

# Genuine equivariant operads

Peter Bonventre, Luís A. Pereira

April 29, 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>2</b>  |
| <b>2</b> | <b>Basic definitions</b>  | <b>2</b>  |
| 2.1      | Grothendieck constructions . . . . .                              | 2         |
| 2.2      | Monads . . . . .  | 3         |
| <b>3</b> | <b>Planar and tall maps</b>                                       | <b>3</b>  |
| 3.1      | Planar structures . . . . .                                       | 3         |
| 3.2      | Outer faces and tall maps . . . . .                               | 7         |
| 3.3      | Substitution . . . . .  | 8         |
| <b>4</b> | <b>The genuine equivariant operad monad</b>                       | <b>11</b> |
| 4.1      | Wreath product over finite sets . . . . .                         | 11        |
| 4.2      | Equivariant leaf-root and vertex functors . . . . .               | 12        |
| 4.3      | Planar strings . . . . .  | 15        |
| 4.4      | A monad on spans . . . . .  | 17        |
| 4.5      | The free genuine operad monad . . . . .                           | 20        |
| 4.6      | Comparison with (regular) equivariant operads . . . . .           | 24        |
| <b>5</b> | <b>Free extensions</b>  | <b>26</b> |
| 5.1      | Extensions over general monads . . . . .                          | 26        |
| 5.2      | Labeled planar strings . . . . .                                  | 27        |
| 5.3      | Bar constructions on spans . . . . .                              | 29        |
| 5.4      | Transferring simplicial colimits of left Kan extensions . . . . . | 31        |
| 5.5      | The category of extension trees . . . . .                         | 35        |
| <b>6</b> | <b>Filtration of cellular extensions</b>                          | <b>40</b> |
| 6.1      | Filtration pieces . . . . .                                       | 40        |
| 6.2      | Notation . . . . .  | 42        |
| 6.3      | Filtration Result . . . . .                                       | 43        |

|          |  |           |
|----------|--|-----------|
| <b>7</b> | <b>Model Structures on Genuine Operads</b>         | <b>45</b> |
| 7.1      | Weak Indexing Systems . . . . .                    | 45        |
| 7.2      | Semi Model Structures on Genuine Operads . . . . . | 46        |
| 7.3      | True Model Structures . . . . .                    | 47        |
| 7.4      | Preservation of Cofibrant Objects . . . . .        | 47        |
| 7.5      | Cofibrant Symmetric Collections . . . . .          | 48        |
| 7.5.1    | $G$ -Operads . . . . .                             | 48        |

## 1 Introduction

No content yet.

## 2 Basic definitions

In this section we recall some definitions that will be used throughout.

### 2.1 Grothendieck constructions

Recall that for a diagram category  $\mathcal{D}$  and functor  $\mathcal{I}_\bullet$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D} &\xrightarrow{\mathcal{I}_\bullet} \mathbf{Cat} \\ d &\longmapsto \mathcal{I}_d \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

the (covariant) Grothendieck construction  $\mathcal{D} \ltimes \mathcal{I}_\bullet$  has objects pairs  $(d, i)$  with  $d \in \mathcal{D}$ ,  $i \in \mathcal{I}_d$  and arrows  $(d, i) \rightarrow (d', i')$  given by pairs

$$(f: d \rightarrow d', g: f_*(i) \rightarrow i'),$$

where  $f_*: \mathcal{I}_d \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_{d'}$  is a shorthand for the functor  $\mathcal{I}_\bullet(f)$ .

We now discuss a basic property of over and under categories that will be used in §5.4. TRANSFSIMP SEC

Given  $\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{C} \in \mathbf{Cat}$  and  $j \in \mathcal{J}$  we will let  $\mathcal{C}^{\downarrow j}$  denote the Grothendieck construction for the functor

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J} &\longrightarrow \mathbf{Cat} \\ i &\longmapsto \mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{J}(i, j)} \end{aligned}$$

Explicitly, an object of  $\mathcal{C}^{\downarrow j}$  is a pair  $(i, \mathcal{J}(i, j) \xrightarrow{\varphi} \mathcal{C})$  and an arrow  $(i, \varphi) \rightarrow (i', \varphi')$  is a pair  $(I: i \rightarrow i', \gamma: \varphi \circ I^* \rightarrow \varphi')$ .

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{J} \in \mathbf{Cat}$  be a small category and  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ . One then has adjunctions*

$$(- \downarrow j): \mathbf{Cat}_{/\mathcal{J}} \rightleftarrows \mathbf{Cat}: (-)^{\downarrow j}, \quad (j \downarrow -): \mathbf{Cat}_{/\mathcal{J}} \rightleftarrows \mathbf{Cat}: (-)^{j \downarrow}.$$

*Proof.* Since  $j \downarrow \mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{I}^{op} \downarrow j)^{op}$  by defining  $(\mathcal{C}^{j \downarrow}) = ((\mathcal{C}^{op})^{\downarrow j})^{op}$  one reduces to the leftmost adjunction.

Given  $\mathcal{I} \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathcal{J}$  and  $\mathcal{C}$  we will show that functors  $\mathcal{I} \downarrow j \xrightarrow{F} \mathcal{C}$  correspond to functors  $\mathcal{I} \xrightarrow{G} \mathcal{C}^{\downarrow j}$  over  $\mathcal{J}$ .

On objects,  $F$  associates to each pair  $(i, J: \pi(i) \rightarrow j)$  an object  $F(i, J) \in \mathcal{C}$ . One thus sets  $G(i) = (\pi(i), F(i, -))$  and these are clearly inverse processes.

On arrows  $F$  associates to  $(i, J' \circ \pi(I)) \xrightarrow{I} (i', J')$  an arrow  $F(i, J' \circ \pi(I)) \xrightarrow{F(I)} F(i', J')$ . One thus defines

$$G(I) = \left( \pi(i) \xrightarrow{\pi(I)} \pi(i'), F(i, (-) \circ \pi(i)) \xrightarrow{F(I)} F(i', -) \right)$$

and again it is clear that these are inverse processes. Finally, the fact that the associativity and unit conditions for  $F, G$  coincide is likewise clear.  $\square$

## 2.2 Monads

We will make multiple uses of the following straightforward result.

**Proposition 2.3.** *Let  $L:C \rightleftarrows D:R$  be an adjunction,  $T$  a monad on  $C$ , and suppose further that*

$$LR \xrightarrow{\epsilon} id_D, \quad LT \xrightarrow{\eta} LTRL$$

*are natural isomorphisms (so that in particular  $D$  is a reflexive subcategory of  $C$ ).*

*Then*

(i)  *$LTR$  is a monad, with multiplication and unit given by*

$$LTRLTR \xrightarrow{\eta^{-1}} LTTR \rightarrow LTR, \quad id_D \xrightarrow{\epsilon^{-1}} LR \rightarrow LTR;$$

(ii)  *$d \in D$  is a  $LTR$ -algebra iff  $Rd$  is a  $T$ -algebra;*

(iii) *there is an induced adjunction*

$$L: \mathbf{Alg}_T(C) \rightleftarrows \mathbf{Alg}_{LTR}(D): R.$$

## 3 Planar and tall maps

### 3.1 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 [8] and further worked out by the second author in [5]. We now define planar structures in this context.

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $T \in \Omega$  be a tree. A *planar structure* of  $T$  is an extension of the descandancy 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 3.2.** An example of a planar structure on a tree  $T$  follows, with  $\leq_r$  encoded by the number labels.



(3.3)

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 3.1 is equivalent to such choosing total orders for each of the sets of input edges. To do so, we first introduce some notation.

**Notation 3.4.** 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  $e$ .

INCOMPNOTOP

INPUTPATHS PROP

We will repeatedly use the following, which is a consequence of [Pe16b, Cor. 5.26].

**Lemma 3.5.** *If  $e \leq_d f$ ,  $e \leq_d f'$ , then  $f, f'$  are  $\leq_d$ -comparable.*

**Proposition 3.6.** *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,  $\bigvee_i e_i = \min(\bigcap_i I(e_i))$ .*

*Proof.* (a) is immediate from Lemma 3.5. To prove (b) we note that  $\min(\bigcap_i I(e_i))$  exists by (a), and that this is clearly the join  $\bigvee e_i$ .  $\square$

**Notation 3.7.** 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 3.8.** *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 3.5. 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 3.9.** *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.*

$$c = e_1 \vee e_2 \vee e_3 = e_i \vee e_j \quad (3.10)$$


TERNJOIN EQ

for some  $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$ , and (3.10) 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 3.8(a).  $\square$

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



**Notation 3.12.** 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 3.13.** *Let  $T \in \Omega$  be a tree. There is a bijection*

$$\begin{aligned} \{\text{planar structures } (T, \leq_p)\} &\longrightarrow \prod_{(a^\dagger \leq a) \in V(T)} \text{Ord}(a^\dagger) \\ \leq_p &\longmapsto (\leq_p \upharpoonright_{a^\dagger}) \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

PLANAR EQ

*Proof.* We will keep the setup of Proposition 3.8 throughout:  $e, f$  are  $\leq_d$ -incomparable edges and we write  $b = e \vee f$ .

We first show that (3.14) is injective, i.e. that the restrictions  $\leq_p|_a$  determine if  $e <_p f$  holds or not. If  $b_e^{\uparrow} <_p b_f^{\uparrow}$ , the relations  $e \leq_d b_e^{\uparrow} <_p b_f^{\uparrow} \geq_d f$  and Definition 3.1 imply it must be  $e <_p f$ . Dually, if  $b_f^{\uparrow} <_p b_e^{\uparrow}$  then  $f <_p e$ . Thus  $b_e^{\uparrow} <_p b_f^{\uparrow} \Leftrightarrow e <_p f$  and hence (3.14) is indeed injective.

To check that (3.14) is surjective, it suffices (recall that  $e, f$  are assumed  $\leq_d$ -incomparable) to check that defining  $e \leq_p f$  to hold iff  $b_e^{\uparrow} < b_f^{\uparrow}$  holds in  $b^{\uparrow}$  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  $e' <_p e <_p f$  and the planar condition, which is the case  $e <_p f \geq_d f'$ , follow from Proposition 3.8(c). Transitivity of  $\leq_p$  in the case  $e <_p f \leq_d f'$  follows since either  $e <_p f'$  or else  $e, f'$  are  $\leq_d$ -incomparable, in which case one can apply 3.8(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 3.9, either (i)  $e \vee f <_d c$ , in which case Proposition 3.9 implies  $c_e^{\uparrow} = c_f^{\uparrow}$  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  $c_e^{\uparrow} < c_f^{\uparrow} < c_g^{\uparrow}$  in  $c^{\uparrow}$  so that  $c_e^{\uparrow} \neq c_g^{\uparrow}$  and by Proposition 3.9 it is also  $e \vee g = c$  and transitivity follows.  $\square$

**Remark 3.15.** Definition 3.1 readily extends to forests  $F \in \Phi$ . The analogue of Proposition 3.13 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. [5, 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 §3.3 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 §3.2 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 3.16.** Some examples of standard models, i.e. objects of  $\Omega^s$ , follow (further, (3.3) can also be interpreted as such an example).



(3.17)

PLANAROMEGAEX1 EQ

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 3.18.** 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 3.15). 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 3.19.** To illustrate our convention, we consider the trees in Example 3.16.

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.



**Example 3.20.** 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 3.21.** 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. [Pe16b, Def. 5.28]) compatible with the planar structures  $\leq_p$ .

**Remark 3.22.** The need for the independence condition is justified by [Pe16b, 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 3.23.** Let  $F \xrightarrow{\varphi} G$  be an independent map in  $\Phi$  (or  $\Omega$ ,  $\Omega_G$ ,  $\Phi_G$ ). Then there is a unique factorization

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

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

*Proof.* We need to show that there is a unique planar structure  $\leq_p^{\bar{F}}$  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  $\varphi(e)$  are distinct. The result now follows from (the forest version of) Proposition 3.13: one simply orders each set  $e^\dagger$  and  $r_F$  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 3.24.** Proposition 3.23 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 (3.17), consider the map  $C \rightarrow T_1$  defined by  $1 \mapsto 1, 2 \mapsto 4, 3 \mapsto 2, 4 \mapsto 5$ .

**Remark 3.25.** 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.

## 3.2 Outer faces and tall maps

In preparation for our discussion of the substitution operation in §3.3, we now recall some basic notions and results concerning outer subtrees and tree grafting, as in [5, §5].

**Definition 3.26.** 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

$$f \leq_d e, \quad \forall_i e_i \not\leq_d f, \quad (3.27)$$

generating broad relations the relations  $f^\dagger \leq f$  for  $f$  satisfying (3.27) and  $\forall_i f \neq e_i$ , and planar structure pulled back from  $T$ .

**Remark 3.28.** 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 3.29.** 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

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \eta & \xrightarrow{v} & T_{\underline{g} \leq v} \\ v \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ T_{\underline{f}v \leq e} & \longrightarrow & T_{\underline{f}g \leq v} \end{array} \quad (3.30)$$

*Proof.* We first show (a). That  $T_{\underline{e} \leq e}$  is indeed a tree is the content of [5, 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 [5, 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 [5, 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 [5, Prop. 5.15].  $\square$

**Definition 3.31.** 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 [Pe16b, Cor. 5.24]

**Proposition 3.32.** 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 3.32 to give the following.

**Corollary 3.33.** Any map  $S \xrightarrow{\varphi} T$  in  $\Omega$  has a factorization, unique up to unique isomorphisms,

$$S \xrightarrow{\varphi^-} U \xrightarrow{\varphi^i} V \xrightarrow{\varphi^u} T \quad (3.34)$$

TRIPLEFACT EQ

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

*Proof.* The factorization (3.34) can be built by first performing the degeneracy-face decomposition and then performing the tall-outer decomposition on the face map.  $\square$


### 3.3 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 [Gr03, (3.30)]).

**Example 3.35.** 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

$$U = (((((U_6 \sqcup_a U_2)) \sqcup_a U_1) \sqcup_b U_3) \sqcup_d U_5) \sqcup_c U_4) \quad (3.36)$$

UFORMULA EQ



(3.37)

SUBSDATUMTREES EQ

We now consider the tree  $T$ , which is built by converting each  $U_i$  into the corolla  $\text{cor}_i(U_i)$  (cf. Remark 3.25), and then performing the same grafting operations as in (3.36).  $T$  can then be



regarded as encoding the combinatorics of the iterated grafting in (3.36), with alternative ways to reorder operations in (3.36) in bijection with ways to assemble  $T$  out of its nodes.

One can now therefore think of the iterated grafting (3.36) as being instead encoded by the tree  $T$  together with the (unique) planar tall maps  $\varphi_i$  below.

$$(3.38)$$

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 (3.38) can equivalently be repackaged using planar tall maps.

**Definition 3.39.** Let  $T \in \Omega$  be a tree.

A  $T$ -substitution datum is a tuple  $\{U_{e \uparrow \leq e}\}_{(e \uparrow \leq e) \in V(T)}$  together with tall maps  $T_{e \uparrow \leq e} \rightarrow U_{e \uparrow \leq e}$ .

Further, a map of planar  $T$ -substitution data  $\{U_{e \uparrow \leq e}\} \rightarrow \{V_{e \uparrow \leq e}\}$  is a tuple of tall maps  $\{U_{e \uparrow \leq e} \rightarrow V_{e \uparrow \leq e}\}$  compatible with the chosen maps.

Lastly, a substitution datum is called a *planar  $T$ -substitution datum* if the chosen maps are planar (so that  $\text{lr}(U_{e \uparrow \leq e}) = T_{e \uparrow \leq e}$ ) and a morphism of planar data is called a planar morphism if it consists of a tuple of planar maps.

**Definition 3.40.** Let  $T \in \Omega$ .

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

**Remark 3.41.** Note that the only maps in  $\text{Sc}(T)$  are inclusions of the form  $\eta_a \subset T_{e \uparrow \leq e}$ . In particular, there are no pairs of composable non-identity relations in  $\text{Sc}(T)$ .

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

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

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

$$\eta \xrightarrow{a} T_{e \uparrow \leq e} \rightarrow U_{e \uparrow \leq e}.$$

**Proposition 3.42.** Let  $T \in \Omega$  be a tree. There is an isomorphism of categories

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Sub}_p(T) &\xrightarrow{\quad} \Omega_{T|}^{\text{pt}} \\ \{U_{e \uparrow \leq e}\} &\longmapsto (T \rightarrow \text{colim}_{\text{Sc}(T)} U_{(-)}) \\ \{U_{\varphi(e \uparrow) \leq \varphi(e)}\} &\longleftarrow (T \xrightarrow{\varphi} U) \end{aligned} \quad (3.43)$$

SUBDATAUNDERPLAN EQ

where  $\text{Sub}_p(T)$  denotes the category of planar  $T$ -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.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \eta & \longrightarrow & \text{colim}_{\text{Sc}(R)} U_{(-)} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{colim}_{\text{Sc}(S)} U_{(-)} & \dashrightarrow & \text{colim}_{\text{Sc}(T)} U_{(-)} \end{array} \quad (3.44)$$

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 it now follows that (3.44) 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 (3.43) are inverse to each other is clear by the same inductive argument.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.45.** *Let  $T \in \Omega$  be a tree. There is an isomorphism of categories*

$$\text{Sub}(T) \xrightarrow{\sim} \Omega_{T|}^t \quad (3.46)$$

SUBDATAUNDERNONPL EQ

where  $\text{Sub}(T)$  denotes the category of  $T$ -substitution data and  $\Omega_{T|}^t$  the category of tall maps under  $T$ .

*Proof.* This is a consequence of Proposition 3.23 together with the previous result, with the functor  $\text{Sub}(T) \rightarrow \Omega_{T|}^t$  given by the same formula. Indeed, Proposition 3.13 can be restated as saying that isomorphisms  $T \rightarrow T'$  are in bijection with substitution data consisting of isomorphisms, and thus bijectiveness reduces to that in the previous result.  $\square$

**Remark 3.47.** It follows from the previous proof that, writing  $U = \text{colim}_{\text{Sc}(T)} U_{(-)}$ , one has

$$V(U) = \coprod_{(e^\dagger \leq e) \in V(T)} V(U_{e^\dagger \leq e}). \quad (3.48)$$

VERTEXDECOMP EQ

Alternatively, (3.48) 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  $f$ .

The following is a converse of sorts to Proposition 3.42.

**Proposition 3.49.** *Let  $U \in \Omega$  be a tree. Then:*

- (i) *given non stick outer subtrees  $U_i$  such that  $V(U) = \coprod_i V(U_i)$  there is a unique tree  $T$  and planar tall map  $T \rightarrow U$  such that  $\{U_i\} = \{U_{e^\dagger \leq e}\}$ ;*
- (ii) *given multiplicities  $m_e \geq 1$  for each edge  $e \in U$ , there is a unique planar degeneracy  $\rho: T \rightarrow U$  such that  $\rho^{-1}(e)$  has  $m_e$  elements;*
- (iii) *planar tall maps  $T \rightarrow U$  are in bijection with collections  $\{U_i\}$  of outer subtrees such that  $V(U) = \coprod_i V(U_i)$  and  $U_j$  is not an inner edge of any  $U_i$  whenever  $U_j \simeq \eta$  is a stick.*

*Proof.* We first show (i) by induction on the number of subtrees  $U_i$ . The base case  $\{U_i\} = \{U\}$  is immediate, setting  $T = \text{lr}(U)$ . Otherwise, letting  $e$  be edge that is both an inner edge of  $U$  and a root of some  $U_i$ , and one can form a pushout diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \eta & \xrightarrow{e} & V \\ e \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ W & \longrightarrow & U \end{array} \quad (3.50)$$

DECOMPPROOF EQ

inducing a nontrivial partition  $\{U_i\} = \{U_i|U_i \hookrightarrow V\} \sqcup \{U_i|U_i \hookrightarrow W\}$ . Existence of  $T \rightarrow U$  now follows from the induction hypothesis. For uniqueness, the condition that no  $U_i$  is a stick guarantees that  $T$  possesses a single inner edge mapping to  $e$ , and thus admits a compatible decomposition as in (3.50), and thus uniqueness too follows by the induction hypothesis.

For (ii), we argue existence by nested induction on the number of vertices  $|V(U)|$  and the sum of the multiplicities  $m_e$ . The base case  $|V(U)| = 0$ , i.e.,  $U = \eta$  is immediate. Otherwise, writing  $m_e = m'_e + 1$ , one can form a decomposition (3.50) where either  $|V(V)|, |V(W)| < |V(U)|$  or one of  $V, W$  is  $\eta$ , so that  $T \rightarrow U$  can be built via the induction hypothesis. For uniqueness, note first that by [5, Lemma 5.33] each pre-image  $\rho^{-1}(e)$  is linearly ordered and by the “further” claim in [5, Cor. 5.39] the remaining broad relations are precisely the pre-image of the non-identity relations in  $U$ , showing that the tree  $T$  is uniquely determined.

(iii) follows by combining (i) and (ii). Indeed, any planar tall map  $T \rightarrow U$  has a unique decomposition  $T \twoheadrightarrow \bar{T} \hookrightarrow U$  as a planar degeneracy followed by a planar inner face, and each of these maps is classified by the data in (b) and (a).  $\square$

TERFACEUNION LEM

**Lemma 3.51.** *Suppose  $T_1, T_2 \hookrightarrow T$  are two outer faces with at least one common edge  $e$ . Then there exists a unique outer face  $T_1 \cup T_2$  such that  $V(T_1 \cup T_2) = V(T_1) \cup V(T_2)$ .*

*Proof.* If either of  $T_1, T_2$  is the root or a leaf the result is obvious. Otherwise, one can necessarily choose  $e$  to be an inner edge of  $T$ , in which case all of  $T_1, T_2, T$  admit compatible decompositions (3.50) and the result follows by induction on  $|V(T)|$ .  $\square$

## 4 The genuine equivariant operad monad

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

### 4.1 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 3.18 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 4.1.** For a category  $\mathcal{C}$ , we let  $\mathbf{F} \wr \mathcal{C}$  denote the opposite of the Grothendieck construction for the functor

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

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 4.2.** *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.*

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

WREATPRODLIM LEM

**Lemma 4.3.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{E}$  is a bicomplete category such that coproducts commute with limits in each variable. If the leftmost diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{F} & \mathcal{E} \\ k \downarrow & \nearrow \eta & \uparrow G \\ \mathcal{D} & & \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} \mathbf{F} \wr \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{F \wr F} & \mathbf{F} \wr \mathcal{E} & \xrightarrow{\Pi} & \mathcal{E} \\ F \wr k \downarrow & \nearrow F \wr \eta & \uparrow F \wr G & \searrow \Pi \circ F \wr G & \\ \mathbf{F} \wr \mathcal{D} & & & & \end{array} \quad (4.4)$$

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

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{C}^{op} & \xrightarrow{F} & \mathcal{E} \\
 \downarrow k & \swarrow \epsilon & \nearrow G \\
 \mathcal{D}^{op} & & 
 \end{array}
 \quad
 \begin{array}{ccccc}
 (\mathbf{F} \wr \mathcal{C})^{op} & \xrightarrow{(\mathbf{F} \wr F^{op})^{op}} & (\mathbf{F} \wr \mathcal{E}^{op})^{op} & \xrightarrow{\Pi} & \mathcal{E} \\
 (\mathbf{F} \wr k^{op})^{op} \downarrow & \swarrow & \searrow (\mathbf{F} \wr G^{op})^{op} & & \\
 (\mathbf{F} \wr \mathcal{D})^{op} & \xrightarrow{\Pi \circ (\mathbf{F} \wr G^{op})^{op}} & & & 
 \end{array}
 \quad (4.5) \quad \boxed{\text{WRLAN EQ}}$$

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 ( $\text{McL [4, X.3.1]}$ ), the claim concerning  $\text{WRLAN EQ}$  amounts to showing that for each  $(d_i) \in \mathbf{F} \wr \mathcal{D}$  one has natural isomorphisms

$$\lim_{((d_i) \rightarrow (kc_j)) \in ((d_i) \downarrow \mathbf{F} \wr \mathcal{C})} \left( \coprod_j F(c_j) \right) \simeq \coprod_i \lim_{(d_i \rightarrow kc_i) \in d_i \downarrow \mathcal{C}} (F(c_i)). \quad (4.6) \quad \boxed{\text{POINTKAN EQ}}$$

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  $(d_i) \downarrow \mathbf{F} \wr \mathcal{C}$ , we see that it is an initial subcategory. Therefore

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

and hence  $\text{POINTKAN EQ}$  (4.6) now follows from the assumption that coproducts commute with limits in each variable.  $\square$

**Notation 4.7.** Using the coproduct functor  $\mathbf{F}^{i2} = \mathbf{F}^{i\{0,1\}} = \mathbf{F} \wr \mathbf{F} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{F}$  (where  $\coprod_{i \in I} J_i$  is ordered lexicographically) and the simpleton  $\{1\} \in \mathbf{F}$  one can regard the collection of categories  $\mathbf{F}^{i\{0, \dots, n\}} \wr \mathcal{C} = \mathbf{F}^{in} \wr \mathcal{C}$  as a coaugmented cosimplicial object in  $\mathbf{Cat}$ . As such, we will denote by

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

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

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

the codegeneracies obtained by applying the coproduct  $\mathbf{F}^{i2} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{F}$  to adjacent  $\mathbf{F}$  coordinates.

## 4.2 Equivariant leaf-root and vertex functors

**Definition 4.8.** 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 4.9.** 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 4.10.** 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 4.11.** Generalizing Remark 3.25,  $\text{lr}(T)$  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 4.12.** One consequence of the fact that planarizations can not be pushed forward along tree maps (cf. Remark 3.24) is that  $\text{lr}: \Omega_G^q \rightarrow \Sigma_G$  is not a categorical fibration. **maybe add to this.**

**Definition 4.13.** 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 4.14.** Following Remark 3.47, 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

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_G^q &\xrightarrow{V_G} \mathbf{F}\wr \Sigma_G \\ T &\longmapsto (T_{v_{Ge}})_{v_{Ge} \in V_G(T)}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.15} \quad \boxed{\text{VFUNCTOR EQ}}$$

**Remark 4.16.** 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 3.39 now immediately generalizes. Here a map is called *rooted* if it induces an ordered isomorphism on the root orbit.

**Definition 4.17.** Let  $T \in \Omega_G$  be a  $G$ -tree.

A *rooted (resp. planar)  $T$ -substitution datum* is a tuple  $\{U_{v_{Ge}}\}_{v_{Ge} \in V_G(T)}$  together with rooted (resp. planar) tall maps  $T_{v_{Ge}} \rightarrow U_{v_{Ge}} = T_{v_{Ge}}$ .

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

**Remark 4.18.** To establish the equivariant analogue of Proposition 3.42 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 4.19.** Let  $T \in \Omega_G$  be a  $G$ -tree. There are isomorphisms of categories

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Sub}_p(T) &\xleftrightarrow{\quad} \Omega_{G,T}^{\text{pt}} & \text{Sub}_r(T) &\xleftrightarrow{\quad} \Omega_{G,T}^{\text{rt}} \\ \{U_{v_{Ge}}\} &\longmapsto (T \rightarrow \text{colim}_{\text{Sc}(T)} U_{(-)}) & \{U_{v_{Ge}}\} &\longmapsto (T \rightarrow \text{colim}_{\text{Sc}(T)} U_{(-)}) \end{aligned} \tag{4.20} \quad \boxed{\text{SUBDATAUNDERPLANG EQ}}$$

*Proof.* This is a minor adaptation of the non-equivariant analogues Proposition 4.19 and Corollary 3.45. Since  $\text{Sc}(T)$  inherits a  $G$  action, one can form the Grothendieck construction  $G \ltimes \text{Sc}(T)$  and by Remark 4.18 equivariant substitution data  $\{U_{v_{Ge}}\}$  therefore induce functors

$U_{(-)}: G \ltimes \mathbf{Sc}(T) \rightarrow \Omega$ . It is then immediate that  $\text{colim}_{\mathbf{Sc}(T)} U_{(-)}$  inherits a  $G$ -action, provided it exists. The key observation is then that, since  $\mathbf{Sc}(T)$  is now a disconnected poset, this colimit is to be interpreted as taken in the category  $\Phi$  of forests rather than in  $\Omega$ .

Additionally, we note that the need to use rooted data comes from the fact that rooted isomorphisms  $T \rightarrow T'$  are in bijection with rooted substitution data that are given by isomorphisms, a statement that fails in the absence of the rooted condition.  $\square$

**Remark 4.21.** We will need to know that in the planar case each of the maps

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

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  $U_{ge! \leq ge}$  is planar by Proposition 4.19; (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.

**Remark 4.22.** The isomorphisms in Proposition 4.19 are compatible with root pullback of trees. More concretely, any pullback  $\pi: S = \varphi^* T \rightarrow T$  induces pullbacks  $\pi_{Ge}: S_{v_{Ge}} \rightarrow T_{v_{Ge}}$  for  $v_{Ge} \in V_G(S)$  and one has commutative diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Sub}_p(S) & \xrightleftharpoons{\quad} & \Omega_{G,S}^{\text{pt}} \\ (\pi_{Ge}) \uparrow & & \uparrow \pi^* \\ \text{Sub}_p(T) & \xrightleftharpoons{\quad} & \Omega_{G,T}^{\text{pt}} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \text{Sub}_r(S) & \xrightleftharpoons{\quad} & \Omega_{G,S}^{\text{rt}} \\ (\pi_{Ge}) \uparrow & & \uparrow \pi^* \\ \text{Sub}_r(T) & \xrightleftharpoons{\quad} & \Omega_{G,T}^{\text{rt}} \end{array} \quad (4.23)$$

### 4.3 Planar strings

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

**Definition 4.24.** 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

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} T_0 & \xrightarrow{f_1} & T_1 & \xrightarrow{f_2} & \dots & \xrightarrow{f_n} & T_n \\ q_0 \downarrow & & q_1 \downarrow & & & & q_n \downarrow \\ T'_0 & \xrightarrow{f'_1} & T'_1 & \xrightarrow{f'_2} & \dots & \xrightarrow{f'_n} & T'_n \end{array} \quad (4.25)$$

where each  $q_i$  is a quotient map.

**Notation 4.26.** 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 4.27.** We extend the vertex functor to a functor  $V_G: \Omega_{G,n+1} \rightarrow \mathbf{F} \wr \Omega_{G,n}$  by

$$V_G(T_0 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow T_n) = (T_{1,v_{Ge}} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow T_{n,v_{Ge}})_{v_{Ge} \in V_G(T_0)} \quad (4.28)$$

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

The following is a reinterpretation of Proposition 4.19.

SUBSASPULL PROP

**Proposition 4.29.** *The diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Omega_{G,n+1} & \xrightarrow{V_G} & F \wr \Omega_{G,n} \\ d_{1,\dots,n+1} \downarrow & & \downarrow F \wr d_{0,\dots,n} \\ \Omega_{G,0} & \xrightarrow{V_G} & F \wr \Sigma_G \end{array} \quad (4.30)$$

PTPULL EQ

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

*Proof.* An object in the pullback (4.30) over  $T \in \Omega_{G,0} = \Omega_G^q$  is precisely the same as a  $n$ -string in  $\mathbf{Sub}(T)$ , and thus by Proposition 4.19 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.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T_{v_{Ge}} \rightarrow T_{1,v_{Ge}} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow T_{n,v_{Ge}} & T_{(-)} \rightarrow T_{1,(-)} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow T_{n,(-)} \\ \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \\ T'_{v_{Ge'}} \rightarrow T'_{1,v_{Ge'}} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow T'_{n,v_{Ge'}} & T'_{(-)} \circ \pi_* \rightarrow T'_{1,(-)} \circ \pi_* \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow T'_{n,(-)} \circ \pi_* \end{array} \quad (4.31)$$

PTNARROWLOC EQ

Passing to colimits then gives the desired commutative diagram (4.25). Moreover, diagrams of the form (4.25) clearly induce diagrams as in (4.31) and it is straightforward to check that these are inverse processes.  $\square$

DSCOM REM

**Remark 4.32.** The diagrams (with back and lower slanted faces instances of (4.30))

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

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

INDVNG NOT

**Notation 4.33.** 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 4.34.** 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 3.47 and 4.14,  $V_{G,n}(T_0 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow T_n)$  is identified with the tuple

$$(T_{n,v_{Ge}})_{v_{Ge} \in V_G(T_n)}, \quad (4.35)$$

VGNISO EQ

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  $V_G(T_n) \rightarrow V_G(T_{n-1}) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow V_G(T_0)$ , 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.



## 4.4 A monad on spans

WSPAN DEF

**Definition 4.36.** 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

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & A_1 & \\ k_1 \swarrow & & \searrow F_1 \\ \mathcal{C} & i \downarrow & \mathcal{D} \\ k_2 \swarrow & \Downarrow \varphi & \nearrow F_2 \\ & A_2 & \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & A_1 & \\ k_1 \swarrow & & \searrow F_1 \\ \mathcal{C} & i \downarrow & \mathcal{D} \\ k_2 \swarrow & \Downarrow \varphi & \nearrow F_2 \\ & A_2 & \end{array} \quad (4.37)$$

TWISTEDARROWRIGHT EQ

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

**Remark 4.38.** There are natural isomorphisms

$$\mathbf{WSpan}^r(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}) \simeq \mathbf{WSpan}^l(\mathcal{C}^{op}, \mathcal{D}^{op}). \quad (4.39)$$

LRSPANISO EQ

**Remark 4.40.** The terms *left/right* are motivated by the existence of adjunctions (which are seen to be equivalent by using (4.39))

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

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

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 4.41.** 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

$$(T_0 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow T_n, (a_{e^\dagger \leq e})_{(e^\dagger \leq e) \in V_G(T_n)}) \quad (4.42)$$

OMEGAGNA EQ

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

**Remark 4.43.** 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 4.29 is then that there are compatible identifications  $\Omega_{G,0}^{(\Omega_{G,n})} \simeq \Omega_{G,n+1}$  which identify  $V_G^{(\Omega_{G,n})}$  with  $V_G$ .

Moreover, since all squares in the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \Omega_{G,n+1}^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{V_G^{(A)}} & \mathbf{F} \wr \Omega_{G,n}^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{F} \wr V_{G,n}^{(A)}} & \mathbf{F} \wr \mathbf{F} \wr A & \xrightarrow{\sigma^0} & \mathbf{F} \wr A \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Omega_{G,n+1} & \xrightarrow{V_G} & \mathbf{F} \wr \Omega_{G,n} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{F} \wr V_{G,n}} & \mathbf{F} \wr \mathbf{F} \wr \Sigma_G & \xrightarrow{\sigma^0} & \mathbf{F} \wr \Sigma_G \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Omega_{G,0} & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{F} \wr \Sigma_G & & & & \end{array} \quad (4.44)$$

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

**Proposition 4.45.** *For any  $A \rightarrow \Sigma_G$  there are functors  $d_0^{(A)}: \Omega_{G,1}^{(A)} \rightarrow \Omega_G^{(A)}$  and natural isomorphisms*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \Omega_{G,1}^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{V_G} & \mathbf{F} \wr \Omega_G^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{F} \wr V_G} & \mathbf{F} \wr \mathbf{F} \wr A \\ d_0^{(A)} \downarrow & & \swarrow \pi^{(A)} & & \downarrow \sigma^0 \\ \Omega_G^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{V_G} & \mathbf{F} \wr A, & & \end{array} \quad (4.46) \quad \text{SHUFFLEPERMA EQ}$$

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

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \Omega_{G,1}^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{V_G^{(A)}} & \mathbf{F} \wr \Omega_{G,0}^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{F} \wr V_G^{(A)}} & \mathbf{F} \wr \mathbf{F} \wr A & \xrightarrow{\sigma^0} & \mathbf{F} \wr A \\ \Omega_{G,1}^{(H)} \downarrow d_0^{(A)} \searrow & & \downarrow & \swarrow \pi^{(A)} & \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathbf{F} \wr H \\ \Omega_{G,1}^{(B)} & \xrightarrow{V_G^{(B)}} & \mathbf{F} \wr \Omega_{G,0}^{(B)} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{F} \wr V_G^{(B)}} & \mathbf{F} \wr \mathbf{F} \wr B & \xrightarrow{\sigma^0} & \mathbf{F} \wr B \\ d_0^{(B)} \searrow & & \downarrow & \swarrow \pi^{(B)} & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Omega_{G,1}^{(B)} & \xrightarrow{V_G^{(B)}} & \mathbf{F} \wr \Omega_{G,0}^{(B)} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{F} \wr V_G^{(B)}} & \mathbf{F} \wr \mathbf{F} \wr B & \xrightarrow{\sigma^0} & \mathbf{F} \wr B \end{array} \quad (4.47) \quad \text{PICUBOIDAB EQ}$$

one has an equality

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

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

*Proof.* Informally, using the object description in (4.42),  $d_0^{(A)}$  is simply given by the formula

$$d_0^{(A)}(T_0 \rightarrow T_1, (a_{e \dagger \leq e})_{(e \dagger \leq e) \in V_G(T_1)}) = (T_1, (a_{e \dagger \leq e})_{(e \dagger \leq e) \in V_G(T_1)}), \quad (4.48) \quad \text{GENDO EQ}$$

though one must note that since in (4.42) 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 (4.48) do not coincide.

It now follows that the composites  $\sigma^0 \circ (\mathbf{F} \wr V_G^{(A)}) \circ V_G^{(A)}$  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 (4.47) is clear.  $\square$

**Definition 4.49.** 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

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

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

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\Sigma & \longleftarrow & \Omega_{G,1}^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{V_G} & F \wr \Omega_G^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{F \wr V_G} & F \wr F \wr A \longrightarrow F \wr F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} \longrightarrow F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} \longrightarrow \mathcal{V}^{op} \\
\parallel & & d_0^{(A)} \downarrow & \nearrow \pi^{(A)} & \downarrow \sigma^0 & \downarrow \sigma^0 & \nearrow \alpha \\
\Sigma & \longleftarrow & \Omega_G^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{V_G} & F \wr A & \longrightarrow & F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} \longrightarrow \mathcal{V}^{op}
\end{array}
\quad (4.50)$$

MULTDEFSPAN EQ

where  $\alpha$  is an associativity isomorphism for the product  $\Pi$ . We note that naturality of  $\mu$  follows from the commutativity of (H.47).

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

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\Sigma & \longleftarrow & A & \xlongequal{\quad} & A & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{V}^{op} \xlongequal{\quad} \mathcal{V}^{op} \\
\parallel & & s_{-1}^{(A)} \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\Sigma & \longleftarrow & \Omega_G^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{V_G} & F \wr A & \longrightarrow & F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} \longrightarrow \mathcal{V}^{op}.
\end{array}
\quad (4.51)$$

UNITSPAN EQ

MONSPAN PROP

**Proposition 4.52.**  $(N, \mu, \eta)$  form a monad on  $\mathcal{Wspan}^r(\Sigma_G, \mathcal{V}^{op})$ .

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

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccc}
\Omega_{G,2}^{(A)} & \rightarrow & F \wr \Omega_{G,1}^{(A)} & \rightarrow & F^{i2} \wr \Omega_G^{(A)} & \rightarrow & F^{i3} \wr A & \rightarrow & F^{i3} \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \rightarrow & F^{i2} \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \rightarrow & F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \rightarrow & \mathcal{V}^{op} \\
d_1^{(A)} \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \nearrow F \wr \pi^{(A)} & & \downarrow \sigma^1 & & \downarrow \sigma^1 & & \nearrow F \wr \alpha & & \parallel & & \parallel \\
\Omega_{G,1}^{(A)} & \rightarrow & F \wr \Omega_G^{(A)} & \rightarrow & F^{i2} \wr A & \rightarrow & F^{i2} \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \rightarrow & F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \rightarrow & \mathcal{V}^{op} \\
d_0^{(A)} \downarrow & & \nearrow \pi^{(A)} & & \downarrow \sigma^0 & & \downarrow \sigma^0 & & \nearrow \alpha & & \parallel \\
\Omega_G^{(A)} & \rightarrow & F \wr A & \rightarrow & F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \rightarrow & \mathcal{V}^{op}
\end{array}
\quad (4.53)$$

ASSOCSPAN1 EQ

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

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccc}
\Omega_{G,2}^{(A)} & \rightarrow & F \wr \Omega_{G,1}^{(A)} & \rightarrow & F^{i2} \wr \Omega_G^{(A)} & \rightarrow & F^{i3} \wr A & \rightarrow & F^{i3} \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \rightarrow & F^{i2} \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \rightarrow & F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \rightarrow & \mathcal{V}^{op} \\
d_0^{(A)} \downarrow & & \nearrow \pi^{(A)} & & \downarrow \sigma^0 & & \downarrow \sigma^0 & & \downarrow \sigma^0 & & \nearrow \alpha & & \parallel & & \parallel \\
\Omega_{G,1}^{(A)} & \rightarrow & F \wr \Omega_G^{(A)} & \rightarrow & F^{i2} \wr A & \rightarrow & F^{i2} \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \rightarrow & F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \rightarrow & \mathcal{V}^{op} \\
d_0^{(A)} \downarrow & & \nearrow \pi^{(A)} & & \downarrow \sigma^0 & & \downarrow \sigma^0 & & \nearrow \alpha & & \parallel \\
\Omega_G^{(A)} & \rightarrow & F \wr A & \rightarrow & F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \rightarrow & \mathcal{V}^{op}
\end{array}
\quad (4.54)$$

ASSOCSPAN2 EQ

That the rightmost sections of (4.53) and (4.54) 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 (4.53) uses the order induced lexicographically from  $T_0 \rightarrow T_2$  while (4.54) uses the order induced lexicographically from  $T_1 \rightarrow T_2$ .

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

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\Omega_G^{(A)} & \longrightarrow & F \wr A & = & F \wr A & \longrightarrow & F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} = F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} \longrightarrow \mathcal{V}^{op} \\
s_0^{(A)} \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \delta^1 & & \downarrow \delta^1 & & \parallel & & \parallel \\
\Omega_{G,1}^{(A)} & \longrightarrow & F \wr \Omega_G^{(A)} & \longrightarrow & F^2 \wr A & \longrightarrow & F^2 \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \longrightarrow & F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{V}^{op} \\
d_0^{(A)} \downarrow & \nearrow \pi^{(A)} & & \downarrow \sigma^0 & & \downarrow \sigma^0 & \nearrow \alpha & & \parallel & & \parallel \\
\Omega_G^{(A)} & \longrightarrow & F \wr A & \longrightarrow & F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{V}^{op}
\end{array} \tag{4.55}$$

UNITSPAN1 EQ

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

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\Omega_G^{(A)} & = & \Omega_G^{(A)} & \longrightarrow & F \wr A & \longrightarrow & F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} \longrightarrow \mathcal{V}^{op} = \mathcal{V}^{op} \\
s_{-1}^{(A)} \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \delta^0 & & \downarrow \delta^0 & & \parallel & & \parallel \\
\Omega_{G,1}^{(A)} & \longrightarrow & F \wr \Omega_G^{(A)} & \longrightarrow & F \wr F \wr A & \longrightarrow & F \wr F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \longrightarrow & F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{V}^{op} \\
d_0^{(A)} \downarrow & \nearrow \pi^{(A)} & & \downarrow \sigma^0 & & \downarrow \sigma^0 & \nearrow \alpha & & \parallel & & \parallel \\
\Omega_G^{(A)} & \longrightarrow & F \wr A & \longrightarrow & F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{V}^{op}
\end{array} \tag{4.56}$$

UNITSPAN2 EQ

It is straightforward to check that the composites of the left and right sections of both (4.55) and (4.56) are strictly commutative diagrams, and thus that (4.55) and (4.56) coincide.  $\square$

## 4.5 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 4.52 and Remark 4.40 give an adjunction

$$\mathbf{Lan} : \mathbf{Wspan}^l(\Sigma_G^{op}, \mathcal{V}) \rightleftarrows \mathbf{Fun}(\Sigma_G^{op}, \mathcal{V}) : \iota \tag{4.57}$$

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 3.18 our model for  $\mathbf{O}_G$  consists of totally ordered sets. One therefore has *root functors*

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

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.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\Omega_G^q & \xrightarrow{lr} & \Sigma_G \\
& \searrow r & \downarrow r \\
& & \mathbf{O}_G
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{ccc}
\Sigma_G & \hookrightarrow & \Omega_G^q \\
& \searrow r & \downarrow r \\
& & \mathbf{O}_G
\end{array} \tag{4.58}$$

ROOTLEAFTROOTCOM EQ

Moreover, the diagrams (4.58) 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 planar structure on roots given by  $A$  and on non-equivariant nodes given by their image via  $\varphi^*(T) \rightarrow T$ .

It now follows that (4.58) are diagrams of split Grothendieck fibrations.

One advantage of split Grothendieck fibrations (in general) is the following initiality condition on overcategories.

**Definition 4.59.** Suppose we have two split fibrations  $r : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$  and  $r : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$  and a map of fibrations  $f$  as below.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{f} & \mathcal{D} \\ & \searrow r & \swarrow r \\ & \mathcal{E} & \end{array}$$

For any  $d \in \mathcal{D}$ , let  $d \downarrow_r \mathcal{C}$  denote the subcategory of  $d \downarrow \mathcal{C}$  of just those maps  $d \rightarrow f(c)$  which map to the identity under  $r$ .

**Lemma 4.60.** *In the above scenario,  $d \downarrow_r \mathcal{C}$  is initial in  $d \downarrow \mathcal{C}$ .*

*Proof.* We must show that the appropriate iterated overcategories are non-empty and connected. To that end, suppose we have a map  $\phi : d \rightarrow f(c)$  in  $\mathcal{D}$ , and let  $q := r(\phi) : r(d) \rightarrow r(c)$ . Since  $\mathcal{C}$  is fibrant over  $\mathcal{E}$ , we have a Cartesian arrow  $q' : c' \rightarrow c$  lifting  $q : r(d) = r(c') \rightarrow r(c)$ . Thus we have diagrams in  $\mathcal{E}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  of the form

$$\begin{array}{ccc} r(d) & \xrightarrow{id} & r(c') \\ & \searrow r(\phi) & \downarrow q \\ & & r(c) \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} d & \xrightarrow{\exists!} & f(c') \\ & \searrow \phi & \downarrow f(q') \\ & & f(c) \end{array}$$

As  $f$  preserves Cartesian arrows,  $f(q')$  is Cartesian, and hence we have a unique lifting  $p(\phi) : d \rightarrow f(c')$  of  $r(d) = r(c')$ . Thus the iterated overcategory is inhabited.

To show it is connected, any other factorization  $d \xrightarrow{\psi} f(c'') \rightarrow f(c)$  such that  $r(\psi) = id$ , we can again use the fact that  $q'$  is Cartesian to produce a lift  $f(c';) \rightarrow f(c')$  of  $r(c'') = r(c')$ ; by uniqueness of the map  $d \rightarrow f(c')$ , we have that the diagram below commutes, finishing the proof.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & d & & \\ & \swarrow \exists! & & \searrow \psi & \\ f(c') & & & & f(c'') \\ & \swarrow f(q') & & \searrow & \\ & & f(c) & & \end{array}$$

□

**Remark 4.61.** The above proof can be easily modified to show that  $d \downarrow_r \mathcal{C}$  is in fact a coreflective subcategory of  $d \downarrow \mathcal{C}$ , with  $\phi \mapsto p(\phi)$  the reflection.

Luis: to actually show this would take just as long - functoriality and the fact that the inclusion is a left adjoint both require unique liftings/factorizations

**Definition 4.62.** A split Grothendieck fibration  $A \xrightarrow{r} \mathcal{O}_G$  is called a *root fibration* and a split Grothendieck fibration diagram

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

is called a *root fibration functor*.

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

**Lemma 4.63.** *If  $A \rightarrow \Sigma_G$  is a root fibration functor then so is  $\Omega_G^{(A)} \rightarrow \Omega_G$ , naturally in  $A$ .*


*Proof.* We consider the pullback diagram below.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Omega_{G,0}^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{V_G^{(A)}} & \mathbf{F} \wr A \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Omega_{G,0} & \xrightarrow{V_G} & \mathbf{F} \wr \Sigma_G \end{array} \quad (4.64) \quad \boxed{\text{ROOTIMPLIESROOT EQ}}$$

The hypothesis that  $A \rightarrow \Sigma_G$  is root fibration implies that the rightmost map in (4.64) 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 4.65.** 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.



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

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \Omega_{G,0}^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{V_G^{(A)}} & \mathbf{F} \wr A & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{V} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & \nearrow & \uparrow \\ \Omega_{G,0} & \xrightarrow{V_G} & \mathbf{F} \wr \Sigma_G & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{V} \end{array} \quad (4.68)$$

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

$$T \downarrow \Omega_{G,0}^{(A)} \rightarrow V_G(T) \downarrow \mathbf{F} \wr A \quad (4.69) \quad \boxed{\text{LANPULLCOMA EQ}}$$

is initial. In the course of the proof of Lemma 4.3 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

$$T \downarrow_{r,\simeq} \Omega_G^{(A)} \simeq \prod_{v_{Ge} \in V_G(T)} T_{v_{Ge}} \downarrow_{r,\simeq} A. \quad (4.70)$$

TDOWNISOA EQ

To see this, we focus first on the case  $A = \Sigma_G$ . In that case, the left hand side of (4.70) 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 3.13.

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 (4.70) 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 4.63 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 4.52 lifts to a monad  $N_r$  in  $\mathbf{Wspan}_r^l(\Sigma_G^{op}, \mathcal{V})$ , and likewise for the adjunction (4.57).

MONSPAN PROP

LANIOTADJ EQ

**Corollary 4.71.** 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 4.67 with Lemma 4.3. □

LANPULLCOMA LEM

FINWREATPRODLIM LEM

**Definition 4.72.** 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

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

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

**Remark 4.73.** 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 4.72, 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 4.74.** 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

REPACKAGERES REM

## 4.6 Comparison with (regular) equivariant operads

We start by noting that in the case  $G = *$ , genuine operads simply recover the usual notion of symmetric operads, i.e.  $\mathbf{Sym}_*(\mathcal{V}) \simeq \mathbf{Sym}(\mathcal{V})$  and  $\mathbf{Op}_*(\mathcal{V}) \simeq \mathbf{Op}(\mathcal{V})$ , and in what follows we will adopt the notations  $\mathbf{Sym}^G(\mathcal{V})$  and  $\mathbf{Op}^G(\mathcal{V})$  for the corresponding categories of  $G$ -objects. Our goal will be to relate these to the categories  $\mathbf{Sym}_G(\mathcal{V})$  and  $\mathbf{Op}_G(\mathcal{V})$  of genuine equivariant sequences and genuine operads.

We will throughout this section fix a total order of  $G$  such that the identity  $e$  is the first element, though we note that the exact order is unimportant, as any other such choice would lead to unique isomorphisms between the constructions in this section.

We thus have an inclusion functor

$$\begin{aligned} \iota: G \times \Sigma &\hookrightarrow \Sigma_G \\ C &\longmapsto G \cdot C \end{aligned}$$

where  $G \cdot C$  is planarized so that the roots inherit the order of  $G$  and each of the individual copies of  $C$  inherits the planarization of  $C$ . Moreover, letting  $\Sigma_G^{\text{fr}} \hookrightarrow \Sigma_G$  denote the full subcategory of  $G$ -free corollas, there is an induced retraction  $\rho: \Sigma_G^{\text{fr}} \rightarrow G \times \Sigma$  defined by  $\rho(\sqcup_{1 \leq i \leq |G|} C_i) = G \cdot C_1$  together with isomorphisms  $C \simeq \rho(C)$  uniquely determined by the condition that they are the identity on the first tree component  $C_1$ .

We now consider the associated adjunctions.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \xleftarrow{\iota_!} & \\ \mathbf{Sym}_G(\mathcal{V}) & \xrightarrow{\quad \quad} & \mathbf{Sym}^G(\mathcal{V}) \\ & \xleftarrow{\iota_*} & \end{array} \quad (4.75) \quad \boxed{\text{TWOADJOINTS EQ}}$$

Explicitly, we have the formulas

$$\iota_! Y(\sqcup_i C_i) = \begin{cases} Y(C_1), & \sqcup_i C_i \in \Sigma_G^{\text{fr}} \\ \emptyset, & \sqcup_i C_i \notin \Sigma_G^{\text{fr}} \end{cases}, \quad \iota_* X(C) = X(G \cdot C), \quad \iota_* Y(\sqcup_i C_i) = \left( \prod_i Y(C_i) \right)^G,$$

where we note that in the formula for  $\iota_*(-)$  the action of  $G$  interchanges factors according to the action on the indexing set, i.e. the root orbit of  $\sqcup_i C_i$ . As a side note, we note that the formulas for  $\iota_!$  and  $\iota_*$  are independent of the chosen order of  $G$ .

There is an obvious natural transformation  $\beta: \iota_! \Rightarrow \iota_*$  which for  $\sqcup_i C_i \in \Sigma_G^{\text{fr}}$  sends  $Y(C_1)$  to the “ $G$ -twisted diagonal” of  $\prod_i Y(C_i)$ . Moreover, letting  $\eta_!, \epsilon_!$  (resp.  $\eta_*, \epsilon_*$ ) denote the unit and counit of the  $(\iota_!, \iota^*)$  adjunction (resp.  $(\iota^*, \iota_*)$  adjunction) it is straightforward to check that the following diagram commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \iota_! \iota^* \iota_* & \xrightarrow{\epsilon_!} & \iota_* \\ \epsilon_* \downarrow \simeq & \nearrow \beta & \simeq \downarrow \eta_! \\ \iota_! & \xrightarrow{\eta_*} & \iota_* \iota^* \iota_! \end{array} \quad (4.76) \quad \boxed{\text{BETADEFSQUARE EQ}}$$

**Remark 4.77.** An exercise in adjunctions shows that any outer square as in (4.76) commutes provided at least one of the adjunctions in (4.75) is (co)reflexive, so that (4.76) can be regarded as an alternative definition of  $\beta$ . BETADEFSQUARE EQ

HERE

The adjunction (4.75) identifies  $\mathbf{Sym}^G$  as a reflexive subcategory of  $\mathbf{Sym}_G$ , with the counit map  $X(C) \rightarrow (\prod_G X(C))^G$  given by the isomorphism between  $X(C)$  and the diagonal of  $\prod_G X(C)$ . TWOADJOINTS EQ

**Proposition 4.78.** *One has the following*



(i) the map  $\iota^* \mathbb{F}_G \xrightarrow{\eta} \iota^* \mathbb{F}_{G\iota_*} \iota^*$  is an isomorphism, and thus (cf. Prop. [MONADADJ PROP 2.3](#))  $\iota^* \mathbb{F}_{G\iota_*}$  is a monad;

(ii) there is a natural isomorphism of monads  $\mathbb{F} \rightarrow \iota^* \mathbb{F}_{G\iota_*}$ .

*Proof.* Throughout this proof we write  $\Sigma_G^{\text{free}} \hookrightarrow \Sigma_G$ ,  $\Omega_{G,0}^{\text{free}} \hookrightarrow \Omega_{G,0}$ , for the full subcategories of those  $G$ -corollas/trees with free  $G$ -actions. We note that the leaf-root and vertex functors  $\text{lr}: \Omega_{G,0} \rightarrow \Sigma_G$ ,  $V_G: \Omega_{G,0} \rightarrow \mathbf{F} \wr \Sigma_G$  then both restrict to free trees, i.e., one has  $\text{lr}: \Omega_{G,0}^{\text{free}} \rightarrow \Sigma_G^{\text{free}}$ ,  $V_G: \Omega_{G,0}^{\text{free}} \rightarrow \mathbf{F} \wr \Sigma_G^{\text{free}}$ . Furthermore, for any  $C \in \Sigma_G^{\text{free}}$  one has an equality of rooted undercategories between  $C \downarrow \Omega_{G,0}$  and  $C \downarrow \Omega_{G,0}^{\text{free}}$ , so that  $\iota^* \mathbb{F}_G A$  is computed by the Kan extension of

$$\begin{array}{c} \Omega_{G,0}^{\text{free}} \longrightarrow \mathbf{F} \wr \Sigma_G^{\text{free}} \xrightarrow{\text{Fl}A} \mathbf{F} \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} \longrightarrow \mathcal{V}^{op} \\ \downarrow \\ \Sigma_G^{\text{free}} \end{array} \quad (4.79) \quad \boxed{\text{IFGI EQ}}$$

so that (i) follows from the obvious claim  $A \rightarrow \iota_* \iota^* A$  is an isomorphism when restricted to  $\Sigma_G^{\text{free}}$  (indeed,  $\Sigma_G^{\text{free}}$  is the closure of the image of  $\iota$  under isomorphism).

To show (ii), we first set some notation. We will slightly abuse notation to write  $G \times \Sigma \hookrightarrow \Sigma_G^{\text{free}} \hookrightarrow \Sigma_G$  for the image of  $\iota$  and similarly  $G \times \Omega_0 \hookrightarrow \Omega_{G,0}^{\text{free}} \hookrightarrow \Omega_{G,0}$  for the image of the obvious analogue functor  $\iota: G \times \Omega_0 \rightarrow \Omega_{G,0}$ . Just as before the leaf-root and vertex functors factor as  $\text{lr}: G \times \Omega_0 \rightarrow G \times \Sigma$ ,  $V_G: G \times \Omega_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{F} \wr (G \times \Sigma)$ . In fact, this notation extends to strings  $G \times \Omega_n$  compatibly with all vertex functors and simplicial functors.

Under this identification,  $\mathbb{F}B$  is then computed as the Kan extension of

$$\begin{array}{c} G \times \Omega_0 \longrightarrow \mathbf{F} \wr (G \times \Sigma) \xrightarrow{\text{Fl}B} \mathbf{F} \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} \longrightarrow \mathcal{V}^{op} \\ \downarrow \\ G \times \Sigma \end{array} \quad (4.80) \quad \boxed{\text{F EQ}}$$

The map  $\mathbb{F} \rightarrow \iota^* \mathbb{F}_{G\iota_*}$  is then induced by the obvious “inclusion” natural transformation of [\(4.80\)](#) into [\(4.79\)](#) when  $B = \iota_* A$ . To check that  $\mathbb{F} \rightarrow \iota^* \mathbb{F}_{G\iota_*}$  is an isomorphism, we first note that there are compatible retractions  $\rho: \Omega_{G,0}^{\text{free}} \rightarrow G \times \Omega_0$ ,  $\rho: \Sigma_G^{\text{free}} \rightarrow G \times \Sigma$  defined by  $\rho(\iota_{1 \leq i \leq |G|} T_i) = G \cdot T_1$  together with uniquely determined isomorphisms  $T \simeq \rho(T)$  which are given by the identity on the first tree component  $T_1$ . It thus now follows that for each  $C \in G \times \Sigma$  the undercategory  $C \downarrow G \times \Omega_0$  is initial (as well as final) in  $C \downarrow \Omega_{G,0}^{\text{free}}$ , showing that  $\mathbb{F} \rightarrow \iota^* \mathbb{F}_{G\iota_*}$  is indeed an isomorphism.

The final claim that  $\mathbb{F} \rightarrow \iota^* \mathbb{F}_{G\iota_*}$  is a map of monads follows from the intuitive fact that the composite  $\mathbb{F}\mathbb{F} \rightarrow \iota^* \mathbb{F}_{G\iota_*} \iota^* \mathbb{F}_{G\iota_*} \rightarrow \iota^* \mathbb{F}_G \mathbb{F}_{G\iota_*}$  is encoded by the analogous natural transformation of diagrams for strings  $G \times \Omega_1 \hookrightarrow \Omega_{G,1}^{\text{free}}$ .

HERE

However, since a rigorous direct proof of this last claim can be fairly cumbersome due to the presence of left Kan extensions in the definitions of  $\mathbb{F}$ ,  $\mathbb{F}_G$ , we sketch here an alternate argument.

HERE

□

Proposition [MONADADJ PROP 2.3](#) now gives the following.

**Corollary 4.81.** The adjunction [TWOADJOINTS EQ 4.75](#) extends to an adjunction

$$\iota^*: \text{Op}_G \rightleftarrows \text{Op}^G_{\iota_*} \quad (4.82) \quad \boxed{\text{JUSTONEDJOINTOP EQ}}$$

identifying  $\text{Op}^G$  as a reflexive subcategory of  $\text{Op}_G$ .

## 5 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.

### 5.1 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 5.1.** *The functor*

$$T^{\times \alpha^{-1}(K)} \Rightarrow \alpha^* T^{\times K} \alpha_! \quad (5.2)$$

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, (5.2) 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.

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

□

TALPHA KMOD REM

**Remark 5.3.** Since  $T^{\times K} \alpha_!$  is a right  $\alpha^* T^{\times K} \alpha_!$ -module, Proposition [MONADICFUN PROP](#) 5.1 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 5.4.** 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

$$\alpha_! T^{\times J} \rightarrow T^{\times K} \alpha_!. \quad (5.5)$$

RIGHTMODULETMAP EQ

We now unpack the content of [RIGHTMODULETMAP EQ](#) (5.5) 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

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \coprod_J TTA_j \sqcup \coprod_{\underline{n}-J} A_j & \longrightarrow & T(\coprod_J TA_j \sqcup \coprod_{\underline{n}-J} A_j) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \coprod_J TA_j \sqcup \coprod_{\underline{n}-J} A_j & \longrightarrow & T(\coprod_J A_j \sqcup \coprod_{\underline{n}-J} A_j) \end{array} \quad (5.6)$$

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](#) (5.6) in fact shows that the right  $T^{\times J}$ -module structure on  $T \circ \coprod$  in fact codifies the multiplication maps

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

## 5.2 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 5.7.** 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 tall 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  $J \subset l$ , 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 5.8.** 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.



(5.9)

SUBSDATUMTREESLAB EQ

LABELED TREES EX

**Definition 5.10.** 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

$$T_0 \xrightarrow{f_1} T_1 \xrightarrow{f_2} \dots \xrightarrow{f_s} T_s \xrightarrow{f_{s+1}} T_{s+1} \xrightarrow{f_{s+2}} \dots \xrightarrow{f_n} T_n \quad (5.11) \quad \boxed{\text{NSTRINGLAB EQ}}$$

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 5.12.** 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 5.3 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 5.13.** We will further write

$$\Omega_{G,n,-1}^J = \coprod_J \Omega_{G,n} \sqcup \coprod_{\underline{l}-J} \Sigma_G, \quad \Omega_{G,n,n+1}^J = \Omega_{G,n} \quad (5.14) \quad \boxed{\text{OMEGANMINUSONE EQ}}$$

To justify this convention, we note that a string as in (5.11) 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 (5.14).

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

$$\Omega_{G,n,s}^J \rightarrow \Omega_{G,n,s'}^J \quad \Omega_{G,n,s}^J \rightarrow \Omega_{G,n,s}^{J'} \quad (5.15) \quad \boxed{\text{NKNFGT EQ}}$$

The simplicial operators in Notation 4.26 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 5.16.** For  $J \subset J'$  the forgetful functor in (5.15) 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 5.8 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 4.33 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 4.41.

**Notation 5.17.** 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

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Omega_{G,n,s}^{(\underline{A}),J} & \xrightarrow{V_{G,n}^{(\underline{A})}} & F \wr \coprod A_j \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Omega_{G,n,s}^J & \xrightarrow{V_{G,n}} & F \wr \Sigma_G^{ul} \end{array} \quad (5.18) \quad \text{LTUPLEAPULL EQ}$$

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 (5.11) 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 §4.3, where they were defined iteratively in terms of simpler functors  $V_G$ . This is because of the possibility that  $s = -1$ , in which case (5.14) applies and some caution is needed in that the following result fails.

**Proposition 5.19.** Suppose  $0 \leq s \leq n$ . One has a diagram of pullback squares (generalizing (4.44))

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \Omega_{G,n,s}^{(\underline{A}),J} & \xrightarrow{V_G^{(\underline{A})}} & F \wr \Omega_{G,n-1,s-1}^{(\underline{A}),J} & \xrightarrow{F \wr V_{G,n}^{(\underline{A})}} & F \wr F \wr \coprod A_j & \xrightarrow{\sigma^0} & F \wr \coprod A_j \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Omega_{G,n,s}^J & \xrightarrow{V_G} & F \wr \Omega_{G,n-1,s-1}^J & \xrightarrow{F \wr V_{G,n}} & F \wr F \wr \Sigma_G^{ul} & \xrightarrow{\sigma^0} & F \wr \Sigma_G^{ul} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & & & \\ \Omega_{G,0} & \xrightarrow{V_G} & F \wr \Sigma_G & & & & \end{array} \quad (5.20) \quad \text{ALLSQUARESJ EQ}$$

such that the composite of the top squares is (5.18).

*Proof.* The  $V_G$  functors are defined just as in (4.28) 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 4.29, and follows from the same proof, since both labels and inertness conditions are inherited when assembling substitution data into trees via Proposition 3.42.  $\square$

### 5.3 Bar constructions on spans

We use the results in the previous sections to obtain a string description of the bar constructions

$$\coprod_j^a N^{\bullet+1} A_j \wr^a \coprod_{\underline{l}-j}^a N A_j.$$

For simplicity, we discuss first the particular case  $\coprod^a N^{\bullet+1} A$ . Writing the span as  $\Sigma_G \leftarrow A \xrightarrow{F} \mathcal{V}$  the identifications  $\Omega_{G,0}^{(\Omega_{G,n}^{(A)})} \simeq \Omega_{G,n+1}^{(A)}$  iteratively identify the operator in the bar construction  $N^{\bullet+1} A$  as follows.

The top boundaries  $d_n$  have natural transformation given by

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \Omega_{G,n}^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{V_G^{an}} & F^{in} \wr \Omega_{G,0}^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{F^{in} \wr F_1} & F^{in} \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \xrightarrow{\Pi^{on}} & \mathcal{V}^{op} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & \swarrow F^{in} \wr m & \parallel & & \parallel \\ \Omega_{G,n-1}^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{V_G^{on}} & F^{in} \wr A & \xrightarrow{F^{in} \wr F} & F^{in} \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \xrightarrow{\Pi^{on}} & \mathcal{V}^{op} \end{array} \quad (5.21)$$

where  $m$  is the natural transformation component of the multiplication  $NA \rightarrow A$ , and the remaining differentials  $d_i$  for  $0 \leq i < n$  are given by

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 \Omega_{G,n}^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{V_G^{on+1}} & F^{in+1} \wr A & \xrightarrow{F} & F^{in+1} \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \xrightarrow{\Pi^{on+1}} & \mathcal{V}^{op} \\
 d_i^{(A)} \downarrow & \swarrow \pi_i^{(A)} & \downarrow \sigma^i & & \downarrow \sigma^i & \swarrow \alpha_i & \parallel \\
 \Omega_{G,n-1}^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{V_G^{on}} & F^{in} \wr A & \xrightarrow{F} & F^{in} \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \xrightarrow{\Pi^{on}} & \mathcal{V}^{op}
 \end{array} \quad (5.22) \quad \boxed{\text{REMAINDIFF EQ}}$$

where  $\pi_i^{(A)}$  interchanges lexicographic orders on the  $i$ -th  $F$  coordinate of  $F^{in}$  and  $\alpha_i$  is the natural associativity isomorphism.

Maybe add degeneracies

Similarly, Proposition 5.19 shows that  $\Omega_{G,n}^{(A)} \simeq \Omega_{G,0}^{(\coprod \Omega_{G,n-1}^{(A_j)})}$  so that the top boundaries  $d_n$  in the bar construction  $N \circ \sqcup \circ (N^{xl})^{on} \underline{A}$  are given by

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 \Omega_{G,n}^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{V_G} & F \wr \coprod \Omega_{G,n-1}^{(A_j)} & \xrightarrow{V_G^{on-1}} & F \wr \coprod F^{in-1} \wr \Omega_{G,0}^{(A_j)} & \xrightarrow{F_1} & F \wr \coprod F^{in-1} \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} \xrightarrow{\Pi^{on-1}} F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} \xrightarrow{\Pi} \mathcal{V}^{op} \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \swarrow \underline{m} & \parallel \\
 \Omega_{G,n-1}^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{V_G} & F \wr \coprod \Omega_{G,n-2}^{(A_j)} & \xrightarrow{V_G^{on-1}} & F \wr \coprod F^{in-1} \wr A_j & \xrightarrow{F} & F \wr \coprod F^{in-1} \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} \xrightarrow{\Pi^{on-1}} F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} \xrightarrow{\Pi} \mathcal{V}^{op}
 \end{array} \quad (5.23)$$

where  $\underline{m}$  stands for the functor induced by the tuple of multiplication maps  $m_j: NA_j \rightarrow A_j$ , and the other boundaries  $d_i$  for  $0 \leq i < n$  are given by

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 \Omega_{G,n}^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{V_G} & F \wr \coprod \Omega_{G,n-1}^{(A_j)} & \xrightarrow{V_G^{on}} & F \wr \coprod F^{in} \wr A & \xrightarrow{F} & F \wr \coprod F^{in} \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} \xrightarrow{\Pi^{on}} F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} \xrightarrow{\Pi} \mathcal{V}^{op} \\
 d_i^{(A)} \downarrow & & \swarrow \pi_i^{(A)} & & \downarrow \sigma^i & & \downarrow \sigma^i \\
 \Omega_{G,n-1}^{(A)} & \xrightarrow{V_G} & F \wr \coprod \Omega_{G,n-2}^{(A_j)} & \xrightarrow{V_G^{on-1}} & F \wr \coprod F^{in-1} \wr A & \xrightarrow{F} & F \wr \coprod F^{in-1} \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} \xrightarrow{\Pi^{on-1}} F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} \xrightarrow{\Pi} \mathcal{V}^{op}
 \end{array} \quad (5.24) \quad \boxed{\text{DISJBARDN EQ}}$$

where again  $\pi_i^{(A)}$  interchanges lexicographic orders on the  $i$ -th  $F$  coordinate and  $\alpha_i$  is again an associativity isomorphism. We note that (5.24) follows directly from (5.22) for  $0 \leq i < n$  but that the case  $i = 0$ , which uses the  $N^{xl}$  right action on  $N \circ \sqcup$  (cf. Remark 5.3), which after unpacked leads to the composite diagram below.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccc}
 \Omega_{G,n}^{(A)} & \rightarrow & F \wr \coprod \Omega_{G,n-1}^{(A_j)} & \longrightarrow & F \wr \coprod F^{in-1} A_j & \rightarrow & F \wr \coprod F^{in-1} \mathcal{V}^{op} & \longrightarrow & F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \rightarrow & \mathcal{V}^{op} \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel & & \parallel \\
 \Omega_{G,n-1}^{(A)} & \rightarrow & F \wr \Omega_{G,n-1}^{(A)} & \rightarrow & F^{i2} \wr \coprod \Omega_{G,n-2}^{(A_j)} & \rightarrow & F^{i2} \wr \coprod F^{in-2} A_j & \rightarrow & F^{i2} \wr \coprod F^{in-2} \mathcal{V}^{op} & \rightarrow & F^{i2} \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} \\
 d_0^{(A)} \downarrow & & \swarrow \pi_0 & & \downarrow \sigma^0 & & \downarrow \sigma^0 & & \downarrow \sigma^0 & & \downarrow \sigma^0 \\
 \Omega_{G,n-1}^{(A)} & \rightarrow & F \wr \coprod \Omega_{G,n-2}^{(A_j)} & \rightarrow & F \wr \coprod F^{in-2} A_j & \rightarrow & F \wr \coprod F^{in-2} \mathcal{V}^{op} & \rightarrow & F \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \rightarrow & \mathcal{V}^{op}
 \end{array} \quad (5.25) \quad \boxed{\text{ASSOCSPANJ1 EQ}}$$

Finally, using the inclusions  $\Omega_{G,n}^{(A),J} \hookrightarrow \Omega_{G,n}^{(A)}$ , one obtains analogous descriptions of the bar constructions  $N \circ \sqcup \circ (N^{xJ})^{on} \underline{A}$ , depicted below.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 \Omega_{G,n}^{(A),J} & \longrightarrow & F \wr \left( \coprod_J F^{in-1} \wr \Omega_{G,0}^{(A_j)} \sqcup \coprod_{I-J} A_j \right) & \xrightarrow{F_1} & F \wr \coprod F^{in-1} \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{V}^{op} \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \swarrow \underline{m} & & \parallel \\
 \Omega_{G,n-1}^{(A),J} & \longrightarrow & F \wr \left( \coprod_J F^{in-1} \wr A_j \sqcup \coprod_{I-J} A_j \right) & \xrightarrow{F} & F \wr \coprod F^{in-1} \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{V}^{op}
 \end{array} \quad (5.26)$$

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\Omega_{G,n}^{(A),J} & \longrightarrow & F \wr (\coprod_J F^{\wr n} \wr A_j \sqcup \coprod_{I-J} A_j) & \xrightarrow{F} & F \wr \coprod F^{\wr n} \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{V}^{op} \\
d_i^A \downarrow & \nearrow \pi_i^{(A)} & \downarrow \sigma^i & & \downarrow \sigma^i & \nearrow \alpha_i & \parallel \\
\Omega_{G,n-1}^{(A),J} & \longrightarrow & F \wr (\coprod_J F^{\wr n-1} \wr A_j \sqcup \coprod_{I-J} A_j) & \xrightarrow{F} & F \wr \coprod F^{\wr n-1} \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{V}^{op}
\end{array} \tag{5.27}$$

DISJBARDNJ EQ

## 5.4 Transferring simplicial colimits of left Kan extensions

Given genuine equivariant operads  $X, Y \in \mathbf{Op}_G$  one has an isomorphism

$$X \wr^a Y \simeq \text{colim}_{\Delta^{op}} (\mathbb{F}_G^{\bullet+1} X \wr^a \mathbb{F}_G^{\bullet+1} Y)$$

so that combining [REPACKAGERES REM 4.74](#) and [PRECOMPPPOSTCOMP REM 5.4](#) with the results in the previous section one obtains isomorphisms

$$X \wr^a Y \simeq \text{colim}_{\Delta^{op}} (\text{Lan} (N^{\bullet+1} \wr X \wr^a N^{\bullet+1} \wr Y)) \tag{5.28}$$

$$\simeq \text{colim}_{\Delta^{op}} (\text{Lan} (N \circ \wr \circ (N^{\times 2})^\bullet (\wr X, \wr Y))) \tag{5.29}$$

$$\simeq \text{colim}_{\Delta^{op}} (\text{Lan}_{\Omega_{G,\bullet}^{2,op} \rightarrow \Sigma_G^{op}} N^{\wr(X,Y)}) \tag{5.30}$$

COLIMLAN EQ

where we write  $N^{\wr(X,Y)}: \Omega_{G,\bullet}^{2,op} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$  for the induced functor.

The purpose of this section will be show that one can repackage formulas such as [\(5.30\)](#) with a single left Kan extension over a category  $\Omega_G^2 = |\Omega_{G,\bullet}^2|$  obtained from  $\Omega_{G,\bullet}^2$  via realization in  $\mathbf{Cat}$ .

We note that  $\Omega_{G,\bullet}^2$  together with the corresponding functors to  $\Sigma_G$ ,  $\mathcal{V}^{op}$  can be viewed as a simplicial object  $\Delta^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{WSpan}^l(\Sigma, G^{op}, \mathcal{V})$ , and our first task will be to repackage such functors in terms of Grothendieck constructions.

**Lemma 5.31.** *Functors  $F: \mathcal{D} \rtimes \mathcal{I}_\bullet \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  are in bijection with lifts*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
& & \mathbf{WSpan}^l(*, \mathcal{C}) \\
& \nearrow \mathcal{I}_\bullet^F & \downarrow \text{fgt} \\
\mathcal{D} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{I}_\bullet} & \mathbf{Cat}.
\end{array}$$

where  $\text{fgt}$  is the functor forgetting the maps to  $*$  and  $\mathcal{C}$ .

*Proof.* This is a matter of unpacking notation. The restrictions  $F|_{\mathcal{I}_d}$  to the fibers  $\mathcal{I}_d \subset \mathcal{D} \rtimes \mathcal{I}_\bullet$  are precisely the functors  $\mathcal{I}_d^F: \mathcal{I}_d \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  describing  $\mathcal{I}_\bullet^F(d)$ .

Furthermore, the images  $F((d, i) \rightarrow (d', f_*(i)))$  of the pushout arrows over a fixed arrow  $f: d \rightarrow d'$  of  $\mathcal{D}$  assemble to a natural transformation

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{I}_d & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{I}_d^F} & \mathcal{C} \\
f_* \downarrow & \searrow & \uparrow \\
\mathcal{I}_{d'} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{I}_{d'}^F} & \mathcal{C}
\end{array} \tag{5.32}$$

which describes  $\mathcal{I}_\bullet^F(f)$ . It is straightforward to check that the associativity and unitality conditions coincide.  $\square$

In the cases of interest we will have  $\mathcal{D} = \Delta^{op}$ , so that  $\mathcal{I}_\bullet$  can be interpreted as an object  $\mathcal{I}_\bullet \in \mathbf{Cat}^{\Delta^{op}}$ . By recalling the standard cosimplicial object  $[\bullet] \in \mathbf{Cat}^\Delta$  given by  $[n] = (0 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow n)$  one obtains the following definition.

**Definition 5.33.** The left adjoint

$$|-|: \mathbf{Cat}^{\Delta^{op}} \rightleftarrows \mathbf{Cat}: (-)^{[\bullet]}$$

will be called the *realization* functor.

**Remark 5.34.** More explicitly, one has

$$|\mathcal{I}_\bullet| = \text{coeq} \left( \coprod_{[n] \rightarrow [m]} [n] \times \mathcal{I}_m \rightrightarrows \coprod_{[n]} [n] \times \mathcal{I}_n \right). \quad (5.35) \quad \boxed{\text{REALDEF EQ}}$$

**Example 5.36.** Any  $\mathcal{I} \in \mathbf{Cat}$  induces objects  $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}_\bullet, \mathcal{I}^{[\bullet]} \in \mathbf{Cat}^{\Delta^{op}}$  where  $\mathcal{I}$  is the constant simplicial object and  $\mathcal{I}_\bullet$  is the nerve  $N\mathcal{I}$  with each level regarded as a discrete category. It is straightforward to check that  $|\mathcal{I}| = |\mathcal{I}_\bullet| = |\mathcal{I}^{[\bullet]}| = \mathcal{I}$ .

**Lemma 5.37.** *Given  $\mathcal{I}_\bullet \in \mathbf{Cat}^{\Delta^{op}}$  one has an identification  $ob(|\mathcal{I}_\bullet|) \simeq ob(\mathcal{I}_0)$ . Furthermore, the arrows of  $|\mathcal{I}_\bullet|$  are generated by the image of the arrows in  $\mathcal{I}_0 \simeq \mathcal{I}_0 \times [0]$  and the image of the arrows in  $[1] \times ob(\mathcal{I}_1)$ .*

For each  $i_1 \in \mathcal{I}_1$ , we will denote the arrow of  $|\mathcal{I}_\bullet|$  induced by the arrow in  $[1] \times \{i_1\}$  by

$$d_1(i_1) \xrightarrow{i_1} d_0(i_1).$$

*Proof.* We write  $d_{\hat{k}}, d_{\hat{k}, \hat{l}}$  for the simplicial operators induced by the maps  $[0] \xrightarrow{0 \mapsto k} [n]$ ,  $[1] \xrightarrow{0 \mapsto k, 1 \mapsto l} [n]$  which can informally be thought of as the “composite of all faces other than  $d_k, d_l$ ”. Using (5.35) one has equivalence relations of objects

$$[n] \times \mathcal{I}_n \ni (k, i_n) \sim (0, d_{\hat{k}}(i_n)) \in [0] \times \mathcal{I}_0$$

and since for any generating relation  $(k, i_n) \sim (l, i'_n)$  it is  $d_{\hat{k}}(i_n) = d_{\hat{l}}(i'_n)$  the identification  $ob(|\mathcal{I}_\bullet|) \simeq ob(\mathcal{I}_0)$  follows.

To verify the claim about generating arrows, note that any arrow of  $[n] \times \mathcal{I}_n$  factors as

$$(k, i_n) \rightarrow (l, i_n) \xrightarrow{I_n} (l, i'_n) \quad (5.38) \quad \boxed{\text{FACTORIZATIONREAL EQ}}$$

for  $I_n: i_n \rightarrow i'_n$  an arrow of  $\mathcal{I}_n$ . The  $d_{\hat{l}}$  relation identifies the right arrow in (5.38) with

$(0, d_{\hat{l}}(i_n)) \xrightarrow{d_{\hat{l}}(I_n)} (0, d_{\hat{l}}(i'_n))$  in  $[0] \times \mathcal{I}_0$  while (if  $k < l$ ) the  $d_{\hat{k}, \hat{l}}$  relation identifies the left arrow with  $(0, d_{\hat{k}, \hat{l}}(i_n)) \rightarrow (1, d_{\hat{k}, \hat{l}}(i_n))$  in  $[1] \times \mathcal{I}_1$ . The result follows.  $\square$

**Remark 5.39.** Given  $\mathcal{I}_\bullet \in \mathbf{Cat}^{\Delta^{op}}$ ,  $\mathcal{C} \in \mathbf{Cat}$ , the isomorphisms

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{Cat}}(|\mathcal{I}_\bullet|, \mathcal{C}) \simeq \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{Cat}^{\Delta^{op}}}(\mathcal{I}_\bullet, \mathcal{C}^{[\bullet]})$$

together with the fact that  $\mathcal{C}^{[\bullet]}$  is always 2-coskeletal show that  $|\mathcal{I}_\bullet|$  is determined by the categories  $\mathcal{I}_0, \mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{I}_2$  and maps between them, i.e. by the truncated version of formula (5.35) with  $n, m \leq 2$ .  $\boxed{\text{REALDEF EQ}}$

Indeed, it can be shown that a sufficient set of generating relations in  $|\mathcal{I}_\bullet|$  is given by

- (i) the relations in  $\mathcal{I}_0$  (including relations stating that identities of  $\mathcal{I}_0$  are identities of  $|\mathcal{I}_\bullet|$ );
- (ii) relations stating that for each  $i_0 \in \mathcal{I}_0$  the arrow  $i_0 = d_1(s_0(i_0)) \xrightarrow{s_0(i_0)} d_1(s_0(i_0)) = i_0$  is an identity; (iii) for each arrow  $I_1: i_1 \rightarrow i'_1$  in  $\mathcal{I}_1$  the relation that the square below commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} d_1(i_1) & \xrightarrow{i_1} & d_0(i_1) \\ d_1(I_1) \downarrow & & \downarrow d_0(I_1) \\ d_1(i'_1) & \xrightarrow{i'_1} & d_0(i'_1) \end{array}$$



and (iv) for each object  $i_2 \in \mathcal{I}_2$  the relation that the following triangle commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} d_{1,2}(i_2) & \xrightarrow{d_1(i_2)} & d_{0,1}(i_2) \\ & \searrow d_2(i_2) \quad \nearrow d_0(i_2) & \\ & d_{0,2}(i_2) & \end{array}$$

**Example 5.40.** For  $\Omega_{G,\bullet}$  the simplicial object of planar strings one has  $|\Omega_{G,\bullet}| = \Omega_G^t$ , the category of  $G$ -trees and tall maps. Indeed, arrows of  $\Omega_{G,0}$  and objects of  $\Omega_{G,1}$  are naturally identified with the quotient arrows and planar tall arrows of  $\Omega_G^t$ , which are a generating set of arrows. And likewise, relations in  $\Omega_{G,0}$ , arrows in  $\Omega_{G,1}$  and objects in  $\Omega_{G,2}$  are identified with the relations of  $\Omega_G^t$ .

Analogously, for  $\Omega_{G,\bullet}^J$  the simplicial object of planar  $J$ -labeled strings that are  $(\{l\} - J)$ -inert, one has  $|\Omega_{G,\bullet}^J| = \Omega_G^{J,t}$ , the category of  $J$ -labeled  $G$ -trees and  $(\{l\} - J)$ -inert tall maps.

The following is the key result in this section.

**Proposition 5.41.** *Let  $\mathcal{I}_\bullet \in \text{Cat}^{\Delta^{op}}$ . Then there is a natural functor*

$$\Delta^{op} \ltimes \mathcal{I}_\bullet \xrightarrow{s} |\mathcal{I}_\bullet|. \quad (5.42)$$

Further,  $s$  is final.

**Remark 5.43.** The  $s$  in the result above stands for *source*. This is because, for any  $\mathcal{I} \in \text{Cat}$ , the map  $\Delta^{op} \ltimes \mathcal{I}^{[\bullet]} \rightarrow |\mathcal{I}^{[\bullet]}| \simeq \mathcal{I}$  is given by  $s(i_0 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow i_n) = i_0$ .

*Proof.* Recall that  $|\mathcal{I}_\bullet|$  is the coequalizer  $\frac{\text{REALDEF EQ}}{(5.35)}$ . Given  $(k, g_m) \in [n] \times \mathcal{I}_m$ , we will write  $[k, g_m]$  for the corresponding object in  $|\mathcal{I}_\bullet|$ . To simplify notation, we will write objects of  $\mathcal{I}_n$  as  $i_n$  and implicitly assume that  $[k, i_n]$  refers to the class of the object  $(k, i_n) \in [n] \times \mathcal{I}_n$ .

We define  $s$  on objects by  $s([n], i_n) = [0, i_n]$  and on an arrow  $(\phi, I_m): (n, i_n) \rightarrow (m, i'_m)$  as the composite (note that  $\phi: [m] \rightarrow [n]$  and  $I_m: \phi^*(i_n) \rightarrow i'_m$ )

$$[0, i_n] \rightarrow [\phi(0), i_n] = [0, \phi^*(i_n)] \xrightarrow{I_m} [0, i'_m]. \quad (5.44)$$

TARGETDEFINITION EQ

To check associativity, the cases of a pair of either two fiber arrows (i.e. arrows where  $\phi$  is the identity) or two pushforward arrows (i.e. arrows where  $I_m$  is the identity) are immediate from (5.44), hence we are left with the case  $([n], i_n) \xrightarrow{I_n} ([n], i'_n) \rightarrow ([m], \phi^*(i'_n))$  of a fiber arrow followed by a pushforward arrow. Noting that in  $\Delta^{op} \ltimes \mathcal{I}_\bullet$  this composite can be rewritten as  $([n], i_n) \rightarrow ([m], \phi^*(i_n)) \xrightarrow{\phi^*(I_n)} ([m], \phi^*(i'_n))$  this amounts to checking that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} [0, i_n] & \longrightarrow & [\phi(0), i_n] = [0, \phi^*(i_n)] \\ I_n \downarrow & & \downarrow \phi^*(I_n) \\ [0, i'_n] & \longrightarrow & [\phi(0), i'_n] = [0, \phi^*(i_n)] \end{array} \quad (5.45)$$

commutes in  $|\mathcal{I}_\bullet|$ , which is the case since the left square is encoded by a square in  $[n] \times \mathcal{I}_n$  and the right square is encoded by an arrow in  $[m] \times \mathcal{I}_n$ .

We now turn to showing that  $s$  is final.

Fix  $j \in \mathcal{I}_0$ . We will show that  $[0, j] \downarrow \Delta^{op} \ltimes \mathcal{I}_\bullet$  is indeed connected. By Lemma  $\frac{\text{OBJGENREL LEMMA}}{5.37}$  any object in this undercategory has a description (not necessarily unique) as a pair

$$\left( ([n], i_n), [0, j] \xrightarrow{f_1} \dots \xrightarrow{f_r} s([n], i_n) \right)$$

where each  $f_i$  is a generating arrow of  $|\mathcal{I}_\bullet|$  induced by either an arrow  $I_0$  of  $\mathcal{I}_0$  or object  $i_1 \in \mathcal{I}_1$ .

We will connect this object to the canonical object  $(([0], h), [0, h] = [0, h])$ , arguing by induction on  $r$ . If  $n \neq 0$ , the map  $d_0: ([n], i_n) \rightarrow ([0], d_0^*(i_n))$  and the fact that  $s(d_0^*) =$

$id_{[0, d_0^*(i_n)]}$  provides an arrow to an object with  $n = 0$  without changing  $r$ . If  $n = 0$ , one can apply the induction hypothesis by lifting  $f_r$  to  $\Delta^{op} \times \mathcal{I}_\bullet$  according to one of two cases: (i) if  $f_r$  is induced by an arrow  $I_0$  of  $\mathcal{I}_0$ , the lift of  $f_r$  is simply  $([0], i'_0) \xrightarrow{I_0} ([0], i_0)$ ; (ii) if  $f_r$  is induced by  $i_1 \in \mathcal{I}_1$  the lift is provided by the map  $([1], i_1) \rightarrow ([0], d_0(i_1))$ .  $\square$

In practice, we will need to know that  $s$  satisfies the following stronger finality condition with respect to left Kan extensions.

**Corollary 5.46.** *Consider a map  $\mathcal{I}_\bullet \rightarrow \mathcal{J}$  between  $\mathcal{I}_\bullet \in \mathbf{Cat}^{\Delta^{op}}$  and a constant object  $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}_\bullet \in \mathbf{Cat}^{\Delta^{op}}$ . Then the source map  $s$*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Delta^{op} \times \mathcal{I}_\bullet & \xrightarrow{s} & |\mathcal{I}_\bullet| \\ & \searrow & \swarrow \\ & \mathcal{J} & \end{array}$$

is Lan-final over  $\mathcal{J}$ , i.e. the functors  $s \downarrow j: (\Delta^{op} \times \mathcal{I}_\bullet) \downarrow j \rightarrow |\mathcal{I}_\bullet| \downarrow j$  are final for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ .

*Proof.* It is clear that  $(\Delta^{op} \times \mathcal{I}_\bullet) \downarrow j \simeq \Delta^{op} \times (\mathcal{I}_\bullet \downarrow j)$  while Lemma 2.2 guarantees that, since  $(-) \downarrow j$  is a left adjoint,  $|\mathcal{I}_\bullet| \downarrow j \simeq |\mathcal{I}_\bullet \downarrow j|$ . One thus reduces to Proposition 5.41.  $\square$

We end this section with two basic lemmas that will allows us to apply Corollary 5.46 to the tree categories we will be interested in.

**Lemma 5.47.** *Let  $\mathcal{I}_\bullet^F \in \mathbf{Span}(*, \mathcal{C})^{\Delta^{op}}$  be such that the diagrams*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{I}_n & \xrightarrow{F_n} & \mathcal{C} \\ d_i \downarrow & \nearrow \delta_i & \uparrow F_{n-1} \\ \mathcal{I}_{n-1} & \xrightarrow{F_{n-1}} & \mathcal{C} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{I}_n & \xrightarrow{F_n} & \mathcal{C} \\ s_j \downarrow & \nearrow \sigma_j & \uparrow F_{n+1} \\ \mathcal{I}_{n+1} & \xrightarrow{F_{n+1}} & \mathcal{C} \end{array} \quad (5.48)$$

commute up to isomorphism for  $0 < i \leq n$ ,  $0 \leq j \leq n$ .

Then the functors  $\tilde{F}_n: \mathcal{I}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  given by the composites

$$\mathcal{I}_n \xrightarrow{d_1, \dots, d_n} \mathcal{I}_0 \xrightarrow{F_0} \mathcal{C}$$

assemble to an object  $\mathcal{I}_\bullet^{\tilde{F}} \in \mathbf{Span}(*, \mathcal{C})^{\Delta^{op}}$  which is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{I}_\bullet^F$  and such that the corresponding diagrams (5.48) for  $0 < i \leq n$ ,  $0 \leq j \leq n$  are strictly commutative.

*Proof.* This follows by a straightforward verification.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.49.** *A (necessarily unique) factorization*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Delta^{op} \times \mathcal{I}_\bullet & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{C} \\ & \searrow s & \nearrow \text{---} \\ & |\mathcal{I}_\bullet| & \end{array} \quad (5.50)$$

exists iff for the associated object  $\mathcal{I}_\bullet \in \mathbf{Span}(*, \mathcal{C})^{\Delta^{op}}$  (cf. Lemma 5.31) all faces  $d_i$  for  $0 < i \leq n$  and degeneracies  $s_j$  for  $0 \leq j \leq n$  are strictly commutative, i.e. they are given by diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{I}_n & \xrightarrow{F_n} & \mathcal{C} \\ d_0 \downarrow & \nearrow \varphi_n & \uparrow F_{n-1} \\ \mathcal{I}_{n-1} & \xrightarrow{F_{n-1}} & \mathcal{C} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{I}_n & \xrightarrow{F_n} & \mathcal{C} \\ d_i \downarrow & \nearrow & \uparrow F_{n-1} \\ \mathcal{I}_{n-1} & \xrightarrow{F_{n-1}} & \mathcal{C} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{I}_n & \xrightarrow{F_n} & \mathcal{C} \\ s_j \downarrow & \nearrow & \uparrow F_{n+1} \\ \mathcal{I}_{n+1} & \xrightarrow{F_{n+1}} & \mathcal{C} \end{array} \quad (5.51)$$

*Proof.* For the “if” direction, it suffices to note that  $s$  sends all pushout arrows of  $\Delta^{op} \ltimes \mathcal{I}_\bullet$  for faces  $d_i$ ,  $0 < i \leq n$  and degeneracies  $s_j$ ,  $0 \leq j \leq n$  to identities and this yields the commutative diagrams (5.51).

For the “only if” direction, this will follow by building a functor  $\mathcal{I}_\bullet \xrightarrow{\bar{F}} \mathcal{C}^{[\bullet]}$  together with the naturality of the source map  $s$  (recall that  $|\mathcal{C}^{[\bullet]}| \simeq \mathcal{C}$ ). We define  $\bar{F}_n|_{k \rightarrow k+1}$  as the map

$$F_{n-k}d_{0,\dots,k-1} \xrightarrow{\varphi_{n-k}d_{0,\dots,k-1}} F_{n-k-1}d_{0,\dots,k}. \quad (5.52)$$

The claim that  $s \circ (\Delta^{op} \ltimes \bar{F})$  recovers the horizontal map in (5.50) is straightforward, hence the real task is to prove that (5.52) indeed defines a map of simplicial objects.

$$\varphi_{n-1}d_i = \varphi_n, \quad 1 < i \leq n-1, \quad \varphi_{n-1}d_1 = (\varphi_{n-1}d_0) \circ \varphi_n, \quad \varphi_{n+1}s_i = \varphi_n, \quad 0 < i \leq n, \quad \varphi_{n+1}s_0 = id_{F_n} \quad (5.53)$$

Next, note that there is no ambiguity in writing simply  $\varphi_{n-k}d_{0,\dots,k-1}$  to denote the map (5.52). We now check that  $\bar{F}_{n-1}d_i = d_i\bar{F}_n$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq n$ , which must be verified after restricting to each  $k \rightarrow k+1$ ,  $0 \leq k \leq n-2$ . There are three cases, depending on  $i$  and  $k$ :

$$\begin{aligned} (i < k+1) \quad & \varphi_{n-k-1}d_{0,\dots,k-1}d_i = \varphi_{n-k-1}d_{0,\dots,k}; \\ (i = k+1) \quad & \varphi_{n-k-1}d_{0,\dots,k-1}d_i = \varphi_{n-k-1}d_1d_{0,\dots,k-1} = (\varphi_{n-k-1}d_0 \circ \varphi_{n-k})d_{0,\dots,k-1} = (\varphi_{n-k-1}d_{0,\dots,k}) \circ (\varphi_{n-k}d_{0,\dots,k-1}); \\ (i > k+1) \quad & \varphi_{n-k-1}d_{0,\dots,k-1}d_i = \varphi_{n-k-1}d_{i-k}d_{0,\dots,k-1} = \varphi_{n-k}d_{0,\dots,k-1}. \end{aligned}$$

The case of degeneracies is similar.  $\square$

**Remark 5.54.** One can twist all results by the opposite functor

$$\Delta \xrightarrow{(-)^{op}} \Delta$$

which sends  $[n]$  to itself and  $d_i, s_i$  to  $d_{n-i}, s_{n-i}$ . In doing so, one obtains vertical isomorphisms

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Delta^{op} \ltimes (\mathcal{J}_\bullet \circ (-)^{op}) & \xrightarrow{s} & |\mathcal{J}_\bullet \circ (-)^{op}| \\ \simeq \downarrow & & \downarrow \simeq \\ \Delta^{op} \ltimes \mathcal{J}_\bullet & \xrightarrow{t} & |\mathcal{J}_\bullet| \end{array}$$

which reinterpret the “source” functor as what one might call the “target” functor, with  $t([n], i_n) = [n, i_n]$  rather than  $s([n], i_n) = [0, i_n]$ .

Corollary 5.46 now says that  $t$  is Lan-final and Lemmas 5.47, 5.49 generalize in the obvious way by replacing  $s$  with  $t$  and  $d_0$  with  $d_n$ .

## 5.5 The category of extension trees

In this section we combine the previous sections to obtain a compact description of free extension pushouts

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{F}_G A & \longrightarrow & X \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbb{F}_G B & \longrightarrow & Y \end{array} \quad (5.55)$$

as a left Kan extension over a convenient category of trees.

For simplicity, we first explain how to obtain a similar description for the simpler case of a coproduct  $X \sqcup^a Y$ . By (5.30), one has a description

$$\begin{aligned} X \sqcup^a Y & \simeq \text{colim}_{\Delta^{op}} \left( \text{Lan}_{\Omega_{G,\bullet}^{2,op} \rightarrow \Sigma_G^{op}} N_\bullet^{(X,Y)} \right) \\ & \simeq \text{Lan}_{\Delta^{op} \ltimes \Omega_{G,\bullet}^{2,op} \rightarrow \Sigma_G^{op}} N_\bullet^{(X,Y)} \end{aligned}$$

where the second identification follows from formal properties of Grothendieck constructions.

Combining the fact that (5.27) consists of natural isomorphisms with (the Remark 5.54 dual of) Lemma 5.47, yields an isomorphic twisted functor  $\tilde{N}_\bullet^{(X,Y)}$  with strictly commutative  $s_i$  and  $d_i$  for  $i \neq n$ . The dual of Lemma 5.49 now says that  $\tilde{N}_\bullet^{(X,Y)}$  factors via the target map  $t$  through  $\Omega_G^{2,op} \tilde{\Omega}_G^{2,op}$  (writing  $\tilde{N}^{(X,Y)}$  for the factorization) and thus the dual of Corollary 5.46 finally yields

$$X \sqcup^a Y \simeq \text{Lan}_{\Omega_G^{2,op} \rightarrow \Sigma_G^{op}} \tilde{N}^{(X,Y)}. \quad (5.56)$$

We recall that by Example 5.40,  $\Omega_G$  is simply the category of  $\underline{2}$ -labeled trees and tall label maps.

More generally, one has

$$\coprod_J^a X_j \sqcup^a \coprod_{\underline{l}-J}^a \mathbb{F}_G X_j \simeq \text{Lan}_{\Omega_G^{J,op} \rightarrow \Sigma_G^{op}} \tilde{N}^{(X)}. \quad (5.57) \quad \text{LANCOPRODDISC}$$

where  $\Omega_G^J$  is the category of  $\underline{l}$ -labeled trees and tall  $(\underline{l} - J)$ -inert label maps.

**Remark 5.58.** We note that the twisting  $\tilde{N}_\bullet^{(X,Y)}$  is fairly harmless. For explicitness, we focus on the simplest case of a “unary coproduct”, in which case (5.57) is simply recovering the genuine equivariant operad  $X$  from its bar resolution. In that case  $N_\bullet^X: \Omega_G^{op} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$  is given by the top map in (4.53) or, equivalently, by the top map in (4.54) (we note that, in the notation therein, it is  $A = \Sigma_G$ ). On the other hand, the twisted map  $\tilde{N}_2^X: \Omega_{G,2}^{op} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$  is given by the left bottom composite in either of (4.53), (4.54). Informally, the role of this twisting is therefore simply that of replacing the order on  $V_G(T_n)$  induced lexicographically by planar strings  $T_0 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow T_n$  with the simpler order induced directly from  $T_n$ .

In what follows we will largely be able to ignore this technicality. Indeed, the role of lexicographic orders in building (5.57) is that of guaranteeing that  $\tilde{N}_\bullet$  satisfies the necessary simplicial identities, which are ensured by appealing to the bar construction for the monad  $N$ .

We now turn to the task of building (5.55) as a left Kan extension. One has a colimit description

$$\mathbb{F}B \coprod_{\mathbb{F}A} X \simeq \text{colim}_{\Delta^{op}} \left( \mathbb{F}B \sqcup \mathbb{F}A \sqcup X \rightrightarrows \mathbb{F}B \sqcup \mathbb{F}A \sqcup \mathbb{F}A \sqcup \mathbb{F}A \sqcup X \rightrightarrows \mathbb{F}B \sqcup \mathbb{F}A \sqcup \mathbb{F}A \sqcup \mathbb{F}A \sqcup \mathbb{F}A \sqcup \mathbb{F}A \sqcup \mathbb{F}A \sqcup X \quad \dots \right) \quad (5.59) \quad \text{FREEEXTUSEFCOL EQ}$$

where all differentials are fold maps of  $\mathbb{F}A$  except to the  $n$ -th differential  $d_n$ , which is induced by the two maps  $\mathbb{F}A \rightarrow X$ ,  $\mathbb{F}A \rightarrow \mathbb{F}B$ .

By the previous discussion each individual object  $X \sqcup (\mathbb{F}A)^{\sqcup 2n+1} \sqcup \mathbb{F}B$  in (5.59) can be described as a left Kan extension over the tree category  $\Omega_G^{\{X\}}$  where  $\{X\} \subset \{B, A, \dots, A, X\}$  is a singleton. The maps in (5.59) can themselves be encoded as span maps between the  $\Omega_G^{\{X\}}$ . To see this, we make (5.59) more precise. Firstly, we write  $\langle n \rangle$  for the poset

$$-\infty \leq -n \leq -n+1 \leq \dots \leq -1 \leq 0 \leq 1 \leq \dots \leq n-1 \leq n \leq +\infty.$$

The posets  $\langle n \rangle$  together with antisymmetric (i.e. such that  $f(-x) = -f(x)$ ) poset maps preserving all three of  $-\infty, 0, +\infty$  then form a simplicial object<sup>1</sup>  $\langle - \rangle: \Delta^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{F}$ .

(5.55) thus induces a simplicial object  $(B, A, X)_{\langle n \rangle} \in \mathbf{F} \wr \text{Fun}(\Sigma_G^{op}, \mathcal{V})$ .

Each level of  $(\iota B, \iota A, \iota X)_{\langle n \rangle}$  is then a  $N^{\times \{+\infty\}}$ -algebra on  $(\text{WSpan}^l(\Sigma_G^{op}, \mathcal{V}))^{\times \langle n \rangle}$ , compatibly with the simplicial maps. One thus obtains a *bisimplicial* object

$$\Sigma_G^{op} \leftarrow \Omega_{G,\bullet}^{\{+\infty\}(\bullet), op} \xrightarrow{N_\bullet^{(B,A,X)(\bullet)}} \mathcal{V}$$

<sup>1</sup>Indeed, we recall that the opposite simplex category  $\Delta^{op}$  can equivalently be described as the category of *intervals*, i.e. finite ordered posets with distinct top and bottom, along with order maps preserving both top and bottom.  $\langle n \rangle$  can then be regarded as obtained by gluing the interval  $0 \leq 1 \leq \dots \leq n \leq +\infty$  with its opposite.

on  $\mathbf{WSpan}^l(\Sigma_G^{op}, \mathcal{V})$  whose realization along the string direction yields the spans

$$\Sigma_G^{op} \leftarrow \Omega_G^{\{+\infty\}(\bullet), op} \xrightarrow{N^{(B,A,X)}(\bullet)} \mathcal{V} \quad (5.60)$$

PARTREALSPAN EQ

discussed above, except now assembled into a simplicial object in  $\mathbf{WSpan}^l(\Sigma_G^{op}, \mathcal{V})$ .

All degeneracies  $s_i$  and differentials  $d_i$  of (5.60) other than the top differential  $d_n$  are induced by maps  $\alpha^*$  described in §5.1 and thus given by strictly commutative diagrams, so that Lemma 5.49 and Corollary 5.46 can be applied (this time with no need to appeal to Lemma 5.47) so as to allow (5.59) to be repackaged as

$$\mathbb{F}B \coprod_{\mathbb{F}A} X \simeq \mathbf{Lan}_{\Omega_G^{e, op} \rightarrow \Sigma_G^{op}} N^{(B,A,X)} \quad (5.61)$$


FREEEXTUSEFCOLNEW EQ

where we write  $\Omega_G^e$  for  $|\Omega_G^{\{+\infty\}(\bullet)}|$ . We now turn to the task of describing  $\Omega_G^e$ , starting with by defining it directly.

**Definition 5.62.** The *extension tree category*  $\Omega_G^e$  is the category whose objects are  $\{B, A, X\}$ -labeled trees and whose maps  $\varphi: T \rightarrow S$  are tall maps of trees such that

- (i) if  $T_{v_{Ge}}$  has an  $A$ -label, then  $S_{v_{Ge}} = T_{v_{Ge}}$  and  $S_{v_{Ge}}$  has an  $A$ -label;
- (ii) if  $T_{v_{Ge}}$  has a  $B$ -label, then  $S_{v_{Ge}} = T_{v_{Ge}}$  and  $S_{v_{Ge}}$  has either an  $A$ -label or a  $B$ -label;
- (iii) if  $T_{v_{Ge}}$  has a  $X$ -label, then  $S_{v_{Ge}}$  has only  $A$  and  $X$ -labels.

**Example 5.63.** The following is an example of a planar map in  $\Omega_G^e$ , where black nodes represent  $X$ -labeled nodes, grey nodes represent  $B$ -labeled nodes and white nodes represent  $A$ -labeled nodes.



(5.64)

REGALTERNMAP EQ

**Proposition 5.65.** One has an identification

$$\Omega_G^e \simeq |\Omega_G^{\{+\infty\}(\bullet)}|.$$

*Proof.* We note first that  $\Omega_G^e$  contains all label maps that are  $\{A, B\}$ -inert. In fact, any map of  $\Omega_G^e$  clearly has a unique factorization as such a label map followed by an underlying planar isomorphism of trees that replaces some of the  $X$  and  $B$  labels with  $A$  labels. We will refer to the former as label maps and to the latter as relabel maps.

We recall that  $\Omega_G^{\{+\infty\}(n)}$  consists of trees with  $2n + 3$  types of labels:  $X$ -labels,  $B$ -labels and  $2n + 1$  distinct types of  $A$ -labels. One can equivalently encode such a tree as a string  $T_0 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow T_n$  of relabel maps. Indeed, the  $A$ -label nodes of  $T_n$  in such a string are partitioned into  $2n + 1$  types according to that node's labels one the  $T_i$  (which are either all  $A$ 's, some  $X$ 's and then  $A$ 's or some  $B$ 's and then  $A$ 's). Moreover, a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} T_0 & \longrightarrow & T_1 & \longrightarrow & \dots & \longrightarrow & T_n \\ f_0 \downarrow & & f_1 \downarrow & & & & f_n \downarrow \\ T'_0 & \longrightarrow & T'_1 & \longrightarrow & \dots & \longrightarrow & T'_n \end{array}$$

with  $f_i$  label maps of  $\Omega_G^e$  is then equivalent to a label map  $f_n: T_n \rightarrow T'_n$  respecting all  $2n+3$  labels in  $\Omega_G^{\{+\infty\}(n)}$ . Since the string description above is also compatible with the simplicial structure maps in the obvious way, the result is now clear.  $\square$

Our next task will be that of identifying a convenient Lan-final subcategory  $\bar{\Omega}_G^e \hookrightarrow \Omega_G^e$ . We first introduce the auxiliary notion of alternating trees. We recall the notion of input path (Notation 3.4)  $I(e) = \{f \in T: e \leq_d f\}$  for an edge  $e \in T$ , which naturally extends to  $T$  in any of  $\Omega, \Phi, \Omega_G, \Phi_G$ .


**Definition 5.66.** A  $G$ -tree  $T \in \Omega_G$  is called *alternating* if, for all leafs  $l \in T$  one has that the input path  $I(l)$  has an even number of elements.

Further, a vertex  $e^\dagger \leq e$  is called *active* if  $|I(e)|$  is odd and *inert* otherwise.

Finally, a tall map  $T \xrightarrow{\varphi} T'$  between alternating  $G$ -trees is called a *tall alternating map* if for any inert vertex  $e^\dagger \leq e$  of  $T$  one has that  $T'_{e^\dagger \leq e}$  is an inert vertex of  $T'$ .

We will denote the category of alternating  $G$ -trees and tall alternating maps by  $\Omega_G^a$ .

**Example 5.67.** Two alternating trees (for  $G = *$  the trivial group) and a planar tall alternating map between them follow, with active nodes in black ( $\bullet$ ) and white nodes in white ( $\circ$ ).



REGALTERNMAPLR EQ

The term “alternating” comes from the fact that no adjacent nodes have the same color. We note, however, that there is additional restriction: the “outer” vertices, i.e. those immediately below a leaf or the one immediately above the root, are necessarily black/active (not, however, that this does *not* apply to stumps).

**Remark 5.69.** One can extend Definition 3.39 to the alternating context by defining a substitution datum to be alternating if it is given by isomorphisms for inert nodes and by alternating maps for active nodes. It is then straightforward to check that Proposition 3.42 and its equivariant analogue Proposition 4.19 extend to give alternating analogues.

**Definition 5.70.**  $\bar{\Omega}_G^e \hookrightarrow \Omega_G^e$  is the full subcategory of  $(B, A, X)$ -labeled trees whose underlying trees is alternating, active nodes are labeled by  $X$ , and passive nodes are labeled by  $A$  or  $B$ .

We note that conditions (i) and (ii) in Definition 5.62 imply that maps in  $\bar{\Omega}_G^e$  are underlying alternating maps.

The following establishes the required finality of  $\bar{\Omega}_G^e$  in  $\Omega_G^e$ .

**Proposition 5.71.** For each  $U \in \Omega_G^e$  there exists a unique  $\text{lr}_X(U) \in \bar{\Omega}_G^e$  together with a unique planar label map of  $\Omega_G^e$

$$\text{lr}_X(U) \rightarrow U.$$

Furthermore,  $\text{lr}_X$  extends to a right retraction  $\text{lr}_X: \Omega_G^e \rightarrow \bar{\Omega}_G^e$ .

LXP PROP

*Proof.* Given  $U$ , we form a collection of outer faces  $\{U_i^A\} \sqcup \{U_j^B\} \sqcup \{U_k^X\}$  where the  $U_i^A, U_j^B$  are simply the  $A, B$ -labeled nodes and the  $\{U_k^X\}$  are the maximal outer subtrees whose nodes have only  $X$ -labels (we note that these may possibly be sticks). Lemma 3.51 then guarantees that the  $V_G(U^X)$  are disjoint, so that one can apply (the equivariant version of Proposition 3.49) to build

$$T = \text{lr}(U) \rightarrow U \quad (5.72)$$


such that  $\{U_{v_{Ge}}\} = \{U_i^A\} \sqcup \{U_j^B\} \sqcup \{U_k^X\}$ .  $T$  has an obvious  $(B, A, X)$ -labeling making (5.72) into a label map, but we must still check  $T \in \bar{\Omega}_G^e$ , i.e. that  $T$  is alternating with the  $X$ -labeled vertices being precisely the  $X$ -labeled vertices. Let us now write any input path of  $T$  as  $I(e) = (e = e_n \leq e_{n-1} \leq \dots \leq e_1 \leq e_0)$ . By Lemma 3.51 and maximality of the  $U_k^X$ , no pair of consecutive vertices  $v_{Ge_i}$  and  $v_{Ge_{i+1}}$  can be both  $X$ -labeled. On the other hand, again by Lemma 3.51 any edge of  $U$  belongs to some  $U_k^X$  and therefore: (i) at least one of in each pair of consecutive vertices  $v_{Ge_i}$  and  $v_{Ge_{i+1}}$  is  $X$ -labeled; (ii) if  $r \in T$  is a root,  $v_{Gr}$  is  $X$ -labeled; (iii) if  $l \in T$  is a leaf  $v_{Gl_{n-1}}$  is  $X$ -labeled. This suffices to conclude  $T \in \bar{\Omega}_G^e$ , and uniqueness of  $T$  is immediate from the uniqueness in Lemma 3.51.

It remains to check that  $\text{lr}_X$  in fact defines a functor. We consider the following diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{lr}_X(U) & \longrightarrow & U \\ \text{lr}_X(f) \downarrow & & \downarrow f \\ \text{lr}_X(V) & \longrightarrow & V \end{array}$$

When  $f$  is a root pullback map, we define  $\text{lr}_X(f)$  to likewise be a root pullback map. When  $f$  is a rooted tall map, writing  $T = \text{lr}_X(U)$  one has a map of rooted  $T$ -substitution data  $\{\text{lr}_X(V_{v_{Ge}})\} \rightarrow \{V_{v_{Ge}}\}$ , which after converted to a tree map yields the desired map  $\text{lr}_X(f)$ . To check that  $\text{lr}_X$  respects composition of maps, the only non immediate case is that of a root pullback followed by a rooted map, in which case this follows from Remark 4.22.  $\square$

**Example 5.73.** The following illustrates the  $\text{lr}_X$  construction when applied to the map  $\varphi$  in (5.64).



## 6 Filtration of cellular extensions

Put together, the results in the previous section show that the free extension  $\mathcal{P}[u]$  given by the pushout

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{F}_G X & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{P} \\ u \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbb{F}_G Y & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{P}[u] \end{array} \quad (6.1) \quad \boxed{\text{CELLEXTPUSH EQ}}$$

is given by a left Kan extension along  $(\bar{\Omega}_G^e)^{op} \xrightarrow{lr} \Sigma_G^{op}$ . So as to study the homotopical properties of the map  $\mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}[u]$  we will identify a suitable filtration of this map, which will in turn be induced by a suitable filtration of the extension tree category  $\bar{\Omega}_G^e$ .

### 6.1 Filtration pieces

We now turn to the task of describing our filtration of  $\bar{\Omega}_G^e$ .

Firstly, we write  $V_X(T)$  (resp.  $V_Y(T)$ ) to denote the set of (non-equivariant) vertices of  $T$  with a  $X$ -label (resp.  $Y$ -label). We now define the *degree* of  $T \in \bar{\Omega}_G^e$ , denoted  $|T|$ , to be the sum  $|T|_X + |T|_Y$ , where  $|T|_X, |T|_Y$  are defined by

$$|T|_X = \frac{|V_X(T)|}{|Gr|} = \sum_{Gv \in V_{G,X}(T)} \frac{|Gv|}{|Gr|}, \quad |T|_Y = \frac{|V_Y(T)|}{|Gr|} = \sum_{Gv \in V_{G,Y}(T)} \frac{|Gv|}{|Gr|}$$

for  $Gr$  the root orbit of  $T$ .

Intuitively,  $|T|_X$  counts the number of  $X$ -labeled vertices in each individual tree component of  $T$ .

**Remark 6.2.** One of the key properties of the degrees just defined is that they are invariant under root pullback.

**Definition 6.3.** We define subcategories of  $\bar{\Omega}_G^e$ :

- $\bar{\Omega}_G^e[\leq k]$  (resp.  $\Omega_G^e[k]$ ) is the full subcategory of trees  $T \in \bar{\Omega}_G^e$  with  $|T| \leq k$  (resp.  $|T| = k$ );
- $\bar{\Omega}_G^e[\leq k, -]$  (resp.  $\bar{\Omega}_G^e[k, -]$ ) is the full subcategory of  $\bar{\Omega}_G^e[\leq k]$  (resp.  $\bar{\Omega}_G^e[k]$ ) of trees  $T$  with  $|T|_Y \neq k$ ;
- $\bar{\Omega}_G^e[k, 0]$  is the full subcategory of  $\bar{\Omega}_G^e[k]$  of trees  $T$  with  $|T|_X = 0$  (or, equivalently,  $|T|_Y = k$ ).

The above definitions still hold if we replace  $\bar{\Omega}_G^e$  with  $\Omega_G^a$ ; in particular, we have vertical forgetful functors

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bar{\Omega}_G^e[k, -] & \hookrightarrow & \bar{\Omega}_G^e[k] \\ & \searrow \text{fgt} & \swarrow \text{fgt} \\ & \Omega_G^a[k] & \end{array}$$

**Remark 6.4.** The categories  $\bar{\Omega}_G^e[k]$  and  $\bar{\Omega}_G^e[k, -]$  have only rather limited morphisms. In fact, all maps in these categories must be underlying quotients of trees. Indeed, it is clear from Definition 5.62 that maps never lower degree and, moreover, degree is preserved iff  $\mathcal{P}$ -vertices are substituted by  $\mathcal{P}$ -vertices (rather than larger trees in  $\bar{\Omega}_G^e$ , which would necessarily possess  $X$ -vertices).

Moreover, we have a clear isomorphism of categories  $\bar{\Omega}_G^e[k, 0] \simeq \Omega_G^a[k]$ .

**Lemma 6.5.**  $\bar{\Omega}_G^e[\leq k-1]$  is *Ran-initial* in  $\bar{\Omega}_G^e[\leq k, -]$  over  $\Sigma_G$ .


In the proof we will make use of the following construction on  $\Omega_{G,e}$ : given  $T \in \Omega_{G,e}$  we will let  $T_{\mathcal{P}}$  denote the result of replacing all  $X$ -labeled nodes of  $T$  with  $\mathcal{P}$ -labeled nodes.



YINERT REM

**Remark 6.6.** Unlike the  $\text{lr}_{\mathcal{P}}$  construction of Proposition 5.71, which defines a functor  $\text{lr}_{\mathcal{P}}: \Omega_G^e \rightarrow \bar{\Omega}_G^e$ , the construction  $(-)_{\mathcal{P}}$  does not define a full functor  $\Omega_G^e \rightarrow \bar{\Omega}_G^e$ , instead being functorial, and the obvious maps  $T_{\mathcal{P}} \rightarrow T$  natural, only with respect to the  $Y$ -inert maps of  $\Omega_G^e$ .

**Example 6.7.** Combining the  $(-)_{\mathcal{P}}$  and  $\text{lr}_{\mathcal{P}}$  constructions one obtains a construction sending trees in  $\bar{\Omega}_G^e$  to trees in  $\bar{\Omega}_G^e$ . We illustrate this for the tree  $T \in \bar{\Omega}_G^e$  below, where black nodes are  $\mathcal{P}$ -labeled, white nodes filled with  $\times$  are  $X$ -labeled, and empty white nodes are  $Y$ -labeled.



*Proof of Lemma 6.5.* Just as in the proof of Lemma 4.67, for each  $C \in \Sigma_G$ , the undercategories  $C \downarrow \bar{\Omega}_G^e[\leq k-1]$ ,  $C \downarrow \bar{\Omega}_G^e[\leq k, -]$  have initial subcategories  $C \downarrow_{r,\approx} \bar{\Omega}_G^e[\leq k-1]$ ,  $C \downarrow_{r,\approx} \bar{\Omega}_G^e[\leq k, -]$  of those objects  $(S, q: C \rightarrow \text{lr}(S))$  such that  $q$  is an ordered isomorphism on roots, and thus an isomorphism in  $\Sigma_G$ .

It now suffices to show (cf. (4, X.3.1)) that for each  $(S, q: C \rightarrow \text{lr}(S))$  in  $C \downarrow_{r,\approx} \bar{\Omega}_G^e[\leq k, -]$  the undercategory

$$(S, q) \downarrow (C \downarrow_{r,\approx} \bar{\Omega}_G^e[\leq k-1]) \quad (6.8)$$

UNDERCATPR EQ

is non-empty and connected. Moreover, we note that an object in (6.8) is uniquely encoded by a map  $T \rightarrow S$  inducing a rooted isomorphism on  $\text{lr}$ .

The case  $S \in \Omega_G^e[\leq k-1]$  is immediate. Otherwise, since  $|S|_Y \neq k$  it is  $\|k\|_{\mathcal{P}}(S_{\mathcal{P}}) < k$  and the map  $\text{lr}_{\mathcal{P}}(S_{\mathcal{P}}) \rightarrow S$ , which is a rooted isomorphism on  $\text{lr}$ , shows that (6.8) is indeed non-empty.

Otherwise, given any rooted tall map  $T \rightarrow S$  with  $T \in \bar{\Omega}_G^e[k-1]$  (which gives a rooted isomorphism on  $\text{lr}$  and thus encodes a unique object of (6.8)). One can then form a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & S & \longleftarrow & \text{lr}_{\mathcal{P}}(S_{\mathcal{P}}) \\ & \nearrow & \uparrow Y\text{-inert} & & \uparrow \\ T & \longrightarrow & T' & \longleftarrow & \text{lr}_{\mathcal{P}}(T'_{\mathcal{P}}) \end{array} \quad (6.9)$$

K-1LANFINAL EQ

where  $T \rightarrow T' \rightarrow S$  is the natural factorization such that the second map is  $Y$ -inert, i.e.,  $T'$  is obtained from  $T$  by simply relabeling to  $X$  those  $Y$ -labeled vertices of  $T$  that become  $X$ -vertices in  $S$ . Note that the existence of the right square in (6.9) follows from the map  $T' \rightarrow S$  being  $Y$ -inert together with Remark 6.6. Since (6.9) becomes a diagram of rooted isomorphism on  $\text{lr}$ , if produces the necessary zigzag connecting the objects  $T \rightarrow S$  and  $\text{lr}_{\mathcal{P}}(S_{\mathcal{P}}) \rightarrow S$  in (6.8), finishing the proof.  $\square$

Similarly to the  $(-)_{\mathcal{P}}$  construction, there is also a construction  $T_Y$  which replaces all  $X$ -labels of  $T \in \bar{\Omega}_G^e$  with  $Y$ -labels. Moreover, in this case the construction restricts directly to a construction on  $\bar{\Omega}_G^e$ , which is easily seen to be functorial (and the  $T_Y \rightarrow T$  maps natural) with regards to  $\mathcal{P}$ -inert maps. Remark 6.4 thus implies that  $(-)_Y: \bar{\Omega}_G^e[k] \rightarrow \bar{\Omega}_G^e[k, 0]$  is a left retraction, resulting in the following.

**Lemma 6.10.**  $\bar{\Omega}_G^e[k, 0]$  is  $\text{Ran}$ -initial in  $\bar{\Omega}_G^e[k]$  over  $\Sigma_G$ .

N\_FINALITY\_LEMMA

In what follows we write  $N^e: \Omega_G^{e,op} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$  for the functor in (5.61), and abuse notation by likewise writing  $N^e$  for any of its restrictions to the subcategories in Definition 6.3. We are now in a position to produce the desired filtration of the map  $\mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}[u]$  in (6.1).

PK\_DEFN

**Definition 6.11.** Let  $\mathcal{P}_k$  denote the left Kan extension

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bar{\Omega}_G^e[\leq k]^{op} & \xrightarrow{N^e} & \mathcal{V} \\ \downarrow \text{lr} & \nearrow \mathcal{P}_k & \\ \Sigma_G^{op} & & \end{array}$$

Noting that  $\bar{\Omega}_G^e[\leq 0] \simeq \Sigma_G$  (since  $|T| = 0$  only if  $T$  is a  $G$ -corolla with  $\mathcal{P}$ -labeled vertex) and that  $\bar{\Omega}_G^e$  is the union of (the nerves of) the  $\bar{\Omega}_G^e[\leq k]$ , one has a filtration

$$\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_2 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow \text{colim}_k \mathcal{P}_k = \mathcal{P}[u]. \quad (6.12)$$

FILT EQ

To analyze (6.12) homotopically we will further make use of a pushout description of each individual map  $\mathcal{P}_{k-1} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_k$ . To do so, we note that the diagram of inclusions

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bar{\Omega}_G^e[k, -] & \longrightarrow & \bar{\Omega}_G^e[\leq k, -] \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \bar{\Omega}_G^e[k] & \longrightarrow & \bar{\Omega}_G^e[\leq k] \end{array} \quad (6.13)$$

INCDIAG EQ

is a pushout of at the level of nerves. Indeed, this follows since

$$\bar{\Omega}_G^e[k] \cap \bar{\Omega}_G^e[\leq k, -] = \bar{\Omega}_G^e[k, -], \quad \bar{\Omega}_G^e[k] \cup \bar{\Omega}_G^e[\leq k, -] = \bar{\Omega}_G^e[\leq k],$$

and since a map  $T \rightarrow S$  in  $\bar{\Omega}_G^e[\leq k]$  will be in one of subcategories in (6.13) iff  $T$  is.

Since Lemma 6.5 provides an identification  $\text{Lan}_{\bar{\Omega}_G^e, e[\leq k, -]^{op}} N^e \simeq \text{Lan}_{\bar{\Omega}_G^e, e[\leq k-1]^{op}} N^e = \mathcal{P}_{k-1}$ , applying left Kan extensions to (6.13) yields the pushout diagram below.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Lan}_{\bar{\Omega}_G^e, e[k, -]^{op}} N^e & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{P}_{k-1} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{Lan}_{\bar{\Omega}_G^e, e[k]^{op}} N^e & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{P}_k \end{array} \quad (6.14)$$

FILTRATION\_LAN\_SQUARE

HERE

## 6.2 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 6.15.** Given a map  $Y_0 \rightarrow Y_1$  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

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

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

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

Q\_DEFINITION

**Definition 6.16.** Given  $u : Y_0 \rightarrow Y_1$  and  $(A, D) \in \mathbf{F} \wr \Sigma_G$  as before, let  $\mathbf{pc}(A)$  denote the “punctured cube” subcategory

$$\mathbf{pc}(A) := (0 \rightarrow 1)^A \setminus \{(1)_a\} \subseteq (0 \rightarrow 1)^A,$$

and define

$$Q[u]^D := \operatorname{colim}_{\mathbf{pc}(A)} [u]^D,$$

and

$$[u]^{\square D} : Q[u]^D \rightarrow \bigotimes_{a \in A} Y_1(D(a))$$

as the natural map.

### 6.3 Filtration Result

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

**Theorem 6.17.** *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*

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

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

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \operatorname{Lan}_{\bar{\Omega}_G^e[k, -]^{op}} N^e & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{P}_{k-1} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \operatorname{Lan}_{\bar{\Omega}_G^e[k]^{op}} N^e & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{P}_k \end{array}$$

where each  $\operatorname{Lan}$  is over the leaf-root functor associated to the given category.

Levelwise, for each  $C \in \Sigma_G$ , we have a filtration of  $\mathcal{P}(C) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}[u](C)$  in  $\mathcal{V}^{\operatorname{Aut}(C)}$ , where  $\mathcal{P}_{k-1}(C) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_k(C)$  is given by the pushout

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

where the left vertical map is the iterated box product

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

$\iota_{\mathcal{P}(T_v)}$  is the canonical map  $\mathcal{Q} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(T_v)$  out of the initial object, and  $\Omega_G^a[k](C)$  is as in Definition 6.3.

*Proof.* The first result is just a restatement of Diagram (6.14). Levelwise analysis follows from understanding the left-hand vertical map of Diagram (6.14), which we will denote

$$l[k] : L_1[k] \rightarrow L_2[k].$$

By stacking left Kan extensions, we have

$$L_i[k] \simeq \operatorname{Lan}_{\Omega_G^a[k]} (\operatorname{Lan}_{\bar{\Omega}_G^e[\epsilon_i] \rightarrow \Omega_G^a[k]} N^e),$$

where  $[\epsilon_1] = [k, -]$  and  $[\epsilon_2] = [k]$ . Evaluating at  $C \in \Sigma_G$  using pointwise left Kan extensions yields

$$L_i[k](C) \simeq \operatorname{colim}_{\substack{\Omega_G^{a,op} \downarrow_r C \\ T \leftarrow C}} \left( \operatorname{colim}_{\substack{\Omega_G^e[\epsilon_i]^{op} \downarrow_r T \\ T^e \leftarrow T}} N^e(T^e) \right).$$

Further, we observe that  $\bar{\Omega}_G^e[k]^{op} \downarrow_r T$  is equivalent to the cube category  $(0 \rightarrow 1)^{V_{G,in}(T)}$  (with only  $\operatorname{Aut}(T)$ -induced isomorphisms), while  $\bar{\Omega}_G^e[k, -]^{op} \downarrow_r T$  is similarly equivalent to the punctured cube category  $\mathbf{pc}(V_{G,in}(T))$ . Unpacked, these statements, in particular that cube categories have terminal objects, Lemma 6.10, and the fact that  $\Omega_G^{a,op} \downarrow_r C$  is a groupoid, combine to imply that  $l[k]$  is equivalent to the map

$$\coprod_{[T] \in \Omega_G^{a,op}[k](C)/\simeq} \left( \bigotimes_{V_{G,p}(T)} \mathcal{P}(T_{Gv}) \otimes Q[u]^{V_{G,in}(T)} \rightarrow N^e(T_Y) \right) \otimes_{\operatorname{Aut}(T)} \operatorname{Aut}(C),$$

as desired. □

## 7 Model Structures on Genuine Operads

come back: this is all disorganized, internally, externally, everything

replaced  $\mathbb{F}$  with  $\mathcal{F}$  (as opposed to  $\mathbb{F}$ )

In order to encode the homotopical information inspired by  $N_\infty$ -operads discussed in the introduction, we will introduce (semi) model structures on the categories  $\mathcal{V}\mathbf{Op}_G$  and  $\mathcal{V}\mathbf{Op}^G$  for a wide range of  $\mathcal{V}$ , which are true model categories in the cases we are most interested in (i.e. for  $\mathcal{V} = \mathbf{sSet}$ ). These model structures will be determined by a choice of weak indexing system, a generalization of the notion defined in [2].

### 7.1 Weak Indexing Systems

We recall certain constructions found in [6] relating graph subgroups, finite  $H$ -sets, and systems of categories.

**Definition 7.1.** A  $G$ -graph subgroup of  $G \times \Sigma_n$  is a subgroup  $\Lambda \leq G \times \Sigma_n$  such that  $\Lambda \cap \Sigma_n = e$ . Equivalently,  $\Gamma = \Gamma(\phi)$  is the graph of some homomorphism  $G \geq H \xrightarrow{\phi} \Sigma_n$ .

**Definition 7.2.** A  $G$ -vertex family is a collection

$$\mathcal{F} = \coprod_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{F}_n$$

where each  $\mathcal{F}_n$  is a family of  $G$ -graph subgroups of  $G \times \Sigma_n$ , closed under subgroups and conjugation. For a fixed  $\mathcal{F}$ , we call an  $H$ -set  $A \in \mathbf{F}^H$   $\mathcal{F}$ -admissible if for some (equivalently, any) choice of bijection  $A \leftrightarrow \{1, \dots, |A|\}$ , the graph subgroup of  $G \times \Sigma_n$  encoding the induced  $H$ -action on  $\{1, \dots, |A|\}$  is in  $\mathcal{F}_n$ .

**Definition 7.3.** For any  $G$ -vertex family  $\mathcal{F}$ , a  $G$ -tree  $T \in \Omega_G$  is called  $\mathcal{F}$ -admissible if, for each vertex  $e_1 \dots e_n \leq e$  in  $V(T)$ , the set  $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$  is an  $\mathcal{F}$ -admissible  $\mathrm{Stab}_G(e)$ -set. We let  $\Omega_{\mathcal{F}} \subseteq \Omega_G$  and  $\Sigma_{\mathcal{F}} \subseteq \Sigma_G$  denote the full subcategories spanned by the  $\mathcal{F}$ -admissible trees.

**Definition 7.4.** A  $G$ -vertex family is called a *weak indexing system* if  $\Omega_{\mathcal{F}}$  is a sieve of  $\Omega_G$ ; that is, for any map  $f : S \rightarrow T$  with  $T \in \Omega_{\mathcal{F}}$ , we have that  $S$  (and the map  $f$ ) are in  $\Omega_{\mathcal{F}}$ .

We note that this always holds for any  $\mathcal{F}$  if  $f$  is an outer face or a quotient (for the latter, this follows from each  $\mathcal{F}_n$  being closed under subgroups). However, closure under degeneracies implies that all trivial orbits  $H/H$  are  $\mathcal{F}$ -admissible, while closure under inner faces implies that the  $\mathcal{F}$ -admissible sets are closed under “broad self-induction”: if  $A \sqcup H/K$  and  $B$  are  $\mathcal{F}$ -admissible  $H$ - and  $K$ -sets, respectively, then  $A \sqcup H \times_K B$  is also an  $\mathcal{F}$ -admissible  $H$ -set. It also implies, in particular, the following:

**Lemma 7.5.** The valence map  $\mathrm{lr}$  restricts to a map  $\mathrm{lr} : \Omega_{\mathcal{F}} \rightarrow \Sigma_{\mathcal{F}}$ ; that is, if  $T$  is  $\mathcal{F}$ -admissible, so is  $\mathrm{lr}(T)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 7.6.** A weak indexing system  $\mathcal{F}$  is an indexing system (in the sense of [2]) if and only if all trivial  $H$ -sets are  $\mathcal{F}$ -admissible, for all  $H \leq G$ .  $\square$

*Proof.* come back

We will define  $\mathcal{F}$ -model structures on  $\mathcal{V}\mathbf{Op}_G$  for any weak indexing system  $\mathcal{F}$ ; the  $\mathcal{F}$ -model structure on  $\mathcal{V}\mathbf{Sym}_G$  will exist for any  $G$ -vertex family  $\mathcal{F}$ , but transferring requires the additional closure properties.

## 7.2 Semi Model Structures on Genuine Operads

Fix a  $G$ -vertex family  $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_n\}$ . For the following section, we fix the following about our base category  $\mathcal{V}$ :

**Definition 7.7.** We say  $\mathcal{V}$  satisfies ASSUMPTION 1 (for  $\mathcal{F}$ ) if the following hold:

1.  $\mathcal{V}$  is a cofibrantly-generated Cartesian symmetric monoidal model category, and
2.  $\mathcal{V}$  has cellular fixed point functors for all finite groups (c.f. [Stephan16](#) [\[7\]](#)).

**Definition 7.8.** The  $\mathcal{F}$ -projective model structure on  $\mathcal{V}\text{Sym} = \mathcal{V}^{\Sigma_G^{op}}$  is the unique model structure induced by the adjunction

$$\mathcal{V}^{\Sigma_G^{op}} \rightleftarrows \mathcal{V}^{\Sigma_{\mathcal{F}}^{op}}.$$

Explicitly, a map  $f$  is a fibration (resp. weak equivalence) if  $f(C)$  is one in  $\mathcal{V}$  for all  $C \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{F}}$ .

**Definition 7.9.** A map  $f : \mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$  in  $\mathcal{V}\text{Op}_G$  is called a

1.  $\mathcal{F}$ -fibration (resp.  $\mathcal{F}$ -weak equivalence) if  $f(C) : \mathcal{O}(C) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(C)$  is one in  $\mathcal{V}$  for all  $\mathcal{F}$ -admissible  $G$ -corollas  $C \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{F}}$ .
2.  $\mathcal{F}$ -cofibration if it has the left lifting property against all maps which are both  $\mathcal{F}$ -fibrations and  $\mathcal{F}$ -weak equivalences.
3.  $\Sigma_{\mathcal{F}}$ -cofibration if  $f$  is an  $\mathcal{F}$ -cofibration in  $\mathcal{V}\text{Sym}_G$ .

In particular,  $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{V}\text{Op}_G$  will be called  $\mathcal{F}$ -cofibrant if  $\emptyset \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$  is an  $\mathcal{F}$ -cofibration.

**Definition 7.10.** The  $\mathcal{F}$ -model structure on  $\mathcal{V}\text{Op}_G$ , if it exists, is the unique model structure with the above specified weak equivalences and fibrations. Equivalently, it is the transferred model structure along the adjoints

$$\mathcal{V}\text{Op}_G \xrightleftharpoons[\text{fgt}]{\mathbb{F}_G} \mathcal{V}^{\Sigma_G^{op}} \xrightleftharpoons{\quad} \prod_{\text{Ob}(\Sigma_G)} \mathcal{V} \xrightleftharpoons{\quad} \prod_{\text{Ob}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{F}})} \mathcal{V}$$

Using general arguments of [Hi03](#) [\[3\]](#), this structure would be cofibrantly generated, with generating arrows

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\mathcal{F}} &= \{\mathbb{F}_G(\Sigma_G(-, C) \cdot i) \mid C \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{F}}, i \in I\} \\ J_{\mathcal{F}} &= \{\mathbb{F}_G(\Sigma_G(-, C) \cdot j) \mid C \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{F}}, j \in J\}, \end{aligned}$$

for  $I$  (resp.  $J$ ) the generating (trivial) cofibrations of  $\mathcal{V}$ .

**Definition 7.11.** If  $\mathcal{F}$  is the complete  $G$ -vertex family - so  $\mathcal{F}_n$  is the family of all graph subgroups of  $G \times \Sigma_n$  - we refer to the  $\mathcal{F}$ -model structure as the *genuine* model structure.

**Theorem 7.12.** The genuine semi-model structure on  $\mathcal{V}\text{Op}_G$  exists for all  $\mathcal{V}$  satisfying ASSUMPTION 1.

*Proof.* By general arguments of Kan [\[3, 11.6.1\]](#), it suffices to show that any transfinite composite of cellular extensions  $\mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}[u]$ , each built by pushouts

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

where  $u : X \rightarrow Y$  is a generating trivial cofibration and  $\mathcal{P}$  is cofibrant in  $\mathcal{V}_{gen}^{\Sigma_G^{op}}$ , is itself a weak equivalence in  $\mathcal{V}_{gen}^{\Sigma_G^{op}}$ .

In particular, it suffices to show that, for  $u$  a genuine level trivial cofibration and  $\mathcal{P}$  genuine level cofibrant, any map  $\mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}[u]$  is itself a genuine level trivial cofibration; since these are weaker conditions on  $u$  and  $\mathcal{P}$ , and transfinite composition is levelwise, this implies the above result. This case follows from the levelwise filtration from Theorem 6.17, by applying Propositions 7.14 and 7.7. □

**Remark 7.13.** In proving the above, we will often use the fact that, given families  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{F}}$  of subgroups of a group  $\Pi$ , the identity map

$$\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^G \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_{\bar{\mathcal{F}}}^G$$

is left Quillen (and in particular preserves cofibrations). In particular, any  $\mathcal{F}$ -cofibration is a genuine cofibration.

**Proposition 7.14.** Fix  $T \in \Omega_G$ , and suppose we are given cofibrations  $f(Gv) \in \mathcal{V}_{gen}^{\text{Aut}(T_{Gv})}$  for all  $Gv \in V_G(T)$ , such that  $f(Gv) = f(\alpha(Gv))$  for all  $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(T)$ . Then the iterated box product

$$f^{\square V_G(T)} = \square_{Gv \in V_G(T)} f(Gv)$$

is a cofibration in  $\mathcal{V}_{gen}^{\text{Aut}(T)}$ .

*Proof.* Using grafting composition  $T \simeq C \circ (T_1^1, \dots, T_1^{k_1}, T_2^1, \dots, T_r^{k_r})$ , we go by induction on  $|V_G(T)|$ . The base cases of  $|V_G(T)| = 0$  or  $1$  are trivial. Now, we note that we have a decomposition

$$f^{\square V_G(T)} = f(Gv_r) \square \square_{i=1}^r \left( \left( f^{\square V_G(T_i)} \right)^{\square k_i} \right)$$

where  $Gv_r$  is the root orbit. We will build this map in stages, preserving cofibrancy in each step.

- By induction, for each  $i$ ,  $f^{\square V_G(T_i)}$  is a cofibration in  $\mathcal{V}_{gen}^{\text{Aut}(T_i)}$ .
- By Proposition [POWERF PROP](#), each  $\left( f^{\square V_G(T_i)} \right)^{\square k_i}$  is a cofibration in  $\mathcal{V}_{gen}^{\Sigma_{k_i} \wr \text{Aut}(T_i)}$ .
- By Remark [EXTERINTADJ EQ](#),  $\square_{i=1}^r \left( \left( f^{\square V_G(T_i)} \right)^{\square k_i} \right)$  is a cofibration in  $\mathcal{V}_{gen}^{\Pi \Sigma_{k_i} \wr \text{Aut}(T_i)}$ .
- By Proposition [FGTLEFT PROP](#),  $f(Gv_r)$  is a cofibration in  $\mathcal{V}_{gen}^{\text{Aut}(T)}$ .
- Finally, by the decomposition on  $\text{Aut}(T)$  and Proposition [BIQUILLENG PROP](#), we have the full  $f^{\square V_G(T)}$  is a cofibration in  $\mathcal{V}_{gen}^{\text{Aut}(T)}$ , as desired.

If any  $f(Gv)$  were trivial, then, during the appropriate step above, the resulting box product would again be trivial, by the same referenced results.  $\square$

**Corollary 7.15.** For any  $G$ -vertex system  $\mathcal{F}$ , the  $\mathcal{F}$ -semi-model structure on  $\mathcal{V}\text{Op}_G$  exists.

*Proof.* This follows from the proof of Theorem [GENUINE\\_SEMI\\_VOP\\_G\\_THM](#) 7.12. In particular, it suffices to show that if  $u : X \rightarrow Y$  is a level trivial  $\mathcal{F}$ -cofibration and  $\mathcal{P}$  is level  $\mathcal{F}$ -cofibrant in  $\mathcal{V}_{gen}^{\Sigma_G}$ , then the cellular extension  $\mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}[u]$  is a level trivial  $\mathcal{F}$ -cofibration. However, such  $u$  are level genuine cofibrations, and such  $\mathcal{P}$  are level genuine cofibrant, and hence  $\mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}[u]$  is a level trivial genuine cofibration, and hence a level trivial  $\mathcal{F}$ -cofibration.  $\square$

### 7.3 True Model Structures

come back

### 7.4 Preservation of Cofibrant Objects

come back

## 7.5 Cofibrant Symmetric Collections

come back: can do all of this for  $\mathcal{V}^{\Omega_G^{op}}$  and  $\mathcal{V}^{\Sigma_G^{op}}$ , don't need these crazy categories.

We first classify cofibrant objects in  $\mathcal{V}^{\Omega_G^e[k]^{op}}$ , by breaking apart our category  $\Omega_G^e[k]$ .

**Definition 7.16.** Given a tree  $T_0 \in \Omega$ , let  $\Omega_G[T_0]$  denote the full subcategory of  $\Omega_G^q$  spanned by those trees which receive a map from  $G \cdot T_0$ ; that is, all trees of the form  $G \cdot T_0/N$ .

**Lemma 7.17.**  $\Omega_G[T_0] \simeq_{O_{\Gamma_{T_0}}} \text{as categories, where } \Gamma_{T_0} \text{ is the family of graph subgroups of } G \times \Sigma_{T_0}.$   $\square$

**Definition 7.18.** Refining the above, given an odd tree  $T_0 \in \Omega^{\text{odd}}$ , let  $T_0(Y) \in \Omega^e$  denote the labeled tree with underlying tree  $T_0$  and all even nodes labeled with  $Y$ . Further, let  $\Omega^e[T_0]$  denote the full subcategory of  $\Omega^e$  spanned by those trees  $(S_0, \lambda_{S_0})$  which receive a map from  $T_0(Y)$  in  $\Omega^e$ . Similarly, let  $\Omega_G^e[T_0]$  denote the full subcategory of  $\Omega_G^e$  spanned by those trees  $(S, \lambda_S)$  which receive a map from  $G \cdot T_0(Y)$ .

We have an inclusion  $\tau : G \times \Omega^e[T_0] \hookrightarrow \Omega_G^e[T_0]$ , refining the inclusion  $G \times \Omega \hookrightarrow \Omega_G$ . This induces an adjunction

$$\mathcal{V}^{G \times \Omega^e[T_0]^{op}} \xrightleftharpoons[\tau_*]{\tau^*} \mathcal{V}^{\Omega_G^e[T_0]^{op}}$$

and we observe that

$$\tau_* X(G \cdot T_0/N, \lambda) \simeq X(G \cdot T_0, q^* \lambda)^N,$$

where we are using the fact that even element in  $\Omega_G^e[T_0]$  has underlying tree of the form  $G \cdot T_0/N$ , and  $q^* \lambda$  is the vertex labeling

$$q^* \lambda : V_G(G \cdot T_0) \rightarrow V_G(G \cdot T_0/N) \xrightarrow{\lambda} \{Y, X\}.$$

We further repackage  $\Omega_G^e[T_0]$ . In particular, we observe that if there is a map  $(T', \lambda') \rightarrow (T'', \lambda'')$  in  $\Omega_G^e[T_0]$ , it is uniquely determined by the underlying quotient map  $T' \rightarrow T''$ . Indeed,  $\Omega_G^e[T_0](T', T'')$  is the subset of  $\Omega_{\Gamma_{T_0}}(G \times \Sigma_{T_0}/N', G \times \Sigma_{T_0}/N'')$ , where  $T' \simeq G \cdot T_0/N'$  and  $T'' \simeq G \cdot T_0/N''$ , of those maps  $q$  such that  $v'' \in V_Y(T'')$  implies  $q^{-1}(v'') \in V_Y(T')$ . Stephan 16

We can now prove a proposition, modeled on the proof of [7, Theorem 2.10].

**Proposition 7.19.** *If  $X \in \mathcal{V}^{\Omega_G^e[T_0]^{op}}$  is cofibrant, then  $\eta_X : X \rightarrow \tau_* \tau^* X$  is an isomorphism.*

*Proof.* come back, type up these sheets

First:  $\eta$  is an iso on representables.

Second: carries through across the necessary cellular extensions.  $\square$

### 7.5.1 $G$ -Operads

**Definition 7.20.** A map  $f : \mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$  in  $\mathcal{V}\text{Op}^G$  is called a

1.  $\mathcal{F}$ -fibration (resp.  $\mathcal{F}$ -weak equivalence) if ...

come back

**Definition 7.21.** The  $\mathcal{F}$ -model structure on  $\mathcal{V}\text{Op}^G$ , ...

come back

**Lemma 7.22.** *The  $\mathcal{F}$ -semi-model structure, if it exists, is the transferred model structure along the adjunction*

$$\mathcal{V}\text{Op}_{\mathcal{F}}^G \rightleftarrows \mathcal{V}\text{Op}_G^{\mathcal{F}}$$

**Corollary 7.23.** *The  $\mathcal{F}$ -(-semi)-model structure exists on  $\mathcal{V}\text{Op}^G$  whenever it exists on  $\mathcal{V}\text{Op}_G$ .*

**Theorem 7.24.**  *$\mathcal{V}\text{Op}_{\mathcal{F}}^G$  and  $\mathcal{V}\text{Op}_G^{\mathcal{F}}$  are Quillen equivalent.*



## References

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">BM03</div>      | [1] C. Berger and I. Moerdijk. Axiomatic homotopy theory for operads. <u>Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici</u> , 78:805–831, 2003.   |
| <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">BH15</div>      | [2] A. Blumberg and M. Hill. Operadic multiplications in equivariant spectra, norms, and transfers. <u>Adv. Math.</u> , 285:658–708, 2015.   |
| <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">Hi03</div>      | [3] P. S. Hirschhorn. <u>Model categories and their localizations</u> , volume 99 of <u>Mathematical Surveys and Monographs</u> . American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003. |
| <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">McL</div>       | [4] S. Mac Lane. <u>Categories for the working mathematician</u> , volume 5 of <u>Graduate Texts in Mathematics</u> . Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1998.                 |
| <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">Pe16b</div>     | [5] L. A. Pereira. Equivariant dendroidal sets. Available at: <a href="http://www.faculty.virginia.edu/luisalex/">http://www.faculty.virginia.edu/luisalex/</a> , 2016.                |
| <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">Per17</div>     | [6] L. A. Pereira. Equivariant dendroidal sets. arXiv preprint: 1702.08119, 2017.  |
| <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">Stephan16</div> | [7] M. Stephan. On equivariant homotopy theory for model categories. arXiv preprint: 1308.0856v3, 2016.  |
| <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">We12</div>      | [8] I. Weiss. Broad posets, trees, and the dendroidal category. Available at: <a href="https://arxiv.org/abs/1201.3987">https://arxiv.org/abs/1201.3987</a> , 2012.                    |