Genuine equivariant operads

Peter Bonventre, Luís A. Pereira

April 12, 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_∞-operads of Blumberg and Hill.

Contents

1 Introduction

No content yet.

2 Planar and tall maps

2.1 Planar structures

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

Our preferred model for trees will be that of broad posets first introduced by Weiss in [3] and further worked out by the second author in [2]. We now define planar structures in this context.

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

- *Planar*: if $e \leq_p f$ and $e \nleq_d f$ then $g \leq_d f$ implies $e \leq_p g$.

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



(2.3) PLANAREX EQ

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

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

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

INPUTPATH NOT **Notation 2.4.** Let $T \in \Omega$ be a tree and $e \in T$ and edge. We will denote

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

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

We will repeatedly use the following, which is a consequence of [2, Cor. 5.26].

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

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

(a) for any $e \in T$ the finite poset $I(e)$ is totally ordered;

(b) the poset $(T, \leq_d)$ has all joins, denoted $\vee$. In fact, $\bigvee_i e_i = \min(\bigcap_i I(e_i))$.

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

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

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

(a) $e <_d b$, $f <_d b$ and $b_e^\uparrow \neq b_f^\uparrow$;

(b) $b_e^\uparrow, b_f^\uparrow \in b^\uparrow$. In fact $\{b_e^\uparrow\} = I(e) \cap b^\uparrow$, $\{b_f^\uparrow\} = I(f) \cap b^\uparrow$;

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

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 $b_e^\uparrow = b_f^\uparrow$ 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 $b_a^* \in b^\uparrow$, where uniqueness follows from Lemma 2.5. Choosing $a = e$ implies $I(e) \cap b^\uparrow = \{b_e^*\}$ 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. □

Proposition 2.9. *Let $c = e_1 \vee e_2 \vee e_3$. Then $c = e_i \vee e_j$ iff $c^{\uparrow}_{e_i} \neq c^{\uparrow}_{e_j}$.*

Therefore, all ternary joins in $(T, \leq_d)$ are binary, i.e.

$$c = e_1 \vee e_2 \vee e_3 = e_i \vee e_j \tag{2.10}$$

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

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

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

Example 2.11. In the following example $b = e \vee f$, $c = e \vee f \vee g$, $c^{\uparrow}_e = c^{\uparrow}_f = b$.



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

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

$$\begin{aligned} \{\textit{planar structures } (T, \leq_p)\} &\longrightarrow \textstyle\prod_{(a^{\uparrow} \leq a) \in V(T)} \mathsf{Ord}(a^{\uparrow}) \\ \leq_p &\longmapsto (\leq_p |_{a^{\uparrow}}) \end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

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

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

To check that (2.14) is surjective, it suffices (recall that e, f are assumed $\leq_d$-incomparable) to check that defining $e \leq_p f$ to hold iff $b^{\uparrow}_e < b^{\uparrow}_f$ 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 $e' \leq_d e <_p f$ and the planar condition, which is the case $e <_p f \geq_d f'$, follow from Proposition 2.8(c). Transitivity of $\leq_p$ in the case $e <_p f \leq_d f'$ follows since either $e \leq_d f'$ or else e, f' are $\leq_d$-incomparable, in which case one can apply 2.8(c) with the roles of f, f' reversed.

It remains to check transitivity in the hardest case, that of $e <_p f <_p g$ with $\leq_d$-incomparable f, g. We write $c = e \vee f \vee g$. By the "therefore" part of Proposition 2.9, either (i) $e \vee f <_d c$, in which case Proposition 2.9 implies $c^{\uparrow}_e = c^{\uparrow}_f$ 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 $c^{\uparrow}_e < c^{\uparrow}_f < c^{\uparrow}_g$ in $c^{\uparrow}$ so that $c^{\uparrow}_e \neq c^{\uparrow}_g$ and by Proposition 2.9 it is also $e \vee g = c$ and transitivity follows. $\square$

Remark 2.15. Definition 2.1 readily extends to forests $F \in \Phi$. The analogue of Proposition 2.13 then states that the data of a planar structure is equivalent to total orderings of the nodes of F together with a total ordering of its set of roots. Indeed, this follows by either adapting the proof above or by noting that planar structures on F are clearly in bijection with planar structures on the join tree $F \star \eta$ (cf. [2, Def. 7.44]), which adds a single edge η to F, serving as the (unique) root of $F \star \eta$.

When discussing the substitution procedure in §2.3 we will find it convenient to work with a model for the category Ω 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 Ω throughout would, among other issues, make the discussion of faces in §2.2 rather awkward. We now outline our conventions to address such issues.

Let Ω^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 $\underline{n} = \{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$ and for which $\leq_p$ coincides with the canonical order.

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



(2.17) PLANAROMEGAEX1 EQ

Here T_1 and T_2 are isomorphic to each other but not isomorphic to any other standard model in Ω^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 $T^s_{\leq_p} \in \Omega^s$ given by replacing each edge by its order following $\leq_p$. Indeed, this defines a retraction $(-)^s \colon \Omega^p \to \Omega^s$ and a natural transformation $\sigma \colon id \Rightarrow (-)^s$ given by isomorphisms preserving the planar structure (in fact, the pair $((-)^s, \sigma)$ is clearly unique).

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

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

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

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

$$\begin{tikzcd} F_1 \arrow[rr, hook] \arrow[dr, hook] & & U \\ & F_2 \arrow[ur, hook] & \end{tikzcd} \qquad \begin{tikzcd} C \arrow[rr] \arrow[dr] & & U \\ & T_1 \arrow[ur] & \end{tikzcd}$$

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 Ω^p. Applying $(-)^s$ to the diagram of underlying identities on the left yields the permutation diagram on the right.

$$\begin{tikzcd} U \arrow[rr, "id"] \arrow[dr, "id"'] & & U_{\leq_{(45)}} \\ & U_{\leq_{(12)}} \arrow[ur, "id"'] & \end{tikzcd} \qquad \begin{tikzcd} U \arrow[rr, "(45)"] \arrow[dr, "(12)"'] & & U \\ & U \arrow[ur, "(12)(45)"'] & \end{tikzcd}$$

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

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





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

More generally, a morphism $F \to G$ in the categories Φ, Φ^G, Ω^G_G of forests, G-forests, G-trees is called a *planar map* if it is an independent map (cf. Pe16b [2, Def. 5.28]) compatible with the planar structures $\leq_p$.

Remark 2.22. The need for the independence condition is justified by Pe16b [2, Lemma 5.33] and its converse, since non independent maps do not reflect $\leq_d$ inequalities.

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

PLANARPULL EQ

Proposition 2.23. *Let $F \xrightarrow{\varphi} G$ be an independent map in Φ (or Ω, Ω_G, Φ_G). Then there is a unique factorization*

$$F \xrightarrow{\simeq} \bar{F} \to G$$

such that $F \xrightarrow{\simeq} \bar{F}$ is an isomorphism and $\bar{F} \to G$ 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 $e^\uparrow \leq e$ of F the edges in $\varphi(e^\uparrow)$ are all distinct while independence of φ likewise ensures that the edges in $\varphi(\underline{r}_F)$ are distinct. The result now follows from (the forest version of) Proposition PLANARIZATIONCHAR PROP 2.13: one simply orders each set $e^\uparrow$ and $\underline{r}_F$ according to its image.

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

PULLPLANAR REM

Remark 2.24. Proposition PLANARPULL EQ 2.23 says that planar structures can be pulled back along independent maps. However, they can not always be pushed forward. As an example, in the notation of (PLANAROMEGAEX1 EQ 2.17), consider the map $C \to T_1$ defined by $1 \mapsto 1$, $2 \mapsto 4$, $3 \mapsto 2$, $4 \mapsto 5$.

UNIQCOR REM

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

OUTTALL SEC

2.2 Outer faces and tall maps

In preparation for our discussion of the substitution operation in §SUBS SEC 2.3, we now recall some basic notions and results concerning outer subtrees and tree grafting, as in Pe16b [2, §5].

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

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

$$f \leq_d e, \quad \forall_i e_i \nless_d f, \tag{2.27}$$ OUTERFACE EQ

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

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

We now recap some basic results.

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

(a) $T_{\underline{e}\le e}$ is a tree with root e and edge tuple $\underline{e}$;

(b) there is a bijection

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

(c) if $R \to S$ and $S \to T$ are outer face maps then so is $R \to T$;

(d) any pair of broad relations $\underline{g} \le v$, $\underline{f}v \le e$ induces a grafting pushout diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\eta \arrow[r, "v"] \arrow[d, "v"'] & T_{\underline{g}\le v} \arrow[d] \\
T_{\underline{f}v\le e} \arrow[r] & T_{\underline{f}\underline{g}\le v}
\end{tikzcd} \tag{2.30}$$

GRAPTPUSH EQ

Proof. We first show (a). That $T_{\underline{e}\le e}$ is indeed a tree is the content of [2, Prop. 5.20]: more precisely, $T_{\underline{e}\le e} = (T^{\le e})_{<\underline{e}}$ in the notation therein. That the root of $T_{\underline{e}\le e}$ is e is clear and that the root tuple is $\underline{e}$ follows from [2, Remark 5.23].

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

(c) follows from the definition of outer face together with [2, Lemma 5.33], which states that the $\le_d$ relations on S, T coincide.

Since by (c) both $T_{\underline{g}\le v}$ and $T_{\underline{f}v\le e}$ are outer faces of $T_{\underline{f}\underline{g}\le v}$, (d) is a restatement of [2, Prop. 5.15]. □

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

$$\varphi(\underline{l}_S) = \underline{l}_T, \qquad \varphi(r_S) = r_T,$$

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

The following is a restatement of [2, Cor. 5.24]

TALLOUTERDEC COR

Proposition 2.32. *Any map $S \xrightarrow{\varphi} T$ in Ω 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, $U = T_{\varphi(\underline{l}_S)\le r_S}$).

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

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

$$S \xrightarrow{\varphi^-} U \xrightarrow{\varphi^i} V \xrightarrow{\varphi^u} T \tag{2.34}$$

TRIPLEFACT EQ

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

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

2.3 Substitution

SUBS SEC

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

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

$$U = (((((U_6 \amalg_a U_2)) \amalg_a U_1) \amalg_b U_3) \amalg_d U_5) \amalg_c U_4 \tag{2.36}$$

UFORMULA EQ



(2.37) SUBSDATUMTREES EQ

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

One can now therefore think of the iterated grafting (2.36) as being instead encoded by the tree T together with the (unique) planar tall maps φ_i below.



(2.38) SUBSDATUMTREES2 EQ

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Remark 2.41. Note that the only maps in $\mathsf{Sc}(T)$ 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 $\mathsf{Sc}(T)$.

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

$$U_{(-)} \colon \mathsf{Sc}(T) \to \Omega$$

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

$$\eta \xrightarrow{a} T_{e^{\uparrow}\leq e} = \mathsf{lr}(U_{e^{\uparrow}\leq e}) \to U_{e^{\uparrow}\leq e}.$$

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

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathsf{Sub}(T) & \rightleftarrows & \Omega^{\mathsf{pt}}_{T/} \\ \{U_{e^{\uparrow}\leq e}\} & \longmapsto & \left(T \to \operatorname{colim}_{\mathsf{Sc}(T)} U_{(-)}\right) \\ \{U_{\varphi(e^{\uparrow})\leq\varphi(e)}\} & \longleftarrow & (T \xrightarrow{\varphi} U) \end{array} \tag{2.43}$$

SUBDATAUNDERPLAN EQ

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

Proof. We first claim that (i) the $\operatorname{colim}_{\mathsf{Sc}(T)} U_{(-)}$ indeed exists; (ii) for the canonical datum $\{T_{e^{\uparrow}\leq e}\}$, it is $T = \operatorname{colim}_{\mathsf{Sc}(T)} T_{(-)}$; (iii) the induced map $T \to \operatorname{colim}_{\mathsf{Sc}(T)} U_{(-)}$ 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 $\mathsf{Sc}(T)$. Otherwise, one can choose a non trivial grafting decomposition so as to write $T = R \amalg_e S$, resulting in identifications $\mathsf{Sc}(R) \subset \mathsf{Sc}(T)$, $\mathsf{Sc}(S) \subset \mathsf{Sc}(T)$ so that $\mathsf{Sc}(R) \cup \mathsf{Sc}(S) = \mathsf{Sc}(T)$ and $\mathsf{Sc}(R) \cap \mathsf{Sc}(S) = \{\eta_e\}$. The existence of $\operatorname{colim}_{\mathsf{Sc}(T)} U_{(-)}$ is thus equivalent to the existence of the pushout below.

$$\begin{tikzcd} \eta \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \operatorname{colim}_{\mathsf{Sc}(R)} U_{(-)} \arrow[d, dashed] \\ \operatorname{colim}_{\mathsf{Sc}(S)} U_{(-)} \arrow[r, dashed] & \operatorname{colim}_{\mathsf{Sc}(T)} U_{(-)} \end{tikzcd} \tag{2.44}$$

ASSEMBLYGRAFT EQ

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

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

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

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

VERTEXDECOMP EQ

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

3 The genuine equivariant operad monad

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

3.1 Wreath product over finite sets

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

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

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

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

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

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

The following is immediate.

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

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

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

$$\begin{tikzcd} \mathcal{C} \arrow[r, "F"] \arrow[d, "k"'] & \mathcal{E} \\ \mathcal{D} \arrow[ur, "G"'] \arrow[u, phantom, "\Uparrow\eta"] & \end{tikzcd} \qquad \begin{tikzcd} \mathsf{F}\wr\mathcal{C} \arrow[r, "\mathsf{F}\wr F"] \arrow[d, "\mathsf{F}\wr k"'] & \mathsf{F}\wr\mathcal{E} \arrow[r, "\amalg"] & \mathcal{E} \\ \mathsf{F}\wr\mathcal{D} \arrow[ur, "\mathsf{F}\wr G"'] \arrow[urr, bend right, "\amalg\circ \mathsf{F}\wr G"'] \arrow[u, phantom, "\Uparrow \mathsf{F}\wr\eta"] & & \end{tikzcd} \tag{3.4}$$ 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

$$\begin{tikzcd} \mathcal{C}^{op} \arrow[r, "F"] \arrow[d, "k"'] & \mathcal{E} \\ \mathcal{D}^{op} \arrow[ur, "G"'] \arrow[u, phantom, "\Downarrow\epsilon"] & \end{tikzcd} \qquad \begin{tikzcd} (\mathsf{F}\wr\mathcal{C})^{op} \arrow[r, "(\mathsf{F}\wr F^{op})^{op}"] \arrow[d, "(\mathsf{F}\wr k^{op})^{op}"'] & (\mathsf{F}\wr\mathcal{E}^{op})^{op} \arrow[r, "\Pi"] & \mathcal{E} \\ (\mathsf{F}\wr\mathcal{D})^{op} \arrow[ur, "(\mathsf{F}\wr G^{op})^{op}"'] \arrow[urr, bend right, "\Pi\circ(\mathsf{F}\wr G^{op})^{op}"'] \arrow[u, phantom, "\Downarrow"] & & \end{tikzcd} \tag{3.5}$$ 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 ([McL 1, X.3.1]), the claim concerning (WRRAN EQ 3.4) amounts to showing that for each $(d_i) \in \mathsf{F} \wr \mathcal{D}$ one has natural isomorphisms

$$\lim_{((d_i)\to(kc_j))\in((d_i)\downarrow \mathsf{F}\wr\mathcal{C})} \left(\coprod_j F(c_j) \right) \simeq \coprod_i \lim_{(d_i \to kc_i)\in d_i\downarrow\mathcal{C}} (F(c_i)). \tag{3.6}$$ POINTKAN EQ

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

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

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

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

POINTKAN EQ

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

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

$$\delta^i \colon \mathsf{F}^{\wr\underline{n-1}} \wr \mathcal{C} \to \mathsf{F}^{\wr\underline{n}} \wr \mathcal{C}, \qquad 0 \le i \le n$$

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

$$\sigma^i \colon \mathsf{F}^{\wr\underline{n+1}} \wr \mathcal{C} \to \mathsf{F}^{\wr\underline{n}} \wr \mathcal{C}, \qquad 0 \le i \le n$$

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

3.2 Equivariant leaf-root and vertex functors

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

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

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

We denote the subcategory of G-trees and quotients by Ω^q_G.

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

Definition 3.10. The *leaf-root functor* is the functor $\Omega^q_G \xrightarrow{\mathsf{lr}} \Sigma_G$ defined by

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

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

EAFROOTEXAMP REM

UNIQCOR REM

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



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

VG DEF

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

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

Remark 3.14. Following Remark VERTEXDECOMP REM 2.45, a planar tall map $f\colon T \to U$ of G-trees induces a G-equivariant map $f^*\colon V(U) \to V(T)$ and thus also a map of orbits $f^*\colon V_G(U) \to V_G(T)$. 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 $f^*\colon V(U) \to V(T)$ 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 $v_{Ge} = (Ge)^{\uparrow} \le Ge$ (which we interpret as the concatenation of the relations $f^{\uparrow} \le f$ for $f \in Ge$) and write

$$T_{v_{Ge}} = T_{(Ge)^{\uparrow} \le Ge} = \coprod_{f \in Ge} T_{f^{\uparrow} \le f}.$$

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

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

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



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

Definition 2.39 now immediately generalizes.

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

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

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

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

Noting that there are decompositions $U_{v_{Ge}} = \coprod_{ge \in Ge} U_{ge^{\uparrow} \leq ge}$ 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 $G \ltimes V(T) \to \Omega$ whose restriction to $V(T) \subset G \ltimes V(T)$ is a (non-equivariant) substitution datum.

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

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathsf{Sub}(T) & \rightleftarrows & \Omega^{\mathsf{pt}}_{G,T/} \\ \{U_{v_{Ge}}\} & \longmapsto & \left(T \to \operatorname{colim}_{\mathsf{Sc}(T)} U_{(-)}\right) \end{array} \tag{3.20}$$

SUBDATAUNDERPLANG EQ

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

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

$$U_{v_{Ge}} \to U = \operatorname{colim}_{\mathsf{Sc}(T)} U_{(-)}$$

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 $U_{ge^{\uparrow} \leq ge}$ is planar by Proposition 3.19; (ii) the restriction to the roots of $U_{v_{Ge}}$ is injective and order preserving since it matches the inclusion of the roots of $T_{v_{Ge}}$, and the map $T \to U$ is a planar map of G-trees.

3.3 Planar strings

PLANARSTRING SEC

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

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

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

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

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} T_0 & \xrightarrow{f_1} & T_1 & \xrightarrow{f_2} & \cdots & \xrightarrow{f_n} & T_n \\ {\scriptstyle q_0}\downarrow & & {\scriptstyle q_1}\downarrow & & & & {\scriptstyle q_n}\downarrow \\ T'_0 & \xrightarrow[f'_1]{} & T'_1 & \xrightarrow[f'_2]{} & \cdots & \xrightarrow[f'_n]{} & T'_n \end{array} \tag{3.23}$$

PTNARROW EQ

where each q_i is a quotient map.

IMPOPERATORS NOT

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

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

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

$$V_G(T_0 \to T_1 \to \cdots \to T_n) = \big(V_G(T_0), (T_{1,v_{Ge}} \to \cdots \to T_{n,v_{Ge}})_{v_{Ge} \in V_G(T_0)}\big)$$

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

The following is a reinterpretation of Proposition 3.19.

SUBSASPULL PROP

Proposition 3.26. *The diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\Omega_{G,n+1} \arrow[r, "V_G"] \arrow[d, "d_{1,\cdots,n+1}"'] & \mathsf{F} \wr \Omega_{G,n} \arrow[d, "\mathsf{F}\wr d_{0,\cdots,n}"] \\
\Omega_{G,0} \arrow[r, "V_G"'] & \mathsf{F} \wr \Sigma_G
\end{tikzcd} \tag{3.27}$$

PTPULL EQ

is a pullback diagram in Cat.

Proof. An object in the pullback (3.27) over $T \in \Omega_{G,0} = \Omega^q_G$ is precisely the same as a n-string in $\mathsf{Sub}(T)$, and thus by Proposition 3.19 equivalent to a $n+1$ planar tall string starting at T.

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

$$\begin{tikzcd}
T_{v_{Ge}} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & T_{1,v_{Ge}} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \cdots \arrow[r] & T_{n,v_{Ge}} \arrow[d] \\
T'_{v_{Ge'}} \arrow[r] & T'_{1,v_{Ge'}} \arrow[r] & \cdots \arrow[r] & T'_{n,v_{Ge'}}
\end{tikzcd}
\qquad
\begin{tikzcd}
T_{(-)} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & T_{1,(-)} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \cdots \arrow[r] & T_{n,(-)} \arrow[d] \\
T'_{(-)} \circ \pi_* \arrow[r] & T'_{1,(-)} \circ \pi_* \arrow[r] & \cdots \arrow[r] & T'_{n,(-)} \circ \pi_*
\end{tikzcd} \tag{3.28}$$

PTNARROWLOC EQ

Passing to colimits then gives the desired commutative diagram (3.23). Moreover, diagrams of the form (3.23) clearly induce diagrams as in (3.28) and it is straightforward to check that these are inverse processes. ☐

DSCOM REM

Remark 3.29. The diagrams (with back and lower slanted faces instances of (3.27))

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\Omega_{G,n+2} \arrow[rr] \arrow[dd] \arrow[dr, "d_{i+1}"] & & \mathsf{F}\wr\Omega_{G,n+1} \arrow[dd] \arrow[dr, "\mathsf{F}\wr d_i"] & \\
& \Omega_{G,n+1} \arrow[rr] \arrow[dl] & & \mathsf{F}\wr\Omega_{G,n} \arrow[dl] \\
\Omega_{G,0} \arrow[rr] & & \mathsf{F}\wr\Sigma_G &
\end{tikzcd}
\qquad
\begin{tikzcd}
\Omega_{G,n+1} \arrow[rr] \arrow[dd] \arrow[dr, "s_i"] & & \mathsf{F}\wr\Omega_{G,n} \arrow[dd] \arrow[dr, "\mathsf{F}\wr s_{i-1}"] & \\
& \Omega_{G,n+2} \arrow[rr] \arrow[dl] & & \mathsf{F}\wr\Omega_{G,n+1} \arrow[dl] \\
\Omega_{G,0} \arrow[rr] & & \mathsf{F}\wr\Sigma_G &
\end{tikzcd}$$

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

HERE

Notation 3.30. We will let

$$V_{G,n}\colon \Omega_{G,n} \to \mathsf{F} \wr \Sigma_G$$

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

Let's try to edit test brunch!!!

3.4 A monad on spans

Definition 3.31. We will write $\mathsf{WSpan}^l(\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D})$ (resp. $\mathsf{WSpan}^r(\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D})$), 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

$$\begin{tikzcd} & A_1 \arrow[dl, "k_1"'] \arrow[dr, "F_1"] \arrow[dd, "i"] & \\ \mathcal{C} & & \mathcal{D} \\ & A_2 \arrow[ul, "k_2"] \arrow[ur, "F_2"'] \arrow[ur, phantom, "\Swarrow\varphi", near start] & \end{tikzcd} \qquad \begin{tikzcd} & A_1 \arrow[dl, "k_1"'] \arrow[dr, "F_1"] \arrow[dd, "i"] & \\ \mathcal{C} & & \mathcal{D} \\ & A_2 \arrow[ul, "k_2"] \arrow[ur, "F_2"'] \arrow[ur, phantom, "\Nearrow\varphi", near start] & \end{tikzcd} \tag{3.32}$$

TWISTEDARROWRIGHT EQ

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

Remark 3.33. There are natural isomorphisms

$$\mathsf{WSpan}^r(\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D}) \simeq \mathsf{WSpan}^l(\mathcal{C}^{op},\mathcal{D}^{op}). \tag{3.34}$$

LRSPANISO EQ

RANLANADJ REM

Remark 3.35. The terms *left/right* are motivated by the existence of adjunctions (which are seen to be equivalent by using (LRSPANISO EQ 3.34))

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

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

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

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

Notation 3.36. Given a functor $\pi\colon A \to \Sigma_G$, we let $\Omega^{(A)}_{G,0}$ denote the pullback (in Cat)

$$\begin{tikzcd} \Omega^{(A)}_{G,0} \arrow[r, "V_G^{(A)}"] \arrow[d] & \mathsf{F} \wr A \arrow[d] \\ \Omega_{G,0} \arrow[r, "V_G"'] & \mathsf{F} \wr \Sigma_G \end{tikzcd}$$

Explicitly, the objects of $\Omega^{(A)}_{G,0}$ are pairs $(T,(a_{e^\uparrow \le e})_{(e^\uparrow \le e)\in V_G(T)})$ such that $\pi(a_{e^\uparrow\le e}) = T_{e^\uparrow \le e}$.

Using the composite map $\Omega^{(A)}_{G,0} \to \Omega_{G,0} \to \Sigma_G$ one can thus iterate the $\Omega^{(-)}_{G,0}$ construction.
HERE

The content of Proposition SUBSASPULL PROP 3.26 is then that there are compatible identifications $\Omega^{(\Omega_{G,n})}_{G,0} \simeq \Omega_{G,n+1}$ which identify $V_G^{(\Omega_{G,n})}$

and we will likewise abbreviate $\Omega_G^{\left(\Omega^{(A)}_{G,n}\right)}$ as $\Omega^{(A)}_{G,n+1}$. Note that then $\Omega^{(\Sigma_G)}_{G,n} = \Omega_{G,n}$.

Moreover, since the $\Omega^{(A)}_{G,0}$ construction is functorial in A, Remark DSCUM REM 3.29 can now be reinterpreted as saying that $\Omega^{(d_i)}_{G_0} = d_{i+1}$ and $\Omega^{s_{i-1}}_{G,0} = s_i$.

HERE

HERE

$$\begin{tikzcd} \Omega^{(A)}_{G,1} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathsf{F} \wr \Omega^{(A)}_{G,0} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathsf{F} \wr \mathsf{F} \wr A \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathsf{F} \wr A \arrow[d] \\ \Omega_{G,1} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathsf{F} \wr \Omega_{G,0} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathsf{F} \wr \mathsf{F} \wr \Sigma_G \arrow[r] & \mathsf{F} \wr \Sigma_G \\ \Omega_{G,0} \arrow[r] & \mathsf{F} \wr \Sigma_G & & \end{tikzcd}$$

Remark 3.37. In the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\Omega^{(A)}_{G,1} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathsf{F}\wr\Omega^{(A)}_{G} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathsf{F}\wr\mathsf{F}\wr A \arrow[d] \\
\Omega_{G,1} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathsf{F}\wr\Omega_{G} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathsf{F}\wr\mathsf{F}\wr\Sigma_G \\
\Omega \arrow[r] & \mathsf{F}\wr\Sigma_G &
\end{tikzcd}$$

the top right, bottom left and left composite rectangles are all pullbacks, and thus so are all rectangles.

Proposition 3.38. *For any $A \to \Sigma_G$ there are functors $d_0^{(A)}\colon\Omega^{(A)}_{G,1} \to \Omega^{(A)}_{G}$ and natural isomorphisms*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\Omega^{(A)}_{G,1} \arrow[r, "V_G"] \arrow[d, "d_0^{(A)}"'] & \mathsf{F}\wr\Omega^{(A)}_{G} \arrow[r, "\mathsf{F}\wr V_G"] & \mathsf{F}\wr\mathsf{F}\wr A \arrow[d, "\sigma^0"] \arrow[dll, phantom, "\Leftarrow\ \pi^{(A)}"] \\
\Omega^{(A)}_{G} \arrow[rr, "V_G"'] & & \mathsf{F}\wr A,
\end{tikzcd} \tag{3.39}$$

SHUFFLEPERMA EQ

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

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\Omega^{(A)}_{G,1} \arrow[rr, "V_G"] \arrow[dr, "d_0^{(A)}"] \arrow[dd, "\Omega^{H}_{G,1}"'] & & \mathsf{F}\wr\Omega^{(A)}_{G} \arrow[r, "\mathsf{F}\wr V_G"] \arrow[dd, dashed] & \mathsf{F}\wr\mathsf{F}\wr A \arrow[dr, "\sigma^0"] \arrow[dd, dashed] \arrow[dll, phantom, "\Leftarrow\ \pi^{(A)}"] & \\
& \Omega^{(A)}_{G} \arrow[rrr, "V_G"] \arrow[dd] & & & \mathsf{F}\wr A \arrow[dd, "\mathsf{F}\wr H"] \\
\Omega^{(B)}_{G,1} \arrow[rr, dashed] \arrow[dr, "d_0^{(B)}"'] & & \mathsf{F}\wr\Omega^{(B)}_{G} \arrow[r, dashed] & \mathsf{F}\wr\mathsf{F}\wr B \arrow[dr, dashed] \arrow[dll, phantom, "\Leftarrow"] & \\
& \Omega^{(B)}_{G} \arrow[rrr, "V_G"'] & & & \mathsf{F}\wr B
\end{tikzcd} \tag{3.40}$$

PICUBOIDAB EQ

one has an equality

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

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

Proof. Since d_0 has already been defined when $B = \Sigma_G$, one can generally define $d_0^{(A)}$ by using diagram PICUBOIDAB EQ (3.40) when $B = \Sigma$ and recalling that the front, back and left faces are all known to be pullbacks.

Fill in the definition of $\pi^{(A)}$. ☐

Definition 3.41. Suppose $\mathcal{V}$ has finite products.

We define an endofunctor N of $\mathsf{Wspan}^r(\Sigma_G, \mathcal{V}^{op})$ by letting $N(\Sigma_G \leftarrow A \to \mathcal{V}^{op})$ be the span $\Sigma_G \leftarrow \Omega^{(A)}_{G} \to \mathcal{V}^{op}$ given by the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\Omega^{(A)}_{G} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathsf{F}\wr A \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathsf{F}\wr\mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[r, "\Pi^{op}"] & \mathcal{V}^{op} \\
\Omega_{G} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathsf{F}\wr\Sigma_G & & \\
\Sigma_G & & &
\end{tikzcd}$$

and defined on arrows in the obvious way.

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

$$
\begin{tikzcd}
\Sigma \arrow[d, equal] & \Omega^{(A)}_{G,1} \arrow[l] \arrow[r, "V_G"] \arrow[d, "d_0^{(A)}"'] & \mathsf{F}\wr\Omega^{(A)}_G \arrow[r, "\mathsf{F}\wr V_G"] & \mathsf{F}\wr\mathsf{F}\wr A \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\sigma^0"] & \mathsf{F}\wr\mathsf{F}\wr\mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\sigma^0"] & \mathsf{F}\wr\mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[r] & \mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[d, equal] \\
\Sigma & \Omega^{(A)}_G \arrow[l] \arrow[rr, "V_G"'] \arrow[urr, Leftrightarrow, "\pi^{(A)}"'] & & \mathsf{F}\wr A \arrow[r] & \mathsf{F}\wr\mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[rr] \arrow[urr, Leftrightarrow, "\alpha"'] & & \mathcal{V}^{op}
\end{tikzcd}
\tag{3.42}
$$

MULTDEFSPAN EQ

where we note that naturality follows from the commutativity of (PICUBOIDAB EQ 3.40).

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

$$
\begin{tikzcd}
\Sigma \arrow[d, equal] & A \arrow[l] \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d, "s_{-1}^{(A)}"'] & A \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[d, equal] \\
\Sigma & \Omega^{(A)}_G \arrow[l] \arrow[r, "V_G"'] & \mathsf{F}\wr A \arrow[r] & \mathsf{F}\wr\mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[r] & \mathcal{V}^{op}.
\end{tikzcd}
\tag{3.43}
$$

UNITSPAN EQ

MONSPAN PROP

Proposition 3.44. (N,μ,η) *form a monad on* $\mathsf{Wspan}^r(\Sigma_G,\mathcal{V}^{op})$.

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

$$
\begin{tikzcd}
\Omega^{(A)}_{G,2} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "d_1^{(A)}"'] & \mathsf{F}\wr\Omega^{(A)}_{G,1} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathsf{F}^{\wr 2}\wr\Omega^{(A)}_G \arrow[r] & \mathsf{F}^{\wr 3}\wr A \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\sigma^1"] & \mathsf{F}^{\wr 3}\wr\mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\sigma^1"] & \mathsf{F}^{\wr 2}\wr\mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[r] & \mathsf{F}\wr\mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & \mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[d, equal] \\
\Omega^{(A)}_{G,1} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "d_0^{(A)}"'] & \mathsf{F}\wr\Omega^{(A)}_G \arrow[rr] \arrow[urr, Leftrightarrow, "\mathsf{F}\wr\pi^{(A)}"'] & & \mathsf{F}^{\wr 2}\wr A \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\sigma^0"] & \mathsf{F}^{\wr 2}\wr\mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[rr] \arrow[d, "\sigma^0"] \arrow[urr, Leftrightarrow, "\mathsf{F}\wr\alpha"'] & & \mathsf{F}\wr\mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[r] & \mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[d, equal] \\
\Omega^{(A)}_G \arrow[rrr] \arrow[urrr, Leftrightarrow, "\pi^{(A)}"'] & & & \mathsf{F}\wr A \arrow[r] & \mathsf{F}\wr\mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[rrr] \arrow[urrr, Leftrightarrow, "\alpha"'] & & & \mathcal{V}^{op}
\end{tikzcd}
\tag{3.45}
$$

ASSOCSPAN1 EQ

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

$$
\begin{tikzcd}
\Omega^{(A)}_{G,2} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "d_0^{(A)}"'] & \mathsf{F}\wr\Omega^{(A)}_{G,1} \arrow[r] & \mathsf{F}^{\wr 2}\wr\Omega^{(A)}_G \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathsf{F}^{\wr 3}\wr A \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\sigma^0"] & \mathsf{F}^{\wr 3}\wr\mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\sigma^0"] & \mathsf{F}^{\wr 2}\wr\mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathsf{F}^{\wr}\mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[r] & \mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[d, equal] \\
\Omega^{(A)}_{G,1} \arrow[rr] \arrow[ur, Leftrightarrow, "\pi\left(\Omega^{(A)}_G\right)"'] \arrow[d, "d_0^{(A)}"'] & & \mathsf{F}\wr\Omega^{(A)}_G \arrow[r] & \mathsf{F}^{\wr 2}\wr A \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\sigma^0"] & \mathsf{F}^{\wr 2}\wr\mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\sigma^0"] & \mathsf{F}\wr\mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[rr] \arrow[urr, Leftrightarrow, "\alpha"'] & & \mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[d, equal] \\
\Omega^{(A)}_G \arrow[rrr] \arrow[urrr, Leftrightarrow, "\pi^{(A)}"'] & & & \mathsf{F}\wr A \arrow[r] & \mathsf{F}\wr\mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[rrr] \arrow[urrr, Leftrightarrow, "\alpha"'] & & & \mathcal{V}^{op}
\end{tikzcd}
\tag{3.46}
$$

ASSOCSPAN2 EQ

Add argument that these commute

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

$$
\begin{tikzcd}
\Omega^{(A)}_G \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "s_0^{(A)}"'] & \mathsf{F}\wr A \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d] & \mathsf{F}\wr A \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\delta^1"] & \mathsf{F}\wr\mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d, "\delta^1"] & \mathsf{F}\wr\mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & \mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[d, equal] \\
\Omega^{(A)}_{G,1} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "d_0^{(A)}"'] & \mathsf{F}\wr\Omega^{(A)}_G \arrow[r] & \mathsf{F}^{\wr 2}\wr A \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\sigma^0"] & \mathsf{F}^{\wr 2}\wr\mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\sigma^0"] & \mathsf{F}\wr\mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[r] & \mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[d, equal] \\
\Omega^{(A)}_G \arrow[rr] \arrow[urr, Leftrightarrow, "\pi^{(A)}"'] & & \mathsf{F}\wr A \arrow[r] & \mathsf{F}\wr\mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[rr] \arrow[urr, Leftrightarrow, "\alpha"'] & & \mathcal{V}^{op}
\end{tikzcd}
\tag{3.47}
$$

UNITSPAN1 EQ

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

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\Omega_G^{(A)} \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d, "s_{-1}^{(A)}"'] & \Omega_G^{(A)} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathsf{F} \wr A \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\delta^0"] & \mathsf{F} \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\delta^0"] & \mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[d, equal] \\
\Omega_{G,1}^{(A)} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "d_0^{(A)}"'] & \mathsf{F} \wr \Omega_G^{(A)} \arrow[r] & \mathsf{F} \wr \mathsf{F} \wr A \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\sigma^0"] & \mathsf{F} \wr \mathsf{F} \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\sigma^0"] & \mathsf{F} \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[r] & \mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[d, equal] \\
\Omega_G^{(A)} \arrow[rr] \arrow[ur, Rightarrow, "\pi^{(A)}"'] & & \mathsf{F} \wr A \arrow[r] & \mathsf{F} \wr \mathcal{V}^{op} \arrow[rr] \arrow[urr, Rightarrow, "\alpha"'] & & \mathcal{V}^{op}
\end{tikzcd} \tag{3.48}$$

UNITSPAN2 EQ

Add argument that these commute ☐

4 Appendix

4.1 Grothendieck fibrations

This is missing a bunch of expository content

Definition 4.1. Suppose $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_c)$ is a pair in Cat such that $\mathcal{D}_c$ is a wide subcategory of $\mathcal{D}$.

A functor $\pi: \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{D}$ is called a partial Grothendieck construction if there are cartesian lifts for every arrow in $\mathcal{D}_c$.

Lemma 4.2. *bla bla*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{C} \times_F \mathcal{B} \arrow[rr, dashed] \arrow[dr, dashed] \arrow[dd, dashed] & & \mathcal{B} \arrow[dd, "\pi"] \\
& \mathcal{C} \times_G \mathcal{B} \arrow[ur, dashed] \arrow[dd, dashed] & \\
\mathcal{C} \arrow[rr, "F"] \arrow[dr, equal] & & \mathcal{D} \\
& \mathcal{C} \arrow[ur, "G"'] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

References

McL [1] S. Mac Lane. Categories for the working mathematician, volume 5 of Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1998.

Pe16b [2] L. A. Pereira. Equivariant dendroidal sets. Available at: `http://www.faculty.virginia.edu/luisalex/`, 2016.

We12 [3] I. Weiss. Broad posets, trees, and the dendroidal category. Available at: `https://arxiv.org/abs/1201.3987`, 2012.