

# THE TORUS TRICK FOR CONFIGURATION CATEGORIES

PEDRO BOAVIDA DE BRITO AND MICHAEL S. WEISS

ABSTRACT. We show that in codimension at least 3, spaces of locally flat topological embeddings of manifolds are correctly modeled by derived spaces of maps between their configuration categories (under mild smoothability conditions, and perhaps with one notable exception: source dimension 1 and target dimension 4). That general claim was reduced in an earlier paper to the special cases where the manifolds in question are euclidean spaces. We deal with these special cases by comparing to other special cases where the manifolds have the form “torus” and “torus times euclidean space”, respectively, and by setting up a torus trick for configuration categories.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. The torus trick	3
3. Lean and fat multipatches	8
4. Perturbation and tolerance	13
5. Partitions of unity in a simplicial setting	18
6. Grounding and bounding	23
7. Bounded lifting	29
A. Choice of geometric models	33
B. Homotopical decisions	36
C. Joins in a simplicial setting	41
D. Another view of conservatization	44
References	50

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Our main theorem relates the space  $\text{emb}^t(\mathbb{R}^\ell, \mathbb{R}^m)$  of locally flat topological embeddings  $\mathbb{R}^\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  to the space of derived maps (over the nerve of  $\text{Fin}$ ) between the configuration categories of  $\mathbb{R}^\ell$  and  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , respectively.

**Theorem 1.1.** *The map  $\text{emb}^t(\mathbb{R}^\ell, \mathbb{R}^m) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\text{map}_{\text{Fin}}(\text{con}(\mathbb{R}^\ell), \text{con}(\mathbb{R}^m))$  determined by the functoriality of configuration categories is a weak equivalence if  $m - \ell \geq 3$  and  $m \geq 5$ .*

---

*Date:* February 12, 2024.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 57R40, 55U40, 55P48.

The project was funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – Project-ID 427320536 – SFB 1442, as well as under Germany’s Excellence Strategy EXC 2044 390685587, Mathematics Münster: Dynamics–Geometry–Structure. P.B. was supported by FCT 2021.01497.CEECIND and grant SFRH/BPD/99841/2014.

We point out that  $\mathbb{R}\mathrm{map}_{\mathrm{Fin}}(\mathrm{con}(\mathbb{R}^\ell), \mathrm{con}(\mathbb{R}^m))$  is weakly equivalent to the space of derived maps from  $\mathcal{E}_\ell$  to  $\mathcal{E}_m$ , where  $\mathcal{E}_m$  denotes the little  $m$ -disk operad. This was shown in [1]. Therefore the theorem implies

$$\mathrm{emb}^t(\mathbb{R}^\ell, \mathbb{R}^m) \simeq \mathbb{R}\mathrm{map}(\mathcal{E}_\ell, \mathcal{E}_m)$$

for  $m - \ell \geq 3$  and  $m \geq 5$ . In this formulation it is more difficult to name the map which gives the equivalence.

In the following corollary,  $L$  and  $M$  are *smooth* manifolds of dimension  $\ell$  and  $m$  respectively, and  $\mathrm{emb}^s(L, M)$  is the space of smooth embeddings from  $L$  to  $M$ .

**Corollary 1.2.** *The square*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{emb}^s(L, M) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{emb}^t(L, M) \\ \downarrow = & & \downarrow \\ \mathrm{emb}^s(L, M) & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{R}\mathrm{map}_{\mathrm{Fin}}(\mathrm{con}(L), \mathrm{con}(M)) \end{array}$$

*is homotopy cartesian. More generally, for compact smooth manifolds with boundary, where  $m - \ell \geq 3$  and  $m \geq 5$ , and a specified smooth embedding  $\partial L \rightarrow \partial M$ , the square*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{emb}_\partial^s(L, M) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{emb}_\partial^t(L, M) \\ \downarrow = & & \downarrow \\ \mathrm{emb}_\partial^s(L, M) & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{R}\mathrm{map}_{\mathrm{Fin}_*}^\partial(\mathrm{con}(L), \mathrm{con}(M)) \end{array}$$

*is homotopy cartesian.*

*Proof of corollary 1.2, conditional on theorem 1.1.* We concentrate on the case where  $L$  and  $M$  have empty boundary. Let  $\mathrm{imm}^s(L, M)$  and  $\mathrm{imm}^t(L, M)$  be the spaces of smooth resp. locally flat topological immersions from  $L$  to  $M$ . In the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathrm{emb}^s(L, M) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{emb}^t(L, M) & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{R}\mathrm{map}_{\mathrm{Fin}}(\mathrm{con}(L), \mathrm{con}(M)) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathrm{imm}^s(L, M) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{imm}^t(L, M) & \xrightarrow{v} & \mathbb{R}\mathrm{map}_{\mathrm{Fin}}(\mathrm{con}^{\mathrm{loc}}(L), \mathrm{con}^{\mathrm{loc}}(M)) \end{array}$$

the left-hand square is a homotopy pullback square by [18, Thm.A] and the outer square is a homotopy pullback square by [1, Cor. 5.2]. The arrow labeled  $v$  is a weak equivalence by theorem 1.1. (Source and target of  $v$  can be described as section spaces of certain fibrations over  $L$ . In the case of the source, the fiber over  $x \in L$  is, informally speaking, the space of pairs  $(y, f)$  where  $y \in M$  and  $f$  is a locally flat embedding  $T_x L \rightarrow T_y M$ . In the case of the target, the fiber over  $x \in L$  is the space of pairs  $(y, f)$  where  $y \in M$  and  $f$  is a derived map from  $\mathrm{con}(T_x L)$  to  $\mathrm{con}(T_x M)$ .) The claim follows with some diagram diagnostics.  $\square$

*Remark.* A result by Haefliger and Hirsch [15, Thm. 4.2] states that the forgetful maps  $\mathrm{imm}^s(L, M) \rightarrow \mathrm{imm}^t(L, M)$  and  $\mathrm{imm}_\partial^s(L, M) \rightarrow \mathrm{imm}_\partial^t(L, M)$  induce surjections on  $\pi_0$  if  $2m > 3\ell$ . Therefore the proof above shows that if  $2m > 3\ell$ , the right-hand columns in those diagrams of corollary 1.2 are weak equivalences.

*Remark.* If  $L$  is compact, and  $m - \ell \geq 3$ ,  $m \geq 5$ , then the space of locally flat embeddings  $\mathrm{emb}^t(L, M)$  is weakly equivalent to the space of all injective continuous maps from  $L$  to  $M$ . See [18, Thm.1]. Note in passing that we normally think of

$\text{emb}^t(L, M)$  as a simplicial set, while the space of all injective continuous maps from  $L$  to  $M$  could also be regarded as an honest space with the compact-open topology; more about that in [18]. We do not know whether  $\text{emb}^t(\mathbb{R}^\ell, \mathbb{R}^m)$  is weakly equivalent to the space of all injective continuous maps from  $\mathbb{R}^\ell$  to  $\mathbb{R}^m$ . Theorem 1.1 implies that one is a homotopy retract of the other since the “functoriality of configuration categories” is perfectly valid for continuous injective maps.

*Remark.* Krannich and Kupers show [17, Cor E] that theorem 1.1 does not extend to the cases  $\ell = m$ , except for  $m \leq 2$ . For  $\ell = m = 2$ , see [16, Thm. 8.5]. Krannich and Kupers also have counterexamples in codimensions 1 and 2; see [17, Cor 8.19].

*Remark.* We are often asked: what is the status of manifold calculus for topological manifolds, especially in relation to spaces of embeddings? As the proof of corollary 1.2 illustrates, Lashof’s homotopy cartesian square almost reduces it to the manifold calculus for smooth embeddings, in the cases where the manifolds in question admit smooth structures. It is not known whether manifold calculus for topological embeddings can be developed in parallel to the existing manifold calculus for smooth embeddings. We can be a little more precise. The manifold calculus for smooth embeddings has the following foundations. On the more categorical side, there are the papers [23] and [13] by Weiss and Goodwillie-Weiss, and on the geometric side, there are Goodwillie’s thesis polished and published as [10], and the two papers [11], [12] by Goodwillie and Klein. Most experts agree that all of these can be exported without difficulty to the non-smooth setting *except* Goodwillie’s thesis [10]. On the other hand there seems to be no evidence that the multiple disjunction results of [10] become false in the setting of topological manifolds. On the contrary, the argument with Lashof’s homotopy cartesian square implies that they are “often” correct.

*Guide to the paper.* The torus trick is explained in section 2. It is easy to understand as a method, but the preparations required to make it work are sobering. The most important of these help us to translate metric conditions on maps between configuration categories into homotopical conditions. For that we have mainly sections 4 and 7. Sections 3 and 6 support sections 4 and 7 respectively by dropping some useful anchors. In section 5 we develop a homotopical decomposition method for configuration categories, based on partitions of unity. This is needed in sections 6 and 7. In the appendix sections A, B, C and D we introduce language, models and points of view. Section D introduces a new procedure for conservatization. (This is new only in relation to the conservatization procedure used in [1, §8], but in a more general context it is well known to some experts.)

## 2. THE TORUS TRICK

**2.1. A form of torus trick for embeddings.** Let  $T^\ell$  be the  $\ell$ -dimensional torus. Let  $f: T^\ell \rightarrow T^\ell \times \mathbb{R}^d$  be a locally flat topological embedding, and let  $H$  be a homotopy from  $f$  to the standard inclusion. For any self-covering map  $\pi: T^\ell \rightarrow T^\ell$ , path lifting determines a unique lift of the homotopy  $H$  to a homotopy  $H'$  satisfying  $(\pi \times \text{id})H' = H\pi$  with  $H'_1$  the standard inclusion. Then  $H'_0$  is an embedding that

lifts  $f$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T^\ell & \xrightarrow{H'_0} & T^\ell \times \mathbb{R}^d \\ \downarrow \pi & & \downarrow \pi \times \text{id} \\ T^\ell & \xrightarrow{f} & T^\ell \times \mathbb{R}^d \end{array}$$

The following instance of a geometric torus trick has guided this paper. Think of  $T^\ell$  as a topological abelian group (hence a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module) and suppose  $d \geq 3$ ,  $\ell + d \geq 5$ .

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $f^{(k)}$  be the lift of  $f$  across the covering map  $\pi: T^\ell \rightarrow T^\ell$  where  $\pi(x) = kx$  for some positive integer  $k$ . If  $k$  is sufficiently large, then the lift  $f^{(k)}$  is isotopic to the standard inclusion.*

(The meaning of *sufficiently large* depends on  $f$  and  $H$ .) The argument for this can be broken up into several steps.

- (1)  $f$  is  $\varepsilon$ -bounded for some  $\varepsilon$  (which can be large)
- (2) if  $f$  is  $\varepsilon$ -bounded then  $f^{(k)}$  is  $\varepsilon/k$ -bounded
- (3) therefore  $f^{(k)}$  is isotopic to the standard inclusion if  $k$  is large enough.

By an  $\varepsilon$ -bounded map  $f: T^\ell \rightarrow T^\ell \times \mathbb{R}^d$  (equipped with a homotopy to the standard inclusion) we mean a map whose lift to the universal cover

$$f^\infty: \mathbb{R}^\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\ell \times \mathbb{R}^d$$

is  $\varepsilon$ -close to the standard inclusion  $e$  in the sense that the distance between  $p_1 e(x)$  and  $p_1 f^\infty(x)$  is  $< \varepsilon$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^\ell$ , where  $p_1: \mathbb{R}^\ell \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\ell$  is the first projection. We are not very interested in the distance between  $p_2 e(x)$  and  $p_2 f^\infty(x)$  since we can easily make it as small as we like (for all  $x$  simultaneously) by applying a suitable isotopy to  $f$  (shrinking in the  $\mathbb{R}^d$  factor).

Points (1) and (2) are clear. For (3) we must refer to the appendix of [18], and specifically to theorems 1 and 2 in there. Together these imply a complicated local contractibility property for spaces of locally flat embeddings of topological manifolds in codimension  $\geq 3$ . Lashof attributes this to [5]. Here the consequence is that  $f^{(k)}$  for sufficiently large  $k$  admits a “small” isotopy to the standard inclusion, but that isotopy might not be locally flat. On the other hand there is a theorem saying that, if there is such an isotopy, then there is also one which is locally flat, although that one might not be small.

Lemma 2.1 has a family version where the embedding  $f$  is replaced by a compact family of embeddings. We restate this in more homotopical terms, after fixing some language and notation.

**Definition 2.2.** A topological embedding  $T^\ell \rightarrow T^\ell \times \mathbb{R}^d$  together with a homotopy to the standard inclusion will be called a *grounded embedding*. The space of such is denoted  $\underline{\text{emb}}^t(T^\ell, T^\ell \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ . It is the homotopy fiber of

$$\text{emb}^t(T^\ell, T^\ell \times \mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \text{map}(T^\ell, T^\ell \times \mathbb{R}^d)$$

over the standard inclusion.

As we noted already, grounded embeddings lift uniquely across self-coverings of the torus. For a covering  $\pi: T^\ell \rightarrow T^\ell$ , this gives a map

$$\underline{\text{emb}}^t(T^\ell, T^\ell \times \mathbb{R}^d) \xrightarrow{\pi^*} \underline{\text{emb}}^t(T^\ell, T^\ell \times \mathbb{R}^d).$$

The family version of Lemma 2.1 is then:

**Proposition 2.3.** *Let  $\pi : T^\ell \rightarrow T^\ell$  be the covering map given by  $\pi(x) = 2x$ . The homotopy colimit of the tower*

$$\underline{\text{emb}}^t(T^\ell, T^\ell \times \mathbb{R}^d) \xrightarrow{\pi^*} \underline{\text{emb}}^t(T^\ell, T^\ell \times \mathbb{R}^d) \xrightarrow{\pi^*} \dots$$

*is contractible.*

**2.2. The torus trick for configuration categories.** For the purposes of this section, we make the following abbreviations. For topological manifolds  $L$  and  $M$  let  $\text{bun}^s(TL, TM)$  be the space of pairs  $(f, g)$  where  $f : L \rightarrow M$  is any map and  $g : TL \rightarrow TM$  covers  $f$ , and is fiberwise linear and injective. The definition of  $\text{bun}^t(TL, TM)$  is similar, but we replace the linearity condition by local flatness. We write

$$\begin{aligned} \text{emb}^p(L, M) &:= \mathbb{R}\text{map}_{\text{Fin}}(\text{con}(L), \text{con}(M)), \\ \text{bun}^p(TL, TM) &:= \mathbb{R}\text{map}_{\text{Fin}}(\text{con}^{\text{loc}}(L), \text{con}^{\text{loc}}(M)). \end{aligned}$$

The superscript  $p$  is a reference to particles or patches. Another justification (for the  $\text{bun}^p$  notation) comes from noting that  $\text{con}^{\text{loc}}(L)$  is in some sense a bundle of configuration categories  $\text{con}(T_x L)$  where  $x \in L$ .

**Definition 2.4.** Let  $\underline{\text{emb}}^p(T^\ell, T^\ell \times \mathbb{R}^d)$  be the homotopy fiber, over the standard inclusion, of the map

$$\text{emb}^p(T^\ell, T^\ell \times \mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \text{map}(T^\ell, T^\ell \times \mathbb{R}^d)$$

given by restriction to the space of objects of  $\text{con}(T^\ell)$  over  $\underline{1}$  in  $\text{Fin}$ . We again refer to the homotopy as a *grounding* and the elements as *grounded things*.

**Remark 2.5.** The forgetful map

$$\underline{\text{emb}}^p(T^\ell, T^\ell \times \mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \text{emb}^p(T^\ell, T^\ell \times \mathbb{R}^d)$$

is a fibration with homotopically discrete fibers. An alternative description of the elements of  $\underline{\text{emb}}^p(T^\ell, T^\ell \times \mathbb{R}^d)$  is as pairs  $(f, f^\infty)$  where  $f \in \text{emb}^p(T^\ell, T^\ell \times \mathbb{R}^d)$  and

$$f^\infty : \mathbb{R}^\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\ell \times \mathbb{R}^d$$

is a lift of the map  $T^\ell \rightarrow T^\ell \times \mathbb{R}^d$  determined by  $f$  to the universal covers. This variant will be used later in the text.

In [3], we have shown that derived maps of configuration categories can be lifted to maps of configuration categories of covering spaces under mild assumptions. Consequently, given a covering map  $\pi : T^\ell \rightarrow T^\ell$ , there is a dashed arrow

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \underline{\text{emb}}^t(T^\ell, T^\ell \times \mathbb{R}^d) & \xrightarrow{\pi^*} & \underline{\text{emb}}^t(T^\ell, T^\ell \times \mathbb{R}^d) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{emb}^p(T^\ell, T^\ell \times \mathbb{R}^d) & \xrightarrow{\dots \pi^* \dots} & \text{emb}^p(T^\ell, T^\ell \times \mathbb{R}^d) \end{array}$$

making the diagram homotopy commutative.

The main technical result of this paper is then:

**Theorem 2.6** (Torus trick for configuration categories). *Let  $\pi : T^\ell \rightarrow T^\ell$  be the degree 2 covering of the torus. The homotopy colimit of the tower*

$$\underline{\text{emb}}^p(T^\ell, T^\ell \times \mathbb{R}^d) \xrightarrow{\pi^*} \underline{\text{emb}}^p(T^\ell, T^\ell \times \mathbb{R}^d) \xrightarrow{\pi^*} \dots$$

*is contractible.*

The remaining sections in the paper taken together prove this theorem. We will indicate how in a moment. Before we do so, let us explain how theorem 2.6 implies theorem 1.1.

**2.3. Proof of theorem 1.1.** To shorten notation, we abbreviate

$$L = T^\ell \quad \text{and} \quad M = T^\ell \times \mathbb{R}^d$$

(and  $m := \ell + d$ ). In analogy with the definitions and notation from before, let

$$\underline{\text{bun}}^?(TL, TM)$$

be the homotopy fiber of  $\text{bun}^?(TL, TM) \rightarrow \text{map}(L, M)$  where ? can be  $s, t$  or  $p$ .

The master diagram, relating the different types of spaces, is:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \underline{\text{emb}}^s(L, M) & \longrightarrow & \underline{\text{emb}}^t(L, M) & \longrightarrow & \underline{\text{emb}}^p(L, M) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \underline{\text{bun}}^s(TL, TM) & \longrightarrow & \underline{\text{bun}}^t(TL, TM) & \longrightarrow & \underline{\text{bun}}^p(TL, TM) \end{array}$$

This has a forgetful map to a similar diagram where no grounding is imposed (the underlining in the terms disappears). The left-hand square is homotopy cartesian by [18, Thm.A] and the outer rectangle is homotopy cartesian by [1, Thm.5.1]. Therefore the right-hand square is almost homotopy cartesian (i.e., the vertical homotopy fiber over the base point in the middle column maps by a weak equivalence to the vertical homotopy fiber over the base point in the right-hand column).

These diagrams are the layers in a tower which is obtained by invoking the self-covering map  $\pi : L \rightarrow L$  of proposition 2.3 and letting it act repeatedly. This extends the towers for  $\underline{\text{emb}}^s(L, M)$ ,  $\underline{\text{emb}}^t(L, M)$  and  $\underline{\text{emb}}^p(L, M)$ . We have explained this for the arrows in the top row (and it is clear for the left-hand square). For the remaining arrows, it is a consequence of two observations (for more details, see [1]). First, the lifting-across- $\pi$  map

$$\pi^* : \underline{\text{emb}}^p(L, M) \rightarrow \underline{\text{emb}}^p(L, M)$$

can be made natural with respect to inclusions of open subsets of  $L$ . Second, the lower row is obtained functorially from the upper row by homotopy sheafification wrt the ordinary notion of open cover.

Passing to the top of the tower, i.e., taking the sequential homotopy colimit in each column, associated to the right-hand square in the diagram above we obtain a square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{colim}_{\text{iterated } \pi^*} \underline{\text{emb}}^t(L, M) & \longrightarrow & \text{colim}_{\text{iterated } \pi^*} \underline{\text{emb}}^p(L, M) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{colim}_{\text{iterated } \pi^*} \underline{\text{bun}}^t(TL, TM) & \longrightarrow & \text{colim}_{\text{iterated } \pi^*} \underline{\text{bun}}^p(TL, TM) . \end{array}$$

Since homotopy pullbacks commute with directed homotopy colimits, this is still almost homotopy cartesian; i.e., the induced map on vertical homotopy fibers over the respective base points is a weak equivalence. Since the terms in the top row

are contractible, it follows that the lower horizontal map is a weak equivalence on base point components.

The last step is easy. Since  $L$  and  $M$  are parallelized, the map

$$\operatorname{colim}_{\text{iterated } \pi^*} \underline{\operatorname{bun}}^t(TL, TM) \rightarrow \operatorname{colim}_{\text{iterated } \pi^*} \underline{\operatorname{bun}}^p(TL, TM)$$

is weakly equivalent to

$$\operatorname{colim}_{\text{iterated } \pi^*} \operatorname{map}(L, \operatorname{emb}^t(\mathbb{R}^\ell, \mathbb{R}^m)) \rightarrow \operatorname{colim}_{\text{iterated } \pi^*} \operatorname{map}(L, \operatorname{emb}^p(\mathbb{R}^\ell, \mathbb{R}^m)).$$

(The maps in these towers are given by precomposition with  $\pi$ .) The last map has the standard comparison map

$$\operatorname{emb}^t(\mathbb{R}^\ell, \mathbb{R}^m) \rightarrow \operatorname{emb}^p(\mathbb{R}^\ell, \mathbb{R}^m)$$

as a retract (use restriction of maps out of  $L$  to the base point, and inclusion of constant maps). Therefore we may conclude that the said comparison map is a weak equivalence on base point components. But these spaces happen to be connected. For the target space, this follows from [14], and here again the condition  $m - \ell \geq 3$  is important. For the source, our local flatness assumption implies that the map  $\operatorname{TOP}(m) \rightarrow \operatorname{emb}^t(\mathbb{R}^\ell, \mathbb{R}^m)$  given by restriction induces a surjection of path components. Famously  $\operatorname{TOP}(m)$  has only two path components, and clearly these determine the same path component of  $\operatorname{emb}^t(\mathbb{R}^\ell, \mathbb{R}^m)$ .

**2.4. Proof of Theorem 2.6.** We keep the abbreviations of section 2.3. For reasons given in [4], we prefer to work with the Rezk completions of the Segal spaces  $\operatorname{con}(L)$  and  $\operatorname{con}(M)$ . They are denoted  $\operatorname{ucon}(L)$  and  $\operatorname{ucon}(M)$ , respectively, where the “u” is for *unordered* as in unordered configuration. The manifolds  $L$  and  $M$  will be regarded as Riemannian manifolds (with the standard flat Riemannian metrics). This allows us to use the Riemannian multipatch models for  $\operatorname{ucon}(L)$  and  $\operatorname{ucon}(M)$ , which are more useful here than the particle models. The multipatch models are described in [1] and/or in appendix A below. In the Riemannian multipatch model,  $\operatorname{ucon}(L)$  and  $\operatorname{ucon}(M)$  are nerves of topological posets (whose elements are the multipatches). Then we can provisionally re-define

$$\operatorname{emb}^p(L, M) := \mathbb{R}\operatorname{map}_{\operatorname{uFin}}(\operatorname{ucon}(L), \operatorname{ucon}(M)) = \operatorname{map}_{\operatorname{uFin}}(\operatorname{ucon}(L), \varphi\operatorname{ucon}(M))$$

where  $\varphi$  is for a Reedy fibrant replacement (whereas  $\operatorname{ucon}(L)$  is already Reedy cofibrant). This is in agreement with the previous definition of  $\operatorname{emb}^p(L, M)$  up to weak equivalence.

As a first step, we restrict cardinalities. That is, we replace the configuration category  $\operatorname{con}(L)$  by the subcategory  $\operatorname{con}(L; \alpha)$ . For each  $\alpha$ , we have a tower

$$\operatorname{emb}^p(L, M; \alpha) \xrightarrow{\pi^*} \operatorname{emb}^p(L, M; \alpha) \xrightarrow{\pi^*} \dots$$

(in self-explanatory notation). It suffices to show that the colimit of each of these towers is contractible. With that in mind, we fix an  $\alpha$  throughout.

In a similar vein, we often find it helpful to restrict the size of patches in a multipatch in  $L$ . This leads to notation like  $\operatorname{ucon}_\delta(L; \alpha)$ , where  $\delta$  is an upper bound on the radius of patches. The inclusion of  $\operatorname{ucon}_\delta(L; \alpha)$  in  $\operatorname{ucon}(L; \alpha)$  is a (degreewise) weak equivalence. We seize the opportunity to re-define once more

$$\operatorname{emb}^p(L, M) := \operatorname{colim}_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \operatorname{map}_{\operatorname{uFin}}(\operatorname{ucon}_\delta(L), \varphi\operatorname{ucon}(M)).$$

(If we have to be precise, the colimit is taken in the category of simplicial sets. There will be no further re-definitions of  $\text{emb}^p(L, M)$  in this section.)

Next, there is a notion of  $\varepsilon$ -boundedness for elements (more correctly, simplices) of  $\text{emb}^p(L, M)$ . This is very similar to the notion of  $\varepsilon$ -boundedness for elements of  $\text{emb}^t(L, M)$ . It is slightly more complicated though; see definitions 4.2 and 6.4.

Now the necessary definitions are in place and the strategy can be outlined. It is close in spirit to the topological torus trick above. Let  $K$  be a finitely generated simplicial set and let  $f: K \rightarrow \text{emb}^p(L, M)$  be a map of simplicial sets. We like to think of  $f$  as a family  $(f_u)_{u \in K}$ .

- (1) After a homotopy applied to the family, each  $f_u$  is  $\varepsilon$ -bounded for some  $\varepsilon$  independent of  $u \in K$ .
- (2) If a simplex in  $\text{emb}^p(L, M; \alpha)$  is  $\varepsilon$ -bounded, and  $k$  is any positive integer, then for sufficiently large  $r$  (depending on  $k$ ) the image of that simplex under the  $r$ -fold iteration of

$$\pi^*: \text{emb}^p(L, M; \alpha) \rightarrow \text{emb}^p(L, M; \alpha)$$

is  $(\varepsilon/k)$ -bounded.

- (3) If  $\varepsilon$  in (1) is sufficiently small, then the family  $(f_u)$  is nullhomotopic. (There is a preferred base point in  $\text{emb}^p(L, M; \alpha)$ .)

Each of these steps is a major undertaking. Step (1) is achieved in theorem 6.5. Step (2) is a consequence of theorem 7.1 and the observation, justified in the last section of [3], that the  $r$ -fold iteration of  $\pi^*: \text{emb}^p(L, M; \alpha) \rightarrow \text{emb}^p(L, M; \alpha)$  is homotopic to the map determined by lifting across the covering map

$$\underbrace{\pi \circ \pi \circ \dots \circ \pi}_r: T^\ell \longrightarrow T^\ell.$$

Step (3) is theorem 4.3. Strictly speaking, theorem 4.3 makes a claim which looks slightly weaker than (3). It says that under conditions as in (3), the composition

$$(2.1) \quad K \xrightarrow{u \mapsto f_u} \text{emb}^p(L, M; \alpha) \xrightarrow{\text{forgetful}} \text{emb}^p(L, M; \alpha)$$

is nullhomotopic. In order to show that this does not make any difference, we expand the map  $\text{emb}^p(L, M; \alpha) \rightarrow \text{emb}^p(L, M; \alpha)$  into a Barratt-Puppe sequence. This gives

$$\dots \rightarrow \Omega \text{emb}^p(L, M; \alpha) \rightarrow \Omega \text{map}(L, M) \rightarrow \text{emb}^p(L, M; \alpha) \rightarrow \text{emb}^p(L, M; \alpha).$$

The map  $\Omega \text{emb}^p(L, M; \alpha) \rightarrow \Omega \text{map}(L, M)$  in the sequence has a right homotopy inverse, since the base point component of  $\text{map}(L, M)$  is weakly equivalent to  $L$  and since  $L$ , being a topological abelian group, is a retract of  $\text{emb}^p(L, M)$ . Therefore, if a map from a simplicial set  $K$  to  $\text{emb}^p(L, M; \alpha)$  is nullhomotopic as a map to  $\text{emb}^p(L, M; \alpha)$ , then it was already nullhomotopic to begin with.

### 3. LEAN AND FAT MULTIPATCHES

*Vocabulary and notation:* see section A.

**Lemma 3.1.** i) Let  $\mathcal{W}$  be an open  $\alpha$ -cover of the closed Riemannian manifold  $L$ . The inclusion  $\text{ucon}_{\mathcal{W}}(L; \alpha) \rightarrow \text{ucon}(L; \alpha)$  is a weak equivalence. ii) Let  $\delta$  be a positive real number. The inclusion  $\text{ucon}_{\delta} \mathcal{W}(L; \alpha) \rightarrow \text{ucon}(L; \alpha)$  is a weak equivalence.  $\square$



**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $L$  be a closed smooth Riemannian manifold and let  $\mathcal{V}$  be an open  $\alpha$ -cover of  $L$ . Then there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that for every finite subset  $S \subset L$  where  $|S| \leq \alpha$ , the open  $\delta$ -neighborhood of  $S$  in  $L$  is contained in some  $U \in \mathcal{V}$ .  $\square$*

(In the case  $\alpha = 1$ , this lemma is a special case of Lebesgue’s covering lemma.) The important implication of lemma 3.2 for us is that if we wish to make a sensible selection of objects of  $\text{con}(L; \alpha)$  by imposing upper bounds on size, as in lemma 3.1, then we can often do so by just imposing a uniform upper bound on the radii of the (multi-)patches.

In the remainder of the section we mainly ask how far we can go in imposing *lower bounds* on the size of objects of  $\text{ucon}(L; \alpha)$  or  $\text{con}(L; \alpha)$ , if we still wish to have a sensible selection. This turns out to be a much more difficult topic.

Again let  $L$  be a closed smooth Riemannian manifold. Let  $k$  be a positive integer. For  $c > 0$  let  $\text{pack}(k, c) \subset \text{emb}(\underline{k}, L)$  be the open subset consisting of the embeddings  $f: \underline{k} \rightarrow L$  such that  $d_L(f(x), f(y)) > 2c$  whenever  $x, y \in \underline{k}$  are distinct (where  $d_L$  is the geodesic distance). If  $c$  is less than the global injectivity radius of  $L$ , then it is alright to think of  $\text{pack}(k, c)$  as the space of multipatches in  $L$  (as in definition A.1) with exactly  $k$  components, where each component has radius exactly  $c$ .

**Proposition 3.3.** *If  $c$  is sufficiently small, then the inclusion*

$$\text{pack}(k, c) \rightarrow \text{emb}(\underline{k}, L)$$

*is a homotopy equivalence.*

*Proof.* Note first that  $\text{emb}(\underline{k}, L)$  is a smooth manifold and  $\text{pack}(k, c)$  is an open subset of it. We may assume from the outset that  $6c$  is less than the global injectivity radius of the Riemannian manifold  $L$ . Call a tangent vector  $v$  to  $f \in \text{pack}(k, c)$  *admissible* (in this proof) if, for every curve  $\gamma: J \rightarrow \text{pack}(k, c)$  (where  $J \subset \mathbb{R}$  is an open interval containing 0) having  $\gamma(0) = f$  and  $\gamma'(0) = v$ , and every choice of distinct  $x, y \in \underline{k}$  such that  $d_L(f(x), f(y)) \leq 6c$ , the distance in question increases along  $\gamma$ . More precisely, we wish to have

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} d_L(\gamma(t)(x), \gamma(t)(y)) > 0$$

for such  $x$  and  $y$ . (The differential quotient exists because of the condition on  $c$ .) Clearly if elements  $v, w$  of the tangent space  $T_f \text{pack}(k, c)$  are admissible, then  $v + w$  is also admissible, and  $sv$  is admissible for any positive  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ . The admissibility condition is an *open condition*, i.e., the set of admissible elements in  $T \text{pack}(k, c)$  (total space of the tangent bundle of  $\text{pack}(k, c)$ ) is an open set. If  $f \in \text{pack}(k, 3c) \subset \text{pack}(k, c)$ , then *every*  $v \in T_f \text{pack}(k, c)$  is admissible. — The next thing to observe is that if  $c$  is sufficiently small, then for every  $f \in \text{pack}(k, c)$  there exists an admissible tangent vector in  $T_f \text{pack}(k, c)$ . To see this, let  $R$  be the smallest equivalence relation on  $\underline{k}$  which contains all pairs  $(x, y) \in \underline{k} \times \underline{k}$  such that  $d_L(f(x), f(y)) \leq 6c$ . We may assume from now on that  $6kc$  is smaller than the global injectivity radius of  $L$ . Each equivalence class  $A$  of  $R$  is contained in an open metric ball  $B_A$  of radius  $6kc$  about some point  $z_A \in L$ . These balls need not be disjoint, but it is clear that if  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  are distinct equivalence classes and  $x \in A_1, y \in A_2$ , then  $d_L(x, y) > 6c$ . Therefore in our effort to find an admissible  $v \in T_f(c, k)$  we may treat each equivalence class  $A$  of  $R$  separately. By applying a “radial expansion” of  $B_A$  with center point  $z_A$ , and restricting that to  $f(A)$ , we obtain a curve  $\gamma_A$  in

$\text{emb}(A, L)$  such that  $\gamma(0) = f|_A$  and such that  $\gamma'_A(0)$  has the required positivity properties, as far as elements  $x, y$  of  $A$  are concerned, provided  $6kc$  is sufficiently small. (Here the smallness requirement could be quantified in terms of the curvature properties of the Riemannian metric, in addition to the global injectivity radius.) Together the vectors  $\gamma'_A(0)$  make up a tangent vector  $v \in T_f \text{pack}(k, c)$  which is admissible. — Using all that and partitions of unity, one can easily construct a smooth vector field  $\xi$  on  $\text{pack}(k, c)$  which is everywhere admissible. The flow of  $\xi$  is “forward complete”. More precisely, if  $f \in \text{pack}(k, c)$ , then by definition of  $\text{pack}(k, c)$  there exists a positive  $\delta$  such that  $f \in \text{pack}(c + \delta, k)$  and  $\delta < 2c$ . The integral curve of  $\xi$  passing through  $f \in \text{pack}(k, c)$  at time  $t = 0$  can never escape from the closure of  $\text{pack}(c + \delta, k)$  in  $\text{pack}(k, c)$ , which is compact. More to the point, if  $C$  is any compact subset of  $\text{pack}(k, c)$ , then the flow of  $\xi$  will move it into the open subset  $\text{pack}(k, 3c)$  in finite time. — Now let  $W \subset \text{pack}(k, c)$  be defined as follows:  $f \in \text{pack}(k, c)$  belongs to  $W$  if and only if  $d_L(x, y) > 6c$  for all distinct  $x, y \in \{1, 2, 3, \dots, k-1\}$ . Then we have a diagram of inclusion maps

$$\text{pack}(k, 3c) \xrightarrow{g_1} W \xrightarrow{g_2} \text{pack}(k, c) \xrightarrow{g_3} \text{emb}(\underline{k}, L).$$

We still want to show that  $g_3$  is a homotopy equivalence. The forgetful projection  $W \rightarrow \text{pack}(k-1, 3c)$  is a fiber bundle. (Each fiber is the complement in  $L$  of  $k-1$  pairwise disjoint metric closed balls of radius  $2c$ ; the balls are disjoint because their center points have distance  $> 6c$ .) By induction, and making  $c$  smaller if necessary, we may assume that the inclusion of  $\text{pack}(k-1, 3c)$  in  $\text{emb}(k-1, L)$  is a homotopy equivalence. It follows that  $g_3 g_2$  in the above diagram is a homotopy equivalence. (We can describe  $g_3 g_2$  as a map between the total spaces of two fiber bundles which respects the bundle projections, induces a homotopy equivalence of the base spaces, and restricts to homotopy equivalences between corresponding fibers.) Now we can conclude with a formal argument. For every *compact* CW-space  $Z$ , the map  $g_2$  induces a surjection, thanks to the vector field  $\xi$ , from the set of homotopy classes  $[Z, W]$  to  $[Z, \text{pack}(k, c)]$ . As we have seen,  $g_3 g_2$  induces a bijection from  $[Z, W]$  to  $[Z, \text{emb}(\underline{k}, L)]$ . Therefore  $g_3$  induces a bijection from  $[Z, \text{pack}(k, c)]$  to  $[Z, \text{emb}(\underline{k}, L)]$ . By itself that does not allow us to conclude that  $g_3$  is a weak homotopy equivalence. But we know also that the target of  $g_3$  is homotopy equivalent to a compact CW-space, so that  $g_3$  has a homotopy right inverse. With that it is an exercise to show that  $g_3$  is a weak equivalence. Then it is also a homotopy equivalence, since source and target are finite dimensional smooth manifolds.  $\square$

There is a mild generalization of proposition 3.3 in which  $L$  is allowed to have a boundary. In the generalization, suppose that  $L$  is a compact smooth Riemannian manifold with boundary and let  $k$  be a positive integer. For  $c > 0$  let  $\text{pack}(k, c)$  be the open subset of  $\text{emb}(\underline{k}, L \setminus \partial L)$  consisting of the embeddings  $f: \underline{k} \rightarrow L \setminus \partial L$  such that  $d_L(f(x), f(y)) > 2c$  whenever  $x, y \in \underline{k}$  are distinct (where  $d_L$  is the geodesic distance), and also  $d_L(f(x), z) > c$  for any  $z \in \partial L$  and  $x \in \underline{k}$ .

**Proposition 3.4.** *For sufficiently small  $c$ , the inclusion*

$$\text{pack}(k, c) \rightarrow \text{emb}(\underline{k}, L \setminus \partial L)$$

*is a homotopy equivalence.*

The proof is left to the reader. It can be modeled on the proof of proposition 3.3. We will only need this in the cases where  $L$  is a disk, though not necessarily a disk with the standard Riemannian metric.  $\square$

It is a easy to think of generalizations and variants of proposition 3.3 and 3.4 where the multipatches are replaced by nested systems of multipatches. We will also need such variants (in the proof of theorem 4.3 below). To specify the type of nested system, we fix a diagram in  $\mathbf{Fin}$ ,

$$(3.1) \quad \mathcal{D} = (\underline{k}_0 \leftarrow \underline{k}_1 \leftarrow \cdots \leftarrow \underline{k}_{p-1} \leftarrow \underline{k}_p)$$

(where  $k_0, k_1, \dots, k_p$  are positive).

Let  $c_0, c_1, \dots, c_p$  be a string of positive real numbers. Suppose that  $c_0$  is less than the global injectivity radius of  $L$ . Let  $\text{Pack}(\mathcal{D}, c_0, c_1, \dots, c_p)$  be the space of systems of multipatches

$$(3.2) \quad U_0 \supset U_1 \supset \cdots \supset U_{p-1} \supset U_p$$

in  $L$  where the string of finite sets and maps obtained by applying  $\pi_0$  to (3.2) is identified with  $\mathcal{D}$  in (3.1), and moreover, for  $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, p\}$ , the individual patches in  $U_j$  have radii  $\geq c_0 c_1 \cdots c_{j-1} c_j$ . (In the case  $p = 0$ , we can write  $\underline{k}_0$  instead of  $\mathcal{D}$ . There is a small distinction between  $\text{Pack}(\underline{k}_0, c_0)$  and  $\text{pack}(k_0, c_0)$  because in one of them we allow patches whose radii are at least  $c_0$ , whereas in the other one the patches must have radii equal to  $c_0$ . But the inclusion  $\text{pack}(k_0, c_0) \hookrightarrow \text{Pack}(\underline{k}_0, c_0)$  is clearly a homotopy equivalence.)

**Theorem 3.5.** *If  $c_0, c_1, \dots, c_p$  are sufficiently small, then the inclusion*

$$\text{Pack}(\mathcal{D}, c_0, c_1, \dots, c_p) \hookrightarrow \text{con}(L)_{\mathcal{D}}$$

*is a homotopy equivalence.*

*Proof.* (See remark 3.7 for an overview.) Let

$$\text{Pack}_1(\mathcal{D}, c_0, c_1, \dots, c_p) \subset \text{Pack}(\mathcal{D}, c_0, c_1, \dots, c_p)$$

be the subspace determined by the additional condition that the innermost multipatch, whose name is  $U_p$  in (3.2), must have all patch radii *equal* to  $c_0 c_1 \cdots c_p$ . It is clear that the inclusion of  $\text{Pack}_1(\mathcal{D}, c_0, c_1, \dots, c_p)$  in  $\text{Pack}(\mathcal{D}, c_0, c_1, \dots, c_p)$  is a homotopy equivalence. Therefore it is enough to investigate  $\text{Pack}_1(\mathcal{D}, c_0, c_1, \dots, c_p)$ .

Let  $d_p \mathcal{D}$  be the diagram obtained from  $\mathcal{D}$  by deleting the object  $\underline{k}_p$ . There is a forgetful map

$$(3.3) \quad \text{Pack}_1(\mathcal{D}, c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{p-1}, c_p) \longrightarrow \text{Pack}(d_p \mathcal{D}, c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{p-1}).$$

If we can show that this is a *weak Serre fibration*, see definition 3.6 below, then we can proceed by induction on  $p$ . Indeed we have a good understanding of the fibers of that forgetful map (by dint of proposition 3.4), and the case  $p = 0$ , the induction beginning, is taken care of by proposition 3.3. Therefore we concentrate on showing that (3.3) is a weak fibration. (This appears to be nontrivial even in the case where the Riemannian metric on  $L$  is flat.) Here we can again proceed by induction on the positive integer  $k_p$ . The case where the map from  $\underline{k}_p$  to  $\underline{k}_{p-1}$  in  $\mathcal{D}$  is injective is trivial, i.e., in that case (3.3) is clearly a weak fibration. In particular that takes care of the case  $k_p = 1$ . Suppose now that the map from  $\underline{k}_p$  to  $\underline{k}_{p-1}$  is not injective. Then  $k_p \geq 2$  and without loss of generality, the elements  $k_p$  and  $k_p - 1$  of  $\underline{k}_p$  both map to the same element of  $\underline{k}_{p-1}$ . Let  $\mathcal{D}'$  be the diagram

obtained from  $\mathcal{D}$  by deleting the element  $k_p$  from the set  $\underline{k}_p$ , and restricting the map  $\underline{k}_p \rightarrow \underline{k}_{p-1}$  accordingly. By inductive assumption, the forgetful map

$$(3.4) \quad \text{Pack}_1(\mathcal{D}', c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{p-1}, 3c_p) \longrightarrow \text{Pack}(d_p \mathcal{D}, c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{p-1})$$

is a weak Serre fibration. (Note that  $d_p \mathcal{D} = d_p \mathcal{D}'$ .) Let

$$W \subset \text{Pack}_1(\mathcal{D}, c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{p-1}, c_p)$$

be the preimage of  $\text{Pack}_1(\mathcal{D}', c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{p-1}, 3c_p)$  under the forgetful map

$$\text{Pack}_1(\mathcal{D}, c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{p-1}, c_p) \rightarrow \text{Pack}_1(\mathcal{D}', c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{p-1}, c_p).$$

(Strictly speaking it is incorrect to say that  $\text{Pack}_1(\mathcal{D}', c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{p-1}, 3c_p)$  is a subspace of  $\text{Pack}_1(\mathcal{D}', c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{p-1}, c_p)$ , but there is a preferred embedding of one into the other given by fattening the innermost multipatches.) By analogy with the proof of proposition 3.3, the map

$$(3.5) \quad W \longrightarrow \text{Pack}(d_p \mathcal{D}, c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{p-1})$$

obtained from (3.3) by restriction is also a weak Serre fibration, since it is the composition of the fiber bundle projection  $W \rightarrow \text{Pack}_1(\mathcal{D}', c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{p-1}, 3c_p)$  and the weak Serre fibration (3.4). Now it is almost true, though perhaps not quite true, that (3.3) is a fiberwise homotopy retract of (3.5). More precisely: the vector field argument from the proof of proposition 3.3 can be employed fiberwise to show that if  $K \subset \text{Pack}_1(\mathcal{D}, c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{p-1}, c_p)$  is any compact subset, then there exists a vertical homotopy

$$(h_t: K \rightarrow \text{Pack}_1(\mathcal{D}, c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{p-1}, c_p))_{t \in [0,1]}$$

such that  $h_0$  is the inclusion and  $h_1(K)$  is contained in  $W$ . (*Vertical* means that each  $h_t$  is a map over  $\text{Pack}(d_p \mathcal{D}, c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{p-1})$ .) Using that and the information that (3.5) is a weak Serre fibration, it is straightforward to deduce that (3.3) is also a weak Serre fibration.  $\square$

**Definition 3.6.** A map  $p: E \rightarrow B$  of spaces is a *weak Serre fibration* if the following holds. For every compact CW-space  $X$  with a map  $g: X \rightarrow E$  and a homotopy  $(h_t: X \rightarrow B)$  such that  $h_0 = pg$  and  $h_t = h_0$  for  $t$  in a neighborhood of  $0 \in [0, 1]$ , there exists a homotopy  $(H_t: X \rightarrow E)_{t \in [0,1]}$  such that  $H_0 = g$  and  $pH_t = h_t$  for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ . (This is a variant of the notion of *weak fibration*; see [7].)

**Remark 3.7.** The formulation of theorem 3.5 reflects the proof. An important guiding principle in that proof is that the face operator  $d_1: \text{con}(L)_1 \rightarrow \text{con}(L)_0$ , also known as *target*, has some good properties, such as being a Serre fibration. The face operator  $d_0$  from  $\text{con}(L)_1$  to  $\text{con}(L)_0$  cannot compete with that. Therefore, to find positive numbers  $c_0, c_1, \dots, c_p$  small enough in theorem 3.5, we determine first  $c_0$  which sets the lower bound for patch radii in  $U_0$  of (3.2), the ultimate target. The upper bound for allowed choices of  $c_0$  will depend strongly on the metric properties of  $L$ , such as diameter, curvature and the like. Then we select  $c_1$ . Together,  $c_0$  and  $c_1$  determine the lower bound  $c_0 c_1$  for patch radii in  $U_1$  of (3.2). (Therefore  $c_1$  has the purpose of a ratio.) The upper bound for the choice of  $c_1$  depends less strongly on the metric properties of  $L$ , especially in the limit  $c_0 \rightarrow 0$ , because it only reflects the Riemannian metric properties of disks or open balls in  $L$  of radius  $\leq c_0$  (which we may rescale to radius 1 without losing essential information). Then we select  $c_2, c_3, \dots, c_p$  in the same manner. The upper bounds for  $c_1, c_2, \dots, c_p$  may depend

on  $c_0$  but they converge to the same positive real number for  $c_0 \rightarrow 0$ , and that positive real number does not even depend on  $L$ .

**Corollary 3.8.** *For every choice of positive integers  $r$  and  $\alpha$  there exist a positive real number  $\rho$  and a simplicial subspace  $X^{\text{fat}}$  of the  $r$ -skeleton  $\text{sk}_r \text{ucon}(L; \alpha)$  such that every patch in a multipatch  $V \in X_0^{\text{fat}}$  has radius  $\geq \rho$ , and the inclusion of  $X^{\text{fat}}$  in  $\text{sk}_r \text{ucon}(L; \alpha)$  is a weak equivalence.*

*Proof.* By theorem 3.5, for every diagram

$$\mathcal{D} = (\underline{k}_0 \xleftarrow{g_1} \underline{k}_1 \xleftarrow{g_2} \dots \xleftarrow{g_{p-1}} \underline{k}_{p-1} \xleftarrow{g_p} \underline{k}_p) \in (\text{NFin})_p,$$

positive real numbers  $b_0, \dots, b_p$  can be selected, all  $\leq 1$  with the possible exception of  $b_0$ , such that the inclusion of  $\text{Pack}(\mathcal{D}, c_0, \dots, c_p)$  in  $\text{con}(L)_{\mathcal{D}}$  is a homotopy equivalence whenever  $0 < c_j \leq b_j$  for all  $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, p\}$ . The selection can be made in such a way that  $b_j = 1$  whenever  $g_j$  is injective. It is a trivial matter to translate this into a statement about the unordered configuration category, but it is convenient to keep the diagram  $\mathcal{D}$ . Therefore we write  $\text{Pack}([\mathcal{D}], c_0, \dots, c_p)$  and  $\text{ucon}(L)_{[\mathcal{D}]}$ . Let  $b$  be the minimum of all the  $b_j$  obtained in this way, for all  $\mathcal{D} \in (\text{NFin})_p$  involving only objects of  $\text{Fin}$  of cardinality  $\leq \alpha$ , and all  $p \leq r$ . This is still a positive real number. By definition, the preimage of  $[\mathcal{D}]$  in  $X_p^{\text{fat}}$  is  $\text{Pack}([\mathcal{D}], c_0, \dots, c_p)$ , where  $c_0, c_1, \dots, c_p$  depend on  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $r$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} c_0 c_1 \dots c_p &= b^{1+r}; \\ c_j &= 1 \text{ if } j > 0 \text{ and } g_j \text{ is injective,} \\ c_j &= b \text{ if } j > 0 \text{ and } g_j \text{ is not injective.} \end{aligned}$$

This defines  $X^{\text{fat}}$  in degrees  $p \leq r$ . By inspection, the simplicial operators in  $\text{sk}_r \text{ucon}(L; \alpha)$  respect  $X^{\text{fat}}$  as long as they are induced by morphisms  $[p] \rightarrow [q]$  in  $\Delta$  where  $p, q \leq r$ . There is exactly one way to finish the construction of  $X^{\text{fat}}$  in such a way that it is a simplicial subspace of  $\text{sk}_r \text{ucon}(L; \alpha)$ . The inclusion of  $X^{\text{fat}}$  in  $\text{sk}_r \text{ucon}(L; \alpha)$  is a degreewise weak equivalence. This is true by theorem 3.5 in degrees  $\leq r$ . In degrees  $> r$  it is an easy consequence of the statement for degrees  $\leq r$  and the observation that both  $X^{\text{fat}}$  and  $\text{sk}_r \text{ucon}(L; \alpha)$  are Reedy cofibrant simplicial spaces. — Therefore  $\rho := b^{1+r}$  is a correct decision.  $\square$

#### 4. PERTURBATION AND TOLERANCE

*Vocabulary and notation:* see section A.

In this section we assume that  $M$  is a Riemannian manifold and  $L$  is a compact smooth submanifold of  $M$  (both without boundary). Then  $L$  inherits a Riemannian metric from  $M$ , and we assume that  $L$  is totally geodesic in  $M$  (all geodesics in  $L$  are also geodesics in  $M$ ) and that  $M$  is geodesically complete. For simplicity we also assume that  $M$  is connected. Then the Riemannian metric on  $M$  induces an honest metric  $d_M$  on  $M$ , the geodesic distance.

We also want to speak of a preferred inclusion of  $\text{ucon}(L)$  in  $\text{ucon}(M)$ . This should be “induced” by the inclusion  $L \rightarrow M$ . On objects, the idea is therefore that we take a multipatch in  $L$  with center points  $z_1, z_2, \dots, z_k$  and radii  $c_1, c_2, \dots, c_k$  to the multipatch in  $M$  with the same center points  $z_1, z_2, \dots, z_k$  and the same radii. But this may not work. We are on the safe side if we assume that for every  $z \in L$  the injectivity radius of  $M$  at  $z$  agrees with the injectivity radius of  $L$  at  $z$ . This is quite a strong condition on the inclusion  $L \hookrightarrow M$ .

**Definition 4.1.** Let  $U$  be an open subset of  $L$ . For  $\varepsilon > 0$  we denote by  $\Theta_\varepsilon U \subset M$  the  $\varepsilon$ -thickening of  $U$  in  $M$ , in other words, the union of all metric open balls in  $M$  with center in  $U$  and radius  $\varepsilon$ . Nota bene: we assumed  $U \subset L$ , but  $\Theta_\varepsilon U$  is an open subset of  $M$ .

**Definition 4.2.** Let  $\varepsilon$  and  $\delta$  be positive real numbers. A map from  $\text{ucon}_\delta(L; \alpha)$  to  $\varphi\text{ucon}(M)$  over  $\text{uFin}$  is  $\varepsilon$ -bounded if for every open subset  $U$  of  $L$ , the map takes  $\text{ucon}_\delta(U; \alpha)$  to  $\varphi\text{ucon}(\Theta_\varepsilon U)$ .

More generally, let  $f$  be a  $k$ -simplex in  $\text{map}(\text{ucon}_\delta(L; \alpha), \varphi\text{ucon}(M))$ . This can be thought of as a family of maps  $f_z : \text{ucon}_\delta(L; \alpha) \rightarrow \varphi\text{ucon}(M)$  depending continuously on  $z \in \Delta^k$ . Consequently we say that  $f$  is  $\varepsilon$ -bounded if each  $f_z$  is  $\varepsilon$ -bounded.

*Remarks.* i) It is sensible, though not compulsory, to require  $\varepsilon \geq \delta$  because otherwise the standard inclusion  $\text{ucon}_\delta(L; \alpha) \rightarrow \varphi\text{ucon}(M)$  will find it difficult to be  $\varepsilon$ -bounded. ii) Remember lemma 3.1.

Let  $Z_\varepsilon \subset \text{map}(\text{ucon}_\delta(L; \alpha), \varphi\text{ucon}(M))$  be the simplicial subset consisting of the  $\varepsilon$ -bounded simplices.

**Theorem 4.3.** *For every choice of  $\alpha$  there exist  $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$ , where  $\varepsilon > \delta$ , such that the inclusion  $Z_\varepsilon \rightarrow \text{map}(\text{ucon}_\delta(L; \alpha), \varphi\text{ucon}(M))$  is based nullhomotopic.*

*Clarification.* The real number  $\varepsilon$  depends on  $L$  and  $M$  with their Riemannian metrics, and on  $\alpha$ . Meaning of *the inclusion is based nullhomotopic*: the inclusion is based homotopic to the constant map which takes everything to the base point. Remember that we have taken some care to set up a base point for  $\text{map}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}_\delta(L; \alpha), \varphi\text{ucon}(M))$ .

*Proof of theorem 4.3.* The finite presentation result of [4] says that for large enough  $r$ , the  $r$ -skeleton  $\text{sk}_r \text{con}(L; \alpha)$  of  $\text{ucon}(L; \alpha)$  contains a finite presentation of  $\text{ucon}(L; \alpha)$ . Therefore it suffices to show: for every  $r \geq 1$  there exist  $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$  such that the composition

$$Z_\varepsilon \hookrightarrow \text{map}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}_\delta(L; \alpha), \varphi\text{ucon}(M)) \xrightarrow{\text{res.}} \text{map}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{sk}_r \text{ucon}_\delta(L; \alpha), \varphi\text{ucon}(M))$$

is nullhomotopic.

Here is an overview of the rest of the proof. Let us write  $X^{\text{lean}}$  for  $\text{sk}_r \text{ucon}_\delta(L; \alpha)$ , simplicial subspace of  $\text{sk}_r \text{ucon}(L; \alpha)$ . By imposing certain *lower* bounds on the radii of patches in multipatches, we define another simplicial subspace  $X^{\text{fat}}$  of  $\text{sk}_r \text{ucon}(L; \alpha)$ ; this was done already in corollary 3.8. The inclusion of  $X^{\text{fat}}$  in  $\text{sk}_r \text{ucon}(L; \alpha)$  is a degreewise weak equivalence by construction. Also by construction,  $X^{\text{lean}}$  and  $X^{\text{fat}}$  are degreewise disjoint simplicial subspaces of  $\text{sk}_r \text{ucon}(L; \alpha)$ . Another simplicial subspace  $X$  of  $\text{sk}_r \text{ucon}(L; \alpha)$  will be defined which contains the (disjoint) union of  $X^{\text{lean}}$  and  $X^{\text{fat}}$ , and then some more to ensure that the inclusion  $X \rightarrow \text{sk}_r \text{ucon}(L; \alpha)$  is a good approximation. It turns out to be a conservatization

map. Then we construct the broken arrow in a strictly commutative diagram

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & \text{map}_{\mathbf{uFin}}(X^{\text{fat}}, \varphi(\mathbf{ucon}(M))) & \\ & \nearrow \text{trivial map} & \uparrow \text{restriction} \\ Z_{\varepsilon, r} & \xrightarrow{\text{dotted}} \text{map}_{\mathbf{uFin}}(X, \varphi(\mathbf{ucon}(M))) & \\ & \searrow \text{forgetful} & \downarrow \text{restriction} \\ & \text{map}_{\mathbf{uFin}}(X^{\text{lean}}, \varphi(\mathbf{ucon}(M))) & \end{array}$$

The two vertical arrows are weak equivalences since the inclusion maps  $X^{\text{fat}} \rightarrow X$  and  $X^{\text{lean}} \rightarrow X$  are weak equivalences modulo conservatization, and the common target  $\varphi(\mathbf{ucon}(M))$  is conservative. This completes the argument. It does not construct an explicit nullhomotopy. Instead it proceeds by making a few useful homotopy equivalences. (*End of overview.*)

First order of business: definition of  $X^{\text{fat}}$  and the choice of  $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$ . For  $X^{\text{fat}}$  we can take the construction in the proof of corollary 3.8. The only condition on  $\varepsilon$  is  $\varepsilon < \rho/2$ , where  $\rho$  is the lower bound in corollary 3.8, also known as  $b^{1+r}$ . The only condition on  $\delta$  is  $\delta < \varepsilon/2$ .

The next order of business is the definition of  $X$ , again a simplicial subspace of  $\text{sk}_r \mathbf{ucon}(L; \alpha)$ . For motivation and warm-up, let us take the view that  $\text{sk}_r \mathbf{ucon}(L; \alpha)$  is a Segal space *in degrees*  $\leq r$ , fiberwise complete over the nerve of  $\mathbf{uFin}$ . (The prefix  $\text{sk}_r$  has done some damage to the Segal property.) Consequently  $X^{\text{fat}}$  and  $X^{\text{lean}}$  are both Segal spaces *in degrees*  $\leq r$ , fiberwise complete over the nerve of  $\mathbf{uFin}$ . (The inclusions  $X^{\text{fat}} \rightarrow \text{sk}_r \mathbf{ucon}(L; \alpha)$  and  $X^{\text{lean}} \rightarrow \text{sk}_r \mathbf{ucon}(L; \alpha)$  are degreewise weak equivalences.) As noted in the overview,  $X^{\text{fat}}$  and  $X^{\text{lean}}$  are degreewise disjoint as simplicial subspaces of  $\text{sk}_r \mathbf{ucon}(L; \alpha)$  (because multipatches in  $L$  which are objects of  $X^{\text{fat}}$  have all patch radii  $> 2\varepsilon$ , whereas multipatches which are objects of  $X^{\text{lean}}$  have all patch radii  $< \varepsilon/2$ ). We wish to define  $X$  as a simplicial subspace of  $\text{sk}_r \mathbf{ucon}(L; \alpha)$ , in such a way that it is also a Segal space in degrees  $\leq r$ . It must contain  $X^{\text{fat}}$  and  $X^{\text{lean}}$ . It should not contain objects other than those in  $X^{\text{fat}}$  and  $X^{\text{lean}}$ . It should however contain “most” of the morphisms in  $\mathbf{ucon}(L; \alpha)$  from objects in  $X^{\text{lean}}$  to objects in  $X^{\text{fat}}$ . (There are no morphisms in  $\mathbf{ucon}(L; \alpha)$  from objects in  $X^{\text{fat}}$  to objects in  $X^{\text{lean}}$ .) To be precise: a morphism in  $\mathbf{ucon}(L; \alpha)$  from an object in  $X^{\text{lean}}$  to an object in  $X^{\text{fat}}$  (which is an inclusion  $U \rightarrow V$  of multipatches) qualifies as a morphism in  $X$  if the closure of  $U$  in  $V$  has distance  $> 2\varepsilon$  from the boundary of  $V$  in  $L$ . Therefore  $X_n$  for  $n \leq r$  is the space of systems of multipatches

$$(4.2) \quad U_0 \supset U_1 \supset \cdots \supset U_{n-1} \supset U_n$$

in  $L$  satisfying one of the following (mutually exclusive) conditions (i),(ii),(iii).

- (i) The entire system is an element in degree  $n$  of  $X^{\text{fat}}$ .
- (ii) The entire system is an element in degree  $n$  of  $X^{\text{lean}}$ .
- (iii) There exists  $p \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, n\}$  such that  $U_{p+1} \supset U_{p+2} \supset \cdots \supset U_{n-1} \supset U_n$  is an element of  $X^{\text{lean}}$  in degree  $n - p - 1$  and  $U_0 \supset U_1 \supset \cdots \supset U_{p-1} \supset U_p$

is an element of  $X^{\text{fat}}$  in degree  $p$ , and the closure of  $U_{p+1}$  in  $U_p$  has distance  $> 2\varepsilon$  from the boundary of  $U_p$  in  $L$ .

We give almost the same definition for  $p > r$ , but then we require in addition that  $U_0 \supset U_1 \supset \cdots \supset U_{n-1} \supset U_n$  is an element of  $\text{sk}_r \text{ucon}(L; \alpha)$  in degree  $p$ . Equivalently, at least  $n - r$  of the containments  $U_{j-1} \supset U_j$  are identities.

By inspection,  $X$  is a Segal space in degree  $\leq r$ . As such it is also fiberwise complete over the nerve of  $\text{uFin}$ . But it is not conservative over the nerve of  $\text{uFin}$  (except perhaps for some extreme choices of  $L$ , such as  $L = \emptyset$ ). Indeed, there are elements in  $X_1$  of the form  $U_0 \supset U_1$  where  $U_0$  is an element of  $X^{\text{fat}}$  in degree 0 and  $U_1$  is an element of  $X^{\text{lean}}$  in degree 0, and the inclusion induces a bijection  $\pi_0(U_1) \rightarrow \pi_0(U_0)$ . These do not qualify as homotopy invertible elements in  $X_1$ .

The Segal space  $X$  comes with an important simplicial map  $w$  to  $\Delta[1]$ , the nerve of  $[1]^{\text{op}}$ . This expresses the fact that objects of  $X$  belong either to  $X^{\text{fat}}$ , in which case  $w$  takes them to 0, or to  $X^{\text{lean}}$ , in which case  $w$  takes them to 1.

Next order of business: construction of the broken arrow in diagram (4.1). Readers are advised to try a construction of their own making, but if none is forthcoming then they should read on. Let  $f$  be a 0-simplex of  $Z_{\varepsilon, r}$ . (We ought to begin with: *let  $f$  be a  $j$ -simplex of  $Z_{\varepsilon, r}$* , but we take  $j = 0$  and leave the generalization to arbitrary  $j \geq 0$  to the reader. Remember that a  $j$ -simplex of  $Z_{\varepsilon, r}$  is nothing but a family of 0-simplices of  $Z_{\varepsilon, r}$  parametrized continuously by  $\Delta^k$ .) Then  $f$  restricts to a map from  $X^{\text{lean}}$  to  $\varphi \text{ucon}(M)$ , which we still denote by  $f$ . We must extend this to a map  $f^!$  defined on  $X$  in such a way that  $f^!$  also extends the standard inclusion  $\iota: \text{sk}_r \text{ucon}(L; \alpha) \rightarrow \text{ucon}(M)$  restricted to  $X^{\text{fat}}$ . In the language and notation of section C, the construction of  $f^!$  can be indicated by the following diagram. Write  $N\mathcal{P}$  for  $\text{ucon}(L; \alpha)$  and  $N\mathcal{Q}$  for  $\text{ucon}(M)$ . These are nerves of topological posets  $\mathcal{P}$  resp.  $\mathcal{Q}$ , because we are using the Riemannian patch models for the configuration categories. The goal is now to define  $f^!: X \rightarrow \varphi N\mathcal{Q}$ .

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} X & & \varphi N\mathcal{Q} \\ \text{(incl., } w) \downarrow & \searrow \text{---} & \uparrow \varphi(\text{proj.}) \\ N\mathcal{P} \times \Delta[1] & & \varphi(N\mathcal{Q} \times \Delta[1]) \\ \text{sep. diag., defn. C.6} \downarrow & & \downarrow \varphi(\text{sep. diag.}) \\ N\mathcal{P} * N\mathcal{P} & \xrightarrow{\iota * f} & N\mathcal{Q} * \varphi N\mathcal{Q} \xrightarrow{\text{defn. C.7}} \varphi(N\mathcal{Q} * N\mathcal{Q}) \end{array}$$

The vertical arrow in the right-hand column with the label  $\varphi(\text{sep. diag.})$  is an embedding. It follows that the broken arrow is unique if it exists. We have to show that it exists, i.e., that the image of the map  $X \rightarrow \varphi(N\mathcal{Q} * N\mathcal{Q})$  obtained by going along the lower circuit is contained in the image of the map with the label  $\varphi(\text{sep. diag.})$ . We begin with an  $n \in \{0, 1, \dots, r\}$  and an element (4.2) of  $X_n$ . In the cases (i) and (ii) of (4.2), there is nothing to verify, so we can assume (iii). Moving forward to  $N\mathcal{Q} * \varphi N\mathcal{Q}$  in (4.3), we obtain the element

$$(\iota(U_0 \supset \cdots \supset U_p), f(U_{p+1} \supset \cdots \supset U_n)) \in N\mathcal{Q}_p \times (\varphi N\mathcal{Q})_{n-p-1} \subset (N\mathcal{Q} * \varphi N\mathcal{Q})_n.$$

The important observation to make now is that

$$(4.4) \quad f(U_{p+1} \supset \cdots \supset U_n) \in (\varphi \text{ucon}(\iota(U_p)))_{n-p-1} \subset (\varphi N\mathcal{Q})_{n-p-1}$$



by (iii) and our assumptions on  $f$ . Now we can apply lemma C.8 and it follows that the broken arrow in (4.3) exists.

There is something tedious left to do under the same heading. The extension  $f^!$  of  $f$  (restricted to  $\text{sk}_r\text{ucon}_\delta(L; \alpha)$ ) has been defined, but it remains to be shown that it is a map over  $\text{uFin}$ . We adopt the point of view developed at the end of section A, after definition A.5 and in lemma A.6. Arguments similar to those which led to lemma A.6 will be used. Therefore, to turn  $f^!$  into a map over  $\text{uFin}$  we require, for every element  $V$  of  $X_0$  (which is a multipatch in  $L$ ), a preferred bijection

$$\omega_V : \pi_0(V) \rightarrow \pi_0(f^!(V)).$$

We have this already because  $V$  belongs either to  $X^{\text{lean}}$ , in which case  $\omega_V$  comes with the package  $f$ , or  $V$  belongs to  $X^{\text{fat}}$ , in which case  $f^!(V) = \iota(V)$  and we define  $\omega_V$  to be the bijection induced by the inclusion of  $V$  in  $\iota(V)$ . It remains only to test for naturality. Suppose that  $U$  and  $V$  are elements of  $X_0$  (multipatches in  $L$ ) such that  $U \subset V$ . Then we must show that the diagram of finite sets

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \pi_0(U) & \xrightarrow{\omega_U} & \pi_0(f^!(U)) \\ \text{ind. by incl.} \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{determined by } f^!(V \supset U) \\ \pi_0(V) & \xrightarrow{\omega_V} & \pi_0(f^!(V)) \end{array}$$

commutes. We must not take for granted that  $f^!(U)$  is contained in  $f^!(V)$ . The cases where  $U$  and  $V$  are both in  $X^{\text{lean}}$  or both in  $X^{\text{fat}}$  are nevertheless trivial. Therefore we may assume that  $U$  belongs to  $X_0^{\text{lean}}$  and  $V$  belongs to  $X_0^{\text{fat}}$ . Then (4.5) simplifies to

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \pi_0(U) & \xrightarrow{\omega_U} & \pi_0(f(U)) \\ \text{ind. by incl.} \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{det. by } f^!(V \supset U) \\ \pi_0(V) & \xrightarrow{\text{ind. by incl.}} & \pi_0(\iota(V)) \end{array}$$

Reasoning as in lemma A.6, we can reduce to the situation where  $\pi_0(U)$  has only one element. More precisely, let  $U_0$  be a connected component of  $U$ . Then (4.6) expands to

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \pi_0(U_0) & \xrightarrow{\omega_{U_0}} & \pi_0(f(U_0)) \\ \text{ind. by incl.} \downarrow & \text{det. by } f(U \supset U_0) \downarrow & \downarrow \\ \pi_0(U) & \xrightarrow{\omega_U} & \pi_0(f(U)) \\ \text{ind. by incl.} \downarrow & \text{det. by } f^!(V \supset U) \downarrow & \downarrow \\ \pi_0(V) & \xrightarrow{\text{ind. by incl.}} & \pi_0(\iota(V)) \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \swarrow \\ \text{det. by } f^!(V \supset U_0) \\ \searrow \end{array}$$

Here the upper square commutes, and the deformed triangle commutes because we have  $f^!(V \supset U \supset U_0)$ , an element in degree 2 of  $\varphi\text{ucon}(M)$ . So if the outer rectangle in (4.7) commutes for every choice of component  $U_0 \subset U$ , then the lower square commutes. — Now we may assume that  $U$  has only one connected component. Let  $V_0$  be the connected component of  $V$  containing  $U$ . Then  $(V_0 \supset U)$  is an

element of  $X$  in degree 1, and  $(V \supset V_0 \supset U)$  is an element of  $X$  in degree 2, and so diagram (4.6) can be expanded as follows:

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \pi_0(U) & \xrightarrow{\omega_U} & \pi_0(f(U)) \\ \text{ind. by incl.} \downarrow & \det. \text{ by } f^!(V_0 \supset U) \downarrow & \downarrow \\ \pi_0(V_0) & \xrightarrow{\text{ind. by incl.}} & \pi_0(\iota(V_0)) \\ \text{ind. by incl.} \downarrow & \text{ind. by incl.} \downarrow & \downarrow \\ \pi_0(V) & \xrightarrow{\text{ind. by incl.}} & \pi_0(\iota(V)) \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \swarrow \\ \det. \text{ by } f^!(V \supset U) \\ \searrow \end{array}$$

Here the upper square commutes for a trivial reason, and the lower square commutes for another trivial reason. The deformed triangle commutes because we have the element  $f^!(V \supset V_0 \supset U)$  in degree 2 of  $\mathbf{ucon}(M)$ . So (4.8) commutes, and therefore (4.5) commutes.

Next and last order of business in this proof: showing that the inclusion of  $X$  in  $Y := \mathbf{sk}_r \mathbf{ucon}(L; \alpha)$  is a conservatization map. There is a good reason why this should be so: the inclusion  $X \hookrightarrow Y$  has a factorization

$$(4.9) \quad X \xrightarrow{(\text{incl.}, w)} Y \times \Delta[1] \xrightarrow{\text{proj.}} Y$$

where the first arrow is a weak equivalence (by inspection). Here we view  $Y$  as a simplicial space with reference map  $Y \rightarrow \mathbf{uFin}$ , as usual, and we view  $\Delta[1]$  as a simplicial space with reference map  $v: \Delta[1] \rightarrow \Delta[0]$ . Therefore  $Y \times \Delta[1]$  is a simplicial space with reference map to  $\mathbf{uFin} \times \Delta[0] \cong \mathbf{uFin}$ . In this situation proposition D.6 states that the conservatization  $\Lambda$  respects products. (We use a new incarnation  $\Lambda^{\text{cla}}$  of the conservation procedure here, but we write  $\Lambda$  for short. See section D.) Therefore the map

$$\text{id}_Y \times v: Y \times \Delta[1] \rightarrow Y \times \Delta[0]$$

is a conservatization map over  $\mathbf{uFin} \times \Delta[0] \cong \mathbf{uFin}$  because  $\text{id}: Y \rightarrow Y$  is a conservatization map over  $\mathbf{uFin}$  and  $\Delta[1] \rightarrow \Delta[0]$  is a conservatization map over  $\Delta[0]$ . This completes the verification that  $X \rightarrow Y$  is a conservatization map, and thereby the proof as a whole.  $\square$

## 5. PARTITIONS OF UNITY IN A SIMPLICIAL SETTING

Let  $Y$  be a space and let  $\mathcal{U} = (U_i)_{i \in J}$  be an open cover of  $Y$ . For every finite nonempty subset  $S$  of  $J$ , write  $U_S = \bigcap_{i \in S} U_i$ . Then  $S \mapsto U_S$  is a contravariant functor from the poset of nonempty subsets of  $J$  to spaces. There is a standard projection map

$$(5.1) \quad \text{hocolim}_{\text{fte nonempty } S \subset J} U_S \longrightarrow Y = \text{colim}_{\text{fte nonempty } S \subset J} U_S.$$

**Lemma 5.1.** (Segal [21, §4].) *If  $Y$  is paracompact, then (5.1) is a homotopy equivalence.*  $\square$

We repeat some of Segal's arguments because we want to make a statement which is stronger in some respects. The official definition of the hocolim in (5.1) is

$$\coprod_S A_S \times U_S / \text{relations}$$

where  $S$  is a nonempty finite subset of  $J$  and  $A_S$  is the classifying space of the poset of nonempty subsets of  $S$ . (The relations in the denominator of the “fraction” are of the coend type; indeed,  $S \mapsto A_S$  is a covariant functor and  $S \mapsto U_S$  is contravariant.) There is a natural identification of  $A_S$  with  $\Delta(S)$ , the simplex spanned by  $S$ . Therefore the source in (5.1) can be written as

$$\coprod_S \Delta(S) \times U_S / \text{relations.}$$

A partition of unity  $(\psi_i: Y \rightarrow [0, 1])_{i \in J}$  subordinate to the cover  $\mathcal{U}$  gives rise to a map from  $Y$  to  $\text{hocolim}_S U_S$  which takes  $x \in Y$  to the element represented by

$$((\psi_i(x))_{i \in T}, x) \in \Delta(T) \times U_T$$

where  $T$  is the finite nonempty set  $\{i \in J \mid \psi_i(x) > 0\}$ . We are using barycentric coordinates in  $\Delta(T)$ . It is easily seen that this map from  $Y$  to  $\text{hocolim}_S U_S$  is continuous, and that it defines a section of (5.1). This is our cue for making a stronger statement.

**Lemma 5.2.** *The space of sections of (5.1) can be identified with the space  $\mathcal{P}(Y, \mathcal{U})$  of partitions of unity subordinate to  $\mathcal{U}$ .*

Here it is necessary to explain what is meant by *space of sections* and the like. In the absence of an obvious or otherwise preferred topology on the set of such sections, we define the space of sections as a simplicial set. A  $k$ -simplex is a map from  $\Delta^k \times Y$  to  $\text{hocolim}_S U_S$  such that (post-)composition with (5.1) gives the projection from  $\Delta^k \times Y$  to  $Y$ . Similarly,  $\mathcal{P}(Y, \mathcal{U})$  is a simplicial set. A  $k$ -simplex is a partition of unity subordinate to the open cover  $(\Delta^k \times U_i)_{i \in J}$  of  $\Delta^k \times Y$ .

As regards the proof of lemma 5.2, the arguments already given can be extended mechanically to give us a map from  $\mathcal{P}(Y, \mathcal{U})$  to the space (simplicial set) of sections of (5.1). This is injective by inspection. Surprisingly, it is in fact bijective. See [24, Lem. 2.3]. (Keep in mind that the hocolim in (5.1) was *not* defined to be a subspace of  $\Delta(J) \times Y$ , not even in the cases where  $J$  is finite. It has a continuous and injective map to  $\Delta(J) \times Y$ , but often this is not a topological embedding. Example: take  $Y = [0, 1]$ , let  $J = \{0, 1\}$  and let  $\mathcal{U}$  be the open cover consisting of  $U_0 = Y \setminus \{0\}$  and  $U_1 = Y \setminus \{1\}$ . Then the hocolim is the homotopy pushout of the diagram  $U_0 \leftarrow U_0 \cap U_1 \rightarrow U_1$ . It is not metrizable and is consequently not homeomorphic to any subspace of  $\Delta^1 \times [0, 1]$  whatsoever.)

The following two lemmas are in the nature of observations.

**Lemma 5.3.** *If  $Y$  is a paracompact space and  $\mathcal{U} = (U_i)_{i \in J}$  is an open cover of  $Y$ , then  $\mathcal{P}(Y, \mathcal{U})$  is a contractible simplicial set. It is also fibrant, i.e., it has the Kan filling property.  $\square$*

**Lemma 5.4.** *If  $Y$  is a paracompact space,  $\mathcal{U} = (U_i)_{i \in J}$  is an open cover of  $Y$  and  $C$  is a closed subspace of  $Y$ , then the forgetful map of simplicial sets*

$$\mathcal{P}(Y, \mathcal{U}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}(C, \mathcal{U}_C)$$

(where  $\mathcal{U}_C := (U_i \cap C)_{i \in J}$ ) *is a Kan fibration.  $\square$*

Next we will develop simplicial variants of lemmas 5.1 and 5.2. So let  $Y$  be a *simplicial* space. Suppose that  $Y_0$  is equipped with an open cover  $\mathcal{U} = (U_i)_{i \in J}$ . For  $j \in [k]$  let  $e_{k,j}: Y_k \rightarrow Y_0$  be the face operator determined by the morphism  $[0] \rightarrow [k]$  in  $\Delta$  taking 0 to  $j$ . We write

$U(k, j)_i$  for the preimage of  $U_i$  under  $e_{k,j}$  (an open subset of  $Y_k$ );  
 similarly  $U(k, j)_S$  for the preimage of  $U_S$  (where  $S \subset J$  is finite, nonempty);  
 $\mathcal{U}(k, j)$  for the open cover of  $Y_k$  determined by  $\mathcal{U}$ , open cover of  $Y_0$ , and  
 pullback along  $e_{k,j}$ .

We make the following assumptions.

- $Y$  is degreewise paracompact Hausdorff and Reedy cofibrant.
- For each  $i \in J$ , we have the following inclusions of open subsets of  $Y_k$ :

$$U(k, 0)_i \subset U(k, 1)_i \subset \cdots \subset U(k, k)_i.$$

Let  $S$  be a finite nonempty subset of  $J$ . Then  $[k] \mapsto U(k, 0)_S$  defines a simplicial subspace of  $Y$ .

**Proposition 5.5.** *There exists a factorization as in*

$$(5.2) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & \text{hocolim} & ([k] \mapsto U(k, 0)_S) \\ & \text{fte nonempty } S \subset J & \\ \varphi^{\text{la}} Y & \xrightarrow{\simeq} & Y \\ & \nearrow & \downarrow \simeq \end{array}$$

where the horizontal arrow is adjoint to the inclusion of  $Y$  in  $\varphi Y$ .

(The hocolim is a degreewise hocolim of simplicial spaces. The vertical arrow is a levelwise homotopy equivalence by lemma 5.1. The factorization is strict.)

*Proof.* For this undertaking we need:

- (i) for every  $p \geq 0$  and every string of  $p$  composable morphisms

$$\mathcal{D} : \quad [k_0] \xleftarrow{g_1} [k_1] \xleftarrow{g_2} [k_2] \xleftarrow{g_3} \cdots \xleftarrow{g_p} [k_p]$$

in  $\Delta_{\text{inj}}$ , a  $p$ -simplex  $\sigma(\mathcal{D})$  in  $\mathcal{P}(Y_{k_0}, \mathcal{U}(k_0, a))$  where  $a = g_1 g_2 \cdots g_p(0)$ .

The simplices  $\sigma(\mathcal{D})$  are jointly subject to the following condition:

- (ii)  $f^*(\sigma(\mathcal{D}))$  is in agreement with  $\sigma(f^*\mathcal{D})$  whenever  $f: [p_1] \rightarrow [p_0]$  is a morphism in  $\Delta$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  is a string of  $p_0$  composable morphisms in  $\Delta_{\text{inj}}$ .

The agreement asked for is an equality of  $p_1$ -simplices in the simplicial set which is the home of  $\sigma(\mathcal{D})$  and  $f^*(\sigma(\mathcal{D}))$ , but  $\sigma(f^*\mathcal{D})$  is a  $p_1$ -simplex in

$$\mathcal{P}(Y_{k_{f(0)}}, \mathcal{U}(k_{f(0)}, b))$$

where  $b = g_{f(0)+1} g_{f(0)+2} \cdots g_{f(p_1)}(0)$ . The request is meaningful because there is a simplicial map

$$\mathcal{P}(Y_{k_{f(0)}}, \mathcal{U}(k_{f(0)}, b)) \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}(Y_{k_0}, \mathcal{U}(k_0, a))$$

by pullback along the face operator  $Y_{k_0} \rightarrow Y_{k_{f(0)}}$  determined by the morphism

$$g_1 g_2 \cdots g_{f(0)} : [k_{f(0)}] \rightarrow [k_0]$$

in  $\Delta_{\text{inj}}$ . This uses also that  $a \geq g_1 g_2 \cdots g_{f(0)}(b)$ .

We have to impose one more condition. Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a diagram in  $\Delta_{\text{inj}}$  as before and let  $s: [k_0] \rightarrow [l_0]$  be a *surjective* morphism in  $\Delta$ . Then diagram  $\mathcal{D}$  can be uniquely

completed to a commutative diagram of the form

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \mathcal{D} : & [k_0] & \xleftarrow{g_1} & [k_1] & \xleftarrow{g_2} & [k_2] & \xleftarrow{g_3} \cdots \xleftarrow{g_p} [k_p] \\ & \downarrow s & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{E} : & [\ell_0] & \xleftarrow{h_1} & [\ell_1] & \xleftarrow{h_2} & [\ell_2] & \xleftarrow{h_3} \cdots \xleftarrow{h_p} [\ell_p] \end{array}$$

in  $\Delta$ , where the arrows in the lower row (and in the upper row) belong to  $\Delta_{\text{inj}}$ . Now the new condition:

(iii)  $\sigma(\mathcal{D})$  is taken to  $\sigma(\mathcal{E})$  under the map

$$\mathcal{P}(Y_{k_0}, \mathcal{U}(k_0, a)) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(Y_{\ell_0}, \mathcal{U}(\ell_0, s(a)))$$

induced by the degeneracy operator  $s^*: Y_{\ell_0} \rightarrow Y_{k_0}$ .

Condition (ii) refers only to the face operators in  $Y$ , whereas condition (iii) refers mainly to the degeneracy operators in  $Y$ .

We begin with the constructing of a collection  $(\sigma(\mathcal{D}))$  satisfying (i), (ii) and (iii). It will proceed by induction on  $(p, k_0)$ , where  $p$  is the length of  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $[k_0]$  is the ultimate target. We use the lexicographic ordering on the set of such pairs  $(p, k_0)$ . The induction therefore begins with  $p = 0$ ,  $k_0 = 0$  and continues with  $p = 0$ ,  $k_0 = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ . The induction steps here (where  $p = 0$  is fixed) grapple with condition (iii) only. Lemma 5.4 makes a contribution. Then we make the step from  $p = 0$  to  $p = 1$ , and this is where condition (ii) becomes important.

*Cases  $p = 0$ ,  $k := k_0$  arbitrary.* Here we have to select a 0-simplex in

$$\mathcal{P}(Y_k, \mathcal{U}(k, 0)),$$

in other words a partition of unity on  $Y_k$  subordinate to the cover  $\mathcal{U}(k, 0)$ . We proceed by induction on  $k$ . For  $k = 0$ , there is no further condition to be satisfied and a solution exists by lemma 5.3. For  $k > 0$ , the partition of unity is already prescribed (by inductive assumption) on the degenerate part of  $Y_k$ , also known as  $\text{latch}_k Y \subset Y_k$ . The induction step can be carried out by lemma 5.4.

*Cases  $p = 1$ ,  $k_0$  arbitrary.* The diagram is  $\mathcal{D} = [k_0] \xleftarrow{g_1} [k_1]$ , and we write  $a = g_1(0)$ . We have to select a 1-simplex  $\sigma(\mathcal{D})$  in

$$\mathcal{P}(Y_{k_0}, \mathcal{U}(k_0, a)),$$

in other words a partition of unity on  $\Delta^1 \times Y_{k_0}$  subordinate to the open cover  $\Delta^1 \times \mathcal{U}(k_0, a)$ . If  $g_1$  is onto, then it is the identity map of  $[k_0]$  and  $\sigma(\mathcal{D})$  is already fully prescribed by condition (ii); it has to be the pullback of  $\sigma([k_0])$  along the projection

$$\Delta^1 \times Y_{k_0} \rightarrow Y_{k_0}.$$

In the more interesting case where  $g_1$  is not onto, we proceed by induction on  $k_0$ . The induction begins with  $k_0 = 1$ . In that case the restriction of  $\sigma(\mathcal{D})$  to  $\partial\Delta^1 \times Y_1$  is prescribed because of condition (ii). Here we are also using the standing assumption that  $\Delta^1 \times \mathcal{U}(k_0, a)$  is refined by  $\Delta^1 \times \mathcal{U}(k_0, 0)$ . The restriction to  $\Delta^1 \times \text{latch}_1 Y$  is also prescribed because of condition (iii). There is a solution by lemmas 5.3 and 5.4. For  $k := k_0 > 1$ , the restriction of  $\sigma(\mathcal{D})$  to  $\partial\Delta^1 \times Y_k$  is prescribed because of condition (ii). Here we are also using the standing assumption that  $\Delta^1 \times \mathcal{U}(k_0, a)$  is refined by  $\Delta^1 \times \mathcal{U}(k_0, b)$  whenever  $b < a$ . The restriction to  $\Delta^1 \times \text{latch}_k Y$  is also prescribed

because of the inductive assumption and condition (iii). There is a solution by lemmas 5.3 and 5.4.

*Cases  $p > 1$ ,  $k_0$  arbitrary.* If one of the maps  $g_j$  in the diagram  $\mathcal{D}$  is onto, hence an identity map, then  $\sigma(\mathcal{D})$  is already determined thanks to condition (ii) and previous steps (smaller  $p$ ). Otherwise, the reasoning is as in the case  $p = 1$ .

It remains to be said how the  $\sigma(\mathcal{D})$  allow us to produce a broken arrow as in (5.2). By equation (B.3), the simplicial space  $\varphi^{\text{la}}Y$  is a quotient of  $\coprod_n Y_n \times \varphi^{\text{la}}(\Delta[n])$ , so that it is enough to exhibit compatible maps from

$$Y_n \times \varphi^{\text{la}}(\Delta[n]) = Y_n \times \underset{\substack{[m] \rightarrow [n] \\ \text{in } \Delta_{\text{inj}}}}{\text{hocolim}} \Delta[m]$$

to the hocolim in (5.2), for  $n \geq 0$ . (The compatibility checks will be left to the reader, however.) In degree  $k$ , the right-hand side of this last equation is

$$Y_n \times \underset{\substack{[m] \rightarrow [n] \\ \text{in } \Delta_{\text{inj}}}}{\text{hocolim}} \text{mor}_{\Delta}([k], [m]).$$

This is a quotient of a disjoint union of pieces  $Y_n \times \Delta^p$  corresponding to pairs  $(f, \mathcal{D})$  where  $f \in \text{mor}_{\Delta}([k], [m])$  and

$$(5.3) \quad \mathcal{D} : \quad [n] = [m_0] \xleftarrow{g_1} [m_1] \xleftarrow{g_2} [m_2] \xleftarrow{g_3} \dots \xleftarrow{g_p} [m_p] = [m]$$

is a diagram much as in item (i) at the beginning of this proof; the  $g_j$  are morphisms in  $\Delta_{\text{inj}}$ , and we can assume that none of them are identity maps. Therefore we have to exhibit compatible maps

$$(5.4) \quad Y_n \times \Delta^p \rightarrow \underset{S}{\text{hocolim}} U(k, 0)_S,$$

one for each of these pairs  $(f, \mathcal{D})$ . Now  $\sigma(\mathcal{D})$  is a  $p$ -simplex in  $\mathcal{P}(Y_n, \mathcal{U}(n, a))$  where  $a = g_1 g_2 \dots g_p(0)$ . It can also be viewed as a  $p$ -simplex in  $\mathcal{P}(Y_n, \mathcal{U}(n, b))$  where  $b = g_1 g_2 \dots g_p f(0)$ . Pulling this back along  $g_1 g_2 \dots g_p f$  we obtain a  $p$ -simplex in  $\mathcal{P}(Y_k, \mathcal{U}(k, 0))$ , which gives us the second arrow in

$$(5.5) \quad Y_n \times \Delta^p \xrightarrow{(g_1 g_2 \dots g_p f)^* \times \text{id}} Y_k \times \Delta^p \longrightarrow \underset{S}{\text{hocolim}} U(k, 0)_S$$

in the manner of lemma 5.2. The composition of the two arrows is the map that we have been looking for.  $\square$

We return to configuration categories. For an open  $\alpha$ -cover  $\mathcal{V} = (V_j)_{j \in J}$  of a (smooth, complete) Riemannian manifold  $L$  we have  $\text{ucon}_{\mathcal{V}}(L; \alpha)$  as in definition A.1. This can also be written as the colimit, over all finite nonempty subsets  $S \subset J$ , of the  $\text{con}(V_S; \alpha)$  where  $V_S = \bigcap_{j \in S} V_j$ .

**Proposition 5.6.** *There exists a factorization*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \underset{S \subset J}{\text{hocolim}} \text{ucon}(V_S; \alpha) & \\ & \nearrow & \downarrow \\ \varphi^{\text{la}}(\text{ucon}_{\mathcal{V}}(L; \alpha)) & \longrightarrow & \text{ucon}_{\mathcal{V}}(L; \alpha) \end{array}$$

(The horizontal arrow is adjoint to the inclusion of  $\text{ucon}_{\mathcal{V}}(L; \alpha)$  in  $\varphi(\text{ucon}_{\mathcal{V}}(L; \alpha))$ . The vertical arrow is the canonical map from the homotopy colimit to the colimit. It is a weak equivalence. The factorization is strict, not just up to homotopy.)

*Proof of proposition 5.6.* This is a straightforward application of proposition 5.5. We choose  $Y := \text{ucon}_{\mathcal{V}}(L; \alpha)$ . The open  $\alpha$ -cover  $\mathcal{V}$  of  $L$  determines an open cover  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $Y_0$  with the same indexing set  $J$ . Namely, a multipatch  $W \in Y_0$  is said to be an element of  $U_i \subset Y_0$  if, as a subset of  $L$ , it is contained in  $V_i$  (for the same  $i \in J$ ). An element of  $U(k, j)_i$  is then a nested system of multipatches

$$W_0 \supset W_1 \supset \cdots \supset W_k$$

such that  $W_j \subset U_i$ . (Confusion alert:  $j \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, k\}$  but  $i \in J$ .) Clearly,  $U(k, j)_i \subset U(k, \ell)_i$  for all  $\ell \in \{j, \dots, k\}$ . So the assumptions of proposition 5.5 are met.  $\square$

**Remark 5.7.** Let  $W \subset L$  be an open set and let  $\mathcal{V}|_W$  be the open cover of  $W$  consisting of the  $V_j \cap W$ , where  $V_j \in \mathcal{V}$ . Then there is a (strictly) commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \varphi^{\text{la}} \text{ucon}_{\mathcal{V}|_W}(W; \alpha) & \longrightarrow & \text{hocolim}_{S \subset J} \text{ucon}(V_S \cap W; \alpha) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \varphi^{\text{la}} \text{ucon}_{\mathcal{V}}(L; \alpha) & \longrightarrow & \text{hocolim}_{S \subset J} \text{ucon}(V_S; \alpha) \end{array}$$

where the vertical arrows are inclusion maps and the lower horizontal arrow is the broken arrow from proposition 5.6. Later we may modify or simplify this. For example, in the upper right-hand term, those  $S \subset J$  for which  $V_S \cap W$  is empty make no contribution to the hocolim and can be left out.

## 6. GROUNDING AND BOUNDING

We return to the setting and hypotheses of section 4. Specifically we have a complete Riemannian manifold  $M$  and a compact smooth submanifold  $L \subset M$  (empty boundary) with the induced Riemannian metric. As in section 4 we also assume that  $M$  is connected. Let  $\Pi_M: A_M \rightarrow M$  be a universal covering space and let  $\Pi_L: A_L \rightarrow L$  be the restricted covering space, so that there is a strict pullback square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A_L & \longrightarrow & A_M \\ \Pi_L \downarrow & & \downarrow \Pi_M \\ L & \longrightarrow & M \end{array}$$

Now  $A_M$  inherits a Riemannian metric from  $M$  such that  $\Pi_M$  is a local isometry. Similarly  $A_L$  inherits a Riemannian metric from  $L$  such that  $\Pi_L$  is a local isometry. Important for us: the preimage under  $\Pi_M$  of a geodesic ball in  $M$  (center  $z$ , radius less than the injectivity radius of  $M$  at  $z$ ) is a disjoint union of geodesic balls in  $A_M$ , of the same radius. Something analogous can be said about  $L$  and  $\Pi_L$ .

**Definition 6.1.** A *grounded* multipatch in  $L$  is a multipatch  $U \subset L$  together with a map  $s: U \rightarrow A_L$  such that  $\Pi_L s: U \rightarrow L$  is the inclusion. (The name can be justified as follows. Select a base point in  $A_M$ . Then  $M$  has a preferred base point, too, and  $A_M$  can be identified with the space of pairs  $(y, [\gamma])$  where  $y \in M$  and  $[\gamma]$  is a homotopy class of paths in  $M$  beginning at  $x$  and ending at the base point. Let  $R$  be the finite set of center points of  $U$ . The datum  $s: U \rightarrow A_L$  is equivalent to a

choice of homotopy classes of paths  $\gamma_x$  in  $M$ , one for every  $x \in R \subset U$ , beginning at  $x \in L \subset M$  and ending at the base point.) Write

$$\text{grucon}(L)$$

for the resulting adaptation of  $\text{ucon}(L)$ . More precisely,  $\text{grucon}(L)$  is (still) the nerve of a topological poset. Namely, a grounded multipatch  $(U, s: U \rightarrow A_L)$  in  $L$  is considered to be  $\leq$  another grounded multipatch  $(V, t: V \rightarrow A_L)$  if  $U \subset V$  and  $s(U) \subset t(V)$ . The notation  $\text{grucon}(L)$  can be combined with embellishments as in  $\text{grucon}_\delta(L; \alpha)$ . (Usually the embellishments refer only to conditions on the underlying multipatch of a grounded multipatch.) The forgetful map from  $\text{grucon}(L)$  to  $\text{ucon}(L)$  is, in every degree, a covering space.

There is an analogous definition of grounded multipatch in  $M$ . This is a multipatch  $U \subset M$  together with a map  $s: U \rightarrow A_M$  such that  $\Pi_M s: U \rightarrow M$  is the inclusion. Now  $\text{grucon}(M)$  can be defined in analogy with  $\text{grucon}(L)$ . The forgetful map  $\text{grucon}(M) \rightarrow \text{ucon}(M)$  is, in every degree, a covering space.

A *grounded map* over  $\text{NuFin}$  from  $\text{ucon}(L)$  to  $\varphi\text{ucon}(M)$  is a pair  $(f, f^\infty)$  as in the following commutative square of maps over  $\text{NuFin}$ ,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{grucon}(L) & \xrightarrow{f^\infty} & \varphi\text{grucon}(M) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{ucon}(L) & \xrightarrow{f} & \varphi\text{ucon}(M) \end{array}$$

where the vertical arrows are forgetful, and the upper horizontal arrow *respects the left actions* of the covering translation group  $\Gamma$  of  $\Pi_M$ . (Here  $f$  is uniquely determined by  $f^\infty$ . Therefore we could also define: a grounded map ... is a  $\Gamma$ -equivariant map from  $\text{grucon}(L)$  to  $\varphi\text{grucon}(M)$  which descends to a map from  $\text{ucon}(L)$  to  $\varphi\text{ucon}(M)$ .) Write

$$\text{grmap}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}(L), \varphi\text{ucon}(M))$$

for the “space” (simplicial set) of these grounded maps. Here too, embellishments can be added, as in  $\text{grmap}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}_\delta(L; \alpha), \varphi\text{ucon}(M))$ . There is a forgetful map

$$\text{grmap}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}(L), \varphi\text{ucon}(M)) \longrightarrow \text{map}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}(L), \varphi\text{ucon}(M))$$

of simplicial sets, and it is a covering space. There is another forgetful map from  $\text{grmap}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}(L), \varphi\text{ucon}(M))$  to  $\text{map}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}(L), \varphi\text{ucon}(A_M))$  which in many cases is not a covering space. *End of definition.*

**Remark 6.2.** The definition of *grounded map* (from  $\text{grucon}(L)$  to  $\varphi\text{grucon}(M)$ ) over  $\text{NuFin}$  has other equivalent formulations. In the definition, as given above, of a grounded map as a pair  $(f, f^\infty)$ , the  $f^\infty$  is already fully determined by  $f$  and the restriction of  $f^\infty$  to the space of grounded “single” patches, which is a map from  $\text{grucon}(L; 1)_0$  to  $\text{grucon}(M; 1)_0$ . More to the point, there is a strict pullback square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{grmap}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}(L), \varphi\text{ucon}(M)) & \longrightarrow & \text{map}^\Gamma(A_L, A_M) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{map}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}(L), \varphi\text{ucon}(M)) & \longrightarrow & \text{map}(L, M) \end{array}$$

where  $\text{map}^\Gamma(A_L, A_M)$  is the space of  $\Gamma$ -maps from  $A_L$  to  $A_M$ . This can be used as another definition of  $\text{grmap}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}(L), \varphi\text{ucon}(M))$ . (For the lower horizontal arrow in that pullback square we need to make a choice. The forgetful map



$\text{ucon}(L; 1)_0 \rightarrow L$  taking single patches in  $L$  to their center points is a fibration with contractible fibers. Choose a section  $t$  for it. A map  $\text{ucon}(L) \rightarrow \varphi\text{ucon}(M)$  can be restricted to give a map of spaces from  $\text{ucon}(L; 1)_0$  to  $\text{ucon}(M; 1)_0$ . This can be precomposed with  $t$  and postcomposed with the projection  $\text{ucon}(M; 1)_0 \rightarrow M$ .

The description of  $\text{gmap}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}(L), \varphi\text{ucon}(M))$  as in definition 6.1 has some advantages which can be appreciated in definition 6.4 below.

**Conventions 6.3.** In the situation of definition 6.1 we will assume that  $\delta$  is less than the global injectivity radius of  $L$ , unless otherwise stated.

**Definition 6.4.** Let  $\varepsilon$  be a positive real number. An element alias 0-simplex  $(f, f^\infty)$  of  $\text{gmap}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}_\delta(L; \alpha), \varphi\text{ucon}(M))$  is said to be *weakly  $\varepsilon$ -bounded* if for every open  $U \subset L$ , the map  $f$  takes  $\text{ucon}_\delta(U; \alpha)$  to  $\varphi\text{ucon}(\Theta_\varepsilon U)$ . (See definition 4.1 and compare definition 4.2.) It is said to be *strongly  $\varepsilon$ -bounded* if for every open  $V \subset L$  equipped with a partial section  $s: V \rightarrow A_L$  of  $\Pi_L$ , the composition

$$\text{ucon}_\delta(V; \alpha) \xrightarrow{s^*} \text{grucon}_\delta(L; \alpha) \xrightarrow{f^\infty} \varphi\text{grucon}(M) \xrightarrow{\text{forgetful}} \varphi\text{ucon}(A_M)$$

lands in  $\varphi\text{ucon}(\Theta_\varepsilon s(V))$ .

For  $k$ -simplices of  $\text{gmap}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}_\delta(L; \alpha), \varphi\text{ucon}(M))$  where  $k > 0$ , there are similar definitions. Such a  $k$ -simplex is a family of pairs  $(f_z, f_z^\infty)$  depending continuously on  $z \in \Delta^k$ , and we say that it is weakly resp. strongly  $\varepsilon$ -bounded if and only if every  $(f_z, f_z^\infty)$  in the family is weakly resp. strongly  $\varepsilon$ -bounded. Let

$$\underline{Z}_\varepsilon \subset \text{gmap}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}_\delta(L; \alpha), \varphi\text{ucon}(M))$$

be the simplicial subset consisting of the strongly  $\varepsilon$ -bounded simplices. Let  $\underline{Z}_\infty$  be the union of the  $\underline{Z}_\varepsilon$  for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ . We may also write  $\underline{Z}_\varepsilon(L, M)$  resp.  $\underline{Z}_\infty(L, M)$  for these simplicial subsets if it helps to avoid confusion.

*Remarks.* a) If a simplex of  $\text{gmap}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}_\delta(L; \alpha), \varphi\text{ucon}(M))$  is strongly  $\varepsilon$ -bounded, then it is weakly  $\varepsilon$ -bounded. Reason:  $\Pi_M$  is distance-non-increasing. b) The simplicial set  $\text{gmap}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}_\delta(L; \alpha), \varphi\text{ucon}(M))$  is a fibrant simplicial set (a.k.a. Kan simplicial set) by construction, and  $\underline{Z}_\varepsilon$  is also fibrant by construction.

**Theorem 6.5.** *The inclusion  $\underline{Z}_\infty \hookrightarrow \text{gmap}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}_\delta(L; \alpha), \varphi\text{ucon}(M))$  admits a homotopy right inverse.*

The  $\delta$  turns out to have little influence in the proof of this, and so it will be written out for  $\text{ucon}(L; \alpha)$ . (That case could be simulated by taking for  $\delta$  a number larger than the diameter of  $L$ .) Apart from that, the proof requires a great deal of preparation.

**Lemma 6.6.** *The smooth compact manifold  $L$  admits an open  $\alpha$ -cover  $\mathcal{V} = (V_j)_{j \in J}$  with finite indexing set  $J$  such that, for each nonempty subset  $S \subset J$ , the set  $V_S = \bigcap_{j \in S} V_j$  is diffeomorphic to a disjoint union of finitely many copies of  $\mathbb{R}^\ell$ .*

*Proof.* Begin with a smooth triangulation  $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}^0$  of  $L$ . Let  $\mathcal{T}^k$  be the  $k$ -fold barycentric subdivision of  $\mathcal{T}^0$ . Let  $\mathcal{W}^{(k)}$  be the open cover of  $L$  defined as follows:  $V \in \mathcal{W}^{(k)}$  iff and only if  $V$  is a disjoint union of finitely many subsets each of which is an open star (of a vertex) in one of the triangulations  $\mathcal{T}^0, \mathcal{T}^1, \dots, \mathcal{T}^k$ . Let us show that for sufficiently large  $k$ , the open cover  $\mathcal{W}^{(k)}$  is an open  $\alpha$ -cover of  $L$ . To this end let  $C_k \subset \text{mapt}(\{1, 2, \dots, \alpha\}, L)$  consist of all  $f: \{1, 2, \dots, \alpha\} \rightarrow L$  such that  $\text{im}(f)$  is not contained in any of the open sets which make up  $\mathcal{W}^{(k)}$ . Then  $C_k$

is compact for all  $k$ , and  $C_0 \supset C_1 \supset C_2 \supset \dots$ , and moreover the intersection of all the  $C_k$  is empty. It follows that there is some  $k \geq 0$  for which  $C_k$  is empty. Set  $\mathcal{V} := \mathcal{W}^{(k)}$  for such a  $k$ .  $\square$

Choose an open cover  $\mathcal{V} = (V_j)_{j \in J}$  as in lemma 6.6. The open cover determines a poset  $\mathcal{K}$  as follows. The elements of  $\mathcal{K}$  are the pairs  $(S, T)$  where  $S$  is a nonempty subset of  $J$  and  $T$  is a subset of  $\pi_0(V_S)$  of cardinality  $\leq \alpha$ . (We allow  $T = \emptyset$ .) The ordering has  $(S_0, T_0) \leq (S_1, T_1)$  if and only if  $S_1 \subset S_0$  and the inclusion

$$V_{S_0} \rightarrow V_{S_1}$$

takes every connected component selected by  $T_0$  to a component selected by  $T_1$ . (The resulting map  $T_0 \rightarrow T_1$  does not have to be injective.)

For  $(S, T) \in \mathcal{K}$  let  $V_{S,T} \subset V_S$  be the union of the connected components of  $V_S$  selected by  $T$ . Then  $(S, T) \mapsto V_{S,T}$  is a covariant functor. The inclusions  $\text{ucon}(V_{S,T}; \alpha) \rightarrow \text{ucon}(L; \alpha)$  determine a map

$$\text{hocolim}_{(S,T) \in \mathcal{K}} \text{ucon}(V_{S,T}; \alpha) \longrightarrow \text{ucon}_{\mathcal{V}}(L; \alpha).$$

**Lemma 6.7.** *There exists a (strict) factorization*

$$(6.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & \text{hocolim}_{(S,T) \in \mathcal{K}} \text{ucon}(V_{S,T}; \alpha) & \\ & \nearrow & \downarrow \simeq \\ \varphi^{\text{la}}(\text{ucon}_{\mathcal{V}}(L; \alpha)) & \longrightarrow & \text{ucon}_{\mathcal{V}}(L; \alpha) \end{array}$$

The important message of the lemma is that there is a homotopy colimit decomposition of the Segal space  $\text{ucon}_{\mathcal{V}}(L; \alpha)$ , indexed by a finite poset, in which every piece  $\text{ucon}(V_{S,T}; \alpha)$  is a Segal space which admits a homotopy terminal object.

*Proof.* The following commutative diagram is our guide.

$$(6.2) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} & & & \varphi \text{hocolim}_{(S,T) \in \mathcal{K}} \text{ucon}(V_{S,T}; \alpha) & \\ & & & \nearrow H & \downarrow \\ & \text{hocolim}_{S \subset J} \text{ucon}(V_S; \alpha) & \longrightarrow & \varphi \text{hocolim}_{S \subset J} \text{ucon}(V_S; \alpha) & \\ & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\ \varphi^{\text{la}}(\text{ucon}_{\mathcal{V}}(L; \alpha)) & \xrightarrow{u} & \text{ucon}_{\mathcal{V}}(L; \alpha) & \longrightarrow & \varphi \text{ucon}_{\mathcal{V}}(L; \alpha) \end{array}$$

The three vertical arrows are induced by inclusions. Two of the horizontal arrows are preferred inclusions and the other one is a preferred projection. The map  $u$  comes from proposition 5.6. The map  $H$  is something that we have to design now, and we use remark B.10 for that. Fix some  $k \geq 0$ . For every nonempty  $S \subset J$  there is a preferred embedding

$$\text{ucon}(V_S; \alpha)_k \longrightarrow \coprod_T \text{ucon}(V_{S,T}; \alpha)_k$$

(whose image is a summand, a.k.a union of connected components) because for every element  $z$  of  $\text{ucon}(V_S; \alpha)_k$  there is a minimal  $T$  such that  $z \in \text{ucon}(V_{S,T}; \alpha)_k$ . These maps are natural in  $S$  (for fixed  $k$ ), and so they determine a map

$$\text{hocolim}_{S \subset J} \text{ucon}(V_S; \alpha)_k \longrightarrow \text{hocolim}_{(S,T) \text{ in } \mathcal{K}} \text{ucon}(V_{S,T}; \alpha)_k.$$

Let this be  $H_{\mathcal{D}}$  in the case where  $\mathcal{D}$  is the diagram in  $\Delta_{\text{inj}}$  consisting of  $[k]$  only. The maps  $H_{\mathcal{D}} = H_{[k]}$  are not claimed to be compatible with the simplicial operators in  $X := \text{hocolim}_{S \subset J} \text{ucon}(V_S; \alpha)$ , respectively  $Y := \text{hocolim}_{(S,T) \text{ in } \mathcal{K}} \text{ucon}(V_{S,T}; \alpha)$ . But for  $g: [j] \rightarrow [k]$  in  $\Delta_{\text{inj}}$  there is a preferred homotopy relating  $g^* H_{[k]}$  to  $H_{[j]} g^*$  because for every  $z \in \text{ucon}(V_S; \alpha)_k$  the minimal  $(S, T_1)$  in  $\mathcal{K}$  for which  $z \in \text{ucon}(V_{S,T_1}; \alpha)$  is  $\geq$  the minimal  $(S, T_0)$  for which  $g^* z \in \text{ucon}(V_{S,T_0}; \alpha)$ . Let this homotopy be  $H_{\mathcal{D}}$  in the case where  $\mathcal{D}$  is  $g: [j] \rightarrow [k]$ . And so on; a diagram

$$\mathcal{D} = ([k_0] \xleftarrow{g^1} [k_1] \xleftarrow{g^2} \cdots \xleftarrow{g^{r-1}} [k_{r-1}] \xleftarrow{g^r} [k_r])$$

in  $\Delta_{\text{inj}}$  determines a map or higher homotopy

$$H_{\mathcal{D}}: X_{k_0} \times \Delta^r \longrightarrow Y_{k_r}.$$

These maps  $H_{\mathcal{D}}$  satisfy the naturality properties listed in remark B.10. Moreover they are maps over  $X$ . Therefore broken arrow  $H$  has come to life and it does make diagram (6.2) commutative. — Now  $Hu$  in diagram (6.2) is a map which we can write in the form

$$\varphi^{\text{la}} \varphi^{\text{la}}(\text{ucon}_{\mathcal{V}}(L; \alpha)) \longrightarrow \text{hocolim}_{(S,T) \text{ in } \mathcal{K}} \text{ucon}(V_{S,T}; \alpha).$$

Then we may pre-compose with  $\varphi^{\text{la}} \rightarrow \varphi^{\text{la}} \varphi^{\text{la}}$  of corollary B.9 to obtain the broken arrow in (6.1). Commutativity in (6.1) follows easily from commutativity in (6.2).

It remains to be shown that the vertical arrow in diagram (6.1) is a weak equivalence. Observe that the rule taking a finite nonempty  $S \subset J$  to the poset of all  $(R, T) \in \mathcal{K}$  with  $R = S$  can be made into a contravariant functor (from the poset of nonempty finite subsets of  $J$  to the category of finite posets). On the basis of that observation we can set up a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{hocolim}_{S \subset J} & \text{hocolim}_{T: (S,T) \in \mathcal{K}} & \text{ucon}(V_{S,T}; \alpha) \\ & \downarrow & \\ \text{hocolim}_{(S,T) \in \mathcal{K}} & \text{ucon}(V_{S,T}; \alpha) & \longrightarrow \text{hocolim}_{S \subset \mathcal{K}} \text{ucon}(V_S; \alpha) \end{array}$$

in which the vertical arrow is a weak equivalence by the general theory of homotopy colimits [8, §9]. Then it suffices to show that the composition of these two arrows is a weak equivalence. The composition is the map of homotopy colimits induced by a natural transformation

$$\text{hocolim}_{T: (S,T) \in \mathcal{K}} \text{ucon}(V_{S,T}; \alpha) \longrightarrow \text{ucon}(V_S; \alpha)$$

of contravariant functors in the variable  $S$ . It suffices to show that this gives a weak equivalence for each  $S$ . But this is clear, e.g., because in each degree it is a fibration with contractible fibers.  $\square$

By lemma 6.7 there is a map

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{holim}_{(S,T) \in \mathcal{K}} \text{grmap}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}(V_{S,T}; \alpha), \varphi \text{ucon}(M)) \\ \downarrow \\ \text{grmap}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}(L; \alpha), \varphi \text{ucon}(M)) \end{array}$$

which is a weak equivalence (of simplicial sets). We move on from there by investigating each term  $\text{grmap}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}(V_{S,T}; \alpha), \varphi \text{ucon}(M))$  separately.

**Lemma 6.8.** *For fixed  $(S, T) \in \mathcal{K}$ , the inclusions  $W \hookrightarrow M$  for  $W \in \text{ucon}(M)_0$  determine a weak equivalence*

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{hocolim}_W \text{grmap}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}(V_{S,T}; \alpha), \varphi \text{ucon}(W)) \\ \downarrow \\ \text{grmap}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}(V_{S,T}; \alpha), \varphi \text{ucon}(M)) \end{array}$$

(The homotopy colimit is taken over the *discrete* poset of multipatches in  $M$ .)

*Proof.* Let  $U$  be a weakly terminal object for  $\text{ucon}(V_{S,T}; \alpha)$ . That is to say,  $U$  is a multipatch in  $V_{S,T}$  such that the inclusion  $U \rightarrow V_{S,T}$  induces a bijection in  $\pi_0$ . Let  $\star_U \subset \text{ucon}(V_{S,T}; \alpha)$  be the simplicial subspace generated by  $U$  as an element of  $\text{ucon}(V_{S,T}; \alpha)$  in degree 0, so that  $\star_U$  has exactly one element in each degree. Then for every multipatch  $W$  in  $M$  there is a homotopy cartesian square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{grmap}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}(V_{S,T}; \alpha), \varphi \text{ucon}(W)) & \longrightarrow & \text{grmap}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}(V_{S,T}; \alpha), \varphi \text{ucon}(M)) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{map}_{\text{uFin}}(\star_U, \varphi \text{ucon}(W)) & \longrightarrow & \text{map}_{\text{uFin}}(\star_U, \varphi \text{ucon}(M)) \end{array}$$

where the vertical arrows are restriction maps. This follows easily from the (derived) universal property of  $U$  and the locality statement [1, Cor.3.6]. Therefore it suffices to show that the map

$$\text{hocolim}_W \text{map}_{\text{uFin}}(\star_U, \varphi \text{ucon}(W)) \longrightarrow \text{map}_{\text{uFin}}(\star_U, \varphi \text{ucon}(M))$$

determined by the inclusions  $W \hookrightarrow M$  is a weak equivalence. Evidently this can be simplified, using the weak homotopy invariance of hocolim. We can choose a bijection  $\underline{k} \rightarrow \pi_0 U$ . Then the simplified map is

$$\text{hocolim}_W \text{emb}(\underline{k}, W) \longrightarrow \text{emb}(\underline{k}, M).$$

It is a weak homotopy equivalence because it is a Serre microfibration with contractible fibers [24, Lem. 2.2]. (The fiber over some  $f \in \text{emb}(\underline{k}, M)$  is the classifying space of the poset of all multipatches  $W$  in  $M$  which contain the image of  $f$ .)  $\square$

*Sketch proof of theorem 6.5.* The most important observation here is that for an element  $(S, T) \in \mathcal{K}$  and a multipatch  $W$  in  $M$ , any grounded map from  $\text{ucon}(V_{S,T}; \alpha)$  to  $\varphi \text{ucon}(W)$  is automatically strongly  $\varepsilon$ -bounded for some  $\varepsilon$ , if we view it as a map

to  $\varphi\text{ucon}(M)$ . Another useful observation, or a pair of useful observations, is that lemma 6.8 gives us a weak equivalence of simplicial sets

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{holim}_{(S,T)} \text{map}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}(V_{S,T}; \alpha), \varphi\text{ucon}(M)) \\ \cong & \text{map}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{hocolim}_{(S,T)} \text{ucon}(V_{S,T}; \alpha), \varphi\text{ucon}(M)) \\ & \downarrow \\ & \text{map}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}(L; \alpha), \varphi\text{ucon}(M)). \end{aligned}$$

By a mechanical refinement of that same lemma, this lifts to a weak equivalence

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{holim}_{(S,T)} \text{grmap}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}(V_{S,T}; \alpha), \varphi\text{ucon}(M)) \\ & \downarrow \\ & \text{grmap}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}(L; \alpha), \varphi\text{ucon}(M)). \end{aligned}$$

which, by inspection, takes  $\text{holim}_{(S,T)} \underline{Z}_\infty(V_{S,T}, M)$  to  $\underline{Z}_\infty(L, M)$ . (The inspection uses the full strength of lemma 6.7. It is important here that the poset  $\mathcal{K}$  is finite.) Therefore the composition

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{holim}_{(S,T)} \text{hocolim}_W \text{grmap}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}(V_{S,T}; \alpha), \varphi\text{ucon}(W)) \\ & \downarrow \\ & \text{holim}_{(S,T)} \text{grmap}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}(V_{S,T}; \alpha), \varphi\text{ucon}(M)) \\ & \downarrow \simeq \\ & \text{grmap}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}(L; \alpha), \varphi\text{ucon}(M)) \end{aligned}$$

lands in  $\underline{Z}_\infty(L, M)$ , and it is a weak equivalence by lemma 6.8.  $\square$

## 7. BOUNDED LIFTING

Now we need to make matters more complicated by introducing a subgroup  $\Gamma_1$  of the group  $\Gamma$  of covering translations of  $\Pi_M: A_M \rightarrow M$ . This subgroup acts freely, tautologically and isometrically on  $A_M$  and  $A_L$ . We write  $E_M$  and  $E_L$  for the orbit spaces, respectively, and

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_M: E_M &\longrightarrow M, & \Pi_{M,\Gamma_1}: A_M &\longrightarrow E_M, \\ \pi_L: E_L &\longrightarrow L, & \Pi_{L,\Gamma_1}: A_L &\longrightarrow E_L \end{aligned}$$

for the resulting covering spaces, so that  $\pi_M \Pi_{M,\Gamma_1} = \Pi_M$  and  $\pi_L \Pi_{L,\Gamma_1} = \Pi_L$ .

Let  $\text{gremb}^s(L, M)$  be the homotopy fiber (over the base point) of the forgetful map from  $\text{emb}^s(L, M)$ , space (simplicial set) of smooth embeddings, to  $\text{map}(L, M)$ . The base point of  $\text{map}(L, M)$  is still the inclusion  $L \hookrightarrow M$ . In [3] we constructed

the broken arrow in a homotopy commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \text{gremb}^s(E_L, E_M) & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{R}\text{grmap}_{\text{Fin}}(\text{con}(E_L), \text{con}(E_M)) \\
 \uparrow & & \uparrow \\
 \text{gremb}^s(L, M) & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{R}\text{grmap}_{\text{Fin}}(\text{con}(L), \text{con}(M))
 \end{array}$$

(where the  $\mathbb{R}$  in  $\mathbb{R}\text{grmap}$  indicates passage to an unspecified derived setting). This used the ordered configuration categories, and for these the particle models, which makes the horizontal arrows obvious. Switching to the Riemannian patch models is inconvenient from this point of view, but we have to do it. More notation, to prepare for diagram (7.1):

- $\text{ubiFin}$  is the completed variant of  $\text{biFin}$ ;
- $\text{grucon}(\pi_L)$  is the limit (pullback) of the forgetful maps

$$\text{ucon}(\pi_L) \rightarrow \text{ucon}(E_L) \leftarrow \text{grucon}(E_L) ;$$

- similarly for  $\text{grucon}(\pi_M)$ ;
- $\text{grmap}_{\text{ubiFin}}(\text{ucon}(\pi_L), \varphi\text{ucon}(\pi_M))$  is the space of matching pairs  $(f, f^\infty)$  where  $f^\infty: \text{grucon}(\pi_L) \rightarrow \varphi\text{grucon}(\pi_M)$  is a map respecting the  $\Gamma_1$ -actions and  $f: \text{ucon}(\pi_L) \rightarrow \varphi\text{ucon}(\pi_M)$  is a map over  $\text{ubiFin}$ ;
- $\text{grmap}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}(\pi_L), \varphi\text{ucon}(M))$  is the space of matching pairs  $(f, f^\infty)$  where  $f^\infty$  is a map  $\text{grucon}(\pi_L) \rightarrow \varphi\text{grucon}(M)$  respecting the  $\Gamma_1$ -actions and  $f: \text{ucon}(\pi_L) \rightarrow \varphi\text{ucon}(M)$  is a map over  $\text{uFin}$ .

The “abstract” description of the broken arrow does not suffer much in the translation. In the language used here (and in the notation just introduced) it is the composition

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \text{grmap}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}(L), \varphi\text{ucon}(M)) \\
 \downarrow \\
 \text{grmap}_{\text{ubiFin}}(\text{ucon}(\pi_L), \varphi\text{ucon}(\pi_M)) \\
 \downarrow \\
 \text{grmap}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}(\pi_L), \varphi\text{ucon}(E_M)) \\
 \downarrow \\
 \text{grmap}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}(E_L), \varphi\text{ucon}(E_M))
 \end{array}
 \tag{7.1}$$

in which the first arrow is an instance of naturality, the second is induced by the forgetful map  $\text{ucon}(\pi_M) \rightarrow \text{ucon}(E_M)$ , and the third one is a homotopy inverse for the map

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \text{grmap}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}(E_L), \varphi\text{ucon}(E_M)) \\
 \downarrow \\
 \text{grmap}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}(\pi_L), \varphi\text{ucon}(E_M))
 \end{array}
 \tag{7.2}$$

induced by the forgetful map  $\text{ucon}(\pi_L) \rightarrow \text{ucon}(E_L)$ . And of course, (7.2) is a homotopy equivalence because  $\text{ucon}(\pi_L) \rightarrow \text{ucon}(E_L)$  is a conservatization map over (the nerve of)  $\text{uFin}$ .

For us it is important to have some form of metric understanding of “the” homotopy inverse for the map (7.2). This is not provided by [3], but it is provided by the next theorem.

**Theorem 7.1.** *For positive  $\varepsilon$  and  $\delta$  satisfying condition  $(\dagger)$  below, there exist positive  $\delta_1 < \delta$  and a filler making the following diagram homotopy commutative:*

$$(7.3) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \underline{Z}_\varepsilon(L, M) & \xrightarrow{\text{incl.}} & \text{grmap}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}_\delta(L; \alpha), \varphi \text{ucon}(M)) \\ \downarrow \text{dotted} & & \downarrow \\ & & \text{grmap}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}_{\delta_1}(\pi_L; \alpha), \varphi \text{ucon}(E_M)) \\ & & \simeq \uparrow \\ \underline{Z}_{\alpha(2\varepsilon+\delta)+\varepsilon}(E_L, E_M) & \xrightarrow{\text{incl.}} & \text{grmap}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{ucon}_{\delta_1}(E_L; \alpha), \varphi \text{ucon}(E_M)) \end{array}$$

$(\dagger)$  Every loop in  $E_M$  of diameter  $\leq (2\alpha^2 + \alpha)(2\varepsilon + \delta)$  can be contracted to a point.

*Proof.* Choose a finite open  $\alpha$ -cover  $\mathcal{W} = (W_j)_{j \in J}$  of  $L$  such that every connected component of every  $W \in \mathcal{W}$  has diameter  $< \delta$ . Then use lemma 3.1 to find  $\delta_1 > 0$  such that

$$\text{ucon}_{\delta_1}(L; \alpha) \subset \text{ucon}_{\mathcal{W}}(L; \alpha).$$

Let  $\mathcal{V}$  be the open  $\alpha$ -cover of  $E_L$  consisting of the  $V_j := \pi_L^{-1}(W_j)$  for  $j \in J$ . For a nonempty  $S \subset J$  let

$$V_S = \bigcap_{j \in S} V_j = \pi_L^{-1}(W_S).$$

Let  $\mathcal{Q}$  be the set of all pairs  $(S, T)$  where  $S$  is a nonempty subset of  $J$  and  $T \subset \pi_0 V_S$  is a subset of cardinality  $\leq \alpha$ . For  $(S, T)$  in  $\mathcal{Q}$  let  $V_{S,T} \subset V_S$  be the union of the components selected by  $T$ . Make  $\mathcal{Q}$  into a poset in such a way that  $(S, T) \mapsto V_{S,T}$  is a covariant functor. By a construction as in lemma 6.7 we can make a map

$$(7.4) \quad \varphi^{\text{la}} \text{grucon}_{\mathcal{V}}(E_L; \alpha) \longrightarrow \text{hocolim}_{(S,T) \in \mathcal{Q}} \text{grucon}(V_{S,T}; \alpha)$$

which is over  $\text{grucon}_{\mathcal{V}}(E_L; \alpha)$ , satisfies  $\Gamma_1$ -equivariance and descends to a map

$$\varphi^{\text{la}} \text{ucon}_{\mathcal{V}}(E_L; \alpha) \longrightarrow \text{hocolim}_{(S,T) \in \mathcal{Q}} \text{ucon}(V_{S,T}; \alpha)$$

over  $\text{ucon}_{\mathcal{V}}(E_L; \alpha)$ . On the other hand, by [3] there is a preferred map

$$|\underline{Z}_\varepsilon(L, M)| \times \text{grucon}_\delta(E_L \xrightarrow{\pi_L} L; \alpha) \longrightarrow \varphi \text{grucon}(E_M; \alpha)$$

which also descends to  $|\underline{Z}_\varepsilon(L, M)| \times \text{ucon}_\delta(E_L \xrightarrow{\pi_L} L; \alpha) \rightarrow \varphi \text{ucon}(E_M; \alpha)$ . By the definition of  $\underline{Z}_\varepsilon(L, M)$ , this map or pair of maps can be refined mechanically to a matching pair of natural transformation of functors in the variable  $(S, T) \in \mathcal{Q}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |\underline{Z}_\varepsilon(L, M)| \times \text{grucon}(V_{S,T} \rightarrow W_S; \alpha) &\longrightarrow \varphi \text{grucon}(\Theta_\varepsilon V_{S,T}; \alpha) \\ |\underline{Z}_\varepsilon(L, M)| \times \text{ucon}(V_{S,T} \rightarrow W_S; \alpha) &\longrightarrow \varphi \text{ucon}(\Theta_\varepsilon V_{S,T}; \alpha) \end{aligned}$$

with  $\Gamma_1$ -equivariance in the upper row. Since the forgetful maps

$$\text{grucon}(V_{S,T} \rightarrow W_S; \alpha) \rightarrow \text{grucon}(V_{S,T}; \alpha)$$

are conservatization maps over  $\text{uFin}$ , this factors up to derived homotopy through a matching pair of *derived* natural transformations

$$(7.5) \quad \begin{aligned} |\underline{Z}_\varepsilon(L, M)| \times \text{grucon}(V_{S,T}; \alpha) &\cdots\cdots\cdots \varphi \text{grucon}(\Theta_\varepsilon V_{S,T}; \alpha) \\ |\underline{Z}_\varepsilon(L, M)| \times \text{ucon}(V_{S,T}; \alpha) &\cdots\cdots\cdots \varphi \text{ucon}(\Theta_\varepsilon V_{S,T}; \alpha) \end{aligned}$$

over  $\mathbf{uFin}$ . (Think of that matching pair as a map from  $\underline{Z}_\varepsilon(L, M)$  to the homotopy end of the functor taking an object  $(V_{S_0, T_0}, V_{S_1, T_1})$  of  $\mathcal{K}^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{K}$  to a certain subspace, more precisely simplicial subset, of

$$\text{grmap}_{\mathbf{uFin}}(\mathbf{ucon}(V_{S_0, T_0}; \alpha), \varphi \mathbf{ucon}(M; \alpha))$$

which deserves the name  $\text{grmap}_{\mathbf{uFin}}(\mathbf{ucon}(V_{S_0, T_0}; \alpha), \varphi \mathbf{ucon}(\Theta_\varepsilon V_{S_0, T_0}; \alpha))$ . See definition 6.1.) These induce an honest map

$$\begin{aligned} |\underline{Z}_\varepsilon(L, M)| \times \text{hocolim}_{(S, T) \in \mathcal{Q}} \text{grucon}(V_{S, T}; \alpha) &\longrightarrow \text{colim}_{(S, T) \in \mathcal{Q}} \varphi \text{grucon}(\Theta_\varepsilon V_{S, T}; \alpha) \\ &\subset \varphi \text{grucon}(E_M; \alpha) \end{aligned}$$

with  $\Gamma_1$ -equivariance and descent property. Pre-composing in the second input variable with (7.4) gives

$$|\underline{Z}_\varepsilon(L, M)| \times \varphi^{\text{la}} \text{grucon}_{\mathcal{V}}(E_L; \alpha) \longrightarrow \varphi \text{grucon}(E_M; \alpha)$$

with an adjoint which we can write in the form

$$\underline{Z}_\varepsilon(L, M) \longrightarrow \text{grmap}_{\mathbf{uFin}}(\varphi^{\text{la}} \mathbf{ucon}_{\mathcal{V}}(E_L; \alpha), \varphi \mathbf{ucon}(E_M)).$$

In order to simplify this we trade the  $\varphi^{\text{la}}$  prefix for a  $\varphi$  prefix attached to  $\varphi \mathbf{ucon}(E_M)$ , and apply the monadic transformation  $\varphi\varphi \rightarrow \varphi$  of lemma B.8. We may also replace the  $\mathcal{V}$ -condition (subscript to  $\mathbf{ucon}$ ) by the stronger  $\delta_1$ -condition, and so we obtain

$$(7.6) \quad \underline{Z}_\varepsilon(L, M) \longrightarrow \text{grmap}_{\mathbf{uFin}}(\mathbf{ucon}_{\delta_1}(E_L; \alpha), \varphi \mathbf{ucon}(E_M)).$$

It remains to show two things:

- (i) the map (7.6) has image contained in  $\underline{Z}_{\alpha(2\varepsilon+\delta)+\varepsilon}(E_L, E_M)$ , and
- (ii) it makes diagram (7.3) homotopy commutative.

Here (ii) does not depend on (i). The construction of (7.6) used the choice of an open  $\alpha$ -cover  $\mathcal{W}$  of  $L$ . It has an invariance property: if we make two choices  $\mathcal{W}$  and  $\mathcal{W}'$  such that  $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{W}'$ , then the two resulting maps (7.6) are homotopic. (The choice of  $\delta_1$  is irrelevant by lemma 3.1.) Using this, we can reduce in two steps to the case  $\mathcal{W} = \{L\}$ . Then (7.6) is in the correct homotopy class. This proves (ii).

To prove (i), we begin with a multipatch  $U$  in  $E_L$  with at most  $\alpha$  components which have diameter  $< \delta_1$ , and  $s: U \rightarrow A_L$ , a section of the covering projection  $A_L \rightarrow E_L$  over  $U$ . For  $(S, T) \in \mathcal{Q}$  such that  $V_{S, T} \cap U \neq \emptyset$  let  $\Theta_\varepsilon^U V_{S, T}$  be the union of all connected components of  $\Theta_\varepsilon V_{S, T}$  which have nonempty intersection with  $\Theta_\varepsilon U$ . Let  $\nu(U) \subset E_M$  be the union of all the  $\Theta_\varepsilon^U V_{S, T}$ . We note that

$$U \subset \nu(U) \subset \Theta_{\alpha(2\varepsilon+\delta)+\varepsilon} U.$$

Hence the diameter of any connected component of  $\nu(U)$  is less than

$$\alpha(2(\alpha(2\varepsilon + \delta) + \varepsilon) + \delta_1) < (2\alpha^2 + \alpha)(2\varepsilon + \delta).$$

Therefore condition (†) ensures that  $s: U \rightarrow A_L$  extends uniquely to a (partial) section of  $A_M \rightarrow E_M$  over  $\nu(U)$  (which we still denote by  $s$ ). The construction of (7.6) on the basis of (7.5) ensures that we have strict and matching factorizations

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \underline{Z}_\varepsilon(L, M) & \xrightarrow{\text{forgetful} \circ (7.6)} & \text{map}_{\mathbf{uFin}}(\mathbf{ucon}_{\delta_1}(E_L; \alpha), \varphi \mathbf{ucon}(E_M)) \\ \downarrow \text{dotted} & & \downarrow \text{res.} \\ \text{map}_{\mathbf{uFin}}(\mathbf{ucon}(U; \alpha), \varphi \mathbf{ucon}(\nu(U))) & \xrightarrow{\text{inc.}} & \text{map}_{\mathbf{uFin}}(\mathbf{ucon}(U; \alpha), \varphi \mathbf{ucon}(E_M)) \end{array}$$



$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\underline{Z}_\varepsilon(L, M) & \xrightarrow{\text{forgetful} \circ (7.6)} & \text{map}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{grucon}_{\delta_1}(E_L; \alpha), \varphi\text{ucon}(A_M)) \\
\downarrow \text{res.} & & \downarrow \text{res.} \\
\text{map}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{grucon}(U; \alpha), \varphi\text{ucon}(s(\nu(U)))) & \xrightarrow{\text{inc.}} & \text{map}_{\text{uFin}}(\text{grucon}(U; \alpha), \varphi\text{ucon}(A_M))
\end{array}$$

This proves (i).  $\square$

### A. CHOICE OF GEOMETRIC MODELS

Which models are we going to choose for the configuration categories? The question is important because we use (geo)metric arguments in order to achieve the goals set out in section 1. Here we make some decisions.

**Definition A.1.** For several reasons we will need unordered configuration categories more than ordered configuration categories. (We authors have made some attempts to avoid them, but these attempts have come to nothing and we have learned that such attempts must be viewed with unrelenting suspicion.)

Let  $L$  be a smooth manifold with a complete Riemannian metric. The preferred model for  $\text{ucon}(L)$  is the Riemannian multipatch model. It is the nerve of a *topological* poset whose elements/objects are the multipatches. Since we will use this consistently, there is no special notation for this, no embellishments. The multipatches are finite disjoint unions of *open* balls  $B(x, s)$  (for  $x \in L$  and  $s > 0$ ) defined using the geodesic metric. We always assume that  $s$  is less than the injectivity radius of the Riemannian manifold  $L$  at the point  $x$ . In such a case the center point of  $B(x, s)$  is uniquely determined by  $B(x, s)$ ; it is the element of  $B(x, s)$  which has maximal distance from the complement of  $B(x, s)$  in  $L$ .

One more condition: we always assume that the patches do not touch, i.e., their closures are still disjoint. This has the consequence that the object space of  $L$  is a disjoint union of manifolds (without boundary). The cardinality  $k$  contribution is a manifold of dimension  $k(\dim(L) + 1)$ .

Often we will impose stronger conditions on the multipatches. Typically these are meaningful when we have an upper bound  $\alpha$  on the *number* of patches in a multipatch. We write  $\text{ucon}(L; \alpha)$  as usual for the corresponding full sub-poset. Suppose that  $\mathcal{W}$  is an open  $\alpha$ -cover of  $L$ . (This means that every finite subset of  $L$  having cardinality  $\leq \alpha$  is contained in some open set of  $\mathcal{W}$ .) We write  $\text{ucon}_{\mathcal{W}}(L; \alpha)$  for the full topological sub-poset of  $\text{ucon}(L; \alpha)$  consisting of the multipatches  $V$  whose closure in  $L$  is contained in some open set of  $\mathcal{W}$ .

Let  $\delta$  be a positive real number. We may write  $\text{ucon}_{\delta}(L; \alpha)$  for the full topological sub-poset of  $\text{ucon}(L; \alpha)$  consisting of the multipatches  $V$  in which every patch has diameter  $< \delta$ . This could also be written in the form  $\text{ucon}_{\mathcal{W}}(L; \alpha)$ , for example if we let  $\mathcal{W}$  consist of all the open subsets  $W$  of  $L$  such that every connected component of  $W$  has diameter  $< \delta$ .

Let  $V \subset L$  be an open set. With the Riemannian metric induced from  $L$ , this may not be complete. In this context, we may nevertheless write  $\text{ucon}(V)$  for the nerve of the topological sub-poset of  $\text{ucon}(L)$  consisting of all multipatches whose closure is contained in  $V$ . Similarly,  $\text{ucon}(V; \alpha)$  means  $\text{ucon}(V) \cap \text{ucon}(L; \alpha)$ .

We use Riemannian patch models for the ordered configuration categories, too. An object of  $\text{con}(L)$  is an object  $V$  of  $\text{ucon}(L)$  with the extra datum of a bijection  $\underline{k} \rightarrow \pi_0 V$  for the appropriate  $k \geq 0$ . The morphisms are inclusions as in  $\text{ucon}(L)$ .

The extra data allow us to make a forgetful functor  $\text{con}(L) \rightarrow \text{Fin}$ . The price for that is that  $\text{con}(L)$  is not the nerve of a topological poset.

**Example A.2.** Let  $L_1, L_2$  be closed topological manifolds and let  $\pi: L_1 \rightarrow L_2$  be a covering space, aka fiber bundle with discrete fibers. Let  $\mathcal{W}$  be an open  $\alpha$ -cover of  $L_2$ . (Meaning: every finite subset of  $L_2$  of cardinality  $\leq \alpha$  is contained in some  $W \in \mathcal{W}$ .) Let  $\mathcal{V}$  be the open cover of  $L_1$  consisting of the sets  $\pi^{-1}(W)$  for  $W \in \mathcal{W}$ . Then  $\mathcal{V}$  is an open  $\alpha$ -cover of  $L_1$ .

Let  $\pi: E \rightarrow L$  be a covering space. In [3] we introduced  $\text{con}(\pi)$  and a forgetful map from  $\text{con}(\pi)$  to  $\text{con}(E)$  over  $N\text{Fin}$ . (These definitions relied on the “particle” models for  $\text{con}(E)$  and  $\text{con}(L)$ , but it is easy to adapt them to the Riemannian patch models in the case where  $L$  has a complete Riemannian metric.) Here we need similar definitions for unordered configuration categories.

**Definition A.3.** Let  $\pi: E \rightarrow L$  be a covering space where  $L$  is a (smooth, complete) Riemannian manifold. Then  $E$  inherits a Riemannian metric from  $L$  which makes  $\pi$  into a local isometry. The topological poset  $\text{ucon}(\pi)$  has as objects pairs  $(V, W)$  where  $W$  is an object of  $\text{ucon}(L)$ , i.e., a multipatch in  $L$ , and  $V$  is a union of finitely many connected components of  $\pi^{-1}(W)$ , therefore a multipatch in  $E$ . *Condition:* every connected component of  $W$  is the image under  $\pi$  of some connected component of  $V$ . A morphism in  $\text{ucon}(\pi)$  is a commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} V_0 & \longleftarrow & V_1 \\ \downarrow \pi & & \downarrow \pi \\ W_0 & \longleftarrow & W_1 \end{array}$$

There are forgetful maps  $\text{ucon}(\pi) \rightarrow \text{ucon}(L)$  and  $\text{ucon}(\pi) \rightarrow \text{ucon}(E)$ . Both of these are maps over  $\text{uFin}$ , but two distinct forgetful maps from  $\text{ucon}(\pi)$  to  $\text{uFin}$  are involved. One of these takes an object  $(V, W)$  to  $\pi_0 W$ , and the other takes the same object to  $\pi_0 V$ . From the definition it is rather clear that  $\text{ucon}(\pi)$  is a complete Segal space.

**Definition A.4.** The definition of  $\text{con}(\pi)$ , Riemannian patch model, is similar to definition A.3 but we spell it out (nearly) in order to make a few useful observations. An object of  $\text{con}(\pi)$  is an object  $(V, W)$  of  $\text{ucon}(\pi)$  together with bijections  $\underline{k} \rightarrow \pi_0 V$  and  $\underline{\ell} \rightarrow \pi_0 W$  for appropriate  $k$  and  $\ell$ . *Condition:* the resulting map  $\underline{k} \rightarrow \underline{\ell}$  is selfic. (See [3, §2].) The precise meaning of *selfic* is not important. The important point is that it makes the bijection  $\underline{\ell} \rightarrow \pi_0 W$  redundant; it is determined by the bijection  $\underline{k} \rightarrow \pi_0 V$ . As a consequence, the commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{con}(\pi) & \longrightarrow & \text{ucon}(\pi) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{Fin} & \longrightarrow & \text{uFin} \end{array}$$

is homotopy cartesian. (The vertical arrows are the forgetful maps taking an object  $(V, W)$  to the set  $\pi_0(V)$ , with resp. without total ordering.) This confirms something which we already observed in [3], that  $\text{con}(\pi)$  is fiberwise complete over  $\text{Fin}$  wrt the vertical arrow of the left-hand column. — There are forgetful maps  $\text{con}(\pi) \rightarrow \text{con}(L)$  and  $\text{con}(\pi) \rightarrow \text{con}(E)$ , defined much like the forgetful maps  $\text{ucon}(\pi) \rightarrow \text{ucon}(L)$  and  $\text{ucon}(\pi) \rightarrow \text{ucon}(E)$

**Definition A.5.** We describe a model  $Z$  for  $\mathbf{uFin}$ , a complete Segal space. (To be consistent with [4] we should go for something like  $\mathbf{ucon}(\mathbb{R}^\infty)$ . This is alright as far as the object space is concerned, but then the morphism spaces contain a lot of useless information.) Let us agree for now that  $Z_0$  is the object space of  $\mathbf{ucon}(\mathbb{R}^\infty) := \operatorname{colim}_n \mathbf{ucon}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . More informally, we may write  $Z_0 = \coprod_{m \geq 0} B\Sigma_m$ . Let

$$W := \prod_{m \geq 0} E\Sigma_m \times_{\Sigma_m} \underline{m}$$

so that we have a canonical projection  $W \rightarrow Z_0$ . Let  $W_x$  be the fiber of  $W \rightarrow Z_0$  over  $x \in Z_0$ . A point in  $Z_k$  shall be an element  $(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \prod_{j=0}^k Z_0$  together with maps (of finite sets)

$$W_{x_0} \leftarrow W_{x_1} \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow W_{x_{k-1}} \leftarrow W_{x_k}.$$

Therefore  $Z_k$  is a covering space of  $\prod_{j=0}^k Z_0$ . Face and degeneracy operators in  $Z$  are obvious, and all of them are now fibrations with *finite* (discrete) fibers.

Often we can avoid specific models for  $\mathbf{uFin}$  altogether. Suppose for example that we are interested in constructing maps *over*  $\mathbf{uFin}$  from  $\mathbf{ucon}(L)$  to the Reedy fibrant replacement of  $\mathbf{ucon}(M)$ . Every point  $x$  of  $\mathbf{ucon}(L)$  (in some degree  $r$ ) determines a diagram of finite sets

$$S_0 \leftarrow S_1 \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow S_{r-1} \leftarrow S_r.$$

These sets are subsets of  $L$  or of some geometric constructions functorially associated with  $L$ . We do not need to think of them as elements in some universal space of finite sets, such as  $\coprod_{k \geq 0} B\Sigma_k$ . The image  $y$  of  $x$  (under the map to be constructed) should live in degree  $r$  of (the fibrant replacement of)  $\mathbf{ucon}(M)$  and it should also determine a diagram of finite sets

$$T_0 \leftarrow T_1 \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow T_{r-1} \leftarrow T_r$$

What we need is *not*: paths from  $S_i$  to  $T_i$  for all  $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$  etc. in a “space of all finite sets”. What we really need is: compatible bijections from  $S_i$  to  $T_i$ .

This observation leads to an even more radical one.

**Lemma A.6.** *Let  $L$  and  $M$  be Riemannian manifolds without boundary. Let  $g: \mathbf{ucon}(L) \rightarrow \varphi\mathbf{ucon}(M)$  be a map of simplicial spaces. Suppose that  $g_0$  preserves cardinalities, in other words  $g_0: \mathbf{ucon}(L)_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{ucon}(M)_0$  takes the cardinality  $s$  summand to the cardinality  $s$  summand, for every  $s \geq 0$ . Then  $g$  can be promoted to the status of a map over  $\mathbf{uFin}$  in at most one way.*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $g_0$  preserves cardinalities. The restriction of  $g_0$  to the summands corresponding to cardinalities  $\leq 1$  is a map over  $\mathbf{uFin}$  for trivial reasons. To be more precise, we take the point of view just advertised. Therefore the correct statement is as follows: if  $U \subset L$  is an element of  $\mathbf{ucon}(L)$  such that  $\pi_0 U$  has at most 1 element, then we have a preferred and unique bijection from  $\pi_0 U$  to  $\pi_0(g(U))$ . Now suppose that  $V \subset L$  is an element of  $\mathbf{ucon}(L)$  of cardinality  $> 1$ . Choose a connected component  $V_0 \subset V$  (a patch in a multipatch). The diagram  $V \supset V_0$  is an element of  $\mathbf{ucon}(L)$  in degree 1. If we look for a preferred bijection  $\omega_V$  from  $\pi_0 V$

to  $\pi_0(g(V))$ , hoping to promote  $g$  to a map over  $\mathbf{uFin}$ , then the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \pi_0(V_0) & \xrightarrow{\text{unique}} & \pi_0(g(V_0)) \\ \text{induced by } (V \supset V_0) \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{induced by } g(V \supset V_0) \\ \pi_0 V & \xrightarrow{\omega_V} & \pi_0(g(V)) \end{array}$$

should commute. (Beware that  $g(V)$  does not necessarily contain  $g(V_0)$ , but the element  $g(V \supset V_0)$  in degree 1 of  $\varphi\text{con}(M)$  gives us an element  $W \supset W_0$  in degree 1 of  $\text{ucon}(M)$ , and paths  $W \rightsquigarrow g(V)$  as well as  $W_0 \rightsquigarrow g(V_0)$  in  $\text{ucon}(M)_0$ . Therefore we get a preferred map from  $\pi_0(g(V_0))$  to  $\pi_0(g(V))$  after all.) Reasoning like that for all connected components of  $V$ , we see that there is a unique map  $\omega_V$  from  $\pi_0 V$  to  $\pi_0(g(V))$  which satisfies these conditions. But it is not obvious that it is a bijection.  $\square$

## B. HOMOTOPICAL DECISIONS

**Notation B.1.** Where we encounter mapping spaces, more often than not they come as simplicial sets because it is tiresome to give them any other status. We will write  $\text{map}(-, -)$  for these. There are a few cases where mapping spaces as topological spaces are more appropriate. For such cases we have the notation  $\text{mapt}(-, -)$ . (It is unlikely that we can be consistent in using it.) *Example:* let  $Y$  be a simplicial space (each  $Y_n$  is a space, a.k.a. object of  $\mathbf{Top}$ ). Then  $\text{mapt}(\Delta[n], Y)$  is a space homeomorphic to  $Y_n$ , whereas  $\text{map}(\Delta[n], Y)$  is a simplicial set isomorphic to the singular simplicial set of  $Y_n$ .

**Definition B.2.** The current preference for a model category structure on  $\mathbf{Top}$  is the mixed model structure [6] in which the objects of  $\mathbf{Top}$  are the compactly generated weak Hausdorff spaces [22], the categorical weak equivalences are the weak homotopy equivalences and the categorical fibrations are the Hurewicz fibrations. This was also used in [3]. The current preference for a model category structure on the category of simplicial spaces is the corresponding Reedy model structure. One of the main reasons for this is that  $\text{con}(L)$  and  $\text{ucon}(L)$  are already Reedy cofibrant; this is a statement about the degeneracy operators in  $\text{con}(L)$  and  $\text{ucon}(L)$  only. It is clear what *Reedy fibrant* means for a simplicial space  $X$ . It means that for every  $n \geq 1$ , the map

$$X_n \longrightarrow \text{match}_m X := \lim_{\substack{f: [m] \rightarrow [n] \text{ in } \Delta_{\text{inj}} \\ m < n}} X_m$$

induced by the various  $f$  is a fibration. More generally, a map of simplicial spaces  $X \rightarrow Y$  is a Reedy fibration if for every  $m \geq 0$  the map from  $X_m$  to the limit of  $(Y_m \rightarrow \text{match}_m Y \leftarrow \text{match}_m X)$  determined by the commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X_m & \longrightarrow & \text{match}_m X \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ Y_m & \longrightarrow & \text{match}_m Y \end{array}$$

is a fibration. — It is less clear what could be meant by the *standard* (functorial) Reedy fibrant replacement  $\varphi X$  of a simplicial space  $X$ . But there is such a thing.

The formula is

$$(\varphi X)_n := \operatorname{holim}_{[m] \rightarrow [n] \text{ in } \Delta_{\text{inj}}} X_m$$

where  $[m] \rightarrow [n]$  runs over the comma category  $(\Delta_{\text{inj}} \downarrow [n])$ . The simplicial operators are defined as follows. (See also [3, §3].) Let  $\varepsilon_n$  be the forgetful functor from the comma category  $(\Delta_{\text{inj}} \downarrow [n])$  to  $\Delta$ . A morphism  $f: [m] \rightarrow [n]$  in  $\Delta$  induces a functor

$$f_! : (\Delta_{\text{inj}} \downarrow [m]) \rightarrow (\Delta_{\text{inj}} \downarrow [n])$$

which is the composition of  $f \circ : (\Delta_{\text{inj}} \downarrow [m]) \rightarrow (\Delta \downarrow [n])$  with the left adjoint of the inclusion  $(\Delta_{\text{inj}} \downarrow [n]) \rightarrow (\Delta \downarrow [n])$ . There is a preferred and obvious natural transformation  $\varepsilon_m \rightarrow \varepsilon_n f_!$  which induces contravariantly  $X \varepsilon_n f_! \rightarrow X \varepsilon_m$  and then

$$(\varphi X)_n = \operatorname{holim}(X \varepsilon_n) \rightarrow \operatorname{holim}(X \varepsilon_n f_!) \rightarrow \operatorname{holim}(X \varepsilon_m) = (\varphi X)_m.$$

**Proposition B.3.** *If  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  is a map of simplicial spaces which is a fibration in the projective structure, i.e., a levelwise fibration, then the induced map  $\varphi f$  from  $\varphi X$  to  $\varphi Y$  is a Reedy fibration.*

*Proof.* In this proof, a commutative square of spaces

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \longrightarrow & B \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ C & \longrightarrow & D \end{array}$$

will be called  $\tau$ -fibrant if the tautological map from  $A$  to the homotopy limit of  $C \rightarrow D \leftarrow B$  is a fibration in  $\mathbf{Top}$ . — We need to show that for every  $n \geq 0$  the commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \operatorname{holim}_{[m] \rightarrow [n]} X_m & \longrightarrow & \lim_{\substack{[m] \rightarrow [n] \\ m < n}} \operatorname{holim}_{[\ell] \rightarrow [m]} X_m \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \operatorname{holim}_{[m] \rightarrow [n]} Y_m & \longrightarrow & \lim_{\substack{[m] \rightarrow [n] \\ m < n}} \operatorname{holim}_{[\ell] \rightarrow [m]} Y_m \end{array}$$

is  $\tau$ -fibrant. The square simplifies immediately to

$$(B.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \operatorname{holim}_{[m] \rightarrow [n]} X_m & \longrightarrow & \operatorname{holim}_{\substack{[m] \rightarrow [n] \\ m < n}} X_m \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \operatorname{holim}_{[m] \rightarrow [n]} Y_m & \longrightarrow & \operatorname{holim}_{\substack{[m] \rightarrow [n] \\ m < n}} Y_m \end{array}$$

We begin with the following observation. If in a commutative diagram of spaces

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} A_0 & \longrightarrow & B_0 & \longleftarrow & C_0 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ A_1 & \longrightarrow & B_1 & \longleftarrow & C_1 \end{array}$$

the vertical arrows are fibrations in  $\mathbf{Top}$ , then the induced map between the homotopy limits of the rows is again a fibration in  $\mathbf{Top}$ . This observation applies to the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 X_m & \longrightarrow & \operatorname{holim}_{\substack{[m] \rightarrow [n] \\ m < n}} X_m & \xleftarrow{\operatorname{id}} & \operatorname{holim}_{\substack{[m] \rightarrow [n] \\ m < n}} X_m \\
 \downarrow f_m & & \downarrow f_* & & \downarrow \operatorname{id} \\
 Y_m & \longrightarrow & \operatorname{holim}_{\substack{[m] \rightarrow [n] \\ m < n}} Y_m & \xleftarrow{f_*} & \operatorname{holim}_{\substack{[m] \rightarrow [n] \\ m < n}} X_m
 \end{array}$$

so that the map between the homotopy limits of the rows is a fibration. But this is exactly the tautological map from the initial term in (B.1) to the homotopy limit of the three-term diagram obtained by deleting the initial term.  $\square$

**Corollary B.4.** *Let  $g: X \rightarrow Y$  be a map of simplicial spaces. Let  $\varphi_Y X$  be the levelwise homotopy limit of*

$$\varphi X \xrightarrow{\varphi(g)} \varphi Y \xleftarrow{\operatorname{incl.}} Y.$$

*Then the projection  $\varphi_Y X \rightarrow Y$  is a Reedy fibration.*

*Proof.* Let  $X^h$  be the homotopy limit of  $X \xrightarrow{g} Y \xleftarrow{\operatorname{id}} Y$  (degreewise) and let

$$g^h: X^h \rightarrow Y$$

be the projection. This is a fibration in the projective model structure, so that  $\varphi(g^h): \varphi(X^h) \rightarrow \varphi Y$  is a Reedy fibration by proposition B.3. Pulling this back along the inclusion  $Y \rightarrow \varphi Y$  gives  $\varphi_Y X \rightarrow Y$ , which is therefore also a Reedy fibration.  $\square$

**Lemma B.5.** *The Reedy fibrant replacement  $\varphi$  has a left adjoint  $\varphi^{\operatorname{la}}$ .*

*Proof.* This follows from the adjoint functor theorem, but we give an explicit description. For  $n \geq 0$  and a (constant) space  $Z$ , the simplicial space  $Z \times \Delta[n]$  is a co-representing object for the functor  $X \mapsto \operatorname{mor}_{\mathbf{Top}}(Z, X_n)$ . It follows that  $\varphi^{\operatorname{la}}(Z \times \Delta[n])$  is a co-representing object for  $X \mapsto \operatorname{mor}_{\mathbf{Top}}(Z, (\varphi X)_n)$ . Therefore

$$(B.2) \quad \varphi^{\operatorname{la}}(Z \times \Delta[n]) = \operatorname{hocolim}_{[m] \rightarrow [n] \text{ in } \Delta_{\operatorname{inj}}} Z \times \Delta[m] = Z \times \varphi^{\operatorname{la}}(\Delta[n])$$

where the homotopy colimit is taken (degreewise) in the category of simplicial spaces. It is still easy to understand how a morphism  $u: [n_0] \rightarrow [n_1]$  in  $\Delta$  induces a simplicial map

$$\varphi^{\operatorname{la}}(\Delta[n_0]) \rightarrow \varphi^{\operatorname{la}}(\Delta[n_1]).$$

(If  $v: [m] \rightarrow [n_0]$  is a morphism in  $\Delta_{\operatorname{inj}}$ , then  $uv$  need not be in  $\Delta_{\operatorname{inj}}$  but it has a unique factorization  $[m] \rightarrow [m'] \rightarrow [n_1]$  in  $\Delta$  where  $[m] \rightarrow [m']$  is surjective and  $[m'] \rightarrow [n_1]$  is injective.) An arbitrary simplicial space  $X$  can be written in the coend form

$$\left( \coprod_n X_n \times \Delta[n] \right) / \text{relations.}$$

Therefore

$$(B.3) \quad \varphi^{\operatorname{la}} X = \left( \coprod_n X_n \times \varphi^{\operatorname{la}}(\Delta[n]) \right) / \text{relations.}$$

The relations are the familiar ones,

$$(f^*a, b) \simeq (a, f_*b)$$

for  $(a, b) \in X_n \times \varphi^{\text{la}}(\Delta[m])$  and  $f: [m] \rightarrow [n]$  in  $\Delta$ .  $\square$

*Remark.* It is correct to say that  $\varphi$  has little effect in low degrees, e.g., no effect in degree 0, but it is wrong to think that  $\varphi^{\text{la}}$  has little effect in low degrees. For example,  $\Delta[1]$  in degree 0 is discrete (with two elements), but  $\varphi^{\text{la}}\Delta[1]$  in degree 0 is the disjoint union of two intervals. Related to this observation: it is always true that  $\varphi(\text{sk}_k X) \cong \text{sk}_k(\varphi X)$ , but for most  $k$  and simplicial spaces  $X$  it would be wrong to claim  $\varphi^{\text{la}}(\text{sk}_k X) \cong \text{sk}_k(\varphi^{\text{la}} X)$ .

**Lemma B.6.** *If  $X$  is a Reedy cofibrant simplicial space, then the map*

$$v: \varphi^{\text{la}} X \rightarrow X$$

*adjoint to the inclusion  $u: X \rightarrow \varphi X$  is a weak equivalence.*

*Proof.* Let  $Y$  be a Reedy fibrant simplicial space. There is a commutative triangle

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{map}(X, Y) & \xrightarrow{\circ v} & \text{map}(\varphi^{\text{la}} X, Y) \\ & \searrow u \circ & \nearrow \cong \\ & \text{map}(X, \varphi Y) & \end{array}$$

in which the arrow labeled  $u \circ$  is a weak equivalence (because  $u$  is a weak equivalence of Reedy fibrant objects and  $X$  is Reedy cofibrant). It follows that the horizontal arrow is always a weak equivalence, and it is a map between spaces (here simplicial sets) which can call themselves derived mapping spaces.  $\square$

**Proposition B.7.** *Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be simplicial spaces and let  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  be a Reedy cofibration. Then  $\varphi^{\text{la}} f: \varphi^{\text{la}} X \rightarrow \varphi^{\text{la}} Y$  is a projective cofibration. In particular, if  $Y$  is a Reedy cofibrant simplicial space, then  $\varphi^{\text{la}} Y$  is projectively cofibrant.*

*Proof.* Let  $g: P \rightarrow Q$  be a map of simplicial spaces which is an acyclic fibration in the projective structure, i.e., a levelwise fibration. We are supposed to show that  $g$  has the appropriate lifting property with respect to  $\varphi^{\text{la}} f$ . By adjunction, this is equivalent to showing that  $\varphi g$  has the appropriate lifting property with respect to  $f$ . But it does have that property because  $\varphi g$  is a Reedy fibration by proposition B.3 and  $f$  is a Reedy cofibration by assumption.  $\square$

Frequently we are confronted with a pile-up of fibrant replacements. In such a case the following lemma can provide relief.

**Lemma B.8.** *The fibrant replacement  $X \mapsto \varphi X$  and the preferred natural inclusion  $\iota_X: X \rightarrow \varphi X$  together admit the structure of a monad.*

*Proof.* We have to find a natural transformation  $\mu: \varphi \circ \varphi \rightarrow \varphi$  satisfying associativity and having  $\iota$  as a two-sided unit. Let  $X$  be a simplicial space and choose  $n \geq 0$ . Then

$$(\varphi \varphi X)_n \cong \text{mapt}(\Delta[n], \varphi \varphi X) \cong \text{mapt}(\varphi^{\text{la}} \Delta[n], \varphi X) \cong \text{mapt}(\varphi^{\text{la}} \varphi^{\text{la}} \Delta[n], X).$$

Therefore we turn our attention to  $\varphi^{\text{la}}\varphi^{\text{la}}\Delta[n]$ . Using (B.3) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi^{\text{la}}\varphi^{\text{la}}\Delta[n] &\cong \coprod_k ((\varphi^{\text{la}}\Delta[n])_k \times \varphi^{\text{la}}\Delta[k]) / \text{relations} \\
&= \coprod_k \left( \text{hocolim}_{[m] \rightarrow [n]} (\Delta[m])_k \times \text{hocolim}_{[j] \rightarrow [k]} \Delta[j] \right) / \text{relations} \\
&= \coprod_k \left( \text{hocolim}_{[m] \rightarrow [n]} \text{mor}_{\Delta}([k], [m]) \times \text{hocolim}_{[j] \rightarrow [k]} \Delta[j] \right) / \text{relations} \\
&\cong \text{hocolim}_{[m] \rightarrow [n]} \left( \coprod_k (\text{mor}_{\Delta}([k], [m]) \times \text{hocolim}_{[j] \rightarrow [k]} \Delta[j]) / \text{relations} \right) \\
&\cong \text{hocolim}_{[m] \rightarrow [n]} \text{hocolim}_{[j] \rightarrow [m]} \Delta[j]
\end{aligned}$$

where  $[m] \rightarrow [n]$ ,  $[j] \rightarrow [k]$  and  $[j] \rightarrow [m]$  denote morphisms in  $\Delta_{\text{inj}}$ . This simplifies some more, so that we have

$$(B.4) \quad \varphi^{\text{la}}\varphi^{\text{la}}\Delta[n] \cong \text{hocolim}_{[j] \rightarrow [m] \rightarrow [n]} \Delta[j].$$

In more detail, there is a category  $\mathcal{B}_n$  whose objects are diagrams  $[j] \rightarrow [m] \rightarrow [n]$  in  $\Delta_{\text{inj}}$ , with fixed  $[n]$ . A morphism is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
[j_0] & \longrightarrow & [m_0] & \longrightarrow & [n] \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow = \\
[j_1] & \longrightarrow & [m_1] & \longrightarrow & [n]
\end{array}$$

Then there is a functor  $Q_n$  from  $\mathcal{B}_n$  to simplicial sets (simplicial spaces) taking  $[j] \rightarrow [m] \rightarrow [n]$  to  $\Delta[j]$ . We have calculated  $\varphi^{\text{la}}\varphi^{\text{la}}\Delta[n] \cong \text{hocolim} Q_n$ .

This calculation is natural in  $[n]$ . Namely, a morphism  $f: [m] \rightarrow [n]$  in  $\Delta$ , not necessarily injective, induces a functor  $f_*: \mathcal{B}_m \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_n$  (details left to the reader) and a natural transformation  $Q_m \rightarrow Q_n f_*$ . These in turn determine a map

$$\text{hocolim} Q_m \rightarrow \text{hocolim} Q_n.$$

Using (B.4) and (B.2), it is easy to produce a natural transformation

$$(B.5) \quad \varphi^{\text{la}}\Delta[n] = \text{hocolim}_{[j] \rightarrow [n]} \Delta[j] \longrightarrow \text{hocolim}_{[j] \rightarrow [m] \rightarrow [n]} \Delta[j] = \varphi^{\text{la}}\varphi^{\text{la}}\Delta[n]$$

(natural in  $[n]$  as an object of  $\Delta$ ). Namely, let  $\mathcal{A}_n$  be the category whose objects are diagrams  $[j] \rightarrow [n]$  in  $\Delta_{\text{inj}}$ , with fixed  $[n]$ , etc., so that  $\text{hocolim}_{[j] \rightarrow [n]} \Delta[j]$  is the hocolim of the functor  $P_n$  on  $\mathcal{A}_n$  given by  $P_n([j] \rightarrow [n]) = \Delta[j]$ . We need functors  $u_n: \mathcal{A}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_n$  and we define them by

$$([j] \rightarrow [n]) \mapsto ([j] \xrightarrow{=} [j] \rightarrow [n]).$$

(This definition of  $u_n$  has the desirable consequence  $u_n f_* = f_* u_m$  for morphisms  $f: [m] \rightarrow [n]$  in  $\Delta$ .) Then  $Q_n u_n = P_n$  and this leads to a map from  $\text{hocolim} P_n$  to  $\text{hocolim} Q_n$  which implements (B.5). The resulting map

$$(\varphi\varphi X)_n \longrightarrow (\varphi X)_n$$

(for a simplicial space  $X$ ) is covariantly natural in  $X$  and contravariantly natural in  $[n]$ , object of  $\Delta$ , by inspection. Therefore we have constructed  $\mu: \varphi \circ \varphi \rightarrow \varphi$ . The associativity property is easily verified on the basis of

$$\varphi^{\text{la}}\varphi^{\text{la}}\varphi^{\text{la}}\Delta[n] \cong \text{hocolim}_{[i] \rightarrow [j] \rightarrow [m] \rightarrow [n]} \Delta[j]$$



(where  $[i] \rightarrow [j]$ ,  $[j] \rightarrow [m]$  and  $[m] \rightarrow [n]$  denote morphisms in  $\Delta_{\text{inj}}$ ). This is a calculation similar to (B.4), the details of which are left to the reader. The unit properties are more obvious. Keep in mind that  $\iota: \text{id} \rightarrow \varphi$  is adjoint to a natural transformation  $\varphi^{\text{la}} \rightarrow \text{id}$  which is induced by certain maps  $\varphi^{\text{la}} \Delta[n] \rightarrow \Delta[n]$ , for  $n \geq 0$ . These maps are just the usual maps from a homotopy colimit to the corresponding colimit,  $\text{hocolim}_{[j] \rightarrow [n]} \Delta[j] \rightarrow \text{colim}_{[j] \rightarrow [n]} \Delta[j] \cong \Delta[n]$ .  $\square$

**Corollary B.9.** *The functor  $X \mapsto \varphi^{\text{la}} X$  and the natural projection  $\varphi^{\text{la}} X \rightarrow X$  together admit the structure of a comonad.*  $\square$

**Remark B.10.** Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be simplicial spaces. How should we imagine a map from  $X$  to  $\varphi Y$ , or equivalently, a map from  $\varphi^{\text{la}} X$  to  $Y$ ? Understanding this can be more useful than having a good idea of what  $\varphi Y$  is, or what  $\varphi^{\text{la}} X$  is. A map from  $X$  to  $\varphi Y$  is a package which provides, for every  $r \geq 0$  and every diagram

$$\mathcal{D} := [k_0] \xleftarrow{g_1} [k_1] \xleftarrow{g_2} \cdots \xleftarrow{g_{r-1}} [k_{r-1}] \xleftarrow{g_r} [k_r]$$

in  $\Delta_{\text{inj}}$ , a map  $H_{\mathcal{D}}: X_{k_0} \times \Delta^r \rightarrow Y_{k_r}$ . These maps  $H_{\mathcal{D}}$  are subject to two naturality conditions. Firstly, for any morphism  $u: [q] \rightarrow [r]$  in  $\Delta_{\text{inj}}$  the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X_{k_0} \times \Delta^r & \xrightarrow{H_{\mathcal{D}}} & Y_{k_r} \\ \text{id} \times u_* \uparrow & & \uparrow (g_{u(r)+1} g_{u(r)} \cdots g_{r-1} g_r)^* \\ X_{k_0} \times \Delta^q & & \\ (g_1 g_2 \cdots g_{u(0)})^* \times \text{id} \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ X_{k_{u(0)}} \times \Delta^q & \xrightarrow{H_{u^* \mathcal{D}}} & Y_{k_{u(r)}} \end{array}$$

commutes. Secondly, if in a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} [k_0] & \leftarrow & [k_1] & \leftarrow & \cdots & \leftarrow & [k_{r-1}] & \leftarrow & [k_r] \\ \downarrow p_0 & & \downarrow p_1 & & & & \downarrow p_{r-1} & & \downarrow p_r \\ [\ell_0] & \leftarrow & [\ell_1] & \leftarrow & \cdots & \leftarrow & [\ell_{r-1}] & \leftarrow & [\ell_r] \end{array}$$

in  $\Delta$ , all horizontal arrows are injective and all vertical arrows are surjective (top row  $\mathcal{D}$ , bottom row  $\mathcal{E}$ ), then

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X_{k_0} \times \Delta^r & \xrightarrow{H_{\mathcal{D}}} & Y_{k_r} \\ \uparrow p_0^* \times \text{id} & & \uparrow p_r^* \\ X_{\ell_0} \times \Delta^r & \xrightarrow{H_{\mathcal{E}}} & Y_{\ell_r} \end{array}$$

commutes.

### C. JOINS IN A SIMPLICIAL SETTING

**Definition C.1.** The (geometric) join  $Y * Z$  of two spaces  $Y$  and  $Z$  is the homotopy colimit, aka homotopy pushout, of

$$Y \xleftarrow{\text{proj.}} Y \times Z \xrightarrow{\text{proj.}} Z.$$

It is often thought of as a quotient of the disjoint union  $Y \sqcup (Y \times Z \times \Delta^1) \sqcup Z$ . If  $Y$  and  $Z$  are both nonempty, it can of course be viewed as a quotient of  $Y \times Z \times \Delta^1$ . In

that case elements can be labeled  $(sy, tz)$  where  $y \in Y$ ,  $z \in Z$  and  $(s, t) \in \Delta^1$ . Then the relations are  $(sy_1, tz_1) \sim (sy_2, tz_2)$  iff  $(s, t) = (1, 0)$  and  $y_1 = y_2$  or  $(s, t) = (0, 1)$  and  $z_1 = z_2$ .

The geometric join can pass for a monoidal product in  $\mathbf{Top}$ . The space  $\emptyset$  is a two-sided unit for the join.

**Example C.2.** For integers  $p, q, n \geq 0$  such that  $p + q + 1 = n$ , there is a preferred homeomorphism  $\Delta^p * \Delta^q \rightarrow \Delta^n$  given by

$$((y_0, y_1, \dots, y_p), (z_0, z_1, \dots, z_q), (s, t)) \mapsto (sy_0, \dots, sy_p, tz_0, \dots, tz_q).$$

**Definition C.3.** The *join* of two simplicial spaces  $A$  and  $B$  is a simplicial space  $A * B$ . The definition begins with a few auxiliary conventions,  $[-1] := \emptyset$  and  $A_{-1} := \star =: B_{-1}$ . Then

$$(A * B)_n := \coprod_{\substack{p, q \geq -1 \\ p + q + 1 = n}} A_p \times B_q$$

for  $n \geq 0$ . The simplicial operator corresponding to a morphism  $f: [m] \rightarrow [n]$  in  $\Delta$  acts on  $A_p \times B_q$  (where  $p + q + 1 = n$ ) as follows. Determine  $m_1 \geq -1$  and  $m_2 \geq -1$  in such a way that  $m_1 + m_2 + 1 = m$  and  $f(x) \leq p$  if and only if  $x \leq m_1$ . Then there are unique monotone maps  $f_1: [m_1] \rightarrow [p]$  and  $f_2: [m_2] \rightarrow [q]$  such that  $f_1(x) = f(x)$  for  $x \in [m_1]$  and  $f_2(x) + p + 1 = f(x + m_1 + 1)$  for  $x \in [m_2]$ . For  $(z_1, z_2) \in A_p \times B_q$  let  $f^*(z_1, z_2) := (f_1^*(z_1), f_2^*(z_2)) \in A_{m_1} \times B_{m_2} \subset (A * B)_m$ .

There are preferred inclusions  $A \rightarrow A * B$  and  $B \rightarrow A * B$ . (The first of these in degree  $n$  is given by  $A_n \cong A_n \times B_{-1} \subset (A * B)_n$ .) There is a preferred simplicial map  $A * B \rightarrow \Delta[1]$  taking the summand  $A_p \times B_q$  of  $(A * B)_n$  to the monotone map  $g: [n] \rightarrow [1]$  which has  $g(x) = 0$  for  $x \leq p$  and  $g(x) = 1$  for  $x > p$ .

**Example C.4.** The join of  $\Delta[p]$  and  $\Delta[q]$  is isomorphic as a simplicial set to  $\Delta[p + q + 1]$ . This is an easy exercise.

The join as in definition C.3 is important to us (particularly in section 4) because of the following observation.

**Proposition C.5.** *If the simplicial spaces  $A$  and  $B$  are Segal spaces, then  $A * B$  is also a Segal space.*  $\square$

Looking at some special cases, we can be a little more precise. Suppose for example that  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  are (discrete) small categories. Let  $N\mathcal{C}$  and  $N\mathcal{D}$  be their nerves. Then  $N\mathcal{C} * N\mathcal{D}$  is isomorphic to the nerve of a third category  $\mathcal{K}$ , defined as follows. The set of objects  $\text{ob}(\mathcal{K})$  is the disjoint union of  $\text{ob}(\mathcal{C})$  and  $\text{ob}(\mathcal{D})$ . For  $x, y \in \text{ob}(\mathcal{K})$  we let

$$\text{mor}_{\mathcal{K}}(x, y) := \begin{cases} \text{mor}_{\mathcal{C}}(x, y) & \text{if } x, y \in \text{ob}(\mathcal{C}) \\ \text{mor}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y) & \text{if } x, y \in \text{ob}(\mathcal{D}) \\ \star & \text{if } x \in \text{ob}(\mathcal{D}) \text{ and } y \in \text{ob}(\mathcal{C}) \\ \emptyset & \text{if } x \in \text{ob}(\mathcal{C}) \text{ and } y \in \text{ob}(\mathcal{D}). \end{cases}$$

A similar example: suppose that  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{Q}$  are topological posets. Then  $N\mathcal{P} * N\mathcal{Q}$  is isomorphic (as a simplicial space) to the nerve of another topological poset. As a space, this is  $\mathcal{P} \sqcup \mathcal{Q}$ , with the order relation which has  $x \leq y$  if and only if

$$x, y \in \mathcal{P} \text{ and } x \leq y \text{ in } \mathcal{P}, \text{ or } x, y \in \mathcal{Q} \text{ and } x \leq y \text{ in } \mathcal{Q}, \text{ or } x \in \mathcal{Q} \text{ and } y \in \mathcal{P}.$$

**Definition C.6.** Let  $C$  be a simplicial space. There is a map of simplicial spaces

$$\kappa: C \times \Delta[1] \longrightarrow C * C$$

as follows. Given  $x \in C_n$  and monotone  $f: [n] \rightarrow [1]$ , let  $p$  be the maximum of the  $x \in [n]$  such that  $f(x) = 0$  (and let  $p = -1$  if there is no such  $x$ ). Let  $q := n - p - 1$ . Let  $g: [p] \rightarrow [n]$  be the inclusion and let  $h: [q] \rightarrow [n]$  be defined by  $h(x) = x + p + 1$ . Then

$$\kappa(x, f) := (g^*(x), h^*(x)) \in C_p \times C_q \subset (C * C)_n.$$

We may call  $\kappa$  the *separation diagonal* if a name is needed.

If  $C$  is the nerve of a topological poset,  $C = N\mathcal{P}$ , then  $\kappa$  in definition C.6 is an embedding of simplicial spaces with closed image. (We assume that the order relation is a closed subset of  $\mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{P}$ .)

The fibrant replacement  $\varphi$  of section B interacts in an interesting way with the join of definition C.3. To explain this we begin with the left adjoint  $\varphi^{\text{la}}$ . Suppose that  $p, q, n$  are integers such that  $p + q + 1 = n$ , where  $n \geq 0$  and  $p, q \geq -1$ . Then there is a preferred map of simplicial spaces

$$(C.1) \quad \varphi^{\text{la}}\Delta[n] \longrightarrow \Delta[p] * \varphi^{\text{la}}(\Delta[q])$$

as follows.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \varphi^{\text{la}}\Delta[n] & & \Delta[p] * \varphi^{\text{la}}\Delta[q] \\ \downarrow = & & = \uparrow \\ \text{hocolim}_{[m] \rightarrow [n]} \Delta[m] & & \Delta[p] * (\text{hocolim}_{[m_2] \rightarrow [q]} \Delta[m_2]) \\ \downarrow \cong & & \uparrow \\ \text{hocolim}_{\substack{[m_1] \rightarrow [p] \\ [m_2] \rightarrow [q]}} \Delta[m_1] * \Delta[m_2] & \longrightarrow & \text{hocolim}_{[m_2] \rightarrow [q]} \Delta[p] * \Delta[m_2] \end{array}$$

(All maps which appear here under hocolim signs are monotone injective. Beware that  $p, q, m_1, m_2$  can take the value  $-1$ . As before,  $[-1]$  means  $\emptyset$ , but we must also agree that  $\Delta[-1] = \emptyset$ .)

**Definition C.7.** Let  $A$  and  $B$  be simplicial spaces. There is a preferred map

$$A * \varphi(B) \longrightarrow \varphi(A * B)$$

as follows. An element of  $A * \varphi(B)$  in degree  $n$  is a pair of simplicial maps  $\Delta[p] \rightarrow A$ ,  $\varphi^{\text{la}}\Delta[q] \rightarrow B$  for some  $p, q \geq -1$  such that  $p + q + 1 = n$ . These determine a simplicial map

$$\Delta[p] * \varphi^{\text{la}}\Delta[q] \longrightarrow A * B$$

which we may pre-compose with the map (C.1). The composition is a map from  $\varphi^{\text{la}}\Delta[n]$  to  $A * B$ . This is tantamount to an element of  $\varphi(A * B)$  in degree  $n$ .

**Lemma C.8.** Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be a topological poset. For  $w \in \mathcal{K}$  let  $\mathcal{K}(w) \subset \mathcal{K}$  be the topological poset consisting of all  $v \in \mathcal{K}$  which satisfy  $v \leq w$ . There is a strict

pullback square of simplicial spaces

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \longrightarrow & \varphi(N\mathcal{K} \times \Delta[1]) \\ \text{incl.} \downarrow & & \downarrow \varphi(\text{separation diag.}) \\ N\mathcal{K} * \varphi N\mathcal{K} & \longrightarrow & \varphi(N\mathcal{K} * N\mathcal{K}) \end{array}$$

where  $A$  is the simplicial subspace of  $N\mathcal{K} * \varphi N\mathcal{K}$  defined as follows.

$$A_n := \coprod_{\substack{p, q \geq -1 \\ p+q+1=n}} A(p, q) \subset \coprod_{\substack{p, q \geq -1 \\ p+q+1=n}} N\mathcal{K}_p \times (\varphi N\mathcal{K})_q$$

and  $A(p, q) \subset N\mathcal{K}_p \times (\varphi N\mathcal{K})_q$  consists of the pairs  $(x, y)$  such that  $y \in (\varphi N\mathcal{K}(x_p))_q$ , where  $x_p \in N\mathcal{K}_0 = \mathcal{K}$  is the ultimate source of  $x \in N\mathcal{K}_p$ . (If  $p = -1$  or  $q = -1$ , then there is no such condition, i.e.,  $A(p, q) = N\mathcal{K}_p \times (\varphi N\mathcal{K})_q$ .)  $\square$

#### D. ANOTHER VIEW OF CONSERVATIZATION

Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a (discrete) small category. Let  $X$  be simplicial space and let  $X \rightarrow N\mathcal{C}$  be a map of simplicial spaces. Recall from [9] or [1, Def.8.1] that  $X \rightarrow N\mathcal{C}$  is *conservative* if (and only if) for every surjective  $f: [m] \rightarrow [n]$  in  $\Delta$ , the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X_n & \xrightarrow{f^*} & X_m \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ (N\mathcal{C})_n & \xrightarrow{f^*} & (N\mathcal{C})_m \end{array}$$

is homotopy cartesian. In [1] we constructed a functor  $\Lambda$  from the category of simplicial spaces over  $N\mathcal{C}$  to itself which is derived left adjoint to the inclusion of the full subcategory consisting of the conservative objects. A map of simplicial spaces over  $N\mathcal{C}$  as in

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W & \longrightarrow & X \\ & \searrow & \swarrow \\ & N\mathcal{C} & \end{array}$$

is a *conservatization map* if  $X$  is conservative over  $N\mathcal{C}$  and the map is derived initial among maps over  $N\mathcal{C}$  from  $W$  to a conservative object; equivalently, if the induced map  $\Lambda W \rightarrow \Lambda X$  is a degreewise weak equivalence of simplicial spaces.

Now we want to describe and use another variant  $\Lambda^{\text{cla}}$  of  $\Lambda$ , definition D.1. This is inspired by [20, §3.3]. It is defined under more general circumstances. Briefly, we can replace  $N\mathcal{C}$  by any simplicial space  $Y$ . A map  $X \rightarrow Y$  of simplicial spaces is *conservative* if (and only if) for every surjective  $f: [m] \rightarrow [n]$  in  $\Delta$ , the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X_n & \xrightarrow{f^*} & X_m \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ Y_n & \xrightarrow{f^*} & Y_m \end{array}$$

is homotopy cartesian.

*In this section and from now on, we write Space for simplicial set. We make an effort to avoid ordinary topological spaces. The realization of a simplicial Space is*

a Space (coend construction; see [19], proof of Thm A). By  $\Delta[n]$  we mean a certain simplicial Space which is discrete in every degree.

**Definition D.1.** Let  $X$  be a simplicial Space and let  $u: X \rightarrow Y$  be a map of simplicial Spaces, where  $Y$  is degreewise fibrant. Let  $X\langle u \rangle$  be the bisimplicial Space defined by

$$([m], [n]) \mapsto \text{holim} \left( \begin{array}{ccc} & & \text{map}(\Delta[m], Y) \\ & & \downarrow \\ \text{map}(\Delta[m] \times \Delta[n], \varphi X) & \xrightarrow{u_*} & \text{map}(\Delta[m] \times \Delta[n], \varphi Y) \end{array} \right).$$

Let  $\Lambda^{\text{cla}}X$  be the simplicial Space obtained from the bisimplicial Space  $X\langle u \rangle$  by realization in the second variable  $[n]$ . There is a preferred inclusion of  $\varphi_Y X$  in  $\Lambda^{\text{cla}}X$  (try  $n = 0$ ) and there is a preferred forgetful map  $\Lambda^{\text{cla}}X \rightarrow Y$ . The composition of these is the standard fibrant replacement of  $u: X \rightarrow Y$ .

*Remarks.* The Space  $\text{map}(\Delta[m], Y)$  is isomorphic to  $Y_m$  and we can say that it is contained in  $(\varphi Y)_m$ . The vertical arrow within the large parentheses is induced by the projection from  $\Delta[m] \times \Delta[n]$  to  $\Delta[m]$ . By definition  $\Delta[n]$  is the simplicial set represented by  $[n]$ , object of  $\Delta$ . With our conventions for *nerve*, it is more obviously identified with the nerve of  $[n]^{\text{op}}$  than with the nerve of  $[n]$ .

Using exponential notation for derived internal hom objects, we see that there is a homotopy cartesian square of simplicial Spaces

$$(D.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} X\langle u \rangle_{m,-} & \longrightarrow & Y_m \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ X^{\Delta[m]} & \longrightarrow & Y^{\Delta[m]} \end{array}$$

where  $Y_m$  in the upper row is meant as a constant simplicial Space.

In the rest of this section we write  $\Lambda$  to mean  $\Lambda^{\text{cla}}$ .

**Proposition D.2.**  $\Lambda X$  is conservative over  $Y$ .

*Proof.* Let  $f: [m+1] \rightarrow [m]$  be a surjective morphism in  $\Delta$ ; let  $t \in [m] \subset [m+1]$  be the unique element such that  $f(t) = f(t+1) = t$ . We have to show that

$$(D.2) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} (\Lambda X)_m & \xrightarrow{f^*} & (\Lambda X)_{m+1} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ Y_m & \xrightarrow{f^*} & Y_{m+1} \end{array}$$

is homotopy cartesian, or equivalently, that the map

$$(D.3) \quad (\Lambda X)_m \longrightarrow \text{holim} \left( \begin{array}{ccc} & & (\Lambda X)_{m+1} \\ & & \downarrow \\ Y_m & \xrightarrow{f^*} & Y_{m+1} \end{array} \right)$$

determined by (D.2) is a weak equivalence. Now (D.3) can be written, up to weak equivalences, in the form of a map of Spaces  $|P| \rightarrow |Q|$  induced by a map of

simplicial Spaces  $f^{(*)}: P \rightarrow Q$ . Here  $P$  is the simplicial Space  $[n] \mapsto X\langle u \rangle_{m,n}$  and  $Q$  is the simplicial space

$$[n] \mapsto \operatorname{holim} \left( \begin{array}{ccc} & X\langle u \rangle_{m+1,n} & \\ & \downarrow & \\ Y_m & \xrightarrow{f^*} & Y_{m+1} \end{array} \right).$$

Let  $g: [m] \rightarrow [m+1]$  be the injective morphism in  $\Delta$  which has  $t \notin \operatorname{im}(g)$ . Then  $g^{(*)}f^{(*)}$  is the identity of  $P$ . To complete the proof we only need to construct a simplicial homotopy  $Q \times \Delta[1] \rightarrow Q$  from the identity to  $f^{(*)}g^{(*)}$ . This means that for every monotone map  $c$  from  $[n]$  to  $[1]$  we need an “induced” map  $Q_n \rightarrow Q_n$ . For that we take the map which is determined by the identity on  $Y_m$ , the map  $(gf)^*: Y_{m+1} \rightarrow Y_{m+1}$  and the map from  $X\langle u \rangle_{m+1,n}$  to  $X\langle u \rangle_{m+1,n}$  which is induced by the order-preserving endomorphism of  $[m+1] \times [n]$  given by  $(s, t) \mapsto (s, t)$  if  $c(t) = 0$ , and  $(s, t) \mapsto (gf(s), t)$  if  $c(t) = 1$ .  $\square$

**Lemma D.3.** *If  $X \xrightarrow{u} Y$  is a conservative map of simplicial spaces, then the induced map  $X^{\Delta[m]} \rightarrow Y^{\Delta[m]}$  is also conservative.*

Once again this uses exponential notation for derived internal hom objects; so  $X^{\Delta[m]}$  is the simplicial space which has  $\operatorname{map}(\Delta[m] \times \Delta[n], \varphi X)$  in degree  $n$ .

*Proof.* Fix  $[m]$  and an epimorphism  $q: [n] \rightarrow [n-1]$  in  $\Delta$ . We have to show that

$$(D.4) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \operatorname{map}(\Delta[m] \times \Delta[n-1], Y) & \xrightarrow{u} & \operatorname{map}(\Delta[m] \times \Delta[n-1], Y) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \operatorname{map}(\Delta[m] \times \Delta[n], \varphi X) & \xrightarrow{u_*} & \operatorname{map}(\Delta[m] \times \Delta[n], \varphi Y) \end{array}$$

is homotopy cartesian. Write

$$\Delta[m] \times \Delta[n] = \operatorname{colim}_{g: [k] \rightarrow [m] \times [n]} \Delta[k]$$

where  $g: [k] \rightarrow [m] \times [n]$  runs over the nondegenerate simplices in  $\Delta[m] \times \Delta[n]$ . (The homotopy limit is taken over  $\mathcal{Q}(m, n)$ , the poset of nondegenerate simplices of  $\Delta[m] \times \Delta[n]$ .) In the Reedy model structure, this colim is a hocolim, and so the lower row of (D.4) can be re-written (up to weak equivalences)

$$\operatorname{holim}_{g: [k] \rightarrow [m] \times [n]} X_k \longrightarrow \operatorname{holim}_{g: [k] \rightarrow [m] \times [n]} Y_k$$

where we use  $X_k \cong \operatorname{map}(\Delta[k], X)$  and  $Y_k \cong \operatorname{map}(\Delta[k], Y)$ . Now we propose to write the upper row in a similar manner:

$$\operatorname{holim}_{g: [k] \rightarrow [m] \times [n]} X_{k(g)} \longrightarrow \operatorname{holim}_{g: [k] \rightarrow [m] \times [n]} Y_{k(g)}$$

where  $k(g)$  is determined by the commutative diagram

$$(D.5) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} [k] & \xrightarrow{g} & [m] \times [n] \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow [m] \times q \\ [k(g)] & \xrightarrow{\quad} & [m] \times [n-1] \end{array}$$

To justify this proposal it suffices to show that the functor  $F$  taking  $g \in \mathcal{Q}(m, n)$  to the injective monotone map  $[k(g)] \rightarrow [m]$  as in (D.5), an element of  $\mathcal{Q}(m, n-1)$ , is homotopy terminal. This amounts to showing that certain subposets of  $\mathcal{Q}(m, n)$  have a (weakly) contractible classifying Space. We can take the view that the objects of  $\mathcal{Q}(m, n)$  are certain nonempty subsets of  $[m] \times [n]$ , and similarly for  $\mathcal{Q}(m, n-1)$ . Now we have to show that for every  $T \in \mathcal{Q}(m, n-1)$ , the full sub-poset of  $\mathcal{Q}(m, n)$  consisting of the  $S \in \mathcal{Q}(m, n)$  such that  $F(S) \supset T$  has a contractible classifying Space. Here  $F(S)$  is simply the image of  $S$  under the right-hand vertical arrow in (D.5). By an adjunction argument, this is equivalent to showing that for every  $T \in \mathcal{Q}(m, n-1)$ , the full sub-poset  $\mathcal{Q}(m, n, T)$  of  $\mathcal{Q}(m, n)$  consisting of the  $S \in \mathcal{Q}(m, n)$  such that  $F(S) = T$  has a contractible classifying Space.

Here we should make a case distinction. Let  $x \in [n-1] \subset [n]$  be the unique element such that  $q(x) = q(x+1)$ . If  $T$  has empty intersection with  $[m] \times \{x\}$ , then  $\mathcal{Q}(m, n, T)$  has exactly one element, and the classifying Space is contractible. If that intersection has  $r+1$  elements,  $r \geq 0$ , then  $\mathcal{Q}(m, n, T)$  is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{Q}(r, 1, U)$  where  $U$  is all of  $[r] \times [0]$ . The classifying Space is a concatenation of  $2r$  copies of  $\Delta[1]$ , and so it is contractible.

Having settled that, we can recast (D.4) in the form of a commutative square

$$(D.6) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \operatorname{holim}_{g: [k] \rightarrow [m] \times [n]} X_{k(g)} & \xrightarrow{u} & \operatorname{holim}_{g: [k] \rightarrow [m] \times [n]} Y_{k(g)} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \operatorname{holim}_{g: [k] \rightarrow [m] \times [n]} X_k & \xrightarrow{u_*} & \operatorname{holim}_{g: [k] \rightarrow [m] \times [n]} Y_k \end{array}$$

determined by the collection of commutative squares

$$(D.7) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} X_{k(g)} & \xrightarrow{u} & Y_{k(g)} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ X_k & \xrightarrow{u_*} & Y_k \end{array}$$

where  $g \in \mathcal{Q}$ , and the vertical arrows are induced by preferred monotone surjections  $[k] \rightarrow [k(g)]$ . Since the squares (D.7) are all homotopy cartesian by our assumption on  $u$ , it follows that (D.6) is homotopy cartesian.  $\square$

**Proposition D.4.** *If  $u: X \rightarrow Y$  is already conservative, then the second-variable simplicial operators  $X\langle u \rangle_{m,0} \rightarrow X\langle u \rangle_{m,n}$  in the bisimplicial Space  $X\langle u \rangle$  are all weak equivalences. Hence the inclusion  $X \rightarrow \Lambda X$  is a weak equivalence.*

*Proof.* By lemma D.3, the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X_m & \longrightarrow & Y_m \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ X^{\Delta[m]} & \longrightarrow & Y^{\Delta[m]} \end{array}$$

is homotopy cartesian. Comparison with (D.1) finishes the proof.  $\square$

Let  $\mathcal{L}(Y)$  be the category of all simplicial Spaces over  $Y$  and let  $\mathcal{K}(Y) \subset \mathcal{L}(Y)$  be the full subcategory consisting of the objects which are conservative.

**Proposition D.5.** *The functor  $\Lambda$ , viewed as a functor  $\mathcal{L}(Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(Y)$ , is a derived left adjoint for the inclusion  $\mathcal{K}(Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(Y)$ . The natural inclusion  $\text{id} \Rightarrow \Lambda$  is the unit of the adjunction.*

*Proof.* Let  $X$  be an object of  $\mathcal{L}(Y)$ . Write  $\iota_X: X \rightarrow \Lambda X$  for the inclusion. The general theory of derived adjoints says that we need to establish two properties of  $\Lambda$  and  $\iota$ .

- (i) If  $X$  is in  $\mathcal{K}(Y)$ , then  $\iota_X: X \rightarrow \Lambda X$  is a weak equivalence.
- (ii) For every  $X$  in  $\mathcal{L}(Y)$ , the map  $\Lambda(\iota_X): \Lambda X \rightarrow \Lambda(\Lambda X)$  induced by  $\iota_X$  is a weak equivalence.

Of these, (i) has already been established. Statement (ii) follows from (i) and

- (iii) for every  $X$  in  $\mathcal{L}(Y)$  and integer  $m \geq 0$ , the two maps  $\iota_{\Lambda X}$  and  $\Lambda(\iota_X)$  from  $\Lambda X$  to  $\Lambda(\Lambda X)$  are (weakly) homotopic in degree  $m$ .

In the proof of (iii) we are going to make heavy use of naturality arguments. Therefore we introduce  $\mathcal{L}$ , the arrow category of simplicial Spaces. (An object is a map of simplicial spaces  $X \rightarrow Y$ , and a morphism is a commutative square. This has a full subcategory  $\mathcal{K}$  spanned by the objects  $u: X \rightarrow Y$  where  $u$  is conservative. We will write objects of  $\mathcal{L}$  in the form  $X \curvearrowright Y$  in order to mark them as objects. For  $\Lambda X$  as in (iii) we will now write  $\Lambda(X \curvearrowright Y)$  to show the dependence on  $Y$ . The functor  $\Lambda$  can be regarded as an endofunctor of  $\mathcal{L}$ , if that is convenient.)

For the proof of (iii) we introduce a small subcategory  $\mathcal{U}_m$  of  $\mathcal{L}$ . This is the image of the functor from  $\Delta$  to  $\mathcal{L}$  taking  $[n]$  to

$$U(m, n) := (\Delta[m] \times \Delta[n] \curvearrowright \Delta[m])$$

where the (curved) arrow is the projection.

Note that  $\Lambda(U(m, n))$  is  $U(m, 0)$  up to weak equivalence, by direct computation. The map  $\iota_{U(m, n)}: U(m, n) \rightarrow \Lambda(U(m, n))$  can be identified with the unique morphism  $U(m, n) \rightarrow U(m, 0)$  in  $\mathcal{U}_m$ . Therefore we have a preferred derived natural transformation

$$(D.8) \quad \begin{array}{c} (U(m, n) \mapsto \star) \\ \Downarrow \\ (U(m, n) \mapsto (\Lambda(U(m, n)))_m) \end{array}$$

by writing  $(\Lambda(U(m, n)))_m \simeq (\Delta[m])_m$  and using the inclusion of the unique non-degenerate element in the finite set  $(\Delta[m])_m$ . This helps us in making a crucial observation.

- (obs) For fixed  $m \geq 0$ , the functor  $(X \curvearrowright Y) \mapsto (\Lambda(X \curvearrowright Y))_m$  from  $\mathcal{L}$  to Spaces is the derived left Kan extension of the constant one-point functor on  $\mathcal{U}_m$ . The derived natural transformation (D.8) is the unit transformation implied by this relationship.

(Justification of (obs): the Space  $(\Lambda(X \curvearrowright Y))_m$  is known to us as the realization of the simplicial Space  $[n] \mapsto \mathbb{R}\text{map}_{\mathcal{L}}(U(m, n), X \curvearrowright Y)$ . The realization is weakly equivalent to the homotopy colimit of the functor  $[n] \mapsto \mathbb{R}\text{map}_{\mathcal{L}}(U(m, n), X \curvearrowright Y)$  on  $\Delta^{\text{op}}$ . But that is also the preferred formula for the value at  $(X \curvearrowright Y)$  of the derived left Kan extension of the constant functor  $\star$  on  $\mathcal{U}_m$  along  $\mathcal{U}_m \hookrightarrow \mathcal{L}$ .)

Because of (obs), statement (iii) can be deduced from a statement about  $\Lambda$  restricted to  $\mathcal{U}_m$ .



- (iv) For  $X \simeq Y$  in  $\mathcal{U}_m \subset \mathcal{L}$ , the two maps  $\iota_{\Lambda X}$  and  $\Lambda(\iota_X)$  from  $\Lambda(X \simeq Y)$  to  $\Lambda(\Lambda(X \simeq Y))$  are (weakly) homotopic in degree  $m$  by a *derived natural* homotopy.

But (iv) is obvious because  $\Lambda(\Lambda U(m, n)) \simeq \Lambda U(m, n) \simeq U(m, 0)$ , so that the  $m$ -th space of  $\Lambda(\Lambda U(m, n))$  is homotopy discrete.  $\square$

Now we are in a good position to prove that conservatization is compatible with products. In more detail, suppose that we have commutative diagrams of simplicial Spaces

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W & \longrightarrow & X \\ & \searrow & \swarrow \\ & & Y \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} W' & \longrightarrow & X' \\ & \searrow & \swarrow \\ & & Y' \end{array}$$

**Proposition D.6.** *If  $W \rightarrow X$  is a conservatization map over  $Y$ , and  $W' \rightarrow X'$  is a conservatization map over  $Y'$ , then the induced map  $W \times W' \rightarrow X \times X'$  is a conservatization map over  $Y \times Y'$ .*

*Proof.* We are told that  $X$  is conservative over  $Y$ , that  $X'$  is conservative over  $Y'$ , and that the maps  $\Lambda W \rightarrow \Lambda X$ ,  $\Lambda W' \rightarrow \Lambda X'$  are weak equivalences. We need to deduce that  $\Lambda(W \times W') \rightarrow \Lambda(X \times X')$  is a weak equivalence. Fibrant replacement  $\varphi$  and the contravariant functor  $\text{map}(\Delta[m] \times \Delta[n], -)$  respect products. The ungeometric realization (applied to Reedy cofibrant simplicial Spaces) also respects products up to weak equivalence.  $\square$

Let  $Y$  be a Segal Space. Let  $X \rightarrow Y$  be a map of simplicial Spaces making  $X$  into a fiberwise complete Segal Space over  $Y$ . Write  $\kappa X \rightarrow \kappa Y$  for the induced map between their Rezk completions.

**Proposition D.7.** *The square of simplicial Spaces*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Lambda(X) & \longrightarrow & \Lambda(\kappa X) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ Y & \longrightarrow & \kappa Y \end{array}$$

*is a (degreewise) homotopy pullback square.*

We will use homotopical shorthand for the proof. In degree  $n$ , the map from  $\Lambda(X)$  to  $\Lambda(\kappa X)$  in the above square is the (ungeometric) realization of the map of simplicial Spaces

$$(D.9) \quad X^{\Delta[n]} \times_{Y^{\Delta[n]}}^h Y_n \longrightarrow (\kappa X)^{\Delta[n]} \times_{(\kappa Y)^{\Delta[n]}}^h \kappa Y_n$$

(The exponential means derived inner hom; so  $Y_n \subset Y^{\Delta[n]}$  and  $\kappa Y_n \subset \kappa Y^{\Delta[n]}$ .)

*Proof.* Since  $X \rightarrow Y$  is fiberwise complete, the map  $X \rightarrow \kappa X \times_{\kappa Y}^h Y$  which it induces is a (degreewise) weak equivalence. Therefore the induced map

$$X^{\Delta[n]} \rightarrow (\kappa X)^{\Delta[n]} \times_{(\kappa Y)^{\Delta[n]}}^h Y^{\Delta[n]}$$

is also a degreewise weak equivalence for each  $n$ . It follows that (D.9) is the upper row in a homotopy cartesian square whose lower row is

$$Y_n \rightarrow \kappa Y_n$$

viewed as a map between constant simplicial Spaces. Therefore (D.9) is a lucky case of a map between simplicial Spaces where we are allowed to interchange realization

with taking homotopy fibers. That is, every homotopy fiber of  $\Lambda X_n \rightarrow \Lambda(\kappa X)_n$  maps by a weak equivalence to the appropriate homotopy fiber of  $Y_n \rightarrow \kappa Y_n$ , settling the claim.  $\square$

**Corollary D.8.** (Notation of definition A.3.) *The forgetful map from  $\text{ucon}(\pi)$  to  $\text{ucon}(E)$  is a conservatization map over  $\text{NuFin}$ .*  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] P. Boavida de Brito and M.S. Weiss, *Spaces of smooth embeddings and configuration categories*, J. Topology 11 (2018), 65–143.
- [2] ———, *The configuration category of a product*, Proc.A.M.S. 146 (2018), 4497–4512.
- [3] ———, *The configuration category of a covering space*, preprint (arXiv).
- [4] ———, *Presentations of configuration categories*, preprint (arXiv).
- [5] A. V. Chernavskii, *Topological embeddings of manifolds*, (Russian) Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR 187 (1969), 1247–1250.
- [6] M. Cole, *Mixing model structures*, Topology and its Applications 153 (2006), 1016–1032.
- [7] A. Dold, *Partitions of unity in the theory of fibrations*, Ann.of Math.78 (1963), 223–255.
- [8] W. Dwyer and D. Kan, *A classification theorem for diagrams of simplicial sets*, Topology 23 (1984), 139–155.
- [9] I. Galvez-Carrillo, J. Kock and A. Tonks, *Decomposition spaces, incidence algebras and Möbius inversion I: Basic theory*, Adv. in Math. 331 (2018), 952–1015.
- [10] T. Goodwillie, *A multiple disjunction lemma for smooth concordance embeddings*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc 86 (1990), viii+317 pp.
- [11] T. Goodwillie and J. Klein, *Multiple disjunction for spaces of Poincaré embeddings*, J. Topol. 1 (2008), no. 4, 761–803.
- [12] ———, *Multiple disjunction for spaces of smooth embeddings*, J. Topol. 8 (2015), no. 3, 651–674.
- [13] T. Goodwillie and M. S. Weiss, *Embeddings from the point of view of immersion theory, II*, Geom. Topol. 3 (1999), 103–118.
- [14] F. Göppl, *A spectral sequence for spaces of maps between operads*, to appear Alg.Geom.Topol.
- [15] A. Haefliger and M. W. Hirsch, *Immersions in the stable range*, Ann.of Math. 75 (1962), 231–241.
- [16] G. Horel, *Profinite completion of operads and the Grothendieck-Teichmüller group*, Adv. Math. 321 (2017), 326–390.
- [17] M. Krannich and A. Kupers, *The disc structure space*, preprint, [arXiv:2205.01755](https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.01755)
- [18] R. Lashof, *Embedding spaces*. Illinois J. Math. 20 (1976), 144–154.
- [19] D. Quillen, *Higher algebraic K-theory I*, in: Bass, H. (ed) Higher K-Theories. Lecture Notes in Math., vol 341. Springer, Berlin-Heidelberg (1973).
- [20] C. Rezk, *A model for the homotopy theory of homotopy theory*, Trans.Amer.Math.Soc. 353 (2001), 973–1007.
- [21] G. Segal, *Classifying spaces and spectral sequences*, Publ. math. IHES 34 (1968), 105–112.
- [22] R. Vogt, *Convenient categories of topological spaces for homotopy theory*, Archiv Math., XXII (1971), 545–555.
- [23] M. S. Weiss, *Embeddings from the point of view of immersion theory, I*, Geom.Topol. 3 (1999), 67–101.
- [24] ———, *What does the classifying space of a category classify?* Homol. Homotop. Appl. 7 (2005), 185–195.

DEPT. OF MATHEMATICS, INSTITUTO SUPERIOR TECNICO, UNIV. OF LISBON, AV. ROVISCO PAIS, LISBOA, PORTUGAL

*Email address:* `pedrobrito@tecnico.ulisboa.pt`

MATH. INSTITUT, UNIVERSITÄT MÜNSTER, 48149 MÜNSTER, EINSTEINSTRASSE 62, GERMANY

*Email address:* `m.weiss@uni-muenster.de`