

PITA FACTORISATION IN OPERADIC CATEGORIES

MICHAEL BATANIN, JOACHIM KOCK, MARK WEBER

ABSTRACT. In strictly factorisable operadic categories, every morphism f factors uniquely as $f = \eta_f \circ \pi_f$ where η_f is order-preserving and π_f is a quasibijection that is order-preserving on the fibres of η_f . We call it the pita factorisation. In this paper we develop some general theory to compensate for the fact that generally pita factorisations do not form an orthogonal factorisation system. The main technical result states that a certain simplicial object in \mathbf{Cat} , called the pita nerve, is oplax (rather than strict as it would be for an orthogonal factorisation system). The main application is the result that the so-called operadic nerve of any operadic category is coherent. This result is a key ingredient in the simplicial approach to operadic categories developed in the ‘main paper’ [4], which motivated the present paper. We also show that in the important case where quasibijections are invertible, the pita nerve is a decomposition space.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Pita factorisation in the skeletal category $\mathbb{F}\mathbf{in}$	6
3. Operadic categories	7
4. Fibrewise order-preserving diagrams	9
5. Functorially factorisable operadic categories	11
6. Strictly factorisable operadic categories	15
7. Locally order-preserving chains	19
8. Top-lax simplicial objects	24
9. The pita nerve	28
10. Decomposition spaces	34
References	38


1. INTRODUCTION

In combinatorics, it is a standard technique to deal with finite sets by working only with standard finite ordinals, but with maps that are not necessarily order-preserving. The following fact is a fundamental tool:

Every map $f : m \rightarrow n$ factors *uniquely* as $f = \eta_f \circ \pi_f$

where η_f is order-preserving and π_f is a fibrewise order-preserving bijection.

The middle object $m \rightarrow m' \rightarrow n$ is the ordinal sum $\sum_{i \in n} f^{-1}(i)$, which can be considered just a reordering of the elements in m . The following picture is very suggestive of the working of this *pita factorisation*.¹ Verbally, make a cut after all the crossings of strands, and insert m' at this level:



The factorisation is implicit in a many situations in combinatorics, in particular in connection with partitions (surjections), where it is often involved in intermediate steps of ‘standardisation’. The factorisation also comes up in operad theory, where it is custom to label inputs of operations with numbers (so as to be able to talk about substitution into input slot number i (the circle- i approach to operads, sometimes called Markl operads)). This often requires reindexing and keeping track of permutations. In some situations, the combinatorics becomes so involved that it is necessary to be explicit about the factorisations. This was the case in our earlier work (in Batanin [2, Prop. 3.1] where explicit use of the factorisations was required in the proof of a general higher Eckmann–Hilton argument; in Weber [28] where these factorisations are involved to compute codescent objects of crossed internal categories; and in Batanin–Kock–Weber [3], where the factorisations enter the proof of the biequivalence between regular patterns and substitutes and between Feynman categories and coloured operads.)

Beyond the skeletal category of finite set, a version of pita factorisation was established by Lavers [22] in the category of vines, whose morphisms are a mixture of set maps and braids. Lavers showed that every morphism f in this category factors as $f = \eta_f \circ \pi_f$ where the fibrewise-order-preserving factor π_f is now a *braiding* rather than just a permutation [22, Prop. 8]. This particular version of the pita factorisation was later exploited by Day and Street [12] who

¹The terminology is just derived from the Greek letters π and η , which we had been using consistently. Unable to come up with a short descriptive name, we finally opted to officialise the name *pita factorisation*. (We are aware that pita is not spelled with an η in Greek.)

interpreted it as a distributive law, and used it to generalise substitutes and braided substitutes to certain lax symmetric or braided monoidal functors to sylleptic (braided) Gray monoids. Weber [28] exploited the braided form of the pita factorisation to prove that the category of vines is the free braided monoidal category on a commutative monoid object.

The theory of operadic categories was introduced and developed by Batanin and Markl [5], originally for the purpose of proving the duoidal Deligne conjecture. It is a general theory for operad-like structures, where each operadic category has its own notion of operads. The afore-mentioned skeletal category $\mathbb{F}\text{in}$ of finite sets is the operadic category whose operads are ordinary symmetric operads. (It is important that the skeleton is used. The notion of operadic category is not invariant under equivalence of categories.) There are operadic categories for other kinds of operads, and these operads in turn have their own notion of algebras, just like ordinary symmetric operads.

Since operadic categories can be seen as generalisations of the skeletal category $\mathbb{F}\text{in}$ (and relate to it via the cardinality functor), and the theory often resorts to arguments exploiting the pita factorisation, it was natural to consider generalisations of the pita factorisation to operadic categories, cf. [7, 6]. For many important operadic categories \mathbb{O} , such as categories of graphs or trees, there is such a notion, whereby a general morphism $f : T \rightarrow S$ in \mathbb{O} factors uniquely as π_f followed by η_f , where η_f is order-preserving (meaning that its cardinality is an order-preserving map in $\mathbb{F}\text{in}$) and π_f is a quasibijection that is order-preserving on fibres. A morphism in an operadic category is a quasibijection if all fibres are trivial (in the technical sense, as recalled below in 4.1). Such operadic categories are called strictly factorisable operadic categories. It is one of the conditions required in order to have a general theory of Koszul duality in operadic categories [7, 6]. In particular, all the examples treated in [6] are strictly factorisable, including many variations of the category of graphs, such as notably connected genus-graded graphs – the operadic category for which algebras over the terminal operad are precisely modular operads [6, Prop. 5.11].

In the present paper we develop further the theory of factorisable operadic categories. The theory can be seen as an effort to learn to live with the fact that the pita factorisation, useful and important as it is, is not an orthogonal factorisation system! Indeed, the defining property of the factorisation is tied locally to the codomain – there is no global characterisation of the left-hand class of maps. This local nature of the factorisations gives the theory a somewhat different flavour.

We are particularly interested in properties of certain associated reflection functors, also an important aspect of orthogonal factorisation systems (cf. Cassidy–Hébert–Kelly [10]).

For an orthogonal factorisation system, it is natural and useful to construct a double category with one class of morphisms as horizontal arrows and the other class vertical, so it can be seen as a simplicial object in \mathbf{Cat} of chains

of maps in the second class – the categories are then with morphisms from the first class. (The double categories obtained are so-called *vacant* double categories [23], [1]; see [27] and [19] for recent developments.) For pita factorisations, things are more involved, because of the local nature of the factorisations. The natural thing to do is to consider only locally order-preserving chains, meaning chains $T_n \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow T_0$ all of whose composites ending in T_0 are order-preserving. (Note that the ‘right-hand class’ – the order-preserving maps – does not have the usual closure property that right-hand classes have in orthogonal factorisation systems: it is not true (not even in $\mathbb{F}\text{in}$) that if gf and g are order-preserving then so is f .) The categories involved then have as maps certain fibrewise order-preserving quasibijections. In its naive form, this is not a simplicial object because the top face operators, those omitting T_0 , are missing, but this can be fixed by exploiting the reflection functor. This provides top face operators, but they do not satisfy the simplicial identities. Our main theorem states that this *pita nerve* is nevertheless coherent in the appropriate sense:

Theorem A. *The pita nerve of a strictly factorisable operadic category is a coherent top-lax simplicial category.*

The notion of top-lax simplicial category is a natural class of oplax simplicial categories arising from decalage, as we explain. The coherators are given by fibrewise order-preserving quasibijections, so the pita nerve is almost a pseudo-simplicial groupoid. (We refrain from calling it a quasi-pseudo-simplicial groupoid.)

In many cases of (strictly factorisable) operadic categories, all quasibijections are invertible. In this case the pita nerve takes values in groupoids instead of categories, and becomes a pseudo-simplicial groupoid. In this case we show

Theorem B. *For a strictly factorisable operadic category with invertible quasibijections, the pita nerve is a decomposition space (a.k.a. 2-Segal space).*

It is beyond the scope of this paper to pursue the decomposition-space aspect to any depth, but we calculate the incidence bialgebra of the operadic category $\mathbb{F}\text{in}_{\text{surj}}$ of finite sets and surjections. It is a coalgebra we have not seen before, closely related to the Faà di Bruno bialgebra.

It is a salient feature of the pita nerve that the top face operators are of a different kind than the remaining face operators. This may look artificial at first sight, but there are several significant instances of this phenomenon elsewhere. We point out a few:

(1) *Waldhausen’s S-dot construction*: in its most naive form, the S-dot construction on an abelian category takes S_n to be the groupoid of chains of $n - 1$ composable epimorphisms (fibrations). The face operators d_0 and d_1 from S_2 to S_1 then send an epimorphism to its codomain and its domain, respectively. The special top face operator d_2 returns the kernel. This gives only a pseudo-simplicial groupoid, and one of Waldhausen’s insights was to rectify this with a less naive construction.

(2) *The two-sided bar construction of an operad* (see for example [20]): here the top face operator is a Kleisli map (with respect to the free-symmetric-strict-monoidal-category monad), whereas all the other face operators are ordinary maps. In terms of trees this is because composing out levels in a tree (or deleting the leaf level) produces again a tree, whereas deleting the root level produces instead a forest.

(3) *Hereditary species*: Carlier [9] constructed an operadic category from any hereditary species in the sense of Schmitt [26] via a simplicial groupoid (which is a decomposition space). This has the flavour of the two preceding examples. For instance, take the hereditary species of graphs: the simplicial groupoid then has contractions of graphs in simplicial degree 2. The face operators d_0 and d_1 assign to such a contraction its codomain and domain, respectively, whereas the special top face operator d_2 assigns the set of fibres (so it is a Kleisli map as in example (2), and it gives only a pseudo-simplicial groupoid as in example (1)). (Cebrian and Forero [11] generalised Carlier’s construction to so-called directed hereditary species [15] and used our results from [4] to give a much simpler proof (covering also Carlier’s result).)

Although we develop general theory, the motivation is one particular application of Theorem A. In the ‘main paper’ [4], we develop a new simplicial approach to operadic categories, but since one technical point turned out to be quite involved and required theory of independent interest, it has now become this stand-alone paper. We briefly explain the relationship, referring to the paper [4] for details. Work of Garner, Kock, and Weber [17] suggested that the structure of operadic category on a category \mathcal{O} should amount to a kind of ‘undeck-ing’: a certain simplicial object X of which \mathcal{O} is the upper decalage – very roughly “ $\text{Dec}_\top X = N\mathcal{O}$ ”. This equation is true for unary operadic categories (categories for which all objects have cardinality 1) [17], but for general operadic categories it is considerably more involved to make sense of the idea. Garner, Kock, and Weber gave one solution, using a modification of the decalage comonad, but the undeck-ing idea is not the most prominent in their work. In [4] we work out a different implementation of the undeck-ing idea, which seems rather natural: the undeck-ing now takes place in the Kleisli category for the free-strict-symmetric-monoidal-category monad \mathbf{S} , and the simplicial object X is thus a simplicial groupoid rather than a simplicial set. The equation is rather $\text{Dec}_\top X = \mathbf{S}N\mathcal{O}$. The top degeneracy operators express the structure of chosen local terminals (as discovered in [17]), whereas the top face operators account for the fibre functor. With some further minor adjustments, we can actually use this equation to *define* operadic categories, and all the axioms end up as simplicial identities. It must be stressed that it is necessary to let X be pseudo-simplicial instead of strict simplicial. A key point in the theory is this:

Theorem [4]. *For any operadic category \mathcal{O} , its operadic nerve X (undeck-ing) is a coherent pseudo-simplicial groupoid.*

We prove this by reducing to Theorem A of the present paper. The non-strictness here is significant, and is not a shortcoming of the formalism: it is closely related to the operadic-category axiom saying that fibres of fibres are fibres. In the way this axiom is formulated originally, one does not see any non-strictness, but if one attempts at assembling the fibres into a list, one will note that the list of fibres of a composite morphism is not equal to the concatenated list of fibres of fibres – a reordering is generally required, and this reordering is an instance of pita factorisation. (Only operadic categories that are actually over Δ will have a strict undeckung.) The *coherence* of this nonstrictness ends up being one of the axioms for the cardinality functor of an operadic category.

2. PITA FACTORISATION IN THE SKELETAL CATEGORY $\mathbb{F}\text{in}$

We denote by $\mathbb{F}\text{in}$ the skeletal category of finite sets, in which the objects are the finite ordinals $\underline{n} = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and the arrows are arbitrary set maps (not necessarily order-preserving). Note that $\mathbb{F}\text{in}$ has a *unique* terminal object $\underline{1}$, which we use to endow $\mathbb{F}\text{in}$ with local terminal objects.

Given $f : \underline{m} \rightarrow \underline{n}$ in $\mathbb{F}\text{in}$ and $i \in \underline{n}$, the inverse image $\{j \in \underline{m} \mid f(j) = i\}$ is not in general an object in the skeletal category $\mathbb{F}\text{in}$, but as a subset of \underline{m} it inherits a linear order, and there is a unique order-preserving bijection with an object in $\mathbb{F}\text{in}$ which we denote $f^{-1}(i)$ and call the *fibre of f at i* . We denote by

$$(1) \quad \epsilon_{f,i} : f^{-1}(i) \rightarrow \underline{m}$$

the unique order-preserving injection whose image is $\{j \in \underline{m} \mid f(j) = i\}$. This is the pullback

$$\begin{array}{ccc} f^{-1}(i) & \xrightarrow{\epsilon_{f,i}} & \underline{m} \\ \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow f \\ \underline{1} & \xrightarrow{\lrcorner_i} & \underline{n} \end{array}$$

in the category $\mathbb{F}\text{in}$.

Given also $g : \underline{\ell} \rightarrow \underline{m}$ in $\mathbb{F}\text{in}$, we write g_i^f for the unique map of $\mathbb{F}\text{in}$ rendering

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (fg)^{-1}(i) & \xrightarrow{\epsilon_{fg,i}} & \underline{\ell} \\ g_i^f \downarrow \vdots & \lrcorner & \downarrow g \\ f^{-1}(i) & \xrightarrow{\epsilon_{f,i}} & \underline{m} \\ \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow f \\ \underline{1} & \xrightarrow{\lrcorner_i} & \underline{n} \end{array}$$

commutative, and call it the *fibre map of g with respect to f at i* .

The order-preserving injections $\epsilon_{f,i} : f^{-1}(i) \rightarrow \underline{m}$ assemble into a single bijection

$$\pi_f : \underline{m} \xrightarrow{\sim} \sum_i f^{-1}(i)$$

expressing \underline{m} as a sum of its fibres. This provides altogether the *pita factorisation*: every arrow $f : \underline{m} \rightarrow \underline{n}$ factors uniquely as

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \underline{m} & & \\ \downarrow f & \searrow \pi_f & \\ & \underline{m}' & = \sum_i f^{-1}(i) \\ & \swarrow \eta_f & \\ & \underline{n} & \end{array}$$

where η_f is order-preserving and π_f is bijective and fibrewise order-preserving. Note that here \underline{m}' is the same object as \underline{m} (since $\mathbb{F}\text{in}$ is skeletal), but it is practical to keep it distinct in the notation to remember that the natural identification with \underline{m} is given by π_f , not by the identity map.

We refer to the picture in the introduction.

The pita factorisation does not constitute a factorisation system, because the left-hand component is not described intrinsically (the condition ‘order-preserving on fibres’ depends on the original map), but it nevertheless has many nice properties, and can be made functorial. It is an important technical aspect of the theory of operadic categories and the main topic of this paper.

3. OPERADIC CATEGORIES

To fix notation, we briefly recall the definition of operadic category of Batanin and Markl [5]. The notion can be seen as specifying a category with *formal* notions of fibre and fibre map. The fibres of a map need not be sub-objects of the domain as in the case of $\mathbb{F}\text{in}$, but the axioms ensure that they retain many important properties of fibres in $\mathbb{F}\text{in}$.

Definition 3.1. [5] An *operadic category* is given by the following data:

- (D1) A category \mathbb{O} endowed with chosen local terminal objects; we write $\tau_X : X \rightarrow U_X$ for the unique morphism to the chosen terminal objects of the component X belongs to.
- (D2) A *cardinality functor* $|-| : \mathbb{O} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}\text{in}$;
- (D3) For each object $X \in \mathbb{O}$ and each $i \in |X|$ a *fibre functor*

$$\varphi_{X,i} : \mathbb{O}/X \rightarrow \mathbb{O}$$

whose action on objects and morphisms we denote as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y \xrightarrow{f} X & \mapsto & f^{-1}(i) \\ \begin{array}{ccc} Z & \xrightarrow{g} & Y \\ & \searrow fg & \swarrow f \\ & X & \end{array} & \mapsto & g_i^f : (fg)^{-1}(i) \rightarrow f^{-1}(i) , \end{array}$$

referring to the object $f^{-1}(i)$ as the *fibre of f at i* , and the morphism $g_i^f : (fg)^{-1}(i) \rightarrow f^{-1}(i)$ as the *fibre map of g with respect to f at i* ;

all subject to the following axioms, where in (A5), we write ϵj for the image of $j \in |f|^{-1}(i)$ under the map $\epsilon_{|f|,i} : |f|^{-1}(i) \rightarrow |Y|$ of (1):

- (A1) If X is a local terminal then $|X| = \underline{1}$;
- (A2) For all $X \in \mathbb{O}$ and $i \in |X|$, the object $(\mathbb{1}_X)^{-1}(i)$ is chosen local terminal;
- (A3) For all $f \in \mathbb{O}/X$ and $i \in |X|$, one has $|f|^{-1}(i) = |f|^{-1}(i)$, while for all $g : fg \rightarrow f$ in \mathbb{O}/X and $i \in |X|$, one has $|g_i^f| = |g|_i^{|f|}$;
- (A4) For $X \in \mathbb{O}$, one has $\tau_X^{-1}(1) = X$, and for $f : Y \rightarrow X$, one has $f_1^{\tau_X} = f$;
- (A5) For $g : fg \rightarrow f$ in \mathbb{O}/X , $i \in |X|$ and $j \in |f|^{-1}(i)$, one has that $(g_i^f)^{-1}(j) = g^{-1}(\epsilon j)$, and given also $h : fgh \rightarrow fg$ in \mathbb{O}/X , one has $(h_i^{fg})_j^{g_i^f} = h_{\epsilon j}^g$.

The preceding definitions are exactly those of [5] with only some slight repackaging changes as in [17]. For subtle variations on the axioms, see Lack [21] and Markl [24].

The category $\mathbb{F}\text{in}$ has a unique (and hence chosen) terminal object. Axiom (A1) now says that the cardinality functor preserves chosen local terminals. Any slice category has a canonical choice of terminal object, namely the identity arrow. With respect to this choice, Axiom (A2) says that the fibre functor preserves chosen local terminals. Axiom (A3) says that for $X \in \mathbb{O}$ and $i \in |X|$, the square

$$(2) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{O}/X & \xrightarrow{\varphi_{X,i}} & \mathbb{O} \\ \downarrow \models_{/X} & & \downarrow \models \\ \mathbb{F}\text{in}/|X| & \xrightarrow{\varphi_{|X|,i}} & \mathbb{F}\text{in} \end{array}$$

commutes. Axiom (A4) says that $\varphi_{X,i}$ is the domain functor whenever $X \in \mathbb{O}$ is chosen local terminal. Intuitively, the first clause of (A5) identifies the fibres of the fibre maps of a map, with the fibres of that map. The second part of (A5) says that the fibre maps of the fibre maps of a map are themselves fibre maps of that map. For the details of these interpretations, see [17].

4. FIBREWISE ORDER-PRESERVING DIAGRAMS

Definition 4.1 ([7, p.8]). A morphism $\sigma : T \rightarrow S$ in an operadic category \mathbb{O} is called a *quasibijection* if all its fibres are trivial (meaning that they are chosen local terminal objects).

Remark 4.2. Any quasibijection induces a bijection of finite sets after application of the cardinality functor. In particular, in the operadic category $\mathbb{F}\text{in}$ the quasibijections are already bijections – in fact, in $\mathbb{F}\text{in}$ the quasibijections are precisely the bijections. In general, quasibijections do not need to be invertible, and not all invertible morphism are necessarily quasibijections. (But the identities are always quasibijections, by Axiom (A2).)

A good example where not all invertible morphisms are quasibijections is the category of bouquets [5]. Here, for an isomorphism to be a quasibijection it must preserve the colourings of the leaves.

Examples where the quasibijections are not invertible are categories of n -ordinals and n -trees [2], see [7]. In these examples, it is in fact relevant to localise by formally inverting the quasibijections, which leads to the theory of locally constant n -operads and a generalised Baez–Dolan–Freudenthal stabilisation theorem [8].

One convenient criterion for invertibility of quasibijections in an operadic category \mathbb{O} is the existence of a discrete operadic fibration (or opfibration) $\mathbb{O} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}$ to an operadic category \mathbb{P} where all quasibijections are invertible (see [7, Table 1]).

Definition 4.3. A morphism $\lambda : T \rightarrow S$ in an operadic category \mathbb{O} is called *order-preserving* if its image $|\lambda|$ under the cardinality functor is order-preserving in $\mathbb{F}\text{in}$.

Let

$$(3) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} T & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & T' \\ f \downarrow & & \downarrow g \\ S & \xrightarrow{\tau} & S' \end{array}$$

be a commutative diagram in \mathbb{O} . We call σ *fibrewise order-preserving* with respect to τ if σ induces order-preserving morphisms on the fibres of $f\tau$ and g . We also call such a square a *fibrewise order-preserving square*. In the particular case of a fibrewise order-preserving square with $\tau = \mathbb{1}$, we will say that the resulting commutative triangle is a *fibrewise order-preserving triangle*.

Observation 4.4. Every map to a local terminal is clearly order-preserving, and as a consequence every square (3) with $g = \mathbb{1}$ is a fibrewise order-preserving square. In particular, σ is always fibrewise order-preserving with respect to itself.

Proposition 4.5. *In an operadic category \mathbb{O} , if in the diagram*

$$(4) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} T & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & T \\ \downarrow f & & \downarrow a \\ S & \xrightarrow{\omega} & S \\ \downarrow g & & \downarrow b \\ R & \xrightarrow{\tau} & R \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} gf \\ \downarrow \\ ba \end{array}$$

ω and σ are fibrewise order-preserving with respect to τ , then σ is fibrewise order-preserving with respect to ω .

Proof. The property of a square being fibrewise order-preserving depends only on the image of this square under the cardinality functor, so we reduce to the corresponding statement in the category $\mathbb{F}\text{in}$. Here it is an elementary calculation. \square

Proposition 4.6. *For a commutative diagram*

$$(5) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} T & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & T' & \xrightarrow{\omega} & T'' \\ a \downarrow & & b \downarrow & & c \downarrow \\ S & \xrightarrow{\tau} & S' & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & S'' \end{array}$$

in an operadic category \mathbb{O} , assume the square on the right is a fibrewise order-preserving square. Then:

- (1) *The square on the left is fibrewise order-preserving provided the composite square is fibrewise order-preserving and $|\omega_i| : |(c\omega)^{-1}(i)| \rightarrow |c^{-1}(i)|$ is an injection for all $i \in |S''|$.*
- (2) *The composite square is fibrewise order-preserving provided the square on the left is fibrewise order-preserving and $|\lambda| : |S'| \rightarrow |S''|$ is a surjection.*
- (3) *If $\sigma, \omega, \tau, \lambda$ are quasibijections, then the composite square is fibrewise order-preserving if and only if the left-hand square is fibrewise order-preserving.*

Proof. We introduce the following notation for the composites indicated with dashed arrows in the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} T & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & T' & \xrightarrow{\omega} & T'' \\ a \downarrow & \searrow h & \downarrow b & \searrow f & \downarrow c \\ S & \xrightarrow{\tau} & S' & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & S'' \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} e \\ \downarrow \\ \end{array}$$

Consider the commutative tetrahedron

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & T' & & \\
 & \nearrow \sigma & \downarrow e & \nwarrow b & \\
 T & \xrightarrow{h} & & \xrightarrow{\quad} & S' \\
 & \searrow f & \downarrow & \swarrow \lambda & \\
 & & S'' & &
 \end{array}$$

By Axiom (A5) we get an equality

$$(\sigma_i)_j = \sigma_i : h^{-1}(j) \rightarrow b^{-1}(j)$$

for any $j \in |S'|$ and $i = |\lambda|(j)$. Hence σ is order-preserving on fibres over S' between h and b if it is order-preserving on fibres of f and e over S'' . On the other hand, the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & T' & & \\
 & \nearrow \sigma & \downarrow e & \nwarrow \omega & \\
 T & \xrightarrow{\omega\sigma} & & \xrightarrow{\quad} & T'' \\
 & \searrow f & \downarrow & \swarrow c & \\
 & & S'' & &
 \end{array}$$

induces a commutative triangle

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 f^{-1}(i) & \xrightarrow{\sigma_i} & e^{-1}(i) \\
 & \searrow (\omega\sigma)_i & \swarrow \omega_i \\
 & & c^{-1}(i)
 \end{array}$$

Therefore, σ_i (as fibre map over S'') is order-preserving provided $(\omega\sigma)_i$ and ω_i are order-preserving over S'' and $|\omega_i|$ is an injection. So we conclude that the left-hand commutative square in (5) is fibrewise order-preserving.

If $|\lambda| : |S'| \rightarrow |S''|$ is a surjection and $\sigma_j : h^{-1}(j) \rightarrow b^{-1}(j)$ is order-preserving for each $j \in |S'|$, then we can clearly reverse the argument to see that the maps $(\omega\sigma)_i : f^{-1}(i) \rightarrow c^{-1}(i)$ are order-preserving for all $i \in |S''|$.

The last point of the proposition is a direct consequence of the first two points. \square

5. FUNCTORIALLY FACTORISABLE OPERADIC CATEGORIES

The following definitions were introduced in [7, 6].

Definition 5.1 ([7, Def. 2.8]). An operadic category \mathbb{O} is called *factorisable* if for any $f : T \rightarrow S$ there is a factorisation

$$(6) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} T & \xrightarrow{\pi(f)} & S \\ & \searrow f & \swarrow \eta(f) \\ & & R \end{array}$$

where $\pi(f)$ is a quasibijection and $\eta(f)$ is order-preserving. We will call such a factorisation *pita factorisation*.

The following lemma is proved in [7, Lemma 2.10], but in a slightly different form. Let U denote a chosen local terminal object.

Lemma 5.2. *If in an operadic category \mathbb{O} every morphism $! : T \rightarrow U$ admits a unique pita factorisation, then the only order-preserving quasibijections in \mathbb{O} are the identities.*

Proof. Let $\sigma : T \rightarrow S$ be an order-preserving quasibijection. We then have two pita factorisations of $! : T \rightarrow U$:

$$T \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1}} T \rightarrow U \quad \text{and} \quad T \xrightarrow{\sigma} S \rightarrow U.$$

From uniqueness of factorisation it follows that $\sigma = \mathbb{1}$. \square

Definition 5.3 ([7, Def. 2.9]). An operadic category \mathbb{O} is called *strongly factorisable* if for every f there is a unique pita factorisation for which (6) is a fibrewise order-preserving triangle.

Lemma 5.4 ([7, Lemma 2.10]). *In a strongly factorisable operadic category, every order-preserving quasibijection is an identity.*

Remark 5.5. The original definition of strongly factorisable category given in [7] required that $\pi(f)$ induces the identities on fibres. In view of Lemma 5.2 that condition is actually automatic, so that the present definition is equivalent to the original [7].

Let \mathbb{O} be an operadic category. For a fixed object $R \in \mathbb{O}$, let $\mathbb{O}/_{\text{ord}} R$ be the full subcategory of the slice category \mathbb{O}/R whose objects are the order-preserving morphisms. Let

$$(7) \quad \mathbf{i} : \mathbb{O}/_{\text{ord}} R \rightarrow \mathbb{O}/R$$

be the inclusion functor.

Definition 5.6. We call \mathbb{O} a *functorially factorisable* operadic category if for every $R \in \mathbb{O}$ the inclusion functor $\mathbf{i} : \mathbb{O}/_{\text{ord}} R \rightarrow \mathbb{O}/R$ has a left adjoint $\mathbf{r} : \mathbb{O}/R \rightarrow \mathbb{O}/_{\text{ord}} R$ such that for any $f : T \rightarrow R$ the commutative diagram representing the unit π of the adjunction

$$(8) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} T & \xrightarrow{\pi_f} & S \\ & \searrow f & \swarrow \mathbf{r}(f) \\ & R & \end{array}$$

is a pita factorisation.

Any functorially factorisable operadic category is obviously factorisable. Conversely, for an arbitrary factorisable operadic category, a choice of pita factorisations provides a map back on objects

$$\begin{aligned} r : \text{Ob}(\mathbb{O}/R) &\longrightarrow \text{Ob}(\mathbb{O}/_{\text{ord}} R) \\ f &\longmapsto \eta(f) \end{aligned}$$

together with a ‘unit’ morphism $\pi(f) : f \rightarrow \eta(f)$.

Proposition 5.7. *A factorisable operadic category \mathbb{O} is functorially factorisable if there are:*

- (1) *A choice of pita factorisation for each morphism $f : T \rightarrow S$;*
- (2) *For each composable pair of morphisms*

$$(9) \quad T \xrightarrow{f} S \xrightarrow{g} R$$

a choice of morphism $\eta(f/g)$ making the following diagram commute:

$$(10) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} T & & \xrightarrow{f} & & S \\ & \searrow \pi(gf) & & \searrow \pi(g) & \\ & T' & \xrightarrow{\eta(f/g)} & S' & \\ & \searrow \eta(gf) & & \searrow \eta(g) & \\ & & R & & \end{array}$$

(Note: In the original image, curved arrows labeled gf and g connect T to R and S to R respectively.)

These choices must satisfy the relations

- (1) $\eta(g/h)\eta(f/hg) = \eta(gf/h)$ for any composable triple of morphism $T \xrightarrow{f} S \xrightarrow{g} R \xrightarrow{h} Q$
- (2) $\eta(\mathbb{1}/f) = \mathbb{1}$.

Proof. This is just an unpacking of Definition 5.6. □

Warning 5.8. Given $T \xrightarrow{g} S \xrightarrow{f} R$, if we iterate the pita factorisation so as to build up the diagram

$$\begin{array}{c} T \\ \downarrow g \quad \searrow \pi(g) \\ \cdot \\ \downarrow \eta(g) \quad \searrow \pi(\pi(f)\eta(g)) \\ S \\ \downarrow f \quad \searrow \pi(f) \\ \cdot \\ \downarrow \eta(f) \quad \searrow \eta(\pi(f)\eta(g)) \\ R \end{array}$$

then one might perhaps expect to find $\pi(fg) = \pi(\pi(f)\eta(g))\pi(g)$ and $\eta(fg) = \eta(f)\eta(\pi(f)\eta(g))$. While the second equality does hold, the first does *not* hold in general, not even in the category $\mathbb{F}\text{in}$. The reason is the local nature of the condition ‘fibrewise order-preserving’: just because it holds over S does not mean it holds over R . In fact one easily gets counterexamples with $R = 1$.

Lemma 5.9. *Let \mathbb{O} be a functorially factorisable operadic category. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) *\mathbb{O} is strongly factorisable.*
- (2) *Any order-preserving quasibijection in \mathbb{O} is the identity.*

In this case the counit of the adjunction $r \dashv i$ is necessarily the identity.

Proof. The implication (1) \Rightarrow (2) is the content of Lemma 5.4

For the converse implication (2) \Rightarrow (1), we need to prove that a fibrewise order-preserving pita factorisation as provided by the adjunction $r \dashv i$ is unique. So consider two different fibrewise order-preserving factorisations of $f : T \rightarrow S$,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & T'' \\ \pi(f) \downarrow & \nearrow \alpha & \downarrow \lambda \\ T' & \xrightarrow{\eta(f)} & S \end{array}$$

where the left bottom corner comes from the adjunction. Then, by the universal property of the unit, there is a unique lifting α .

Notice that we have a commutative triangle for each $i \in |S|$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} f^{-1}(i) & \xrightarrow{\sigma_i} & \lambda^{-1}(i) \\ & \searrow \pi(f)_i & \nearrow \alpha_i \\ & \eta(f)^{-1}(i) & \end{array}$$

In this diagram, σ_i and $\pi(f)_i$ are identities, because they are order-preserving quasibijections. Hence α_i is the identity, and moreover, α is a quasibijection, because the fibres of α coincide with the fibres of $\alpha_i, i \in |S|$ by Axiom (A5). Observe then that $|\alpha|$ is an identity since $|\lambda|$ and $|\eta(f)|$ are order-preserving morphisms in $\mathbb{F}\text{in}$. So α is an order-preserving quasibijection in \mathbb{O} , and is therefore an identity by assumption.

The counit of the adjunction $r \dashv i$ is invertible because i is fully faithful. So the component of this counit at an order-preserving morphism f must be the inverse to $\pi(f)$. But f admits a canonical pita factorisation as the identity followed by f . Since \mathbb{O} is strongly factorisable, we have $\pi(f) = 1$. \square

Definition 5.10. A functorially factorisable operadic category satisfying the conditions of Lemma 5.9 is called *strongly functorially factorisable*.

In a strongly functorially factorisable operadic category \mathbb{O} , we now consider three functions on the components of the nerve of \mathbb{O} :

- (1) $\pi(-) : \mathbb{O}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{O}_1$ which maps f to the component of the unit $\pi(f)$ of the adjunction $r \dashv i$.
- (2) $\eta(-) : \mathbb{O}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{O}_1$ where $\eta(f) = r(f)$.
- (3) $\eta(-/-) : \mathbb{O}_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{O}_1$, which for a composable pair $T \xrightarrow{f} S \xrightarrow{g} R$ (as in (9)) associates the morphism $\eta(f/g)$ as in Proposition 5.7.

The following lemma summarises relations enjoyed by these functions, which will be very useful later.

Lemma 5.11. *In a strongly functorially factorisable operadic category \mathbb{O} , with reference to $T \xrightarrow{f} S \xrightarrow{g} R \xrightarrow{h} Q$ one has:*

- (1) $\pi(\pi(f)) = \mathbb{1}$, $\eta(\eta(f)) = \eta(f)$, $\pi(\eta(f)) = \mathbb{1}$, $\eta(\pi(f)) = \mathbb{1}$;
- (2) $\eta(g)\eta(f/g) = \eta(gf)$;
- (3) $\eta(g/h)\eta(f/hg) = \eta(gf/h)$;
- (4) $\eta(f/\mathbb{1}) = \eta(f)$;
- (5) $\eta(\mathbb{1}/f) = \mathbb{1}$;
- (6) If g and gf are order-preserving, then $\eta(f/g) = f$.

Lemma 5.12. *In a strongly functorially factorisable operadic category \mathbb{O} , the naturality squares*

$$(11) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} T & \xrightarrow{\pi(gf)} & T' \\ f \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta(f/g) \\ S & \xrightarrow{\pi(g)} & S' \end{array}$$

of the unit π of $\mathbf{r} \dashv \mathbf{i}$ are fibrewise order-preserving squares.

Proof. Consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} T & \xrightarrow{\pi(gf)} & T' & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1}} & T' \\ f \downarrow & & \eta(f/g) \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta(gf) \\ S & \xrightarrow{\pi(g)} & S' & \xrightarrow{\eta(g)} & R. \end{array}$$

The right-hand square is obviously fibrewise order-preserving, and the composite rectangle is fibrewise order-preserving since it is precisely the pita factorisation of gf . Proposition 4.6 now ensures that also the left-hand square is fibrewise order-preserving, as asserted. \square

6. STRICTLY FACTORISABLE OPERADIC CATEGORIES

Being a strongly functorially factorisable operadic category is still an extra structure on \mathbb{O} , not just a property. But the only piece of this structure is a choice of the morphism $\eta(f/g)$ for each composable pair $T \xrightarrow{f} S \xrightarrow{g} R$. (This choice is the choice of a left adjoint \mathbf{r} .) The situation where this choice is unique is important enough to deserve a definition:

Definition 6.1. A strongly factorisable operadic category \mathbb{O} is called *strictly factorisable* if for each chain of morphisms $T \xrightarrow{f} S \xrightarrow{g} R$ there exists a unique morphism $\eta(f/g)$ making the diagram (10) commutative.

Lemma 6.2. *A strictly factorisable operadic category is also functorially factorisable.*

Proof. We only need to establish the functoriality relations (1) and (2) from Proposition 5.7. But they follow readily from the uniqueness of $\eta(f/g)$. \square

Another obvious characterisation of strictly functorially factorisable operadic categories is given in the following

Lemma 6.3. *A strongly factorisable operadic category is strictly factorisable if and only if for any $R \in \mathbb{O}$ there exists a unique left adjoint \mathbf{r} satisfying Definition 5.6.*

Lemma 6.4. *The category $\mathbb{F}\text{in}$ is strictly factorisable.*

Proof. This is a direct check. See also Example 6.7 □

More general examples of strictly factorisable operadic categories can be established using blow-up axioms. Recall [7, p.9–10], [6, p.4–5] that \mathbb{O} is said to satisfy the *weak blow-up axiom* if for each order-preserving morphism $h : T \rightarrow R$ and each $|R|$ -indexed family of morphisms $f_i : h^{-1}(i) \rightarrow F_i, i \in |R|$ there exists a unique factorisation

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T & \xrightarrow{f} & S \\ & \searrow h & \nearrow g \\ & R & \end{array}$$

such that g is an order-preserving morphism and the induced morphisms on fibres are exactly $f_i : h^{-1}(i) \rightarrow F_i, i \in |R|$.

Lemma 6.5. *Let \mathbb{O} be a strongly functorially factorisable operadic category in which the weak blow-up axiom is satisfied. Then \mathbb{O} is strictly factorisable.*

Proof. Since \mathbb{O} is strongly functorially factorisable, there exists at least one filler $\eta(f/g)$ in the diagram (10). Let α be yet another filler. Then from the commutativity of the top square we have

$$\alpha_i = \alpha_i \pi(gf)_i = \pi(g)_i f_i = f_i \text{ for all } i \in |R|.$$

Thus $\eta(f/g)$ and α induce equal morphisms on fibres over R and both $\eta(gf)$ and $\eta(g)$ are order-preserving. Hence, by weak blow-up we conclude that $\eta(f/g) = \alpha$. □

Proposition 6.6. *In a factorisable category \mathbb{O} , if all quasibijections are invertible and the weak blow-up axiom is satisfied, then \mathbb{O} is a strictly factorisable operadic category.*

Proof. It was proved in [7, Lemma 2.11] that the conditions imply that the operadic category \mathbb{O} is strongly factorisable. To prove that it is functorially factorisable we define $\eta(f/g) = \pi(g)f\pi(gf)^{-1}$. By Lemma 6.5, \mathbb{O} is strictly factorisable. □

Example 6.7. The category $\mathbb{F}\text{in}$ satisfies the weak blow-up axiom (see [6]) and has invertible quasibijections, so it is strictly factorisable. Similarly, the operadic category $\mathbb{F}\text{in}_{\text{surj}}$ is strictly factorisable. A more complicated example is the operadic category of graphs: it is shown in [6, 3.15–3.18] that it satisfies the conditions of Proposition 6.6. For many other examples, see [7, 6].

The following feature, shared with orthogonal factorisation systems, is a consequence of functoriality, but note that due to the local nature of pita factorisation, the map τ on domains must be required to be a quasibijection:

Proposition 6.8. *Let \mathcal{O} be a strictly factorisable operadic category and consider a commutative square*

$$(12) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} T & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & T' \\ f \downarrow & & \downarrow g \\ S & \xrightarrow{\tau} & S' \end{array}$$

in which τ is a quasibijection. Then:

- (1) *There exists a unique morphism $\omega = \omega(\sigma, \tau) : T_1 \rightarrow T'_1$ making the following diagram commutative*

$$(13) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} T & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & T' \\ \pi(f) \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi(g) \\ T_1 & \xrightarrow{\omega(\sigma, \tau)} & T'_1 \\ \eta(f) \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta(g) \\ S & \xrightarrow{\tau} & S' \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} f \swarrow \quad \searrow g \\ \quad \quad \quad \end{array}$$

- (2) *If σ is a quasibijection which is fibrewise order-preserving with respect to τ , then ω is also fibrewise order-preserving with respect to τ and*
- (a) $\omega = \pi(\tau\eta(f))$,
 - (b) $\eta(g) = \eta(\tau\eta(f))$.

Proof. To prove the first statement, consider the following factorisations in the square (12):

$$(14) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} T & & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & & T' \\ & \searrow \pi(f) & & \swarrow \pi(g) & \\ & T_1 & \xrightarrow{\omega} & T'_1 & \\ & \searrow \eta(f) & \swarrow \pi(\tau\eta(f)) & \searrow \eta(g) & \\ & S & & T_2 & \\ & \searrow \eta(f) & \swarrow \eta(\tau\eta(f)) & \searrow \eta(g) & \\ & S & \xrightarrow{\tau} & S' & \end{array}$$

The part of this diagram under the diagonal can be written as a pasting of squares:

$$(15) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} T & \xrightarrow{\pi(f)} & T_1 & \xrightarrow{\pi(\tau\eta(f))} & T_2 \\ f \downarrow & & \eta(f) \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta(\tau\eta(f)) \\ S & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1}} & S & \xrightarrow{\tau} & S' \end{array}$$

Notice that both squares are fibrewise order-preserving, hence their pasting is also fibrewise order-preserving by Lemma 4.6 (3). Moreover, the composite $\pi(\tau\eta(f))\pi(f)$ is a quasibijection and $\eta(\tau\eta(f))$ is order-preserving. It follows

that this pasting represents the canonical pita factorisation of τf . By strict functorial factorisability we have an arrow

$$\eta(\sigma/g) : T_2 \rightarrow T_1$$

fitting in the commutative diagram (14) as the vertical dashed arrow. Now we define

$$\omega = \eta(\sigma/g)\pi(\tau\eta(f))$$

shown in the diagram as a horizontal dashed arrow. We need to show that ω is unique. Assume $\omega' : T_1 \rightarrow T'_1$ is another filler. Then we have a commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T_1 & \xrightarrow{\omega'} & T'_1 \\ \pi(\tau\eta(f)) \downarrow & \alpha \nearrow & \downarrow \eta(g) \\ T_2 & \xrightarrow{\eta(\tau\eta(f))} & S \end{array}$$

with $\eta(g)$ order-preserving. The property of the unit of the adjunction now gives a unique lifting α in this square and ω' , and in particular a factorisation $\omega' = \alpha\pi(\tau\eta(f))$. Observe also that α makes the following diagram commutative:

$$(16) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} T & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & & & T' \\ & \searrow \pi(f)\pi(\tau\eta(f)) & & \swarrow \pi(g) & \\ & T_2 & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & T'_1 & \\ & \searrow \eta(\tau\eta(f)) & & \swarrow \eta(g) & \\ & & S' & & \end{array}$$

τf (curved arrow from T to S') g (curved arrow from T' to S')

The uniqueness property of strictly factorisable operadic categories (6.1) now tell us $\alpha = \eta(\sigma/g)$, and therefore $\omega' = \omega$.

For the second statement, consider a commutative diagram over S' :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & T' \\ \pi(f) \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi(g) \\ T_1 & \xrightarrow{\omega} & T'_1 \\ & \searrow \tau\eta(f) & \swarrow \eta(g) \\ & & S' \end{array}$$

g (curved arrow from T' to S')

For each $i \in |S'|$ we have the induced commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (\sigma g)^{-1}(i) & \xrightarrow{\sigma_i} & g^{-1}(i) \\ \pi(f)_i \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi(g)_i \\ (\tau\eta(f))^{-1}(i) & \xrightarrow{\omega_i} & \eta(g)^{-1}(i). \end{array}$$

The pasting (15) shows that $\pi(f)_i$ is an order-preserving quasibijection; it must therefore be the identity. Similarly, $\pi(g)_i$ is an identity. Finally, if σ is a quasibijection which is fibrewise order-preserving with respect to τ , then σ_i is

the identity too, and therefore ω_i is the identity. By Axiom (A4), the fibres of ω are equal to the fibres of $\omega_{|g|(j)}$, and so the fibres of ω are trivial. Hence ω is a quasibijection.

Since ω provides a factorisation of $\tau\eta(f)$ into a fibrewise order-preserving quasibijection followed by an order-preserving morphism $\eta(g)$, it must be equal to $\pi(\eta(f)\tau)$ and therefore we have $\eta(g) = \eta(\eta(f)\tau)$. \square

7. LOCALLY ORDER-PRESERVING CHAINS

For the remainder of the paper, we fix a strictly factorisable operadic category \mathbb{O} . In this section we study categories of certain locally order-preserving chains of fixed length n . In the next section, we let n vary and assemble these categories into a top-lax simplicial category, called the pita nerve (it's a very special kind of a oplax simplicial category, almost strict).

Definition 7.1. A *fibrewise order-preserving diagram* in \mathbb{O} is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T_n & \xrightarrow{\sigma_n} & S_n \\ f_n \downarrow & & \downarrow g_n \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ f_1 \downarrow & & \downarrow g_1 \\ T_0 & \xrightarrow{\sigma_0} & S_0 \end{array}$$

in which σ_i is fibrewise order-preserving with respect to σ_0 for all $0 \leq i \leq n$.

We first define a category $W(\mathbb{O})_n$ (for each $n \geq 0$). The objects are chains of morphisms

$$T_n \xrightarrow{f_n} \dots \xrightarrow{f_1} T_0.$$

A morphism between two chains is a fibrewise order-preserving diagram in \mathbb{O} (in the sense of Definition 7.1)

$$(17) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} T_n & \xrightarrow{\sigma_n} & S_n \\ f_n \downarrow & & \downarrow g_n \\ \dots & & \dots \\ f_1 \downarrow & & \downarrow g_1 \\ T_0 & \xrightarrow{\sigma_0} & S_0 \end{array}$$

in which all horizontal arrows are quasibijections. It follows from Proposition 4.5 that each commutative square in this diagram is a fibrewise order-preserving square. Proposition 4.6 (3) allows us to compose these morphisms (horizontally).

Definition 7.2. A chain of morphisms in \mathbb{O}

$$T_n \xrightarrow{f_n} \dots \xrightarrow{f_1} T_0$$

is called a *locally order-preserving chain* if all composites

$$T_k \xrightarrow{f_k} \cdots \xrightarrow{f_1} T_0, \quad k = 0, \dots, n$$

ending in T_0 are order-preserving morphisms. The word ‘locally’ thus means ‘locally at the last object in the chain’. Note that this does not imply that other morphisms in the chain are necessarily order-preserving. Even in the category $\mathbb{F}\text{in}$ that is not generally the case.

Let

$$\mathbf{i}_n : P(\mathbb{O})_n \subset W(\mathbb{O})_n$$

be the full subcategory of $W(\mathbb{O})_n$ consisting of locally order-preserving chains.

Proposition 7.3. *For each n , the subcategory $P(\mathbb{O})_n$ is a reflective subcategory with a unique reflection*

$$\mathbf{r}_n : W(\mathbb{O})_n \rightarrow P(\mathbb{O})_n.$$

Proof. For $n = 0$ we have $W(\mathbb{O})_0 = P(\mathbb{O})_0$.

Let $n = 1$. We define the reflection \mathbf{r}_1 on an object $f : T_1 \rightarrow T_0$ of $W(\mathbb{O})_1$ by pita factorisation: $\mathbf{r}_1(f) = \eta(f) : T'_1 \rightarrow T_0$. The unit of the adjunction $\pi : \mathbb{1} \rightarrow \mathbf{i}_1 \mathbf{r}_1$ is given by the π -factor of the pita factorisation:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T_1 & \xrightarrow{\pi(f)} & T'_1 \\ f \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta(f) \\ T_0 & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1}} & T_0, \end{array}$$

clearly a fibrewise order-preserving square. The counit of the adjunction $\mathbf{r}_1 \dashv \mathbf{i}_1$ is the identity (by 5.9).

The value of the reflection \mathbf{r}_1 on a morphism

$$(18) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} T_1 & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & S_1 \\ f \downarrow & & \downarrow g \\ T_0 & \xrightarrow{\tau} & S_0 \end{array}$$

is defined by the commutative square from Proposition 6.8:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T'_1 & \xrightarrow{\omega(\sigma, \tau) = \pi(\tau \eta(f))} & S'_1 \\ \eta(f) \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta(g) \\ T_0 & \xrightarrow{\tau} & S_0 \end{array}$$

The functoriality of \mathbf{r} and naturality of the unit is again the content of Proposition 6.8.

We consider now the case $n = 2$. Let

$$(19) \quad T \xrightarrow{f} S \xrightarrow{g} R$$

be an object of $W(\mathbb{O})_2$. We then have a commutative diagram

$$(20) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} T & \xrightarrow{\pi(gf)} & T' \\ \downarrow f & \eta(f/g) \downarrow & \downarrow \\ S & \xrightarrow{\pi(g)} & S' \\ \downarrow g & \eta(g) \downarrow & \downarrow \\ R & \xrightarrow{1} & R \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} gf \curvearrowleft \\ \curvearrowright \eta(gf) \end{array}$$

In this diagram the right-hand column $T' \xrightarrow{\eta(f/g)} S' \xrightarrow{\eta(g)} R$ is a locally order-preserving chain, which we take as value of r_2 on (19). Furthermore, the two squares of the diagram together constitute a morphism in $W(\mathbb{O})_2$, which we take as the unit π_2 of the adjunction $r_2 \dashv i_2$. The counit of this adjunction is the identity, as usual (by 5.9).

To prove functoriality of r_2 , let

$$(21) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} T & \xrightarrow{\omega} & T' \\ f \downarrow & & \downarrow a \\ S & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & S' \\ g \downarrow & & \downarrow b \\ R & \xrightarrow{\rho} & R' \end{array}$$

be a commutative diagram in \mathbb{O} , in which all horizontal maps are quasibijections and both σ and ω are fibrewise order-preserving with respect to ρ . Then we define the value of r_2 on (21) to be the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T_1 & \xrightarrow{\pi(\rho\eta(gf))} & T'_1 \\ \eta(f/g) \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta(a/b) \\ S_1 & \xrightarrow{\pi(\rho\eta(g))} & S'_1 \\ \eta(g) \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta(b) \\ R & \xrightarrow{\rho} & R' \end{array},$$

but we need to check various things before we can make sense of that. Note first of all that the vertical composites match the value of r_2 on objects already defined. Second, we claim that both the horizontal arrows in the diagram are quasibijections that are fibrewise order-preserving with respect to ρ . To see this, apply Proposition 6.8 to the bottom square of Diagram (21) and to the

whole composite square, to get the solid part of the commutative diagram

$$(22) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} T_1 & \xrightarrow{\pi(\rho\eta(gf))} & T'_1 \\ \downarrow \eta(f/g) & & \downarrow \eta(a/b) \\ S_1 & \xrightarrow{\pi(\rho\eta(g))} & S'_1 \\ \downarrow \eta(g) & & \downarrow \eta(b) \\ R & \xrightarrow{\rho} & R' \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{l} \eta(gf) \swarrow \quad \searrow \eta(ba) \\ \end{array}$$

Then we have $\eta(g)\eta(f/g) = \eta(gf)$ and $\eta(b) = \eta(a/b)\eta(b)$ by Lemma 5.11, giving the commutativity of the triangles in the diagram. It remains to establish that the top square commutes, which is the equality $\eta(a/b)\pi(\rho\eta(gf)) = \eta(f/g)\pi(\rho\eta(g))$. This square appears as the middle horizontal square in the big diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & T & & \\ & \swarrow \xi & \downarrow \pi(gf) & \searrow \omega & \\ S & & T_1 & & T' \\ & \searrow \sigma & \downarrow \eta(f/g) & \swarrow \alpha & \\ & & S_1 & & S' \\ \pi(g) \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta(gf) & & \downarrow \pi(ba) \\ S_1 & & R & & T'_1 \\ & \searrow \pi(\rho\eta(g)) & \downarrow \eta(b) & \swarrow \pi(\rho\eta(gf)) & \\ & & S'_1 & & \\ \eta(g) \downarrow & & \downarrow \rho & & \downarrow \eta(ba) \\ R & & R' & & \\ & \searrow \rho & & \swarrow \rho & \\ & & R' & & \end{array}$$

Here the four vertical composites are pita factorisations. The left-hand and right-hand composite faces commute because they are instances of Diagram (10). The front and back composite faces commute because they are instances of Proposition 6.8 (2) (b). The top face commutes by assumption, and the bottom face trivially commutes. The middle horizontal square is now forced to

commute by Proposition 6.8 (1) (uniqueness) applied to

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T & \xrightarrow{a\omega=\sigma f} & S' \\ gf \downarrow & & \downarrow b \\ R & \xrightarrow{\rho} & R'. \end{array}$$

For an arbitrary $n \geq 0$, we define the value of r_n on a chain $T_n \xrightarrow{f_n} \cdots \xrightarrow{f_1} T_0$ to be equal to

$$T'_n \xrightarrow{\eta(f_n/f_1 \cdots f_{n-1})} T'_{n-1} \xrightarrow{\eta(f_{n-1}/f_1 \cdots f_{n-2})} \cdots \xrightarrow{\eta(f_1)} T_0.$$

The unit of the adjunction is given by the fibrewise order-preserving diagram

$$(23) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} T_n & \xrightarrow{\pi(f_1 \cdots f_{n-1} f_n)} & T'_n \\ f_n \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta(f_n/f_1 \cdots f_{n-1}) \\ \vdots & \cdots & \vdots \\ f_3 \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta(f_3/f_1 f_2) \\ T_2 & \xrightarrow{\pi(f_1 f_2)} & T'_2 \\ f_2 \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta(f_2/f_1) \\ T_1 & \xrightarrow{\pi(f_1)} & T'_1 \\ f_1 \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta(f_1) \\ T_0 & \xrightarrow{1} & T_0 \end{array}$$

For functoriality of r_n we observe that a commutative diagram in \mathbb{O}

$$(24) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} T_n & \xrightarrow{\sigma_n} & S_n \\ f_n \downarrow & & \downarrow g_n \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ f_1 \downarrow & & \downarrow g_1 \\ T_0 & \xrightarrow{\sigma_0} & S_0 \end{array}$$

in which all horizontal maps are quasibijections and σ_i are fibrewise order-preserving with respect to σ_0 induces a commutative diagram

$$(25) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} T_n & \xrightarrow{\pi(\sigma_0 \eta(f_1 \cdots f_n))} & S'_n \\ \eta(f_n/f_1 \cdots f_{n-1}) \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta(g_n/g_1 \cdots g_{n-1}) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \eta(f_1) \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta(g_1) \\ T_0 & \xrightarrow{\sigma_0} & S_0 \end{array}$$

by an induction similar to the case $n = 2$. \square

Definition 7.4. We define $(\mathbf{t}_n, \mathbb{1}, \pi_n)$ to be the idempotent monad on $W(\mathbb{O})_n$ induced by the adjunction $\mathbf{r}_n \dashv \mathbf{i}_n$.

Lemma 7.5. *The functor $P(\mathbb{O})_n \rightarrow P(\mathbb{O})_0$ that sends a locally order-preserving chain $T_n \xrightarrow{f_n} \cdots \xrightarrow{f_1} T_0$ to T_0 and a morphism (17) to σ_0 is a discrete opfibration.*

Proof. Indeed, if a chain $T_n \xrightarrow{f_n} \cdots \xrightarrow{f_1} T_0$ is locally order-preserving, then any $\sigma_0 : T_0 \rightarrow S_0$ admits a unique lifting to a morphism in $P(\mathbb{O})_n$ using Diagram (25). \square

8. TOP-LAX SIMPLICIAL OBJECTS

In the next section we shall assemble the categories $P(\mathbb{O})_n$ into some kind of simplicial object called the *pita nerve*. It is not quite a simplicial object but rather what we call a *top-lax simplicial object*. The elementary definition of this notion may appear somewhat specialised and ad hoc, but in this section we explain how it is in fact a very natural notion, springing naturally from the fundamental notion of decalage.

In elementary terms, a top-lax simplicial object in a 2-category \mathcal{K} should be a special case of normal oplax simplicial object (meaning an oplax functor $\Delta^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$) whose non-strictness is concentrated in the top face operators in the following way. There are two conditions:

- (1) The restriction to a $\Delta^{\mathbf{t}}$ -presheaf is strict.
- (2) For every triangle given by two composable generators of Δ that are *not* two top face operators, the corresponding 2-cell in \mathcal{K} is strict.

The same structure can be described in term of squares instead of triangles (cf. Remark 8.2 further below). This viewpoint takes as starting point the simplicial identities, but replaces one family of identities with non-invertible 2-cells subject to some equations:

Definition 8.1. A *top-lax simplicial object* in a 2-category \mathcal{K} consists of

- (1) a sequence of object X_n , $n \geq 0$;

- (2) face and degeneracy operators d_i, s_i like in a simplicial object;
- (3) 2-cells (for $n \geq 0$)

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X_{n+2} & \xrightarrow{d_{n+2}} & X_{n+1} \\ d_{n+1} \downarrow & \beta_n \nearrow & \downarrow d_{n+1} \\ X_{n+1} & \xrightarrow{d_{n+1}} & X_n. \end{array}$$

These data are subject to the following axioms.

- (1) All the strict simplicial identities except the ones replaced by β_n (that is, all simplicial identities except those involving two consecutive top face operators);
- (2) The following two sequences of equations for the 2-cells β_n :

(26)

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{array}{ccccc} X_{n+3} & \xrightarrow{d_{n+3}} & X_{n+2} & & \\ \downarrow d_{n+1} & \searrow d_{n+2} & \nearrow \beta_{n+1} & \searrow d_{n+2} & \\ & X_{n+2} & \xrightarrow{d_{n+2}} & X_{n+1} & \\ & \downarrow d_{n+1} & \nearrow \beta_n & \downarrow d_{n+1} & \\ & X_{n+1} & \xrightarrow{d_{n+1}} & X_n & \end{array} & = & \begin{array}{ccccc} X_{n+3} & \xrightarrow{d_{n+3}} & X_{n+2} & & \\ \downarrow d_{n+1} & & \downarrow d_{n+1} & \searrow d_{n+2} & \\ & X_{n+2} & \xrightarrow{d_{n+2}} & X_{n+1} & \\ & \downarrow d_{n+1} & \nearrow \beta_n & \downarrow d_{n+1} & \\ & X_{n+1} & \xrightarrow{d_{n+1}} & X_n & \end{array} \end{array}$$

(27)

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{array}{ccccc} & & X_{n+2} & & \\ & \nearrow s_{n+1} & \downarrow d_{n+1} & \searrow d_{n+2} & \\ X_{n+1} & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1}} & X_{n+1} & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1}} & X_{n+1} \\ & \searrow d_{n+1} & \nearrow \beta_n & \searrow d_{n+1} & \\ & & X_{n+1} & \xrightarrow{d_{n+1}} & X_n \end{array} & = & \begin{array}{ccccc} & & X_{n+2} & & \\ & \nearrow s_{n+1} & \downarrow d_{n+1} & \searrow d_{n+2} & \\ X_{n+1} & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1}} & X_{n+1} & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1}} & X_{n+1} \\ & \searrow d_{n+1} & \nearrow \beta_n & \searrow d_{n+1} & \\ & & X_{n+1} & \xrightarrow{d_{n+1}} & X_n \end{array} \end{array}$$

It is this second description that naturally arises from decalage, as we proceed to explain. Recall that the decalage comonad is induced by the adjunction

$$\begin{array}{c} \Delta^t \\ i \uparrow \dashv \downarrow u \\ \Delta \end{array}$$

as

$$D := i^* u^*.$$

Here Δ^t is the category of ordinals with a top element and top-preserving order-preserving maps, and $i \dashv u$ is the free-forgetful adjunction.

It was observed in [17] that \mathbf{D} -coalgebra structure, which in turn is equivalent to having extra top degeneracy maps so as to form a Δ^t -presheaf, is equivalent to having chosen local terminal objects. The same adjunction induces a monad structure on Δ^t -presheaves (that is, on the category of \mathbf{D} -coalgebras), which is denoted $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}$ [17, Definition 9]. The algebras for this monad are simplicial objects again! In detail, while coalgebras for \mathbf{D} amount to adding extra top degeneracy operators, which constitute the coalgebra structure maps $s : X \rightarrow \mathbf{D}(X)$, in turn for \mathbf{D} -coalgebras (Δ^t -presheaves) we already have those extra top degeneracy operators, and $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}$ -algebra structure amounts to adding extra top face operators further on top – these constitute the algebra structure map $d : \tilde{\mathbf{D}}(X) \rightarrow X$ – so as to obtain a simplicial object again (cf. [17, Lemma 11]).

The only little twist we introduce in these fundamental relationships is that we now consider presheaves with values in a 2-category \mathcal{K} , and are concerned with *normal oplax* $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}$ -algebras instead of strict algebras. We briefly recall these notions.

Let $\mathbf{T} : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ be a strict monad on a 2-category \mathcal{K} . Recall that a normal oplax \mathbf{T} -algebra is an triple (A, a, β) consisting of an object $A \in \mathcal{K}$, a 1-morphism

$$\mathbf{T}A \xrightarrow{a} A$$

and a 2-cell

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{T}\mathbf{T}A & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{T}(a)} & \mathbf{T}A \\ \mu_A \downarrow & \beta \nearrow & \downarrow a \\ \mathbf{T}A & \xrightarrow{a} & A. \end{array}$$

This 2-cell is subject to the equation

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{T}\mathbf{T}\mathbf{T}A & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{T}\mathbf{T}a} & \mathbf{T}\mathbf{T}A \\ \mu_{\mathbf{T}A} \downarrow & \searrow \mathbf{T}\mu_A & \nearrow \mathbf{T}\beta \\ \mathbf{T}\mathbf{T}A & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{T}a} & \mathbf{T}A \\ \mu_A \downarrow & \searrow \mu_A & \nearrow \beta \\ \mathbf{T}A & \xrightarrow{a} & A \end{array} = \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{T}\mathbf{T}\mathbf{T}A & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{T}\mathbf{T}a} & \mathbf{T}\mathbf{T}A \\ \mu_{\mathbf{T}A} \downarrow & \searrow \mu_A & \nearrow \beta \\ \mathbf{T}\mathbf{T}A & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{T}a} & \mathbf{T}A \\ \mu_A \downarrow & \searrow \mu_A & \nearrow \beta \\ \mathbf{T}A & \xrightarrow{a} & A \end{array}$$

(here the commutative square on the left is (strict) associativity of the monad multiplication, and the commutative square on the right is naturality), as well

as the equation

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & TTA & \\
 \nearrow T\eta & & \searrow Ta \\
 TA & \xrightarrow{\quad \text{"} \quad} & TA \\
 \searrow \mathbb{1} & & \nearrow \beta \\
 & TA & \\
 & \downarrow a & \\
 & A &
 \end{array}
 =
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 & TTA & \\
 \nearrow T\eta & & \searrow Ta \\
 TA & \xrightarrow{\quad \text{"} \quad} & TA \\
 \searrow \mathbb{1} & & \nearrow \text{"} \\
 & TA & \\
 & \downarrow a & \\
 & A &
 \end{array}$$

The triangle on the left commutes because T is a strict monad. The triangle on the right commutes because the algebra is required to be normal.

Instantiating now this notion to the case of the monad \tilde{D} on the 2-category $\text{Fun}(\Delta^{\text{top}}, \mathbf{Cat})$ of strict \mathbf{Cat} -valued Δ^{t} -presheaves (that is, D -coalgebras in \mathbf{Cat}), we arrive precisely at the notion of top-lax simplicial category. The new top face operators constitute the structure map for such an algebra. The fact that the underlying object in D -coalgebras is strict is precisely to say that the restriction to Δ^{t} is strict. The fact that the structure map is a morphism of strict D -coalgebras translates precisely into the condition that squares that do not involve two consecutive top face operators must be strictly commutative.

Remark 8.2. Except in the special case where all 2-cells are invertible (which we treat in Section 10), it is not a priori clear that a top-lax simplicial object is in fact a special case of an oplax simplicial object (i.e. an oplax functor $\Delta^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Cat}$). The subtlety is that the definition of top-lax simplicial object provides some non-invertible squares, whereas an oplax simplicial object is based on triangles. Each β -square would correspond to two triangles, and the oplax cells sitting in them qua oplax functor would be oriented in opposite directions preventing them from being composed, as below left

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 X_{n+2} & \xrightarrow{d_{n+2}} & X_{n+1} \\
 \downarrow d_{n+1} & \searrow \beta & \downarrow d_{n+1} \\
 & & \\
 X_{n+1} & \xrightarrow{d_{n+1}} & X_n
 \end{array}
 \quad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 X_{n+2} & \xrightarrow{d_{n+2}} & X_{n+1} \\
 \downarrow d_{n+1} & \searrow \beta & \downarrow d_{n+1} \\
 & & \\
 X_{n+1} & \xrightarrow{d_{n+1}} & X_n
 \end{array}$$

But in fact one can uniformly define all the ω -cells to be identities. First of all we should choose an image for every composite of generating arrows in Δ : each composite corresponds to a simplicial identity, and for all the commuting squares we can choose either way around the square – they are equal. For the only non-commuting square (the β squares) we choose as image the composite not involving two consecutive top face operators, thus making the lower triangles in each square an identity 2-cell. In this way we have provided oplax 2-cells for all triangles in Δ .

To justify why this is enough to fully define a (normal) oplax functor, a coherence theorem is required. Such a coherence result can be established based on the supercoherence result of Jardine [18], quoted as Proposition 10.2. It states that for *invertible* 2-cells corresponding to the simplicial identities, certain 17 families of equations listed among these 2-cells suffice to obtain a fully coherent pseudo-simplicial object. We will invoke Jardine’s result in the invertible case in Section 10. In view of the subtleties with squares versus triangles, it is not clear that Jardine’s result can be upgraded to the case of non-invertible 2-cells in full generality, but in the very special case where only the β -cells are not identities, Jardine’s proof seems to carry over. We do not wish to provide the details, since for the present paper it is not logically necessary to know that a top-lax simplicial object (defined as above in terms of decalage) is actually a special case of an oplax functor.

9. THE PITA NERVE

We return to the categories $P(\mathbb{O})_n$, continuing the standing assumption that \mathbb{O} is a strictly factorisable operadic category.

We aim to assemble the categories $P(\mathbb{O})_n$ into a top-lax simplicial category.

There are three arguments involved:

- 1) The categories $W(\mathbb{O})_n$ form a strict simplicial category.
- 2) Levelwise we have the reflective subcategories $P(\mathbb{O})_n \subset W(\mathbb{O})_n$, and we exploit the reflections to obtain a pre-simplicial structure on the categories $P(\mathbb{O})_n$ – by this we mean all the face and degeneracy operators, but not all the simplicial identities;
- 3) Finally we exploit the properties of strictly factorisable categories to show that non-strict part of this pre-simplicial category enjoys the coherence axioms for being a top-lax simplicial category.

Proposition 9.1. *The categories $W(\mathbb{O})_n$, $n \geq 0$ form a strict simplicial category*

$$W(\mathbb{O}) : \Delta^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Cat},$$

whose face and degeneracy operators we denote by δ_n and γ_n , respectively.

Apology 9.2. Note that the top face operator δ_n omits object T_0 and that the bottom face operator δ_0 omits object T_n , which is unfortunate from the viewpoint of standard simplicial indexing. We apologise for this awkward situation. We have made this choice because it seems more important that locally order-preserving chains (which are the main interest) end in object T_0 , the reference point for the notion of fibrewise order-preserving map, and that this index should always be zero, not a number depending on the length of the chain.

In contrast to $W(\mathbb{O})$, the categories $P(\mathbb{O})_n$ do not form a strict simplicial object by restriction of simplicial operators. The reason is that the result of

an application of the last simplicial operator δ_n to a locally order-preserving chain $T_n \xrightarrow{f_n} \dots \xrightarrow{f_1} T_0$ gives $T_n \xrightarrow{f_n} \dots \xrightarrow{f_2} T_1$, which is not necessarily a locally order-preserving chain. But we do get a simplicial-object-with-missing-top-face-operators, or more formally, a strict presheaf on the subcategory $\Delta^t \subset \Delta$ of last-element-preserving order-preserving maps: Let

$$\mathbf{d}_i = \delta_i : P(\mathbb{O})_{n+1} \rightarrow P(\mathbb{O})_n, \text{ and } \mathbf{b}_i = \gamma_i : P(\mathbb{O})_n \rightarrow P(\mathbb{O})_{n+1}, \quad 0 \leq i \leq n$$

be the restrictions of the corresponding face and degeneracy operators of $W(\mathbb{O})$. (Only the top face operator in each degree is missing.)

Lemma 9.3. *The reflection functors $\mathbf{r}_n : W(\mathbb{O})_n \rightarrow P(\mathbb{O})_n$ assemble into a natural transformation of Δ^t -presheaves.*

Proof. We need to check the commutativity of the squares

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W(\mathbb{O})_{n+1} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{r}_{n+1}} & P(\mathbb{O})_{n+1} \\ \delta_i \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathbf{d}_i \\ W(\mathbb{O})_n & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{r}_n} & P(\mathbb{O})_n \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} W(\mathbb{O})_{n+1} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{r}_{n+1}} & P(\mathbb{O})_{n+1} \\ \gamma_i \uparrow & & \uparrow \mathbf{b}_i \\ W(\mathbb{O})_n & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{r}_n} & P(\mathbb{O})_n \end{array} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq i \leq n.$$

For the face operators: going right and then down in the square, the reflection functor \mathbf{r}_{n+1} sends a chain $T_{n+1} \xrightarrow{f_{n+1}} \dots \xrightarrow{f_2} T_1 \xrightarrow{f_1} T_0$ to the chain

$$T'_{n+1} \xrightarrow{\eta(f_{n+1}/f_1 \dots f_n)} \dots \xrightarrow{\eta(f_2/f_1)} T'_1 \xrightarrow{\eta(f_1)} T_0,$$

and the i th face operator \mathbf{d}_i then composes at object T'_{n+1-i} to get at that step

$$(28) \quad T'_{n+2-i} \xrightarrow{\eta(f_{n+1-i}/f_1 \dots f_{n-i}) \circ \eta(f_{n-i}/f_1 \dots f_{n-i-1})} T'_{n-i}.$$

If instead we go down and then right in the square, the effect of the face operator δ_i is to compose at object T_{n+1-i} to get (at that step) $f_{n+2-i} \circ f_{n+1-i}$, and then we apply \mathbf{r}_n to get a long chain of eta maps, where the interesting part is

$$(29) \quad T'_{n+2-i} \xrightarrow{\eta(f_{n+1-i} \circ f_{n-i}/f_1 \dots f_{n-i-1})} T'_{n-i}.$$

Elsewhere in the chain it is clear that the two ways around give the same result. The apparent discrepancy between (28) and (29) is resolved by Lemma 5.11 item (3), which shows that they are in fact equal.

The argument for the degeneracy operators is similar: starting with a chain $T_n \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow T_0$, the effect of applying \mathbf{r}_n is to get a long chain of eta maps, and \mathbf{d}_i then duplicates the object T'_{n-i} by inserting an identity map

$$T'_{n-i} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1}} T'_{n-i}.$$

The other way around, we first apply γ_i to have an identity map $T_{n-i} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1}} T_{n-i}$, and then we apply \mathbf{r}_{n+1} to get a chain of eta maps. The interesting step in that chain is

$$T'_{n-i} \xrightarrow{\eta(\mathbb{1}/f_1 \dots f_{n-i})} T'_{n-i}.$$

Again the apparent discrepancy between these two results is resolved by Lemma 5.11, this time item (5). (Note that for $i = n$ we need Lemma 5.11 item (4) instead.) \square

In each simplicial degree $n \geq 0$, we define separately the top face operator

$$\mathbf{d}_n : P(\mathbb{O})_n \rightarrow P(\mathbb{O})_{n-1}$$

as the composite

$$P(\mathbb{O})_n \xrightarrow{i_n} W(\mathbb{O})_n \xrightarrow{\delta_n} W(\mathbb{O})_{n-1} \xrightarrow{r_{n-1}} P(\mathbb{O})_{n-1}.$$

For what follows it will be convenient to consider this operator as a restriction of the endofunctor $\mathbf{t}_{n-1}\delta_n : P(\mathbb{O})_n \rightarrow P(\mathbb{O})_n$ and write

$$\mathbf{d}_n = \mathbf{t}_{n-1}\delta_n.$$

Because the definition of these top face operators \mathbf{d}_n involves this extra back-and-forth, they will not satisfy the strict simplicial identities, but we shall see shortly that we get precisely the required β -cells

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P(\mathbb{O})_{n+2} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{d}_{n+2}} & P(\mathbb{O})_{n+1} \\ \mathbf{d}_{n+1} \downarrow & \beta_n \nearrow & \downarrow \mathbf{d}_{n+1} \\ P(\mathbb{O})_{n+1} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{d}_{n+1}} & P(\mathbb{O})_n \end{array}$$

to have a top-lax simplicial object (see Equation (30) further below).

Lemma 9.4. *All the other simplicial identities involving top face operators hold strictly:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P_{n+2} \xrightarrow{d_{n+2}} P_{n+1} & P_{n+2} \xrightarrow{d_{n+2}} P_{n+1} & P_{n+1} \xrightarrow{d_{n+1}} P_n \\ d_i \downarrow \quad (i) \quad \downarrow d_i & s_i \uparrow \quad (ii) \quad \uparrow s_i & s_n \uparrow \quad (iii) \quad \uparrow \mathbb{1} \\ P_{n+1} \xrightarrow{d_{n+1}} P_n & P_{n+1} \xrightarrow{d_{n+1}} P_n & P_n \end{array}$$

Proof. For fixed $n \geq 0$ and $i \leq n$, square (i) is obtained as the composite

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} P(\mathbb{O})_{n+2} & \xrightarrow{i_{n+2}} & W(\mathbb{O})_{n+2} & \xrightarrow{\delta_{n+2}} & W(\mathbb{O})_{n+1} & \xrightarrow{r_{n+1}} & P(\mathbb{O})_{n+1} \\ d_i \downarrow & & \delta_i \downarrow & & \delta_i \downarrow & & \downarrow d_i \\ P(\mathbb{O})_{n+1} & \xrightarrow{i_{n+1}} & W(\mathbb{O})_{n+1} & \xrightarrow{\delta_{n+1}} & W(\mathbb{O})_n & \xrightarrow{r_n} & P(\mathbb{O})_n. \end{array}$$

Here the first square commutes since $i \leq n$, so we are in the Δ^t range. The second square is a simplicial identity for $W(\mathbb{O})$ (since $i \leq n$), and the third square commutes by Δ^t -naturality of r (cf. Lemma 9.3).

The argument for the sequence of squares (ii) is essentially the same.

For the triangle (iii), the argument is

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 P(\mathbb{O})_{n+1} & \xrightarrow{i_{n+1}} & W(\mathbb{O})_{n+1} & \xrightarrow{\delta_{n+1}} & W(\mathbb{O})_n & \xrightarrow{r_n} & P(\mathbb{O})_n \\
 \beta_n \uparrow & & \gamma_n \uparrow & \nearrow \mathbb{1} & & & \\
 P(\mathbb{O})_n & \xrightarrow{i_n} & W(\mathbb{O})_n & & & &
 \end{array}$$

Here the square commutes because we are within the Δ^t range; the triangle is a simplicial identity for $W(\mathbb{O})$, and now i_n and r_n cancel out strictly, so we are left with the identity. \square

We define β to be the natural transformation

$$(30) \quad \beta_n : \mathbf{d}_{n+1}\mathbf{d}_{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbf{d}_{n+1}\mathbf{d}_{n+2}$$

given as the composite

$$\mathbf{t}_n \delta_{n+1} \delta_{n+1} = \mathbf{t}_n \delta_{n+1} \delta_{n+2} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{t}_n \delta_{n+1} \pi_{n+1} \delta_{n+2}} \mathbf{t}_n \delta_{n+1} \mathbf{t}_{n+1} \delta_{n+2},$$

where $\pi_{n+1} \delta_{n+2} : \delta_{n+2} \rightarrow \mathbf{t}_{n+1} \delta_{n+2}$ is the unit of the monad \mathbf{t}_{n+1} precomposed with δ_{n+2} . Note that the components of β_n are fibrewise order-preserving, cf. (17).

Theorem 9.5. *For a strictly factorisable operadic category \mathbb{O} , the sequence of categories $P(\mathbb{O})_n$, $n \geq 0$ with the face and degeneracy operators and β -cells as defined above form a top-lax simplicial object $P(\mathbb{O})$ in \mathbf{Cat} .*

Proof. We have already checked in Lemma 9.4 that all the simplicial identities other than the β cases are strict. We need to check that the 2-cells β satisfy Equations (26) and (27). Equation (26) amounts to the commutative diagram

$$(31) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc}
 \mathbf{d}_{n+1}\mathbf{d}_{n+1}\mathbf{d}_{n+1} & \xrightarrow{\beta_n \mathbf{d}_{n+1}} & \mathbf{d}_{n+1}\mathbf{d}_{n+2}\mathbf{d}_{n+1} & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1}} & \mathbf{d}_{n+1}\mathbf{d}_{n+1}\mathbf{d}_{n+3} \\
 \mathbb{1} \downarrow & & & & \downarrow \beta_n \mathbf{d}_{n+3} \\
 \mathbf{d}_{n+1}\mathbf{d}_{n+1}\mathbf{d}_{n+2} & \xrightarrow{\beta_n \mathbf{d}_{n+2}} & \mathbf{d}_{n+1}\mathbf{d}_{n+2}\mathbf{d}_{n+2} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{d}_{n+1}\beta_{n+1}} & \mathbf{d}_{n+1}\mathbf{d}_{n+2}\mathbf{d}_{n+3}
 \end{array}$$

Let us analyse $\beta_0 : \mathbf{d}_1\mathbf{d}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{d}_1\mathbf{d}_2$. By definition, the component $(\beta_0)_a$ on a locally order-preserving chain $a = (T_2 \xrightarrow{f_2} T_1 \xrightarrow{f_1} T_0)$ is given by $\mathbf{t}_0(\delta_1(\pi_1\delta_2(a)))$. The monad \mathbf{t}_0 is the identity and $\delta_2(a) = (T_2 \xrightarrow{f_2} T_1)$. The unit of the monad \mathbf{t}_1 on this chain is given by the fibrewise order-preserving square:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 T_2 & \xrightarrow{\pi(f_2)} & T'_2 \\
 f_2 \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta(f_2) \\
 T_1 & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1}} & T_1
 \end{array}$$

Hence $(\beta_0)_a$ is equal to the quasibijection $\pi(f_2) : T_2 = \mathbf{d}_1\mathbf{d}_1(a) \rightarrow T'_2 = \mathbf{d}_1\mathbf{d}_2(a)$.

Let us also compute the component of $\beta_1 : \mathbf{d}_2 \mathbf{d}_2 \rightarrow \mathbf{d}_2 \mathbf{d}_3$ at a locally order-preserving chain $b = (T_3 \xrightarrow{f_3} T_2 \xrightarrow{f_2} T_1 \xrightarrow{f_1} T_0)$. The unit $\pi_2 \delta_3(b)$ is presented by the fibrewise order-preserving diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T_3 & \xrightarrow{\pi(f_2 f_3)} & T'_3 \\ f_3 \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta(f_3/f_2) \\ T_2 & \xrightarrow{\pi(f_2)} & T'_2 \\ f_2 \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta(f_2) \\ T_1 & \xrightarrow{1} & T_1. \end{array}$$

The result of application of δ_2 to this morphism is the top square in this diagram. We now apply \mathbf{t}_1 to this square and obtain a fibrewise order-preserving square which represents $(\beta_1)_b$:

$$(32) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} T'_3 & \xrightarrow{\pi(\pi(f_2)\eta(f_3))} & T''_3 \\ \eta(f_3) \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta(\eta(f_3/f_2)) \\ T_2 & \xrightarrow{\pi(f_2)} & T'_2. \end{array}$$

In general, with reference to Diagram (21) the transformation β_{n-2} on a locally order-preserving chain $a = (T_n \xrightarrow{f_n} \dots \xrightarrow{f_1} T_0)$ is given by the following fibrewise order-preserving diagram:

$$(33) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} T'_n & \xrightarrow{\pi(\pi(f_2)\eta(f_3 \dots f_n))} & T''_n \\ \eta(f_n/f_3 \dots f_{n-1}) \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta(\eta(f_n/f_2 \dots f_{n-1})/\eta(f_3 \dots f_{n-1}/f_2)) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ T'_3 & \xrightarrow{\pi(\pi(f_2)\eta(f_3))} & T''_3 \\ \eta(f_3) \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta(\eta(f_3/f_2)) \\ T_2 & \xrightarrow{\pi(f_2)} & T'_2, \end{array}$$

where the right-hand side of the diagram is calculated using the relations of Lemma 5.11.

Having understood the components of β , we are ready to establish the commutativity of Diagram (31), which amounts to the equality

$$(34) \quad \beta_n \mathbf{d}_{n+3} \beta_n \mathbf{d}_{n+1} = \mathbf{d}_{n+1} \beta_{n+1} \beta_n \mathbf{d}_{n+2}.$$

Let us compute both sides of this equation for $n = 0$. We start from $\beta_0 \mathbf{d}_3 \beta_0 \mathbf{d}_1$ computed at $b = (T_3 \xrightarrow{f_3} T_2 \xrightarrow{f_2} T_1 \xrightarrow{f_1} T_0)$. The transformation $\beta_0 \mathbf{d}_1$ on b is the quasibijection $\pi(f_2 f_3)$. The transformation $\beta_0 \mathbf{d}_3$ on b is equal to β_0 on

$\mathbf{d}_3(b) = (T'_2 \xrightarrow{\eta(f_3/f_2)} T'_2 \xrightarrow{\eta(f_2)} T_1)$ and therefore is equal to the quasibijection $\pi_2(\eta(f_3/f_2))$. Thus the left-hand side of the equation is $\pi_2(\eta(f_3/f_2))\pi(f_2f_3)$. To compute the right-hand side $\mathbf{d}_1\beta_1\beta_0\mathbf{d}_2$ on b we first see that $\beta_0\mathbf{d}_2$ is given by the quasibijection $\pi(f_3)$, whereas $\mathbf{d}_1\beta_1$ will be equal to $\pi(\pi(f_2)\eta(f_3))$ according to (32). So in the end the equation we need to establish is

$$(35) \quad \pi(\eta(f_3/f_2))\pi(f_2f_3) = \pi(\pi(f_2)\eta(f_3))\pi(f_3).$$

To establish this equation, we apply Proposition 6.8 to the commutative fibre-wise order-preserving square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T_3 & \xrightarrow{\pi(f_2f_3)} & T'_3 \\ f_3 \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta(f_3/f_2) \\ T_2 & \xrightarrow{\pi(f_2)} & T'_2 \end{array}$$

to get

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T_3 & \xrightarrow{\pi(f_2f_3)} & T'_3 \\ \downarrow \pi(f_3) & \searrow \pi(\eta(f_3/f_2)) & \downarrow \eta(f_3/f_2) \\ f_3 \swarrow T''_3 & \xrightarrow{\pi(\pi(f_2)\eta(f_3))} & T'''_3 \searrow \eta(f_3/f_2) \\ \downarrow \eta(f_3) & \searrow \eta(\eta(f_3/f_2)) & \downarrow \eta(f_3/f_2) \\ T_2 & \xrightarrow{\pi(f_2)} & T'_2 \end{array}$$

But commutativity of the top square is now precisely the desired Equation (35).

For $n > 0$, a direct calculation of the two sides of Equation (34) would lead to a series of long and complicated relations between various pita factorisations. Fortunately Lemma 7.5 shows that it is not necessary, because the corresponding morphisms are uniquely determined by the bottom quasibijection in Diagram (33). Those calculations then amount to exactly the same calculations as for $n = 0$. In the end, it is thus the strictness of the pita factorisation that ensures coherence.

Finally we check Equation (27). We do it for $n = 0$; the other cases are similar, only with longer chains). In the leftmost corner of Equation (27), we start with a (locally) order-preserving 1-chain $T_1 \rightarrow T_0$. The degeneracy operator sends it to $T_1 \rightarrow T_0 \xrightarrow{1} T_0$. The claim is that the component of the β -cell at this element is trivial. But this is true, because d_2 just omits the last copy of T_0 , and since in this case the remaining $T_1 \rightarrow T_0$ is already order-preserving, the reflection does nothing to it. Both ways around the β -square thus return the object T_1 , and the β -cell itself is the identity, as asserted. \square

10. DECOMPOSITION SPACES

We finish with some further treatment of the important case where the strictly factorisable operadic \mathbb{O} has the property that all quasibijections are invertible. We show that in this case the pita nerve is a decomposition space [14] (a.k.a. 2-Segal space [13]).

To show first of all that the pita nerve is a fully coherent pseudo-simplicial groupoid, we invoke Jardine’s supercoherence result.

Definition 10.1. We use the word *pre-simplicial object* in a 2-category \mathcal{K} for the data of

- (1) An object X_n for each $n \geq 0$;
- (2) Face and degeneracy operators d_i and s_j like in a simplicial object;
- (3) 2-cells replacing all of the usual simplicial identities:

$$\begin{aligned} d_j d_i &\rightarrow d_i d_{j+1}, i \leq j, \\ d_i s_j &\rightarrow s_{j-1} d_i, i < j, \\ d_i s_j &\rightarrow s_j d_{i-1}, i > j + 1, \\ \mathbb{1} &\rightarrow d_i s_i, \\ \mathbb{1} &\rightarrow d_{i+1} s_i, \\ s_i s_j &\rightarrow s_{j+1} s_i, i \leq j. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 10.2 (Supercoherence, Jardine [18]). *A pre-simplicial object becomes a fully coherent pseudo-simplicial object (that is, a pseudo-functor $\Delta^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$) provided all the 2-cells are invertible and satisfy a specific list of 17 families of equations (listed as Equations (1.4.1)–(1.4.17) in [18]).*

Proposition 10.3. *For a strictly factorisable operadic category \mathbb{O} in which all quasibijections are invertible, the pita nerve is a fully coherent pseudo-simplicial groupoid.*

Proof. The data of a pre-simplicial object has already been provided in Section 9: all the 2-cells are identities except the β -cells. Note that since the components of β are now invertible, the pita nerve takes values in groupoids rather than categories. Since most of the 2-cell data is trivial, 15 out of the 17 families of equations are satisfied trivially. There are only two families of equations left in Jardine’s list, and they are precisely Equations (26) and (27), which we already checked. \square

This pseudo-simplicial groupoid is generally not Segal (except in the special case where all morphisms in \mathbb{O} are order-preserving, which is to say that the cardinality functor factors through the subcategory $\Delta_+ \subset \mathbb{F}\text{in}$). Indeed, the Segal condition says that the map $P_2 \rightarrow P_1 \times_{P_0} P_1$ is an equivalence. But for a composable pair of order-preserving morphisms $T_2 \xrightarrow{f} T_1 \xrightarrow{g} T_0$ (an element in $P_1 \times_{P_0} P_1$), there are generally many locally order-preserving chains $p \in P_2$ whose d_2 and d_0 give f and g . For example, in addition to

the order-preserving chain consisting of f and g themselves, one can insert a fibrewise order-preserving quasibijection to get other locally order-preserving chains with the same image in $P_1 \times_{P_0} P_1$.

Seeing thus a kind of multi-valued composition, it is natural to ask if the pita nerve P (of a strictly factorisable operadic category \mathbb{O} in which all quasibijections are invertible) is a decomposition space [14] (a.k.a. 2-Segal space [13]). ■
This is indeed the case:

Theorem 10.4. *For any strictly factorisable operadic category \mathbb{O} in which all quasibijections are invertible, the pita nerve $P = P(\mathbb{O})$ is a decomposition space.*

Proof. Since clearly the upper decalage $D(P)$ is a Segal space, we are left with checking that the following squares are pullbacks for all $n \geq 0$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P_{n+3} & \xrightarrow{d_1} & P_{n+2} \\ d_{n+3} \downarrow & & \downarrow d_{n+2} \\ P_{n+2} & \xrightarrow{d_1} & P_{n+1} \end{array}$$

We do the case $n = 0$. All the higher cases are analogous, only with longer chains. For each element $p \in P_2$ in the upper right corner of the diagram we compare the fibre of d_1 over p with the fibre of d_1 over $d_2(p)$, and show that they are equivalent groupoids. Let p be the locally order-preserving chain

$$T_3 \xrightarrow{f} T_1 \rightarrow T_0.$$

The d_1 -fibre is the groupoid G_1 of all factorisations of f and fibrewise order-preserving quasibijections between them at the middle object. More precisely this groupoid has objects as the columns in the next diagram, and morphisms given by the horizontal map σ , forming altogether a fibrewise order-preserving diagram:

$$(36) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} T_3 & \xrightarrow{1} & T_3 \\ \downarrow f_3 & & \downarrow \tilde{f}_3 \\ f \left(T_2 \right. & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & \left. \tilde{T}_2 \right) f \\ \downarrow f_2 & & \downarrow \tilde{f}_2 \\ T_1 & \xrightarrow{1} & T_1 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ T_0 & \xrightarrow{1} & T_0 \end{array}$$

The other groupoid G_2 in play is the fibre over $\mathbf{d}_2(p)$. Recall that $\mathbf{d}(p)$ is the locally order-preserving chain

$$T'_3 \xrightarrow{\eta(f)} T_1,$$

so the \mathbf{d}_1 -fibre over it is the groupoid of factorisations

$$(37) \quad \eta(f) \left(\begin{array}{ccc} T'_3 & \xrightarrow{1} & T'_3 \\ \downarrow h & & \downarrow \tilde{h} \\ T_2 & \xrightarrow{w} & T'_2 \\ \downarrow e & & \downarrow \tilde{e} \\ T_1 & \xrightarrow{1} & T_1 \end{array} \right) \eta(f)$$

Checking that the two groupoids are equivalent boils down to the following lemma, which we separate out since it clarifies the connections between decomposition space property and strict factorisability. \square

The following can be seen as a converse to Proposition 5.7.

Lemma 10.5. *In a strictly factorisable operadic category let C_1 be the category Then there is an adjunction between the category C_1 of factorisations $f = f_2 \circ f_3$ whose morphisms are fibrewise order-preserving diagram like (36) and the category C_2 of factorisations $\eta(f_2) = eh$ like (37) with order preserving e , whose counit is an identity and unit is the quasibijection $\pi(f_2)$. In particular, if all quasibijections are invertible this adjunction is an equivalence.*

Proof. First of all observe that the category C_2 is discrete. Indeed, since w is a fibrewise order-preserving quasibijection and e and \bar{e} are both order preserving it follows that if w exists it must be an identity. This observation simplifies the rest of the proof.

We construct a functor $F : C_1 \rightarrow C_2$ by application of Proposition 5.7(2) to a factorisation $f = f_2 f_3$. Observe that the internal commutative triangle in the diagram (10) is an object of the category C_2 and we take this factorisation $\eta(f) = \eta(f_2)\eta(f_3/f_2)$ as value $F(f_2 f_3)$. Functoriality of this correspondence follows easily from Proposition 6.8(1). Indeed, given a morphism (36) we take $w = \omega(\sigma, 1)$ as its image.

To construct a left adjoint to F we consider a given factorisation $\eta(f) = eh$ and build a factorisation $f = e(h\pi(f))$. Now, we check

$$FG(eh) = F(e(h\pi(f))) = \eta(e)\eta(h\pi(f)/e) = eh$$

because e is order preserving. On the other hand,

$$GF(f_2 f_3) = G(\eta(f_2)\eta(f_3/f_2)) = \eta(f_2)(\eta(f_3/f_2)\pi(f))$$

and $\pi(f_2)$ provides a morphism in C_1 from the factorisation $f_3 f_2$ to the factorisation $\eta(f_2)(\eta(f_3/f_2)\pi(f))$ due to the commutativity of the diagram (5.7). We leave checking naturality of this morphism to the reader as an exercise. \square

One reason to be interested in decomposition spaces is that they have incidence coalgebras [14], [16]. It follows from the theorem that any strictly factorisable operadic category with invertible quasibijections has associated to it a new coalgebra.

Recall from [14] that the incidence coalgebra of a decomposition space X has basis given by iso-classes of elements in X_1 , and that the comultiplication is given on a basis element $f \in X_1$ as

$$\Delta(f) = \sum_{p \in X_2 | d_1(p)=f} d_2(p) \otimes d_0(p).$$

In the present case of the pita nerve P , the formula thus gives, for any order-preserving morphism f :

$$\Delta(f) = \sum_{f=e \circ h} \eta(h) \otimes e,$$

where in the sum we require e to be order-preserving, but h is not required to be so.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to investigate the significance of this construction, but as an illustration we just work out the example of $\mathbb{F}\text{in}_{\text{surj}}$. This is a strictly factorisable operadic category, and the quasibijections are just the bijections. The comultiplication is now very explicit, and it is easy to list all the factorisations of a given order-preserving surjection. Furthermore, because of the compatibility of ordinal sum with pita factorisation in $\mathbb{F}\text{in}$, the coalgebra actually becomes a bialgebra (see [14]). To describe the comultiplication, it is thus enough to give its effect on connected surjections, meaning surjections of the form $n \rightarrow 1$. In the left-hand tensor factor of the formula for comultiplication we have first a general morphism h , but after replacing it with $\eta(h)$ we get an order-preserving morphism, and then it splits uniquely as the ordinal sum of connected surjections. So altogether everything can be described in terms of connected surjections only. Let A_n denote the isoclass of the surjection $n \rightarrow 1$. Then

$$\Delta(A_1) = A_1 \otimes A_1$$

$$\Delta(A_2) = 2! \cdot A_1^2 \otimes A_2 + A_2 \otimes A_1$$

$$\Delta(A_3) = 3! \cdot A_1^3 \otimes A_3 + 2! \cdot 3A_2A_1 \otimes A_2 + A_3 \otimes A_1$$

$$\Delta(A_4) = 4! \cdot A_1^4 \otimes A_4 + 3! \cdot 6A_2A_1^2 \otimes A_3 + 2! \cdot (4A_3A_1 + 3A_2^2) \otimes A_2 + A_4 \otimes A_1$$

The general formula is

$$\Delta(A_n) = k! \cdot B(n, k)(A_1, A_2, A_3, \dots) \otimes A_k$$

where $B(n, k)(A_1, A_2, \dots)$ are the Bell polynomials counting partitions of n into k blocks of sizes specified by the vector (A_1, A_2, \dots) .

This is very similar to the Faà di Bruno bialgebra, but the factors $k!$ make this different from the usual Faà di Bruno bialgebra (which has the Bell polynomials without the factorials), and it is not an obvious base change of it either. Recall that the usual Faà di Bruno bialgebra arises as the incidence bialgebra

of the fat nerve of the category $\mathbb{F}\text{in}_{\text{surj}}$ without regard to the operadic-category structure, and that the Dynkin–Faà di Bruno bialgebra [25] arises as the incidence bialgebra of the category of order-preserving surjections (without regard to operadic-category structure). Over the rational numbers, these two are isomorphic by the base change that sends A_n to $A_n/n!$. The factorials in the new example enter in a different way, intertwined with the summation. (See [20] for these two Faà di Bruno bialgebras as well as further generalisations from an operadic perspective.)

REFERENCES

- [1] NICOLAS ANDRUSKIEWITSCH and SONIA NATALE. *Double categories and quantum groupoids*. Publ. Mat. Urug. **10** (2005), 11–51. ArXiv:math/0308228.
- [2] MICHAEL BATANIN. *The Eckmann–Hilton argument and higher operads*. Adv. Math. **217** (2008), 334–385. ArXiv:math/0207281.
- [3] MICHAEL BATANIN, JOACHIM KOCK, and MARK WEBER. *Regular patterns, substitutes, Feynman categories and operads*. Theory Appl. Categ. **33** (2018), 148–192.
- [4] MICHAEL BATANIN, JOACHIM KOCK, and MARK WEBER. *MAIN PAPER*.
- [5] MICHAEL BATANIN and MARTIN MARKL. *Operadic categories and duoidal Deligne’s conjecture*. Adv. Math. **285** (2015), 1630–1687. ArXiv:1404.3886.
- [6] MICHAEL BATANIN and MARTIN MARKL. *Koszul duality for operadic categories*. Compositionality **5** (2023), No. 4, 1–56.
- [7] MICHAEL BATANIN and MARTIN MARKL. *Operadic categories as a natural environment for Koszul duality*. Compositionality **5** (2023), No. 3, 1–46.
- [8] MICHAEL BATANIN and DAVID WHITE. *Homotopy theory of algebras of substitutes and their localisation*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **375** (2022), 3569–3640. ArXiv:2001.05432.
- [9] LOUIS CARLIER. *Hereditary species as monoidal decomposition spaces, comodule bialgebras, and operadic categories*. Int. Math. Res. Notices **2020** (2020), 5745–5780. ArXiv:1903.07964.
- [10] C. CASSIDY, M. HÉBERT, and G. M. KELLY. *Reflective subcategories, localizations and factorization systems*. J. Austral. Math. Soc. Ser. A **38** (1985), 287–329.
- [11] ALEX CEBRIAN and WILSON FORERO. *Directed hereditary species and decomposition spaces*. Preprint, arXiv:2211.07721.
- [12] BRIAN DAY and ROSS STREET. *Abstract substitution in enriched categories*. J. Pure Appl. Algebra **179** (2003), 49–63.
- [13] TOBIAS DYCKERHOFF and MIKHAIL KAPRANOV. *Higher Segal spaces*. No. 2244 in Lecture Notes in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, 2019. ArXiv:1212.3563.
- [14] IMMA GÁLVEZ-CARRILLO, JOACHIM KOCK, and ANDREW TONKS. *Decomposition spaces, incidence algebras and Möbius inversion I: Basic theory*. Adv. Math. **331** (2018), 952–1015. ArXiv:1512.07573.
- [15] IMMA GÁLVEZ-CARRILLO, JOACHIM KOCK, and ANDREW TONKS. *Decomposition spaces and restriction species*. Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN (2020), 7558–7616. ArXiv:1708.02570.
- [16] IMMA GÁLVEZ-CARRILLO, JOACHIM KOCK, and ANDREW TONKS. *Decomposition spaces in combinatorics*. To appear in: Higher Segal spaces and applications (Banff 2024), Contemp. Math., AMS (2025). ArXiv:1612.09225.
- [17] RICHARD GARNER, JOACHIM KOCK, and MARK WEBER. *Operadic categories and décalage*. Adv. Math. **377** (2021), 107440. ArXiv:1812.01750.
- [18] J.F. JARDINE. *Supercoherence*. J. Pure Appl. Algebra **75** (1991), 103–194.
- [19] BRANKO JURAN. *On orthogonal factorization systems and double categories*. Preprint, arXiv:2501.01363.

- [20] JOACHIM KOCK and MARK WEBER. *Faà di Bruno for operads and internal algebras*. J. London Math. Soc. **99** (2019), 919–944. ArXiv:1609.03276.
- [21] STEPHEN LACK. *Operadic categories and their skew monoidal categories of collections*. High. Struct. **2** (2018), 1–29. ArXiv:1610.06282.
- [22] T. G. LAVERS. *The theory of vines*. Comm. Algebra **25** (1997), 1257–1284.
- [23] KIRILL C. H. MACKENZIE. *Double Lie algebroids and second-order geometry, I*. Adv. Math. **94** (1992), 180–239.
- [24] MARTIN MARKL. *Cloven operadic categories: An approach to operadic categories with cardinalities in finite unordered sets*. Compositionality **7** (2025), 1–28. ArXiv:2502.09163.
- [25] HANS MUNTHE-KAAS. *Lie-Butcher theory for Runge-Kutta methods*. BIT Numer. Math. **35** (1995), 572–587.
- [26] WILLIAM R. SCHMITT. *Hopf algebras of combinatorial structures*. Canad. J. Math. **45** (1993), 412–428.
- [27] MILOSLAV ŠTĚPÁN. *Factorization systems and double categories*. Theory Appl. Categ. **41** (2024), 551–592.
- [28] MARK WEBER. *Internal algebra classifiers as codescent objects of crossed internal categories*. Theory Appl. Categ. **30** (2015), 1713–1792. ArXiv:1503.07585.

Address: Department of Mathematics, HSE University, 119048 Usacheva str., 6, Moscow, Russia

Email addresses: `bataninmichael@gmail.com`, `mbatanin@hse.ru`

Address: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, University of Copenhagen, and Centre de Recerca Matemàtica

Email address: `joachim.kock@uab.cat`

Address: Macquarie University, Sydney

Email address: `mark.weber.math@gmail.com`

Grant info: We acknowledge support from grant No. 10.46540/3103-00099B from the Independent Research Fund Denmark, grant PID2024-158573NB-I00 (AEI/FEDER, UE) of Spain and grant 2021-SGR-1015 of Catalonia, as well as the Severo Ochoa and María de Maeztu Program for Centers and Units of Excellence in R&D grant number CEX2020-001084-M and the Danish National Research Foundation through the Copenhagen Centre for Geometry and Topology (DNRF151).