

# Beyond Eckmann-Hilton: Commutativity in Higher Categories

Thibaut Benjamin, Ioannis Markakis, Wilfred Offord, Chiara Sarti, Jamie  
Vicary

*Department of Computer Science and Technology, University of Cambridge, 15 JJ  
Thomson Ave, CB3 0FD, Cambridge, UK*

---

## Abstract

We show that in a weak globular  $\omega$ -category, all composition operations are equivalent and commutative for cells with sufficiently degenerate boundary, which can be considered a higher-dimensional generalisation of the Eckmann-Hilton argument. Our results are formulated constructively in a type-theoretic presentation of  $\omega$ -categories. The heart of our construction is a family of padding and repadding techniques, which gives an equivalence relation between cells which are not necessarily parallel. Our work has been implemented, allowing us to explicitly compute suitable witnesses, which grow rapidly in complexity as the dimension increases. These witnesses can be exported as inhabitants of identity types in Homotopy Type Theory, and hence are of relevance in synthetic homotopy theory.

*Keywords:* higher categories, weak  $\omega$ -categories, Eckmann-Hilton, Homotopy Type Theory, formalisation

*2020 MSC:* 18N65, 18N30, 03B38, 68V20

---

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1. Motivation

Since Grothendieck's original conception of (weak, globular)  $\omega$ -groupoids, a principal goal of higher category theory has been to give an algebraic language for homotopy theory: "The task of working out the foundations of tame topology, and a corresponding structure theory for 'stratified (tame) spaces', seems to me a lot more urgent and exciting still than any program of homological, homotopical or topological algebra" [1, p. 2]. One expression of this idea is the

---

*Email addresses:* [thibaut.benjamin@universite-paris-saclay.fr](mailto:thibaut.benjamin@universite-paris-saclay.fr) (Thibaut Benjamin),  
[ioannis.markakis@cl.cam.ac.uk](mailto:ioannis.markakis@cl.cam.ac.uk) (Ioannis Markakis), [wgbo2@cam.ac.uk](mailto:wgbo2@cam.ac.uk) (Wilfred Offord),  
[cs2197@cam.ac.uk](mailto:cs2197@cam.ac.uk) (Chiara Sarti), [jamie.vicary@cl.cam.ac.uk](mailto:jamie.vicary@cl.cam.ac.uk) (Jamie Vicary)

*homotopy hypothesis*, which says that  $\omega$ -groupoids should be the same as homotopy types, and remains unproven in this setting. The definition of  $\omega$ -groupoid has since been generalised by Batanin into that of a weak  $\omega$ -category [2], and further key contributions have been made by Leinster, Maltsiniotis and Ara [3, 4, 5] among many others.

However, using these theories to produce explicit homotopy witnesses is challenging, and therefore Grothendieck’s original goal is largely unrealised. One homotopical argument with an  $\omega$ -categorical analogue is the well-known Eckmann-Hilton argument [6], which is traditionally used to establish commutativity of higher homotopy groups of topological spaces [7]. In our setting, the statement of Eckmann-Hilton is that any 2-cells whose boundaries are identity cells commute with each other, up to isomorphism, under (vertical) composition, and moreover their vertical and horizontal composites are equivalent, up to some unitor isomorphisms. In both cases, while the homotopical argument is simple, constructing the isomorphism witnessing it in the weak  $\omega$ -categorical setting is not trivial. Once constructed, however, suspending it produces isomorphisms witnessing the commutativity of any  $n$ -cells with identity boundary under composition in the  $(n - 1)^{\text{th}}$  direction.

Homotopically, it is obvious that the Eckmann-Hilton argument should extend to composites of  $n$ -cells with sufficiently degenerate boundaries in all  $n$  possible composition directions. Indeed, if our definition of  $\omega$ -category is to satisfy the homotopy hypothesis, such composites should all be commutative and equivalent in the appropriate sense. However, this has never previously been established.

In this paper, we demonstrate commutativity and equivalence of these composites for the first time. We do this by exploiting a recent type-theoretic approach to  $\omega$ -categories due to Finster and Mimram [8, 9]. This provides strong evidence that these algebraic models behave in the way that we expect. We have implemented our construction, allowing us to compute, in principle, witnesses of these results in any dimension, and by the work of Benjamin [10] export them into Homotopy Type Theory [11].

## 1.2. Globular $\omega$ -categories

In the globular setting, for  $n > 0$ , an  $n$ -cell  $a$  has source and target  $(n - 1)$ -cells  $\partial^-(a)$ ,  $\partial^+(a)$ , which we denote as  $a : \partial^-(a) \rightarrow \partial^+(a)$ . For  $n > 1$  we impose the *globularity condition*, that whenever  $a : u \rightarrow v$ , then  $u$  and  $v$  have the same boundary. We may further define the  $k$ -dimensional source and target  $\partial_k^-(a)$ ,  $\partial_k^+(a)$  for any  $0 \leq k < n$  by taking successive boundaries.

The structure of a higher category allows  $n$ -cells to be composed in a variety of ways. In particular, if  $a, b$  are  $n$ -cells with  $\partial_k^+(a) = \partial_k^-(b)$ , for  $0 \leq k < n$  we may form their *binary  $k$ -composite*  $a *_k b$ , which we understand as “gluing”  $a$  and  $b$  along their common  $k$ -dimensional boundary. We illustrate this in Figures 1a and 1b, which show the 1- and 0-composites, respectively, of a pair of 2-cells.

The axioms of a higher category also give us access to a class of cells, called *coherences*, that serve as witnesses that their source and target are in some



Figure 1: Composites of a pair of 2-cells.

sense “equivalent”. To give some first examples, given a 0-cell  $x$ , we may construct the *identity*, a 1-cell  $\text{id}_x : x \rightarrow x$ , and the *unbiased unitor*, a 2-cell  $u_x : \text{id}_x *_0 \text{id}_x \rightarrow \text{id}_x$ ; and given a 1-cell  $f : x \rightarrow y$ , we may construct the *left unitor*  $\lambda_f : \text{id}_x *_0 f \rightarrow f$ , and the *right unitor*  $\rho_f : f *_0 \text{id}_x \rightarrow f$ . All such coherences are part of a broader class of cells called *equivalences*, which are cells with *inverses* satisfying a cancellation law up to higher equivalences. For an equivalence  $e : u \rightarrow v$ , we denote its inverse  $e^{-1} : v \rightarrow u$ .

In a higher category, there is no reason to expect that the composition operations are related. For example, for 2-cells  $a$  and  $b$ , we do not in general expect an equivalence between  $a *_0 b$  and  $a *_1 b$  when they are both defined; indeed testing these cells for equivalence would not usually make sense, as they have different boundaries. However, if the cell boundaries are degenerate – that is, given by identities – we can make this question well-posed by composing  $a *_0 b$  with the coherences  $u_x$  and  $u_x^{-1}$ , to change its boundary, a procedure which we call *padding*. We can then construct the following equivalence, which we illustrate in Figure 2:

$$H(a, b) : a *_1 b \rightarrow u_x^{-1} *_1 (a *_0 b) *_1 u_x$$

Furthermore, applying a duality construction, we obtain a dual equivalence:

$$H^{\text{op}}(a, b) : a *_1 b \rightarrow u_x^{-1} *_1 (b *_0 a) *_1 u_x$$

Finally, we may combine these to obtain the following equivalence:

$$EH(a, b) := H(a, b) *_2 (H^{\text{op}}(b, a))^{-1} : a *_1 b \rightarrow b *_1 a$$

Hence we conclude that the operation  $*_1$  is commutative up to equivalence. This construction has been described, for instance, by Cheng and Gurski [12], and can be seen as a categorical version of the classical Eckmann-Hilton argument.

### 1.3. Results

In this paper, we use a type-theoretic definition of  $\omega$ -category to generalise this construction, producing a parameterised family of equivalences as follows, where  $a, b$  are  $n$ -cells with fully degenerate boundaries<sup>1</sup>, and where  $0 \leq k, l < n$  are distinct composition directions:

$$H_{k,l}^n(a, b) : a *_k b \rightarrow \Theta_{k,l}^n(a *_l b)$$

<sup>1</sup>For  $n > 1$ , an  $n$ -cell is *fully degenerate* when it is of the form  $\text{id}_x^n := \text{id}(\dots(\text{id}_x)\dots)$ , where  $x$  is a 0-cell.




Figure 2: The equivalence  $H : a *_1 b \rightarrow u_x^{-1} *_1 (a *_0 b) *_1 u_x$ .

Here  $\Theta_{p,q}^n$  is a *padding* operation, which composes its argument with coherences, generalising our earlier use of  $u_x$  and  $u_x^{-1}$ . Our padding technique is inspired by similar constructions in the work of Finster et al. [13] and Fujii et al.[14], and includes these as a special case.

We interpret the cells  $H_{k,l}^n(a, b)$  as a *congruence* between the composites  $a *_k b$  and  $a *_l b$ . Congruence is a relation we introduce, extending the notion of equivalence to cells with different boundaries. We define it as the smallest equivalence relation on  $n$ -cells extending equivalence such that any cell is congruent to its composite in any dimension with a coherence. We note that in a strict  $\omega$ -category, coherence cells are all identities, and so congruence and equivalence coincide. Thus congruence is a minimal extension of equivalence that allows “fixing” the boundaries of cells using coherences.

We can apply a duality operation as in dimension 2 to produce another  $(n+1)$ -cell with type  $b *_k a \rightarrow \Theta_{k,l}^n(a *_l b)$ , and compose to obtain an equivalence:

$$EH_{k,l}^n(a, b) : a *_k b \rightarrow b *_k a$$

This witnesses that composition of  $n$ -cells with degenerate boundary is commutative in any choice of direction  $k$ , up to equivalence. Such a construction can reasonably be described as a *higher Eckmann-Hilton argument*. Furthermore, we have a family of such witnesses, according to the choice of the second parameter  $l$ .

Furthermore, our  $H_{k,l}^n$  construction can be extended to the case where paddings can appear on both sides, yielding cells  $H_{p,k,l}^n$  as follows:

$$H_{p,k,l}^n : \Theta_{p,k}^n(a *_k b) \rightarrow \Theta_{p,l}^n(a *_l b)$$

When  $p = k$  the operation  $\Theta_{p,k}^n(-)$  becomes the identity, and so this construction is an extension of our main result, with:

$$H_{k,k,l}^n = H_{k,l}^n \quad H_{l,k,l}^n = (H_{k,l}^n)^{-1}$$

These cells  $H_{p,k,l}^n$  together with their opposites can be arranged in a structure we call the *Eckmann-Hilton sphere*, which we illustrate for  $n = 3$  in Figure 3. This structure has been studied before in semi-strict models [15], but not in the fully weak setting.




Figure 3: The 3-dimensional Eckmann-Hilton sphere.

#### 1.4. Type theory

We work in the type theory **CaTT** due to Finster and Mimram [8], whose models correspond to Grothendieck-Maltsiniotis [16] or to Batanin-Leinster  $\omega$ -categories [5, 17]. Due to these equivalences, our results are valid in any of those models. Benjamin et. al. [18] have further shown that the type-theoretical approach to higher category theory is equivalent to the *computadic* approach of Dean et. al. [19], and thanks to this, many results for computads carry over directly to our setting. We will freely quote their implications for **CaTT**. In particular, we will use the suspension and the opposite operations [20] for **CaTT**, as well as the invertibility constructions of Benjamin and Markakis [21], which have been constructed using the computadic approach.

The theory **CaTT** has an interpretation in Homotopy Type Theory [10], and as a result our constructions can be exported as inhabitants of identity types. The Eckmann-Hilton cell  $\text{EH}_{1,0}^2$  has been previously constructed in Homotopy Type Theory [11], which easily yields  $\text{EH}_{n-1,n-2}^n$  by changing the base type. However, for the remaining cases of  $\text{EH}_{k,l}^n$ , this is the first explicit algebraic construction. Furthermore, our setting is more general than that of Homotopy Type Theory in two ways. Firstly, it is *fully weak*, containing equivalences such as the unbiased unitor  $u_x : \text{id}_x \rightarrow \text{id}_x *_0 \text{id}_x$  that are identities in Homotopy Type Theory. Secondly, it is *directed*, i.e. not all cells have to be invertible. Thus our construction applies to a wider class of examples.

The type theory **CaTT** has been implemented as a proof assistant [22], in which we have automated our construction as a meta-operation. This allows us to evaluate the cells  $\text{H}_{k,l}^n$  for any given parameter values, and in Appendix A we show that the complexity of these composites grows quickly with dimension. Due to their intricate structure, defining these cells directly by hand would likely not be feasible.

#### 1.5. Technical approach

Our main result is Theorem 4.4, which demonstrates congruence for  $a *_k b$  and  $a *_l b$  when  $a, b$  have sufficiently degenerate boundary, by constructing an equivalence




Figure 4: Construction of the base cases  $H_{n-1,0}^n$  for the case  $n = 2$ .

as follows:

$$H_{k,l}^n(a, b) : a *_k b \rightarrow \Theta_{k,l}^n(a *_l b)$$

These cells are constructed by induction, and the primary technical obstacle is definition of the base cases  $H_{n-1,0}^n(a, b)$  and  $H_{0,n-1}^n(a, b)$ . Once these cases are established, we obtain the remaining cases using a *naturality* operation which allows us to construct  $H_{k,l}^{n+1}(a, b)$  from  $H_{k,l}^n(a, b)$ , and a *suspension* operation which allows us to construct  $H_{k+1,l+1}^{n+1}(a, b)$  from  $H_{kl}^n(a, b)$ .

Here we give an outline of our approach to defining the base cases, to serve as an informal preview of the full construction given in Section 3. The base case  $H_{n-1,0}^n(a, b)$  is constructed as the following composite, which we illustrate in Figure 4:

$$H_{n-1,0}^n(a, b) = X_1 *_n X_2 *_n X_3 *_n X_4$$

We now examine these four steps in turn.

*Step 1. Application of Generalised Unitors.* In the first step, our goal is to apply equivalences to transform the cells  $a$  and  $b$  into their identity composites  $a *_0 \text{id}_x^n$  and  $\text{id}_x^n *_0 b$ , respectively. This cannot be done directly, as these cells do not have the same boundary. Instead we build coherences as follows, which we call *generalised unitors*:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_a^n &: \Theta_\rho^n(a *_0 \text{id}_x^n) \rightarrow a \\ \lambda_b^n &: \Theta_\lambda^n(\text{id}_x^n *_0 b) \rightarrow b \end{aligned}$$

Here  $\Theta_\rho^n(-)$  and  $\Theta_\lambda^n(-)$  are padding operations which iteratively compose their argument with generalised right or left unitors respectively. This yields the following:

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 &: a *_n b \rightarrow \Theta_\rho^n(a *_0 \text{id}_x^n) *_n \Theta_\lambda^n(\text{id}_x^n *_0 b) \\ X_1 &= (\rho_a^n)^{-1} *_n (\lambda_b^n)^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

*Step 2. Repadding.* For the next step, we apply equivalences which modify the generalised left and right unitors, transforming them into generalised *unbiased* unitors. This “unbiasing” process is related to the familiar coherence equation  $\rho_I = \lambda_I$  of monoidal categories [23, Equation 5.2], which recognizes that left and right unitors become equivalent at the monoidal unit  $I$ . This yields equivalences as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta_{\rho \rightarrow u}^n(a * \text{id}_x^n) &: \Theta_\rho^n(a * \text{id}_x^n) \rightarrow \Theta_{n-1,0}^n(a * \text{id}_x^n) \\ \Theta_{\lambda \rightarrow u}^n(\text{id}_x^n * b) &: \Theta_\lambda^n(\text{id}_x^n * b) \rightarrow \Theta_{n-1,0}^n(\text{id}_x^n * b)\end{aligned}$$

which comprise our next cell in the composite:

$$\begin{aligned}X_2 &: \Theta_\rho^n(a * \text{id}_x^n) *_{n-1} \Theta_\lambda^n(\text{id}_x^n * b) \rightarrow \Theta_{n-1,0}^n(a * \text{id}_x^n) *_{n-1} \Theta_{n-1,0}^n(\text{id}_x^n * b) \\ X_2 &= \Theta_{\rho \rightarrow u}^n(a * \text{id}_x^n) *_{n-1} \Theta_{\lambda \rightarrow u}^n(\text{id}_x^n * b)\end{aligned}$$

*Step 3. Pseudofunctoriality of Padding.* At this point, both  $a * \text{id}_x^n$  and  $\text{id}_x^n * b$  are present in the term with the same unbiased padding. This allows us to apply a *pseudofunctoriality of padding* construction  $\Xi$ , which relates the composite of paddings to the padding of the composite. This construction takes the form of a cell:

$$\begin{aligned}X_3 &: \Theta_{n-1,0}^n(a * \text{id}_x^n) *_{n-1} \Theta_{n-1,0}^n(\text{id}_x^n * b) \rightarrow \Theta_{n-1,0}^n((a * \text{id}_x^n) *_{n-1} (\text{id}_x^n * b)) \\ X_3 &= \Xi_{n-1,0}^n(a * \text{id}_x^n, \text{id}_x^n * b)\end{aligned}$$

*Step 4. Interchanger.* In the final step, we apply the standard interchanger coherence, which recognizes that the following composites are equivalent:

$$\zeta^n : (a * \text{id}_x^n) *_{n-1} (\text{id}_x^n * b) \rightarrow a * b$$

We apply an unbiased padding to this interchanger to obtain the final cell in our composite. Below, the notation  $\uparrow$  indicates the *functorialisation* construction, which we describe in Section 2.2:

$$\begin{aligned}X_4 &: \Theta_{n-1,0}^n((a * \text{id}_x^n) *_{n-1} (\text{id}_x^n * b)) \rightarrow \Theta_{n-1,0}^n(a * b) \\ X_4 &= (\Theta_{n-1,0}^n \uparrow v_0^n) \llbracket \zeta^n \rrbracket\end{aligned}$$

The construction of the cell  $H_{0,n-1}^n(a, b)$  makes use of similar components. This concludes the overview of our construction.

## 2. CaTT and Previous Work

The type theory **CaTT** gives a convenient inductive syntax for the theory of  $\omega$ -categories. More specifically, contexts  $\Gamma$  of **CaTT** correspond to *finite computads*, which are finite generating data for free  $\omega$ -categories. Terms  $\Gamma \vdash t : A$  of  $\Gamma$  correspond to the cells of the  $\omega$ -category generated by  $\Gamma$ , with the type  $A$  indicating the source, target, and dimension of  $t$ . Models of **CaTT** in the sense of Dybjer [24] are exactly  $\omega$ -categories in the sense of Grothendieck-Maltsiniotis and Batanin-Leinster [16, 5, 17], and thus all our constructions hold for any cells with degenerate boundary in an  $\omega$ -category.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{\emptyset : \text{Ctx}} \qquad \frac{\Gamma : \text{Ctx} \quad A : \text{Ty}}{(\Gamma, x : A) : \text{Ctx}} (x \notin \text{Var}(\Gamma)) \\
\\
\frac{}{\star : \text{Ty}} \qquad \frac{A : \text{Ty} \quad u : \text{Tm} \quad v : \text{Tm}}{u \rightarrow_A v : \text{Ty}} \\
\\
\frac{}{x : \text{Tm}} \qquad \frac{\Gamma : \text{Ctx} \quad A : \text{Ty} \quad \sigma : \text{Sub}}{\text{coh}(\Gamma : A)[\sigma] : \text{Tm}} \\
\\
\frac{}{\langle \rangle : \text{Sub}} \qquad \frac{\sigma : \text{Sub} \quad t : \text{Tm}}{\langle \sigma, x \mapsto t \rangle : \text{Sub}}
\end{array}$$

Figure 5: The untyped syntax of  $\text{CaTT}$ .

$$\begin{array}{ll}
x[\langle \rangle] := x & x[\langle \sigma, y \mapsto t \rangle] := x[\sigma] \text{ if } x \neq y \\
x[\langle \sigma, x \mapsto t \rangle] := t & \text{coh}(\Gamma : A)[\tau][\sigma] := \text{coh}(\Gamma : A)[\tau \circ \sigma] \\
\star[\sigma] := \star & (u \rightarrow_A v)[\sigma] := u[\sigma] \rightarrow_{A[\sigma]} v[\sigma] \\
\langle \rangle \circ \sigma := \langle \rangle & \langle \tau, x \mapsto t \rangle \circ \sigma := \langle \tau \circ \sigma, x \mapsto t[\sigma] \rangle
\end{array}$$

Figure 6: Definition of the action of substitutions

### 2.1. The Type Theory $\text{CaTT}$

The type theory  $\text{CaTT}$  has 4 kinds of syntactic entities: contexts, types, terms, and substitutions. The introduction rules for this untyped syntax is presented in Figure 5. We assume a countable alphabet  $x, y, z, f, g, h, a, b \dots$  of variable symbols  $\mathcal{V}$ . For a context  $\Gamma$ ,  $\text{Var}(\Gamma)$  is the set of variables in the context.

We give the definition of substitution application and composition in Figure 6. We define also the *support*  $\text{supp}_\Gamma(t)$  (resp.  $\text{supp}_\Gamma(A)$ ,  $\text{supp}_\Gamma(\sigma)$ ) of a term  $t$ , (resp. a type  $A$ , or substitution  $\sigma$ ) relative to a context  $\Gamma$ , to be the union ranging over  $(x : B) \in \Gamma$  such that  $x$  appears in  $t$  (resp.  $A$ ,  $\sigma$ ) of the sets  $\{x\} \cup \text{supp}_\Gamma(B)$ . When there is no ambiguity, we omit the index  $\Gamma$ . We say a term  $t$  (resp. a type  $A$ ) is *full* in a context  $\Gamma$  if  $\text{supp}_\Gamma(t) = \text{Var}(\Gamma)$  (resp.  $\text{supp}_\Gamma(A) = \text{Var}(\Gamma)$ ).

A special role in  $\text{CaTT}$  is played by *pasting contexts*, a class of contexts that correspond to certain pastings of discs. They may be characterised formally via a bijection with finite rooted planar trees (*Batanin trees*). Given such a tree, we assign to each node  $N$  a sequence of labels  $v_1, \dots, v_{n+1}$  taken from our set of variables  $\mathcal{V}$ , where  $n$  is the number of children of  $N$ . To each node  $N$  we then recursively assign a type  $\text{Ty}(N)$  for its variables: the type of the root is  $\star$  and the type of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  child of a node  $N$  labelled  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  is  $(v_i \rightarrow_{\text{Ty}(N)} v_{i+1})$ . To






Figure 7: The correspondence between pasting contexts, Batanin trees and pastings of discs.

produce the context associated with such a labelled tree, it remains to choose an order on the variables: we fix an arbitrary ordering for each tree, such that every positive-dimensional variable is listed after its source and target. We illustrate this correspondence in Figure 7; formal treatments are available in the literature [18, Theorem 5.5].

We write  $\Gamma \vdash_{\text{ps}}$  if  $\Gamma$  is a pasting context. A nontrivial<sup>2</sup> pasting context  $\Gamma$  has well-defined *source* and *target* pasting contexts  $\partial^-\Gamma$  and  $\partial^+\Gamma$ , corresponding to the trees obtained by removing the leaves of maximal height, and keeping either the leftmost or rightmost labels for the new leaves, respectively. Denoting  $\Gamma$  the pasting context defined in Figure 7, its source of and targets are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial^-\Gamma &= (x : \star, y : \star, f : x \rightarrow_\star y, z : \star, g : y \rightarrow_\star z) \\ \partial^+\Gamma &= (x : \star, y : \star, f : x \rightarrow_\star y, z : \star, k : y \rightarrow_\star z) \end{aligned}$$

The untyped syntax of **CaTT** is subject to 4 judgements, the derivation rules for which are presented in Figure 8:

- $\Gamma \vdash$  the judgement that  $\Gamma$  is a valid context
- $\Gamma \vdash A$  the judgement that  $A$  is a valid type in  $\Gamma$
- $\Gamma \vdash t : A$  the judgement that  $t$  is a term of type  $A$  in  $\Gamma$
- $\Gamma \vdash \sigma : \Delta$  the judgement that  $\sigma$  is a substitution  $\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta$

Substitution and composition preserve those judgements as expected [9, Prop. 3], and together with the identity substitutions  $\text{id}_\Gamma$ , contexts of **CaTT** thus form a category.

The coh-introduction rule has a side condition (\*) which can be satisfied in two ways:

$$(*) \quad \begin{cases} A = u \rightarrow_B v \text{ where } u \text{ is full in } \partial^-\Gamma \text{ and } v \text{ full in } \partial^+\Gamma \\ A = u \rightarrow_B v \text{ where both } u \text{ and } v \text{ are full in } \Gamma \end{cases}$$

<sup>2</sup>The trivial pasting context is the point context  $\mathbb{P} = (x : \star)$ .

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{\emptyset \vdash} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash \quad \Gamma \vdash A}{(\Gamma, x : A) \vdash} (x \notin \text{Var}(\Gamma)) \\
\\
\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \star} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A \quad \Gamma \vdash u : A \quad \Gamma \vdash v : A}{\Gamma \vdash u \rightarrow_A v} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash \quad (x : A) \in \Gamma}{\Gamma \vdash x : A} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash_{ps} \quad \Gamma \vdash A \quad \Delta \vdash \sigma : \Gamma}{\Delta \vdash \text{coh}(\Gamma : A)[\sigma] : A[[\sigma]]} (*) \\
\\
\frac{\langle \rangle : \emptyset \rightarrow \Gamma}{\langle \rangle : \emptyset \rightarrow \Gamma} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash \sigma : \Delta \quad \Delta, x : A \vdash \quad \Gamma \vdash t : A[[\sigma]]}{\Gamma \vdash \langle \sigma, x \mapsto t \rangle : (\Delta, x : A)}
\end{array}$$

Figure 8: Typing rules of **CaTT**.

In the first case,  $u$  and  $v$  are ways to compose the source and target of  $\Gamma$ , and the term  $\text{coh}(\Gamma : A)[\text{id}]$  is a composition of the entire pasting context  $\Gamma$ . In the second case,  $\text{coh}(\Gamma : A)[\text{id}]$  is an equivalence between the operations  $u$  and  $v$ .

**Definition 2.1.** We say a well-typed term  $t$  of the form  $\text{coh}(\Gamma : A)[\sigma]$  is a composite if its typing derivation uses the first side-condition, and a coherence if it uses the second side-condition.

**Definition 2.2.** We define the dimension of types, terms in a context, and contexts as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\dim(\star) &:= -1 & \dim(u \rightarrow_A v) &:= \dim A + 1 \\
\dim_\Gamma(t) &:= \dim A + 1 & \text{for } \Gamma \vdash t : A \\
\dim(\Gamma) &:= \max\{\dim_\Gamma(x) : x \in \text{Var}(\Gamma)\}
\end{aligned}$$

We write just  $\dim(t)$  for  $\dim_\Gamma(t)$  and  $u \rightarrow v$  for  $u \rightarrow_A v$  where there is no ambiguity. We refer to terms in a context  $\Gamma$  as *cells* of  $\Gamma$ , and  $n$ -dimensional terms as *n-cells*. If  $\Gamma \vdash t : u \rightarrow_A v$ , we write  $u = \partial^- t$  and  $v = \partial^+ t$ . These source and target operations can be iterated, and we write  $\partial_k^- t$  and  $\partial_k^+ t$  for the  $k$ -dimensional source and target of  $t$ , respectively.

The rules of **CaTT** allow us to construct familiar categorical operations. We first define the *sphere* and *disc* contexts:

**Definition 2.3** (Sphere and Disc contexts). We define the contexts  $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  and  $\mathbb{D}^n$  and the type  $\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \vdash \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  for  $n \geq 0$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{S}^{-1} &:= \emptyset & \mathbb{S}^{n+1} &:= (\mathbb{S}^n, d_-^{n+1} : \mathbb{S}^n, d_+^{n+1} : \mathbb{S}^n) \\
\mathbb{S}^{-1} &:= \star & \mathbb{S}^{n+1} &:= d_-^{n+1} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}^n} d_+^{n+1} \\
\mathbb{D}^n &:= (\mathbb{S}^{n-1}, d^n : \mathbb{S}^{n-1})
\end{aligned}$$

Given a context, its *locally-maximal variables* are those which do not appear in the type of any other variable. By type inference and unification, a substitution  $\Gamma \vdash \sigma : \Delta$  is fully determined by its action on locally-maximal variables of  $\Delta$ . If  $t_1, \dots, t_n$  are the images of the locally-maximal variables of  $\Delta$  under  $\sigma$ , we often use the shorthand  $u[[t_1, \dots, t_n]] := u[\sigma]$ .

**Definition 2.4.** Give a well-typed term  $a$  of dimension  $n$  in context  $\Gamma$ , we define its identity  $\text{id}_a$  and iterated identities  $\text{id}_a^k$  by induction as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{id}_a &:= \text{coh}(\mathbb{D}^n : d^n \rightarrow d^n)[a] \\ \text{id}_a^{k+1} &:= \text{id}_{\text{id}_a^k}\end{aligned}$$


**Definition 2.5.** Given a pasting context  $\Gamma$ , we define recursively a term  $\text{comp}_\Gamma$ , called its composite, as follows:

$$\text{comp}_\Gamma := \begin{cases} d^n & \Gamma = \mathbb{D}^n \\ \text{coh}(\Gamma : \text{comp}_{\partial-\Gamma} \rightarrow \text{comp}_{\partial+\Gamma})[\text{id}_\Gamma] & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We will also use the following more familiar notation for composites and whiskering:

$$t_1 *_k \dots *_k t_n := \text{comp}_\Gamma[[t_1, \dots, t_n]]$$

in the case where  $\Gamma$  is the pasting context obtained from a sequence of discs, potentially of different dimensions, by identifying the variable  $d_+^k$  of each disc with the variable  $d_-^k$  of its successor. For instance, the whiskering of a 2-cell  $a$ , a 1-cell  $h$ , and a 3-cell  $p$  is denoted by  $a *_0 h *_0 p := \text{comp}_\Gamma[[a, h, p]]$ . The pasting context over which is defined is illustrated below:



We extend the composition operation  $t *_k \dots *_k t$  to the case  $\dim(t_i) \leq k$ , by adopting the convention that in this case  $t_1, \dots, t_n$  are composable only if they are all equal, in which case  $t *_k \dots *_k t := t$ . With this convention, for any  $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have

$$\partial^\pm(\text{id}_x^n *_k \text{id}_x^n) = \text{id}_x^{n-1} *_k \text{id}_x^{n-1}$$

In weak  $\omega$ -categories, those compositions are not strictly associative nor unital. However, the second side condition of the coh-introduction rule allows us to construct, for example, unitors:

$$\begin{aligned}u_x &:= \text{coh}((x : \star) : \text{id}_x \rightarrow \text{id}_x *_0 \text{id}_x)[x] \\ \rho_f &:= \text{coh}((x, y : \star, f : x \rightarrow y) : f *_0 \text{id}_y \rightarrow f)[f]\end{aligned}$$




Figure 9: A context (top left), its suspension (right), and its  $\{1\}$ -opposite (bottom left).

**Definition 2.6.** Throughout this article, we will use the notation  $\mathbb{P} := (x : \star)$  for the point context with the variable named  $x$ . In this context, we also define the following terms and type, which play a fundamental role in the construction of the cells  $H_{k,l}^n$ :

$$(\text{id}_x^n)^{*l} := (\text{id}_x^n) * l (\text{id}_x^n) \quad I_k^n := (\text{id}_x^n)^{*k} \rightarrow (\text{id}_x^n)^{*k}$$

## 2.2. Meta-Operations

Various meta-operations have been introduced [9, 20, 21, 25] for **CaTT** allowing for the automatic construction of complex terms. We give a concise presentation of some of these that we will leverage below.

*Suspension.* This meta-operation was defined and implemented for **CaTT** by Benjamin [9, Sec. 3.2], and analogous to the suspension from topology. Suspending a context  $\Gamma$  produces another context  $\Sigma\Gamma$  comprised of two new 0-dimensional variables  $N, S$ , as well as all variables of  $\Gamma$ . A variable  $x$  of type  $A$  in context  $\Gamma$  has type  $\Sigma A$ , obtained by formally replacing the base type  $\star$  with the type  $N \rightarrow S$ , in context  $\Sigma\Gamma$ . This increases by 1 the dimension of the variables, as illustrated in Figure 9.

**Definition 2.7.** The suspension meta-operation is defined on the syntax of **CaTT** as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma\emptyset &:= (N : \star, S : \star) & \Sigma(\Gamma, x : A) &:= (\Sigma\Gamma, x : \Sigma A) \\ \Sigma\star &:= N \rightarrow_\star S & \Sigma(u \rightarrow_A v) &:= \Sigma u \rightarrow_{\Sigma A} \Sigma v \\ \Sigma x &:= x & \Sigma(\text{coh}(\Gamma : A)[\sigma]) &:= \text{coh}(\Sigma\Gamma : \Sigma A)[\Sigma\sigma] \\ \Sigma\langle \rangle &:= \langle N \mapsto N, S \mapsto S \rangle & \Sigma\langle \sigma, x \mapsto t \rangle &:= \langle \Sigma\sigma, x \mapsto \Sigma t \rangle \end{aligned}$$

*Opposites.* Opposites for weak-categories have been studied by Benjamin and Markakis [20]. Whereas a 1-category has a single opposite,  $\omega$ -categories have opposites for each subset  $M \subseteq \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ , corresponding to flipping the direction of cells of dimension  $n \in M$ .

**Definition 2.8.** For  $M \subseteq \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ , the opposite meta-operation  $\text{op } M$  is defined on the syntax of  $\text{CaTT}$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\emptyset)^{\text{op } M} &:= \emptyset & (\Gamma, x : A)^{\text{op } M} &:= (\Gamma^{\text{op } M}, x : A^{\text{op } M}) \\
(\star)^{\text{op } M} &:= \star & x^{\text{op } M} &:= x & \langle \rangle^{\text{op } M} &:= \langle \rangle \\
(u \rightarrow_A v)^{\text{op } M} &:= \begin{cases} u^{\text{op } M} \rightarrow_{A^{\text{op } M}} v^{\text{op } M} & \dim u + 1 \notin M \\ v^{\text{op } M} \rightarrow_{A^{\text{op } M}} u^{\text{op } M} & \dim u + 1 \in M \end{cases} \\
(\text{coh}(\Gamma : A)[\sigma])^{\text{op } M} &:= \text{coh}(\Gamma' : A^{\text{op } M}[\llbracket \gamma \rrbracket])[\gamma^{-1} \circ \sigma^{\text{op } M}] \\
\langle \sigma, x \mapsto t \rangle^{\text{op } M} &:= \langle \sigma^{\text{op } M}, x^{\text{op } M} \mapsto t^{\text{op } M} \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

Where  $\Gamma'$  is uniquely determined as the pasting context isomorphic to  $\Gamma^{\text{op } M}$  under a unique isomorphism  $\gamma : \Gamma^{\text{op } M} \rightarrow \Gamma'$  which reorders the variables. When  $M = \{1\}$ , we write  $(-)^{\text{op}}$  for  $(-)^{\text{op } M}$ . This construction is illustrated in Figure 9.

*Chosen inverses.* An  $n$ -cell  $f : x \rightarrow y$  in an  $\omega$ -is coinductively defined to be an equivalence [26] if there is an  $n$ -cell  $g : y \rightarrow x$ , together with two equivalences

$$\varepsilon : f *_{n-1} g \rightarrow \text{id}_x \quad \eta : \text{id}_y \rightarrow g *_{n-1} f$$

When this is the case, we say that  $g$  is an *inverse* of  $f$ . Benjamin and Markakis [21] have shown that in  $\text{CaTT}$ , all coherences are equivalences, and all composites  $t = \text{coh}(\Gamma : A)[\sigma]$  where  $\sigma$  maps all maximal-dimension variables to equivalences are equivalences. For such equivalences  $t : u \rightarrow v$ , the authors construct a chosen of inverse, denoted  $t^{-1}$ , and cancellators  $\varepsilon$  and  $\eta$ . They also prove the following result

**Lemma 2.9.** *Every term  $\Gamma \vdash t : A$  with  $\dim(t) > \dim(\Gamma)$  is an equivalence.*

We extend the notion of equivalence to that of congruence between terms of  $\text{CaTT}$ . This notion is more generic insofar that it allows for two cells with different types to be congruent. The cells  $H_{k,l}^n$  that we will construct in this paper are congruences.

**Definition 2.10.** *The congruence is the smallest equivalence relation such that an  $n$ -cell is congruent to its composite in any dimension with a coherence, and equivalent cells are congruent.*

*Functorialisation and Naturality.* Composites in  $\omega$ -categories are functorial with respect to their arguments, while coherences are natural. This is made precise by the *functorialisation* [9, §3.4] and the *naturality meta-operations* [25]. Both operations can be seen as the *depth-0* and *depth-1* cases of the same inductive scheme described below. Here, the *depth* is a parameter defined for contexts

$\Gamma$ , types  $\Gamma \vdash A$ , terms  $\Gamma \vdash t : A$  and substitutions  $\Gamma \vdash \sigma : \Delta$ , and for a set of variables  $X \subseteq \text{Var } \Gamma$  by

$$\begin{aligned}\text{depth}_X t &= \max\{\dim t - \dim x : x \in \text{supp}(t) \cap X\} \\ \text{depth}_X A &= \max\{\dim A - \dim x : x \in \text{supp}(A) \cap X\} \\ \text{depth}_X \sigma &= \max\{\text{depth}_X x[\sigma] : x \in \text{Var } \Delta\} \\ \text{depth}_X \Gamma &= \text{depth}_X(\text{id}_\Gamma)\end{aligned}$$

where  $\max \emptyset = -1$ . The scheme further requires that the set  $X$  is *up-closed*, meaning that if a variable  $x \in X$  appears in the support of some variable  $y \in \text{Var}(\Gamma)$ , then also  $y \in X$ . To present the definition, we introduce the preimage  $X_\sigma$  of a set of variables  $X$  under a substitution  $\Gamma \vdash \sigma : \Delta$  as follows:

$$X_\sigma = \{y \in \text{Var}(\Delta) : \text{supp}(y[\sigma]) \cap X \neq \emptyset\}$$

The construction proceeds recursively on the derivation tree to produce for every context  $\Gamma \vdash$  and every up-closed  $X \subseteq \text{Var}(\Gamma)$  such that  $\text{depth}_X \Gamma \leq 1$ , a new context  $\Gamma \uparrow X$  together with substitutions:

$$\Gamma \uparrow X \vdash \text{in}^\pm : \Gamma$$

Moreover, it produces for every term  $\Gamma \vdash t : A$  such that  $0 \leq \text{depth}_X t \leq 1$ , a new term:

$$\Gamma \uparrow X \vdash t \uparrow X : A \uparrow^t X$$

and for every substitution  $\Gamma \vdash \sigma : \Delta$  such that  $\text{depth}_X \sigma \leq 1$ , a new substitution:

$$\Gamma \uparrow X \vdash \sigma \uparrow X : \Delta \uparrow X_\sigma$$

When  $\Gamma \vdash_{\text{ps}}$  is a pasting context, it also produces for full types  $\Gamma \vdash A$  such that  $0 \leq \text{depth}_X(\text{coh}(\Gamma : A)[\text{id}]) \leq 1$ , a term:

$$\Gamma \uparrow X \vdash \text{coh}(\Gamma : A) \uparrow X : A \uparrow^{\text{coh}(\Gamma:A)[\text{id}]} X$$

- *Contexts.* This procedure duplicates the variables in  $X$  and adds a connecting variable relating the two copies. More formally, it is given by:

$$\emptyset \uparrow \emptyset := \emptyset$$

If  $x \notin X$ , we define:

$$(\Gamma, x : A) \uparrow X := (\Gamma \uparrow X, x : A)$$

If  $x \in X$ , we let  $X' = X \setminus \{x\}$  and define:

$$(\Gamma, x : A) \uparrow X := (\Gamma \uparrow X', x^- : A, x^+ : A, \vec{x} : A \uparrow^x X)$$

The inclusion substitutions  $\text{in}^\pm$  are determined by:

$$y[\llbracket \text{in}^\pm \rrbracket] = \begin{cases} y & \text{if } y \notin X \\ y^\pm & \text{if } y \in X \end{cases}$$

- *Types.* The type  $A \uparrow^t X$  relates the terms  $t\llbracket \text{in}^- \rrbracket$  and  $t\llbracket \text{in}^+ \rrbracket$ . It is an arrow type of the form  $L_{A,t,X} \rightarrow R_{A,t,X}$ , where if  $A = \star$  we define  $L_{A,t,X}$  as  $t\llbracket \text{in}^- \rrbracket$  and  $R_{A,t,X}$  as  $t\llbracket \text{in}^+ \rrbracket$ , and when  $A = u \rightarrow v$  they are given by:

$$L_{A,t,X} := \begin{cases} t\llbracket \text{in}^- \rrbracket *_{n-1} (v \uparrow X) & \text{if } \text{supp}(v) \cap X \neq \emptyset \\ t\llbracket \text{in}^- \rrbracket & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$R_{A,t,X} := \begin{cases} (u \uparrow X) *_{n-1} t\llbracket \text{in}^+ \rrbracket & \text{if } \text{supp}(u) \cap X \neq \emptyset \\ t\llbracket \text{in}^+ \rrbracket & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

- *Terms.* The term  $t \uparrow X$  is defined recursively by:

$$x \uparrow X := \vec{x}$$

$$\text{coh}(\Delta : A)[\sigma] \uparrow X := (\text{coh}(\Delta : A) \uparrow X_\sigma) \llbracket \sigma \uparrow X \rrbracket$$

- *Substitutions.* For  $x \notin X_\sigma$ ,  $\sigma \uparrow X$  is given by:

$$x \llbracket \sigma \uparrow X \rrbracket := x \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket$$

and for  $x \in X_\sigma$  by:

$$x^\pm \llbracket \sigma \uparrow X \rrbracket := x \llbracket \sigma \circ \text{in}^\pm \rrbracket$$

$$\vec{x} \llbracket \sigma \uparrow X \rrbracket := x \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket \uparrow X$$

- *Full types.* Let  $t = \text{coh}(\Gamma : A)[\text{id}]$ . When  $\text{depth}_X(\Gamma) = 0$ , then  $\Gamma \uparrow X$  is again a pasting diagram and  $A \uparrow^t X$  is full, allowing one to define

$$\text{coh}(\Gamma : A) \uparrow X = \text{coh}(\Gamma \uparrow X : A \uparrow^t X)[\text{id}]$$

When  $\text{depth}_X(\Gamma) = 1$ , then  $\Gamma \uparrow X$  is no longer a pasting diagram, and  $t$  is a composite. The term  $\text{coh}(\Gamma : A) \uparrow X$  has been constructed by Benjamin et al. [25] in this case.

**Example 2.11.** *The functorialisation of the composite  $f *_0 g$  of two 1-cells with respect to  $f$  is the whiskering  $\text{comp}_\Gamma \llbracket \vec{f}, g \rrbracket$  where  $\Gamma$  is the following pasting context:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & f & \\ x & \xrightarrow{\quad} & y \xrightarrow{h} z \\ & \Downarrow a & \\ & g & \end{array}$$


**Example 2.12.** *Consider the right unitor  $\rho_f : f *_0 \text{id}_y \rightarrow f$  in the context  $\Gamma_f = (x, y : \star, f : x \rightarrow_\star y)$ . Letting  $X = \{f\}$ , we get a term  $\rho_f \uparrow X$  filling the following square:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} f^- *_0 \text{id}_y & \xrightarrow{\rho_{f^-}} & f^- \\ \downarrow \vec{f} *_0 \text{id}_y & \swarrow \rho_{\vec{f}} & \downarrow \vec{f} \\ f^+ *_0 \text{id}_y & \xrightarrow{\rho_{f^+}} & f^+ \end{array}$$

**Example 2.13.** Consider the context:

$$\mathbf{3} := (x, y, z, w : *, f : x \rightarrow y, g : y \rightarrow z, h : z \rightarrow w)$$

Letting  $X = \{f, y, g, z, h\}$  the context  $\mathbf{3} \uparrow X$  is given by:



Consider now the term  $t = f *_0 g *_0 h$  over  $\mathbf{3}$ . Its naturality with respect to  $X$  is a term over  $\mathbf{3} \uparrow X$  of type:

$$f^- *_0 g^- *_0 h^- \rightarrow f^+ *_0 g^+ *_0 h^+$$

Given 2-cells  $a, b, c$  whose boundaries match as in the context  $\mathbf{3} \uparrow X$ , we define their hexagonal composite:

$$\text{hexcomp}[[a, b, c]] := (t \uparrow X)[[a, b, c]]$$

Let  $\sigma$  be a substitution whose target is an iterated suspension of the context of the hexagonal composition:

$$\sigma : \Gamma \rightarrow \Sigma^k(\mathbf{3} \uparrow X)$$

Denoting  $a, b$  and  $c$  the respective images of  $\vec{f}, \vec{g}$  and  $\vec{h}$  under the action of  $\sigma$ , we use suspension implicitly and write:

$$\text{hexcomp}[[a, b, c]] := (\Sigma^k(t \uparrow X))[[\sigma]]$$

We will use the hexagonal composition and its suspensions in for construction of the repadding in Sec. 3.

### 3. Padding and Repadding

This section is dedicated to the presentation of our theory of padding, which lies at the heart of our method to construct congruences. Our technique is inspired by the padding constructions in Fujii et al. [14] and Finster et al. [13], but takes a more axiomatic approach, describing the general shape of such paddings.



### 3.1. Padding

Our method for padding cells involves recursively adjusting their boundaries as necessary, starting with the lowest dimension where they differ, proceeding until the cell has the desired type. To capture this dimensionwise recursive structure, we introduce a notion of filtration.

**Definition 3.1.** A filtration  $\Gamma = (\Gamma^i, v^i, \sigma^i)_{i=m}^n$  of height  $m$  constitutes a sequence of contexts  $\Gamma^i$  of dimension  $i$ , together with a chosen variable  $v^i$  in context  $\Gamma^i$  and a sequence of substitutions  $\sigma^i$  for  $m < i \leq n$  satisfying:

$$\Gamma^i \vdash \sigma^i : (\Gamma^{i-1} \uparrow v^{i-1}) \quad \overrightarrow{v^i} \llbracket \sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket = v^{i+1}$$

A family of types  $\mathbf{A} = (A^i)_{i=m}^n$  is adapted to the filtration  $\Gamma$  when  $\Gamma^m \vdash v^m : A^m$ , and for all  $i \in \{m+1, \dots, n\}$ , there exist terms  $s^i, t^i$  satisfying:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma \vdash s^i : A^i \llbracket \sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket \quad \Gamma \vdash t^i : A \llbracket \sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket \\ A^{i+1} = s^i \rightarrow_{A^i \llbracket \sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket} t^i \end{aligned}$$

Finally a set of padding data  $\mathbf{p} = (p^i, q^i)_{i=m}^{n-1}$  for the type family  $\mathbf{A}$  adapted to the filtration  $\Gamma$  is defined mutually inductively together with its associated padding  $\Theta_{\mathbf{p}}$ . Padding data consists in a family of terms  $p^i$  and  $q^i$  satisfying:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma^{i+1} \vdash p^i : s^i \rightarrow \Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i \llbracket \text{in}^- \circ \sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket \\ \Gamma^{i+1} \vdash q^i : \Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i \llbracket \text{in}^+ \circ \sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket \rightarrow t^i \\ v^{i-1} \notin \text{supp}(p^i) \cup \text{supp}(q^i) \end{aligned}$$

Its associated padding is a term  $\Gamma^i \vdash \Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i : A^i$  defined for  $m \leq i \leq n$  by:

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^m &:= v^m \\ \Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^{i+1} &:= p^i *_i (\Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i \uparrow v^i) \llbracket \sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket *_i q^i \end{aligned} \quad (\dagger)$$

Figure 10 illustrates the shape of the paddings of height 0 and dimension up to 2. We now define the *unbiased padding*, illustrated in Figure 11. This is the padding appearing in the type of the Eckmann-Hilton cells  $H_{k,l}^n$ , as well as in the respective source and targets of  $X_3$  and  $X_4$  in Figure 4. It transports terms from type  $I_k^n$  of Def. 2.6 to type  $I_l^n$  using *generalised unbiased unitors*. It will turn out to be self-dual, i.e. invariant under opposites, a crucial property necessary to define the cells  $H_{k,l}^n$  and assemble into the commutativity cells  $\text{EH}_{k,l}^n$ .

**Definition 3.2** (Unbiased unitors and unbiased paddings). For  $n \geq 2$  and  $k, l < n$ , we denote  $m = \min\{k, l\} + 1$ , and we introduce the filtration  $\Gamma_{k,l}^n = (\Gamma_l^i, v_l^i, \sigma^i)_{i=m}^n$  where

$$\Gamma_l^i = (x : \star, v_l^i : I_l^{i-1}) \quad \sigma_l^i = \langle x \mapsto x, \overrightarrow{v_l^i} \mapsto v_l^{i+1} \rangle$$




Figure 10: Paddings of height 0 with simplified notation, e.g. writing  $p^0[[\sigma^3]]$  for  $p^0[[\text{in}_{\Gamma_1}^- \circ \sigma^2 \circ \text{in}_{\Gamma_2}^- \circ \sigma^3]]$ .

We then define a set of padding data  $\mathbf{u}_{k,l}^n = (p_{k,l}^i, q_{k,l}^i)_{i=m}^n$  for the family  $(\Gamma_k^i)_{i=m}^n$  adapted to  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{k,l}^n$  with associated padding denoted  $\Theta_{k,l}^i$ , by:

$$p_{k,l}^i := \text{coh}(\mathbb{P} : (\text{id}_x^i)^{*k} \rightarrow \Theta_{k,l}^i[[\text{id}_x^i]^{*l}])[x]$$

$$q_{k,l}^i := \text{coh}(\mathbb{P} : \Theta_{k,l}^i[[\text{id}_x^i]^{*l}] \rightarrow (\text{id}_x^i)^{*k})[x] = (p_{k,l}^i)^{-1}$$

We call the terms  $p_{k,l}^i$  of this family the generalised unbiased unitors and its associated padding  $\Theta_{k,l}^i$  the unbiased padding.

We now aim to prove that the unbiased padding satisfies a self-duality property. To do this, we will need the following lemma:

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $0 \leq l$  and  $i > l$ . The contexts  $\Gamma_l^i$  appearing in the unbiased filtration satisfy, for any  $M \subseteq \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ :*

$$(\Gamma_l^i)^{\text{op } M} = \Gamma_l^i$$

*Proof.* It suffices to show the following

$$(I_l^{i-1})^{\text{op } M} = I_l^{i-1} :$$

By Lemma B.4, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} (I_l^{i-1})^{\text{op } M} &= ((\text{id}_x^{i-1})^{*l} \rightarrow (\text{id}_x^{i-1})^{*l})^{\text{op } M} \\ &= ((\text{id}_x^{i-1})^{*l})^{\text{op } M} \rightarrow ((\text{id}_x^{i-1})^{*l})^{\text{op } M} \\ &= \text{id}_x^{i-1} * l \text{id}_x^{i-1} \end{aligned}$$

□

**Proposition 3.4** (Self-duality of unbiased padding). *Let  $0 \leq k, l$  and let  $m := \min\{k, l\} + 1$ . For any  $r$ , and for any  $m \leq i$ :*

$$(\Theta_{k,l}^i)^{\text{op}\{r\}} = \Theta_{k,l}^i \quad (\text{a})$$

Furthermore, for  $i > m$ :

$$\begin{aligned} (p_{k,l}^{i-1})^{\text{op}\{r\}} &= \begin{cases} p_{k,l}^{i-1} & r \neq i \\ q_{k,l}^{i-1} & r = i \end{cases} \\ (q_{k,l}^{i-1})^{\text{op}\{r\}} &= \begin{cases} q_{k,l}^{i-1} & r \neq i \\ p_{k,l}^{i-1} & r = i \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{b})$$

*Proof.* We proceed by induction on  $i$ .

When  $i = m$ , then have the equality on the terms  $v_l^i = \Theta_{k,l}^i = (\Theta_{k,l}^i)^{\text{op}\{r\}}$ .

For  $i > m$ , we first show (b). Recall the definitions:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} &:= (x : \star) \\ p_{k,l}^{i-1} &:= \text{coh}(\mathbb{P} : (\text{id}_x^{i-1})^{*k} \rightarrow \Theta_{k,l}^{i-1} \llbracket (\text{id}_x^{i-1})^{*l} \rrbracket)[x] \\ q_{k,l}^{i-1} &:= \text{coh}(\mathbb{P} : \Theta_{k,l}^{i-1} \llbracket (\text{id}_x^{i-1})^{*l} \rrbracket \rightarrow (\text{id}_x^{i-1})^{*k})[x] \end{aligned}$$

The context  $\mathbb{P}$  satisfies  $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}^{\text{op}\{r\}} = \mathbb{P}'$  and  $\gamma_{\mathbb{P}} = \text{id}_{\mathbb{P}}$ . We carry out the computation of  $(p_{k,l}^{i-1})^{\text{op}\{r\}} \llbracket x \rrbracket$ , The one of  $(q_{k,l}^{i-1})^{\text{op}\{r\}} \llbracket x \rrbracket$  being similar. If  $n \neq i$ , we have, by induction and Lemmas B.4 and B.3:

$$\begin{aligned} (p_{k,l}^{i-1})^{\text{op}\{r\}} &= \text{coh}(\mathbb{P} : ((\text{id}_x^{i-1})^{*k})^{\text{op}\{r\}} \rightarrow (\Theta_{k,l}^{i-1} \llbracket (\text{id}_x^{i-1})^{*l} \rrbracket)^{\text{op}\{r\}})[x] \\ &= \text{coh}(\mathbb{P} : (\text{id}_x^{i-1})^{*k} \rightarrow (\Theta_{k,l}^{i-1})^{\text{op}\{r\}} \llbracket (\text{id}_x^{i-1})^{*l} \rrbracket)[x] \\ &= \text{coh}(\mathbb{P} : (\text{id}_x^{i-1})^{*k} \rightarrow \Theta_{k,l}^{i-1} \llbracket (\text{id}_x^{i-1})^{*l} \rrbracket)[x] \\ &= p_{k,l}^{i-1} \end{aligned}$$

And similarly, if  $r = i$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} (p_{k,l}^{i-1})^{\text{op}\{r\}} &= \text{coh}(\mathbb{P} : ((\Theta_{k,l}^{i-1} \llbracket (\text{id}_x^{i-1})^{*l} \rrbracket)^{\text{op}\{i\}} \rightarrow (\text{id}_x^{i-1})^{*k})^{\text{op}\{i\}})[x] \\ &= \text{coh}(\mathbb{P} : (\Theta_{k,l}^{i-1})^{\text{op}\{r\}} \llbracket (\text{id}_x^{i-1})^{*l} \rrbracket \rightarrow (\text{id}_x^{i-1})^{*k})[x] \\ &= \text{coh}(\mathbb{P} : \Theta_{k,l}^{i-1} \llbracket (\text{id}_x^{i-1})^{*l} \rrbracket \rightarrow (\text{id}_x^{i-1})^{*k})[x] \\ &= q_{k,l}^{i-1} \end{aligned}$$

We now show (a). We have:

$$\Theta_{k,l}^i = p_{k,l}^{i-1} *_{i-1} (\Theta_{k,l}^{i-1} \uparrow v_l^{i-1}) \llbracket \sigma^i \rrbracket *_{i-1} q_{k,l}^{i-1}$$

Denote the middle term  $u := ((\Theta_{k,l}^{i-1} \uparrow v_l^{i-1}) \llbracket \sigma^i \rrbracket)$ . We remark that by Lemma 3.3, the substitution  $\text{op}_{\Gamma_l^{i-1}, v_l^{i-1}, \{r\}}^\uparrow$  is the identity, and  $(\sigma^i)^{\text{op}} = \sigma^i$ . Then, induction, together with Lemmas B.3 and B.12, if we have:

$$\begin{aligned} u^{\text{op}\{r\}} &= (\Theta_{k,l}^{i-1} \uparrow v_l^{i-1})^{\text{op}\{r\}} \llbracket \sigma^i \rrbracket \\ &= ((\Theta_{k,l}^{i-1})^{\text{op}\{r\}} \uparrow v_l^{i-1}) \llbracket \sigma^i \rrbracket \\ &= (\Theta_{k,l}^{i-1} \uparrow v_l^{i-1}) \llbracket \sigma^i \rrbracket \\ &= u \end{aligned}$$

Using this equation and Lemma B.4 and the inductive hypothesis, for  $r \neq i$  we have:

$$\begin{aligned} (\Theta_{k,l}^i)^{\text{op}\{r\}} &= (p_{k,l}^{i-1})^{\text{op}\{r\}} *_{i-1} u^{\text{op}\{r\}} *_{i-1} (q_{k,l}^{i-1})^{\text{op}\{r\}} \\ &= p_{k,l}^{i-1} *_{i-1} u^{\text{op}\{r\}} *_{i-1} q_{k,l}^{i-1} \\ &= \Theta_{k,l}^i \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, if  $r = i$ :

$$\begin{aligned} (\Theta_{k,l}^i)^{\text{op}\{i\}} &= (q_{k,l}^{i-1})^{\text{op}\{i\}} *_{i-1} u^{\text{op}\{i\}} *_{i-1} (p_{k,l}^{i-1})^{\text{op}\{i\}} \\ &= p_{k,l}^{i-1} *_{i-1} u^{\text{op}\{i\}} *_{i-1} q_{k,l}^{i-1} \\ &= \Theta_{k,l}^i \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

We now introduce the *generalised biased unitors* and their associated *biased paddings*. These are illustrated in Figure 11 and play a key role in our construction of the cells  $H_{n-1,0}^n$ , appearing in  $X_1$  of Figure 4. To shorten the construction, we leverage a duality argument, allowing us to focus only on right unitors. In fact, we define two flavours  $\rho^n, \bar{\rho}^n$  of right unitors and respective associated padding  $\Theta_\rho^n, \Theta_{\bar{\rho}}^n$ , the first appearing in the construction of  $H_{n-1,0}^n$  and the latter in that of  $H_{0,n-1}^n$ .

**Definition 3.5** (Generalised unitors and biased paddings). *We define the filtration  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_\rho^n = (\Gamma_\rho^i, v^i, \sigma_\rho^i)$  by:*

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_\rho^i &= (\mathbb{S}^i, v^i : d_-^{i-1} *_0 \text{id}^{i-1}(d_+^0) \rightarrow d_+^{i-1} *_0 \text{id}^{i-1}(d_+^0)) \\ \sigma_\rho^i &= \langle d_\pm^j \mapsto d_\pm^j, (v^{i-1})^\pm \mapsto d_\pm^{i-1}, \overrightarrow{(v^{i-1})} \mapsto v^i \rangle \end{aligned}$$

We then define the padding data  $\mathbf{p}_\rho^n = (p_\rho^i, q_\rho^i)_{i=1}^{n-1}$  for the type family  $(d_-^{i-1} \rightarrow d_+^{i-1})_{i=1}^n$  adapted to  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_\rho^n$ , whose associated padding we denote  $\Theta_\rho^n$ , as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^i &:= \text{coh}(\mathbb{D}^i : \Theta_\rho^i \llbracket d^i *_0 \text{id}_{d_+^0} \rrbracket \rightarrow d^i) [\text{id}_{\mathbb{D}^i}] \\ p_\rho^i &:= (\rho^i)^{-1} \llbracket d_-^i \rrbracket & q_\rho^i &:= \rho^i \llbracket d_+^i \rrbracket \end{aligned}$$




Figure 11: Biased and unbiased paddings in dimension 2. The unlabelled arrows are identities.

We also define the filtration  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_\rho^n = (\mathbb{D}^i, d^i, \sigma^i)_{i=1}^n$  where  $\mathbb{D}^i$  is the  $i$ -disc context of Def. 2.3, and  $\sigma^i$  is the isomorphism between  $(\mathbb{D}^{i-1} \uparrow d^{i-1})$  and  $\mathbb{D}^i$ . Consider the following type family adapted to the filtration  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_\rho^n$ :

$$(d_-^{i-1} *_0 \text{id}_{d_+^0}^{i-1} \rightarrow d_+^{i-1} *_0 \text{id}_{d_+^0}^{i-1})_{i=1}^n$$

We define padding data  $\mathbf{p}_\rho^n = (p_\rho^i, q_\rho^i)_{i=1}^{n-1}$  for this type family, whose associated padding we call  $\Theta_\rho^i$ , as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho}^i &:= \text{coh}(\mathbb{D}^i : \Theta_\rho^i[d_-^i] \rightarrow d^i *_0 \text{id}_{d_+^0}^i)[\text{id}_{\mathbb{D}^i}] \\ p_\rho^i &:= (\tilde{\rho}^i)^{-1} \llbracket d_-^i \rrbracket & q_\rho^i &:= \tilde{\rho}^i \llbracket d_+^i \rrbracket \end{aligned}$$

We call the coherences  $\rho^n, \tilde{\rho}^n$  generalised right unitors. The paddings  $\Theta_\rho^n$  and  $\Theta_\rho^n$  are the right-biased paddings. Using the duality, we define the generalised left unitors and left-biased paddings as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^n &:= (\rho^n)^{\text{op}} & \tilde{\lambda}^n &:= (\tilde{\rho}^n)^{\text{op}} \\ \Theta_\lambda^n &:= (\Theta_\rho^n)^{\text{op}} & \Theta_\lambda^n &:= (\Theta_\rho^n)^{\text{op}} \end{aligned}$$

We now define morphisms of filtrations. Those will allow us to transport paddings over difference filtrations. Using such morphisms, we can transport the left-biased and right-biased paddings to the filtration of the unbiased padding, and subsequently to relate them in Sec. 3.2. This relation is analogue to the equation  $\rho_{\text{id}} = \lambda_{\text{id}}$  from monoidal categories.

**Definition 3.6.** A morphism of filtrations  $\psi = (\psi^i)_{i=m}^n$  between filtrations  $(\Delta^i, w^i, \tau^i)_{i=m}^n$  and  $(\Gamma^i, v^i, \sigma^i)_{i=m}^n$  consists of substitutions  $\psi^i : \Delta^i \rightarrow \Gamma^i$  such that  $\{w^i\}_{\psi^i} = \{v^i\}$ , and the following commutes for each  $i$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Delta^{i+1} & \xrightarrow{\tau^{i+1}} & \Delta^i \uparrow w^i \\ \psi^{i+1} \downarrow & & \downarrow \psi^i \uparrow w^i \\ \Gamma^{i+1} & \xrightarrow{\sigma^{i+1}} & \Gamma^i \uparrow v^i \end{array} \quad (1)$$

Given a family of types  $\mathbf{A} = (A^i)_{i=m}^n$ , and padding data  $\mathbf{p} = (p^i, q^i)_{i=m}^{n-1}$  for  $\mathbf{A}$  with associated padding  $\Theta_{\mathbf{p}}$ , we denote:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A}[\![\psi]\!] &:= (A^i[\![\psi^i]\!])_{i=m}^n & \mathbf{p}[\![\psi]\!] &:= (p^i[\![\psi^{i+1}]\!], q^i[\![\psi^{i+1}]\!])_{i=m}^{n-1} \\ \Theta_{\mathbf{p}}[\![\psi]\!] &:= (\Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i[\![\psi^i]\!])_{i=m}^n \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 3.7.** Given  $\psi : \Delta \rightarrow \Gamma$  a morphism of filtrations, if  $\mathbf{A}$  is a type family adapted to  $\Gamma$ , then  $\mathbf{A}[\![\psi]\!]$  is adapted to  $\Delta$ . If  $\mathbf{p}$  is padding data for  $\mathbf{A}$  with associated padding  $\Theta_{\mathbf{p}}$ , then  $\mathbf{p}[\![\psi]\!]$  is padding data for  $\mathbf{A}[\![\psi]\!]$ , with associated padding  $\Theta_{\mathbf{p}}[\![\psi]\!]$ .

*Proof.* Consider a type family  $A^i = s^{i-1} \rightarrow t^{i-1}$  adapted to  $\Gamma$ . Because  $\psi$  is a morphism of padding filtrations,  $w^m = v^m[\![\psi^m]\!]$ . Since  $\Gamma^m \vdash v^m : A^m$  and we have:

$$\Gamma^m \vdash w^m : A^m[\![\psi^m]\!]$$

In context  $\Gamma^{i+1}$ , the terms  $s^i$  and  $t^i$  have type  $A^i[\![\sigma^{i+1}]\!]$ , so in context  $\Delta^{i+1}$ , the types  $s^i[\![\psi^{i+1}]\!]$  and  $t^i[\![\psi^{i+1}]\!]$  have type  $A^i[\![\sigma^{i+1} \circ \psi^{i+1}]\!]$ . The following equality, proved by (1) then lets us conclude that  $\mathbf{A}[\![\psi]\!]$  is adapted to  $\Delta$ :

$$A^i[\![\sigma^{i+1} \circ \psi^{i+1}]\!] = A^i[\![\psi^i \uparrow w^i \circ \tau^{i+1}]\!] = A^i[\![\psi^i]\!][\![\tau^{i+1}]\!]$$

Let  $\mathbf{p}$  be padding data for  $\mathbf{A}$ . In context  $\Gamma^{i+1}$ , the term  $p^i$  has type:

$$s^i \rightarrow \Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i[\![\text{in}^- \circ \sigma^{i+1}]\!]$$

Therefore in context  $\Delta^{i+1}$ , the term  $p^i[\![\psi^{i+1}]\!]$  has type:

$$s^i[\![\psi^{i+1}]\!] \rightarrow \Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i[\![\text{in}^- \circ \sigma^{i+1} \circ \psi^{i+1}]\!]$$

Furthermore, by equation (1), and Lemmas B.7 and B.5, since  $w^i \notin \text{supp}(\Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i[\![\psi^i]\!])$ , the target of this type satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i[\![\text{in}^- \circ \sigma^{i+1} \circ \psi^{i+1}]\!] &= \Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i[\![\text{in}^- \circ (\psi^i \uparrow w^i) \circ \tau^{i+1}]\!] \\ &= \Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i[\![\psi^i \circ \text{in}_{\Delta^i}^- \circ \tau^{i+1}]\!] \\ &= \Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i[\![\psi^i \circ \tau^{i+1}]\!] \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, one can show that:

$$\Delta^{i+1} \vdash q^i \llbracket \psi^{i+1} \rrbracket : \Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i \llbracket \text{in}^+ \circ \sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket \rightarrow t^i \llbracket \psi^{i+1} \rrbracket$$

Finally, consider padding data  $\Theta_{\mathbf{p}}$  associated to  $\mathbf{p}$ . We show that  $\Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i \llbracket \psi^i \rrbracket$  satisfies the defining formula ( $\dagger$ ), using (1) and Lemma B.8:

$$\begin{aligned} & \Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^{i+1} \llbracket \psi^{i+1} \rrbracket \\ &= (p^i *_i (\Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i \uparrow v^i) \llbracket \sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket *_i q^i) \llbracket \psi^{i+1} \rrbracket \\ &= p^i \llbracket \psi^{i+1} \rrbracket *_i (\Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i \uparrow v^i) \llbracket \sigma^{i+1} \circ \psi^{i+1} \rrbracket *_i q^i \llbracket \psi^{i+1} \rrbracket \\ &= p^i \llbracket \psi^{i+1} \rrbracket *_i (\Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i \uparrow v^i) \llbracket (\psi^i \uparrow w^i) \circ \tau^{i+1} \rrbracket *_i q^i \llbracket \psi^{i+1} \rrbracket \\ &= p^i \llbracket \psi^{i+1} \rrbracket *_i (\Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i \llbracket \psi^i \rrbracket \uparrow w^i) \llbracket \tau^{i+1} \rrbracket *_i q^i \llbracket \psi^{i+1} \rrbracket \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

We now proceed with the definition of the unbiased paddings of the identity, which are padding data for the same type as  $\mathbf{u}_{k,0}^n$  and  $\mathbf{u}_{k,n-1}^n$ , but distinct from them. In Sec. 3.2, we define the *unbiasing repaddings* to relate these distinct paddings.

**Definition 3.8.** *We define two morphisms of filtrations:*

$$\begin{array}{ll} \psi_{\rho} : \Gamma_{k,0}^n \rightarrow \Gamma_{\rho}^n & \psi_{\bar{\rho}} : \Gamma_{k,n-1}^n \rightarrow \Gamma_{\bar{\rho}}^n \\ v^i \llbracket \psi_{\rho}^i \rrbracket = v_0^i & d^i \llbracket \psi_{\bar{\rho}}^i \rrbracket = v_{n-1}^i \end{array}$$

*Applying these morphisms to the biased paddings, we obtain new padding data, that we call the biased paddings of the identity*

$$\mathbf{p}_{\rho}^n \llbracket \psi_{\rho} \rrbracket \qquad \mathbf{p}_{\bar{\rho}}^n \llbracket \psi_{\bar{\rho}} \rrbracket$$

We conclude this section with a presentation of suspension of paddings. While it does not appear in the construction of the steps presented in Figure 4, this notion still plays an important role for constructing the cells  $H_{k,l}^n$ . It is central in Lemma 4.2, allowing us to leverage the suspension meta-operation to construct  $H_{k+1,l+1}^{n+1}$  from  $H_{k,l}^n$ .

**Definition 3.9.** *Let  $\Gamma = (\Gamma^i, v^i, \sigma^i)_{i=m}^n$  be a filtration, and  $\mathbf{p} = (p^i, q^i)_{i=m}^n$  be padding data. We define:*

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma \Gamma &:= (\Sigma \Gamma^{i-1}, \Sigma v^{i-1}, \Sigma \sigma^i)_{i=m+1}^{n+1} \\ \Sigma \mathbf{p} &:= (\Sigma p^{i-1}, \Sigma q^{i-1})_{i=m+1}^{n+1} \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 3.10.** *If  $\Gamma$  is a filtration, then so is  $\Sigma \Gamma$ . If the type family  $\mathbf{A}$  is adapted to  $\Gamma$ , then  $\Sigma \mathbf{A}$  is adapted to  $\Sigma \Gamma$ , and if  $\mathbf{p}$  is padding data for  $\mathbf{A}$ , then  $\Sigma \mathbf{p}$  is padding data for  $\Sigma \mathbf{A}$ , with associated padding  $\Sigma \Theta_{\mathbf{p}}$ :*

*Proof.* First we show that  $\Sigma\Gamma$  is a filtration. The variable  $v^{i-1}$  is a maximal dimension variable in  $\Sigma\Gamma^{i-1}$  which is of dimension  $i$ . By Lemma B.9, we have:

$$\Sigma(\Gamma^{i-1} \uparrow v^{i-1}) = (\Sigma\Gamma^{i-1}) \uparrow v^{i-1}$$

The substitution  $\Sigma\sigma^i : \Sigma\Gamma^i \rightarrow (\Sigma\Gamma^{i-1}) \uparrow v^{i-1}$  satisfies, by definition of the suspension of substitutions:

$$\overrightarrow{v^{i-1}} \llbracket \Sigma\sigma^i \rrbracket = v^i$$

Let  $\mathbf{A} = (A^i = s^{i-1} \rightarrow t^{i-1})$  a type family adapted to  $\Gamma$ . We show that the type family  $\Sigma\mathbf{A}$  is adapted to  $\Sigma\Gamma$ . Since in context  $\Gamma^m$  the variable  $v^m$  has type  $A^m$ , in context  $\Sigma\Gamma^m$ , the same variable has type  $\Sigma A^m$ . Moreover, in context  $\Gamma^{i+1}$ , the terms  $s^i$  and  $t^i$  have type  $A^i \llbracket \sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket$ , so by Lemma B.1, in context  $\Sigma\Gamma^{i+1}$ , the terms  $\Sigma s^i$  and  $\Sigma t^i$  have type:

$$(\Sigma A^i) \llbracket \Sigma\sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket$$

Finally, consider a padding  $\Theta_{\mathbf{p}}$  associated to  $\mathbf{p}$ , we show that  $\Sigma\Theta_{\mathbf{p}}$  is a padding associated to  $\mathbf{p}$ . First, we note that in context  $\Gamma^{i+1}$ , the term  $p^i$  has type:

$$s^i \rightarrow \Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i \llbracket \text{in}^- \circ \sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket$$

Thus, by Lemmas B.1 and B.9, the term  $\Sigma p^i$  has the following type in context  $\Sigma\Gamma^{i+1}$ :

$$\Sigma s^i \rightarrow (\Sigma\Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i) \llbracket \text{in}^- \circ \Sigma\sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket$$

We now check that  $\Sigma\Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i$  satisfies  $(\dagger)$  for  $\Sigma\mathbf{p}$ . Using Lemmas B.2, B.1 and B.10, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma\Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^{i+1} &= \Sigma(p^i *_i (\Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i \uparrow v^i) \llbracket \sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket *_i q^i) \\ &= \Sigma p^i *_i \Sigma(\Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i \uparrow v^i) \llbracket \Sigma\sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket *_i \Sigma q^i \\ &= \Sigma p^i *_i \Sigma(\Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i \uparrow v^i) \llbracket \Sigma\sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket *_i \Sigma q^i \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

### 3.2. Repadding

We now introduce repadding, which allows us to change between two padding datas for the same type family. This will constitute the heart of the construction of  $X_2$  in Figure 4.

**Definition 3.11.** Consider a filtration  $(\Gamma^i, v^i, \sigma^i)_{i=m}^n$ , a type family  $\mathbf{A}$  adapted to it, and two sets of padding data for  $\mathbf{A}$ :

$$\mathbf{p}_0 = (p_0^i, q_0^i)_{i=m}^{n-1} \quad \mathbf{p}_1 = (p_1^i, q_1^i)_{i=m}^{n-1}$$

We define sets of repadding data  $\mathbf{r} : \mathbf{p}_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{p}_1$  and their associated repadding  $\Theta_{\mathbf{r}}^i$  together by mutual induction. A set of repadding data  $\mathbf{r} : \mathbf{p}_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{p}_1$  consists of families of terms  $(f^i, g^i)_{i=m}^{n-1}$  of type:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma^{i+1} \vdash f^i : p_0^i *_i \Theta_{\mathbf{r}}^i \llbracket \text{in}^- \circ \sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket &\rightarrow p_1^i \\ \Gamma^{i+1} \vdash g^i : q_0^i &\rightarrow \Theta_{\mathbf{r}}^i \llbracket \text{in}^+ \circ \sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket *_i q_1^i \end{aligned}$$






Figure 12: The repadding cell  $\Theta_{\mathbf{r}}^{i+1}$ .

Its associated repadding, the term,  $\Gamma^i \vdash \Theta_{\mathbf{r}}^i : \Theta_{\mathbf{p}_0}^i \rightarrow \Theta_{\mathbf{p}_1}^i$  is defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_{\mathbf{r}}^m &:= \text{id}_{v^m} \\ \Theta_{\mathbf{r}}^{i+1} &:= \text{hexcomp} \llbracket f^i, ((\Theta_{\mathbf{r}}^i \uparrow v^i) \llbracket \sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket)^{-1}, g^i \rrbracket \end{aligned}$$

The definition of  $\Theta_{\mathbf{r}}^{i+1}$ , illustrated in Figure 12, uses an inverse, which exists by Lemma 2.9. We now introduce the *unbiasing repaddings* as the crucial ingredients of cell  $X_2$  of Figure 4, allowing us to change a biased padding applied to the identity into an unbiased padding.

**Definition 3.12** (Unbiasing repaddings). *Given  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we recall the biased paddings of the identity  $\mathbf{p}_{\rho}^n \llbracket \psi_{\rho} \rrbracket$  from Def. 3.8 and the unbiased paddings  $\mathbf{u}_{n-1,0}^n$  from Def. 3.2. We define a set of repadding data  $\mathbf{r}_{\rho \rightarrow u}^n = (f_{\rho \rightarrow u}^i, g_{\rho \rightarrow u}^i)_{i=1}^{n-1}$  from  $\mathbf{p}_{\rho}^n \llbracket \psi_{\rho} \rrbracket$  to  $\mathbf{u}_{n-1,0}^n$  and its associated repadding, which we write just as  $\Theta_{\rho \rightarrow u}^i$ , as follows:*

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\rho \rightarrow u}^i &:= \text{coh}(\mathbb{P} : p_{\rho}^i \llbracket \psi_{\rho}^i \rrbracket *_i \Theta_{\rho \rightarrow u}^i \llbracket \text{in}^- \circ \sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket \rightarrow p_{n-1,0}^i)[x] \\ g_{\rho \rightarrow u}^i &:= \text{coh}(\mathbb{P} : q_{\rho}^i \llbracket \psi_{\rho}^i \rrbracket \rightarrow \Theta_{\rho \rightarrow u}^i \llbracket \text{in}^+ \circ \sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket *_i q_{n-1,0}^i)[x] \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we define repadding data  $\mathbf{r}_{\bar{\rho} \rightarrow u}^n = (f_{\bar{\rho} \rightarrow u}^i, g_{\bar{\rho} \rightarrow u}^i)_{i=1}^{n-1}$  from  $\mathbf{p}_{\bar{\rho}}^n \llbracket \psi_{\bar{\rho}} \rrbracket$  to  $\mathbf{u}_{0,n-1}^n$ , and its associated repadding  $\Theta_{\bar{\rho} \rightarrow u}^i$ , as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\bar{\rho} \rightarrow u}^i &:= \text{coh}(\mathbb{P} : p_{\bar{\rho}}^i \llbracket \psi_{\bar{\rho}}^i \rrbracket *_i \Theta_{\bar{\rho} \rightarrow u}^i \llbracket \text{in}^- \circ \sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket \rightarrow p_{0,n-1}^i)[x] \\ g_{\bar{\rho} \rightarrow u}^i &:= \text{coh}(\mathbb{P} : q_{\bar{\rho}}^i \llbracket \psi_{\bar{\rho}}^i \rrbracket \rightarrow \Theta_{\bar{\rho} \rightarrow u}^i \llbracket \text{in}^+ \circ \sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket *_i q_{0,n-1}^i)[x] \end{aligned}$$

We call the associated repaddings the right-unbiasing repaddings. They provide the following equivalences, which are needed for  $X_2$  in Figure 4:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_0^n &\vdash \Theta_{\rho \rightarrow u}^n : \Theta_{\rho}^n \llbracket v_0^n \rrbracket \rightarrow \Theta_{n-1,0}^n \\ \Gamma_{n-1}^n &\vdash \Theta_{\bar{\rho} \rightarrow u}^n : \Theta_{\bar{\rho}}^n \llbracket v_{n-1}^n \rrbracket \rightarrow \Theta_{0,n-1}^n \end{aligned}$$

We also define the left-unbiasing repadding:

$$\Theta_{\lambda \rightarrow u} := (\Theta_{\rho \rightarrow u})^{\text{op}} \quad \Theta_{\tilde{\lambda} \rightarrow u} := (\Theta_{\bar{\rho} \rightarrow u})^{\text{op}}$$

By Proposition 3.4, these terms satisfy:

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_0^n &\vdash \Theta_{\lambda \rightarrow u}^n : \Theta_\lambda^n \llbracket v_0^n \rrbracket \rightarrow \Theta_{n-1,0}^n \\ \Gamma_{n-1}^n &\vdash \Theta_{\lambda \rightarrow u}^n : \Theta_\lambda^n \llbracket v_{n-1}^n \rrbracket \rightarrow \Theta_{0,n-1}^n\end{aligned}$$

### 3.3. Pseudo-Functoriality of the Unbiased Padding

The key idea for  $X_3$  in Figure 4 is to construct a witness that relates the unbiased padding of a composite, with the composite of unbiased paddings. We think of this as a pseudo-functoriality property, since it is exactly one of the pieces of data for pseudo-functoriality of a 2-functor.

**Proposition 3.13.** *In the context  $(\Gamma_l^n, w : I_k^{n-1})$  we can construct a cell:*

$$\Xi_{k,l}^n : \Theta_{k,l}^n \llbracket v_l^n \rrbracket *_{n-1} \Theta_{k,l}^n \llbracket w \rrbracket \rightarrow \Theta_{k,l}^n \llbracket v_l^n *_{n-1} w \rrbracket$$

*Proof.* Recall the filtration  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{k,1}^n = (\Gamma_l^i, v_l^i, \sigma^i)_{i=m}^n$  for the unbiased padding, defined in Def 3.2. Given a term  $\Gamma_l^i \vdash t : A$ , we introduce the notation:

$$\begin{aligned}t \uparrow^0 v_l^i &:= t \\ t \uparrow^{k+1} v_l^i &:= ((t \uparrow^k v_l^i) \uparrow v_l^{i+k}) \llbracket \sigma^{i+k+1} \rrbracket\end{aligned}$$

We construct by induction on  $i \geq m$  terms  $\Xi_{k,l}^{i \uparrow^{n-i}}$  and then specialise this construction to define  $\Xi_{k,l}^n := \Xi_{k,l}^{n \uparrow^0}$ . The terms  $\Xi_{k,l}^{i \uparrow^{n-i}}$  that we construct will be valid in the context  $\Gamma_l^n$ , and will have source:

$$(\Theta_{k,l}^i \uparrow^{n-i} v_l^i) \llbracket v_l^n \rrbracket *_{n-1} (\Theta_{k,l}^i \uparrow^{n-i} v_l^i) \llbracket w \rrbracket$$

and target:

$$(\Theta_{k,l}^i \uparrow^{n-i} v_l^i) \llbracket v_l^n *_{n-1} w \rrbracket$$

We first claim that, for any  $m < i \leq n$  and  $0 \leq j \leq n-i$ , the unbiased padding satisfies the following equation:

$$\Theta_{k,l}^i \uparrow^j v^i = p_{k,l}^{i-1} *_{i-1} (\Theta_{k,l}^{i-1} \uparrow^{j+1} v_l^{i-1}) *_{i-1} q_{k,l}^{i-1}$$

To see this, we will proceed by induction on  $j$ . When  $j = 0$ , using the defining formula  $(\dagger)$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta_{k,l}^i \uparrow^0 v^n &= \Theta_{k,l}^i \\ &= p_{k,l}^{i-1} *_{i-1} (\Theta_{k,l}^{i-1} \uparrow v_l^{i-1}) \llbracket \sigma^i \rrbracket *_{i-1} q_{k,l}^{i-1} \\ &= p_{k,l}^{i-1} *_{i-1} (\Theta_{k,l}^{i-1} \uparrow^1 v_l^{i-1}) *_{i-1} q_{k,l}^{i-1}\end{aligned}$$

When  $j > 0$ , we have, by induction and using that  $v^{i+j-1} \notin \text{supp}(p_{k,l}^{i-1})$  or  $\text{supp}(q_{k,l}^{i-1})$ , so these are fixed by  $\sigma^{i+j}$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Theta_{k,l}^i \uparrow^j v^i \\
&= ((\Theta_{k,l}^i \uparrow^{j-1} v^i) \uparrow v^{i+j-1}) \llbracket \sigma^{i+j} \rrbracket \\
&= ((p_{k,l}^{i-1} *_{i-1} (\Theta_{k,l}^{i-1} \uparrow^j v_l^{i-1}) *_{i-1} q_{k,l}^{i-1}) \uparrow v^{i+j-1}) \llbracket \sigma^{i+j} \rrbracket \\
&= p_{k,l}^{i-1} *_{i-1} ((\Theta_{k,l}^{i-1} \uparrow^j v_l^{i-1}) \uparrow v^{i+j-1}) \llbracket \sigma^{i+j} \rrbracket *_{i-1} q_{k,l}^{i-1} \\
&= p_{k,l}^{i-1} *_{i-1} (\Theta_{k,l}^{i-1} \uparrow^{j+1} v_l^{i-1}) *_{i-1} q_{k,l}^{i-1}
\end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim.

Returning to the construction of  $\Xi_{k,l}^{i \uparrow n-i}$ , when  $i = m$ , we define  $\Xi_{k,l}^{m \uparrow (n-m)} := \text{id}(v_l^n *_{n-1} w)$ . When  $m < i < n$ , we have:

$$\Theta_{k,l}^i \uparrow^{n-i} v^i = p_{k,l}^{i-1} *_{i-1} (\Theta_{k,l}^{i-1} \uparrow^{n-i+1} v_l^{i-1}) *_{i-1} q_{k,l}^{i-1}$$

by the claim above. This allows us define  $\Xi_{k,l}^{i \uparrow n-i}$  as a composite of an interchanger with an application of the whiskering of  $\Xi_{k,l}^{i-1 \uparrow n-i+1}$ . Formally, to construct this interchanger we consider the pasting context  $\mathbb{X}^N$  for  $N \geq 2$ , given by:

$$\left( \begin{array}{l} d_L^0, d_-^0 : \star, d_L^1 : d_-^0 \rightarrow d_+^0, d_+^0 : \star \\ d_-^1, d_+^1 : d_-^0 \rightarrow d_+^0, \dots, d_-^{N-2}, d_+^{N-2} : d_-^{N-3} \rightarrow d_+^{N-3}, \\ d_-^{N-1}, d_0^{N-1} : d_-^{N-2} \rightarrow d_+^{N-2}, d_T^N : d_-^{N-1} \rightarrow d_0^{N-1}, \\ d_+^{N-1} : d_0^{N-2} \rightarrow d_+^{N-2}, d_B^N : d_0^{N-1} \rightarrow d_+^{N-1}, \\ d_R^0 : \star, d_R^1 : d_+^0 \rightarrow d_R^0 \end{array} \right)$$

The pasting contexts  $\mathbb{X}^2$  and  $\mathbb{X}^3$  are illustrated in Figure 13.

In this context, given a term  $\mathbb{X}^N \vdash t : A$  whose 0-dimensional source is  $d_-^0$  and whose 0-target is  $d_+^0$ , we write  $w(t)$  for the whiskering  $d_L^1 *_0 t *_0 d_R^1$ . We then define:

$$\chi_N := \text{coh}(\mathbb{X}^N : w(d_T^N) *_{N-1} w(d_B^N) \rightarrow w(d_T^N) *_{N-1} d_R^1) [\text{id}_{\mathbb{X}^N}]$$

Equipped with the interchangers  $\chi_N$ , we define  $\Xi_{k,l}^{i \uparrow n-i}$  as the composite summarised by the diagram below, where  $t = \Theta_{k,l}^{i-1} \uparrow^{n-i+1} v_l^{i-1}$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left( p_{k,l}^{i-1} *_{i-1} t \llbracket v_l^n \rrbracket *_{i-1} q_{k,l}^{i-1} \right) *_{n-1} \left( p_{k,l}^{i-1} *_{i-1} t \llbracket w \rrbracket *_{i-1} q_{k,l}^{i-1} \right) \\
& \quad \downarrow \Sigma^{i-1} \chi_{n-i+1} \\
& p_{k,l}^{i-1} *_{i-1} (t \llbracket v_l^n \rrbracket *_{n-1} t \llbracket w \rrbracket) *_{i-1} q_{k,l}^{i-1} \\
& \quad \downarrow \text{whiskering of } \Xi_{k,l}^{i-1 \uparrow n-i+1} \\
& p_{k,l}^{i-1} *_{i-1} t \llbracket v_l^n *_{n-1} w \rrbracket *_{i-1} q_{k,l}^{i-1}
\end{aligned}$$




Figure 13: The pasting contexts  $\mathbb{X}^2$  and  $\mathbb{X}^3$

Finally, for  $i = n$  we define  $\Xi_{k,l}^{n\uparrow 0}$  as the composite of two steps presented below, with  $t = \Theta_{k,l}^{n-1} \uparrow v_l^{n-1}$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left( p_{k,l}^{n-1} *_{n-1} t \llbracket v_l^n \rrbracket *_{n-1} q_{k,l}^{n-1} \right) *_{n-1} \left( p_{k,l}^{n-1} *_{n-1} t \llbracket w \rrbracket *_{n-1} q_{k,l}^{n-1} \right) \\
& \quad \downarrow \text{cancellator for the inverses } q_{k,l}^{n-1} \text{ and } p_{k,l}^{n-1} \quad \text{associators} + \\
& p_{k,l}^{n-1} *_{n-1} (t \llbracket v_l^n \rrbracket *_{n-1} t \llbracket w \rrbracket) *_{n-1} q_{k,l}^{n-1} \\
& \quad \downarrow \text{whiskering of } \Xi_{k,l}^{n-1\uparrow 1} \\
& p_{k,l}^{n-1} *_{n-1} t \llbracket v_l^n *_{n-1} w \rrbracket *_{n-1} q_{k,l}^{n-1}
\end{aligned}$$

□

Note that in the construction above, only the case  $\Xi_{k,l}^{n\uparrow 0}$  used the specific padding data  $\mathbf{u}_{k,l}^n$ , where the witnesses of invertibility were used. The constructions of  $\Xi_{k,l}^{i\uparrow n-1}$  for  $i < n$ , however, work, for arbitrary padding data. We record this in the following slight generalisation:

**Lemma 3.14.** *Let  $\Gamma = (\Gamma^i, v^i, \sigma^i)_{i=m}^n$  be a filtration,  $\mathbf{A}$  be a type adapted to  $\Gamma$  and  $\mathbf{p}$  padding data for  $\mathbf{A}$ . Suppose given a context  $\Delta$  together with terms and substitutions*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Delta \vdash v : s \rightarrow_B t & \Delta \vdash w : t \rightarrow_B u \\
& \Delta \vdash \sigma_v : \Gamma \uparrow v^n & \Delta \vdash \sigma_w : \Gamma \uparrow v^n & \Delta \vdash \sigma_{v*w} : \Gamma^n \uparrow v^n
\end{aligned}$$

such that

$$\vec{v}^n \llbracket \sigma_v \rrbracket = v \quad \vec{v}^n \llbracket \sigma_w \rrbracket = w \quad \vec{v}^n \llbracket \sigma_{v * w} \rrbracket = v * w$$

and for every over variable  $x$ ,

$$x \llbracket \sigma_v \rrbracket = x \llbracket \sigma_w \rrbracket = x \llbracket \sigma_{v * w} \rrbracket.$$

Then, for any  $0 \leq k \leq n - m$ , there exists a term  $\Xi_{\mathbf{p}}^{n-k \uparrow k+1}$  which is derivable in context  $\Delta$  with type:

$$\begin{aligned} & ((\Theta^{n-k} \uparrow^k v^{n-k}) \uparrow v^n) \llbracket \sigma_v \rrbracket *_n ((\Theta^{n-k} \uparrow^k v^{n-k}) \uparrow v^n) \llbracket \sigma_w \rrbracket \\ & \rightarrow ((\Theta^{n-k} \uparrow^k v^{n-k}) \uparrow v^n) \llbracket \sigma_{v * w} \rrbracket \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* The proof is exactly similar to that of Proposition 3.13.  $\square$

### 3.4. Iterated Padding

We conclude our section on padding with additional results regarding relating the nested padding of a padding with a padding performed in a single step. This is used in Corollary 4.6 to construct generalisations of the cells  $H_{k,l}^n$ .

**Definition 3.15.** Let  $\Gamma = (\Gamma^i, v^i, \sigma^i)_{i=m}^n$  be a filtration and  $B^i$  a type family adapted to it. Denote  $A^i$  the type family defined by  $\Gamma^i \vdash v^i : A^i$ . Let  $\Gamma \setminus v^i$  be the context obtained by removing  $v^i$ . Since  $v^i$  is locally maximal, this context is well-formed. Moreover, due to the dimension of  $B^i$ , we have  $\Gamma^i \setminus v^i \vdash B^i$ . We define a family  $\Gamma_{/B} := (\Gamma_{/B}^i, w^i, \sigma_{/B}^i)_{i=m}^n$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{/B}^i &:= (\Gamma^i \setminus v^i, w^i : B^i) \\ \Gamma_{/B}^i &\vdash \sigma_{/B}^i : \Gamma_{/B}^{i-1} \uparrow w^i \\ x \llbracket \sigma_{/B}^i \rrbracket &:= \begin{cases} w^i & \text{if } x = \overline{w^{i-1}} \\ x \llbracket \sigma^i \rrbracket & \text{if } x \in \Gamma^i \setminus v^i \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

**Proposition 3.16.** For any filtration  $\Gamma$  and type family  $B$  adapted to it, the family  $\Gamma_{/B}$  is a filtration. Moreover, a type family  $C$  is adapted to  $\Gamma$  if and only if it is adapted to  $\Gamma_{/B}$ .

*Proof.* We first show that  $\sigma_{/B}^i$  is well-typed. Denoting  $B^i = s^{i-1} \rightarrow_{B^{i-1}[\sigma^i]} t^{i-1}$ , we necessarily have the following, showing that  $\sigma_{/B}^i$  is well-typed, and thus that  $\Gamma_{/B}$  is a filtration:

$$(w^{i-1})^- \llbracket \sigma^i \rrbracket = s^{i-1} \quad (w^{i-1})^+ \llbracket \sigma^i \rrbracket = t^{i-1}$$

For the second part, note that any type family  $C = (C^i)_{i=m}^n$  adapted to either  $\Gamma$  or  $\Gamma_{/B}$  must satisfy:

$$\Delta^i \vdash C^i$$

Since  $A^m = B^m$ , and since  $\sigma^i$  and  $\sigma_{/B}^i$  coincide on  $\Delta^{i-1}$ ,  $C$  is adapted to  $\Gamma$  if and only if it is adapted to  $\Gamma_{/B}$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 3.17.** *Given a filtration  $\Gamma$  with two types families  $B$  and  $C$  adapted to it. Suppose we have padding data  $\mathbf{p} = (p_-^i, p_+^i)_{i=m}^{n-1}$  for  $B$  adapted to  $\Gamma$  and padding data  $\mathbf{q} = (q_-^i, q_+^i)_{i=m}^{n-1}$  for  $C$  adapted to  $\Gamma_{/B}$ . Then there exists padding data  $\mathbf{q} \square \mathbf{p} = (q_-^i \boxminus p_-^i, p_+^i \boxplus q_+^i)_{i=m}^{n-1}$  for  $C$  adapted to  $\Gamma$  and equivalences:*

$$\Gamma^i \vdash \mu_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}}^i : \Theta_{\mathbf{q}}^i \llbracket \Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i \rrbracket \rightarrow \Theta_{\mathbf{q} \square \mathbf{p}}^i$$

*Proof.* Throughout this proof, we suppose that the filtration is given by  $\Gamma = (\Gamma^i, v^i, \sigma^i)$  and we write:

$$A^i = a_-^{i-1} \rightarrow a_+^{i-1} \quad B^i = b_-^{i-1} \rightarrow b_+^{i-1} \quad C^i = c_-^{i-1} \rightarrow c_+^{i-1}$$

We write  $w^i$  for the chosen variable of  $\Gamma_{/B}^i$  in the filtration  $\Gamma_{/B}$ . We construct my mutual the following:

- Padding data  $\mathbf{q} \square \mathbf{p} = (q_-^i \boxminus p_-^i, p_+^i \boxplus q_+^i)_{i=m}^{n-1}$  for the type  $C$  adapted to the filtration  $\Gamma$ .
- Equivalences  $\Gamma^i : \mu_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}}^i : \Theta_{\mathbf{q}}^i \llbracket \Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i \rrbracket \rightarrow \Theta_{\mathbf{q} \square \mathbf{p}}^i$ .

We first define  $q_-^i \boxminus p_-^i$  and  $p_+^i \boxplus q_+^i$  in terms of  $\mu_{\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}}^i$ :

$$\begin{aligned} q_-^i \boxminus p_-^i &:= q_-^i *_i (\Theta_{\mathbf{q}}^i \uparrow w^i) \llbracket p_-^i \rrbracket *_i \mu_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}}^i \llbracket \text{in}^- \circ \sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket \\ p_+^i \boxplus q_+^i &:= (\mu_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}}^i \llbracket \text{in}^+ \circ \sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket)^{-1} *_i (\Theta_{\mathbf{q}}^i \uparrow w^i) \llbracket p_+^i \rrbracket *_i q_+^i \end{aligned}$$

Thus we are left with defining the equivalences  $\mu_{\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}}^i$ . When  $i = m$ , it suffices to chose  $\mu_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}}^m := \text{id}_{v^m}$ . Now, supposing that  $\mu_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}}^i$  has been constructed, we construct  $\mu_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}}^{i+1}$  in three main steps. The source of  $\mu_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}}^{i+1}$  is the following, writing  $*$  for  $*_i$ :

$$\Theta_{\mathbf{q}}^{i+1} \llbracket \Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^{i+1} \rrbracket = q_-^i * (\Theta_{\mathbf{q}}^i \uparrow w^i) \llbracket p_-^i * (\Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i \uparrow v^i) \llbracket \sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket * p_+^i \rrbracket * q_+^i$$

Our first step consist of a ternary variation of the pseudo-functoriality witness  $\Xi_{\mathbf{q}}^{i+1}$  from Lemma 3.14. We can define this ternary variation  $X$  using associators and the binary one as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\Theta_{\mathbf{q}}^i \uparrow w^i) \llbracket p_-^i * (\Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i \uparrow v^i) \llbracket \sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket * p_+^i \rrbracket \\ & \quad \downarrow (\text{associator}) \\ & (\Theta_{\mathbf{q}}^i \uparrow w^i) \llbracket (p_-^i * (\Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i \uparrow v^i) \llbracket \sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket) * p_+^i \rrbracket \\ & \quad \downarrow \Xi_{\mathbf{q}}^{i+1} \\ & (\Theta_{\mathbf{q}}^i \uparrow w^i) \llbracket p_-^i * (\Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i \uparrow v^i) \llbracket \sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket \rrbracket * (\Theta_{\mathbf{q}}^i \uparrow w^i) \llbracket p_+^i \rrbracket \\ & \quad \downarrow \Xi_{\mathbf{q}}^{i+1} \\ & ((\Theta_{\mathbf{q}}^i \uparrow w^i) \llbracket p_-^i \rrbracket * (\Theta_{\mathbf{q}}^i \uparrow w^i) \llbracket (\Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i \uparrow v^i) \llbracket \sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket \rrbracket) * (\Theta_{\mathbf{q}}^i \uparrow w^i) \llbracket p_+^i \rrbracket \\ & \quad \downarrow (\text{associator}) \\ & (\Theta_{\mathbf{q}}^i \uparrow w^i) \llbracket p_-^i \rrbracket * (\Theta_{\mathbf{q}}^i \uparrow w^i) \llbracket (\Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i \uparrow v^i) \llbracket \sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket \rrbracket * (\Theta_{\mathbf{q}}^i \uparrow w^i) \llbracket p_+^i \rrbracket \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma B.8, the target of this cell is equal to:

$$(\Theta_{\mathbf{q}} \uparrow w^i) \llbracket p_-^i \rrbracket * (\Theta_{\mathbf{q}} \llbracket \Theta_{\mathbf{p}} \rrbracket \uparrow w^i) \llbracket \sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket * (\Theta_{\mathbf{q}} \uparrow w^i) \llbracket p_+^i \rrbracket$$

To proceed further, we use the term  $\mu_{\mathbf{q},\mathbf{p}}^i \uparrow v^i$ , which in context  $\Gamma^i \uparrow v^i$  has type:

$$\mu_{\mathbf{q},\mathbf{p}}^i \llbracket \text{in}^- \rrbracket *_i (\Theta_{\mathbf{q}\square\mathbf{p}}^i \uparrow v^i) \rightarrow (\Theta_{\mathbf{q}}^i \llbracket \Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i \rrbracket \uparrow v^i) *_i \mu_{\mathbf{q},\mathbf{p}}^i \llbracket \text{in}^+ \rrbracket$$

We now construct a new cell denoted  $Y$ , defined as a composite of 5 steps:

$$\begin{aligned} & \Theta_{\mathbf{q}}^i \llbracket \Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i \rrbracket \uparrow v^i \\ & \downarrow (\text{unit}) \\ & (\Theta_{\mathbf{q}}^i \llbracket \Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i \rrbracket \uparrow v^i) *_i \text{id}(\Theta_{\mathbf{q}}^i \llbracket \Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i \rrbracket \llbracket \text{in}^+ \rrbracket) \\ & \downarrow ((\text{whiskering of } \varepsilon_{\mu_{\mathbf{q},\mathbf{p}}^i \llbracket \text{in}^+ \rrbracket}^{-1})) \\ & (\Theta_{\mathbf{q}}^i \llbracket \Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i \rrbracket \uparrow v^i) *_i (\mu_{\mathbf{q},\mathbf{p}}^i \llbracket \text{in}^+ \rrbracket *_i (\mu_{\mathbf{q},\mathbf{p}}^i \llbracket \text{in}^+ \rrbracket)^{-1}) \\ & \downarrow (\text{associator}) \\ & ((\Theta_{\mathbf{q}}^i \llbracket \Theta_{\mathbf{p}}^i \rrbracket \uparrow v^i) *_i \mu_{\mathbf{q},\mathbf{p}}^i \llbracket \text{in}^+ \rrbracket) *_i (\mu_{\mathbf{q},\mathbf{p}}^i \llbracket \text{in}^+ \rrbracket)^{-1} \\ & \downarrow (\text{whiskering of } (\mu_{\mathbf{q},\mathbf{p}}^i \uparrow v^i)^{-1}) \\ & (\mu_{\mathbf{q},\mathbf{p}}^i \llbracket \text{in}^- \rrbracket *_i (\Theta_{\mathbf{q}\square\mathbf{p}}^i \uparrow v^i)) *_i (\mu_{\mathbf{q},\mathbf{p}}^i \llbracket \text{in}^+ \rrbracket)^{-1} \\ & \downarrow (\text{associator}) \\ & \mu_{\mathbf{q},\mathbf{p}}^i \llbracket \text{in}^- \rrbracket *_i (\Theta_{\mathbf{q}\square\mathbf{p}}^i \uparrow v^i) *_i (\mu_{\mathbf{q},\mathbf{p}}^i \llbracket \text{in}^+ \rrbracket)^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma C.3, the target of  $Y$  rewrites as:

$$\mu_{\mathbf{q},\mathbf{p}}^i \llbracket \text{in}^- \circ \sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket *_i (\Theta_{\mathbf{q}\square\mathbf{p}}^i \uparrow v^i) *_i (\mu_{\mathbf{q},\mathbf{p}}^i \llbracket \text{in}^+ \circ \sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket)^{-1}$$

This allows us to define the cell  $\mu_{\mathbf{q},\mathbf{p}}^{i+1}$  as a ternary composite as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{p}_- &= (\Theta_{\mathbf{q}} \uparrow w^i) \llbracket p_-^i \rrbracket & \tilde{p}_+ &= (\Theta_{\mathbf{q}} \uparrow w^i) \llbracket p_+^i \rrbracket \\ \mu_{\mathbf{q},\mathbf{p}}^{i+1} &:= (q_-^i * (X *_i (\tilde{p}_- * Y * \tilde{p}_+)) * q_+^i) *_i (\text{associator}) \end{aligned}$$

Here the associator is determined by the type:

$$\begin{aligned} & f_1 * (f_2 * (f_3 * f_4 * f_5) * f_6) * f_7 \\ & \downarrow \\ & (f_1 * f_2 * f_3) * f_4 * (f_5 * f_6 * f_7) \end{aligned}$$

This construction is illustrated in Figure 14. □




Figure 14: The constructions of  $q_-^i \boxminus p_-^i$ , for  $i = 0, 1, 2$ , where the filtration has height 0.

#### 4. Construction of Eckmann-Hilton Cells

We now construct the cells  $H_{k,l}^n$  for  $0 \leq k, l < n$  with  $k \neq l$ , using our theory of padding. We first present the construction of  $H_{n-1,0}^n$  and  $H_{0,n-1}^n$ , then describe how suspension allows the construction of  $H_{k+1,l+1}^{n+1}$  from  $H_{k,l}^n$ , while naturality allows the construction of  $H_{k,l}^{n+1}$  from  $H_{k,l}^n$ . This covers all cases. To simplify the notation, we introduce the contexts for these cells and types of these cells:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^n &:= (x : \star, a, b : \text{id}_x^{n-1} \rightarrow \text{id}_x^{n-1}) \\ E_{k,l}^n &:= a *_{k,l} b \rightarrow \Theta_{k,l}^n[a *_{l,k} b] \end{aligned}$$

One can check that this type is valid in context  $\mathbb{E}^n$ . Our main result, Theorem 4.4, gives the construction of cells  $H_{k,l}^n$  such that the following judgement is derivable:

$$\mathbb{E}^n \vdash H_{k,l}^n : E_{k,l}^n \quad (2)$$

We begin with the base cases  $H_{n-1,0}^n$  and  $H_{0,n-1}^n$ .

**Lemma 4.1.** *For every  $n \geq 2$ , we can construct cells  $H_{n-1,0}^n$  and  $H_{0,n-1}^n$  satisfying:*

$$\mathbb{E}^n \vdash H_{n-1,0}^n : E_{n-1,0}^n \qquad \mathbb{E}^n \vdash H_{0,n-1}^n : E_{0,n-1}^n$$

*Proof.* The construction of  $H_{n-1,0}^n$  follows exactly the structure in the steps  $X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4$  shown in Figure 4. We recall the generalised biased unitors



(Def. 3.5), unbiassing repaddings (Def. 3.12), and pseudofunctoriality of the unbiased padding (Proposition 3.13):

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{D}^n &\vdash \rho^n : \Theta_\rho^n \llbracket d^n *_{\text{id}_{d_+^n}} \rrbracket \rightarrow d^n \\
\mathbb{D}^n &\vdash \lambda^n : \Theta_\lambda^n \llbracket \text{id}_{d_-^n} *_{\text{id}_{d_-^n}} d^n \rrbracket \rightarrow d^n \\
\Gamma_0^n &\vdash \Theta_{\rho \rightarrow u}^n : \Theta_\rho^n \llbracket v_0^n \rrbracket \rightarrow \Theta_{n-1,0}^n \\
\Gamma_0^n &\vdash \Theta_{\lambda \rightarrow u}^n : \Theta_\lambda^n \llbracket v_0^n \rrbracket \rightarrow \Theta_{n-1,0}^n \\
(\Gamma_0^n, w : I_0^{n-1}) &\vdash \Xi_{n-1,0}^n : \Theta_{n-1,0}^n \llbracket v_0^n \rrbracket *_{n-1} \Theta_{n-1,0}^n \llbracket w \rrbracket \\
&\rightarrow \Theta_{n-1,0}^n \llbracket v_0^n *_{n-1} w \rrbracket
\end{aligned}$$

The remaining ingredient is the final interchange step (corresponding to  $X_4$  in Figure 4). We define a family of pasting context  $\mathbb{Z}^N$  for  $N \geq 2$ , as the 0-gluing of two  $N$ -discs. The contexts  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  and  $\mathbb{Z}^3$  are illustrated in Figure 15, and the general formula for  $\mathbb{Z}^N$  is:

$$\left( \begin{array}{l} d_L^0, d_0^0 : \star, d_{L-}^1, d_{L+}^1 : d_L^0 \rightarrow d_0^0, \\ d_{L-}^i, d_{L+}^i : d_{L-}^{i-1} \rightarrow d_{L+}^{i-1} \\ d_L^N : d_{L-}^{N-1} \rightarrow d_{L+}^{N-1} \\ d_R^0 : \star, d_{R-}^1, d_{R+}^1 : d_0^0 \rightarrow d_R^0, \\ d_{R-}^i, d_{R+}^i : d_{R-}^{i-1} \rightarrow d_{R+}^{i-1} \\ d_R^N : d_{R-}^{N-1} \rightarrow d_{R+}^{N-1} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{for } 1 < i < N \\ \text{for } 1 < i < N \end{array} \right)$$

We then define:

$$\zeta^N := \text{coh}(\mathbb{Z}^N : (d_L^N *_{\text{id}_{d_{R-}^{N-1}}} ) *_{N-1} (\text{id}_{d_{L+}^{N-1}} *_{\text{id}_{d_{L+}^{N-1}}} d_R^N) \rightarrow d_L^N *_{\text{id}_{d_{L+}^{N-1}}} d_R^N) [\text{id}_{\mathbb{Z}^N}]$$

We construct the cell  $H_{n-1,0}^n$  as the following 4-ary composite, using the above ingredients, as described in Figure 4:

$$\begin{aligned}
&a *_{n-1} b \\
&\downarrow (\rho^n)^{-1} \llbracket a \rrbracket *_{n-1} (\lambda^n)^{-1} \llbracket b \rrbracket \\
&\Theta_\rho^n \llbracket a *_{\text{id}_x^n} \rrbracket *_{n-1} \Theta_\lambda^n \llbracket \text{id}_x^n *_{\text{id}_x^n} b \rrbracket \\
&\downarrow \Theta_{\rho \rightarrow u}^n \llbracket a *_{\text{id}_x^n} \rrbracket *_{n-1} \Theta_{\lambda \rightarrow u}^n \llbracket \text{id}_x^n *_{\text{id}_x^n} b \rrbracket \\
&\Theta_{n-1,0}^n \llbracket a *_{\text{id}_x^n} \rrbracket *_{n-1} \Theta_{n-1,0}^n \llbracket \text{id}_x^n *_{\text{id}_x^n} b \rrbracket \\
&\downarrow \Xi_{n-1,0}^n \llbracket a *_{\text{id}_x^n}, \text{id}_x^n *_{\text{id}_x^n} b \rrbracket \\
&\Theta_{n-1,0}^n \llbracket (a *_{\text{id}_x^n}) *_{n-1} (\text{id}_x^n *_{\text{id}_x^n} b) \rrbracket \\
&\downarrow (\Theta_{n-1,0}^n \uparrow v_0^n) \llbracket \zeta^n \rrbracket \\
&\Theta_{n-1,0}^n \llbracket a *_{\text{id}_x^n} b \rrbracket
\end{aligned}$$




Figure 15: The pasting contexts  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  and  $\mathbb{Z}^3$

Similarly, for  $H_{0,n-1}^n$  recall the cells:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{D}^n &\vdash \bar{\rho}^n : \Theta_{\bar{\rho}}^n \llbracket d^n \rrbracket \rightarrow d^n *_0 \text{id}_{d_+^0}^n \\
\mathbb{D}^n &\vdash \tilde{\lambda}^n : \Theta_{\tilde{\lambda}}^n \llbracket d^n \rrbracket \rightarrow \text{id}_{d_+^0}^n *_0 d^n \\
\Gamma_0^n &\vdash \Theta_{\bar{\rho} \rightarrow u}^n : \Theta_{\bar{\rho}}^n \llbracket v_{n-1}^n \rrbracket \rightarrow \Theta_{0,n-1}^n \\
\Gamma_0^n &\vdash \Theta_{\tilde{\lambda} \rightarrow u}^n : \Theta_{\tilde{\lambda}}^n \llbracket v_{n-1}^n \rrbracket \rightarrow \Theta_{0,n-1}^n \\
(\Gamma_{n-1}^n, w : I_{n-1}^{n-1}) &\vdash \Xi_{0,n-1}^{n-1} : \\
&\Theta_{0,n-1}^n \llbracket v_{n-1}^n \rrbracket *_{n-1} \Theta_{0,n-1}^n \llbracket w \rrbracket \rightarrow \Theta_{n-1,0}^n \llbracket v_{n-1}^n *_{n-1} w \rrbracket
\end{aligned}$$

We then define  $H_{0,n-1}^n$  as the following composite:

$$\begin{aligned}
&a *_0 b \\
&\downarrow (\zeta^n)^{-1} \\
&(a *_0 \text{id}_x^n) *_{n-1} (\text{id}_x^n *_0 b) \\
&\downarrow (\bar{\rho}^n)^{-1} \llbracket a \rrbracket *_{n-1} (\tilde{\lambda}^n)^{-1} \llbracket b \rrbracket \\
&\Theta_{\tilde{\lambda}}^n \llbracket a \rrbracket *_{n-1} (\Theta_{\tilde{\lambda}}^n)^{\text{op}} \llbracket b \rrbracket \\
&\downarrow \Theta_{\bar{\rho} \rightarrow u}^n \llbracket a \rrbracket *_{n-1} \Theta_{\tilde{\lambda} \rightarrow u}^n \llbracket b \rrbracket \\
&\Theta_{0,n-1}^n \llbracket a \rrbracket *_{n-1} \Theta_{0,n-1}^n \llbracket b \rrbracket \\
&\downarrow \Xi_{0,n-1}^{n-1} \llbracket a, b \rrbracket \\
&\Theta_{0,n-1}^n \llbracket a *_{n-1} b \rrbracket
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.2.** *Assuming that a cell  $H_{k,l}^n$  satisfying the judgement (2) is defined, we can define a cell  $H_{k+1,l+1}^{n+1}$  such that:*

$$\mathbb{E}^{n+1} \vdash H_{k+1,l+1}^{n+1} : E_{k+1,m+1}^{n+1}$$

*Proof.* The cell  $\Sigma H_{k,l}^n \llbracket a, b \rrbracket$  is of type:

$$a *_{k+1} b \mapsto (\Sigma \Theta_{k,l}^n) \llbracket a *_{l+1} b \rrbracket$$

To obtain a cell of the desired type, we use the morphism of filtrations:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_\Sigma : \Gamma_{k+1,l+1}^{n+1} &\rightarrow \Sigma \Gamma_{k,l}^n \\ \Sigma v_l^i \llbracket \psi_\Sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket &= v_{l+1}^{i+1} \end{aligned}$$

We then define repadding data  $\mathbf{r}_{k,l}^n = (f_{k,l}^i, g_{k,l}^i)_{i=m+1}^n$  from  $\Sigma \mathbf{u}_{k,l}^n \llbracket \psi_\Sigma \rrbracket$  to  $\mathbf{u}_{k+1,l+1}^{n+1}$ , whose associated repadding is denoted  $\Theta_{\Sigma(k,l) \rightarrow (k+1,l+1)}^i$ . We define this repadding as follows, denoting  $j = i + 1$ :

$$\begin{aligned} f_{k,l}^i &:= \text{coh}(\mathbb{P} : \Sigma p_{k,l}^{i-1} \llbracket \psi_\Sigma^i \rrbracket *_{\Sigma(k,l) \rightarrow (k+1,l+1)} \llbracket \text{in}^- \circ \sigma^j \rrbracket \rightarrow p_{k+1,l+1}^i)[x] \\ g_{k,l}^i &:= \text{coh}(\mathbb{P} : \Sigma q_{k,l}^{i-1} \llbracket \psi_\Sigma^i \rrbracket \rightarrow \Theta_{\Sigma(k,l) \rightarrow (k+1,l+1)}^i \llbracket \text{in}^+ \circ \sigma^j \rrbracket *_{\Sigma(k,l) \rightarrow (k+1,l+1)} q_{k+1,l+1}^i)[x] \end{aligned}$$

The associated repadding then has type:

$$\Gamma_{l+1}^{n+1} \vdash \Theta_{\Sigma(k,l) \rightarrow (k+1,l+1)}^n : (\Sigma \Theta_{k,l}^n) \llbracket v_{l+1}^{n+1} \rrbracket \rightarrow \Theta_{k+1,l+1}^{n+1}$$

We thus define the cell as follows:

$$H_{k+1,l+1}^{n+1} := \Sigma H_{k,l}^n *_{\Sigma(k,l) \rightarrow (k+1,l+1)} \Theta_{\Sigma(k,l) \rightarrow (k+1,l+1)}^n \quad \square$$

**Lemma 4.3.** *Assuming that a cell  $H_{k,l}^n$  satisfying the judgement (2) is defined, we can define a cell  $H_{k,l}^{n+1}$  such that:*

$$\mathbb{E}^{n+1} \vdash H_{k,l}^{n+1} : E_{k,l}^{n+1}$$

*Proof.* We construct the cell as the following composite:

$$\begin{array}{c}
a *_k b \\
\downarrow (\text{unitor}) \\
(a *_k b) *_n \text{id}(\text{id}_x^n *_k \text{id}_x^n) \\
\downarrow (a *_k b) *_n \xi \\
(a *_k b) *_n (\text{H}_{k,l}^n \llbracket \text{id}_x^n, \text{id}_x^n \rrbracket *_n q_{k,l}^n) \\
\downarrow (\text{associator}) \\
((a *_k b) *_n \text{H}_{k,l}^n \llbracket \text{id}_x^n, \text{id}_x^n \rrbracket) *_n q_{k,l}^n \\
\downarrow (\text{naturality}) \\
(\text{H}_{k,l}^n \llbracket \text{id}_x^n, \text{id}_x^n \rrbracket *_n (\Theta_{k,l}^n \uparrow v_l^n) \llbracket a *_l b \rrbracket) *_n q_{k,l}^n \\
\downarrow (\text{associator}) \\
\text{H}_{k,l}^n \llbracket \text{id}_x^n, \text{id}_x^n \rrbracket *_n (\Theta_{k,l}^n \uparrow v_l^n) \llbracket a *_l b \rrbracket *_n q_{k,l}^n \\
\downarrow \xi' *_n q_{k,l}^n \\
p_{k,l}^n *_n (\Theta_{k,l}^n \uparrow v_l^n) \llbracket a *_l b \rrbracket *_n q_{k,l}^n
\end{array}$$

The step labelled “naturality” is an application of the inverse of naturality of the cell  $\text{H}_{k,l}^n$ , and  $\xi$  and  $\xi'$  are the unique coherences of the required type in the context  $\mathbb{P}$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 4.4.** *For every  $0 \leq k, l < n$  with  $k \neq l$ , we can construct a cell  $\text{H}_{k,l}^n$  such that:*

$$\mathbb{E}^n \vdash \text{H}_{k,l}^n : E_{k,l}^n$$

*This witnesses that  $a *_k b$  is congruent to  $a *_l b$ .*

*Proof.* This is obtained by Lemmas 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3  $\square$

**Corollary 4.5.** *Given  $0 \leq k, l < n$  with  $k \neq l$ , we construct cells  $\text{EH}_{k,l}^n$  such that the following judgements are derivable:*

$$\mathbb{E}^n \vdash \text{EH}_{k,l}^n : a *_k b \rightarrow b *_k a$$

*Proof.* We make the following definition:

$$\text{EH}_{k,l}^n := \text{H}_{k,l}^n \llbracket a, b \rrbracket *_n ((\text{H}_{k,l}^n)^{\text{op}\{l+1\}} \llbracket b, a \rrbracket)^{-1}$$

The judgement follows from Theorem 4.4 and Proposition 3.4.  $\square$

We can also extend our construction of  $\text{H}_{k,l}^n$  to include the case where a padding  $\Theta_{p,-}^n$  appears in both the source and the target, as in the vertical morphisms appearing in the Eckmann-Hilton sphere in Figure 3.

**Corollary 4.6.** *For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $p, k, l \leq n$  with  $k \neq l$ , there exist terms:*

$$\mathbb{E}^n \vdash H_{p,k,l}^n : \Theta_{p,k}^n \llbracket a *_k b \rrbracket \rightarrow \Theta_{p,l}^n \llbracket a *_l b \rrbracket$$

*Proof.* If  $p = k$ , we define  $H_{k,k,l}^n := H_{k,l}^n$ , and if  $p = l$ , we define  $H_{l,k,l}^n := (H_{l,k}^n)^{-1}$ . Suppose that  $p, k, l$  are pairwise disjoint, then by Prop. 3.17, we get terms  $\mu_{p,k,l}^n := \mu_{\mathbf{u}_{p,k}^n, \mathbf{u}_{k,l}^n}^n \llbracket a *_l b \rrbracket$ . In context  $\Gamma_l^n$ , the term  $\mu_{p,k,l}^n$  has type:

$$\Theta_{p,k}^n \llbracket \Theta_{k,l}^n \llbracket a *_l b \rrbracket \rrbracket \rightarrow \Theta_{\mathbf{u}_{p,k}^n \sqcup \mathbf{u}_{k,l}^n}^n \llbracket a *_l b \rrbracket$$

We then define repadding data  $(f_{p,k,l}^i, g_{p,k,l}^i)$  in the point context  $\mathbb{P} = (x : \star)$ , with associated repadding  $\Theta_{(p,k) \square (k,l) \rightarrow (p,l)}^n$ :

$$\begin{aligned} f_{p,k,l}^i &:= \text{coh}(\mathbb{P} : p_{p,k}^i \sqcup p_{k,l}^i *_i \Theta_{(p,k) \square (k,l) \rightarrow (p,l)}^i \llbracket \text{in}^- \circ \sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket \rightarrow p_{p,l}^i)[x] \\ g_{p,k,l}^i &:= \text{coh}(\mathbb{P} : q_{k,l}^i \boxplus q_{p,k}^i \rightarrow \Theta_{(p,k) \square (k,l) \rightarrow (p,l)}^i \llbracket \text{in}^+ \circ \sigma^{i+1} \rrbracket *_i q_{p,m}^i)[x] \end{aligned}$$

We then have:

$$\Gamma_l^n \vdash \Theta_{(p,k) \square (k,l) \rightarrow (p,l)}^n : \Theta_{\mathbf{u}_{p,k}^n \sqcup \mathbf{u}_{k,l}^n}^n \llbracket a *_l b \rrbracket \rightarrow \Theta_{p,l}^n \llbracket a *_l b \rrbracket$$

This lets us define the term  $H_{p,k,l}^n$  as follows:

$$(\Theta_{p,k}^n \uparrow v_k^n) \llbracket H_{k,l}^n \rrbracket *_n \mu_{p,k,l}^n \llbracket a *_l b \rrbracket *_n \Theta_{(p,k) \square (k,l) \rightarrow (p,l)}^n \llbracket a *_l b \rrbracket \quad \square$$

This completes our construction of all cells appearing in the Eckmann-Hilton spheres in all dimensions. By the work of Benjamin and Markakis, these are all equivalences [21].

## Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Alex Corner, Eric Finster and Alex Rice for helpful conversations.

## References

- [1] A. Grothendieck, Pursuing stacks (1983). [arXiv:2111.01000](#).
- [2] M. A. Batanin, Monoidal globular categories as a natural environment for the theory of weak  $n$ -categories, *Advances in Mathematics* 136 (1) (1998) 39–103. [doi:10.1006/aima.1998.1724](#).
- [3] T. Leinster, Operads in higher-dimensional category theory, Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge (2000). [arXiv:math/0011106](#).
- [4] G. Maltsiniotis, Grothendieck  $\infty$ -groupoids, and still another definition of  $\infty$ -categories (Sep. 2010). [arXiv:1009.2331](#).

- [5] D. Ara, Sur les  $\infty$ -groupoïdes de grothendieck et une variante  $\infty$ -catégorique, Phd thesis, Université Paris Diderot (Paris 7) (2010).
- [6] B. Eckmann, P. J. Hilton, Structure maps in group theory, *Fundamenta Mathematicae* 50 (1961) 207–221. doi:10.4064/fm-50-2-207-221.
- [7] A. Hatcher, Algebraic topology, 18th Edition, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2018.
- [8] E. Finster, S. Mimram, A type-theoretical definition of weak  $\omega$ -categories, in: Proceedings of the 32nd Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS 2017), ACM, 2017, pp. 1–12. doi:10.5555/3329995.3330059.
- [9] T. Benjamin, A type theoretic approach to weak  $\omega$ -categories and related higher structures, Phd thesis, Institut Polytechnique de Paris (Nov. 2020).
- [10] T. Benjamin, Generating higher identity proofs in homotopy type theory (Dec. 2024). arXiv:2412.01667.
- [11] T. U. F. Program, Homotopy Type Theory: Univalent Foundations of Mathematics, <https://homotopytypetheory.org/book>, Institute for Advanced Study, 2013.
- [12] E. Cheng, N. Gurski, The periodic table of n-categories for low dimensions I: degenerate categories and degenerate bicategories., in: Categories in algebra, geometry and mathematical physics, Vol. 431 of Contemporary Mathematics, AMS, Providence (R.I.), 2007, pp. 143–164.
- [13] E. Finster, D. Reutter, J. Vicary, A. Rice, A type theory for strictly unital  $\infty$ -categories, in: Proceedings of the 37th Annual ACM / IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS 2022), 2022, pp. 1–12. doi:10.1145/3531130.3533363.
- [14] S. Fujii, K. Hoshino, Y. Maehara,  $\omega$ -weak equivalences between weak  $\omega$ -categories, *Advances in Mathematics* 480 (2025) 110490. doi:10.1016/j.aim.2025.110490.
- [15] E. Cheng, A. Corner, A higher-dimensional eckmann–hilton argument (2024).  
URL <https://alex-corner.github.io/slides/corner-ct24.pdf>
- [16] T. Benjamin, S. Mimram, E. Finster, Globular weak  $\omega$ -categories as models of a type theory, *Higher Structures* 8 (2) (2024) 1–69. doi:10.21136/HS.2024.07.
- [17] J. Bourke, Iterated algebraic injectivity and the faithfulness conjecture, *Higher Structures* 4 (2) (2020) 183–210. doi:10.21136/HS.2020.13.

- [18] T. Benjamin, I. Markakis, C. Sarti, Catt contexts are finite computads, in: Electronic Notes in Theoretical Informatics and Computer Science, Vol. 4 - Proceedings of MFPS XL, 2024, p. . doi:10.46298/entics.14675.
- [19] C. J. Dean, E. Finster, I. Markakis, D. Reutter, J. Vicary, Computads for weak  $\omega$ -categories as an inductive type, Advances in Mathematics 450 (2024) 109739. doi:10.1016/j.aim.2024.109739.
- [20] T. Benjamin, I. Markakis, Hom  $\omega$ -categories of a computad are free, Journal of the London Mathematical Society (2025). doi:10.1112/jlms.70367.
- [21] T. Benjamin, I. Markakis, Invertible cells in  $\omega$ -categories (Jun. 2024). arXiv:2406.12127.
- [22] T. Benjamin, Catt - an infinity categorical coherence typechecker (2024). URL <https://github.com/thibautbenjamin/catt>
- [23] S. MacLane, Natural associativity and commutativity, Rice Institute Pamphlet - Rice University Studies 49 (4) (1963) 28–46.
- [24] P. Dybjer, Internal type theory, in: S. Berardi, M. Coppo (Eds.), Types for Proofs and Programs, Vol. 1158, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1996, pp. 120–134. doi:10.1007/3-540-61780-9\_66.
- [25] T. Benjamin, I. Markakis, W. Offord, C. Sarti, J. Vicary, Naturality for higher-dimensional path types, in: 2025 40th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS), 2025, pp. 275–288. doi:10.1109/LICS65433.2025.00028.
- [26] E. Cheng, An  $\omega$ -category with all duals is an  $\omega$ -groupoid, Applied Categorical Structures 15 (4) (2007) 439–453. doi:10.1007/s10485-007-9081-8.
- [27] P. L. Lumsdaine, Weak  $\omega$ -categories from intensional type theory, in: Typed Lambda Calculi and Applications, Vol. 5608, Springer, 2009, pp. 172–187. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-02273-9\_14.
- [28] B. van den Berg, R. Garner, Types are weak  $\omega$ -groupoids, Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society 102 (2) (2011) 370–394. doi:10.1112/plms/pdq026.
- [29] T. Altenkirch, O. Rypacek, A syntactical approach to weak  $\omega$ -groupoids, in: 21st Annual Conference of the EACSL (CSL 2012), 2012, pp. 16–30. doi:10.4230/LIPICS.CSL.2012.16.

## A. Implementation

The type theory `CaTT` is implemented as a proof assistant. The proof assistant reads `.catt` files, and typechecks the terms defined therein.

The provided version has our constructions of the cells  $H_{k,l}^n$  and  $EH_{k,l}^n$  implemented as new built-in operations, accessible under the names `H` and `EH`.

When invoked with suitable arguments, these will trigger our construction to be executed within the proof assistant. As an example, the following commands typecheck and print the terms  $H_{2,0}^3$  and  $EH_{2,0}^3$ :

```
check H(3,2,0)
check EH(3,2,0)
```

Using this automation, we can easily compare the size of the terms generated as  $n$ ,  $k$ , and  $l$  vary. To assess the complexity of the terms we produce, we use an output method where all the subterms are recursively defined through “let-in” definitions. If a subterm appears multiple times, it is only defined once, and the corresponding name is reused. This allows us to factor out the high degree of repetition in the terms we produce, thus giving a reasonable lower-bound of the work a user would have to do to define those terms manually.

We have used this method to generate a range of pre-computed output artifacts, which are included in the supplementary material in the directory **results**. As  $n - \max\{k, l\}$  increases, the size of the output artifact grows rapidly, and we find that terms with  $n - \max\{k, l\} > 4$  are typically too large to be computed and type-checked on our available resources, due to the memory overhead required by the type-checker. Performance analysis indicates that it is the naturality step that dominates the complexity of the proof terms in the limit. In Figure A.16, we list the sizes of a variety of artifacts that we have constructed.

Types in Martin-Löf Type Theory have the structure of an  $\omega$ -groupoid [27, 28, 29], and this has been exploited by Benjamin to implement a pipeline that can convert **CaTT** terms to elements of identity types in Homotopy Type Theory, within the prover Rocq [10]. We have run this on a selection of our generated terms, and in each case Rocq has successfully validated the resulting structures. It may be interesting to explore opportunities to integrate such Rocq outputs as part of larger proof terms in Homotopy Type Theory.

## B. Interactions Between Meta-Operations

Here we record some lemmas about the various interactions between suspensions, opposites, functoriality, and substitutions. Some of these results are already known and we give references where appropriate.

**Lemma B.1.** *Let  $\sigma : \Delta \rightarrow \Gamma$  be a substitution. Then:*

$n$	$H_{1,0}^n$	$H_{2,1}^n$	$H_{3,2}^n$	$H_{2,0}^n$	$H_{3,1}^n$	$H_{3,0}^n$
2	5,340					
3	67,208	6,993		44,209		
4	5,339,606	116,343	8,152	3,117,243	73,981	2,615,998
5	(overflow)	(overflow)	178,592	(overflow)	6,176,548	(overflow)

Figure A.16: Character counts for selected artifacts  $H_{k,l}^n$ .



- If  $\Gamma \vdash t : A$ ,  $\Sigma(t[\![\sigma]\!]) = (\Sigma t)[\![\Sigma\sigma]\!]$
- If  $\Gamma \vdash A$ ,  $\Sigma(A[\![\sigma]\!]) = (\Sigma A)[\![\Sigma\sigma]\!]$

Moreover, if  $\Gamma \vdash_{\text{ps}}$ , then  $\Sigma\partial^\pm\Gamma = \partial^\pm\Sigma\Gamma$ , and  $\Sigma\text{id}_\Gamma = \text{id}_{\Sigma\Gamma}$ .

*Proof.* This was proved by Benjamin [9, Lemma 71].  $\square$

**Lemma B.2.** For any family of terms  $t_0, \dots, t_n$  in a context  $\Gamma$  such that  $t_0 *_k \dots *_k t_n$  is well defined in  $\Gamma$ , the following equality holds:

$$\Sigma(t_0 *_k \dots *_k t_n) = (\Sigma t_0) *_k \dots *_k (\Sigma t_n)$$

For any term  $\Gamma \vdash t : A$ , the following equality holds:

$$\Sigma(\text{id}_t^n) = \text{id}_{\Sigma t}^n$$

*Proof.* For the first claim, we prove the more general statement that for any pasting context  $\Gamma$ , we have  $\Sigma \text{comp}_\Gamma = \text{comp}_{\Sigma\Gamma}$ . We prove this by induction on the pasting context  $\Gamma$ . If  $\Gamma = \mathbb{D}^n$  is a disc, then we note that up to the  $\alpha$ -conversion renaming  $d^n$  into  $d^{n+1}$ , we have  $\Sigma\mathbb{D}^n = \mathbb{D}^{n+1}$ . Then, up to the same  $\alpha$ -conversion, we have:  $\Sigma \text{comp}_{\mathbb{D}^n} = d^n = \text{comp}_{\mathbb{D}^{n+1}}$ . When  $\Gamma$  is not a disc, we have by induction and Lemma B.1.

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma \text{comp}_\Gamma &= \text{coh}(\Sigma\Gamma, \Sigma \text{comp}_{\partial-\Gamma} \rightarrow \text{comp}_{\partial+\Gamma})[\Sigma \text{id}_\Gamma] \\ &= \text{coh}(\Sigma\Gamma, \text{comp}_{\partial-\Gamma} \rightarrow \text{comp}_{\partial+\Gamma})[\text{id}_{\Sigma\Gamma}] \\ &= \text{comp}_{\Sigma\Gamma} \end{aligned}$$

Here we use the fact the  $\partial^\pm$  reduces the dimension of pasting contexts and that the unique pasting context of dimension 0 is a disc for this induction to be well-founded.

For the second statement, we proceed by induction on  $n$ . By definition,  $\Sigma(\text{id}_t^0) = \Sigma t = \text{id}_{\Sigma t}^0$ . For  $n > 0$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma(\text{id}_t^n) &= \text{coh}(\Sigma\mathbb{D}^n : \Sigma d^n \rightarrow \Sigma d^n)[\Sigma \text{id}_t^{n-1}] \\ &= \text{coh}(\mathbb{D}^{n+1} : d^{n+1} \rightarrow d^{n+1})[\Sigma \text{id}_t^{n-1}] \\ &= \text{coh}(\mathbb{D}^{n+1} : d^{n+1} \rightarrow d^{n+1})[\text{id}_{\Sigma t}^{n-1}] \\ &= \text{id}_{\Sigma t}^n \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

**Lemma B.3.** Let  $M \subseteq \mathbb{N}_{>0}$  and  $\sigma : \Delta \rightarrow \Gamma$ . For any term  $\Gamma \vdash t : A$ , we have:

$$(t[\![\sigma]\!])^{\text{op } M} = t^{\text{op } M}[\![\sigma^{\text{op } M}]\!]$$

Similarly, for any substitution  $\tau : \Gamma \rightarrow \Theta$ , we have:

$$(\tau \circ \sigma)^{\text{op } M} = \tau^{\text{op } M} \circ \sigma^{\text{op } M}$$

*Proof.* This is functoriality of the opposites construction, proved by Benjamin and Markakis [20, §5.2], together with the fact that well-typed terms  $\Gamma \vdash t : A$  of dimension  $n$  are in bijection with substitutions  $\Gamma \vdash \sigma : \mathbb{D}^n$ .  $\square$

**Lemma B.4.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a context and  $M \subseteq \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ , for any family  $t_0, \dots, t_n$  of terms in  $\Gamma$  such that  $t_0 *_k \dots *_k t_n$  is well defined, we have:*

$$(t_0 *_k \dots *_k t_n)^{\text{op } M} = \begin{cases} (t_0)^{\text{op } M} *_k \dots *_k (t_n)^{\text{op } M} & k+1 \notin M \\ (t_n)^{\text{op } M} *_k \dots *_k (t_0)^{\text{op } M} & k+1 \in M \end{cases}$$

For any term  $t$  in  $\Gamma$ , we have

$$(\text{id}_t^m)^{\text{op } M} = \text{id}_{t^{\text{op } M}}^m$$

*Proof.* We first prove the first claim, by proving a more general statement, that is, for any pasting context  $\Gamma$ , we have  $(\text{comp}_\Gamma)^{\text{op } M} = \text{comp}_{\Gamma'}[\llbracket \gamma^{-1} \rrbracket]$ , where  $\Gamma'$  is the unique pasting context isomorphic to  $\Gamma^{\text{op } M}$  and  $\gamma$  is the isomorphism. We prove this by induction on  $\Gamma$ . First when  $\Gamma = \mathbb{D}^n$  is a disc, we have  $(\mathbb{D}^n)' = \mathbb{D}^n$ , with the isomorphism  $\gamma$  swapping  $d_-^k$  and  $d_+^k$  for every  $k \in M$  such that  $k < n$ , and acting as the identity on all other variables. Thus, we have

$$(\text{comp}_\Gamma)^{\text{op } M} = d^n = d^n[\llbracket \gamma^{-1} \rrbracket] = \text{comp}_{\Gamma'}[\llbracket \gamma^{-1} \rrbracket]$$

If  $\Gamma$  is not a disc, we distinguish two cases. If  $\dim(\Gamma) \notin M$ , then we have the equality  $\partial^\pm(\Gamma') = (\partial^\pm \Gamma)'$  [20, Lemma 16], and thus:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\text{comp}_\Gamma)^{\text{op } M} \\ &= \text{coh}(\Gamma' : (\text{comp}_{\partial-\Gamma})^{\text{op } M}[\llbracket \gamma \rrbracket] \rightarrow (\text{comp}_{\partial+\Gamma})^{\text{op } M}[\llbracket \gamma \rrbracket])[\gamma^{-1}] \\ &= \text{coh}(\Gamma' : \text{comp}_{(\partial-\Gamma)'} \rightarrow \text{comp}_{(\partial+\Gamma)'})[\gamma^{-1}] \\ &= \text{coh}(\Gamma' : \text{comp}_{\partial-(\Gamma')} \rightarrow \text{comp}_{\partial+(\Gamma')})[\gamma^{-1}] \\ &= \text{comp}_{\Gamma'}[\llbracket \gamma^{-1} \rrbracket] \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, if  $\dim(\Gamma) \in M$  then we have the equality  $\partial^\pm(\Gamma') = (\partial^\mp \Gamma)'$  [20, Lemma 16], and thus:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\text{comp}_\Gamma)^{\text{op } M} \\ &= \text{coh}(\Gamma' : (\text{comp}_{\partial+\Gamma})^{\text{op } M}[\llbracket \gamma \rrbracket] \rightarrow (\text{comp}_{\partial-\Gamma})^{\text{op } M}[\llbracket \gamma \rrbracket])[\gamma^{-1}] \\ &= \text{coh}(\Gamma' : \text{comp}_{(\partial+\Gamma)'} \rightarrow \text{comp}_{(\partial-\Gamma)'})[\gamma^{-1}] \\ &= \text{coh}(\Gamma' : \text{comp}_{\partial+(\Gamma')} \rightarrow \text{comp}_{\partial-(\Gamma')})[\gamma^{-1}] \\ &= \text{comp}_{\Gamma'}[\llbracket \gamma^{-1} \rrbracket] \end{aligned}$$

As before, we use the fact the  $\partial^\pm$  reduces the dimension of pasting contexts and that the unique pasting context of dimension 0 is a disc for this induction to be well-founded.

For the second statement, we proceed by induction on  $m$ . When  $m = 0$ , we have  $(\text{id}_t^m)^{\text{op } M} = t^{\text{op } M} = \text{id}_{t^{\text{op } M}}^0$  as required. When  $m > 0$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{id}_t^m)^{\text{op } M} &= \text{coh}((\mathbb{D}^m)' : d^m[\llbracket \gamma \rrbracket] \rightarrow d^m[\llbracket \gamma \rrbracket])[(\text{id}_t^{m-1})^{\text{op } N}] \\ &= \text{coh}(\mathbb{D}^m : d^m \rightarrow d^m)[(\text{id}_t^{m-1})^{\text{op } M}] \\ &= \text{coh}(\mathbb{D}^m : d^m \rightarrow d^m)[\text{id}_{t^{\text{op } M}}^{m-1}] \\ &= \text{id}_{t^{\text{op } M}}^m \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma B.5.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a context and  $X \subseteq \text{Var}(\Delta)$  a set of maximal-dimension variables. Then for any term  $\Gamma \vdash t : A$  such that  $\text{supp}(t) \cap X = \emptyset$ , we have  $t[\text{in}^\pm] = t$ . Moreover, for any substitution  $\Gamma \vdash \sigma : \Delta$  such that  $\text{supp}(\sigma) \cap X = \emptyset$ , we have  $\sigma \circ \text{in}^\pm = \sigma$ .*

*Proof.* We prove these two results by mutual induction. For a term  $t = x$  which is a variable, by hypothesis,  $x \notin X$ , so  $x[\text{in}^\pm] = x$ . For the term  $\text{coh}(\Theta : B)[\tau]$  we have that  $\text{supp}(t) = \text{supp}(\tau)$ , and we see thus by induction that:

$$t[\text{in}^\pm] = \text{coh}(\Theta : B)[\tau \circ \text{in}^\pm] = t$$

For the empty substitution  $\langle \rangle$ , we have  $\langle \rangle \circ \text{in}^\pm = \langle \rangle$ . For the substitution  $\langle \sigma, x \mapsto t \rangle$ , we have  $\text{supp}(t) \subseteq \text{supp}(\sigma)$ , thus by induction,

$$\langle \sigma, x \mapsto t \rangle \circ \text{in}^\pm = \langle \sigma \circ \text{in}^\pm, x \mapsto t[\text{in}^\pm] \rangle = \langle \sigma, t \rangle \quad \square$$

**Lemma B.6.** *Let  $\Delta$  be a context. Then for any term  $\Delta \vdash t : A$ , we have that  $\text{supp}(A) \subseteq \text{supp}(t)$ . Moreover, for any term  $\Delta \vdash t : A$ , and any substitution  $\Gamma \vdash \sigma : \Delta$ , we have:*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{supp}(t[\sigma]) &= \bigcup_{y \in \text{supp}(t)} \text{supp}(y[\sigma]) \\ \text{supp}(A[\sigma]) &= \bigcup_{y \in \text{supp}(A)} \text{supp}(y[\sigma]) \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* This was proved by Dean et al. [19, Lemma 7.3].  $\square$

**Lemma B.7.** *Let  $\Gamma \vdash \sigma : \Delta$  be a substitution. Let  $X \subseteq \text{Var}(\Gamma)$  be an up-closed set of variables of depth at most 1 in  $\Gamma$  and  $\sigma$ . Then the inclusions  $\Delta \upharpoonright X_\sigma \vdash \text{in}_\Delta^\pm : \Delta$  and  $\Gamma \upharpoonright X \vdash \text{in}_\Gamma^\pm : \Gamma$  satisfy:*

$$\text{in}_\Delta^\pm \circ (\sigma \upharpoonright X) = \sigma \circ \text{in}_\Gamma^\pm$$

*Proof.* We will show that they coincide on every variable  $x$ . If  $x \notin X_\sigma$ , then by definition

$$x[\text{in}_\Delta^\pm \circ \sigma \upharpoonright X] = x[\sigma]$$

Since  $\text{supp}(x[\sigma]) \cap X = \emptyset$ , by Lemma B.5

$$x[\sigma \circ \text{in}_\Gamma^\pm] = x[\sigma]$$

proving the equality. If  $x \in X_\sigma$ , then by definition,

$$x[\text{in}_\Delta^\pm \circ (\sigma \upharpoonright X)] = x^\pm[\sigma \upharpoonright X] = x[\sigma \circ \text{in}_\Gamma^\pm] \quad \square$$

**Lemma B.8.** *Let  $\Gamma \vdash \sigma : \Delta$  a substitution between contexts of the same dimension, and  $X \in \text{Var}(\Gamma)$  a set of variables of depth 0 with respect to  $\Gamma$  and  $\sigma$ . Then for any term  $\Delta \vdash t : A$  such that  $\text{depth}_X t[\sigma] = 0$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} (A \uparrow^t X_\sigma) \llbracket \sigma \uparrow X \rrbracket &= A \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket \uparrow^{t[\sigma]} X \\ (t \uparrow X_\sigma) \llbracket \sigma \uparrow X \rrbracket &= t \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket \uparrow X \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for any substitution  $\Delta \vdash \tau : \Theta$  such that  $\text{depth}_X(\tau \circ \sigma) = 0$ , we have:

$$(\tau \uparrow X_\sigma) \circ (\sigma \uparrow X) = (\tau \circ \sigma) \uparrow X$$

*Proof.* The equality of types is a consequence of Lemma B.7, along with the fact that since  $A$  has disjoint support from  $X$ , we have  $A \llbracket \sigma \uparrow X \rrbracket = A \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket$ :

$$\begin{aligned} (A \uparrow^t X_\sigma) \llbracket \sigma \uparrow X \rrbracket &= t \llbracket \text{in}^- \circ (\sigma \uparrow X) \rrbracket \rightarrow_{A \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket} t \llbracket \text{in}^+ \circ (\sigma \uparrow X) \rrbracket \\ &= t \llbracket \sigma \circ \text{in}^- \rrbracket \rightarrow_{A \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket} t \llbracket \sigma \circ \text{in}^+ \rrbracket \\ &= (A \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket \uparrow^{t[\sigma]} X) \end{aligned}$$

We prove the equalities on terms and substitution by mutual induction. For a term  $t = x$  which is a variable, if  $x \in X_\sigma$  then by definition:

$$(x \uparrow X_\sigma) \llbracket \sigma \uparrow X \rrbracket = x \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket \uparrow X$$

If  $x \notin X_\sigma$  then

$$(x \uparrow X_\sigma) \llbracket \sigma \uparrow X \rrbracket = x \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket$$

whereas and since  $x \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket \cap X = \emptyset$ , we also have

$$x \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket \uparrow X = x \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket$$

For the term  $\text{coh}(\Theta : B)[\tau]$ , then if  $X_{\tau \circ \sigma} \neq \emptyset$  we have by induction, denoting  $u = \text{coh}(\Theta : B)[\text{id}_\Theta]$ :

$$\begin{aligned} (t \uparrow X_\sigma) \llbracket \sigma \uparrow X \rrbracket &= \text{coh}(\Theta \uparrow (X_\sigma)_\tau : u[\text{in}^-] \rightarrow u[\text{in}^+])[(\tau \uparrow X_\sigma) \circ (\sigma \uparrow X)] \\ &= \text{coh}(\Theta \uparrow (X_{\tau \circ \sigma}) : u[\text{in}^-] \rightarrow u[\text{in}^+])[(\tau \circ \sigma) \uparrow X] \\ &= t \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket \uparrow X \end{aligned}$$

If  $X_{\tau \circ \sigma} = \emptyset$ , by Lemma B.6 we have  $\text{supp}(t \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket) \cap X = \emptyset$ . Then by induction together with Lemmas B.5 and B.7, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} (t \uparrow X_\sigma) \llbracket \sigma \uparrow X \rrbracket &= t \llbracket \sigma \uparrow X \rrbracket \\ &= t \llbracket \text{in}_\Delta^\pm \circ \sigma \uparrow X \rrbracket \\ &= t \llbracket \sigma \circ \text{in}_\Gamma^\pm \rrbracket \uparrow X \\ &= t \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket \end{aligned}$$

For the empty substitution  $\langle \rangle$ , we have:

$$(\langle \rangle \uparrow X_\sigma) \circ (\sigma \uparrow X) = \langle \rangle = (\langle \rangle \circ \sigma) \uparrow X$$

For substitutions of the form  $\langle \tau, x \mapsto t \rangle$ , if  $x \in X_{\tau \circ \sigma}$ , we have, by induction and Lemma B.7:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\langle \tau, x \mapsto t \rangle \uparrow X_\sigma) \circ (\sigma \uparrow X) \\ &= \left\langle \begin{array}{l} (\tau \uparrow X_\sigma) \circ (\sigma \uparrow X), x^\pm \mapsto t \llbracket \text{in}^\pm \circ (\sigma \uparrow X) \rrbracket, \\ \vec{x} \mapsto (t \uparrow X_\sigma) \llbracket \sigma \uparrow X \rrbracket \end{array} \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \begin{array}{l} (\tau \circ \sigma) \uparrow X, x^\pm \mapsto t \llbracket \text{in}^\pm \circ (\sigma \uparrow X) \rrbracket, \\ \vec{x} \mapsto (t \uparrow X_\sigma) \llbracket \sigma \uparrow X \rrbracket \end{array} \right\rangle \\ &= \langle (\tau \circ \sigma) \uparrow X, x^\pm \mapsto t \llbracket \sigma \circ \text{in}^\pm \rrbracket, \vec{x} \mapsto (t \uparrow X_\sigma) \llbracket \sigma \uparrow X \rrbracket \rangle \\ &= \langle (\tau \circ \sigma) \uparrow X, x^\pm \mapsto t \llbracket \sigma \circ \text{in}^\pm \rrbracket, \vec{x} \mapsto t \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket \uparrow X \rangle \\ &= (\langle \tau, x \mapsto t \rangle \circ \sigma) \uparrow X \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, if  $x \notin X_{\tau \circ \sigma}$ , we have by induction,

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \tau, x \mapsto t \rangle \uparrow X_\sigma \circ (\sigma \uparrow X) \\ &= \langle \tau \uparrow X_\sigma \circ (\sigma \uparrow X), x \mapsto t \llbracket \sigma \uparrow X \rrbracket \rangle \\ &= \langle (\tau \circ \sigma) \uparrow X, x \mapsto t \llbracket \sigma \uparrow X \rrbracket \rangle \\ &= (\langle \tau, x \mapsto t \rangle \circ \sigma) \uparrow X \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

**Lemma B.9.** *For every context  $\Gamma \vdash$  and every  $X \in \text{Up}(\Gamma)$  such that  $\text{depth}_X(\Gamma) = 0$ :*

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma(\Gamma \uparrow X) &= (\Sigma\Gamma) \uparrow X \\ \Sigma \text{in}_{\Gamma, X}^\pm &= \text{in}_{\Sigma\Gamma, X}^\pm \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We proceed by structural induction on  $\Gamma$ . For the empty context  $\emptyset$ , we have:

$$\Sigma(\emptyset \uparrow \emptyset) = (\Sigma\emptyset) \uparrow \emptyset = (N : \star, S : \star).$$

For the context  $(\Gamma, x : A)$ , denote  $X' = X \setminus \{x\}$ . Then, if  $x \in X$  we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma((\Gamma, x : A) \uparrow X) &= \Sigma(\Gamma \uparrow X', x^\pm : A, \vec{x} : x^- \rightarrow_A x^+) \\ &= (\Sigma(\Gamma \uparrow X'), x^\pm : \Sigma A, \vec{x} : x^- \rightarrow_{\Sigma A} x^+) \\ &= ((\Sigma\Gamma) \uparrow X', x^\pm : \Sigma A, \vec{x} : x^- \rightarrow_{\Sigma A} x^+) \\ &= \Sigma(\Gamma, x : A) \uparrow \Sigma X \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, if  $x \notin X$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma((\Gamma, x : A) \uparrow X) &= \Sigma(\Gamma \uparrow X', x : A) \\ &= (\Sigma(\Gamma \uparrow X'), x : \Sigma A) \\ &= ((\Sigma\Gamma) \uparrow X', x : \Sigma A) \\ &= \Sigma(\Gamma, x : A) \uparrow \Sigma X \end{aligned}$$

For the second statement, consider a variable  $x$  of  $\Gamma$ . If  $x \notin X$ , then we have:

$$x[\![\text{in}_{\Sigma\Gamma, X}^\pm]\!] = x = \Sigma(x[\![\text{in}_{\Gamma, X}^\pm]\!]).$$

If  $x \in X$ , then:

$$x[\![\text{in}_{\Sigma\Gamma, X}^\pm]\!] = x^\pm = x[\![\Sigma \text{in}_{\Gamma, X}^\pm]\!].$$

Finally, since  $N, S \notin X$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} N[\![\text{in}_{\Sigma\Gamma, X}^\pm]\!] &= N = N[\![\Sigma \text{in}_{\Gamma, X}^\pm]\!] \\ S[\![\text{in}_{\Sigma\Gamma, X}^\pm]\!] &= S = S[\![\Sigma \text{in}_{\Gamma, X}^\pm]\!] \end{aligned}$$

The two substitutions thus coincide on all variables and therefore are equal.  $\square$

**Lemma B.10.** *For every context  $\Gamma$  and every  $X \in \text{Up}(\Gamma)$  such that  $\text{depth}_X(\Gamma) = 0$ , the following hold:*

- For any term  $\Gamma \vdash t : A$  such that  $\text{depth}_X(t) = 0$ , we have:

$$\Sigma(t \uparrow X) = (\Sigma t) \uparrow X$$

- For any substitution  $\Gamma \vdash \sigma : \Delta$  such that  $\text{depth}_X(\sigma) = 0$ , we have:

$$\Sigma(\sigma \uparrow X) = (\Sigma \sigma) \uparrow X$$

- For any term  $\Gamma \vdash t : A$  such that  $\text{depth}_X(t) = 1$ , we have:

$$\Sigma(A \uparrow^t X) = (\Sigma A) \uparrow^{\Sigma t} X$$

*Proof.* We prove the first two statements together by mutual induction. If  $t = x$  is a variable in  $X$ , then:

$$\Sigma(x \uparrow X) = \vec{x} = (\Sigma x) \uparrow \Sigma X$$

If  $t = \text{coh}_{\Delta, B}[\sigma]$  and  $\sigma^{-1}X = \emptyset$ , then:

$$\Sigma(t \uparrow X) = \Sigma t = (\Sigma t) \uparrow \Sigma X$$

If  $\sigma^{-1}X \neq \emptyset$ , since  $N, S \notin X$ , we have that  $\sigma^{-1}X = (\Sigma \sigma)^{-1}X$ . Denoting  $Y = \sigma^{-1}X$  and  $u = \text{coh}_{\Delta, B}[\text{id}]$ , we have by Lemma B.9:

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma(t \uparrow X) &= \text{coh}_{\Sigma(\Delta \uparrow Y), (\Sigma u)[\![\Sigma \text{in}_{\Delta, Y}^-]\!] \rightarrow (\Sigma u)[\![\Sigma \text{in}_{\Delta, Y}^+]\!]}[\Sigma(\sigma \uparrow X)] \\ &= (\Sigma t) \uparrow \Sigma X \end{aligned}$$

For the second statement, for the empty substitution  $\langle \rangle$ , we have, since  $N, S \notin X$ :

$$\Sigma(\langle \rangle \uparrow X) = \langle N \mapsto N, S \mapsto S \rangle = (\Sigma \langle \rangle) \uparrow X$$

For the substitution  $\langle \sigma, x \mapsto t \rangle$ , if  $x \notin X$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma(\langle \sigma, x \mapsto t \rangle \uparrow X) &= \langle \Sigma(\sigma \uparrow X), x \mapsto \Sigma t \rangle \\ &= \langle (\Sigma \sigma) \uparrow X, x \mapsto \Sigma t \rangle \\ &= (\Sigma \langle \sigma, x \mapsto t \rangle) \uparrow X\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, if  $x \in X$ , then by the inductive hypothesis, by Lemma B.9, and by the following equation [9, Lemma 71]

$$\Sigma(t \llbracket \text{in}_{\Gamma, X}^{\pm} \rrbracket) = (\Sigma t) \llbracket \Sigma \text{in}_{\Gamma, X}^{\pm} \rrbracket$$

we may compute that:

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma(\langle \sigma, x \mapsto t \rangle \uparrow X) &= \langle \Sigma(\sigma \uparrow X), x^{\pm} \mapsto \Sigma(t \llbracket \text{in}_{\Gamma, X}^{\pm} \rrbracket), \vec{x} \mapsto \Sigma(t \uparrow X) \rangle \\ &= \langle (\Sigma \sigma) \uparrow X, x^{\pm} \mapsto \Sigma(t \llbracket \text{in}_{\Gamma, X}^{\pm} \rrbracket), \vec{x} \mapsto (\Sigma t) \uparrow X \rangle \\ &= \langle (\Sigma \sigma) \uparrow \Sigma X, x^{\pm} \mapsto (\Sigma t) \llbracket \text{in}_{\Sigma \Gamma, X}^{\pm} \rrbracket, \vec{x} \mapsto (\Sigma t) \uparrow X \rangle \\ &= (\Sigma \langle \sigma, x \mapsto t \rangle) \uparrow X\end{aligned}$$

Finally, for the last statement, write  $A = u \rightarrow v$  and  $n = \dim A$ . If  $\text{Var}(v) \cap X = \emptyset$  then the source of  $\Sigma(A \uparrow^t X)$  is given by  $\Sigma(t \llbracket \text{in}_{\Gamma, X}^- \rrbracket)$ . On the other hand, the source of  $(\Sigma A) \uparrow^{\Sigma t} X$  is  $(\Sigma t) \llbracket \text{in}_{\Sigma \Gamma, X}^- \rrbracket$ . Again by Lemma B.9 and the same equality as above, we may deduce that the two sources agree. If  $\text{Var}(v) \cap X = \emptyset$ , then the source of  $\Sigma(A \uparrow^t X)$  is  $\Sigma((t \llbracket \text{in}_{\Gamma, X}^- \rrbracket) *_{\mathbf{n}} (v \uparrow X))$ , while the source of  $(\Sigma A) \uparrow^{\Sigma t} X$  is  $(\Sigma t) \llbracket \text{in}_{\Sigma \Gamma, X}^- \rrbracket *_{\mathbf{n}+1} ((\Sigma v) \uparrow X)$ . By the first part of the lemma and the same reasoning as in the previous case, we see that the two sources agree. A similar argument shows that the target are also equal, proving that the two types coincide.  $\square$

**Lemma B.11.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a  $n$ -dimensional context and  $X \subseteq \text{Var}(\Gamma)$  a set of variables of dimension  $n$ . Then for any  $M \subseteq \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ , there exists an isomorphism:*

$$\text{op}_{\Gamma, X, M}^{\uparrow} : (\Gamma \uparrow X)^{\text{op } M} \xrightarrow{\sim} (\Gamma^{\text{op } M}) \uparrow X \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Moreover, the source and target inclusions  $\Gamma \uparrow X \vdash \text{in}_{\Gamma}^{\pm} : \Gamma$  and  $\Gamma^{\text{op } M} \uparrow X \vdash \text{in}_{\Gamma^{\text{op } M}}^{\pm} : \Gamma^{\text{op } M}$  satisfy

$$(\text{in}_{\Gamma}^{\pm})^{\text{op } M} = \begin{cases} \text{in}_{\Gamma^{\text{op } M}}^{\pm} \circ \text{op}_{\Gamma, X, M}^{\uparrow} & n+1 \notin M \\ \text{in}_{\Gamma^{\text{op } M}}^{\mp} \circ \text{op}_{\Gamma, X, M}^{\uparrow} & n+1 \in M \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

If  $\Gamma$  is a pasting context, denote  $\Gamma'$  the unique pasting context isomorphic to  $\Gamma^{\text{op } M}$  and  $\Gamma' \vdash \gamma_{\Gamma} : \Gamma^{\text{op } M}$  the associated isomorphism. Similarly, denote by  $(\Gamma \uparrow X)'$  the unique pasting context isomorphic to  $(\Gamma \uparrow X)^{\text{op } M}$  and denote by

$(\Gamma \uparrow X)' \vdash \gamma_{\Gamma \uparrow X} : \Gamma^{\text{op} M} \uparrow X^{\text{op} M}$  the associated isomorphism, then:

$$(\Gamma \uparrow X)' = \Gamma' \uparrow X \quad (\text{B.3})$$

$$\gamma_{\Gamma} \uparrow X = \text{op}_{\Gamma, X, M}^{\uparrow} \circ \gamma_{\Gamma \uparrow X} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

$$\gamma_{\Gamma}^{-1} \circ (\text{in}_{\Gamma^{\text{op} M}}^{\pm}) \circ \gamma_{\Gamma \uparrow X} = \begin{cases} \text{in}_{\Gamma'}^{\pm} & n+1 \notin M \\ \text{in}_{\Gamma'}^{\mp} & n+1 \in M \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

*Proof.* Before proving the lemma, we note that  $\Gamma \uparrow X$  is a pasting context [9, Lemma 87], so  $(\Gamma \uparrow X)'$  exists. We first prove the isomorphism (B.1) by structural induction on  $\Gamma$ . For the empty context  $\emptyset$ , we have:

$$(\emptyset \uparrow X)^{\text{op} M} = \emptyset = \emptyset^{\text{op} M} \uparrow X$$

For contexts of the form  $(\Gamma, x : A)$ , if  $x \notin X$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} ((\Gamma, x : A) \uparrow X)^{\text{op} M} &= ((\Gamma \uparrow X)^{\text{op} M}, x : A^{\text{op} M}) \\ &= (\Gamma^{\text{op} M} \uparrow X, x : A^{\text{op} M}) \\ &= (\Gamma, x : A)^{\text{op} M} \uparrow X \end{aligned}$$

If  $x \in X$ , and  $n+1 \in M$ , then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} ((\Gamma, x : A) \uparrow X)^{\text{op} M} \\ = ((\Gamma \uparrow (X \setminus \{x\}))^{\text{op} M}, x^{\pm} : A^{\text{op} M}, \vec{x} : x^+ \rightarrow x^-) \end{aligned}$$

Thus we define the isomorphism:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{op}_{\Gamma, X, M}^{\uparrow} : ((\Gamma, x : A) \uparrow X)^{\text{op} M} &\rightarrow (\Gamma \uparrow, x : A)^{\text{op} M} \\ \langle \text{op}_{\Gamma, X \setminus \{x\}, N}^{\uparrow}, x^{\pm} \mapsto x^{\mp}, \vec{x} \mapsto \vec{x} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

If  $x \in X$  and  $n+1 \notin M$ , then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} ((\Gamma, x : A) \uparrow X)^{\text{op} M} \\ = ((\Gamma \uparrow (X \setminus \{x\}))^{\text{op} M}, x^{\pm} : A^{\text{op} N}, \vec{x} : x^- \rightarrow x^+) \end{aligned}$$

Thus we define the isomorphism:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{op}_{\Gamma, X, M}^{\uparrow} : ((\Gamma, x : A) \uparrow X)^{\text{op} M} &\rightarrow (\Gamma \uparrow, x : A)^{\text{op} M} \\ \langle \text{op}_{\Gamma, X \setminus \{x\}, N}^{\uparrow}, x^{\pm} \mapsto x^{\pm}, \vec{x} \mapsto \vec{x} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

We then prove (B.2) by showing that the two substitutions coincide on every variable. Let  $x \in \text{Var}(\Gamma)$ , if  $x \notin X$ , then we have:

$$x \llbracket (\text{in}_{\Gamma}^{\pm})^{\text{op} M} \rrbracket = x = x \llbracket \text{in}_{\Gamma^{\text{op} M}}^{\pm} \circ \text{op}_{\Gamma, X, M}^{\uparrow} \rrbracket$$

If  $x \in X$ , and  $n+1 \in M$ , then we have:

$$x \llbracket (\text{in}_{\Gamma}^{\pm})^{\text{op} M} \rrbracket = x^{\pm} = x \llbracket \text{in}_{\Gamma^{\text{op} N}}^{\pm} \circ \text{op}_{\Gamma, X, M}^{\uparrow} \rrbracket$$



If  $x \in X$ , and  $n + 1 \notin M$ , then we have:

$$x \llbracket (\text{in}_\Gamma^\pm)^{\text{op } M} \rrbracket = x^\mp = x \llbracket \text{in}_{\Gamma^{\text{op } N}}^\pm \text{op}_{\Gamma, X, M}^\uparrow \rrbracket$$

Equation (B.3) follows from (B.1) by uniqueness, since  $\Gamma' \uparrow X$  is a pasting context isomorphic to  $\Gamma^{\text{op } M} \uparrow X = (\Gamma \uparrow X)^{\text{op } M}$ . Equation (B.4) is then a consequence of this equality, obtained by noticing that both  $\gamma_\Gamma \uparrow X$  and  $\text{op}_{\Gamma, X, M}^\uparrow \circ \Gamma \uparrow X$  are isomorphism whose source is the pasting context  $(\Gamma \uparrow X)'$ . Thus there must be equal since pasting context have no non-trivial automorphisms [8]. Finally, Equation (B.5) follows from (B.2) at the level of variables, since by definition the substitutions  $\gamma_\Gamma$  and  $\gamma_{\Gamma \uparrow X}$  act as the identity on every variable. The substitution have the same source and target and coincide on every variable, thus, they are equal.  $\square$

**Lemma B.12.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a context,  $X \subseteq \text{Var}(\Gamma)$  a set of maximal-dimensional variables of  $\Gamma$  and  $M \subseteq \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ . For any term  $\Gamma \vdash t : A$  such that  $\text{depth}_X(t) = 0$ , we have that:*

$$\begin{aligned} (A \uparrow^t X)^{\text{op } M} \llbracket \text{op}_{\Gamma, X, M}^\uparrow \rrbracket &= A^{\text{op } M} \uparrow^{t^{\text{op } M}} X \\ (t \uparrow X)^{\text{op } M} \llbracket \text{op}_{\Gamma, X, M}^\uparrow \rrbracket &= t^{\text{op } M} \uparrow X \end{aligned}$$

Moreover for any substitution  $\Gamma \vdash \sigma : \Delta$  such that  $\text{depth}_X(\sigma) \leq 0$ , we have:

$$(\sigma \uparrow X)^{\text{op } M} \circ \text{op}_{\Gamma, X, M}^\uparrow = (\text{op}_{\Delta, X_\sigma, N}^\uparrow)^{-1} \circ \sigma^{\text{op } M} \uparrow X$$

*Proof.* We prove the statements together by mutual induction. First note that by definition, the substitution  $\text{op}_{\Gamma, X, M}^\uparrow$  acts as the identity on every variable that is not in  $X$ , and thus for any term whose support does not intersect  $X$ , we have we have  $t \llbracket \text{op}_{\Gamma, X, M}^\uparrow \rrbracket = t$ , and consequently, we have:

$$(t \uparrow X)^{\text{op } M} \llbracket \text{op}_{\Gamma, X, M}^\uparrow \rrbracket = t^{\text{op } M} = t^{\text{op } M} \uparrow X$$

Thus it suffices to prove the result for terms whose support intersect  $X$ . For a term  $t = x$  which is a variable, necessarily  $x \in X$  and thus we have:

$$(x \uparrow X)^{\text{op } M} \llbracket \text{op}_{\Gamma, X, M}^\uparrow \rrbracket = \overrightarrow{x} = x \uparrow X$$

For the term  $\text{coh}(\Delta : B)[\sigma]$ , we denote  $u = \text{coh}(\Delta : B)[\text{id}_\Delta]$ , and  $v = \text{coh}(\Delta' : B^{\text{op } M} \llbracket \gamma_\Delta \rrbracket)[\text{id}_{\Delta'}] = u^{\text{op } N} \llbracket \gamma_\Delta \rrbracket$ . We note that by induction and Lemmas B.8 and B.11, we have the equalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{\Delta \uparrow X_\sigma}^{-1} \circ (\sigma \uparrow X)^{\text{op}} \circ (\text{op}_{\Gamma, X, M}^\uparrow) &= (\gamma_\Gamma^{-1} \circ (\sigma \uparrow X))^{\text{op}} \\ (B \uparrow^u X_\sigma)^{\text{op } M} \llbracket \gamma_{\Delta \uparrow X} \rrbracket &= B^{\text{op } M} \llbracket \gamma_\Delta \rrbracket \uparrow^v X_\sigma \\ (\Delta \uparrow X_\sigma)' &= \Delta' \uparrow X_\sigma \end{aligned}$$

Using this equality together with Lemma (B.3) shows:

$$\begin{aligned} &(t \uparrow X)^{\text{op } M} \llbracket \text{op}_{\Gamma, X, M}^\uparrow \rrbracket \\ &= \text{coh}(\Delta' \uparrow X_\sigma : (B^{\text{op } M} \llbracket \gamma_\Gamma \rrbracket \uparrow^v X)) [(\gamma_\Delta^{-1} \circ (\sigma \uparrow X))^{\text{op}}] \\ &= t^{\text{op}} \uparrow X \end{aligned}$$

Given a term  $\Gamma \vdash t : A$ , of dimension  $n$ , by Lemma B.11, we have, if  $n + 1 \in M$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
& (A \uparrow^t X)^{\text{op } M} \llbracket \text{op}_{\Gamma, X, M}^\uparrow \rrbracket \\
&= t^{\text{op } M} \llbracket (\text{in}_\Gamma^+)^{\text{op } M} \circ \text{op}_{\Gamma, X, M}^\uparrow \rrbracket \rightarrow t^{\text{op } M} \llbracket (\text{in}_\Gamma^-)^{\text{op } M} \circ \text{op}_{\Gamma, X, M}^\uparrow \rrbracket \\
&= t^{\text{op } M} \llbracket \text{in}_{\Gamma^{\text{op } M}}^+ \rrbracket \rightarrow t^{\text{op } M} \llbracket \text{in}_{\Gamma^{\text{op } M}}^- \rrbracket \\
&= A^{\text{op } M} \uparrow^{t^{\text{op } M}} X
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, if  $n + 1 \notin M$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
& (A \uparrow^t X)^{\text{op } M} \llbracket \text{op}_{\Gamma, X, M}^\uparrow \rrbracket \\
&= t^{\text{op } M} \llbracket (\text{in}_\Gamma^-)^{\text{op } M} \circ \text{op}_{\Gamma, X, M}^\uparrow \rrbracket \rightarrow t^{\text{op } M} \llbracket (\text{in}_\Gamma^+)^{\text{op } M} \circ \text{op}_{\Gamma, X, M}^\uparrow \rrbracket \\
&= t^{\text{op } M} \llbracket \text{in}_{\Gamma^{\text{op } M}}^- \rrbracket \rightarrow t^{\text{op } M} \llbracket \text{in}_{\Gamma^{\text{op } M}}^+ \rrbracket \\
&= A^{\text{op } M} \uparrow^{t^{\text{op } M}} X
\end{aligned}$$

For the empty substitution  $\langle \rangle$ , we have:

$$(\langle \rangle \uparrow \emptyset)^{\text{op } N} \circ \text{op}_{\emptyset, \emptyset, X}^\uparrow = \langle \rangle = \langle \rangle^{\text{op } N} \uparrow \emptyset$$

For a substitution of the form  $\Gamma \vdash \langle \sigma, x \mapsto t \rangle : (\Gamma, x : A)$ , if  $x \notin X$ , we have by induction:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\langle \sigma, x \mapsto t \rangle \uparrow X)^{\text{op } M} &= \langle (\sigma \uparrow X)^{\text{op } M}, x \mapsto t^{\text{op } M} \rangle \\
&= \langle \sigma^{\text{op } M} \uparrow X^{\text{op } M}, x \mapsto t^{\text{op } M} \rangle \\
&= \langle \sigma, x \mapsto t \rangle^{\text{op } M} \uparrow X
\end{aligned}$$

If  $x \in X$  and  $\dim(x) + 1 \notin M$ , then we have, by induction and Lemma B.11:

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\langle \sigma, x \mapsto t \rangle \uparrow X)^{\text{op } M} \circ \text{op}^\uparrow \\
&= \left\langle \frac{(\sigma \uparrow X)^{\text{op } M} \circ \text{op}^\uparrow, x^\pm \mapsto t^{\text{op } M} \llbracket (\text{in}_\Gamma^\pm)^{\text{op } M} \circ \text{op}^\uparrow \rrbracket}{\vec{x} \mapsto (t \uparrow X)^{\text{op } M} \llbracket \text{op}^\uparrow \rrbracket}, \right\rangle \\
&= \left\langle \frac{\sigma^{\text{op } M} \uparrow X, x^\pm \mapsto t^{\text{op } M} \llbracket \text{in}_\Gamma^\pm \rrbracket}{\vec{x} \mapsto t^{\text{op } M} \uparrow X}, \right\rangle \\
&= \langle \sigma, x \mapsto t \rangle^{\text{op } M} \uparrow X
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, if  $\dim(x) + 1 \in M$ , then:

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\langle \sigma, x \mapsto t \rangle \uparrow X)^{\text{op } M} \circ \text{op}^\uparrow \\
&= \left\langle \frac{(\sigma \uparrow X)^{\text{op } M} \circ \text{op}^\uparrow, x^\pm \mapsto t^{\text{op } M} \llbracket (\text{in}_\Gamma^\mp)^{\text{op } M} \circ \text{op}^\uparrow \rrbracket}{\vec{x} \mapsto (t \uparrow X)^{\text{op } M} \llbracket \text{op}^\uparrow \rrbracket}, \right\rangle \\
&= \left\langle \frac{\sigma^{\text{op } M} \uparrow X, x^\pm \mapsto t^{\text{op } M} \llbracket \text{in}_\Gamma^\pm \rrbracket}{\vec{x} \mapsto t^{\text{op } M} \uparrow X}, \right\rangle \\
&= \langle \sigma, x \mapsto t \rangle^{\text{op } M} \uparrow X
\end{aligned}$$

□

## C. Interactions with Inverses

We record some lemmas about inverses. First, we present the definition.

**Definition C.1.** We say a coherence term  $t = \text{coh}(\Gamma : A)[\sigma]$  is invertible if either:

- (a)  $t$  is a coherence.
- (b)  $t$  is a composite, and  $\sigma$  satisfies the invertible image condition.

Where we say a substitution  $\Delta \vdash \sigma : \Gamma$  satisfies the invertible image condition if the images of all maximal-dimension variables of  $\Gamma$  under  $\sigma$  are invertible.

The work of Benjamin and Markakis [21] shows that these are exactly the equivalences of  $\mathbf{CaTT}$ , justifying the definition.

**Definition C.2.** We define, by mutual induction:

- Let  $t = \text{coh}(\Gamma : u \rightarrow v)[\sigma]$  be an invertible term. Let  $n = \dim(t)$ . We define:

$$t^{-1} := \begin{cases} \text{coh}(\Gamma : v \rightarrow u)[\sigma] & \text{if (a)} \\ \text{coh}(\Gamma' : A^{\text{op}\{n\}}[\llbracket \gamma \rrbracket])[\gamma^{-1} \circ \bar{\sigma}] & \text{if (b)} \end{cases}$$

- Let  $\Delta \vdash \sigma : \Gamma$  be a substitution satisfying the invertible image condition. Let  $n = \dim(\Gamma)$ . We define:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \vdash \bar{\sigma} : \Gamma^{\text{op}\{n\}} \\ x[\bar{\sigma}] := \begin{cases} (x[\sigma])^{-1} & \dim(x) = n \\ x[\sigma] & \dim(x) < n \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma C.3.** If  $\Delta \vdash t : A$  is invertible, and  $\Gamma \vdash \sigma : \Delta$  is a substitution, then  $t[\sigma]$  is invertible, and the following also holds:

$$(t[\sigma])^{-1} = t^{-1}[\sigma]$$

If  $\Gamma \vdash \sigma : \Delta$  and  $\Delta \vdash \tau : \Theta$  are substitutions, and  $\tau$  satisfies the invertible image condition, then so does  $\tau \circ \sigma$ , and the following also holds:

$$\overline{\tau \circ \sigma} = \bar{\tau} \circ \sigma$$

*Proof.* We prove the two statements by mutual induction. For the term  $\text{coh}(\Theta : u \rightarrow v)[\tau]$ , if it satisfies (a), then so does  $\text{coh}(\Theta : u \rightarrow v)[\tau \circ \sigma] = t[\sigma]$ , so it is also invertible, and we have:

$$(t[\sigma])^{-1} = \text{coh}(\Theta : v \rightarrow u)[\tau \circ \sigma] = t^{-1}[\sigma]$$

If  $\text{coh}(\Theta : u \rightarrow v)[\tau]$  satisfies (b), then  $\tau$  satisfies the invertible image condition, and so by the inductive hypothesis for the second statement, so does  $\tau \circ \sigma$ , so  $\text{coh}(\Theta : u \rightarrow v)[\tau \circ \sigma] = t[\sigma]$  is invertible. Moreover, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} (t[\sigma])^{-1} &= \text{coh}(\Theta' : (u \rightarrow v)^{\text{op}\{n\}}[\gamma])([\gamma^{-1} \circ \overline{\tau \circ \sigma}]) \\ &= \text{coh}(\Theta' : (u \rightarrow v)^{\text{op}\{n\}}[\gamma])([\gamma^{-1} \circ \overline{\tau} \circ \sigma]) \\ &= t^{-1}[\sigma] \end{aligned}$$

For the empty substitution  $\langle \rangle$  which trivially satisfies the invertible image condition, we have:

$$\overline{\langle \rangle \circ \sigma} = \overline{\langle \rangle} = \langle \rangle = \langle \rangle \circ \sigma = \overline{\langle \rangle} \circ \sigma$$

For the substitution  $\langle \tau, x \mapsto t \rangle$ , then either  $\dim(x) = n$  or  $\dim(x) < n$ . In the first case, we have by induction:

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\langle \tau, x \mapsto t \rangle \circ \sigma} &= \langle \overline{\tau \circ \sigma}, x \mapsto (t[\sigma])^{-1} \rangle \\ &= \langle \overline{\tau} \circ \sigma, x \mapsto t^{-1}[\sigma] \rangle \\ &= \overline{\langle \tau, x \mapsto t \rangle} \circ \sigma \end{aligned}$$

In the second case, we have by induction:

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\langle \tau, x \mapsto t \rangle \circ \sigma} &= \langle \overline{\tau \circ \sigma}, x \mapsto t[\sigma] \rangle \\ &= \langle \overline{\tau} \circ \sigma, x \mapsto t[\sigma] \rangle \\ &= \overline{\langle \tau, x \mapsto t \rangle} \circ \sigma \end{aligned}$$

□