

# Reflexive graph lenses in univalent foundations

Jonathan Sterling

March 31, 2024

## Abstract

Martin-Löf’s identity types provide a generic (albeit opaque) notion of identification or “equality” between any two elements of the same type, embodied in a canonical reflexive graph structure  $(=_A, \mathbf{refl})$  on any type  $A$ . The miracle of Voevodsky’s *univalence principle* is that it ensures, for essentially any naturally occurring structure in mathematics, that this the resultant notion of identification is equivalent to the type of *isomorphisms* in the category of such structures. Characterisations of this kind are not automatic and must be established one-by-one; to this end, several authors have employed *reflexive graphs* and *displayed reflexive graphs* to organise the characterisation of identity types. We contribute **reflexive graph lenses**, a new family of intermediate abstractions lying between families of reflexive graphs and displayed reflexive graphs that simplifies the characterisation of identity types for complex structures. Every reflexive graph lens gives rise to a (more complicated) displayed reflexive graph, and our experience suggests that many naturally occurring displayed reflexive graphs arise in this way. Evidence for the utility of reflexive graph lenses is given by means of several case studies, including the theory of reflexive graphs itself as well as that of polynomial type operators. Finally, we exhibit an equivalence between the type of reflexive graph fibrations and the type of *univalent* reflexive graph lenses.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1	Martin-Löf’s identity types . . . . .	3
1.2	Characterising identity types using (displayed) reflexive graphs . . . .	6
1.2.1	Shallow characterisation of identity types . . . . .	6
1.2.2	Deep characterisation using reflexive graphs . . . . .	7
1.2.3	Dependent types and displayed reflexive graphs . . . . .	8
1.3	Characterising <i>transport</i> with reflexive graph lenses . . . . .	9
1.4	Characterising <i>identification induction</i> with midpoint lenses . . . . .	11
1.5	Discussion of related work . . . . .	12
1.5.1	Path objects in homotopy type theory . . . . .	12
1.5.2	Reflexive graphs and reflexive graph fibrations . . . . .	13
1.5.3	The structure identity principle . . . . .	13
1.5.4	Delta lenses and applied category theory . . . . .	13
1.6	The structure of this paper . . . . .	14

<b>2</b>	<b>Reflexive graphs and path objects</b>	<b>14</b>
2.1	Basic constructions on reflexive graphs . . . . .	15
2.2	Duality involution for reflexive graphs . . . . .	17
2.3	Path objects and the univalence condition . . . . .	17
2.4	Path algebra in a path object . . . . .	19
2.5	Univalent families and reflexive graph images . . . . .	20
2.6	Basic closure properties of path objects . . . . .	21
<b>3</b>	<b>Lenses of reflexive graphs and path objects</b>	<b>24</b>
3.1	Lenses of reflexive graphs . . . . .	24
3.2	Bivariant midpoint lenses . . . . .	25
3.3	Duality involution for reflexive graph lenses . . . . .	27
3.4	Definitional lenses of reflexive graphs . . . . .	28
3.4.1	Example: definitional lenses from univalent families . . . . .	29
3.4.2	Example: definitional lenses for finite ordinals . . . . .	29
3.4.3	Definitional replacement of lenses . . . . .	30
3.4.4	Polynomials and partial products of reflexive graphs . . . . .	31
3.5	Coherence in the theory of path object lenses . . . . .	34
<b>4</b>	<b>Case study: path objects classifying reflexive graphs</b>	<b>36</b>
4.1	Classifying reflexive graphs . . . . .	36
4.2	Classifying displayed reflexive graphs over a fixed base . . . . .	38
4.3	Classifying displayed reflexive graphs with variable base . . . . .	39
4.4	Classifying families and lenses of reflexive graphs . . . . .	40
<b>5</b>	<b>Fibred reflexive graphs</b>	<b>41</b>
5.1	Duality involution for fibred reflexive graphs . . . . .	41
5.2	Fibred reflexive graphs and univalence . . . . .	42
5.3	Fibred reflexive graphs from lenses of path objects . . . . .	43
5.4	The underlying lens of a covariant fibration of reflexive graphs . . . . .	44
5.4.1	Straightening of displayed edges . . . . .	44
5.4.2	The underlying lens of a covariant fibration . . . . .	46
5.5	Characterisation of fibred reflexive graphs . . . . .	47

**Acknowledgments** I thank Rafaël Bocquet for suggesting the terminology of *path objects*. I am also grateful to Fredrik Bakke, Marcelo Fiore, Daniel Gratzer, Tom de Jong, Egbert Rijke and David Wärn for helpful conversations. This work was funded by the United States Air Force Office of Scientific Research under grant FA9550-23-1-0728 (*New Spaces for Denotational Semantics*; Dr. Tristan Nguyen, Program Manager). Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author only and do not necessarily reflect those of AFOSR.

**Conventions** We work in Martin-Löf’s intensional dependent type theory with products  $\prod_{(x:A)} B(x)$ , sums  $\sum_{(x:A)} B(x)$ , identity types  $x =_A y$ , a unit type  $\mathbf{1}$ , and type  $\mathbb{N}$  of natural numbers; products, sums, and the unit type are assumed to have definitional  $\eta$ -laws. We do not globally assume any universes, nor function extensionality, nor univalence; these constructs are assumed locally where needed. We use the symbol  $\equiv$  to denote definitional equality, and  $=_A$  to denote identity types. We follow the vernacular of univalent foundations, in which *propositions* and *sets* are defined extrinsically in terms of identity types. When we refer to existence, we mean it in the usual propositionally

truncated sense of standard mathematical vernacular rather than in the sense of the HoTT Book [Univalent Foundations Program, 2013].

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Martin-Löf’s identity types

In the setting of Martin-Löf’s intensional type theory [Nordström et al., 1990], every type  $A$  comes equipped with a type constructor  $x : A, y : A \vdash x =_A y : \mathbf{type}$  that classifies *identifications* between elements of  $A$ , *i.e.* witnesses that two given elements are “equal”. Rather than being defined separately for each  $A$ , the identity type constructor  $=_A$  is specified generically for all types by means of formation, introduction, elimination, and computation rules:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{FORMATION} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash A : \mathbf{type} \quad \Gamma \vdash u, v : A}{\Gamma \vdash u =_A v : \mathbf{type}}
\end{array}
\qquad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{INTRODUCTION} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash A : \mathbf{type} \quad \Gamma \vdash u : A}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{refl} : u =_A u}
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{ELIMINATION} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash A : \mathbf{type} \quad \Gamma, x : A, y : A, p : x =_A y \vdash C(x, y, p) : \mathbf{type} \quad \Gamma, x : A \vdash c(x) : C(x, x, \mathbf{refl}) \quad \Gamma \vdash u, v : A \quad \Gamma \vdash w : u =_A v}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{J}_A^C(c; u, v, w) : C(u, v, w)}
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{COMPUTATION} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash A : \mathbf{type} \quad \Gamma, x : A, y : A, p : x =_A y \vdash C(x, y, p) : \mathbf{type} \quad \Gamma, x : A \vdash c(x) : C(x, x, \mathbf{refl}) \quad \Gamma \vdash u : A}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{J}_A^C(c; u, u, \mathbf{refl}) \equiv c(u) : C(u, u, \mathbf{refl})}
\end{array}$$

The formation and introduction rule for the identity type can be thought of as equipping  $A$  with the structure of a *reflexive graph*<sup>1</sup> (see Definition 18). The elimination and computation rule then ensure that this reflexive graph structure is the smallest possible one that can be formed with vertices in  $A$ . This universal property is most commonly employed in terms of the principle of *identification induction* below.

**Principle 1** (Identification induction). *Given a family of types  $x, y : A; p : x =_A y \vdash C(x, y, p) : \mathbf{type}$ , to define a dependent function  $x, y : A; p : x =_A y \vdash f(x, y, p) : C(x, y, p)$  it suffices to specify  $x : A \vdash f(x, x, \mathbf{refl}) : C(x, x, \mathbf{refl})$ .*

*Proof.* To define  $x, y, p \vdash f(x, y, p) : C(x, y, p)$  in terms of  $x \vdash f(x, x, \mathbf{refl}) : C(x, x, \mathbf{refl})$ , we use the elimination rule of the identity type as follows:

$$f(x, y, p) := \mathbf{J}_A^C(x. f(x, x, \mathbf{refl}); x, y, p) \quad \square$$

A special case of Principle 1 is *transport*, which materialises identifications  $u =_A v$  as functions  $B(u) \rightarrow B(v)$  for any family  $x : A \vdash B(x) : \mathbf{type}$ .

**Corollary 1** (Transport). *Given a family of types  $x : A \vdash B(x) : \mathbf{type}$ , for any  $x, y : A$  and  $p : x =_A y$  we may define a mapping  $p_*^B : B(x) \rightarrow B(y)$  such that for all  $x : A$  and  $b : B(x)$  we have  $\mathbf{refl}_* b \equiv b$ .*

<sup>1</sup>In the context of category theory, one uses the term “graph” to refer to what combinatorialists would normally refer to as *multigraphs* or *pseudo-graphs*. A graph in the traditional sense would be a graph (in the present generalised sense) in which the type of vertices is a set and the type of edges between two fixed vertices is a proposition; we might refer to such objects as “locally propositional set-graphs”.

*Proof.* Let  $C(x, y, p) := B(x) \rightarrow B(y)$ ; using Principle 1 we may define a dependent function  $\text{transport}(x, y, p) : C(x, y, p)$  by specifying  $\text{transport}(x, x, \mathbf{refl}) := \lambda b. b$ . Then for any  $p : x =_A y$  we define  $p_*^B b := \text{transport}(x, y, p)$ .  $\square$

**Definition 2** (Singletons). Given an element  $u : A$ , we define the *singleton type* at  $x$  to be the type  $\{u\}_A$  of elements of  $A$  equipped with identifications from  $u$ :

$$\{u\}_A := \sum_{(y:A)} u =_A y$$

Of course, the simplest element of  $\{u\}_A$  is the pair  $(u, \mathbf{refl})$ . We can prove using Principle 1 that  $(u, \mathbf{refl})$  is the *only* element of  $\{u\}_A$ .

**Corollary 3** (Contractibility of singletons). *For any fixed element  $u : A$ , we may define a dependent function  $\Phi_u : \prod_{(q:\{u\}_A)} (u, \mathbf{refl}) =_{\{u\}_A} q$  witnessing that any element of  $\{u\}_A$  can be identified with  $(u, \mathbf{refl})$ , such that  $\Phi_u(u, \mathbf{refl}) \equiv \mathbf{refl}$ .*

*Proof.* We define the following dependent function using Principle 1:

$$x, y : A; p : x =_A y \vdash \Phi_x(y, p) : (x, \mathbf{refl}) =_{\{x\}_A} (y, q)$$

*by Principle 1*

$$x : A \vdash \Phi_x(x, \mathbf{refl}) : (x, \mathbf{refl}) =_{\{x\}_A} (x, \mathbf{refl})$$

*by reflexivity*

$$x : A \vdash \Phi_x(x, \mathbf{refl}) \equiv \mathbf{refl} \quad \square$$

There is an alternative, equivalent, formulation of identification induction due to Paulin-Mohring [1993], that fixes an element  $u : A$  and allows induction on data of the form  $y : A, p : u =_A y$ . This is called “based identification induction”:

**Principle 2** (Based identification induction). *Given a fixed element  $u : A$  and a family of types  $y : A, p : u =_A y \vdash B(y, p) : \mathbf{type}$ , to define a dependent function  $y : A, p : u =_A y \vdash f(y, p) : B(y, p)$  it suffices to specify  $f(u, \mathbf{refl}) : B(u, \mathbf{refl})$ .*

We recall Martin Hofmann’s proof below as reported by Streicher [1994, Addendum].

*Proof.* Let  $q : \{u\}_A \vdash B^\sharp(u) : \mathbf{type}$  be the family  $B^\sharp((y, p)) := B(y, p)$ . For any  $y : A$  and  $p : x =_A y$  we have by the contractibility of singletons (Corollary 3) an identification  $\Phi_u(y, p) : (u, \mathbf{refl}) =_{\{u\}_A} (y, p)$ . By transport (Corollary 1), we have  $(\Phi_u(y, p))_*^{B^\sharp} : B(x, \mathbf{refl}) \rightarrow B(y, p)$ . We may therefore define  $y, p \vdash f : (y, p) : B(y, p)$  to be  $(\Phi_u(y, p))_*^{B^\sharp}(f(u, \mathbf{refl}))$ , as we have the following definitional equivalences:

$$(\Phi_u(u, \mathbf{refl}))_*^{B^\sharp}(f(u, \mathbf{refl})) \equiv \mathbf{refl}_*^{B^\sharp}(f(u, \mathbf{refl})) \equiv f(u, \mathbf{refl}) \quad \square$$

Independently, van den Berg and Garner [2011] and Lumsdaine [2010] have shown that identification induction exhibits a weak globular  $\infty$ -groupoid structure on each type  $A$ . In the lowest dimension, this corresponds to the construction of compositors for identifications and associators for the resulting compositions, *etc.*

**Construction 4** (Unbiased compositor). For each  $p : u =_A v$  and  $q : v =_A w$ , we may define an identification  $p \cdot q : u =_A w$  in such a way that  $\mathbf{refl} \cdot \mathbf{refl} \equiv \mathbf{refl}$ .

*Proof.* Generalising over all our assumptions, define the following term using Principle 2 followed by Principle 1:

$$x, y : A; p : x =_A y, z : A, q : y =_A z \vdash p \cdot q : x =_A z$$

by Principle 2

$$x, y : A; p : x =_A y \vdash p \cdot \mathbf{refl} : x =_A y$$

by Principle 1

$$x : A \vdash \mathbf{refl} \cdot \mathbf{refl} : x =_A x$$

by reflexivity

$$x : A \vdash \mathbf{refl} \cdot \mathbf{refl} \equiv \mathbf{refl}$$

□

**Construction 5** (Left unitor). For any  $p : u =_A v$ , we may define an identification  $\text{lunit}_p : \mathbf{refl} \cdot p =_{u=A v} p$  in such a way that  $\text{lunit}_{\mathbf{refl}} \equiv \mathbf{refl}$ .

*Proof.* We define the following term using Principle 1:

$$x, y : A; p : x =_A y \vdash \text{lunit}_p : \mathbf{refl} \cdot p =_{x=A y} p$$

by Principle 1

$$x : A \vdash \text{lunit}_{\mathbf{refl}} : \mathbf{refl} \cdot \mathbf{refl} =_{x=A x} \mathbf{refl}$$

by Construction 4

$$x : A \vdash \text{lunit}_{\mathbf{refl}} : \mathbf{refl} =_{x=A x} \mathbf{refl}$$

by reflexivity

$$x : A \vdash \text{lunit}_{\mathbf{refl}} \equiv \mathbf{refl}$$

□

**Exercise 6** (Associator). For any identifications  $p : t =_A u$ ,  $q : u =_A v$ , and  $r : v =_A w$ , constructor an identification  $\alpha_{p,q,r} : (p \cdot q) \cdot r =_{t=A w} p \cdot (q \cdot r)$  in such a way that  $\alpha_{\mathbf{refl}, \mathbf{refl}, \mathbf{refl}} \equiv \mathbf{refl}$ .

Higher identities relating different ways of composing the associators and unitors can be established in the same way as the above.

**Construction 7** (Biased compositors). For each  $p : u =_A v$  and  $q : v =_A w$  we may define identifications  $p \cdot_l q, p \cdot_r q : u =_A w$  such that  $\mathbf{refl} \cdot_l q \equiv q$  and  $p \cdot_r \mathbf{refl} \equiv p$ .

*Proof.* The right-biased compositor is constructed using Principle 2 like so:

$$x, y : A; p : x =_A y, z : A, q : y =_A z \vdash p \cdot_r q : x =_A z$$

by Principle 2

$$x, y : A; p : x =_A y \vdash p \cdot_r \mathbf{refl} : x =_A y$$

by hypothesis

$$x, y : A; p : x =_A y \vdash p \cdot_r \mathbf{refl} \equiv p$$

The left-biased compositor is constructed using Principle 1 as follows:

$$x, y : A; p : x =_A y, z : A, q : y =_A z \vdash p \cdot_l q : x =_A z$$

by Principle 1

$$x, z : A; q : x =_A z \vdash \mathbf{refl} \cdot_l q : x =_A z$$

by hypothesis

$$x, z : A; q : x =_A z \vdash \mathbf{refl} \cdot_l q \equiv q$$

□

**Construction 8** (Action on identifications). Given a function  $f : A \rightarrow B$ , to each identification  $p : u =_A v$  we may assign an identification  $\text{act}_f p : fu =_B fv$  such that  $\text{act}_f \mathbf{refl} \equiv \mathbf{refl}$ . This assignment is called the *action of  $f$  on identifications*.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup>Owing to the terminology of the HoTT Book [Univalent Foundations Program, 2013],  $\text{act}_f$  is often written as  $\text{ap}_f$ .

*Proof.* We may define the action of  $f$  on identifications by one application of Principle 1.

$$x, y : A; p : x =_A y \vdash \text{act}_f p : fx =_B fy$$

*by Principle 1*

$$x : A \vdash \text{act}_f \text{refl} : fx =_B fx$$

*by reflexivity*

$$x : A \vdash \text{act}_f \text{refl} \equiv \text{refl}$$

□

**Construction 9** (Action of the identity map). For any identification  $p : u =_A v$ , we can define a higher identification  $\text{actIdn } p : \text{act}_{1_A} p =_{u=A v} p$  witnessing that the action of the identity function is the identity function on identifications, such that we have  $\text{actIdn refl} \equiv \text{refl}$ .

*Proof.* We may construct the witness using Principle 1 as follows:

$$x, y : A; p : u =_A v \vdash \text{actIdn } p : \text{act}_{1_A} p =_{x=A y} p$$

*by Principle 1*

$$x : A \vdash \text{actIdn refl} : \text{act}_{1_A} \text{refl} =_{x=A y} p$$

*by Construction 8*

$$x : A \vdash \text{actIdn refl} : p =_{x=A y} p$$

*by reflexivity*

$$x : A \vdash \text{actIdn refl} \equiv \text{refl}$$

□

## 1.2 Characterising identity types using (displayed) reflexive graphs

The role of the identity type is similar to that of equality in set theory: it expresses a single *global* notion of identification whose rules apply to all types simultaneously.<sup>3</sup> On the other hand, because the rules of identity types have to apply uniformly to all types, these rules do not reflect any of the specific characteristics of individual types that would, if taken seriously, make it easier to both exhibit and use identifications.

**Remark 10.** Everything in this section is derived from prior works, such as the HoTT Book [Univalent Foundations Program, 2013], Rijke’s textbook on homotopy type theory [Rijke, 2022], and the work of Schipp von Branitz and Buchholtz [2021], although we do impose our own terminological conventions.

### 1.2.1 Shallow characterisation of identity types

For example, it is very natural to build up an identification of type  $(x, u) =_{A \times B} (y, v)$  from a pair of identifications  $x =_A y$  and  $u =_B v$ . This principle can be formalised by *characterising* the identity type of  $A \times B$  in terms of the identity types of  $A$  and  $B$ .

**Proposition 11** (Shallow characterisation of the binary product). *Each of the following functions is an equivalence:*

$$\begin{aligned} x, y : A; u, v : B \vdash \text{splitId}_{A,B} : (x, u) =_{A \times B} (y, v) &\rightarrow (x =_A y) \times (u =_B v) \\ x : A, u : B \vdash \text{splitId}_{A,B} \text{refl} &\equiv (\text{refl}, \text{refl}) \end{aligned}$$

<sup>3</sup>Naturally, intensional type theory can speak about more than sets — but the spirit of having a single global notion of identity is the same in both type theory and set theory.

*Proof.* We can explicitly construct an inverse to  $\text{splitId}_{A,B}$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} x, y : A; u, v : B \vdash \text{unsplitId}_{A,B} : (x =_A y) \times (u =_B v) &\rightarrow (x, u) =_{A \times B} (y, v) \\ x : A, u : B \vdash \text{unsplitId}_{A,B}(\mathbf{refl}, \mathbf{refl}) &\equiv \mathbf{refl} \end{aligned}$$

The coherences of the equivalence are given by identification induction.  $\square$

Of course, although the characterisation of identifications in  $A \times B$  in Proposition 11 is useful, it does not help us directly to characterise identifications in more complex types. For example, we may wish to characterise the identity type of  $(A \times B) \times C$  by asserting that the canonical map  $((x, u), m) =_{(A \times B) \times C} ((y, v), n) \rightarrow ((x =_A y) \times (u =_B v)) \times (m =_C n)$  is an equivalence. This can be established directly in the same way as Proposition 11, but this existing lemma does not help do so. Naturally, it would be better to have a toolkit for building up “deep” characterisations of identity types piece-by-piece.

### 1.2.2 Deep characterisation using reflexive graphs

A “deep” characterisation of the identity type for binary products would take the following form: *If we have characterised the identity type of  $A$  and the identity type of  $B$ , then we may characterise the identity type of  $A \times B$ .*

Proposition 11 can be “deepened” along these lines by replacing the types  $A$  and  $B$  with *reflexive graphs*  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  so that we have the following data:

$$\begin{array}{ll} |\mathcal{A}| : \mathbf{type} & |\mathcal{B}| : \mathbf{type} \\ \approx_{\mathcal{A}} : |\mathcal{A}| \rightarrow |\mathcal{A}| \rightarrow \mathbf{type} & \approx_{\mathcal{B}} : |\mathcal{B}| \rightarrow |\mathcal{B}| \rightarrow \mathbf{type} \\ \mathbf{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} : \prod_{(x : |\mathcal{A}|)} x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} x & \mathbf{rx}_{\mathcal{B}} : \prod_{(x : |\mathcal{B}|)} x \approx_{\mathcal{B}} x \end{array}$$

These reflexive graph structures follow the pattern of instances of the formation and introduction rules for the identity type. Tentatively, we shall say that a given reflexive graph  $\mathcal{G}$  is **univalent** when the following function is an equivalence:<sup>4</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} x, y : |\mathcal{G}| \vdash \text{idToEdge}_{\mathcal{G}}^{x,y} : x =_{|\mathcal{G}|} y &\rightarrow x \approx_{\mathcal{G}} y \\ x : |\mathcal{G}| \vdash \text{idToEdge}_{\mathcal{G}}^{x,x} \mathbf{refl} &\equiv \mathbf{rx}_{\mathcal{G}} x \end{aligned}$$

We shall often refer to a univalent reflexive graph as a **path object** for short. With these constructions on reflexive graphs in hand, a *deep* characterisation of the identity type for binary products can be formulated.

First we define a new reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}| &\equiv |\mathcal{A}| \times |\mathcal{B}| \\ (x, u) \approx_{\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}} (y, v) &\equiv (x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y) \times (u \approx_{\mathcal{B}} v) \\ \mathbf{rx}_{\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}}(x, u) &\equiv (\mathbf{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x, \mathbf{rx}_{\mathcal{B}} u) \end{aligned}$$

Then the deep characterisation of binary products amounts saying that path objects (*i.e.* univalent reflexive graphs) are closed under binary products.

**Proposition 12** (Deep characterisation of the binary product). *If  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  are two path objects, then  $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$  is a path object.*

<sup>4</sup>See Definition 43; in fact, our provisional definition of the univalence condition for a reflexive graph is not the most practical one for everyday use, but it is one of several equivalent conditions that we shall expose later.

The compositional character of Proposition 12 allows us to deduce other useful corollaries immediately by iteration. For example, if  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}$  are all univalent reflexive graphs, then  $(\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}) \times \mathcal{C}$  is a univalent reflexive graph, *etc.* On the other hand, the shallow characterisation (Proposition 11) is immediately recoverable via the following definition of the *discrete* reflexive graph on a type  $A$ , which is univalent by definition:

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta A| &::= A \\ x \approx_{\Delta A} y &::= x =_A y \\ \mathbf{rX}_{\Delta A} x &::= \mathbf{refl} \end{aligned}$$

Then Proposition 11 is precisely the instantiation of Proposition 12 with  $\mathcal{A} ::= \Delta A$  and  $\mathcal{B} ::= \Delta B$ . We can also generalise the binary product of reflexive graphs to arbitrary arity: if  $A$  is a type and  $\mathcal{B}(x)$  is a reflexive graph for each  $x : A$ , define  $\prod_{(x:A)} \mathcal{B}(x)$  to be the following reflexive graph:

$$\begin{aligned} |\prod_{(x:A)} \mathcal{B}(x)| &::= \prod_{(x:A)} |\mathcal{B}(x)| \\ f \approx_{\prod_{(x:A)} \mathcal{B}(x)} g &::= \prod_{(x:A)} f x \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x)} g x \\ \mathbf{rX}_{\prod_{(x:A)} \mathcal{B}(x)} f &::= \lambda x. \mathbf{rX}_{\mathcal{B}(x)} (f x) \end{aligned}$$

**Proposition 13** (Deep characterisation of product). *Given  $\mathcal{B}(x)$  a path object for each  $x : A$ , the product  $\prod_{(x:A)} \mathcal{B}(x)$  is univalent assuming dependent function extensionality holds.*

### 1.2.3 Dependent types and displayed reflexive graphs

So far we have described how to give shallow and deep characterisations of *non-dependent* types. Of course, most mathematical structures of any interest (*e.g.* monoids, groups, rings, *etc.*, or even reflexive graphs themselves!) are described by dependent types, as the types of the operations depend on the carrier types.

Given a type  $A : \mathbf{type}$  and a family of types  $x : A \vdash B(x) : \mathbf{type}$ , how can we characterise the identity type of the sum  $\sum_{(x:A)} B(x)$ ? A shallow characterisation in the style of Section 1.2.1 is at least not out of reach.

**Proposition 14** (Shallow characterisation of the indexed sum). *Each of the following functions is an equivalence:*

$$\begin{aligned} x, y : A; u : B(x), v : B(y) &\vdash \\ \text{dsplitld}_{A,B} : (x, u) =_{\sum_{(x:A)} B(x)} (y, v) &\rightarrow \sum_{(p:x=Ay)} p_*^B u =_{B(y)} v \\ \text{dsplitld}_{A,B} \mathbf{refl} &::= (\mathbf{refl}, \mathbf{refl}) \end{aligned}$$

The shallow characterisation in Proposition 14 is more complex than that of Proposition 11 because the second component of the the sum  $\sum_{(p:x=Ay)} p_*^B u =_{B(y)} v$  involves a *transport*. From a higher vantage point, the problem being solved by transport here is that we wish to identify  $u : B(x)$  with  $v : B(y)$  but these do not have the same type. Transport uses the identification  $p : x =_A y$  to find a common type in which  $u$  and  $v$  can be compared; but note that the choice of a forward transport  $p_*^B : B(x) \rightarrow B(y)$  is somewhat arbitrary, as we might have also defined a backward transport  $p_B^* : B(y) \rightarrow B(x)$  and compared  $u, v$  in  $B(x)$ .

In order to generalise Proposition 14 to a *deep* characterisation of the indexed sum, we must naturally generalise the concept of reflexive graph to one in which vertices



form a *dependent* type and edges go between different components linked by an edge in the base. This is precisely the purpose of the *displayed reflexive graphs* of Schipp von Branitz and Buchholtz [2021].

In particular, let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a reflexive graph as before and let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a **displayed reflexive graph** over  $\mathcal{A}$  so that we have the following data:

$$\begin{array}{ll} |\mathcal{A}| : \mathbf{type} & |\mathcal{B}| : |\mathcal{A}| \rightarrow \mathbf{type} \\ \approx_{\mathcal{A}} : |\mathcal{A}| \rightarrow |\mathcal{A}| \rightarrow \mathbf{type} & \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^{\bullet} : \prod_{\{x,y:|\mathcal{A}|\}} x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y \rightarrow |\mathcal{B}|(x) \rightarrow |\mathcal{B}|(y) \rightarrow \mathbf{type} \\ \mathbf{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} : \prod_{(x:|\mathcal{A}|)} x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} x & \mathbf{rx}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\bullet} : \prod_{(x:|\mathcal{A}|)} \prod_{(u:|\mathcal{B}|(x))} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathbf{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x} u \end{array}$$

Any displayed reflexive graph such as  $\mathcal{B}$  gives rise to a family of ordinary reflexive graphs  $\mathcal{B}(x)$  indexed in vertices  $x : |\mathcal{A}|$ .

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{B}(x)| &:= |\mathcal{B}|(x) \\ u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x)} v &:= u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathbf{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x} v \\ \mathbf{rx}_{\mathcal{B}(x)} u &:= \mathbf{rx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u \end{aligned}$$

A displayed reflexive graph  $\mathcal{B}$  will be called **univalent** (or a displayed path object for short) when each of its components is univalent. We can now define the **total reflexive graph** of  $\mathcal{B}$  with vertices in the sum of  $|\mathcal{B}|$  over  $|\mathcal{A}|$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{A}.\mathcal{B}| &:= \sum_{(x:|\mathcal{A}|)} |\mathcal{B}|(x) \\ (x, u) \approx_{\mathcal{A}.\mathcal{B}} (y, v) &:= \sum_{(p:x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y)} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^p v \\ \mathbf{rx}_{\mathcal{A}.\mathcal{B}}(x, u) &:= (\mathbf{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x, \mathbf{rx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u) \end{aligned}$$

Then the deep characterisation for indexed sums is exactly the statement that the total reflexive graph of a displayed path object is a path object.

**Proposition 15** (Deep characterisation of the indexed sum). *Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a displayed path object over a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then the total reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}.\mathcal{B}$  is a path object.*

### 1.3 Characterising transport with reflexive graph lenses

Everything we have described so far is more or less standard. Path objects (and equivalent concepts such as *torsorial families*) have been used to great effect in a variety of formalised libraries of univalent mathematics, including agda-unimath [Rijke et al., 2023] and the 1Lab [1Lab Development Team, 2022]. The purpose of the present paper is to give a deeper analysis of a large class of displayed path objects that arise in a particularly simple way, in fact obviating the need to separately prove many univalence lemmas. We return to the shallow characterisation of the identity types of dependent sums from Proposition 14:

$$(x, u) =_{\sum_{(x:A)} B(x)} (y, v) \cong \sum_{(p:x=A)} p_*^B u =_{B(y)} v$$

In our deep characterisation (Proposition 15), we generalised  $x =_A y$  to the edges  $x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y$  of a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$  and we generalised  $p_*^B u =_{B(y)} v$  to the *displayed edges*  $u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^p v$  of a displayed reflexive graph  $\mathcal{B}$  over  $\mathcal{A}$ . This generalisation abstracts away the use of transport to get the vertices  $u$  and  $v$  to lie in the same component of  $B$ , at the cost of needing to specify  $\mathcal{B}$  as a displayed reflexive graph rather than as a family of reflexive graphs indexed in  $\mathcal{A}$ .

Our starting point is to consider a different, less abstract, generalisation of Proposition 14 in which we replace  $A$  with a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$  as before, but we replace  $B$  not with a displayed reflexive graph over  $\mathcal{A}$ , but instead with a *family* of reflexive graphs  $\mathcal{B}(x)$  indexed in vertices  $x : |\mathcal{A}|$  that is equipped with a *transport* or *pushforward* operation to jump from one component to the next. To a first approximation, we have assumed the following data:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{A}| &: \mathbf{type} & |\mathcal{B}(-)| &: |\mathcal{A}| \rightarrow \mathbf{type} \\ \approx_{\mathcal{A}} &: |\mathcal{A}| \rightarrow |\mathcal{A}| \rightarrow \mathbf{type} & \approx_{\mathcal{B}(-)} &: \prod_{(x:|\mathcal{A}|)} |\mathcal{B}(x)| \rightarrow |\mathcal{B}(x)| \rightarrow \mathbf{type} \\ \mathrm{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} &: \prod_{(x:|\mathcal{A}|)} x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} x & \mathrm{rx}_{\mathcal{B}(-)} &: \prod_{(x:|\mathcal{A}|)} \prod_{(u:|\mathcal{B}(x)|)} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x)} u \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathrm{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\bullet} : \prod_{\{x,y:|\mathcal{A}|\}} \prod_{(p:x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y)} |\mathcal{B}(x)| \rightarrow |\mathcal{B}(y)|$$

With this data in hand, we can define an appropriate displayed reflexive graph  $\mathrm{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}$  over  $\mathcal{A}$  that mirrors the passage from the shallow characterisation (Proposition 14) to the deep characterisation (Proposition 15):

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathrm{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}|(x) &:= |\mathcal{B}(x)| \\ u \approx_{\mathrm{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}}^{p:x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y} v &:= \mathrm{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} v \end{aligned}$$

It remains to define the displayed reflexivity datum  $\mathrm{rx}_{\mathrm{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}}^x u : \mathrm{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathrm{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x)} u$ , but we do not have anything on hand from which to define this. We are therefore led to assert this reflexivity datum as part of the *data* of  $\mathcal{B}$ :

$$\mathrm{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\bullet} : \prod_{(x:|\mathcal{A}|)} \prod_{(u:|\mathcal{B}(x)|)} \mathrm{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathrm{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x)} u$$

The above has the appearance of an *oplax unitor* for the pushforward operation. Using this oplax unitor, we may finish defining the displayed reflexive graph  $\mathrm{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}$ :

$$\mathrm{rx}_{\mathrm{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}}^x u := \mathrm{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u$$

Altogether, we shall refer to a family of reflexive graphs  $\mathcal{B}$  equipped with  $\mathrm{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\bullet}$  and  $\mathrm{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\bullet}$  as an **oplax covariant lens** of reflexive graphs (see Definition 62) over  $\mathcal{A}$  — *covariant* because  $\mathrm{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\bullet}$  implements a forward transport, and *oplax* because of the orientation of the unitor  $\mathrm{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}$ . The terminology of *lenses* is borrowed from Johnson and Rosebrugh [2013], Chollet et al. [2022], who use it to refer to an algebraic generalisation of fibrations in which the chosen lifts are not required to have a universal property but instead satisfy a unit law (strictly, in the case of *op. cit.*).

Naturally, we can (and will) introduce a dual notion of *lax contravariant lens* for characterising backward transport in a family of reflexive graphs. When  $\mathcal{B}$  is a lax contravariant lens in this sense (see Definition 63), we can likewise associate a displayed reflexive graph  $\mathrm{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^- \mathcal{B}$  in which a displayed edge  $u \approx_{\mathrm{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^- \mathcal{B}}^{p:x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y} v$  is given by an edge  $u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x)} \mathrm{pull}_{\mathcal{B}}^p v$ .

**Proposition 16** (See Lemma 68). *Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be an oplax covariant (resp. lax contravariant) lens of path objects over a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then the displayed reflexive graph  $\mathrm{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}$  (resp.  $\mathrm{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^- \mathcal{B}$ ) is univalent.*

The pay-off of introducing lenses of reflexive graphs is twofold. First of all, many naturally occurring displayed reflexive graphs have the shape of  $\mathrm{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}$  or  $\mathrm{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^- \mathcal{B}$  already; more importantly, however, it frequently happens that the components of the

given displayed reflexive graph arise as a pre-existing family of reflexive graphs for which we have already proved univalence. Therefore, it is advantageous to obtain a displayed path object automatically from a very simple algebraic structure on a pre-existing family of path objects: a pushforward operator and a lax unitor.

#### 1.4 Characterising *identification induction* with midpoint lenses

Naturally, not all useful displayed path objects arise from (oplax covariant, lax contravariant) lenses. We have found, however, that many of the important counterexamples instead arise from a common generalisation of oplax covariant and lax contravariant lenses, which shares the advantages thereof over working directly with displayed reflexive graphs. Consider for example the case of *magmas* in a universe  $U$ , which are specified by the following data:

$$\begin{aligned} |M| &: \mathbf{type} \\ \otimes_M &: |M| \times |M| \rightarrow |M| \end{aligned}$$

An equivalence of magmas  $M \approx_{\mathbf{Magma}_U} N$  is given by an equivalence of types  $f : |M| \cong |N|$  that preserves the binary operation in the following sense:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} |M| \times |M| & \xrightarrow{\otimes_M} & |M| \\ f \times f \downarrow & & \downarrow f \\ |N| \times |N| & \xrightarrow{\otimes_N} & |N| \end{array}$$

If we write  $\mathcal{U}$  for the reflexive graph structure on the universe  $U$  given by equivalences of types, then we would expect that the reflexive graph  $\mathbf{Magma}_U$  should arise as the total reflexive graph of the following displayed reflexive graph over  $\mathcal{U}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{BinOp}_U|(A) &:= A \times A \rightarrow A \\ \otimes_A \approx_{\mathbf{BinOp}_U}^{f:A \approx_U B} \otimes_B &:= \prod_{(x,y:A)} f(x \otimes_A y) =_B (fx \otimes_B fy) \\ \mathbf{rx}_{\mathbf{BinOp}_U}^A \otimes_A &:= \lambda x, y. \mathbf{refl} \end{aligned}$$

The displayed reflexive graph above does *not* arise from an oplax covariant lens, nor from a lax contravariant lens. The following somewhat artificial displayed reflexive graphs could have been obtained from such lenses, but they would be difficult to use:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{BinOp}_U^+|(A) &:= A \times A \rightarrow A \\ \otimes_A \approx_{\mathbf{BinOp}_U^+}^{f:A \approx_U B} \otimes_B &:= \prod_{(x,y:B)} f(f^{-1}x \otimes_A f^{-1}y) =_B x \otimes_B y \\ \mathbf{rx}_{\mathbf{BinOp}_U^+}^A \otimes_A &:= \lambda x, y. \mathbf{refl} \\ |\mathbf{BinOp}_U^-|(A) &:= A \times A \rightarrow A \\ \otimes_A \approx_{\mathbf{BinOp}_U^-}^{f:A \approx_U B} \otimes_B &:= \prod_{(x,y:A)} x \otimes_A y =_A f^{-1}(fx \otimes_B fy) \\ \mathbf{rx}_{\mathbf{BinOp}_U^-}^A \otimes_A &:= \lambda x, y. \mathbf{refl} \end{aligned}$$

In order to capture the structure necessary to obtain the displayed reflexive graph  $\text{BinOp}_U$  from a *family* of ordinary reflexive graphs, we must consider a different kind of lens. Before generalising, we first work with this specific case. Let  $\text{BinOp}_U^\pm(f)$  be a reflexive graph as defined below for each equivalence  $f : A \approx_U B$  of types:

$$\text{BinOp}_U^\pm(f : A \approx_U B) := \prod_{(\cdot : A \times A)} \Delta B$$

Then we define the following operations on  $\text{BinOp}_U^\pm$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{lex}^\bullet_{\text{BinOp}_U^\pm} &: \prod_{\{A, B : U\}} \prod_{(f : A \approx_U B)} \text{BinOp}_U^\pm(\text{rx}_U A) \rightarrow \text{BinOp}_U^\pm(f) \\ \text{lex}^{f : A \approx_U B}_{\text{BinOp}_U^\pm} \otimes_A &:= \lambda(x, y) : A \times A. f(x \otimes_A y) \\ \text{rex}^\bullet_{\text{BinOp}_U^\pm} &: \prod_{\{A, B : U\}} \prod_{(f : A \approx_U B)} \text{BinOp}_U^\pm(\text{rx}_U B) \rightarrow \text{BinOp}_U^\pm(f) \\ \text{rex}^{f : A \approx_U B}_{\text{BinOp}_U^\pm} \otimes_B &:= \lambda(x, y) : A \times A. f x \otimes_B f y \\ \text{lexRx}^\bullet_{\text{BinOp}_U^\pm} &: \prod_{(A : U)} \prod_{(\otimes_A : A \times A \rightarrow B)} \text{lex}^{\text{rx}_U A}_{\text{BinOp}_U^\pm} \otimes_A \approx_{\text{BinOp}_U^\pm(\text{rx}_U A)} \text{rex}^{\text{rx}_U A}_{\text{BinOp}_U^\pm} \otimes_A \\ \text{lexRx}^A_{\text{BinOp}_U^\pm} \otimes_A &:= \text{rx} \prod_{(\cdot : A \times A)} \Delta B \otimes_A \end{aligned}$$

We can now reconstruct the displayed reflexive graph  $\text{BinOp}_U$  in terms of  $\text{BinOp}_U^\pm$ :

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{BinOp}_U|(A) &\equiv |\text{BinOp}_U^\pm(\text{rx}_U A)| \\ \otimes_A \approx_{\text{BinOp}_U}^{f : A \approx_U B} \otimes_B &\equiv \text{lex}^f_{\text{BinOp}_U^\pm} \otimes_A \approx_{\text{BinOp}_U^\pm(f)} \text{rex}^f_{\text{BinOp}_U^\pm} \otimes_B \\ \text{rx}_{\text{BinOp}_U}^A \otimes_A &\equiv \text{lexRx}^A_{\text{BinOp}_U^\pm} \otimes_A \end{aligned}$$

Abstracting from the specific example of binary operations, the critical move above has been (1) to replace a given family of reflexive graphs  $x : |\mathcal{A}| \vdash \mathcal{B}(x)$  with a more general family  $x, y : |\mathcal{A}|; p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y \vdash \mathcal{B}'(x, y, p)$  such that  $\mathcal{B}'(x, x, \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x) \equiv \mathcal{B}(x)$ , and then (2) define coercions  $\text{lex}^\bullet_{\mathcal{B}'} : \mathcal{B}(x) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}'(x, y, p)$  and  $\text{rex}^\bullet_{\mathcal{B}'} : \mathcal{B}(y) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}'(x, y, p)$  from the “left-hand” and “right-hand” diagonal components to the “centre”. Naturally these coercions must be further equipped with at least a coherence of the form  $\text{lexRx}^x_{\mathcal{B}'} : \text{lex}^{\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x}_{\mathcal{B}'} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x)} \text{rex}^{\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x}_{\mathcal{B}'} u$  in order to generate a reflexivity datum; it will happen that in order for the univalence property carry from  $\mathcal{B}$  to the associated displayed reflexive graph, we shall also need a coherence of the form  $\text{rexRx}^x_{\mathcal{B}'} : u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x)} \text{rex}^{\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x}_{\mathcal{B}'} u$ . Together, all this data forms what we shall refer to as a **bivariant midpoint lens** of reflexive graphs over  $\mathcal{A}$ .

**Remark 17.** In the same way as oplax covariant (*resp.* lax contravariant) lenses express the interface of forward (*resp.* backward) *transport* for a family of reflexive graphs, bivariant midpoint lenses express the interface of (forward and backward) *based identification induction*: the coercions  $\text{lex}$  and  $\text{rex}$  extend data defined on a given reflexivity datum  $\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x$  to data defined on an arbitrary path based at  $x : |\mathcal{A}|$ .

## 1.5 Discussion of related work

### 1.5.1 Path objects in homotopy type theory

A biased version of path objects was introduced already in the HoTT Book [Univalent Foundations Program, 2013, § 5.8] under the name *identity system*; this concept is developed much further in the displayed direction by Rijke in his introductory

textbook on homotopy type theory [Rijke, 2022, § 11.2]. In their guise as *torsorial families*, biased identity systems are employed pervasively in *agda-unimath*, an “online encyclopedia of formalized mathematics ... from a univalent point of view” [Rijke et al., 2023]. An unbiased version of identity systems is used extensively in the *1Lab* [1Lab Development Team, 2022], another library of univalent mathematics formalised in Cubical Agda [Vezzosi et al., 2019].

Our work is most directly inspired by that of Schipp von Branitz and Buchholtz [2021], Schipp von Branitz [2020], who have emphasised the importance of displayed path objects as an organising principle for univalent mathematics. The various notions of lens that we introduce can be thought of as organisational devices to simplify carrying out the methods suggested by *op. cit.* in practice.

### 1.5.2 Reflexive graphs and reflexive graph fibrations

Although *univalent* reflexive graphs are the ones that are important for characterising identity types, we have found it very useful to develop as much structure as possible in the language of ordinary reflexive graphs; this is because the reflexive graph structure captures the aspects of an identity type’s characterisation that we intend to have good definitional/computational behavior, whereas the univalent part describes a universal property that we expect to hold (opaquely) only up to homotopy. Our starting point in studying the theory of reflexive graphs has been the doctoral dissertation of Rijke [2019], who introduces many important concepts from the univalent point of view, including the univalence condition (called *discreteness* by *op. cit.*) as well as the notion of (covariant, contravariant) fibration of reflexive graphs. (It should be noted that the concept of fibred (non-reflexive) graph was introduced already by Boldi and Vigna [2002].)

Schipp von Branitz and Buchholtz [2021], Schipp von Branitz [2020] introduced *displayed reflexive graphs* as a more type theoretical presentation of homomorphisms of reflexive graphs; we have re-based Rijke [2019]’s theory of reflexive graph fibrations in terms of displayed reflexive graphs in roughly the same way that Ahrens and Lumsdaine [2019] re-examine (Street) fibrations of categories in terms of displayed categories.

### 1.5.3 The structure identity principle

Azel [2012], Coquand and Danielsson [2013] have famously observed that Voevodsky’s univalence principle ensures that the identity types of various algebraic structures (*e.g.* groups, rings, graphs, *etc.*) can be characterised so as to coincide precisely with the natural notion of invertible homomorphism: for example, an identification of groups valued in a univalent universe is precisely a group isomorphism. These *structure identity principles* are the special case of the more general theory of path objects, restricted to the case of displaying an algebraic structure over the path object given by types and equivalences. Of course, not all important path objects take this form: for example, it is necessary to characterise the identity type of the type of sections of a given map, and the base of this thing is a function space rather than a universe. This is why it is important to develop the theory of path objects in its most general form, and then specialise it to obtain a variety of structure identity principles.

### 1.5.4 Delta lenses and applied category theory

Diskin et al. [2011] have introduced *delta lenses* as an algebraic structure modeling bidirectional transformations between systems (modelled as categories). As many

authors have pointed out [Chollet et al., 2022, Johnson and Rosebrugh, 2013, Clarke, 2020], delta lenses can be thought of as an algebraic generalisation of split opfibrations in which lifts are chosen functorially but are not required to be cocartesian.

Our reflexive graph lenses resemble a version of delta lenses that replaces categories with reflexive graphs, but there are some important differences. When  $\mathcal{B}' \equiv \text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}$  is the displayed reflexive graph associated to an oplax covariant lens  $\mathcal{B}$ , we do indeed assign to each  $u : |\mathcal{B}'|(x)$  and  $p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y$  a displayed vertex  $\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u : |\mathcal{B}'|(x)$  and a lift  $\bar{p} : u \approx_{\mathcal{B}'}^p \text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u$  given by the reflexivity datum on the former in  $\mathcal{B}(y)$ . In contrast to delta lenses, we do *not* require that  $\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x} u$  is equal to  $u$ : we require only an *oplax unitor*, i.e. an edge  $\text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u : \text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} u$ .

We also consider contravariant versions of reflexive graph lenses, which turn out to be equally important in practice. Our alignment of (covariant, contravariant) and (oplax, lax) is not chosen arbitrarily, but is rather forced by the need to transform a lens of whichever variance into a displayed reflexive graph.

In Section 3.4, we study an important class of reflexive graph lenses in which pushforward along the reflexivity edge is definitionally equivalent to the identity function. These *definitional lenses* correspond most closely to delta lenses, and arise frequently when establishing structure identity principles in the sense of Section 1.5.3.

## 1.6 The structure of this paper

In Section 2, we shall recall the theory of (displayed) reflexive graphs and path objects in detail (at the risk of some repetition). In Section 3, we expose the theory of (oplax covariant, lax contravariant, and bivariate midpoint) lenses and prove the uniqueness of all these structures on families of path objects over a path object. In Section 4, we develop a case study that applies the theory of reflexive graph lenses to characterise the identity types of reflexive graphs, displayed reflexive graphs, *etc.*—in short, we construct large reflexive graphs classifying small reflexive graphs, *etc.* Finally, in Section 5, we develop the theory of reflexive graph fibrations (building on Rijke [2019]) and conclude with our main result: an equivalence between reflexive graph fibrations and lenses of path objects.

## 2 Reflexive graphs and path objects

We recall the theory of reflexive graphs from Rijke [2019], incorporating the viewpoint of *displayed* reflexive graphs from Schipp von Branitz and Buchholtz [2021].

**Definition 18** (Reflexive graph). A *reflexive graph*  $\mathcal{A} \equiv (|\mathcal{A}|, \approx_{\mathcal{A}}, \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}})$  is defined to be a type  $|\mathcal{A}| : \mathbf{type}$  of *vertices* together with a family of types  $x : |\mathcal{A}|, y : |\mathcal{A}| \vdash x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y$  of *edges* and a reflexivity datum  $x : |\mathcal{A}| \vdash \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} x$ .

**Definition 19** (Displayed reflexive graph). Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a reflexive graph. A *displayed reflexive graph*  $\mathcal{B} \equiv (|\mathcal{B}|, \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^{\bullet}, \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\bullet})$  over  $\mathcal{A}$  is given by the following data:

$$\begin{aligned} x : |\mathcal{A}| \vdash |\mathcal{B}|(x) : \mathbf{type} & & (\text{vertices}) \\ p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y, u : |\mathcal{B}|(x), v : |\mathcal{B}|(y) \vdash u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^p v : \mathbf{type} & & (\text{edges}) \\ x : |\mathcal{A}|, u : |\mathcal{B}|(x) \vdash \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u : u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x} u & & (\text{reflexivity}) \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 20** (Components of a displayed reflexive graph). Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a displayed reflexive graph over  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then the **component** of  $\mathcal{B}$  at an element  $x : |\mathcal{A}|$  is the reflexive graph  $\mathcal{B}(x)$  defined from  $\mathcal{B}$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{B}(x)| &:= |\mathcal{B}|(x) \\ u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x)} v &:= u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x} v \\ \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}(x)} u &:= \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u \end{aligned}$$

**Notation 21** (Diagonal family of reflexive graphs). When  $\mathcal{B}$  is a displayed reflexive graph over  $\mathcal{A}$ , we will at times write  $\mathcal{B}_{\text{rx}}$  for the “diagonal”  $|\mathcal{A}|$ -indexed family of reflexive graphs assigning to each  $x : |\mathcal{A}|$  the component  $\mathcal{B}_{\text{rx}}(x) := \mathcal{B}(x)$ .

## 2.1 Basic constructions on reflexive graphs

**Definition 22** (Total reflexive graph). If  $\mathcal{A}$  is a reflexive graph and  $\mathcal{B}$  is a displayed reflexive graph over  $\mathcal{A}$ , then the **total reflexive graph**  $\mathcal{A}.\mathcal{B}$  can be defined with vertices in  $\sum_{(x:|\mathcal{A}|)} |\mathcal{B}|(x)$  and edges  $(a_0, b_0) \approx_{\mathcal{A}.\mathcal{B}} (a_1, b_1)$  in  $\sum_{(p:a_0 \approx_{\mathcal{A}} a_1)} b_0 \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^p b_1$ , with reflexivity data given by  $\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}.\mathcal{B}}(a, b) := (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}a, \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}}b)$ . Naturally, we have a projection homomorphism  $\pi_{\mathcal{B}} : \mathcal{A}.\mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  defined like so:

$$\begin{aligned} |\pi_{\mathcal{B}}|(x, y) &:= x \\ \pi_{\mathcal{B}}^{\approx}(p, q) &:= p \\ \pi_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}}(x, y) &:= \text{refl} \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 23** (Binary product of reflexive graphs). If  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  are reflexive graphs, then we may form the product of reflexive graphs  $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$  with vertices in  $|\mathcal{A}| \times |\mathcal{B}|$ , where the type of edges  $(a_0, b_0) \approx_{\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}} (a_1, b_1)$  is the cartesian product  $(a_0 \approx_{\mathcal{A}} a_1) \times (b_0 \approx_{\mathcal{B}} b_1)$  with reflexivity data defined by  $\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}}(x, y) := (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x, \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}}y)$ .

We can generalise Definition 23 to arbitrary families.

**Definition 24** (Product of reflexive graphs). Let  $A$  be a type and let  $\mathcal{B}(x)$  be a reflexive graph for each  $x : A$ . The product  $\prod_{(x:A)} \mathcal{B}(x)$  of the family of  $\mathcal{B}$  reflexive graphs is defined like so:

$$\begin{aligned} |\prod_{(x:A)} \mathcal{B}(x)| &:= \prod_{(x:A)} |\mathcal{B}(x)| \\ f \approx_{\prod_{(x:A)} \mathcal{B}(x)} g &:= \prod_{(x:A)} f_x \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x)} g_x \\ \text{rx}_{\prod_{(x:A)} \mathcal{B}(x)} f &:= \lambda x. \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}(x)}(f_x) \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 25** (Coproduct of reflexive graphs). Let  $A$  be a type and let  $\mathcal{B}(x)$  be a reflexive graph for each  $x : A$ . The coproduct  $\coprod_{(x:A)} \mathcal{B}(x)$  of the family  $\mathcal{B}$  of reflexive graphs is defined like so:

$$\begin{aligned} |\coprod_{(x:A)} \mathcal{B}(x)| &:= \sum_{(x:A)} |\mathcal{B}(x)| \\ (a_0, b_0) \approx_{\coprod_{(x:A)} \mathcal{B}(x)} (a_1, b_1) &:= \sum_{(p:a_0=Aa_1)} p_*^{|\mathcal{B}(-)|} b_0 \approx_{\mathcal{B}(a_1)} b_1 \\ \text{rx}_{\coprod_{(x:A)} \mathcal{B}(x)}(a, b) &:= (\text{refl}, \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}(a)}b) \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 26** (Tensor and cotensor of reflexive graphs). Let  $A$  be a type and let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a reflexive graph; then the **tensor** and **cotensor** of  $\mathcal{B}$  by  $A$  are defined respectively using coproducts and products as below:

$$\begin{aligned} A \cdot \mathcal{B} &:= \coprod_{(x:A)} \mathcal{B} && (\text{tensor}) \\ A \pitchfork \mathcal{B} &:= \prod_{(x:A)} \mathcal{B} && (\text{cotensor}) \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 27** (Discrete reflexive graph). The *discrete reflexive graph*  $\Delta A$  on a type  $A$  is given by its identity type, *i.e.* we define  $\Delta A := (A, =_A, \mathbf{refl})$ .

**Definition 28** (Codiscrete reflexive graph). A type  $A$  can be, conversely, equipped with the *codiscrete reflexive graph* structure  $\nabla A$  that identifies any two elements:

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla A| &::= A \\ x \approx_{\nabla A} y &::= \mathbf{1} \\ \mathbf{rx}_{\nabla A} x &::= * \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 29** (Constant displayed reflexive graph). Let  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  be reflexive graphs. The *constant displayed reflexive graph* over  $\mathcal{A}$  induced by  $\mathcal{B}$  is the displayed reflexive graph specified  $\mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{B}$  below:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{B}|(x) &::= |\mathcal{B}|(x) \\ u \approx_{\mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{B}}^P v &::= u \approx_{\mathcal{B}} v \\ \mathbf{rx}_{\mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{B}}^x u &::= \mathbf{rx}_{\mathcal{B}} u \end{aligned}$$

Thus, evidently, we have  $(\mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{B})(x) \equiv \mathcal{B}$  for all  $x : |\mathcal{A}|$ .

**Observation 30** (Binary product as a total reflexive graph). *For any two reflexive graphs  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$ , we have  $\mathcal{A}.(\mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{B}) \equiv \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$ .*

**Definition 31** (Subgraph comprehension). Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a reflexive graph, and let  $P(x)$  be a proposition for each vertex  $x : \mathcal{A}$ . We define the *comprehension* of  $P$  to be the following reflexive graph:

$$\begin{aligned} |\{x : \mathcal{A} \mid P(x)\}| &::= \sum_{(x : |\mathcal{A}|)} P(x) \\ (x, p) \approx_{\{x : \mathcal{A} \mid P(x)\}} (y, q) &::= x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y \\ \mathbf{rx}_{\{x : \mathcal{A} \mid P(x)\}}(x, p) &::= \mathbf{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x \end{aligned}$$

**Construction 32** (Restriction of iterated displayed reflexive graphs). Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a path object, and let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a displayed path object over  $\mathcal{A}$ , and let  $C$  be a displayed path object over  $\mathcal{A}.\mathcal{B}$ . Then for any  $x : |\mathcal{A}|$ , we may define a displayed path object  $C|_{\mathcal{B}(x)}$  over the component  $\mathcal{B}(x)$  with vertices given as follows:

$$u : |\mathcal{B}|(x) \vdash |C|_{\mathcal{B}(x)}(u) ::= |C|(x, u)$$

Displayed edges and reflexivity data are defined in terms of those of  $C$  like so:

$$\begin{aligned} u, v : |\mathcal{B}|(x); p : u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x)} v; c : |C|(x, u), d : |C|(x, v) \\ \vdash c \approx_{|C|_{\mathcal{B}(x)}}^P d &::= c \approx_C^{(\mathbf{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x, p)} d \\ u : |\mathcal{B}|(x), c : |C|(x, u) \\ \vdash \mathbf{rx}_{|C|_{\mathcal{B}(x)}}^u c &::= \mathbf{rx}_C^{(\mathbf{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x, u)} c \end{aligned}$$

**Computation 33** (Components of the restriction). Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a path object, and let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a displayed path object over  $\mathcal{A}$ , and let  $C$  be a displayed path object over  $\mathcal{A}.\mathcal{B}$ . Given  $x : |\mathcal{B}|$  and  $u : |\mathcal{B}|(x)$ , the component  $(C|_{\mathcal{B}(x)})(u)$  of the restriction of  $C$  to  $\mathcal{B}(x)$  at  $u$  is definitionally equal to the component  $C((x, u))$  of  $C$  at  $(x, u) : |\mathcal{A}.\mathcal{B}|$ .



## 2.2 Duality involution for reflexive graphs

**Definition 34** (Opposite reflexive graph). We define the *opposite* of a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}}| &:= |\mathcal{A}| \\ x \approx_{\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}}} y &:= y \approx_{\mathcal{A}} x \\ \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}}} x &:= \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x \end{aligned}$$

**Observation 35.** *The opposite reflexive graph operation is definitionally involutive: we have  $(\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}})^{\text{op}} \equiv \mathcal{A}$  definitionally.*

**Definition 36** (Total opposite of a displayed reflexive graph). Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a reflexive graph, and let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a displayed reflexive graph over  $\mathcal{A}$ . We define the *total opposite*  $\mathcal{B}^{\text{op}}$  of  $\mathcal{B}$  to be the following displayed reflexive graph over  $\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{B}^{\text{op}}|(x) &:= |\mathcal{B}|(x) \\ u \approx_{\mathcal{B}^{\text{op}}}^p v &:= v \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^p u \\ \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}^{\text{op}}}^x u &:= \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u \end{aligned}$$

Note that Definition 36 does not define the actual “opposite” of a displayed reflexive graph  $\mathcal{B}$ , which would naturally have the same base as  $\mathcal{B}$ ; opposites of arbitrary displayed reflexive graphs do not make sense (for the same reason that Bénabou’s definition of opposites applies only to displayed categories that are additionally fibrations).

Observation 35 extends to the following duality involution on displayed reflexive graphs vs Definition 36.

**Observation 37** (Duality involution for displayed reflexive graphs). *The operation sending a displayed reflexive graph to its total opposite is definitionally involutive, i.e. we have  $(\mathcal{B}^{\text{op}})^{\text{op}} \equiv \mathcal{B}$ .*

## 2.3 Path objects and the univalence condition

**Definition 38** (The orbit of a vertex). Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a reflexive graph. The *outward orbit* of a vertex  $x : |\mathcal{A}|$  is defined to be the type  $\{x\}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ := \sum_{(y:A)} x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y$  of vertices equipped with an edge from  $x$ ; dually, the *inward orbit* of a vertex  $x : |\mathcal{A}|$  is defined to be the type  $\{x\}_{\mathcal{A}}^- := \sum_{(y:A)} y \approx_{\mathcal{A}} x$  of vertices equipped with an edge *toward*  $x$ .

**Lemma 39.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a reflexive graph; then every outward orbit of  $\mathcal{A}$  is a proposition if and only if every inward orbit of  $\mathcal{A}$  is a proposition.*

*Proof.* First we assume that every outward orbit is contractible:

$$\begin{aligned} x : |\mathcal{A}|; u_0, u_1 : \{x\}_{\mathcal{A}}^- &\vdash u_0 =_{\{x\}_{\mathcal{A}}^-} u_1 \\ &\text{by reassociating} \\ x, y_0, y_1 : |\mathcal{A}|; p_0 : y_0 \approx_{\mathcal{A}} x, p_1 : y_1 \approx_{\mathcal{A}} x &\vdash (y_0, p_0) =_{\{x\}_{\mathcal{A}}^-} (y_1, p_1) \\ \{y_0\}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ &\text{ is contractible by assumption} \\ y_0, y_1 : |\mathcal{A}|; p_1 : y_1 \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y_0 &\vdash (y_0, \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} y_0) =_{\{y_0\}_{\mathcal{A}}^-} (y_1, p_1) \\ \{y_1\}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ &\text{ is contractible by assumption} \\ y_1 : |\mathcal{A}| &\vdash (y_1, \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} y_1) =_{\{y_1\}_{\mathcal{A}}^-} (y_1, \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} y_1) \\ &\text{by reflexivity} \end{aligned}$$

Conversely, assume that every inward orbit is contractible.

$$x : |\mathcal{A}|; u_0, u_1 : \{x\}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \vdash u_0 =_{\{x\}_{\mathcal{A}}^+} u_1$$

by reassociating

$$x, y_0, y_1 : |\mathcal{A}|; p_0 : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y_0, p_1 : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y_1 \vdash (y_0, p_0) =_{\{x\}_{\mathcal{A}}^+} (y_1, p_1)$$

$\{y_0\}_{\mathcal{A}}^-$  is contractible by assumption

$$y_0, y_1 : |\mathcal{A}|; p_1 : y_0 \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y_1 \vdash (y_0, \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} y_0) =_{\{y_0\}_{\mathcal{A}}^+} (y_1, p_1)$$

$\{y_1\}_{\mathcal{A}}^-$  is contractible by assumption

$$y_1 : |\mathcal{A}| \vdash (y_1, \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} y_1) =_{\{y_1\}_{\mathcal{A}}^+} (y_1, \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} y_1)$$

by reflexivity

□

**Construction 40** (From identifications to edges). The reflexivity datum of a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$  induces a function from identifications to edges as follows:

$$x, y : |\mathcal{A}|; p : x =_{|\mathcal{A}|} y \vdash \lfloor p \rfloor_{\mathcal{A}}^{x,y} : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y$$

by identification induction

$$x : |\mathcal{A}| \vdash \lfloor \text{refl} \rfloor_{\mathcal{A}}^{x,x} : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} x$$

by reflexivity

$$x : |\mathcal{A}| \vdash \lfloor \text{refl} \rfloor_{\mathcal{A}}^{x,x} \equiv \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x$$

When it causes no ambiguity, we will write  $\lfloor p \rfloor_{\mathcal{A}}$  for  $\lfloor p \rfloor_{\mathcal{A}}^{x,y}$ .

**Lemma 41** (From edges to identifications via propositional orbits). Suppose that each outward orbit  $\{x\}_{\mathcal{A}}^+$  of a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$  is a proposition. Then each  $\lfloor - \rfloor_{\mathcal{A}}^{x,y}$  has a retraction  $\llbracket - \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{x,y} : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y \rightarrow x =_{|\mathcal{A}|} y$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\Phi_x$  be the proof that a given outward orbit  $\{x\}_{\mathcal{A}}^+$  is a proposition. Rather than defining  $\llbracket - \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{x,y} : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y \rightarrow x =_{|\mathcal{A}|} y$  directly, we construct a slightly more general function that anticipates the contractibility of  $\{x\}_{\mathcal{A}}^+$ .

$$x, y : |\mathcal{A}|; p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y; \phi : (x, \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x) =_{\{x\}_{\mathcal{A}}^+} (y, p) \vdash \llbracket p; \phi \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{x,y} : x =_{|\mathcal{A}|} y$$

by identification induction

$$x : |\mathcal{A}| \vdash \llbracket \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x; \text{refl} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{x,y} : x =_{|\mathcal{A}|} x$$

by reflexivity

$$x : |\mathcal{A}| \vdash \llbracket \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x; \text{refl} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{x,y} \equiv \text{refl}$$

Then we define  $\llbracket - \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{x,y}$  by instantiation.

$$x, y : |\mathcal{A}|; p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y \vdash \llbracket p \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{x,y} \equiv \llbracket p; \Phi_x (x, \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x) (y, p) \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{x,y}$$

Next we exhibit the witness of retraction.

$$x, y : |\mathcal{A}|; p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y \vdash \llbracket \llbracket p \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{x,y} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{x,y} =_{x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y} p$$

by definition

$$\dots \vdash \llbracket \llbracket p; \Phi_x (x, \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x) (y, p) \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{x,y} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{x,y} =_{x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y} p$$

by generalising over  $\Phi_x (x, \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x) (y, p)$

$$x, y : |\mathcal{A}|; p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y; \phi : (x, \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x) =_{\{x\}_{\mathcal{A}}^+} (y, p) \vdash \llbracket \llbracket p; \phi \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{x,y} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{x,y} =_{x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y} p$$

by identification induction

$$x : |\mathcal{A}| \vdash \llbracket \llbracket \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x; \text{refl} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{x,x} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{x,x} =_{x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} x} \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x$$

by definition of  $\llbracket -; - \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{x,x}$

$$x : |\mathcal{A}| \vdash \llbracket \text{refl} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{x,x} =_{x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} x} \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x$$

by definition of  $\llbracket - \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{x,x}$

$$x : |\mathcal{A}| \vdash \mathsf{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x =_{x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} x} \mathsf{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x$$

*by reflexivity*

□

**Lemma 42.** *For a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$ , each function  $[-]_{\mathcal{A}}^{x,y}$  is an equivalence if and only if each outward orbit  $\{z\}_{\mathcal{A}}^+$  is a proposition.*

*Proof.* Suppose that each component of  $[-]_{\mathcal{A}}^{x,y}$  is an equivalence; then clearly each  $\{z\}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \equiv \sum_{(y:|\mathcal{A}|)} z \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y$  is a retract of  $\sum_{(y:|\mathcal{A}|)} x =_{|\mathcal{A}|} y \equiv \{x\}_{|\mathcal{A}|}$ , which is contractible by the contractibility of singletons. Therefore, each outward orbit is contractible. On the other hand, we suppose that each outward orbit is contractible to show that the fibers of  $[-]_{\mathcal{A}}^{x,y}$  are contractible. The fiber of  $[-]_{\mathcal{A}}^{x,y}$  at  $p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y$  is the sum  $\sum_{(\alpha: x =_{|\mathcal{A}|} y)} [\alpha]_{\mathcal{A}}^{x,y} =_{x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y} p$ . By Lemma 41,  $x =_{|\mathcal{A}|} y$  is a retract of  $x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y$  and so the fiber above is a retract of the following type:

$$\sum_{(q: x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y)} [\llbracket q \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{x,y}]_{\mathcal{A}}^{x,y} =_{x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y} p$$

By the retraction condition, the above is equivalent to the contractible type  $\sum_{(q: x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y)} q =_{x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y} p$ . Thus fiber of  $[\llbracket - \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{x,y}]_{\mathcal{A}}^{x,y}$  at  $p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y$  is contractible because it is a retract of a contractible type. □

**Definition 43** (Univalent reflexive graph). A reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$  is called **univalent** when any of the following equivalent conditions hold:

1. Each outward orbit  $\{x\}_{\mathcal{A}}^+$  is a proposition.
2. Each inward orbit  $\{x\}_{\mathcal{A}}^-$  is a proposition.
3. Each outward orbit  $\{x\}_{\mathcal{A}}^+$  is contractible with centre  $(x, \mathsf{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x)$ .
4. Each inward orbit  $\{x\}_{\mathcal{A}}^-$  is contractible with centre  $(x, \mathsf{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x)$ .
5. Each of the functions  $\mathsf{idToEdge}_{x,y} : x =_{|\mathcal{A}|} y \rightarrow x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y$  defined in Construction 40 is an equivalence.

We shall refer to a univalent reflexive graph as a **path object**.

*Proof.* The equivalence of the stated conditions follows from Lemmas 39 and 42. □

**Definition 44** (Univalent displayed reflexive graph). Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a reflexive graph. A displayed reflexive graph  $\mathcal{B}$  over  $\mathcal{A}$  is called **univalent** when for each  $x : |\mathcal{A}|$ , the component (Definition 20)  $\mathcal{B}(x)$  is univalent in the sense of Definition 43. We shall refer to a univalent displayed reflexive graph as a **displayed path object**, regardless of whether the base  $\mathcal{A}$  is univalent.

## 2.4 Path algebra in a path object

Edges in an arbitrary reflexive graph cannot be concatenated or inverted; when the reflexive graph is *univalent*, i.e. a *path object*, the type of edges becomes (by Lemma 42) equivalent to the first level of the canonical  $\infty$ -groupoid structure on the type of vertices, and as such brooks fully coherent concatenation and inversion operations. We will need these operations only rarely — and indeed, the central thesis of the theory of path objects in univalent foundations is that it is often possible to avoid painful path algebra by very careful choices of path object structure.

**Construction 45** (Path algebra toolkit). Given any path object  $\mathcal{A}$ , we may construct the following terms facilitating path algebra in  $\mathcal{A}$ .

$$\begin{aligned} p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y, q : y \approx_{\mathcal{A}} z &\vdash p \cdot_{\mathcal{A}} q : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} z \\ p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y &\vdash p_{\mathcal{A}}^{-1} : y \approx_{\mathcal{A}} x \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y & \\ \vdash \text{runit}_p : p \cdot_{\mathcal{A}} \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} y &=_{x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y} p \\ \vdash \text{lunit}_p : \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x \cdot_{\mathcal{A}} p &=_{x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y} p \\ \vdash \text{rsym}_p : p \cdot_{\mathcal{A}} p_{\mathcal{A}}^{-1} &=_{x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} x} \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x \\ \vdash \text{lsym}_p : p_{\mathcal{A}}^{-1} \cdot_{\mathcal{A}} p &=_{y \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y} \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} y \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} p : u \approx_{\mathcal{A}} v, q : v \approx_{\mathcal{A}} w, r : w \approx_{\mathcal{A}} x & \\ \vdash \text{assoc}_{p,q,r} : (p \cdot_{\mathcal{A}} q) \cdot_{\mathcal{A}} r &=_{u \approx_{\mathcal{A}} x} p \cdot_{\mathcal{A}} (q \cdot_{\mathcal{A}} r) \end{aligned}$$

Of course, there is no end to the possible combinators, so we have presented just a few representative examples that we will make use of.

**Lemma 46** (Pre-concatenation equivalence). *For a path object  $\mathcal{A}$  and an edge  $p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y$ , we have a family of equivalences induced by pre-concatenation with  $p$  as below,*

$$z : |\mathcal{A}| \vdash (p \cdot_{\mathcal{A}} -) : y \approx_{\mathcal{A}} z \rightarrow x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} z$$

with chosen inverse  $(p_{\mathcal{A}}^{-1} \cdot_{\mathcal{A}} -) : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} z \rightarrow y \approx_{\mathcal{A}} z$ .

*Proof.* Simple path algebra using `assoc`, `lunit`, `lsym`, and `rsym` from Construction 45.  $\square$

## 2.5 Univalent families and reflexive graph images

**Definition 47** (Reflexive graph image). The *reflexive graph image* of a type  $A$  under a family of types  $x : A \vdash B(x) : \mathbf{type}$  is defined to be the following reflexive graph  $A/B$ :

$$\begin{aligned} |A/B| &\equiv A \\ x \approx_{A/B} y &\equiv \text{Equiv}(B(x), B(y)) \\ \text{rx}_{A/B} x &\equiv \text{idnEquiv}_{B(x)} \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 48** (Univalent family of types). Let  $A$  be a type, and let  $B$  be a family of types indexed in  $A$ . The pair  $(A, B)$  is said to be *univalent* when any of the following equivalent conditions hold:

1. For each  $x : A$ , the type  $\sum_{(y:A)} \text{Equiv}(B(x), B(y))$  is a proposition.
2. For each  $x : A$ , the type  $\sum_{(y:A)} \text{Equiv}(B(x), B(y))$  is a contractible.
3. For each  $x, y : A$  the canonical map  $x =_A y \rightarrow \text{Equiv}(B(x), B(y))$  sending **refl** to the identity equivalence is an equivalence.
4. The reflexive graph image  $A/B$  is univalent.

One often refers to a univalent family of types  $(U, E)$  as a *universe* to emphasise that it may be closed under various type constructors, *etc.*

**Definition 49** (Propositional reflexive graph image). Let  $B(x)$  be a proposition for each  $x : A$ . The **propositional reflexive graph image** of  $A$  under  $B$  is defined to be the following reflexive graph  $A/_-1B$ :

$$\begin{aligned} |A/_-1B| &::= A \\ x \approx_{A/_-1B} y &::= (B(x) \rightarrow B(y)) \times (B(y) \rightarrow B(x)) \\ \text{rx}_{A/_-1B} x &::= (\lambda u. u, \lambda u. u) \end{aligned}$$

**Observation 50.** Let  $B$  be a family of propositions indexed in  $A$ . The pair  $(A, B)$  is univalent if and only if the propositional reflexive graph image  $A/_-1B$  is univalent.

**Definition 51** (Univalent family of path objects). A **univalent family of path objects** is defined to be a pair  $(U, \mathcal{E})$  where  $U$  is a type and  $A : U \vdash \mathcal{E}(A)$  is a family of path objects in  $U$  such that the reflexive graph image  $U/|\mathcal{E}|$  is univalent.

## 2.6 Basic closure properties of path objects

**Lemma 52** (Opposite path object). A reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$  is univalent if and only if its opposite  $\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}}$  is univalent.

*Proof.* This is an immediate consequence of Lemma 39.  $\square$

**Lemma 53** (Total path object). If  $\mathcal{A}$  is a path object and  $\mathcal{B}$  is a displayed path object over  $\mathcal{A}$ , then  $\mathcal{A}.\mathcal{B}$  is a path object.

*Proof.* Univalence is established as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} u : |\mathcal{A}.\mathcal{B}|; s_0, s_1 : \{u\}_{\mathcal{A}.\mathcal{B}}^+ &\vdash s_0 =_{\{u\}_{\mathcal{A}.\mathcal{B}}^+} s_1 \\ \text{by reassociating and unfolding hypotheses} \\ x, x_0, x_1 : |\mathcal{A}|; y : |\mathcal{B}(x)|, y_0 : |\mathcal{B}(x_0)|, y_1 : |\mathcal{B}(x_1)|, \\ p_0 : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} x_0, p_1 : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} x_1, q_0 : y \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^{p_0} y_0, q_1 : y \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^{p_1} y_1 \\ \vdash ((x_0, y_0), (p_0, q_0)) =_{\{(x, y)\}_{\mathcal{A}.\mathcal{B}}^+} ((x_1, y_1), (p_1, q_1)) \\ \text{as } \mathcal{A} \text{ is a path object and thus } \{x\}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \text{ is contractible} \\ x : |\mathcal{A}|, y : |\mathcal{B}(x)|, y_0 : |\mathcal{B}(x_0)|, y_1 : |\mathcal{B}(x_1)|, \\ q_0 : y \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x)} y_0, q_1 : y \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x)} y_1 \\ \vdash ((x, y_0), (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x, q_0)) =_{\{(x, y)\}_{\mathcal{A}.\mathcal{B}}^+} ((x, y_1), (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x, q_1)) \\ \text{as } \mathcal{B}(x) \text{ is a path object and thus } \{y\}_{\mathcal{B}(x)}^+ \text{ is contractible} \\ x : |\mathcal{A}|, y : |\mathcal{B}(x)| \vdash ((x, y), (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x, \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}(x)} y)) =_{\{(x, y)\}_{\mathcal{A}.\mathcal{B}}^+} \\ ((x, y), (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x, \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}(x)} y)) \\ \text{by reflexivity} \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

**Observation 54** (Constant displayed path object). Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a reflexive graph and let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a path object. Then the constant displayed reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{B}$  over  $\mathcal{A}$  is univalent.

*Proof.* This follows immediately, considering that we have  $(\mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{B})(x) \equiv \mathcal{B}$  for each  $x : |\mathcal{A}|$  by definition.  $\square$

**Corollary 55** (Binary product of path objects). If  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{A}$  are path objects, then so is  $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$ .

*Proof.* By Observations 30 and 54.  $\square$

**Definition 56** (Function extensionality). *Dependent function extensionality* is precisely the property that for each type  $A$  and family  $\mathcal{B}(x)$  of path objects indexed in  $x : A$ , the product  $\prod_{(x:A)} \mathcal{B}(x)$  is a path object. Likewise, *non-dependent function extensionality* states that for each type  $A$  and path object  $\mathcal{B}$ , the cotensor  $A \pitchfork \mathcal{B}$  is a path object.

**Lemma 57** (Coproduct of path objects). *For any type  $A$  and family  $\mathcal{B}(x)$  of path objects indexed in  $x : A$ , the coproduct  $\coprod_{(x:A)} \mathcal{B}(x)$  is a path object.*

*Proof.* We establish the univalence condition as follows.

$$u : \sum_{(x:A)} |\mathcal{B}(x)|; s_0, s_1 : \{u\}_{\coprod_{(x:A)} \mathcal{B}(x)}^+ \vdash s_0 = \{u\}_{\coprod_{(x:A)} \mathcal{B}(x)}^+ s_1$$

*by reassociating and unfolding hypotheses*

$$x, x_0, x_1 : A; y : |\mathcal{B}(x)|, y_0 : |\mathcal{B}(x_0)|, y_1 : |\mathcal{B}(x_1)|, p_0 : x =_A x_0, p_1 : x =_A x_1,$$

$$q_0 : (p_0)_*^{|\mathcal{B}(-)|} y \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x_0)} y_0, q_1 : (p_1)_*^{|\mathcal{B}(-)|} y \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x_1)} y_1$$

$$\vdash ((x_0, y_0), (p_0, q_0)) =_{\{\{(x,y)\}\}_{\coprod_{(x:A)} \mathcal{B}(x)}^+} ((x_1, y_1), (p_1, q_1))$$

*by based identification induction on  $(x_0, p_0)$*

$$x, x_1 : A; y : |\mathcal{B}(x)|, y_0 : |\mathcal{B}(x)|, y_1 : |\mathcal{B}(x_1)|, p_1 : x =_A x_1,$$

$$q_0 : y \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x)} y_0, q_1 : (p_1)_*^{|\mathcal{B}(-)|} y \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x_1)} y_1$$

$$\vdash ((x, y_0), (\mathbf{refl}, q_0)) =_{\{\{(x,y)\}\}_{\coprod_{(x:A)} \mathcal{B}(x)}^+} ((x_1, y_1), (p_1, q_1))$$

*by based identification induction on  $(x_1, p_1)$*

$$x : A; y : |\mathcal{B}(x)|, y_0 : |\mathcal{B}(x)|, y_1 : |\mathcal{B}(x)|, q_0 : y \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x)} y_0, q_1 : y \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x)} y_1$$

$$\vdash ((x, y_0), (\mathbf{refl}, q_0)) =_{\{\{(x,y)\}\}_{\coprod_{(x:A)} \mathcal{B}(x)}^+} ((x, y_1), (\mathbf{refl}, q_1))$$

*as  $\mathcal{B}(x)$  is a path object and thus  $\{y\}_{\mathcal{B}(x)}^+$  is contractible*

$$x : A; y : |\mathcal{B}(x)| \vdash ((x, y), (\mathbf{refl}, \mathbf{rx}_{\mathcal{B}(x)} y)) = \dots ((x, y), (\mathbf{refl}, \mathbf{rx}_{\mathcal{B}(x)} y))$$

*by reflexivity*

□

**Corollary 58** (Tensor of path objects). *The tensor  $A \cdot \mathcal{B}$  of a path object  $\mathcal{B}$  by a type  $A$  is a path object.*

**Corollary 59** (Discrete path object). *The discrete reflexive graph  $\Delta A$  on any type  $A$  is univalent.*

*Proof.* This is precisely the contractibility of singletons.

□

**Lemma 60** (Codiscrete path object). *The codiscrete reflexive graph  $\nabla A$  on a type  $A$  is univalent if and only if  $A$  is a proposition.*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\mathcal{A}$  is a proposition. Then univalence is established like so:

$$x : A; s_0, s_1 : \{x\}_{\nabla A}^+ \vdash s_0 = \{x\}_{\nabla A}^+ s_1$$

*by reassociating and unfolding hypotheses*

$$x, x_0, x_1 : A \vdash (x_0, *) =_{\{x\}_{\nabla A}^+} (x_1, *)$$

*as  $A$  is a proposition*

$$x : A \vdash (x, *) =_{\{x\}_{\nabla A}^+} (x, *)$$

*by reflexivity*

□

Conversely, assume that  $\nabla A$  is univalent. For any two  $x, y : A$ , we evidently have  $* : x \approx_{\nabla A} y$  and thus  $\llbracket * \rrbracket_{\nabla A}^{x,y} : x =_A y$  by Lemma 41.

**Lemma 61** (Path subobject comprehension). *If  $\mathcal{A}$  is a path object and  $P(x)$  is a proposition for each vertex  $x : |\mathcal{A}|$ , then the comprehension  $\{x : \mathcal{A} \mid P(x)\}$  is a path object.*

$\frac{\text{LEMMA 52} \quad \mathcal{A} \text{ univalent}}{\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}} \text{ univalent}}$	$\frac{\text{LEMMA 53} \quad \mathcal{A} \text{ univalent} \quad \mathcal{B} \text{ univalent over } \mathcal{A}}{\mathcal{A}.\mathcal{B} \text{ univalent}}$
$\frac{\text{COROLLARY 55} \quad \mathcal{A} \text{ univalent} \quad \mathcal{B} \text{ univalent}}{\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B} \text{ univalent}}$	$\frac{\text{DEFINITION 56} \quad \text{dep. funext.} \quad x : A \vdash \mathcal{B}(x) \text{ univalent}}{\prod_{(x:A)} \mathcal{B}(x) \text{ univalent}}$
$\frac{\text{LEMMA 57} \quad x : A \vdash \mathcal{B}(x) \text{ univalent}}{\coprod_{(x:A)} \mathcal{B}(x) \text{ univalent}}$	$\frac{\text{COROLLARY 58} \quad \mathcal{B} \text{ univalent}}{A \cdot \mathcal{B} \text{ univalent}}$
	$\frac{\text{DEFINITION 56} \quad \text{funext.} \quad \mathcal{B} \text{ univalent}}{A \pitchfork \mathcal{B} \text{ univalent}}$
$\frac{\text{COROLLARY 59}}{\Delta A \text{ univalent}}$	$\frac{\text{LEMMA 60} \quad A \text{ proposition}}{\nabla A \text{ univalent}}$
	$\frac{\text{LEMMA 61} \quad \mathcal{A} \text{ univalent} \quad x :  \mathcal{A}  \vdash B(x) \text{ proposition}}{\{x : \mathcal{A} \mid B(x)\} \text{ univalent}}$
	$\frac{\text{OBSERVATION 54} \quad \mathcal{B} \text{ univalent}}{\mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{B} \text{ univalent over } \mathcal{A}}$

Figure 1: Summary of univalence lemmas for (displayed) reflexive graphs.

$\frac{\text{LEMMA 68} \quad x :  \mathcal{A}  \vdash \mathcal{B}(x) \text{ univalent}}{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{A} \text{ univalent over } \mathcal{A}}$	$\frac{\text{LEMMA 69} \quad x :  \mathcal{A}  \vdash \mathcal{B}(x) \text{ univalent}}{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^- \mathcal{A} \text{ univalent over } \mathcal{A}}$
$\frac{\text{LEMMA 73} \quad x, y :  \mathcal{A} ; p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y \vdash \mathcal{B}(p) \text{ univalent}}{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\pm} \mathcal{A} \text{ univalent over } \mathcal{A}}$	

Figure 2: Summary of univalence lemmas for reflexive graph lenses.

*Proof.* Univalence is established as follows:

$u : \sum_{(x:|\mathcal{A}|)} P(x); s_0, s_1 : \{u\}_{\{x:\mathcal{A}|P(x)\}}^+ \vdash s_0 =_{\{u\}_{\{x:\mathcal{A}|P(x)\}}^+} s_1$   
*by reassociating and unfolding hypotheses*  
 $x, x_0, x_1 : |\mathcal{A}|; y : P(x), y_0 : P(x_0), y_1 : P(x_1), p_0 : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} x_0, p_1 : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} x_1$   
 $\vdash ((x_0, y_0), (p_0, *)) =_{\{(x,y)\}_{\{x:\mathcal{A}|P(x)\}}^+} ((x_1, y_1), (p_1, *))$   
*as  $\mathcal{A}$  is a path object and so  $\{x\}_{\mathcal{A}}^+$  is contractible*  
 $x : |\mathcal{A}|; y, y_0, y_1 : P(x) \vdash ((x, y_0), (r\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{A}}x, *)) = \dots ((x, y_1), (r\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{A}}x, *))$   
*as  $P(x)$  is a proposition*  
 $x : |\mathcal{A}|, y : P(x) \vdash ((x, y), (r\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{A}}x, *)) = \dots ((x, y), (r\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{A}}x, *))$   
*by reflexivity*

□

### 3 Lenses of reflexive graphs and path objects

In this section, we are concerned with various kinds of *families* of ordinary reflexive graphs, and how they give rise to certain naturally occurring *displayed* reflexive graphs.

#### 3.1 Lenses of reflexive graphs

We introduce two dual kinds of lens of reflexive graphs.

**Definition 62** (Oplax covariant lens). Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a reflexive graph. An *oplax covariant lens* of reflexive graphs over  $\mathcal{A}$  is defined to be a family of reflexive graphs  $\mathcal{B}(x)$  indexed in  $x : |\mathcal{A}|$  equipped with the following data:

$$\begin{aligned} x, y : |\mathcal{A}|; p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y, u : |\mathcal{B}(x)| &\vdash \text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u : |\mathcal{B}(y)| \\ x : |\mathcal{A}|, u : |\mathcal{B}(x)| &\vdash \text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u : \text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}^x} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x)} u \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 63** (Lax contravariant lens). Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a reflexive graph. A *lax contravariant lens* of reflexive graphs over  $\mathcal{A}$  is defined to be a family of reflexive graphs  $\mathcal{B}(x)$  indexed in  $x : |\mathcal{A}|$  equipped with the following data:

$$\begin{aligned} x, y : |\mathcal{A}|; p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y, u : |\mathcal{B}(y)| &\vdash \text{pull}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u : |\mathcal{B}(x)| \\ x : |\mathcal{A}|, u : |\mathcal{B}(x)| &\vdash \text{pullRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u : u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x)} \text{pull}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}^x} u \end{aligned}$$

In the context of Definition 62 or Definition 63, we will refer to  $\mathcal{B}$  as a *lens of path objects* or a *univalent lens* when each  $\mathcal{B}(x)$  is univalent.

**Definition 64** (Display of oplax covariant lenses). Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be an oplax covariant lens over a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$ . The (covariant) *display* of  $\mathcal{B}$  over  $\mathcal{A}$  is defined to be the following displayed reflexive graph  $\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}$  over  $\mathcal{A}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} x : |\mathcal{A}| &\vdash |\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}|(x) := |\mathcal{B}(x)| \\ p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y, u : |\mathcal{B}(x)|, v : |\mathcal{B}(y)| &\vdash u \approx_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}}^p v := \text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} v \\ x : |\mathcal{A}|, u : |\mathcal{B}(x)| &\vdash \text{rx}_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}}^x u := \text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 65** (Display of lax contravariant lenses). Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a lax contravariant lens over a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$ . The (contravariant) *display* of  $\mathcal{B}$  over  $\mathcal{A}$  is defined to be the following displayed reflexive graph  $\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^- \mathcal{B}$  over  $\mathcal{A}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} x : |\mathcal{A}| &\vdash |\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^- \mathcal{B}|(x) := |\mathcal{B}(x)| \\ p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y, u : |\mathcal{B}(x)|, v : |\mathcal{B}(y)| &\vdash u \approx_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^- \mathcal{B}}^p v := u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x)} \text{pull}_{\mathcal{B}}^p v \\ x : |\mathcal{A}|, u : |\mathcal{B}(x)| &\vdash \text{rx}_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^- \mathcal{B}}^x u := \text{pullRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u \end{aligned}$$

**Computation 66** (Components of the display of oplax covariant lenses). Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be an oplax covariant lens over a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$ . For any  $x : |\mathcal{A}|$ , the component  $(\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B})(x)$  is precisely the following:

$$\begin{aligned} |(\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B})(x)| &\equiv |\mathcal{B}(x)| \\ u \approx_{(\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B})(x)} v &\equiv \text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}^x} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x)} v \\ \text{rx}_{(\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B})(x)} u &\equiv \text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u \end{aligned}$$

We likewise have the following description of outward orbits:

$$\{u\}_{(\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B})(x)}^+ \equiv \{\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}^x} u\}_{\mathcal{B}(x)}^+$$



**Computation 67** (Components of the display of lax contravariant lenses). Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a lax contravariant lens over a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$ . For any  $x : |\mathcal{A}|$ , the component  $(\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{-}\mathcal{B})(x)$  unfolds as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} |(\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{-}\mathcal{B})(x)| &\equiv |\mathcal{B}(x)| \\ u \approx_{(\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{-}\mathcal{B})(x)} v &\equiv u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x)} \text{pull}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x} v \\ \text{rx}_{(\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{-}\mathcal{B})(x)} u &\equiv \text{pullRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u \end{aligned}$$

We have the following description of inward orbits:

$$\{u\}_{(\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{-}\mathcal{B})(x)}^{-} \equiv \{\text{pull}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x} u\}_{\mathcal{B}(x)}^{-}$$

**Lemma 68** (Display of oplax covariant lenses of path objects). *Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be an oplax covariant lens over a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$ . If each  $\mathcal{B}(x)$  is univalent, then the display  $\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{+}\mathcal{B}$  is univalent.*

*Proof.* We must check that each component  $(\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{+}\mathcal{B})(x)$  is univalent. It suffices to check that for each  $u : |\mathcal{B}(x)|$ , the outward orbit  $\{u\}_{(\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{+}\mathcal{B})(x)}^{+}$  is a proposition. By Computation 66, we have  $\{u\}_{(\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{+}\mathcal{B})(x)}^{+} \equiv \{\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x} u\}_{\mathcal{B}(x)}^{+}$ , which is a proposition by our assumption that  $\mathcal{B}(x)$  is univalent.  $\square$

**Lemma 69** (Display of lax contravariant lenses of path objects). *Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a lax contravariant lens over a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$ . If each  $\mathcal{B}(x)$  is univalent, then the display  $\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{-}\mathcal{B}$  is univalent.*

*Proof.* Analogous to Lemma 68.  $\square$

### 3.2 Bivariant midpoint lenses

In this section, we describe a slightly strange technical device that generalises both oplax covariant and lax contravariant lenses that we name the *bivariant midpoint lens*. The reason for introducing these is to characterise the identity types of structures involving mixed variance (including, for example, the type of reflexive graphs!).

**Definition 70** (Bivariant midpoint lens). Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a reflexive graph. A *bivariant midpoint lens* over  $\mathcal{A}$  is defined to be a family of reflexive graphs  $\mathcal{B}(p)$  indexed in edges  $p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y$  equipped with the following data:

$$\begin{aligned} x, y : |\mathcal{A}|; p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y, u : |\mathcal{B}(\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)| &\vdash \text{lex}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u : |\mathcal{B}(p)| \\ x, y : |\mathcal{A}|; p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y, u : |\mathcal{B}(\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}y)| &\vdash \text{rex}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u : |\mathcal{B}(p)| \\ x : |\mathcal{A}|, u : |\mathcal{B}(\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)| &\vdash \text{lexRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u : \text{lex}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)} \text{rex}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x} u \\ x : |\mathcal{A}|, u : |\mathcal{B}(\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)| &\vdash \text{rexRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u : u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)} \text{rex}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x} u \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 71** (Display of bivariant midpoint lenses). Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a bivariant midpoint lens over a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$ . The *display* of  $\mathcal{B}$  over  $\mathcal{A}$  is defined to be the following displayed reflexive graph  $\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\pm}\mathcal{B}$  over  $\mathcal{A}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} x : |\mathcal{A}| &\vdash |\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\pm}\mathcal{B}|(x) \equiv |\mathcal{B}(\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)| \\ p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y, u : |\mathcal{B}(x)|, v : |\mathcal{B}(y)| &\vdash u \approx_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\pm}\mathcal{B}}^p v \equiv \text{lex}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(p)} \text{rex}_{\mathcal{B}}^p v \\ x : |\mathcal{A}|, u : |\mathcal{B}(x)| &\vdash \text{rx}_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\pm}\mathcal{B}}^x u \equiv \text{lexRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u \end{aligned}$$

**Remark 72.** Only  $\text{lex}\text{Rx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u$  was needed to define the display of bivariant midpoint lenses, whereas the lax unitor  $u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)} \text{rext}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x} u$  played no role. The reason for including the latter is that it is required in order for univalence of each  $\mathcal{B}(p)$  to imply univalence for the display  $\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\pm} \mathcal{B}$ . Naturally, univalence would *also* follow if we instead included an oplax unitor  $\text{lex}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)} u$ . What we must not do is include both  $\text{lex}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)} u$  and  $u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)} \text{rext}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x} u$ , as we intend the type of *fiberwise univalent* bivariant midpoint lens structures on a family of path objects over a path object to be a proposition. This situation is somewhat similar to that of *half-adjoint equivalences* in homotopy type theory being coherent only by virtue of omitting one of the snake identities which can be obtained from the other. Of course, our current situation in the world of reflexive graphs is a bit different as we cannot obtain the lax unitor from the oplax unitor, and vice versa: as these unitors play no computational role, however, we will let it slide.

**Lemma 73** (Display of bivariant midpoint lenses of path objects). *Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a bivariant midpoint lens over a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$ . If each  $\mathcal{B}(x)$  is univalent, then so is the display  $\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\pm} \mathcal{B}$ .*

The following Construction 74 shows that bivariant midpoint lenses generalise *both* oplax covariant and lax contravariant lenses up to definitional equality.

**Construction 74** (From biased to unbiased lenses). Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a path object.

1. Any oplax covariant lens  $\mathcal{B}$  over  $\mathcal{A}$  induces a bivariant midpoint lens  $[\mathcal{B}]_{+}^{\pm}$  over  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\pm} \mathcal{B} \equiv \text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\pm} ([\mathcal{B}]_{+}^{\pm})$  definitionally:

$$\begin{aligned} p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y &\vdash [\mathcal{B}]_{+}^{\pm}(p) \equiv \mathcal{B}(y) \\ p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y, u : |\mathcal{B}(x)| &\vdash \text{lex}_{[\mathcal{B}]_{+}^{\pm}}^p u \equiv \text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u \\ p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y, u : |\mathcal{B}(y)| &\vdash \text{rext}_{[\mathcal{B}]_{+}^{\pm}}^p u \equiv u \\ x : |\mathcal{A}|, u : |\mathcal{B}(x)| &\vdash \text{lex}\text{Rx}_{[\mathcal{B}]_{+}^{\pm}}^x u \equiv \text{push}\text{Rx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u \\ x : |\mathcal{A}|, u : |\mathcal{B}(x)| &\vdash \text{rext}\text{Rx}_{[\mathcal{B}]_{+}^{\pm}}^x u \equiv \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}(x)} u \end{aligned}$$

2. Any lax contravariant lens  $\mathcal{B}$  over  $\mathcal{A}$  induces a bivariant midpoint lens  $[\mathcal{B}]_{-}^{\pm}$  over  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\pm} \mathcal{B} \equiv \text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\pm} ([\mathcal{B}]_{-}^{\pm})$  definitionally:

$$\begin{aligned} p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y &\vdash [\mathcal{B}]_{-}^{\pm}(p) \equiv \mathcal{B}(x) \\ p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y, u : |\mathcal{B}(x)| &\vdash \text{lex}_{[\mathcal{B}]_{-}^{\pm}}^p u \equiv u \\ p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y, u : |\mathcal{B}(y)| &\vdash \text{rext}_{[\mathcal{B}]_{-}^{\pm}}^p u \equiv \text{pull}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u \\ x : |\mathcal{A}|, u : |\mathcal{B}(x)| &\vdash \text{lex}\text{Rx}_{[\mathcal{B}]_{-}^{\pm}}^x u \equiv \text{pull}\text{Rx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u \\ x : |\mathcal{A}|, u : |\mathcal{B}(x)| &\vdash \text{rext}\text{Rx}_{[\mathcal{B}]_{-}^{\pm}}^x u \equiv \text{pull}\text{Rx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u \end{aligned}$$

*Computation.* We compute the displays as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\pm} [\mathcal{B}]_{+}^{\pm}|(x) &\equiv |[\mathcal{B}]_{+}^{\pm}(\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x) \equiv |\mathcal{B}(x)| \equiv |\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\pm} \mathcal{B}|(x) \\ |\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\pm} [\mathcal{B}]_{-}^{\pm}|(x) &\equiv |[\mathcal{B}]_{-}^{\pm}(\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x) \equiv |\mathcal{B}(x)| \equiv |\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\pm} \mathcal{B}|(x) \\ u \approx_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\pm} [\mathcal{B}]_{+}^{\pm}}^p v &\equiv \text{lex}_{[\mathcal{B}]_{+}^{\pm}}^p u \approx_{[\mathcal{B}]_{+}^{\pm}(p)} \text{rext}_{[\mathcal{B}]_{+}^{\pm}}^p v \equiv \text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} u \equiv u \approx_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\pm} \mathcal{B}}^p v \\ u \approx_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\pm} [\mathcal{B}]_{-}^{\pm}}^p v &\equiv \text{lex}_{[\mathcal{B}]_{-}^{\pm}}^p u \approx_{[\mathcal{B}]_{-}^{\pm}(p)} \text{rext}_{[\mathcal{B}]_{-}^{\pm}}^p v \equiv u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} \text{pull}_{\mathcal{B}}^p v \equiv u \approx_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\pm} \mathcal{B}}^p v \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rx}_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+[\mathcal{B}]_+}^x u &\equiv \text{lxtRx}_{[\mathcal{B}]_+}^x u \equiv \text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u \equiv \text{rx}_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}}^x u \\ \text{rx}_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+[\mathcal{B}]_-}^x u &\equiv \text{lxtRx}_{[\mathcal{B}]_-}^x u \equiv \text{pull}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u \equiv \text{rx}_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^- \mathcal{B}}^x u \end{aligned}$$

□

### 3.3 Duality involution for reflexive graph lenses

We have seen in Definition 34 and Observation 35 the duality involution for reflexive graphs that flips the direction of edges. This involution hosts a (definitional) equivalence between the types of oplax covariant and lax contravariant lenses respectively. By virtue of this equivalence, from a result about all oplax covariant lenses one obtains automatically a dual result about all lax contravariant lenses.

**Definition 75** (Total opposite of a lens). Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a reflexive graph, and let  $\mathcal{B}$  be an oplax covariant lens of reflexive graphs over  $\mathcal{A}$ . We define the *total opposite* of  $\mathcal{B}$  to be the following lax contravariant lens  $\mathcal{B}^{\text{op}}$  over  $\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}^{\text{op}}(x) &:= \mathcal{B}(x)^{\text{op}} \\ \text{pull}_{\mathcal{B}^{\text{op}}}^p u &:= \text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u \\ \text{pullRx}_{\mathcal{B}^{\text{op}}}^x u &:= \text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u \end{aligned}$$

Conversely, if  $\mathcal{B}$  is a lax contravariant lens we define its total opposite to be the following lax contravariant lens  $\mathcal{B}^{\text{op}}$  over  $\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}^{\text{op}}(x) &:= \mathcal{B}(x)^{\text{op}} \\ \text{push}_{\mathcal{B}^{\text{op}}}^p u &:= \text{pull}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u \\ \text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}^{\text{op}}}^x u &:= \text{pullRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u \end{aligned}$$

The purpose of *total opposites* is to exhibit a duality involution identifying oplax covariant and lax contravariant lenses.

**Observation 76** (Duality involution for lenses). *By virtue of Definition 75, we see that an oplax covariant lens over  $\mathcal{A}$  is precisely the same thing as a lax contravariant lens over  $\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}}$ ; and, conversely, that a lax contravariant lens over  $\mathcal{A}$  is precisely the same thing as an oplax covariant lens over  $\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}}$ .*

**Lemma 77** (Display of total opposites). *Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be an oplax covariant lens of reflexive graphs over a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then we have a definitional equivalence  $\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}}}^-(\mathcal{B}^{\text{op}}) \equiv (\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B})^{\text{op}}$  of displayed reflexive graphs.*

*Proof.* We compute explicitly.

$$\begin{array}{ll} |\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}}}^-(\mathcal{B}^{\text{op}})|(x) & |(\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B})^{\text{op}}|(x) \\ \text{by Definition 65} & \text{by Definition 36} \\ \equiv |\mathcal{B}^{\text{op}}(x)| & \equiv |\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}|(x) \\ \text{by Definition 75} & \text{by Definition 64} \\ \equiv |\mathcal{B}(x)^{\text{op}}| & \equiv |\mathcal{B}(x)| \\ \text{by Definition 34} & \\ \equiv |\mathcal{B}(x)| & \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ll}
u \approx_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}}}^-(\mathcal{B}^{\text{op}})}^{p:x \approx_{\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}}} y} v & u \approx_{(\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+(\mathcal{B}))^{\text{op}}}^{p:x \approx_{\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}}} y} v \\
\text{by Definition 65} & \text{by Definition 36} \\
\equiv u \approx_{\mathcal{B}^{\text{op}}(y)} \text{pull}_{\mathcal{B}^{\text{op}}}^p v & \equiv v \approx_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+(\mathcal{B})}^{p:y \approx_{\mathcal{A}} x} v \\
\text{by Definition 75} & \text{by Definition 64} \\
\equiv u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)^{\text{op}}} \text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p v & \equiv \text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p v \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} u \\
\text{by Definition 34} & \\
\equiv \text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p v \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} u & \\
\\
\text{rx}_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}}}^-(\mathcal{B}^{\text{op}})}^x u & \text{rx}_{(\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+(\mathcal{B}))^{\text{op}}}^x u \\
\text{by Definition 65} & \text{by Definition 36} \\
\equiv \text{pullRx}_{\mathcal{B}^{\text{op}}}^x u & \equiv \text{rx}_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+(\mathcal{B})}^x u \\
\text{by Definition 75} & \text{by Definition 64} \\
\equiv \text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u & \equiv \text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u \quad \square
\end{array}$$

**Corollary 78.** Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a lax contravariant lens of reflexive graphs over a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then we have a definitional equivalence  $\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}}}^+(\mathcal{B}^{\text{op}}) \equiv (\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^-(\mathcal{B}))^{\text{op}}$  of displayed reflexive graphs.

*Proof.* By Lemma 77 via duality (Observation 76).  $\square$

Although many other definitions can be obtained directly by duality, we will continue to specify various concepts and results for both oplax covariant and lax contravariant lenses in order to facilitate easy reference.

### 3.4 Definitional lenses of reflexive graphs

An (oplax covariant, lax contravariant) lens equips a family with a pushforward or pullback operator together with a witness of a unit law holding up to a directed edge. That the unit law holds only up to an edge is the meaning of the “oplax/lax” terminology. An important class of lenses are the ones in which the unit law holds up to definitional equality, so that the oplax or lax witness or the unit law can be given by the reflexivity datum of the component reflexive graph. We study these *definitional lenses* in the present section, with an eye to developing the theory of polynomials and partial products of lenses in Section 3.4.4.

**Definition 79** (Definitional lens). A *definitional covariant lens* is an oplax covariant lens  $\mathcal{B}$  over  $\mathcal{A}$  in which the following equations hold definitionally:

$$\begin{aligned}
x : |\mathcal{A}|, u : |\mathcal{B}(x)| &\vdash \text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}^x} u \equiv u \\
x : |\mathcal{A}|, u : |\mathcal{B}(x)| &\vdash \text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u \equiv \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}(x)} u
\end{aligned}$$

By the same token, a *definitional contravariant lens* is a lax contravariant lens in which the following equations hold definitionally:

$$\begin{aligned}
x : |\mathcal{A}|, u : |\mathcal{B}(x)| &\vdash \text{pull}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}^x} u \equiv u \\
x : |\mathcal{A}|, u : |\mathcal{B}(x)| &\vdash \text{pullRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u \equiv \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}(x)} u
\end{aligned}$$

**Computation 80** (Display of definitional lenses). The display of definitional lenses is, naturally, more simple than that of ordinary lenses. If  $\mathcal{B}$  is a definitional covariant lens over  $\mathcal{A}$ , its display computes as follows:

$$|\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+(\mathcal{B})(x)| \equiv |\mathcal{B}(x)|$$

$$u \approx_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}}^{P: x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y} v \equiv \text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^P u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} v$$

$$\text{rx}_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}}^x u \equiv \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}(x)} u$$

Likewise, if  $\mathcal{B}$  is a definitional contravariant lens, its display computes as follows:

$$|\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^- \mathcal{B}|(x) \equiv |\mathcal{B}(x)|$$

$$u \approx_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^- \mathcal{B}}^{P: x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y} v \equiv u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x)} \text{pull}_{\mathcal{B}}^P v$$

$$\text{rx}_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^- \mathcal{B}}^x u \equiv \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}(x)} u$$

### 3.4.1 Example: definitional lenses from univalent families

**Example 81** (Definitional lenses of from univalent families). Any univalent family of path objects has a canonical *definitional* lens structure. In particular, given a univalent family of path objects  $(U, \mathcal{E})$  we can equip  $\mathcal{E}$  with the structure of a covariant and a contravariant lens over the reflexive graph image  $U/\mathcal{E}$ :

$$A_0, A_1 : U; f : A_0 \approx_{U/\mathcal{E}} A_1; a : |\mathcal{E}(A_0)| \vdash \text{push}_{\mathcal{E}}^f a \equiv fa$$

$$A_0, A_1 : U; f : A_0 \approx_{U/\mathcal{E}} A_1; a : |\mathcal{E}(A_1)| \vdash \text{pull}_{\mathcal{E}}^f a \equiv f^{-1}a$$

$$A : U; a : |\mathcal{E}(A)| \vdash \text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{E}}^A a \equiv \text{rx}_{\mathcal{E}(A)} a$$

$$A : U; a : |\mathcal{E}(A)| \vdash \text{pullRx}_{\mathcal{E}}^A a \equiv \text{rx}_{\mathcal{E}(A)} a$$

**Example 82** (Definitional lenses from universes). Any univalent family of types  $(U, E)$ , *e.g.* a universe, determines a univalent family of path objects  $(U, \Delta E)$ . In this case,  $U/|\Delta E| \equiv U/E$  is precisely the canonical path object structure on  $U$  determined by equivalences between components of  $E$ , and we may consider the corresponding definitional lens structures on  $\Delta E$  by specialising Example 81.

**Example 83** (Definitional lenses from subuniverses). Let  $(U, \mathcal{E})$  be a univalent family, and let  $P(A)$  be a proposition for every  $A : U$ . We can restrict  $\mathcal{E}$  to a family of path objects  $\mathcal{E}_P$  over  $\{A : U/|\mathcal{E}| \mid P(A)\}$  setting  $\mathcal{E}_P(A, h) \equiv \mathcal{E}(A)$ . Then  $\mathcal{E}_P$  can be equipped with the structure of a definitional covariant and contravariant lens over  $U/|\mathcal{E}|$  in the following way:

$$A, B : |\{A : U/|\mathcal{E}| \mid P(A)\}|; f : A \approx_{U/|\mathcal{E}|} B, x : |\mathcal{E}(\pi_1 A)| \vdash \text{push}_{\mathcal{E}_P}^f x \equiv fx$$

$$A, B : |\{A : U/|\mathcal{E}| \mid P(A)\}|; f : A \approx_{U/|\mathcal{E}|} B, x : |\mathcal{E}(\pi_1 B)| \vdash \text{pull}_{\mathcal{E}_P}^f x \equiv f^{-1}x$$

$$A : |\{A : U/|\mathcal{E}| \mid P(A)\}|, x : |\mathcal{E}(\pi_1 A)| \vdash \text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{E}_P}^A x \equiv \text{rx}_{\mathcal{E}(\pi_1 A)} x$$

$$A : |\{A : U/|\mathcal{E}| \mid P(A)\}|, x : |\mathcal{E}(\pi_1 A)| \vdash \text{pullRx}_{\mathcal{E}_P}^A x \equiv \text{rx}_{\mathcal{E}(\pi_1 A)} x$$

### 3.4.2 Example: definitional lenses for finite ordinals

For each  $n : \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\mathcal{F}(n)$  be the following path object with vertices in the standard finite set with  $n$  elements:

$$\mathcal{F}(n) \equiv \{i : \Delta \mathbb{N} \mid i < n\}$$

The reflexive graph image of  $\mathbb{N}$  under  $\mathcal{F}$  is *not* univalent because  $\mathbb{N}$  is a set and thus each  $m \equiv_{\mathbb{N}} n$  is a proposition whereas there is a proper set of equivalences from  $\mathcal{F}(m)$  to  $\mathcal{F}(n)$ . Therefore, we cannot apply Example 81 nor Example 83 to obtain a good

definitional lens structure on  $\mathcal{F}$ . Nonetheless, we can impose with some ingenuity a more restricted path object structure on  $\mathbb{N}$  over which it is not difficult to exhibit  $\mathcal{F}$  as a definitional lens.

**Example 84.** We may classify the *augmented simplices* by the following reflexive graph structure  $\Delta_a$  with vertices in the natural numbers and edges given by monotone equivalences between finite ordinals:

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta_a| &:= \mathbb{N} \\ m \approx_{\Delta_a} n &:= \sum_{(f: \text{Equiv}(|\mathcal{F}(m)|, |\mathcal{F}(n)|))} \text{isMonotone } f \\ \text{rx}_{\Delta_a} n &:= (1_{|\mathcal{F}(n)|}, \text{idnMono}) \end{aligned}$$

We shall deduce that Example 84 yields a path object, using the fact that the category of augmented simplices is *gaunt* in the sense that there is at most one monotone isomorphism between any two finite ordinals.

**Lemma 85** (A path object classifying augmented simplices). *The reflexive graph  $\Delta_a$  of augmented simplices is univalent.*

*Proof.* Fixing  $m : \mathbb{N}$ , we must check that the orbit  $\{m\}_{\Delta_a}^+$  is a proposition. Unfolding definitions, we have  $\{m\}_{\Delta_a}^+ \equiv \sum_{(n: \mathbb{N})} \sum_{(f: \text{Equiv}(|\mathcal{F}(m)|, |\mathcal{F}(n)|))} \text{isMonotone } f$ . As there can be at most one monotone equivalence between  $|\mathcal{F}(m)|$  and some  $|\mathcal{F}(n)|$ , it remains only to observe that  $|\mathcal{F}(n)|$  being equinumerous with  $|\mathcal{F}(m)|$  implies  $m = n$ .  $\square$

**Example 86** (Definitional lens structure of finite ordinals). We may exhibit definitional covariant and contravariant lens structures on  $\mathcal{F}$  over  $\Delta_a$  like so:

$$\begin{aligned} m, n : \mathbb{N}; (f, f^\leq) : m \approx_{\Delta_a} n, i : |\mathcal{F}(m)| \vdash \text{push}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(f, f^\leq)} i &:= fi \\ m, n : \mathbb{N}; (f, f^\leq) : m \approx_{\Delta_a} n, i : |\mathcal{F}(n)| \vdash \text{pull}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(f, f^\leq)} i &:= f^{-1}i \\ m : \mathbb{N}; i : |\mathcal{F}(m)| \vdash \text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{F}}^m i &:= \text{rx}_{\mathcal{F}(m)} i \\ m : \mathbb{N}; i : |\mathcal{F}(m)| \vdash \text{pullRx}_{\mathcal{F}}^m i &:= \text{rx}_{\mathcal{F}(m)} i \end{aligned}$$

### 3.4.3 Definitional replacement of lenses

We have seen that in some examples of definitional lenses, the reflexive graph structure on the base required some ingenuity. In this section, we describe a general method to reparameterise any lens as a *definitional* lens over a different base.

**Construction 87** (Flattening of lenses). Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be an oplax covariant or lax contravariant lens of reflexive graphs over a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$ . We may equip  $|\mathcal{A}|$  with a new reflexive graph structure  $\mathcal{A}_{\downarrow \mathcal{B}}^+$  or  $\mathcal{A}_{\downarrow \mathcal{B}}^-$  respectively called the *flattening* of  $\mathcal{B}$  onto  $\mathcal{A}$ .

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{A}_{\downarrow \mathcal{B}}^+| &:= |\mathcal{A}| \\ x \approx_{\mathcal{A}_{\downarrow \mathcal{B}}^+} y &:= \sum_{(p: x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y)} \sum_{(p': |\mathcal{B}(x)| \rightarrow |\mathcal{B}(y)|)} \prod_{(u: |\mathcal{B}(x)|)} \text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} p'u \\ \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}_{\downarrow \mathcal{B}}^+} x &:= (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x, 1_{|\mathcal{B}(x)|}, \text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x) \\ |\mathcal{A}_{\downarrow \mathcal{B}}^-| &:= |\mathcal{A}| \\ x \approx_{\mathcal{A}_{\downarrow \mathcal{B}}^-} y &:= \sum_{(p: x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y)} \sum_{(p': |\mathcal{B}(y)| \rightarrow |\mathcal{B}(x)|)} \prod_{(u: |\mathcal{B}(y)|)} p'u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x)} \text{pull}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u \\ \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}_{\downarrow \mathcal{B}}^-} x &:= (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x, 1_{|\mathcal{B}(x)|}, \text{pullRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x) \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 88** (Flattening of lenses of path objects onto path objects). *Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be an oplax covariant or lax contravariant lens of path objects over a path object  $\mathcal{A}$ . Assuming function extensionality, the flattening of  $\mathcal{B}$  onto  $\mathcal{A}$  is univalent.*

*Proof.* We consider only the covariant case, as the contravariant one is similar. Fixing  $x : |\mathcal{A}|$ , we must check that the outward orbit  $\{x\}_{\mathcal{A}^+_{\downarrow \mathcal{B}}}^+$  is a proposition. First we compute the orbit up to definitional equality:

$$\begin{aligned} \{x\}_{\mathcal{A}^+_{\downarrow \mathcal{B}}}^+ &\equiv \sum_{(y:\mathcal{A})} x \approx_{\mathcal{A}^+_{\downarrow \mathcal{B}}} y \\ &\equiv \sum_{(y:\mathcal{A})} \sum_{(p:x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y)} \sum_{(p':|\mathcal{B}(x)| \rightarrow |\mathcal{B}(y)|)} \prod_{(u:|\mathcal{B}(x)|)} \text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} p' u \\ &\equiv \sum_{(y:\mathcal{A})} \sum_{(p:x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y)} \sum_{(p':|\mathcal{B}(x)| \rightarrow |\mathcal{B}(y)|)} \text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p \approx_{|\mathcal{B}(x)| \multimap \mathcal{B}(y)} p' \\ &\equiv \sum_{(y:\mathcal{A})} \sum_{(p:x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y)} \{\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p\}_{|\mathcal{B}(x)| \multimap \mathcal{B}(y)}^+ \end{aligned}$$

As each  $\mathcal{B}(y)$  is univalent, we deduce from function extensionality that the cotensor  $|\mathcal{B}(x)| \multimap \mathcal{B}(y)$  is univalent. Therefore, each orbit  $\{\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p\}_{|\mathcal{B}(x)| \multimap \mathcal{B}(y)}^+$  is contractible and so we have the following equivalences:

$$\begin{aligned} \{x\}_{\mathcal{A}^+_{\downarrow \mathcal{B}}}^+ &\cong \sum_{(y:|\mathcal{A}|)} \sum_{(p:x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y)} \{\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p\}_{|\mathcal{B}(x)| \multimap \mathcal{B}(y)}^+ \\ &\cong \sum_{(y:|\mathcal{A}|)} x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y \\ &\equiv \{x\}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \end{aligned}$$

As  $\mathcal{A}$  is assumed to be univalent,  $\{x\}_{\mathcal{A}}^+$  is a proposition and thus so is  $\{x\}_{\mathcal{A}^+_{\downarrow \mathcal{B}}}^+$ .  $\square$

**Construction 89** (The definitional replacement of a lens). Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be an oplax covariant lens of reflexive graphs over a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$ . The **covariant definitional replacement** of  $\mathcal{B}$  is defined to be the following *definitional* covariant lens  $\text{drep}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}$  over the flattening  $\mathcal{A}^+_{\downarrow \mathcal{B}}$  with  $\mathcal{B}$  as its underlying family of reflexive graphs.

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{drep}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B})(x) &\equiv \mathcal{B}(x) \\ \text{push}_{\text{drep}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}}^{(p,p')} u &\equiv p' u \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, if  $\mathcal{B}$  is a lax contravariant lens of reflexive graphs over a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$ , we define the **contravariant definitional replacement** of  $\mathcal{B}$  to be the following definitional contravariant lens  $\text{drep}_{\mathcal{A}}^- \mathcal{B}$  over the flattening  $\mathcal{A}^-_{\downarrow \mathcal{B}}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{drep}_{\mathcal{A}}^- \mathcal{B})(x) &\equiv \mathcal{B}(x) \\ \text{pull}_{\text{drep}_{\mathcal{A}}^- \mathcal{B}}^{(p,p')} u &\equiv p' u \end{aligned}$$

### 3.4.4 Polynomials and partial products of reflexive graphs

Any family of types  $x : A \vdash B(x) : \mathbf{type}$  induces a **polynomial** type operator  $\mathbf{P}_A(C, B) \equiv \sum_{(x:A)} \prod_{(u:B(x))} C$ ; the universal property of  $\mathbf{P}_A(C, B)$  is that of a *partial product* [Dyckhoff and Tholen, 1987]. In this section, we generalise the construction of polynomials to lenses of reflexive graphs; the definitions of the polynomial reflexive graphs will then mirror the description of *covariant* and *contravariant* partial products in a 2-category [Johnstone, 1993, 2002]. We then show how to specialise the construction of polynomials to obtain suitable path object structures on the *partial map classifier* of a given dominance as in synthetic domain theory [Rosolini, 1986].

In this section, we assume function extensionality.

**Construction 90.** Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a definitional covariant lens of reflexive graphs over a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$ , and let  $C$  be an arbitrary reflexive graph. Then we may define a *definitional contravariant* lens of reflexive graphs  $\text{pp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+(C, \mathcal{B})$  over  $\mathcal{A}$  by setting each  $(\text{pp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+(C, \mathcal{B}))(x) := |\mathcal{B}(x)| \pitchfork C$ . The definitional contravariant lens structure of  $\text{pp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+(C, \mathcal{B})$  over  $\mathcal{A}$  is defined from the definitional covariant lens structure of  $\mathcal{B}$  by precomposition like so:

$$\begin{aligned} x, y : |\mathcal{A}|; p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y; c : |\mathcal{B}(y)| &\rightarrow |C| \\ \vdash \text{pull}_{\text{pp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+(C, \mathcal{B})}^P c &:= c \circ \text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^P \end{aligned}$$

**Construction 91.** Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a definitional contravariant lens of reflexive graphs over a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$ , and let  $C$  be an arbitrary reflexive graph. Then we may define a *definitional covariant* family of path objects  $\prod_{\mathcal{B}} C$  over  $\mathcal{A}$  by setting each  $(\prod_{\mathcal{B}} C)(x) := |\mathcal{B}(x)| \pitchfork C$ . The definitional covariant lens structure of  $\prod_{\mathcal{B}} C$  over  $\mathcal{A}$  is defined from the definitional contravariant lens structure of  $\mathcal{B}$  by precomposition:

$$\begin{aligned} x, y : |\mathcal{A}|; p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y; c : |\mathcal{B}(x)| &\rightarrow |C| \\ \vdash \text{push}_{\prod_{\mathcal{B}} C}^P c &:= c \circ \text{pull}_{\mathcal{B}}^P \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 92** (Partial products of definitional lenses). Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a definitional covariant lens of reflexive graphs over a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then the *covariant partial product* of a reflexive graph  $C$  with  $\mathcal{B}$  over  $\mathcal{A}$  is defined to be the following total reflexive graph:

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}^+(C, \mathcal{B}) := \mathcal{A}.\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^-(\text{pp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+(C, \mathcal{B}))$$

When  $\mathcal{B}$  is a definitional contravariant lens, we define the *contravariant partial product* of  $C$  with  $\mathcal{B}$  over  $\mathcal{A}$  as follows:

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}^-(C, \mathcal{B}) := \mathcal{A}.\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+(\text{pp}_{\mathcal{A}}^-(C, \mathcal{B}))$$

**Computation 93** (Covariant partial product). The covariant partial product of a reflexive graph  $C$  with a definitional covariant lens of reflexive graphs  $\mathcal{B}$  over a reflexive graphs  $\mathcal{A}$  computes as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}^+(C, \mathcal{B})| &\equiv \mathbf{P}_{|\mathcal{A}|}(|C|, |\mathcal{B}|) \\ (x, c) \approx_{\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}^+(C, \mathcal{B})} (y, d) &\equiv \sum_{(p: x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y)} \prod_{(u: \mathcal{B}(x))} cu \approx_C d(\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^P u) \\ \text{rx}_{\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}^+(C, \mathcal{B})}(x, c) &\equiv (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x, \lambda u. \text{rx}_C(cu)) \end{aligned}$$

**Computation 94** (Contravariant partial product). The contravariant partial product of a reflexive graph  $C$  with a definitional contravariant lens of reflexive graphs  $\mathcal{B}$  over a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$  unravels up to definitional equivlance as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}^-(C, \mathcal{B})| &\equiv \mathbf{P}_{|\mathcal{A}|}(|C|, |\mathcal{B}|) \\ (x, c) \approx_{\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}^-(C, \mathcal{B})} (y, d) &\equiv \sum_{(p: x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y)} \prod_{(u: \mathcal{B}(y))} c(\text{pull}_{\mathcal{B}}^P u) \approx_C du \\ \text{rx}_{\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}^-(C, \mathcal{B})}(x, c) &\equiv (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x, \lambda u. \text{rx}_C(cu)) \end{aligned}$$

**Example 95** (Partial map classifiers). A *dominance* in the sense of Rosolini [1986] is a univalent universe  $(\Sigma, T)$  closed under the terminal type and internal sums such that for each  $\phi : \Sigma$ , the component  $T(\phi)$  is a proposition. In this case, we may equip each  $T(\phi)$  with the codiscrete path object structure  $\nabla(T(\phi))$  so that  $(\Sigma, \nabla T)$  is a univalent family



of path objects and  $\nabla T$  has definitional covariant and contravariant lens structure over the propositional reflexive graph image  $\Sigma/_{-1}T$ .

The partial map classifier of a given type  $A$  in the dominance  $(\Sigma, T)$  is the polynomial type  $\mathbf{P}_\Sigma(A, T) \equiv \sum_{(\phi:\Sigma)} \prod_{(p:T(\phi))} A$ . A suitable lifting of the partial map classifiers to path objects  $\mathcal{A}$  can be obtained by means of covariant or contravariant partial products:

$$\mathcal{A}_\perp^+ := \mathcal{P}_{\Sigma/_{-1}T}^+(\mathcal{A}, \nabla T) \quad \mathcal{A}_\perp^- := \mathcal{P}_{\Sigma/_{-1}T}^-(\mathcal{A}, \nabla T)$$

We compute the above reflexive graph structures as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{A}_\perp^+| &\equiv |\mathcal{A}_\perp^-| \equiv \mathbf{P}_\Sigma(|\mathcal{A}|, T) \\ (\phi, a) \approx_{\mathcal{A}_\perp^+} (\psi, b) &\equiv \sum_{((p,q):(\phi \rightarrow \psi) \times (\psi \rightarrow \phi))} \prod_{(u:T(\phi))} au \approx_A b(pu) \\ (\phi, a) \approx_{\mathcal{A}_\perp^-} (\psi, b) &\equiv \sum_{((p,q):(\phi \rightarrow \psi) \times (\psi \rightarrow \phi))} \prod_{(u:T(\psi))} a(qu) \approx_A bu \\ \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}_\perp^+}(\phi, a) \equiv \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}_\perp^-}(\phi, a) &\equiv ((\lambda u. u, \lambda u. u), \lambda u. \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}(au)) \end{aligned}$$

**Example 96** (Lists). A simple example of a polynomial type operator is that of *lists*: letting  $F(n)$  be the standard finite type  $\sum_{(i:\mathbb{N})} i < n$ , we may define  $\text{List}(A) := \mathbf{P}_\mathbb{N}(F, A)$ . This representation of lists lifts to path objects by means of partial products via our account in Section 3.4.2 of the path object  $\Delta_a$  classifying finite ordinals and the definitional lens  $\mathcal{F}$  of elements of a given finite ordinal. In particular, for any path object  $\mathcal{A}$  we consider the following covariant and contravariant partial products:

$$\text{List}^+(\mathcal{A}) := \mathcal{P}_{\Delta_a}^+(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}) \quad \text{List}^-(\mathcal{A}) := \mathcal{P}_{\Delta_a}^-(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F})$$

These reflexive graphs compute as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{List}^+(\mathcal{A})| &\equiv |\text{List}^-(\mathcal{A})| \equiv \text{List}(A) \equiv \sum_{(n:\mathbb{N})} \prod_{(i:F(n))} A \\ (m, a) \approx_{\text{List}^+(\mathcal{A})} (n, b) &\equiv \sum_{((f,f^\leq):m \approx_{\Delta_a} n)} \prod_{(i:F(m))} ai \approx_{\mathcal{A}} b(fi) \\ (m, a) \approx_{\text{List}^-(\mathcal{A})} (n, b) &\equiv \sum_{((f,f^\leq):m \approx_{\Delta_a} n)} \prod_{(i:F(n))} a(fi) \approx_{\mathcal{A}} bi \\ \text{rx}_{\text{List}^+(\mathcal{A})}(m, a) \equiv \text{rx}_{\text{List}^-(\mathcal{A})}(m, a) &\equiv ((\text{idnEquiv}_{F(m)}, \text{idnMono}), \lambda i. \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}(ai)) \end{aligned}$$

Buchholtz [2023] has shown how to use the classifying space of the symmetric group on two elements to define several variations on unordered pairs in univalent foundations. In what follows, we assume the existence of propositional truncations  $\|-\|$ .

**Example 97** (Homotopy unordered pairs [Buchholtz, 2023]). Let  $(U, E)$  be a univalent universe containing the two-element type  $\mathbf{2}$ ; following Buchholtz [2023] we may define the “classifying type”  $B\Sigma_2$  to the type of  $U$ -small types merely equivalent to  $\mathbf{2}$  as follows, *i.e.* we define  $B\Sigma_2 := \sum_{(X:U)} \|\text{Equiv}(E(X), \mathbf{2})\|$ . We define a decoding family  $K : B\Sigma_2 \vdash E_2(K) : \mathbf{type}$  by setting  $E_2(X, h) := E(X)$ . Then *op. cit.* defines the type of *homotopy unordered pairs* in a type  $A$  to be the following polynomial type:

$$\text{hUP}(A) := \mathbf{P}_{B\Sigma_2}(A, E_2) \equiv \sum_{(K:B\Sigma_2)} \prod_{(i:E_2(K))} A$$

A suitable path object structure on  $B\Sigma_2$  is obtained by path object comprehension:

$$\mathcal{B}\Sigma_2 := \{X : U/E \mid \|\text{Equiv}(E(X), \mathbf{2})\|\}$$

Then  $E_2$  lifts discretely to a definitional covariant and contravariant lens  $\mathcal{E}_2$  of path objects over  $\mathcal{B}\Sigma_2$  by Example 83, setting  $\mathcal{E}_2(K) := \Delta(E_2(K))$ . A suitable path

object structure on homotopy unordered pairs is then obtained by either covariant or contravariant partial products:

$$\mathbf{hUP}^+(\mathcal{A}) := \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{B}\Sigma_2}^+(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}_2) \quad \mathbf{hUP}^-(\mathcal{A}) := \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{B}\Sigma_2}^-(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}_2)$$

These reflexive graph structures compute as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{hUP}^+(\mathcal{A})| &\equiv |\mathbf{hUP}^-(\mathcal{A})| \equiv \mathbf{hUP}(|\mathcal{A}|) \\ ((L, h_L), a) \approx_{\mathbf{hUP}^+(\mathcal{A})} ((K, h_K), b) &\equiv \sum_{(f: \text{Equiv}(E(L), E(K)))} \prod_{(i: E(L))} a i \approx_{\mathcal{A}} b(f i) \\ ((L, h_L), a) \approx_{\mathbf{hUP}^-(\mathcal{A})} ((K, h_K), b) &\equiv \sum_{(f: \text{Equiv}(E(L), E(K)))} \prod_{(i: E(K))} a(f i) \approx_{\mathcal{A}} b i \\ \mathbf{rx}_{\mathbf{hUP}^+(\mathcal{A})}((K, h), a) \equiv \mathbf{rx}_{\mathbf{hUP}^-(\mathcal{A})}((K, h), a) &\equiv (\text{idnEquiv}_{E(K)}, \lambda i. \mathbf{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}(a i)) \end{aligned}$$

### 3.5 Coherence in the theory of path object lenses

**Lemma 98.** *Assuming dependent function extensionality, it is a proposition that a given reflexive graph is univalent.*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a reflexive graph; a witness that  $\mathcal{A}$  is univalent is an element of the following product:

$$\prod_{(x: |\mathcal{A}|)} \text{isProp } \{x\}_{\mathcal{A}}^+$$

As being a proposition is a proposition, this is a product of propositions. Dependent function extensionality implies the closure of propositions under products.  $\square$

**Lemma 99.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a reflexive graph, and let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a displayed reflexive graph over  $\mathcal{A}$ . Assuming dependent function extensionality, it is a proposition that  $\mathcal{B}$  is univalent.*

*Proof.* Univalence of  $\mathcal{B}$  amounts to the following product:

$$\prod_{(x: |\mathcal{A}|)} \text{isUnivalent } (\mathcal{B}(x))$$

By dependent function extensionality, it suffices to check that each  $\text{isUnivalent } (\mathcal{B}(x))$  is a proposition; but this is Lemma 98.  $\square$

**Lemma 100.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a path object and let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a family of path objects over  $\mathcal{A}$ . Assuming dependent function extensionality, the type of oplax covariant lens structures on  $\mathcal{B}$  over  $\mathcal{A}$  is a proposition.*

*Proof.* We first write out in detail the type of oplax covariant lens structures on  $\mathcal{B}$ :

$$\sum_{(\Phi: \prod_{(x, y: |\mathcal{A}|)} \prod_{(p: x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y)} |\mathcal{B}(x)| \rightarrow |\mathcal{B}(y)|)} \prod_{(x: |\mathcal{A}|)} \prod_{(u: |\mathcal{B}(x)|)} \Phi x x (\mathbf{rx}_{\mathcal{A}x}) u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x)} u$$

By the distributivity of products over sums, the above is equivalent to the following:

$$\prod_{(x: |\mathcal{A}|)} \sum_{(\Phi: \prod_{(y: |\mathcal{A}|)} \prod_{(p: x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y)} |\mathcal{B}(x)| \rightarrow |\mathcal{B}(y)|)} \prod_{(u: |\mathcal{B}(x)|)} \Phi x (\mathbf{rx}_{\mathcal{A}x}) u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x)} u$$

By dependent function extensionality, it suffices to assume that for each  $x : |\mathcal{A}|$  the following type is a proposition:

$$\sum_{(\Phi: \prod_{(y: |\mathcal{A}|)} \prod_{(p: x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y)} |\mathcal{B}(x)| \rightarrow |\mathcal{B}(y)|)} \prod_{(u: |\mathcal{B}(x)|)} \Phi x (\mathbf{rx}_{\mathcal{A}x}) u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x)} u$$

Re-associating, the above is equivalent to:

$$\sum_{(\Phi: \prod_{((y, p): \{x\}_{\mathcal{A}}^-)} |\mathcal{B}(x)| \rightarrow |\mathcal{B}(y)|)} \prod_{(u: |\mathcal{B}(x)|)} \Phi (x, \mathbf{rx}_{\mathcal{A}x}) u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x)} u$$

By our assumption that  $\mathcal{A}$  is univalent, we know that  $\{x\}_{\mathcal{A}}^-$  is contractible with centre  $(x, \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)$ . Therefore, the above is equivalent to the following simplified type:

$$\sum_{(\Phi:|\mathcal{B}(x)| \rightarrow |\mathcal{B}(x)|)} \prod_{(u:|\mathcal{B}(x)|)} \Phi u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x)} u$$

The above is definitionally equal to the orbit of the identity function in  $|\mathcal{B}(x)| \multimap \mathcal{B}(x)$  as we can see below:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{(\Phi:|\mathcal{B}(x)| \rightarrow |\mathcal{B}(x)|)} \prod_{(u:|\mathcal{B}(x)|)} \Phi u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x)} u \\ & \equiv \sum_{(\Phi:|\mathcal{B}(x)| \rightarrow |\mathcal{B}(x)|)} \Phi \approx_{|\mathcal{B}(x)| \multimap \mathcal{B}(x)} (\lambda u. u) \\ & \equiv \{\lambda u. u\}_{\mathcal{B}(x)}^- \end{aligned}$$

The orbit is indeed a proposition, as we have assumed that each  $\mathcal{B}(x)$  is univalent.  $\square$

**Lemma 101.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a path object and let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a family of path objects over  $\mathcal{A}$ . Assuming dependent function extensionality, the type of lax contravariant lens structures on  $\mathcal{B}$  over  $\mathcal{A}$  is a proposition.*

*Proof.* Analogous to Lemma 100.  $\square$

**Lemma 102.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a path object, and let  $\mathcal{B}(p)$  be a path object for each edge  $p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ . Assuming dependent function extensionality, the type of bivariate midpoint lens structures on  $\mathcal{B}$  over  $\mathcal{A}$  is a proposition.*

*Proof.* The type of bivariate midpoint lens structures on  $\mathcal{B}$  over  $\mathcal{A}$  can be written as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{(\Phi: \prod_{(x,y:|\mathcal{A}|)} \prod_{(p:x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y)} |\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)| \rightarrow |\mathcal{B}(x,y,p)|)} \\ & \sum_{(\Psi: \prod_{(x,y:|\mathcal{A}|)} \prod_{(p:x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y)} |\mathcal{B}(y,y,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}y)| \rightarrow |\mathcal{B}(x,y,p)|)} \\ & \left( \prod_{(x:|\mathcal{A}|)} \prod_{(u:|\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)|)} \Phi x x (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x) u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)} \Psi x x (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x) u \right) \\ & \times \left( \prod_{(x:|\mathcal{A}|)} \prod_{(u:|\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)|)} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)} \Psi x x (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x) u \right) \end{aligned}$$

Considering the distributivity of products over sums, it suffices by dependent function extensionality to prove that for each  $x : |\mathcal{A}|$ , the following type is a proposition:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{(\Phi: \prod_{(y:|\mathcal{A}|)} \prod_{(p:x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y)} |\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)| \rightarrow |\mathcal{B}(x,y,p)|)} \\ & \sum_{(\Psi: \prod_{(y:|\mathcal{A}|)} \prod_{(p:x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y)} |\mathcal{B}(y,y,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}y)| \rightarrow |\mathcal{B}(x,y,p)|)} \\ & \left( \prod_{(u:|\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)|)} \Phi x x (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x) u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)} \Psi x x (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x) u \right) \\ & \times \left( \prod_{(u:|\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)|)} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)} \Psi x x (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x) u \right) \end{aligned}$$

We re-associate to expose various orbits in  $\mathcal{A}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{(\Phi: \prod_{((y,p):\{x\}_{\mathcal{A}}^+)} |\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)| \rightarrow |\mathcal{B}(x,y,p)|)} \\ & \sum_{(\Psi: \prod_{((y,p):\{x\}_{\mathcal{A}}^+)} |\mathcal{B}(y,y,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}y)| \rightarrow |\mathcal{B}(x,y,p)|)} \\ & \left( \prod_{(u:|\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)|)} \Phi x x (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x) u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)} \Psi x x (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x) u \right) \\ & \times \left( \prod_{(u:|\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)|)} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)} \Psi x x (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x) u \right) \end{aligned}$$

As  $\mathcal{A}$  is univalent, the orbit  $\{x\}_{\mathcal{A}}^+$  contracts onto  $(x, \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)$  as reflected below:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{(\Phi: |\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)| \rightarrow |\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)|)} \\ & \sum_{(\Psi: |\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)| \rightarrow |\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)|)} \\ & \left( \prod_{(u:|\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)|)} \Phi u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)} \Psi u \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\times (\prod_{(u:|\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)|)} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)} \Psi u)$$

The above is definitionally equivalent to the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum (\Phi:|\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)| \rightarrow |\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)|) \\ & \sum (\Psi:|\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)| \rightarrow |\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)|) \\ & \times (\Phi \approx_{|\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)| \multimap \mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)} \Psi) \\ & \times ((\lambda u. u) \approx_{|\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)| \multimap \mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)} \Psi) \end{aligned}$$

We can re-associate the above as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum (\Phi:|\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)| \rightarrow |\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)|) \\ & \sum ((\Psi, \Psi): \{\lambda u. u\}_{|\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)| \multimap \mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)}^+) \\ & \Phi \approx_{|\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)| \multimap \mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)} \Psi \end{aligned}$$

As  $\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)$  is assumed to be univalent, so is its cotensor by  $|\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)|$ ; thus, the orbit of  $\lambda u. u$  in the cotensor contracts to  $(\lambda u. u, \lambda u. \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)} u)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum (\Phi:|\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)| \rightarrow |\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)|) \\ & \Phi \approx_{|\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)| \multimap \mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)} \lambda u. u \end{aligned}$$

The above is just the orbit  $\{\lambda u. u\}_{|\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)| \multimap \mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)}^-$ , which is a proposition because  $\mathcal{B}(x,x,\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x)$  is assumed univalent.  $\square$

## 4 Case study: path objects classifying reflexive graphs

In this section, we assume dependent function extensionality. Let  $(U, E)$  be a univalent family in the sense of Definition 48 so that the reflexive graph image  $U/E$  is univalent. Given  $A : U$ , we will write  $A : \mathbf{type}$  in place of  $E(A)$  when it causes no confusion.

### 4.1 Classifying reflexive graphs

**Construction 103** (A univalent lens for graph structures). A  $U$ -small graph structure on  $A : U$  is given by a vertex of the path structure  $\text{GphOn}_U(A) := A \multimap A \multimap U/E$ . We shall equip  $\text{GphOn}_U$  as a *lax contravariant lens of path objects* over  $U/E$  as follows:

$$A_0, A_1 : U; f : \text{Equiv}(A_0, A_1), E : A_1 \rightarrow A_0 \rightarrow U \vdash$$

$$\text{push}_{\text{GphOn}_U}^f E : A_0 \rightarrow A_0 \rightarrow U$$

$$\text{push}_{\text{GphOn}_U}^f E x y := E(fx) (fy)$$

$$A : U, E : A \rightarrow A \rightarrow U \vdash$$

$$\text{pushRx}_{\text{GphOn}_U}^A E : \text{push}_{\text{GphOn}_U}^{\text{idnEquiv}^A} E \approx_{\text{GphOn}_U(A)} E$$

$$\text{pushRx}_{\text{GphOn}_U}^A E := \text{rx}_{\text{GphOn}_U(A)} E$$

**Computation 104** (A path object classifying graphs). Thus we obtain a path object classifying  $U$ -small graphs by taking the total path object of the display of the lax contravariant lens  $\text{GphOn}_U$  over  $U/E$ , defining  $\text{Gph}_U := (U/E).\text{disp}_{U/E}^- \text{GphOn}_U$ . Unraveling definitions, we see that its underlying reflexive graph structure is precisely the natural one that would arise from invertible graph homomorphisms:

$$|\text{Gph}_U| \equiv \sum_{(A:U)} A \rightarrow A \rightarrow U$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{G}_0 \approx_{\text{Gph}_U} \mathcal{G}_1 &\equiv \sum_{(f:\text{Equiv}(|\mathcal{G}_0|, |\mathcal{G}_1|))} \prod_{(x,y:|\mathcal{G}_0|)} \text{Equiv}(x \approx_{\mathcal{G}_0} y, f x \approx_{\mathcal{G}_1} f y) \\ \text{rx}_{\text{Gph}_U} \mathcal{G} &\equiv (\text{idnEquiv}_{|\mathcal{G}|}, \lambda x, y. \text{idnEquiv}_{x \approx_{\mathcal{G}} y})\end{aligned}$$

Given  $f : \mathcal{G}_0 \approx_{\text{Gph}_U} \mathcal{G}_1$ , we will write  $|f| : \text{Equiv}(|\mathcal{G}_0|, |\mathcal{G}_1|)$  for the first component and  $f \approx : \prod_{(x,y:|\mathcal{G}_0|)} \text{Equiv}(x \approx_{\mathcal{G}_0} y, |f|x \approx_{\mathcal{G}_1} |f|y)$  for the second component.

In order to classify reflexive graphs, we naturally wish to define a further lens over  $\text{Gph}_U$  whose components classify reflexivity data on a given graph. Unfortunately, due to the mixed variance of reflexivity data in the underlying graph, it seems we can find neither a suitable lax contravariant nor oplax covariant lens for reflexivity data. It happens, however, that the desirable displayed path object over  $\text{Gph}_U$  arises via Lemma 73 from a particularly simple *bivariant midpoint lens* that we now define straightaway.

**Construction 105** (A univalent bivariant midpoint lens for reflexivity data). A reflexivity datum over an *equivalence* of  $U$ -small graphs  $f : \mathcal{A} \approx_{\text{Gph}_U} \mathcal{B}$  is given by an assignment of self-edges in the image of  $f$ ; these are the vertices of the following family of path objects:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} : |\text{Gph}_U|; f : \mathcal{A} \approx_{\text{Gph}_U} \mathcal{B} \vdash \\ \text{RxOn}_U(f) &:= \prod_{(x:|\mathcal{A}|)} \Delta(|f|x \approx_{\mathcal{B}} |f|x)\end{aligned}$$

When instantiated to the reflexivity datum in  $\text{Gph}_U$  on a specific graph  $\mathcal{A}$ , we recover the usual notion of reflexivity data up to definitional equality:

$$\text{RxOn}_U(\text{rx}_{\text{Gph}_U} \mathcal{A}) \equiv \prod_{(x:|\mathcal{A}|)} \Delta(x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} x)$$

We now equip  $\text{RxOn}_U$  with the structure of a bivariant midpoint lens over  $\text{Gph}_U$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} : |\text{Gph}_U|; f : \mathcal{A} \approx_{\text{Gph}_U} \mathcal{B}; \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} : |\text{RxOn}_U(\text{rx}_{\text{Gph}_U} \mathcal{A})| \vdash \\ \text{lext}_{\text{RxOn}_U}^f \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} : |\text{RxOn}_U(f)| \\ \text{lext}_{\text{RxOn}_U}^f \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} &\equiv \lambda x : |\mathcal{A}|. f \approx x x (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x)\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} : |\text{Gph}_U|; f : \mathcal{A} \approx_{\text{Gph}_U} \mathcal{B}; \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}} : |\text{RxOn}_U(\text{rx}_{\text{Gph}_U} \mathcal{B})| \vdash \\ \text{rext}_{\text{RxOn}_U}^f \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}} : |\text{RxOn}_U(f)| \\ \text{rext}_{\text{RxOn}_U}^f \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}} &\equiv \lambda x : |\mathcal{A}|. \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}}(|f|x)\end{aligned}$$

The laws of the midpoint lens hold definitionally, so we are done!

**Computation 106** (A path object classifying reflexive graphs). A path object classifying  $U$ -small reflexive graphs is obtained from the display of the bivariant midpoint lens  $\text{RxOn}_U$  over  $\text{Gph}_U$  by setting  $\text{RxGph}_U := \text{Gph}_U.\text{disp}_{\text{Gph}_U}^{\pm} \text{RxOn}_U$ . It is not difficult to see that the underlying reflexive graph of  $\text{RxGph}_U$  is precisely the desired one:

$$\begin{aligned}|\text{RxGph}_U| &\equiv \sum_{(\mathcal{G}:|\text{Gph}_U|)} \prod_{(x:|\mathcal{G}|)} x \approx_{\mathcal{G}} x \\ \mathcal{A}_0 \approx_{\text{RxGph}_U} \mathcal{A}_1 &\equiv \sum_{(f:\mathcal{A}_0 \approx_{\text{Gph}_U} \mathcal{A}_1)} \prod_{(x:|\mathcal{A}_0|)} f \approx x x (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}_0} x) =_{|f|x \approx_{\mathcal{A}_1} |f|x} \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}_1}(|f|x) \\ \text{rx}_{\text{RxGph}_U} \mathcal{A} &\equiv (\text{rx}_{\text{Gph}_U} \mathcal{A}, \lambda x : |\mathcal{A}|. \text{refl})\end{aligned}$$

Given  $f : \mathcal{A}_0 \approx_{\text{RxGph}_U} \mathcal{A}_1$ , we will write  $f : \mathcal{A}_0 \approx_{\text{Gph}_U} \mathcal{A}_1$  for the first component and  $f^{\text{rx}} : \prod_{(x:|\mathcal{A}_0|)} f \approx x x (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}_0} x) =_{|f|x \approx_{\mathcal{A}_1} |f|x} \text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}_1}(|f|x)$  for the second component.

## 4.2 Classifying displayed reflexive graphs over a fixed base

In this section, let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a fixed reflexive graph.

**Construction 107** (A lens for displayed graph structures over a fixed family of displayed vertices). We shall define a lax contravariant lens over  $|\mathcal{A}| \multimap U/E$  classifying displayed graph structures on a fixed family of types representing displayed vertices.

$$B : |\mathcal{A}| \rightarrow U \vdash \text{DGphOn}_U^{\mathcal{A}}(B) \equiv \prod_{(x,y:|\mathcal{A}|)} (x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y) \multimap Bx \multimap By \multimap U/E$$

We equip the family of path objects above with the structure of a definitional contravariant lens over  $|\mathcal{A}| \multimap U/E$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} B_0, B_1 : |\mathcal{A}| \rightarrow U; f : B_0 &\approx_{|\mathcal{A}| \multimap U/E} B_1; E : |\text{DGphOn}_U^{\mathcal{A}}(B_1)| \vdash \\ \text{pull}_{\text{DGphOn}_U^{\mathcal{A}}}^f E : |\text{DGphOn}_U^{\mathcal{A}}(B_0)| \\ \text{pull}_{\text{DGphOn}_U^{\mathcal{A}}}^f E &\equiv \lambda x, y, p, u, v. E \, x \, y \, p \, (fxu) \, (fyv) \end{aligned}$$

**Computation 108** (A path object for displayed graph structures over  $\mathcal{A}$ ). From the display of  $\text{DGphOn}_U^{\mathcal{A}}$  over  $|\mathcal{A}| \multimap U/E$ , we obtain a suitable path object  $\text{DGph}_U^{\mathcal{A}} := (|\mathcal{A}| \multimap U/E). \text{disp}_{|\mathcal{A}| \multimap U/E}^- \text{DGphOn}_U^{\mathcal{A}}$  classifying displayed graph structures over  $\mathcal{A}$ .

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{DGph}_U^{\mathcal{A}}| &\equiv \sum_{(B:|\mathcal{A}| \rightarrow U)} \prod_{(x,y:|\mathcal{A}|)} (x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y) \multimap Bx \multimap By \multimap U/E \\ \mathcal{B}_0 \approx_{\text{DGph}_U^{\mathcal{A}}} \mathcal{B}_1 &\equiv \\ \sum_{(f:\prod_{(x:A)} \text{Equiv}(|\mathcal{B}_0|x, |\mathcal{B}_1|x))} & \\ \prod_{(x,y:|\mathcal{A}|)} \prod_{(p:x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y)} \prod_{(u:|\mathcal{B}_0|x)} \prod_{(v:|\mathcal{B}_1|x)} & \\ \text{Equiv}(u \approx_{\mathcal{B}_0}^p v, f x u \approx_{\mathcal{B}_1}^p f x v) & \\ \text{rx}_{\text{DGph}_U^{\mathcal{A}}} \mathcal{B} &\equiv (\lambda x. \text{idnEquiv}_{|\mathcal{B}|x}, \lambda x, y, p, u, v. \text{idnEquiv}_{u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^p v}) \end{aligned}$$

**Construction 109** (A univalent bivariate midpoint lens for displayed reflexivity data). Next, we exhibit a bivariate midpoint lens classifying displayed reflexivity data on a given displayed graph over  $\mathcal{A}$ . In particular, we define specify a family of path objects  $\text{DRxOn}_U^{\mathcal{A}}$  over the edges of  $\text{DGph}_U^{\mathcal{A}}$  in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_0, \mathcal{B}_1 : |\text{DGph}_U^{\mathcal{A}}|; f : \mathcal{B}_0 &\approx_{\text{DGph}_U^{\mathcal{A}}} \mathcal{B}_1 \vdash \\ \text{DRxOn}_U^{\mathcal{A}}(f) &\equiv \prod_{(x:|\mathcal{A}|)} \prod_{(y:|\mathcal{B}_0|x)} \Delta(|f|xy \approx_{\mathcal{B}_1}^{\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x} |f|xy) \end{aligned}$$

Along the diagonal we recover the desired notion of displayed reflexivity data:

$$\text{DRxOn}_U^{\mathcal{A}}(\text{rx}_{\text{DGph}_U^{\mathcal{A}}} \mathcal{B}) \equiv \prod_{(x:|\mathcal{A}|)} \prod_{(y:|\mathcal{B}|x)} \Delta(y \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x} y)$$

The midpoint lens structure is given in such a way that the laws hold definitionally:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_0, \mathcal{B}_1 : |\text{DGph}_U^{\mathcal{A}}|; f : \mathcal{B}_0 &\approx_{\text{DGph}_U^{\mathcal{A}}} \mathcal{B}_1; \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}_0} : |\text{DRxOn}_U^{\mathcal{A}}(\text{rx}_{\text{DGph}_U^{\mathcal{A}}} \mathcal{B}_0)| \vdash \\ \text{left}_{\text{DRxOn}_U^{\mathcal{A}}}^f \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}_0} : |\text{DRxOn}_U^{\mathcal{A}}(f)| \\ \text{left}_{\text{DRxOn}_U^{\mathcal{A}}}^f \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}_0} &\equiv \lambda x, y. f \approx x \, x \, (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}^x) \, y \, y \, (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}_0} x y) \\ \mathcal{B}_0, \mathcal{B}_1 : |\text{DGph}_U^{\mathcal{A}}|; f : \mathcal{B}_0 &\approx_{\text{DGph}_U^{\mathcal{A}}} \mathcal{B}_1; \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}_1} : |\text{DRxOn}_U^{\mathcal{A}}(\text{rx}_{\text{DGph}_U^{\mathcal{A}}} \mathcal{B}_1)| \vdash \\ \text{right}_{\text{DRxOn}_U^{\mathcal{A}}}^f \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}_1} : |\text{DRxOn}_U^{\mathcal{A}}(f)| \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{rext}_{\text{DRxOn}_U^{\mathcal{A}}}^f \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}_1}^x \equiv \lambda x, y. \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}_1}^x (|f|xy)$$

**Computation 110.** From the display of  $\text{DRxOn}_U^{\mathcal{A}}$  over  $\text{DGph}_U^{\mathcal{A}}$ , we obtain a path object classifying displayed reflexive graphs over  $\mathcal{A}$ , defining  $\text{DRxGphOver}_U(\mathcal{A})$  as follows:

$$\text{DRxGphOver}_U(\mathcal{A}) \equiv \text{DGph}_U^{\mathcal{A}}.\text{disp}_{\text{DGph}_U^{\mathcal{A}}}^{\pm} \text{DRxOn}_U^{\mathcal{A}}$$

Unraveling definitions, we see that the underlying reflexive graph  $\text{DRxGphOver}_U(\mathcal{A})$  is precisely the desirable one classifying displayed reflexive graphs over  $\mathcal{A}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{DRxGphOver}_U(\mathcal{A})| &\equiv \sum_{(\mathcal{B}:\text{DGph}_U^{\mathcal{A}})} \prod_{(x:|\mathcal{A}|)} \prod_{(u:Bx)} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}^x} u \\ \mathcal{B}_0 &\approx_{\text{DRxGphOver}_U(\mathcal{A})} \mathcal{B}_1 \equiv \\ &\sum_{(f:\mathcal{B}_0 \approx_{\text{DGph}_U^{\mathcal{A}}} \mathcal{B}_1)} \prod_{(x:|\mathcal{A}|)} \prod_{(u:|\mathcal{B}_0|)} \\ &f^{\approx} x x (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}^x) y y (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}_0}^x u) =_{|f|xu \approx_{\mathcal{B}_1}^{\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}^x} |f|xu} \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}_1}^x (|f|xu) \\ \text{rx}_{\text{DRxGphOver}_U(\mathcal{A})} \mathcal{B} &\equiv ((\lambda x. \text{idnEquiv}_{|\mathcal{B}|x}, \lambda x, y, p, u, v. \text{idnEquiv}_{u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^p v}), \lambda x, u. \text{refl}) \end{aligned}$$

### 4.3 Classifying displayed reflexive graphs with variable base

**Construction 111** (A lax contravariant lens for  $U$ -small displayed reflexive graphs over a given reflexive graph). We can extend  $\text{DRxGphOver}_U$  with the structure of a definitional contravariant lens over  $\text{RxGph}_U$ . We first describe how to restrict a displayed reflexive graph  $\mathcal{B}$  along a reflexive graph equivalence  $f : \mathcal{A}_0 \approx_{\text{RxGph}_U} \mathcal{A}_1$ ; on vertices and edges, one simply uses the restriction of the corresponding components of  $\mathcal{B}$  along  $f$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_0, \mathcal{A}_1 : |\text{RxGph}_U|; f : \mathcal{A}_0 \approx_{\text{RxGph}_U} \mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{B} : |\text{DRxGphOver}_U(\mathcal{A}_1)| \vdash \\ \text{pull}_{\text{DRxGphOver}_U}^f \mathcal{B} : |\text{DRxGphOver}_U(\mathcal{A}_0)| \\ |\text{pull}_{\text{DRxGphOver}_U}^f \mathcal{B}|x \equiv |\mathcal{B}|(fx) \\ u \approx_{\text{pull}_{\text{DRxGphOver}_U}^f \mathcal{B}}^{p:x \approx_{\mathcal{A}_1} y} v \equiv u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^{f^{\approx} x y p} v \end{aligned}$$

To define the restricted reflexivity datum, we must transport along the witness that  $f$  preserves reflexivity data.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rx}_{\text{pull}_{\text{DRxGphOver}_U}^f \mathcal{B}}^x u : u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^{f^{\approx} x x (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}_1}^x)} u \\ \text{rx}_{\text{pull}_{\text{DRxGphOver}_U}^f \mathcal{B}}^x u \equiv (f^{\text{rx}x})_*^{u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^{\bullet} u} (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}}^{fx} u) \end{aligned}$$

The lens is definitional because  $\mathcal{B} \equiv \text{pull}_{\text{DRxGphOver}_U}^{\text{rx}_{\text{RxGph}_U} \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{B}$  definitionally.

**Computation 112** (A path object classifying  $U$ -small displayed reflexive graphs over a variable base). By computing the display of  $\text{DRxGphOver}_U$  over  $\text{RxGph}_U$ , we obtain a path object classifying reflexive graphs  $\mathcal{A}$  equipped with a displayed reflexive graph  $\mathcal{B}$  over  $\mathcal{A}$ .

$$\text{DRxGph}_U \equiv \text{RxGph}_U.\text{disp}_{\text{RxGph}_U}^- \text{DRxGphOver}_U$$

We compute as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{DRxGph}_U| &\equiv \sum_{(\mathcal{A}:|\text{RxGph}_U|)} |\text{DRxGphOver}_U(\mathcal{A})| \\ (\mathcal{A}_0, \mathcal{B}_0) &\approx_{\text{DRxGph}_U} (\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{B}_1) \equiv \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum (f : \mathcal{A}_0 \approx_{\text{RxGph}_U} \mathcal{A}_1) \\
& \sum (|g| : \prod_{(x : |\mathcal{A}_0|)} \text{Equiv}(|\mathcal{B}_0| x, |\mathcal{B}_1|(f x))) \\
& \sum (g^\approx : \prod_{(x, y : |\mathcal{A}_0|)} \prod_{(p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}_0} y)} \prod_{(u : |\mathcal{B}_0| x)} \prod_{(v : |\mathcal{B}_1| y)} \text{Equiv}(u \approx_{\mathcal{B}_0}^p v, u \approx_{\mathcal{B}_1}^{f \circ x \circ p} v)) \\
& \prod_{(x : |\mathcal{A}_0|)} \prod_{(u : |\mathcal{B}_0|)} \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}_0}^x u =_{u \approx_{\mathcal{B}_0}^{\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}_0} x} u} (f^{\text{rx}_x})_*^{u \approx_{\mathcal{B}_1}^{\bullet} u} (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}_1}^{f x} u) \\
& \text{rxDRxGph}_U(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \equiv (\text{rxRxGph}_U \mathcal{A}, \text{rxDRxGphOver}_U(\mathcal{A}) \mathcal{B})
\end{aligned}$$

#### 4.4 Classifying families and lenses of reflexive graphs

**Construction 113** (A definitional covariant lens for vertices). We can define a definitional covariant lens  $\text{Vtx}_U$  over the path object  $\text{RxGph}_U$  whose component over a  $U$ -small reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$  is  $\mathcal{A}$  itself. Setting  $\text{Vtx}_U(\mathcal{A}) \equiv \mathcal{A}$ , we define the definitional lens structure as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{A}_0, \mathcal{A}_1 : |\text{RxGph}_U|; f : \mathcal{A}_0 \approx_{\text{RxGph}_U} \mathcal{A}_1; x : |\mathcal{A}| \\
& \vdash \text{push}_{\text{Vtx}_U}^f x \equiv |f|x
\end{aligned}$$

**Computation 114** (A path object classifying  $U$ -small families of  $U$ -small reflexive graphs). Using our theory of partial products of lenses (Section 3.4.4), we can define a path object that classifies pairs  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  where  $\mathcal{A}$  is a  $U$ -small reflexive graph and  $\mathcal{B}$  is a family of  $U$ -small reflexive graphs indexed in the vertices of  $\mathcal{A}$ .

$$\text{RxGphFam}_U \equiv \mathcal{P}_{\text{RxGph}_U}^+(\text{RxGph}_U, \text{Vtx}_U)$$

We have the following computation:

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\text{RxGphFam}_U| \equiv \sum_{(\mathcal{A} : |\text{RxGph}_U|)} \prod_{(x : |\mathcal{A}|)} |\text{RxGph}_U| \\
& (\mathcal{A}_0, \mathcal{B}_0) \approx_{\text{RxGphFam}_U} (\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{B}_1) \equiv \\
& \sum_{(f : \mathcal{A}_0 \approx_{\text{RxGph}_U} \mathcal{A}_1)} \prod_{(x : |\mathcal{A}_0|)} \mathcal{B}_0 x \approx_{\text{RxGph}_U} \mathcal{B}_1(|f|x) \\
& \text{rxRxGphFam}_U(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \equiv (\text{rxRxGph}_U \mathcal{A}, \lambda x. \text{rxRxGph}_U \mathcal{B}(x))
\end{aligned}$$

It would be desirable to find a good path object classifying lens structures on a given family of reflexive graphs. Unfortunately, there are some limitations on our ability to do this: although the pushforward/pullback data are easy to classify, it is unclear how to define a notion of path between oplax/lax unitors *over* a homotopy between pushforward/pullback data. Therefore, the best we can do is impose the *discrete* reflexive graph structure on the first component of a lens, combining it with a family of path object structures classifying unitors by coproduct (Definition 25 and Lemma 57); on the other hand, we can still exhibit a useful displayed reflexive graph structure classifying lenses with variable base by means of a bivariate midpoint lens as we shall see in Construction 115 below.

**Construction 115** (A definitional bivariate midpoint lens classifying oplax covariant lens structure). Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a fixed reflexive graph. We define a componentwise discrete definitional bivariate midpoint lens  $\text{LensStr}_{\mathcal{A}}^+$  over  $|\mathcal{A}| \curvearrowright \text{RxGph}_U$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& f : \mathcal{B}_0 \approx_{|\mathcal{A}| \curvearrowright \text{RxGph}_U} \mathcal{B}_1 \vdash \text{LensStr}_{\mathcal{A}}^+(f) \equiv \\
& \prod_{(\Phi : \prod_{(x, y : |\mathcal{A}|)} \prod_{(p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y)} |\mathcal{B}_0 x| \rightarrow |\mathcal{B}_1 y|)} \\
& \prod_{(x : |\mathcal{A}|)} \prod_{(u : |\mathcal{B}_0 x|)} \Phi x x (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x) u \approx_{\mathcal{B}_1 x} |f x| u
\end{aligned}$$



Naturally,  $\text{LensStr}_{\mathcal{A}}^+(\text{rxRxGph}_U \mathcal{B})$  is precisely the type of oplax covariant lens structures on family of  $U$ -small reflexive graphs  $\mathcal{B}$  over  $\mathcal{A}$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
f : \mathcal{B}_0 &\approx_{|\mathcal{A}| \wr \text{RxGph}_U} \mathcal{B}_1; (\Phi, \hat{\Phi}) : \text{LensStr}_{\mathcal{A}}^+(\text{rxRxGph}_U \mathcal{B}_0) \vdash \\
\pi_1(\text{lext}_{\text{LensStr}_{\mathcal{A}}^+}^f(\Phi, \hat{\Phi})) &\equiv \lambda x, y, p, u. |fy|(\Phi x y p u) \\
\pi_2(\text{lext}_{\text{LensStr}_{\mathcal{A}}^+}^f(\Phi, \hat{\Phi})) &\equiv \lambda x, u. (fx)^\approx (\Phi x x (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x) u) u (\hat{\Phi} x u) \\
f : \mathcal{B}_0 &\approx_{|\mathcal{A}| \wr \text{RxGph}_U} \mathcal{B}_1; (\Phi, \hat{\Phi}) : \text{LensStr}_{\mathcal{A}}^+(\text{rxRxGph}_U \mathcal{B}_1) \vdash \\
\pi_1(\text{rext}_{\text{LensStr}_{\mathcal{A}}^+}^f(\Phi, \hat{\Phi})) &\equiv \lambda x, y, p, u : |\mathcal{B}_0 x|. \Phi x y p (|fx|u) \\
\pi_2(\text{rext}_{\text{LensStr}_{\mathcal{A}}^+}^f(\Phi, \hat{\Phi})) &\equiv \lambda x, u. \hat{\Phi} x (|fx|u)
\end{aligned}$$

The unit laws of this bivariant midpoint lens hold definitionally.

**Computation 116** (A path object classifying oplax covariant lenses with fixed base). Finally, we may define path object classifying oplax covariant lenses over a fixed reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$ .

$$\text{Lens}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ := (|\mathcal{A}| \wr \text{RxGph}_U). \text{disp}_{|\mathcal{A}| \wr \text{RxGph}_U}^\pm \text{LensStr}_{\mathcal{A}}^+$$

## 5 Fibred reflexive graphs

A lens is kind of like a fibration in which the lifts have no universal property, as noted by Chollet et al. [2022]. In this section, we make the analogy between lenses and fibrations of reflexive graphs precise by characterising fibrations *precisely* as lenses of path objects in Corollary 135. We begin by translating the notion of *fibred* reflexive graphs from Rijke [2019] into the language of *displayed* reflexive graphs.

**Definition 117.** A *covariant fibration* over a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$  is defined to be a displayed reflexive graph  $\mathcal{B}$  over  $\mathcal{A}$  such that for every edge  $p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y$  and displayed vertex  $u : |\mathcal{B}|(x)$ , the sum  $\sum_{(v : |\mathcal{B}|(y))} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^p v$  is contractible.

We will write  $p_*^{\mathcal{B}} u : |\mathcal{B}|(y)$  and  $p_{\dagger}^{\mathcal{B}} u : u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^p p_*^{\mathcal{B}} u$  for the first and second components component of the centre of contraction respectively.

**Definition 118.** A *contravariant fibration* over a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$  is defined to be a displayed reflexive graph  $\mathcal{B}$  over  $\mathcal{A}$  such that for every edge  $p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y$  and displayed vertex  $v : |\mathcal{B}|(y)$ , the sum  $\sum_{(v' : |\mathcal{B}|(x))} v' \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^p v$  is contractible.

We shall write  $p_{\mathcal{B}}^* v : |\mathcal{B}|(x)$  and  $p_{\dagger}^{\mathcal{B}} v : p_{\mathcal{B}}^* v \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^p v$  for the first and second components of the centre of contraction respectively.

### 5.1 Duality involution for fibred reflexive graphs

In this section, we show that covariant and contravariant fibrations are interchangeable via the duality involution for displayed reflexive graphs (Section 2.2).

**Lemma 119** (Total opposite of a fibration). *Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a covariant (resp. contravariant) fibration of reflexive graphs over a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then the total opposite displayed reflexive graph  $\mathcal{B}^{\text{op}}$  is a contravariant (resp. covariant) fibration over  $\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}}$ .*

Lemma 119 allows us to translate results about all covariant fibrations into results about all contravariant fibrations.

## 5.2 Fibred reflexive graphs and univalence

Fibred reflexive graphs are always univalent, as we see in Lemma 120. Therefore, it is natural to refer to a fibration of reflexive graphs as a fibration of path objects.

**Lemma 120** (Fibrations of reflexive graphs are univalent). *Any (covariant, contravariant) fibration of reflexive graphs over a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$  is univalent, i.e. a displayed path object.*

*Proof.* Suppose without loss of generality (by Lemma 119) that  $\mathcal{B}$  is a covariant fibration. Fixing  $x : |\mathcal{A}|$  and  $u : |\mathcal{B}|(x)$ , it suffices to show that the outward orbit  $\{u\}_{\mathcal{B}(x)}^+$  is a proposition. We have the following definitional computation of the orbit:

$$\begin{aligned} & \{u\}_{\mathcal{B}(x)}^+ \\ & \text{by Definition 38} \\ & \equiv \sum_{(w:|\mathcal{B}|(x))} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x)} w \\ & \text{by Definition 20} \\ & \equiv \sum_{(w:|\mathcal{B}|(x))} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^{r_{\mathcal{A}}^x} w \end{aligned}$$

The latter is contractible by our assumption that  $\mathcal{B}$  is a covariant fibration. Suppose, on the other hand, that  $\mathcal{B}$  is a contravariant fibration. To show that  $\mathcal{B}$  is univalent, it suffices to show that each of the inward orbits  $\{u\}_{\mathcal{B}(x)}^-$  is a proposition, which we compute below:

$$\begin{aligned} & \{u\}_{\mathcal{B}(x)}^- \\ & \text{by Definition 38} \\ & \equiv \sum_{(w:|\mathcal{B}|(x))} w \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x)} u \\ & \text{by Definition 20} \\ & \equiv \sum_{(w:|\mathcal{B}|(x))} w \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^{r_{\mathcal{A}}^x} u \end{aligned}$$

The latter is contractible because  $\mathcal{B}$  is a contravariant assumption.  $\square$

A converse to Lemma 120 cannot hold, as we see in Example 121.

**Example 121.** *Not every univalent displayed reflexive graph is a fibration.* In particular, consider the following displayed reflexive graph over the codiscrete reflexive graph  $\nabla \mathbf{2}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & i : \mathbf{2} \vdash |\mathcal{G}|(i) \equiv i =_{\mathbf{2}} 1 \\ & i, j : \mathbf{2}; p : i =_{\mathbf{2}} 1, q : i =_{\mathbf{2}} 1 \vdash p \approx_{\mathcal{G}}^* q \equiv \mathbf{1} \\ & i : \mathbf{2}, p : i =_{\mathbf{2}} 1 \vdash r_{\mathcal{G}}^i p \equiv * \end{aligned}$$

We can see that for each  $i : \mathbf{2}$ , the component  $\mathcal{G}(i)$  is the codiscrete reflexive graph  $\nabla(i =_{\mathbf{2}} 1)$ , which is univalent by Lemma 60 as  $\mathbf{2}$  is a set. Therefore  $\mathcal{G}$  is univalent, and we will see that it can be neither a covariant nor a contravariant fibration.

Suppose that  $\mathcal{G}$  were a covariant fibration. We have an edge  $* : 1 \approx_{\nabla \mathbf{2}} 0$  and thus a pushforward map  $(*)_* : 1 =_{\mathbf{2}} 1 \rightarrow 0 =_{\mathbf{2}} 1$ . On the other hand, if  $\mathcal{G}$  were a contravariant fibration, would use pullback along  $* : 0 \approx_{\nabla \mathbf{2}} 1$  to obtain a contradiction.

Example 121 also shows that not every univalent displayed reflexive graph can be obtained from a lens structure on its components.

### 5.3 Fibred reflexive graphs from lenses of path objects

We will now show that when a lens is valued in path objects, its display is a fibration.

**Definition 122** (Universal pushforwards/pullbacks). An oplax covariant lens  $\mathcal{B}$  over a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$  is said to have **universal pushforwards** when for every edge  $p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y$  and vertex  $u : |\mathcal{B}(x)|$ , the outward orbit  $\{\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u\}_{\mathcal{B}(y)}^+$  is a proposition.

Conversely, a lax contravariant lens  $\mathcal{B}$  over a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$  is said to have **universal pullbacks** when for every edge  $p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y$  and vertex  $v : |\mathcal{B}(y)|$ , the inward orbit  $\{\text{pull}_{\mathcal{B}}^p v\}_{\mathcal{B}(x)}^-$  is a proposition.

**Lemma 123** (Covariant fibrations from universal pushforwards). *Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be an oplax covariant lens over a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$  that has universal pushforwards. Then the covariant display  $\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}$  can be made into a covariant fibration of reflexive graphs in which  $p_* u \equiv \text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u$  and  $p^{\dagger} u \equiv \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}(y)}(\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u)$ .*

*Proof.* We note that for any edge  $p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y$  and vertex  $u : |\mathcal{B}(x)|$ , we have the following sequence of definitional equivalences:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(u' : |\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}|)} u &\approx_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}}^p v \\ &\text{by Definition 64} \\ &\equiv \sum_{(u' : |\mathcal{B}(y)|)} \text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} u' \\ &\text{by Definition 38} \\ &\equiv \{\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u\}_{\mathcal{B}(y)}^+ \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we may choose a centre of contraction for the latter freely so long as it is a proposition (which we have by assumption).  $\square$

**Lemma 124** (Contravariant fibrations from universal pullbacks). *Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a lax contravariant lens over a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$  that has universal pullbacks. Then the contravariant display  $\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^- \mathcal{B}$  can be made into a contravariant fibration of reflexive graphs in which  $p^* u \equiv \text{pull}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u$  and  $p^{\dagger} u \equiv \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}(x)}(\text{pull}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u)$ .*

*Proof.* Analogous to Lemma 123.  $\square$

**Corollary 125.** *An (oplax covariant, lax contravariant) lens  $\mathcal{B}$  has universal (pushforwards, pullbacks) if and only if each component  $\mathcal{B}(x)$  is univalent.*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be an oplax covariant lens over a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$ .

1. Suppose that  $\mathcal{B}$  has universal pushforwards. We want to show that each outward orbit  $\{u\}_{\mathcal{B}(x)}^+$  is a proposition; using our assumption of universal pushforwards, we can show that  $\{u\}_{\mathcal{B}(x)}^+$  is a retract of  $\{\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x} u\}_{\mathcal{B}(x)}^+$ , which is a proposition because  $\mathcal{B}$  has universal pushforwards.
2. Suppose conversely that each component  $\mathcal{B}(x)$  is univalent; then *all* orbits in the components of  $\mathcal{B}$  are propositions, including  $\{\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u\}_{\mathcal{B}(y)}^+$  for some  $p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y$  and  $u : |\mathcal{B}(x)|$ .

The case for when  $\mathcal{B}$  is a lax contravariant lens is established by duality via Lemmas 120 and 124.  $\square$

## 5.4 The underlying lens of a covariant fibration of reflexive graphs

The pushforward operation  $p_*^{\mathcal{B}}$  of a covariant fibration gives rise to an oplax covariant lens structure on the components of  $\mathcal{B}$ , which we construct and study in this section.

1. We first exhibit a “straightening/unstraightening” equivalence between displayed edges  $u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^{p: x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y} v$  and vertical edges  $\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} v$  in Constructions 126 and 127 and Lemma 128
2. We use the straightening equivalence to exhibit the underlying lens of a displayed reflexive graph in Construction 129.
3. Finally, Theorem 134 exhibits an equivalence of displayed reflexive graphs between any displayed reflexive graph  $\mathcal{B}$  and the display of its underlying lens.

### 5.4.1 Straightening of displayed edges

**Construction 126** (Straightening of edges). Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a covariant fibration of reflexive graphs over a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$ . We can define a “straightening” function that converts displayed edges in  $\mathcal{B}$  to vertical edges using the pushforward operation of the fibration.

First, we define a more general function incorporating a witness of contraction.

$$x, y : |\mathcal{A}|; p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y; u : |\mathcal{B}|(x); v : |\mathcal{B}|(y); q : u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^p v;$$

$$H : (p_*^{\mathcal{B}} u, p_{\dagger}^{\mathcal{B}} u) =_{\sum_{(w: |\mathcal{B}|(y))} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^p w} (v, q)$$

$$\vdash \text{strGen}_{\mathcal{B}}^p q H : p_*^{\mathcal{B}} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} v$$

*by identification induction on H*

$$x, y : |\mathcal{A}|; p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y \vdash \text{strGen}_{\mathcal{B}}^p (p_{\dagger}^{\mathcal{B}} u) \text{refl} : p_*^{\mathcal{B}} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} p_*^{\mathcal{B}} u$$

*by reflexivity data*

$$x, y : |\mathcal{A}|; p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y \vdash \text{strGen}_{\mathcal{B}}^p (p_{\dagger}^{\mathcal{B}} u) \text{refl} \equiv \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}}^y (p_*^{\mathcal{B}} u)$$

Then we define the straightening function by instantiation with one of the witnesses of contraction of  $\sum_{(w: |\mathcal{B}|(y))} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^p w$ , which we leave nameless.

$$x, y : |\mathcal{A}|; p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y; u : |\mathcal{B}|(x); v : |\mathcal{B}|(y); q : u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^p v \vdash$$

$$\text{str}_{\mathcal{B}}^p q : p_*^{\mathcal{B}} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} v$$

$$\text{str}_{\mathcal{B}}^p q \equiv \text{strGen}_{\mathcal{B}}^p q (\dots)$$

**Construction 127** (Unstraightening of edges). Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a covariant fibration of reflexive graphs over a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$ . We can “unstraighten” vertical edges of the form  $p_*^{\mathcal{B}} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} v$  to displayed edges  $u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^p v$  as follows:

$$x, y : |\mathcal{A}|; p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y, u : |\mathcal{B}|(x), v : |\mathcal{B}|(y), q : p_*^{\mathcal{B}} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} v$$

$$H : (p_*^{\mathcal{B}} u, \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}}^y (p_*^{\mathcal{B}} u)) =_{\sum_{(w: |\mathcal{B}|(y))} p_*^{\mathcal{B}} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} w} (v, q)$$

$$\vdash \text{unstrGen}_{\mathcal{B}}^p q H : u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^p v$$

*by identification induction on H*

$$x, y : |\mathcal{A}|; p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y, u : |\mathcal{B}|(x)$$

$$\vdash \text{unstrGen}_{\mathcal{B}}^p (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}}^y (p_*^{\mathcal{B}} u)) \text{refl} : u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^p p_*^{\mathcal{B}} u$$

$$\vdash \text{unstrGen}_{\mathcal{B}}^p (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}}^y (p_*^{\mathcal{B}} u)) \text{refl} \equiv p_{\dagger}^{\mathcal{B}} u$$

Then we define the unstraightening function by instantiation with an anonymous witness that can be obtained from the fact that  $\sum_{(w: |\mathcal{B}|(y))} p_*^{\mathcal{B}} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} w$  is a proposition.

$$\begin{aligned}
& x, y : |\mathcal{A}|; p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y, u : |\mathcal{B}|(x), v : |\mathcal{B}|(y); q : p^{\mathcal{B}} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} v \vdash \\
& \text{unstr}_{\mathcal{B}}^p q : u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^p v \\
& \text{unstr}_{\mathcal{B}}^p q \equiv \text{unstrGen}_{\mathcal{B}}^p q (\dots)
\end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 128** (Straightening is an equivalence). *Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a covariant fibration of reflexive graphs over a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$ . Each straightening function  $\text{str}_{\mathcal{B}}^p : u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^p v \rightarrow p^{\mathcal{B}} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} v$  is an equivalence, with the inverse tracked by  $\text{unstr}_{\mathcal{B}}^p : p^{\mathcal{B}} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} v \rightarrow u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^p v$ .*

*Proof.* We first check that straightening is a retraction of unstraightening. It suffices to prove the following slightly generalised lemma.

$$\begin{aligned}
& x, y : |\mathcal{A}|; p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y, u : |\mathcal{B}|(x), v : |\mathcal{B}|(y), q : p^{\mathcal{B}} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} v, \\
& H : (p^{\mathcal{B}} u, \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}}^y(p^{\mathcal{B}} u)) =_{\sum_{(w:|\mathcal{B}|(y))} p^{\mathcal{B}} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} w} (v, q), \\
& I : (p^{\mathcal{B}} u, p_{\dagger}^{\mathcal{B}} u) =_{\sum_{(w:|\mathcal{B}|(y))} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^p w} (v, \text{unstrGen}_{\mathcal{B}}^p q H) \\
& \vdash \text{strGen}_{\mathcal{B}}^p (\text{unstrGen}_{\mathcal{B}}^p q H) I =_{p^{\mathcal{B}} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} v} q
\end{aligned}$$

by identification induction on  $H$

$$\begin{aligned}
& x, y : |\mathcal{A}|; p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y, u : |\mathcal{B}|(x), v : |\mathcal{B}|(y), \\
& I : (p^{\mathcal{B}} u, p_{\dagger}^{\mathcal{B}} u) =_{\sum_{(w:|\mathcal{B}|(y))} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^p w} (p^{\mathcal{B}} u, \text{unstrGen}_{\mathcal{B}}^p (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}}^y(p^{\mathcal{B}} u)) \text{refl}) \\
& \vdash \text{strGen}_{\mathcal{B}}^p (\text{unstrGen}_{\mathcal{B}}^p (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}}^y(p^{\mathcal{B}} u)) \text{refl}) I =_{p^{\mathcal{B}} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} v} \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}}^y(p^{\mathcal{B}} u)
\end{aligned}$$

by unfolding the definition of  $\text{unstrGen}_{\mathcal{B}}^p$

$$\begin{aligned}
& x, y : |\mathcal{A}|; p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y, u : |\mathcal{B}|(x), v : |\mathcal{B}|(y) \\
& I : (p^{\mathcal{B}} u, p_{\dagger}^{\mathcal{B}} u) =_{\sum_{(w:|\mathcal{B}|(y))} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^p w} (p^{\mathcal{B}} u, p_{\dagger}^{\mathcal{B}} u) \\
& \vdash \text{strGen}_{\mathcal{B}}^p (p_{\dagger}^{\mathcal{B}} u) I =_{p^{\mathcal{B}} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} v} \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}}^y(p^{\mathcal{B}} u)
\end{aligned}$$

because  $\mathcal{B}$  is a covariant fibration,  $\sum_{(w:|\mathcal{B}|(y))} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^p w$  is a set

$$\begin{aligned}
& x, y : |\mathcal{A}|; p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y, u : |\mathcal{B}|(x), v : |\mathcal{B}|(y) \\
& \vdash \text{strGen}_{\mathcal{B}}^p (p_{\dagger}^{\mathcal{B}} u) \text{refl} =_{p^{\mathcal{B}} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} v} \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}}^y(p^{\mathcal{B}} u)
\end{aligned}$$

by unfolding the definition of  $\text{strGen}_{\mathcal{B}}^p$

$$\vdash \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}}^y(p^{\mathcal{B}} u) =_{p^{\mathcal{B}} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} v} \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}}^y(p^{\mathcal{B}} u)$$

by reflexivity

Conversely, we check that straightening is a section of unstraightening by means of the following generalised lemma.

$$\begin{aligned}
& x, y : |\mathcal{A}|; p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y, u : |\mathcal{B}|(x), v : |\mathcal{B}|(y), q : u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^p v, \\
& H : (p^{\mathcal{B}} u, p_{\dagger}^{\mathcal{B}} u) =_{\sum_{(w:|\mathcal{B}|(y))} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^p w} (v, q), \\
& I : (p^{\mathcal{B}} u, \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}}^y(p^{\mathcal{B}} u)) =_{\sum_{(w:|\mathcal{B}|(y))} p^{\mathcal{B}} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} w} (v, \text{strGen}_{\mathcal{B}}^p q H) \\
& \vdash \text{unstrGen}_{\mathcal{B}}^p (\text{strGen}_{\mathcal{B}}^p q H) I =_{u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^p v} q
\end{aligned}$$

by identification induction on  $H$

$$\begin{aligned}
& x, y : |\mathcal{A}|; p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y, u : |\mathcal{B}|(x) \\
& I : (p^{\mathcal{B}} u, \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}}^y(p^{\mathcal{B}} u)) =_{\sum_{(w:|\mathcal{B}|(y))} p^{\mathcal{B}} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} w} (p^{\mathcal{B}} u, \text{strGen}_{\mathcal{B}}^p (p_{\dagger}^{\mathcal{B}} u) \text{refl}) \\
& \vdash \text{unstrGen}_{\mathcal{B}}^p (\text{strGen}_{\mathcal{B}}^p (p_{\dagger}^{\mathcal{B}} u) \text{refl}) I =_{u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^p v} p_{\dagger}^{\mathcal{B}} u
\end{aligned}$$

by unfolding the definition of  $\text{strGen}_{\mathcal{B}}^p$

$$x, y : |\mathcal{A}|; p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y, u : |\mathcal{B}|(x)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
I &: (p_*^{\mathcal{B}} u, \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}}^y(p_*^{\mathcal{B}} u)) =_{\sum_{(w:|\mathcal{B}|(y))} p_*^{\mathcal{B}} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}^y w} (p_*^{\mathcal{B}} u, \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}}^y(p_*^{\mathcal{B}} u)) \\
&\vdash \text{unstrGen}_{\mathcal{B}}^p(\text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}}^y(p_*^{\mathcal{B}} u)) I =_{u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^p v} p_{\dagger}^{\mathcal{B}} u \\
&\text{because } \mathcal{B} \text{ is a covariant fibration, } \sum_{(w:|\mathcal{B}|(y))} p_*^{\mathcal{B}} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}^y w} w \text{ is a set} \\
&x, y : |\mathcal{A}|; p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y, u : |\mathcal{B}|(x) \\
&\vdash \text{unstrGen}_{\mathcal{B}}^p(\text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}}^y(p_*^{\mathcal{B}} u)) \mathbf{refl} =_{u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^p v} p_{\dagger}^{\mathcal{B}} u \\
&\text{by unfolding the definition of } \text{unstrGen}_{\mathcal{B}}^p \\
&\vdash p_{\dagger}^{\mathcal{B}} u =_{u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^p v} p_{\dagger}^{\mathcal{B}} u \\
&\text{by reflexivity}
\end{aligned}$$

□

#### 5.4.2 The underlying lens of a covariant fibration

We are now equipped to construct the underlying lens of a given covariant fibration.

**Construction 129** (The underlying lens of a covariant fibration). A covariant fibration of reflexive graphs  $\mathcal{B}$  over a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$  induces a (canonical, as we shall see) oplax covariant lens structure on the diagonal family  $\mathcal{B}_{\text{rx}}$  via straightening.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
x, y : |\mathcal{A}|; p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y, u : |\mathcal{B}|(x) \vdash & x : |\mathcal{A}|, u : |\mathcal{B}|(x) \vdash \\
\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{rx}}}^p u : |\mathcal{B}|(y) & \text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{rx}}}^x u : (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x)_*^{\mathcal{B}} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x)} u \\
\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{rx}}}^p u \equiv p_*^{\mathcal{B}} u & \text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{rx}}}^x u \equiv \text{str}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x}(\text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u)
\end{array}$$

Theorem 130 below shows that if we take the display of the underlying lens of a covariant fibration, we obtain the original displayed reflexive graph.

**Theorem 130** (Roundtrip for fibrations of reflexive graphs). *Let  $(U, E)$  be a univalent universe, and let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a  $U$ -small covariant fibration of reflexive graphs over a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then the display  $\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}_{\text{rx}}$  of the underlying lens of  $\mathcal{B}$  may be identified with  $\mathcal{B}$  by means of an equivalence of displayed reflexive graphs  $\mathcal{B} \approx_{\text{DRxGphOver}_U(\mathcal{A})} \text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}_{\text{rx}}$ .*

*Proof.* We shall use the characterisation of identifications of displayed reflexive graphs that we established in Section 4.2. In particular, we shall construct an equivalence of displayed reflexive graphs  $\phi : \mathcal{B} \approx_{\text{DRxGphOver}_U(\mathcal{A})} \text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}_{\text{rx}}$ . We can use the identity equivalence on vertices, and the straightening–unstraightening equivalence on edges:

$$\begin{aligned}
|\phi| &: \prod_{(x:|\mathcal{A}|)} \text{Equiv}(|\mathcal{B}|(x), |\mathcal{B}_{\text{rx}}(x)|) \\
|\phi|x &:= \text{idnEquiv}_{|\mathcal{B}|(x)} \\
\phi^{\approx} &: \prod_{(x,y:|\mathcal{A}|)} \prod_{(p:x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y)} \prod_{(u:|\mathcal{B}|(x))} \prod_{(v:|\mathcal{B}|(y))} \text{Equiv}(u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^p v, u \approx_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}_{\text{rx}}}^p v) \\
&\text{by introduction} \\
x, y &: |\mathcal{A}|; p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y, u : |\mathcal{B}|(x), v : |\mathcal{B}|(y) \\
&\vdash \phi^{\approx} xypuv : \text{Equiv}(u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^p v, u \approx_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}_{\text{rx}}}^p v) \\
&\text{by computation} \\
&\vdash \phi^{\approx} xypuv : \text{Equiv}(u \approx_{\mathcal{B}}^p v, p_*^{\mathcal{B}} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} v) \\
&\text{by straightening} \\
&\vdash \phi^{\approx} xypuv := \text{str}_{\mathcal{B}}^p
\end{aligned}$$

The displayed reflexivity data are preserved up to definitional equality, as we have:

$$\phi^{\text{rx}} : \prod_{(x:|\mathcal{A}|)} \prod_{(u:|\mathcal{B}|(x))} \phi^{\approx} x x (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}^x u) u (\text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}} x u) =_{u \approx_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}_{\text{rx}}}^{\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}} x} u} \text{rx}_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}_{\text{rx}}}^x u$$

by introduction

$x : |\mathcal{A}|, u : |\mathcal{B}|(x)$

$$\vdash \phi^{rx}xu : \phi^{\approx}xx(rx_{\mathcal{A}}^xu)uu(rx_{\mathcal{B}}xu) =_{u \approx_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}_{rx}}^{rx_{\mathcal{A}}^x} u} rx_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}_{rx}}^x u$$

by computation

$$\vdash \phi^{rx}xu : \text{str}_{\mathcal{B}}^P(rx_{\mathcal{B}}^xu) =_{(rx_{\mathcal{A}}^xu)u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x)} u} \text{str}_{\mathcal{B}}^P(rx_{\mathcal{B}}^xu)$$

by reflexivity

$$\vdash \phi^{rx}xu \equiv \mathbf{refl}$$

□

## 5.5 Characterisation of fibred reflexive graphs

Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be an oplax covariant lens of  $U$ -small path objects over a reflexive graph  $\mathcal{A}$ . By Lemma 123, the display  $\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}$  is a covariant fibration. By Construction 129, we obtain an oplax covariant lens  $(\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B})_{rx}$  that we may compare with  $\mathcal{B}$ . We first recall from Computation 66 the underlying reflexive graph of each component  $(\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B})_{rx}(x)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} |(\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B})_{rx}(x)| &\equiv |\mathcal{B}(x)| \\ u \approx_{(\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B})_{rx}(x)} v &\equiv \text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^{rx_{\mathcal{A}}^x} u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(x)} v \\ rx_{(\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B})_{rx}(x)} u &\equiv \text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u \end{aligned}$$

**Computation 131.** We compute the lens structure of  $(\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B})_{rx}$  as follows, recalling Construction 129 and Lemma 123.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{push}_{(\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B})_{rx}}^P u &\equiv p_*^{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}} u \equiv \text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^P u \\ \text{pushRx}_{(\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B})_{rx}}^x u &\equiv \text{str}_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}}^{rx_{\mathcal{A}}^x} (rx_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}}^x u) \equiv \text{str}_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}}^{rx_{\mathcal{A}}^x} (\text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u) \end{aligned}$$

**Construction 132.** We have an equivalence  $\eta_{\mathcal{B}} : \mathcal{B} \approx_{|\mathcal{A}| \text{ RxCat}_U} (\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B})_{rx}$  of underlying families of reflexive graphs over  $\mathcal{A}$ , which we define below making use of Corollary 125, Construction 45, and Lemma 46.

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_{\mathcal{B}} : \mathcal{B} &\approx_{|\mathcal{A}| \text{ RxCat}_U} (\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B})_{rx} \\ |\eta_{\mathcal{B}}x| &\equiv rx_{U/E} |\mathcal{B}(x)| \\ (\eta_{\mathcal{B}}x)^{\approx} &\equiv \lambda u, v. (\text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u \cdot_{\mathcal{B}(x)} -) \\ (\eta_{\mathcal{B}}x)^{rx} &\equiv \lambda u. \text{runit}_{\text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u} \end{aligned}$$

**Computation 133.** Write  $\text{lex}_{\text{LensStr}_{\mathcal{A}}^+}^{\eta_{\mathcal{B}}} \mathcal{B} : \text{LensStr}_{\mathcal{A}}^+(\eta_{\mathcal{B}})$  for the extension of the lens structure from  $\mathcal{B}$  onto the equivalence  $\eta_{\mathcal{B}} : \mathcal{B} \approx_{|\mathcal{A}| \text{ RxCat}_U} (\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B})_{rx}$  of families of reflexive graphs. Likewise, write  $\text{rex}_{\text{LensStr}_{\mathcal{A}}^+}^{\eta_{\mathcal{B}}} (\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B})_{rx} : \text{LensStr}_{\mathcal{B}}^+(\eta_{\mathcal{B}})$  for the corresponding extension of the lens structure of  $(\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B})_{rx}$  onto  $\eta_{\mathcal{B}}$ . We have the definitional computations of the lens structures:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{push}_{\text{lex}_{\text{LensStr}_{\mathcal{A}}^+}^{\eta_{\mathcal{B}}} \mathcal{B}}^P u &\equiv \text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^P u \\ \text{pushRx}_{\text{lex}_{\text{LensStr}_{\mathcal{A}}^+}^{\eta_{\mathcal{B}}} \mathcal{B}}^x u &\equiv \text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x (\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^{rx_{\mathcal{A}}^x} u) \cdot_{\mathcal{B}(x)} \text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u \\ \text{push}_{\text{rex}_{\text{LensStr}_{\mathcal{A}}^+}^{\eta_{\mathcal{B}}} (\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B})_{rx}}^P u &\equiv \text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^P u \\ \text{pushRx}_{\text{rex}_{\text{LensStr}_{\mathcal{A}}^+}^{\eta_{\mathcal{B}}} (\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B})_{rx}}^x u &\equiv \text{str}_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}}^{rx_{\mathcal{A}}^x} (\text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u) \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We outline the explicit computations below, unfolding Constructions 115 and 129 and Computation 131.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\text{push}_{\text{lex}_{\text{LensStr}_{\mathcal{A}}^+}^{\eta_{\mathcal{B}}}}^P \mathcal{B}^u & \text{pushRx}_{\text{lex}_{\text{LensStr}_{\mathcal{A}}^+}^{\eta_{\mathcal{B}}}}^x \mathcal{B}^u \\
\text{by Construction 115} & \text{by Construction 115} \\
\equiv |\eta_{\mathcal{B}} y| (\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^P u) & \equiv |\eta_{\mathcal{B}} x|^{\approx} (\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}, \mathcal{A}^x} u) u (\text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u) \\
\text{by Construction 129} & \text{by Construction 129} \\
\equiv \text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^P u & \equiv \text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x (\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}, \mathcal{A}^x} u) \cdot_{\mathcal{B}(x)} \text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u \\
\\
\text{push}_{\text{rex}_{\text{LensStr}_{\mathcal{A}}^+}^{\eta_{\mathcal{B}}}}^P (\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B})_{\text{rx}} u & \text{pushRx}_{\text{rex}_{\text{LensStr}_{\mathcal{A}}^+}^{\eta_{\mathcal{B}}}}^x (\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B})_{\text{rx}} u \\
\text{by Construction 115} & \text{by Construction 115} \\
\equiv \text{push}_{(\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B})_{\text{rx}}}^P (|\eta_{\mathcal{B}} x| u) & \equiv \text{pushRx}_{(\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B})_{\text{rx}}}^x (|\eta_{\mathcal{B}} x| u) \\
\text{by Construction 129} & \text{by Construction 129} \\
\equiv \text{push}_{(\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B})_{\text{rx}}}^P u & \equiv \text{pushRx}_{(\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B})_{\text{rx}}}^x u \\
\text{by Computation 131} & \text{by Computation 131} \\
\equiv \text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^P u & \equiv \text{str}_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}, \mathcal{A}^x} (\text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u) \quad \square
\end{array}$$

**Theorem 134** (Roundtrip for oplax covariant lenses of path objects). *The equivalence  $\eta_{\mathcal{B}} : \mathcal{B} \approx_{|\mathcal{A}| \upharpoonright \text{RxGph}_U} (\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B})_{\text{rx}}$  of families of reflexive graphs extends to an equivalence  $\mathcal{B} \approx_{\text{Lens}_{\mathcal{A}}^+} (\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B})_{\text{rx}}$  of oplax covariant lenses over  $\mathcal{A}$ .*

*Proof.* We must construct a displayed equivalence  $\mathcal{B} \approx_{\text{disp}_{|\mathcal{A}| \upharpoonright \text{RxGph}_U}^{\eta_{\mathcal{B}}} \text{LensStr}_{\mathcal{A}}^+} (\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B})_{\text{rx}}$  of lens structures over  $\eta_{\mathcal{B}}$ . This consists of an (ordinary) equivalence of lenses as below:

$$\text{lex}_{\text{LensStr}_{\mathcal{A}}^+}^{\eta_{\mathcal{B}}} \mathcal{B} \approx_{\text{LensStr}_{\mathcal{A}}^+(\eta_{\mathcal{B}})} \text{rex}_{\text{LensStr}_{\mathcal{A}}^+}^{\eta_{\mathcal{B}}} (\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B})_{\text{rx}}$$

Unfolding the definition of  $\text{Lens}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \eta_{\mathcal{B}}$  from Construction 115 and using Computation 133, we see that the pushforward datum for each lens depicted above is definitionally equal to that of  $\mathcal{B}$ . Therefore, it suffices to construct an equivalence between oplax unitors as below:

$$\begin{array}{l}
x : |\mathcal{A}|, u : |\mathcal{B}(x)| \\
\vdash \text{pushRx}_{\text{lex}_{\text{LensStr}_{\mathcal{A}}^+}^{\eta_{\mathcal{B}}}}^x \mathcal{B}^u = \dots \text{pushRx}_{\text{rex}_{\text{LensStr}_{\mathcal{A}}^+}^{\eta_{\mathcal{B}}}}^x (\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B})_{\text{rx}}^u \\
\text{by Computation 133} \\
\vdash \text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x (\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}, \mathcal{A}^x} u) \cdot_{\mathcal{B}(x)} \text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u = \dots \text{str}_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}, \mathcal{A}^x} (\text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u) \\
\text{by Construction 126} \\
\vdash \text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x (\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}, \mathcal{A}^x} u) \cdot_{\mathcal{B}(x)} \text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u = \dots \text{strGen}_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}, \mathcal{A}^x} (\text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^x u) (\dots)
\end{array}$$

Up to definitional equality, the goal above is a substitution instance of the following more general goal which we establish below.

$$\begin{array}{l}
x, y : |\mathcal{A}|; p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y, u : |\mathcal{B}(x)|, v : |\mathcal{B}(y)|, q : \text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^P u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} v, \\
H : (p_{\ast}^{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}} u, p_{\dagger}^{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}} u) =_{\Sigma(|\mathcal{B}(y)|)} (v, q) \\
\vdash \text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^y (\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^P u) \cdot_{\mathcal{B}} q =_{\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}, \mathcal{A}^x} (\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^P u) \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} v} \text{strGen}_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}}^P q H
\end{array}$$

by Lemma 123 and Computation 131



$$\begin{aligned}
& x, y : |\mathcal{A}|; p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y, u : |\mathcal{B}(x)|, v : |\mathcal{B}(y)|, q : \text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} v, \\
& H : (\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u, \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}(y)}(\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u)) =_{\Sigma(|\mathcal{B}(y)|)} (v, q) \\
& \vdash \text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^y(\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u) \cdot_{\mathcal{B}} q =_{\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x}(\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u) \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} v} \text{strGen}_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}}^p q \, H
\end{aligned}$$

by identification induction on  $H$

$$\begin{aligned}
& x, y : |\mathcal{A}|; p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y, u : |\mathcal{B}(x)| \\
& \vdash \text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^y(\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u) \cdot_{\mathcal{B}} \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}(y)}(\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u) =_{\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x}(\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u) \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} \text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u} \\
& \quad \text{strGen}_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}}^p(\text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}(y)}(\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u)) \, \text{refl}
\end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 123

$$\begin{aligned}
& x, y : |\mathcal{A}|; p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y, u : |\mathcal{B}(x)| \\
& \vdash \text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^y(\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u) \cdot_{\mathcal{B}} \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}(y)}(\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u) =_{\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x}(\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u) \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} \text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u} \\
& \quad \text{strGen}_{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}}^p(p_{\dagger}^{\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}} u) \, \text{refl}
\end{aligned}$$

by Construction 126 and Lemma 123

$$\begin{aligned}
& x, y : |\mathcal{A}|; p : x \approx_{\mathcal{A}} y, u : |\mathcal{B}(x)| \\
& \vdash \text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^y(\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u) \cdot_{\mathcal{B}} \text{rx}_{\mathcal{B}(y)}(\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u) =_{\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{rx}_{\mathcal{A}}x}(\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u) \approx_{\mathcal{B}(y)} \text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u} \\
& \quad \text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^y(\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u)
\end{aligned}$$

by  $\text{runit}_{\text{pushRx}_{\mathcal{B}}^y(\text{push}_{\mathcal{B}}^p u)}$  from Construction 45 □

**Corollary 135** (Characterisation of fibred reflexive graphs). *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a reflexive graph, and let  $(U, E)$  be a univalent universe. Assuming function extensionality, the following two types are equivalent:*

1. *The type of oplax covariant (resp. lax contravariant) lenses of  $U$ -small path objects over  $\mathcal{A}$ .*
2. *The type of covariant (resp. contravariant) fibrations of  $U$ -small reflexive graphs over  $\mathcal{A}$ .*

*Proof.* An oplax covariant lens of path objects  $\mathcal{B}$  over  $\mathcal{A}$  is sent to covariant fibration  $\text{disp}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \mathcal{B}$  as described in Lemma 123. Conversely, a covariant fibration  $\mathcal{B}$  over  $\mathcal{A}$  is sent to its underlying lens of path objects  $\mathcal{B}_{\text{rx}}$  as specified in Construction 129. That these transformations are mutually inverse follows from Theorems 130 and 134, as both  $\text{Lens}_{\mathcal{A}}^+$  and  $\text{DRxGphOver}_U(\mathcal{A})$  are univalent in the presence of function extensionality.

The equivalence between lax contravariant lenses and contravariant fibrations is established from the above by duality (Sections 2.2 and 5.1). □

## References

The 1Lab Development Team. The 1Lab, 2022. URL <https://1lab.dev>.

- Peter Aczel. Homotopy type theory and the structure identity principle, February 2012. URL <https://www.newton.ac.uk/files/seminar/20120207160016301-153011.pdf>. Slides from a talk given at the Isaac Newton Institute.
- Benedikt Ahrens and Peter LeFanu Lumsdaine. Displayed categories. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 15, March 2019. doi: 10.23638/LMCS-15(1:20)2019. URL <https://lmcs.episciences.org/5252>.
- Benedikt Ahrens, Paige Randall North, Michael Shulman, and Dimitris Tsementzis. The univalence principle, 2022.
- Steve Awodey. Structuralism, invariance, and univalence. *Philosophia Mathematica*, 22 (1):1–11, 2014.
- Paolo Boldi and Sebastiano Vigna. Fibrations of graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 243(1): 21–66, 2002. ISSN 0012-365X. doi: 10.1016/S0012-365X(00)00455-6.
- Ulrik Buchholtz. Unordered pairs in homotopy type theory. Unpublished manuscript, February 2023. URL <https://ulrikbuchholtz.dk/pairs.pdf>.
- Emma Chollet, Bryce Clarke, Michael Johnson, Maurine Songa, Vincent Wang, and Gioele Zardini. Limits and colimits in a category of lenses. *Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science*, 372:164–177, November 2022. ISSN 2075-2180. doi: 10.4204/eptcs.372.12.
- Bryce Clarke. Internal split opfibrations and cofunctors. *Theory and Applications of Categories*, 35:1608–1633, 2020.
- Thierry Coquand and Nils Anders Danielsson. Isomorphism is equality. *Indagationes Mathematicae*, 24(4):1105–1120, 2013. ISSN 0019-3577. doi: 10.1016/j.indag.2013.09.002. In memory of N.G. (Dick) de Bruijn (1918–2012).
- Zinovy Diskin, Yingfei Xiong, and Krzysztof Czarnecki. From state- to delta-based bidirectional model transformations: the asymmetric case. *Journal of Object Technology*, 10:6:1–25, 2011. ISSN 1660-1769. doi: 10.5381/jot.2011.10.1.a6.
- Roy Dyckhoff and Walter Tholen. Exponentiable morphisms, partial products and pullback complements. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 49(1):103–116, 1987. ISSN 0022-4049. doi: 10.1016/0022-4049(87)90124-1.
- Michael Johnson and Robert D. Rosebrugh. Delta Lenses and Opfibrations. *Electronic Communications of the EASST*, 57:129–146, 2013. doi: 10.14279/tuj.eceasst.57.875.
- Peter T. Johnstone. Fibrations and partial products in a 2-category. *Applied Categorical Structures*, 1(2):141–179, June 1993. doi: 10.1007/BF00880041.
- Peter T. Johnstone. *Sketches of an Elephant: A Topos Theory Compendium: Volumes 1 and 2*. Number 43 in Oxford Logical Guides. Oxford Science Publications, 2002.
- Peter LeFanu Lumsdaine. Weak omega-categories from intensional type theory. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, Volume 6, Issue 3, September 2010. doi: 10.2168/LMCS-6(3:24)2010. URL <https://lmcs.episciences.org/1062>.

- Bengt Nordström, Kent Peterson, and Jan M. Smith. *Programming in Martin-Löf's Type Theory*, volume 7 of *International Series of Monographs on Computer Science*. Oxford University Press, NY, 1990.
- Christine Paulin-Mohring. Inductive definitions in the system coq rules and properties. In Marc Bezem and Jan Friso Groote, editors, *Typed Lambda Calculi and Applications*, pages 328–345, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1993. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. ISBN 978-3-540-47586-6.
- Egbert Rijke. *Classifying Types*. PhD thesis, Carnegie Mellon University, 2019.
- Egbert Rijke. Introduction to homotopy type theory. To appear, Cambridge University Press, 2022.
- Egbert Rijke, Elisabeth Stenholm, Jonathan Prieto-Cubides, Fredrik Bakke, et al. The agda-unimath library, 2023. URL <https://github.com/UniMath/agda-unimath/>.
- Guiseppe Rosolini. *Continuity and effectiveness in topoi*. PhD thesis, University of Oxford, 1986.
- Johannes Schipp von Branitz. Higher groups via displayed univalent reflexive graphs in cubical type theory. Master's thesis, Technische Universität Darmstadt, October 2020. URL <https://jsvb.xyz/files/master.pdf>.
- Johannes Schipp von Branitz and Ulrik Buchholtz. Using displayed univalent graphs to formalize higher groups in univalent foundations. Unpublished manuscript, October 2021. URL <https://jsvb.xyz/files/durges.pdf>.
- Thomas Streicher. *Investigations Into Intensional Type Theory*. Habilitation, Universität München, 1994. URL <https://www2.mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de/~streicher/HabilStreicher.pdf>.
- The Univalent Foundations Program. *Homotopy Type Theory: Univalent Foundations of Mathematics*. <https://homotopytypetheory.org/book>, Institute for Advanced Study, 2013.
- Benno van den Berg and Richard Garner. Types are weak  $\omega$ -groupoids. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, 102(2):370–394, 2011. doi: 10.1112/plms/pdq026. URL <https://londmathsoc.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1112/plms/pdq026>.
- Andrea Vezzosi, Anders Mörtberg, and Andreas Abel. Cubical Agda: A Dependently Typed Programming Language with Univalence and Higher Inductive Types. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Functional Programming*, Boston, Massachusetts, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery. doi: 10.1145/3341691.