

# BIVARIANT OPERADIC CATEGORIES

MARTIN MARKL

ABSTRACT. We develop a self-dual, bivariant extension of the concept of an operadic category, its associated operads and their algebras. Our new theory covers, besides all classical subjects, also generalized traces and bivariant versions of Kapranov's charades. It is, moreover, combinatorially rich and aesthetically pleasing.

## CONTENTS

Introduction	1
1. Perfect operadic categories	4
2. Unary dioperadic categories	5
3. Unary bioperadic categories	11
4. Bicharades	16
5. General dioperadic categories	22
6. General bioperadic categories	28
Epilogue	33
References	34

## INTRODUCTION

**O**PERADIC categories, the related operads and their algebras were introduced in [4], cf. also Section 1 of the freely available article [3]. Any operadic category  $\mathcal{O}$  is, by definition, equipped with the cardinality functor  $\mathcal{O} \xrightarrow{|\cdot|} \mathbf{sFSet}$  to the skeletal category of finite sets. Each morphism  $h : S \rightarrow T$  in  $\mathcal{O}$  has  $n$  fibers  $F_1, \dots, F_n \in \mathcal{O}$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , where  $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$  is the cardinality of the target  $T$  of  $h$ . We will express this fact by writing

$$(1a) \quad F_1, \dots, F_n \triangleright S \xrightarrow{h} T.$$

Operadic categories support operads. An  $\mathcal{O}$ -operad is a collection  $\mathcal{P} = \{\mathcal{P}(T)\}_{T \in \mathcal{O}}$  of objects of some symmetric monoidal category  $\mathbb{V} = (\mathbb{V}, \otimes, 1)$ , with the compositions

$$(1b) \quad \gamma_h : \mathcal{P}(T) \otimes \mathcal{P}(F_1) \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{P}(F_n) \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}(S),$$

associated to each morphism  $h : S \rightarrow T$  with fibers  $F_1, \dots, F_n$  as in (1a).

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 18M85, 18M60; secondary 18D70.

Supported by the Institute of Mathematics, Czech Academy of Sciences (RVO 67985840), and Praemium Academiæ of Martin Markl.

Finally, operads have algebras; a  $\mathcal{P}$ -*algebra* is collection  $A = \{A_c\}_{c \in \pi_0(\mathcal{O})}$  of objects of  $\mathcal{V}$  indexed by the set  $\pi_0(\mathcal{O})$  of connected components of  $\mathcal{O}$ , equipped with structure operations

$$(1c) \quad a_T : \mathcal{P}(T) \otimes \bigotimes_{c \in \mathbf{s}(T)} A_c \longrightarrow A_{\mathbf{t}(T)}, \quad T \in \mathcal{O},$$

where  $\mathbf{s}(T)$ , the *source* of  $T$ , is the list of connected components of the fibers of the identity morphism  $\mathbb{1}_T : T \rightarrow T$ , and where  $\mathbf{t}(T)$ , the *target* of  $T$ , is the connected component of  $\mathcal{O}$  to which  $T$  belongs. The operations (1b) and (1c) are, of course, subjects of appropriate axioms cf. the first sections of [4] or [3]. The situation is captured by the triad

$$\boxed{\text{algebras}} \implies \boxed{\text{operads}} \implies \boxed{\text{operadic categories}}$$

in which “ $A \implies B$ ” must be read as “ $A$  is governed by  $B$ .”

The above concept, inspired by Batanin’s  $n$ -operads [2], covers, either as ‘operads’ or as their ‘algebras,’ the most common operad-like structures, such as the traditional operads, their variants such as cyclic or modular operads, and also diverse versions of PROPs such as wheeled properads, dioperads, and even more exotic objects such as permutads and pre-permutads. However, it is still not fully satisfactory for the following reasons. First, the sources and the target of a given  $T \in \mathcal{O}$  are objects of different types – while the sources very crucially use the fiber structure of  $\mathcal{O}$ , the target does not refer to it at all. Second, each  $T$  has only one target, so the ‘operads’ of the theory cannot have operations with multiple outputs.

Our goal is to modify and extend the standard concept of an operadic category so that morphisms will possess, along with the fibers as before, also the *cofibers*, so instead of (1a) we would have something as

$$F_1, \dots, F_n \triangleright S \xrightarrow{h} T \triangleleft D_1, \dots, D_m.$$

The target of an object  $T$  will then be the list of connected components of the cofibers of the identity  $\mathbb{1}_T : T \rightarrow T$ . As expected, we define cofibers by dualization of the properties of the fibers. We will also need suitable compatibilities between fibers and cofibers. The emerging self-dual concepts of *di-* and *bioperadic* categories will be the main subjects of this article.

Let us point out some salient features of these two new concepts. While operadic categories have operads, dioperadic categories also have cooperads and new types of ‘bimodules.’ However, it turns out that to define algebras for operads, coalgebras for cooperads, and traces for bimodules, one needs to impose some additional conditions. Bioperadic categories are defined as dioperadic categories that satisfy them. The landscape is sketched in Figure 1. In our setup, traces are objects governed by bimodules in the same way that algebras are governed by operads and coalgebras are governed by cooperads. The terminology is explained by Examples 16 and 51. By Proposition 49, the bivariate concept presented here does indeed generalize the theory of unital operadic categories, their operads and algebras, introduced in [4].

Abelian categories admit a bioperadic structure, given by the kernels and the cokernels, having an interesting, unexpected property. This property is abstracted in Section 4 by the notion of a *bicharadic* category. The rôles of algebras are played by *bicharades*, which are bivariate generalizations of the (absolute) Kapranov’s charades [6, Definition 3.2]. The charadic structure of determinants and Steinberg modules naturally extends to our bivariate concept.




FIGURE 1. Dioperadic duad (left) and bioperadic triad (right).

**The layout of the paper.** The article opens with a short section dedicated to a certain property of fibers in an operadic category, and the induced maps. The main body of the article then contains two parallel parts. In Sections 2 and 3 we focus on di- and bioperadic categories, whose morphism have only one fiber and one cofiber. The general case is postponed to Sections 5 and 6. The correspondence between the individual items is described in

unary - Secs. 2, 3	general - Secs. 5, 6
Definition 9	Definition 33
Definition 14	Definition 41
Definition 17	Definition 45
Proposition 19	Proposition 46
Definition 22	Definition 48
Definition 23	Definition 50

We have chosen this arrangement for expository reasons. While the unary, i.e. one fiber–one cofiber case, exhibits all the salient features of these novel concepts, it avoids complications caused by the complex combinatorics of multiple (co)fibers, and the associated numerical conditions. We assumed that starting directly with the general case would make the article unreadable; the daring reader may of course skip Sections 2 and 3. Between the two parallel parts mentioned above we have inserted one section on bicharades, which are unary in nature. In the brief epilogue, as an inspiration for future work, we propose possible modifications of our setup.

**Conventions.** Given a category  $\mathcal{C}$ , we denote by  $\mathcal{C}^\dagger$  the opposite category, and by  $(-)^\dagger : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^\dagger$  the corresponding contravariant isomorphism. If the meaning is clear from the context, we will abuse the notation and use the same symbols for the maps in  $\mathcal{C}$  and their images in  $\mathcal{C}^\dagger$ . By  $\pi_0(\mathcal{C})$  we denote the set of connected components of  $\mathcal{C}$  and by  $\pi_0(T)$  the connected component to which an object  $T \in \mathcal{C}$  belongs. We will assume that the set of connected components of categories considered here is small with respect to a sufficiently large surrounding universe. By a luff (full read backwards) subcategory we mean a subcategory with the same objects as the overcategory.

Unless otherwise noted, all operadic categories considered here are strict and nonunital. The latter means that we do not assume the existence of the chosen local terminal objects and the associated axioms in [4, page 1634]. The simplified axioms for unary, i.e. one-fiber, operadic categories, sufficient for Sections 2–4, can be found in [5].

We use the definition of operads in which the components of the fibers act, unlike in [4, Definition 1.11], from the right on the component of the target. Also, operads in this article act, unlike in [4, Definition 1.11], on their algebras from the left. This convention is closer to the traditional setup.

Finally, we denote by  $\mathbb{N}$  the set of natural numbers including 0 and, for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , by  $\Sigma_n$  the symmetric group on  $n$  elements. All algebraic objects will live in a symmetric monoidal category  $\mathbb{V} = (\mathbb{V}, \otimes, 1)$ .

**Acknowledgment.** I am indebted to the participants of my seminar held at the Mathematical Institute in Prague, especially Michael Batanin and Dominik Trnka, for many useful suggestions and comments. Last but not least, I would like to thank Jaroslav Vodrážka for taking me back 50 years in my memories.

## 1. PERFECT OPERADIC CATEGORIES

**O**UR original definition of operadic categories [4, Section 1] required the existence of selected local terminal objects and the corresponding axioms, i.e. the *unitality*. In the course of working on [5], it became clear that without assuming the existence of local terminal objects, the theory takes on an unexpected flexibility, including new examples. We also understood that the unitality is a combination of two conditions of different characters – the left and the right unitality:

**Definition 1.** Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be an operadic category equipped with a family

$$(2) \quad \{U_c \in \mathcal{O} \mid c \in \pi_0(\mathcal{O})\}$$

of local terminal objects of cardinality [1], such that  $U_c$  belongs to the connected component  $c$  of  $\mathcal{O}$ . The category  $\mathcal{O}$  is *left unital* if the fibers of the identity automorphism  $\mathbb{1}_S : S \rightarrow S$  belong to the family (2) of the chosen local terminal objects, for each  $S \in \mathcal{O}$ . The category  $\mathcal{O}$  is *right unital* if the fiber functor restricted to  $\mathcal{O}/U_c$  is the domain functor, for each  $c \in \pi_0(\mathcal{O})$ . Finally,  $\mathcal{O}$  is *unital* if it is both left and right unital.

The property introduced in the following definition is automatically satisfied by unary operadic categories.

**Definition 2.** To each operadic category  $\mathcal{O}$  we associate a substructure  $\mathcal{O}_F \subset \mathcal{O}$  consisting of the fibers of morphisms of  $\mathcal{O}$  and of the induced morphisms between them. We say that  $\mathcal{O}$  is *perfect* if  $\mathcal{O}_F$  is a subcategory of  $\mathcal{O}$ . We then call  $\mathcal{O}_F$  the *fiber subcategory* of  $\mathcal{O}$ .

Definition 2 needs an explanation. Each chain  $S \xrightarrow{h} T \xrightarrow{g} R$  of morphisms of  $\mathcal{O}$  induces, for  $i \in |R|$ , the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F & \xrightarrow{h_i} & G \\ \nabla & & \nabla \\ S & \xrightarrow{h} & T \\ & \searrow^{gh} & \swarrow_g \\ & & R \end{array}$$

in which  $F \xrightarrow{h_i} G$  is the induced map between the  $i$ th fibers of  $gh$  and  $g$ , respectively. The perfectness of  $\mathcal{O}$  means that the composite of induced morphisms is again an induced morphism. The structure  $\mathcal{O}_F$  is then an operadic subcategory of  $\mathcal{O}$ .

**Proposition 3.** *Each right unital operadic category  $\mathcal{O}$  is perfect, with  $\mathcal{O}_F = \mathcal{O}$ .*

The proof is obvious. Later we will see several perfect operadic categories that are not right unital.

## 2. UNARY DIOPERADIC CATEGORIES

**I**N this section we propose a ‘self-dual closure’ of the notion of a unary operadic category; the non-unary case will be addressed in Section 5.

**2.1. Unary operadic categories.** By definition, the cardinality of each object of an unary operadic category  $\mathcal{O}$  is [1]. Morphisms thus have only one fiber, so (1a) reduces to  $F \triangleright S \xrightarrow{h} T$ . The unarity brings some simplifications to the axioms, which are in this simplified form presented in [5, Section 1]. The fiber structure is in the unary case expressed by a single *fiber functor*  $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{O}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}$ , cf. [5, Definition 3], from the *décalage*

$$(3) \quad \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{O}) := \coprod_{c \in \mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}/c$$

of the category  $\mathcal{O}$ . The following proposition describes a particular kind of unary operadic categories. We will refer to it at several places later in this paper.

**Proposition 4.** *Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be a small category and  $r : \mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}$  an endofunctor. The rule that defines the fiber of a map  $h : S \rightarrow T$  in  $\mathcal{O}$  to be  $r(S)$ , that is,  $r(S) \triangleright S \xrightarrow{h} T$ , and the induced map between its fibers as  $h_R := r(h)$  in*

$$(4) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} r(S) & \xrightarrow{h_R := r(h)} & r(T) \\ \nabla & & \nabla \\ S & \xrightarrow{h} & T \\ & \searrow^{gh} & \swarrow_g \\ & & R \end{array}$$

*converts  $\mathcal{O}$  to a (nonunital) unary operadic category if and only if  $r$  is idempotent, i.e.  $r^2 = r$ .*

*Proof.* The proposition can be proved by checking the axioms of an operadic category for the fiber functor  $\mathcal{F} := rd_0 : \mathcal{D}(0) \rightarrow 0$ , with  $d_0 : \mathcal{D}(0) \rightarrow 0$  the domain functor, but we offer a more elegant approach. The décalage assembles to an endofunctor  $\mathcal{D} : \text{Cat} \rightarrow \text{Cat}$  on the category of small categories, and the domain functor  $d_0 : \mathcal{D}(0) \rightarrow 0$  gives rise to a natural transformation  $d : \mathcal{D} \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{1}_{\text{Cat}}$ . By [5, Corollary 7], the pair  $(\mathcal{D}, \mu)$  with  $\mu := \mathcal{D}(d) : \mathcal{D}^2 \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{D}$  is a nonunital monad in  $\text{Cat}$ . Proposition 8 loc. cit. then states that the algebras for this monad are unary (nonunital) operadic categories.

A functor  $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{D}(0) \rightarrow 0$  is thus the fiber functor of a unary operadic category if it is an algebra for the nonunital monad  $(\mathcal{D}, \mu)$ , i.e. if  $\mathcal{F}\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{F}\mu$ . In the particular case with  $\mu = \mathcal{D}(d)$  and  $\mathcal{F} = rd_0$  this leads to

$$(5) \quad rd_0\mathcal{D}(rd_0) = rd_0\mathcal{D}(d_0).$$

We notice that  $rd_0 = d_0\mathcal{D}(r)$  since  $d$  is a natural transformation, so the left hand side of (5) equals  $d_0\mathcal{D}(r)\mathcal{D}(rd_0)$  which in turn equals  $d_0\mathcal{D}(r^2)\mathcal{D}(rd_0)$  by the functoriality of  $\mathcal{D}$ . Using the naturality of  $d$  again, we eventually rewrite the left hand side to  $r^2d_0\mathcal{D}(d_0)$  and conclude that (5) is equivalent to

$$r^2d_0\mathcal{D}(d_0) = rd_0\mathcal{D}(d_0).$$

Since the functor  $d_0\mathcal{D}(d_A) : \mathcal{D}^2(0) \rightarrow 0$  is surjective on both the objects and the morphisms of  $0$ , the latter equation is satisfied if and only if  $r^2 = r$ .  $\square$

**Example 5.** Each category  $0$  admits the *tautological* unary operadic category structure given by choosing, in Proposition 4,  $r$  to be the identity endofunctor  $\mathbb{1}_0 : 0 \rightarrow 0$ . The result is the rule  $S \triangleright S \xrightarrow{h} T$ , for each morphism of  $0$ .

**Example 6.** In the presence of a collection (2) we have an important idempotent functor featured in Proposition 4 defined by  $r(S) := U_c$ , where  $U_c$  is the chosen object in the connected component  $\pi_0(S)$  of  $S \in 0$ . The rule  $U_c \triangleright S \xrightarrow{h} T$  thus makes  $0$  a unary operadic category.

**Proposition 7.** *The category  $0$  with the operadic structure given by an idempotent  $r : 0 \rightarrow 0$  is left unital, cf. Definition 1, if and only if  $r : 0 \rightarrow 0$  is the identity endofunctor. It is right unital if and only if the image of  $r : 0 \rightarrow 0$  consists of the chosen local terminals in (2). Therefore  $0$  is unital if and only if it is discrete, i.e. a small set.*

We leave the proof of Proposition 7 as an exercise. Thus the only left unital unary operadic categories produced by Proposition 4 are the tautological ones in Example 5, and the only right unital are those in Example 6.

**Example 8.** Each unary operadic category with the structure given by an idempotent  $r$  in Proposition 4 is perfect, with  $0_F$  the image of  $r$ . Indeed, the maps between the fibers are of the form  $r(h)$  for a morphisms  $h$  of  $0$ . Since

$$r(g)r(h) = r^2(g)r^2(h) = r(r(g)r(h)),$$

the subclass of morphisms of that form is closed under composition. Another example of a perfect unary operadic category is the tautological operadic category  $\mathcal{T}(A)$  generated by  $A$ , cf. [5, Definition 9], with  $\mathcal{T}(A)_F$  the décalage  $\mathcal{D}(A)$  of the category  $A$ .

**2.2. Unary dioperadic categories – definition and examples.** We will consider triples  $\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{Q}_L, \mathbb{Q}_R$  consisting of a unary operadic category  $\mathbb{Q}_L$  with the underlying category  $\mathbb{Q}$ , together with a unary operadic category  $\mathbb{Q}_R$  with the underlying category the opposite category  $\mathbb{Q}^\dagger$ . We will express this situation by writing  $\mathbb{Q} = (\mathbb{Q}_L, \mathbb{Q}_R)$ . A morphism  $h : S \rightarrow T$  of  $\mathbb{Q}$  has thus its *fiber*, say  $F$ , in  $\mathbb{Q}_L$  and its *cofiber*, say  $D$ , which is the fiber of the map  $h^\dagger : T^\dagger \rightarrow S^\dagger$  in  $\mathbb{Q}_R$ . We will abbreviate this by

$$(6) \quad F \triangleright S \xrightarrow{h} T \triangleleft D.$$

**Definition 9.** We say that  $\mathbb{Q} = (\mathbb{Q}_L, \mathbb{Q}_R)$  as above is *left dioperadic* if  $\mathbb{Q}_L$  is perfect. In this case we denote by  $\mathbb{Q}_F$  the fiber subcategory of  $\mathbb{Q}_L$ . Dually,  $\mathbb{Q}$  is *right dioperadic* if  $\mathbb{Q}_R$  is perfect, with  $\mathbb{Q}_C$  denoting the fiber subcategory of  $\mathbb{Q}_R$ . Finally,  $\mathbb{Q}$  is *dioperadic* if it is both left and right dioperadic.

**Convention.** The rest of this and the following section will concentrate on the unary case, thus all dioperadic categories and their variants will be unary without mentioning it.

**Example 10.** In Example 1.22 of [4] we discussed a unary operadic structure on the subcategory  $\text{Epi}(\mathbb{A})$  of epimorphisms of an Abelian category  $\mathbb{A}$ , with the kernels of maps as the fibers. Operads over  $\text{Epi}(\mathbb{A})$  were the (absolute) Kapranov's charades [6, Definition 3.2]. In the present example we consider the whole  $\mathbb{A}$ , with the fiber-cofiber structure  $\mathbb{A} = (\mathbb{A}_L, \mathbb{A}_R)$  given by the scheme

$$\text{Ker}(a) \triangleright X \xrightarrow{a} Y \triangleleft \text{Coker}(a)$$

where  $\text{Ker}(a)$  resp.  $\text{Coker}(a)$  is a chosen kernel resp. cokernel of a morphism  $a$  of  $\mathbb{A}$ . Let us verify that the above definition of fibers is functorial. To this end, consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} F'' & \xrightarrow{\kappa''} & X & \overset{h_Z}{\dashrightarrow} & Y \\ \downarrow \alpha & \nearrow s & \downarrow x & & \downarrow y \\ F' & \xrightarrow{\kappa'} & S & \xrightarrow{h} & T \\ & & \downarrow gh & & \downarrow g \\ & & & & Z \end{array}$$

in which  $X \xrightarrow{x} S$  resp.  $Y \xrightarrow{y} T$  is the kernel of  $gh$  resp. the kernel of  $g$ . Since  $g(hx) = (gh)x = 0$  and since  $y$  is an equalizer of  $g$  and the null morphism, i.e.  $y = \text{Eq}(g, 0)$ , there exists a unique  $h_Z : X \rightarrow Y$  making the upper rectangle of the diagram commutative. The functoriality follows from the uniqueness of this construction.

Let us compare the domain  $F'$  of the kernel  $\kappa'$  of  $h$  to the domain  $F''$  of the kernel  $\kappa''$  of  $h_Z$ . Since  $h(x\kappa'') = y(h_Z\kappa'') = 0$  and since  $\kappa' = \text{Eq}(h, 0)$ , there exist a unique  $\alpha : F'' \rightarrow F'$  making the left square commutative. Since  $gh(\kappa') = g(h\kappa') = 0$  and since  $x = \text{Eq}(gh, 0)$ , there exists a diagonal map  $s : F' \rightarrow X$  such that the lower right triangle in the left square commutes. Finally,  $yh_Zs = (hx)s = \kappa'h = 0$  and, thus,  $h_Zs = 0$  since  $y$ , as a kernel, is a monomorphism. So there exists  $\beta : F' \rightarrow F''$  making the upper left triangle commutative. Let us prove that  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are mutual inverses. By the standard diagram chase

$$\kappa'\alpha\beta = x\kappa''\beta = sx = \kappa' \quad \text{and} \quad x\kappa''\beta\alpha = xs\alpha = \kappa'\alpha = x\kappa''.$$

Since both  $\kappa'$  and  $x\kappa''$  are monomorphisms,  $\alpha\beta = \mathbb{1}_{F'}$  and  $\beta\alpha = \mathbb{1}_{F''}$  as claimed. The cofiber side can be attended to by dualizing the above steps.

Notice that we did not actually prove that  $F' = F''$  as required by Axiom (iv) of an operadic category, we only constructed a natural and canonical isomorphism  $F' \cong F''$ . This indicates that this example must be taken *cum grano salis*. However, in some concrete cases when  $\mathbf{A}$  is concrete (pardon the pun) and the kernels are actual set-theoretic preimages of 0, we indeed have  $F' = F''$  as required.

If  $\mathbf{A}$  is the category of finite dimensional vector spaces, which is the only case relevant to our applications, we can take, as the cokernel of a map  $h: X \rightarrow Y$ , the space  $(\text{Ker}(h^*))^*$ , i.e. the linear dual of the set-theoretic kernel of the dual map  $h^*: Y^* \rightarrow X^*$ . With this choice, the canonical isomorphisms became equalities also on the cofiber side.

It is easy to see that  $A_L$  is unital, with the collection of units (2) formed by the null object 0, so  $A_F = A_L$ , cf. Example 8. Dually,  $A_R = A_C$ , so both  $A_L$  and  $A_R$  are perfect, and  $\mathbf{A} = (A_L, A_R)$  is dioperadic. The fiber-cofiber structure of  $\mathbf{A}$  has however a very specific, subtle additional property which will be the topics of Subsection 4. We postpone further discussion of  $\mathbf{A}$  to that subsection.

**Example 11.** Let  $\text{Set}^\circ$  be the category of small pointed sets. Define the fiber of a map  $S \xrightarrow{h} T$  as the preimage of the base point of  $T$ , and its cofiber as the complement of  $\text{Im}(h)$  in  $T$  with the formally attached base point  $\circ$ , that is

$$F := \{s \in S \mid h(s) = \circ\} \triangleright S \xrightarrow{h} T \triangleleft (T \setminus \text{Im}(h)) \sqcup \{\circ\} =: D.$$

The induced map  $h_R: F \rightarrow G$  between the fibers in the diagram of pointed sets

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F & \xrightarrow{h_R} & G \\ \nabla & & \nabla \\ S & \xrightarrow{h} & T \\ \text{gh} \curvearrowright & & \curvearrowleft g \\ & R & \end{array}$$

is the restriction of  $h$  to  $F = \{s \in S \mid gh(s) = \circ\}$ . The induced map

$$h^R: H = (T \setminus \text{Im}(g)) \sqcup \{\circ\} \longrightarrow D = (S \setminus \text{Im}(hg)) \sqcup \{\circ\}$$

between the cofibers in the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} D & \xleftarrow{h^R} & H \\ \nabla & & \nabla \\ T & \xleftarrow{h} & S \\ hg \curvearrowright & & \curvearrowleft g \\ & R & \end{array}$$

is given by

$$h^R(s) := \begin{cases} h(s), & \text{if } h(s) \notin \text{Im}(hg), \text{ and} \\ \circ, & \text{if } h(s) \in \text{Im}(hg). \end{cases}$$



The dioperadicity of  $\text{Set}^\circ = (\text{Set}_L^\circ, \text{Set}_R^\circ)$  follows, as in Example 10, from the (co)unitality of  $\text{Set}_L^\circ$  resp.  $\text{Set}_R^\circ$ .

**Example 12.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a category and  $\text{Arr}(\mathcal{C})$  the category of arrows in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Objects of  $\text{Arr}(\mathcal{C})$  are morphisms of  $\mathcal{C}$  and morphisms of  $\text{Arr}(\mathcal{C})$  are commutative squares in  $\mathcal{C}$ . We can make  $\text{Arr}(\mathcal{C})$  a dioperadic category by postulating that the fiber resp. the cofiber of a morphism  $S \rightarrow T$  in  $\text{Arr}(\mathcal{C})$  given by the pair  $(F, D)$  of morphisms of  $\mathcal{C}$  as in:

$$(7) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} a & \xrightarrow{F} & c \\ s \downarrow & & \downarrow T \\ b & \xrightarrow{D} & d \end{array}$$

is  $F$  resp.  $D$  interpreted as objects of  $\text{Arr}(\mathcal{C})$ , that is

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} a & & a & \xrightarrow{F} & c & & b \\ F \downarrow & \triangleright & s \downarrow & & \downarrow T & \triangleleft & \downarrow D \\ c & & b & \xrightarrow{D} & d & & d \end{array}$$

A simple calculation reveals that the fiber subcategory  $\text{Arr}(\mathcal{C})_F$  consists of morphisms (7) with  $D$  the identity map. In other words,  $\text{Arr}(\mathcal{C})_F$  is the décalage  $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{C}) = \coprod_{c \in \mathcal{C}} \mathcal{C}/c$ , with the fiber diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} a & \xrightarrow{F} & b \\ F \downarrow & \triangleright & \begin{array}{ccc} a & \xrightarrow{F} & b \\ s \searrow & & \swarrow T \\ & c & \end{array} \end{array}$$

Similarly,  $\text{Arr}(\mathcal{C})_C = \coprod_{c \in \mathcal{C}} c/C$ . We see that here both  $\mathcal{Q}_F \subset \mathcal{Q}_L$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_C \subset \mathcal{Q}_R$  are proper subcategories.

**Example 13.** Take in the previous example as  $\mathcal{C}$  the chaotic category  $\text{Chaos}(\mathcal{C})$  on a set  $\mathcal{C}$  of ‘colors.’ The associated category of arrows will be the chaotic category generated by the symbols  $\frac{a}{b}$  with  $a, b \in \mathcal{C}$ , and the fiber-cofiber diagrams

$$\frac{a}{c} \triangleright \frac{a}{b} \longrightarrow \frac{c}{d} \triangleleft \frac{b}{d}.$$

It is the unary version of the category of  $\mathcal{C}$ -bibouquets in Example 35.

**2.3. Operads, cooperads and bimodules.** The main definition of this subsection involves a non-unital  $\mathcal{Q}_F$ -operad  $\mathcal{P} = \{\mathcal{P}(T)\}_{T \in \mathcal{Q}_F}$  and a non-counital  $\mathcal{Q}_C$ -cooperad  $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{C}(T)\}_{T \in \mathcal{Q}_C}$  with the (de)compositions

$$(8) \quad \gamma_h : \mathcal{P}(T) \otimes \mathcal{P}(F) \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}(S) \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_h : \mathcal{C}(T) \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}(D) \otimes \mathcal{C}(S)$$

given for any  $h : S \rightarrow T$  in (6) belonging to  $\mathcal{Q}_F$  in the operad case, resp. to  $\mathcal{Q}_C$  in the cooperad case. An explicit definition of non-unital operads over unary operadic categories can be found in [5, Section 1], axioms of cooperads are the formal duals of the operad axioms. While operads and cooperads use only a part of the structure of  $\mathcal{Q}$ , namely the subcategories  $\mathcal{Q}_F$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_C$ , the structure introduced below uses the entire dioperad structure.

**Definition 14.** Let  $\mathbb{Q} = (\mathbb{Q}_L, \mathbb{Q}_R)$  be a dioperadic category,  $\mathcal{P}$  a  $\mathbb{Q}_F$ -operad and  $\mathcal{C}$  a  $\mathbb{Q}_C$ -cooperad. A  $\mathcal{C}$ - $\mathcal{P}$ -bimodule is a collection  $\mathcal{M} = \{\mathcal{M}(S)\}_{S \in \mathbb{Q}}$  of objects of  $\mathbb{V}$  with an action

$$(9a) \quad \omega_h : \mathcal{M}(T) \otimes \mathcal{P}(F) \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}(D) \otimes \mathcal{M}(S)$$

defined for each  $h$  as in (6). We moreover require a compatibility between this action and the (co)operad structures of  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{C}$ . Namely we require, for each diagram

$$(9b) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} F \triangleright X & \xrightarrow{h_Z} & Y & & \\ \parallel & \nabla & & \nabla & \\ F \triangleright S & \xrightarrow{h} & T \triangleleft D & & \\ & \searrow gh & & \nearrow g & \\ & & Z & & \\ & & \begin{array}{ccc} H & \triangleleft & R \\ \parallel & \nabla & \\ H & \triangleleft & R \end{array} & & \end{array}$$

in which  $h_Z$  resp.  $g^S$  are the induced maps between the (co)fibers, and where the equalities  $F = F$  resp.  $H = H$  follow from the axioms of the operadic categories  $\mathbb{Q}_L$  resp.  $\mathbb{Q}_R$ , the commutativity of

$$(9c) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M}(Z) \otimes \mathcal{P}(Y) \otimes \mathcal{P}(F) & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1} \otimes \gamma_{h_Z}} & \mathcal{M}(Z) \otimes \mathcal{P}(X) \\ \downarrow \omega_g \otimes \mathbb{1} & & \downarrow \omega_{gh} \\ \mathcal{C}(H) \otimes \mathcal{M}(T) \otimes \mathcal{P}(F) & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1} \otimes \omega_h} & \mathcal{C}(H) \otimes \mathcal{C}(D) \otimes \mathcal{M}(S) \\ & & \downarrow \delta_{g^S} \otimes \mathbb{1} \end{array}$$

Notice that all objects and maps in (9c) are defined, since  $F \triangleright X \xrightarrow{h_Z} Y$  is a scheme in  $\mathbb{Q}_F$  and  $D \xrightarrow{g^S} R \triangleleft H$  a scheme in  $\mathbb{Q}_C$ .

**Remark 15.** Assume that the base monoidal category  $\mathbb{V}$  is the category of vector spaces. The linear dual of the  $\mathbb{Q}_C$ -cooperad  $\mathcal{C}$  in Definition 14 is a  $\mathbb{Q}_C$ -operad  $\mathcal{R}$  with the structure operations  $\rho_h : \mathcal{R}(S) \otimes \mathcal{R}(D) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}(T)$  for  $h : S \rightarrow T$  as in (6). The action (9a) induces an action

$$(10a) \quad \omega_h : \mathcal{R}(D) \otimes \mathcal{M}(T) \otimes \mathcal{P}(F) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}(S)$$

and the commutativity of (9c) implies the commutativity of

$$(10b) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{R}(D) \otimes \mathcal{R}(H) \otimes \mathcal{M}(Z) \otimes \mathcal{P}(Y) \otimes \mathcal{P}(F) & \xrightarrow{\rho_{g^S} \otimes \mathbb{1} \otimes \gamma_{h_Z}} & \mathcal{R}(R) \otimes \mathcal{M}(Z) \otimes \mathcal{P}(X) \\ \downarrow \mathbb{1} \otimes \omega_g \otimes \mathbb{1} & & \downarrow \omega_{gh} \\ \mathcal{R}(D) \otimes \mathcal{M}(T) \otimes \mathcal{P}(F) & \xrightarrow{\omega_h} & \mathcal{M}(S) \end{array}$$

For  $\varphi \in \mathcal{P}(F)$ ,  $\psi \in \mathcal{P}(Y)$ ,  $\zeta \in \mathcal{M}(Z)$ ,  $\eta \in \mathcal{R}(H)$  and  $\delta \in \mathcal{R}(D)$  the commutativity of (10b) means

$$(10c) \quad \omega_{gh} \left( \rho_{g^s}(\delta, \eta), \zeta, \gamma_{h_z}(\psi, \varphi) \right) = \omega_h(\delta, \omega_g(\eta, \zeta, \psi), \varphi).$$

One may wonder why we did not define bimodules using more conventional action (10a) that avoids the use of cooperads. One of the reasons was that the linear dual of an operad need not be a cooperad, and that the action (10a) need not induce an action (9a) unless  $\mathcal{R}$  satisfies appropriate finitariness assumptions. Our approach is therefore more general. The main reason for our choice was however the manifest self-duality of Definition 14.

**Example 16.** Let  $\mathcal{V}$  be, as in Remark 15, the category of vector spaces. For the terminal one-object, one-morphism dioperadic category  $\odot$ , Definition 14 leads to an associative algebra  $R$ , a coassociative coalgebra  $C$ , a vector space  $M$ , and a linear map

$$(11) \quad \omega : M \otimes R \longrightarrow C \otimes M.$$

The compatibility of  $\omega$  with the associative multiplication  $\mu : R \otimes R \rightarrow R$  and the coassociative comultiplication  $\delta : C \rightarrow C \otimes C$  means the commutativity of the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M \otimes R \otimes R & \xrightarrow{1 \otimes \mu} & M \otimes R \\ \omega \otimes 1 \downarrow & & \downarrow \omega \\ C \otimes M \otimes R & \xrightarrow{1 \otimes \omega} & C \otimes C \otimes M \\ & & \downarrow \delta \otimes 1 \end{array}$$

In the disguise of Remark 15 this structure appears as an  $L$ - $R$ -bimodule  $M$  for associative algebras  $L$  and  $R$ , with  $L$  the linear dual of  $C$ . Equation (10c) in this setup yields

$$[(a' a''), m, (b'' b')] = [a', [a'', m, b''], b'], \quad a', a'' \in L, \quad b'', b' \in R, \quad m \in M,$$

where  $[-, -, -] : L \otimes M \otimes R \rightarrow M$  is the structure operation of the bimodule  $M$ . This explains the terminology used in Definition 14.

### 3. UNARY BIOPERADIC CATEGORIES

**D**IOPERADIC categories in Definition 33 are structures satisfying the smallest set of conditions that guarantee the existence of operads, cooperads and bimodules. In this section we analyze when also the notions of the associated algebras, coalgebras and traces make sense. To do this, we resume our quest for a ‘bivariant’ definition of algebras by analyzing the unary version of [4, Definition 1.20].

**3.1. Operad algebras revisited.** Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be a unary operadic category and  $\mathcal{P}$  an  $\mathcal{O}$ -operad with structure operations as in (8). A  $\mathcal{P}$ -algebra is ‘classically’ a collection  $A = \{A_c\}_{c \in \pi_0(\mathcal{O})}$  of objects of  $\mathcal{V}$  indexed by the set  $\pi_0(\mathcal{O})$  of connected components of  $\mathcal{O}$ , equipped with structure operations that are the unary versions of (1c), i.e.

$$(12) \quad a_T : \mathcal{P}(T) \otimes A_{\mathbf{s}(T)} \rightarrow A_{\mathbf{t}(T)}, \quad T \in \mathcal{O},$$

where  $\mathbf{s}(T)$  is the connected component of the unique fiber  $U_T$  of the identity  $\mathbb{1}_T : T \rightarrow T$ , and  $\mathbf{t}(T) := \pi_0(T) \in \pi_0(0)$  is the connected component of  $T$ . The associativity of the actions (12) requires that the diagram

$$(13) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{P}(T) \otimes \mathcal{P}(F) \otimes A_{\mathbf{s}(F)} & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1} \otimes a_F} & \mathcal{P}(T) \otimes A_{\mathbf{t}(F)} \stackrel{\textcircled{3}}{=} \mathcal{P}(T) \otimes A_{\mathbf{s}(T)} \\ \gamma_h \otimes \mathbb{1} \downarrow & & \downarrow a_T \\ \mathcal{P}(S) \otimes A_{\mathbf{s}(F)} & \boxed{F \triangleright S \xrightarrow{h} T} & A_{\mathbf{t}(T)} \\ \textcircled{1} \parallel & & \parallel \textcircled{2} \\ \mathcal{P}(S) \otimes A_{\mathbf{s}(S)} & \xrightarrow{a_S} & A_{\mathbf{t}(S)} \end{array}$$

commutes for each  $F \triangleright S \xrightarrow{h} T$ .

Let us explain the equalities in (13). Equality  $\textcircled{1}$  follows from the equality  $U_S = U_F$  in the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} U_F \triangleright F & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1}_F} & F \\ \parallel \quad \nabla & & \nabla \\ U_S \triangleright S & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1}_S} & S \\ & \text{h} \curvearrowright & \text{h} \\ & & T \end{array}$$

which is the particular case of [5, equation (4)]. Equality  $\textcircled{2}$  follows from the mere existence of the map  $h : S \rightarrow T$  that implies that  $S$  and  $T$  belong to the same component of  $0$ . Similarly,  $\textcircled{3}$  follows from the existence of the induced map  $h_T : F \rightarrow U_T$  from the fiber of  $h : S \rightarrow T$  to the fiber of  $\mathbb{1}_T : T \rightarrow T$  in the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F & \xrightarrow{h_T} & U_T \\ \nabla & & \nabla \\ S & \xrightarrow{h} & T \\ \text{h} \curvearrowright & & \text{h} \\ & & T. \end{array}$$

**3.2. Unary bioperadic categories – definition and examples.** Let us try to formulate a bivariate definition of operad algebras, i.e. the one that uses the sources and the targets satisfying

$$(14) \quad \mathbf{s}(X) = \mathbf{t}(X^\dagger) \text{ and } \mathbf{t}(X) = \mathbf{s}(X^\dagger), \text{ for any } X \in \mathbb{Q}.$$

If  $\mathbb{Q} = (\mathbb{Q}_L, \mathbb{Q}_R)$  is a (left or/and right) dioperadic category, the obvious choice is to define the *source*  $\mathbf{s}(X)$  resp. the *target*  $\mathbf{t}(X)$  of  $X$  as the connected component of the fiber  $U_X$ , resp. cofiber  $C_X$ , of the identity  $\mathbb{1}_X : X \rightarrow X$ , in shorthand

$$(15) \quad U_X \triangleright X \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1}_X} X \triangleleft C_X \implies \mathbf{s}(X) := \pi_0(U_X), \mathbf{t}(X) := \pi_0(C_X).$$

Such a choice obviously fulfills the self-duality property (14).

Let  $\mathbb{Q}$  be a dioperadic category. To each morphism  $h : S \rightarrow T$  in (6) we associate its *analysis*, which is the scheme

$$(16) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} U_F \triangleright F & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1}_F} & F \triangleleft C_F \\ \parallel & \nabla & \nabla \\ U_S \triangleright S & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1}_S} & S \triangleleft C_S \\ & \downarrow h & \downarrow h \\ & \boxed{\text{analysis}} & \\ U_T \triangleright T & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1}_T} & T \triangleleft C_T \\ & \Delta & \Delta \\ U_D \triangleright D & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1}_D} & D \triangleleft C_D \end{array}$$

in which the two equalities follow from the axioms of operadic categories  $\mathbb{Q}_L$  and  $\mathbb{Q}_R$ .

Consider again the associativity diagram (13) for  $0 = \mathbb{Q}_F$ , but now with the sources and targets defined in (15). Equality ① is implied by the equality  $U_F = U_S$  in the upper left corner of (16). Equality ② however requires  $\pi_0(C_S) = \pi_0(C_T)$  which need not hold in general. Equality ③, i.e.  $A_{\mathbf{t}(F)} = A_{\mathbf{s}(T)}$ , is moreover of very different nature, since it refers both to the fiber and cofiber structures of  $\mathbb{Q}$ .

Definition 17 below formulates conditions assuring that diagram (13) and the similar diagrams for coalgebras and traces make sense. The notation refers to the analysis (16) of  $h : S \rightarrow T$ .

**Definition 17.** A *left bioperadic* category is a left dioperadic category  $\mathbb{Q}$  such that, for an arbitrary morphism  $h : S \rightarrow T$  in the fiber subcategory  $\mathbb{Q}_F$ ,

$$(17a) \quad C_F = U_T, \text{ and}$$

$$(17b) \quad C_S = C_T.$$

Dually, a right dioperadic category  $\mathbb{Q}$  is *right bioperadic* if, for an arbitrary  $h : S \rightarrow T$  in the cofiber subcategory  $\mathbb{Q}_C$ ,

$$(18a) \quad U_D = C_S, \text{ and}$$

$$(18b) \quad U_T = U_S.$$

Finally,  $\mathbb{Q}$  is *bioperadic* if it is both left and right dioperadic, and if (17a) and (18a) are fulfilled for any morphism  $h : S \rightarrow T$  of  $\mathbb{Q}$ .

Observe that (17a), with the sources and targets (15), implies  $\mathbf{t}(F) = \mathbf{s}(T)$ , thus  $A_{\mathbf{t}(F)} = A_{\mathbf{s}(T)}$  as required in ③ of (13). Similarly, (17b) implies  $\mathbf{t}(S) = \mathbf{t}(T)$ . Dually, (18a) implies  $\mathbf{s}(D) = \mathbf{t}(S)$  and (18b) implies  $\mathbf{s}(T) = \mathbf{s}(S)$ .

**Remark 18.** Let  $F \triangleright S \xrightarrow{h} T \triangleleft D$  be a morphism of a bioperadic category  $\mathbb{Q}$ . The equalities  $\mathbf{s}(F) = \mathbf{s}(S)$  resp.  $\mathbf{t}(T) = \mathbf{t}(D)$  always hold by the axioms of the operadic categories  $\mathbb{Q}_L$  resp.  $\mathbb{Q}_R$ . Combining them with (17b)–(18a) we conclude that, for  $h$  in the intersection  $\mathbb{Q}_F \cap \mathbb{Q}_C$ ,

$$(19) \quad \mathbf{t}(S) = \mathbf{t}(T) = \mathbf{t}(D) = \mathbf{s}(D) \text{ and } \mathbf{s}(S) = \mathbf{s}(T) = \mathbf{s}(F) = \mathbf{t}(F).$$

**Proposition 19.** *The inclusion of sets*

$$(20a) \quad \{U_T \mid T \in \mathbb{Q}_F\} \subseteq \{C_T \mid T \in \mathbb{Q}_F\} \text{ implying } \{\mathbf{s}(T) \mid T \in \mathbb{Q}_F\} \subseteq \{\mathbf{t}(T) \mid T \in \mathbb{Q}_F\}$$

where, as before,  $U_T$  resp.  $C_T$  is the fiber resp. cofiber of the identity  $\mathbb{1}_T : T \rightarrow T$ , holds in any left bioperadic category. Dually, the inclusion

$$(20b) \quad \{U_T \mid T \in \mathbb{Q}_C\} \supseteq \{C_T \mid T \in \mathbb{Q}_C\} \text{ implying } \{\mathbf{s}(T) \mid T \in \mathbb{Q}_C\} \supseteq \{\mathbf{t}(T) \mid T \in \mathbb{Q}_C\}$$

holds in any right bioperadic category. If  $\mathbb{Q}$  is bioperadic, then

$$(20c) \quad \{\mathbf{s}(T) \mid T \in \mathbb{Q}\} = \{\mathbf{t}(T) \mid T \in \mathbb{Q}\} \text{ implying } \{\mathbf{s}(T) \mid T \in \mathbb{Q}\} = \{\mathbf{t}(T) \mid T \in \mathbb{Q}\}.$$

Thus the sets of the sources and the targets of a bioperadic category are the same.

*Proof.* Apply equality (17a) to  $h = \mathbb{1}_S$ , i.e. to the situation  $U_S \triangleright S \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1}_S} S \triangleleft C_S$  to obtain  $U_S = C_{U_S}$  for  $S \in \mathbb{Q}_F$ , which implies (20a). Similarly, (18a) gives  $U_{C_S} = C_S$  for  $S \in \mathbb{Q}_C$ , which implies (20b). In a bioperadic category,  $U_S = C_{U_S}$  and  $U_{C_S} = C_S$  hold for any  $S \in \mathbb{Q}$ , which gives (20c).  $\square$

**Example 20.** Any abelian category  $\mathbb{A}$  with the dioperadic structure  $\mathbb{A} = (\mathbb{A}_L, \mathbb{A}_R)$  in Example 10 is bioperadic. Indeed, the kernels and cokernels of the identities equal the null object, thus (17b)–(18a) are trivially fulfilled. The similar argument holds also for the category  $\text{Set}^\circ$  with the dioperadic structure in Example 11.

**Example 21.** Let us come back to the arrow category  $\text{Arr}(\mathbb{C})$  from Example 12. For  $F \triangleright S \xrightarrow{h} T \triangleleft D$  given by the commutative square (7) we compute

$$C_F = \begin{array}{c} c \\ \downarrow \mathbb{1}_c \\ c \end{array}, \quad U_T = \begin{array}{c} c \\ \downarrow \mathbb{1}_c \\ c \end{array}, \quad U_D = \begin{array}{c} b \\ \downarrow \mathbb{1}_b \\ b \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad C_S = \begin{array}{c} b \\ \downarrow \mathbb{1}_b \\ b \end{array},$$

so both (17a) and (18a) is fulfilled by all morphisms. We moreover have

$$C_T = \begin{array}{c} d \\ \downarrow \mathbb{1}_d \\ d \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad U_S = \begin{array}{c} a \\ \downarrow \mathbb{1}_a \\ a \end{array}.$$

Since  $b = d$  if  $h$  belongs to the fiber subcategory, (17b) is fulfilled; (18b) is fulfilled for the similar reasons. The category  $\text{Arr}(\mathbb{C})$  is therefore bioperadic.

**3.3. Algebras, coalgebras and traces.** Assume that  $\mathbb{Q}$  is left bioperadic,  $F \in \mathbb{Q}_F$  an object of the fiber subcategory, and  $U_F \triangleright F \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1}_F} F \triangleleft C_F$ . It is clear that  $U_F \in \mathbb{Q}_F$ , but we claim that  $C_F \in \mathbb{Q}_F$  too. Indeed,  $F$  is a fiber of a map, say  $F \triangleright S \xrightarrow{h} T$ , so  $C_F = U_T$  by (17a), while clearly  $U_T \in \mathbb{Q}_F$ .

Dually, if  $\mathbb{Q}$  is right dioperadic and  $D \in \mathbb{Q}_C$  an object of the cofiber subcategory, then both  $U_D$  and  $C_D$  in the diagram  $U_D \triangleright D \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1}_D} D \triangleleft C_D$  belong to  $\mathbb{Q}_C$ . The structure maps  $a_F$  and  $b_D$  in the following definition are therefore well-defined.

**Definition 22.** Let  $\mathbb{Q}$  be a left bioperadic category and  $\mathcal{P}$  a  $\mathbb{Q}_F$ -operad. A  $\mathcal{P}$ -algebra is a collection  $A = \{A_c\}_{c \in \pi_0(\mathbb{Q}_F)}$  of objects of  $\mathbb{V}$  together with structure operations

$$a_F : \mathcal{P}(F) \otimes A_{\mathbf{s}(F)} \longrightarrow A_{\mathbf{t}(F)}, \quad F \in \mathbb{Q}_F,$$

where the sources and targets are as in (15), such that the diagram

$$(21a) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{P}(T) \otimes \mathcal{P}(F) \otimes A_{\mathbf{s}(F)} & \xrightarrow{1 \otimes a_F} & \mathcal{P}(T) \otimes A_{\mathbf{t}(F)} \xrightarrow{(17a)} \mathcal{P}(T) \otimes A_{\mathbf{s}(T)} \\ \downarrow \gamma_h \otimes 1 & & \downarrow a_T \\ \mathcal{P}(S) \otimes A_{\mathbf{s}(F)} & \xrightarrow{\boxed{F \triangleright S \xrightarrow{h} T}} & A_{\mathbf{t}(T)} \\ \text{axiom of } \mathcal{Q}_L \parallel & & \parallel (17b) \\ \mathcal{P}(S) \otimes A_{\mathbf{s}(S)} & \xrightarrow{a_S} & A_{\mathbf{t}(S)} \end{array}$$

commutes for each  $F \triangleright S \xrightarrow{h} T$  in  $\mathcal{O}_F$ .

Dually, suppose that  $\mathcal{Q}$  is right bioperadic and  $\mathcal{C}$  a  $\mathcal{Q}_C$ -cooperad. A  $\mathcal{C}$ -coalgebra is a collection  $B = \{B_C\}_{C \in \pi_0(\mathcal{Q}_C)}$  together with structure operations

$$b_D : \mathcal{C}(D) \otimes B_{\mathbf{s}(D)} \longrightarrow B_{\mathbf{t}(D)}, \quad D \in \mathcal{Q}_C,$$

such that the diagram

$$(21b) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C}(D) \otimes \mathcal{C}(S) \otimes B_{\mathbf{s}(S)} & \xrightarrow{1 \otimes b_S} & \mathcal{C}(D) \otimes B_{\mathbf{t}(S)} \xrightarrow{(18a)} \mathcal{C}(D) \otimes B_{\mathbf{s}(D)} \\ \uparrow \delta_h \otimes 1 & & \downarrow b_D \\ \mathcal{C}(T) \otimes B_{\mathbf{s}(S)} & \xrightarrow{\boxed{S \xrightarrow{h} T \triangleleft D}} & B_{\mathbf{t}(D)} \\ (18b) \parallel & & \parallel \text{axiom of } \mathcal{Q}_R \\ \mathcal{C}(T) \otimes B_{\mathbf{s}(T)} & \xrightarrow{b_T} & B_{\mathbf{t}(T)} \end{array}$$

commutes for each  $S \xrightarrow{h} T \triangleleft D$  in  $\mathcal{Q}_C$ .

**Definition 23.** Let  $\mathcal{Q}$  be a bioperadic category and  $\mathcal{M}$  a  $\mathcal{C}$ - $\mathcal{P}$ -bimodule as in Definition 14. An  $\mathcal{M}$ -trace consists of a  $\mathcal{P}$ -algebra  $A$  and an  $\mathcal{C}$ -coalgebra  $B$  as above, together with structure operations

$$c_T : \mathcal{M}(T) \otimes A_{\mathbf{s}(T)} \longrightarrow B_{\mathbf{t}(T)}, \quad T \in \mathcal{Q},$$

such that the diagram

$$(22) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M}(T) \otimes \mathcal{P}(F) \otimes A_{\mathbf{s}(F)} & \xrightarrow{1 \otimes a_F} & \mathcal{M}(T) \otimes A_{\mathbf{t}(F)} \xrightarrow{(17a)} \mathcal{M}(T) \otimes A_{\mathbf{s}(T)} \xrightarrow{c_T} B_{\mathbf{t}(T)} \\ \downarrow \omega_h \otimes 1 & & \downarrow \text{axiom of } \mathcal{Q}_R \\ \mathcal{C}(D) \otimes \mathcal{M}(S) \otimes A_{\mathbf{s}(F)} & \xrightarrow{\boxed{F \triangleright S \xrightarrow{h} T \triangleleft D}} & B_{\mathbf{t}(T)} \\ \text{axiom of } \mathcal{Q}_L \parallel & & \parallel \\ \mathcal{C}(D) \otimes \mathcal{M}(S) \otimes A_{\mathbf{s}(S)} & \xrightarrow{1 \otimes c_S} & \mathcal{C}(D) \otimes B_{\mathbf{t}(S)} \xrightarrow{(18a)} \mathcal{C}(D) \otimes B_{\mathbf{s}(D)} \xrightarrow{b_D} B_{\mathbf{t}(D)} \end{array}$$

commutes for each  $F \triangleright S \xrightarrow{h} T \triangleleft D$  in  $\mathcal{Q}$ .

Notice that diagrams (21a),(21b) and (22) make sense because we assumed (17b)–(18a). The punchline of our approach thus reads:

*Bioperadic categories are dioperadic categories for which algebras over operads, coalgebras over cooperads, and traces over bimodules could be defined.*

**Example 24.** In the situation of Example 16, Definition 23 describes structures consisting of an associative algebra  $R$  acting on a left module  $A$ , of a coassociative coalgebra  $C$  acting on a left module  $B$ , and of a vector space  $M$  with an action  $c : M \otimes A \rightarrow B$ . The commutativity of (22) requires that

$$(23) \quad c(m \otimes (ra)) = \sum c_{(1)} c(m_{(2)} \otimes a), \quad m \in M, r \in R, a \in A,$$

with  $\sum c_{(1)} \otimes m_{(2)} \in C \otimes M$  denoting the image of  $m \otimes r \in M \otimes R$  under the structure map (11).

Equation (23) assumes a particularly nice form when the coalgebra  $C$  equals the ground field  $\mathbb{k}$  with the comultiplication given by the canonical isomorphism  $\mathbb{k} \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathbb{k} \otimes \mathbb{k}$  and when  $B$  bears the trivial  $\mathbb{k}$ -action. Equation (23) in this case says that the map

$$\varpi : M \rightarrow \text{Hom}(A, B),$$

adjoint to  $c : M \otimes A \rightarrow B$ , is a morphism of right  $R$ -modules. Here the  $R$ -module structure of  $M$  is given by the action (11) after the identification  $\mathbb{k} \otimes M \cong M$ , and the right  $R$ -action on  $\text{Hom}(A, B)$  is induced by the left  $R$ -action on  $A$  in the usual manner. Less simple-minded examples can be found in Examples 51 and 52 below.

#### 4. BICHARADES

**I**N this section we explore a particular property of the dioperadic category  $\mathbb{A}$  introduced in Example 10. As before we consider triples  $\mathbb{Q} = (\mathbb{Q}_L, \mathbb{Q}_R)$  of a unary operadic category  $\mathbb{Q}_L$  with the underlying category  $\mathbb{Q}$ , together with a unary operadic category  $\mathbb{Q}_R$  whose underlying category is the category  $\mathbb{Q}^\dagger$  opposite to  $\mathbb{Q}$ .

**Definition 25.** A *bicharadic category* is a triple  $\mathbb{Q} = (\mathbb{Q}_L, \mathbb{Q}_R)$  such that, in the situation described by diagram (9b), the fiber  $\Omega$  of  $g^S$  is naturally isomorphic to the cofiber  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $h_Z$ . We moreover require that each isomorphisms  $s : S' \rightarrow S''$  and  $t : T' \rightarrow T''$  in the commutative square

$$(24) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} F' \triangleright & S' & \xrightarrow{h'} & T' & \triangleleft D' \\ \downarrow s_t & \downarrow s \cong & & \cong \downarrow t & \downarrow t_s \\ F'' \triangleright & S'' & \xrightarrow{h''} & T'' & \triangleleft D'' \end{array}$$

induce functorial isomorphisms  $s_t : F' \rightarrow F''$  and  $t_s : D' \rightarrow D''$  such that  $s_t$  for  $t = \mathbb{1}$  resp.  $t_s$  for  $s = \mathbb{1}$  equals the induced map between the fibers in  $\mathbb{Q}_L$  resp.  $\mathbb{Q}_R$ .



A *strict bicharadic category* is a triple  $Q = (Q_L, Q_R)$  such that the fiber of  $g^S$  in diagram (9b) equals the cofiber of  $h_Z$  in the same diagram, so that we have

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 F \triangleright X & \xrightarrow{h_Z} & Y \triangleleft \Xi & & \\
 \parallel & \nabla & \nabla & \nabla & \\
 F \triangleright S & \xrightarrow{h} & T \triangleleft D & & \\
 & \searrow^{gh} & & \swarrow^g & \\
 & & Z & & \\
 & & \triangleleft & \triangleright & \\
 H & & & & R \\
 & \cong & & & \\
 & & H & & 
 \end{array}$$

The naturality of the isomorphism between the fiber  $\Omega$  and the cofiber  $\mathcal{U}$  required in Definition 25 refers to commutative diagrams of the form

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & T'' & \\
 h'' \nearrow & & \nwarrow u \\
 S & \xrightarrow{h'} & T' \\
 g' h' = g'' h'' \searrow & & \swarrow g' \\
 & Z & \\
 & \downarrow g'' & \\
 & & 
 \end{array}$$

For such a diagram denote by  $\mathcal{U}'$  the cofiber of the induced map  $h'_Z$  between the fibers of  $g'h'$  and  $g'$ , and by  $\Omega'$  the fiber of the induced map  $g'^S$  between the cofiber of  $h'$  and the cofiber of  $g'h'$ . Let  $\mathcal{U}''$  and  $\Omega''$  have the similar meanings, so that, in the notation parallel to (9b),

$$X \xrightarrow{h'_Z} Y' \triangleleft \mathcal{U}', \quad \Omega' \triangleright D' \xrightarrow{g'^S} R, \quad X \xrightarrow{h''_Z} Y'' \triangleleft \mathcal{U}'', \quad \Omega'' \triangleright D'' \xrightarrow{g''^S} R.$$

The commutative triangle of the induced maps between fibers induces the map  $u_Z^X: \mathcal{U}' \rightarrow \mathcal{U}''$  in

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{U}' & \xrightarrow{u_Z^X} & \mathcal{U}'' \\
 \nabla & & \nabla \\
 Y' & \xrightarrow{u_Z} & Y'' \\
 h'_Z \nearrow & & \nwarrow h''_Z \\
 & X & 
 \end{array}$$

Similarly, we construct a map  $u_R^S: \Omega' \rightarrow \Omega''$ . The naturality is expressed by the commutativity of

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{U}' & \xrightarrow{u_Z^X} & \mathcal{U}'' \\
 \rho' \downarrow \cong & & \cong \downarrow \rho'' \\
 \Omega' & \xrightarrow{u_R^S} & \Omega''
 \end{array}$$

where  $\rho': \mathcal{U}' \rightarrow \Omega'$  and  $\rho'': \mathcal{U}'' \rightarrow \Omega''$  are the isomorphism required in Definition 25.

Strict bicharadic categories seem to be rare. For instance, the arrow category  $\text{Arr}(\mathcal{C})$  of Example 12 is strict bicharadic only if  $\mathcal{C}$  has one object, i.e. when it is an associative monoid. The following proposition however shows that some abelian categories produce (non-strict) bicharadic categories.

**Proposition 26.** *Assume that  $\mathcal{A}$  is the abelian category  $R\text{-Mod}$  of modules over a ring  $R$ . Then  $\mathcal{A}$  with the fiber-cofiber structure of Example 10 is bicharadic.*

*Proof.* Assume that the fibers and cofibers are given by the standard kernels and cokernels in the category of modules, that is

$$\text{Coker}(h_Z) = \frac{\text{Ker}(g)}{\text{Im}(h) \cap \text{Ker}(g)} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Ker}(g^S) = \text{Ker}\left(\frac{T}{\text{Im}(h)} \xrightarrow{[g]} \frac{Z}{\text{Im}(gh)}\right)$$

where the map  $[g]$  takes the equivalence class of  $t \in T$  to the equivalence class of  $g(t) \in Z$ . Define  $\rho : \text{Coker}(h_Z) \rightarrow \text{Ker}(g^S)$  as the map induced by the inclusion  $\text{Ker}(g) \hookrightarrow T$ .

Let us prove that  $\rho$  is injective. Given an equivalence class  $[k] \in \text{Coker}(h_Z)$  of some  $k \in \text{Ker}(g)$ ,  $\rho([k]) = 0$  means  $k \in \text{Im}(h)$ , so  $k \in \text{Im}(h) \cap \text{Ker}(g)$  thus  $[k] = 0$  in  $\text{Coker}(h_Z)$ . To prove that  $\rho$  is surjective, consider the class  $[t] \in T \text{ mod } \text{Im}(h)$  of some  $t \in T$ . Such  $[t]$  belongs to  $\text{Ker}([g])$  if  $g(t) = gh(s)$  for some  $s \in S$ . If this happens, we replace  $t$  by  $t' := t - h(s)$  which is the same mod  $\text{Im}(h)$  on one hand, and which belongs to  $\text{Ker}(g)$  in the one hand. We conclude that  $[t] = [t'] \in \text{Im}(\rho)$ .

The naturality of  $\rho : \text{Coker}(h_Z) \rightarrow \text{Ker}(g^S)$  follows from the universality of the objects featured in the proof. The existence of functorial induced maps in (24) is obvious.  $\square$

A natural morphism  $\rho : \text{Coker}(h_Z) \rightarrow \text{Ker}(g^S)$  exists in an arbitrary Abelian category. It is induced by the composition  $\delta := \text{Ker}(g) \hookrightarrow T \twoheadrightarrow \text{Coker}(h)$  in the diagram

$$(25) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} \text{Ker}(gh) & \longrightarrow & \text{Ker}(g) & \twoheadrightarrow & \text{Coker}(h_Z) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & \searrow \delta & \dashrightarrow \rho \\ S & \xrightarrow{h} & T & \twoheadrightarrow & \text{Coker}(h) \\ \downarrow gh & & \downarrow g & & \downarrow g^S \\ Z & \twoheadrightarrow & & & \text{Coker}(gh) \end{array}$$

We were however unable to construct an inverse of  $\rho$ , though the full power of the axioms of Abelian categories [7, IX.§2] might provide it.

If  $\mathcal{A}$  is small, we can follow a suggestion of M. Batanin, invoke Mitchell's full imbedding theorem [13, Theorem 4.4] and apply a fully faithful exact functor  $F : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow R\text{-Mod}$  on the diagram in (25). We will get a similar diagram in the category of  $R$ -modules in which  $R(\rho)$  is an isomorphism. Since  $F$  is full and faithful,  $\rho$  must be an isomorphism too. However, the only Abelian category we will use will be the category of finite dimensional vector spaces, so the current formulation of Proposition 26 is sufficient.

**Example 27.** Let us return to the category  $\text{Set}^\circ$  of pointed small sets with the dioperadic structure of Example 11. For the diagram

$$(26) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \{u, \circ\} & \xrightarrow{h} & \{x, y, \circ\} \\ & \searrow gh & \swarrow g \\ & & \{v, \circ\} \end{array}$$

with  $h(u) := y$ ,  $g(x) = g(y) := v$ , the map  $\rho : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}$  is the inclusion  $\{\circ\} \subsetneq \{x, \circ\}$  of a proper subset, not an isomorphism.

This illustrates the importance of linearity for bicharades:  $g(x) = g(y)$  does not imply that the (nonexistent) difference  $x - y$  belongs to the ‘kernel’ of  $g$ . Let us compare that to the linearized version of (26)

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Span}\{u\} & \xrightarrow{\text{Span}\{h\}} & \text{Span}\{x, y\} \\ & \searrow \text{Span}\{gh\} & \swarrow \text{Span}\{g\} \\ & & \text{Span}\{v\} \end{array}$$

with  $\text{Span}\{h\}(u) := y$ ,  $\text{Span}\{g\}(x) = \text{Span}\{g\}(y) := v$ . Then  $\mathcal{U} = \text{Span}\{x - y\}$ ,  $\mathcal{O} = \text{Span}\{x\}$  and  $\rho : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}$  is the isomorphism given by  $\rho(x - y) := x$ .

Bicharadic categories admit the following bivariant version of Kapranov’s charades [6, Definition 3.2].

**Definition 28.** Let  $\mathcal{Q}$  be a bicharadic category. A  $\mathcal{Q}$ -bicharade is a functor  $\mathcal{C}h : \text{Iso}(\mathcal{Q}) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$  from the luff subcategory of isomorphisms of  $\mathcal{Q}$  to the base monoidal category  $\mathcal{V}$ , with an action

$$\chi_h : \mathcal{C}h(T) \otimes \mathcal{C}h(F) \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}h(D) \otimes \mathcal{C}h(S)$$

defined for each morphism  $F \triangleright S \xrightarrow{h} T \triangleleft D$ , compatible with the isomorphisms (24) in the sense that the induced diagram

$$(27a) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C}h(T') \otimes \mathcal{C}h(F') & \xrightarrow{\chi_{h'}} & \mathcal{C}h(D') \otimes \mathcal{C}h(S') \\ \mathcal{C}h(t) \otimes \mathcal{C}h(s_t) \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathcal{C}h(t_s) \otimes \mathcal{C}h(s) \\ \mathcal{C}h(T'') \otimes \mathcal{C}h(F'') & \xrightarrow{\chi_{h''}} & \mathcal{C}h(D'') \otimes \mathcal{C}h(S'') \end{array}$$

commutes. We also require the commutativity of

$$(27b) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{C}h(Z) \otimes \mathcal{C}h(Y) \otimes \mathcal{C}h(F) & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1} \otimes \chi_{h_Z}} & \mathcal{C}h(Z) \otimes \mathcal{C}h(\mathcal{U}) \otimes \mathcal{C}h(X) & \xleftarrow[\cong]{\text{symmetry}} & \mathcal{C}h(Z) \otimes \mathcal{C}h(X) \otimes \mathcal{C}h(\mathcal{U}) \\ \chi_g \otimes \mathbb{1} \downarrow & & & & \downarrow \chi_{gh} \otimes \mathcal{C}h(\rho) \\ \mathcal{C}h(H) \otimes \mathcal{C}h(T) \otimes \mathcal{C}h(F) & & & & \\ \mathbb{1} \otimes \chi_h \downarrow & & & & \\ \mathcal{C}h(H) \otimes \mathcal{C}h(D) \otimes \mathcal{C}h(S) & \xleftarrow[\cong]{\chi_{g^S} \otimes \mathbb{1}} & \mathcal{C}h(R) \otimes \mathcal{C}h(\mathcal{O}) \otimes \mathcal{C}h(S) & \xleftarrow[\cong]{\text{symmetry}} & \mathcal{C}h(R) \otimes \mathcal{C}h(S) \otimes \mathcal{C}h(\mathcal{O}) \end{array}$$

for each diagram (9b) and the isomorphism  $\rho : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}$  assumed in Definition 25.

**Example 29.** The terminal category  $\odot$  is strict bicharadic. A  $\odot$ -bicharade is an object  $B \in \mathcal{V}$  with a morphism  $E : B \otimes B \rightarrow B \otimes B$  such that

$$(\mathbb{1} \otimes E)(E \otimes \mathbb{1}) = (E \otimes \mathbb{1})(\mathbb{1} \otimes \sigma)(E \otimes \mathbb{1})(\mathbb{1} \otimes \sigma)(\mathbb{1} \otimes E)$$

where  $\sigma : B \otimes B \rightarrow B \otimes B$  is the symmetry. We have no idea where to place this object.

**Example 30.** The arrow category  $\text{Arr}(M)$  of an associative monoid  $M$  considered as a category with one object is strict bicharadic. An  $\text{Arr}(M)$ -bicharade is a collection  $B = \{B(a)\}_{a \in M}$  of objects of  $\mathcal{V}$  with structure operations  $B(a) \otimes B(b) \rightarrow B(c) \otimes B(d)$  specified for any  $a, b, c, d \in M$  with  $ab = cd$ . An interested reader can easily figure out what diagram (27b) requires in this case. We have no idea what kind of object we described.

**Example 31.** We will show that the determinant, i.e. the top exterior power, is a bicharade over the abelian category  $\text{fdVec}$  of finite-dimensional vector spaces with the fiber-cofiber structure of Example 10, cf. Proposition 26. First of all, it is clear that any isomorphism  $\varpi : S' \xrightarrow{\cong} S''$  in  $\text{fdVec}$  induces a natural isomorphism

$$(28a) \quad \det(\varpi) : \det(S') \xrightarrow{\cong} \det(S'')$$

of determinants. We will also use the fact that any short exact sequence  $S'' \hookrightarrow S \twoheadrightarrow S'$  in  $\text{fdVec}$  induces a natural isomorphism

$$(28b) \quad \det(S') \otimes \det(S'') \xrightarrow{\cong} \det(S),$$

cf. [6, pages 122–123]. In particular, we have natural a isomorphism

$$(28c) \quad \det(S' \oplus S'') \cong \det(S') \otimes \det(S'')$$

related to  $S'' \hookrightarrow S'' \oplus S' \twoheadrightarrow S'$ .

An arbitrary diagram  $\text{Ker}(h) \hookrightarrow S \xrightarrow{h} T \twoheadrightarrow \text{Coker}(h)$  in  $\text{fdVec}$  extends to the exact sequence at the bottom of the diagram

$$(29) \quad F := \text{Ker}(h) \twoheadrightarrow S \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{h} \\ \curvearrowright \end{array} \text{Im}(h) \twoheadrightarrow T \twoheadrightarrow D := \text{Coker}(h)$$

which gives rise to two isomorphism as in (28b), namely


$$\bullet h : \det(\text{Im}(h)) \otimes \det(F) \xrightarrow{\cong} \det(S) \quad \text{and} \quad h^\bullet : \det(D) \otimes \det(\text{Im}(h)) \xrightarrow{\cong} \det(T).$$

We then define

$$(30) \quad \chi_h : \det(T) \otimes \det(F) \longrightarrow \det(D) \otimes \det(S)$$

via the span of isomorphisms

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \det(D) \otimes \det(\text{Im}(h)) \otimes \det(F) & \\ & \swarrow h^\bullet \otimes \mathbb{1} \quad \cong \quad \searrow \mathbb{1} \otimes h & \\ \det(T) \otimes \det(F) & \xrightarrow[\cong]{\chi_h} & \det(D) \otimes \det(S). \end{array}$$


 FIGURE 2. The standard form of  $S \xrightarrow{h} T \xrightarrow{g} Z$ .

We claim that the isomorphisms (28a) together with structure operations (30) make the collection  $\det = \{\det(S)\}_{S \in \text{fdVec}}$  a  $\text{fdVec}$ -bicharade. While the commutativity of (27a) is immediate, the commutativity of (27b) requires some attention.

By elementary linear algebra, each diagram  $S \xrightarrow{h} T \xrightarrow{g} Z$  is isomorphic, in the category of diagrams, to the ‘standard’ diagram with

$$(31) \quad S = \alpha \oplus \beta \oplus \gamma, \quad T = \beta \oplus \gamma \oplus \varphi \oplus \psi \quad \text{and} \quad Z = \gamma \oplus \varphi \oplus \zeta$$

for some  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \varphi, \psi, \zeta \in \text{fdVec}$  such that

$$h(\alpha) = 0, \quad h|_{\beta \oplus \gamma} = \mathbb{1}_{\beta \oplus \gamma}, \quad g(\beta \oplus \psi) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad g|_{\gamma \oplus \varphi} = \mathbb{1}_{\gamma \oplus \varphi},$$

cf. the schematic Figure 2. For the vector spaces in (27b) we have, besides (31), canonical isomorphisms

$$X \cong \alpha \oplus \beta, \quad Y \cong \gamma \oplus \psi, \quad F \cong \alpha, \quad \mathcal{U} \cong \Omega \cong \psi, \quad H \cong \zeta, \quad D \cong \varphi \oplus \psi \quad \text{and} \quad R \cong \varphi \oplus \zeta.$$

Using the above isomorphisms we conclude that the spaces at the boundary of the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} Z \oplus Y \oplus F & \longleftrightarrow & Z \oplus \mathcal{U} \oplus X & \longleftrightarrow & Z \oplus X \oplus \mathcal{U} \\ \updownarrow & \searrow & \updownarrow & \swarrow & \updownarrow \\ H \oplus T \oplus F & \longleftrightarrow & \alpha \oplus \beta \oplus \gamma \oplus \varphi \oplus \psi \oplus \zeta & \longleftrightarrow & H \oplus D \oplus S \\ \updownarrow & \swarrow & \updownarrow & \searrow & \updownarrow \\ H \oplus D \oplus S & \longleftrightarrow & R \oplus \Omega \oplus S & \longleftrightarrow & R \oplus S \oplus \Omega \end{array}$$

are canonically isomorphic to the space in the center, so that the triangles and thus also the boundary rectangle commutes. Applying  $\det(-)$  on the boundary rectangle and invoking the iterated (28c) we verify the commutativity of

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \det(Z) \otimes \det(Y) \otimes \det(F) & \longleftrightarrow & \det(Z) \otimes \det(\mathcal{U}) \otimes \det(X) & \longleftrightarrow & \det(Z) \otimes \det(X) \otimes \det(\mathcal{U}) \\ \updownarrow & & & & \updownarrow \\ \det(H) \otimes \det(T) \otimes \det(F) & & & & \\ \updownarrow & & & & \updownarrow \\ \det(H) \otimes \det(D) \otimes \det(S) & \longleftrightarrow & \det(R) \otimes \det(\Omega) \otimes \det(S) & \longleftrightarrow & \det(R) \otimes \det(S) \otimes \det(\Omega) \end{array}$$

which is (27b) for the determinant.

This proves the commutativity of (27b) for diagrams  $S \xrightarrow{h} T \xrightarrow{g} Z$  in the standard form. Since the isomorphism

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} S' & \xrightarrow{h'} & T' & \xrightarrow{g'} & Z' \\ \cong \downarrow & & \cong \downarrow & & \downarrow \cong \\ S'' & \xrightarrow{h''} & T'' & \xrightarrow{g''} & Z'' \end{array}$$

of diagrams induces compatible isomorphisms of the objects featured in (9b), and since each diagram  $S \xrightarrow{h} T \xrightarrow{g} Z$  is isomorphic to a diagram in the standard form, this establishes the commutativity of (27b) for an arbitrary diagram by (27a). We believe there is a smarter proof not using the standard forms, but we have not been able to find it.

**Example 32.** In this example we use the material of [6, §3.3]. Let  $\text{fdVec}/\mathbb{F}$  denote the category of finite-dimensional vector spaces over a finite field  $\mathbb{F}$ . The Tits building of an  $n$ -dimensional vector space  $S \in \text{fdVec}/\mathbb{F}$  is the simplicial set  $B_\bullet(S)$  whose  $m$ -simplices are flags of subspaces  $S_0 \subset \cdots \subset S_m \subset S$  such that either  $S_0 \neq \{0\}$  or  $S_m \neq S$ . It is known that the homology  $H_i(B_\bullet(S); \mathbb{k})$  with coefficients in a field  $\mathbb{k}$  is zero for  $i \neq 0, n-1$ . The space  $St(S) := H_{n-1}(B_\bullet(S); \mathbb{k})$  is the *Steinberg module* of  $S$ .

Trusting in [6, page 132], each short exact sequence  $S' \hookrightarrow S \twoheadrightarrow S''$  in  $\text{fdVec}/\mathbb{F}$  induces a natural map

$$\mu_{S'S''} : St(S') \otimes St(S'') \longrightarrow St(S).$$

Mimicking the methods of Example 31 we get, for each morphism  $h$  as in (29), the span

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & St(D) \otimes St(\text{Im}(h)) \otimes St(F) & \\ h^\bullet \otimes 1 \swarrow & & \searrow 1 \otimes h \\ St(T) \otimes St(F) & & St(D) \otimes St(S). \end{array}$$

Since neither  $h^\bullet$  nor  $1 \otimes h$  are isomorphisms in general, the above diagrams interpreted as operations

$$\chi_h : St(T) \otimes St(F) \longrightarrow St(D) \otimes St(S)$$

can make  $St = \{St(S)\}_{S \in \text{fdVec}/\mathbb{F}}$  only a  $\text{fdVec}/\mathbb{F}$ -bicharade in the category of spans in  $\text{fdVec}$ .

## 5. GENERAL DIOPERADIC CATEGORIES

**W**E focus again on a pair  $\mathbb{Q} = (\mathbb{Q}_L, \mathbb{Q}_R)$  of two operadic categories such that  $\mathbb{Q}$  is the underlying category of  $\mathbb{Q}_L$ , and the underlying category of  $\mathbb{Q}_R$  is the opposite category  $\mathbb{Q}^\dagger$ . If both  $\mathbb{Q}_L$  and  $\mathbb{Q}_R$  are unary, we are in the context of Definition 9. Although the structures discussed below are straightforward generalizations of the corresponding ones in Section 2, several new important examples will occur.

**5.1. Dioperadic categories – definition and examples.** Recall from [4, page 1623] that each operadic category comes with a cardinality functor  $|\cdot|$  to the skeletal category  $\mathbf{sFSet}$  of finite sets. Objects of  $\mathbf{sFSet}$  are linearly ordered sets  $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and morphisms are arbitrary maps between these sets. In the above situation we thus have two cardinality functors,  $|\cdot|_L : \mathbb{Q} \rightarrow \mathbf{sFSet}$  and  $|\cdot|_R : \mathbb{Q} \rightarrow \mathbf{sFSet}^\dagger$ , given by the operadic structures of  $\mathbb{Q}_L$  and  $\mathbb{Q}_R$ , which together form the *bicardinality* functor

$$\|\cdot\| : \mathbb{Q} \longrightarrow \mathbf{sFSet} \times \mathbf{sFSet}^\dagger.$$

The latter category will be used so often that we introduce a condensed notation

$$\mathbf{sFSet}_{\mathbb{1}\Theta\mathbb{S}\mathbb{F}\mathbb{S}} := \mathbf{sFSet} \times \mathbf{sFSet}^\dagger.$$

The objects of  $\mathbf{sFSet}_{\mathbb{1}\Theta\mathbb{S}\mathbb{F}\mathbb{S}}$  are pairs  $([m], [n])$  of finite ordinals; we will sometimes use the shorter notation  $(m, n)$  instead of  $([m], [n])$ .

Assuming  $\|S\| = (a, m)$  and  $\|T\| = (n, b)$ , a morphism  $h : S \rightarrow T$  of  $\mathbb{Q}$  has  $n$  fibers  $F_i$  and  $m$  cofibers  $D_j$ ,  $i \in [n]$ ,  $j \in [m]$ , which we express by

$$(32) \quad F_1, \dots, F_n \triangleright S \xrightarrow{h} T \triangleleft D_1, \dots, D_m.$$

We will sometimes denote the  $i$ th fiber  $F_i$  of  $h$  in  $\mathbb{Q}_L$  by  $\overrightarrow{h}^{-1}(i)$  and the  $j$ th cofiber  $D_j$  of  $h$ , i.e. the  $j$ th fiber of  $h^\dagger$  in  $\mathbb{Q}_R$ , by  $\overleftarrow{h}^{-1}(j)$ . We emphasize that here neither  $\overrightarrow{h}$  or  $\overleftarrow{h}$  are actual maps, the arrows only distinguish between fibers and cofibers.

**Definition 33.** We say that  $\mathbb{Q} = (\mathbb{Q}_L, \mathbb{Q}_R)$  is *left dioperadic* if  $\mathbb{Q}_L$  is perfect. Dually,  $\mathbb{Q}$  is *right dioperadic* if  $\mathbb{Q}_R$  is perfect. Finally,  $\mathbb{Q}$  is *dioperadic* if both  $\mathbb{Q}_L$  and  $\mathbb{Q}_R$  are perfect. As in the unary case, we denote by  $\mathbb{Q}_F$  resp.  $\mathbb{Q}_C$  the fiber, resp. the cofiber subcategory.

**Example 34.** The archetype of a dioperadic category is  $\mathbf{sFSet}_{\mathbb{1}\Theta\mathbb{S}\mathbb{F}\mathbb{S}}$  itself, with the identity automorphism playing the rôle of the bicardinality. A morphism  $\varphi : (a, m) \rightarrow (n, b)$  is a pair  $\varphi = (\overrightarrow{\varphi}, \overleftarrow{\varphi})$  of arbitrary maps  $\overrightarrow{\varphi} : [a] \rightarrow [n]$  and  $\overleftarrow{\varphi} : [b] \rightarrow [m]$  of finite sets. The  $i$ th fiber of  $\varphi$  is the pair  $(\overrightarrow{\varphi}^{-1}(i), 1)$  and the  $j$ th cofiber the pair  $(1, \overleftarrow{\varphi}^{-1}(j))$ , for  $i \in [n]$ ,  $j \in [m]$ . Here  $\overrightarrow{\varphi}^{-1}(i)$  is the  $i$ th fiber of the map  $\overrightarrow{\varphi} : [a] \rightarrow [n]$  in  $\mathbf{sFSet}$  defined, as in [4, Section 1], to be the pullback of  $\overrightarrow{\varphi}$  along the map  $[1] \rightarrow [n]$  which picks up  $i \in [n]$ :

$$(33) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \overrightarrow{\varphi}^{-1}(i) & \xrightarrow{I_i} & [a] \\ \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \overrightarrow{\varphi} \\ [1] & \xrightarrow{1 \mapsto i} & [n]. \end{array}$$

The fiber  $\overrightarrow{\varphi}^{-1}(i)$  is unique by the skeletality of  $\mathbf{sFSet}$ . The expression  $\overleftarrow{\varphi}^{-1}(j)$  has the obvious similar meaning. It is easy to verify that


$$(34) \quad \left( \mathbf{sFSet}_{\mathbb{1}\Theta\mathbb{S}\mathbb{F}\mathbb{S}} \right)_F \cong \left( \mathbf{sFSet}_{\mathbb{1}\Theta\mathbb{S}\mathbb{F}\mathbb{S}} \right)_C \cong \mathbf{sFSet}.$$

**Example 35.** The subtle combinatorics of dioperadic categories is nicely illustrated by the category  $\mathbf{BBq}(\mathcal{C})$  of bibouquets, which is a ‘colored’ version of the dioperadic category  $\mathbf{sFSet}_{\mathbb{1}\Theta\mathbb{S}\mathbb{F}\mathbb{S}}$  and simultaneously a bivariant version of the operadic category of  $\mathcal{C}$ -bouquets in [4, Example 1.7].

Given a set of ‘colors’  $\mathcal{C}$ , a  $\mathcal{C}$ -*bibouquet* is a pair of maps  $B = (\beta, g) : [n] \times [m] \rightarrow \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}$ ,  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ , represented by the ‘fraction’

$$(35) \quad \frac{u_1, \dots, u_n}{v_1, \dots, v_m}, \quad u_i := \beta(i), \quad v_j := g(j), \quad i \in [n], \quad j \in [m],$$

of ordered lists of colors. The biarity of  $B$  is  $(m, n)$ . The symbol in (35) can be visualized as a directed corolla with  $m$  inputs labelled  $v_1, \dots, v_m$  and  $n$  outputs labelled  $u_1, \dots, u_n$ , as in



Let  $B' = (\beta', g') : [a] \times [m] \rightarrow \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}$  and  $B'' = (\beta'', g'') : [n] \times [b] \rightarrow \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}$  be bibouquets. Morphisms  $\Phi : B' \rightarrow B''$  are arbitrary maps  $\varphi = (\overrightarrow{\varphi}, \overleftarrow{\varphi}) : (a, m) \rightarrow (n, b)$  in  $\mathbf{SFSet}_{\mathbf{Set}}^{\mathbf{SFSet}}$ . The  $i$ th fiber of  $\Phi$  is the bibouquet

$$\overrightarrow{\Phi}^{-1}(i) := (\beta' I_i, 1 \mapsto g'(i)) : \overrightarrow{\varphi}^{-1}(i) \times [1] \rightarrow \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}, \quad i \in [n],$$


where  $I_i$  is the upper horizontal morphism in (33). The cofibers are defined similarly. For example, for  $\varphi = (\overrightarrow{\varphi}, \overleftarrow{\varphi}) : (4, 3) \rightarrow (2, 3)$  given by

$$\overrightarrow{\varphi}(1) = \overrightarrow{\varphi}(3) := 2, \quad \overrightarrow{\varphi}(2) = \overrightarrow{\varphi}(4) := 1, \quad \overleftarrow{\varphi}(1) := 3, \quad \overleftarrow{\varphi}(2) = \overleftarrow{\varphi}(3) := 2,$$

the fiber-cofiber diagram reads

$$\frac{u'_2, u'_4}{u'_1}, \frac{u'_1, u'_3}{u'_2} \triangleright \frac{u'_1, u'_2, u'_3, u'_4}{v'_1, v'_2, v'_3} \xrightarrow{\Phi} \frac{u''_1, u''_2}{v''_1, v''_2, v''_3} \triangleleft \frac{v'_1}{\emptyset}, \frac{v'_2}{v''_2, v''_3}, \frac{v'_3}{v''_1}.$$

The fiber subcategory  $\mathbf{BBq}(\mathcal{C})_F$  consists of bibouquets of the form  $B = (\beta, g) : [n] \times [1] \rightarrow \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Notice that  $g$  just picks an element of  $\mathcal{C}$ , the ‘root color’ of  $B$ . The maps of bibouquets  $B' \rightarrow B''$  in  $\mathbf{BBq}(\mathcal{C})_F$  whose root colors coincide are arbitrary maps of  $\mathbf{BBq}(\mathcal{C})$ , otherwise there is no map between  $B'$  and  $B''$ . We recognize  $\mathbf{BBq}(\mathcal{C})_F$  as the operadic category  $\mathbf{Bq}(\mathcal{C})$  of  $\mathcal{C}$ -bouquets from [4, Example 1.7], with the maps existing only between ‘flowers’



with identical pots. The cofiber category  $\mathbf{BBq}(\mathcal{C})_C$  is isomorphic to  $\mathbf{Bq}(\mathcal{C})$  too. Notice that the fiber subcategory  $\mathbf{BBq}(\mathcal{C})_F$  is the proper subcategory of the full subcategory of  $\mathbf{BBq}(\mathcal{C})$  of objects of bicardinalities  $(n, 1)$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and that  $\mathbf{BBq}(\mathcal{C})$  is not the product  $\mathbf{BBq}(\mathcal{C})_F \times \mathbf{BBq}(\mathcal{C})_F^\dagger$ .



**Example 36.** Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be a right unital operadic category with a family of local terminal objects (2). Then  $\widehat{\mathcal{O}} = (\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_L, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_R)$ , with  $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_L := \mathcal{O}$  and  $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_R$  the unary operadic category of Example 6, is dioperadic. Indeed,  $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_L$  is right unital, thus perfect by Proposition 3, with  $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_F = \mathcal{O}$ . By Example 8, also  $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_C$  is perfect, with  $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_F$  the discrete category with objects  $U_c$ ,  $c \in \pi_0(\mathcal{O})$ .

**Example 37** (due to M. Batanin). Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be a perfect operadic category. Consider  $\check{\mathcal{O}} = (\check{\mathcal{O}}_L, \check{\mathcal{O}}_R)$  with  $\check{\mathcal{O}}_L := \mathcal{O}$  and  $\check{\mathcal{O}}_R$  the category opposite to the underlying category of  $\mathcal{O}$ , with the cardinality defined by  $|\check{T}|_R := \{0\}$  for each  $T$ . Then  $\check{\mathcal{O}}$  is dioperadic, with  $\check{\mathcal{O}}_F = \mathcal{O}_F$  and  $\check{\mathcal{O}}_C$  the empty category.

**Example 38.** The décalage  $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{C})$  of a category  $\mathcal{C}$  is a unital operadic category. The construction of Example 36 leads to the dioperadic category  $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{A})$  with  $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{A})_F = \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{C})$  and  $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{A})_C \cong \mathcal{C}_{\text{disc}}$ , the discrete category with objects of  $\mathcal{C}$ .

**5.2. Operads, cooperads and bimodules.** This subsection contains generalizations of the notions introduced in Subsection 2.3. The only, but essential, conceptual difference is that the translation of Definition 14 to the form in Example 15 does not make much sense if objects of cardinalities different from [1] occur, cf. Remark 42 below.

**Definition 39.** A  $\mathcal{Q}$ -operad over a left dioperadic category  $\mathcal{Q}$  is a collection  $\mathcal{P} = \{\mathcal{P}(T)\}_{T \in \mathcal{Q}_F}$  of objects of a symmetric monoidal category  $\mathcal{V}$ , with structure operations

$$(36a) \quad \gamma_h : \mathcal{P}(T) \otimes \mathcal{P}(F_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{P}(F_n) \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}(S),$$

specified for an arbitrary morphism  $F_1, \dots, F_n \triangleright S \xrightarrow{h} T$  in  $\mathcal{Q}_F$ , and satisfying the associativity axiom in item (i) of [4, Definition 1.11].

Dually, a  $\mathcal{Q}$ -cooperad over a right dioperadic category  $\mathcal{Q}$  is a collection  $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{C}(T)\}_{T \in \mathcal{Q}_C}$  of objects of  $\mathcal{V}$  with structure operations

$$(36b) \quad \delta_h : \mathcal{C}(T) \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}(D_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{C}(D_m) \otimes \mathcal{C}(S)$$

that are given for any morphism  $S \xrightarrow{h} T \triangleleft D_1, \dots, D_m$  in  $\mathcal{Q}_C$ , and that satisfy the obvious dual form of the associativity diagram in item (i) of [4, Definition 1.11].

**Example 40** (due to M. Batanin). The ‘dioperadic envelope’  $\mathcal{O} \mapsto \check{\mathcal{O}}$  constructed in Example 37 defines a full and faithful embedding of the category of perfect operadic categories to the category of dioperadic categories. The category of  $\mathcal{O}_F$ -operads is isomorphic to the category of  $\check{\mathcal{O}}$ -operads.

Inspired by the shorthand used in [4, Definition 1.1] we introduce, for  $h : S \rightarrow T$  as in (32) and a  $\mathcal{Q}$ -operad  $\mathcal{P}$  over a left dioperadic category  $\mathcal{Q}$ , the notation

$$(37a) \quad \mathcal{P}(h) := \mathcal{P}(F_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{P}(F_n).$$

If  $\mathcal{Q}$  is right dioperadic and  $\mathcal{C}$  a  $\mathcal{Q}$ -cooperad, we similarly denote

$$(37b) \quad \mathcal{C}(h) := \mathcal{C}(D_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{C}(D_m).$$

With this shorthand, the operations in (36a) and (36b) assume a nice concise form

$$\gamma_h : \mathcal{P}(T) \otimes \mathcal{P}(h) \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}(S) \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_h : \mathcal{C}(T) \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}(h) \otimes \mathcal{C}(S).$$




FIGURE 3. The structure of a bimodule. The rectangles represent the corresponding pieces of the bimodule, the triangles the corresponding pieces of the operad and the cooperad. The equalities  $a = a_1 + \dots + a_n$  and  $b = b_1 + \dots + b_m$  following from the axioms of the operadic categories  $\mathcal{Q}_L$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_R$  are assumed.

**Definition 41.** Let  $\mathcal{Q}$  be a dioperadic category,  $\mathcal{P}$  a  $\mathcal{Q}_F$ -operad and  $\mathcal{C}$  a  $\mathcal{Q}_C$ -cooperad. A  $\mathcal{C}$ - $\mathcal{P}$ -bimodule is a collection  $\mathcal{M} = \{\mathcal{M}(S)\}_{S \in \mathcal{V}}$  of objects of  $\mathcal{V}$  with structure morphisms

$$(38) \quad \omega_h : \mathcal{M}(T) \otimes \mathcal{P}(F_1) \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{P}(F_n) \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}(D_1) \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{C}(D_m) \otimes \mathcal{M}(S)$$

given for each  $F_1, \dots, F_n \triangleright S \xrightarrow{h} T \triangleleft D_1, \dots, D_m$ .

We moreover require a compatibility between this action and the (co)operad structures of  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{C}$ . Namely, let

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S & \xrightarrow{h} & T \\ & \searrow gh & \swarrow g \\ & & Z \end{array}$$

be a commutative diagram in  $\mathcal{Q}$ . Both  $g$  and  $gh$  have  $a := |Z|_L$  fibers; denote by  $h_1, \dots, h_a$  the maps between them induced by  $h$ . Likewise  $h$  and  $gh$  have  $b := |S|_R$  cofibers; denote by  $g^1, \dots, g^b$  the maps between them induced by  $g$ . We demand the commutativity of the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M}(Z) \otimes \mathcal{P}(g) \otimes \mathcal{P}(h_1) \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{P}(h_a) & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1} \otimes \gamma_{h_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \gamma_{h_a}} & \mathcal{M}(Z) \otimes \mathcal{P}(gh) \\ \downarrow \omega_g \otimes \mathbb{1} & & \downarrow \omega_{gh} \\ \mathcal{C}(g) \otimes \mathcal{M}(T) \otimes \mathcal{P}(h) & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1} \otimes \omega_h} & \mathcal{C}(g^1) \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{C}(g^b) \otimes \mathcal{C}(h) \otimes \mathcal{M}(S) \\ & & \downarrow \delta_{g^1} \otimes \dots \otimes \delta_{g^b} \otimes \mathbb{1} \\ & & \mathcal{C}(gh) \otimes \mathcal{M}(S) \end{array}$$

which uses the shorthand (37a)–(37b) and implicitly assumes the equality of the set of the (co)fibers of a map and the set of the (co)fibers of the induced map between these (co)fibers required by Axiom (iv) of the definition of an operadic category in [4, page 1634]. The structure morphism (38) is symbolized by the ‘flow diagram’ in Figure 3.




FIGURE 4. An attempt to rewrite bimodule action (38).

**Remark 42.** Assume, as in Example 15, that the base monoidal category  $\mathcal{V}$  is the category of vector spaces and try to rewrite the bimodule action (38) to the form (10a), with  $\mathcal{R}$  the linear dual of  $\mathcal{D}$ . Instead of the diagram in Figure 3 we obtain a structure sketched in Figure 4, where the row of triangles on the left symbolizes the spaces  $\mathcal{R}(D_1), \dots, \mathcal{R}(D_m)$ . The bicardinality of the left figure is  $(a_1 + \dots + a_n, b_1 + \dots + b_m)$ , while the bicardinality of  $S$  is  $(a, m)$ . The map  $\omega$  may exist only if the respective cardinalities agree, i.e. if

$$(39) \quad a_1 + \dots + a_n = a \text{ and } b_1 + \dots + b_m = m.$$

The first equality follows from the axioms of the operadic category  $\mathcal{Q}_L$ . But there is no reason why the second equation should hold, unless we assume that  $b_j = 1$  for all  $j$ , which brings us back to the unary case. Furthermore, equations (39) are not self dual. However, the structures like the one in Figure 4 make sense in the context of the ‘contramodules’ discussed in the Epilogue.

**Example 43.** The category  $\mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{1}}^{\text{FSet}}_{\mathbb{1}}^{\text{Set}}$  is the terminal dioperadic category. Since the fiber subcategory of  $\mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{1}}^{\text{FSet}}_{\mathbb{1}}^{\text{Set}}$  is  $\text{sFSet}$ , cf. (34),  $\mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{1}}^{\text{FSet}}_{\mathbb{1}}^{\text{Set}}$ -operads are the same as  $\text{sFSet}$ -operads, which are, by [4, Example 1.15], the most classical  $\Sigma$ - (aka symmetric) operads of V.A. Artamonov [1] in 1969, i.e. collections  $\mathcal{P} = \{\mathcal{P}(n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $\Sigma$ -modules in  $\mathcal{V}$  with structure operations

$$\mathcal{P}(n) \otimes \mathcal{P}(k_1) \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{P}(k_n) \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}(k_1 + \dots + k_n),$$

that are given for any  $n, k_1, \dots, k_n \in \mathbb{N}$  and that satisfy the standard associativity and equivariance axioms [10, Definition 1]. Dually,  $\mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{1}}^{\text{FSet}}_{\mathbb{1}}^{\text{Set}}$ -cooperads are  $\Sigma$ -cooperads with structure operations

$$\mathcal{D}(l_1 + \dots + l_m) \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}(l_1) \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{D}(l_m) \otimes \mathcal{D}(m),$$

given for any  $m, l_1, \dots, l_m \in \mathbb{N}$  and satisfying the formal duals of the operad axioms.

Finally,  $\mathcal{D}$ - $\mathcal{P}$ -bimodules are bicollections  $\mathcal{M} = \{\mathcal{M}(n, m)\}_{n, m \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that each  $\mathcal{M}(n, m)$  is a  $\Sigma_m$ - $\Sigma_n$ -bimodule in  $\mathcal{V}$ , with structure operations

$$\mathcal{M}(n, l_1 + \dots + l_m) \otimes \mathcal{P}(k_1) \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{P}(k_n) \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}(l_1) \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{D}(l_m) \otimes \mathcal{M}(k_1 + \dots + k_n, m)$$

defined for any  $n, m, k_1, \dots, k_n, l_1, \dots, l_m \in \mathbb{N}$ . We are however not going to write the bimodule axioms explicitly here since they can be obtained easily by expanding the definition. Operads,

cooperads and bimodules over the dioperadic category  $\text{BBq}(\mathcal{C})$  of  $\mathcal{C}$ -bibouquets introduced in Example 35 are the  $\mathcal{C}$ -colored extensions of the above objects.

There are important particular cases of  $\mathcal{C}$ - $\mathcal{P}$ -bimodules with  $\mathcal{M}(n, m) = 0$  whenever  $m \neq 0$ . With  $\mathcal{M}(n) := \mathcal{M}(n, 0)$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the structure operations

$$\mathcal{M}(n) \otimes \mathcal{P}(k_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{P}(k_n) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}(k_1 + \cdots + k_n)$$

are that of a *right  $\mathcal{P}$ -module* in the sense of [9, page 1476], cf. also [11, Definition 2.2]. In this particular case the cooperad  $\mathcal{C}$  does not enter the picture at all, since there are no cofibers.  $\mathcal{C}$ - $\mathcal{P}$ -bimodules thus generalize the ‘classical’ right operadic modules which capture e.g. the structure of the compactification of the moduli space of points in a manifold [8, Proposition 6.4].

**Example 44.** The dioperadic category  $\mathfrak{SFS}_{\text{Set}}$  has a dioperadic subcategory  $\Delta_{\text{alg}}^{\text{alg}} := \Delta_{\text{alg}} \times \Delta_{\text{alg}}^{\dagger}$ , where  $\Delta_{\text{alg}}$  is the category of finite ordinals, including the empty one. The related objects, i.e. operads, cooperads and bimodules, are non- $\Sigma$  versions of the corresponding objects in Example 43.

## 6. GENERAL BIOPERADIC CATEGORIES

**T**HE aim of this section is to generalize the material of Section 3 to categories with objects of arbitrary bicardinality. The analysis of the morphism (32) now consists of the schemes

$$(40) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} F_i & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1}_{F_i}} & F_i \triangleleft C_{F_i}^1, \dots, C_{F_i}^{|F_i|_R} \\ \nabla & & \nabla \\ U_S^1, \dots, U_S^a \triangleright S & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1}_S} & S \triangleleft C_S^1, \dots, C_S^m \\ \downarrow h & \boxed{\text{analysis}} & \downarrow h \\ U_T^1, \dots, U_T^n \triangleright T & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1}_T} & T \triangleleft C_T^1, \dots, C_T^b \\ \Delta & & \Delta \\ U_{D_j}^1, \dots, U_{D_j}^{|D_j|_L} \triangleright D_j & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1}_{D_j}} & D_j \triangleleft C_{D_j}^1, \dots, C_{D_j}^m \end{array}$$

given for each  $i \in [n]$ ,  $j \in [m]$ .

**6.1. Operad algebras and coalgebras revisited.** We follow the principle formulated after Definition 23 and try to define  $\mathcal{P}$ -algebras,  $\mathcal{C}$ -coalgebras and  $\mathcal{M}$ -traces for general dioperadic categories. Guided by our philosophy, the *source*  $\mathbf{s}(X)$  of an object  $X \in \mathcal{Q}$  must be the list of connected components of the fibers of  $\mathbb{1}_X : X \rightarrow X$  and, similarly, the *target*  $\mathbf{t}(X)$  the list of connected components of the cofibers. That is, in the situation

$$U_X^1, \dots, U_X^n \triangleright X \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1}_X} X \triangleleft C_X^1, \dots, C_X^m, \quad \|X\| = (n, m)$$

we shall define

$$(41) \quad \mathbf{s}(X) := \{ \pi_0(U_X^i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n \} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{t}(X) := \{ \pi_0(C_X^j) \mid 1 \leq j \leq m \}.$$

For a collection  $C = \{C_c\}_{c \in \pi_0(Q)}$  of objects of the base monoidal category  $V$  parametrized by the connected components of  $Q$  we will abbreviate

$$(42) \quad C_{\mathbf{s}(X)} := \bigotimes_{c \in \mathbf{s}(X)} C_c \quad \text{and} \quad C_{\mathbf{t}(X)} := \bigotimes_{c \in \mathbf{t}(X)} C_c.$$

The non-unary version of the associativity (21a) of a  $\mathcal{P}$ -operad action would require, for each  $F_1, \dots, F_n \triangleright S \xrightarrow{h} T$  in the fiber subcategory  $Q_F \subset Q_L$ , isomorphisms

$$(43a) \quad A_{\mathbf{t}(T)} \cong A_{\mathbf{t}(S)}, \quad \text{and}$$

$$(43b) \quad A_{\mathbf{s}(T)} \cong A_{\mathbf{t}(F_1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes A_{\mathbf{t}(F_n)}.$$

Likewise, the non-unary version (21b) of the associativity for a  $\mathcal{C}$ -cooperad action needs

$$(44a) \quad B_{\mathbf{s}(S)} \cong B_{\mathbf{s}(T)}, \quad \text{and}$$

$$(44b) \quad B_{\mathbf{t}(S)} \cong B_{\mathbf{s}(D_1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes B_{\mathbf{s}(D_m)}$$

for arbitrary  $S \xrightarrow{h} T \triangleleft D_1, \dots, D_m$  in the cofiber subcategory  $Q_C \subset Q_R$ . Since (22) for the bimodule action involves both  $\mathcal{P}$ -algebras and  $\mathcal{C}$ -coalgebras, it requires all the isomorphisms above. The isomorphisms (43b) and (44b) must moreover hold for arbitrary  $h : S \rightarrow T$  as in (32), not only for morphisms in  $Q_F$  resp.  $Q_C$ . Notice that the isomorphisms

$$A_{\mathbf{s}(F_1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes A_{\mathbf{s}(F_n)} \cong A_{\mathbf{s}(S)} \quad \text{and} \quad B_{\mathbf{t}(D_1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes B_{\mathbf{t}(D_m)} \cong B_{\mathbf{t}(T)}$$

follow, as in the unary case, from [4, Axiom (iv), page 1634] which guarantees the equalities of disjoint unions

$$\mathbf{s}(S) = \mathbf{s}(F_1) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \mathbf{s}(F_n) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{t}(T) = \mathbf{t}(D_1) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \mathbf{t}(D_m).$$

**6.2. General bioperadic categories, (co)algebras and traces.** The central definition of this section, formulated below, imposes on dioperadic categories additional conditions that imply isomorphisms (43a)–(44b). Furthermore, every object of  $Q_F$  must have exactly one ‘output,’ since algebras for  $Q_F$ -operads must be structures with many-to-one operations. For the same reasons, every object of  $Q_C$  must have exactly one ‘input.’ This gives rise to an extra numerical condition, which is automatically satisfied in the unary case.

**Definition 45.** A *left bioperadic* category is a left dioperadic category  $Q$  in Definition 33 such that all objects of the fiber subcategory  $Q_F$  are of bicardinality  $(a, 1)$  with some  $a \in \mathbb{N}$  and, for any morphism  $F_1, \dots, F_n \triangleright S \xrightarrow{h} T$  in  $Q_F$ ,

$$(45a) \quad (F_i \xrightarrow{1_{F_i}} F_i \triangleleft C_{F_i} \ \& \ U_T^1, \dots, U_T^n \triangleright T \xrightarrow{1_T} T) \implies (C_{F_i} = U_T^i), \ 1 \leq i \leq n, \quad \text{and}$$

$$(45b) \quad (S \xrightarrow{1_S} S \triangleleft C_S \ \& \ T \xrightarrow{1_T} T \triangleleft C_T) \implies C_S = C_T.$$

Dually, a right dioperadic category  $Q$  is *right bioperadic* if and all objects of the cofiber subcategory  $Q_C$  are of bicardinality  $(1, b)$  with some  $b \in \mathbb{N}$  and, for every  $S \xrightarrow{h} T \triangleleft D_1, \dots, D_m$  in  $Q_C$ ,

$$(46a) \quad (U_{D_j} \triangleright D_j \xrightarrow{1_{D_j}} D_j \ \& \ S \xrightarrow{1_S} S \triangleleft C_S^1, \dots, C_S^m) \implies (U_{D_j} = C_S^j), \ 1 \leq j \leq m, \quad \text{and}$$

$$(46b) \quad (U_T \triangleright T \xrightarrow{1_T} T \ \& \ U_S \triangleright S \xrightarrow{1_S} S) \implies U_T = U_S.$$

Finally, a dioperadic category is *bioperadic* if it is both left and right bioperadic, and if (45a) and (46a) are fulfilled for any morphism  $h : S \rightarrow T$  of  $Q$ .

Notice that  $m = b = 1$  in the analysis (40) of a morphism  $h : S \rightarrow T$  of the fiber subcategory, so the identity in (45b) indeed involves only one cofiber. Likewise, the identity in (46b) involves only one fiber. The equalities in (45a) imply  $\mathbf{t}(F_1) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \mathbf{t}(F_n) = \mathbf{s}(T)$  and the equalities in (46a) imply that  $\mathbf{s}(D_1) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \mathbf{s}(D_m) = \mathbf{t}(S)$ . The objects in the intersection  $\mathbb{Q}_F \cap \mathbb{Q}_C$  have the bicardinality  $(1, 1)$ , so the morphisms in  $\mathbb{Q}_F \cap \mathbb{Q}_C$  are of the form  $F \triangleright S \xrightarrow{h} T \triangleleft D$  and they satisfy equalities (19) in Remark 18.

**Proposition 46.** *The inclusion of the sets*

$$\{U_T^i \mid U_T^1, \dots, U_T^n \triangleright T \xrightarrow{1_T} T, T \in \mathbb{Q}_F, i \in [n]\} \subseteq \{C_T^j \mid T \xrightarrow{1_T} T \triangleleft C_T^1, \dots, C_T^m, T \in \mathbb{Q}_F, j \in [m]\}$$

*holds in an arbitrary left bioperadic category  $\mathbb{Q}$ . In a right bioperadic category,*

$$\{U_T^i \mid U_T^1, \dots, U_T^n \triangleright T \xrightarrow{1_T} T, T \in \mathbb{Q}_C, i \in [n]\} \supseteq \{C_T^j \mid T \xrightarrow{1_T} T \triangleleft C_T^1, \dots, C_T^m, T \in \mathbb{Q}_C, j \in [m]\}.$$

*If  $\mathbb{Q}$  is bioperadic, then*

$$\{U_T^i \mid U_T^1, \dots, U_T^n \triangleright T \xrightarrow{1_T} T, T \in \mathbb{Q}, i \in [n]\} = \{C_T^j \mid T \xrightarrow{1_T} T \triangleleft C_T^1, \dots, C_T^m, T \in \mathbb{Q}, j \in [m]\},$$

*so the sets of elements of the sources and the sets of elements of the targets are the same.*

*Proof.* A straightforward modification of the proof of Proposition 19. □

**Proposition 47.** *Let  $\mathbb{Q} = (\mathbb{Q}_L, \mathbb{Q}_R)$  be left dioperadic. Then*

- (i) *the subcategory  $\mathbb{Q}_F \subset \mathbb{Q}_L$  is an operadic subcategory,*
- (ii) *the fibers of all maps in  $\mathbb{Q}$  have bicardinalities of the form  $(a, 1)$ , with some  $a \in \mathbb{N}$ ,*
- (iii) *for each morphism  $h : S \rightarrow T$  as in (32) and  $i \in [n]$ ,  $\|\overrightarrow{h}^{-1}(i)\| = \|\overleftarrow{h}\|^{-1}(i)$ .*

*Dually, if  $\mathbb{Q} = (\mathbb{Q}_L, \mathbb{Q}_R)$  is right dioperadic, then*

- (!) *the subcategory  $\mathbb{Q}_C \subset \mathbb{Q}_R$  is an operadic subcategory,*
- (!!) *the cofibers of all maps in  $\mathbb{Q}$  have bicardinalities of the form  $(1, b)$ , with some  $b \in \mathbb{N}$ ,*
- (!!!) *for each morphism  $h : S \rightarrow T$  as in (32) and  $j \in [m]$ ,  $\|\overleftarrow{h}^{-1}(j)\| = \|\overrightarrow{h}\|^{-1}(j)$ .*

In item (iii),  $\|\overrightarrow{h}^{-1}(i)\|$  is the biarity of the  $i$ th fiber of  $h$  and  $\|\overleftarrow{h}\|^{-1}(i)$  is the  $i$ th fiber of the induced map  $\|\overrightarrow{h}\| : \|\mathbb{S}\| \rightarrow \|\mathbb{T}\|$ . Recall from [4, page 1634] that the cardinality functor in any operadic category satisfies

$$(47) \quad |f^{-1}(i)| = |f|^{-1}(i), \text{ for } f : S \longrightarrow T, i \in |T|.$$

The equalities in items (iii) and (!!!) are dioperadic versions of (47).

*Proof of Proposition 47.* Item (i) is obvious. Item (ii) follows from the left bioperadicity and the fact that the fibers of all maps belong to  $\mathbb{Q}_F$ . Let us analyze (iii). We have, by definitions

$$\|\overrightarrow{h}^{-1}(i)\| = (\|\overrightarrow{h}^{-1}(i)\|_L, \|\overrightarrow{h}^{-1}(i)\|_R) \text{ and } \|\overleftarrow{h}\|^{-1}(i) = (\|\overleftarrow{h}\|^{-1}(i), [1]),$$

while  $\|\overrightarrow{h}^{-1}(i)\|_L = \|\overleftarrow{h}\|^{-1}(i)$  by property of the cardinality functor recalled in (47). Thus the equality in item (iii) is equivalent to  $\|\overrightarrow{h}^{-1}(i)\|_R = [1]$ , meaning that the  $i$ th fiber of  $h$  has the biarity  $(a, 1)$  with some  $a \in \mathbb{N}$ . This however follows from (ii). The proof of the second part of the proposition is similar. □

**Definition 48.** Let  $\mathbb{Q} = (\mathbb{Q}_L, \mathbb{Q}_R)$  be a left bioperadic category and  $\mathcal{P}$  a  $\mathbb{Q}_F$ -operad. A  $\mathcal{P}$ -algebra is a collection  $A = \{A_c\}_{c \in \pi_0(\mathbb{Q}_F)}$  together with structure operations

$$a_F : \mathcal{P}(F) \otimes A_{\mathbf{s}(F)} \longrightarrow A_{\mathbf{t}(F)}, \quad F \in \mathbb{Q}_F,$$

where  $\mathbf{s}(F)$  and  $\mathbf{t}(F)$  are as in (41), and the shorthand of (42) is used. Moreover, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{P}(T) \otimes \mathcal{P}(F_1) \otimes A_{\mathbf{s}(F_1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{P}(F_n) \otimes A_{\mathbf{s}(F_n)} & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1} \otimes a_{F_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes a_{F_n}} & \mathcal{P}(T) \otimes A_{\mathbf{t}(F_1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes A_{\mathbf{t}(F_n)} \\ \text{symmetry} \uparrow \cong & & \parallel (45a) \\ \mathcal{P}(T) \otimes \mathcal{P}(F_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{P}(F_n) \otimes A_{\mathbf{s}(F_1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes A_{\mathbf{s}(F_n)} & & \mathcal{P}(T) \otimes A_{\mathbf{s}(T)} \\ \gamma_h \otimes \mathbb{1} \downarrow & & \downarrow a_T \\ \mathcal{P}(S) \otimes A_{\mathbf{s}(F_1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes A_{\mathbf{s}(F_n)} & & A_{\mathbf{t}(T)} \\ \text{axiom of } \mathbb{Q}_L \parallel & & \parallel (45b) \\ \mathcal{P}(S) \otimes A_{\mathbf{s}(S)} & \xrightarrow{a_S} & A_{\mathbf{t}(S)} \end{array}$$

is required to commute for each  $F_1, \dots, F_n \triangleright S \xrightarrow{h} T$  in  $\mathbb{Q}_F$ .

Dually, suppose that  $\mathbb{Q}$  is right bioperadic and  $\mathcal{C}$  a  $\mathbb{Q}_C$ -cooperad. A  $\mathcal{C}$ -coalgebra is a collection  $B = \{B_c\}_{c \in \pi_0(\mathbb{Q}_C)}$  together with structure operations

$$b_D : \mathcal{C}(D) \otimes B_{\mathbf{s}(D)} \longrightarrow B_{\mathbf{t}(D)}, \quad D \in \mathbb{Q}_C,$$

such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C}(D_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{C}(D_m) \otimes \mathcal{C}(S) \otimes B_{\mathbf{s}(S)} & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1}^{\otimes m} \otimes b_S} & \mathcal{C}(D_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{C}(D_m) \otimes B_{\mathbf{t}(S)} \\ \delta_h \otimes \mathbb{1} \uparrow & & \cong (46a) \\ \mathcal{C}(T) \otimes B_{\mathbf{s}(S)} & & \mathcal{C}(D_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{C}(D_m) \otimes B_{\mathbf{s}(D_1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes B_{\mathbf{s}(D_m)} \\ (46b) \parallel & & \cong \text{symmetry} \\ \mathcal{C}(T) \otimes B_{\mathbf{s}(T)} & & \mathcal{C}(D_1) \otimes B_{\mathbf{s}(D_1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{C}(D_m) \otimes B_{\mathbf{s}(D_m)} \\ b_T \downarrow & & \downarrow b_{D_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes b_{D_m} \\ B_{\mathbf{t}(T)} & \xrightarrow{\text{axiom of } \mathbb{Q}_R} & B_{\mathbf{t}(D_1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes B_{\mathbf{t}(D_m)} \end{array}$$

commutes for an arbitrary  $S \xrightarrow{h} T \triangleleft D_1, \dots, D_m$  in  $\mathbb{Q}_C$ .

**Proposition 49.** The ‘bivariant envelope’  $\mathbb{0} \mapsto \widehat{\mathbb{0}}$  constructed in Example 36 defines a faithful embedding of the category of unital operadic categories to the category of bioperadic categories  $\mathbb{Q} = (\mathbb{Q}_L, \mathbb{Q}_R)$  with unital  $\mathbb{Q}_L$ . The categories of  $\mathbb{0}$ - and  $\widehat{\mathbb{0}}$ -operads are isomorphic and so are also the categories of the associated algebras.

*Proof.* We claim that the dioperadic category  $\widehat{\mathbb{0}} = (\widehat{\mathbb{0}}_L, \widehat{\mathbb{0}}_R)$  is bioperadic if  $\mathbb{0}$  is unital. Let us start by verifying (45a) for  $h : S \rightarrow T \in \widehat{\mathbb{0}} = \mathbb{0}$  as in

$$(49) \quad F_1, \dots, F_n \triangleright S \xrightarrow{h} T \triangleleft D, \quad D := U_c, \quad c := \pi_0(T),$$

where  $F_1, \dots, F_n$  are the fibers of  $h$  in  $\mathbb{0}$  and  $U_c$  belongs to the family (2). By definition,  $C_{F_i}$  is the chosen local terminal object  $U_c^i$  in the connected component of  $F_i$ , while  $U_T^i$  is the  $i$ th fiber of the identity  $\mathbb{1}_T : T \rightarrow T$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , that is

$$U_T^1, \dots, U_T^n \triangleright T \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1}_T} T.$$

By the left unitality of  $\mathbb{0}$ , all  $U_T^1, \dots, U_T^n$  are chosen local terminal. The functoriality of the fiber functors gives the map  $h_i : F_i \rightarrow U_T^i$  in the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F_i & \xrightarrow{h_i} & U_T^i \\ \nabla & & \nabla \\ S & \xrightarrow{h} & T \\ \curvearrowright h & & \curvearrowleft \mathbb{1}_T \\ & T & \end{array}$$

thus  $F_i$  and  $U_T^i$  are in the same connected component, therefore  $U_c^i = U_T^i$  for each  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . This proves (45a). By definition,  $C_S = U_a$  and  $C_T = U_b$ , where  $a := \pi_0(S)$  and  $b := \pi_0(T)$ . If  $S$  is connected with  $T$  by a morphism,  $a = b$ , so  $C_S = C_T$ . This verifies (45b).

For  $h : S \rightarrow T \triangleleft D$ ,  $D = U_b$  with  $b := \pi_0(T)$ , so  $U_D$  is the fiber of  $U_b \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1}_{U_b}} U_b$ , therefore  $U_D = U_b$  by the right unitality of  $\mathbb{0}$ . By definition,  $C_S$  is the cofiber of  $S \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1}_S} S$ , i.e. the chosen local terminal object in the connected component of  $S$ . Since  $S$  and  $T$  are connected by a morphism, we conclude that  $C_S = U_b = U_D$ , which is (46a). The equalities in (46a) are immediate because  $\widehat{\mathbb{0}}_C$  is discrete, cf. Example 36. The numerical assumptions about the biarities are clearly satisfied, so  $\widehat{\mathbb{0}}$  is bioperadic as claimed. The rest of the the proposition is obvious.  $\square$

Unlike the Example 40, the embedding given by the bivariant envelope is not full, since there may exist functors between the envelopes that do not preserve the chosen local terminals.

**Definition 50.** Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a  $\mathcal{C}$ - $\mathcal{P}$ -bimodule. An  $\mathcal{M}$ -trace consists of an  $\mathcal{P}$ -algebra  $A$  and a  $\mathcal{C}$ -coalgebra  $B$  as in Definition 48, together with structure operations

$$c_T : \mathcal{M}(T) \otimes A_{\mathbf{s}(T)} \longrightarrow B_{\mathbf{t}(T)}, \quad T \in \mathbb{Q},$$

such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M}(T) \otimes A_{\mathbf{s}(T)} & \xrightarrow{c_T} & B_{\mathbf{t}(T)} \xrightarrow{\text{axiom of } \mathbb{Q}_R} B_{\mathbf{t}(D_1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes B_{\mathbf{t}(D_m)} \\ \text{(45a)} \parallel & & \uparrow b_{D_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes b_{D_m} \\ \mathcal{M}(T) \otimes A_{\mathbf{t}(F_1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes A_{\mathbf{t}(F_n)} & & \mathcal{C}(D_1) \otimes B_{\mathbf{s}(D_1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{C}(D_m) \otimes B_{\mathbf{s}(D_m)} \\ \mathbb{1} \otimes a_{F_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes a_{F_n} \uparrow & & \cong \downarrow \text{symmetry} \\ \mathcal{M}(T) \otimes \mathcal{P}(F_1) \otimes A_{\mathbf{s}(F_1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{P}(F_n) \otimes A_{\mathbf{s}(F_n)} & & \mathcal{C}(D_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{C}(D_m) \otimes B_{\mathbf{s}(D_1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes B_{\mathbf{s}(D_m)} \\ \text{symmetry} \cong \downarrow & & \parallel \text{(46a)} \\ \mathcal{M}(T) \otimes \mathcal{P}(F_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{P}(F_n) \otimes A_{\mathbf{s}(F_1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes A_{\mathbf{s}(F_n)} & & \mathcal{C}(D_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{C}(D_m) \otimes B_{\mathbf{t}(S)} \\ \omega_h \otimes \mathbb{1}^{\otimes n} \downarrow & & \uparrow \mathbb{1}^{\otimes m} \otimes c_S \\ \mathcal{C}(D_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{C}(D_m) \otimes \mathcal{M}(S) \otimes A_{\mathbf{s}(F_1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes A_{\mathbf{s}(F_n)} & \xrightarrow{\text{axiom of } \mathbb{Q}_L} & \mathcal{C}(D_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{C}(D_m) \otimes \mathcal{M}(S) \otimes A_{\mathbf{s}(S)} \end{array}$$



commutes for each morphism  $F_1, \dots, F_n \triangleright S \xrightarrow{h} T \triangleleft D_1, \dots, D_m$  in  $\mathbb{Q}$ .

Notice that the algebra operations  $a_{F_i} : \mathcal{P}(F_i) \otimes A_{\mathfrak{s}(F_i)} \rightarrow A_{\mathfrak{t}(F_i)}$  in the diagram in Definition 50 are defined, since  $F_i \in \mathbb{Q}_F$  for each  $i \in [n]$ . The coalgebra operations are defined for the similar reasons.

**Example 51.** Let us return to the context of Example 43. The traces for the ‘traditional’ right operadic modules were introduced in [11, Definition 2.6]. Denote  $Cycl(n) := \text{Span}\{\Sigma_{n-1}\}$ , the  $\mathbb{k}$ -linear span of the symmetric group on  $n-1$  elements. As argued in [11, Example 2.8], the collection  $Cycl = \{Cycl(n)\}_{n \geq 1}$  is a right module over the operad  $\mathcal{A}ss$  for associative algebras. A *Cycl*-trace is given by a map  $T : A \rightarrow W$  from an associative algebra  $A$  to a vector space  $W$  such that

$$T(ab) = T(ba), \quad a, b \in A,$$

i.e.  $T$  is a trace of an associative algebra in the traditional sense.

**Example 52.** The augmentation ideal  $\overline{\mathcal{A}ss}$  in the operad  $\mathcal{A}ss$  for associative algebras bears an obvious right  $\mathcal{A}ss$ -action. An  $\overline{\mathcal{A}ss}$ -trace is given by an associative algebra  $A$ , a vector space  $B$  and a bilinear map  $T : A \otimes A \rightarrow B$  satisfying

$$T(ab, c) = T(a, bc), \quad \text{for all } a, b, c \in A.$$

More interesting examples of traces involving Stasheff’s associahedra acting on the cyclohedra can be found in [11, Section 2].

## EPILOGUE

**T**HE structures studied so far have alternatives in the form of objects  $\mathbb{Q} = (\mathbb{Q}', \mathbb{Q}'')$ , where  $\mathbb{Q}'$  and  $\mathbb{Q}''$  are operadic categories sharing the same underlying category  $\mathbb{Q}$ . Morphisms of  $\mathbb{Q}$  would then possess two sets of fibers, so instead of (32) we would have

$$(50) \quad \left. \begin{array}{l} F'_1, \dots, F'_n \triangleright \\ F''_1, \dots, F''_m \triangleright \end{array} \right\} S \xrightarrow{h} T.$$

Given a  $\mathbb{Q}'$ -operad  $\mathcal{P}'$  and a  $\mathbb{Q}''$ -operad  $\mathcal{P}''$ , the bimodules in Definition 41 would be replaced by ‘contramodules’  $\mathcal{M} = \{\mathcal{M}(S)\}_{S \in \mathbb{Q}}$  with structure operations

$$(51) \quad \omega_h : \mathcal{P}'(F'_1) \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{P}'(F'_n) \otimes \mathcal{M}(T) \otimes \mathcal{P}''(F''_1) \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{P}''(F''_m) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}(S)$$

given for any  $h : S \rightarrow T$  in (50), visualized in Figure 5.

A typical example of  $\mathbb{Q} = (\mathbb{Q}', \mathbb{Q}'')$  is the category  $\mathfrak{sFSet}^2 := \mathfrak{sFSet} \times \mathfrak{sFSet}$ . The structure operations (51) are of the form

$$\mathcal{P}'(a_1) \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{P}'(a_n) \otimes \mathcal{M}(n, m) \otimes \mathcal{P}''(b_1) \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{P}''(b_m) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}(a_1 + \dots + a_n, b_1 + \dots + b_m)$$

and defined for all  $n, m, a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_m \in \mathbb{N}$ .

**Example 53.** Each  $\frac{1}{2}$ PROP  $\mathbb{P} = \{\mathbb{P}(n, m)\}_{n, m \in \mathbb{N}}$ , cf. [12, Definition 1], contains the ‘lower’ and the ‘upper’ suboperads  $\mathbb{P}^\uparrow = \{\mathbb{P}^\uparrow(n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\mathbb{P}^\downarrow = \{\mathbb{P}^\downarrow(m)\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  given by

$$\mathbb{P}^\uparrow(n) := \mathbb{P}(n, 1) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}^\downarrow(n) := \mathbb{P}(1, n) \quad \text{for } n, m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

The triple  $(\mathbb{P}^\uparrow, \mathbb{P}, \mathbb{P}^\downarrow)$  is a natural  $\mathfrak{sFSet}^2$ -contramodule.




FIGURE 5. A  $\frac{1}{2}$ PROPic version of Figure 3. The rectangles represent the corresponding pieces of  $\mathcal{M}$ , the triangles the pieces of  $\mathcal{P}'$  and  $\mathcal{P}''$ , respectively. The equalities  $a = a_1 + \dots + a_n$  and  $b = b_1 + \dots + b_m$  are assumed.

One may wish to develop a theory parallel to that for di- and bioperadic categories also for the above structures generalizing  $\frac{1}{2}$ PROPs, but we won't do it here because in our opinion the time is not yet ripe for that. A natural question is whether also fully-fledged PROPs or at least properads can be described as operad-type objects over an operadic-like category. We don't have the slightest idea if or how to do it. We welcome any suggestion in this direction.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] V.A. Artamonov. Multioperator algebras and clones of polylinear operators. *Russian Mathematical Surveys*, 24(1):45–57, 1969.
- [2] M.A. Batanin. Monoidal globular categories as a natural environment for the theory of weak  $n$ -categories. *Adv. Math.*, 136(1):39–103, 1998.
- [3] M.A. Batanin and M. Markl. Operadic categories as a natural environment for Koszul duality. *Compositionality*, 5(3), 2023.
- [4] M.A. Batanin and M. Markl. Operadic categories and duoidal Deligne's conjecture. *Adv. Math.*, 285:1630–1687, 2015.
- [5] M.A. Batanin and M. Markl. Operads, operadic categories and the blob complex. *Applied Categorical Structures*, 32:6, 2024.
- [6] M.M. Kapranov. Analogies between the Langlands correspondence and topological quantum field theory. In *Functional analysis on the eve of the 21st century, Vol. 1 (New Brunswick, NJ, 1993)*, volume 131 of *Progr. Math.*, pages 119–151. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1995.
- [7] S. MacLane. *Homology*. Springer Verlag, 1963.
- [8] M. Markl. A compactification of the real configuration space as an operadic completion. *J. Algebra*, 215:185–204, 1999.
- [9] M. Markl. Models for operads. *Communications in Algebra*, 24(4):1471–1500, 1996.
- [10] M. Markl. Operads and PROPs. In *Handbook of algebra. Vol. 5*, pages 87–140. Elsevier/North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2008.
- [11] M. Markl. Simplex, associahedron, and cyclohedron. *Contemporary Mathematics*, vol. 227, 235–265, 1999.
- [12] M. Markl and A.A. Voronov. PROPped-up graph cohomology. In *Algebra, Arithmetic, and Geometry. Volume II: In Honor of Yu.I. Manin*, Birkhäuser, 249–282, Boston 2009.
- [13] B. Mitchell. The full imbedding theorem. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 86(3): 619–637, 1964.

Email address: markl@math.cas.cz

THE CZECH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, ŽITNÁ 25, 115 67 PRAGUE 1, THE CZECH REPUBLIC