Categorical tools Descriptive Complexity Theory Adan & Conghaile Dagstahl, 2021.

Outline

- · Finite Models & Computation
- · Lower bounds in Descriptive Complexity
- · Comonads à possible connections to DST.

Expressiveness & Computational Complexity Let o be a finite relational signature R(O) category of (finile) o-structures & homomorphisms [Lagin 73] ("Logic can cepture computational complexity") C = R(o) a class of finishe structures

6 in NP (=) B= Mod(P) for PE 350.

Is there a L capturing P.

PTIME = trank (Ca: Force Innerma '92)

How do we prove tlese lower bounds? $A \equiv_{F_0} B \iff A \cong B$ $A \Rightarrow_{J_4F_0} B \iff A \rightarrow B$ Problem: On finite models, So to show (not definite in L recol

· L - () L

AREC BREC · { A 2 } , 9 Bul

Le Bre : Duplicator winning me

Categorical tools for these hierarchies [Abremsky, Dawar, Wary 17] Idea: Represent game using endofunctor g: R(0) + R(0) g-winning strategy for Duplicator is hom gA -> B. Results: Many such endofunctors are comonads where

(cokleisli maps = one-way games)

cokleisli isoms = two-way games)

coalgebrus = decompositions

Examples

Logics	Games	Cononads
FO+C = U L, (#)	Ehrenfeucht-J-raissé	En [Abremsty + Shah'18]
FPC S U Low (#)	Pebble sames	Ph [Abramsty, Dawer, Wany 17]
Fo (an) & U L & (an)	Hella games	1Hn, LOC., Davar 21]
F-0(21) = U L2 (21)	Z-linear gancs	Zz [Abransky, 6C., Daver f/c]

Why an I here!

Computable Endofunctors Game Comunads · d - continuous maps capture · g-winning maps capture "Logical reluxations" of humamorphisms "topological relaxations" of ets maps in category of represented spaces in RO d-neasurable, d-admissable, d-Harsdorff g-ison, g-mck-und forth, g-decompositions

Question:

· Is there a connection between these pictures.

-In particular

- Can we recast game comonads in terms of rep spaces,

- Can game comunads help understand computable monads?

- Is there a "synthetic" descriptive complexity theory?