

Free decomposition spaces

PHILIP HACKNEY* AND JOACHIM KOCK**

* *University of Louisiana at Lafayette*

** *Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona and Centre de Recerca Matemàtica;
currently at the University of Copenhagen*

Abstract

We introduce the notion of free decomposition spaces: they are simplicial spaces freely generated by inert maps. We show that left Kan extension along the inclusion $j: \Delta_{\text{inert}} \rightarrow \Delta$ takes general objects to Möbius decomposition spaces and general maps to CULF maps. We establish an equivalence of ∞ -categories $\mathbf{PrSh}(\Delta_{\text{inert}}) \simeq \mathbf{Decomp}_{/BN}$. Although free decomposition spaces are rather simple objects, they abound in combinatorics: it seems that all comultiplications of deconcatenation type arise from free decomposition spaces. We give an extensive list of examples, including quasi-symmetric functions.

Contents

Introduction	2
1 Preliminaries	6
1.1 Active and inert maps	6
1.2 Decomposition spaces and incidence coalgebras	7
2 Free decomposition spaces	9
2.1 Left Kan extension along j	9
2.2 Two identifications	10
2.3 $j_!$ gives decomposition spaces and CULF maps	12
3 Main theorem	13
3.1 Untwisting theorem	13
3.2 Equivalence between $\Delta_{\text{inert}}^{\text{op}}$ -diagrams and decomposition spaces over BN	14
3.3 Fully faithfulness	15
4 Miscellaneous results	16
4.1 Remarks about sheaves	16
4.2 Restriction \mathbb{L} -species	18
5 Examples in combinatorics	19
5.1 Paths and words	19
5.2 Further examples of deconcatenations	23
5.3 Simplices in simplicial sets	25

Introduction

Background

Möbius inversion. The motivation for this work comes from the theory of Möbius inversion in incidence algebras of posets (Rota [49]), which is an important tool in enumerative combinatorics, as well as in application areas such as probability theory, algebraic topology, and renormalization, just to mention a few. The idea is generally to write down counting functions on suitable posets (or more precisely on their incidence coalgebras), and then express recursive relations in such a way that the solution is given in terms of convolution with the Möbius function. In this work we are not directly concerned with counting problems or Möbius functions, but rather with features of the overall framework.

Decomposition spaces. The starting point is the recent discovery that objects more general than posets admit the construction of incidence algebras and Möbius inversion: these are called *decomposition spaces* by Gálvez, Kock, and Tonks [20], [21], and they are the same thing as the *2-Segal spaces* of Dyckerhoff and Kapranov [16] who were motivated mainly by representation theory and homological algebra. (The last ingredient in the equivalence between the two notions, the fact that a certain unitality condition is automatic, was provided only recently by Feller et al. [17].)

From the viewpoint of combinatorics, the importance of decomposition spaces is that many combinatorial coalgebras, bialgebras, and Hopf algebras are not directly the incidence coalgebra of any poset, but that it is often possible instead to realize them as incidence coalgebras of a decomposition space (as illustrated in Section 5 below), and in this way make standard tools available. The price to pay is that the theory of decomposition spaces is more technical than that of posets. In particular, a little bit of background in simplicial homotopy theory and category theory is assumed as a prerequisite for this work, and their basic vocabulary is used freely. We refer to the introductions and preliminaries sections of the papers [20, 21, 19] for background material on the use of simplicial methods for combinatorial coalgebras.

Briefly (cf. 1.2.1 below), a decomposition space is a simplicial space satisfying the exactness condition (weaker than the Segal condition) stating that active-inert pushouts in the simplex category Δ are sent to homotopy pullbacks. The active-inert factorization system was already an important ingredient in the combinatorics of higher algebra, as in Lurie's book [45], where the terminology originates.

In the present work, we explore further the fundamental relationship between decomposition spaces and the active-inert factorization system, and single out a new class of decomposition space, the *free decomposition spaces*, being simplicial spaces freely generated by inert maps. We show that most comultiplications in algebraic combinatorics of deconcatenation type arise from free decomposition spaces.

Active and inert maps for categories and higher categories. The *active* maps in the simplex category Δ are the endpoint-preserving maps; the *inert* maps are the distance-preserving maps (cf. 1.1.1 below). The two classes of maps form a factorization system $\Delta = (\Delta_{\text{active}}, \Delta_{\text{inert}})$ first studied (by Leinster and Berger [4]) to express the interplay between algebra and geometry in the notion of category: for the nerve of a category, the active maps parametrize the algebraic operations of composition and identity arrows, while the inert maps express the bookkeeping that these operations are subject to, namely source and target. The geometric nature of this background fabric is manifest in the fact that the category Δ_{inert} has a natural Grothendieck topology, through which the gluing conditions are expressed: a simplicial set X is the nerve of a category if and only if $j^*(X)$, the restriction of X along $j: \Delta_{\text{inert}} \rightarrow \Delta$, is a sheaf. This is one form of the classical nerve theorem, which characterizes the essential image of the nerve functor. In particular, the question whether a simplicial set is the nerve of a category depends only on the inert part. This viewpoint is the starting point for the Segal–Rezk approach to ∞ -categories, defined by replacing simplicial sets by simplicial spaces, and considering the sheaf condition up to homotopy. Many other developments exploit the active-inert machinery to obtain nerve theorems in fancier contexts, including Weber’s extensive theory of local right adjoint monads and monads with arities, with abstract nerve theorems [56], [57], [5], as well as special nerve theorems for specific operad-like structures (polynomial monads in terms of trees [36], [24], properads in terms of directed graphs [37], modular operads and wheeled properads as well as infinity versions [27], [28], and so on); see [25] for a survey. Recently Chu and Haugseng [14] have even developed a general Segal approach to operad-like structures in terms of *algebraic patterns*, where the notion of active-inert factorization system is taken as primitive.

Active and inert maps for decomposition spaces. For decomposition spaces, the active-inert interplay is more subtle than for categories, and the exactness condition that characterizes them can no longer be measured on the inert maps alone. It is now about *decomposition* of ‘arrows’ rather than composition. Roughly, the active maps encode all possible ways to decompose arrows, and the inert maps then separate out the pieces of the decomposition. The exactness condition characterizing decomposition spaces combines active and inert maps. It can be interpreted as a locality condition, stating roughly that the possible decompositions of a local region are not affected by anything outside the region [23], [19].

Active and inert maps for morphisms. Turning to morphisms, the situation is more complex for decomposition spaces than for categories. For categories, the nerve functor is fully faithful, meaning that all simplicial maps are relevant: the simplicial identities for simplicial maps simply say that source and target, composition and identities are preserved. For decomposition spaces, this is no longer the case, as there are different ways in which a simplicial map could be said to preserve decompositions. The most well-behaved class of simplicial maps in this respect are the CULF maps [20] (standing for ‘conservative’ and

‘unique lifting of factorizations’), a class of maps well studied in category theory, originating with Lawvere’s work on dynamical systems [41], and exploited in computer science in the algebraic semantics of processes [12], [31], [11]. From the viewpoint of combinatorics the interest in CULF maps is that they preserve decompositions in a way such as to induce coalgebra homomorphisms between incidence coalgebras [43], [42], [20]. The formal characterization of CULF maps is that when interpreted as natural transformations, they are cartesian on active maps. Independently of the coalgebra interpretation, this pullback condition interacts very well with the exactness condition characterizing decomposition spaces.

Contributions of the present paper

In the present work, the focus is not so much on restriction along $j: \Delta_{\text{inert}} \rightarrow \Delta$ as in the Segal case, but rather on its left adjoint $j_! \dashv j^*$, left Kan extension along j . Given a presheaf $A: \Delta_{\text{inert}}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ (with values in spaces), we are thus concerned with the simplicial space $j_!(A): \Delta^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$. It is rarely the case that $j_!(A)$ is Segal. We show instead that $j_!(A)$ is always a decomposition space:

Theorem. (Cf. Proposition 2.3.2 and Corollary 2.3.3.) *For any $A: \Delta_{\text{inert}}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$, the left Kan extension $j_!(A): \Delta^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ is a Möbius decomposition space, and for any map $A' \rightarrow A$ of $\Delta_{\text{inert}}^{\text{op}}$ -diagrams, we have that $j_!(A') \rightarrow j_!(A)$ is CULF.*

The decomposition spaces that arise with $j_!$ we call *free decomposition spaces*.

A key to understand the relationship between Δ_{inert} -presheaves and decomposition spaces is the action of $j_!$ on the terminal presheaf $1 \in \mathbf{PrSh}(\Delta_{\text{inert}})$. The following result is just a calculation:

Lemma 2.3.1. *We have $j_!(1) \simeq BN$, the classifying space of the natural numbers.*

It follows that free decomposition spaces admit a CULF map to BN . In fact this feature characterizes free decomposition spaces:

Proposition. (Cf. Corollary 3.2.2.) *A decomposition space is free if and only if it admits a CULF map to BN .*

We derive this from the following more precise result.

Theorem 3.2.1. *The $j_!$ functor induces an equivalence of ∞ -categories*

$$\mathbf{PrSh}(\Delta_{\text{inert}}) \simeq \mathbf{Decomp}_{/BN}.$$

Here \mathbf{Decomp} is the ∞ -category of decomposition spaces and CULF maps, and $\mathbf{Decomp}_{/BN}$ its slice over BN .

The proof of this result turned out to be quite involved, and ended up developing into a proof of the following very general result, which is an ∞ -version of a theorem of Kock and Spivak [40]:

Theorem 3.1.2. *For D a decomposition space, there is a natural equivalence of ∞ -categories*

$$\mathbf{Decomp}_{/D} \simeq \mathbf{Rfib}(\mathrm{tw} D).$$

Here $\mathrm{tw}(D)$ denotes the edgewise subdivision of the simplicial space D — when D is a (Rezk complete) decomposition space, this is an ∞ -category [26], called the twisted arrow category of D . The right-hand side $\mathbf{Rfib}(\mathrm{tw} D)$ is the ∞ -category of right fibrations over $\mathrm{tw}(D)$, which is equivalent to $\mathbf{PrSh}(\mathrm{tw} D)$ under the basic equivalence between right fibrations and presheaves (see for example [2, Theorem 3.4.6]).

In order to apply the general theorem, take $D = B\mathbb{N}$, and note the following:

Lemma 2.2.2. *There is a natural equivalence of categories*

$$\Delta_{\mathrm{inert}} \simeq \mathrm{tw}(B\mathbb{N}).$$

Theorem 3.2.1 follows essentially from this observation and the general theorem, but there is still some work to do to show that in this special case, the untwisting of the general theorem can actually be identified with left Kan extension along j , surprisingly.

Since the general theorem is of independent interest, and since the proof is very long, we have separated it out into a paper on its own [26].

Having characterized free decomposition spaces as those admitting a CULF map to $B\mathbb{N}$, it is interesting to know that such a map is unique if it exists. This statement is equivalent to the following result.

Proposition 3.3.3. *The forgetful functor $\mathbf{Decomp}_{/B\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Decomp}$ is fully faithful.*

Together with Theorem 3.2.1, this implies a fundamental property of j :

Corollary 3.3.4. *The functor $j_! : \mathbf{PrSh}(\Delta_{\mathrm{inert}}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Decomp}$ is fully faithful.*

Theorem 3.2.1 readily implies the following classical and more special result due to Street [54]: *a category admits a CULF functor to $B\mathbb{N}$ if and only if it is free on a directed graph.*

We also characterize a large class of free decomposition spaces in terms of a class of species called *restriction \mathbb{L} -species* (Proposition 4.2.3).

Although free decomposition spaces are rather simple, they abound in combinatorics. Generally it seems that all comultiplications of deconcatenation type

(i.e. in the spirit of splitting a word into a prefix and a postfix) arise from free decomposition spaces. In Section 5 we illustrate and substantiate this principle by giving a long list of examples of deconcatenation-type comultiplications and the free decomposition spaces they are incidence coalgebras of. This includes many variation on paths and words, including parking functions, Dyck paths, noncrossing partitions, as well as processes of transition systems, Petri nets, and rewrite systems. In particular, the comultiplication of the Hopf algebra of quasi-symmetric functions QSym is shown to be the incidence coalgebra of a free decomposition space Q , namely that of words in the alphabet \mathbb{N}_+ .

1 Preliminaries

We run through some standard material just to set up notation.

1.1 Active and inert maps

As usual, Δ denotes the category of finite nonempty ordinals

$$[n] = \{0 < 1 < \dots < n\}.$$

This category admits a presentation by generators (the coface and codegeneracy maps; see (1) below) and relations (the cosimplicial identities).

1.1.1. The active-inert factorization system. The category Δ has an active-inert factorization system: every map factors uniquely as an active map followed by an inert map. The *active maps*, written $g: [k] \rightarrow [n]$, are those that preserve end-points, $g(0) = 0$ and $g(k) = n$; the *inert maps*, written $f: [m] \rightarrow [n]$, are those that are distance preserving, $f(i+1) = f(i) + 1$ for $0 \leq i \leq m-1$. The active maps are generated by the codegeneracy maps and the inner coface maps; the inert maps are generated by the outer coface maps d^\perp and d^\top . This is illustrated in the following diagram of generating maps of Δ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 [0] & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{d^1} \\ \xrightarrow{d^0} \end{array} & [1] & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{d^2} \\ \xrightarrow{d^0} \end{array} & [2] & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{d^3} \\ \xrightarrow{d^0} \end{array} & [3] & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{d^4} \\ \xrightarrow{d^0} \end{array} & \dots & (1)
 \end{array}$$

(This orthogonal factorization system is an instance of the important general notion of generic-free factorization system of Weber [57], who referred to the two classes as generic and free. The active-inert terminology is due to Lurie [45].)

1.1.2. Active maps vs. k -tuples. For fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}$, write $\text{Act}(k)$ for the set of active maps out of $[k]$. For each n there is a unique active map $[1] \rightarrow [n]$, which implies that $\text{Act}(1) \cong \mathbb{N}$. For $i = 1, \dots, k$, write $\rho_i: [1] \rightarrow [k]$ for the inert map whose image is $i-1, i$. For an active map $\alpha: [k] \rightarrow [n]$, write $[n_i]$ for the ordinal

appearing in the active-inert factorization of $\alpha \circ \rho_i$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} [1] & \cdots \dashrightarrow & [n_i] \\ \rho_i \downarrow & & \downarrow \gamma_i^\alpha \\ [k] & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & [n] \end{array}$$

This defines a k -tuple $(n_1, \dots, n_k) \in \mathbb{N}^k$.

Conversely, given a k -tuple $(n_1, \dots, n_k) \in \mathbb{N}^k$, define an active map $\alpha: [k] \rightarrow [n]$ (with $n := \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} n_i$) by sending $j \in [k]$ to $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq j} n_i \in [n]$. Clearly $\alpha(0) = 0$ and $\alpha(k) = n$, so α is indeed active.

These assignments are inverse to each other so as to define a bijection

$$\text{Act}(k) \cong \mathbb{N}^k.$$

(Below (in 2.2.3) we shall vary k and fit these bijections into an isomorphism of categories.)

1.2 Decomposition spaces and incidence coalgebras

1.2.1. Decomposition spaces. Active and inert maps in Δ admit pushouts along each other, and the resulting maps are again active and inert. A *decomposition space* [20] is a simplicial space¹ $X: \Delta^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ that takes all such active-inert pushouts to pullbacks:

$$X \left(\begin{array}{ccc} [n'] & \longleftarrow & [n] \\ \uparrow & \lrcorner & \uparrow \\ [m'] & \longleftarrow & [m] \end{array} \right) = \begin{array}{ccc} X_{n'} & \longrightarrow & X_n \\ \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\ X_{m'} & \longrightarrow & X_m. \end{array}$$

Every Segal space is also a decomposition space [20, Prop. 3.7], [16, Prop. 2.5.3]. In particular, posets and categories are decomposition spaces, via the nerve construction.

1.2.2. Incidence coalgebras. The motivation for the notion of decomposition space is that they admit the construction of coassociative coalgebras [20], [21], generalizing the classical theory of incidence coalgebras of posets developed by Rota [49], [32] in the 1960s. Just as incidence coalgebras of posets are spanned linearly by the poset intervals, the incidence coalgebra of a decomposition space

¹As is common in modern categorical homotopy theory, ‘space’ means ∞ -groupoid. The collection of spaces forms the ∞ -category \mathcal{S} , and simplicial spaces and so on therefore also form ∞ -categories. The amount of ∞ -category theory needed in this paper is rather limited, and we can work with ∞ -categories model independently, as is often done in the theory of decomposition spaces [20], [21], [22]. For specificity, the reader can take the model of quasi-categories of Joyal [34] and Lurie [44], where in particular, ∞ -groupoid means Kan complex.

X is spanned linearly by X_1 . The comultiplication (which generalizes the case of posets) is given by (for $f \in X_1$)

$$\Delta(f) = \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in X_2 \\ d_1(\sigma) = f}} d_2(\sigma) \otimes d_0(\sigma)$$

which verbalizes into ‘sum over all 2-simplices with long edge f and return the two short edges.’

1.2.3. CULF maps. A simplicial map $F: Y \rightarrow X$ between simplicial spaces is called *CULF* [20] (standing for *conservative* and having *unique lifting of factorizations*) when it is cartesian on active maps (i.e. the naturality squares on active maps are pullbacks). If X is a decomposition space (e.g. a Segal space) and $F: Y \rightarrow X$ is CULF, then also Y is a decomposition space (but not in general Segal). We denote by **Decomp** the ∞ -category of decomposition spaces and CULF maps.

From the viewpoint of incidence coalgebras, the interest in CULF maps is that the incidence coalgebra construction is functorial (covariantly) in CULF maps [20].

1.2.4. Finiteness conditions and Möbius decomposition spaces. The theory of incidence coalgebras of decomposition spaces is natively ‘objective,’ meaning that the constructions deal directly with the combinatorial objects rather than with the vector spaces they span [20]. At this level the theory does not require any finiteness conditions. However, in order to be able to take (homotopy) cardinality to arrive at coalgebras in vector spaces as in classical combinatorics, it is necessary to impose certain finiteness conditions [21]. A decomposition space is *locally finite* when the maps $X_0 \xrightarrow{s_0} X_1 \xleftarrow{d_1} X_2$ are (homotopy) finite [21]. Often they are also discrete, in which case X is called *locally discrete*. The first condition ensures that the general incidence-coalgebra construction admits a (homotopy) cardinality. The discreteness condition ensures that the sum formula for comultiplication is free from denominators. An important class of locally finite decomposition spaces, called *Möbius decomposition spaces*, are characterized by (a completeness condition and) one further finiteness condition, namely that for every 1-simplex $f \in X_1$ there are only finitely many higher nondegenerate simplices with long edge f (recall that the long edge of $\sigma \in X_n$ is the pullback of σ along the unique active map $[1] \rightarrow [n]$). As suggested by the terminology, Möbius decomposition spaces admit a Möbius inversion principle [21]. Möbius decomposition spaces that are nerves of ordinary categories are precisely the Möbius categories of Leroux [43]. When the category is a poset, the condition is equivalent to being locally finite, as in the classical theory of Rota [49].

We shall not need to verify any of these finiteness conditions directly. We shall only need the fact [21] that if $Y \rightarrow X$ is CULF and if X is locally finite, locally discrete, or Möbius, then so is Y . (And then we shall invoke the fact that BN has all three properties.)

2 Free decomposition spaces

2.1 Left Kan extension along j

The input data for free construction is a Δ_{inert} -presheaf; the category Δ_{inert} admits a presentation as follows (compare to (1) on page 6).

$$[0] \xrightarrow[d^\perp]{d^\top} [1] \xrightarrow[d^\perp]{d^\top} [2] \xrightarrow[d^\perp]{d^\top} [3] \xrightarrow[d^\perp]{d^\top} \dots \quad d^\top d^\perp = d^\perp d^\top. \quad (2)$$

Throughout, $j: \Delta_{\text{inert}} \rightarrow \Delta$ denotes the inclusion functor. Our immediate goal is to give a formula for the left Kan extension along j in Corollary 2.1.4. We first prove a general lemma concerning factorization systems.

2.1.1. Factorization systems and cartesian fibrations. Let \mathcal{C} be an ∞ -category with a factorization system $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$. Let $\text{Arr}(\mathcal{C}) = \text{Fun}(\Delta^1, \mathcal{C})$ be the ∞ -category of arrows, with the cartesian fibration $\text{dom}: \text{Arr}(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$. Consider now the full subcategory spanned by the arrows in \mathcal{E} , denoted $\text{Arr}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mathcal{C})$. This is again a cartesian fibration, and the cartesian arrows are those for which the codomain component is in \mathcal{F} [22, Lemma 1.3]. If we take only those, we thus get a right fibration $\text{Arr}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mathcal{C})^{\text{cart}} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$. This corresponds to a presheaf $\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$, sending an object x to the space of \mathcal{E} -arrows out of x . (The inclusion $\text{Arr}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \text{Arr}(\mathcal{C})$ does not preserve cartesian arrows, but it has a right adjoint which sends an arrow to its \mathcal{E} -factor, and this right adjoint does preserve cartesian arrows.)

Lemma 2.1.2. *Suppose that $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is a factorization system on \mathcal{C} . For a presheaf $A: \mathcal{F}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ with corresponding right fibration $\tilde{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$, the left Kan extension along $j: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ corresponds to the left-hand composite in the pullback diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} j_!(\tilde{A}) & \longrightarrow & \tilde{A} \\ \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\ \text{Arr}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mathcal{C})^{\text{cart}} & \xrightarrow{\text{codom}} & \mathcal{F} \\ \text{dom} \downarrow & & \\ \mathcal{C} & & \end{array}$$

Proof. The codomain functor codom admits a right adjoint s (which is also a right inverse): s sends an object x to the identity arrow on x . Since codom is a left adjoint of s , we have $\text{codom}^* = s_!$ as functors $\mathbf{Rfib}(\mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Rfib}(\text{Arr}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mathcal{C})^{\text{cart}})$. Further, $\text{dom} \circ s = j$, hence $j_! = \text{dom}_! \circ s_! = \text{dom}_! \circ \text{codom}^*$. \square

Instantiating at the active-inert factorization system from 1.1.1, we obtain the following.

Corollary 2.1.3. For a presheaf $A: \Delta_{\text{inert}}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ with corresponding right fibration $\tilde{A} \rightarrow \Delta_{\text{inert}}$, the left Kan extension along $j: \Delta_{\text{inert}} \rightarrow \Delta$ corresponds to the left-hand composite in the pullback diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 j_!(\tilde{A}) & \longrightarrow & \tilde{A} \\
 \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\
 \text{Arr}^{\text{act}}(\Delta)^{\text{cart}} & \xrightarrow{\text{codom}} & \Delta_{\text{inert}} \\
 \text{dom} \downarrow & & \\
 \Delta & &
 \end{array}$$

Explicitly, $\text{Arr}^{\text{act}}(\Delta)^{\text{cart}}$ is the category whose objects are the active maps in Δ and whose arrows from α' to α are commutative squares

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 [k'] & \longrightarrow & [k] \\
 \alpha' \downarrow & & \downarrow \alpha \\
 [n'] & \twoheadrightarrow & [n].
 \end{array}$$

The corollary gives the following explicit sum-over-active-maps formula for $j_!(A)$:

Corollary 2.1.4. The simplicial space $X = j_!(A)$ has

$$X_k = \sum_{[k] \twoheadrightarrow [n]} A_n.$$

Proof. In the diagram in 2.1.3, the fiber over $[k] \in \Delta$ is computed by first expanding the fiber in $\text{Arr}^{\text{act}}(\Delta)^{\text{cart}}$ over $[k]$, which is the set $\{[k] \twoheadrightarrow [n]\}$ (for varying n). For each element in this set, the fiber is clearly A_n . \square

Example 2.1.5. Let A be the Δ_{inert} -presheaf $1 \xleftarrow{=} 0 \xleftarrow{=} 0 \cdots$. Then $j_!(A) = 1$, the terminal simplicial space.

2.2 Two identifications

2.2.1. Twisted arrow categories. Recall that for \mathcal{C} a small category (we shall only need the construction for 1-categories), the *twisted arrow category* $\text{tw}(\mathcal{C})$ is the category of elements of the Hom functor $\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$. It thus has the arrows of \mathcal{C} as objects, and trapezoidal commutative diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & & \cdot \\
 & \nearrow & \uparrow \\
 \cdot & & \cdot \\
 f' \uparrow & & \uparrow f \\
 \cdot & \nwarrow & \cdot
 \end{array}$$

as morphisms from f' to f . (Fancier viewpoints in the ∞ -setting play a key role in [26], but in this paper only the naive viewpoint is needed.)

Lemma 2.2.2. *There is a natural equivalence of categories*

$$\Delta_{\text{inert}} \simeq \text{tw}(B\mathbb{N}).$$

Proof. The category $B\mathbb{N}$ has only one object, and its set of arrows is \mathbb{N} . Therefore, the object set of $\text{tw}(B\mathbb{N})$ is \mathbb{N} , just as for Δ_{inert} . A general map in $\text{tw}(B\mathbb{N})$ is of the form

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & \cdot \\ & \nearrow^b & \uparrow \\ \cdot & & \cdot \\ m \uparrow & & \uparrow^{a+m+b} \\ \cdot & & \cdot \\ & \nwarrow_a & \cdot \end{array}$$

and it corresponds precisely to

$$(d^\top)^b \circ (d^\perp)^a : [m] \longrightarrow [a+m+b]$$

in Δ_{inert} . □

This result should be well known, but we are not aware of a reference for it. It should also be mentioned that it is also closely related to a recent fancier result (Hoang [30] and Burkin [13]) stating that Δ itself is the twisted arrow category (in a certain generalized sense) of the operad for unital associative algebras.

In the next lemma, and later in the paper, we make reference to the category of elements of a simplicial set or simplicial space X . Recall that $X : \Delta^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ has an associated right fibration over Δ , and the category of elements is the domain of this right fibration $\text{el}(X) \rightarrow \Delta$. The objects of $\text{el}(X)$ are simplices $\Delta^n \rightarrow X$.

Lemma 2.2.3. *There is a canonical identification*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Arr}^{\text{act}}(\Delta)^{\text{cart}} & \simeq & \text{el}(B\mathbb{N}) \\ \searrow^{\text{dom}} & & \swarrow \\ & \Delta & \end{array}$$

of right fibrations over Δ .

Proof. The objects of $\text{Arr}^{\text{act}}(\Delta)^{\text{cart}}$ in the fiber over $[k] \in \Delta$ are the active maps $[k] \rightarrow [n]$, whereas the objects in $\text{el}(B\mathbb{N})$ over $[k]$ are k -tuples (n_1, \dots, n_k) of natural numbers. The bijection between these sets was already described in 1.1.2.

Functoriality amounts to matching up cartesian lifts for the two fibrations. For active maps in Δ , the lifts in $\text{Arr}^{\text{act}}(\Delta)^{\text{cart}}$ are given by composition, and the lifts in $\text{el}(B\mathbb{N})$ are given by addition of natural numbers. For inert maps in Δ , the lifts in $\text{Arr}^{\text{act}}(\Delta)^{\text{cart}}$ are given by active-inert factorization, and the cartesian lifts in $\text{el}(B\mathbb{N})$ are given by projections. The checks are routine. □

2.3 $j_!$ gives decomposition spaces and CULF maps

Lemma 2.3.1. *For the terminal $\Delta_{\text{inert}}^{\text{op}}$ -diagram 1 we have*

$$j_!(1) = B\mathbb{N}$$

(nerve of the one-object category \mathbb{N}).

Proof. Under the basic equivalence $\mathbf{PrSh}(\Delta) \simeq \mathbf{Rfib}(\Delta)$ between presheaves and right fibrations, Lemma 2.1.2 gives us that $j_!(1)$ is $\text{Arr}^{\text{act}}(\Delta)^{\text{cart}} \rightarrow \Delta$, and by Lemma 2.2.3 this is equivalent to $\text{el}(B\mathbb{N}) \rightarrow \Delta$, as asserted. The result can also be proved by a direct calculation using Lemma 2.1.4: In simplicial degree k we have

$$j_!(1)_k = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Hom}_{\Delta_{\text{act}}}([k], [n]) \cong \mathbb{N}^k,$$

where the isomorphism sends $f: [k] \rightarrow [n]$ to $(f(i) - f(i-1))_{1 \leq i \leq k}$. It then remains to describe the face and degeneracy maps. \square

Proposition 2.3.2. *If $A \rightarrow B$ is a map of $\Delta_{\text{inert}}^{\text{op}}$ -diagrams, then $j_!(A) \rightarrow j_!(B)$ is CULF.*

Proof. By standard arguments (see [20, Lemma 4.1]) it is enough to show that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the naturality square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} j_!(A)_k & \longrightarrow & j_!(A)_1 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ j_!(B)_k & \longrightarrow & j_!(B)_1 \end{array}$$

is a pullback. We establish this by showing that the fibers of the two horizontal maps are equivalent (for every point $x \in j_!(A)_1$). Let us compute the fiber of the top map. By the explicit formula in Corollary 2.1.4, this map is

$$\sum_{[k] \rightarrow [n]} A_n \longrightarrow \sum_{[1] \rightarrow [n]} A_n$$

given on the indexing sets by precomposition with the (unique) active map $[1] \rightarrow [k]$ and on the summands by the identity map $A_n \rightarrow A_n$. The fiber is thus discrete, given by the finite set $\text{Hom}_{\Delta_{\text{act}}}([k], [n])$ of active maps from $[k]$ to $[n]$. In particular, the fiber does not depend on the point $x \in A_n$, and indeed does not even depend on A , only on n . It is therefore the same for B . \square

Lemma 2.3.1 states that $j_!(1) = B\mathbb{N}$. Since $B\mathbb{N}$ is a Möbius decomposition space (in fact even a Möbius category in the sense of Leroux [43]), and since anything CULF over a Möbius decomposition space is again a Möbius decomposition space [21, Prop. 6.5], it follows from Proposition 2.3.2 that:

Corollary 2.3.3. *For any $A: \Delta_{\text{inert}}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$, the left Kan extension $j_!(A): \Delta^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ is a Möbius decomposition space, called the free decomposition space associated to A .*

3 Main theorem

In this section we prove the main theorem, that left Kan extension along the inclusion $j: \mathbb{A}_{\text{inert}} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ induces an equivalence $j_!: \mathbf{PrSh}(\mathbb{A}_{\text{inert}}) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathbf{Decomp}_{/B\mathbb{N}}$. We also show that in fact the CULF map to $B\mathbb{N}$ is unique if it exists, and as a result the forgetful functor $\mathbf{Decomp}_{/B\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Decomp}$ is fully faithful. Combining these results we see that actually $j_!: \mathbf{PrSh}(\mathbb{A}_{\text{inert}}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Decomp}$ itself is fully faithful.

3.1 Untwisting theorem

We briefly reproduce the main result of [26].

3.1.1. Edgewise subdivision and twisted arrow categories. The edgewise subdivision $\text{sd}(X)$ of a simplicial space $X: \mathbb{A}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ is given by precomposing with the functor $Q: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$, $[n] \mapsto [2n + 1]$; see [26]. In particular, $\text{sd}(X)_0 = X_1$ and $\text{sd}(X)_1 = X_3$. When X is a decomposition space then $\text{sd}(X)$ is in fact a Segal space (and conversely [9]); it is then denoted $\text{tw}(X)$. Furthermore, sd takes CULF maps to right fibrations. When X is the nerve of a category (or Segal space), then $\text{sd}(X)$ is the nerve of the twisted arrow category.

There is a natural transformation $\lambda: \text{el} \Rightarrow \text{tw}$ from the category of elements to the twisted arrow category [26], given on objects by sending $\Delta^n \rightarrow X$ (an object in $\text{el}(X)$) to the composite $\Delta^1 \rightarrow \Delta^n \rightarrow X$ (an object in $\text{tw}(X)$).²

Theorem 3.1.2 ([26]). *For D a decomposition space, there is a natural equivalence of ∞ -categories*

$$\mathbf{Decomp}_{/D} \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathbf{Rfib}(\text{tw } D).$$

In the forward direction, it takes a CULF map $X \rightarrow D$ to $\text{tw}(X) \rightarrow \text{tw}(D)$. In the backward direction it is given essentially (modulo some translations involving nerves and elements) by pullback along λ .

In more detail, given a right fibration $X \rightarrow \text{tw}(D)$, in the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \lambda^*(X) & \longrightarrow & X \\ f \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\ \text{el}(D) & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & \text{tw}(D) \\ \downarrow & & \\ \mathbb{A} & & \end{array}$$

the simplicial map associated to f (a map of right fibrations over \mathbb{A}) is shown to be CULF.

We shall need the theorem only in the very special case where D is $B\mathbb{N}$, and give an explicit description of λ in this case.

²The natural transformation λ goes back to Thomason's *Notebook 85* [55], where it is described in the special case of the nerve of a 1-category.

3.2 Equivalence between $\Delta_{\text{inert}}^{\text{op}}$ -diagrams and decomposition spaces over $B\mathbb{N}$

Theorem 3.2.1. *The $j_!$ construction induces an equivalence of ∞ -categories*

$$\mathbf{PrSh}(\Delta_{\text{inert}}) \simeq \mathbf{Decomp}_{/B\mathbb{N}}.$$

Corollary 3.2.2. *A decomposition space is free if and only if it admits a CULF map to $B\mathbb{N}$.*

Proof of Theorem 3.2.1. Theorem 3.1.2 and Lemma 2.2.2 give us equivalences

$$\mathbf{Decomp}_{/B\mathbb{N}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{Rfib}(\text{tw } B\mathbb{N}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{PrSh}(\Delta_{\text{inert}}).$$

It only remains to see that the inverse equivalence is actually given by $j_!$.

To this end, for $A \in \mathbf{PrSh}(\Delta_{\text{inert}})$ and $\tilde{A} \rightarrow \Delta_{\text{inert}}$ its associated right fibration, we need to match up the diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \lambda^*(\tilde{A}) & \longrightarrow & \tilde{A} \\ \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\ \text{el}(B\mathbb{N}) & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & \text{tw}(B\mathbb{N}) \\ \downarrow & & \\ \Delta & & \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} j_!(\tilde{A}) & \longrightarrow & \tilde{A} \\ \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\ \text{Arr}^{\text{act}}(\Delta)^{\text{cart}} & \xrightarrow{\text{codom}} & \Delta_{\text{inert}} \\ \text{dom} \downarrow & & \\ \Delta & & \end{array}$$

because the first diagram computes the inverse equivalence according to Theorem 3.1.2, whereas the second diagram computes $j_!$ according to 2.1.3. But this is the content of the following lemma. \square

Lemma 3.2.3. *The identifications $\text{Arr}^{\text{act}}(\Delta)^{\text{cart}} \simeq \text{el}(B\mathbb{N})$ (Lemma 2.2.3) and $\Delta_{\text{inert}} \simeq \text{tw}(B\mathbb{N})$ (Lemma 2.2.2) are compatible with the maps λ and codom :*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{el}(B\mathbb{N}) & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & \text{tw}(B\mathbb{N}) \\ \simeq \downarrow & & \downarrow \simeq \\ \text{Arr}^{\text{act}}(\Delta)^{\text{cart}} & \xrightarrow{\text{codom}} & \Delta_{\text{inert}}. \end{array}$$

Proof. On objects, start with an element (n_1, \dots, n_k) in $\text{el}(B\mathbb{N})$ (lying over $[k] \in \Delta$). The component of λ takes this to the long edge, which is just the sum $n := \sum_{i=1}^k n_i$, which is an object of $\text{tw}(B\mathbb{N})$. Under the identification in Lemma 2.2.2, this corresponds to the object $[n] \in \Delta_{\text{inert}}$. The other way around: via the identification of Lemma 2.2.3, $(n_1, \dots, n_k) \in \text{el}(B\mathbb{N})$ corresponds to $[k] \rightarrow [n]$, whose codomain is $[n] \in \Delta_{\text{inert}}$.

To see that the diagram commutes also on morphisms is a bit more involved. A morphism in $\text{el}(B\mathbb{N})$ is the data of $\Delta^h \xrightarrow{\phi} \Delta^k \xrightarrow{(n_1, \dots, n_k)} B\mathbb{N}$. To compute λ

(see [26] for details), we first need to write down the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\Delta^1 & \xrightarrow{d^\top d^\perp} & \Delta^3 & & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \\
\Delta^h & \xrightarrow{\phi} & \Delta^k & & 0 & \phi(0) & \phi(h) & k
\end{array}$$

The value of λ is now the 3-simplex $\Delta^3 \rightarrow B\mathbb{N}$ given by composition, namely the 3-tuple

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\phi(0)} n_i, \sum_{i=\phi(0)+1}^{\phi(h)} n_i, \sum_{i=\phi(h)+1}^k n_i \right) =: (a, m, b).$$

Under the identification in Lemma 2.2.2, this is the inert map $[m] \xrightarrow{(d^\perp)^a (d^\top)^b} [n]$.

The other way around: starting again with the morphism $\Delta^h \xrightarrow{\phi} \Delta^k \xrightarrow{(n_1, \dots, n_k)}$ $B\mathbb{N}$ in $\text{el}(B\mathbb{N})$, under the identification of Lemma 2.2.3 the corresponding morphism in $\text{Arr}^{\text{act}}(\Delta)^{\text{cart}}$ is the commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
[h] & \longrightarrow & [k] \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
[m] & \xrightarrow{\quad} & [n]
\end{array}$$

given by active-inert factorization of the composite $[h] \rightarrow [k] \rightarrow [n]$, so we have

$$m = \sum_{i=\phi(0)+1}^{\phi(h)} n_i,$$

and the inclusion is given by writing $n = a + m + b$ where $a = \sum_{i=1}^{\phi(0)} n_i$ and $b = \sum_{i=\phi(h)+1}^k n_i$. This is the same inert map as we found above. \square

3.3 Fully faithfulness

Recall from [21, §6] that the *length* of a 1-simplex $f \in X_1$ is by definition the biggest dimension of a nondegenerate simplex σ such that f is the long edge of σ . If every 1-simplex has finite length, then it defines the *length-filtration* on X , which is a function $X_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. As mentioned in 1.2.4, a decomposition space with length filtration is Möbius if it is furthermore locally finite.

Lemma 3.3.1. *If $Y \rightarrow X$ is a CULF map of decomposition spaces, and if X is Möbius, then Y is Möbius again, and moreover the length filtration of Y is induced from that of X (by precomposition).*

Proof. The first statement is Proposition 6.5 of [21]. The more precise statement that in fact the length filtration of Y is induced from that of X follows from the

main ingredient in the proof of that Prop. 6.5, namely the fact (Proposition 2.11 of [21]) that CULF maps preserve and reflect nondegenerate simplices. But the length filtration is defined entirely in terms of dimensions of nondegenerate simplices. \square

Next note that $B\mathbb{N}$ admits the length filtration tautologically: the length of a 1-simplex $n \in (B\mathbb{N})_1$ is clearly n . Now if we are given a CULF map $\phi: X \rightarrow B\mathbb{N}$, then by the lemma $\phi_1: X_1 \rightarrow (B\mathbb{N})_1 = \mathbb{N}$ is the length filtration. In particular, if we have two CULF maps ϕ and ψ , then they must agree in simplicial degree 1, since the notion of length is intrinsic to X . But if they agree in simplicial degree 1, then they must in fact agree in all degrees, as seen from the coincidence of the two commutative squares

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X_n & \longrightarrow & \prod_{i=1}^n X_1 \\ \phi_n \stackrel{?}{=} \psi_n \downarrow & & \downarrow \Pi \phi_1 = \Pi \psi_1 \\ (B\mathbb{N})_n & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \prod_{i=1}^n (B\mathbb{N})_1. \end{array}$$

In conclusion we have established the following result.

Lemma 3.3.2. *If a decomposition space admits a CULF map to $B\mathbb{N}$, then it admits precisely one such map.*

Proposition 3.3.3. *The forgetful functor $\mathbf{Decomp}_{/B\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Decomp}$ is fully faithful.*

Proof. The mapping space from $\phi: X \rightarrow B\mathbb{N}$ to $\phi': X' \rightarrow B\mathbb{N}$ of the slice ∞ -category $\mathbf{Decomp}_{/B\mathbb{N}}$ is calculated by the fiber sequence

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Map}_{/B\mathbb{N}}(\phi, \phi') & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Map}(X, X') \\ \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \mathrm{post} \phi' \\ 1 & \xrightarrow{\tau_{\phi^{-1}}} & \mathrm{Map}(X, B\mathbb{N}). \end{array}$$

The bottom horizontal map, which picks out the unique map ϕ , is an equivalence by Lemma 3.3.2, so by pullback also the top horizontal map is an equivalence, which is the statement of fully faithfulness. \square

In conjunction with Theorem 3.2.1 we get

Corollary 3.3.4. *The functor $j_1: \mathbf{PrSh}(\Delta_{\mathrm{inert}}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Decomp}$ is fully faithful.*

4 Miscellaneous results

4.1 Remarks about sheaves

We have shown that $j_!(A)$ is always a decomposition space. In this subsection we analyze under what conditions it is actually Segal.

It is well known (see e.g. [4] or [36]) that Δ_{inert} (interpreted as the category of nonempty linear graphs) has a Grothendieck topology for which a family of arrows constitute a covering when it is jointly surjective on vertices and edges. The elementary graphs are [0] (the vertex) and [1] (the edge), and every linear graph is canonically covered by its elementary subgraphs. We get in this way a canonical equivalence

$$\mathbf{PrSh}(\Delta_{\text{el}}) \simeq \mathbf{Sh}(\Delta_{\text{inert}})$$

given by left Kan extension along the (full) inclusion $\Delta_{\text{el}} \subset \Delta_{\text{inert}}$ of the category of elementary graphs. Note that $\mathbf{PrSh}(\Delta_{\text{el}})$ is the category of graphs.

Proposition 4.1.1. *The free decomposition space $j_!(A) : \Delta^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ is Segal if and only if $A : \Delta_{\text{inert}}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ is a sheaf.*

Proof. The Segal map for $X := j_!(A)$ is (for each k) the map

$$X_k \longrightarrow X_1 \times_{X_0} \cdots \times_{X_0} X_1. \quad (3)$$

Lemma 2.1.4 gives

$$X_k = \sum_{\alpha: [k] \rightarrow [n]} A_n$$

on the left, whereas the right-hand side unpacks to

$$\left(\sum_{n_1} A_{n_1} \right) \times_{A_0} \cdots \times_{A_0} \left(\sum_{n_k} A_{n_k} \right) = \sum_{(n_1, \dots, n_k)} (A_{n_1} \times_{A_0} \cdots \times_{A_0} A_{n_k}).$$

The Segal map is the specific combination of inert maps

$$\sum_{\alpha: [k] \rightarrow [n]} A_n \longrightarrow \sum_{(n_1, \dots, n_k)} (A_{n_1} \times_{A_0} \cdots \times_{A_0} A_{n_k})$$

given by sending the α -summand to the (n_1, \dots, n_k) -summand via the map

$$(\gamma_1^\alpha, \dots, \gamma_k^\alpha)^* : A_n \longrightarrow A_{n_1} \times_{A_0} \cdots \times_{A_0} A_{n_k}.$$

Recall from 1.1.2 that the maps γ_i^α are the maps appearing in the active-inert factorization of $\alpha \circ \rho_i$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} [1] & \cdots \cdots \cdots \rightarrow & [n_i] \\ \rho_i \downarrow & & \downarrow \gamma_i^\alpha \\ [k] & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & [n] \end{array}$$

The families $\{\gamma_i^\alpha \mid i \in [k]\}$ are precisely the reduced coverings of $[n]$, so if A is a sheaf, all the maps $(\gamma_1^\alpha, \dots, \gamma_k^\alpha)^*$ are thus equivalences, and therefore the Segal map, which is the sum of them all, is an equivalence, which is to say that X is Segal. Conversely, if X is Segal, all these maps $(\gamma_1^\alpha, \dots, \gamma_k^\alpha)^*$ are equivalences, ensuring that A is a sheaf. \square

This result is only slightly more precise than the following classical result:

Corollary 4.1.2 (Street [54]). *A category admits a CULF functor to \mathbf{BN} if and only if it is the free category on a directed graph.*

The following corollary may be surprising at first sight:

Corollary 4.1.3. *$A : \Delta_{\text{inert}}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ is a sheaf if and only if $j^* j_!(A) : \Delta_{\text{inert}}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ is a sheaf.*

Proof. It is well known that a simplicial space $X : \Delta^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ is Segal if and only if $j^* X : \Delta_{\text{inert}}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ is a sheaf [4]. The result now follows from Proposition 4.1.1. \square

4.2 Restriction \mathbb{L} -species

We briefly comment on the relationship between free decomposition spaces and certain species.

4.2.1. Restriction species. A *combinatorial species* [33], [6], [1] is a functor $F : \mathbb{B} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$, where \mathbb{B} is the groupoid of finite sets and bijections. An *F-structure* on a finite set S is by definition an element in $F[S]$. Standard examples of *F-structures* are lists, trees, permutations, and so on. The theory of species is an objective approach to exponential generating functions. In order to get a comultiplication of the set of *F-structures*, F should furthermore be contravariantly functorial in injections: Schmitt [50] thus defined a *restriction species* to be a functor $R : \mathbb{I}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$. For $G \in R[S]$ an *R-structure* on a finite set S , the comultiplication is then given by

$$\Delta(G) = \sum_{A+B=S} G|A \otimes G|B \quad (4)$$

where the sum is over all splittings of the underlying set into two disjoint subsets, and where $G|A$ denotes the restriction of G along $A \subset S$.

Schmitt's construction was subsumed in decomposition space theory in [23], where the following more general notion was also introduced, covering many interesting examples. Let \mathbb{C} denote the category of finite posets and convex monotone injections, i.e. full sub-poset inclusions $f : C \rightarrow P$ for which intermediate points between points in C are again in C . A *directed restriction species* is a functor $\mathbb{C}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$. The resulting comultiplication formula is very similar to (4), except that the sum is now over splittings where A is required to be a downward closed sub-poset and B an upward closed sub-poset. Schmitt's restriction species are the special case of directed restriction species supported on discrete posets.

4.2.2. \mathbb{L} -species and restriction \mathbb{L} -species. There is another special case, which covers many of the examples of free decomposition spaces listed below, namely those directed restriction species that are supported on linear orders. Classically [6, Ch. 5], *\mathbb{L} -species* are functors $\mathbb{L}^{\text{iso}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$, where \mathbb{L}^{iso} is the groupoid of linear orders and monotone bijections (this groupoid is of course discrete). Where species provide a combinatorial theory for exponential generating functions, \mathbb{L} -species do the same for ordinary generating functions [6, Ch. 5].

Combining the notions of directed restriction species and \mathbb{L} -species, we arrive at the notion of *restriction \mathbb{L} -species*, defined to be functors

$$\mathbb{L}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set},$$

where now \mathbb{L} denotes the category of linear orders and convex monotone injections. The point is that the category \mathbb{L} has a presentation like this:

$$\underline{0} \longrightarrow \underline{1} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{d^\top} \\ \xleftarrow{d^\perp} \end{array} \underline{2} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{d^\top} \\ \xleftarrow{d^\perp} \end{array} \underline{3} \quad \dots \quad d^\top d^\perp = d^\perp d^\top.$$

Comparing with the presentation for Δ_{inert} (see (2) in §2.1), we have:

Proposition 4.2.3. *A restriction \mathbb{L} -species is the same thing as a functor $A : \Delta_{\text{inert}}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ for which the two face maps $A_0 \xleftarrow{\quad} A_1$ coincide.*

The upshot is that restriction \mathbb{L} -species can be given as input to the free decomposition space construction $j_!$. In particular, presheaves $A : \Delta_{\text{inert}}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ for which $A_0 = *$ can be regarded as restriction \mathbb{L} -species, as will be the case in many of the examples below.

5 Examples in combinatorics

The following selection of examples serves to illustrate the nature of free decomposition spaces as a common origin of comultiplications of deconcatenation type.³ The prototypical example (cf. 5.1.3 below) is that of splitting a word into a prefix and a postfix in all ways, essentially undoing the familiar operation of concatenation. Note however that in many of the examples, the deconcatenation does not arise from a concatenation! More precisely, in these cases the free decomposition space is not Segal.

All the simplicial spaces in this section are actually simplicial sets.

5.1 Paths and words

5.1.1. Graphs and paths. For any directed graph (quiver) $A_0 \xleftarrow{\quad} A_1$, put

$$A_n = A_1 \times_{A_0} \cdots \times_{A_0} A_1, \quad n \geq 2.$$

This is the length- n path space of the graph. Since $A : \Delta_{\text{inert}}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is a sheaf by construction, $X := j_!(A)$ is a category, by Proposition 4.1.1; it is of course the free category on the graph.

This example is the starting point for a wealth of variations, some more exotic than others. As a first variation, we can decide to truncate at some length, so as to allow only paths that are of length at most r , that is, setting

³Since these comultiplications are often the very simplest aspect of the combinatorial structure in question, we do not pretend to have made any contribution to the various application areas.

$A_n = A_1 \times_{A_0} \cdots \times_{A_0} A_1$, for $2 \leq n \leq r$ and $A_n = \emptyset$ for $n > r$. This is clearly still a valid $\Delta_{\text{inert}}^{\text{op}}$ -diagram, but the resulting free decomposition space is no longer Segal. Truncations like this were considered by Bergner et al. [8]. An extreme case of this is to truncate at $n = 1$, keeping only the graph itself $A_0 \xleftarrow{\quad} A_1$ and setting $A_n = \emptyset$ for $n \geq 2$. The resulting free decomposition space $X := j_1(A)$ was considered already by Dyckerhoff and Kapranov [16, Ex. 3.1.1].

5.1.2. Shifting up and shifting down. Further variations can be obtained by shifting A up or down before applying j_i . For example, we can define A' by shifting up all spaces, putting $A'_0 = *$ and letting $A'_n := A_{n-1}$. When taking now $X := j_1(A')$ we get

$$X_0 = *, \quad X_1 = * + \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n$$

and also

$$X_2 = * + \sum_{n_1+n_2 \geq 1} A_{n_1+n_2-1} = * + \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n + \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_{n+1} + \sum_{n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}} A_{n_1+n_2+1}.$$

Easier to understand is the shifting down, setting $A'_n := A_{n+1}$. This can be described by starting with $A_1 \xleftarrow{\quad} A_2$, and then observe that $A_3 = A_1 \times_{A_0} A_1 \times_{A_0} A_1 = A_2 \times_{A_1} A_2$. We see that A' is the path space on another graph, namely the graph whose vertices are the old edges, and where an edge from f to g is a 2-path in which f is the first leg and g is the second leg. When we now set $X := j_1(A')$ we get for X_1 the set of all paths of length ≥ 1 , and for X_2 the set of paths with a marked step. The inner face map forgets the mark. The face map d_0 deletes all steps before the marked edge e and keeps e and all following steps. The face map d_2 deletes everything after e , and keeps everything up to and including e . (This $X := j_1(A')$ is actually (the nerve of) a preorder on the set of edges: we can say that $f \leq g$ if $d_0(f) = d_1(g)$.)

Similarly the path $\Delta_{\text{inert}}^{\text{op}}$ -diagram of a quiver can be shifted down d places. Then X_1 is the set of all paths of length $\geq d$, and X_2 is the set of all paths of length $\geq d$ with a marked d -path somewhere in the middle. The resulting comultiplication will then comultiply a path by selecting a d -path γ somewhere inside it, and then returning the prefix (including γ) on the left, and returning the postfix (also including γ) on the right. The group-like elements are thus the d -paths.

5.1.3. Words. Let S be an alphabet, whose elements we call *symbols*, reserving the term *letter* for the entries of a word. (Thus *cbabb* is a 5-letter word comprising three symbols.) Although words in an alphabet can be seen as special cases of paths in a graph, namely in graphs with only one vertex $* \xleftarrow{\quad} S$, this case deserves special mention for its importance in combinatorics. We define $W(S): \Delta_{\text{inert}}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ by letting $W(S)_n$ be the set of words of length n ; the face maps delete the first or last letter. In the resulting free decomposition space $X := j_1(W(S))$, we have X_1 the set of all words, and X_2 the set of all words with a splitting, say $s_1 s_2 s_3 | s_4 s_5$, and the outer face maps return those prefix and

postfix words. The comultiplication of the incidence coalgebra is the standard deconcatenation, splitting a word in all possible ways into two parts.

This example is actually Segal. But we can disturb it by the same techniques: truncate (say, to allow only words of length between 4 and 13); that is, put the words of length 4 in degree 0, etc. The comultiplication in the incidence coalgebra will now sum over all ways to select a (convex) 4-letter subword (so that's a middle part), and then include that middle subword in both tensor factors of the comultiplication.

An interesting special case of this is *nonempty words*. This is to put the length- n words in degree $n - 1$. Here the resulting comultiplication splits a word at a letter (not between two letters), and that letter then forms part of both sides of the split. (This coalgebra came up recently in connection with the Baez–Dolan construction [38].) This decomposition space can easily be interpreted as a category: the objects are the symbols, and a word from x to y is any word whose first letter is x and whose last letter is y . Such arrows are composed by gluing words along their one-letter overlap.

5.1.4. Quasi-symmetric functions, I. When the alphabet is $S = \mathbb{N}_+$, the set of positive integers, then the decomposition space

$$Q := j_!(\mathbb{W}\mathbb{N}_+)$$

is the decomposition space whose incidence coalgebra is the coalgebra of quasi-symmetric functions QSym in the M -basis [18]. Recall (for example from [53]) that quasi-symmetric functions are certain power series of bounded degree in countably many variables x_1, x_2, \dots : for each word $w \in Q_1$ of length k there is a quasi-symmetric function

$$M_w := \sum_{i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k} x_{i_1}^{w_1} x_{i_2}^{w_2} \cdots x_{i_k}^{w_k},$$

and the ring of quasi-symmetric functions is the linear span of these so-called *monomial* quasi-symmetric functions M_w . The set Q_1 of all words in \mathbb{N}_+ thus indexes this *monomial basis*. For example, to a word such as (23114) corresponds the quasi-symmetric function $M_{23114} = \sum_{i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_5} x_{i_1}^2 x_{i_2}^3 x_{i_3}^1 x_{i_4}^1 x_{i_5}^4$. Although the actual power series are important in many applications, the algebraic structure is governed by the combinatorics of words in \mathbb{N}_+ (in the M -basis and in several related bases), and in the following we shall not need the actual power series. In particular the coalgebra structure of QSym can be described purely in terms of words: the comultiplication is simply word splitting (deconcatenation). (This is not the most interesting aspect of the Hopf algebra of quasi-symmetric functions, but it is the aspect that arises from a free decomposition space.)

5.1.5. WQSym and FQSym. Word quasi-symmetric functions and free quasi-symmetric functions are certain variations of the previous example. We shall not give the definitions here, but content ourselves to describe the combinatorics of the comultiplications in these Hopf algebras. (The decomposition spaces here are still from [18], but the $j_!$ interpretation is new.) We continue with the ordered

alphabet $S = \mathbb{N}_+$. A word is *packed* if whenever a symbol occurs in it, then all smaller symbols occur too. If the first or last letter of a packed word is omitted, and if that letter was the only occurrence of a symbol, then the result is not again a packed word, but there is a canonical way to ‘pack’ it, by shifting down all bigger symbols. With this prescription the sets A_n of packed words of length n assemble into a $\Delta_{\text{inert}}^{\text{op}}$ -diagram, and we get a free decomposition space $X := j_!(A)$, where X_1 is the set of all packed words, and X_2 is the set of all packed words with a word splitting. The resulting comultiplication is that of the F -basis in the Hopf algebra of word quasi-symmetric functions WQSym (cf. [7], [29]).

The same arguments apply to packed words without repetition of symbols. A packed word without repetition is the same thing as a permutation. We obtain the comultiplication of the Hopf algebra FQSym (free quasi-symmetric functions, also called the Malvenuto–Reutenauer Hopf algebra, after [46]), in the F -basis.

There is a different way to assemble packed words into a free decomposition space: let A_n denote the set of packed words on n symbols (any length), and let d_{\top} delete all occurrences of the largest symbol, and let d_{\perp} delete all occurrences of the smallest symbol (decrementing all larger symbols, for the word to remain packed). The resulting free decomposition space $X := j_!(A)$ has X_1 the set of all packed words, and X_2 the set of all packed words with a linear splitting of the set of employed symbols into what we can call lower and upper symbols. Now $d_2 : X_2 \rightarrow X_1$ deletes from a word all upper symbols, while d_0 deletes all lower symbols (decrementing the remaining symbols until the word is packed again).

5.1.6. Parking functions. A *parking function* (see [52]) is a word w in the alphabet \mathbb{N}_+ such that if reordered to form a monotone word m , then we have $m_i \leq i, \forall i$. Let A_n denote the set of parking functions of length n . The face maps are defined by deleting the first or last letter. This may violate the parking condition, but there is a canonical way to ‘parkify,’ by shifting down all bigger symbols (see [47] for details). With this prescription the sets A_n assemble into a $\Delta_{\text{inert}}^{\text{op}}$ -diagram, and we get a free decomposition space $X := j_!(A)$. Here X_1 is the set of all parking functions, and X_2 is the set of all parking function with a word splitting. The resulting comultiplication is that of the F -basis in the Hopf algebra of parking quasi-symmetric functions PQSym of [47].

There is another way to assemble parking functions into a $\Delta_{\text{inert}}^{\text{op}}$ -diagram. A *breakpoint* of a length- ℓ parking function is an $i \in \{0, \dots, \ell\}$ such that there are exactly b occurrences of symbols smaller or equal to i . For example the breakpoints of the parking function 162436166 are 0, 5, 9. Let A_n denote the set of parking functions (of any length) with precisely $n + 1$ breakpoints. There are face maps $A_{n-1} \xleftarrow{\quad} A_n$ given as follows: if the breakpoints of w are $(0 = b_0, \dots, b_n = \ell)$, then d_{\top} deletes all occurrences of symbols $> b_{n-1}$, and d_{\perp} deletes all occurrences of symbols $\leq b_1$; this involves parkification. The resulting $X := j_!(A)$ has X_1 the set of all parking functions, and X_2 the set of all parking functions with a chosen breakpoint. The resulting comultiplication is that of the G -basis in the Hopf algebra of parking quasi-symmetric functions PQSym (see [47] again).

5.1.7. Functorialities. All the constructions are functorial: given a homomorphism of graphs $G \rightarrow H$, there is induced a CULF map $X_G \rightarrow X_H$, and this works for all the variations mentioned.

Similarly, given a map of alphabets $S \rightarrow T$, there is induced a CULF functor for the associated free decomposition spaces $j_!(WS) \rightarrow j_!(WT)$. In particular, it is an interesting case when the alphabet S is positively graded, meaning that it has a map to \mathbb{N}_+ . This gives a CULF map $j_!(WS) \rightarrow j_!(W\mathbb{N}_+) = Q$, the decomposition space for QSym , which we shall come back to below.

For a graph $V \xrightarrow{\text{---}} E$, consider words on the set of edges E . Then there is a morphism of $\Delta_{\text{inert}}^{\text{op}}$ -diagrams from paths to words. This can be seen as coming from the graph homomorphism from $V \xrightarrow{\text{---}} E$ to $1 \xrightarrow{\text{---}} E$ (collapsing all vertices to a single vertex).

5.2 Further examples of deconcatenations


5.2.1. Noncrossing partitions. A partition $\pi = \{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_k\}$ of a linearly ordered set $\mathbf{n} = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ is called *noncrossing* where there are no $a, b \in \pi_i$ and $c, d \in \pi_j$ with $i \neq j$ such that $a < c < b < d$. For example, the partition $\{\{1\}, \{2, 4\}, \{3\}\} = \text{||}\downarrow$ is noncrossing, whereas $\{\{1, 3\}, \{2, 4\}\} = \text{||}\downarrow$ is crossing. The $a < c < b < d$ condition is just the formalization of the intuitive idea of crossing in such pictures (see [52] for background).

Let A_n denote the set of noncrossing partitions of \mathbf{n} . Given a noncrossing partition $\pi \in A_n$, one can obtain a new noncrossing partition in A_{n-1} by deleting the element $n \in \mathbf{n}$, or by deleting the element $1 \in \mathbf{n}$ (and then standardizing by shifting all the elements one down). These assignments define the face maps of a $\Delta_{\text{inert}}^{\text{op}}$ -diagram, and we get thus a free decomposition space $X := j_!(A)$, where X_1 is the set of all noncrossing partitions, and X_2 is the set of all noncrossing partitions with a marked gap: a *gap* of \mathbf{n} just a natural number g from 0 to n thought of as splitting the elements into those $\leq g$ and those $> g$. The resulting comultiplication is given (for $\pi \in A_n$) by


$$\Delta(\pi) = \sum_{\mathbf{a}+\mathbf{b}=\mathbf{n}} \pi|_{\mathbf{a}} \otimes \pi|_{\mathbf{b}}.$$

Here the sum is over the splitting of \mathbf{n} into an initial segment and a final segment, and $\pi|_{\mathbf{a}}$ and $\pi|_{\mathbf{b}}$ denote the restriction of π to these two subsets (and standardizing).


5.2.2. Dyck paths. A *Dyck path* is a lattice path in $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ starting at $(0, 0)$ and ending at $(2\ell, 0)$ (for some $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$), taking only steps of type $(1, 1)$ and $(1, -1)$. The height of a Dyck path is the maximal second coordinate. Let A_n be the set of Dyck paths (varying ℓ) of height n . The face maps $A_n \xrightarrow{\text{---}} A_{n+1}$ are given by clipping the path, either at the top or at the bottom, and sliding the disconnected pieces left (and down) until they meet up again, as exemplified here at $A_3 \xrightarrow{\text{---}} A_4$:



Then $X := j_1(A)$ has X_1 the set of all Dyck paths (all lengths and all heights), X_2 is the set of all Dyck paths with a marked level, and more generally X_k is the set of all Dyck paths with $k - 1$ marked levels (which may coincide). The inner face maps delete a level marking (without affecting the path), whereas the outer face maps clip the path outside the outermost level. For example, the outer face maps involved in the formula for comultiplication in the incidence coalgebra, namely $X_1 \xleftarrow{\quad} X_2$, are exemplified here:



There is another way to assemble Dyck paths into a free decomposition space: A *baseline point* of a Dyck path is one with second coordinate 0. Let A_n be the set of Dyck paths (any length and height) with $n - 1$ baseline points (and A_0 consists of the trivial Dyck path). Then $X := j_1(A)$ has in degree 1 the set of all Dyck paths, and in degree 2 the set of all Dyck paths with a chosen baseline point. The inner face maps forget baseline points, and the outer face maps delete the portion before the first or after the last chosen baseline point. For example



This construction is actually just an instance of the general word example, namely where the alphabet is the set of irreducible Dyck paths (meaning Dyck paths whose only baseline points are the start and the finish). The first construction is not of this form, as can be seen by the fact that an element in X_2 contains more information than its two layers.

5.2.3. Layered posets (and quasi-symmetric functions, II). An \mathbf{n} -layered poset is a poset P equipped with a monotone map to an ordinal \mathbf{n} ; the fibers of this map are referred to as layers. Let A_n denote the set of (iso-classes of) \mathbf{n} -layered posets. We define face maps $A_{n-1} \xleftarrow{\quad} A_n$ by deleting all elements in layer n , respectively deleting all elements in layer 1 (and then shifting down all layers to obtain an $(\mathbf{n} - \mathbf{1})$ -layered poset. In the resulting free decomposition space $X := j_1(A)$, we have X_1 the set of all layered posets (for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$) and X_2 the set of layered posets with an ordinal-sum splitting of the ordinal \mathbf{n} into a initial segment and a final segment. The resulting comultiplication is given by

$$\Delta(P) = \sum_{\mathbf{a}+\mathbf{b}=\mathbf{n}} P_{|\mathbf{a}} \otimes P_{|\mathbf{b}}.$$

where the sum is over ordinal-sum splittings, and $P|_{\mathbf{a}}$ and $P|_{\mathbf{b}}$ denote the restriction of P along the ordinal-sum inclusions $\mathbf{a} \subset \mathbf{n} \supset \mathbf{b}$.

Many variations on this construction are possible, for example by demanding the monotone maps $P \rightarrow \mathbf{n}$ to be injective, surjective, bijective, or by putting constraints on P . If we require P to be a linear poset and demand $P \rightarrow \mathbf{n}$ to be surjective, then we recover again the decomposition space Q of quasi-symmetric functions from Example 5.1.4. Indeed, to give a surjective monotone map $\mathbf{m} \rightarrow \mathbf{n}$ is the same as giving the length- n word (m_1, \dots, m_n) of the sizes of the layers, so that the set $A_n = \{\mathbf{m} \rightarrow \mathbf{n}\}$ is identified with $W(\mathbb{N}_+)_n$, and we end up with $j_!(A) = Q$. In fact, the viewpoint of monotone surjections is the original description of Q from [18].

5.2.4. Heap orders, scheduling, and sequential processes. In the previous class of examples, if we allow general posets P , but demand $P \rightarrow \mathbf{n}$ to be bijective, we arrive precisely at the notion of *heap-order*, i.e. a order-compatible numbering of the elements in the poset. (See also Stanley [51] who used the terminology ‘labelled posets’.) In computer science, this is also called a ‘topological sort’ [35]. They come up in connection with sorting and efficient data structures (most notably heap-ordered planar binary trees). A similar idea occurs in scheduling problems. In this case, each poset element is interpreted as a task, and the order relation of the poset expresses dependency among tasks. A map $P \rightarrow \mathbf{n}$ then encodes a scheduling of the tasks subject to the constraints.

Mild generalizations cover many other situations where one considers sequences of computation steps, such as labelled transition systems (see for example [58] or [10]), Petri nets (see for example [48]), or rewrite systems (such as double-pushout rewrite systems of graphs or other adhesive categories, as in [15]). It would take us too far afield to go into details with these examples, but the idea is clear: in each case there is a $\Delta_{\text{inert}}^{\text{op}}$ -diagram A , where A_n is the set of sequences of length n , and where the face maps shorten the sequence at its beginning or at its end. In some situations one cannot simply concatenate such sequences, but deconcatenation is always possible, and the decomposition-space viewpoint can then be fruitful (see [39] for Petri nets, and [3] for double-pushout rewriting, where freeness of the decomposition spaces actually plays a role).

5.3 Simplicies in simplicial sets

5.3.1. Decomposition space of simplicies. For any simplicial set X , one can restrict to $\Delta_{\text{inert}} \subset \Delta$ and then left Kan extend back to get the free decomposition space $j_!j^*(X)$, the decomposition space of all simplicies of X . If X is the nerve of a category, this construction gives the free category on the underlying directed graph of X . The following subtle variation is much richer, though.

5.3.2. The decomposition space of nondegenerate simplicies. Instead of considering all simplicies, we restrict to nondegenerate simplicies. Suppose that X is a simplicial set with the property that outer faces of nondegenerate simplicies are again nondegenerate.⁴ This occurs, for instance, when X is a discrete

⁴Or more generally, X could be a ‘complete stiff simplicial space’ [21, §4].

decomposition space. Let $\vec{X}_n \subset X_n$ denote the set of nondegenerate simplices. One can form the *decomposition space* $J(X)$ of nondegenerate simplices [18], by first constructing the $\Delta_{\text{inert}}^{\text{op}}$ -diagram

$$\vec{X}_0 \xleftarrow{\quad} \vec{X}_1 \xleftarrow{\quad} \vec{X}_2 \quad \cdots$$

and then setting $J(X) := j_!(\vec{X})$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} J(X)_0 &= X_0 \\ J(X)_1 &= \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \vec{X}_n, \end{aligned}$$

the set of all nondegenerate simplices in all dimensions. In higher simplicial dimension, it has *subdivided* nondegenerate simplices. Precisely, a k -simplex of $J(X)$ is a diagram

$$\Delta^k \rightarrow \Delta^n \xrightarrow{\text{nondeg}} X$$

where the second map determines the nondegenerate n -simplex in X and the active map $\Delta^k \rightarrow \Delta^n$ gives the subdivision, whereby the n -simplex is subdivided into k ‘stages.’ (Note that if X is Segal, then $J(X)$ will be Segal again.)

The decomposition space of nondegenerate simplices seems to be interesting in general. (See [3] for a recent use in rewriting theory.) One reason for its importance is the general link with quasi-symmetric functions:

5.3.3. Quasi-symmetric functions, III. In the special case where the decomposition space X is the nerve of the monoid $(\mathbb{N}, +)$, then the $\Delta_{\text{inert}}^{\text{op}}$ -diagram of nondegenerate simplices has \mathbb{N}_+^n in degree n , and the free decomposition space is

$$J(B\mathbb{N}) = Q$$

the decomposition space of words in \mathbb{N}_+ , whose incidence coalgebra is QSym , the coalgebra of quasi-symmetric functions already visited in 5.1.4 and 5.2.3 (cf. [18]).

Acknowledgments. This work was supported by a grant from the Simons Foundation (#850849, PH). JK gratefully acknowledges support from grants MTM2016-80439-P and PID2020-116481GB-I00 (AEI/FEDER, UE) of Spain and 2017-SGR-1725 of Catalonia, and was also supported through the Severo Ochoa and María de Maeztu Program for Centers and Units of Excellence in R&D grant number CEX2020-001084-M.

References

- [1] MARCELO AGUIAR and SWAPNEEL MAHAJAN. *Monoidal functors, species and Hopf algebras*, vol. 29 of CRM Monograph Series. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010. With forewords by Kenneth Brown and Stephen Chase and André Joyal. doi:10.1090/crmm/029.

- [2] DAVID AYALA and JOHN FRANCIS. *Fibrations of ∞ -categories*. High. Struct. **4** (2020), 168–265.
- [3] NICOLAS BEHR and JOACHIM KOCK. *Tracelet Hopf algebras and decomposition spaces*. In *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Applied Category Theory ACT2021 (Cambridge, 2021)*, vol. 372 of Electr. Proc. Theoret. Comput. Sci., pp. 323–337, 2022. doi:10.4204/EPTCS.372.23, arXiv:2105.06186.
- [4] CLEMENS BERGER. *A cellular nerve for higher categories*. Adv. Math. **169** (2002), 118–175. doi:10.1006/aima.2001.2056.
- [5] CLEMENS BERGER, PAUL-ANDRÉ MELLIÈS, and MARK WEBER. *Monads with arities and their associated theories*. J. Pure Appl. Algebra **216** (2012), 2029–2048. doi:10.1016/j.jpaa.2012.02.039, arXiv:1101.3064.
- [6] FRANÇOIS BERGERON, GILBERT LABELLE, and PIERRE LEROUX. *Combinatorial species and tree-like structures*, vol. 67 of Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998. Translated from the 1994 French original by Margaret Readdy, With a foreword by Gian-Carlo Rota. doi:10.1017/CBO9781107325913.
- [7] NANTEL BERGERON and MIKE ZABROCKI. *The Hopf algebras of symmetric functions and quasi-symmetric functions in non-commutative variables are free and co-free*. J. Algebra Appl. **8** (2009), 581–600. doi:10.1142/S0219498809003485, arXiv:math/0509265.
- [8] JULIA E. BERGNER, ANGÉLICA M. OSORNO, VIKTORIYA OZORNOVA, MARTINA ROVELLI, and CLAUDIA I. SCHEIMBAUER. *2-Segal sets and the Waldhausen construction*. Topology Appl. **235** (2018), 445–484. doi:10.1016/j.topol.2017.12.009, arXiv:1609.02853.
- [9] JULIA E. BERGNER, ANGÉLICA M. OSORNO, VIKTORIYA OZORNOVA, MARTINA ROVELLI, and CLAUDIA I. SCHEIMBAUER. *The edgewise subdivision criterion for 2-Segal objects*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **148** (2020), 71–82. doi:10.1090/proc/14679, arXiv:1807.05069.
- [10] J. A. Bergstra, A. Ponse, and S. A. Smolka, editors. *Handbook of process algebra*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 2001. doi:10.1016/B978-0-444-82830-9.X5017-6.
- [11] MARTA BUNGE and MARCELO FIORE. *Unique factorisation lifting functors and categories of linearly-controlled processes*. Math. Struct. Comput. Sci. **10** (2000), 137–163. doi:10.1017/S0960129599003023.
- [12] MARTA BUNGE and SUSAN NIEFIELD. *Exponentiability and single universes*. J. Pure Appl. Algebra **148** (2000), 217–250. doi:10.1016/S0022-4049(98)00172-8.

- [13] SERGEI BURKIN. *Twisted arrow categories, operads and Segal conditions*. Theory Appl. Categ. **38** (2022), Paper No. 16, 595–660.
- [14] HONGYI CHU and RUNE HAUGSENG. *Homotopy-coherent algebra via Segal conditions*. Adv. Math. **385** (2021), 107733. doi:10.1016/j.aim.2021.107733, arXiv:1907.03977.
- [15] ANDREA CORRADINI, UGO MONTANARI, FRANCESCA ROSSI, HARTMUT EHRIG, REIKO HECKEL, and MICHAEL LÖWE. *Algebraic approaches to graph transformation - Part I: basic concepts and double pushout approach*. In Grzegorz Rozenberg, editor, *Handbook of Graph Grammars and Computing by Graph Transformations, Volume 1: Foundations*, pp. 163–246. World Scientific, 1997. doi:10.1142/9789812384720_0003.
- [16] TOBIAS DYCKERHOFF and MIKHAIL KAPRANOV. *Higher Segal spaces*, vol. 2244 of Lecture Notes in Mathematics. Springer, Cham, 2019. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-27124-4, arXiv:1212.3563.
- [17] MATTHEW FELLER, RICHARD GARNER, JOACHIM KOCK, MAY U. PROULX, and MARK WEBER. *Every 2-Segal space is unital*. Commun. Contemp. Math. **23** (2021), 2050055, 6. doi:10.1142/S0219199720500558, arXiv:1905.09580.
- [18] IMMA GÁLVEZ-CARRILLO, JOACHIM KOCK, and ANDREW TONKS. *Decomposition spaces of quasi-symmetric functions*. Unpublished/in preparation.
- [19] IMMA GÁLVEZ-CARRILLO, JOACHIM KOCK, and ANDREW TONKS. *Decomposition spaces in combinatorics*. Preprint, arXiv:1612.09225.
- [20] IMMA GÁLVEZ-CARRILLO, JOACHIM KOCK, and ANDREW TONKS. *Decomposition spaces, incidence algebras and Möbius inversion I: Basic theory*. Adv. Math. **331** (2018), 952–1015. doi:10.1016/j.aim.2018.03.016, arXiv:1512.07573.
- [21] IMMA GÁLVEZ-CARRILLO, JOACHIM KOCK, and ANDREW TONKS. *Decomposition spaces, incidence algebras and Möbius inversion II: Completeness, length filtration, and finiteness*. Adv. Math. **333** (2018), 1242–1292. doi:10.1016/j.aim.2018.03.017, arXiv:1512.07577.
- [22] IMMA GÁLVEZ-CARRILLO, JOACHIM KOCK, and ANDREW TONKS. *Decomposition spaces, incidence algebras and Möbius inversion III: The decomposition space of Möbius intervals*. Adv. Math. **334** (2018), 544–584. doi:10.1016/j.aim.2018.03.018, arXiv:1512.07580.
- [23] IMMA GÁLVEZ-CARRILLO, JOACHIM KOCK, and ANDREW TONKS. *Decomposition spaces and restriction species*. Int. Math. Res. Notices **2020** (2020), 7558–7616. doi:10.1093/imrn/rny089, arXiv:1708.02570.

- [24] DAVID GEPNER, RUNE HAUGSENG, and JOACHIM KOCK. *∞ -Operads as analytic monads*. Int. Math. Res. Notices **2022** (2022), 12516–12624. doi:10.1093/imrn/rnaa332, arXiv:1712.06469.
- [25] PHILIP HACKNEY. *Segal conditions for generalized operads*. Preprint, arXiv:2208.13852, to appear in Higher Structures in Geometry, Topology and Physics, Contemp. Math. AMS.
- [26] PHILIP HACKNEY and JOACHIM KOCK. *Culf maps and edgewise subdivision*. Preprint, arXiv:2210.11191, with an appendix coauthored with Jan Steinebrunner.
- [27] PHILIP HACKNEY, MARCY ROBERTSON, and DONALD YAU. *Infinity properads and infinity wheeled properads*, vol. 2147 of Lecture Notes in Mathematics. Springer, Cham, 2015. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-20547-2, arXiv:1410.6716.
- [28] PHILIP HACKNEY, MARCY ROBERTSON, and DONALD YAU. *Modular operads and the nerve theorem*. Adv. Math. **370** (2020), 107206. doi:10.1016/j.aim.2020.107206, arXiv:1906.01144.
- [29] FLORENT HIVERT, JEAN-CHRISTOPHE NOVELLI, and JEAN-YVES THIBON. *Commutative combinatorial Hopf algebras*. J. Algebraic Combin. **28** (2008), 65–95. doi:10.1007/s10801-007-0077-0, arXiv:0605262.
- [30] TRUONG HOANG. *Quillen cohomology of enriched operads*. Preprint, arXiv:2005.01198.
- [31] PETER JOHNSTONE. *A note on discrete Conduché fibrations*. Theory Appl. Categ. **5** (1999), No. 1, 1–11.
- [32] SAJ-NICOLE A. JONI and GIAN-CARLO ROTA. *Coalgebras and bialgebras in combinatorics*. Stud. Appl. Math. **61** (1979), 93–139. doi:10.1002/sapm197961293.
- [33] ANDRÉ JOYAL. *Une théorie combinatoire des séries formelles*. Adv. Math. **42** (1981), 1–82. doi:10.1016/0001-8708(81)90052-9.
- [34] ANDRÉ JOYAL. *The theory of quasi-categories and its applications*. No. 45 in Quaderns. CRM, Barcelona, 2008. Available at <http://mat.uab.cat/~kock/crm/hocat/advanced-course/Quadern45-2.pdf>.
- [35] DONALD E. KNUTH. *The Art of Computer Programming, Vol. 1: Fundamental Algorithms*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass., third edition, 1997.
- [36] JOACHIM KOCK. *Polynomial functors and trees*. Int. Math. Res. Notices **2011** (2011), 609–673. doi:10.1093/imrn/rnq068, arXiv:0807.2874.
- [37] JOACHIM KOCK. *Graphs, hypergraphs, and properads*. Collect. Math. **67** (2016), 155–190. doi:10.1007/s13348-015-0160-0, arXiv:1407.3744.

- [38] JOACHIM KOCK. *The incidence comodule bialgebra of the Baez–Dolan construction*. Adv. Math. **383** (2021), Paper No. 107693, 79. doi:10.1016/j.aim.2021.107693, arXiv:1912.11320.
- [39] JOACHIM KOCK. *Whole-grain Petri nets and processes*. J. ACM. **70** (2022), 1–58. doi:10.1145/3559103, arXiv:2005.05108.
- [40] JOACHIM KOCK and DAVID I. SPIVAK. *Decomposition-space slices are toposes*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **148** (2020), 2317–2329. doi:10.1090/proc/14834, arXiv:1807.06000.
- [41] F. WILLIAM LAWVERE. *State categories and response functors. Dedicated to Walter Noll*. Preprint (May 1986).
- [42] F. WILLIAM LAWVERE and MATÍAS MENNI. *The Hopf algebra of Möbius intervals*. Theory Appl. Categ. **24** (2010), 221–265.
- [43] PIERRE LEROUX. *Les catégories de Möbius*. Cahiers Topol. Géom. Diff. **16** (1976), 280–282.
- [44] JACOB LURIE. *Higher topos theory*, vol. 170 of Annals of Mathematics Studies. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2009. doi:10.1515/9781400830558.
- [45] JACOB LURIE. *Higher algebra*. Available from <http://www.math.harvard.edu/~lurie/>, 2013.
- [46] CLAUDIA MALVENUTO and CHRISTOPHE REUTENAUER. *Duality between quasi-symmetric functions and the Solomon descent algebra*. J. Algebra **177** (1995), 967–982. doi:10.1006/jabr.1995.1336.
- [47] JEAN-CHRISTOPHE NOVELLI and JEAN-YVES THIBON. *Hopf algebras and dendriform structures arising from parking functions*. Fund. Math. **193** (2007), 189–241. doi:10.4064/fm193-3-1, arXiv:0511200.
- [48] WOLFGANG REISIG. *Petri Nets: An Introduction*, vol. 4 of EATCS Monographs on Theoretical Computer Science. Springer, 1985. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-69968-9.
- [49] GIAN-CARLO ROTA. *On the foundations of combinatorial theory. I. Theory of Möbius functions*. Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete **2** (1964), 340–368. doi:10.1007/BF00531932.
- [50] WILLIAM R. SCHMITT. *Hopf algebras of combinatorial structures*. Canad. J. Math. **45** (1993), 412–428. doi:10.4153/CJM-1993-021-5.
- [51] RICHARD STANLEY. *Ordered structures and partitions*. Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society, no. 119. American Mathematical Society, Providence, 1972.

- [52] RICHARD P. STANLEY. *Parking functions and noncrossing partitions*. Electron. J. Combin. **4** (1997), Research Paper 20, 1–14. The Wilf Festschrift (Philadelphia, PA, 1996). doi:10.37236/1335.
- [53] RICHARD P. STANLEY. *Enumerative combinatorics. Vol. 2*, vol. 62 of Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511609589.
- [54] ROSS STREET. *Categorical structures*. In *Handbook of algebra, Vol. 1*, pp. 529–577. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1996. doi:10.1016/S1570-7954(96)80019-2.
- [55] ROBERT THOMASON. Notebook 85, 1995. <https://www.math-info-paris.cnrs.fr/bibli/digitization-of-robert-wayne-thomasons-notebooks/>.
- [56] MARK WEBER. *Generic morphisms, parametric representations and weakly Cartesian monads*. Theory Appl. Categ. **13** (2004), 191–234.
- [57] MARK WEBER. *Familial 2-functors and parametric right adjoints*. Theory Appl. Categ. **18** (2007), 665–732.
- [58] GLYNN WINSKEL and MOGENS NIELSEN. *Models for concurrency*. In *Handbook of logic in computer science*, vol. 4, pp. 1–148. Oxford Univ. Press, New York, 1995.