

# ON THE BÉNABOU-ROUBAUD THEOREM

BRUNO KAHN

**ABSTRACT.** We give a detailed proof of the Bénabou-Roubaud theorem. As a byproduct it yields a weakening of its hypotheses: the base category does not need fibre products and the Beck-Chevalley condition, in the form of a natural transformation, can be weakened by only requiring the latter to be epi.

**Introduction.** The Bénabou-Roubaud theorem [2] establishes, under certain conditions, an equivalence of categories between a category of descent data and a category of algebras over a monad. This result is widely cited, but [2] is a note “without proofs” and the ones I know in the literature are a bit terse ([5, pp. 50/51], [6, proof of Lemma 4.1], [7, Th. 8.5]); moreover, [6] and [7] are formulated in more general contexts.

The aim of this note is to provide a detailed proof of this theorem in its original context. This exegesis has the advantage of showing that the original hypotheses can be weakened: it is not necessary to suppose that the base category admits fibred products, and the Chevalley property of [2], formulated as an exchange condition, can also be weakened by requiring that the base change morphisms be only epi. I hope this will be useful to some readers. I also provided a proof of the equivalence between Chevalley’s property and the exchange condition (attributed to Beck, but see remark 1.1): this result is part of the folklore but, here again, I had difficulty finding a published proof. In Corollary 5.2, I give a condition (probably too strong) for the Eilenberg-Moore comparison functor to be essentially surjective. Finally, I give in Proposition 6.1 cases where the exchange isomorphism holds; this is certainly classical, but it recovers conceptually Mackey’s formula for the induced representations of a group (example 6.3).

*Notation.* I keep that of [2]: thus  $P : \mathbf{M} \rightarrow \mathbf{A}$  is a bifibrant functor in the sense of [4, §10]. If  $A \in \mathbf{A}$ , we denote  $\mathbf{M}(A)$  the fibre of  $P$  above  $A$ . For an arrow  $a : A_1 \rightarrow A_0$  of  $\mathbf{A}$ , we write  $a^* : \mathbf{M}(A_0) \rightarrow \mathbf{M}(A_1)$  and  $a_* : \mathbf{M}(A_1) \rightarrow \mathbf{M}(A_0)$  for the associated inverse and direct image

---

*Date:* March 7, 2024.

*2020 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 18D30, 18C15, 18F20.

*Key words and phrases.* Descent, monad, Beck-Chevalley condition.

functors ( $a_*$  is left adjoint to  $a^*$ ) and  $\eta^a$ ,  $\varepsilon^a$  for the associated unit and counit. We also write  $T^a = a^*a_*$  for the associated monad, equipped with its unit  $\eta^a$  and its multiplication  $\mu^a = a^*\varepsilon^aa_*$ . *We do not assume the existence of fibre products in  $\mathbf{A}$ .*

**1. Adjoint chases.** To elucidate certain statements and proofs, I start by doing two things: 1) “deploy” the notion of monad above, which will allow us to remove the quotation marks from “natural” at the bottom of [2, p. 96], 2) not assume the Beck-Chevalley condition to begin with, which will allow us to clarify the functoriality in the first lemma of the note and to weaken hypotheses.

Let  $a_i : A_i \rightarrow A_0$  ( $i = 1, 2, 3$ ) be three morphisms in  $\mathbf{A}$ . For  $i < j$ , consider a commutative square

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} A_{ij} & \xrightarrow{a_j^{ij}} & A_j \\ a_i^{ij} \downarrow & & a_j \downarrow \\ A_i & \xrightarrow{a_i} & A_0. \end{array}$$

The natural isomorphism

$$(1.2) \quad u : (a_i^{ij})^* a_i^* \xrightarrow{\cong} (a_j^{ij})^* a_j^*$$

yields a base change morphism

$$(1.3) \quad \chi : (a_j^{ij})_*(a_i^{ij})^* \Rightarrow a_j^*(a_i)_*$$

equal to the composition  $\varepsilon^{a_j^{ij}} a_j^*(a_i)_* \circ (a_j^{ij})_* u(a_i)_* \circ (a_j^{ij})_*(a_i^{ij})^* \eta^{a_i}$ . Hence a map

$$(1.4) \quad \xi_{ij} : \mathbf{M}(A_j)(a_j^*(a_i)_* M_i, M_j) \xrightarrow{\chi_{M_i}^*} \mathbf{M}(A_j)(a_j^{ij})_*(a_i^{ij})^* M_i, M_j) \\ \xrightarrow{\text{adj}} \mathbf{M}(A_{ij})((a_i^{ij})^* M_i, (a_j^{ij})^* M_j)$$

for  $(M_i, M_j) \in \mathbf{M}(A_i) \times \mathbf{M}(A_j)$ . It goes in the opposite direction to the map  $K^a$  of [2] (which we will find back in (4.1)).

*Remark 1.1.* The morphism (1.3) is sometimes called “Beck transformation”. However, it already appears in SGA4 (1963/64) to formulate the proper base change and smooth base change theorems [1, §4]. I have adopted the terminology “base change morphism” in reference to this seminar.

**Lemma 1.2** (key lemma). *For any  $\varphi \in \mathbf{M}(A_j)(a_j^*(a_i)_* M_i, M_j)$ , one has*

$$\xi_{ij}(\varphi) = u_{(a_j)_* M_j} \circ (a_i^{ij})^*(\varphi \circ \eta_{M_i}^{a_i})$$

where  $u$  is the natural isomorphism of (1.2).

*Proof.* For  $\psi \in \mathbf{M}(A_j)(a_j^{ij})_*(a_i^{ij})^*M_i, M_j)$  one has  $\text{adj}(\psi) = (a_j^{ij})^*\psi \circ \eta_{(a_i^{ij})^*M_i}^{a_j^{ij}}$ , hence

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_{ij}(\varphi) &= \text{adj}(\varphi \circ \chi_{M_i}) = (a_j^{ij})^*(\varphi \circ \chi_{M_i}) \circ \eta_{(a_i^{ij})^*M_i}^{a_j^{ij}} \\ &= (a_j^{ij})^*(\varphi \circ (\varepsilon_{a_j^{ij}}^{a_j^{ij}} a_j^*(a_i)_* \circ (a_j^{ij})_* u_{(a_i)_*} \circ (a_j^{ij})_*(a_i^{ij})^* \eta_{M_i}^{a_i})) \circ \eta_{(a_i^{ij})^*M_i}^{a_j^{ij}} \\ &= (a_j^{ij})^* \varphi \circ (a_j^{ij})^* \varepsilon_{a_j^*(a_i)_* M_i}^{a_j^{ij}} \circ (a_j^{ij})^*(a_j^{ij})_* u_{(a_i)_* M_i} \circ (a_j^{ij})^*(a_j^{ij})_*(a_i^{ij})^* \eta_{M_i}^{a_i} \circ \eta_{(a_i^{ij})^*M_i}^{a_j^{ij}} \\ &= (a_j^{ij})^* \varphi \circ (a_j^{ij})^* \varepsilon_{a_j^*(a_i)_* M_i}^{a_j^{ij}} \circ (a_j^{ij})^*(a_j^{ij})_*(u_{(a_i)_* M_i} \circ (a_i^{ij})^* \eta_{M_i}^{a_i}) \circ \eta_{(a_i^{ij})^*M_i}^{a_j^{ij}} \\ &= (a_j^{ij})^* \varphi \circ (a_j^{ij})^* \varepsilon_{a_j^*(a_i)_* M_i}^{a_j^{ij}} \circ \eta_{(a_i^{ij})^* a_j^*(a_i)_* M_i}^{a_j^{ij}} \circ u_{(a_i)_* M_i} \circ (a_i^{ij})^* \eta_{M_i}^{a_i} \\ &= (a_j^{ij})^* \varphi \circ u_{(a_i)_* M_i} \circ (a_i^{ij})^* \eta_{M_i}^{a_i} = u_{(a_j)_* M_j} \circ (a_i^{ij})^*(\varphi \circ \eta_{M_i}^{a_i}) \end{aligned}$$

where we successively used the naturality of  $\eta^{a_j^{ij}}$ , an adjunction identity and the naturality of  $u$ .  $\square$

Let  $A \in \mathbf{A}$  be equipped with “projections”  $c_{ij} : A \rightarrow A_{ij}$ ; we assume that  $b_i = a_i^{ij} \circ c_{ij} : A \rightarrow A_i$  only depends on  $i$ .

*Canonical example 1.3.*  $A_{ij} = A_i \times_{A_0} A_j$ ,  $A = A_1 \times_{A_0} A_2 \times_{A_0} A_3$ , all morphisms given by the natural projections.

We then have maps

$$\mathbf{M}(A_{ij})((a_i^{ij})^*M_i, (a_j^{ij})^*M_j) \rightarrow \mathbf{M}(A)(b_i^*M_i, b_j^*M_j)$$

induced by  $c_{ij}^*$ , hence composite maps

$$(1.5) \quad \theta_{ij} : \mathbf{M}(A_j)(a_j^*(a_i)_*M_i, M_j) \rightarrow \mathbf{M}(A)(b_i^*M_i, b_j^*M_j) \quad (i < j).$$

In addition, we have a natural transformation

$$(1.6) \quad \lambda = a_3^* \varepsilon^{a_2}(a_1)_* : a_3^*(a_2)_* a_2^*(a_1)_* \Rightarrow a_3^*(a_1)_*.$$

The commutative square  $(A, A_{12}, A_{23}, A_2)$ <sup>1</sup> yields another base change morphism  $(c_{23})_* c_{12}^* \Rightarrow (a_2^{23})^*(a_2^{12})_*$ , hence a composition

$$(1.7) \quad (b_3)_* b_1^* = (a_3^{23})_*(c_{23})_* c_{12}^*(a_1^{12})_* \Rightarrow (a_3^{23})_*(a_2^{23})^*(a_2^{12})_*(a_1^{12})_* \\ \Rightarrow a_3^*(a_2)_* a_2^*(a_1)_*$$

which induces a map

$$(1.8) \quad \rho : \mathbf{M}(A_3)(a_3^*(a_2)_* a_2^*(a_1)_* M_1, M_3) \rightarrow \mathbf{M}(A)(b_1^* M_1, b_3^* M_3).$$

<sup>1</sup>Note that it is Cartesian in the canonical example.

An adjoint chase gives:

**Lemma 1.4.** *One has  $\theta_{13} = \rho \circ \lambda^*$  (see (1.5), (1.6) and (1.8)).*  $\square$

Let  $\varphi_{ij} \in \mathbf{M}(A_j)(a_j^*(a_i)_*M_i, M_j)$  now be three morphisms. We have a not necessarily commutative square:

$$(1.9) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} a_3^*(a_2)_*a_2^*(a_1)_*M_1 & \xrightarrow{a_3^*(a_2)_*\varphi_{12}} & a_3^*(a_2)_*M_2 \\ \lambda_{M_1} \downarrow & & \varphi_{23} \downarrow \\ a_3^*(a_1)_*M_1 & \xrightarrow{\varphi_{13}} & M_3. \end{array}$$

Write  $\hat{\varphi}_{ij} = \theta_{ij}(\varphi_{ij}) : b_i^*M_i \rightarrow b_j^*M_j$ .

**Lemma 1.5.** *Let  $\psi$  (resp.  $\psi'$ ) be the composition of (1.9) passing through  $a_3^*(a_2)_*M_2$  (resp. through  $a_3^*(a_1)_*M_1$ ). Then  $\rho(\psi) = \hat{\varphi}_{23} \circ \hat{\varphi}_{12}$  and  $\rho(\psi') = \hat{\varphi}_{13}$ .*

*Proof.* The first point follows from a standard adjunction calculation, and the second follows from lemma 1.4.  $\square$

**Proposition 1.6.** *If (1.9) commutes, we have  $\hat{\varphi}_{13} = \hat{\varphi}_{23} \circ \hat{\varphi}_{12}$ ; the converse is true if  $\rho$  is injective in (1.8).*

*Proof.* This is obvious in view of Lemma 1.5.  $\square$

In (1.4), assume  $M_j$  is of the form  $a_j^*M_0$  and write  $a^{ij} : A_{ij} \rightarrow A_0$  for the projection. We have a composition

$$(1.10) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{M}(A_1)(M_1, (a_i)_*M_0) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \mathbf{M}(A_0)((a_i)_*M_i, M_0) \\ \xrightarrow{a_j^*} & \mathbf{M}(A_j)(a_j^*(a_i)_*M_i, a_j^*M_0) & \xrightarrow{\xi_{ij}} \mathbf{M}(A_{ij})((a_i^{ij})_*M_i, (a^{ij})_*M_0) \end{array}$$

where the first arrow is the adjunction isomorphism. A new adjoint chase gives:

**Lemma 1.7.** *The composition (1.10) is induced by  $(a_i^{ij})^*$ .*  $\square$

**2. Exchange condition and weak exchange condition.** Now we introduce the

**Definition 2.1.** A commutative square (1.1) is said to satisfy the *exchange condition* if the base change morphism (1.3) is invertible; we say that (1.1) satisfies the *weak exchange condition* if (1.3) is epi.

**Lemma 2.2** (cf. [9, Prop. 11]). *The exchange condition of Definition 2.1 is equivalent to the Chevalley condition (C) of [2].*

*Proof.* Recall this condition: given a commutative square

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} M'_1 & \xrightarrow{k_1} & M_1 \\ \chi' \downarrow & & \downarrow \chi \\ M'_0 & \xrightarrow{k_0} & M_0, \end{array}$$

above (1.1) (where we take  $(i, j) = (1, 2)$  to fix ideas), if  $\chi$  and  $\chi'$  are Cartesian and  $k_0$  is co-Cartesian, then  $k_1$  is co-Cartesian.

I will show that the exchange condition is equivalent to the following two conditions: (C) and

**(C')**: if  $k_0$  and  $k_1$  are co-Cartesian and  $\chi'$  is Cartesian, then  $\chi$  is Cartesian.

Let us translate the commutativity of (2.1) in terms of the square

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{M}(A_{12}) & \xrightarrow{(a_2^{12})_*} & \mathbf{M}(A_2) \\ (a_1^{12})^* \uparrow & & a_2^* \uparrow \\ \mathbf{M}(A_1) & \xrightarrow{(a_1)_*} & \mathbf{M}(A_0). \end{array}$$

The morphisms of (2.1) correspond to morphisms  $\tilde{k}_0 : (a_1)_* M'_0 \rightarrow M_0$ ,  $\tilde{k}_1 : (a_1^{12})_* M'_1 \rightarrow M_1$ ,  $\tilde{\chi} : M_1 \rightarrow a_2^* M_0$  and  $\tilde{\chi}' : M'_1 \rightarrow (a_2^{12})^* M'_0$ , which fit in a commutative diagram of  $\mathbf{M}(A_1)$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (a_2^{12})_* (a_1^{12})^* M'_0 & \xrightarrow{c} & a_2^* (a_1)_* M'_0 \\ (a_2^{12})^* \tilde{\chi}' \uparrow & & \downarrow a_2^* \tilde{k}_0 \\ (a_1^{12})_* M'_1 & \xrightarrow{\tilde{k}_1} & M_1 \xrightarrow{\tilde{\chi}} a_2^* M_0 \end{array}$$

where  $c$  is the base change morphism of (1.3). The cartesianity conditions on  $\chi$  and  $\chi'$  (resp. co-cartesianity conditions on  $k_0$  and  $k_1$ ) amount to requesting the corresponding morphisms decorated with a  $\tilde{\phantom{x}}$  to be isomorphisms.

Suppose  $c$  is an isomorphism. If  $\tilde{\chi}'$  and  $\tilde{k}_0$  are isomorphisms,  $\tilde{\chi}$  is an isomorphism if and only if  $\tilde{k}_1$  is. Thus, the exchange condition implies conditions (C) and (C'). Conversely,  $M'_0$  being given, let  $\tilde{k}_0$ ,  $\tilde{\chi}$  and  $\tilde{\chi}'$  be identities, which successively defines  $M_0$ ,  $M_1$  and  $M'_1$ . The arrow  $c$  then defines an arrow  $\tilde{k}_1$ , which is an isomorphism if and only if so is  $c$ . This shows that the exchange condition implies (C), and we argue in the same way for (C') by taking  $\tilde{k}_1$  to be the identity.  $\square$

*Remarks 2.3.* a) This proof did not use the hypothesis that (1.1) be Cartesian.

b) Under conservativity assumptions for  $(a_2^{12})^*$  or  $a_2^*$ , we obtain converses to (C) and (C').

**3. Pre-descent data.** We now assume  $A_1 = A_2 = A_3$ ,  $M_1 = M_2 = M_3 =: M$  and that the three squares (1.1) are identical. We note  $a$  for  $a_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, 3$ ).

**Definition 3.1.** A *pre-descent datum* on  $M$  is a morphism  $v \in \mathbf{M}(A_{12})((a_1^{12})^*M, (a_2^{12})^*M)$  which verifies the condition of Proposition 1.6. We write  $\mathbf{D}^{\text{pre}}$  for the category whose objects are pairs  $(M, v)$ , where  $v$  is a pre-descent datum on  $M$ , and whose morphisms are those of  $\mathbf{M}(A_1)$  which commute with pre-descent data.

Let us introduce the

**Hypothesis 3.2.** The weak exchange condition is verified by the squares  $(A_{12}, A_1, A_2, A_0)$ ,  $(A_{23}, A_2, A_3, A_0)$  and  $(A, A_{12}, A_{23}, A_2)$ .

(Of course, the first two squares coincide and  $A_{12} = A_{23}$  in the third, but I keep these notations for clarity.)

**Proposition 3.3** (cf. [2, lemme]). *In (1.9), assume  $\varphi_{12} = \varphi_{23} = \varphi_{13} =: \varphi$ . If  $\varphi$  satisfies the associativity condition of a  $T^a$ -algebra, then  $\xi_{12}(\varphi)$  in (1.4) is a weak descent datum; the converse is true under Hypothesis 3.2.*

*Proof.* In view of Proposition 1.6, it suffices to show that Hypothesis 3.2 implies the injectivity of  $\rho$ , which is induced by the composition of the two natural transformations of (1.7). The second is epi, therefore induces an injection on Hom's, and so does the first by adjunction.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.4.** *Let  $\mathbf{M}_{\text{ass}}^a$  denote the category of associative  $T^a$ -algebras which are not necessarily unital. Then Proposition 3.3 defines a faithful functor  $\xi : \mathbf{M}_{\text{ass}}^a \rightarrow \mathbf{D}^{\text{pre}}$  commuting with the forgetful functors to  $\mathbf{M}(A_1)$ ; under Hypothesis 3.2, it is an isomorphism of categories.*

*Proof.* Commutation of  $\xi$  with the forgetful functors is obvious. This already shows that it is faithful; under Hypothesis 3.2, it is essentially surjective by Proposition 3.3 and we see immediately that it is also full.  $\square$

**4. The unit condition.** We now introduce an additional ingredient: a ‘‘diagonal’’ morphism  $\Delta : A_1 \rightarrow A_{12}$  such that  $a_1^{12}\Delta = a_2^{12}\Delta = 1_{A_1}$ .

**Definition 4.1.** A *descent datum* on  $M$  is a pre-descent datum  $v$  such that  $\Delta^*v = 1_M$  modulo the isomorphisms  $\Delta^*(a_i^{12})^* \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Id}_{\mathbf{M}(A_1)}$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . We denote by  $\mathbf{D}$  the full subcategory of  $\mathbf{D}^{\text{pre}}$  given by the descent data.

*Remark 4.2.* In the canonical example 1.3, a pre-descent datum  $v$  satisfies the condition of Definition 4.1 if and only if  $v$  is invertible (therefore is a descent datum in the classical sense): this follows from [3, A.1.d pp. 303–304].

Let  $\mathbf{M}^a \subset \mathbf{M}_{\text{ass}}^a$  be the category of  $T^a$ -algebras.

**Theorem 4.3** (cf. [2, théorème]). *For all  $\varphi \in \mathbf{M}(A_1)(a^*a_*M, M)$ , we have*

$$\Delta^*\xi_{12}(\varphi) = \varphi \circ \eta_M^a$$

modulo the isomorphisms  $\Delta^*(a_i^{12})^* \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Id}_{\mathbf{M}(A_1)}$ . In particular,  $\xi(\mathbf{M}^a) \subset \mathbf{D}$  and  $\xi : \mathbf{M}^a \rightarrow \mathbf{D}$  is an isomorphism of categories under Hypothesis 3.2.

*Proof.* This follows from Lemma 1.2 and Corollary 3.4.  $\square$

As in [8, VI.3, Th. 1], we have the Eilenberg-Moore comparison functor

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{aligned} K^a : \mathbf{M}(A_0) &\rightarrow \mathbf{M}^a \\ M_0 &\mapsto (a^*M_0, a^*\varepsilon_{M_0}^a). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have the natural isomorphism of (1.2)

$$u_{M_0} : (a_1^{12})^*a^*M_0 \xrightarrow{\sim} (a_2^{12})^*a^*M_0$$

and Lemma 1.7 yields:

**Proposition 4.4.** *We have  $u_{M_0} = \xi_{12}(a^*\varepsilon_{M_0}^a)$ . In other words, in the diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathbf{M}(A_0) & \xrightarrow{\Psi^a} & \mathbf{D} & \xrightarrow{U^a} & \mathbf{M}(A_1) \\ & \searrow K^a & \uparrow \xi & \nearrow U^{T^a} & \\ & & \mathbf{M}^a & & \end{array}$$

the left triangle commutes.  $\square$

## 5. A complement.

**Proposition 5.1.** *Let  $a^*$  be fully faithful and  $\mathbf{M}(A_0)$  Karoubian. Let  $\varphi : a^*a_*M \rightarrow M$ , verify the identity  $\varphi \circ \eta_M^a = 1_M$ . Then there exists  $M_0 \in \mathbf{M}(A_0)$  and an isomorphism  $\nu : M_1 \xrightarrow{\sim} a^*M_0$  such that  $\varphi = \nu^{-1}a^*\varepsilon_{M_0}^a a_*\nu$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $e$  denote the idempotent  $\eta_M^a\varphi \in \text{End}_{\mathbf{M}(A_1)}(a^*a_*M)$ . By hypothesis,  $e = a^*\tilde{e}$  where  $\tilde{e}$  is an idempotent of  $\text{End}_{\mathbf{M}(A_0)}(a_*M)$ , of image

$M_0$ . Then  $a^*M_0$  is isomorphic to the image  $M$  of  $e$  via a morphism  $\nu$  as in the statement, such that

$$\nu \circ \varphi = a^*\pi, \quad a^*\iota \circ \nu = \eta_M^a$$

where  $\iota\pi$  is the epi-mono factorization of  $\tilde{e}$ .

To finish, it is enough to see that  $a^*\pi = a^*\varepsilon_{M_0}^a a^*a_*\nu$ . But we also have

$$\eta_{a^*M_0}^a \circ \nu = a^*a_*\nu \circ \eta_M^a = a^*a_*\nu \circ a^*\iota \circ \nu$$

hence  $\eta_{a^*M_0}^a = a^*a_*\nu \circ a^*\iota$ . This concludes, since  $\eta_{a^*M_0}^a a^*\varepsilon_{M_0}^a$  is the epi-mono factorisation of the idempotent of  $\text{End}(a^*a_*a^*M_0)$  of image  $a^*M_0$ .  $\square$

We thus obtain the following complement:

**Corollary 5.2.** *Assume Hypothesis 3.2, and also that  $a^*$  is fully faithful and  $\mathbf{M}(A_0)$  Karoubian. Then*

- a) *every unital  $T^a$ -algebra is associative;*
- b)  *$K^a$  is essentially surjective.*  $\square$

Can one weaken the full faithfulness assumption in this corollary? The following lemma does not seem sufficient:

**Lemma 5.3.** *Let  $M, N \in \mathbf{M}(A_1)$ . Then the map*

$$a^* : \mathbf{M}(A_0)(a_*M, a_*N) \rightarrow \mathbf{M}(A_1)(a^*a_*M, a^*a_*N)$$

*has a retraction  $r$  given by  $r(f) = \varepsilon_{a_*N}^a \circ a_*f \circ a_*\eta_M^a$ . More generally, we have an identity of the form  $r(a^*g \circ f) = g \circ r(f)$ .*

*Proof.* For  $f : a^*a_*M \rightarrow a^*a_*N$  et  $g : a_*N \rightarrow a_*P$ , we have

$$r(a^*g \circ f) = \varepsilon_{a_*P}^a \circ a_*a^*g \circ a_*f \circ a_*\eta_M^a = g \circ \varepsilon_{a_*N}^a \circ a_*f \circ a_*\eta_M^a = g \circ r(f).$$

Taking  $f = 1_{a^*a_*M}$ , we obtain that  $r$  is a retraction.  $\square$

## 6. Appendix: a case where the exchange condition is verified.

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a category. Take for  $\mathbf{A}$  the category of presheaves of sets on  $\mathcal{A}$ . Write  $\int A$  for the category associated to  $A \in \mathbf{A}$  by the Grothendieck construction [4, §8]. Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be another category. We take for  $\mathbf{M}$  the fibred category of representations of  $\mathbf{A}$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ : for  $A \in \mathbf{A}$ , an object of  $\mathbf{M}(A)$  is a functor from  $\int A$  to  $\mathcal{C}$ . For all  $a \in \mathbf{A}(A_1, A_0)$  we have an obvious pull-back functor  $a^* : \mathbf{M}(A_0) \rightarrow \mathbf{M}(A_1)$ , which has a left adjoint  $a_*$  (direct image) given by the usual colimit if  $\mathcal{C}$  is cocomplete. We can then ask whether the exchange condition is true for Cartesian squares of  $\mathcal{A}$ .



**Proposition 6.1.** *This is the case if  $\mathcal{C}$  is the category of sets  $\mathbf{Set}$ , and more generally if  $\mathcal{C}$  admits a forgetful functor  $\Omega : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$  with a left adjoint  $L$  such that  $(L, \Omega)$  satisfies the conditions of Beck's theorem [8, VI.7, Th. 1].*

*Proof.* First suppose  $\mathcal{C} = \mathbf{Set}$ ; to verify that (1.3) is a natural isomorphism, it is enough to test it on representable functors. Consider Diagram (2.2) again. For  $(c, \gamma) \in \int A_1$  and  $(d, \delta) \in \int A_2$  (with  $c, d \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\gamma \in A_1(c)$ ,  $\delta \in A_2(d)$ ), we have

$$\begin{aligned} a_2^*(a_1)_*y(c, \gamma)(d, \delta) &= a_2^*y(c, a_1(\gamma))(d, \delta) = y(c, a_1(\gamma))(d, a_2(\delta)) \\ &= \{\varphi \in \mathcal{A}(d, c) \mid \varphi^*a_1(\gamma) = a_2(\delta)\} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (a_2^{12})_*(a_1^{12})^*y(c, \gamma)(d, \delta) &= \varinjlim_{(e, \eta) \in (d, \delta) \downarrow a_2^{12}} (a_1^{12})^*y(c, \gamma)(e, \eta) \\ &= \varinjlim_{(e, \eta) \in (d, \delta) \downarrow a_2^{12}} y(c, \gamma)(e, a_1^{12}(\eta)) = \varinjlim_{(e, \eta) \in (d, \delta) \downarrow a_2^{12}} \{\psi \in \mathcal{A}(e, c) \mid \psi^*\gamma = a_1^{12}(\eta)\}. \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$(d, \delta) \downarrow a_2^{12} = \{(e, \eta_1, \eta_2, \theta) \in \mathcal{A} \times A_1(e) \times_{A_0(e)} A_2(e) \times \mathcal{A}(d, e) \mid \theta^*\eta_2 = \delta\}.$$

This category has the initial set  $\{(d, \eta_1, \delta, 1_d) \mid a_1(\eta_1) = a_2(\delta)\}$ , so

$$\begin{aligned} (a_2^{12})_*(a_1^{12})^*y(c, \gamma)(d, \delta) &= \coprod_{\{(\eta_1 \in A_1(d) \mid a_1(\eta_1) = a_2(\delta))\}} \{\varphi \in \mathcal{A}(d, c) \mid \varphi^*\gamma = \eta_1\} \\ &= \{\varphi \in \mathcal{A}(d, c) \mid a_1(\varphi^*\gamma) = a_2(\delta)\} \end{aligned}$$

and the map  $(a_2^{12})_*(a_1^{12})^*y(c, \gamma)(d, \delta) \rightarrow (a_2^*(a_1)_*y(c, \gamma)(d, \delta)$  is clearly equal to the identity.

*General case:* let us write more precisely  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{C}}(A) = \mathbf{CAT}(\int A, \mathcal{C})$ . The functors  $L$  and  $\Omega$  induce pairs of adjoint functors (same notation)

$$L : \mathbf{M}^{\mathbf{Set}}(A) \rightleftarrows \mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{C}}(A) : \Omega.$$

These two functors commute with pull-backs; as  $L$  is a left adjoint, it also commutes with direct images. Therefore, in the above situation, the base change morphism  $\chi_M : (a_2^{12})_*(a_1^{12})^*M \rightarrow a_2^*(a_1)_*M$  is an isomorphism when  $M \in \mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{C}}(A_1)$  is of the form  $LX$  for  $X \in \mathbf{M}^{\mathbf{Set}}(A_1)$ . For any  $M$ , we have its canonical presentation [8, (5) p. 153]

$$(6.1) \quad (L\Omega)^2M \rightrightarrows L\Omega M \rightarrow M$$

whose image by  $\Omega$  is a split coequaliser (*loc. cit.*). Given the hypothesis that  $\Omega$  creates such coequalisers, (6.1) is a coequaliser. Since pull-backs are cocontinuous, as well as direct images (again, as left adjoints),

(6.1) remains a coequaliser after applying the functors  $(a_2^{12})_*(a_1^{12})^*$  and  $a_2^*(a_1)_*$ . Finally, a coequaliser of isomorphisms is an isomorphism.  $\square$

*Examples 6.2* (for  $\mathcal{C}$ ). Varieties (category of groups, abelian groups, rings...): [8, VI.8, Th. 1].

*Example 6.3* (for  $\mathcal{A}$ ). The category with one object  $\underline{G}$  associated with a group  $G$ : then  $\mathbf{A}$  is the category of  $G$ -sets. Let us take for  $\mathcal{C}$  the category of  $R$ -modules where  $R$  is a commutative ring. If  $A \in \mathbf{A}$  is  $G$ -transitive,  $\int A$  is a connected groupoid, which is equivalent to  $\underline{H}$  for the stabilizer  $H$  of any element of  $A$ ; thus,  $\mathbf{M}(A)$  is equivalent to  $\mathbf{Rep}_R(H)$ . If  $a : A_1 \rightarrow A_0$  is the morphism of  $\mathbf{A}$  defined by an inclusion  $K \subset H \subset G$  ( $A_1 = G/K$ ,  $A_0 = G/H$ ), then  $a^*$  is restriction from  $H$  to  $K$  and  $a_*$  is induction  $V \mapsto RH \otimes_{RK} V$ . From Proposition 6.1, we thus recover conceptually the Mackey formula of [10, 7.3, Prop. 22], proven “by hand” in *loc. cit.*

#### REFERENCES

- [1] M. Artin *Le théorème de changement de base pour un morphisme propre*, exposé XII in Séminaire de géométrie algébrique du Bois-Marie: théorie des topos et cohomologie étale des schémas (SGA4), Lect. Notes in Math. **305**, Springer, 1973, 79–131.
- [2] J. Bénabou, J. Roubaud *Monades et descente*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris **270** (1970), 96–98.
- [3] A. Grothendieck *Technique de descente et théorèmes d’existence en géométrie algébrique. I. Généralités. Descente par morphismes fidèlement plats*, Sémin. Bourbaki, 1960, exp. **190**, 299–327, [http://www.numdam.org/item/SB\\_1958-1960\\_\\_5\\_\\_299\\_0.pdf](http://www.numdam.org/item/SB_1958-1960__5__299_0.pdf).
- [4] A. Grothendieck *Catégories fibrées et descente*, exp. VI of Revêtements étales et groupe fondamental (SGA1), new edition, Doc. Math. **3**, SMF, 2003.
- [5] X. Guo *Monadicity, purity, and descent equivalence*, PhD thesis, York Univ. Toronto, 2000.
- [6] C. Herminda *Descent on 2-fibrations and strongly 2-regular 2-categories*, Appl. categorical structures **12** (2004), 427–459.
- [7] F. Lucatelli Nunes *Pseudo-Kan extensions and descent theory*, Theory Appl. Categ. **33** (2018), Paper No. 15, 390–444.
- [8] S. Mac Lane *Categories for the working mathematician*, Grad. Texts in Math. **5**, Springer (2nd ed.), 1998.
- [9] D. Pavlovič *Categorical interpolation: descent and the Beck-Chevalley condition without direct images*, Category theory (Como, 1990), 306–325, Lect. Notes in Math. **1488**, Springer, 1991.
- [10] J.-P. Serre *Représentations linéaires des groupes finis* (2nd ed.), Hermann, 1971.

CNRS, SORBONNE UNIVERSITÉ AND UNIVERSITÉ PARIS CITÉ, IMJ-PRG,  
CASE 247, 4 PLACE JUSSIEU, 75252 PARIS CEDEX 05, FRANCE

*Email address:* bruno.kahn@imj-prg.fr