

**Proposition 2.6.** Let  $T \in \Omega$  be a tree. Then

- (a) for any  $e \in T$  the finite poset  $I(e)$  is totally ordered;
- (b) the poset  $(T, \leq_d)$  has all joins, denoted  $\vee$ . In fact,  $\vee_i e_i = \min(\cap_i I(e_i))$ .

*Proof.* (a) is immediate from Lemma 2.5. To prove (b) we note that  $\min(\cap_i I(e_i))$  exists by (a), and that this is clearly the join  $\vee e_i$ .  $\square$

**Notation 2.7.** Let  $T \in \Omega$  be a tree and suppose that  $e <_d b$ . We will denote by  $b_e^\dagger \in T$  the predecessor of  $b$  in  $I(e)$ .

**Proposition 2.8.** Suppose  $e, f$  are  $\leq_d$ -incomparable edges of  $T$  and write  $b = e \vee f$ . Then

- (a)  $e <_d b$ ,  $f <_d b$  and  $b_e^\dagger \neq b_f^\dagger$ ;
- (b)  $b_e^\dagger, b_f^\dagger \in b^\dagger$ . In fact  $\{b_e^\dagger\} = I(e) \cap b^\dagger$ ,  $\{b_f^\dagger\} = I(f) \cap b^\dagger$ ;

(c) if  $e' \leq_d e$ ,  $f' \leq_d f$  then  $b = e' \vee f'$  and  $b_{e'}^\dagger = b_e^\dagger$ ,  $b_{f'}^\dagger = b_f^\dagger$ .

*Proof.* (a) is immediate: the condition  $e = g$  (resp.  $f = g$ ) would imply  $f \leq_d e$  (resp.  $e \leq_d f$ ) while the condition  $b_e^\dagger = b_f^\dagger$  would provide a predecessor of  $b$  in  $I(e) \cap I(f)$ .

For (b), note that any relation  $a <_d b$  factors as  $a \leq_d b_a^* <_d b$  for some unique  $b_a^* \in b^\dagger$ , where uniqueness follows from Lemma 2.5. Choosing  $a = e$  implies  $I(e) \cap b^\dagger = \{b_e^*\}$  and letting  $a$  range over edges such that  $e \leq_d a <_d b$  shows that  $b_e^*$  is in fact the predecessor of  $b$ .

To prove (c) one reduces to the case  $e' = e$ , in which case it suffices to check  $I(e) \cap I(f') = I(e) \cap I(f)$ . But if it were otherwise there would exist an edge  $a$  satisfying  $f' \leq_d a <_d f$  and  $e \leq_d a$ , and this would imply  $e \leq_d f$ , contradicting our hypothesis.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.9.** Let  $c = e_1 \vee e_2 \vee e_3$ . Then  $c = e_i \vee e_j$  iff  $c_{e_i}^\dagger \neq c_{e_j}^\dagger$ .  
Therefore, all ternary joins in  $(T, \leq_d)$  are binary, i.e.


$$c = e_1 \vee e_2 \vee e_3 = e_i \vee e_j \quad (2.10)$$

for some  $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$ , and (2.10) fails for at most one choice of  $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$ .

*Proof.* If  $c_{e_i}^\dagger \neq c_{e_j}^\dagger$ , then  $c = \min(I(e_i) \cap I(e_j)) = e_i \vee e_j$ , whereas the converse follows from Proposition 2.8(a).

The “therefore” part follows by noting that  $c_{e_1}^\dagger, c_{e_2}^\dagger, c_{e_3}^\dagger$  can not all coincide, or else  $c$  would not be the minimum of  $I(e_1) \cap I(e_2) \cap I(e_3)$ .  $\square$

**Example 2.11.** In the following example  $b = e \vee f$ ,  $c = e \vee f \vee g$ ,  $c_e^\dagger = c_f^\dagger = b$ .



**Notation 2.12.** Given a set  $S$  of size  $n$  we write  $\text{Ord}(S) \simeq \text{Iso}(S, \{1, \dots, n\})$ . We will usually abuse notation by regarding its objects as pairs  $(S, \leq)$  where  $\leq$  is a total order in  $S$ .

**Proposition 2.13.** Let  $T \in \Omega$  be a tree. There is a bijection

$$\{\text{planar structures } (T, \leq_p)\} \longrightarrow \prod_{(a^\dagger \leq a) \in V(T)} \text{Ord}(a^\dagger) \quad (2.14)$$

$$\leq_p \longmapsto (\leq_p \upharpoonright_{a^\dagger})$$

*Proof.* We will keep the setup of Proposition 2.8 throughout:  $e, f$  are  $\leq_d$ -incomparable edges and we write  $b = e \vee f$ .

We first show that (2.14) is injective, i.e. that the restrictions  $\leq_p \upharpoonright_{a^\dagger}$  determine if  $e <_p f$  holds or not. If  $b_e^\dagger <_p b_f^\dagger$ , the relations  $e \leq_d b_e^\dagger <_p b_f^\dagger \geq_d f$  and Definition 2.1 imply it must be  $e <_p f$ . Dually, if  $b_f^\dagger <_p b_e^\dagger$  then  $f <_p e$ . Thus  $b_e^\dagger <_p b_f^\dagger \Leftrightarrow e <_p f$  and hence (2.14) is indeed injective.

To check that (2.14) is surjective, it suffices (recall that  $e, f$  are assumed  $\leq_d$ -incomparable) to check that defining  $e \leq_p f$  to hold iff  $b_e^\dagger < b_f^\dagger$  holds in  $b^\dagger$  yields a planar structure.

Antisymmetry and the total order conditions are immediate, and it thus remains to check the transitivity and planar conditions. Transitivity of  $\leq_p$  in the case  $e' \leq_p e <_p f$  and the planar condition, which is the case  $e <_p f \geq_d f'$ , follow from Proposition 2.8(c). Transitivity of  $\leq_p$  in the case  $e <_p f \leq_d f'$  follows since either  $e \leq_d f'$  or else  $e, f'$  are  $\leq_d$ -incomparable, in which case one can apply 2.8(c) with the roles of  $f, f'$  reversed.


It remains to check transitivity in the hardest case, that of  $e <_p f <_p g$  with  $e, f, g$  incomparable. We write  $c = e \vee f \vee g$ . By the “therefore” part of Proposition 2.9, either (i)  $e \vee f <_d c$ , in which case Proposition 2.9 implies  $c_e^\dagger = c_f^\dagger$  and transitivity follows; (ii)  $f \vee g <_d c$ , which follows just as (i); (iii)  $e \vee f = f \vee g = c$ , in which case  $c_e^\dagger < c_f^\dagger < c_g^\dagger$  in  $c^\dagger$  so that  $c_e^\dagger \neq c_g^\dagger$  and by Proposition 2.9 it is also  $e \vee g = c$  and transitivity follows.  $\square$

**Remark 2.15.** Definition 2.1 readily extends to forests  $F \in \Phi$ . The analogue of Proposition 2.13 then states that the data of a planar structure is equivalent to total orderings of the nodes of  $F$  together with a total ordering of its set of roots. Indeed, this follows by either adapting the proof above or by noting that planar structures on  $F$  are clearly in bijection with planar structures on the join tree  $F \star \eta$  (cf. [3, Def. 7.44]), which adds a single edge  $\eta$  to  $F$ , serving as the (unique) root of  $F \star \eta$ .

When discussing the substitution procedure in §2.3 we will find it convenient to work with a model for the category  $\Omega$  that possesses exactly one representative of each possible planar structure on each tree or, more precisely, such that the only isomorphisms preserving the planar structures are the identities. On the other hand, using such a model for  $\Omega$  throughout would, among other issues, make the discussion of faces in §2.2 rather awkward. We now outline our conventions to address such issues.

Let  $\Omega^p$ , the category of *planarized trees*, denote the category with objects pairs  $T_{\leq_p} = (T, \leq_p)$  of trees together with a planar structure and morphisms the *underlying* maps of trees (so that the planar structures are ignored). There is a full subcategory  $\Omega^s \hookrightarrow \Omega^p$ , whose objects we call *standard models*, of those  $T_{\leq_p}$  whose underlying set is one of the sets  $\underline{n} = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  and for which  $\leq_p$  coincides with the canonical order.

**Example 2.16.** Some examples of standard models, i.e. objects of  $\Omega^s$ , follow (further, (2.3) can also be interpreted as such an example).



Here  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  are isomorphic to each other but not isomorphic to any other standard model in  $\Omega^s$  while both  $C$  and  $U$  are the unique objects in their isomorphism classes.

Given  $T_{\leq_p} \in \Omega^p$  there is an obvious standard model  $T_{\leq_p}^s \in \Omega^s$  given by replacing each edge by its order following  $\leq_p$ . Indeed, this defines a retraction  $(-)^s: \Omega^p \rightarrow \Omega^s$  and a natural transformation  $\sigma: id \Rightarrow (-)^s$  given by isomorphisms preserving the planar structure (in fact, the pair  $((-)^s, \sigma)$  is clearly unique).

**Convention 2.18.** From now on, we will write simply  $\Omega, \Omega_G$  to denote the categories  $\Omega^s, \Omega_G^s$  of standard models (where planar structures are defined in the underlying forest as in Remark 2.15). Similarly  $\mathbf{O}_G$  will denote the model  $\mathbf{O}_G^s$  for the orbital category whose objects are the orbital  $G$ -sets whose underlying set is one of the sets  $\underline{n} = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ .

Therefore, whenever one of our constructions produces an object/diagram in  $\Omega^p, \Omega_G^p, \mathbf{O}_G^p$  (of trees,  $G$ -trees, orbital  $G$ -sets with a planarization/total order) we will hence implicitly reinterpret it by using the standardization functor  $(-)^s$ .

**Example 2.19.** To illustrate our convention, we consider the trees in Example 2.16.

One has subfaces  $F_1 \subset F_2 \subset U$  where  $F_1$  is the subtree with edge set  $\{1, 2, 6, 7\}$  and  $F_2$  is the subtree with edge set  $\{1, 2, 3, 6, 7\}$ , both with inherited tree and planar structures. Applying  $(-)^s$  to the inclusion diagram on the left below then yields a diagram as on the right.




Similarly, let  $\leq_{(12)}$  and  $\leq_{(45)}$  denote alternate planar structures for  $U$  exchanging the orders of the pairs 1, 2 and 4, 5, so that one has objects  $U_{\leq_{(12)}}$ ,  $U_{\leq_{(45)}}$  in  $\Omega^p$ . Applying  $(-)^s$  to the diagram of underlying identities on the left yields the permutation diagram on the right.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} U & \xrightarrow{id} & U_{\leq_{(45)}} \\ id \searrow & & \nearrow id \\ & U_{\leq_{(12)}} & \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} U & \xrightarrow{(45)} & U \\ (12) \searrow & & \nearrow (12)(45) \\ & U & \end{array}$$

**Example 2.20.** An additional reason to leave the use of  $(-)^s$  implicit is that when depicting  $G$ -trees it is preferable to choose edge labels that describe the action rather than the planarization (which is already implicit anyway).

For example, when  $G = \mathbb{Z}/4$ , in both diagrams below the orbital representation on the left represents the isomorphism class consisting of the two trees  $T_1, T_2 \in \Omega_G$  on the right.



**Definition 2.21.** A morphism  $S \xrightarrow{\varphi} T$  in  $\Omega$  that is compatible with the planar structures  $\leq_p$  is called a *planar map*.

More generally, a morphism  $F \rightarrow G$  in the categories  $\Phi$ ,  $\Phi^G$ ,  $\Omega^G$  of forests,  $G$ -forests,  $G$ -trees is called a *planar map* if it is an independent map (cf. [3, Def. 5.28]) compatible with the planar structures  $\leq_p$ .

**Remark 2.22.** The need for the independence condition is justified by [3, Lemma 5.33] and its converse, since non independent maps do not reflect  $\leq_d$  inequalities.

We note that in the  $\Omega_G$  case a map  $\varphi$  is independent iff  $\varphi$  does not factor through a non trivial quotient iff  $\varphi$  is injective on each edge orbit.

**Proposition 2.23.** Let  $F \xrightarrow{\varphi} G$  be an independent map in  $\Phi$  (or  $\Omega$ ,  $\Omega_G$ ,  $\Phi_G$ ). Then there is a unique factorization

$$F \xrightarrow{\cong} \bar{F} \rightarrow G$$

such that  $F \xrightarrow{\cong} \bar{F}$  is an isomorphism and  $\bar{F} \rightarrow G$  is planar.

*Proof.* We need to show that there is a unique planar structure  $\leq_{\bar{F}}$  on the underlying forest of  $F$  making the underlying map a planar map. Simplicity of  $G$  ensures that for any vertex  $e^\dagger \leq e$  of  $F$  the edges in  $\varphi(e^\dagger)$  are all distinct while independence of  $\varphi$  likewise ensures that the edges in  $\varphi(e^\dagger)$  are distinct. The result now follows from (the forest version of) Proposition 2.13: one simply orders each set  $e^\dagger$  and  $\underline{r}_F$  according to its image.

not quite complete... maybe that  $\leq_p$  is the closure of  $\leq_d$  and the vertex relations under transitivity and the planar condition  $\square$

**Remark 2.24.** Proposition 2.23 says that planar structures can be pulled back along independent maps. However, they can not always be pushed forward. As an example, in the notation of (2.17), consider the map  $C \rightarrow T_1$  defined by  $1 \mapsto 1$ ,  $2 \mapsto 4$ ,  $3 \mapsto 2$ ,  $4 \mapsto 5$ .

**Remark 2.25.** Given any tree  $T \in \Omega$  there is a unique corolla  $\text{lr}(T) \in \Sigma$  and planar tall map  $\text{lr}(T) \rightarrow T$ . Explicitly, the number of leaves of  $\text{lr}(T)$  matches that of  $T$ , together with the inherited order.

## 2.2 Outer faces and tall maps

In preparation for our discussion of the substitution operation in §2.3, we now recall some basic notions and results concerning outer subtrees and tree grafting, as in [3, §5].

**Definition 2.26.** Let  $T \in \Omega$  be a tree and  $e_1 \cdots e_n = \underline{e} \leq e$  a broad relation in  $T$ .

We define the *planar outer face*  $T_{\underline{e} \leq e}$  to be the subtree with underlying set those edges  $f \in T$  such that

$$f \leq_d e, \quad \forall_i e_i \not\leq_d f, \quad (2.27)$$

generating broad relations the relations  $f^\dagger \leq f$  for  $f$  satisfying (2.27) and  $\forall_i f \neq e_i$ , and planar structure pulled back from  $T$ .

**Remark 2.28.** If one forgoes the requirement that  $T_{\underline{e} \leq e}$  be equipped with the pullback planar structure, the inclusion  $T_{\underline{e} \leq e} \rightarrow T$  is usually called simply an *outer face*.

We now recap some basic results.

**Proposition 2.29.** Let  $T \in \Omega$  be a tree.

- (a)  $T_{\underline{e} \leq e}$  is a tree with root  $e$  and edge tuple  $\underline{e}$ ;
- (b) there is a bijection

$$\{\text{planar outer faces of } T\} \leftrightarrow \{\text{broad relations of } T\};$$

- (c) if  $R \rightarrow S$  and  $S \rightarrow T$  are outer face maps then so is  $R \rightarrow T$ ;
- (d) any pair of broad relations  $\underline{g} \leq v$ ,  $\underline{f}v \leq e$  induces a grafting pushout diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \eta & \xrightarrow{v} & T_{\underline{g} \leq v} \\ v \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ T_{\underline{f}v \leq e} & \longrightarrow & T_{\underline{f}g \leq v} \end{array} \quad (2.30)$$

*Proof.* We first show (a). That  $T_{\underline{e} \leq e}$  is indeed a tree is the content of [3, Prop. 5.20]; more precisely,  $T_{\underline{e} \leq e} = (T^{\leq e})_{< \underline{e}}$  in the notation therein. That the root of  $T_{\underline{e} \leq e}$  is  $e$  is clear and that the root tuple is  $\underline{e}$  follows from [3, Remark 5.23].

(b) follows from (a), which shows that  $\underline{e} \leq e$  can be recovered from  $T_{\underline{e} \leq e}$ .

(c) follows from the definition of outer face together with [3, Lemma 5.33], which states that the  $\leq_d$  relations on  $S, T$  coincide.

Since by (c) both  $T_{\underline{g} \leq v}$  and  $T_{\underline{f}v \leq e}$  are outer faces of  $T_{\underline{f}g \leq v}$ , (d) is a restatement of [3, Prop. 5.15].  $\square$

**Definition 2.31.** A map  $S \xrightarrow{\varphi} T$  in  $\Omega$  is called a *tall map* if

$$\varphi(l_S) = l_T, \quad \varphi(rs) = r_T,$$

where  $l_{(-)}$  denotes the leaf tuple and  $r_{(-)}$  the root.

The following is a restatement of [3, Cor. 5.24]

**Proposition 2.32.** Any map  $S \xrightarrow{\varphi} T$  in  $\Omega$  has a factorization, unique up to unique isomorphism,

$$S \xrightarrow{\varphi^t} U \xrightarrow{\varphi^u} T$$

as a tall map followed by an outer face (in fact,  $U = T_{\varphi(l_S) \leq r_S}$ ).

We recall that a face  $F \rightarrow T$  is called inner if is obtained by iteratively removing inner edges, i.e. edges other than the root or the leaves. In particular, it follows that a face is inner iff it is tall. The usual face-degeneracy decomposition thus combines with Corollary 2.32 to give the following.

**Corollary 2.33.** Any map  $S \xrightarrow{\varphi} T$  in  $\Omega$  has a factorization, unique up to unique isomorphisms,

$$S \xrightarrow{\varphi^-} U \xrightarrow{\varphi^i} V \xrightarrow{\varphi^u} T \quad (2.34) \quad \text{TRIPLEFACT EQ}$$

as a degeneracy followed by an inner face followed by an outer face.


*Proof.* The factorization (2.34) can be built by first performing the degeneracy-face decomposition and then performing the tall-outer decomposition on the face map.  $\square$

## 2.3 Substitution

One of the key ideas needed to describe operads is that of substitution of tree nodes, a process that we will prefer to repackage in terms of maps of trees. We start by discussing an example, focusing on the related notion of iterated graftings of trees (as described in (2.30)).

**Example 2.35.** The trees  $U_1, U_2, \dots, U_6$  on the left below can be grafted into the tree  $U$  in the middle. More precisely (among other possible grafting orders), one has

$$U = (((((U_6 \sqcup_a U_2)) \sqcup_a U_1) \sqcup_b U_3) \sqcup_d U_5) \sqcup_c U_4) \quad (2.36) \quad \text{UFORMULA EQ}$$



We now consider the tree  $T$ , which is built by converting each  $U_i$  into the corolla  $\text{Ir}(U_i)$  (cf. Remark 2.25), and then performing the same grafting operations as in (2.36).  $T$  can then be regarded as encoding the combinatorics of the iterated grafting in (2.36), with alternative ways to reorder operations in (2.36) in bijection with ways to assemble  $T$  out of its nodes.

One can now therefore think of the iterated grafting (2.36) as being instead encoded by

the tree  $T$  together with the (unique) planar tall maps  $\varphi_i$  below.

(2.38)

SUBSDATUMTREES2 EQ

From this perspective,  $U$  can now be thought as obtained from  $T$  by substituting each of its nodes with the corresponding  $U_i$ . Moreover, the  $\varphi_i$  assemble to a planar tall map  $\varphi: T \rightarrow U$  (such that  $a_i \mapsto a, b \mapsto b, \dots, e \mapsto e$ ), which likewise encodes the same information.

Our perspective will then be that data for substitution of tree nodes such as in (2.38) can equivalently be repackaged using planar tall maps.

SUBSDATUMTREES2 EQ

UBSTITUTIONDATUM

**Definition 2.39.** Let  $T \in \Omega$  be a tree.

A  $T$ -substitution datum is a tuple  $\{U_{e^\dagger \leq e}\}_{(e^\dagger \leq e) \in V(T)}$  such that  $\text{lr}(U_{e^\dagger \leq e}) = T_{e^\dagger \leq e}$ .

Further, a map of  $T$ -substitution data  $\{U_{e^\dagger \leq e}\} \rightarrow \{V_{e^\dagger \leq e}\}$  is a tuple of planar tall maps  $\{U_{e^\dagger \leq e} \rightarrow V_{e^\dagger \leq e}\}$ .

**Definition 2.40.** Let  $T \in \Omega$ .

The *Segal core poset*  $\text{Sc}(T)$  is the poset with objects the edge subtrees  $\eta_e$  and vertex subtrees  $T_{e^\dagger \leq e}$ . The order relation is given by inclusion.

**Remark 2.41.** Note that the only maps in  $\text{Sc}(T)$  are inclusions of the form  $\eta_a \subset T_{e^\dagger \leq e}$ . In particular, there are no pairs of composable non-identity relations in  $\text{Sc}(T)$ .

Given a  $T$ -substitution datum  $\{U_{e^\dagger \leq e}\}$  we abuse notation by writing

$$U_{(-)}: \text{Sc}(T) \rightarrow \Omega$$

for the functor  $\eta_a \mapsto \eta, T_{e^\dagger \leq e} \mapsto U_{e^\dagger \leq e}$  and sending the inclusions  $\eta_a \subset T_{e^\dagger \leq e}$  to the composites

$$\eta \xrightarrow{a} T_{e^\dagger \leq e} = \text{lr}(U_{e^\dagger \leq e}) \rightarrow U_{e^\dagger \leq e}.$$

**Proposition 2.42.** Let  $T \in \Omega$  be a tree. There is an isomorphism of categories

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Sub}(T) &\xleftrightarrow{\quad} \Omega_{T/}^{\text{pt}} \\ \{U_{e^\dagger \leq e}\} &\longmapsto (T \rightarrow \text{colim}_{\text{Sc}(T)} U_{(-)}) \\ \{U_{\varphi(e^\dagger) \leq \varphi(e)}\} &\longleftarrow (T \xrightarrow{\varphi} U) \end{aligned} \tag{2.43}$$

SUBDATAUNDERPLAN EQ

Where  $\text{Sub}(T)$  denotes the category of  $T$ -substitution data and  $\Omega_{T/}^{\text{pt}}$  the category of planar tall maps under  $T$ .

*Proof.* We first claim that (i) the  $\text{colim}_{\text{Sc}(T)} U_{(-)}$  indeed exists; (ii) for the canonical datum  $\{T_{e^\dagger \leq e}\}$ , it is  $T = \text{colim}_{\text{Sc}(T)} T_{(-)}$ ; (iii) the induced map  $T \rightarrow \text{colim}_{\text{Sc}(T)} U_{(-)}$  is planar tall.

The argument is by induction on the number of vertices of  $T$ , with the base cases of  $T$  with 0 or 1 vertices being immediate, since then  $T$  is the terminal object of  $\text{Sc}(T)$ . Otherwise, one can choose a non trivial grafting decomposition so as to write  $T = R \sqcup_e S$ ,



resulting in identifications  $\text{Sc}(R) \subset \text{Sc}(T)$ ,  $\text{Sc}(S) \subset \text{Sc}(T)$  so that  $\text{Sc}(R) \cup \text{Sc}(S) = \text{Sc}(T)$  and  $\text{Sc}(R) \cap \text{Sc}(S) = \{\eta_e\}$ . The existence of  $\text{colim}_{\text{Sc}(T)} U_{(-)}$  is thus equivalent to the existence of the pushout below.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \eta & \longrightarrow & \text{colim}_{\text{Sc}(R)} U_{(-)} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{colim}_{\text{Sc}(S)} U_{(-)} & \dashrightarrow & \text{colim}_{\text{Sc}(T)} U_{(-)} \end{array} \quad (2.44)$$

ASSEMBLYGRAFT EQ

By induction, the top right and bottom left colimits exist for any  $U_{(-)}$ , equal  $R$  and  $S$  in the case  $U_{(-)} = T_{(-)}$ , and the maps  $R \rightarrow \text{colim}_{\text{Sc}(R)} U_{(-)}$ ,  $S \rightarrow \text{colim}_{\text{Sc}(S)} U_{(-)}$  are planar tall. But is now follows that (2.44) is a grafting pushout diagram, so that the pushout indeed exists. The conditions that  $T = \text{colim}_{\text{Sc}(T)} T_{(-)}$  and  $T \rightarrow \text{colim}_{\text{Sc}(T)} U_{(-)}$  is planar tall follow.

The fact that the two functors in (2.43) are inverse to each other is clear by the same inductive argument.  $\square$

**Remark 2.45.** It follows from the previous proof that, writing  $U = \text{colim}_{\text{Sc}(T)} U_{(-)}$ , one has

$$V(U) = \coprod_{(e^\dagger \leq e) \in V(T)} V(U_{e^\dagger \leq e}). \quad (2.46)$$

VERTEXDECOMP EQ

Alternatively, (2.46) can be regarded as a map  $f^*: V(U) \rightarrow V(T)$  induced by the planar tall map  $f: T \rightarrow U$ . Explicitly,  $f^*(U_{u^\dagger \leq u})$  is the unique  $T_{t^\dagger \leq t}$  such that  $U_{u^\dagger \leq u} \subset U_{t^\dagger \leq t}$ . We note that  $f^*$  is indeed contravariant in the tall planar map  $f$ .

### 3 The genuine equivariant operad monad

We now turn to the task of building the monad encoding genuine equivariant operads.

#### 3.1 Wreath product over finite sets

In what follows we will let  $\mathbf{F}$  denote the usual skeleton of the category of finite sets and all set maps. Explicitly, its objects are the finite sets  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  for  $n \geq 0$ . However, much as in the discussion in Convention 2.18 we will often find it more convenient to regard the elements of  $\mathbf{F}$  as equivalence classes of finite sets equipped with total orders.

**Definition 3.1.** For a category  $\mathcal{C}$ , we let  $\mathbf{F} \wr \mathcal{C}$  denote the opposite of the Grothendieck construction for the functor

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{F}^{op} & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{Cat} \\ I & \longmapsto & \mathcal{C}^I \end{array}$$

Explicitly, the objects of  $\mathbf{F} \wr \mathcal{C}$  are tuples  $(c_i)_{i \in I}$  and a map  $(c_i)_{i \in I} \rightarrow (d_j)_{j \in J}$  consists of a pair

$$(\phi: I \rightarrow J, (f_i: c_i \rightarrow d_{\phi(i)})_{i \in I}),$$

henceforth abbreviated as  $(\phi, (f_i))$ .

The following is immediate.

**Proposition 3.2.** Suppose  $\mathcal{C}$  has all finite coproducts. One then has a functor as on the left below. Dually, if  $\mathcal{C}$  has all finite products, one has a functor as on the right below.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{F} \wr \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{\Pi} & \mathcal{C} \\ (c_i)_{i \in I} & \longmapsto & \coprod_{i \in I} c_i \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} (\mathbf{F} \wr \mathcal{C}^{op})^{op} & \xrightarrow{\Pi} & \mathcal{C} \\ (c_i)_{i \in I} & \longmapsto & \prod_{i \in I} c_i \end{array}$$

**Lemma 3.3.** Suppose that  $\mathcal{E}$  is a bicomplete category such that coproducts commute with limits in each variable. If the leftmost diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{F} & \mathcal{E} \\ k \downarrow & \nearrow \eta & \uparrow G \\ \mathcal{D} & & \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} F \wr \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{F \wr F} & F \wr \mathcal{E} & \xrightarrow{\Pi} & \mathcal{E} \\ F \wr k \downarrow & \nearrow F \wr \eta & \nearrow F \wr G & \searrow \Pi \circ F \wr G & \\ F \wr \mathcal{D} & & & & \end{array} \quad (3.4) \quad \boxed{\text{WRRAN EQ}}$$

is a right Kan extension diagram then so is the composite of the rightmost diagram.

Dually, if in  $\mathcal{E}$  products commute with colimits in each variable, and the leftmost diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C}^{op} & \xrightarrow{F} & \mathcal{E} \\ k \downarrow & \nearrow \epsilon & \uparrow G \\ \mathcal{D}^{op} & & \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} (F \wr \mathcal{C})^{op} & \xrightarrow{(F \wr F)^{op}} & (F \wr \mathcal{E}^{op})^{op} & \xrightarrow{\Pi} & \mathcal{E} \\ (F \wr k)^{op} \downarrow & \nearrow & \nearrow (F \wr G)^{op} & \searrow \Pi \circ (F \wr G)^{op} & \\ (F \wr \mathcal{D})^{op} & & & & \end{array} \quad (3.5) \quad \boxed{\text{WRLAN EQ}}$$

is a left Kan extension diagram then so is the composite of the rightmost diagram.

*Proof.* Unpacking definitions using the pointwise formula for Kan extensions ( $\frac{\text{McL}}{[2, \text{X.3.1}]}$ ), the claim concerning (3.4) amounts to showing that for each  $(d_i) \in F \wr \mathcal{D}$  one has natural isomorphisms

$$\lim_{((d_i) \rightarrow (kc_j)) \in ((d_i) \downarrow F \wr \mathcal{C})} \left( \coprod_j F(c_j) \right) \simeq \coprod_i \lim_{(d_i \rightarrow kc_i) \in d_i \downarrow \mathcal{C}} (F(c_i)). \quad (3.6) \quad \boxed{\text{POINTKAN EQ}}$$

Noting that the canonical factorizations of each  $(\varphi, (f_i)): (d_i)_{i \in I} \rightarrow (kc_j)_{j \in J}$  as

$$(d_i)_{i \in I} \rightarrow (c_{\phi(i)})_{i \in I} \rightarrow (kc_j)_{j \in J}$$

exhibit  $\prod_i (d_i \downarrow \mathcal{C})$  as a coreflexive subcategory of  $(d_i) \downarrow F \wr \mathcal{C}$ , we see that it is an initial subcategory. Therefore

$$\lim_{((d_i) \rightarrow (kc_j)) \in ((d_i) \downarrow F \wr \mathcal{C})} \left( \coprod_j F(c_j) \right) \simeq \lim_{((d_i) \rightarrow (kc_i)) \in \prod_i (d_i \downarrow \mathcal{C})} \left( \coprod_i F(c_i) \right)$$

and hence (3.6) now follows from the assumption that coproducts commute with limits in each variable.  $\square$

**Notation 3.7.** Using the coproduct functor  $F^{\wr 2} = F^{\wr \{0,1\}} = F \wr F \xrightarrow{\Pi} F$  (where  $\coprod_{i \in I} J_i$  is ordered lexicographically) and the simpleton  $\{1\} \in F$  one can regard the collection of categories  $F^{\wr \{0, \dots, n\}} \wr \mathcal{C} = F^{\wr n} \wr \mathcal{C}$  as a coaugmented cosimplicial object in  $\mathbf{Cat}$ . As such, we will denote by

$$\delta^i: F^{\wr n-1} \wr \mathcal{C} \rightarrow F^{\wr n} \wr \mathcal{C}, \quad 0 \leq i \leq n$$

the cofaces obtained by inserting simpletons  $\{1\} \in F$  and by

$$\sigma^i: F^{\wr n+1} \wr \mathcal{C} \rightarrow F^{\wr n} \wr \mathcal{C}, \quad 0 \leq i \leq n$$

the codegeneracies obtained by applying the coproduct  $F^{\wr 2} \xrightarrow{\Pi} F$  to adjacent  $F$  coordinates.

## 3.2 Equivariant leaf-root and vertex functors

**Definition 3.8.** A morphism  $T \xrightarrow{\varphi} S$  in  $\Omega_G$  is called a *quotient* if the underlying morphism of forests

$$\coprod_{[g] \in G/H} T_{[g]} \rightarrow \coprod_{[h] \in G/K} S_{[h]}$$

maps each tree component (or, equivalently, some tree component) isomorphically onto its image component.

We denote the subcategory of  $G$ -trees and quotients by  $\Omega_G^q$ .


**Definition 3.9.** The  $G$ -symmetric category, which we will also call the *category of  $G$ -corollas*, is the full subcategory  $\Sigma_G \subset \Omega_G^q$  of those  $G$ -trees that are corollas, i.e.  $G$ -trees such that each edge is either a root or a leaf (but not both).

**Definition 3.10.** The *leaf-root functor* is the functor  $\Omega_G^q \xrightarrow{\text{lr}} \Sigma_G$  defined by

$$\text{lr}(T) = \{\text{leaves of } T\} \sqcup \{\text{roots of } T\}$$

with a broad relation  $l_1 \cdots l_n \leq r$  holding in  $\text{lr}(T)$  iff its image holds in  $T$  and similarly for the planar structure  $\leq_p$ .

**Remark 3.11.** Generalizing Remark 2.25,  $\text{lr}(T)$  can alternatively be characterized as being the *unique*  $G$ -corolla which admits an also unique (tree-wise) tall planar map  $\text{lr}(T) \rightarrow T$ . Moreover,  $\text{lr}(T)$  can usually be regarded as the “smallest inner face” of  $T$ , obtained by removing all the inner edges, although this characterization fails when  $T = G \cdot_H \eta$  is a stick  $G$ -tree. Some examples with  $G = \mathbb{Z}_{/4}$  follow.




**Remark 3.12.** One consequence of the fact that planarizations can not be pushed forward along tree maps (cf. Remark 2.24) is that  $\text{lr}: \Omega_G^q \rightarrow \Sigma_G$  is not a categorical fibration. **maybe add to this.**

**Definition 3.13.** Given  $T \in \Omega_G$  we define the set  $V_G(T)$  of  $G$ -vertices of  $T$  to be the orbit set  $V(T)/G$ , i.e. the quotient of the vertex set  $V(T)$  by its  $G$ -action.

Furthermore, we will regard  $V_G(T)$  as an object in  $\mathbf{F}$  by equipping it with its lexicographic order: i.e. vertex equivalence classes  $[e^\dagger \leq e]$  are ordered according to the planar order  $\leq_p$  of the smallest representative  $ge$ ,  $g \in G$ .

**Remark 3.14.** Following Remark 2.45, a planar tall map  $f: T \rightarrow U$  of  $G$ -trees induces a  $G$ -equivariant map  $f^*: V(U) \rightarrow V(T)$  and thus also a map of orbits  $f^*: V_G(U) \rightarrow V_G(T)$ . We note, however, that  $f^*$  is not in general compatible with the order on  $V_G$ , as is indeed the case even in the non-equivariant case.

A minimal example follows.



In  $V(T)$  the vertices are ordered as  $a < c < d$  while in  $V(U)$  they are ordered as  $a < e < c < d$  but the map  $f^*: V(U) \rightarrow V(T)$  is given by  $a \mapsto a, c \mapsto c, d \mapsto d, e \mapsto d$ .


Note that each element of  $V_G(T)$  corresponds to an unique edge orbit  $Ge$  for  $e$  not a leaf. As such, we will represent the corresponding  $G$ -vertex by  $v_{Ge} = (Ge)^\dagger \leq Ge$  (which we interpret as the concatenation of the relations  $f^\dagger \leq f$  for  $f \in Ge$ ) and write

$$T_{v_{Ge}} = T_{(Ge)^\dagger \leq Ge} = \coprod_{f \in Ge} T_{f^\dagger \leq f}.$$

We note that  $T_{v_{Ge}}$  is always a  $G$ -corolla. Indeed, noting that a quotient map  $\varphi: T \rightarrow S$  induces quotient maps  $T_{v_{Ge}} \rightarrow S_{v_{G\varphi(e)}}$  one obtains a functor

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_G^q &\xrightarrow{V_G} \mathbf{F} \wr \Sigma_G \\ T &\longmapsto (T_{v_{Ge}})_{v_{Ge} \in V_G(T)}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.15} \quad \boxed{\text{VFUNCTOR EQ}}$$

**Remark 3.16.** The need to introduce the  $\mathbf{F} \wr \mathcal{C}$  categories comes from the fact that general quotient maps do not preserve the number of  $G$ -vertices. For a simple example, let  $G = \mathbb{Z}/4$  and consider the quotient map



sending edges labeled  $a, b, c$  to the edges with the same name and the edges  $a^{+1}, b^{+1}$  to the edges  $a+1, b+1$ . We note that  $T$  has three  $G$ -vertices  $v_{Gc}, v_{Gb}, v_{Gb+1}$  while  $S$  has only two  $G$ -vertices  $v_{Gc}$  and  $v_{Gb}$ .  $V(\phi)$  then maps the two corollas  $T_{v_{Gb}}$  and  $T_{v_{Gb+1}}$  isomorphically onto  $T_{S_{Gb}}$  and the corolla  $T_{v_{Gc}}$  non-isomorphically onto  $S_{v_{Gc}}$ .

Definition 2.39 now immediately generalizes.

**Definition 3.17.** Let  $T \in \Omega_G$  be a  $G$ -tree.

A  $T$ -substitution datum is a tuple  $\{U_{v_{Ge}}\}_{v_{Ge} \in V_G(T)}$  such that  $\text{lr}(U_{v_{Ge}}) = T_{v_{Ge}}$ .

Further, a map of  $T$ -substitution data  $\{U_{v_{Ge}}\} \rightarrow \{V_{v_{Ge}}\}$  is a tuple of planar tall maps  $\{U_{v_{Ge}} \rightarrow V_{v_{Ge}}\}$ .

**Remark 3.18.** To establish the equivariant analogue of Proposition 2.42 we will prefer to repackage equivariant substitution data in terms of non-equivariant terms.

Noting that there are decompositions  $U_{v_{Ge}} = \coprod_{ge \in Ge} U_{ge^\dagger \leq ge}$  and letting  $G \ltimes V(T)$  denote the Grothendieck construction for the action of  $G$  on the non-equivariant vertices  $V(T)$  (often called the action groupoid), it is immediate that an equivariant  $T$ -substitution datum is the same as a functor  $G \ltimes V(T) \rightarrow \Omega$  whose restriction to  $V(T) \subset G \ltimes V(T)$  is a (non-equivariant) substitution datum.

**Proposition 3.19.** Let  $T \in \Omega_G$  be a  $G$ -tree. There is an isomorphism of categories

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Sub}(T) &\xrightleftharpoons{\quad} \Omega_{G,T}^{\text{pt}} \\ \{U_{v_{Ge}}\} &\longmapsto (T \rightarrow \text{colim}_{\text{Sc}(T)} U_{(-)}) \end{aligned} \tag{3.20} \quad \boxed{\text{SUBDATAUNDERPLANG EQ}}$$

*Proof.* This is a minor adaptation of the non-equivariant analogue Proposition 3.19. Since  $\text{Sc}(T)$  inherits a  $G$ -action, one can form the Grothendieck construction  $G \ltimes \text{Sc}(T)$  and by Remark 3.18 equivariant substitution data  $\{U_{v_{Ge}}\}$  therefore induce functors  $U_{(-)}: G \ltimes \text{Sc}(T) \rightarrow \Omega$ . It is then immediate that  $\text{colim}_{\text{Sc}(T)} U_{(-)}$  inherits a  $G$ -action, provided it exists. The key observation is then that, since  $\text{Sc}(T)$  is now a disconnected poset, this colimit is to be interpreted as taken in the category  $\Phi$  of forests rather than in  $\Omega$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.21.** We will need to know that each of the maps

$$U_{v_{Ge}} \rightarrow U = \text{colim}_{\text{Sc}(T)} U_{(-)}$$

induced by the previous proof is a planar map of  $G$ -trees. This requires two observations: (i) the restrictions to each of the constituent non-equivariant trees  $U_{ge^\dagger \leq ge}$  is planar by Proposition 3.19; (ii) the restriction to the roots of  $U_{v_{Ge}}$  is injective and order preserving since it matches the inclusion of the roots of  $T_{v_{Ge}}$ , and the map  $T \rightarrow U$  is a planar map of  $G$ -trees.

### 3.3 Planar strings

The leaf-root and vertex functors will allow us to reinterpret our results concerning substitution.

**Definition 3.22.** The category  $\Omega_{G,n}$  of *substitution  $n$ -strings* is the category whose objects are strings

$$T_0 \xrightarrow{f_1} T_1 \xrightarrow{f_2} \dots \xrightarrow{f_n} T_n$$

where  $T_i \in \Omega_G$  and the  $f_i$  are tall planar maps, and arrows are commutative diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} T_0 & \xrightarrow{f_1} & T_1 & \xrightarrow{f_2} & \dots & \xrightarrow{f_n} & T_n \\ q_0 \downarrow & & q_1 \downarrow & & & & q_n \downarrow \\ T'_0 & \xrightarrow{f'_1} & T'_1 & \xrightarrow{f'_2} & \dots & \xrightarrow{f'_n} & T'_n \end{array} \quad (3.23)$$

PTNARROW EQ

where each  $q_i$  is a quotient map.

**Notation 3.24.** Since compositions of planar tall arrows are planar tall and identity arrows are planar tall it follows that  $\Omega_{G,\bullet}$  forms a simplicial object in  $\mathbf{Cat}$ , with faces given by composing and degeneracies by inserting identities.

Noting that  $\Omega_{G,0} = \Omega_G^q$  and setting  $\Omega_{G,-1} = \Sigma_G$ , the leaf-root functor  $\Omega_G^q \xrightarrow{\text{lr}} \Sigma_G$  makes  $\Omega_{G,\bullet}^q$  into an augmented simplicial object and, furthermore, the maps  $s_{-1}: \Omega_{G,n}^q \rightarrow \Omega_{G,n+1}^q$  sending  $T_0 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow T_n$  to  $\text{lr}(T_0) \rightarrow T_0 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow T_n$  equip it with extra degeneracies.

**Notation 3.25.** We extend the vertex functor to a functor  $V_G: \Omega_{G,n+1} \rightarrow \mathbf{F} \wr \Omega_{G,n}$  by

$$V_G(T_0 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow T_n) = (T_{1,v_{Ge}} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow T_{n,v_{Ge}})_{v_{Ge} \in V_G(T_0)} \quad (3.26)$$

VGDEF EQ

where we abuse notation by writing  $T_{i,v_{Ge}}$  for  $T_{i,(f_1 \circ \dots \circ f_i)(v_{Ge})}$ .

The following is a reinterpretation of Proposition 3.19.

**Proposition 3.27.** *The diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Omega_{G,n+1} & \xrightarrow{V_G} & \mathbf{F} \wr \Omega_{G,n} \\ d_{1,\dots,n+1} \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{Fid}_{0,\dots,n} \\ \Omega_{G,0} & \xrightarrow{V_G} & \mathbf{F} \wr \Sigma_G \end{array} \quad (3.28)$$

PTPULL EQ

is a pullback diagram in  $\mathbf{Cat}$ .

*Proof.* An object in the pullback (3.28) over  $T \in \Omega_{G,0} = \Omega_G^q$  is precisely the same as a  $n$ -string in  $\text{Sub}(T)$ , and thus by Proposition 3.19 equivalent to a  $n+1$  planar tall string starting at  $T$ .

The case of arrows is slightly more subtle. A quotient map  $\pi: T \rightarrow T'$  induces a  $G$ -equivariant poset map  $\pi_*: \mathbf{Sc}(T) \rightarrow \mathbf{Sc}(T')$  (or equivalently, a map of Grothendieck constructions  $G \ltimes \mathbf{Sc}(T) \rightarrow G \ltimes \mathbf{Sc}(T')$ ) and diagrams as on the left below (where  $v_{Ge}$  ranges over  $V_G(T)$  and  $e' = \varphi(e)$ ) induce diagrams (of functors  $\mathbf{Sc}(T) \rightarrow \Omega$ ) as on the right below.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
T_{v_{Ge}} & \longrightarrow & T_{1,v_{Ge}} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow T_{n,v_{Ge}} \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
T'_{v_{Ge'}} & \longrightarrow & T'_{1,v_{Ge'}} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow T'_{n,v_{Ge'}}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{ccc}
T_{(-)} & \longrightarrow & T_{1,(-)} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow T_{n,(-)} \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
T'_{(-)} \circ \pi_* & \longrightarrow & T'_{1,(-)} \circ \pi_* \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow T'_{n,(-)} \circ \pi_*
\end{array}
\tag{3.29}$$

Passing to colimits then gives the desired commutative diagram (3.23). Moreover, diagrams of the form (3.23) clearly induce diagrams as in (3.29) and it is straightforward to check that these are inverse processes.  $\square$

**Remark 3.30.** The diagrams (with back and lower slanted faces instances of (3.28))

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\Omega_{G,n+2} & \longrightarrow & F \wr \Omega_{G,n+1} \\
\downarrow & \searrow d_{i+1} & \downarrow \\
& \Omega_{G,n+1} & \longrightarrow F \wr \Omega_{G,n} \\
\downarrow & \swarrow & \downarrow \\
\Omega_{G,0} & \longrightarrow & F \wr \Sigma_G
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{ccc}
\Omega_{G,n+1} & \longrightarrow & F \wr \Omega_{G,n} \\
\downarrow & \searrow s_i & \downarrow \\
& \Omega_{G,n+2} & \longrightarrow F \wr \Omega_{G,n+1} \\
\downarrow & \swarrow & \downarrow \\
\Omega_{G,0} & \longrightarrow & F \wr \Sigma_G
\end{array}$$

commute whenever defined (i.e.  $0 \leq i \leq n+1$ ).

**Notation 3.31.** We will let

$$V_{G,n}: \Omega_{G,n} \rightarrow F \wr \Sigma_G$$

be inductively defined by  $V_{G,n} = \sigma_0 \circ V_{G,n-1} \circ V_G$ .

**Remark 3.32.** When  $n = 2$ ,  $V_{G,2}$  is thus the composite

$$\Omega_{G,2} \xrightarrow{V_G} F \wr \Omega_{G,1} \xrightarrow{V_G} F \wr F \wr \Omega_{G,0} \xrightarrow{V_G} F \wr F \wr F \wr \Sigma_G \xrightarrow{\sigma^0} F \wr F \wr \Sigma_G \xrightarrow{\sigma^0} F \wr \Sigma_G$$

In light of Remarks 2.45 and 3.14,  $V_{G,n}(T_0 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow T_n)$  is identified with the tuple

$$(T_n, v_{Ge})_{v_{Ge} \in V_G(T_n)}, \tag{3.33}$$

though this requires changing the total order in  $V_G(T_n)$ . Rather than using the order induced by  $T_n$ , one instead equips  $V_G(T_n)$  with the order induced lexicographically from the maps  $V_G(T_n) \rightarrow V_G(T_{n-1}) \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow V_G(T_0)$ , i.e., for  $v, w \in V_G(T_n)$  the condition  $v < w$  is determined by the lowest  $i$  such that the images of  $v, w \in V_G(T_i)$  are distinct.

### 3.4 A monad on spans

**Definition 3.34.** We will write  $\mathbf{WSpan}^l(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$  (resp.  $\mathbf{WSpan}^r(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ ), which we call the category of *left weak spans* (resp. *right weak spans*), to denote the category with objects the spans

$$\mathcal{C} \xleftarrow{k} A \xrightarrow{F} \mathcal{D},$$

arrows the diagrams as on the left (resp. right) below

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
& A_1 & \\
k_1 \swarrow & & \searrow F_1 \\
\mathcal{C} & & \mathcal{D} \\
k_2 \swarrow & \downarrow i & \searrow F_2 \\
& A_2 &
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{ccc}
& A_1 & \\
k_1 \swarrow & & \searrow F_1 \\
\mathcal{C} & & \mathcal{D} \\
k_2 \swarrow & \downarrow i & \searrow F_2 \\
& A_2 &
\end{array}
\tag{3.35}$$

which we write as  $(i, \varphi): (k_1, F_1) \rightarrow (k_2, F_2)$ , and composition given in the obvious way.

**Remark 3.36.** There are natural isomorphisms

$$\mathbf{WSpan}^r(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}) \simeq \mathbf{WSpan}^l(\mathcal{C}^{op}, \mathcal{D}^{op}). \quad (3.37)$$

LRSPANISO EQ

**Remark 3.38.** The terms *left/right* are motivated by the existence of adjunctions (which are seen to be equivalent by using (3.37))

$$\mathbf{Lan} : \mathbf{WSpan}^l(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}) \rightleftarrows \mathbf{Fun}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}) : \iota$$

$$\iota : \mathbf{Fun}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}) \rightleftarrows \mathbf{WSpan}^r(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})^{op} : \mathbf{Ran}$$

where the functors  $\iota$  denote the obvious inclusions (note the need for the  $(-)^{op}$  in the second adjunction) and  $\mathbf{Lan}/\mathbf{Ran}$  denote the left/right Kan extension functors.

We will mainly be interested in the span categories  $\mathbf{WSpan}^l(\Sigma_G^{op}, \mathcal{V}) \simeq \mathbf{WSpan}^r(\Sigma_G, \mathcal{V}^{op})$ .

**Notation 3.39.** Given a functor  $\pi : A \rightarrow \Sigma_G$ , we let  $\Omega_{G,n}^{(A)}$  denote the pullback (in  $\mathbf{Cat}$ )

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Omega_{G,n}^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{V_{G,n}^{(A)}} & \mathbf{F} \wr A \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Omega_{G,n} & \xrightarrow{V_{G,n}} & \mathbf{F} \wr \Sigma_G \end{array}$$

Explicitly, the objects of  $\Omega_{G,n}^{(A)}$  are pairs

$$(T_0 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow T_n, (a_{e^\dagger \leq e})_{(e^\dagger \leq e) \in V_G(T_n)}) \quad (3.40)$$

OMEGAGNA EQ

such that  $\pi(a_{e^\dagger \leq e}) = T_{n, e^\dagger \leq e}$ .

**Remark 3.41.** Our primary interest here will be in the  $\Omega_{G,0}^{(A)}$  construction. Importantly, the composite maps  $\Omega_{G,0}^{(A)} \rightarrow \Omega_{G,0} \rightarrow \Sigma_G$  allow us to iterate the  $\Omega_{G,0}^{(-)}$  construction. In practice, the role of higher strings  $\Omega_{G,n}^{(A)}$  will then be to provide more convenient models for iterated  $\Omega_{G,0}^{(-)}$  constructions.

Indeed, the content of Proposition 3.27 is then that there are compatible identifications  $\Omega_{G,0}^{(\Omega_{G,n}^{(A)})} \simeq \Omega_{G,n+1}$  which identify  $V_G^{(\Omega_{G,n}^{(A)})}$  with  $V_G$ .

Moreover, since all squares in the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \Omega_{G,n+1}^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{V_G^{(A)}} & \mathbf{F} \wr \Omega_{G,n}^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{F} \wr V_G^{(A)}} & \mathbf{F} \wr \mathbf{F} \wr A & \xrightarrow{\sigma^0} & \mathbf{F} \wr A \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Omega_{G,n+1} & \xrightarrow{V_G} & \mathbf{F} \wr \Omega_{G,n} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{F} \wr V_G} & \mathbf{F} \wr \mathbf{F} \wr \Sigma_G & \xrightarrow{\sigma^0} & \mathbf{F} \wr \Sigma_G \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & & & \\ \Omega_{G,0} & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{F} \wr \Sigma_G & & & & \end{array} \quad (3.42)$$

ALLSQUARES EQ

are pullback squares (the top center square is so by induction, the top right square by direct verification, the total top square by definition of  $\Omega_{G,n+1}^{(A)}$  and the bottom left square by

Proposition 3.27), we likewise obtain identifications  $\Omega_G^{(\Omega_{G,n}^{(A)})} \simeq \Omega_{G,n+1}^{(A)}$ .

**Proposition 3.43.** For any  $A \rightarrow \Sigma_G$  there are functors  $d_0^{(A)} : \Omega_{G,1}^{(A)} \rightarrow \Omega_G^{(A)}$  and natural isomorphisms

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \Omega_{G,1}^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{V_G} & \mathbf{F} \wr \Omega_G^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{F} \wr V_G} & \mathbf{F} \wr \mathbf{F} \wr A \\ d_0^{(A)} \downarrow & \nearrow \pi^{(A)} & & & \downarrow \sigma^0 \\ \Omega_G^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{V_G} & \mathbf{F} \wr A, & & \end{array} \quad (3.44)$$

SHUFFLEPERMA EQ

both natural in  $A \rightarrow \Sigma$ . Here naturality of  $\pi^{(-)}$  means that for a functor  $H: A \rightarrow B$  with corresponding diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \Omega_{G,1}^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{V_G^{(A)}} & F \wr \Omega_{G,0}^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{F \wr V_G^{(A)}} & F \wr F \wr A \\
 \downarrow \Omega_{G,1}^{(H)} & \searrow d_0^{(A)} & \swarrow \pi^{(A)} & \downarrow V_G^{(A)} & \downarrow \sigma^0 \\
 & & \Omega_{G,0}^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{V_G^{(A)}} & F \wr A \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow F \wr H \\
 \Omega_{G,1}^{(B)} & \xrightarrow{d_0^{(B)}} & F \wr \Omega_{G,0}^{(B)} & \xrightarrow{V_G^{(B)}} & F \wr F \wr B \\
 & & \swarrow \pi^{(B)} & \downarrow V_G^{(B)} & \downarrow \\
 & & \Omega_{G,0}^{(B)} & \xrightarrow{V_G^{(B)}} & F \wr B
 \end{array}
 \tag{3.45} \quad \text{PICUBOIDAB EQ}$$

one has an equality

$$(F \wr H) \pi^{(A)} = \pi^{(B)} \Omega_{G,1}^{(H)}$$

(i.e. the two natural isomorphisms between the two distinct functors  $\Omega_{G,1}^{(A)} \Rightarrow F \wr B$  coincide).

*Proof.* Informally, using the object description in (3.40),  $d_0^{(A)}$  is simply given by the formula

$$d_0^{(A)}(T_0 \rightarrow T_1, (a_{e^\dagger \leq e})_{(e^\dagger \leq e) \in V_G(T_1)}) = (T_1, (a_{e^\dagger \leq e})_{(e^\dagger \leq e) \in V_G(T_1)}), \tag{3.46} \quad \text{GENDO EQ}$$

though one must note that since in (3.40) the order in  $V_G(T_1)$  is induced lexicographically from the string, the two orders for  $V_G(T_1)$  in each side of (3.46) do not coincide.

It now follows that the composites  $\sigma^0 \circ (F \wr V_G^{(A)}) \circ V_G^{(A)}$  and  $V_G^{(A)} \circ d_0^{(A)}$  differ by the natural automorphism  $\pi^{(A)}$  given by the tuple permutations interchanging the two orders in  $V_G(T_1)$  for each  $T_0 \rightarrow T_1$ .

The commutativity of (3.45) is clear.  $\square$

**Definition 3.47.** Suppose  $\mathcal{V}$  has finite products.

We define an endofunctor  $N$  of  $\mathbf{Wspan}^r(\Sigma_G, \mathcal{V}^{op})$  by letting  $N(\Sigma_G \leftarrow A \rightarrow \mathcal{V}^{op})$  be the span  $\Sigma_G \leftarrow \Omega_G^{(A)} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}^{op}$  given composition along the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \Omega_{G,0}^{(A)} & \longrightarrow & F \wr A & \longrightarrow & F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} \xrightarrow{\Pi^{op}} \mathcal{V}^{op} \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 \Omega_{G,0} & \longrightarrow & F \wr \Sigma_G & & \\
 \downarrow & & & & \\
 \Sigma_G & & & & 
 \end{array}$$

and defined on maps of spans in the obvious way.

One has a multiplication  $\mu: N \circ N \Rightarrow N$  given by the natural isomorphisms

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 \Sigma & \longleftarrow & \Omega_{G,1}^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{V_G} & F \wr \Omega_G^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{F \wr V_G} & F \wr F \wr A \longrightarrow F \wr F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} \longrightarrow F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} \longrightarrow \mathcal{V}^{op} \\
 \parallel & & \downarrow d_0^{(A)} & \nearrow \pi^{(A)} & \downarrow \sigma^0 & \downarrow \sigma^0 & \nearrow \alpha \\
 \Sigma & \longleftarrow & \Omega_G^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{V_G} & F \wr A & \longrightarrow & F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} \longrightarrow \mathcal{V}^{op} \\
 & & & & & & \parallel
 \end{array}
 \tag{3.48} \quad \text{MULTDEFSPAN EQ}$$

where  $\alpha$  is an associativity isomorphism for the product  $\Pi$ . We note that naturality of  $\mu$  follows from the commutativity of (3.45).



Lastly, there is a unit  $\eta: id \Rightarrow N$  given by the strictly commutative diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 \Sigma & \longleftarrow & A & \xlongequal{\quad} & A & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{V}^{op} \xlongequal{\quad} \mathcal{V}^{op} \\
 \parallel & & \downarrow s_{-1}^{(A)} & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \parallel \\
 \Sigma & \longleftarrow & \Omega_G^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{V_G} & F \wr A & \longrightarrow & F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{V}^{op}.
 \end{array} \tag{3.49}$$

UNITSPAN EQ

MONSPAN PROP

**Proposition 3.50.**  $(N, \mu, \eta)$  form a monad on  $\mathbf{Wspan}^r(\Sigma_G, \mathcal{V}^{op})$ .

*Proof.* The natural transformation component of  $\mu \circ (N\mu)$  is given by the composite diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccc}
 \Omega_{G,2}^{(A)} & \rightarrow & F \wr \Omega_{G,1}^{(A)} & \rightarrow & F^{!2} \wr \Omega_G^{(A)} & \rightarrow & F^{!3} \wr A & \rightarrow & F^{!3} \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \rightarrow & F^{!2} \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \rightarrow & F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \rightarrow & \mathcal{V}^{op} \\
 d_1^{(A)} \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \swarrow F \wr \pi^{(A)} & & \downarrow \sigma^1 & & \downarrow \sigma^1 & & \swarrow F \wr \alpha & & \parallel & & \parallel \\
 \Omega_{G,1}^{(A)} & \rightarrow & F \wr \Omega_G^{(A)} & \rightarrow & F^{!2} \wr A & \rightarrow & F^{!2} \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \rightarrow & F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \rightarrow & \mathcal{V}^{op} & & \parallel & & \parallel \\
 d_0^{(A)} \downarrow & & \swarrow \pi^{(A)} & & \downarrow \sigma^0 & & \downarrow \sigma^0 & & \swarrow \alpha & & \parallel & & \parallel & & \parallel \\
 \Omega_G^{(A)} & \rightarrow & F \wr A & \rightarrow & F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \rightarrow & \mathcal{V}^{op} & & & & & & & & 
 \end{array} \tag{3.51}$$

ASSOCSPAN1 EQ

whereas the natural transformation component of  $\mu \circ (\mu N)$  is given by

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccc}
 \Omega_{G,2}^{(A)} & \rightarrow & F \wr \Omega_{G,1}^{(A)} & \rightarrow & F^{!2} \wr \Omega_G^{(A)} & \rightarrow & F^{!3} \wr A & \rightarrow & F^{!3} \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \rightarrow & F^{!2} \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \rightarrow & F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \rightarrow & \mathcal{V}^{op} \\
 d_0^{(A)} \downarrow & & \swarrow \pi(\Omega_G^{(A)}) & & \downarrow \sigma^0 & & \downarrow \sigma^0 & & \downarrow \sigma^0 & & \swarrow \alpha & & \parallel & & \parallel \\
 \Omega_{G,1}^{(A)} & \rightarrow & F \wr \Omega_G^{(A)} & \rightarrow & F^{!2} \wr A & \rightarrow & F^{!2} \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \rightarrow & F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \rightarrow & \mathcal{V}^{op} & & \parallel & & \parallel \\
 d_0^{(A)} \downarrow & & \swarrow \pi^{(A)} & & \downarrow \sigma^0 & & \downarrow \sigma^0 & & \swarrow \alpha & & \parallel & & \parallel & & \parallel \\
 \Omega_G^{(A)} & \rightarrow & F \wr A & \rightarrow & F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \rightarrow & \mathcal{V}^{op} & & & & & & & & 
 \end{array} \tag{3.52}$$

ASSOCSPAN2 EQ

That the rightmost sections of (3.51) and (3.52) coincide follows from compatibility of the associativity isomorphisms for  $\Pi^{op}$ .

For the leftmost sections, note first that, in either diagram, the top right and bottom left paths  $\Omega_{G,2}^{(A)} \rightarrow F \wr A$  differ only by the induced order on  $V_G(T_2)$  for each string  $T_0 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow T_2$ . More explicitly, the top right paths use the order induced lexicographically from the string  $T_0 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow T_2$  while the bottom left paths use the order induced exclusively by  $T_2$ . The two left sections then coincide since are both given by the permutation interchanging these orders, the only difference being that the intermediate stage of (3.51) uses the order induced lexicographically from  $T_0 \rightarrow T_2$  while (3.52) uses the order induced lexicographically from  $T_1 \rightarrow T_2$ .

As for unit conditions,  $\mu \circ (N\eta)$  is represented by

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 \Omega_G^{(A)} & \rightarrow & F \wr A & \xlongequal{\quad} & F \wr A & \rightarrow & F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} \xlongequal{\quad} F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}^{op} \\
 s_0^{(A)} \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \delta^1 & & \downarrow \delta^1 & \parallel & \parallel \\
 \Omega_{G,1}^{(A)} & \rightarrow & F \wr \Omega_G^{(A)} & \rightarrow & F^{!2} \wr A & \rightarrow & F^{!2} \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \rightarrow & F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}^{op} \\
 d_0^{(A)} \downarrow & & \swarrow \pi^{(A)} & & \downarrow \sigma^0 & & \downarrow \sigma^0 & \swarrow \alpha & \parallel \\
 \Omega_G^{(A)} & \rightarrow & F \wr A & \rightarrow & F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \rightarrow & \mathcal{V}^{op} & & 
 \end{array} \tag{3.53}$$

UNITSPAN1 EQ

while  $\mu \circ (\eta N)$  is represented by

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 \Omega_G^{(A)} & = & \Omega_G^{(A)} & \longrightarrow & F \wr A & \longrightarrow & F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} \longrightarrow \mathcal{V}^{op} = \mathcal{V}^{op} \\
 s_{-1}^{(A)} \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \delta^0 & & \downarrow \delta^0 \\
 \Omega_{G,1}^{(A)} & \longrightarrow & F \wr \Omega_G^{(A)} & \longrightarrow & F \wr F \wr A & \longrightarrow & F \wr F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} \longrightarrow F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} \longrightarrow \mathcal{V}^{op} \\
 d_0^{(A)} \downarrow & \nearrow \pi^{(A)} & & \downarrow \sigma^0 & & \downarrow \sigma^0 & \nearrow \alpha \\
 \Omega_G^{(A)} & \longrightarrow & F \wr A & \longrightarrow & F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{V}^{op}
 \end{array} \quad (3.54) \quad \text{UNITSPAN2 EQ}$$

It is straightforward to check that the composites of the left and right sections of both (3.53) and (3.54) are strictly commutative diagrams, and thus that (3.53) and (3.54) coincide.  $\square$  UNITSPAN1 EQ

### 3.5 The free genuine operad monad

Recalling that  $\mathbf{Wspan}^r(\Sigma_G, \mathcal{V}^{op}) \simeq \mathbf{Wspan}^l(\Sigma_G^{op}, \mathcal{V})$ , Proposition 3.50 and Remark 3.38 give an adjunction MONSPAN\_PROP RANLANADJ\_REM

$$\mathbf{Lan}: \mathbf{Wspan}^l(\Sigma_G^{op}, \mathcal{V}) \rightleftarrows \mathbf{Fun}(\Sigma_G^{op}, \mathcal{V}): \iota \quad (3.55) \quad \text{LANIOTAADJ EQ}$$

together with a monad  $N$  in the leftmost category  $\mathbf{Wspan}^l(\Sigma_G^{op}, \mathcal{V})$ . We now turn to showing that, under reasonable hypothesis on  $\mathcal{V}$ , the composite  $\mathbf{Lan} \circ N \circ \iota$  inherits a monad structure from  $N$ . The key will be to show that under such conditions the map  $\mathbf{Lan} \circ N \Rightarrow \mathbf{Lan} \circ N \circ \iota \circ \mathbf{Lan}$  is a natural isomorphism.

Recall that following Convention 2.18 our model for  $\mathbf{O}_G$  consists of totally ordered sets. One therefore has *root functors* PLANARCONV\_CON

$$\Omega_G^q \xrightarrow{r} \mathbf{O}_G, \quad \Sigma_G \xrightarrow{r} \mathbf{O}_G$$

sending each planar  $G$ -tree to its ordered orbital  $G$ -set of roots.

Root functors are compatible with the leaf-root functor and the inclusion, i.e. the following commute.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \Omega_G^q & \xrightarrow{lr} & \Sigma_G \\
 & \searrow r & \downarrow r \\
 & & \mathbf{O}_G
 \end{array}
 \quad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 \Sigma_G & \hookrightarrow & \Omega_G^q \\
 & \searrow r & \downarrow r \\
 & & \mathbf{O}_G
 \end{array} \quad (3.56) \quad \text{ROOTLEAFTROOTCOM EQ}$$

Moreover, the diagrams (3.56) possess some extra structure we will need to make use of. Indeed, both functors are split Grothendieck fibrations: given a map  $\varphi: A \rightarrow B$  in  $\mathbf{O}_G$  and  $G$ -tree  $T$  such that  $r(T) = B$  we can build a cartesian arrow  $\varphi^*(T) \rightarrow T$  by letting  $\varphi^*(T)$  to be the pullback  $G$ -tree together with the planariz structure on roots given by  $A$  and on non-equivariant nodes given by their image via  $\varphi^*(T) \rightarrow T$ . ROOTLEAFTROOTCOM EQ

It now follows that (3.56) are diagrams of split Grothendieck fibrations.

**Definition 3.57.** A split Grothendieck fibration  $A \xrightarrow{r} \mathbf{O}_G$  is called a *root fibration* and a split Grothendieck fibration diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 A & \longrightarrow & B \\
 & \searrow r & \downarrow r \\
 & & \mathbf{O}_G
 \end{array}$$

is called a *root fibration functor*.

The relevance of root fibrations is given by the following couple of lemmas.

**Lemma 3.58.** *If  $A \rightarrow \Sigma_G$  is a root fibration functor then so is  $\Omega_G^{(A)} \rightarrow \mathbf{O}_G$ , naturally in  $A$ .* ROOTFIBPULL LEM


*Proof.* We consider the pullback diagram below.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Omega_{G,0}^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{V_G^{(A)}} & \mathbf{F} \wr A \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Omega_{G,0} & \xrightarrow{V_G} & \mathbf{F} \wr \Sigma_G \end{array} \quad (3.59) \quad \boxed{\text{ROOTIMPLIESROOT EQ}}$$

The hypothesis that  $A \rightarrow \Sigma_G$  is root fibration implies that the rightmost map in (3.59) is a map of split Grothendieck fibrations over  $\mathbf{F} \wr \mathbf{O}_G$ .

Since the map  $V_G$  sends the chosen cartesian arrows in  $\Omega_{G,0}$  (over  $\mathbf{O}_G$ ) to chosen cartesian arrows of  $\mathbf{F} \wr \Sigma_G$  (over  $\mathbf{F} \wr \mathbf{O}_G$ ), the result follows.  $\square$

**Example 3.60.** Let  $G = \mathbb{Z}/8$ . The following exemplifies a pull back along the twist map  $\varphi: G/2G \rightarrow G/2G$  (i.e., accounting for order,  $\varphi$  is the permutation (12)), with the topmost representation of  $\varphi^*T$  maintaining the chosen generators for each edge orbit from  $T$  and the bottom representation choosing instead the generators to be minimal with regard to the planar structure.



(3.61)

We note that  $(\varphi^*(T))_{v_{Ge}} = \psi^*(T_{v_{Gb}})$  for  $\psi$  the permutation (13)(24) encoded by the composite identifications  $\{1, 2, 3, 4\} \simeq \{e, e+2, e+3, e+1\} \simeq \{b+1, b+3, b, b+2\} \simeq \{3, 4, 1, 2\}$ .

**Lemma 3.62.** Suppose that  $\mathcal{V}$  is complete and that  $A \rightarrow \Sigma_G$  is a root fibration. If the rightmost triangle in

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \Omega_{G,0}^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{V_G^{(A)}} & \mathbf{F} \wr A & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{V} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & \nearrow & \\ \Omega_{G,0} & \xrightarrow{V_G} & \mathbf{F} \wr \Sigma_G & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{V} \end{array} \quad (3.63)$$

is a right Kan extension diagram then so is the composite diagram.

*Proof.* Unpacking definitions using the pointwise formula for right Kan extensions ( $\frac{\text{McL}}{\text{X.3.1}}$ ), it suffices to check that for each  $T \in \Omega_{G,0}$  the functor

$$T \downarrow \Omega_{G,0}^{(A)} \rightarrow V_G(T) \downarrow \mathbf{F} \wr A \quad (3.64) \quad \boxed{\text{LANPULLCOMA EQ}}$$

is initial. In the course of the proof of Lemma 3.3 it was shown that the subcategory

$$\prod_{v_{Ge} \in V_G(T)} T_{v_{Ge}} \downarrow A$$

is initial in the  $V_G(T) \downarrow \mathbf{F} \wr A$ .

On the other hand, since  $\Omega_G^{(A)} \rightarrow \Omega_G$  is a root fibration functor,  $T \downarrow \Omega_G^{(A)}$  has an initial subcategory  $T \downarrow_{r,\simeq} \Omega_G^{(A)}$  with objects  $(S \in \Omega_G^{(A)}, T \rightarrow u(S))$  such that  $T \rightarrow u(S)$  is a quotient map that induces an ordered isomorphism on roots. Note that this can be restated as saying that  $T \rightarrow u(S)$  is an isomorphism preserving the order of the roots.

The result now follows from the natural isomorphism

$$T \downarrow_{r,\simeq} \Omega_G^{(A)} \simeq \prod_{v_{Ge} \in V_G(T)} T_{v_{Ge}} \downarrow_{r,\simeq} A. \quad (3.65)$$

TDOWNISOA EQ

To see this, we focus first on the case  $A = \Sigma_G$ . In that case, the left hand side of (3.65) encodes replanarizations of  $T$  that preserve the root order. On the other hand, the right hand side encodes replanarizations of all the  $G$ -vertices that preserve the order of their roots, or, equivalently, replanarizations of the non-equivariant vertices of  $T$ . That these are equivalent is the content of Proposition 2.13.

TDOWNISOA EQ

Note that  $(T \rightarrow S) \in (T \downarrow_{r,\simeq} \Omega_G)$  is then encoded by a tuple  $(T_{v_{Ge}} \rightarrow \varphi_{v_{Ge}}^* S_{v_{Ge}})_{v_{Ge} \in V_G(T)}$  where the pullbacks  $\varphi_{v_{Ge}}^*$  are needed to correct the root order.

The case of general  $A$  follows likewise, using the corresponding pullbacks  $\varphi_{v_{Ge}}^*$ .

**Note:** an addendum is needed to show that (3.65) suffices, since  $T \downarrow_{r,\simeq} \Omega_G^{(A)}$  is not sent directly to  $\prod_{v_{Ge} \in V_G(T)} T_{v_{Ge}} \downarrow_{r,\simeq} A$  □

TDOWNISOA EQ

Lemma 3.58 can be interpreted as saying that, if one defines a category  $\mathbf{Wspan}_r^l(\Sigma_G^{op}, \mathcal{V})$  of rooted spans

$$\Sigma_G^{op} \leftarrow A^{op} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$$

where  $A \rightarrow \Sigma_G$  is a root fibration functor, the monad  $N$  built in Proposition 3.50 lifts to a monad  $N_r$  in  $\mathbf{Wspan}_r^l(\Sigma_G^{op}, \mathcal{V})$ , and likewise for the adjunction (3.55).

MONSPAN PROP

LANIOTADJ EQ

**Corollary 3.66.** Suppose that finite products in  $\mathcal{V}$  commute with colimits in each variable. The functors

$$\mathbf{Lan} \circ N_r \Rightarrow \mathbf{Lan} \circ N_r \circ \iota \circ \mathbf{Lan}, \quad \mathbf{Lan} \circ \iota \Rightarrow id$$

are natural isomorphisms.

*Proof.* This follows by combining Lemma 3.62 with Lemma 3.3. □

LANPULLCOMA LEM

FINWREATPRODLIM LEM

**Definition 3.67.** The genuine equivariant operad monad is the monad  $\mathbb{F}_G$  on  $\mathbf{Fun}(\Sigma_G^{op}, \mathcal{V})$  given by

$$\mathbb{F}_G = \mathbf{Lan} \circ N_r \circ \iota$$

and with multiplication and unit given by the composites

$$\mathbf{Lan} \circ N_r \circ \iota \circ \mathbf{Lan} \circ N_r \circ \iota \xleftarrow{\simeq} \mathbf{Lan} \circ N_r \circ N_r \circ \iota \Rightarrow \mathbf{Lan} \circ N_r \circ \iota$$

$$id \xleftarrow{\simeq} \mathbf{Lan} \circ \iota \Rightarrow \mathbf{Lan} \circ N_r \circ \iota.$$

**Remark 3.68.** The functor  $\mathbf{Lan} \circ N_r \circ \iota$  is isomorphic to  $\mathbf{Lan} \circ N \circ \iota$ , and this isomorphism is compatible with the multiplication and unit in Definition 3.67, and we will henceforth simply write  $N$  rather than  $N_r$ .

THEMONAD DEF

From this point of view, the role of root fibrations is to guarantee that  $\mathbf{Lan} \circ N \circ \iota$  is indeed a monad, but unnecessary to describe the monad structure itself.

**Remark 3.69.** Since a map

$$\mathbb{F}_G X = \mathbf{Lan} \circ N_r \circ \iota X \rightarrow X$$

is adjoint to a map

$$N_r \circ \iota X \rightarrow \iota X$$

one easily verifies that  $X$  is a genuine equivariant operad, i.e. a  $\mathbb{F}_G$ -algebra, iff  $\iota X$  is a  $N$ -algebra. Moreover, the bar resolution

$$\mathbb{F}_G^{\bullet+1} X$$

is isomorphic to

$$\mathbf{Lan}(N^{\bullet+1} \iota X).$$

THEMONAD DEF

## 4 Free extensions

Our overall goal in this section will be to produce a description of free genuine operad pushouts, i.e. pushouts of the form

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{F}_G A & \longrightarrow & X \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbb{F}_G B & \longrightarrow & Y \end{array}$$

in the category  $\mathbf{Op}_G$  of genuine equivariant operads.

### 4.1 Extensions over general monads

Any monad  $T$  on  $\mathcal{C}$  one obtains induced monads  $T^{\times l}$  on  $\mathcal{C}^{\times l}$ , and we will make use of several standard relations between these. In particular, any map  $\alpha: \underline{l} \rightarrow \underline{m}$  induces a forgetful functor such that for the forgetful functor  $\alpha^*: \mathcal{C}^{\times l} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^{\times n}$  one has  $T^{\times l} \alpha^* \simeq \alpha^* T^{\times m}$ .

Indeed, we will need to make use of a slightly more general setup. Letting  $I$  denote the identity monad on  $\mathcal{C}$ , and  $K \subset \underline{m}$  be a subset, there is a monad  $T^{\times K} \times I^{\times(\underline{m}-K)}$  on  $\mathcal{C}^{\times m}$ , which we abusively denote simply as  $T^{\times K}$ . Identities then determine maps of monads  $T^J \rightarrow T^{\times K}$  whenever  $J \subset K$  and, moreover, there are identifications  $T^{\times \alpha^{-1}(K)} \alpha^* \simeq \alpha^* T^{\times K}$ . One then has the following.

**Proposition 4.1.** *The functor*

$$T^{\times \alpha^{-1}(K)} \Rightarrow \alpha^* T^{\times K} \alpha_! \quad (4.2)$$

MONADFUNCTORALPHA EQ

*adjoint to the identification  $T^{\times \alpha^{-1}(K)} \alpha^* \simeq \alpha^* T^{\times K}$  is a map of monads on  $\mathcal{C}^{\times n}$ .*

*Proof.* We first note that there are identifications of functors  $(FG)^{\times K} \simeq F^{\times K} G^{\times K}$  which are compatible with the identifications  $F^{\times \alpha^{-1}(K)} \alpha^* \simeq \alpha^* F^{\times K}$  in the sense that the identification  $(FG)^{\times \alpha^{-1}(K)} \circ \alpha^* \simeq \alpha^* (FG)^{\times K}$  matches the composite identification  $F^{\times \alpha^{-1}(K)} G^{\times \alpha^{-1}(K)} \alpha^* \simeq F^{\times \alpha^{-1}(K)} \alpha^* G^{\times K} \simeq \alpha^* F^{\times K} G^{\times K}$ .

Letting  $\eta, \epsilon$  denote the unit and counit for the  $(\alpha_!, \alpha^*)$  adjunction, (4.2) is then the composite

$$T^{\times \alpha^{-1}(K)} \xrightarrow{\eta} T^{\times \alpha^{-1}(K)} \alpha^* \alpha_! \simeq \alpha^* T^{\times K} \alpha_!.$$

That this is a monad map is the condition that the following multiplication and unit diagrams commute.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T^{\times \alpha^{-1}(K)} \circ T^{\times \alpha^{-1}(K)} & \longrightarrow & \alpha^* T^{\times K} \alpha_! \circ \alpha^* T^{\times K} \alpha_! \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ T^{\times \alpha^{-1}(K)} & \longrightarrow & \alpha^* T^{\times K} \alpha_! \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} I^{\times n} & & \\ \downarrow & \searrow & \\ T^{\times \alpha^{-1}(K)} & \longrightarrow & \alpha^* T^{\times K} \alpha_! \end{array}$$

We argue only the case of the leftmost multiplication diagram, with commutativity of the unit diagram following by a similar but simpler argument. Since the precomposition  $(-) \circ \alpha^*$  is the left adjoint to the precomposition  $(-) \circ \alpha_!$  this follows from the following diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} T^{\times \alpha^{-1}(K)} T^{\times \alpha^{-1}(K)} \alpha^* & \xrightarrow{\simeq} & T^{\times \alpha^{-1}(K)} \alpha^* T^{\times K} & \xrightarrow{\eta} & T^{\times \alpha^{-1}(K)} \alpha^* \alpha_! \alpha^* T^{\times K} & \xrightarrow{\simeq} & \alpha^* T^{\times K} \alpha_! \alpha^* T^{\times K} \\ \downarrow & & & \searrow & \downarrow \epsilon & & \downarrow \epsilon \\ & & & & T^{\times \alpha^{-1}(K)} \alpha^* T^{\times K} & \xrightarrow{\simeq} & \alpha^* T^{\times K} T^{\times K} \\ & & & & & & \downarrow \\ T^{\times \alpha^{-1}(K)} \alpha^* & \xrightarrow{\simeq} & & & & & \alpha^* T^{\times K} \end{array}$$

□

**Remark 4.3.** Since  $T^{\times K} \alpha_!$  is a right  $\alpha^* T^{\times K} \alpha_!$ -module, Proposition [MONADICFUN PROP 4.1](#) implies that it is also a right  $T^{\times \alpha^{-1}(K)}$ -module or, moreover, a right  $T^{\times J}$ -module whenever  $\alpha(J) \subset K$ .

**Remark 4.4.** Combining the precomposition and postcomposition adjunctions, the identification  $T^{\times \alpha^{-1}(K)} \alpha^* \simeq \alpha^* T^{\times K}$  is then adjoint to a functor  $\alpha_! T^{\times \alpha^{-1}(K)} \rightarrow T^{\times K} \alpha_!$  which is readily checked to be a map of right  $T^{\times \alpha^{-1}(K)}$ -modules.

More generally, for  $\alpha(J) \subset K$ , the composite  $T^{\times J} \alpha^* \rightarrow T^{\times \alpha^{-1}(K)} \alpha^* \simeq \alpha^* T^{\times K}$  is thus adjoint to a map of right  $T^{\times J}$ -modules

$$\alpha_! T^{\times J} \rightarrow T^{\times K} \alpha_!. \quad (4.5)$$

RIGHTMODULETMAP EQ

We now unpack the content of [RIGHTMODULETMAP EQ \(4.5\)](#) when  $\alpha: \underline{l} \rightarrow *$  is the unique map to the singleton  $* = \underline{1}$ . In this case we can instead write  $\alpha_! = \coprod$ ,  $\alpha^* = \Delta$ , and we thus have commutative diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \coprod_J TTA_j \sqcup \coprod_{\underline{n}-J} A_j & \longrightarrow & T(\coprod_J TA_j \sqcup \coprod_{\underline{n}-J} A_j) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \coprod_J TA_j \sqcup \coprod_{\underline{n}-J} A_j & \longrightarrow & T(\coprod_J A_j \sqcup \coprod_{\underline{n}-J} A_j) \end{array} \quad (4.6)$$

RIGHTMODULETMAPAUX EQ

where the vertical maps come from the right  $T^{\times J}$ -module structure. Writing  $\sqcup^a$  for the coproduct of  $T$ -algebras and recalling the canonical identifications  $\coprod_K^a (TA_k) \simeq T(\coprod_K A_k)$ , [RIGHTMODULETMAPAUX EQ \(4.6\)](#) in fact shows that the right  $T^{\times J}$ -module structure on  $T \circ \coprod$  in fact codifies the multiplication maps

$$\coprod_J^a TTA_j \sqcup^a \coprod_{\underline{l}-J}^a TA_j \rightarrow \coprod_J^a TA_j \sqcup^a \coprod_{\underline{l}-J}^a TA_j.$$

## 4.2 Labeled planar strings


We now translate the results in the previous section to the context of the monad  $N$  on  $\mathbf{WSpan}^l(\Sigma^{op}, \mathcal{V})$ . In analogy to the planar string models  $\Omega_{G,n}^{(A)}$  for iterations  $N^{on+1}$  of the monad  $N$ , we will find it convenient to build similar string models  $\Omega_{G,n}^{(\underline{A}_J)}$  for  $N \circ \coprod \circ (N^{\times J})^{on}$ .

**Definition 4.7.** A  $l$ -node labeled  $G$ -tree (or just  $l$ -labeled  $G$ -tree)  $G$ -tree is a pair  $(T, V_G(T) \rightarrow \{1, \dots, l\})$  with  $T \in \Omega_G$ , which we think of as a  $G$ -tree together with  $G$ -vertices labels in  $1, \dots, l$ .

Further, a map  $\varphi: T \rightarrow S$  between  $l$ -labeled trees is called a *label map* if for each  $G$ -vertex  $v_{Ge}$  of  $T$  with label  $j$ , the vertices of the subtree  $S_{v_{Ge}}$  are all labeled by  $j$ .

Lastly, given a subset  $J \subset \underline{l}$ , a planar label map  $\varphi: T \rightarrow S$  is said to be  $J$ -inert if for every  $G$ -vertex  $v_{Ge}$  of  $T$  with label  $j \in J$  it is  $S_{v_{Ge}} = T_{v_{Ge}}$ .

**Example 4.8.** Consider the 2-labeled trees below (for  $G = *$  the trivial group), with black nodes ( $\bullet$ ) denoting labels by the number 1 and white nodes ( $\circ$ ) labels by the number 2. The planar map  $\varphi$  (sending  $a_i \mapsto a$ ,  $b \mapsto b$ ,  $c \mapsto c$ ,  $d \mapsto d$ ,  $e \mapsto e$ ) is a label map which is  $\{1\}$ -inert.



(4.9)

SUBSDATUMTREESLAB EQ

**Definition 4.10.** Let  $0 \leq s \leq n$  and  $J \subset \underline{l}$  be a subset.

We define  $\Omega_{G,n,s}^J$  to have as objects  $n$ -planar strings

$$T_0 \xrightarrow{f_1} T_1 \xrightarrow{f_2} \dots \xrightarrow{f_s} T_s \xrightarrow{f_{s+1}} T_{s+1} \xrightarrow{f_{s+2}} \dots \xrightarrow{f_n} T_n \quad (4.11)$$

NSTRINGLAB EQ

together with  $l$ -labelings of  $T_s, T_{s+1}, \dots, T_n$  such that the  $f_r, r > s$  are  $(\underline{l} - J)$ -inert label maps.

Arrows in  $\Omega_{G,n,s}^J$  are quotients of strings  $(q_r: T_r \rightarrow T_r')$  such that  $q_r, r \leq s$  are label maps.

Informally,  $\Omega_{G,n,s}^l$  consists of  $n$ -strings such that trees and maps after  $T_s$  are  $l$ -labeled.

**Remark 4.12.** Our main case of interest will that of  $s = 0$ , in which case we abbreviate  $\Omega_{G,n}^J = \Omega_{G,n,0}^J$ . Indeed, such strings will suffice to build models for  $N \circ \coprod (N^{\times J})^{\text{on}}$

However, to unpack the right  $N^{\times J}$ -module structure as in Remark 4.3 one further needs to encode composites  $NN \circ \coprod (N^{\times J})^{\text{on}-1}$ , a role played by strings  $\Omega_{G,n,1}^J$ .

**Notation 4.13.** We will further write

$$\Omega_{G,n,-1}^J = \coprod_J \Omega_{G,n} \sqcup \coprod_{\underline{l}-J} \Sigma_G, \quad \Omega_{G,n,n+1}^J = \Omega_{G,n} \quad (4.14)$$

OMEGANMINUSONE EQ

To justify this convention, we note that a string as in (4.11) can be extended by prepending to it the map  $\text{lr}(T_0) = T_{-1} \xrightarrow{f_0} T_0$ . If one then attempts to define  $\Omega_{G,n,-1}^J$  by insisting that  $T_{-1}$  also be labeled, it follows that all node labels in each string must coincide, resulting in the coproduct decomposition in (4.14).

There are a number of obvious functors relating the  $\Omega_{G,n,s}^J$  categories, which we now make explicit. Given  $s \leq s'$  or  $J \subset J'$  there are forgetful functors

$$\Omega_{G,n,s}^J \rightarrow \Omega_{G,n,s'}^J \quad \Omega_{G,n,s}^J \rightarrow \Omega_{G,n,s}^{J'} \quad (4.15)$$

NKNFGT EQ

The simplicial operators in Notation 3.24 generalize to operators (where  $0 \leq i \leq n, -1 \leq j \leq n$ )

$$\begin{aligned} d_i: \Omega_{G,n,s}^J &\rightarrow \Omega_{G,n-1,s-1}^J & i < s & & s_j: \Omega_{G,n,s}^J &\rightarrow \Omega_{G,n+1,s+1}^J & j < s \\ d_i: \Omega_{G,n,s}^J &\rightarrow \Omega_{G,n-1,s}^J & s \leq i & & s_j: \Omega_{G,n,s}^J &\rightarrow \Omega_{G,n+1,s}^J & s \leq j \end{aligned}$$

which are compatible with the forgetful functors in the obvious way.

**Remark 4.16.** For  $J \subset J'$  the forgetful functor in (4.15) is a fully faithful inclusion. However, and somewhat subtly, this is not the case for the  $s \leq s'$  forgetful functors. Indeed, regarding  $T \rightarrow U$  in Examples 4.8 as an object in  $\Omega_{*,n,0}^2$ , changing the label of the  $a_1 \leq a_2$  vertex of  $T$  from a  $\circ$ -label to a  $\bullet$ -label yields an alternate object  $\bar{T} \rightarrow U$  of  $\Omega_{*,n,0}^2$  forgetting to the same object of  $\Omega_{*,n,1}^2$ , yet  $T \rightarrow U$  and  $\bar{T} \rightarrow U$  are not isomorphic.

We note that this is a consequence of the fact that substitution data can replace unary nodes by stumps, which have no nodes.

Generalizing Notation 3.31 there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Omega_{G,n,s}^J & \xrightarrow{V_{G,n}} & \text{F} \wr \Sigma_G^{\text{ul}} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Omega_{G,n} & \xrightarrow{V_{G,n}} & \text{F} \wr \Sigma_G \end{array}$$

where for a labeled string it is  $V_G(T_0 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow T_n) = (T_{n,v_{G_e}})_{V_G(T_n)}$ , where we regard  $T_{n,v_{G_e}} \in \Sigma_G^{\text{ul}} \simeq \Omega_{G,-1,-1}^l$  by using the label in  $1 \dots l$

We now expand Notation 3.39.

**Notation 4.17.** Let  $\underline{A}$  denote a  $\underline{l}$ -tuple  $(\pi_j: A_j \rightarrow \Sigma_G)_{\underline{l}}$  of categories over  $\Sigma_G$ . We define  $\Omega_{G,n,s}^{(\underline{A}),J}$  by the pullback diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Omega_{G,n,s}^{(\underline{A}),J} & \xrightarrow{V_{G,n}^{(\underline{A})}} & F \wr \coprod A_j \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Omega_{G,n,s}^J & \xrightarrow{V_{G,n}} & F \wr \Sigma_G^{\underline{l}} \end{array} \quad (4.18) \quad \boxed{\text{LTUPLEAPULL EQ}}$$

Explicitly, an object of  $\Omega_{G,n,s}^{(\underline{A}),J}$  consists of a labeled string  $T_0 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow T_n$  as in (4.11) together with a tuple  $(a_{v_{Ge}})_{v_{Ge} \in V_G(T_n)}$  such that  $a_{v_{Ge}} \in A_j$  if  $v_{Ge}$  has label  $j$  and  $\pi_j(a_{v_{Ge}}) = T_{n,v_{Ge}}$ .

The reader may have noticed a certain asymmetry between our definition of the  $V_{G,n}$  functors here versus their analogues in §3.3, where they were defined iteratively in terms of simpler functors  $V_G$ . This is because of the possibility that  $s = -1$ , in which case (4.14) applies and some caution is needed in that the following result fails.

**Proposition 4.19.** Suppose  $0 \leq s \leq n$ . One has a diagram of pullback squares (generalizing (3.42))

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \Omega_{G,n,s}^{(\underline{A}),J} & \xrightarrow{V_G^{(\underline{A})}} & F \wr \Omega_{G,n-1,s-1}^{(\underline{A}),J} & \xrightarrow{F \wr V_{G,n}^{(\underline{A})}} & F \wr F \wr \coprod A_j & \xrightarrow{\sigma^0} & F \wr \coprod A_j \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Omega_{G,n,s}^J & \xrightarrow{V_G} & F \wr \Omega_{G,n-1,s-1}^J & \xrightarrow{F \wr V_{G,n}} & F \wr F \wr \Sigma_G^{\underline{l}} & \xrightarrow{\sigma^0} & F \wr \Sigma_G^{\underline{l}} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & & & \\ \Omega_{G,0} & \xrightarrow{V_G} & F \wr \Sigma_G & & & & \end{array} \quad (4.20) \quad \boxed{\text{ALLSQUARESJ EQ}}$$

such that the composite of the top squares is (4.18).

*Proof.* The  $V_G$  functors are defined just as in (3.26) via the formula

$$V_G(T_0 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow T_n) = (T_{1,v_{Ge}} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow T_{n,v_{Ge}})_{v_{Ge} \in V_G(T_0)}$$

with the strings  $T_{1,v_{Ge}} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow T_{n,v_{Ge}}$  inheriting the extra structure in the obvious way.

Since the top composite square, top center square and top right square are all pullback squares, it remains only to show that the bottom left square is a pullback. This last claim is simply a variation of Proposition 3.27, and follows from the same proof, since both labels and inertness conditions are inherited when assembling substitution data into trees via Proposition 2.42.  $\square$

### 4.3 Bar constructions on spans

kk

HERE  
HERE

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \Omega_{1,0}^{(A \amalg B, A \amalg B)} & & F \wr (\Omega^{(A \amalg B)} \amalg \Omega^{(A \amalg B)}) & & \\ & \searrow & \downarrow & \searrow & \\ & \Omega_{1,1}^{(A \amalg B)} & & & F \wr \Omega^{(A \amalg B)} \\ \Omega_{1,0} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & F(\Omega \amalg \Omega) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & F \wr \Omega \\ & \searrow & \searrow & \searrow & \\ & \Omega_{1,1} & & & \end{array}$$



$$\Omega_2^{(A,B)} \longrightarrow \mathbf{F} \wr \left( \Omega_1^{(A)} \sqcup \Omega_1^{(B)} \right)$$

$$\Omega_2^{(A \sqcup B, A \sqcup B)} \longrightarrow \mathbf{F} \wr \left( \Omega_1^{(A \sqcup B)} \sqcup \Omega_1^{(A \sqcup B)} \right)$$

$$\Omega_2^{(A \sqcup B)} \longrightarrow \mathbf{F} \wr \Omega_1^{(A \sqcup B)}$$

## 5 Filtration of Cellular Extensions

As we saw above, we have the the free extension  $\mathcal{P}[u]$  given by the pushout

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{F}_G X & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{P} \\ u \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbb{F}_G Y & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{P}[u] \end{array}$$

can be built via Kan extensions over  $\Omega_{G,e}$ . Thus, in order to filter the map  $\mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}[u]$ , it will suffice, via naturality of Kan extensions, to filter the category  $\Omega_{G,e}$ .

We begin by analyzing the objects of this category. These are  $(\mathcal{P}; X, Y)$ -alternating  $G$ -trees  $T$ ; that is, an odd tree  $T$  with each odd vertex labeled by  $\mathcal{P}$ , and the even vertices labeled by either  $X$  or  $Y$ .

Adjusting the general notation of the previous section to this setting, given  $T \in \Omega_{G,e}$  we let  $V_{\mathcal{P}}(T)$ ,  $V_X(T)$ , and  $V_Y(T)$  denote the  $G$ -sets of vertices labeled by  $\mathcal{P}$ ,  $X$ , or  $Y$ , respectively, and  $V_{G,\mathcal{P}}(T)$  (and similarly) the set  $V_{\mathcal{P}}(T)/G$  of orbits. Further, let  $V_{G,in}(T) = V_{G,X}(T) \sqcup V_{G,Y}(T)$  denote the set of *inert* or *passive* nodes. Moreover, we let  $\mathbb{V}_{G,in}(T) \in \mathbf{F} \wr \mathcal{V}$  denote the map  $V_{G,in}(T) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$  which sends  $T_v$  to  $X(T_v)$  or  $Y(T_v)$ , depending on the labeling of the vertex  $v$ .

Further, we define the *degree* of  $T$ , denote  $|T|$ , to be the sum  $|T|_X + |T|_Y$ , where  $|T|_X$  is define by

$$|T|_X = \frac{|V_X(T)|}{|G.r|} = \sum_{G.v \in V_{G,X}(T)} \frac{|G.v|}{|G.r|}$$

where  $G.r$  is the root  $G$ -set of  $T$ , and similarly for  $|T|_Y$ . Intuitively,  $|T|_X$  is the number of  $X$ -labeled vertices in any (every) single tree component of  $T$ .

### 5.1 Filtration Pieces

We begin our filtration of  $\Omega_{G,e}$ .

**Definition 5.1.** We define subcategories of  $\Omega_G^e$ .

1. Let  $\Omega_G^e[\leq k]$  (respectively  $\Omega_G^e[k]$ ) be the full subcategory of  $\Omega_G^e$  spanned by trees  $T$  with  $|T| \leq k$  (respectively,  $|T| = k$ ).
2. Let  $\Omega_G^e[\leq k, -]$  (respectively  $\Omega_G^e[k, -]$ ) be the full subcategory of  $\Omega_G^e[\leq k]$  (respectively  $\Omega_G^e[k]$ ) spanned by trees  $T$  with  $|T|_Y \neq k$ .
3. Let  $\Omega_G^e[\leq k, 0]$  (respectively  $\Omega_G^e[k, 0]$ ) be the full subcategory of  $\Omega_G^e[\leq k]$  (respectively  $\Omega_G^e[k]$ ) spanned by trees  $T$  with  $|T|_X = 0$  (equivalently,  $|T|_Y = k$ ).
4. If  $\Xi$  is any of the above categories, and  $C \in \Sigma_G$ , let  $\Xi(C)$  denote the full subcategory of  $\Xi$  spanned by those trees  $T$  with  $val(T) \simeq C$ .

**Remark 5.2.** The categories  $\Omega_G^e[k]$  and  $\Omega_G^e[k, -]$  have only very limited morphisms, as there cannot be any “active substitutions”. Thus, any map  $S \rightarrow T$  in these categories just changes some  $Y$ -labelings into  $X$ -labelings, while the underlying  $(\mathcal{P}; Z)$ -alternating tree remains fixed (where here the one passive colour  $Z$  encompasses both  $Y$  and  $X$ ).

**Lemma 5.3.**  $\Omega_G^e[\leq k-1]^{op}$  is Lan-final in  $\Omega_G^e[\leq k, -]^{op}$  over  $\Sigma_G^{op}$ .


In order to prove this, we will first need a particular construction  $T \mapsto T_{\mathcal{P}}^{\wedge}$  on  $\Omega_{G,e}$ .

**Definition 5.4.** Given a  $(\mathcal{P}; X, Y)$ -alternating  $G$ -tree  $T$ , let  $T_{\mathcal{P}}^{\wedge}$  denote the  $(\mathcal{P}; Y)$ -alternating tree created from  $T$  by

1. relabelling at  $X$ -nodes  $\mathcal{P}$  (yielding a  $(\mathcal{P}, Y)$ -labeled tree); then
2. collapsing all connected components of  $\mathcal{P}$ -labeled nodes.

There is a unique planar-tall map  $\partial_{\mathcal{P}} : T_{\mathcal{P}}^{\wedge} \rightarrow T$ , and in fact this map factors through all maps of the form  $\partial_{\mathcal{P}} : S \rightarrow T$ .

**Example 5.5.** We observe that this construction is symmetric across all tree components, and hence, to give an example, it suffices to show what happens on a single component (i.e. when  $G = \{e\}$ ). Consider the  $(\mathcal{P}; X, Y)$ -alternating tree  $T$  below, where black nodes are  $\mathcal{P}$ -labeled, white nodes filled with  $\times$  are  $X$ -labeled, and empty white nodes are  $Y$ -labeled. After Step (1), we produce the tree  $T_{\mathcal{P}}^{\sim}$  in the middle, and collapsing connected  $\mathcal{P}$ -components yields the tree  $T_{\mathcal{P}}^{\wedge}$  on the right.



**Proof of Lemma 5.3.** MINUS\_LAN\_FINAL\_LEMMA Fix an arbitrary  $C \in \Sigma_G$ , and consider an element  $q_S : \text{val}(S) \leftarrow C$  in  $\Omega_G^e[\leq k, -]^{op} \downarrow C$  (so in particular  $S \in \Omega_G^e[\leq k, -]$ ). We must show that the overcategory

$$(\Omega_G^e[\leq k-1]^{op} \downarrow C) \downarrow (\text{val}(S) \leftarrow C)$$

is non-empty and connected. If in fact  $S \in \Omega_G^e[\leq k-1]$ , the result is immediate. Otherwise, consider the map

$$S_{\mathcal{P}}^{\wedge} \xrightarrow{\partial_{\mathcal{P}}} S.$$


Since  $|S|_Y \neq k$ ,  $|S_{\mathcal{P}}^{\wedge}| \leq k-1$ , and hence we have a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{val}(S) & \xleftarrow{\partial_{\mathcal{P}}} & \text{val}(S_{\mathcal{P}}^{\wedge}) \\ & \swarrow q_S \quad \searrow q_S & \\ & C & \end{array} \quad (5.6) \quad \boxed{\text{K-1\_LAN\_FINAL\_EQ1}}$$

showing that the desired overcategory is inhabited. Further, given any other element

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{val}(S) & \xleftarrow{f} & \text{val}(T) \\ & \swarrow q_T \quad \searrow q_S & \\ & C & \end{array} \quad (5.7) \quad \boxed{\text{K-1\_LAN\_FINAL\_EQ2}}$$

in the overcategory, consider the following zig-zag of maps connecting the objects  $(\frac{\mathbb{K}-1\_LAN\_FINAL\_EQ1}{5.6})$  and  $(\frac{\mathbb{K}-1\_LAN\_FINAL\_EQ2}{5.7})$ :



(5.8)

K-1\_LAN\_FINAL\_DIAGRAM

Here, we have omitted the notation “ $val$ ” from the top three rows. To understand this diagram, we first record that we have a factorization:

$$q_S = \tilde{q}_T q_T,$$

Then, if we let  $C_S = val(S) = val(S_P^\wedge)$  and  $C_T = val(T)$ , we have

$$C \xrightarrow{q_T} C_T \xrightarrow{\tilde{q}_T} C_S$$

and hence, by the unique factorization of maps in  $\Omega_{G,e}$ , a factorization

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C_T & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \tilde{q}_T^*(S_P^\wedge) \\ \tilde{q}_T \downarrow & & \downarrow \tilde{q}_T \\ C_S & \xrightarrow{\quad} & S_P^\wedge \end{array}$$

(where we are recording  $C \rightarrow val(S)$  as a planar-tall map  $C \rightarrow S$ ). A similar analysis shows that the top left trapezoid commutes.

The other regions also commute by a straightforward analysis. Indeed, the top right trapezoid commutes by unique factorization, and finally the middle triangle of  $\partial_P$  maps commutes since  $(\tilde{q}_T^* S)^\wedge = \tilde{q}_T^*(S_P^\wedge)$ .

Lastly, we must check that the middle two maps are in fact elements of the appropriate overcategory. This follows from the fact that  $S_P^\wedge$  and  $T$  have  $|-|_Y < k$ . Thus, the overcategory in question is connected, as desired.  $\square$

come back: define  $S_Y^\wedge$ .

N\_FINALITY\_LEMMA

**Lemma 5.9.**  $\Omega_G^e[k, 0]^{op}$  is Lan-final in  $\Omega_G^e[k]$  over  $\Sigma_G^{op}$ .

Similarly, we need a construction  $T \mapsto T_Y^\wedge$  in order to prove this lemma. However, in this case, the analogous notion is much simpler, as  $T_Y^\wedge$  has the same underlying  $(\mathcal{P}; Z)$ -alternating  $G$ -tree, but we just relabel all  $X$ -vertices as being  $Y$ -labeled.

*Proof of Lemma 5.9.* This follows analogously to Lemma 5.3, by replacing Diagram 5.8 with

ZERO\_LAN\_FINALITY\_LEMMA

MINUS\_LAN\_FINAL\_LEMMA

K-1\_LAN\_FINAL\_DIAGRAM

the diagram below:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & S & & \\
 & \nearrow \partial_Y & \uparrow \tilde{q}_T & \nwarrow f & \\
 & & \tilde{q}_T^*(S) & & \\
 & \nwarrow \partial_Y & \uparrow \partial_Y & \nearrow \partial_Y & \\
 S_Y^\wedge & \xleftarrow{\tilde{q}_T} & \tilde{q}_T^*(S_Y^\wedge) & \xrightarrow{\partial_Y} & T \\
 & \nwarrow q_S & \uparrow q_T & \nearrow q_T & \\
 & & C & & 
 \end{array}$$

□

Finally, we show that each layer  $\Omega_G^e[\leq k]$  can be built from  $\Omega_{G,e}[\leq k-1]$  via a pushout which attaches trees with precise degree  $k$ . While dealing with general pushouts of categories requires solving a “word problem” on morphisms, we will only work in cases where the problem collapses. We recall that, given a square of categories

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{A} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{C} \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 \mathcal{C} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{D}
 \end{array}$$

if the nerve of this square is a pushout in  $\mathbf{sSet}$ , then this is a pushout of categories (since the nerve is the inclusion of a reflective subcategory).

**Definition 5.10.** We call such squares *nervous pushouts* of categories.

If we further assume that the span of functors is built out of fully-faithful inclusions, these pushouts behave as nicely as possible with left Kan extensions.

**Lemma 5.11.** *Given any diagram in categories of the form*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{f} & \mathcal{C} & & \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow i & & \\
 \mathcal{B} & \xrightarrow{g} & \mathcal{D} & \xrightarrow{Y} & \mathcal{V} \\
 & & \downarrow j & & \\
 & & \mathcal{D} & & 
 \end{array}$$

such that the square is a nervous pushout of fully-faithful functors, then  $\text{Lan}_j Y$  is the pushout of the induced span

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \text{Lan}_{jif}(Yif) & \longrightarrow & \text{Lan}_{ji}(Yi) \\
 \downarrow & & \\
 \text{Lan}_{jg}(Yg) & & 
 \end{array}$$

*Proof.* By the universal property of left Kan extensions, it suffices to show that, for any functor  $Z : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ , the natural map

$$\mathcal{V}^{\mathcal{D}}(Y, Zj) \longrightarrow \mathcal{V}^{\mathcal{B}}(Yg, Zjg) \prod_{\mathcal{V}^{\mathcal{A}}(Yif, Zjif)} \mathcal{V}^{\mathcal{C}}(Yi, Zji)$$

is a bijection. These two sets give the same data: a collection of maps  $\Phi_b : Y(b) \rightarrow Z(b)$  and  $\Phi_c : Y(c) \rightarrow Z(c)$  for all  $b \in \mathcal{B}$  and  $c \in \mathcal{C}$ , such that  $\Phi_b = \Phi_c$  whenever  $b = c \in \mathcal{A}$ . In general, the compatibilites required on the right are less demanding. However, with the above assumptions, a map  $d \rightarrow d'$  in  $\mathcal{D}$  is *uniquely* a map in  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $\mathcal{B} \setminus \mathcal{A}$ , or  $\mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{A}$ , and thus all the necessary compatibilities are covered by (at least) one of the  $\{\Phi_b\}$  or  $\{\Phi_c\}$ . □

We can now build our category  $\Omega_{G,e}[\leq k]$  inductively.

**Lemma 5.12.**  $\Omega_G^e[\leq k]$  is isomorphic to the pushout below.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Omega_G^e[k, -] & \longrightarrow & \Omega_G^e[\leq k, -] \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Omega_G^e[k] & \longrightarrow & \Omega_G^e[\leq k] \end{array}$$

In fact, it is a nervous pushout of fully-faithful functors.

*Proof.* Since maps in  $\Omega_G^e$  can only increase  $|-|$  by adding  $|-|_X$ , if  $T$  is a tree with  $|T| = |T|_Y = k$ , then any other tree  $S \in \Omega_G^e$  connected to  $T$  via a zig-zag of maps must have  $|S| = k$ ; that is, if  $T \in \Omega_G^e[\leq k] \setminus \Omega_G^e[\leq k, -]$ , then the connected component of  $T$  is entirely contained in  $\Omega_G^e[k]$ . Conversely, if  $T \in \Omega_G^e[\leq k] \setminus \Omega_G^e[k]$ , the connected component of  $T$  is entirely contained in  $\Omega_G^e[\leq k, -]$ . Since the natural induced map

$$\Omega_G^e[k] \sqcup \Omega_G^e[\leq k, -] \rightarrow \Omega_G^e[\leq k]$$

is clearly full and surjective on objects, the result follows from the above discussion and the obvious fully-faithfulness of the span.  $\square$

Abusing notation, we will denote by  $N^e$  the restriction of that functor to any of the subcategories of  $\Omega_G^e$  in the above pushout square.

We can now define the sequencers which will make up our filtration of  $\mathcal{P}[u]$ :

**Definition 5.13.** Let  $\mathcal{P}_k$  denote the left Kan extension

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Omega_G^e[\leq k]^{op} & \xrightarrow{N^e} & \mathcal{V} \\ \text{\scriptsize val} \downarrow & \searrow \text{\scriptsize } \mathcal{P}_k & \\ \Sigma_G^{op} & & \end{array}$$

Note that by naturality of Lan, we have maps  $\mathcal{P}_{k-1} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_k$ .

## 5.2 Notation

Luis: should this be stated earlier when defining the categorical wreath products?

In order to state our filtration result, we will need to identify another categorical construction. This filtration will be built out of “pushout products over trees of maps of sequences”. This subsection is dedicated to making that statement precise.

**Definition 5.14.** Given a map  $u: Y_0 \rightarrow Y_1$  of  $G$ -symmetric sequences  $\mathcal{V}^{\Sigma_G^{op}}$ , and  $(A, D) \in \mathbf{F} \wr \Sigma_G$ , we borrow notation from [1] and define the functor

$$[u]^D : (0 \rightarrow 1)^A \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$$

as the composite

$$(0 \rightarrow 1)^A \rightarrow \mathbf{F} \wr \mathcal{V} \xrightarrow{x} \mathcal{V}$$

where the first map is defined on  $\xi : A \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  by

$$(a \mapsto \xi(a)) \mapsto (A, (a \mapsto Y_{\xi(a)}(D(a))))$$

We recall that, in a general category  $\mathcal{C}$ , a subcategory  $\mathcal{C}' \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  is called *convex* if whenever  $c' \in \mathcal{C}'$  and  $c \rightarrow c'$  is an arrow in  $\mathcal{C}$  then both  $c$  and the map are in  $\mathcal{C}'$ .

**Q\_DEFINITION**

**Definition 5.15.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a convex subcategory of  $(0 \rightarrow 1)^A$ . We define

$$Q_{\mathcal{C}}[u]^D := \text{colim}_{\mathcal{C}} [u]^D.$$

Moreover, given nested convex subcategories  $\mathcal{C}' \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ , we let

$$[u]^D \square_{\mathcal{C}'}^{\mathcal{C}} : Q_{\mathcal{C}'}[u]^D \rightarrow Q_{\mathcal{C}}[u]^D$$

denote the unique natural map.

In particular, if  $\mathcal{C}$  is the full “punctured cube” subcategory  $(0 \rightarrow 1)^A \setminus \{(1)_a\}$ , we simplify the notation as follows:

$$Q[u]^D := Q_{\mathcal{C}}[u]^D$$

$$[u]^{\square D} := [u]^D \square_{\mathcal{C}}^{(0 \rightarrow 1)^A} : Q[u]^D \rightarrow \bigotimes_{a \in A} Y_1(D(a)).$$

### 5.3 Filtration Result

We can now state our filtration of the cellular extension  $\mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}[u]$ .

**Theorem 5.16.** *Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a genuine  $G$ -operad, and suppose we are given a map of  $G$ -symmetric sequences  $u : Y_0 \rightarrow Y_1$ . Then we have a filtration in  $G$ -sequences of the cellular extension*

$$\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \text{colim}(\mathcal{P}_i) = \mathcal{P}[u],$$

where  $\mathcal{P}_{k-1} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_k$  is given by the pushout

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Lan}_{\Omega_{G,e}[k,-]^{op}} N^e & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{P}_{k-1} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{Lan}_{\Omega_{G,e}[k]^{op}} N^e & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{P}_k \end{array}$$

Levelwise, for each  $C \in \Sigma_G$ , in the underlying category  $\mathcal{V}^{G \times \Sigma^n}$ , we have a filtration on the evaluations at  $C$ , where  $\mathcal{P}_{k-1}(C) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_k(C)$  is given by the pushout

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \coprod_{[T] \in \Omega_{G,e}[k,0](C)/\simeq} \left( \bigotimes_{v \in V_{G,\mathcal{P}}(T)} \mathcal{P}(T_v) \otimes Q[u]^{\vee_{G,in}(T)} \right) \otimes_{\text{Aut}(T)} \text{Aut}(C) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{P}_{k-1}(C) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \coprod_{[T] \in \Omega_{G,e}[k,0](C)/\simeq} \left( \bigotimes_{v \in V_{G,\mathcal{P}}(T)} \mathcal{P}(T_v) \otimes \bigotimes_{v \in V_{G,in}(T)} Y_1(T_v) \right) \otimes_{\text{Aut}(T)} \text{Aut}(C) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{P}_k(C) \end{array}$$

where the left vertical map is the iterated box product

$$\coprod_{V_{G,\mathcal{P}}(T)} \square_{\mathcal{P}(T_v)} \iota_{\mathcal{P}(T_v)} \square[u]^{\square_{\vee_{G,in}(T)}},$$

$\iota_{\mathcal{P}(T_v)}$  is the canonical map  $\mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(T_v)$ , out of the initial object, and  $\Omega_{G,e}[k,0](C)$  is as in Definition 5.1.

**LAN\_PUSHOUT\_TREE\_FORMS\_DECOMP\_LEMMA**

*Proof.* Combining Lemmas 5.11 and 5.12, we have that  $\mathcal{P}_k$  can be computed as the pushout

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Lan}_{\Omega_{G,e}[k,-]^{op}} N^e & \longrightarrow & \text{Lan}_{\Omega_{G,e}[\leq k,-]^{op}} N^e \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{Lan}_{\Omega_{G,e}[k]^{op}} N^e & \longrightarrow & \text{Lan}_{\Omega_{G,e}[\leq k]^{op}} N^e := \mathcal{P}_k \end{array} \quad (5.17)$$

**FILTRATION\_LAN\_SQUARE**

MINUS LAN FINAL LEMMA

By Lemma 5.3, the top right corner can be identified with  $\mathcal{P}_{k-1}$ . Thus, it remains to identify the left hand side.

ZERO LAN FINALITY LEMMA

By Lemma 5.9, we may replace the bottom left corner with  $\text{Lan}_{\Omega_{G,e}[k,0]^{op}} N^e$ . Now, given  $T \in \Omega_{G,e}[k,0]$ , let  $[T]$  denote the isomorphism class of  $T$  in  $\Omega_{G,e}[k,0]$ . With this notation, the bottom left corner can further be identified with

$$\coprod_{[T] \in \Omega_{G,e}[k,0](C)/\sim} N^e(T) \otimes_{\text{Aut}(T)} \text{Aut}(C) = \coprod_{[T]} \left( \bigotimes_{v \in V_{G,\mathcal{P}}(T)} \mathcal{P}(T_v) \otimes \bigotimes_{v \in V_{G,Y}(T)} Y_1(T_v) \right) \otimes_{\text{Aut}(T)} \text{Aut}(C).$$

Next, we observe that the non-invertible morphisms of  $\Omega_{G,e}[k,-]^{op} \downarrow C$  are just those which change the labeling of some nodes from  $X$  to  $Y$ . Given  $S$  and  $T$  in  $\Omega_{G,e}[k,-]$ , write  $S \sim T$  if they are in the same path component, and again note that this implies  $|S| = |T|$ , and moreover that  $S$  and  $T$  forget to the same  $(\mathcal{P}; Z)$ -alternating tree. Denote the path component of  $T$  by  $(T)$ .

We note that the set of path components of those trees with  $\text{val}(T) = C$  is equal to the set of isomorphism classes in  $\Omega_{G,e}[k,0](C)$ , as both are just determined precisely by their underlying  $(\mathcal{P}; Z)$ -alternating tree.

To account for the  $\text{Aut}(C)$ -action on the indexing category, we note that each connected component of  $\Omega_{G,e}[k,-]^{op} \downarrow C$  has an action of  $\text{Aut}([T])$ . Thus, the top left corner of Diagram (5.17) can be identified with the image of the colimit map below:

$$\begin{array}{c} \coprod_{[T] \in \Omega_{G,e}[k](C)/\sim} \left( \coprod_{S \in (T) \setminus \{T\}} N^e(S) \right) \otimes_{\text{Aut}(T)} \text{Aut}(C) \\ \downarrow \text{colim} \\ \coprod_{[T]} \left( \bigotimes_{v \in V_{G,\mathcal{P}}(T)} \mathcal{P}(T_v) \otimes Q[u]^{\vee_{G,in}(T)} \right) \otimes_{\text{Aut}(T)} \text{Aut}(C) \end{array}$$

where  $Q[u]^{\vee_{G,in}(T)}$  is the source of the pushout product map defined in Definition 5.15. Q\_DEFINITION

Lastly, this left-side map is induced, via the naturality of Kan extensions, by an inclusion of categories, in particular the product of multiple inclusions of categories, each corresponding to the inclusion of a punctured cube into the full cube. Thus, after taking colimits, we have that the left-side map in Diagram (5.17) is in fact (multiple copies of) the pushout-product maps FILTRATION LAN SQUARE DIAGRAM

$$[u]^{\square_{\vee_{G,in}(T)}} : Q[u]^{\vee_{G,in}(T)} \rightarrow \bigotimes_{v \in V_{G,in}(T)} Y_1(T_v),$$

as desired.  $\square$

## References

- BM03 [1] C. Berger and I. Moerdijk. Axiomatic homotopy theory for operads. Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici, 78:805–831, 2003.
- McL [2] S. Mac Lane. Categories for the working mathematician, volume 5 of Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1998.
- Pe16b [3] L. A. Pereira. Equivariant dendroidal sets. Available at: <http://www.faculty.virginia.edu/luisalex/>, 2016.
- We12 [4] I. Weiss. Broad posets, trees, and the dendroidal category. Available at: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1201.3987>, 2012.