

COMPUTADS AND STRING DIAGRAMS FOR N -SESQUICATEGORIES

Manuel Araújo

October 17, 2022

Manuel Araújo
Department of Computer Science and Technology
University of Cambridge
United Kingdom
manuel.araujo@cst.cam.ac.uk

Abstract. An n -sesquicategory is an n -globular set with strictly associative and unital composition and whiskering operations, which are however not required to satisfy the Godement interchange laws which hold in n -categories. In [6] we showed how these can be defined as algebras over a monad $T_n^{D^s}$ whose operations are simple string diagrams. In this paper, we give an explicit description of computads for the monad $T_n^{D^s}$ and we prove that the category of computads for this monad is a presheaf category. We use this to describe a string diagram notation for representing arbitrary composites in n -sesquicategories. This is a step towards a theory of string diagrams for semistrict n -categories.

Keywords. String diagrams. Higher categories. Monads. Computads.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010). 18N20, 18N30.

1. Introduction

The use of string diagram notation as a tool for representing composites in higher categories is becoming ever more widespread. This paper is part of a project which aims to give a definition of semistrict n -category based on a purely algebraic/combinatorial notion of string diagram. In [6] we defined a monad $T_n^{D^s}$ on the category of n -globular sets, whose operations we call simple string diagrams. We give a generators and relations description of $T_n^{D^s}$, which allows us to characterize its algebras, which we call n -sesquicategories, as n -globular sets equipped with strictly associative and unital composition and whiskering operations, which however do not satisfy the Godement interchange laws that hold in a strict n -category. We think of simple string diagrams as analogous to the globular pasting diagrams used in the definition of the monad T_n^{str} whose algebras are strict n -categories ([21]). In the present paper we study computads for the monad $T_n^{D^s}$ and show how morphisms in an n -sesquicategory generated by a computad C can be depicted as general C -labelled string diagrams. We also prove that the category of computads for this monad is equivalent to the category of presheaves on a small category of computadic cell shapes. In future work, we will show how to add coherent weak interchange laws to get a notion of semistrict n -category,

1.1 Results

We now describe the main result in this paper. Denote by Comp the category of $(n + 1)$ -computads for $T_n^{D^s}$, by $\mathbb{1}$ the terminal computad and by $F(C)$ the n -sesquicategory generated by a computad C . Cells $c \in \mathbb{1}_k$ are called (computadic) k -cell shapes and morphisms $d \in F(\mathbb{1})_k$ are called unlabelled k -diagrams. A morphism $x \in F(C)$ is said to have shape d if its image in $F(\mathbb{1})$ is d . Given such d , we construct a computad \hat{d} with the property that d -shaped morphisms in a computad D are in canonical bijection with maps $\hat{d} \rightarrow D$. Applying this to cells, we define a small category Cell whose objects are cell shapes, together with a fully faithful embedding $\widehat{(-)} : \text{Cell} \hookrightarrow \text{Comp}$. From this we construct the nerve/realization adjunction

$$|-| : \text{Psh}(\text{Cell}) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\perp} \\ \xleftarrow{\perp} \end{array} \text{Comp} : N .$$

Theorem 1.1. *The adjunction $| - | : \text{Psh}(\text{Cell}) \xrightleftharpoons[\perp]{} \text{Comp} : N$ is an equivalence of categories.*

We now give an outline of the proof. In [6] we showed that $T_n^{D^s}$ has a presentation with generators \mathcal{O}_n and relations \mathcal{E}_n . We can describe morphisms in the n -sesquicategory generated by an n -computad C as equivalence classes of trees whose internal vertices are labelled by generators in \mathcal{O}_n and whose leaves are labelled by cells in C . The equivalence relation is generated by the relations in \mathcal{E}_n . We then prove that each of these trees has a unique canonical form in its equivalence class. This allows us to show that for an unlabelled diagram d the category $\text{Comp}(d)$ of pairs (C, x) , where C is a computad and x is a morphism of shape d , has an initial object, which we denote (\hat{d}, \tilde{d}) . This allows us to construct the nerve/realization adjunction as mentioned above and then the proof of the Theorem follows by formal arguments from the fact (\hat{c}, \tilde{c}) is initial, for $c \in \text{Cell}$.

After we've established this Theorem, we go on to give a description of the diagrammatic interpretation of morphisms in the n -sesquicategory generated by C as C -labelled string diagrams.

1.2 Related work

The string diagrammatic calculus for monoidal categories and bicategories is by now well established. Generalizations to Gray 3-categories also exist, in the theory of surface diagrams ([11], [20]). Recently there has been a lot of progress in extending this to higher dimensions, with the discovery of the theory of associative n -categories ([16]), later developed into the manifold diagrams of [17]. These manifold diagrams have a combinatorial counterpart, which the authors of [17] call trusses, which are in turn equivalent to the notion of zigzags introduced in [24] and which forms the basis for an online proof assistant for diagrammatic calculus in higher categories ([1]).

There are two main differences between the approach above and the one followed in this paper. The first is that the input of our theory is the simple **combinatorial** notion of simple string diagram introduced in [6], whereas manifold diagrams start from the geometry and obtain from that a combinatorial description, by passing to exit path posets. The second is that we want to produce an **algebraic** notion of semistrict n -categories, by which we mean

that these will be algebras over a certain monad on n -globular sets. One advantage of the manifold diagrams approach to semistrict n -categories is that all coherences are already encoded in the basic cell shapes, whereas we naturally produce a theory of n -sesquicategories, to which we then have to add coherent weak interchange laws. The main advantage of our approach is its simplicity, as in a sense everything follows from the combinatorial notion of simple string diagrams introduced in [6].

Most closely related to our work is [10]. There the authors develop a framework which is the basis for another proof assistant for diagrammatic calculus in higher categories ([9]). The authors have a notion of **signature**, which corresponds exactly to a computad for T_n^{Ds} , and a notion of **diagram** over a signature, which corresponds exactly to a morphism in the n -sesquicategory generated by a computad. In this sense, our work can also be seen as providing a mathematical foundation for the kinds of higher categorical structures implemented by this proof assistant.

Our work is also related to questions in the general theory of computads for monads on globular sets. If one considers the monad T_n^{str} whose algebras are strict n -categories, then computads consist of presentations for strict n -categories. Cells of dimension $k \leq n$ are generating k -morphisms and $(n + 1)$. The cells of the terminal n -computad for T_n^{str} are the most general n -categorical cell shapes and the morphisms in the n -category generated by it can be thought of as general unlabelled pasting diagrams. One would then like to say that the category of computads for T_n^{str} is a category of presheaves on the cell shapes, but this turns out to be false ([23], [14]), essentially because of the Eckman-Hilton argument. This lead to the question of finding conditions on monads or restrictions on allowable cells in the associated computads that guarantee that one obtains a presheaf category ([13],[19],[15]). Our paper can also be seen as a continuation of this line of research, providing a monad on n -globular sets which is related to T_n^{str} and whose category of computads is a presheaf category.

Finally, the motivation for developing this theory was to be able to use string diagrams to prove results about higher categories. In [3] we develop a string diagram calculus for strict 4-categories and we use it to prove a result about fibrations of mapping 4-groupoids. In [4] and [5] we use this string diagram calculus to prove coherence results for adjunctions in 3 and 4-categories. In [2], we use a string diagram calculus for strict monoidal 3-

categories to prove a coherence result for 3-dualizable objects in strict symmetric monoidal 3-categories.

1.3 Future work

One can construct a monad T_n^{ss} by adding invertible cells to $T_n^{D^s}$ connecting each pair of string diagrams that map to the same pasting diagram under the map of monads $T_n^{D^s} \rightarrow T_n^{str}$. This gives a notion of **semistrict n -category** which comes with a string diagram calculus. This is the subject of ongoing research and we will explore it in future papers.

We are also interested in finding finite descriptions of T_n^{ss} . In an upcoming paper, we show how to construct T_3^{ss} by adding a finite set of generators and relations to the monad $T_3^{D^s}$. We then show that its algebras agree with Gray 3-categories. We are working on extending this to dimension 4.

Once the definitions of semistrict 3 and 4-categories are in place, we can extend the coherence results for adjunctions of [4] and [5] to this setting. We will then put this together to extend the coherence result for 3-dualizable objects of [2] to this setting. An extension of this result to the fully weak setting would give a finite presentation of the framed fully extended 3-dimensional bordism category, by the Cobordism Hypothesis ([8],[22],[7],[18]).

2. Background

Denote by gSet_n the category of n -globular sets. Given a finitary monad $T : \text{gSet}_n \rightarrow \text{gSet}_n$ one can define categories Comp_k^T of computads for T , for $k = 0, \dots, n + 1$, together with adjunctions

$$F_k : \text{Comp}_k^T \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\quad} \\ \leftarrow \perp \\ \xleftarrow{\quad} \end{array} \text{Alg}_T : V_k.$$

This is done inductively, by defining a k -computad C to be a tuple $(C_k, C_{\leq k-1}, s, t)$ where C_k is a set, which we call the set of k -cells of C , $C_{\leq k-1}$ is a $(k-1)$ -computad, and $s, t : C_k \rightarrow F_{k-1}(C_{\leq k-1})_{k-1}$ satisfy the globularity relations

$ss = st$ and $ts = tt$. One then defines F_k , for $k \leq n$, by the pushout

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T_n^{D^s}(C_k \times \partial\theta^{(k)}) & \longrightarrow & T_n^{D^s}(C_k \times \theta^{(k)}) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ F_{k-1}(C_{\leq k-1}) & \longrightarrow & F_k(C), \end{array}$$

where $\theta^{(k)}$ is the globular set represented by k . For $k = n + 1$, we replace the inclusion $\partial\theta^{(k)} \hookrightarrow \theta^{(k)}$ by the collapse $\partial\theta^{(n+1)} \rightarrow \theta^{(n)}$. Similarly, one defines V_k by a pullback. See [25] for a detailed exposition of this theory of computads (the original reference is [12]).

Remark 2.1. There are inclusion maps $\text{Comp}_k^T \hookrightarrow \text{Comp}_{k+1}^T$ for $k \leq n$, so we can think of k -computads as $(n + 1)$ -computads. For this reason, we sometimes write Comp^T instead of Comp_{n+1}^T and use the term *computad* to refer to an $(n + 1)$ -computad.

In [6] we introduced a monad $T_n^{D^s}$ on globular sets, based on a notion of simple pasting diagrams and we defined an n -**sesquicategory** as an algebra over this monad.

Notation 2.2. We denote by Sesq_n the category of $T_n^{D^s}$ -algebras.

In [6] we gave a presentation of $T_n^{D^s}$ by generators \mathcal{O}_n and relations \mathcal{E}_n . There is a generator $\circ_{i,j}$ for each $i, j = 1, \dots, n$ and a generator u_i for each $i = 1, \dots, n$. Given an n -sesquicategory \mathcal{C} , the generator $\circ_{i,j}$ induces a map $\circ_{i,j}^{\mathcal{C}} : \mathcal{C}_i \times_{\mathcal{C}_m} \mathcal{C}_j \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_M$, where $m = \min\{i, j\}$ and $M = \max\{i, j\}$. We call this **composition** when $i = j$ and **whiskering** when $i \neq j$. The generator u_i induces a map $u_i^{\mathcal{C}} : \mathcal{C}_{i-1} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_i$ and we call $u_i^{\mathcal{C}}(x)$ the **identity** on x . The relations in \mathcal{E}_n essentially express the associativity and unitality of $\circ_{i,j}$. We also characterize n -sesquicategories inductively as categories \mathcal{C} equipped with a lift of the Hom functor

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \text{Sesq}_{n-1} & \\ \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}} \nearrow & & \searrow (-)_0 \\ \mathcal{C}^{op} \times \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}} & \text{Set}, \end{array}$$

=

but this will not be relevant in the present paper.

We now briefly review the generators and relations description of $T_n^{D^s}$, which our description of computads in the present paper will build on. This discussion will be informal, see [6] for details.

Definition 2.3. *Let X be an n -graded set. A k -dimensional (\mathcal{O}_n, X) -labelled tree is a rooted tree T , together with*

1. *a labelling of its internal vertices by generators in \mathcal{O}_n ;*
2. *a labelling of its leaves by elements in X ;*
3. *a bijection between the incoming edges at an internal vertex and the inputs of the associated generator;*

such that

1. *the root label has dimension k ;*
2. *the source of each incoming edge at an internal vertex has a label of the appropriate dimension.*

We denote the set of k -dimensional (\mathcal{O}_n, X) -labeled trees by $\text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}}(X)(k)$ or $\text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}}(X)_k$.

When X is an n -globular set, we can define source and target maps $s, t : \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}}(X)_k \rightarrow \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}}(X)_{k-1}$, although in general they won't satisfy the globularity relation.

Definition 2.4. *An n -preglobular set is an n -graded set $X = \coprod_{i=0}^n X_i$ equipped with source and target maps $s, t : X_k \rightarrow X_{k-1}$. A **globular relation** on X is a relation \sim such that*

1. *if $x \sim \tilde{x}$ then $s(x) \sim s(\tilde{x})$ and $t(x) \sim t(\tilde{x})$;*
2. *$ss(x) \sim st(x)$ and $ts(x) \sim tt(x)$.*

Note that this means the quotient X/\sim is an n -globular set.

So given an n -globular set X , we have an n -preglobular set $\text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}}(X)$.

Definition 2.5. We define an n -preglobular subset $\text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O},\mathcal{E}}(X) \subset \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}}(X)$ of $\stackrel{\epsilon}{=}$ -compatible trees, equipped with a preglobular relation $\stackrel{\epsilon}{=}$. The definition is by induction on height. The relation $\stackrel{\epsilon}{=}$ is generated by the relations in \mathcal{E}_n . A tree is $\stackrel{\epsilon}{=}$ -compatible if for every subtree of the form $x \rightarrow \circ_{i,j} \leftarrow y$ we have $s^{i-m+1}(x) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} t^{j-m+1}(y)$, where $m = \min\{i, j\}$.

Finally we define $\widetilde{\text{Tree}}_n^{\mathcal{O},\mathcal{E}}(X) := \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O},\mathcal{E}}(X)/\stackrel{\epsilon}{=}$ and we show that this defines a monad on n -globular sets. We construct a map of monads $\varphi : \widetilde{\text{Tree}}_n^{\mathcal{O},\mathcal{E}} \rightarrow T_n^{D^s}$. Each generator in \mathcal{O}_n is a simple string diagram, so one can use composition of simple string diagrams to produce this map.

Theorem 2.6 ([6]). *The map $\varphi : \widetilde{\text{Tree}}_n^{\mathcal{O},\mathcal{E}} \rightarrow T_n^{D^s}$ is an isomorphism of monads.*

3. Computads for $T_n^{D^s}$

We give an explicit description of computads for $T_n^{D^s}$ and of the n -sesquicategories generated by them, which we will later show is equivalent to the notion described in the previous section. We will simply call them computads, leaving the monad $T_n^{D^s}$ implicit.

Definition 3.1. Given $k \leq n + 1$, an (n, k) -**precomputad** (or simply k -**precomputad**, leaving n implicit) C consists of sets C_i for $0 \leq i \leq k$, together with maps $s, t : C_i \rightarrow \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}}(C_{\leq i-1})_{i-1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$.

Definition 3.2. Given a k -precomputad C , we define source and target maps $s, t : \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}}(C)_i \rightarrow \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}}(C)_{i-1}$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$. For trees of height zero, these are the maps $s, t : C_i \rightarrow \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}}(C)_{i-1}$. For trees of nonzero height, we use the following inductive formulas for s , where $j < i$ and x and y have appropriate dimensions in each case. The map t is defined by the same formulas, replacing every instance of s with t .

$$s(x \rightarrow u_i) = x;$$

$$s(x \rightarrow \circ_{i,i} \leftarrow y) = s(y);$$

$$s(x \rightarrow \circ_{j,i} \leftarrow y) = x \rightarrow \circ_{j,i-1} \leftarrow s(y);$$

$$s(x \rightarrow \circ_{i,j} \leftarrow y) = s(x) \rightarrow \circ_{i-1,j} \leftarrow y.$$

Remark 3.3. Since the source or target of a k -cell may be an arbitrary (\mathcal{O}_n, C) -labelled tree, the source and target maps above can increase the height of trees. This is in contrast to the situation of [6], where we considered $\text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}}(X)$ for a globular set X . This means that the arguments in [6] which relied on induction on the height of the tree must now be replaced by simultaneous induction on both the height and the dimension of the tree.

The following definitions refer to each other and should be interpreted by mutual induction.

Definition 3.4. Given $k \leq n+1$, an (n, k) -**computad** (or simply k -**computad**, leaving n implicit) C consists of sets C_i for $0 \leq i \leq k$, together with maps $s, t : C_i \rightarrow \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C_{\leq i-1})_{i-1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$, such that $ss(x) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} st(x)$ and $ts(x) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} tt(x)$ for all $x \in C_i$.


Terminology 3.5. A **computad** is an (n, k) -computad, where n is usually implicit in the context and $k \leq n+1$ is arbitrary.

The definition that follows is almost identical to the analogous one in [6]. The only difference is the one explained in Remark 3.3.

Definition 3.6. Let C be a computad. For each k , we define, by induction on h , subsets $\tau_{\leq h} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_k \subset \tau_{\leq h} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}}(C)_k$ equipped with a relation $\stackrel{\epsilon}{=}_h$. Elements in $\tau_{\leq h} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_k$ are called $\stackrel{\epsilon}{=}_{h-1}$ -**compatible**. We say that $x \in \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}}(C)_k$ is $\stackrel{\epsilon}{=}_{h-1}$ -compatible for some h and define $\text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_k \subset \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}}(C)_k$ the set of $\stackrel{\epsilon}{=}_{\epsilon}$ on $\text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_k$ by declaring $x \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} \tilde{x}$ when $x \stackrel{\epsilon}{=}_h \tilde{x}$ for some h . The definition is by overall induction on k and is presented below.

When $h = 0$, we let $\tau_{\leq 0} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_k := \tau_{\leq 0} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}}(C)_k = C_k$ and the relation $\stackrel{\epsilon}{=}_0$ is =.

Now consider $h \geq 1$. Any $x \in \tau_{\leq h} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}}(C)_k$ of height zero is $\stackrel{\epsilon}{=}_{h-1}$ -compatible. Let $x \in \tau_{\leq h-1} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}}(C)_i$, $y \in \tau_{\leq h-1} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}}(C)_j$ and $m = \min\{i, j\}$. Then



is $\stackrel{\epsilon}{=}_{h-1}$ -compatible if and only if x, y are $\stackrel{\epsilon}{=}_{h-2}$ -compatible and $s^{i-m+1}(x) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} t^{j-m+1}(y)$. Moreover, $x \rightarrow u_{i+1}$ is $\stackrel{\epsilon}{=}_{h-1}$ -compatible if and only if x is $\stackrel{\epsilon}{=}_{h-2}$ -compatible. Now we must define the globular relation $\stackrel{\epsilon}{=}_h$ on $\tau_{\leq h} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_k$.

If $x, y \in \tau_{\leq h} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_k$ have height zero and $x \stackrel{\epsilon}{=}_0 y$, then $x \stackrel{\epsilon}{=}_h y$.

Let $i \leq k$, $x \in \tau_{\leq h-2} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_{i-1}$, $y \in \tau_{\leq h-1} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_k$. If $x \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} t^{k-i+1}(y)$, then

$$(\lambda_{i,k}) : \begin{array}{c} \circ_{i,k} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ u_i \quad y \\ \uparrow \\ x \end{array} \stackrel{\epsilon}{=}_h y.$$

Let $i \leq k$, $x \in \tau_{\leq h-1} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_k$, $y \in \tau_{\leq h-2} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_{i-1}$. If $s^{k-i+1}(x) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} y$, then

$$(\rho_{k,i}) : \begin{array}{c} \circ_{k,i} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ x \quad u_i \\ \quad \uparrow \\ \quad y \end{array} \stackrel{\epsilon}{=}_h x.$$

Let $i < k$, $x \in \tau_{\leq h-2} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_i$, $y \in \tau_{\leq h-2} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_{k-1}$. If $s(x) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} t^{k-i}(y)$, then

$$(\rho_{i,k}) : \begin{array}{c} \circ_{i,k} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ x \quad u_k \\ \quad \uparrow \\ \quad y \end{array} \stackrel{\epsilon}{=}_h \begin{array}{c} u_k \\ \uparrow \\ \circ_{i,k-1} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ x \quad y \end{array}.$$

Let $i < k$, $x \in \tau_{\leq h-2} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_{k-1}$, $y \in \tau_{\leq h-2} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_i$. If $s^{k-i}(x) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} t(y)$, then

$$(\lambda_{k,i}) : \begin{array}{c} \circ_{k,i} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ u_k \quad y \\ \uparrow \\ x \end{array} \stackrel{\epsilon}{=}_h \begin{array}{c} u_k \\ \uparrow \\ \circ_{k-1,i} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ x \quad y \end{array}.$$

Let $k \geq 1$ and $x, y, z \in \tau_{\leq h-2} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_k$. If $s(x) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} t(y)$ and $s(y) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} t(z)$, then

$$(\circ_{k,k,k}) : \begin{array}{c} \circ_{k,k} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ x \quad \quad y \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \circ_{k,k} \end{array} \quad \xrightarrow{\epsilon} \quad \begin{array}{c} \circ_{k,k} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ x \quad \quad \circ_{k,k} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ y \quad \quad z \end{array} .$$

Let $i < k$, $x, y \in \tau_{\leq h-2} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_i$, $z \in \tau_{\leq h-2} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_k$. If $s(x) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} t(y)$ and $s(y) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} t^{k-i+1}(z)$, then

$$(\circ_{i,i,k}) : \begin{array}{c} \circ_{i,k} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \circ_{i,i} \quad \quad z \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ x \quad \quad y \end{array} \quad \xrightarrow{\epsilon} \quad \begin{array}{c} \circ_{i,k} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ x \quad \quad \circ_{i,k} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ y \quad \quad z \end{array} .$$

Let $i < k$, $x, z \in \tau_{\leq h-2} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_i$, $y \in \tau_{\leq h-2} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_k$. If $s(x) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} t^{k-i+1}(y)$ and $s^{k-i+1}(y) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} t(z)$, then

$$(\circ_{i,k,i}) : \begin{array}{c} \circ_{k,i} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \circ_{i,k} \quad \quad z \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ x \quad \quad y \end{array} \quad \xrightarrow{\epsilon} \quad \begin{array}{c} \circ_{i,k} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ x \quad \quad \circ_{k,i} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ y \quad \quad z \end{array} .$$

Let $i < k$, $x \in \tau_{\leq h-2} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_k$, $y, z \in \tau_{\leq h-2} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_i$. If $s^{k-i+1}(x) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} t(y)$ and $s(y) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} t(z)$, then

$$(\circ_{k,i,i}) : \begin{array}{c} \circ_{k,i} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \circ_{k,i} \quad \quad z \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ x \quad \quad y \end{array} \quad \xrightarrow{\epsilon} \quad \begin{array}{c} \circ_{k,i} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ x \quad \quad \circ_{i,i} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ y \quad \quad z \end{array} .$$

Let $i < k$, $x \in \tau_{\leq h-2} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_i$, $y, z \in \tau_{\leq h-2} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_k$. If $s(x) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} t^{k-i+1}(y)$ and $s(y) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} t(z)$, then

$$(\circ_{i,k,k}) : \begin{array}{c} \circ_{i,k} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ x \quad \quad \circ_{k,k} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ y \quad \quad z \end{array} \quad \xrightarrow{\epsilon} \quad \begin{array}{c} \circ_{k,k} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \circ_{i,k} \quad \quad \circ_{i,k} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \quad \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ x \quad \quad y \quad x \quad \quad z \end{array} .$$

Let $i < k$, $x, y \in \tau_{\leq h-2} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_k$, $z \in \tau_{\leq h-2} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_i$. If $s(x) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} t(y)$ and $s^{k-i+1}(y) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} t(z)$, then

$$(\circ_{k,k,i}) : \begin{array}{c} \circ_{k,i} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \circ_{k,k} \quad z \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ x \quad y \end{array} \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} \begin{array}{c} \circ_{k,k} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \circ_{k,i} \quad \circ_{k,i} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \quad \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ x \quad z \quad y \quad z \end{array} .$$

Let $i < j < k$ and take $x \in \tau_{\leq h-2} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_i$, $y \in \tau_{\leq h-2} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_j$ and $z \in \tau_{\leq h-2} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_k$. If $s(x) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} t^{j-i+1}(y)$ and $s(y) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} t^{k-j+1}(z)$, then

$$(\circ_{i,j,k}) : \begin{array}{c} \circ_{i,k} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ x \quad \circ_{j,k} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ y \quad z \end{array} \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} \begin{array}{c} \circ_{j,k} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \circ_{i,j} \quad \circ_{i,k} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \quad \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ x \quad y \quad x \quad z \end{array} .$$

Let $i < j < k$ and take $x \in \tau_{\leq h-2} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_i$, $y \in \tau_{\leq h-2} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_k$ and $z \in \tau_{\leq h-2} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_j$. If $s(x) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} t^{k-i+1}(y)$ and $s^{k-j+1}(y) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} t(z)$, then

$$(\circ_{i,k,j}) : \begin{array}{c} \circ_{i,k} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ x \quad \circ_{k,j} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ y \quad z \end{array} \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} \begin{array}{c} \circ_{k,j} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \circ_{i,k} \quad \circ_{i,j} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \quad \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ x \quad y \quad x \quad z \end{array} .$$

Let $i < j < k$ and take $x \in \tau_{\leq h-2} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_j$, $y \in \tau_{\leq h-2} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_k$ and $z \in \tau_{\leq h-2} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_i$. If $s(x) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} t^{k-j+1}(y)$ and $s^{k-i+1}(y) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} t(z)$, then

$$(\circ_{j,k,i}) : \begin{array}{c} \circ_{k,i} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \circ_{j,k} \quad z \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ x \quad y \end{array} \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} \begin{array}{c} \circ_{j,k} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \circ_{j,i} \quad \circ_{k,i} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \quad \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ x \quad z \quad y \quad z \end{array} .$$

Let $i < j < k$ and take $x \in \tau_{\leq h-2} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_k$, $y \in \tau_{\leq h-2} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_j$ and $z \in \tau_{\leq h-2} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_i$. If $s^{k-j+1}(x) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} t(y)$ and $s^{j-i+1}(y) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} t(z)$, then

$$(\circ_{k,j,i}) : \begin{array}{c} \circ_{k,i} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \circ_{k,j} \quad z \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ x \quad y \end{array} \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} \begin{array}{c} \circ_{k,j} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \circ_{k,i} \quad \circ_{j,i} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \quad \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ x \quad z \quad y \quad z \end{array} .$$

Let $x, \tilde{x} \in \tau_{\leq h-1} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_{k-1}$. If $x \stackrel{\epsilon}{=}_{h-1} \tilde{x}$, then

$$(u_k) : \begin{array}{c} u_k \\ \uparrow \\ x \end{array} \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} \begin{array}{c} u_k \\ \uparrow \\ \tilde{x} \end{array} .$$

Let $x, \tilde{x} \in \tau_{\leq h-1} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_i$, $y, \tilde{y} \in \tau_{\leq h-1} \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_j$ and $m = \min\{i, j\}$. If $x \stackrel{\epsilon}{=}_{h-1} \tilde{x}$, $y \stackrel{\epsilon}{=}_{h-1} \tilde{y}$, $s^{i-m+1}(x) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} t^{j-m+1}(y)$ and $s^{i-m+1}(\tilde{x}) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} t^{j-m+1}(\tilde{y})$ then

$$(\circ_{i,j}) : \begin{array}{c} \circ_{i,j} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ x \quad y \end{array} \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} \begin{array}{c} \circ_{i,j} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \tilde{x} \quad \tilde{y} \end{array} .$$

Lemma 3.7. *The construction above defines an n -preglobular subset $\text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C) \subset \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}}(C)$ with a globular relation $\stackrel{\epsilon}{=}$, meaning we have*

1. if $x \in \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}}(C)$ is $\stackrel{\epsilon}{=}$ -compatible, then so are $s(x)$ and $t(x)$;
2. if $x \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} \tilde{x}$ then $s(x) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} s(\tilde{x})$ and $t(x) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} t(\tilde{x})$;
3. if x is $\stackrel{\epsilon}{=}$ -compatible, then $ss(x) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} st(x)$ and $ts(x) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} tt(x)$.

Proof. The proof is very similar to the one for the analogous result in [6], the only difference being the one already mentioned in Remark 3.3. \square

Definition 3.8. *Let $0 \leq k \leq n$ and let C be a k -computad. We write*

$$\overline{\text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)} := \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C) / \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} .$$

Definition 3.9. *Let C be an $(n+1)$ -computad. We define a relation $\stackrel{\epsilon, C}{=}$ on $\text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)$ by adding the new equation $s(x) \stackrel{\epsilon, C}{=} t(x)$ for each $x \in C_{n+1}$.*

Lemma 3.10. *Let C be an $(n+1)$ -computad. Then $\stackrel{\epsilon, C}{=}$ is a globular relation on $\text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)$.*

Proof. This is easy to check. \square

Definition 3.11. Let C be an $(n + 1)$ -computad. We write

$$\overline{\text{Tree}}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C) := \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C) / \stackrel{\epsilon, C}{\cong}.$$

Remark 3.12. The fact that $\stackrel{\epsilon}{\cong}$ and $\stackrel{\epsilon, C}{\cong}$ are globular relations implies $\overline{\text{Tree}}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)$ is an n -globular set. Using the isomorphism of monads $\widetilde{\text{Tree}}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}} \rightarrow T_n^{D^s}$ allows us to define a $T_n^{D^s}$ action on $\overline{\text{Tree}}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)$ by simply grafting trees. We refer to $\overline{\text{Tree}}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)$ as the n -**sesquicategory presented by C** .

Definition 3.13. Given k -computads C, D a map $f : C \rightarrow D$ is a collection of maps $f_i : C_i \rightarrow D_i$ such that $s(f_i(x)) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} f_{i-1}(s(x))$ and $t(f_i(x)) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} f_{i-1}(t(x))$ for all $x \in C_i$, where we have inductively used the map on trees induced by a map of $(k - 1)$ -computads.

A map $f : C \rightarrow D$ induces a map $f : \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C) \rightarrow \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(D)$ by applying f to leaf labels.

Definition 3.14. For $k \leq n + 1$, we denote by Comp_k^n the category of (n, k) -computads and (n, k) -computad maps.

Remark 3.15. Adding empty sets of cells provides an inclusion map

$$\text{Comp}_k^n \hookrightarrow \text{Comp}_{k+1}^n,$$

for $k \leq n$, so we can think of k -computads as $(n + 1)$ -computads. For this reason, we sometimes write Comp^n instead of Comp_{n+1}^n and refer to $(n + 1)$ -computads simply as **computads**. In fact we will usually denote this category simply by Comp , leaving n implicit.

Lemma 3.16. Let C be a computad. Then the following diagram is a pushout, for $k \leq n$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T_n^{D^s}(C_k \times \partial\theta^{(k)}) & \longrightarrow & T_n^{D^s}(C_k \times \theta^{(k)}) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \overline{\text{Tree}}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C_{\leq k-1}) & \longrightarrow & \overline{\text{Tree}}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C_{\leq k}) \end{array}$$

Proof. We must show that functors

$$\varphi_{\leq k} : \overline{\text{Tree}}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C_{\leq k}) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$$

correspond to pairs $(\varphi_{\leq k-1}, \varphi_k)$, where $\varphi_{\leq k-1} : \overline{\text{Tree}}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C_{\leq k-1}) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is a functor and $\varphi_k : C_k \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_k$ is a map, such that $\varphi_{\leq k-1}(s(x)) = s(\varphi_k(x))$ and $\varphi_{\leq k-1}(t(x)) = t(\varphi_k(x))$ for all $x \in C_k$. This is clear. \square

Lemma 3.17. *Let C be a computad. Then the following diagram is a pushout.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T_n^{D^s}(C_k \times \partial\theta^{(n+1)}) & \longrightarrow & T_n^{D^s}(C_{n+1} \times \theta^{(n)}) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \overline{\text{Tree}}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C_{\leq n}) & \longrightarrow & \overline{\text{Tree}}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C) \end{array}$$

Proof. We must show that functors

$$\varphi : \overline{\text{Tree}}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$$

correspond to functors $\varphi_{\leq n} : \overline{\text{Tree}}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C_{\leq n}) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ such that $\varphi_{\leq n}(s(x)) = \varphi_{\leq n}(t(x))$ for all $x \in C_{n+1}$. This is clear. \square

In order to show that our notion of computad corresponds to the usual notion of computad for $T_n^{D^s}$, there is still one issue we need to address. Namely, a computad C should come with maps $s, t : C_i \rightarrow \overline{\text{Tree}}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C_{\leq i-1})_{i-1}$ and not $s, t : C_i \rightarrow \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C_{\leq i-1})_{i-1}$ as in our definition above. To fix this, we will construct for every $x \in \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_i$ another element $c(x)$ called the **canonical form** of x . This has the property that $x \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} c(x)$ and $c(x) = c(y)$ whenever $x \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} y$. This gives a canonical section of the quotient map $\text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C_{\leq i})_i \rightarrow \overline{\text{Tree}}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C_{\leq i})_i$, which resolves the problem we just mentioned. It will also be the essential ingredient in the proof that $\text{Comp}^{T_n^{D^s}}$ is a presheaf category.

4. Canonical form

In this section we introduce the notion of canonical form for elements of $\text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)$ and we prove that for any $x \in \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)$ there exists a unique element $c(x)$ such that $c(x) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} x$ and $c(x)$ is in canonical form.

Notation 4.1. We write $m(\circ_{i,j}) := \min\{i, j\}$. When v is an internal vertex in an (\mathcal{O}, C) -labelled tree with label $\circ_{i,j}$, we write $m(v) = m(\circ_{i,j})$.

Definition 4.2. An $x \in \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}}(C)$ is ***m -ordered*** if for every edge of the form $v \rightarrow w$, where v, w are \circ -labelled, we have $m(v) < m(w)$.

Definition 4.3. An $x \in \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}}(C)$ is ***m -constant*** if there are no u -labelled vertices and for every internal edge $v \rightarrow w$ we have $m(v) < m(w)$.

Definition 4.4. An m -constant $x \in \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}}(C)_k$ is in ***canonical form*** if it is of one of the following forms (where we omit leaf labels):

1. $\circ_{k,i} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow \circ_{k,i} \rightarrow \circ_{i,k} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow \circ_{i,k}$, with $i < k$;
2. $\circ_{k,k} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow \circ_{k,k}$.

Definition 4.5. An $x \in \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}}(C)$ is in ***canonical form*** if it is m -ordered, it contains no edges of the form $u \rightarrow \circ$ and each of its m -constant components is in canonical form.

Definition 4.6. Let $x \in \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}}(C)$. Define its ***cell dimension*** to be the maximum of the dimensions of the cells labelling the leaves of x . Denote this by $\text{cd}(x)$.

Lemma 4.7. Let $x, \tilde{x} \in \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)$ and suppose $x \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} \tilde{x}$. Then $\text{cd}(x) = \text{cd}(\tilde{x})$.

Proof. This is clear. □

Lemma 4.8. Given $x \in \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)$, there exists $c(x) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} x$ which is in canonical form.

Proof. One uses the defining equations of $\stackrel{\epsilon}{=}$ to rearrange generators. The (λ) and (ρ) relations allow us eliminate all units u_i for $i \leq \text{cd}(x)$ and push the other units towards the root. Then the (\circ) relations allow us to pass to an m -ordered tree and finally to put each m -constant component in canonical form. □

Now we need to show that this canonical form is unique.

Proposition 4.9. *Let $x, \tilde{x} \in \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)$ be in canonical form and suppose $x \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} \tilde{x}$. Then $x = \tilde{x}$.*

We will prove this below. First we reduce to diagrams without u -labelled vertices.

Lemma 4.10. *Let $x, \tilde{x} \in \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_k$ be in canonical form and suppose $x \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} \tilde{x}$. Let $\text{cd} := \text{cd}(x) = \text{cd}(\tilde{x})$. Then $x = (x_{\circ} \rightarrow u_{\text{cd}+1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow u_k)$ and $\tilde{x} = (\tilde{x}_{\circ} \rightarrow u_{\text{cd}+1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow u_k)$, where x_{\circ} and \tilde{x}_{\circ} are in canonical form, have no u -labelled vertices and $x_{\circ} \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} \tilde{x}_{\circ}$.*

Proof. It is obvious that one can decompose elements in canonical form into a unit chain and a component containing no units. The only thing that requires proof is the fact that $x_{\circ} \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} \tilde{x}_{\circ}$. This follows from the observation that $x_{\circ} = s^{k-\text{cd}}(x)$ and $\tilde{x}_{\circ} = s^{k-\text{cd}}(\tilde{x})$. \square

The above Lemma allows us to reduce the proof of Proposition 4.9 to the case where x, \tilde{x} have no units. Now we would like to reduce to the case where one gets from x to \tilde{x} without introducing units along the way.

Definition 4.11. *Define $\text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}(\circ)}(C) \subset \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}}(C)$ to be the preglobular subset consisting of those trees not containing any u -labelled vertices. We then define a preglobular subset $\text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}(\circ), \mathcal{E}(\circ)}(C) \subset \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}(\circ)}(C)$ of $\stackrel{\circ}{=}$ -compatible trees with a globular relation $\stackrel{\circ}{=}$, in exactly the same way we defined $\stackrel{\epsilon}{=}$ and $\stackrel{\circ}{=}$ -compatibility, except we omit all equations involving u .*

Definition 4.12. *We define the **reduction** $r(x) \in \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}(\circ)}$ of $x \in \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}}(C)$ inductively, as follows. We let $r(x) = x$ when x has height zero. Then, for $i < k$, we let $r(x \rightarrow u_k) = \emptyset$ and*

$$r(x \rightarrow \circ_{k,k} \leftarrow y) = \begin{cases} r(y) & r(x) = \emptyset; \\ r(x) & r(y) = \emptyset; \\ r(x) \rightarrow \circ_{k,k} \leftarrow r(y) & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases}$$

$$r(x \rightarrow \circ_{i,k} \leftarrow y) = \begin{cases} r(y) & r(x) = \emptyset; \\ \emptyset & r(y) = \emptyset; \\ r(x) \rightarrow \circ_{i,k} \leftarrow r(y) & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases}$$

$$r(x \rightarrow \circ_{k,i} \leftarrow y) = \begin{cases} r(x) & r(y) = \emptyset; \\ \emptyset & r(x) = \emptyset; \\ r(x) \rightarrow \circ_{k,i} \leftarrow r(y) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Lemma 4.13. *If $x \in \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}(\circ)}$, then $r(x) = x$.*

Proof. This is obvious. \square

Lemma 4.14. *If $w \in \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O},\mathcal{E}}(C)$ and $r(w) = \emptyset$ then $s(w) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} t(w)$.*

Proof. The proof is by induction on the height of w . There are four cases, corresponding to the four possible root labels: u_k , $\circ_{k,k}$, $\circ_{i,k}$ and $\circ_{k,i}$, for $i < k$. Each of these follows by a simple argument. \square

Lemma 4.15. *Given $w, \tilde{w} \in \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O},\mathcal{E}}(C)$, we have*

1. $r(w) \in \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}(\circ),\mathcal{E}(\circ)}(C)$;
2. if $r(w) \neq \emptyset$, then $sr(w) \stackrel{\circ}{=} rs(w)$ and $tr(w) \stackrel{\circ}{=} rt(w)$;
3. if $w \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} \tilde{w}$, then $r(w) \stackrel{\circ}{=} r(\tilde{w})$.

Proof. The proof is by mutual induction on dimension and height. For 1. there is a case for each possible root label of w : u_k , $\circ_{k,k}$, $\circ_{i,k}$ and $\circ_{k,i}$ ($i < k$). Each of these follows from a simple inductive argument.

For 2. there are cases for root labels u_k , $\circ_{k,k}$, $\circ_{k-1,k}$, $\circ_{k,k-1}$, $\circ_{i,k}$ and $\circ_{k,i}$ ($i < k-1$). We explain the $\circ_{k,k}$ case and leave the others to the reader. Let $w = (x \rightarrow \circ_{k,k} \leftarrow y)$. Now

$$sr(w) = \begin{cases} sr(x) & r(y) = \emptyset \\ sr(y) & r(y) \neq \emptyset \end{cases}$$

and $rs(w) = rs(y)$. If $r(y) \neq \emptyset$, we have $rs(y) \stackrel{\circ}{=} sr(y)$ by induction, so $rs(w) \stackrel{\circ}{=} sr(w)$. When $r(y) = \emptyset$, we need to show that $sr(x) \stackrel{\circ}{=} rs(y)$. We have $r(x) \neq \emptyset$, because $r(w) \neq \emptyset$. Then $sr(x) \stackrel{\circ}{=} rs(x)$ by induction. We also have $s(y) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} t(y)$ by Lemma 4.14. Since w is ϵ -compatible, we have $s(x) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} t(y)$, so we have $s(x) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} s(y)$ and then using 3. by induction we have $rs(x) \stackrel{\circ}{=} rs(y)$, so $sr(x) \stackrel{\circ}{=} rs(y)$.

To prove 3., there is one case for each of the defining equations of $\overset{\circ}{=}$. We explain the $(\circ_{k,k,k})$ case, leaving the others to the reader. Let w and \tilde{w} be the left and right hand sides of this equation, respectively. If at least one of the trees $r(x)$, $r(y)$, $r(z)$ is empty, then we get $r(w) = r(\tilde{w})$ and we are done. So we may assume they are all nonempty. In this case we get $r(w) \overset{\circ}{=} r(\tilde{w})$ by the same $(\circ_{k,k,k})$ equation, as long as $r(x)$, $r(y)$, $r(z)$ are $\overset{\circ}{=}$ -compatible, $sr(x) \overset{\circ}{=} tr(y)$ and $sr(y) \overset{\circ}{=} tr(z)$. This first condition follows from 1. by induction on height. The second condition follows from 2. and 3. by induction on height and dimension. \square

Notation 4.16. Given $x \in \text{Tree}_n^{\circ}(C)$, we denote by $L(x)$ its set of leaves. Given $\ell \in L(x)$, we denote by $|\ell|$ the dimension of the cell labelling ℓ . We denote by $L_{\geq i}(x) \subset L(x)$ the set of leaves ℓ such that $|\ell| \geq i$.

Definition 4.17. Given $x \in \text{Tree}_n^{\circ(\circ)}(C)$, we define $M(x) = \max\{j : |L_{\geq j}(x)| \geq 2\}$. If x only has one leaf, then $M(x) = -\infty$.

Lemma 4.18. If $x \overset{\circ}{=} \tilde{x}$, then $M(x) = M(\tilde{x})$.

Proof. One just needs to check that this holds for each of the defining equations of $\overset{\circ}{=}$, which is easy. \square

Definition 4.19. Given $w \in \text{Tree}_n^{\circ}(C)$, we define a linear ordering of $L(w)$ as follows. When $w = (x \rightarrow u_k)$ then $L(w) = L(x)$ and we can just use induction on height. When $w = (x \rightarrow \circ_{i,j} \leftarrow y)$ then $L(w) = L(x) \amalg L(y)$ and we define the linear order on $L(w)$ by using the linear orders on $L(x)$ and $L(y)$ provided by induction on height, together with the rule that $\ell_x > \ell_y$ for any $\ell_x \in L(x)$ and $\ell_y \in L(y)$.

Lemma 4.20. Let $w, \tilde{w} \in \text{Tree}_n^{\circ(\circ), \mathcal{E}(\circ)}(C)$ and suppose $w \overset{\circ}{=} \tilde{w}$. Let $M := M(w) = M(\tilde{w})$. Then there is a (necessarily unique) order preserving isomorphism $L_{\geq M}(w) \rightarrow L_{\geq M}(\tilde{w})$.

Proof. One just needs to check this for each of the equations defining $\overset{\circ}{=}$. The only equations requiring some consideration are $(\circ_{i,k,k})$, $(\circ_{k,k,i})$, $(\circ_{i,j,k})$, $(\circ_{i,k,j})$, $(\circ_{j,k,i})$ and $(\circ_{k,j,i})$, which double some of the leaves. In each case, one can see that this doubling does not affect leaves in $L_{\geq M}$. For example, the $(\circ_{i,k,k})$ equation doubles the leaves in the subtree x . But since we have

no u -labelled vertices, the subtrees y and z must both have at least one leaf labelled by a k -cell, so that w must have at least two leaves labelled by k -cells, so that $M = k$. Then $i < k$ implies $i < M$, so there are no leaves labelled by cells of dimension $\geq M$ in x . \square

Definition 4.21. Let $w \in \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}(\circ), \mathcal{E}(\circ)}(C)_k$, let $M(w) \leq M \leq k$, and let $\ell \in L_{\geq M}(w)$. We define $\sigma_\ell^M(w) \in \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}(\circ)}(C)_{|\ell|}$ by induction on height as follows. If w has height zero, then it consists of a single leaf ℓ , and we let

$$\sigma_\ell^M(\ell) = \ell.$$

If w has nonzero height, then we have a case for each possible root label. For $p, q \in \{M, k\}$ (with at least one equal to k) and $i < M$, we let

$$\sigma_\ell^M(x \rightarrow \circ_{p,q} \leftarrow y) = \begin{cases} \sigma_\ell^M(x), & \ell \in L(x); \\ \sigma_\ell^M(y), & \ell \in L(y); \end{cases}$$

$$\sigma_\ell^M(x \rightarrow \circ_{i,k} \leftarrow y) = (x \rightarrow \circ_{i,|\ell|} \leftarrow \sigma_\ell^M(y));$$

$$\sigma_\ell^M(x \rightarrow \circ_{k,i} \leftarrow y) = (\sigma_\ell^M(x) \rightarrow \circ_{|\ell|,i} \leftarrow y).$$

Lemma 4.22. Let $w \in \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}(\circ), \mathcal{E}(\circ)}(C)_k$, let $M(w) \leq M \leq k$ and let $\ell \in L_{\geq M}(w)$. Then

1. $\sigma_\ell^M(w)$ is $\overset{\circ}{=}$ -compatible;
2. $s^{|\ell|-i+1}(\sigma_\ell^M(w)) \overset{\circ}{=} s^{k-i+1}(w)$ and $t^{|\ell|-i+1}(\sigma_\ell^M(w)) \overset{\circ}{=} t^{k-i+1}(w)$ for $i < M$;
3. if $w \overset{\circ}{=} \tilde{w}$ and $\tilde{\ell} \in L_{\geq M}(\tilde{w})$ is the image of ℓ , then $\sigma_\ell^M(w) \overset{\circ}{=} \sigma_{\tilde{\ell}}^M(\tilde{w})$.

Proof. The proof is by mutual induction on the height of w . One proves 1. easily by splitting into the cases which appear in the definition of σ_ℓ^M and using 2. on trees of smaller height.

To prove 2., we again split into the cases appearing in the definition of σ_ℓ^M . We explain only the case $w = (x \rightarrow \circ_{p,q} \leftarrow y)$, as the others are simpler. We also do only s , as t is completely analogous. So we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
s^{|\ell|-i+1}(\sigma_\ell^M(x \rightarrow \circ_{p,q} \leftarrow y)) &= \begin{cases} s^{|\ell|-i+1}(\sigma_\ell^M(x)), & \ell \in L(x) \\ s^{|\ell|-i+1}(\sigma_\ell^M(y)), & \ell \in L(y) \end{cases} \\
&\stackrel{\circ}{=} \begin{cases} s^{p-i+1}(x), & \ell \in L(x) \\ s^{q-i+1}(y), & \ell \in L(y), \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

where we used induction. On the other hand

$$s^{k-i+1}(x \rightarrow \circ_{p,q} \leftarrow y) = s^{q-i+1}(y).$$

Now recall that $\stackrel{\circ}{=}$ is a globular relation, so $ss \stackrel{\circ}{=} st$. Moreover, we have $s^{p-m+1}(x) \stackrel{\circ}{=} t^{q-m+1}(y)$, where $m = \min\{p, q\}$, because w is $\stackrel{\circ}{=}$ -compatible. This allows us to compute

$$s^{p-i+1}(x) = s^{m-i} s^{p-m+1}(x) \stackrel{\circ}{=} s^{m-i} t^{q-m+1}(y) \stackrel{\circ}{=} s^{m-i} s^{q-m+1}(y) \stackrel{\circ}{=} s^{q-i+1}(y)$$

so we are done.

For 3. there is one case for each of the defining equations of $\stackrel{\circ}{=}$. The arguments are simple in every case, so we leave them to the reader. \square

Definition 4.23. Let $w \in \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}(\circ), \mathcal{E}(\circ)}(C)$. We define $\sigma_\ell(w) := \sigma_\ell^{M(w)}(w)$.

Definition 4.24. Let $x \in \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}(\circ)}(C)$. We define

$$H(x) = |\{m(v) : v \in I(T)\}|.$$

Lemma 4.25. Let $x, \tilde{x} \in \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}(\circ), \mathcal{E}(\circ)}(C)$ and suppose $x \stackrel{\circ}{=} \tilde{x}$. Then

$$H(x) = H(\tilde{x}).$$

Proof. One checks this is true for each of the equations defining $\stackrel{\circ}{=}$, which is easy. \square

Lemma 4.26. Let $x, \tilde{x} \in \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}(\circ), \mathcal{E}(\circ)}(C)$ be in canonical form and suppose $x \stackrel{\circ}{=} \tilde{x}$. Then $x = \tilde{x}$.

Proof. The proof is by induction on $H := H(x) = H(\tilde{x})$. If $H = 0$, then x, \tilde{x} both have height zero, so they must be equal as the relation $\overset{\circ}{=}$ is just $=$ on elements of height zero.

Now suppose $H \geq 1$ and let $l = |L_{\geq M}(x)| = |L_{\geq M}(\tilde{x})|$. Then x, \tilde{x} each consist of a maximal m -constant component containing the root, which we denote x_0 and \tilde{x}_0 , to which are grafted trees x_1, \dots, x_l and $\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_l$. Moreover, it is easy to see that $x_i = \sigma_{\ell_i}(x)$ and $\tilde{x}_i = \sigma_{\tilde{\ell}_i}(\tilde{x})$, where $L_{\geq M}(x) = \{\ell_1 < \dots < \ell_l\}$ and $L_{\geq M}(\tilde{x}) = \{\tilde{\ell}_1 < \dots < \tilde{\ell}_l\}$. By Lemma 4.22, we must have $\sigma_{\ell_i}(x) \overset{\circ}{=} \sigma_{\tilde{\ell}_i}(\tilde{x})$ and so by induction we have $\sigma_{\ell_i}(x) = \sigma_{\tilde{\ell}_i}(\tilde{x})$.

Now we must show $x_0 = \tilde{x}_0$. If $M = k$ then both must be equal to $\circ_{k,k} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \circ_{k,k}$, where there are $l - 1$ copies of $\circ_{k,k}$. If $M < k$, then only one of the leaves ℓ_i will be labelled by a k -cell, let it be ℓ_p . This also means $\tilde{\ell}_p$ must be the only leaf in \tilde{x} labelled by a k -cell. Then both x_0 and \tilde{x}_0 must be equal to $\circ_{k,M} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \circ_{k,M} \rightarrow \circ_{M,k} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \circ_{M,k}$ where we have $p - 1$ copies of $\circ_{k,M}$ and $l - p$ copies of $\circ_{M,k}$. \square

Proof of Proposition 4.9. We have $x, \tilde{x} \in \text{Tree}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}}(C)_k$, both in canonical form, and $x \overset{\epsilon}{=} \tilde{x}$. By Lemma 4.10, we can assume that x, \tilde{x} contain no u -labelled vertices. By Lemmas 4.13 and 4.15, we then have $x \overset{\circ}{=} \tilde{x}$ and we can apply Lemma 4.26 to conclude $x = \tilde{x}$. \square

Using the canonical form and Lemmas 3.16 and 3.17 it is now easy to show that the canonical map $\text{Comp}_k^n \rightarrow \text{Comp}_k^{T_n^{D^s}}$ is an isomorphism.

Proposition 4.27. *For $k \leq n + 1$, the map $\text{Comp}_k^n \rightarrow \text{Comp}_k^{T_n^{D^s}}$ is an isomorphism of categories, and the following diagram commutes.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \text{Comp}_k^n & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \text{Comp}_k^{T_n^{D^s}} \\
 \searrow & & \swarrow \\
 \overline{\text{Tree}}_n^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{E}} & & \text{F}_k \\
 & \searrow & \swarrow \\
 & \text{Sesq}_n &
 \end{array}$$

5. Comp is a presheaf category

We now define a category Cell_{n+1} of computadic cell shapes of dimension $\leq n + 1$, with a fully faithful functor $\text{Cell}_{n+1} \hookrightarrow \text{Comp}_{n+1}^n$, which we usually

denote $\text{Cell} \leftrightarrow \text{Comp}$. Then we construct the associated nerve/realization adjunction

$$|-| : \text{Psh}(\text{Cell}) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\perp} \\ \xleftarrow{\perp} \end{array} \text{Comp} : N$$

and prove that it is an equivalence of categories.

Definition 5.1. Denote by $\mathbb{1}$ the terminal computad. One can define it inductively by saying that it has exactly one 0-cell and exactly one k -cell x with $s(x) = x_0$ and $t(x) = x_1$ for each ordered pair (x_0, x_1) of parallel $(k-1)$ -morphisms in $F_{k-1}(\mathbb{1}_{\leq k-1})$.

Notation 5.2. For any computad C , we denote by $\sigma : C \rightarrow \mathbb{1}$ the unique map of computads.

We think of the cells in $\mathbb{1}$ as **cell shapes** and of the morphisms in $F(\mathbb{1})$ as **unlabelled diagrams**. Now we show how one can associate a computad to each unlabelled diagram.

Definition 5.3. Let $d \in F(\mathbb{1})$ be an unlabelled diagram. We define a category $\text{Comp}(d)$ as follows. Its objects are pairs (C, x) , where C is a computad, $x \in F(C)$ and $F(\sigma)(x) = d$. A morphism $(C, x) \rightarrow (D, y)$ is a map of computads $\varphi : C \rightarrow D$ such that $F(\varphi)(x) = y$.

Now we show that the category $\text{Comp}(d)$ has an initial object. For this we will need to take colimits in Comp . The following result seems to be well known, but not having found a suitable reference we include a simple proof here.

Lemma 5.4. Let $T : \text{gSet}_n \rightarrow \text{gSet}_n$ be a finitary monad and let $k \leq n+1$. For each $m \leq k$, denote by $[-]_m : \text{Comp}_k^T \rightarrow \text{Set}$ the functor taking a k -computad to its set of m -cells. Then the following hold:

1. the category Comp_k^T is cocomplete;
2. each functor $[-]_m$ is cocontinuous;
3. the functors $[-]_m$ for $m = 0, \dots, k$ jointly reflect isomorphisms.

Proof. Let $\Gamma : I \rightarrow \text{Comp}_k^T$ be a diagram. To prove 1. and 2. we may as well assume $m = k$, otherwise we can pass to the underlying diagram of m -computads. We construct, by induction on k , a k -computad C which will be the colimit of this diagram. Define its set of k -cells to be $C_k := \text{colim}_i [\Gamma(i)]_k$ and its underlying $(k - 1)$ -computad as $C_{\leq k-1} := \text{colim}_i [\Gamma(i)]_{\leq k-1}$. Now define source and target maps

$$s, t : \text{colim}_i [\Gamma(i)]_k \rightarrow [F_{k-1}(\text{colim}_i [\Gamma(i)]_{\leq k-1})]_{k-1}$$

by the composite

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(i)_k &\rightarrow [F_{k-1}(\Gamma(i)_{\leq k-1})]_{k-1} \rightarrow \text{colim}_i [F_{k-1}(\Gamma(i)_{\leq k-1})]_{k-1} \rightarrow \\ &\rightarrow [\text{colim}_i F_{k-1}(\Gamma(i)_{\leq k-1})]_{k-1} = [F_{k-1}(\text{colim}_i \Gamma(i)_{\leq k-1})]_{k-1} \end{aligned}$$

where the equality comes from the fact that F_{k-1} is left adjoint and the last arrow is induced by the maps


$$[F_{k-1}([\Gamma(i)]_{\leq k-1})]_{k-1} \rightarrow [\text{colim}_i F_{k-1}([\Gamma(i)]_{\leq k-1})]_{k-1}$$

on sets of $(k - 1)$ -morphisms associated to the canonical maps of T -algebras $F_{k-1}([\Gamma(i)]_{\leq k-1}) \rightarrow \text{colim}_i F_{k-1}([\Gamma(i)]_{\leq k-1})$. Now one needs to check that s, t satisfy globularity and that the construction has the right universal property. This is straightforward. Point 3. is easy to prove by induction. \square

Proposition 5.5. *For each unlabelled diagram $d \in F(\mathbb{1})$ the category $\text{Comp}(d)$ has an initial object, which we denote (\hat{d}, \tilde{d}) .*

Proof. We construct (\hat{d}, \tilde{d}) by induction on the dimension of d and on the height of its canonical form. For the inductive procedure, it is useful to include also the statement that the canonical forms of d and \tilde{d} differ only in their leaf labels.

If d is a 0-diagram then it consists of a single 0-cell. Then \hat{d} is the 0-computad with a single 0-cell and \tilde{d} is the diagram consisting of that 0-cell. Now suppose d consists of a single k -cell. By induction on dimension and the fact that $ss(d) = st(d)$ and $ts(d) = tt(d)$, we have the following diagram.



We build $\widehat{\hat{d}}$ by taking the colimit of this diagram in Comp and then adding a k -cell $\widehat{\tilde{d}} : \widehat{s(d)} \rightarrow \widehat{t(d)}$. It's now easy to see, by induction on dimension, that $(\widehat{\hat{d}}, \widehat{\tilde{d}})$ is an initial object in $\text{Comp}(d)$.

Now suppose d has canonical form $x \rightarrow \circ_{i,j} \leftarrow y$. Let $m = \min\{i, j\}$ and let $x \cap y = s^{i-m+1}(x) = t^{j-m+1}(y)$. By induction on height and dimension, we have a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\widehat{x \cap y} & \hookrightarrow & \hat{x} \\
\downarrow & & \\
\hat{y} & &
\end{array}$$

We let \hat{d} be the pushout of this diagram in Comp and $\tilde{d} = (\tilde{x} \rightarrow \circ_{i,j} \leftarrow \tilde{y})$. Note that if we take \tilde{x} and \tilde{y} in canonical form, then \tilde{d} as above is already in canonical form. This is because $x \rightarrow \circ_{i,j} \leftarrow y$ is in canonical form and x, y agree with \tilde{x}, \tilde{y} except for leaf labels, by induction. Now given $(C, m) \in \text{Comp}(d)$, a map $(\hat{d}, \tilde{d}) \rightarrow (C, m)$ is given by maps $f : \hat{x} \rightarrow C$ and $g : \hat{y} \rightarrow C$ such that $(f(\tilde{x}) \rightarrow \circ_{i,j} \leftarrow g(\tilde{y})) \stackrel{\epsilon}{=} m$. Note that the left hand side is already in canonical form, since we simply apply maps f, g to the leaf labels. This means the canonical form of m must be equal to this, by uniqueness of canonical form. This determines $f(\tilde{x}), g(\tilde{y}) \in F(C)$ uniquely, because it determines their canonical forms as the two evident subtrees of the canonical form of m . Then by induction this determines f, g uniquely, so we conclude that (\hat{d}, \tilde{d}) is initial. Moreover, \tilde{d} clearly has the same canonical form as d , except for leaf labels.

Finally suppose d has canonical form $x \rightarrow u_i$. Then take $\hat{d} = \hat{x}$ and $\tilde{d} = \tilde{x} \rightarrow u_i$. \square

Example 5.6. It is well known ([23],[14]) that the category of computads for the monad T_n^{str} , whose algebras are strict n -categories, is not a prehaf category, when $n \geq 3$. This example illustrates why the the above Proposition fails in this case. Denote by $\mathbb{1}$ the terminal computad for T_n^{str} and let $s : \text{id}_* \Rightarrow \text{id}_*$ be the unique 2-cell in $\mathbb{1}$ whose source and target are the identity on the unique 0-cell. We construct a diagram $d \in F(\mathbb{1})_2$ consisting of the vertical composite $s \circ s$. Consider $(\hat{d}, \tilde{d}) \in \text{Comp}^{T_n^{str}}(d)$ defined by letting \hat{d} be the computad consisting of a 0-cell $*$, together with two 2-cells $\alpha, \beta : \text{id}_* \Rightarrow \text{id}_*$, and \tilde{d} the vertical composite $\alpha \circ \beta$. By the Eckmann-Hilton argument, we have $\alpha \circ \beta = \beta \circ \alpha$, so \hat{d} admits a nontrivial automorphism which maps $\tilde{d} \mapsto \tilde{d}$, namely the one that permutes α and β . If $\text{Comp}(d)$ had an initial object I , then the unique map $I \rightarrow (\hat{d}, \tilde{d})$ would be invariant under composition with this automorphism. This would mean that α, β are not in the image of the map, so I contains only 0-cells, which is absurd.

In order to show that Comp is a presheaf category, what we actually need is the fact that $\text{Comp}(c)$ has an initial object when $c \in \mathbb{1}_k$ is a computadic cell shape. This will fail for any 3-cell shape whose source or target is the diagram d above.

Definition 5.7. Let Cell_{n+1} be the category whose objects are cell shapes $c \in F_k(\mathbb{1})$ for $k \leq n + 1$, and where a morphism $c \rightarrow d$ is a map of computads $\hat{c} \rightarrow \hat{d}$. We usually denote this simply by Cell . It comes with a fully faithful functor

$$\widehat{(-)} : \text{Cell} \hookrightarrow \text{Comp}.$$

Definition 5.8. We define the nerve functor

$$N : \text{Comp} \rightarrow \text{Psh}(\text{Cell})$$

as the composite $\text{Comp} \hookrightarrow \text{Psh}(\widehat{\text{Comp}}) \rightarrow \text{Psh}(\text{Cell})$ of the Yoneda embedding with the restriction along $\widehat{(-)}$.

Definition 5.9. We define the realization functor by the following left Kan extension, which exists because Comp is cocomplete.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Cell} & \xleftarrow{\widehat{(-)}} & \text{Comp} \\ \downarrow \mathcal{Y} & \nearrow \text{---} & \\ \text{Psh}(\text{Cell}) & & \end{array}$$

We thus obtain the usual nerve/realization adjunction

$$|-| : \text{Psh}(\text{Cell}) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\quad} \\ \xleftarrow{\perp} \end{array} \text{Comp} : N .$$

Theorem 5.10. *The adjunction $|-| : \text{Psh}(\text{Cell}) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\quad} \\ \xleftarrow{\perp} \end{array} \text{Comp} : N$ is an equivalence.*

Proof. By [15][Proposition 5.14] it is enough to show that the functors

$$\text{Comp}(\hat{c}, -) : \text{Comp} \rightarrow \text{Set},$$

for $c \in \text{Cell}$, are cocontinuous and jointly reflect isomorphisms. This follows easily from Lemma 5.4 and the fact that for $c \in \mathbb{1}_k$ we have

$$\text{Comp}(\hat{c}, C) = \{x \in C_k : \sigma(x) = c\},$$

which is itself a direct consequence of the fact that (\hat{c}, \tilde{c}) is initial in $\text{Comp}(c)$. \square


6. String diagrams for n -sesquicategories

Let C be an n -computad for $T_n^{D^s}$. In this section we explain how to associate a C -labelled string diagram to each morphism in $F_n(C)$. It is enough to describe the unlabelled diagrams corresponding to morphisms in $F_n(\mathbb{1})$, since C -labelled diagrams are then obtained by simply adding labels at appropriate places.


So let $w \in F_n(\mathbb{1})_k$. We proceed by induction on k and the height of the canonical form of w . When $k = 0$, the morphism w simply consists of the unique 0-cell in $\mathbb{1}$. The associated diagram is just a point. In general, when k is odd (resp. even) we depict a generating k -cell $w \in \mathbb{1}_k$ by drawing the $(k - 1)$ -diagram corresponding to its source on the left (resp. top), the one corresponding to its target on the right (resp. bottom) and then forming a double cone on this disjoint union. We denote this double cone by drawing the cone point in the middle and curves connecting each cell in the source and target diagrams to the cone point. We need to distinguish lines which correspond to cells of different codimension, which we can do by using different thickness, transparency, dashing or any other method.

Now suppose $w = (x \rightarrow \circ_{i,j} \leftarrow y)$ is in canonical form. By induction, we already know how to draw the diagrams associated to x and y and the diagram $\circ_{i,j}$ determines how we should compose these two pictures to obtain the picture for w . Finally, if $w = (x \rightarrow u_k)$ in canonical form, then we draw two copies of x and we draw lines connecting generators, again using a different notation for generators of different codimension.

We now give some examples. First it is useful to recall from [6] the graphical notation for the generators $\circ_{i,j}$. We include here the pictures for $i, j \leq 4$.




Now we can move on to examples of unlabelled cells and diagrams. The unique 1-cell in $\mathbb{1}$ is denoted $\text{---}\bullet\text{---}$. The diagram $* \rightarrow u_1$ is denoted --- . The diagram $\text{---} \rightarrow \circ_{1,1} \leftarrow \text{---}$ is denoted $\text{---}\bullet\text{---}$. Here are some 2-cells, with their source and target 1-diagrams.




The 2-diagrams $* \rightarrow u_1 \rightarrow u_2$ and $\text{---} \rightarrow u_2$ are denoted

$$\mathbb{I} : \text{---} \rightarrow \text{---} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{I} : \text{---}\bullet\text{---} \rightarrow \text{---}\bullet\text{---}.$$


Here is a 2-diagram in canonical form, then its canonical form where we replace each generator by its picture and finally the picture of the diagram itself.



Here are some other 2-diagrams.




Here are some 3-cells with their source and target 2-diagrams.



Notice how the notation distinguishes the 3-cell $\mathbb{I} \bullet \mathbb{I}$ above from the diagram

$$\mathbb{I} \bullet \mathbb{I} = (\mathbb{I} \bullet \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \circ_{3,1} \leftarrow \text{---}\bullet\text{---}).$$

Here is a 4-cell with its source and target 3-diagrams.



References

- [1] homotopy.io. ncatlab.org/nlab/show/homotopy.io.
- [2] Manuel Araújo. *Coherence for 3-dualizable objects*. PhD thesis, University of Oxford, 2017.
- [3] Manuel Araújo. String diagrams for 4-categories and fibrations of mapping 4-groupoids. arXiv:2012.03797, 2020.
- [4] Manuel Araújo. Coherence for adjunctions in a 3-category via string diagrams. *Compositionality*, 4, August 2022.
- [5] Manuel Araújo. Coherence for adjunctions in a 4-category. arXiv:2207.02935, 2022.
- [6] Manuel Araújo. Simple string diagrams and n -sesquicategories. arXiv:2202.09293, 2022.
- [7] David Ayala and John Francis. The cobordism hypothesis. arXiv:1705.02240, 2017.
- [8] John C. Baez and James Dolan. Higher-dimensional algebra and topological quantum field theory. *J.Math.Phys.* 36 (1995) 6073-6105, 1995.
- [9] Krzysztof Bar, Aleks Kissinger, and Jamie Vicary. Globular: an online proof assistant for higher-dimensional rewriting. In *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics*, volume 52, pages 34:1–34:11, 2016. ncatlab.org/nlab/show/Globular.
- [10] Krzysztof Bar and Jamie Vicary. Data structures for quasistrict higher categories. arXiv:1610.06908, 2016.

- [11] John W. Barrett, Catherine Meusburger, and Gregor Schaumann. Gray categories with duals and their diagrams. arXiv:1211.0529, 2012.
- [12] M. A. Batanin. Computads for finitary monads on globular sets. In *Higher Category Theory*, volume 230 of *Contemporary Mathematics*, pages 37–57. American Mathematical Society, 1998.
- [13] M. A. Batanin. Computads and slices of operads. arXiv:math/0209035, 2002.
- [14] Eugenia Cheng. A direct proof that the category of 3-computads is not cartesian closed. *Cahiers de Topologie et Géométrie Différentielle Catégoriques*, LIV:3–12, 2013.
- [15] Christopher J. Dean, Eric Finster, Ioannis Markakis, David Reutter, and Jamie Vicary. Computads for weak ω -categories as an inductive type. arXiv:2208.08719, 2022.
- [16] Christoph Dorn. *Associative n -categories*. PhD thesis, University of Oxford, 2018.
- [17] Christoph Dorn and Christopher L. Douglas. Manifold diagrams and tame tangles. arXiv:2208.13758, 2022.
- [18] Daniel Grady and Dmitri Pavlov. The geometric cobordism hypothesis. arXiv:2111.01095, 2021.
- [19] Simon Henry. Non-unital polygraphs form a presheaf category. *Higher Structures*, 3:248–291, 2019.
- [20] Benjamin Hummon. *Surface diagrams for gray-categories*. PhD thesis, University of California, San Diego, 2012.
- [21] Tom Leinster. *Higher Operads, Higher Categories*. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [22] Jacob Lurie. On the classification of topological field theories. *Current Developments in Mathematics*, 2008:129–280, 2008.

- [23] Mihaly Makkai and Marek Zawadowski. The category of 3-computads is not cartesian closed. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 212(11):2543–2546, 2008.
- [24] David Reutter and Jamie Vicary. High-level methods for homotopy construction in associative n -categories. arXiv:1902.03831, 2019.
- [25] Christopher Schommer-Pries. *The Classification of Two-Dimensional Extended Topological Field Theories*. PhD thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 2009.