

Local categories: a new framework for partiality

MARCELLO LANFRANCHI and JEAN-SIMON PACAUD LEMAY

Macquarie University, School of Mathematical and Physical Sciences

ABSTRACT. Restriction categories provide a categorical framework for partiality. In this paper, we introduce three new categorical theories for partiality: local categories, partial categories, and inclusion categories. The objects of a local category are partially accessible resources, and morphisms are processes between these resources. In a partial category, partiality is addressed via two operators, restriction and contraction, which control the domain of definition of a morphism. Finally, an inclusion category is a category equipped with a family of monics which axiomatize the inclusions between sets. The main result of this paper shows that restriction categories are 2-equivalent to local categories, that partial categories are 2-equivalent to inclusion categories, and that both restriction/local categories are 2-equivalent to bounded partial/inclusion categories. Our result offers four equivalent ways to describe partiality: on morphisms, via restriction categories; on objects, with local categories; operationally, with partial categories; and via inclusions, with inclusion categories. We also translate several key concepts from restriction category theory to the local category context, which allows us to show that various special kinds of restriction categories, such as inverse categories, are 2-equivalent to their analogous kind of local categories. In particular, the equivalence between inverse (restriction) categories and inverse local categories is a generalization of the celebrated Ehresmann-Schein-Nambooripad theorem for inverse semigroups.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Restriction categories: partiality on morphisms	4
3	Local categories: partiality on objects	7
4	Restriction categories are equivalent to local categories	9

5	Concepts of local categories	21
6	Cartesian local categories	28
7	Split local categories	33
8	Inverse local categories	36
9	Join local categories	40
10	Partial categories: an operational approach to partiality	46
11	Inclusion categories: partiality via inclusions	52
12	The fundamental theorem of partiality	58

1 Introduction

Partiality is a fundamental concept through all of mathematics and computer science. Restriction categories provide a categorical framework for partiality. Restriction category theory is now a firmly established field with a rich literature, having found interesting connections and applications to various areas in mathematics and computer science. Restriction categories were originally introduced in [3], inspired by the works of [9], [21], [14], and [20]. In a restriction category, every morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ is associated with an endomorphism $\bar{f}: A \rightarrow A$, called the *restriction idempotent* of f , containing the information about the domain of definition of f . For example, if $g: A \rightarrow C$ is another morphism, the composition $\bar{f}g$ of \bar{f} followed by g is interpreted as the *restriction* of g to the domain of definition of f . In particular, $\bar{f}f$ coincides with f itself, and $\bar{f}\bar{g} = \bar{g}\bar{f}$ is interpreted as the intersection of the domain of definitions of f and g . The archetypal example of a restriction category is the category PAR of sets and partial functions, whose restriction idempotents $\bar{f}: A \rightarrow A$ are the partial functions which send each a to itself when $f(a)$ is defined and undefined elsewhere. One of the advantages of restriction categories is that one can refer to $f: A \rightarrow B$ as a morphism from A to B despite f being only partially defined on A . In particular, a theory developed for total functions of a restriction category is also defined for partially-defined functions, without the need to rethink the latter as total functions on a different domain.

In this paper, we present a new categorical approach to encoding partiality: *local categories*. The objects of a local category can be regarded as partially accessible resources, and morphisms as processes between these resources. In particular, a local category \mathbb{C} is a category equipped with an assignment, for every object M , of a morphism $\eta_M: M \rightarrow LM$, where LM is called the *enlargement* of M , satisfying some basic natural axioms: (i) η_{LM} is the identity on LM ; (ii) η_M is

monic; (iii) the pullback $m: P \rightarrow N$ of η_M along any morphism $f: N \rightarrow LM$ exists, $LP = LN$, and $m: P \rightarrow N$ composed with η_N is equal to η_P . The archetypal example of a local category is the category PARSET whose objects are pairs (U, A) of sets in which $U \subseteq A$ is a subset of A , and whose morphisms $f: (U, A) \rightarrow (V, B)$ are functions $f: U \rightarrow V$ between the subsets. The enlargement $L(U, A)$ of (U, A) is (A, A) , and $\eta_{(U, A)}$ is the inclusion morphism of U into A .

The main result of this paper is showing that local categories are not an orthogonally different perspective on partiality but rather an equivalent alternative to restriction categories. Indeed, while restriction categories encode partiality via morphisms, local categories encode partiality via the objects. We make this precise in Theorem 4.19 by constructing a 2-equivalence between the 2-category of restriction categories and 2-category of local categories. Exploiting this equivalence, we translate various concepts of restriction categories into concepts for local categories, with the table below summarizing our findings.

Restriction categories	Local categories	Definition	Theorem
Restriction functors	Local functors	4.7	4.19
Restriction natural transformations	Local natural transformations	4.8	4.19
Total natural transformations	Total natural transformations	4.8	4.19
Total morphisms	Total objects	3.3	
Compatibility of morphisms $f \smile g$	Compatibility of objects $A \smile B$	5.1	
Partial order on morphisms $f \leq g$	Partial order on objects $A \leq B$	5.2	5.6
Restriction monics	Monics	5.13	5.12
Cartesian restriction category	Cartesian local category	6.7	6.9
Split restriction category	Split local category	7.3	7.6
Inverse (restriction) category	Inverse local category	8.3	8.9
Join restriction category	Join local category	9.2	9.8

Moreover, we also introduce two new other approaches to partiality: *partial categories* and *inclusion categories*. In these settings, neither the objects nor the morphisms carry an intrinsic notion of partiality. Instead, partiality is treated extrinsically. In particular, a partial category consists of a category equipped with a partial order \leq on objects and two operators: *restriction* and *contraction*. One can regard an object $U \leq A$ of a partial category as an object *included* in A . Thus, given a $U \leq A$, the restriction operator *restricts* a morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ to a morphism $f \downarrow U: U \rightarrow B$, which is the restriction of f to the elements of U . On the other hand, given a $V \leq B$, the contraction operator *contracts* a morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ to a morphism $f \uparrow V: A \uparrow_f V \rightarrow V$ defined on an object $A \uparrow_f V \leq A$, which can be regarded as the pre-image of V along f . After introducing a technical assumption, boundedness, we prove the second main Theorem 12.9 of the paper: restriction categories, local categories, bounded partial categories, and bounded inclusion categories are all 2-equivalent to each other. This result generalizes the fundamental theorem of restriction categories, which establishes that *split* restriction categories are 2-equivalent to \mathcal{M} -categories, categories equipped with a system of monics,

stable under composition and pullbacks. Theorem 12.9 shows that (non-necessarily split) restriction categories are 2-equivalent to *bounded inclusion categories*, which are categories equipped with a system of monics which satisfy slightly different axioms from the system of monics of an \mathcal{M} -category and that generalize inclusions of sets.

OUTLINE. In Section 2, we briefly recall the definition of a restriction category and give some examples. In Section 3, we introduce and study local categories. In Section 4, we prove that restriction categories are 2-equivalent to local categories and in Section 5, we harness this equivalence to introduce some concepts of local categories. In Sections 6, 7, 8, and 9 we introduce Cartesian, split, inverse, and join local categories, respectively, and prove that they are 2-equivalent to their restriction analogs. In Section 10, we introduce partial categories and give some examples. In Section 11, we introduce inclusion categories, give some examples, and show that partial categories are 2-equivalent to inclusion categories. Finally, in Section 12, we introduce boundedness and prove that restriction categories, local categories, bounded partial categories, and bounded inclusion categories are all 2-equivalent to each other.

CONVENTIONS. We assume that the reader is familiar with the basics of category theory. We denote an arbitrary category by \mathbb{X} , objects using capital letters such A, B, C , etc., morphisms as arrows $A \rightarrow B$ denoted using lowercase letters such as f, g, h , etc., and we denote identity morphisms as $\text{id}_A : A \rightarrow A$. In this paper, we use diagrammatic notation for composition, that is, we write $fg : A \rightarrow C$ to denote the composition of $f : A \rightarrow B$ and $g : B \rightarrow C$ of first doing f then g .

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS. We thank Steve Lack for pointing out an important remark 12.7, and we are grateful to Richard Garner for suggesting to compare our work with the ESN theorem, as discussed in Section 12. This material is based upon work supported by the AFOSR under award number FA9550-24-1-0008.

2 Restriction categories: partiality on morphisms

In this background section, we review the basics of restriction categories. For an in-depth introduction to restriction categories, we invite the reader to see [3].

Definition 2.1. [3, Section 2.1.1] A **restriction structure** on a category \mathbb{X} consists of an assignment of each morphism $f : A \rightarrow B$ of \mathbb{X} to an endomorphism $\bar{f} : A \rightarrow A$, called the **restriction idempotent** of f , satisfying the following axioms:

[R.1]: For each $f : A \rightarrow B$, $\bar{f}f = f$;

[R.2]: For each $f : A \rightarrow B$ and $g : A \rightarrow C$, $\bar{f}\bar{g} = \bar{g}\bar{f}$;

[R.3]: For each $f: A \rightarrow B$ and $g: A \rightarrow C$, $\bar{g}\bar{f} = \overline{gf}$;

[R.4]: For each $f: A \rightarrow B$, $g: B \rightarrow C$, $f\bar{g} = \overline{fg}f$.

A **restriction category** is a category equipped with a restriction structure.

As we will see below, the restriction idempotent \bar{f} is indeed an idempotent in the usual sense, that is, $\bar{f}\bar{f} = \bar{f}$. So to help better understand the axioms **[R.1]**-**[R.4]**, let us assume that the restriction idempotent \bar{f} splits, that is, there exists an object $E_{\bar{f}}$ and a section-retraction pair $s_{\bar{f}}: E_{\bar{f}} \hookrightarrow A: r_{\bar{f}}$ such that $s_{\bar{f}}r_{\bar{f}} = \text{id}_{E_{\bar{f}}}$ and $\bar{f} = r_{\bar{f}}s_{\bar{f}}$. Morphisms f of a restriction category are interpreted as being partially defined and so we interpret $E_{\bar{f}}$ as the domain of definition of f . Then **[R.1]** says that f is defined on its domain of definition. **[R.2]** says that the intersection of the domain of definition of f with the domain of definition of g is equal to the intersection of the domain of definition of g with that of f . **[R.3]** establishes that the intersection of the domain of definitions of two morphisms $f: A \rightarrow B$ and $g: A \rightarrow C$ is equal to the domain of definition of the morphism f restricted to the domain of definition of g . Finally, **[R.4]** establishes that restricting a morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ to those elements of A whose image along f lands in the domain of definition of a morphism $g: B \rightarrow C$ is to restrict f to the domain of definition of the composition fg of f with g . Here are some key examples of restriction categories.

Example 2.2. Every category is trivially a restriction category by setting $\bar{f} = \text{id}_A$ for all morphisms $f: A \rightarrow B$. In this case, the restriction idempotents are the identities.

Example 2.3. A restriction monoid consists of a monoid M equipped with an operation which sends every element $x \in M$ to \bar{x} , such that $\bar{x}x = x$, $\bar{x}\bar{y} = \bar{y}\bar{x} = \overline{xy}$, and $x\bar{y} = \overline{xy}x$. In particular, a restriction monoid is precisely a one-object restriction category.

Example 2.4. Sets and partial morphisms form a restriction category denoted by **PAR**. The restriction idempotent of a partial morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ is the partial morphism \bar{f} such that $\bar{f}(a) = a$ for every a on which f is defined, and undefined elsewhere.

Example 2.5. Topological spaces and continuous functions $f: A \rightarrow B$ defined on open subsets $U \subseteq A$ form a restriction category whose restriction idempotents are defined as in **PAR**.

Example 2.6. Commutative and unital rings and non-unital ring morphisms, so functions $f: A \rightarrow B$ which preserve zero, sum, and multiplication but not necessarily the unit, so $f(1)$ does not necessarily equal 1, form a category denoted by **CRING_•**. The opposite category **CRING_•^{op}** is a restriction category, or in other words, **CRING_•** is a corestriction category. So for a morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ in **CRING_•**, its corestriction idempotent $\bar{f}: B \rightarrow B$ sends each $b \in B$ to $f(1)b$.

We now recall two important classes of morphisms in restriction categories.

Definition 2.7. [3, Section 2.1.2] In a restriction category \mathbb{X} , a **total morphism** is a morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ whose restriction idempotent is the identity, $\bar{f} = \text{id}_A$. Moreover, a **restriction idempotent** is an endomorphism $e: A \rightarrow A$ that is equal to its own restriction idempotent, $e = \bar{e}$.

Intuitively, total morphisms are those morphisms which are everywhere defined, while the restriction idempotents encode domains of definitions of morphisms.

Definition 2.8. Total morphisms of a restriction category \mathbb{X} are closed under composition and identities; thus, they form a sub-category of \mathbb{X} denoted by $\text{Tot}[\mathbb{X}]$, known as the **total subcategory** of \mathbb{X} .

Here are some useful identities which we will make use of throughout this paper.

Lemma 2.9. [3, Lemma 2.1] In a restriction category \mathbb{X} , the following statements hold:

- (a) Every restriction idempotent $e = \bar{e}$ is an idempotent, that is, $ee = e$;
- (b) For every $f: A \rightarrow B$, \bar{f} is a restriction idempotent, that is, $\bar{\bar{f}} = \bar{f}$;
- (c) For every $f: A \rightarrow B$ and $g: B \rightarrow C$, $\overline{fg} = \bar{f}\bar{g}$;
- (d) Every monic $m: A \rightarrow B$ is total.

As with ordinary idempotents, we can also ask all restriction idempotents to split, as was done above when we discussed interpretations of the axioms [R.1]-[R.4].

Definition 2.10. [3, Section 2.3.3] A **split restriction category** is a restriction category \mathbb{X} whose restriction idempotents split, that is, for each restriction idempotent $e = \bar{e}$, there exists an object E_e of \mathbb{X} and a section-retraction pair $(s_e, r_e): E_e \rightleftarrows A$ such that $r_e s_e = e$.

We conclude this section by recalling that every restriction category \mathbb{X} canonically embeds in a split restriction category $\text{Split}_R[\mathbb{X}]$ [3, Proposition 2-26], which is the **split completion** of \mathbb{X} . Since $\text{Split}_R[\mathbb{X}]$ plays an important role in our story, let us unpack this construction:

[Objects]: An object of $\text{Split}_R[\mathbb{X}]$ consists of a pair (A, a) formed by an object A of \mathbb{X} together with a restriction idempotent $a = \bar{a}: A \rightarrow A$ of \mathbb{X} ;

[Morphisms]: A morphism $f: (A, a) \rightarrow (B, b)$ of $\text{Split}_R[\mathbb{X}]$ consists of a morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ of \mathbb{X} , such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{a} & A \\ f \downarrow & \searrow f & \downarrow f \\ B & \xrightarrow{b} & B \end{array}$$

Equivalently, f satisfies that $afb = f$;

[Identities]: The identity morphism $\text{id}_{(A,a)} : (A, a) \rightarrow (A, a)$ is the morphism $a : A \rightarrow A$;

[Composition]: Composition works as in \mathbb{X} ;

[Restriction]: The restriction idempotent of a morphism $f : (A, a) \rightarrow (B, b)$ is as in \mathbb{X} , so $\bar{f} : (A, a) \rightarrow (A, a)$;

[Splitting]: The splitting of a restriction idempotent $e = \bar{e} : (A, a) \rightarrow (A, a)$ is given by the object (A, e) with morphisms $r_e : (A, a) \rightarrow (A, e)$ and $s_e : (A, e) \rightarrow (A, a)$ both defined as $r_e = e$ and $s_e = e$.

3 Local categories: partiality on objects

In this section, we introduce the first major contribution of this paper: local categories. In contrast to restriction categories, which encode partiality on morphisms, local categories provide a categorical context to capture partiality on objects.

Definition 3.1. A **local structure** on a category \mathbb{C} consists of an assignment for each object $M \in \mathbb{C}$ to an object $\mathsf{L}M$, called the **enlargement** of M , with a morphism $\eta_M : M \rightarrow \mathsf{L}M$, called the **maximal inclusion** of M , which satisfies the following axioms:

[L.1]: For every $M \in \mathbb{C}$, $\mathsf{L}\mathsf{L}M = \mathsf{L}M$ and $\eta_{\mathsf{L}M} = \text{id}_{\mathsf{L}M}$;

[L.2]: For every $M \in \mathbb{C}$, $\eta_M : M \rightarrow \mathsf{L}M$ is monic in \mathbb{C} ;

[L.3]: For every $M \in \mathbb{C}$ and every morphism $f : N \rightarrow \mathsf{L}M$, the pullback

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P & \xrightarrow{\quad} & M \\ m \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \eta_M \\ N & \xrightarrow{\quad f \quad} & \mathsf{L}M \end{array}$$

of η_M along f exists in \mathbb{C} and $\mathsf{L}P = \mathsf{L}N$ and the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P & \xrightarrow{\quad m \quad} & N \\ \eta_P \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta_N \\ \mathsf{L}P & \xlongequal{\quad} & \mathsf{L}N \end{array}$$

A **local category** is a category equipped with a local structure.

Remark 3.2. It is important to stress that L is only an assignment on objects and does not involve any assignment on morphisms. In particular, L does not extend to a functor. Similarly, η is not a natural transformation.

In a local category, LM can be regarded as a total space in which M embeds via the inclusion $\eta_M: M \rightarrow LM$. With this interpretation, [L.1] establishes that the enlargement LLM of the enlargement LM of M is just itself and that the inclusion morphism η_{LM} corresponds to the identity; [L.2] makes η_M into a proper inclusion; finally, [L.3] establishes that the pre-image P of M along f exists in \mathbb{C} and is embedded into N . An important class of objects in a local category are those which coincide with their enlargement.

Definition 3.3. A **total object** in a local category is an object M which coincides with its enlargement, that is, $M = LM$, and $\eta_M = \text{id}_M$.

Here are now some examples of local categories.

Example 3.4. Every category is trivially a local category where for each object M we set $LM := M$ and $\eta_M = \text{id}_M$. In this case, every object is total.

Example 3.5. Given a restriction monoid M , consider the category $L[M]$ of restriction idempotents of M , which is the category whose objects are elements $a \in M$ such that $a = \bar{a}$, while a morphism $x: a \rightarrow b$ from a to b is an element $x \in M$ such that $\bar{x} = a$ and $xb = x$. In particular, the identity morphism of an object a is represented by a itself. Thus, $L[M]$ comes with a local structure, where for each object a , $La := 1$ is the unit of M and $\eta_a: a \rightarrow 1$ is a .

Example 3.6. Consider the category PARSET whose objects are pairs (A, U) formed by two sets such that $U \subseteq A$ and whose morphisms $f: (A, U) \rightarrow (B, V)$ are functions $f: U \rightarrow V$ defined between the subsets. Thus, PARSET is a local category, where $L(A, U) := (A, A)$ and $\eta_{(A, U)}$ is the inclusion function $U \hookrightarrow A$.

Example 3.7. Consider the category PARTOP whose objects are pairs (A, U) formed by two topological spaces such that $U \subseteq A$ and in which the topology of U is the induced topology, and whose morphisms $f: (A, U) \rightarrow (B, V)$ are continuous functions $f: U \rightarrow V$ defined between the subspaces. Thus, PARTOP is a local category, where $L(A, U) := (A, A)$ and $\eta_{(A, U)}$ is the inclusion function $U \hookrightarrow A$.

Example 3.8. Consider the category IDEMRING whose objects are pairs (R, e_R) formed by a unital and commutative ring R and an idempotent element $e_R \in R$, that is, $e_R^2 = e_R$, and whose morphisms $f: (S, e_S) \rightarrow (R, e_R)$ are functions $f: S \rightarrow R$ that preserve the sum, the zero, and multiplication, but not necessarily the unit, and such that $f(e_S) = f(1_S) = e_R$, where 1_S denotes the unit of S . Then IDEMRING^{op} is a local category, or in other words, IDEMRING is a colocal category where $L(R, e_R) := (R, 1_R)$ and $\eta_{(R, e_R)}: L(R, e_R) \rightarrow (R, 1_R)$ sends $r \in R$ to $e_R r$.

4 Restriction categories are equivalent to local categories

In this section, we provide one of the main results of this paper: restriction categories are 2-equivalent to local categories. This justifies the concept that restriction categories and local categories are two sides of the same coin, with one encoding partiality using morphisms and the other using objects.

We begin by onstructing a local category from a restriction category. So given a restriction category \mathbb{X} , define the category $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$ as the total morphisms of the split completion of \mathbb{X} , that is, $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}] = \text{Tot}[\text{Split}_R[\mathbb{X}]]$. Let us unwrap the definition of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$:

[Objects]: An object of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$ consists of a pair (A, a) formed by an object A of \mathbb{X} together with a restriction idempotent $a = \bar{a}: A \rightarrow A$ of \mathbb{X} ;

[Morphisms]: A morphism $f: (A, a) \rightarrow (B, b)$ of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$ consists of a morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ satisfying the following conditions:

$$\bar{f} = a \qquad fb = f$$

[Identities]: The identity morphism $\text{id}_{(A, a)}: (A, a) \rightarrow (A, a)$ is the morphism $a: A \rightarrow A$;

[Composition]: Composition works as in \mathbb{X} .

On morphisms $f: (A, a) \rightarrow (B, b)$, the first condition $\bar{f} = a$ comes from f being a total morphism in $\text{Split}_R[\mathbb{X}]$, which requires the restriction idempotent \bar{f} of f to be the identity on (A, a) , that is, the restriction idempotent a . An object (A, a) of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$ can be interpreted as a subobject to the object A of \mathbb{X} . This interpretation is supported by the fact that every morphism $f: (A, a) \rightarrow (B, b)$ satisfies the equation $\bar{f} = a$, which imposes that the domain of f is fully determined by the restriction idempotent a . From a resource-theory point of view, the objects of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$ can be regarded as partially accessible resources, and morphisms as processes which access only the allowed component of each resource. With this perspective, the equation $fb = f$, establishes that the accessible resources of A processed by f end up in the accessible component of B .

Each object (A, a) of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$, we can associate to the object $\mathbf{L}(A, a) := (A, \text{id}_A)$ which can be regarded as the enlargement in which (A, a) lives. In the resource interpretation, applying the assignment \mathbf{L} to a resource (A, a) means removing every restriction on the resource A . Furthermore, for each object (A, a) there is a distinct morphism

$$\eta_{(A, a)}: (A, a) \xrightarrow{a} (A, \text{id}_A) = \mathbf{L}(A, a)$$

of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$. It is immediate to see that $\mathbf{L}\mathbf{L}(A, a) = \mathbf{L}(A, a)$ and that $\eta_{\mathbf{L}(A, a)} = \text{id}_{\mathbf{L}(A, a)}$. This proves that \mathbf{L} and η satisfy **[L.1]** of Definition 3.1. The next lemma proves that **[L.2]** is also satisfied.

Lemma 4.1. *For each object (A, a) of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$, the morphism $\eta_{(A,a)}$ is monic in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$.*

Proof. Consider two parallel morphisms $f, g: (B, b) \rightarrow (A, a)$ such that $f\eta_{(A,a)} = g\eta_{(A,a)}$. Since f and g are morphisms of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$, they must satisfy the following equations:

$$fa = f \qquad ga = g$$

However, $\eta_{(A,a)}$ is, by definition, a , thus:

$$f = fa = f\eta_{(A,a)} = g\eta_{(A,a)} = ga = g$$

Thus, $f\eta_{(A,a)} = g\eta_{(A,a)}$ implies $f = g$, that is, $\eta_{(A,a)}$ is monic in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$. \square

The next step is to show that \mathbf{L} and η satisfy **[L.3]**. To show this, let us first prove that η admits all pullbacks.

Lemma 4.2. *For every morphism $f: (B, b) \rightarrow \mathbf{L}(A, a)$ of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$, the following*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (B, \bar{f}a) & \xrightarrow{fa} & (A, a) \\ \bar{f}a \downarrow & & \downarrow a \\ (B, b) & \xrightarrow{f} & (A, \text{id}_A) \end{array}$$

is a pullback diagram in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$.

Proof. For starters, let us prove that this diagram commutes. We compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{f}af &= f\bar{a} && \text{([R.4])} \\ &= fa && (\bar{a} = a) \\ &= faa && \text{(Lemma 2.9 (a))} \end{aligned}$$

Now, consider two morphisms $g: (C, c) \rightarrow (B, b)$ and $h: (C, c) \rightarrow (A, a)$ such that $gf = ha$. In particular, $gf = ha = h$, since $ha = h$, being h a morphism in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$. Define the following morphism:

$$t: (C, c) \xrightarrow{g} (B, \bar{f}a)$$

Let us prove that t is a well-defined morphism of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$. First of all, since $\bar{g} = c$, we get that $\bar{t} = c$. Moreover, we compute that:

$$\begin{aligned} t\bar{f}a &= g\bar{f}a && (t = g) \\ &= \bar{g}fag && \text{([R.4])} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \overline{h}ag && (gf = h) \\
&= \overline{h}g && (ha = h) \\
&= \overline{g}g && (\overline{h} = c = \overline{g}) \\
&= g && ([\mathbf{R.1}]) \\
&= t && (t = g)
\end{aligned}$$

Now, we want to show that $t\overline{f}a = g$ and $tfa = h$. The first equation is already proven, since $g = t = t\overline{f}a$. Thus, we easily compute that:

$$\begin{aligned}
tfa &= gfa && (t = g) \\
&= ha && (gf = h) \\
&= h && (ha = h)
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, let $t' : (C, c) \rightarrow (B, \overline{f}a)$ be a morphism of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$ satisfying $t'\overline{f}a = g$ and $t'fa = h$. Thus,

$$t' = t'\overline{f}a = g = t$$

where we used that $t' = t'\overline{f}a$, since t' a morphism of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$. Thus t is unique, and so we conclude that the desired diagram is a pullback. \square

Proposition 4.3. *For a restriction category \mathbb{X} , $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$ is a local category.*

Proof. **[L.1]** is immediate since $\mathbf{L}\mathbf{L}(A, a) = \mathbf{L}(A, \text{id}_A) = (A, \text{id}_A) = \mathbf{L}(A, a)$ and $\eta_{\mathbf{L}(A, a)} = \eta_{(A, \text{id}_A)} = \text{id}_A = \text{id}_{\mathbf{L}(A, a)}$. **[L.2]** is proved by Lemma 4.1. To prove **[L.3]**, notice that by Lemma 4.2, the pullback of $\eta_{(A, a)}$ along every morphism $f : (B, b) \rightarrow (A, \text{id}_A)$ exists in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$ and the pullback is given by the object $(B, \overline{f}a)$. In particular, $\mathbf{L}(B, \overline{f}a) = (B, \text{id}_B) = \mathbf{L}(B, b)$. Moreover, the morphism $\overline{f}a : (B, \overline{f}a) \rightarrow (B, b)$, pullback of η along f , commutes with the maximal inclusions, since:

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{f}a\eta_{(B, b)} &= \overline{f}ab \\
&= \overline{\overline{f}ab\overline{f}a} && ([\mathbf{R.4}]) \\
&= \overline{b\overline{f}a\overline{f}a} && ([\mathbf{R.2}]) \\
&= \overline{b\overline{f}a}\overline{f}a && (\text{Lemma 2.9 (c)}) \\
&= \overline{f}a\overline{f}a && (bf = f) \\
&= \overline{f}a && (\text{Lemma 2.9 (a)}) \\
&= \eta_{(B, \overline{f}a)} && \square
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 4.4. Examples 3.4 - 3.8 are all examples of local categories $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$, where \mathbb{X} runs through Examples 2.2 - 2.6, respectively. Of course, the point of this section is to show that all local categories are essentially of this form.

We now go the other way, constructing a restriction category $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$ from a local category \mathbb{C} . So define $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$ as follows:

[Objects]: An object of $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$ is a total object of \mathbb{C} ;

[Morphisms]: A morphism of $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$ from a total object M to a total object N consists of a class of isomorphism of pairs (U, f) formed by an object U of \mathbb{C} such that $\mathbf{L}U = M$, and a morphism $f: U \rightarrow N$. In particular, two pairs $(U, f): M \rightarrow N$ and $(V, g): M \rightarrow N$ are isomorphic when there exists an isomorphism $\varphi: U \rightarrow V$ such that $\varphi\eta_V = \eta_U$ and $\varphi g = f$. In the following, we shall denote morphisms of $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$ as $(U, f): M \rightarrow N$;

[Identities]: The identity morphism of an object $M = \mathbf{L}M$ of $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$ is the morphism $(M, \text{id}_{\mathbf{L}M})$;

[Composition]: The composition of two morphisms $(U, f): M \rightarrow N$ and $(V, g): N \rightarrow P$ of $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$ is the morphism $(W, \pi_V g): M \rightarrow P$, where:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W & \xrightarrow{\pi_V} & V \\ \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \eta_V \\ U & \xrightarrow{f} & N \end{array}$$

[Restriction]: The restriction idempotent of a morphism $(U, f): M \rightarrow N$ of $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$ is the morphism $\overline{(U, f)} := (U, \eta_U): M \rightarrow M$.

It is convenient to regard the morphisms $(U, f): A \rightarrow B$ of $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$ as (classes of isomorphisms of) spans:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & & B \\ & \nwarrow \eta_U \quad \nearrow f & \\ & U & \end{array}$$

In fact, using this notation, the composition of morphisms coincides precisely with the composition of spans.

Proposition 4.5. *For a local category \mathbb{C} , $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$ is a restriction category.*

Proof. Let us start by proving **[R.1]**. Consider a morphism $(U, f): M \rightarrow N$ of $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$. Since $\eta_U: U \rightarrow \mathbf{L}U = M$ is monic, the pullback

$$\begin{array}{ccc} U & \xlongequal{\quad} & U \\ \parallel & \lrcorner & \downarrow \eta_U \\ U & \xrightarrow{\eta_U} & M \end{array}$$

of η_U along itself [19, Dual of Example 4.4] is just U and the second projection $\pi_U: U \rightarrow U$ of the pullback is the identity on U . Thus:

$$\overline{(U, f)}(U, f) = (U, \eta_U)(U, f) = (U, \pi_U f) = (U, f)$$

This proves **[R.1]**.

Now, consider two morphisms $(U, f): M \rightarrowtail N$ and $(V, g): M \rightarrowtail P$ and its restriction idempotents $\overline{(U, f)} = (U, \eta_U)$ and $\overline{(V, g)} = (V, \eta_V)$. The pullback of η_U along η_V is isomorphic to the pullback of η_V along η_U , by the canonical symmetry $U \times_M V \cong V \times_M U$. Thus, the isomorphism classes represented by $\overline{(U, f)}\overline{(V, g)}$ and $\overline{(V, g)}\overline{(U, f)}$ coincide. This proves **[R.2]**. To prove **[R.3]**, consider again the same pair of morphisms $(U, f): M \rightarrow N$ and $(V, g): M \rightarrow P$. First, let us compute the composition $\overline{(U, f)}(V, g)$. Consider the pullback diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} U \times_M V & \xrightarrow{\pi_V} & V \\ \pi_U \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \eta_V \\ U & \xrightarrow{\eta_U} & M \end{array}$$

Thus:

$$\overline{(U, f)}(V, g) = (U \times_M V, \pi_V g)$$

Therefore:

$$\overline{\overline{(U, f)}(V, g)} = \overline{(U \times_M V, \pi_V g)} = (U \times_M V, \eta_{U \times_M V})$$

However, $\eta_{U \times_M V} = \pi_V \eta_V$. Now, recall that $\overline{(U, f)}\overline{(V, g)}$ is equal to $(U \times_M V, \pi_V \eta_V)$. Thus, $\overline{(U, f)}\overline{(V, g)} = \overline{(U, f)}(V, g)$, and so **[R.3]** holds.

Finally, consider two composable morphisms $(U, f): M \rightarrowtail N$ and $(V, g): N \rightarrowtail P$. Then by the following pullback diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} U \times_N V & \xrightarrow{\pi_V} & V \\ \pi_U \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \eta_V \\ U & \xrightarrow{f} & N \end{array}$$

we have that $\overline{(U, f)}\overline{(V, g)} = (U \times_N V, \pi_V g)$. On the other hand, we first compute $\overline{(U, f)}(V, g)$ to be:

$$\overline{(U, f)}(V, g) = \overline{(U \times_N V, \pi_V g)} = (U \times_N V, \eta_{U \times_N V})$$

However, $\eta_{U \times_N V} = \pi_V \eta_V = \pi_U f$. Now, let us compose $\overline{(U, f)(V, g)}$ with (U, f) . First, consider the following pullback diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} U \times_N V & \xrightarrow{\pi_U} & U & \xlongequal{\quad} & U \\ \parallel & \lrcorner & \parallel & \lrcorner & \downarrow \eta_U \\ U \times_N V & \xrightarrow{\pi_U} & U & \xrightarrow{\eta_U} & M \end{array}$$

Therefore:

$$\overline{(U, f)(V, g)}(U, f) = (U \times_N V, \pi_U f) = (U \times_N V, \pi_V \eta_V) = (U, f)\overline{(V, g)}$$

This proves [R.4]. □

Remark 4.6. Examples 2.2 - 2.6 are all examples of restriction categories $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$, where \mathbb{C} runs through Examples 3.4 - 3.8, respectively. Of course, the main result of this section tells that every restriction category is essentially of this form.

We now want to extend the assignments which send a restriction category \mathbb{X} to the local category $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$ and a local category \mathbb{C} to the restriction category $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$ to two 2-functors. We start by introducing the appropriate notions of functors between local categories.

Definition 4.7. A **local functor** from a local category \mathbb{C} to another local category \mathbb{C}' consists of a functor $F: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}'$ which preserves the local structure strictly, that is, $F\mathbf{L}M = \mathbf{L}'FM$ and $F\eta_M = \eta'_{FM}$, for each $M \in \mathbb{C}$, and that preserves each pullback of η_N along every morphism $f: M \rightarrow \mathbf{L}N$.

Next, we introduce 2-morphisms between local functors.

Definition 4.8. A **local natural transformation** from a local functor $F: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}'$ to another local functor $G: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}'$ is a natural transformation $\varphi_M: FM \rightarrow GM$. A **total natural transformation** from a local functor $F: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}'$ to another local functor $G: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}'$ is a local natural transformation $\varphi_M: FM \rightarrow GM$ such that for every $M \in \mathbb{C}$, the naturality square diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} FM & \xrightarrow{\varphi_M} & GM \\ F\eta_M \downarrow & & \downarrow G\eta_M \\ F\mathbf{L}M & \xrightarrow{\varphi_{\mathbf{L}M}} & G\mathbf{L}M \end{array}$$

of η_M is a pullback diagram.

Local categories, local functors, and local natural transformations form a 2-category denoted by LCAT_{Iax} . Furthermore, the 2-subcategory of LCAT_{Iax} with total natural transformations is denoted by LCAT .

Unsurprisingly, the definitions of local functors and local and total natural transformations are designed to match the notions of restriction functors and restriction and total natural transformations via the \mathbf{L} construction. For starters, recall the definitions of restriction functors and restriction/total natural transformations.

Definition 4.9. [3, Section 2.2.1] A **restriction functor** from a restriction category \mathbb{X} to a restriction category \mathbb{X}' consists of a functor $F: \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}'$ which preserves restriction idempotents $F(\bar{f}) = \overline{F(f)}$.

The literature offers two distinct flavours of 2-morphisms between restriction functors [3].

Definition 4.10. [3, Section 2.2.2] [4, Remark 4.5] A **total natural transformation** from a restriction functor $F: \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}'$ to another restriction functor $G: \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}'$ consists of a natural transformation $\varphi_A: FA \rightarrow GA$ such that for each A , φ_A is total in \mathbb{X}' . A **restriction natural transformation** from a restriction functor $F: \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}'$ to another restriction functor $G: \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}'$ consists of a collection of total morphisms $\varphi_A: FA \rightarrow GA$, such that for any morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ of \mathbb{X} , the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} FA & \xrightarrow{F\bar{f}} & FA & \xrightarrow{\varphi_A} & GA \\ Ff \downarrow & & & & \downarrow Gf \\ FB & \xrightarrow{\varphi_B} & & & GB \end{array}$$

Restriction categories, restriction functors, and restriction natural transformations form a 2-category denoted by RCAT_{Iax} . Furthermore, the 2-subcategory of RCAT_{Iax} with total natural transformations is denoted by RCAT .

Now that we have introduced the appropriate 2-categorical structure for local categories, we can extend the operation \mathbf{L} , which sends every restriction category \mathbb{X} to a local category $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$ to a 2-functor. Consider a restriction functor $F: \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}'$ of restriction categories and let $\mathbf{L}[F]: \mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}] \rightarrow \mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}']$ be the functor which sends an object (A, a) of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$ to (FA, Fa) and a morphism $f: (A, a) \rightarrow (B, b)$ of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$ to Ff . It is immediate that (FA, Fa) is an object of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}']$ and that $Ff: (FA, Fa) \rightarrow (FB, Fb)$ is a morphism of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}']$. In particular, $\overline{Ff} = F\bar{f} = Fb$, since F preserves restriction idempotents. To show that $\mathbf{L}[F]$ is local, consider $\eta_{(A,a)}: (A, a) \rightarrow (A, \text{id}_A)$. Then $\mathbf{L}[F](\eta_{(A,a)}) = (FA, F\text{id}_A) = \mathbf{L}'(\mathbf{L}[F](A, a))$. Moreover:

$$\mathbf{L}[F](\eta_{(A,a)}) = Fa = \eta'_{(FA, Fa)} = \eta'_{\mathbf{L}[F](A,a)}$$

Finally, $\mathbf{L}[F]$ preserves the pullback of Lemma 4.2 on the nose. Now, consider a restriction natural transformation $\varphi_A: FA \rightarrow GA$ between two restriction functors $F, G: \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}'$ and define:

$$\mathbf{L}[\varphi]_{(A,a)} := (FA, Fa) \xrightarrow{(Fa)\varphi_A} (GA, Ga)$$

Lemma 4.11. *Given a restriction natural transformation $\varphi_A: FA \rightarrow GA$ between two restriction functors $F, G: \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}'$, the transformation $\mathbf{L}[\varphi]_{(A,a)} := (Fa)\varphi_A$ is a local natural transformation from $\mathbf{L}[F]$ to $\mathbf{L}[G]$.*

Proof. First, let us prove that $(Fa)\varphi_A$ is a well-defined morphism of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}']$:

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{(Fa)\varphi_A} &= \overline{(Fa)\overline{\varphi_A}} && \text{(Lemma 2.9 (c))} \\ &= \overline{Fa} && (\varphi \text{ total}) \\ &= Fa && (F \text{ preserves restriction idempotents}) \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by the restriction naturality applied to $a: A \rightarrow A$ we have that:

$$(Fa)\varphi_A(Ga) = (Fa)\varphi_A$$

This shows that $(Fa)\varphi_A: (FA, Fa) \rightarrow (GA, Ga)$ is morphism of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}']$. Now, we want to prove that $\mathbf{L}[\varphi]$ is natural. Consider a morphism $f: (A, a) \rightarrow (B, b)$ of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$. Let us compute:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{L}[F](f))(\mathbf{L}[\varphi]_{(B,b)}) &= (Ff)(Fb)\varphi_B \\ &= (Ff)\varphi_B && (fb = f) \\ &= (F\bar{f})\varphi_A(Gf) && ((Ff)\varphi_B = (F\bar{f})\varphi_A(Gf)) \\ &= (Fa)\varphi_A(Gf) && (\bar{f} = a) \\ &= (\mathbf{L}[\varphi]_{(A,a)})(\mathbf{L}[G]f) \end{aligned}$$

This proves that $\mathbf{L}[\varphi]$ is a local natural transformation as desired. \square

Lemma 4.12. *Given a total natural transformation $\varphi_A: FA \rightarrow GA$ between two restriction functors $F, G: \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}'$, the transformation $\mathbf{L}[\varphi]_{(A,a)} := (Fa)\varphi_A$ is a total natural transformation from $\mathbf{L}[F]$ to $\mathbf{L}[G]$.*

Proof. We have already proved in the previous lemma that $(Fa)\varphi_A: (FA, Fa) \rightarrow (GA, Ga)$ is a well-defined morphism of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}']$. Moreover, since φ_A is natural, for any morphism $f: (A, a) \rightarrow (B, b)$:

$$(Ff)\varphi_B = \varphi_A(Gf) = \varphi_A G(\bar{f})(Gf) = (F\bar{f})\varphi_A(Gf)$$

Thus, φ is also a restriction natural transformation; thus, by the previous lemma, $\mathbf{L}[\varphi]$ is natural. To conclude, we now need to prove that the following is a pullback diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (FA, Fa) & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{L}[\varphi]_{(A,a)}} & (GA, Ga) \\ \mathbf{L}[F]\eta_{(A,a)} \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathbf{L}[G]\eta_{(A,a)} \\ (FA, F\mathrm{id}_A) & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{L}[\varphi]_{(A,\mathrm{id}_A)}} & (GA, G\mathrm{id}_A) \end{array}$$

However, this corresponds to the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (FA, Fa) & \xrightarrow{(Fa)\varphi_A} & (GA, Ga) \\ Fa \downarrow & & \downarrow Ga \\ (FA, \mathrm{id}_{FA}) & \xrightarrow{\varphi_A} & (GA, \mathrm{id}_{GA}) \end{array}$$

which, by the naturality of φ_A which implies $(Fa)\varphi_A = \varphi_A Ga$, coincides with the pullback diagram of Lemma 4.2 where $f = \varphi_A$, a is replaced by Ga , b by id_{Fa} , and $\overline{fa} = \overline{\varphi_A Ga}$. \square

Bringing all of this together gives us our 2-functor from restriction categories to local categories.

Proposition 4.13. $\mathbf{L}_{\mathrm{lax}}: \mathbf{RCAT}_{\mathrm{lax}} \rightarrow \mathbf{LCAT}_{\mathrm{lax}}$ and $\mathbf{L}: \mathbf{RCAT} \rightarrow \mathbf{LCAT}$ are 2-functors.

We now turn towards extending \mathbf{R} to a 2-functor. Consider a local functor $F: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}'$ between two local categories \mathbb{C} and \mathbb{C}' . Define $\mathbf{R}[F]: \mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}']$ as the functor which sends an object M of $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$ to FM and a morphism $(U, f): M \rightarrow N$ to $(FU, Ff): FM \rightarrow FN$. Moreover, since $F(\eta_U) = \eta'_{FU}$ for each $U \in \mathbb{C}$, $\mathbf{R}[F]$ preserves the restriction idempotents. Moreover, since F preserves the pullbacks of the maximal inclusions along every morphism, $\mathbf{R}[F]$ preserves composition. Thus, $\mathbf{R}[F]$ is a restriction functor.

Consider now a local natural transformation $\varphi_M: FM \rightarrow GM$, natural in M , between two local functors $F, G: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}'$. Define $\mathbf{R}[\varphi]_M = (FM, \varphi_M): FM \rightarrow GN$. First, notice that $\mathbf{R}[\varphi]$ is total in \mathbb{C}' , since $\overline{(FM, \varphi_M)} = (FM, \eta'_{FM})$ and that local functors preserve total objects, $\eta'_{FM} = F\eta_M = F\mathrm{id}_M = \mathrm{id}_{FM}$.

Lemma 4.14. *Given a local natural transformation $\varphi_M: FM \rightarrow GM$ between two local functors $F, G: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}'$, the transformation $\mathbf{R}[\varphi]_M := (FM, \varphi_M)$ is a restriction natural transformation from $\mathbf{R}[F]$ to $\mathbf{R}[G]$.*

Proof. Consider a morphism $(U, f): M \rightarrowtail N$ of $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$. We want to show that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 FM & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{R}[F](\overline{U, f})} & FM & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{R}[\varphi]_M} & GM \\
 \downarrow \mathbf{R}[F](U, f) & & & & \downarrow \mathbf{R}[G](U, f) \\
 FN & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{R}[\varphi]_N} & & & GN
 \end{array}$$

Let us start by composing $\mathbf{R}[F](U, f)$ with $\mathbf{R}[\varphi]_N$. To do so, we have the following pullback diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 FU & \xlongequal{\quad} & FU \\
 Ff \downarrow & & \downarrow Ff \\
 FN & \xlongequal{\quad} & FN
 \end{array}$$

Therefore, we get that:

$$(\mathbf{R}[F](U, f)) \mathbf{R}[\varphi]_N = (FU, Ff)(FN, \varphi_N) = (FU, (Ff)\varphi_N)$$

Let us now compute the composition $(\mathbf{R}[F](\overline{U, f}))\mathbf{R}[\varphi_M](\mathbf{R}[G](U, f))$:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\mathbf{R}[F](\overline{U, f}))\mathbf{R}[\varphi_M](\mathbf{R}[G](U, f)) &= (FU, F\eta_U)(FM, \varphi_M)(GU, Gf) \\
 &= (FU, (F\eta_U)\varphi_M)(GU, Gf)
 \end{aligned}$$

However, since φ_M is natural in M , we can replace $(F\eta_U)\varphi_M$ with $\varphi_U G\eta_U = \varphi_U \eta'_{GU}$. Moreover, since η'_{GU} is monic, we compute the following pullback diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 FU & \xrightarrow{\varphi_U} & GU & \xlongequal{\quad} & GU \\
 \parallel & \lrcorner & \parallel & \lrcorner & \downarrow \eta'_{GU} \\
 FU & \xrightarrow{\varphi_U} & GU & \xrightarrow{\eta'_{GU}} & GM
 \end{array}$$

Therefore:

$$(\mathbf{R}[F](\overline{U, f}))\mathbf{R}[\varphi_M](\mathbf{R}[G](U, f)) = (FU, (F\eta_U)\varphi_M)(GU, Gf) = (FU, \varphi_U Gf)$$

Finally, by the naturality of φ , $\varphi_U(Gf) = (Ff)\varphi_N$. Therefore, we conclude that:

$$(\mathbf{R}[F](\overline{U, f}))\mathbf{R}[\varphi_M](\mathbf{R}[G](U, f)) = (\mathbf{R}[F](U, f))\mathbf{R}[\varphi]_N$$

Thus, $\mathbf{R}[\varphi]$ is a restriction natural transformation. □

Lemma 4.15. *Given a total natural transformation $\varphi_M: FM \rightarrow GM$ between two local functors $F, G: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}'$, the transformation $\mathbf{R}[\varphi]_M := (FM, \varphi_M)$ is a total natural transformation from $\mathbf{R}[F]$ to $\mathbf{R}[G]$.*

Proof. We have already commented on the fact that $\mathbf{R}[\varphi]_M$ is a total morphism from $\mathbf{R}[F](M)$ to $\mathbf{R}[G](M)$. To prove that $\mathbf{R}[\varphi]$ is total, we shall show that the following diagram commutes for every morphism $(U, f): M \rightarrow N$ of $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} FM & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{R}[\varphi]_M} & GM \\ \downarrow \mathbf{R}[F](U, f) & & \downarrow \mathbf{R}[G](U, f) \\ FN & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{R}[\varphi]_N} & GN \end{array}$$

In the previous lemma, we have already computed the composition of $\mathbf{R}[F](U, f)$ with $\mathbf{R}[\varphi]_N$, which turns out to be the morphism $(FU, (Ff)\varphi_N)$. To compute the other composition, notice that, since φ is total, the following diagram is a pullback:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} FU & \xrightarrow{\varphi_U} & GU \\ \downarrow F\eta_U & \lrcorner & \downarrow \eta_U \\ FM & \xrightarrow{\varphi_M} & GM \end{array}$$

Therefore:

$$\mathbf{R}[\varphi]_M(\mathbf{R}[G](U, f)) = (FM, \varphi_M)(GU, Gf) = (FU, \varphi_U(Gf))$$

However, since φ is natural, we can replace $\varphi_U(Gf)$ with $(Ff)\varphi_N$ and conclude that $\mathbf{R}[\varphi]$ is a total natural transformation. \square

Bringing this together, we obtain our 2-functor from local categories to restriction categories.

Proposition 4.16. $\mathbf{R}_{\text{lax}}: \mathbf{LCAT}_{\text{lax}} \rightarrow \mathbf{RCAT}_{\text{lax}}$ and $\mathbf{R}: \mathbf{LCAT} \rightarrow \mathbf{RCAT}$ are 2-functors.

Now that we have made \mathbf{L} and \mathbf{R} into 2-functors, we not only show that $\mathbf{R}_{\text{lax}} \dashv \mathbf{L}_{\text{lax}}$ and $\mathbf{R} \dashv \mathbf{L}$ form two 2-adjunctions, but also that these adjunctions are 2-equivalences. Let us start by defining the unit and the counit of the adjunction. Consider a restriction category \mathbb{X} and let us unwrap the definition of $\mathbf{R}[\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]]$:

[Objects]: An object of $\mathbf{R}[\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]]$ consists of a pair (A, a) formed by an object A of \mathbb{X} together with a restriction idempotent $a = \bar{a}$ of \mathbb{X} . However, since (A, a) should be total in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$, $a = \text{id}_A$. Thus, objects of $\mathbf{R}[\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]]$, really are pairs (A, id_A) , where $A \in \mathbb{X}$;

[Morphisms]: A morphism $f: (A, \text{id}_A) \rightarrow (B, \text{id}_B)$ of $\mathbf{R}[\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]]$ consists of a restriction idempotent a of \mathbb{X} together with a morphism $f: (A, a) \rightarrow (B, \text{id}_B)$ of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$. In particular, $a = \bar{f}$;

[Restriction]: The restriction idempotent of a morphism $f: (A, \text{id}_A) \rightarrow (B, \text{id}_B)$ is given by $\eta_{(A, \bar{f})}: (A, \bar{f}) \rightarrow (A, \text{id}_A)$, that is, by $\bar{f}: (A, \bar{f}) \rightarrow (A, \text{id}_A)$.

Proposition 4.17. *For every restriction category \mathbb{X} , the restriction category $\mathbf{R}[\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]]$ is isomorphic, as a restriction category, to \mathbb{X} . Moreover, this isomorphism is natural in \mathbb{X} .*

Proof. From the previous discussion, we can construct a functor $N: \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}[\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]]$ which sends every object A to (A, id_A) and every morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ to $f: (A, \bar{f}) \rightarrow (B, \text{id}_B)$. Finally, it is easy to see that this functor is an isomorphism of categories, which is natural in \mathbb{X} and preserves the restriction structure. \square

Let us now unwrap the definition of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]]$ for a local category \mathbb{C} :

[Objects]: An object of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]]$ is a pair (A, U) formed by a total object $A = \text{LA}$ of \mathbb{C} together with an object U of \mathbb{C} , such that $\text{LU} = A$;

[Morphisms]: A morphism $(W, f): (A, U) \rightarrow (B, V)$ of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]]$ consists of an object W of \mathbb{C} subject to the condition $\text{LW} = A$, together with a morphism $f: W \rightarrow B$. The morphism f needs also to meet two further conditions: (1) f should be total in $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$ and (2) $(W, f)(V, \eta_V) = (W, f)$. Condition (1) implies that $W = U$, while condition (2) implies the existence of a unique morphism $\tilde{f}: U \rightarrow V$ such that $\tilde{f}\eta_V = f$. Therefore, a morphism of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]]$, really is a morphism $\tilde{f}: U \rightarrow V$;

[Local]: The L-assignment of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]]$ sends each (A, U) to (A, A) , and $\eta_{(A, U)}$ is $\eta_U: U \rightarrow A$.

Proposition 4.18. *For every local category \mathbb{C} , the local category $\mathbf{L}[\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]]$ is isomorphic, as a local category, to \mathbb{C} . Moreover, this isomorphism is natural in \mathbb{C} .*

Proof. From the previous discussion, we can construct a functor $E: \mathbf{L}[\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ which sends an object (A, U) of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]]$ to U and a morphism $f: (A, U) \rightarrow (B, V)$ to $\tilde{f}: U \rightarrow V$. It is not hard to see that such a functor is natural in \mathbb{C} , and that it preserves the local structure. Furthermore, we can also define an inverse of $E: \mathbf{L}[\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ which sends an object M of \mathbb{C} to (LM, M) and a morphism $f: M \rightarrow N$ to the morphism $f\eta_N: (\text{LM}, M) \rightarrow (\text{LN}, N)$. However, since $\tilde{f}\eta_N = f$, this functor, which is also a local functor, defines an inverse to E . Thus, E is a natural isomorphism of local categories. \square

Finally, we can prove the main result of this section.

Theorem 4.19. *The two 2-functors \mathbf{L}_{lax} and \mathbf{R}_{lax} form a 2-equivalence $\mathbf{RCAT}_{\text{lax}} \simeq \mathbf{LCAT}_{\text{lax}}$. Moreover, this 2-equivalence restricts to a 2-equivalence $\mathbf{RCAT} \simeq \mathbf{LCAT}$.*

Proof. To prove that \mathbf{L}_{Iax} and \mathbf{R}_{Iax} form a 2-equivalence, one only needs to show that the two natural isomorphisms of Propositions 4.17 and 4.18 satisfy the triangle identities. Let us start with the first triangle equation:

$$E_{\mathbf{L}} \circ \mathbf{L}[N] = \text{id}_{\mathbf{L}}$$

First, notice that, $\mathbf{L}[N]$ sends an object (A, a) of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$ to $(N(A), N(a)) = ((A, \text{id}_A), a)$ and a morphism $f: (A, a) \rightarrow (B, b)$ to $f: ((A, \text{id}_A), a) \rightarrow ((B, \text{id}_B), b)$. Thus, $E_{\mathbf{L}} \circ \mathbf{L}[N]$ sends each (A, a) to (A, a) and each $f: (A, a) \rightarrow (B, b)$ to itself. Now, let us prove the second triangle equation:

$$\mathbf{R}[E] \circ N_{\mathbf{R}} = \text{id}_{\mathbf{R}}$$

For starters, $N_{\mathbf{R}}$ sends an object $M = \mathbf{L}M$ of $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$ to (M, id_M) and a morphism $f: M \rightarrow N$ to $f: (M, \text{id}_M) \rightarrow (N, \text{id}_N)$. Finally, $\mathbf{R}[E]$ sends each (M, id_M) to M and each $f: (M, \text{id}_M) \rightarrow (N, \text{id}_N)$ to $f: M \rightarrow N$. \square

5 Concepts of local categories

Restriction categories offer a language for partiality on morphisms by introducing concepts like total morphisms or the compatibility between parallel morphisms. The goal of this section is to translate these concepts for local categories, giving us a language of partiality on objects. For starters, let us recall some key concepts in restriction category theory.

Definition 5.1. In a restriction category \mathbb{X} :

- [6, Proposition 6.3] Two parallel morphisms $f, g: A \rightarrow B$ are **compatible**, written as $f \smile g$, when $\bar{f}g = \bar{g}f$;
- [6, Definition 6.7] A **family of compatible morphisms** consists of a family \mathcal{F} of morphisms, which are pair-wise compatible, that is, $f \smile g$, for each $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$;
- [3, Section 2.1.4] A morphism $g: A \rightarrow B$ **bounds** a morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ **from above**, written as $f \leq g$, when $\bar{f}g = f$.

Two parallel morphisms f and g are compatible when, restricting g to the domain of definition of f , that is, by considering the morphism $\bar{f}g$, it amounts to restricting f to the domain of definition of g . Moreover, $f \leq g$ when, by restricting g to the domain of definition of f , we get f . We now introduce the analogue concepts in the language of local categories.

Definition 5.2. In a local category \mathbb{C} :

- Two objects M, N are **compatible**, written as $M \smile N$, when $\mathbf{L}M = \mathbf{L}N$;

- An object N **bounds** an object M **from above**, written as $M \leq N$, when $M \smile B$ and there exists a morphism $m: M \rightarrow N$ such that $m\eta_N = \eta_M$;
- An **extendible morphism** is a morphism $f: M \rightarrow N$ such that there exists a morphism $\tilde{f}: LM \rightarrow LN$, called an **extension** of f , making the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M & \xrightarrow{f} & N \\ \eta_M \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta_N \\ LM & \xrightarrow{\tilde{f}} & LN \end{array}$$

commutative and a pullback diagram of \mathbb{C} .

Two objects M and N of a local category are compatible when they are embedded in the same enlargement. Moreover, $M \leq N$ when M is embedded into N . Finally, a morphism $f: M \rightarrow N$ is extendible when there exists a morphism $\tilde{f}: LM \rightarrow LN$ between the enlargements of M and N which restricts to f .

Compatibility between morphisms in a restriction category is reflexive and symmetric; however, in general, it fails to be transitive. The next lemma shows that compatibility between objects of a local category defines instead an equivalence relation.

Lemma 5.3. *The binary relation \smile of compatibility between objects of a local category is an equivalence relation.*

Proof. It is immediate to see that every object A is compatible with itself. Moreover, if $A \smile B$, then $LA = LB$, then $B \smile A$, and finally, if $A \smile B$ and $B \smile C$, then $LA = LB = LC$, thus, $A \smile C$. \square

We now show that the relation \leq defined between objects of a local category is a partial order.

Definition 5.4. A category \mathbb{C} admits a **partial order on objects** when \mathbb{C} comes equipped with a binary relation \leq which satisfies the following conditions:

[PO.1]: For every object A , $A \leq A$;

[PO.2]: For each A , B , and C , $A \leq B$ and $B \leq C$ implies $A \leq C$;

[PO.3]: For each A and B , $A \leq B$ and $B \leq A$ implies $A \cong B$.

Lemma 5.5. *In a local category \mathbb{C} , $A \leq B$ if and only if $LA = LB$ and there exists a unique morphism $m: A \rightarrow B$ such that $m\eta_B = \eta_A$. Moreover, such m is monic.*

Proof. Since $m\eta_B = \eta_A$ is monic, m is monic as well. Moreover, if $m': A \rightarrow B$ satisfy the equation $m'\eta_B = \eta_A = m\eta_B$, since η_B is monic, $m' = m$. \square

Proposition 5.6. *Every local category \mathbb{C} has a partial order on objects.*

Proof. For every A in \mathbb{C} , $A \leq A$, since $\text{id}_A\eta_A = \eta_A$. Consider now $A \leq B$ and $B \leq C$. Thus, there exist $m: A \rightarrow B$ and $m': B \rightarrow C$ such that $m\eta_B = \eta_A$ and $m'\eta_C = \eta_B$. Thus, $mm'\eta_C = m\eta_B = \eta_A$. Thus, $A \leq C$. Finally, suppose that $A \leq B$ and $B \leq A$. Thus, there exist $m: A \rightarrow B$ and $m': B \rightarrow A$ such that $m\eta_B = \eta_A$ and $m'\eta_A = \eta_B$. However, using that η_A and η_B are monic, we also conclude that mm' and $m'm$ must be the identities on A and B , respectively. Thus, $A \cong B$. \square

Next, we shall extend the partial order between objects of a local category to morphisms. First, let us introduce the following concepts.

Definition 5.7. In a local category \mathbb{C} :

- Two morphisms $f: A \rightarrow C$ and $g: B \rightarrow C$ are **compatible**, written as $f \smile g$, when their domains are compatible $A \smile B$, and the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A \wedge B & \xrightarrow{\iota_B} & B \\ \downarrow \iota_A & & \downarrow g \\ A & \xrightarrow{f} & C \end{array}$$

where $A \wedge B$ is given by the following pullback:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A \wedge B & \xrightarrow{\iota_B} & B \\ \downarrow \iota_A & \lrcorner & \downarrow \eta_B \\ A & \xrightarrow{\eta_A} & \mathsf{L}A = \mathsf{L}B \end{array}$$

- A **family of compatible morphisms** consists of a family \mathcal{F} of morphisms, which are pair-wise compatible, that is, $f \smile g$ for each $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$;
- A morphism $g: B \rightarrow C$ **bounds** a morphism $f: A \rightarrow C$ **from above**, written $f \leq g$, when $A \leq C$ and the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & & \\ \downarrow m & \searrow f & \\ B & \xrightarrow{g} & C \end{array}$$

where $m: A \rightarrow B$ is the unique morphism such that $m\eta_B = \eta_A$.

Compatibility between morphisms of a local category defines a coherence relation, that is, reflexive and symmetric, which, however, fails in general to be transitive; \leq defines a partial order on morphisms.

Lemma 5.8. *The binary relation \smile of compatibility between morphisms of a local category is a coherence relation.*

Proof. This is a direct consequence of Lemma 5.3. \square

Proposition 5.9. *The relation \leq defined on morphisms of a local category is a partial order.*

Proof. This is a direct consequence of Proposition 5.6. We leave the reader to spell out all the details of the proof. \square

We now prove that compatibility and partial order in the restriction sense correspond to compatibility and partial order in the local sense.

Lemma 5.10. *Consider two parallel morphisms $f, g: A \rightarrow B$ in a restriction category \mathbb{X} . Then f and g are compatible in \mathbb{X} if and only if $\bar{f}: (A, \bar{f}) \rightarrow (B, \text{id}_B)$ and $\bar{g}: (A, \bar{g}) \rightarrow (B, \text{id}_B)$ are compatible in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$. Moreover, $f \leq g$ in \mathbb{X} if and only if $\bar{f} \leq \bar{g}$ in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$.*

Proof. For starters, let us assume that $f \smile g$ in \mathbb{X} . Thus, $\bar{g}f = \bar{f}g$. By Lemma 4.2, the pullback of $\eta_{(A, \bar{f})}$ along $\eta_{(A, \bar{g})}$ is given by the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (A, \bar{f}\bar{g}) & \xrightarrow{\bar{f}\bar{g}} & (A, \bar{g}) \\ \bar{f}\bar{g} \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \bar{g} \\ (A, \bar{f}) & \xrightarrow{\bar{f}} & (A, \text{id}_A) \end{array}$$

Thus, since $f \smile g$, the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (A, \bar{f}\bar{g}) & \xrightarrow{\bar{f}\bar{g}} & (A, \bar{g}) \\ \bar{f}\bar{g} \downarrow & & \downarrow g \\ (A, \bar{f}) & \xrightarrow{f} & (B, \text{id}_B) \end{array}$$

since $\bar{f}\bar{g}f = \bar{g}\bar{f}f = \bar{g}f = \bar{f}g = \bar{f}\bar{g}g$. Thus, f and g are compatible in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$.

Now, suppose that f and g are compatible in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$. Thus, the previous diagram must commute, explicitly, $\bar{f}\bar{g}f = \bar{f}\bar{g}g$; however, this means that $f \smile g$ in \mathbb{X} .


Now, assume that $f \leq g$ in \mathbb{X} . Thus, $\bar{g}f = f$. In particular, this implies that $\bar{f}: (A, \bar{f}) \rightarrow (A, \bar{g})$ is a morphism of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$. Moreover, it is the unique morphism such that $\bar{f}\eta_{(A, \bar{g})} = \bar{f}\bar{g} = \bar{g}f = \bar{f} = \eta_{(A, \bar{f})}$. Thus, $(A, \bar{f}) \leq (A, \bar{g})$. Moreover, $\bar{f}g = f$. Thus, $f \leq g$ in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$.

Conversely, assume that $f \leq g$ in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$. Thus, there exists a morphism $m: A \rightarrow A$ such that the following equalities hold: $\bar{m} = \bar{f}$, $m\bar{g} = m$, and $m\bar{g} = \bar{f}$. Thus, $m = m\bar{g} = \bar{f}$. Moreover, $mg = f$. Thus, $\bar{f}g = f$, that is, $f \leq g$ in \mathbb{X} . \square

Conversely, we can prove that compatibility and partial order in a local category correspond to compatibility and partial order in a restriction category.


Lemma 5.11. *Consider two morphisms $f: M \rightarrow P$ and $g: N \rightarrow P$ in a local category \mathbb{C} . Thus, f and g are compatible in \mathbb{C} if and only if $(M, f\eta_P): LM \rightarrow LP$ and $(N, g\eta_P): LN \rightarrow LP$ are compatible in $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{X}]$. Moreover, $f \leq g$ in \mathbb{C} if and only if $(M, f\eta_P) \leq (N, g\eta_P)$ in $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{X}]$.*

Proof. Consider f and g in \mathbb{C} and assume that $f \smile g$; in particular, $LM = LN$. Consider now the composition $\overline{(M, f\eta_P)}(N, g\eta_P)$ and $\overline{(N, g\eta_P)}(M, f\eta_P)$ in $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{X}]$:




However, since f and g are compatible, the right legs of the two spans coincide. Therefore, $\overline{(M, f\eta_P)}(N, g\eta_P) = \overline{(N, g\eta_P)}(M, f\eta_P)$. Now, assume that $(M, f\eta_P)$ and $(N, g\eta_P)$ are compatible. However, this implies that the two right legs of the two above spans must coincide, which means that $f \smile g$ in \mathbb{C} .

Now, suppose that $f \leq g$ in \mathbb{C} . Thus, $M \leq N$ and $mg = f$, for m the (necessarily unique) morphism of \mathbb{C} such that $m\eta_N = \eta_M$. Now, consider the composition $\overline{(M, f\eta_P)}(N, g\eta_P)$ in $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$:



However, since $m\eta_N = \eta_M$ and that η_N is monic, we can rewrite it as follows:



However, $mg = f$, thus, $\overline{(M, f\eta_P)}(N, g\eta_P) = (M, f\eta_P)$. Therefore, $(M, f\eta_P) \leq (N, g\eta_P)$ in $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$. \square

We conclude this section by introducing a new concept for restriction categories, restriction monics, that corresponds to ordinary monics through the 2-equivalence of Theorem 4.19.

Lemma 5.12. *A morphism $f: (A, a) \rightarrow (B, b)$ of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$ is monic if and only if for each pair of parallel morphisms $g, h: C \rightarrow A$ of \mathbb{X} satisfying the following equations*

$$gf = hf \qquad g\bar{f} = g \qquad h\bar{f} = h$$

the morphism g coincides with h .

Proof. Suppose first that $f: (A, a) \rightarrow (B, b)$ is a morphism of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$ such that f is a restriction monic of \mathbb{X} . Consider two parallel morphisms $g, h: (C, c) \rightarrow (A, a)$. In particular, g and h satisfy the following equations:

$$\bar{g} = c = \bar{h} \qquad ga = g \qquad ha = h$$

Suppose now that $gf = hf$. Since $\bar{f} = a$, $g\bar{f} = g$ and $h\bar{f} = h$, thus, since f is a restriction monic of \mathbb{X} , this implies that $g = h$. Therefore, f is monic in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$.

Conversely, assume that f is monic in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$ and consider two morphisms $g, h: C \rightarrow A$ of \mathbb{X} such that $gf = hf$, $g\bar{f} = g$, and $h\bar{f} = h$. We compute that:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{g} &= \overline{g\bar{f}} & (g = g\bar{f}) \\ &= \overline{gf} & (\text{Lemma 2.9 (c)}) \\ &= \overline{hf} & (gf = hf) \\ &= \overline{h\bar{f}} & (\text{Lemma 2.9 (c)}) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \bar{h} \quad (h = h\bar{f})$$

Therefore, $g, h: (C, c) \rightarrow (A, a)$ become morphisms of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$ where $c = \bar{g} = \bar{h}$. Thus, since f is monic in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$ and $gf = gf, g = h$. \square

The previous lemma suggests the following definition.

Definition 5.13. A **restriction monic** in a restriction category \mathbb{X} , consists of a morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ such that, for each pair of parallel morphisms $g, h: C \rightarrow A$, if g and h satisfy the following equations

$$gf = hf \quad g\bar{f} = g \quad h\bar{f} = h$$

then g and h necessarily coincide.

Lemma 5.14. A morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ of a local category \mathbb{C} is a monic in \mathbb{C} if and only if $(A, f\eta_B): \mathbf{L}A \rightarrow \mathbf{L}B$ is a restriction monic in $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$.

Proof. Consider two morphisms $g, h: C \rightarrow \mathbf{L}A$ of $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$. In particular, they correspond to two morphisms $g, h: V \rightarrow \mathbf{L}A$ of \mathbb{C} with $V \leq C$. The restriction idempotent of $(A, f\eta_B): \mathbf{L}A \rightarrow \mathbf{L}B$ in $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$ is given by (A, η_A) . Thus, the equality $g(\overline{A, f\eta_B}) = g$ in $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$ implies the existence of a unique morphism $\tilde{g}: V \rightarrow A$ of \mathbb{C} such that $\tilde{g}\eta_A = g$. The same condition on h implies the existence of a unique morphism $\tilde{h}: V \rightarrow A$ of \mathbb{C} such that $\tilde{h}\eta_A = h$.

Now, assume that f is monic in \mathbb{C} and let us prove that $(A, f\eta_B)$ is restriction monic in $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$. Consider two $g, h: C \rightarrow \mathbf{L}A$ as before which also satisfy the equations

$$g(\overline{A, f\eta_B}) = g \quad h(\overline{A, f\eta_B}) = h$$

in $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$. This implies that $\tilde{g}f = \tilde{h}f$ in \mathbb{C} . Therefore, since f is monic in \mathbb{C} , this implies that $\tilde{g} = \tilde{h}$. Thus, $g = \tilde{g}\eta_A = \tilde{h}\eta_A = h$.

Conversely, assume that $(A, f\eta_B)$ is restriction monic in $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$ and consider two morphisms $g, h: C \rightarrow \mathbf{L}A$ of \mathbb{C} such that $gf = hf$. Since η_A is monic, it is not hard to see that $(A, g\eta_A)$ and $(A, h\eta_A)$ satisfy the equations:

$$(A, g\eta_A)(\overline{A, f\eta_B}) = (A, g\eta_A) \quad (A, h\eta_A)(\overline{A, f\eta_B}) = (A, h\eta_A)$$

Thus, since $(A, f\eta_B)$ is restriction monic, this implies that $(A, g\eta_A) = (A, h\eta_A)$. However, this means that $g\eta_A = h\eta_A$ and using again that η_A is monic, we conclude that $g = h$. \square

Example 5.15. Thanks to Lemma 5.12 and 5.14, we can compute the restriction monics of the restriction category \mathbf{PAR} of Example 2.4. In particular, a partial function $f: A \rightarrow B$ of \mathbf{PAR} is a restriction monic if and only if $f: (U, A) \rightarrow (B, B)$ is a monic in \mathbf{PARSET} of Example 3.6, where U is the domain of definition of f . However, since \mathbf{PARSET} is equivalent to the category \mathbf{SET} of sets, monics in \mathbf{PARSET} are precisely injective functions $f: U \rightarrow B$. Thus, restriction monics in \mathbf{PAR} are precisely partial injective functions.

6 Cartesian local categories

In this section, we introduce Cartesian local categories, which, as the name suggests, are the local category analogue of Cartesian restriction categories under the 2-equivalence of Theorem 4.19.

To begin, let us briefly recall the definition of a Cartesian restriction category, which was introduced and studied in [5]. To do so, recall that a Cartesian object in a 2-category \mathbf{K} with finite 2-products consists of an object \mathbb{X} of \mathbf{K} such that the terminal morphism $! : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{1}$ and the diagonal morphism $\Delta : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{X}$ admit right adjoints in \mathbf{K} [2]. Therefore, a Cartesian restriction category is a Cartesian object in the 2-category $\mathbf{RCAT}_{\text{lat}}$. This leads us to the notions of a restriction terminal object and restriction products, which have slightly weaker universal properties than the usual notions.

Definition 6.1. [5, Section 4.1] A **restriction terminal object** in a restriction category \mathbb{X} consists of an object $*$ of \mathbb{X} such that for every object A of \mathbb{X} there exists a unique total morphism $!_A : A \rightarrow *$ and for any morphism $f : A \rightarrow B$, the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{f} & B \\ \bar{f} \downarrow & & \downarrow !_B \\ A & \xrightarrow{!_A} & * \end{array}$$

Definition 6.2. [5, Section 4.1] The **restriction product** of two objects A and B in a restriction category \mathbb{X} consists of an object $A \times B$ together with two total morphisms $\pi_A : A \times B \rightarrow A$ and $\pi_B : A \times B \rightarrow B$ such that for any pairs of morphisms $f : C \rightarrow A$ and $g : C \rightarrow B$, there exists a unique morphism $\langle f, g \rangle : C \rightarrow A \times B$ rendering the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} C & \xleftarrow{\bar{g}} & C & \xrightarrow{\bar{f}} & C \\ f \downarrow & & \downarrow \langle f, g \rangle & & \downarrow g \\ A & \xleftarrow{\pi_A} & A \times B & \xrightarrow{\pi_B} & B \end{array}$$

commutative. In other words, $\langle f, g \rangle$ is the unique morphism such that $\overline{\langle f, g \rangle} = \bar{f}\bar{g}$ and also that $\langle f, g \rangle \pi_A \leq f$ and $\langle f, g \rangle \pi_B \leq g$.

Thus, a Cartesian restriction category consists of a restriction category which admits a restriction terminal object and restriction products. To correctly define a Cartesian local category, we need to define the local analogue of restriction terminal objects and restriction products. To do so, we explain how restriction terminal objects and restriction products correspond to usual terminal objects and products in the local category $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$.

Lemma 6.3. *Let \mathbb{X} be a restriction category. An object $*$ of \mathbb{X} is a restriction terminal object if and only if $(*, \text{id}_*)$ is a terminal object in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$.*

Proof. Suppose that $*$ is a restriction terminal object of \mathbb{X} . Consider an object (A, a) of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$ and define the morphism $!_{(A,a)}: (A, a) \rightarrow (*, \text{id}_*)$ as the composite $!_{(A,a)} = a!_A$. First, let us show that $!_{(A,a)}$ is well-defined:

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{!_{(A,a)}} &= \overline{a!_A} \\ &= \overline{a!_A} && \text{(Lemma 2.9 (c))} \\ &= \bar{a} && (!_A \text{ total}) \\ &= a && (\bar{a} = a) \end{aligned}$$

This proves that $!_{(A,a)}$ is a morphism of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$. Now, consider a morphism $f: (A, a) \rightarrow (*, \text{id}_*)$. Thus, $\bar{f} = a$. Moreover, by the universal property of $*$, the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{f} & * \\ \bar{f} \downarrow & & \downarrow !_* \\ A & \xrightarrow{!_A} & * \end{array}$$

However, since $!_* = \text{id}_*$ (since the identity morphism is total and there a unique total morphism of type $* \rightarrow *$), this implies that $f = \bar{f}!_A = a!_A = !_{(A,a)}$. Thus, $(*, \text{id}_*)$ is terminal in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$, as desired.

Conversely, assume that $(*, \text{id}_*)$ is terminal in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$. Consider an object A of \mathbb{X} and let $!_A: (A, \text{id}_A) \rightarrow (*, \text{id}_*)$ be the terminal morphism in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$. In particular, this means that $!_A: A \rightarrow *$ is total in \mathbb{X} and we also have that $!_* = \text{id}_*$. Consider now a morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$. Thus, there exists a unique morphism $!_{(A,\bar{f})}$ from (A, \bar{f}) to $(*, \text{id}_*)$. However, the morphism

$$(A, \bar{f}) \xrightarrow{f} (B, \text{id}_B) \xrightarrow{!_B} (*, \text{id}_*)$$

is also well-defined in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$. Thus, $f!_B$ must coincide with $!_{(A,\bar{f})}$. However, for any object (A, a) , $!_{(A,a)}$ coincides with $a!_A$, since $a!_A = \eta_{(A,a)}!_{\mathbf{L}(A,a)}: (A, a) \rightarrow (*, \text{id}_*)$ is a morphism of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$. Thus, $f!_B = \bar{f}!_A$. So we conclude that $*$ is a restriction terminal object in \mathbb{X} as desired. \square

Lemma 6.4. *Let \mathbb{X} be a restriction category and consider two objects A and B of \mathbb{X} . An object $A \times B$ is the restriction product of A and B in \mathbb{X} if and only if $(A \times B, \text{id}_{A \times B})$ is the product of (A, id_A) and (B, id_B) in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$.*

Proof. Suppose that $A \times B$ is the restriction product of A and B in \mathbb{X} . Consider an object (C, c) of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$ and two morphisms $f: (C, c) \rightarrow (A, \text{id}_A)$ and $g: (C, c) \rightarrow (B, \text{id}_B)$. In particular,

$\bar{f} = c = \bar{g}$. Thus, there exists a unique morphism $\langle f, g \rangle: C \rightarrow A \times B$ such that $\langle f, g \rangle \pi_A = \bar{g}f$ and $\langle f, g \rangle \pi_B = \bar{f}g$. However, since $\bar{f} = \bar{g}$, these two equations become $\langle f, g \rangle \pi_A = f$ and $\langle f, g \rangle \pi_B = g$. Moreover:

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\langle f, g \rangle} &= \overline{\langle f, g \rangle \pi_A} & (\pi_A = \text{id}_{A \times B}) \\ &= \overline{\langle f, g \rangle \pi_A} & (\text{Lemma 2.9 (c)}) \\ &= \bar{f} & (\langle f, g \rangle \pi_A = \bar{g}f = f) \\ &= c & (\bar{f} = c) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\langle f, g \rangle$ becomes the unique morphism $\langle f, g \rangle: (C, c) \rightarrow (A \times B, \text{id}_{A \times B})$ satisfying $\langle f, g \rangle \pi_A = f$ and $\langle f, g \rangle \pi_B = g$. Thus, $(A \times B, \text{id}_{A \times B})$ is the product of (A, id_A) and (B, id_B) in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$ as desired.

Conversely, suppose that $(A \times B, \text{id}_{A \times B})$ is the product of (A, id_A) and (B, id_B) in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$. Thus, there are two morphisms

$$\pi_A: (A \times B, \text{id}_{A \times B}) \rightarrow (A, \text{id}_A) \quad \pi_B: (A \times B, \text{id}_{A \times B}) \rightarrow (B, \text{id}_B)$$

satisfying the universal property of a product. In particular, π_A and π_B are total in \mathbb{X} . Consider now an object C of \mathbb{X} and two morphisms $f: C \rightarrow A$ and $g: C \rightarrow B$. Consider the two following morphisms:

$$(C, \bar{f}\bar{g}) \xrightarrow{\bar{g}f} (A, \text{id}_A) \quad (C, \bar{f}\bar{g}) \xrightarrow{\bar{f}g} (B, \text{id}_B)$$

It is immediate to see that $\bar{g}f = \bar{f}\bar{g}$ and $\bar{f}g = \bar{f}\bar{g}$, thus, these are two morphisms of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$. Therefore, there exists a unique morphism $h: (C, \bar{f}\bar{g}) \rightarrow (A \times B, \text{id}_{A \times B})$ of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$ such that $h\pi_A = \bar{g}f$ and $h\pi_B = \bar{f}g$. Thus, $A \times B$ is the restriction product of A and B in \mathbb{X} . \square

Inspired by the above lemmas, we define local terminal objects and local products as being usual terminal objects and products which are compatible with the local structure as follows.

Definition 6.5. A **local terminal object** in a local category \mathbb{C} consists of a total object $*$ of \mathbb{C} which is terminal in \mathbb{C} .

Definition 6.6. A **local product** between two object M and N in a local category \mathbb{C} consists of an object $M \times N$ together with two morphisms $\pi_M: M \times N \rightarrow M$ and $\pi_N: M \times N \rightarrow N$ such that $M \times N$ is the product of M and N in \mathbb{C} , and also that the product of LM and LN exists in \mathbb{C} with $LM \times LN = L(M \times N)$ and $\eta_{M \times N} = \eta_M \times \eta_N$.

Definition 6.7. A **Cartesian local category** consists of a local category \mathbb{C} which admits a local terminal object and local products.

To further justify these definitions, we now show that a restriction category has restriction products if and only if its associated local category does.

Proposition 6.8. *A restriction category \mathbb{X} admits a restriction terminal object $*$ if and only if $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$ admits a local terminal object. Moreover, \mathbb{X} admits restriction products if and only if $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$ admits local products.*

Proof. The first statement is precisely the thesis of Lemma 6.3. Let us focus on the second statement. First, assume that $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$ admits local products. Consider two objects A and B of \mathbb{X} . Thus, the local product $(A, \text{id}_A) \times (B, \text{id}_B)$ of (A, id_A) and (B, id_B) exists in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$. Moreover, since (A, id_A) and (B, id_B) are total we have that:

$$\mathbf{L}((A, \text{id}_A) \times (B, \text{id}_B)) = \mathbf{L}(A, \text{id}_A) \times \mathbf{L}(B, \text{id}_B) = (A, \text{id}_A) \times (B, \text{id}_B)$$

Therefore, $(A, \text{id}_A) \times (B, \text{id}_B) = (A \times B, \text{id}_{A \times B})$. Thus, by Lemma 6.4, $A \times B$ is the restriction product of A and B in \mathbb{X} .

Conversely, assume that \mathbb{X} admits all restriction products. Consider two objects (A, a) and (B, b) of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$. Define $(A, a) \times (B, b) := (A \times B, a \times b)$, where $A \times B$ is the restriction product of A and B and $a \times b: A \times B \rightarrow A \times B$ is the unique morphism such that $(a \times b)\pi_A = \overline{\pi_B b} \pi_A a$ and $(a \times b)\pi_B = \overline{\pi_A a} \pi_B b$. Let us prove that $a \times b = \overline{\pi_A a} \pi_B b$:

$$\overline{\pi_A a} \pi_B b \pi_A = \overline{\pi_B b} \pi_A a \pi_A \quad ([\mathbf{R.2}])$$

$$= \overline{\pi_B b} \pi_A \bar{a} \quad ([\mathbf{R.4}])$$

$$= \overline{\pi_B b} \pi_A a \quad (\bar{a} = a)$$

Similarly, one can show that $\overline{\pi_A a} \pi_B b \pi_B = \overline{\pi_A a} \pi_B b$. Thus, by the universal property of restriction products, $a \times b = \overline{\pi_A a} \pi_B b$. We use this to prove that $(A \times B, a \times b)$ is the local product of (A, a) and (B, b) in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$. First, define the two projections as follows:

$$\pi_{(A,a)}: (A \times B, a \times b) \xrightarrow{\overline{\pi_B b} \pi_A a} (A, a) \quad \pi_{(B,b)}: (A \times B, a \times b) \xrightarrow{\overline{\pi_A a} \pi_B b} (B, b)$$

It is not hard to see that $\pi_{(A,a)}$ and $\pi_{(B,b)}$ are well-defined. Now consider two morphisms $f: (C, c) \rightarrow (A, a)$ and $g: (C, c) \rightarrow (B, b)$. In particular, $\bar{f} = c = \bar{g}$ and $fa = f$ and $gb = g$. Thus, there exists a unique morphism $\langle f, g \rangle: C \rightarrow A \times B$ satisfying the following two equations:

$$\langle f, g \rangle \pi_A = \bar{g} f = c f = f \quad \langle f, g \rangle \pi_B = \bar{f} g = c g = g$$

Let us prove that $\langle f, g \rangle \pi_{(A,a)} = f$ and $\langle f, g \rangle \pi_{(B,b)} = g$:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f, g \rangle \pi_{(A,a)} &= \langle f, g \rangle \overline{\pi_B b} \pi_A a \\ &= \overline{\langle f, g \rangle \pi_B b} \langle f, g \rangle \pi_A a & ([\mathbf{R.4}]) \\ &= \overline{g b} f a & ((\langle f, g \rangle \pi_B = g, \langle f, g \rangle \pi_A = f)) \\ &= \bar{g} f & (g b = g, f a = f) \\ &= f & (\bar{g} = c = \bar{f}, [\mathbf{R.1}]) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, one can show that $\langle f, g \rangle \pi_{(B,b)} = g$. Suppose now that $h: (C, c) \rightarrow (A \times B, a \times b)$ satisfies the equations $h\pi_{(A,a)} = f$ and $h\pi_{(B,b)} = g$. However, since $h(a \times b) = h$, we can compute that:

$$\begin{aligned}
h\pi_{(A,a)} &= h\overline{\pi_B b} \pi_A a \\
&= h\overline{\pi_B b} \pi_A \bar{a} && (a = \bar{a}) \\
&= h\overline{\pi_B b} \overline{\pi_A a} \pi_A && \text{([R.4])} \\
&= h(a \times b) \pi_A && (\overline{\pi_B b} \overline{\pi_A a} = a \times b) \\
&= h\pi_A && (h(a \times b) = h)
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, one can show that $h\pi_{(B,b)} = h\pi_B$. Thus, by the universal property of the restriction product $A \times B$, $h = \langle f, g \rangle$. This proves that $(A \times B, a \times b)$ is the product of (A, a) and (B, b) in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$. To prove that this is a local product, let us demonstrate its compatibility with the local structure. By Lemma 6.4, we already know that the product $(A, \text{id}_A) \times (B, \text{id}_B)$ is equal to $(A \times B, \text{id}_{A \times B})$. Thus:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{L}(A, a) \times \mathbf{L}(B, b) &= (A, \text{id}_A) \times (B, \text{id}_B) = (A \times B, \text{id}_{A \times B}) \\
&= \mathbf{L}(A \times B, a \times b) = \mathbf{L}((A, a) \times \mathbf{L}(B, b))
\end{aligned}$$

Finally:

$$\eta_{(A,a) \times \mathbf{L}(B,b)} = \eta_{(A \times B, a \times b)} = a \times b = \eta_{(A,a)} \times \eta_{(B,b)}$$

Thus, $(A \times B, a \times b)$ is the local product of (A, a) and (B, b) in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$. □

We may now finally prove the main result of this section that a restriction (resp. local) category is Cartesian if and only if its associated local (resp. restriction) category is Cartesian. To this end, we denote by $\text{CRCAT}_{\text{lax}}$ the 2-subcategory of RCAT_{lax} spanned by Cartesian restriction categories and restriction functors which preserve restriction terminal objects and restriction products, and similarly we denote by $\text{CLCAT}_{\text{lax}}$ the 2-subcategory of LCAT_{lax} spanned by Cartesian local categories and local functors which preserve local terminal objects and local products.

Theorem 6.9. *Cartesian local categories are Cartesian objects in the 2-category LCAT_{lax} . Moreover, the 2-equivalence of Theorem 4.19 restricts to a 2-equivalence $\text{CRCAT}_{\text{lax}} \simeq \text{CLCAT}_{\text{lax}}$.*

Proof. Let us first prove that Cartesian objects in LCAT_{lax} are precisely Cartesian local categories. Start by considering a Cartesian local category \mathbb{C} . By forgetting the local structure, we define the functors $*$: $\mathbb{1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ and \times : $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, which are right adjoints to the terminal functor $! : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{1}$ and the diagonal functor $\Delta : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}$ in the 2-category CAT of categories, respectively. Since the 2-morphisms of LCAT_{lax} are just natural transformations, we only need

to check that $*$ and \times are local functors. First, notice that the terminal local category $\mathbb{1}$ is the terminal category $\{1\}$ equipped with the trivial local structure (see Example 3.4). Thus, by requiring $*$ to be a local functor is to require the following equations to hold

$$L(*(\mathbb{1})) = *(L(\mathbb{1})) = *(\mathbb{1}) \quad \eta_{*(\mathbb{1})} = *(\eta_{\mathbb{1}}) = *(\text{id}_{\mathbb{1}}) = \text{id}_{*(\mathbb{1})}$$

which is to say that the terminal object must be total in \mathbb{C} , that is, $*$ is a local terminal object. Note that the functors $*$ and \times necessarily preserve the pullbacks of the maximal inclusions since right adjoints preserve limits. Consider now the product functor \times . Requiring \times to be local amounts to requiring the following equations to hold, for every M and N in \mathbb{C}

$$L(M \times N) = (LM) \times (LN) \quad \eta_M \times \eta_N = \eta_{M \times N}$$

which is precisely to say that $M \times N$ is a local product. Conversely, consider a Cartesian object \mathbb{C} of LCAT_{lax} . The forgetful 2-functor $\text{LCAT}_{\text{lax}} \rightarrow \text{CAT}$ which forgets the local structure, preserves adjunctions, thus, the underlying category of \mathbb{C} is Cartesian. Moreover, since the right adjoints $*$ and \times of the terminal local functor $!$ and of the diagonal local functor Δ , respectively, are local functors, the terminal object of \mathbb{C} must be a local terminal object and the products of \mathbb{C} must be local products. This proves that Cartesian objects of LCAT_{lax} are precisely the Cartesian local categories.

Finally, by [16, Proposition 6.1.7], every 2-equivalence $\mathbf{K} \simeq \mathbf{J}$ between two categories preserves adjunctions, thus, in particular, it lifts to a 2-equivalence between the 2-categories of Cartesian objects and Cartesian preserving 1-morphisms $\text{CART}[\mathbf{K}] \simeq \text{CART}[\mathbf{J}]$. Thus, the 2-equivalence $\text{RCAT}_{\text{lax}} \simeq \text{LCAT}_{\text{lax}}$ of Theorem 4.19 lifts to a 2-equivalence $\text{CART}[\text{RCAT}_{\text{lax}}] \simeq \text{CART}[\text{LCAT}_{\text{lax}}]$. However, we have already shown that $\text{CART}[\text{LCAT}_{\text{lax}}]$ is the 2-category of Cartesian local categories. Finally, as discussed in [5, Section 4.1], $\text{CART}[\text{RCAT}_{\text{lax}}]$ is the 2-category of Cartesian restriction categories. \square

Remark 6.10. In [5], a full theory of restriction limits was explored. So far, we have not yet developed a full theory of local limits, that is, the correct notion of limits for local categories which would correspond to restriction limits under the 2-equivalence $\text{RCAT}_{\text{lax}} \simeq \text{LCAT}_{\text{lax}}$. This turned out to be more subtle and complicated than one might expect, so leave this for future work.

7 Split local categories

In this section, we introduce split local categories, which are those local categories that correspond to split restriction categories under the 2-equivalence of Theorem 4.19. We begin by showing that split restriction idempotents in a restriction category are isomorphic to total objects in the associated local category.

Lemma 7.1. *Let \mathbb{X} be a restriction category. A restriction idempotent $a: A \rightarrow A$ in \mathbb{X} splits in \mathbb{X} if and only if (A, a) is isomorphic to a total object in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$.*

Proof. Suppose that a restriction idempotent $a = \bar{a}: A \rightarrow A$ splits as a section-retraction pair $(s, r): E \rightleftarrows A$ in \mathbb{X} . We prove that (A, a) is isomorphic to (E, id_E) in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$. To do so, let us first compute the restriction idempotent of s and r . Since s is monic, by Lemma 2.9, $\bar{s} = \text{id}_E$. Moreover, we can compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{r} &= \overline{r\bar{s}} & (\bar{s} = \text{id}_E) \\ &= \bar{r}\bar{s} & (\text{Lemma 2.9 (c)}) \\ &= \bar{a} & (rs = a) \\ &= a & (\bar{a} = a) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, since $sa = srs = s$, we get that $s: (E, \text{id}_E) \rightarrow (A, a)$ and $r: (A, a) \rightarrow (E, \text{id}_E)$ are morphisms of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$. Furthermore, since $sr = \text{id}_E$ and $rs = a = \text{id}_{(A, a)}$, s inverts r in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$, that is, (A, a) is isomorphic to (E, id_E) , which is a total object of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$.

Conversely, assume that (A, a) is isomorphic to a total object (E, id_E) of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$ via an isomorphism $s: (E, \text{id}_E) \rightarrow (A, a)$ and its inverse $r: (A, a) \rightarrow (E, \text{id}_E)$. In particular, this means that $sr = \text{id}_E$ and that $rs = \text{id}_{(A, a)} = a$. Thus, (s, r) is a section-retraction pair and $a = rs$. Thus, a splits in \mathbb{X} . \square

Remark 7.2. It is important to notice that, despite the object (A, a) of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$ being isomorphic to a total object when a splits, the object (A, a) itself is not total in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$. In particular, being total is not stable under isomorphisms.

The previous lemma suggests the following definition for objects to split in a local category.

Definition 7.3. An object A in a local category \mathbb{C} **splits** when A is isomorphic to a total object, $A \cong LE$. A **split local category** is a local category for which all of its objects split.

Lemma 7.1 shows that if a restriction idempotent $a = \bar{a}: A \rightarrow A$ splits in a restriction category \mathbb{X} , then the object (A, a) splits in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$, according to Definition 7.3. In fact, the main objective of this section is to show that the splitting condition in the local sense implies the splitting condition in the restriction sense and that this correspondence extends to a 2-equivalence between split restriction categories and split local categories. To do so, we first prove a technical lemma.


Lemma 7.4. *In any category, given two composable morphisms $f: A \rightarrow B$ and $g: B \rightarrow C$, if fg is an isomorphism and g is monic, then both f and g are isomorphisms.*

Proof. Denote $h := fg$, which, by assumption, is an isomorphism. Let $f^{-1} := gh^{-1}$. Thus $ff^{-1} = fgh^{-1} = hh^{-1} = \text{id}_A$ and $f^{-1}fg = gh^{-1}h = g$. However, since g is monic, this implies that $f^{-1}f = \text{id}_B$, thus f is an isomorphism. Finally, $g = f^{-1}h$ is a composition of isomorphisms, thus, g is also an isomorphism. \square


Thanks to the previous lemma, we can prove the following result.

Lemma 7.5. *Let \mathbb{C} be a local category. An object U of \mathbb{C} splits if and only if the restriction idempotent $(U, \eta_U): A \rightarrowtail A$ splits in $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$, where $A = \downarrow U$. In particular, \mathbb{C} is a split local category if and only if $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$ is a split restriction category.*

Proof. Assume that U splits in \mathbb{C} . Thus, U is isomorphic to a total object $E = \mathsf{L}E$ via an isomorphism $s: E \rightarrow U$ and its inverse $r: U \rightarrow E$. Consider the morphisms $(U, r): A \rightarrowtail E$ and $(E, s\eta_U): E \rightarrowtail A$ of $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$, where $A = \mathsf{L}U$ and $\eta_U: U \rightarrow A$. Let us prove that (U, r) and $(E, s\eta_U)$ define a splitting for $(U, \eta_U): A \rightarrowtail A$ in $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$. For starters, let us compute the composition $(E, s\eta_U)(U, r)$:



However, since $sr = \text{id}_E$, we conclude that $(E, s\eta_U)(U, r) = \text{id}_E$ in $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$. We now compute the composition $(U, r)(E, s\eta_U)$ as follows:



However, since $rs = \text{id}_U$, we conclude that $(U, r)(E, s\eta_U) = (U, \eta_U)$. Thus, $((E, s\eta_U), (U, r))$ forms a splitting for (U, η_U) in $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$.

Conversely, assume that (U, η_U) splits in $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$. Thus, there are two morphisms $(U_1, r')\colon A \twoheadrightarrow E$ and $(U_2, s')\colon E \rightarrow A$ such that $(U_1, r')(U_2, s') = (U, \eta_U)$ and $(U_2, s')(U_1, r') = \text{id}_E$. From these two equations, we deduce the existence of four morphisms of \mathbb{C} as follows:

$$p_1: U \rightarrow U_1$$

$$p_2: U \rightarrow U_2$$

$$q_1: E \rightarrow U_1$$

$$q_2: E \rightarrow U_2$$

satisfying the following conditions

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 U \xrightarrow{p_1} U_1 & U \xrightarrow{p_2} U_2 & E \xrightarrow{q_1} U_1 \\
 \searrow \eta_U & \searrow \eta_U & \parallel \downarrow r' \\
 & A & E
 \end{array}
 \quad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 E \xrightarrow{q_2} U_2 & & \\
 \parallel \downarrow \eta_2 & & \\
 & E &
 \end{array}$$

where, as a shorthand, we denoted by η_1 and η_2 , η_{U_1} and η_{U_2} , respectively. Furthermore, the following two diagrams are pullbacks in \mathbb{C} :

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 U & \xrightarrow{p_2} & U_2 \\
 p_1 \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \eta_2 \\
 U_1 & \xrightarrow{r'} & E
 \end{array}
 \quad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 E & \xrightarrow{q_1} & U_1 \\
 q_2 \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \eta_1 \\
 U_2 & \xrightarrow{s'} & A
 \end{array}$$

From $q_2\eta_2 = \text{id}_E$, that η_2 is monic, and by Lemma 7.4, we deduce that both q_2 and η_2 are isomorphisms in \mathbb{C} . However, since p_1 is a pullback of η_2 and η_2 is invertible, p_1 is also an isomorphism, since isomorphisms are stable under pullbacks. From the equation $p_2s' = \eta_U$, since η_U is monic, so is p_2 . However, since $p_1r' = p_2\eta_2$, that p_1 is invertible and that η_2 is monic, we conclude that $r' = p_1^{-1}p_2\eta_2$ is also monic. Finally, using that $q_1r' = \text{id}_E$, that r' is monic, and by Lemma 7.4, r' is an isomorphism in \mathbb{C} . Thus, since both $p_1: U \rightarrow U_1$ and $r': U_1 \rightarrow E$ are isomorphisms, U is isomorphic to E in \mathbb{C} . However, since E is an object of $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$, E is total in \mathbb{C} . \square

With this, we may now state the main result of this section. To this end, we denote by SLCAT the full 2-subcategory of LCAT spanned by split local categories, and similarly, SRCAT the full 2-subcategory of RCAT spanned by split restriction categories.

Theorem 7.6. *The 2-equivalence $\text{RCAT} \simeq \text{LCAT}$ of Theorem 4.19 restricts to a 2-equivalence $\text{SRCAT} \simeq \text{SLCAT}$.*

8 Inverse local categories

Inverse categories were introduced in [17] as a multi-object version of inverse semigroups and inverse monoids. Concretely, an inverse category consists of a category for which every morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ admits a morphism $f^\circ: B \rightarrow A$ such that $ff^\circ f = f$ and $f^\circ ff^\circ = f^\circ$. As observed in [3, Section 2.3.2], inverse categories can be seen as a special class of restriction categories, where $ff^\circ: A \rightarrow A$ defines the restriction idempotent of a morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$.

Informally, inverse categories are the restriction version of a groupoid. Inverse categories find applications in computer science. In particular, they have been employed in [11] as a categorical language for inverse computation.

In this section, we introduce inverse local categories, which are those local categories which correspond to inverse categories under the 2-equivalence of Theorem 4.19. For starters, recall the definition of an inverse category.

Definition 8.1. [3, Section 2.3.2] In a restriction category \mathbb{X} , a **restriction isomorphism** is a morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ for which there exists a (necessarily unique) morphism $f^\circ: B \rightarrow A$ such that $f f^\circ = \bar{f}$ and $f^\circ f = \bar{f}^\circ$. An **inverse restriction category** is a restriction category \mathbb{X} in which every morphism is a restriction isomorphism.

Remark 8.2. In the literature, restriction isomorphisms are also known as partial isomorphisms [3, Section 2.3.2].

We now introduce the analogue of inverse categories for local categories.

Definition 8.3. In a local category \mathbb{X} , a **local isomorphism** is a morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ for which there exists an object $V \leq B$ and a morphism $f \upharpoonright V: A \rightarrow V$ such that $(f \upharpoonright V)m = f$ and $f \upharpoonright V$ is an isomorphism, where $m\eta_B = \eta_V$. An **inverse local category** consists of a local category whose morphisms are all local isomorphisms.

To justify this definition, let us show that restriction isomorphisms in a restriction category correspond to local isomorphisms in the associated local category.

Lemma 8.4. *A morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ in a restriction category is a restriction isomorphism if and only if $f: (A, \bar{f}) \rightarrow (B, \text{id}_B)$ is a local isomorphism in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$.*

Proof. Assume that $f: A \rightarrow B$ is a restriction isomorphism. Thus, there is a morphism $f^\circ: B \rightarrow A$ such that $f f^\circ = \bar{f}$ and $f^\circ f = \bar{f}^\circ$. We can compute the following

$$\begin{aligned} f \bar{f}^\circ &= \bar{f} \bar{f}^\circ f & ([R.4]) \\ &= \bar{f} f & (f f^\circ = \bar{f}) \\ &= f & ([R.1]) \end{aligned}$$

and dually, we also have that $f^\circ \bar{f} = f^\circ$. Thus, we have two morphisms $f: (A, \bar{f}) \rightleftarrows (B, \bar{f}^\circ): f^\circ$ of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$. Moreover, $(B, \bar{f}^\circ) \leq (B, \text{id}_B)$. Finally, from $f f^\circ = \bar{f}$ and $f^\circ f = \bar{f}^\circ$, we deduce that $(A, \bar{f}) \cong (B, \bar{f}^\circ)$. Thus, f becomes a local isomorphism in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$.

Conversely, suppose that f is a local isomorphism in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$. Thus, there exists an object $(B, b) \leq (B, \text{id}_B)$ such that $(A, \bar{f}) \cong (B, b)$. Let $\tilde{f}: (A, \bar{f}) \rightarrow (B, b)$ be this isomorphism and $f^\circ: (B, b) \rightarrow (A, \bar{f})$ be its inverse. Now we have that $\tilde{f}\eta_{(B,b)} = f$, thus, $\tilde{f}b = f$. However, $\tilde{f}b = f$, thus, $\tilde{f} = f$ in \mathbb{X} . We also know that $b = \bar{f}^\circ$ and that $f^\circ \tilde{f} = \text{id}_{(B,b)}$ and $\tilde{f} f^\circ = \text{id}_{(A,\bar{f})}$, which precisely translates into the conditions $f^\circ f = \bar{f}^\circ$ and $f f^\circ = \bar{f}$, respectively. Thus, f is a restriction isomorphism in \mathbb{X} as desired. \square

Corollary 8.5. *A restriction category \mathbb{X} is an inverse category if and only if $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$ is an inverse local category.*

The main objective of this section is to show that the above corollary extends to a 2-equivalence between inverse (restriction) categories and inverse local categories. For starters, let us prove that local isomorphisms in a local category \mathbb{C} correspond to restriction isomorphisms in $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$. To this end, let us prove a technical lemma.

Lemma 8.6. *Consider a morphism $f: M \rightarrow N$ in a category such that there exists an object P isomorphic to M via an isomorphism $g: P \cong M$ and such that $f: M \rightarrow N$ factors through g^{-1} as $f = g^{-1}m$ and $m: P \rightarrow N$ is monic. Then the following is a pullback diagram:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M & \xlongequal{\quad} & M \\ g^{-1} \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow f \\ P & \xrightarrow{\quad m \quad} & N \end{array}$$

Proof. Consider two morphisms $h: X \rightarrow M$ and $k: X \rightarrow P$ such that $hf = km$. Thus, the morphism $h: X \rightarrow M$ satisfies that $hg^{-1}m = hf = km$. However, since m is monic, this implies that $hg^{-1} = k$. Finally, it is immediate to see that $h: X \rightarrow M$ is the unique morphism satisfying the universal property of the pullback diagram. \square


Lemma 8.7. *A morphism $f: M \rightarrow N$ in a local category \mathbb{C} is a local isomorphism if and only if $(M, f\eta_N): \mathbf{L}M \rightarrow \mathbf{L}N$ is a restriction isomorphism in $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$.*

Proof. Suppose that $f: M \rightarrow N$ is a local isomorphism in \mathbb{C} . In particular, this means that there exists an object $P \leq N$ and an isomorphism $g: P \cong M$. The condition $P \leq N$ means that $\mathbf{L}P = \mathbf{L}N$ and that there exists a (necessarily unique) morphism $m: P \rightarrow N$ such that $m\eta_N = \eta_P$. Let us define $(M, f\eta_N)^\circ$ as follows:


$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathbf{L}N = \mathbf{L}P & \mathbf{L}M \\ & \nwarrow \eta_P & \nearrow g\eta_M \\ (M, f\eta_N)^\circ: & & P \end{array}$$

We shall prove that $(M, f\eta_N)^\circ$ is a partial inverse for $(M, f\eta_N)$ in $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$. Let us start by working

out the composition $(M, f\eta_N)(M, f\eta_N)^\circ$:



where we used Lemma 8.6 to compute the bottom pullback diagram. However, this span coincides with $\overline{(M, f\eta_N)}$. Now, consider the composition $(M, f\eta_N)^\circ(M, f\eta_N)$:



However, $gf\eta_N = gg^{-1}m\eta_N = m\eta_N = \eta_P$. Thus, $(M, f\eta_N)^\circ(M, f\eta_N) = \overline{(M, f\eta_N)}^\circ$. This proves that $(M, f\eta_N)$ is a restriction isomorphism in $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$.

Conversely, assume that $(M, f\eta_N)$ is a restriction isomorphism in $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$. Thus, there exists a morphism $(P, f^\circ): LN \rightarrow LM$ such that $(M, f\eta_N)(P, f^\circ) = \overline{(M, f\eta_N)}$ and $(P, f^\circ)(M, f\eta_N) = \overline{(P, f^\circ)} = (P, \eta_P)$. Recall that P must satisfy $P \leq N$, thus, there exists an $m: P \rightarrow N$ such that $m\eta_N = \eta_P$. The first equation implies the existence of a morphism $h: M \rightarrow P$ such that

$hf^\circ = \eta_M$ and $h\eta_P = f\eta_N$. However, since $\eta_P = m\eta_N$ and that η_N is monic, we obtain that $hm = f$. The second equation implies the existence of a second morphism $g: P \rightarrow M$ such that $gf\eta_N = \eta_P$ and $g\eta_M = f^\circ$. Thus:

$$gh\eta_M = hf^\circ = \eta_M \quad hg\eta_P = gf\eta_N = \eta_N$$

Using that η_M and η_N are monic, we conclude that g and h are inverse to each other. Thus, f is a local isomorphism of \mathbb{C} . \square

Corollary 8.8. *A local category \mathbb{C} is an inverse local category if and only if $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$ is an inverse category.*

With this, we may finally state the main result of this section. To this end, we denote by $\text{INVRCAT}_{\text{lax}}$ the full 2-subcategory of RCAT_{lax} spanned by inverse restriction categories, and similarly we denote by $\text{INVLCAT}_{\text{lax}}$ the full 2-subcategory of LCAT_{lax} spanned by inverse local categories.

Theorem 8.9. *There is a 2-equivalence $\text{INVRCAT}_{\text{lax}} \simeq \text{INVLCAT}_{\text{lax}}$.*

9 Join local categories

Join restriction categories were introduced in [7]. Concretely, the join of two compatible morphisms $f, g: A \rightarrow B$ of a restriction category, that is, partially-defined morphisms that agree on the intersection of their domains, can be allegedly interpreted as the morphism obtained by gluing together f and g along the intersection of their domains. Join restriction categories were further studied in [12]; they also found application in tangent category theory [1, 8].

In this section, we introduce join local categories, which are those local categories that correspond to join restriction categories under the 2-equivalence of Theorem 4.19. We begin by recalling the notion of join restriction categories.

Definition 9.1. [7, Definition 10.1] In a restriction category \mathbb{X} the **join** of a family \mathcal{F} of compatible morphisms $f: A \rightarrow B$ of \mathbb{X} is the (necessarily unique) morphism $\bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} f: A \rightarrow B$ subject to the following conditions:

- For every $g \in \mathcal{F}$, $g \leq \bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} f$;
- If a morphism $h: A \rightarrow B$, satisfies $f \leq h$, for every $f \in \mathcal{F}$, then $\bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} f \leq h$.

A **join restriction category** consists of a restriction category \mathbb{X} subject to the following conditions:

[JR.1]: Every family \mathcal{F} of compatible morphisms of \mathbb{X} (including the empty family) admits a join;

[JR.2]: The join of a family \mathcal{F} of compatible morphisms is stable under pre-composition, explicitly:

$$g \left(\bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} f \right) = \bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} (gf)$$

[JR.3]: The join of a family \mathcal{F} of compatible morphisms is stable under post-composition, explicitly:

$$\left(\bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} f \right) h = \bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} (fh)$$

As noticed by Cockett and Manes in [7, Lemma 6.10(2)], **[JR.3]** is redundant. We will prove a similar result for join local categories using the equivalence. First, let us introduce join local categories. To begin, let us adopt the following notation. Given a family \mathcal{F} of compatible morphisms $f: M_f \rightarrow N$ of a local category \mathbb{C} , the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P \wedge M_f & \xrightarrow{g \upharpoonright M_f} & M_f \\ \pi_P^f \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \eta_{M_f} \\ P & \xrightarrow{g} & \mathbb{L}M_f \end{array}$$

denotes the pullback of η_{M_f} along a morphism $g: P \rightarrow \mathbb{L}M_f$.

Definition 9.2. In a local category \mathbb{C} , the **join** of a family \mathcal{F} of compatible morphisms is the (necessarily unique) morphism $\bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} f: \bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} M_f \rightarrow N$ subject to the following conditions:

- For every $f \in \mathcal{F}$, $f \leq \bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} f$;
- If $g: M \rightarrow N$ satisfies $f \leq g$, for every $f \in \mathcal{F}$, then $\bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} f \leq g$.

A **join local category** consists of a local category \mathbb{C} subject to the following conditions:

[JL.1]: Every family \mathcal{F} of compatible morphisms of \mathbb{C} (including the empty family) admits a join;

[JL.2]: Given a family \mathcal{F} of morphisms $f: M_f \rightarrow N$ of \mathbb{C} , the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} (P \wedge M_f) & \xrightarrow{\bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} ((g \uparrow M_f) m_f)} & \bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} M_f \\ \downarrow \bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \pi_P^f & & \downarrow \eta_{\bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} M_f} \\ P & \xrightarrow{g} & L\left(\bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} M_f\right) \end{array}$$

is a pullback in \mathbb{C} , for every g , where $m_f: M_f \rightarrow \bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} M_f$ denotes the unique monic that commutes with the maximal inclusions.

In Section 5, we constructed a partial order on morphisms of a local category and showed a correspondence between compatibility and partial order in the local sense with compatibility and partial order in the restriction sense. In this section, we use this correspondence to prove that joins in the restriction sense correspond to joins in the local sense.

Lemma 9.3. *Let \mathbb{X} be a restriction category. A family \mathcal{F} of compatible morphisms $f: A \rightarrow B$ of \mathbb{X} admits a join if and only if the family of morphisms $f: (A, \bar{f}) \rightarrow (B, \text{id}_B)$ admits a join in the local category $L[\mathbb{X}]$.*

Proof. Suppose that \mathcal{F} admits a join $\bigvee_f f: A \rightarrow B$ in \mathbb{X} . Consider the morphism

$$\bigvee_f f: (A, \bigvee_f \bar{f}) \rightarrow (B, \text{id}_B)$$

$L[\mathbb{X}]$, which is well-defined since the restriction operation commutes with joins, that is, $\overline{\bigvee_f f} = \bigvee_f \bar{f}$. Moreover, for every $g \in \mathcal{F}$, $(M, \bar{g}) \leq (M, \bigvee_f \bar{f})$ since $g \leq \bigvee_f f$ and thus, $\bar{g} \leq \bigvee_f \bar{f}$. Now, consider $h: (A, \bar{h}) \rightarrow (B, \text{id}_B)$ such that, for every $f \in \mathcal{F}$, $f \leq h$ in $L[\mathbb{X}]$. Thus, by Lemma 5.10, $f \leq h$ in \mathbb{X} . Thus, $\bigvee_f f \leq h$ in \mathbb{X} , which implies that $\bigvee_f f \leq h$ in $L[\mathbb{X}]$.

Conversely, let us assume that there exists a join $\bigvee_f f: (A, a) \rightarrow (B, \text{id}_B)$ of the family of morphisms f in $L[\mathbb{X}]$. Thus $\overline{\bigvee_f f} = a$. Moreover, since each $g \in \mathcal{F}$ satisfies $g \leq \bigvee_f f$ in $L[\mathbb{X}]$, by Lemma 5.10, $g \leq \bigvee_f f$ in \mathbb{X} . Now, consider $h: M \rightarrow N$ such that $f \leq h$ in \mathbb{X} for each $f \in \mathcal{F}$. Thus, $f \leq h$ in $L[\mathbb{X}]$, where $h: (A, \bar{h}) \rightarrow (B, \text{id}_B)$. Thus, $\bigvee_f f \leq h$ in $L[\mathbb{X}]$, which implies that $\bigvee_f f$ is a join of \mathcal{F} in \mathbb{X} . \square

Next, we prove a technical lemma that comes in handy when we prove the equivalence between join restriction and join local categories.

Lemma 9.4. *In a local category \mathbb{C} satisfying [JL.1], joins are stable under post-composition, that is:*

$$\left(\bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} f \right) h = \bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} (fh)$$

Proof. Consider a family \mathcal{F} of compatible morphisms $f: M_f \rightarrow N$ and a morphism $h: N \rightarrow P$ of \mathbb{C} . For every $f \in \mathcal{F}$, by the properties of the join, $f \leq \bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} f$, that is, there exists a monic $m_f: M_f \rightarrow \bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} M_f$ that commutes with the maximal inclusions and such that $m_f \bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} f = f$. However, by postcomposing by h , we also obtain $m_f(\bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} f)h = fh$. Therefore, for every $f \in \mathcal{F}$, $fh \leq (\bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} f)h$. By the properties of the join, this implies that $\bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} (fh) \leq (\bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} f)h$. Therefore, there exists a unique monic m commuting with the maximal inclusions such that $m(\bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} f)h = \bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} (fh)$. However, the domains of $\bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} (fh)$ and $(\bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} f)h$ coincide with $\bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} M_f$. However, for every object Q of \mathbb{C} , there is exactly one monic $Q \rightarrow Q$ that commutes with the maximal inclusions: the identity. Therefore, m is the identity, and thus, we obtain the desired identity $(\bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} f)h = \bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} (fh)$. \square

Corollary 9.5. *The local category $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$ of a join restriction category \mathbb{X} is a join local category.*

Proof. Suppose that \mathbb{X} is a join restriction category and consider a family \mathcal{F} of compatible morphisms $f: (A, \bar{f}) \rightarrow (B, b)$ of $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$. Thus, the family of morphisms $f\eta_{(B,b)}: (A, \bar{f}) \rightarrow (B, \text{id}_B)$ admits a join in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$. Let $\bigvee_f f\eta_{(B,b)}$ be the join. To construct the join of \mathcal{F} , consider the following pullback diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (A, \bigvee_f \bar{f}b) & \xrightarrow{\bigvee_f fb} & (B, b) \\ \bigvee_f \bar{f}b \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \eta_{(B,b)} \\ (A, \bigvee_f \bar{f}b) & \xrightarrow{\bigvee_f fb} & (B, \text{id}_B) \end{array}$$

where we used that $bb = b$ and that joins commute with composition. Let $h: (A, \bigvee_f \bar{f}b) \rightarrow (B, b)$ be a morphism in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$ such that $f \leq h$ in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$ for every $f \in \mathcal{F}$. It is not difficult to see that this implies that $f\eta_{(B,b)} \leq h\eta_{(B,b)}$, which implies that $\bigvee_f \bar{f}b\eta_{(B,b)} \leq h\eta_{(B,b)}$. Then using that η is monic, we prove that $\bigvee_f \bar{f}b \leq h$, thus, $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$ verifies **[JL.1]**. Now, let us prove **[JL.2]**. Thanks to Lemma 4.2, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (C, \overline{g \bigvee_f \bar{f}}) & \xrightarrow{g \bigvee_f \bar{f}} & (A, \bigvee_f \bar{f}) \\ \overline{g \bigvee_f \bar{f}} \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta \\ (C, c) & \xrightarrow{g} & (A, \text{id}_A) \end{array}$$

is a pullback in $\mathbf{L}[\mathbb{X}]$. However, by **[JR.2]**, $g \bigvee_f \bar{f} = \bigvee_f g\bar{f}$. Moreover, the restriction operator

commutes with joins. Thus, the diagram reduces to the following pullback

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (C, \bigvee_f \overline{g\bar{f}}) & \xrightarrow{\bigvee_f g\bar{f}} & (A, \bigvee_f \bar{f}) \\ \bigvee_f \overline{g\bar{f}} \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \eta \\ (C, c) & \xrightarrow{g} & (A, \text{id}_A) \end{array}$$

which is precisely the pullback of [JL.2]. \square

Let us now prove the converse, in that local joins in a local category correspond to restriction joins in the associated restriction category.

Lemma 9.6. *A family \mathcal{F} of compatible morphisms $f: M_f \rightarrow P$ of a local category \mathbb{C} admits a join if and only if the family of morphisms $(M_f, f\eta_P): \mathbb{L}M_f \rightarrow \mathbb{L}P$ admits a join in $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{F} be a family of compatible morphisms which admits a join $\bigvee_f f: \bigvee_f M_f \rightarrow P$. Consider the following morphism

$$\left(\bigvee_f M_f, \bigvee_f f\eta_P \right) : \mathbb{L}M = \mathbb{L}M_f \rightarrow \mathbb{L}P$$

in $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$. Let us show that $\mathbf{R}[\bigvee_f f]$ is the join of $\mathcal{F}' := \{(M_f, f\eta_P)\}_{f \in \mathcal{F}}$. For starters, since for each $g \in \mathcal{F}$, $g \leq \bigvee_f f$, by Lemma 5.11, it follows that $(M_g, g\eta_P) \leq (\bigvee_f M_f, \bigvee_f f\eta_P)$. Now, consider $(U, h): \mathbb{L}M \rightarrow \mathbb{L}P$ such that, for every $f \in \mathcal{F}$, $(M_f, f\eta_P) \leq h$ in $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$. Thus, $(\overline{M_f, f\eta_P})h = (M_f, f\eta_P)$, that is, the span

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \mathbb{L}M & & \mathbb{L}P \\ & \nwarrow \eta_{M_f} & \nearrow \eta_{M_f} & \nwarrow \eta_U & \nearrow h \\ & M_f & & U & \\ & \nwarrow \pi_{M_f} & \wedge & \nearrow m_f & \\ & M_f \wedge U & & & \end{array}$$

must coincide with $(M_f, f\eta_P)$. Thus, using that η_{M_f} is monic, we conclude that $M_f \wedge U = M_f$, that $\pi_{M_f} = \text{id}_{M_f}$, and that $m_f: M_f \rightarrow U$ satisfies $m_f\eta_U = \eta_{M_f}$ and $m_f h = f$, thus, $f \leq h$ in \mathbb{C} . Thus, $\bigvee_f f \leq h$ in \mathbb{C} and, by Lemma 5.11, $(\bigvee_f M_f, \bigvee_f f) \leq (U, h)$ in $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$.

Conversely, assume that \mathcal{F}' admits a join $\bigvee_f (M_f, f\eta_P) = (M, \tilde{f})$ in $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$. In particular, for every $f \in \mathcal{F}$, $(M_f, f\eta_P) \leq \bigvee_f (M_f, f\eta_P)$, which, by Lemma 5.11, implies that $f \leq \tilde{f}$ in \mathbb{C} , since $(M, \tilde{f}) = \bigvee_f (M_f, f\eta_P)$. Let h in \mathbb{C} such that $f \leq h$, for each $f \in \mathcal{F}$. Thus, $(M_f, f\eta_P) \leq (U, h)$ in $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$. Thus, $\bigvee_f (M_f, f\eta_P) \leq (U, h)$, which implies that $\tilde{f} \leq h$ in \mathbb{C} . Therefore, \tilde{f} is a join of \mathcal{F} in \mathbb{C} . \square

Corollary 9.7. *The restriction category $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$ of a join local category \mathbb{C} is a join restriction category.*

Proof. Let \mathbb{C} be a join local category. We already shown that $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$ admits joins, that is, $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$ verifies [JR.1]. We shall prove that $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$ verifies [JR.2], as well. Consider a family of compatible morphisms $(M_f, f): M \rightarrowtail N$ of $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$ and let $(V, g): P \rightarrow M$ be a morphism. Thanks to [JL.2], the composition of (V, g) with $\bigvee_f (M_f, f)$ consists of the span:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 P & & M & & N \\
 \swarrow \eta_V & & \nearrow g & & \nwarrow \eta \\
 & V & & \bigvee_f M_f & \\
 & \nwarrow & \nearrow & \nwarrow \bigvee_f f & \\
 & & \bigvee_f (g \upharpoonright M_f) m_f & & \\
 & & \wedge & & \\
 & & \bigvee_f (V \wedge M_f) & &
 \end{array}$$

However, by Lemma 9.4, we can compute

$$\left(\bigvee_f ((g \upharpoonright M_f) m_f) \right) \left(\bigvee_f f \right) = \bigvee_f \left((g \upharpoonright M_f) m_f \bigvee_f f \right) = \bigvee_f ((g \upharpoonright M_f) f)$$

where we used that $m_f \bigvee_f f = f$. However, the join of the family $\{(V, g)(M_f, f)\}_f$ is precisely the morphism $(V, \bigvee_f ((g \upharpoonright M_f) f))$. Thus, $\mathbf{R}[\mathbb{C}]$ verifies [JR.2]. \square

Combining the above corollaries together, we may state the main result of this section. To this end, we denote by $\mathbf{JRCAT}_{\text{Iax}}$ the 2-subcategory of $\mathbf{RCAT}_{\text{Iax}}$ of join restriction categories, restriction functors which preserve joins, and restriction natural transformations. Similarly, we denote by $\mathbf{JLCAT}_{\text{Iax}}$ the 2-subcategory of $\mathbf{LCAT}_{\text{Iax}}$ of join local categories, join-preserving local functors, and local natural transformations.

Theorem 9.8. *There is a 2-equivalence $\mathbf{JRCAT}_{\text{Iax}} \simeq \mathbf{JLCAT}_{\text{Iax}}$.*

We mentioned before that [JR.3] in Definition 9.1 comes for free from the other axioms. For this reason, in our definition of a join local category, we omitted the corresponding axiom. In light of the 2-equivalence of Theorem 9.8, we can now state the equivalent axiom for a join local category as a result.

Corollary 9.9. *In a join local category \mathbb{C} , given a family \mathcal{F} of morphisms $f: M_f \rightarrowtail N$ of \mathbb{C} , the diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} (M_f \wedge N) & \xrightarrow{\bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \pi_N^f} & N \\
 \downarrow \bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} (\pi_{M_f} m_f) & & \downarrow \eta_N \\
 \bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} M_f & \xrightarrow{\bigvee_{f \in \mathcal{F}} f} & \mathbf{L}N
 \end{array}$$

is a pullback in \mathbb{C} .

10 Partial categories: an operational approach to partiality

In Section 3, we introduced local categories as a new categorical framework to encode partiality. We made a case that local categories are suitable to describe *partiality on objects*, in contrast with restriction categories, which are designed to encode *partiality on morphisms*. In this section, we introduce a third approach to reasoning around partiality: partial categories. The objects and morphisms of a partial category shall not be interpreted as partial objects or partial morphisms, instead, the objects should be regarded as resources whose access is not constrained and morphisms as processes that consume their input resources in their entirety. Partiality in a partial category is instead captured by a partial order \leq on the objects and by two operators, **restriction** and **contraction**, that control the access of the processes to the correct amount of resources. In particular, the restriction operator *restricts* the access of a process $f: A \rightarrow B$ to a resource $U \leq A$, while the contraction operator *contracts* a process $f: A \rightarrow B$ to a new process $f \uparrow V: A \uparrow_f V \rightarrow V$ which ensures that the outputs land inside a resource $V \leq B$.

Definition 10.1. A **partial structure** on a category \mathbb{C} consists of an order \leq on objects together with an operator, called **restriction**

$$[\downarrow] \frac{U \leq A, \quad f: A \rightarrow B}{f \downarrow U: U \rightarrow B}$$

satisfying the following axioms:

[P.1]: For every $f: A \rightarrow B$:

$$f \downarrow A = f$$

[P.2]: For every $f: A \rightarrow B$ and $V \leq U \leq A$:

$$(f \downarrow U) \downarrow V = f \downarrow V$$

[P.3]: For every $f: A \rightarrow B$, $g: B \rightarrow C$, and $U \leq A$:

$$(f \downarrow U)g = (fg) \downarrow U$$

and with another operator, called **contraction**

$$[\uparrow] \frac{V \leq B, \quad f: A \rightarrow B}{A \uparrow_f V \leq A, \quad f \uparrow V: A \uparrow_f V \rightarrow V}$$

satisfying the following axioms:

[P.4]: For every $f: A \rightarrow B$:

$$A \mathbin{\circlearrowleft}_f B = A \qquad f \mathbin{\circlearrowleft} B = f$$

[P.4']: For every $U \leq A$:

$$A \mathbin{\circlearrowleft}_{\text{id}_A} U = U \qquad \text{id}_A \mathbin{\circlearrowleft} U = \text{id}_U$$

[P.5]: For every $f: A \rightarrow B$ and $W \leq V \leq B$:

$$(A \mathbin{\circlearrowleft}_f V) \mathbin{\circlearrowleft}_{f \mathbin{\circlearrowleft} V} W = A \mathbin{\circlearrowleft}_f W \qquad (f \mathbin{\circlearrowleft} V) \mathbin{\circlearrowleft} W = f \mathbin{\circlearrowleft} W$$

[P.6]: For every $f: A \rightarrow B$, $g: B \rightarrow C$, and $W \leq C$:

$$A \mathbin{\circlearrowleft}_f (B \mathbin{\circlearrowleft}_g W) = A \mathbin{\circlearrowleft}_{fg} W \qquad (f \mathbin{\circlearrowleft} (B \mathbin{\circlearrowleft}_g W)) \mathbin{\circlearrowleft} W = (fg) \mathbin{\circlearrowleft} W$$

Furthermore, restriction and contraction must also satisfy the following two coherence axioms:

[P.7]: For every $f: A \rightarrow B$ and $V \leq B$:

$$(A \mathbin{\circlearrowleft}_f V) \mathbin{\circlearrowleft}_{f \mathbin{\circlearrowleft} (A \mathbin{\circlearrowleft}_f V)} V = A \mathbin{\circlearrowleft}_f V \qquad (f \mathbin{\circlearrowleft} (A \mathbin{\circlearrowleft}_f V)) \mathbin{\circlearrowleft} V = f \mathbin{\circlearrowleft} V$$

[P.8]: For every $f: A \rightarrow B$, $g: B \rightarrow C$, and $V \leq B$:

$$(fg) \mathbin{\circlearrowleft} (A \mathbin{\circlearrowleft}_f V) = (f \mathbin{\circlearrowleft} V) (g \mathbin{\circlearrowleft} V)$$

A **partial category** is an ordered category equipped with a partial structure.

The restriction operator *restricts* the access of a process $f: A \rightarrow B$ to a sub-resource $U \leq A$ of A . While the contraction operator *contracts* a process $f: A \rightarrow B$ to a process $f \mathbin{\circlearrowleft} V$ whose output lands in a sub-resource $V \leq B$ of B . In particular, the contraction $A \mathbin{\circlearrowleft}_f V$ of A to V along f can be allegedly interpreted as the pre-image of V along f . By **[P.1]**, restricting a morphism to its domain gives back the original morphism. **[P.2]** establishes that restriction is an idempotent operation: by restricting a morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ first to an object $U \leq A$ and then restricting the restriction to a $V \leq U$ is equivalent to restricting f directly to V . **[P.3]** establishes that the restriction of the composition of two morphisms is equal to the composition of the restriction of the first one by the second one. By **[P.4]**, contracting a morphism to its codomain gives back the original domain and the original morphism, while by **[P.4']**, the contraction of the identity of A to $U \leq A$ gives back U and the identity on U . **[P.5]** says that the contraction is an idempotent operation, that is, that by contracting first a morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ to $V \leq B$ and

then contracting the contraction to $W \leq V$, it is equivalent to contracting f directly to W . [P.6] establishes that contracting the composition of two morphisms to $V \leq C$ is equivalent to the composition of the contraction of the two morphisms, the second one to V and the first one to the contraction $B \mathbin{\mathfrak{I}}_g V$ of B onto V along g . Moreover, [P.7] states that the contraction of the restriction of $f: A \rightarrow B$ to the contraction $A \mathbin{\mathfrak{I}}_f V$ of A onto V along f , to V coincides with the contraction of f onto V . Finally, [P.8] establishes that the restriction of the composition of two morphisms $f: A \rightarrow B$ and $g: B \rightarrow C$ to the contraction of A onto $V \leq B$ along f coincides with the composition of the contraction of f onto V with the restriction of g to V . Here are now some examples of partial categories.

Example 10.2. Every category \mathbb{C} is trivially a partial category in which $A \leq B$ if and only if $A = B$ and in which restriction and contraction are just identities.

Example 10.3. PARSET (Example 3.6) is a partial category in which $(A, W) \leq (A', U)$ if and only if $A = A'$ and W is a subset of U , that is, $W \subseteq U$. The restriction operator sends a morphism $f: (A, U) \rightarrow (B, V)$, explicitly, a function $f: U \rightarrow V$, and an object $(A, W) \leq (A, U)$ to the restriction $f \downarrow W := f|_W: W \rightarrow V$ of f to W . The contraction operator sends a morphism $f: (A, U) \rightarrow (B, V)$ and an object $(B, W) \leq (B, V)$ to $f \mathbin{\mathfrak{I}}(B, W): (A, U) \mathbin{\mathfrak{I}}_f(B, W) \rightarrow (B, W)$, where:

$$(A, U) \mathbin{\mathfrak{I}}_f(B, W) := (\{u \in U, f(u) \in W\}, A) \quad f \mathbin{\mathfrak{I}}(B, W): (A, U) \mathbin{\mathfrak{I}}_f(B, W) \ni u \mapsto f(u) \in W$$

Example 10.4. SET is a partial category in which $U \leq A$ if and only if U is a subset of A , that is, $U \subseteq A$, and in which the restriction operator sends a function $f: A \rightarrow B$ and a subset U of A to the restriction $f \downarrow U := f|_U: U \rightarrow B$ of f to U , while the contraction operator sends a function $f: A \rightarrow B$ and a subset V of B to $f \mathbin{\mathfrak{I}} V: A \mathbin{\mathfrak{I}}_f V \rightarrow V$, where:

$$A \mathbin{\mathfrak{I}}_f V := \{a \in A, f(a) \in V\} \quad f \mathbin{\mathfrak{I}} V: A \mathbin{\mathfrak{I}}_f V \ni a \mapsto f(a) \in V$$

This example shows that not every partial category is a local category (in a non-trivial way).

Example 10.5. PARTOP (Example 3.6) is a partial category whose partial structure is defined as in Example 10.3.

Example 10.6. TOP is a partial category whose partial structure is defined as in Example 10.4.

Example 10.7. Consider a restriction semigroup A [15], that is, a semigroup A equipped with an operator that sends every element a to another element \bar{a} of A satisfying the same axioms [R.1]-[R.4] of Definition 2.1. Construct the following category $P[A]$ as in Example 3.5 (notice that this time there is no unit). The objects are the restriction idempotents $a = \bar{a}$ of A , and a morphism $x: a \rightarrow b$ is an element x of A such that $\bar{x} = a$ and $xb = x$. In particular, the identities are the morphisms $a: a \rightarrow a$. $P[A]$ comes with a partial structure defined as follows.

For starters, $a \leq b$ when $ab = a$. Given a morphism $x: a \rightarrow b$ and $a' \leq a$, the restriction $x \downarrow a'$ of x to a' is the morphism $a'x: a' \rightarrow b$; the contraction of $x: a \rightarrow b$ to $b' \leq b$ is the morphism $xb': ab' \rightarrow b'$.

Example 10.8. Let IDEMRING^\bullet be the category of pairs (R, e_R) formed by a non-unital commutative ring R and an idempotent element $e_R \in R$ of R , explicitly, $e_R^2 = e_R$. A morphism $f: (S, e_S) \rightarrow (R, e_R)$ of IDEMRING^\bullet is a non-unital ring morphism $f: S \rightarrow R$ which satisfies the following equations

$$f(se_S) = f(s) = e_R f(s)$$

for every $s \in S$. The identity morphism of an object (R, e_R) of IDEMRING^\bullet is the morphism which sends each $r \in R$ to $e_R r$. Thus, $\text{IDEMRING}^{\bullet\text{op}}$ is a partial category, that is IDEMRING^\bullet is a copartial category where $(R, e_R) \leq (S, e_S)$ if and only if $R = S$ and $e_S e_R = e_S$. The corestriction operator sends a morphism $f: (S, e_S) \rightarrow (R, e_R)$ and $(R', e'_R) \leq (R, e_R)$ to $f \downarrow (R', e'_R): (S, e_S) \rightarrow (R', e'_R)$ defined as follows:

$$(f \downarrow (R', e'_R))(s) := e'_R f(s)$$

The cocontraction operator sends a morphism $f: (S, e_S) \rightarrow (R, e_R)$ and $(S, e'_S) \leq (S, e_S)$ to $(R, e_R) \uparrow_f (S, e'_S) := (R, e_R f(e'_S))$ and $f \uparrow (R, e_R): (R, e_R f(e'_S)) \rightarrow (S, e'_S)$ defined as follows:

$$(f \uparrow (R, e_R))(s) := f(e'_S s)$$

We now prove two important lemmas about partial categories. The first lemma establishes that the restriction operator is equivalent to precomposing morphisms by a special family of monics. The next lemma establishes that the contraction operator in a partial category is equivalent to taking the pullback of morphisms along those monics.

Lemma 10.9. *In a partial category \mathbb{C} , $U \leq A$ if and only if there exists a unique monic $m: U \rightarrow A$ such that, for any $f: A \rightarrow B$, $f \downarrow U = mf$. In particular, $U \uparrow_m U = U$ and $m \uparrow U = \text{id}_U$.*

Proof. Let $m := \text{id}_A \downarrow U: U \rightarrow A$. Notice that for every $f: A \rightarrow B$:

$$\begin{aligned} mf &= (\text{id}_A \downarrow U)f \\ &= (\text{id}_A f) \downarrow U \\ &= f \downarrow U \end{aligned} \tag{[P.2]}$$

Moreover, if $m': U \rightarrow A$ satisfies the equation $m'f = f \downarrow U$, then, by taking f to be id_A , we obtain:

$$m' = m' \text{id}_A = \text{id}_A \downarrow U = m$$

Let us prove that m is monic. To do so, we first prove that $U \mathbin{\circlearrowleft}_m U$. By **[P.4']**, $U = A \mathbin{\circlearrowleft}_{\text{id}_A} U$. Moreover, by **[P.8]**:

$$U = A \mathbin{\circlearrowleft}_{\text{id}_A} U = (A \mathbin{\circlearrowleft}_{\text{id}_A} U) \mathbin{\circlearrowleft}_{\text{id}_A \circ (A \mathbin{\circlearrowleft}_{\text{id}_A} U)} U = U \mathbin{\circlearrowleft}_m U$$

Now, let us compute the following:

$$\begin{aligned} (fm) \mathbin{\circlearrowleft} U &= f \mathbin{\circlearrowleft} (U \mathbin{\circlearrowleft}_m U) && \text{([P.6])} \\ &= f \mathbin{\circlearrowleft} U && (U \mathbin{\circlearrowleft}_m U = U) \\ &= f && \text{([P.4])} \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $(gf) \mathbin{\circlearrowleft} U = g$. Thus, $f = (fm) \mathbin{\circlearrowleft} U = (gm) \mathbin{\circlearrowleft} U = g$. Therefore, m is monic. Furthermore, by taking $f = \text{id}_U$, we also obtain $m \mathbin{\circlearrowleft} U = \text{id}_U$. \square

Lemma 10.10. *In a partial category, for every morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ and $V \leq B$, the diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A \mathbin{\circlearrowleft}_f V & \xrightarrow{f \mathbin{\circlearrowleft} V} & V \\ m' \downarrow & & \downarrow m \\ A & \xrightarrow{f} & B \end{array}$$

is a pullback diagram, where $m = \text{id}_B \circ V$ and $m' = \text{id}_A \circ (A \mathbin{\circlearrowleft}_f V)$.

Proof. We first prove that the diagram commutes:

$$\begin{aligned} (f \mathbin{\circlearrowleft} V)m &= (f \mathbin{\circlearrowleft} V)(\text{id}_B \circ V) \\ &= (f \text{id}_B) \circ (A \mathbin{\circlearrowleft}_f V) && \text{([P.8])} \\ &= (\text{id}_A f) \circ (A \mathbin{\circlearrowleft}_f V) \\ &= (\text{id}_A \circ (A \mathbin{\circlearrowleft}_f V))f && \text{([P.2])} \\ &= m'f \end{aligned}$$

Consider now an object X and two morphisms $\alpha: X \rightarrow A$ and $\beta: X \rightarrow V$ such that $\alpha f = \beta m$. Consider also the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X \mathbin{\circlearrowleft}_\alpha (A \mathbin{\circlearrowleft}_f V) & \xrightarrow{\alpha \mathbin{\circlearrowleft} (A \mathbin{\circlearrowleft}_f V)} & A \mathbin{\circlearrowleft}_f V \\ m'' \downarrow & & \downarrow m' \\ X & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & A \end{array}$$

where $m'' = \text{id}_X \circ (X \circ_\alpha (A \circ_f V))$. By using the same calculations as above, this diagram commutes. Moreover, we can compute that:

$$\begin{aligned}
X \circ_\alpha (A \circ_f V) &= X \circ_{\alpha f} V && \text{([P.6])} \\
&= X \circ_{\beta m} V && (\alpha f = \beta m) \\
&= X \circ_\beta (V \circ_m V) && \text{([P.6])} \\
&= X \circ_\beta V && \text{(Lemma 10.9, } V \circ_m V = V) \\
&= X && \text{([P.4])}
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we also obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\alpha \circ (A \circ_f V))(f \circ V) &= (\alpha f) \circ V && \text{([P.6])} \\
&= (\beta m) \circ V && (\alpha f = \beta m) \\
&= (\beta \circ (V \circ_m V))(m \circ V) && \text{([P.6])} \\
&= (\beta \circ V)(m \circ V) && \text{(Lemma 10.9, } V \circ_m V = V) \\
&= \beta(m \circ V) && \text{([P.4])} \\
&= \beta && \text{(Lemma 10.9, } m \circ V = \text{id}_V)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, define $\gamma := \alpha \circ (A \circ_f V): X \rightarrow A \circ_f V$. Then we obtain that:

$$\gamma(f \circ V) = (\alpha \circ (A \circ_f V))(f \circ V) = \beta$$

Moreover:

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma m' &= (\alpha \circ (A \circ_f V))(\text{id}_A \circ (A \circ_f V)) \\
&= (\alpha \text{id}_A) \circ (X \circ_\alpha (A \circ_f V)) && \text{([P.8])} \\
&= \alpha \circ X && (X \circ_\alpha (A \circ_f V) = X) \\
&= \alpha && \text{([P.1])}
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, if $\gamma': X \rightarrow A \circ_f V$ satisfies the same equations as γ , thus, $\gamma' m' = \gamma m'$, however, since m' is monic by Lemma 10.9, $\gamma' = \gamma$. \square

We end this section by introducing the 2-categorical structure for partial categories, starting with partial functors.

Definition 10.11. A **partial functor** from a partial category \mathbb{C} to a partial category \mathbb{C}' consists of a functor $F: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}'$ which preserves the partial order, that is, such that $A \leq B$ in \mathbb{C} , then $FA \leq FB$ in \mathbb{C}' , and preserves restriction and contraction, explicitly, for every morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ and $U \leq A$ and $V \leq B$:

$$F(f \circ U) = (Ff) \circ (FU) \quad F(A \circ_f V) = (FA) \circ_{Ff} (FV) \quad F(f \circ V) = (Ff) \circ (FV)$$

Next, we define natural transformations between partial functors. As per restriction categories and local categories, we introduce two distinct flavours of 2-morphisms.

Definition 10.12. A **partial natural transformation** from a partial functor $F: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}'$ to a partial functor $G: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}'$ consists of a natural transformation $\varphi_A: FA \rightarrow GA$, natural in A . A **total natural transformation** from F to G consists of a partial natural transformation $\varphi_A: FA \rightarrow GA$ such that for every pairs of objects U, A of \mathbb{C} such that $U \leq A$, the following equations hold:

$$(FA) \upharpoonright_{\varphi_A} (GU) = FU \qquad \varphi_A \upharpoonright (GU) = \varphi_U$$

Partial categories, partial functors, and partial natural transformations form a 2-category denoted by PCAT_{lax} . The full 2-subcategory of PCAT_{lax} of partial categories, partial functors, and total natural transformations is denoted by PCAT .

11 Inclusion categories: partiality via inclusions

In the previous section, we introduced partial categories as an operational context for controlling partiality. With Lemmas 10.9 and 10.10, we proved that in every partial category there is a special family of monics, obtained by restricting identities $\text{id}_A: A \rightarrow A$ to each $U \leq A$, and that the restriction and the contraction operators are entirely determined by those monics. In particular, the restriction of a morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ to $U \leq A$ coincides with the composition $m.f: U \rightarrow B$ where $m := \text{id}_A \downarrow U: U \rightarrow A$ and the contraction of a morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ onto $V \leq B$ coincides with the pullback of f along $m := \text{id}_B \downarrow V: V \rightarrow B$. In this section, we isolate the properties of this family of monics by introducing inclusion categories. We then show that inclusion categories are 2-equivalent to partial categories.

Definition 11.1. An **inclusion system** on a category \mathbb{C} consists of a family \mathcal{N} of morphisms of \mathbb{C} satisfying the following conditions:

- [I.1]: Identities belong to \mathcal{N} ;
- [I.2]: Every morphism of \mathcal{N} is monic in \mathbb{C} ;
- [I.3]: For each pair of parallel monics $m, m': A \rightarrow B$, $m \in \mathcal{N}$ and $m' \in \mathcal{N}$ implies $m = m'$;
- [I.4]: \mathcal{N} is stable under composition, that is, for each $m: A \rightarrow B$ and $m': B \rightarrow C$ where $m, m' \in \mathcal{N}$, thus, $mm' \in \mathcal{N}$;

[I.5]: \mathcal{N} is a display system, that is, for every $m: A \rightarrow B$ of \mathcal{N} and any morphism $f: C \rightarrow B$, the pullback

$$\begin{array}{ccc} D & \longrightarrow & A \\ m' \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow m \\ C & \xrightarrow{f} & B \end{array}$$

of m along f exists in \mathbb{C} and $m': D \rightarrow C$ belongs to \mathcal{N} .

The monics of an inclusion system are called **inclusions**. An **inclusion category** consists of a category equipped with an inclusion system.

Remark 11.2. [3, Theorem 3.4] establishes a 2-equivalence between split restriction categories and \mathcal{M} -categories. An \mathcal{M} -category is a category equipped with a family \mathcal{M} of monics which is stable under composition and pullbacks, and that contains all isomorphisms. An inclusion system satisfies two of the axioms of such a family \mathcal{M} , however, it need not satisfy the latter. In fact, [I.3] establishes that two objects A and B might have at most one inclusion $m: A \rightarrow B$.

Here are some examples of inclusion categories.

Example 11.3. Every category admits a trivial inclusion system, whose only inclusions are identities.

Example 11.4. PARSET (Example 3.6) is an inclusion category whose inclusions are given by inclusions of sets, that is, $m: (A, U) \rightarrow (B, V)$ is an inclusion if and only if $A = B$ and $m: U \rightarrow V$ is the inclusion morphism of $U \subseteq V$.

The next example shows that not every inclusion category is a local category (in a non-trivial way).

Example 11.5. SET is an inclusion category whose inclusions are inclusions of sets, that is, $m: A \rightarrow B$ is an inclusion if and only if $A \subseteq B$ and m is the inclusion morphism.

Example 11.6. PARTOP (Example 3.6) is an inclusion category whose inclusions are defined as in Example 11.4.

Example 11.7. TOP is an inclusion category whose inclusions are defined as in Example 11.5.

Example 11.8. $P[A]$ (Example 10.7) is an inclusion category whose inclusions $m: a \rightarrow b$ are those morphisms $m = a: a \rightarrow b$, where $ab = a$.

Example 11.9. $\text{IDEMRING}^{\bullet\text{op}}$ (Example 10.8) is an inclusion category, that is IDEMRING^\bullet is a coinclusion category whose coinclusions $m: (S, e_S) \rightarrow (R, e_R)$ are those morphisms $m: S \rightarrow R$ where $R = S$ and m sends each $s \in S = R$ to se_R .

Next, we introduce the appropriate 2-categorical structure for inclusion categories, starting with inclusion functors.

Definition 11.10. An **inclusion functor** from an inclusion category \mathbb{C} to an inclusion category \mathbb{C}' consists of a functor $F: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}'$ which sends every inclusion $m \in \mathcal{N}$ of \mathbb{C} to an inclusion $Fm \in \mathcal{N}'$ of \mathbb{C}' and such that, for any morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ and inclusion $m: V \rightarrow B$, it preserves the pullback of f along m .

Next, we define natural transformations between inclusion functors. As per restriction categories, local categories, and partial categories, we introduce two distinct flavours of 2-morphisms.

Definition 11.11. An **inclusion natural transformation** from an inclusion functor $F: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}'$ to an inclusion functor $G: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}'$ consists of a natural transformation $\varphi_A: FA \rightarrow GA$, natural in A . A **total natural transformation** from F to G consists of an inclusion natural transformation $\varphi_A: FA \rightarrow GA$ such that for each inclusion $m: U \rightarrow A$ of \mathbb{C} , the naturality square of m is a pullback diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} FU & \xrightarrow{\varphi_U} & GU \\ Fm \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow Gm \\ FA & \xrightarrow{\varphi_A} & GA \end{array}$$

We may now prove that inclusion categories are 2-equivalent to inclusion categories. To this end, we denote by NCAT_{Iax} 2-category of inclusion categories, inclusion functors, and inclusion natural transformations. We also denote by NCAT the full 2-subcategory of NCAT_{Iax} of inclusion categories, inclusion functors, and total natural transformations. For starters, let us show that every partial category carries an inclusion system whose inclusions are the restriction of identities $\text{id}_A: A \rightarrow A$ to each $U \leq A$.

Proposition 11.12. *Given a partial category \mathbb{C} , the monics $m: A \rightarrow B$ of Lemma 10.9 form an inclusion system for \mathbb{C} .*

Proof. [I.1] and [I.2] are established by Lemma 10.9. Given $m: A \rightarrow B$ and $m': B \rightarrow C$, since, $A \leq B$ and $B \leq C$, by transitivity, $A \leq C$, thus, by Lemma 10.9, there exists a monic $m'': A \rightarrow C$, which, by uniqueness, must coincide with mm' . Finally, stability under pullbacks is established by Lemma 10.10. \square

Next, we show that every inclusion system defines a partial structure.

Proposition 11.13. *If a category \mathbb{C} comes equipped with an inclusion system \mathcal{N} , then \mathbb{C} is a partial category with the following partial structure:*

- $A \leq B$ if there exists an inclusion $m: A \rightarrow B$;
- For every $U \leq A$ and $f: A \rightarrow B$, the restriction of f to A is the morphism $m f: U \rightarrow B$, where $m: U \rightarrow A$ is the (necessarily unique) inclusion from U to A ;
- For every $V \leq B$ and $f: A \rightarrow B$, the contraction of f to V is the morphism $f \upharpoonright V: A \upharpoonright V \rightarrow V$ defined by the pullback diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A \upharpoonright_f V & \xrightarrow{f \upharpoonright V} & V \\ m' \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow m \\ C & \xrightarrow{f} & B \end{array}$$

of f along $m: V \rightarrow B$, where m and m' are inclusions.

Proof. For starters, since \mathcal{N} contains identities, is stable under composition, and by the uniqueness of the monics of \mathcal{N} , it is not hard to prove that \leq defines a partial order on the objects of \mathbb{C} . To prove that $m f$ defines a restriction for f , we use that $f \downarrow A = \text{id}_A f = f$, $(f g) \downarrow U = m f g = (f \downarrow U) g$ and finally, that $(f \downarrow U) \downarrow V = n m f = f \downarrow V$, where $m: U \rightarrow A$ and $n: V \rightarrow U$. Let us prove that $f \upharpoonright V$ defines a contraction for f . [P.4] and [P.4'] follow from the fact that the pullback of a morphism f along the identity is still f . Consider the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (A \upharpoonright_f V) \upharpoonright_{f \upharpoonright V} W & \xrightarrow{(f \upharpoonright V) \upharpoonright W} & W \\ \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow n \\ A \upharpoonright_f V & \xrightarrow{f \upharpoonright V} & V \\ \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow m \\ A & \xrightarrow{f} & B \end{array}$$

Thus, [P.5] follows from the fact that vertical composition of pullback diagrams is still a pullback diagram. Next, consider the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} A \upharpoonright_f (B \upharpoonright_g W) & \longrightarrow & B \upharpoonright_g W & \xrightarrow{g \upharpoonright W} & W \\ \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow m \\ A & \xrightarrow{f} & B & \xrightarrow{g} & C \end{array}$$

Thus, **[P.6]** follows from the fact that horizontal composition of pullback diagrams is still a pullback diagram. To prove **[P.7]**, consider the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A \mathfrak{!}_f V & \xrightarrow{f \mathfrak{!} V} & V \\ m' \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow m \\ A & \xrightarrow{f} & B \end{array}$$

Thus, $f \mathfrak{!}(A \mathfrak{!}_f V) = m' f = (f \mathfrak{!} V) m$. Let us take the pullback diagram of $f \mathfrak{!}(A \mathfrak{!}_f V)$ along m and use that m is monic:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} A \mathfrak{!}_f V & \xrightarrow{f \mathfrak{!} V} & V & \xlongequal{\quad} & V \\ \parallel & \lrcorner & \parallel & \lrcorner & \downarrow m \\ A \mathfrak{!}_f V & \xrightarrow{f \mathfrak{!} V} & V & \xrightarrow{m} & B \\ & \searrow & \text{f} \mathfrak{!}(A \mathfrak{!}_f V) & & \end{array}$$

However, by definition, the pullback of $f \mathfrak{!}(A \mathfrak{!}_f V)$ along m is $(f \mathfrak{!}(A \mathfrak{!}_f V)) \mathfrak{!} V$. This proves **[P.7]**. Finally, let us prove **[P.8]**. Consider the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} A \mathfrak{!}_f V & \xrightarrow{f \mathfrak{!} V} & V & & \\ m'' \downarrow & \lrcorner & m' \downarrow & \searrow g \mathfrak{!} V & \\ A & \xrightarrow{f} & B & \xrightarrow{g} & C \end{array}$$

However, by definition, $(fg) \mathfrak{!}(A \mathfrak{!}_f V) = m'' fg = (f \mathfrak{!} V)(g \mathfrak{!} V)$. □

Consider now a partial functor $F: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}'$. Since F preserves the restriction operator, it sends each $\text{id}_A \mathfrak{!} U: U \rightarrow A$ to $F(\text{id}_A \mathfrak{!} U) = (F \text{id}_A) \mathfrak{!}(FU) = \text{id}_{FA} \mathfrak{!}(FU): FU \rightarrow FA$. Furthermore, since F preserves the contraction operator, it also preserves the pullbacks of inclusions along every morphism, since the following is a pullback by Lemma 10.10:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (FA) \mathfrak{!}_{Ff}(FV) & \xrightarrow{(Ff) \mathfrak{!}(FV)} & FV \\ \text{id}_{FA} \mathfrak{!}((FA) \mathfrak{!}_{Ff}(FV)) \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \text{id}_{FB} \mathfrak{!}(FV) \\ FA & \xrightarrow{Ff} & FB \end{array}$$

Conversely, consider an inclusion functor $F: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}'$. Since F preserves inclusions, it also preserves the contraction operator defined by pre-composing with inclusions. Furthermore,

since F preserves pullbacks along inclusions, it also preserves the associated contraction operator. Thus, F becomes an inclusion functor.

Both partial natural transformations and inclusion natural transformations are simply natural transformations, thus, the correspondence between partial categories and inclusion categories becomes 2-functorial. In particular, there are two 2-functors:

$$P_{\text{lax}}: \text{NCAT}_{\text{lax}} \rightarrow \text{PCAT}_{\text{lax}} \qquad N_{\text{lax}}: \text{PCAT}_{\text{lax}} \rightarrow \text{NCAT}_{\text{lax}}$$

Furthermore, a total natural transformation $\varphi_A: FA \rightarrow GA$ of partial functors satisfy the following property. Since $FA \upharpoonright_{\varphi_A} GU$ and $\varphi_A \upharpoonright GU = \varphi_U$, by Lemma 10.10, the following diagram is a pullback diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} FU & \xrightarrow{\varphi_U} & GU \\ \downarrow F(\text{id}_A \downharpoonright U) & & \downarrow G(\text{id}_A \downharpoonright U) \\ FA & \xrightarrow{\varphi_A} & GA \end{array} = \begin{array}{ccc} FA \upharpoonright_{\varphi_A} GU & \xrightarrow{\varphi_A \upharpoonright GU} & GU \\ \downarrow \text{id}_{FA} \downharpoonright FU & \lrcorner & \downarrow \text{id}_{GA} \downharpoonright GU \\ FA & \xrightarrow{\varphi_A} & GA \end{array}$$

Thus, $\varphi_A: FA \rightarrow GA$ becomes a total natural transformation of inclusion functors. Conversely, if $\varphi_A: FA \rightarrow GA$ is a total natural transformation of inclusion functors, since the naturality square of each inclusion $m: U \rightarrow A$ along φ_A is a pullback, we conclude that $FA \upharpoonright_{\varphi_A} GU = FU$ and that $\varphi_A \upharpoonright GU = \varphi_U$. Thus, φ_A becomes a total natural transformation of partial functors. Thus, the two 2-functors P_{lax} and N_{lax} restrict to two 2-functors:

$$P: \text{NCAT} \rightarrow \text{PCAT} \qquad N: \text{PCAT} \rightarrow \text{NCAT}$$

Theorem 11.14. *The 2-functors P_{lax} and N_{lax} form a 2-equivalence $\text{PCAT}_{\text{lax}} \simeq \text{NCAT}_{\text{lax}}$. Moreover, this 2-equivalence restricts to another 2-equivalence $\text{PCAT} \simeq \text{NCAT}$.*

Proof. Consider a partial category \mathbb{C} . Thus, $P[N[\mathbb{C}]]$ is the same category as \mathbb{C} equipped with the following partial structure. $U \leq A$ in $P[N[\mathbb{C}]]$ if and only if there exists an inclusion $m: U \rightarrow A$ in $N[\mathbb{C}]$, if and only if $U \leq A$ in \mathbb{C} . The restriction of $f: A \rightarrow B$ is the morphism $mf: U \rightarrow B$ where $m: U \rightarrow A$ is the inclusion of U into A in $N[\mathbb{C}]$, that is, the restriction $\text{id}_A \downharpoonright U$ of id_A to U in \mathbb{C} , thus:

$$\begin{aligned} mf &= (\text{id}_A \downharpoonright U)f \\ &= (\text{id}_A f) \downharpoonright U \\ &= f \downharpoonright U \end{aligned} \tag{[P2]}$$

The contraction of $f: A \rightarrow B$ onto $V \leq B$ in $P[N[\mathbb{C}]]$ is the pullback of f along the inclusion $m = \text{id}_B \downharpoonright V: V \rightarrow B$. Thus, by Lemma 10.10, it coincides with the contraction of f onto V in \mathbb{C} (up to a unique isomorphism).

Conversely, consider an inclusion category \mathbb{C} . Thus, $N[P[\mathbb{C}]]$ is the same category as \mathbb{C} . Moreover, $m: U \rightarrow A$ is an inclusion in \mathbb{C} if and only if $m = \text{id}_A \circ U$ in $P[\mathbb{C}]$, however, the restriction of a morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ in \mathbb{C} is given by pre-composing f by the inclusion $m: U \rightarrow A$, which is unique by [I.3]. Thus, m is an inclusion in $N[P[\mathbb{C}]]$ if and only if it is an inclusion in \mathbb{C} . We leave it to the reader to prove that this correspondence defines a full 2-equivalence. \square

Remark 11.15. Under the 2-equivalence of Theorem 11.14, Examples 10.2 - 10.6, and 10.8, of partial categories correspond to the Examples 11.3 - 11.7, and 11.9, respectively.

12 The fundamental theorem of partiality

Every local category \mathbb{C} carries a canonical inclusion system, whose inclusions are those monics $m: U \rightarrow A$ between two objects $U \leq A$ of \mathbb{C} such that $m\eta_A = \eta_U$. In general, an inclusion category does not carry a local structure (see Example 11.5). In this section, we isolate the exact condition which makes inclusion categories and partial categories 2-equivalent to restriction and local categories: boundedness. We then use this characterization to prove the main result of this paper: restriction categories, local categories, bounded partial categories, and bounded inclusion categories are all 2-equivalent to each other. As an application, we revisit the definition of an inverse local category and connect this to the Ehresmann-Schein-Nambooripad theorem for inverse categories. We begin by defining bounded partial categories and bounded inclusion categories.

Definition 12.1. A partial category \mathbb{C} is **bounded** if for every object A of \mathbb{C} there exists a unique object LA such that $A \leq LA$ and LA is maximal in the sense that $LA \leq B$ implies $B = LA$.

Definition 12.2. An inclusion category \mathbb{C} is **bounded** when for every object A of \mathbb{C} , there exists a unique inclusion $\eta_A: A \rightarrow LA$, called the **maximal inclusion** of A , such that if there exists an inclusion $x: LA \rightarrow B$, then $LA = B$.

We now show that the 2-equivalence of Theorem 11.14 restricts to a 2-equivalence between bounded partial categories and bounded inclusion categories. To this end, we denote by $\text{BPCAT}_{\text{lax}}$ (BPCAT) the 2-subcategory of PCAT_{lax} (PCAT) of bounded partial categories, partial functors which preserve the boundedness, that is, $F LA = L F A$, and partial (total) natural transformations. Similarly, we denote by $\text{BNCAT}_{\text{lax}}$ (BNCAT) the 2-subcategory of NCAT_{lax} (NCAT) of bounded inclusion categories, inclusion functors which preserve the boundedness, that is, $F \eta_A = \eta_{F A}$, and inclusion (total) natural transformations.

Theorem 12.3. *The 2-equivalences of Theorem 11.14 restricts to a 2-equivalence $\text{BPCAT}_{\text{lax}} \simeq \text{BNCAT}_{\text{lax}}$ and a 2-equivalence $\text{BPCAT} \simeq \text{BNCAT}$.*

Proof. Consider a bounded partial category \mathbb{C} . Thus, for every object there exists a unique maximal object $\mathsf{L}A$ which bounds A from above, that is, $A \leq \mathsf{L}A$. Let η_A be the contraction $\text{id}_{\mathsf{L}A} \circ A: A \rightarrow \mathsf{L}A$ of the identity on $\mathsf{L}A$ to A . Suppose that there exists an inclusion $\mathsf{L}A \rightarrow B$ in $\mathsf{N}[\mathbb{C}]$. In particular, $\mathsf{L}A \leq B$. Thus, $B = \mathsf{L}A$. Now, suppose that $m': A \rightarrow \mathsf{L}'A$ is another maximal inclusion for A in $\mathsf{N}[\mathbb{C}]$. Thus, $A \leq \mathsf{L}'A$. Consider B such that $\mathsf{L}'A \leq B$, thus, there exists an inclusion $\mathsf{L}'A \rightarrow B$, thus, since m' is also maximal, $B = \mathsf{L}'A$. Therefore, $\mathsf{L}'A$ is another maximal object which bounds A from above. Thus, by the uniqueness of $\mathsf{L}A$, $\mathsf{L}'A = \mathsf{L}A$. This, together with [I.3], proves that η_A is the unique maximal inclusion of $\mathsf{N}[\mathbb{C}]$ and therefore that $\mathsf{N}[\mathbb{C}]$ is bounded.

Conversely, consider a bounded inclusion category \mathbb{C} . Thus, every object A of \mathbb{C} admits an object $\mathsf{L}A$ and a unique maximal inclusion $\eta_A: A \rightarrow \mathsf{L}A$. Thus, $A \leq \mathsf{L}A$ in $\mathsf{P}[\mathbb{C}]$. Suppose that $\mathsf{L}A \leq B$. Thus, there exists an inclusion $x: \mathsf{L}A \rightarrow B$. Thus, by maximality of η_A , $B = \mathsf{L}A$. Suppose now that $A \leq \mathsf{L}'A$ and for every B , if $\mathsf{L}'A \leq B$, thus $B = \mathsf{L}'A$. Thus, there is an inclusion $m': A \rightarrow \mathsf{L}'A$, which is maximal. By uniqueness of η_A , $m' = \eta_A$, thus, $\mathsf{L}'A = \mathsf{L}A$. Therefore, $\mathsf{P}[\mathbb{C}]$ is bounded.

We leave it to the reader to show that boundedness-preserving partial functors correspond to boundedness-preserving inclusion functors. \square

The next step is to compare bounded inclusion categories with local categories. We first show that every local category carries a canonical inclusion system.

Proposition 12.4. *Let \mathbb{C} be a local category. Define \mathcal{N} as the family of morphisms $m: A \rightarrow B$ of \mathbb{C} where $A \smile B$ and subject to the following equation:*

$$m\eta_B = \eta_A$$

Then \mathcal{N} is a bounded inclusion system for \mathbb{C} .

Proof. First of all, identities are part of \mathcal{N} , since trivially, $\text{id}_A \eta_A = \eta_A$. Secondly, since $m\eta_B = \eta_A$ is monic, m is also monic. Moreover, if $m': A \rightarrow B$ satisfies the equation $m'\eta_B = \eta_A = m\eta_B$, since η_B is monic, $m = m'$. Consider now, $m: A \rightarrow B$ and $m': B \rightarrow C$ such that $m\eta_B = \eta_A$ and $m'\eta_C = \eta_B$. Thus, $mm'\eta_C = m\eta_B = \eta_A$. Thus, $mm' \in \mathcal{N}$. Finally, consider a morphism $f: C \rightarrow B$. Consider the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} D & \xrightarrow{\quad g \quad} & A & & \\ m' \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \eta_A & & \\ C & \xrightarrow{\quad f \quad} B & \xrightarrow{\quad \eta_B \quad} & \mathsf{L}B = \mathsf{L}A & \end{array}$$

Using that $m\eta_B = \eta_A$, we can rewrite this diagram as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 D & \xrightarrow{g} & A \\
 m' \downarrow & & \downarrow m \\
 C & \xrightarrow{f} & B \\
 & \searrow f\eta_B & \downarrow \eta_B \\
 & & LB
 \end{array}
 \quad
 \begin{array}{c}
 \nearrow \eta_A \\
 \searrow \eta_B
 \end{array}$$

Since the outer diagram is a pullback, it is not hard to see that the internal square diagram is a pullback as well. Finally, to prove that \mathcal{N} is bounded, notice that for each $A \in \mathbb{C}$, $A \leq LA$, since $\eta_A: A \rightarrow LA$. Moreover, if $LA \leq B$, thus, in particular, $LB = LLA = LA$. Now, suppose that $L'A$ is another object such that $A \leq L'A$. Thus, $LA = LL'A$. Thus, $L'A \leq LL'A = LA$. Thus, $L'A = LA$. \square

Conversely, every bounded inclusion category comes with a local structure.

Proposition 12.5. *Let \mathbb{C} be a bounded inclusion category. Then, \mathbb{C} is a local category where for every object A , $\eta_A: A \rightarrow LA$ is the maximal inclusion of A .*

Proof. Let us start by proving [L.1]. By definition, $\eta_A\eta_{LA}: A \rightarrow LLA$ factors through η_A , thus, since η_A is maximal, $LLA = LA$. However, since identities are inclusions, by [L.3], $\eta_{LA} = \text{id}_{LA}$. Since η_A is an inclusion, η_A is monic, thus, also [L.2] holds. To prove [L.3], consider a morphism $f: A \rightarrow LB$. Since η_A is an inclusion and since inclusions are stable under pullbacks, the pullback of η_A along f exists.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 C & \xrightarrow{\quad} & B \\
 m \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \eta_B \\
 A & \xrightarrow{f} & LB
 \end{array}$$

Moreover, $m: C \rightarrow A$ is an inclusion. Consider $m\eta_A: C \rightarrow LA$. For any B , such that there is an inclusion $LA \rightarrow B$, $B = LA$, thus, $m\eta_A$ is maximal. However, by the uniqueness of maximal inclusions, we conclude that $\eta_C = m\eta_A$ and that $LC = LA$, proving [L.3]. \square

Thanks to Propositions 12.4 and 12.5, we can now prove a 2-equivalence between local categories and bounded inclusion systems.

Theorem 12.6. *There is a 2-equivalence $\text{LCAT}_{\text{lax}} \simeq \text{BNCAT}_{\text{lax}}$. Furthermore, this 2-equivalence restricts to a 2-equivalence $\text{LCAT} \simeq \text{BNCAT}$.*

Proof. Propositions 12.4 and 12.5 already proved a correspondence between local categories and bounded inclusion categories. It is immediate to see that these two constructions invert each other, since the η_A of a local category are maximal inclusions in the associated inclusion system. We leave it to the reader to prove that this correspondence lifts to a 2-equivalence. \square

Remark 12.7. SET and PARSET (Example 3.6) are equivalent as categories. However, while the latter carries a local structure, the former does not¹. As pointed out in Examples 10.4, 10.3, 11.5, and 11.4, both SET and PARSET carry a partial structure and an inclusion system and SET and PARSET are equivalent both as partial categories and as inclusion categories. In light of Theorem 12.6, since the local structure of PARSET is not carried over by the equivalence to SET, we conclude that boundedness is not stable under equivalence of categories.

Remark 12.8. As pointed out in Remark 11.2, inclusion categories resemble \mathcal{M} -categories. Theorem 12.9 and Theorem 7.6 clarify exactly the relationship between these two concepts. By [3, Theorem 3.4], \mathcal{M} -categories are 2-equivalent to split restriction categories. Thus, there is a 2-equivalence between \mathcal{M} -categories and split bounded inclusion categories, that is, bounded inclusion categories whose associated local structure splits. However, the family of inclusions \mathcal{N} of the inclusion category associated to an \mathcal{M} -category \mathbb{X} does not lie in the same category of \mathbb{X} . For instance, consider the restriction category PAR of Example 2.4. PAR splits, thus it corresponds to the \mathcal{M} -category whose underlying category is still PAR and whose system of monics is given by the inclusion morphisms $U \hookrightarrow A$. The inclusion category that corresponds to the restriction category PAR is the category PARSET of Example 11.4. Thus, the system of monics \mathcal{M} and inclusion system \mathcal{N} corresponding to a split restriction category do not live in the same category².

In this paper, we have introduced three new categorical approaches to reason around partiality: local categories, in which partiality is on objects, instead of being on morphisms as per restriction categories; (bounded) partial categories, in which partiality is encoded operationally, via the restriction and the contraction operators; (bounded) inclusion categories, in which partiality is described by a class of monics, which generalize inclusions of sets. We may now state the main result of this paper: that all these four approaches for describing partiality, restriction categories, local categories, bounded partial categories, and bounded inclusion categories are equivalent, allowing one to move from one approach to another one, as desired.

Theorem 12.9. *There is a chain of 2-equivalences*

$$\text{RCAT}_{\text{lax}} \simeq \text{LCAT}_{\text{lax}} \simeq \text{BPCAT}_{\text{lax}} \simeq \text{BNCAT}_{\text{lax}}$$

¹We thank Steve Lack for pointing this out to us

²We thank Steve Lack and Richard Garner for helping clarify this point.

Moreover, these 2-equivalences restrict to total natural transformations, providing another chain of 2-equivalences:

$$\text{RCAT} \simeq \text{LCAT} \simeq \text{BPCAT} \simeq \text{BNCAT}$$

Proof. Theorem 4.19 already proves that RCAT_{lax} (RCAT) is 2-equivalent to LCAT_{lax} (LCAT). Moreover, Theorem 12.3 proves that $\text{BPCAT}_{\text{lax}}$ (PCAT_{lax}) is 2-equivalent to $\text{BNCAT}_{\text{lax}}$ (BNCAT). Finally, Theorem 12.6 proves that local categories are 2-equivalent to bounded inclusion categories. \square

We conclude this paper with a discussion on how our main result connects to the celebrated Ehresmann-Schein-Nambooripad (ESN) theorem [18, Theorem 4.1.8]³. Briefly recall that the ESN theorem establishes an equivalence between the categories of inverse semigroups and inductive groupoids, which are groupoids equipped with a partial order and two operations, a restriction and a corestriction, satisfying some properties. We suggest the reader consult [13] for details on this result. An inverse category can be seen as a multi-object categorical version of an inverse semigroup. In [10], the ESN theorem was generalized to inverse categories by proving that inverse categories are equivalent to *top-heavy locally inductive groupoids*. We show how our construction of the bounded inclusion category associated to an inverse category recaptures the construction of DeWolf and Pronk.

Thanks to the equivalence provided by Theorem 12.6, we can reformulate the definition of an inverse local category in terms of inclusion categories as follows.

Definition 12.10. An **inverse inclusion category** consists of an inclusion category \mathbb{C} in which every morphism factors as an isomorphism followed by an inclusion. An inverse inclusion category is **bounded** when it is bounded as an inclusion category.

Let $\text{INVBNCAT}_{\text{lax}}$ and INVBNCAT be the two full 2-subcategories of $\text{BNCAT}_{\text{lax}}$ and BNCAT , respectively, spanned by inverse inclusion categories.

Theorem 12.11. *The 2-equivalences of Theorem 12.6 restrict to two 2-equivalences $\text{INVLCAT}_{\text{lax}} \simeq \text{INVBNCAT}_{\text{lax}}$ and $\text{INVLCAT} \simeq \text{INVBNCAT}$.*

Remark 12.12. Notice that inverse inclusion categories are more general than inverse local categories, and consequently, to inverse (restriction) categories, since they are not, in general, bounded.

By putting together the equivalence between inverse (restriction) categories and inverse local categories of Theorem 8.9 and the equivalence of Theorem 12.11, we obtain the following.

Theorem 12.13. *There are two 2-equivalences $\text{INVRCAT}_{\text{lax}} \simeq \text{INVBNCAT}_{\text{lax}}$ and $\text{INVRCAT} \simeq \text{INVBNCAT}$.*

³We thank Richard Garner for suggesting this direction to us.

In particular, given an inverse (restriction) category \mathbb{X} , the morphisms of the associated bounded inverse inclusion category $N[\mathbb{X}]$ factor as isomorphisms followed by inclusions. The maximal subgroupoid of $N[\mathbb{X}]$, that is, the groupoid of all isomorphisms of $N[\mathbb{X}]$, coincides with the top-heavy locally inductive groupoid of \mathbb{X} constructed by DeWolf and Pronk. In particular, the order is induced by the partial order defined by inclusions in $N[\mathbb{X}]$.

Theorem 12.14. *The maximal subgroupoid of the bounded inverse inclusion category $N[\mathbb{X}]$ associated to an inverse (restriction) category \mathbb{X} equipped with the partial order induced by $N[\mathbb{X}]$ is precisely the top-heavy locally inductive groupoid of \mathbb{X} of [10, Theorem 2.17].*

References

- [1] Cockett, J. R. B. & Crutwell, G. S. H. Differential Structure, Tangent Structure, and SDG. *Applied Categorical Structures*. **22.2** (2014), pp. 331-417.
- [2] Carboni, A., Kelly, G. M. & Wood, R. J. A 2-categorical approach to change of base and geometric morphisms. I. *Cahiers Topologie Géom. Différentielle Catég.* **32.1** (1991), pp. 47-95.
- [3] Cockett, J. R. B. & Lack, S. Restriction categories I: categories of partial maps. *Theoretical Computer Science*. **270.1-2** (2002), pp. 223-259.
- [4] Cockett, J. R. B. & Lack, S. Restriction categories II: partial map classification. *Theoretical Computer Science*. **294.1-2** (2003), pp. 61-102.
- [5] Cockett, J. R. B. & Lack, S. Restriction categories III: colimits, partial limits and extensivity. *Mathematical Structures In Computer Science*. **17.4** (2007), pp. 775-817.
- [6] Cockett, J. R. B. & Lemay, J. -S. P. Classical distributive restriction categories. *Theory Appl. Categ.* **42** Paper No. 6 (2024), pp. 102-144.
- [7] Cockett, J. R. B. & Manes, E. Boolean and classical restriction categories. *Math. Structures Comput. Sci.* **19.2** (2009), pp. 357-416.
- [8] Cockett, J. R. B. & Schwarz, F. Lie groups in tangent join restriction categories. eprint: arxiv:2509.18410 (2025).
- [9] Di Paola, R. & Heller, A. Dominical categories: recursion theory without elements. *J. Symbolic Logic*. **52.3** (1987), pp. 594-635.
- [10] DeWolf, D. & Pronk, D. The Ehresmann-Schein-Nambooripad theorem for inverse categories. *Theory Appl. Categ.* **33** Paper No. 27 (2018), pp. 813-831.

- [11] Giles, B. An investigation of some theoretical aspects of reversible computing. PhD thesis. University of Calgary (2014).
- [12] Guo, X. Products, joins, meets, and ranges in restriction categories. PhD thesis. University of Calgary (2012).
- [13] Hollings, C. The Ehresmann-Schein-Nambooripad theorem and its successors. *European Journal Of Pure And Applied Mathematics*. **5.4** (2012), pp. 414-450.
- [14] Jacobs, B. Semantics of weakening and contraction. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*. **69.1** (1994), pp. 73-106.
- [15] Jones, P. R. Almost perfect restriction semigroups. *J. Algebra*. **445** (2016), pp. 193-220.
- [16] Johnson, N. & Yau, D. 2-dimensional categories. Oxford University Press (2021), pp.xix+615.
- [17] Kastl, J. Inverse categories. *Algebraische Modelle, Kategorien Und Gruppoide* (1979), pp. 51-60.
- [18] Lawson, M. V. Inverse semigroups. The theory of partial symmetries. World Scientific Publishing Co., Inc., River Edge, NJ. (1998), pp. xiv+411.
- [19] MacLane, S. Categories for the working mathematician. Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin. Vol. 5. Graduate texts in Mathematics (1971), pp. ix+262.
- [20] Mulry, P. S. Partial map classifiers and partial Cartesian closed categories. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*. **136.1** (1994), pp. 109-123.
- [21] Robinson, E. & Rosolini, G. Categories of partial maps. *Inform. And Comput.*. **79.2** (1988), pp. 95-130.