

ASSEMBLY OF CONSTRUCTIBLE FACTORIZATION ALGEBRAS

EILIND KARLSSON, CLAUDIA I. SCHEIMBAUER, AND TASHI WALDE

ABSTRACT. We provide a toolbox of extension, gluing, and assembly techniques for factorization algebras.

Using these tools, we fill various gaps in the literature on factorization algebras on stratified manifolds, the main one being that constructible factorization algebras form a sheaf of symmetric monoidal ∞ -categories. Additionally, we explain how to assemble constructible factorization algebras from the data on the individual strata together with module structures associated to the relative links; thus answering a question by Ayala.

Along the way, we give detailed proofs of the following facts which are also of independent interest: constructibility is a local condition; the ∞ -category of disks is a localization of any sufficiently fine poset of disks; constructibility implies the Weiss condition on disks; constructible factorization algebras are algebras for the ∞ -operad of embedded disks. For each of these, variants or special cases already existed, but they were either incomplete or not general enough.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	3
1.1. Opening the toolbox	4
1.2. Constructibility tools	5
1.3. Conventions and notation	7
1.4. Acknowledgements	8
2. Background on Weiss cosheaves	9
2.1. Sieves, (hyper)covers and refinements	9
2.2. Locality and descent	13
2.3. Weiss cosheaves and hypercosheaves	15
2.4. Multiplicative and factorizing bases	16
2.5. Remarks about terminology	19
3. Background on (constructible) factorization algebras	22
3.1. Basics on factorization algebras	22
3.2. Conical manifolds	26
3.3. Constructible factorization algebras	29
3.4. Restriction and pushforward	30
4. The toolbox	33
4.1. Overview	33
4.2. A colimit of ∞ -operads	34
4.3. Extending from factorizing bases	37
4.4. Extending multiplicative algebras to disjoint union completion	40
5. Constructibility tools	49
5.1. Constructibility is local	49
5.2. Localizing at isotopy equivalences	52
5.3. Constructible implies Weiss on disks	59
6. Main theorems and applications	63
6.1. Gluing of constructible factorization algebras	63
6.2. The symmetric monoidal ∞ -category of constructible factorization algebras	65
6.3. Link decomposition of constructible factorization algebras	67

6.4. Factorization algebras from factorization homology	73
Appendix A. Category theory	76
A.1. Quillen's Theorem B	76
A.2. A localization criterion	76
A.3. A cofinality criterion	80
A.4. Localizations of pre-cocartesian ∞ -operads	80
Appendix B. Operadic colimits and left Kan extensions	85
Appendix C. Homotopy colimits of transfinite cubes	89
C.1. Transfinite sequences	89
C.2. Transfinite cubes	89
C.3. The latching operator	91
C.4. Very cofibrant cubes	93
Appendix D. Proof of Proposition 6.19	96
References	102

1. INTRODUCTION

The notion of a factorization algebra was first developed by Beilinson and Drinfeld in the algebro-geometric context. In the topological context, Lurie defined a variant in [Lur17] under the name factorizable cosheaves, and Costello and Gwilliam [CG17] defined a variant suitable for (perturbative quantization of) observables of a field theory. Constructible factorization algebras live on stratified spaces and enjoy the property that their values on certain inclusions of disks (which “look the same with respect to the stratification”) are equivalences. A special case is that of an empty stratification, which reflects a field theory being topological. A closely related concept is factorization homology as developed by Lurie, Ayala, Francis, and Tanaka: indeed, a key source of constructible factorization algebras is provided by factorization homology. We discuss this below in more detail.

Informally, a factorization algebra on a space X valued in a symmetric monoidal ∞ -category \mathcal{C} is an assignment which sends an open set U to an object $\mathcal{F}(U) \in \mathcal{C}$ and to any inclusion of disjoint opens $U_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup U_n \subseteq V$ it assigns a morphism in \mathcal{C}

$$f_{U_1, \dots, U_n; V}: \mathcal{F}(U_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{F}(U_n) \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}(V)$$

respecting composition. Moreover, this assignment is required to be multiplicative, which says that the maps

$$f_{\emptyset}: \mathbb{1} \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{F}(\emptyset) \quad \text{and} \quad f_{U, V; U \sqcup V}: \mathcal{F}(U) \otimes \mathcal{F}(V) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{F}(U \sqcup V)$$

are equivalences for disjoint opens U and V , and is required to satisfy descent for so-called Weiss covers¹. To encode this formally with all the correct coherences, one uses the operadic language: A factorization algebra on a space X is an algebra in \mathcal{C} for an operad $\text{Open}(X)^\otimes$ of disjoint open sets in X , which satisfies a multiplicativity condition and descent for Weiss covers.

Basic examples include associative algebras, viewed as factorization algebras on the real line, bimodules (or left/right modules) with a chosen basepoint, viewed as constructible factorization algebras on the reals (or non-positive/non-negative reals) with the point 0 as the stratification, and \mathbb{E}_n -algebras, viewed as factorization algebras on \mathbb{R}^n .

The main goal of this article is to provide a toolbox of techniques to prove various statements about factorization algebras. While the three main applications deal with constructible factorization algebras, many of the intermediate steps work without this assumption. Before delving deeper into the toolbox we first explain these applications.

The first application of this toolbox is the following: Although widely expected (and sometimes claimed), there is no proof in the literature that factorization algebras can be glued; for example, that given an open cover $X = U \cup V$ and factorization algebras \mathcal{F} on U and \mathcal{G} on V together with an isomorphism $\mathcal{F}|_{U \cap V} \simeq \mathcal{G}|_{U \cap V}$, we can produce a unique factorization algebra on X that restricts to \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} . In other words, factorization algebras form a sheaf of categories. We fill this gap with this article in the constructible setting, that is, for smooth conical manifolds².

Our first main theorem states that constructible factorization algebras can be glued from constructible factorization algebras on the opens in any cover.

Theorem A (Theorem 6.1). *Let \mathcal{U} be an open cover of a smooth conical manifold X . Then the map induced by restricting factorization algebras*

$$\text{FACT}_X^{\text{cstr}}(\mathcal{C}) \longrightarrow \lim_{\{U_1, \dots, U_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{U}} \text{FACT}_{U_1 \cap \dots \cap U_n}^{\text{cstr}}(\mathcal{C})$$

¹The descent condition is a standard descent condition in topos theory. However, there are variations appearing in the literature, so we encourage even the reader already familiar with factorization algebras to look at Remark 3.16 and Section 2.5.

²A smooth conical manifold is what Ayala–Francis–Tanaka call a “conically smooth stratified space”. Furthermore, in all main Theorems we require the existence of “enough good disks”, see Definition 3.34 and Remark 3.36.

is an equivalence of ∞ -categories. In other words, $\text{FACT}_{(-)}(\mathcal{C})$ is a sheaf of ∞ -categories.

In the unstratified situation, i.e., for locally constant factorization algebras, this was already shown in [Mat17].

We also record an easy consequence of our gluing results. For our very basic examples above, note that both algebras and (bi)modules admit a symmetric monoidal structure, given by endowing the tensor product of the underlying vector spaces (or object in the underlying category) with the desired structure. The analogous statement for constructible factorization algebras holds. This result was also long believed to be true and has been stated several times in the literature, albeit without proof.

Theorem B (Corollary 6.8 and Proposition 6.10). *For every smooth conical manifold X , the functor*

$$\text{FACT}_X^{\text{cstr}, \otimes}(\mathcal{C}) : \text{FIN}_* \rightarrow \text{CAT}_\infty, \quad I_+ \mapsto \text{FACT}_{X|I}^{\text{cstr}}(\mathcal{C})$$

exhibits a monoid object in $(\text{CAT}_\infty, \times)$, i.e., a symmetric monoidal structure on the ∞ -category $\text{FACT}_X^{\text{cstr}}(\mathcal{C})$ of constructible factorization algebras on X .

In fact, Theorem A can be upgraded to the symmetric monoidal version: $\text{FACT}_{(-)}(\mathcal{C})$ is a sheaf of symmetric monoidal ∞ -categories.

Remark 1.1. These two results are essential ingredients for building higher Morita categories using constructible factorization algebras as was exploited in work by the second author [Sch14, JFS17]. As these results had been widely claimed in the literature, the authors relied on them, and a purpose of this article is to fill this gap.

The last application of our toolbox is to unravel the data required for a constructible factorization algebra on a smooth conical manifold. The simplest version is for cones, and answers a question of David Ayala. The same result was also obtained by Brav–Rozenblyum [BR23] using very different techniques, see also Remark 6.14.

Theorem C (Theorem 6.12). *Let Z be a compact smooth conical manifold. We have a pullback square of ∞ -categories*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{FACT}_{\mathbf{C}Z}^{\text{cstr}}(\mathcal{C}) & \longrightarrow & \text{FACT}_{Z \times (0, \infty)}^{\text{cstr}}(\mathcal{C}) & \mathcal{A} \\ \downarrow p_* & \lrcorner & \downarrow p_* & \downarrow \\ \text{FACT}_{[0, \infty)}^{\text{cstr}}(\mathcal{C}) & \longrightarrow & \text{FACT}_{(0, \infty)}^{\text{cstr}}(\mathcal{C}) & \int_Z \mathcal{A} \end{array}$$

where the vertical functors are pushforward along the quotient map $p: \mathbf{C}Z \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ and the horizontal functors are restriction to open subspaces.

The lower right hand side is equivalent to algebra objects in \mathcal{C} , and the left bottom side encodes a module for such an algebra; see Example 5.27. Moreover, there should be a version of Dunn’s additivity for constructible factorization algebras, and combining this with the above-mentioned result gives that the top right corner encodes an algebra object in constructible factorization algebras on Z .

We elaborate on how to globalize this statement for a general smooth conical manifold in Construction 6.15 and Remark 6.17.

1.1. Opening the toolbox. To prove the main theorems, we develop a toolbox of techniques for (constructible) factorization algebras. A key step in the toolbox is to formulate the statements at a level general enough to be useful in other settings as well.

Let us briefly outline the strategy of the proof of gluing of constructible factorization algebras in the special case of an open cover of a topological space of X with two elements $\mathcal{U} = \{U, V\}$ and use this to explain our toolbox.

Step 1: The first step, which is done in Section 4.2, is to compute the pushout of ∞ -operads along the natural inclusions

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Open}(U \cap V)^\otimes & \longrightarrow & \text{Open}(U)^\otimes \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{Open}(V)^\otimes & \dashrightarrow & \mathcal{U}_\downarrow^\otimes. \end{array}$$

We explain why this can be computed as the (strict) colimit of dendroidal sets. Here, $\mathcal{U}_\downarrow^\otimes$ is simply the ∞ -operad corresponding to the collection of opens which are either in U or in V , and $\mathcal{U}_\downarrow^\otimes$ -algebras and hence also $\mathcal{U}_\downarrow^\otimes$ -factorization algebras can be evaluated on precisely those opens. From this pushout we immediately see that (constructible) $\mathcal{U}_\downarrow^\otimes$ -factorization algebras are glued from (constructible) $\text{Open}(U)^\otimes$ - and $\text{Open}(V)^\otimes$ -factorization algebras, see Proposition 4.9 and Corollary 4.10. In fact, we explain how to compute the colimit of certain ∞ -operads of open sets in more generality, which is also used in proving Theorem C.

From these partially defined, constructible factorization algebras on X we extend to factorization algebras defined on all opens in X by left Kan extending along two inclusions. In each step, there are two substeps: the first (a) uses our toolbox, namely performing certain Kan extensions. The second (b) uses “constructibility tools”, which are generalizations of statements already (mostly) existing in the literature.

Step 2a: First, in Section 4.4 we enlarge $\mathfrak{B} = \mathcal{U}_\downarrow^\otimes$ by adding disjoint unions of opens which are already contained in \mathfrak{B} to obtain \mathfrak{B}_\cup . In our example of only two open sets U and V in the cover, this means adding open sets of the form $W_1 \cup W_2$, where $W_1 \subset U$ and $W_2 \subset V$. We show that there is an equivalence of categories between multiplicative prefactorization algebras for \mathfrak{B} and for \mathfrak{B}_\cup , given by left Kan extending along the inclusion, see Proposition 4.15.

Step 2b: To guarantee Weiss descent we restrict to constructible factorization algebras, since in this case the Weiss condition is automatically satisfied as long as we consider algebras Kan extended from a suitable poset of disks. This is proven in Proposition 6.3 and relies on a generalization of a proof by Ayala-Francis, see Corollary 5.22.

Step 3a: This is the final step, which is done in Section 4.3, to reach factorization algebras defined on all opens. In fact, \mathfrak{B}_\cup is a so-called factorizing basis, so it is enough to show that a factorization algebra can be recovered from its values on a factorizing basis. This was already shown in [CG17] for \mathcal{C} being chain complexes by an explicit construction. For general \mathcal{C} , we again perform an operadic left Kan extension, this time along the inclusion of the factorizing basis into all opens, see Proposition 4.12. This last step already gives an equivalence at the level of prefactorization algebras satisfying only Weiss descent (Proposition 4.11).

Step 3b: The above equivalence restricts to constructible factorization algebras (Proposition 6.2) since constructibility is local, which we prove in Theorem 5.2 generalizing a proof of Ginot.

Summarizing, we have the following chain of equivalences.

$$\text{FACT}_X^{\text{cstr}} \xrightarrow[\sim]{6.2} \text{FACT}_{\mathcal{U}_\cup}^{\text{cstr}} \xrightarrow[\sim]{6.3} \text{FACT}_{\mathcal{U}_\downarrow}^{\text{cstr}} \xrightarrow[\sim]{4.9} \lim_{\{U_1, \dots, U_n\} \subset \mathcal{U}} \text{FACT}_{U_1 \cap \dots \cap U_n}^{\text{cstr}}.$$

1.2. Constructibility tools. In Section 5 we collect, complete, and generalize some folklore results (partially) existing in the literature needed in parts (b) of the steps above. These are interesting in their own right and may be considered a constructibility toolbox.

First we generalize a result of Ginot which proves that local constancy is in fact a local condition.

Theorem D (Theorem 5.2). *Let M be a conical manifold and \mathcal{A} a factorization algebra on M . Then \mathcal{A} is constructible if and only if it is locally constructible.*

The proof is an adaptation of Ginot’s proof to the constructible setting and allows checking constructibility locally, for instance using a cover.

The second constructibility tool deals with localizing at isotopy equivalences. This relates the localization of the discrete category of (certain) disks with the topological/ ∞ -category \mathcal{D} isks of disks and is a main result of [AFT17a]. Although versions of the missing argument had appeared before in various places (see Remark 5.11), here we provide the details; in the unstratified setting the original outline was also completed independently by Arakawa [Ara24] at the same time this paper was being written. Moreover, we need a more general version of this result, which allows localizing a smaller poset $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \text{Disks}(X)$ of disks:

Theorem E (Theorem 5.10). *Let X be a smooth conical manifold and $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \text{Disks}(X)$ be a decomposable³ and multiplicative⁴ basis of X . Then the tautological functor*

$$\mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}\text{isks}/_X$$

is an ∞ -categorical localization.

We apply this result in our main Theorem C, and given its flexibility we expect this to be applicable to other situations as well.

For a long time it has been folklore that constructibility automatically implies the Weiss condition. We prove that this is true on disks.

Theorem F (Corollary 5.22, Corollary 5.23, and Corollary 5.24). *Let X be a smooth conical manifold with enough good disks and $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \text{Disks}(X)$ a decomposable disk-basis which is factorizing⁵.*

- (1) *Every multiplicative prefactorization algebra on \mathfrak{B} is automatically a Weiss cosheaf, hence a factorization algebra.*
- (2) *Restriction yields equivalences*

$$\text{FACT}_X^{\text{cstr}}(\mathcal{C}) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \text{ALG}_{\text{Disks}(X)}^{\text{m,cstr}}(\mathcal{C}) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \text{FACT}_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\text{cstr}}(\mathcal{C}) = \text{ALG}_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\text{m,cstr}}(\mathcal{C})$$

of ∞ -categories.

We also prove an operadic extension of the aforementioned localization result and use it to compare the two main different ways that “constructible factorization algebras” are usually defined in the literature.

Theorem G (Proposition 5.19 and Corollary 5.26). *Let X be a smooth conical manifold.*

- (1) *For every decomposable multiplicative disk-basis \mathfrak{B} of X , the tautological map*

$$\mathfrak{B}^{\otimes} \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}\text{isks}/_X)^{\otimes}$$

is a localization of ∞ -operads.

- (2) *If X has enough good disks, we construct an equivalence*

$$\text{FACT}_X^{\text{cstr}}(\mathcal{C}) \simeq \text{ALG}_{\mathcal{D}\text{isks}/_X}^{\text{m}}(\mathcal{C})$$

between constructible factorization algebras on X and multiplicative algebras for the ∞ -operad of embeddings of disks in X .

³decomposable = closed under disjoint decompositions; see Definition 2.49

⁴multiplicative = closed under disjoint unions; see Definition 2.45

⁵factorizing = closed under disjoint unions and intersections; see Definition 2.45

Note that in part (2) of Theorem F, we prove the first equivalence by first proving that the composite is an equivalence. For this, it is crucial that the collection \mathfrak{B} of disks is closed under intersections. In particular, the collection $\mathfrak{B} := \text{Disks}(X)$ of *all* disks does not satisfy this, but for example taking *convex* disks of an unstratified smooth manifold with respect to a chosen metric does. In the unstratified setting, an analogous result was also obtained in Carmona’s thesis [Sán23], who also needs the assumption on good disks.

We contrast this with [AF20] where in the unstratified setting the analogous statement is made for $\mathfrak{B} = \text{Disks}(X)$; see also Remark 5.25.

A corollary of these results is that given a fixed (framed) n -manifold and an E_n -algebra \mathcal{A} , assigning to any open U the factorization homology $\int_U \mathcal{A}$ is a factorization algebra. As stated, this was already proven in [GTZ12] under the assumption of the gluing Theorem 6.1 and has long been folklore to be a corollary of the localization result. Here we record this as a corollary of the previous result in the stratified setting.

Theorem H (Theorem 6.20). *Let \mathcal{X} be a type of tangential structure. For M a \mathcal{X} -structured manifold and \mathcal{A} a $\text{Disks}(\mathcal{X})$ -algebra, the prefactorization algebra*

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}: \text{Open}(M)^{\otimes} \rightarrow \text{Mfld}(\mathcal{X})^{\otimes} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}\text{fld}(\mathcal{X})^{\otimes} \xrightarrow{\int_{-}^{\mathcal{A}}} \mathcal{C}^{\otimes}$$

given by precomposing the factorization homology functor is a factorization algebra.

1.3. Conventions and notation.

- We freely use the language of ∞ -categories ((co)limits, Kan extensions, localizations, (co)cartesian fibrations etc.) as developed in [Lur09]; another good reference is [Cis19]. None of our arguments make use of any of the specific features of the Joyal–Lurie implementation in quasicategories, so that we allow ourselves to use a model-agnostic language.
- We view posets and (ordinary) categories as ∞ -categories whose mapping spaces are (-1) -truncated and 0 -truncated, respectively. Thus we do not need to explicitly apply the nerve construction to treat a poset or category as an ∞ -category.
- We adopt the usual conventions regarding set-theoretic size issues: we fix Grothendieck universes of “small” and “large” sets. Sets and spaces are always small by default; ∞ -categories are large but have small mapping spaces.
- We also make free use of the theory of ∞ -operads and algebras thereover, which we view as implemented within the theory of ∞ -categories as in [Lur17]. We make heavy use of operadic colimits and left operadic Kan extensions; for the convenience of the reader we summarize its key features in Appendix B specializing and summarizing Lurie’s more general theory.
- We write GPD_{∞} , CAT_{∞} , SMONCAT_{∞} , and OPD_{∞} for the ∞ -categories of (small) spaces/ ∞ -groupoids, ∞ -categories, symmetric-monoidal ∞ -categories, and ∞ -operads, respectively.
- The corresponding full subcategories of (small) sets, categories, symmetric monoidal categories, and operads are denoted by SET , CAT , SMONCAT , and OPD , respectively. Note that this makes CAT and OPD into $(2, 1)$ -categories whose 2-cells are the natural isomorphisms.
- In contrast, we denote by CAT' and OPD' the $(1, 1)$ -categories of categories and operads, respectively. This means that we allow no non-trivial natural isomorphisms and that invertible arrows are *isomorphisms* of categories/operads—a notion that is usually too strict to be useful.
- We use the symbols X, Y, Z for topological spaces, which we always assume to be Hausdorff. Often they will be (topological or smooth) manifolds or stratified manifolds; we recall the relevant definitions in Section 3.2.
- When talking about ∞ -operads, we write \mathcal{O}^{\otimes} for the operad itself and \mathcal{O} for its underlying ∞ -category of 1-ary operations. Conversely, some ∞ -categories \mathcal{U}

- can be naturally enhanced to an ∞ -operad (for example if they carry a partial symmetric monoidal structure) which we then denote by \mathcal{U}^\otimes .
- All our algebras take values in (\mathcal{C}, \otimes) , which is a \otimes -presentable symmetric monoidal ∞ -category that we fix throughout the paper. We write $\text{ALG}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathcal{C})$ for the ∞ -category of \mathcal{O}^\otimes -algebras and often omit “ \mathcal{C} ”, since it is always fixed.
 - We write $\text{Open}(X)$ for the poset of opens of X , while $\text{Disks}(X)$ is the full subposet of embedded multidisks (=finite disjoint unions of embedded disks); see Notation 3.32. They yield corresponding operads $\text{Open}(X)^\otimes$ and $\text{Disks}(X)^\otimes$ by disjoint union.
 - We write ALG_X and FACT_X for the ∞ -categories of prefactorization algebras and factorization algebras on X , respectively; see Section 3.1 for the definitions. Our prefactorization algebras are lax by default, while our factorization algebras are non-lax (=multiplicative).
 - We use the superscripts “lc” and “cstr” to denote ∞ -categories of locally constant or constructible (pre-)factorization algebras, respectively; see Section 3.3 for the definitions.
 - We write Mfld and $\mathcal{M}\text{fld}$ for the ordinary category and the ∞ -category of conically smooth stratified spaces of [AFT17b], respectively, which we call (smooth) conical manifolds; $\mathcal{D}\text{isks}$ refers to the full sub- ∞ -category of multidisks. We recall the definitions in Section 3.2.
 - We also use the versions $\text{Mfld}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\mathcal{M}\text{fld}(\mathcal{X})$ where all smooth conical manifolds are equipped with a tangential structure of type \mathcal{X} .
 - A copresheaf is simply a functor to \mathcal{C} , usually defined on some poset of opens of X , see Definition 2.4
 - We use a simplified version of the general theory of descent and cosheaves, which is self-contained and well-adapted for our setting. We provide a detailed account in the first background section, Section 2.
 - In particular, we use certain terms such as “sieve”, “cover”, “refinement”, “hypercover” in a slightly non-standard way. We explain how these relate to the more standard notions in Section 2.5.
 - We write $U \cup V$ for the union of two subsets of X , and $U \sqcup V$ if this union is disjoint. We distinguish this from $U \amalg V$ which refers to the abstract external coproduct, unrelated to the inclusions into X .
 - If \mathcal{U} is a poset of open subsets of X , we denote by \mathcal{U}_\cap , \mathcal{U}_\downarrow and \mathcal{U}_\cup its closure under finite intersections, open subsets and finite disjoint unions, respectively.
 - We write $\mathbf{C}Z$ for the cone of Z and $\mathbf{C}_t X$ for the cone of X of radius t , see Construction 3.19.

1.4. Acknowledgements. We thank David Ayala for posing the question that led to Theorem 6.12. Pelle Steffens pointed out the magic of the Seifert–Van Kampen Theorem and suggested applying it for Theorem 5.10. CS thanks her coauthors for joining in finally filling these gaps in the literature.

All authors were supported by the SFB 1085: Higher Invariants from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG). CS was supported by the Simons Collaboration on Global Categorical Symmetries (1013836).

2. BACKGROUND ON WEISS COSHEAVES

In this section we will set up the foundations and background needed to be precise in later arguments. In particular, we will first explain how we think of posets of opens in different ways. Then we will discuss the notion of locality, before defining Weiss covers and cosheaves with respect to Weiss covers. We also comment on the terminology used here before lastly defining the notion of a factorizing basis.

We fix

- a topological space X which we always assume to be Hausdorff;
- a \otimes -presentable symmetric monoidal ∞ -category (\mathcal{C}, \otimes) .

2.1. Sieves, (hyper)covers and refinements. In this paper, we will be juggling many different sets of open subsets of X . Sometimes, we will think of such a set as a poset (inheriting the inclusion-ordering of $\text{Open}(X)$) while other times we just treat them as subsets.

To minimize potential confusion, we summarize our conventions here, before defining all the terms; see also Remark 2.55 below for more explanation justifying this terminology.

- “(Pre)covers” refer to subsets of $\text{Open}(X)$; they are denoted by mathcal-letters such as $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W}$.
- “Hyper(pre)covers” and “(pre)sieves” refer to (full) subposets of $\text{Open}(X)$; they are denoted by mathfrak-letters such as $\mathfrak{B}, \mathfrak{U}, \mathfrak{W}$.

Definition 2.1.

- A *precover* of X is a set $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \text{Open}(X)$ of open subsets of X .
- Given two such precovers \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{U} of X we say that \mathcal{V} *refines* \mathcal{U} if for every $V \in \mathcal{V}$ there is an $U \in \mathcal{U}$ with $V \subseteq U$. We say that we have a *refinement* $\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$.
- Clearly refinements compose. We write PCov_X for the category of precovers and refinements.
- We call a refinement of the form $\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \{U\}$ (with singleton codomain) a precover. We say that \mathcal{V} is a precover of the open set U and just write $\mathcal{V} \rightarrow U$.
- Such a precover is called a *cover* if $\bigcup \mathcal{V} = U$.

When we just say that \mathcal{U} is a precover, we implicitly mean that it is precover of X unless stated otherwise.

We distinguish different kinds of subposets of $\text{Open}(X)$.

Definition 2.2. When we say that \mathfrak{U} is a *poset of opens* (of X), we mean that $\mathfrak{U} \subseteq \text{Open}(X)$ is a full subposet. It is called

- a *presieve*, if it is closed under intersections, i.e. if $U, U' \in \mathfrak{U}$ implies $U \cap U' \in \mathfrak{U}$;
- a *sieve* if it is downward closed, i.e. if $U \in \mathfrak{U}$ and $U' \subseteq U$ imply $U' \in \mathfrak{U}$.

Precovers and posets of opens are related by the following constructions:

Construction 2.3.

- Every poset of opens \mathfrak{U} has an underlying precover \mathfrak{U}^\diamond by just forgetting the poset structure.
- For every precover \mathcal{U} we have the associated presieve

$$\mathcal{U}_\cap := \{U_1 \cap \cdots \cap U_n \mid n \geq 1, U_i \in \mathcal{U}\}$$

obtained by adding all finite intersections and the associated sieve

$$\mathcal{U}_\downarrow := \{U' \in \text{Open}(X) \mid \exists U \in \mathcal{U} : U' \subseteq U\}$$

obtained by closing it downward.

Throughout this paper, we will be working with \mathcal{C} -valued copresheaves on X , i.e. functors $\mathcal{A}: \text{Open}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$. Moreover, it will be convenient to consider copresheaves defined not on all opens of X but only on a smaller selection.

Definition 2.4. Let $\mathfrak{U} \subseteq \text{Open}(X)$ be a poset of opens. A (\mathcal{C} -valued) *copresheaf on \mathfrak{U}* is a functor $\mathcal{A}: \mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$.

Notation 2.5. We say that \mathcal{A} is a *copresheaf defined on \mathfrak{U}* if $\mathcal{A}: \mathfrak{U}' \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is a copresheaf with $\mathfrak{U}' \supseteq \mathfrak{U}$ some poset of opens which we wish to leave unspecified. Whenever we use this turn of phrase, we are making the implicit claim that any statement we then make about \mathcal{A} does not depend on the choice of \mathfrak{U}' .

Construction 2.6. Let \mathfrak{U} be a poset of opens and $\mathcal{A}: \mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be a copresheaf. Then we can evaluate \mathcal{A} not just on elements of \mathfrak{U} , but also on any precover $\mathcal{V} \in \text{PCov}_X$ (and refinements between them) by left Kan extending along the inclusion

$$\mathfrak{U} \subseteq \text{Open}(X) \hookrightarrow \text{PCov}_X, \quad U \mapsto \{U\}.$$

Explicitly, the value of \mathcal{A} at \mathcal{V} is given by the colimit

$$\mathcal{A}_{|\mathfrak{U}}(\mathcal{V}) := \text{colim } \mathcal{A}_{|\mathfrak{U} \cap \mathcal{V}_\downarrow}. \quad (2.1)$$

We will also need the following more general notion.

Definition 2.7. A *hyperprecover of X* is a full subposet $\mathfrak{U} \subseteq \text{Open}(X)$. Given two hyperprecovers \mathfrak{U} and \mathfrak{W} , we say that \mathfrak{U} *hyperrefines \mathfrak{W}* , written $\mathfrak{U} \dashrightarrow \mathfrak{W}$ if for each $U \in \mathfrak{U}$ the poset $\mathfrak{W}_{U/\downarrow} := \{W \in \mathfrak{W} \mid U \subseteq W\}$ is weakly contractible.

Remark 2.8. If \mathfrak{U} hyperrefines \mathfrak{W} then for each $U \in \mathfrak{U}$ the poset $\mathfrak{W}_{U/\downarrow}$ is in particular non-empty, so that \mathfrak{U}^\diamond refines \mathfrak{W}^\diamond .

Remark 2.9. Although the phrases “poset of opens” and “hyperprecover” are synonyms, we use them differently: A poset of opens is used as the *domain of definition* of a co(pre)sheaf $\mathcal{A}: \mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$, while a hyperprecover is something a co(pre)sheaf can be *evaluated on* (see Definition 2.14 and Definition 2.15 below). Of course every poset of opens can be interpreted as a hyperprecover: the value of $\mathcal{A}: \mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ on \mathfrak{U} corresponds to the global sections of \mathcal{A} .

Notation 2.10. When we have a hyperrefinement $\mathfrak{W} \dashrightarrow \{U\}$ of a singleton, we say that \mathfrak{W} is a *hyperprecover of U* and just write $\mathfrak{W} \dashrightarrow U$. Note that this happens precisely if we have a precover $\mathfrak{W}^\diamond \rightarrow U$.

A hyperprecover $\mathfrak{W} \dashrightarrow U$ is called a *hypercover* if, for each finite list $W_1, \dots, W_n \in \mathfrak{W}$, the precover

$$\{W \in \mathfrak{W}^\diamond \mid W \subseteq W_1 \cap \dots \cap W_n\} \rightarrow W_1 \cap \dots \cap W_n$$

is a cover. Here the intersection is taken in U so that the case $n = 0$ says precisely that $\mathfrak{W}^\diamond \rightarrow U$ is a cover.

Remark 2.11. Every inclusion $\mathfrak{U} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{W}$ of hyperprecovers is also a hyperrefinement because for each $U \in \mathfrak{U}$ the poset $\mathfrak{W}_{U/\downarrow}$ has an initial object, namely U itself. In particular, the hyperrefinement-relation is reflexive.

Warning 2.12. In general hyperrefinements do *not* compose; i.e. given $\mathfrak{U} \dashrightarrow \mathfrak{V} \dashrightarrow \mathfrak{W}$ it does not follow that $\mathfrak{U} \dashrightarrow \mathfrak{W}$. Consider for example $\mathfrak{U} = \{U\}$, $\mathfrak{V} = \{V\}$ and $\mathfrak{W} = \{W, W'\}$ such that we have

$$\begin{array}{ccc} U & \hookrightarrow & V \hookrightarrow W \\ & & \searrow \\ & & W' \end{array}$$

and no other inclusions between them. By construction we have $\mathfrak{W}_{U/\downarrow} = \{W, W'\}$ with no non-trivial morphisms, i.e. it is not weakly contractible and hence \mathfrak{U} does not hyperrefine \mathfrak{W} .

Remark 2.13. Although hyperrefinements do not compose in general, there are special cases where they do. The cases relevant in this article are:

- (1) Inclusions of hyperprecovers compose: Given $\mathfrak{U} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{V} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{W}$ it is clear that $\mathfrak{U} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{W}$.
- (2) Hyperrefinements into a singleton compose: Given $\mathfrak{U} \dashrightarrow \mathfrak{V} \dashrightarrow \{W\}$, it follows that $\mathfrak{U} \dashrightarrow \{W\}$. By Remark 2.8 the given hyperrefinements gives refinements $\mathfrak{U}^\circ \rightarrow \mathfrak{V}^\circ$ and $\mathfrak{V}^\circ \rightarrow \{W\}$. Since refinements do compose it follows that $\mathfrak{U}^\circ \rightarrow \{W\}$ is a refinement, which is equivalent to $\mathfrak{U} \dashrightarrow \{W\}$ exactly because the target is a singleton.

We want to evaluate any copresheaf $\mathcal{A}: \mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ on hyperprecovers \mathfrak{W} , as well as hyperrefinements between them, in a similar way to Construction 2.6. However, since hyperprecovers and hyperrefinements do not form a category we, a bit unsatisfyingly, need to pointwise define what the evaluation is.

Definition 2.14. Let $\mathcal{A}: \mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be a copresheaf. For every hyperprecover $\mathfrak{W} \subseteq \mathfrak{U}$ we define the evaluation of \mathcal{A} on \mathfrak{W} to be

$$\mathcal{A}^h(\mathfrak{W}) := \mathcal{A}^h|_{\mathfrak{U}}(\mathfrak{W}) := \operatorname{colim}_{W \in \mathfrak{W}} \mathcal{A}(W).$$

Note that this definition does not depend on the ambient poset of opens \mathfrak{U} , so that we can omit it from the notation.

We can now also define how to evaluate a copresheaf on certain hyperrefinements:

Definition 2.15. Let $\mathfrak{V}, \mathfrak{W}$ be hyperprecovers with a hyperrefinement $\mathfrak{V} \dashrightarrow \mathfrak{W}$. Let \mathcal{A} be a copresheaf defined on \mathfrak{V} and \mathfrak{W} . The evaluation of \mathcal{A} on this hyperrefinement is defined to be the composite

$$\operatorname{colim}_{V \in \mathfrak{V}} \mathcal{A}(V) \xleftarrow{\cong} \operatorname{colim}_{V \subseteq W} \mathcal{A}(V) = \operatorname{colim}_{W \in \mathfrak{W}} \operatorname{colim}_{V \subseteq W} \mathcal{A}(V) \rightarrow \operatorname{colim}_{W \in \mathfrak{W}} \mathcal{A}(W), \quad (2.2)$$

where V and W range over \mathfrak{V} and \mathfrak{W} , respectively.

Note that since \mathfrak{W} hyperrefines \mathfrak{V} , the cartesian fibration $\{W \subseteq V\} \rightarrow \mathfrak{W}$ has weakly contractible fibers, hence is colimit cofinal; this is why the first map of (2.2) is an equivalence.

Lemma 2.16. Let $\mathfrak{U}, \mathfrak{V}, \mathfrak{W}$ be hyperprecovers with hyperrefinements $\mathfrak{U} \dashrightarrow \mathfrak{V} \dashrightarrow \mathfrak{W}$ and let \mathcal{A} be a copresheaf defined on all of them. Assume that we also have the hyperrefinement $\mathfrak{U} \dashrightarrow \mathfrak{W}$. Then the induced diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{A}^h(\mathfrak{U}) \simeq \operatorname{colim}_{\mathfrak{U}} \mathcal{A} & \longrightarrow & \operatorname{colim}_{\mathfrak{V}} \mathcal{A} \simeq \mathcal{A}^h(\mathfrak{V}) \\ & \searrow & \downarrow \\ & & \operatorname{colim}_{\mathfrak{W}} \mathcal{A} \simeq \mathcal{A}^h(\mathfrak{W}) \end{array}$$

commutes in \mathcal{C} .

Proof. Using Equation (2.2) we get the outer square of the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \operatorname{colim}_{U \in \mathfrak{U}} \mathcal{A}(U) & \xleftarrow{\cong} & \operatorname{colim}_{U \subseteq V} \mathcal{A}(U) & \longrightarrow & \operatorname{colim}_{V \in \mathfrak{V}} \mathcal{A}(V) \\ \uparrow \cong & & \uparrow \circ & & \uparrow \cong \\ \operatorname{colim}_{U \subseteq W} \mathcal{A}(U) & & \operatorname{colim}_{U \subseteq V \subseteq W} \mathcal{A}(U) & \longrightarrow & \operatorname{colim}_{V \subseteq W} \mathcal{A}(V) \\ \downarrow & \swarrow \bullet & & & \downarrow \\ \operatorname{colim}_{U \subseteq W} \mathcal{A}(U) & \longrightarrow & & & \operatorname{colim}_{W \in \mathfrak{W}} \mathcal{A}(W) \end{array} \quad (2.3)$$

Firstly, note that the inner 3 squares commute. Secondly, the arrow marked with a circle (“ \circ ”) is an equivalence: we have a pullback (of posets)

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \{U \subseteq V \subseteq W\} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \{V \subseteq W\} \\ \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\ \{U \subseteq V\} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \{V \in \mathfrak{V}\}, \end{array}$$

where U, V, W ranges over $\mathfrak{U}, \mathfrak{V}, \mathfrak{W}$ respectively. Here, the right vertical map is a cartesian fibration, and its fibers are weakly contractible exactly because $\mathfrak{V} \dashrightarrow \mathfrak{W}$. It follows that the left vertical map is also a cartesian fibration with weakly contractible fibers, and hence colimit cofinal.

From commutativity of the left upper square in (2.3) it follows that the arrow marked with a filled circle (“ \bullet ”) is also an equivalence. Thus, the diagram witnesses the evaluation of \mathcal{A} on the hyperrefinement $\mathfrak{U} \dashrightarrow \mathfrak{W}$ as the composition of \mathcal{A} evaluated on $\mathfrak{U} \dashrightarrow \mathfrak{V}$ and $\mathfrak{V} \dashrightarrow \mathfrak{W}$, and we are done. \square

Lemma 2.17. *Let \mathcal{A} be a copresheaf defined on \mathfrak{U} . We have the following explicit formulas:*

- (1) *Evaluating on a hyperprecover of the form $\mathfrak{W} \dashrightarrow V$ yields the canonical map*

$$\operatorname{colim}_{W \in \mathfrak{W}} \mathcal{A}(W) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(V),$$

induced by the inclusions $W \hookrightarrow V$.

- (2) *For any precover \mathcal{W} with $\mathcal{W}_\cap \subseteq \mathfrak{U}$ the canonical map*

$$\mathcal{A}^h(\mathcal{W}_\cap) := \operatorname{colim}_{\mathcal{W}_\cap} \mathcal{A}|_{\mathcal{W}_\cap} \xrightarrow{\cong} \operatorname{colim}_{\mathfrak{U} \cap \mathcal{W}_\downarrow} \mathcal{A}|_{\mathfrak{U} \cap \mathcal{W}_\downarrow} =: \mathcal{A}|_{\mathfrak{U}}(\mathcal{W})$$

is an equivalence.

- (3) *For any precover \mathcal{W} with $\mathcal{W}_\cap \subseteq \mathfrak{U}$, we have $\mathcal{A}|_{\mathfrak{U}}(\mathcal{W}) \simeq \mathcal{A}|_{\mathcal{W}_\cap}(\mathcal{W})$.*

Proof.

- (1) Direct simplification of the formula (2.2) in the case where $\mathfrak{V} = \{V\}$ is a singleton.
- (2) We claim that the inclusion $\mathcal{W}_\cap \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{U} \cap \mathcal{W}_\downarrow$ is colimit cofinal. Indeed, for every $U \in \mathfrak{U} \cap \mathcal{W}_\downarrow$ the slice $(\mathcal{W}_\cap)_{U/\!/}$ is nonempty and closed under finite intersections, hence downward directed, hence weakly contractible.
- (3) Follows directly from part 2 since both sides are just equivalent to $\mathcal{A}^h(\mathcal{W}_\cap)$. \square

Notation 2.18. Lemma 2.17 tells us that the value on precovers \mathcal{W} is independent of the ambient poset of opens \mathfrak{U} , as long as $\mathcal{W}_\cap \subseteq \mathfrak{U}$. Thus we may abbreviate

$$\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{W}) := \mathcal{A}|_{\mathfrak{U}}(\mathcal{W})$$

without ambiguity as long as \mathcal{A} is defined at least on \mathcal{W}_\cap .

Warning 2.19. For a hyperprecover $\mathfrak{W} \subseteq \mathfrak{U}$ with underlying precover $\mathcal{W} := \mathfrak{W}^\circ$, much headache can arise by conflating

$$\mathcal{A}^h(\mathfrak{W}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{A}|_{\mathfrak{U}}(\mathcal{W}).$$

We emphasize that these two do *not* agree in general. In other words, when evaluating a copresheaf on a collection of opens, we have to carefully distinguish whether we view the collection as a poset (=hyperprecover) or just a set (=precover).

Luckily, Lemma 2.17 states that if \mathfrak{W} is a presieve, then the two ways of evaluating agree; hence at least in that case we do not have to worry about this distinction.

It is sometimes convenient to compute the value on a precover as a colimit of its Čech nerve, which in our context most naturally takes the form of a punctured cube.

Lemma 2.20. *Let \mathfrak{U} be a poset of opens and \mathcal{V} a precover with $\mathcal{V}_\cap \subseteq \mathfrak{U}$. Let $\mathcal{A}: \mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be a copresheaf. Let β be an ordinal and $V_\bullet: \beta \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ a surjection, so that we can write $\mathcal{V} = \{V_i\}_{i < \beta}$. Then the punctured cube*

$$\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^{\text{op}}(\beta) \setminus \{\emptyset\} \rightarrow \mathfrak{U} \cap \mathcal{V}_\downarrow, \quad I \mapsto V_I := \bigcap_{i \in I} V_i$$

(which is well defined because \mathfrak{U} contains \mathcal{V}_\cap) is colimit cofinal. In particular, it induces an equivalence

$$\text{colim}_{\beta \supseteq I \supseteq \emptyset} \mathcal{A}(V_I) \xrightarrow{\cong} \text{colim}_{U \in \mathfrak{U} \cap \mathcal{V}_\downarrow} \mathcal{A}(U) = \mathcal{A}_{|\mathfrak{U}}(\mathcal{V}).$$

Proof. Fix an open $U \in \mathfrak{U} \cap \mathcal{V}_\downarrow$ and consider the slice poset

$$K := \{I \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^{\text{op}}(\beta) \setminus \{\emptyset\} \mid U \subseteq V_I\}$$

under U . This poset is nonempty because by definition there exists a $V \in \mathcal{V}$ with $U \subseteq V$, so that $\{i\} \in K$ for every $i < \beta$ with $V_i = V$; such i exists because V_\bullet is surjective. The poset K is also downward directed since for every $I, I' \in K$, we also have $I \cup I' \in K$. Every directed poset is weakly contractible, so the result follows. \square

2.2. Locality and descent. In this subsection we first define what we mean by locality for refinements and hyperrefinements. Then we collect some general results regarding situations where locality follows, which will be useful later on.

Definition 2.21. Let \mathfrak{U} be a poset of opens and $\mathcal{A}: \mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ a copresheaf.

- Let $\mathcal{W}' \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$ be a refinement with $\mathcal{W}', \mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathfrak{U}$. We say that the refinement $\mathcal{W}' \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$ is \mathcal{A} -local, if the induced map $\mathcal{A}_{|\mathfrak{U}}(\mathcal{W}') \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{|\mathfrak{U}}(\mathcal{W})$ is an equivalence in \mathcal{C} .
- A hyperrefinement $\mathfrak{W}' \xrightarrow{-h} \mathfrak{W}$ of hyperprecovers $\mathfrak{W}', \mathfrak{W} \subseteq \mathfrak{U}$ is called \mathcal{A} -local, if the induced map $\mathcal{A}^h(\mathfrak{W}') \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^h(\mathfrak{W})$ is an equivalence.

Remark 2.22. Commonly one says that \mathcal{A} satisfies descent with respect to a (pre-)cover $\mathfrak{U} \rightarrow U$ (or a hyper(pre-)cover $\mathfrak{U} \xrightarrow{-h} U$) if that (pre-)cover (or hyper(pre-)cover) is \mathcal{A} -local.

Remark 2.23. By definition, a refinement $\mathcal{W}' \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$ is \mathcal{A} -local if and only if the inclusion $\mathfrak{U} \cap \mathcal{W}'_\downarrow \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{U} \cap \mathcal{W}_\downarrow$ of hyperprecovers is an \mathcal{A} -local hyperrefinement. Note that this depends on the ambient poset of opens \mathfrak{U} unless \mathcal{W}' and \mathcal{W} are presieves.

The easiest way to produce local hyperrefinements is to exhibit an inverse:

Lemma 2.24. *Let $\mathfrak{V}, \mathfrak{W}$ be two hyperprecovers with hyperrefinements $\mathfrak{V} \xrightarrow{-h} \mathfrak{W}$ and $\mathfrak{W} \xrightarrow{-h} \mathfrak{V}$. Then both those hyperrefinements are \mathcal{A} -local for every copresheaf defined on \mathfrak{V} and \mathfrak{W} .*

Proof. Noting that the identity hyperrefinements $\mathfrak{W} \xrightarrow{-h} \mathfrak{W}$ and $\mathfrak{V} \xrightarrow{-h} \mathfrak{V}$ yield the identity map on colimits, we can apply Lemma 2.16 to the hyperrefinements

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{V} & \xrightarrow{-h} & \mathfrak{W} \\ & \searrow = & \downarrow h \\ & & \mathfrak{V} & \xrightarrow{-h} & \mathfrak{W} \end{array}$$

to see that the induced map $\mathcal{A}^h(\mathfrak{W}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^h(\mathfrak{V})$ has both a left and a right inverse, hence is an equivalence. And analogously for $\mathfrak{V} \xrightarrow{-h} \mathfrak{W}$. \square

Example 2.25. Some useful examples of invertible hyperrefinements are:

- For every $V \in \mathfrak{U}$, the inclusion $\{V\} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{U} \cap V_\downarrow$ has an inverse $\mathfrak{U} \cap V_\downarrow \xrightarrow{-h} V$.
- For every presieve \mathfrak{V} , the inclusion $\mathfrak{V} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{V}_\downarrow$ has an inverse $\mathfrak{V}_\downarrow \xrightarrow{-h} \mathfrak{V}$ since for every $U \in \mathfrak{V}_\downarrow$, the poset $\{V \in \mathfrak{V} \mid U \subseteq V\}$ is non-empty by definition and downward directed by \cap .

Notation 2.26. For two precovers \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} , we write

$$\mathcal{U} \wedge \mathcal{V} := \{U \cap V \mid U \in \mathcal{U}, V \in \mathcal{V}\}$$

for (the specific choice of) a coarsest common refinement. In terms of the associated sieves we have

$$(\mathcal{U} \wedge \mathcal{V})_{\downarrow} = \mathcal{U}_{\downarrow} \cap \mathcal{V}_{\downarrow}.$$

We use the same notation $\mathfrak{U} \wedge \mathfrak{W}$ also for posets of opens.

A useful lemma for detecting local refinements is the following:

Lemma 2.27. *Let \mathcal{U} be a precover and $V \subseteq X$ an open subset. Let \mathcal{A} be a copresheaf defined both on \mathcal{U}_{\cap} and on $\mathcal{U}_{\cap} \wedge \{V\}$. Assume that for each $U \in \mathcal{U}_{\cap}$ the inclusion $U \cap V \rightarrow U$ is \mathcal{A} -local. Then the refinement*

$$\mathcal{U} \wedge \{V\} := \{U \cap V \mid U \in \mathcal{U}\} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$$

is also \mathcal{A} -local.

Proof. Choose a surjection $U_{\bullet}: \beta \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{U}$, which then yields the surjection $U_{\bullet} \cap V: \beta \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{U} \wedge \{V\}$. With the notation $U_I := \bigcap_{i \in I} U_i$ for all finite $I \subset \beta$, we have a commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \operatorname{colim}_{\beta \supseteq I \supseteq \emptyset} \mathcal{A}(U_I \cap V) & \longrightarrow & \operatorname{colim}_{\beta \supseteq I \supseteq \emptyset} \mathcal{A}(U_I) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{U} \wedge \{V\}) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{U}) \end{array},$$

using $\bigcap_{i \in I} (U_i \cap V) = U_I \cap V$ in the top left corner. The vertical maps are equivalences by Lemma 2.20 and the top horizontal map is an equivalence by assumption (because each U_I lies in \mathcal{U}_{\cap}). Hence the lower horizontal map is also an equivalence, as desired. \square

Definition 2.28. A hyperrefinement $\mathfrak{W} \dashrightarrow \mathfrak{U}$ is called *strongly \mathcal{A} -local* if for every $U \in \mathfrak{U}$ the induced hyperprecover $\mathfrak{W} \cap U_{\downarrow} \dashrightarrow U$ is \mathcal{A} -local. This definition makes sense whenever \mathcal{A} is a copresheaf defined on \mathfrak{W} and \mathfrak{U} .

Lemma 2.29. *Let \mathcal{A} be a copresheaf defined on all opens that appear.*

- (1) *An inclusion $\mathfrak{W} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{U}$ of posets of opens is a strongly \mathcal{A} -local hyperrefinement if and only if the copresheaf $\mathcal{A}|_{\mathfrak{U}}$ is a left Kan extension of its restriction $\mathcal{A}|_{\mathfrak{W}}$.*
- (2) *Every strongly \mathcal{A} -local hyperrefinement is \mathcal{A} -local.*

Proof.

- (1) By the pointwise formula, $\mathcal{A}|_{\mathfrak{U}}$ is a left Kan extension of $\mathcal{A}|_{\mathfrak{W}}$ if and only if each comparison map $\operatorname{colim} \mathcal{A}|_{\mathfrak{W} \cap U_{\downarrow}} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(U)$ is an equivalence if and only if each hyperprecover $\mathfrak{W} \cap U_{\downarrow} \dashrightarrow U$ is \mathcal{A} -local; that is the definition of strong \mathcal{A} -locality.
- (2) Let $\mathfrak{W} \dashrightarrow \mathfrak{W}$ be a strongly \mathcal{A} -local refinement. Then by definition, for each $V \in \mathfrak{W}$ the hyperprecover $\mathfrak{W} \cap V_{\downarrow}$ is \mathcal{A} -local, which says precisely that the right map in the formula (2.2) is a colimit of equivalences, hence an equivalence. Therefore the map $\mathcal{A}(\mathfrak{W}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(\mathfrak{W})$ is an equivalence, as desired. \square

Lemma 2.30. *If $\mathfrak{W} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{U}$ is a strongly \mathcal{A} -local inclusion of posets of opens and \mathcal{W} is a precover, then the inclusion $\mathfrak{W} \cap \mathcal{W}_{\downarrow} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{U} \cap \mathcal{W}_{\downarrow}$ is also strongly \mathcal{A} -local.*

Proof. Assume that $\mathfrak{W} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{U}$ is strongly \mathcal{A} -local. For every $U \in \mathfrak{U} \cap \mathcal{W}_{\downarrow}$ we have $U_{\downarrow} \subseteq \mathcal{W}_{\downarrow}$, hence the hyperprecover

$$(\mathfrak{W} \cap \mathcal{W}_{\downarrow}) \cap U_{\downarrow} = \mathfrak{W} \cap U_{\downarrow} \dashrightarrow U$$

is \mathcal{A} -local by assumption. \square

2.3. Weiss cosheaves and hypercosheaves. In the standard Grothendieck topology on $\text{Open}(X)$ a cover corresponds to an ordinary open cover. However, for factorization algebras we do not want a cosheaf condition for ordinary open covers but rather so-called *Weiss covers*. In [CG17], factorization algebras are defined to be Weiss cosheaves without an extra multiplicativity condition we will impose, so one could alternatively call them *non-multiplicative factorization algebras*.

Definition 2.31. A cover $\mathcal{W} \rightarrow U$ is called a *Weiss cover* if for each finite subset $S \subset U$ there exists a $W \in \mathcal{W}$ with $S \subseteq W$.

Example 2.32. A cover $\mathcal{W} \rightarrow U$ is called degenerate if $U \in \mathcal{W}$. Every degenerate cover is trivially Weiss.

If a Weiss cover is not degenerate, then it is necessarily infinite. In this sense, Weiss covers are typically very big. There are two tautological ways of constructing Weiss covers for every space X , which in some sense embody two different extremes:

Example 2.33. Choose an infinite set \mathcal{K} of pairwise disjoint closed subsets of X . Then $\{X \setminus K \mid K \in \mathcal{K}\}$ is a Weiss cover of X . For example, $\mathcal{K} := \{\{x\} \mid x \in X\}$ could simply be the set of all singletons of X .

Example 2.34. Let \mathfrak{B} be a basis for the topology of X . Fix a subset $U \subseteq X$. For each finite set $S \subset U$ we may choose pairwise disjoint opens $B_s^s \in \mathfrak{B}$ (for $s \in S$) with $s \in B_s^s \subset U$ (since X is Hausdorff and \mathfrak{B} is a basis); then we set $B_S := \bigcup_{s \in S} B_s^s$. By construction, the set $\mathcal{W} := \{B_S \mid S \subset U \text{ finite}\}$ is a Weiss cover of U .

Remark 2.35. If $\mathcal{W} \rightarrow U$ is a Weiss cover, then $\mathcal{W} \wedge \{V\} \rightarrow V$ is again a Weiss cover for every open subset $V \subseteq U$.

Given a poset of opens \mathfrak{U} we say that a precover $\mathcal{W} \rightarrow U$ or hyperprecover $\mathfrak{W} \dashrightarrow U$ are *in* \mathfrak{U} if all the involved open sets are contained in \mathfrak{U} , i.e., if $\mathcal{W} \cup \{U\} \subseteq \mathfrak{U}^\circ$ or $\mathfrak{W} \cup \{U\} \subseteq \mathfrak{U}$, respectively.

Definition 2.36. Let \mathfrak{U} be a poset of opens and \mathcal{A} a copresheaf defined on \mathfrak{U} . We say that \mathcal{A} is a *Weiss cosheaf on* \mathfrak{U} if every Weiss cover $\mathcal{W} \rightarrow U$ in \mathfrak{U} is \mathcal{A} -local, i.e. if we have an equivalence

$$\mathcal{A}_{|\mathfrak{U}}(\mathcal{W}) := \text{colim}_{\mathfrak{U} \cap \mathcal{W}_\downarrow} \mathcal{A} \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{A}(U). \quad (2.4)$$

We denote the full ∞ -category of Weiss cosheaves on \mathfrak{U} by

$$\text{coShv}^{\text{W}}(\mathfrak{U}, \mathcal{C}) \subset \text{Fun}(\mathfrak{U}, \mathcal{C}).$$

It will be convenient to also work with hyper-analogues of Weiss covers and cosheaves.

Definition 2.37.

- A hyperprecover $\mathfrak{W} \dashrightarrow U$ is called a *Weiss hypercover* if the precover $\mathfrak{W}^\circ \rightarrow U$ is a Weiss cover and for each $W \in \mathfrak{W}_\cap$ we have a Weiss hypercover $\mathfrak{W} \cap W_\downarrow \dashrightarrow W$.⁶
- A hyperrefinement $\mathfrak{V} \dashrightarrow \mathfrak{U}$ is called *strongly Weiss* if for each $U \in \mathfrak{U}$ we have a Weiss hypercover $\mathfrak{V} \cap U_\downarrow \dashrightarrow U$.

Remark 2.38. For each $W \in \mathfrak{W}_\cap$ and $W' \in (\mathfrak{W} \cap W_\downarrow)_\cap = \mathfrak{W}_\cap \cap W_\downarrow$ we have $(\mathfrak{W} \cap W_\downarrow) \cap W'_\downarrow = \mathfrak{W} \cap W'_\downarrow$. Hence in the second condition for a Weiss hypercover $\mathfrak{W} \dashrightarrow U$ it suffices to require that for each $W \in \mathfrak{W}_\cap$ we have a Weiss cover $(\mathfrak{W} \cap W_\downarrow)^\circ \rightarrow W$ (as opposed to a hypercover).

⁶This definition is not circular, but rather coinductive. By definition, this means that the class of Weiss hypercovers is the *largest* class of hyperprecovers which satisfies the given property.

Remark 2.39. Let $\mathfrak{W} \dashrightarrow U$ be a hyperprecover. If it is a Weiss hypercover, then by definition the underlying precover $\mathfrak{W}^\circ \rightarrow U$ is a Weiss cover.

The converse does *not* hold in general; but it *does* hold when \mathfrak{W} is a presieve because then for each $W \in \mathfrak{W}_\cap$ we have a degenerate cover $\mathfrak{W} \cap W_\downarrow \rightarrow W$.

Before we define Weiss hypercosheaves we give a short lemma showing how Weiss covers and Weiss hypercovers interact.

Lemma 2.40. *Let $\mathcal{W} \rightarrow U$ be a Weiss cover.*

- (1) *We have a Weiss hypercover $\mathcal{W}_\cap \dashrightarrow U$.*
- (2) *The inclusion $\mathcal{W}_\downarrow \hookrightarrow U_\downarrow$ is strongly Weiss.*

Proof.

- (1) Follows from Remark 2.39.
- (2) For every $V \subseteq U$ we have a restricted Weiss cover

$$\mathcal{W}_\downarrow \cap V_\downarrow = \mathcal{W}_\downarrow \wedge \{V\} \rightarrow V, \quad (2.5)$$

which by Remark 2.39 yields the desired Weiss hypercover $\mathcal{W}_\downarrow \cap V_\downarrow \dashrightarrow V$ since it is a presieve (even a sieve). \square

Remark 2.41. Note that we could not replace \mathcal{W}_\downarrow by \mathcal{W}_\cap in the second statement since the equation in (2.5) would not hold in that case.

Definition 2.42. Let \mathfrak{U} be a poset of opens and \mathcal{A} a copresheaf defined on \mathfrak{U} . We say that \mathcal{A} is a *Weiss hypercosheaf on \mathfrak{U}* if every Weiss hypercover $\mathfrak{W} \dashrightarrow U$ in \mathfrak{U} is \mathcal{A} -local, i.e. if

$$\mathcal{A}^h|_{\mathfrak{U}}(\mathfrak{W}) := \operatorname{colim}_{W \in \mathfrak{W}} \mathcal{A}(W) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{A}(U).$$

We denote the full ∞ -category of Weiss hypercosheaves on \mathfrak{U} by

$$\operatorname{coHShv}^W(\mathfrak{U}, \mathcal{C}) \subset \operatorname{Fun}(\mathfrak{U}, \mathcal{C}).$$

Remark 2.43. Let \mathfrak{U} be a presieve. Then by Lemma 2.17 a Weiss cover $\mathcal{W} \rightarrow U$ in \mathfrak{U} evaluates the same as the Weiss hypercover $\mathcal{W}_\cap \dashrightarrow U$. So while a Weiss hypercosheaf is characterized by *all* Weiss hypercovers $\mathfrak{W} \dashrightarrow U$ being \mathcal{A} -local, to be a Weiss cosheaf only requires it for Weiss *presieves*, i.e., Weiss hypercovers which are closed under intersection. In particular, we have a (fully faithful) inclusion

$$\operatorname{coHShv}^W(\mathfrak{U}, \mathcal{C}) \subseteq \operatorname{coShv}^W(\mathfrak{U}, \mathcal{C}).$$

Warning 2.44. If \mathfrak{U} is not a presieve then it might happen that not every Weiss hypercosheaf on \mathfrak{U} is a Weiss cosheaf. For example, let $X := \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathfrak{U} := \{X\} \cup \{X \setminus \{x\} \mid x \in X\}$. Then there are no nondegenerate hypercovers in \mathfrak{U} , so that the hypercosheaf condition is vacuous. However, the tautological Weiss cover $\mathfrak{U} \setminus \{X\} \rightarrow X$ imposes the non-trivial constraint $\mathcal{A}(X) \simeq \prod_{x \in X} \mathcal{A}(X \setminus \{x\})$ on Weiss cosheaves \mathcal{A} .

2.4. Multiplicative and factorizing bases. In this subsection we will introduce a few notions of bases that prove convenient for example when extending factorization algebras to bigger posets of opens (or all of $\operatorname{Open}(X)$). The notion of a factorizing basis is due to Costello–Gwilliam, see [CG17, §7 Definition 2.1.1]. We need the following variants:

Definition 2.45. Let \mathfrak{U} be a poset of opens. A *multiplicative basis* of \mathfrak{U} is a subposet $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \mathfrak{U}$ which is

- a basis for the topology of $\bigcup \mathfrak{U}$, i.e., for each $x \in V \in \mathfrak{U}_\downarrow$ there is a $B \in \mathfrak{B}$ with $x \in B \subseteq V$;
- closed under disjoint unions subordinate to \mathfrak{U} , i.e., for each $B, B' \in \mathfrak{B}$ with $B \cup B' \in \mathfrak{U}_\downarrow$ we have $B \cup B' \in \mathfrak{B}$.

A multiplicative basis \mathfrak{B} of \mathfrak{U} is called a *factorizing basis* if it is additionally

- closed under intersections, i.e., $B \cap B' \in \mathfrak{B}$ for all $B, B' \in \mathfrak{B}$.

Notation 2.46. When we refer to a multiplicative/factorizing basis of an open $U \subseteq X$, we mean a multiplicative/factorizing basis of $\mathfrak{U} := U_{\downarrow}$.

Construction 2.47. For any poset of opens \mathfrak{U} , we denote by

$$\mathfrak{U}_{\sqcup} := \{U_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup U_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}; U_1, \dots, U_n \in \mathfrak{U} \text{ pairwise disjoint}\}$$

the completion under finite disjoint unions. Note that \mathfrak{U}_{\sqcup} always contains the empty set \emptyset which is the disjoint union of the empty list.

Example 2.48. Let X be a smooth manifold and denote by $\mathfrak{B} := \text{Disks}(X) \subset \text{Open}(X)$ the poset of opens consisting of all disjoint unions of embedded disks; see also Notation 3.32 below. Then \mathfrak{B} is a multiplicative basis of X but *not* a factorizing basis because the intersection of two embedded disks need not be a disjoint union of embedded disks again; for example the intersection of the embedded disks $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \mathbb{R}_{< 0}$ in \mathbb{R}^3 is $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \mathbb{R} = \mathbb{R} \times (\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\})$ which has non-trivial fundamental group hence isn't a disjoint union of disks.

It is sometimes convenient to work with posets of opens which are closed under disjoint decompositions.

Definition 2.49. We say that a poset of opens \mathfrak{U} is *decomposable* if for any open $U \sqcup U' \in \mathfrak{U}$ it follows that $U \in \mathfrak{U}$ and $U' \in \mathfrak{U}$.

Remark 2.50. If \mathfrak{U} is a decomposable posets of opens and $\mathfrak{B} \subset \mathfrak{U}$ is a multiplicative/factorizing basis, then we can always add all disjoint union components of elements of \mathfrak{B} to obtain a multiplicative/factorizing basis which is decomposable.

Thus we will sometimes assume without loss of generality that our multiplicative/factorizing bases are decomposable.

The main selling point of multiplicative bases is that they provide a large supply of Weiss (hyper)covers.

Lemma 2.51. *Let \mathfrak{U} be a poset of opens and let $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \mathfrak{U}$ be a multiplicative basis for \mathfrak{U} . Then for each $U \in \mathfrak{U}_{\downarrow}$ we have a Weiss hypercover $\mathfrak{B} \cap U_{\downarrow} \xrightarrow{-h} U$.*

Proof. It suffices to check that for each $V \in \mathfrak{U}_{\downarrow}$ we have a Weiss cover $(\mathfrak{B} \cap V_{\downarrow})^{\diamond} \rightarrow V$; we can then apply this to $V := U$ and each $V \in (\mathfrak{B} \cap U_{\downarrow})_{\cap}$.

For this, let $S \subset V$ be a finite set. Choose pairwise disjoint open subsets $B_s \in \mathfrak{B} \cap V_{\downarrow}$ with $s \in B_s$ (indexed by $s \in S$), which is possible because \mathfrak{B} is a basis of \mathfrak{U} and X is Hausdorff. Then the disjoint union $B := \bigsqcup_{s \in S} B_s$ is contained in V , hence lies in $\mathfrak{B} \cap V_{\downarrow}$ by multiplicativity. By construction, it contains S , which concludes the proof. \square

More generally, we can input a Weiss cover to get more Weiss (hyper)covers.

Lemma 2.52. *Let \mathfrak{B} be a multiplicative basis for \mathfrak{U} . Let $\mathcal{W} \rightarrow U$ be a Weiss cover in $\mathfrak{U}_{\downarrow}$.*

- (1) *We have a Weiss hypercover $\mathfrak{B} \cap \mathcal{W}_{\downarrow} \xrightarrow{-h} U$.*
- (2) *The inclusion $\mathfrak{B} \cap \mathcal{W}_{\downarrow} \hookrightarrow U_{\downarrow}$ is strongly Weiss.*

Proof.

- (1) Let $S \subset U$ be a finite set. Since $\mathcal{W} \rightarrow U$ is a Weiss cover, we find a $W \in \mathcal{W} \subset U_{\downarrow}$ with $S \subset W$. Since $(\mathfrak{B} \cap W_{\downarrow})^{\diamond} \rightarrow W$ is a Weiss cover of W by Lemma 2.51, we find a $B \in \mathfrak{B} \cap W_{\downarrow} \subseteq \mathfrak{B} \cap \mathcal{W}_{\downarrow}$ with $S \subset B$. This shows that we have a Weiss cover $(\mathfrak{B} \cap \mathcal{W}_{\downarrow})^{\diamond} \rightarrow U$. Moreover, for each $W \in (\mathfrak{B} \cap \mathcal{W}_{\downarrow})_{\cap} = \mathfrak{B} \cap \mathcal{W}_{\downarrow}$ we have the Weiss cover

$$((\mathfrak{B} \cap \mathcal{W}_{\downarrow}) \cap W_{\downarrow})^{\diamond} = (\mathfrak{B} \cap W_{\downarrow})^{\diamond} \rightarrow W$$

(again by Lemma 2.51), hence we have the desired Weiss hypercover.

- (2) Let $V \in U_\downarrow$. We can restrict the Weiss cover $\mathcal{W} \rightarrow U$ to a Weiss cover $\mathcal{W} \wedge \{V\} \rightarrow V$. Hence we have the desired Weiss hypercover

$$(\mathfrak{B} \cap \mathcal{W}_\downarrow) \cap V_\downarrow = \mathfrak{B} \cap (\mathcal{W} \wedge \{V\})_\downarrow \xrightarrow{-h} V$$

by part 1. \square

Finally, we come to the main result of this subsection which essentially outlines how factorizing bases interact nicely with the Weiss condition when left Kan extending. This will be important in Section 4.3 where we prove that factorization algebras defined on a factorizing basis extends.

Proposition 2.53 (Unique extension from a basis). *Let $\mathcal{A}: \mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be a copresheaf on the poset of opens \mathfrak{U} . Let $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \mathfrak{U}$ be a factorizing basis of \mathfrak{U} .*

- (1) *Every Weiss cosheaf on \mathfrak{U} is a Weiss cosheaf on \mathfrak{B} and a left Kan extension along $\mathfrak{B} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{U}$.*
- (2) *Assume that \mathfrak{U} is a presieve. Left Kan extension along $\mathfrak{B} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{U}$ from a Weiss cosheaf on \mathfrak{B} yields a Weiss cosheaf on \mathfrak{U} .*

Proof.

- (1) Since \mathfrak{B} is a presieve, the evaluation of \mathcal{A} on a Weiss cover $\mathcal{W} \rightarrow U$ computed in \mathfrak{B} agrees with the evaluation in \mathfrak{U} (see Notation 2.18); hence restriction of a Weiss cosheaf is a Weiss cosheaf again.

For every $U \in \mathfrak{U}$, the pointwise left Kan extension condition amounts to the hyperrefinement $\mathfrak{B} \cap U_\downarrow \xrightarrow{-h} U$ being \mathcal{A} -local. This is a Weiss hypercover by Lemma 2.51 and also a presieve because \mathfrak{B} is a presieve. Therefore it is local for every Weiss cosheaf (see Remark 2.43).

- (2) Assume that $\mathcal{A}|_{\mathfrak{U}}$ is a left Kan extension of a Weiss cosheaf $\mathcal{A}|_{\mathfrak{B}}$. Since \mathfrak{U} is a presieve, we only have to show that every Weiss presieve $\mathfrak{W} \xrightarrow{-h} U$ is \mathcal{A} -local (see Remark 2.43). We have the following square of hyperrefinements

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{B} \cap \mathfrak{W}_\downarrow & \hookrightarrow & \mathfrak{B} \cap U_\downarrow \\ \downarrow \scriptstyle h & & \downarrow \scriptstyle h \\ \mathfrak{W} & \xrightarrow{h} & U \end{array}$$

where the left vertical map is the composite $\mathfrak{B} \cap \mathfrak{W}_\downarrow \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{W}_\downarrow \xrightarrow{-h} \mathfrak{W}$ which exists since \mathfrak{W} is a presieve. Note that by Remark 2.13 the composite is again a hyperrefinement making the diagram commute, and Lemma 2.16 ensures that applying \mathcal{A} yields a commuting diagram in \mathcal{C} .

- The right vertical map is \mathcal{A} -local because \mathcal{A} is a pointwise left Kan extension along $\mathfrak{B} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{U}$
- We claim that the upper horizontal inclusion is strongly \mathcal{A} -local. By Lemma 2.52, we have the pointwise Weiss hypercovers $\mathfrak{B} \cap (\mathfrak{W} \wedge \{V\})_\downarrow \xrightarrow{-h} V$ in \mathfrak{B} for all $V \in U_\downarrow$, hence a fortiori for all $V \in \mathfrak{B} \cap U_\downarrow$. Since they are sieves relative to \mathfrak{B} , they take the same value as their underlying Weiss cover (computed in \mathfrak{B}). Hence they are \mathcal{A} -local because $\mathcal{A}|_{\mathfrak{B}}$ is a Weiss cosheaf.
- The left vertical hyperrefinement is strongly \mathcal{A} -local, because each $\mathfrak{B} \cap W_\downarrow \xrightarrow{-h} W$ is again an instance of the pointwise left Kan extension. \square

Remark 2.54. In both conclusions of part (1) of Proposition 2.53 we make crucial use of the fact that \mathfrak{B} is intersection-closed. For example, the value on a Weiss cover $\mathcal{W} \rightarrow U$ might be different when computed in \mathfrak{B} or in \mathfrak{U} so that the restriction of a Weiss cosheaf might not be a Weiss cosheaf again. However, the statement (1) of Proposition 2.53 still holds with exactly the same proof for an arbitrary (not necessarily intersection-closed)

multiplicative basis $\mathfrak{B} \subset \mathfrak{U}$ if we replace “Weiss cosheaf” by “Weiss hypercosheaf” both in the hypothesis and in the conclusion.

One might also expect a version of part (2) for Weiss hypercosheaves. We do not know of such a statement and note that our proof can not be adapted to yield one: indeed if $\mathfrak{W} \dashrightarrow U$ is an arbitrary Weiss hypercover which is not a presieve, there does not usually exist the hyperrefinement $\mathfrak{B} \cap \mathfrak{W}_\downarrow \dashrightarrow \mathfrak{W}$ on which our proof crucially relies.

2.5. Remarks about terminology. A few remarks are in order about the terminology we chose to adopt, and how it relates to and differs from other sources.

Remark 2.55. In topos theory one can express sheaf or hypersheaf conditions on a site H via three different types of objects: sets/families of morphisms, simplicial diagrams, and sieves.

- The covering families are certain sets $\{u_i \rightarrow x\}$ of morphisms.
- A hypercover is defined to be a simplicial diagram in a site, such that all matching maps are covers; a Čech diagram is a special type of hypercover in which all but the 0th matching map are equivalences.
- A sieve on x is a subfunctor of the hom-functor $H(-, x)$, which just translates to a collection of maps $u \rightarrow x$ closed under precomposition.

In this paper we implicitly work with topologies on $\text{Open}(X)$ (mainly the Weiss topology), but express the various notions in a slightly more ad-hoc way using sets and posets of opens; completely avoiding simplicial diagrams. With this adjustment, (what we call) presieves are the analog of Čech nerves and (what we call) hypercovers are the analog of the usual hypercovers. We refer to Section 4.4 of [DI04], where this relation is explained in more detail; note that what we call hypercovers corresponds to their complete covers.

Remark 2.56. In the literature on (co)sheaves and factorization algebras, the reader might encounter formulas that look similar, but a bit different from ours. To preempt this confusion, we quickly sketch how some of these possible different formulas relate to each other. Let \mathfrak{U} be a category and $\mathcal{A}: \mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ a copresheaf on \mathfrak{U} . Of course for us $\mathfrak{U} \subseteq \text{Open}(X)$ is always a poset of opens of X , but the discussion below works in greater generality.

- (1) Let $\mathcal{V} = \{V_i \rightarrow U\}_{i < \beta}$ be a precover of some $U \in \mathfrak{U}$. From the perspective of topos theory, the “official” way of evaluating \mathcal{A} on $\mathcal{V} \rightarrow U$ is as a colimit over the associated sieve, which is defined as the full subcategory $\text{sieve}(\mathcal{V}) \subseteq \mathfrak{U}/U$ spanned by those maps that factor through some $V_i \rightarrow U$. Of course, in our setting \mathfrak{U} is just a poset, so that this full subcategory is precisely $\text{sieve}(\mathcal{V}) = \mathfrak{U} \cap \mathcal{V}_\downarrow$, thus justifying our original formula (2.1).
- (2) In the presence of sufficient fiber products, one can replace⁷ the colimit over the sieve with the colimit over the (unordered) Čech nerve of the cover, defined as the simplicial object

$$\check{C}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{A}): \Delta^{\text{op}} \ni [n] \mapsto \coprod_{i_0, \dots, i_n \in \beta} \mathcal{A}(V_{i_0} \times_U \cdots \times_U V_{i_n}). \quad (2.6)$$

In our setting, these fiber products are just intersections and so this Čech nerve is well defined as soon as $\mathcal{V}_\cap \subseteq \mathfrak{U}$.

⁷One way to see this is to observe that in the presheaf-topos $\text{Fun}(\mathfrak{U}^{\text{op}}, \text{GPD}_\infty)$ the (-1) -truncated approximation of the map $\prod_{i < \beta} \mathfrak{U}(-, V_i) \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}(-, U)$ can either be computed explicitly pointwise to yield the subobject $\text{sieve}(\mathcal{V}) \subseteq \mathfrak{U}(-, U)$ of those $f: O \rightarrow U$ which factor through some $V_i \rightarrow U$, or as the colimit of its Čech nerve $\check{C}(\mathcal{V})$ (see [Lur09, Prop. 6.2.3.4]). Applying the colimit preserving extension $\mathcal{A}: \text{Fun}(\mathfrak{U}^{\text{op}}, \text{GPD}_\infty) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ to the two ways of presenting this approximation, one obtains the desired comparison $\text{colim } \check{C}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{A}) \simeq \text{colim } \mathcal{A}|_{\text{sieve}(\mathcal{V})}$.

- (3) One can normalize the unordered Čech nerve by removing all the degenerate cofactors, yielding the semi-simplicial object

$$\Delta_{\text{inj}}^{\text{op}} \ni [n] \mapsto \coprod_{\substack{i_0, \dots, i_n \in \beta \\ \forall_j: i_{j-1} \neq i_j}} \mathcal{A}(V_{i_0} \times_U \cdots \times_U V_{i_n}),$$

where we only allow those indexing sequences with no adjacent duplicate indices. To recover the original Čech nerve one simply left Kan extends along the inclusion $\Delta_{\text{inj}}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \Delta^{\text{op}}$, so they have the same colimit.

- (4) Sometimes it is convenient to work with the punctured cubical diagram

$$\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^{\text{op}}(\beta) \setminus \{\emptyset\} \ni \{i_0, \dots, i_n\} \mapsto \mathcal{A}(V_{i_0} \times_U \cdots \times_U V_{i_n}) \quad (2.7)$$

rather than the simplicial diagram. In our setting, this is justified by Lemma 2.20 which makes use of the fact that the sieve $\text{sieve}(\mathcal{V}) = \mathfrak{A} \cap \mathfrak{V}_\downarrow$ is a poset. More generally, a similar proof shows that the map

$$\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^{\text{op}}(\beta) \setminus \{\emptyset\} \rightarrow \text{sieve}(\mathcal{V})$$

is colimit cofinal as long as every map $V_i \rightarrow U$ of the precover is a monomorphism (i.e. (-1) -truncated).

- (5) Another way of encoding the same colimit is via the *strictly ordered* Čech nerve, defined as the semisimplicial object

$$\check{C}^<(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{A}): \Delta_{\text{inj}}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}, \quad [n] \mapsto \coprod_{i_0 < \cdots < i_n < \beta} \mathcal{A}(V_{i_0} \times_U \cdots \times_U V_{i_n}).$$

or the *weakly ordered* Čech nerve, defined as the simplicial object

$$\check{C}^{\leq}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{A}): \Delta^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}, \quad [n] \mapsto \coprod_{i_0 \leq \cdots \leq i_n < \beta} \mathcal{A}(V_{i_0} \times_U \cdots \times_U V_{i_n}).$$

These arise from the punctured cubical diagram (2.7) by left Kan extension along the tautological map

$$\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^{\text{op}}(\beta) \setminus \{\emptyset\} \rightarrow \Delta_{\text{inj}}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \Delta^{\text{op}}$$

that sends $\emptyset \neq I \subset \beta$ to the nonempty set I with the linear order induced from β .

Since this left Kan extension does not change the colimit, the respective colimits over the ordered Čech nerves again compute the value of \mathcal{A} on the precover \mathcal{V} . Note that since the comparison between ordered and unordered Čech nerves passes through the punctured cubical diagram, it only holds if all maps $V_i \rightarrow U$ of the cover are monomorphisms.

- (6) In the case where the target category \mathcal{C} is stable (such as the derived category of an abelian category), one can further invoke the Dold–Kan correspondence to replace the colimit of the aforementioned (semi-)simplicial objects by totalizations of the associated chain complexes obtained by taking alternating sums of the face maps.

Warning 2.57. It might seem more natural to normalize the unordered Čech nerve as the semi-simplicial object

$$\Delta_{\text{inj}}^{\text{op}} \ni [n] \mapsto \coprod_{\substack{i_0, \dots, i_n \in \beta \\ \text{pairwise distinct}}} \mathcal{A}(V_{i_0} \times_U \cdots \times_U V_{i_n}),$$

i.e., by throwing out index sequences with *any* duplicated indices, not just adjacent ones. However, this would yield the *wrong* colimit: for example, if $\mathcal{V} = \{V_1, V_2\}$ is the degenerate

2-element cover of U with $V_1 = U = V_2$, this formula would yield the colimit over the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{A}(V_1 \cap V_2) & & \mathcal{A}(V_2 \cap V_1) \\ \downarrow & \swarrow & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{A}(V_1) & & \mathcal{A}(V_2) \end{array}$$

which is $\mathbf{S}^1 \otimes \mathcal{A}(U)$ instead of the correct value $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{V}) = \mathcal{A}(U)$.

Remark 2.58. In this paper we chose to work with Weiss cosheaves (rather than with *hyperc*osheaves) as is more standard in the literature surrounding factorization algebras. We want to warn the reader that this convention is not universal, so that there is a high potential for confusion, exacerbated by the relative subtle (and often not explicitly addressed) distinction between covers and hypercovers when both just amount to a collection of opens; see also Warning 2.19.

For example, we want to compare our setting with that of Eric Berry, whose PhD thesis [Ber21] on the additivity of locally constant factorization algebras uses many techniques similar to ours (and in fact we learned some of them from there!). Berry’s factorization algebras \mathcal{A} are “ J_∞ -cosheaves” (see [Ber21, Definition 2.0.10]) which amounts to the condition

$$\operatorname{colim}_{U \in \mathfrak{U}} \mathcal{A}(U) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{A}(O).$$

for every “ J_∞ -cover” \mathfrak{U} of an open O (see [Ber21, Definition 2.0.7]). Since Berry’s J_∞ -covers are precisely our Weiss hypercovers $\mathfrak{U} \dashrightarrow O$, his “ J_∞ -cosheaf” condition translates to what we call the “Weiss hypercosheaf” condition.

3. BACKGROUND ON (CONSTRUCTIBLE) FACTORIZATION ALGEBRAS

In this section we define the ∞ -category $\text{FACT}_{\mathfrak{B}}$ of factorization algebras on a poset of opens \mathfrak{B} . In addition we define what it means for a factorization algebra to be “constructible” or “locally constant with respect to a stratification”.

3.1. Basics on factorization algebras. We give a brief introduction to factorization algebras in this section. Most of the definitions below can be found in [CG17] in the special case of chain complex valued, non-multiplicative factorization algebras. See also [Gin15] for a nice introduction.

Both [CG17] and [Gin15] work in a 1-categorical context using techniques from homological algebras to ensure the correct homotopical notions. Instead, we work directly in the intrinsic ∞ -categorical setting of ∞ -operads. This is similar to Lurie’s theory of factorizable cosheaves [Lur17] and is also the approach of [AF20] and [Mat17]. There are other related approaches, such as the model categorical approach taken in [Sán23]. A G -equivariant version is developed in [Mur20].

Let \mathfrak{B} be a poset of opens, i.e. a full subposet $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \text{Open}(X)$. We turn this into a colored operad (in SET) as follows: the colors are all the opens of \mathfrak{B} . Let $(b_i)_{i \in n}$, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be an n -tuple of colors. The set of multimorphisms out of this tuple into some color c is the singleton set if the b_i ’s are pairwise disjoint and each b_i is a subset of c ; otherwise it is the empty set.

There is a standard way to turn a colored operad into an ∞ -operad ([Lur17, Construction 2.1.1.7]), and we spell out this construction for \mathfrak{B} below. Recall that FIN_* is the category of finite pointed sets and point-preserving maps.

Construction 3.1. The ∞ -operad \mathfrak{B}^{\otimes} (corresponding to the poset of opens \mathfrak{B}) has as objects pairs $(I_+, (b_i))$, where $I_+ \in \text{FIN}_*$ and (b_i) is an I -indexed collection of opens $b_i \in \mathfrak{B}$. A morphism $f : (I_+, (b_i)_{i \in I}) \rightarrow (J_+, (b'_j)_{j \in J})$ is a morphism $f : I_+ \rightarrow J_+$ in FIN_* such that for each $j \in J$, the tuple $(b_i \mid i \in f^{-1}(j))$ is a collection of pairwise disjoint open subsets of b'_j .




FIGURE 1. An example of a morphism $f : (5_+, (U_i)) \rightarrow (2_+, (V_j))$ in $\text{Open}(\mathbb{R}^2)^{\otimes}$. The map $f : 5_+ \rightarrow 2_+$ is the map in FIN_* defined by $1, 2 \mapsto 1$; $3, 4 \mapsto 2$ and $5 \mapsto +$. This requires that the opens U_1 and U_2 are disjoint and contained in V_1 and that the opens U_3 and U_4 are disjoint and contained in V_2 . There are no other conditions, so for example U_2 and U_3 may overlap and the open U_5 need not be included in any V_j .

A special type of morphisms in \mathfrak{B}^{\otimes} that will be important are the cocartesian morphisms.

Observation 3.2. The cocartesian morphisms in \mathfrak{B}^\otimes are of the form

$$(I_+, (b_i)) \xrightarrow{f} \left(J_+, \left(\bigcup_{i \in f^{-1}(j)} b_i \right) \right).$$

Given $(I_+, (b_i))$, J_+ and the map $I_+ \rightarrow J_+$ in \mathbf{FIN}_* , we have a cocartesian morphism as above exactly when, for each $j \in J$, the opens $(b_i)_{i \in f^{-1}(j)}$ are all pairwise disjoint and their disjoint union $\bigcup_{i \in f^{-1}(j)} b_i$ lies in \mathfrak{B} .

We remind the reader that we work with a \otimes -presentable symmetric monoidal ∞ -category (\mathcal{C}, \otimes) . In particular, this means that \mathcal{C} has all small colimits and that the tensor product \otimes preserves them in each variable.

Remark 3.3. Here and in the rest of the paper, we view the symmetric monoidal ∞ -category (\mathcal{C}, \otimes) as encoded in a cocartesian fibration $\mathcal{C}^\otimes \rightarrow \mathbf{FIN}_*$ as in [Lur17, Chapter 2]. Its tensor products are defined uniquely (up to contractible choice) by cocartesian transfer, so that the cocartesian morphisms in \mathcal{C}^\otimes are (tautologically) the ones of the form

$$(I_+, (V_i)) \xrightarrow{f} \left(J_+, \left(\bigotimes_{i \in f^{-1}(j)} V_i \right) \right).$$

Let us now give the first definition on the way towards factorization algebras.

Definition 3.4. Let \mathfrak{B} be a poset of opens. A *prefactorization algebra on \mathfrak{B}* (with values in \mathcal{C}) is a morphism of ∞ -operads

$$\mathcal{A}: \mathfrak{B}^\otimes \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^\otimes.$$

We equivalently say that \mathcal{A} is a \mathfrak{B} -prefactorization algebra in this situation. The ∞ -category of \mathfrak{B} -prefactorization algebras is $\mathbf{ALG}_{\mathfrak{B}} := \mathbf{ALG}_{\mathfrak{B}}(\mathcal{C})$, where we usually leave the target category implicit unless necessary.

Example 3.5. Let $X = \mathbb{R}$ and \mathfrak{B} the poset of nonempty open intervals. Let \mathcal{A} be an associative unital algebra in $\mathcal{C} = \mathbf{VECT}_{\mathbb{K}}$ of \mathbb{K} -vector spaces. We can define a \mathfrak{B} -prefactorization algebra \mathcal{A} as follows. Any interval b is sent to \mathcal{A} , and, given an inclusion of intervals $\bigcup_{i=1}^n b_i \hookrightarrow c$, we assign:

- if $n = 1$, the identity $\mathcal{A} \xrightarrow{=} \mathcal{A}$;
- if $n \geq 2$, the composite

$$\mathcal{A}(b_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{A}(b_n) \xrightarrow[\rho]{\cong} \mathcal{A}(b_{\rho(1)}) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{A}(b_{\rho(n)}) = \mathcal{A} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{A} \xrightarrow{\mu^n} \mathcal{A};$$

where μ^n is the n -uple multiplication map and ρ is the unique permutation of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ such that the disjoint intervals $b_{\rho(1)} < \cdots < b_{\rho(n)}$ are in ascending order with respect to the ordering induced from \mathbb{R} .

- if $n = 0$, the unit viewed as a map $\mathbb{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$.

This assignment being a prefactorization algebra translates precisely to the algebra \mathcal{A} being associative and unital.

Example 3.6. Now let $X = \mathbf{S}^1$ and choose an orientation. Let \mathfrak{B} be the poset of nonempty open intervals in X . Again, let \mathcal{A} be an associative unital algebra in $\mathcal{C} = \mathbf{VECT}_{\mathbb{K}}$. We define a \mathfrak{B} -prefactorization algebra $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{S}^1}$ exactly as in the previous example, but now using the unique permutation ρ of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ such that when identifying c with \mathbb{R} using the orientation, the disjoint intervals $b_{\rho(1)} < \cdots < b_{\rho(n)}$ are in ascending order with respect to the ordering induced from \mathbb{R} .

Example 3.7. Let $X = \mathbb{R}$ and \mathfrak{B} the poset of nonempty open intervals. Let A_1, A_2 be associative unital algebras in $\text{VECT}_{\mathbb{K}}$, M an (A_1, A_2) -bimodule, and $m \in M$. We define a \mathfrak{B} -prefactorization algebra \mathcal{M} as follows:

$$\mathcal{M}(b) = \begin{cases} A_1, & \text{if } b \subset (-\infty, 0), \\ M, & \text{if } 0 \in b, \\ A_2, & \text{if } b \subset (0, \infty). \end{cases}$$

Let $\bigcup_{i=1}^n b_i \hookrightarrow c$ be an inclusion of intervals and let ρ be the unique permutation of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ such that the disjoint intervals $b_{\rho(1)} < \dots < b_{\rho(n)}$ are in ascending order with respect to the ordering induced from \mathbb{R} . Let $1 \leq k \leq n$ be the largest number such that $b_{\rho(k)} \not\subset (0, \infty)$.

Then to this inclusion we assign the composite

$$\begin{aligned} & \bigotimes_{i \in n} \mathcal{M}(b_i) \xrightarrow[\rho]{\cong} \mathcal{M}(b_{\rho(1)}) \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{M}(b_{\rho(n)}) \\ & \begin{cases} \xrightarrow{=} A_1^{\otimes k-1} \otimes M \otimes A_2^{\otimes n-k} \xrightarrow{\mu_1^{k-1} \otimes \text{id}_M \otimes \mu_2^{n-k}} A_1 \otimes M \otimes A_2 \xrightarrow{\beta} M, & \text{if } 0 \in b_{\rho(k)} \\ \xrightarrow{=} A_1^{\otimes k} \otimes A_2^{\otimes n-k} \xrightarrow{\mu_1^k \otimes \mu_2^{n-k}} A_1 \otimes A_2 \xrightarrow{\beta(-, m, -)} M, & \text{if } b_{\rho(k)} \subset (-\infty, 0) \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where $\mu_i^l: A_i^{\otimes l} \rightarrow A_i$ are the l -uple multiplication maps (which is the identity for $l = 1$ and the unit $\mathbb{K} \rightarrow A_i$ for $l = 0$), and where $\beta: A_1 \otimes M \otimes A_2 \rightarrow M$ is the bimodule action map. Note that if $n = 0$ then this is just the map $\mathbb{K} \xrightarrow{m} M$.

Example 3.8. We continue our previous examples, but now extending from \mathfrak{B} to \mathfrak{B}_{\cup} , i.e. the poset of finite disjoint unions of non-empty open intervals. We can extend the \mathfrak{B} -prefactorization algebras $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{S}^1}$, and $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{M}$ from the previous examples to \mathfrak{B}_{\cup} -prefactorization algebras by setting

$$\mathcal{F}(b_1 \cup \dots \cup b_n) := \mathcal{F}(b_1) \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{F}(b_n).$$

This includes the empty set (corresponding to the empty disjoint union), to which is assigned the empty tensor product, i.e., $\mathcal{F}(\emptyset) = \mathbb{K}$.

We impose two conditions on a prefactorization algebra to get a factorization algebra. First, a factorization algebra satisfies a local-to-global condition. This is expressed by the Weiss cosheaf condition recalled in Definition 2.36.

Definition 3.9. A *Weiss algebra* on \mathfrak{B} is a \mathfrak{B} -prefactorization algebra whose underlying copresheaf $\mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is a Weiss cosheaf. Define the full ∞ -subcategory of Weiss algebras on \mathfrak{B} to be the pullback

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{ALG}_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\text{Weiss}}(\mathcal{C}) & \hookrightarrow & \text{ALG}_{\mathfrak{B}}(\mathcal{C}) \\ \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\ \text{coShv}^{\text{W}}(\mathfrak{B}, \mathcal{C}) & \hookrightarrow & \text{Fun}(\mathfrak{B}, \mathcal{C}) \end{array}.$$

The second condition is that disjoint unions of opens should be sent to tensor products.

Definition 3.10. A \mathfrak{B} -prefactorization algebra \mathcal{A} is said to be *multiplicative* if it sends cocartesian morphisms in \mathfrak{B}^{\otimes} to cocartesian morphisms in \mathcal{C}^{\otimes} . Denote by

$$\text{ALG}_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\text{m}} \hookrightarrow \text{ALG}_{\mathfrak{B}}$$

the full ∞ -subcategory whose objects are the multiplicative \mathfrak{B} -prefactorization algebras.

Remark 3.11. The cocartesian morphisms in \mathfrak{B}^{\otimes} are generated under concatenation of tuples by the ones of the form $(b_1, \dots, b_n) \rightarrow b$, where $b = b_1 \cup \dots \cup b_n$. Thus a

prefactorization algebra on \mathfrak{B} is multiplicative if and only if for each such decomposition, the induced map

$$\mathcal{A}(b_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{A}(b_n) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(b_1 \cup \cdots \cup b_n)$$

in \mathcal{C} is an equivalence. Of course by induction it suffices to check this for $n = 0$ and $n = 2$.

Combining the two conditions we arrive at our main definition.

Definition 3.12. Let \mathfrak{B} be a poset of opens (of X). The ∞ -category of \mathfrak{B} -factorization algebras (with values in \mathcal{C}) is the intersection

$$\text{FACT}_{\mathfrak{B}}(\mathcal{C}) := \text{ALG}_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\text{m}}(\mathcal{C}) \cap \text{ALG}_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\text{Weiss}}(\mathcal{C})$$

of full subcategories of $\text{ALG}_{\mathfrak{B}}(\mathcal{C})$. Explicitly, a \mathfrak{B} -factorization algebra is a morphism of ∞ -operads $\mathcal{A}: \mathfrak{B}^{\otimes} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^{\otimes}$ that restricts to a Weiss cosheaf and sends cocartesian morphisms in \mathfrak{B}^{\otimes} to cocartesian morphisms in \mathcal{C}^{\otimes} .

Remark 3.13. In [CG17], “factorization algebras” are defined to be what we call “Weiss algebras”, without imposing multiplicativity. They write “multiplicative factorization algebra” for what we just call “factorization algebra”. Most other references use our convention.

Example 3.14. Consider the prefactorization algebra \mathcal{A} from Example 3.5. It is tautologically multiplicative, since the only cocartesian morphisms in \mathfrak{B}^{\otimes} lie over $1_+ \in \text{FIN}_*$. To see that it is a Weiss cosheaf, first observe that every Weiss cover $\mathcal{W} \rightarrow U$ in \mathfrak{B} must contain an ascending chain of intervals $(w_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ covering U . We explain this for $U = (a, \infty)$; the other cases are similar. For each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, let $S_i := \{a + \frac{1}{i}, i\}$. Since \mathcal{W} is a Weiss cover, there is a $w_i \in \mathcal{W}$ containing S_i ; thus we have $U = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} w_i$. After potentially passing to a subsequence, we may assume without loss of generality that the w_i are ascending, thus yielding a colimit cofinal map $w: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B} \cap \mathcal{W}_{\downarrow}$.

Finally, we conclude that we have an equivalence

$$\text{colim}_{\mathbb{N}} \mathcal{A} \simeq \text{colim}_{\mathfrak{B} \cap \mathcal{W}_{\downarrow}} \mathcal{A} = \text{colim}_{\mathfrak{B} \cap \mathcal{W}_{\downarrow}} \mathcal{A}|_{\mathfrak{B} \cap \mathcal{W}_{\downarrow}} \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{A}(U) = \mathcal{A},$$

because \mathbb{N} is weakly contractible and all maps in the colimit are equivalences.

Example 3.15. Consider the prefactorization algebra \mathcal{M} from Example 3.7. Again, there is nothing to show for multiplicativity. To see that it is a Weiss algebra, we use the same argument as in the previous example. Given a Weiss cover $\mathcal{W} \rightarrow U$ in \mathfrak{A} , we find $(w_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathfrak{B} \cap \mathcal{W}_{\downarrow}$ which is cofinal. So

$$\text{colim}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{M}(w_i) \simeq \text{colim}_{\mathfrak{B} \cap \mathcal{W}_{\downarrow}} \mathcal{M}|_{\mathfrak{B} \cap \mathcal{W}_{\downarrow}} \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{M}(U),$$

where we use that either $\mathcal{M}(w_i) = A_1 = \mathcal{M}(U)$ or $\mathcal{M}(w_i) = A_2 = \mathcal{M}(U)$ (for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ if $0 \notin U$, or $\mathcal{M}(w_i) = M = \mathcal{M}(U)$ (for all $i \gg 0$) if $0 \in U$).

Since there are several slightly different definitions of (multiplicative) factorization algebras in the literature we now remark on how some of them compare.

Remark 3.16. Consider factorization algebras on \mathfrak{B} , and let \mathcal{W} be a Weiss cover such that $\mathcal{W}_{\cap} \subseteq \mathfrak{B}$. We then have several equivalent ways of giving the Weiss cosheaf condition as thoroughly explained in Remark 2.56. In particular, the definition used in this article (see Equation (2.4)) exactly corresponds to taking the colimit over the Weiss covering sieves as in Remark 2.56 (1). This is also the condition appearing in [AF20, Definition 2.20] (for $\mathfrak{B} = \text{Open}(X)$).

To compare our definition to that of [Gin15, Section 4.1] we first note that his “factorizing bases” only become Weiss covers after adding all disjoint unions, and one needs to impose multiplicativity for the comparison. Modulo these differences his definition corresponds to taking a colimit over the unordered Čech nerve as in Equation (2.6).

Regarding [CG17, §6 Definition 1.4.1], it is clear from the context (see e.g. [CG17, App. A, Definition 4.3.1]), that Costello–Gwilliam mean the Čech complex associated to any of the equivalent Čech nerves described in Remark 2.56. However, we warn the reader that as written, their formulas can easily be misinterpreted to yield the wrong result, as explained in Warning 2.57.

Related but slightly different is [Ber21, Definition 2.0.12], who works with Weiss hypercosheaves rather than Weiss cosheaves; see also Remark 2.58. Since evaluation on a Weiss hypercover is just its colimit, no version of the Čech nerve needs to be considered in his context.

We also introduce the following notation to match the literature on factorization algebras.

Notation 3.17. Whenever we are in the situation where the poset of opens \mathfrak{B} consists of all opens, i.e., $\mathfrak{B} = X_{\downarrow} = \text{Open}(X)$, we simply omit referencing \mathfrak{B} and often also leave X implicit. Explicitly, FACT_X is called the ∞ -category of factorization algebras on X .

3.2. Conical manifolds. We recall the key notions of conical manifolds and smooth conical manifolds, introduced by Ayala–Francis–Tanaka [AFT17b] under the names “ C^0 stratified spaces” and “conically smooth stratified spaces”. These are the analogs of topological and smooth manifolds in the conically stratified setting.

Definition 3.18. A *stratified space* $X = (X \rightarrow P)$ consists of a topological space X , together with a surjective continuous map $X \rightarrow P$, where P is a poset equipped with the upwards-closed topology

$$\{U \subseteq P \mid \forall u \in U, \forall p \in P: u < p \implies p \in U\}.$$

A map $(X \rightarrow P) \rightarrow (Y \rightarrow Q)$ of stratified spaces is just a commutative square.

Construction 3.19. For every topological space X and every $t \in (0, \infty]$, we write

$$\mathbf{C}_t X := \{0\} \amalg_{\{0\} \times X} [0, t) \times X$$

for *the cone of X of radius t* . We abbreviate $\mathbf{C}X := \mathbf{C}_{\infty}X$. If X is equipped with a stratification $\sigma: X \rightarrow P$, then we equip $\mathbf{C}_t X$ with the stratification

$$\mathbf{C}_t X \rightarrow \{-\infty\} \star P, \quad (s, x) \mapsto \begin{cases} -\infty, & \text{for } s = 0 \\ \sigma(x), & \text{for } s > 0 \end{cases}$$

where $\{-\infty\} \star P$ arises from the poset P by adding a new minimal element.

Example 3.20. Let $X = \mathbf{S}^1 \rightarrow P = \{0 < 1\}$ be the circle stratified with 3 points as in Figure 2a. The corresponding cone $\mathbf{C}X$ is illustrated in Figure 2b. Each of the marked points trace out a line in the cone $\mathbf{C}X$, and the added minimal element corresponds to the marked point at the apex of the cone.




FIGURE 2. An example of a stratified circle and the corresponding cone.

Remark 3.21. As a topological space, we have a canonical homeomorphism $\mathbf{CS}^{n-1} \cong \mathbb{R}^n$ which restricts to the corresponding homeomorphism $\mathbf{C}_t\mathbf{S}^{n-1} \cong \mathbf{B}_t(0)$ for each $t > 0$. Note that this is not an isomorphism of stratified spaces, since \mathbb{R}^n has no 0-dimensional stratum $\{0\}$ corresponding to the cone point of \mathbf{CS}^{n-1} .

Now we introduce conical manifolds, the stratified analog of a topological manifold. These were introduced by Ayala–Francis–Tanaka under the name “ C^0 stratified spaces”, see [AFT17b, Definition 2.1.15 and Lemma 2.2.2].

Definition 3.22. Conical manifolds and conical disks are defined by mutual induction:

- (1) A stratified space X is called a *conical manifold* if it is second countable Hausdorff and the collection of embedded conical disks forms a basis for the topology of X .
If X is nonempty then we say that X is of *dimension* N or $\leq N$ if all these embedded conical disks are of dimension N or $\leq N$, respectively. We declare the empty conical manifold to be of dimension -1 .
- (2) A *conical disk* is a stratified space isomorphic to

$$\mathbf{D}(X, n) := \mathbf{C}X \times \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and X is a compact conical manifold. If X is of dimension k or $\leq k$ then we declare $\mathbf{D}(X, n)$ to be of dimension $k + n + 1$ or $\leq k + n + 1$, respectively.

Remark 3.23. Unlike the case of ordinary manifold, even a connected conical manifold might not have a well-defined dimension. For example $\mathbf{C}(\mathbf{S}^1 \amalg \mathbf{S}^0)$ is homeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^2 \vee \mathbb{R}$; it is a conical manifold of dimension ≤ 2 but it includes points of local dimension 1 and 2.

A conical manifold might even have unbounded dimension, in which case it is not compact. Since we define conical disks only to arise from cones of *compact* conical manifolds, they are always of bounded dimension. This in turn means that conical manifolds at least have *locally* bounded dimension.

Example 3.24. A conical manifold with trivial stratification is the same as an ordinary (topological) manifold, because in this case the only local disks that can appear are of the form $\mathbf{D}(\emptyset, n) = \mathbb{R}^n$.

Since we declare the empty conical manifold \emptyset to be of dimension -1 , the disks $\mathbb{R}^n = \mathbf{D}(\emptyset, n)$ are of dimension n , as expected. This means that in the unstratified case we recover the usual dimension of a manifold.

Example 3.25. The simplest example of a non-trivial stratification is a line with finitely many points. Take $X = \mathbb{R} \rightarrow P = \{0 < 1\}$, with the preimage of 0 a finite set of points $S \subset X$. This space is covered by conical disks isomorphic to \mathbf{CS}^0 and \mathbb{R} .

Remark 3.26. Every conical manifold X admits a Weiss cover by (finite disjoint unions of) conical disks. This is analogous to the argument in Example 2.34, using that the conical disks form a basis for the topology of X and that X is Hausdorff.

While annoyingly inductive, Definition 3.22 is relatively straightforward, since (just as for topological manifolds) one does not need to put any extra conditions on the transition maps appearing between the charts by conical disks. The situation for *smooth* conical manifolds is significantly more delicate and requires an elaborate inductive definition. In this paper we never work directly with the definition but only with follow-up facts proved by Ayala–Francis–Tanaka; hence we allow ourselves to only sketch the definition and refer to [AFT17b] for the details.

Note that we call “smooth conical manifolds” what Ayala–Francis–Tanaka call “conically smooth stratified spaces”.

Definition 3.27 (Sketch of [AFT17b, Section 3.2]). The following notions are defined by mutual recursion.

- A *smooth conical manifold* X is a paracompact and Hausdorff stratified space equipped with an inclusion-maximal collection $\{\psi_i: \mathbf{D}_i \hookrightarrow X\}_{i \in I}$ (called a *conically smooth atlas*) of open embeddings of *smooth conical disks* \mathbf{D}_i , such that for each $i, j \in I$ and each $x \in \psi_i(\mathbf{D}_i) \cap \psi_j(\mathbf{D}_j)$ there is a $k \in I$ with $x \in \mathbf{D}_k$ and a commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{D}_k & \hookrightarrow & \mathbf{D}_i \\ \downarrow & \searrow^{\psi_k} & \downarrow \psi_i \\ \mathbf{D}_j & \hookrightarrow & X \end{array}$$

in which the left vertical map and upper horizontal map are *conically smooth embeddings*.

- A *conically smooth map* $f: X' \rightarrow X$ between smooth conical manifolds with smooth conical atlas $\{\psi'_i\}$ and $\{\psi_j\}$, respectively, is a map of stratified spaces which induces conically smooth maps $\psi_j^{-1} \circ f \circ \psi'_i$ on all charts.
- A *smooth conical disk* is a stratified space of the form

$$\mathbf{D}(X, n) := \mathbf{C}X \times \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where X is a compact *smooth conical manifold*.

- *Conical smoothness* for a map $\mathbf{D}(X, n) \rightarrow \mathbf{D}(Y, m)$ of *smooth conical disks* is defined in terms of *conical smoothness* of maps $X \rightarrow Y$ (plus the ordinary notion of smoothness between euclidean spaces). We omit the precise definition here.

Remark 3.28. Every smooth manifold can be viewed as a smooth conical manifold with the trivial stratification. Between smooth manifolds, the conically smooth maps are precisely the ordinary smooth maps.

Notation 3.29. For every point $x \in X$ in a smooth conical manifold there is a unique compact smooth conical manifold Z (up to isomorphism) and a unique $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that embedded disks of the type $\mathbf{D}(Z, n)$ form a neighborhood basis around x ; see [AFT17b, Theorem 4.3.1 and Corollary 4.3.2]. We call Z the *link* at x in X , and write $\text{link}_x(X) := Z$.

For each stratum S we have the link bundle $\text{Link}_S(X) \rightarrow S$ whose fiber over $s \in S$ is the link at s in X ; see [AFT17b, Definition 7.3.3]. If S is connected then the fiber of the link bundle is well defined up to isomorphism. In this case we write $\text{link}_S(X)$ for this fiber and call it the *link* at S in X .

Notation 3.30. Smooth conical manifolds and embeddings assemble into a category Mfld and, more subtly, into an ∞ -category $\mathcal{M}\text{fld}$ whose homotopies are given by conically smooth isotopies. We refer to [AFT17b, Section 4.1] for the precise definition.

Remark 3.31. Nocera–Volpe [NV23] proved that any Whitney stratified space admits a canonical smooth conical structure. Hence, all classical examples of Whitney stratified spaces from differential topology like analytic varieties are also examples of smooth conical manifolds.

3.3. Constructible factorization algebras. Having a good understanding of the stratifications relevant for us, we now want to define constructibility. This will be a condition checked on conical disks, hence we first define when it makes sense to ask for such a condition to begin with.

Notation 3.32. We write $\text{Disks}(X) \subset \text{Open}(X)$ for the full poset of finite disjoint unions of embedded disks, where “embedded disks” needs to be interpreted according to the type of object we view X as. More specifically, $\text{Disks}(X)$ refers to

- the full subposet of finite disjoint unions of embedded conical disks if X is (viewed as) a conical manifold;
- the full subposet of finite disjoint unions of conically smoothly embedded smooth conical disks if X is (viewed as) a smooth conical manifold.

As a special case we get the usual notion of continuously or smoothly embedded disks in a topological or smooth (unstratified) manifold.

Definition 3.33. Let \mathcal{U} be a poset of opens. We say that a subposet $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ is a *disk-basis* of \mathcal{U} if $\mathfrak{B} \subset \text{Disks}(X)$ and \mathfrak{B} is a basis for the topology of $\bigcup \mathcal{U}$.

Definition 3.34. A poset of opens $\mathcal{U} \subset \text{Open}(X)$ is said to *have enough good disks* if there exists a factorizing disk-basis \mathfrak{B} of \mathcal{U} (cf. Definition 2.45).

We say that X *has enough good disks* if the poset of opens $\text{Open}(X)$ has enough good disks witnessed by a factorizing disk-basis $\mathfrak{B} \subset \text{Disks}(X)$.

Remark 3.35. If X has enough good disks, every sieve $\mathcal{U}_\downarrow \subset \text{Open}(X)$ also has enough good disks, because $\mathfrak{B} \cap \mathcal{U}_\downarrow$ is still a factorizing disk-basis of \mathcal{U}_\downarrow .

Remark 3.36 (Existence of enough good disks). In general it is not true that $\mathfrak{B} := \text{Disks}(X)$ is a factorizing basis of X , because the intersection of two embedded disks need not be a disk. Thus a priori, there might not exist any poset of opens of X which has enough good disks.

For (unstratified) smooth manifolds there is a standard trick to get around this: one can choose a Riemannian metric on X and then let $\mathfrak{B} \subset \text{Disks}(X)$ consist only of disjoint unions of *geodesically convex* disks. Since the intersections of convex disks is a convex disk again, this \mathfrak{B} does indeed yield a factorizing basis of X .

For this paper, we choose not to address this question of existence further. Instead we just “define the issue away”: when needed, we simply assume that our (smooth) conical manifolds have enough good disks.

Remark 3.37. Let \mathcal{U} be a poset of opens which is closed under subordinate disjoint unions, i.e. $U \cup U' \in \mathcal{U}$ whenever $U, U' \in \mathcal{U}$ are disjoint opens and $U \cup U' \in \mathcal{U}_\downarrow$. Then to establish enough good disks it suffices to find a *prefactorizing disk-basis* \mathfrak{B} of \mathcal{U} , i.e., a subposet $\mathfrak{B} \subset \mathcal{U}$ which

- is a basis of the topology of $\bigcup \mathcal{U}$,
- is closed under intersection,
- consists of (disjoint unions of) disks

(but is not necessarily closed under disjoint unions). Indeed, one can then obtain a factorizing disk-basis of \mathcal{U} by simply closing \mathfrak{B} under disjoint unions subordinate to \mathcal{U} .

Definition 3.38. Let X be a conical manifold and let $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \text{Open}(X)$ be a poset of opens with enough good disks. Let $\mathcal{A}: \mathcal{U}^\otimes \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^\otimes$ be a \mathcal{U} -factorization algebra. We say that \mathcal{A} is

constructible or *locally constant with respect to the stratification* if every inclusion $U \hookrightarrow V$ in \mathfrak{U} of (abstractly) isomorphic conical disks is \mathcal{A} -local. We write

$$\text{FACT}_{\mathfrak{U}}^{\text{cstr}} \subset \text{FACT}_{\mathfrak{U}},$$

for the full ∞ -subcategory of constructible factorization algebras on \mathfrak{U} .

Note that without requiring the poset of opens \mathfrak{U} above to have enough disks one might get an entirely vacuous condition. In the special case of ordinary manifolds we abbreviate the name:

Definition 3.39. Let X be a manifold and $\mathfrak{U} \subseteq \text{Open}(X)$ a poset of opens with enough good disks. A \mathfrak{U} -factorization algebra is called *locally constant* if it is constructible with respect to the trivial stratification.

Example 3.40. We return to Example 3.5 and Example 3.14. In this case, \mathcal{A} is locally constant as a \mathfrak{B} -factorization algebra, since every inclusion of intervals is even sent to the identity. Of course it remains constructible if we refine the stratification, such as by adding finitely many points as in Example 3.25.

Example 3.41. We return to Example 3.7 and Example 3.15. In this case, \mathcal{M} is not locally constant, since the inclusion of an interval not containing the point 0 into one containing the point 0 is not an equivalence. However, it is a constructible factorization algebra if we view \mathbb{R} as the smooth conical manifold $\mathbb{R} = \mathbf{CS}^0$, i.e., with the stratification $\{0\} \subset \mathbb{R}$.

3.4. Restriction and pushforward. We recall the two operations for transferring factorization algebras from one space to another.

Construction 3.42 (Restriction and pushforward).

- Given an open subspace $U \subseteq X$, the inclusion of operads $\text{Open}(U)^{\otimes} \hookrightarrow \text{Open}(X)^{\otimes}$ induces the *restriction* functor

$$-|_U: \text{ALG}_X \rightarrow \text{ALG}_U$$

of algebras by precomposition.

- For each continuous map $f: X \rightarrow Y$, we have an induced functor

$$f^{-1}: \text{Open}(Y)^{\otimes} \rightarrow \text{Open}(X)^{\otimes}$$

of operads, which induces the *pushforward* functor

$$f_{\star}: \text{ALG}_X \rightarrow \text{ALG}_Y$$

of algebras by precomposition.

Lemma 3.43. *Restriction along $U \subseteq X$ preserves (separately) multiplicativity, Weiss cosheaves, and constructibility. In particular, it induces restriction functors*

$$-|_U: \text{FACT}_X \rightarrow \text{FACT}_U \quad \text{and} \quad -|_U: \text{FACT}_X^{\text{cstr}} \rightarrow \text{FACT}_U^{\text{cstr}}$$

on (constructible) factorization algebras.

Proof. This is straightforward, since every instance in U of a multiplicativity, Weiss cosheaf, or constructibility condition is also an instance in X . Note that here we use that $U_{\downarrow} \subseteq \text{Open}(X)$ is a presieve (in fact, a sieve), so that Weiss covers in U are evaluated the same as Weiss covers in X . \square

Lemma 3.44. *Pushforward along a continuous map $f: X \rightarrow Y$ preserves (separately) multiplicative algebras and Weiss cosheaves. In particular, it induces a pushforward functor*

$$f_{\star}: \text{FACT}_X \rightarrow \text{FACT}_Y$$

on factorization algebras.

Proof. Every instance $V = V_1 \cup \cdots \cup V_n$ of the multiplicativity condition on Y translates to an instance $f^{-1}(V) = f^{-1}(V_1) \cup \cdots \cup f^{-1}(V_n)$ of the multiplicativity condition on X ; thus multiplicative algebras are preserved by f_*

Similarly, to prove that Weiss cosheaves are preserved by f_* , it suffices to observe that f^{-1} preserves intersections (so that f_* is compatible with the evaluation of (pre-)covers), and to show that the preimage of a Weiss cover $\mathcal{W} \rightarrow V$ in Y is again a Weiss cover; indeed, for every finite set $S \subset f^{-1}(V)$ we can find a $W \in \mathcal{W}$ covering the finite set $f(S)$ so that $f^{-1}(W) \in f^{-1}(\mathcal{W})$ covers S as desired. \square

Example 3.45. If X and Y are smooth (conical) manifolds, even pushforward along (conically) smooth maps need not preserve constructible factorization algebras. For example consider an associative algebra A viewed as a locally constant factorization algebra \mathcal{A} on \mathbb{R} with $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{R}) = A$. On finite disjoint unions of intervals, this is simply the \mathfrak{B}_{\cup} -factorization algebra⁸ from Example 3.8. Consider the smooth map $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by $f(x) = x^2$. Then the inclusion $\mathbb{R}_{>0} \subset \mathbb{R}$ of abstractly isomorphic disks need not be local for $f_*(\mathcal{A})$, since it evaluates as the multiplication map

$$A \otimes A = \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{R}) = A, \quad (3.1)$$

which of course need not be an equivalence.

This defect can be corrected by refining the stratification: Indeed, pushforward along the map $f: x \mapsto x^2$ above does preserve constructible factorization algebras if the codomain is equipped not with the trivial stratification, but instead with the stratification $\{0\} \subset \mathbb{R}$. In this case the two conical disks $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $\mathbb{R} \cong \mathbf{CS}^0$ are no longer abstractly isomorphic, which excludes the problematic non-equivalence (3.1) from the picture.

Remark 3.46. There are many maps between smooth conical manifolds along which the pushforward *does* preserve constructible factorization algebras, for example locally trivial fibrations of (unstratified) manifolds or so-called “adequately stratified” maps of conical manifolds as defined by Ginot; see [Gin15, Sections 5.1 & 6.1].

In this paper we only need the following very degenerate example, for which the proof is straightforward.

Lemma 3.47. *For each $n \geq 0$, pushforward along the n -fold fold map $\nabla^n: X^{\amalg n} \rightarrow X$ (which is the empty map for $n = 0$) preserves constructible factorization algebras.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{F} be a constructible factorization algebra on $X^{\amalg n}$; we need to check that $\nabla_*^n(\mathcal{F})$ is constructible. To see this, start with an inclusion of abstractly isomorphic conical disks $U \subseteq V \subset X$. Then we have the commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \nabla_*^n \mathcal{F}(U) & \longrightarrow & \nabla_*^n \mathcal{F}(V) \\ \parallel & & \parallel \\ \mathcal{F}(U^{\amalg n}) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}(V^{\amalg n}) \\ \simeq \uparrow & & \simeq \uparrow \\ \mathcal{F}(U)^{\otimes n} & \xrightarrow{\simeq} & \mathcal{F}(V)^{\otimes n} \end{array}$$

where the lower vertical and horizontal maps are equivalences by multiplicativity and constructibility of \mathcal{F} , respectively; hence the top horizontal map is also an equivalence as desired. \square

Lemma 3.48. *Let $f_i: X_i \rightarrow Y_i$ for $i \in I$. If pushforward along each f_i preserves constructible factorization algebras, then so does pushforward along their disjoint union $\coprod_i f_i$.*

⁸One can extend this to all open sets using the techniques from this paper. However, for our purposes in this example, the \mathfrak{B}_{\cup} -factorization algebra is enough.

Proof. This follows directly from the fact that any inclusion of abstractly isomorphic conical disks $U \subseteq V$ in the disjoint union $\coprod_i Y_i$ already lies in one of the Y_i . \square

4. THE TOOLBOX

The goal of this section is to build a toolbox of techniques and results related to gluing of (constructible) factorization algebras. First of all we motivate the different tools in Section 4.1 by giving a detailed outline of how gluing of constructible factorization algebras will be proven. In Section 4.2 we use the theory of dendroidal sets to extend factorization algebras on opens U_I^\otimes of some cover \mathcal{U} to factorization algebras on $\mathcal{U}_\downarrow^\otimes$. Then, in Section 4.3 we prove that factorization algebras defined on some factorizing basis can be extended. Finally, in Section 4.4 we prove that multiplicative algebras on some decomposable poset of opens \mathfrak{B} can be extended to multiplicative algebras on the disjoint union completion \mathfrak{B}_\cup .

4.1. Overview. Let \mathcal{U} be an open cover of a space X . Let β be an ordinal and $V_\bullet: \beta \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ be a surjection, so we can write $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i < \beta}$. For any finite subset $I \subset \beta$, denote $U_I := \bigcap_{i \in I} U_i$.

Our motivating application (Theorem 6.1) was to show that constructible factorization algebras glue; that is, that the natural map

$$\text{FACT}_X^{\text{cstr}} \xrightarrow{\simeq} \lim_{\beta \supset I \supseteq \emptyset} \text{FACT}_{U_I}^{\text{cstr}},$$

which can be found in the first horizontal row in the large diagram, is an equivalence. The proof of this relies on three main steps corresponding to the columns in the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 \lim_{\beta \supset I \supseteq \emptyset} \text{FACT}_{U_I}^{\text{cstr}} & \xleftarrow[\text{Cor. 4.10}]{\simeq} & \text{FACT}_{U_\downarrow}^{\text{cstr}} & \xleftarrow[\text{Prop. 6.3}]{\simeq} & \text{FACT}_{U_{\downarrow \cup}}^{\text{cstr}} & \xleftarrow[\text{Prop. 6.2}]{\simeq} & \text{FACT}_X^{\text{cstr}} \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 \lim_{\beta \supset I \supseteq \emptyset} \text{FACT}_{U_I} & \xleftarrow[\text{Prop. 4.9}]{\simeq} & \text{FACT}_{U_\downarrow} & \xleftarrow[\text{Question 4.1}]{\text{---}} & \text{FACT}_{U_{\downarrow \cup}} & \xleftarrow[\text{Prop. 4.12}]{\simeq} & \text{FACT}_X \\
 & \searrow & \swarrow & & \swarrow & \searrow & \swarrow \\
 & & \text{ALG}_{U_\downarrow}^{\text{Weiss}} & \xleftarrow{\simeq} & \text{ALG}_{U_{\downarrow \cup}}^{\text{Weiss}} & \xleftarrow[\text{Prop. 4.11}]{\simeq} & \text{ALG}_X^{\text{Weiss}} \\
 & \searrow & \swarrow & & \swarrow & \searrow & \swarrow \\
 & & \text{ALG}_{U_\downarrow}^{\text{m}} & \xleftarrow[\text{Prop. 4.15}]{\simeq} & \text{ALG}_{U_{\downarrow \cup}}^{\text{m}} & \xleftarrow{\simeq} & \text{ALG}_X^{\text{m}} \\
 & \searrow & \swarrow & & \swarrow & \searrow & \swarrow \\
 \lim_{\beta \supset I \supseteq \emptyset} \text{ALG}_{U_I} & \xleftarrow[\text{Cor. 4.8}]{\simeq} & \text{ALG}_{U_\downarrow} & \xleftarrow{\simeq} & \text{ALG}_{U_{\downarrow \cup}} & \xleftarrow{\simeq} & \text{ALG}_X
 \end{array}$$

The leftmost column of equivalences are all proven in Section 4.2. The key insight is to understand the ∞ -operad $\mathcal{U}_\downarrow^\otimes$ as a colimit of the ∞ -operads U_I^\otimes . For this we work in the model of dendroidal sets. This gives rise to an equivalence of the corresponding ∞ -categories of algebras (Corollary 4.8), which immediately also restricts to the subcategories of factorization algebras and constructible factorization algebras (Proposition 4.9 and Corollary 4.10).

For the rightmost column we have that $\mathcal{U}_{\downarrow \cup}$ is a factorizing basis of X . Hence, the results from Section 4.3 regarding extending factorization algebras from a factorizing basis apply. Explicitly, in Proposition 4.11 we show that Weiss algebras on a factorizing basis extend, and in Proposition 4.12 that this equivalence restricts to the corresponding categories of factorization algebras. Combining extension from a factorizing basis with Theorem 5.2, i.e. that constructibility is local, gives the top rightmost equivalence as proven in Proposition 6.2. Note that this step requires that we work with a cover and does not hold for any factorizing basis.

Finally, for the middle column, observe that \mathcal{U}_\downarrow by definition only contains those disjoint unions that are subordinate to some open U of the cover. Hence, to get a factorizing basis from \mathcal{U}_\downarrow we need to add in all disjoint unions. In Proposition 4.15 of Section 4.4 we prove that at the level of multiplicative algebras we get an equivalence. This naturally raises the question:

Question 4.1. Does the equivalence on multiplicative algebras in Proposition 4.15 descend to an equivalence on factorization algebras $\text{FACT}_{\mathcal{U}_\downarrow} \xrightarrow{\cong} \text{FACT}_{\mathcal{U}_\downarrow \sqcup \mathcal{U}_\downarrow}$?

In Remark 4.20 we briefly outline what the problem with the straightforward approach to this questions is, and hence why it is still open. As a solution we restrict to the subcategories of constructible factorization algebras and in Proposition 6.3 show that at this level we get an equivalence. This relies on Theorem 5.21, or more precisely Corollary 5.22, which extends techniques of Ayala–Francis and Ayala–Francis–Tanaka to prove that the Weiss cosheaf condition is automatically satisfied when left Kan extending from (a suitable collection of) disks.

4.2. A colimit of ∞ -operads. In this subsection we prove the first step towards gluing of factorization algebras. Given an open cover \mathcal{U} of X , we will “glue together” prefactorization algebras on opens $U \in \mathcal{U}$ of the cover to give a prefactorization algebra defined on \mathcal{U}_\downarrow . In particular, this will be done by exhibiting the ∞ -operad corresponding to \mathcal{U}_\downarrow as a suitable (homotopy) colimit cube.

It turns out that to understand the colimit cube of ∞ -operads it is helpful to work in the model category of dendroidal sets. To that end we briefly recall the basics needed for us, and refer the reader to e.g. [CM11] for further details.

Recall that OPD' is the $(1, 1)$ -category of operads, in contrast to the $(2, 1)$ -category OPD .

Definition 4.2 ([MW07], Definition 4.1). Let Ω denote the *symmetric tree category*, i.e. the full subcategory $\Omega \hookrightarrow \text{OPD}'$ of those symmetric operads that are free on finite rooted non-planar trees. The category of *dendroidal sets* is the presheaf category

$$\text{DSET} = \text{Fun}(\Omega^{\text{op}}, \text{SET}).$$

Remark 4.3.

- (1) The category DSET of dendroidal sets has a model structure [CM11, Theorem 2.4]. The cofibrations are the *normal monomorphisms*.
- (2) A dendroidal set B is said to be *normal* if and only if for any tree T , the action of the group $\text{Aut}(T)$ on $B(T)$ is free. By [CM11, Corollary 1.8] we know that any monomorphism of dendroidal sets $\iota: A \hookrightarrow B$ where B is normal is a normal monomorphism. In particular, all dendroidal sets appearing below are normal, so any monomorphism is automatically normal, and hence a cofibration.
- (3) The model structure is left proper [CM11, Proposition 2.6].

Definition 4.4 ([MW07], Example 4.2). The *dendroidal nerve functor* $N_d: \text{OPD}' \rightarrow \text{DSET}$ is defined by

$$N_d(\mathcal{O})(T) = \text{OPD}'(T, \mathcal{O}),$$

i.e. it picks out operations of the shape of the tree T in the operad \mathcal{O} .

Since the nerve does *not* preserve homotopy colimits we are extra careful to include the nerve in this section. The colimits we want to compute take the shape of (punctured) cubes. To avoid finiteness assumptions on the covers we are working with, we will even work with transfinite cubes. The details regarding these transfinite cubes are given in Appendix C. Before going to the general results we give a small example to make the general arguments more digestible.

Example 4.5. Let $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in \{0,1,2\}}$ be an open cover of X with three opens. For any subset $J \subseteq \{0,1,2\}$, let $U_J = \bigcap_{j \in J} U_j$. Then we have a 3-cube (see Example C.2) coming from inclusions:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \mathrm{N}_d(U_{012}^\otimes) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{N}_d(U_{12}^\otimes) & & \\
 \downarrow & \searrow & \downarrow & \searrow & \\
 & & \mathrm{N}_d(U_{01}^\otimes) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{N}_d(U_{1}^\otimes) \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 \mathrm{N}_d(U_{02}^\otimes) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{N}_d(U_{2}^\otimes) & & \\
 \downarrow & \searrow & \downarrow & \searrow & \\
 & & \mathrm{N}_d(U_{0}^\otimes) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{N}_d(X_\downarrow^\otimes).
 \end{array} \tag{4.1}$$

$F := \mathrm{N}_d(U_{-\downarrow}^\otimes) =$

We claim that this is a very cofibrant cube as in Definition C.5. Recall from Equation (C.5) that for every subset $S \subseteq \{0,1,2\}$ the S -restricted latching map is given by the transformation $\partial_S F \rightarrow \tau_S F \rightarrow F$. That is, one first restricts the cube (but still views it as a 3-cube by setting $F(I) \simeq \emptyset$ for all $I \not\subseteq S$), then apply the latching map. We want all of these S -restricted latching maps to be levelwise cofibrations. More explicitly, let $S = \{0,2\}$. The corresponding restricted cube $\tau_S F$ is illustrated in Example C.3. We have for example⁹

$$\partial_S F(02) \simeq \emptyset \rightarrow F(02) = \mathrm{N}_d(U_{02}^\otimes),$$

where we get \emptyset from taking the colimit over the empty diagram. Asking for this map to be a cofibration is the same as asking for $\mathrm{N}_d(U_{2}^\otimes)$ to be normal, which it is. Now consider

$$\partial_S F(2) \simeq F(02) = \mathrm{N}_d(U_{02}^\otimes) \longrightarrow \mathrm{N}_d(U_{2}^\otimes) = F(2).$$

It follows from the inclusion $U_{02} \hookrightarrow U_2$ that this is a monomorphism of dendroidal sets, and in the light of Remark 4.3(2) it is even a cofibration. Lastly we look at

$$\partial_S F(\emptyset) \simeq \mathrm{colim} \left(\mathrm{N}_d(U_{0}^\otimes) \leftarrow \mathrm{N}_d(U_{02}^\otimes) \rightarrow \mathrm{N}_d(U_{2}^\otimes) \right) \longrightarrow \mathrm{N}_d(X_\downarrow^\otimes) = F(\emptyset). \tag{4.2}$$

Recall that colimits of functors are computed pointwise. Let $T \in \Omega$ be any tree, and consider the map

$$\mathrm{colim} \left(\mathrm{OPD}'(T, U_{0}^\otimes) \leftarrow \mathrm{OPD}'(T, U_{02}^\otimes) \rightarrow \mathrm{OPD}'(T, U_{2}^\otimes) \right) \longrightarrow \mathrm{OPD}'(T, \mathcal{U}_\downarrow^\otimes)$$

in the category of sets. This is a monomorphism for any tree T . Thus it follows that the map in (4.2) is a cofibration.

Note that all maps considered are cofibrations for essentially the same reason: all the maps in the cube in (4.1) are monomorphisms between normal dendroidal sets. The remaining maps to check cofibrancy for are completely analogous.

We are now ready to look at the general statement. From now on, let \mathcal{U} be an open cover of X . Let β be an ordinal and $V_\bullet: \beta \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ be a surjection, so that we can write $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i < \beta}$. For any finite subset $I \subset \beta$, denote $U_I := \bigcap_{i \in I} U_i$.

This construction yields a β -cube in OPD' which we can compose with the dendroidal nerve to obtain a cube

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathrm{N}_d(U_{-\downarrow}^\otimes): \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{fin}}^{\mathrm{op}}(\beta) &\longrightarrow \mathrm{dSET} \\
 I &\longmapsto \mathrm{N}_d(U_I^\otimes)
 \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

of dendroidal sets.

⁹We refrain from writing out all the corresponding copies of \emptyset since they do not change the colimits.

Lemma 4.6. *The cube (4.3) induces an isomorphism*

$$\operatorname{colim}_{\beta \supset I \supseteq \emptyset} \mathsf{N}_d(U_{I\downarrow}^\otimes) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathsf{N}_d(\mathcal{U}_{\downarrow}^\otimes).$$

of dendroidal sets, and the strict colimit coincides with the homotopy colimit.

Proof. We claim that the cube $F := \mathsf{N}_d(U_{-\downarrow}^\otimes)$ is very cofibrant. This is an immediate generalization of the argument from Example 4.5. Recall that we need to show that for every subset $S \subset \beta$, the corresponding S -restricted latching map is a levelwise cofibration. The pointwise formula for the S -restricted latching map is given in (C.6). That is, let I be a finite subset of S and consider

$$\partial_S \mathsf{N}_d(U_{I\downarrow}^\otimes) = \operatorname{colim}_{S \supseteq J \supseteq I} \mathsf{N}_d(U_{J\downarrow}^\otimes) \longrightarrow \mathsf{N}_d(U_{I\downarrow}^\otimes).$$

The lefthand colimit is a colimit in the presheaf category DSET , and is hence computed pointwise. Let $T \in \Omega$ be any tree, and consider

$$\partial_S \mathsf{N}_d(U_{I\downarrow}^\otimes)(T) = \operatorname{colim}_{S \supseteq J \supseteq I} \mathsf{OPD}'(T, U_{J\downarrow}) \longrightarrow \mathsf{OPD}'(T, U_{I\downarrow}).$$

For all the opens U_J appearing in the colimit above we have inclusions $U_J \subset U_I$, hence $U_{J\downarrow} \subset U_{I\downarrow}$. As a result all maps appearing in the colimit are inclusions of subsets into the codomain $\mathsf{OPD}'(T, U_{I\downarrow})$. Hence the colimit, which is now computed in the category of sets, is simply the union of the sets. From the inclusions it also follows that the map always is a monomorphism. By Remark 4.3(2) it is even a normal monomorphism, hence a cofibration. We conclude that the cube is indeed very cofibrant.

Since the cube $\mathsf{N}_d(U_{-\downarrow}^\otimes)$ is very cofibrant (and the model structure on DSET is left proper) we can employ Corollary C.9. Hence the strict colimit of nerves, which, as just explained, we can compute as

$$\operatorname{colim}_{I \supseteq \emptyset} \mathsf{N}_d(U_{I\downarrow}^\otimes) = \bigcup_{i \in \beta} \mathsf{N}_d(U_{i\downarrow}^\otimes) = \mathsf{N}_d(\mathcal{U}_{\downarrow}^\otimes),$$

coincides with the homotopy colimit in the model category DSET . \square

We used the model category of dendroidal sets to be able to work explicitly with the above (homotopy) colimit, but now we move away from this model. Recall the following comparison results between different models of ∞ -operads:

- Barwick shows that Lurie's model for ∞ -operads is Quillen equivalent to Barwick's model in [Bar18].
- Chu, Haugseng and Heuts show that Barwick's model is Quillen equivalent to that of complete dendroidal Segal spaces in [CHH18].
- Finally, Cisinski and Moerdijk compare the three dendroidal models amongst each other, and also dendroidal sets to simplicial operads in [CM13a, CM13b].

In total this means that the homotopy theory of Lurie's ∞ -operads is equivalent to that of dendroidal sets and to that of simplicial operads [CHH18, Corollary 1.2].

Corollary 4.7. *The inclusions $U_I \hookrightarrow \bigcup_{i \in \beta} U_i = \mathcal{U}_{\downarrow}$ induce an equivalence of ∞ -operads*

$$\operatorname{colim}_{I \supseteq \emptyset} U_{I\downarrow}^\otimes \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{U}_{\downarrow}^\otimes. \quad (4.4)$$

The above corollary has the following consequence at the level of algebras.

Corollary 4.8. *Restriction induces an equivalence of ∞ -categories*

$$\mathsf{ALG}\mathcal{U}_{\downarrow} \xrightarrow{\cong} \lim_{\beta \supset I \supseteq \emptyset} \mathsf{ALG}U_{I\downarrow}. \quad (4.5)$$

Proof. Taking maps of ∞ -operads out of (4.4), into some fixed symmetric monoidal ∞ -category \mathcal{C}^\otimes gives the equivalences:

$$(\mathrm{ALG}_{\mathcal{U}_\downarrow}(\mathcal{C}))^\simeq \simeq \mathrm{OPD}_\infty \left(\mathrm{colim}_{\beta \supset I \supseteq \emptyset} U_{I\downarrow}^\otimes, \mathcal{C}^\otimes \right) \simeq \lim_{\beta \supset I \supseteq \emptyset} \mathrm{OPD}_\infty \left(U_{I\downarrow}^\otimes, \mathcal{C}^\otimes \right) \simeq \lim_{\beta \supset I \supseteq \emptyset} (\mathrm{ALG}_{U_{I\downarrow}}(\mathcal{C}))^\simeq. \quad (4.6)$$

This establishes the desired equivalence (4.5) on the underlying ∞ -groupoids.

To get an actual equivalence of ∞ -categories we employ a standard argument by bootstrapping to all simplices using the functoriality of the equivalence (4.6). More explicitly we observe that functorially in $[n] \in \Delta^{\mathrm{op}}$ and any ∞ -operad \mathcal{O} we have

$$\mathrm{Fun}([n], \mathrm{ALG}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathcal{C})) \simeq \mathrm{ALG}_{[n]}(\mathrm{ALG}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathcal{C})) \simeq \mathrm{ALG}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathrm{ALG}_{[n]}(\mathcal{C}))$$

(where we view $[n] = \{0 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow n\}$ as an operad with only 1-ary operations) so that we can replace the symmetric monoidal ∞ -category \mathcal{C} by all of the symmetric monoidal ∞ -categories $\mathrm{ALG}_{[n]}(\mathcal{C})$ to promote the equivalence (4.6) to an equivalence of complete Segal spaces

$$\mathrm{Fun}([\bullet], \mathrm{ALG}_{\mathcal{U}_\downarrow})^\simeq \xrightarrow{\simeq} \lim_{\beta \supset I \supseteq \emptyset} \mathrm{Fun}([\bullet], \mathrm{ALG}_{U_{I\downarrow}})^\simeq \simeq \mathrm{Fun}([\bullet], \lim_{\beta \supset I \supseteq \emptyset} \mathrm{ALG}_{U_{I\downarrow}})^\simeq$$

presenting the desired equivalence of ∞ -categories (4.5). \square

We now restrict the above result to the subcategories of factorization algebras.

Proposition 4.9. *The equivalence in Corollary 4.8 restricts to an equivalence*

$$\mathrm{FACT}_{\mathcal{U}_\downarrow} \xrightarrow{\simeq} \lim_{\beta \supset I \supseteq \emptyset} \mathrm{FACT}_{U_{I\downarrow}}.$$

Proof. Note that the posets of opens here are all presieves (even sieves), so by Notation 2.18 the Weiss covers evaluate the same. Hence, restricting a factorization algebra on $\mathcal{U}_\downarrow^\otimes$ gives factorization algebras on all intersections $U_{I\downarrow}^\otimes$.

Conversely, let $\mathcal{A} \in \mathrm{ALG}_{\mathcal{U}_\downarrow}$ be an algebra such that each restriction $\mathcal{A}|_{U_I}$ lies in $\mathrm{FACT}_{U_{I\downarrow}}$. Recall that any open in \mathcal{U}_\downarrow is subordinate to some $U \in \mathcal{U}$. Hence, checking the multiplicativity or Weiss cosheaf condition for \mathcal{A} boils down to checking it for opens that are all subordinate to the same $U \in \mathcal{U}$. This follows from the restrictions of \mathcal{A} being in $\mathrm{FACT}_{U_{I\downarrow}}$, so we are done. \square

Corollary 4.10. *The equivalence in Proposition 4.9 restricts to an equivalence*

$$\mathrm{FACT}_{\mathcal{U}_\downarrow}^{\mathrm{cstr}} \xrightarrow{\simeq} \lim_{\beta \supset I \supseteq \emptyset} \mathrm{FACT}_{U_{I\downarrow}}^{\mathrm{cstr}}.$$

Proof. As before, restricting a constructible factorization algebra on $\mathcal{U}_\downarrow^\otimes$ gives constructible factorization algebras on all intersections.

Conversely, let $\mathcal{A} \in \mathrm{FACT}_{\mathcal{U}_\downarrow}$ be an algebra such that each restriction $\mathcal{A}|_{U_I}$ lies in $\mathrm{FACT}_{U_{I\downarrow}}^{\mathrm{cstr}}$. By definition, we know that any inclusion of abstractly isomorphic disks in \mathcal{U}_\downarrow is subordinate to some open $U \in \mathcal{U}$ of the cover. Using constructibility of $\mathcal{A}|_U$, we see that this inclusion is \mathcal{A} -local. Thus it follows that \mathcal{A} is constructible. \square

4.3. Extending from factorizing bases. In this subsection we prove that whenever \mathfrak{B} is a factorizing basis of \mathfrak{U} we can extend \mathfrak{B} -factorization algebras to \mathfrak{U} -factorization algebras. Moreover, this gives rise to an equivalence of the corresponding ∞ -categories. In the special case where \mathfrak{B} is a factorizing basis of X , this produces factorization algebras on all of X .

For the reader unfamiliar with operadic left Kan extensions we refer to Appendix B where the definitions and results relevant to our situation are summarized. In particular,

any map $\iota: \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}$ gives rise to an adjunction

$$\iota_*: \text{ALG}_{\mathfrak{B}}(\mathcal{C}) \rightleftarrows \text{ALG}_{\mathfrak{U}}(\mathcal{C}) : \iota^*. \quad (4.7)$$

The right adjoint ι^* is restriction, and the left adjoint ι_* is given by operadic left Kan extension, which is computed by the pointwise operadic colimit formula given in Equation (B.3).

We now consider the situation where we operadic left Kan extend from a factorizing basis, and how this interacts with the Weiss condition.

Proposition 4.11. *Let \mathfrak{U} be a presieve and let \mathfrak{B} be a factorizing basis of \mathfrak{U} . Then restriction induces an equivalence*

$$\iota^*: \text{ALG}_{\mathfrak{U}}^{\text{Weiss}} \xrightarrow{\cong} \text{ALG}_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\text{Weiss}}.$$

Proof. First we need to check that restricting Weiss algebras on \mathfrak{U} indeed gives Weiss algebras on \mathfrak{B} . Assume that \mathcal{A} is a Weiss algebra on \mathfrak{U} . Since \mathfrak{B} is a factorizing basis it follows from Proposition 2.53 (1) that $\iota^*(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{A}|_{\mathfrak{B}}$ is also a Weiss algebra.

Conversely, consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \text{ALG}_{\mathfrak{B}} & \xrightarrow{\text{oLKE}} & \text{ALG}_{\mathfrak{U}} \\ & \nearrow & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{ALG}_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\text{Weiss}} & \xrightarrow{\text{---}} & \text{ALG}_{\mathfrak{U}}^{\text{Weiss}} & & \\ & \searrow & \downarrow & \xrightarrow{\text{LKE}} & \downarrow \\ & & \text{Fun}(\mathfrak{B}, \mathcal{C}) & \xrightarrow{\text{LKE}} & \text{Fun}(\mathfrak{U}, \mathcal{C}) \\ & \nearrow & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{coShv}^{\text{W}}(\mathfrak{B}, \mathcal{C}) & \xrightarrow[\cong]{2.53} & \text{coShv}^{\text{W}}(\mathfrak{U}, \mathcal{C}) & & \end{array}$$

The left and right side squares are pullbacks (by Definition 3.9). The backmost square commutes and is a pullback by Lemma B.3, which applies because \mathfrak{B} is closed under disjoint unions subordinate to \mathfrak{U} . Since the cube commutes it follows from the pasting law of pullbacks that the front square is also a pullback square.

Finally, since \mathfrak{B} is a factorizing basis and \mathfrak{U} is a presieve, the bottom horizontal map between the categories of Weiss cosheaves on \mathfrak{B} and \mathfrak{U} is an equivalence by Proposition 2.53. But since the front square is a pullback and pullbacks preserves equivalences it follows that the top horizontal dashed map is also an equivalence. \square

Recall from Remark 2.43 that whenever the ambient poset of opens is a presieve we have two ways of checking the Weiss condition. Namely, either one checks the Weiss cosheaf condition for all Weiss covers, or equivalently one checks the Weiss hypercosheaf condition for all Weiss presieves. We will often use the later approach in this section.

Proposition 4.12. *Let \mathfrak{U} be a presieve. For any factorizing basis \mathfrak{B} of \mathfrak{U} , the equivalence in Proposition 4.11 restricts to an equivalence*

$$\iota^*: \text{FACT}_{\mathfrak{U}} \xrightarrow{\cong} \text{FACT}_{\mathfrak{B}}.$$

Proof. We need to check that the equivalence from Proposition 4.11 restricts to multiplicative algebras. It is clear that restricting a multiplicative algebra on \mathfrak{U}^{\otimes} gives a multiplicative algebra on \mathfrak{B}^{\otimes} .

Conversely, let $\mathcal{A} \in \text{ALG}_{\mathfrak{U}}^{\text{Weiss}}$ be a Weiss algebra on \mathfrak{U} such that $\mathcal{A}|_{\mathfrak{B}} \in \text{FACT}_{\mathfrak{B}}$. We want to show that \mathcal{A} is multiplicative on \mathfrak{U} , and thus a \mathfrak{U} -factorization algebra. For notational simplicity we only consider a cocartesian map of the form $(2_+, (U_1, U_2)) \xrightarrow{!} (1_+, U_1 \cup U_2)$ in \mathfrak{U} ; the general case is completely analogous.

A factorizing basis is in particular a multiplicative basis so by Lemma 2.51 we have Weiss hypercovers $\mathfrak{B} \cap U_{i\downarrow} \dashrightarrow U_i$, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Moreover, since \mathfrak{B} is even a factorizing basis these Weiss hypercovers are Weiss presieves. Hence the top horizontal map in the following commutative diagram is an equivalence since \mathcal{A} is a Weiss cosheaf.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \operatorname{colim}_{B_1 \in \mathfrak{B} \cap U_{1\downarrow}} \mathcal{A}(B_1) \otimes \operatorname{colim}_{B_2 \in \mathfrak{B} \cap U_{2\downarrow}} \mathcal{A}(B_2) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \mathcal{A}(U_1) \otimes \mathcal{A}(U_2) \\
 \downarrow \cong & & \downarrow \\
 \operatorname{colim}_{(B_1, B_2) \in \mathfrak{B} \cap U_{1\downarrow} \times \mathfrak{B} \cap U_{2\downarrow}} \mathcal{A}(B_1) \otimes \mathcal{A}(B_2) & & \\
 \downarrow \cong & & \\
 \operatorname{colim}_{(B_1, B_2) \in \mathfrak{B} \cap U_{1\downarrow} \times \mathfrak{B} \cap U_{2\downarrow}} \mathcal{A}(B_1 \cup B_2) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \mathcal{A}(U_1 \cup U_2)
 \end{array}$$


The top left vertical map is an equivalence because our target category is \otimes -presentable. The bottom left vertical map is an equivalence because \mathcal{A} is multiplicative when restricted to \mathfrak{B} . Note that we have a Weiss presieve

$$\{B_1 \cup B_2 \mid B_i \in \mathfrak{B} \cap U_{i\downarrow}\} \dashrightarrow U_1 \cup U_2 \quad (4.8)$$

because each $\mathfrak{B} \cap U_{i\downarrow} \dashrightarrow U_i$ is a Weiss presieve (for $i = 1, 2$) and \mathfrak{B} has all of the disjoint unions appearing in (4.8) since they are subordinate to $U_1 \cup U_2 \in \mathfrak{U}$. Hence we can, once again, use that \mathcal{A} is a Weiss algebra to get the bottom horizontal equivalence.

We conclude that the rightmost vertical map is also an equivalence; thus \mathcal{A} is multiplicative on \mathfrak{U} . \square

Example 4.13. Recall Example 3.8. In that case, \mathfrak{B}_{\cup} is a factorizing basis of $\operatorname{Open}(\mathbb{R})$ and $\operatorname{Open}(\mathbf{S}^1)$, respectively, so using Proposition 4.12 we can extend \mathcal{A} , $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{S}^1}$ and \mathcal{M} to factorization algebras on all of \mathbb{R} and \mathbf{S}^1 , respectively. Hence, we can now evaluate $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{S}^1}$ on \mathbf{S}^1 . The standard trick for this computation is to pushforward $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{S}^1}$ along the projection $p: \mathbf{S}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as indicated in the following picture:



Then $(\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{S}^1})_{\star}$ is a constructible factorization algebra on \mathbb{R} stratified by the two points indicated. From the pushforward formula, we immediately see that for any interval I_1 containing s_1 but not s_2 we have that $p_{\star}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{S}^1})(I_1) = \mathbb{A}$, and similarly for any interval I_2 containing s_2 but not s_1 we have $p_{\star}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{S}^1})(I_2) = \mathbb{A}$. Moreover, any interval between the points is sent to $\mathbb{A} \otimes_{\mathbb{A}^{\text{op}}} \mathbb{A}$, and any interval outside $[s_1, s_2]$ is sent to \mathbb{K} .

We will see in Example 6.4 that then we have that

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{S}^1}(\mathbf{S}^1) = p_{\star}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{S}^1})(\mathbb{R}) = \mathbb{A} \otimes_{\mathbb{A} \otimes_{\mathbb{A}^{\text{op}}} \mathbb{A}} \mathbb{A}.$$

Without assuming the Weiss cosheaf condition above one quickly runs into problems. An explicit example of this is:

Example 4.14. Consider the factorizing basis $\mathfrak{B} = (X \amalg X)_{\downarrow} \setminus \{X \amalg \emptyset, \emptyset \amalg X\}$ of the space $X \amalg X$. Let \mathcal{A} be a multiplicative algebra on \mathfrak{B}^{\otimes} such that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{A}: \mathfrak{B}^{\otimes} &\longrightarrow \mathcal{C}^{\otimes} \\
 X \amalg X &\mapsto L \neq \mathcal{A}(X) \otimes \mathcal{A}(X).
 \end{aligned}$$

Even though \mathcal{A} is multiplicative we can choose $L \neq \mathcal{A}(X) \otimes \mathcal{A}(X)$ because the cocartesian morphism $(2_+, (X \amalg \emptyset, \emptyset \amalg X)) \xrightarrow{!} (1_+, (X \sqcup X))$ is not actually in \mathfrak{B} . Left Kan extending \mathcal{A} along the inclusion $\mathfrak{B} \hookrightarrow (X \amalg X)_\downarrow$ will, by construction, not give a multiplicative algebra.

4.4. Extending multiplicative algebras to disjoint union completion. In this subsection we will explain how one can extend multiplicative algebras on some decomposable poset of opens \mathfrak{B} to multiplicative algebras on the corresponding disjoint union completion \mathfrak{B}_\cup . Explicitly:

Proposition 4.15. *Let $\mathfrak{B} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{B}_\cup$ be the inclusion of a decomposable poset of opens into its disjoint union completion. Then the adjunction (4.7) restricts to an equivalence of ∞ -categories*

$$\mathrm{ALG}_{\mathfrak{B}_\cup}^{\mathrm{m}} \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathrm{ALG}_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\mathrm{m}}. \quad (4.9)$$

We first record some easy consequences of this result.

Corollary 4.16. *Let \mathfrak{B} be a poset of opens all of whose elements are connected. Then restriction induces an equivalence*

$$\mathrm{ALG}_{\mathfrak{B}_\cup}^{\mathrm{m}} \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathrm{ALG}_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\mathrm{m}}.$$

Proof. Since all elements of \mathfrak{B} are connected, it is trivially decomposable; and multiplicativity is a vacuous condition for prefactorization algebras on \mathfrak{B} . Hence the equivalence (4.9) simplifies to the desired equivalence. \square

Remark 4.17. The analog of Corollary 4.16 is also obtained in Carmona's thesis [Sán23] in the special case where X is a smooth manifold and $\mathfrak{B} := \mathrm{Disk}(X)$ is the poset of connected disks; whose completion under disjoint unions is $\mathrm{Disk}(X)_\cup = \mathrm{Disks}(X)$.

Corollary 4.18. *Assume that the space X is a conical manifold. Let \mathfrak{B} be a decomposable poset of opens. Then the restriction map*

$$\mathrm{ALG}_{\mathfrak{B}_\cup}^{\mathrm{m}, \mathrm{cstr}} \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathrm{ALG}_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\mathrm{m}, \mathrm{cstr}}$$

is an equivalence.

Proof. This follows directly from the equivalence (4.9) by restricting to the constructible algebras on both sides. Indeed, the definition of constructibility only refers to conical disks; since these are connected, no new conical disks lie in \mathfrak{B}_\cup that didn't already lie in \mathfrak{B} . \square

As explained in Question 4.1, we do not know whether the equivalence in Proposition 4.15 restricts to an equivalence on the ∞ -categories of factorization algebras. The key missing ingredient is the following seemingly harmless statement:

Question 4.19. Let $X = X_1 \sqcup X_2$ be a disjoint decomposition into open subsets. Let \mathcal{A} be a multiplicative prefactorization algebra on X which is a Weiss cosheaf when restricted to X_1 and X_2 . Does \mathcal{A} satisfy descent for each Weiss presieve $\mathcal{W} \dashrightarrow X$?

Remark 4.20. If $\mathcal{W}_1 \dashrightarrow X_1$ and $\mathcal{W}_2 \dashrightarrow X_2$ are Weiss presieves, then we obtain a Weiss presieve

$$\mathcal{W}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{W}_2 := \{W_1 \sqcup W_2 \mid W_i \in \mathcal{W}_i\} \dashrightarrow X$$

which is \mathcal{A} -local by multiplicativity and the Weiss cosheaf condition on each X_i :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{W}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{W}_2) &\simeq \mathrm{colim}_{W_1, W_2} \mathcal{A}(W_1 \sqcup W_2) \simeq \mathrm{colim}_{W_1} \mathcal{A}(W_1) \otimes \mathrm{colim}_{W_2} \mathcal{A}(W_2) \\ &= \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{W}_1) \otimes \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{W}_2) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathcal{A}(X_1) \otimes \mathcal{A}(X_2) \simeq \mathcal{A}(X). \end{aligned}$$

Of course not every Weiss presieve of X is of this form; a general Weiss presieve $\mathcal{W} \dashrightarrow X$ can always be factored as

$$\mathcal{W} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{W}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{W}_2 \dashrightarrow X,$$

where $\mathcal{W}_i := \{W \cap X_i \mid W \in \mathcal{W}\}$ for $i = 1, 2$. By the previous observation, we are thus reduced to the question whether the left inclusion is \mathcal{A} -local, i.e., whether the canonical map

$$\operatorname{colim}_{W \in \mathcal{W}} \mathcal{A}(W \cap X_1) \otimes \mathcal{A}(W \cap X_2) \longrightarrow \operatorname{colim}_{W, W' \in \mathcal{W}} \mathcal{A}(W \cap X_1) \otimes \mathcal{A}(W' \cap X_2)$$

induced by the diagonal $\mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{W} \times \mathcal{W}$ is an equivalence.

Note that in general the diagonal $\mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{W} \times \mathcal{W}$ is not cofinal since there might be $W', W'' \in \mathcal{W}$ for which there is no $W \in \mathcal{W}$ such that $W' \cup W'' \subseteq W$. For example, if $\mathcal{W} = \{X \setminus S \mid S \subset Y \text{ finite}\}$ and X is not finite.

We now start working towards the proof of Proposition 4.15. The main work consists in simplifying the (operadic) colimits which appear in the formula for the operadic left Kan extension along $\mathfrak{B} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{B}_{\cup}$. For $\bar{r} \in \mathfrak{B}_{\cup}^{\otimes}$, a priori this is given as a colimit over the category $\{\bar{b} \xrightarrow{\text{act}} \bar{r}\}$ of active maps into it; we will reduce to the poset $\{\bar{t} \xrightarrow{!} \bar{r}\}$ of cocartesian maps by a sequence of cofinality and Kan extension arguments.

We now introduce some notation that will be convenient to use, before embarking on the technical preliminary results we need.

Notation 4.21. Let \mathfrak{B} be a poset of opens with corresponding ∞ -operad \mathfrak{B}^{\otimes} , and let $\pi_+ : \mathfrak{B}^{\otimes} \rightarrow \operatorname{FIN}_*$ denote the forgetful functor down to finite pointed sets. For any object $\bar{b} \in \mathfrak{B}^{\otimes}$, let $\pi(\bar{b})$ denote the subset of $\pi_+(\bar{b})$ where the base point is discarded.

- Objects of \mathfrak{B}^{\otimes} will be abbreviated by only the finite tuple, i.e. $\bar{b} := (\pi(\bar{b})_+, (\bar{b}))$, where $\bar{b} = (b_i)_{i \in \pi(\bar{b})}$. A 1-tuple is simply $b := (1_+, (b))$.
- If an edge is cocartesian we label the arrow $\xrightarrow{!}$.
- If a morphism admits a factorization into an active morphism followed by a cocartesian morphism we label it by $\xrightarrow{!}$.

For many of the below arguments we need to understand the data of active and cocartesian maps in ∞ -operads of the form \mathfrak{B}^{\otimes} . It turns out to be convenient to think of active and cocartesian maps by the equivalence classes that they induce on the opens of the target.

Construction 4.22. Let \mathfrak{B} be a poset of opens. All objects and morphisms below are in \mathfrak{B}^{\otimes} .

- (1) An active map $\alpha : \bar{r} \rightarrow b$ defines an equivalence relation \sim_{α} on $\pi_0(b)$ as follows: Identify two connected components $b', b'' \in \pi_0(b)$ if $r_i \cap b' \neq \emptyset$ and $r_i \cap b'' \neq \emptyset$ for some $i \in \pi(\bar{r})$, and then transitively complete to get an actual equivalence relation. In equations,

$$\alpha : \bar{r} \rightarrow b \text{ active} \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \pi_0(b) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{J}_{\alpha} := \pi_0(b) / \sim_{\alpha}.$$

- (2) For cocartesian maps the above procedure automatically gives an equivalence relation of a particularly simple form. Explicitly,

$$\gamma : \bar{s} \xrightarrow{!} b \text{ cocartesian} \quad \longleftrightarrow \quad \pi_0(b) = \coprod_{i \in \pi(\bar{s})} \pi_0(s_i) \twoheadrightarrow \pi(\bar{s}) = \mathcal{J}_{\gamma}.$$

In words, the cocartesian map corresponds to a “partitioning” of the connected components of b into $\pi(\bar{s})$ parts.

Remark 4.23. Whenever we need to produce active maps into some fixed tuple \bar{b} we will always implicitly use the identification $\mathfrak{B}^{\otimes} /_{\bar{b}}^{\text{act}} \cong \prod_{i \in \pi(\bar{b})} \mathfrak{B}^{\otimes} /_{b_i}^{\text{act}}$. In words, it is sufficient to produce active maps into each object b_i , with $i \in \pi(\bar{b})$, of the tuple \bar{b} .

Example 4.24. We provide an example of Construction 4.22(1). Let

$$\bar{r} = (4_+, (r_1, r_{2,1} \cup r_{2,2}, r_{3,1} \cup r_{3,2}, r_{4,1} \cup r_{4,2}))$$

be the object whose opens are as illustrated in Figure 3 below. Similarly, $b = (1_+, (b_1 \cup b_2 \cup b_3 \cup b_4 \cup b_5))$ has connected components as depicted below. Let $\alpha: \bar{r} \rightarrow b$ be the unique active map $4_+ \rightarrow 1_+$, with corresponding inclusions. For example, r_2 maps into both the first and third connected component of b , which means b_1 and b_3 are in the same equivalence class. Also note that r_3 maps into the third and fourth connected component of b , hence b_3 and b_4 are also in the same equivalence class. Upon transitively completing, we get that α induces the three equivalence classes $[b_1] = [b_3] = [b_4]$, $[b_2]$ and $[b_5]$.




FIGURE 3. An example of an active map $\alpha: \bar{r} \rightarrow b$ giving rise to three equivalence classes on $\pi_0(b)$. The dashed lines connect the different connected components of the same r_i .

Just knowing the equivalence relation \sim_α on $\pi_0(b)$ does not suffice to recover an active map $\alpha: \bar{r} \rightarrow b$ because we only know which connected components should be equivalent, but not by which opens this should be realised.

The following Lemma shows that one can recover a cocartesian map $\gamma: \bar{s} \xrightarrow{!} b$ from its equivalence relation \sim_γ . Recall from Definition 2.49 that a poset of opens \mathfrak{B} is *decomposable* if for any open $b \cup b' \in \mathfrak{B}$ it follows that both $b \in \mathfrak{B}$ and $b' \in \mathfrak{B}$.

Lemma 4.25. *Let \mathfrak{B} be a poset of opens and $b \in \mathfrak{B}$. The assignment $\gamma \mapsto \sim_\gamma$ of Construction 4.22 yields a fully faithful embedding*

$$\left\{ \bar{s} \xrightarrow{!} b \right\} \hookrightarrow \left\{ \sim \text{ on } \pi_0(b) \mid |\pi_0(b)_{/\sim}| < \infty \right\}$$

of the category of cocartesian arrows in \mathfrak{B} over b (and cocartesian arrows between them) into the poset of equivalence relations on $\pi_0(b)$ with finitely many equivalence classes (and inclusions between them).

If the poset \mathfrak{B} is decomposable, then this embedding is an equivalence.

Proof. The inverse functor sends an equivalence relation \sim on $\pi_0(b)$ to the cocartesian arrow

$$\left(I_+, \left(\bigcup_{V \in I} V \right) \right) \rightarrow (1_+, b)$$

where $I := \pi_0(b)_{/\sim}$ is the finite set of equivalence classes of \sim . This is well defined on the full subposet of those equivalence relations \sim such that for each equivalence class $V \in \pi_0(b)_{/\sim}$ the disjoint unions $\bigcup V$ lies in \mathfrak{B} .

Note that this is always the case when \mathfrak{B} is decomposable: in general we have a decomposition $b = \bigsqcup V \sqcup b'$, where $b' = \bigsqcup_{W \neq V} W$ is the disjoint union of all components of b that do not lie in the equivalence class V . When \mathfrak{B} is decomposable it follows that $\bigsqcup V \in \mathfrak{B}$. \square

We now consider some different ways of capturing the data of an active-cocartesian factorization of an active map.

Lemma 4.26. *Let \mathfrak{R} be a poset of opens and fix an object $r \in \mathfrak{R}$. Let $\alpha: \bar{b} \rightarrow r$ and $\gamma: \bar{t} \xrightarrow{!} r$ be an active and a cocartesian maps into r , respectively. Then the following are equivalent pieces of data:*

- (1) an active map $\beta: \bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{t}$ such that the diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bar{b} & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & r \\ & \searrow \beta & \nearrow \gamma \\ & & \bar{t} \end{array}$$

- (2) a surjective map $\mathcal{J}_\alpha \twoheadrightarrow \pi(\bar{t})$ such that the diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathcal{J}_\alpha & \\ \nearrow & & \searrow \\ \pi_0(r) & \longrightarrow & \pi(\bar{t}) = \mathcal{J}_\gamma \end{array}$$

- (3) an inclusion $\sim_\alpha \subseteq \sim_\gamma$.

If any of these pieces of data exists then so do the others and each of them is unique.

Proof. Follows directly by unravelling the definitions. \square

We now construct a category that assembles all active-cocartesian factorizations of a fixed active map:

Construction 4.27. Let $\mathfrak{B} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{R}$ be an inclusion of posets of opens. Let $\bar{r} \in \mathfrak{R}^\otimes$ and fix an object $\alpha: \bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{r}$ in $\mathfrak{B}^\otimes /_{\bar{r}}^{\text{act}}$. We define the *category of factorizations of α* , denoted K_α , as follows:

- objects are factorizations $\bar{b} \xrightarrow{\beta} \bar{t} \xrightarrow{\gamma} \bar{r}$, where β is an active morphism in \mathfrak{B}^\otimes and γ is a cocartesian morphism in \mathfrak{R}^\otimes such that $\gamma \circ \beta = \alpha$.
- Let $\bar{b} \xrightarrow{\beta'} \bar{t}' \xrightarrow{\gamma'} \bar{r}$ be a second object. A morphism from (γ, β) to (γ', β') is a cocartesian morphism λ such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \bar{t} & & \\ & \nearrow \beta & \downarrow \lambda & \searrow \gamma & \\ \bar{b} & & & & \bar{r} \\ & \searrow \beta' & \downarrow \lambda & \nearrow \gamma' & \\ & & \bar{t}' & & \end{array} \quad (4.10)$$

commutes.

Lemma 4.28. *If $r = \bar{r}$ lies over 1_+ then the category K_α embeds fully faithfully into the poset of equivalence relations \sim on $\pi_0(r)$ (under inclusion) such that*

- (1) there are finitely many equivalence classes,
- (2) for each equivalence class V , the open set $\bigsqcup V$ lies in \mathfrak{B} ,
- (3) and $\sim_\alpha \subseteq \sim$.

If the poset of opens \mathfrak{B} is decomposable, then this embedding is an equivalence.

Proof. Since for a given $\gamma: \bar{t} \rightarrow r$ there is at most one $\beta: \bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{t}$ with $(\gamma, \beta) \in K_\alpha$, we have that K_α includes as a subposet into the poset of cocartesian arrows over r . It is actually a full subposet since in the diagram (4.10) the left triangle automatically commutes because there is at most one active map $\beta'': \bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{t}'$ with $\gamma' \circ \beta'' = \alpha$.

Thus K_α is equivalent to the essential image of this embedding which consists of those cocartesian arrows $\gamma: \bar{t} \xrightarrow{!} r$ where \bar{t} lies in \mathfrak{B}^\otimes and where α factors through γ . Under the embedding of Lemma 4.25, these correspond precisely to the equivalence relations which in addition to having finitely many equivalence classes satisfy the conditions 2 and 3. \square

Lemma 4.29. *The category K_α , as defined in Construction 4.27, is either empty or weakly contractible when the poset of opens \mathfrak{B} is decomposable or a presieve.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume that $\bar{r} = r$. We use the description of Lemma 4.28 and show that K_α is codirected as long as it is not empty. Indeed for two equivalence relations \sim and \sim' on $\pi_0(r)$ satisfying conditions 1–3, the same is true for the equivalence relation $\sim \cap \sim'$. This is clear for 1 and 3. For 2 we use that \mathfrak{B} is either closed under intersections (i.e. a presieve) or decomposable. \square

Remark 4.30. While conditions 1 and 3 are closed upward, condition 2 is closed downward, so it can happen that there are no equivalence relations satisfying all three conditions at the same time.

Corollary 4.31. *Let $\mathfrak{B} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ be an inclusion of posets of opens, where \mathfrak{B} is decomposable. Fix some object $\bar{r} \in \mathfrak{A}^\otimes$. Then the subcategory of cocartesian maps from \mathfrak{B}^\otimes into \bar{r} , i.e.*

$$\left\{ \bar{t} \xrightarrow{!} \bar{r} \right\} \subset \mathfrak{B}^\otimes /_{\bar{r}}^{\text{act}},$$

is either empty or weakly contractible.

Proof. Note that each object of \mathfrak{B} admits a unique nullary operation, so that the empty tuple is an initial object of \mathfrak{B}^\otimes . Hence we obtain the claim as the special case of Lemma 4.29 by setting \bar{b} to be the empty tuple. \square

Construction 4.32. Let $\mathfrak{B} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ be an inclusion of posets of opens. Fix an object $\bar{r} \in \mathfrak{A}$. Let $\mathcal{I} := \{ \bar{b} \xrightarrow{!} \bar{r} \}$ denote the subcategory of $\mathfrak{B}^\otimes /_{\bar{r}}^{\text{act}}$ where the active map admits at least one factorization into an active morphism followed by a cocartesian morphism. We define a functor

$$F: \mathcal{I}^{\text{op}} \longrightarrow \text{CAT}$$

as follows:

- Objects α are sent to the category K_α of factorizations by an active and cocartesian morphism, as defined in Construction 4.27.
- Let $\alpha: \bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{r}$ and $\alpha': \bar{b}' \rightarrow \bar{r}$ be two objects of \mathcal{I} , and $\mu: \bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{b}'$ a morphism between these two objects, i.e. such that $\alpha = \alpha' \circ \mu$. The functor F sends the morphism μ to the functor $\mu^*: K_{\alpha'} \rightarrow K_\alpha$ defined by precomposing with μ . Explicitly, on objects μ^* is defined by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bar{b}' & \xrightarrow{\alpha'} & \bar{r} \\ & \searrow \beta' & \nearrow \gamma' \\ & \bar{t}' & \end{array} \quad \longmapsto \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \bar{b} & \xrightarrow{\alpha' \circ \mu} & \bar{r} \\ & \searrow \beta' \circ \mu & \nearrow \gamma' \\ & \bar{t}' & \end{array},$$

and analogously on morphisms.

Unstraightening the functor F gives the cartesian fibration

$$\left\{ \bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{t} \xrightarrow{!} \bar{r} \right\} \xrightarrow{g} \left\{ \bar{b} \xrightarrow{!} \bar{r} \right\}.$$

All objects of \mathcal{I} admits at least one factorization by construction, so from Lemma 4.29 we know that all the fibers of g are weakly contractible. Thus, the functor g is colimit cofinal because it is a cartesian fibration with weakly contractible fibers.

Corollary 4.33. *Let $\mathfrak{B} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{R}$ be an inclusion of posets of opens, where \mathfrak{B} is decomposable. Let $\bar{r} \in \mathfrak{R}^\otimes$ and fix an active morphism $\alpha: \bar{s} \rightarrow \bar{r}$ in $\mathfrak{B}^\otimes_{/\bar{r}}$. The functor*

$$E' := \left\{ \begin{array}{ccc} \bar{b} & \longrightarrow & \bar{s} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \alpha \\ \bar{t} & \xrightarrow{!} & \bar{r} \end{array} \right\} \xrightarrow{f} \left\{ \begin{array}{ccc} \bar{b} & \longrightarrow & \bar{s} \\ \searrow \varphi & & \swarrow \alpha \\ & \bar{r} & \end{array} \right\} =: \mathcal{I}_{/\alpha},$$

where $\bar{b} \in \mathfrak{B}^\otimes$, is a cartesian fibration with weakly contractible fibers. In particular, the functor f is colimit cofinal.

Proof. Observe that the category E' is the pullback of the functor g from Construction 4.32 along the forgetful functor $\mathcal{I}_{/\alpha} \rightarrow \mathcal{I}$, and recall that the pullback of a cartesian fibration is again a cartesian fibration. Since the fibers of g are weakly contractible, it follows that the fibers of f are also weakly contractible, and hence the functor f is also colimit cofinal. \square

Note that one important consequence of decomposability is that for any object $\bar{s} \in \mathfrak{B}^\otimes$ the ∞ -operad \mathfrak{B}^\otimes contains all cocartesian maps of the form $\bar{k} \xrightarrow{!} \bar{s}$.

Lemma 4.34. *Let $\mathfrak{B} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{B}_\sqcup$ be the inclusion of a decomposable poset of opens into its disjoint union completion. Fix some object $\bar{r} \in \mathfrak{B}_\sqcup^\otimes$, and fix an active morphism $\alpha: \bar{s} \rightarrow \bar{r}$ in $\mathfrak{B}_\sqcup^\otimes_{/\bar{r}}$. For each cocartesian arrow $\bar{t} \xrightarrow{!} \bar{r}$ with $\bar{t} \in \mathfrak{B}^\otimes$ the pullback*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bar{t} \times_{\bar{r}} \bar{s} & \xrightarrow{!} & \bar{s} \\ \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\ \bar{t} & \xrightarrow{!} & \bar{r} \end{array}$$

in $\mathfrak{B}_\sqcup^\otimes$ exists and the top structure map is cocartesian as indicated. Moreover the object $\bar{t} \times_{\bar{r}} \bar{s}$ again lies in \mathfrak{B}^\otimes

These pullbacks assemble to yield a right adjoint R to the projection functor

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{B}^\otimes \ni \bar{b} & \longrightarrow & \bar{s} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \alpha \\ \bar{t} & \xrightarrow{!} & \bar{r} \end{array} \right\} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{proj}} \\ \xleftarrow{R} \end{array} \left\{ \begin{array}{ccc} & & \bar{s} \\ & & \downarrow \alpha \\ \bar{t} & \xrightarrow{!} & \bar{r} \end{array} \right\}$$

Proof. We only have to show that the indicated pullbacks exist; the existence of the right adjoint R is then a formal consequence.

To construct the pullbacks, we start with the solid arrows on the left-hand side of (4.11) below. Using Construction 4.22 we translate this to the solid arrows on the right-hand side. Let $\bar{k} \rightarrow s$ be the cocartesian map corresponding to the epi-mono factorization of the composite map $\pi_0(s) \rightarrow \pi_0(\bar{t})$, i.e. $\pi_0(s) \twoheadrightarrow \pi_0(\bar{k}) \hookrightarrow \pi_0(\bar{t})$. This is well-defined because \mathfrak{B} is decomposable.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{array}{ccc} \bar{k} & \xrightarrow{!} & s \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \alpha \\ \bar{t} & \xrightarrow{!} & r \end{array} & \rightsquigarrow & \begin{array}{ccc} \pi_0(s) & \dashrightarrow & \pi_0(\bar{k}) \\ \downarrow \pi_0(\alpha) & & \downarrow \\ \pi_0(r) & \twoheadrightarrow & \pi_0(\bar{t}) \end{array} \end{array} \quad (4.11)$$

We now want to show that \bar{k} as defined above indeed is a pullback. Let \bar{b} together with the maps on the left-hand side of (4.12) below be an arbitrary object of the target category of R . By Construction 4.22 and Lemma 4.26 this translates to the commuting diagram on the right-hand side below.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \bar{b} & \xrightarrow{\beta} & s \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \alpha \\
 \bar{t} & \xrightarrow{!} & r
 \end{array}
 \rightsquigarrow
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 & & \mathcal{J}_\beta \\
 & \nearrow & \downarrow \\
 \pi_0(s) & & \mathcal{J}_{\alpha\circ\beta} \\
 \downarrow \pi_0(\alpha) & & \searrow \\
 \pi_0(r) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \pi(\bar{t})
 \end{array}
 \quad (4.12)$$

To say that \bar{k} is a pullback we need to produce a (necessarily unique) active map δ as indicated by the dashed arrow in (4.13) below, or equivalently a surjective map $\mathcal{J}_\beta \rightarrow \pi(\bar{k})$. By the definition of \bar{k} (using the epi-mono factorization of $\pi_0(s) \rightarrow \pi(\bar{t})$), we get a dashed surjective map $\mathcal{J}_\beta \rightarrow \pi(\bar{k})$ making the right-hand side diagram below commute, which ensures the existence of δ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \bar{b} & \xrightarrow{\beta} & s \\
 \downarrow & \dashrightarrow \delta & \downarrow \alpha \\
 \bar{t} & \xrightarrow{!} & r
 \end{array}
 \rightsquigarrow
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 & & \mathcal{J}_\beta \\
 & \nearrow & \dashrightarrow \pi(\bar{k}) \\
 \pi_0(s) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \pi(\bar{k}) \\
 \downarrow \pi_0(\alpha) & & \downarrow \\
 \pi_0(r) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \pi(\bar{t})
 \end{array}
 \quad (4.13)$$

This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 4.35. *Let $\mathfrak{B} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{B}_\cup$ be the inclusion of a decomposable poset of opens into its disjoint union completion. Fix some object $\bar{r} \in \mathfrak{B}_\cup^\otimes$, and let $\mathcal{A} \in \text{ALG}_{\mathfrak{B}_\cup}$ be an algebra such that \mathcal{A} is multiplicative when restricted to \mathfrak{B}^\otimes . The commutative diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{I} := \{\bar{b} \xrightarrow{?} \bar{r}\} & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{B}_{\text{act}}^\otimes \xrightarrow{\mathcal{A}_{\text{act}}} \mathcal{C}_{\text{act}}^\otimes \\
 \downarrow & \nearrow & \downarrow \\
 \mathcal{J} := \{\bar{b} \xrightarrow{\text{act}} \bar{r}\} & \longrightarrow & \text{FIN}_*
 \end{array}$$

exhibits the diagonal composite $\mathcal{A}|_{\mathcal{J}}$ as an operadic left Kan extension of its restriction to \mathcal{I} .

Proof. Fix some arbitrary object $\bar{s} \xrightarrow{\alpha} \bar{r} \in \mathcal{J}$. We need to show that

$$\text{ocolim}_{\bar{b} \in \mathcal{I}/\alpha} \mathcal{A}(\bar{b}) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathcal{A}(\bar{s}).$$

We first simplify the operadic colimit. Consider the functors

$$\mathcal{D} := \left\{ \begin{array}{ccc} & & \bar{s} \\ & & \downarrow \alpha \\ \bar{b} & \longrightarrow & \bar{r} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \bar{t} & \xrightarrow{!} & \bar{r} \end{array} \right\} \xrightarrow{R} \left\{ \begin{array}{ccc} \bar{b} & \longrightarrow & \bar{s} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \alpha \\ \bar{t} & \xrightarrow{!} & \bar{r} \end{array} \right\} \xrightarrow{f} \left\{ \begin{array}{ccc} \bar{b} & \longrightarrow & \bar{s} \\ \downarrow & \searrow & \swarrow \alpha \\ & \bar{r} & \end{array} \right\} = \mathcal{I}/\alpha.$$

By Corollary 4.33 the rightmost functor f is colimit cofinal. The leftmost functor R is a right adjoint by Lemma 4.34, so in particular it is also colimit cofinal. Since the

composition of colimit cofinal functors is again colimit cofinal we have

$$\operatorname{ocolim}_{\bar{t} \in \mathcal{D}} (\mathcal{A} \circ f \circ R)(\bar{t}) = \operatorname{ocolim}_{\bar{t} \in \mathcal{D}} \mathcal{A}(\bar{t} \times_{\bar{r}} \bar{s}) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \operatorname{ocolim}_{\bar{b} \in \mathcal{I}/\alpha} \mathcal{A}(\bar{b}). \quad (4.14)$$

Observe that the category \mathcal{D} is non-empty because $\bar{r} \in \mathfrak{B}_{\cup}^{\otimes}$. Since α is fixed, \mathcal{D} is weakly contractible by Corollary 4.31. Additionally, all the morphisms of the diagram \mathcal{D} are cocartesian morphisms in \mathfrak{B}^{\otimes} , so, by assumption, \mathcal{A} sends them to cocartesian morphisms of $\mathcal{C}_{\text{act}}^{\otimes}$. This puts us in the situation of Lemma B.7, which says that the operadic colimit exists and all the structure maps are cocartesian. Hence, for any fixed object $\bar{t}_0 \xrightarrow{!} \bar{r} \in \mathcal{D}$ we have

$$\operatorname{ocolim}_{\mathcal{I}/\alpha} \mathcal{A} \stackrel{(4.14)}{\simeq} \operatorname{ocolim}_{\bar{t} \in \mathcal{D}} \mathcal{A}(\bar{t} \times_{\bar{r}} \bar{s}) \stackrel{B.7}{\simeq} \bigotimes \mathcal{A}(\bar{t}_0 \times_{\bar{r}} \bar{s}) \simeq \mathcal{A}(\bar{s}),$$

where the last equivalence follows from \mathcal{A} being multiplicative on \mathfrak{B}^{\otimes} since the (fixed) pullback comes with a cocartesian map into \bar{s} , i.e. $\bar{t}_0 \times_{\bar{r}} \bar{s} \xrightarrow{!} \bar{s}$. \square

Before we are ready to prove the main result of this subsection, we have one final preliminary lemma.

Lemma 4.36. *Let $\mathfrak{B} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{B}_{\cup}$ be the inclusion of a decomposable poset of opens into its disjoint union completion, and let $\mathcal{A} \in \text{ALG}_{\mathfrak{B}_{\cup}}$ be an algebra such that \mathcal{A} is multiplicative when restricted to \mathfrak{B}^{\otimes} . The algebra \mathcal{A} is multiplicative on $\mathfrak{B}_{\cup}^{\otimes}$ if and only if \mathcal{A} sends cocartesian morphisms $\bar{t} \xrightarrow{!} \bar{r}$, where $\bar{t} \in \mathfrak{B}^{\otimes}$ and $\bar{r} \in \mathfrak{B}_{\cup}^{\otimes}$, to cocartesian morphisms in the target category \mathcal{C}^{\otimes} .*

Proof. The forward implication is clear. For the converse, let $\bar{k} \xrightarrow{!} \bar{r}$ be any cocartesian morphism in $\mathfrak{B}_{\cup}^{\otimes}$. Since \mathfrak{B}_{\cup} is the disjoint union completion of \mathfrak{B} , and \mathfrak{B} is decomposable, there exists some $\bar{t}_0 \in \mathfrak{B}^{\otimes}$ such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \bar{k} & \\ \begin{array}{c} \nearrow \\ ! \\ \lambda \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \searrow \\ ! \\ \gamma \end{array} \\ \bar{t}_0 & \xrightarrow[\lambda']{!} & \bar{r} \end{array}$$

commutes. If \mathcal{A} sends λ and λ' to cocartesian morphisms in \mathcal{C}^{\otimes} , it follows that $\mathcal{A}(\gamma)$ is also cocartesian by the 2-out-of-3 property that holds for cocartesian morphisms. Hence, \mathcal{A} is multiplicative on all of $\mathfrak{B}_{\cup}^{\otimes}$, and we are done. \square

We are finally ready to prove the main result of this subsection.

Proof of Proposition 4.15. It is clear that restricting a multiplicative algebra on $\mathfrak{B}_{\cup}^{\otimes}$ gives a multiplicative algebra on \mathfrak{B}^{\otimes} . Conversely, since we are operadic left Kan extending along a fully faithful map, we know that there is an equivalence between $\text{ALG}_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\text{m}}$ and the essential image of $\iota_!$. Thus, we need to compare the essential image to $\text{ALG}_{\mathfrak{B}_{\cup}}^{\text{m}}$. Explicitly, given $\mathcal{A} \in \text{ALG}_{\mathfrak{B}_{\cup}}$ such that $\mathcal{A}|_{\mathfrak{B}}$ is multiplicative we need to show that

$$\mathcal{A} \simeq \iota_! \mathcal{A}|_{\mathfrak{B}} \iff \mathcal{A} \in \text{ALG}_{\mathfrak{B}_{\cup}}^{\text{m}}. \quad (4.15)$$

Before addressing the above implications, let us once again simplify the colimit of the operadic left Kan extension. Fix some arbitrary object $\bar{r} \in \mathfrak{B}_{\cup}^{\otimes}$, and consider the diagram

$$\left\{ \bar{t} \xrightarrow{!} \bar{r} \right\} \xrightarrow[R]{L} \left\{ \bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{t} \xrightarrow{!} \bar{r} \right\} \xrightarrow{g} \left\{ \bar{b} \xrightarrow{?} \bar{r} \right\} \longleftarrow \left\{ \bar{b} \xrightarrow{\text{act}} \bar{r} \right\}, \quad (4.16)$$

where we note that $\iota_! \mathcal{A}(\bar{r})$ is computed by the operadic colimit over the rightmost category. By Lemma 4.35, \mathcal{A} restricted to the rightmost category $\{\bar{b} \xrightarrow{\text{act}} \bar{r}\}$ is an operadic left Kan extension of \mathcal{A} restricted to $\{\bar{b} \xrightarrow{!} \bar{r}\}$. The middle functor g is colimit cofinal by Construction 4.32. The functors L and R in (4.16) are defined as follows on objects:

$$L(\bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{t} \xrightarrow{!} \bar{r}) = \bar{t} \xrightarrow{!} \bar{r}, \quad R(\bar{t} \xrightarrow{!} \bar{r}) = \bar{t} \xrightarrow{\text{id}} \bar{t} \xrightarrow{!} \bar{r},$$

and analogously on morphisms. This defines an adjunction where R is a right adjoint, hence it is in particular colimit cofinal.

Note that the leftmost category in (4.16) is non-empty because $r \in \mathfrak{B}_{\mathfrak{U}}^{\otimes}$, and hence it is weakly contractible by Corollary 4.31. Moreover, every morphism of this category is carried to a cocartesian morphism in the target category because $\mathcal{A}_{|\mathfrak{B}}$ is multiplicative. Hence, we are in the situation of Lemma B.7, which tells us that for any fixed object $\bar{t}_0 \in \{\bar{t} \xrightarrow{!} \bar{r}\}$ the structure map into the corresponding operadic colimit is cocartesian. In summary, for any fixed cocartesian morphism $\bar{t}_0 \xrightarrow{!} \bar{r}$ we have

$$\iota_! \mathcal{A}_{|\mathfrak{B}}(\bar{r}) = \text{ocolim}_{\{\bar{b} \xrightarrow{\text{act}} \bar{r}\}} \mathcal{A}_{|\mathfrak{B}}(\bar{b}) \simeq \text{ocolim}_{\{\bar{t} \xrightarrow{!} \bar{r}\}} \mathcal{A}_{|\mathfrak{B}}(\bar{t}) \simeq \bigotimes \mathcal{A}(\bar{t}_0). \quad (4.17)$$

Recall from Lemma 4.36 that \mathcal{A} is multiplicative on $\mathfrak{B}_{\mathfrak{U}}^{\otimes}$ if and only if it is multiplicative on the objects of the category $\{\bar{t} \xrightarrow{!} \bar{r}\}$. Thus the forward implication of (4.15) follows from the left-hand side operadic colimit of (4.17) by assumption being equivalent to $\mathcal{A}(\bar{r})$. Conversely, assuming that \mathcal{A} is multiplicative we know that $\bigotimes \mathcal{A}(\bar{t}_0) \simeq \mathcal{A}(\bar{r})$, which, by reading (4.17) backwards, gives that $\mathcal{A} \simeq \iota_! \mathcal{A}_{|\mathfrak{B}}$. \square

5. CONSTRUCTIBILITY TOOLS

In this section we collect various tools to deal specifically with *constructible* factorization algebras; tools which are not available or meaningful in the general situation.

Some versions of these tools were already present in the literature, mainly in [Gin15], [AF20] and [AFT17a]. Unfortunately the available proofs are either not general enough or not detailed enough for our purposes, thus requiring us to expand them and record our own versions. As an added benefit, it makes this paper mostly self-contained and better suited as a reference document.

We also extract some of the abstract and reusable intermediate results that were previously left implicit; hopefully, this make future generalizations and variations less laborious. Since these results are of very general category-theoretic nature, we collect them in Appendix A for ease of navigation and reference.

5.1. Constructibility is local. In this section we prove that constructibility of a factorization algebra can be checked locally. This is claimed as [Gin15, Proposition 24], albeit without proof. The idea of this proof is adapted from [Gin15, Proposition 13], but allows for general targets, streamlines the argument, and works in the stratified setting.

Definition 5.1. Let \mathcal{A} be a factorization algebra on X . We say that \mathcal{A} is *locally constructible* if there is an open cover \mathcal{U} of X such that for each $U \in \mathcal{U}$, the restriction $\mathcal{A}|_U$ is a constructible factorization algebra on U .

Theorem 5.2 (Constructibility is local). *Let M be a conical manifold with enough good disks and \mathcal{A} a factorization algebra on M . Then \mathcal{A} is constructible if and only if it is locally constructible.*

Corollary 5.3. *Every locally locally constant¹⁰ factorization algebra on a smooth manifold is locally constant.*

We collect some intermediate lemmas before we prove Theorem 5.2.

Lemma 5.4. *Let X be a conical manifold with enough good disks and \mathcal{A} a constructible factorization algebra on $\mathbb{R}^n \times X$. Then the pushforward $p_*\mathcal{A}$ along the projection $p: \mathbb{R}^n \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ of \mathcal{A} is constructible, that is, for each inclusion $U \subseteq V$ of disks in \mathbb{R}^n the inclusion $U \times X \hookrightarrow V \times X$ is \mathcal{A} -local.*

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{B} \subset \text{Disks}(X)$ be a factorizing basis of X . Then for each $W \in \mathfrak{B}$ we have an inclusion $U \times W \hookrightarrow V \times W$ of abstractly isomorphic conical disks, which is hence \mathcal{A} -local. This yields the top horizontal equivalence in the following commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \operatorname{colim}_{W \in \mathfrak{B}} \mathcal{A}(U \times W) & \xrightarrow{\simeq} & \operatorname{colim}_{W \in \mathfrak{B}} \mathcal{A}(V \times W) \\ \downarrow \simeq & & \downarrow \simeq \\ \mathcal{A}(U \times X) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{A}(V \times X) \end{array}$$

Moreover, the vertical maps are also equivalences since they are induced by the Weiss presieves

$$\{U \times W \mid W \in \mathfrak{B}\} \dashrightarrow U \times X \quad \text{and} \quad \{V \times W \mid W \in \mathfrak{B}\} \dashrightarrow V \times X.$$

Thus we conclude that the lower map is an equivalence, as desired. \square

¹⁰Usually in topology, “locally P” means “P for every sufficiently fine open cover”. However it does not really make sense to talk about “constant” factorization algebras, unless one means the trivial one sending everything to the monoidal unit of \mathcal{C} . Therefore one might argue that the established terminology “locally constant” is a bit of a misnomer since it does not mean “constant on any sufficiently small open set”. Corollary 5.3 shows that at least being “locally constant” is a local property, as the name suggests.




FIGURE 4. The key construction in the proof of Lemma 5.5. The whole disk is the cone (where we omit the \mathbb{R}^0 -component) on the circle $X = \mathbf{S}^1$ with three points, see Example 3.20. The whole red region is one of the sectors $S_{(t-\epsilon, t+\epsilon)}(U, \mathbb{R}^0)$ with U being an interval on the circle. The darker inner red region is the smaller sector $S_{(t-\epsilon, t)}(U, \mathbb{R}^0)$ yielding the inclusion (5.1).

Lemma 5.5. *Fix a compact conical manifold X with enough good disks, a natural number $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and a factorization algebra \mathcal{A} on the stratified space $\mathbf{D}_\infty := \mathbf{C}X \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Assume that \mathcal{A} is locally constructible away from the cone point (i.e., locally constructible on $\mathbf{D}_\infty \setminus \{0\}$). Then for every $0 < t \leq \infty$, the inclusion*

$$\mathbf{D}_t := \mathbf{C}_t X \times \mathbf{B}_t(0) \hookrightarrow \mathbf{C}X \times \mathbb{R}^n = \mathbf{D}(X, n) =: \mathbf{D}_\infty$$

is \mathcal{A} -local.

Proof. We wish to apply Lemma C.1 to the diagram $F: (0, \infty] \xrightarrow{\mathbf{D}_-} \text{Open}(\mathbf{D}_\infty) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{C}$, which will immediately yield the desired result if we can establish its assumptions. Since \mathcal{A} is a Weiss cosheaf, assumption 2 follows directly from the fact that for all subsets $S \subseteq (0, \infty]$, the presieve $\{\mathbf{D}_s \mid s \in S\}$ is a Weiss cover of $\mathbf{D}_{\sup S}$.

The rest of the proof is devoted to proving assumption 1. Fix $0 < t \leq \infty$. We have to find an $\epsilon > 0$ such that the inclusion $\mathbf{D}_t \hookrightarrow \mathbf{D}_{t+\epsilon}$ is \mathcal{A} -local. Using the identification of Remark 3.21, we introduce the following notation: Let $I \subseteq [0, \infty)$ be an interval and $U \subseteq X$ and $V \subseteq \mathbf{S}^{n-1}$ open subsets. We write $S_I(U, V) \subseteq \mathbf{D}_\infty$ for the image of

$$I \times U \times I \times V \subseteq [0, \infty) \times X \times [0, \infty) \times \mathbf{S}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}X \times \mathbf{C}\mathbf{S}^{n-1} \cong \mathbf{D}_\infty;$$

see Figure 4 for an example illustration. Note that the projection $I^2 \times U \times V \rightarrow S_I(U, V)$ is an isomorphism as long as $0 \notin I$.

Since \mathcal{A} is locally constructible away from the cone point and X and \mathbf{S}^{n-1} are compact, we can find finite open covers \mathcal{U} of X and \mathcal{V} of \mathbf{S}^{n-1} as well as an $\frac{t}{2} > \epsilon > 0$ such that \mathcal{A} is constructible on each $S_{(t-\epsilon, t+\epsilon)}(U, V)$ with $U \in \mathcal{U}_\downarrow$ and $V \in \mathcal{V}_\downarrow$.

Consider the cover

$$\mathcal{W}' := \text{Open}(\mathbf{D}_t) \cup \{S_{(t-\epsilon, t+\epsilon)}(U, V) \mid U \in \mathcal{U}_\downarrow, V \in \mathcal{V}_\downarrow\}$$

of $\mathbf{D}_{t+\epsilon}$. Observe that \mathcal{W}' is closed under intersections since for all $O \in \text{Open}(\mathbf{D}_t)$ and $U, U' \in \mathcal{U}_\downarrow$ and $V, V' \in \mathcal{V}_\downarrow$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} O \cap S_{(t-\epsilon, t+\epsilon)}(U, V) &\in \text{Open}(\mathbf{D}_t) \\ S_{(t-\epsilon, t+\epsilon)}(U, V) \cap S_{(t-\epsilon, t+\epsilon)}(U', V') &= S_{(t-\epsilon, t+\epsilon)}(U \cap U', V \cap V'). \end{aligned}$$

Write $\mathcal{W} := \mathcal{W}'_{\sqcup}$ for the cover obtained from \mathcal{W}' by closing under finite disjoint unions; it is again a presieve because \cap distributes over \sqcup . Note that for each $W' \in \mathcal{W}'$, the inclusion $W' \cap \mathbf{D}_t \hookrightarrow W'$ is \mathcal{A} -local: this is trivial in the case $W' \in \text{Open}(\mathbf{D}_t)$; in the case $W' = S_{(t-\epsilon, t+\epsilon)}(U, V)$ we can identify this inclusion with

$$W' \cap \mathbf{D}_t \cong (t - \epsilon, t)^2 \times U \times V \hookrightarrow (t - \epsilon, t + \epsilon)^2 \times U \times V \cong W' \quad (5.1)$$

which is \mathcal{A} -local by Lemma 5.4 because \mathcal{A} is constructible on W' by the choice of \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} . Since \mathcal{A} is multiplicative, the same is also true for each $W \in \mathcal{W}$.

It follows that in the following commutative square of refinements

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{W} \wedge \{\mathbf{D}_t\} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{W} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbf{D}_t & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{D}_{t+\epsilon} \end{array}$$

the top horizontal map is \mathcal{A} -local by Lemma 2.27. Furthermore, observe that the two vertical maps are Weiss covers and recall that \mathcal{A} is a Weiss cosheaf; hence the two vertical maps are also \mathcal{A} -local. We conclude that the bottom horizontal map is \mathcal{A} -local, which is exactly what we set out to prove. \square

Lemma 5.6. *Let $U \subset V$ be an inclusion of conical disks such that U and V are (abstractly) isomorphic. Then there exists an isomorphism $\phi: V \cong \mathbf{D}(X, n)$ and inclusions*

$$\mathbf{D}_t \subset \phi(U) \subseteq \mathbf{D}(X, n).$$

for all sufficiently small $t > 0$.

Proof. Without loss of generality we may assume that $V = \mathbf{D}(X, n)$. Choose a point $u \in U_0$ in the minimal stratum U_0 of U . Note that $U_0 \subseteq V_0 = \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^n$, hence $u = (0, t)$ for some $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Hence with the isomorphism

$$\phi: V = \mathbf{D}(X, n) \xrightarrow[\cong]{\text{id}_{\mathbf{D}(X, n)} \times (x \mapsto x-t)} \mathbf{D}(X, n)$$

we have $0 \in \phi(U)$. Since $\phi(U) \subset \mathbf{D}(X, n)$ is open, we also have

$$0 \in \mathbf{D}_t \subset \phi(U)$$

for every sufficiently small $t > 0$. \square

We can now finally prove that constructibility is local.

Proof of Theorem 5.2. Every constructible factorization algebra is automatically locally constructible.

To prove the converse direction, assume that \mathcal{A} is locally constructible and let $U \subset V \subseteq X$ be an inclusion of opens, both isomorphic to the same standard conical disk $\mathbf{D}(X, n)$. We aim to show that the inclusion $U \hookrightarrow V$ is \mathcal{A} -local.

We produce the following diagram of inclusions and identifications

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} T & \hookrightarrow & W & \hookrightarrow & U & \hookrightarrow & V \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \cong & & \downarrow \cong & & \downarrow \cong \\ \cong & & \mathbf{D}_t & \hookrightarrow & U' & \hookrightarrow & \mathbf{D}(X, n) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \cong & & \downarrow \cong & & \\ \mathbf{D}_{t'} & \hookrightarrow & W' & \hookrightarrow & \mathbf{D}(X, n) & & \end{array}$$

by first applying Lemma 5.6 to $U \subseteq V$ (to obtain $W = \phi^{-1}(\mathbf{D}_t)$), and then again to $W \subseteq U$. Then the inclusions $W \hookrightarrow V$ and $T \hookrightarrow U$ are \mathcal{A} -local by Lemma 5.5 which explicitly means that $\mathcal{A}(W) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(U)$ has both a left and a right inverse, hence is an

equivalence. But then $\mathcal{A}(U) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(V)$ is also an equivalence as desired, since it is the retraction of an equivalence. \square

Let us also record the following consequence of Theorem 5.2 which says that constructibility is only a non-vacuous condition away from the 0-dimensional strata.

Corollary 5.7. *Let M be a conical manifold with enough good disks and let \mathcal{A} be a factorization algebra on M . Let S be the union of all 0-dimensional strata of M and assume that \mathcal{A} is constructible on $M \setminus S$. Then \mathcal{A} is constructible on all of M .*

Proof. By Theorem 5.2, it suffices to show that \mathcal{A} is locally constructible at each point $s \in S$. For each $s \in S$ choose a conical disk $\mathbf{D}(X, n) \cong O \subset M$ with s on its deepest stratum and $O \cap S = \{s\}$. Because S is discrete, such a conical disk exists and we have $n = 0$, so that $O \cong \mathbf{C}X$ is a pure cone and s its cone point. We claim that \mathcal{A} is constructible on O .

Let $U \hookrightarrow V$ be an inclusion of abstractly isomorphic conical disks in O . Since they are abstractly isomorphic, they either both contain the cone point s of O or none of them do. In the second case, they are both contained in $M \setminus S$, where \mathcal{A} is constructible. In the first case we may proceed as in the proof of Theorem 5.2: we invoke Lemma 5.6 and Lemma 5.5 (which only requires constructibility away from the cone point) twice to construct $T \hookrightarrow W \hookrightarrow U$ such that both $T \hookrightarrow U$ and $W \hookrightarrow V$ are \mathcal{A} -local and conclude that $U \hookrightarrow V$ is \mathcal{A} -local as well. \square

5.2. Localizing at isotopy equivalences. Let X be a smooth conical manifold. In [AFT17a] Ayala–Francis–Tanaka computed the localization of $\text{Disks}(X)$ with respect to all isotopy equivalences of disks. In this section we consider a slight generalization where we localize a sufficiently nice poset of opens $\mathfrak{B} \subset \text{Disks}(X)$ with respect to its subordinate isotopy equivalences and get the same result.

We first define what we mean by the subposet of isotopy equivalences.

Definition 5.8. Let $\mathfrak{B} \subset \text{Disks}(X)$ be a poset of open disks of X . Denote by $\mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{B}} \subset \mathfrak{B}$ the wide subposet of those inclusions $U \hookrightarrow V$ of opens in \mathfrak{B} which induce a bijection $\pi_0(U) \xrightarrow{\cong} \pi_0(V)$ and such that for each component V^j of V the conical disks $U^j = V^j \cap U$ and V^j are abstractly isomorphic.

By definition, a factorization algebra \mathcal{A} on \mathfrak{B} is constructible precisely if the underlying functor $\mathcal{A}: \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ sends all maps in $\mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{B}}$ to equivalences, i.e., if it factors through the localization $\mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}[\mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{B}}^{-1}]$.

As mentioned, when $\mathfrak{B} = \text{Disks}(X)$ this localization was computed in [AFT17a]: The result is the slice ∞ -category $\mathcal{D}\text{isks}/_X$, where $\mathcal{D}\text{isks} \subseteq \mathcal{M}\text{fld}$ is the full subcategory spanned by those smooth conical manifolds which are disjoint unions of conical disks.

We want to use this localization-result in the context of operadic left Kan extending from certain presieves later on, but since arbitrary disks are not closed under intersections we cannot use all of $\text{Disks}(X)$. However, a version of their proof can be made to work as long as we work with a poset of opens with sufficiently many disks; the authors thank Pelle Steffens for this observation.

Lemma 5.9 ([AFT17b], Theorem 4.3.1). *Let $U \hookrightarrow V$ be an inclusion of conical disks. The following are equivalent:*

- *the disks U and V are abstractly isomorphic;*
- *the disk U contains a point in the deepest stratum of V ;*
- *the inclusion $U \hookrightarrow V$ becomes an equivalence in $\mathcal{D}\text{isks}$.*

Lemma 5.9 implies that the canonical functor

$$\mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}\text{isks}/_X$$

sends all maps of $\mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{B}}$ to equivalences. We aim to show that this functor is an ∞ -categorical localization at these maps.

Theorem 5.10 (Variation of [AFT17a, Proposition 2.22]). *Let X be a smooth conical manifold and $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \text{Disks}(X)$ be a decomposable multiplicative disk-basis of X . Then the induced map*

$$\mathfrak{B}[\mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{B}}^{-1}] \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathcal{D}\text{isks}/X$$

is an equivalence of ∞ -categories.

Remark 5.11. As explained to us by David Ayala in private communication, the original proof of [AFT17a, Proposition 2.22] (which Theorem 5.10 generalizes) contains a major gap, which was only later closed using a result of Mazel-Gee [MG19]. Unfortunately, a revised version has yet to appear in print.

We learned about a version of the missing argument from Berry’s thesis [Ber21]; a version of this argument also appeared in [Cep22].

To make this argument more transparent and reusable for later variations on the common localization theme, we have abstracted it as a separate, purely category-theoretic statement, which we prove as Lemma A.2 in the appendix.

After the completion of this paper we were made aware of the independent and contemporaneous work by Arakawa, who in the unstratified setting also gave a complete proof of this localization result for $\mathfrak{B} = \text{Disks}(X)$ following the same outline and using the same localization lemma; see [Ara24, Theorem 2.24 and Proposition 2.27].

Before we turn to the proof of Theorem 5.10 we need some notation and preliminary results.

Notation 5.12.

- (1) Every object $U \in \mathcal{D}\text{isks}$ can be written as an (external) disjoint union

$$U = \coprod_{i \in I} k_i \times U_i$$

of pairwise non-isomorphic conical disks U_i , each appearing k_i times.

- (2) Similarly, we can decompose each $U \in \text{Disks}(X)$ as an internal disjoint union

$$U = \bigcup_{i \in I} \bigcup_{j=1}^{k_i} U_i^j,$$

where the $U_i^j \subset X$ are conical disks, two of which are abstractly isomorphic if and only if they have the same lower index “ i ”. An example of this is depicted in Figure 5.

- (3) In either case, we write $[U]$ for the isomorphism type of such a disjoint union of conical disks.
- (4) For each connected conical disk D we write $X_{[D]} \subset X$ for the subspace of those points whose local neighborhoods have type D . Each $X_{[D]}$ is an (unstratified) manifold that is locally closed in X and we have a decomposition $X = \bigcup_{[D]} X_{[D]}$ since local neighborhood types are unique by Lemma 5.9.
- (5) For a topological space Y , we write $\text{Conf}_k(Y)$ for the *unordered* configuration space of k points in Y .
- (6) Given an isomorphism type $[U]$, we write $\mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{B}}^{[U]} \subseteq \mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{B}}$ for the full poset consisting only of those disjoint unions of disks which are of that prescribed type.




FIGURE 5. With $X = \mathbb{R}^2$, an example of an object $U \in \text{Disks}(X)$ and its decomposition $U = U_1 \cup U_2^1 \cup U_2^2$ from Notation 5.12 (2). The space X decomposes into four different pieces $X_{[D]}$, where D ranges over the types indicated on the right.

Lemma 5.13 ([AFT17a], Lemma 2.21). *The underlying ∞ -groupoid of $\mathcal{D}\text{isks}/_X$ is canonically identified with the space*

$$(\mathcal{D}\text{isks}/_X) \simeq \coprod_{[U]} \prod_{i \in I} \text{Conf}_{k_i}(X_{[U_i]}), \quad (5.2)$$

where the coproduct ranges over the isomorphism classes of disjoint unions of conical disks.

Remark 5.14. From the proof of [AFT17a, Lemma 2.21] we can extract an explicit description of the equivalence (5.2): an embedding $(\phi: U = \coprod_i k_i \times U_i \hookrightarrow X)$ is sent to the tuple of configurations $(\phi(S_i))_i$, where each $S_i = \{x_1, \dots, x_{k_i}\}$ contains precisely one point $x_j \in (U_i)_{[U_i]}$ in the deepest stratum of each of the k_i copies of U_i ; this is well defined because the space of such S_i is contractible.

Lemma 5.15. *Let $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \text{Disks}(X)$ be a decomposable multiplicative basis of X . Fix an isomorphism type $[U] = [\coprod_{i \in I} k_i \times U_i]$. Then we have a canonical equivalence of ∞ -groupoids*

$$|\mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{B}}^{[U]}| \simeq \prod_{i \in I} \text{Conf}_{k_i}(X_{[U_i]}).$$

Proof. For each element $V = \bigcup_{i,j} V_i^j \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{B}}^{[U]}$ we have the open subset

$$\text{Conf}_=(V) := \left\{ (S_i \in \text{Conf}_{k_i}(X_{[V_i]}))_{i \in I} \mid \forall i \in I \forall 1 \leq j \leq k_i : \#(S_i \cap V_i^j) = 1 \right\} \subset \prod_{i \in I} \text{Conf}_{k_i}(X_{[U_i]})$$

consisting of those tuples of configurations $(S_i)_i$ of points where all points of S_i have local neighborhood type $[U_i]$ (in particular, the S_i are pairwise disjoint) and which induces a bijection $\pi_0(S_i) \xrightarrow{\cong} \pi_0(V_i)$. This assignment assembles into a functor

$$\text{Conf}_=(-): \mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{B}}^{[U]} \rightarrow \text{Open} \left(\prod_{i \in I} \text{Conf}_{k_i}(X_{[U_i]}) \right); \quad V \mapsto \text{Conf}_=(V).$$

We now want to apply Lurie's Seifert–Van Kampen theorem [Lur17, Theorem A.3.1] to $\text{Conf}_=(-)$. For each point $S = (S_i = \{s_i^1, \dots, s_i^{k_i}\})_i \in \prod_{i \in I} \text{Conf}_{k_i}(X_{[U_i]})$ we have to check that the full subposet

$$K_S := \{V \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{B}}^{[U]} \mid S \in \text{Conf}_=(V)\} \subseteq \mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{B}}^{[U]}$$

is weakly contractible.

Claim: The poset K_S is cofiltered.

- Let $W \subseteq X$ be an arbitrary open subset containing S . Since \mathfrak{B} is a basis for X we can find, for each $s_i^j \in S_i$, an $V_i^j \in \mathfrak{B}$ with $s_i^j \in V_i^j$. By possibly shrinking them further, we may assume that all the V_i^j are pairwise disjoint (because the sets S_i are pairwise disjoint and X is Hausdorff), and that each V_i^j is connected (because \mathfrak{B} is decomposable) and of type $[U_i]$ (because the local type around s_i^j is $[U_i]$ by definition). But this means precisely that $V := \bigcup_{i,j} V_i^j \subset W$ lies in K_S (because \mathfrak{B} is multiplicative, i.e. closed under disjoint unions) showing that this poset is non-empty.
- Given $V, V' \in K_S$ we can simply apply the previous argument to the open set $W := V \cap V'$ to get a $V'' \in K_S$ with $V'' \subset V'$ and $V'' \subset V$. Recall that $K_S \subset \mathfrak{B}$ is not a full subposet, hence it remains to show that these inclusions lie in K_S . By construction, the inclusions induce bijections $\bigcup_i \pi_0(S_i) \xrightarrow{\cong} \pi_0(V'') \xrightarrow{\cong} \pi_0(V')$ and for each i, j , the corresponding connected components V''^j_i and V'^j_i have a common point s_i^j in their deepest strata, which by Lemma 5.9 implies that they are abstractly isomorphic. Therefore the inclusion $V'' \subset V'$ lies in $\mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{B}}$, hence in K_S which is a full subposet thereof. The same argument applies to $V'' \subset V$.

Since cofiltered posets are weakly contractible, we can apply the Seifert–Van Kampen theorem and obtain the desired equivalence

$$\left| \mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{B}}^{[U]} \right| = \operatorname{colim}_{V \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{B}}^{[U]}} \{\star\} \xleftarrow{\cong} \operatorname{colim}_{V \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{B}}^{[U]}} \operatorname{Conf}_{=} (V) \xrightarrow{\cong} \prod_{i \in I} \operatorname{Conf}_{k_i} (X_{[U_i]}), \quad (5.3)$$

where on the left we use that each $\operatorname{Conf}_{=} (V)$ is homeomorphic to $\prod_{i,j} (V_i^j)_{[U_i]}$, hence contractible (because each V_i^j is a disk of type U_i , so that $(V_i^j)_{[U_i]}$ is just the lowest stratum of a cone, which is some \mathbb{R}^{n_i}). \square

Finally, we arrive at the proof of Theorem 5.10. The heavy category-theoretic lifting in this proof is done by Lemma A.2, which is a general criterion for detecting localizations of ∞ -categories.

Proof of Theorem 5.10. Lemma 5.9 tells us that $\mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{B}}$ is exactly the collection of those arrows in \mathfrak{B} which are sent to equivalences in $\mathcal{D}\text{isks}/_X$. Hence we only have to invoke Lemma A.2 for the functor $D := \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow E := \mathcal{D}\text{isks}/_X$ with $W := \mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{B}}$. We check its two assumptions:

- (1) We have to check that the induced map $|\mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{B}}| \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}\text{isks}/_X)^{\simeq}$ is an equivalence. Consider the commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{B}} & & \\ & \swarrow \text{---} & & \searrow & \\ \operatorname{colim}_{V \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{B}}} (\mathcal{D}\text{isks}/_V)_{\text{term}}^{\simeq} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \operatorname{colim}_{V \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{B}}} (\mathcal{D}\text{isks}/_V)^{\simeq} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & (\mathcal{D}\text{isks}/_X)^{\simeq} \\ \downarrow \simeq & & \downarrow \simeq & & \downarrow \simeq \\ \operatorname{colim}_{V \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{B}}} \operatorname{Conf}_{=} (V) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \operatorname{colim}_{V \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{B}}} \prod_{[U]} \prod_{i \in I} \operatorname{Conf}_{k_i} (V_{[U_i]}) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \prod_{[U]} \prod_{i \in I} \operatorname{Conf}_{k_i} (X_{[U_i]}) \\ & & \searrow \simeq & & \\ & & & & \end{array}$$

where

- $(\mathcal{D}\text{isks}/_V)_{\text{term}}$ is the full subcategory of the slice consisting only of those objects where the structure map $U \hookrightarrow V$ is an equivalence, i.e. the subgroupoid of terminal objects,

- the right diagonal map is given explicitly as $V \mapsto (V \hookrightarrow X)$, hence tautologically factors as the dashed diagonal map $V \mapsto (V, V \xrightarrow{\text{id}} V)$,
- the lower left horizontal map is given for each V by the inclusion $\text{Conf}_=(V) \hookrightarrow \prod_{i \in I} \text{Conf}_{k_i}(V)$ into the summand corresponding to the type $[U] = [V]$,
- the middle and right vertical equivalences are those of Lemma 5.13,
- the lower horizontal composite equivalence is that of Equation (5.3),
- the left vertical dashed map exists because if $U \hookrightarrow V$ is an equivalence then every choice of points S_i as in Remark 5.14 will yield a tuple of configurations that lies in $\text{Conf}_=(V)$,
- the dashed vertical map is an equivalence since both $(\mathcal{D}\text{isks}/V)_{\text{term}}$ and $\text{Conf}_=(V)$ are contractible.

Finally we observe that since every $(\mathcal{D}\text{isks}/V)_{\text{term}}^{\simeq}$ is contractible, we have that

$$|\mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{B}}| \simeq \text{colim}_{V \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{B}}} * \simeq \text{colim}_{V \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{B}}} (\mathcal{D}\text{isks}/V)_{\text{term}}^{\simeq} .$$

Hence, the dashed diagonal map presents the localization $\mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{B}} \rightarrow |\mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{B}}|$ to the classifying space. We conclude that the desired map $|\mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{B}}| \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}\text{isks}/X)_{\text{term}}^{\simeq}$ is presented as the upper horizontal composite, which we have shown is a composite of equivalences.

- (2) For each $U \in \mathfrak{B}$ we have to check that the map

$$|\mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{B}} \times_{\mathfrak{B}} (\mathfrak{B} \cap U_{\downarrow})| \rightarrow ((\mathcal{D}\text{isks}/X)_{/U \hookrightarrow X})^{\simeq}$$

is an equivalence. But this map is canonically equivalent to the map

$$|\mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{B} \cap U_{\downarrow}}| \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}\text{isks}/U)^{\simeq}$$

which is an equivalence by applying the previously proved part 1 to the decomposable multiplicative basis $\mathfrak{B} \cap U_{\downarrow}$ of the smooth conical manifold U . \square

We end this section with some easy consequences of the localization result.

Proposition 5.16. *Let \mathfrak{U} be a poset of opens and $\iota: \mathfrak{B} \subseteq \mathfrak{U}$ a decomposable multiplicative disk-basis. Let \mathcal{A} be a constructible multiplicative prefactorization algebra on \mathfrak{B} . Let $U = U_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup U_n$ be a disjoint union of connected disks. Since \mathfrak{B} is a decomposable multiplicative disk-basis of \mathfrak{U} we can choose $B = B_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup B_n \in \mathfrak{B}$, where each $B_i \subseteq U_i$ is an abstractly isomorphic subdisk. Then for any such choice, the inclusion $B \hookrightarrow U$ induces an equivalence*

$$\mathcal{A}(B) = \iota_! \mathcal{A}(B) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \iota_! \mathcal{A}(U).$$

Proof. By assumption, \mathfrak{B} is closed under disjoint unions subordinate to \mathfrak{U} , so that by Lemma B.3 we may simply work with the underlying copresheaf and its ordinary left Kan extension. Observe that $\mathfrak{B} \cap U_{\downarrow}$ is a decomposable multiplicative disk-basis of U , so that Theorem 5.10 yields that the functor

$$\mathfrak{B} \cap U_{\downarrow} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}\text{isks}/U$$

is a localization, hence in particular colimit cofinal. Since \mathcal{A} is multiplicative and constructible it factors through this localization, yielding the right equivalence in the composite

$$\mathcal{A}(B) \rightarrow \iota_! \mathcal{A}(U) = \text{colim}_{\mathfrak{B} \cap U_{\downarrow}} \mathcal{A}|_{\mathfrak{B} \cap U_{\downarrow}} \xrightarrow{\simeq} \text{colim}_{\mathcal{D}\text{isks}/U} \mathcal{A}|_{\mathcal{D}\text{isks}/U}. \quad (5.4)$$

By Lemma 5.9, the inclusion $B \hookrightarrow U$ becomes an equivalence in $\mathcal{D}\text{isks}$, hence a terminal object in $\mathcal{D}\text{isks}/U$; thus the composite map (5.4) is an equivalence, which concludes the proof. \square

Corollary 5.17. *Let \mathfrak{U} be a poset of opens and $\iota: \mathfrak{B} \subset \mathfrak{U}$ be a decomposable multiplicative disk-basis. Then the operadic left Kan extension $\iota_! \mathcal{A}$ of a constructible multiplicative prefactorization algebra \mathcal{A} on \mathfrak{B} is constructible on \mathfrak{U} .*

Proof. Consider an inclusion $U \hookrightarrow V$ of abstractly isomorphic conical disks. Then for any choice of $B \hookrightarrow U$ as in Proposition 5.16, both the lower horizontal and the left diagonal map are equivalences

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \iota_! \mathcal{A}(U) & \\ \nearrow \simeq & & \searrow \\ \mathcal{A}(B) & \xrightarrow{\simeq} & \iota_! \mathcal{A}(V) \end{array}$$

hence also the right diagonal one, as desired. \square

Corollary 5.18. *Let $\iota: \mathfrak{B} \subseteq \text{Disks}(X)$ be a decomposable multiplicative disk-basis. Then restriction along ι yields the equivalence*

$$\text{ALG}_{\text{Disks}(X)}^{\text{m,ctr}} \xrightarrow{\simeq} \text{ALG}_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\text{m,ctr}}$$

between multiplicative constructible prefactorization algebras on \mathfrak{B} and $\text{Disks}(X)$, respectively.

Proof. Starting from the usual operadic left Kan extension adjunction

$$\iota_!: \text{ALG}_{\mathfrak{B}} \rightleftarrows \text{ALG}_{\text{Disks}(X)} : \iota^*$$

with fully faithful left adjoint $\iota_!$, we only have to prove the following two things:

- Every multiplicative constructible prefactorization algebra \mathcal{A} on $\text{Disks}(X)$ is an operadic left Kan extension of its restriction to \mathfrak{B} . Indeed, for each $U \in \text{Disks}(X)$ we have a commutative diagram with B as in Proposition 5.16:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \iota_! \iota^* \mathcal{A}(U) & \\ \nearrow \simeq & & \searrow \\ \mathcal{A}(B) & & \mathcal{A}(U) \\ \simeq \uparrow & & \simeq \uparrow \\ \mathcal{A}(B_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{A}(B_n) & \xrightarrow{\simeq} & \mathcal{A}(U_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{A}(U_n) \end{array}$$

where the upper left diagonal map is an equivalence by Proposition 5.16, the lower horizontal map is an equivalence by constructibility, and the lower vertical maps are equivalences by multiplicativity.

- If \mathcal{A} is a constructible multiplicative prefactorization algebra on \mathfrak{B} , then $\iota_! \mathcal{A}$ is also multiplicative and constructible. Constructibility is precisely Corollary 5.17 for $\mathfrak{U} := \text{Disks}(X)$. To prove multiplicativity, let $U, U' \in \text{Disks}(X)$ be disjoint. We can choose corresponding B, B' as in Proposition 5.16 and obtain a commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{A}(B) \otimes \mathcal{A}(B') & \xrightarrow{\simeq} & \iota_! \mathcal{A}(U) \otimes \iota_! \mathcal{A}(U') \\ \simeq \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{A}(B \cup B') & \xrightarrow{\simeq} & \iota_! \mathcal{A}(U \cup U') \end{array}$$

where the two horizontal maps are equivalences by Proposition 5.16 (note that $B \cup B' \in \mathfrak{B}$ is a valid choice for $U \cup U' \in \text{Disks}(X)$) and the left vertical map is an equivalence by multiplicativity of \mathcal{A} . Thus the right vertical map is an equivalence as desired. \square

We also record the following variant of Theorem 5.10 regarding the *operads* of disks, as opposed to the mere categories.

Recall that the ∞ -category $\mathcal{M}\text{fld}$ has a symmetric monoidal structure \amalg , given by disjoint union of smooth conical manifolds. Since the unit \emptyset of this symmetric monoidal structure is an initial object, we then have an induced operad structure $(\mathcal{D}\text{isks}/_X)^\otimes$ on each slice $\mathcal{D}\text{isks}/_X$ which is pre-cocartesian in the sense of Definition A.7; see Example A.10. Note that despite the chosen symbol, \amalg is *not* the coproduct in $\mathcal{M}\text{fld}$, and the ∞ -operad $(\mathcal{D}\text{isks}/_X)^\otimes$ is not monoidal or even partially monoidal.

Proposition 5.19. *Let X be a smooth conical manifold and $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \text{Disks}(X)$ a decomposable multiplicative disk-basis of X . Then the operad map*

$$\mathfrak{B}^\otimes \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}\text{isks}/_X)^\otimes$$

is a localization at the arrows in $\mathcal{J}_\mathfrak{B}$ so that the restriction map

$$\text{ALG}_{\mathcal{D}\text{isks}/_X} \longrightarrow \text{ALG}_\mathfrak{B}$$

is fully faithful with essential image consisting of those algebras which send all operations in $\mathcal{J}_\mathfrak{B}$ to equivalences.

Proof. Since \mathfrak{B} is multiplicative, the operad \mathfrak{B}^\otimes is pre-cocartesian. The operad map $\mathfrak{B}^\otimes \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}\text{isks}/_X)^\otimes$ is pre-cocartesian since the composite $\mathfrak{B}^\otimes \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}\text{isks}/_X)^\otimes \rightarrow \mathcal{D}\text{isks}$ is a map of (partial) symmetric monoidal ∞ -categories, i.e., sends \cup to \amalg .

Hence we can apply Lemma A.11 with $W = \mathcal{J}_\mathfrak{B}$ by checking its conditions:

- 1 We already verified the localization conditions on the underlying categories in Theorem 5.10.
- 2 Given an inclusion $D_1 \cup \dots \cup D_n = O \hookrightarrow O'$ in $\mathcal{J}_\mathfrak{B}$, we obtain the unique factorization (A.9) by letting each

$$D_i \hookrightarrow D'_i := \bigcup \{V \in \pi_0(O') \mid V \cap D_i \neq \emptyset\} \hookrightarrow O'$$

be the union of those connected components of O' which are hit by D_i .

- 3 Both sides of (A.10) are just the set of equivalence relations on the finite set $\pi_0(O) = \pi_0(f(O))$.

Note that we made repeated use of the fact that \mathfrak{B} is decomposable so that every subset $I \subseteq \pi_0(O)$ does give a well defined object $\bigcup I \in \mathfrak{B} \cap O_\perp$. \square

An algebra for the ∞ -operad $(\mathcal{D}\text{isks}/_X)^\otimes$ (or any other pre-cocartesian ∞ -operad) is called *multiplicative*, if it sends pre-cocartesian arrows to cocartesian ones. Note that this is compatible with Definition 3.10, because in that setting the pre-cocartesian arrows are just the cocartesian ones. As with pre-factorization algebras, we use the superscript “m” to denote categories of multiplicative algebras.

Corollary 5.20. *Let X be a smooth conical manifold and $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \text{Disks}(X)$ a decomposable multiplicative disk-basis of X . Restriction yields an equivalence*

$$\text{ALG}_{\mathcal{D}\text{isks}/_X}^{\text{m}} \xrightarrow{\simeq} \text{ALG}_\mathfrak{B}^{\text{m, cstr}}.$$

Proof. The multiplicativity condition on \mathfrak{B} corresponds to that on $\mathcal{D}\text{isks}/_X$ since every pre-cocartesian arrow in $(\mathcal{D}\text{isks}/_X)^\otimes$ is equivalent to one that comes from \mathfrak{B}^\otimes . For multiplicative prefactorization algebras on \mathfrak{B} the constructibility condition amounts precisely to inverting the operations in $\mathcal{J}_\mathfrak{B}$. Hence the result follows directly from Proposition 5.19. \square

5.3. Constructible implies Weiss on disks. It has long been folklore that for constructible factorization algebras extended from disks the Weiss condition is redundant. A version of this statement first appeared in [AF20] in the unstratified setting. In contrast, we work in the stratified setting, and also allow for the additional freedom of restricting to a suitable collection of disks.

Theorem 5.21. *Let X be a smooth conical manifold and let $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \text{Disks}(X)$ be a decomposable multiplicative disk-basis of X . Every left Kan extension of a constructible copresheaf on \mathfrak{B} to any poset of opens $\mathfrak{U} \supseteq \mathfrak{B}$ is automatically a Weiss hypercosheaf.*

We will prove Theorem 5.21 below. First, we deduce some corollaries.

Corollary 5.22. *Let X be a smooth conical manifold, $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \text{Disks}(X)$ a decomposable multiplicative disk-basis of X and $\mathfrak{U} \supseteq \mathfrak{B}$ a presieve. Then for every constructible copresheaf on \mathfrak{B} , the left Kan extension to \mathfrak{U} is a Weiss cosheaf.*

Proof. This is a direct consequence of Theorem 5.21 because every Weiss hypercosheaf on a presieve is a Weiss cosheaf (see Remark 2.43). \square

Corollary 5.23. *Let X be a smooth conical manifold, $\mathfrak{U} \subseteq \text{Open}(X)$ a presieve and $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \mathfrak{U}$ a decomposable factorizing disk-basis of \mathfrak{U} . Then restriction yields an equivalence*

$$\text{FACT}_{\mathfrak{U}}^{\text{cstr}} \xrightarrow{\cong} \text{FACT}_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\text{cstr}} = \text{ALG}_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\text{m,cstr}}$$

of ∞ -categories.

Proof. We start with the equivalence

$$\iota^* : \text{FACT}_{\mathfrak{U}} \xrightarrow{\cong} \text{FACT}_{\mathfrak{B}}$$

of Proposition 4.12 which restricts to an equivalence

$$\iota^* : \text{FACT}_{\mathfrak{U}}^{\text{cstr}} \xrightarrow{\cong} \text{FACT}_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\text{cstr}}$$

by Corollary 5.17. Finally, we observe that the inclusion $\text{ALG}_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\text{m,cstr}} \subseteq \text{FACT}_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\text{cstr}}$ is an equality by Corollary 5.22. \square

Corollary 5.24. *Let X be a smooth conical manifold with enough good disks. Then restriction yields an equivalence*

$$\text{FACT}_X^{\text{cstr}} \xrightarrow{\cong} \text{ALG}_{\text{Disks}(X)}^{\text{m,cstr}}$$

of ∞ -categories.

Proof. Choose a decomposable factorizing disk-basis \mathfrak{B} of X . Then the claim follows by 2-out-of-3 for the composition

$$\text{FACT}_X^{\text{cstr}} \rightarrow \text{ALG}_{\text{Disks}(X)}^{\text{m,cstr}} \xrightarrow{\cong} \text{ALG}_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\text{m,cstr}}$$

where the composite is the equivalence of Corollary 5.23 and the right restriction functor is the equivalence of Corollary 5.18. \square

Remark 5.25. Ayala–Francis state the unstratified analog of Corollary 5.24 namely [AF20, Proposition 2.22] without using the existence of enough good disks. Their proof seems to go along the same lines as our proof of Corollary 5.23 (and in fact we learned some of the key ideas from them) but directly applied to the poset of opens $\text{Disks}(X)$ of *all* disks. However, since this poset of opens is *not* closed under intersections, we were not able to reproduce their proof. For this reason we have to go through the auxiliary factorizing disk-basis \mathfrak{B} whose existence we have to postulate.

Still in the unstratified setting, essentially the same result was also obtained in Carmona’s thesis [Sán23], who like us requires the existence of enough good disks.

At this point it is still unclear to us whether this statement can be proved without the existence of enough good disks; if so, it might require some more high-powered machinery.

The final corollary is the full comparison of factorization algebras in our sense with those defined as multiplicative ∞ -categorical disk algebras.

Corollary 5.26. *Let X be a smooth conical manifold with enough good disks. We have a canonical equivalence*

$$\mathrm{FACT}_X^{\mathrm{cstr}} \simeq \mathrm{ALG}_{\mathcal{D}\mathrm{isks}/X}^m \simeq \mathrm{ALG}_{\mathcal{D}\mathrm{isk}/X}$$

Proof. For the first equivalence combine Corollary 5.24 with Corollary 5.20. The second one follows analogously using Corollary 4.18. \square

Example 5.27 (Associative algebras and modules). Using the identification of Corollary 5.26, we can now explain Example 3.5 and Example 3.7 systematically: constructible factorization algebras on the open interval $(0, \infty)$ are given precisely by associative algebras \mathcal{A} ; constructible factorization algebras on the half-open interval $[0, \infty)$ additionally encode the data of a pointed \mathcal{A} -module (see also [AFT17a, Section 2.6]).

Explicitly, let RMod_* be the discrete operad encoding a pointed right action:

- It has two colors a and m (corresponding to the algebra and the module).
- It has operations $\sigma: (a, \dots, a) \rightarrow a$ and $\tau: (m, a, \dots, a) \rightarrow m$ (with $n \geq 0$ many a 's) where σ and τ are linear orders of the multiset $\{a, \dots, a\}$ or $\{m, a, \dots, a\}$, respectively, with m always being required to be the first element.
- Unlike the usual operad RMod encoding an unpointed right action, there is an additional 0-ary operation $() \rightarrow m$ that yields a pointing of the module.
- Composition is evident.

Moreover, there is an explicit operad map

$$\mathrm{ALG}_{\mathcal{D}\mathrm{isk}/[0, \infty)} \rightarrow \mathrm{RMod}_* \tag{5.5}$$

that sends the disks of type $[0, \infty)$ to m and the disks of type $(0, \infty)$ to a . If I_1, \dots, I_n, I are disks with embeddings $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n, \phi$ into $[0, \infty)$, then the space of operations

$$((I_1, \phi_1), \dots, (I_n, \phi_n)) \rightarrow (I, \phi)$$

is the space of

(\dagger) embeddings $\psi: I_1 \amalg \dots \amalg I_n \hookrightarrow I$ with isotopies $h_i: \psi|_{I_i} \simeq \phi_i$.

The map (5.5) sends such a pair $(\psi, (h_i))$ to the linear order of the set v_1, \dots, v_n induced by ϕ , thus yielding the operation $(v_1, \dots, v_n) \rightarrow v$; here the symbol v and each v_i is either “ m ” or “ a ” depending on the type of the disk I and I_i .

Finally, we observe that each space (\dagger) has contractible connected components and that the operad map (5.5) is actually an equivalence¹¹. In particular the equivalence of Corollary 5.26 yields the desired identification between constructible factorization algebras on $[0, \infty)$ and RMod_* -algebras, i.e., pointed right modules.

Remark 5.28. As explained in Example 5.27 the identification with associative algebras and modules thereover is very straightforward when working with the topologized version of factorization algebras (i.e., the ∞ -operad $\mathcal{D}\mathrm{isk}/[0, \infty)$). For this reason, this identification is often accepted as a basic fact of the theory of constructible factorization algebras with the implicit understanding that “factorization algebra” is to be read as $\mathcal{D}\mathrm{isk}/[0, \infty)$ -algebra.

From our definition of (constructible) factorization algebras (which, for example, is also that of Costello-Gwilliam and Ginot), this is not at all obvious and relies on the highly non-trivial localization result that underlies the comparison Corollary 5.26.

¹¹This boils down to the fact that the space of smooth embeddings $\mathbb{R}^n \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is discrete (up to equivalence) with $n! \cdot 2^n$ connected components, corresponding to the linear orders of the n copies and a choice of orientation for each. The identifications h_i fix the orientations, leaving precisely the choice of linear order.

For associative algebras without a module (and more generally \mathbb{E}_n -algebras for each n), this identification goes back to Lurie (modulo some results about extensions from a factorizing basis, since Lurie only deals with disks and does not use the Weiss-condition¹²). While an extension of his techniques to the stratified setting (which means taking into account an additional module) seems relatively straightforward, it has not appeared in print as far as we are aware.

After having recorded these immediate corollaries, we start working towards the proof of Theorem 5.21 for which we need some preliminaries. One key ingredient is the well-known fact that the colimit over a hypercover of a topological space computes the homotopy type of that space. This is another instance of the Seifert–Van Kampen theorem.

Lemma 5.29 ([DI04], Proposition 4.6 (c)). *Let X be a topological space. The fundamental ∞ -groupoid functor*

$$\text{Open}(X) \rightarrow \text{GPD}_\infty$$

which sends an open set to its homotopy type is a hypercosheaf. Explicitly this means that for each hypercover¹³ $\mathfrak{W} \dashrightarrow X$ we have the equivalence

$$\text{colim}_{W \in \mathfrak{W}} W \xrightarrow{\simeq} X$$

in the ∞ -category of spaces.

We now come to the proof of Theorem 5.21. Apart from the aforementioned hypercover lemma, the key category theoretic ingredient in the proof is Lemma A.4 in the appendix, which provides a useful cofinality criterion to help manipulate the relevant colimits.

Proof of Theorem 5.21. Let $\mathcal{A}: \mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be a copresheaf left Kan extended from \mathfrak{B} and assume that $\mathcal{A}|_{\mathfrak{B}}$ is constructible. For each $U \in \mathfrak{U}$ we can apply Theorem 5.10 to the decomposable multiplicative basis $\mathfrak{B} \cap U_\downarrow$ of U to get a factorization

$$\mathcal{A}|_{\mathfrak{B} \cap U_\downarrow}: \mathfrak{B} \cap U_\downarrow \rightarrow \mathcal{D}\text{isks}/U \rightarrow \mathcal{C} \quad (5.6)$$

where the first functor is a localization.

Now, let $\mathfrak{W} \dashrightarrow M$ be a Weiss hypercover of an open set M in \mathfrak{U} . We aim to show that it is \mathcal{A} -local. We apply Lemma A.4 to

- the ∞ -category $\mathcal{M} := \mathcal{M}\text{fld}$ of smooth conical manifolds,
- the full subcategory $\mathcal{D} := \mathcal{D}\text{isks} \subseteq \mathcal{M}\text{fld}$ of conical disks,
- the object M (viewed as an object of $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}\text{fld}$),
- the diagram $F: \mathfrak{W} \subset \text{Open}(M) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}\text{fld}/_M$.

To establish the assumption of Lemma A.4, let $d \in \mathcal{D}\text{isks}/_M$. Pick a $U \in \mathfrak{B} \cap M_\downarrow$ that maps to d under the localization functor and write $U = \bigcup_{i,j} U_i^j$ as in Notation 5.12. Then by Lemma 5.13 the map (A.5) is identified with the map of ∞ -groupoids

$$\text{colim}_{W \in \mathfrak{W}} \prod_{i \in I} \text{Conf}_{k_i}(W_{[U_i]}) \rightarrow \prod_{i \in I} \text{Conf}_{k_i}(M_{[U_i]}) \quad (5.7)$$

induced by the hyperprecover

$$\left\{ \prod_{i \in I} \text{Conf}_{k_i}(W_{[U_i]}) \mid W \in \mathfrak{W} \right\} \dashrightarrow \prod_{i \in I} \text{Conf}_{k_i}(M_{[U_i]}). \quad (5.8)$$

¹²More precisely: First we view associative algebras as \mathbb{E}_1 -algebras, as in [Lur17, Example 5.1.0.7]. Then [Lur17, Theorem 5.4.5.9] specializes under [Lur17, Example 5.4.5.3] to an equivalence between \mathbb{E}_1 -algebras and constructible multiplicative prefactorization algebras on $\text{Disks}(\mathbb{R})$. These in turn are equivalent to locally constant factorization algebras on $\mathbb{R} \cong (0, \infty)$ by Corollary 5.24.

¹³What we call “hypercover” is called “complete cover” by Dugger–Isaksen. See also Remark 2.55.

The fact that $\mathfrak{W} \dashrightarrow M$ is a Weiss hypercover directly implies that (5.8) is a hypercover, so that Lemma 5.29 yields the desired equivalence (5.7) of ∞ -groupoids.

Having established the assumptions of Lemma A.4, we are entitled to its conclusion: the right vertical functor in the commutative square of ∞ -categories

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \operatorname{colim}_{W \in \mathfrak{W}} \mathfrak{B} \cap W_{\downarrow} & \longrightarrow & \operatorname{colim}_{W \in \mathfrak{W}} \mathcal{D}isks/W \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathfrak{B} \cap M_{\downarrow} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{D}isks/M \end{array}$$

is colimit cofinal. By setting $U := M$ and $U := W$ in (5.6), and passing to colimits of ∞ -categories we see that the horizontal functors are localizations through which \mathcal{A} factors (uniquely). After passing to colimits in \mathcal{C} , this implies that the right vertical map in the following commutative diagram is an equivalence:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \operatorname{colim}_{W \in \mathfrak{W}} \mathcal{A}(W) & \longleftarrow & \operatorname{colim}_{W \in \mathfrak{W}} \operatorname{colim} \mathcal{A}|_{\mathfrak{B} \cap W_{\downarrow}} \quad \equiv \quad \operatorname{colim}_{W \in \mathfrak{W}} \mathcal{A}|_{\operatorname{colim}_{W \in \mathfrak{W}} \mathfrak{B} \cap W_{\downarrow}} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \simeq \\ \mathcal{A}(M) & \longleftarrow & \operatorname{colim} \mathcal{A}|_{\mathfrak{B} \cap M_{\downarrow}} \end{array}$$

Moreover, the two horizontal arrows are equivalences because \mathcal{A} is a left Kan extension of its restriction to \mathfrak{B} . We conclude that the left vertical map is an equivalence which was the goal. \square

6. MAIN THEOREMS AND APPLICATIONS

In this section we give some applications of our gluing techniques.

6.1. Gluing of constructible factorization algebras. Our first application is the main theorem of this article, namely that constructible factorization algebras on an open cover glue. In other words, they form a sheaf of ∞ -categories. In the locally constant case, this was proven in [Mat17, Theorem 1.3].

Without further ado,

Theorem 6.1. *Let \mathcal{C}^\otimes be a \otimes -presentable symmetric monoidal ∞ -category. Let X be a smooth conical manifold with enough good disks. Let $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i < \beta}$ be an open cover of X . For any finite subset $I \subset \beta$, denote $U_I := \bigcap_{i \in I} U_i$.*

Then we have an equivalence of ∞ -categories

$$\mathrm{FACT}_X^{\mathrm{cstr}}(\mathcal{C}) \xrightarrow{\cong} \lim_{\beta \supset I \supseteq \emptyset} \mathrm{FACT}_{U_I}^{\mathrm{cstr}}(\mathcal{C}). \quad (6.1)$$

In other words: the assignment $U \mapsto \mathrm{FACT}_U^{\mathrm{cstr}}(\mathcal{C})$ is a sheaf of ∞ -categories.

Proof. We factor the map (6.1) as the following composite of equivalences.

$$\mathrm{FACT}_X^{\mathrm{cstr}} \xrightarrow[\mathrm{Prop\ 6.2}]{\cong} \mathrm{FACT}_{\mathcal{U}_{\downarrow \cup}}^{\mathrm{cstr}} \xrightarrow[\mathrm{Prop\ 6.3}]{\cong} \mathrm{FACT}_{\mathcal{U}_{\downarrow}}^{\mathrm{cstr}} \xrightarrow[\mathrm{Cor\ 4.10}]{\cong} \lim_{\beta \supset I \supseteq \emptyset} \mathrm{FACT}_{U_I}^{\mathrm{cstr}}.$$

The first functor is an equivalence by Proposition 6.2 below; the last by Corollary 4.10. The middle functor is an equivalence by applying Proposition 6.3 below to $\mathfrak{P} = \mathcal{U}_{\downarrow}$, which (being a sieve) is a decomposable presieve; it has enough good disks because X has enough good disks. \square

Proposition 6.2. *Assume that X has enough disks and let \mathcal{U} be a cover of X . Then the restriction functor*

$$\iota^*: \mathrm{FACT}_X^{\mathrm{cstr}} \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathrm{FACT}_{\mathcal{U}_{\downarrow \cup}}^{\mathrm{cstr}} \quad (6.2)$$

is an equivalence.

Proof. Observe that $\mathcal{U}_{\downarrow \cup}$ is a decomposable factorizing basis of the presieve X_{\downarrow} , so that Proposition 4.12 yields the equivalence

$$\iota^*: \mathrm{FACT}_X \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathrm{FACT}_{\mathcal{U}_{\downarrow \cup}}. \quad (6.3)$$

Note that a factorization algebra \mathcal{A} on X is constructible on $\mathcal{U}_{\downarrow \cup}$ if and only if it is constructible on each $U \in \mathcal{U}$ (because each instance of the constructibility condition involves only connected disks). Since constructibility is local (see Theorem 5.2) this happens if and only if \mathcal{A} is constructible on X . Thus the equivalence (6.3) restricts to the desired equivalence (6.2). \square

Proposition 6.3. *Let $\mathfrak{P} \subseteq \mathrm{Open}(X)$ be a decomposable presieve. Then the restriction*

$$\mathrm{FACT}_{\mathfrak{P}_{\downarrow \cup}}^{\mathrm{cstr}} \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathrm{FACT}_{\mathfrak{P}}^{\mathrm{cstr}} \quad (6.4)$$

is an equivalence of ∞ -categories.

Proof. We start with the equivalence

$$\mathrm{ALG}_{\mathfrak{P}_{\downarrow \cup}}^{\mathrm{m,cstr}} \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathrm{ALG}_{\mathfrak{P}}^{\mathrm{m,cstr}}$$

of Corollary 4.18 and claim that it restricts to the desired equivalence (6.4), i.e., that (the copresheaf underlying) any given multiplicative constructible prefactorization algebra \mathcal{A} on $\mathfrak{P}_{\downarrow \cup}$ is a Weiss cosheaf if and only if its restriction to \mathfrak{P} is a Weiss cosheaf.

“Only if” is clear because \mathfrak{P} is a presieve so the value of Weiss covers in \mathfrak{P} do not change when evaluated in $\mathfrak{P}_{\downarrow \cup}$.

For the converse, assume that $\mathcal{A} \in \text{ALG}_{\mathfrak{P}_\cup}^{\text{m, cstr}}$ is a Weiss cosheaf when restricted to \mathfrak{P} . Choose a factorizing disk-basis \mathfrak{D} of \mathfrak{P} , witnessing that it has enough disks; without loss of generality we may assume that \mathfrak{D} is decomposable. We note two facts:


- Since $\mathcal{A}|_{\mathfrak{P}}$ is a Weiss cosheaf it is a left Kan extension from the factorizing basis \mathfrak{D} by Proposition 2.53 (1). Moreover, \mathfrak{D} is closed under disjoint unions subordinate to \mathfrak{P} , so that $\mathcal{A}|_{\mathfrak{P}^\otimes}$ is also an *operadic* left Kan extension from \mathfrak{D}^\otimes by Lemma B.3.
- Applying Proposition 4.15 to $\mathfrak{B} := \mathfrak{D}$ and to $\mathfrak{B} := \mathfrak{P}$ (which are both decomposable), we get that the multiplicative prefactorization algebras $\mathcal{A}|_{\mathfrak{D}^\otimes}$ and $\mathcal{A}|_{\mathfrak{P}^\otimes}$ are necessarily operadic left Kan extensions from $\mathcal{A}|_{\mathfrak{D}^\otimes}$ and $\mathcal{A}|_{\mathfrak{P}^\otimes}$, respectively.

By the transitivity and 2-out-of-3 property for operadic left Kan extensions for the commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{D}^\otimes & \hookrightarrow & \mathfrak{P}^\otimes \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathfrak{D}_\cup^\otimes & \hookrightarrow & \mathfrak{P}_\cup^\otimes \end{array}$$

of operads, we conclude that \mathcal{A} (which, recall, is defined on $\mathfrak{P}_\cup^\otimes$) is an operadic left Kan extension from $\mathfrak{D}_\cup^\otimes$. Again invoking Lemma B.3 this means that the underlying copresheaf $\mathcal{A}|_{\mathfrak{P}_\cup}$ is a left Kan extension from $\mathcal{A}|_{\mathfrak{D}_\cup}$, which is constructible (since \mathcal{A} was constructible). Since \mathfrak{D}_\cup is a decomposable multiplicative (even factorizing) disk-basis of \mathfrak{P}_\cup , it follows from Corollary 5.22 that \mathcal{A} is a Weiss cosheaf on \mathfrak{P}_\cup , which is what we were required to prove. \square

Example 6.4. Let $U = (0, 3)$ and $V = (2, 5)$ be intervals in \mathbb{R} , and $X = U \cup V$. We choose to stratify both intervals with a single point, say, choose $\{1\} \subset U$ and $\{4\} \subset V$. Consider constructible factorization algebras \mathcal{F}_U on U and \mathcal{F}_V on V , together with an isomorphism $t(\mathcal{F}_U) := (\mathcal{F}_U)|_{(2,3)} \cong (\mathcal{F}_V)|_{(2,3)} =: s(\mathcal{F}_V)$. Then they can be glued (up to equivalence) to a factorization algebra on all of X .



The main example of this situation to keep in mind is when \mathcal{F}_U and \mathcal{F}_V arise, similarly to Example 3.7, Example 3.15, and Example 4.13, from an (A_1, A_2) -bimodule M_1 and an (A_2, A_3) -bimodule M_2 , respectively¹⁴. We shall now compute that the value of the glued factorization algebra \mathcal{F} on the open set $X = (0, 5)$ is the relative tensor product $M_1 \otimes_{A_2} M_2$. Moreover, \mathcal{F} also encodes the data of $M_1 \otimes_{A_2} M_2$ as a (A_1, A_3) -bimodule.

To compute the value of \mathcal{F} on X , we denote by \mathcal{K} the poset of nonempty compact subsets of $U \cap V = (2, 3)$ with finitely many connected components and consider the Weiss presieve

$$\mathcal{W} := \{X \setminus K \mid K \in \mathcal{K}\} \rightarrow X.$$

It is a well known result that the canonical functor

$$\mathcal{W} \cong \mathcal{K}^{\text{op}} \xrightarrow{\pi_0} \Delta^{\text{op}}, \quad (6.5)$$

(where each set $\pi_0(K)$ is endowed with the linear order induced from \mathbb{R}) is an ∞ -categorical localization; for convenience we also provide a short proof as Proposition A.3 in the appendix. Since \mathcal{F} is constructible and multiplicative, the induced functor $\mathcal{F}: \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ factors through this localization. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we choose an arbitrary compact subset $K = K_0 \cup \dots \cup K_n$ of $U \cap V$ with exactly $n+1$ components (written in ascendent order) and

¹⁴Together with pointings which we do not write out explicitly in this example.

let $U := X \setminus K = U_0 \cup \dots \cup U_{n+1}$ be its open complement with exactly $n + 2$ components (written in ascendent order). Then we compute


$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(X) &\simeq \operatorname{colim}_{[n] \in \Delta^{\text{op}}} \mathcal{F}|_{\mathcal{W}} \simeq \operatorname{colim}_{[n] \in \Delta^{\text{op}}} \mathcal{F}(X \setminus (K_0 \cup \dots \cup K_n)) \\ &\simeq \operatorname{colim}_{[n] \in \Delta^{\text{op}}} \mathcal{F}(U_0) \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{F}(U_{n+1}) \simeq \operatorname{colim}_{[n] \in \Delta^{\text{op}}} M_1 \otimes A_2^{\otimes n} \otimes M_2. \end{aligned}$$

From left to right in the chain of equivalences, we use that that \mathcal{F} is a Weiss cosheaf, that the localization functor (6.5) is cofinal, \mathcal{F} is multiplicative, and that the singularity points 1 and 4 lie in U_0 and U_{n+1} , respectively. The final simplicial colimit is precisely the usual definition of the relative tensor product $M_1 \otimes_{A_2} M_2$.

Without going into great detail we will quickly explain why these simple examples are important in the context of *the higher Morita category* $\operatorname{Alg}_1(\mathcal{C})$ constructed from constructible factorization algebras:

Remark 6.5. The above example is the key step in proving composition of 1-morphisms in the higher Morita category $\operatorname{Alg}_1(\mathcal{C})$ of [Sch14, GS18]. Very informally, objects of this $(\infty, 2)$ -category are locally constant factorization algebras on $(0, 1)$, 1-morphisms are constructible factorization algebras for $(0, 1)$ stratified with a marked point, and 2-morphisms are maps of such constructible factorization algebras. The source and target of a 1-morphism are given by restricting to the left and right of the chosen point, respectively. Given two 1-morphisms, i.e. \mathcal{F}_0 and \mathcal{F}_1 such that the target and source are equivalent, we compose as follows. One first glues together the two constructible factorization algebras to produce a constructible factorization algebra \mathcal{F} on an interval with 2 marked points as in Example 6.4. Since the gluing is only defined up to equivalence, composition is only defined up to equivalence. Indeed, $\operatorname{Alg}_1(\mathcal{C})$ is actually an $(\infty, 1)$ -category modelled by a complete Segal space; the situation with several points as the stratification corresponds to proving the Segal condition in general.

Then we push forward along a “collapse-and-rescale map” ϱ that collapses everything between the 2 marked points to a single point and rescales back to get $(0, 1)$ as illustrated below.



Pushing forward along this map produces a *constructible* factorization algebra $\varrho_*\mathcal{F}$ on $(0, 1)$ with 1 marked point, which is again a 1-morphism in $\operatorname{Alg}_1(\mathcal{C})$.

The above example of course does not depend on working with the interval in any way. There is a more general notion of the higher Morita category, denoted $\operatorname{Alg}_n(\mathcal{C})$, and generalising the above procedure indeed gives compositions of k -morphisms, for all $k \leq n$.

6.2. The symmetric monoidal ∞ -category of constructible factorization algebras. Let X be a smooth conical manifold and \mathcal{C}^{\otimes} a \otimes -presentable symmetric monoidal ∞ -category. The goal of this section is to construct a symmetric monoidal structure on the ∞ -category $\operatorname{FACT}_X^{\text{cstr}}(\mathcal{C})$ of constructible factorization algebras.

On prefactorization algebras it is easy to write down a symmetric monoidal structure. Namely, given prefactorization algebras \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} we set

$$(\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{G})(U) := \mathcal{F}(U) \otimes \mathcal{G}(U). \quad (6.6)$$

This was already suggested in [CG17, §3 Section 1.5]. However, it is not immediately obvious that this satisfies the Weiss condition.

The formula (6.6) can be interpreted as the following two-step process:

- Glue the prefactorization algebras \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} on two copies of U to a prefactorization algebra $\mathcal{F} \amalg \mathcal{G}$ on $U \amalg U$.
- Pushforward along the fold map $\nabla: U \amalg U \rightarrow U$ to define the tensor product

$$\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{G} := \nabla_*(\mathcal{F} \amalg \mathcal{G}).$$

We now implement this idea to construct the fully coherent symmetric monoidal structure on the ∞ -categories of *constructible* factorization algebras.

Construction 6.6. Let X be a topological space. Consider the functor of 1-categories

$$\text{FIN}_* \rightarrow \text{OPD}^{\text{op}}, \quad I_+ \mapsto \text{Open}(X^{\amalg I})^{\otimes}$$

where a map $f: I_+ \rightarrow J_+$ is sent to

$$\text{Open}(X^{\amalg J})^{\otimes} \rightarrow \text{Open}(X^{\amalg I})^{\otimes}, \quad \coprod_{j \in J} U_j \mapsto \coprod_{i \in I} U_{f(i)}.$$

Here we use the convention that for the base point $+$ of J_+ we have $U_+ := \emptyset$.

Then we postcompose with

$$\text{ALG}_-(\mathcal{C}): \text{OPD}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{CAT}_{\infty}$$

to get the functor

$$\text{ALG}_X^{\otimes}(\mathcal{C}): \text{FIN}_* \rightarrow \text{CAT}_{\infty}, \quad I_+ \mapsto \text{ALG}_{X^{\amalg I}}(\mathcal{C}).$$

This functor is the one exhibiting the symmetric monoidal structure on the ∞ -category $\text{ALG}_X(\mathcal{C})$ of prefactorization algebras.

Proposition 6.7. *We have a subfunctor*

$$\text{FACT}_X^{\text{cstr}, \otimes} \subset \text{ALG}_X^{\otimes}: \text{FIN}_* \rightarrow \text{CAT}_{\infty}$$

by pointwise passing to the full subcategories of constructible factorization algebras.

Proof. We need to check that for each $f: I_+ \rightarrow J_+$ in FIN_* , the functor $\text{ALG}_X^{\otimes}(f): \text{ALG}_{X^{\amalg I}} \rightarrow \text{ALG}_{X^{\amalg J}}$ preserves constructible factorization algebras. We may show this separately when f is active or inert because every map in FIN_* is a composite of an active and an inert map.

If f is active, then $\text{ALG}_X^{\otimes}(f)$ is given by pushing forward along a disjoint union

$$\coprod_{j \in J} (X^{\amalg f^{-1}(j)} \rightarrow X)$$

of fold maps. This pushforward preserves constructible factorization algebras by Lemma 3.47 and Lemma 3.48.

If f is inert, then $\text{ALG}_X^{\otimes}(f)$ is restriction along an open embedding, which preserves constructible factorization algebras by Lemma 3.43. \square

Corollary 6.8. *For every smooth conical manifold X with enough good disks, the functor*

$$\text{FACT}_X^{\text{cstr}, \otimes}: \text{FIN}_* \rightarrow \text{CAT}_{\infty}, \quad I_+ \mapsto \text{FACT}_{X^{\amalg I}}^{\text{cstr}}$$

exhibits a monoid object in $(\text{CAT}_{\infty}, \times)$, i.e., a symmetric monoidal structure on the ∞ -category $\text{FACT}_X^{\text{cstr}}$ of constructible factorization algebras on X .

Proof. We need to show that the functor satisfies the Segal condition. That is, that for each $I_+, J_+ \in \text{FIN}_*$ the diagram induced by the projections

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (I + J)_+ & \xrightarrow{\iota_I} & I_+ \\ \downarrow \iota_J & & \downarrow \\ J_+ & \longrightarrow & \emptyset_+ \end{array}$$

is a pullback square. Applying $\text{FACT}_X^{\text{cstr}, \otimes}$, this amounts to showing that the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{FACT}_{X^{\text{II}(I+J)}}^{\text{cstr}} & \longrightarrow & \text{FACT}_{X^{\text{II}I}}^{\text{cstr}} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{FACT}_{X^{\text{II}J}}^{\text{cstr}} & \longrightarrow & * \end{array}$$

is a pullback. This is an instance of Theorem 6.1 for the decomposition $X^{\text{II}(I+J)} = X^{\text{II}I} \coprod X^{\text{II}J}$. \square

Finally we record an improvement on our main gluing theorem (Theorem 6.1), exhibiting constructible factorization algebras not just as a sheaf of ∞ -categories but of *symmetric monoidal* ∞ -categories.

Recall that Mfld is the 1-category of smooth conical manifolds and embeddings between them.

Construction 6.9. Consider the functor of 1-categories

$$\text{Mfld} \times \text{FIN}_* \rightarrow \text{OPD}, \quad (X, I_+) \mapsto \text{Open}(X^{\text{III}})^{\otimes}$$

extending the one of Construction 6.6. By postcomposing with $\text{ALG}_-(\mathcal{C})$ and then passing to the subfunctor of constructible factorization algebras, we obtain the functor

$$\text{Mfld} \times \text{FIN}_* \rightarrow \text{CAT}_\infty, \quad (X, I_+) \mapsto \text{FACT}_{X^{\text{III}}}^{\text{cstr}}.$$

Since for fixed $X \in \text{Mfld}$ this defines a symmetric monoidal ∞ -category (= a Segal object in CAT_∞), we can transpose it to obtain a functor

$$\underline{\text{Fact}}^{\text{cstr}, \otimes}(\mathcal{C}): \text{Mfld} \rightarrow \text{sMONCAT}_\infty \subset \text{Fun}(\text{FIN}_*, \text{CAT}_\infty), \quad X \mapsto \text{FACT}_X^{\text{cstr}, \otimes}(\mathcal{C}).$$

Proposition 6.10. *The functor $X \mapsto \text{FACT}_X^{\text{cstr}, \otimes}(\mathcal{C})$ of Construction 6.9 is a sheaf of symmetric monoidal ∞ -categories.*

Proof. We have to show that for each open cover $\{U_i\}_{i < \beta}$ of a smooth conical manifold X , the restriction functors induce an equivalence

$$\text{FACT}_X^{\text{cstr}, \otimes} \xrightarrow{\simeq} \lim_{\beta \supset I \supseteq \emptyset} \text{FACT}_{U_I}^{\text{cstr}, \otimes}$$

of symmetric monoidal ∞ -categories. When encoded as Segal objects $\text{FIN}_* \rightarrow \text{CAT}_\infty$, limits of symmetric monoidal ∞ -categories are computed pointwise; hence we only have to show that for each $J_+ \in \text{FIN}_*$, the induced map

$$\text{FACT}_{X^{\text{II}J}}^{\text{cstr}} \xrightarrow{\simeq} \lim_{\beta \supset I \supseteq \emptyset} \text{FACT}_{U_I^{\text{II}J}}^{\text{cstr}}$$

is an equivalence of ∞ -categories. This is an instance of Theorem 6.1 for the cover $\{U_i^{\text{II}J}\}_{i < \beta}$ of $X^{\text{II}J}$. \square

6.3. Link decomposition of constructible factorization algebras. We now turn to applying our toolbox to answer the following question, which was proposed to us by David Ayala.

Question 6.11. Is the data of a constructible factorization algebra on a cone $\mathbf{C}Z$ the same as the following?

- (1) An associative algebra \mathcal{A} in constructible factorization algebras on Z and
- (2) a pointed module for the associative algebra $\mathcal{A}(Z) = \int_Z \mathcal{A}$.

We reinterpret this question in the following way:

- We interpret associative algebras as locally constant factorization algebras on $(0, \infty)$ and pointed modules with constructible extensions to $[0, \infty)$; see Example 5.27.

- Using a version of Dunn’s additivity theorem, we can thus interpret the data in (1) as a constructible factorization algebra \mathcal{A} on $Z \times (0, \infty)$. Such additivity was established in Berry’s thesis [Ber21] in the unstratified setting; the general result for smooth conical manifolds is work in progress by Anja Švraka¹⁵.

With this reformulation, the following theorem gives a positive answer to Ayala’s question:

Theorem 6.12. *Let \mathcal{C}^\otimes be a \otimes -presentable symmetric monoidal ∞ -category. Let Z be a compact smooth conical manifold with enough good disks. We have a pullback square of ∞ -categories*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{FACT}_{\mathbf{C}Z}^{\mathrm{cstr}}(\mathcal{C}) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{FACT}_{Z \times (0, \infty)}^{\mathrm{cstr}}(\mathcal{C}) & & \mathcal{A} \\ \downarrow p_* & \lrcorner & \downarrow p_* & & \downarrow \\ \mathrm{FACT}_{[0, \infty)}^{\mathrm{cstr}}(\mathcal{C}) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{FACT}_{(0, \infty)}^{\mathrm{cstr}}(\mathcal{C}) & & \int_Z \mathcal{A} \end{array} \quad (6.7)$$

where the vertical functors are given by pushforward along the quotient map $p: \mathbf{C}Z \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ and the horizontal functors are given by restriction to open subspaces.

Remark 6.13. Specifically, the square (6.7) is induced by applying $\mathrm{ALG}_-(\mathcal{C})$ to the following square of (discrete, colored) operads

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Open}(\mathbf{C}Z)^\otimes & \longleftarrow & \mathrm{Open}(Z \times (0, \infty))^\otimes \\ \uparrow p^{-1} & & \uparrow p^{-1} \\ \mathrm{Open}([0, \infty))^\otimes & \longleftarrow & \mathrm{Open}((0, \infty))^\otimes \end{array}$$

and then passing to the full subcategories of constructible factorization algebras.

Remark 6.14. After the completion of this paper we were made aware of a result of Brav-Rozenblyum [BR23, Section 3.2] who independently proved the analog of Theorem 6.12 but on the other side of the equivalence of Corollary 5.26. Their proof techniques rely on monadicity results and appear to be completely different from ours.

Before we go into the proof of Theorem 6.12, we explain how this local result can be globalized. This globalization allows constructible factorization algebras on a smooth conical manifold to be assembled inductively from algebras and modules in locally constant factorization algebras on the individual strata, each of which is an (ordinary) smooth manifold.

Construction 6.15 (Global link decomposition). Let M be a smooth conical manifold and let d be the smallest dimension appearing among the strata of M . Let $S \subset M$ be the union of all strata of M of dimension d ; in particular S is closed in M .

Around S there is a tubular neighborhood $T = T(S)$ (see [AFT17b, Proposition 8.2.3]) which yields a (usually nontrivial) cone-bundle $p: T \rightarrow S$ so that all fibers of p are of the form $\mathbf{C}Z$ for some compact smooth conical manifold Z (the link at $s \in S$ in M). The bundle $p: T \rightarrow S$ has the cone-point-section which corresponds to the inclusion $i: S \subset T$ into the tubular neighborhood.

Denote by $r: V \rightarrow S$ the ray bundle obtained from $p: T \rightarrow S$ by fiberwise passing to the quotient $q: \mathbf{C}Z \rightarrow [0, \infty)$. Note that unlike the cone bundle $p: T \rightarrow S$, the ray bundle $r: V \rightarrow S$ is automatically trivial because the space of stratified self-diffeomorphisms of $[0, \infty)$ is contractible; hence we can write $V = S \times [0, \infty)$.

¹⁵To even state such an additivity result in the stratified situation one needs to construct the symmetric monoidal structure on the ∞ -category of constructible factorization algebras. We do this in Section 6.2.

Thus for each local chart $\mathbb{R}^d \cong U \subset S$ we have the situation

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & T_U & \xleftarrow{\cong} & \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbf{CZ} & \xleftarrow{\quad} & \mathbb{R}^d \times Z \times (0, \infty) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & T_U \setminus U \\
 & \nearrow & \downarrow q_U & & \downarrow \mathbb{R}^d \times q & & \downarrow \mathbb{R}^d \times q & & \downarrow q_U \\
 i_U & & U \times [0, \infty) & \xleftarrow{\cong} & \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, \infty) & \xleftarrow{\quad} & \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, \infty) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & U \times (0, \infty) \\
 & \searrow & \downarrow r_U & & \downarrow & & & & \\
 & & U & \xleftarrow{\cong} & \mathbb{R}^d & & & &
 \end{array}$$

Therefore we obtain the following pullback square of ∞ -categories

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbf{FACT}_{T_U}^{\text{cstr}} & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{FACT}_{T_U \setminus U}^{\text{cstr}} \\
 \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\
 \mathbf{FACT}_{U \times [0, \infty)}^{\text{cstr}} & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{FACT}_{U \times (0, \infty)}^{\text{cstr}}
 \end{array}$$

either by slightly generalizing Theorem 6.12 to account for the extra copy of \mathbb{R}^d everywhere or by applying Theorem 6.12 to $\mathcal{C} = \mathbf{FACT}_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{\text{cstr}}$ and then invoking an additivity result.

Finally we use our main gluing result, Theorem 6.1, to glue all these pullback squares together, where we let U range over an intersection-closed collection of charts of S , for example, the geodesically convex disks with respect to a chosen metric. Therefore we obtain the lower of the following two pullback squares; the upper one is another instance of gluing, namely for the cover $M = T \cup (M \setminus S)$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbf{FACT}_M^{\text{cstr}} & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{FACT}_{M \setminus S}^{\text{cstr}} \\
 \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\
 \mathbf{FACT}_T^{\text{cstr}} & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{FACT}_{T \setminus S}^{\text{cstr}} \\
 \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\
 \mathbf{FACT}_{S \times [0, \infty)}^{\text{cstr}} & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{FACT}_{S \times (0, \infty)}^{\text{cstr}}
 \end{array}$$

Corollary 6.16. *Let M be a smooth conical manifold. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have a pullback square*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbf{FACT}_{M_{\geq n}}^{\text{cstr}} & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{FACT}_{M_{\geq n+1}}^{\text{cstr}} \\
 \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\
 \mathbf{FACT}_{M_n \times [0, \infty)}^{\text{cstr}} & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{FACT}_{M_n \times (0, \infty)}^{\text{cstr}}
 \end{array} \tag{6.8}$$

of ∞ -categories, where M_n or $M_{\geq n}$ denotes the union of all strata of M of dimension n or of dimension $\geq n$, respectively.

Proof. For each n , apply Construction 6.15 to the smooth conical manifold $M_{\geq n}$, whose lowest dimensional strata comprise $S = M_n$. \square

Remark 6.17. Using the interpretation established at the beginning of the section, the pullback square (6.8) can be viewed as a decomposition of the datum of a constructible factorization algebra on $M_{\geq n}$ into

- a constructible factorization algebra \mathcal{A} on $M_{\geq n+1}$
- together with right modules for the associative algebra $\int_{\text{Link}_n(M)} \mathcal{A}$ in locally constant factorization algebras on M_n ,

where $\text{Link}_n(M)$ denotes the link bundle of M_n in $M_{\geq n}$ see Notation 3.29.

Overall we can then say that the descending filtration

$$M = M_{\geq 0} \supseteq M_{\geq 1} \supseteq M_{\geq 2} \supseteq \cdots,$$

induces a sequence of cartesian fibrations

$$\text{FACT}_M^{\text{cstr}} = \text{FACT}_{M_{\geq 0}}^{\text{cstr}} \longrightarrow \text{FACT}_{M_{\geq 1}}^{\text{cstr}} \longrightarrow \text{FACT}_{M_{\geq 2}}^{\text{cstr}} \longrightarrow \cdots$$

whose fibers are all given by categories of right modules in $\text{FACT}_{M_0}^{\text{lc}}, \text{FACT}_{M_1}^{\text{lc}}, \text{FACT}_{M_2}^{\text{lc}}, \dots$, respectively, each of which is locally constant factorization algebras on an (unstratified) smooth manifold.

The rest of this section is dedicated to the proof of Theorem 6.12. We start with some notation.

Construction 6.18. Denote by

$$\mathfrak{N} := (Z \times (0 \times \infty))_{\downarrow} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{H} := p^{-1}[0, \infty)_{\downarrow}$$

the posets of opens of opens that

- do *not* contain the cone point, or
- are *horizontal*, i.e., of the form $p^{-1}(U)$ for some open $U \subseteq [0, \infty)$,

respectively. Write $\mathfrak{U} := \mathfrak{N} \cup \mathfrak{H}$ for their union. Observe that \mathfrak{U} is a presieve because sets of each type are closed under intersection and an intersection $U \cap V$ with $U \in \mathfrak{N}$ again lies in \mathfrak{N} . By construction, the associated operad \mathfrak{U}^{\otimes} fits into a pullback square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{U}^{\otimes} & \longleftarrow & \mathfrak{N}^{\otimes} \\ \uparrow & \lrcorner & \uparrow \\ \mathfrak{H}^{\otimes} & \longleftarrow & \mathfrak{N}^{\otimes} \cap \mathfrak{H}^{\otimes} \end{array} \quad (6.9)$$

of operads and fully faithful embeddings.

Proposition 6.19. *The square (6.9) is a pushout of operads and even of ∞ -operads.*

Key insight. Let us just explain the key insight that goes into proving this fact; the actual proof is unfortunately rather technical, so we relegate it to Appendix D. The main obstacle to overcome is that there are operations in \mathfrak{U}^{\otimes} whose output open contains the cone point but at least one input open is not horizontal. See Figure 6 for an easy example. Such an operation will not lie in \mathfrak{N} nor in \mathfrak{H} ; nonetheless, we need to show that it lies in the pushout.¹⁶ The reason is that such an operation f can be factored canonically into a composition of an operation $b \in \mathfrak{N}^{\otimes}$ away from the cone point, and a horizontal operation $a \in \mathfrak{H}^{\otimes}$:

- Let U' be the output open of the operation f , which we assume contains the cone point (otherwise f lies in \mathfrak{N} and there is nothing to do).
- There is at most one input open of f which contains the cone point. If such an open exists, we denote it by U . We denote the other input opens of f by V_1, \dots, V_n .
- Consider the open U'' defined as the interior of $U' \cap (Z \times (0, \infty)) \setminus U$. Note that U'' is again horizontal, since U' and U are horizontal. By construction, we have an inclusion

$$a: (U \cup) U'' \hookrightarrow U',$$

which is a 2- or 1-ary operation of \mathfrak{H} depending on whether U exists or not. Note that a just depends on $(U$ and) U' , but not on f .

¹⁶The reader might wonder why an analogous obstacle did not arise in the setting of Section 4.2, where it was almost tautological that the cube (4.3) was a strict pushout of dendroidal sets. In that setting every operation of the big operad \mathcal{U}_{\downarrow} with output color in some small operad $U_{I\downarrow}$ was already fully contained in that small operad, because all $U_{I\downarrow}$ were sieves.

- Since the V_i are open, do not contain the cone point and are disjoint to U , we have an inclusion

$$b_f: V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n \hookrightarrow U'',$$

which lies in \mathfrak{N} .

- By construction, the composite $a \circ b_f$ is the original $((n+1)$ -ary or n -ary) operation

$$f: (U \cup V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n) \hookrightarrow U'.$$

Thus every operation of \mathfrak{U}^\otimes can be written as a composite of operations in \mathfrak{N} and \mathfrak{H} . The technical part is to use the universality of the operations a described above to obtain the desired pushout; this is the content of Proposition D.1 \square




FIGURE 6. An example of a 2-ary operation $f: U \cup V_1 \rightarrow U'$ in \mathfrak{U}^\otimes which does not lie in \mathfrak{H} because V is not horizontal, but also does not lie in \mathfrak{N} because U and $U' = \mathbf{C}Z$ contain the cone point. The open U'' is the interior of the cone minus the open U . One directly sees that the inclusions $a: U \cup U'' \hookrightarrow U'$ and $b_f: V_1 \hookrightarrow U''$ compose to the original 2-ary operation f .

Proof of Theorem 6.12. From Proposition 6.19 it follows that after passing to algebras in \mathcal{C} , we get a pullback square of ∞ -categories

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{ALG}_{\mathfrak{U}} & \longrightarrow & \text{ALG}_{Z \times (0, \infty)} \\ \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\ \text{ALG}_{[0, \infty)} & \longrightarrow & \text{ALG}_{(0, \infty)} \end{array}$$

Next, we need to show that we retain a pullback square when passing to the full subcategories of constructible factorization algebras. In other words, we have to show that an algebra \mathcal{A} on \mathfrak{U} is multiplicative, Weiss and constructible if its restriction to each of the two posets of opens $(Z \times (0, \infty))_{\downarrow}$ and $p^{-1}[0, \infty)_{\downarrow}$ has the corresponding property:

- For constructibility, let $D \hookrightarrow D'$ be an inclusion of abstractly isomorphic conical disks in \mathfrak{U} . Note that it cannot happen that one contains the cone point and the other one does not, because then they would not be abstractly isomorphic (Lemma 5.9). Therefore they both lie in $p^{-1}[0, \infty)_{\downarrow}$ or they both lie in $(Z \times (0, \infty))_{\downarrow}$; in either case we are done.
- For multiplicativity, consider a decomposable open $U \in \mathfrak{U}$. If U lies in $(Z \times (0, \infty))_{\downarrow}$, then the same is true for all its components, so that we can apply the multiplicativity on $(Z \times (0, \infty))_{\downarrow}$. If U lies in $p^{-1}[0, \infty)_{\downarrow}$ and contains the cone point, then we can write it as $U = U' \cup U''$, where $U' \in p^{-1}[0, \infty)_{\downarrow}$ is the connected component of the cone point and $U'' \in (Z \times (0, \infty))_{\downarrow}$. By multiplicativity on $p^{-1}[0, \infty)_{\downarrow}$, the algebra \mathcal{A} is multiplicative with respect of the decomposition $U = U' \cup U''$. Any finer decomposition must happen completely within U'' (since U' is connected), so that we can reduce to the case of $U \in (Z \times (0, \infty))_{\downarrow}$ which we already established.

- For the Weiss condition, we have to show that every Weiss presieve $\mathfrak{W} \dashrightarrow U$ in \mathfrak{U} is \mathcal{A} -local (this makes use of the fact that \mathfrak{U} is a presieve, see Remark 2.43). If U does not contain the cone point, then neither does any open in \mathfrak{W} , so that we can just invoke the Weiss condition on $Z \times (0, \infty)_{\downarrow}$. It remains to consider the case where U contains the cone point. Let $\mathfrak{W}' \subset \mathfrak{W}$ be the subpresieve consisting of those $W \in \mathfrak{W}$ which contain the cone point 0.
 - The presieve \mathfrak{W}' is still a Weiss cover of U . Indeed, for any finite subset $S \subset U$ there must be a $W \in \mathfrak{W}$ that contains the finite set $S \cup \{0\}$ (because $\mathfrak{W} \dashrightarrow U$ is a Weiss presieve) but then W lies in \mathfrak{W}' by definition and contains S .
 - Next, we claim that the inclusion $\mathfrak{W}' \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{W}$ is \mathcal{A} -local. To this end, observe that for each $W \in \mathfrak{U} \cap \mathfrak{W}_{\downarrow}$, we have a Weiss presieve

$$\mathfrak{U} \cap \mathfrak{W}'_{\downarrow} \cap W_{\downarrow} \dashrightarrow W \tag{6.10}$$

by the same argument as above: for each finite $S \subset W$ there is a $W' \in \mathfrak{W}'$ with $W' \supset S \cup \{0\}$, hence $W' \cap W$ is an element of $\mathfrak{U} \cap \mathfrak{W}'_{\downarrow} \cap W_{\downarrow}$ containing S . Moreover, note that the Weiss presieve (6.10) is degenerate if W contains the cone point (because then $W \in \mathfrak{W}'_{\downarrow}$) and fully contained in $Z \times (0, \infty)$ otherwise. In either case, we have that it is \mathcal{A} -local. In conclusion, we have proved that the lower horizontal inclusion in the following commutative square (by Remark 2.13) of presieve inclusions is strongly \mathcal{A} -local, hence \mathcal{A} -local by Lemma 2.29.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{W}' & \hookrightarrow & \mathfrak{W} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathfrak{U} \cap \mathfrak{W}'_{\downarrow} & \hookrightarrow & \mathfrak{U} \cap \mathfrak{W}_{\downarrow} \end{array}$$

The two vertical inclusions are also \mathcal{A} -local because \mathfrak{W}' and \mathfrak{W} are presieves so that we have inverse hyperrefinements $\mathfrak{U} \cap \mathfrak{W}'_{\downarrow} \dashrightarrow \mathfrak{W}'$ and $\mathfrak{U} \cap \mathfrak{W}_{\downarrow} \dashrightarrow \mathfrak{W}$ (as in Example 2.25). Lemma 2.16 ensures that the diagram stays commutative after applying \mathcal{A} , thus we conclude that the top horizontal inclusion is \mathcal{A} -local, as desired.

In total, we are in the situation where the left inclusion in $\mathfrak{W}' \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{W} \dashrightarrow U$ is \mathcal{A} -local. The composite is a Weiss presieve that is fully contained in $p^{-1}[0, \infty)_{\downarrow}$, hence also \mathcal{A} -local. We conclude that $\mathfrak{W} \dashrightarrow U$ is \mathcal{A} -local, as desired.

Summarizing, we have now established the pullback square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{FACT}_{\mathfrak{U}}^{\text{cstr}} & \longrightarrow & \text{FACT}_{Z \times (0, \infty)}^{\text{cstr}} \\ p_{\star} \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow p_{\star} \\ \text{FACT}_{[0, \infty)}^{\text{cstr}} & \longrightarrow & \text{FACT}_{(0, \infty)}^{\text{cstr}} \end{array}$$

To complete the proof we have to show that the inclusion $\mathfrak{U} \hookrightarrow \text{Open}(\mathbf{C}Z)$ of posets induces an equivalence on the categories of constructible factorization algebras. More precisely, we consider the factorization $\mathfrak{U} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{U}_{\downarrow} \hookrightarrow \text{Open}(\mathbf{C}Z)$ by closing \mathfrak{U} under disjoint unions, and show separately that both of the induced restriction functors

$$\text{FACT}_{\mathbf{C}Z}^{\text{cstr}} \longrightarrow \text{FACT}_{\mathfrak{U}_{\downarrow}}^{\text{cstr}} \longrightarrow \text{FACT}_{\mathfrak{U}}^{\text{cstr}}$$

are equivalences.

- For the left equivalence we observe that $\mathfrak{U}_{\downarrow}$ is a factorizing basis of $\mathbf{C}Z$ so that Proposition 4.12 yields the equivalence

$$\text{FACT}_{\mathbf{C}Z} \xrightarrow{\cong} \text{FACT}_{\mathfrak{U}_{\downarrow}}.$$

It remains to show that this equivalence restricts to an equivalence on constructible factorization algebras, i.e., that a factorization algebra \mathcal{A} on $\mathbf{C}Z$ is constructible if it is constructible on \mathfrak{U}_\cup , or equivalently, on $Z \times (0, \infty)$ and on $p^{-1}[0, \infty)_\downarrow$. For this we apply Corollary 5.7 which in fact says that it suffices to check constructibility on $\mathbf{C}Z \setminus \{0\} = Z \times (0, \infty)$. Note that here we use compactness of Z because otherwise $M = \mathbf{C}Z$ would not be a conical manifold.

- For the right equivalence we observe that the poset of opens \mathfrak{U} is decomposable so Corollary 4.18 yields the equivalence

$$\mathrm{ALG}_{\mathfrak{U}_\cup}^{\mathrm{m}, \mathrm{cstr}} \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathrm{ALG}_{\mathfrak{U}}^{\mathrm{m}, \mathrm{cstr}}.$$

It remains to show that this equivalence restricts to an equivalence on constructible factorization algebras, i.e., that a multiplicative constructible algebra \mathcal{A} on \mathfrak{U}_\cup is a Weiss cosheaf if it is a Weiss cosheaf on \mathfrak{U} . Choose a factorizing disk-basis \mathfrak{B} of Z , witnessing that it has enough good disks; without loss of generality we may assume that \mathfrak{B} is decomposable. Write $\mathfrak{D} \subseteq \mathfrak{U}$ for the poset of opens consisting of

- the standard cones $\mathbf{C}_t Z$, for $0 < t \leq \infty$
- disjoint unions of disks $D \times (a, b)$, where $D \in \mathfrak{B}$ and $0 < a < b \leq \infty$.

Observe that \mathfrak{D}_\cup is a decomposable factorizing disk-basis of $\mathbf{C}Z$, so that we can invoke Corollary 5.22: to show that \mathcal{A} is a Weiss cosheaf on \mathfrak{U}_\cup it suffices to prove that it is a left Kan extension from \mathfrak{D}_\cup , i.e., that for each $U \in \mathfrak{U}_\cup$, the presieve $\mathfrak{D}_\cup \cap U_\downarrow \rightarrow U$ is \mathcal{A} -local. If we write $U = U' \cup U''$, where U' is the component of the cone point, then by multiplicativity of \mathcal{A} we can write the desired comparison map as the composite

$$\mathcal{A}(\mathfrak{D}_\cup \cap U_\downarrow) \simeq \mathcal{A}(\mathfrak{D}_\cup \cap U'_\downarrow) \otimes \mathcal{A}(\mathfrak{D}_\cup \cap U''_\downarrow) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(U') \otimes \mathcal{A}(U'') \simeq \mathcal{A}(U), \quad (6.11)$$

where the first equivalence holds because \mathfrak{D}_\cup is decomposable and closed under disjoint unions, so that we have the isomorphism $-\cup -: \mathfrak{D}_\cup/U' \times \mathfrak{D}_\cup/U'' \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathfrak{D}_\cup/U$. Hence it suffices to show that the two \otimes -components of the middle arrow in (6.11) are equivalences.

- For the U'' -component observe that $\mathfrak{D}_\cup \cap U'' \dashrightarrow U''$ is a Weiss presieve fully contained in $(Z \times (0, \infty))_\downarrow \subset \mathfrak{U}$, hence \mathcal{A} -local.
- For the U' -component, observe that U' must be a standard cone $\mathbf{C}_t Z$ for some t , because these are the only connected opens in \mathfrak{U}_\cup that contain the cone point. Therefore the presieve $\mathfrak{D}_\cup \cap U'_\downarrow \dashrightarrow U'$ is actually degenerate, hence \mathcal{A} -local. \square

6.4. Factorization algebras from factorization homology. We show that fixing a smooth manifold M (possibly stratified, with framings or other tangential structures), taking factorization homology locally gives a factorization algebra. This proof is a relatively straightforward consequence of the results established in Section 5 and does not rely on our gluing results. In the locally constant case a proof relying on gluing of locally constant factorization algebras was given in [GTZ12].

In the remainder of this section, we adopt terminology similar to that of [AFT17a], in particular:

- \mathcal{C}^\otimes is a symmetric monoidal \otimes -presentable ∞ -category;
- \mathcal{X} is a notion of tangential structure on smooth conical manifolds, encoded as a presheaf on the ∞ -category of basics;
- $\mathrm{Mfld}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\mathcal{M}\mathrm{fld}(\mathcal{X})$ are the category and ∞ -category of \mathcal{X} -manifolds (i.e. smooth conical manifolds equipped with a tangential structure of type \mathcal{X}), respectively; the morphisms are embeddings;
- $\mathrm{Mfld}(\mathcal{X})^\otimes$ and $\mathcal{M}\mathrm{fld}(\mathcal{X})^\otimes$ are the symmetric monoidal category and ∞ -category of \mathcal{X} -manifolds, respectively.

If \mathcal{X} is the trivial presheaf (encoding no tangential structure) then $\text{Mfld}(\mathcal{X}) = \text{Mfld}$ and $\mathcal{M}\text{fld}(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{M}\text{fld}$ (even as symmetric monoidal categories). Two other cases to keep in mind are orientations and framings, defined compatibly with the stratifications.

We first recall the definition of factorization homology and a main computational tool ([AFT17a] Theorem 2.15, Lemmas 2.16 & 2.17). The *factorization homology functor* \int_- is a left adjoint to the restriction

$$\text{Fun}^\otimes(\mathcal{D}\text{isks}(\mathcal{X})^\otimes, \mathcal{C}^\otimes) \longleftarrow \text{Fun}^\otimes(\mathcal{M}\text{fld}(\mathcal{X})^\otimes, \mathcal{C}^\otimes),$$

which, since \mathcal{C} is \otimes -sifted cocomplete, can be computed as the (ordinary) left Kan extension

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{D}\text{isks}(\mathcal{X}) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{A}} & \mathcal{C} \\ \downarrow & \dashrightarrow_{\int_- \mathcal{A}} & \\ \mathcal{M}\text{fld}(\mathcal{X}) & & \end{array},$$

which is automatically an operadic left Kan extension; the resulting functor $\int_- \mathcal{A}$ is automatically symmetric monoidal.

If M is a \mathcal{X} -manifold and U is an open subset of M , then U inherits the structure of a \mathcal{X} -manifold, so we have that $\text{Open}(M) = \text{Mfld}(\mathcal{X})_{/M}$, and a map of ∞ -operads

$$\iota_M: \text{Open}(M)^\otimes \rightarrow \text{Mfld}(\mathcal{X})^\otimes \rightarrow \mathcal{M}\text{fld}(\mathcal{X})^\otimes.$$

Hence, given a symmetric monoidal functor $\mathcal{A}: \mathcal{D}\text{isks}(\mathcal{X})^\otimes \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^\otimes$, we obtain by precomposing, a prefactorization algebra

$$\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{A}: \text{Open}(M)^\otimes \rightarrow \text{Mfld}(\mathcal{X})^\otimes \rightarrow \mathcal{M}\text{fld}(\mathcal{X})^\otimes \xrightarrow{\int_- \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{C}^\otimes.$$

Theorem 6.20. *The prefactorization algebra $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{A}$ is a constructible factorization algebra. Hence, for M a \mathcal{X} -manifold, the composite*

$$\mathcal{F}_-: \text{Fun}^\otimes(\mathcal{D}\text{isks}(\mathcal{X})^\otimes, \mathcal{C}^\otimes) \xrightarrow{\int_-} \text{Fun}^\otimes(\mathcal{M}\text{fld}(\mathcal{X})^\otimes, \mathcal{C}^\otimes) \xrightarrow{-\circ \iota_M} \text{ALG}_{\text{Open}(M)}(\mathcal{C})$$

factors through $\text{FACT}_M^{\text{cstr}}(\mathcal{C})$.

Proof. To see that $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{A}$ is constructible, note that inclusions of disks in M which are abstractly isomorphic become equivalences in $\mathcal{M}\text{fld}(\mathcal{X})$, hence $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{A}$ evaluates to an equivalence. Next, since factorization homology is symmetric monoidal, $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{A}$ is multiplicative.

It remains to check that $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{A}$ is a left Kan extension of its restriction to $\text{Disks}(M) = \text{Disks}(\mathcal{X})_{/M}$; indeed, the Weiss condition will then be automatic by Corollary 5.22 applied to the tautological disk-basis $\mathfrak{B} := \text{Disks}(M)$ of M . Consider the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \text{Disks}(M) & \longrightarrow & \text{Disks}(\mathcal{X}) & \xrightarrow{L} & \mathcal{D}\text{isks}(\mathcal{X}) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{A}} & \mathcal{C} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \dashrightarrow_{\int_- \mathcal{A}} & \uparrow \\ \text{Open}(M) & \longrightarrow & \text{Mfld}(\mathcal{X}) & \xrightarrow{\ell} & \mathcal{M}\text{fld}(\mathcal{X}) & & \\ & & & & & \text{---} \mathcal{F}_\mathcal{A} & \end{array}$$

We need to show that the induced map

$$\text{colim}_{D \in \text{Disks}(M)_{/U}} \mathcal{A}(L(D)) \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_\mathcal{A}(U) = \text{colim}_{D' \in \mathcal{D}\text{isks}(\mathcal{X})_{/\ell(U)}} \mathcal{A}(D')$$

is an equivalence. Here the right expression comes from the formula for factorization homology as a left Kan extension.

To see this, we observe that the composite map

$$\text{Disks}(U) = \text{Disks}(M)_{/U} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}\text{isks}(\mathcal{X})_{/\ell(U)} \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{D}\text{isks}_{/\ell(U)}$$

is a localization by Theorem 5.10 for $X = U$ and hence cofinal. The right map is an equivalence because a tangential structure on an embedded disk $D \hookrightarrow \ell(U)$ is uniquely determined by the structure on U ; see [AFT17a, Observation 2.7] for details. \square

APPENDIX A. CATEGORY THEORY

A.1. Quillen's Theorem B. The following version of Quillen's theorem B is a well known fact of higher category theory; we provide a proof for completeness and the convenience of the reader.

Lemma A.1 (Quillen B for cocartesian fibrations). *Let*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X' & \longrightarrow & X \\ \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow p \\ W' & \xrightarrow{f} & W \end{array} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

be a cartesian square of ∞ -categories where both vertical maps are cocartesian fibrations. Assume that for each arrow $d \rightarrow d'$ in W , the induced map $|X_d| \rightarrow |X_{d'}|$ is an equivalence of ∞ -groupoids. Then the square (A.1) remains cartesian after applying the classifying space functor $|-|$.

Proof. We write $X_\bullet: W \rightarrow \text{CAT}_\infty$ for the functor classifying the cocartesian fibration p , so that we can write $X \simeq \int_{d \in W} X_d$. Then the assumption of the lemma says that the composite functor

$$|X_\bullet| := \left(W \xrightarrow{X_\bullet} \text{CAT}_\infty \xrightarrow{|-|} \text{GPD}_\infty \right)$$

factors through the classifying space $W \rightarrow |W|$ so that we can compute

$$\begin{aligned} |X| &= X[\text{all}^{-1}] \simeq \left(\int_{d \in W} X_d \right) [\text{fiberwise}^{-1}][\text{cocart}^{-1}] \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\simeq} \left(\int_{d \in W} |X_d| \right) [\text{cocart}^{-1}] \stackrel{(b)}{\simeq} \text{colim}_{d \in W} |X_d| \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\simeq} \text{colim}_{d \in |W|} |X_d| \stackrel{(b)}{\simeq} \int_{d \in |W|} |X_d| \end{aligned}$$

(over $|W|$), where we used (a) that fiberwise localizations are compatible with unstraightening, (b) the explicit computation of colimits of ∞ -groupoids via unstraightening and (c) that $W \rightarrow |W|$ is cofinal. Together with a similar computation for $X'_\bullet = X_{f(\bullet)}$, this shows that the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} |X'| & \longrightarrow & |X| \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ |W'| & \longrightarrow & |W| \end{array}$$

can be identified with the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \int_{d \in |W'|} |X_{fd}| & \longrightarrow & \int_{d \in |W|} |X_d| \\ \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\ |W'| & \xrightarrow{|f|} & |W| \end{array}$$

which is manifestly cartesian. \square

A.2. A localization criterion. The following lemma is a general criterion for detecting localizations and underpins the computation in Section 5.2.

We extracted this lemma as the abstract and reusable core of an argument that was first sketched in [AFT17a] with a major gap and then completed using a result of Mazel-Gee [MG19]. We learned about this argument from Berry's thesis [Ber21] and private communication with David Ayala; it also appeared in [Cep22].

The same lemma with essentially the same proof was also independently isolated by Arakawa [Ara24, Proposition 2.27].

Lemma A.2. *Let $F: D \rightarrow E$ be a functor between ∞ -categories. Define $W := F^{-1}(E^\simeq)$ to be the wide subcategory of D containing those arrows which become invertible in E . Assume that*

(1) *the map of ∞ -groupoids*

$$|W| \xrightarrow{\simeq} E^\simeq$$

induced by F is an equivalence and

(2) *for each $d \in D$ the map*

$$|W \times_D D_{/d}| \xrightarrow{\simeq} (E_{/Fd})^\simeq$$

induced by F is an equivalence.

Then F induces an equivalence

$$D[W^{-1}] \xrightarrow{\simeq} E.$$

Proof. For this proof we will view ∞ -categories as complete Segal simplicial spaces. We will consider the so-called Rezk nerve $N^{\text{Rezk}}(D, W)$ of the pair (D, W) and show separately that the canonical structure map $N^{\text{Rezk}}(D, W) \rightarrow D[W^{-1}]$ and the composite $N^{\text{Rezk}}(D, W) \rightarrow D[W^{-1}] \rightarrow E$ are equivalences of simplicial spaces.

We recall the definition of the Rezk-nerve as described in [MG19, Section 3]: For any category T write $W(T, D) \subset \text{Fun}(T, D)$ for the wide subcategory where we only allow transformations that are pointwise in W . Letting $T = [n] \in \Delta^{\text{op}} \subseteq \text{CAT}$ vary and passing to classifying spaces, we obtain a simplicial space

$$N^{\text{Rezk}}(D, W): [n] \mapsto |W([n], D)|.$$

It comes equipped with a canonical map of simplicial spaces

$$N^{\text{Rezk}}(D, W) \rightarrow D[W^{-1}] := \text{Fun}([\bullet], D[W^{-1}])^\simeq. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Theorem 3.8 of [MG19] states that up to Rezk-fibrant replacement, the Rezk nerve presents the ∞ -categorical localization $D[W^{-1}]$. In particular, the comparison map (A.2) is an equivalence of spaces if $N^{\text{Rezk}}(D, W)$ is already complete Segal.

We claim that under the assumptions of Lemma A.2, the simplicial space $N^{\text{Rezk}}(D, W)$ is indeed complete Segal so that $N^{\text{Rezk}}(D, W) \rightarrow D[W^{-1}]$ is an equivalence.

- For each $n \geq 1$ we have a pullback square of categories

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W([n], D) & \longrightarrow & W(\{0 < 1\}, D) \\ \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\ W(\{1 < \dots < n\}, D) & \longrightarrow & W(\{1\}, D) \end{array} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

in which the vertical maps are cocartesian fibrations classified by

$$W(\{1 < \dots < n\}, D) \rightarrow W(\{1\}, D) = W \xrightarrow{d \mapsto W \times_D D_{/d}} \text{CAT}_\infty.$$

For each map $d \rightarrow d'$ in W , we have a commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} |W \times_D D_{/d}| & \longrightarrow & |W \times_D D_{/d'}| \\ \simeq \downarrow & & \downarrow \simeq \\ (E_{/Fd})^\simeq & \xrightarrow{\simeq} & (E_{/Fd'})^\simeq \end{array}$$

in which the lower horizontal map is an equivalence (because $Fd \rightarrow Fd'$ is an equivalence in E) and the vertical maps are equivalences by the second assumption.

It follows that the square (A.3) satisfies the assumptions of Lemma A.1 so that it induces the pullback square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{N}^{\text{Rezk}}(D, W)_n & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{N}^{\text{Rezk}}(D, W)_1 \\ \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\ \mathbb{N}^{\text{Rezk}}(D, W)_{n-1} & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{N}^{\text{Rezk}}(D, W)_0 \end{array}$$

of ∞ -groupoids which exhibits $\mathbb{N}^{\text{Rezk}}(D, W)$ as a Segal space.

- To show that $\mathbb{N}^{\text{Rezk}}(D, W)$ is complete, let $\alpha: d \rightarrow d'$ be any arrow in D such that $\alpha \in |W([1], D)|$ is invertible (with respect to the composition in the Segal space $\mathbb{N}^{\text{Rezk}}(D, W)$). Since the two maps of Segal spaces

$$\mathbb{N}^{\text{Rezk}}(D, W) \rightarrow D[W^{-1}] \xrightarrow{F} E$$

preserve invertible arrows, it follows that $F\alpha$ is invertible in E , which means that we have $\alpha \in W$. But then the commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} d & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & d' \\ \alpha \downarrow & & \downarrow = \\ d' & \xrightarrow{=} & d' \end{array}$$

is a morphism $\alpha \rightarrow \text{id}_{d'}$ in $W([1], D)$, which in $|W([1], D)|$ becomes a homotopy from α to a degenerate 1-simplex. Thus we have shown that every invertible 1-simplex of $\mathbb{N}^{\text{Rezk}}(D, W)$ is equivalent to a degenerate one; this is precisely the completeness condition.

Since $\mathbb{N}^{\text{Rezk}}(D, W)$ is a complete Segal space, it presents the localization $D[W^{-1}]$, so we are reduced to showing that the map

$$\mathbb{N}^{\text{Rezk}}(D, W) \rightarrow E$$

induced by F is an equivalence of complete Segal spaces. For this it suffices to check that it is an equivalence on 0 and 1-simplices:

- On 0-simplices, we have the map

$$|W| \cong |W([0], D)| = \mathbb{N}^{\text{Rezk}}(D, W)_0 \rightarrow E_0 = E^{\simeq},$$

which is an equivalence of ∞ -groupoids by the first assumption.

- We have a commutative square induced by F

$$\begin{array}{ccc} |W(\{0 < 1\}, D)| & \longrightarrow & \text{Fun}(\{0 < 1\}, E)^{\simeq} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ |W| & \longrightarrow & E^{\simeq} \end{array} \tag{A.4}$$

where by definition the right vertical map is classified by

$$e \mapsto (E/e)^{\simeq}.$$

Moreover, we established earlier that the left vertical map is classified by the functor

$$d \mapsto |W \times_D D/d|.$$

Since the comparison transformation

$$d \mapsto |W \times_D D/d| \xrightarrow{\simeq} (E/Fd)^{\simeq}$$

is an equivalence by the second assumption, it follows that the square (A.4) is a pullback of ∞ -groupoids. Since we have established the lower horizontal map to be an equivalence, so is the upper map, which is just the map

$$N^{\text{Rezk}}(D, W)_1 \rightarrow E_1$$

on 1-simplices. \square

As an application of Lemma A.2 we give a simple proof of the following well-known fact.

Proposition A.3. *Consider the poset \mathcal{K} of compact nonempty subsets of \mathbb{R} with finitely many connected components. The connected-component functor*

$$\pi_0: \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \Delta$$

is an ∞ -categorical localization at the π_0 -equivalences.

Proof. We invoke Lemma A.2:

- (1) Denote by $W \subset \mathcal{K}$ the wide subposet of π_0 -equivalences and $W_n \subseteq W$ the full subposets consisting of compacts with exactly $n + 1$ many connected components. We aim to show that the canonical map

$$\coprod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |W_n| \cong |W| \rightarrow \Delta \simeq \mathbb{N}$$

is an equivalence, i.e., that each W_n is weakly contractible. For each $K \in W_n$, write $\text{Conf}_=(\mathbb{R} \setminus K) \subset \text{Conf}_{n+2}(\mathbb{R})$ for the subspace of those configurations such that there is precisely one point in each of the $n + 2$ components of $\mathbb{R} \setminus K$. Observe that for each $S = \{s_0 < \dots < s_{n+1}\} \in \text{Conf}_{n+2}(\mathbb{R})$ the poset $\{K \in W_n \mid S \in \text{Conf}_=(\mathbb{R} \setminus K)\}$ is the product over $0 \leq i \leq n$ of the posets of nonempty closed intervals in (s_i, s_{i+1}) ; each of these posets is filtered, hence weakly contractible. Therefore we may apply Lurie's Seifert–Van Kampen [Lur17, Theorem A.3.1] to obtain the desired equivalence

$$|W_n| = \text{colim}_{K \in W_n^{\text{op}}} * \simeq \text{colim}_{K \in W_n^{\text{op}}} \text{Conf}_=(\mathbb{R} \setminus K) \simeq \text{Conf}_{n+2}(\mathbb{R}) \simeq *$$

because both

$$\text{Conf}_{n+2}(\mathbb{R}) = \{(s_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+2} \mid s_0 < \dots < s_{n+1}\}$$

and each $\text{Conf}_=(\mathbb{R} \setminus K) \cong \mathbb{R}^{n+2}$ are convex, hence contractible.

- (2) For each $K \in \mathcal{K}$ we have to show that the map

$$|W \times_{\mathcal{K}} \mathcal{K}_{/K}| \rightarrow (\Delta_{/\pi_0(K)}) \simeq$$

is an equivalence. By working one connected component of K at a time, we may assume that K is connected; hence the target is $(\Delta_{/[0]}) \simeq \Delta \simeq \mathbb{N}$, so it suffices to show that each $W_n \times_{\mathcal{K}} \mathcal{K}_{/K}$ is weakly contractible. We do a very similar argument as in part 1, but this time we only cover the subspace $\mathcal{R}_K \subseteq \text{Conf}_{n+2}(\mathbb{R})$ consisting of those configurations which have at most one point in each of the two components of $\mathbb{R} \setminus K$; in formulas

$$\mathcal{R}_K = \{(s_i) \in (-\infty, \max K] \times K^n \times [\min K, \infty) \mid s_0 < \dots < s_{n+1}\}.$$

Then we observe that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and each $S = \{s_0 < \dots < s_{n+2}\} \in \mathcal{R}_K$, the poset

$$\{K \supseteq L \in W_n \mid S \in \text{Conf}_=(\mathbb{R} \setminus L)\}$$

is isomorphic to the product over $0 \leq i \leq n$ of the posets of nonempty closed intervals in $(s_i, s_{i+1}) \cap K$. Since each $(s_i, s_{i+1}) \cap K$ is a possibly closed or half-closed, but crucially *nonempty* interval (by the assumption $S \in \mathcal{R}_K$), we again

conclude that this poset is filtered. Hence the Seifert–Van Kampen theorem yields the desired equivalence

$$|W_n| = \operatorname{colim}_{K \supseteq L \in W_n^{\text{op}}} * \simeq \operatorname{colim}_{K \supseteq L \in W_n^{\text{op}}} \operatorname{Conf}_=(\mathbb{R} \setminus L) \simeq \mathcal{R}_K \simeq *$$

because \mathcal{R}_K and each $\operatorname{Conf}_=(\mathbb{R} \setminus L) \cong \mathbb{R}^{n+2}$ are convex, hence contractible. \square

A.3. A cofinality criterion. The following cofinality criterion is used in Section 5.3. It was extracted from an argument we learned from [AF20].

Lemma A.4. *Let \mathcal{M} be an ∞ -category and $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ a full subcategory. Fix an object $M \in \mathcal{M}$ and a diagram*

$$F: P \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{/M}; \quad p \mapsto (F(p) \rightarrow M).$$

Assume that for each d in the essential image of $\mathcal{D}_{/M} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ the induced map

$$\operatorname{colim}_{p \in P} \mathcal{M}(d, F(p)) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(d, M) \tag{A.5}$$

is an equivalence of spaces. Then the map

$$\operatorname{colim}_{p \in P} \mathcal{D}_{/F(p)} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{/M} \tag{A.6}$$

of ∞ -categories is colimit cofinal.

Proof. Note that the map (A.6) of ∞ -categories lies canonically over \mathcal{D} so that we may compute the colimit in the slice $\operatorname{CAT}_{\infty/\mathcal{D}}$. Since both

$$\mathcal{D}_{/M} \rightarrow \mathcal{D} \quad \text{and each} \quad \mathcal{D}_{/F(p)} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$$

are right fibrations, the map (A.6) factors as follows:

$$\left(\begin{array}{c} \operatorname{colim}_{p \in P} \mathcal{D}_{/F(p)} \\ \downarrow \\ \mathcal{D} \end{array} \right) = \operatorname{colim}_{p \in P} \left(\begin{array}{c} \mathcal{D}_{/F(p)} \\ \downarrow \\ \mathcal{D} \end{array} \right) \longrightarrow \operatorname{RFib} \operatorname{colim}_{p \in P} \left(\begin{array}{c} \mathcal{D}_{/F(p)} \\ \downarrow \\ \mathcal{D} \end{array} \right) \rightarrow \left(\begin{array}{c} \mathcal{D}_{/M} \\ \downarrow \\ \mathcal{D} \end{array} \right) \tag{A.7}$$

Here the third colimit is computed in the reflective full subcategory $\operatorname{RFib}(\mathcal{D}) \subseteq \operatorname{CAT}_{\infty/\mathcal{D}}$ of right fibrations, so that the middle arrow is a right fibrant approximation. Moreover, the rightmost arrow is an equivalence: indeed, colimits in $\operatorname{RFib}(\mathcal{D}) \simeq \operatorname{Fun}(\mathcal{D}^{\text{op}}, \operatorname{GPD}_{\infty})$ are computed pointwise and for each $d \in \mathcal{D}$ in the essential image of $\mathcal{D}_{/M} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ the induced map on fibers is precisely the map (A.5) which is assumed to be an equivalence; both fibers are empty for all other $d \in \mathcal{D}$.

We conclude that the composite map (A.7) is a right fibrant approximation. Since every right fibrant approximation is colimit cofinal (see [Cis19, Proposition 4.1.11]), the result follows. \square

A.4. Localizations of pre-cocartesian ∞ -operads. Analogously to the setting of ∞ -categories, we call a map $\mathcal{O}^{\otimes} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^{\otimes}$ of ∞ -operads a *localization* at a class of 1-ary operations W , if for each operad \mathcal{Q}^{\otimes} the restriction functor

$$\operatorname{OPD}_{\infty}(\mathcal{P}^{\otimes}, \mathcal{Q}^{\otimes}) \rightarrow \operatorname{OPD}_{\infty}(\mathcal{O}^{\otimes}, \mathcal{Q}^{\otimes})$$

is fully faithful with essential image spanned by those operad maps $\mathcal{O}^{\otimes} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}^{\otimes}$ which invert the operations in W .

Remark A.5. Given a class W of 1-ary operations in \mathcal{O}^{\otimes} , i.e., a class of arrows in \mathcal{O} , we can consider the class W^{\otimes} of those morphisms in the various fibers $\mathcal{O}_{n+}^{\otimes} \simeq \mathcal{O}^n$ which are represented by tuples all of whose components lie in W . Then an operad map $\mathcal{O}^{\otimes} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^{\otimes}$ inverts the operations in W if and only if it sends the arrows in W^{\otimes} to equivalences. We use these two perspectives interchangeably.

The goal of this section is to provide an operadic analog of the localization criterion Lemma A.2. We start with an easy lemma.

Lemma A.6. *Let $\mathcal{O}^\otimes \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^\otimes$ be a map of operads. Assume that the map $\mathcal{O}^\otimes \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^\otimes$ of total ∞ -categories (i.e. forgetting the structure map to \mathbf{FIN}_*) is a localization of ∞ -categories. Then $\mathcal{O}^\otimes \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^\otimes$ is a localization of ∞ -operads.*

Proof. Denote by W^\otimes the class of arrows in \mathcal{O}^\otimes that become equivalences in \mathcal{P}^\otimes . Assume that the functor $\mathcal{O}^\otimes \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^\otimes$ is a localization of ∞ -categories at W^\otimes . Then for every functor $\mathcal{Q}^\otimes \rightarrow \mathbf{FIN}_*$ we can consider the commutative cube

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \mathrm{Fun}_{\mathbf{FIN}_*}(\mathcal{P}^\otimes, \mathcal{Q}^\otimes) & \xrightarrow{\quad\quad\quad} & \mathrm{Fun}(\mathcal{P}^\otimes, \mathcal{Q}^\otimes) & & \\
 \downarrow & \searrow & \downarrow & \searrow & \\
 & \mathrm{Fun}_{\mathbf{FIN}_*}(\mathcal{O}^\otimes, \mathcal{Q}^\otimes) & \xrightarrow{\quad\quad\quad} & \mathrm{Fun}(\mathcal{O}^\otimes, \mathcal{Q}^\otimes) & \\
 & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\
 * & \xrightarrow{\quad\quad\quad} & \mathrm{Fun}(\mathcal{P}^\otimes, \mathbf{FIN}_*) & & \\
 & \searrow & \searrow & & \\
 & * & \xrightarrow{\quad\quad\quad} & \mathrm{Fun}(\mathcal{O}^\otimes, \mathbf{FIN}_*) & \\
 & & & \downarrow & \\
 & & & * &
 \end{array}$$

where the front and the back are cartesian by definition. By the localization assumption, the two right diagonal restriction maps along $\mathcal{O}^\otimes \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^\otimes$ are fully faithful with essential image spanned by those functors that invert arrows in W^\otimes ; hence by pulling back the same is true for the upper left diagonal map.

Next, we claim that every cocartesian map $p \xrightarrow{!} p'$ in \mathcal{P}^\otimes over some inert $I_+ \rightarrow I'_+$ admits a lift to an inert cocartesian map in \mathcal{O}^\otimes : indeed we can lift p to an object o (because we assumed that $\mathcal{O}^\otimes \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^\otimes$ is a localization, in particular essentially surjective) and then find an inert lift $o \xrightarrow{!} o'$ of o along $I_+ \rightarrow I'_+$; this lift $o \xrightarrow{!} o'$ must then map to $p \xrightarrow{!} p'$ since $\mathcal{O}^\otimes \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^\otimes$ preserves inert maps and the cocartesian lift of p along $I_+ \rightarrow I'_+$ is unique. Hence, when \mathcal{Q}^\otimes is an ∞ -operad, to check that a map $\mathcal{P}^\otimes \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}^\otimes$ over \mathbf{FIN}_* preserves inert maps, it suffices to check it for the ones that come from \mathcal{O}^\otimes ; in other words, we have a cartesian square of inclusions

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathrm{OPD}_\infty(\mathcal{P}^\otimes, \mathcal{Q}^\otimes) & \hookrightarrow & \mathrm{OPD}_\infty(\mathcal{O}^\otimes, \mathcal{Q}^\otimes) \\
 \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\
 \mathrm{Fun}_{\mathbf{FIN}_*}(\mathcal{P}^\otimes, \mathcal{Q}^\otimes) & \hookrightarrow & \mathrm{Fun}_{\mathbf{FIN}_*}(\mathcal{O}^\otimes, \mathcal{Q}^\otimes)
 \end{array}$$

Unraveling the above constructions it is immediate that the essential image of the resulting fully faithful restriction map

$$\mathrm{OPD}_\infty(\mathcal{P}^\otimes, \mathcal{Q}^\otimes) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{OPD}_\infty(\mathcal{O}^\otimes, \mathcal{Q}^\otimes)$$

consists precisely of those operad maps $\mathcal{O}^\otimes \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}^\otimes$ which invert all arrows in W^\otimes , which is precisely what we needed to show. \square

We will only concern ourselves with operads which are very close to being symmetric monoidal ∞ -categories; most operads in this paper have this property.

Definition A.7. An ∞ -operad $\mathcal{O}^\otimes \rightarrow \mathbf{FIN}_*$ is called *pre-cocartesian* if it admits a class of active maps called *pre-cocartesian* (which we decorate by the symbol “!p”) such that

each active map $\alpha: \bar{o} \rightarrow \bar{u}$ in \mathcal{O}^\otimes with codomain \bar{u} over $I_+ \in \text{FIN}_*$ factors uniquely as the composite

$$\bar{o} \xrightarrow{\text{!P}} \bar{o}' \xrightarrow{\alpha'} \bar{u}$$

of a pre-cocartesian arrow followed by an arrow in the fiber over I_+ .

An operad map $\mathcal{O}^\otimes \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^\otimes$ between pre-cocartesian operads is called *multiplicative* if it preserves pre-cocartesian arrows.

Remark A.8. If \mathcal{O}^\otimes is pre-cocartesian then for every object $\bar{u} \in \mathcal{O}_{I_+}^\otimes$ the inclusion

$$\mathcal{O}_{I_+/\bar{u}}^\otimes \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{/\bar{u}}^{\otimes/\text{act}}$$

has a left adjoint $\alpha \mapsto \alpha'$. Thus the class of pre-cocartesian arrows is uniquely determined rather than being additional data: it consists precisely of those α such that α' is an equivalence.

Example A.9. If \mathcal{O}^\otimes is a symmetric monoidal ∞ -category (i.e., if it admits all cocartesian lifts), then it is pre-cocartesian with the pre-cocartesian arrows being precisely the cocartesian ones.

More generally we can consider operads arising from *partially* symmetric monoidal ∞ -categories: for such operads, the operations $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \rightarrow a$ are still given as maps $a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n \rightarrow a$ and only exist for those tuples (a_i) for which the tensor product exists. We call such operads *partially monoidal*; they are precisely those which are pre-cocartesian with all pre-cocartesian arrows being cocartesian.

Example A.10. Let (\mathcal{M}, \otimes) be a symmetric monoidal ∞ -category and assume that the monoidal unit is an initial object \emptyset . Let $\mathcal{D}^\otimes \subseteq \mathcal{M}^\otimes$ be a full symmetric monoidal subcategory. Then for each object $x \in \mathcal{M}$ there is a canonical pre-cocartesian ∞ -operad structure $(\mathcal{D}_{/x})^\otimes$ on the slice category $\mathcal{D}_{/x}$. We only provide an informal description of this ∞ -operad and refer to [AFT17a, Corollary 1.20] for a formal construction:

An operation $(y_i \rightarrow x)_{i \in I} \rightarrow (z \rightarrow x)$ consists of

- (1) an extension along the inclusions $y_i \rightarrow y := \bigotimes_{i \in I} y_i$ (which exist, using that the monoidal unit is initial) of the objects $y_i \rightarrow x$ to an object $y \rightarrow x$ in $\mathcal{D}_{/x}$, and
- (2) a map $(y \rightarrow x) \rightarrow (z \rightarrow x)$ in $\mathcal{D}_{/x}$.

The unique factorization of an operation $\alpha: (y_i \rightarrow x) \rightarrow (z \rightarrow x)$ is precisely $(y_i \rightarrow x) \xrightarrow{\text{!P}} (y \rightarrow x) \xrightarrow{\alpha'} (z \rightarrow x)$ with the notation above. The ∞ -operad $(\mathcal{D}_{/x})^\otimes$ comes equipped with the forgetful operad map $(\mathcal{D}_{/x})^\otimes \rightarrow \mathcal{D}^\otimes$; the pre-cocartesian arrows in $(\mathcal{D}_{/x})^\otimes$ are precisely those which are sent to cocartesian arrows in \mathcal{D}^\otimes .

If the tensor product \otimes is the coproduct, then the choice of auxiliary extension data 1 is unique, and $(\mathcal{D}_{/x})^\otimes$ is again a symmetric monoidal ∞ -category. However, in general this extra data is *not* unique and the ∞ -operad $(\mathcal{D}_{/x})^\otimes$ need not have any non-inert cocartesian arrows at all.

We can now state the extension of Lemma A.2 to pre-cocartesian operads.

Lemma A.11. *Let $f: \mathcal{O}^\otimes \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^\otimes$ be a multiplicative map of pre-cocartesian ∞ -operads. Denote by W^\otimes the class of those arrows in \mathcal{O}^\otimes that are inverted by f and write $W := W^\otimes \cap \mathcal{O}$. Assume the following:*

- (1) *The functor $f|_{1_+}: \mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ on the underlying ∞ -categories satisfies the two assumptions of Lemma A.2, i.e.,*

$$|W| \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathcal{P}^\simeq \quad \text{and} \quad |W \times_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}_{/u}| \xrightarrow{\simeq} (\mathcal{P}_{/f(u)})^\simeq \tag{A.8}$$

for all $u \in \mathcal{O}$.

- (2) Given a composition $\bar{d} \xrightarrow{!P} o \xrightarrow{w} o'$ in \mathcal{O}^\otimes with $o, o' \in \mathcal{O}$ where the first arrow is pre-cocartesian and the second is in W , there is a unique factorization of the form

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bar{d} & \xrightarrow{\bar{w}} & \bar{d}' \\ !P \downarrow & & \downarrow !P \\ o & \xrightarrow{w} & o' \end{array} \quad (\text{A.9})$$

where the top arrow is in W^\otimes and the right arrow is pre-cocartesian.

- (3) For each object $o \in \mathcal{O}$, the map f induces an equivalence

$$W^\otimes \times_{\mathcal{O}^\otimes} \mathcal{O}^\otimes /_{!P}^o \xrightarrow{\simeq} \left(\mathcal{P}^\otimes /_{!P}^{f(o)} \right)^\simeq \quad (\text{A.10})$$

of ∞ -groupoids¹⁷, where on both sides the symbol “ $!P$ ” denotes the full subcategories of the slice spanned by the pre-cocartesian arrows.

Then $f: \mathcal{O}^\otimes \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^\otimes$ is a localization of ∞ -operads at W .

Proof. By Lemma A.6 it suffices that the functor $f: \mathcal{O}^\otimes \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^\otimes$ on total categories is a localization of ∞ -categories at W^\otimes . For this we aim to apply Lemma A.2 to this total functor. Before checking its two assumptions, we perform a preliminary computation.

First, note that we have an (a priori lax) square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{O}^\otimes /_{!u}^{\text{act}} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{P}^\otimes /_{f(u)}^{\text{act}} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{O} /_u & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{P} /_{f(u)} \end{array}$$

where the horizontal morphisms are induced by f and the vertical morphisms are induced by the left adjoints described in Remark A.8; the square actually commutes because f preserves pre-cocartesian arrows.

After restricting only to those morphisms that become equivalences in \mathcal{P}^\otimes , we obtain the commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W^\otimes \times_{\mathcal{O}^\otimes} \mathcal{O}^\otimes /_{!u}^{\text{act}} & \longrightarrow & \left(\mathcal{P}^\otimes /_{f(u)}^{\text{act}} \right)^\simeq \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ W \times_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O} /_u & \longrightarrow & \left(\mathcal{P} /_{f(u)} \right)^\simeq \end{array} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

We know the following facts about the square (A.11):

- Condition 2 states exactly that the left vertical map is a left fibration; in particular its fibers are ∞ -groupoids.
- After factoring through the classifying space, the lower horizontal map becomes an equivalence by the second assumption of condition 1.
- For each object $(o \rightarrow u)$ in the lower left, the induced map on fibers is

$$W^\otimes \times_{\mathcal{O}^\otimes} \mathcal{O}^\otimes /_{!o}^o \rightarrow \left(\mathcal{P}^\otimes /_{f(o)}^o \right)^\simeq,$$

which is an equivalence of ∞ -groupoids by condition 3.

It is a straightforward consequence of Quillen’s theorem B (see Lemma A.1) that for any such square the top horizontal map induces an equivalence

$$\left| W^\otimes \times_{\mathcal{O}^\otimes} \mathcal{O}^\otimes /_{!u}^{\text{act}} \right| \xrightarrow{\simeq} \left(\mathcal{P}^\otimes /_{f(u)}^{\text{act}} \right)^\simeq \quad (\text{A.12})$$

¹⁷As explained in the proof, condition 2 implies that the left side of (A.10) is automatically an ∞ -groupoid, so that we do not need to pass to its classifying space like we do in (A.8).

of ∞ -groupoids.

Now we can easily show the two conditions of Lemma A.2 for the functor $f: \mathcal{O}^\otimes \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^\otimes$:

(1) We have the equivalence

$$|W^\otimes| = \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |W|^n \xrightarrow{\simeq} \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (\mathcal{P}^\simeq)^n = (\mathcal{P}^\otimes)^\simeq$$

using the first assumption of condition 1.

(2) Note that an active map $h: \vec{d} \rightarrow \vec{u}$ in an operad is uniquely described by a collection of active maps $\vec{d}_i \rightarrow u_i$ (which jointly form the active part $h^{\text{act}}: \bigoplus_i \vec{d}_i \rightarrow u$ of h) together with a finite tuple $(d_j)_{j \in J}$ which correspond to components of the domain that are discarded by the inert part h^{inert} .

Hence for each $\vec{u} = (u_i) \in \mathcal{O}_{I_+}^\otimes$ we have the desired equivalence

$$\begin{aligned} |W^\otimes \times_{\mathcal{O}^\otimes} \mathcal{O}^\otimes /_{\vec{u}}| &= \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left(\prod_{i \in I} |W^\otimes \times_{\mathcal{O}^\otimes} \mathcal{O}^\otimes /_{\vec{u}_i}^{\text{act}}| \times |W|^n \right) \\ &\xrightarrow{\simeq} \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left(\prod_{i \in I} (\mathcal{P}^\otimes /_{f(u_i)}^{\text{act}})^\simeq \times (\mathcal{P}^\simeq)^n \right) = (\mathcal{P}^\otimes /_{f(\vec{u})}). \end{aligned}$$

again using the equivalence $|W| \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^\simeq$ and the key computation (A.12). \square

APPENDIX B. OPERADIC COLIMITS AND LEFT KAN EXTENSIONS

We make liberal use of the theory of operadic colimits and operadic left Kan extensions developed in Section 3.1 of [Lur17]. The results therein are written in much greater generality than what is needed for our purposes. For the convenience of the reader, we summarize the relevant special cases used in this paper.

Throughout, let (\mathcal{C}, \otimes) , or more precisely, $q: \mathcal{C}^\otimes \rightarrow \mathbf{FIN}_*$ be a symmetric monoidal ∞ -category; the underlying ∞ -category is $\mathcal{C} := \mathcal{C}_{1+}^\otimes \subset \mathcal{C}^\otimes$. We sometimes write objects of \mathcal{C}^\otimes as tuples $(I_+, (c_i)_{i \in I})$ or $(c_i)_{i \in I}$, or abbreviate them as \bar{c} . We write $c = (1_+, (c))$ for objects in the fiber $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_{1+}^\otimes$ over 1_+ .

- We always assume that (\mathcal{C}, \otimes) is *compatible with all (small) colimits* ([Lur17, Definition 3.1.1.18]), which means that the ∞ -category \mathcal{C} has all colimits and that the tensor product functor

$$\bigotimes_I: \mathcal{C}^I \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$$

preserves them in each variable.

- [Lur17, Definition 3.1.1.2] We write *operadic colimit cone* for what Lurie calls “operadic q -colimit diagram” since we never consider a case where q is anything other than the structure-defining cocartesian fibration to \mathbf{FIN}_* . When we have an operadic colimit cone $F^\triangleright: K^\triangleright \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\text{act}}^\otimes$ whose value at the cone point $\infty \in K^\triangleright$ lies in the fiber over $I_+ \in \mathbf{FIN}_*$, we write

$$\text{ocolim}_{k \in K} F(k) \xrightarrow{\simeq} F^\triangleright(\infty) \in \mathcal{C}_{I_+}^\otimes.$$

This is a mild abuse of notation, since to specify an operadic colimit one needs to specify not just the base diagram $F: K \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\text{act}}^\otimes$ but also a cone $F_0^\triangleright: K^\triangleright \rightarrow \mathbf{FIN}_*^{\text{act}}$ of $F_0 := qF$, which is left implicit in the notation.

- [Lur17, Proposition 3.1.1.15 (2) and Proposition 3.1.1.20] Let $F^\triangleright: K^\triangleright \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\text{act}}^\otimes$ be a cone and let $\bigotimes F^\triangleright: K^\triangleright \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be the transferred cone along the terminal transformation $qF^\triangleright(-) \Rightarrow 1_+$. Then F^\triangleright is an operadic colimit cone if and only if $\bigotimes F^\triangleright$ is an (ordinary) colimit cone in \mathcal{C} . In other words, we have

$$\text{ocolim}_{k \in K} F(k) \xrightarrow{\simeq} F^\triangleright(\infty) \in \mathcal{C}_{qF^\triangleright(\infty)}^\otimes$$

if and only if we have

$$\text{colim}_{k \in K} \bigotimes F(k) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \bigotimes F^\triangleright(\infty) \in \mathcal{C}.$$

In particular, every diagram $F: K \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\text{act}}^\otimes$ admits an operadic colimit with cone point in $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_{1+}^\otimes$ by the formula

$$\text{ocolim}_{k \in K} F(k) := \text{colim}_{k \in K} \bigotimes F(k) \in \mathcal{C} \tag{B.1}$$

(lying over the unique cone $F_0^\triangleright: qF \Rightarrow 1_+$ which is left implicit).

- [Lur17, Proposition 3.1.1.8] If $(F_i^\triangleright: K_i^\triangleright \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\text{act}}^\otimes)_{i \in I}$ is a finite tuple of operadic colimit cones, then the induced cone

$$\left(\prod_i K_i \right)^\triangleright \rightarrow \prod_i K_i^\triangleright \xrightarrow{\prod_i F_i^\triangleright} \prod_i \mathcal{C}_{\text{act}}^\otimes \xrightarrow{\oplus_I} \mathcal{C}_{\text{act}}^\otimes;$$

is also an operadic colimit cone (where \oplus denotes concatenation of tuples). In particular, if all cone points $F_i^\triangleright(\infty)$ take value in $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_{1+}^\otimes$, we can write

$$\text{ocolim}_{k \in \prod_i K_i} (F_i(k_i))_{i \in I} = \left(\text{ocolim}_{k_i \in K_i} F_i(k_i) \right)_{i \in I} \in \mathcal{C}_{1+}^\otimes. \tag{B.2}$$

- [Lur17, Remark 3.1.1.4] Precomposition with colimit cofinal maps preserves operadic colimit cones. In other words, we have

$$\operatorname{ocolim}_{h \in H} F(\alpha(h)) \simeq \operatorname{ocolim}_{k \in K} F(k) \in \mathcal{C}_{F_0^\triangleright(\infty)}^\otimes$$

whenever $\alpha: H \rightarrow K$ is a colimit cofinal map.

- [Lur17, Corollary 3.1.3.5] Given a map $\iota: \mathcal{O}^\otimes \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^\otimes$ of small ∞ -operads, we have an adjunction

$$\iota_!: \operatorname{ALG}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathcal{C}) \rightleftarrows \operatorname{ALG}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}) : \iota^*$$

where the right adjoint ι^* is restriction and the left adjoint $\iota_!$ is *operadic left Kan extension*. The operadic left Kan extension is characterized uniquely by the pointwise operadic colimit formula

$$\operatorname{ocolim} \mathcal{A}|_{\mathcal{O}^\otimes /_{\bar{p}}^{\operatorname{act}}} \xrightarrow{\simeq} (\iota_! \mathcal{A})(\bar{p}). \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Corollary B.1. *If $\iota: \mathcal{O}^\otimes \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^\otimes$ is fully faithful then $\iota_!$ is also fully faithful and induces an equivalence*

$$\operatorname{ALG}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathcal{C}) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \left\{ \mathcal{A} \in \operatorname{ALG}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}) \left| \forall p \in \mathcal{P}: \operatorname{ocolim}_{\bar{o} \xrightarrow{\operatorname{act}} p} \mathcal{A}|_{\mathcal{O}}(\bar{o}) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathcal{A}(p) \right. \right\}.$$

Proof. If ι is fully faithful, then for all $o \in \mathcal{O}$ the unit

$$\mathcal{A}(o) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \operatorname{ocolim} \mathcal{A}|_{\mathcal{O}^\otimes /_{o}^{\operatorname{act}}} \simeq (\iota^* \iota_! \mathcal{A})(o)$$

is an equivalence because $o \in \mathcal{O}^\otimes /_{o}^{\operatorname{act}} \simeq \mathcal{O}^\otimes /_{i(o)}^{\operatorname{act}}$ is a terminal object. \square

Corollary B.2. *An algebra $\mathcal{A} \in \operatorname{ALG}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C})$ is the operadic left Kan extension of its restriction to \mathcal{O} if and only if it induces an equivalence*

$$\operatorname{colim}_{\bar{o} \xrightarrow{\operatorname{act}} p} \bigotimes \mathcal{A}(\bar{o}) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathcal{A}(p) \in \mathcal{C}$$

for all $p \in \mathcal{P}$.

Proof. It follows from (B.2) and the canonical identification

$$\mathcal{O}^\otimes /_{\bar{p}}^{\operatorname{act}} \xrightarrow{\simeq} \prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{O}^\otimes /_{p_i}^{\operatorname{act}}$$

for each $\bar{p} = (p_i) \in \mathcal{P}_{I_+}^\otimes$ that it suffices to check the operadic left Kan extension condition (B.3) for only those $\bar{p} = p$ that lie over $1_+ \in \operatorname{FIN}_*$. Then the claim follows from the identification of (B.1). \square

In special situations, there is a very tight relationship between the operadic and the ordinary left Kan extension.

Lemma B.3. *Let $\iota: \mathcal{O}^\otimes \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}^\otimes$ be a fully faithful inclusion of ∞ -operads. Assume that for every object $\bar{o} \in \mathcal{O}_{I_+}^\otimes$ and every active map $\iota(\bar{o}) \rightarrow p$ with codomain $p \in \mathcal{P}$, there exists a cocartesian arrow $\bar{o} \rightarrow o$ in \mathcal{O}^\otimes lifting the active map $I_+ \rightarrow 1_+$ which remains cocartesian in \mathcal{P}^\otimes . Then the (a priori lax) square*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \operatorname{ALG}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathcal{C}) & \xleftarrow{\operatorname{oLKE}} & \operatorname{ALG}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}) \\ (-)_{1_+} \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow (-)_{1_+} \\ \operatorname{Fun}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{C}) & \xleftarrow{\operatorname{LKE}} & \operatorname{Fun}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{C}) \end{array} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

commutes and is a pullback, where the upper and lower horizontal functors are operadic and ordinary left Kan extension, respectively.

Remark B.4. In this paper we are mostly concerned with operads arising from (subposets of) $\text{Open}(X)$ together with its partial symmetric monoidal structure given by disjoint union. For an inclusion $\mathfrak{B} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{U}$ of such poset of opens, the associated operad inclusion $\mathfrak{B}^\otimes \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{U}^\otimes$ satisfies the assumption of Lemma B.3 if and only if \mathfrak{B} is closed under disjoint unions subordinate to \mathfrak{U} , i.e., whenever $U, V \in \mathfrak{B}$ are disjoint and $U \cup V \in \mathfrak{U}_\downarrow$ it follows that $U \cup V \in \mathfrak{B}$.

Proof of Lemma B.3. The assumption imply that every active arrow of the form $\alpha: \iota(\bar{o}) \rightarrow p$ admits a unique factorization $\alpha = (\iota(\bar{o}) \xrightarrow{!} \iota(o) \xrightarrow{\alpha'} p)$ where the first arrow is cocartesian and the second one lies in the \mathcal{P} . Hence the canonical inclusion

$$\mathcal{O}/p \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}^\otimes /_{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{act}}$$

has a left adjoint given by $\alpha \mapsto \alpha'$, in particular it is colimit cofinal. Thus for every algebra $\mathcal{A} \in \text{ALG}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathcal{C})$ and every $p \in \mathcal{P}$ the canonical comparison map

$$\text{LKE}\mathcal{A}_{1+}(p) \simeq \text{colim } \mathcal{A}|_{\mathcal{O}/p} \xrightarrow{\simeq} \text{colim } \bigotimes \mathcal{A}|_{\mathcal{O}^\otimes /_{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{act}}} \simeq \text{oLKE}\mathcal{A}(p)$$

is an equivalence (using Corollary B.2 for the rightmost equivalence). It follows directly that the diagram (B.4) commutes and is a pullback. \square

We also use the following natural extension of Lurie's terminology even though it does not, strictly speaking, appear in this form.

Definition B.5. Given the solid outer commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K & \xrightarrow{F} & \mathcal{C}_{\text{act}}^\otimes \\ \downarrow & \dashrightarrow \bar{F} & \downarrow q \\ L & \xrightarrow{F_0} & \text{FIN}_*^{\text{act}} \end{array}$$

where the left vertical map is fully faithful¹⁸ we say that a dashed lift \bar{F} is a/the operadic left Kan extension of F (again, with F_0 left implicit), if for each $l \in L$ we have

$$\text{ocolim}_{k \rightarrow l} F(k) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \bar{F}(l).$$

Remark B.6. Equivalently, \bar{F} is a left Kan extension of F if the transferred diagram $\bigotimes \bar{F}: L \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is an (ordinary) left Kan extension of the transferred diagram $\bigotimes F: K \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$. In particular, operadic left Kan extensions are transitive and preserve the operadic colimits of a diagram.

Lemma B.7. *Let $F: K \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\text{act}}^\otimes$ be a diagram that sends all arrows in K to cocartesian morphisms. Assume that K is weakly contractible. Then for each extension $F_0^\triangleright: K^\triangleright \rightarrow \text{FIN}_*^{\text{act}}$ of qF there exists an operadic colimit cone F^\triangleright of F over F_0^\triangleright and all structure maps*

$$F(k) \rightarrow \text{ocolim}_{k \in K} F(k)$$

are cocartesian.

Proof. Let $F(-) \Rightarrow F'(-): K \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\text{act}}^\otimes$ be a pointwise cocartesian transformation exhibiting a transfer along $F_0(-) \Rightarrow F_0^\triangleright(\infty)$. Since F sends all arrows to cocartesian morphisms, it follows that F' sends all arrows to equivalences. Since K is weakly contractible, F' then admits a colimit cone $F'(-) \Rightarrow F^\triangleright(\infty)$ all of whose arrows are equivalences. Such colimit

¹⁸We stick to (operadic) left Kan extensions along fully faithful inclusions to avoid having to work with lax diagrams. This generality is sufficient for the purposes of this paper.

cones are preserved by any functor, in particular by the transfer along the unique active map $F_0^\triangleright(\infty) \rightarrow 1_+$. It follows that the composite transformation

$$F(-) \Rightarrow F'(-) \Rightarrow F^\triangleright(\infty)$$

is an operadic colimit cone $F^\triangleright: K^\triangleright \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\text{act}}^\otimes$ over F_0^\triangleright ; all of its arrows are cocartesian by construction. \square

APPENDIX C. HOMOTOPY COLIMITS OF TRANSFINITE CUBES

Let \mathbf{M} be a model category presenting the ∞ -category $\mathcal{C} := \mathbf{M}[W^{-1}]$ obtained by localizing at the weak equivalences. We say that a conical diagram $D^\triangleright \rightarrow \mathbf{M}$ is a homotopy colimit cone if its image in \mathcal{C} is a colimit cone.

In Section 4.2 we need that a sufficiently cofibrant colimit cube in the model category of dendroidal sets (presenting the ∞ -category of ∞ -operads) is a homotopy colimit cube. Since we could not find a reference in the literature for the infinite version of this statement, we provide an elementary proof by induction which directly generalizes to the transfinite case.

C.1. Transfinite sequences.

- By default, all ordinals are assumed to be small. We denote by Ord the first large ordinal. It is the large set of (small) ordinals.
- By a *transfinite sequence*

$$x_0 \rightarrow x_1 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow x_\alpha \rightarrow x_{\alpha+1} \rightarrow \cdots$$

in \mathcal{M} , we mean a diagram $x: \text{Ord} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ or a diagram $x: \beta \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ where β is a (small) ordinal.

- A transfinite sequence x is called *cocontinuous* if at each limit ordinal λ , the comparison map $\text{colim}_{\alpha < \lambda} x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\cong} x_\lambda$ is an equivalence.
- We say that a cocontinuous sequence $x: \beta + 1 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ exhibits the map $x_0 \rightarrow x_\beta$ as a *transfinite composition* of the maps $x_\alpha \rightarrow x_{\alpha+1}$ (for $\alpha < \beta$).

Lemma C.1. *Let T be a partially ordered (small) set with all suprema; in particular, T has a unique maximal element $\max T = \sup T$. Let $F: T \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be an T -indexed diagram in some ∞ -category \mathcal{C} . Assume that*

- (1) *for each $t < \max T$ there exists a $t < t'$ such that the map $F(t) \rightarrow F(t')$ is an equivalence.*
- (2) *for each subset $S \subset T$ the induced map $\text{colim}_{s \in S} F(s) \xrightarrow{\cong} F(\sup S)$ is an equivalence.*

Then for each $t \in T$, the map $F(t) \rightarrow F(\max T)$ is an equivalence.

Proof. Fix $t \in T$. By transfinite recursion, we find a successor ordinal $\beta + 1$ and a transfinite sequence $p: \beta + 1 \rightarrow T$ as follows:

- We start with $p_0 := t$.
- For each ordinal α , the successor value $p_{\alpha+1} > p_\alpha$ is chosen using condition 1 such that $F(p_\alpha) \rightarrow F(p_{\alpha+1})$ is an equivalence; unless $p_\alpha = \max T$, in which case the recursion terminates and we set $\beta := \alpha$.
- For each limit ordinal λ , we set $p_\lambda := \sup_{\alpha < \lambda} p_\alpha$.

Note that the recursion must eventually terminate because otherwise it would produce an injection $\text{Ord} \hookrightarrow T$ which is impossible due to size. By construction, the sequence p is cocontinuous, hence so is $F \circ p$ by condition 2. Hence the map $F(t) = F(p_0) \rightarrow F(p_\beta) = F(\max T)$ is the transfinite composition of the maps $F(p_\alpha) \rightarrow F(p_{\alpha+1})$, which are all equivalences by construction. We are done, since the transfinite composition of equivalences is an equivalence. \square

C.2. Transfinite cubes. Let \mathcal{M} be an ∞ -category with all colimits. Denote by \emptyset its initial object.

- For every ordinal β we denote by $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^{\text{op}}(\beta)$ the poset of finite subsets of β ordered by reverse inclusion.
- A β -cube in \mathcal{M} is a diagram $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^{\text{op}}(\beta) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$.

- We denote by

$$\text{Cube}_\beta \mathcal{M} := \text{Fun}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^{\text{op}}(\beta), \mathcal{M})$$

the ∞ -category of β -cubes in \mathcal{M} .

- For each $\alpha < \beta$, the *restriction operator*

$$\tau_\alpha: \text{Cube}_\beta \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \text{Cube}_\alpha \mathcal{M}$$

has a fully faithful left adjoint given by left Kan extension. Via this inclusion, we identify α -cubes with those β -cubes F where $F(I) \simeq \emptyset$ for all $I \not\subseteq \alpha$.

- We write

$$\text{Cube} \mathcal{M} = \text{colim}_{\beta \in \text{Ord}} \text{Cube}_\beta \mathcal{M}$$

for the ∞ -category of all cubes; the colimit is taken along the aforementioned full embeddings. Note that the ∞ -category $\text{Cube} \mathcal{M}$ is still locally small, since every pair of cubes lie in some common $\text{Cube}_\beta \mathcal{M} \subset \text{Cube} \mathcal{M}$.

- We can identify $\text{Cube} \mathcal{M}$ with the category of those (large) cubes $F: \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^{\text{op}}(\text{Ord}) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ which take the value $F(I) = \emptyset$ for all except a small amount of I 's.
- The counits of the adjunctions

$$\cdots \rightrightarrows \text{Cube}_\alpha \mathcal{M} \rightrightarrows \text{Cube}_{\alpha+1} \mathcal{M} \rightrightarrows \cdots \rightrightarrows \text{Cube} \mathcal{M}$$

induce a cocontinuous Ord-indexed sequence

$$\tau_0 \rightarrow \tau_1 \cdots \rightarrow \tau_\alpha \rightarrow \tau_{\alpha+1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow \text{id} \tag{C.1}$$

of restriction operators $\text{Cube} \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \text{Cube} \mathcal{M}$.

- For each (small) subset $S \subset \text{Ord}$ denote by $\text{ord}(S)$ the *order type* of S , i.e. the unique ordinal β isomorphic to $(S, <)$. Then we have the *restriction operator*

$$\tau_S: \text{Cube} \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \text{Cube}_{\text{ord}(\beta)} \mathcal{M}, \tag{C.2}$$

given by precomposition with the embedding

$$\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^{\text{op}}(\text{ord}(S)) \cong \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^{\text{op}}(S) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^{\text{op}}(\text{Ord}).$$

This notation agrees with the previous one in the case where S is an initial segment of Ord, i.e. $S = \text{ord}(S)$.

- For each ordinal α , we have the cocontinuous *back face operator*

$$\sigma_\alpha: \text{Cube} \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \text{Cube}_\alpha \mathcal{M}$$

obtained by pulling back along the embedding

$$- \cup \{\alpha\}: \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^{\text{op}}(\alpha) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^{\text{op}}(\text{Ord})$$

of posets.

- The data of an $(\alpha + 1)$ -cube F , amounts precisely to
 - the α -cubes $\sigma_\alpha F$ and $\tau_\alpha F$ which are its back and front face “in direction α ” respectively, and
 - the transformation $\sigma_\alpha F \rightarrow \tau_\alpha F$ between those two faces.

More precisely, we have an equivalence of ∞ -categories

$$(\sigma_\alpha \rightarrow \tau_\alpha): \text{Cube}_{\alpha+1} \mathcal{M} \xrightarrow{\simeq} \text{Fun}(\Delta^1, \text{Cube}_\alpha \mathcal{M}).$$

Example C.2. Consider a 3-cube $F \in \text{Cube}_3\mathcal{M}$:

$$F = \begin{array}{ccccc} F(012) & \longrightarrow & F(12) & & \\ & \searrow & \downarrow & \searrow & \\ & & F(01) & \longrightarrow & F(1) \\ & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \\ F(02) & \longrightarrow & F(2) & & \\ & \searrow & \downarrow & \searrow & \\ & & F(0) & \longrightarrow & F(\emptyset) \end{array}$$

Then $\sigma_2 F \rightarrow \tau_2 F$ are the 2-cubes (=squares)

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F(012) \longrightarrow F(12) & & F(01) \longrightarrow F(1) \\ \downarrow & \longrightarrow & \downarrow \\ F(02) \longrightarrow F(2) & & F(0) \longrightarrow F(\emptyset) \end{array}$$

comprising the back and front face of F , respectively.

C.3. The latching operator.

- For each ordinal β , we have the *latching operator*

$$\partial_\beta: \text{Cube}_\beta\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \text{Cube}_\beta\mathcal{M}$$

given by left Kan extension and then restriction along the cospan

$$\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^{\text{op}}(\beta) \times \{1\} \longleftarrow Q \longleftarrow \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^{\text{op}}(\beta) \times \{0\}$$

(read from left to right) where Q is the set $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^{\text{op}}(\beta) \times \{0, 1\}$ equipped with the lexicographic ordering, i.e. $(J, j) < (I, i)$ if and only if $J \supsetneq I$ or both $J = I$ and $j < i$.

- Explicitly, we have the pointwise formula

$$\partial_\beta F(I) = \text{colim}_{(J,1) < (I,0)} F(J) = \text{colim}_{\beta \supseteq J \supseteq I} F(J), \quad (\text{C.3})$$

where we keep implicit the fact that J only ranges over finite subsets¹⁹.

- A straightforward computation shows that for any two ordinals $\alpha < \beta$, the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Cube}_\alpha\mathcal{M} & \xrightarrow{\partial_\alpha} & \text{Cube}_\alpha\mathcal{M} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{Cube}_\beta\mathcal{M} & \xrightarrow{\partial_\beta} & \text{Cube}_\beta\mathcal{M} \end{array}$$

canonically commutes.

- Therefore we may assemble all the ∂_β into a single cocontinuous latching operator

$$\partial = \partial_{\text{Ord}}: \text{Cube}\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \text{Cube}\mathcal{M},$$

with the pointwise formula

$$\partial F(I) = \text{colim}_{\text{Ord} \supseteq J \supseteq I} F(J). \quad (\text{C.4})$$

This colimit is well defined, since it is equivalent to the small colimit (C.3) for any sufficiently large (but still small) ordinal β .

¹⁹Even if F is defined on a larger class of subsets of β (not just the finite ones), this notation is still not ambiguous because the inclusion $\{J \text{ finite}\} \hookrightarrow \{\beta \supseteq J \supseteq I\}$ is colimit cofinal for every I .

- The operator ∂ comes equipped with the tautological transformation $\partial F \rightarrow F$, which we call the *latching map*. A cube F is *cocartesian* (i.e. a colimit diagram in \mathcal{M}) if and only if the latching map $\partial F(\emptyset) \rightarrow F(\emptyset)$ at \emptyset is an equivalence.
- For each (small) subset $S \subset \text{Ord}$, we write²⁰ $\partial_S := \partial \circ \tau_S$. We call

$$\partial_S F \rightarrow \tau_S F \rightarrow F \quad (\text{C.5})$$

the *S-restricted latching map*. The corresponding pointwise formula is simply that of (C.4) applied to the *S*-restricted cube, i.e.

$$\partial_S F(I) = \text{colim}_{\text{Ord} \supseteq J \supseteq I} \tau_S F(J) \simeq \text{colim}_{S \supseteq J \supseteq I} F(J). \quad (\text{C.6})$$

- Composing the cocontinuous functor ∂ with the cocontinuous sequence (C.1) yields the cocontinuous Ord-indexed sequence

$$\partial_0 \rightarrow \partial_1 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow \partial_\alpha \rightarrow \partial_{\alpha+1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow \partial \rightarrow \text{id}$$

of functors $\text{Cube}\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \text{Cube}\mathcal{M}$.

- The transformation $\sigma_\alpha \rightarrow \tau_\alpha$ factors as

$$\sigma_\alpha \rightarrow \tau_\alpha \partial_{\alpha+1} \rightarrow \tau_\alpha$$

where the first map is pointwise just the structure map

$$\sigma_\alpha F(I) = F(I \cup \{\alpha\}) \xrightarrow{J=I \cup \{\alpha\}} \text{colim}_{\alpha+1 \supseteq J \supseteq I} F(J) = \partial_{\alpha+1} F(I)$$

of the colimit (for $I \subseteq \alpha$).

- For all ordinals α and subsets $S \subseteq \alpha$ we have the natural identification

$$\sigma_\alpha \partial_{S \cup \{\alpha\}} F(I) = \text{colim}_{S \cup \{\alpha\} \supseteq J \supseteq I \cup \{\alpha\}} F(J) \xrightarrow{J=K \cup \{\alpha\}} \text{colim}_{S \supseteq K \supseteq I} F(K \cup \{\alpha\}) = \partial_S \sigma_\alpha F(I) \quad (\text{C.7})$$

and in particular (for $S = \alpha$)

$$\sigma_\alpha \circ \partial_{\alpha+1} = \partial_\alpha \circ \sigma_\alpha.$$

Example C.3. Consider again the 3-cube from Example C.2. For the subset $S = \{0, 2\}$ the corresponding restriction operator from Equation (C.2) is

$$\tau_S F = \begin{array}{ccccc} \emptyset & \longrightarrow & \emptyset & & \emptyset \\ & \searrow & \downarrow & \searrow & \\ & & \emptyset & \longrightarrow & \emptyset \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ F(02) & \longrightarrow & F(2) & & \\ & \searrow & \downarrow & \searrow & \\ & & F(0) & \longrightarrow & F(\emptyset) \end{array} .$$

The corresponding *S*-restricted latching map is pointwise given by (C.6). For example for $I = \emptyset$ we have

$$\partial_S F(\emptyset) = \text{colim}_{\{0,1,2\} \supseteq J \supseteq \emptyset} \tau_S F(J) \simeq \text{colim} (F(0) \leftarrow F(02) \rightarrow F(2)).$$

Note that a priori the colimit is over the entire punctured cube, i.e. with the 4 copies of \emptyset , but these do not contribute to the colimit so we omit them for simplicity.

Now, let $\mathcal{L}: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be a functor between cocomplete ∞ -categories that preserves the initial object. We do *not* assume that \mathcal{L} preserves colimits. The typical situation is when \mathcal{M} is a model category and \mathcal{L} is its ∞ -categorical localization.

²⁰Note that for $S = \text{ord}(S) = \beta$, this notation is compatible with the previous one because for every β -cube F we have $\tau_\beta F = F$.

- The functor \mathcal{L} induces an operator $\text{Cube}\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \text{Cube}\mathcal{C}$ by postcomposition, which we also denote \mathcal{L} .
- For each ordinal α the operators \mathcal{L} and σ_α canonically commute, since one is given by postcomposition and the other by precomposition.
- Since \mathcal{L} preserves the initial objects, it also commutes with the restriction operators τ_β .
- On the other hand, \mathcal{L} does not in general commute with the latching operator ∂ . The universal property of the colimit (C.4) (or more precisely of the left Kan extension assembled from those pointwise colimits) yields a natural transformation $\partial\mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}\partial$, which is not usually an equivalence.

C.4. Very cofibrant cubes. From now on let \mathcal{M} be equipped with a wide subcategory of morphisms called cofibrations. We call an object $x \in \mathcal{M}$ *cofibrant* if $\emptyset \rightarrow x$ is a cofibration.

Assumption C.4. We require the following properties:

- (1) Let

$$\begin{array}{ccc} x & \longrightarrow & x' \\ \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\ y & \longrightarrow & y' \end{array} \quad (\text{C.8})$$

be a pushout square in \mathcal{M} where $x \rightarrow y$ is a cofibration. Then $x' \rightarrow y'$ is also a cofibration. Moreover, the square (C.8) remains a pushout in \mathcal{C} after applying \mathcal{L} .

- (2) Let $x_0 \rightarrow x_\beta$ be a transfinite composition in \mathcal{M} of cofibrations $x_\alpha \rightarrow x_{\alpha+1}$ (for $\alpha < \beta$) and assume that x_0 is cofibrant. Then the comparison map $\text{colim}_{\alpha < \beta} \mathcal{L}x_\alpha \rightarrow \mathcal{L}x_\beta$ is an equivalence.

Definition C.5. A cube F in \mathcal{M} is called *very cofibrant* if for each subset $S \subset \text{Ord}$, the S -restricted latching map $\partial_S F \rightarrow F$ is a levelwise cofibration.

Remark C.6. When F is a β -cube, it suffices to check the levelwise cofibrancy of the maps $\partial_S F \rightarrow F$ only for the subsets $S \subseteq \beta$, since for every $S \subset \text{Ord}$, we have $\partial_{S \cap \beta} F = \partial_S F$.

Lemma C.7. *If F is a very cofibrant cube, then so is the back face $\sigma_\alpha F$ for every ordinal α .*

Proof. Assume that F is very cofibrant. Since $\sigma_\alpha F$ is an α -cube, it suffices to show that for each subset $S \subseteq \alpha$, the restricted latching map $\partial_S \sigma_\alpha F \rightarrow \sigma_\alpha F$ is a levelwise cofibration. But by (C.7), this map is identified with

$$\sigma_\alpha(\partial_{S \cup \{\alpha\}} F \rightarrow F),$$

which is a levelwise cofibration by assumption, and σ_α preserves levelwise cofibrations (since it is just given by a precomposition). \square

Our goal is to prove the following:

Theorem C.8. *Let $\mathcal{L}: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be a functor between cocomplete ∞ -categories which preserves the initial object and satisfies Assumption C.4.*

Then for every very cofibrant cube F in \mathcal{M} the comparison map

$$\partial\mathcal{L}F(\emptyset) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}\partial F(\emptyset)$$

is an equivalence in \mathcal{C} .

More specifically, we care about the following consequence.

Corollary C.9. *Let \mathbf{M} be a left proper model category and $F \in \text{Cube}\mathbf{M}$ a very cofibrant cube in \mathbf{M} . Then the colimit*

$$\partial F(\emptyset) := \operatorname{colim}_{I \supseteq \emptyset} F(I)$$

is a homotopy colimit, i.e. remains a colimit in the ∞ -category $\mathcal{C} := \mathbf{M}[W^{-1}]$ presented by \mathbf{M} .

Proof. Follows immediately from Theorem C.8, because for every left proper model category \mathbf{M} , the localization functor $\mathbf{M} \rightarrow \mathbf{M}[W^{-1}]$ satisfies Assumption C.4:

- (1) Pushouts of cofibrations in a model category are always cofibrations because they are characterized by left lifting against trivial fibrations. In a left proper model category, a pushout square of the form (C.8) is automatically a homotopy pushout; for example see [Lur09, Proposition A.2.4.4].
- (2) This follows from the existence of the (generalized) Reedy model structure on the category of transfinite sequences $x: \beta+1 \rightarrow \mathbf{M}$ where the cofibrant objects are precisely those sequences where x_0 is cofibrant and all latching maps $\operatorname{colim}_{\alpha < \beta} x_\alpha \rightarrow x_\beta$ are cofibrations. For example, see [Lur09, Corollary A.2.9.25]. \square

We will prove Theorem C.8 by induction on the dimension of the cube. The following is the key lemma used in the inductive step.

Lemma C.10. *For every ordinal α and every cube F , we have a natural pushout square of α -cubes*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \sigma_\alpha \partial_{\alpha+1} F & \xlongequal{\quad} & \partial_\alpha \sigma_\alpha F & \longrightarrow & \partial_\alpha F \\ \downarrow & & & & \downarrow \\ \sigma_\alpha F & \longrightarrow & & \longrightarrow & \tau_\alpha \partial_{\alpha+1} F \end{array} \quad (\text{C.9})$$

Moreover, if F is very cofibrant, then the two vertical maps are levelwise cofibrations.

Proof. For every $I \subset \alpha$, the value in the bottom right is by definition the colimit

$$\partial_{\alpha+1} F(I) = \operatorname{colim}_{\alpha+1 \supseteq J \supseteq I} F(J).$$

We can compute this colimit by considering the cover

$$\{\alpha + 1 \supseteq J \supseteq I\} = \{J \neq I \cup \{\alpha\}\} \cup \{\alpha \in J\}$$

of the indexing poset; with the intersection being the poset

$$\{J \neq I \cup \{\alpha\}\} \cap \{\alpha \in J\} = \{\alpha + 1 \supseteq J \supseteq I \cup \{\alpha\}\} \xleftarrow[\cong]{J=K \cup \{\alpha\}} \{\alpha \supseteq K \supseteq I\}.$$

The inclusion

$$\{\alpha \supseteq J \supseteq I\} \hookrightarrow \{\alpha + 1 \supseteq J \supseteq I \mid J \neq I \cup \{\alpha\}\},$$

has a left adjoint $J \mapsto J \cap \alpha$, hence is colimit cofinal; the poset $\{\alpha \in J \supseteq I\}$ has a terminal object $J = I \cup \{\alpha\}$. All told we have a pushout square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \operatorname{colim}_{\alpha \supseteq K \supseteq I} F(K \cup \{\alpha\}) & \longrightarrow & \operatorname{colim}_{\alpha \supseteq J \supseteq I} F(J) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ F(I \cup \{\alpha\}) & \longrightarrow & \partial_{\alpha+1} F(I) \end{array}$$

which is exactly the desired pushout square (C.9) after substituting back in the definitions of σ_α and ∂_α .

It remains to show that for a very cofibrant cube F , the left vertical map is a levelwise cofibration; the same then follows for the right one by Assumption C.4 (1). Indeed, the comparison map $\partial_{\alpha+1} F \rightarrow F$ is a levelwise cofibration by the definition of very cofibrant; and applying σ_α does not change that. \square

Proof of Theorem C.8. By transfinite induction on β , we prove that for every very cofibrant cube F , the comparison map $\partial_\beta \mathcal{L}F(\emptyset) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}\partial_\beta F(\emptyset)$ is an equivalence in \mathcal{C} . This yields the claimed result, since for every fixed F we have $\partial_\beta F = \partial F$ for sufficiently large β .

- The induction start $\beta = 0$ is trivial, since $\partial_0 F = \emptyset$ (independently of F) and \mathcal{L} preserves initial objects.
- For the successor step $\alpha \rightsquigarrow \alpha + 1$ consider the commutative cube

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \partial_\alpha \sigma_\alpha \mathcal{L}F(\emptyset) & \xrightarrow{\quad\quad\quad} & \partial_\alpha \mathcal{L}F(\emptyset) & & \\
 \downarrow & \searrow & \downarrow & \searrow & \\
 & & \mathcal{L}\partial_\alpha \sigma_\alpha F(\emptyset) & \xrightarrow{\quad\quad\quad} & \mathcal{L}\partial_\alpha F(\emptyset) \\
 & & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \\
 \sigma_\alpha \mathcal{L}F(\emptyset) & \xrightarrow{\quad\quad\quad} & \partial_{\alpha+1} \mathcal{L}F(\emptyset) & & \\
 \Downarrow & \searrow & \searrow & & \\
 & & \mathcal{L}\sigma_\alpha F(\emptyset) & \xrightarrow{\quad\quad\quad} & \mathcal{L}\partial_{\alpha+1} F(\emptyset)
 \end{array}$$

The back face is the pushout square of Lemma C.10 for the cube $\mathcal{L}F$ in \mathcal{C} . The front face is obtained by applying \mathcal{L} to the pushout square of Lemma C.10 for the cube F itself; it remains a pushout in \mathcal{C} by Assumption C.4 (1).

The two upper diagonal arrows are equivalences by applying the induction hypothesis to the cubes $\sigma_\alpha F$ and F , respectively. From the pushout property, it follows that the lower right diagonal arrow is also an equivalence, as required.

- Finally, let λ be a limit ordinal. Then we can factor the comparison map $\partial_\lambda \mathcal{L}F(\emptyset) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}\partial_\lambda F(\emptyset)$ as a composition of equivalences

$$\partial_\lambda \mathcal{L}F(\emptyset) = \operatorname{colim}_{\alpha < \lambda} \partial_\alpha \mathcal{L}F(\emptyset) \xrightarrow{\cong} \operatorname{colim}_{\alpha < \lambda} \mathcal{L}\partial_\alpha F(\emptyset) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{L}\partial_\lambda F(\emptyset),$$

where

- the first \cong is the induction hypothesis;
- the second \cong follows from Assumption C.4 (2) because $\partial_0 F(\emptyset) \rightarrow \partial_\lambda F(\emptyset)$ is a transfinite composition of cofibrations $\partial_\alpha F(\emptyset) \rightarrow \partial_{\alpha+1} F(\emptyset)$ with cofibrant domain $\partial_0 F(\emptyset) = \emptyset$. \square

APPENDIX D. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 6.19

In this section we provide a proof of Proposition 6.19 using some explicit combinatorics of dendroidal sets. More precisely, we formulate the following proposition, which captures the features of the situation that make Proposition 6.19 work.

The reader is invited to keep in mind the setting of Construction 6.18, where we consider the following full suboperads of opens in a cone:

- The colors in O^\otimes are those opens that contain the cone point 0.
- The colors of H^\otimes are the *horizontal* opens.
- The colors of N^\otimes are the opens that do *not* contain the cone point.
- The colors of U^\otimes are those that are horizontal or do not contain the cone point.

Proposition D.1. *Let U^\otimes be an operad with two full suboperads N^\otimes and H^\otimes . Let us write $O^\otimes := H^\otimes \setminus (N^\otimes \cap H^\otimes)$, by which we mean the full suboperad of H^\otimes spanned by those colors that do not lie in N^\otimes . We make the following assumptions:*

- (A1) *Every color of U^\otimes lies in H^\otimes or in N^\otimes , i.e., $U^\otimes = H^\otimes \cup N^\otimes$.*
- (A2) *No color of O^\otimes has any non-trivial automorphisms and the composite of two non-invertible 1-ary operations is always non-invertible.*
- (A3) *The operad U^\otimes is unital, i.e., every color x admits a unique 0-ary operation $\emptyset_x: () \rightarrow x$.*
- (A4) *For every operation in $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \rightarrow x$ in U^\otimes , at most one input color x_i lies in O^\otimes . If an input color x_i lies in O^\otimes , then so does the output color x .*
- (A5) *Let $\iota: \bar{o} \rightarrow o'$ be an n -ary operation in O^\otimes (this implies $n = 0$ or $n = 1$ by Assumption (A4)). We assume that we have a complement operation for ι , by which we mean an $(n+1)$ -ary operation $a_\iota: (\bar{o}, o'') \rightarrow o'$ in H^\otimes with the following properties:*
 - *The color o'' lies in N^\otimes (hence in $N^\otimes \cap H^\otimes$).*
 - *We have $\iota = a_\iota \circ (\bar{o}, \emptyset_{o''})$.*
 - *Let $f: (\bar{o}, x_1, \dots, x_n) \rightarrow o'$ be an operation in U^\otimes with $x_1, \dots, x_n \in N^\otimes$ and with $\iota = f \circ (\bar{o}, \emptyset_{x_1}, \dots, \emptyset_{x_n})$. Then there is a unique operation $b_f: (x_1, \dots, x_n) \rightarrow o''$ in N^\otimes with $f = a_\iota \circ (\bar{o}, b_f)$.*

Then the pullback square of operads

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 N^\otimes \cap H^\otimes & \longrightarrow & H^\otimes \\
 \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\
 N^\otimes & \longrightarrow & U^\otimes
 \end{array} \tag{D.1}$$

is a pushout square of operads and even of ∞ -operads.

Remark D.2. In the setting of Assumption (A5) the complement operation a_ι is uniquely determined up to unique isomorphism. Thus we may say that o'' is the complement of ι , and we write $o' - \bar{o} := o''$.

It might be tempting to believe that when $\bar{o} = ()$ is the empty tuple, the complement $o' - ()$ is just o' ; this is never the case because the latter lies in O^\otimes while the former lies in N^\otimes .

The remainder of this section is dedicated to the proof of the proposition. From now on, we assume that we are in the setting of Proposition D.1. We make some preliminary observations and definitions.

First, we can lift the square (D.1) to a square in the $(1, 1)$ -category OPD' of operads and functors, where everything commutes strictly and there are no non-trivial natural isomorphisms. Moreover, we may assume that the operads U^\otimes , H^\otimes , N^\otimes , $N^\otimes \cap H^\otimes$ and


O^\otimes are skeletal, and that all the inclusion functors are injective on objects²¹; in particular the complement operations of (A5) are unique on the nose²². Indeed, to achieve all that we may simply choose a set of representatives for the isomorphism classes of the colors of U^\otimes ; the other skeletal operads are then just given by appropriate subsets.²³

By applying the dendroidal nerve $N_d: \text{OPD}' \rightarrow \text{DSET}$, we may view all these operads as dendroidal sets; going forward we will do so without explicitly writing the dendroidal nerve N_d every time.

Explicitly, a dendrex of U^\otimes is a tree (in the sense of [MW07]) where each edge is decorated with a color of U^\otimes and each vertex is decorated with an appropriate operation. Such a dendrex is degenerate precisely if some 1-ary operation is decorated with an identity. Since we assume that U^\otimes is skeletal, we may reformulate Assumption (A2) as saying that the composite of non-identities is always a non-identity, which translates to saying that every face of a non-degenerate dendrex is non-degenerate. For every dendrex F we denote by $m(F)$ the dendrex obtained from F by removing all 1-ary operations labelled by identities. This means that we have $m(F) = F$ if and only if F is non-degenerate; otherwise $m(F)$ is the unique non-degenerate dendrex of which F is a degeneration.

Due to condition (A4), every dendrex in U^\otimes is of one of the following types:

- A dendrex of N^\otimes , which means that no color in O^\otimes appears.
- A tree of the form



with $n \geq 0$ and the following conventions:

- Each \bar{o}_i is always just a single color $\bar{o}_i = o_i \in O^\otimes$, except for $i = 0$ where we additionally allow the possibility $\bar{o}_0 = ()$ (the empty tuple). The latter case happens precisely if the total dendrex has no input colors that lie in O^\otimes ; pictorially we would then just not draw the upper-left-most edge.

²¹Note that an operad being skeletal or a functor being injective on objects is not a property that is invariant under equivalence, so it is meaningless for objects or morphisms in OPD . It only becomes meaningful after we lift our diagram from the theory of operads and equivalences to the theory of operads and isomorphisms.

²²again, a statement that is meaningless before lifting to OPD'

²³Note that in the setting of Section 6.3, the operads in question are already presented as skeletal operads in OPD' since they arise from explicit inclusions of posets of opens. So in that case there is nothing that needs to be done.

- Each $(\bar{o}_{i-1}, \bar{x}_i) \rightarrow o_i$ is a tree obtained by grafting a forest F_i in N^\otimes with roots $y_1^1, \dots, y_i^{l_i}$ onto an operation $f_i: (\bar{o}_{i-1}, y_i^1, \dots, y_i^{l_i}) \rightarrow o_i$ which definitely does not lie in N^\otimes (since $o_i \in O^\otimes$), but might also not lie in H^\otimes if some $y_i^j \notin H^\otimes$.

We say that such a tree is of *shape* (n, d) , where $d = \sum_{i=1}^n |F_i|$ is the total number of vertices across all forests F_i .

Let F be a dendrex of the second kind and consider one of the operations $f_i: (\bar{o}_{i-1}, \bar{y}_i) \rightarrow o_i$ described above. By (A5), this operation factors uniquely as

$$(\bar{o}_{i-1}, \bar{y}_i) \xrightarrow{(\bar{o}_{i-1}, b_{f_i})} (o_{i-1}, o_i - o_{i-1}) \xrightarrow{a_\iota} o_i \quad (\text{D.3})$$

where $\iota = f_i \circ (\bar{o}_{i-1}, \emptyset_{\bar{y}_i}) : \bar{o}_{i-1} \rightarrow o_i$ and a_ι is the chosen complement operation.

Definition D.3. We say that the dendrex F is *special at position* i if the resulting operation $b_{f_i}: \bar{y}_i \rightarrow o_i - o_{i-1}$ is an identity, i.e., if the forest F_i is actually a tree with root $o_i - \bar{o}_{i-1}$ and $f_i = a_\iota$ is the chosen complement operation. In this case we abbreviate $a_i = a_\iota$. We say that F is *special* if it is special at all $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Construction D.4. Denote by $R(F)$ the dendrex obtained from F by replacing the corolla $f_i: (\bar{o}_{i-1}, \bar{y}_i) \rightarrow o_i$ with the 2-vertex tree (D.3) for each position i at which F is not special; by construction, $R(F)$ is now special. Tautologically, we have $R(F) = F$ if and only if F is already special.

Definition D.5. We now define the precise *spawn time* of any dendrex F of U^\otimes as follows:

- If F fully lies in N^\otimes or fully lies in H^\otimes then we say that it spawns at time 0.
- If F is non-degenerate and special of shape (n, d) , we say that F spawns at time (n, d) .
- Otherwise, we say that F spawns at the same time as $mR(F) = Rm(F)$.

The set of possible spawn times of a dendrex is $L := \{0\} \cup (\mathbb{N}_{\geq 1} \times \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1})$, which we view well-ordered lexicographically, hence of order type $1 + \omega \cdot \omega = \omega^2$. Note that every special tree of shape $(n, 0)$ or $(0, d)$ is fully contained in H^\otimes ; which is why those spawn times do not appear (or alternatively, we could just define $L \cong \mathbb{N} \wedge \mathbb{N}$, so that $0 = (n, 0) = (0, d)$).

We observe the following:

- A special dendrex of shape (n, d) spawns at or before time (n, d) .
- A dendrex F always spawns at the same time as $R(F)$.
- An arbitrary dendrex F of shape (n, d) spawns at or before time $(n, d + n)$, since that is the largest possible shape of $R(F)$.

Moreover, for each dendrex F of U^\otimes

- applying a degeneracy does not change the spawn time,
- applying a face map does not increase the spawn time.

Therefore for each $\alpha \in L$, the collections

$$Q^{\leq}(\alpha) := \{\text{dendrices of } U^\otimes \text{ that spawn at time } \leq \alpha\}$$

are dendroidal subsets of U^\otimes ; their ascending union is U^\otimes because every dendrex spawns at some time. Note that by definition we have $Q^{\leq}(0) = H^\otimes \amalg_{N^\otimes \cap H^\otimes} N^\otimes$ (the strict pushout of dendroidal sets). We also abbreviate $Q^{<}(\alpha) := \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} Q^{\leq}(\beta)$ consisting of all dendrices that spawn before time α .

Construction D.6. For each non-degenerate special dendrex F that spawns at time α we define the dendroidal set $\lambda^{<}(F)$ as the following pullback:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \lambda^{<}(F) & \longrightarrow & Q^{<}(\alpha) \\ \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\ \Omega[T] & \xrightarrow{F} & Q^{\leq}(\alpha) \end{array} \quad (\text{D.4})$$

Lemma D.7. *Let F be a non-degenerate special dendrex that spawns at time $\alpha > 0$. The inclusion $\lambda^{<}(F) \hookrightarrow \Omega[T]$ is the dendroidal subset spanned by the following faces:*

- all outer faces
- all inner faces except for those which under F correspond to a root of one of the trees F_i in the picture (D.2) (recall that a priori each F_i is a forest, but since F is special they are actually trees).

Proof. The right vertical map in the square (D.4) is a levelwise inclusion, hence the same is true for the left one. Concretely, $\lambda^{<}(F)$ is the dendroidal subset of $\Omega[T]$ spanned by those non-degenerate dendrices $\sigma: \Omega[S] \rightarrow \Omega[T]$ where the dendrex $F\sigma$ of U^\otimes spawns before time $\alpha = (n, d)$.

First let σ be an outer faces which means that the dendrex $F\sigma$ is obtained from F by omitting an external vertex v . There are the following possibilities:

- The vertex v is a leaf-vertex of one of the F_i .
- The tree F_1 consists of a single edge $o_1 - \bar{o}_0$ and v is the vertex $(\bar{o}_0, o_1 - \bar{o}_0) \rightarrow o_1$.
- The tree F_n consists of a single edge $o_n - \bar{o}_{n-1}$ and v is the vertex $(\bar{o}_{n-1}, o_n - \bar{o}_{n-1}) \rightarrow o_n$.

(Note that in the last two cases we must have $n \geq 2$, because otherwise F would lie in H^\otimes , which is impossible since F spawns at time $\alpha > 0$.) Then the dendrex $F\sigma$ is again special and is of shape $(n, d - 1)$, $(n - 1, d)$ or $(n - 1, d)$, respectively. Hence it already spawned before time (n, d) .

Next, let us consider inner faces, which means that $F\sigma$ is obtained from F by contracting an inner edge e . Let us consider the following possibilities:

- The edge e is a non-root edge of one of the F_i . In this case the dendrex $F\sigma$ is special of shape $(n, d - 1)$ so that is the latest possible spawn time for it.
- The edge e is one of the edges labelled o_i , for $1 \leq i < n$ (hence $n \geq 2$). In this case the dendrex $F\sigma$ spawned at or before time $(n - 1, d + 1)$, because that is the shape of $R(F\sigma)$. Indeed, contracting the edge reduces n by one; the resulting tree is not special at position i anymore, requiring $R(F)$ to add one new vertex. See also Figure 7 for an illustration of this case.

In either of those cases we see that $F\sigma$ has spawned before time $\alpha = (n, d)$.

Finally, let $\sigma: \Omega[S] \rightarrow \Omega[T]$ be the intersection of all the inner faces of T that have not yet been listed above. Then the dendrex $F\sigma$ is obtained from F by collapsing the root edge of each of the trees F_i . Note that $F\sigma$ cannot be special at any position i because otherwise the tree F_i would be of the form

$$\dots \rightarrow o_i - \bar{o}_{i-1} \xrightarrow{v} o_i - \bar{o}_{i-1}$$

with $a_i \circ (\bar{o}_{i-1}, v) = a_i$, which by the uniqueness in Assumption (A5) would imply that $v = \text{id}$ making F degenerate, which it is not. It follows that $R(F\sigma) = F$, so that $F\sigma$ spawns at the same time as F and not before.

For every subdendrex $\sigma: \Omega[S] \rightarrow \Omega[T]$ we have shown:

- If σ is contained in one of the listed faces, then it lies in $\lambda^{<}(F)$.
- If σ contains the intersection of the unlisted faces then it does not lie in $\lambda^{<}(F)$.

This means that $\lambda^{<}(F)$ consists precisely of the union of the listed faces, as desired. \square

Lemma D.8. *Let $G: \Omega[S] \rightarrow U^\otimes$ be a dendrex that spawns at time $\alpha > 0$. Then there is a unique factorization*

$$G: \Omega[S] \xrightarrow{\sigma} \Omega[T] \xrightarrow{F} U^\otimes$$

where $F: \Omega[T] \rightarrow U^\otimes$ is a special non-degenerate dendrex that spawns at time α .




FIGURE 7. On the left, a special dendrex F of shape $(2, 2 + d')$, where a_1 and a_2 are chosen complement operations and $d' := |F'_1| + |F'_2|$. After collapsing the edge decorated by o_1 —which means passing to the dendrex $F\sigma$ for the appropriate inner face σ —the tree is no longer special because the composition $a_2 \circ a_1$ of two complement operations is not a complement operation anymore. We make it special again by passing to the tree $R(F\sigma)$, depicted on the right. The operation b_{12} is uniquely determined by the relation $a_{12} \circ b_{12} = a_2 \circ a_1$ due to the defining property of the complement operation a_{12} . The tree $R(F\sigma)$ has shape $(1, 3 + d')$ so it spawned before F .

Proof. First, assume we had such a factorization (F, σ) with $F\sigma = G$. Factor $\sigma = \tau\rho$, where ρ consists of degeneracies and τ of face inclusions. Since F must be non-degenerate so must $F\tau$ hence we must have $F\tau = mG$ which also uniquely determines ρ . Note that τ cannot lie in $\lambda^<(F)$, since otherwise $mG = F\tau$ would have already spawned before time α . Hence by Lemma D.7, mG arises from F precisely by collapsing the root edges of the trees F_i in all positions i where G is not special. Therefore F is uniquely determined to be $F = Rm(G) = mR(G)$ and τ corresponds to the aforementioned edge collapses. \square

We also make use of the following result.

Lemma D.9 ([MW09], Lemma 5.1). *Let $\{\sigma_j: \Omega[T_j] \rightarrow \Omega[T]\}_j$ be a set of faces of $\Omega[T]$ which contains all outer faces and does not contain all inner faces. Then the inclusion $\bigcup_j \Omega[T_j] \rightarrow \Omega[T]$ is anodyne.*

Proof of Proposition D.1. We claim that the square (D.1) is a homotopy pushout in the Cisinski-Moerdijk model structure [CM11], thus yielding the desired pushout of ∞ -operads (and a fortiori, of operads).

Fix a positive spawn time $\alpha = (n, d) > 0$. We make the following claims.

- (1) The inclusion $\lambda^<(F) \rightarrow \Omega[T]$ is an anodyne extension.
- (2) We have a pushout square

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \coprod_F \lambda^<(F) & \longrightarrow & Q^<(\alpha) \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 \coprod_F \Omega[T] & \xrightarrow{(F)} & Q^{\leq}(\alpha)
 \end{array} \tag{D.5}$$

where F ranges over the non-degenerate special dendrices of U^\otimes that spawn at time α .

Jointly these claims imply that each inclusion $Q^{<}(\alpha) \rightarrow Q^{\leq}(\alpha)$ is anodyne, hence also their transfinite composition $H^\otimes \amalg_{N^\otimes \cap H^\otimes} N^\otimes = Q^{\leq}(0) \rightarrow U^\otimes$. Since all inclusions in the square (D.1) are cofibrations, this implies that this square is a homotopy pushout, as desired.

So it remains to show the claims:

- (1) The first claim follows directly from Lemma D.7 and Lemma D.9.
- (2) To show that the square (D.5) is a pushout of dendroidal sets, we have to show that for each tree S the comparison map

$$\left(Q^{<}(\alpha) \amalg_{\amalg_F \lambda^{<}(F)} \prod_F \Omega[T] \right) (S) \rightarrow Q^{\leq}(\alpha)(S)$$

is a bijection. For this, let $G: \Omega[S] \rightarrow Q^{\leq}(\alpha)$ be an arbitrary dendrex; we have to show that there is a unique dendrex in the pushout that hits it. We distinguish the following two cases:

- The dendrex G spawned before time α . In this case, G already lies in $Q^{<}(\alpha)$. Moreover, if $\sigma: \Omega[S] \rightarrow \Omega[T]$ is a dendrex in the component labeled by F that hits G , i.e., $F\sigma = G$, then the pair (G, σ) lies in $\lambda^{<}(F)$ and witnesses an equality $[\sigma] = [G]$ in the pushout.
- The dendrex G spawns at time α . In this case the only elements that can possibly hit G come from the component $\prod_F \Omega[T]$. Lemma D.8 states precisely that this component has a unique dendrex σ that hits G . \square

REFERENCES

- [AF20] David Ayala and John Francis. A factorization homology primer. In *Handbook of homotopy theory*, CRC Press/Chapman Hall Handb. Math. Ser., pages 39–101. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, [2020] ©2020.
- [AFT17a] David Ayala, John Francis, and Hiro Lee Tanaka. Factorization homology of stratified spaces. *Selecta Math. (N.S.)*, 23(1):293–362, 2017.
- [AFT17b] David Ayala, John Francis, and Hiro Lee Tanaka. Local structures on stratified spaces. *Adv. Math.*, 307:903–1028, 2017.
- [Ara24] Kensuke Arakawa. A context for manifold calculus, 2024.
- [Bar18] Clark Barwick. From operator categories to higher operads. *Geom. Topol.*, 22(4):1893–1959, 2018.
- [Ber21] Eric Daniel Berry. *Additivity of factorization algebras & the cohomology of real Grassmannians*. PhD thesis, Montana State University-Bozeman, College of Letters & Science, 2021.
- [BR23] Christopher Brav and Nick Rozenblyum. The cyclic deligne conjecture and calabi-yau structures, 2023.
- [Cep22] Anna Cepek. Higher-categorical combinatorics of configuration spaces of Euclidean space, 2022.
- [CG17] Kevin Costello and Owen Gwilliam. *Factorization algebras in quantum field theory. Vol. 1*, volume 31 of *New Mathematical Monographs*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2017.
- [CHH18] Hongyi Chu, Rune Haugseng, and Gijs Heuts. Two models for the homotopy theory of ∞ -operads. *J. Topol.*, 11(4):857–873, 2018.
- [Cis19] Denis-Charles Cisinski. *Higher categories and homotopical algebra*, volume 180 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2019.
- [CM11] Denis-Charles Cisinski and Ieke Moerdijk. Dendroidal sets as models for homotopy operads. *J. Topol.*, 4(2):257–299, 2011.
- [CM13a] Denis-Charles Cisinski and Ieke Moerdijk. Dendroidal Segal spaces and ∞ -operads. *J. Topol.*, 6(3):675–704, 2013.
- [CM13b] Denis-Charles Cisinski and Ieke Moerdijk. Dendroidal sets and simplicial operads. *J. Topol.*, 6(3):705–756, 2013.
- [DI04] Daniel Dugger and Daniel C. Isaksen. Topological hypercovers and \mathbb{A}^1 -realizations. *Math. Z.*, 246(4):667–689, 2004.
- [Gin15] Grégory Ginot. Notes on factorization algebras, factorization homology and applications. In *Mathematical aspects of quantum field theories*, Math. Phys. Stud., pages 429–552. Springer, Cham, 2015.
- [GS18] Owen Gwilliam and Claudia I. Scheimbauer. Duals and adjoints in higher Morita categories, 2018.
- [GTZ12] Gregory Ginot, Thomas Tradler, and Mahmoud Zeinalian. Derived higher Hochschild homology, topological chiral homology and factorization algebras, 2012.
- [JFS17] Theo Johnson-Freyd and Claudia I. Scheimbauer. (Op)lax natural transformations, twisted quantum field theories, and “even higher” Morita categories. *Adv. Math.*, 307:147–223, 2017.
- [Lur09] Jacob Lurie. *Higher topos theory*, volume 170 of *Annals of Mathematics Studies*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2009.
- [Lur17] Jacob Lurie. Higher algebra, 2017. Unpublished.
- [Mat17] Takuo Matsuoka. Descent properties of topological chiral homology. *Münster J. Math.*, 10(1):83–118, 2017.
- [MG19] Aaron Mazel-Gee. The universality of the Rezk nerve. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 19(7):3217–3260, 2019.
- [Mur20] Laura Josephine Wells Murray. *Equivariant Factorization Algebras: An Infinity-Operadic Approach*. Phd thesis, University of Notre Dame, March 2020.
- [MW07] Ieke Moerdijk and Ittay Weiss. Dendroidal sets. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 7:1441–1470, 2007.
- [MW09] Ieke Moerdijk and Ittay Weiss. On inner Kan complexes in the category of dendroidal sets. *Adv. Math.*, 221(2):343–389, 2009.
- [NV23] Guglielmo Nocera and Marco Volpe. Whitney stratifications are conically smooth. *Selecta Math. (N.S.)*, 29(5):Paper No. 68, 20, 2023.
- [Sán23] Víctor Carmona Sánchez. *On Homotopical Algebra & Quantum Field Theories*. Phd thesis, Universidad de Sevilla, May 2023.
- [Sch14] Claudia I. Scheimbauer. *Factorization Homology as a Fully Extended Topological Field Theory*. PhD thesis, ETH Zürich, 2014.

(Eilind Karlsson) TU MÜNCHEN, BOLTZMANNSTRASSE 3, 85748 GARCHING, GERMANY
Email address: `eilind.karlsson@ma.tum.de`

(Claudia I. Scheimbauer) TU MÜNCHEN, BOLTZMANNSTRASSE 3, 85748 GARCHING, GERMANY
Email address: `scheimbauer@tum.de`

(Tashi Walde) TU MÜNCHEN, BOLTZMANNSTRASSE 3, 85748 GARCHING, GERMANY
Email address: `tashi.walde@ma.tum.de`